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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 u₂₄₃₅₃₄₂₅₅₇, has been presented in a variorum edition by Aaron Shaffer. 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 ISER 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. Additional manuscripts in Istanbul, London and Baghdad have become available in cuneiform over the years: ISER I pl. 199 Ni 9847, ISER II pl. 51 Ni 9626, CT 58 no. 54 and Cavigneaux, Urak (AWE 23) no. 98. The two tablets from Mē-Turan announced in 1993 have since been published alongside editions of UETVI nos. 59 and 60 from Ur; the latter is a manuscript that continues the poem after the place where it ends in the scribal traditions of Nippur and Mē-Turan. Further pieces from Nippur have been identified in Philadelphia, Chicago and Baghdad, especially during the cataloguing of the 3N-I collections from Area TA. Two fragments cut down from a single tablet of unknown provenance are now in the Schøyen Collection awaiting definitive publication (Fig. 15). A tablet from Isin is also still to be published, as are further pieces from Ur.

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. 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 Gilgames’, 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.


7. I am grateful to M. Civil 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 (Il. 172-end) is given here in syncopic 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–F) and supplemented by Attinger (GG–Kk),94 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–m).

All sources for Il. 172ff. currently known to me in Philadelphia (MSS H, W, Y, Z, AA, CC, DD, EE, FF, SS, SS–UU, CCC–EEE), London (MSS r, t, k, l, mm, nn) and Oslo (MS rr) have been studied at first hand. The results of these collations are incorporated in the transcriptions given below.98 Most changes to the previously available text are minor, but substantive new readings have been obtained in Il. 204, 228–9, 260, 266, 271, d, e, f, k, l, m, n and s 1. MS nr offers significant new knowledge of Il. 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>N</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>1–27, 52–74</td>
<td>Shaffer, ‘Sumerian Sources’, pl. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>14067</td>
<td>1–25, 26–58</td>
<td>Chiera, SEM no. 31, photograph Kramer, Sumerian Mythology, pl. 8 (obv. only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N–T</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>1–14, 23–33</td>
<td>Shaffer, ‘Sumerian Sources’, pl. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>990y</td>
<td>7–16</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N–T</td>
<td>903, 132</td>
<td>1–10, 36–45</td>
<td>Shaffer, ‘Sumerian Sources’, pl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>4507</td>
<td>1–18, 46–64</td>
<td>Kramer in Shaffer, ‘Sumerian Sources’, pl. 4; JEF 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>4249</td>
<td>1–23, 63–75, b–e</td>
<td>Kramer, SLTN no. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>15150 +19950</td>
<td>11–26, 62–86, 98–112, 127–49, 177–92, 196–235, 231–68, a–c, q–t</td>
<td>Shaffer, ‘Sumerian Sources’, pl. 5–6; photograph Kramer, From the Tablets of Sumer, p. 140, Fig. 69 (CBS 19950 only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

94 The literary history is given above, in Ch. 1.
96 Collection of the Ur MSS of Il. 1–171 produced only one significant result: Il. 157–2 on MS r (JEF 156 obv. 10) traces are visible of 50 mu lines. I have not used MS XX.
97 As kindly confirmed by Kevin Dunn, this is the full number of the assemblage copied by Shaffer as MS H and catalogued by Gerndt, A Bibliography of the Tablet Collections of the University Museums, p. 188.
<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, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>3N-T 905, 198</td>
<td>13–23</td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2513</td>
<td>40–7, 63–74</td>
<td>Chiera, SRT no. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>CBS 13121</td>
<td>65–81, 100–18</td>
<td>Radau, HAV no. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ N 3137</td>
<td></td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>HS 1445</td>
<td>75–104</td>
<td>Bernhardt, TiaM nr III no. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ni 4354</td>
<td>106–15, 141–7</td>
<td>Kramer in Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 4; ISET II 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>CBS 9869</td>
<td>105–50</td>
<td>Chiera, SEM no. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>3N-T 124</td>
<td>125–69</td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 7–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Ni 9744</td>
<td>126–31, ii unplaced</td>
<td>Kramer in Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 4; ISET II 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Ni 2270</td>
<td>135–59</td>
<td>Langdon, BE XXXI no. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>3N-T 905, 190</td>
<td>138–42, 151–5</td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>907, 262</td>
<td></td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>HS 1482</td>
<td>173–81, 204–24,</td>
<td>Bernhardt, TiaM nr III no. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 2502 + 2612</td>
<td>249–52, 262–8</td>
<td>(HS 1482 only); Wilcke, Kollationen, p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>CBS 10400</td>
<td>176–85, 237–9</td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>UM 29–16–463</td>
<td>183–97, 226–38</td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 10 (without N 2696)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>UM 29–16–58</td>
<td>188–221</td>
<td>Kramer, From the Tablets of Sumer, fig. 70; id., History Begins at Sumer, p. 259, fig. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>UM 29–16–58</td>
<td>199–214, 225–32</td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Ni 2378</td>
<td>228–47, 252–65</td>
<td>Langdon, BE XXXI no. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Ni 1470</td>
<td>253–8, ii traces</td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>CBS 13116</td>
<td>255–68, a–e, i–k, o, q–t, u</td>
<td>Radau, HAV no. 11 (13116 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>13560</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>3N-T 927, 527</td>
<td>256–62</td>
<td>Ciğ/Kazluyu, ISET I 1194 (+) JJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>UM 29–13–536</td>
<td>259–68, h</td>
<td>Shaffer, 'Sumerian Sources', pl. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>Ni 4585</td>
<td>234–48</td>
<td>Ciğ/Kazluyu, ISET I 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>Ni 9847</td>
<td>136–41, 177–82</td>
<td>Ciğ/Kazluyu, ISET I 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI</td>
<td>Ni 9626</td>
<td>231–42</td>
<td>Kramer, ISET II 51 (+) GG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>UM 29–15–847</td>
<td>i, k, o, q–t, t</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>N 4507</td>
<td>230–9</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>UU</td>
<td>3N-T 902, 66</td>
<td>222–9 // 231–7</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</td>
<td>119–23</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 etc.</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGG</td>
<td>UM 29–16–740</td>
<td>?–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 S8 no. 54 |
| k₂  | BM 99876      | 4–12        | Geller, CT S8 no. 54 |

**Ur**

| g   | URx44        | 1–30, 31–62  | Gadd, UETVI no. 55 |
| r   | U 9364       | 128–63, 164–201 | Gadd, Rd 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, i–t, q–t, t, w–y | Gadd, UETVI no. 58 |
| mm  | Unnumbered   | f–i, m, q, t–t | Gadd, UETVI no. 59 |
| nn  | U 1790fL     | traces, 1–17' | Gadd, UETVI no. 60 (rev. only) |
| iii etc. | U 5635 etc. | forthcoming in UETVI3 |

**Išu**

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

**Uruk**

| oo  | W 17259ad    | 70–81        | Falkenestein in Cavigneaux, Uruk no. 98 |

---

*Revised: 1:5... kg14 [....2:1...]. im mu 10...3:1...]. un dabi [unug4...4:...]. še im...
Transliteration

172 V i 1' sti.kim? ma mu-e nagar ra1 [a... dla.gal.lam
r 45 u3, ba eellag mu-e nagar ra ka mu uk.ma mu.dal.la
1 1 XI 1 tuma puku sus bit naggi2 ri[a2[e2

173 V i 2' dam nagar ra ama ugu mu-ga / nu 'uk ma da.dal la lam
r 46 dam nagar ra ama ugu mu-ga / nu 'uk ma da.dal la lam
2 1 XII XI 1 [zaDat naggi2 ri ka umm] / datiya3 ri [esi2

174 V i 3' dumu nagar ra nin, ban da mu gin, nu uk.ma da.dal la lam
r 47 dumu nagar ra nin, ban da mu gin, nu uk.ma da.dal la lam
3 1 XII XI 1 m[nari naggi2 ri ka bi] asta[yu] 2[ti] ri [esi2

175 V i 4' eellag [mu] kur.she mu da sab a ba a ma ra ab, e1, de
r 48 eellag mu kur.ta a ba im.ta e1, de
2 1 XII XI 1 tuma pu[kku] ana era[ti] im[utani][n(uru)]

176 V i 5' sti.kim ma ma ganzi [r.e mu da sab] a ba a ma ra ab, e1, de
W iii 1' [.....] ganzi [tja] [.....]
r 49 sti.kim ma ma ganzi [ta a ba im.ta e1, de
2 1 XII XI 1 m[bbi] ana e[rs4] im[nu][tani][n(uru)]

177 V iv 1' [en.ki.dug.e] /m[bil.gam] mes inim mu1, [ni.ib gi, gi]
W ii 1' [.....]

178 H iv 2' lugal.m[.u er] e ne ba.she, she, she, she [.....]
V i 7' lugal.mur e ne ba.she, en sa.hul a na,a.shu e de
W iii 3' [.....]
HH rev. 2' [.....]
r 51 lugal.mur e ne ba.she, she, she, she, she[sa] a na,a.shul ba.gi
XII 12 b[tti mina tabi lida ha a temun]

179 H iv 3' eellag.zu ku[r], ta ga e ma mu ra [.a .a...]
V i 8' [.....]
W iii 4' [.....]
HH rev. 3' [.....]
r 52 uu da eellag ku kur.ta ga. e hu. mu. ra ab, e, de
XII 8 tuma pukkan usa era[i] ana tu[u](6[l4kka]

180 H iv 4' sti.kim ma za[u] ganzi ta ga e ga [.a...]
V i 9' sti.kim ma za ganzi ta ()[ga]1 e ga. mu. ra ab, e, de
W iii 5' sti.kim ma zu igiz.ta, ta ga e ga [.a...]
HH rev. 4' [.....]
r 53 sti.kim ma zu ganzi ta ga e hu. mu. ra a[b, e1, d] e
XII 9 mimbel usa era[i] ana tu[u][6[l4kka]

181 H iv 5' [bil.gam] esas[.e] en ki dug e inim mu [na, ni, ib, gi, gi]
V i 10' [.....]
W iii 6' bil.gam.es en ku [k].dug ra in[.....]
HH rev. 5' [.....]
r om.
XII 10 Gisgabes Enkidu (ippalu)

182 H iv 6' tukum.bi uu, da kur sel e mu in, e1, de
W iii 7' uu da kur ra mu un, e1, [.....]
HH rev. 6' [.....]
r 54 tukum.bi uu, da kur sel e im, e a e1, d, de
XII 11 summa ana era[ti] (narrad)

183 H iv 7' [na ga ri a..........]
W iii 8' [na ga ri na ri mu] [.....]
Y obv. 1 [.....]
XII 12 ana astir[i] (ba taladdad)

184 H iv 8' [inim ga ra ab, d][u] [.....]
W iii 9' inim ga ra ab, (.....) g[i] (.....)
Y obv. 2 [.....] ga ra ab, du, inim mu se g[i] [.....]

One source transposes 183-4:
184 r 55 inim ga ra dug, inim mu he, dab
185 r 56 inim ga e ri na [ru] mu he, dab
...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z</th>
<th>om.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>obv. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>207</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>208</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>209</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>210</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>211</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>212</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>213</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**


16 *Id.*, p. 1 and fn. 2.


18 *Id.*


20 Not nu, um, gid, i.
Five sources transpose ll. 236–7:

237 H v 7' [............] m.e.unu,sub.kur.re-im.ma.an.dab₂
BB obv. 9 (ki) nam.ni,ke₃, m.e.unu,sub.kur.re-im.ma.an.dab₂
GG 3' [............] ta.ke₃, m.e[.............]
JJ 6' [............] nu.unu,sub.kur.re[......] dab₂

238 H v 8–9' [?]udug₂ .ni.e₃, eri₃, gaḫ₃ sag šu.ni.du₃, nu.unu,un.dab₂, kur.r[e] .im.ma.an.dab₂
BB obv. 10–11 [?]udug₂ .ni.e₃, gaḫ₃ sag šu.ni.du₃, nu.unu,un.dab₂, kur.r[e] .im.ma.an.dab₂
GG 4–5' [?]udug₂ .ni.e₃, eri₃, gaḫ₃ sag šu.ni.du₃, nu.unu,un.dab₂, kur.r[e] .im.ma.an.dab₂
JJ 7–8' [?]udug₂ .ni.e₃, gaḫ₃ sag šu.ni.du₃, nu.unu,un.dab₂, kur.r[e] .im.ma.an.dab₂

One source transposes ll. 246–7:

246 H v 12' i.na.ni.kur.ta e₁₃, d.[ē] m]u.na.₃
BB obv. 14 i.na.ni.kur.ta e₁₃, d.[ē] m]u.na.₃
GG 8' i.na.ni.kur.ta e₁₃, d.[ē] m]u.na.₃
THE STANDARD BABYLONIAN EPIC

249 H v 21' [za].e tuša ėr ga.ē[1] ga.taš ga.ē[t]
V iii 1' za.[. . . . . . . . . .]
r1 i 1'
x[. . . . . . . . . .]
XII 94-5

250 H v 22' [giš? šu bi.in.tag [giš] ša.žu ba.e.bûl
V iii 2' x[. . . . . . . . . .]
r1 ii 2'
uš[tš]
XII 96

251 H v 23' [x x (x) mu.u.n.lu.d[n] bi.in.dug
V iii 3' u[š[š]]
XII 96

252 H v 24' [x x sumun] 1,1.gin uš bi.in.tas[ag]
V iii 4' g[alš] [ . . . . . . . . . .]
BB rev. 1' [. . . . . . . . . .]
CC iii 1' [. . . . . . . . . .]
r1 i 4'
galš ta.la (me)[. . . . . . . . . .]
XII 97

253 H v 25' [. . . . . . . . . .]
BB rev. 2' [. . . . . . . . . .]
CC iii 2' [. . . . . . . . . .]
r1 i 5'
galš la ki.in[. . . . . . . . . .]
XII 98

254 H v 26' [. . . . . . . . . .]
BB rev. 3' [. . . . . . . . . .]
CC iii 3' [. . . . . . . . . .]
r1 i 6'
en.e uš bi.in.dug sahar ra baš[. . . . . . . . . .]
XII 100

255 H v 27'-8' lu.dumu ni diš.ām igi bi.duš.ām [igī ti]šuš.ām a.naɡin a.na.ak
BB rev. 4' [. . . . . . . . . .]
CC iii 4' [. . . . . . . . . .]
DD obv. 1 [. . . . . . . . . .]
qqa [ . . . . . . . . . .]
r1 i 5' lu.dumu ni diš.ām [. . . . . . . . . .]
XII 102

256 H v 29' e.gag e.gar.r4 a.na ab.[r ū] a [gīš] ga i[i]
BB rev. 5' [. . . . . . . . . .]
CC iii 5' e.gag.gar. ra.an ab.[r ū] a [gīš] ga [...]
DD obv. 2 [. . . . . . . . . .]
EE 1 [. . . . . . . . . .]
qqa [ . . . . . . . . . .]
r1 i 9' e.gag e.gar.r4 [...]
XII 103

257 H v 30'-1' lu.dumu ni min.ām igi bi.duš.ām igi bi.duš.ām a.na.ɡin a.na.ak
BB rev. 6' [luš] lu.dumu ni min.ām igi bi.duš.ām a.na.ɡin a.na.ak
CC iii 6' lu.dumu ni min.ām igi bi.duš.ām igi bi.duš.ām [...]
DD obv. 3a [. . . . . . . . . .]
EE 2 [. . . . . . . . . .]
pp rev. 1'-2' [. . . . . . . . . .]
qqa obv. 4-5 [. . . . . . . . . .]
r1 i 10' lu.dumu ni min.ām [. . . . . . . . . .]
XII 104

258 H v 32' sig a a lu.šu ni.d[a] a.gi.e,
BB rev. 7' sig a a lu.šu ni.d[a] a.gi.e,
CC iii 7' sig a a lu.šu ni.d[a] a.gi.e,
DD obv. 3b sig a a lu.šu ni.d[a] a.gi.e,
EE 3 [. . . . . . . . . .]
pp rev. 3' [x x][x]
qqa obv. 6 [. . . . . . . . . .]
r1 i 11' sig a a lu.šu [. . . . . . . . . .]
XII 105

259 H v 33' lu.dumu ni eš.ām igi bi.duš.ām igi bi.duš.ām a.na.ɡin a.na.ak
BB rev. 8' lu.dumu ni eš.ām igi bi.duš.ām igi bi.duš.ām a.na.ɡin a.na.ak
BB rev. 9' [. . . . . . . . . .]
DD obv. 4a [. . . . . . . . . .]
EE 4 [. . . . . . . . . .]
FF 1' [. . . . . . . . . .]
pp rev. 4'-5' [. . . . . . . . . .]
qqa obv. 7-8 [. . . . . . . . . .]
rq i 12' lu.dumu ni eš.ām [. . . . . . . . . .]
XII 106

MS rs alone has the following extra line:

254a r1 i 7' nu.uš.ma.ab [be.e nu ku.li nu nu.uš.ma.ab be.e]

255a r1 i 7' nu.uš.ma.ab [be.e en ku.li nu nu.uš.ma.ab be.e]

260 H v 34' a.mumu dag.si.ke a a nal.na
BB rev. 9' a.mumu dag.si.ke [ke a] a[a] a[nal.na]
BB rev. 9' [a.mumu dag.si.ke [ke a] a[a] nal.na]
BB rev. 9' [a.mumu dag.si.ke [ke a] a[a] nal.na]
BB rev. 9' [a.mumu dag.si.ke [ke a] a[a] nal.na]
BB rev. 9' [a.mumu dag.si.ke [ke a] a[a] nal.na]
BB rev. 9' [a.mumu dag.si.ke [ke a] a[a] nal.na]
BB rev. 9' [a.mumu dag.si.ke [ke a] a[a] nal.na]

261 H v 34' a.mumu dag.si.ke a a nal.na
BB rev. 9' [. . . . . . . . . .]
BB rev. 9' [. . . . . . . . . .]
BB rev. 9' [. . . . . . . . . .]
BB rev. 9' [. . . . . . . . . .]
BB rev. 9' [. . . . . . . . . .]
BB rev. 9' [. . . . . . . . . .]
BB rev. 9' [. . . . . . . . . .]
BB rev. 9' [. . . . . . . . . .]
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 (d–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):

a 1 H vi 20'–1' [lú idiliu; nu:tuku / [igi bi:duh ám igi bi:duh;á]m a:na.gin; an ak
V iii 21' lú idiliu nu.tuku igi bi:duh;ám
DD obv. 19 lú [ibli] nu.tuku igi bi:]
DIDD 1' [ ]'nu.tuku;í [ig]i:na.
pp r. 19'–20' [ ....... ] lú idiliu nu.tuku [igi bi:duh;á]m a:na.gin; an ak
DIDD 1' [ ... ];í nu.tuku;í [ig]i:na.
DIDD 2' [ ... ];í nu.tuku;í [ig]i:na.

a 2 H vii 22' [sig, giš.xin ra.gin; ninda a]l;gu, e
V ii 22' sig, giš.xin ra.gin; ninda a]l;gu, e
DD obv. 20 sig, giš.xin ra.gin; ninda a]l;gu, e
DIDD 2' [ ... ]
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pp rev. 21' [.............] ninda i.gi-ع.e

tr. i' 23' [.............] sîg, gis.t-ki.i.na.1[.............]

b 1 F vi 2 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
H v 44'-5' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
V iii 23' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
DD obv. 11 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
FF 12' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
DDDD 3' [.............] sîg, p[.............]

b 2 F vi 3 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
H v 46' pa [.............] sîg, p[.............]
V iii 24' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
DD obv. 12 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
DDDD 4' [.............] sîg, p[.............]

XII 118-19 [.............]

c 1 F vi 4 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
H v 47'-8' munus ū.nu.tu i.gi bi.du,ām[.............]
V iii 25' munus ū.nu.tu i.gi bi.du,ām[.............]
DD obv. 13 munus ū.nu.tu i.gi bi.du,ām[.............]
DDDD 5' munus ū.nu.tu i.gi bi.du,ām[.............]
qq rev. 1-2 munus ū.nu.tu i.gi bi.du,ām[.............]

c 2 F vi 5 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
H v 49' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
V iii 26' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
DD obv. 14 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
DDDD 6' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
qq rev. 3 [.............] sîg, p[.............]

d 1 F vi 6 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
H v 50' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
V iii 29' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
DD obv. 15 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
DDDD 7' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
qq rev. 4-5 [.............] sîg, p[.............]

d 2 F vi 7 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
H v 51'-2' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
V iii 30'-1' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
DD obv. 16 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
DDDD 8' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
qq rev. 6 [.............] sîg, p[.............]

PSDA/A3, p. 196, reads ama.ta, but the other sources are unequivocal.
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E 1 F vi 8 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
H v 53' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
V iii 27' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
DD obv. 17 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
qq rev. 7-8 [.............] sîg, p[.............]

E 2 F vi 9 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
V iii 28' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
DD obv. 18 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
qq rev. 9 [.............] sîg, p[.............]

F 1 V iv 6' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
II obv. 1 [.............] sîg, p[.............]

F 2 V iv 7' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
II obv. 2 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
mm rev. 5 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
mm rev. 15 [.............] sîg, p[.............]

G 1 V iv 4' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
qq o. 34-5 [.............] sîg, p[.............]

G 2 V iv 5' [.............] sîg, p[.............]
qq rev. 36 [.............] sîg, p[.............]
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?"
177  His servant Enkidu answered:25
178  "My lord, why are you weeping? Wherefore are you sick at heart?
179  This day I 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.26
182  "I’ll do27 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!28
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 it 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,

25 Caravineaux’s transliteration makes the line count higher by 2, supposing the lacuna that intervenes in the middle of MS qq:obv. to account for six ligatures produced? (Pap 67, p. 17) However, the copy and photograph clearly do not allow so many (Pap 62, pp. 14–15).
26 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?”
27 So MSV; MS H and HH: ‘[Enkidu] answered Bilgames’; MS r: ‘his servant Enkidu called to him’.
28 So MSSVW; MS H omits ‘this day’.
29 So MSS H/WH; MS r omits the line.
30 So MSS H/WH; MS W omits ‘it’.
31 So MSS HWY; MS r transposes II. 183–4.
32 So MSS 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 wretches [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:

31 So MSY; MSS Zr: 'Do not make a noise in the Netherworld!'
32 Ll. 193-8 are so given in MSS YZr. MS H orders them [195], 198, 197, 196; MS EEE has 195, 197, 196, 198.
33 So MSS HYZ; MS AA omits the line.
34 Ll. 204--5 in MSS SYVAA only; MSS HZ omit both.
35 So MSS HVA; MSS Z omits the line.
36 So MSS HZ; MSS VAA: 'they gathered about him'.
37 So MSS HVZ; MS pp: 'carried'
38 So MSS HVZ; MS pp: 'put'.
39 So MSS HVZ; MS pp: 'making'.

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 malt 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 malt 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:

40 Ll. 221a-q in MS pp only.
41 So MSS SYVY; MS pp: 'before Mullah be...'; MSS HU omit the line.
42 So MSS AA; MSS UU: 'the Netherworld'.
43 So MSS VAAA; MS pp, corruptly: 'Enkidu, to go out, to bring (it) up!'
44 This line in MS pp only.
45 MSS AABBCC transpose ll. 228 and 229; in l. 228 MS SU erroneously reads 'seize' for 'fall'.
46 So MS BB; MS AA, erroneously: 'Nippur'. MS Y, corruptly: 'I will go to Nippur.'
47 So MSS HYTTT; MSS AABB omit the line.
48 So MSS VAA; MSS HBBTTT omit the line.
49 MSS HBBGGG] transpose ll. 236 and 237.
‘Now, when you make an opening in the Netherworld,
bring his servant up to him from the Netherworld!’

Young Hero Utu, [the son born of Ningal],

he made an opening in the Netherworld,
by means of his phantom he brought his servant up to him from the Netherworld.
He hugged him tight and kissed him,
in asking and answering they made themselves weary:
‘Did you see the way things are ordered in the Netherworld?
If only you would tell me, my friend, if only [you would tell] me!’
‘If I am to [tell] you the way things are ordered in the Netherworld,
O sit you down and weep!’ ‘Then I will sit and weep!’
The one who handled (your) penis (so) you were glad at heart,
(and) you said, “I am going to [. . . like] a roof-beam,”
her vulva is infested with vermin like an [old] cloak,
(her) vulva is filled with dust like a crack in the ground.’
‘Ah, weep!’ said the lord, and sat down in the dust.

‘If only [you would] [tell] me, [my friend, if only you would tell me]!’
‘Did you see the man with one son?’ “I saw him.”
‘For the peg set in his wall bitterly he laments.
Did you see the man with two sons?’ “I saw him.”
‘How does he fare?’
‘Seated on two bricks he eats a bread-round.’
‘Did you see the man with three sons?’ “I saw him.”
‘How does he fare?’
‘He drinks water from the waterskin (shung) on the saddle.’
‘Did you see the man with four sons?’ “I saw him.”
‘How does he fare?’
‘Like a man with a team of four donkeys his heart rejoices.’
‘Did you see the man with five sons?’ “I saw him.”
‘How does he fare?’
‘Like a scribe his hand is deft
and he enters the palace with ease.
Did you see the man with six sons?’ “I saw him.”
‘How does he fare?’
‘Like a man with plough in harness his heart is content.’
‘Did you see the man with seven sons?’ “I saw him.”
‘How does he fare?’
‘Among the junior deities he sits on a throne and listens to the proceedings.’

‘Did you see the man with no heir?’ “I saw him.”
‘How does he fare?’

‘He eats a bread-round like a kiln-fired brick.’

b 1 ‘Did you see the palace eunuoch? ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’
b 2 ‘Like a useless alala-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 Ishkur 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 wasteful 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 wasteful 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,
a 1 a wooden “head” (is) his daily food ration, he destroys the.’

36 This line in MS rr only.
31 So MSS HBBG; MS rr probably read: “his servant Enki/su [he brought up to him from the Netherworld].”
32 MS rr transposes ll. 246 and 247.
33 This line in MS rr only.
34 Some sources always include Enki/su’s response, others sometimes, and still others always omit it.
35 So Nippur MSS passim; MSS m spilled.gq passim: “How is he?”
36 So MSS HCCDDds; MS BB: “a brick”; MSS pspq: “He is seated on [. . .]”, omitting “he eats a bread-round”.
37 So MSS HYBBBds; MS pp: “his heart is content”.
38 Lit. “his arm is open.”
39 So MSS HDDpp, MSV: “his heart rejoices”.
40 So MSS HYqqq, MS DD, erroneously: “slave girl”.
41 So MSS HYIDds; MS qq: “no man gives her [a glance]”.
42 So MSS HYDDs; MS qq: “He holds a hand-worked reed mat, bitterly weeping over the hand-worked reed mat” (cf.
43 c 2).
44 So MSS FYIDds, MS qq: “at once over the pole”.
45 So MSS VVDDs; MS qq: “She holds a triple-ply cord, bitterly weeping over the triple-ply cord”.
46 So MSS VBBqq; MS mm: “He weaves (kob for dial) like an ox as the vermin consume him.”
47 So MSS L; MS qq: “the man whom litter summoned”.
48 So MSS L; MS qq: “he kneads like an ox eating fodder.”
49 So MSS L; MSS VYDSS: “He twitches like an ox as the vermin consume him.”
50 So MSS V; MSS DD: “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.”
51 So MSS VSmmqq; MS DD adds: “after it was dropped.”
52 MS rr transposes ll. k 2 and k 3.
11 ‘Did you see the man who did not respect the word of his mother and father?’ ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’
12 ‘He drinks water measured in a scale, he never gets enough.’
13 ‘Did you see the man afflicted by the curse of his mother and father?’ ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’
14 ‘He is deprived of an heir, his ghost still roams.’
15 ‘Did you see the man who made light of the name of his god?’ ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’
16 ‘His ghost eats bitter bread, drinks bitter water.’
17 ‘Did you see the man fallen in battle?’ ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’
18 ‘His father and mother could not hold his head, his wife weeps.’
19 ‘Did you see [the one] whose body lies out in the plain?’ ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’
20 ‘His ghost is not at rest in the Netherworld.’
21 ‘Did you see the shade of him who has no one to make funerary offerings?’ ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’
22 ‘He eats scrapings (as) bread rations, a stick tossed away in the street.’
23 ‘Did you see the little stillborn babies, who knew not names of their own?’ ‘I saw them.’ ‘How do they fare?’
24 ‘They play amid syrup and ghee at tables of silver and gold.’
25 ‘Did you see the man who died a natural death?’ ‘I saw him.’ ‘How does he fare?’
26 ‘He lies drinking clean water on the bed of the gods.’
27 ‘Did you see the man who was burnt to death?’ ‘I did not see him.’
28 ‘Why, my friend, did you not spare (.)? I asked that question, my friend.’
29 ‘His ghost is not there; his smoke went up to the heavens.’

The version of the poem known at Nippur ended abruptly here. MS D adds as catch-line:

u 1 ‘Did you see the . . . man? (.)

u 2 [ ]

MS II, 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 libation of water is 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 Hwawawa A (MS qq, from Mé-Turan):

1’ The heart was stricken, his mind despaired.
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 GEs [Gilgames̄-Epos] können leider immer noch nicht vollständig werden, ohne dass man reichlichen Gebrauch von der Phantasie machte’ (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 1 1.1, readers of the epic have been telescoping into one couplet what is in fact two parallel couplets. The new piece also provides the ends of the the first four lines. However, the beginnings of II 2 // 4, 5 and 6 are still open to restoration, as is the end of I 5. In discussing these lines, as elsewhere 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 I 1 is a case in point, for none of the many suggestions had come close to ša-māš, 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 // 3. The incipit of the Standard Babylonian epic, ša nāqābat̄ i inurna, is known from the many colophons which refer to the text under this title (Tablet I: MSS [B]J; 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 G, his Kp, reads i-mu-ra e-g[a], i-mu-ra be-[i], and is thus not at odds with the text given here.

On nāqābat see Chapter 10, the introduction to Tablet I. The phrase ša-māš is well attested in the meaning ‘stability of the land’, especially in the expression ša-nāqābat̄ i inurna, ‘to keep the land stable’ (used by e.g. Hammurapi: D. Frayne, RIME 4, pp. 334–5, 12–15 // 13–16: suญpa ma-da . . . ma-ni-ge, en // SUNAG KALAM . . . a-kī-in-nam). Its use as an epithet without kābu 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 nāqābat rather than Gilgames̄. 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: ša . . . karuna ša-giška šinaš šarrītu.

2 // 4. The variety of restorations proposed for the beginning of the line is considerable. Thompson, ignoring the case ending, opted for kūl-[l]-i, followed by Böhl (cf. also Heidel, Speiser, Tigay, Evolutions, p. 261, Dalley, Kovacs, Pettinato, Shaffer, Sumerian Sources, p. 20, Parpola, SAA Gilg.). Oppenheim suggested [a]-ma-[l]-i, ‘the seas’ (OrNS 17 (1948), p. 17; also von Soden, ZA 53, p. 221, Reclam2, Labat, Jacobsen, Studies Moran, p. 246, fn. 22). Other ideas are [ru]-ge-[l]-i, ‘die Ferne’ (von Soden, ZA 72, p. 162, Reclam5) and [k]iš-ba-[l]-a-[l]-i, ‘the world regions’ (Wšcke, ZA 67, p. 201; cf. Boštoru’s [ša] terre en tàière(?)). At the end of the line only Wšcke and Parpola had suggested ḫassu. It should be noted that in I 4 MS F does not leave enough room after irtiš for kalāma ḫassu; presumably the repetition was not fully spelled out on this tablet.

5. The older commentators, in particular, were sensibly very reluctant to restore in this line. Viable modern suggestions for the first word are: Böhl, [nunš]-imma; Wšcke, [ša x (ša)-l]-i-ruz; Tigay [ša]-l]-i-ruz; Parpola, [i]-l]-i-ruz. The last word, now pa-x-x, might be pa-x-(ak-š). This is reminiscent of the omen apodosis that probably records Gilgames̄’s dominance over šarrītu dābūti parakūt (I.8 of the collection of omens quoted in Chapter 3, the subsection on omens mentioning Gilgames̄), 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 2/2, p. 160, though others have read the first word [kiš]-m[ar] (Wšcke etc.) and [ra]-aš (Böhl etc.). At the end of the line there is only room for two signs at most following z (see MS F3), which discounts i-[ša]-tu 4,4 (von Soden, ZA 72, p. 162, Reclam4). Böhl and others restored i-[ša]-tu, Parpola i-[ša]-tu. The latter fits better the metrical construction at the line end of a stressed penultimate syllable.

7. The orthography ṣa-tu for ṣa-tu is no sin in a Late Babylonian manuscript such as MS d. Indifference to the nature of final vowels already occurs in manuscripts of Gilgames̄ from Kuyunjik and Alâku, 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 urPu ṣa-ni-giška aššu-ra-pāpu is a stock phrase in SB Gilgames̄, occurring on its own in SB 19, II 24–5, III 47–8, IV 54, X 64 // 141 // 241, and also as part of a standard couplet (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 [iš]-ru-[š], supposedly meaning ‘he engraved’ (e.g. CAD H1, p. 94; Åhew, p. 324; Böhl, Wilcke, ZA 67, p. 202; C. B. Walker, JCS 33 (1981), p. 194; Tigay, Evolution, p. 262; Parpola, SAA Gilg.), even though ba₃₃tu, ‘to cut off, in’, is not used in such a meaning elsewhere. In fact, Haupt annotated the broken sign in his copy (Nimbushe, 1) as either ṣa-ni or ṣa-bu, with no suggestion of ṣa. To my eyes the traces are even less ambiguous, certainly of ṣa-ni or šar. The shape of the fragment (B5) also discounts [ša]-n[u], 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]-tu, [ra]-tu, [ša]-tu and [ša]-tu, the last three absolutely secure (note also that since the fragment is from near the top left corner of a typical Gilgames̄ 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]-tu in I.4, than for [a] in the present line). This consideration rules out as too long the obvious [ša]-l, and we are left only with [ša]-l. I take this as an active stative, the first of many in SB Gilgames̄.

11. Thompson’s reading of the first word as sa-se-piš was taken from BM 34916, since published separately in Pinches’ copy (CT 46 17) and now joined and recopied by L. Finkel as MS h. As

22–3. As I. L. Finkel, the copyist of MS h, first noticed, the new variant in l. 22 for pitru, the number 1800, demonstrates that pitru here has nothing to do with the word for uncultivated land but is simply the term for one half of a šaru (šaru = 3600 or, in the sexagesimal system, 1,0,0). According to the metrological table appended to the E-sagili Tablet, as a linear-based surface measure the šaru is 1080 šuk, equivalent to 108 or in the capacity-based system (TCLVI 132, 5, ed. George, Topos Texts, p. 118). In Kassite and early NB metrology, which in measuring land customarily employed a large cubit, 1 šuk was the equivalent of about 0.81 hectare, and the area of Uruk as roughly given here, 3.5 šaru, would convert to 3,062 hectares, or a little over thirty square kilometers. Even using the smaller cubit standard, so that 1 šuk was the equivalent of about 0.36 hectare, 3.5 šaru converts to 1,360 hectares. Neither figure is remotely close to the actual area enclosed by the walls of Uruk, which is about five square kilometers (see A. von Haller, UVB 7, p. 44). The exaggeration is not out of place, of course, in a text such as the Gilgamesh epic. The question remains, if 1 šaru = 1,080 (or 18,0) šuk, of what unit is it the 3,600-fold multiple? The arithmetic produces 30 madašu (0.18 šuk), but such an example is not known as a unit in itself. There may be another explanation: according to M. A. Powell the largest unit in the linear-based system of surface measure is the šuru (Sum. bur), but sixty bur is called šar, a word normally meaning 60; 3600 bur is šargal, which normally means 60. This suggests that both the regular number words and the terms for 60 bur and its multiples are named after counters (tokens), perhaps šar, “ball”, šargal, “big ball” (RAVII, pp. 480–1).

The clay-put, essu, is what is left after people excavate material for brick-making, mud-plastering, flooring and other purposes that require coarse clay (see, for example, the apocryphal tradition of Sargon’s excavation of earth from the essu’s of Babylon: Grayson, Chronicles, p. 153, 18). In a country where groundwater is high, such holes very naturally fill with water, and this explains why in lexical texts essu is, in equation with Semitic words for pond or cistern (pû, rû), associated with šaru, itself a pit more often than not full of water (see CAD I J, p. 204; other words that are roughly synonymous are mēša and šatu). In l. 23 the word tamīlu is new. Curiously, the verb mašatu, “to measure”, is not yet attested in the II/1 stem, from which tamīlu should take its meaning. The lack of syntactical relation in this line is noteworthy.

24. On tupāname, tablet-box, and the similarity of this line to the incipit of the legend of Narāmsūr, tup-len-na-pi-ic-em-a in both OB and SB versions, see C. B. F. Walker, JCS 33 (1981), pp. 192–3. The restoration of pāi’mu in our passage is, however, more likely with bētu, the box’s lid, in l. 26.

25. For the first word (MS g only) Wiseman offered ‘ša-šu-er-e’ (Iraq 37 (1974), p. 163), but this can be discounted as too unconventional a spelling. The trace does not appear to allow the obvious restoration [pu-ru] (Parpola, SAA Gilg.). As restored here the verb uses the II/1 stem because of the plural object.

26. The scribe of MS h, sit-il-šu, evidently found šasari a tongue-twister.

27. The phrase usu-usulahu haša mursatā is a standard expression in Gilgamesh: see OB VA + BM ii 3; SB VII 251; X 55–6 // 132–3 // 232–3.

29. The phrase lamu-lamot bēl pattu, literally ‘valorous lord of bodily form’, has no implication of lordly status but is an example of bēlu with reference to one especially well endowed with a particular attribute, in this case a fine manly figure. Comparable phrases in the area of physical excellence are bēl birri, ‘runner’, and bēl emiṣiq, ‘strong man’.

31. The use of the present ilu in this and the following line is a mark of the habitual past, the first of many such presents in the narrative (note especially l. 63–93, describing Gilgamesh’s tyranny, and II. 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, ‘itsalat itabbi, “weinend setze er sich”: iparrat für die Vergangenheit in der akkadischen Epoche’, OR 64 (1995), pp. 33–91. Strecker offers many different meanings of translation of such verbs, for example, ‘stem ging er’ for itabbi in the present coupled and ‘immer verlagert waren’ for itadad in the narrative of Gilgamesh’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 Strecker 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 itabbi 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 (GAO §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. Ilī-kibītu, ‘My god is my bank’, and Kibrī-Dagāni, ‘My bank is Dagāni’ (a selection of references is given in CAD K, p. 335; from OAkk to OA and OB, especially Mari). There kiru 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 rimus meaning ‘one beloved’ there may be intentional ambiguity in the expression rım Lugaluanda. The meaning ‘wild bull’ takes obvious preference, however, since the prevailing imagery of the couplet is bovine. The goddess Ninurta’s name, ‘Lady Wild-Cow’, is here very explicitly rendered in Akkadian. The compound Rimat-Ninsu, standard in the SB epic, goes back to the Pennsylvania tablet’s rimat na supārin(m) Ninurta (OB II 236–7). The variants *nin-šin-šu-na (MS h) for *nin-šin-na is of the same order as *dam-ki-an-na for Damkina, which is common in late texts.

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

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

40. On ayaba, often Ocean in a mythological sense, see A. Malamat, Mari and the Early Israelite Experience (London, 1989), pp. 108–12. The phrase ayaba tamatu napatu also occurs in exorcistic literature, where it is something of a cliché (e.g. Surpu V 190, VIII 84, Mašqi VI 100; further references in CAD A1, p. 221). The word written ta-ma-iṭ(m) is most probably singular, literary for tāmāti, as often in Ensūna eil. For the extra vowel see above, on l. 14.

42. The relentless succession of active participles in II. 38–44 means kašı-d cannot here be an active stativ. The resulting phrase is kašı-d damnassu, in which a construct state is followed, exceptionally, 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: ita-ta-ta dan-mu-su-ur (Luckenbill, OIP 2, p. 75, 96–7). As for the grammar, note the common phrase šar piana and its variant šar māṭu, ‘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 Alamsārišpal II: kašı-d šu-šu(t) e-bet-ta-ā šašu-lašu-ā ša šimiš(a.b a.ba) rabiti(g, ū), ‘who conquered from the River Tigris to Mount Lebanon and the Great Sea’ (Grayson, RIMA 2, p. 306, 4–6); see GAO §148b.
43. The LB manuscript confirms the reading of MS g proposed by W. G. Lambert, ‘Gilg. 11:41’, Rd 73 (1979), p. 89.

45–6. As the text of Ninurta MS g stands, the verbs of both lines of this couplet are plural, which is ungrammatical after mannu, 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 line 45, where šannan is indicative singular, but in line 46, unless one construes šis as a subordinating conjunction, šabbu is also plural or subjunctive for no reason. The solution is that the text is indeed defective, ša having dropped out of šannu. This is proved by Easaschon that adapts L.45 in its correct form (Berger, Eas., p. 58, v. 21–2): man-na ša it-ta-ia šis-an-na-nu a-na larri-u-ši, ‘who is there that can be compared with me in kingly status?’ MS h’s šannu 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. nabi), not ši-lu-pu (Wilcke). On vocalic endings in NA manuscripts that are erroneous by earlier standards, see Chapter 9, the section on spelling sub-ši (e4).

48. The line reappears in SB IX 51, which has nominative šinšu, 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 šunu in this line. This word is the conventional term for the height of a human being (cf. OB II 184, and slave sales, passim), 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, RLAV VII, p. 473). Unfortunately the edge of MS g has been damaged, so that only witnesses to the text that follows šunu are the photograph and Wiseman’s copy, from which the traces on my copy are drawn. Wiseman had no knowledge of MS h’s lâ-a-nu, so missed the word šunu and read na-ba-la šu. [. . .] Since both photograph and copy indicate that the two signs between /lâ-a-nu and /â/ are very damaged, there must be a suspicion that this is a measurement in cubits, i.e. 10 + x ammatu (bub), a figure, incidentally, which bears comparison with eleven cubits in the Hitite version (Chicago Hitite Dictionary, p. 65).

53. In the standard (OB) system of metrology, the unit ninkaszu is three cubits, about 1.5 m, though in NB and LB it became 3.5 cubits (Powell, RLAV VII, p. 471). The ninkaszu, ‘rod’, is twelve cubits (later 40 cubits), so, as the text stands, the hero’s feet were half as long as his legs. Evidently the text is corrupt.

57. The expression bištir puridu, literally ‘between the legs’, can also mean the area of the upper thigh or groin (šapidal in commentaries on Šumma dû and Sukhâbu see CAD Š1/1, p. 492), but the reference here is certainly to the other end of the leg. A similar idiom occurs in bilingual liturgical texts: dûg bad (aš) za a.b a.b šu ša (aš) ina pi-iš pu-ri-di-ka man-nu ši-pu-na-ša-ši, ‘when you open your stride who can escape?’ (IV R2 26 no. 4, 41–2; BRMIT IV 8, 23; Billeritschke, 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 wording to express the same thing, 6 ammatu as against šišu nindi, looks like a stylistic device (‘elaganni variation’). The measurement of Gilgamesh’s stride, at least, is double the conventional norm of Babylonian, where the puridu, ‘pace’, was a unit of length equivalent to three cubits, i.e. a man’s longest stride (see Powell, RLAV VII, p. 476; H. Hunger, Enûka 1102, 11: [2 pu]-ri-du ga-nu-ši : 4 pu-ri-du šinshu, ‘2 strides = 1 reed, 4 strides =1 rod’).

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

60. The restoration follows L.107, where the same verb describes Enhidu. The image alludes to the ‘hairy’ ear of ripe barley. Nisaba, the goddess of grain, had hair of barley tied thick in sheaves, according to Güdes, Cyl. A iv 24 // v 21: sag.ša ši k-carad-ki mun-ak, ‘sprouting on her head, sheaves were arranged’. It remains uncertain whether in the ‘god description texts’ LK4 72 rev. 10: [š.]NAGA qim-maš-su, and KAR 307 obv. 1: [. . .]NAGA qim-maš-su, one should restore (‘nîssaba šE.NAGA) = nisaba qimmensusu, ‘the hair of his head is barley’, or #sin-gi (GAD.NAGA) = bûnu qimmensusu, ‘the hair of his head is tamarisk’ (nisaba: B. Landsberger, WO 1 (1950), p. 363, fn. 18; CAD N, p. 273; Q, p. 253; bûnu: Tbl, pp. 31 and 47; Livingstone, Mystical Works, p. 94; id., Court Poetry, pp. 98–9). Livingstone states a preference for bûnu on grounds of the space available for restoration in LK4 72 (see Mystical Works, pp. 98–9), but there is little to choose between šE.NAGA (or ḫE.NAGA) and GAD.NAGA. Note also, in a syncretistic hymn which equates parts of Ninurta’s body with other gods (KAR 102, 10): qim-maš-su [. . .] ‘the hair of your head is the god(dess) (Nisaba)?’.

61. The sign before the final MS d can hardly be anything but ša, but a reading ša-nu-ša-ti, ‘in the presence of his brother’, is most likely. Even if elsewhere on this MS ina is written i-na, it is difficult to escape ša-nušu. Tournay and Shaffer preferred to avoid ina by restoring ša-ša ni-ša-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 ša-ni-ša-ti.

62. The trace after re, as well as the gender of šagšu, rules out dual rēšu. 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-su-ša ri-mu ša-qu a-na eš-ša, ‘a wild bull giving chase, head held high’ (W. G. Lambert, ORN 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 ša-ha 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 tehē habûhù, ‘his weapons are at the ready’, cf. Erra 14:5: šu-ru ez-za-su te-šu-ša kēkē, ‘they were in a fury and so their weapons were ready for action’, and Sargin II: ša a-na sam-qut na-ki-ri šu-šu-šu-ša #kēkē(tukul)-ša, ‘whose weapons are made ready to bring down the enemy’ (Fuchs, Sargin, p. 62, 11–12). The enclitic ma, here attached to the object not the verb, is probably not coordinative but serves instead to prevent the complete absence of any rival; compare má-tam-me in L.108, which reports another negative state.

66. Comparison with I.83, alongside MS F’s pu-uk-bu (hardly pu-uk-bu-[ii], suggests that pu-uk-buša te-šu-ša in the LB manuscript very likely derives from a mistranslation (or mishearing in autodiction) of pu-uk-buš-šu šu-šu (cf. von Soden, ZA 53, p. 221; Tiggay argues for the opposite). Analysis of puškub in this passage has not yielded a consensus. Some modern commentators take it as the II.1 infinitive pušku, ‘to attend, wait on’ (following B. Landsberger, WZKM 56 (1960), p. 125, fn. 49), while others derive it from the puškub which is paired with mukša 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). Tiggay goes so far as to state categorically that the word in SB I is not the noun pušku but the verb pušku, and that the ‘Akkadian epic preserved the motif of athletic competition in this episode, but, ironically, misunderstood the word puškub 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-uk-buš-ša, which in the conventional orthography of the period would be most unusual for pušku, though not entirely without parallel.

If the word is puškub not pušku, the question then is: how does it tie in with the arousal, mobilization or excitation (all are possibly with ša-ha and habù) of Gilgamesh’s companions? The two transl-
tors who take *pubišu* as a ball differ on this point. Jacobsen renders the line ‘the young men are called up, away from the puck (of their game),’ commenting to the effect that they are called away from their play in order to perform corvée work (Studies Moran, p. 234, fn. 7). J. Klein translates ‘on account of his ball (game) his companions are (constantly) aroused,’ and later ‘his companions are aroused by his *pubišu*’ (Jacobson Mem. Vol., pp. 196–9). Klein seems to me to be nearer the mark. The subject of the verb, *rišū*, is too specific to refer to the considerable body of men who would be called up for public service; those are *ebātu*. These are not just the menfolk of Uruk in general but Gilgamesh’s close companions (cf. B. Foster, Essays Pope, p. 24). The *pubišu* which keeps them in a state of perpetual activity is, *pars pro toto*, a symbol of engagement in athletic and sporting contests. 67 // 84. The present form *ū-it-ad-ad-dāri* (for *ūaddarā*, l. 67) looks superior to the new variant *ū-it-dir* (for *ūddarā*, l. 84), for its tense agrees with the other verbs in this passage (ūṣadārā, umālšu, išaddī). The reading ku-kti-tū is assured from MS h, as first read by W. R. Mayer (VJS XXIV, p. 13). The word *kūtitu* is rare and obscure, occurring outside this line only in lexical and omen texts. In omens it appears in the apodosis as a negative comment (e.g., *Išba* VI 6: ku-ki-ti-ka-āi-ka-đa-[a]; ‘it is k., you must wait,’ i.e. put off any plans until later), and in the protasis as the designation of what must be an inauspicious part of the extra. Commentaries on these texts, collected in the dictionaries s.v., equate it with disagreement (lā mitgirtu), lack of prudence (lā mitilku) and behaviour inappropriate to one’s position (lā tiṣitu). 69 // 86. The adverb išā, which is attested here for the first time, perfectly describes the violence which attends Gilgamesh’s behaviour. 70. The broken sign begins like la or perhaps in. Since this is probably the same line as l. 88 (qv.), I will propose as appropriate. The hero is also Gilgamesh *sarru* in SB IX 53 // 130. 71. This line appears to be the same as l. 87, but the trace on MS d, before lā introduces an element of doubt. It is not a well-written ma, nor a good sīpu: it looks more like ajī. 73–4. This couplet remains very poorly preserved. It appears to be narrative, describing how the women begin complaining to the gods. Their complaint is articulated in l. 75–6, two lines that develop the theme of Gilgamesh’s misconduct narrated in ll. 67–72. Towards the end of l. 74 perhaps read iši-iši-ri, ‘(their complaint?) has become unaru’. 75. The traces that follow miši in MS x appear to be the remains of signs that have been partly erased. 78. There has been some discussion about the significance of the use here of the *l*3 stem of *šemāl. For von Schrön the stem conveys careful attention on behalf of the listener (cf. *Aha* 12, 1212, ‘genau anhören’). For Oppenheim it denoted the eventual realization of the action (OPNS 17 (1948), p. 22, fn. 9). For Foster it is a device to represent speaking or perception over a great distance, especially between heaven and earth (Essays Pope, p. 24, with reference also to SB I 248 and VII 133). The answer may lie in the use in this episode of the present tense for recurring action (see M. P. Streck, *Ors* 64 (1951), p. 41). Each time the women complained, the goddesses listened to what they had to say. The complaint being regular and repeated, the iterative stem is suitable for the divine response. When, eventually, the narrative moves from circumstance to action, the l3 pretense is used (l. 94, *išu*), followed by a succession of perfects. However, this explanation does not explain the use of the *l*3 stem in *ilananašīlu* (SB IV 195 // VII 133), where repetition of Šamaš’s interventions is intrinsically unlikely. The verb requires a plural subject, but there is not enough space to accommodate a plural determinative on *iš*. The lack of it may not be an oversight. The same phenomenon occurs in a LB manuscript of *Min pi III* *illi* (dirigī) *u* 4 15 (F. N. H. Al-Rawi and George, *Iraq* 57 (1995), p. 225, 6). There are many other occasions when apparently singular spellings of *illānu*, ‘godness’, are paired with plural *illā*, ‘godness’, and thus seem also to stand for a plurality. The following passages adequately illustrate dirigīs *u* *iš-ter* (Borger, Esarh., p. 23, with var. *iš-ter*, *šakār*), *na-ša-par-te diqurū* *u* *iš-ter* (ibid., p. 45, 6); [DNP] ba-nu-u diqurū *m* ma-al-šī *iš-ter* (A. Livingstone, Court Poets no. 1, 16: Ašurbanipal’s Hymn to Aššur); ma-ba-[iš]-išu diqurū *iš-ter* (H. Weissbach, Wadi Bria, B v 41–2, PBS XV 79 ii 65; Nbk); *šin* ... *bēl* *eš-nu* *iš-ter* (CT 34 27, 42; Nbk); ana diqurū *u* *iš-ter* (LN 63 i 6; Nbk). Plural *illā* is also sometimes written with just *iš*, as in *Ludlul I 55 (sarru šer if), ‘the king, the flesh of the gods’, spelled variously dirigī, dirigīs and dirigī-dirigī. The reverse can also occur, i.e. dirigīs for the singular. (See below on SB II 36–7). Other writings indicate that a formally masculine plural *illānu* existed alongside *illānu. pašak dirigīs* *u* *iš-ter* (TCL III 115, ed. W. Mayer, MDG 115 (1983), p. 78; Sargon II; Borger, Esarh., p. 97, 35); *ši-gi-gi-ši-ši 600 dirigīs* *u* *iš-ter* (E. Helbing, *Or* ns 17 (1948), p. 26 (follows p. 272), 9, ed. B. Pongratz-Leisten, *Išša šulim tarī* p. 244, rev. 9; Exaltation of Nabû); *ši-gi-gi 600 dirigīs* *u* *iš-ter* (Livingstone, Court Poets no. 30: Ašurbanipal’s Acrostic Hymn to Marduk; cf. *ši-tamū* in l. 36). Note also the existence of a plural form *illānī* parallel with *ilânī* (STT 45, 9: *iš-ter-ni*). On this evidence it would appear that the spellings *iš-ter* and *iš-ter* are, in effect, logographic, standing for *illānu* and (by homophony?) *illānu*; if not also for *iš-illānu* and *iš-illānu*. In a note on the second passage cited in the previous paragraph, Borger offered a slightly different solution, repeating the old view of F. Delitzsch: *illānu* (kann auch kollektiv ‘Götterinnen’ bedeuten) (Esarh., p. 45). In his study on the ‘Assyrian Tree of Life’ S. Parpola 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). Whichever is the correct interpretation, there seems no reason why the spelling *iš* should not also be used in the same manner as *ša-ter* and *ša-ter*, for a plurality of goddesses. 79. The expression *bišiši* seems unavoidable in the light of the new source, MS x. The word *siru* here is to be compared with its use in l. 96 and 100, where it signifi es an idea or initiative. The epithet *bišiši* is probably to be understood as a reference to the fact that the gods of heaven, in this period the īpikka, are those that can exercise initiative in the divine assembly, unlike the deities confined in the Netherworld. As such, they are perhaps under an obligation, once the complaint of the folk of Uruk 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 *iš-ša-lu-lu*-lā, ‘they (the gods) called out to him (Anu)’, but for the moment the extent traces here and at the beginning of the line (where *ša-* is one possibility) defy certain decipherment. 81. For the stressed enclitic *ma* in questions see GAG 3 // 123b. 86. The spelling *u-it-ad-dir* is ambiguous. I take it as III/1 perfect, subject Gilgamesh, but, given the variant *uaddarā* in l. 57, it may also be parsed as III/2 pretense, subject *eš-nu dir* then renders as bisyllable). Neither tense goes well in a passage replete with verbs in the present. 88. Probably a repetition of l. 70. The restoration of *nāt nāptiš* is encouraged by the feminine plural possessive in the next line (for *nāt, ‘numerous, teeming’, see below, the commentary on SB VIII 9–10). Such a restoration makes a participle such as *muššara, muššarum* or *mušmarri* likely in the missing middle of the line, unless we read bare *ša-nāt nāptiš*. 93. The subject of this line must be singular. The speech made to the mother goddess in ll. 95–8 are certainly the words of Anu, since they are described in l. 100 as *sirū šar Anû*. The fact that there
is no line introducing Anu as the speaker of IL 95–8 makes it very difficult to avoid restoring him here as the one who listens (lēmā 1/3, as in 1.78) to the preceding speech.

94. With this line, which also occurs in MB Nippur, (1.5), compare OB Atran-šaštī I 192: i-ta-am utsa-ta-an is-la-a, ‘they summoned the goddess and asked her’, and SB Amûz I 172: i-ta-nu-nim-ma 6be-lit uš-ma a-fat (lit râ-bat), ‘they summoned Bêlit-ti, the sister of the great gods’. Both lines follow a speech of Ea. The line of Gilgameš may be a conscious imitation of Atra-šaštī, for the context there is similar to the present passage: the mother goddess is summoned to solve an act of creation, in that case of mankind in general, a crisis marked by the mutiny of the lower orders against their king, in that case the Igigi’s revolt against Enîl (for a detailed comparison between the respective texts see Tigay, Evolution, pp. 194–7). The background of Amûz’s epithet ‘great one’ is that she is as ancient as the universe itself; see the note on MB Nippur, 1.

95. The restoration follows MB Nippur, 7. The line is almost identical to one in a SB account of the creation of mankind and the king: at-ti-ta na-ab-ni-ma lûdî il-ge-me-la, ‘you it is that created man, (now fashion the king)’ (W. R. Mayer, Or s.N 56 (1987), p. 56, 32).

96. The word zikra in this and other lines of the SB text (IL 106, VIII 121) is taken by many (following Oppenheim, Or s.N 17, p. 23; CAD Z, p. 116), to mean ‘image, counterpart, replica’, and the suffix to refer to Gilgameš: ‘create his image!’ Though this makes good sense, and provides lâ māḫûr (or māḫûr) with an explicit subject, it is not without problems. The phrase zikra barû in the other passages of Gilgameš cited, and elsewhere too (CT 15 46 rev 11: Descent of Ibtar), simply means to make the word flesh, i.e. to convert an idea or spoken initiative into reality. If the phrase bûm zikra is understood in this way, it should be translated ‘make his idea a reality!’ But whose idea? In IL 100 the zikra is identified as Anu’s, and von Soden and others have translated the phrase accordingly (Reclam’s: . . . as er beföhl’, Wäclec: was er (zu Anu) sagt, Bottero: ‘ce qu’Anu (ou) dit’). They implicitly ascribe the speech of IL 95–8, in which direct instructions are given to Amûz, to the unspecified plural subject of ītu (l. 94), i.e. the gods in general. However, MB Nippur, reveals that one god only issues the command to Amûz (l. 6: iṣu-ga-pa-at). Accordingly it is probable that Amûz himself is speaking in this line, and therefore the third person referent of the possessive pronoun on zikra cannot be him, but must instead be whatever god it was who made the original suggestion. I suspect that this figure was Ea. It is one of Ea’s characteristic functions to solve crises by suggesting the creation of new life-forms, as he does in Atra-šaštī and related texts, or by creating them himself, as in the Descent of Ibtar. He alone among the gods has the imagination to conceive ingenious ideas of this kind. As I see it, then, in a divine assembly convened to debate the crisis, Ea made his customary intervention in suggesting how the problem could best be solved, Amûz was brought on and Anu (in MS Enûl) issued her with instructions: ‘convert Ea’s idea into reality!’ The question is: was the line still so understood when all reference to the god who had the initial idea had been edited out of the text?

That Ea was instrumental in the creation of Enûkû has already been proposed on other grounds by Bottero, L’oppiole, p. 69, fn. 1, who sees a reference to such an idea in the writing of his name in the SB text as ‘Enkû.Iû. “Enkû (‘)a crê’” (so also S. Parpola, Sâkû IX, p. ccixii, id., CCG 44, p. 318). Dalley has drawn attention to an improbable play on zikra and zikr(u); ‘man, male’ (Mythû, p. 126, 9). 97. As Ebeling noted, as well as ma-š[ir] one may also read ma-š[i] (AFO 8, p. 226).

98. Of course, on l. 96. There is a parallel line in Amûz I 157: i-tu-an i-ta-an na il-bi-lu, where uzu seems to correspond to this zikr(u). ‘Ea fashioned a clever idea(?) in his heart.’ Kovacs proposes a play on zikr(u) la Anûn and kîrû la Anûn, the phrase that foretells Enûkû’s coming in lll. 245 and 262. Dalley’s suggestion that zikr(u) alludes also to sobr(u), among ‘cult personnel of uncertain sexual affinities’ (Mythû, p. 126, 10), makes assumptions about the latter word which seem to be unfounded. The feminine adjective sobr(u), ‘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 sobr(u) (zi.su.tum 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 sobr(u) was recognizable as a counterpart of sobr(u), it is doubtful that it could readily have conveyed the idea of ‘male concubine’. 100. 2. These two lines are one of only two quotations from Gilgameš known from commentaries (the other is SB VI 69). They are quoted in a commentary on the prognostic and diagnostic text, Sâkûlu I, to illustrate the received wisdom that man is made from clay (George, Râûsû 1991, p. 146, 2 b 4–5: ti-ti ti-ha a-na-ti ti-si-djî i-nu ti-rê (eddn); i-nu ti-rê (eddn) i-ma-sî-rî-djî i-nu ti-rê (eddn) i-ma-sî-rî-djî i-nu ti-rê (eddn)). For the phrase ši-ta-karû see W. R. Mayer, Or s.N 56 (1987), p. 62.

101. Most commentators follow von Soden’s emphasis of qûlû as the quiet of night (ZA 53, p. 222: ‘Nachts’-Sülle’; cf. Elbing, AFO 8, p. 227). Others have avoided this reading by emending to ku-ha-ri with CâD K, p. 506 (offspring of potter’s clay). I prefer not to emend, but I do not see why Enûkû should be the offspring of the quiet of night as against any other part of the day. For me the reference is instead to Enûkû’s supernatural birth. He was not delivered into the world through the travails of a human mother: silence, not screams, attended his arrival on the earth. The apparent variant mušû, ‘death’, for qûlû is a mechanical error based on the misreading of qalû and needs no further exegesis. The phrase kîrû Ninûrta makes several allusions. First, kîrû as a description of a person evokes in comparison personal names such as Kîrû-DN, DN-šuṣurû-kuṣarû and DN-šuṣarû. The dictionaries interpret this use of kîrû, ‘knot, bonding’, and kîrû, ‘to knot, tie together’, as referring to the support or strengthening of the individual by a god: his form is bonded 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, Ninûrta is a god associated with successful feats of arms, particularly in single combat with a mighty rival (e.g. Anûzû, Asshû). Enûkû, whose physical being has been given cohesion by Ninûrta, will be the champion of the people of Uruk and will meet with Gilgameš in single combat. In Anû VII Ninûrta is also for some reason especially associated with qûlû, ‘silence’ (CT 24 A 1, 65: kînûšûkû = kînû-ta-ra ša-nu-3-il-3), a reference which places the phrase tišû qûlû and kîrû Ninûrta in a nearly synonymous relation. The latter expression also anticipates the kîrû la Anûn that symbolizes Enûkû in Gilgameš’s dreams.

102. The variant for uppû in MS h (hardly nuppû) is mystifying. The form pûnu, literary for pûnu, occurs in the status rectus only here and in SB II 176; see further Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (i).

103. This line has already been used to describe Gilgameš (SB I 60).

104. Although I retain the conventional interpretation that the use of lâ in a main clause represents emphatic negation (‘überhaupt nicht’, GAG §22a), this is a line where it might have the force ‘not yet’, as suggested by M. Stol, OB History, p. 53, fn. 30 (referring to OB II 93). The words nûšû, ‘people, family’, and mušû, ‘nation’, denote the smaller and greater social groups from which the individual takes his identity. The variant ‘god’ or ‘gods’ for the former raises the question of whether they were held in any way to be synonymous. In some peripheral areas of Mesopotamia, notably Emûr and Ninûzû in the second millennium, the two concepts are closely connected in the context of the ancestor cults, for the household gods (tulu) are mentioned alongside family ancestors referred to as ‘dead persons’ (wišû) and ‘ghosts’ (šemû). Some equate the three terms (see K. van der Toorn, ‘Gods and ancestors in Emûr and Ninûzû’, ZA 84 (1994), pp. 38–59); others do not (see W. T. Pitard, ‘Care of the dead at Emûr’ and B. B. Schmidt, ‘The gods and the dead
of the domestic cult at Emar: a reassessment’, both in M. W. Chavalas (ed.), *Emar*, pp. 123–40, 141–63). In Babylonian proper the evidence for deified ancestors is patchy. At least two deceased *emn* -priestesses of Ur were included by those in charge of the offerings among the minor gods of the moon god’s sanctuary (see P. Weadock, *Iraq* 37 (1975), p. 104). This distinction was no doubt accorded them not because they were dead but because they had been, in some sense, the brides of Nanna-Suen (the use of the divine determinative by kings who had been ‘husbands’ of Inanna, from Šulgi to Rim-Sin I, and the presence of much the same kings in litany of dead gods in later cultic laments such as *Edinu-psaggus* are exactly analogous). Many dead Mesopotamian kings were the object of special funerary cults, and though they did not usually attract the term *ibu* their statues were often venerated, bathed and provisioned in that context much as gods’ statues were (for a résumé see W.W. Hallo, ‘Royal ancestor worship in the biblical world’, *Studies in the Babylonian Periodical Writing*, p. 17, rev. 3, ed. Streck, *Ash.*, p. 250). Ordinary Babylonians made funerary offerings (*kaspu*) to their immediate ancestors but there is as yet no evidence that these could be called ‘gods’ as they may have been in Nuži and Emar (see M. Bayliss, *The cult of dead kin in Assyria and Babylonia*, *Iraq* 35 (1973), pp. 115–25; A. Tsukimato, *Untersuchungen zur Totenpflege* (*kaspu*) *im alten Mesopotamien*). However, some have suggested that *ibu* in personal names sometimes refers to the spirit of a deceased family member (Stamm, *Nomengebungen*, pp. 245, 264; *CAD* I, p. 102; Bayliss, *Iraq* 35, p. 117, fn. 19). This, and the question of the relationship of dead ancestors to personal gods and protective deities such as the *kula*, are topics that need further investigation. For this reason it is best for the model to allow the variants ‘gods’ and ‘family’ in this line may be arbitrary and unrelated.

109. For the reading of *gilt as Šakkân see W. G. Lambert, ‘The reading of the divine name Šakkân’, *Or**. 55 (1986), pp. 152–8, *Cil. 1* a garment like Šakkân’s* means simply wearing only the hairy coat that Nun had given him, as did all the creatures of Šakkân, the lord of the animals.

110. *The mention of Šakkán in the preceding line paves the way for gazelles in this line, for these animals are the typical beasts of Šakkán (cf. C.T. 7946, 13: ša-ši, 14: ša-ši, 15: ša-ši, 16: *Šakkân = the god of gazelles*).

111. 176. The verb of this line used to be read *tapparr*, supposedly the LII intransitive stem of *tapparru*, which in legal documents from Elam means ‘to satisfy’ (*CAD* D, p. 104; M, p. 384), or *tipparr* (*Al footage*, p. 1380, ‘Deutung unsicher’). More recently W. L. Moran has suggested a verb *decubatu* (ki), ‘to push in, become aggressive’ (*JCS* 33 (1981), pp. 44, fn. 3). However, the spelling *te-te-pa-pi* used in the Late Babylonian sources in the parallel passages ( *SB* I 176, MS x: 281, MS b) suggests instead, given that a present tense is expected, a verb *suppu* / *Upuru* / *Upuru* II (cf. already W. R. Mayor, *ISB* 24, 1991). In MB Ur 28 the precreative *tipparr* might be the same verb with a voiced first radical. Whatever its derivation, the meaning is determined by its use to describe animals thronging at a water-hole, as here, and a crowd gathering to stare at Enlilu (*SB* Ia 288, I 105). Elsewhere MS P replaces *tapparr with *tilati, ‘the drinks’ (I 176 and, probably, 172), which suggests an unimaginative editorial change made in the face of an obscure word.

112. 177. The verb of this line is also an object of doubt. The old reading *i-tāb* was emended to *i-tābb*, present to match the other verbs of the passage, by von Soden, *ZA* 53, p. 222. This revision failed to take account of MS F’s *i-tā-bu* in *SB* I 173, parallel to this line. This spelling of preterite *tāb* can be explained as an example of CV-CVC for CVC; others in Kuyunjik manuscripts of SB

Gilsameš are listed in Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub (q). A present ventive *stēbah* is theoretically possible—for ventives spelled with *u* see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub (v)—but I know of no other examples of *tābū* in the ventive. The derivation of the forms spelled *i-tāb* and *i-tā-bu* is now challenged by the Late Babylonian source’s *i-tē-pan* in the parallel passage (Ⅰ 177, MS x). Mayer, *ISB* XXIV, p. 13, suggests a parsing from the known verb *edipuru*, ‘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 *tābū* there are the verbs *dēpē* and *tāpē*, which have to do with weaving and are plainly also out of contention: *dēpē* and *tēpē* are unattested. This being so, the principal obstacle to the traditional parsing is the sign *pi* 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 *nab-bi* (MS dd) for *nakpu*. Consequently it is unwise to place too much weight on one LB manuscript. For the moment MS x’s *i-tē-*pi should be considered, like MS F’s *i-tē-bi*, to be a spelling of *tēb*.

114. Prepositional phrases involving *pi* + water have often proved awkward for translators (e.g. B. R. Foster, *ANES* 14 (1982), p. 33: ‘(fishier) edge’). A collection of the extant attestations suggests that such phrases mean no more than ‘on/to the bank/shore of’, ‘beside a river, sea, etc.; see e.g. SB Astra-šašu 71 (ed. George and Al-Rawi, *Iraq* 58 (1996), p. 182): *ana pu-ut nārāt(ī) i-ra-si-lāb, ‘he sit down beside (not facing) the river’, replacing older pu-ut-nārāt (OB Atra-šašu II 26; cf. Assyrian recension S 32): in OAQ inscriptions of Sargon (Frayne, *RIMA* 2, pp. 28, 8/8–8/10: *a-dina pu-ti i-i-am, ‘as far as the sea shore’ [zag a-ab, ka-ba še, ‘to the edge of the sea’, and Narîm-Sîn (ibid.), p. 91, 9/12: *a-na pu-ati burannuk, ‘to the bank of the Euphrates’, (ibid.), p. 133, ii 9–11: *i-tam-ma pu-ati burannuk, ‘from the bank of the Euphrates’; and, if correctly translated, in Assyrian royal inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta II (Grayson, *RIMA* 2, p. 175, 83: *ina šakkiššu-ša ša pi-sag*) *pu-ni-nu, in the mountains beside the Euphrates*; Aššurâšgal II (ibid., p. 214, 29: *a-na pi-sag*) *pu-ni-nu a-za-bi, ‘I marched to the bank of the Euphrates’, (ibid., p. 215, 40–1) *bi-su-ru ša pi-sag* *pu-nu-za le i-za-bat, ‘he took to Mt Bisuru, which is beside the Euphrates’; and Shalmanezer III (Grayson, *RIMA* 3, p. 46, 21): *a-na pi-sag* *4-ni ši-diqita (ba-ba) a-šar mû-ašNão* *a-ši, ‘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 *pi* and *lidāku*: see e.g. in Aššurâšgal II (Grayson, *RIMA* 2, pp. 199, 77): *i-dâ-šar a-za-bat, ‘I marched along the River Habur’, (ibid., p. 218, 84) *i-dâ-šar a-za-bat, ‘I marched along the Lebanon range’, (ibid., p. 219, 96): *i-za-bat, ‘I marched upstream along the Euphrates’. In agreement with the respective meanings of *pi*, ‘short side’, and *lidāku*, ‘long side’, it seems that *pi* is used when the subject encounters the river or sea as a short stretch, *lidāku* when the subject travels along 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 *ši* (no other restoration seems obvious) probably marks a change of subject, as elsewhere in SB Gilgamesh (e.g. I 172, 20, 181; cf. Jjin *SB* I 143/164). The translation in *CAD* B, p. 292, ‘he (Enlilus) and his animals had intruded into his (the hunter’s) region’, agrees, but is too contrived to convince. Enlilus 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 *ši-tum edīb* is thus a simple metaphor.

117–18. These two lines serve to highlight the frequent use in poetry of enclitic *-ma* on verbs that
have no obvious need of coordination. At the end of a couplet (as Frum-ma) enclitic -ma cannot normally serve for coordination, for a sentence very rarely extends over the boundary between couplets. At the end of a line containing a verb (as iy-trans-) it is also questionable whether coordination is intended, for main clauses in different lines usually exhibit no syntactical dependence. There are exceptions, for example SB XI 207-8: eninnima anu kiša manna nihil upahkakumma-ma ili bātītu ša tuba’tu tūtat attu, where there is a consecutive relationship ("so that"). However, most lines, and especially couplets, display syntactical autonomy. There are many other instances of -ma where no coordination is probable: OB II 6 iy-trans(-) -ma, 64 atka-ma, 162 aqar-ma, 177 iru-ma, 179 atsaz-ma, 197 naši-ma, 212 ibe-ma, 227 qnš-ma, OB III 106 ša-ma, 172 tālī-ma(?), 184 lūkušu-ma, 201 il-ma, OB Schwyzer II 154 ša-ma, 13 ittcqarqar-ma, 27 ša-ma, 58 šēlu-ma, OB Nippur II appulsum-ma, OB Harmaš I 1 ša-ma, OB Ishshali 11 šešakam-ma, 26 šešu-ma, OB VA + BM I 12 šašlum-ma, ili 20 šašlum-ma, ili 21 šušlum-ma, ili 22 šušlum-ma, ili 24 šušlum-ma, ili 26 šušlum-ma, ili 27 šušlum-ma, ili 28 šušlum-ma, ili 32 šušlum-ma, OB Malq 11 ša-sašlum-ma, S 13 šašlum-ma, I 140 šašlum-ma, I 170 šašlum-ma, I 172 šašlum-ma, I 173 šašlum-ma, I 175 šašlum-ma, I 176 šašlum-ma, I 177 šašlum-ma, I 178 šašlum-ma, I 180 šašlum-ma, I 247 šašlum-ma, I 248 šašlum-ma, I 249 šašlum-ma, I 250 šašlum-ma, I 251 šašlum-ma, I 252 šašlum-ma, I 253 šašlum-ma, I 254 šašlum-ma, I 255 šašlum-ma, I 256 šašlum-ma, I 257 šašlum-ma, I 258 šašlum-ma, I 259 šašlum-ma, I 260 šašlum-ma, I 261 šašlum-ma, I 262 šašlum-ma, I 263 šašlum-ma, I 264 šašlum-ma, I 265 šašlum-ma, I 266 šašlum-ma, I 267 šašlum-ma, I 268 šašlum-ma, I 269 šašlum-ma, I 270 šašlum-ma, I 271 šašlum-ma, I 272 šašlum-ma, I 273 šašlum-ma, I 274 šašlum-ma, I 275 šašlum-ma, I 276 šašlum-ma, I 277 šašlum-ma, I 278 šašlum-ma, I 279 šašlum-ma, I 280 šašlum-ma, I 281 šašlum-ma, I 282 šašlum-ma, I 283 šašlum-ma, I 284 šašlum-ma, I 285 šašlum-ma, I 286 šašlum-ma, I 287 šašlum-ma, I 288 šašlum-ma, I 289 šašlum-ma, I 290 šašlum-ma, I 291 šašlum-ma, I 292 šašlum-ma, I 293 šašlum-ma, I 294 šašlum-ma, I 295 šašlum-ma, I 296 šašlum-ma, I 297 šašlum-ma, I 298 šašlum-ma, I 299 šašlum-ma, I 300 šašlum-ma, I 301 šašlum-ma, I 302 šašlum-ma, I 303 šašlum-ma, I 304 šašlum-ma, I 305 šašlum-ma, I 306 šašlum-ma, I 307 šašlum-ma, I 308 šašlum-ma, I 309 šašlum-ma, I 310 šašlum-ma, I 311 šašlum-ma, I 312 šašlum-ma, I 313 šašlum-ma, I 314 šašlum-ma, I 315 šašlum-ma, I 316 šašlum-ma, I 317 šašlum-ma, I 318 šašlum-ma, I 319 šašlum-ma, I 320 šašlum-ma. Among these lines, the vast majority have no obvious need of coordination.

119. Restore perhaps [le-ma-n] or [li-mi-n].

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 arqa-rḫiššat aššu-nuḫḫu on its own see also above, on SB X. In none of these passages is arqa construed as masculine, consequently the spelling ru-qu-ti stands for fem. sing. arqa (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 ru-qu-NV observed in other

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 "hump of Anu", i.e. "solid matter of the sky", as a byword for one endowed with superhuman strength (cf. SB I 137, where it refers to Gilgamesh). In Gilgamesh's dream the "hump of Anu" is clearly a meteorite, and symbol of Enkidu (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 is also a matter of some interest in the Sumerian poet of Lugalaubanda, where the hero's mighty axe is described in the following passage:

130-4. The term an can here can hardly be tin, which is useless for an axe-head; rather, kū. bi an can is a literary circumlocution for the next line's iron (following Vanshphor, CRRA 43, p. 399). The equation of the "hump of Anu" with meteoric iron, so much stronger than bronze, explains its use in Gilgamesh SB I as a symbol signifying great strength.

For kiššu denoting a crude lump of unworked metal, note also kiššu par-su-al-lu, 'a lump of iron', but see also E. Posener, "A Classification of the Copper and Iron of the Neo-Assyrian Period", Iraq 1930-1.}
and concessive conditional ("even if . . .") among them (e.g., ABB XI 90, 27; 106, 32; 160, 23). Note also in a NB letter sent home by a man travelling abroad the reassurance na-ku-ta-a la ta-re-
șă ță ti-ma-a la ta-șă-șa-ma-. "Even though you hear no news of me, you must not start worrying about me!" (CT 22 6, 7-8). No doubt a thorough search would yield many more examples.

The expression eš ērištu is often rendered 'on his steppe' or paraphrased as 'with him in the wild', but also 'sous sa tutelle' (Labat). I follow a private suggestion of A. Shaffer, that eš ērištu in Gīgâmele simply means 'in(to) the presence of' (see e.g. SB1136, XI 6; cf. already Jacobsen, Acta Or 8 [1930], p. 67, fn. 2; also Bottéro: 'avec lui').

148. The preposition ina should perhaps be emended to ana.

160. This is the first instance of the less common formula used in SB Gīgâmele to introduce direct speech, which employs only izakharra; on the use of the present tense in such formulae see Chapter 5, the note on OB II 1.

161. The spelling bušum is 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 Spellings sub (i).

166. The word adana 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 Anû 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 (see ANZû II 1: bi šim ur-šak ma-a-a-dan-na, 'fashion a path (to the mountain), determine a place to meet (Anû in combat)' in OB Anû II 52 la-a-kan-a na-da-an is an obvious error for šimādum adādan.

170-1. The word ušu remains a hapax legomenon. The suggestion that this means 'hiding-place' (AHH, p. 1441, 'Versteck') fits the context well enough, but since the preposition is ana not ina I have opted for a less concrete meaning, literally for 'their waiting'. The venitive of ušu-šu is very rare; itatūši (both MSS in lines 169). One MS in line 171 may for that reason be corrupted by ditography from ušidūši in line 169.

176. In I. 176 MS P replaces mašqā tēppi in the parallel line (I. 111) with mašiqā šattu, and the verb may thus once have been tēppi in this line also.

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

178. Lit. 'his origin was the very uplands'; for šašišu meaning not so much 'offspring' or 'birth' as the stock from which one comes, see with the reference to the Sèvethu, Enna 124: i-li-ti-ta-ša-a ma-a-at-ša, '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, asila na šadū, 'he was born in the hills'.

175-7. These lines repeat II. 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. 119). 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 flashback. 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 bušiši 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 S/1, p. 71: the uncivilized man'; Bottéro: 'ébauche d'homme'). A. D. Kilmer's
suggestion that the word alludes to Enkidu's future role as sexual partner of Gilgamesh (Kušu AV, p. 130; tulūtu-āmēli): pun on tulūtu/tulūtu seems over-contrived.

180. The kirimmu is usually the folded arm which typically cradles a nursing baby. In 1.188 kirimmu is replaced with dādu, usually translated ‘loincloth’ but perhaps an under-garment 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 under-garment 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 tūr̂a petē is literally 'to open the vulva' and is taken literally by some, but it also means to bare the genital area (cf. kūseta petē in l. 164). Similarly kūseta 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 ūrē for ērē (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 napāsū 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 napāsū leqē is parallel with kūseta leqē and that napāsū is a 'euphemism for virility' (CAD N/1, p. 305; cf. Speiser, 'welcome his ardent!', and similarly according). According to B. Landsberger's editorial footnote in Schott, ZA 42 (1934), p. 100, fn. 2, the phrase can mean 'ganz nahe an ihn herantreten'. With this in mind I follow a suggestion made privately made by the late Thorild Jacobsen, who very plausibly suggested that this is a trapper's language, 'to take his scent' (cf. already Daly: 'take wind of him'). This would mean moving close enough to one's target to obtain a good shot: Šamhat approaches Enkidu with a hunter's caution, so as not to frighten him off.

183. Having advertised her wares the prostitute is to let Enkidu approach. Note that petē commonly has the meaning sexual favours; the language is loaded. Curiously this line is never explicitly realized as narrative.

184 // 191. The phrase labāli muṣā incorporates an idiom common in rituals, where puṣā muṣā 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 LK 141 obv. 9. [kūseta gu] tušut[ā] ni[sā ] among[ti]) but in this case the language is clearly that of seduction. 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 tūr̂a but also the prostitute is doing something labāli.

185. Here, and probably also in L.193, the Babylonian source has the prostitute's dādu as the subject of habābū. Given the nature of habābū, 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 habābū is usually translated 'caress' or the like. CAD, s.v., distinguishes between habābū A, of noise (babbling of running water, chirping of birds, buzzing of flies, lowing of oxen, to which must be added the noise of lightning, STT 23, 12' Anzu) and habābū B, of motion involving sensuous physical contact (in lovemaking and of a snake sliding over someone). After takes them as one, meaning, in the context of lovemaking, 'to whisper' (cf. Reclam); see further B. Groneberg, RD 80 (1986), pp. 189–90. Likewise I see no reason to separate habābū into two verbs: movement, as well as sound, is characteristic of lovemaking. The ancient view is expressed by a line of the synonym list Malātu, in which ha-ba-bu = na-ṣa-gu, '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 habābū can accompany sexual intercourse; note especially the sequence la-ub-bi-ba-ni... ina-ka-ba-ni (Biggs, Sumer, p. 31, 46–7), 'he, me, copulate with me' in a potency incantation. Indeed, some have suggested that he can be a euphemism for coitus itself (T. Jacobsen, Acta Or 8 (1930), pp. 69–70, fn. 2; J. S. Cooper, Finkelstein's Mem. lîlû, p. 43, fn. 22; etc.). However, the context indicates that dādu habābū is, in this passage, the last stage of lovemaking before actual copulation (ēri in l. 194).

It should be noted that the construction with dādu is unique. Elsewhere in Gilgamesh the verb habābū appears as Gilgamesh's response in his dreams to the meteorite and axe that are symbolic of Enkidu (SB I 256, 267, 284, 289; cf. OB II 34). The construction used there also, with a personal subject, occurs in similar context in the goddess Anušūnum's oracular promise to Zimri-Lim, ana-ku e-li-ka a-ha-ab-ub bu (ARM X 8, 10–11), 'I will make love to you'. In these passages the expression habābū 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 dādu? 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. dādu 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-ta-ku-an-da-da-hu (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 kūšū see W. G. Lambert, On Words 36 (1967), p. 132). In the same way the phrase used here, dādu habābū, might refer both to general dalliance (the whispering of sweet nothings) and to the object of which the dweller of a dreaming 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, VÉ XXIV, p. 13).

188. Foster speculates that kirimmu in the parallel (l. 180) is replaced here by dādu to prepare for a play on dādu (Essay On Pede, p. 24).

194. This line almost repeats a couplet of the Pennsylvania tablet, where, however, the probability is 'seven days and seven nights' (OB II 48–50; 156 ūm ike-ke he se-[te]-ma builder [En[i] ni] 7 ina). 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 later version: in the delaying of Enkidu's burial (OB VA + BM i 8: 8 ūm ike-ke he te-[ma builder] [se] SB XX 18 // 233 // 235: 6 ūr [7 mašid], and in the duration of the Deluge (OB Arram-ḫantis I 4: 24: 7 u-mi 7 ūr-[eš]-tam) // SB XI 128 (MS T): 6 ūr [7 ] mašid). 'Six days and seven nights' is also the period of sleeplessness set Gilgamesh by Uta-napil 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: enašiša tabiš lapšišu ta-tu-em ūr, 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-â-ni li-lî-â-pu er-ka-su li-ta-nu-â (TIM IX 65, 9/66, 17–19), ‘the bâman-viper’s mouth is six, seven are its tongues’. 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 East Face of Helicon, pp. 259–61). In Babylonian literature the sequence six + seven was by some way the most popular of these numerical sequences. In Gilgamesh the change from OB ‘seven and seven’ to SB ‘six and seven’ begins to look as if it was a conscious policy, perhaps leading to a literary fashion.

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

197. Most translators ignore the present tense of ināpapu. M. P. Streck translates ‘lieven 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 special nuance that ‘der Sachverhalt verläuft in verschiedenere Richtungen’ (Ons 64 (1955), pp. 48–80). This nuance is not proven, for the examples Streck adduces can all be explained as presents of circumstance, as imperfects denoting action that continued for a time, or in other conventional ways. A less radical interpretation of ināpapu is that the tense denotes the result of imtâlû, ‘they saw . . . and as a result they ran’. However, I have understood it also to denote action that continues along the 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, Ons 54 (1985), pp. 50–2. The verb šēbhû (so MSS Pn) has since been discussed at length by W. R. Mayer, Ons 57 (1988), pp. 155–9. (see also A. Westenholz and U. Koch-Westenholz, Studies Lembert, p. 449, fn. 9). Very appropriately, for the present context, it signifies defiance through illicit sexual congress. The variant ulâbhû (MS B) does not produce notably better sense and is presumed a corruption. With Mayer and Westenholz I take ulâlu as the adjective, noting the semantic opposition which contrasts Enki’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–v). Other have taken ulâlu as a II/3ative from âldû, 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 ulâhû-ulâlu-unmaštû in the narrative (SB I 199–201) fits the unambiguous šâbhû (SB var. šēbhû)-ella-tulâmûmû in Enkidu’s reminiscence of it (MB Ur 38–40 and SB VII 129–31).

200. The verb bûnkû 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 šîru in the sense ‘to stand still’ see SB IV 250: ‘[sawmen]r umâšûma luna isárû, and the description of impossible marching conditions in Sîn-Marûdû’s kudarân: ni-isê-su šu râhišat-su (gaštu)’, and siš(uár, kur)nu, and ša-is-â-si-is-su (BBS 6 i 20; Nbi 1), ‘the best of even the largest horses came to a halt’. The venitive on ulâhû is almost always to be construed ‘coupe’, ‘cause’, 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 (Bülgic Mem.Vol.; Ankara, 1997), pp. 173–90. However, lûkû (var. lûkka) in the present line looks like a rare exception to the rule, for the animals’ motion clearly puts space between them and Enkidu. The alternative is to parse the verb as feminine plural. Wherever else in the SB epic bûnkû is construed as singular, note the apparent use of at least one feminine plural verb in a Mari letter: bu-lum (\ldots) a-na li-bî-li na-em ulla ulla li-â-li-li-lî-â-pu ulla bu-lum li a-bi-la li-â-li-li-lî-â-pu (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 (sûma ‘block’, sagallûa, ‘catle’).

201. Note the irregular orthography of umâštû, even in a Kuyunjik MS (F). The verb mûnûtû (II/1) can mean ‘to be diminished’ in speed as well as in strength. For the former nuance see a NA astrological report noting the slowing of Mars: inû-dû-ta li-li-â-pu um-de-â-tu (Hunger, SAA 381-3, 3), ‘it was slowed in its course’. For the latter see the famous letter of Urâd-Gula to Aššurânûpal, describing an unfinished consultation with a prophet: mûnûtû-ta li-ta-â-ta um-ta-â-tu (Parpola, Studies Rimer, p. 264 = SAA X 294 rev. 32), ‘he was contrary and weak of vision’. Both nuances apply to Enkidu.

202. Thompson’s restoration of i-âlû, endorsed by von Soden (ZA 53, pp. 222), is rejected here, since the space given over to the sign š in the tablet (MS F) indicates that the sign that follows starts a new word. We hold to Schott’s št-â-mâ (ZA 42, p. 101), though with some reservation, since the typically OA-MA value št is rarely used by NA scribes. Note that very little can be missing in the lacuna; št ti-is-â-sa-ta would certainly be too long. Ebeling’s št-ti-tim-mu (AP 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 i-tu-ar-ram-mu were already clear to Haupt; Thompson’s i-tu-ar-ram-mu is erroneous. However, I do not see how ra-ram-mu can be a satisfactory form of ramû (so Parpola), and so take all five signs as one word. The enclitic -mu is here written -mu, as in SB X 81, also a Kuyunjik MS (cf. AH 59, p. 664). This development is nothing to do with vowel harmony but is analogous with the displacement of ōa by ō 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 venitive (see this Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions).

204. The disagreement of the two Kuyunjik manuscripts over the gender of the pronominal suffix permits the alternative translations offered here. Both make sense. As he leads the realm of the animals for good, Enkidu begins to treat Šamšur in a less animal manner: he regards her face (pānta) attentively and listens to her speech with new understanding (similarly Oppenheim, Ons 17, p. 26). Alternatively one might comment that Šamšur’s observation in l. 207 might logically follow a prolonged gaze at his face (pânta). 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 šinnattû is present for the same reason šîrû is: the action continues during the following direct speech (see Chapter 5, the note on OB II 1).

207. The restoration of damâštû is a mixture of parallelism from the Babylonian, MB Boğ, Fragment a, 1. The variant in MS P is not, to my eyes, tab-ba-ši (so Thompson). This line and the following exhibit in slightly different forms a couple of the Pennsylvania tablet: anû ùkinnu ùmmu lâm taballû bûtâmû in a mmuništu kámum ša aštâ śi-tumû (OB II 53–5).

208. The line recurs as SB II 29.

209–10. There is no room on MS P for lu-û-î-ru-ka (e.g., CAD A 2, p. 314); the broken sign is much shorter. Of the alternatives lu-û-î-ru-ka and lu-û-ir-ru-ka the latter is a better fit. The change from OB štûkû (OB II 56) to SB štûtûrûka is unexciting and the conversion of Urâk šûrûtu to Urâk šûrûtu is routine, but the expansion of mâšû-[n] ša anûm (OB II 58) to mâšû šûrûtu is interesting; see Chapter 5, the introduction to the Pennsylvania tablet.

210a–b. This couplet is present in the manuscript from LB Urâk, perhaps represents an expansion of the text known at Kuyunjik, with material taken from l. 217 (i.e. quddûš) 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: ține anășita intactor gahă (OB II 66).

214. Enkidu’s miša lăbu recurs in SB II 32, perhaps II 59, and, with a different allusion, II 240.

216. The orthography kom-ba-ta for Șamši is unusual in a Kuyunjik manuscript (MS P), but not unacceptable: see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (e). An alternative reading, kom-ba ta-gi-er-re-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 qaddûlu qualifies miša instead of not lăbu.

220. The spelling lu-ug-ri-lum-ma displays an ostensibly native 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, ḫarrūma (see further Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub b); and (b) grammatical: the use of native independent pronouns for accusative is a stylistic feature of the late epic where: SB I 265 șakālu (*tanzi + am)-lum-ma // I 283 allālu-lum-ma (both LB MS h), XI 197 wakāru-lum-ma (MS S C). Probably there is too much space on MS B between da-an and the trace, to read da-an-nīl 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-ku (von Soden, ZA 53, p. 222).

221. There does not seem to be room here for [lu-äš-tar]-ri-ṣ (cf. CAD S 2, p. 39), and space is short even for [lu-šar]-ri-ṣ, but no better solution presents itself. Tournay and Shaffer offer [li]-tši-ri-ṣ ou li-iš-ri-ṣ (Zepho, p. 58, fn. 62), but a verb in the first person is required. Parpola’s [lu-šar]-ri-ṣ it meets that need but employs an unexpected stem.

222. A restoration [eš]-u-lum-ma, ‘I will enter’ (von Soden, op. cit.), is possible but bland; [ana]-lu-lum-ma, emphatic, is a more plausible alternative (for anēlu-ma spelled so at Kuyunjik see SB II 123). The spelling lu-ša-ou, if correctly read, is taken as an example of a literary singular, lūša, 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 lūša, a scribal lapse easily paralleled.

224. The restoration of niša provides a good antecedent for lūša, 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-kaš-im-ka 4Gilemeš a-la... (Essays Pop, p. 29), unadorned by square brackets, relies on the parallel in 1. 234, but the traces do not support it.

227. The word sēkku is the conventional reading of țibēl, but it does not provide the trochaic line ending required by the metre; perhaps read šagmis? 228. The trace after up is more like ṭi than ṭu.

229. The line is restored after AHAH, p. 959. More wordy restorations have been made (e.g. a-šar [ṣi-ša-aš-še-ma-ra ša]-ma a-la-ū (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 Nacht der sind gebreitet die großen Decken’, i.e. m[u-us-ša-u m]u-ša-u (Reclarm; 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 nabū, i.e. ‘the great ones escape’, using the rare meaning of šīḫu found in Enûma lăšt (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 Pop, 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 nabû here means ‘old’, as in the phrase šeṣer nabû, nabû 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 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 șa-dā’u amēlu is syntactically suspect and semantically unbalanced, coupling as it does an apparent active (șa-dā’u) and an exclamation (amēlu) as a makeshift 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 ṣa-dā’u (ša-dā’u), 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, Gilgamel uses ṣa-dā’u of 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 ša-dā’-u-ṣ must therefore be explained as a spelling which preserves as variants two alternative accusative case endings, respectively NB and MB.

The discovery of ša-dā’u in two lines of Gilgamesh forces one to look again at the supposed attestations of the word Ḫattuš. This is a term which physiognomic omens use to denote someone whose temperament predisposes them to bad fortune or other troubles (Böck, Morphoskopie, pp. 265, 21: Ḫa-ar-tu-ša-ta-ta-ttu, ‘he is a Ḫa, he will not thrive’; 266, 24: Ḫa-ti-ša ša-ingi ḪakPATU-i-dāk, ‘he is a Ḫa, he will die by the sword’; Kraus, ZA 43 (1943), p. 83, 3: Ḫi-tu ki Ḫa-ar-ša-ta-ta-ttu ša-ingi, ‘if in temperament he is a Ḫa, he will suffer’, etc. Böck, Morphoskopie, p. 140, 52: Ḫ a-ša-ta-eš-an-sa ša-eš-an ša-eš-an, ‘if in temperament he is a Ḫa, his husband (…)?’. Since the spellings are ambiguous, some of these attestations may, in fact, belong to ša-dā’u, the carefree seeker after pleasure, rather than Ḫattuš. 239. Nothing appears to be lost in the slender break between țibēl and ša: the latter introduces an unusual expression, but compare, e.g., šar ur-nimša.

240. Sense insists that MS B’s ša-na-ra is an inferior variant born of a lack of understanding. To challenge Gilgamesh is to dispute the will of the gods, specifically his particular patron, Šamaš (l. 241), and the ruling triad of Anu, Enlil and Ea (l. 242). With the couplel l. 241–2 compare SB VII 78–81, which probably lists the same gods in the same order.

244. MS P’s ša-na-ta la is probably ventive; see further Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (v).

245. The form lūšāru is already found in the Pennsylvania tablet (OB II 1), OB Schayen, 1 (where it is otherwise lūšāru) and in MB Bog 3’. In the text the word recurs as a trisyllable in SB II 273a (MS h only), VI 181–2 and XI 197, but as lūša in SB I 276, IV passim, VII passim (šu-na-ta in VII 165 is for ša-na-ta and IX 13. A comparable example of this literary affectation in the SB epic is rāqišu for rāqišu; for this and other examples of such style in SB Gilgamel see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (l).
246. Similar lines are SB VII 165: minimmā ibrānu(a) irtu(m) māšīya and Lugal II 22 // 30: ina šumā(m) a-ta-nu mu-ši-[i]-. In the second of these, aštālu māšīya 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 aštālu (MS B) and aštālu (MS P) is taken instead as indicative it exhibits a verb (as already in I. 244). In all three lines māšīya is genitive and one must assume an idiomatic ellipse of ina. For māšīya and other expressions of time with pronominal suffixes see now M. Stol, ‘Suffixe bei Zeitangaben im Akkadischen’, WZKM 86 (1996), pp. 413–24.

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

248. SB kipṣu la ʾamin 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 kipṣu la ʾamin is here clearly a meteorite, as entered in CAD K, p. 441; see further J. K. Bjorkman, Meteorites and Meteorites 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 itubit making way for SB dâm, and umissūma replaced by the iterative irtu(m)baškittumā. In this passage and its parallels note the contrast between the plain aššumma and aššumma, used when the action is unsuccessful (II. 249, 263), and the ventives aššummā and aššummmā, which appear when the action leads to the successful delivery of the object to Ninsu (II. 257, 265, 283).

251–5. These lines expand the couplet OB II 10–11: Urūk mašum pašir ešla / erti / šumum ummašāl lišepa. The restorations are made from the parallels (SB I 279–82, II 103–7). For erti-pīr 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 Ninsu’s reply and the second dream, though the actions are there given in a different order. For kâšušu see above, on I. 186. This line has no place in the first dream recounted in the Pennsylvania tablet, but appears only in the second dream (OB II 33–4; aššumma kina aššitumu abububu ešla). 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 aššumma kina aššitumu abububu and its variants are paired with the line a šumum ummašāl lišepa 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 itašatālu ana erti šéširki (OB II 14) has turned into itašatālu ina šéširki.

258. As with I. 256, this line is found in the Pennsylvania tablet only in the second dream (OB II 43: aššum ummašāl lišepa). The making equal of Enkidu is achieved on his adoption by Nisunum as a brother for Gilgamesh in SB III 127–8 (see already Cooper, PenelitstEin Mem. Vél., p. 40). For this reason I reject the translation of ummašāl in this passage as ‘to compete’ (e.g. CAD M/1, p. 70). It is equally certain that the context of Gilgamesh and Enkidu was not arranged by Nisunum but by Ana (SB 198), probably at Ea’s suggestion (MB Nippur, 4).

259. Where MS has māšīlu (as too MSS B and H in the parallel line, I. 286), MS P reads an-t lá. Neither bâšu-lá, ‘her lord’, nor e-ni-tá, ‘her en-priest’, makes sense in the context. Instead, MS P’s spelling is an error arising from a confusion of Akkadian marû, ‘son’, with Aramaic marû, ‘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 bēl(l)umum-lá), have been noted by Simo Parpola, ‘Assyrians after Assyria’, Journal of Assyrian Academic Society 12/II (2000), p. 12. This line and the following represent an expansion of the Pennsylvania tablet’s shorter couplet: ummī Gilgamēš māšīlu at kalâmâ / issaqâram ana Gilgamēl (OB II 15–16). The same epithets are applied to Gilgamesh’s mother in SB III 17 and 117.

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

269. Note e-mu-qi-ši in the LB MS h, which may be a witness to a different tradition, rather than an example of crasis or a mistake.

272. MS h’s zisâzîkabu now confirms MS B’s iterative [aklu]nezâzîkabu (von Soden, ZA 53, p. 222, suggested with reference to SB III 4).

273. The restoration of the Kuyunjik MS follows Landshamer, RA 62 (1968), p. 116, with reference to parallels later in the epic (SB IV 28–9, 109, SB VII 72–4, MB Megiddo oab. 10–11). Other suggestions for the broken word are [ma-qi-š][a] and [po-zi-š][a] (von Soden). In view of the Pennsylvania tablet’s istâltama istâmar istâmam (OB II 24), one should perhaps give precedence to the LB manuscript. There the spelling šu-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 (šēdād); is that really what the scribe intended?

274–5. This couplet develops the single line OB II 25: šu irtu(m)ma ana ummîlu. The first line reappears as SB III 22.

276. The word ḫunu, a simple variation on [appu]nû, is new. The LB MS h’s ummîlu (instead of ummî) appears to represent an unusual intrusion of late dialect. The line is an expansion of the Pennsylvania tablet’s ummî umâmā šênêtam (OB II 26).

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

278–85. 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 h’s ka-la-l u šu kalâma is a spelling that is to be interpreted as kalâma. For the late shift of intervocalic /i/ to /o/ see GAG 531d.

295. It is unclear whether [a]n-ma, preserved only on the LB manuscript (MS o), is a writing for SB ummî, with indifferent final vowel, or, as in I. 276, the late dialect form ummî. As always, it is uncertain whether the spellings maš-lû and [ma-š]-lû represent māšku, ‘counsellor’, or māšku/malkû, ‘prince’. According to the dictionaries Enlil can be either. The connection with Gilgamesh’s instinctive desire for counsel argues for the former. Enlil is māšku not so much because he gives advice but because he deliberates 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 asserts (W. G. Lambert, JCS 18 (1957–8), p. 50, 18 // 10): šu-â-na ša-lam enlîlu(din) do-xu 6 =e-šu pi i-nî (dag)nu mi-ši mašku(gur), ‘he himself is the eternal image of Enlil, who hears the people’s voice, the nation’s opinion.’ The mortal king is in fact māšku-annu, ‘the counsellor-man’, the phrase coined for him in a mythological text which describes the separate creation of man and king (W. M. R. Mayer, Or ns 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; es-lil = marduk(amar.u) ša be-šu-ti u mit-ša-ši-ti, ‘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 wilāhu māhar ṣarrattim / urta’āmi kilallim, whence the restorations are taken.

### TABLET II

1. The end of the line might very plausibly be restored [ḫi-sa]-qu, ‘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 Asšurbanipal (see Colophons of the manuscripts, MS B).

28. Von Wehler reads [ṣa] ṣa-an nam, but it seemed to me that the line begins with na or ina UD. The parallels do not help. A vat (nammūtu) is not an obvious desideratum here, though the spelling na-an-zi-tū is not without parallel. A more plausible reading would be ina limi/(ud) anni, ‘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. This line is restored from SB I 208 cf. (the Pennsylvania tablet: OB II 54–5).

30. This line might be a replication of SB I 214: mādu ḫabbalāt īš’tā’ ībra. However that may be, it may also recur as SB II 59.

34–5. The couplet is a repetition of the Pennsylvania tablet’s šaḫtu šabānu šarratum ulubissu / šabānu šarrām ū šaṭalak (OB II 69–72).

36–7. These two lines are restored from the almost identical couplet in the Pennsylvania tablet: pāšak qāṣu kūma īmān iktiridātu / ana guqdi ša rēmām ašar tābūtum (OB II 72–6). The introduction of plural ša for šarrām may be simply an orthographic feature, but note that the same thing has happened in l. 110 (MS k). The writing dingirus for the singular is occasionally attested in the first millennium. Some examples are given in CAD I[1], p. 91; note also in l. 49 of the Theodicy singular ša (parallel li-li-i-i, l. 51) spelled dingir, dingir, dingir and dingirum.

38. Cf. the Pennsylvania tablet: ina širittā ṣabānu rešu (OB II 77).

39. As it stands on the tablets this curious line presents two prepositional phrases with no verb of any kind. Heidell found one by ignoring šašu (which on the manuscript that was available to him is partly obscured by an erasure) and reading the remaining half line as nammī mīšuma, ‘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 ramāšīma to the tradition is now confirmed by MB Bog a 9; ina na-na-ana-du-u. One should assume that the beginning of the line is corrupt.

40. This older version of this couplet is astenu Gāgumē māṣi wilātu padatum / šarām šašu šaṭatum pabûtu (OB II [80–2] // 183–5); l. 41 and 42 is repeated as SB II 164. The word šašu-iššu is stative šašu with a typical LB redundam final vowel (so already Heidell). At the end šašu-šaštum is accordingly for šašu-šašu-šaštum is also 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; mādu šaḫtu išušatū ina šabānu (cf. MB Bog, Fragment a, 11). On minds 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 asakalāma šartum manḥara (OB II 87) by the addition of a parallel line.

46. The Pennsylvania tablet has išušatū ina šašu / išušatū (OB II 88). Here the spelling ša-šašu may signify that this word was no longer understood as šašu, for though the ‘overhanging’ vowel would be unremarkable, the value ša is not typical of LB orthography outside the archaising royal inscriptions. The translation nevertheless assumes in ša-šašu a corruption of šašu, for want of an alternative. A verb pašu or pašu appears in lexical texts (see AHw, p. 809), but its meaning is unknown. No verb pašu or pašu is known.

47–8. This couplet is freely restored in the spirit of the Pennsylvania tablet: ušušu ina šabānu akhānu / šarrātu ina šabānu šarrātu (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 šiššu šašu and šiššu šarrātu 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 šiššu šarrātu in OB II 98.

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

59. One may also read na-ra-ša-šašu, ‘his greatness’.

60. The restorations are taken from OB II 115–16: utu-utu šarānu šarrātu. 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 survives on the Pennsylvania tablet: šiššu šarrātu raššum / Enkidu maṣṣušu assālu ērum (OB II 117–19). The stative [ni]šarrāmu is restored on grounds of space. The spelling na-sada-ša-šašu for *maṣṣušu-šarrāmu exhibits the occasional Neo-Assyrian preference for masculine plural pronouns with dissimilated vowels, as attested in the possessive suffixes -šumu and -šamu 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 a very rare case of a real Assyrian dialect form intruding in the text of a Kulunnik manuscript of the SB epic. For others see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (viii).

63. The beginning of the line is restored from OB II 120. As argued in the note on the OB text, the formula šušu šunu 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 ša šašu would therefore likely signify the house where the wedding ceremony was due to take place, i.e. šušu šunu, and is presumed to be corrupt (von Soden, ZA 53, p. 222, suggested ša-šašu, ‘er šarṭu’).

ii 1–2. Though the context is not yet certain, dam in l. 2’ recalls the passage of the Pennsylvania tablet that describes the išs primas naṣṣats (especially OB II 161); if so the preceding line is very likely to be restored šarru ša Urku šuturēti […] (cf. OB II 154, 156).

100–2. These lines expand on a couplet of the Pennsylvania tablet: šarrāmu šašu [šarrāmu šašu / šarrāmu šarrāmu] (OB II 200–3), but the sense of the interpolated line remains rather difficult to fathom. As von Soden noted, iššu is not obviously meaningful; he suggested emending to ša-šašu-šašu, ‘er oriet’ (ZA 53, pp. 222–3); Hecker’s ‘ša Aššur’ (TUT IV/4, p. 683) evidently takes iššu-šašu as an exceptional spelling of epēšu.

103–7. These five lines repeat SB II 4 101 // 279–82.

109–10. This couplet is a slighth rewriting of the Pennsylvania tablet: ana Gāgumē kūma ūšu šarrātu mešrum / ana šašu šarrātu nāšīnā (OB II 194–7). In l. 109 there is no room for [mu-
118. At the beginning of this line Gilgame restored [in-nad]-tu-ma (AF 08 1932–3, p. 227), 'they embraced one another', for which there is just enough space, but other restorations are possible.

119. The spelling a-na in the Kuyunjik tablet (MS X) for accusative singular amātu or amātu can be explained as (a) being an early indication in script of the loss of final vowels in the vernacular, (b) using a rebus-spelling, a-na(a) or (c) exhibiting the principle that NV/CVC signs may represent the bisyllabic CVV, not only where the two vowels are the same (well known in NA writing) but even where they differ. Spellings CVC for CV, CV are not remarkable in LB sources; other examples in Kuyunjik manuscripts of SB Gilgame are collected in Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (c). For examples in older Neo-Assyrian manuscripts see the introduction to Chapter 7.


119. An older version of this line occurs in OB Schabae, 64 // 67 // 76: ira-e₂₃₄₅₆₇ a₂₃₄₅₆₇₉ b₂₃₄₅₆₇₉. The writing of pa₂₃₄₅₆₇ for pēša could be put down to typographical error of a final vowel but for the fact that this particular spelling of the pronoun suffix is so infrequent that it must have been expressly avoided as an error. At a time when the feminine suffix -ā₂₃₄₅₆₇ was very often written -ā₂₃₄₅₆₇, an example of the opposite may be an instance of hypercorrection. Alternatively, it is plain sloppiness, comparable with MS bbb's pēšā₂₃₄₅₆₇ in l. 274.

213. Possibly i₂₃₄₅₆₇-k₂₃₄₅₆₇, 'let me cut' (Parpola).

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

218 // 227 // 284 // 298. The spelling i₂₃₄₅₆₇-še₂₃₄₅₆₇ for the construct state šala₂₃₄₅₆₇ can be explained in one of two ways: (a) the writing preserves an LB concrete construct state in -u or (b) it exhibits an unnecessary 'overhanging' vowel (CV for C). 218–29. This passage, which develops OB III 106–16 // 195–200, is repeated later in the tablet (SB II 275–86; cf also 291–9). For recensional differences in the order of lines in both passages see Chapter 9, the section on Textual variants.

221 // [278] // 291. The late text retains the OB text's rīgum₂₃₄₅₆₇ (literary for rīgā₂₃₄₅₆₇) in nearly all manuscripts.

222 // 279 // 292. The text retains the OB line, although the intermediate version of the text represented by Assyrian MS y offers the variant sē₂₃₄₅₆₇ (g, obv. 12) for nā₂₃₄₅₆₇.

223 // 280 // 293. The reading rīm sitsi₂₃₄₅₆₇, already legible in MS X (though badly abraded), is now confirmed by the additional evidence furnished by MS y. 224 // 281 // 295. MS y's sē₃₄₅₆₇-r is the loss of subjunctive -u is unremarkable in a LB source; for arē₂₃₄₅₆₇ and forests see the OB version of this line, OB III 109 // 196 manum₂₃₄₅₆₇ ta₂₃₄₅₆₇ šala₂₃₄₅₆₇.

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

223–3. This couplet reworks the older u₂₃₄₅₆₇-sē₂₃₄₅₆₇ (Enkidu): ki₂₃₄₅₆₇ arē₂₃₄₅₆₇ / pēša rīm₂₃₄₅₆₇ tū₂₃₄₅₆₇ ("OB III 156–7 // Assyrian MS y, 7° and 9°). It appears again as SB 180–1; cf SB IV 233.

234–5. Restored after the Yale tablet: arē₂₃₄₅₆₇ manum₂₃₄₅₆₇ sē₂₃₄₅₆₇ / manum₂₃₄₅₆₇ šala₂₃₄₅₆₇ (or ša₂₃₄₅₆₇ manum₂₇₋₋ OB III 142–3). The second verb has changed from present to prettice. Assyrian MS y, 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 šā₁₃₄₅₆₇ in, and in any case, the verb ša₁₃₄₅₆₇ looks as if it requires a feminine plural subject.

Assyrian MS y, has the second and third of these lines, but separated by others (6': etīšum ṣib-ba-ru, [makar], 8': [ ... ] kāšiku nī[ta]), In l. 238 of the present passage the verb of the OB version has been replaced with a near homophone and its subject made plural: ṣib-b humilitya tabiš. Consequently this is no longer entirely appropriate and its restoration is open to question. In l. 239 the late text represented by MS ee has retained the verb (the rare 1/M stem of nītāru, see George, NAU 191/19.1), even preserving the ṣib of the old spelling. However, the variant ṣib厨师 of MS e points to the interference of an uncomprehending editor, who at some time replaced the verb with a common verb that sounded similar.

241-2. This couplet can be restored after OB III 161 and 163: [al̄aman ʾišša ana kikkarīm kāšiku(m) ... ] ṣib-ba na (a)ku (a)nna māšaša(m) ṣib厨师, but it is by no means certain that the late text would favor the hapax legomenon māšaša above other verbs of motion.

247. The first word is restored after the Yale tablet's müša (OB III 164). Note that OB ušad-ta-dān (III:2) is replaced with ušanamōdaš (III:2, lex). 248. If ni-ši-ši-qa stands for the cognomotive i niptiq (ventive in -u, as often in LB copies), it would appear that the narrative of the Yale tablet (OB III 165-70) has been replaced by speech (cf. von Wehrer, ZA 62 (1972), pp. 225 and 228; Bontero). For a common example of a cognomotive without speech see SB III 15: nālak (Kuyunjik MS). The alternative is to assume that the ni is an error and read the passage as narrative (with Hecker, TUAT III/4, p. 685).

250. For distributive bišš see Ch. 5, the note on OB III 166.

251. As the scribal annotations in ll. 251 and 254 indicate, the sole surviving source for the text of ll. 251 ff. was copied from a broken master copy. In this line the sign read as i could instead be the remains of an integer, i.e., 'x [talents]', where x is a number between five and nine.

254. The surviving signs may be the remnants of narrative štēšibni, 'they cast' (ventive, as in l. 248).

260. The annotation x šumā šēšī, 'x lines are skipped' (l. 260), is usually used where text is omitted as predictable (as in lātinu), but it is unlikely that such would be the reason here. Given also the presence of the annotation šēšib in the immediately preceding lines, I assume that the scribe has used it instead of x šumā šēšī, 'x lines are broken', which is the conventional way of expressing the loss of lines in a break (for šēšīpa as a technical scribal term for omitting lines, see W. R. Mayer, Or Na 39 (1990), pp. 32-3). From l. 254 on the damage was evidently so bad that the scribe could only report the number of lines missing. This is a particular shame, for these lines would have described the convening of the assembly, an episode which is also fragmentary in the Yale tablet (OB III 172-7). Though the scribal annotation follows šumā šēšib nišib I assume that it summarizes the gap that precedes the line that begins so. There is nowhere no choice to interpolate the convening of the assembly. Such a placement of the annotation is not illogical, for the missing end of this line is the last lacuna resulting from the break on the master copy in which the five lines fell. It is thus the only conveniently empty space suitable for annotation.


262-71. The lines are restored from the parallel passage SB III 24-34, where the line corresponding to l. 262 fills two lines of poetry. The present l. 262 fills two lines of poetry. The present allāk in the same line makes the result of aga-duš. The usage of gapāša attributed in this line finds a parallel in the older version of the poem of Anzu, where the occasion is also a warrior setting of battle: q̄i-nu-suš ta-ba-si-im-ta-dā-pa ša-dī-tā ša-pa-ud-ša-dū-ša-lu ša-bi-ša-da-ša, 'the hero of battle became bold, [he went] off to the mountain' (OB Anzu II 74), and again, q̄i-nu-suš ta-ba-lu ša-dū-ša-lu ša-bi-ša-da-ša da-ša-bi-ša-da-ša, 'the hero of battle became bold, he went back to [the mountain]' (OB Anzu III 73). For riqāq instead of riqātu see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (2).

271. For alā tuwaṣṣun see also SB I 229.

272. The verb is restored in the present tense because it introduces direct speech (see Chapter 5, the note on OB II 1). However, the last sign is indistinct. One might instead read q̄i-[ba-kān tē]-ma, 'he stated (his) opinion' (cf. SB III 120 iṣakkaša šēmu).

274. One expects q̄ēšibhumum

275-85. See already SB II 218-29.

278-9. The first line of this couplet, which is written on one line of tablet in both extant manuscripts, one would expect to read Hūmūm iṣam nāma šumkaš (as in the several parallels (OB III 110-12 // 197-8; SB II 221-2 // 291-2)), but the traces do not quite fit.

287-90. These two couplets offer a slight variation on the Yale tablet: šēmu ta-šāra šēšib šīna(m) uru ura iṣāmu šēmu šēšib šīna(m) šēmu šē
6'. a-li-kās mahā-ri šu-ut is-šak-ú-ka-e (NA hymn); Langdon, R4 12 (1915), p. 191, 3: a-li mahā-ri šin (škar-prayer, NA copy); KAR 132 ii 12 (RAc, p. 101): inša mahā-ri pa-ni-tā (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 Akkāk genitive construct (see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub ii). For other spellings like šar-ra (MS BB) for šarrātu 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-dā-ni (MS BB) for múdālu see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (g).

19–20. The sequence ša-pat-bi ... šalkū occurs also in MB Bog. i 5', where both verbs are ven- tive. I take the present šalkū as an indication of a final clause; alternatively it can be circumstantial (M. P. Streck, Or 68 1995), p. 61: 'während sie gingen'. The word gātusur (var. gātussu) is a variant of locative gātussu, comparable with such forms as kar-šu-si-ni-na, 'in their minds' (Enûma eli 111), kak-ku-us-su, 'with his weapon' (Anzû i 13), 'en-li-us-su-na, 'before their supreme lord' (Anzû i 16), ša-ša-us-su, 'to his mountain' (Anzû i 82 // 109 // 127 // 148), and ša-pa-us-su, 'for her work' (Buûussa-ra's hymn to Gula. W. G. Lambert, Or 36 1967, p. 118, 42). These variants, with ši instead of šū, perhaps arose by analogy with the ending -šaššu(m) found in verbs of time, especially in the late period (gmussu, 'daily', arúsusu, 'monthly', OB šaššu(m) > NB šaššu, 'yearly').

22. The restoration follows SB i 274: ūšina šar-ra ana maḫar šarri ummuṭu. This line is thus revealed as part of the epic repertoire. It was not completely petrified, however, for MS M clearly differs in the proposition that precedes the common noun šarri.


25. The trisyllabic spelling of raqqatu is ra-qâ-tu is the most common in SB Gilgameš, being also attested in SB III 48, IX 54, X 110, 141 and 241; one also meets ra-qâ-tum (SB 19) and ra-qu-ti (SB 111, fem. sing., see ad loc.). The intrusion of a normally unwarranted epenthetic vowel is a mark of literary style. For other examples in SB Gilgameš see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (b).

28. Note the additional word, ūšappātu, absent from the parallel SB II 265. Its tense is the 'performative' preterite (see above, on 1.1).

35–6. This couplet offers a very rare example in the Babylonian Gilgameš of what may be called enaimement—the continuation of a clause beyond the end of the verse—with the boundary of the poetic lines splitting the paired object Gilgameš marītu u Enkidu. Realization of the beginning of a new sentence of the form 'When preceding a noun the prepositional phrase is normally ana pār in OB and literary Babylonian: The variant maḫri offered in this line is rare. Other examples of genitive construct maḥri before a noun beginning with a consonant (i.e. where crisis is discounted) are rare, and more often than not comprise the second element of compounds: Enûna eli I 149 // II 35 // III 39 a-li-kū maḫ-ri (III 97 ma[k]-ma-ni, Craig, ABRT I S5 i 5, ed. Livingstone, Court Poetry no. 4 i
there is no suggestion in the epic that Ūnûmanna is what such a rendering implies, the source of all evil in the land. In exorcistic and medical literature minimamem 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 mim-ma lem-ma (‘Evil Thing whatever that may exist, or any Evil Thing that has no name’) (Wiggermann, Protective Spirits, p. 6, 9–10). Later on in the same text the unidentified malign influence is adjured to depart: mim-ma lem-mu mim-ma šūma(dūg.gal) šī-bīr(danna) šī-sa-a ma-bar-bar-a-un, ‘the Evil Thing, the Bad Thing shall depart a myriad leagues from your presence!’ (ibid., p. 20, 306–7). This understanding of minimamem fits Humbaba well, for he is by reputation an Evil Thing of nature hostile to man but otherwise unknowable except for remote and untried. Since Humbaba is assumed to be evil, Šamaš, the god of justice, is naturally seen to oppose him. For the spelling šal-laqt (MS BB), lacking the subjunctive -u, see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (c).

55. I follow Tournay and Shaffer, L’ippopée, p. 102, fn. 17, in assuming that this line refers to the day-time journey of the sun across the sky, crossing the cosmic boundaries of heaven and earth. Instead of šan they restore the very rare word šalu, ‘circumference’: ‘these limits of the ced’ Other readings are possible.

56. For Aya as ‘bride’ see the references collected in CAD K, p. 81. On the spelling kal-lat for kallatu see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (c).

66. I assume medēku 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:

izī.gar.zu.lē dug₃, ga ak dingir.gal.gal.e.ne
a-na nu-ri-ka u-paq-qi šī[s]i.dingir] mé kābi[itu(gal)an]mé
"a.nun.na.ka.e.e ne gi.bar.ra sag.zu mu.un.i.dug₃
"a-nun-na-ki gi-mir-sū-nu i-na-at-ta lu pa-ni-ka


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


80–4. These five lines recur as §§ 130–4. The vocabulary of §§ 132 is reminiscent of statements in EAE XV and Kûshar II of the seasonal changes in the lengths of day and night, e.g. šama irriša mustu šarāru (see F.N. Al-Rawi and A. R. George, AO 38–9 (1991–2), pp. 60–1). Line 83 is restored in the light of the common expression for travelling on foot, puridda-pēši, ‘to open one’s stride’, see especially Ludlul IV 41, where pur-ta a pur-ri-duk is a metonymy for all who go on two legs.

85. In its first and last words this line recalls the narrative statement OB Schøyen, S 2: nānattum iskiša intānum, though the traces do not allow the expected phrase iskiša intānum.

89–92. The realization of this wish is §§ 137–41. The verb šī in §§ 142–144 may have been a variant of šītu, ‘they beat’ (Humbabba’s face), for the Hittite paraphrase renders the narrative line as nu-kaš (ATA ḫuwa[wa] tra-HA-ra EGR-pa usāšiṭa-anu, ‘and the ḫuwa[wa] slams the door, closed the door over you’ (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:
103. By virtue of his agá, '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. xxvii 41-6): fín(n.en.zu) . . . agá(m) agá kussú an.gi.gu ša lú-ru-tim ilt-ê-ta-er-ê, 'May Šina take from him the crown and throne of kingship!' Compare also the names of city gates in Babylon (Tintur V 72: 'šin(30) mu-kin agá(m) be-šu-ti-á; Šin is the Estubisher of his Lordy Crown') and Sennacherib's Nineveh (CT 26 32, 91 // R. C. Thompson, Iraq 7 (1940), p. 90, 28: wasu-ru na-šir(lmu) mu-kin agá(m) be-šu-ti-á, 'The Moon is the Estubisher (var. Protector) of my Lordy Crown'). The lack of agreement at the end of the line between the extant manuscripts can perhaps be resolved by placing an original ending šáttu u palá, 'sceptre and royal symbol'. These two items of regalia go together as a pair in an incantation to Enmešar [Cuig, ABRT II 13, 8; na-din at-ša[pigiduru] u palá(bala)]. How exactly Gilgamesh is to share the moon's regalia is not clear to me.

104. Perhaps one should instead emend to ina apis. As deciphered, this line provides the first attestation of a verb eméšu (iši), 'to be deep, profound, wise'. The meaning is evident from the well-known adjective emu.

105–6. Irini or Irina is best known as an aspect of the warlike Isar, as in Agušaya A (VIS X 214 vi 25) and a god list (CT 25 17 ii 11 // 44, Sm 1558, 5). The name is translated 'Victory' by J. Jacobsen, Toward the Image of Tammuz, p. 34. Elsewhere in Gilgamesh Irini is accredited with ownership of the Cedar Mountain, though there the name appears to refer to goddesses in general (SBV 6). In other lists there is a deity Irina of chthonic character (CT 25 8 obv. 12; KAV 65 ii 8; E. Weidner, AK 2 (1924–5), p. 73, 26), and that is certainly the point here, for in the next line is Ningishzida. For his role as the 'chamberlain' (gwaspad) of the Netherworld, and the mythology in which he figures, see W. G. Lambert, Studies Moræ, pp. 295–300.

117. Restored after l. 17, etc.

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

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

122. The word written at-mu-ka is difficult. It usually understood as the preterite or present of the verb amu, though one would expect šam(m)uška, or the preterite of samu, though one would expect amēka. There is a marked lack of consensus as to what these participles meant in the context (see amēka: Oppenheim: 'I pronounce you'; Heidel: 'I have accepted(?) you'; similarly Speiser, von Soden: 'sprach ich zu dir'; similarly Kovacs and Hecker; Labat: 'je te déclare (mien)'; Foster: 'I have bespoken you'; Lambert: 'I reflect upon you'; samu: Botteri, 'je t'adjure', similarly Tournay and Shaffer; note also improbable amēka: Schott: unclear: Pettinato, 'ti ho annoverato'). These difficulties of form and meaning lead me to reject both verbs, and to read amēka as a regular form, from the noun amu (cf. already Dalley, 'your offspring'). The clause is thus a nominal one.

The word amu, 'hatching, chick', is otherwise used of human young only by Shalmaneser I (Grayson, RIM 4 1, 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 an amu (SBV 87–8).

123. For the plural of askakku see OB Atram-šassî III vii 6: is-ul-ak-ka-ti.

124. The exact nature of indu, 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 RIS 17 (1948), p. 34, fn. 1; also CAD IJ, 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 Oppenheim, p. 43, 44:2.12–14). They may have been have been ‘slave tags’ worn around the neck (so M. A. Dandamaev, Slavery in Babylonia, p. 234), but this function is disputed (see Brinkman, Studies Oppenheim, pp. 37–8). The word īnād fits nowhere in the known technical terminology for slave marking. We know from legal documents that the mark of a šīrīku libaṭu of ītār (as Bīlet-Uruk) in Neo-Babylonian Uruk was a star symbol (ḥakābatu), which took the form of a brand mark (aṭūtu) on the hand (see the references collected in CAD S/3, p. 106); on the marking of these and other temple slaves with branding irons (tiṃdu-paraš) and other devices in the first millennium see Dandamaev, Slavery, pp. 488–9. Marking (ašīg) 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. Steinkeller in OIP 104, p. 243; D. A. Foxvog, ‘Sumerian brands and branding-irons’, ZA 85 (1995), pp. 1–7). The classic slave mark of the second millennium was the style of hair called abuttu. Judging from our passage, which serves as an etymology of the ritual induction of libatu in Ur, in earlier times some form of identification was displayed on the neck that denoted the slave’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 āqat is certainly another example of the ‘performative’ preterite (see above, on SB III 11): urabba predicts the outcome of the induction and is present-future.

127. In MS M, the reading of the sign  id as i is now seems inescapable. Other examples of writings of the first-person conjugation prefix e/ with signs normally displaying i/ are not uncommon; in this book SB III 127 u-tu-šē-ē (MS M) / e-šē-ē (MS aa) is joined by XI 82 t-e-za-ē (MS T) / e-e-ze-ē (MS D) and XI 41 a-te-ša-ē (MS C) / e-e-te-ša (MS SWW). MS aa’s eqat is a further example of the ‘performative’ preterite. This statement looks like a version of the very words spoken on adoption, for which the phrase used in OB legal documents is also ana a-mardīm lāqām (see M. David, Die Adoption im altbabylonischen Recht (Leipzig, 1927), pp. 38 ff.; M. de F. Ellis, JCS 27 (1975), p. 127).

128. The verb dana-nuq also occurs in the context of an OB manumission document from Sippar (BELVI 1/96, 1–7): ‘su-er a-ra-tu-e; a-ešī-šu-ē-ni-nil-ta-ītu-hur’ šamaš (ara) umma-ša  u-da-am-mi-qi-āša-ma a-na ma-ri-i-ša il-su-ki-ri-lī [ē] ešī-šu-ē-a; . . . [ē]-iš-ša-ē-ša; “Suruṭum, whom Erīti-Aya, the natuham of Šamaš, her mother, had favored with adoption (lit.: favored and adopted): Erīti-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 hindibad but the verb describes the expected behaviour of the adopting family towards the new member.

129. Parpola restores a[a]-du, ‘do not fear!’


148. Or [a]-ša-bar-tā-lā or [ma]-bar-tā-lā?

150. Or in a m. ān ná (Parpola).

152. Or [a]-rāq sur-gin-nil, ‘the one who scatters the income offerings’.

166. This line compares with a line of the elders’ blessing in the Yale tablet: [āša]hūdha errittahh Shauntu (SB III 257).

167. This mention of Marduk, the god of Babylon, is unique in Gilgamesh, in which the divine dramatis personae are predominantly drawn from the local pantheon of Ur and the national pantheon of Sumer.

169. The first word can also be read ku-nī-tā, ‘sheaves’ (skūnūlīa, see Landsberger, RA 62, p. 103, fn. 24).

173. This cannot be the catch-line for SB IV, appearing as it does on col. v of MS c. It is obviously too early for the narrative of the journey to begin, since the final valedictions are yet to be made, so one must assume that this line comprises instructions in direct speech and continues the episode in which Gilgamesh and Enkidu are blessed for the journey. As such it would compare with the similarly detailed instructions of the elders in the Yale tablet (OB III 268–71).


211. The line is related to OB Harmal 17: ni-škidu kaša ina bāb kalūnūra.

214. Note the alliteration that attends the kissēs: khabaddah šumāqaš ūpāšu.

215–27. This speech is a repetition of ll. 1–12 (from which it is restored), with the addition of the single line 223. The burden of this incomplete line seems to be that Enkidu will guide Gilgamesh safely through the mountains. In the Sumerian poems of Gilgamesh and Hwawara there is a comparable line: ma ki ma, ki ma šu, šu sag. gaš. ku, šu mu, mu: ni in tim, time...
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-ununnī stellte Libanum nur ein Zwischenziel auf dem langen Marsch der Freunde [to the Cedar Forest] dar' (Reclams, 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, lābum 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 Landsberger pointed out, there is a contradiction inherent in this, because the mention of Lebanon in L. 4 would seem to indicate that Gilgames and Enkidu had already arrived at the Cedar Forest after three days’ journey (RA 62, p. 102). To resolve this difficulty we have to assume that pēšu here, and also in OB Schayen, means ‘to draw nearer’ (so already Renger in Oinas (ed.), Heroic Epic and Saga, p. 42).

In the Himite version of the epic the arrival at the Cedar Forest ostensibly occurred on the sixth day of the journey (H. Otten, Istaraler Mitteilungen 8 (1958), p. 109), which would represent a simple doubling of this figure. However, the figure in question can be read [UD] 15.KAM, i.e. after a journey of fifteen days, which would then agree with the SB text (E. Laroche, RHA 26 (1968), p. 126, Eg 4). However that may be, the late poet’s enthusiasm for repetition and aggrandisement means that the account we have has left reality a long way behind and is, in effect, a fairy tale. As Landsberger 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 sie die Merkmale reiner Märchen tragen’ (RA 62, p. 99, fn. 7).

4. To my eyes the place name on MS w is ‘lab-na-nu’ not ‘lib-na-mu’ (collated against Lambert’s copy). Late in this tablet, however, MS r has a clear ‘lib-na-nu’ (see l. 124). For this reason one would be tempted to read MS w’s ‘lab-na-nu’ as ‘lib-na-mu’, were it not for the fact that other Babylonian attestations of the toponym, where unambiguous, unanimously report it as Labānu (see M. Weipert, ‘Libanon’, RLAVLVI, 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 the Yale tablet: ina matsatika hirī bāritum iš la kāyarnī mī ellītum ina nādītum / kāsūtum mī aha Sāmīnī tanakku līka tabassāsa Luqabanda (OB III 266–71). On Gilgames and wells see Chapter 3, the section on Digging wells.


[11] // [44] // 89 // [131] // 172. The reading [BA] dari sarbišu is based on Labat’s ‘un [abri?] conte’ (vb)’ vent’, and encouraged by the verb retaš. 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 supposed [DI] or [DI]ŠI-g, for both of which room is lacking, however. For sarbišu, ‘stormwind’, see MLSIV, p. 35, Eemers; Voc. III 90. maSa ci.agg = nuSi.agg = kar-bīl-šu, following āšūtu and metētu, and Malibu III 192: [DI]-šI-g-qu = min (i.e. bīl-šu) (von Weilert, Uruk III 120), among other winds.

[13] // 46 // 91 // [133] // 174. The three signs after kūna have usually been interpreted as ‘mountain barley’ (‘le-Sādī’, Assyrian orthography), but to my eyes the second sign seems more like šēt than kūn. For šēt, in Sumarian sa. (Su.) ur. na, ‘flat-laid net’, a tool of the fowler, see CAD S/3, p. 339 (despite the claim la šēt the entries in OB Lu clearly indicate that the genitive is šēt). The verb described by this sign should mean ‘he threw himself down flat’, but no plausible restoration occurs to me.
192. Note the ventive imperative of *iṣantu* (cf. l. 161 above).

194–5. As Landsberger noted (RA 62, p. 105), this couplet also occurs as SB VII 132–3: Šamaš iššu (so also MS AA here) [aši]-iššu *ša* aššu aššu šamāš šatarrāšatu. The second verb is present before direct speech but the force of the -iššu-infinitive is uncertain (see the commentary on SB 178).

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

205. There is a temptation to compare this line with a passage of OB Harimal, in which Enkidu says, migittu mēnumma [Huwatoba] / kina / Adad iššu an ešeṭiu (ll. 19–20), while both contexts are so fragmentary it is best not to use this to justify restoration.

213. On *uš* 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 spelling of *italu* (see above, on l. 190). As such it makes a better active (I/1 perfect) than passive (IV/II tita-latādī contra Bottéro (‘des enfants ont été mis au monde’) for *akku* with an active masculine subject one need only cite Enūma elīš 116: *u*a-num tam-ti-la-šu ti-līd ‘nu-dim-mud. 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-gi*-ga looks to my eyes a better fit than *i riš-mašu (AHA, p. 1155). The restoration of iššu is supported by mangušu la iššu in l. 242.

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

235. The traces do not support Tournay and Shaffer’s [ka a]-la-ki pu-tu-um (Uloppée, p. 119, fn. 58).

238. Neither *ibepu* nor *uṣuru* (ibid., p. 119, fn. 60) fits the traces.

239. Von Soden parses both *tal-tap-pi*-ši here and *il-ta-pi* in SB X 175 from šadimmā, ‘to sweep’ (AHA, p. 536). I follow Landsberger, op. cit., and CAD L, p. 89, in parsing instead from *lapatu*, 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-tu* ma-šaš ši *tal-tap-pi*-ti, ‘You, O oath, who keep on touching!’ That this also must be *lapatu // is accepted in AHA.

240. An apilu is some kind of marginal cultic figure according to an entry in a synonym list: *a-pi-ši-šu* (var. *pišli-šu*) = *ku-šu* (CT 18 5, K 4193 rev. 10 // LTB II 1 vi 46).

241. The line is also known from OB Harimal, 5: *kina lātāsān šišan ōn *šišan. Falling on the enemy with loud yells is a tactic also employed at SB X 97: *ina lātāsān ōn *šišan (Teleg.)

242. The stock phrase mangušu la *tu*’u is common enough, but compare especially a narrative parallel to this line reproduced as a couplet in Lugal -II 77–8.

245–8. These lines appear to contain proverbial wisdom, some of it similar or close to parallels occurring earlier in the story (cf. OB III 255–6; SB III 4–5 // 218–19). Note the ‘gnomic’ pretenses in l. 247.

6. The spelling e-ma-ru for immarati is Assyrian in its use of the prefix e- and in the non-marking of the genitative beam, 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 (viii, ix).

The epithet of the Cedar Mountain given here is an expansion of the earlier miški₂ ili Enumaēli (OB IM 17–18) // miški Enumaēli (OB Ishchali 38). Given the clear parallelism in our line between miški₂ and parak₂-in-ni, I assume that the in-ni stands not for the well-known aspect of ḫtar (Irini) but for goddessess in general; in other words, it is a variant on the common noun ibrari, which often appears paired with in in a formally masculine plural guise (on this see the commentary on SB 178). It may be transcribed iminni₂.

8. I take the spelling za-abu for the stative tāb 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’.


74. Another version of this line can be found in BM Emar, iii 8², q.v.

75. The word τακ-κα-α-ti, so read by Landsberger, RA 62, p. 108, is taken to be a plural form of τακτα (see AIH, p. 1309).

76. The ‘three-ply rope’ also occurs in the fragment, probably of proverbs, K 16804 (coll. B 4: 3-lo-ša-ta-ta-ta—in, cited CAD S/3, p. 383). The Sumerian equivalent of the saying is ši₃.tab.la ši₃ nu₃.kud₃, ‘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 nahal ḥemliḥi b’i ḥemlīḥiyā, ‘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-Isrāĕl 16 (1965), pp. 246–50, and again, in the light of the publication of MS u₂ Eretz-Isrāĕl 9 (1968), p. 160. Though in his edition of the Sumerian text D. O. Edzard persists in Kramer’s reading tū₂.tab.la₂, ‘three-draft sheep’s wool’, occasional confusion between ši₃ and tū₂ is to be expected in words written in Sumerian script. In Proverbs Collection 5 no. 56 the two signs occur as variants for the same reason (Alter, Proverbs, p. 403).

86. W. R. Mayer has proposed an alternative reading of the first two words, ši₃-ri kis-il₂-lā, understanding the whole line as insulating: ‘Fishsmen-Benut, Gilgames, dummer Kurt’ (Deller, Mayer and Sommerfeld, OrNa 56 (1987), p. 210). In my view ši₃ kis-il₂ (var. of kis-il₂), ‘kiss-smith of a fish’, is not a plural that in Babylonian would convey abuse; as a creature of Ea the fishman was also fish-like that is apotropaic function in religious iconography (Wiggermann, Protective Spiritae, pp. 182–3). The word ši₃ here has been cited as ‘ein schönes Beispiel literarischer Ambiguität’, on the grounds that as well as meaning ‘fish’ it alludes to the ši₃-du₂-tu₂-demon who fathered Gilgames (Renger, Studia Reiner, p. 320). I am not convinced that the text gains from such ambiguity.

89. The spelling a-ger-ru₂-ba₂-ka could be for indicative apa₂rabu₂ (CV for VC) but can be otherwise explained as exhibiting a ventive in -a₂(m), on which see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub (v).

The dechipherment of the words that precede in₂ karši₂a is a real problem. Previous translators have not been able to agree on whether the four signs ši₃-tab₂-ba₂ represent two words or one. Most choose the verb ši₃-ba₂, ‘to satisfy’. This is possible with karši₂a (sec V R 9 ix 67, ed. Streck, Am 8, p. 4.5).

78. ši₃-šu₂ la ši₃-tab₂-ba₂ ku₃-na₃ ši₃-šu₂-ku₃, ‘they could not sate their bellies with milk’, but inša would represent an unwanted intrusion. Other translations are more compelling: Bottéro suggests tāmē ṣēnāku₂(šu₂), Westenholz ‘du betet jetzt noch nicht’ (tāmē), it is difficult to precise what remains of the first line as any form of tāmē, ‘to kill’, though many have tried. Lambert suggests šu₂ ta₂₃₄₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃₃¢}
kūš.kūš = ra-a-[s]m  channel
ši.ña = MIN nu-ka-rub-[bi]  date-cultivator's channel
tűš.kūš = MIN nui-pa-[la]  coppersmith's channel
me.a = MIN ša me-[e]  channel for water or trough?

MSL XVII. p. 29, 53–6

Note also, in the context of copper-working vocabulary, Divī VI 84: ku-ku-uš [raw] kūš  ú-ni-du-ú-min-na-bi = ra-a-tu (A. Goetz, JASOS 65 (1945), p. 225, 65). A ra-âr tûparra (zabur), 'of bronze', occurs in the context of bronze casting in a MA letter, KAV 205, 28 (ed. Freydank and Saproitu, Bāltu-abā-iddīna, pp. 34, 73). Goetz confidently identified kūš.kūš = tûmu as an ingot mould: 'obviously another term for the furnaces in front of the crucible [ama.tun = agarīnna], with agarīnna already explained as the 'furnace in front of the crucible into which the molten metal flows, in which it hardens, and which is taken out in the form of ingots' (JASOS 65, p. 235). H. Lütem translated the same lexical entry neutrally, as 'caniveau' (Metal, p. 276). The function of the nappāḫi becomes clearer from the Sumerian literary contexts in which the phrases kūš.kūš.a si.(s) and kūš.kūš.a de.de are found in bronze-founding contexts:

e.kur-ra wawgi.dilm (sur. muzzi-zi.in) gal gal.bi kūš.kūš.a bi.in.si.si (sur. ilin.de.de)
Of the Elur, he poured (sur. melted down) its great shovels (sur. axes) into a k.
Curse of Akkade 128
alam.gim kūš.kūš.a de.de me/š (s) e.de. e.en.de de.
We are being [poured out] like figurines melted into a k.
Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur 229
ē.sīki é nam.tar.ra ka alam gim kūš.kūš.a si.bi.
In the pure house, the house of destinies, pour (an item of bronze called a zabur[5a]) into a k like a figurine!

Sargon Legend 34, cf. 36 and 45

For de, 'to melt down' see Anisgalaf 254, de = sa-a-du ki ēr, 'to melt, of copper' (MSL XVII, p. 219). These passages clearly show that kūš.kūš = tûmu is a vessel for receiving molten copper and not, for example, the furnace's blowpipe. They have been discussed in detail by J. S. Cooper and W. Heimpel, 'The Sumerian Sargon legend', JASOS 103 (1983), pp. 81–2. Cooper identifies the kūš.kūš as a mould for casting objects generally. Heimpel follows Goetz's view that it is an ingot mould and sees the passages quoted as examples of recycling copper and bronze castings by melting them down into ingots. He adduces additional evidence that such ingots conformed to standards, but the passages he cites are open to other interpretations: the rūnu of copper, silver and gold in the OB list of coefficients, MCT, p. 134, 22–4, may be interpreted as metal vessels as well as standard ingots, while the deitied rūnu and šiluruvats in the temple of Aššur were items of sacred bronze equipment and not necessarily standard measures; see Šalmareser's report of the refurbishment of the brewery, Grayson, RIMA, 1, p. 192, 36.

Nevertheless, Goetz's original identification of the nappāḫi remains tenable. Although the non-specific translation of kūš.kūš as a mould is repeated by Joannes, RL VIII, p. 107, and by some translators of this line, it seems to me that if rūnu, 'channel', describes a mould it does for reasons of shape rather than function. The word's use for the irrigation of date palms (see Erīmālu II 54) and for the watering of sheep (OB Atram-baslis III iv 20) suggests that the typical shape of a rūnu 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 Goetz's 'furnace'. Since Goetz'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 1.5–2 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. Dever and M. Tadmor, 'A copper hoard of the Middle Bronze Age II', IJEF 26 (1976), pp. 163–9, from the Hebron hills; R. Maddin and T. Stech Wheeler, 'Metallurgical study of seven bar ingots', IJEF 26 (1976), pp. 170–3; more generally, J. F. Merkul and W. D. Dever, 'Metalworking technology at the end of the Early Bronze Age in the southern Levant', Institute for Archaeologists, 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 nappāḫi must have been a common sight in the ancient Mesopotamia.

However, a dissenting view is expressed by J. Bottéro in his translation of the line under comment, namely that the rūnu nappāḫi is not a mould, as such, but a channel down which molten metal flows on its way into a mould: 'la goulotte qui conduisait au moule (mot à mot: "la rigole du fondateur"). 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. Merkul 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 rūnu 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, eri, but the spelling e-er is unsatisfactory and suggests that the text is corrupt. The word after eri was not copied adequately by von Weissenberg and has been the subject of guesswork. It is the key to what happens to the copper in the rūnu. The blank space left by the scribe between e-er and šā very likely signifies a word division, which argues against an emendation such as e-er-ā:kā šā šă-da-šă; the simplest solution is to assume a missing a and read e-eri-ā:kā šā šă-da-šă, the significance of the lengthened final syllable being to mark a question. The well-attested phrase epra šāša means to scoop up dust from the ground; eri šāša thereby thus suits 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 infinitive phrases. The first refers to bringing the crucible up to temperature by forcing air on to the coals; tu-ū-eri is a spelling of tuurru (tūruru or tuurun) that recurs in the commentary published by R. D. Biggs, RD 62 (1968), p. 54, 23. The equally time-consuming process described by the second infinitive phrase is less intelligible. The last word is written so small that I could not make sure whether it is šā-la-ū or mu-la-ū. 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 ll. 103 and 104: 'le métaux en
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 (Bagh. Mitt. 11 (1980), pl. 15). A reading (fur-pu-lum)ma was suggested privately by A. Westholm. The line would then allude to the fact that, as described in l. 133-4, Humbaba's mountain now lies broken: 'by Samub'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 saq-ga-ba-a is presumed faulty, to represent nasa-ba-a.

154-5. An antecedent of this couplet is Harmal, 46-7: lurabbi akhunn(?) erinam larnam suppani l Ahi domin is muddintu halim.

177. Other translators see nothing wrong with ina nereb papalla qittašu, but the sense of the phrase is much improved if it is assumed that nereb and papalla have become transposed. Enkidu's body, hanging 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 (SBV 94).

182-4. These three lines are really a quatrain, 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 couplet on its repetition (pattern abab'a; 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 abab, in Nergal and Ereshkigal (Hecker, Untersuchungen, pp. 148-9). Either way, the omission of eréni 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 ḫullaq, not for example, ḫullagī, which obliges one to take ḫa-en-łu as its object (= ṣumū). Since the verb ṣumū is never written with the sign ṣer but ṣumū so often is, in the first millennium especially, the orthography corroborates this decipherment.

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

229. Given the key word ḫanna, one wonders whether this line might be related to OB Ishali 15: šiti uṣirum bārma šokum ilubā bārānumū.

254. With the traces compare MB Bog. Fragment a, rev. 3:  giết tə khás la šita la tilu [š iš teš].

257. The spelling ki-i-ri for gekirri is already explained in JNES 52 (1993), p. 302, where I noted it as 'an unconventional spelling of ĺi-ri'; the same orthographic practice is well known in Neo-Assyrian (as first listed by Deller, ORS 31 (1962), pp. 188ff., 'Schreibungen VK statt KV'), but has not yet been formally documented in NB and LB. For the idiom gekirri ay irin in curses see further CAD Q, p. 202 (boundary stones and colophon).

259. MN H 5a-qaq-ba-kum-ma reverts von Soden's statement that the 'tenancive Gilgamelespos' the 2nd masc. sg. dative suffix is always -ašum before the enclitic -ma (ZA 40 (1931), p. 170); kamma is a common vocalization in late language (ibid., fn. 2; GAC 42, n. 8).

262-5. These four lines are a reworking of a passage that appears in OB Ishali 19-23: ūme Gilgamesh širri šušu / šeš bānimma šanu qirri / šinan namarru šanu šabbiš / Gilgamesh širri šibidam / Enkidu širri išip šabbiš. For variations on ll. 263-4 see the commentary ad loc. In l. 265 the first sign can hardly be ʾu, and is ignored as an error. After Enkidu one might restore šibba ʾu-šu-tu or šibba iš-šu-tu as the counterpart of OB šabbiš išip. Elliptical usage of šabbiš 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 ‘ferrule’ (Speiser on SB VII, CAD) and ‘pivoting-stone’ (Kovacs, SB VII) for šāhūrī 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 šakūtā. The verses are correctly rendered in the parallel SB VII 44–5.

297–8. The older text reads (OB IM 27–9): ama liti Ellil šibl Peratum / li šalātum uumān Nippur / li littim Ellil. Consequently it would appear that Kuyunjik MS H's amūn is a corruption of uumān. 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: ‘ut recevurient le pont de branchages’) evidently took hār-mu for amūn and am-ru for amu, but this remains highly speculative.

302. The broken sign after šum-ba-ba appeared to Haupt as ab but to Delitzsch as ra (Haupt, Ninurta, p. 26). Either way it rules out the restoration šīkṣamāma (or ittakšamāma) ṣāqērbā . . . that is suggested by Assyrian MS š2, obv. 22’.

TABLE VI

2. The variant of unassī offered by MS O₁ does not lead to easy interpretation. Though nassī also appears as nassī, and even nāṣī, ša-nā-š[a]-[s-m]a does not look like a viable reading as the traces now stand, and nor quite does ša-na-ṣ[a]-[s-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, Ninurta, p. 150) is an incomplete ra, lacking the lower horizontal wedge.


9. This line is also found in MB Nergal and Ereškigal, where it is spoken by another goddess, the queen of the Netherworld (EA 357, 82: at-ta lu mu-ur-ta a-na-ba ša dā-ša-ta-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 Ardat ūlī incantation since rephrased, 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.EN me e. me. en e. dam. ū. ša a
kuppu ša-an-ka ša-mal-ka
am. ū. ša a e. e. ū. ša a
at-ta lu-ud dā-ša-ta ana-ba lu-ud mu-at-ka

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 Bilgamas and the Bull of Heaven see Chapter 10, the introduction to this tablet.
10. The variant lāqānādu (MS Q) is Middle Babylonian.
11. The ‘horns’ of a chariot are the subject of a section of ḫāt V:

\[ \text{gīš. dū. a. gīgīṭr} = \text{qar-nu} \]
\[ \text{gīš. dū. a. gīgīṭr} = \text{MIN} \]
\[ \text{gīš. būb. a. gīgīṭr} = \text{MIN} \]
\[ \text{gīš. āl.i, stāt, gīgīṭr} = \text{[qar-nu]} \]

MSL VI, pp. 6–7, 25–7a

Salonen considered that these ‘horns’ were the looped rings through which the reins passed (Landafahrzeug, 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 ēmtuk 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 ūnu (Sum. ud) or ūnu rābū (also ugal, as Sum. u, g) is the lion-headed monster that pulls the chariots of the storm god Adad, the sun, the warriors Ninurta and Marduk and the warlike ḫtār (see further Wiggermann, Mesopotamian Protective Spirits, pp. 169–72)

13. The rare word zāmmūtu, here plural, is perhaps cognate with Arabic zannūna, ‘smell at’ (Lambert, Personal Atoll)

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 ‘rabbed’ joints that were a very distinctive feature of Mesopotamian religious architecture (see George, Iraq 57 (1995), pp. 181–2). Most previous translators have taken arattu as ‘dais’ (Heidel, Speiser) or ‘throne’ (ebratu, Bassi Nemedi in the synonym lists). Others have read the two words together, (ē)-ē-pa-ur arattu, 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 arattu could be used of priests, which would be unparalleled, it ought to be plural, arattītu. Note that MB Emar, apparently has koppu, ‘hand’ (i 1’), for SB’s lēpu, ‘foot’.

16. The realization of this promise appears in a prayer that invokes Gilgamesh as ruler and judge of the shades: šarrūru (lagal) mekkarākākā (Gīk. Nīta) me rābū (nun) me hāmbī (gīgīṭr) ka kom-tu, ‘kings, governors and nobles are bowed down in your presence’ (Haupt, Nimrodopos no. 53, 9 ed. Chapter 3 above, the section on Gilgamesh in exorcistic rituals). The sequence šarru bātu (a) rābū and its variants are literary clichés (e.g. IV R 55 no. 2, 4, 6, 10: ritual to gain favour; PBS U 113, 37–8: hymn to Šamaš). The variation on this phrase in MS Q, ārattād ārātītu (en) me rēpaq (e.g. dated 1200), might be seen as a secondary development, in which idām is hāmbī has been interpreted as ašē = ārātītu, for the use of hāmbī is characteristic of NA orthography (e.g. S. Parpola, Iraq 34 (1972), p. 25). However, the slightly different version of this line in MB Emar, might already have bēl-ta-ū (12’), so the variation between kašātītu and bēlātī may be old.

17. The word likqi is something given to a superior, as in the OB expiatory prayer in which it refers to the diviner’s offering to the sun god: šamaš (atātu) na-ba-ki-um li-šam-tum li-ša-qi-ut me-eš-a-ša-sa-qi-im el-le-tim, ‘O Šamaš, I am bearing you (nākākkum na-rābū/kum) a gift: pick up the pure drink of sasqā-water!’ (YOS XI 22, 25, ed. A. Goetze, JCS 22 (1968–9), p. 26). The discovery of likqi in this line settles the question of how to read Māliu IV 231 (LTRA II 1 xii 101): liq-qi = bit-tum with ADH, pp. 126, 555, against the emendation ilq(-il) tā in CAD (B, p. 229; L, p. 207) and the entry īp-tām in the commentary on the Babylonian Theodicy (Lambert, BBWL, p. 80).

Many previous commentators have been led astray by the only source which is complete for this line, MS a, where the decipherment of NAMAR-di remains a problem. Von Soden (‘die Lullubier’) evidently interpreted the signs as līlī-lū-bī, but serious emendation is still needed to yield Lūlūlū. 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 kalummi (p. 129, note 54), but the herb lūlumki is a specific plant, not found outside plant lists and medical texts, and unlikely to be used generically for vegetation in general. A development ma > bī is also improbable. It seems simplest to assume that lāmAR-di is corrupt.

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

\[ \text{u₃₂ miša, min.bi nu.bar.ru} = \text{No ewe had given birth to its twins,} \]
\[ \text{ū₂ₑ₃ maš e₅₁, bi nu.bar.ru} = \text{nor nanny-goat to its triple kids.} \]


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

19. The reading in this line of dūr (AN.ZA.NA) as mūru 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 ‘veneke’, lēra-ū, to satisfy the requirements of metre.

20. The plural determinative on sītu (preserved only on MS a) is at odds with the verb it governs, karūt, 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-uri-i. Since the meaning of this is doubtful I am reluctant to restore it here. The solecistic use of the dative phrase anu kāštākē (ēkē), where a direct object is expected, is found sporadically in SB. Other examples are anu-kā anu kā-a-ti aš-šar-ki-ma, ‘I took hold of you’ (Biggs, Šāpār, ps. 77, 14: incantation); anu-kā aššar-ki-ma ir-ta-nu aš-šar-ki-ma, ‘they will keep insulating you’ (Lambert, BBWL, p. 148, 68/34: Dialogue of Pessimism); anu kā-a-ti-ma se-šar-ta (a-di–i), ‘bring her back to me!’ (CT 15 48, 21: Ištar’s Descent). These are unlikely to be cases of anu as nota accusativus, which is a late usage not expected in SB. Presumably the phrase is simply an irregularity deriving from the fact that in the dative kāšti(m) often needs the preposition: the phrase anu kāšti 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 kurmanmati and bēlātī are apparently reversed in MB Emar, i 9.

27–8. These lines are restored with reference to Šamālu’s words to Enki when reminding him of the advantages that meeting the prostitute had won him (SB IV 156–6; ša-šākkiškā aššu imtu-tāšatu kurmanma šākkiškā ša-šākkiškā). An objection is that šakkinim might have been expected. For šašti with the ventive see the Lamattu incantation PBS U 115, 1: šašti šaššar aššu-ma-um ša-šākkiškā, ‘She has (the newborn) drink amniotic fluid (lit. water of labour)’.

29. The only word remaining in this line is taken provisionally from eššā, ‘to bind (by agreement)’. Cf. Botterweck’s ‘Me faudra-t-il [. . . ?]’

30. The reading lā-u Šā-bi-uk (ADH, p. 1441) does not seem plausible, for sēši, 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 volantive written with plene lā-u see SB XI 166 and 280.

32. Restoration after l. 24.
33. The restoration is owed to MB Emar, i 13, where the word preceding lā kāsrāt may be ḫalū, 'frost'. For ḥāṣtar la ša bērīt, 'to solidify, with reference to ice', in OB and SB see CAD K, p. 260.

34. The restoration goes back to von Soden, OLZ 50 (1955), 515. The aršabštumādu door is glossed as da-al-tum la qa-zi-tum, 'incomplete door', in Malāṭa 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, Targ. 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" (Essays Poly., p. 34; also Kovacs). I do not know what the textual justication 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’ (Or. Ns 17 (1948), p. 36, fn. 4). Labat translates, seemingly ad hoc, ‘un turban (?) [qui étoffe] celui qui en est couvert’. However, the signs pi-i-ra 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 pišu (or se'aru) 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 Bottero are worth repeating (I. Espérou, p. 125 with fn. 1):

‘Un éléphant [qui jette à bas] son harnachement: il s’agit de la pièce de harnais qui permettait à un éléphant de transporter des passagers. Le trait est intéressant, sur le plan culturel, puisqu’il suppose connue par les Méopotamiens la domestication de l’animal, propre à l’Inde, semblait-il, d’où on en aurait tiré l’image. Nous n’avons pas la moindre trace ni d’un parel usage, ni d’un parel animal, en Méopotamie.

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

38. The particle conventionally understood in this line is muṣṣāṣu (R. Frankena in Garcell, AIG, p. 120), but note von Soden, AHur, p. 996 (mu-ru-2a-ṣa-at nāṣaša). Though MB Emar, i 16 might have read muṣṣāṣu, 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: [yau]aḫu mu’ābbithu dīr asur), 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 lack of treachery in such a sentiment prompted Bottero, I. Espérou, p. 125, fn. 3, to translate the signs kuru kū šu-ta as ‘un pays non-ennemi’, i.e., māt la-nunahkiš (kūš). This is unconvincing, both because the orthography mu-šu-ta is so standard it seems unlikely that it could also be read as the opposite, and because the phrase māt la-nunahkiš is never found. Instead the lines may allude not to šaṭar’s treachery but to her destructiveness: like a battering ram in action, the goddess is a blustering instrument, crude and violent. The expression dīr asur ubbu also occurs in Malāṭa II 141, describing the god of fire: gīnā al-ša-ka-ka mu-ab-bi dīr bābī (abmīna), ‘Mighty Girra, who destroys walls of stone’ (from KAR 235, var. iṣṭigāmu in an mīmīn našu, trees and stones’); and in Marduk’s Address to the Demons (W. G. Lambert, A/O 17 (1954–6), p. 313, B 14): (aša-kū assāl-bi) la ba-bi-ru-lu ub-ba-tu dīr bābī, ‘I am Assurli, 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 ([ʔa]-st-ti dān-mi Lī, Sān, p. 8, 63). However, in L 40 MS A clearly reads mu-ab-bi-sa (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 hāmassā is literary for hāmassā; see further Chapter 9, 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 šāri and MB Emar, šāri (i 19).

43. The proposed restoration is tentative (A. Westenholz suggests ša irtamūti), but the verb irtu 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 allal-la, a type of bird which also appears in i. 48 as a former object of šar’s desires, and the noun which is a synonym of ‘warrior’ (Malāṭa I 27: al-lat-tu gīn-ru-da). The former meaning anticipates the story of the bird maimed by šar and the latter provides a human parallel with hāmassē 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, šar’s allal-la-bird cannot fly off to the sky, and unlike an allal-la-bird, an allal-la-man cannot go to heaven.

44. For uqṣuṣ used of calculation see the OB letter I.H. 49, 12–15, ed. ABI II 47: ša-an . . . ap-pa-su-ša-ma ta-2-2, ‘work out the (amount of) barley . . . and hand it out’. With the idiom mindā bûpuša cf. at Ugarit bâmmi ša-nu qa-pa-2, ‘His Majesty will count (soldiers, i.e. review the parade)’ (PRU IV, p. 192, 15–16). The restoration [mi-nu-ta] is preferred to [mi-nu-ta] (or [mi-ni-ta]) 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 ša būdīmūna (or pūdīmūna) is uncertain and will probably remain so until the middle of the line is deciphered, but a little can be said. The section II 45–50 is the first of four, marked off by rulings, that recount the sticky ends to which šar’s various lovers came (II 45–79). Each section exhibits an individual pattern of structure. Thus the second section comprises two couplets and a triplet, the third 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 this analysis is to suggest that the section on the shepherd Dumuzi begins at 1. 45 not 1. 46. The term ša būdīmūna, which in the MB letter PBS i 79, 4, 8, etc. appears to be a professional title, thus ought to have some connection with him. As already seen by Delly, who translates the phrase as ‘he of the sheep’ (Myrks, p. 78), the common link between būdu and Dumuzi is sheep. In fact sheep are not themselves būdu but one of the items suitable for a būdu, 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), p. 22, Hh XIII 163a: udu zamām = im-mer bū-du, for further references see CAD B, p. 305; cf. AHur, s.v. pāšu II)).

46. Dumuzi’s epithet is a variant of that given in Inar’s Descent, ḫa-miṣ ša-ṭa-ma [n-ti-l] (CT 15 47 rev. 47 [4 48, 22]) ša-ṭa-ma [n-ti-l] (CAD I 1 rev. 46).

47. Von Soden took šašmānūš in this and the comparable lines (54–7) as examples of the 2/3 stem of permanence, ‘for ever (always)’. (AHur, p. 1225.) If this stem were correct in such a meaning we would expect to encounter it much more often, given the nature of šamū šāmu. A V final 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 favour, he blames her for his unrequited grief. She replies that the women mourning the text ends with describing the ruin of the shrine that witnessed their lovemaking. The contrast would seem to be the death of Dumuzi. The first speaker is Dumuzi, rejected by Istar and held captive in the Netherworld. His interlocutor is Istar, whose description of women mourning refers to the ritual lamentation for the dead Dumuzi. The ruined sanctuary is a symbol of their broken love.

48. The pairing of the allallu-bird with Dumuzi is no coincidence, for in Hg XVIII it is classified as a variety of the ‘shepherd-bird’:

\[
\text{sipatir}\text{.t} \quad \text{‘shepherd-bird’} = \text{re-\text{a}-\text{um}} \quad \text{‘shepherd’}
\]
\[
\text{sipatir.ri} \quad \text{‘lesser shepherd-bird’} = \text{al-\text{la}}
\]
\[
\text{sipatir.ri} \quad \text{‘wood shepherd-bird’} = \text{kub-\text{li} kar-mat} \quad \text{‘speekle-culp’}
\]

MSL VIII/2, p. 134, 239–41

The last of these fits well the description bitramu here. The bird’s familiar cry (1. 50) is proffered in Hg C to explain the second entry:

\[
\text{[sipatir.ri] = [al-la-l] bitramu = kus-pa ip-pa-\text{u-s}} \quad \text{‘it makes a kappo-noise’}
\]

MSL VIII/2, p. 172, 18

A. Salonen equates the ‘shepherd-bird’ with the hoopoe (Vögel, p. 245), and although he identifies the allalul, or ‘lesser shepherd-bird’, with the Indian roller (ibid., p. 113, following Thompson), one is struck by the similarity of the hoopoe’s eponymous cry with kappo and kappo. No other association of Istar with this bird is known to me and presumably the myth of their liaison derives from its Sumerian name, which recalls the shepherd Dumuzi. Otherwise the bird of Dumuzi is a kind of pigeon or dove, as noted in a bird-call text (W. G. Lambert, Asv 20 (1970), p. 114, 13): \text{a-mu-ba-\text{na} = ip-pu \text{dumu-zi = re-\text{u} [. . .]}; cf. turszā in modern Iraqi Arabic, J. A. Black and F. N. H. Al-Rawi, ZA 77 (1987), p. 125.}

The enclitic -\text{u} on the verb sarramu, here and in ll. 31, 33, 38 and 64, is understood as emphatic by Foster, Essays Poes, p. 35: ‘you even fell in love’. There may be other explanations; see the commentary on SB 111–17.

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 (\text{bir}—see K. Deller, Or no 31 (1962), p. 194). Examples in Kuyunjik tablets of Gilgames are rare; see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (f).

50. I have taken the present tense of izaza (var. aib), and also of utarraddatu in l. 62, as present continuous, with reference to the habitual behaviour of allallu-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 emiqa in the Aššur 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 labattu, ‘lioness’). She sometimes drives a team of seven (e.g. Bēlet-Uruk ka sa-an-da-ti’ la-abur, Messerschmidt, MVAG 1/1, p. 75, ii 14–15; cf. 31–33; Nn.; also sa-an-lum aššar ša nēla(utur-ma) ši-in-di-tum; Meissner, MVAG 12/III, p. 16, 6–7; NB letter). The lion bears the epithet ‘dog of Istar’ (ur-maš kalat(utur-gi) aššar-R. Caplice, ORS 34 (1965), p. 108, 6; Nmbarbi incantation. 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).

53. The epithet na-ašz gab-li is traditional for the horse, being also found in the fable of Ose and Horse (Lambert, BOWL, pp. 177, 24; 180, 13). The phrase has been parsed as the adjective in the construct state and a genitive noun (e.g., CAD N/I, p. 66: na-šz gab-li). However, the variants gab-\text{a} and gab-lum in MSS Qa are accusative singular and speak for a stative phrase like sarša zāšma (SB VI 20). The spelling gab-li (MSS AO), if to be taken seriously, is therefore for the accusative plural. The ambiguity of na-šz 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 the Proverbs Collection 5 no. 37, ed. Alster, Proverbs, p. 125: ašše kuru-šim il-pu, en i.nag-zu, ‘like the horse you paw as you drink’.

57. The identity of the divine Silii, presumably held to be the mythical ancestor of the horse, 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 northern origins of the horse. A name An-ti-ti, which could be read An-ti-li, belongs to one of several persons listed as ‘men of Simaški’ (šu smiški) in an Ur III document (see the discussion of I. J. Gelb, Hurrians and Suburians, pp. 100, 104, 108; for šu smiški, ‘Simáški’, see P. Steinke, ‘On the identity of the toponym šu smiški’, MAF 108 (1988), pp. 197–202; M. Civiali, NABU 1996/41). A connection with the goddess ‘ti-li-li-tum, the vixier of the Divine Rainbow (W. G. Lambert, RAVII, p. 345), does not seem likely.

58. The variant for nāqiš utula in MS A1, TA BU LA, can probably be put down to inconsistent editorial work, via a spelling *u-ti(T)U-la. On the double consonant in the spelling na-qid-da (MS a), see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (e).

59. Von Soden’s suggestion that tumri is elliptical for akal tumri or kamu tumri (AHRFA, p. 1370) appears confirmed by the Emmerz variant of SB tumri šupukkab, which reads šupukkab as tumma (MB Emar, 34). If it is maintained nevertheless that both versions are corrupt it has to be assumed that akal or kamuš dropped out by mistake in a forerunner common to both versions. The variant verb in MS a, šupukkab, can be parsed as an active II/I stative, but one wonders whether the scribe is using its consonants only (i.e. šup for šiṭ). Comparable things can certainly happen in Assyrian tablets with CVC signs in non-initial position.

62. For the implications of the present tense of utarradišu see the commentary above, on 1. 50.

64. The name Šušušu seems to be a variant of the well-known Ur III and OB personal name Šušušu. The equation of Šušušu and Sumerian Šuškešu, another gardener who fell foul of Inanna, has been observed in the entry šu.sušu.ta.du = šu-[ti-a]-tum (MSL XIII, p. 118, OB Níggi bilingual 124; cf. W. W. Hallo, RA 74 (1970), p. 94). The word Šušušu is a common noun, referring to a person with a physical defect of some sort. The personal name thus falls in to the
category of J. J. Stamm's 'Bezeichnungen nach Körperformen' (Namengebung §38.1). The omen texts report that the condition was, or could be, present from birth (Summa 40:1 64; U. Jeyes, OB Esoteric no. 14, rev. 6). According to Summa dlu, the presence of many such people in a city was a bad omen (CT 38:4, 71: sap[ā]b[r]i ["sāli, "scattering of the city."] We learned that the condition was a defining characteristic of a person from an OB deed in which a house is described as stēb [da]bit[ē] 
[sib-ni-"en-īl hu-la-nu-am 'adjacent to the property of Ibnī-Enīl, the šullūnum (TIM IV 22, 2). The exact nature of the defect suffered by šullūnum is uncertain. The usual suggestion is 'warty', from šullūnum, 'wart'. The ancient vocabularies equate the word with the equally obscure šaru (MSL XII, p. 228, 31; CT 25 43 viii 14). This may or may not be the same šaru that describes pig-like lips in phonetic masons' (CAD S2, s.v., translates šaru as 'sairy' but 'fleshy' is also possible. More productive evidence is provided by an extract of three lines from a group vocabulary in one of the commentaries on Sakkhūtu 1:33: gīg.tā [pa = -su -a], "dwarf", lu-tu-ru, lu-sil-ru-ru (ed. George, RA 85 (1991), p. 150, 33 a). Note that the Sumerian equivalent of šullūnum in bilingual Nigga is similarly a common noun associated with the physically defective. It can be masculine or feminine according to MSL XIII, p. 100, OB Niga 158-9: ku.kal.le.tu, ku.kal.le.tu.na, ku.kal.le.tu.na. In OB Proto-Lu 539-43 (see now C. Wilcke in B. Hrouda, Ištar-līš ḫafıratū 111, p. 100), it is listed between ba.za, "dwarf", and ğu, "dead" (see further Volp, Inanna and Šukalekuta, p. 171). The association with dwarfism and deafness suggests that the šullūnum suffered a defect more severe than being afflicted with warts.

The significance of the name šullūnum in this episode has been discussed by J.-M. Durand, RA 73 (1979), p. 165, fn. 45. He compares Šukalekuta's epithet šurūt, which he translates "pepit, servant, scribe", with the commentary on Sakkhūtu I, where he understands all three Akkadian words to describe people of stunted growth. For this reason he suggests that šullūnum would be the "avatar of šurūt šullūnum, like one on disse "main Pet." An objection is that in literary Sumerian šùlūnum means "child, youngest" (e.g. Instructions of Sinuppak 107. Curse of Adad 10, Nanna-Suen's Journey 320; see further A. W. Sjoberg, Mondgort, pp. 161-2), and that is how it should be taken in Inanna and Šukalekuta, where the context is the gardener's conversation with his father (l. 139, 177; cf. Volp, Inanna and Šukalekuta, p. 191). Nevertheless, the groupings of šu.kal.le.tu.da with ba.za and šullūnum with petēš is in the vocabularies remains suggestive. None of the ancient evidence contradicts the possibility that šullūnum refers to people of stunted growth. The story narrated in the following lines is surely aetiological, like the five more briefly worded episodes that precede it, and thus will describe how the subject, by courtesy of Ištar, ended up in his present plight. Though the ultimate fate of šullūnum's counterpart, Šukalekuta, is still lost in a lacuna, there is some suspicion that his punishment involved a reduction in size (l. 254): šu.kal.le.tu.na dili.ni im a im.tur.tur.re, 'in the wind she makes Šukalekuta, him alone, small' (cf. J. Bottero and S. N. Kramer, Lorsque les dieux faisient l'homme, p. 268; Volp, Inanna and Šukalekuta, p. 205, is not certain that this is to be taken literally). If Durand's idea is right it would seem that the stories of šullūnum and Šukalekuta explained how dwarfs came to be so short. See further the commentary on dalalum, l. 76 below.

65. The variant for luqerād offered by the Ašur MS cannot be the synonym tališ, as suggested by von Soden (AHw, p. 1366). Frankena's suggestion, that l. 65 is a repetition of l. 59, looks improbable too. Perhaps šurād had a by-form tugu (a,r).n.

67. For the aquisitive nuance of the expression ina narā see the commentary above, on SBVI 6.

68. The unnecessary epenthetic vowel in kūšišāti is a mark of literary style; see the section on language in Chapter 9. The feminine suffix on this word is very odd. Possibly Ištar is taunting the reluctant šullūnum as not man enough to take her. Otherwise -śa has turned to -śi by crisis in the presence of šušā (so Abusch, History of Religions 26 (1963), p. 217, fn. 61). The orthography insula for šušā is remarkable in a manuscript from Ašur (a). A predilection for the vowel /u/ 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 hurēdatu in the next line. Foster considered that 'the use of the "royal plural" seems to satirize the epithet "princess" applied to Ištar throughout this episode' (Essays Pope, p. 35). However, the use of the plural in intimate amatory contexts is widespread, as shown by J. Goodnick-Westenholt 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. 85-97.

68 ff. In a footnote to his translation Labat pointed out that ašša is Ištar's speech is repeated, with different nuance, in šullūnum's, and that luqerā is probably echoed in elēpu: 'I feint de ne pas comprendre' (Les religions, p. 183, fn. 7); also Bottero, Lorsque les dieux, p. 274).

69. This line is one of only two passages of Gilgameš quoted in the extant commentaries (the other is SB I 102-3). Illustrating the use of the rare word hurēdatu in a comprehensive of treatments of women in labour (a copy survives as BAML II 30), a LB medical commentary from Ningirsu reads gu-aša šu-ta-am-sa-am-ma šu-ta-tu lu-ta-da-at ra (M. Civil, JNES 33 (1974), p. 332, 41; cf. A. Caviglia, Aida Or s (1987?), p. 255). This brings the number of variant forms of the first verb to three. I see šu-ta-am-sa-am-ma, the least felicitous of the three, as the result of editorial misinterpretation of an erstwhile orthography šu-tam-sa-am-ma, though use of the sign šu in anything other than final position is exceedingly rare (according to Foster, collation by P. Machinist and C. B. F Walker suggested that MS actually reads šu-ta-am-sa-am-ma, but šušā and šušā can look very alike in some Kuyunjik scripts and to my eyes šušā remains preferable). The form šušā remains 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/3 stem in the inpt. (*šušā), not of the III/2 (impt. *šušā) exhibited in the awkward prefix šušān of the former verb. Given Ištar's appetite for sex, the imperative stem can be seen as appropriate, though the Ašur MS uses the simple III/1 stem. Regarding hurēdatu, von Soden attributes the 1st pl, poss. suffix -na to NBL dialect (GAGO §42-k, n. 9). Its appearance in an Ašur MS, as well as in the medical commentary, shows that the orthography hur-da-a-na entered the copying tradition quite early in the first millennium. Its presence alongside šušā in the previous line might be evidence for a provincial variant pronominal suffix and prefix, -na and -na for n- and -ni. If so, Ištar appears to Ištar as a country girl, using his kind of language.

Thoralf Jacobson suggested that this line is an example of an ancient practice of the touching genitals in oath-weathering that he maintained is found in Sumerian texts and, in very special contexts, in Genesis: Ištar demands it of Gilgameš (šid as a binding acceptance of her offer of marriage) (Jacobson, Harpa, p. 168, fn. 2). It seems to me that Ištar's approach to the gardener šullūnum is impelled not by thoughts of marriage but by a simple desire for sexual gratification. The phrase hurēdatu šatīpurum is standard sexual language. A similar invitation is issued in an OB love song: šu-ta-am-ma šu-me-lī-šu lu-si-ši-ma Šu-ta-da-at ni, 'put your left hand out and stroke our vulva' (J. Goodnick-Westenholt, Studies Reiner, p. 422, 137). From an orgasitic OB cult song of Ištar comes the corresponding proposal from a male participant: al-ši šu-la-ap-ši šu-da-at ši 'come, let me stroke your vulva' (W. von Soden, Or vs 60 (1991), p. 340, 11). Some have understood šušā in our line as a euphemism for penis, like Hebrew yād (for a history of the literature see Paul, Studies Greenfield, p. 593, fn. 30).

72. For Foster 'the archaic verb form *šušā' provides a proverbial expression, here used perhaps with the obstinate recourse to clichés 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 ṁēḫu of our passage as the same (Volk, *Inanna und Šukalkinda*, pp. 57, fn. 158–9). This remains very speculative. The word da-ru(UTC) . . . is usually read as dâlu, dâlu, '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 Iššūnu 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 cliché (see K. Hecker, *Untersuchungen zur akkadischen Epik*, pp. 178–9). Other examples are:

- *il-luk šamaši(utu) i-na pa-an (var. šap-zabkal ana igi) 4 im(30) abī(AD)-tā i-ba-ki-i  
  i-na pa-an  
  i-a šarrā(lugal) il-il-ka di-ma-a-bā*  
  
  CT 15 46 rev. 3–4: Descent of Ištar, var. from *KAR* 1 rev. 3  
  
  Šamaš (or Papsukkal) went weeping before Sin, his father,  
  his tears flowing before King Ea.  

- *il-luk ur-ul tu ana pān(igi) šamaši(utu) i-bak-ki  
  ana pān(igi) i-a il-il-ka di-ma-a-bā*  
  CT 17 50, 7–8: Worm and Toothache  
  
  The worm went weeping before Šamaš,  
  its tears flowing before Ea.

Slightly different versions are:

- * . . . il-ö re-lā-tā ana pān(igi) šamaši(utu) i-bak-ki  
  ana pān(igi) kā-ra-ru šamaši(utu) illāhat(pim) di-ma-a-bā*  
  
  Lambert, *BWL*, p. 200, 19–20: Fable of the Fox  

- . . . He lifted up his head, weeping before Šamaš,  
  his tears flowing before the rays of the sun.

- *ūši rēšu Enlēdu ana pān Šamaš inammi (var. šabbe)  
  ana pān tarēši šamaš šalikī di₃i₃i₃i₃u*  
  
  SB Gilgamesh VII 91–2, var. from MB Ur 2–3  
  
  Enlēdu lifted up his head, lamenting (var. weeping) before Šamaš,  
  his tears flowing before the rays of the sun.

- *gūru(mu) ši-[a-i]-li-ṣa i-ba-ki  
  a-na pa-an šamaš(u) i-[la-ka di₃i₃i₃i₃u-ba]*  
  
  SB Enûa III 59–60; cf. *OB* Enûa I/C 30–7  
  
  The snake lay weeping,  
  his tears flowing before Šamaš.

85. For Frankena the Aṣzur MS's in-dar-na-a represented a mistake for the Kuyunjik manuscripts' *undenā* (*undimmā*), but if need be it can be taken as a legitimate variant, i.e. a preterite (*cimimmā*). Contra Foster, *Essays Pope*, p. 36, *undenā* is a perfectly good MB form, exhibiting *nd/  
  /nd/ and /c/ as in e.g. *un-de-lī-is ur-mātimmā* (cf. *GAG* §316f.), *Aro, *StOr* 20 (1955), pp. 40–9; the change
from /śi/ to /ši/ in a closed syllable before /š/ remains valid even when the /š/ disappears through contraction (e.g. ṭemēlā < ṭimēlāš).

89. The explanation that opens Anu’s speech is also found in OB Atran-īššu III 4 v 5, where a bu-ma-an expresses Nintu’s grief at the effect of the deluge. Here a-ša may thus be an expression of a father’s sympathy with an aggrieved daughter. However, it may also have a contrasting function (‘but on the other hand’), as perhaps in the OB trial document Luž, UCP IX, 6, p. 381, 12 (A. Westenholz, private communication).

90-1. Like MS Q, MB Emar, apparently has a one-line version of this couplet: u [Gilgameš erriti] šī paš[t]i im[mešu] (ll 3’-4’).

91. In common with most other recent translators I prefer CAD’s binamma, ’give me, please’ (B, pp. 216-17, already in early NB), to von Soden’s bināmmu, ’scaﬀold’ (for an Akkadian etymology of binā, ’give me,’ see von Soden, Orns 37 (1968), p. 269). The ﬂiry bull of heaven was already present in heaven, as a constellation, when Ishtar picked it as the perfect weapon with which to pursue her quarrel with Gilgamesh.

92. As Frankena saw, the traces on MS a do not appear to allow simply lu-nūr liša šub-šu-ša. Nor do they allow lu-nūr-r[i] [or ’n[i] (CAD N1/1, p. 349). If correctly read, the word lu-nūr-ru is ventive; cf. Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (v).

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

94. The object of Ishtar’s proposed strike is clearly the Netherworld, for by smashing it she expects to release the death from the gates that keep them safely locked away below. Hence the elision of MS Q provides a rare synonym of šummeṭu. The trace preserved after adī in MS Q and the space available afterward suggest that this source had more than adī šabāṭa. It may be that, like the parallel passages of Ishtar’s Descent, it occurred a variant text.

95. The traces present in MS Q seem not to represent the second word. Possible readings are [a-la-dik]a-a, an unlikely spelling in a Kuyunjik manuscript, and, with transposed words, [a-ta-baša ana] lašš[i][ti],a/mi [a]ša-pa-anitu x x x x x x x].

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

97. The Assyrian MS’s variant lapašhēr is 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 Asšur. I am uncertain about what verb ₃u-na is best restored in MS a. The verb ₃u-na/su is constructed with ana, but ‘I will draw his attention to the bull’s fury’ is hardly compelling. Nor are derivations from na to, ‘to roar’, and ner, to ‘turn inside’.

99. The damaged verb must describe the means by which Ishtar will avenge her humiliation. This has already been articulated as his death, luššuru in I 95. The II 1 stem of the verb is very rare but occurs in uncontrasted Assyrian form in the version of SB VIII 22 from Sultantepe (MS d: na-na-er). The rarity of the stem is not the only drawback, however. If one reads i-na-’l [lar-ša] 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’.

100. The construct state ₃u-baš (MS A, Asšur) is not current usage in Babylonia after the third millennium (see GAG p. 641) but is good second-millennium Assyrian. In the parallel I 154 the spelling ga-bē-e in MS O bears witness to the Babylonian form of the word. I presume ₃u-baš represents a survival from an Assyrianizing manuscript of the late second millennium. In a manuscript from Asšur this is not so surprising. See also the commentary above, on SB VI 75.

101. There is no need to emend to the common formulation ₃i-na ammati (1.kōš). The orthographic style ₃i-na (1.kōš) is exactly paralleled in an inscription of Asšurbanipal (VR 1146, ed, Streich, Asb., p. 6: S ammati (1.kōš) le’u’zi (še-am) ıš-qu ina ab-šur-ni-ba, ‘barley grew ﬁve cubits tall in its furrow’).

102. The circumlocution X-ba ṣa-A, meaning X of Y, ﬁrst appears in Old Babylonian (see GAG p. 138). 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: du-ma-aṭu la ัส.

103. The spelling im-a-ša-asu, represents istaqatu, which I would parse as a I 3 stem of serial action, (see GAG p. 91): the men fell into the hole one by one. When an individual falls into a hole, as Enkidu does in I 124, the I 3 stem is not used.

104. The spelling of the verb in MS a represents a mixed Babylonian-NA dialect form, istaquat (see GAG p. 311).

105. Repeatedly checked conﬁrming that the traces of e-la-le are deﬁnitely so and cannot be read e-la-la. 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.

106. The traces on MS a do not allow a reading े-ra-la-šu. The restoration favoured by recent translators is [ba]-la-us-su [i]-ad (or some such verb), which goes back to [wa]-ṭa[e]n the Mish (von Soden, ZA 53, p. 226); cf. the [flukted] its excrement (CAD K p. 29). This is, however, too uncertain to become so established. If dung is wanted, [ni]-la-us-su is also possible (Westenholz), but many other restorations might be put forward (e.g. [i]-la-pu-usu, as Labat: ’le (frappu’), Hecker: ’trafe er tu’).

107. The recovery of this line depends on MB Emar, iii 5: [a]-na nipallā kanām(r)i (ni)l. With kanu used of a crowd, compare the standard line eštimā lākammar dūshu (SB I 254, 282, II 106).

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

109. It seems diﬃcult to reconstruct the text in such a way that alamīmu is parsed as autive. 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 ašu (MS O) or =*ušu (MS A); restore perhaps e-[a]-ē-a-nit-ṣa, ‘I shall keep passing?’

130-6. The restorations follow the parallel lines of narrative, 142-6.

137. The last word is presumed to be the frst recovered instance in Babylonian of the word entered in the dictionaries as sālu (Ahho sālu II ‘Oberschenkel, Schoﬁb, CAD sālu ’lap, dāgīh’), previously found only in Middle and Neo-Assyrian. Either there exists a doublet sālu: sālu or the Assyrian spellings, customarily defective, disguise the double consonant. Compare also sālu, a paired body part cognate with Arabic sala, ‘leg below the knee’, ‘foot’ (for drawing my attention to the Arabic word I am grateful to my colleague Muhammad Abdel Haleem). The root of these words is perhaps iš-qi > Akk. šaš-pu, ‘to be narrow’, the leg below the knee being narrower than above. The use of sālu/sālu and sālu for ‘lap’ is analogous with the much more common use of bīlu, ‘knee’, in the same meaning.

138, 144. The last word is perhaps some part of rahušu, ‘to trample, stamp, kick’.

140. The word napislak, here clearly a part of the anatomy of the Bull of Heaven, is taken as a napisl ak stems formation, which as a nemen loc indicates the place on the ox where the butcher places his knife in slaughtering the animal (palākšu). By the lexical entry restored as
154. On MS a I do not see enough room for ū-la-a[š]. The suggestion offered in the apparatus, ū-la-š, supposes a variant (Assyrian?) form šullu for the verb šuldu, 'to tear off', perhaps by analogy with Bab. šaldu: Ass. saldi. An alternative analysis would derive it from the verb šal, '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, iddi, isuk and šiš. MS O's šiš is particularly striking, since the verb šaldu is not found outside Assyrian; on Assyrianisms in the SB epic see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (vii). The išimu (Sum. zug.dib) 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 išimu, 'right hand', and clearly a "metaphor" for "penis" (SAI IX, pp. xxvii-xxviii). It would certainly be more obviously an insult for Enkidu to toss the bull's penis at Ištar, and such an interpretation of išimu 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 manuscripts, 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. Gronberg, 'Die sumerisch-akkadische Inanna/Ištar: Hermaphroditos?', WO 17 (1986), pp. 15-25). However male she may have been elsewhere, the goddess of the Gilgamesh epic is not likely to have had male genitals.

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

156-157. According to GAG§152b.f, the force of lā and the preterite is either a matter of emphasis or one of wishful thinking ('hâte (un) sollen'), both in the past (it also occurs in the hypothetical past, as in the Yale tablet, OB III 114: summa anatqui hattu lâ ušli, 'I'll shall have fallen, I should have made my name'). The conventional rendering of lâ akkudû in our line as a conditional is justified on the grounds of juxtaposition of clauses. A comparable passage is SB VII 47-55: lâ tīde... lā aššu... lâ erabû, 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 (āl ki-es-re-e-[i] lambo-a-ti a ha-ri-ma-[i]). For hetzru-women see Chapter 10, the introduction to SB Tablet I on ll. 245 ff.

159. The spelling ša-šu-nu (MS a) is for šišin (CV for VC or C); on this orthographic feature in Assyrian manuscripts of Gilgamesh see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub (a) and (w).

160. The problematical variant šišin-ša-ša-ni-e appears to be a corruption of an original šišin-sha-še-ni-e, 'two minas each' (note the indecision of A'Hô, pp. 1243: ši šaša, against p. 1302: 'jezzi Finger'; von Soden, Recant, p. 60: 'zweei Zoll'; cf. D. O. Edzard, 'Zahmen, Zählen und Messen im Gilgamesh-Epos', in W. Gross et al. (eds.), Texte, Methode und Grammatik, pp. 62-63). However, while the meaning of šaša-ni-e remains so uncertain it would be unwise to write šaša-ni-e off completely. The variant spellings ša-ša-tu-še-ni-še (MS A) and ša-ša-sha-še-ni (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 VII 159).

161. For Lugulbanda as the god of Gilgamesh see OB III 271 and note.

162. The line is perhaps standard, for it occurs also in MB Bog; i 5: ippabûni ippabûnî, 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 nu-pâ-pî-la 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 uzūrīni 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 read mu-šīlū [līb-bi] i-šū (ZA 53, p. 227), and the line referred to Barz’s loss of prestige: she has no one in the street to please her. However, the traces visible before ul on MS A discount both līb-bi, and šī.

TABLE VII

1. On the spelling mi-in-na-ma (MS Q) for mināma (or minamma) see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (b).
27. Haupt’s copy of the traces suggests [ñ][ñ][ñ][ñ][ñ][ñ][ñ], but the reading is not secure.
30. The conventional restoration is kīl [amēlā], ‘like a man’.

39. 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 (Malāhu II 159 // CT 18.4 iv 12; hal-bi = qī-ā-lam), the word hal-bi only appears with reference to the forest of Lebanon, both elsewhere in the Gilgamesh Epic (SB IV 197) and note that the reference given in the dictionaries to hal-bi in the Yale tablet is a mis-reading of wa-āl-bi in OB III 101) and in the Divine Directory of Aššur (Menzel, Tempel II no. 64, 116; šakur (ši) hal-bi). 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 Šer (later Mrū). The trace of [ša] is seen by Haupt but not by Thompson. The presence of this preposition suggests an infinitive phrase, perhaps ina lā ba-[la-i]-ni, ‘in your insertion state’.

40. The reading of the first word in this difficult line is open to other interpretations. Von Soden reads ba-liš, ‘without’ (Recklaw, p. 63; cf. AHuv, p. 1546, s.v. halātu), but this word is otherwise restricted to the Old and Neo-Assyrian dialects. Bottéro emends to obtain sense: ‘Il n’y a pas de conscience (en) ton!’ ‘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-lāq-ū ni-šū (meaning?). Reading ba-liš ueni (sg.) Enkidu contrasts his own consciousness with the door’s obvious lack of it. At the end perhaps restore i-ša-šū-šū-šű [ša-ša-i].

41. The phrase ana 20 bih 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-ša-ša) it appears that the singular noun šu or išu exhibits triplicative declension before possessive suffixes: i ša šāši, i šu šāši, i ša šāši (other examples in the dictionaries of this word with suffixed pronouns are non-diagnostic, being genitive or plural). In this respect it reflects the well-known pattern of three other bi-radical nouns, ašu, abu and enu (see GAC 365h).

43. The verb šīlu is unsurprisingly singular, so the restoration offered by CAD A/1, p. 211: iš-šu qı-lı-[q], ‘the trees of the forest’, is unconvincing. On qı or qılu with pronominal suffixes see the note on l. 41. The use of ašu, normally ‘stranger, foreigner; enemy’, to denote a rival is unparalleled but understandable.

44–5. See the parallel, SBV 295–6.
46. That the word after šašu is from reša, 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 arākā šališu.
47. The restoration of gimuslu is the suggestion of B. Landsberger (RA 62 (1968), p. 103, fn. 22).
48. The line is apparently given in the Kuyunjik MS as a annu dumu[šlu], which is a little light for a poetic line. Though one does not usually prefer a Sultantepe reading to a Kuyunjik reading, probably the sign ši on MS L is a simple mistake for kimī, which could then stand for šašuši dalat kī
t.
53. The mythical Anzû bird was widely used as an apotropaic figure stationed at gates and elsewhere in temples. To the attestations cited in CAD A/2, p. 155, add Frayne, RIME 3/III, p. 135 (in E-meslam at Kutha; Šulgi), and George, RA 82 (1988), p. 144, 22’ (in E-sagil at Babylon; Nebuchadnezzar II) and p. 151; see also Wiggermann, Protective Spirits, p. 159. This function of Anzû 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 id-[di]-ni, for that form fails to provide the usual penultimate stress. For examples of the perfect tense where assimilation of id/[di] to jen] is explicit in the spelling see SB XI 275: ta-at-sun-na-aš-šum-ma and 280: at-tan-nah-hum-ma; here there is room for the morpho-graphemic spelling ita-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 Urkuk and the door is in Nippur. What is wanted is some indirect expression of frustration and despair. Probably he ripped off his clothing and cast it aside, exactly as Gilgamesh does in SBVIII 64: inazalu u inamu damušu.
73. The conventional restoration is šapāšu, ‘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 ša-ul-um, but the identification of the line as a saying means it need have no immediate relationship with the context. The suggestion mitu is supported by the use of ešu in, 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 mitu in an OA letter in which the writers identify themselves as heirs (G. Eissner and J. Lewy, MVAG 33 no. 464, 5): me-e iš-ša-ša-šu ni-a-a-tu ni ša-ul-um e-zi-ad-ni-ati, ‘we are the sons of the deceased. Our father left us a tablet’.
78. The word written iš-ša-šu (both MSS) is, as Landsberger observed, ‘für ikku 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 iška
99. This line is not found in MB Ur. A possible restoration is [[l̚ li-bi (or blāti)], (the gods of the house (or house)) that he enters], which would mark the hunter as one who brings bad luck wherever he goes. The lack of subjunctive after a-far (MS g, coll.) is not significant in a LB copy.

102. The Kuyunjik sources can be restored to yield [il-im]-tu as well as literary [il-in]-tu. The latter, which is also found in SB I 1222, agrees with MB Ur 11 and is probably supported by the LB manuscript (il-ma-u = ū-mā-ta) on. Words with unnecessary epenthetic vowels in SB Gilgamesh see above, Chapter 9, the section on Language and style sub (i, i).

104. The second of these three lines is additional to the text of MB Ur 11–12: akī Šamhātu ūmātā bāšti kū hazzurki ēzara rātu. The traces of MS E, seem to prohibit simple [ha-um-mi-kī], although that is what is expected from MB Ur 13: ḫurri ḫarri ēzara rātu u ši ḫurri kā hi. If one prefers not to interpolate the conjunction in an alternative solution would be to restore (*ha)-mi-kī. The trace of ḫurri before -ki ha-a-tu on MS Z, reported by Haupt on collation of his no. 6, obs. 9 (4A1, p. 106), was not visible to my eyes. MS g's -kū ha-a-tu is routine in a LB copy.

107. This line represents an addition to the text of MB Ur. Von Soden associates the hapax legomenon ta-ḫu-ub-ki with ušāk II (AHU, p. 1203), a rare word that refers to the young of animals and is equated with mār, 'son', in Explicit Malik I 119.2. The context here, as in MB Ur 14–15, is the prostitute's exclusion from the respectable wifey duty of making a household and raising a family within it, and taḫātu thus describes human young. Langsdorfer restored the beginning of the line as [ra]-ram-mi to match the form of the other prohibitions in these curtes. 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 [la]-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.

111–12. This couplet is evidently longer than the counterpart, MB Ur 18–19: e ūrri ṣa ṣašū / . . . šatim ūša pabār, but apparently to the same effect: the conventional reward of respectable women, a house full of beautiful things, is not within the prostitute's expectations. Before ša pabār Langsdorfer suggested ki-re-ṣu-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', kinīna, a lump of potter's clay, does not meet this need.

113–14. The couplet is certainly the counterpart of the damaged MB Ur 20–1 (note ay irti there for e ṣašū, and omission of balu), but until new text is discovered the decipherment of (in particular) the first line is uncertain. Langsdorfer read [la] n-a-mi-ra pa-rim, 'you did not sacrifice Alabashron', but this is doubtful. The sign he read rim looks to me equally like ki or di with interior damage, and the phrase itself does not convince.

115. For [bakkum] as somewhere suitable for the slaves' quarters, see Chapter 5, the notes on MB Ur 22.

116–17. Note that mišakkāti, mašallāti and manassāti are consistently plural (as too in the parallel passages quoted in the introduction, Ch. 10), while MB Ur 23–5 has mišakkāti (pl.), mašallāti (sing.) and manassāti (pl.). The phrase [sipallaritu (or šipallaritu?)] ša ḫarrāti is the counterpart of MB Ur's šippallari pābārī.
Landberger) replaces MB Ur's innáša ūnīkā (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 chimera editorial work on text preserved on a damaged original, with šī-ni-ki misread as niq-ni-ki.

159. For the restoration see MB Ur 56: anu ešši ša kunnūtu [na] kunnīṭuša šabiškuk š[aššuš]

160. The Assyrian 3rd sg. precative turātā (masculine) is another example of an Assyrianism in MS L (see above, on l. 153).

161. The restoration assumes that the form written mar-ra-ta (MS L) is indicative, with a redundant ‘overhanging’ vowel (for comparable spellings in the same manuscript see below, on ll. 165 and 167).

162–4. These lines replace MB Ur 59–61: Gilgamēl ašš mašāšu / ul[aš]ba-ab mi-mumu kaṭthaššu / ippāṭu anā šašu. They may be interpreted as containing no new information. The verb paššu is probably an erroneous, probably for azazu, which is also present in an Assyrian fragment from the same period. The line ending in šašu may be a fragment of a longer word, possibly paššu "giving" or "giving birth".

163. To my eyes ul-ša-ša-ba-lu looks less likely; cf. al elsewhere on fragments of MS L at ll. 30 (L 4), 140–1 (L 1, iii 12–13), 145 (L 1, iii 17). Unless vestigial, which seems improbable, the spelling ša-la-la exhibits the late convention that a syllable CVC can be written CV-CV: see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub (g).

164. The spelling ša-na-a-ta in MS L stands for šu-a-at-tu, and in doing so accords with well-known quirks of NA orthography (CV for VC, CVC for CV-CVC); cf. MS L's ša-na-at and the same relative clause in SB I 246: šu-a-ta-ta-ta maššu. Split as they are by the vocative ibur, the words maššu and šu-a-at do not exhibit the same syntactic relation as the genitive construction ninmu ša-ta and must form a nominal clause.

165. The spelling za-ra-ti, 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 vestigial, azazu (note LB variant za-ra-ta), expressing location ("I was standing there"), as elsewhere in the epic (see OB II 179 and note).

166. The SB text omits rāwr, which in MB Ur 66 qualifies Anzu. The line is identical with a phrase used in the Vision of Kūnamu (quoted in the notes on MB Ur).

172. The keppā is more than an ordinary skipping-rope: it is the playing of štar, her instrument of war, and perhaps a metaphor for the surge of battle (for a discussion see B. Landberger, WZKM 56 (1960), pp. 121–3). The verb maḥāšu is also found with keppā in the Tukulti-Ninurta Epic, where štar's striking of it has the effect of driving the enemy 'out of their senses' (Ebeling, MAOIG 12/P, p. 8, 32: im-ša-a-šep-pa-la štar). It is clear that there does not seem to be the space for Landberger's suggested uš-a-ba-hi-ta (RA 62, p. 130); in any case kahāšu refers to the step of humans not animals. The verb maḥāšu is characteristic of horses and other equids, meaning 'to kick' as well as 'trample', but note its use with an ox in SB XI 106 (see further the commentary, ad loc.).

175. The sign before pāğma is perhaps kali (so already Landberger).

176. Landberger's reading at the end, [uš tu-ši-ni]-ša-[iš]-ni, is not confirmed by the existing traces.

182. The restoration is suggested by the parallels in SB VI 61 and 76. Ishkalka is a name of the queen of the Netherworld, but its etymology indicates that it originally designated her cosmic domain (= Sum. eri-gal, 'Great City'). See further W. Röllig, RAV, p. 64, who here and in parallel passages reads huba šar šerkalka, 'seat of the goddess of Ishkalka'.

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 appallama. Elsewhere in SB Gilgamēl napasū takes a direct object (SB I 145 ištāša samatētu, V 2 ittānnapasū mitētē, V 3 ittānnapasū nēbē, IX 141 etc. ana palēša arkašu, XI 93, išma ana ittāša, 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 Šakkan with Ereshkigal's kingdom can be observed in his relationship with Nergal, the lord of the Netherworld, for there is a tradition in which, like Šakkan, Nergal too has dominion over wild animals (PBS I/2 119, 11: [8]-u-zi šakkan nam-ma-lá-a qa-tuk tu iz-qi-dí, 'O Nergal, Enlil gave into your care the beasts of Šakkan, the wild animals' [Bell-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-ner-gal(ê-dû) ... šal-tú(aš) ù-er-zi tu-tu-ni ... Ninurta and Nergal entrusted to me the beasts of the wild and commanded me to go hunting'); Tukulti-Ninurta II; cf. ibid., p. 135, 68-8; Ashur-îšu II, pp. 226, 40; 291, 84-5; Aššurnaṣirpal II; RIMA 3, p. 41, 40-1; Šalmanesser III, etc.). These passages demonstrate that Nergal's dominion over the 'beasts of Šakkan' derives from his prowess as a hunter.

A closer relationship between Šakkan and Nergal can be inferred from lists. In the lexical text A I 16 even in its various manifestations, with one of the 'beasts of the wild', namely the gazelle:

|ma-us-ma-šu.| = 2a-bi-tum |mes.lam.ta.ta |nē.eri.ri.ari |gur, bugal.itu, tut[a] |

MSL XIV, p. 228, 126-8

Elsewhere the god of gazelles is Šakkan, of course (see above, the commentary on SB I 110). This association is given further expression in the esoteric text I.nam.gil.eš.tu, šu, according to which šu-gur (i.e. Nergal) and šuš share a mystical number (CT 25 50, 15, ed. Livingstone, Mystical Works, p. 33, rev. 4). In this list there are two other entries where divine names are paired: Bēl and Marduk (rev. 1) and Girra, or Gihil, and Nuska (rev. 5). In the first of these entries the two deities are identical: Bēl 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 šu-gur and šuš. With regard to this particular text I am inclined to suspect that ancient scholars would not have ignored the hidden possibilities offered by the orthography šuš is Šakkan. Speculative etymology of the kind practised in some scribal circles would find no difficulty in linking Šakkan with šuš(iš) eri, gal, bugal.itu, (šuš) ra and šuš-ra, and thus extrapolating an equation of the kind that the Netherworld. Such an analysis would be given good cause by the observed existence of a close association of the two gods, as documented in the texts just cited.

204. As Ereshkigal's scribe, Bēlet-šeri is the Akkadian name of the goddess also known as (Nin)-Geštinanna and Azimmu, the wife of the chthonic deity Ninglissâda (see W. G. Lambert, Studies Marduk, 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.la.aralli, 'chief scribe of Hades', as in the Deity of Ur-Nammu 126 (Kramer, JCS 21, p. 115; nin.a.zi.[ma unleash], a Gatteg II inscription (Ebeling, ArOr 21, p. 388, 66-9, = šu-lar-ra-iš nu-šu-la MIN-e, = STR 210, 12; nin.geštin.an-an), and OB and SB recensions of Udâgâl (Forunner, 48 and 284; Geller, UHES, pp. 22, 36; SB III, CT 16 3, 95-8, = šu-lar-ra-tum šu-šu-la-su-šu-šu-šu-šu, = von Werder, Ur 354 137-8; cf. SB IV: CT 16 9 4-5; nin.geštin.an = šu-šu-la-su-šu-šu-šu). Elsewhere she is the divine scribe par excellence, in an inscription (CT 23 16, 15; nin.geštin.an-an) šuš(iš) ša šuš(iš), cf. G. Castellino, OR 82 24 (1955), p. 246), the Enumerated text (BR 24 36, 36; Bēlet-šeri šu šuš(iš) ša šuš(iš) u eres), ed. W. G. Lambert, FS Berger, p. 149), diviniza-
tion prayers (BBR 87 ii 7 // Besold, Cat., Sm 802, 7; *lītāt-ēnkī-de-suk-kāt tā-ni=dī)، also OB YOS XI 23, 14 *gēnītān (gī). an-na ta-as-si-ka-at i-li ni-ga-ni-at 4-na-ni, giving her also the specifically celestial office of 'herald of Anu', and elsewhere (RAM 323, 47) *nin.gēnītān (lā) ta-as-suk-ka-tum [. . .]; K 3424, 7–8 *nin.gēnītān (lā) tā-as-suk-kāt lā-ka-ru-ti [. . .]). Note that the seal inscription read by H. Lümet, Sexagesimae tactes, p. 113, 11, 6 as *nin.gēnītān tā-as-suk-kāt-lā-ka-ru-ti in fact reads *nin.in lā-as-suk-kāt-ti (coll. W. G. Lambert).

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

209. The restorations are the suggestions of Landsberger, RA 46, p. 131, fn. 129. The pairing of ūnāri and kimamā in this couplet recalls a line of Luâlu II, in which the conqueror consumes his death: pe-lit-ēnamā an-i-ē lu-ka-na-ru-a-a (my) tomb was open, my funerary furnishings were ready’ (Lambert, BB, p. 114). Note, also utilizing the same root, the phrase tar-ē-ni-ē kimamā ‘funerary preparations’, in a NA inscription describing the burial of an Assyrian king (Ṭul., p. 57, 12; cf. J. MacGinnis, SAAB 11 (1987), p. 2, i 14). Our passage may have Esēšeuropäikei contemplating his own funerary furnishings—or rather lack of them, since he has been transported to the Netherworld in a dream. More likely Eresēsī is still speaking, and follows up her preliminary enquiries as to who brought Esēnihui 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?


253. At the end Landsberger’s pa-(u-ni-ti), ‘in Traum . . . , für den es keine Deutung gibt’, is not quite compatible with the phrase. Perhaps pa-(nu-si-lā-la), ‘a dream that will never be matched’.

256–7. According to A. Schott, ZA 42 (1934), p. 130, Jensen privately suggested restoring allā ṣāṣī, at least in l. 256, after the parallel in SB XI 244.

261. The broken sign on MS SG might be restored ḫa-ka-bi, after MB Megiddo rev. 10: murru ṭakum lētu, but there is not sufficient agreement between the two versions of Esēnihui’s death to be confident of this restoration.


262. Enough remains of the broken sign apparently to rule out an exact equivalence of this line to MB Megiddo rev. 12: ʾiššima Gilgamesh ʾa-ne-xī . . .

TABLE VIII

3. The spelling of the predicate ʾa-bi-ti is presumably for a trisyllable, since the stative ʾaṭā would not provide the required stress pattern at the line’s end. The two alternative analyses are the noun in the nominative in apposition (the parse adopted here) or in the stative with subjunctive ending (as in MB); both are rendered ʾaṭānu.

4. The trace of ḫ in the Sultantepe manuscript (MS e) suggested the verb ṣāṣī to O. R. Gurney (JCS 8 (1954), p. 92) and all since. However, there must remain a certain reluctance to restore ṣāṣī here, since the wild animals did not themselves bring Esēnihui into the world but only reminded him. It may be significant that in the Kuyunjik manuscript the preserved trace will not allow ʾa-ṣāṣī-l-nu-l, ṣāṣī-l-nu-l is possible, if less likely. Some other verb is suspected.

5–6. Von Soden was the first to restore ʾuṣurīnu but read ʾu instead of ʾa (ZA 53, p. 229). CAD has opted for ʾa but takes it as introducing an inverted genitive construction, ʾa ʾuṣurīnu-ri-ri lē-zi-bi-šan

(Sp. p. 318), with Esēnihui’s adopted mother and father as subject. I have treated this couplet as a right unit, with bonds of syntax and meaning between the lines that constitute it which are greater than those that tie the couplet to the preceding text. Accordingly, šurīnu will be the subject of the verb and ša introduces a pair of relative clauses. This analysis presupposes an erroneous lack of subjunctive on the proposed verb sāṣī-l-nu in l. 6, a partial restoration which was the idea of von Soden, loc. cit. However, in the Sultantepe manuscript which is the only witness to this word, such a lack is routine (cf. l. 10; 18, 247, 30, 32, 34, 53).

7. Elsewhere in the Sultantepe manuscript the plural determinative is appended to nouns which are almost certainly singular (see l. 17 and 22): consequently the Kuyunjik manuscript can just as well be restored ʾa-nu. . . .

8. I cannot easily make good sense of MS e’s text between what may be restored as šā-ka (or ḫa)-lāši and ʾaš; while ʾaš could be taken as a reinforcement of the negative wish, i.e. ‘not by night (nor) by day’, it must be noted that the signs šā-ka are clearly written on the tablet as if they were taken to be one word. In any case, in the present context ay ʾaš, ‘may it not go back’, is semantically difficult. Gurney suggested ʾa-a i-pa-li, ‘may they not fall silent’, and this is generally accepted by recent translators; alternatively one might propose a-a i-ba-a-lu ‘ay ʾaššakāl’; may they not cease’. The problem with both proposals is that, while the sign šā gives the 3rd fem. pl. ending required if we take kaskalši at face value, the trace on the more reliable Kuyunjik manuscript still will not agree: it is of a sign like šā-ša-l (or ša-l). The first of these suggests a-a i-sa-ša-l again, the second perhaps a-a i-pa-lu, ša-l the imperative writing in CT 16 20, 67), synonymous with ay ʾaššakāl. 9–10. Uruk is also preceded by the epithet ʾaššakāl in IL 25 and 43 (restored) of this tablet. In describing šāš, ‘city’, and other such nouns passim (e.g. ʾaššu as a term for the Netherworld later in this tablet, ʾašš, ‘people’, and maššu, ‘land, nation’), the adjective ṣāṣī, lit. ‘wide’, has connotations less of spaciousness than of large population. A key witness is the poem of Arin-baši where the associated verb means ‘to become well populated’, as is plain from the often-repeated line ma-tum ša-ta-pi ša-nu mi-ti-da, ‘the land grew populous, the people numerous’ (OB III 355 // II 2; cf. Assyrian recension S IV 1, SBV 44, ed. George and Al-Rawi, Iraq SB (1996), p. 176). Thus ṣāṣī ṣāṣī the it deriving people’s land and ʾašši ʾašši is the ‘densely populated Netherworld’ below.

The present couplet harks back to the events that preceded Gilgamesh and Esēnihui’s departure for the Cedar Forest. The old men will be those that repeatedly counselled caution, who are known in SB II as iššimā ṣāṣī, ‘the senior advisers’, but as ṣāṣītum in the Yale tablet (OB III 189, 247). The crowd will be the younger men who saw the gods with avowedly maddening messages (šalakkāššu and ʾaššu) according to SB III 212–14; note, in comparison with the end of SBV VIII: 10 lines that end iššimā ṣāṣī and arkišu respectively). The preference of this and other Sultantepe manuscripts for the vowel ša in which is seen in two words in this couplet, šā-ka-na-ka šu-lā antišiššu and arkišu ša arkišu, is one of the distinctive features collected in Chapter 7, in the introduction to MS e.

11. Von Soden was adamant that men should be restored before ša-ta-ta šurīnu (‘would [faithful-ly-ti], “die Manner”’). According to the following lines seem all to refer to the natural world, probably again with reference to the Cedar Forest (see especially l. 15), I would expect some more topographical allusion and follow Labat’s ‘les hautes sommets’ (?’).

12. There seems to be no room for this line on MS e.

14. If the Kuyunjik manuscript held ša ši-šu (in agreement with the Sultantepe tablet), there would seem to be room for the name of a third tree, providing it was written with two signs only (šu). The word ša šišišu is suggested because it fulfils this condition and because, like šurīnu and ʾuṣurīnu, it was a timber cut in the mountains of the west, as we know from the foundation bricks of Yakedun-Lim that report his lumber expedition (D. F. Frayne, RIME 4, p. 606, 54–5; ša-šišišu
about preferring the reading of this very inferior manuscript to that of the Kuyunjik tablet, despite its apparent clearness on this occasion, and the presence of himartu 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 ē-kē could otherwise be emended to ē-kē-qi, and that the two signs that follow will match Kuyunjik if exchanged. However, ē-kē-qi-na ina pīša 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 nēki, 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 herdsman. Part of the work of a shepherd boy (kapparu, sipa.tur) seems indeed to have been churning milk, as we learn from a line of Išbi-Erra’s hymn to Ninسابا: sipa.turse ɡa ni ib.dum, 4akaru nu da da, ‘the shepherd boy does not churn the milk, he does not pour it in the churn’ (D. Reisman, Kramer, AV, p. 359, 30; cf. A. Berlin, Enmerkar and Annunziadana, p. 86; M. Stol, ‘Mîlch (produkte) A’, RLAVIII, p. 195). The butter substance himatū, ‘ghee’, could be made from the milk of both cows and goats (see Stol, RLAVIII, pp. 194–6; id., RSA7 (1993), pp. 101–2).

30. In the Sultantepe manuscript ki.ta looks unavoidable (cf. the shape of the sign ta in 1.61) but cannot be correct. I assume that šapīša is an error for šapīša, which is itself suggested by the traces observed on the Kuyunjik manuscript.

31-2. This couplet deals with the production of alcoholic drink, so it is very likely that MS e’s šabītu is a mistake for šabi, ‘brewer’.

33-4. If this couplet follows the pattern set in the preceding lines, the prostitute should be the subject of the relative clause as well as of 33-ākā, and the relative clause should describe an activity typical of her trade. Recent translators follow Garro in taking sap-pa-ši as 2 masc. sg. reflexive; however, although according to the Pennsylvania tablet Išbi-Erra did indeed anoint himself with oil when he left the wild (OB II 108: šamānu izqalsim uštulli kai), the structural parallel would then be lost. My translation assumes that sap-pa-ši is the Sultantepe scribal’s orthography for the active napalītu, with 3rd fem. sg. prefix under Assyrian influence. The anointing of the head with oil can occur for legal reasons to mark a change of status (R. Harris, JCS9 (1955), p.92, no. 59, 10: šamānu 4a-ši-šu-pa-ši-tu, ‘their (the buyer’s and seller’s) head was anointed with oil; OB land sale), especially as a preliminary to marriage (see the Middle Assyrian Laws §43, also the ritual KAR 66, 10: šabīlu-ša-ša qauppānu (ṣaqgu-du) tu šišamītu(dub₂), ‘you pour oil pomade on (the figure’s) head’ in preparation for its symbolic wedding to a piglet). However, this practice also occurs as a part of general festivization, according to the Middle Assyrian Laws §42 (i-na ša-me ša-qa-qa, ‘on a holiday’) and inscriptions of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon that report festivals marking the completion of building works. There the phrase is nīshig 4aši, ‘to soak the crown of the head’ with perfumed ungents, respectively rāštā, ‘oil of,’ the first pressing, virgin oil’ (Frahm, Sarcher, pp. 79–80, 268–73; Lachennel, OIP 2, p. 125, 51), and konam rāštā igūtu, ‘virgin oil and oil pomade’ (Borger, Esarh., p. 63, vi 53). To promote an auspicious ambience Nabonidus turned the construction of the El-babbarra at Sippar into one long festival by plying his workforce with food, wine, ungents for the body and narēqi šammi šabītu, ‘perfume made from sweet-scented oil’ for their heads, using the same phrase as his Assyrian predecessors (OECC T 27 iii 29–30: nar-ēqi-ši li gīši gā muš-4a-ša-ša-ša 4a-ši-tu-ši-ši-gi-qi). It can easily be imagined that Babylonian prostitutes, who were especially visible during festivals and public holidays, would be prepared to pamper their clients with pomades. One may also point a literary style: the natural word order is deliberately altered to depict Enkidu’s head (nīṣīṣābu) enveloped in the permeated oil (šammi, . . . šabītu).

35-6. The loss of much of this couplet, with its tantalizing reference to a wedding, is particularly frustrating. If we accept the pattern established in the preceding couplets, the subject of šabītu,
and of the following relative clause, seems this time to be something to do with emâtu, a word that almost always occurs in the compound bit emâtu. The bit emâtu 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 l. 22.

The second line of the couplet is partly corrupt, one suspects, but the mention of a wife confirms that the context is nuptial. According to the pattern established in 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 ši ki ha suggest ši-ki-ka, 'give you to drink,' but the text may well be corrupt (cf. von Soden, Reclam, p. 72: 'Im Sippenhaus des Gatten einen Ring gab man dir,' reading ši-šul-šu-ka in Aḫḫu, p. 1422). An imaginative attempt to solve the difficulties without emendation was made by J.M. Diakonoff, BeO 18 (1961), p. 62: ši-kš-šu e-ti is-si-it(? bit e-mušu ši-la šah-um-um mi-ši-ka [šu-ša]. 'Let those weep over you who have entered the bit emâtu, Who have [obtained] a wife (through) your wise(?) counsel,' with the footnote: 'ša aššu aḫ-meš-túša [šib] ša aššu aḫ-meš-túša (= ina aḫ-meš-túša) mištûša [šib] (Sandhi). However, it is not known whether Enkidu counselled aspiring husbands. Bottéro restores boldly Pleurerez-le, invici, qui, pour la once, lui aviez glissé au doigt un anneau! but comments, 'l'absence à la couronne de "passer un anneau au doigt" des invités à un mariage est intéressante. Je n'en connais pas d'autre attesté' (Ufipépou, 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 namâtûma 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 abekekkâ-la, a form which addresses Enkidu in the second person. For this reason I see ina na-me-šu-šu as an inferior variant, probably deriving from the phrase ina sumâtûma through a mistake of reading (so for na) or of hearing (crãs?). The phrase ina sumâtûma has an emphatic function, signifying that what follows is heart of the matter, and here it marks the climax of the preclusive section of Gilgamesh's peroration.

50. The word ša-rûdu was once also taken at face value, as an active participle in the construct state (šarû, e.g. Heidel, Speiser: 'who chased(s) the wild ass'), but the discovery of MS w, with its variant šar-du, encouraged Gurney and most subsequent translators to analyse it as the passive participle, šit-ešu, 'sent away, banished'. The latter parsing is confirmed correct by the phrase ak-ban-ni šaru (var. šar-ar-du) in a potency incantation, where the image is of the recalcitrant penis as a wild donkey, disobedient and uncooperative (Biggs, Sargis, p. 17, no. 2, 7, translating 'hunted wild ass'). The manum of the word šaru is certainly 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 purser. He is a mute because mute, being infantile, 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 précis 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 ovb. S'-S').

56. For namânu, 'to become darkened, eclipsed,' in the sense of losing consciousness, see A. L. Oppenheim, Or N 17 (1948), p. 45. The dative 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 Ilar, and thus a tamgpim may well have been a suitable gift for her. If kal-li-m-e is the name of a wood it appears to be a hapax legomenon. Perhaps it should be seen as a variant of hallarum, a variety of mdu (MSL V, pp. 110, Hb III 211; mdu tu = k; 129, 418; mdu asal = k).

136. It is possible, on the face of it, to parse ukaladim in this and the subsequent parallel lines as passive (II/2), with the grave-goods as subject. However, in 1. 218 the same form of the verb is evidently active, being coordinated with wina'saramma, and I assume that we have II/3 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 591).

145–6. The expansion of ereti to ereti rapkiz 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 Isuk’s Descent, where flutes of lapis lazuli accompany him on his passage to and from the Netherworld: gš.gš asum (za.gin) (CT 15 147, 28 and 35 // 48, 24 and 31); and in a ritual that mimics his funeral, where a flute is one of the gifts presented to him (Farber, Isuk and Dumuzi, pp. 140 ff, 21, 61).

154. For Namtar as sukku ereti, “the vizer of the Netherworld”, see the vision of Kummā (A. Livingstone, Court Poetry, p. 71, 2), and an incantation against warfare (W.G. Lambert, AO 18 (1957–8), p. 293, 65). In Ar I V his title is the vizer of Ereškigm (CT 25 5, 31; cf. also the myth of Nergal and Ereškigm).

159. As Namtar’s wife (see W. G. Lambert, RLA IV, p. 532), Hubullog follows him in the parallel passage of the Death of Ur-Namru (see Chapter 10, the introduction to SB Tablet VIII), and is placed here for that reason. Her epithet is restored after a Gatum III incantation (E. Ebeling, AO 21 (1953), p. 296, 65; agrig kar ni.i, coll. Lambert). In the Vision of Kummā Namtar’s wife is his female aspect, šum-tar-ru (Livingstone, Court Poetry, p. 71, 3).

164. The gender of Ereškigm’s sweeper is masculine, if we accept the evidence of his title and the verb he governs (ša ṣad). The name Qasā-ṣabat, “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 (KAR 172 ii 10; ša n. du, 179 ii 11; ša. ni. du, ug), on whom see further T. Jacobsen, JACOS 103 (1983), p. 199. A name exactly opposite in meaning is attached to one of the councilors of Lugal-Maradā, ša ni.dug. (His hand is heavy) (CT 25 1, 1). The pairing of Qasā-ṣabat with the cleaner (muššarum) Ninshuburānmmu confirms the benign nature of his responsibilities as šášu, for their titles are nearly synonymous: in hymnograms the phrases šašu la ša-ši-bi, “he must not sweep his house” (KAR 176 rev. 124 // 178 ii 11; etc.), and šašu la ša-ši-bi, “he must not tidy his house” (C. Viseldeus, ZA 19 (1905–6), p. 378, 10), are interchangeable before the suffix šašu la ša-ši-bi, “he must not wash his feet.”

166. 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-nin-dur-šu must thus be treated with some scepticism: perhaps it is intended for ša-kal-ma, yielding 4-ša šašu šabla; 4-ša šašu tam-mi, “he should not be anxious nor sick at heart.” The line recurs as SB VIII 174 in MS m. As noted by Cavigneaux, Gilgamesh la Mort, p. 43, it is remi-
niscient of a standard Sumerian poetic line, ur, nam. ba.e.ug, ša nam. ba.e. ság.ge, which occurs in the Death of Bīšgame 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 hesitations revealed by the tentative nature of his script indicates that he did not feel secure about what he was writing. The deity Ninsūlūḫatumma, ‘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 II 347: *šug. tu.la tāšīlim = mu-la-ta-šug*). This item is a kind of broom made of spades of the date palm, for as seen in the hermeneutics quoted above (l. 164), šugūru is treated as a near-synonym of kāšū, ‘to sweep’. The menial nature of the task Ṣa-a šīšu is further seen in a legal document from Nuzi, in which a girl given into the service of the temple of Istar of Nineveh for the provision of šašīšušu, ‘cleaning the courtyard’, must attend twice a month to ‘ tidy up and fetch water’ (HSS 14 106, 16–17: *šišu-šišušu er* *maš* l cza.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 Kuyunji version of this line appears instead to make the deity the subject, while the break intrudes this is not completely certain. To my eyes the traces do not allow a reading *u-a* (or *a* ) *šišu-* bi’-let him say, “Woe!” *!*

175. For *par-* as a writing of the singular noun in construct state see Chapter 9, the section on Language and style (d). The proposal that *kattupp* here is not the word for *bit* (the mouthpiece of a bridge) but means ‘double-edged’ is the perceptive idea of A. Westenholz, who draws attention to ka = pū in the meaning ‘edge’. See further A. W. Sjöberg, TCS III, p. 75, quoting the Sumerian expression ka gir.kin, ‘edge of a pointed blade’, found in the Enlil hymn, Falkenstein, Götterbilder I, p. 11, 16, and explained in MSL XIII, p. 244, Kagal D 3:7: ka gir.kin = pi-ia-zi-nu-im az-ag-tum. The reading *šišu-*šur, against *šišu-*šur (Parpola), is proved by the lexical entry MSL XIV, p. 491, A VIII/1 92: *maš* Šišu ši purru (gir). So already CAD S 834 (p. 440).

176. The first word is of uncertain decipherment and derivation. For Parpola *mī-šu-*ti represents *mēštā* ‘blade’. One might also propose a word *mēštā* ‘replica’ (*vmēšta*), 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 *reši* and *rešum*. To avoid this one can transfer the adjective and read in apposition *mi-ti* šišu ši purru-ši-ti, ‘the holy water-course, the Euphrates’, but note that the inverted phrase *šaši* Purru also occurs 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. Bībū is otherwise known from the Vision of Kūmnā, where he bears the same title (Linguistics, Court Poetry, p. 73, 19; I see no justification for Livingstone’s translation of *gir.la* = *pāši* as ‘hangman’). He appears appropriately as a death-bringing demon in an incantation, alongside the ‘Snatcher’, Eḫkēnu (K 8104, 17, cited in CAD B, p. 219). When not a general term but a specific planet, *babu* (udul.ti) is sometimes interpreted as Mercury (e.g. MSL XVIII, p. 229, Antak G 308: *ši-bi-šu = šug* (udul.ti.gu, 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.su, = *babu* (udul.ti); 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 when in the

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

nīšu.til = muš-me bi-lim
nīšu-ba-tu-ri = muš-ta-ba-ru-ri *mu-ta-nu* ‘which cuts down livestock’

Nergal’s title is that of a shepherd, and thus the phrase *dayyan Aššur*, ‘shepherd of the Lord’, is an epithet born by Bībū himself in the incipit of the prayer that describes his chthonic functions (Haupt, Nimrud in no. 53, i/ KAR 227 ii 7: di.ku, 3a-um-nu-pa-ki, quoted in full above, in Chapter 3, the section on Gilgameš in esoteric rituals). The
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 incantations (dı̈kutu a-nu-nu-ú). G. J. Lambert, AJIO 18 (1957–8), p. 293, 53; KAR 224 rev. 11). The sun god is more likely meant here, but 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 fashion Anu’s sikru (‘word, idea’) in her heart (ina šēbātu), 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. Cavigneaux that this line is related to the passage of the Death of Gilgames in which the Euphrates is diverted by damming while the hero’s tomb is built in its bed (Cavigneaux, Gilgames et la Mort, p. 11). The spelling zik-ru is thus for sikru or sekitu, 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 umallu cannot be much different from umallu. This is probably another case of an iterative stem (here II/3) denoting a serial process, resulting in rows (GAG 591f). With the use here of mallatu, a variant of mallu, in funeral rites compare a Sumerian lament in which water is poured from an an-nu ma la tür ma in a libation for the deceased (Kramer, Finkelstein Mem. Vol., p. 141, 43; D. Katz, RA 93 (1999), p. 110).

### Table IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kur</th>
<th>Li-du-ù</th>
<th>I-AD 灌溉</th>
<th>Mountain</th>
<th>Mountain of Enlil</th>
<th>Seat of Bēlet-Līl</th>
<th>Mountain of Adad</th>
<th>Cedar Mountain</th>
<th>Dītu</th>
<th>Cypress Mountain</th>
<th>Dītu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kur</td>
<td>ma-a-bi</td>
<td>I-AD 灌溉</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>Mountain of Enlil</td>
<td>Seat of Bēlet-Līl</td>
<td>Mountain of Adad</td>
<td>Cedar Mountain</td>
<td>Dītu</td>
<td>Cypress Mountain</td>
<td>Dītu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kur</td>
<td>ma-bu</td>
<td>I-AD 灌溉</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>Mountain of Enlil</td>
<td>Seat of Bēlet-Līl</td>
<td>Mountain of Adad</td>
<td>Cedar Mountain</td>
<td>Dītu</td>
<td>Cypress Mountain</td>
<td>Dītu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kur</td>
<td>ma-brur</td>
<td>MIN MIN</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>Mountain of Enlil</td>
<td>Seat of Bēlet-Līl</td>
<td>Mountain of Adad</td>
<td>Cedar Mountain</td>
<td>Dītu</td>
<td>Cypress Mountain</td>
<td>Dītu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kur</td>
<td>su-ab-ba-nu</td>
<td>MIN MIN</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>Mountain of Enlil</td>
<td>Seat of Bēlet-Līl</td>
<td>Mountain of Adad</td>
<td>Cedar Mountain</td>
<td>Dītu</td>
<td>Cypress Mountain</td>
<td>Dītu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kur</td>
<td>a-na-a-ri</td>
<td>MIN MIN</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>Mountain of Enlil</td>
<td>Seat of Bēlet-Līl</td>
<td>Mountain of Adad</td>
<td>Cedar Mountain</td>
<td>Dītu</td>
<td>Cypress Mountain</td>
<td>Dītu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first line of this section is restored in the light of the parallel that appears to exist between II. 10–12 and 24–6.

11. The phrase mutal Sin, if correctly restored, simply means ‘at night’. 15–16. For these stock lines see the commentary on OB Ishchali 20–1; līpu ḫaṣṣum an aqālu / šēg našarru ina šībātu, where ina šībātu suggests that šī in the SB text is ‘arm’ not ‘side’ (summ pro parte). In l. 16 the break does not seem to be wide enough to accommodate našarru ina, which is the phrasing expected from the only versions of this line that survives unbroken (OB Ishchali, Nergal and Ereškigal), and the big area of blank clay before šibātu suggests that there was no preposition on this occasion. Consequently našarru is restored in construe state. The phrase našarru šībī occurs, with bašīm ašši, in a passage of Gilgamesh’s lament for Enkidu that is closely related to the two-line version of the present passage (SB VII 46–7).

17. This line also appears in the company of the preceding couplet at SB X 96. Note also something very similar in Sargón II (TCL III 133): hi-i-ia iš-ta-ta ez-zi i-na liš-šu am-quin-ma, ‘I fell amongst them like a terrible arrow’.

19. For the last word see the commentary on SBVI 43.

37. The spelling le-mu for ša-mu was understood by von Soden as standing for Šemu (AHw, pp. 1274–5). However, according to J. J. Gell Šemu derives from older šimun (BiOr 12 (1955), p. 105; cf. Hebrew šem), so this orthography might instead derive from an archaic or dialectal variant of the word. The word displays another peculiarity, in that le-mu-ša exhibits triplicite declension, resetting the nominative case vowel before the possessive suffix, a formation that is exceptional with this word (one expects ša-mu). Perhaps, in the end, the text will turn out to be corrupt (read še šem-šā). However that may be, the singular possessive suffix here in l. 42 (šēbī, unless the referent there is the sun) is at first glance difficult to reconcile with the plural possessive suffixes in II. 40–1 (ešien, innsu). 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. 45). The singular pronouns refer to the nominative 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 to meet his wife at his evening homecoming, is identified as Mt. Bušugud in SB Hh XXII and the lišaq-lišaqu based on it, but as kur ša-1. . . = ni-er-e šu Utu ʾa-A-a in the Enuma version of Hh as given by Arnaud, Emar VI 6/459, 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:
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 cedars of the mountain Mt. Hammur, however, is the Amuru 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 cedars of mountains were situated in the far east (see Sijjo, TCS III, p. 90; Tigray, Evolution, p. 77, fn. 11; Klein, CRR A 44/III, pp. 63–4). One of them is Mt. Hajar, present in Hk XXII and also attested as a name for one of the cedars mountains in Diri VI 2 10’ (cited in CAD E, p. 147). This mountain, whose name is taken from the timber-bearing evergreen trees that grew on it in legend ( unjustus is perhaps a type of cypress or cedar), is mythical in that it is never found outside literary contexts, even if 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 Hajar (or from Уhajar-trees’ (EWO 373: `Уhajar-tures a.e.; TCI XV 7, 13: `Utu Уhajar-tures a.e.; the mountain’s location is confirmed by a prayer to the sun god that reports his rising at dawn: `Уtu an.īa kī.á.gi.ta e.ē.ē.a.ze.ū.de
`Ušami(uru) ul-ut šamin(ān)’ ellittu(ka) ina a-je-ka
kur ḫa.šur-ra.ta b[a]l[a].dē.zu.de
īa-šu-ur ḫa.šur[a] r ina na-bal-kur-ti-ka
Meek, BD X x1, pp. 66 and 68, K 3052+5982, 11–14, ed. ibid., p. 1
O Šamaš, as you come out from heaven’s pure interior (Akku: the pure heavens), as you pass over Mt. Hajar . . .

An easterner location is also implicit in an incantation from Uduqglu that describes the course of the Tigris and Euphrates from start to finish:
mū(a) nīti idiqlār (lul. bal) mū(a) nīti pu-ru-ti ellsitu(ka) ina
īa-šu-ur-ri a-na ḫa.šur a-je-ni
KAR 34, 14–15
Pure waters of Tigris and waters of Euphrates, which come forth from (their springs) to Mt. Hajar.

The identification of Mt. Hajar with the ‘whole of the eastern Taurus and part of the northern Zagros’ by M.B. Rowson (JNES 26 (1967) p. 265) 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 plūtērēkēn see Chapter 10, the introduction to Table X 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 (Sijjo, AFO 24 (1973), p. 28, 9: kur uru). – a mountain belonging to Negal (TCI XV 26, ed. van Dijk, Götterkunde II, p. 37, 46: kur ani); and an incantation that refers to the mountain of the sunset (Uduqglu IV 61: ṣyur. sag. uru. a ša: ona šadīr(ku)-e-rē šamarin(uru)); courtesy M.J. Gelier). The gloss [kur] ni-ṣi-šašamin(uru) in MSL V, p. 38, 46b(4) probably explains a lost entry in Hg 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 ereb šamin as well as apē šamin. Gilgamesh is standing at the foot of only one of the Twin Mountains, identified here as the eastern twin.

40. I follow von Soden in analysing e-ša-ša-nu as a noun (AHS, s.v. ešu ‘the Obere’) and viewing the line as an expression of the common literary image in which mountain peaks are said to reach as high as the heaven (for many instances see CAD E, p. 139, emdēr 1.a.c.; the proposed restoration in-ša is for the stative endēr emdēr (khaš-ša) has also been considered but is rejected on grounds of spacing and because the word same appears in l. 41). An alternative view is that e-ša-ša-nu is the preposition eli in the locative (ëšanama), as in CAD S 3, 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 šapuš šamin is, in any case, not clearly a synonym for tiš šamin, ‘horizon’. The word šapu evokes the picture of the worker-broncos casting something in a mould (šapulu), and is better understood as meaning the solid material of which something is made (cf. AHS, s.v. šapu ‘Aufgeschütztes’); therefore šapuš šadi, the stuff of mountains, is a byword for hardness and solidity. It follows that šapuš šamin 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 šapuš šamin as ‘firmament’).

41. Elsewhere the phrase irat šadda, ‘breast, chest of a mountain’, occurs in cultic lamentations, for example as the haunt of bandits (F. Thureau-Dangin, RA 43 (1936), p. 104, 26–7: mu.lu.lul la gaba kur. ra.ka: sa-ar-ri šad šadda, ‘a criminal from the “breast” of the mountains’; Urammiwaiti, cf. Cohen, Lamentations, p. 563, 144), and of porters collecting brushwood (lili: ibid., pp. 543, 90 // 553, 90). In the lament Edinanaqasa the Sumerian gaba kur. ra refers to the uplands where Damu’s mother works his body, though in the later period the phrase is given a chthonic interpretation and translated r-ra-er-se-rim, ‘the breast of the Netherworld’ (ibid., p. 673, 668 // 688, 98 = IV 21 30 no. 2, 22–3; cf. Jacobson, Harks, p. 71, 175). In these passages irat šadda means something like ‘hillocks’ and is comparable with e.g. the Paps of Jura. In our line the exact issue is the topic, for the image of mountains being ground in the lowest levels of the cosmos is conventional. Another use of irat for the base of something is in the lexical passage ḫḫV 19–21: ṣiša.gal gāl gīgīr = ir-tam, šat-tam (gabal-gala), which seems to be the bottom part of a wagon (see George, RA 85 (1991), p. 162). Otherwise one might suspect that inšunu is corrupt for inšuma, ‘their bases’.

42. Translators are divided on how to read the second verb. The least damage to orthography and grammar is done if palaḫa ṣu raḫabata can be second objects of berim, alongside the plural pānītu. It must be admitted that in the nearest parallel (Bauer, Ass II, p. 90, rev. 12: er-e-iw pā-ti 1 šem-ma, ‘let him (sc. the moon god) cover his face with glory’), the second object is a better instrument for producing darkness than palaḫa ṣu raḫabata is here; but one must allow for metaphor in poetic language. The alternative reading of the verb, ṣīšil, assumes that the spelling pa-ni-ša is for pānītu, nom. sg., an analysis that is quite possible, even in a Kuyunjik source. A third solution, in which palaḫa ṣu raḫabata are viewed as objects of the preceding verb (Oppenheim and others), is less probable in my view, because berinšišimma is already limited by the accusative pronoun (referring to the scorpion monsters) and should not be pressed into unaccustomed overtime.

43. On išma šabān, ‘to take hold of one’s senses’, with the nuance of plucking up the courage to do something, see Oppenheim’s translation of this passage, Or ns 17 (1948), p. 46. For the line’s second verb von Soden prefers iš-ru-šu, ‘grill’, ‘sich neigte’ (ZA 53, p. 230; Reckendorf; also CAD K, p. 197), but it seems too early in the narrative for such a display of manners. Not until the scorpionman has discussed with his mate the nature of the stranger does he hail him.

44. The phrase širē ma represents that Gilgamesh is immediately recognized as a king, of divine birth: see ll. 53 // 130 and the commentary on the latter.
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', *SAA* IX, pp. xxxvi-xlix. The separate creation of man (lullū-amāti) and king (māšitu-amāti) is the subject of a mythological fragment published by W. R. Mayer, 'Ein Mythis von der Erschaffung des Menschen und des Königs', *Or nS 56* (1967), pp. 55-68.

1-1. The restoration of this couplet here and throughout this episode relies on the better-preserved parallels in ll. 158-66. Though *pašu* in the I/1 stem is not common, the tablet has a clear *iš* (not *ni*) word where the word is preserved (ll. 159, 162, 166). For the significance of Gilgames's repeated backward glances see the introduction to this episode in Ch. 10.

10. There are three verbs *gargāmu* with present tense in *iš*. *CAD* and others analyse *šarrar* from *gargāmu* D, 'to hurry' (*CAD* S, p. 101). Another school chooses *šarru* B, a verb of lamentation. The third verb, *šarru* A, means 'to heat up', typically of water, in the I/1 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. see *šarru*—[li]?) *Kisin* is ruled out, as I see the traces.

15-4. The north wind perhaps symbolizes the drought which heralds Gilgames's approach to the far end of the tunnel. Oppenheim suggested restoring some part of the verb *nāpādu*, 'to blow', before *pāšu* (*Or nS 17*, p. 47).

170. The phrase *limā šāmit* is temporal not spatial, making it clear that Gilgames 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 Gilgames as he escapes from the tunnel.

172. Oppenheim read *bi-ḫu-ta* 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 kūr, was not copied by Haupt, but he noted its presence in Be 1, p. 117, and drew attention to it on other Kuyunji tablets. Since then other examples have been discovered on tablets from Kuyunji and Babylon and discussed by W. G. Lambert, *Kraus Av*, p. 216, who demonstrated that this was a notation marking an error,SUMERian reading kūr, AKAadian equivalence uncertain (part of nakāra?); cf. also Firber, *Baby-Beachwörterbuch*, 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 amāri*, which may stand instead for *ana amāri* 'he went straight to look (at it)' (so Oppenheim, *Or nS 17*, p. 47, fn. 2).


188. The stone *zan.mā.gul.me* is entered in the lexical lists as an equivalent of *zalātu* (or *salkātu*):
4. A possible restoration is 𒄨-𒄠-𒄢; 𒄠-𒄢-𒄨, ‘veiled with a veil’. This is a passage in a prayer to the constellation Ursa Major, in which kallatu and kallu are alternative readings (STT 73, 77; kal-lar ƙWAR kal-I lar // YOS XI 75, 2; kal-lar ƙWAR kal-lar-nam // UET VII 118, 22: kal-lar ƙWAR kut-tum-nin).

5. At the end one might restore nali, mali or even fή. The recovery of the penultimate word allows one to see that the phrase anticipates the action to come. The lion’s skin makes Gīlgameš frightening to behold, and in due course Šūrû is terrified at the sight of him.

6. The restoration is made in the light of SB IX 49: ša biliñamād sin šīt zumūtu.

7. The sign qa is written over qa; the scribe originally wrote qa-ru-qa, as in SB 121. For this image in Gīlgameš see the commentary on SB I 9; for the fem. sg. nqiṣu see the commentary on SB II 25, 10-12. The triplet recurs, adjusted for a masculine subject, as SB X 184-6, where ud-tam-ma is written ud-tam-ma-qa. The protominant suffix on imatqallūnna, ostensibly dative, derives from the LB manuscript and was to be taken to indicate the more usual accusative (CVC-CV for CVVC) were it not for imatqallūkunna in SB XI 2. It appears that this verb can be construed with either case.

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

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

27. The traces allow a restoration [kābab il]ēnā etek arba tār (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 Gīlgameš’s recounting of his heroic adventures in his lament for Enkidu (SB VIII 52-5), and the later episodes in which Gīlgameš meets, respectively, Ur-šarrukin and Utu-napišti (SB X 113-48 // 213-48).

32. There are two versions of this line. In SB VIII 53 the text reads nāqi[a] ilēna mināru but in SB X 229 allā nāqiṣallu ilēna mināru. 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 Gīlgameš’s lament for Enkidu. Thus it very likely refers to the episode related in SB IX 15-18, in which Gīlgameš attacks a pair of lions at a mountain pass, and this is the justification for Thompson’s restoration in II. 34 // 131 // 231 of nēribti before ša kābab (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 adīkhe in the same lines (note dub for duba in l. 34, and for duba or duba in l. 38; but this is nothing unusual in LB orthography). However, the intrusion of the first person in this griefstricken reminiscence would be jarring, and I have followed other recent translators in opting for the plural.

36. The trace before ša is collated. Humbaba’s epithet ‘Guardian’ (of the Cedar Forest), is found in OB Ishchali 26; maṣṣurum (cf. ibid. 30, 34; maṣṣurum qatismaninum; SB IV 203: maṣṣurum). Elsewhere the word niṣu is used in the same connection but seemingly as the epithet of the god Wēr rather than of Humbaba (OB III 131; cf. SB II 277).

55-60 // 132-7 // 232-7. These six lines, really four couples, were passed down almost verbatim from the OB epic (OBVA+BM ii 0'-6'): [ibir ša arammuša dušu] / ittāya itsalaku halu mar Throwable / Enkidu ša arammuša dušu / ittāya itsalaku halu mar Throwable / šiškina ana ṣišma aṣṣašūm / urru ƙụf fiški ša aṣṣašūm.
exhibiting an accusative ending, the word is better taken as the subject of šeppu than as an adverbial qualification, for elsewhere in the epic this is unambiguously the case: OB Harmaš, 5: kēma lilmisā šalápā šīg[a]kā // SBT II 241: [kēma] lilmisā šalápā šīg[a]kā. The spelling thus joins those peculiarities listed in Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub 10.

99. The sign after it is strictly mal. Most emend to it-ša, but šaššimu is a poor object of šanu. Others read ši-ša, as in I.93, and this is surely better. The second verb is provisionally understood as rādu, a word that exactly expresses the joining of battle (see OB Atram-hus 181 I 83, 110: qa-ālus irtuša; SB Asdu II 56: ši-tu-ša ... qab-ša; further George, NABU 1991/19). The remaining signs, ir-x[...] (where x can be ša, bu, tu, ti, etsc.) can also be restored to give forms of rādu, tremble, rādu, quiver, rapādu, roam, reda, chase, and rāduša, shake, to give only the most obvious candidates.

101. Most translators read ir-ša-su as 'his chest' but CAD A 1, p. 61, offers the ingenious restoration (ina šakkû) iratuša, 'he nailed him down [with pegs]'; a reading (ki-ma šakha-ti), 'he secured him to ... like a peg,' is also possible. In the context of tying someone down the verb Š NN calls to mind the tale of the Poor Man of Nippur:

\[\text{ir-ša-su ina dun-ni qa-qa-ti 5 šakkû}\]
\[\text{qattu šepiš[šu] qaqašu[a] šag[d]u ši-pak-kir-[šu]}\]
\[\text{STT 38, 132}\]

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 kappalûma 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 stressed 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): allūm ša la apâdattu mē nūmum ša šakirum šanu itišu.

106. The line compares with OB VA+BM iv 1: šanum ukkappumma ina uzašu.

117. The sign a, which intrudes before šarbi, may be partly erased, but in the parallel passages the Nimrud 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 a₃₄₃) = mā, common in rituals and prescriptions, yielding mā šarbi, 'icy water' or winter rain. However, the phrase ina šarbi u šettū is also found in SB X 126 (partly restored), which suggests that the writing šar-ba stands for šar-ba alone. Since the logogram for šarbu is šēg (A,AN), I suspect that the spelling šar-ba descends from a glossed orthography A,AN₃₄₃₄₃. 

118. Thanks to Assyrian MS z this line is now complete. The idiom pān X šakir means to have the appearance of X (see CAD 6/1, p. 133). As we know from SB VII 147 // VIII 91, Gīlgamesh is clad in a lion's skin.

153. Note the use of the sign ū₃₄₃₄₃₄₃₄₃₄₄ for ū₄₃₄₄₃₄₄₄₄, an example of MB orthography which is edited out in the next line.

157. The reading tatašabk is assured by the parallel in l. 106.
160. This and the parallel line (166) are restored after OB VA+BM iv 26: partaš ša pappaš šiše škan. I agree with M. A. Powell, who writes: 'the usual restoration [2.8] for these lines is based, I believe on a misunderstanding of Gilgamesh IV 8 [= 180]' (ZA 72 (1982), p. 94, fn. 30). He argues that 2.8 is 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 OB VA+BM are not likely to diminish to as little as 120 in the later tradition. On partaš see the commentary on the OB text. On the imperative erid instead of regular rid see von Soden, GAOC §103n.

161. The word translated 'boots', papaš, is lit. 'teat' or 'nipple'. In the OB text the parallel phrase is šukanša-šu-tumu (OB VA+BM iv 27). In the later periods šukaš was the more common word, for it appears in comments (see MSL IX, p. 35, H2 B IV 33; uzšu 4.***_šum 4.ŠUMU-TAL = tu-lu-šu, cf. the commentaries on Šumma itibu, ed. Leichty, Êibu, p. 221, 3257–71; von der Wehr, Uruk II 37, 41; p. 231, 376g). On the nature of the 'teat' of a punting-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, šilla or šiša; cf. the orthography bi-ša-la in SB IV 42.

164–5. On these stock lines see OB Išchali 20’–1’ and commentary.

169–70. This couplet is restored from its repetition in SB XI 271–2. The verb nāšu, 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 bed Ur-šanabi and Gilgamesh are more than passengers. They must do the propelling of the boat and steering it. The magiluš is an ocean-going boat typically used in long-distance trading ventures, as we know from Enki and the World Order:

\[\begin{align*}
\#\text{ma.}[\text{g}][\text{i}][\text{s}][\text{i}][\text{g}] & \quad \text{Let the magiluš-boat of Meluḫḫa} \\
\text{ku.}[\text{s}][\text{i}][\text{g}][\text{i}] & \quad \text{transport gold and silver.}
\end{align*}\]


Note also Gilgames and Huwawa A 111–13:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ba.}[\text{s}][\text{u}][\text{a}][\text{a}] & \quad \text{After it sank, after it sank,}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{u} & \quad \text{After the boat of Magan sank,}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\#\text{ma.}[\text{g}][\text{i}][\text{s}][\text{i}][\text{g}] & \quad \text{After the ship, the magiluš-boat sank.}
\end{align*}\]


The verb nāšu with the nuance 'to launch (a boat)' is documented in CAD Nb 1, p. 80.

171. The phrase māšak arēni u kapakku ina kalsi šumi 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 ǔm màš T R̆, and noted in the margin 'um nicht dupā'. (Nimrudodena, pl. 70). I agree with him, though the interior wedge of T R̆ is damaged. This is a meaningless combination of signs, of course, and the text is certainly corrupt.

175. For ilāppa instead of ilāapu see the commentary on SB IV 239.

180. As noted already, I follow Powell's understanding of 2.ši as a metrical note (see above, on l. 160; one ści = 60 nindan). The reading of the unit şi as gii is adopted in the light of the Sumerian homophone gii, 'sixty' (as already observed in George, Topag. Texts, p. 135, fn. 24; according to J. Krecher, Matuša Festschrift II, pp. 42 and 47, both are [gii]). In this I disagree with Powell, who refers to Akkadian ddu and speculates that 'ṭiš is perhaps originally a phonetic complement indicating a reading šu, "sixty"' (loc. cit.). In the present line Powell takes 2.ši as 120 nindan, i.e. about 7200 metres, and goes on to calculate the rate of progress per point, which at 2.4 metres seems ridiculously unhocial, 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.ši as a notation for 2 × 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 'fur-long' is not meant to give an exact equation with the ancient measure; it is a term coined for lack of a suitable unit in English (two fur-lands is a quarter of mile, just over 400 metres; one şi is about 360 metres).

181. On qadda šu-tu, 'to undress', the opposite of q. nāšu, see A. L. Oppenheim, Or ns 14 (1945), p. 239; cf. R. Borger, ORV 27 (1958), p. 148 (in Erna IIC 49). The restoration of Ur-šanabi at the end of the line is the suggestion of A. Westendorf, the change of subject being signposted by u ši at the beginning of the line. Confirmation comes from the verb ša-mušu, which is used of taking off someone else's clothing—not one's own—and by force; see CAD H 60, where the sense of this line is already suggested in the translation: 'Gilgamesh stripped off his Ur-šanabi's iš 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 kui, marking an error (on which see the commentary on SB IX 172).

195. The trace is not of a-na-aj-tu-a-la 'l-ma.

226–7. The beginning of the second line of the couplet, preserved only on Assyrian MS z (kūšanu šarši), is expected to read Enkidu ši-bi šu-ma ši-ba or Enkidu kūšanu ši-ba, 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 Nimrud scribe that the missing material was appended to the indented overrun of the preceding line.

230. That umma can introduce thought as well as speech has been pointed out by M. Soll, BJOR 49 (1992), p. 146. At the beginning of Soden read ūtu-um-uma, "wohlan!" (AHw, p. 1369), but the space available does not permit this. The abbreviated pronominal suffix on idabba-bū-si (if not vernacular) a mark of elevated style of a kind rare in SB Gilgamesh.

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

250. The omission of this essential line by the Kuyunji manuscript can be put down to the carelessness that engendered other errors of substance in this source (see ll. 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 [tahat]al maltakinusha ḫkal šīr (OB VA+BM i 2'). Here the verb that follows maltakinusha cannot be any part of ṭabēb but is likely to refer to some technique of turning raw animal pelt into a skin to wear. The expression maltakinusha(tahat) (once ḫkal ṭabēb, 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 maltak-b[i]l al[a][?]u] šī-[u]-t[u]-bi-[u]; K. Kessler, Bagh. Mitt. 13 (1982), p. 63, 15: malak(b[i]l ala)[?u] šī-[u]-bi-[u]; CT 43 59, 21: ma-[d]-la-ta šī-[u]-a-[t]-ta il-te-er). There the phrase in this line was translated literally, 'I carved up their hides'. I suppose that tahat ḫkal is here a synonym for ḫkal, 'to flay'. 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 l 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 events accompanied by general merrymaking and considerable mēlēta. It may be recalled that, before leaving for the Cedar Forest, Gilgamesh promises to celebrate the principal religious festival of Urush twice on his return (SB II 268–9 // III 31–2), which implies that it had to be suspended in his absence. This situation no doubt also obtained during the absence of the king on his quest for Utanapidda. Accordingly the restoration of ukušitišu, 乌鲁 loops or some such word in l 264 looks probable.

265. In response to MS b's variant (see the apparatus) I have been encouraged to reject the hapax legomenon *a-ad-dī3-s'- (Thompson; von Soden, ALlu, p. 808), and opt for a known word. The context recommends ḫaddišu думать (Harriss) or ḋairušu's, 'sinner' (I owe this preference to the insight of A. Westenholz). The word intentionally echoes the prostitute's description of Gilgamesh as ḫaddišu amēlimu (SB I 234), and evokes the happy frame of mind and life of carefree pleasure that was his in the good old days.

272. The spelling kar-lum-me looks construct state and since this word often appears qualified by ḫaru I have restored accordingly. At the end of the line one should probably add an adjective describing good-quality ghee, e.g. ukušsul, 'fresh, pure'.

273. The words tahat (var. tahat) and ḫkal ṭabēb are ostensibly accusative, so the subject of the missing verb will be the fool.

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

279. Negation with lī indicates that the verb is subordinated, presumably by ella in l 276.

280. While the idioms reša valu, '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 m-e-l-la ša lī-[u], 'why has he shown no concern for me?' Other examples of the phrase where the parties concerned are a superior and an inferior, as here, are omen apodopes such as i-ni-um re-l a-tu-lim i-na-da-lī (CT 5 6, 69; OB). This need not refer to a god's protection or 'exaltation' of an individual, merely to his solicitude for him: 'a god will show concern for a man'.PNs of the type DN-reša valu or reša valu can be rendered likewise, 'the god So-and-so showed concern for me'.

287. The first word of this line might be restored as [marr]-nu (so already Parpola), yielding a question reminiscent of a proverbial saying preserved in an OB or MB tablet from Nippur: ša lī-[u] lar-zi-am  куда-ку-му am-an-mi-um, 'the king who has no king or queen—who is his master?' (Lambert, BWWL p. 277, 13–14). The implication for the present context would be that Utanapidda reminds Gilgamesh of the duties of his position.

288. A possessive suffix on šappānu 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. Jacobsen's translation 'where do you howl?' implies a reading sa-lēš-pu; but the middle sign is to my eyes better to read as al, with Lambert (CRRA 26, p. 54, 6). The final vowel is wrong for ṭaṣa, 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 ṭu-šu for ṭu in l 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 Languages 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 ḫa-ḫi-pi3 or ḫa-ḫi-pi1 (Lambert: ḫa-ḫi-pi1-pi1), 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, ša ṭiša ṭa3-su ša su-pu šamšu, 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 (l 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 immatina in this and the following lines as introducing a statement or a rhetorical question. The translation of CAD MU, p. 410, 'do we build a house forever', is a mistranslation based on the ambiguity of English, for immatina means 'at some time' (past, present or future), and is not a synonym for e.g. ana dīr dīr, 'for ever and ever' (The translation 'did dido we ever . . .' [Heidel et. al.] succeeds, in my view, only when 'ever' is understood as 'forever'; translated into unambiguous language, the questions 'do we at any time build a house, start a family, etc.?', seem, 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 . . .' (CRRA 26, p. 55, 17–21). This view assumes that immatina means the same as adi mats, for which I can find no substantiation; elsewhere the interrogative ina matina 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. 81.

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 ina, can only be of a single, rather small sign, to judge from the spacing. The only trace of this word, on MS f, is compatible with kāri, and I have followed the solution suggested by W. G. Lambert's reading ma-š, though to fact those signs are not actually preserved anywhere. MS b's variant is not absolutely certain. The traces might be read ma-š[u], but ma-[u]-u 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' (māšmin) the chosen heir (aplu) receiving more than the less favoured sons—there would always be possibility for jealousy and resentment among brothers. I translate šīrūs as 'feudal', since, whether manu or manūtu, 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 ʿiddalāpā explicitly may be put down to crisis: ʿiddalāpā is known in Sumerian as the 'river locust' (baru, ku-da) and, according to omen texts, Mesopotamian rivers in flood habitually carry with them large numbers of these insects (CT 39 19, 110–19: Šumma dišu LXIA A, ACHR Šamši 14, 14, lītar 2, 51; both Enišma Arù Bušu; Hunger, SAd V VIII 46, 3). This phenomenon could be observed until recently on the Tigris,
which at the time of the spring flood carried large quantities of mayflies, Sialis lataria, Arabic killī, according to M. Drower (as reported in E. D. van Buren, Fauna of Ancient Mesopotamia, p. 108; cf. E. Ebeling, "Fliic", RLA III, p. 87; W. Heimpel, RLA V, p. 106; A. D. Kramer, Studies Reiner, pp. 176–7). The epiphanial nature of the mayfly is proverbial, and for this reason (as well as the Arabic cognate) I prefer to take killī as 'mayfly' rather than the customary 'dragonfly'. As Daley notes (Myths, p. 133, n. 121), the image evokes a passage of Atra-ḥasis in which the mother goddess likens those drowned in the Deluge to mayflies borne along by a river: ki-ma ku∥bi-in la-a-nim na-ra-am, 'they fill the river like mayflies' (OB Atra-ḥasis III 4v).

316. Though some translators cling to Heidel and Oppenheim's old idea of emending šal-lu to šal-la, 'sleep', I ally myself with those who do not see the need. The point of šal-lu, however, is not just any 'prisoner' (Lambert), so much as one who has been forcibly abducted (von Soden: 'der Verschleppte'), Jacobson: 'the one snatched away'). The usual reference of the term is to someone carried off in an enemy raid, taken prisoner in battle or pressed 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 ē-dul (vocative or passive of ēnū) or ē-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 (Z 53, p. 231) that the phrase šal-lu šešub in the Kuyunjik source alludes to the events described in Tablet XI, when Enlil blesses Uta-napišti and his wife and confers on them the life of the gods (ll. 200–2). This interpretation looks strong at first sight and all have followed. When, after the publication of MSS 6f, it became apparent that the LB manuscripts differ substantially from the Kuyunjik tablet, Lambert maintained the existing understanding of the line by dismissing its readings as corrupt. This follows accepted practice in dealing with sources for SB literary texts; tablets from Assurbanipal'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 Assurbanipal 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 (ll. 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 dedication of Uta-napišti 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 šeu-ili in any case). And would not such a reference the evidence revealed to Gilgamesh in the telling of the Flood story—the whole point of which is to prepare the ground for Gilgamesh's disillusionment—and thus reduce its effectiveness? Before narrating that story Uta-napišti tells Gilgamesh that he is about to reveal to him a 'secret of the gods' (SB XI 9–10). Such a promise hardly rings true if Gilgamesh has been told in advance of Uta-napišti'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 Uta-napišti: l. 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-ḥasis III vi 47–8, in which the mother goddess imposes death on postdiluvial man to keep down his numbers (see on this point Chapter 10, the introduction to Tablet X).

If we take the two final couples 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 Gilgamesh 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 šalu šešub [...] loses the context conventionally assigned to it and becomes still less satisfactory. Is it then corrupt, with šalu developed from šal? And if it is, is it the immediately preceding text, which also disagrees with the LB manuscripts, also corrupt? The sense of the phrase šalu šešub edī is appropriate enough, as demonstrated in Lambert's exegesis (CPh 26, p. 56), so on the criterion of meaning the text passes. But if we place confidence in the Kuyunjik manuscript, and take its Trennungzeichen 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, 1c. bād, is no doubt a corruption of 1c. dū and the Glossenkiel (p. 56). The truth might just as easily lie the other way around, with MS K's 1d. bād and the Glossenkiel a corruption of the Babylonian 1c. bād.

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 f, like MS K, has only space for two signs after the verb šešub, and must have lacked ka-ka-bi. The line therefore reminds us of other lines in Tablet X where an extra word has been present after the verb in some sources but not in others (ll. 261, 310). From the point of view of syntax, the Babylonian line looks satisfactory in both its versions: two nouns, which might be analysed as object and subject (or, disregarding the case vowel of šešub, subject and object), then the verb, negated, then a second object or parenomastic infinitive, cognate with the verb, and finally a prepositional phrase (to my eyes the wedge that follows ka-ka-bi in MS f is too elongated to be part of a ʾu, and has to be ʾa). 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 Uta-napišti'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 Uta-napišti's story and in doing so has to place an unsatisfactory interpretation on the following two couples; and on stylistic grounds, since the division of l. 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 šīmī šiššarā into bānāt šīmī šiššarā(nu), for the suffixed bānāt šīmī is an attested epithet of the mother goddess (OB
Atrahasis III vi 47, quoted in the introduction to this Tablet; NA Atrahasis MS S iii 11). The enclitic -me in MS b has been explained as -ma coloured by vocal harmony (see AHus, p. 639: ‘ns/pB, NA selten nach e[d(er) en]’).

322. As Lambert noted, both LB manuscripts preserve a variant ulidda, introduced by the conventional notation, ‘šamši, ‘alternatively’. Though he is surely right to remark that ‘the TE is no doubt a graphic corruption of ku’ (ult-te-su isult-ul-du-ül), if ulidda replaces ul uidda in its entirety, exactly the opposite sense is placed on the line through the loss of the negative. Such a wrongheaded variant is not likely to have been thought so worth preserving that it entered the copying tradition as a permanent part of the text, and I suggest that, no matter the origins of the variant through corruption of ul to te, ulidda was understood as a variant for uidda only.

TABLET XI

5. The phrase murmarcha lēhī is literally ‘in respect to you my heart was fully concentrated (on doing battle)’. Some older translations attribute bellicosity to Uta-napišti, not Gilgamesh, relying on an original idea of T. Jacobsen (Heidel, Gilgamesh, p. 80, fn. 164). The translation put forward here follows Jacobsen’s revised interpretation (Treasures, p. 206). It is Gilgamesh’s instinct to obtain his desires by the sword, not Uta-napišti’s.

6. At the beginning (ana-lu) it is possible but not secure. As so often in Gilgamesh the prepositional phrase du ešī 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 uidda to the apparent variant nodida. MS W’s md-te-atu does not have to be a second-person form: the tri-syllabic spelling of a finally weak verb in stative 3rd fem. sg. can be paralleled elsewhere in seventh-century Assyrian orthography (see GAP §75c, 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 (b). The phrase aša nadda, often rendered as ‘to be negligent’, also means ‘to procrastinate, let up’ (cf. nidad). Gilgamesh, weary of his exertions and perhaps intimidated in the presence of the venerable sage, no longer has the energy or the will to wrestle Uta-napišti’s secret out of him, and holds back from violence.

7. Cf. SB IX 76. On the last word (se’u) see W. G. Lambert, JSS 24 (1979), pp. 271–2, against W. von Soden, ZA 53, p. 232. Here baldatu še’u, which describes the success of Uta-napišti in attaining what Gilgamesh imagines was his goal, is used in contrast to baldatu ba’u (I. 206) and baldatu salīrum (OB BA 8 BM ii 2), which describe the vain quest of Gilgamesh himself; še’u 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 Tablet (I. 281–2).

11. The variant Šuruppak for Šuruppuk also occurs in l. 25, where [lu-...]ip-pa-hu-šu and lu-ru-ug-pa-hu-šu are both attested, and in Hg E, commenting on a lost line of LH XXVII LAM x KUR.400 = lu-rj₁-pa-gaṭ; note also the OB personal name “ušur(lu)-lu-ri-gaṭ (NI 373 / 21”, cited in Nashaf, Rep. géogr., p. 253). The conventional reading is based on (a) Dir TIV: lu-tu-pa-gaṭ KUR.413 ku-us KU-šu KU-šu bulu 2-ki lu-ru-ug-pa-ät (CT 11 49, 33). Note also (b) a bilingual incantation that equates Lam x KUR.13 and lu-ru-ug-pa-ät (CT 16 36, 5; Udaghu), and (c) the spelling lu-ru-ug-pa-ät in the Akkadian version of the Instructions of Šuruppuk (KAR 27 28v. 1, ed. Lambert, BWL, p. 95). Contra Zadok, Rep. géogr. VIII, p. 209, the relevant entry in Proto-Dirr = OECT IV 153 occurs at iii 40 not ii 40 and reads Lam KUR.400 = lu-ri₁-pa-šu, Lak x KUR.13 = lu-ri₂-pa-šu.

12. The trace on MSW might also be read 1-[ma; that on MS j, a]-ri₂.

13. In common with most recent translators I take the second clause as nominal, with the locative qæršu (var. qeršu) as a prepositional phrase (cf. Berger, Bel2, p. 145). Note, however, von Soden’s “die Götter waren ihr nah, i.e., qeršu (Reclam’).

15–18. The painful history of the decipherment of the first word of I. 15 is reported by J. C. C. Karringa, Akkadica 36 (1984), pp. 19–20. The rest of these two couplets is taken over from Atra-hasis, where they are the stock phrases that enumerate the hierarchy of divine taskmasters who lorded it over the assembly of the gods (OB Atrahasis 7–10; cf. 124–7 //136–9). There the text before Enhunnu reads not gassallouma but ḫa-ül-la-šu-nu // ḫa-ül-la-šu-nu (so also the late version, SB Atra-hasis I 7–10, II 11–14 // 23–6, ed. George and Al-Rawi, Iraq 58 (1996), pp. 153, 163). Enhunnu’s title is conventionally gassallu (see Lambert and Millard, Atra-hasis, pp. 147–8), but Ninurta seems to have the prerogative of this function here. As noted by Lambert, gassal ‘contestable’, is very suitable while gassallu 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 Enhunnu’s riverine activities in Surpu IV 103 (also the hemerology KAR 178 iv 58; šu-ru-ḫi₂ uṣu₂, gal šu-‘a-nin’).

19. For Ea’s title mišiška see still W. G. Lambert, Atra-hasis, pp. 148–9. The binding of ūnku is described more fully in Atra-hasis, where the verb is tummum (OB VII b 38, 42). On this account the old reading of the last word, ša-ḥi₂, is rejected in favour of the stative ša-šu. The force of the stative is that it is active (so AHus, p. 1317) but that Ea did not swear of his own accord, being placed under oath against his will; compare the common adoration šu amdu, lit. ‘be you sworn’, addressed to evil spirits and ghosts in exorcism. For the function of enliti –wē here see GAP §12a: ‘gashshu’.

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

23. This line appears to quote verbatim a line of the Akkadian translation of the Instructions of Šuruppuk. On this, and the name Ubē-Tunu, see Chapter 4, the section on Uta-napišti.

24–7. These two couplets, which developed from OB Atrahasis III ii 22–4, have been discussed by H. A. Höffner, Kramer AV, pp. 241–5. He has an understanding of OB u-bi bustling is-a and ma-ak-hu-ru ze-e-ta-ra very different (‘free your home, build a huge boat!’) from the translations usually put forward, and proposed that the replacing of these phrases in SB Gilgamesh by uṣur ṣāq and mandātu šērima 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 Höffner’s lexical proposals to the SB text on the assumption that when the text was read, the text presents an example of ‘isaur’ parallèlisme (Astra Som. 2001–1991), pp. 419–21. The philological evidence that Hoffner adduces in support of his translation is very tenuous, however (see already the remarks of M. Malu, Astra Som. 17 (1995), pp. 339–40, fn. 6). As far as the lines of SB Gilgamesh 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 BC.

28–31. Cf. OB Atrahasis III i 25–31. In our l. 29 note the III/II stative manašatā in the LB manuscript. The verb of I. 31 has sometimes been translated as from ša-didū, ‘to rest’, with reference
to mooring the boat on the Apsu (reading [e]-ma apsu, 'wherever the A:'); see most recently P. Naster, 'pullulu dans Gilgamesh XI, 31', *Symbologia Bökl.*, pp. 295–8. However, a III stem of that pullulu remains unparalled and the preposition šam is not felicitous; the traces of the sign before šam 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 ša-ma (CT 46 3 29). The obvious derivation of pullulu as a denominate verb from pullišu, 'root', remains a much better idea. Note that in OB Atram-bāsīsu III i 31: la-ù-ass-ba-at-si-li-il-ti la-ap-bi-il-si, let it be roofed over 'above and below', the adverbial phrase signifies 'fore and aft' (see A. Shaffer, *RA* 75 (1981), pp. 186–9).

33. As can best be seen from the following line, where only the sign at it is missing, there is not space enough at the beginning of the line for von Soden's [zi-k-sa] (ZA 53, p. 232), and the horizontal wedges are, in any case, rather too long for it. As well as [am]-qi or 'performative' pro-terite, GAG 579b*-580a*, mit-[qi] might be read: 'What you told me thus, master, is agreed.'

35. The word kūl with enclytic -mi is otherwise found only in the Dialogue of Pessimism, and there as an expression 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 Uruk 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]-la 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 the people you are building a boat, too you will tell them'.

39. On mina see Ch. 5, the note on OB II 17. This line begins a sequence in which all but one of seven lines terminate with the enclytic particle. Other examples occur in Ša-šappišu's monologue, certainly XI 114: ša izipputum abumman-um, and 124: ki marā nāt iš abumman-um, etc., etc.

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

44. The first word is restored from Atram-bāsīsu, which for this line reads bī-šī-bi išši-ri bu-du-ri nu-i (OB Atram-bāsīsu 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 paaru, '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 'Begung', 'Verborgenes').

45. The traces after the break in MST do not appear to allow the reading -hunēti. 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 nu-ir is finally discounted by the unavoidable disposal of the signs in the new manuscript, e. In all three lines the noun šīr appears to be in the absolute state. The frequency with which the expression ina šīr occurs in other texts makes it unlikely that ina šīr numbers with the bestime lokal und temporale Ausdrücke' noted as employing the absolute state in GAG 562b; but another explanation escapes me.

49. The use of the epithet Atram-bāsīsu, '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 Ša-šappišu's self-reference in the 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, e., this passage is easier to reconstruct and can now be seen to number seven lines not six. From here on the traditional modern numeration of lines has therefore been abandoned. The passage corresponds to three couples of Atram-bāsīsu, which fall in a slightly different order:

The comparison reveals that SB XI 52 represents an interpolation padding out the preceding couplet and that MS e has ll. 53–4 in reverse order. Alternative restorations of the final words of ll. 50–1 have been offered by von Soden, namely pa-[ar]-ri, 'poles' (AHwu, p. 839; cf. Reclam: 'Holzposten'), and whatever lies behind the translation 'Klammeren', 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 Atram-bāsīsu, that what the craftsmen are bringing here are their tools of trade, the axe for trimming timber and the stone for flattening reed (Lambert and Millard, Atram-bāsīsu, p. 160). For the carpenter and reed-worker in the context of shipbuilding see for example, in an OB letter, the conjunction 'naggātum (nagātum) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub) tu ašgissu (ad. ši) temalēti (mā.i.dub).
C’s ša-nu (as he read it then) was an orthography for karn, ‘rich,’ and drew attention to other examples of what he considered unexpected gemination of consonants in this Tablet (I. 58 ıs-qa-a-a, 69 ın-i-q-ğu, 85 başı-as-na-ar-u-ru, all of which have good morphological or orthographic explanations, however). One can now see that MS C begins ša-nu-š and postulate the existence of a *parras*-type adjective karnu.

57. I do not accept the suggestion of D. G. M. de Rooji, as published by Stol, op. cit., that “būna nadū” [57] introduces the construction of the Ark on the horizontal level(s), and . . . “būna nadū” [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 I. 58 not I. 60. I see the contrast as between the external dimensions of the hull, bottom, sides and top (būna), and the interior subdivision of the boat’s body into compartments (lūnu).

58. The form šappā (Hardly an Assyrian II/1 stative) is an example of the use of the *parras* stem for the plural of adjectives of dimension (on this see N. J. C. Kouwenhoven, Genimation in the Akkadian Verb (Assen, 1997), pp. 52–7; D. O. Edzard, ZA 90 (2000), p. 293).

Note, in MS W, the use of the accusative suffix -di for genitive -di (I. 60); this is exceptional at Kuyunjik but well attested in LB copies (e.g. above, SBVIII 125). W. L. Moran’s alternative exegesis of šar-an-ši as šā amī, “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 | object + verb.

62–3. Note in both lines, on apraras and gerbusu, masculine suffixes with reference to a feminine boat (cf. also I. 80). This is rare at Kuyunjik (another inescapable example is kādāmar in I. 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 incidence of a shift from final /a/ to /u/ (which is first observed in the change in the acc. sg. case ending, but also, as is less generally known, in ventives in –u, see Chapter 9).

64. The šibātu nū were probably bilge plugs: see J. Schmidtke, “Wasserflocke” (Glg. XI 63), Festschrift Friedrich, pp. 247–34. MST’s ambassā, if not an error, suggests a variant of the line in which the verb is qualified with two accusatives, the pegs and the boat.


70. The great obscurity here is the word ni-iq-ğu, the various renderings of recent translators are collected by Edzard, loc. cit. These translations are ad hoc, with the word seen as a technical term in shipbuilding, or they accompany it with a known word (e.g. niqi, ‘lig’pollen’; niqi, ‘sacrifice’), or they surrender to an ellipsis. For waterproofing the fabric of an ancient Mesopotamian boat, shipbuilders needed oil or fat of some kind (šamnu in such usage is found with the verbs pešu, ‘to seal, caulk’, and napītu, ‘to smear’: see CAD Š1, p. 324). The problem posed by ni-iq-ğu may be resolved by a Sumerian document from Girsu which records the distribution of oil or tar to preparing various salted barks for a procession of the gods on water (R. Kutscher, Acta Sum 5 (1983), pp. 60–1; Šolg). Some of the oil is used to caulk the boats (is. du-a-a), some for smearing on the hulls (Isa. bišu), some for reducing friction at the dockside (ma. kar. re. taggu), some for the teams of hauliers (Is. tinin. ma. gildi) and some for ‘sacrifice’ (Is. iskuru). The last would translate into Akkadian as lamann niqi/niqī and appears to vindi ci plate translators of Gilgameš who interpret ni-iq-ğu as a late orthography of niqi for the conception of expressing a long vowel in an open syllable by closing the syllable see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub...
88. MS J's orthography šī-ka-as-nu-am-nu for ušānam + V (sg.: cf. ll. 43–7) contains two peculiarities, a ventive in -a 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. I.43).

91. I take this as direct speech, i.e. Ušu-nāpšilī's announcement to the city folk as he loads his cargo, an encouraging reminder of the coming fulfillment of the divine promise. Others have taken it as narrative but this is awkward, for the storm has not yet begun.

95. The tiny horizontal wedge at the beginning of the line in MS 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 ṣi-si discussed above in the commentary on SB IX 172.

99. The variant of MSW, [IB]ārīq]um (on it [IR]ārīq]um), recalls OB Atar-hāšis III 553: aadda ši-ka-as-gu-am-nu-ka-er-ri-ti, and is probably more original than MS J's tamammāma (the text is preferred in the composite text only because it is fully preserved). The description of the storm's onset is otherwise very different in Atra-hāšis.

100. The deities Sullat and Hanīš are twin agents of destruction identified as aspects of Šamaš and Adad, respectively (An III 243–6; see further D. O. Edzard and W. G. Lambert, RLA IV, pp. 107–8). Hanīš's destructive force is also found in Erra IV 145, where the devastated vegetation of Mt Šaršak is likened to woodland over which 'Hanīš had passed'. The image is probably one of trees flattened by a gale. Here, in the parallel line OB Atar-hāšis II vii 49–50, Sullat and Hanīš are the vanguards of the storm, and thus the harbingers of Adad. The word gazzal in the following line can also refer to them, in which case they are specifically his 'thrones-bearers', attendant on his progress.

101. The words šadī ru u mānum are unlikely to locate caret cases, for these are not expected in SB Gilgameš. They are instead accusative phrases (so Borger, Bel2, p. 146). The expression finds a close parallel in a letter of Yasašu-Addu from Mari: i-na a-sa li-li-ka-bi-ri-ti ma-a-tuš šadī ku(l)un), 'by my constant travelling between interior and uplands' (ARMVY 66, 7–9).

102–3. This couplet appears, slightly modified and with lines transposed, in the Assyrian recension of Atra-hāšis, MS U rev. 14–15: [l]-lak "inur-ti li-ša-ra [li-la-dī] / li-er-al-ka la-nu a-ba [larr̄al-dī]. That the Gilgameš epic preserves the original order of the lines can be seen from OB Atar-hāšis II vii 51–3: a-ar-ka-an-ū-lī[er-[ra-ka-lī-ni-li]-ī][i-lī]-li-[t]ē[3] "in-nar-tar] li-ir-[de mi-ša] na-ša-lə. In both versions of Atra-hāšis našdē is used in the intensive stem, as in our MS C. Streck interprets ṣadê as 'literarisch-pluralische Sachverhalte der Vergangenheit, wobei . . . der Sachverhalt verläuft in verschiedene Richtungen' (Or ps 64 (1995), pp. 49–50). To my mind this is an over-interpretation. The present tense describes circumstance attending an action in the past: just by moving on the water, Ninurta drove it into great waves. The god was present in the gale itself.

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 chaos of 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 tarkūltī. Ninurta had a particular association with weirs, as recorded in the god list An = Aūšu īu anāli, where *u*n-ér = "in-nar-tar li-me-bi-ri (CT 24 41, 63).

105. Adad's šukururu is the 'calm before the storm'. Since this noun is singular, the verb it governs, šadî, must be viewed as expressing a ventive in -a.

107. Since Thompson's edition the broken word in the middle of the line has customarily been read e-nu-si, '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-nammatu in the light of the stock idiom tīnu namru ana da-nammatu tātu (III R 41 = BBSI 7 ii 20: Marduk-āni-[ud]-iš; SB Azur II 16; cf. OB Azur II 52: u-nu-namru da-umma-um-ta-lu-[u]unu). No such usage is found with šadî. The endingless spelling da-um-ma-tu in MS C (there is no room on that tablet for da-um-ma-tu-it etc.) is of the kind collected in Chapter 9, sub (c). The question then is whether the first word is nim-nu, as usually read, or u-nu-nu for Šama. A horizontal stroke before nu, suggesting [m]nu, was seen by George Smith (TSBA I 1874), p. 551, 50; IV R 51 ii 50, though not by Pinches (IV R 43) or Haupt (p. 97). However, Thompson's copy also shows it (pl. 47). A reading [u]nu is probably to be discounted on other evidence, for no trace of any head of an upright wedge is visible to the left of ma. At the end is yet another ventive in -a. The repeated im sounds of this line, as restored, may be deliberate, to match the gloomy picture described.

108. In Atra-hāšis the subject of this line is Azur (OB III iii 9–10; Assyrian recension, MS U rev. 17). Despite hi-nu karpati(dug) in the Assyrian recension, the sign after gig in the present line, though somewhat abraded at the end, appears to be more na-ni, than dug. The verb nakku is typical of equals but appears with a bovine subject in SB VII 174 (kima nīn da-in[i] irītu] zelīn[a] 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 inaḫṣu, pasīm in omen apodoses and elsewhere). The end of the line can also be read šer-pi niba(kadi) or even šer-pi-ni, but probably not šer-pi-es-pi). 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-pa-ni and kima karpati(dug), but if the simile of the Assyrian recension is still desired kar-pa-ni might be considered, though to my knowledge this exact form is not yet attested.

110–13. George Smith's copies of these lines (TSBA I 1874), p. 551; IV R 50 preserve wedge-sounds, 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 82-5-22, 316 (now part of MST2), 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 šer-pi-ni a-mu-[e-ta-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 akubu as the last word of the line relies on the parallel couplet in Atra-hāšis, in the first line of which (OB Atar-hāšis III ii 11) only this word, a-bu-tu, remains (though the Assyrian recension has . . . 1T-su-ya-a a-bu-tu, MS U rev. 18). The preceding word in Gilgameš, šakku, could refer to the upland north, the source of river-born foes, but note that a wind is blowing earlier in the line and that the east wind, šaši, is especially considered the bringer of rain, as found in a proverb (Alster, Proverbs, p. 114, 4, 9, 2): im-sa]-um im im Še-ga, 'the east wind is the rain wind', and in a passage of Udukuš (BIN II 22, 51–2) K 4625 obv. 16–17, ed. O. R. Gurney, AAT 22 (1935), p. 78: "sa]-um-im-im-im-im Še-ga = šaši-ša [-ta] šamē-ša šaši-ša-ša-ša, '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-hāšis couplet, as preserved in the OB text and the Assyrian recension (OB III iii 12: [ki-nu]
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 lä ùter expresses wish (strictly retrospective wish, however; Landsberger’s rendering matches lütir, not lä ùter). In such an analysis inmu ulla 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 lü ùter (T. Jacobsen and K. Nielsen, Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament 6 (1992), p. 192).

The expression ana itti šuru does not sit easily with a given day, but if inmu 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. inmu unlu) but there are exceptions that suggest we need not let the number of inmu force us down a difficult path unnecessarily (e.g. inmu šat). The old world is gone forever, and Bēlet-illī’s grief is compounded by the realization that her human family has been wiped out because of a divine conspiracy at which she herself conpired.

120–1. Cf. OB Åtrams-bāṣīs III i 36–7. The comparison reveals that MS C’s pu-šar is taken over from the older text; MS J’s mu-šar is secondary and inferior.

123. With this line compare Enki’s words in Atra-bāṣīs, a-na-bu-ma ti-ul-la-da [a-bu-ba] (OB Åtrams-bāṣīs II vii 46). In our line the orthography of the first word is unexpected: mimation is not wanted on anki. Labar and Boer chose to circumvent this problem by reading anki umma (‘moi, aj e pu dīr’), but the resulting speech within a speech is not convincing. Boer’s translation of the remainder of the line as ‘meine Leute zeugten gebären zwar’ (BAl 1, p. 146) also fails to satisfy. The most straightforward solution is to reckon the rendering anki-umma with others that mark a long vowel (here long by virtue of stress, anakū-ma) in an open syllable by closing the syllable: see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub (b). Most translators distort the grammar of anki-ma so that it serve as the object of uššal. 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 Åtrams-bāṣīs III iv 15. At the end of the line MS J writes ša over a partially erased erti.

126. Lambert’s comments on the relationship of this line to Atra-bāṣīs (OB Åtrams-bāṣīs III iv 18–19a) have been elaborated by C. Sapereti, who puts forward the suggestion that MS J’s line should be interpreted more closely with the older text, with a-na dā-bī taken as aki aššub ‘gli dei, dove (le) 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 aki, he could have failed to use the standard orthography, and I maintain Lambert’s interpretation of aššub < aššur as a clumsy corruption. Lambert saw MST’s ina murub nissat as probably the result of editorial work on a corruption of a-na dā-bī ma nissat”, 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 ina murub nissat (marginally the tesi difficilus, 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-bāṣīs: šunu aššub (i-a-na > i-bu, nu > aššub > nu); the last derivation, in particular, would explain the presence of the irregular orthography ab-the for aššub. The phrase murub nissat is a vivid image evoking the streaming eyes and nose of a person in tears (cf. ḫep-ē̄-en, ‘nasal mucus’ = nu-ru-ub ap-pi, ‘wetness of the nose’, in a commentary on Šammaš, ed. Leichty, Isbu, p. 231, 3761).

127. Cf. OB Åtrams-bāṣīs 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 vn-ma as sam-ma-us, or even of –am-ma vn-ma as ta-ša-sam-ma, and can be marked as inferior.

137,139. On the phrase dūr api 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-tu in MSS CJ is pātu, paatu or pātu; I have translated ad ensam. Von Soden thinks it may be an error (AHlu, 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 Oppenheimer's idea that the reference is to direction rather than distance (Orts 17 (1948), p.54: 'in each of the 14 directions').

148/151. Unlike other translators I prefer here to take šīna in the meaning 'to fetch out', as in SB VIII 215, rather than 'send out'; this action thus precedes the actual release. As matters now stand, more manuscripts have is-il-at than have is-il-br, which appears only in MS J. However, confusion between the signs šar and šar was rife at Nimrud, and it is almost certain that the two spellings do not mark variations in the tense of the verb.

149/152. All recent translators prefer the easy variant of MS J to MSS CW's is-il-ra-am-ma. Since the suspicion is that MSJ is one of its predecessors replaced the difficult verb exactly because of its obscurity (apparently by ignoring a wedge, and reading i-ta-ra-am-ma), MSS CW's reading must be taken as the more original. The return of the birds is, in any case, reported in the following lines (issarā). Since the birds' first instinct on release would be to find food (cf. I.156), perhaps one might derive the word in question from Ēparr, 'to provide food', and assume a nuance of 'to forage' (seeking and finding being activities often conveyed by the same verb: cf. ambru and šem). There is also the verb i-pa-ra-n in broken context in SB IV 42 to consider. As it stands, it is better to withhold judgement.

150/153. While MS C reads śālamma MSS CW have śālamma. This need not be an error, for the two nouns to which the pronominal suffixes refer are both written logographically and can be read as masculine (summum, sīōn) as well as feminine (summātum, sīōntum).

156. Part of this line finds a parallel in an akīr prayer to Šamaš and Adad (Craig, ABRIT 60, 19: e-haš i-ta-ra i-ta-ra; coll. W. Mayer, AHlu, p. 1589). The context there is the behaviour of a gazelle kid. Both verbs after škallu are problematic and are translated from context alone. I connect i-ta-ra-ši with the presence of the omens text Šamaš 5a, describing behaviour typical of a raven: nāšašu isken arabāš (iš-kar) kina (gim) arābāš (purru)šišā tāšiš (šam-ma) i-ta-ra, 'if a waterfowl...low like a raven' (CT 40 49, 32). MS C places the verb of the omens under šiš, 'to
swoop", even though the trisyllabic form is not good (S/2, pp. 244; "anomalous"). Two such 'anomalies' begin to make a case for a variant form of the verb. Von Soden originally thought similarly (OLZ 38 (1935), 146: "ist steht für šīš(i) . . . er flattert umher"), but later rejected this decipherment (AHu, p. 1133, Reclam: 'scharrie'; otherwise Dalley: 'preamed'; Bottero: 'croassa(?).').

Consideration of the context leads us to reject a derivation from šīšu 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 susum, e.g. 'caw', but has been more recently associated by von Soden with zibiba tarh, '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 it-tar(r) (and it-tar, etc.); it may have held a different text.

157-9. These lines are remarkable in that they all display final stress (niṣād, šādi, ukhān). Such stresses occur sporadically in Gilgamesh, 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-šašis only a-na ša-a-ri remains (OB Atram-šašis III v. 30). Most recent translators have assumed that the implicit object of ašiṣma is the occupants, animal and human, of Utanapišti'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 Cenaternal, p. 131). Both renderings seem to me unjustified: ašiṣma 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/2, p. 339, though otherwise S/2, p. 136).

158. The phrase ziqquarat šādi is an unusual coinage, but reminds us that religious ritual in ancient Mesopotamia was essentially 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 surquinuna . . . zizquarat 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 eshipuku: [šamal a-la-ka]-an a-na pi ti-gu-ur-ri-ni lam [m-a-la]-ri-i i-ka`erri(m)en] el-lu-su li-lu-bi-ur-ru-[ni] li-ṣi-ri-am ni-ta-bu-tum. "O Šamál, I am putting pure cedar into the mouth of the censer that is before you; let the censer rest, it invite the great gods here" (YOS X/2, 14-16; ed. A. Goetze, JCS 22 (1968-9), p. 28).

159-60. These two lines explain in detail how Utanapišti made the first ritual offering of food to the gods and therefore elaborate on the phrase surquinnu šahūnu in l. 158. The word ukhān can be parsed as I/3I perfect but perhaps also as I/3I preterite, iterative but serial, with the nuance of setting in or rows or one by one (see GAQ 591). The objects set up in this manner, called adaguru (or okhuru), are small vessels that contain liquid for rituals of libation. Around their bases Utanapišti 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 adaguru. This container is nowhere directly associated with fire and we do not expect libations to be warm. It remains true that the aromatic's 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): [šar]4 [e-ri-la-am ni iš-qi-nu1 ba].

**CRITICAL AND PHILOLOGICAL NOTES: TABLET XI**

be-ul,ba, ‘without you [the gods] cannot smell the aroma’. Perhaps aromatic leaves and gum were on some occasions thought pungent enough nevertheless to reach the gods’ nostrils without being burnt as incense. Further study is required of the various ways in which the gods of Babylonia could be fed.

161-7. This passage is parallel to OB Atram-šašis III v 34-vi 4 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-šašis III v 2-4, where a nominal clause modified with preterit ša is followed by a clause with the volantive ša-asu: ša-asu ša-at-a-[ni]-mu ša-la aq-ri-lu ki-lu-la-di-[a]-a-ma / ša-asu šu-la-as-a-ri-me-a [an-nu-tim] a-la-la [tast]. [The flies shall be] the lapsi bezil (beads) around my neck, so that I remember these days [  ].’ (cf. von Soden, TUAT III/4, p. 643). The phrase asašma in our l. 166 is preserved only on MS W (though not in MS J) and is suspicious for this very reason: in the light of the OB text it can be ignored as digraphy from l. 167. The uncertainty of the sources regarding the verb of the second line has led a number of commentators to read ašumassu, with or without ša, but neither form makes sense (ša 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 ša-asu ša-as-a-ri-me-a, an orthography comparable with the same tablet’s ša-asu-si-te in SB XI 281 (note also ša-asu ša-as-a-ri-me-a in SB VI 30, Kuyunjik MS). The other manuscripts’ ašumassu is corrupt.

168-9. The heavy repetition of the consonant ša in the phrases ša šabkuran and Elili ay išša may be intentional, to suggest that the mother goddess uttered her words in a kind of ululation.

170-1. Cf. OB Atram-šašis III iii 53-4 // v 42-3: ša ša šabkuran šana išša / nāš išunu ana karāši (where the subject is not Enlil but Anu).

173-4. Cf. ibid., vi 5-6: mākurr uran quriduš Ellili / lībasī mati ša līgīpt. (Note the two words preterite, oblique case, quriduš, the diacritic, ša, līgīpt.)

175. As Lambert remarked in his note on the parallel couplet of Atra-šašis (OB III vi 9-10), the older text’s a-a-a-na indicates that MS E (which is better restored [a-a-a]-nu- than Borger’s [mon]-nu, BAL2, p. 110) has the better tradition of reading in this line, since it avoids the conflict of gender between ašumassu and našaša. The same manuscript also confirms that ll. 175-6 are a couplet, not a single line.

176. The vestitive ay išša normally (if not always) denotes wish in the present-future, ‘may he not survive’ in this line, it is nevertheless conventionally translated as referring to the past (e.g. von Soden, Reclam: ‘überleben sollt’ niemand’). Further research is needed to discover whether the negation of past ša išša ‘would that he had survived’, could really be ay išša and not, as expected, ša ša išša (cf. in form positive and negative wish with the stative, ša kasmu: ša ša kasmu) :

177-8. Cf. OB Atram-šašis 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-šašis (courtesy W G Lambert):

be-ul [e-er-ti]3 miš la-ter-s[u]
be-ul [ša-la]-e-ti miš lá-šit-s[u]

MMA 86.11.378A rev. v 11-12, ed. Lambert, CTMMA 2 forthcoming.

187. Cf. OB Atram-šašis III vi 24: [. . .] ša 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 nos 17 (1948), p. 55, with fn. 2: “the verbs ramu and sadatu have here the nuance ‘to go slow, to let loose’”). I can find no support for this. While sadatu can be ‘to heed’, even without inana lībi (as in SB XII 32) and ramu can be ‘to relax’ (trans.), so far from being synonyms they are more commonly antonyms, ‘to pull taut’ and ‘to slacken, loosen’; and ayibatu 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 get (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 (sadatu 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. Enlil’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 the reduction of human numbers.

188–9. These lines, and the six that follow, are conventionally translated as if the precatives lišša(m)ma and liššišimma were lī šša(m)ma and lī ššišimma, in other words, as retrospective wishes. The Deluge is certainly past (šalkuma) 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 Enlil’s disposal and should be used in future.

193 and 195. The end of the l. 193 could also be read mātu lī[m-ta], ‘so that the land became diminished’. Other translators have had various ideas. For reasons of literary structure I prefer an active verb, parallel with iššašir (ll. 189 and 191). Similarly, if mātu lī[m]-tu is the correct reading in l. 195, so too it must be in l. 193 (thus also Burger, BALI, p. 111). MS f’s variant mātu in l. 195 is rejected as upsetting the carefully balanced rhythm of these lines. The phrase Era-ka (nom.) iššašir is a standard literary expression for the ravages of plague (cf. Era V 57; STT 71, 16, ed. W. G. Lambert, RA 53 (1959), p. 135: prayer to Nabi); the use of the same verb with iššašir, 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 orthographic feature rather than an error of grammar (see already the commentary on SB I 230).

198. Since Ea is addressing only Enlil, I take the first word of the phrase miskšu mīkšu 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 šalu here is now discovered not to be ‘to put (aboard)’ as 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 Arma-šaš in which iššašir that gives a variant account of this episode (courtesy W. G. Lambert):

\[
iššašir [\text{šašašir}]\]

\[
iššašir [\text{šašašir}]\]

MMA 86.11.378A rev. v 15–16, ed. Lambert, CTMMA 2 forthcoming

Enlil came up into the [boat,]
he took hold of my hand, he took me out of [the boat.]

It does, indeed, make better sense if Enlil removes Šut-napšiti and his wife from the ark before spiritting them away. That way they are blessed and immortalized in full view of the gods whose number they join.

202. The spelling bi-ri-in-ni can be taken as an example of late spelling (see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling sub b) or as a morphological development, birin > birin (GAG §20d; for other examples see Borger, BALI, p. 142 on 125). The repetition of the syllable /put/ is perhaps intended to suggest the pat of Enlil’s hand on the foreheads of Šut-napšiti and his wife. Enlil’s action is also reported in the new fragment of Atra-šaš, MMA 88.11.378A rev. v 21: [il]-pu-ut pu-us a pu-us-ša, ‘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, pāsu tālim, lit. ‘to render the forehead pure’.

208. The spelling tu-ut-ta-a is ambiguous (as too is ur-ta in l. 317): it is uncertain whether a stem or a 2nd stem of utu is at issue. An example of this verb exhibiting an ambiguous II/1 stem occurs on a Kassite-period cylinder seal: see W. G. Lambert, AJO 23 (1970), p. 47: balātu(tila) bu-ta-ti, ‘may I find life’ (I am obliged to Lambert for this reference).

212. For the rare word marāštu see the note on OB BA5-BM ii 13.

213. Thompson’s amēla damu was accepted by Heidel and others but von Soden rejected it in favour of amēla ešu (ZA 53, p. 233). Others have presumed that it is a determinative and I agree with them. In Gilgamesh the orthography *gurul = gulu is not usual, but is also found in l. 53 of this Tablet, in SB 77 and MB Boš, obv. 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 harran inšiša šarrum ina šalim is to be found in the namburu of the broken chariot (CT 34 8, 8: ina harran(kassal) ilkešu) to la-mu-sa-anu-ma(lum) (kurs) šu-ta runa, ‘so he will come back safely to his land by the way he went’ (for this text and its duplicates see now Mail, Zuchtschreizüügung, pp. 387–99).

220. The first sign of the line had already lost clarity when Haupt saw it (Nimrud Tablets, p. 111, fn. 2: ‘sehr unverständlich’), but it is unquestionably a complete nag on the old photograph (Fig. 13). The spelling a-me-la-tu-tu could be taken as an Assyrianism (GAG §56s), 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 šutakheni (with šutakhen in l. 223) is an unambiguous example of the serial nuance of the iterative infix /t/ 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 §91i). A comparable use if the /il/ stem of the same verb occurs in the scribe of Nebuchadnezzar II in which he sets in position a row of cedar logs to form the deck of a bridge (at-tāš-ha-an; George, RA 82 (1988), p. 149, 26).

226 and 238. It is conventional to derive mut-ta-kār from musukka, 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 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 mutukka, 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 musukka as ‘leathery’ already occurs in J. Gardner and J. Maier, Gilgamesh, Translated from the Sîn-lagâ-anunnaki Version (New York, 1985), pp. 241 and 245.)

230 and 241. Most translators read ina šušatima and take it as a unique verb of time (see AHE, p. 871), qualifying ilpar/pa the bread. A derivation from šunum is preferable, as already seen by Oppenheim (Or nos 17 (1948), p. 57: ‘in the oven’).

244. The "Thief" is a metaphor for death and almost a demonic personification, as in Bit miširi II (G. Meier, AJO 14 (1941–4), p. 144, 80): lu-ú-me-tum lu-ú-ek-he-ne mu-ú-ág-gi-tú lu-ú-hab-bi-tri,
'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 MS proves (for the venitive in -i see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling subjunctive). As object of the verb CAD E, p. 69, restores specifically [šir]-iš, 'my flesh'; but von Soden prefers [šāri]-iš (ZA 53, p. 233); other words are also possible.

246. Haupt's denial that the broken sign on MS was ul (Nimrodopos, p. 112, fn. 7) seems to my eyes unfounded. All recent translators restore the missing word as ša-piš-ya, 'my feet' (cf. 1.11), often without square brackets, but it seems to me that the less specific ša-piš-ya is the better idiom; it often occurs after the conjunction asar (usually in the static, e.g., asar ša-niššu ša-baštu, '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), [ši]-lamiš-ta, 'may it humidly humble you'.

254. // 263. Note the heavy alliteration on ša-niššu and naššu. CAD E, p. 106, takes šaššu here as a synonym of šamšu, with reference to a class of priest-bathers to ensure cultic purity. Most other translators render šamšu as 'like snow', a translation that, as far as I can see, is based entirely on the syllabic list Malik VI 217–18 (CT 18 23, K. 2036 // 4190i, 9–10), where šu-ša-nu, 'snow', and šu-ša-šu, 'winter' are matched with ša-lam, 'pure'. These two entries are not necessarily to be taken as exact synonyms, however. In another syllabic list šamšu is itself explained as the metals copper (en) and bronze (sarsam) because they are bright and shiny (CAD N/1, p. 240, citing 'An VII 34 and 45').

The equation of šamšu with ice and snow in Malik need only be to their shining purity, Jacobson translated the phrase šamšu as 'as if with clear oil' (Studies in Or. 1924; in this analysis šamšu is elliptical for ša-niššu laššu, a type of sesame oil). None of these proposed similes seems satisfactory to me. Instead I compare the idiom with Maqāl III 70: e-ša-tu bī-ni-nu nam-rū. There is no class of priest known as namru and the phrase seems to mean 'I have become as pure as pure can be'. The commentary on this line offers the explanation nam-rū = ši-maš, '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 bīl.la.gin im.ma.na.ni.im.gar in Gudea's hymn on cylinders (Cyl. A xiv 5–6, xvii 26, xx 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-iluna the same Sumerian phrase relates the pleasure felt by Šamaš at the destiny Enlil has decreed for Sippar. An Akkadian translation is extant: ki-ma bi-ša-tu it-ta-at-ka-饷-saš-mu (Frayne, 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 constructing an adjective with ša-niššu // šamšu.

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 subjunctive (ši-ša).

268–70. The omission of these three lines in MS J can no doubt be put down to a simple slip of the eye, from ša-niššu in l. 267 to the same word in 1. 770.

271–2. The coupé is repeated from SB X 169–70.

273. The form tattannash 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). Ša-niššu's repetition of his wife's words in the same tense (l. 280) is by way of exclamation, a rhetorical question begging the answer 'nothing'.

281–2. The coupé is repeated from earlier in this Tablet (l. 9–10).
and concludes, undoubtedly correctly, ‘demnach wäre niggatu/mikhtu “Herzschlag, pulsierendes Leben’” ("Bagh. Mūt. 25 (1994), p. 583, fn. 6). I read niggatu and not niggitu because, in Gilgameš, the associated verb, meaning ‘to beat’ (of the heart), is nukidu (SB VIII 58). The plant is thus one which ensures that fundamental sign of life, the healthy heartbeat of youth and all the strong pulse that accompanies it.

296. For the expression nappita kudkdu, ‘to regain one’s vigour’, see the OB letter TCL XVIII 91, 5–6: 𒉗𒆦 𒈺𒆠 𒀀 𒊒 𒇹 𒉃 𒍣 𒉏 𒈺 (‘I came here I fell ill but then I recovered (my) health’). This makes less probable von Soden’s suggested rendering of the last word as nāl-lₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐₐ (ZA 53, p. 233, following T. Bauer).

299. The old reading of the first word, ūnūma, is suspect. The antecedent of feminīne ša would have to be the masculine ānāma. This is not impossible on a Gilgameš tablet from Kuyunjik, 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 ili (TSEB 3 (1874), p. 581, IV R’ 51 vi 9). While admitting that the second sign was badly damaged, Haupt read šum-ša, referring to detect at the end of the damaged sign two vertical heads and a trace of an oblique wedge high in front of them (Ninurtaapis, p. 104, fn. 11). However, Delitzsch, who copied the tablet at much the same time as Haupt, saw šum-ša (AL’), 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 MS W’s ša, about which he wrote, ‘die Variante ša = šar von C ist richtig’ (loc. cit.). Though MS W’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, š[a]-š[a] (ša) with II. 298–9 then occupying the same line of tablet. According it has no bearing on how to read MS C’s šum-ša. I cannot see on MS C as much as Haupt. All that is visible now is one final upright wedge and, distinctly, 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 šumma and ša. 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 outboard leg of Gilgameš’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.

306. The restoration of the first word follows von Soden, ZA 53, p. 233. Others have restored ināša miša (Heidel, Speiser).

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 I. 322, i.e. Gilgameš ana šāšina isakkaru ana Ur-šamši melāti. An abbreviated version must have been used. However, the traces of the first word, extant only on MS W, are not certainly of Gilgameš, of and šašina or of isakkaru; 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 Ebyon: Essays . . . in Honor of G. W. Ahlstrom (Sheffield, 1984), pp. 221–2. He traces the phrase back to Ebla (na-ša-ga-ra-im), and, more revealingly, notes the semantic equation between nēl(k) ša qaqqarī and Greek χαμαλέον, both meaning ‘earth-lion’, and also the long-known equation entered in the pharmaceutical series Uruanna III, nēl(ma) qaqqarī = lūša-ma-lē, which is itself commonly rendered chameleon (MSL VIII/2, p. 58). Sjöberg thus proposes that the animal that makes off with Gilgameš’s plant could have been a chameleon and that ‘either “earth-lion” (nēlša qaqqarī) was interpreted as an epiteth of the snake or ša-ga might have been the more general “reptile”’. Since underhand behaviour of the kind Gilgameš encounters here is universally the mark of snakes rather than lizards, I am inclined to keep nēlša qaqqarī in our line separate from nēlša qaqqarī 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 Mesopotamian lizards and snakes were of more a kind than one might think for, they held an equal terror for the Babylonian traveller. According to the common omen apotropaic šabātē šašina and šābātē šašina, ‘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 S3/2, p. 416). For MS C’s spelling of first-person ūnpīt with initial i- see SB XI 82 and commentary.

315. For ana ša-bēr as signifying ‘a long way’ see also SB VII 41 and commentary. With the rest of the line compare Sennacherib’s description of the incoming tide (III R 12 no. 2, 28, ed. Luckenbill, OIP 2, p. 74, 75: e-du-ta ma-ta ša-gā-bīl [ša]-šā-am-ma, ‘the tide of the sea rose against me in a great swell’). The verb ša-bēr is here intransitive. Diakonoff has a very different understanding of this and the following lines:

... at twenty league distance the tide rocks the flower [ināša šāšina],
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 [iššā]
And even the boat I’ve left on the shore.


Quite apart from the fact that nēlša is intransitive, his reading adē ināša šāšina is now precluded by the new variant ināša adē (Assyrian MS X).

316. The verb šakīdū 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: nēr(a)ša-bēr ƙakhab(naklu) ša-ta-ta-hab-bīl, ‘you will force the enemy to abandon his weapons’). A reading iš-su-fr, as put forward by CAD (E, p. 36), seems to be discounted by the traces.

317. On ut-ša see above, the commentary on l. 208.

317–18. Most take the final clause of I. 317 as an avowal of future intentions—the abandonment of the quest with the mention of leaving the boat anchored on a curious afterthought (c.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 anāša šā anāša after I. 318, which then yields ‘“I left the barque at the river / Et j’(en) suis (trop) loin”’ (Cépédé, p. 204). For me the couplet reads just as well, and acquires metrical balance, with the words left in the o-der that has come down to us with a different line division, so that anāša šā anāša introduces I. 3 rather than concluding I. 317. It is then a lament that Gilgameš did not leave the boat on the shore and turn back (cf. CAD N 1, p. 128; Reclam’s). 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 9: šaši). The point is that if Gilgameš had never reached Šutapipiš 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 Šutapipiš had advised him. 323–8. See already SB I 16–23 and commentary.
mean a solid, wooden ball (note, however, that the phonetic similarity between pukuu 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, e.e.lag (sar. illar) ra.a.gin; dum dam an.da.ab.za (sar. i.b.i.za)

Alster, Proverbs, 3.95 // 5.93

He (or she) howls like a dog struck by a ball (sar. throw-stick).

Though the identification of pukuu as 'ball' was repudiated as 'hardly acceptable' by M. Duhesnes-Guillemin ('Pukuu and melkdu', Iraq 45 (1983), p. 153), her objection was based on an erroneous interpretation of šedu in SB 166 and can be disregarded (as, indeed, it has been by Jacobsen, Cooper, Klimmer and others). It is in the light of ball-games that one must understand pukuu and melkdu in the Sumerian poem of Bilgames and the Netherworld. Gilgamesh 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 bowels of the earth:

e.ne úr.bi e.e.lag a.ni.la.bi.ba.da.ab.dim.me
150 pa.bi e.e.ki, ma.ni.še ba.ab.dim.me

e.e.lag al.du.11, du.11, ge (sar. in.du.?, du.?, e) sű.ar ra e.e.lag na.mu.un.e (sar. c. e.â.â)
IM.DI (sar. KAD, MED) du.11, du.11, ge (sar. in.du.?, du.?, e) sű.ar ra IM.DI (sar. KAD, MED)

an.mu.un.e (sar. c. e.â.â)
guruš ušu.na ka e.e.lag al.du.11, du.11, ga ne
e.še e.še dum nu.mu.un.ba.su.ka.ni.bu ba ušu a
155 a gű.aa mu a灯笼 mu a.ni ri im.gi ga ga ne
ama.tuku dumu ni ir ninda mu na.ab tûm
nínšu tušu še.an ti a mu na.du.e
ú.su.11.an e um.ma.kar.ta
ki e.e.lag gar ra.ka ni giš hur in hurur ra
160 e.e.lag a.ni iši ni a mu ni.û in.ê e.su.i.la mu.un.tûm
á.gű.aa gi.ta ki giš hur in hurur ra išu ba a
šu du.aa nu.mu.un.su.aa
ti.4tu ki šiši į.ur.ta ra
e.e.lag a.ni ni e.e.ki, ke:kà, ma ni dur kur ra.še ba da.an sha

Bilgames and the Netherworld, 64--66, 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.
making a mark (at) the place where his ball was situated (lit. his place where the ball was situated), he lifted his ball up before him and carried it off to his house.
At dawn, on (his) mounting piggyback at the place where he had made the mark, at the complaint of the widows the outcry of the young girls, his ball and his mallet fell down to the bottom of the Netherworld.

Different renderings are possible for ll. 151–3, which are plagued by substantive variants and were evidently open to different interpretations in antiquity. The sequence of signs 𒈗𒈠𒀭, 𒈠𒀭–𒉺𒉽 can also be interpreted as 𒈗𒈠𒀭, ‘to want’ (though its phonetically spelled variant undermines that position): IMLDI and KADDI ought, by reason of the parallel, to refer to the mallet (otherwise 𒈗𒈠𒈠𒈠 in KI.LI ma) but have also been very plausibly interpreted as 𒈠𒈠𒈠𒈠, ‘self glorification’, construed with the verb 𒈠 to vaunt oneself’. The variant mâ.mi (ULL GI 37 rev. 3, coll.) is obscure. See further P. Artinger, Éléments de linguistique sumérienne, p. 676; J. Klein, ‘A new look at the “oppression of Urkuk” episode in the Gilgamesh epic’, Jacobson Mem. Vol., p. 194, fn. 26. These details, however, do not affect the point under discussion.

It was Landsberger who first supposed that the pukkā and mukkū were the equipment used to play ‘a kind of polo or Croquet’ (loc. cit.). But this was not polo or croquet as we know it. The reason for the young men’s discomfort and their womenfolk’s outcry is that the youths of Urkuk have to carry the giant Gilgamesh as he wielded his huge mallet and great wooden ball. The ball evidently came to rest on the ground, for its position could be marked in the dust while the game was suspended for the night. The logical conclusion is that Gilgamesh struck the ball from one place to the next with the mallet. It would seem that the game was a kind of piggyback golf or solo polo. Klein reached a similar conclusion independently (Klein, op. cit., pp. 192–4).

4–5. The Akkadian text is witness to a tradition in which the Sumerian of BN 175–6 evidently read simply 𒀭𒈠𒈠𒈠 mu.da.še / 𒈠𒈠𒈠 k.KI.LI ma.mu ganziň.še mu.da.šub. As regards the restoration of the final word, impuštiššu is suggested by XII 57–8 but impuštiššu by XII 65–6.

6. Here the Akkadian follows the tradition of Sumerian MS H (BN 177), rather than those of MSS RVW.

7. In retaining main this line follows MSS RVW not MS H, which omits 𒈠𒈠 da (l. 179).

8. The Akkadian ana iriššu renders the Nippur tradition of MSS HYZ (Irš.im.biše), not the Ur tradition of MS r (Irš.im.zu.biše).

9. The proposition ana, when ana is expected, is the result of a misplacing of Sumer. as.kur as kur and dative instead of kur and locative.

10. As its etymology suggests (cf. ḫabātu, ‘to strike’), the ḫabātu, a rod of cornel wood (Sumer. ṣma.nu), is not a badge of office but a deliverer of violence. As such it is carried by soldiers (cf. CAD 31 sar. ḫabātu B) and, according to the poet of the Vision of Kurnama, brandished at new arrivals in the Netherworld by Nergal, the terrible king of the Babylonian Hades, as a death-dealing instrument (Livingstone, Court Poetry no. 32 rev. 15–16); ḫaš-ki-su-si-mat lu-zi-še . . . ḫaš-ki-su-su-ma-ka-ša-[ja], ‘he was wielding the staff appropriate to his divine office (as) to kill [me]’. This allusion, in particular, explains why the shades of the dead will tremble in terror.

11. The Sumerian sources for BN 194 disagree as to what word precedes the verb. MS r, from Ur, has ka, which is best read as gā (so Gadd, RA 30 (1933), p. 133, and Shaffer, ‘Sumerian Sources’, p. 75) and provides the translator’s riginu. Shaffer saw that the trace in MS Y, from Nippur, was of a different sign but he offered no decipherment. Help is provided by the narrative parallel, where Nippur MSS HZ and MS V appear to have ṣar-ki-šu-nā and ṣar-ki-šu-nā, respectively (BN 216). Since the latter means ‘to quake’, the former may be taken as an orthographic variant for synonymous gā-ri-šu = ṣar-ki-šu or ṣar-ki-šu (for both verbs in lexical equations with nišpu see CAD N/2, p. 113). The trace of MS Y 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 ṣar-ki-šu or ṣar-ki-šu as ṣar = gā.

28. The epithet ‘mother of Ninazu’ is also used of Ereškigal in the doxology of the Death of Bilgames in the version from Mè-Turan (Cavigliaues, Gilgamesh et la Mort, p. 36, 305). For Ninazu as Ereškigal’s son see further the Collection of Sumerian Temple Hymns 182 etc. (Å. W. Sjöberg, TCS III, p. 27; cf. W. G. Lambert, CARRA 26, pp. 61; F. A. M. Wiggerman, RL 51 IX, 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 ka = ṣar used of shoulders, has connotations of ‘courage’ like other residents of the Netherworld Ereškigal is deprived of sun, and her gleaming white flesh stands out in the dark. The bur-šagān is translated here as pār šappātu but in l. 50 as pār ša-kāti, reflecting the dual entries in lexical texts:

\[\text{[la-šagān dug-šagān]} = [\text{[līš}-ka-tu]}\]
\[\text{[līš]}-pa-tu] \]

\[\text{DirV 256–7 (CAD 51, p. 477); cf. Hā 103–4} \]

These equations suggest that the bur-šagān was a vessel shaped like wine jar (šappātu) or an oil flask (ša-kāti), i.e. narrow of neck and bulbous of body. It was typically made of stone (for three instances of 𒀭ḫur šagānu in administrative documents see PSD B, p. 183). According to Lugal-e 599, where 𒀭ḫur šagānu is also translated ū-ša-tu liq-ka-tum, this stone was ṣagatu, ša-maru, commonly rendered ‘marcassite’, and the vessel was used for filtration of water, oil or wine (see F. N. H. Al-Rawi, Inās 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 gād in Inanna’s Descent 233 // 260 makes ša-kāti, ‘to pull, draw’, the obvious derivation, though von Soden read naddātu (ZA 53 (1959), p. 234: ‘ist nicht behängt’; followed by W. R. S. Littles, ‘Inanna’s Descent’, p. 209). I assume that the verb matches gād bûr 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 ša-kātiššu ša-da-tu see CAD 31, 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’. Ereškigal’s breasts, the clothing rent from them in mourning, are seen hanging pale and pendulous like twin flanks of marcassite.

31–2. These lines represent an expansion of the original Sumerian, at least as it is given in MSS HAA (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 1. 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 is not an exact match (BN 221–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 gù šu in.ta.gu (BIN 250), i.e. the owner of the gāl, la (BIN 252–3), into the second person (tālipu), i.e. Gilgames. 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 Enkidu reports in the translation is the decay of his own corpse and in my view this is s‘ul the case. Enkidu had a penis but surely no vulva. Sumerian gāl, la has three common counterparts in Akkadian, bišārum and qallī, both meaning ‘vulva’, and āru, ‘crotch’; the last of these is attested as part of a man’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 Enkidu, and that is exactly what I assume was done. In short, the newly revealed explicitness of the Sumerian passage, as rendered in the Akkadian version, is further evidence for the often doubted sexual relationship between Gilgames and Enkidu.

97. For kalmatu, lit. ‘house’, as a term for the grub of the clothes moth see the lexical entry Hh XIV 267: ub.tūg.ba = kal-ma tài-ba-ti (MSL VIII/2, p. 30). For me with the value tuba, meaning ‘cloak’, in the Sumerian line (BIN 252, MS rr), see OB Proto-Ea (MSL XIV, pp. 43, 73; 128, 23: nūm me = nā-al-ba-šam).

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: saḫar.ub.bā ba ādur : ina e-pe-ri in-ša-pal-saḫ (Haupt, ASKT, p. 120, rev. 5–6); saḫar. ra dura.na eš.ām : ina e-per in-ša-pal-i-šu (Meece, BA X/1, p. 109, no. 27 obv. 12–13).

102. The writing ta-um-ru here and in succeeding lines of MSS UKK is taken as a spelling in which the final CV sign marks the preceding syllable as stressed, tamūr; for comparable spellings of long closed syllables see Chapter 9, the section on Spelling conventions sub (g). MSS GN use the regular spelling, ta-um (I. 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 Sînêjer, 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 dag > dāḥā is also elucidated.

111. C. Wilcke has translated a. nī gāl bi. in.ta.gu = ina peṭaš as ‘lāṭer (beim Gehen) die Arme weit schwingen’ (Lugalsûndespos, p. 180). However, the phrase seems to have some other meaning in scribal context, as we learn from Enkiškali and Enkiškali 112 (PSD A7, p. 2): a. nī gāl bi in.ta. gī. da.nu ub.ubē, ‘he “opened his arm”, he cannot recite a “long song”’. Heidel took the phrase to mean ‘his arm is bared’ (also Speeter), while von Soden translated ‘arbeitsbereit’ (Reckhaus). 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’).

118. The place of this line soon after the section dealing with numbers of sons leads one to compare it with BIN a-e, which have in common that their subjects are childless. The presence of tubu makes a correlation with ub. du. gu (BIN b) highly attractive. Though tirimmu diamu is not an exact match for pa a.la. la šu.ru/šur.ra, ‘a useless ala- stick’, a standard and a stick are at
least comparable items (see further A. R. George, "Sumerian 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 ewilu's splendid livery. The next line represents an expansion of the original and, were it legible, it might provide a rendering nearer the Sumerian of BN b. The line asking after the palace eunuch begins the second section of Gilgamesh and Enkidu's dialogue in four of six manuscripts of the Sumerian poem (MSS FHDFFF v. MSS VDDD), so I assume that it comes first in the Akkadian version too. Since the preceding section is restorable by line up to 1.116, Gilgamesh's first query of the new section will fall at 1.117. 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 ṭarkâtûlu, not 'mast' but 'mooring-pole', see SB XI 102 and A. Salonen, Wasserfahrzeuge, p. 127.

145. Though the two lines do not exhibit a vorbautem correspondence, the Akkadian phrase ina našuš iškûtu(m) evidently corresponds to the Sumerian ḫa-mī.gi3 bu.ū.ni/ta a (BN 297). The Akkadian verb is an example of the construct state of the I/1 infinitive in parēs (or parēs; for this see GAG9 § 87: K. W. R. Mayer, Orḫēš 59 (1990), p. 452). The oldest datable attestation of such an infinitive is in an inscription of Sargon II from Dūr-Šarrukīn (now Puchs, Sargons, p. 78, 30: u-si-pi), but the presence of another such construct state in the SB epic, qaḫ (var. qaḫ) in SB VI 154, alongside the various other SB attestations added by Mayer, is evidence that points to an older origin for the usage. The word iškûtu, 'peg', is elicited from gag, 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 1.103. In any case, it seems the unfortunate shield will find no rest, being spurred into constant motion every time a peg is pulled out. In the Sumerian poem the variant ti bu.ū.ni '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 smitten—in this case the subject was impaled in a boating accident.

146. The text of the line's Sumerian 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 māt šēkā, lit. 'death (decided) by one's god', occurs in omen apodosis. See especially YOS X 18, 55-6: astūli(m)n) ina jakarām (kaskal) kūšit الذي (ūdu) i-ma-na-ge-um i-ma-a-zi-ia,1,2,1, u1,3-1,3-ma-am r-e-g1,3-d-a-am mua-ti ti (dirger)-tu astūli(m)n) i-ma-a-za-um, '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. Leichty, Ištum, p. 202), Šumma šatu VIII 67 (ed. Leichty, Ištum, p. 108), Šumma manāššu VI 72 (ed. Koch-Westenholz, Liver Omens, p. 112), Pān ṣāluḫīn IX 180 and commentary (ed. Koch-Westenholz, Liver 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 māt šēkā (or šēkā). 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 Sumerian 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 ki₃lu₃,la a lā₃) which many shades have to drink (see especially the continuation of the Sumerian poem in the Ur tradition).

149. The Akkadian follows a tradition in which the first verb is not negated. Both the legible Sumerian 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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GENERAL INDEX

Aanepadda 105
Aaron 63
Abraham 61
Abu Salabikh 5, 73, 120
Achaemenes 61
Achilles 57
Achileon 473
Adab 5, 76, 123
Adad 199, 235, 239, 240, 255, 258, 359, 514, 567, 571, 709, 830, 844, 863, 884, 889
Adad-abhē-usur 411, 740
Adad-apla-iddina 30
Adad-puppi 486, 487
Adapa, poem of 36, 39
Ačīlan 61, 69, 89, 106, 525 n. 291
Aeneid 33, 483
aetiology 462, 467, 474, 476, 503, 511, 517, 518, 524, 525
Affan 66
Abyssenu 886
‘Abeyyā 63
Ahūqar (Ahuqar) 59, 70, 102
Aḫētu 170, 457, 458, 569, 575
Akkā 8, 9, 103, 104, 105
Akkāde 119, 183, 456
Ašalakh 27, 145, 332
Alexander Romance 67, 68
Al-Khidhr 66
Ala 453
Alansu 149
Al-Šuyurī 60, 89
Amanum (Hamanu), Mt 20, 94, 226, 456, 468, 864
Amanu 340, 347, 351
Amār-Suen 104, 105, 117, 473
Amamumgal 5
Amamumgalana 6
see also Dumuzi-Amamumgalanna
Amorites 466, 777
Amurru 121
An, see Anu
Anūn (or Dingirum) 92, 101, 171
ancestor cults 789–90
Anān 205, 214
Antiochus 411, 740
Anu 131, 623
Anu-iliṣur 393
Anunnaki (Anunnā) 95, 134, 135, 199, 265, 269, 466, 488, 489, 490, 514, 579, 663, 697, 709, 711, 814, 862
Anunnātum 797
‘Anūzāqar 463
Anzū 31, 170, 190, 290, 306, 637, 789, 849, 885
bird 209, 227, 243, 245, 246, 301, 305, 306, 345, 464, 463, 844
poem of 21, 31, 36, 39, 170, 405
Apīlā 245
Apocryphon of Jannes and Jambres 63
Apsō (Ašu) 13, 121, 444, 445, 461, 501, 510, 520, 522–4, 526, 581, 705, 723, 895
and the ‘mouth of the rivers’ 520–1
and the Netherworld 500, 861
Arabian Nights 60, 65, 70, 89, 497
Ararat, Mt 516
Aratta 5
Arbil 136, 305
Arsaces 740
Artemis 473
Asāru 289, 290, 291, 450, 543, 545, 788
Asakku (Azag) 190, 731–3, 773, 789
Assalūšu-mansum 30
Ashkelon 340
Aṣūlūšu-namer (Aṣ-namer) 304, 479
Eridu 733, 773
Erīšu-Aya 816
Erra (Jra) 715, 851, 884
as Errakal 514, 709
poem of Erra 39
Erra-imrīt 456
Esagil 411, 832, 845
Esagil-kīn-apī 30, 32, 352
Esarhaddon 102, 131, 133, 305, 338, 485, 487, 817, 855
Ešninna 218, 246
Etana 61, 103, 128, 129, 483, 645
in the Netherworld 850
poem of 21, 36, 39, 405
E-temen-anki 513
Euphrates 13, 15, 98, 261, 267, 271, 326, 332, 390, 519, 520, 524, 613, 629, 663, 705, 791, 854, 860, 862, 864
E-zida 364, 391, 392
Para 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 119, 122, 138
see also Šarrukin
Flood 63, 102, 273, 349, 365, 445, 503, 508, 877
bird episode 516–17
duration of 515–16
hero 23, 25, 96, 99, 117, 273, 275, 496, 508, 514, 522
myth 23, 32, 56, 70, 504, 509–19, 527, 880
portents of 510–12
see also Deluge
Forest of Cedar, see Cedar Forest
Fountain of Life 66
fountain of youth 522
Fowler and the Sun God 35
funerary rites
banquet 487–8
grave-goods 131, 488–9
period of mourning 486
rites of commemoration 524–12, 126–7
statue 487
Gaddi-ilišu-èreš 738
Gabriel 66
Galîtu 843
Ganzir 771, 773
Garden of the Hesperides 67
Gelga 78, 79, 112
Genesis 516–17, 527
Gilgamesh 143, 851
ghouls of the burned 14
Gibil 80, 851
Gilgamesh 3 and passion
in art 100–1
Babylonian Charon 130–1, 132, 501
as Gilgames 7–16, 66, 71, 74–8, 80, 89, 91, 108, 109, 489, 771, 773, 777
boat of 86, 120
cult of 123–7
as cultural hero 98
as en 103, 122, 190
in exorcism 132–5
and Festival of Lights 15, 126
and funerary cults 52–3, 124–7, 131–2, 530
gardens of 112, 125
as Gilgames 61, 89
in god lists etc. 119–22
as Jiljamiš 61, 89
king 29, 101–2, 125 n. 144
name and spellings 71–90
and the Netherworld 121, 127–32
in omens 112–17
parentage 106–8
in personal names 122
and Šulgi etc. 108–12
tomb of 15, 19, 490
well of 94–5, 282
Gilgamesh–ginnu 76, 122
Girra 851, 890
Girsu 7, 14, 124, 125, 151, 777
Gilgamesh etc. 85
[n̄ašša.mafē] 80 n. 62
Goliath 447
Gondar poem 12
Gudea 94, 186, 513
hymn on cylinders 76
Gula 108, 211, 810
Gutium 109
Hades 131, 669, 900
Hahah (Habha) 62, 63
Hammurapī 21, 30, 54, 82, 150, 183, 246, 338, 449, 778, 815
Code of 171
Hana 191
Haniš 514, 709, 884
Harran 58, 817
Ḫabur, Mt 259, 864
Ḫatra 58
Ḫattusa 25, 35, 79, 80, 84, 132, 139, 306, 309
see also Boğazköy
Hayqat the Sage 70
see also Ahhiqar
Ibkit 149
Ḫedimškug 129, 861
Hercules 497
Herodotus 59
Hesperides 497
Ḫeyā Ḫeya 63
Ḫa XXI 512
Hierapolis 64
Ḫolabiš 60, 62, 63, 70, 147
Ḫurbūbū 147
Homer 6, 7, 30, 55–7
Homeric epic 516
Ḫubur 130, 131, 132, 500, 501, 862
Ḫuṣmāba (Ḫuwawa) 3 and passion
as guardian of the Cedar Forest 869
name and spellings 144–5
in omens 145–6
narks of 469
Ḫumabu 147
Ḫumānum 146
Ḫunnisām 147
Ḫuwaš-tabal 131, 306, 500
Ḫutibāš 129, 489, 661, 859, 861
Ḫuwaša, see Hymba
Ḫuṣirina 348, 369, 371, 381, 406
Ḫub-pi-El II 246
Ḫubi-šī 104, 105, 125
Ḫiddin-Elī 740
id.nun 124
Ḫigš 489, 567, 571, 787, 788
Ḫin-šemeš 92
Ḫilud 55, 57
Ḫiš-ši ĕniš 218

see also Kuyunjik

Ninagal 773, 774

Ningal Sinannuna 129

Ningirida 129

Ningirsu 94, 151, 190, 785


Ninḫursag 489

Ninlilu 121

 Ninissina 37, 85

Ninlil 104, 112, 305, 736


as Gašinimuna 147

name and spellings 147–8

Ninsunnuna 541 n. 4, 783

Rimâ-Ninsun 783, 803

Ninlilu (nin-lil-ka) 289, 704

NINšubur 122

NINšulúŋtuṣumuna 489, 663, 859, 860

Nintu 507, 840

Ninurta 31, 108, 121, 125, 127, 151, 170, 190, 211, 290, 335, 457, 458, 514, 519, 545, 705, 709, 715, 785, 789, 810, 830, 868, 881, 884, 891

Ninurta-pâšiâdîSin’s Dog-Bite 85

Nippur 7, 8, 16, 17, 21, 24, 35, 38, 76, 78, 82, 83, 99, 104, 105, 111, 120, 121, 125, 139, 141, 149, 161, 192, 216, 225, 241, 267, 271, 287, 288, 457, 470, 478, 486, 530, 611, 613, 615, 637, 743, 745, 773 n. 46, 776, 845, 901, 904, 905

Nippur Compendium 457

see NÎD-da 129

Nissaba 10, 543, 545, 784, 785

Nîṣîr, Mt 516

Nîṣît, Mt 516

Nîṣît, Mt 498 n. 186

Qâš-at-tábat 489, 661, 859

Qatna 27, 145

Qinga 170

Queen of Serpents 66

Qumran 60, 62, 63, 70, 89, 155

Qurîr-Nergal 370, 406

Rab (Rav) 58

Ras Shamra 76

see also Ugarit

Rehoboam 19 n. 52

Rûm-Sin 21, 790

Sakhar, King 66

Samson 68

Samsuiluna 122, 161, 288

literary letter of 36, 118

Sardanapalus 59

Sargon of Akkad 20, 27, 36, 57, 93, 94, 152, 153, 182, 186, 245, 258, 453, 456, 467, 468, 474, 791

birth-legend of 36, 473–4

Sargon II 53, 282, 738, 863, 904

Sarina, see Sirion

scorpion-men 492–3, 669–71, 866, 869

scribal training 35–8

Seleucus 64, 411, 740

Semiramis 59

Sennacherib 385, 388, 389, 815, 855, 897

Seechorha 61

Seven Sages 91, 539, 781

Shalmanser (Šalmanser) I 824

Shalmanser III 791

Shamshu-apli-Jabbar 68

Shem 61

Shemashara 240, 881

Sidon 340

Sililu 623, 835

Sin 111, 118, 129, 130, 150, 260, 457, 492, 529, 667–9, 731–3, 839, 839, 862

as moon god 488, 491, 815

see also Nanna

Sinâbu 738

Sin-tâšid 171

Sin-šēqi-umunnâ 27, 28, 29–33, 47, 49, 54, 68, 102, 295, 297, 419

Sippar 23, 31, 35, 38, 99, 118, 149, 272,
PHILOLOGICAL INDEX

adammu 795
apaššēšu 881
āšumma 870
ēnu.an.zu.gilyu = zaššītu 868
āšāritti 784

bil)i 71
kirmum 338
būâ 833
būu 'ō 337

dōšu 797
dakkanna 303
dulla (dallātu) 838
dialect
-Assyrian 316, 327, 330, 349–50, 352, 361, 385, 436, 805, 806, 840, 843, 844, 848, 849, 893
-Late Babylonian 437, 803
-Middle Babylonian 295, 351, 435–6
-Neo-Babylonian 437
-provincial 258, 260, 327, 837, 838

-dūr aqqi 213

cū gīri 795
cēnu 'be deep, profound' 815
cēnu var. of ēna 240
cēnu.māti 802

ešū 782
gāšu 'grow bold' 808
gīš = gīm 83
gīš = biša 74
gīš = biša 74
grammar

-n → -u 799
-adverbial -usu 811
-aspiration (epenthetic) vowel 162n.15, 238, 301, 303, 432, 811, 847
-concessive ša 794–5

enclitic -ma 785, 791–2, 794, 880, 886
gnomic preterite 214–5, 820, 845
infinitive in *parā 842, 904
-ne var. of ni-(conj. pref.) 247, 252, 260
paronomastic inf. 258–9
*parāti: *parārītu 213
"performative" preterite 300, 810, 816
plural in love poetry 837
sequence of tenses 180, 184
triptotic declension 780, 844, 863
ventive in -u 441

haššāni 796–7
haššānum var. of abānum 211
haššānu 801, 874
haššāni 801
haššānum 'ogre' 265–6
haššānīnu māli 188
hāšānu 854
hāšānu 854
hāšānīnu māli 842
hāšānīnu māli 842
hāššānum < haššānum 239

ia.lu, lu, 10n. 29
ina berti DN 432n. 13
ippānnu 803
isat lādi 865
isā, pl. isāri 866–7
isān usāmum etc. 186

hantuš 'double-edged' 860
heqā 849
heqā 453–4
heqā 'refuge' 783
hēna // gīm + adi. = superlative 894
kirimmu 796
kisru 789, 793
kisru 786
kisru 'mayfly' 875–6
| CT (cont.): | GEIV IV 153 366, 676, 701 |
| 18 4 iv 12 844 | IV 199 536 |
| 18 5, K 4193 rev. 10 820 | Curse of Akkade 128 824 |
| 18 29 ii 19–24 87 | Death of Gilgames, incipit 14 |
| 18 30 iv 6–10 96 | M 52–61 // 120–62 96 |
| 22 6, 7–8 795 | M 72–7 // 162–7 507 |
| 22 48 obv. 10' 152 n. 77 | M 78–83 // 168–73 128 |
| 23 16, 15 851 | M 103 // 193 487 n. 143 |
| 24 41, 63 884 | M 104–7 // 194–7 482 |
| 24 41, 65 789 | M 110–11 // 200–1 142 |
| 24 50 obv. 8 803 | M 117–18 // 206–9 142 |
| 25 28, K 7659, 2'–4' 120 | M 126–7 491 |
| 26 32, 91 815 | M 238 15 n. 43 |
| 26 40 iv 9 860 | N<sub>r</sub> / N<sub>r</sub> v 6–11 126 |
| 28 48, K 182+ rev. 13–14 116 | N<sub>r</sub> v 28 487 n. 143 |
| 29 46, 13 790 | N<sub>r</sub> 23–5 483 |
| 30 12, Rm 480 obv. 14'–15' 115 | N<sub>r</sub> rev. 1–2, 8–10 142 |
| 32 35, 10344 obv. 2 125 n. 145 | SC 3027 14 n. 42 |
| 34 8, 8 893 | SC 3027 obv. 18 103 n. 50 |
| 34 17 K 14945 616 | SEM 24 'obs. 4'–10' 96 |
| 38 45 obv. 14' 823 | Death of Ur-Namru 95 127 |
| 40 11, 73 116 | 126 851 |
| 40 49, 32 889 | see also Ur-Nammu A |
| 41 43 obv. 4 71 n. 1 | Deimel, Taf. II 1 rev. iii 25 71, 119 |
| 42 7 iii 1 108, 810 | Dialogue of Pessimism 76–8 526 |
| 43 59, 21 874 | Diru I 265 838 |
| 46 16 276 | V 256–7 901 |
| 46 17 536 | VI 84 824 |
| 46 18 537 | Proto-Diru 80 n. 60 |
| 46 19–20 536 | DP 54 rev. ii 7, iii 4 124 n. 132 |
| 46 21 587, 602 | Dumu's Dream 17 491 |
| 46 22 587 | Durand, Catalogue EPHE 341 rev. 8–10' 471 n. 97 |
| 46 23–5 634 | EA 47, 17 874 |
| 46 26 407 n. 83 | 357, 82 829 |
| 46 27 649 | Ecclesiastes 4: 12 822 |
| 46 28 573 | 9: 7–9 275 |
| 46 29 572 | Emesal Voc. III 15 842 |
| 46 30 677 | III 90 818 |
| 46 31 136 | Enkid and Ninhursag 56 520 n. 270 |
| 46 32 677 | Enkid and the World Order 126–7 872 |
| 46 33 676 | 373 863 |
| 46 34 727 | Enkidu and Enki-regal 112 903 |
| 46 35 702 | Enkimdu el Ish 116 820 |
| 48 18 ii 5'–7' 99 | Enkimdu el Ish 116 820 |
| 58 54 747 | I 149 // II 35 // III 39 810 |
| 12 586 | IV 41–8 813 |
| 13–21 616 | V 9–10 493 n. 170 |
| 24 572 | VII 97 143 n. 20 |
| 25 558 | Ermišu II 53–6 824 |
| 26–7 633 | Il 66 814 |
| 29 572 | Erru I 24 795 |
| 30–1 856 | I 45 785 |
| 32 666 | IV 52 843 |
| 33–4 676 | Brana SB II 59–60 839 |
| 35 649 | Ewe and Grain, see Lahar and Almah |
| 36 573 | 37 676 |
| 40 9 648 | FEOS 9 II, p. 355, no. 1 122 n. 127 |
| 41 633 | Farber, Lars und Damuzi, p. 134, 130 147 |
| 43 535 | Friedrichstein Mem. Vol., p. 141, 43 862 |
| 44 572 | Fuchs, Sargony, p. 62, 11–12 785 |
| 45 558 | Garelli, Gilgamesh, pp. 53–4 648 |
| 46 667 | 47–8 648 |
| 49 113–14, 399 n. 52 | 119–22 617 |
| 50, 1 and 9 137 | George, Penguin, p. xxix 617 |
| 53, 1–11 134 | 3 536 |
| 53 rev. 1' 135 n. 189 | 13 559 |
| 54 586 | 31 587 |
| 55 632 | 64 371 |
| 56–7 700 | 87 677 |
| 58 701 | 128 290 |
| 59 700 | 134 310 |
| 60 702 | 213 573 |
| Gesche, Schulunterricht, p. 518, 66609 obv. 5–6 120 n. 124 |
| 61–4 700 | Grayson, BULL, p. 50, 14–15 515 |
| 65–6 701 | Gudea Cyl. A 24 // v 21 785 |
| 67–8 700 | p. 117 unnum. 701 |
| 124 bottom 700 | Cyl. A xii 12–13 491 |
| HAW nos. 11–12 746 | Cyl. A xiv 5–6, xvi 28, xx 4, 12 894 |
| Hg A II 135 527 n. 293 | Cyl. B xxiii 16 76 n. 42 |
| BIV 33 872 | Statue B v 28 94 n. 14 |
| BV b 4 864 | Haupt, ASKT, p. 120, rev. 5–6 903 |
| C XVIII 18 834 | Haupt, Nimenrepetos nos. 1–3 535 |
| Hh III 211, 418 859 | 4–5 632 |
| III 407 860 | 6 633 |
| IV 341–2a 120 | 7–8 572 |
| V 19–21 865 | 9 558 |
| V 25–71a 830 | 10 572 |
| V 252–4 828 | 11 602 |
| VII A 79–80 859 | 12 586 |
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—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 7498n)+ 9211z (74104z)+9301d (74159d)</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>MB Emar2 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 Bog5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.U. 51/7</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.U. 51/129A</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>f</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>HL1 286</td>
<td>= IM 52615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL1 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 (HL1 286)</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OB Harmal4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 52750 (HL1 295)</td>
<td>OB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OB Harmal3</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 Nippur₂</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 76873 (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</td>
<td>= IM 67564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND 4405/4</td>
<td>= IM 67577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 22554/7</td>
<td>= IM 76985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 22729/9</td>
<td>= IM 76941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 22744/1 b</td>
<td>= IM 76973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W '23018' (230132)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 23130</td>
<td>= IM 76873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-T 75</td>
<td>= IM 57836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-T 376</td>
<td>= IM 58451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Berlin: Vorderasiatisches Museum**

| VAT 4105 | OB | — | OB VA+BR₂ | 17–19 |
| VAT 9667 (Ass 21600c) | SB | VI | a₂ | 89–91 |
| VAT 10217 | Ass | (IV) | x | 28 |
| VAT 10585b | Ass | (II) | y₁ | 31 |
| VAT 10586 | SB | XI | b | 137 |
| VAT 10916 | Ass | (II) | y₂ | 31 |
| VAT 11000 | SB | XI | c₁ | 138–9 |
| VAT 11087 | SB | XI | c₂ | 138–9 |
| VAT 11294 | SB | XI | c₃ | 138–9 |
| VAT 11576 | SB | VI | d | 87 |
| VAT 12890 | MB | — | MB Boğ₂ | 26–7 |
| VAT 14512 | SB | IV | w₁ | 71 |
| VAT 14513 | SB | IV | w₂ | 71 |
| VAT 17234 | SB | I | x | 51 |
| VAT 19286 (BE 27125) | SB | III | y | 68 |

**Boğazkale, Turkey: Site Museum**

Bo 83/614 | MB | — | MB Boğ c | 24 |
Bo 83/615 | MB | — | MB Boğ d | 25 |
Bo 83/625 | MB | — | MB Boğ s | 24 |

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>see K 2252+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 913+</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 2756A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2756C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2756D+20778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2756E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 913+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2756F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 913+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 2360+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3252+8561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 2252+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3382+Rm 621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3990+4579+DT 2+  Rm 578+Rm 2 197</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 4486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 2252+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 4579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 3990+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 4579A+8018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 5335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 6497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see Ch. 8, fn. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 6541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 913+</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 7224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 4579A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8517+8518+8569+8593+8595</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>W₁</td>
<td>132–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 8517+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 3252+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 8517+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Museum number**

<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>see K 6899+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8565+9997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 8517+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8589+Sm 1681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 8517+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8594+21502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 8517+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 9196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 9245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 4465+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 9716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 6899+</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>see K 8565+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 10777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 11659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 1200Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 13525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 13874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 2756A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 13880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see p. 136</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>d₂</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 15193 (Rm unnumbered)</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Q₁</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 17343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 18183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 19276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 19325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 19549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 20013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 20778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 2756D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 21502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 8594+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 22153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 4465+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 3990+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see K 3475+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT unnumbered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>see Sm 2112+</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>Sm 401</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Y₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 1040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 1681</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 1754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 1881</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>O₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2097</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>GG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2112+DT unnumbered</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>82-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2131+1916+Rm II 383</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>T₂</td>
<td>128-9,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2132</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>GG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2133</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Y₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2194</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>O₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 2196</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>GG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 289+unnumbered</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>54-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 535</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>J₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 578</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 579</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>U₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 616</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 621</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Z₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 751+BM 34853</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>116-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 853</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>U₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 907</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>U₂</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>SB</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 964</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>J₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm 1017</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Y₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm unnumbered</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>L₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm II 197</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>L₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm II 262</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>L₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm II 383</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>JJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm II 390</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>L₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rm II 399</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>L₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 265</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>L₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 297</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>L₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 299</td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>L₄</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-2-4, 327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-2-4, 460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-6-25, 454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-6-25, 482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-7-6, 314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-7-6, 426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-7-27, 93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-11-3, 840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-5-22, 316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-5-22, 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-5-22, 1230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-9-18, 12726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-1-21, 1788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-1-21, 2338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902-10-11, 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ki 1904-10-9, 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-6-18, 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 30559+32418</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34160+34193+35174+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35348+35413+35628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sp 265+299+Sp II 726+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922+998+Sp III 140)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34191+4835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34314 (Sp 426)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34449 (Sp 573)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34873 (Sp II 380)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34916+35419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sp II 431+1005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35079+35103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sp II 614+645)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35245 (Sp II 812)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35380 (Sp II 960)</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>BM 35413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35567 (Sp III 74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 36909+37023 (80-6-17,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660-767)+F 235)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 37023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 37163 (80-6-17, 913)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 41835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 45883 (81-7-6, 314)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 46002 (81-7-6, 446)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 54325+54900</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 72719 (82-9-18, 12726)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 93052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 99876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 996974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 98990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 135909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 30559+32418</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34160+34193+35174+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35348+35413+35628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sp 265+299+Sp II 726+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>922+998+Sp III 140)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34191+4835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34314 (Sp 426)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34449 (Sp 573)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34873 (Sp II 380)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 34916+35419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sp II 431+1005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35079+35103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sp II 614+645)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35245 (Sp II 812)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 35354</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>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 Nippur₃</td>
<td>21</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>—</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 3162</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>N 2696+3162</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>MB Nippur₃</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>EE</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Private collections: Schøyen Collection, Norway

SC 1989 Cylinder seal, see p. 101

SC 2652/5
SC 2887
SC 3025
SC 3361
SC 4577

Private collections: anonymous owners

—
—
—
MB — MB Emars, b 29
—
MB — MB Emars, c 29
—
SB IV v 52

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
IM 52615

obv.

rev. 10

11. OB Harmal., Copy by W. G. Lambert, collations by the author
12. OB Harmal₂ obv. Copy by W. G. Lambert, collations by the author

13. OB Harmal₂ rev. Copy by W. G. Lambert, collations by the author
IM 21180x

14. OB IM obv.

15. OB IM rev. and top edge
The hatched area is restored from Millard's copy (CT 46 no.16)

19. OB VA+BM col. iii. Copy by W. G. Lambert, collation by the author
20. MB Nippur₁ (top and middle) and MB Nippur₂ obv. (bottom)

21. MB Nippur₃ (top and middle) and MB Nippur₄ (bottom)
24. MB Boğ, Fragments (a), (b) and (c)

25. MB Boğ, Fragments (d), (e) and (f) (top and middle),
    MB Boğ (bottom right)
28. MB Emar₁, M 9238d and Assyrian MS x

29. MB Emar, Unnumbered fragments copied by I. L. Finkel
30. MB Megiddo, Copy by Takayoshi Oshima

31. Assyrian MSS y₃ (top left) and y₂. Copies by Stefan M. Maul
32. Assyrian MS z obv.

33. Assyrian MS z rev.
34. Assyrian MS e. The hatched areas are restored from the photograph

35. Kuyunišk 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
54. SB Tablet II. MS X, cols. i, ii and v

55. SB Tablet II. MSS X, cols. iii and iv, X, and s
ee W'23018' (23013?)

58. SB Tablet II. MS ee. Copy by E. von Weiher

59. SB Tablet III. MS c. Copy by I. L. Finkel. In col. v a ruling separates ll. 172 and 173
60. SB Tablet II. MS M outline sketch. The position of M is uncertain.
66. SB Tablet III. MS aa obv.

67. SB Tablet III. MS aa rev.
68. SB Tablet III, MSS i and y
69. SB Tablet IV, MSS Y, DD and CC obv.
71. SB Tablets IV-V. MSS r, u and w. Copies by W. G. Lambert, collations by the author.
74. SB Tablet V. MS dd cols. i and ii. The hatched areas are restored from the photograph.

75. SB Tablet V. MS dd cols. iii and iv.
80. SB Tablet VI. MS A col. vi

81. SB Tablet VI. MS A cols. iv and v
82. SB Tablet VI. MS O, outline sketch. O₁ and O₂ touch but do not join

83. SB Tablet VI. MS O obv.
84. SB Tablet VI. MS O, cols. iv and v
86. SB Tablet VI. MS Q, outline sketch. The positions of Q₁ and Q₂ 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. L₂ and L₅ overlap but do not join
96. SB Tablet VII. MS Z cols. ii, MS GG

97. SB Tablet VII. MS Z cols. iii and iv. Z₂ backs on to Z₁ but does not join.
The hatched area is restored from Haupt's copy.
f S.U. 51/129 A

obv.

45

47-8
49-50
51-2
53-4
55
3
2
1
0

72-3
74-5

0 1 cm

detached flake

f S.U. 51/129 A rev.

78-9
80-1
82-3
85
87-8
89-90
94-5
102-3
104-5
106-7
108-9
110
111-112
115-16

0 1 cm

98. SB Tablet VII. MS f obv. The hatched area is restored from an old photograph

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.
108. SB Tablet IX. MS JJ.
SB Tablet X. MS K col. i

109. SB Tablet X. MS K, outline sketch
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.
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 c₃) and W. G. Lambert (c₂).
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.
144. SB Tablet XII. MSS KK and G col. iii
147. SB Tablet XII. MSS a and q. Copies by W. G. Lambert (a) and I. L. Finley (q)