

**Bilinguals from Boghazköi. I<sup>1</sup>**By **Jerrold S. Cooper** — Baltimore*Introduction*

Boghazköi is the source of the largest corpus of extant Sumerian-Akkadian "literary" texts written down between the end of the Old Babylonian period and ca. 1100 B.C. As such, this corpus is of prime importance in understanding one of the most important periods in Mesopotamian literary history, a period to which much of the redaction and editing that shaped the standard "literary" corpus known from the first millennium has been assigned. This redaction and editing included the selection of only certain genres and compositions from the Old Babylonian Sumerian literary corpus for further transmission, the composition of new types of Sumerian texts not known from earlier periods, and the provision of Akkadian translations for most of the Sumerian literature thus selected or composed. Although we can identify exceedingly few literary texts that were written down in Babylonia during the Kassite period, the existence of many texts at contemporary Bogh. and in post-Kassite Assyria at the time of Tiglathpilesar I (1115—1077)<sup>2</sup> in the form we know them from the first millennium,

<sup>1</sup> This article is based on one chapter of an unpublished Oriental Institute dissertation. The term "bilingual" is restricted here to connected texts which contain both a Sumerian and an Akkadian version written on the same tablet. Excluded are lexical and grammatical texts and other lists (e.g. KUB 4 11, containing *sukkal*'s and epithets of Šamaš, yet possibly part of a text similar to that published by Castellino, *Oriens Antiquus* 8 1 ff.), texts that are possibly bilingual but are too fragmentary to determine that fact with certainty (e.g. KUB 4 10), and tablets that were possibly bilingual, but in their present state preserve only a Sumerian or Akkadian version (e.g. KUB 4 39; cf. Ugaritica V p. 24 n. 2). Abbreviations follow CAD A/2. Bibliography contained in Borger HKL is generally not repeated.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to The Johns Hopkins University, whose generosity enabled me to collate many of the texts discussed below, as well as to the authorities of the British Museum and the museums in Istanbul and Ankara, who kindly placed their facilities at my disposal.

<sup>2</sup> See Weidner, AfO 16 197 ff. and Lambert and Millard, *Catalogue ... Second Supplement*, p. ix. The "library" of Tiglathpilesar I includes twenty bilinguals,

indicates that the dearth of material from Babylonia proper is accidental.<sup>3</sup>

---

to which may be added five MA Assur texts found at Nineveh (all listed in Lambert and Millard, *op. cit.*):

### Main Dialect Religious Texts

1. KAR 15—16 (Nininsina/Ninkarrak hymn)
2. BM 134793

### Emesal Religious Texts

3. KAR 9 (ér-šà-ḫun-gá to Enlil)
4. KAR 97 (Ningirsu/Ninurta hymn; cf. Falkenstein, MDOG 85 2)
5. KAR 128—129 (Prayer of Tukulti-Ninurta I)
6. KAR 375 (Enlil liturgy; MB ductus)

### Incantation

7. KAR 24 (udug-ḫul-a D+1; cf. Borger, AOAT 1 2)

### "Myths"

8. Lugale
  - a. KAR 13 (I—IV), b. KAR 14 (IX—XII), c. BM 122625 (XIII—XVI), d. KAR 17 (III)
9. Angim
  - a. BM 122652 (I—IV), b. KAR 12 (II), c. KAR 18 (IV)
10. KAR 4 (Silbenalphabet A and Creation Myth)

### "Wisdom"

11. KAR 119 = Lambert BWL pl. 32 (Preceptive Hymn to Ninurta; MB ductus)
12. Proverbs
  - a. KAR 103 = Lambert BWL pl. 58f. (cf. Lambert BWL 225), b. Lambert BWL pl. 67f. (VAT 10810)

### Technical Literature

13. KAV 218 (Astrolabe B)

### Miscellaneous

14. KAR 113
15. KAR 333
16. Th 1905—4—9, 2 (= BM 98496; Bezold Cat. Supp. pl. III; cf. Lambert and Millard, *op. cit.*, p. ix<sup>2</sup>. The text is reminiscent in tenor and format of KAR 128—129 (cf. Borger HKL 659) but is not written in Emesal).

<sup>3</sup> For the importance of the Kassite period and the Bogh. texts in Mesopotamian literary history, see Lambert BWL 13 ff.; Falkenstein, "Die altorientalische Literatur" in *Die Literaturen der Welt*, 6 and 13; Biggs, TCS 2 6 with n. 35; Riemscheider, StBoT 9 6f.; Meier, ZANF 11 196; and cf. already Langdon BL pp. vif. [W. von Soden, MDOG 85, 22].

Among the few literary texts from Kassite Babylonia are one or possibly two bilinguals. Peiser Urkunden P 92 (now LB 806)<sup>4</sup> is apparently a school exercise, with a short seven line excerpt from an otherwise unknown Sumerian prayer on one side and an Akkadian translation on the reverse. Sumer 9 no. 28 (IM 50964) is a unique bilingual hemerology with an interlinear translation.<sup>5</sup>

One of the hallmarks of the entire Bogh. corpus is the comparatively large number of separate languages represented in it. Whereas in Mesopotamia, cuneiform was, with few exceptions, used to write only Sumerian and Akkadian, at Bogh. it was employed for no fewer than seven languages.<sup>6</sup> Actual bilinguals are, however, relatively rare. The oldest example is the Akkado-Hittite "political testament" of Ḫattusili I,<sup>7</sup> which exists in a late copy. The format is parallel columns, with the Akkadian on the left. The Akkadian contains errors which indicate that the Hittite text was the original;<sup>8</sup> nevertheless, the position of the Akkadian in the left-hand column, which is generally reserved for the original in bilinguals (Sumerian in Sumero-Akkadian bilinguals, Hattic in Hattic-Hittite bilinguals), suggests that Akkadian was more prestigious in the eyes of the scribe. Four other Akkado-Hittite bilinguals have been published: two omen texts, one with an interlinear translation and another with a parallel column translation format;<sup>9</sup> a hymn to Šamaš and Sîn that has traces of what appears to be a Hittite translation column;<sup>10</sup> and an Akkadian wisdom text — known also from Ugarit — with a partial Hittite translation in a parallel column format.<sup>11</sup>

Hattic-Hittite bilinguals are represented by a small number of published texts which are arranged either in parallel columns (Hattic

<sup>4</sup> It is difficult to ascertain why Peiser included this text among his Kassite documents, but note in this regard Böhl, *BiOr* 7 45<sup>1</sup>, where the text is likewise designated Kassite.

<sup>5</sup> Edited together with unilingual Akkadian parallels by Landsberger, *MSL* 9 107 ff. (add the late unilingual Sumerian parallel UET 6/2 184 [recognized by M. Civil]).

<sup>6</sup> See Goetze, *Kleinasien* 45 ff. and 171 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Sommer-Falkenstein Bil. Cf. Güterbock, *JAOS* 84 108. Another text of this king exists in an original Akkadian version and a later Hittite translation on separate tablets (Güterbock, *loc. cit.*).

<sup>8</sup> Sommer-Falkenstein Bil. 203 ff.

<sup>9</sup> KUB 4 1 iii 15 ff. and KUB 29 11 + an unpublished Akkadian column (Güterbock, oral communication).

<sup>10</sup> KBo 1 12, edited by Ebeling, *Or NS* 23 209 ff.

<sup>11</sup> KUB 4 3 +? KBo 12 70; see Ugaritica V pp. 273 ff. and 779 ff. (No. 163).

left — Hittite right) or in an expanded interlinear format, in which a small section of Hattic is followed by its Hittite translation.<sup>12</sup> Aside from a few translated Luwian sentences,<sup>13</sup> the only other bilinguals known from Bogh. are Sumero-Akkadian, to which a Hittite translation is sometimes added.<sup>14</sup> One unusual text contains only Sumerian and Hittite versions (1).<sup>15</sup>

Over half of the eight Sumero-Akkadian bilinguals found at Bogh. are incantations (3—7).<sup>16</sup> In the first millennium, incantations are one of the three main groups into which most bilinguals can be apportioned. The other two groups, Emesal liturgies, which are never found outside of Mesopotamia, and “wisdom” literature (including *edubba* compositions) are not represented at all among the bilinguals at Bogh., although a Bogh. fragment of a unilingual Sumerian *edubba* text with bilingual duplicates from Ugarit and first millennium Assyria may have had an Akkadian translation column in its unbroken state.<sup>17</sup> At Ugarit, the situation as we know it since the publication of Ugaritica V is quite different. There are four Sumero-Akkadian bilinguals,<sup>18</sup> three of which fall into the “wisdom” category (Ugaritica V Nos. 15, 164, 165; possibly also 166). Unilingual Sumerian incantations in phonetic orthography have been found at Ugarit on one text together with several unilingual Akkadian incantations.<sup>19</sup> This format, although well known from first millennium texts, never occurs in OB.<sup>20</sup> Another link between

<sup>12</sup> See Laroche Cat. 358—362, 364, 372.

<sup>13</sup> Goetze, *Kleinasien*, 49.

<sup>14</sup> Note that Otten, AfO 22 111 and StBoT 7 7<sup>1</sup> now reports finding a Hittite-Hurrian bilingual ritual.

<sup>15</sup> Numbers in parentheses refer to the catalogue below. The large numbers of unilingual Hittite translations and adaptations of Sumero-Akkadian and other literature will not be discussed here, nor will texts whose original version appears on one tablet and the translation on another.

<sup>16</sup> KUB 4 23 (8) is perhaps also an incantation, although what can be read on the fragment suggests more probably other genres (see below).

<sup>17</sup> KUB 4 39; see n. 1 above.

<sup>18</sup> Note also the Akkadian-Hurrian bilingual RS 15.10 (PRU III 311 ff.). For the Sumerian and bilingual texts from Ugarit, see now in general the remarks of Krecher in UF 1.

<sup>19</sup> Ugaritica V No. 17.

<sup>20</sup> Note that KUB 4 26 (+) King HT 13 (+) KUB 37 112 contains an Akkadian text followed by a phonetic Sumerian text, but these cannot be decisively identified as incantations. This text should be added to the list of texts in phonetic orthography of Krecher, ZANF 24 30, together with KBo 13 37, KUB 37 108—110, KUB 37 111 (6), KUB 34 4 (5) and AT 453. The texts in phonetic orthography from Ugaritica V (add possibly PRU III 16.416) are to be treated in a future article by Krecher (cf. UF 1 143).

the MB peripheral centers and first millennium tradition is provided by one of the Bogh. incantation texts (3), which on its reverse contains an incantation of the "classical" Sumerian type known from OB, but on the obverse contains an "incantation-prayer" of the *ki-<sup>d</sup>utu-kam* type known exclusively from the first millennium.<sup>21</sup> AT 453, a partially bilingual text from Alalah IV — apparently the only Sumerian text found in a peripheral center other than Bogh. or Ugarit — also contains an incantation-prayer of this type.<sup>22</sup>

In addition to the wisdom and *edubba* text duplicates found both at Bogh. and Ugarit mentioned above, close relations between the schools of the two capitals<sup>23</sup> are evidenced by the discovery at Ugarit of a duplicate (Ugaritica V No. 169) to the trilingual Sumerian-Akkadian-Hittite version of the "Message of Ludingira" known from Bogh. (2). Nougayrol has shown the Ugarit tablet to be an actual import from Bogh.<sup>24</sup> The format of the Ludingira text — four parallel columns of Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian, Akkadian, and Hittite in that order — is the same as that of a hymn to Iškur (1), the only other Bogh. Sumerian-Akkadian-Hittite trilingual. One fragment of the Iškur hymn omits the Akkadian column entirely, and is thereby the only known Sumero-Hittite bilingual.

In the first millennium, all bilingual incantations — with a few exceptions<sup>25</sup> — are arranged in an interlinear translation format. The

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Kunstmann, LSS NF 2 48ff. and Falkenstein, RLA 3 159f. The OB "incantation" to Utu published by Castellino, *Oriens Antiquus* 8 1ff., has certain affinities to the *ki-<sup>d</sup>utu-kam*, and might lead us to reconsider our conception of the development of the Sumerian incantation-prayer.

<sup>22</sup> The beginning of the text (A) seems to parallel the first lines of 4R 17 (B), the *ki-<sup>d</sup>utu-kam* of the fourth "house" of the *būt rimki* ceremony:

A	en-galeš-ša-an-kù-ga-t[a] e-da-zu-[dè]
B	en-gal an-ša-kù-ga-ta [è-da]-zu-dè
A	ur-sag šul-lu-tu en [an]-ša-kù-ga-ta [el]-[zu-dè]
B	ur-sag šul- <sup>d</sup> utu an-ša-kù-ga-ta [è-da]-zu-dè
A	si-qar an-kù-ga-ta ...
B	š <sup>15</sup> si-gar an-kù-ga-ta ...

A omits the following line of B, but duplicates at least the two lines after that. Further study of AT 453 can be profitable only after collation.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Nougayrol, Ugaritica V 277, and note also for possible relations between the schools of Bogh. and Alalah, AT 454, a Hittite incantation text.

<sup>24</sup> Ugaritica V 310.

<sup>25</sup> These are the *zi-pà* incantations represented by ASKT 11 (see Borger, AOAT 1 1ff.) and Ebeling, ArOr 21 357ff., and the so-called "paradigm series" of incantations (Falkenstein Haupttypen 4). Other rare exceptions include BA 5/5 No. 14 and AJSL 35 141f. (Th 1905—4—9, 23).

Akkadian line is either indented below the Sumerian line it translates, as in Nineveh and southern (Babylonian) texts, or paired with the Sumerian text between horizontal dividing lines, as in many Assur texts. Often the lines are both indented and paired, rarely neither.<sup>26</sup> When the lines are short, and the Akkadian text appears together with the Sumerian on the same line, the Akkadian may either follow the Sumerian or be set between two halves of the Sumerian text line. In either case, the Sumerian and Akkadian are almost always delimited by *Glossenkeile*.<sup>27</sup> At Bogh., this standardization in format cannot be observed. Two incantation fragments have a paired interlinear format (3 and 6), two preserve portions that show only the format Sumerian-*Glossenkeil*-Akkadian (4 and 5; note that this is the earliest attested use of the *Glossenkeil* for this purpose), and one, in MB rather than Hittite ductus, is arranged in a parallel column translation format (7), which in the first millennium is reserved mainly for proverbs, some *edubba* compositions, and certain special incantation texts with an apparently didactic function.<sup>28</sup> At Ugarit, the bilingual proverbs likewise are not present only in the parallel column format standard for this genre in the first millennium, as Ugaritica V No. 164 is arranged with interlinear translations.

The absence of the standardized translation formats of later periods for the various genres of MB bilinguals from Bogh. and Ugarit corresponds to the situation in the Old Babylonian period, where the close to forty published bilingual texts likewise show no uniformity or pattern in translation format. However, the genres represented at Bogh. and Ugarit — overwhelmingly incantations and proverbs — contrast markedly to the extremely varied groups of OB bilinguals.<sup>29</sup> This

<sup>26</sup> E.g. STT 182 and KAR 252 iii 4 ff.

<sup>27</sup> Instead of using *Glossenkeile*, late Babylonian bilinguals will often write the Akkadian between the two halves of the Sumerian text line in smaller script. Cf. Lambert, JCS 21 126, but note that his generalizations on format may have to be qualified.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. note 25 above, and Lambert, JCS 21 126. Lambert suggests that there is “no good reason” to consider the parallel column arrangement pedagogic. One “good reason” might be that the kinds of texts regularly found in this format in the first millennium are lexical and grammatical texts and other compendia, the list-like incantation texts mentioned above, and other texts associated specifically with the schools, such as proverbs and *edubba* compositions. On the other hand, the bilinguals known to have been utilized outside the schools, those belonging to the categories of *kalātu* and *āšipūtu*, were regularly transmitted in the interlinear format.

<sup>29</sup> The author hopes to study the OB bilinguals in a future article.

indicates that the process through which many genres of OB Sumerian literature — royal hymns and correspondance, epics and myths,<sup>30</sup> to name only the most obvious — left the stream of tradition<sup>31</sup> was already underway, although the Ludingira fragments indicate that the process was far from complete.<sup>32</sup> The existence of an incantation-prayer at Bogh. and Alalah indicates that the creation of new Sumerian texts was also underway<sup>33</sup>. The absence at Bogh. and Ugarit of Emesal liturgical texts — the third major group of bilinguals in the first millennium — can perhaps be explained by the limited appeal of these texts outside Mesopotamia.

In the Old Babylonian period the bilingual text was a rarity, and the Akkadian translations were seemingly the work of individual scribes, done to facilitate their understanding of the Sumerian text, or as a school exercise. In the first millennium, bilingual texts are the rule, although there remains a substantial number of unilingual texts, many, of course, possessing bilingual duplicates. The Akkadian translations are not the work of the individual scribes, but are relatively fixed accompaniments of the Sumerian texts. Because at least half of the Sumerian texts from Bogh. are bilingual, one could conclude that the trend to regularly include an Akkadian translation with a Sumerian text had already begun in the Kassite period, and that these translations were generally not composed by the Bogh. scribes, but originated with the Babylonian models upon which the Bogh. copies were ultimately based.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> The only Sumerian epic or mythical compositions of the OB period to be incorporated in the first millennium canon were Lugale and Angim, which are, to be sure, rather atypical. There are however, enough individual bilingual pieces of other "classical" compositions to indicate that although the corpus of OB Sumerian epics and myths remained outside the first millennium stream of tradition, it had not been entirely lost. These pieces are:

1. Lugabanda and Enmerkar (two pieces; see Wilcke, *Das Lugabandaepos*)
2. Enlil and Ninlil (JRAS 1919 190f. [80—11—12, 484])
3. Enki and Ninmah (OECT 6 pl. 16 [K. 2168])
4. Ziusudra (?; CT 46 5)
5. Myth of Sud (see Civil, JNES 26 200f.)

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Falkenstein in *Die Literaturen der Welt*, p. 6.

<sup>32</sup> Indeed, it never was totally complete, as the texts in note 30 indicate.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Falkenstein, MDOG 85 7ff.

<sup>34</sup> This is, however, not true with respect to the text edited below (No. 7), which despite its MB ductus appears to have been written and translated by a Babylonianizing scribe in Bogh. (see the comment on r. 7). Other texts with MB ductus have been attributed by Falkenstein. ZANF 11 11, to Babylonian

In summary, the bilinguals from Bogh. and Ugarit indicate that many of the processes that transformed the classical OB Sumerian corpus into the Sumerian corpus known from the first millennium — rejection of certain OB genres, the creation of new genres, and the regular addition of an Akkadian translation — were operative in the Kassite period. Another process, the standardization of translation formats, had not yet begun. Before we can be more specific as to the extent to which the bilingual corpus had developed in the Kassite period, our small sample of texts will have to be appreciably enlarged. But the evidence from the time of Tiglathpilesar I,<sup>35</sup> only a few centuries after the fall of Hattusas, indicates that much of the bilingual tradition known from the first millennium was fully formed before the end of the Hittite empire.

### *Catalogue*<sup>36</sup>

#### **Trilinguals**

##### **1. Hymn to Iškur (KUB 4 4)**

Three parallel columns preserved: phonetic Sumerian, Akkadian, and Hittite. This is the only one of five fragments of the otherwise unknown hymn reconstructed by Laroche, RA 58 69ff. that preserves both Sumerian (traces only) and Akkadian text portions. The other fragments are:

KUB 4 5 + KBo 12 73 — Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian, Hittite

KUB 4 6 — Sumerian, phonetic Sumerian

KUB 4 8 — Akkadian, Hittite

KBo 12 72 — Akkadian only

While it is possible that any or all of these, with the exception of KUB 4 5 +, are fragments of four-column Sumerian — phonetic Sumerian — Akkadian — Hittite texts (KUB 4 4 certainly is), none have been preserved intact.

---

scholars in residence at Bogh., whereas Köcher, KUB 37 p. i n. 2 considers them to be Babylonian imports. In those cases where orthography as well as ductus are Babylonian, the origin of the tablets—Bogh. or Babylonia—might be established by a chemical analysis of the tablets. Note also the possibility of a Babylonian import among the Sumero-Akkadian texts from Ugarit (Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* V p. 210<sup>1</sup> and Krecher, *UF* 1 133 and 147).

<sup>35</sup> See n. 2, above.

<sup>36</sup> At the head of each catalogue entry is information regarding the number of columns and the translation format (parallel columns, on one line separated by Glossenkeile, or interlinear; if interlinear, whether paired between dividing lines or not).



## 2. "The Message of Ludingira" (KUB 4 97 + KUB 4 2)

Three parallel columns preserved: phonetic Sumerian, Akkadian, and Hittite. This text originally had a column of Sumerian in normal orthography, and is thus identical in format with its duplicate Ugaritica V No. 169, a Boghazköi import found at Ras Shamra, edited by Nougayrol and Laroche, *ibid.* pp. 310ff. and 773ff. For unilingual Sumerian OB duplicates, see Civil, JNES 23 1ff. The difficulties in establishing the text of this composition in the face of the frequently divergent and equally corrupt OB versions have not been ameliorated by the publication of the Ras Shamra duplicate.

## Incantations

## 3. KBo 7 1 + KUB 37 115, and KBo 7 2 (edited in part II)

One column; paired interlinear. KBo 7 1 and KUB 37 115 join physically. KBo 7 2, which was thought to be definitely part of this tablet during the reconstruction of the text, proved upon examination to be an independent duplicate.<sup>37</sup> The designations "obverse" and "reverse" on the copies of KBo 7 1 and KUB 37 115 are to be reversed.

The obverse of the tablets contains a poorly preserved incantation of the Marduk-Ea type.<sup>38</sup> The reverse contains an incantation-prayer to Šamaš parallel, with some divergence in line order, to STT 197 — used in a *mīs pi* ritual<sup>39</sup> — and K. 9235 (Sumerian only; Laessøe Bit Rimki pl. II:V) // K. 4862 (Geers copy; recognized by M. Civil)<sup>40</sup> // 4R 23 No. 3 (+?)<sup>41</sup> 4R 13 No. 2 + Sm 542 (join communicated by W. G. Lambert; Laessøe Bit Rimki pl. III:IX), the *ki-utu-kam* for the second

<sup>37</sup> KBo 7 1 + KUB 37 115 is burnt, warped and quite thick, whereas KBo 7 2 is very much lighter and thinner, and is unwarped.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Falkenstein Haupttypen 44 ff.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. the text's concluding lines:

a-lam dingir-re-ne igi-zu-še mu-un-gu-bi-iš  
ana šalam ili anné ša ina maḥrika izzazzu  
nam gal-bi tar-ra-an-še  
šimta rabīš šimšu

"Grandly ordain the fate of this divine image that stands before you!"

Christopher Walker has kindly informed me that this text has no parallels among the *mīs pi/pi pi* texts studied by him.

<sup>40</sup> Also identified by Christopher Walker (cf. JCS 21 7). There is no evidence that this fragment joins 4R 23 or 4R 13 2 + Sm 542, although it preserves a portion of the text (= STT 197:20—22, 27—39) which they do not. KAR 55 is an Akkadian šu-fl-la whose first lines parallel in part the beginning of the text (cf. Laessøe Bit Rimki 35).

<sup>41</sup> The texts do not join physically.

"house" of the *bīt rimki* ceremony.<sup>42</sup> The ending of the Bogh. text has not been preserved, so that we lack any indication of the type of ritual in which it was utilized.<sup>43</sup> It is an important text, because it indicates that this type of incantation-prayer, unknown in OB, was extant by the time of the Bogh. archives. This fact is also evidenced by another incantation-prayer from this period, AT 453 (see p. 5 above). It is certain, however, that the ancients did not make the distinction we do between this kind of incantation-prayer and the classical Sumerian incantation, not only because both are in the first millennium prefaced by *én* "incantation", but also because this incantation-prayer was included on the same tablet as a classical Marduk-Ea type.

#### 4. KUB 34 3

One column fragment; translations on the same line as the Sumerian, set off by *Glossenkeil*. This fragment is from the main theme of a prophylactic incantation (see Falkenstein Haupttypen 40ff.). In OB incantations of this type, the verbs in this theme generally end in (-dè)-en, indicating that the demons are being addressed in the second person singular (cf. the example in Falkenstein Haupttypen 40f.). In similar passages of first millennium texts, where final -en often drops (see Poebel GSG par. 484), the resulting -NE (i.e. -dè-) was sometimes misinterpreted as a third plural suffix -ne in the Akkadian translation (e.g. in the concluding theme of legitimizing incantations, see Falkenstein, l.c. 32<sup>1</sup>). Since the dates of the first millennium translations are thus fixed to a point after the -en dropped, it is interesting to note that this has already occurred in the fragment KUB 34 3. Unfortunately, the Akkadian verbs are not preserved.

#### 5. KUB 34 4

One column fragment; format as No. 4. This tiny fragment is possibly not bilingual at all, or at least some of the Sumerian lines have been left without translation. Note *én* (line 4) and *dasal*-[*lú*-*hi*] (line 8), both to the right of the *Glossenkeil*, where one would expect

<sup>42</sup> Laessøe hesitantly assigned Sm 542 to the fifth "house" (Laessøe *Bīt Rimki* 54 and 56), but the join with 4R 13 No. 2 proves it definitely to be the *ki-<sup>a</sup>utu-kam* of the second "house". Cf. now also Borger, JCS 21 7.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. the indications at the end of STT 197 (n. 39 above) and the characteristic formulae of the *bīt rimki* texts (Kunstmann, LSS NF 2 52f.). Note also the remark of Laessøe that *ki-<sup>a</sup>utu-kam* prayers of the *bīt rimki* cycle were possibly used in other ritual series as well (*Bīt Rimki* 51f.). LKA 75, a duplicate of the *ki-<sup>a</sup>utu-kam* of the third "house" of *bīt rimki* ("Q" in the edition of Borger, JCS 21 1ff.) was apparently *not* used in the royal ritual (r. 19 has *lú-u<sub>x</sub>-lu* for the *lugal-e* of the other texts; cf. Borger, JCS 21 2 and 5f.).

Akkadian. However, note also <sup>d</sup>*Marduk* (AMAR.UTU) in line 7, which suggests an Akkadian translation after all. The text is from the ritual instructions of a Marduk-Ea incantation, in partially phonetic Sumerian orthography (u-me-ni-in-e, u-mi-ni-en-zu).

#### 6. KUB 37 III

Two columns; paired interlinear. Occasionally translations are on the same line as the Sumerian and set off by a *Glossenkeil*. The Sumerian orthography is frequently phonetic. The obverse contains the introductory theme of a prophylactic type incantation (see Falkenstein Haupttypen 39 for similar passages), and the reverse contains the end of the main theme (cf. *ibid.* 40 ff.) plus a very elaborate zi-pà formula (cf. *ibid.* 34 f.).

#### 7. KUB 37 100a + b (+) 101 (+) 102 (+) 103 (+) 106 (partially edited below)

Parallel columns; MB ductus. The first incantation on the obverse, reconstructed from 100a + b (+) 103 (+) 106 (placed from left to right in that order; note that the copy places 100b two lines too low in relation to 100a), duplicates CT 4 3 rev. (OB Sumerian) and its first millennium bilingual duplicates (originally edited by Falkenstein Haupttypen 96 ff.; re-edited with the Bogh. text below). The obverse of 100a (Sumerian only preserved) continues with a Marduk-Ea incantation, unusual because it concludes on the reverse with a thanksgiving formula generally associated with the ki-<sup>d</sup>utu-kam, and known rarely in other genres of Sumerian literature (cf. the references given by Borger JCS 21 7; note that the incantation CT 16 7:260 ff. to which the formula is also appended is not a normal "classical" Sumerian incantation [Falkenstein Haupttypen 26 f]. Add now an OB occurrence: Castellino, *Oriens Antiquus* 8 27:105 ff.) The fragments 101 and 102 cannot be placed, but probably restore the remaining two incantations on the reverse of 100a.

### Miscellaneous

#### 8. KUB 4 23

One column fragment; paired interlinear. The first and second person forms suggest either a hymn or "wisdom" composition.

*Sample Texts.**CT 4 3:35ff. and Duplicates<sup>44</sup>**Composition*

A CT 4 3:35ff. (Old Babylonian unilingual Sumerian)

B KUB 37 100a + b + 106:1'ff.

C Sm 28 + 83 (NA; see photograph below)<sup>44a</sup>

C' BM 128027 (NA; rev. preserves first signs of r. 32f., according to a written communication of C. Walker. For the obv., see Walker, BiOr 26 77)

C'' UET 6/2 393:9-11 (NB school excerpt of r. 5-7)

NB: C' and C'' have been incorporated into the text of C given below.



Sm 28 + 83

*Transliteration<sup>45</sup>*

35 A   <sup>d</sup>en-ki-ke<sub>4</sub> abzu-ta [h<sub>4</sub>ul-la]

36 A   nam-igi-h<sub>4</sub>ul-h<sub>4</sub>ul nam-igi-ša<sub>6</sub>-ša<sub>6</sub>

<sup>44</sup> Cf. the discussion in the catalogue above, No. 7, and Falkenstein Haupt-typen 73.

<sup>44a</sup> Published with permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.

<sup>45</sup> Line numbering follows CT 4 3. Only minimal restoration of the text of B and C has been attempted.

- B nam-igi'ḫúl'-[ ]
- 37 A nam-gal-gal nam-bi tar-ra  
B nam-gal-gal [ ]
- r. 1 A lú-libiš-gig-ga ba-an-gur<sub>4</sub>-gur<sub>4</sub>-re  
B lú libiš-a g[ig! ]
- 2 A lú-a šà-díḫ-ba ba-an-ši-in-ḫun-e  
B lú-[a] [š]à-dib-ba [ ]
- 3 A lú-a šà-ga ba-an-ši-íḫ-du<sub>10</sub>-ge  
B lú-[a] [š]à ba-an-š[i-íḫ-du<sub>10</sub>]-ge  
li-ba-šu [ ] x [ ]
- 4 A nam-erím-e gú ki-bé gi<sub>4</sub>-a  
B nam-erím-e [ ]-a  
ma-mi-ta AN a-na aš-ri-ša [ú-ta-ar]
- 5 A dingir-re-e-ne šu-dù-dù-a-na ba-an-ak-eš  
B dingir-[el-[n]e šu-x[ ]-eš  
ti-ri-iš ú-ba'-ni ša DINGIR ma-la i-[ ]
- C níg-nam-dingir-re-e-ne-ke<sub>4</sub> šu-dù-dù-ba in-gar-re-eš  
šá DINGIR.MEŠ'xx' [ ]
- 6 A nun-lugal-e-ne ba-an-ši-gam-e-dè-eš  
B nun-l[u]gal'-e-n[e ]-eš  
a-na ru-bé-e ša-ra-ni ú-ka-ni-[šu]
- C nun-lugal-e-ne ba-an-ši-in-gam-[x]  
ru-bu-ú u šar-ri ka-an-šu-uš
- 7 A an-na a-ba-te an-zà-bi-šè ba-du<sub>10</sub>-ge  
B an-na [b]a-te an-[ ]-eš  
a-na AN iṭ-ḫé-ma AN-ú a-na pá-ti-šú-n[u ú-ti-ib]
- C an-na ba-te an-na zà-bi-šè ba-an-du<sub>10</sub>-ge-eš  
a-na AN-e iṭ-ḫe-e-ma AN-e ana pat-ti-šu-<nu> ú-tib
- 8 A ki-a a-ba-te ki-a zà-bi-šè ba-du<sub>10</sub>-g[e]  
B ki-a [b]a-te k[i ]-ge'  
a-na KI iṭ-ḫé-ma KI ana pá-ti-šú [ú-ti-ib]
- C ki-a ba-te ki [ ]  
a-na KI-ti[m ]
- 9 A igi-bi-šè ní-te-gá-da a-ga-bi-šè ḫu-luḫ-fe-da l  
B igi-b[i'-š]è ní-[ ]x-luḫ'-e-dè  
a-na pa-ni-šu pu-luḫ-ḫé-tum ka-an-sà a-na ar-[ki-šu]
- C igi-bi-šè ní-te-g[á ]  
a-na pa-ni-šu pu-luḫ-tú [ ]
- 10 A igi-du<sub>8</sub>-du<sub>8</sub>-bi-šè šu in-sìg-ge  
B igi-[du<sub>8</sub>-d]u<sub>8</sub>-bi-š[è ]  
a-na a-mi-ri-šú ka-mi-is

- C igi-du<sub>8</sub>-du<sub>8</sub>-bi-e-ne-šè [       ]  
*a-me-ru-šu i-*[       ]
- 11 A šu-luḥ mu-pà-da dingir-re-e-ne-ke<sub>4</sub>  
 B [       ]-e-ne  
*šu-luḥ zi¹-kir* [       ]
- C šu-luḥ-ḥa mu-pà-d[a       ]  
*šu-luḥ-ḥa ni-*[*bit*       ]
- 12 A kin-búr-ru-da sikil-la šu-ni-ta gál-la  
 B kin¹-b[úr]-re-t[a       g]ál-la  
*ši-pir<sub>6</sub> piš-ra¹-ti el-le-ti ša i-na q[d¹-ti-šú]*
- C kin-[búr-rul-[       ]  
*ši-pir pi-š[ir-ti       ]*
- 13 A nam-ti zi-šà-gál bar-bi-a gál-la  
 B nam-ti zi-šà¹-[gál       ] gál¹-a  
*ba-la-aṭ na-púš-ti SAL ŠID KI ša ina* [       ]
- C nam-ti-la z[i-šà-gál       ]  
*ba-laṭ šik-nat* [*na-piš-ti       ]*
- 14 A arḥ[ú]š šà-lá-sù za-gìn-na šu-tag-ga  
 B šà-ar[ḥú]š šà-lá¹-[sù za-gìn-n)a [šu-tag]-ga  
[       ]x *ri-me-nu-ú li-pit qa-ti u[q-ni-i]*
- C arḥúš šà-lá-[sù       ]  
*i-lit-tum*[       ]
- 15 A alan-ša<sub>6</sub>-ga-gin<sub>x</sub> x x gub-bu-da-na  
 B alan-sig<sub>6</sub>-ga-g[in<sub>x</sub> gub-b]u-ta-na  
ALAN *bu-un-na-né-e dām-qu li-iz-z[iz]*
- C alan-sig<sub>6</sub>-[ga-gin<sub>x</sub>       ]  
*ki-ma šal-mi* [       ]
- 16 A lú mu-pàd-bi-šè [kil-bi-šè gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>  
 B lú mu-pàd-bi-[šè       ] gi-[g]i  
*a-na ša šum-šú iz-ku-ru lib-bu aš-ri¹-ša li-[ti-ir]*
- C lú mu-pàd-[       ]  
*šá za-kar* [*šu-mi-šu       ]*
- 17 A nam-erím-e ki-[lú-ku<sub>6</sub>]ru-da-bé  
 B nam-er[i]-ma [       d]ub-dub-bé  
*ma-mi-tum a-na aš-ri-ša li-[ti-ir]*
- C nam-erím [       ]  
*ma-mit a-[na       ]*
- 18 A nam-erím-e lú-ba in-dúb-dúb-bé  
 B nam-er[ím       d]ub-dub-bé  
*ma-mi-tum a-na a-mi-lam ša-a-[ti] li-pu-u[s]*

- C nam-erím [ ]  
ma-mit [ ]
- 19 A níg-ak-a kù-zu lú-a mu-un-tag-tag-[ga]  
B níg-ak-a [ ]-ga!  
kiš-pu ru-ḥu-ú a-mi'-lam lu-u[p-pu-tu]
- C níg-ak-[a][ ]  
up-pi-[šu][ ]
- 20 A tu-ra en-gi-ša<sub>6</sub> níg im-gig-ga  
B tu-ra [ ] níg-gig im'-gig-ga-a  
mur-šu ta-di-ru ša a-na m[a-r]u-uš-[ti ]  
C tu-ra e[n- ]  
mur-šu [ ]
- 21 A da-da zà-ki-a in-gub-gub-bé  
B UD.UD za-za [ ] in-gub-gub-[b]é  
i-na ša-ḥa-aṭ LÚ i-na ka-ma-[ti li-i]t-ta-ziz  
C zà-[ ]
- 22 A nam-erím-e ki-lú-ku<sub>5</sub>-ru-da-bé  
B nam-ri-m[a ]x-ta-[b]é  
mi-qīt ma-mi-ti ša a-na it-[ ] la UD x[ ]
- 23 A zà-še im-gin-gin-e su-din<sup>mušen!</sup>-gin<sub>x</sub>im-[dal]-e  
B zà-šè' in'-[ ] su-di]n-gin<sub>x</sub> in-dal-[ ]  
i-na i-te-e li-it-al-l[ak ki-ma š]u-di-ni [lippariš]
- 24 A anše-edin-na-gin<sub>x</sub> ḥáš im-ši-bad-[du]  
B anše-edin-n[a-gin<sub>x</sub> ] in-DU[ ]  
ki-ma sîr<sup>ir</sup>-ri-im x[ ] x x[ ]
- 25 A du<sub>10</sub>-ge-eš su-bi-a im-ši-ša<sub>6</sub>-[ge]  
B su gú [ ] ba-an-ši-in-[ ]  
ri-šu-tum ša zu-[um-ri-šu ]  
C [ ]-in-sìg-sìg-[ge]  
[ ] zu-um-ra ú-pa-áš-[šah]
- 26 A sa<sub>7</sub>-alan-sa<sub>7</sub>-alan-bi si in-sá-sá  
B sa<sub>7</sub>'-alan x[ ] šu im-[ ]  
bu-un-na-ni-[šú ]  
C sa<sub>7</sub>-alan-bi ḥé-ni-ib-si-sá-e-[dè]  
bu-un-na-ni-šu uš-te-šèr
- 27 A giš-gi-en-gi-na-bi in-ši-in-g[i<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>]  
B giš-gi-e[n- ] ba-an-ši-in-[gi]-[gi]  
mi-na-ti-š[ú'  
C giš-gi-en-gi-na-bi mu-un-ši-in-gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>  
bi-na-ti-šu ú-šal-lam

- 28 A sa ní-te-a-ni in-ši-in-d[úb-dúb-bé]  
 B sa-a ní-[ ] ba-an-ši-in-dub-[dub-bé]  
*še-er-ʔ-a-a[n ]*  
 C sa ní-te-a-ni mu-un-ši-in-dúb-dúb-bu  
*šér-a-an ra-ma-ni-šú ú-šap-šah*
- 29 A zag-še lá-a-bi in-gub-gub-bé  
 B sag-še lá¹-[ ] in-gub-gub-[bé]  
*i-ta-ti-š[ú¹ ]*  
 C du<sub>10</sub>-du<sub>10</sub> zà-è in-gub-gub-bu  
*bir-ki a-ša-te i-kal-la*  
 B adds: a-ga-bi-š[è ]  
*a-na ar-k[i¹-šú ]*
- 30 A á-bi-šè á-sù-sù šu in-ši-ri-e  
 B á-šu-šu [ ] šu im-[ ]  
*mi-n[a-ti-šú ]*  
 C á-bi-šè x x x mu-un-ši-in-gar-ra  
*a-na i-di-šu šá-da-ḥa i-šak-kan*
- 31 A ka-ka-ni gál in-ši-in-tuk<sub>4</sub>-tuk<sub>4</sub>  
 B ka-a-ni [gál -i]n-tag<sub>4</sub>-[tag<sub>4</sub>-ge]  
*a-[ ]*  
 C ka-ka-na gál ši-en-tag<sub>4</sub>  
*pi-i-šu i-pe-ti*
- 32 A ʔasal-lú-ḥi nam-šub ba-an-si  
 B ʔasal-lú-ḥi [ ] ba-an-[ ]  
 C ʔasal-lú-ḥi nam-šub ba-an-si  
*ʔmàrduḥ šip-ta id-di*
- 33 A tu<sub>6</sub>-tu<sub>6</sub>-e abzu-eridu<sup>k1</sup>-ga nam-mu-un-da-búr-re¹  
 B tu<sub>6</sub>-tu<sub>6</sub> abz[u- ] nam-m[u- ]  
 C tu<sub>6</sub>[-t]u<sub>6</sub> abzu-eridu<sup>k1</sup>-ga nam-mu-un-ši-in-búr-ra  
*ši-[pat ] [eri<sub>4</sub>-du<sub>10</sub>] a-a ip-pa-šir tu<sub>6</sub>-én*
- 34 A tu<sub>6</sub> én-é-nu-ru

### Translation

- 35 Enki, who joyfully in Apsu,  
 Determines a happy fate,  
 A beneficent fate, a great fate,  
 r. 1 Will make the sick man feel well,  
 Will soothe the angry man,  
 Will make the man happy.



He (Enki) who turns back the neck of the (malevolent) Oath  
to its place (of origin),

Akk. B: He [turns back] the (malevolent) divine (?) Oath to its place  
(of origin).

- 5 The gods acted at his bidding (lit. "pointing"),

Akk. B: The pointing of the gods ...

Princes and kings submitted to him.

Akk. B: They made kings submit to the prince.

He approaches (Akk.: approached) heaven, and gladdens (Akk.:  
gladdened) heaven unto its outermost reaches.

He approaches (Akk.: approached) earth, and gladdens (Akk.:  
gladdened) earth unto its outermost reaches.

Fear is before him, fright behind him,

Akk. B: Fears are before him, they are cowering behind him.

- 10 He *salutes* his viewers.

The divinely ordained purification,

The pure art of nullification (Akk. B adds: which is) in his hand,

The life of living creatures (Akk. B adds: which is) at his side,

The compassionate, merciful one, adorned with lapis,

Akk. C: The child ...

- 15 When he stands ... like a fine figurine,

Akk. B: Let a fine figurine of features (?) stand!

He turns back (the malevolent Oath) to its place (of origin) for  
him who invokes his name.

Akk. B: Let him turn it (the malevolent Oath) back to its place (of origin)  
for him who invokes his name!

The (malevolent) Oath, to the man who swore it,

Akk. B: Let him turn back the (malevolent) Oath to its place (of origin)!

He will push the (malevolent) Oath back to that man.

Akk. B: Let him push the (malevolent) Oath back to that man!

The clever sorcery which afflicts the (sick) man,

Akk. B: Sorcery and "venom" afflict the man.

- 20 The sickness and depression which causes illness,

He will set far off to the side.

Akk. B: Let it stand without at the man's side!

The (malevolent) Oath, to the man who swore it,

Akk. B: The blow of the (malevolent) Oath ...

He will make it go off to the side and fly away like a bat.

Akk. B: Let it go off to the side and fly away like a bat!

He will chase it away like a wild ass.

- 25 He will make his (the sick man's) body feel better,

Akk. B: The joy of his body ...

C: ... he will sooth the body.

Restore his appearance to normal,  
 Heal his limbs,  
 And enable him to relax his muscles.

He will support his swaying sides.

C: He will support his buckling knees.

B adds: Behind him . . .

30 He will enable him to swing his arms.

He will open his mouth.

Marduk has cast the spell!

May no one be able to nullify the incantation of Apsu-Eridu!

Akk. C: May the incantation of . . . Eridu not be nullified!

### *Commentary*

The text began with a long catalogue of the patient's afflictions, and continues here with an elaborate description of Enki in all his magnificent power (35-r. 15). This sets the stage for the patient's cure (r. 16-31), followed by the concluding formula.

35. This line does not exist in B, which reads before line 36:

asal-[lú-ḫi	]	
Á.K[A]L ḫI[	]	(or á-sàg x ḫI[ ])
a-a-ni en-[ki	]	
inim-zu mu-u[n?-	]	
inim-zu [	]	
dumu?-sal-la [	]	

These lines, which represent an unorthodox Marduk-Ea formula, require collation. They have no parallel in A; C is broken at this point. Falkenstein Haupttypen 73 remarked that the sudden appearance of Asalluḫi in r. 32 of A and C was unrelated to the rest of the text, so that these Bogh. lines might represent a more complete version of the incantation. Note, however, that it is unlikely, that the Bogh. text, which in its broken state numbers fifty lines, originally contained enough lines to complete the first part of the incantation as known from A and C. Thus, it is possible that the first part of the Bogh. text was entirely different than the first part of A and C.

### *Reverse*

1. Note that B writes libiš in the OB manner, ÁB.ŠĀ, and not ÁB x ŠĀ, as do later texts.

5. If the Akk. of B is to be restored *i[baššú]*, the entire line is difficult to relate syntactically<sup>46</sup>. The *mala* probably derives from an incorrect understanding of the Sum. a-na in šu-dù-dù-a-na, and must also be connected with the níg-na-m in the Sumerian of C and C". For šu-dù = *ubāna tarāšu*, cf. Lambert BWL 119:7f. For a sense similar to the one here, see Ugaritica V p. 294:26'f., where šu-dù = *ṭemu*. Note that C replaces the personal suffix -ani (+ a) with the incorrect impersonal suffix -bi (+ a). Errors of this kind, based on a misunderstanding of the Sumerian two-class system, begin in late OB Sumerian texts, and in fact are frequent elsewhere in text A (r. 9, 10, 13, 16, 25, 26, 27, 29).

6. If the verb *kunnušu* of the Akk. of B is not taken literally, but as *kanāšu*, a more sensible, though incorrect in terms of the Sumerian, translation can be made ("They bowed to the prince of kings").

7. This and the following line are perhaps plays on certain negative descriptions of malevolent entities. Compare, for example, TCL 16 89:3f. // Langdon BL 3:3 (cf. Falkenstein, OLZ 1933 303f., Ebeling, Ar Or 17/1 206ff., and Jestin, RA 41 58ff.):

an-né(var. -e) ba-te im nu(var. omits)-šèg-šèg  
 ki-a(var. omits) ba-te ú-šem nu-mú-mú(var. DI)  
 "He approaches heaven, and it no longer rains.

"He approaches earth, and vegetation no longer grows."

The final -eš in the Sumerian of B and C may represent an incorrect accusative third person personal plural inserted under the influence of the Akkadian plurale tantum *šamú*. Note that the prospective preformative ù > a- in this line and the next is lost in B and C, possibly because of haplography with the preceding suffix -a. Note the use of the typically peripheral syllabic values *pá* (BA) and *hé* in this and the following line, as well as *pír*<sub>6</sub> (NAM) in r. 12, and *dám* (UD) in r. 15. Note also the following phonetic writings in the Sumerian orthography:

a. -ta for -(e)da	r. 12, 22
b. da <sub>7</sub> -da <sub>7</sub> za-za for da-da zà	r. 21
c. nam-ri-ma for nam-erím-ma	r. 17, 22
d. dub for dúb	r. 18, 28
e. gi for gi <sub>4</sub>	r. 27
f. sag for zag	r. 29
g. á-šu-šu for á-sù-sù	r. 30

<sup>46</sup> A restoration *i-[pu-šu]*, because of the Sum, ak, is also possible, but is equally difficult syntactically.

Certain of these writings exhibit characteristics that Falkenstein considered to be Bogh. rather than Babylonian (ZANF 11 9ff.): the lack of distinction between voiced and voiceless consonants (a and f), and the use of CVC signs (d and f). These orthographic features, together with the use of certain values in the Akkadian syllabary mentioned above, as well as the frequent mistranslations in the Akkadian of B, strongly suggest that this text, despite its MB ductus, was written in Bogh. by a local scribe, who himself made the Akkadian translation.

10. šú — sig must be some sort of gesture; the translation *kamāsu* seems only approximate. šu — sig also occurs in KAR 14 ii 44f. (Lugale), where it replaces the verb šu — e of the OB text (SEM 32 ii 24):

- OB: giriš-gin<sub>x</sub> šu ḥa-ba-e-dè-e[n-zé-en]  
 "May you be handeled/I have handeled you like a butterfly!"  
 KAR: giriš-gin<sub>x</sub> šu ḥa-ba-an-sig-ge-[en-zé-en]  
*kīma kuršipti e-mi-is-ku-nu-[ti]*  
 "I have destroyed you like a butterfly!"

The translation assumes that *mēsu* "to destroy"<sup>47</sup> suits the context better than *mēšu* "to neglect"<sup>47</sup>. Neither verb, however, illuminates the line under consideration here.

11. Lines 10 and 11 are on one line in B.

14. For ŠILAM (this reading here, rather than TÜR, suggested by Langdon, AfO 8 238) = arḥúš, and for šà-lá-sù, see Römer Königshymnen 245f. and Sjöberg, TCS 3 p. 105. The *ilitu* of C can possibly be explained as a partial homonym of *litu*, from a misunderstood ŠILAM.

15ff. B translates all preserved verbs from here on with Akkadian precativ constructions. In the classical Sumerian incantation, ritual instructions replace the long description of Enki and his powers found in this text, and the resulting cure of the patient, beginning here with r. 16, would be expressed by Sumerian verbs with the prefix ḥé-, corresponding to Akkadian precativ forms (see Falkenstein Haupttypen 62ff.). In this incantation, however, the cure is described not as the anticipated result of the correct performance of a ritual, but as the

<sup>47</sup> AHW "zu Boden werfen". A meaning "to destroy" is suggested by the equations with *dāku* and Sum. *me-ri-gaz*. For šu-sig, cf. also Gordon, JCS 12 60. A literal translation of the Sum. verb leads to a meaning "to swat" or perhaps even "to crush". which is well-suited to the image of the butterfly.

result of Enki's direct intervention, and verbs are formed with the simple Sumerian verbal prefix *l-* (replaced by *mu-* in C) in the present-future tense. The Akkadian of C correctly translates these verbs as indicative present-future forms, but B, under the influence of the standard verb pattern described above, translates the verbs as Akkadian precatives. This begins in B one line too early, since line 15 is clearly still part of the description of Enki. The translation of *alan* as *ALAN bunnanné* in B is puzzling, since *damqu* clearly can modify only *šalmu*.

17. The preserved Sumerian of B appears identical to line 18, though the translation approximates the text of A for this line. Perhaps inverse dittography is involved here, indicating that the text was copied from another tablet, rather than from dictation. For *nam-r[i-m]a*, cf. 1. 22 and Sauren, ZANF 23 22f. for similar writings in Ur III Nippur.

19. This line seems to have been skipped in the copy of KUB 37 103. *up-pi-šu* in C = *upišu* "witchcraft" (see ŠL 597.130b).

20. For *en-gi-ša<sub>6</sub>*, known otherwise only as a stone, cf. 1.30 of the incantation's obverse. *tādīru*, otherwise unattested, is apparently the same as *tādirtu* (cf. CAD s.v. *adāru* A).

23. *ZAG-še* of A is here interpreted according to the *zà-šè* of B, rather than as in line 29, below.

24. *sir<sup>ir</sup>-ri-im* is a third confirmation of the reading *sirrimu* rather than \**purimu* (see Nougayrol, JCS 2 203ff. and Lambert BWL 305 for two other references supporting this reading). *ḥáš-bad* is here interpreted on analogy with *du<sub>10</sub>-bad* "to move quickly" (see most recently Römer Königshymnen 63).

26. The use of the Sumerian prefix *ḥé-* in C, even though the Akkadian translation of C follows the Sumerian of A, is a reversion to the classical Sumerian incantation style described in the note to r. 15ff., above. The incorrect writing of the compound verb *si — sa* in C is not uncommon in first millennium Sumerian texts, especially with this particular verb, possibly because of the phonetic similarity between the two components, which might have led scribes to treat the compound simply as a reduplicated verb (numerous examples in CAD s.v. *ešēru*<sup>48</sup>; cf. also Kärki, StOr 35 p. 91 for an example from an OB royal inscription). Examples of this occurring with other compound verbs are:

<i>mu-un-ki-tuš</i>	KAR 4:10
<i>mu-un-še-ša<sub>4</sub></i>	Langdon SBP 268:25
<i>bí-in-šu-du<sub>7</sub></i>	TCS 2 No. 26:8

<sup>48</sup> In an OB literary text, see OECT 1 pl. 4 iv 20.

29. For *zag-še*, see most recently Wilcke, *Lugalbandaepos* 179, and Sjöberg, TCS 3 139.

30. For *á-sù-sù* = *šadāhu*, see most recently Wilcke, *Lugalbandaepos* 180. The traces in C, which possibly involve an erasure, are unclear, but not *á-sù-sù*.

31. For *ka-ka* as an older form of *ka* "mouth", see Landsberger, MSL 9 145<sup>2</sup>.

32. For this line, see Falkenstein Haupttypen 70 and his comment on p. 73, and cf. the comment to 1.35, above.

33. The -e of A is difficult to account for, but the translation offered for this line gives better sense than that in Falkenstein Haupttypen 99 („Die Beschwörungsformel soll im Apsû, in Eridu, nicht gelöst werden!"). For a similar line, cf. PBS 1/2 131:18f. (see van Dijk, Or NS 38 543 and 545):

nam-šub-eridu<sup>k1</sup>-ga . . . nam-mu-da-búr-e

"May no one be able to nullify the spell of Eridu . . ."