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CUNEIFORM TEXTS

Plates 1–147
Bilgames and the Netherworld 172–End

The text of the Sumerian poem of Bilgames and the Netherworld (BN), known in ancient times as ṣ.u.ṣ.tīra ṣ.u.ṣ.tīra, ‘In those days, in those far-off days’, has been presented in a variorum edition by Aaron Shaffer.1 Nearly forty years have elapsed since then, and further publications have advanced our knowledge of the composition considerably. The cuneiform text of Shaffer’s MS Q, NI 9744, was published in ISET II pl. 53, while copies of MSS g, r, t and U 16878 appeared as UETVI nos. 55–8. The Jena source, MS V, has been supplemented by new joins.2 Additional manuscripts in Istanbul, London and Baghdad have become available in cuneiform over the years: ISET I pl. 199 NI 9847, ISET II pl. 51 NI 9626, CT 58 no. 54 and Cavigneaux, Ursk (AUWE 23) no. 98. The two tablets from Mē-Turan announced in 19933 have since been published alongside editions of UETVI nos. 59 and 60 from Ur,4 the latter is a manuscript that continues the poem after the place where it ends in the scribal traditions of Nippur and Mē-Turan.5 Further pieces from Nippur have been identified in Philadelphia, Chicago and Baghdad, especially during the cataloguing of the 3N-T collections from Area TA.6 Two fragments cut down from a single tablet of unknown provenance are now in the Schøyen Collection awaiting definitive publication (Fig. 15).7 A tablet from Isin is also still to be published, as are further pieces from Ur.8

That this composition was some sort of counterpart to Tablet XII of the Standard Babylonian epic was first seen by C. J. Gadd in publishing Shaffer’s MS r.7 In due course, as the Sumerian poem became better known through the efforts of Samuel Noah Kramer and others, the history of the text became clearer. The latter half of Bilgames and the

1 A. Shaffer, ‘Sumerian Sources of Tablet XII of the Epic of Gilgamesh’, PhD thesis (Pennsylvania, 1963), distributed by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor (63–7085). On the text in general see further the relevant section of Ch. 1 above.
2 Wilcke, Kollationen, pp. 19–21.
5 First revealed as such by Tourray and Shaffer, ‘L’épopée de Gilgamesh’, pp. 372–4.
7 I am grateful to M. Civit for allowing full quotation of them here, and to Mr M. Schøyen for permission to reproduce my photographs of them.
Netherworld had been translated into Akkadian prose and attached in that form to the Standard Babylonian epic as Tablet XII."

To facilitate comparison between the Sumerian poem and the Akkadian translation edited in the preceding chapter, the relevant part of the former (II/172-end) is given here in synoptic style, with the text of all manuscripts given in full for each line (Nippur sources first) and the Akkadian interpolated in transcription as if in a regular bilingual text. The sigla used for the Sumerian sources follow the series established by Shaffer (A–FF) and supplemented by Attinger (GG–KK), with capital letters for Nippur manuscripts and lower case for tablets from Ur and other sites. Manuscripts not previously given sigla follow in sequence (L–II).

All sources for II/172 ff. currently known to me in Philadelphia (MSS H, W, Z, AA, CC, DD, EE, FF, SS–UU, CCC–EEE), London (MSS r, t, k, ll, mm, nn) and Oslo (MS rr) have been studied at first hand. The results of these collations are incorporated in the transcriptions given below. Most changes to the previously available text are minor, but substantive new readings have been obtained in II/204, 228–9, 260, 266, 271, 273, 274, 276, 277, 278, 279, and s. 1. MS rr offers significant new knowledge of II/250–3 and provides for the first time the Sumerian original (p.) of the Akkadian line SB XII 150.

MANUSCRIPTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Disposal of lines</th>
<th>Publication of cuneiform text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nippur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>N 1452</td>
<td>1–27, 52–74</td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>CBS 14068</td>
<td>1–25, 26–58</td>
<td>Chiera, SEM no. 21, photograph Kramer, Sumerian Mythologies, pl. 8 (obv. only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3N-T 381</td>
<td>1–14, 23–33</td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 909y (A)35376</td>
<td>7–16</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3N-T 903, 132</td>
<td>1–10, 36–45</td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ni 4507</td>
<td>1–18, 46–64</td>
<td>Kramer in Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 4, JCS II 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ni 4249</td>
<td>1–23, 63–75, 7–8</td>
<td>Kramer, SDTN no. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>CBS 15150 + 19950</td>
<td>11–26, 62–86, 98–</td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pls. 5–6, photograph Kramer, &quot;From the Tablets of Samas&quot;, p. 140, fig. 69 (CBS 19950 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 3280 + 3474 +</td>
<td>92, 196–235, 331–48, a–q–q–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The literary history is given above, in Ch. 1.

** P. Attinger, "Bibliography of the Tablet Collections of the University Museum," p. 188.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Disposal of lines</th>
<th>Publication of cuneiform text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3N-T 557</td>
<td>13–25, 26–39</td>
<td>Shaffer, <em>Sumerian Sources</em>, pl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>3N-T 905, 198</td>
<td>13–23</td>
<td>Shaffer, <em>Sumerian Sources</em>, pl. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2513</td>
<td>40–7, 63–74</td>
<td>Chiera, <em>SRT</em> no. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>CBS 13121 + N 3137</td>
<td>65–81, 100–18</td>
<td>Radau, <em>HAV</em> no. 12, unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>HS 1445</td>
<td>75–104</td>
<td>Bernhardt, <em>TiM</em> nr III no. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ni 4354</td>
<td>106–15, 141–7</td>
<td>Kramer in Shaffer, <em>Sumerian Sources</em>, pl. 4; <em>ISET</em> II 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>CBS 9869</td>
<td>105–50</td>
<td>Chiera, <em>SEM</em> no. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>3N-T 124</td>
<td>125–69</td>
<td>Shaffer, <em>Sumerian Sources</em>, pls. 7–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ni 9744</td>
<td>126–31, ii unplaced</td>
<td>Kramer in Shaffer, <em>Sumerian Sources</em>, pl. 4; <em>ISET</em> II 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Ni 2270</td>
<td>135–59</td>
<td>Langdon, <em>BE</em> XXXI no. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>3N-T 905, 190 + 907, 262</td>
<td>138–42, 151–5</td>
<td>Shaffer, <em>Sumerian Sources</em>, pl. 10, unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>HS 1482 + 2502 + 2612</td>
<td>173–81, 204–24, 1482 only; Wülke, <em>Kollationen</em>, p. 21</td>
<td>Bernhardt, <em>TiM</em> nr III no. 14 (HS); Wülke, <em>Kollationen</em>, p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>CBS 10400</td>
<td>176–85, 237–9</td>
<td>Shaffer, <em>Sumerian Sources</em>, pl. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>UM 29-16-463 + N 2696 + 3162</td>
<td>183–97, 226–38</td>
<td>Shaffer, <em>Sumerian Sources</em>, pl. 10 (without N 2696)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>UM 29-16-58</td>
<td>188–221</td>
<td>Kramer, <em>From the Tablets of Sumer</em>, fig. 70; id., <em>History Begins at Sumer</em>, p. 259, fig. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Ni 2378</td>
<td>228–47, 252–65</td>
<td>Langdon, <em>BE</em> XXXI no. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Ni 1470</td>
<td>253–8, ii traces</td>
<td>Shaffer, <em>Sumerian Sources</em>, pl. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CBS 13116 + 15360</td>
<td>255–68, a–e, i–k, o, q–t, u</td>
<td>Radau, <em>HAV</em> no. 11 (13116 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3N-T 927, 527</td>
<td>256–62</td>
<td>Shaffer, <em>Sumerian Sources</em>, pl. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>UM 29-13-536</td>
<td>259–68, h</td>
<td>Shaffer, <em>Sumerian Sources</em>, pl. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>Ni 4585</td>
<td>234–48</td>
<td>Çığ/Kızıluyaş, <em>ISET</em> II 149 ((+) JJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>Ni 9847</td>
<td>136–41, 177–82</td>
<td>Çığ/Kızıluyaş, <em>ISET</em> II 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Ni 9626</td>
<td>231–42</td>
<td>Kramer, <em>ISET</em> II 51 ((+) GG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>UM 29-15-847</td>
<td>i, k, o, q–r, t</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>N 4507</td>
<td>230–9</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU</td>
<td>3N-T 902, 66</td>
<td>222–9 // 231–7, 116</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td>3N-T 902, 95</td>
<td>114–20</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>3N-T 903, 124</td>
<td>15–22, 45–52</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>N 1867</td>
<td>225–9, 236–44</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YY</td>
<td>N 3311</td>
<td>127–35</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZZ</td>
<td>N 4209</td>
<td>14–26</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>3N-T 906, 228</td>
<td>3 ll. then 95–101, 119–23</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>3N-T 908, 292</td>
<td>15–21 or //</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>3N-T 908, 302</td>
<td>159–68, 207–15</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDD</td>
<td>3N-T 918, 443</td>
<td>277–8, a–d</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEE</td>
<td>3N-T 923, 498</td>
<td>195–8 (or 217–20?)</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFF</td>
<td>3N-T 923, 500</td>
<td>34–9 // 77–82 et seq.</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGG</td>
<td>UM 29-16-740</td>
<td>7–13, 40–5</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHH</td>
<td>3N-T 496</td>
<td>15–317</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sippar**

| kk1 | BM 54325+54900 | 13–22, 31–4 | Geller, *CT* 58 no. 54 |
| kk2 | BM 99876 | 4–12 | Geller, *CT* 58 no. 54 |

**Ur**

| g | URRx44 | 1–30, 31–62 | Gadd, *UETVI* no. 55 |
| r | U 9364 | 128–63, 164–201 | Gadd, *RT* 30 (1933), pp. 128–9; *UET VI* no. 56 |
| t | U 16874 | 136–49, 150–66 | Gadd, *UETVI* no. 57 |
| ii | U 16878 | f, h–i, n–o, q–r, t, w–y | Gadd, *UETVI* no. 58 |
| mm | U unnumbered | f, i–m, q–r, t | Gadd, *UETVI* no. 59 |
| nn | U 17900L | traces, 1–17 | Gadd, *UETVI* no. 60 (rev. only); forthcoming in *UETVI3* |
| iii etc. | U 5635 etc. | | |

**Isin**

| i | IB 930 | 57–63, 84–98 | unpublished |

**Uruk**

| oo | W 17259ad | 70–81 | Falkenstein in Caviguenaux, *Uruk* no. 98 |
The Standard Babylonian Epic

**TRANSLITERATION**

**172**

V i1'

[a*h.[u ]ma.e nagar,ra1 k[a ... dla.gil.am

u.r, ba ellenag,ra.e nagar,ra.k a mu.u.k,ma.da.gil.la

tena puku ina bit naggari lili[e][e]

XII 1

**173**

V i2'

da.nag,ra a ma.egu.mu.gi / nu.uk,ma.da.gil.la.am

dam,nag,ra.a ngu.egu.mu.gi, nu.uk,ma.da.gil.la

XII 2

[utu naggari la ki umma] i dertiya la [e][e][e]

**174**

V i3'

dumu.nag,ra nin,b.,d.a.du.mu,gin, nu.uk,ma.da.gil.la.am

dumu.nag,ra nin,b.,d.a.du.mu,gin, nu.uk,ma.da.gil.la

XII 3

m[un]nag,ra la ki [a][l][u] [ya][ ][e][[e]

**175**

V i4'

ellenag.[mu] kur.s [me du ab a ba a ma ra.ab.e1],de

ellenag.mu.kur.ta a ba.im.ta.e1,de

tena pu[ku] ana a[ra] ereta im[u][e][e][u][u]

XII 4

**176**

V i5'

[aa.kide.ma.e] gan[zi]r,se du da.[ab a ba] a ma ra.ab.e1,de

[... ] gan[zi]r.ta a a[m] [ta]e1,de

mik[b]e ana ereta [iu][p][u][u][u]

XII 5

**177**

H iv1'

[en.ki.dug,e e][bi]g[al.ma] inim mu1,[ni ib.gis,gi]

XII 6

[En.kide] Gilgale[i] [ippal][u]

V i6'

ir.d.a ni en.ki.dug.e inim mu.un,ni.ib.gi,gi

W ii1'

[... ] en.ki.dug.ra k[a ...]

One source transposes II. 183–4:

**184**

r 55

inim ga.ru,du,ga inim mu[... ]

na.g.a ri.ni [a][u][u]

178

H iv2'

lu[gal.m u er] e.ne ba.se,se,se[4 a ...]

V i7'

lu[gal.m u] e.ne ba.se,se,se en a.na.a[sh][... ]

W iii3'

[... ] e.ne ba.se,se,se[4 a ...]

HH rev.2'

[... ] e.ne ba.se,se,se[4 a ...]

r 51

lu[gal.m u] e.ne ba.se,se,se[4 a ...] a[na.a]sh[... ]

bibi mina tabbi lukuwa [lumun]

XII 7

179

H iv3'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[a ...]

V i8'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

W iii4'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

HH rev.3'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

r 52

uellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[ab,e1,de]

XII 8

180

H iv4'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

V i9'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

W iii5'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

HH rev.4'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

r 53

ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[ab,e1,de]

XII 9

181

H iv5'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

V i10'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

W iii6'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

HH rev.5'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

r 54

ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[ab,e1,de]

XII 10
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178

H rev.1'

[... ] e inim[... ]

r 50

ir.d.a ni en.ki.dug.e ga mu.un,na.de

179

H iv2'

lu[gal.m u er] e.ne ba.se,se,se[4 a ...]

V i7'

lu[gal.m u] e.ne ba.se,se,se en a.na.a[sh][... ]

W iii3'

[... ] e.ne ba.se,se,se[4 a ...]

HH rev.2'

[... ] e.ne ba.se,se,se[4 a ...]

r 51

lu[gal.m u] e.ne ba.se,se,se[4 a ...] a[na.a]sh[... ]

bibi mina tabbi lukuwa [lumun]

XII 7

179

H iv3'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[a ...]

V i8'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

W iii4'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

HH rev.3'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

r 52

uellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[ab,e1,de]

XII 8

180

H iv4'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

V i9'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

W iii5'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

HH rev.4'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

r 53

ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[ab,e1,de]

XII 9

181

H iv5'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

V i10'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

W iii6'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

HH rev.5'

[du]ellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[... ,de]

r 54

uellenag.zu.ku[r] ta ga.e ga.mu,ru[ab,e1,de]

XII 10

Gilgamel Einbüch [ippal][u]

182

H rev.1'

tukun,bi uu, du kur.s [e] mu.ni.in.e1,de

W iii7'

uu, du kur.ra mu.un,e1[...]

HH rev.6'

[... ] bi uu, du kur.[...]

r 54

tukun,bi uu, du kur.s e im.e.a.e1,de

XII 11

183

H iv7'

na.g.a ri.ni[a ...]

W iii8'

na.g.a ri.ni [a][u][u]

Y obv.1

[... ] na.ri.mu he.db,ba

XII 12

ana airtia [ba [a]aladadd]

184

H iv8'

inim ga.ru,du,ga [u][u][u]

W iii9'

inim ga.ru,db,ba[... ]

Y obv.2

[... ] ga.[a] ru[... ]

One source transposes II. 183–4:

184

r 55

inim ga.ru,du,ga inim mu[... ]

na.g.a ri.ni [a][u][u]

183

r 56

inim ga.ru,du,ga inim mu[... ]

na.g.a ri.ni [a][u][u]
r 65 [..u][..e][..i],sir gir, za nam.mu.un.si.ga
   XII 21 sema ina šipkā lī šaltān

194 Y obv. 12 [..(dun.)] d(un.) ni[m.mu.un.gā.gā.an
   Z 7 kur ra[x (x)] nam.m[u.un].gā.gā
   r 66 kūr ka kur ra nam.mu.un.gā.gā
   XII 22 rigmu ina erēti lī šaltān

195 Y obv. 13 [..ā]g.gā, za [ne] na an, su.ub.bē, en
   Z 8 dam kiāg. zu ne na an, su.ub.bē
   EEE 1 [dam] kiāg.a.ni ne na an, su.ub.bē
   r 67 dam kiāg. zu ne na an, su.ub.bē
   XII 23 aššaka ša tarammu lī šatānīq

196 Y obv. 14 [..g][..g].g[a], zu [ni][g][..g].m[u].ra.ra[a]
   Z 9 dam kuł[gi]g, zu [ni][g] nam, mu, ra, ra, ra
   r 68 dam kuł[gi]g, zu [ni][g] nam, mu, ra, ra
   XII 24 aššaka ša taṣerum ša šatānīq

197 Y obv. 15 [..][..] za ne n[a, a, n][..]
   Z 10 dumu [k][..] zu ne n[a, a, n]. su, ub, bē
   r 69 dumu ku[l][gi]g, zu ne na an, su, ub, bē
   XII 25 māšaka ša tarammu lī šatānīq

198 Y obv. 16 [..][..]g, ga zu [ni][g] nam, mu, ra, ra, ra
   Z 11 'dumu kuł[gi]g, ga zu [ni][g] nam, mu, ra, ra, ra
   r 70 dumu kuł[gi]g, ga zu [ni][g] nam, mu, ra, ra
   XII 26 māšaka ša taṣerum ša šatānīq

Two sources give l. 196–8 in different orders:

198 H iv 20’ dumu kuł[gi]g, [..]
197 H iv 21’ dumu ku[l][gi]g, [..]
196 H iv 22’ dam kuł[gi]g, [..]

197 EEE 2 [du] mu kiāg, a, ni ne na an, su, ub, bē
196 EEE 3 [dam ku[l][gi]g, ga a, ni] nim ni g, mu, un, ra, ra
194 EEE 4 [dumu kuł[gi]g, ga a], [ni], ni g, mu, un, ra, ra

199 H iv 23’ [i, j][u][t][u] kur[x (x)]
   Y obv. 17 [..][..][..] [k][u][t][u], ra [ni, m][u, e, b, e][..]
   Z 12 [i, j][u][t][u] kur ra ba, e, d, b, bē, e[n]
   AA obv. 1 [..], j[u][t][u] kur ra ba, e, d, b, bē
   r 71 [i, j][u][t][u] kur ra ba, e, d, b, bē
   XII 27 uṣṣāmu erēti išshāsaka

200 H iv 24’ i, n[a], ra, [a, a, a, a, a,...
   Y obv. 18 [..]a, ra, i, n[a, a, a, a, a]
   Z 13 i, n[a, a, a, a, a, a, ra
Z
om.

AA
obv. 7
[... lug[a][l][a] na[1] šu nu.un[ma] a(u) x]
XII 32–2
[Ellipsus ana ešer]t urrad [ana anārī] Gilgāmeš ul tšud

207 H
iv 29'
[tug dum, dum, na, ni im, ma, an, mu]
V
ii 4'
tug dum, dum, na, ni im, ma, an, mu,
Z
17
[tug dum, dum, na, ni, ni, [...]]
AA
obv. 8
[...][[im, ma, an, mu, [...]]
CCC
rev. 1'
tug dum, dum, [...]
XII 33
[šubāla zako] šuduš

208 H
iv 30'
g[ri, gi, li, ginkim im, ma, an, e][e]
V
ii 5'
giri, giri, ginkim im, ma, an, ne, eš
Z
18
[... gi, ri, ginkim i[...]]
AA
obv. 9
[...][m] an, ne, eš
CCC
rev. 2'
giri, gir[i, ...]
XII 34
kina u[štarma] u šuduš

209 H
iv 31'
[... ga][b u r], ra im, ma, an, šeš[es]
V
ii 6'
i dug, ga, bur, ra im, ma, an, šeš,
Z
19
[... ga][b u r], ra im, ma, an, šeš[es]
AA
obv. 10
[...][m] an, ne, eš
CCC
rev. 3'
i dug, ga[...]
XII 35
kima šurri,[i]šuš šurriš

210 H
iv 32'
[...][im, bi, še], im, ma, nigin, ne[...]
V
ii 7'
isim, im, bi, še, gi im, ma, gar, re, eš
Z
20
[isim, bi, še], im, ma, nigin, ne, eš
AA
obv. 11
[...][im, ma, ga, re, eš]
CCC
rev. 4'
is, iši[...]
XII 36
[...][a]šurriš, šatiršuš

211 H
iv 33'
[išilla] ar kur, ra im, ma, ni in, sig, [ge]
V
ii 8'
[išilla] kur, ra im, ma, ni in, sig, [ge]
Z
21
[išilla] kur, ra im, an, sig, ge
AA
obv. 12
[...][im, ma, in, siš]
CCC
rev. 5'
[išilla][...]
XII 37–7a
šurriš a na ešer[iš]
šamšuša, šamšuša šurriš

212 H
iv 34'
[išilla] šu ra im, ma, nigin, ne [es]
V
ii 9'
[išilla] šu ra im, ma, nigin, ne, eš
Z
22
[išilla] šu ra im, ma, nigin, ne, eš
AA
obv. 13
[...][im, ma, nigin, ne]
CCC
rev. 6'
iši[...]
XII 38
ša iša šurriš, šatiršuša šurriš

213 H
iv 35'
[...][u] šu, na im, ma, in, gar
V
ii 10'
[...][u] šu, na im, ma, in, gar
Z
23
[...][u] šu, na im, ma, in, gar

16 Ibid., p. 1 and fn. 2.
18 Ibid.
20 Not nu, um, gid.
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237
Y
rev. 18
ki nam.nita.a.ke[m]l[m]a [..... k]ur.r[e im.ma.an.dab]

TT
8'
[.....] nita.ke[m]a mu.un.sub kur.[.....]

rrr
1'
traces

XII 78

"asar tähāzə zih[ari ul imqat ersetz irbasu]"

Five sources transpose ll. 236–7:

237
H
v 7'
[..... ] m[e] nu.un.sub kur[r[e im.ma.an.dab]

BB
obv. 9
(b) nam.nita.ke[m]a n[e] nu.un.sub kur[r[e im.ma.an.dab]

GG
3'
[.....] ta.ke[m]a [.....]

JJ
6'
[..... ] nu.un.sub kur[r[e [.....] d[ab]

236
H
v 8'–9'

W
iv 1'–2'
[..... ] da[b][.....] a) n dab

BB
obv. 10–11

GG
4'–5'
[.....] t[u]dug g[al] sag [mu x ] [..... ] kur[r[e im.im.ma.an.dab]

JJ
7'–8'
[..... ] g[a] g[al] sag [..... ] kur[r[e im.im.ma.an.dab]

238
H
v 10'
a a em ki inim.[bi] ba[e] de gub

W
iv 3'
[..... ] gu[b]

Y
rev. 19'
[a a em ki inim.[bi ba[e] de gub]

BB
obv. 12
a a em ki inim.[bi ba[e] de gub]

GG
6'
[.....] a em ki inim.[bi]

JJ
9'
[..... ] b] ba[e] de[e]

TT
9'
[..... ] ba[e] de[e]

rrr
1' 2'
a a em ki inim.[.....]

XII 79

"abu Ea [na?] [.....]

239
H
v 11'
ur sag sul tutu:ra dumu [.....] x[e] ra [da gū mu:nu:de][e]

W
iv 4'
[..... ] g[u][.....]

BB
obv. 13
ur sag sul tutu:ra dumu[.....] gū mu:nu:de[e]

GG
7'
[.....] sa[s] sul tu:ru:a[.....]

JJ
10'
[.....] r[a] dumu mu:nu:[.....]

TT
10'
[.....] x gū mu:nu:[.....]

rrr
1' 3'
ur sag sul [.....]

XII 80

an qarrādu dili [šamaš iqabbē]

XII 81

qarrādu ešu šamaš mār Ningal [.....]

240
H
v 12'
1.nē sē ab.lāl kur:ra gā[.....] m:ma an:tag[

W
iv 5'
[..... ] t[a][.....]

BB
obv. 14

JJ
11'
[.....] ur:ra gāi[.....]

GG
8'
[.....] n[e] sē ab.lāl[.....]

rrr
1' 4'
ne sē ab.lāl[.....]

XII 82

li:man takkab [ersetz tepette]

241
H
v 13'
šubur:an:kur:ta e:d[m]u:na:ab

BB
obv. 15
[.....] a:ni kur:ta e:d[m]u:na:ab

JJ
12'
[..... ] e:d[m]u:na:ab[.....]
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GG
9'
[..... r[a ki su:ru ta [.....]

rrr
1' 5'
šubur:an:kur:ta [.....]

XII 83

utukku ša Ea[kidu ki su:ru ta] ulu ersetz tukkab[.....]

MS r has the following extra line:

241a
rrr
1' 6'
ur sag sul[utu:ra dumu] [.....] gū mu:nu:de[e]

XII 84

ana qībtā [Ea [.....]

XII 85

qarrādu ešu šamaš mār Ningal [x x x]

242
H
v 14'
ab:lāl kur:ra gāi im:ma:an:tag[

BB
obv. 16
ab:lāl kur:re gāi mu:nu:ab:tag[

JJ
13'
[..... ] m[a:.....]

GG
10'
[.....] a:ni kur:ra gāi[.....]

rrr
1' 7'
ab:lāl kur:ra[.....]

XII 86

li:man takkab [ersetz tepette]

243
H
v 15'
ši:si:ig:ni:ta šubur:an:kur:ta [.....]

BB
obv. 17
ši:si:ig:ni:ta šubur:an:kur:ta mu:ni:in e:ni:

GG
11'

rrr
1' 8'
šubur:an:kur:ta[.....]

XII 87

utukku ša Enlītu ki sa:qi a:lu ersetz utukku

244
H
v 16'

BB
obv. 18
[.....] gū:da mu:nu:un:su:ub:be[e]

GG
12'
[.....] gū:da mu:nu:un:su:ub:be[e]

rrr
1' 9'
gū:ni gū:da [.....]

XII 88

immedšīna utukkāqi

245
H
v 17'
[.....] tar:re im:kū:īl]u:ri[.....]

BB
obv. 19
[.....] re im:mi:na:ki:tu:ne [02?

GG
13'
[.....] tar:re im[ku:.....]

rrr
1' 10'
[.....] tar:re [.....]

XII 89

immedšīna ušzallū

246
H
v 18'
[.....] a:āg gū kur:ra i:gi[b]\in:du:ah\in:

BB
obv. 20
[.....] a:āg gū kur:re i:gi[b]:du:ah[.....]

GG
14'
[.....] a:āg gū kur:ra[.....]

XII 90–1
qībā iibir qišā iibir iibir ersetz ti a:žmūra qībā

247
H
v 19'

BB
obv. 21
[.....] a:ba[h:é]:en[.....]

GG
15'
[.....] a:ba[h:é]:en[.....]

XII 92

ul aqabbāku iibir ul aqabbāku

One source transposes ll. 246–7:

247
rrr
1' 11'
nu:š:ma:ab:be[.....]

246
rrr
1' 12'
[.....] a:āg gū [.....]

248
H
v 20'
tukkāq bi a:āg gū kur:ra:mu:ra:ab:be[en]

GG
16'
[.....] a:āg gū [.....]
From here onwards the manuscripts disagree as to the number and order of the remaining lines. In order to avoid an artificial line count I have assigned to each group of questions and replies a letter instead of line numbers and organized them roughly by theme. First are childless people (a-c), then those that have been disfigured (f-k), those that have sinned against parents and gods (l-n), those that are denied funerary rituals (o-q), those that have a comfortable afterlife (r-s) and those whose ghosts are not to be found in the Netherworld but roam the world above (t):
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C 1 F vi 8 [.............].um.si.ge/ [.............].duḫ.ām a.na.gin, an.āk
H v 53' trace
V 11' 27' Nkik.[i̯]tūr dar.mas.ka tūg mu.si.ge/ [.............]
DD obv. 17 b.a.t:šir.tūr dar.mas.ka tūg nu.si.ge/ [.............]
qq rev. 7-8 tī.šiš.ūark[aš-tu] a.na.gin-ki gāl

C 2 F vi 9 [.............] x x x x x
V 11' 28' [gi.šu.kašiš][i̯]tūr dar.mas.ka tūg mu.si.ge/ [.............]
DD obv. 18 b.a.t:šir.tūr dar.mas.ka tūg nu.si.ge/ [.............]
qq rev. 9-11 šar.tūr dar.mas.ka tūg mu.si.ge/ [.............]

D 1 F vi 4 [.............] ak
H v 47'-8' mu.nu.šu.tēt i-gi bī.duḫ.ām a.na.gin-ki gāl
V 11' 25' [mu.nu.šu.tēt i-gi bī.duḫ.ām a.na.gin-ki gāl]
DD obv. 13 b.a.t:šir.tūr dar.mas.ka tūg nu.si.ge/ [.............]
DDD obv. 14 [.............] b.a.t:šir.tūr dar.mas.ka tūg nu.si.ge/ [.............]

D 2 F vi 7 [.............] x x x x x
H v 51'-2' [.............] šu.im.mi.in.d[u] [.............] [šu.im.mi.in.d[u] [.............]
V 11' 30'-1' [ešu.su.a][k] (.t'?) šu.im.mi.in.d[u] d[a] (u)šu.(su.a) šu.(u.a)[ka] b[a] [ešu.su.a][k] (.t'?) šu.im.mi.in.d[u]
DD obv. 16 [ešu.su.a][k] (.t'?) šu.im.mi.in.d[u] d[a] (u)šu.(su.a) šu.(u.a)[ka] b[a] [ešu.su.a][k] (.t'?) šu.im.mi.in.d[u]
DDD obv. 16 [ešu.su.a][k] (.t'?) šu.im.mi.in.d[u] d[a] (u)šu.(su.a) šu.(u.a)[ka] b[a] [ešu.su.a][k] (.t'?) šu.im.mi.in.d[u]
The text is a page from a document, likely a historical or literary text, written in an ancient script. The layout is dense with text, and the content appears to be a continuous block of writing, possibly a poem, letter, or narrative. There are signs of transliteration or translation, indicating that the text is being presented in a modern form alongside its ancient counterpart. The document includes what seems to be philosophical or mythological content, given the style and language used. The page contains multiple sections, each with its own heading or label, suggesting different parts or chapters of the text. Without clearer visibility or context, it's challenging to translate or fully understand the content provided.
At Mē-Turan a different ending was current, following on from t 2:

Doxologies and colophons:

Unplaced lines:

Transliteration of the Sumerian text:

172 ‘On that day, if only my ball had stayed for me in the carpenter’'s house!
173 O carpenter’s wife, like a mother to me! If only it had stayed there!
174 O carpenter’s daughter, like a little sister to me! If only it had stayed there!
175 My ball has fallen down to the Netherworld, who will bring it up for me?
176 My mallet has fallen down to Ganzir, who will bring it up for me?24
177 He then sent Enkidu answered:25
178 ‘My lord, why are you weeping? Wherefore are you sick at heart?
179 This day26 I myself will bring your ball up for you from the Netherworld,
180 I myself will [bring] your mallet up for you from Ganzir!
181 Bilgames [answered] Enkidu:27
182 ‘If28 this day you are going down to the Netherworld,
183 I will give you instructions, you should take in my instructions,
184 I will tell you a word, give ear to my word!29
185 Do not dress in your clean garment,
186 they would surely take it as the sign of a stranger!
187 Do not anoint yourself with sweet oil from the flask,
188 at the scent of it28 they will surely surround you!
189 Do not hurl a throwstick in the Netherworld,
190 those struck by the throwstick will surely surround you!
191 Do not hold a cornel rod in your hand,

24 Carneaux's transliteration makes the line count higher by 2, supposing the lacune that intervenes in the middle of MS qq; obv. 2 to account for 'six ligures profusus?' (lagn 67, p. 17). However, the copy and photograph clearly not allow so many (lagn 67, pp. 14-15.)

25 So MS V, MS r (and probably W), hold a shorter version of the 2 lines: 'Who will bring my ball up from the Netherworld? Who will bring my mallet up from Ganzir?'

26 So MS V, MS r; MS H and HH: ‘Enkidu answered Bilgames’; MS r: ‘his servant Enkidu called to him’.

27 So MS V, MS W; MS H omit ‘this day’.

28 So MS H, MS W; MS S omits ‘this day’,

29 So MS HW, MS r omits the line.

30 So MS H, MS W; MS S omits ‘this day’.

31 So MS H; MS S transposes ll. 183-4.

32 So MS HYZ, MS r: ‘you’.
the shades will tremble before you!
Do not wear sandals on your feet,
you will surely make [the Netherworld] shake!\
Do not kiss the wife you loved,
do not strike the wife you hated,
do not kiss the son you loved,
do not strike the son you hated,\ the outcry of the Netherworld will seize you!
To the one who lies, the one who lies,
to the Mother of Ninazu who lies—
no garment covers her shining shoulders,\ no linen is spread over her shining breast,\ her finger (nails) she wields like a rake,\ she wrenches [her hair] out like [leeks].\
Enkidu paid no attention to the [word] of his master: he dressed in his clean garment,
they took it as the sign of a stranger! He anointed himself in sweet oil from the flask,
at the scent of it they surrounded him!\ He hurled a throwstick in the Netherworld,
those struck by the throwstick surrounded him!
He held\ a cornel rod in his hand,
the shades did tremble before him!
He wore\ sandals on his feet,
he made\ the Netherworld shake!
He kissed the wife he loved,
he struck the wife he hated,
he kissed the son he loved,
he struck the son he hated,\ the outcry of the Netherworld seized him!
From (that) evil day to the seventh day thence,
his servant Enkidu came not forth from the Netherworld.\ The king uttered a wail, weeping bitter tears:

---

221d 'My favourite servant, [my] steadfast companion, the one who counselled me—
the Netherworld [seized him!]
221e Namtar did not seize him, Azag did not seize him, the Netherworld [seized him!]
221f The sheriff of Nergal that [releases no] man did not seize him, the Netherworld
seized him!
221g He did not fall in battle, at the place of manly endeavour, the Netherworld
seized him!\
222 The warrior Bilgames, son of Ninsun,
223 made his way alone to Ekur, the house of Enlil,
224 before Enlil he [wept]:
225 '[O Father] Enlil, my ball fell into the Netherworld, my mallet fell into Ganzir,
226 Enkidu went to bring it up, the Netherworld [seized him!]
226a My favourite [servant], my steadfast companion, the one who counselled me—
the Netherworld [seized him!]
227 Namtar did not seize him, Azag did not seize him, the Netherworld seized him!
228 The sheriff of Nergal that releases no man did not seize him, the Netherworld
seized him!
229 He did not fall in battle, at the place of manly endeavour, the Netherworld
seized him!\
230 Father Enlil did not help him in this matter. He went to Eridu.
231 He made his way alone to Eridu, the house of Enki,
232 before Enki he wept:
233 'O Father Enki, my ball fell into the Netherworld, my mallet fell into Ganzir,
Enkidu went to bring it up, the Netherworld seized him!
234a [My favourite servant, my steadfast companion, the one who counselled me—
the Netherworld seized him!]
235 Namtar did not seize him, Azag did not seize him, the Netherworld seized him!
236 The sheriff of Nergal that releases no man did not seize him, the Netherworld
seized him!
237 He did not fall in battle, at the place of manly endeavour, the Netherworld
seized him!\
238 Father Enki helped him in this matter,
239 he spoke to Young Hero Utu, the son born of Ningal:

---

31 So MSY; MSS Zr: 'Do not make a noise in the Netherworld!'\
31a L 193–8 are so given in MSS YYZ. MS H omits them [195], 198, 197, 196; MS EEE has 195, 197, 196, 198.
31b So MS HYZ; MS AA omits the line.
31c L 194–5 in MSS SVAA only; MSS HZ omit both.
31d So MS HYAA; MS Z omits the line.
31e So MS HZ; MSS VAA: 'they gathered about him'.
31f So MS HYZ; MS pp: 'carried'\ So MS HYZ; MS pp: 'put'.
31g So MS HYZ; MS pp: 'making'.
40 L 221a–q in MS pp only.
41 So MSSVY; MS pp: 'before Mulil he...'; MSS HRU omit the line.
42 So MSS AAP; MS UU: 'the Netherworld'.
43 So MS YAAU; MS pp, corruptly: 'Enkidu, to go out, to bring (it) up'.
44 This line in MS pp only.
45 MSS AABGCU transpose ll. 228 and 229; in l. 229 MS TU erroneously reads 'seize' for 'fall'.
46 So MS BB; MS AA, erroneously: 'Nippur'. MS Y, corruptly: 'I will go to Nippur.'
47 So MS HYYJTT; MSS AAABB omit the line.
48 So MSSYAA; MSS HBBYJTT omit the line.
49 MSS HBBGGJ transpose ll. 236 and 237.
b 1 ‘Did you see the palace eurush? ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’

b 2 ‘Like a useless alalo-stick he is propped in a corner.’

c 1 ‘Did you see the woman who had not given birth?’ ‘I saw her.’ ‘How does she fare?’

c 2 ‘Like a defective pot she is discarded with force, no man takes pleasure in her.’

d 1 ‘Did you see the young man who had not bared the lap of his wife?’ ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’

d 2 ‘He is finishing a hand-worked rope, he weeps over that hand-worked rope.’

e 1 ‘Did you see the young woman who had not bared the lap of her husband?’ ‘I saw her.’ ‘How does she fare?’

e 2 ‘She is finishing a hand-worked reed mat, she weeps over the hand-worked reed mat.’

f 1 ‘Did you see the person who fell from a roof?’ ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’

f 2 ‘They cannot repair his bones.’

g 1 ‘Did you see the man eaten by a lion? How does he fare?’

g 2 ‘Bitterly he cries, “O my hand! O my foot!”’

h 1 ‘Did you see the man whom Lškur struck down in an inundation?’ ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’

h 2 ‘He twitches like an ox as the vermin consume him.’

i 1 ‘Did you see the leper?’ ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’

i 2 ‘His grass is set apart, his water is set apart, he eats uprooted grass, he drinks swaste water, he lives outside the city.’

j 1 ‘[Did you see] the [..] ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’

j 2 ‘His grass is set apart, his water is set apart, he eats uprooted grass, he drinks swaste water.’

k 1 ‘Did you see the man struck by a mooring-pole?’ ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’

k 2 ‘Whether a man says for him, “O my mother!”, or pours a libation of water whenever a mooring-pole is pulled out,

k 3 a wooden “head” (iš) his daily food ration, he destroys the..’

---

56 This line in MS rr only.
55 So MSS HBCG; MS rr probably read: ‘his servant Enkišdu [he brought up to him from the Netherworld].
54 MS rr transposes ll. 246 and 247.
53 This line in MS rr only.
52 Some sources always include Enkišdu’s response, others sometimes, and still others always omit it.
51 So Nippur MS passim; MSS rnpqepqrr passim: “How is he?”
50 So MSS HCCD; MS BB: ‘a brick’; MSS ipqep ‘He is seated [on... .], omitting ‘he eats a bread-round’.
49 So MSS HVCBDD; MS pp: ‘his [heart] is content’.
48 Lit. ‘his arm is open’.
47 So MSS HBB; MS rvp ‘his heart rejoices’.  
46 This line in MS rr only.
45 So MSS HVq; MS DD, erroneously: ‘shavegirl’.  
44 So MSS HVDD; MS qqs: ‘[no] man gives her [a glasium]’.
43 So MSS HVDD; MS qqs: ‘He holds a hand-worked reed mat, bitterly weeping over the hand-worked reed mat’ (cf. ll. 22).
42 So MSS HVDD; MS qqs: ‘wooden the pix of’.
41 So MSS VBB; MS qqs: ‘She holds a triple-ply cord, bitterly weeping over the triple-ply cord’.
40 So MSS VBB; MS mm: ‘He twitches [rub for dub] like an ox as the vermin consume him’.
39 So MS r; MS qqs: ‘the man whom little maupected’.
38 So MS r; MS qqs: ‘He kneels like an ox eating fodder’.
37 So MS r; MS VBB: ‘He twitches [like an ox] as the vermin consume him.’ MS qqs: ‘Water that is set apart, grass that is set apart, ... he lives outside’; MS rr: ‘His grass is set apart, his water (is set apart), he eats bitter grass, he drinks bitter water, he lives outside the city.’
36 So MSS VSS; MS DD adds: ‘after it was dropped’.
35 MS rr transposes ll. 2 and 3.
The Standard Babylonian Epic

MS ll, from Ur, adds:

v 1 'Did you see the one who cheated a god and swore an oath? I saw him. How does he fare?'

v 2 'At the places where libations of water are offered at the top of the Netherworld, he drinks...'

w 1 'Did you see the citizen of Girsu at the place of sighs of his father and mother? I saw him. How does [he fare]?'

w 2 'Facing each man there are one thousand Amorites, his shade cannot push them off with his hands, he cannot charge them down with his chest.'

w 3 'In the place where the libations of water are offered at the top of the Netherworld, the Amorite takes first place.'

x 1 'Did you see the sons of Sumer and Akkad? I saw them. How do they fare?'

x 2 'They drink water from the place of a massacre, dirty water.'

y 1 'Did you see where my father and mother dwell? I saw them. [How do they fare]?

y 2 ' [The two] of them drink water from the place of a massacre, [dirty water.]'

MS nn, also from Ur, concludes the text thus:

1 'He sent them back to [Uruk],
2 he sent them back to their city.
3 Gear and equipment, hatchet and spear he put [away] in the store,
4 he made merry in his palace.
5 'The young men and women of Uruk, the old men and women of Kullab,
6 looking upon those statues, they rejoiced.
7 'He lifted his head as Utu was coming forth from his chamber,'
8 he issued instructions:
9 'O my father and my mother, drink clear water!'
10 'The day was not half gone by, . . ., they were . . .'
11 'Bilgames performed the mourning rites,'
12 for nine days he performed the mourning rites.
13 'The young men and women of Uruk, the old men and women of Kullab wept,
14 'And it was just as he had said,
15 'the citizen(s) of Girsu 'touched the edge';
16 'O my father and my mother, drink clear water!'

Another ending adds three lines that link the text with the beginning of Bilgames and Husawa A (MS qq, from Me-Turan):

1'’ The heart was stricken, his mind despised.
2’’ The king searched for life,
3’’ the lord to the Living One’s land44 did turn [his] mind.

Doxology (MS nn):

O warrior Bilgames, son of Ninsun, sweet is your praise!
44 Or 'mountain.'
Critical and Philological Notes on the Standard Babylonian Epic

TABLET I

1–6. Soon after Thompson’s edition of 1930 A. Schott wrote: ‘die Anfangszeilen des GE [Gilgamesh-Epos] können leider immer noch nicht vollständig werden, ohne daß man reichlichen Gebrauch von der Phantasie machen’ (ZA 42 (1934), p. 93). Much fantasy has indeed been brought to bear on the text’s incipit, for the situation has changed only very recently, with the discovery of Rm 956, a new piece of MS d. This fragment demonstrates that for the past century, ever since Haupt’s copy identified the first line preserved on MS B. as SB I 1, readers of the epic have been telescoping into one couplet what is in fact two parallel couplets. The new piece also provides the ending of the first four lines. However, the beginnings of ll. 2-4, 5 and 6 are still open to restoration, as is the end of l. 5. In discussing these lines, especially in this commentary in comparable situations, I have thought it useful to collect for comparison the many and different restorations of earlier editors and the more recent translators, insofar as they have not been refuted by the discoveries of the intervening years. Though some ideas put forward for these opening lines are more attractive than others, there is often little to choose between them. It also remains eminently possible in each case that none of them is right. The recovery of the end of l. 1 is a case in point, for none of the many suggestions had come close to šedu māti, and we are reminded how perilous it is to restore all but the most predictable lines of this poem. In many lines, here and elsewhere, I thus prefer to leave open the question of restoration.

1 // 1. The incipit of the Standard Babylonian epic, ša naqubti ımmurta, is known from the many colophons which refer to the text under this title (Tablet I: MSS BM, Tablet V: MS a, Tablet VI: MSS AOa, Tablet VIII: MS R, Tablet IX: MS D, Tablet X: MS K, Tablet XI: MS C, Tablet XII: MS G). Note that contra the transliteration of C. Wilcke, ZA 67 (1977), p. 202, the colophon of MS M, his K69, reads im-mu-ra 60-ge, a, la-3-ru, la-3-ru-3, and is thus not at odds with the text given here.

On naqbu see Chapter 10, the introduction to Tablet I. The phrase šedu māti is well attested in the meaning ‘stability of the land’, especially in the expression šedu māti kummu, ‘to keep the land stable’ (used e.g. Hammurapi: D. Frayne, RIME 4, pp. 334–5, 12–15 // 13–16: 5u3.3. wada . . . ma. ni nga, en // SUMMA KALAM . . . i-k3-ın-nam). Its use as an epithet without hubu or another such verb is found in the description of things in the divine sphere (gods, goddesses and temples), but it is not a phrase that describes kings, so here it qualifies naqbu rather than Gilgamesh. A line with identical structure, in which the verb of a relative clause is sandwiched between its object and an epithet that modifies its object, is SB VII 136: ka . . . karumu šiga-ka sumum šarri. ı

2 // 4. The variety of restorations proposed for the beginning of the line is considerable. Thompson, ignoring the case ending, opted for kül-la-ti, followed by Böhl (cf. also Heidel, Speiser, Tigay, Evolution, p. 261, Dalley, Kovacs, Pettinato, Shaffer, Sumerian Sources, p. 20, Parpola, SAA Gilg.). Oppenheim suggested [ku-ta-ri-i]-ti, ‘the sea’ (OrNS 17 (1948), p. 17; also von Soden, ZA 53, p. 221, Reclam1, Labat, Jacobsen, Studies Moran, p. 246, fn. 22). Other ideas are [nu-ge]-ti, ‘die Fernen’ (von Soden, ZA 72, p. 162, Reclam2) and [sīkin-ku-3]-ti, ‘the world regions’ (Wilcke, ZA 67, p. 201; cf. Bottero’s [la terre en]tière(?)). At the end of the line only Wilcke and Parpola had suggested hussu. It should be noted that in l. 4 MS F does not leave enough room after ına for kalama hussu; presumably the repetition was not fully spelled out on this tablet.

5. The other commentators, in particular, were sensibly very reluctant to restore in this line. Viable modern suggestions for the first word are: Böhl, [punari]imma; Wilcke, [sī x (x)-ru]-ti-ma; Tigay [sī-ru]-mua; Parpola, [sī-ru]-mua. The last word, now pa-x-x, might be pa-š-ak-ki. This is reminiscent of the omen apodosis that probably records Gilgamesh’s domination over šarri, ına-šum (l. 8 of the collection of omens quoted in Chapter 3, the subsection on omens mentioning Gilgamesh), but until the beginning of the line is recovered it is probably unsafe to persevere.

6. With this line the reader reaches safer ground. I restore after CAD N/2, p. 160, though others have read the first word [naš-me] ur (Wilcke etc.) and [na]-dī (Böhl etc.). At the end of the line there is only room for two signs at most following i (see MS F.), which discounts i-[lim-ta] ıma-ra (von Soden, ZA 72, p. 162, Reclam3). Böhl and others restored i-[di-3]-mua, Parpola i-[lu-3]-mua. The latter fits better the metrical construction at the line end of a stressed penultimate syllable.

7. The orthography ip-tu for ippu is no sin in a Late Babylonian manuscript such as MS d. Indicence of final vowels already occurs in manuscripts of Gilgamesh from Kuyunjik and Aššur, though less frequently. See the list of culprits assembled in Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (t).

8. On the significance of this line see the introduction to Tablet I in Chapter 10.

9. The expression ura rāqat rīqata alku rapādu is a stock phrase in SB Gilgamesh, occurring on its own in SB I 9, II 24–5, III 47–8, IX 54, X 64 // 141 // 241, and also as part of a standard colophon (for which see SB 120–1 and commentary).

10. The conventional restoration at the beginning of this line, since Thompson’s edition at least, has been i-[te]-u, supposedly meaning ‘he engraved’ (e.g. CAD H, p. 94; Ahw., p. 324; Böhl, Wilcke, ZA 67, p. 202; C. B. F. Walker, JCS 33 (1981), p. 194; Tigay, Evolution, p. 262; Parpola, SAA Gilg.), even though harpu, ‘to cut off, in’, is not used in such a meaning elsewhere. In fact, Haupt annotated the broken sign in his copy (Nümmerdepots, p. 1) as either kiš or bēš, with no suggestion of u. To my eyes the traces are even less ambiguous, certainly of kiš or tār. The shape of the fragment (B.) also discounts ḫaru, for it indicates that only one sign can be missing before these traces, and only a short one, at that. Compare each of the immediately preceding lines, where only a single sign, or parts of a single sign, are missing: [na]-pu, [ra], [la] and [sir], the last three absolutely secure (note also that since the fragment is from near the top left corner of a typical Gilgamesh library tablet, the margin will not be vertical, but slightly inclined along the tablet’s bevelled edge, allowing more slightly space for, e.g., [na]-pu in l. 1, 4, than for [sir] in the present line). This consideration rules out as too long the obvious [ṣ]-3-šu-in, and we are left only with [ṣ]-i-in. I take this as an active stative, the first of many in SB Gilgamesh.

11. Thompson’s reading of the first word as ı-še-pišu was taken from BM 34916, since published separately in Pinches’s copy (CT 46 17) and now joined and recopied by L. Finkel as MS h. As
the new copy reveals, Thompson's reading was erroneous in every particular, though this lapse is fully explained by the bizarre orthography. Consideration of the space available on MS B, should have indicated that [u-je-pâ] was impossible, however; there is only room there for [ap-pâ]. The use of the II/1 stem for construction work is not common, but note, in an inscription of Aššur-tim-nišîtu, dîaru lu ... ab-la-i a-i-up-pi-ia-ni, 'the wall that ... my predecessors built' (A. K. Grayson, *RIMA* I, p. 101, 5–8). CAD E, p. 232, explains the use of the II/1 stem in this passage as marking plurality of subject, a point which cannot be made in our line; perhaps the building of a city wall, which would best be begun in several places at once, was in itself an intensive activity.

The designation of Uruk as supāru, 'sheepfold', which almost everywhere in the SB text replaces the OB epic's nûlûtu, is also found in *Surpu* II 168 and the poetic narrative K 3200 (Thompson, *Gilgamesh*, pl. 59, 11, 13). The epithet alludes to the common notion of the ruler protecting his people as a shepherd does his flock. The image of the city with its wall encompassing the human flock like the fence of a sheepfold is also found in the ceremonial name of the wall of Borsippa, *Tâbâku*-supâru, 'its sheepfold is pleasant' (for references see George, *Bôr* 53 (1996), 365–6).


13. The reading of the last word of the line continues to cause difficulty, with the traces on MS F1 very difficult to read. In his earlier copy of this fragment (*Neimmepes* no. 10) Haupt saw a sign beginning with two horizontals, the lower preceding the upper, but later thought he saw more (no. 43, like *yâlu* or *yâlu*). Despite this, most commentators have opted for ni-ep-šu-la or ni-ep-hi-la (from E. Ebeling, *Afo* 8 (1932–3), p. 226, to J. N. Postgate, *NABU* 1998/30). I agree with Haupt's first impression. The new copy of MS H confirms the possibility of only one sign after ni-ep, and a short one at that. Since the sign on F1 is not šu, ha or bi, all readings that use ni-ep, nêhi, nebû, etc., are discounted. An added difficulty is the ambiguity of âku, which can mean 'thread, string, cord', and 'copper, bronze'. The last word either qualifies gišu, 'like a q. of k.', or is a predicate, 'whose n. is like a q. or who is n. like a q.'

One possibility is suggested by Kovacs's rendering 'which gleams like copper(?)', namely that ni-ep-šu derives from the root *yâlu* > *nêhi* > 'to shine'. In that case the phrase lâmu qu n. would literally mean 'whose gleaming is like q.', i.e. the wall gleams red like copper. An argument against this is that before a possessive suffix one would expect a trisyllabic in tripartite declension (GAGP 565b), whether the form is parsed as the infinitive (nêhi) or as a previously unattested noun *ni-ep* (nêhi). As well known, the construct state of nouns of the type *pars*, *pars* and *pars* deriving from finally weak roots can be monosyllabic (e.g. *biš, mar*) as well as bisyllabic (e.g. *biš, mar*). However, a search of such nouns reveals almost no cases of a possessive suffix attached to a monosyllabic base. In the dictionary articles on nouns from finally weak roots that display monosyllabic stems (*biš* III, IV, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* I, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II, *biš* II), the only such cases I can find among the dozens of regular, tripartite forms that hold to the paradigm *marâbi*, *marâbi*, *marâbi* are three: (a) s.v. bâlu, the reading mulâlu us-ud-la in the Tukulti-Ninurta Epic iv b 19 (*CAD* H, p. 224); (b) s.v. niḫu, the LB PN Tâb- multiplication as, as analysed by *CAD* N/2, pp. 205 and 248); and (c) s.v. zēnu, one spelling

ze-er-ku in OB Susa (*MDP* XXII 70, 1). However, these are all treacherous witnesses, for different reasons. Case (a) is now discredited (read mul-ta-rû-ut-ka). In case (b) the derivation of the second element of the name is not niḫu but nēhi, 'Sweet is the (newborn's) smell (or breath)' (*AHT*, p. 792). The remaining case (c) is the lapse of a single foreign scribe; set against the many attestations of zēnu and zēnu, it is not enough to overturn a grammatical rule. Transcriptions such as marâbi and marâbi (e.g. even GAGP 565c, 135g, 138c) remain ungrammatical, accordingly, and in the line under comment a reading *niḫu, 'his gleam', is ruled out.

For help in this problem one may ask what is the conventional imagery attached to walls. It is a cliché that walls are 'high as a mountain', but this figure does not fit lâmu qu. As already noted in George, *NABU* 1991/101, in Lugalgaha Epic II the wall of Uruk is compared with the drawing of a bird snare stretched out over the plain (II 305, 37: bâlu us-ud-la qu mu lâmu niḫu *biš, mar*), and in an inscription of Nabopolassar the wall of Babylon is described as 'a mighty cincture' (F. H. N. Al-Rawi, *Iraq* 47 (1985), p. 10, ii 41: e-tiš-d an-num, see *NABU* 1991/19, 3; against this interpretation see W. Parher, *NABU* 1991/72; cf. also H. Vanstiphout, *NABU* 1991/103). These passages bear witness to an image of the city wall as a cord or belt. In the light of this it seems more probable that lâmu qu in the present line means 'like a cord' not 'like copper'. As the text stands, I can suggest no better than qu niḫu. The word niḫu appears to signify one of the strands of the netting that are the result of pulling apart (napâšu) a tuft of wool (šuqa), and thus a stage in the process of turning raw wool into woven thread. As such a niḫu can be twined (kardu) around *maserras* for insertion into the nostril as a remedy for nosebleeds (S. Parpola, *SdA* 32 I, rev. 8, 14), and used to bind (râšu) hands (*BBR* 60 obv. 20; ed. B. Menzel, *Tempel* II 51; *divination ritual*). The image is not wholly convincing, however, and it remains possible that the text is corrupt. Emendation to *e-ni-ep-šu* yields tolerable sense (which is constructed to be like a cord'), but is rather neutral.

14. The form samâli is literacy for samâli as see further Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub i). The suffixed -šu for -šu in both Babylonian manuscripts contrasts with the present line but is otherwise unremarkable in such late copies.

15. Most translators take *kuru*, as 'threshold' or 'door sill', i.e. *ashippatu*, and it could be so, for the determinative has no significance. However, if the line is to be taken as conveying the idea of feeling the wall's ancient threshold, the verb saḫḫu presents a difficulty, for it means 'take hold of' rather than simply 'touch'. There may have been paving slabs that one could grip in the hand, of course, but I agree with Touray and Stuffer (‘prends donc l’escalier’) that what is meant is not the threshold of a city gate but a stairway on the wall, which the reader is invited to climb so that he can go up on to it (i. 16: eššina). The idiom samâli samâli, 'to take the stairs' (cf. barrēnu, urba saḫḫu), is also known from an inscription of Esarhaddon (Borger, *Istarh.* p. 58, v 12: pe-Ιαï-θt-ši kâ ��-râtu si-im-še-šu si-im-še-šu ru-šu-a-šu, 'those who ran fast and took to the slopes of distant mountains'. Though E-anna is situated in the middle of Uruk, the topography of the town is such that there are city walls that take one nearer to the temple area (i. 16: *girub ana E-anna*).

17. The line is slightly long as it stands; perhaps amēlu is a late intrusion.

18–23. These lines are repeated in SB XI 323–6, addressed to Ur-šanbi at the end of Gilgamesh's wanderings, where the second imperative is correctly given as i-tal-lak. For their exegesis see Chapter 10, on Tablet XI.

21. By older standards MS H's us-šu-šu displays the wrong case, but this is unremarkable in a LB copy; in the parallel line the two Kuyunjik manuscripts have, as one would expect, us-šu-šu (SB XI 326). The seven funculas are presumably none other than the Seven Sages (*apkallu*) who in Babylonian mythology instructed mankind in the arts of civilization (see E. Reiner, *Or nis 30
tyranny, and ll. 110–12, describing Enkidu’s behaviour in the wild). On this and other nuances of the present tense in Babylonian narrative poetry see now M. P. Streck’s meticulous study, ‘tukalak tukaki “weinend setzte er sich”: iparrut für die Vergangenheit in der akkadischen Epik’, Orv 64 (1995), pp. 33–91. Streek offers many different means of translation of such verbs, for example, ‘stap ging er’ for ilak in the present couplet and ‘immer verlangsamt wurden’ for ûzadak in the narrative of Gilgameš’s tyranny (SB 167). He cites both as examples of ‘generell-iterative Sachverhalte der Vergangenheit’, one of many divisions of usage he distinguishes for the Akkadian present (op. cit., p. 40). In my translation I have often felt it unnecessary to use such precise phrasing. In poetic contexts in English the present and imperfect tenses and the participles adequately convey many of the nuances Streek identifies. On other occasions, where there is repetition, there are sound literary reasons for using present forms in translation (see the commentary on SB 1175–7).

32. The enclitic –ma cannot here coordinate ilak with the following clause, for this line logically forms a couplet with the preceding. It is instead an example of the rarer usage in which it brings the nuance ‘likewise’ to the verbal predicate (GA 7 § 12a: ‘gleichfalls’). On non-coordinative –ma see further below, on SB 1117–18.

33. Though a river bank is not usually symbolic of protection in literature, compare its use in personal names, e.g. Dukbī, lit. ‘My god is my bank’, and Kibīr-Dagāni, ‘My bank is Dagān’ (a selection of references is given in CAD K, p. 335; from OAAK to OA and OB, especially Mari). There kāru is best rendered ‘refuge’; the imagery is drawn from riverine navigation, in which the bank offers safe haven in a storm or other difficulty. The juxtaposition of the protective river bank in this line and the destructive flood-wave in the next makes for a highly effective contrast.

35–6. Since there is also a word rimu meaning ‘one beloved’ there may be intentional ambiguity in the expression rimu Lagalbanda. The meaning ‘wild bull’ takes obvious preference, however, since the prevailing imagery of the couplet is bovine. The goddess Ninsun’s name, ‘Lady Wild-Cow’, is here very explicitly rendered in Akkadian. The compound Rimat-Ninsun, standard in the SB epic, goes back to the Pennsylvania tablet’s rimatu ka supāri(m) Ninsu(na) (OB II 236–7). The variant rim-u(n)-an-na (MS H) for rim-u(n)-na is of the same order as dam-ki-an-na for Damkina, which is common in late texts.

37. The word order štukat Gilgameš may be an example of inversion for emphasis; see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (j).

39. For Gilgamesh and wells see Chapter 3, the sub-section on Digging wells.

40. On ayabha, often Ocean in a mythological sense, see A. Malamat, Mari and the Early Israelite Experience (London, 1989), pp. 108–12. The phrase ayabha tāmātu rapadlu also occurs in exorcistic literature, where it is something of a cliché (e.g. Surpu-VI 190, VIII 84, Maqal VI 100; further references in CAD A1, p. 221). The word written ta-ma-ri(m) is most probably singular, literary for tamēti, as often in Enlīm elī. For the extra vowel see above, on 1. 14.

42. The relentless succession of active participles in ll. 38–44 means ka-lūd cannot here be an active stative. The resulting phrase is ka-šūluanna, in which a construct state is followed, exceptually, by an adverbial accusative. Lexically this can be compared with Sennacherib’s report that his warriors ‘captured through their sheer force’ the cities of the king of Elam: ib-ru-du da-nu-su-ur (Luckenbill, OIP 2, p. 75, 96–7). As for the grammar, note the common phrase šar-pāna and its variant šar-maṭa, ‘king of bygone times’, in which the construct state is qualified by an adverb. A more elaborate example of this syntactical peculiarity is displayed in an epithet of Aḥšurpalip II: ka-šūlu(ta) e-er-su-an 4stulal a-di 4zulab-na-na u šāmta(l a.b.b.a) rábab(gal), ‘who conquered from the River Tigris to Mount Lebanon and the Great Sea’ (Grayson, RIM 2, p. 306, 4–6); see GA 7 § 148b.
43. The LB manuscript confirms the reading of MS g proposed by W. G. Lambert, ‘Gilg. II 41’, RAd 73 (1979), p. 89.

45–6. As the text of Nimrud MS g stands, the verbs of both lines of this couplet are plural, which is ungrammatical after mammu, or subjunctive, with the relative pronoun omitted by mistake (there is no space to restore [man-na ša] in MS g). In the LB MS h there is no problem in l. 45, where šuannan is indicative singular, but in l. 46, unless one construes iš as a subordinating conjunction, išqabbá is also plural or subjunctive for no reason. The solution is that the text is indeed defective, ša having dropped out of subjunctive. This is proved by Exarhadon that adapts l. 45 in its correct form (Berger, Easrh., p. 58, v. 21–2): man-nu ši-ši-ši ši-ša-an-na a-na larru-ut-ti, ‘who is there that can be compared with me in kingly status?’ MS h’s šuannan probably arose from a scribe’s desire to adjust the grammar of l. 45 in the absence of the relative pronoun, a correction that was not prosecuted into l. 46.

47. The new copy of MS g confirms that the penultimate word is na-bu (i.e. nā-bi), not išl-pu (Wilcke). On vocalic endings in NA manuscripts that are erroneous by earlier standards, see Chapter 9, the section on spelling sub (4–).

48. The line reappears in SB IX 51, which has nominative šitušu, as MS h does here.

52. In the passage which gives Gilgamesh’s vital statistics it is reasonable to presume that the description begins with the hero’s height, which will be lāna in this line. This word is the conventional term for the height of a human being (cf. OB II 184, and slave sales, pāssim), though there is uncertainty as to whether it refers to a person’s full height or to his height to the shoulder (see M. A. Powell, RA VII, p. 473). Unfortunately the edge of MS g has been damaged, so that only witnesses to the text that follows lāna are the photograph and Wiseman’s copy, from which the traces on my copy are drawn. Wiseman had no knowledge of MS h’s lāva-na, so missed the word lāna and read na-ba-ši-ši šī-ša-an (see also photograph and copy indicate that the two signs between lā-na and šī are very damaged, there must be a suspicion that this is a measurement in cubits, i.e. 1 10 x ammatu (68), a figure, incidentally, which bears comparison with eleven cubits in the Hittite version (Chicago Hittite Dictionary p. 65).

56. In the standard (OB) system of metrology, the unit nikkasu is three cubits, about 1.5 m, though in NB and LB it became 3.5 cubits (Powell, RA VII, p. 471). The nikkasu, ‘rod’, is twelve cubits (later fourteen), so, as the text stands, the hero’s feet were half as long as his legs. Evidently the text is corrupt.

57. The expression bērit puridda, literally ‘between the legs’, can also mean the area of the upper thigh or groin (a šatīlu in commentaries on Šummaši and Sakkabu see CADD 5/1, p. 492), but the reference here is certainly to the other end of the leg. A similar idiom occurs in bilingual liturgical texts: dū-ug bad. (r)u, a a-ba ra-šub, šub, iš-ša-pu riš-ri-šu man-na iš-šu-na-šiša, ‘when you open your stride who can escape?’ (IV R 26 no. 4, 41–2; BRMT IV 8, 23; Bilingtemps, Nergal, p. 32, 40). Six cubits as the measure of Gilgamesh’s stride is equal to the length of leg, which is about right. The use of different variation to express the same thing, 6 ammatu against mēlī źinnidu, looks like a stylistic device (‘elegant variation’). The measurement of Gilgamesh’s stride, at least, is doubtless the conventional norm of Babylonia, where the puridda, ‘pace’, was a unit of length equivalent to three cubits, i.e. a man’s longest stride (see Powell, RA VII, p. 476; H. Hunger, Urkuk I 102, 11: [2 pu]-riš-du ga-šu-šu: 4 pu-riš-du źinnidu, [2] strides =1 reed, 4 strides =1 rod).

58. The word ašerra is not previously known in reference to part of the body. Tournay and Shaffer plausibly suggest that this is the thumb, restoring ša [ba-na]-sa-ši.

60. The restoration follows l. 107, where the same verse describes Enkidu. The image alludes to the ‘hairly’ ear of ripe barley. Nissaba, the goddess of grain, had hair of barley tied thick in sheaves, according to Guéde, Cyl. A 24 // 21 sag. sā ki karadin mu. ak, ‘sprouting on her head, sheaves were arranged’. It remains uncertain whether in the ‘god description texts’ LJK 42 rev. 10: [r.NA] aqdu qim-ma-ta-ša, and KAR 307 obv. 1: [. . . ]NA aqdu qim-ma-ta-ša, one should restore (‘nissaba [ša NAGA] = nissabu qimmassu, ‘the hair of his head is barley’, or šēnin (GAD.NAGA) = bīnu qimmassu, ‘the hair of his head is tamarisk’ (Nissaba: B. Landsberger, W 1 (1950), p. 363, fn. 18; CAD N, p. 273; Q, p. 253; bīnu: BuL, pp. 31 and 47; Livingstone, Mystical Works, p. 94; id., Court Poetry, pp. 98–9). Livingstone states a preference for bīnu on grounds of the space available for restoration in LJK 42 (see Mystical Works, pp. 98–9), but there is little to choose between [ša NAGA] or (šēnin) and (GAD.NAGA). Note also, in a syncretistic hymn which equates parts of Ninurta’s body with other gods (KAR 102, 10): qim-ma-ta-ša [. . . ] ‘the hair of your head is the god(dess) Nissaba(?).’)

61. The sign before Ṯu on MS d, can hardly be anything but ša, but a reading šašu a-nī-ša-ti, ‘in the presence of his brother’, is most unlikely. Even if elsewhere on this MS išna is written i-na, it is difficult to escape išna šušu. Tournay and Shaffer preferred to avoid išna by restoring šišu iš-ši-ti, but either way the infinitive appears to be an exceptional, petrified form, taken over from an OB version of the epic and not brought up to date. At the end of the line there may be room for more than just šašu [šašu].

62. The trace after re, as well as the gender of šagū, rules out dual rēšū. An image very close to the one given in this line is to be found in the Gula Hymn of Ballusa-rabi, where Ningirsu is described as re-āšu-ri-išu ša-ša-rešā ša-ša-rešā, ‘a wild bull giving chase, head held high’ (W. G. Lambert, OR 36 (1967), p. 116, 29).

65 // 82. The line can be taken to read ‘the onslaught of his weapons has no equal’, and most translators are content to render it thus. If this makes awkward sense—can an infinitive have a rival?—then aša can be understood as a locative with Gilgamesh the subject of ša. In SB Gilgamesh this is a desperate measure, however. The option preferred here is to split the line into two separate clauses. For tehe kabbē, ‘his weapons are at the ready’, cf. Erra 145: šu-ru ez-ša-ša to-ba-še-ša kabbē šišu-ši, ‘they were in a fury and so their weapons were ready for action’, and Sargon II: šu-ru ša-šu ša-ša ūša nū-qat na-ši-ri ša-šu-bi šašu kabbē šišu to-ba-še-ša to-ba-še-ša, ‘whose weapons are made ready to bring down the enemy’ (Fuchs, Sargons, p. 62, 11–12). The enclitic -ša, here attached to the object not the verb, is probably not coordinative but serves instead to complete the absence of any rival; compare mātum-nu in l. 108, which reports another negative state.

66. Comparison with l. 83, alongside MS F’s pu-ak-ku (hardly pu-ak-ku-[šu], suggests that pu-ak-ku-ša pu-ak-ku-ša in the LB manuscript very likely derives from a misunderstanding (or mishearing in autoex-citation) of pu-ak-ku ša-ša-še-ša (cf. von Soden, ZA 53, p. 221; Tigay argues for the opposite). Analysis of pu-akku in this passage has not yielded a consensus. Some modern commentators take it as the II/1 infinitive maqqa, ‘to attend, wait on’ (following B. Landsberger, WZK 56 (1960), p. 125, fn. 49), while others derive it from the pu-akku which is paired with māšu in the Sumerian tale of Gilgamesh and the Netherworld and its translation, SB XII (for these playthings see the commentary below, on SB XII 1). Tigay goes so far as to state categorically that the word in SB I is not the noun pu-akku but the verb pu-akku, and that the Akkadian epic preserved the motif of athletic competition in this episode, but, ironically, misunderstood the word pu-akku which stood at the center of that episode in the original (Sumerian text)’ (Evolution, pp. 190–1). There is no proof whatsoever that either contention is so. Indeed, the word in the Kuyunjik manuscript is written pu-ak-ku, which in the conventional orthography of the period would be most unusual for pu-akku, though not entirely without parallel.

If the word is pu-akku not pu-akku, the question then is: how does it tie in with the arousal, mobilization or excitement (all are possibly with ištušu and labbišu) of Gilgamesh’s companions? The two transla-
pair with plural išu, 'gods,' and thus seem also to stand for a plurality. The following passages simply illustrate dungišu and ți-tar (Borger, Esarh., p. 23, 9, with var. ți-tar-(Š), šak̄aši) na-â-šar-ti dungišu and tı-tar (ibid., p. 45, 6; [DNP] ba-na-â dungišu mu-â-l-kid tı-tar (A, Livingsstone, Court Poem no. 1, 16; Aššurbanipal’s Hymn to Aššur); mu-â-l-kid dungišu tı-tar (F. H. Weissbach, Wadi Biaus, IV, 41–2, PBS XV 79 i3 65; Nbk); šù... šell (en) digumšu tı-tar (CT 34 27, 42; Nbk); ana dungišu ći-kid și-na-a si-ša-ap-pu-ù (N 63 i 6; Nbn). Plural išu is also sometimes written with just ası or as Lulûd I 55 (šarru šu šu išu, ‘the king, flesh of the gods,’ spelled variously dungišu and dungišu and digumšu). The reverse can also occur, i.e. dungišu for the singular (see below on SB 36–7).

Other writings indicate that a formally masculine plural išarûl existed alongside išarûr (pašaši digumšu and ći-ta-ti (TCL III 115 ed. W. Mayer, MDOG 115 (1983), p. 78; Sargon II; Esarh., p. 97, 35); šašiši šašiši 600 digumšu and ći-ta-ti (E. Ebeling, Or 117 1948), p. 26 (follows p. 272), 9; and B. Pongratz-Leisten, Ina Śulûm Ishu, p. 244, rev. 9; Exaltation of Nebû); šašiši šašiši dungišu and ći-ta-ti (Livingsstone, Court Poem no. 30; Aššurbanipal’s Acrostic Hymn to Marduk; cf. šaš̄-tane in I. 36). Note also the existence of a plural form šaš̄rû similarity with šanû (STT 45, 9; ści-ta-ti-ni). On this evidence it would appear that the spellings ći-ta-ti and ści-ta-ti are, in effect, logographic, standing for šarû and (by homophony?) šarû, if not also for šaš̄arû and šaš̄arû. A note on the second passage cited in the previous paragraph, Borger offered a slightly different solution, repeating the old view of F. Delitzsch: šarû is kann auch kollektiv “Götterin” bedeutet (Esarh., p. 45). In his study on the Assyro-Aramaic Tree of Life (F. Pargolz has inferred the contrary from these spellings, that ‘there was, in fact, only one, not several, “female” deities,’ all the goddesses being subsumed in Ishtar’s person (YNES 52 (1993), p. 187, fn. 97). Whatever is the correct interpretation, there seems no reason why the spelling ści-ti should not also be used in the same manner as ści-ta-ti and ści-ta-ti, for a plurality of goddesses.

79. The expression bēl zikir is said to be nonexistent in the light of the new source, MS X. The word zikir here is to be compared with its use in ll. 96 and 100, where it signifies an idea or initiative. The epithet bēl zikir is probably to be understood as a reference to the fact that the gods of heaven, in this period the lipit-ii, are those that can exercise initiative in the divine assembly, unlike the deities confined in the Netherworld. As such, they perhaps under an obligation, once the complaint of the folk of Urkuk has been reported to them, to do something to relieve the problem. Accordingly they bring the complaint to the attention of the highest powers.

80. This line ought to narrate the action taken by the gods of the previous line. Since ll. 81–91 are speech, addressed to a single person, in all probability to Anu (see below, on l. 93), some conventional expression of address is expected. The last word might just read i3-ta-si-lu-zu, ‘they (the gods) called out to him (Anu),’ but for the moment the extraneous traces here and at the beginning of the line (where št3-išši is one possibility) deny certain decipherment.

81. For the stressed enclitics -m in questions see GA16 123b.

82. The spelling wē-ta-dir is ambiguous. I take it as III/1 perfect, subject Gilgamès, but, given the variant šak̄aši in l. 67, it may also be parsed as III/2 pretetite, subject eþašu (dir then renders a bisyllable). Neither tense goes well in a passage replete with verbs in the present.

83. Probably a repetition of l. 70. The restoration of nāši šagkâši is encouraged by the feminine plural possessive in the next line (for šagkâši, ‘numerous, teeming,’ see below, the commentary on SB VIII 9–10). Such a restoration makes a participle such as mulšarâ, mulširu or mulšarru likely in the missing middle of the line, unless we read bare šar nāši šagkâši.

85. The subject of this line must be singular. The speech made to the mother goddes in ll. 95–8 are certainly the words of Anu, since they are described in l. 100 as šikiru šu Anin. The fact that there
of uncertain sexual affiliations' (Myths, p. 126, 10), makes assumptions about the latter word which seem to be unfounded. The feminine adjective sobretu, 'closed off', refers to women who live in seclusion, whether as devotees of a deity or royal concubines in the harem. The masculine only occurs in logographic spellings of sobretu (zi.urum etc.) and may have existed as a lexical abstraction only. Babylonian men did not find themselves cloistered, so far as I know, and even if a word sobrētu was recognizable as a counterpart of sobrētu, it is doubtful that it could have conveyed the idea of a 'male concubine'.

102–3. These two lines are one of only two quotations from Gilgamesh known from commentaries (the other is SB VI 69). They are quoted in a commentary on the prognostic and diagnostic text, Šakktu, to illustrate the received wisdom that man is made from clay (George, RA 185 [1991], p. 146, 2 b 4–5'; ti-ti šu-ka-ša-i ši-ta-dīš i-na šerē (edin) : i-na šerē (edin) ki-ka-ša ša-ni-ri-neša-du). For the phrase tišta kardu see W. R. Mayer, Or NS 56 (1987), p. 62.

104. Most commentators follow von Soden's emphasis of gilūtu as the quiet of night (ZA 53, p. 222: ('Nacht')-Stille'; cf. Ebeling, AF 8, p. 227). Others have avoided reading by emending to kul-(la)-i, with C4 D 58 K, p. 506 ('offspring of potter's clay'). I prefer not to emend, but I do not see why Enki should be the offspring of the quiet of night as against any other part of the day. For me the reference is instead to Enkidu's supernatural birth. He was not delivered into the world through the travail of a human mother; silence, not screams, attended his arrival on the earth. The apparent variant ministu, 'death', for gilūtu is a mechanical error based on the misreading of qal and needs no further exegesis. The phrase kežur Ninurta makes several allusions. First, kežur as a description of a person evokes in comparison personal names such as Kipur-DN, DN-šapiru-šakkanu and DN-kapitum. The dictionaries interpret this use of kežur, 'knot, bonding', and šapiru, 'to knot, tie together', as referring to the support or strengthening of the individual by a god: his form is bound and consolidated into something strong and lasting, like a wall of brick. As the champion of the gods and the epitome of the young hero, Ninurta is a god associated with successful feats of arms, particularly in single combat with a mighty rival (e.g. Anu, Asakku). Enkidu, whose physical being has been given cohesion by Ninurta, will be the champion of the people of Uruk and will meet with Gilgamesh in single combat. In An VII Ninurta is also for some reason especially associated with qališa, 'silence' (CT 24.1, 65: qalîsî - ni-a-sa-ku-ur-ri-a), a reference which places the names qališa and kežur Ninurta in a nearly synonymous relation. The latter expression also anticipates the kežur la Anum which symbolizes Enkidu in Gilgamesh's dreams.

106. The variant for uppu in MS H (hardly nuppû) is mystifying. The form pûru, literary for pûtu, occurs in the status rectus only here and in SB II 176; see further Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (i).
Gīlgameš are listed in Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub (g). A present ventive *ṣibhu* is theoretically possible—for ventives spelled with *a* see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub (v)—but I know of no other examples of *āmu* in the ventive. The derivation of the forms spelled *i-tāb* and *i-ti-bu* from *āmu* is now challenged by the Late Babylonian source's *i-dī-pī* in the parallel passage (l. 177, MS x). Mayer, ISt 24, p. 13, suggests a parsing from the known verb *edī-pu*, 'to blow', but its sense argues against this. The spellings of MSS F and X suggest a middle weak verb, for trisyllabic orthographies, exhibiting final, 'overhanging' vowels, often spell forms of middle weak verbs in NA, NB and later orthography, as also other words that in earlier grammar would end with a syllable that was both long and closed. Apart from *āmu* there are the verbs *dī-pu* and *tāpu*, which have to do with weaving and are plainly also out of context; *dī-pu* and *tāpu* are unattested. This being so, the principal obstacle to the traditional parsing is the sign *pī* in MS x, for it cannot usually express the consonant *b*/. Confusion between *b* and *p* can arise in LB spelling, however: note in this book SBV 294 nak-hi (MS dd) for nak-pu. Consequently it is unwise to place too much weight on one LB manuscript. For the moment MS x's *i-dī-pī* should be considered, like MS F's *i-dī-bu*, to be a spelling of *āmu*.

114. Prepositional phrases involving *pū* + water have often proved awkward for translators (e.g. B. R. Foster, ANES 14 (1982), p. 33; '(fisher) edge'). A collection of the extant attestations suggests that such phrases mean more than 'on/to the bank/shore of', 'beside a river, sea, etc.; see e.g. SB Atra-šašu's V 71 (ed. George and Al-Rawi, Iraq 58 (1996), p. 182): *ana pu-ut nāri(lī) it-sa-lab, 'he sat down beside (not facing) the river', replacing older pu-ut it-sa-nu-ri (OB Atran-šašu II 11; cf. Assyrian recension S 32); in OAk inscriptions of Sargon (FRAYE 2, p. 28, 8/8–10): *a-di- ma pu-it i-a-am-tām, 'as far as the sea shore' // *zag a.ad ba ka šā, 'to the edge of the sea', and Narām-Sin (ibid., p. 91): *ana pu-it bunurdimi, 'to the bank of the Euphrates', (ibid., ibid., 133, ii 9–11) *i-tam-ma pu-ri bunurdimi, 'from the bank of the Euphrates'; and, if correctly transcribed, in Assyrian royal inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta II (Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 175, 83; *ina iškāšišak* ša *pū-sak) *pu-nar-tā, 'in the mountains beside the Euphrates'; Aššur-nerari II (ibid., 214, 29): *ana pū-sak) *pu-nar-ta a-ši-bat, 'I marched to the bank of the Euphrates', (ibid., p. 215, 40–1) *ni-bu-ru ša *pū-sak) *pu-nar-ta lu-ši-bat, 'he took to Mt. Bissur, which is beside the Euphrates'; and Shalmaneser III (Grayson, RIMA 3, p. 46, 21): *a-nu pū-sak) *ši-ni ša ʾapkūša[b, 'a-šar mu-nu-ša šā mērišak) a-ši-bat', 'I went to the edge of the source of the Tigris, the place where the waters flow forth'.

In the Assyrian inscriptions there is a noticeable contrast between *pū* and **šakū**: see e.g. in Aššur-nerari II (Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 199, 77): *ši di-li ṣi-bar a-ša-bat, 'I marched along the River Hubur'; (ibid., p. 218, 84): *ši di-li ʾab-nu-ša lu aš-ši-bat, 'I marched along the Lebanon range', (ibid., p. 219, 96) *ši di-li ʾap-ša-ta a-na e-ši-le ni ʾah-bi (dab) ša, 'I marched upstream along the Euphrates'. In agreement with the respective meanings of *pū-sak* 'short side', and **šakū** 'long side', it seems that *pū* is used when the subject encounters the river or sea as a short stretch, **šakū** when the subject travels alongside it for a long stretch.

117. Some appear to take this line to describe the trapper going home with his haul of game; others leave ambiguity. However, the pronoun ša (no other restoration seems obvious) probably marks a change of subject, as elsewhere in SB Gīlgameš (e.g. l. 172, X 181; cf. JfN in SB 1143, 164. The translation in CAD B, p. 292, 'he (Enkidu) and his animals had intruded into his (the hunter's) region', agrees, but is too contrived to convince. Enkidu and his herd leave the water-hole and head for home, leaving the astonished trapper frozen in terror (so already Schott, ZA 42 (1934), p. 97). The idiom *šu-um erēbi* is thus a simple metaphor.

117–18. These two lines serve to highlight the frequent use in poetry of enditic -ma on verbs that
passages is singular, with extra vowel for literary effect (see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub b).

122. This is the first example in SB Gilgamesh of the longer of the common literary formulae for introducing direct speech. For the syntax see Chapter 5, the note on OB II 51–2.

123–33. Restorations not marked as questionable are restored from the repetition of this speech in ll. 150–60.

124–5//151–2. This is a stock couplet, recurring also in SB I 269–70, 292–3 and II 162–3. The second line is used on its own in SB I 137 and II 43. The simile introduces the concept of the "lump of Anu", i.e. "solid matter of the sky", as a byword for something of superhuman strength (cf. SB I 137, where it refers to Gilgamesh). In Gilgamesh's dream the "lump of Anu" is clearly a meteorite, and symbolic of Enki (see SB I 248). Meteorites, of course, were an important source of good-quality iron in the Bronze Age. The celestial origin of this rare metal was described in the Sumerian poem of Lugalbanda, where the hero's mighty axe is described in the following passage:

The term an.an here can hardly be tin, which is useless for an axe-head; rather, kû, bi an.an is a literary circumlocution for the next line's iron (following Vanshtruph, CRRA 43 (1998), p. 411). He took up in hand his axe—its metal was 'of heaven', he grasped his dagger (worn at) the thigh—it was of iron.

The standard Babylonian epic

119. Restore perhaps [te-mu-um] or [ti-mi-in].

120–1. This couplet is standard in SB Gilgamesh, appearing also in SB X (9–10, 42–3, [49–50], 115–16, 122–3, 215–16, 222–3). For ra demás ra demás uluḫu to on its see also above, on SB I 19. In none of these passages is uruḫ construed as masculine, consequently the spelling ra-ru-tī stands for fem. sing. raḫu (for the use of a CV-sign to express VC in Kuyunjik manuscripts of Gilgamesh see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub a). The spelling ra-ru-tī, observed in other
enemy' (R. C. Thompson, *AKA* 20 (1933), pl. 90, 9; Abb.; še-er *damšu-ni* lušu-tā-a-gi-il-ka šu-(nu)-lu-in-an, 'the lucky net is stretched out, the snakes are set for you!' (STT 215 lmi 18 // CAD N11, p. 206; Hubal inscription). The word nuballu, 'wing', is uniquely used in this line and its repetition (14/8); presumably it describes a net shaped like a wing (see further the discussion of E. von Osten-Sacken, *MDOG* 123 (1991), pp. 140–1).

136. For šešēlu šērūšu see below, on l. 145.

138. The line is restored after l. 148, which realizes the old man's advice as narrative. Restoration 140–5. Restorations are taken from the parallel passage, ll. 162–6, where there is, however, no repetition of l. 141.

143 // 146. The enclitic -me attached to the final word of a clause either stresses that word (cf. l. 65 above) or coordinates the two clauses. In this case I have assumed the latter. Clear examples in the Akkadian Giganmele of coordinate -me attached the last word of the clause where word that is not a verb are OB II 104 šīlu šērušu, OB III 53 // 75 šīlu šērušu manišašu, MB 27 // 21 šīlu šērušu manašašu, SG I 143 // 164 šīlu šērušu manašašu, LL II 60 šīlu šērušu manašašu, VL 155 šīlu šērušu manašašu manašašu, VL 147 // 155 šīlu šērušu manašašu manašašu manašašu, contrast VIII 91 šīlu šērušu manašašu manašašu, SG I 143 // 164 šīlu šērušu manašašu manašašu.)

161. This is the first instance of the less common formula used in SG Gilgamesh to introduce direct speech, which employs only *izikkara*; on the use of the present tense in such formulae see Chapter 5, the note on OB II 11.

162. The spelling *bu-lim* for the nominative in a Kuyunjik tablet (MS P) is a notably aberrant orthography of the standards of earlier grammar. For comparable spellings see Ch. 9, the section on Spelling sub (i).

163. The word *adumu* usually signifies an appointed or prearranged time ('deadline'). Here it is evidently used with reference to an arranged point in space rather than time. The same usage may occur in the Amuš poem when the mother goddess enjoins her son Ningirsu to set out for battle with the enemy. Her instructions more obviously refer to location than time (OB Amuš II 1: bi-im ur-ša šak-ka-a-dan-na, 'fashion a path (to the mountain), determine a place to meet (Amuš in combat)' (in OB Amuš II 52 šu-shu-ur-ša-dan-na, *Ishtar* is an obvious error for *ishtar adanum*).

170–1. The word *aduš* remains a hapax legomenon. The suggestion that this means 'hiding-place' (*AHH* 1441, 'Versteck') fits the context well enough, but since the proposition is *ana* not *ina* I have opted for a less concrete meaning, literally 'for their waiting'. The variant on *aduš* is very rare; *adušimm* (both MSS in l. 170, one MS in l. 171) may for that reason be corrupted by dittography from *ishtar* in l. 169.

172. In l. 176 MS P replaces *mašiq šeppir* of the parallel line (l. 111) with *mašiq šattu*, and the verb may thus once have been *šeppir* in this line also.

173. Note the orthography *nam-maš-ka* (Kuyunjik MS P), apparently genitive or plural but expressing the nominative singular. On the verb see above, on XI 112 // 177.

174. Lit. 'his origin was the very uplands'; for *littu* meaning not so much 'offspring' or 'birth' as the stock from which one comes, see with the reference to the Sebetta, Erra 12: iššu iššu-ša-a-ba-at mašqqarum, 'their origin was strange'. The phrase of the present line is also used of Enkidu in SB II 42, where it is replaced in some manuscripts with what is effectively an easier paraphrase, *aš iššu našur*, 'he was born in the hills'.

177–5. These lines repeat l. 110–12. M. P. Streck analyses the repetition as circumstantial clauses, the original occurrence as 'generell-iterativ' clauses and adjusts his translations accordingly (Or 64 (1995), p. 62, fn. 199). Repetition is a literary device. The arrival of Enkidu here automatically invokes the description that accompanied his first appearance in the poem, as a kind of foreshadowing. Such repetition is a feature of traditional narrative poetry and, in my view, it is best to keep the translation identical to highlight it.

178. The word *lušu* is typically used of man in the context of his creation (see Tigay, *Evolution*, p. 202). In SB X 318 the emphasis is on the mortality of man, appropriately enough, for in Babylonian theology it was essentially the mortality of the new being that distinguished it from its divine creators. Here, however, the emphasis is on the newly created as something untouched by civilization (cf. CAD *Ši*1, p. 71: 'the uncivilized man'; Bottero: 'ébauche d'homme'). A. D. Kilmer's
suggestion that the word alludes to Enkidu’s future role as sexual partner of Gilgamesh (Krusz AW, p. 130; *lullu*-amētu; pun on lullū/lullā) seems over-contrived. Enkidu’s is usually the folded arm which typically cradles a nursing baby. In line 188 kirimmu is replaced with dādē, usually translated ‘oincloth’ but perhaps an undergarment that covered more than just the lower trunk. The switch of words implies that kirimmu may also refer to a garment (cf. CAD D, p. 136). The undoing of the kirimmu would then mean the release of the undergarment behind which a babe in arms might be held for shelter and nursing. As well as releasing her grip on her garment, allowing it to fall, the prostitute’s gesture opens her arms to prepare for embrace.

181 // 189. The phrase inā petē is literally ‘to open the vulva’ and is taken literally by some, but it also means to bare the genital area (cf. kueha petē in line 164). Similarly kueha leqē may mean to possess a woman sexually but also means to take in her charms, i.e. become physically attracted to her (see T. Jacobsen, ANES 5 (1973), pp. 207–8). Note in MS F the variant ėnēka for ënēkē (l. 181), unremarkable in a LB source but noteworthy in a Kuyunjik MS.

182 // 190. The prostitute’s next act of seduction is described as nāpāku leqē, literally ‘to take in his breath (or smell)’. Some have understood this at face value or as indicating embrace, but Enkidu does not come near Šamhat until the next line. Others propose that nāpāku leqē is parallel with kueha leqē and that nāpāku is a ‘euphemism for virility’ (CAD N/1, p. 305; cf. Speiser, ‘welcome his ardent’, and similarly others). According to B. Landsberger’s editorial footnote in Schott, ZA 42 (1934), p. 100, fn. 2, the phrase can mean ‘ganz nahe an ihm herantreten’. With this in mind I follow a suggestion made privately by the late Thorild Jacobsen, who very plausibly suggested that this is a trapper’s language, ‘to take his scent’ (cf. already Dalley: ‘take wind of him’). This would mean moving close enough to one’s target to obtain a good shot; Šamhat approaches Enkidu with a huntsman’s caution, so as not to frighten him off.

183. Having advertised her wares the prostitute is to let Enkidu approach. Note that ēnēka commonly has the meaning of seeking sexual favours: the language is loaded. Curiously this line is never explicitly realised as narrative.

184 // 191. The phrase labāti muṣṣē recalls an idiom common in rituals, when muṣṣē μυστήριον refers to the spreading out of a piece of cloth as an adornment of the ritual area or object, if not as a precaution against dirt (typical is LKA 141 obv. 9: *kueha* gaussa) namaddi labāti μυστήριον. ‘If you set up a chair, spread a linen cloth over it and sit the god of the house on it’; cf. J.S. Cooper, ZA 62 (1972), p. 72, 14; Mayer, Gebestsbeschreibungen, p. 523, 17; IV R2 S4 no. 20, 40; etc.). In the Descent of Ilar, II, 42–60, muṣṣē means to remove an item of clothing, but elsewhere also to lay it out. The point here is not only that the prostitute takes off her garment but that she spreads it out on the ground like a blanket and lies on it, a gesture which invites Šamhat to join her.

185 // 192. Nearly all modern translators take bulū here as ‘man’, and bulū amētu has just been used to describe Enkidu, in line 178. Heidel held a different view, translating ‘incita in eo libidinem’ (?), opus feminae’ (cf. Grayson, Papyri and Tablets, p. 142: ‘show him lust, woman’s art’). This idea is attractive, for in sex the traditional work of a woman, especially a prostitute, is to excite a man’s desire. Perhaps the language is intentionally ambiguous. Enkidu is the bulū but also the prostitute is doing something bulū. Not only does she walk in the water, but also she handles the water as if it were as her own.”

186. Here, and probably also in line 193, the Babylonian source has the prostitute’s dādē as the subject of habābu. Given the nature of habābu, as examined below, there is no determining whether the more original text is presented in the Kuyunjik sources or in the Babylonian manuscript, i.e. whether the line reports the instinctive reaction of Enkidu or the practised arts of the prostitute. When not rendered ad hoc habābu is usually translated ‘caress’ or the like. CAD, s.v., distinguishes between habābu A, of noise (babbling of running water, chirping of birds, buzzing of flies, lowing of oxen, to which must be added the noise(s) of lightning, STT 23, 12′; Anzu) and habābu B, of motion involving sensuous physical contact (in lovemaking and of a snake sliding over someone). Atri takes them as one, meaning, in the context of lovemaking, ‘to whisper’ (cf. Reclus); see further B. Gronenbeek, RD 80 (1986), pp. 189–90. Likewise I see no reason to separate habābu into two verbs: movement, as well as sound, is characteristic of lovemaking. The ancient view is expressed by a line of the synonym list Malbē, in which ha-ba-ba Seamless to ‘kiss’ (III 8). This equation need not suggest exact synonymy, of course, but it confirms what is known from the present line and other passages, that habābu can accompany sexual intercourse; note especially the sequence ku-abhi-ba-ni ... rie-ha-ba-ni (Biggs, Sázigue, p. 31, 46–7), ‘he, me, copulate with me!’ in a potency incantation. Indeed, some have suggested that ḫ can be a euphemism for coitus itself (T. Jacobsen, Acta Or 8 (1930), pp. 69–70, fn. 2; J.S. Cooper, Finkelsteins Mem. v. L., p. 43, fn. 22; etc.). However, the context indicates that dādē habābu is, in this passage, the last stage of lovemaking before actual copulation (vēša in l. 194).

It should be noted that the construction with dādē is unique. Elsewhere in Gilgamesh the verb habābu appears as Gilgamesh’s response in his dream to the meteorite and axe that are symbolic of Enkidu (SB 1256, 267, 284, 289; cf. OB II 34). The construction used here is also, with a personal subject, occurs in similar context in the goddess Annunānum’s oracular promise to Zimri-Lim, an-an-ha e-li-ha a-ka-ab-u-bu-w (ARM X 8, 10–11), ‘I will make love to you’. In these passages the expression habābu eli means acting tenderly like a lover. In the present line, where the naked Šamhat is lying down with the wild Enkidu on top of her, something more passionate is meant; the question is, what exactly is meant by dādē This word seems to mean generally ‘love’, but it also denotes the object of love (‘darling’) and the physical realization of love (‘lovemaking’). It comes also to be a euphemism for the lower abdomen, i.e. the genital region, in both female and male physiology (AHw s.v. 2; CAD s.v. dādē B 2). Use of the word therefore may convey the suggestive ambiguity that is characteristic of the language of flirtation and sex. The incipit of the love song ki-i-pa-a-ba-na da-di-ha (KAR 158 rev. ii 11) means ‘I am amorous at the thought of your love’, but it also suggests ‘I am amorous at the thought of your manhood’ (for habābu see W. G. Lambert, Or ns 36 (1967), p. 132). In the same way the phrase used here, dādē habābu, might refer both to general dalliance (the whispering of sweet nothings) and to the physical enticing of a reclining couple that is the prelude to coitus. Given Šamhat’s profession and Enkidu’s animal nature we may be certain that in this line the latter is meant.

186–7. All the Kuyunjik manuscripts have transposed the lines of this couplet into an illogical sequence, as now proved by Late Babylonian MS x (cf. W.R. Mayer, VIs XXIV, p. 13).

188. Foster speculates that kirimmu in the parallel (l. 180) is replaced here by dādē to prepare for a play on dādē (Essays Poppe, p. 24).

194. This line almost repeats a couplet of the Pennsylvania tablet, where, however, the problem is ‘seven days and seven nights’ (OB IV 48–50: *ēnēka* *se* *me* *madāti* / En[ēdēku] *ēnēka* *Madāti*). Twice elsewhere in the epic when the Old Babylonian text offers ‘seven days and seven nights’, we find ‘six days and seven nights’ in the latest version: in the delaying of Enkidu’s burial (OB VA + BM ii 8′; *ēnēka* *me* *Madāti* / SB X 58 ii 135 // 235: 6 *ēnēka* / 7 madāti), and in the duration of the Deluge (OB Atrak-šiati III 4 IV 24: ? *ēnēka* *se* *me* *Madāti* / SB XI 128 (MS T): 6 *ēnēka* / 7 Madāti). ‘Six days and seven nights’ is also the period of sleeplessness Galgāmeš by Ħa-nappû in SB XI 209, for which there is as yet no OB counterpart. The numerical sequence n, n + 1 is a well-known pattern in ancient Near Eastern poetry. For another example in Gilgamesh see SB VI 18: enēna ṭakū ḫanušku *tu* *ēnēka* ḫilītu, where, exceptionally, the sequence is in reverse (triplets ... twins). Elsewhere in Babylonian poetry and prose more conventional
examples occur, for example in an OB snake incantation: ša ba-ā-mi ši-ši-ut pi-ša se-bē-er ši-sa-nu-ša (TIM IX 65, 9/66, 17–19), ‘the bûmû-viper’s mouth is six, seven and its tongue’. Further examples in Mesopotamian and other ancient Near Eastern literatures have been collected by W. M. W. Roth, ‘The numerical sequence x/x + 1 in the Old Testament’, 

Vetus Testamentum 12 (1962), pp. 300–11 (see also M. L. West, The Easiest Face of Hesiod, pp. 259–61). In Babylonian literature the sequence six + seven was by some way the most popular of these numerical sequences. In Gilgameš the change from OB ‘seven and seven’ to SB ‘six and seven’ begins to look as if it was a conscious policy, perhaps indicating a literary fashion.

Note the present of continuing action, šeššû, in MSS Fn, which is at odds with the preterite išhû offered by the Pennsylvania tablet as well as by MS B.

197. Most translators ignore the present tense of išappú. M. P. Streck translates ‘liest kopflos’, counting it among a few other verbs in the literary corpus where he understands this tense to convey an ‘iterative-plural function’, with the especial nuance that ‘der Sachverhalt verläuft in verschiedenen Richtungen’ (Or ns 64 (1955), pp. 48–9). This nuance is not proven, for the examples Streck adduces can all be explained as presents of circumstance, as imperfect denoting action that continued for a time, or in other conventional ways. A less radical interpretation of išappú is that the tense denotes the result of imardû, ‘they saw . . . and as a result they ran’. However, I have understood it also to denote action that continues following the lists of following lines, by analogy with the present in verbs that introduce direct speech (see Chapter 5, the note on OB II 1, and below on SB I 205).

199. For a history of the treatment of this difficult line see D. O. Edzard, Or ns 54 (1985), pp. 50–2. The verb šašašu (so MSS Fn) has since been discussed at length by W. R. Mayer, Or ns 57 (1988), pp. 155–8. (see also A. Westenholz and U. Koch- Westenholz, Studies Lambert, p. 449, fn. 9). Very appropriately for the present context, it signifies deficiency through illicit sexual congress. The variant iššabû (MS B) does not produce notably better sense and is presumed a corruption. With Mayer and Westenholz I take ulla as the adjective, noting the semantic opposition it contrasts Enkidû’s erstwhile innocence with his debasement. The result is a reversed adjectival phrase, with the adjective attracting special emphasis accordingly; for other examples of such reversal in Gilgamesh see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style (iii–). Others have taken iššašu as a II/2 late form from iššašu, to mean ‘his body was bound’, i.e. unable to move as freely as before, but this seems too contrived and disallows the parallelism in vocabulary noted by Westenholz, in which the sequence iššabû-ulla-umaššu in the narrative (SB I 199–201) fits the unambiguous šašašu (SB var. šašašu)-ella-tursumûni in Enkidû’s reminiscence of it (MB Ur 38–40 and SB VII 129–31).

200. The word bûšû is literally ‘knee’ but often signifies the leg as an instrument of motion (see Chapter 5, OB Schaefer, 7 and note). For a comparable instance of inassu in the sense ‘to stand still’ see SB IV 250: [ágammu]₃ umatînum tuum inassu, and the description of impossible marching conditions in Sîtî-Marduk’s kudurru: ni-šî-qa ta šaḫilîtu[gal]₃ sum inâ (keš.kur um)₃ and it-su-šii-su (BBS 5 I 20; Nbû I), ‘the best of even the largest horses came to a halt’. The ventive on alâku is almost always to be construed ‘come, come’, as is generally the case in Akkadian and demonstrated for this text in the recent study of H. Hirsch, ‘Die Heimkehr des Gilgamesch’, Archivum Anatolicum 3 (Bílíc Mem.Vol.; Ankara, 1997), pp. 173–90. However, ilâku (var. ilâku) in the present line looks like a rare exception to the rule, for the animals’ motion clearly puts space between them and Enkidû. The alternative is to parse the verb as feminine plural. Though elsewhere in the SB epic bûšû is construed as singular, note the apparent use of at least one feminine plural verb in a Mari letter: bu-bû-su [š...] a-na ši-ši-ri nasa-er-ma ša a-bi-ša li-(li)-ka? ši ti bu-bû-su ša a-bi-ša li-ku-la (ARM II 45 rev. 9–11), ‘let the herd [move] to my father’s pasture so they can graze with my father’s herd’. The usage is perhaps born of analogy with comparable collective nouns that are genuine feminine plurals (ginni ‘flock’, sagallûni, ‘cattle’).

201. Note the irregular orthography of umaššu, even in a Kuyunjik MS (F). The verb umaššu (II I) can mean ‘to be diminished’ in speed as well as in strength. For the former nuance see the OB astrological report noting the slowing of Mars: ina? ta-ši-ši-ri uru-de-tu (Hunger, SAA VII 312, 3), ‘it was slowed in its course’. For the latter see the famous letter of Ur-Ilu to Asšurbanipal, describing an uninterrupted consultation with a prophet: mal-aḫ-êtu di-ti-šu uru-us-su-ti (Parpola, Studies Reiner, p. 264 = SAA X 294 rev. 32), ‘he was contrary and weak of vision’. Both nuances apply to Enkidû.

202. Thompson’s restoration of ši-su-er-ram-mu, endorsed by von Soden (ZA 53, p. 222), is rejected here, since the space given over to the sign š in the tablet (MS F) indicates that the sign that follows it starts a new word. We hold to Schott’s šu-ša-su (ZA 42, p. 101), though with some reservation, since the typically OA–MA value šu is rarely used by NA scribes. Note that very little can be missing in the lacuna; šu ši-su-is-ta would certainly be too long. Ebeling’s ši-su-ši-šu-ma (AFO 8, p. 226) is unsatisfactory for the same reason as Thompson’s reading and, to my mind, also because it anticipates what has not yet happened.

203. The signs ša-su-er-ram-mu were already clear to Haupt; Thompson’s ša-su-er-ram-mu is erroneous. However, I do not see how ram-mu can be a satisfactory form of rumû (so Parpola), and so take all five signs as one word. The adverbial -mišu is here written -ma, as in SB X 81, also a Kuyunjik MS (cf. AHö, p. 644). This development is nothing to do with vowel harmony but is analogous with the displacement of ai/ by ai/ in the accusative singular of the noun. A similar trend can be observed in LB pronominal suffixes (-hu for -ka, -ši for -ši) and, less well documented, in verbal endings, including the ventive (see this Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions).

204. The disagreement of the two Kuyunjik manuscripts over the genre of the pronominal suffix permissibly the alternative translations offered here. Both make sense. As he leaves the realm of the animals for good, Enkidû begins to treat Šamšû in a less animal manner: he regards her face (pûnîtu) attentively and listens to her speech with new understanding (similarly Oppenheim, Or ns 17, p. 26). Alternatively one might comment that Šamšû’s observation in l. 207 logically might follow a prolonged gaze at his face (pûnîtu). It is not impossible, however, that the masculine variant is an early attestation of LB orthographic practice noted in the commentary on the preceding line. In this analysis only the former interpretation is admissible.

205. The reading of the beginning of the line follows von Soden, ZA 53 (1959), p. 222. The verb šašâmna is present for the same reason šašhû is: the action continues during the following direct speech (see Chapter 5, the note on OB II 1).

207. The restoration of damdûta is a parallel from the collection of both Bojzkózy, MB Boğ, Fragment a, 1. The variant in MS P is not, to my eyes, tab-ša-li (so Thompson). This line and the following exhibit in slightly different forms of the Pennsylvania tablet: ušattâša Enlilù ši hûrû tabalûti in amnûnûni iti nunaššûttu šušûm (OB II 53–5).

208. The line recurs as SB II 29.

209–10. There is no room on MS P for lu-la-šu-ru-ka (e.g., CAD A2, p. 314); the broken sign is much shorter. Of the alternatives lu- [ša]-ru-ka and lu-[ša]-ra-ru-ka the latter is a better fit. The change from OB lullûti (OB II 56) to SB lullûtišu is unexciting and the conversion of UrPu ṭimmûtu to UrPu sušumûtu is routine, but the expansion of mûšûšu (ša Anûm (OB II 58) to mûšûšu Anûm u ḫar) is interesting; see Chapter 5, the introduction to the Pennsylvania tablet.

210.a–b. This couplet, present only in the manuscript from LB Urûk, perhaps represents an expansion of the text known at Kuyunjik, with material taken from l. 217 (i.e. qudûdûtu) as well as l.
209–10. It should be noted, however, that the OB epic also spent two couples on this theme (OB II 56–60); these are grounds for adopting an alternative position, that the Kuyunjik manuscripts preserve at this point a telescoped version of the text.

212. This line develops the image, first found in l. 64, of the bull dominating the herd by sheer physical presence and brute force.

213. Cf. the Pennsylvania tablet: *tūma anāssā intagāt gahālā* (OB II 66).

214. Einkūdu’s mida lību recurs in SB II 32, perhaps II 59, and, with a different allusion, II 240.

216. The orthography kim-buat-sa for Samhūl is unusual in a Kuyunjik manuscript (MS P), but not unacceptable: see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (e). An alternative reading, kim-buat ta-qi-ri-en-ni (as a command, ‘you must invite me!’), is possible but less convincing.

217. This line repeats l. 210 but with the addition of a second adjective. Since double adjectives are very rare I assume qadduqīq qualifies midālī not lību.

220. The spelling lu-ur-rī-um-ma displays an ostensibly dative pronoun where an accusative is expected. There are alternative solutions: (a) orthographic: a syllable written closed can express an open syllable with a long or stressed vowel, ḫṛtūsā-ma (see further Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub b); and (b) grammatical: the use of dative independent pronouns for accusative is a stylistic feature of the text that could suffice to transferred pronouns by analogy. Other examples of ḫum for accusative in the late epic are: SB I 265 sūlijī(*tumī + ūm) -um-ma // I 283 sūlijī-um-ma (both LB MS H), XI 197 wāšārī-um-ma (MS S C). Probably there is too much space on MS B, between da-an and the trace, to read da-an-nīlī with Thompson, and such a reading is in any case unlikely on orthographic grounds. The traces at the end of the line (MS P) do not appear to allow lu gah-lu (von Soden, ZA 53, p. 222).

221. There does not seem to be room here for [lu-a-tar]-ri-ē (cf. CAD Š 22, p. 39), and space is short even for [lu-tar]-ri-ē, but no better solution presents itself. Tournaï and Shaffer offer [li-ē]-ri-ē ou li-ē-ri-ē (Zippelius, p. 58, fn. 62), but a verb in the first person is required. Parpola’s [lu-šar]-ri-ē means that need but employs an unexpected stem.

222. A restoration [en]-um-ma, ‘I will enter’ (von Soden, op. cit.), is possible but bland; [ana-bu]-um-ma, emphatic, is a more plausible alternative (for anā-um-ma spelled so at Kuyunjik see SB XI 123). The spelling š-a-ma, if correctly read, is taken as an example of a literary singular, šiana, as also in SB VII 102; cf. Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (l). An alternative parsing would be to take it as the plural accusative šiš, a scribal lapse easily parallelled.

224. The restoration of nānī provides a good antecedent for šiš, though it produces a line that is perhaps something of a non sequitur. The spelling of the verb may not have to be taken at face value but, without the beginning of the next line also, the significance of the entire couplet remains to be discovered.

225. Foster’s u-kal-īm-ka “Gilgameš a-šar...” (Essays Ppos, p. 29), unadorned by square brackets, relies on the parallel in l. 234, but the traces do not support it.

227. The word šēlētu is the conventional reading of *nīlī, but it does not provide the trochaic line ending required by the metre; perhaps read ūflamī?

228. The trace after uu is more like ʾiš than ʾiš.

229. The line is restored after AHA, p. 959. More wordy restorations have been made (e.g. a-šar [ī-ša-as-ša-ma-ru ūš]-nu a-šar-ā CAD A/1, p. 378), but the wide spacing of MS P, especially, makes a short line more probable.

232. The interpretation of this line has caused difficulty. Some ignore the gender of the verb and take the girls as subject: ‘they drive the great ones from their couches’ (Speiser). Von Soden evidently restores differently: ‘auf Nachtwandler sind gebreitet die großen Decken’, i.e. m[u-as-u-šu m][a]-u-šu (Reclam; cf. Kovace). The space available on MS B will not admit this reading. Pettinato also has another verb in mind: ‘I Grandi giacciono (con loro)’. If the verb is taken at face value the subject is masculine; however, either nakhšu, i.e. ‘the great ones escape’, using the rare meaning of šu in Enûma elīš (CAD A/2, p. 383), or impersonal for passive. For Foster the reference is to a well-known topos in Mesopotamian poetry wherein the “Great Ones” retiring for the night is used as an image for the silence and loneliness of the deep night (Essays Ppos, p. 29). The implication would be that night becomes day, but the image is not so common that it need be at issue here. Another possibility is that nakhšu here means ‘old’, as in the phrase šēqer nakhšu; nakhšu may also have this meaning in OB II 117; SB II 287, 300. However that may be, the line certainly means that the merrymaking goes on all night.

233. The use in a relative clause of the third person with reference to the second is common in literature, particularly prayers.

234. The conventional way to take the final phrase of the line is as ‘the happy-woe-man’ (cf. CAD H, p. 24), and most recent translators follow (note, however, Pettinato’s ‘un uomo pieno di gioia’). The interpretation *haddi-lu anāša* is syntactically suspect and semantically unbalanced, coupling as it does an apparent passive (*haddi*) and an exclamation (*ēna*) as a make-shift noun. It relies only on the orthography of MS P; B does not necessarily support it. I have thought it wise to abandon it in favour of the word haddi-’u (haddi), which has the virtue at least of being a known word and one that is attested elsewhere in the epic, in SB X 265. There, significantly enough, Gilgameš uses haddi-’u himself while reminiscing about the ‘good old days’ when life was fun, that is, the very time described here (see the commentary, ad loc.). MS P’s ha-dī-’a-hu must therefore be explained as a spelling which preserves as variants two alternative accusative case endings, respectively NB and MB.

235. The discovery of haddi-’u in two lines of Gilgameš forces one to look again at the supposed attestation of the word hāṭu. This is a term which physiognomically omens use to denote someone whose temperament predisposes them to bad fortune or other troubles (Böck, Morphophonik, pp. 265, 21: hā-at-āmī ša-tir-tīb; he is a hā, he will not thrive’; 266, 24: ha-tī-ina *akakē-ti-ēdok; he is a hā, he will die by the sword’; Kraus, ZA 43 (1936), p. 83, 3; DĪ 555 hā-at-āmī *-tī-ēza; if in temperament he is a hā, he will suffer’; cf. Böck, Morphophonik, p. 140, 52: hāmmer hā-at-ā ištē-ā [zu...], if he is a hā, (his wife [...]’). Since the spellings are ambiguous, some of these attestations may, in fact, belong to haddi-’u, the carefree seeker after pleasure, rather than hāṭu.

239. Nothing appears to be lost in the slender break between gēlītu and šā; the latter introduces an unusual expression, but compare, e.g., šā ṣārī/mēšā.
246. Similar lines are SB VII 165: minūnu šumūṣatu(a) aṭtukṣa maṭīṭuša and Lugalṭal III 22//30: insa šunut(maššu,ga.) aṭ-ta-ša mu-šil-[i-sa]. In the second of these aṭtukṣa maṭīṭuša is certainly a relative clause, in the former probably, and consequently I prefer to analyse the present line in the same way. If the verb written aṭtukṣa (MS B) and aṭtukša (MS P) is taken instead as indicative it exhibits a vestige (as already in l. 244). In all three lines maṭīṭuša is genitive and one must assume an idiomatic elliptis of insa. For maṭīṭuša and other expressions of time with pronoun suffixes see now M. Stol, 'Suffixes bei Zeitangaben im Akkadischen', WZKM 86 (1996), pp. 413-24.

247. The word šušnīnatu is the rather neutral counterpart of the Pennsylvania tablet’s probable šušnīnatum (OB II 6).

248. SB kṣurta la-šinīn replaces the uncertain phrase of the Pennsylvania tablet (OB II 7), and the verb is now iterative (though the significance of the I/3 stem here is uncertain). The kṣurta la-šinīn is here clearly a meteorite, as entered in CAD K, p. 441; see further J. K. Bjorkman, Meteorites and Meteories in the Ancient Near East (Tempe, Ariz., 1973), pp. 115-17. The term refers to the very fabric of the sky, a material of proverbial strength (see above, on SB I 124-5).

249-50. This couplet is the same as the Pennsylvania tablet (OB II 8-9), but with OB šukštukša(ma) missing way for SB dān, and umissīmā replaced by the iterative ušlabakhsītimā. In this passage and its parallel note the contrast between the plain ušlabakhsītimā and ušlabakhsītimā, used when the action is unsuccessful (l. 249, 263), and the verbs ušlabakhsītimā and ušlabakhsītimā, which appear when the action leads to the successful delivery of the object to Ninsun (l. 257, 265, 283).

251-5. These five lines expand the couplet OB II 10-11: Uruk mātūm paḫšī ešītu e šulatu usṣāṣūtum šēpū. The restorations are made from the parallels (SB I 279-82, II 103-7). For i-tep-pir see above, on I 111. From the point of view of grammar, the simile ‘like a little baby’ can refer to object or subject (e.g. CAD L, p. 114: ‘as if they were small children’). However, any parent knows that infants are not natural kissers of feet while adults commonly find babies’ feet irresistible. The phrase obviously refers to the meteorite as the centre of a great fuss.

256. The restorations in this and the following lines are taken from Ninsun’s reply and the second dream, though the actions are there given in a different order. For ṭašušašu see above, on I. 186. This line has no place in the first dream as recounted in the Pennsylvania tablet, but appears only in the second dream (OB II 33-4: avarištam kīnī āšatam abānḫušu ešītu). It may be that here II. 256 and 257 have been inadvertently transposed, for they appear in reverse order in II. 283-4, and on three other occasions in the late text the line avarištam kīnī āšatam ešītu abānḫušu and its variants are paired with the line u ušlabku usšaḫrušu šēka and its variants (II. 266-7, 284-5, 289-90). The verbs of the couplet thus formed vary in tense from manuscript to manuscript. I have given precedence to the most logical tense on each occasion, recording the variations in the footnotes.

257. The Pennsylvania tablet’s atšidūša ana šēkušu (OB II 14) has turned into atšatāšu insa šēpūšu.

258. As with l. 256, this line is found in the Pennsylvania tablet only in the second dream (OB II 43: atššašu usšaḫrušu šēka). The making equal of Einkidu is achieved on his adoption by Ninsun as a brother for Gilgameš in SB III 127-8 (see already Cooper, Pessimistic Mem., p. 40). For this reason I reject the translation of usšaḫrušu in this passage as ‘to compete’ (e.g. CAD M I, p. 70), but also that the context between Gilgameš and Einkidu was not arranged by Ninsun but by Ana (SB I 98), probably at Ea’s suggestion (MB Nippur, 4).

259. Where MS ṣ has mārētu (as too MSS B and H in the parallel line, I. 286), MS P reads šat-išā. Neither bēšiša, ‘her lord’, nor eššišu, ‘her en-priest’, makes sense in the context. Instead, MS P’s spelling is an error arising from a confusion of Akkadian māru, ‘son’, with Aramaic maru, ‘lord’. This and the opposite confusion, the use of the logogram for ‘son’ to signify ‘lord’ in a NA letter (SAA I 220, 3: a-na bēšišu(pummu)-uši), have been noted by Simo Parpola, ‘Assyrians after Assyria’, Journal of Assyrian Academic Society 12/2 (2000), p. 12. This line and the following represent an expansion of the Pennsylvania tablet’s shorter couplet: ummu Gilgameš mārētuša kalāmaš iššaqaram ana Gilgameš (OB II 15-16). The same epithets are applied to Gilgameš’s mother in SB III 17 and 117.

260. I do not agree with CAD R, p. 359, that Kinsat-Ninsun means ‘Ninsun is a wild cow’. The dying (Išnašu) is an example of a name developing from the absolute state in the vocative, as with Bēl and Šamaš, as a name of Ninsun the phrase also occurs at SB I 287, II 167, III 35, III 100, III 116-17.

261. The word ešu-ša-šu in the LB MS ša, which may be a witness to a different tradition, rather than an example of crisis or a mistake.

262. MS ša’s šušēbīa now confirms MS B’s iterative [u]šēbēbīa (von Soden, ZA 53, p. 222, suggested with reference to OB III 4).

263. The restoration of the Kuyunjik MS follows Landsberger, RA 62 (1968), p. 116, with reference to parallels later in the epic (SB IV 28-9, 109, SB VII 72-4, MB Megiddo obv. 10-11'). Other suggestions for the broken word are [ma-ša-i-Jat] and [pa-ša-i-Jat] (von Soden). In view of the Pennsylvania tablet’s itištamū ilišnam šamur šaštam (OB II 24), one should perhaps give precedence to the LB manuscript. There the spelling ša-na-at-ti is peculiar even by LB standards. Closing the second syllable in this way gives an irregular form but provides the required penultimate stress (šamur); is that really what the scribe intended?

274-5. This couplet develops the single line OB II 25: šiška šamur šan anumtītu. The first line reappears as SB III 22.

276. The word ipšēnu, a simple variation on appu(nu), is new. The LB MS ša’s ummū (instead of ummu) appears to represent an unusual intrusion of late dialect. The line is an expansion of the Pennsylvania tablet’s ummu šišnam šamur šaštam (OB II 26).

277. The beginning of the line is restored from OB II 27. Note the presence here of Uruk šibītu, as favoured by the OB tablets, against the stock phrase Uruk Šapīru.

278-9. These lines are repeated from the first dream, and, apart from I. 284 (= OB II 33-4), have no exact correspondence in the Pennsylvania tablet.

286-7. MS ša’s ka-la-a-sa kalāmaš is a spelling that is to be interpreted as kalāmaš. For the late shift of intervocalic im to i see GAG 531d.

295. It is unclear whether [a]-mu-na, preserved only on the LB manuscript (MS ō), is a writing for Šibim, with different final vowel, or, as in l. 276, the late dialect form Šibim. As always, it is uncertain whether the spellings mu-liš and [na]-ši-ki represent mālīšu, ‘counselor’, or mālīšu/mašlišu, ‘prince’. According to the dictionaries Enlil can be either. The connection with Gilgameš’s instinctive desire for counsel argues for the former. Enlil is mālīšu not so much because he gives advice but because he delivers on it and thus comes to a decision that is well informed, judicious and correct. In this respect he is the divine prototype of the perfect mortal king, about whom the ‘Tukulti-Ninurta Epic’ attests (W. G. Lambert, AFO 13 (1957-8), p. 50, 18//10; šu-ša-šu ša-šam Enlil(din) da-da-šu ša-e-ne pu-i-līšu mel(maššu) ša-ši-kī mālīša(kur)), ‘He himself is the eternal image of Enlil, who hears the voice of men, the nation’s opinion’. The mortal king is in fact mālīšu-anušu, ‘the counselor-man’, the phrase coined for him in a mythological text which describes the separate creation of man and king (W. R. Mayer, Or ix 56 (1987), p. 56, 36’; cf. pp. 64-5). The ability of the perfect king to give careful thought to advice goes hand in hand with his ability to exercise dominion. Both are characteristic of Enlil, as we learn from the syncretistic god-list BM 47406 (CT 24 50) obv. 8; ann-šu-Šumūšu amar(u) ša šif-išu ut-ma-aš-tu, ‘Enlil
is Marduk of rulership and deliberation’ (for this list see now S. Parpola, *Festschrift von Soden 1995*, pp. 398–9).

300. This line and the catch-line (SB II 1) are an inversion of OB II 45–6: *Enkidu vaštib mahār haratiniš / surta 'amāt kilallum*, whence the restorations are taken.

**TABLET II**

1. The end of the line might very plausibly be restored [lit.]-sa'-su, ‘they kissed each other’, or another part of the same verb but the question must remain open for the time being. The material added to this line in Dalley’s translation owes its presence there, at least in part, to a mistaken identification of what is actually a standard colophon of Assurbanipal (see Colophons of the manuscripts, MS B).

28. Von Weider read [ ] *ki an num*, but it seemed to me that the line begins with *na or ina ud*. The parallels do not help. A vat (*namzītu*) is not an obvious *desideratum* here, though the spelling *na-an-zī-ū* is not without parallel. A more plausible reading would be *ina tēni*(*ud) anā, ‘on this day’, with the last word written as a kind of pseudo-logogram *an-nam*, but the sign after *an* is different from *nam* in vi 1 of the same MS (L. 247). For the moment it is best to reserve judgement.

29. The line is restored from SB I 208 (cf. the Pennsylvania tablet: OB II 54–5).

32. This line might be a repetition of SB I 214: *múdā šalabalu šē'ī tišra*. However that may be, it may also recur as SB II 59.

34–5. The couplet is a repetition of the Pennsylvania tablet’s *šuš šalabum šārumu lašabosu / šalabum šanām ši štalabal* (OB II 69–72).

36–7. These two lines are restored from the almost identical couplet in the Pennsylvania tablet: *šabat gissu kīma ili ummedītu / anu gissu ša tišrī misturabīm* (OB II 73–6). The introduction of plural šā for šamī may be simply an orthographic feature, but note that the same thing has happened in l. 110 (MS k). The writing dinigšis for the singular is occasionally attested in the first millennium. Some variants are given in CAD I, p. 91; note also in l. 49 of the Theodicy singular šī (parallel ili-ti-ši-l. 51) spelled dinigd, dingir.dingir and [dingier].

38. Cf. the Pennsylvania tablet: *ina šēru šurur ušu* (OB II 77).

39. As it stands on the tablets this curious phrase contains two prepositional phrases with no verb of any kind. Heida found one by ignoring šēru (which on the manuscript that was available to him is partly obscured by an erasure) and reading the remaining half line as *namūn nišuma, the people whispered* (?) *JNES 11* (1952), p. 140–1). This was rejected by von Soden, *ZA* 53, p. 223, and rightly so, for the faithfulness of *ina namūnima* to the tradition is now confirmed by MB Boğ a 9: *ina na-ma-an-ud*. One should assume that the beginning of the line is corrupt.

40–1. An older version of this couplet is *ānāmu Gilgundū maš lišadatu / lišma šamū šepā šarām* puškūt (OB II 80–2) / 183–5); l. 41 is probably repeated as SB II 164. The word šēru-šu is stative šī with a typical LB redundam final vowel (so already Heida). At the end šā-[ra] is accordingly for *šurur ša-ra* as well is possible.

42. The line exists in two versions (that of MS z is restored from SB II 174), but ultimately both go back to OB II [83–4] / 186–7: *mišlē [ši] išisaldu ina soden* (cf. MB Boğ, Fragments a, 11). On *minde* see Chapter 5, the note on OB II 17.

43. This is a standard line much used in SB I (see the commentary above, on SB I 124–5).

44–5. This couplet develops the Pennsylvania tablet’s *aškalam iškantu mahārāt* (OB II 87) by the addition of a parallel line.

46. The Pennsylvania tablet has *ipšišma išsatu išpuša* (OB II 88). Here the spelling ip-te-gi may signify that this word was no longer understood as ipša, for though the ‘overhanging’ vowel would be unremarkable, the value gi is not typical of LB orthography outside the archaising royal inscriptions. The translation nevertheless assumes in *ip-te-gi* a corruption of ipša, for want of an alternative. A verb *paša* or *paša* appears in lexical texts (see AHu, p. 809), but its meaning is unknown. No verb *pūga* or *pūga* is known.

47–8. This couplet is freely restored in the spirit of the Pennsylvania tablet: *uš iš Enkidu aššak ana akdim / šakarum anu tāsum la šumūlu* (OB II 90–3).

50–1. This couplet presumably represents a variation on the harlot’s encouraging words, as known from the Pennsylvania tablet and a fragment from Boğazköy (OB II 96–8; MB Boğ a 15). Though *simu šurā / simu šurā* might have been expected at the line ends, as in the Boğazköy piece (cf. also the parallels SB VI 27–8, VII 135–6), they do not fit. Instead the restorations are suggested by *šumī nuriši (m)* in OB II 98.

52–3. The line of tablet ending in ši is so closely written that I have assumed it to contain two lines of poetry.

59. One may also read nar-bal-ša-ma, ‘his greatness’.

60. The restorations are taken from OB II 115–16: *ušappu barburī ṭaḥhī ukāshī*. The enclitic -ma could emphasize the object but more probably functions as a coordinative (for coordinative -ma attached to nouns see above, on SB I 143. The need for a trochaic ending indicates that MS k’s ‘overhanging’ vowel is orthographic and without phonological or morphological significance.

61–2. This couplet only slightly varies on the Pennsylvania tablet: *tišu nišum rābūtu / Enkidu māqarrāra axilum šarum* (OB II 117–19). The stative *nī*šumima is restored on grounds of space. The spelling *nišum-a-nu* for *nišum-unum* exhibits the occasional Neo-Assyrian preference for masculine plural pronouns with dissimilated vowels, as attested in the possessive suffixes '-šumu and -šunu and the independent pronoun šumu. These variant forms seem always to occur in the presence of a suffixed particle, such as the enclitic -ma (as here) or subjunctive -ni. The present instance is very rare case of a real Assyrian dialect form intruding in the text of a Kuyunjik manuscript of the SB epic. For others see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (vii).

63. The beginning of the line is restored from OB II 120. As argued in the note on the OB text, the formula *šēru ušu* marks the man in question as a new character, no doubt the wedding guest whose report of the customs of Uruk so shocks Enkidu. The difficult complex of signs šēru ušu would therefore likely signify the house where the wedding ceremony was due to take place, i.e. šēru emi, and is presumed to be corrupt (von Soden, *ZA* 53, p. 222, suggested šēruz, ‘er sārat’).

64–5. Though the context is not yet certain, dam in l. 2 recalls the purpose of the Pennsylvania tablet that describes the *tis primas locas* (especially OB II 161); if so then the preceding line is very likely to be restored *šaruru* (sa Uruk supātu . . .) (cf. OB II 154, 156).

100–2. These lines expand on a couplet of the Pennsylvania tablet: *iškalamma išsatu išpuša / ipšašak luššum la Gilgundū* (OB II 200–3), but the sense of the interpolated line remains rather difficult to fathom. As von Soden noted, šēru is not obviously meaningful; he suggested emending to *ša-šēru ša Šar ‘er šēru* (ZA 53, pp. 222–3); Hecker’s ‘das Ausläumen’ (TUAT III/4, p. 683) evidently takes šēru-šu as an exceptional spelling of ipša.

103–7. These five lines repeat SB II 251–5 / 279–82.

109–10. This couplet is a slight rewriting of the Pennsylvania tablet: *ana Gilgundū kīma šaš šakilīnum mekārum / ana šērušu aššaklum nasam* (OB II 194–7). In l. 109 there is no room for *mu-
In the beginning of this line the spelling in-nid-ra-ma was restored (Mesopotamian Akkadian) for accuseative singular amātu or amatu. This can be explained as (a) being an early indication in script of the loss of final vowels in the vernacular, (b) using a root-spelling, a-mātu(kur) or (c) exhibiting the principle that CVVC signs can represent the biconsonantal CVCV, not only where the two vowels are the same (well known in NA writing) but even where they differ. Spellings CVVC for CVCC are not remarkable in LB sources; other examples in Kuyunjik manuscripts of SB Gigamet are collected in Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions (c). For examples in older Neo-Assyrian manuscripts see the introduction to Chapter 7.

186. After restored II. 180–1. 191. An older version of this line occurs in OB Schayen, 64 // 67 // 76: isra erbûrum ari bû. 192. The writing of pa-a-ša for paša could be put down to typical LB indifference to the quality of a final vowel but for the fact that this particular spelling of the pronominal suffix is so infrequent that it must have been expressly avoided as an error. At a time when the feminine suffix -ša was very often written -ša, an example of the opposite may be an instance of hypercorrection. Alternatively, it is plain sloppiness, comparable with MS bb's piššuššan in L. 274.

213. The spelling of kiš-ša-lat, 'let me cut' (Parpola).

217. Restored from the Yale tablet (OB III 129–30).

218a // 227 // 284 // 298. The spelling til-ša-ma for the construct state dūšum can be explained in one of two ways: (a) the writing preserves an LB descriptive construct state in -a or (b) it exhibits an unnecessary 'overhanging' vowel (CV for C2).

218b–29. This passage, which develops OB III 108–16 // 195–200, is repeated later in the tablet (SB II 275–86; cf. also 291–9). For the parallel phrases see the introduction to Chapter 9, the section on textual variants.

221 // 278 // 291. The late text retains the OB text's rīgmatu (literary for rigmatu) in nearly all manuscripts.

222 // 279 // 292. This text retains the OB line, although the intermediate version of the text represented by Assyrian MS X offers the variant sašur (cf. OB, 12) for napšu.

223 // 280 // 293. The reading nimmat qāti, already legible in MS X (though badly abraded), is now confirmed by the additional evidence furnished by MS X in L. 280. On the probable development of this line from the earlier ana lāš šab nammat qāti see Chapter 5, the note on OB III 108.

224 // 281 // 295. MS K's šarru, the loss of subjunctive -u is unremarkable in a LB source; for arāšu and forests see the OB version of this line, OB III 109 // 196 manna ša šarrumu ana lībātu.

225 // 282 // 297. For the point of this line see the note on its ancestor, OB III 134–5.

223–2. This couplet reworks the older u-asta (Enkiškudīkīs) kūma pasdūqi(m) taqabbi / piša iršānim tišummin lībītu 'OB III 156–7 // Assyrian MS X, 7' and 9'. It appears again as SB IV 200–1; cf. SB IV 233.

234–5. Restored after the Yale tablet: astūnimmu mašša ēlima / minima ša šarrumu šārida (or šarrumma) OB III 142–3. The second verb has changed from present to proteric. Assyrian MS X, 2' has a quite different version of the second line of this couplet (see Chapter 7).

236. The first three signs do not appear to yield šārišku and, in any case, the verb šārišku looks as if it requires a feminine plural subject.

237–9. Restored from the Yale tablet (OB III 151–3): inšiškalam(l) tarāši(m) ina šerim / tūnšušma lābbu(m) kalama šēd / eššušum ši-šu mašānka. The intermediate text represented by
TABLE III

1-12. This speech, similar to that spoken by the elders of Uruk in the Yale tablet (OB III 249-71), is repeated later on at 215-27. The correct restoration of 1.1 is now clear for the first time. Previously it had been assumed to be a line of narrative specifying the speakers and introducing the speech. Evidently that line must now be sought at the end of SB II.
2. The phrase ginim emtiq̆a[ha, literally 'the totality of your might', is reminiscent of the lion loved by Ishar, who is ginim emtiq̆a (SB VI 51).

4–5. One is tempted to emend to (i)-iṣ-pur, following l. 219 (MS c, LB) and also l. 9, but note that the forerunner of this couplet preserved on the Yale tablet also uses a combination of present and preterite: [šiliḫ maḫuš tappă ṣallim | ša tānītu ṣallir̃ waqarrī na-natār] (OB III 255–6). The use of the past tense leads me to assume that both sets of lines quote proverbial wisdom (see the commentary on the OB couplet).

10. Opinion is divided as to whether ki-ru-a-ti is the plural of ḫūrušu, 'ditch', or of ḫīrušu, 'bride' (first wife), or intentionally ambiguous (Dalley, p. 127, 26). In trying to make the line more meaningful, translations of ḫūrušu as 'pifflar' (Sperrer), 'grave' (Dalley), 'sepṭpqah' (Pettinato), 'chaussée-trape' (Bottero) obscure the fact that the usage of the word ḫūrušu is limited in the extant documentation to channels of water, especially irrigation ditches and city moats. For me in any case ana ḫīru suggests motion towards, as against motion over (see the commentary on SB I 145), and for this reason too I favour the words. The fact that Gilmageš was envisaged in the Sumerian story of Bilgameš and Huwawa as unmarried and without the responsibilities of family (D. O. Edzard, ZA 81 (1991), p. 184, A 53: nita-sag-dišı n.e.n gin, akā, 'single men like him'), need not mean that he holds the same status in the Akkadian epic. The undeniable problem, however, is that an historical Babylonian would have one ḫīrušu only. Subsequent wives were not of the same status as the first. Gilmageš was an epic hero of fabled appetite: was he imagined to have had brides in large numbers? The sentiment expressed, that the king return safely home to his wives after a dangerous expedition, was no doubt a popular and topical one at the Babylonian court.

11. The spelling pa-ah-ri-in-ma (MS BB) for parpušina exhibits the convention of some first-millennium scribes that an open syllable with a long vowel can be denoted in writing by closing the syllable. Other examples in SB Gilmageš are listed in Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions (b). The elders are in the process of relinquishing temporarily their responsibility for counselling the king, so niqq̆abaka is an example of the 'performative' preterite (on this see further GAG 579v). This usage is best known in the word ašak, 'I hereby invoke you', at the beginning of SB prayers (CAD S 2, p. 157). In SB Gilmageš it occurs also in SB III 28 waappid, III 125 išq̆, III 127 išq̆, VII 93 // MB Ur 4 amšurika, XI 33 amniej.

12. The spelling tu-qa-qd-da-na-ti (MS M) exhibits a repeated consonant at the boundary between stem and affix; for this practice see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub (e).

15. Unless the scribe inadvertently lost a sign, the form nittik must be a NB cognate, for earlier i nittel. The temple name ș.gal.maḫ, 'Exalted Palace', is given to sanctuaries of Gula (Ninsin), most famously at Isin, but also at Babylon, Ur, Uruk and Ashur (see George, House Most High, p. 88). Ninsin occupies Gula's temple in Uruk by virtue of the syncretism which equated the divine couple Ninurta and Gula with Lugalbanda and Ninsin, as made explicit in the two-column Weidner god list (E. Weidner, AFR 2 (1924–5), p. 14, 17–18). This equation can be traced back to the early second millennium, for in an Old Babylonian copy of an esnamma Gula is explicitly invoked as (CT 42 7 i 41, ed. Cohen, Eškīmhi, p. 102, 109) utudna (ni su-pa es) en bitu, ga, mes, the one who gave birth to the lord Bilgameš.

16. When preceding a noun the prepositional phrase is normally ana maḫar in OB and literary Babylonian. The variant maḫarri offered in this line is rare. Other examples of genitive construct maḫarri before a noun becoming with a consonant (i.e. where crisis is discounted) are rare, and more often than not comprise the second element of compounds: Ešnāna elīš I 149 // II 35 // III 39 a-li-hu maḫarri (III 97 maḫar) pa-ax un-ma-ni, Craig, ABRT I 55 I 5, ed. Livingstone, Court Poetry no. 4 i

6'. a-li-kaš maḫarri šar-ut se-er-ut at-še-e (NA hymn); Langdon, R4 12 (1915), p. 191, 3: a-li maḫarri šīṁ (šīṁ-prayer, NĀ copy); KAR 132 i 2 (RAct, I: 101): inna maḫarri pa-ni-taš (LB ritual). In first-millennium sources the variant may be orthographic only but, if genuinely morphemic, it can be explained as an example of the survival in literary style of the AKAK generative construct (see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub ii). For other spellings like šā-nat (MS BB) for šā-nati see also Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (c).

17. These epithets have already appeared in SB 1259–60 // 286–7. On the spelling mu-da-ti (MS BB) for midat šīk see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (g).

19–20. The sequence šīrakāti šīrakū occurs also in MB Boğ 5 7, where both verbs are ven- tive. I take the present šīrakū as an indication of a final clause; alternatively it can be circumstantial (M. P. Streick, Or 64 (1995), p. 61: 'while she gienge'). The word ša’tunaš (var. šatunaš) is a variant of locative ša’tunaš, comparable with such forms as šar-šu-šu-sa-ni, 'in their minds' (Ešnāna elīš I 111), šak-šu-šu-sa, 'with his weapon' (Anūz I 13), 'in-li-šu-šu-sa, 'before their supreme lord' (Anūz I 16), šak-šu-šu-sa, 'to his mounain' (Anūz I 82 // 129 // 148), and šip-šu-šu-sa, 'for her work' (Bubluša-šabi's hymn to Gula, W. G. Lambert, Or 66 (1967), p. 118, 42). These variants, with širušu instead of šīrakū, perhaps arose by analogy with the ending -šašu(s(m) found in verbs of time, especially in the late period (šatunaš, 'daily', šatunaš, 'monthly'), OB šašu(s(m) > NB šatunaš, 'yearly').

22. The restoration follows SB I 274: šēnāḫa šar-ut ana maḫar šar-ut ummiṭu. This line is thus revealed as part of the epic recopito. It was not completely petrified, however, for MS M clearly differs in the preposition that precedes the common noun šammiṭu.


25. The trisyllabic spelling of ša.tiya as ra.qa-tu is the most common in SB Gilmageš, being also attested in SB III 48, IX 54, X 110, 141 and 241; one also meets ra.qa-tum (SB 19) and ra.qi-ti (SB 1121, fem. sing., see ad loc.). The intrusion of a normally unwarranted epenthetic vowel is a mark of literary style. For other examples in SB Gilmageš see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (f).

28. Note the additional word, waappid, absent from the parallel SB II 265. Its tense is the 'performative' preterite (see above, on i. 11).

35–6. This couplet offers a very rare example in the Babylonian Gilmageš of what may be called enjambement—the continuation of a clause beyond the end of the verse—with the boundary of the poetic lines splitting the paired object Gilmageš mēṣarā u Ešnāna.

37. A similar line occurs in Nergal and Ereshkīgal: (i) ši-i-ša (BB) nar-ma-ki i-šu-um (STT 22 i 45 // iii 59 // iv 5 // iv 34); Hunger, Ur II 1 iv 14.

38. Another example of the use in combination of the two purificants, tammaršu and allašu (literally 'You-Make-Pure plant'), occurs in a ritual of the diviner: alḫuššu ša i-šal-šal 'he purifies himself with tammuš and soapwort' (BBR no. 11 rev. i 6).

39. The adornment of Ninurta's breast was perhaps an ornamental stag (šimunu). Such a thing, weighing 2.5 kg, is known in an OB dowry (VOS XII 157, 4).

40. The verb i-pi-ra-ni remains obscure, even though its subject is now recovered. Whether it can be the same verb as the enigmatic i-pi-ra-am-na of SB X 149 // 152 remains to be seen.

41. The line is over-long and may have once been two, perhaps divided as: an minimū telku ana mēṣarā Gilmageš i bēšu-šē šaliba šēnāша (otherwise CAD S 5, p. 72, where the division is placed after mēṣarēš). In doing without the second verb, MSS BB and BA leave the line with an unsatisfactory antepenultimate stress, šaliba.

54. The phrase mimma lēmnu, lit: 'something evil', is often translated as 'everything evil', but
there is no suggestion in the epic that Ḫumbaba is what such a rendering implies, the source of all evil in the land. In exorcistic and medical literature minima lemmu refers not to a general abstract idea but to a very real being, though one that has to remain unspecified because its name and other particulars are unknown. A good illustration of this comes from an apotropaic ritual which rounds off a long list of identifiable malign powers with the catch-all phrases lu min-ma lemmu(lit.) [ma-as bal[i(gal)]] lu min-ma la šibû[dug,ga] ša šuma(mu) la nah(a,sa)*, 'or any Evil Thing whatsoever that may exist, or any Bad Thing that has no name' (Wiggermann, Protective Spirits, p. 6, 9–10). Later on in the same text the unidentified malign influence is adjudged to depart: min-ma lam-nu min-ma la šibû(dug,ga) ši bér(danna) la-i-ša-a ma-ba-r-an-un, 'the Evil Thing, the Bad Thing shall depart a myriad leagues from your presence!' (Ibid., p. 20, 306–7).
This understanding of minima lemmu fits Ḫumbaba well, for he is by reputation an Evil Thing of nature hostile to man but otherwise unknown except remote and untried. Since Ḫumbaba is assumed to be evil, Šamaš, the god of justice, is naturally seen to oppose him. For the spelling ku-bel-laq (MS BB), lacking the subjunctive -u, see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (c).

55. I follow Tournay and Shaffer, L'Épopée, p. 102, fn. 17, in assuming that this line refers to the daylight journey of the sun across the sky, crossing the cosmic boundaries of heaven and earth. Instead of iti they restore the very rare word itita, 'circumference': 'the limits of the sky'. Other readings are possible.

56. For Ayā as 'bride' see the references collected in CAD K, p. 81. On the spelling ka-l-lat for kallatu see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (c).

66. I assume mi-tāku is an example of an adjective used as a noun. A derivation from the infinitive, 'your making red,' seems less likely.

73. The restoration follows a couplet of a bilingual incantation to the Sun God:

izzi.gar.zu,še dugu,ax ak dinigir.gal,gal.e,ne
a-na nu-ri-ka a-paq-qu ili(diingir)mek rubatu(gal)mek
a.nun.na,ke,ne ne gi,bar,ra sag,zu mu.un,i,du,m
a-sun-nu-hi gi-mir-ta-ku in-na-at-ta pa-ni-ka
IV R' 19 no. 2, 37–40

The great gods wait intent on your light,
all the Anunnaki gaze on your face.

74–75. Restored from II 56–7.

80–4. These five lines recur as SB II 130–4. The vocabulary of II 82 // 132 is reminiscent of statements in EAE XIV and **Apín II of the seasonal changes in the lengths of day and night, e.g. *u[i]n[i] irrihit mušša ikarrā (see F.N. H. Al-Rawi and A. R. George, AFO 38–9 (1991–2), pp. 60–1). Line 83 is restored in the light of the common expression for travelling on foot, purid/peti̇, 'to open one's stride'; see especially Lušat IV 41, where pu-ta-a pu-ri-du is a metonymy for all who go on two legs.

85. In its first and last words this line recalls the narrative statement OB Schuyt, S2: nuhatum tiszáti littâl, though the traces do not allow the expected phrase litsipi littâl.

88–92. The realization of this wish is SB V 137–41. The verb šu in I 92 // IV 141 may have been a variant of šupi, 'they beat' (Ḫumbaba's face), for the Hittite paraphrase renders the narrative line as nu-kar ([AHU] šuwaša šen-hi,ša-me egir-ra tisipiš/men, 'and the šuwaša slay(ing) them, who are ever with the Augen zurück' (G. Wilhelm, ZA 78 (1988), p. 113). The list of winds in this passage is almost identical to that preserved on a lexical fragment from Emar:

Comparison suggests that im. slu can be read daltamun, but without further evidence I have transcribed it conventionally. MS y's ti-gil-du in 1. 90 is clearly meant to be ti-mir-ra.

The use of the winds in battle is a mythological device best known from the Creation Epic, where Marduk mobilizes eleven in his combat with Tālamat:

i-pu-usa ma sa-pa-ra lu-mu-ú quer-bi ti-amat
er-bat-ti lá-a-ri út-te-es-bi-ta la a-se-e mim-mi-taš
im. slu im.sú im.kur.ra im.mar.dú
i-du-ú sa-pa-ra a-ut-ri-ba gu-ti-ti ab(i-ad)-du *a-ni
ši-ni im-šul-la (im laš-nu) me-ba-a a-kam-su-um
im.limmu,ba im.imin.bi im.sú im.sú a.am.nu.sú a
ši-ba-am-ma lárši(im)mek ši-ta-su-ú te-bi-ti-bi-un
quer-bi ti-amat šu-ud-la Šu ti-bu-ú arki(egir)-iš

Énûma eši IV 41–8

He made a net to enclose the inside of Tālamat,
he posted the four winds, so that no part of her would escape:
South Wind, North Wind, East Wind and West Wind,
the gift of Anu, his father, he placed hard by the net.
He created Tempest, Hurricane, Tornado,
the Four Winds, the Seven Winds, Chaos Wind and Indomitable Wind:
he let loose the seven winds he had created,
to stir up the inside of Tālamat they drew up behind him.

A comparable list of winds occurs in the Assyrian recension of Atra-ḫasis, where the context is of Adad marshalling his forces for the coming storm:

šu-ú-tu il-ta-nu kaddi(ku)š a-mur-[ru]
si-su (siq?) siq-su-me be-lu-ú rúdu (10 × 10) = agar,

IM-šul-la ad ma lu la te-bi-ti-biš lárši(im)mek

W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, Atra-ḫasis, pp. 122–4, rev. 6–8;
cf. Lambert, JSS 5 (1960), p. 121

Compare further the eight winds that are loosed against Ḫumbaba in the Hittite Gilgamesh:

Given the established sequence šitu-šinâma-sâlata-amurušu, south–north–east–west, one is minded to consider IM.GAL in this list as standing for šitu, 'south,' and to restore the missing two winds accordingly (either IM.GAL is a corruption of the standard šatu(gal)=šatu, or it is related to Arraiššu II 66: da-gal = šu-ur, ša-tú). Many of the rare words for storm winds that occur in these passages are also collected in the synonym lists, for example Malé III 173–80: zi-qi-qiu, ma-ni-tum, me-šu-ú, le-šu-ú, [me]-er-ú, ši-par-ziq-qi, ši-qiq-qi, im-shu-urum = ša-ur-ú

93. I take šatu(ka) ... šatu-ur as an unremarkable LB spelling for šukku ... šišašu; alternatively one may read it as plural, šukku ... šišašu.

94. The verb Šapāšu, 'to blow, rekindle,' is commonly used to describe the rising of celestial bodies, especially the sun. The notion that Šamaš's fires are rekindled after his rest from the doors of heaven (see W. Heimpel, JCS 38 [1986], p. 142). A bilingual incantation from Bit-rimku takes the metaphor further, describing the sun god's rising much as if he were a householder starting the day:

én uttu an ši-ur ra ši-ni bu
šamēš(m)ma ina i-šaš šamēš(m)ma tap-pu-ša-am ma
ši gar.ku an.na ke, nam.tu.e.gal
ši-gar šamēš(m)ma(2) elīši(ku) esip tap-ta
ši-qi an.na ke, gil im mi.in.tag
da-lat šamēš(m)ma(1) tap-ta-

IV R² 20 no. 2, 1–6 and duplicates, cf. Langdon, OECTVI, p. 52

Incantation. O Šamaš, you rekindled (your fire) at the horizon, you undid the pure bolt of heaven (Abk: the bolt of the pure heavens), you opened the door of heaven.

96. The reference to mules is to the steeds that pull the sun's chariot through the sky. They are also known from a line of an incantation in Bit-rimši: ta-(as)-a-an-da pa-ra-ka (var. gil(m)ši ši-nu-ru la-as-[ma] (var. a-la-kam), 'you (Šamaš) have hitched up your mules, which are ardent for running,' (cf. Laessoe, Bit Rimši, p. 57, 63).

97. The old break should perhaps be restored mawâd māši.

102–6. The force of ši in first position, remote from its verb, seems to be emphatic, as it is in SB X 304-6: uš mamma šiša-im mar / uš mamma ša šiša-im mar pāštā / uš mamma ša šiša-rim ša-māš (šus[e]). While those clauses are emphatic statements, another occasion on which such syntax appears in SB Gileames is a rhetorical question (SB IV 213: uš māši italātiš). The problem of whether the present lines are statements or questions is resolved by II. 105–6. These can hardly be interpreted as emphatic denials of Gileames's eventual function as a ruler of the shades in the Netherworld; they must be rhetorical questions.

102. Alternatively one might read (ina) šamēš ūezeš, 'will Gileames not stand with you in(t) the heavens?' Whichever deactivation is preferred, the point seems to be that Gileames will share the celestial role of his god. His association with Šamaš is well known for the Netherworld, where after death he will judge the dead in partnership with Šamaš. The two appear together or with the Anunnakī in a collection of incantations against ghosts (KAR 227 and duplicates; see Chapter 3, the sub-section on Gileames in exorcistic rituals). The prayer to Gileames from the same collection records that Šamaš himself made this arrangement: "šamēš(šu)n ši-pa-ta u purusâš(šu) bar qa-un-ka tp-qid, Šamaš delegated to you verdict and decision" (quoted in full in Chapter 3). However, there is no unequivocal evidence in support of a celestial partnership, and the line's significance remains a puzzle.

103. By virtue of his aqā, 'crown,' the moon god is one of the traditional custodians of the symbols of kingship, as best articulated in the curses of Hammurapi's laws (Codex Hammurapi rev. xxviii 41–6): Šīni(m)zu ... agāš(a) šusašu-gašu ša ša-ra-šu in di-su-er-ku, 'May Šīni take from him the crown and throne of kingship!' Compare also the names of city gates in Babylon (Timmâr VII 2: šuši(t)u aqāš(a) be-la-ša-taš, 'Šīni is the Establisher of his Lordly Crown') and Senacherib's Nineveh (CT 26 30, 91 // R.C. Thompson, Iraq 7 [1940], p. 28: ṣuši-ta šuši(u) ša ša-ra-šu in di-su-er-ku, 'The Moon is the Establisher (var. Protector) of my Lordly Crown'). The lack of agreement at the end of the line between the extant manuscripts can perhaps be resolved by an original ending ša-su aqā, 'sceptre and royal symbol.' These two items of regalia go together as a pair in an incantation to Enmaazzar (Craig, ABRT II 13, 8): šu-siš aššuq(gi) di-šu ... aqā šu-siš (bašištigiduru) u aqā (bala). How exactly Gileames is to share the moon's regalia is not clear to me.

117. Restored after l. 17, etc.

119. To my eyes the broken sign is not n[a] (so Thompson).

120. This line offers another example of a problem noted earlier: we cannot determine whether šakkanu is present tense to express a final clause or to introduce direct speech (or both); see Chapter 5, on OB II 1.

122. The word written as-ma-ka is difficult. It usually understood as the preterite or present of the verb amū, though one would expect šamū(m)šēš, or the preterite of tamū, though one would expect amēša. There is a marked lack of consensus as to the meaning of this verb, which would mean in the context (<amēša, Oppenheim: 'I pronounce you'; Heidel: 'I have adopted(? you,' similarly Speiser, von Soden: 'sprach ich zu dir,' similarly Kovacs and Hecker; Labat: 'je te déclare (mien);' Foster: 'I have bespoken you'; Lambard: 'I reflect upon you'; tamū: Botéro, 'je t'adjure,' similarly Tournay and Shaffer; note also improbable amēša): Schott: unclear; Pettinato, 'ti ho annunciato et ti ho annoverato'). These difficulties of form and meaning lead me to reject both verbs, and to read amēša as a regular form, of the noun amū (cf. already Dalley, 'your offspring'). The clause is thus a nominal one.

The word amū, 'hatching, chick,' is otherwise used of human young only by Shalmaneser I (Grayson, RIMA I, p. 183, 42). The word is chosen carefully, for it vividly conveys the helpless plight of orphaned children when first taken into a temple's care and service. Perhaps it also highlights their parentless state, for elsewhere in the epic, when Humbaba addresses Enkidu as someone 'who knew no father' or 'mother,' he calls him amū (SBV 87–8).

123. For the plural of aqētu see OB Atram-šašši III vii 6: is-ug-ša-ak-ka-ti.

124. The exact nature of šedu, lit. 'imposition,' that is placed on Enkidu's neck to mark his new status is not clear. In Oppenheim's discussion of this episode he translated it as 'tag,' referring to an object in the British Museum (O R N S 17 [1948], p. 34, fn. 1; also CAD I J, p. 110). There are several such 'tags' extant. They are pierced ovoids of clay each bearing the names of an individual, the per-
son responsible for them and a date in the reign of Merodach-baladan II (catalogued by J. A. Brinkman, Studies Onippenus, p. 43, 44.2.12-14). They may have been known as ‘slave tags’ worn around the neck (so M. A. Dandamaev, Slavery in Babylonia, p. 234), but this function is disputed (see Brinkman, Studies Onippenus, pp. 37-8). The word īnā is found nowhere in the known technical terminology for slave marking. We know from legal documents that the mark of a šītušu, oblate of Ištar (as Bél-lit-Uruk) in Neo-Babylonian Uruk was a star symbol (habakātu), which took the form of a brand mark (arrat) on the hand (see the references collected in CAD S3, p. 106); on the marking of these and other temple slaves with branding ions (šītušu parāšu) and other devices in the first millennium see Dandamaev, Slavery, pp. 488-9. Marking (zālu) of slaves by branding, and perhaps also other means, was known in the third millennium but it was not common, nor do we know on what part of the slave’s body the mark was imposed (see P. Steinkeiler in OIP 104, p. 243; D. A. Foxvog, ‘Sumerian brands and branding-ions’, ZA 85 (1995), pp. 1-7). The classic slave mark of the second millennium was the style of hair called abittu. Judging from our passage, which serves as an analogy of the ritual induction of oblates in Uruk, in earlier times some form of identification was displayed on the neck that denoted the oblate’s status and obligation.

125-6. These lines can be taken as quoting the protocol by which foundlings were inducted into the temple personnel. Denoting as it does the act of induction, the verb īlā is certainly another example of the ‘performative’ preterite (see above, on SB III 11); urabbi predicts the outcome of the induction and is present-future.

127. In MS M the reading of the sign īl as ēl now seems inescapable. Other examples of writings of the first-person conjunction prefix ēi/ with signs normally displaying ī/i are not uncommon; in this book SB III 127 ite-ēl (MS M) // īl-ā-li (MS aa) is joined by XI 82 t-e-pa-ni (MS T) // e-e-pa-ēl (MS D) and XI 314 t-e-pu-āl (MS C) // i-e-pu-āal (MSSW). MS aa’s ēlā is a further example of the ‘performative’ preterite. This statement looks like a version of the words spoken on adoption, for which the phrase used in OB legal documents is ana marātim legitum (see M. David, Die Adoption im altbabylonischen Recht (Leipzig, 1927), pp. 38 ff.; M. de F. Ellis, JCS 27 (1975), p. 126).

128. The verb dāumuqa also occurs in the context of an OB manumission document from Sippur (BEVU 196, 96, 1-7); ‘yu-im-ra-tum ... ēl eri-ī-ī-sa naddḫu (tukur) šamālu (ara) iwa-ma-sa i-da-am-mi-qī-īs-ma a-na ma-ra-ri-ta il-ku-nu-li [ē] erī-il-ī-sa ... [a]-ti-il-ī-lī; Ṣurratu, whom Erīli-Aya, the naddhu of Šamaš, her mother, had favoured with adoption (lit. favoured and adopted): Ėrišī-Aya [also] redeemed her from slavery’. In the present line it is evidently Gilgamesh who will show favour to his new brother; there is no hinduḫu but the verb describes the expected behaviour of the adopting family towards the new member.

132. The mention of Marduk, the god of Babylon, is unique in Gilgamesh, in which the divine drumanuqas personae are predominantly drawn from the local pantheon of Uruk and the national pantheon of Sumer.

169. The first word can also be read ku-ri-ī-s; ‘sheaves’ (kurnulla, see Landsberger, RA 62, p. 103, fn. 24).
of this, because as the text of SB IV stands it would seem that the distance of 150 bēr covered by the end of the third day was not the total distance of the journey from Uruk to the Cedar Forest, but only that covered before each dream episode. Von Soden avoided this problem by maintaining that *für Sin-leq-unnīni* stelle Libanon nur ein Zwischenziel auf dem langen Marsch der Freunde [to the Cedar Forest] dar (Reclainy, p. 40, fn. 3), but the difficulty here is that, according to SBV (as well as OB Ishchali), the Cedar Forest was on Mt Lebanon. For this reason, too, the lab-na-nu must be restored in all the parallels to the passage under comment.

To return to the discussion of distance and time, there are five dream episodes in the late version of the text, as reconstructed, so that in this account the journey took fifteen days. As Landesberger pointed out, there is a contradiction inherent in this, because the mention of Lebanon in 1.4 would seem to indicate that Gilgames and Enkidu had already arrived at the Cedar Forest after three days' journey (RA 42, p. 102). To resolve this difficulty we have to assume that *šēqū here, and also in OB Schayen; 1.6, means 'to draw nearer' (so already Renger in Oinas (ed.), Heroic Epic and Saga, p. 42).

In the Nītīte version of the epic the arrival at the Cedar Forest ostensibly occurred on the sixth day of the journey (H. Otten, Istanbuler Mitteilungen 8 (1958), p. 109), which would represent a simple doubling of this figure. However, the figure in question can be read [un] 1.6.KAM, i.e. after a journey of fifteen days, which would then agree with the SB text (E. Larroche, RAH 26 (1968), p. 126, Eg 4). However that may be, the late poet's enthusiasm for repetition and aggrandizement means that the account we have has left reality a long way behind and is, in effect, a fairy tale. As Landesberger wrote when reflecting on von Soden's attempt at reconciling the statistics of this passage with reality, 'je junger die Erzählungen von Gilgames sind, desto mehr sind sie die Merkmale reiner Märchen tragen' (RA 42, p. 99, fn. 7).

4. To my eyes the place name on MS w is *lab-na-nu* not *lib-na-nu* (collated against Lambert's copy). Late in this tablet, however, MS r has a clear *lib-na-nu* (see 1.124). For this reason one would be tempted to read MS w's *lab-na-nu as lib-na-nu*, were it not for the fact that other Babylonian attestations of the toponym, where unambiguously, unambiguously report it as Libannû (see M. Weipert, 'Libannon', RAIV 6, pp. 644–5).

5–6] // 38–9 // 83–4 // 125–6 // 166–7. The second line of this couplet is not yet fully recovered; since it seems to mention water it may be narrative related to instructions like those given by the elders in theYale tablet: *ina nakkahā hār bērītum lū ašurātu anā nānītu ḫasītim mi anā Šamīm tānqarū u ḫasītim mi anā ḫasītim u ḫasītim mi anā ḫasītim*. Ugi 1.56–7. On Gilgamel and wells see Chapter 3, the section on Digging wells.

7] // 40// 85 // 127 // 168. This line is the late counterpart of OB Schayen, 27: *inma Gilmānī amā nīr šaddim*.

11] // [44] // 59 // [131] // 172. The reading *daltu sarbīl* is based on Labat's 'un [abi? (?) contre le] vent', and encouraged by the verb *retal*. I presume the shelter is a makeshift tent, and that this is the flap that goes over the entrance to keep out the weather. Others have suggested [šīq 2] or [šīq 1], for both of which room is lacking, however. For *sarbīl*, 'stormwind', see MSL IV, p. 35, Eremas Voc. III 90. *uk 2a* 29 = *ur-lib-ba*, following *tekku* and *matu*, and Malzke III 192: [šīq 2] = *qū = min (i.e.) *bil-ba* (von Weiler, Uruk III 120), among other winds.

13] // [46] // 91 // [133] // 174. The three signs after *kīma* have usually been interpreted as 'mountain barley' (*šādīl*), Assyrian orthography, but to my eyes the second sign seems more like *šīr* than *kāur* for *kīma*, in Usurian *sa. ù*, *flat-laid net*, a tool of the fowler, see CAD S3, p. 339 (despite the evidence in OB Lu clearly indicate that the genitive is *šīr*). The verb described by this simile should mean 'he threw himself down flat', but no plausible restoration occurs to me.


25. The conventional interpretation of *kī-inim* is 'like flies of the reed-bed', but given the lack of context this is still very uncertain.

26. It has not been noticed previously that this line and I.107 are essentially the same. The line is related to OB IM 19, where it is clearly part of the narrative, introducing a speech by Enkidu: *walūdum šīrīn midukum ilī:. išta-gar [em] ana ibī [.]. On account of *ni-le-[x] in I.107, one has to consider taking the late version of the line as direct speech, reading the first word *[gi*] allāmama, and I have taken this option on that occasion, where the following line is fuller than it is here. But in the present line an antecedent subject is needed for *inakuru ana anātu*, and for this reason I suppose that it was closer to the OB line, and restore *ile [...]*, which juxtaposition of Enkidu's illogical origins and his cleverness in the interpretation of dreams (and in the OB text in advising a course of action) is an interesting poetical device. In this connection we may recall that dream interpretation, at least, is an intuitive art—in ancient Mesopotamia traditionally a female one—that needs no scholarly or courtly training.

27. The verb *šamālur* here and in the similar I.108 means literally 'to make something acceptable'. The point must be that Gilgamesh can only come to terms with the dreams that so bewilder him if their contents can be revealed as meaningful.

28. The line recurs as SB IV 109 and 155.

33. The phrase *amaš Šamāl damsiga* seems a little unlikely but is secure from the parallel SB IV 162.

102. Because of the need for penultimate stress it is better to parse *eštātum* as plural; accordingly, *ēq* is no venire.

105. Restoration from Parpola. Though separate from it, *nabūtu* agrees with *šīlūtu* (so CAD N2, p. 149), as is clearly the case in the forerunner of this line (OB Schayen, 40: *suppillātum ibrīl īštātum*). For other examples of remote adjectives in SB Gilgamesh see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (vi).

106. Comparison with OB Schayen, 41 suggests that the first word should be restored as *nabūtu*. However, the SB line is not identical to the OB line, for they do not agree in the number of the verb in the second half of the line: OB Schayen, 41: *štārù lašir*, SB IV 106: *štārù ana tumril*. For the moment one must assume that in the late version of the line the subject is not *nabūtu* but *šīlūtu*, carried over from I.105. I have restored accordingly.

107–9. See the notes on the parallel lines, IV 26–8.

124. The spelling *šēqū-ša-nu* is unique for a text from Babylonia, where the mountain is usually rendered *Labānu* (see above, on 1.4).

161. The LB spellings *ni-ia-uza-a* (MS w) and *ni-ia-za-az-a* (MS v) look ventive; for forms of *štētum* in the ventive see OB II 1/9 and the note thereon.

190–205. This passage has been studied by Landesberger, RA 62, pp. 105–7.

190. Landesberger restored this line as narrative, *[a-na pān Šamāl i]-i 1 la-šētum di-ma-a-lu*, but this remains conjectural. More probably the line is direct speech.

191. The restoration of the beginning of this line and 193 rely on SB V 148: *perumma la šētib Šuruk kurrī Gilmānī*. If it is correct to restore thus Landesberger's reading *taq-ta-š* at the end of the line looks less probable.
192. Note the ventive imperative of īshātu (cf. l. 161 above).

194–5. As Landsberger noted (R4 62, p. 105), this couplet also occurs as SB VII 132–3: Šanāl šītu (so also MS 83 here) za’iru šušu aštūt mētu šaši šašu šamassalītu. The second verb is present before direct speech but the force of the -tam-infix is uncertain (see the commentary on SB 178).

198. The seven cloaks are seven terrible auras that Enlil bestowed on Humbaba for his protection.

205. There is a temptation to compare this line with a passage of OB Harmaš, in which Enkidu says, migštum nēmāna (Huzurvas / kalmā. Addā lā-bā mē šītuštu (ll. 19–20), while both contexts are so fragmentary it is best not to use this to justify restoration.

213. On ul in first position, separated from its verb, see the commentary on SB III 102–6. The word e-tal-šu is taken as an Assyriological rendering of stāšu (see above, on ll. 20). As such it makes a better active (I1 perfect) than passive (IV1.3 štal-šādī) contra Botteró (‘des enfants ont été mis au monde’). For addūš with an active masculine subject one need only cite Enūma elīš 116: u-a-num tā-nī-lā-šu u-ud na-dom mašd. Perhaps the point of the line was that Gilgamesh fears he will die without heir.


230–48. This passage has been studied by Landsberger, RA 62, pp. 110–12. Not all his restorations have been adopted here.

231. The verb i-man-galī-ga looks to my eyes a better fit than i-ni-maša (AHu, p. 1155). The restoration of išdiyē is supported by mangu ša iddišu in l. 242.

233. The line is restored after SB II 232 // V 100.

235. The traces do not support Tournay and Shaffer’s [ša a]-la-ki pat-tum (UHep̄e, p. 119, fn. 58).

238. Neither išdiš nor išgur (ibid., p. 119, fn. 60) fits the traces.

239. Von Soden parses both tal-sap-pi here and il-la-pi in SB X 175 from šabītu, ‘to sweep’ (AHu, p. 536). I follow Landsberger, op. cit., and CAD L, p. 89, in parsing instead from lāpūtu, assuming that the modified stems of this (a/u) verb can utilize (i/) forms. Apart from these two instances, the incipit of an incantation in Šurpu exhibits a similar form (‘Tablet I rev. II 5’): at-ti ma-mi ti tal-sap-pi-ti, ‘You, O oath, who kept on touching!’ That this also must be lāpūtu // is accepted in AHu.

240. An apāli is some kind of marginal cultic figure according to an entry in a synonym list: a-pi-lu-a (var. pil-pi-lu-a) = ku-lu-a (CT 18 S, K 4193 rev. 10 // LTB II 1 vi 46).

241. The line is also known from OB Harmaš, 4: kalmā lāṣum šišku ūgulma [išku]. Falling on the enemy with loud yells is a tactic also employed at SB X 97: ina šīti šišku šepa [šepa].

242. The stock phrase mangu ša lu-ul is common enough, but compare especially a narrative parallel to this line reproduced as a couplet in Ludūm II 77–8:

man-gu is-bat i-ši-ia
le-ta im-a-qa pu-ellir-ia

Stiffness seized my arms,
feetlessness has befallen my knees.

245–8. These lines appear to contain proverbial wisdom, some of it similar to lines occurring earlier in the story (cf. OB III 255–6; SB III 4–5 // 218–19). Note the ‘gnomic’ pretenses in l. 247.
4–5. Compare a version of this couplet in OB Harra: la ḫuwasma iṣuḫ(alā) / šakū inšum šaššar padīnuna (ll. 14–15).

6. The spelling e-ma-ra for iṣṣara is Assyrian in its use of the prefix e- and in the non-marking of the genitum but, in the absence of vowel harmony, it is not actually an example of Assyrian dialect. For other examples in tablets of the SB text proper see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (vii, ix).

The epithet of the Cedar Mountain given here is an expansion of the earlier māšā bāl Enummaḫtu (OB IM 17–18) // māšā Enummaḫti (OB Ishchali 38). Given the clear parallelism in our line between māšā bāl and parak Ǧi-ni-ni, I assume that the Ǧi-ni-ni stands not for the well-known aspect of littar (Irinna) but for goddesses in general; in other words, it is a variant on the common noun ṣarrī, which often appears paired with ḫi in a formally masculine plural guise (see on this see the commentary on SR 178). It may be transcribed ḫinīnrī.

8. I take the spelling sa-ḫa-ri for the stative ṣār and not as the adjective (for extra vowels appended to closed syllables with long vowels see the section of Chapter 9 on Spelling, sub g). Otherwise one may translate as a single clause “its shade so sweet was full of delight”.


11. Perhaps ḫi-ḫa-ša-ri, “pit”.

76. Another version of this line can be found in MB Emar, iii 8', q.v.

77. The word tāš-a-zi, so read by Landsberger, RA 62, p. 108, is taken to be a plural form of tāšu (see A1125, p. 1309).

78. The ‘three-ply rope’ also occurs in the fragment, probably of a proverbs, K 16804 (col. B 4: ēl-ba ša-ḫa-ša-ri, lā, dated C4D 5/3, p. 383). The Sumerian equivalent of the saying is eš3.tab.lā ḫu nu ḫa-ša-ri, ‘no man can snap a three-ply rope’, a proverb which is embedded in similar context in the tale of Gilgames and Ḫuwawa A 107. Its equivalence to the well-known Hebrew proverb nilaḫu ẖemmīlī b' bnr śmuq, ‘a three-ply cord is not snapped in a hurry’ (Ecclesiastes 4:12, where the context is also of two prevailing over one), was first remarked by S. N. Kramer, JCS 1 (1947), p. 40, and established by A. Shaffer, Eretz-Izrael 16 (1967), pp. 246–50, and again, in the light of the publication of MS u, Eretz-Izrael 9 (1968), p. 160. Though in his edition of the Sumerian text D. O. Edzard persists in Kramer’s reading tīg, ḫa-ša-ri, ‘a three-pli cord is not snapped in a hurry’ (ZA 81 (1991), p. 202, 107), the equation stands. Occasional confusion between eš and tīg is to be expected in written sources. In Proverb Collection 5 no. 56 the two signs occur as variants for the same reason (Alster, Proverbs, p. 403).

86. W. R. Mayer has proposed an alternative reading of the first two words, Ǧa-ri bēš-lī-sa-ri, understanding the whole line as insulting: “Fischmensch-Brut, Gilgames, dummer Kerl!” (Deller, Mayer and Sommerfeld, Orts B 56 (1987), p. 210). In my view Ǧa-ri kūli (var. of ṣatūlū), ‘kinsman of a fishman’, is not a platitude in which an infant could be conveyed; as a creature of Ea the fish-man was a fabulous monster of apotropaic function in religious iconography (Wiggersmann, Protective Spirits, pp. 182–3). The word ḫiša here has been cited as ‘ein schönes Beispiel literarischer Ambiguität’, on the ground as that means ‘foot’ it alludes to the ḫiša-demon who fathered Gilgames (Renger, Studien Reiner, p. 320). I am not convinced that the text gains from such ambiguity.

89. The spelling a-ger-ru-ba-ka could be for indicative aqarrakha (CV for VC) but can be otherwise explained as exhibiting a ventive in -u(m), on which see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (v).

90. The decipherment of the words that precede ina ḫarīya is a real problem. Previous translators have not been able to agree on whether the four signs inšu-tab-ba-ka represent two words or one. Most choose the verb šabbu, ‘to satisfy’. This is possible with šabbu (sec V R 9 ix 67, ed. Streck, Arh. p.
shape of a riši was a shallow trough or ditch dug in the ground. Though open (one-sided) moulds for such things as spear and arrow-heads might conceivably be dubbed 'channels', a better case can be argued for Goetzke's 'furrow'. Since Goetzke's day many second-millennium bar ingots have come to light that seem from their triangular section and irregular aspect to have been rough-cast in small sand or clay channels as he described. Typically secondary castings from recycled copper, usually measuring 1.5–20 cm long and 2.5–3 cm wide, these ingots seem to be the readily portable working material of itinerant copper-smiths. For good examples from the Levant see W. G. Dever and M. Tadmor, 'A copper hoard of the Middle Bronze Age I', IJES 26 (1976), pp. 163–9, from the Hebron hills; R. Maddin and T. Stech Wheeler, 'Metallurgical study of seven bar ingots', IJES 26 (1976), pp. 170–3; more generally, J. F. Merkell and W. G. Dever, 'Metalworking technology at the end of the Early Bronze Age in the southern Levant', Institute for Archaeological Studies 14 (1989), pp. 1–4. On casting in sand or clay in antiquity see P. R. S. Moorey, Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries (Oxford, 1994), pp. 270–1, who makes the point that such moulds will not show in the archaeological record. The making of rough bar ingots in the riši nappādī must have been in common sight in ancient Mesopotamia.

However, a dissenting view is expressed by J. Bottéro in his translation of the line under comment, namely that the riši nappādī is not a mould, as such, but a channel down which molten metal flows on its way into a mould: ‘la goutte qui conduitait au moule (mot à mot: “la rigole du fondeur”).’ A technical term for such a channel is a ‘runner’, part of the ‘gate-assembly’ of a mould (for advice on the practicalities of ancient Near Eastern metal-casting I am indebted to John F. Merkell of the Institute of Archaeology, University College London). At their simplest, runners are hollow tubes that run from the outside of a closed mould into the cavity within. More complex channels (also known as pouring gates) are funnel-shaped and act as small reservoirs or basins to hold the molten metal as it sinks into the mould. Of whatever style, the runner is an integral part of the mould. The surplus metal that hardens in it, and in the 'riser' (the vent that lets the air out of a closed mould), is chiselled off the casting when cold.

The Sumerian evidence given above can accommodate the meaning 'runner' for kūš.kūš just as easily as it can 'mould'. As rišu seems also to mean 'tube' it might be an appropriate technical term for the runner. Study of the end of the line is needed to clarify which function is more appropriate, tube or ingot-mould. The second half of the line clearly refers to copper, erī, but the spelling e-ri is unsatisfactory and suggests that the text is corrupt. The word after eri was not copied accurately by von Wehr, and has been the subject of guesswork. It is the key to what happens to the copper in the rišu. The blank space left by the scribe between e-ri and šī very likely signifies a word division, which argues against an emendation such as e-ri-ah (šī) ba-ša-ša; the simplest solution is to assume a missing šī and read e-ri-ah (šī) ša-ša-ša, the significance of the lengthened final syllable being to mark a question. The well-attested phrase e-pu šaša means to scoop up dust from the ground; eri šaša thus situates a situation in which copper ingots are moulded directly in channels in the floor and collected up when cool.

104. The theme of copper-working is expanded with two carefully balanced indicative phrases. The first refers to bringing the crucible up to temperature by forcing air on to the coals; wu-erī is a spelling of urānu (wu urānu or urānu) that recurs in the commentary published by R. D. Biggs, Rā 62 (1968), p. 54, 23. The equally time-consuming process described by the second indicative phrase is less intelligible. The last word is written so small that I could not be sure whether it is šī-ša-a or mu-la-a. As a lengthy process following the heating of the crucible in the furnace, cooling comes to mind, whether it is the process of letting smelted copper cool in the crucible or allowing a casting to set in its mould; contra Bottéro's exegesis of these lines, which inverts il. 103 and 104: 'le métal en
fusion, après avoir été chauffé (le durée de l'opération est définie par..., bēru..., une "double-heure"), était laissé au repos dans le creuset ("refroidi"), puis versé dans la goutte de qui conduisait au moule (mot à mot: "la rigole du fondateur"): il n'était alors plus temps de l'arrêter (Bottéro, *Dépôt*, p. 114, fn. 3), molten copper is not allowed to cool before being cast. A word written ša-šu-šu, at least, can be interpreted as known verbs, (a) the common šašu meaning 'to shoot' arrows and other weapons, 'to spray, splash dust and liquids, and (b) the rare šašu (with stressed final syllable again marking a question), meaning 'to plaster'. However, it escapes me how exactly either of these might relate to a stage in the copper-casting process that could last two hours. For techniques working copper in the ancient Near East see further J. D. Muhly, 'Kupfer B. Archäologisch', *RLA VI*, pp. 348-64; idem, 'Metalle B. Archäologisch', *RLAVIII*, pp. 119-36, and literature there cited; *Moorey, Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries*, pp. 242-78; K. Reiter, *Die Metalle im Alten Orient* (AOAT 249), pp. 204-5.

The function of this line and its neighbours in Enkidu's argument is a further problem. Enkidu has exhorted Gilgamesh to act (1.104). Why the mention of ingot-casting and lengthy processes in copper-casting at this point? I can only suppose that they form rhetorical questions for which 1.105, with its parallel syntax, gives an answer. In effect Enkidu tells Gilgamesh, 'There's only one thing we have to do know' (102), asks 'Is the price already there for the taking or does it require a lot more preparation?' (103-4), and answers, 'A task of mythical proportions calls for swift and sudden action' (105).


133. On the analysis of i-bi-šu-ba as singular and ventive from bēšu, 'to go separate ways', see George, *ZA* 80 (1990), pp. 216-17.

137-43. These are the realization of Nisnas’s prayer to Samuš in SB II 88-93, q.v.

137-139. The present tense of the verbs dramatically convey Humbaba’s plight. Alternatively, they express consecutive meanings, ‘so that he could not…’. On nāhuntu, ‘to kick’ of equids, and girt-ra-ra, its Sumerian equivalent in this meaning, see the omen in which a donkey kicks an exorcist on his way to visit a patient (Sakidna I 26: diš inšātu ināk-iša-ra) and the ancient commentaries thereon (a) girt-ra-ra = ra-ša-ša; b) enlā in-ša-ša; c) ra = ra-ša-ša; d) ra = ma-ša-ša), edited and discussed by George, *ZA* 85 (1991), pp. 142, 148, 157-8. A meaning ‘trample down’ has also been suggested for nāhuntu as an action characteristic of horses and donkeys in the context of damage to a standing crop (see B. Landerberg, *ZA* 43 (1936), p. 75 on Theodicy 60; id., *JNES* 8 (1949), p. 249, fn. 8). This nuance is confirmed by the lexical equation *Antakal N ii 13*: girt-ra-gan, ‘to trample’ = ra-ša-ša ša šepi (*MSL XCVII*, p. 246), where the Sumerian verb is a variant of the compound girt-sagšu/sagšu (šepi) —dug, ak etc. (for which see J. S. Cooper, ‘girt-KIN’ ‘to stamp out, trample’), *Rd* 66 (1972), pp. 81-3. A meaning ‘trip’ or ‘stamp’ is not as appropriate in the present context, however, as ‘kick’, for understood thus, the combination here of nāhuntu and nāhuntu juxtaposes the modes of attack of bulls and horses respectively.

145. This is a standard line: see SB II 289 var. and commentary. Here it is not cautionary, as it was when used by the wise elders of Uruk in response to Gilgamesh’s youthful bravado, but flattering.

147. The customary reading is Samuš biši (umum) šad. The sun god can be ‘lord of the mountain’ in liturgical texts (e.g. Cohen, *Lamentations*, p. 804, 11: šad ‘uru u mu un hur sag.gi, OB; SHB 48 obv. 17: šal(rum) ‘fitu umum hur sag.gi, OB; LB). I have reservations, however, because in the present context a logographic spelling umum = šadu would be most unusual, though not unrelated. At parallel, the traces do not support von Weiber’s (at-be-)e-ma, though with regard to the first sign the would-be collator is now handicapped by the disappearance of the middle of the three small fragments that are shown on the photograph (Balat. Mit. 11 (1980), pl. 15). A reading (at-be-)e-ma was suggested privately by A. Westenholz. The line would then allude to the fact that, as described in li. 133-4, Humbaba’s mountain now lies broken: ‘by Samuš’s command also my mountain you levelled’. Something similar is preserved in OB Harmal, 44-5 but there, too, the text is damaged.

148. With this curiously line of greeting compare the similar wording of SB IV 191-3.

153. The spelling sāq-ga-ka-as is presumably faulty, to represent saghābā.

154–5. An antecedent of this couplet is Humba’s, 46-7: lurabbu akkum (?) erēnum šarrēnum šepāli; iššītim igi sinnutu thallīm.

177. Other translators see nothing wrong with ina nēreb papilla qīitū, but the sense of the phrase is much improved if it is assumed that nēreb and papilla have become transposed. Enkidu's body, dangling low in the branches of a young tree at the forest's edge, would be a suitable warning for the next intruder. A comparable technique is still practised by British gamekeepers, who display the bodies of foxes and other predators at the boundary of game reserves in order to discourage the ingress of more of their kind.

178. This is a repetition of Humbaba’s earlier threat to Gilgamesh (SB IV 94).

182-4. These three lines are really a quatrains, but one that does not quite conform to the commonest pattern of repeated couplets, in which something, typically a name, is added to the first line of the couplets on its repetition (pattern *ahab-ahab*, see K. Hecker, *Untersuchungen zur akkadischen Epik*, pp. 146-50). Possibly the appearance of Humbaba’s name in l. 182 as well as l. 184 is an inadvertent intrusion. However, there is at least one other example of unaltered repetition, after the pattern *ahab*, in Nergal and Ereshkigal (Hecker, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 148–9). Either way, the omission of *erēnum* in l. 184 is a straightforward error.

183. Other translators take the penultimate word as an imperative, i.e., ‘grind him, destroy him’. However, the spacing of the line on the tablet clearly reveals that the last word is *ullušau* not, for example, *ullušiu*, which obliges one to take *ši-erēnum* as its object (= *šēnum*). Since the verb *šēnum* is never written with the sign *ši* but *šēnum* so often is, in the first millennium especially, the orthography corroborates this decipherment.

185–9. These lines are repeated as ll. 242–5, whence some come of the restorations.

229. Given the key word *ēkāma*, one wonders whether this line might be related to OB Ilaḫi-ili 15*: širī ištaruru bijāma ęšum ilitāšu *umānu*.

254. With the traces compare MB Bōg. Fragment a, rev. 3*: e tēmē lāsīša u latūla [iš telēl].

257. The spelling ki-erēri for gētīri is already explained in *JNES* 52 (1993), p. 302, where I noted it as ‘an unconventional spelling of gē-ēri: the same orthographic practice is well known in Neo-Assyrian (as first listed by Deller, *Or na* 31 (1962), pp. 188ff., ‘Schreibungen VK statt KV’), but has not yet been formally documented in NB and LB. For the idiom gētīri ay irri in curses see further CAD Q, p. 202 (boundary stones and clopophar.)

259. MN H a-qa-ba-ba-um-ma retutes von Soden’s statement that in the ‘tenevusche Gilgamelespois’ the 2nd masc. sg. dative suffix is always -hum before the enclitic -ma (ZA 40 (1931), p. 170); -huma is a common vocalization in late grammar (ibid., fn. 2; *GAC* §42k, n. 8).

262–5. These lines are a reworking of a passage that appears in OB Ilaḫi-ili 19–23: išme Gilgameš šir ėrišu / šiša的样子 ina ėriša / šiša namramum ina šēnū / Gilgameš šir šiša ģalādām / Enkidu irtu irta šēnum. For variations on ll. 263-4 see the commentary ad loc. In l. 265 the first sign can hardly be *u*, and is ignored as an error. After Enkidu one might restore [ša-ša]i-erē-num or [ša-ša]i-erē-num as the counterpart of OB šēnum. Elliptical usage of šēnum in the meaning ‘to use a
pole appears to have been a knob, which held the door assembly upright in the door-frame or lintel; the bottom end acted as a load-bearing pivot, and needed to be rounded to fit snugly in the floor socket. However, I have rejected the translations ‘errule’ (Speiser on SB VII, CAD) and ‘pivot-stone’ (Kovacs, SB VII) for šuḫūru on the grounds that there is no evidence for it being made of any material other than wood, though, as Speiser notes, it may have been fitted with a metal shoe.

295–6. The line division is misplaced, for it should fall before šuḫūru. The verses are correctly rendered in the parallel SB VII 44–5.

297–8. The older text reads (OB IM 27–9): ana biši Ellî Ellî Peratum ~ li šašima manymu Nippur ~ liEllî Ellî. Consequently it would appear that Kuyunjik MS H shines a corruption of manymu. The correct word has nevertheless survived intact in the LB copying tradition represented by MS dd.

299. I assume that the opening of the line is corrupt. Tournay and Shaffer (p. 137: ‘il recouvrant le pont de branchages’) evidently took ša-mu for manymu and am-mu for ammu, but this remains highly speculative.

302. The broken sign after šum-ba-ba appeared to Haupt as ab but to Delitzsch as ra (Haupt, Namerodep, p. 26). Either way it rules out the restoration šikismamma (or itakismamma) qējlip(i) . . . that is suggested by Assyrian MS y2, obv. 22”.

TABLE VI

2. The variant of unassī offered by MS O1 defies easy interpretation. Though nusūsu also appears as nusassu, and even nus[u], ú-nu-zi (⇒-m) does not look a viable reading as the traces now stand, and nor quite does ú-nu-u (⇒-l), which in any case would be, as it were, a hybrid form. We are left with the solution presented in the apparatus, that the sign after na (which is perfectly clear, despite Haupt’s annotation, Namerodep, p. 150) is an incomplete ra, lacking the lower horizontal wedge.


9. This line is also found in MB Nergal and Ereshkigal, where it is spoken by another goddess, the queen of the Netherworld (EA 357, 82: at-ta bu mu-ti-ma a-na-ba li aš-kà-ag-at-ka). S. Greengus has drawn attention to a third literary passage in which such words are spoken (JAOS 89 (1969), p. 516). In this text, an Ararat lill incantation since republished, the words are spoken in the more conventional fashion, by a man to a female; the promise of lavish gifts also finds an echo in our passage:

ku. sigi ku. babbar ur zu ba.ni.in.si
kasta ḫurta su-un-ka u-nal-la
dam.mu be.me en.gá.e dam.zu ī.e.a
at-ta bu aš-kà-ti ana-ba lu-ù mu-at-ka
S. Lackenbacher, RA 65 (1971), p. 126, 12–14

I shall fill your lap with silver and gold!
You be my wife, I will be your husband.

For the Sumerian counterpart to Istar’s proposal in Bilgame and the Bull of Heaven see Chapter 10, the introduction to this tablet.
10. The variant *lūlimduka* (MS Q) is Middle Babylonian.
11. The 'horns' of a chariot are the subject of a section of * Há V:*

\[
\begin{align*}
gūš.ii. dú.a.girš &= \text{ qar-nu} \\
gūš.ii. dú.a.girš &= \text{ MIN} \\
gūš.ii. bāb.a.girš &= \text{ MIN} \\
gūš.īl.(n.) nīšt.a.girš &= \text{ [qar-nu]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

*MSL VI,* pp. 6–7, 25–7a

Salonen considered that these 'horns' were the looped rings through which the reins passed (*Landfahrten,* pp. 93–4). Dalley suggests that they are the yoke terminals (p. 129, note 52). In this line they are in the dual, so there were two of them. The material *ēmu* can be a precious metal and in such usage is usually translated 'electrum', but it is also known to be a rare, semi-mythical stone and I have opted for that. This stone is known for its bright colour. Its identification as amber is most recently discussed by P. Kingsley, *JRAS* 1992, p. 342.

12. The *ūmu* (*Sum. ud*) or *umu nabā* (*also ugašiu* and *Sum. ugā*) is the lion-headed monster that pulls the chariots of the storm god Adad, the sun, the warriors Ninurta and Marduk and the warlike Ištar (see further Wiggermann, *Mesopotamian Protective Spirits,* pp. 169–72).

13. The rare word *samūtūtu,* here plural, is perhaps cognate with Arabic *samāma,* 'smell at' (Lambert, personal communication).

14–15. Strictly speaking, a *sippu* is the angle formed where the brickwork of a wall gives way to the doorway. In temples the most important doorways were stepped back into the wall by means of several *sippu,* the *rabādā* jambstones that were a very distinctive feature of Mesopotamian religious architecture (see George, *Iraq* 57 (1995), pp. 181–2). Most previous translators have taken *aratu* as 'daïs' (Heidel, Speiser) or 'thronc' (=hēbu, *kussi nāmedī* in the synonym lists). Others have read the two words together, (i)-sā-bu arātu, following *CAD A* 2 (p. 239): 'may the noble purification priests kiss your feet'; cf. earlier A. Schott, *ZA* 42 (1934), p. 120). This emendation fails to recommend itself: even if the adjectival *aratu* could be used of priests, which would be unparalleled, it ought to be plural, *arattūtu.* Note that MB Emar, apparently has *kappu,* 'hand' (i 1), for SB's *ēba, foot'.

16. The realization of this promise appears in a prayer that invokes Gilgameṣ in the role of judge and judge of the shades: *sarāru (g)alagā* *(leškēkatā (g)nrātā)* & *rubā*(*n)a *(nno)* & *mahārīgī=ka kom-ta,* ‘kings, governors and nobles are bowed down in your presence’ (Haupt, *Nimrud-Tello* no. 53, 9, ed. Chapter 3 above, the section on Gilgameṣ in exorcistic rituals). The sequence *sarāru* *kātu* (*a*) *rubā* and its variants are literary clichés (e.g. *IV* 55 no. 2, 4, 6, 10, 13: ritual to gain favour; *PBS I* 137, 37–8; hymn to Šamaš). The variation on this phrase in MS Q, *sarāru* *gēlītu* (*en)* & *rubā*, might be seen as a secondary development, in which *idūm* has been interpreted as *ēba = kēlu,* for the use of *ēba* is characteristic of BA orthography (e.g. *S. P. Curran* 1972, p. 25). However, the slightly different version of this line in MB Emar, might already have *ēba-tu-ē* (l 2), so the variation between *kabūttu* and *bēlū* may be old.

17. The word *lātuq* is something given to a superior, as in the OB extispicy prayer in which it refers to the diviner's offering to the sun god: *šamaš* *(stu)* *na-īš-ka-un li-īā-tam lu-śi-qi-ūt me-ē sa-ar-qi-im e-ī-ku-tūm* (‘O Šamaš, I am bearing to you (našēkēm < nāšūz דג) & kum’) a gift; pick up the pure drink of *sāsiq*–water’ (*YS* X 22, 25, ed. A. Goetze, *JCS* 22 (1968–9), p. 26). The discovery of *lātuq* in this line settles the question of how to read *Mālaš* IV 231 (*LTRA II* 1 xiii 101): *lātuq = bītu* with *AH₂,* pp. 126, 555, against the emendation *ūq*1(1)–*ū* 2 in *CAD* (B, p. 229; L, p. 207) and the entry *ūq*–*tum* in the commentary on the Babylonian Theodicy (Lambert, *BWJ* p. 80). Many previous commentators have been led astray by the only source which is complete for this line, *MS Q,* where the decernment of *mr* is a problem. Von Soden (‘die Lullubär’) evidently interpreted the signs as *tu-ā-tam,* but serious emendation is still needed to yield *Lullubā.* A reference to one particular people is in any case unexpected, for the whole world will offer tribute. Dalley's “verdure” interprets the signs ‘very tentatively’ as *lāttum* (p. 129, note 54), but the herb *lāttum* is a specific plant, not found outside plant lists and medical texts, and unlikely to be used generically for vegetation in general. A development *mr > bā is also improbable. It seems simplest to assume that *mr* is corrupt.

18. The language of this line evokes a proverbial image: see Lašar and Ašana 8–9:

\[
\begin{align*}
u₂&.ē mēlu₂, bi nā.nub.tu.ud & \text{ No eave had given birth to its twins,} \\
ū₂&.ē mēlu₂, bi nā.nub.tu.ud & \text{ nor nanny-goat to its triple kids.}
\end{align*}
\]


Both passages are examples of the numerical sequence *n, n + 1,* though the sequence is reversed in our line. On this literary device in Gilgameṣ see further SB I 194 and commentary.

19. The reading in this line of *dūr (AN.NA) as māru* has been doubted by *CAD* on the grounds that in this and other passages it signifies not a foal but a ‘mature’ male donkey’ *(CAD M* 2, p. 230). I take the verb as venire, *ētu₂, to satisfy the requirements of metre.

20. The plural determinative on *siū, preserved only on MS a,* is at odds with the verb it governs, *sarū, which is singular. The singular donkey and ox of adjacent lines suggest that the determinative is a corruption.

24–5. Compare MB Emar, i 7–8, where the verb is written *lā-su-ū₂,* Since the meaning of this is doubtful I am reluctant to restore it here. The solecistic use of the dative phrase *ana kāšākā* (ēš), where a direct object is expected, is found sporadically in SB. Other examples are *ana-ka ana ka-a-lī as-lat-ki-ma,* ‘I took hold of you’ (Biggs, *SZ* p. 77, 14: incantation); *[a]-nu ka-ka-a-lī i-tā-nam-su-[ru-ka] // *ana ka-a-lī ... i-ta-na-ru-ka,* ‘they will keep insuling you’ (Lambert, *BWJ,* p. 148, 68//34: Dialogue of Pessimism); *a-nu lā-ši-ma sē-ad-[a]-di₂–e₂,* ‘bring her back to me!’ (CT 15 48, 21).18 Ištar's Descent). These are unlikely to be cases of *ana as a toto accusative,* which is a late usage not expected in SB. Presumably the phrase is simply an irregularity deriving from the fact that in the dative *kāšā* (ēš) often needs the preposition: the phrase *ana kāšā* becomes a unit which can remain intact even when the pronoun is later used for the accusative and the preposition is thereby made redundant.

26. The words *kūramma* and *bēttē* are apparently reversed in MB Emar, i 9.

27–8. These lines are restored with reference to Šamaš’s words to Enkiud when reminding him of the advantages that meeting the prostitute had won him (SB VII 156–6): *ē baššākā aš-ke šimā *kūramma* *ša*-ka *u* *niššā* *šimā* *bēttē.* An objection is that *u* *šimā* might have been expected. For *šimā* with the ventive see the Lamaddu incantation *PBS I* 11 135, 1: *šimā–ka šī–tuₐ₂–a₂* ‘She has (the new) drink amniotic fluid (lit. water of labour’).

29. The only word remaining in this line is taken provisionally from *ēlu₂,* ‘to bind (by agreement)’. Cf. Botterweck’s ‘*Me faudra-tu₂ [.., ]?*’

30. The reading *lu₂-* *šā-ku-šak* (*AH₂,* p. 1441) does not seem plausible, for *šāku₂,* otherwise known only from SB I 170, seems to be either the act of lying in wait for animals or a ‘hide’ where this is done. For examples of the voluteur written with *še₂ lu₂-* see SB XI 166 and 280.

33. The restoration is owed to MB Emar i 13, where the word preceding là bàdaru may be ḫaltu, 'frost'. For ḫalṭ̂u la erti, 'to solidify, with reference to ice', in OB and SR see CAD K, p. 260.

34. The restoration goes back to von Soden, OIZ 50 (1955), 515. The arakhbīnātu door is glossed as da-as-lum la qa-latum, 'incomplete door', in Malatya II 172, which explains why it is not effective at keeping our draughts. There was one in E-sagili, the temple of Marduk at Babylon; see further George, Topog. Texts, pp. 404–5.

35. Foster has a partial restoration for the middle of this line, [x mu]-ak-bi-lat, and translates 'an elephant which [de]vours its own covering' (Eipsys Paps., p. 34; also Kovač). I do not know what the textual justificiation for this reading is. In Oppenheim's view, the metaphor 'hardly refers to the elephant (and his cover) because this animal is very rarely mentioned in cuneiform texts, and especially because the other similes are all taken from the realm of daily life and its incidents' (Orνσυς 17 (1948), p. 36, fn. 4). Labat translates, seemingly ad hoc, 'un turban (?) [qui étoffe] celui qui en est couvert'. However, the signs pi-tu-ru are clear and, in what was evidently a well-spaced line, are followed by a gap which marks the boundary of the word; until another word pīra (or sēna) is found the elephant remains. Wild elephants are known to have been hunted in parts of Syrian Mesopotamia until Neo-Assyrian times (cf. the allusion to the ivory trade in SB V 267). The translation and comment of Bottéro are worth repeating (IHop. 5, p. 125 with fn. 1):

'Un éléphant [qui jette à bas] son harnachement:' Il s'agit de la pièce de harnais qui permettait à l'éléphant de transporter des passagers. Le trait est intéressant, sur le plan culturel, puisqu'il suppose connue par les Mésopotamiens la domestication de l'animal, propre à l'Inde, semble-t-il, d'où l'on en aurait tiré l'image. Nous n'avons pas la moindre trace ni d'un parel usage, ni d'un parel animal, en Mésopotamie.

37. The spacing of the signs on MSS A (probably) and a (certainly) discounts a restoration [gāṭ] nāḫša, here and in the next line.

38. The particle conventionally chosen in this line is mānakhintu (R. Frankena in Garcell, Gilg., p. 120), but note von Soden, AHI, p. 996 (mu-ru-zi-as-sa-at nāḫša). Though MB Emar i 16' might have read mānakhintu, MS A seems not to, and I have followed von Soden.

39-40. These two lines represent an expansion, though perhaps not a very satisfactory one; of what was originally a single line (cf. MB Emar i 17; [xu]a[u] mu lābbītu dūt aḫru), where the point might be that in certain circumstances wood will overcome stone, despite its apparent disadvantage in hardness. However, the SB text explicitly informs us that the battering ram is active against the enemy's property. The use of treachery in such a sentiment prompted Bottéro, IHop. 5, p. 125, fn. 3, to translate the signs kur nu kūr ta as 'un pays non-ennemi, i.e. māt lātakūr (kūr)'. This is unconvincing, both because the orthography māt na-bir-ni is so standard it seems unlikely that it could also be read as the opposite, and because the phrase māt lātakūr is never found. Instead the lines may allude not to lāt's treachery but to her destructiveness: like a battering ram in action, the goddess is a blunt instrument, crude and violent. The expression dūr aḫnu uḫbaa also occurs in Malatya II 141, describing the god of fire: gīnu al-la-lu aḫu mu-ah-bī dūr (baš) abīn(na), 'Mighty Girra, who destroys walls of stone!' (from KAR 223, var. šš̄išqāmu) u aḫnu abīn(na), 'trees and stones'); and in Marduk's Address to the Demons (W. G. Lambert, AOS 17 (1954–6), p. 313, B 14): (a[n-a]k ašš̄al-lā-bī) lā bīr-bīr-nu-li ub-ba-tu dūr (baš) ab-nu; 'I am Aššīlū, whose fiery radiance destroys walls of stone'.

In MB Emar i 17 the gender of the battering ram is masculine, as indeed it is on the only other occasion known to me when it is qualified by an adjective (āššīlā-bī dam-ni, Lit., Sen., p. 8, 63). However, in L 40 MS A clearly reads mu-ab-bī-ta-(a-x), with probably no more than one sign missing before the margin (the line of poetry occupies two lines of tablet), and the restoration of the feminine participle is inescapable. Either this is an error or the word exhibits varying gender.

42. The form ḫāmēršu is literary for ḫāmēršu; see further Chapter 9 of the section on Language and style sub i. Note the phonetic similarity between the second syllables of the two variants for the verb in this line, SB šīru and MB Emar, šīrum (1 19).

43. The proposed restoration is tentative (A. Westenholz suggests [ā ṣaḥμ], but the verb āṣē is very suggestive. The point is that none of the lovers of the queen of heaven ever joined her there. If I am right, the language involves an untranslatable word-play between allalu, a type of bird which also appears in l. 48 as a former object of lāšu's desires, and the noun which is a synonym of 'warrior' (Malatya II 27: al-la-la-lu-gu-di-ru-da). The former meaning anticipates the story of the bird maided by lāšu and the latter provides a human parallel with ḫāmeru in the first line of the couplet, and so introduces an implicit contrast between the capabilities of the bird and the man. The points made are thus twofold: by virtue of a broken wing, lāšu's allalu-bird cannot fly off to the sky, and unlike an allalu-bird, an allalu-man cannot go to heaven.

44. For uppušu used of calculation see the OB letter LII 49, 12–15, ed. ABB II 47: ša-as-um... up-pu-šu-la, 'work out (the amount of barley)... and hand it out'. With the idiom mi-[nā] ṣaḥālu, cf. at Ugurit ša-[am]miššu ni-nu-zi-e-ṣu-aš, 'His Majesty will count (soldiers, i.e. review the parade)' (PRU IV, p. 192, 15–16). The restoration [mi-nu-ṣa] is preferred to [mi-nu-ša] (or [mi-ni-ša]) because in late orthography 'overhanging' vowels on nouns in construct state are, more often than not, of the same quality as the vowel of the preceding syllable.

45. The phrase sa šaぎndušu (or šaḥīndušu) is uncertain and will probably remain so until the middle of the line is deciphered, but a little can be said. The second line 45–50 is the first of four, marked off by rulings, that recount the sticky ends to which lāšu's various lovers came (l. 45–79). Each section exhibits an individual pattern of structure. Thus the second section comprises two couplets and a triplet, the second two triplets. The fourth section mixes couples and triplets like the second. Given that the first section is, like the third of six lines, it is realistic to expect it to comprise two triplets. The point of analysis is to suggest that the section on the shepherd Dumuzi begins at l. 45 not l. 46. The term ša šaḥīndušu, which in the MB letter PBS I 72 4, 8–13 appears to be a professional title, thus ought to have some connection with him. As already seen by Dalley, who translates the phrase as 'he of the sheep?' (Myths, p. 78), the common link between šaḥīdu and Dumuzi is sheep. In fact sheep are not themselves šaḥīdu but one of the items suitable for a šaḥīdu, which in the OB period seems on the evidence available to be some kind of food-offering in the cult (note the lexical entry MSL VIII 1 4, 22, Hb XIII 163: udu zu-nam-sha = im-meš ba-ša; for further references see CAD B, p. 305; cf. AHI, s.v. pušu II). A person denoted by the phrase ša šaḥīdu could reasonably be the official in charge of the collection, delivery or presentation of this šaḥīdu, or a person otherwise responsible for providing it. OB Lu does not know ša ḫāmēru but preserves an entry ki-ba-si = ba-er ba-ṣa-im, 'owner of the' (MSL XII, p. 170, A 407), with probably the same meaning. However that may be, perhaps Dumuzi can properly be designated ša šaḥīdu on account of the sheep regularly given by shepherds for sacrifice in honour of lāšu (cf. below, l. 60).

46. Dumuzi's epithet is a variant of that given in Inanna's Descent, hu-mir ti-ṣu-rum-[ši]-šu (CT 15 47 rev. 47 // 48, 22) / ti-ṣu-ad-zi-[ši]-šu (CAD 1 rev. 46).

47. Von Soden took šaṇaḥšu in this and the comparable lines (54–7) as examples of the 2/3 stem of permanence, 'for a never-becoming' (AHI, p. 1225). If this stem were current in such a meaning we would expect to encounter its much more often, given the nature of šaṇaḥšu. A V-I perfect is a perfectly good parsing. A damaged passage of a Middle Babylonian dialogue is reminiscent of the present line:
The first speaker has been lamenting the loss of his paramour. She seems to have withdrawn her favor for him in order to grieve. She replies that the women mourn him. The text ends with her description of the ruin of the shrine that she witnessed in her dreams.

The paring of the alallu-bird with Dumuzi is no coincidence, for in Hu XVIII it is classified as a variety of the 'shepherd-bird':

sipa.lur.ûmum = 'shepherd-bird' = re-e-a-um 'shepherd'
sipa.tur.ûmûnum = 'lesser shepherd-bird' = al-lu-šu
sipa.tir.rul = 'wood shepherd-bird' = kub-šu kar-mas 'speckle-cap'

The last of these fits well the description bitrumu here. The bird's familiar cry (I. 50) is proffered in Hu C to explain the second entry:

[sipa.tur.ûmûnum = al-lu-šu = kapt-pa is-pu-aš = it makes a kappula-noise]

MSL VII/2, p. 172, 18

A. Salonen equates the 'shepherd-bird' with the hoopoe (Vögel, p. 245), and although he identifies the alallu, or 'lesser shepherd-bird', with the Indian roller (ibid., p. 113, following Thompson), he is struck by the similarity of the hoopoe's eponymous cry with kappel and kappara. No other association of Ishtar was ever known to me and presumably the myth of its origin derives from its Semitic name, which recalls the shepherd Dumuzi. Another bird of Dumuzi is a kind of pigeon or dove, as noted in a bird-call text: (W. G. Lambert, Ana 1970), p. 114, 13; a-mur-ša-nu.ûmûnum = is-pu 4dumuzi re-e-a-s [. . .]; cf. muršin in modern Iraqi Arabic, J. A. Black and F. N. H. Al-Rawi, Za 77 (1987), p. 125.

The enclitic -me on the verb baratem, here and in II. 51, 53, 58 and 64, is understood as emphatic by Foster, Essays, p. 35; 'you even fell in love'. There may be other explanations; see the commentary on SB II 117–118.

49. The spelling tal-te-bir in MSS Qa is not solecistic use of a masculine form but an example of a CVC sign expressing CVC (br-bir) see K. Deller, Or 31 (1962), p. 194. Examples in Kuyunjik tablets of Gilgamesh are rare; see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (f).

50. I have taken the present tense of iziš (var. izzib), also of utarradatu in l. 62, as present continuous, with reference to the habitual behaviour of alallu-birds and wolves, conditioned, as it were, by their ancestors' encounter with Istar. Both verbs can also be interpreted as indicating result in the past, referring to the individual cases of Istar's lovers.

51. The variant migir emmaḫ in the Akk MS does not yield good sense and is presumably corrupt. The lion is commonly associated with Istar. The goddess can herself be personified as a lion (cf. her epithet iškunatu 'lions'). She sometimes drives a chariot of seven (e.g. Belo-Uruk ka za-an-da-ti 7 la-ab-bu); Messerschmidt, MARG 11, p. 75, ii, 15–15; cf. 31–33; Nbn; also za-an 7baš-šar la nēša(um.sā) ši-in-di-tum: Meissner, MARG 12/3, p. 16, 6–7; NB letter). The lion bears the epithet 'dog of Istar' (um.sā kar.tu) ši-in-di-tum: Caplice, Or 34 (1965), p. 108, 6; Naram-Sin inscription. For a representation of Istar holding a lion on a leash like a dog, see a Na seal impression drawn by Tessa Rickards in Black and Green, Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia (p. 108 middle).

52. The epithet na-2-ša qaš-lu is traditional for the horse, being also found in the fable of Ox and Horse (Lambert, BML, pp. 177, 181, 13). The phrase has been parsed as the adjective in the construct state and a genitive noun (e.g., CADD 11, p. 66: naš-ša qaš-lu). However, the variants qaš-lu and qaš-tum in MSS Qa are accusative singular and speak for a stative phrase like šarrī šašu (SB VI 20). The spelling qaš-šu (MSS AO), if to be taken seriously, is therefore for the accusative plural.

The ambiguity of naš-lu, from naššu A or B, is felicitous, since fame and reliability are both feasible attributes of the battle-horse.

56. The horse's habit of muddying its water with its hooves is proverbial, being also remarked in Proverbs 5. 37; ed. Alster, Proverbs, p. 125: ašu.kur.šum 1mu 1l. n. l. n. su, 'like the horse you paw as you drink'.

57. The identity of the divine Siliši, presumably held to be the mythical ancestor of the shire, is still unknown. The name exhibits the well-known pattern of reduplicated second syllable common in the third and second millennia and is probably foreign, as one would expect given the dominant origins of the horse. A name Sin-tištiš, which could be read Sin-tišiš, belongs to one of several persons listed as 'men of Simāški' (lú.su.mê) in an Ur III document (see the discussion of I. J. Gelb, Hurrians and Subarians, pp. 100, 104, 108; on lú.su, 'Simåški', see M. Steinke, 'On the identity of the toponym lú.su.(A)', AOAS 108 (1988), pp. 197–202; M. Cervin, NABU 1996/41). A connection with the goddess tiššiš-tum, the vizier of the Divine Rainbow (W. G. Lambert, RLAVI, p. 345), does not seem likely.

58. The variant for nagesa usutia in MS A, TA BU LA, can probably be put down to incompetent editorial work, via a spelling nagesa luo. On the double consonant in the spelling na-qaš-da (MS a), see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (c).

59. Von Soden's suggestion that tumrī is elliptical for akal tumrī or hamuš tumrī (Afflo, p. 1370) appears confirmed by the Ermar version of SB tumrī šapukkub, which reads šapukkub akal tumma (MB Ermar 34). If it is maintained nevertheless that both versions are corrupt it has to be assumed that akal hamuš dropped out by mistake in a forerunner common to both versions. The variant verb in MS a, šapukkab, can be parsed as an active II/II, but one wonders whether the scribe is using its consonants only (i.e., tum for tiššiš). Comparable things can certainly happen in Assyrian tablets with CVC signs in non-initial position.

62. For the implications of the present tense of utarradatu see the commentary above, on I. 50.

64. The name Šullina seems to be a variant of the well-known Ur III and OB personal name Šulluna. The equation of Šullina and Sumerian Šukalentu, another gardener who fell foul of Inanna, has been observed in the entry by kalk.an.šu = Šu-[a]-a-(a)-mu-tam (MSL XIII, p. 118, OB Nippur bilingual 124; cf. W. W. Hallo, RLA 10, 74 (1970), p. 94). The word Šullina is a common noun, referring to a person with a physical defect of some sort. The personal name thus falls in to the
na-buri for niku is remarkable in a manuscript from Ašur (A). A predilection for the vowel /a/ over /i/ is found in NA copies of literary texts from Sultantepe, e.g. MS e of Tablet VIII (from which similar spellings are collected in Chapter 7), but see also the commentary on hurudama in the next line. Foster considers that 'the use of the “royal plural” seems to satirize the epitaph “princess” applied to Ishtar throughout this episode' (Essays Pope, p. 35). However, the use of the plural in intimate amatory contexts is widespread, as shown by J. Goodnick-Westenholz in her edition of an OB love song in which a woman voices similar explicit sexual advances (Studies Reiner, p. 417, citing also Sumerian parallels from the Inanna-Dumuzi literature). She suggests that the plural may imply shared enjoyment. On this subject see further Sefati, Love Songs, pp. 83–4, and S. M. Paul, ‘The “plural of ecstasy” in Mesopotamian and biblical love poetry’, Studies Greenfield, pp. 585–97.

68 ff. In a footnote to his translation Labat pointed out that aššu in Ittar’s speech is repeated, with different nuance, in Šuiliunu’s, and that šepat is probably echoed in Šepat ‘I feinit de ne pas comprendre’ (Les religions, p. 183, fn. 7); also Böttéro, Lorsque les dieux, p. 274.

69. This line is one of only two passages of Gilgamesh quoted in the extant commentaries (the other is IB 102–3). Illustrating the use of the rare word hurudama in a compendium of treatments of women in labour (a copy survives as BA M 24810 ii 30), a LB medical commentary from Nimrud reads ga-as-ta lu-ja-um-um ma lu-u-tu lu-la-ar-at ma. (M. Civil, JNES 33 (1974), p. 332, 41; cf. A. Caviglia, Ausa Or 5 (1987), p. 255). This brings the number of variant forms of the first verb to three. I see lù-la-as-ta-ar-ma, the least felicitous of the three, as the result of editorial misinterpretation of an erasure orthography šu-tam-la-am-ma, though use of the sign šu in anything other than final position is exceedingly rare (according to Foster, collation by P. Machnic and C. B. F. Walker suggests that MS actually reads šu-ta-as-ma×a, but šù and šu can look very alike in some Kuyunjik scripta and to my eyes šù remains preferable). The form šuamāššuma preserved in the commentary is probably the original. Since the imperative takes a direct object here this will be a first attestation of the III/2 stem in the impf. (*šuappt), not of the III/2 (impf. *šùshù) exhibited in the awkward precative litiššuma. Given Ittar’s appetite for sex, the imperative stem can be seen as appropriate, though the Ašur MS uses the simple III/1 stem. Regarding hurudama, von Soden attributes the 1st pl. poss. suffix -na to NYB dialect (GAG 5 § 42–k, n. 9). Its appearance in an Ašur MS, as well as in the medical commentary, shows that the orthography lù-la-as-at-ma entered the copying tradition quite early in the first millennium. Its presence alongside niku in the previous line might be evidence for a provincial variant pronominal suffix and prefix, -na and -ma for nì- and -ni. If so, Ittar appears to Šuiliunu as a country girl, using his kind of language.

Thorold Jacobson suggests that this line is an example of an ancient practice of the touching genitals in oath-swearings that he maintained is found in Sumerian texts and, in very special contexts, in Genesis: ‘Ittar demands it of Gilgamesh (šù) as a binding acceptance of her offer of marriage’ (Jacobson, Harpp, p. 168, fn. 2). It seems to me that Ittar’s approach to the gardener Šuiliunu is impelled not by thoughts of marriage but by a simple desire for sexual gratification. The phrase huruduma latium is standard sexual language. A similar invitation is issued in an OB love song: bi-la-as ma lu-me-ši bi-pi-it-ma lu-in-da-at-mi, ‘put your left hand out and stroke our vulva’ (J. Goodnick-Westenholz, Studies Reiner, p. 422, 137). From an orgiastic OB cult song of Ittar comes the corresponding proposal from a male participant: al-ši lu-la-ap-pi-it hur-da-at-ši, ‘come, let me stroke your vulva’ (W. von Soden, Or vs 60 (1991)), p. 340, 11). Some have understood šùnu in our line as a euphemism for penis, like Hebrew yad (for a history of the literature see Paul, Studies Greenfield, p. 595, fn. 30).

72. For Foster ‘the archaic verb form aqqad suggests a proverbial expression, here used perhaps with the obstinate recourse to cliches often thought characteristic of the peasant in literature’.
supposes the context to be irrigation by shadow, and identifies the 'cloud' with a counterweight of mud fixed at other end of the pole from the bucket and the ṣilib of our passage as the same (Volk, Inanna und Šukallatuda, pp. 57, fn. 158–9). This remains very speculative. The word da-še(urse) ... is usually read as dāṣu, dālu, 'bucket' (with W.F. Albright, RA 16 (1919), p. 180), but until the end of the line is recovered it may be better to reserve judgement. Whatever the exact meaning of the line's technical vocabulary, it is apparent that the fate of Iššušu rendered him incapable of reaching the apparatus with which a gardener customarily irrigated his date palms.

82–3. This couplet is a variation on a standard literary cliche (see K. Hecker, Untersuchungen zur akkadischen Epik, pp. 178–9). Other examples are:

- il-lik šamuṣ(uva) i-na pa-an (var. šap-sukkal ana igi) di(30) abi(3) tā i-ba(k)-te
- i-na pa-an lā-šarrī(lugal) il-la-ka di-ma-a-li
- CT 15 46 rev. 3–4: Descent of Ištar, var. from KAR 1 rev. 3
- Šamšu (or Papsukkallu) went weeping before Sin, his father, [his] tears flowing before King Ea.
- il-lik ut-ulu lu ana pān(igī) šamšu(uva) i-bak-ki ana pān(igī) lā il-ša-ka di-ma-a-lā
- CT 17 50, 7–8: Worm and Toothache
- The worm went weeping before Šamšu, its tears flowing before Ea.

Slightly different versions are:

- ... il-še li-ta ana pān(igī) šamšu(uva) i-bak-ki ana pān(igī) kū-ru ša šamšu(uva) iššušu(pin) di-ma-a-lā
- Lambert, BVL, p. 200, 19–20: Fable of the Fox
- He lifted up his head, weeping before Šamšu, his tears flowing before the rays of the sun.
- ūši ūšiša Enlil u šamšu inambi (var. ibabale) ana pān tarriša šamšu iššušu dimūšu
- SB Gilgamesh VII 91–2, var. from MB Ur 2–3
- Enlilu lifted up his head, lamenting (var. weeping) before Šamšu, his tears flowing before the rays of the sun.
- ēr[uššišu] ī-(a)[-i]-ša i-bak-ki
- a-na pa-an šamuš(uva) tī-[la]-ša di-ma-a-lā
- EB Enna II 59–60; cf. EB Enna I C 36–7
- The snake lay weeping,
  [his tears flowing] before Šamšu.

85. For Frankena the Aššur MS's in-din-na-a represented a mistake for the Kuyunjik manuscripts' undersēnu (ypsumatu), but if need be it can be taken as a legitimate variant, i.e. I3 preretite (<cintamētu), contra Foster, Essays, p. 36, undersēnā is a perfectly good MB form, exhibiting /nd/ and /nd/ as in e.g. un-de-lī-ir < umtallār (cf. GAG 331f., Aro, StOr 20 (1955), pp. 40–9); the change
from 3b to 6 in a closed syllable before 3b remains valid even when the 3b disappears through contraction (e.g., 3mélil < 3mélil)."

89. The explanation that opens Ann's speech is also found in OB Atam-lisšat III iv 5, where a-ba-ma-an expresses Nintu's grief at the effect of the deluge. Here a-ba may thus be an expression of father's sympathy with an aggrieved daughter. However, it may also have a contrastive function ("but on the other hand")."

90-1. Like MS Q, MB Emar, apparently has a one-line version of this couplet: u [Gilgamesh errin] ni [ofi] di [eri] me [ren] (ii 3'-4').

91. In common with most other translators I prefer CAD's Binnana, 'give me, please.' (Bp., pp. 216-17, already in early NB), to von Soden's Binnenna, 'scaft mir' (for an Aramaic etymology of Binna, 'give me,' see von Soden, Ortsp. 37 (1968), p. 269). The fiery bull of heaven was already present in heaven, as a constellation, when in the Epic, it was placed as the perfect weapon with which to pursue her quarel with Gilgamesh.

92. As Frankena says, the traces on MS A do not appear to allow simply lu-nîr [i] šu-î [i]-šu. Nor do they allow lu-nîr-ri [i] (or ri) (CAD N 1/1, p. 349). If correctly read, the word lu-nîr-ri is ventive; cf. Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions (v).

93. Note the Assyrian present taddarum in MS A. The Kuyunjik MSS are not preserved at this point. The Assyrian form fails to provide a penultimate stress but to would Babylonian taddina. For other Assyrianisms in the SB text see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style (viii).

94. The object of Istar's proposed strike is clearly the Netherworld, for by comparing the text she expects to release the food from the gates that keep them safely locked away below. Hence the emendation of MS Q to provide a rare synonym of erru. The trace preserved after addi in MS Q and the space available after it suggest that this source had more than addi bêlû. It may be that, like the parallel passages of Istar's Descent, it offers a variant text.

95. The traces present in MS Q seem not to represent the second word. Possible readings are [a-la-ak]-k[a]-a, a very unlikely spelling in a Kuyunjik manuscript, and, with transposed words, [a-ta-sa] ak[a]-a [s-par] [s-par-a-nû] [s] [s] [s] [s].

96. The final vowel on the verb can be explained as an archaistic or a morphological phenomenon. If the former, it is to be disregarded as superfluous (CV for C, akamaddû); for comparable spellings in Assyrian manuscripts see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling (v). If the latter, it is to be passed as ventive, on which see the same section (v).

97. The Assyrian MS variant lapâlî further another Assyrian form (see l. 96) but not a good one, for it exhibits the wrong gender.

98. The spacing of the signs on the line suggests that very little is missing at the end of MS A; the independent pronoun that terminates the line in MS A was evidently not present at Assur. I am uncertain about what verb dar is best restored in MS A. The verb na-dar is constructed with ana, but 'I will draw his attention to the bull's fury' is hardly compelling. Nor are derivations from na-dar, 'to roar', and na-r, 'to turn aside.' The damaged verb must describe the means by which Istar will avenge her humiliation. This has already been articulated as his death, lamuru in l. 95. The II 1 stem of the verb is very rare but occurs in uncontracted Assyrian form in the version of SB VIII 22 from Sultantepe (MS c: na-er). The rarity of the stem is not the only drawback; however, if one reads na-ra-[i] [a] [a] [a] [a] [a] [a] it must be assumed that the scribe has written a-na for r-na, 'I will slay [him] by means of the bull's fury'.

113. The construct state gapâ (MS A, Assur) is not current usage in Babylonia after the third millennium (see GAG 564) but is good second-millennium Assyrian. In the parallel l. 154 the spelling ga-bê-e in MS O bears witness to the Babylonian form of the word. I presume gapâ represents a survival from an Assyriologic manuscript of the late second millennium. In a manuscript from Assur this is not so surprising. See also the commentary above, on SB VI 75.

118. There is no need to emend to the common formulation 3 (na) amarrat (1.kû), the orthographic style seba (7) amarrat (1.kû) is exactly paralleled in an inscription of Assurbanipal (VR 1146, ed. Streck, Ash., p. 6: S amarrat (1.kû) la:u [i] (se-an) 3-qa ina ab-sin-ni-šu, 'barley grew five cubits tall in its furrows'.

119. The circumlocution X-su ti Y, meaning X of Y, first appears in Old Babylonian (see GAG 538). It is another stylistic feature that is confined in the Gilgamesh epic to SB Tablet VI, where it also appears in l. 132 and l. 134: dumu4, aš-lumber. P01. The spelling im-sas-pu, represents istuqqatu, which I would parse as a 3-stem of serial action, (see GAG 591): the men fell into the hole one by one. When an individual falls into a hole, as Enkidu does in l. 124, the 3-stem is not used.

124. The spelling of the verb in MS A represents a mixed Babylonian-NA dialect form, istaqt (see GAG 531).

125. Repeated checking confirmed that the traces of e-ši are definitely so and cannot be read ši-eši. The line as given in MS A was evidently rather shorter than the better-preserved variant of MS A. Although MS O is broken off too soon for us to be sure from its text whether it followed MS A rather than MS A, the spacing of the existing signs confirms it as a witness of the shorter line.

126. The traces on MS A do not allow a reading ye-riššu.

137. The restoration favoured by recent translators is [a]-lu-us-us (sad-dû) (or some such verb), which goes back to "[waf er] seini [Mist]' (von Soden, ZA 53, p. 226); cf. the [flicked] his excrement' (CAD K, p. 29). This is, however, too uncertain to become so established. If dung is wanted, ni-su-us-su is also possible (Westenholz), but many other restorations might be put forward (e.g., [I]-pa-ut-us, as Labat: 'le [freppe]', Hecker: 'naf er išu')

138. The recovery of this line depends on MB Emar, iii 5: [a] nipuša kamab[i] (ni). With kamus used of a crowd, compare the standard line ešušu uškamar na ešušu (SI 254, 282, II 106).

139. For the possessive construction used here see the commentary above, on l. 119.

140. It seems difficult to reconstruct the text in such a way that alammudû could be parsed as subject. It is not clear whether the ending is superfluous or ventive (see above, on the verb in l. 100). By comparison with l. 141 one expects the verb to be from ašubu (MS O) or šešu (MS A); restore perhaps e-šu-[e]-ēt-eši], 'I shall keep passing'?

136-40. The restorations follow the parallel lines of narrative, 142-6.

137, 138. The last word is presumably to be the first recovered instance in Babylonian of the word entered in the dictionaries as šešu (Ahiqqe II 'Oberschenkel, Schöll'; CAD S šešu 'lap, thigh'), previously found only in Middle and Neo-Assyrian. Either there exists a doublet šešu : šešu or the Assyrian spellings, customarily defective, disguise the double consonant. Compare also šešu, a paired body part cognate with Arabic šaq, 'leg below the knee', 'lock' (for drawing my attention to the Arabic word I am grateful to my colleague Muhammad Abdel Haleem). The root of these words is perhaps š-q > Akk. šqāp, 'to be narrow', the leg below the knee being narrower than above. The use of šešu and šešu for 'lap' is analogous with the much more common use of šišu, 'knee', in the same meaning.

138, 144. The last word is perhaps some part of rašū, 'to trample, stamp, kick'.

140. The word šapšalu, here clearly a part of the anatomy of the Bull of Heaven, is taken as a *napass stem formation, which as a nemen loc indicates the place on the ox where the butcher places his knife in slaughterling the animal (palāk[i]). By the lexical entry restored as
154. On MS a l do not see enough room for ū-la-u[u]. The suggestion offered in the apparatus, ū-su-[u], supposes a variant (Assyrian?) form salsalu ‘to tear off’, perhaps by analogy with Bab. salatu: Ass. salatu. An alternative analysis would derive it from the verb salu, ‘to hurl’ (missiles), in which case the word would anticipate the action at the end of the line. The final verb is itself interesting, for the three extant MSS offer three different words, tiddi, isukh and šitk. MS O’s šitk is particularly striking, since the verb salu is not found outside Assyrian; on Assyrianisms in the SB epic see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (viii). The insitu (Sum. zagr) of a bull is the top portion of the leg, though whether the shoulder or the haunch seems unclear. Since it was a choice cut I assume it was from the rear leg. S. Parpola has suggested, on the basis of a supposed analogy with a bullfight that marked castration rites among the Galli of Anatolia, that the word is otherwise insitu, ‘right hand’, and clearly a “metaphor” for “pennis” (SAA IX, pp. xcvii–xcviii). It would certainly be more obviously an insult for Enkidu to toss the bull’s penis at Ištar, and such an interpretation of insitu was first offered by George Smith in 1875, who intuitively translated the word as ‘member’ (Assyrian Discoveries, p. 174). However, the following line, in which Enkidu states a desire to do the same to the goddess, then becomes a problem, for he cannot castrate her. Though Ištar was bearded in some managements, in Uruk she was firmly of the female sex (on the gender of Ištar see W. Heimpel, Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 4/3 (1982), pp. 12–14; B. Gronborg, ‘Die sumerisch-akkadische Išannu/Ištar: Hermaphroditos?’, WO 17 (1986), pp. 25–46). However male she may have been elsewhere, the goddess of the Gilgamesh epic is not likely to have had male genitalia.

156. MS Q appears to start this line quite differently, though nothing is preserved beyond the first sign.

156–7. According to GAG §15b f, the force of lā and the preterite is either a matter of emphasis or one of wishful thinking (‘hätte (von) sollen’), both in the past (it also occurs in the hypothetical past, as in the Yale tablet, OB III 114: tumultu antaquaque lâ u sibel, ‘(If) shall I have fallen, I should have made my name’). The conventional rendering of lā akuditu in our line as a conditional is justified on the grounds of juxtaposition of clauses. A comparable passage is SB VII 47–55: lā i lē dē lā ašī lā išariki etc., ‘Had I known . . ., I would have picked up . . ., I would have shipped by raft . . .’

158. Uruk is ‘the city of courtesans, prostitutes and harlots’ in Erra IV 52 (ā adients-a 2 [i] lāma-ša-a-ru-ša [i] 2). For hizedu—women see Chapter 10, the introduction to SB Tablet I, on ll. 245 ff.

159. The spelling šu-ba-nu (MS a) is for šibun (CV for VC or C); on this orthographic feature in Assyrian manuscripts of Gilgamesh see the section on Spelling sub (a) and (w).

160. The problematical variant šin-nu-ša-šaymi appears to be a corruption of an original šin-nuša-šın—ša-ša, ‘two minas each’ (note the indecision of AHA, p. 1243: šin manš, against p. 1302: ‘je zwei Finger’; von Soden, Recant, p. 60; ‘zwei Zoll’; cf. D. O. Edzard, ‘Zahlen, Zählen und Messen im Gilgamesh-Epos’, in W. Gross et al. (eds.), Texte, Methode und Grammatik, pp. 62–63). However, while the meaning of šabatū remains so uncertain it would be unwise to write the line as presented off completely. The variant spellings 4šu-ša-ba-ši-bi-nu (MS A) and 4šu-ša-ba-ba-ši-ba (MS O) can be explained by reference to the principle in Neo-Assyrian writing that CV signs can stand for VC (see above on SB VI 159).

165. For Lugabanda as the god of Gilgamesh see OB III 271 and note.

168. The line is perhaps standard, for it occurs also in MB Bogi, i: 5: šapaltu ililiškū, in the context of the heroes’ march to the Cedar Forest. Note also the same verbs in sequence, but without the ventive suffixes, in SB III 19–20.

171. The variant mu-tāp-pi-ša in MS O looks very out of place; in describing the people who
chorus the triumph of the returning heroes, it is obviously a variant inferior to the serving girls. Possibly it represents an intrusion of the same word from l. 177.

176–7. This couplet is poorly preserved but not beyond hope. The plural pronominal suffix on uzinni demands a subject in the first person, which means that at least the first line is direct speech, and probably the second too. The vital question is: who is speaking? For von Soden, the end of l. 177 reads mu-lh[i] (zA 53, p. 227), and the line referred to Bar's loss of prestige: he has no one in the street to please her. However, the traces visible before ul on MS A discount both l[bh]-[i] and l:k.

TABLE VII

1. On the spelling mi-in-na-ma (MS Q) for minâma (or minannam) see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (b).

27. Haupt's copy of the traces suggests [l][bh]-[i] ki-[x]. . . , but the reading is not secure.

28. The conventional restoration is kl-[u]ni, 'like a man'.

29. This line begins Enkidu's speech. Some commentators view II, 39–40 as narrative and l. 41 as the first line of direct speech. The absence there of any vocative makes such a reading less likely. Outside plant lists and two synonym lists (Malibu II 159 // CT 18 4 iv 12: hal-ba = qu-âtuum), the word halû only appears with reference to the forest of Lebanon, both elsewhere in the Gilgamesh Epic (SB IV 197; note that the reference given in the dictionaries to hal-ba in the Yale tablet is a mis-reading of tua-âtu in OB III 110) and in the Divine Directory of Aššur (Menzel, Tempel II no. 64, 116; šakur ([k]) hal-ba). In the latter text 'Adad of the Woodland' is presumably the Levantine storm god who resided on the Lebanon range, and who is known to Mesopotamian sources, including OB Gilgamesh III, as Wêr (later Mêr). The trace of [u]ni was seen by Haupt but not by Thompson. The presence of this preposition suggests an indefinite phrase, perhaps ina lâ laa-[a]-ki, 'in your insertive state'.

40. The reading of the first word in this difficult line is open to other interpretations. Von Soden reads ba-laa, 'without' (Reclame!, p. 63; cf. AHw, p. 1546, s.v. halû), but this word is otherwise restricted to the Old and Neo-Assyrian dialects. Bottéro reminds to obtain sense: "Il n'y a pas de conscience (en) tolè" Le copiste a oublié un mot et employé, au lieu du pronom de la deuxième personne, celui de la troisième (p. 136 with fn. 1). Parpola reads ba-laq va-ni-âa (meaning?). Reading baât umî (sg.) Enkidu contrasts his own consciousness with the obvious lack of it. At the end perhaps restoring i-aa-dû-laâ-ki ha-arâ-a.

41. The phrase ana 20 bêl also occurs in SB XI 315. In both lines it may be an idiomatic expression for 'here, there and everywhere' (A. Westenholz). From this line (acc. sg. i-za-ha) and l. 43 (nom. sg. i-u-ba-ki) it appears that the singular noun iu or iu-ba exhibits triphthongal declension before possessive suffixes: i(u)-bâk, i(u)-bâki, i(u)-bâki (other examples in the dictionaries of this word with suffixed pronouns are not diagnostic, being genitive or plural). In this respect it follows the well-known pattern of three other bi-radical nouns, ašu, abi and ašku (see GAG, §65f).

43. The verb šu is unarguably singular, so the restoration offered by CAD A/1, p. 211: i[u]-qi-[š]-a, 'the trees of the forest', is unconvincing. On iš or iu with pronominal suffixes see the note on l. 41. The use of ašu, normally 'stranger, alien; enemy', to denote a rival is unparalleled but understandable.

44–5. See the parallel, SBV 295–6.

46. That the word after šu-ta is from re'âtu, the standard verb for hanging a door in a gateway, seems inescapable. I am unable to decipher the end of the line satisfactorily. Perhaps the text is a corruption of arišu hâl.

47. The restoration of ginâškû is the suggestion of B. Landsberger (RA 62 (1968), p. 103, fn. 22).

48. The line is apparently given in the Kuyunjik MS as u anûna dumul-qâtu, which is a little light for a poetic line. Though one does not usually prefer a Sumerian word reading to a Kuyunjik reading, probably the sign a on MS L is a simple mistake for KIMN, which would then stand for lâ lide dalat kl.

53. The mythical Anzu bird was widely used as an apotropaic figure stationed at gates and elsewhere in temples. To the attestations cited in CAD A/2, p. 377, add Frayne, RIME III, p. 135 (in E-nam at Kutha; Sulgi), and George, RA 82 (1988), p. 144, 42 (in E-sagil at Babylon; Nebuchadnezzar II) and p. 151; see also Wiggermann, Protective Spirits, p. 159. This function of Anzu incidentally explains how in the eponymous myth he came so easily by the opportunity to carry off his master's regalia from the temple of Enlil at Nippur.

58. The last word is unlikely to have been preterite iš-[i]-nu, for that form fails to provide the usual penultimate stress. For examples of the perfect tense where assimilation of /nd/ to /nd/ is explicit in the spelling see SB XI 275: ta-at-ta-nu-â-tu-um ma and 280: ta-at-ta-nu-â-tu-um ma; here there is room for the morpho-graphemical spelling it-ta-ad-na only if the text continued on to the edge.

60. It is difficult to take this line as a factual statement: Enkidu knows that he is dying and will not be able to destroy his handiwork himself. The truth of this is confirmed by the curses of the next three lines, which anticipate the door's destruction by some future king. Accordingly I have taken the line as a rhetorical question. The unspoken, negative answer ('No, you cannot') leads directly to a statement of who can.

62. The god seems to be out of place here: human agents are expected to be the instrument of all these curses.

64. The verbs of the line fit the context of the destruction of a door as envisaged in l. 60 but the door cannot be the object here for, as I understand it, Enkidu is in Uruk and the door is in Nippur. What is wanted is some volition of frustration and despair. Probably he ripped off his clothing and cast it aside, exactly as Gilgamesh does in SB VIII 64: inu-âshu u umât dumâqki.

73. The conventional restoration is šakîku, 'your lips' (Landsberger, RA 62, p. 119), but more may be missing.

75–6. The import of this couplet is that when a death occurs it is those who are left behind that are afflicted with pain. Already noted for its 'proverbial insight' (cf. H.-P. Müller, ZA 68 (1978), p. 247), the couplet is confirmed as a proverbial saying by use of the preterite. On the 'gnomic preterite' in such contexts see Chapter 5 above, the note on OB III 255–6. In l. 76 the conventional restoration is [u]-um-tum, but the identification of the line as a saying means it need have no immediate relationship with the context. The suggestion mutu is supported by the use of ezabu, which often means 'to leave for posterity' (see CAD E, pp. 420–1). This is the exact verb for the context of the deceased and his legacy, being used with mutu in an OA letter in which the writers identify themselves as heirs (G. Eissen and J. Lewy, MVA6 no. 246, 5). meer-e-me-tum nu-â-âtu u-ba-ni-as pă-pa-am e-zi-ib-ni-a-it; we are the sons of the deceased. Our father left us a tablet'.

78. The word written i ša-ka (both MSS) is, as Landsberger observed, 'für išku sehr hart' (RA 62, p. 122, fn. 90). However, recent translators all take this word exactly so, as the singular object of the following verb. In the context it is difficult to win any other decipherment except perhaps šuška
This line is not found in MB Ur. A possible restoration is [šu bit (or šūṭi)], 'the gods of the house (or houses) that he enters', which would mark the hunter as one who brings bad luck whenever he goes. The lack of subjunctive after a-šar (MS g, coll.) is not significant in a LB copy.

The Kuyunjik sources can be restored to yield [ši-im]-šu as well as literary [ši-im]-šu. The latter, which is also found in SB I 222, agrees with MB Ur 11 and is probably supported by the LB manuscript (ši-ma-šu = šimašu (a)). On words with unnecessary epenthetic vowels in SB Gilgamesh see above, Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (i),

The second of these three lines is additional to the text of MB Ur 11–12: akī šamhat ši-mašu šiuškku hazzurki izzāra rabā. The traces of MS E, seem to prohibit simple [ša-a]-ki-šu, although that is what is expected from MB Ur 13: ša-tišt šarrari izzišu a šišu anā kāši. If one prefers not to interpolate the conjunction a t alternate solution would be to restore [ša-a]-ki. The trace of šu before -ša-a-šu on MS Z, reported by Haupt on collation of his nos. 6, obr. 9 (B/4, p. 106), was not visible to my eyes. MS g’s -ša for -šu is routine in a LB copy.

This line represents an additional to the text of MB Ur. Von Soden associates the hapax legomenon ta-šu-ti-ki with taštā (AHu, p. 1303), a rare word that refers to the young of animals and is equated with māru, 'sor', in Explicit Malku I 192. The context here, as in MB Ur 14–15, is the prostitute's exclusion from the respectable working class of making a household and raising a family within it, and taštā thus describes human young. Landsberger restored the beginning of the line as [ša]-ram-mi-šu to match the form of the other prohibitions in these curses. Though the verb rammu means 'loosen', it would be unwise to exclude it while the middle of the line is undeciphered. It is also possible to read the verb as [ša]-ram-mu, yielding 'you are not to love (your family, etc.)', but to me the point is not that the prostitute does not love her children (or have children to love), but that she cannot provide them with a respectable home.

This couplet is evidently longer than the counterpart, MB Ur 18–19: e tārī bit udātī / ...-šašum ša paḫārī, but apparently to the same effect: the conventional warning of respectable women, a house full of beautiful things, is not within the prostitute's expectations. Before ša-paḫārī Landsberger suggested ki-ru-er-ša-mu (RA 62, p. 125, fn. 99). This is not out of the question according to the preserved trace, but to my mind what is required is some such phrase as 'the luxury products of the potter'; kārimu, a lump of potter's clay, does not meet this need.

The couplet is certainly the counterpart of the damaged MB Ur 20–1 (note ay irš there for ša tarā, and omission of balatu), but until new text is discovered the decipherment of (in particular) the first line is uncertain. Landsberger read [ša]-nam-ri pu-rim, 'von dem schimmernden Alabaster', but this is doubtful. The sign he reads rim looks to me equally like ki or di with interior damage, and the phrase itself does not convince. For dabbamu as somewhere suitable for the slaves' quarters, see Chapter 5, the notes on MB Ur 22.

Note that mūšūtā, mašullāti and mānasṣūtāi are consistently plural (as in the parallel passages quoted in the introduction, Ch. 10), while MB Ur 23–5 has mūšūtā (pl.), mašullāti (sing.) and mānasṣūtā (pl.). The phrase [ši-palaltu (or ši-palalšušu)] ša šarrāni is the counterpart of Ur's ši-palalšu šarrāni.

The late text preserves MB Ur's e-lešu bal-ti in reverse order, here as also in SB IX 188; the order balatu a šūšu is conventional in later literary texts.

The first word was read 'šu-nešu' by Landsberger (RA 62, p. 126), but the space available is not adequate for ści, nor do the traces of the first sign permit 'u-lapšu-ti um-ni,' 'sanitary towel' (so Lambert in Haas (ed.), Außerseiter, p. 129). In my view the first sign must be A or 2A: perhaps read
Landsberger) replaces MB Ur’s išināli wa-niški (l. 55). However, it does not improve the sense and is also remarkable in that it produces a more concise text. It may be that the change represents chummy editorial work on text preserved on a damaged original, with iš-ni-ki misread as niš-ni-ki. 159. For the restoration see MB Ur 56: ana eṣiš ki murrēni (na) kumurrēni iš-kidānišu iš-kiddāši. 160. The Assyrian 3rd sg. precative irtārē (masculine) is another example of an Assyrianism in MS L (see above, on l. 153). 162. The restoration assumes that the form written mar-ša-at (MS L) is indicative, with a redundant ‘overhanging’ vowel (for comparable spellings in the same manuscript see below, on l. 165 and 167). 164. These lines replace MB Ur 59–61: Gilgāmēl ašī mašara / ıš[br]ābab minna khatātattu / ıškabbātu anna šātā. 165. To my eyes ıš-[a]-aš-ša) looks less likely; cf. al elsewhere on fragments of MS L at l. 30 (Lg i 4’), 140–1 (Lg, ii 12’–13’), 145 (Lg, iii 17’). Unless ventive, which seems improbable, the spelling ls-ta-šu for ıš-tāl exhibits the late convention that a syllable CVC can be written CV-CV; see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub (g). 166. The spelling ls-ta-ša at-ju in MS L stands for šumati āštum, and in doing so accords with well-known quirks of NA orthography (CV for CV, CVC for CV-CVC); cf. MS g’s ls-ni-št- and the same relative clause in SB II 246: šumati at-ta-liša matušiya. Split as they are by the vocative ībrī, the words minna and šumati do not exhibit the same syntactic relation as the genitive construction minnā šātī and must form a nominal clause. 167. The spelling as-za-zu, probably for azazu, conforms MS L, as the work of a scribe who was happy to write CV for C alone, as well as for VC. Alternatively, the verb is ventive, azazu (note LB variant az-za-za), expressing location ‘I was standing there’, as elsewhere in the epic (see OB II 179 and note). 168. The SB text omits nār, which in MB Ur 66 qualifies Anāz. The line is identical with a phrase used in the Vision of Kūnām (quoted in the notes on MB Ur). 172. The kepā is more than an ordinary skipping-rope: it is the playing vehicle of Ištar, her instrument of war, and perhaps a metaphor for the surge of battle (for a discussion see B. Landsberger, WZKM 56 (1960), pp. 121–3). The verb mašānu is also found with kepā in the Turkh-šinurta Epic, where Ištar’s striking of it has the effect of driving the enemy ‘out of their senses’ (Ebeling, MAOG 12/II, p. 8, 32: im-ta-as hep-pa-la šātār). 174. There does not seem to be the space for Landsberger’s suggested ıš-kab-hi-š (RA 62, p. 130); in any case kilabu refers to the step of humans not animals. The verb ruḫu is characteristic of horses and other equids, meaning ‘to kick’ as well as ‘trample’, but note its use with an ox in SB XI 108 (see further the commentary, ad loc.). 175. The sign before pārḫu is perhaps kāl (so already Landsberger). 176. Landsberger’s reading at the end, [aš ti-ša-zi]-di-[an]-ni, is not confirmed by the extant traces. 182. The restoration is suggested by the parallels in SB VI 61 and 76. 184. Irkalla is a name of the queen of the Netherworld, but its etymology indicates that it originally designated her canal domain (< Sum. eri-), ‘Great City’). See further W. Röllig, RA V, p. 64, who here and in parallel passages reads labat ıpt Irkalla, ’sac of the goddess of Irkalla’. 193. There are two alternative ways of dealing with ana in this line and its repetition (l. 198). Either it is a mistake for ina and introduces a locative phrase or it marks the indirect object of appalamma. Elsewhere in SB Gilgameš napēatsu takes a direct object (SB 144 itpalas samēpatu, V 2 itnapēatsu mitētē, V 3 itnapēatsu nērētu, IX 141 etc. ana palēša arkuwa, XI 93, līmu ana itpalēti, XI
Babylonian forerunner (*TCL XV 10, 188; CT 24 32, 112), this does not mean that he necessarily shares in the sun god's chthonic role as judge of the dead.

However, a certain connection of Šakkân with Ereškîgal's kingdom can be observed in his relationship with Nergal, the lord of the Netherworld, for there is a tradition in which, like Šakkân, Nergal has dominion over wild animals (PBS I/2 119, 11, [8]: ku-ud *šakkânum nam-ma-la-a qa-tuk iga-qi-ka 'O Nergal, Enlil gave into your care the beasts of Šakkân, the wild animals'; šallâ-prayer). Neo-Assyrian kings relate their success in hunting to the commission of Ninurta and Nergal (Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 178, 134: *ninurta(maš) u*nergal(ig.dug) . . . sîlka(m.a) sîr(resu) *šakkânum Ninurta and Nergal entrusted to me the beasts of the wild and commanded me to go hunting'); Tukulti-Ninurta II; cf. ibid., p. 135, 68-9; Asîkîr-dîn II, pp. 226, 40; 291, 84-5; Ašurnârēpîl II; RIMA 3, p. 41, 40-1; Šammaneser III, etc.). These passages demonstrate that Nergal's dominion over the 'beasts of Šakkân' derives from his prowess as a hunter.

A closer relationship between Šakkân and Nergal can be inferred from lists. In the lexical text A I/6 it is even mentioned in various its enumerations, with one of the 'beasts of the wild', namely the gazelle:

\[
\text{ša-la-maš.DA} = \text{za-bi-tum}
\]

\[
\text{1st.6.e.t.t.e.a}
\]

\[
\text{na.sîr.11.gal (sur. igugal.lu1, r1[a])}
\]

MSL XIV, p. 228, 126-8

Elsewhere the god of gazelles is Šakkân, of course (see above, the commentary on SB I 110). This association is given further expression in the esoteric text I.38m. chấpן בם ק, which, according to *ša-pir (i.e. Nergal) and *šin share a mystical number (CT 25 50, 15, ed. Livingstone, Mytryal Works, p. 33, rev. 4). In this list there are two other entries where divine names are paired: Baal and Marduk (rev. 1) and Girra, or Gilib, and Nuska (rev. 5). In the first of these entries the two deities are identical: Baal is the common name of Marduk. In the second, the first named, Girra, is the agent of the second named, Nuska, the god of fire. Since Girra is himself fire personified, the two deities are in many respects almost identical. On this evidence we would expect a close bond, if not an identity, to exist between *ša-pir and *šin. With regard to this particular text I am inclined to see that ancient scholars would not have ignored the hidden possibilities offered by the orthography *ša-pir is Šakkân. Speculative etymology of the kind practised in some scribal circles would find no difficulty in linking Šakkân with *ši-te (šin)*.gal, i.e. *ša-la-maš.DA and *ša-pir, and thus extrapolating an equation of the god and the Netherworld. Such an analysis would be good cause by the observed existence of a close association of the two gods, as documented in the texts just cited.

204. As Ereškîgal's scribe, Bêlêš-sêrî is the Akkadian name of the goddess also known as (Nin)-Geštinanna and Azimmu, the wife of the chthonic deity Ningîšzidda (see W. G. Lambert, Studies Mesopotamian, pp. 298-9). The epithet given this goddess here is a variation on the title bestowed on her in Sumerian literature, duh sar maḫ a.ur.laši, 'chief scribe of Hades', as in the Death of Ur-Nammu 128 (Kramer, FCS 21, p. 115; nin.a.zi, [ma]), a Guttau II inscription (Ebeling, AOR 21, p. 388, 66-9, = sup-lar-ra-zi til-zi a 1-11, = SIT 210, 12; nin.geštin.an.na), and OB and SB recensions of Udâgâlug (Forunner 48 and 284; Geller, UF 4, pp. 22, 36; SB III, CT 16 3, 95-8, = sup-lar-ra-tum til-zi a 4-4; von Weicker, Uruk 614 27-8; cf. SB IV, CT 16 9i 4-5; nin.geštin.na = *ša-la-maš.DA). Elsewhere she is the divine scribe par excellence, in an inscription (CT 23 16, 15; nin.geštin.an.na *šu-laži, cf. G. Castellino, Or N 24 (1955), p. 246), the Enemdrumanni text (BRR 24, 36, 1: *bêlêš-sêrî kud-kud kamû 'u egerem', ed. W. G. Lambert, Ps. Berger, p. 149), divina-
tion prayers (BBR 87 ii 7 // Beoldz, Cat., Sm 502, 7; 4:147-418 klik-ta-as-bak-ta t/su(m) rabûti(m), also OB YOS XI 23, 14: 4147-418 klik-ta-as-bak-ta t/su(m) rabûti(m), giving her also the specifically celestial office of ‘herald of Anu’), and elsewhere (RAM 323, 47: 4147-418 ninnin.in/(la) lam-suk-ma-tum [...]; K 3424, 7-8: 4147-418 ninnin.in/(la) lam-suk-ma-tum [...]; lam-suk-ma-tum [...]). Note that the seal inscription read by H. Lümer, Sasanian inscriptions, p. 113, 11. 6, as 4147-418 ninnin.in/(la) lam-suk-ma-tum in fact reads 4147-418 lam-suk-ma-tum (coll. W. G. Lambert).

209. The superfluous ištâ on MS Z is rather small, probably an error which the scribe neglected to erase.

210. -9. The restorations are the suggestion of Landsberger, R 462, p. 131, fn. 129. The pairing of bataru and kimûtu in this couplet recalls a line of Lugalii, in which the sufferer contemplates the death: pe-ta-kí kimûtu ar-tu='a la-ka-mu-a, ’my tomb was open, my funerary furnishings were ready’ (Lambert, BWL, p. 114, 114). Note also, utilizing the same root, the phrase tar-si-û kimûtu, ’funerary preparations’, in a NA inscription describing the burial of an Assyrian king (Tul., p. 57, 12; cf. J. MacGinnis, SAA 11 (1987), p. 2, i 14). Our passage may have Enkidu contemplating his own funerary rites—or rather lack of them, since he has been transported to the Netherworld in a dream. More likely Eresgigal is still speaking, and follows up her preliminary inquiries as to who brought Enkidu to her realm with a further question: how did he happen to come without the vital gifts of tribute for the gods of the Netherworld?

211. The line is restored after a standard line of Gilgamesh’s wanderings, ibrî ša anum-ma-a donnî / īnā tiškaltu kala maradim (OBVA + BM ii 0-3 // 2.3.5.3; SB X 55-6 // 110-2 // 232-3).

212. At the end Landsberger’s p(a-ba-r), ’ein Traum ... für den es keine Deutung gibt’, is not quite compatible with the trace. Perhaps a[m-sal-ša-la], ’a dream that will never be traced’.

256-7. According to A. Schott, ZA 42 (1934), p. 130, Jensen privately suggested restoring ašš mašu, at least in I. 256, after the parallel in SB XI 244.

261. The broken sign on MS GG might be restored īl-k-ša-bi, after MB Megiddo rev. 10: mar-ri šakabî elûtu, but there is not sufficient agreement between the two versions of Enkidu’s death to be confident of such restoration.

262. Compare MB Megiddo rev. 11‘: Enkidu ina may ruš na-šidâ.

263. Enough remains of the broken sign apparently to rule out an exact equivalence of this line to MB Megiddo rev. 12: iština Gilgâmêl ā-la-ši-x ...
about preferring the reading of this very inferior manuscript to that of the Kuyunjik tablet, despite its apparent slowness on this occasion, and the presence of himmatu here is made suspect by its appearance in the next couplet. In trying to resolve the differences between the two sources one can only observe that Sultantepe's he-e could otherwise be emended to he-e(qa), and that the two signs that follow will match Kuyunjik if exchanged. However, ša-ša-gi ınu piša does not yield good sense and thus the verb of the Kuyunjik manuscript remains uncertain.

29–30. In the Kuyunjik text the extant traces would allow this person also to be n measures, but he has already appeared in l 27; stylistic criteria would suggest that another word is required. I cannot reconcile the traces of the two sources, so I have allowed each to have its own different synonym for herdman. Part of the work of a shepherd boy (kaparutu, signa) seems indeed to have been churning milk, as we learn from a line of Ibi-Erra's hymn to Nisaba: signa ra ıkum du, signa nu da, da, iš, iš, iš, iš, ıs, ı
and of the following relative clause, seems this time to be something to do with ēnūtu, a word that almost always occurs in the compound bit ēnūtu. The bit ēnūtu is the term that describes the house of the bride's father-in-law at the time of the wedding ceremony, and has already been met in the episode of Enkidu's wrestling match with Gilgamesh (SB II 113). That episode is not necessarily the reference here, however, since allusions to the past career of the dead hero seem to stop at 1. 22. The second line of the couplet is partly corrupt, one suspects, but the mention of a wife confirms that the context is nuptial. As the pattern established earlier lines the wife should be the object of the relative clause. The general import of the couplet thus seems to be that the bride's family and other people present at a wedding ceremony, at which Enkidu was in some way associated with a wife, will weep for him. The signs il hi ka suggest īt-qa-ka, 'you gave to drink', but the text may well be corrupt (cf. von Soden, Reclam, p. 72: 'I'm Sippendeutu des Gastes einen Ring gab man dir', reading iš-il-šu-ka in AHu, p. 1422). An imaginative attempt to solve the difficulties without emendation was made by I. M. Diakonoff, BÉOr 18 (1961), p. 62: is-iš-šu-ka e-li-šu-ur(i)? bit e-mu-ta / is il-ša-šu umu ilāti-ša-ka [šu-ša-ša]. 'Let those weep [over you who have entered the bit ūmu], Who have [obtained] a wife (through your wise?) counsel,' with the footnote: 'ša alātu nāšu ilāti-ša-ka = ša alātu enqa (= ina enqa) ilāti-ša-ka (Sandhi). However, it is not known that Enkidu counselled aspilng husbands. Bottev restoros boldly Pleurez-le, invités, qui, pour la noce, lui aviez glissé au doigt un anneau!' but comments, 'l'allusion à la coutume de "passer un anneau au doigt" des invités à un mariage est intéressante. Je n'en connais pas d'autre attestation' (Utépéps, p. 150, fn. 5).

For the moment it is probably wise to suspend judgement as to the exact meaning of the line.

41. Recent translators have followed Gurney in taking ina namēdetma at face value ('on his steppe', etc.). The subsequent publication of MS m, however, shows that this phrase begins the poetic line and so qualifies the verb ababkē̄ka, a form which addresses Enkidu in the second person. For this reason I see ina ina-nēše-ša-ašu as an inferior variant, probably deriving from the phrase ina ūmu through a mistake of reading (ša for na) or of hearing (crasik?). The phrase ina ūmu has an emphatic function, signifying that what follows is heart of the matter, and here it marks the climax of the preceptive section of Gilgamesh's peroration.

50. The word ša-arārd was once also taken at face value, as an active participle in the construct state (šārd, e.g. Heidel, Speiser: 'who chased(s) the wild ass'), but the discovery of MS w, with its variant šar-dū, encouraged Gurney and most subsequent translators to analyze it as the passive participle, šar-anš, 'sent away, banished'. The latter parsing is confirmed correct by the phrase ak-kon-ni šar-dū (var. sa-ar-ū) in a potency incantation, where the image is of the recalcitrant penis as a wild donkey, unyielding and uncooperative (Biggs, Sarina, p. 17, no. 2, 7, translating 'hunted wild ass'). The nuances of the word šārd are several here. Enkidu was a famously swift runner until he was effectively banished from his homeland by the wiles of a woman. Now he is chased by death, a more lethal pursuer. He is a male because males, being inferiors, die as he does, without offspring.

50–4. This section of five lines, a couplet and a triplet, is repeated in a slightly expanded form (three couplets) in SB X 126–31, 226–31 (also, omitting the first couplet, in IX 31–4). It is odd that the material presented in this precis of Gilgamesh and Enkidu's joint career is not ordered according to the sequence of the narrative; the killing of the Bull of Heaven intrudes on the climbing of the mountains and the defeat of Humbaba, which are both exploits from the story of the heroes in the Cedar Forest. The older text represented by the Megiddo fragment may have preserved a different, more chronologically correct order (MB Megiddo oiv. 5′–6′).

56. For naštūr, 'to become darkened, eclipsed', in the sense of losing consciousness, see A. L. Oppenheim, Or No 17 (1948), p. 45. The active suffix poignantly stresses Gilgamesh's personal anguish: 'you do not sense even my presence.'
The throwstick was a hunting weapon naturally associated with the warlike Istar, and thus a tammušu may well have been a suitable gift for her. If kal-ba-m-e is the name of a wood it appears to be a hapsak legomenon. Perhaps it should be seen as a variant of ḫallurum, a variety of mētu (MSL I, pp. 110, 113. 211. 219. 418. 422. 425, 43); and I assume that we have III throughout. The force of the modified stem is not iterative but serial, denoting the action of setting things down in a row or side by side (see GAC §91).

145–6. The expansion of erēti to erēti šapātu as restored in this passage (and II. 154–5, 159–60) relies on the parallels later in this section (II. 177–8, 181–2). The extra word is used perhaps for metrical reasons, to fill out the line.

148. A flute is a fitting gift for a shepherd god. Dumuzi and flutes are associated in Istar’s Descent, where flutes of lapis lazuli accompany him on his passage to and from the Netherworld: gi.gi 4mu (ca.gin) (CT 15 47, 28 and 35 // 48, 24a and 31); and in a ritual that mimics his funeral, where a flute is one of the gifts presented to him (Farber, Istar and Dumuzi, pp. 140ff. 21, 61).

154. For Namtar as uṣuk erēti, ‘the vizier of the Netherworld’, see the Vision of Kunnā (A. Livingstone, Court Poetry, p. 71, 2), and an incantation against witchcraft (W. G. Lambert, AFO 18 (1957–8), pp. 293, 65). In A N his title is the vizier of Ereškigal (CT 25 5, 31; cf. also the myth of Nergal and Ereškīgal).

159. As Namtar’s wife (see W. G. Lambert, RLA IV, p. 532), Ḥabiliq follows him in the parallel passage of the Death of Ur-Nammu (see Chapter 10, the introduction to SB Tablet VIII), and is placed here for that reason. Her epitaph is restored after a Gatum III incantation (E. Ebeling, AOr 21 (1953), pp. 396, 65; ariq kr ri la, coll. Lambert). In the Vision of Kunnā Namtar’s wife is his female aspect, nam-tar-ru (Livingstone, Court Poetry, p. 71, 3).

164. The gender of Ereškigal’s sweeper is masculine, if we accept the evidence of his title and the verb he governs (ša-had). The name Qassā-tībat, ‘Her hand is light’, thus refers not to his own character but to the easy relationship he enjoyed with his divine mistress, and functions like a personal name. It is uncertain whether this god is connected with the deity who bears the Sumerian version of his name, one of the cowherds of Sin (KAV 172 ii 10: ša.ri, du. 179 ii 11: ša.ri, du, uga), on whom see further T. Jacobsen, JAOS 103 (1983), p. 199. A name exactly opposite in meaning is attached to one of the counsellors of Lugal-Maradua, ša. ni, du, ‘His hand is heavy’ (CT 25 1, 1). The pairing of Qassā-tībat with the cleaner (muṣṣirna) Ninīšuḫḫārasumu confirms the minial nature of his responsibilities as šāštāt, for their titles are nearly synonymous: in hieroglyphs the phrases ša-ša la ša-bi-ta, ‘he must not sweep his house’ (KAR 176 rev. 124 // 178 ii 71; etc.), and mitu la ša-bi-ta, ‘he must not tidy his house’ (C. Vroonenbos, ZA 19 (1905–6), p. 378, 10), are interchangeable before the inflection ša-ša la ša-bi-ta, ‘he must not wash his feet’.

The beginning of this line is very lightly written, suggesting that, as becomes clear in II. 168–73a, where the beginnings of some lines are left blank, the scribe was dealing with a broken original. The verb ša-ṣmār-rašu should thus be treated with some scepticism; perhaps it is intended for ša-ša-la-ša, yielding ša-ša la ša-bi-ta, ‘he must not be anxious nor sick at heart’. The line recurs as SB VIII 174 in MS m. As noted by Cavigneaux, Gilgamesh et la Mort, p. 43, it is remi-
niscent of a standard Sumerian poetic line, ur, nam.bu.e ud.; ša nam.bu.e šag ge, which occurs in the Death of Bšgmar and other texts as a stock line describing the despair of an individual faced with imminent death.

169. At this point the only significance of the Cedar Forest can be that the decorated interior of the object was a representation of it. That Enkišu’s grave-goods should be embellished with mementoes of his career would seem natural. See also the dagger perhaps decorated with a representation of the Euphrates (l. 176), and cf. l. 200.

171–3 The scribe of MS m has attempted to restore these more formulaic lines, but the hesitation revealed by the tentative nature of his script indicates that he did not feel secure about what he was writing. The deity Ninšubalḫaḫumu, ‘Lady Suited to the Cleansing Rites’, is otherwise unknown; she has an appropriate name for one whose job is to do the housework: cf. the lexical entry MSL V, p. 128, Ha III 407: "šag.ti lu.bu ka glimmur = mu-ša-ar-[ta]. This item is a kind of bread made of spades of the date palm for, as seen in the heraldories quoted above (l. 164), šaaru is treated as a near-synonym of kaludu, ‘to sweep’. The musical nature of the task ša-an šaaru is further seen in a legal document from Nuzi, in which a girl given into the service of the temple of Ištar of Nineveh for the purpose of ša-an šaaru, ‘cleaning the courtyard’, must attend twice a month to ‘tidy up and fetch water’ (JHS 14 106, 16-17: ša-an ša-ar-[ke]-mu ša-an ša-ar-[ke]-bi)

174. The version of this line in MS m has already occurred at l. 167, where its relationship to a stock line of Sumerian poetry has been noted. The Kuyuniq version of this line appears instead to make the deity the subject, but while the break intrudes this is not completely certain. To my eyes the traces do not allow a reading ša-an (or ša) ša-an ša-ar-bi, ‘let him say, “Well!”’.

175. For par-ti as a writing of the singular noun in construct state see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style (d). The proposal that kutapu here is not the word for ‘bit’ (the mouthpiece of a bridge) but means ‘double-edged’ is the perspicuous idea of A. Westenholz, who draws attention to ka = šu in the meaning ‘edge’. See further A. W. Sjöberg, TCS III, p. 75, quoting the Sumerian expression ša-ki-šu, ‘edge of a pointed blade’, used in the Enûl hymn, Falkenstein, Götterbilder I, p. 11, 16, and explained in MSL XIII, p. 244, Kapal I 3:7: ka ša-ki-šu = gi-pu-an-ri-im za-[ag-nim]. The reading ša-ki-šu, against ša-ri-nu (Parpola), is proved by the lexical entry MSL XIV, p. 491, A VIII 29: 31-gam = ša-ki-šu ša-ru(p) (so already CAD S 384, p. 440).

176. The first word is of uncertain decipherment and derivation. For Parpola mi-ša-ti represents mešḫušu, ‘blade’. One might also propose a word mi-šašu, ‘replica’ (ššašu), with reference to the shape of the dagger’s blade or handle. In both cases the word would be a noun in construct state in an exceptional construction, with an adjectival modifying the noun falling between regens und rectum. To avoid this one can transfer the adjective and read in adposition mi-ša-ti es-ša-tin-te pu-ni-ti ‘the holy water-course, the Euphrates’; but note that the inverted phrase eštu Paran is also occurring at SB VIII 19 and was perhaps a compound. With all three readings of the first word there is no obvious syntactic connection of this line to the immediate context. Consequently it may be corrupt, and for the moment it is safer not to offer a complete translation.

177. Bibbu is otherwise known from the Vision of Kuminšu, where he bears the same title (Livingstone, Court Poetry, p. 73, 19; I see no justification for Livingstone’s translation of giššu = ša-balü as ‘bargain’). He appears appropriately as a death-bringer in a demon in an inscription, alongside the ‘Snatcher’, Eškur (K 8104, 7’, cited in CAD B, p. 219). When not a general term but a specific planet, ša-balü (ud) is sometimes interpreted as Mercury (e.g. MSL XVII, p. 229, Antakar G 308: ša-balü = ša-balü (ud); or, with the same implication, Ninurta (see CAD B, p. 218), but once, in the Great Star List, it is equated with the ‘red star’, i.e. Mars (CT 26 40 iv 9: ul-sa, = ša-balü (ud)); cf. U. Koch-Westenholt, Mesopotamian Astrology, pp. 194–5, 170). This raises the possibility that a tradition existed which maintained that Mars was red because in the

Netherworld he was, by reason of his duties there, bathed in blood. A close relationship between Bibbu and Mars (Šalbatina), which is the astral manifestation of the god Nergal, is also found in an astronomical commentary, where they appear together in association with fatal epidemics:

=ša-balü (ud) = maš-mašu-bu-lim  ‘which cuts down livestock’
=ša-balü-ba-nu = maš-ta-ba-šu-ru-ü ma-ta-nu  ‘which causes continual plague’

V R 46 no. 1, 41–2

Note that in the Gatum III incantation the name of the butcher of the Netherworld is different (PIS L 112, 66, ed. Ebeling, Ar Or 21 (1953), p. 396): ša-bal ū bi-idd gir.la kur-ra.ki. However, in Gatum II this deity has instead the title ‘dragon of the Netherworld’ (Ebeling, Ar Or 21 (1953), p. 388, 76): ša-bal ū bi-idd ušumgal kur-ra.ki. // STT 210 rev. 18: šar.du.bi di-ud ušumgal kur-ra.ki. 181. In god lists there are many divine epitopes [...]-abzu, but only a few are true divine names rather than titles or epitaphs. The best known of these is Dumuzi-abzu. The question is: did this deity have the chthonic connections that would support the restoration of the name in the line? At Girsu in the third millennium Dumuzi-abzu was a goddess with the title ‘Lady of Kinun’ (H. Stehler, FASOS 9, pp. 138, Ur-Babā 1 vi 9–10; 178, Gudea Stat. II is 3); at Kinunir itself her name could be abbreviated simply to Dumuzi (see House Most High, p. 163, 1297). Kinunir is otherwise known, in the Ur III period, as a cult centre of the chthonic gods Nergal and Ningal (G. Edzard and G. Farber, Rep. kugl. II, p. 102). Possibly they occupied shrines in the sanctuary of the city goddess. In the big OB forerunner to An an Anum, Dumuzi-abzu is a name of Zarpanitu (TCL XV 10, 100), while in a later tradition the name is given to a male deity, a son of Enki (An II: CT 24 16, 30 28, 82). Edzard maintains that Dumuzi-abzu is not a Dumuzi figure (RLA V, p. 603). That may be true for the goddess of the third millennium, but the change of sex suggests that in the second and first millenniums the obvious syncretism with the famous dying and rising god was accomplished. One observes that a certain cosmological confusion is sometimes apparent between abzu and Apsu, Ea’s domain, and the realm of Anušikkal, both being below ground (cf. W. G. Lambert in C. Blacker and M. Loewe (eds.), Ancient Cosmologies, p. 48; Horowitz, Cosmic Geography, pp. 342–4; for apsā as a rare synonym of the Netherworld see CAD A 2.196). Gods of Ea’s court do occasionally appear in the Netherworld. A good example is ṣīdim.(me).kug, who is sometimes the daughter of Ea, sometimes of Namtar and Nuhkūg (see W. G. Lambert, RLA IV, p. 244; presumably this is the later version of the goddess dim.(mi).me.kug, who is one of the divine residents of the Netherworld in the Death of Bšgmar and the Death of Ur-Namma, ‘standing at the side’ of Ninḫiṣida). Note also Nergal’s title, šu-gal.gi.abzu, ‘great king of Apsu’ (CT 25 36 rev. 3 // 37, 1), an epithet which one would have thought was the preserve of Ea. Thus the cosmological overlap of Apsā and the Netherworld also affected theology. In the light of this confusion the name Dumuzi-abzu, whatever its original application, was open to the secondary interpretation as Dumuzi in his aspect as a god resident in the Netherworld.

The word maššu-lu-ba is a hapax legomenon but very reminiscent of the Sumerian loanword maššu-lu-ba, ‘scapegoat’, and quite plausibly no more than a simple phonetic variant (see now the study of A. Caviglia, ‘Maššu-lu-ba’, Fs Boehner, pp. 53–67). Such an epithet would be highly appropriate to Dumuzi in the Netherworld, for he is held captive there in substitution for Ištar.

200. Cedar may be the material of which was made whatever object was described in this line, but one might also restore šu-tur eršu (cf. above, on l. 169).

210. The phrase dāyas ṣu-nām-ba-kī is an epithet born by Gilgameš himself in the incipit of the prayer that describes his chthonic functions (Haupt, Nimrud-epos no. 53, i 4 KAR 227 ii 7: di.ku ša-nu-šu-nu-kī, quoted in full above, in Chapter 3, the section on Gilgameš in exorcistic rituals).
meaning of the phrase is not so much ‘judge of the Anunnaki’ as ‘judge among the Anunnaki’, i.e. the one among the number of chthonic gods whose role is judge of the shades of men. The epithet is also held by Šamaš in inscriptions (di.ku₃ ₃-a-nu-na-ki₃ W. G. Lambert, AJO 18 (1957–8), p. 293, 53; KAR 224 rev. 11). The sun god is more likely meant here, while the text is so damaged it is not possible to be sure.

211–12. This couplet follows the same pattern as SB I 99–100, where the mother goddess fashions Anu’s sitru (“word, idea”) in her heart (ina šibbâtû), with the result that Enkidu is created. While na-a-ri in l. 212 could be ‘singer’ rather than ‘river’, it does not seem likely that a minstrel has been singing, and all recent translators opt for ‘river’. The river is presumed to be the Hubur, the Babylonian Styx. What the word ‘idea’ of this river might be is unknown. Instead I follow the suggestion of A. Cavigliauax that this line is related to the passage of the Death of Gilgamesh in which the Euphrates is diverted by damming while the hero’s tomb is built in its bed (Cavigliauax, Gilgamesh et la Mort, p. 11). The spelling zik-ru is thus for sitru or sekêru, so written because it was misunderstood under the influence of SB I 100.

216–17. Since the actions the two verbs describe are parallel, the meaning of umásili cannot be much different from umásili. This is probably another case of an iterative stem (here II/3 denoting a serial process, resulting in rows (“GAGP’ 591)). With the use here of mallatu, a variant of mallatu, in funerary rites compare a Sumerian lament in which water is poured from an ’anul.ma.al.tum.ma in a libation for the shade of the deceased (Kramer, Finkenstein Mem. Vol., p. 141, 43; D. Katz, RA 93 (1999), p. 110).

### TABLE IX

| 11. The trace after a-na is not certainly di[ngir], either here or in the apparent parallel l. 25, but the indirect object of šibbât suppû a is very likely a deity. The plural imperative šullimû’inni in l. 12 presupposes that more than one deity was invoked, and thus rules out a repetition of šin from l. 10. As the most prominent of the astral deities, Venus is perhaps the foremost candidate for restoration here, but this is uncertain while the trace before šullimû’inni in l. 12 is undeciphered. In the break before šin in the present line the trace that precedes š in could be of pa as well as mir, but Parpola’s se-ci appears inadmissible. If it is right to restore a divine name following ana, there is no room enough in the break also to accommodate the standard epithet šêkin(ah) namirî (used of both Sin and Šamaš, and also the fire god: see CAD N/I, p. 229). As a provisional solution I propose simply DN namirî. |
| 12. The first line of this sign is restored in the light of the parallel that appears to exist between ll. 10–12 and 24–6. |
| 14. The phrase mustû Sin, if correctly restored, simply means ‘at night’. |
| 15–16. For these stock lines see the commentary on OB Ishchali 20–’1: tilq ānassûm ina qatînû šullamûnam ina šibbâtû, where ina šibbâtû suggests that šû in the SB text is ‘arm’ not ‘side’ (‘unum pro parte’). In l. 16 the break does not seem to be wide enough to accommodate šullamûnam ina, which is the phrasing expected from the only version of this line that survives unbroken (OB Ishchali, Nergal and Ereshkigal), and the big area of blank clay before šibbâtû suggests that there was no preposition on this occasion. Consequently šullamûnam is restored in construct state. The phrase namšar šibbît occurs, with haššin abî, in a passage of Gilgamesh’s lament for Enkidu that is closely related to the two-line version of the present passage (SB VIII 46–7). |
| 17. This line also appears in the company of the preceding couplet at SB X 96. Note also something very similar in Sargôn II (TCII III 133): hi-i ṣîl-ta-bi ez-zi-i na liù-bi-bu am-qi-ma, ‘I fell amongst them like a terrible arrow’. |
| 19. For the last word see the commentary on SBVI 43. |
| 37. The spelling še-₅um for šum was understood by von Soden as standing for šum (AHw, pp. 1274–5). However, according to J. Gelb šum derives from older šimûn (Bir Or 12 (1955), p. 105; cf. Hebrew šêm), so this orthography might instead derive from an archaic or dialectal variant of the word. The word displays another peculiarity, in that še-₅um-bû exhibits triplicite declension, reshaping the nominal case vowel before the possessive suffix, a formation that is exceptional with this word (one expects šum-bû). Perhaps, in the end, the text will turn out to be corrupt (read še šêm-bû). However that may be, the singular possessive suffixes here in l. 42 (šibbût, unless the referent there is the sun) is at first glance difficult to reconcile with the plural possessive suffixes in ll. 40–1 (šûlimûnam, inasatu). The solution proposed is that the Twin Mountains were indeed two mountains, one in the west and one in the east (such is the clear implication of l. 43). The singular pronouns refer to the nominate Gilgamesh has reached, the plural to the mountains as a pair. On the cosmic geography see further the introduction to Table IX in Chapter 10. |
| 38–9. The mountain of the sunrise bears this name nowhere else, to my knowledge. Its counterpart in the west, described as the place where the sun goes in to meet his wife at his evening homecoming, is identified as Mt Budughungud in SB Hh XXII and the šîpar-šûtanî based on it, but as kur ša-₅a-₅. ša-₅a-₅-eb šûtanî ú ’A₅-a in the Emar version of Hh as given by Arnaud, Emar VI/4 559, 5. However, his reconstruction is open to question, for it ignores the true extent of damage on the tablet, as given in his copy. Probably the two versions of the list are much more alike, as follows: |

| kur | ša-di₃-a | mountain |
| kur ša-a-bu | ša-ad ₃-en-il |
| kur šur-ṣag | šu-baṭ ’be-let-ill’(dingir)’im |
| kur šul-mun | ša-ad šu-di₃ad(šikur) |
| kur šu₃-dug₃-du₃-dug | ne-re₂ šulimûnanatu (and) ’a-a-a |
| kur ša₃-na₃-nu | ša-ad ’e-re₃-ni |
| kur ša₃-nu₃-tur | MIN MIN |
| kur ša₃-nu₃-tur | MIN MIN |
| kur ši₃-ra₃-tur (var. ši₃-ra₃-a) | MIN MIN |
| kur ša₃-ab₃-na₃-nu | MIN MIN |
| kur ša₃-dî₃-lu₃ | MIN MIN |
| Hh XXII 1–11 (MSL XI, p. 23 // von Welner, Uruk III 114), with l. 5 emended after the šûtar-šûtanî ed. Reiner, FNES 15 (1956), p. 132, 4 |
| kur | ša-di₃-a | mountain |
| kur šu₃-[- ] | ša-di₃-a | mountain of Enlî |
| kur ša₃-[n.] | ša-[n.] | seat of Bèlet-ill |
| kur ša₃-[n.] | ša-[n.] | mountain of Adad |
| kur šu₃-[n.] | ša-[n.] | Šamaš's entrance to Aya |
| kur ša₃-[n.] | ša-[n.] | cedar mountain |
| kur šu₃-[n.] | ša-[n.] | ditto |
| kur šu₃-[n.] | ša-[n.] | ditto |
| kur šu₃-[n.] | ša-[n.] | ditto |
| kur šu₃-[n.] | ša-[n.] | cypress mountain |
| kur šu₃-[n.] | ša-[n.] | ditto |

Arnaud, Emar VI/1, Mak 74115 obv. ii 24–33’
Read so, the Emar version duplicates the SB text except for the transpositions of ll. 7–8 and 9–10. Since the list presents the name of the mountain of sunset it is likely also to have included a name for the mountain of sunrise, and we might expect this in the next line. The cedar mountain Mt Ḥamnū, however, is the Amanus in Turkish Syria, which, from an early Mesopotamian perspective, might be another name for the mountain of sunset but cannot be associated with the sunrise. It is well known that other, mythical cedar mountains were situated in the far east (see Sijjerg, TCS III, p. 90; Tīgany, Evolution, p. 77, fn. 11; Klein, CRR A 44/III, pp. 63–4). One of them is Mt Ḥaštir, present in Ḥk XXII and also attested as a name for one of the cedar mountains in Diri VI 2 Â 102 (cited in CAD H, p. 147). This mountain, whose name is taken from the timber-bearing evergreen trees that grow on it in legend (ḥaštirru is perhaps a type of cypress or cedar), is mythical in that it is never found outside literary contexts, where it is strongly associated with the rising sun. In Enki and the World Order and a Sumerian hymn to Ninurta the sun is described as ‘rising from Ḥaštir (or from Ḥaštir-trees’)’ (EWO 373: ḫa ša-tum i; TCL XV 7, 13: ʾatu ša ša-tum i; ḫa ša a). The mountain’s location is confirmed by a prayer to the sun god that reports his rising at dawn:

ātu ʾ aan ša ša-ga ta e ša-a-zu-ū
dī ʾsamāl(uru) ši qaš ša-šamāq(ānu) elišṭu(ka) māš iš a-pa-ka
kur ša ša-tum i; ḫa ša-ša-a r iš na-bal-[ku]-ti-ka
Meek, BD X I, pp. 66 and 68, K 3052+5982, 11–14, ed. ibid., p. 1
O Ṣamāl, as you come out from heaven’s pure interior (Akk.: the pure heavens), as you pass over Mt Ḥaštir . . .

An easterly location is also implicit in an inscription from Udubgalu I that describes the course of the Tigris and Euphrates from start to finish:

mū(a) n. ni išdiššu (iš)al (hal al)
ša ša-pu-rat-ii elišṭu(ka) māš
dī ʾiš ḫa ša-tum i[a]-a-nā ḫa ša-tum a-pa-ši
KAR 34, 14–15
Pure waters of Tigris and waters of Euphrates, which come forth from (their) springs to Mt Ḥaštir.

The identification of Mt Ḥaštir with the ‘whole of the eastern Taurus and part of the northern Zagros’ by M. B. Rowton (JNES 26 [1967] p. 268) is based on a misunderstanding of this and other literary sources. The Tigris and Euphrates were considered in antiquity to sink underground in the southern marshes and emerge again in the far east, at the place called ṣli nārā which is the entire width of the river, Chapter 10, the introduction to SB Table XI.

For texts which cite mountains of sunrise and sunset together see Chapter 10, fn. 169. Other attestations of these mountains singly are a hymn to Nungal in which the expression ‘mountain of the sunrise’ is used figuratively, as an epithet of the E-kur (Sijjerg, AFO 24 [1973], p. 28, 9; kur ʾuṭu-ē); another hymn which claims it as a mountain belonging to Ningal (TCL XV 26, ed. van Dijk, Götterbilder II, p. 37, 46; kur ūṭu-ē); and an inscription that refers to the mountain of the sunset (Udubgalu IV 61: šu-sag ʾaššu ša ša : ona šad dišku e-re bel ʾsamāl(uru); courtesy M. J. Geller). The gloss (kur) ni-pi-ē šamālu(uru) in Ḥg B V (MSL XII, p. 38, b4) probably explains a lost entry in Ḥg XXI and so refers to the ‘land of the sunrise’, not a mountain.

39. At the end of the line there is certainly not room enough before the margin to restore eēb šamāl as well as apē šamāl. Gilgamesh is standing at the foot of only one of the Twin Mountains, identified hereby as the eastern twin.

40. I follow von Soden in analysing e-ša-ta-nu as a noun (AHu, s.v. elu i ‘das Obere’) and viewing the line as an expression of the common literary image in which mountain peaks are said to reach as high as heaven (for many instances see CAD E, p. 139, emekā l a.c.); the proposed restoration in-du is for the stative eššu-emek (keš-ša-du) has also been considered but is rejected on grounds of spacing and because the same word appears in l. 41. An alternative view is that e-ša-ta-nu is the preposition eli in the locative (el₁šunu), as in CAD Š 3/1, p. 324, where this line is rendered, ‘over which [extends only] the horizon’. I do not understand what such a translation would mean. The phrase šapuk šamāl is, in any case, not clearly a synonym for šīš šamā, ‘horizon’. The word šapuk evokes the picture of the worker-brickcutter casting something in a mould (šapukku), and is better understood as meaning the solid material of which something is made (cf. AHu, s.v. ‘Aufgeschüttetes’); thus šapuk šadī, ‘the stuff of mountains’, is a byword for hardness and solidity. It follows that šapuk šamāl denotes the solid matter of heaven, beyond the stars (the term and its variants are discussed by Horowitz, Cosmic Geography, pp. 240–1, and p. 97, where in considering the present passage he translates šapuk šamāl as ‘firmament’).
By decree of Ea himself his form is reckoned as sharing the flesh of gods, by decision of the Lord-of-the-Lands his fabric was successfully shaped in the ingot-mould of the womb of the gods.

He himself is the eternal image of Enlil, who bears the people's voice, the nation's opinion.

These passages document a belief that kings were not made of the same stuff and in the same way as men, but were fashioned by the gods. On this as a central ideology in the Assyrian imperial court and elsewhere see S. Parpola, 'The king as god's son and chosen one', SAd IX, pp. xxxvi-xxxv. The separate creation of man (ullulamanna) and king (mashlimanna) is the subject of a mythological fragment published by W. R. Mayer, 'Ein Mythen von der Erschaffung des Menschen und des Königs', Or ns 56 (1987), pp. 55-68.

140-1. The restoration of this couplet here and throughout this episode relies on the better-preserved parallels in ll. 158-66. Though paita in the 1st stem is not common, the tablet has a clear lu (not nu) where the word is preserved (ll. 159, 162, 166). For the significance of Gilgamesh's repeated backward glances see the introduction to this episode in Ch. 10.

160. There are three verbs sarathi with present tense in /i/. CAD and others analyse šparraḫ as sarathi D, 'to hurry' (CAD §, p. 101). Another school chooses sarathi B, a verb of lamentation. The third verb, sarathi A, means 'to heat up', typically of water, in the 1st stem and is to be discounted. The choice depends on the damaged phrase that occupies the middle of the line, which I understand as a simple introduced by kina. However, other readings are possible (e.g. šep[am]-[lu]?) KIMIN is ruled out, as I see the traces.

163-4. The north wind perhaps symbolizes the draught which heralds Gilgamesh's approach to the far end of the tunnel. Oppenheim suggested restoring some part of the verb napadu, 'to blow', before pātum (Or ns 17, p. 47).

170. The phrase lam samši is temporal not spatial, making it clear that Gilgamesh comes out before the sun does, not into the sunshine.

171. Division of the lines into couplets makes it clear that the namiru pertains not to the sun but to the magic trees of jewels (against Oppenheim, loc. cit.). Their brilliance, even before dawn, is the dazzling sight that greets Gilgamesh as he escapes from the tunnel.

172. Oppenheim read ši-še-še, which he understood to be an enclosed garden (Or ns 17, p. 47, fn. 1). However, this word has not been adopted by the dictionaries. The scribal notation in the margin, a small KUR, was not copied by Haupt, but he noted its presence in Bel I, p. 117, and drew attention to it on other Kuyunjik tablets. Since then other examples have been discovered on tablets from Kuyunjik and Babylon and discussed by W. G. Lambert, Kraus AV, p. 216, who demonstrated that this was a notation marking an error, Sumarian reading kur, Akkadian equivalence uncertain (part of nakāru?); cf. also Farber, Baby-Boomvorgänger, p. 22, fn. 21. Note also the use of a single wedge as a scribal notation in SB XI 95, MSW. If the mark means here that something in l. 172 is actually an error, then either it will be the name of the tree, which is already so damaged that decipherment has eluded us, or perhaps the infinitive phrase ina amārī, which may stand instead for ana amārī, 'he went straight to look (at it)' (so Oppenheim, Or ns 17, p. 47, fn. 2).

174. With ši-še, šipātāku, 'I am attractive', as understood by W.G. Lambert, Or ns 36 (1967), p. 132. Another view is that of von Soden, ZA 53, p. 230, and AHw, s.v. šāstpātu I ('been put up').

188. The stone *an.zu.gul.me is entered in the lexical lists as an equivalent of zabšu (or zaltu):
4. A possible restoration is ḫu-lu-ba ku-lu-lu-lu, ‘veiled with a veil’. This is a passage in a prayer to the constellation Ursa Major, in which ḫatu-mu and kušša are alternative readings (STT 73, 77; ku-lu-lu-lu // YOS XI 75, 2; ku-lu-lu-lu ku-lu-lu-lu // UET VII 118, 22; ku-lu-lu-lu ku-lu-lu-lu-tum).

5. At the end one might restore ṣaš, maš or even ḫušu. The recovery of the penultimate word allows one to see that the phrase anticipates the action to come. The lion’s skin makes Gīla-meskepti frighten to behold, and in due course Šīrāt is terrified at the sight of him.

6. The restoration is made in the light of SB IX 49: ṣa tiš-kamkād šiš šu-šumur-ur. The sign qa is written over qa: the scribe originally wrote mu-qa, as in SB 121. For this image in Gīla-meskepti see the commentary on SB II 9; for the fem. sg. nāqum see the commentary on SB III 25, 10–12. The triplet recurs, adjusted for a masculine subject, as SB X 184–6, where ud-tum-ma is written ud-tum-ma-a. The pronominal suffix on inātitikku, ostensibly dative, derives from the LB manuscripts and would be taken to indicate the more usual accusative (CVC-CV for CVCV) were it not for inātitikku in SB XI 2. It appears that this verb can be construed with either case.

22. This line is restored from the Ninveh manuscript of Ištar’s Descent (quoted in Chapter 10, the introduction to SBTV).

23. The Babylonian manuscript, MS b, evidently differed from MS K but not enough is preserved to allow confident restoration (erēbatu see the apparatus).

27. The traces disallow a restoration [kas-[ê] dilišan akk[i] ša šaš]-a ša šaš (after II. 16 and 21).

28. The partial restoration relies on SB IX 57, where the Scorpion Man asks the same question.

31–71. The restoration of these lines relies on Gīla-meskepti’s recounting of his heroic adventures in his lament for Enkidu (SB VIII 52–5), and the later episodes in which Gīla-meskepti meets, respectively, Ur-šanabi and Utu-napišti (SB X 113–4 // 213–48).

32. These are two versions of this line. In SB VIII 53 the text reads nišḫ-[aš] ša šaša [nišḫa] but in SB X 229 anša nūšša-anša ašša nišḫa. The text at SB X 129 is entirely missing, as it is here, and cannot help decide the matter one way or the other. However, in the reprise of this line at SB X 39 MS b seems to have enough space missing for the fuller version and too much for the simpler. For this reason I suspect Tablet X uses the fuller version throughout.

34. Considered as a joint achievement, the mention of lion-slaying is new: no such feat appears in Gīla-meskepti’s lament for Enkidu. Thus it very likely refers to the episode related in SB IX 15–18, in which Gīla-meskepti attacks a pair of lions at a mountain pass, and this is the justification for Thompson’s restoration in II. 34 // 131 // 231 of nērbuštim bar [sa kab] (which is itself assured by I. 38). This was not an adventure in which the dead Enkidu could take part, of course, and it may be that one should restore adššu in the same lines (note dša in I. 34, and for dša or dšaš in I. 38; but this is nothing unusual in LB orthography). However, the intrusion of the first person in this gristle-stripping reminiscence would be jarring, and I have followed other recent translators in opting for the plural.

36. The trace before ša is collated. Ḫumbaba’s epithet ‘Guardian’ (of the Cedar Forest), is found in OB Ishchali 26: maṣṣarum (cf. Ibi 30, 34: maṣṣarum šikṣmu-šarrim; SB IV 203: maṣṣar-šarrim). Elsewhere the word maṣṣarum is used in the same connection but seemingly as the epithet of the god Wēr rather than of Ḫumbaba (OB II 131; cf. SB II 277).

55–60 // II 232–7. These six lines, really four couplets, were passed down almost verbatim from the OB epic (OBVA + BM IV 0–67): [ibši ša arammiš]-šat / šinti šat-takk šalu marš-us / Enkidu ša arammiš-šat / šinti šat-takk šalu marš-us / šaša šaša / šaša šaša / šaša šaša / šaša šaša.
exhibiting an accusations ending, the word is better taken as the subject of lēppu than as an adverbial qualification, for elsewhere in the epic this is unambiguously the case: OB Harmal: 5: kēnlā lēšîrim lēšip naqr(a) // SB IV 241: [kēnlā] lēšîrim lēšip naqr(a). The spelling thus joins those peculiarities listed in Chapter 9, the section on spelling conventions sub i).

99. The sign after it is strictly mal. Most emend to tā-sa, but lāṣim in a poor object of šû. Others read tā-sa, as in I.93, and this is surely better. The second verb is provisionally understood as nādu, a word that exactly expresses the meaning of battle (see OB Atram-Hasû I.81 // 83, 110: qa-álamum i-ta-aa-sa; SB Anzu II 56: i-ta-aa-sa ... qab-du; further George, NABU 1991/19). The remaining signs, ir- ... (where x can be še, sa, tu, tu, etc.) can also be restored to give forms of šutu, šum, šurupu, šerupu, šum, šidu, ‘shake’ to give only the most obvious candidates.

101. Most translators read it tā-sa as 'his chest' but CAD A.l, p. 61, offers the ingenious restoration [ina sikkū] šurupu, ‘he nailed him down [with pegs]’; a reading [ki-ma šik-ha-ša], ‘he secured him to ... like a peg,’ is also possible. In the context of tying someone down the verb šuši calls to mind the tale of the Poor Man of Nippur:

\[ it-tu-im ina in-ni qaš-qa-ri 5 šik-ha \]
\[ qāt(i) šul šurupu qašqada(sag, du) u-pak-kir-sa \]

STT 38, 132

He drove five pegs into the solid floor, he bound him fast by the hands, feet and head.

However, while the two signs that follow kappâššuna in MS b defy reading and more text is not forthcoming, the conclusion of the line must remain ambiguous.

102-5. The suspense of the Stone One’s fate is drawn out over these two couplets, which evidently stress their importance for safe passage over the ocean and through the Waters of Death. Accordingly, they are likely to be an expansion of two lines which in the OB text are put into the boatman’s mouth (OB VA+BM iv 22, 24): allum ša allatumu mē šumum um šutu um šumum šumum šûtu šûtutu.

106. The line compares with OB VA+BM iv 1: šûtu um šuššeru ina uššašu.

117. The sign A, which intrudes before šurbi, may be partly erased, but in the parallel passages the Nimirad manuscript has it too (SB X 217 and 224) and it must be taken seriously. One solution would be to take it as the abbreviated logogram a (for ašmak) = mē, common in rituals and prescriptions, yielding mē šurbi, ‘icy water’ or winter rain. However, the phrase ina šurbi u šûtu is also found in SB IX 126 (partly restored), which suggests that the writing A šur-ša stands for šurbi alone. Since the logogram for šurbi is šûg (A.AN), I suspect that the spelling šur-ša descends from a glossed orthography A.AN šûg.

118. Thanks to Assyrian MS z this line is now complete. The idiom pān X šarbi means to have the appearance of X (see CAD S/I, p. 133). As we know from SB VII 147 // VIII 91, Gilgamë is clad in a lion’s skin.

153. Note the use of the sign ūr for šu, an example of MB orthography which is edited out in the next line.

157. The reading tatahak is assured by the parallel in I.106.

158. The reading of the end of this line is made in the light of I.88, where uru gatēppu seems to be a necessary prelude to the safe passage of Ur-bašami’s boat. One could also read ša-mu ša [...], but the traces seem to disallow von Soden’s reading baq-mu ul-[ša] (AHoa, p. 1410).
160. This and the parallel line (166) are restored after OBVA+BM iv 26: partti la suppa 5 šuš kišam. I agree with M. A. Powell, who writes: 'the usual restoration [2.tš] for these lines is based, I believe on a misunderstanding of Gilgamel X iv 8 [= 180]' (ZA 72 (1982), p. 94, fn. 30). He argues that 2.tš in the latter line is not the number of poles used, but the distance travelled (see below, ad loc.). An additional argument in favour of this would point out that, as a general rule, numbers in the older text are either reproduced accurately or exaggerated, but not reduced. According to this observation the 300 poles of OBVA+BM are not likely to diminish to as little as 120 in the later tradition. On partti see the commentary on the OB text. On the imperative erid instead of regular rid see von Soden, GAoC §103n.

161. The word translated 'boss', sušu, is lit. 'teat' or 'nipple'. In the OB text the parallel phrase is ṣukum ṣa-ri-tim (OBVA+BM iv 27). In the later periods sušu was the more common word, for it explains suru in commentaries (see MSL IX, p. 35, Ḥl B 33: 311: aššu sušu = per-tum = tu-še-Š; cf. the commentaries on ṣumma isibu, ed. Leichty, Ḥlu, p. 221, 3257-7; von Weiker, Ūršu II 37, 41; p. 231, 376g). On the nature of the 'teat' of a puncting-pole see further Chapter 5, the note on the OB text.

162. The writing of the vestive imperative with a closed syllable suggests a secondary lengthening of that syllable, bila or bita; cf. the orthography bi-ša in SB IV 42.

164-5. On these stock lines see OB Ichihali 20'-1' and commentary.

169-70. This couplet is restored from its repetition in SB XI 271-2. The verb rāšḫu, which occurs twice in the couplet, before the launch and afterwards, utilizes both its meanings, (a) to ride aboard a boat and (b) to embark (as in Adapa, BRM IV 3, 19). The significance of the verb on its repetition, with subject independently marked, is that in the absence of the crew Ur-šānabi and Gilgamesh are more than passengers. They must do the propeller of steering and propelling it. The magilgu is an ocean-going boat typically used in long-distance trading ventures, as we know from Enki and the World Order:

^mā.gišu, mum ciu, ba^a, ka, kū.sig, ku.babbar bala.še бе.аке
Let the magilgu-boat of Meluhha
transport gold and silver.


Note also Bigames and Huwawa A 111-13:

ba.su.a.ba ba.su.a.ba After it sank, after it sank,

uššmā.mā.gan.na ba.su.a.ba after the boat of Magan sank,

^mā.gurššmā.gišu, lum ba.su.a.ba after the ship, the magilgu-boat sank.


The verb nadda with the nuance 'to launch (a boat)!' is documented in CAD N/I, p. 80.

171. The phrase múšak arišu u kapitu ina šat-šu-im is standard for long journeys in SB Gilgamesh: see SB IV 4 // 37 // 82 // 123.

174. The tablet has more than simply Thompson's dup-pir: Haupt copied um -repeat, and noted in the margin 'um nicht dupl' (Nimrudepos, pl. 70). I agree with him, though the interior wedge of dr is damaged. This is a meaningless combination of signs, of course, and the text is certainly corrupt.

175. For ilapipt instead of ilapap see the commentary on SB IV 239.

180. As noted already, I follow Powell's understanding of 2.tš as a metrical notation (see above, on l. 160; one tš = 60 nindan). The reading of the unit tš as giši is adopted in the light of the Sumerian homophone giši, 'sixty' (as already observed in George, Topog. Texts, p. 135, fn. 24; according to J. Kicke, Manolu Früherztn II, pp. 42 and 47, both are /giš/). In this I disagree with Powell, who refers to Akitinan XIX and speculates that 'tiš is perhaps originally a phonetic complement indicating a reading ša, “sixty”' (loc. cit.). In the present line Powell takes 2.tš as 120 nindan, i.e. about 7200 metres, and goes on to calculate the rate of progress per punt, which at 2.4 metres seems ridiculously unhercule, especially for such an enormous man wielding such immense poles. Powell puts this slow progress down to the depth of the sea being not much less than the length of the poles, but it is certainly futile to speculate on the depth of the ocean and its effect on the length of each punt: this is epic! However, the solution adopted here is to take 2.tš as a notation for 2 X 60 units, i.e. 7200 nindan, which is a little over forty-three kilometres, yielding, if it is relevant, a rate of progression of 144 metres per punt. The use in the translation of the word 'furlong' is meant to give an exact equation with the ancient measure; it is a term coined for lack of a suitable unit in English (two furlongs is a quarter of mile, just over 400 metres; one tiš is about 360 metres).

181. On qabla šaššu, 'to undress', the opposite of q. tukšašu, see A. L. Oppenheim, Or xx 14 (1945), p. 239; cf. R. Binger, Or xxv 27 (1958), p. 148 (on Enmansu 49). The restoration of Ur-šānabi at the end of the line is the suggestion of A. Westenholz, the change of subject being signposted by uššu at the beginning of the line. Confirmation comes from the verb šämušu, which is used of taking off someone else's clothing—not one's own—and by force: see CAD H, p. 60, where the sense of this line is already suggested in the translation 'Gulgamesh stripped off his (Ur-šānabi's?) clothing'.

184-5. The ends of these lines are restored from the parallel, ll. 10-11.

187. The significance of the small horizontal wedge in the margin of MS K between column iv and v is unknown. This is not a manuscript which keeps count of its lines with wedges in the margin at every tenth line ('decimal markers'). It may be an incomplete notation kiš, marking an error (on which see the commentary on SB IX 172).

195. The trace is not of a-na-aj-ta-lam-ma.

226-7. The beginning of the second line of the couplet, preserved only on Assyrian MS x (kūššašu šaššu), is expected to read Enkidu bēl šadana šadu or Enkidu šadana šadu, after SBVII 51. Since the repetition of a line with an added proper noun is a standard device in Babylonian poetry (and Sumerian before that), either the extant text is defective at this point or the line division was so placed by the Ninurta scribe that the missing material was appended to the intended overrun of the preceding line.

250. That umma can introduce thought as well as speech has been pointed out by M. Sod, BiOr 49 (1992), 146. At the beginning of von Soden read tu-um-umma, 'wohlaim' (AHw, p. 1369b), but the space available does not permit this. The abbreviated pronominal suffix on tammabušu (if not vernacular) is a mark of elevated style of a kind rare in SB Gilgamesh.

254. The signs at the beginning of the line in MS f are marked aside by means of the Trennungssignen. They cannot be overrun from column vi, for that was written after this line, of course. If the first sign were clearly tiš the phrase could be read aniku unma, as restored in l. 250, and taken as ditography, but this does not look feasible either. In fact, it looks more like [n]u, as Lambert's copy indicates. I am unable to explain the significance of this interpolation.

257. The omission of this essential line by the Kuyunjik manuscript can be put down to the carelessness that engendered other errors of substance in this source (see II. 80, 82, 117, 318).

258. With the beginning of the line cf. SB IX 6.

259-60. Cf. the rather similar litany of wild animals in Gilgamesh's lament for Enkidu (SB VIII 16-17).
261. The parallel line in the OB epic reads simply [itaššal] maššuhurum īkāl šīram (OB VA•BM i 2'). Here the verb that follows maššuhuran cannot be any part of šīram but is likely to refer to some technique of turning raw animal pelt into a skin to wear. The expression maššal tuḫubtu (once tuḫubtu, inexplicably) can be read in three MB documents, as documented by the writer, with the help of K. Deller, in NABU 1991/19 (UET VII 40, 7: 31 maššal-[tuḫ] (alip-[g]a)-tuḫ-[bi]-[a]-ah-[i]; K. Kessler, Bagh. Mitt. 13 (1982), p. 63, 15: maššal-[tuḫ] alip-[g]a]-tuḫ-[bi]-[a]-ah-[i]; CT 43 59, 21: maššal-[tuḫ]-bu-[a]-aš-ta il-šu-en. There the phrase in this line was translated literally, 'I carved up their hides'. It should be noted that tuḫubtu in this sentence represents a whole for a klāš. The Seleucid source MS i seems to have room for extra material after the verb, perhaps for 'clothing' or something like it. Something similar also happens in line 310 and one wonders whether, in fact, it is the (uncharacteristically unreliable) Kuyunjik manuscript that is in error.

264. The games that Gilgamesh looks forward to are not only the activities described in SB Tablet I and the Sumerian tale of Gilgamesh and the Netherworld. As is well known, the religious festivals of Babylonia were accompanied by general merrymaking and considerable nātālu. It may be recalled that, before leaving for the Cedar Forest, Gilgamesh promises to celebrate the principal religious festival of Urnītwice on his return (SB II 268–69 / III 31–2), which implies that it had to be suspended in his absence. This situation does not only occur during the absence of the king on his quest for Uta-nāpīšti. Accordingly the restoration of usāšīlu, usātišti or some such word in line 264 looks probable.

265. In response to MS b's variant (see the apparatus) I have been encouraged to reject the hapax legomenon *aš-ad-tuš* (Thompson; von Soden, Albu, p. 808), and opt for a known word. The context recommends haddā < haddī (the *parrīs* over hāshī's, 'dinner' (I owe this preference to the insight of A. Westendorf). The word intentionally echoes the prostitute's description of Gilgamesh as haddī umūlī (SB I 1234), and evokes the happy frame of mind and life of carefree pleasure that was his in the good old days.

272. The spelling šar-im-mu looks construct state and since this word often appears qualified by ēšar I have restored accordingly. At the end of the line one should probably add an adjective describing good-quality ghee (e.g. *fresh, pure*).

273. The words nēkah (var. nēku) and kubullā are ostensibly accusative, so the subject of the missing verb will be the fool.

274. The root of māhūndu, šīrim, shows it to be a garment worn for warmth; evidently in this context it is a rude item of no sophistication.

275. Negation with li indicates that the verb is subordinated, presumably by aš at l in l 276.

278. While the idiom nēšu nāš, 'to lift (someone's) head', can mean 'to hold in honour' (e.g. SB XII 149), here is more likely conveys the sense of showing concern for another, as in a letter of Burnaburiash to Amenophis IV (EA 7, 17): am-ma-ni re-e-lu li e-lu [i] (CT 5 69; OB). This need not refer to a god's promotion or 'exaltation' of an individual, merely to his solicitude for him: 'a god will show concern for a man'. PNs of the type DN-nēšu-nāš/li can be rendered likewise, 'the god So-and-so showed concern for me'.

279. The first word of this line might be restored as [mar]-nu (so already Parpola), yielding a question reminiscent of a proverbial saying preserved in an OB or MB tablet from Nippur: la lā-li-šu lā-nu an lā-nu-am, 'the man who has no king or queen—who is his master?' (Lambert, BWL p. 277, 13–14). The implication for the present context would be that Uta-nāpīšti reminds Gilgamesh of the duties of his position.

287. A possessive suffix on *sappānu* usually denotes the object of the aid, so I suspect the word refers to the aid that gods traditionally gave kings in ancient Mesopotamian ideology.

297. Jacobson's translation 'why do you howl?' implies a reading sa-k-[apu], but the middle sign is to my eyes better read as al, with Lambert (CCR 26, p. 54, 6). The final vowel is wrong for *išat*, but indifference to the quality of vowels of final open syllables is a well-known and all-pervading feature of LB orthography, though it extends less commonly to the vowels of III weak verbs (the first example in SB Gilgamesh is ip-šu for ip-ši in I 5, MS 4).

300. For other examples of an adjective separated from its noun by the verb that they qualify see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (vi).

301. The syntax of this line is open to two interpretations, depending on whether the last two words are analysed as the predicate (Lambert) or as part of the relative clause. The spelling of the verb, whether ka-šu-šu or ka-šu-šu-šu (Lambert: ka-šu-šu-šu), does not decide the issue, since in a LB source any such writing can be indicative or subjunctive. For literary reasons I prefer a long relative clause, lā šīnam uši apī šaṣu lamā, and no main verb. Note that this line begins a section whose opening and closing lines report the same fact, from the points of view of first the object of the action and then the subject (I 307). It is fitting that they should be similarly constructed, both being nominal sentences in which the predicate is a descriptive phrase: 301 subject: pronoun + relative clause, 307 subject: participial phrase.

308. Recent translators are divided as to whether to understand the adverb immatimma in this and the following lines as introducing a statement or a rhetorical question. The translation of CAD M/1, p. 410, 'do we build a house forever?', is a mistranslation based on the ambiguity of English, for immatīma, at some time (past, present or future), is not a synonym for e.g. ana diš dār, 'for ever and ever'. The translation 'alādīdī sīrīnu we ṣarrē, 'Heiced et al.' succeeds, in my view, only when 'ever' is understood as 'forever'; translated into unambiguous language, the question 'do we at any time build a household, start a family, etc.? see, as rhetorical questions, to be encouraging a negative answer and consequently ill suited to the context. Lambert evidently saw this difficulty, for he translates 'for how long, ...?', (CCR 26, p. 55, 17–21). This view assumes that immatīma means the same as adā mātis, which I can find no substantiation; elsewhere the interrogative ina matimma means 'when?' Thus I join those who take the lines as plain statements of fact, observations on the daily life of men and their generations.

309. Collation confirms the reading of CAD Q, p. 51.

310. Note the extra word in the Babylonian manuscript, and cf. the commentary on l 261.

311. In MS K the restoration at the end of the line, after iša, can only be of a single, rather small sign, to judge from the spacing. The only trace of this word, on MS j, is compatible with kār, and I have followed the solution suggested by W. G. Lambert's reading ma-šu, though in fact those signs are not actually preserved together anywhere. MS b's variant is not absolutely certain. The traces might be read ma-šu, but ma-šu-šu is also possible and might be a more satisfying end to the couplet. Because a paternal estate was divided unequally between those with the status of 'sonship' (marātu-the chosen heir (apli)) receiving more than the less favoured sons—there would always be possibility for jealousy and resentment among brothers. I translate nāšu as 'feud' since, whether mašu or marātu, the reference seems to be mutual hostility breaking out among an extended family.

313. The failure of MS K to write the first syllable of iqqalēppā explicitly may be put down to crisis: kudā/ili-qqalēppā. The kudā is known in Sumerian as the 'river locus' (baru, ik-da) and, according to omen texts, Mesopotamian rivers in floods habitually carry with them large numbers of these insects (CT 39 19, 110–19; Šumma ala LXII a, AHA Samâl 14, 13; Iktar 2, 51: both Enûma Anu Bûlû; Hunger, SAd IV 46 l, 3). This phenomenon could be observed until recently on the Tigrá.
which at the time of the spring flood carried large quantities of mayflies, Sialis lutaria, Arabic.kill, according to M. Drower (as reported in E. D. van Buren, Fauna of Ancient Mesopotamia, p. 108; cf. E. Ebeling, ‘Fliegen’, RLA III, p. 87; W. Heimpel, RLA V, p. 106; A. D. Kilmer, Studies Reiner, pp. 176–7). The epistemical nature of the mayfly is proverbial, and for this reason (as well as the Arabic cognate) I prefer to take killu as ‘mayfly’ rather than the customary ‘dragonfly’. As Dalley notes (Ayroko, p. 133, n. 121), the image evokes a passage of Atra-šatši in which the mother goddess likens those drowned in the Deluge to mayflies borne along by a river: ki-ma ku-li-lu-um la-a-nim na-ra-am, ‘they fill the river like mayflies’ (OB Atra-šatši III 4:6).

316. Though some translators cling to Heidel and Oppenheim’s old idea of emending lu lu to pallu, ‘sleeping’; I ally myself with those who do not see the need. The point of killu, however, is not just any ‘prisoner’ (Lambert), so much as one who has been forcibly abducted (von Soden: ‘der Verschleppte’; Jacobsen: ‘the one snatched away’). The usual reference of the term is to someone carried off in an enemy raid, taken prisoner in battle or press-ganged into permanent slavery or other service. Such a person, unable to send word of his fate to his family, would be lost to them more completely than, say, a man locked up in the local jail. Given up for dead, he would be for all practical purposes no more alive than the dead man with whom he is coupled here.

318. Recent translations opt for one of two interpretations in the first half of this line, in MS K reading either e-til (vocative orative of e-tila) or e-dil. All take the second half of the line as looking forward to what follows in the next lines. These consist essentially of a reminder that the gods, among them the mother goddess, who, as man’s creator, is given special mention, at some time in the past had made a distinction between life and death. Von Soden proposed in 1959 (ZA 53, p. 231) that the phrase asu išrubu in the Kuyunjik source alludes to the events described in Tablet XI, when Enlil blesses Ut-ana-pitšī and his wife and confers on them the life of the gods (IL 200–2). This interpretation looks right at first sight and all have followed. When, after the publication of MSS by, it became apparent that the LB manuscripts differ substantially from the Kuyunjik tablet, Lambert maintained the existing understanding of the line by dismissing their readings as corrupt. This follows accepted practice in dealing with sources for SB literary texts; tablets from Ashurbanipal’s libraries are given precedence over late manuscripts and this is usually a demonstrably reliable procedure. However, in the case of MS K I am not so confident of Kuyunjik reliability: as we have seen, this manuscript has, for an Ashurbanipal tablet, a rather high proportion of corrections (cf. above, on L 257), and twice these have involved the intrusion of a sign not present in the late manuscripts (IL 80, 117). Accordingly, in Tablet X one feels inclined to give more weight to the LB sources than one might in other texts.

The question then arises: does the Kuyunjik manuscript ring true? And then: do the LB sources yield sense? To deal with the first question first, it must be asked whether Enlil’s blessing and deification of Ut-ana-pitšī on his survival of the Deluge is really the occasion referred to in the following lines. The LB manuscripts make it unlikely that Enlil’s name is to be restored in MS K at the end of this line, as von Soden originally proposed (and there was precious little room for ‘en-til in any case). And would not such a reference the knowledge revealed to Gilgamē in the telling of the Flood story—the whole point of which is to prepare the ground for Gilgamē’s disillusionment—and thus reduce its effectiveness? Before narrating that story Ut-ana-pitšī tells Gilgamē that he is about to reveal to him a ‘secret of the gods’ (SB XI 9–10). Such a promise hardly rings true if Gilgamē has been told in advance of Ut-ana-pitšī’s blessing by the gods. Apart from this the description here of the proceedings of the divine assembly does not fit the episode in which Enlil deifies Ut-ana-pitšī: 1. 321 states that the gods’ ‘established death and life’, but no one is condemned to die in SB XI 201–3; quite the reverse. There is in that assembly no trace of the business conducted in OB Atra-šatši III vi 47–8, in which the mother goddess imposes death on postdiluvian man to keep down his numbers (see on this point Chapter 10, the introduction to Tablet X).

If we take the two final couplets of Tablet X together, they stand independently very well. And in isolation the reference becomes clear; the assembly described is that convened when the gods for the first time had to make a distinction between the respective destinies of those beings that were to be immortal and those that were to be mortal. As discussed in the introduction, in the tradition passed on by the poets of Babylonian Gilgameš epic this event took place at man’s creation, not after the Flood.

If SB X 319–22 refer to events which took place at man’s first creation, MS K’s phrase asu išrubu […] loses the context conventionally assigned to it and becomes less satisfactory. Is it then corrupt, with all developed from as? And if it is, is it the immediately preceding text, which also disagrees with the LB manuscripts, also corrupt? The sense of the phrase lullā-anēšu edit is appropriate enough, as demonstrated in Lambert’s exegesis (CRRA 26, p. 56), so on the criterion of meaning the text passes. But if we place confidence in the Kuyunjik manuscript, and take its Trenzigzeichen to mark the boundary between two lines of poetry, it has to be remarked that we are left with two exceedingly short lines. Writing with regard to this phrase, Lambert supposed that ‘the reading of the Babylonian copies, t0. boon, is no doubt a corruption of t0. boon and the Glossenkiel (p. 56). The truth might just as easily lie the other way around, with MS K’s t0. boon and the Glossenkiel a corruption of the Babylonian t0. boon. This brings us to the second question posed above, as to whether good sense can be had from the late sources. These themselves differ, but only with regard to the tail end of the line: MS K, like MS K, has only space for signs after the verb išrubu, and must have lacked ka-ra-bi. The line therefore refers us to another line in Tablet X where an extra word has been present after the verb in some sources but not in others (IL 261, 310). From the point of view of syntax, the Babylonian line looks satisfactory in both its versions: two nouns, which might be: as an object and subject (or, disregarding the case vowel of lullā, subject and object), then the verb, negated, then a second object or paraenomastic infinitive, cognate with the verb, and finally a prepositional phrase (to my eyes the wedge that follows ka-ra-bi in MS K is too elongated to be part of a word, and has to be a3). The line itself, then, as preserved in the LB sources, presents on its own no difficulty to the literal translator. The difficulty lies in interpreting the import of what is written. I take it to mean that the dead, once their shades are successfully delivered to the Netherworld, have no further contact with the living. The preterite verb can be explained as ‘gnomic’, indicative of a proverbial saying (see on this Chapter 5, the note on OB III 255–6).

Thus the line is a second reminder of the finality of death. The imagery is not simple—and this explains the editorial changes made to produce the text preserved in MS K—but much of the imagery in Ut-ana-pitšī’s homily, and in wisdom literature generally, is not immediately accessible. In my view the text of the Kuyunjik manuscript is inferior on literary grounds, since it pre-empts the revelation of Ut-ana-pitšī’s story and in doing so has to place an unsatisfactory interpretation on the following two couplets; and on stylistic grounds, since the division of 318 into two lines results in a pair of overly short lines. Thus I see the Babylonian manuscripts’ text as the more original version of the line and MS K’s text as an inferior, though not meaningless, corruption.

320. Here again the Kuyunjik manuscript offers, in comparison with the Babylonian tablets, an expansion. This time I suspect the LB sources of telescoping bānāt ūtim into bānāt ūtimma(ju), for the suffixless bānāt ūtim is an attested epithet of the mother goddess (OB
TABLE XI

5. The phrase pammakha lihiti is literally "in respect to you my heart was fully concentrated (on doing battle)." Some older translations attribute bellicosity to Ūta-napišti, not Gilgameš, relying on an original idea of T. Jacobsen (Heidel, Gilgamash, p. 80, fn. 164). The translation put forward here follows Jacobsen's revised interpretation (Treatises, p. 206). It is Gilgameš's instinct to obtain his desires by the sword, not Ūta-napišti's.

6. At the beginning [ana-ki] is possible but not secure. As so often in Gilgameš the prepositional phrase du-giš is not literal but means "in the presence of" (see above, on SB I 145//166). Thus I follow von Soden, ZA 53, p. 232, in preferring na-daddu to the apparent variant nadadu. MS W's mada-asu does not have to be a second-person form: the triasylabic spelling of a finally weak verb in stative 3rd pers. sg. can be paralleled elsewhere in seventh-century Assyrian orthography (see GAOG §57c, n. 11) and the expression of a long vowel in non-final position by writing the syllable as closed is also attested in late orthography; see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (b). The phrase aša na/dadu, often rendered as 'to be negligent,' also means 'to procrastinate, let up' (cf. niša-dadu). Gilgameš, weary with his exertions and perhaps intimidated in the presence of the venerable sage, no longer has the energy or the will to wrestle Ūta-napišti's secret out of him, and holds back from violence.

7. Cf. SB IX 76. On the last word (se) see W. G. Lambert, JSS 24 (1979), pp. 271–2, against W. von Soden, ZA 53, p. 232. Here balšina liš, which describes the success of Ūta-napišti in attaining what Gilgameš imagined was his goal, is used in contrast to balšina biš (l. 206) and balšiša sadarum (OB VI A:RM III 2), which describe the vain quest of Gilgameš himself. liš thus has the nuance of "to seek successfully" (cf. its meaning 'to visit, seek out'); e.g. deities in their sanctuaries, as used constantly by the pious kings of the Chaldaean Dynasty.

9–10. The couplet is repeated later in the text (l. 281–2).

11. The variant Šuruppak for Šuruppak also occurs in l. 25, where lu-ri-šum-pa-kur-ú and lu-ru-ut-pa-kur-ú are both attested, and in Hg E, commenting on a lost line of I[A KAL: XAM x KUR.RUM] = lu-ri-ši-pa-šak; note also the OB personal name "šurit-sa" (lu-ri-sa) (NH 373 721), cited in Nashef, Rêp. géogr., p. 253). The conventional rendering is based on (a) DiRT IV. lu-ri-paš-sa KUR.RUM ku-ša ku-šum-Šum-ša (CT 11 49, 33). Note also (b) a bilingual incantation that equates KUR.RUM and lu-ri-šum-ša (CT 16 36, 5; Uduḫšu), and (c) the spelling "lu-ri-šam-paššak" in the Akkadian version of the Instructions of Šuruppak (KAR 27 27v. 1, ed. Lambert, BWL, p. 95).

Contra Zadok, Rêp. géogr. VIII, p. 209, the relevant entry in Prote-Diri = OECT IV 133 occurs at l. 40 not l. 40 and reads KUR.RUM = lu-ri-šum-ša KUR.RUM = lu-ri-šum-ša-šak.

12. The trace on MS W might also be read lú-ša, that on MS lú, a-ḫi. In common with most recent translators I take the second clause as nominal, with the locative qapšim (var. qapšu) as a prepositional phrase (cf. Berger, Bsl 2, p. 145). Note, however, von Soden's "die Götter waren ihr nähr, i.e. qapšim (Reclam')."

15–18. The painful history of the decipherment of the first word of l. 15 is reported by J. C. C. Kambinga, Akkadica 36 (1984), pp. 19–20. The rest of these two couplets is taken over from Atra-ḫasis, where they are the stock phrases that enumerate the hierarchy of divine taskmasters who lorded it over the assembly of the gods (OB Atra-ḫasis I 7–10; cf. 124–7 // 136–9). There the text before Ennugi reads not gassakaluna but u-ša-al-šu-ki-nu // u-ša-al-šu-ki-nu (so also the latest version, SB Atra-ḫasis I 7–10, II 11–14 // 23–6, ed. George and Al-Rawi, Iraq 58 (1996), pp. 153, 163). Ennugi's title is conventionally gusali (see Lambert and Millard, Atra-ḫasis, pp. 147–8), but Ninurta seems to have the prerogative of that function here. As noted by Lambert, gusali, 'constable,' is very suitable while gusališa is a title 'quite inappropriate for an officer in a divine assembly.' He saw the change of title as a corruption, put down to a knowledge of Ennugi's riverine activities in Surpu IV 103 (also the hemerology KAR 178 iv 58; 'en-ru-guššuš) gal ša 'a-nin).

19. For Ea's title nibša see still W. G. Lambert, Atra-ḫasis, pp. 148–9. The binding of tīltu is described more fully in Atra-ḫasis, where the verb is tammurum (OB VI A:RM 38, 42). On this account the old reading of the last word, ša-is, is rejected in favour of the stative ša-is. The force of the stative is not that it is active (so AH 111, p. 1317) but that Ea did not swear of his own accord, being placed under oath against his will; compare the common adjuration ša-tamūš, lit. 'be you sworn, addressed to evil spirits and ghosts in exorcism. For the function of enlulti -na here see GAOG §12a: 'gleichfalls.'

21–2. The older text is differently worded (OB Atra-ḫasis III 20–1; cf. the Assyrian recension, MS U obv. 15–16). The alliteration of sibilants, and in particular kihis, perhaps evokes the sound of whispered words. Though an šurā need not always be made of mud brick (cf. l. of the ark in l. 58), in a domestic context it normally is, so in šakšišu and šušu the present couplet presents a contrasting pair. Between them they constitute the permanent and temporary divisions of a house, its courtyard and enclosure wall. Thus the fabric of Ūta-napišti's house (or, in the Assyrian recension of Atra-ḫasis, Ea's temple) is the intermediary that passes on Ea's message in what is only much later identified specifically as a dream (l. 197; see the commentary below).

23. This line appears to quote verbatim a line of the Akkadian translation of the Instructions of Šuruppak. On this, and the name ūtu Tutum, see Chapter 4, the section on Ūta-napišti.

24–7. These two couplets, which developed from OB Atra-ḫasis III 22–4, have been discussed by H. A. Hoffner, Kramer AV, pp. 241–3. He has an understanding of OB û-ša-šum-ša and ma-ša-ša-ša as very different 'flee your home,' 'build a huge boat!' from the translations usually put forward, and proposed that the replacing of these phrases in SB Gilgameš by šurpu šita and muddakina šatna significantly altered the sense and structure of the passage and may have been the result of editorial misunderstandings. This idea has been developed by Scott B. Noegel, who transferred Hoffner's lexical proposals to the SB text on the grounds that, when read, the text presents an example of 'jinaus' parallelism (Acta Semitica 1991), pp. 419–21. The philological evidence that Hoffner adduces in support of his translation is very tenuous, however (see already the remarks of M. Malul, Acta Semitica 17 (1995), pp. 339–40, fn. 6). As far as the lines of SB Gilgameš are concerned, there is little doubt in my mind that the conventional modern understanding is that which would also have been current in the first millennium B.C.

28–31. Cf. OB Atra-ḫasis III 1–25–1. In our l. 29 note the II 1 stative Mundūdā in the LS manuscript. The verb of l. 31 has sometimes been translated as from šalilis, 'to rest,' with reference
to mooring the boat on the Apu (reading [e]-ma apu, 'wherever the A:'); see most recently P. Naster, 'pullulus dans Gilgamesh XI, 31', *Zum Batter Bäck*, pp. 295–8. However, a II stem of that pullūla remains unparalleled and the preposition erta is not felicitous; the traces of the sign before ama on MSW may have suggested to Thompson but to my eyes (as well as Haupt's) the sign ends in a single vertical wedge. In the OB poem the preposition is in any case clearly hā-ama (CT 46 1 29). The obvious derivation of pullūla as a derivative noun from pullūla, 'roof', remains a much better idea. Note that in OB Atram-bāṣīs III i 31: lu-ē ã-sā-du-bu-ats-lām erta lu-ē ap-lē-ē, 'let it be roofed over after above and below', the adverbial phrase signifies 'fore and aft' (see A. Shaffer, RA 75 (1981), pp. 188–9).

33. As can best be seen from the following line, where only the sign at is missing, there is not space enough at the beginning of the line of the line of von Soden's zik-ē-[a] (ZA 53, p. 232), and the horizontal wedges are, in any case, rather too long for it. As well as tam-gur 'performative' preterite, GAG 570a, *mit[gur] might be read: 'What you told me thus, master, is agreed.'

35. The word kī with ekinī- is otherwise found only in the Dialogue of Pessimism, and there as an ejaculation of consent (IL 36, 40, 63, 71). The city comprises the council of elders and the rest, a bipartite division that recalls the similar arrangements described for Utuk in the narrative of the preparations for the journey to the Cedar Forest (OB III, SB II–III; cf. also SB VIII 9–10).

38. Von Soden proposed [e]-lu at the beginning of the line (ZA 53, p. 232), but it is doubtful whether there is quite enough space for this. As I read it, the conjunction introduces the additional information: 'as well as telling thee the people are building a boat, this too you will tell them'.

39. On mūda see Ch. 5, the note on OB II 1 7. This line begins a sequence in which all but one of several lines terminate with the enclitic particle. Other examples occur in Utuka-nāpišti's monologue, certainly XI 114: tiši išpālu ā-bûma-ama and 124: kī māri ūtāt aświši ā-tāma-ama.

40–2. Cf. OB Atram-bāṣīs III 147–9, where the reason given for the hero's flight is that Enlil and Enki were quarrelling.

44. The first word is restored from Atra-basīs, which for this line reads bi-is-bi is-šī ri bu-du-ri mu-ni (OB Atram-bāṣīs III i 35; see further Lambert's note, op. cit., p. 159). The word bu-du-ri was evidently unknown to one or other editor of Gilgamesh, who replaced it with pururr, 'secret, hidden', perhaps because this was the nearest word he knew with an appropriate meaning (i.e. 'secret stock'; 'hidden supply?'. cf. von Soden's 'Besgangung'; 'Verborgenheit').

45. The traces after the break in MST do not appear to allow the reading -rumēlē. Evidently the first half of the line contains more than just the missing verb.

46. At the start of this line and its parallels (II 88, 91) the old reading ma-tūr is finally discounted by the unambiguous disposal of the signs in the new manuscript, c, in all three lines the noun šēr appears to be in the absolute state. The frequency with which the expression iša šēr occurs in other texts makes it unlikely that iša šēr numbers with the 'bestimme lokale und temporale Ausdrücke' noted as employing the absolute in GAG 562b; but another explanation escapes me.

49. The use of the epithet Atra-basīs, 'Exceeding-Wise', in this line is a indication, if one were needed, of the source of the Flood narrative in Gilgamesh. From a literary point of view Utuka-nāpišti's self-reference in this third person does not sit well with the use of the first person in rest of the narration; it is perhaps an indication that the adaptation of the story was not carried out as expertly as it might have been.

50–6. Thanks to the new manuscript, c, this passage is easier to reconstruct and can now be seen to number seven lines not six. From here on the traditional modern numerical lines of numbers has therefore been abandoned. The passage corresponds to three couples of Atra-basīs, which fall in a slightly different order:

---

**Critical and Philological Notes: Tablet XI**

The comparison shows that in tablet XI 25 represents an interpolation padding out the preceding couplet and that MS has II 1 2 in reverse order. Alternative restorations of the final words of II 50–1 have been offered by von Soden, namely iša nr-rī, 'polies' (AHuv, p. 839; cf. Reclam: 'Hölzposten'), and whatever lies behind the translation 'Klammern', Labat's sacrificial lambs and rams go back to an older idea of von Soden, ZA 53, p. 232, now discarded. I follow the idea put forward by W. G. Lambert in his note on the couplet of Atra-basīs, that the craftsmen are bringing here are their tools of trade, the axe for trimming timber and the stone for flattening reed (Lambert and Millard, Atra-basīs, p. 160). For the carpenter and reed-worker in the context of ship-building see for example, in an OB letter, the injunction *nāsgārit (tugāt)*, *iš iššīšā, (mā lā-mi) u aššu-pāli (mā lā-dub) iš-pu-bu, 'let the carpenters, shipwrights and reed-workers...build a cargo-boat' (LHI 8 rev. 7–10, ed. AAB II 8).

52. The third craftsman of the passage just quoted, mādšītu, is an obvious candidate for restoration as the one who carries the aššālāku. The writing of this word is unique but clearly more closely based on the Sumerian aššālū from other phonetic orthographies, which vary as to the vowels of the second element but all exhibit the unvoiced final consonant expected in a borrowing from Sumerian (OB a-ša-la-hi-im, Mari MGA-ri-li-hi, a-ša-la-li-li-hi-im, Shemshara a-ša-la-li-hi, a-ša-la-li-ham, SB lex. li-hum, etc.: see CAD A'n, pp. 148–9; the restoration of this word in K 1356 by A. Livingstone, NABU 1990/87, is uncertain). Since the line is an interpolation the spelling may be symptomatic of a learned editor at work. The tool in question, a heavy-weight axe, has recently been discussed by Danielle Cadelli in publishing a letter from Mari that is concerned with tools for felling timber (Fiorullum marianum 2, p. 167). Elsewhere it is carried as a weapon by Ninurta (Anu-gen) and wielded as an implement of demolition by Narām-Sin (Cune. of Akkad 114). In Sumerian Gilgamesh the hero has his smiths cast such an axe for his expedition to the Cedar Forest (Bīgamas and Huvawa A 55), but there it can have dual purpose, for battle and for cedar-felling. Its use in the present context, however, as a tool brought to a shipbuilding, must be much the same as the carpenter's ṣēlū (1. 50), for cutting the ship's timbers to size.

53. The second word looks like a verb. The copyst of the new manuscript noted the broken sign 'das Zeichen nach i am ehesten zu lesen' (S. M. Muhl, private communication). Neither tīrāt (or tērāk) nor ṣēlūlēs rings true in this context, but i-gal-šī, 'they were rushing' (<tēlū) is not impossible; however, what is really wanted is a verb of carrying and the decipherment is left open for the moment.

54. Now that the passage is better preserved, Dalley's pēša looks the best candidate for the damaged word that terminates this line. As a kind of rope, twisted by hand from fibres of the date-palm, this is an appropriate object to bring to a shipbuilding, and the only known lexeme pēša...tu that can be considered such (on ṣēlū see B. Landsberger, Date Palm, p. 21). The traces do not allow a reading pi-ē-ē-ē-tu but may represent til over an ensur.

55. The new manuscript at last decides the first word of this line, which was something of a crux. The solution had already been anticipated by M. Stol, AFO 35 (1988), p. 78, who argued that MS
C’s šaru- (as he read it then) was an orthography for šarru, ‘rich’, and drew attention to other examples of what he considered unexpected gemination of consonants in this Tablet (L SS laq-qa-ä, 69 ni-iq-qa, 88 šù-kì-az-va-ar-ur, all of which have good morphological or orthographic explanations, however). One can now see that MS C begins šaru-ú and postulate the existence of a *parras-type adjective šarru.

57. I do not accept the suggestion of D. G. M. de Rooij, as published by Stol, op. cit., that ‘šinka nadāš [57] introduces the construction of the Ark on the horizontal level(s), and ... šinka nadāš [60] is followed by the erection of the stories, vertically’. The idea is nearer than the reality, for the height of the boat is detailed in L 58 not L 60. I see the contrast as between the external dimensions of the hull, bottom, sides and top (šinka), and the interior subdivision of the boat’s body into compartments (šešun).

58. The formal šiska (Hardly an Assyrian II/1 active) is an example of the use of the *parras stem for the formative adjective of nouns (see this see N. J. C. Kouwenhoven, Gemination in the Akkadian Verb, Assen, 1997, pp. 52–7). D. O. Edzard, ZA 90 (2000), p. 293.

60. Note, in MS W, the use of the accusative suffix -ši for genitive -ša (L 60); this is exceptional at Kuyunjik but well attested in LB copies (e.g. above, SBVIII 125). W. L. Moran’s alternative exegesis of ša-ar-ši as ša amāk, ‘I did not forget’ (reported by H. A. Hoffner, Kramer AV, p. 244), avoids the need to question MS W’s reliability at this point. MS W, however, is a source that sometimes exhibits final vowels that are wrong by the standards of earlier grammar (at least seven examples are collected in Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions). Moreover, the conventional interpretation of the line yields a pleasing syntax, verb + object + verb, verb + object + verb.

62–3. Note in both lines, on aśparas and gertišu, masculine suffixes with reference to a feminine boat (cf. also L 80). This is rare at Kuyunjik (another inescapable example is kaššitu in L 164), but use of the masc. sg. possessive suffix for the feminine is common in LB copies, and on nouns can be seen as another indication of a shift from initial /a/ to /u/ (which is first observed in the change in the acc. sg. case ending, but also, as is less generally known, in vowels in -i; see Chapter 9).

64. The šumkāt māti were probably bilge plugs: see E. Schmidtke, ‘Wasserblöcke (Gen. XI 63)’, Festschrift Friedrich, pp. 427–34. MTS’s màmḥassu, if not an error, suggests a variant line in which the verb is qualified with two accusatives, the pegs and the boat.


66. The great obscurity here is the word ni-iq-šu, the various renderings of recent translators are collected by Edzard, loc. cit. These rendered ad hoc, with the word seen as a technical term in shipbuilding, or they associate it with a known word (e.g. nīqu, ‘gig pollens’; nîqu, ‘sacrifice’), or they surrender to an ellipse. For waterproofing the fabric of an ancient Mesopotamian boat, shipbuilders needed oil or fat of some kind (šummu in such usage is found with the verbs péšu, ‘to seal, caulk’, and ṣapāru, ‘to smear’; see CAD S 1, p. 324). The problem posed by ni-iq-šu may be resolved by a Sumerian document from Girsu which records the disbursement of oil or tar to preparing various calcic barge for a procession of the gods on water (R. Kutscher, Acta Sum 5 (1983), pp. 60–1; Šugli). Some of the oil is used to caulk the boats (i. m. du₂₃₄₅), some for smearing the hulls (i. šu₂₁₃₄), some for recognizing the crossroads (i. mā bāre ṣag₂₃₄), some for the teams of hauliers (i. šu₂₁₃₄₅) and some for ‘sacrifice’ (i. šīktur₂₃₄). The last would translate into Akkadian as šummu nīq₂₃₄ and appears to vindicate those translators of Gilgamesh who interpret ni-iq-šu as a late orthography of nīqu for the convention of expressing a long vowel in an open syllable by closing the syllable see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub

(b). Evidently shipbuilding was attended by some ritual in which oil was ceremoniously poured out, presumably over the hull, as an offering to secure the vessel’s safety. Nowadays shipbuilders use champagne.

70. The remaining oil, to be stowed away by the boatman, is obviously for future use, whether this be for re-waterproofing or lubrication of the gunwales, for consumption by those on board, or, as Edzard proposes, for the boatman’s illicit profit (op. cit., p. 396).

74. The rest or follows Heidel and others. An alternative restoration, um-nu-šuṭ šu-aš-šu, ‘they drank soups’, is offered by von Soden (ZA 53, p. 232; AFA 5, p. 1414; Reclam²), but offers one object too many (see the objection of M. Srecek, Orn 64 (1995), p. 67, fn. 141).

76. I have followed the usual convention in placing šušu (MS J II 20) at the beginning of this line. However, this manuscript does double lines up on occasion, and therefore it is possible that this last extant line of the column is l. 77, not l. 76, which would yield a variant šamušu [ša-raš] for šum šamušu in this line. As currently read this line throws up a problem of sense, since it is not clear how salting with oil could be the finishing touch with which the boat was completed. Perhaps what is referred to is the lubrication of the hull to facilitate launching or the ritual libation proposed in the commentary on l. 69. Others have had different solutions: Labat associated ēkassu with the preceding festivities and took qatt addu to mean a cessation of labour, Von Soden rejects pāšušu as to do with oil and translates ad sumušu: ‘bei Sonnenaufgang legte ich Hand an, das Laste zu tun’ (Reclam²). In Babylonian of the first millennium the expression ša-mű-nāti means to touch sacrificially (CAD N 1, p. 94) but it did not always carry that nuance, for the OA king Erisum I uses it in the sense to start a job of work (Grayson, RIMA I, p. 22, 15–17).

79. At this beginning of the line Boger reads ša-ṭ-tu (BAL 1, p. 107; cf. p. 145). However, to my eyes the big oblique wedge that is all that remains of the word is a little low (for the end of n). The use of Šum(nu) with the infinitive is common (cf. Lambert and Millard, Atra-šaš, p. 126, 4: ša-am-a-biš-a-tu, and the present perfect is thus the opposite of the standard šum šamušu). The history of reading of the first five signs has been given by O. R. Gurney (RE 73 (1979), pp. 89–90; 75 (1981), p. 189). Gurney discarded the etymologies gevıamti (as originally proposed by Salonen, Wasserführungen, p. 93), in favour of Thompson’s emendation, ēt̂-tišu (or ē-r̂-tišu). As understood by A. L. Oppenheim (Orns 17 (1948), p. 53) and Gurney, this was a slip-wear comprising rollers that had to be moved from back to front as the ark was slowly launched from the bank. On the use of ı̂šu šaplu, ‘front and to back’ on the horizontal plane, see A. Shaffer, RE 75 (1981), pp. 188–9. With regard to the sign that follows šu-mušu, I do not agree with Gurney’s contention that ‘the sign can just as well be as [aš]’; to my eyes the oblique wedge is too low—and too deep—to allow the reading šu, and the faint interior trace suggests the head of an upright; on this evidence the verb must be šu-šaš-kaša. All difficulties of parsing from šu-nāšnu disappear if we read instead šu-nāšnu (I 3 ventive).

80. Most translators follow the understanding of Oppenheim (op. cit.: ‘when eventually aloft two thirds of it (i.e. the craft) [stood out of the water]’) or Schott and von Soden (Reclam²: ‘bis das Schiff zu zwei Drittel im Wasser schwamm’). In the light of ll. 62–3, one may disregard Speiser’s warning that the masculine suffix on šin̄etā is means ‘the antecedent cannot be the feminine eleqtu’ (ANET², p. 94, fn. 201).

81–4. These two couples pad out OB Atran-šaš III ii 30–1.

82. The spelling ša-ṭ-tu in MS J, ostensibly third person, might be thought a legacy of an imperfect transfer of Šas-shaš’s narrative to the first person. More probably it represents an unusual spelling of first-person ereth; comparable spellings of other verbs in the first person can be found in first-millennium manuscripts (see above, the commentary on SB III 127).
88. MS J's orthography ši-šu-az-su-um-nu for údzu-um + V (sg.: cf. ll. 43–7) contains two peculiarities, a ventive in -u and the repetition of the final consonant at the morpheme boundary. The former feature is unremarkable in late SB and the latter is an occasional orthographic habit of Neo-Assyrian scribes (for both see above, Chapter 9). Despite Samaš’s intrusion the subject of this verb is Enlil, if the text is consistent (cf. l.43).

91. I take this as direct speech, i.e. Šu-napli’a’s announcement to the city folk as he loads his cargo, an encouraging reminder of the coming fulfilment of the divine promise. Others have taken it as narrative but this is awkward, for the storm has yet not begun.

95. The tiny horizontal wedge at the beginning of the line in MS W is evidently a scribal notation of some sort. The line is without obvious fault, so the wedge is unlikely to be an abbreviated example of the marginal notation ši-a discussed above in the commentary on SB IX 172.

99. The variant of MS W, [BR]Aw[lum] or [IR]Aw[lum], recals OB Atram-basis III ii 53: 4-adad ša-šu-az-su-um-nu in marsh-ti, and is probably more original than MS J’s isso-Omanma (the preferred form in the composite text only because it is fully preserved). The description of the storm’s onset is otherwise very different in Atra-basis.

100. The deities Sullat and Šamaš are twin agents of destruction identified as aspects of Šamaš and Adad respectively (As III 243–6; see further D. O. Edzard and W. G. Lambert, RLA IV, pp. 107–8). Šamaš’s destructive force is also found in Erra IV 145, where the devastated vegetation of Mt Šarrukin is likened to woodland over which ‘ Šamaš had passed’. The image is probably one of trees flattened by a gale. Here, as in the parallel line OB Atram-basis II vii 49–50, Sullat and Šamaš are the vanguards of the storm, and thus the harbingers of Adad. The word gulašu in the following line can also refer to them, in which case they are specifically his ‘thronemen’, attendant on his progress.

101. The words šašu in maḫum are unlikely to lend locative case endings, for these are not expected in SB Gilgamesh. They are instead accusatives of place (so Boerger, Belles, p. 146). The expression finds a close parallel in a letter of Yasmá-baddu from Mari: i-na a-su-ka-bi a-ri-ti ma-um šu kaddu(ku), ‘by my constant travelling between interior and uplands’ (ARMY IV, 66, 7–9).


Neither Erra nor Ninurta is mentioned at random. According to Erra IV 118–20 the god of plague and war considered pulling out mooring poles one of his duties. There the boats floating loose on the river is a metaphor for the anarchy of civil war. Here the fuller form of his name allows the poet to anticipate the consonants of tarkultu. Ninurta had a particular association with weirs, as recorded in the god list An = Aunu ka analli, where šu-nu-nu = šinnu-tri šat-me-eb-ru (CT 24 41, 63).

106. Adad’s sluḫanna is the ‘calm before the storm’. Since this noun is singular, the verb it governs, šašu, must be viewed as exhibiting a ventive in -u.

107. Since Thompson’s edition the broken word in the middle of the line has customarily been read e-pu-ti, ‘darkness’, though very little of it remains. In fact the first sign seems much too long for e (see also Haupt’s copy). It is not a complete da, either, but the general shape is better and I am encouraged to restore da-anummati in the light of the stock idiom ūmu namru ana da-šummati tatu (III R 41 = BBS r 7 ii 20; Marduk-nadin-ahhe; SB Aruz II 16; cf. OB Arzu II 68: u-šu nam-ru da-anummat-tu da-anummat-[tum] bu-um). No such usage is found with šītu. The endingless spelling da-šummat-tum in MS C (there is not room on that tablet for da-šummat-tum) is of the kind collected in Chapter 9, sub (c). The question then is whether the first word is maštu, as usually read, or maštu-a for Šamaš. A horizontal trace before maštu, suggesting [mu]-maštu, was seen by George Smith (TSBA 3 (1874), p. 551, 550; IV R 50 ii 50), though not by Pinches (IV R 43) or Haupt (p. 97). However, Thompson’s copy also shows it (pl. 47). A reading maštu-a is probably to be discounted on other evidence, for no trace of any head of an upright wedge is visible to the left of maštu. At the end is yet another ventive in -u. The repeated mu sounds of this line, as restored, may be deliberate, to match the gloomy picture described.

108. In Atra-basis the subject of this line is Aruzu (OB III iii 9–10; Assyrian recension, MS U rev. 17). Despite his-a karpatu (dug) in the Assyrian recension, the sign after gima in the present line, though somewhat abraded at the end, appears to be more nearly gima, than dug. The verb naḫu is typical of equals but appears with a bovine subject in SB VII 174 (kūma ṭurmu in[i ṭurmu sīMa] and in the context of storms generally, where the bellowing storm god rampaging the land and harvest is a metaphor that evokes a bull on the rampage (Adad inqālib, inasitu in orad apades and elsewhere). The end of the line can also be read iš-[piš]-maštu (kurri) or even iš-[piš]-aš, but probably not iš-[piš]-aš. What precedes it is witnessed by the solitary trace of an upright wedge from the end of the word (which comprised three signs at most). This trace rules out kar-ṣu-ṣu and kūma karpatu (dug), but if the simile of the Assyrian recension is still desired kar-ṣu-ṣu might be considered, though my knowledge this exact form is not yet attested.

110–13. George Smith’s copies of these lines (TSBA 3 (1874), p. 551; IV R 50) preserve wedges, and sometimes entire signs, that were already missing by the time Delitzsch (1885) and Pinches and Haupt (both 1891) published their copies. Smith’s copies relied on MS J, only at this point, since the single other source for these lines currently extant, the fragment 82–52, 316 (now part of MSTJ), was not excavated until 1878 at the earliest (it came to the British Museum as part of the collection registered in May 1882, which included, among much Babylonian material, Rassam’s penultimate consignment of tablets from Kuyunjik). While Delitzsch and Haupt acknowledged the missing signs of MS J, in footnotes, Thompson was evidently unaware of the tablet’s earlier deterioration and the lost text is missing from his edition (except in l. 113, where, curiously enough, his copy even completes the end of the line as if it were intact). This omission has meant that later translators of the text have also failed to take account of all Smith’s original readings.

110. At the end of the line Smith’s text could be read is-ma-tum-e-[de-er-ti], but though the coming destruction certainly sent most of mankind to its destiny, the phrase does not ring true at this point in the narrative. Instead, the restoration of adatu as the last word of the line relies on the parallel couplet in Atra-basis, in the first line of which (OB Atram-basis III iii 11) only this word, a-[u]-bu-bu, remains (though the Assyrian recension has: ... TÌ-TI-za-[u]-a a-[u]-bu-bu, MS U rev. 18). The preceding word in Gilgamesh, iššu, could refer to the upland north, the source of river-borne foods, but note that a wind is blowing earlier in the line and that the east wind, šašu, is especially considered the bringer of rain, as found in a proverb (Alster, Proverbs, p. 114, 4.9.2; im su, šu tum im im šāg ga, ‘the east wind is the rain wind’, and in a passage of Udugul (BIN II 22, 51–2) K 4625 obv. 16–17, ed. O. R. Gurney, AAT 22 (1935), p. 78: ... ša, su tum im ma an ta šāg ‘ša-šu-zi ša-ša aša (s)ašu-eš-lā ša-ša aša aša, ‘east wind that brings rain from the heavens’).

111. From Smith’s copy it can be seen that this line is almost identical with the second line of the Atra-basis couplet, as preserved in the OB text and the Assyrian recension (OB III iii 12: [ki-ma-
Translations such as Landsberger’s ‘jener tag, möge er doch zur Erde werden’ (in E. Lehmann, Textbuch zur Religionsgeschichte (Leipzig, 1912), p. 92), and many since, are predicated on the alternative assumption, that šá štar expresses wish (strictly retrospective wish, however; Landsberger’s rendering matches štar, not šá štur). In such an analysis šna šulur would refer to the day that the gods made their fateful decision to send the Deluge, which, to paraphrase the metaphor, ‘should never have existed’. Jacobsen’s novel translation of this line as ‘O that you day had turned to clay’, with the suggestion that the goddess is ‘cursing the day’, stands on the third person šá štur (T. Jacobsen and K. Nielsen, Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament 6 (1992), p. 192).

The expression ša šiš štur does not sit easily with a given day, but if šna refers to the age gone by, and all that lived in it, the image becomes meaningful. An objection is that references to periods of time in general, either past or future, are commonly expressed with the plural (e.g. šna šullat); but there are exceptions that suggest we need not let the number of šna force us down a difficult path unnecessarily (e.g. šna šatru). The old world is gone forever, and Bélér-šur’s grief is compounded by the realization that her human family has been wiped out because of a divine necessity at which she herself conformed.

109–10. Cf. OB Atram-šašis III 36–7. The comparison reveals that MS C’s šna šur is taken over from the older text; MS J’s šna šur is secondary and inferior.

123. With this line compare Enki’s words in Atra-šašis, a-na-šu-ma si-ul-la-da [a-šu-biš] (OB Atram-šašis II vii 46). In our line the orthography of the first word is unexpected: mimation is not wanted on šur. Labar and Boger chose to circumvent this problem by reading šuru umma (‘moi, (ai)-je pu dire’), but the resulting speech within a speech is not convincing. Boger’s translation of the remainder of the line as ‘meine Leute zeugen/gebiiren zwar’ (BAT II, p. 146) also fails to satisfy. The most straightforward solution is to reckon the spelling a-na-šu-ma with others that mark a long vowel (here long by virtue of stress, a-na-ša) in an open syllable by closing the syllable; see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub (b). Most translators distort the grammar of niša to make it serve as the object of uld-ta. The word occupies a whole half-line and is best taken as a nominal clause.

124. For the final enclitic see above, the commentary on SB XI 39.

125. Cf. OB Atram-šašis III ii 15. At the end of the line MS J writes šur over a partially erased šur.

126. Lambert’s comments on the relationship of this line to Atra-šašis (OB Atram-šašis III iv 18–19a) have been elaborated by C. Saporreti, who puts forward the suggestion that MS J’s line should be interpreted more closely with the older text, with al-na al-ži taken as al-ašur ʾil dē, dove (ler) stava, in pianto (stavano) (Egisto e Vicino Oriente 5 (1982), pp. 59–61). However, I find it difficult to believe that, if the scribe of MS J meant al-ašur, he could have failed to use the standard orthography, and I maintain Lambert’s interpretation of ašur < ašur as a clumsy corruption. Lambert saw the MS’s šna murub ʾnissati as probably the result of ‘editorial work on a corruption of ašur ma ʾnissati’, but this manuscript is usually more reliable than MS J, and I suspect that matters were the other way around. It is possible to imagine that šna murub ʾnissati (marginally the text difficult, on account of the rare word murub) was original to Gilgamesh and was later corrupted (MS J) by contamination with a similar line of Atra-šašis: šur ašur ašur (i-na > i-hu, nu > al, ru > ra, ur > ra, už > bi). The last derivation, in particular, would explain the presence of the irregular orthography aš-ši for ašur. The phrase murub ʾnissati is a vivid image evoking the streaming eyes and nose of a person in tears (cf. šna ʾé-pén, ’nasal mucus’ = šur-šur ʾap-pi, ‘weeping of the nose’, in a commentary on Šumma šunu, ed. Leichty, šunu, p. 231, 3761).

127. Cf. OB Atram-šašis III iv 21. This line is discussed at length by Lambert in his note on III.
134. The variant of MSJ apparently resulted from an old misreading of u-ma as sam-ma-(lu), or even of an-ma as tan-ma, and can be marked as inferior.

137.139. On the phrase dir appi and the standard epic line that uses it, see Chapter 5, the note on OB III 229.

140. There is no agreement as to whether the word written pa-su in MSS CJ is pātu, pāsu or pātun. I have translated ad sumum. Von Soden thinks it may be an error (AHw, p. 849), and one is left wondering what followed anu in MSJ.

141. In the matter of the number I have given precedence once again to the reading of the more reliable MS T over that of MS J. Most translators prefer 'twelve' and assume that this figure is a measure of length and that a metrological unit must be understood. However, this does not account for the distributive determinative, and I am more sympathetic to Oppenheim's idea that the reference is to direction rather than distance (OR 17 (1948), p. 54: 'in each of (the 14) directions'). The use of naqši evokes the famous world 'map' ('diagram') would be the more accurate term), in which areas of land depicted as beyond the Bitter Sea, at the edge of the world, are so termed (CT 22.48). Šum-ši šiši, or newspapers, is similar. An expanse of water relieved at intervals by distant islands, the evidence for naqš with reference to islands is collected by W. Horowitz in his discussion of the map, Cosmic Geography, pp. 68–104. Oppenheim took the figure fourteen as significant, 'in the case of the seven naqš mountains depicted on the well-known Babylonian map of the world, we have here double the amount (the variant '12' of one copy is to be emended'), and he referred for confirmation to H. and J. Lewy's 'seven-direction system' (HUGA 17 (1943), pp. 8–13). However, it is by no means certain that the map, when complete, showed seven such islands: some commentators presume eight to be more likely (W. G. Lambert in C. Blacker and M. Loewe (eds.), Ancient Cosmologies, p. 69; Horowitz, loc. cit.).
swoop", even though the trisyllabic form is not good (Št/2, pp. 244: 'anomalies'). Two such 'anomalies' begin to make a case for a variant form of the verb. Von Soden originally thought similarly (OIZ 38 (1935), 146: 'steh für šašu(?)...-er flattert umher?'), but later rejected this decipherment (AHU, p. 1133, Reclam: 'scharrie'; otherwise Dalley: 'preened(?); Bottero: 'croassa(?).')

Consideration of the contexts leads us to reject a derivation from šašu and consider another verb entirely. What does a gazelle kid do when eating that a raven also does? Certainly not fly. The third verb of the line used to be translated ad sasum, e.g. 'caw', but has been more recently associated by von Soden with zibhitum tāra, 'to hold the tail raised', behaviour attributed to pigs and dogs in a number of omen texts (see AHU, p. 1336). The two verbs together may describe a jerky movement of an animal or bird when feeding, perhaps the motion head down, tail up and vice versa. Note that the traces in MS W are incompatible with i-tar-ri (and i-ta-ri, etc.); they may have held a different text.

157-8. These lines are remarkable in that they all display final stress (niqqa, šadī, uktin). Such stresses occur sporadically in Gilgames, as in other poetry, but to find a group of three makes one wonder whether they are deliberate. Further investigation of such stresses may shed light on the question, but for the moment it will suffice to draw attention to the sequence as noteworthy.

157. Of the parallel in Atra-šaššu only a-na ša-a-ri remains (OB Atram-šašši III v 30). Most recent translators have assumed that the implicit object of ultumna is the occupants, animal and human, of Ūta-napišti's boat, with reference perhaps to Genesis 8: 19. S. J. Lieberman takes it intransitively, 'I came out' (in M. de Ellis (ed.), Nippur at the Cenetenial, p. 131). Both renderings seem to me unjustified: šadī means to fetch something out of something (as with the birds in ll. 148-54, and the table in SB VIII 215), and here describes the preparation for the sacrifice. The winds, which symbolize the four corners of the earth, are thus not the directions in which the boat's cargo disperses but those in which the sacrifices are made (so also Lieberman and CAD N/1, p. 339, though otherwise Št/2, p. 136).

158. The phrase ziqrarti šadī is an unusual coinage, but reminds us that religious ritual in ancient Mesopotamia was essentially and temple-bound. The juxtaposition between the manmade and the natural also evokes a theme essential to the epic, the contrast between the city and the wilderness. Perhaps the alliteration surjum ... ziqrartu also affected the choice of words. Incense is burnt to attract the gods to the sacrifice, of course, as is explicit in, for example, an OB divination prayer recited in preparation for extispicy: šašu a-la-ka-an a-na pi ša-ur-ri-nim la m(a-a)-ri-i-la ušum[men eren] el-la-um li-lu₂-šu-ur-ri-nu li-ši-ri-am i-li ta-uu-tim 'O Šamaš, I am putting pure cedar into the mouth of the censer that is before you: let the censer rest, let it invite the great gods here' (YS 11 XI 22, 14-16; ed. A. Goette, JCS 22(1968-9), p. 28).

159-60. These two lines explain in detail how Ūta-napišti made the first ritual offering of food to the gods and therefore elaborate on the phrase surjum šabum ins l. 158. The word uktin can be passed as III/1 perfect but perhaps also an III/3 preterite, not iterative but serial, with the nuance of setting in rows or one by one (see KAO 5910). The objects set up in this manner, called adgaruru (or õtumnu), are small vessels that contain liquid for rituals of libation. Around their bases Ūta-napišti puts perfumed leaves and resin. It has been suggested that these were thrown on to fire beneath the vessels (CAD A/1, p. 93), but this does not tally with what we know of the function of the adgaruru. This container is nowhere directly associated with fire and we do not expect libations to be warm. It remains true that the aromatics' function in such rituals was to attract the gods' attention to their meal, and that to that end they were usually burnt on a censer. This understanding informs the ritual quoted in the preceding paragraph and is expressed directly in an incantation prayer to Girra, the fire god (LKA 139, 49): [šašu]² e-ra-la-am ni ša-gaštu⁻¹ bal.

Critical and Philological Notes: Tablet XI

161-7. This passage is parallel to OB Atram-šašši III v 34-41 but very much condensed.

166-7. The couplet's syntax has caused difficulties (the most recent exegesis is by J. N. Postgate, NABU 1998:30). It is best understood in the light of the parallel OB Atram-šašši III v 2-4, where a nominal clause prefaced by līktu is followed by a clause with the volutive lī̂kta: ša-a-ša-a urum[um] urum[um] li-ši-liš-ur-ri-nu li-ši-ri-am i-li la-ša-su-tim. 'these flies (shall be) the lapsi [beads] (beads) around my neck, so that I remember these days [(...)'] (cf. von Soden, TUAT III/4, p. 643). The phrase ayamül in ll. 166 is preserved only on MS W (does not hold it), but 'without theme' is a suspicious view for this very reason; in the light of the OB text it can be ignored as ditography from l. 167. The uncertainty of the sources regarding the verb of the second line has led some commentators to read aphysumma, with or without līt, but neither form makes sense (līt with the preterite denotes retrospective wish, 'I should have ...', or reports past fact, 'I did ...'). Reference to the OB text encourages me instead to read MS C as la-ša-su-su-la-su-um-ma, an orthography comparable with the same tablet's la-ša-su-um in SB XXI 281 (note also laša-su-su-um in SB VI 30, Kuyunjik MS). The other manuscripts' aphisumma is corrupt.

168-9. The heavy repetition of the consonant l in the phrases šiša lēlēlēnīm and Ellīl ay illīša may be intentional, to suggest that the mother goddess uttered her words in a kind of ululation.

170-1. Cf. OB Atram-šašši III v 53-54 // v 42-2; ša la intakkēnum ša{k}unat aššuša na a]kar]ī (where the subject is not Enlil but Anu).


175. As Lambert remarked in his note on the parallel couplet of Atra-šaššu (OB III vi 9-10), the older text's a-ša-a-ru indicates that MS e (which is better restored [a-ša-a]-lu than Borger's [mon]-nu-1, BAL2, p. 110) has the better tradition of reading in this line, since it avoids the conflict of gender between uzumma and napisšu. The same manuscript also confirms that ll. 175-6 are a couplet, not a single line.

176. The repetitive ay ilūtu normally (if not always) denotes wish in the present-future, 'may he not survive', though in this line it is nevertheless conventionally translated as if referring to the past (e.g. von Soden, Reclam: 'überleben sollt niemand'). Further research is needed to discover whether the negation of past līt ilūtu, 'would that he had survived', can really be ay ilūtu and not, as expected, līt līt ilūtu (cf. in form positive and negative wish with the suffixive, lī ša dunka: ša lī ša dunka).

177-82. Cf. OB Atram-šašši III vi 11-17, where, however, there are two differences: first, it is Anu who suggests to Enlil the culprit's identity. The reason for his substitution by Ninurta is not clear. Second, Enki addresses his reply to 'the great gods', i.e. all the gods in assembly.

183. The choice of epithets is surely loaded with irony.

185-6. i.e. punish the guilty but not the innocent. A slightly different version of this couplet survives on the newly discovered NB copy of SB Atra-šaššu (courtesy W G Lambert):


MMMA 86.11.375A rev. v 11-12, ed. Lambert, CTMMMA 2 forthcoming.

187. Cf. OB Atram-šašši III vi 24: [...]. lī ru-um-mi. In trying to make this line fit the specific context of the punishment of sinful mankind, most translators have followed the spirit of A. L.
Oppenheim's rendering: "but be careful lest (an innocent) might be punished, act gently that an(other) might not [come to harm]." (Or 17 (1948), p. 55, with fn. 2: "the verbs ramû III and sadalu have here the nuance "to go slow, to let loose". I can find no support for this. While sadalu can be 'to heed', even without ina/ana libbi (as in SB XII 32) and ramû can be 'to relax' (trans.), so far from being synonyms they are more commonly antonyms, 'to pull taut' and 'to slacken, loosen'; and ay ibbatuq has nothing to do with punishment. Heidel translates more accurately 'let loose, that he shall not be cut off; pull tight, that he might not go (too loose)', but still identifies the anonymous third person singular with 'man'. I do not find this convincing. In my view the line is proverbial, using the imagery of hauling a boat upstream (sadalu is the usual verb for this work). The point is that the appropriate amount of force must be applied: too much, and the rope will snap under the boat's inertia; too little, and momentum will be lost as the line goes slack. Enlii's retribution has been out of all proportion to what was required, and Ea goes on to list the less dire means that are suitable for reducing human numbers.

188-9. These lines, and the six that follow, are conventionally translated as if the precatives lātēmu-ma and lītēkimma were lā lētēmu-ma and lī lētēkimma, in other words, as retrospective wishes. The Deluge is certainly past (šakuna) but this does not allow us to ignore the grammar and force the alternative meanings of reducing the population into the past also. Ea uses the precative because the alternatives remain at Enlii's disposal and should be used in future.

193 and 195. The end of the l. 193 could also be read mātu ili-[m-t], 'so that the land became diminished'. Other translators have had various ideas. For reasons of literary structure I prefer an active verb, parallel with Íšālpur (ll. 189 and 191). Similarly, if mātu ili-[g] is the correct reading in l. 195, so too it must be in l. 193 (thus also Borger, BAL 3, p. 111). MS Ps variant nātu in l. 195 is rejected as upsetting the carefully balanced repetition of these lines. The phrase Erra (nom.) ṭalēnu is a standard literary expression for the ravages of plague (cf. Erra V 57; STT 71, 16, ed. W. G. Lambert, RA 53 (1959), p. 135: prayer to Nabû); the use of the same verb with ṭuṣēlēnu, as if this last were a demonic personification of famine, appears to be an original figure.

197. Curiously, both extant manuscripts (Cj) write the verb's pronoun suffix as dative (-lam-) when an accusative is wanted. This may be an ornithographic feature rather than an error of grammar (see already the commentary on SB l 230).

198. Since Ea is addressing only Enlii, I take the first word of the phrase mulāku mulku as the verb, not the second, which makes a less satisfactory singular imperative.

200. Notice the alliteration on the liquid /l/ and the bilabials /m, /b, and /p/. The meaning of itū is here now discovered not to be 'to put (aboard)' as it was in ll. 27 and 85 and as it has conventionally been understood, but 'to remove', effectively the opposite. This has become clear from a new manuscript of SB Atra-šašis that gives a variant account of this episode (courtesy W. G. Lambert):

\[i/lam-\text{-}u\text{ `[}en\text{-}][\text{-}i\text{-}]\text{-}a\text{-}\text{na\; lib\text{-}bi\text{`}}\text{[p]eppi\text{`} (mā)]}\\či\text{-}u\text{-}t\text{-}a\text{ [n]}\text{-}i\text{-}\text{e\text{-}la\text{-}a\text{-}\text{ni\; il\text{-}e\text{-}\text{bi\text{`}}\text{[p]eppi\text{`}}
\]

MMA 86.13.78A rev. v 15-16, ed. Lambert, CTMMA 2 forthcoming

Enlii came up into the [boat],
it he took hold of my hand, it took me out of [the boat].

It does, indeed, make better sense if Enlii removes Ua-napišti and his wife from the ark before spiriting them away. That way they are blessed and immortalized in full view of the gods whose number they join.

202. The spelling bi-rin-ki can be taken as an example of late spelling (see Chapter 9, the

section on Spelling sub b) or as a morphological development, bi-ri-ni > bi-ri-niši (GAG §20d; for other examples see Borger, BAL 3, p. 142 on 125). The repetition of the syllable /put/ is perhaps intended to suggest the path of Enlii's hand on the forefront of Ua-napišti and his wife. Enlii's action is also reported in the new fragment of Atra-šašis, MMA 86.11.378A rev. v 21: [i-l]u-pu-i-ta pu-um-si[a], 'he touched my forehead and her forehead'. Lambert comments that 'this ceremony was no doubt based on a custom in human society, perhaps the OB rite of freeing a slave', comparing an OB expression used in those circumstances, pušam ilišum, lit. 'to render the forehead pure'.

208. The spelling tu-ut-ta-ši is ambiguous (as too is us-ta in l. 317): it is uncertain whether a stem or a II stem of atu is at issue. An example of this verb exhibiting an unambiguous II stem occurs on a Kasset-period cylinder seal: see W. G. Lambert, AFO 23 (1970), p. 47: itušitatu (l.i).TÚ us-tu-ši, 'may I find life' (I am obliged to Lambert for this reference).

212. For the rare word marātu see the note on OB-BA 8 BM iii 13.

213. Thompson's amēlu damuwa was accepted by Heidel and others but von Soden rejected it in favour of amēla ealu (ZA 53, p. 233). Others have presumed that lu is a determinative and I agree with them. In Gilgamesh the orthography *gurul = ealu is not usual, but is also found in l. 53 of this Tablet, in SB 77 and MB Boğ 25. 15 (note also gurul in MB Ur 56 and 65).

217-18. This couplet distantly echoes the words of the prayers made at the beginning of Gilgamesh's heroic career (OB III 214-15, SB III 29-30). This may be an intentional signal that at last his journey is over. A more prosaic formulation of barraš luša šiša ina šum-ki is to be found in the nambare of the broken chariot (CT 34 8. 8: ina barraš (kašal) šušuš (kašal) *lal-mu-si-su-anu-ma-litu-[kur] ti tu-er-nu, 'so he will come back safely to his land by the way he went' (for this text and its duplicates see now Maul, Zakunšfrävölging, pp. 387-99).

220. The first sign of the line had already lost clarity when Haupt saw it (Nimrodepos, p. 111, fn. 2: 'sehr unbedeutend'), but it is unquestionably a complete nag on the old photograph (Fig. 13). The spelling a-me-lu-ta could be taken as an Assyrianism (GAG §56b), for there are several certain Assyrian dialect forms in Kuyunjik manuscripts of Gilgamesh (see Chapter 5, the section on Language and style sub viii, ix), but the suffix -atu is so spelled in many Babylonian tablets, too.

221. The verb šakkanū (with šakkanū in l. 223) is an unwieldy example of the serial nuance of the iterative inflex (tan) found especially with verbs of placing; the subject puts things in position in turn, or one by one, to form a row of them (see GAG §91). A comparable use if the 13 stem of the same verb occurs in a passage of Nebuchadnezzar II in which he sets in position a row of cedar logs to form the deck of a bridge (at-tāk-ka-um: Gerhard, RA 82 (1988), p. 149, 26).

226 and 238. It is conventional to derive mu-šu-bār from mušaraka, which means 'to be ugly, foul, vile'. According to the attestations of this verb and associated words in the dictionaries, this root never uses /l/ as its middle radical. Semantically it is not obviously appropriate. Its most common use is of tarnished reputation and it is not found with foodstuffs. Bread in any case does not purify in the open: it goes mouldy and hard. Thus I feel emboldened to posit as a denominative verb mušarka, to turn (something) into leather, for bread, particularly Mesopotamian bread, goes leathery as it dries out. (It is only proper to note that long after reaching this conclusion I found that the translation of muškarat as 'leatherly' already occurs in J. Gardner and J. Maier, Gilgamesh, Translated from the Sin-lagaddenu Edition (New York, 1985), pp. 241 and 245.)

230 and 241. Most translators read ina pišammu and take it as a unique adverb of time (see AEhu, p. 871), qualifying ilpuššu or the bread. A derivation from piššu is preferable, as already seen by Oppenheim (Or 17 (1948), p. 57: 'in the oven').

244. The 'Thief' is a metaphor for death and almost a demonic personification, as in Bit mēstī (G. Meier, AFO 14 (1941-4), p. 144, 50): lu-šu-mu-tum lu-šu-tum lu-šu-tum lu-šu-tum lu-šu-tum.
be it Death or the 'Thief, be it the Butcher or the Robber' (other, better-known demons follow). The verb is singular venitive, as the variant in SM proves (for the venitive in -šu see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling subj.); as object of the verb CAD E, p. 69, restores specifically šīr-ša, 'my flesh', but von Soden prefers šer-ša (ZA 53, p. 233); other words are also possible.

246. Haupt's denial that the broken sign on MS was īl (Nimrodopes, p. 112, fn. 7) seems to my eyes unfounded. All recent translators restore the missing word as šēṭiya, 'my feet' (cf. 1:41), often without square brackets, but it seems to me that the less specific šēṭi-ša is the better idiom; it often occurs after the conjunction arā (usually in the static, e.g. arā šēṭi-ša šēṭi-ša, 'where he intends to go').

248. The new MS b proves correct the restoration of the first verb in CAD Z, p. 99, against von Soden's reading (ZA 53, p. 233), [li-šar]-ti-ka, 'may it humble you'.

254.//263. Note the heavy alliteration on šaš/ and šaš/ CAD E, p. 106, takes šaš here as a synonym of šām(ii)u, with reference to a class of priest bidden to ensure cultic purity. Most other translators render kinma šaš as 'like snow', a translation that, as far as I can see, is based entirely on the synonym list Malālu VI 217-18 (CT 18 23, K 2036 // 4190, 9-10), where šal-pu-ši, 'frost', and ši-luš, 'winter' are matched with el-lum, 'pure'. These two entries are not necessarily to be taken as exact synonyms, however. In another synonym list šaš is itself explained as the metals copper (èr) and bronze (šišu) because they are bright and shiny (CAD N/1, p. 240, citing 'An VII 34 and 45'). The equation of šaš with ice and snow in Malālu need only be to their shining purity, Jacobson translated the phrase kinma šaš as 'as if with clear oil' (Studies Moran, p. 242; in this analysis šaš is elliptical for šammu šašu, a type of sesame oil). None of these proposed similes seems satisfactory to me. Instead I compare the idiom with Maqqāš III 70: e-te-il ki-ma nam-su. There is no class of priest known as nam-su and the phrase seems to mean 'I have become as pure as pure can be'. The commentary on this line offers the explanation nam-su = ši-tam̄, 'pure = sun' (KAR 94, 44), but this explanation is not convincing and probably represents a late scholar's ad hoc rendering of an old idiom that had perhaps fallen out of use. Previous commentators have failed to notice that Sumerian possesses a similar construction, as seen in the stock phrase bīla.gīm im. na-ni ā.ī. gar in Gudea's hymn on cylinders (Cyl. A 45:5-6, xviii 12, 4.12), translated as 'it made him extremely happy', in my view correctly, by D. O. Edzard, RIME 3/1, pp. 77-81. In a building inscription of Samsu-ilum the same Sumerian phrase relates the pleasure felt by Šamaš at the destination Enlil has decreed for Sippur. An Akkadian translation is extant: ki-ma ÷a-da-tum it-ta-lu-ka-an-sum (Fraeye, RIME 4, p. 376, 23-4 // 31-2). This looks very much like a mechanical rendering of a construction that was not properly understood. I conclude that both languages, Akkadian and Sumerian, can express the superlative by constraining an adjective with kīm via gitma.

256.//265. The inversion of the noun and its adjective, a device that serves to emphasize the latter, is compounded by the intrusion between them of the verb; for both devices see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style subj. (ii–vi).

268-70. The omission of these three lines in MS can no doubt be put down to a simple slip of the eye, from ēdātu in 1.267 to the same word in 1.270.

271-2. The couplet is repeated from SB X 169-70.

273. The form tattannālā is perfect not, as most translators have it, present-future. The assimilation is typical of MB and later dialects (see CAD N/1, p. 44). Ūta-napišti's repetition of his wife's words in the same tense (l. 280) is by way of explanation, a rhetorical question begging the answer 'nothing'.

281-2. The couplet is repeated from earlier from this Tablet (II. 9–10).
and concludes, undoubtedly correctly, ‘demnach wäre niqitu/miteitu “Herzschlag, pulsierendes Leben”’ (Bagh. Mitt. 25 (1994), p. 583, fn. 6). I read nikitu and not niqitu because, in Gilgali, the associated verb, meaning ‘to beat’ (of the heart), is naskātu (SB VIII 58). The plant is thus one which ensures that fundamental sign of life, the healthy heartbeat of youth and the strong pulse that accompanies it.

296. For the expression napāta naskātu, to regain one’s vigour’, see the OB letter TCL XVIII 91, 5–6: šam-an-mi-gal-la-kam-an-ruk-ma na-pi-ša-tam-ab-šu-ud, ‘after I came here I fell ill but then I recovered (my health). This makes less probable von Soden’s suggested reading of the last word as nask-ša-la, ‘sciene Geneus’ (ZA 53, p. 233, following T. Bauer).

299. The old reading of the first word, lānuša, is suspect. The antecedent of famine – ša would have to be the masculine lammu. This is not impossible on a Gili tablet from Kujunjik, for careless writings of final vowels abound (see Chapter 9), but there are other grounds for doubt. The first word of l. 299 is only certainly preserved on MS C, where it was already so indistinct in George Smith’s day that he read the two signs together as ša (TSBe 3 (1874), p. 581, 9; IV R 51 vi 9). While admitting that the second sign was badly damaged, Haupt read šum-ša, claiming to detect at the end of the damaged sign two vertical heads and a trace of an oblique wedge high in front of them (Nummepos, p. 104, fn. 11). However, Delitzsch, who copied the tablet at much the same time as Haupt, saw šum-ša (Allen, p. 109, 267). Haupt, having nailed his colours to the mast, promptly condemned this as ‘entschieden falsch’ (BA 1 (1889), p. 143). Thompson followed Haupt. Given that the signs were already indistinct in Smith’s lifetime, I suspect that Haupt’s reading šum-ša was influenced by knowledge of MSW’s ša, about which he wrote, ‘die Variante ša = gar von C ist richtig’ (loc. cit.). Though MSW’s ša has been taken to represent šum-ša ever since, it may just as easily be seen as a vestige of the preceding ša, [ša]-ša-[ša], with ša 298–9 then occupying the same line of tablet. Accordingly it has no bearing on how to read MS C’s šum-ša. I cannot see on MS C as much of Haupt. All that is visible now is one final upright wedge and, less distinct, a long horizontal wedge low down. This suggests šum-ša, with Delitzsch, or even šum-ma. The former reading provides a pronoun that agrees with the gender of lammu and ṣumma. The latter allows a very different interpretation. The implications have already been discussed in the introduction to SB Tablet XI.

301–2. This couplet, much used on the outbound leg of Gilgamel’s first great journey (SB IV passim), is found again in II. 319–20. Its use on the return leg of his last great journey is a literary device intentionally suggesting a kind of symmetry in the hero’s adventures.


309. Cf. above, SB XI 139.

310. To judge from MS J there is not enough space for a standard line on the model of l. 322, i.e. Gilgali an šaššiša isakkanu ana Ur-sumsši málšši. An abbreviated version must have been used. However, the traces of the first word, extant only on MS W, are not certainly of Gilgali, of an šaššiša or of isakkanu; perhaps an adverb opened the line.

314. The identity of the Lion of the Earth’ has recently been discussed by A. W. Sjöberg, ‘Eve and the chameleon’, in W. Boyd Barrick and J. R. Spencer (eds.), In the Shelter of Elam: Essays ... in Honor of G. W. Akhström (Sheffield, 1984), pp. 221–2. He traces the phrase back to Ebla (na-ša-ga-ri-im), and, more revealingly, notes the semantic equation between nēšu ša qaqarri and Greek χαμαλαῖον, both meaning ‘earth-lion’, and also the long-known equation entered in the pharmaceuticals series Uruanna III, nēšu maḫš qaqqara = ša-la-me-[ša], which is itself commonly rendered chameleon (MSL VIII/2, p. 58). Sjöberg thus proposes that the animal that makes off with Gilgamel’s plant could have been a chameleon and that ‘either “earth-lion” (nēšu ša qaqarri) was interpreted as an epithet of the snake or qagū might have been the more general “reptile”’. Since underhand behaviour of the kind Gilgamel encounters here is universally the mark of snakes rather than lizards, I am inclined to keep nēšu ša qaqarri in our line separate from nēšu qaqarri the chameleon. The Lion of the Earth’ is an epithet well suited to the snake, which when alarmed is a threat every bit as dangerous to human beings as the more obviously threatening four-legged version. In ancient Mesopotamia lions and snakes were more of a kind than one might think, for they held an equal terror for the Babylonian traveller. According to the common omen apotropaic šinšî nēšu and šīššî qagū, ‘attack by lion’ and ‘attack by snake’, the two most feared encounters in the open were with exactly these two animals, and these alone: according to the dictionaries no other animal appears in this phrase in such texts (AHw, p. 1209; CAD S 3/2, p. 416). For MS C’s spelling of first-person ṭalult with initial š- see SB XI 82 and commentary.

315. For ana 20 šašša as signifying ‘a long way’ see also SB VII 41 and commentary. With the rest of the line compare Semnarcheb’s description of the approaching tide (III R 12 no. 2, 28, ed. Luckenbill, OIP 2, p. 74, 75: e-du-ša-ta-nu-ši gip-ša šiš-ša-an-ma, ‘the tide of the sea rose against me in a great swell’). The verb naššu is here intransitive. Diakonoff has a very different understanding of this and the following lines:

... at twenty league distance the tide rocks the flower [inši šašša],
When I opened the well I lost my tools,
Something I’ve found that to me is a sign: it’s my fate to renounce it [lūhša],
And even the boat I’ve left on the shore.

M. Diakonoff, Rozpravy OrientálnyChar 41/II (1980), p. 19

Quite apart from the fact that nēšu is intransitive, his reading edī inši šašša is now precluded by the new variant inšāš šašša (Assyrian MS Z).

316. The verb šakāšu of tools means to drop them where one stands (cf. the omen passages cited by von Soden, ZA 53, p. 233; also CT 31 45, 5: šakāšu [šaššu] ša-maššu šu-ti ša-ša-kab-bi, ‘you will force the enemy to abandon his weapons’). A reading ša-ša-baš, as put forward by CAD (E, p. 36), seems to be discounted by the traces.

317. On ut-ša see above, the commentary on II. 208.

317–18. Most take the final clause of L 317 as an avowal of future intentions—the abandonment of the quest with the mention of leaving the boat tackled on as a curious afterthought (e.g. Diakonoff, quoted above). Metrical as well as semantic considerations suggest that there is something wrong with the text: if the afterthought is an unsatisfactory antilimax, the lines are unevenly balanced. Bottero solved these problems by placing anšūšu la aḫḫuš after l. 318, which then yields “‘I laša šašša ar Ruwa / Et l’(en) suis (trop) loin’” (Cézaro, p. 204). For me the couplet reads just as well, and acquires metrical balance, with the words left in the -šer that has come down to us but with a different line division, so that anšūšu la aḫḫuš introduces l. 3 rather than concluding l. 317. It is then a lament that Gilgamel did not leave the boat on the shore and turn back (cf. CAD N 1, p. 128; Reclam*). This must be a reference to the initial crossing of the ocean, to which, of course, the alternative was ‘coming away’, using the same word as here (SB X 91: ṣišu). The point is that if Gilgamel had never reached Utu-zapški he would not have suffered the successive failures that so demoralize him. How much better had he given up his quest when he first reached the ocean, just as the wise Šikuri had advised him.

323–8. See already SB I 18–23 and commentary.
324. The spelling bi-i-ti-ma (MS C) for the masculine imperative bitma displays a CV sign in use for VC or C alone; for other examples among the Kuyuniq manuscripts see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub (a) and (w).

TABLET XII AND BILGAMES AND THE NETHERWORLD 172–END

1. The identification of the pukku and mekkal has exercised the minds of many scholars. The latter problem is the mikkal (Sum. gis.ki.kid/mia.ma, probably to be read ke.ki.ma). This, fashioned in Bilgames and the Netherworld from a branch of Inanna’s šulappu-tree, may clearly have been some kind of long stick. The pukku (Sum. i.eologi) was made from the base of the tree; that fact, together with the sign which is used to write the Sumerian word (LAGAB), suggests that it was round. Scholars have interpreted the pair variously as drum and drumstick, hoop and stick, musical scraper and stick, and ball and stick (for a synopsis of the discussion see D. O. Edzard, RIA VIII, p. 34; not mentioned there is the singular contribution by M. Schneider, ‘Pukku und mikkal: ein Beitrag zum Aufbau und zum System der Zahlermythos des Gilgamesch-Epos’, Antiquity 9 (1967), pp. 262–83). Two well-known passages about Inanna-Istar mention pukku in connection with the war goddess’s bloody sport (on this see most recently A. D. Kühmer, AIF 18 (1991), p. 15). To Istar the mortal fray of battle is just a game. This is nowhere more clear than in the bilingual Exaltation of Inanna:

| inanna-tiš giš.lā erekē.t[e] 4innin, gin-ū mi ni iš sar sar
| 3sar a-na-an-tu tu-qa-un-ta ki-ma kep-pē-e tu-tuk-pi ma
| eeilag giš.du.a.gin nin.mà a ur.ā ra še.še ga ba.ni iš
| ki-ma pu-uk-ku ē ne-ek-ke-e be-let ta-ša-ši šu-tam-hi-pu tam-ša-ru
| B. Huška, ARor 37 (1969), pp. 488, 3–6

O Inanna (Akk. Istar), make fight and combat ecb and flow (lit. bend back) like a skippng rope,

O lady of battle, make the fray clash together like pukku and mekkal!

Here the imagery derives in my view from the different outdoor games of girls and boys: girls skip, boys play pukku. A related passage occurs in the cultic lament UrnammanIRRi, in which Inanna describes how she revels in the business of hand-to-hand combat:

| sag.du eeilag.gur.i ra.šiš mi ni iš.gur, gur, re.e on
| qa-qa-da-a-it kim(a) pu-uk-ki ku-ša-bu-ši uš-ta-nag-ra-ar
| 3mes gu ni gin mu a ni iš sar sar re e n
| kep-pē-e šin giš 4 šiš ra-mu em-še-ba-[la]
| SBBH 56 rev. 45–8 // Rm 218 iii 4°–5°, ed. Volk, Batal-Komposition, p. 200

I send heads rolling like heavy puddas,

I play with my skipping rope whose cord is specked (with blood).

Decapitated heads do not roll like drums, hoops or scrapers. As Landsberger saw when this passage was fully recovered for the first time (WZKM 57 (1961), p. 23), the terms eeilag and pukku mean a solid, wooden ball (note, however, that the phonetic similarity between pukku and ‘puck’, which is related to ‘pocket’, is entirely coincidental). A child’s ball, too, makes a good missile, as one reads in the Sumerian proverb:

| ur.gi, eeilag (var. illar) ra.a gin; dum dam an da ab za (var. i.ša)
| Alster, Proverbs, 3.95 // 5.93
| He (or she) how’s like a dog struck by a ball (var. throw-stick).

Though the identification of pukku as ‘ball’ was repudiated as ‘hardly acceptable’ by M. Duchesne-Guillénin, ‘Pukku and mekkal’, Iraq 45 (1983), p. 153, her objection was based on an erroneous interpretation of šekē in SB II 166 and can be disregarded (as, indeed, it has been by Jacobsen, Cooper, Kühmer and others). It is in the light of ball-games that one must understand pukku and mekkal in the Sumerian poem of Bilgames and the Netherworld. Gilgames makes the playthings for himself and involves the young men of his city in a game that lasts all day. As play is about to resume one morning the womenfolk complain to the gods and the playthings disappear into the bowls of the earth:

| e ne ur bi eeilag an i še ba da ab dim me
| pa bi eš ke ma ni še ba ab dim me
| eeilag al du an,i du,i ge (var. in du,i, du,i e) siš ur ra eeilag na mu un iš (var. e, iš ē)
| imdu (var. kadi, meli) du,1 du,1 ge (var. in du,i, du,i e) siš ur ra imdu (var. kadi, meli) na mu un iš (var. e, iš ē)

| 150 gur wi ur na ka eeilag al du,1 du,1 ga ne
| e ne eni dumu nu mu un su a ke, ne ib ba us a
| 155 a gu mu a ib ba mu a nir ni im ga ga ne
| ama tu ku dumu ni ir ninda mu na ab tum
| nin ti tu kuš a ni ir a mu na de e
| 3 sa,1 an e um ma kar ta
| ki e eeilag gar ra ka ni giše hur in hur ru
| 160 eeilag an i ni gu mu nu ni, ni e a ri še mu an tum
| a gu nu ga ta ki giš hur in hur ru ib ba us a
| šu du,1 du,1 nu mu un su a t a
| i,4 tu ku sišl tu ra ta
| eeilag an i ni iš ke ke, ma ni diš kur ra še ba da an šub

Bilgames and the Netherworld 164, ed. Shaffer, ‘Sumerian Sources’, pp. 66–7

As for himself he fashions its base into his ball,
he fashions its branch into his mallet.
Playing with the ball he took the ball out in the city square,
playing with the . . . he took the . . . out in the city square.
The young men of his city were playing with the ball,
with him riding piggyback (lit. on the hips) (among) a band of widows’ sons.
‘O my neck! O my hips!’ they kept groaning.
The son who has a mother, she brought him bread,
the brother who has a sister, she pours him water.
After evening drew nigh,
parallel, where Nippur MSS HZ and MS V appear to have du₂₄₃ du₂₄₃ and nu₂₄₃ nu₂₄₃, respectively (BN 216). Since the latter means 'to quake', the former may be taken as an orthographic variant for synonymous bū₂₄₃ = du₂₄₃ or nu₂₄₃ du₂₄₃ for both verbs in lexical equations with na₄₃ see CAD N/2, p. 113). The trace of MSY in BN 194 seems to be this verb in its conventional spelling. The Nippur tradition is thus that the wearing of shoes in the Netherworld upsets the shades of the dead by making the ground shake. The shift from the idea of shaking to the idea of noise, in which the Ur manuscript is followed by the Akkadian text, perhaps came about through a misunderstanding of du₂₄₃ or du₂₄₃ as du₂₄₃ = ka₄₃ = gu₄₃.

28. The epithet 'mother of Nizzak' is also used of Ereškigm in the doxology of the Death of Bilgames in the version from Mè-Turan (Cavigi, Gilgames et la mort, p. 36, 305). For Nizzak as Ereškigm's son see further the Collection of Sumerian Temple Hymns 182 etc. (A. W. Sjöberg, TCS III, p. 27; cf. W. A. Lambert, CRRA 26, p. 61; F. A. M. Wiggerman, LRAD LX, p. 330).

29-30. As Shaffer had already implied, the Akkadian of these lines renders the Sumerian of Inanna's Descent 232-3 // 259-60 more nearly than that of BN 202-3. The adjective ka₄₃ = du₂₄₃ used of shoulders, has connotations of cu₄₃: like other residents of the Netherworld Ereškigm is deprived of sun, and her gleaming white flesh stands out in the dark. The burišašu is translated here as pār koppašu but in L 50 as pār šīkhašu, reflecting the dual entries in lexical texts:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[la-]gān} & \quad \text{dug.ğasu} = \quad \text{[uš]-ka₄₃-[u]} \\
\text{[uš]-pa-[u]} & \quad \text{[uš]-pa-[u]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

DirV 256-7 (CAD S/1, p. 477); cf. HIs X 103-4

These equations suggest that the burišašu was a vessel shaped like wine jar (šappâru) or an oil flask (šākku), i.e. narrow at neck and bulbous of body. It was typically made of stone (for three instances of šākur.ğasu in administrative documents see PSS B, p. 183). According to Lagale 599, where šākur.ğasu is also translated pus-i₄₃-i₄₃ ka₄₃-šam, this stone was maz.šu₄₃ la₄₃ = marāšu₃, commonly rendered 'marasce', and the vessel was used for filtration of water, oil or wine (see F. N. H. Al-Rawi, Inaš 57 (1995), p. 220, and my note on p. 222 of that volume).

The verb at the end of L 30 has caused difficulty in the past. The correspondence with gīd in Inanna's Descent 233 // 260 makes laddu₄₃, 'to pull, draw, the obvious derivation, though von Soden read nadda₄₃ (ZA 53 (1959), p. 234: 'ist nicht behagt'; followed by W. R. Siadak, 'Inanna's Descent', p. 209). I assume that the verb makes gādu₄₃ būr in BN 203 and so conveys not the shape of the breast or the bowl ('drawn out') but the drawing over the breast of a garment (so already Heidel; for the phrase laddu₄₃-gādu₄₃ see CAD S/1, p. 22). Most recent translations have lost sight of the reference of the simile, which applies to the breast and not the draping. Speiser already saw the point, translating 'her crumpled breasts are not wrapped in cloth'. Ereškigm's breasts, the clothing rent from them in mourning, are seen hanging pale and pendulous like twin flanks of marasce.

31-2. The lines represent an expansion of the original Sumerian, at least as it is given in MSS HA (BN 206).

37a. This line, present in the tables from Nineveh but absent from the Babylonian manuscript and the Sumerian text, probably derives from ditography of L 40.

48-54. These lines are absent from the Nippur recension of the Sumerian poem, though the last three survive at two appropriate points later in the narrative (BN 227-9, 235-7). The Mè-Turan recension offers a parallel but it is not an exact match (BN 221a-g, MS pp). Evidently the Akkadian version is based on some other, similarly divergent edition of the Sumerian text.
thrust of the passage in translation. While evidently keeping the two lines that frame the passage he adapted BIN 251–2 freely, imposing on the text a parallelism not present in the Sumerian, and converting the third-person subject of theā bi.in.tag.gā (BIN 250), i.e. the owner of the gala, la (BIN 252–3), into the second person (talpita), i.e. Gilgamesš. In this way the Akkadian lines appear at first glance to describe the decomposition of a both a male and a female body. It has always been suspected, however, that what Enkidū reports in the translation is the decay of his own corpse and in my view this is stil the case. Enkindu had a penis but surely no vulva. Sumerian gala, la has three common counterparts in Akkadian, bēšara and galitu, both meaning ‘vulva’, and īrum, ‘crotch’; the last of these is attested as part of a male’s body as well as a woman’s. In this way it was open to the translator to apply both sets of parallel lines to Enkindu, and that is exactly what I assume was done. In short, the newly revealed explicitness of the Sumerian passage, as reworded in the Akkadian version, is further evidence for the often doubted sexual relationship between Gilgamesš and Enkindu.

97. For kalimatu, lit. ‘house’, as a term for the grub of the clothes moth see the lexical entry HH XIV 267: ub.tug.ba = kal-mas pu-ba-ti (MSL VIII/2, p. 30). For mel with the value tuba, meaning ‘cloak’, in the Sumerian line (BIN 252, MS rr), see OB Proto-En (MSL XIV, pp. 34, 73: ni=me; 128, 23: ni=me = na-al-ba-sam).

100–1. This couplet combines the two different versions of the Sumerian exhibited by the Nippur sources on the one hand (MS H, at least) and MS rr on the other (BIN 254). Compare two other bilingual passages: šašar.issh.ba.bu.dù: ina e-per-ii in-ta-pal-saḫ (Haupt, ASKT, p. 120, rev. 5–6); šašar.ra duran.na.čašam : ina e-per-ii in-ta-pal-si-lu (Meek, BA X/1, p. 109, no. 27. obv. 12–13).

102. The writing ta-uma-ri here and in succeeding lines of SSS UKK is taken as a spelling in which the final CV sign marks the preceding syllable as stressed, ta∂i∂; for comparable spellings of long closed syllables see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub g). MSS GN use the regular spelling, ta-mu (l. 144–52).

103. As Shaffer noted, the peg in the wall is a mark of ownership: the implication seems to be that the house has changed hands’ (Sumerian Sources’, p. 149; further Tournay and Shaffer, p. 265, fn. g. Bauer, Studies Sijpesteijn, p. 22). Where a house has been pledged as collateral security for a loan, such a peg can also mark the creditor’s interest in his debtor’s property. As the debtor weeps in the realization that the future of his household is precarious, so the father of a single son laments the lack of family to provide his shade with water.

107. The original Sumerian line (BIN 260) is now explained by M. Civil, Studies Reiner, p. 47, where the meaning of dagā = da∂ā is also elucidated.

111. C. Wilcke has translated a:n gil bi.in.tag.a = inu petā as ‘lifft er (beim Gehen) die Arme weit schwingen’ (Lugalsargassos, p. 180). However, the phrase seems to have some other meaning in scribal context, as we learn from Enkiduš and Enkidušuša (PSS 72, p. 2): a:n gil bi.in.tak, ši.gid da nu ububbē, he “opened his arm”, he cannot recite a “long song”. Heidel took the phrase to mean “his arm is bored” (also Spitzer), while von Boden transliterated arubaburri (“Buckathorn”). I see an ‘open’ arm as a more positive attribute, one that can obtain a scribe a coveted position in the palace administration. Presumably then it means a swift and nimble hand (cf. Tournay and Shaffer, ‘son bras se remue’).
least comparable items (see further A. R. George, ‘Sumarian tiru = “eunuch”’, NABU 1997/97). Since it may be assumed that palace eunuchs, like soldiers, wore some kind of uniform or standardized dress, the simile of the ‘fine standard’ perhaps draws attention to the hero’s splendid livery. The next line represents an expansion of the original and, were it legible, it might provide a rendering nearer the Sumarian of BN b. The line asking after the palace eunuch begins the second section of Gilgameš and Enkidu’s dialogue in four of six manuscripts of the Sumarian poem (MSS FHDDFF e, MSS YDDD); so I assume that it comes first in the Akkadian version too. Since the preceding section is restorable by line up to l. 116, Gilgameš’s first query of the new section will fall at l. 117. The place of this line, MS G v 1, as Enkidu’s corresponding answer, is thus fixed by restoration at 118, confirming Thompson’s calculation from the physical shape of MS G.

144. For šabkulu, not ‘mast’ but ‘mooring-pole’, see SB XI 102 and A. Salonen, Wasserfahrzeuge, p. 127.

145. Though the two lines do not exhibit a verbal correspondence, the Akkadian phrase ina bassetikku evidently corresponds to the Sumarian ina bita a BN 297). The Akkadian verb is an example of the construct state of the I/ infinitive in parrs (or parros; for this see GAG § 377c, W. R. Mayer, Or ns 59 (1990), p. 452). The oldest datable attestation of such an infinitive is in an inscription of Sargon II from Dûr-Šarrukîn (now Fuchs, Sargons, p. 78, 30; xasp), but the presence of another such construct state in the SB epic, qalî (var. qalî) in SB VI 15, alongside the various other SB attestations adduced by Mayer, is evidence that points to an older origin for the usage. The word šabkulu, ‘peg’, is elicited from qalî, and though there is plenty of evidence for such a thing in nautical life (e.g. SB XI 64), there may be a confusion with the peg of ownership encountered above in l. 103. In any case, it seems the unfortunate shade will find no rest, being spurred into constant motion every time a peg is pulled out. In the Sumarian poem the variant bit ur. na ‘his rib being pulled out’ (BN k, Ur MS mm), suggests that the antecedent of this line is one of several dealing with people who have been maltreated—in this case the subject was impaled in a boating accident.

146. The text of the line’s Sumarian counterpart (BN s 1) can now be properly read for the first time, thanks to MS rr, and this allows at last the correct reading of the Akkadian. The phrase mûš šabku, lit. ‘death (decided) by one’s god’, occurs in omen apotropes. See especially YOS X 18, 55–6: astutu(di) ina tarrui (tuskal) iškuku (du) i ma-ra-a-ia ma i ma-a-la'(li) u ma-am re-qa(ia) a-an mu-ur ur (dingir)-la asrumu (di) i ma-a-ar, ‘a man will fall ill and die on a journey he undertakes; (or else) at some future time the man will die “the death of his god”’. Other instances of the phrase are YOS X 56 i 16 (ed. Leichy, Įsha, p. 202), Summa ištu VIII 67 (ed. Leichy, Įsha, p. 108), Summa manaššum VI 72 (ed. Koch-Westenholz, Livor Omens, p. 112), Pâl tâkali I 180 and commentary (ed. Koch-Westenholz, Livor Omens, pp. 374, 432). According to the dictionaries the expression signifies a death of natural causes (as opposed to death by violence or disease) and is therefore a synonym of the more common mûš šabku (or šureš). The significance of the present passage would then be that those who enjoy the goodwill of a divine guardian in life will also be blessed after death.

147. The second clause is absent from the Nippur sources of the Sumarian poem but now appears on the tablet currently in Norway (BN s 2, MS rr). The water is ‘clear’ as opposed to the foul and polluted water (a ḫul)uša a ḫula) which many shades have to drink (see especially the continuation of the Sumarian poem in the Ur tradition).

149. The Akkadian follows a tradition in which the first verb is not negated. Both the legible Sumarian manuscripts have a clear negative (BN o 2, MSS mm and rr); the Nippur sources are broken at the crucial point (MSS DD and SS).
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| EPOS 9 II, p. 355, no. I 122 n. 127 |
| Farber, IIar und DumaZi, p. 134, 130 147 |
| Finkelnburg Mem.Vol., p. 141, 43 862 |
| Fuchs, Sargon, p. 62, 11–12 785 |
| Garelli, Gilgames, pp. 53–4 648 |
| 55 726 |
| 119–22 617 |
| George, Penguin, p. xxix 617 |
| 3 536 |
| 13 559 |
| 31 587 |
| 64 371 |
| 87 677 |
| 128 290 |
| 134 310 |
| 213 573 |
| Gesche, Schulunterricht, p. 518, 66609 obv. 5–6 120 n. 124 |
| Grayson, BHIL, p. 50, 14–15 515 |
| Gupteau Cyl. A iv 24 // v 21 785 |
| Cyl.A xii 12–13 491 |
| Cyl.A xiv 5–6, xvi 28, xx 4, 12 894 |
| Cyl. B xxxii 7 16 76 n. 42 |
| Statue B v 28 94 n. 14 |
| Hauk, ASKT, p. 120, rev. 5–6 903 |
| Hauk, Nimrud: nos. 1–3 355 |
| 4–5 632 |
| 6 633 |
| 7–8 572 |
| 9 558 |
| 10 572 |
| 11 602 |
| HS III 211, 418 859 |
| III 407 860 |
| IV 341–2a 120 |
| V 19–21 865 |
| V 25–71 a 830 |
| V 252–4 828 |
| VIIA 79–80 859 |
# INDEX OF CUNEIFORM TABLETS AND OTHER OBJECTS BY MUSEUM NUMBER

This list includes an entry for all cuneiform tablets used as sources of the Babylonian Gilgamesh epic and of Bilgames and the Netherworld 172—end, for other cuneiform tablets published in the plates and for objects published in the figures. The abbreviations of period signal the chapter in which the tablets are edited, e.g. OB (Old Babylonian) = Chapter 5, MB (Middle Babylonian) = Chapter 6, Ass (Assyrian) = Chapter 7, SB (Standard Babylonian) = Chapter 11, Sum (Sumerian) = Chapter 12. BN = Bilgames and the Netherworld.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aleppo: National Museum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9204n (Msk 7498a)+9211z (74104e)+9301d (74159d)</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>MB Emar₂₄ a</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9211z</td>
<td>see M 9204n+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9212m (Msk 74105m)</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9238d (Msk 74128d)</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>MB Emar₁</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 9301d</td>
<td>see M 9204n+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msk 7498n</td>
<td>= M 9204n+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msk 74104z</td>
<td>see M 9204n+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msk 74105m</td>
<td>= M 9212m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msk 74128d</td>
<td>= M 9238d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msk 74159d</td>
<td>see M 9204n+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ankara: Museum of Anatolian Civilizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 284/d</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>MB Bo₃₄</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.U. 51/7</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VIII e</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.U. 51/129A</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII f</td>
<td></td>
<td>98-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.U. 51/187</td>
<td>see Ch. 8, fn. 81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.U. 51/216</td>
<td>see Ch. 8, fn. 81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baghdad: Iraq Museum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 154</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 157</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>qq</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL² 286</td>
<td>= IM 52615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL² 295</td>
<td>= IM 52750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 21180x</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>OB IM</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 52615 (HL² 286)</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>OB Harmal₃</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 52750 (HL² 295)</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>OB Harmal₄</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum number</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>Siglum</td>
<td>Plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 57836 (2N-T 75)</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>MB Nippur₃</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 58451 (3N-T 376)</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>OB Nippur</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 67564 (ND 4381)</td>
<td>Ass</td>
<td>(X–XI)</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>32–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 67577 (ND 4405/4)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 76973 (W 23130)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>66–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 76941 (W 22729/9)¹</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>bb</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 76973 (W 22744/1 b)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>cc</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 76985 (W 22554/7)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>dd</td>
<td>74–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND 4381 = IM 67564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND 4405/4 = IM 67577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 22554/7 = IM 76985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 22729/9 = IM 76941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 22744/1 b = IM 76973</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W '23018' (230132)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 23130 = IM 76873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-T 75 = IM 57836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-T 376 = IM 58451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Berlin: Vorderasiatisches Museum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAT 4105</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>OBVA+BM₄</td>
<td>17–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 9667 (Ass 21600c)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>a₂</td>
<td>89–91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 10217</td>
<td>Ass</td>
<td>(IV)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 10585b</td>
<td>Ass</td>
<td>(II)</td>
<td>y₁</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 10586</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 10916</td>
<td>Ass</td>
<td>(II)</td>
<td>y₂</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 11000</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>c₁</td>
<td>138–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 11087</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>c₂</td>
<td>138–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 11294</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>c₃</td>
<td>138–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 11576</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 12890</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>MB Boğ₅</td>
<td>26–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 14512</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>w₁</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 14513</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>w₂</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 17234</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 19286 (BE 27125)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Boğazkale, Turkey: Site Museum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bo 83/614</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>MB Boğ₆</td>
<td>c 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 83/615</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>MB Boğ₆</td>
<td>d 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 83/625</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>MB Boğ₆</td>
<td>a 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This tablet was on loan to the provincial museum of Misan at Amara when it was looted during the uprising in early 1991. The tablet’s present whereabouts are unknown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K 2602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2756A+2756B+13874</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>37–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2756B</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2756C</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2756D+20778</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>G₁</td>
<td>142–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2774</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>72–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3252+8561</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3375</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>J₁</td>
<td>124–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3382+Rm 621</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>K₁</td>
<td>108–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3389</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>L₁</td>
<td>94–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3423+Sm 2097+Rm 579</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>M₁</td>
<td>61–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3475+DT 13+81-2-4, 327</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3588</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>L₂</td>
<td>94–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3990+4579+DT 2+Rm 578+Rm II 197</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>O₁</td>
<td>82–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 4465+9245+22153+Sm 2133</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>42–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 4474</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>M₂</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 4486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 4579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 4579A+8018</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Q₁</td>
<td>86–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 5335</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>79,81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 6497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 6541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 6899+8564+9716+Rm II 262</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>100–1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 7017</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 7224</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 7752+81–2–4, 245+296+460</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>T₁</td>
<td>128–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8018</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>G₂</td>
<td>143–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8225</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>U₁</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8226</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>V₁</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8281</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>W₁</td>
<td>132–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8517+8518+8569+8593+8595</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>M₀</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K 8564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8565+9997</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>V₂</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8573</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>M₄</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8574</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>X₃</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8579</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>K₀</td>
<td>109,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8584</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8586</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Y₁</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8587</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>V₂</td>
<td>102–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8589+Sm 1681</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>K₉</td>
<td>108–9, 112–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8590</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Z₁</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8591</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8594+21502</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>W₂</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 9196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 9245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 9716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 9885+80–7–19, 306</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>BB₁</td>
<td>63–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 9997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 10777</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>69–70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 11659</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>E₁</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 1200Q</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 13525</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 13874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 13880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 14945 (Rm unnumbered)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Q₃</td>
<td>86,88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 15145 (Rm unnumbered)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>d₁</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 15193 (Rm unnumbered)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Q₉</td>
<td>86–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Sm 401+Sm 2194</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 16024</td>
<td>Ass</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>YY</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 17343</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>W₃</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 18183</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 19276</td>
<td>Ass</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ZZ</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 19325</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Z₁</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 19549</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>V₁</td>
<td>102–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 20013</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>E₀</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 20778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 21502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 22153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT unnumbered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDEX OF CUNEIFORM TABLETS, ETC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sm 401</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 1040</td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 15193+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 1681</td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 8589+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 1754</td>
<td></td>
<td>see p. 739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 1881</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2097</td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 2252+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2112+DT unnumbered</td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 3423+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2131+2196+Rm II 383</td>
<td>+390+82+5+22+316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2132</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>O₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2133</td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 4465+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2194</td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 15193+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2196</td>
<td></td>
<td>see Sm 2131+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 289+unnumbered</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>X₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 535</td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 3990+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 578</td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 3423+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 579</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>d₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 616</td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 3382+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 621</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>J₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 751+BM 34853</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sp II 357)+35546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sp III 52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 785+956+1017+</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>d₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34248 (Sp 355)+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34357 (Sp 472)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 853</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 907</td>
<td></td>
<td>see Ch. 8, fn. 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 933</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>U₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 956</td>
<td></td>
<td>see Rm 785+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 964</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 1017</td>
<td></td>
<td>see Rm 785+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm unnumbered</td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 14945, 15145,15193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm II 197</td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 3990+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm II 262</td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 6899+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm II 383</td>
<td></td>
<td>see Sm 2131+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm II 390</td>
<td></td>
<td>see Sm 2131+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm II 399</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Z₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 265</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 34160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 297</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 34191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 299</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 34193, see BM 34160+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 355</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 34248, see Rm 785+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sp 426</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 34314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 472</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 34357, see Rm 785+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 573</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 34449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp II 357</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 34853, see Rm 751+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp II 380</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 34873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp II 431</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 34916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp II 614</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 35079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp II 645</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 35103, see BM 35079+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp II 726</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 35174, see BM 34160+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp II 812</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 35245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp II 922</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 35348, see BM 34160+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp II 960</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 35380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp II 998</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 35413, see BM 34160+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp II 1006</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 35419, see BM 34160+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp III 52</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 35546, see BM 34853+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp III 74</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 35567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp III 140</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 35628, see Rm 751+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$76$-11-17, 286</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 30559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$76$-11-17, 2152</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 32418, see BM 30559+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$79$-7-8, 137</td>
<td></td>
<td>see Ch. 8, fn. 85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$79$-7-8, 194</td>
<td></td>
<td>see Ch. 8, fn. 83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$79$-7-8, 320</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>L₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$79$-7-8, 335</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>L₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$79$-7-8, 342</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Y₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-6-17, 660</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 36909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-6-17, 767</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 37023, see BM 36909+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-6-17, 913</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 37163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-11-12, 422</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 38538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-11-12, 718</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BM 38833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1-2-4, 245</td>
<td></td>
<td>see Rm 7752+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum number</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>Siglum</td>
<td>Plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-2-4, 296</td>
<td>see K 7752+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-2-4, 327</td>
<td>see K 3475+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-2-4, 460</td>
<td>see K 7752+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-6-25, 454</td>
<td>= BM 41835, see BM 34191+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-6-25, 482</td>
<td>= BM 41862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-7-6, 314</td>
<td>= BM 45583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-7-6, 446</td>
<td>= BM 46002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-7-27, 93</td>
<td>see K 913+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-11-3, 840</td>
<td>= BM 48131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-5-22, 316</td>
<td>see Sm 2131+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-5-22, 466</td>
<td>= BM 54325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-5-22, 1230</td>
<td>= BM 54900, see BM 54325+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-9-18, 12726</td>
<td>= BM 72719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-1-21, 1788</td>
<td>= BM 93052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-1-21, 2238</td>
<td>= BM 99876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902-10-11, 28</td>
<td>= BM 96974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI 1904-10-9, 19</td>
<td>= BM 98990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-6-18, 1</td>
<td>= BM 135909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 30559+32418</td>
<td>SB XII a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sp 76-11-17, 286+2152)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 32418</td>
<td>see BM 30559+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34160+34193+35174+35348+35413+35628</td>
<td>SB X b</td>
<td>114-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sp 265+299+Sp II 726+922+998+Sp III 140)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34191+4835</td>
<td>SB III c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sp 297+81-6-25, 454)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34193</td>
<td>see BM 34160+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34248</td>
<td>see Rm 785+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34314 (Sp 426)</td>
<td>see p. 136</td>
<td>SB ?</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34357</td>
<td>see Rm 785+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34449 (Sp 573)</td>
<td>SB II c</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34853</td>
<td>see Rm 751+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34873 (Sp II 380)</td>
<td>SB VII g1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34916+35419</td>
<td>SB I h</td>
<td>48-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sp II 431+1008)</td>
<td>SB III i</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35079+35103</td>
<td>(Sp II 614+645)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35103</td>
<td>see BM 35079+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35174</td>
<td>see BM 34160+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35245 (Sp II 812)</td>
<td>SB VII g2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35348</td>
<td>see BM 34160+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35380 (Sp II 960)</td>
<td>SB XI j</td>
<td>140-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM 35413</td>
<td>see BM 34160+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35419</td>
<td>see BM 34916+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35546</td>
<td>see Rm 751+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35567 (Sp III 74)</td>
<td>SB II k</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35628</td>
<td>see BM 34160+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 36909+37023 (80-6-17, 660+767)+F 235</td>
<td>SB VIII m1</td>
<td>104-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 37023</td>
<td>see BM 36909+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 37163 (80-6-17, 913)</td>
<td>SB I n</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+F 234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 37189 (80-6-17, 942)</td>
<td>SB VIII m1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 38538 (80-11-12, 422)</td>
<td>SB I o</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 38833 (80-11-12, 718)</td>
<td>SB II p</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 41862 (81-6-25, 482)</td>
<td>SB XII q</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 41835</td>
<td>see BM 34191+</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 45583 (81-7-6, 314)</td>
<td>SB VII g2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 46002 (81-7-6, 446)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 54325+54900</td>
<td>Sum BN kk1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(82-5-22, 466+1230)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 54900</td>
<td>see BM 54325+</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 72719 (82-9-18, 12726)</td>
<td>SB IV t</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 93052 (83-1-21, 1788)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>OBVA+BM2</td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 96974 (1902-10-11, 28)</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>BM2</td>
<td>63-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 99890 (KI 1904-10-9, 19)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td></td>
<td>BB1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 99876 (83-1-21, 2238)</td>
<td>Sum BN kk2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 135909 (1973-6-18, 1)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XII KK</td>
<td>144-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection
YBC 2178 | OB III | OB III | 4-6 |

Oxford: Ashmolean Museum
Ash. 1924.1795 | See Ch. S, fn. 46 |

Philadelphia: University Museum
CBS 7771 | OB II | OB II | 1-3 |
CBS 10400 | Sum BN W |       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum number</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBS 13116+15360</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>DD</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS 14167</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>MB Nippur₂</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS 15150+19950+UM 29-13-438+N 3280+3474+3634</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS 15360</td>
<td>see CBS 13116+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS 19950</td>
<td>see CBS 15150+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 1470</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 2696</td>
<td>see UM 29-16-463+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 3280</td>
<td>see CBS 15150+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 3474</td>
<td>see CBS 15150+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 3634</td>
<td>see CBS 15150+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 4507</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM 29-13-438</td>
<td>see CBS 15150+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM 29-13-536</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM 29-13-570</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>OB UM</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM 29-15-847</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM 29-15-993</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM 29-16-58</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM 29-16-463+</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM 29-16-606</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>MB Nippur₂</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-T 902, 66</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>UU</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-T 908, 302</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-T 918, 443</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>DDD</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-T 923, 498</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>EEE</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-T 923, 500</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>FFF</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-T 927, 527</td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>EEE</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Private collections: Schøyen Collection, Norway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC 1989</td>
<td>Cylinder seal, see p. 101</td>
<td>Fig. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC 2652/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC 2887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC 3025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC 3361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC 4577</td>
<td>Macehead, see p. 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Private collections: anonymous owners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>MB Emar₂ b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>MB Emar₂ c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The Pennsylvania tablet (OB II) cols. i and ii
2. The Pennsylvania tablet (OB II) cols. iii and iv

3. The Pennsylvania tablet (OB II) cols. v and vi
10. OB Nippur

11. OB Harma, Copy by W. G. Lambert, collations by the author
20. MB Nippur₁ (top and middle) and MB Nippur₂ obv. (bottom)

21. MB Nippur₃ (top and middle) and MB Nippur₄ (bottom)
30. MB Megiddo. Copy by Takayoshi Oshima

31. Assyrian MSS y₁ (top left) and y₂. Copies by Stefan M. Maul
34. Assyrian MS e. The hatched areas are restored from the photograph

35. Kuyuniuk MSS ZZ and YY, unplaced fragment K 13880, colophon fragment SB MS FF, omen fragment Rm 535
36. SB Tablet I. MS B, outline sketch. B_3 backs on to B_1 but does not join

37. SB Tablet I. MS B obv.
48. SB Tablet I. MS h obv. Copy by I. L. Finkel. BM 34196 is now very fragmentary; the present copy incorporates signs known only from Pinches's copy, CT 46 no. 17

49. SB Tablet I. MS h rev. Copy by I. L. Finkel
50. SB Tablet I. MS n, copy by I. L. Finkel, collation from CT 46 no. 20. MS o, copy by W. G. Lambert, collation by the author. The scale applies to MS n only.

51. SB Tablet I. MS x
52. SB Tablet I, MS cc. Tablet IV, MSS t and v

53. SB Tablet II. MSS e, k and p. Copies by I. L. Finkel
58. SB Tablet II. MS ee. Copy by E. von Weiher

59. SB Tablet III. MS c. Copy by J. L. Finkel. In col. v a ruling separates ll. 172 and 173
60. SB Tablet III. MS M₄ outline sketch. The position of M₄ is uncertain.
82. SB Tablet VI. MS O, outline sketch. O₁ and O₂ touch but do not join

83. SB Tablet VI. MS O obv.
86. SB Tablet VI. MS Q, outline sketch. The positions of Q₁ and Q₃ are approximate.
90. SB Tablet VI. MS a cols. ii and iii

91. SB Tablet VI. MS a cols. iv and v, and two unplaced fragments, possibly of a
94. SB Tablet VII. MS L. obv.

95. SB Tablet VII. MS L. rev. L\textsubscript{2} and L\textsubscript{5} overlap but do not join
f  S.U. 51/129A

obv.

98. SB Tablet VII. MS f obv. The hatched area is restored from an old photograph

f  S.U. 51/129A rev.

99. SB Tablet VII. MS f rev.
104. SB Tablet VIII. MS m obv. Copies by W. G. Lambert (m₂) and I. L. Finkel (m₁).
Collation of m₂ by the author. The scale applies to m₁ only.

105. SB Tablet VIII. MS m rev. Copy by I. L. Finkel.
112. SB Tablet X. MS K col. v

113. SB Tablet X. MS K cols. iv and vi. The hatched area is restored from Haupt's copy.
124. SB Tablet XI. MS J cols. i and ii

125. SB Tablet XI. MS J col. iii. The hatched areas are restored from Smith's copy (PPE 43.1-50.2) and the old photograph (Fig. 12).
126. SB Tablet XI. MS J col. v. The hatched area is copied from the old photograph (Fig. 13)

127. SB Tablet XI. MS J col. iv. The hatched area is restored from the old photograph (Fig. 13)
138. SB Tablet XI. MS c obv. Copies by S. M. Maul (c₁ and c₂) and W. G. Lambert (c₃).
The scale applies to c₁ and c₃ only.

139. SB Tablet XI. MS c. Outline sketch of obv. by S. M. Maul, copy of c₂ rev. by
W. G. Lambert, collation by the author