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# BABYLONIAN TEXTS FROM THE FOLIOS OF SIDNEY SMITH 

Part Two: Prognostic and Diagnostic Omens, Tablet I

by A. R. George

This article continues with вм 38362 the publication of the copies of the late Sidney Smith begun in a previous volume. ${ }^{1}$ A complete Neo-Babylonian tablet, it gives the text of Tablet I of the prognostic and diagnostic omen series Sakikku, "Physical Ailments", which is better known by its incipit Enūma ana bït marṣi āšipu illaku, "When an exorcist goes to a patient's house". ${ }^{2}$ The previously available sources for this Tablet were the two manuscripts, also Neo-Babylonian, utilised by Labat in his edition of Sakikku (mss AB). ${ }^{3}$ These had been supplemented only recently by von Weiher's publication of a short Late Babylonian extract tablet as Uruk III 87 (here ms C). Smith's tablet is thus the fourth source extant and becomes ms D. Under the impetus of the discovery of вм 38362 several fragments of Sakikku I identified by Leichty in the course of cataloguing the British Museum's Sippar collection have been

[^0]rejoined to provide another, more fragmentary, Neo-Babylonian source (ms E). ${ }^{4}$ In addition a Neo-Assyrian tablet in Chicago awaits publication as the sixth extant exemplar (ms F). ${ }^{5}$

The new source from the Smith folios, ms D, allows the restoration of almost the entire text of Tablet I, which, as has long been known, deals with portents observed by the exorcist on his way to the house where the sick person is confined. This text is the subject of three separate commentaries (mss $a b c$ ), all made available within recent years. ${ }^{6}$ ms D differs from the previously available text in some small particulars, but chiefly in the order of its lines. Writing in 1982 on the difference between the order of lines exhibited on the one hand in mss AB and commentaries $b c$, and on the other in commentary $a$, Cavigneaux noted that the order of the latter pursued a more logical sequence. He went on to observe that the text followed by commentary $a$ "ne nous est pas préservé, mais on le retrouvera peut-être un jour'". ${ }^{7}$ Happily the wait has not been long, for in fact three of the four new sources (mss CDF) display the same sequence of lines as commentary $a$, and thus confirm the existence of two versions of this Tablet of Enūma ana bīt marṣi äšipu illaku. ${ }^{8}$ The one, represented by mss ABE and commentaries $b c$, of which all but mss AE certainly come from Warka, can probably be considered the variant version, handed down especially at Uruk. ${ }^{9}$ The better-
4. вм $54629(+) 54653+54982+55256(+) 54653 a+54843$ (joins by Finkel and George).
5. D-S 32-15, to be appear in a volume of Khorsabad tablets by Parpola and Brinkman, who kindly allowed me prior access to the piece.
6. For cuneiform texts see the bibliography below. Commentaries bc were first edited by Hunger, Uruk I, pp. 34-37, and commentary $a$ by Durand, Un commentaire à TDP I, ao 17661, RA 73 (1979), pp. 153-170, with corrections to $b c$; see also Cavigneaux, Remarques sur les commentaires à Labat TDP I, JCS 34 (1982), p. 231-241.
7. Cavigneaux, loc. cit., p. 239.
8. With regard to Cavigneaux's remarks on the order of the lines, note also that the omens drawn from noises made by the door of the sick man's house, which appear near the beginning of mss ABE, are now obviously better placed in the new sources, mss DF, as the last omens of the exorcist's journey. Lines of DF are found in the following order in ABE: 1-3, 42-43, 50-51, 5-11, 13, 12, 14-28, 31, 36-41, 30, 44-45, 33, 32, 4, 35, 46-49, 34. One line, 29, is omitted by ABE, and AE's rubric confirms that these sources indeed knew a text of only 50 lines.
9. This raises the question of the provenance of mss AE. A is one of seven tablets of Sakikku in Chicago which look much alike in clay and script and fall into the range of museum numbers A 3437-A 3456. Many tablets in the neighbouring part of the collection were purchased by Breasted from the dealer G. Khayat of Baghdad in 1919-1920, and large numbers of Warka tablets are included among them, especially Seleucid ephemerides. The script of the diagnostic omen tablets is not Seleucid, however, but nb, and one notes the possible dating of one by its colophon to the reign of Merodach-baladan II (A $3442=T D P$ II 31, Sakikku XII, restoring [Marduk-ap]la-iddina. Brinkman, Studies Oppenheim, p. $37^{219}$; p. 48, 44.3.6, and JCS 16 (1962), p. 96, would rather restore this royal name Nabû-apla-iddina, while Finkel, Studies Sachs, p. 144, proposes the much earlier Adad-apla-iddina; cf. also Brinkman, PKB, p. 141 ${ }^{854}$ ). However, this group of tablets of Sakikku may all still come from Warka, since the colophon of another of them describes it as "the property of Eanna" ( $m a k k u ̈ r$ (nig.ga) é.an.na: A $3438=T D P$ II 57, Sakikku XXXVI). ms E is comprised of six fragments from the
organised text, attested by mss C, also from Warka; D, which as part of the 80-1112 collection is most probably from Babylon; F, from Dūr-Šarrukēn; and commentary $a$, evidently from Nippur, ${ }^{10}$ is taken as the standard version. The present edition, of first the main text and then the commentaries, adopts the order of the standard version. The notes which follow are intended to supplement rather than replace those of other recent editors, and dwell in particular on the attempts of the Babylonian commentators to find justification for the apodosis of an omen in its protasis, an ancient investigation of the principle of cause and effect. The type of contrived philology that lies behind the etymological speculation used in these commentaries, a hallmark of Babylonian scholarship, has been well described by Bottéro in his discussion of the commentaries on the names of Marduk, ${ }^{11}$ and by others. ${ }^{12}$

Throughout the commentaries the common formula šá e-ú is rendered ša iqbû rather than the usual ša qab $\hat{u}$, because of the phonetic writing šá $i q-b u$ - $u$ in commentary $b$, rev. $5(=1.18)$. We have left the phrase impersonal in translation, since it often introduces quotations from the traditional corpus of anonymous literature; but the referent in 3 rd m . sg. can on other occasions be a living man, the scholar who expounded the text under discussion to the writer of the commentary tablet. Such a situation, where learning is handed down by word of mouth from master to pupil, is also implied by the phrases typically used by commentators in attributing their work to the oral instruction of a scholar (e.g., in the colophon of $a$ : ṣâtu šūt pı̂ u maš'altu ša pî ummâni). It is evident that commentaries stem from the school environment, and were used as aids to reading and understanding. ${ }^{13}$ It can be imagined that many such tablets were not tools of the teaching programme-like the texts they treated-but actual products of the learning process, being composed lby pupils engaged in writing up notes, as it were, on seminars given by their teachers, or in sitting examinations.

In this regard it is interesting to compare our commentaries $b$ and $c$, since they were found together in the same library, that of the exorcist Šamaš-iddin and his son,

[^1]the apprentice exorcist Anu-ikṣur. ${ }^{14} \mathrm{We}$ find that though they sometimes agree word for word, more often than not they treat the same subject matter in slightly different ways. Commentary $c$, the tablet of Anu-iksur, is rather concise in its explanations. While usually quoting the same lexical equations as $c, b$ often adds additional material. Typical among this extra material are the literary quotations that are often also present in commentary $a$ from Nippur, and thus appear to have been traditionally attached to the lines under discussion. On occasion $c$ offers material that is absent in $b$. Certainly the one tablet is not a copy or digest of the other. Nevertheless, by content they appear to derive from a common source. In the absence of its colophon, it is not known whether $b$ was also written by Anu-iksur or not, for the handwriting is not itself distinctively different. However, our suspicion is that these commentaries are the notes of two different pupils written up after their attendance at very similar expositions of Sakikku I. While the pupils might be identified as Anu-ikṣur and his brother, Rīmūt-Ani, no tablets written by Rīmūt-Ani were present in the library. ${ }^{15}$ A better solution would perhaps be that the longer commentary $b$ was a relic of the father's schooldays, included in his library along with those other tablets that are explicitly attributed to his time as a junior exorcist. The similarity exhibited by commentary $c$ would then be explained if Šamaš-iddin was Anu-ikṣur's instructor in turn, or if the same man had taught them both.

[^2]Sources for Sakikku I
MS Museum No.
Cuneiform Text
Main Text

| A | A $3439 a+b^{16}$ | F. W. Geers, A Babylonian Om |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | AJSL 43 (1926/7), pp. 22-417 |

Commentaries
$\begin{array}{lll}a & \text { ао } 17661 & \text { J. M. Durand, TBER 56-57 } \\ b & \text { гм } 74357(\mathrm{~W} 22307 / 6) & \text { H. Hunger, Uruk I 2719 } \\ c & \text { iм } 74374 \text { (W 22307/24) } & \text { H. Hunger, Uruk I 28 } \\ & & \text { here, fig. 4 (A. R. George; obv. only) }{ }^{20}\end{array}$
16. mss AE contain the text of two Tablets, I and II: in A lines 1-44 give the text of Tablet I, in E i 1-ii 6'.
17. Collations below, fig. 5 .
18. See above, footnote 5 . The text of D-S $32-15$ has not been incorporated into the present edition, but it has been used to restore the two places where the published mss fail us, the apodoses of 1.47 and 49.
19. Collations by Cavigneaux and Bottéro, JCS 34 (1982), pp. $239^{46}$, 240 f. Further collations are given below, fig. 5 .
20. A new copy of the obverse of $c$ was made necessary when cleaning of the tablet revealed there to be far more text extant on this side of the tablet than the few signs copied by Hunger.

| 1 | ACD |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | AGD | DIš ina sūqi(sila) haş̣a(šika) zaq-pa īmur(igi) |  |
|  |  |  | marṣu(gig) šû(bi) na-qud là iṭehhe(te)-šú |
| 3 | ACDE | DIŠ̌ KI.UD.BA ${ }^{\text {ılmur }}$ | marṣu šû māmītu(nam.érim) iṣbat(dab)-su ú-zab-bal-ma imatt(ba. $\left.\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)$ |
| 4 | ABCDE | DIŠ agurra( $\operatorname{sig}_{4}$. al. ùr.ra) $\begin{aligned} & \text { inmur }\end{aligned}$ | marṣu šû imât (ba. $\mathrm{ug}_{7}$ ) |
| 5 AGDE |  |  |  |
|  |  | marșu šû imât (ba. $\mathrm{ug}_{7}$ ) |  |
| 6 | ACDE | DIš šahâ ṣalma ı̂mur | marṣu š̂û imât( $\mathrm{ba}_{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{ug}_{7}$ ): uštapaššaq(pap.hal)meš -ma iballut $(\mathrm{ti})$ |
| 7 | ACDE | DIš šahhâ peṣâ(babbar) $\bar{\imath} m u r$ | ```marṣu šu iballuṭ(tin) : f}dannatu(kala.ga iṣabbat(dab)-su``` |
| 8 | ACDE |  | marṣu šu ana iti $3^{\mathrm{kam}}$ : ana ud $3^{\mathrm{kam}} \operatorname{imât}\left(\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)$ |
| 9 | ACDE | DIŠ šaḩâ burruma(gùn. a) ı̈mur | marṣu šu â a-ga-nu-til-la-a maruṣ(gig) na-qud là itehhe-šú |
| 10 ACDE |  | DIš šahûmeš zibbāti(kun)meš-šú-nu ittaššû(il)meš-ma ı̈mur |  |
|  |  | marṣu šû na-qud là iṭehhe-šú |  |
| 11 | ACDE | DIš šahêmeš rit-ku-bu-ti īmur | marşu šû imât ${ }^{\text {c }} \mathrm{ug}_{7}$ ) |
| 12 | ACDE | DIŠ alpa(gud) ṣalma īmur | marṣu šû ana ud $5^{\mathrm{kam}}$ : ana ud $15^{\mathrm{kam}}$ $\operatorname{imat} t\left(\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)$ |
| 13 | ACDE | Diš alpa peṣâ īmur | marṣu šû qāt(šu) ili-šú : qāt ${ }^{\text {d}}$ nin-urta : qāt ${ }^{\mathrm{d} m a ̄ s ̌ u ̄}(\mathrm{maš} . \mathrm{tab} . \mathrm{ba}) ~ n a-q u d ~ l a ̀ ~ i t ̣ e h h e-s ̌ u ́ ~$ |
| 14 | ACD | DIš alpa sāma īmur | marṣu šu iballutut ${ }^{\text {(ti) }}$ |
| 15 | ACDE | DIš alpa burruma īmur | marṣu šu ${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ lamaštu(dìm.me) $i s ̣ b a t(\mathrm{dab})-s u$ : māmītu iṣbat-su ár-hiš imât $\left(\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)$ |
| 16 | ACDE | DIŠ alpu qaran(si)-šú iddi(šub)ma ı̈mur | marṣu šû ár-hiš imât $\left(\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)$ : ana ud 7 kam $\operatorname{imat}\left(\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)$ |
| 17 | ADE | DIš alpu ik-kil-mu-šu | marṣu šû na-qud là iṭehhe-šú |
| 18 | ADE | DIš alpu ik-kip-šu | marṣu šû na-qud là iṭehhe-šú |
| 19 | ADE | diš qaran alpi īmur | marṣu šâ imatt $\mathrm{ug}_{7}$ ) |
| 20 | ADE | dIŠ imēru(anše) ana imni(15)-šú ìtiq(dib) ${ }^{\text {iq }}$ |  |
|  |  | marṣu šâ iballuṭt(ti)-ma ana mu 1kam $\operatorname{imât}\left(\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)$ |  |
| 21 | ADE | DIŠ imēru ana šumēli(150)-šú ìtiqu | marṣu šu issalla'(lil)-ma imât $\left.\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right):$ iballut ${ }^{(\mathrm{ti})}$ |
| 22 | ADE | DIŠ imēru atāna(munus.anše) irkab $\left(\mathrm{u}_{5}\right)$-ma imur | marṣu šâ mu-tu u šu-ú ik-tap-pi-lu na-qud là iṭehhe-sú |
| 23 | ADE | diš imēra peṣâ ı̀mur | marṣu šû qāt aššat(dam) amēli(lú) imât $\mathrm{ug}_{7}$ ) |
| 24 | DE | DIŠ imèra sāma ïmur | marșu šu quāt ili-šú imât $\left.\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)$ |
| 25 | ABD | DIš imēra burruma ìmur | marṣu šû na-qud là itehhe-šú |
| 26 | ADE | DIš imēru irhiṣs(ra)-su | marṣu šû na-qud là 「iṭehhe-šú ${ }^{\text {l }}$ |
| 27 | ABDE | DIš sı̈sâ(anše.kur.ra) īmur | marṣu šu ina-an-ziq |

Variants

1 CD om. dıš A: ana, om. lú; 3 C : zı.érim AG: ú-za-bal-ma A: gam; 4 B om. ra; C: $\mathrm{ug}_{7} ; 5 \mathrm{CE}$ :
 8 AE om. 2nd $a n a ; 8-9 \mathrm{CD}$ om. gig. bi; $9 \mathrm{C}: a-g a-a-n u-t i l-l a-a ; 10 \mathrm{C}$ om. gig. bi; $11 \mathrm{AE}: \mathrm{u}_{5} \mathrm{meš}^{\prime} ; 12 \mathrm{C}: \mathrm{gi}_{6}$ sup. ras.

1 When an exorcist goes to a patient's house:-
2 If he sees a potsherd standing upright in the street: that patient is dangerously sick, one must not go near him.
3 If he sees a...(Ki.ud.ba): that patient is suffering from a curse, he will languish and die.
4 If he sees a kiln-fired brick: that patient will die.
5 If he sees either a black dog or a black pig: that patient will die.
6 If he sees a black pig: that patient will die; (or,) he will reach a crisis and then recover.
7 If he sees a white pig: that patient will recover; (or,) he will endure distress.
8 If he sees a red pig: that patient will die within three months; (or,) within three days.
9 If he sees a dappled pig: that patient is ill with dropsy; he is dangerously sick, one must not go near him.
10 If he sees pigs lifting their tails up and down: that patient is dangerously sick, one must not go near him;
11 If he sees pigs mounting one another: that patient will die.
12 If he sees a black ox: that patient will die within five days; (or,) within fifteen days.
13 If he sees a white ox: that patient (is suffering from) the Hand of his God; (or,) the Hand of Ninurta; (or,) the Hand of the Divine Twins; he is dangerously sick, one must not go near him.
14 If he sees a red ox: that patient will recover (var.: die).
15 If he sees a dappled ox: that patient is afflicted by the demon Lamaštu; (or,) a curse; he will die soon.
16 If he sees an ox cast a horn: that patient will die soon; (or,) he will die within seven days.
17 If an ox glares at him: that patient is dangerously sick, one must not go near him.
18 If an ox butts him: that patient is dangerously sick, one must not go near him.
19 If he sees an ox's horn: that patient will die.
20 If a donkey passes him on the right: that patient will recover, but will die within one year.

21 If a donkey passes him on the left: that patient will sicken and die; (or,) he will recover.
22 If he sees a donkey mounting a jenny: that patient and death are intertwined; he is dangerously sick, one must not go near him.
23 If he sees a white donkey: that patient (is suffering from) the Hand of a Married Woman; he will die.
24 If he sees a red donkey: that patient (is suffering from) the Hand of his God; he will die.
25 If he sees a dappled donkey: that patient is dangerously sick, one must not go near him.
26 If a donkey kicks him: that patient is dangerously sick, one must not go near him.
27 If he sees a horse: that patient will be troubled.

[^3]

```
catch- D dIš amēlu(na) ana b\imath̄t marş[i illi]k(du)-「ma surdû(súr.[dù])mušen1 ana imni(15)-
    line šú ìtiqiq
rubrics A 50 mu.šid.bi im 1kam Diš e-nu-ma ana é gig ka.pirig duk[u]
    B dub 1r[am (DIš)] e-nu-ma 「ana é`[...]
    D im 1kam.ma 「DIš ud ana ` é lúgig ka.pirig duku nu al.til
    E 50「mu`.[......]
colophon D 「libir.ra.bi.gim ab.sar ba.an.è
        [tup-p]i md
        [а m ...]x-nu
```

Variants
28 D om．gig．bi； 30 ABE：mihiṣ（sig）is dmaš．tab．ba； $31 \mathrm{~A}: m a-a h-h a-a \mathrm{D}$ om．gig．bi； 32 A：lúsuk－ku－ka



28 If he sees a sheep: that patient's sickness will be prolonged.
29 If he sees a cat: that patient (is suffering from) the Hand of Ištar.
30 If he sees a "Prowling God": (the patient is suffering from) the Hand (var.: Stroke) of the Divine Twins.
31 If he sees an ecstatic (var.: (an object) like a gold ring): that patient (is suffering from) the Hand of Ninurta.
32 If he sees a deaf man: (the patient is suffering from) the Hand of Nergal; (or,) the Hand of Šamaš.
33 If he sees a dwarf: (the patient is suffering from) the Hand of Ninurta.
34 If he sees a blind man: (the patient) is severely ill: he will sicken and die.
35 If he sees a human corpse: that patient will recover.
36 If his right arm hurts him: [that] patient (is suffering from) the Hand of his God.
37 If his left arm hurts him: [that] patient will soon get up.
38 If his right eye twitches: (it portends) failure to achieve one's goal.
39 If his left eye twitches: (the patient) will die during the evening; (or, he is suffering from) the Touch of Namtar; he will die.
40 If his right ear rings: (the patient) is suffering from a severe illness.
41 If his left ear rings: (the patient) will recover; (or, he is suffering from) the Hand of Ištar.
42 If he stubs the thumb of his right hand: that patient will die within seven days.
43 If he stubs the thumb of his left hand: the patient will sicken and die; (or,) he will recover.
44 If he sees a soiled towel: (the patient is suffering from) the Hand of Mankind.
45 If he sees a (tuft of) goat's hair: (the patient) is suffering from the Hand of the Roaming Spirit; his illness will be prolonged.
46 If he sees a chariot: that patient (is suffering from) the Hand of Ištar.
47 If he sees a carriage: that patient's days [will be long.]
48 If he sees a cart: that patient will be troubled.
49 If he sees a gabagallu: that [patient will recover.]
50 If the door of the household where the patient is laid up creaks: that patient will die.
51 If the door of the household where the patient is laid up snarls like a lion: that patient has broken the taboo of his god; he will languish and die.
catch-line If a man goes to a patient's house and a falcon passes him on the right.
rubric Tablet I, "When an exorcist goes to a patient's house", (series) to be continued.
colophon Written and rendered according to its original.
Tablet of Nergal-līpī-uṣur, son of Arad-Gula, [descendant of...]...

 tap-pi-du, da; 46 D om. gig.bi; 47 DE: gišgag.si.lá D om. gig.bi; 49 A om. giš; 50-51 D om. lú; 51 D om. gig.bi

## Commentaries

$1 a \quad{ }^{1}$［DIš］「e7－［nu－ma ā］šipu（ka．pirig）ana bīt lúmarṣi（gig）illaku（du）ku：ka．pirig ：a－ši－［pu ${ }^{2}$ piri］g：nam－ri：pirig．gal：pirig．gal．e．ne：pirig．gal abzu ：nu－ú［r rabû（gal）ús nu－ú］r－šú－nu〈rabûù〉：nu－úr rabûu šá ap－si－i ：
［obv．$\left.{ }^{1} . . . ..\right]:$ ka．［pirig ：$\left.a-s ̌ i-p u^{2} . . . ..\right]-z u: k[a . .$.
$2 a \quad$ DIš ina sūqi（sila）haṣba（šika）zaq－pa īmur（igi）marṣu（gig）［šu（bi）］${ }^{4}$ na－qud là iṭehhe（te）－šú ：
 $k a r-p i \quad h a-a s ̣-b u-u m-m a 「 i m-t u-u t^{1}[a m e ̄ l(l u ́)-u t-t u]^{6}$ se－ekšika（LA）：haṣ－bi ：la－lu－ú ：ma－ri ：
 $p a-h a-r\left[u-m a a^{{ }^{\prime}}\right.$ it－te－eh－pi k］ar－pat ha－ṣa－bu－um－ma im－tu－ut amēlu（lú）－〈tu〉e－ṣi－「id ${ }^{p}$
 $s$ sēri（edin）：i－na ṣēri ${ }^{\mathrm{md}}$ en－ki－dù ib－ta－n［i qu－ra－du］
 ［di－i－šú］
DIŠ KI．UD．BI $\bar{\imath} m u r m[\bar{a} m \bar{\imath} t u(n a m . e ́ r i m) ~ i s ̣ b a t(d a b)-s] u{ }^{7} l u-u 「 s ̌ a ́{ }^{7}$ ana niqê（siskur）mi－hir lu－u šá ana d $n e r g a l(\mathrm{U} . \mathrm{GUR})$ lu－u šá ana hi－s［u－ú－ti？šaknu（gar）nu］lìb－bu－ú ina KI．UD．BI－šú nindabû（nidba）meš ilīmeš rabûtimeš uq－［tar－ra－bu？］${ }^{9}$ šá itti（ki）dnergal kaš－kaš ili na－ram ${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ nin－men－na šá ina nam．é［rim．búr．ru．d］a ${ }^{10} i q b \hat{u}(\mathrm{e}){ }^{\mathfrak{u}}:$ кi．Ud．bi ：ki ：áš－ri ：ud ：el－lu $s ̌ a ́-n i s ̌ ~ k i . U D . b i ~: ~ u[d ~: ~ e b-b] u ~ u$
${ }^{6^{\prime}}$［KI．UD．BA $\left.a-s ̌ a\right] r n i q e ̂(s i s k u r) m i h r i(g a b a . r i): ~ K I . ~ U D . ~ B A: ~ a-s ̌ a r ~ t e-b\left[i-i b-t i{ }^{7 \prime}\right.$ níg．ú．rum ： t］am．ma ：tam．tam．ma ：ta－lim ：qa－a－pi〈：〉te－bi－i［b－ti ${ }^{{ }^{\prime}}$ ina кı．UD．вA－šú $\left.{ }^{\prime} \bar{s}\right] i k a r u(k a s ̌)$ rēştû（sag）nindab̂̂（nidba）ilīmeš rabûtimeš $u q-t a-\left[r a b ?^{{ }^{9 \prime}}\right.$ šá ina nam．é］rim．búr．ru．da māmītu（nam．érim）mál i－na sakikk［i（sa．gig）${ }^{10 \prime} \dot{i q b u ̂}(\mathrm{e})^{\dot{u}}:$ ú］－za－bal－ma $i$－kaš－ma $: z u-u b-$ $b u-l u: k a-a-s ̌ a ~ l i ̀ b-b u-u ́\left[{ }^{11 \prime} i-k a b-b i-i\right] t ?-m a$ ：gá．gá ：za－ba－lu šá 「mur－ṣu ：
［ ${ }^{5} \quad$ KI．UD．bA $\left.a s ̌ a r(k i)\right] ~ n i q e ̂(s i s k u r) ~ m i h r i(g a b a . r i) ~: ~ K I . U D . B A ~ a-s ̌ a r ~ t e-b[i-i b-t i] ~{ }^{6}$ ［níg．ú．rum ：ta］m．ma ：tam．tam．ma ：ta－lim ：qa－a－pi ：te－bi－i［b－t］i［7 ú］－「za－bal－ma ${ }^{7}$ ［：i］－「kab－bit－ma ：gá．gá ：za－ba－lu šá m［ur－s］u
${ }^{11}$ diš agurra（ $\operatorname{sig}_{4}$ ．al．ùr．ra）$\imath m u r$ ：šá ina hhur－sà－an i－tu－ru ：a ：me－e ：gur ：ta－a－ri šá－ni［š erītu（munus． $\left.\left.\mathrm{pes}_{4}\right)\right]^{12} \mathrm{a}: m a-r i: \operatorname{kìr}\left(\mathrm{GUR}_{4}\right): k a-r a-s ̣ i: s ̌ a ́-n i s ̌ a: m a-r i: \operatorname{gur}: n a-[s ̌ u-u ́]^{13} s a l-s ̌ i s ̌$ ha－ban－na－nu ：a ：me－e ：gur ：m［a－l］u－ú ：



rev．${ }^{7 \prime}$ agurra（ $\operatorname{sig}_{4}$ ．al．ùr．ra）$\imath$ imur marṣu šâ $\operatorname{imât}\left(\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)$ aš－šum ùr ：šá－rap ：ùr ：ṣa－ra－pa
 imât（ba． $\mathrm{ug}_{7}$ ）：šá－niš［uštapaššaq（pap．hal）meš－m］a iballuṭ（tin）uṭ ${ }^{15}$ ki－i marṣu dan－na－at i－mu－ru iballuṭut ki－i dan－na－at la［īmuru（igi）］imât $\left(\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)$［lib－b］u－u ${ }^{16}$ DIš šahû ana ùr－ši bīt amēli（lú） $\bar{\imath} r u b\left(\mathrm{ku}_{4}\right)$ a－sir－tum ana bīt amēli irrub ：$a-\left\ulcorner\operatorname{sir}{ }^{1}-t[u m: e-s e-r] u^{?}{ }^{17}\right.$ māmītu（nam．érim）ma－la ina！sakikki（sa．gig）：

 šahû ana qé－reb ur－ši īrub $\left(\mathrm{ku}_{4}\right)^{u b}$ e－si－ir－ti［ana bī］t（é）bēli（en）－šú 「irrub ${ }^{7 u b}$［ ${ }^{15^{\prime}}$ šá ina

 imât $\left(\mathrm{ba}^{\left(\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)\langle:\rangle}\right.$
$1 a \quad$［＂When an］exorcist（ka．pirig）goes to a patient＇s house＂－
ka．pirig＝＂exorcist＂；pirig＝＂bright＂；pirig．gal，pirig．gal．e．ne，pirig．gal abzu＝＂great light＂，＂their 〈great＞light＂，＂great light of Apsû＂．
［．．．．．．］；ka．［pirig＝＂exorcist＂．．．．．．．］．．．［．．．．．．］
$2 a \quad$＂If he sees a potsherd（šika）standing upright in the street：［that］patient is dangerously sick，one must not go near him＂－
šika．al．ús．sa＝＂sherd＂，＂potsherd＂；al．ús．sa＝＂ground［underfoot］＂；as in the context＂My pot has been broken into a potsherd，［mankind］has died＂；sika＝＂pot－ sherd＂，＂prime of life＂，＂son＂．
$\ldots . ..] . .=$＂death＂；［gisgišimmar．al．ús．sa＝＂squashed（date）＂；＂．．．］Ea the potter moulded＂；＂The pot［has been broken］into a potsherd，man〈kind〉 has died＂；＂The reaper of［．．．．．．］knows，a clay image of mankind＂；＂She nipped［off］a piece of clay and［threw it］down in the wild；in the wild she created［the hero］Enkidu＂．
$3 a$＂If he sees a．．．（ki．ud．bi）：（that patient）［is suffering from a curse＂］－
Whether（the ki．ud．bi）be one［set up］for a sacrificial offering，for Nergal or for a mnemonic purpose；as in the context＂On his ki．ud．bi the meal－offerings of the great gods are［presented］＂，which belongs with＂Nergal，most powerful of the gods，beloved of Ninmenna＂，as was said in Namerimburrudú；кı．ud．bi：ki＝＂place＂；ud＝＂pure＂； or，ki．ud．bi：ud＝［＂cleansed＂．］
$b$［Kı．ud．ba：a］place of sacrificial offering；ki．ud．ba：a place of cleansing：［níg．ú．rum，］ tam．ma，tam．tam．ma＝＂twin＂，＂to entrust＂，＂cleansing＂；［＂On his ki．ud．ba］fine beer，the meal－offering of the great gods，is［presented＂，as was said in］a Namerim－ burrudu of any curse in Sakikku；＂he will languish＂＝＂he will linger＂：＂to languish＂ $=$＂to linger＂，in the meaning［＂he will become worse＂］；gá．gá＝＂to languish＂，of illness． will become worse＂；gá．gá＝＂to languish＂，of illness．
＂If he sees a kiln－fired brick（agurru）＂－
it is one who turned back from the river ordeal： $\mathrm{a}=$＂water＂，gur＝＂to turn back＂； secondly，［it is a pregnant woman：］ $\mathrm{a}=$＂son＂， $\mathrm{GUR}_{4}=$＂to nip off＂；or， $\mathrm{a}=$＂son＂， gur＝＂to［carry］＂；thirdly，it is a water vessel： $\mathrm{a}=$＂water＂，gur＝＂to be full＂．
（the brick has）the usual meaning；secondly，it is a man who turned back［from the river］ordeal：［ $a=$＂water＂，］gur＝＂to return＂；thirdly，（it is）a pregnant woman： $a=$＂son＂，GUR 4 ＝［＂to nip］off＂；［or，］ $\mathrm{a}=$＂son＂，gur＝＂to carry＂． because ùr＝＂to burn＂，ùr＝＂to fire＂．
$6 a \quad$＂If［he sees］a black pig（šah）＂－
as was said，it is for good or ill：šAB＝＂ague＂，（so）＂he will die；alternatively，［he will reach a crisis］and then recover＂－if the patient has experienced distress，he will recover；if he has not［experienced］distress，he will die．［Meaning as in the］context ＂If a pig goes into a man＇s bedroom，a concubine will come into a man＇s estate＂： concubine［＝confinement］；any curse in Sakikku．
$b \quad$＂If he sees a black pig：that patient will die；or，he will reach a crisis and then recover＂－ ［šAH］＝＂strong＂，šA $=$＝＂young man＂；šab＝＂pig＂；šAH＝＂ague＂；［meaning as in the context］＂If a pig goes inside a bedroom，a concubine will come［into］her master＇s estate＂，［as］〈was said＞［in＂If a city］lies on a rise＂；the concubine，as was said， （represents）the confinement of the patient；［if the］patient has experienced distress he will recover；if he has not experienced distress，he will die．
 šá－niš ki－i［17’ marṣu na－aq－d］u a－na $3 u_{4}-m u 「 k i-i^{`}$ la na－［a］q－du ana iti 3 imât $\left(\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)$ ：

 $\operatorname{imat} t\left(\mathrm{ug}_{7}\right)$
 me－e：a．g［a：malû（ $\left.\mathrm{sa}_{5}\right)$ šá m］e－e

Dıš šahâ（šah）burruma（gùn）ïmur šá iqbûú［ ${ }^{18 \prime}$ šah．z］é．da．s［ur．ra ：］bu－ri－ia－a－mu šá
 šá ár－kat－su la balātu（tin）［20＇$a$－ga－nu－ti］l－la－a ma－ak－「kur ilī？mešl la qa－a－tu－u ：a ：me－e


 ［．．．．．．
「im？${ }^{\text {－}-x}{ }^{1}$－ra ikkib（nig．gig）${ }^{\text {d }}$ nin！－urta


 $m \bar{a} r a t(\mathrm{~d}[\mathrm{umu} . \mathrm{mu}] \mathrm{nus}) \mathrm{d}_{\operatorname{anim}(60)}$ ：me ：um－mu［26＇ina māmīti（nam．érim）］－šá \｛：\}
 ba－ra－mu šá iqbû［ú］ki－ma nim－ri tuk－ku＇－pa［ ${ }^{28 \prime}$ kalâtu（ellag）meš－šáa ：］dim．me．meš
 $n i-i s ̌ ~ i l i ̆$ meš
DIš alpu qaran（si）－šú iddi（šub）－ma ìmur ：šá－［niš DIš alpu ru－pu－uš－t］um！ 21 is－su－ku ： šá－「niš DIš ru｀－pu－「uš－tum iddi－ma i－m［u－ur ：si ：qar－nu ${ }^{22}$ si ：ru－pu－uš－tum ：「šub ：qarna（si） $n a-d i-i^{p 1}\left[\right.$ lib－bu－úu ki－i alpu］${ }^{23}$ qaran－šú ú－šap－pi－lu ：ana eperi（sahar）？šá－k［i－in？．．．］${ }^{24}$ lu－u ki alpu ik－ki－pu－ú－ma qa［ran－šú？．．．
$\left[{ }^{30}, \ldots \ldots\right]$ x si ：ru－pu－uš－til［rev． $\left.1 \ldots \ldots\right]$ šu－ú－ru ：gišepinnu（apin）
$b \quad\left[{ }^{2} \ldots .\right.$. igi．hu $]$ š？ né－kel－mu－u ：igi ：i－ni $\left[{ }^{3}\right.$ huš ：ez－zu？．．．ig］i．il ：né－kel－mu－u ： šá in－šú $\left[{ }^{4} \times \mathrm{x} h\right] a^{?}-a$ iš－šu－「ku ：né－kel－mu－u${ }^{1}: a-m a-r i ́ s a ́ a ́ z e-e-\{e\}-r i$
${ }^{5}$（DIš）alpu ik－ki］p－šú marṣu šâ na－qud là itehhhe－šú šá iq－bu－ú ina libbi（šà）šá gu ${ }_{4}$ ： al－pi ： $\mathrm{gu}_{4}$ ：e－tem－mu
 šá－ru－ru－šú im－qu－tu ：
（．．．）］${ }^{25}$ is－sa－al－la－＇－［m］a ：líl ：s［i－li－tu ．．．
（．．．）］${ }^{28}$ ik－tap－pi－lu ：šá $a$－「ha－meš｀$x[\ldots \text { atānu（ème）pa－an mars } i]^{27}$ imēru（anše）pa－an mu－túu šá－kin li $[b-b u-u ́ . . . . .$.
b imēru atāna irkab－ma īmur marṣu š̂ $\left.{ }^{8}{ }^{8} m u-t u ́\right]$ u šu－ú ik－tap－pi－lu ：la．ga ：imēru（anše）： la．ga：la nap－ṭu－［r］u：$\left[{ }^{9} \times \mathrm{x}\right.$ pa］－ni imèri sáániš pa－ni ṣēri（muš）

${ }^{\bullet}$ cont．$q \bar{a} t ~ a s ̌ s a t(\mathrm{dam})$ amēli（na）lib－bu－ú a－na aššat amèli（na）ithe（te）he
［ ${ }^{2 \prime}$ qāt aššat amēli lib－bu］－ú a－na aššat amēli（lú）it $[$［he（te）he］
 ${ }^{\text {d ud．}}$ dè．anše ：ud．da ：${ }^{\text {dadad（iškur）：}}$
$\left[{ }^{10}\right.$（DIš）imèru ra－s］u：imēru ir－hi－is－su ：ra ：ma－ha－su ：
 not dangerously sick, within three months.
c
$b c$
$26 a \quad$ "If a donkey kicks him"-
gir ra.ra="to kick": gir="foot", ra=["to strike"]; secondly, Udde-ANšE: Udda =Adad.
["If a donkey kicks (ra)] him"-
"a donkey kicks him": ra="to strike".
c
["If he sees a] red pig: [that patient will die] within three months; (or,) within [three] days"-as] was said: [if] he is dangerously sick he will die [within three days;] if he is not dangerously sick, [within] three months.
"If he sees......"-
...[...]...; future without life; secondly, dropsy (agannutillû)="full of water": a.ga [ $=$ "to be full of $]$ water".
"If he sees a dappled pig"-
as was said, [šah.z]é.da.s[ur.ra]="porcupine", "whose body is marked like yarn"; dropsy (agannutillû): lack of future; dropsy: one whose future is without life; dropsy: divine property without end; $\mathrm{a}=$ "water", $\left[\mathrm{a} . \mathrm{il}^{1}\right]=$ "to draw", of water, rnig?. $\mathrm{a}^{\text { }} . \mathrm{ga}^{27}$ $=$ "property"; secondly, il="to carry", [...]...... ="water-bearer", who to draw water [...]...
["If he sees a dappled pig"-as was said, šah.zé].da.sur.ra="porcupine" [......
"If he sees a white ox: that patient (is suffering from) the Hand of Ninurta"-
"in the ox's stall Ninurta......": taboo of Ninurta.
"If he sees a red ox: that patient is afflicted by the demon Lamaštu"-
"the daughter of [Anu, the...]... of the great gods", (as) was said.
"If he sees a dappled ox: that patient is afflicted by the demon Lamaštu"-
Lamaštu(dim.me): fever, daughter of Anu: me="fever"; "he will die of her [curse (nam.érim)"]-nam ="death", érim ="wicked" break: he will die [the death of the] wicked; gùn ="to be dappled", as was said "[Her kidneys] are spotted like a leopard": Lamaštu demons; giš.hur, sag.ba, sag.dingir, [mu.dingir.ra="engraving"], "curse", "river-ordeal", "by the life of the gods".
"If he sees an ox cast a horn"-
alternatively, ["If] he sees [an ox] spit [saliva]", or, "dribble saliva": [si="horn"], $\mathrm{si}=$ "saliva", šub ="to cast a horn", [meaning if an ox] lowered his horns; to the dust was set $[\ldots . .$.$] ; or if an ox butted and [broke his] horn.$
$[\ldots .$.$] si =$ "saliva" [.....] bull; plough [(...)]
$[\ldots$. igi.hu $]$ š? $=$ "to glare": igi $=$ "eye", [huš="angry"?; ...ig]i.il="to glare", "one whose eye [...]...bit"; "to glare"="to look", of hate.
["If an ox butts] him: that patient is dangerously sick, one must not go near him"as was said, it is implicit in $\mathrm{gu}_{4}=" \mathrm{ox} ", \mathrm{gu}_{4}=$ "ghost".
["If he sees an ox's horn:] that patient will die"-
$\mathrm{si}=$ "horn", si="light", $\mathrm{si}=$ "rays", [as in the context] "Its rays diminished".
[(...)] "He will sicken"': líl=["sickness"; ......]
$[(\ldots)]$ "They are intertwined": who together are...[...; the jenny] serves [for the patient], the donkey for death, as in the [context......]
bc "If he sees a donkey mounting a jenny: that patient and [death] are intertwined"la.ga ="donkey", la.ga="not to be released"; [...] a donkey's face, alternatively, a snake's face.
"The Hand of a Married Woman"-meaning he had sex with a married woman.
["If a donkey] kicks him"-
ra $=$ "to kick", $\mathbf{r a}=$ "to strike".

47 DIŠ gišsaparra（gag．si．lá）īmur ${ }^{44}$ 「gišgag．si．lá šá lúkab－tu ：
$b$
DIŠ ila sah－hi－ri īmur：lu－u ${ }^{\mathrm{d}}[\mathrm{x} \mathrm{x}]^{30} l u-u$ ur－gu－la－a lu－u ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} g a z-b a-b a: s ̌ a ́-n i s ̌ ~ u n-n a-n i s ̌-s ̌ u ́ u: ~$
 ri－kis ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} n a-r u-d u$ ：


 $\left.{ }^{17} i z z a z z u \bar{u}(\text { gub．meš）})^{z}\right]^{\text {d }} l u ́$－làl $u^{\text {d }} l a-t a-r a-a k-a$ ：
$\left[{ }^{4^{\prime}} i l\right] a!$ sah－hi－ra $:{ }^{\mathrm{d}} l a-t a-r a-a k-a$ ：
 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ ninurta（maš）：lúan．dib．ba．ra ：ní．「zu｀．ra．a［h ：kur．gar．r］a ${ }^{34}$ lúan．sal．la：mahh－hu－u： $a-h u r-r u-u: k u r g a r r \hat{u}(k u r . g a . r a)^{u}:[a] s-s[i n-n u]$
 nam．tar ：mur－ṣu šá－niš nam．tar［ ${ }^{12}$ mu－tú ${ }^{?}$ ］
${ }^{35}$ DIš suk－ku－ku $\imath m u r ~ q a ̄ t ~ d n e r g a l(U . G U R) ~: ~ q a q q a r(k i) ~ m u l k a . d u h . a ~ a-l i[d u] q-q[u-u] q$ ${ }^{36}$ šá－niš suk－ku－uk ：iz－bi uznā（geštu）${ }^{\text {min }}-a$－šú ki－la－at－ta－an l［ $\bar{a}$（ba．ra）pal］šā（bùr！）meš！ ${ }^{37}$ mi－qit－tu $u_{4}$ dúr ${ }^{d u-u r_{-}}{ }_{-g i s ̌-l u-u ́ a}$ ibašši $(\text { gál })^{s ̌ i}$ ：dúr－giš－lu－ú ：d［ur？．giš？］．「lam？nibrukipา ${ }^{38}$ dúr－giš－lu－ú ：nippuru（nibru）${ }^{\mathrm{ki}}-\hat{u}$ ：áš－šú ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} \operatorname{nergal(U.GUR)}$ ：
 $u q-q u-u q\left[{ }^{21} s u k-k u-k\right] u:$
 an．zu ：pe－hu－u ${ }^{40} \mathrm{~g}[\mathrm{i}] \mathrm{g} . \mathrm{til} . \mathrm{la}: p e-s u-u ́: s ̌ u-u ́-l u{ }^{「}: s u^{\top}-u l-l a-n u$
${ }^{17}$ lúpessâ（ba．an．za） $\bar{\imath} m u r q \bar{a} t{ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ nin－urta ${ }^{18} \mathrm{ba}$ ．an．za $\left.p\right] e-s u-u: k u-r u-u:$ ba．an．za：ba．an ： $m i$－šil $\left[{ }^{19}\right.$ za ：a－m］e－lu ：${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ šad－da－ri ：${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ nin－urta ：šá－da－ri ：mi－šil
${ }^{6 \prime}$ lúba．an．zi ：pe－su－ú mi－šil amēli（lú）
${ }^{\text {r8＇}}$ pagra（adda）${ }^{7}$ 乞̈mur marṣu šû iballuṭ（ti）ut ：šá－al－ma－ti lìb－bu－ú pu－ú－hu ïmur
${ }^{41}$ DIš［idi（á）］imni（15）－sú iz－qut－su ：šá zi－iq－tum ：šá－n［iš DIŠ］imnu－šú ana lúāšipi（maš． maš）$i-z a q-q i-\left\ulcorner i t^{7}\right.$
obv． $11^{\prime}$ ubān（šu．si） $\operatorname{imni(15)-šúa~rabîtiti~} i k-k i p\left[{ }^{12^{\prime}} \mathrm{u}: u-b a\right]-n u: \mathrm{u}: q a-a b-r u:$
［rev． 12 （Diš）t］úgulāpa（níg．dára）lupputa（šu．lál）：ú－la－a－pa su－u－nu ：níg．dára ：ú－la－pa ： šu ：ú－ba－nu［ ${ }^{13}$ lál ：$\left.k a-m\right] u-u$ ：「 ${ }^{\text {u }}{ }^{7}$ ．ma ：ù．na ：igi．huš ：
túgulāpa（níg．dára）lupputa（šu．lál）${ }^{5^{\prime}}$ ú－la－pi lu－「구－ú ：šu．lál ：lu－’－ú ${ }^{6^{\prime}}$ šu．lál ：lu－up－ pu－ut－tum：
${ }^{42}$ DIš［gišnarkabt］a（gigir）īmur qāt ${ }^{\text {dištar（15）}}$ ：gišnarkabti šá rēši（sag）：［gi］šnarkabtu šá šarri（lugal）：qāt ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{r}_{\text {ištar }}{ }^{43}$［kakkabu（mul）$\left.{ }^{4}\right]$ á ina lìb－bi mulnarkabti ：${ }^{\mathrm{d} \text { dili－bat ：}}$
 ${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ dili－bat ：mın gigir ：nar－kab－tum ：d［i－li－pat？：${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ ištar（15）？${ }^{25}$ lìb－bu－u？diš］tar（15）－ $k a k k a b \bar{\imath}(\mathrm{mul}) \mathrm{meš}$ ：min gigir ：nar－kab－tum ：ú－buubu $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{x}}(\mathrm{U}): \operatorname{di-l[i-pat}{ }^{26}$ šá－niš？ú］－bu ： $0.0 .13 q a$ ：ú－bu： 15 ：${ }^{\text {dištar（15）}}$
［9＇gišnarkabta（gigir）］īmur marṣu š̂u qāt dištar（15）ina libbi šá ${ }^{\text {mul }}$ narkabti ：${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ dili－bat
gišgag．si．［lá ：gišgag ${ }^{27}$ sa－par？］－ri ：si ：a－gal－lum ：l［á ：］ra－ka－su ：

| $30 a$ | "If he sees a 'Prowling God' ', |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | either [DN], Leo or Gazbaba; secondly, Unnānîššu = Amurru; (thirdly), lúan.na.ba.ti, lú.giškéš. da nin nun.gal.e.ne ="shaman", "(man of the) knot of Narudu". |
| $b$ | "Prowling God"- Gazbaba: [...]...frenzied......; "to Bēltīya, Sîn, Bēlet-Eanna, [and Gazbaba] he spoke'’; secondly, Lātarāk; thirdly, Unnānîsi [=Amurru;] the |
|  | Divine Twins, as was said: "The Divine Twins who are [stationed] opposite Sipazianna (Orion) are Lulal and Lātarāk". |
| $c$ | "Prowling God"'-Lātarāk. |
| $31 a$ | "If he sees an ecstatic: (the patient is suffering from) the Hand of Ninurta"lúgub.ba="ecstatic", Lugalibigubba=Ninurta; lúan.dib.ba.ra, ní.zu.ra.ah, [kur. gar.ra], lúan.sal.la ="ecstatic", "catamite", "transvestite", "hermaphrodite". |
| $b$ | "If he sees an ecstatic: (the patient is suffering from) the Hand of Ninurta"[lúgub.b]a="ecstatic", Lugalbagubba = Ninurta; nam.tar="illness", secondly, nam. tar $=$ [death.] |
| $32 a$ | "If he sees a deaf man: (the patient is suffering from) the Hand of Nergal""(If a child) is born under the constellation Kaduha (Cygnus), it will be dumb; alternatively, deaf"; "(If) both earholes of a newborn child are lacking, the downfall of Durgišlû will come to pass'": Durgišlû: Durgišlam, Nibru=Durgišlû, Nippur; on account of Nergal. |
| $b$ | "If he sees a [deaf man]: (the patient is suffering from) the Hand of Nergal""(If a child) is born under the constellation Udkaduha (Cygnus), it will be dumb; [(or) deaf"]. |
| $33 a$ | "If he sees a dwarf: (the patient is suffering from) the Hand of Ninurta"lúba.an.zu ="dwarf", "midget"'; lúba.an.zu="stupid"; gig.til.la="dwarf", "gnome", "pigmy". |
| $b$ | "If he sees a dwarf: (the patient is suffering from) the Hand of Ninurta"[ba.an.za]="dwarf", "midget"; ba.an.za is ba.an="half", [za]="man"; Saddari = Ninurta, šadari="half". |
| $c$ | lúba.an.zi $=$ "dwarf"': half a man. |
| $35 c$ | "If he sees a human corpse: that patient will recover"a body, meaning he saw a substitute. |
| $36 a$ | "If his right [arm] hurts him"the reference is to a sharp pain; alternatively, ["If] the exorcist's right arm begins to hurt him". |
| 42 b | "If he stubs the thumb of his right hand"$[\mathrm{u}]=$ "finger", $\mathrm{u}=$ "grave". |
| $44 b$ | "Soiled towel (túgníg.dára šu .lál)"-a sanitary towel; níg.dára ="towel", šu ="finger", [lál="to] bind"; "triumph", "overbearing", "glare". |
| $c$ | "Soiled towel"-a dirty towel: šu.lál="dirty", šu.lál="soiled". |
| $46 a$ | "If he sees a [chariot]: (the patient is suffering from) the Hand of Ištar"the chariot of a high official, the chariot of the king; "the Hand of Ištar" - [the star] inside the constellation of the Chariot (Auriga): Dilibat (Venus). |
| $b$ | "If he sees a chariot: that patient (is suffering from) the Hand of Istar"[gisgigir ="chariot"], the constellation of the Chariot (Auriga), Dilibat (Venus); ditto gigir ="chariot", [Dilipat, which is Ištar, meaning] Ištar of the Star; ditto gigir = "chariot", ubu=Dilipat (Venus), [or, ] ubu = $15 q \hat{u}$, (so) ubu=15=Ištar. |
| $c$ | "If he sees [a chariot]: that patient (is suffering from) the Hand of Ištar"inside the constellation of the Chariot (Auriga) is Dilibat (Venus). |
| $47 a$ | "If he sees a carriage"the carriage of a dignitary. |
| $b$ | Carriage(gišgag.si.lá): [gišgag ="carriage",] si="ass", lá="to harness". |

```
\(48 a \quad\) giš「mar.gíd \({ }^{7}\).da : e-req-「 \({ }^{〔} u^{75}{ }^{45}\) šá-niš ta[l-l]ak-tum :
    \(b\) gišm[ar.gíd.da : e-req-qu \({ }^{28}\) šá-niš \(\left.a-r\right] i-i k-t u m ~ s ̌ a ́ ~ m a h-r a t-s u!~ g i s ̌ n a r k a b t u ~ u ̀ ~ a r k a t(e g i r)-s u ~\)
        x[...]
        [ \(\mathbf{1 0}^{\prime}\) gišmar.gíd. d]a : a-ri-ik-tum :
\(49 a \quad\) DIŠ gišgaba-gál-la : 「pi-it-nu gišmar.gíd.da? \({ }^{46}\) šá ištēn \({ }^{e n}\) parû(anše.kúnga) u lu-u
        ištēn \({ }^{e n}\) anše. \(\left.\mathrm{x}[\ldots] \mathrm{x} \times \mathrm{x}\right]\)
```




```
        [(x)]
```

（title）$a^{47}$ sakikku（sa．gig）ri－kis mur－ṣu šá－niš n［ap－har mur－ṣu ．．．］
b［ $\left.{ }^{30} \ldots . ..\right] \times[\ldots$

## Colophons







## Notes on text and commentaries

1 The association of $\bar{a} s ̌ i p u(k a . p i r i g)$ with $n a m r u$ and $n \bar{u} r u$ calls to mind such lexical entries as pi－rig pírig（UD）$=$ nam－rum（ $M S L$ XIV，p．334，A III／3 81），u－ugúg（GìR）$=n u-r u m$（p．340，A III／4 68 ），and ${ }^{\text {pi－rig }}$ pirig（Gìr）$=n u-[u-r u]$（Idu II 219）．The compiler of the Weapon Name Exposition used similar evidence in explaining the names d．giš̌tukul．sag．pirig and dme．sag．pirig as giškakku šá pānū－šú nam－ru and ta－ha－za šá pānū－šúa nam－rù respectively，with the justification pirig ＝nam－rum（Livingstone，Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Baby－ lonian Scholars（Oxford，1986），p．54，21－25）．The same equation is used by the compiler of com－ mentary $a$ ，which he follows with an unidentified bilingual extract of three lines；note here and elsewhere in these commentaries the use of what is known as the vertical reading of an individual section of a lexical text，the custom with Erimhuš，Antagal，and other group vocabularies（cf．Cavi－ gneaux，RlA VI，p．635；$M S L$ XVII，p．3）．A clue to the relevance of this luminary image appears in the last entry of this second extract：the exorcist＇s art is $\bar{a} s ̌ i p u ̄ t u$ ，given to mankind by Ea，who might well be seen in this connection as＂the great light of Apsû＂．
2 On the observation of potsherds and their fatal significance see Cavigneaux，JCS 34 （1982）， p． 232 ff ．

Commentaries $a c$ begin by defining haṣbu：it is a fragment of a smashed pot．The new text supplied by the obverse of ms $c$ differs a little from ms $a$ ，both in the apparent introduction into the etymological discussion of $m u ̈ t u$ ，＂death＂，and in the quotation of Hh III 303 in full：gišgišim－ mar．al．ús．sa $=d i s{ }^{s} u(M S L V, p .118)$ ．The same material can now be seen to have been present in commentary $b$ ，which goes on，however，to quote several literary passages in addition（one also cited in $a$ ）．These illustrate the symbolic equation of clay and man by reference to the well－

```
\(48 a\) gišmar.gíd.da="cart", alternatively, "wagon".
    \(b\) gišmar.[gíd.da ="cart", alternatively,] "long (cart)": the front of it is a chariot, the
        back of it a...[......]
        [gišmar. gíd.d] \(\mathbf{a}=\) "long (cart)".
\(49 a \quad\) "If (he sees) a gabagallu"-
        the box of a cart, which a single mule or a single donkey [......]
    b [......]... break to which a single beast is [hitched......... new] break...[......]
    c gaba.gál.la="box"; [secondly, gaba.gá]l.la="to hold back", in the sense of ". . .[...]
        the chest'".
```

(title) a Sakikku: a knot of illness, alternatively, all [illnesses; . . . . . . ]
a Commentary, oral explanation and question-and-answer dialogue according to a scholar, from the text of "When an exorcist goes to a patient's house", Tablet I, series Sakikku, to be continued with "If a man comes to a patient's house and a falcon passes him [on the right]".
Tablet of Enlil-bēlšunu, [junior] exorcist, son of Nāṣir, divination priest of Enlil, descendant of Absummu the Sumerian.
c ["If a man] comes [to the house of a sick man] and a falcon passes him on the right". [Question-and-answer dialogue] according to a scholar from "When an exorcist [goes] to a patient's house".
[Tablet of Anu]-ikșur, descendant of the Sang $\hat{u}$ of Ninurta, [junior exorcist.]
known tradition in which mankind was originally fashioned from clay by the Mother Goddess, and is therefore considered clay made animate (for the most recent example of this mythology see VAS 2492 , ed. W. R. Mayer, OrNS 56 (1987), p. 55 ff.). Though sometimes the role of Ea in such myths is as instigator rather than actual creator (so in Mayer's myth and to some extent in Atra-hasis I), elsewhere he works the clay himself (RAcc., p. 46, 26), and in this way earns the title of "potter" given him in the first text quoted by commentary $b$ (for Ea as "potter" note also his equation with the divine potter Nunurra in MSL XIV, p. 411, $A$ V/1 134-135: nun-ur-ru bÁHAR $=$ šu, ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} \dot{e}-a$, and in the god lists, documented by Hallock, $A S 7$, p. 75, on ii 49. Nunurra is otherwise the potter of Anu: ${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ nun. $\mathrm{ur}_{4}$. ra báh $\langle\mathrm{ar}\rangle$ gal an. na. $\mathrm{ke}_{4} / /{ }^{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{min}^{2} p a-h a-r u$ rabûúu šá ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} a-n i m$, Meek, $B A$ X/1, p. 105, 14-16; incantation). The identification of this citation as a known line of Atrahasis itself, as suggested by Durand, RA 73 (1979), p. $155^{6}$, involves too much emendation to be convincing. Of the other literary citations, that common to both commentaries, ittehpi karpat ( $\bar{\imath})$ haṣbumma imtūt amēlūtu, is now known to be taken from what appears to be a bilingual account of the early history of mankind (unpublished вм, courtesy Finkel; the Sumerian of this line is lost). The last quotation presented in commentary $b$, which deals with the creation of Enkidu, is from the Gilgames Epic (I ii 34-35, as many have noted).

The function of all the quotations is plainly to demonstrate the symbolic connection between the fragment of shattered clay pot observed by the exorcist in the omen's protasis and the fatal predicament of the sick man predicted in its apodosis (Cavigneaux sees a more specific but highly contentious reason for the quotation of Gilgameš I, namely etymological speculation on the name Enkidu and the apodosis' naq/kud: loc. cit., p. 235). Commentary a concludes with
a separate analysis, using other values and equivalences of the sign for "potsherd", which seems to imply a symbolic equivalence of the potsherd ( $\mathrm{LA}=\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{s} e \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{x}} / \text { šika) and a human being in its prime }}$ ( $L A=l a$ ): the portent is thus of a human life prematurely abbreviated.
3 KI.UD.ba, as the commentaries show, is plainly a public cultic fixture of some kind, at or on which rites of sacrifice and purification could be carried out. The line quoted with a minor variation in commentaries $a b$ to illustrate its function is said to be from the exorcistic genre Namerimburrudu, "(Incantations) to Dispel Curses", for which see CAD M/1, p. 194; and Reiner, Šurpu, p. 52 ff. (further texts with the rubric ka.inim.ma nam.érim.búr.ru.da.kam are given by Borger, HKL III, p. 87, to whose list can be added von Weiher, Uruk II 25). In commentary $b$ this title is qualified by the phrase māmītu mala ina Sakikki, which apparently refers to a subsection of the genre dealing with the treatment by incantation of physical ailments (sa.gig) that were considered to have been induced by curse (the phrase recurs, though not qualifying Namerimburrudu, in commentary $a$ on 1. 6). The second literary line cited by $a$, apparently also attributed by the commentator to Namerimburrudu, is also found in a šu.il.la prayer to Nergal (BMS 27, 4; cf. Durand, RA 73 (1979), p. 158). Elsewhere the ki. ud.ba is found in Šurpu III 32 ([ma-mit K]I. Ud.ba $a-n a$ pān améli šá-ka-nu, "curse arising from setting up a ki. Ud.ba in front of a man'"); VIII 75 and Maqlû IV 26 (in the company of various kilns or ovens, brazier and bellows); and in an unpublished incantation against the personification of curse, the demon Māmitu, K $1363+10293,7$ and [11] (cf. also Reiner, Šurpu, p. 56).

In addition to the literary reference all commentaries seek to explain the meaning of Ki.Ud.ba/bi etymologically. The last equation of commentary $a$ was restored Ki. UD. $\mathrm{BI}=i[m-b] u$ by Durand, loc. cit., p. 155, with reference to the explanation ki. ud // im-bu-ú, "palm fibre", in a commentary on Šumma ālu, but while the intrusion of apparent irrelevancy is not unknown in this commentary, the long final vowel of imbut argues against such a reading. As we restore it the equation offers a simple alternative to ellu in the preceding etymological interpretation of KI.UD.

The first lexical passage cited in $b c$ we assume to be a direct "vertical" quotation of Erimhuš I a 29-31 (MSL XVII, p. 14), which can be provisionally restored as follows (with copy by Cavigneaux, FB 20-21 (1980), p. 260, vat 10426 i; coll.):

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
{[\text { níg. ú].rum }} & =t a-l i-m u \\
{[\operatorname{tam} . \mathrm{m}] \mathrm{a}^{?}} & =q a-a-p u \\
{[\operatorname{tam} . \operatorname{tam} . \mathrm{m}] \mathrm{a}} & =t e-b i-i b-t u
\end{array}
$$

The citation of this passage is of course to justify, through manipulation of the sign $u d=t a m$, the interpretation of ki. Ud. ba as ašar tēbibti. The second lexical citation of b, gá.gá=zabālu ša murși, is reminiscent of $M S L$ XVII, p. 203, Antagal D 53: [gá].gá=zu-ub-bu-[lu] šá irt $[i]$; see also p. 155, III 140: gá.gá $=s ̣ u-u b-b u-l u$.
4 This line, written in ms A on the same line of tablet as our 1. 32, was accidentally omitted from Geers' copy ( $A J S L 43$ (1926-1927), p. 39, 39b); see the collation on fig. 5.

To the remarks of Durand and Cavigneaux one may add that the discussion of the implications of the brick in commentaries $a$ and $b$ assumes the application of the reverse of the principle seen at work in l. 35, in which a dead body is interpreted as the sick man's substitute, thus relieving him of danger. Here, through the customary etymological speculation, the brick is seen to be a man who has evaded risk of death in rejecting the river-ordeal, and the inference is taken that the exorcist's patient will die in his place (on the idiom ina hursāni târu see the references collected by Cavigneaux, JCS 34 (1982), p. $237^{28}$ ). The interpretation of the brick as a pregnant woman is also etymologically explained, and, as Cavigneaux noted, may allude to the ritual rôle of the brick in childbirth. The equation supposes that the patient's death is portended by the imminent creation of a new life. This suggests a view of death and birth as reciprocal events in a continuous cycle of human existence. But the introduction of the failed triallist and the expectant mother is not just to demonstrate an interrelation between life and death. This is shown by the final interpretation of agurru, in commentary a only, as something without com-

a clay vessel for communal waste water (as in the Descent of Ištar, CT 15 47, rev. 25: ${ }^{\mathrm{dug}_{h}}{ }_{h a-b a-}$ na-at alli). Cavigneaux has since pointed out an Aramaic cognate with the meaning "idle" (RA 76 (1982), p. 190). The diminutive habannānu, "little water tub", may then refer figuratively either to someone bloated with dropsy or, pejoratively, to a fat, lazy person (whence the cognate). But whether water tub or tubby fellow, the habbanānu is doubtless something that might typically be observed in the street by the exorcist. Accordingly, it appears that the commentator's lexical speculation on the syllables $a$ and gur provides three variant observations, all of which can be expected to yield the same fatal prognosis as the brick. In this way the scope of the text is widened by extrapolating prognoses from portents not actually recorded in it (commentaries bc show similar practice in line 9 , where the sighting of a dappled pig is shown through lexical virtuosity to hold good for a porcupine as well). Commentary $c$ is less speculative, and sees the fired brick as a simple metaphor for the patient, who will ultimately perish as if consumed by fire.

There is evidence that the sort of hermeneutic ingenuity brought to bear on the brick in commentaries $a b$ was recognized as lying in stark contrast to what was considered the "normal" reading of the text. The key word here is the term kayyānu, "regular", as used in commentary $b$. The commentator first accepts the brick for what it is. This is, as he reports, the "normal" reading of the text: kayyān (the significance of this scribal notation as one which "désigne très probablement ici l'interprétation littérale", was discovered by Cavigneaux, JCS 34 (1982), p. 237). The three variant observations extracted from the brick through etymological speculation are, by inference, not normal; that is to say, they are achieved cryptically.

Another occurrence of kayyān in the same usage is in a commentary discussing the predicament of the Moon God's cow, Geme-Sîn. In BAM 248 (i 38; cf. the parallel in iii 56), a collection of incantations against difficult birth, she is described as lying on the ground struggling to calve, one horn digging into the earth and her tail raising a cloud of dust as it sweeps the ground. The commentary reads as follows (Civil, JNES 33 (1974), p. 332, 15-16): ina qar-ni-šú qaq-qar te-ra-at : ta-ru-u kayyān(sag.ús) sá-niš te-ra-at: he-eṣ-né-et: ta-ru-u: ha-ṣa-nu lib-bu-u gú.da.ri=na-an-du-ra, "' with her horn she is piercing the earth': tarâ has the usual meaning; alternatively terât ='it is given shelter': (because) taru $\hat{u}=$ 'to give shelter', as in gú.da.ri='to be eclipsed'." Civil interpreted the passage otherwise (cf. also Cavigneaux, AulaOr 5 (1987), p. 253). As I understand it however, the secondary (i.e. not kayyānu) interpretation of the idiom ina qarni qaqqara ter $\hat{u}$ introduces terms suggestive of astronomical observation, and shows that the commentator is reminded of the similar phrase "its horn(s) pierce the sky/earth" found in lunar omen protases (qarnu/ā šamê/erseta terât/â: cf. AHw, p. 1388 f.). This image, a metaphor drawn from bovine behaviour, relies on the well-known identification of the lunar crescent as a pair of cow-horns. Just as Geme-Sin's horns dig into the ground as the calving gets more difficult, so the moon's horns or cusps can look as if they are sticking into the earth or sky. The reference is here to the appearance of the lunar crescent as it crosses the horizon at moon-rise or moon-set. At these moments the moon's horn could well be said to be "given shelter" or "eclipsed" by the earth's rim (the commentator's final, decisively astronomical citation is adapted by homophony from MSL IV, p. 72, Hh II 287: gú.da.ri = na-an-du-ru, "interclasped"; at present there is no evidence for hasānu as an astronomical term, but it evidently serves to clarify the appropriate nuance of terât).

A third occurrence of kayyān denoting literal meaning is in the commentary вм 47447, obv. 30 (F. Rochberg-Halton, AfO Beiheft 22, p. 284), where ša-niš ka-a-a-nu follows a secondary interpretation.
6 Quotation from the omen tablet Šumma ālu XLV (CT 3030 K 3, rev. 9: [Diš šaĥu ana $q] e ́-r e b ~ u r-s ̌ i ~ i ̄ r u b ~ a-s i-i r-t u ~ a n a ~ b i ̄ t ~ b e ̄ l i-s ̌ u ́ ~ i r r u b) ~ i n ~ c o m m e n t a r i e s ~ a ~ a n d ~ b ~ d e m o n s t r a t e s ~ t h e ~ s i g n i f i-~$ cance of the pig as a portent of captivity, which in the case of a sick man is confinement to bed. The writing $\dot{u} r-s ̌ i$ in $a$ was also known to Šumma $\bar{a} l u$, as can be inferred from what remains of the commentary tablet (CT $4131,21:[\mathrm{x}(\mathrm{x}) \mathrm{x}] \mathrm{x}$ : ùr : sa-pa-nu: e-si-ir! (IT)-tum ana bīt bēli-šú irrub; cf. Durand, loc. cit., p. 160). The apodosis is also linked to the protasis by manipulation of the values of the sign for "pig" (su-ulsul("šAg") $=l e-e-b u$ is a citation from $A$ VIII/3, comm. 23: MSL XIV, p. 507).

7 In ms C the verb of the first apodosis is written with a rather abbreviated form of the sign tin (coll. fig. 5).
8 For ana with units of time, meaning "within (so many days, etc.)" or "by (a certain date", see $A H w$, p. 47, ana E $2 b$; also $C T 299 a, 4 ; 528$, rev. 11'; TLB IV 68, 6, 11; TIM II 90, 11 ( $a-n a n a!-a b-r i-i$ ), all ов letters; and George, Iraq 41 (1979), p. 137, no. 49, 1 (Lb contract). $s ̌ a n i s{ }^{s}$ in the commentary $b$ introduces a variant apodosis, which is cited as a quotation of the scholar in $c$.
9 As anticipated by Cavigneaux (loc. cit., p. 237), the order of omens in ms C disallows Durand's reading of commentary $a$ as referring to a dead body (loc. cit., p. 160). Cavigneaux's tentative solution of the difficult ba-ri ba. $\mathrm{ug}_{7}$, which appears in $a$ where one expects šahâ burruma, was to read it as ba-ri-imât for barmāti, but, as he also observed, the passage may well be corrupt.

The reinterpretation by commentaries bc of the "dappled pig" (šah gùn.a) as a quite different animal offers the new variants šah.zé.da.sur.ra=buriyāmu for MSL VIII/2, p. 20, Hh XIV 164: šah.zé.da.bar.sur.ra/zé.e.pa.sur.ra=bur-ma-mu. For this animal, apparently a porcupine, see Landsberger, Fauna, p. 103 f . The phrase appended to this lexical item in b, $s ̌ a ~ z u m u r s ̌ u ~ k \stackrel{\imath}{m} a ~ t ̦ i ̄ m e ~ u s ̣ s u r u, ~ i s ~ a p p a r e n t l y ~ a ~ q u o t a t i o n ~(n o t e ~ s ̌ a ~ i q b \hat{u})$, and offers an etymological explanation of the Sumerian bar.sur.ra, "woven-bodied" (bar=zumru, sur=țamê). For the element zé. da see Landsberger, op. cit., p. $104^{1}$. That the porcupine was classed a kind of pig in Sumerian-as in some modern languages-accounts for the entry bur-ma-mu=šá-hu-u in the synonym list Malku V 48 ( $M S L$ VIII/2, p. 74). The philological extrapolation of porcupine from dappled pig is presumably not simply a display of erudition. The commentators wish to give this line of text a wider application: the omen is to be considered valid not only for observation of the pig, but also for that of an animal not mentioned in the main text.

The commentary on the disease aganutillû in $b$ demonstrates considerable virtuosity in its interpretation of a.ga nu.til, although the poor condition of the text does not allow complete understanding. Collation of $1.20^{\prime}$ has provided a text rather different from that given by previous editors. Though makkūr il̄$l \bar{a} q a \bar{a} t \hat{u}$ seems an unlikely phrase, the following commentary at least partly supports it: nu.til.la provides lā qātû, of course; the consequent deduction that a.ga must supply makkūru (usually níg.ga) seems to be justified by the equation in l. 21'.
13 The association of the ox in the protasis and Ninurta in one of the variant apodoses is made by means of what is probably a literary quotation referring to some customary activity of this god in the ox-stall. Unfortunately I have not been able to restore the verb describing this activity.
14/5 Commentary $a$ quotes the protasis of 1.14 with the apodosis of 15 !
15 The line of quoted text introduced by the phrase ša iqbâ in commentary $b$ is, as Hunger noted (Uruk I, p. 36), from the Lamaštu incantations (Myhrman, ZA 16 (1902), p. 170, 37); its citation is evidently an attempt to demonstrate that variegated colouring is common to both protasis and apodosis, and as such the factor that determines the logic of the sequence. The item dilm. me ${ }^{\text {meš }}$ obviously picks up the apodosis' theme of affliction by the Lamaštu demon, but its function in the commentator's train of thought at this point is not obvious. Perhaps he wished to draw attention to the similarity of this group of signs to ellag(BIR $)^{\text {mess }}=k a l a ̂ t u$ at the end of the preceding quotation; this would show a hidden connection between the demon and kidneys, though it would not add to the present context. What follows next is a vertical quotation of Erimhus VI 80-83 (MSL XVII, p. 83):

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { giš.hur } & =i-\left\ulcorner s i q^{2}-t u \dot{u}^{? 1}\right. \\
\text { sag.ba } & =m a-[m] i-t[u] \\
\text { sag. AN } & =h u r-s{ }^{2} \dot{a}-a n \\
\text { mu.dingir.ra } & =n i-[i] s ̌ \text { ili(dingir) }
\end{array}
$$

(The restoration in 1.80 is new: Landsberger suggested $i-[s] i-[r u]$, and $A H w, \mathrm{p} .391$, offered $i s ̣ u r t u$, but neither is easily compatible with the copy of $M S L$ 's ms A since published by Cavigneaux, $F B$ 20-21 (1980), p. 265. With the proposed new equation cf. the following item from a commentary on an incantation: giš.hur : e-se-qu:e-se-qu:iṣ-sur-tú, "giš.hur='to engrave', 'to engrave'
$=$ 'depiction' '’: Meier, AfO 12 (1937-1939), p. 241, 2. Since esēqu is used of depiction on stele and relief isiqtu is perhaps a portrait on stone, and may occur with such a meaning in an omen apodosis
 will be plague; the land will [...] an engraving of the king'; cf. $A H w$ 's "Bildzeichnung" in this passage.) While the quotation of Erimhuš reintroduces the topic of curse, its use in the scholar's argument is also obscure.

In $b$, after the sign me, the Trennungszeichen and $u m-m u$ are written over an erased $u m-m u$ (collation on fig. 5).
16 For the idiom of bovine behaviour rupušta nasāku, which commentary $a$ offers as a variant reading of the omen's protasis (if the emendation is correct), see Gilgamesh VI 132: alû ana $p a-n i-s \not ́ u ́ i s-\left\ulcorner s u{ }^{7}-k a r u-p u-u[\check{s}-t a]\right.$, "the Bull of Heaven spat slaver in his face".
18 The apodosis is made a logical consequence of the protasis by etymological speculation: the ox is interpreted as a ghost, an obvious symbol of the patient's impending death. The lexical quotation is an inversion of $I d u$ II 215-216: gu-u $_{\text {gu }}^{4}$ $=e$-tem- $[m u]$, al-pu (vat 9712 ii 21-22, cited from $A H w)$.
19 The lexical citation of commentary $b$ is probably quoted from the list $\mathrm{S}^{\text {a }} \mathrm{N} 1^{\prime}-4^{\prime}$, omitting $2^{\prime}$ : $\left.{ }^{\text {si-i }} \mathrm{si}\right]=[q a]-\left\ulcorner a r^{\top}-n u\right.$, [i]-ta-nu, [n]u-ú-ru, [šá]-ru-ru (MSL III, p. 66; l. $1^{\prime}$ as restored in $C A D Q$, p. 134); or from a very similar text. As observed by Lambert, AfO 26 (1979-1980), p. 110, the horn presages the patient's demise because by homophony it represents rays of sunlight. These by their nature diminish (maqātu) with the coming of evening. The line order speaks against Cavigneaux's proposal that this item of commentary treats 1.16 (JCS 34 (1982), p. $236 \mathrm{f}{ }^{26}$ ).
22 The donkeys joined in copulation are a symbol for the fatal bond between the sick man and death, as commentaries $a$ and $b$ show. $b$ also explores an etymological link between the donkey and the inevitability of the patient's fate ( $l \bar{a}$ napṭuru) through speculation on the sign-group la. GA (on which see Durand, loc. cit., p. $161^{28}$ ). The donkey as a portent of death is also found in a line of the seventh Tablet of the series, for which a commentary reads (Hunger, Uruk I 32, rev. 11-13, on Labat, $T D P$, p. 68, $\left.87^{\prime}-92^{\prime}\right)$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { DIŠ } \operatorname{rigim}(\mathrm{gu}) \text { marși(gig) taš-「mi-ma kĭma(gim) rigim } \operatorname{im}[\text { ēri(anše) ana] ud }
\end{aligned}
$$

$i-m e-[r u]$
"If you hear the patient's cry, and it is like the braying of a donkey, he will die
[within] one day"-as was said, "death is the face of Anzû"; Anzû=anš $\hat{u}$
= donkey.

Here the donkey is associated, through homophony with an otherwise unattested-or spontaneously invented-Sumerian loanword, anšû, with the lion-headed eagle Anzû (so already Hunger, p. 41), and so, by the medium of a literary quotation of as yet undetermined origin, with death. Note that a more substantial connection between Anzû and equids may lie behind the scholar's speculation: for Anzû in the shape not of an eagle but of a celestial horse, a Babylonian Pegasus, see Weidner, AfO 19 (1959-1960), p. 108, and Livingstone, Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works, p. 147.
23 The commentaries appear to remark that the disease "Hand of a Man's Wife" is a penalty of the adultery implicit in the sexual euphemism tehu. If the illness was venereal its name gives early recognition to the link between promiscuity and sexual disease.
26 In the light of the commentaries' remarks on rahāsu as referring to striking (specifically with the foot in $a$ ) this verb must describe the act of kicking (cf. already Durand, loc. cit., p. 162, "frapper avec le pied"). The lexical entries Antagal F 249 (MSL XVII, p. 219: gìr gá. gá =ra-ha-ṣu šá šēpi) and $A$ V/l 46 (XIV, p. 408: gu-uzguz =ra-ha-ṣu šá šēpi) will refer to the same activity. This characteristically equine trait is also found in a line of the Gilgamesh Epic which, in describing the immobilization of Humbaba by the winds, contrasts the different manners of bovine and equine aggression (Uruk V ii 13: von Weiher, Bagh. Mitt. 11 (1980), p. $95=$ Uruk III 59):
ul i-nak-kip a-na pa-ni-šú ul i-rah-hi-iṣ ana arki-šú
He is not able to butt to the front of him, nor can he kick to his rear.

The action described by rahassu naturally involves, as the rear legs fly up, a backward movement in the animal that makes it the antithesis of nakapu, the motion of the bull's head as it pushes its horns forward to gore.

On the alternative reasoning offered for this line by commentary $a$, which refers to Adad, see the observations of Lambert, RA 73 (1979), p. 170, note.
30 At first sight a demonic character is suggested for the "Prowling God" by Šurpu III 84-87, where one finds as agents of curses the sequence šēd $\bar{\imath}$ meš $s a-i a-h u-t i$, "wanton spirits", utukkīmeš
 gi-šu-ti, "roving demons". The "prowling god" is glossed in commentary a first as either a god whose name is lost (room for the demon Lātarāk? cf. bc), or the constellation Leo, which is itself explained elsewhere as Lātarāk ( $M S L$ VI, p. 143, $H g$ B II 194: gišur.gu.la $=$ šu $={ }^{\mathrm{d}} l a-t a-r a k$ ), or the Borsippean goddess Gazbaba (a daughter of Nanāy: Weidner, RlA III, p. 153); then as Unnānîši (interpreted as "Carry my Prayer" by Cavigneaux, loc. cit., p. 238), who is further explained as the god Amurru; and lastly as an ešsebû and "(man of) the knot of Narudu". Commentary $b$ also gives a threefold explanation of the "prowling god". The first part of this is marred by a break in the text and an obscure sequence of signs; if one emends what follows šēhu-bAD É me, collated by Bottéro, JCS 34 (1982), p. 241, and clear also to me-to lú!. líl.lá, then one may interpret this sequence of signs as either an idiot (MSL XII, p. 201, ов Lu, Fragm. 1, 14: lú.「líl`.lá=li-il-lum) or the demon (lú).líl.lá>lilû. However that may be, this first part concerns Gazbaba again, ending with what appears to be a literary quotation mentioning her; the second part, repeated in commentary $c$, offers as the "prowling god" the Asakku demon Lātarāk; the third gives Unnānîši. Finally commentary $b$ ties in the "prowling god" of the protasis with the Divine Twins of the apodosis by quotation of an astrological text which cites Lātarāk as one half of a pair of stellar Divine Twins (cf. CT 2645,12 , where the same ${ }^{\text {mul }} m \bar{a} \bar{s} \bar{u}($ maš. tab. ba) šá ina mehret ${ }^{f t \mathrm{mul}_{\text {sipa }}} \mathrm{zi} .\langle\mathrm{an}\rangle$. na $i z z a z z \bar{u}^{z u}$ are the third of seven such sets).

What, then, did the exorcist actually see, that the text calls a "prowling god"? This "prowling god" also occurs in the omen tablet Funck 3, where too he is encountered by someone walking along a street (Köcher-Oppenheim, AfO 18 (1957-1958), p. 76, B9; note in l. 11-13 ominous encounters with exorcist, diviner and medicine-man). Given the solid nature of the other portents in both texts it is clear that something concrete and familiar is indicated by the term "prowling god". The commentaries' explanations equating ilu sahhiru with divine and demonic figures do not help here, in that one does not expect supernatural beings to be treated as visible in the same way that, for example, oxen, pigs and donkeys are. The sighting of the constellation Leo might be a feasible portent, but further evidence will show that the final explanation of commentary $a$ is closest to the mark: the "prowling god" is to be connected with the eššebû and the "(man of) the knot of Narudu". The eššeb $\hat{u}$ was an ecstatic who characteristically indulged in black magic (see $C A D E, \mathrm{p} .371$ ), a kind of shaman-in the loose sense of the wordwho, shunned for his dangerous power, would certainly be an ominous figure. The "knot of Narudu"" (rikis Narudu) recalls a ritual in which the kurgarrû and assinnu tie on (rakāsu) a head-gear of the goddess Narudu as part of a cultic performance (RAcc., p. 115, 7; cf. LKU51, obv. 18; the head-gear is a tillû, "sash", which may have been used as a mask: so CAD A/2, p. $341 ;$ K, p. 558). Whether this second phrase thus describes the ešsebû in terms of a characteristic knotted head-gear (or hairstyle), or is a separate item referring to another kind of cultic figure, remains uncertain while the origin of the citation is unknown; but there is an obvious link between the eššebû and the cultic performer in the ecstatic frenzy that would have been common to both.

In addition to commentary $a$ 's association of the "prowling god" with these figures, a further affinity between him and cultic ecstatics is found in commentary $b$ 's citing of šēhu in explanation of the present line (for šēhu as an ecstatic, cf. in Šumma izbu XI 7 the omen apodosis māta ma-hi-a-tum iṣabbatā(dab) meš, "female ecstatics will seize the land", explained in a commentary as māta še-e-hu i-ṣab-bat, "a frenzied ecstatic will seize the land", with the justification $m a h-h u-u ́=s ̌ e-h a-a-n u$ : Leichty, TCS IV, p. 231, 365d-e). The interpretation of the term "prowling god" as an ecstatic or cultic performer is also given circumstantial support by the coupling of the
present line with the following one，in which the ominous sighting is of a similar figure，the ecstatic priest mahhû．Now the eššeb $\hat{u}$ of commentary $a$ is himself explained as a type of mahhû， as the lexical texts show（LTBA II 1，vi 41：eš－še－bu－u＝mah－hu－u；MSL XII，p．226，Hgg B VI 147：lúan．né．ba．tu $=e s ̌-s ̌ e-b u-\dot{u}=m a h-h u-\dot{u})$ ，and these pairings might suggest again that the ＂prowling god＂was，if not an eššeb $\hat{u}$ ，then someone very similar．But more significant are two lines of the short version of Igituh（Landsberger－Gurney，AfO 18 （1957－1958），p．84，267－268）：

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { lúzilulu(PA. GIŠGAL })^{z} & =s a h-h i-r u \\
\text { lúan.né.ba.tu }(v a r .: ~ t u ́) & =e s ̌-s ̌ e-b u-u
\end{array}
$$

The dictionaries translate this sahhiru as＂tramp，vagabond＂（ $C A D S, \mathrm{p} .56$ ）and＂Hausierer＂ （ $A H w$, p．1009），clearly in recognition of the vagrant（＂prowling＂）life that characterises these figures．But examination of its position in Igituh，following cultic ecstatics and performers （mahhû，zabbu，kulu＇u，assinnu）and preceding not only the eššebû but also other practitioners of magic（naršiddu，ēpiš ipš̃$)$ ，reminds us that ilu sahhiru is found in the company of similar people－ecstatics and professional persons－in the present text and the Funck omen tablet quoted above．It is clear that the sahhiru of Igituh and the ilu sahhiru are one and the same．The cumulative evidence demonstrates that the term（ilu）sahhiru refers to a man of rather particular talents，similar to those of the ecstatic and those of the magician．In the light of this our＂prowling god＂is most probably to be seen as some kind of ecstatic cultic performer whose special profession apparently caused him to be considered divine（a reading dsahhiru instead of ilu sahhiru is not excluded，of course）．

Some explanation is needed to suggest how this ecstatic cultic performer comes to be considered a＂prowling god＂．The appellation of a mortal man as a＂god＂is，with the exception of a few early deified kings，as foreign to Babylonian thought as it is to ours．However，one observes that in primitive societies the frenzy of the ecstatic－be it epileptic or induced by chemical stimulant or physical excitement－is frequently considered to be a symptom of divine possession（for a panoramic，if dated，view see J．G．Frazer＇s chapter on＂Incarnate Human Gods＂in The Golden Bough，chapter 7）．The idea is that the regular，if temporary，seizure of man by god manifestly demonstrates that individual＇s divinity．In effect，he personifies a god， and the god is incarnate in him．The divine inspiration of the ecstatic is a notion familiar to ancient Mesopotamia，and may be implicit in the terminology．Sumerian lúan．né．ba．tu，of which eššebû is the Akkadian equivalent，possibly means＂one afflicted by heaven＂＇（tu ． $\mathrm{r}=$ marāṣu， suggested to me as appropriate by Shaffer）：in the light of the variant in the passage of Igituh quoted above，and now commentary $a^{\prime}$ s lúan．na．ba．ti，tu in this phrase can be read tu or dú but not $\mathrm{ku}_{4}$ ，so the interpretation of the phrase as＂one who has been entered by a divine power＂， put forward in $C A D E$ ，p．371，is only tenable if one admits the evidence of glosses in late lexical texts（ $\mathbf{T U}=e r e \bar{e} b u$ is glossed with 「du ${ }^{\text {？1 }}-\mathrm{u}$ in $\mathrm{S}^{b}$ I 196 （MSL III，p．113，corrected in IV，p．206）； and with tu in vat 10270，vi 19：known to me from $A H w$ ，p．234；for other interpretations of lúan．né．ba．tu／an．na．ba．ti see Durand，$R A 73$（1979），p． 162 f．${ }^{34}$ ）．Similarly lú ${ }_{\text {AN }}$ ．dib．ba．ra， a term for another kind of ecstatic（Akk．mahhû，see Erimhuš III 169，quoted by commentary a on the next line），may be interpreted as＂one struck by a passing god＂．The temporary nature of the frenzy explains the adjective sahhiru：the god constantly prowls from place to place like the malignant demons with which this discussion opened，entering now this individual and now that．But unlike those demons he is no foul incubus in search of a victim；instead he seeks a human medium through whose inspiration divine will can be revealed．The suggestion is thus that the Babylonian term ilu sahhiru，＂prowling god＂，when used with reference to a certain kind of ecstatic cultic performer，is a legacy of the very ancient superstition that ecstatic frenzy is an attribute of incarnate gods，which has survived into a period whose view of the lowly place of human beings in the universe would never permit the fresh coinage of such a term．
31 Rather than attesting an independent reading，ms B＇s variant gim har kù（coll．）for mahhâ may be an example of ancient editorial：a broken ${ }^{「} m a h-h a{ }^{\top}$ or ${ }^{「} m a-a h-h a{ }^{7}$ might conceivably be misread as such．

In commentaries $a b$ the dependence of the apodosis on the protasis is demonstrated by associating the Sumerian for mahh $\hat{u}$, lú.gub.ba, with Ninurta's name Lugalibigubba, as already explained by Lambert, RA 73 (1979), p. 170, note. Commentary $a$ goes on to quote vertically the lexical passage Erimhuš III 169-172 (MSL XVII, p. 51), listing cultic personnel. Note that the variant to $z a b-b u$ in 1.170 , ms $\mathrm{S}_{9}$, will now read $a$-hur- $[r u-u]$ with our citation, and since this development sheds new light on an old problem, it must be asked again what this person is, and whether here and elsewhere he is to be read amurrû or ahurrû. The appearance of this word among cultic personnel leads one to suppose that the lexical entry $a-r a-r u-\dot{u}=k u-l u-{ }^{\prime} u$ in a synonym list ( $L T B A$ II 1, vi 48) conceals in the hapax legomenon *ararû a corruption of ahurrû. However this may be, the unequivocally cultic context of this word as it appears in Erimhuś, at least, appears at first to clash with our understanding of ahurrû as a young boy or ruffian, someone of contemptible status (see $C A D \mathrm{~A} / 1, \mathrm{p} .216$; $A H w, \mathrm{p} .23$ ); and amurrû, "Amorite", does not seem wholly appropriate to a such a context either. The presence in the same citation of the well-known androgynous cultic figures, kurgarr $\hat{u}$ and assinnu, calls to mind the proverb in which the [a]-h/mur-ru-ú exchanges (sexual) roles with his wife ( $B W L, \mathrm{p} .226$, i 1-7). This can be restored as follows:
$[a]-h / m u r-r u-u ́[a-n] a$ aššati(dam)-šu i-qab-bi $[a t]-t i l u$ et-lu $[a-n a-k] u$ lu ar-da-tu
$[i-n u-m] a$ a-na ettli(guruš) at-tu-ru [at-ti l]u si-ni-šu [a-na-ku l]u zi-ka-ru
The ahurrû/amurrû says to his wife, "You be the man, I'll be the girl! [When]
I've changed back to a man, [you] be the female, [I'll be] the male!"

From this it seems that ahurrû or amurrû denotes a man who in sexual intercourse typically took the part of a woman (or boy), and this is the justification for the new translation "catamite". As a temple servant he would be a male prostitute, probably transvestite, a role that is often suggested for his peers in Erimhuš, the kurgarrû and assinnu (e.g. by Bottéro, RlA IV, pp. 463466). The sex life of the married professional catamite would be an obvious target for ribald comment of the sort attested by the proverb. Note in passing that the activities of this fellow were not confined to prostitution: the etymology of the Sumerian equivalent for ahurrû or amurrû given in commentary $a$ 's citation of Erimhuš III 170, lúní.zu.ra.ah, may allude to cultic self-mutilation of some kind (see CAD Z, p. 7).

Still it will be asked whether this fellow is ahurrû or amurrû. We cannot refute the idea that playing the catamite may have been a typically Amorite practice, whether cultic or secular (see Lambert and Landsberger, BWL, p. 230), but it is also easy to imagine that the term "catamite" would readily become used as an insult of any despicable person. Since this very usage is witnessed by the association in lexical texts of ahurrû (usually written unambiguously $a-h u-r u-u$ ) and such words of contempt as nu' $\hat{u}$, ishappu, guzallu, lillu, makkann $\hat{u}$ and $a k \hat{u}$, our feeling is that the catamite was an ahurru rather than amurrû.

The relevance of the commentary on Namtar in $b$ is obscure. The equation nam.tar $=m u r s u^{u} u$ is also known from MSL XIII, p. 221, Izi Q 274; mūtu is provisionally restored from the synonym list LTBA II 2, 264: nam-t $[a-r u=m] u-u-t u ́$.
32 As noted by Hunger and Durand both commentaries adapt a horoscope which associates deafness with the influence of ${ }^{\text {mul }}$ ud.ka.duh.a ( $T C L$ VI $14=$ Sachs, JCS 6 (1952), p. 67, rev. 32), and this being the star of Nergal ( ${ }^{m u l}$ Apin I: $C T 331, \mathrm{i} 28$ ) the commentators thereby demonstrate a dependence of apodosis on protasis. Commentary a apparently seeks a further link with Nergal in the quotation of Šumma izbu IV 38 and its commentary; but the significance of the name of Nippur Durgišlû (Sum. Dur-gišlam) in respect of Nergal is unknown. Durand rightly called attention to Erimhuš V 21-23 (MSL XVII, p. 67):

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { dur.giš.lam.ma } & =d u r-g i s ̌-l a m \\
\text { nibru }^{\mathrm{ki}} & \\
\text { ki.in.giki } & \\
& =s i-i p-p u-m e-r u-u \text { ú }
\end{aligned}
$$

Here it is further assumed that commentary a explains Durgišlû by vertical quotation of the first two entries of this group.

33 Commentaries $a b$ both open with a citation of the same two equivalences of Sumerian ba.an.za that are found in the commentary on Šumma izbu I 54 (Leichty, TCS IV, p. 212, 23). The connection between protasis and apodosis is made explicit in commentaries bc with the interpretation of ba.an.za as "half a man": ba.an suggests bán, a value of maš, "half", which yields Ninurta ( ${ }^{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{MAŠ5}$ ). In addition $b$ explains Ninurta's name Šaddari ( $C T 2512,10$ ) as "half", via the obscure word šá-da-rí (if such it is). For a discussion of sūlu (šullu) and šullānu as gnomish figures, against von Soden's tentative "große Warze" and "mit Warzen Bedeckter" ( $A H w$, p. 1267), see Durand, loc. cit., p. $165^{45}$.

34 For ubbuṭu, rather than lā nātilu, as the most likely equivalent of lúigi.nu.tuku in sb texts see Farber, Akkadisch "blind", $Z A 75$ (1985), pp. 210-233, esp. p. 229 f.
35 For pagra one might alternatively read mītu(lú.úš), "dead man". As the commentary explains, the dead body is interpreted as the patient's substitute, and his recovery is assured. On the symbolism of substitution see above, on l. 4.
36 In commentary $a$ one should, perhaps, emend ana to šáa, and read more felicitously imnūšu ša āšipi izaqqis[su].
42 The justification of the apodosis from the protasis is achieved by simple lexical speculation. $\mathrm{u}=u b \bar{a} n u$ is commonly attested in both lexical texts and logographic usage; for the second equation see MSL XIV, p. 281, A II/4 31: ${ }^{\text {u }} \mathbf{u}=q a b$-rum.
44 In commentary $b$ ù.ma $=$ ernettu, nizmatu, ù.na $=k a d a ̄ r u$, igi.hुus $=n e k e l m \hat{u}$, but their relevance to the line under discussion is unclear to me.
46 All three commentaries call attention to Ištar's celestial association as Venus with the constellation Auriga (this apparently stretches the astronomical facts a little: modern Auriga lies near the ecliptic, but not quite on the path of Venus). $b$ goes on to give two expositions of the sign $U$ in its value $u b u_{\mathrm{x}}\left(\mathrm{GE}_{23}\right)$. The first of these identifies it with the star Dilibat (Venus). The second exposition, as already seen by von Soden in $A H w$, p. 1400, is based on the standard equivalence between surface measure and volume measure in the early Neo-Babylonian system of land measurement, and quotes an equation which finds fuller expression in the metrological table appended to the E-sagil Tablet (Babylonian Topographical Texts, no. $13=T C L$ VI 32,
 thus symbolises Ištar because $1 s \bar{u} t u 3 q \hat{u}=15 q \hat{u}$, and 15 is her number. This brings us to the significance of the sign $U$ in the exposition. In the third millennium the sign for "chariot" could be written with lagabxu (gigir) rather than with lagabxbad (gigir); indeed gisgigir was used exclusively in Lagaš at the time of Uruinimgina (see Rosengarten, RSP, p. 128 on no. 259). Though it later fell out of use in conventional orthography, the sign gigir(lagabxu) was preserved in the lexical tradition ( $M S L$ XIV, p. 178, Ea I 48-50: lagabxbad, lagabxdílitenû, lagabxu =nar-kab-tu; see also p. 212, A I/2 144-147; VI, p. 5, Hh $h$ V 4-6), and so was well known to scholars in the first millennium. Thus the chariot, orthographically the sign U enclosed within a square box, is taken by our commentary to depict pictographically Ištar residing as the star Dilibat within the constellation Auriga. By this ingenuity the diagnosis given in the apodosis is seen to rely on the portent observed in the protasis.

In this and the following line commentary $a$ deftly defines the chariot as a vehicle such as might be driven by a king or high official ( sa rēssi), while a rather different vehicle, the saparru, is seen as typical of the less exalted dignitary (on saparru, which seems to have been a comfortable family saloon, see Durand, loc. cit., p. $166^{47}$ ). The less flamboyant status of this carriage is also evinced by a na letter which puts the grandee in a sedan chair, the second-ranked in a saparru, and the ordinary fellow on a mule (ABL 1285, rev. 18-19: dan-nu-ti ina gis̆ kussémes̀ lúšani-ú-ti

47 The restoration of the apodosis in the main text relies on unpublished ms $\mathrm{F}: \mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{r}} \mathrm{ud}^{\text {meš }}$-šú gid. da $^{\text {meš }}$.
48 On tallaktum, a type of heavy goods vehicle, see Durand, loc. cit., p. $166^{48}$. Commentary b, as restored here, offers ariktu as a variant for tallaktu, and $c$ agrees, citing an equation not found elsewhere, [gis̆mar.gid.d]a $=$ ariktu (the restoration of gišmar.gid.da rather than giš.gid.da is demanded on the grounds of space). Though usually a kind of spear, ariktu cannot be a weapon
in this context-the following phrase clearly describes it as a vehicle, as Hunger noted-and one must understand the word as an adjective, with ellipsis of the nominal referent: (ereqqu) ariktu. Such ellipsis is not an uncommon phenomenon in lexical texts where a nominal referent appears in a preceding line. Two appropriate examples are $M S L$ VI, p. 11 f., $H h$ V 73-79, where gišmar.gid.da $=e-r e q-q u$, and various types of giš̀mar.gid.da are then listed by adjective only-su-mu-tu, na-sik-tu, su-bu-ri-tu, e-la-mi-tu, qu-ú-ti-tu; and MSL V, p. 179, Hh IV 346-347, where one must refer back to the earlier line gis má=e-lep-pu (262) in order to understand correctly gišmá.gid.da $=a-$-rik-tum, "long(boat)", gišmá.sig.ga $=s i-i q-t u m$, "narrow(boat)".
49 The apodosis is restored from unpublished ms F: gi[g.b]i 「ti'. For gabagallu as part of a vehicle see $M S L$ VI, p. $6, H_{h}$ V 19-21: gis̆gaba.gál.gigir =ir-tum, šu-lum; and the dictionaries. In the light of the commentaries' explanation of it as a "box" (pitnu), the "chest" of a wagon suggests not the "Stirnwand" (AHw, p. 271) or "front guard" (Civil, JAOS 88 (1968), p. 10) but the part nearest the ground, the floor or body of the vehicle: the comparison is with the chest of the quadruped rather than the biped. Thus what the exorcist sees is a small wagon-of the kind pulled by a single animal, as the commentaries expain-stripped of wheels, axles and shaft. In commentary $a$, giš̆mar. šum (Akk. mayyāltu, a wheeled vehicle of some kind) is also a possibility following pitnu (so Durand, loc. cit., p. 167).
title The explanations of the series' title Sakikku given by commentary a appear in other prognostic omen commentaries (Hunger, Uruk I $39,9^{\prime}$; cf. 31, 33 f.), and are probably traditional interpretations. There they are supported by etymological analysis of sa.gig: sa=riksu, $\mathrm{sa}=$ napharu (the former is confirmed by MSL XVII, p. 224, Antagal G 127, the latter reiterated in Hunger, Uruk I 84, 19). With them may be compared the similar expressions used by the redactor Esagil-kin-aplī in the subscript to his catalogue of prognostic and diagnostic omen tablets: sa-kik-ka ri-kis murși u ri-kis k[u-ri], "Sakikku, knot of illness and knot of stupor" (Finkel, in Leichty et al. (eds.), A Scientific Humanist: Studies...Sachs, p. 148, B 28'; a variant adds [u ri-kis $a-d i] r-t i$, " $[$ and knot of] apprehension"). As Hunger noted (Uruk I, p. 48), the phrase "all illnesses" is an appropriate description of the subject of Sakikku. The exact significance of a "knot of illness" is not so clear; can it be that which is seen to bind a malady to the afflicted, and so perhaps a disease's physical manifestation? In this regard one recalls the translation of sa.gig =sakikku as "symptom" put forward by Kinnier Wilson (Iraq 18 (1956), p. 140 f.) and supported by Oppenheim (OrNS 31 (1962), p. 31 f.).
colophon of ms a For the scribal ancestor Absummu "the Sumerian" in colophons of tablets from late Achæmenid Nippur see Oelsner, RA 76 (1982), p. 94 f. The use of this title where in colophons an adjective denoting the ancestor's city-e.g. Uruk $\hat{u}$ or Dēr $\hat{u}-$ often appears suggests to me that by these late scribes the adjective Šumerû was employed as a learned term for "the Nippurian". The scholarly tradition which equated Sumer with Nippur is of course well established in the lexical literature: see, e.g., MSL XI, p. 11, Hh XXI 3, ki.in.giki $=n i-i p-p u-r u$, and the grouping of Nippurû and Šumerû in one section of Erimhuš (V 21-23, quoted above in the note on 1.32).


In the spirit of Civil's remark that commentaries have the incidental benefit of helping "the lexicographer in his reconstruction of the native lexical traditions" (JNES 33 (1974), p. 329), it may be of use to conclude with a summary list of the lexical passages that have so far been identified as quoted by the composers of the three commentary tablets (mss abc). Quotations documenting commonly attested equivalences, e.g. $\mathrm{ki}=a \check{r} r u$, gur $=t \hat{a} r u$, are omitted, along with other extracts of single lines which cannot be attributed for certain to a particular source.

| Lexical Text | Commentary | Line <br> of Sakikku I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hh III 303 | $a[b] c$ |  |
| Erimhuš I a 29-31 | $b c$ | 2 |
| A VIII/3 comm. 23 | $a b$ | 3 |
| Hh XIV 164 | $b c$ | 6 |
| Erimhuš VI 80-83 | $b$ | 9 |
| Idu II 215-216 | $b$ | 15 |
| S $^{\text {a N 1', 3'-4' or similar }}$ | $b$ | 18 |
| Erimhuš III 169-172 | $a$ | 19 |
| Izi Q 274 | $b$ | 31 |
| Erimhuš V 21-22? | $a$ | 31 |
| A II/4 31 | $b$ | 32 |
|  |  | 42 |
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A new duplicate of Tablet I of Sakikku, the Babylonian diagnostic and prognostic omen series, discovered among the folios of the late Prof. Sidney Smith, and another from the Sippar collections of the British Museum almost completely restore the text and prompt a new, fully annotated, critical edition of both the main text and the three tablets of commentary.
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Fig. 5. - Collations of mSS ACb


[^0]:    1. RA 82 (1988), pp. 139-162. I have had the pleasure of discussing some aspects of this paper with Prof. W. G. Lambert, but responsibility for errors is my own. вм $38362,54629,54653+54982+55256$ and $54653 a$ +54843 are published by permission of the Trustees of the British Museum. Small adjustments have been made in Smith's copy of вм 38362 after careful collation of the tablet. Collations of other tablets appear by permission of the Director of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Baghdad, and the curators of the tablet collections of the Iraq Museum, Baghdad, the Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin, and the Oriental Institute, Chicago. Abbreviations are those of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary.
    2. For the meaning of sa.gig=sakikku see below, on the traditional interpretations of the series title which conclude commentary $a$ (p.162). Additional published sources for the series as a whole (besides those in Borger, $H K L$, and those given below) are Hunger, Uruk I 29-42; and von Weiher, Uruk III 86-89. On the compilation and reconstruction of the series Sakikku see now also Finkel, Adad-apla-iddina, Esagil-kin-apli, and the Series sa. gig, in Leichty et al. (eds), A Scientific Humanist: Studies in Memory of Abe Sachs (Philadelphia, 1988), p. 143-159.
    3. Labat, TDP I, p. 2-6.
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[^1]:    collection accessioned in London on 22nd May 1882, which was made up of tablets retrieved by Rassam from Kuyunjik, Babylon and, especially, Sippar-Abu Habbah (see Reade in Leichty, Catalogue VI, p. xxxir f.). Clearly Sippar or Babylon was the provenance of this particular manuscript, but it is not possible to determine which. By all accounts it cannot have come from Uruk, which was outside Rassam's sphere of operation.
    10. For the provenance of ao 17661, as well as its date in the late Persian period, see the discussion of its colophon by Oelsner, RA 76 (1982), p. 94 f.
    11. Les noms de Marduk, l'écriture et la "logique" en Mésopotamie ancienne, Finkelstein Mem. Vol., pp. 5-28.
    12. Durand, RA 79 (1973), p. 168 ff.; A. Livingstone, Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars (Oxford, 1986), p. 49 ff.; Cavigneaux, AulaOr 5 (1987), p. 246 ff.
    13. On this see the remarks of Meier, AfO 12 (1937/9), p. 237 ff .

[^2]:    14. Sammelfund W. 22307, for which see Hunger, Uruk I, pp. 11-13, where the scholastic background of many of the library's commentary tablets is also noted.
    15. Though he is recorded as the owner of one tablet.
[^3]:     16 A : si-šu D om. gig.bí DE om. 2nd apodosis; 17 AE : ik-kil-muš; 17-18 D om. gig. bi; 18 AE: ik-kip-šú; 20 E : tin-ma; 20-21 D om. gig.bi; 21 E : is-sal-la-'-ma, tiut; 23-24 D: ba. $\mathrm{ug}_{7} ; 23-26 \mathrm{D}$ om. gig. bi; 25 B : gùn]. 「a igi gig. [bi;

