

Burn your way to success

Studies in the Mesopotamian Ritual and Incantation Series *Šurpu*

by

Francis James Michael Simons

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Classics, Ancient History and Archaeology

School of History and Cultures

College of Arts and Law

University of Birmingham

March 2017

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

Abstract

The ritual and incantation series *Šurpu* 'Burning' is one of the most important sources for understanding religious and magical practice in the ancient Near East. The purpose of the ritual was to rid a sufferer of a divine curse which had been inflicted due to personal misconduct. The series is composed chiefly of the text of the incantations recited during the ceremony. These are supplemented by brief ritual instructions as well as a ritual tablet which details the ceremony in full.

This thesis offers a comprehensive and radical reconstruction of the entire text, demonstrating the existence of a large, and previously unsuspected, lacuna in the published version. In addition, a single tablet, tablet IX, from the ten which comprise the series is fully edited, with partitur transliteration, eclectic and normalised text, translation, and a detailed line by line commentary.

Dedicated to my mum, Lesley, who has read the whole thing
despite the lack of murders.
Also, to Laura and Ben, without whom I'd have starved to death
5 years ago.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to several people who have offered assistance during the writing of this thesis. Two people must be singled (doubled?) out. Henry Stadhouders and Elyze Zomer have put up with dozens of (often stupid) e-mails and skype messages a day with complete equanimity. They have offered consistent and continuous support over a period of several years. Their help has been of inestimable value in solving the problems of *Šurpu*.

I am very grateful to the denizens of the British Museum tablet room. In particular, I should like to thank Christopher Walker, who drew my attention to BM 33636 and BM 33584, and John Taylor who has provided photos and collations when I could not make it to the museum.

A vast swathe of the Assyriological community has received e-mails and questions from me since I started writing. Anybody generous (or foolish) enough to respond positively usually received a dozen follow-up questions or a large chunk of writing and a request for their thoughts. I am very grateful to all of them for their help: Hannelore Agnetheler, Odette Boivin, Jay Crisostomo, Jeanette Fincke, Enrique Jiménez, Evelyne Koubkova, Mikko Luukko, Stefan Maul, Daniel Schwemer, Selena Wisnom and Martin Worthington

I am also indebted to Kate Kelley for first suggesting, then enforcing, a writing pact which ensured that rather than frittering days away, actual words appeared. This has been particularly valuable over the final few weeks.

My thanks are due to the Assyriological staff and students of Julius-Maximilians Universität, Würzburg, in particular Mikko Luukko, who made me very comfortable for several days in their marvellous library.

Finally, there is absolutely no chance that this thesis would exist were it not for the constant and unwavering support of Birgit Haskamp and Dr Alasdair Livingstone. My first knowledge of the ancient Near East came from them, as did my earliest training in Akkadian and Sumerian. They saved me from Egyptology, suggested the topic of this thesis and followed the progress of my research, often with more interest than I had for it. I owe them a very great debt.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1-6
History of research	2-5
Structure of thesis	6
Chapter 1 - A Proposal for the Reconstruction of <i>Šurpu</i>	7-23
Tablet I	7-8
Tablet V-VI	8
Tablet V-VI exploded	8-9
Tablet VIII restored	9
Evidence of the catalogues	9-14
Tablet VIII	14-17
Place of tablet VIII in <i>Šurpu</i>	17-20
Subscript of IX explained	20-21
Conclusion	21-22
Comparison of recensions	22-23
Chapter 2 - Tablet IX	24-55
Edition	28-55
Sigla	28
Partitur	29-45
Eclectic text, normalisation and facing translation	46-55
Chapter 3 - Line-by-line commentary	56-116
<i>Kultgötterbeschwörung</i>	56-91
List of <i>māmītu</i>	99-113
Washing ritual	114-116
Excursus – Kusu	117-137
Conclusion	138
Bibliography	139-147

List of Tables

Table 1	Incantations of Recension β	10-11
Table 2	Incipits of Reiner's text and Recension α	12
Table 3	Tablet VIII Incantations	14
Table 4	Recension α	21
Table 5	<i>Šurpu</i>	22
Table 6	<i>Šurpu</i> IX Sigla	28
Table 7	Feast Gods	125
Table 8	Feast Gods redux	127

Introduction

The ritual and incantation series *Šurpu* ‘Burning’, at over a thousand lines, is the longest and most detailed Mesopotamian composition to deal with assuagement of divine displeasure. The text consists of dozens of incantations, spread over 10 Tablets,¹ which were recited with ritual accompaniment during an elaborate ceremony. The majority of the incantations are written in Akkadian, though some also feature interlinear Sumerian translations, and the final tablet of the series is written entirely in Sumerian. The ceremony involved four distinct stages, the first two and the last of which have been known since Zimmern’s 1896 *editio princeps* of the text, while the third is presented here for the first time, having been newly discovered during the course of the present research. The first stage consisted of the recitation of several extensive lists of offences that may have been committed to incur divine sanction, coupled with a plea that the sanction be removed. The second stage was the eponymous burning ritual, in which the patient’s offences were likened to various materials that were then burnt, symbolising the destruction of the patient’s problems and thereby removing them in an act of sympathetic magic. The third stage is unfortunately poorly preserved but seems to have consisted of various acts of magical transference in which the patient’s problems were passed into objects and locations and then absorbed, either by other people, by animals, or into the earth. The final stage of the ceremony, re-edited in chapter 2, involved the invocation of an extensive list of divine figures and a re-enumeration of some of the sins listed in the first stage, followed by a ritual purification using sanctified water. This is followed by a Tablet of *Kultmittelbeschwörungen*, a type of incantation designed to enhance the ritual efficacy of objects, such as juniper and water, used during the ceremony.

Approximately 170 tablets and fragments of *Šurpu* are extant, over 100 of which were found in the 19th century excavations of Aššurbanipal’s library at Nineveh. Outside of Nineveh, fragments have been found at practically every major literary centre in Mesopotamia, as well as at some smaller sites. Manuscripts have so far been found at Aššur, Babylon, Kish, Khorsabad, Nimrud, Sippar, Sultantepe, Ur and Uruk. No *Šurpu* tablet so far discovered dates to earlier than the first millennium BC, though a small selection of the text is known from earlier copies. A Middle Babylonian *sammeltablet* (compilation tablet) from Aššur (KAR 226) containing an assortment of anti-witchcraft incantations includes an early form of an incantation belonging to the newly discovered tablet discussed in chapter 1.² Many of the *Kultmittelbeschwörungen* from the final tablet have been found on Old Babylonian tablets.³ There is no manuscript evidence, however, that *Šurpu* existed before the first millennium – the incantations found on *sammeltablet* are in a clearly distinct context and their contents differ substantially from the established text of the series, while the *Kultmittelbeschwörungen* are common to many ritual and incantation texts. Reiner has argued that *Šurpu* was a Middle Babylonian composition, based in part on the existence of Old Babylonian copies of the *Kultmittelbeschwörungen*, but chiefly on the widely held understanding that the major works of Mesopotamian literature were first canonised during the Kassite period.⁴ It is impossible, given the currently known exemplars, however, to give more than a *terminus ante quem* for the

¹ ‘Tablets’ in this sense refers not to individual lumps of clay, but rather to discrete sections of the text roughly comparable to chapters. In this thesis, wherever the individual manuscripts are meant rather than the chapters, ‘tablets’ is left uncapitalised. All Tablet numbers used in this introduction are those of the revised numbering presented in chapter 1 below.

² Abusch and Schwemer 2016: 157-166.

³ e.g. Ist Ni 2399, Falkenstein 1931: 99-100.

⁴ Reiner 1958: 2.

date of composition. The Khorsabad and Sultantepe tablets are likely the earliest manuscripts, dating to c. 700 BC.

The basic features of this type of magic are cleaning or purification, and prayer. These are supplemented, depending on the purpose of the text, by a variety of ritual actions including burning incense, making and burying clay figures, rubbing the subject with flour, and tying and untying knots. Ankarloo and Clark point out that these actions were not simply symbolic as we now see them. To the Mesopotamians, ritual purification by water was as ‘real and effective [as] the physical cleaning process of taking a shower is to us’.⁵ These ritual actions were believed to have actual, tangible effects. Demons were physically removed ‘through an effective incantation – the word of Ea.’⁶ Witchcraft was effectively countered by burning and burying figurines.⁷ To the Mesopotamian mind, these ritual actions were the best defence against a host of mysterious problems, and performing them was considered no more superstitious than visiting a doctor is today.

Šurpu is very closely connected to a number of other ritual and incantation series. It has been generally understood that the foremost of these was *Maqlû*, ‘Incineration.’ While the two bear certain similarities, however, there are vast differences in tone and intent. *Maqlû* is aimed at undoing the machinations of a human agent – a witch or sorceress. *Šurpu* is concerned only with the relationship between the patient and the gods. While it addresses many gods, *Maqlû* is fundamentally concerned with influencing the decision of Šamaš, the sun god, against the witch. Depending on the recension, *Šurpu* either addresses as many gods as possible, or is directed towards Marduk – in either case, Šamaš is not an especially important figure. This is perfectly logical as the sun god was the arbiter of justice – witchcraft is unjust (not to mention illegal) and therefore his role as judge compels him to act. This is not the case for *Šurpu*, in which the problem is the anger of a god or gods – there is no question here of injustice, except insofar as the patient himself may have committed a crime against the gods. To appeal to Šamaš would be fruitless unless one could be sure that Šamaš was the god responsible for the punishment – far better to hedge one’s bets and beseech as many gods as possible or to address the unparalleled king of the gods, Marduk.

History of Research

The earliest publication of any part of *Šurpu*,⁸ though not recognised as belonging to the series until much more recently, is a partial translation of an incantation belonging to Tablet I⁹ by George Smith in an 1870 issue of the *North Britain Review*.¹⁰ Smith presumably found the incantation during his work on the first edition of the fourth volume of Rawlinson’s *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* (conventionally abbreviated to IV R¹), published in 1875, in which cuneiform composites of 14 fragments from Tablets I, II, V, VI and VII appear.¹¹

⁵ Ankarloo and Clark 2001: xiii.

⁶ Geller 2007: 198.

⁷ Thomsen 2001: 13.

⁸ Excluding K. 4320, an ancient commentary on *Šurpu* and an as yet unidentified medical text. This first appeared in copy in II R (Rawlinson 1866: Pl. 35, 1), and subsequently two more copies were published by Langdon (1913-1923: Pl. 8 & 1931: 124-126, 134). Langdon’s first publication identifies the tablet as a *Šurpu* commentary but makes no other mention of it. The remainder of the article deals with word lists and K. 4320 is presumably included simply on the basis of its description in II R as a ‘bilingual list’ (Rawlinson 1866: 7). In his second publication he gives an edition of the text and identifies the lines of *Šurpu* with which the commentary deals.

⁹ This was first recognised as belonging to *Šurpu* by Reiner who published the text and several duplicates as ‘Appendix’ (Reiner 1958: 52-53).

¹⁰ Smith 1870: 162. Bezold (1889: xvii) is mistaken in stating that the article is to be found on page 305ff.

¹¹ Rawlinson 1875: Pls. 7, 8, 14.2, 19.1, 58 and 59.

In the second edition of this work, published in 1891, improved versions of these composite texts appear, with 5 additional fragments included, and Tablets II, V, VI and VII are explicitly identified as *Šurpu*.¹² Tablet I was still not recognised as belonging to the series as its subscript is broken off. The publication of the texts in IV R, as well as the continuing progress of Bezold's catalogue of the Kouyunjik collection, sparked a flurry of work on *Šurpu*. Bezold, Delitzsch, Haupt, Halévy,¹³ Lenormant, Oppert, Sayce, George Smith, Samuel Smith, and Talbot, all contributed partial translations, transliterations and copies of *Šurpu* tablets throughout the 1870s and 1880s.¹⁴ More substantially, in 1884 Peter Jensen published, in Latin, a full edition with transliteration, translation and commentary of Tablets V and VI.¹⁵ This was followed by a lengthy article, also in Latin, expanding on his commentary,¹⁶ and three further supplements in German.¹⁷

All of this early work was superseded in 1896 when Heinrich Zimmern published the first full edition of the series in the first instalment of his *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion*.¹⁸ This work made use of 44 tablets and fragments, comprising a tolerably complete version of Tablets II-VII and IX-X.¹⁹ In 1901, Zimmern published an updated edition, including 7 additional fragments²⁰ and making corrections suggested in several reviews of the first edition, notably that of King.²¹ Understandably, Zimmern does not make any mention of Craig's comments on his work. In a heartfelt (and lengthy) rebuttal of Zimmern's and Jensen's reviews of his own work, Craig says of Zimmern:

‘Prof. ZIMMERN has had some experience, but a very limited experience in this kind of work.

The sum total of his contribution to textual work amounts to not much more than a score of pages, viz. 18 pages of the *Šurpu* texts which are among the easiest, if they are not altogether the easiest, in the British Museum, and a few additional pages in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*.’²²

Craig's comments notwithstanding, Zimmern's work was the standard edition of *Šurpu* for over 50 years. Zimmern subsequently published further fragments as they were discovered,²³ and King, in his supplement to Bezold's Kouyunjik catalogue, published the cuneiform text of several additional fragments.²⁴ In 1919, Ebeling published *Keilschrifttext aus Assur Religiösen Inhalts* (KAR), a collection of copies of religious tablets and fragments unearthed during the German excavations of Aššur, which included copies of 17 *Šurpu* tablets, though two of these were not recognised as belonging to the series.²⁵

No more work on *Šurpu* was published until the 1950s, when a glut of publications appeared. In 1951, Weidner published a 10 line note alerting the scholarly community to the existence of a new fragment of *Šurpu*

¹² Rawlinson 1891: Pls 7, 8, 14.2, 19.1, 51 and 52. Note that K. 4632 and K. 5123 mentioned in the contents page of this volume as being additions to 19.1 are from *Utukkū Lemnūtu* (Geller 2016: 133), not *Šurpu*. This is acknowledged by Pinches and it is not clear why they are included.

¹³ Halévy (1882: *passim*) published transliterations of several *Šurpu* tablets into Hebrew characters. See Bezold (1889-1896) for details.

¹⁴ See Bezold 1889-1896 for the details of these publications.

¹⁵ Jensen 1884.

¹⁶ Jensen 1885a.

¹⁷ Jensen 1885b, 1885c and 1886.

¹⁸ Zimmern 1896: ix & 1-80.

¹⁹ While Zimmern's edition certainly superseded all earlier work on the series, he missed at least one duplicate known at the time. In 1893, Pinches had quoted extracts of a duplicate to K. 2866 without mentioning its tablet number (Pinches 1893: 193-194). He quoted further extracts in a second article published 11 years later (Pinches 1904: 53-54). The duplicate has since been identified by Lambert (unpublished note) as BM 76211. It is edited below (Chapter 3).

²⁰ As well as 2 more, K 9422 and Rm.542 which are now known not to belong to *Šurpu*.

²¹ King 1897: 142-148.

²² Craig 1897: iii. Craig's rebuttal extends to 5 pages

²³ Zimmern 1914; Zimmern 1915-1916.

²⁴ King 1914: *passim*.

²⁵ Ebeling 1919: Nos. 30, 51, 67, 75, 89, 93, 133, 231, 232, 264, 270, 271, 273, 274 and 371. Nos. 165 and 78 are identified in chapter 1 of the present work as belonging to Tablet VIII.

IV, though he did not publish the tablet itself.²⁶ Two years later, Ebeling produced *Literarische Keilschrifttexte aus Assur* (LKA), another volume of copies from the German excavations at Aššur, including the only known version of a *Šurpu* Ritual Tablet.²⁷ In 1954 Köcher recopied 13 of the Aššur tablets and presented a new edition of Tablet III from all sources, as well as editing the Aššur fragments of Tablet II.²⁸ In 1957 Knudsen published a Nimrud fragment of Tablet VII,²⁹ and in the same year Gurney and Finkelstein published the first volume of texts from the excavations at Sultantepe, including two manuscripts of Tablet IV.³⁰

These publications were all superseded in 1958 by the publication of Erica Reiner's doctoral thesis - a new edition of the entire series, including transliteration, translation and limited commentary.³¹ Reiner's edition made use of 94 tablets and fragments and represented a considerable advance over Zimmern's earlier edition, filling in the vast majority of lacunae and providing the first edition of the Ritual Tablet and of Tablet I.

Further work on *Šurpu* has been surprisingly infrequent considering the length of time that has elapsed since Reiner's edition. Apart from a lengthy and important review of her work by Frankena³² and a brief note by Lambert,³³ the only improvements to the text before the turn of the century came from the autograph copies published in various series of volumes containing texts from individual sites: three more tablets from Sultantepe were published in 1966 in the second volume of texts from that site;³⁴ six autograph copies of Late Babylonian texts from Ur appeared in volumes 6/2 and 7 of *Ur Excavation Texts*;³⁵ seven Late Babylonian manuscripts discovered in the excavations of Uruk were published and edited by Hunger and von Weiher in four volumes of *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk*;³⁶ a single tablet from Babylon was published by Cavigneaux in *Textes Scolaires du Temple de Nabû ša Harê*;³⁷ in 1989 eight autograph copies of tablets and fragments found in excavations at Kish were published by Gurney in volume 11 of *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts*.³⁸

In 2000, two important works appeared. Gesche's monumental *Schulunterricht in Babylonien*, in which a vast array of school exercise tablets were identified, catalogued, copied, and edited for the first time.³⁹ Gesche identified 11 excerpts from *Šurpu* among her corpus and published 9 of them. Even more important, as far as *Šurpu* is concerned, Borger produced a partitur edition of all Tablets of the series not to include any Sumerian text.⁴⁰ Over 100 tablets and fragments are edited in this work, despite the fact that just four Tablets are included. As mentioned above, the total number of known exemplars of *Šurpu* now stands at around 170, nearly twice the number known to Reiner. Unfortunately, Borger did not include any commentary, or even a

²⁶ Weidner 1945-1951.

²⁷ Ebeling 1953a: No. 91. The ritual tablet is discussed extensively in chapter 1, below.

²⁸ Köcher 1954: 218-244.

²⁹ Knudsen 1957.

³⁰ Gurney and Finkelstein 1957: Nos. 84-85.

³¹ Reiner 1958.

³² Frankena 1960.

³³ Lambert 1959-1960.

³⁴ Gurney and Hulin 1964: nos. 142, 204 & 205.

³⁵ Gadd and Kramer 1966: nos. 406-409; Gurney 1973: nos. 120 & 136.

³⁶ Hunger 1976: no. 123; von Weiher 1983: nos. 13, 14 & 15; 1988: nos. 70 & 71; 1998: no. 242. The last of these belongs to Tablet VIII, newly discovered in the present work. It is discussed in chapter 1 below.

³⁷ Cavigneaux 1981: 177.

³⁸ Gurney 1989: Nos 36-43. A further Kish tablet, a school exercise bearing 5 lines of Tablet 4, was published in a *Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon, Supplementary Series* (MSL SS 1) by Gurney (1986: no. 88).

³⁹ Gesche 2000.

⁴⁰ Borger 2000. A partitur edition is one in which, for each line of text, every witness is fully transliterated and the resultant text laid out diagrammatically. It takes its name from the German for a musical score as it resembles orchestral sheet music. An example of a partitur edition is presented in chapter 2, below.

translation, and so his work was in no real sense a new edition of the text. Since 2000, just two publications with a bearing on *Šurpu* have appeared. In 2008, Linssen published a 6 page article consisting of 7 autograph copies of previously unpublished tablets, though all but one of these had been edited in Borger's partitur.⁴¹ In 2016, the second volume of Abusch and Schwemer's *Corpus of Mesopotamian anti-Witchcraft Rituals* was published, including the only edition of Tablet VIII so far published.⁴² This is discussed extensively in chapter 1, below.

Despite its relatively early and thorough publication, *Šurpu* has been something of a poor relation to *Maqlû* in terms of serious study. Though often mentioned in the same breath, it has rarely been investigated with great rigour. With certain notable exceptions, such as Bottéro's article on the series⁴³ and Geller's articles dealing with the concept of *māmītu*,⁴⁴ generally speaking, very little use has been made of the text. This apparent disinterest is due, at least in part, to the state of the text. Reiner's edition, while very thorough and well done for its time, suffers from several major drawbacks which have limited its use. In the first place, in common with most work of the time, she does not include a partitur or autograph copies. As such it has been relatively difficult to engage with the text beyond Reiner's own understanding of it. Further, Reiner included only a very brief commentary, which has meant that many of the substantial difficulties of the text were not addressed. Such notes as she does include tend to focus on philology over content, which, while doubtless very important, has not served to elucidate the meaning of the text.

Most fundamentally, however, despite Reiner and Linssen's statements that the series is 'almost complete,' this is not the case. Apart from small breaks which deprive us of the beginning or end of odd lines, there are three substantial lacunae in Reiner's edition of *Šurpu*:

- Tablet I is at best only about half preserved, so the opening phases of the ritual are still in part obscure.
- The sole known copy of the Ritual Tablet is broken halfway through, so we are unaware of the action of the second half of the ceremony.
- Most problematic of all, Tablet VIII, in which the third stage of the ritual is carried out, is missing altogether.

The final problem has been compounded by the belief that the series was essentially complete. The absence of an entire tablet renders substantial chunks of the preserved text practically meaningless, and, because the text has been thought of as complete, the meaningless sections have been ignored. Reiner herself speaks of the last three tablets in her edition as having 'defeated the purpose' of *Šurpu*, and this belief has doubtless prevented much serious engagement with the text. In fact, as this thesis will demonstrate, when the limitations of the public sources are acknowledged, the entire text is meaningful and should be understood as a coherent and well-organised ceremony.

⁴¹ Linssen 2008.

⁴² Abusch and Schwemer 2016: 157-166 (Text 8.20). It must be noted that this is not a full edition of Tablet VIII as it does not include all known manuscripts. In fact, it is not primarily a publication of *Šurpu* but of KAR 226, a *sammeltablet* (compilation tablet) of anti-witchcraft incantations. The *Šurpu* material is included only because it duplicates one of the incantations of KAR 226. The existence of this edition is partly thanks to my own identification of SpTU V 242 (8.20, manuscript d) as a duplicate of K. 2467+ (8.20, manuscript A). This in turn led to Greta van Buylaere's identification of BM 38294 (8.20 manuscript e) as a further duplicate. BM 38294 had previously been edited separately by Abusch and Schwemer, but without SpTU V 242 there was no reason to connect it to Text 8.20.

⁴³ Bottéro 1976-177.

⁴⁴ Geller 1980 and 1990.

Structure of thesis

This thesis consists of two main sections – a reconstruction of the text as a whole (Chapter 1), and an edition and commentary of a single Tablet from the series (Chapters 2-3 and Excursus).

Chapter 1 examines the structure and composition of the text as a whole, and as just mentioned, argues that the series can only be understood if the idea that it is complete is abandoned. In this chapter, a new reconstruction of the entire series is presented, including an investigation of what is known about the missing elements. In addition, the recensional history of the text is examined leading to the discovery that there are three different versions of the series reflected in the preserved sources. This is concluded with a brief examination of what can be learnt from the differences between the various recensions of the text.

Chapter 2 consists of a full partitur edition of Tablet IX (Reiner's Tablet VIII) based on first hand examination of almost all manuscripts.⁴⁵ This is accompanied by an eclectic text, a normalised text and an English translation.⁴⁶ This has led to the realisation that what has been generally understood as over a dozen extremely short incantations followed by a repetitive list of *māmītu* is in fact a single long incantation with a fairly well-defined structure.

This has facilitated the writing of chapter 3, a thorough line-by-line commentary on Tablet IX. In this I have sought not only to explain the basic principles underlying the text, such as the nature of *māmītu* and the purpose of what I have called the *Kultgötterbeschwörung*, but also to understand the thought behind the individual lines. While this has not been possible in every case, the majority of the lines can be convincingly understood.

A lengthy excursus on the goddess Kusu, who is one of the deities listed in the *Kultgötterbeschwörung*, ends the thesis. In this I have endeavoured to rationalise and simplify the apparent complexities surrounding this figure, and in so doing, have demonstrated that the name represents a single purification goddess in almost every case.

⁴⁵ All tablets held in the collections of the British Museum were examined at first hand. It was not possible to examine the three tablets held in other collections - Ashm. 1924-2042, VAT 9726 and W. 22730/4. For the first of these, I made use of photos published on the CDLI website. For the other two I have had to rely on autograph copies.

⁴⁶ An eclectic text is an edited version of the text in which the best readings, as far as the editor can tell, are presented, but in which each individual sign is written separately. As a partitur is included, there is no need to refer to variant readings. Normalisation is the next stage in the editorial process, in which the various modern editorial marks, in particular the accents and subscript numbers which distinguish different signs with the same phonetic reading, are discarded, logograms are replaced with the Akkadian words they represent, and length and grammatical endings are added. This gives a text which is as close as possible to Akkadian as it would have been spoken. Thus *īa-ba-a-tū* in the eclectic text becomes *tābātu* in normalisation.

Chapter 1

A proposal for the reconstruction of Šurpu

The numbering of the tablets in the canonical recension of Šurpu, as presented in Reiner's edition,⁴⁷ presents several problems. In the first place, Reiner's Tablet I (the Ritual Tablet) manifestly is not Tablet I of Šurpu. Reiner⁴⁸ doubted this identification herself, as did Lambert,⁴⁹ and both suggested that Tablet I may in fact be represented by a tablet she published as an appendix. In fact, as will be discussed below, the Ritual Tablet belongs to a close, but slightly different recension of Šurpu. The Appendix Tablet, likewise, does not seem to belong to the canonical version *per se*, but should nonetheless be understood as Tablet I.

Tablet I

This is evident from the Ritual Tablet, which specifically states the incantations which were to be recited first in Šurpu – gá.e lú.kù.ga me.en 'I am a pure man', ⁴BIL.GI NUN.ME kur.ra íl 'Gibil, sage, exalted in the country', íd.lú.ru.gú.gin₇ mú.mú.da.bi 'River, which renews itself constantly' and *ašši* GI.IZI.LÁ *puṭur lemnu* 'I hold the torch, release from the evil!'. The first of these is evidently a purification incantation to be read by the officiating priest. It is also listed first in the Ritual Tablets to *Illī ul īdi*⁵⁰ and *Muššu'u*,⁵¹ but no copy has yet been discovered. It should certainly be restored at the start of the Reiner's Appendix, which preserves the other three incantations along with brief ritual instructions. 'Gibil, wise' is a *Kultmittelbeschwörung* to the deified fire, listing properties of the element such as 'you are the one who refines gold and silver, you are the one who brews beer'. It was to be recited as the torch was lit. 'River, which renews' is a poetic description of the power of smoke to alleviate the patient's suffering, to be recited while fumigating the patient with smoke from the torch just lit. The final incantation, 'I hold the torch' encourages Nusku, a god associated with fire and light and occasionally described as the father of Gibil, to help the patient. It was presumably recited as the fire was lit, though the tablet containing ritual instructions is broken at this point.⁵²

Purification, both of the officiating priest or priests and the patient, and supplication to the fire gods when lighting the ritual flame, are evidently necessary precursors to the main ceremony of Šurpu. As such, these incantations must have comprised the first Tablet, though no labelled manuscripts survive. The text quoted in Reiner's appendix is unlikely to be Tablet I of the canonical series as it includes ritual instructions between the incantations, which do not occur in the rest of the text. This creates a slight problem, as a fourth incantation is preserved in the Appendix – a kù.ga a nam.šub.ba 'Pure water, water of the incantation'. This is a *Kultmittelbeschwörung* to water, detailing its divine lineage, and was to be recited three times over the holy water basin. It is likely that this would be necessary for the ceremony, and the Ritual Tablet mentions the sprinkling of water, but we have no specific textual authority for the assumption.

The frequent mentions of *māmītu* in the text of the appendix incantations indicate that it could belong to a version of Šurpu, though as these incantations could be fairly generally applied, the text might represent Tablet I

⁴⁷ Reiner 1958.

⁴⁸ Reiner 1958: 4.

⁴⁹ Lambert 1959-1960: 122.

⁵⁰ Lambert 1974.

⁵¹ Böck 2007: 72.

⁵² The end of the incantation is now known from von Weier 1998: 34-35 (= SpTU V 242).

of a number of series⁵³ – purification, fumigation, holy water and a fire were required for many, if not all, ceremonies. In fact, as the label *én* ‘incantation’ was used to mean either an individual incantation or an entire Tablet opening with this incantation,⁵⁴ it is eminently plausible that this text was ‘Tablet I’ for all series that required it. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, however, and since the majority of the incantations preserved are specifically listed as the first actions of *Šurpu*, it seems reasonable to re-designate Reiner’s Appendix Tablet as Tablet I.

Tablet V-VI

The second problem with the tablet numbers of Reiner’s edition is the confusingly labelled Tablet V-VI. This Tablet contains 11 incantations. It opens with a conversation between Marduk and Ea, in which Ea tells Marduk how to alleviate the patient’s suffering through the burning ritual of *Šurpu*, this is followed by seven incantations detailing the burning ritual itself. After this is a short incantation involving the magical transfer of *māmītu*-sanctions to a thread which is then cut. The Tablet closes with two incantations concerning the extinguishment of the fire. The subscript of this Tablet is not preserved on any manuscript, and so its number has been a source of some confusion. Reiner took the numeration over from Zimmern,⁵⁵ and was evidently dissatisfied with it.⁵⁶

The uncertainty concerning the number of this Tablet is connected to a third problem with Reiner’s numeration – the catchline to Tablet VII. Several manuscripts of Tablet VII preserve the catchline *ÉN ni ‘šu niḥlu guḥlu ḥaḥḥu ru’tu* ‘Incantation: Sneeze, catarh, cough, slime, spittle’ which is not the incipit to any preserved incantation. The next Tablet in Reiner’s edition opens with ‘I am raising my curved sticks’, and, though its subscript is lacking, bears the catchline for Tablet IX whose subscript is complete.

There are two possible solutions which address both these problems. The first option is that Reiner’s Tablet V-VI is in fact Tablet V. In this case, the subscript to Tablet VII must be regarded as an error for Tablet VI, and its catchline understood to refer to the new Tablet VII. This is possible, but requires us to discount the evidence of two separate manuscripts, each of which preserves the subscript and catchline to Reiner’s Tablet VII.

The second option is that Reiner’s Tablet V-VI is Tablets V and VI. That is to say, two separate Tablets of the series are preserved together on a single tablet. If this is accepted, Tablet VII’s subscript can be trusted, but its catchline creates difficulties. The catchline must either be regarded as either a mistake or as the incipit of Tablet VIII, in which case Reiner’s Tablet VIII is in the way. As no manuscript of Reiner’s VIII has an intact subscript, it is simple enough to make this Tablet IX. Reiner’s Tablet IX does, however, have a subscript, and so we must account for this.

This explanation, though slightly convoluted, follows the available evidence very closely. Three points need to be addressed. In the first place, Reiner’s Tablet V-VI will be examined to understand the reason for the use of a single tablet. Next, it will be demonstrated that the catchline is not a mistake, and should be understood to represent Tablet VIII of *Šurpu*. Finally, the subscript to Tablet IX will be explained by reference to the recension history of *Šurpu*.

Tablet V-VI exploded

Identifying the two Tablets preserved in Reiner’s Tablet V-VI is very simple. The text falls naturally into two

⁵³ *Muššu’u* or *Ilī ul īdi* for example.

⁵⁴ Geller 2000: 225.

⁵⁵ Zimmern 1901.

⁵⁶ Reiner 1958: 5.

sections: V - the dialogue between Ea and Marduk, and VI - the succession of burning rituals. These are chiefly distinguished by their content – the Ea-Marduk dialogue is connected to, but distinct from the burning rituals. In addition, however, one recension of *Šurpu*⁵⁷ reverses their order and places a series of extra rituals between them.

The basic difficulty with Tablet V seems to have been brevity. Although its subject matter – the Ea-Marduk dialogue - gave it sufficient gravity to be an independent Tablet; at just 60 lines it was too small to merit a tablet to itself. As a result, it was regularly subsumed not only into Tablet VI, but also Tablet IV. This is clear from K. 3378 (+) K. 4649, in which the Ea-Marduk dialogue shares a tablet with **Nin** IV, followed by the catchline for the first of the burning incantations.

An apparent consequence of this is that no manuscript exists containing just Tablet V. Nonetheless, we are not justified in using Reiner's numeration. In the first place it is inaccurate - given the evidence of K. 3378, IV-V would be just as reasonable. In the second place, the lack of extant manuscripts containing only Tablet V should not be taken as evidence that such manuscripts did not exist. The fact that Tablet IV-V exists, proves that Tablet VI must have existed at least once as an independent manuscript. That no such manuscript is extant does not diminish this fact.

Despite the fact that no manuscript preserves either Tablet V or VI separately, as the two Tablets are clearly discernible, and as their unification on a single tablet was not constant, we are warranted in referring to the component parts of Reiner's V-VI by their individual numbers.

Tablet VIII restored

The accuracy of the catchline of Reiner's Tablet VII can be fairly conclusively demonstrated. Through an examination of the catalogues of *Šurpu* it is possible to identify several incantations belonging to the Tablet, and to establish their place in the text. A comparison of the subject matter of these incantations with Reiner's edition of *Šurpu* heavily supports the evidence of the catalogues.

Evidence of the catalogues

The Ritual Tablet to *Šurpu*, as noted by Lambert,⁵⁸ represents two distinct compositions. The first, covering the obverse, and originally a portion of the reverse, in a single column is the Ritual Tablet to a form of *Šurpu* close to, but distinct from, the canonical version. This describes the action of the ritual and lists the necessary incantations in order. It is broken immediately after the last incantation of Tablet V, but doubtless originally continued to the end of the composition. This is followed by a double ruling, after which the tablet is divided into two columns which fill the remainder of the reverse. The second text is a catalogue of a different recension of *Šurpu*. It does not contain any ritual instructions, but simply lists the necessary incantations and groups them according to their Tablet numbers in this recension. The text of the catalogue is substantially complete, and appears to represent a very different tradition from the canonical version. The incantations are listed in a different order and numbered differently; eight are not even mentioned in the standard edition!

In addition to the two compositions (hereafter **Rit** [Ritual Tablet] and **Cat** [catalogue]) represented in Reiner's Tablet I, there exist three further texts which list *Šurpu* incantations in an equivalent manner. These are VAT

⁵⁷ **Cat**, See below, table 1.

⁵⁸ Lambert 1959-1960: 122.

13723+ (hereafter **VAT**),⁵⁹ PBS I/1 No. 13 rev. 52-55 (hereafter **PBS**)⁶⁰ and SpTU II/12 iii 42-47 and iv 1-2 (hereafter **SpTU**).⁶¹ **VAT** is a catalogue listing the incipits of several series, such as *Maqlû* and *Muššu'u*, with single rulings and subscripts separating the series. *Šurpu* incantations are listed at the beginning of the catalogue, though the tablet is broken here and only the final three lines of the section are preserved. **PBS** and **SpTU** are connected to another ritual and incantation series, *bīt rimki*, 'House of Ablutions' - an extremely long series which has not yet been fully edited. It was performed by the king, and involved the recitation of dozens of incantations in front of statues of different gods, as well as ritual purification in various rooms of the eponymous house. **SpTU** is a version of the Ritual Tablet of the series, while **PBS** is a closely related ritual, though its precise identification is unclear.⁶² Presumably because of its stature as a specifically royal ritual, the performance of *bīt rimki* included not only several unique recitations, but also the recital of the majority of the incantations from many other series – elements of *Šurpu*, *Maqlû*, *Lamaštu*, *Ilī ul īdi* and assorted others were all required for the enactment of *bīt rimki*. As a result, the relevant portion of the Ritual Tablet of the series serves as a catalogue of *Šurpu*.

Including the uncatalogued form of *Šurpu* (hereafter **Nin**), which can be deduced from surviving subscripts, six lists of the series are known. Only **PBS**, the shortest of the catalogues, is wholly intact. The remainder preserve varying amounts – **VAT** preserves just the final three incipits; **Cat** is missing 4 lines at the start; **Rit** is broken immediately after the fire is extinguished; and **SpTU** seems to be missing the end of the series, assuming it originally continued into the next column of the tablet. As has just been discussed, **Nin** is missing its first and eighth Tablets. Between them, these six sources preserve the order of three recensions – the 'canonical' form (**Nin**), a version very close to the canonical form (**Rit**, **PBS** and **SpTU**), and a different version, (**Cat** and **VAT**), which is also known from at least 4 tablets (K. 2390, SpTU V 242, and OECT 11 39 and 40). This version of the text (hereafter **β**) is of the utmost value to us for the list of incipits it preserves:

Table 1: Incantations of Recension β

Cat	VAT	Cat no.	Nin no.
(Broken)	(Broken)		
<i>ma-mit DÛ.A.BI</i>		IIa	III
<i>li-iz-zi-zu^d A-num u An-tum li-ni-?-u GIG</i>		IIb	IVb
<i>ášši GI.IZI.LÁ</i>		IIIa	Ib?
<i>ki-ma SUM.SAR an-ni-i</i>		IIIb	VIa
<i>ki-ma ZÚ.LUM.MA an-ni-i</i>		IIIc	VIb
<i>ki-ma ŠU.SAR</i>		III d	VIc
<i>ki-ma SÍG.AKÀ</i>		IIIe	VI d
<i>ki-ma SÍG.ÛZ</i>		III f	VI e
<i>ki-ma šir-pi</i>		III g	VI f

⁵⁹ Geller 2000: 227.

⁶⁰ Myhrman 1911: Pl.13.; A new edition with several duplicates is published in Abusch & Schwemer 2011: 387ff. (= CMAwR 9.2).

⁶¹ von Weiber 1983: 63-64.

⁶² Abusch & Schwemer 2011: 389.

ŠE.NUMUN <i>ú-pu-un-ta</i>		IIIh	VIg
ŠANGÁ.MAH-ku-ma		IIIi	VIj
<i>nu-uh</i> ^d GIŠ.BAR		IIIj	VIk
<i>ni-i²-šu ni-iḫ-lu</i>		IIIk	VIIIa
<i>at-ti túb-qin-nu</i>		III	?
<i>at-ti ma-mit šá tal-tap-pi-tú</i>		III _m	?
<i>ma-mit</i> DUMU.SAL ^d A-nim		III _n	?
<i>at-ti</i> Ú.KI.KAL		III _o	?
<i>at-ti</i> GIŠ.ŠINIG		III _p	?
<i>ak-tab-sa-ka šá-ad-dak-ka</i>		III _q	?
DÙ ^d DIŠ <i>ip-šur</i> ^d DIŠ		III _r	?
áš.ḫul gal ₅ .lá.gin ₈		IVa	V
íd.lú.ru.gú.gin ₈		IVb	Ic?
^d BIL.GI <i>ap-kál</i>		IVc	Id?
giš.šinig aš an.edin.na mú.a	giš.šinig aš an.edin.na mú.a	VIa	Xa
<i>áš-ši gam-li-ia</i>	<i>áš-ši gam-li-ia</i>	VIb	IX
<u><i>ilī ul īdi</i></u>	<u><i>ilī ul īdi</i></u>	N/A	N/A

The bold text indicates an incantation whose incipit is not mentioned, but which is known from K.2390, on which *ma-mit* DÙ.A.BI is followed by *li-iz-zi-zu*^dA-num u *An-tum li-ni-²-u* GIG, with the catchline *ášši* GI.ZI.LÁ. The underlined incantations are the incipits of the next series to be recited. They are worthy of note because of their presence also in **SpTU**, but are of no consequence to the current discussion.

The last two columns list the Tablet number of each incantation in both the **Nin** and **β** recensions. As can be seen, the majority of the incipits preserved here are known from **Nin**. Crucially, however, those following *ni-²-šu ni-iḫ-lu* ‘Sneeze, catarh’ are not. These can only be the incipits of the incantations, or a selection of the incantations, belonging to Tablet VIII.

Although the fact that the burning incantations from Tablet V are listed in the canonical order earlier in the catalogue adds some measure of support to our hypothesis concerning Tablet VIII, as this catalogue represents a different recension of *Šurpu* this list alone does not substantiate it beyond doubt. Fortunately, at this point we can turn to the other catalogues for confirmation:

Table 2: Incipits of Reiner's text and Recension *a*

Reiner	Rit	PBS	SpTU
(Missing)	gá.e lú.kù.ga me.en		
	^d BIL.GI NUN.ME kur.ra íl		
	íd.lú.ru.gú.gin ₇ mú.mú.da.bi		
	ášši GI.IZILÁ pu-tur lim-nu		
lu paṭ-ra DINGIR .MEŠ GAL.MEŠ	lu paṭ-ra DINGIR .MEŠ GAL.MEŠ	lu paṭ-ra DINGIR .MEŠ GAL.MEŠ	lu paṭ-ra DINGIR .MEŠ GAL.MEŠ
ma-mit DÛ.A.BI	ma-mit DÛ.A.BI	ma-mit DÛ.A.BI	ma-mit DÛ.A.BI
e-peš ri-is-bi			
li-iz-zi-zu ^d A-num u An-tum li-ni- [?] -u GIG	li-iz-zi-zu ^d A-num u An-tum li-ni- [?] -u GIG		
áš.hul gal ₅ .lá.gin ₈	áš.hul gal ₅ .lá.gin ₈	áš.hul gal ₅ .lá.gin ₇	áš.hul gal ₅ .lá.gin ₇
ki-ma SUM.SAR an-ni-i	ki-ma SUM.SAR an-ni-i	ki-ma SUM.SAR an-ni-i	ki-ma SUM.SAR an-ni-i
ki-ma ZÚ.LUM.MA an-ni-i	ki-ma ZÚ.LUM.MA an-ni-i		*
ki-ma ŠU.SAR an-ni-i	ki-ma ŠU.SAR an-ni-i		
ki-ma SÍG.AKÀ an-ni-i	ki-ma SÍG.AKÀ an-ni-i		
ki-ma SÍG.ÛZ an-ni-i	ki-ma SÍG.ÛZ an-ni-i		
ki-ma šir-pi an-ni-i	ki-ma šir-pi an-ni-i		
ŠE.NUMUN ú-pu-un-ta	ŠE.NUMUN ú-pu-un-ta		
gu [^d Uttu] šu.na ba.ni.in.gar			
ŠANGÁ.MAḤ-ku-ma	(broken?)		
nu-uḥ ^d GIŠ.BAR	nu-uḥ ^d GIŠ.BAR		
buru ₅ šà.ZU+AB.ta im.ta.è.a.na	(broken)		buru ₅ šà.abzu.ta im.ta.è.a.na
			**
ni-'i-šu ni-iḥ-lu			ni-'i-šu ni-iḥ-lu
(Missing)			gu. ^d Šakkan.na
			at-ta ma-mit
			at-ta sassatu (ú.ki.kal)
			[ak-tab-sa-ka šá-ad-dak]-ka ⁶³
			[ipuš ^d An ip-šur ^d An]
áš-ši gam-li-ia			(broken)
giš.šinig aš an.edin.na mú.a			

⁶³ This and the next incipit are reconstructions suggested by von Weiher (1983: 69). They are based on the *Cat* incipits as only the final signs of each survive.

The bold text in **Rit** indicates incantations that are not specifically listed by incipit, but are implied by the ritual instructions. The * in **SpTU** is in place of the first three incantations of the series *ilī ul īdi* ‘My god, I did not know.’ ** is in place of *ú š . ḥ u l . g á l* – the opening incantation of *Muššu’u* Tablet VI.

That **Rit**, **PBS** and **SpTU** belong to the same recension (hereafter **α**) is very clear. The differences between them are minimal, and almost entirely accounted for by their individual contexts. The first four incantations, preserved only in **Rit**, are, as discussed above, simply purification incantations required before the start of the ritual. **PBS** and **SpTU** do not have these inasmuch as they are not describing the start of a ritual – the *Šurpu* incantations are being used as a subsection of a larger ritual.

The specific context of **SpTU** also explains the interruption by the first three *ilī ul īdi* incantations⁶⁴ and by *ú š . ḥ u l . g á l*.⁶⁵ Both series are very similar to *Šurpu* in intent, and so the out of context adoption of elements of each makes sense in the larger ritual *bīt rimki*. The *ilī ul īdi* incantations are, moreover, distanced from the *Šurpu* incipits by the ritual instructions in **SpTU**. While reciting the first of the *ilī ul īdi* incantations the king must address Šamaš, for the other two he stands before his personal god and goddess. The following *Šurpu* incantations, along with *ú š . ḥ u l . g á l*, are recited before Bēlet-Šēri.

The absence of the bulk of the burning ritual incantations, as well as the fire extinguishing incantation *nu-uh* ^dGĪŠ.BAR, from **PBS** and **SpTU** is easily explained by the principle mentioned earlier, that an incipit can refer either to a single incantation or an entire Tablet beginning with that incantation. **Rit** has to describe each element of the burning ritual in order to give instructions to the officials on how to perform it, whereas for **PBS** and **SpTU** the Tablet incipit suffices. This is probably also the case with *li-iz-zi-zu* ^dA-num u An-tum li-ni-²-u GIG ‘May Anu and Antum stand by, may they ward off sickness’, which seems to have shared a Tablet with *ma-mit* DÛ.A.BI. This is indicated by K.2390 on which the two are written together, though, as is clear from its catchline, this manuscript belongs to the recension **β**. It is further indicated by the resemblance this placement displays to Tablet II - *lu paṭ-ra* DINGIR .MEŠ GAL.MEŠ ‘May it be released, great gods’. Tablet II is divided into three sections by use of the leitmotiv phrase *lu paṭra* ‘May it be released...’⁶⁶ – the first two sections are lists of possible offences committed by the patient, mirroring *ma-mit* DÛ.A.BI; the final section is an appeal to a list of gods to release the patient, mirroring *li-iz-zi-zu* ^dA-num u An-tum li-ni-²-u GIG.

When we compare the **α** recension to the **Nin** text, it is evident that the versions are very similar, though three divergences stand out. The first is the absence of ŠANGÁ.MAH-*ku-ma* from **Rit**. This incantation is recited as the fire is extinguished, and is essentially the climax of the ritual burning. As mentioned in the table, there is half a line broken in **Rit** which may have originally held the incipit. Alternatively, it is possible that it was implied by a ritual instruction along the lines of ‘You extinguish the fire’. In either case, it seems unlikely that this would have been omitted from **α** - in **PBS** and **SpTU** we can safely understand it to have been implied by the *ki-ma* SUM.SAR *an-ni-i*. The second difference between the recensions - the absence of *epēš risbi* from **α** - perhaps implies that this paean to Marduk was a later interpolation, though as we are unable to determine the relative sequence of the recensions, this is impossible to judge.

The important difference for our current purpose, however, is to be found in the final incantations of **SpTU**. Two of these incipits, *at-ta ma-mit* ‘You, oath’⁶⁷ and *at-ta sassatu* (*ú . k i . k a l*) ‘You, weed’⁶⁸, are also found in

⁶⁴ For which see Lambert 1974: 18.

⁶⁵ Böck 2007: 223ff.

⁶⁶ Reiner 1958: 2.

⁶⁷ Cat III m

the list from recension **β**. Another two incipits from recension **β**, [*ak-tab-sa-ka šá-ad-dak-ka*] ‘I have trodden on you’ and [DÙ^d *An ip-šur*^d] *An* ‘An does it, An undoes it’,⁶⁹ can be reasonably restored. Their presence here strongly supports their identification, and by extension the identification of the other **Cat** incipits, with the missing incantations of Tablet VIII. The difficulty of belonging to a radically different recension does not apply in this case, as recension **α** is very close to the canonical form.

Further confirmation is found in the other incipit mentioned at the end of **SpTU** - *gu*.^d *Šakkan.na* ‘Thread of Šakkan.’ This is almost certainly to be equated with Reiner’s *gu* [^dUttu šu.n] *a ba.ni.in.gar* ‘[Uttu took] the thread into her hand’, **Nin** VII.⁷⁰ This places at least one of the putative Tablet VIII incantations unquestionably within the canonical tradition, though it is not where it should be expected.

Tablet VIII

The catalogues, then, not only provide support for our argument that a Tablet is missing from *Šurpu*, but also offer two lists of the missing incipits:

Table 3: Tablet VIII incantations

Cat	SpTU	Preservation
<i>ni-i²-šu ni-iḫ-lu</i>	<i>ni-i²-šu ni-iḫ-lu</i>	End preserved
<i>at-ti túb-qin-nu</i>		Complete but for last line
	<i>gu</i> ^d <i>Šakkan.na</i>	Probably complete - Identical with VIi?
<i>at-ti ma-mit šá tal-tap-pi-tú</i>	<i>at-ta ma-mit</i>	Incipit preserved? More on VAT 10297 and duplicates? Fragments of end preserved? KAR 165
<i>ma-mit DUMU.SAL</i> ^d <i>A-nim</i>		Fragments of start preserved
<i>at-ti Ú.KI.KAL</i>	<i>at-ta sassatu</i> (ú.ki.kal)	Complete but for fragments of first few lines
<i>at-ti GIŠ.ŠINIG</i>		Fragments of start and end preserved
<i>ak-tab-sa-ka šá-ad-dak-ka</i>	[<i>ak-tab-sa-ka šá-ad-dak-ka</i>] <i>ka</i>	Complete
DÙ ^d <i>DIŠ ip-šur</i> ^d <i>DIŠ</i>	[DÙ ^d <i>AN ip-šur</i> ^d] <i>AN</i>	Complete

There is some difference between the two lists of incipits, and given the lack of manuscripts it is impossible for us to say whether this represents a difference between recensions, a lackadaisical approach to cataloguing, or the specific requirements of *bīt rimki*. It appears that at least *gu* ^d*Šakkan.na* represents a recensional difference, but the incantations missing from **SpTU** could equally be attributed to any of these causes.

Three of the incantations, *at-ti ma-mit* ‘You, Oath’, *ma-mit DUMU.SAL* ^d*A-nim* ‘Oath, daughter of Anu’ and *at-ti GIŠ.ŠINIG* ‘You, Tamarisk’, are known only very scrappily. It is not even clear whether any of *at-ti ma-mit* survives. Reiner suggests it may be found on VAT 10297, a duplicate to LKA 153, BMS 61 and VAT 13668, but neither LKA nor BMS contain any incantation starting ‘You, Oath’, and the tablets actually belong to the *nam-érim-búr-ru-da* series in any case.⁷¹ It is possible that the end of the incantation survives in KAR 165. This tablet contains parts of three other incantations – the incipit of ‘You, Tamarisk’, the first few lines of ‘Oath, daughter of Anu’ and the whole of ‘You, grass,’ bar the incipit and possibly the first few lines. In

⁶⁸ **Cat** IIIo

⁶⁹ We can offer no explanation for the replacement of Ea with An.

⁷⁰ See below, page 16.

⁷¹ Maul, personal communication, 2016.

addition, it contains fragments of the final four lines of an unidentified incantation which may be ‘You, Oath.’ It is difficult to be more certain about the identification because the order of the incantations as preserved on the tablet is not clear. It is possible that the incantations follow the expected order, as presented above, but for this to be the case we must assume that Ebeling confused recto and verso. If so, KAR 165 is a fragment from the bottom left of a two column tablet, Column I of which ends with ‘Oath, daughter of Anu’ and Column II of which begins with ‘You, Grass’. The fragmentary remains (r.³1’-4’) preserved before ‘Oath daughter of Anu’ could then be confidently identified as ‘You, Oath’, and the whole tablet as a manuscript of the lost Tablet VIII. If Ebeling is correct, however, then the order precludes identification in the absence of duplicates.

‘Oath, Daughter of Anu’ is known from KAR 165 (r.³5’-10’) and BM 117759 (1-5), a Lamaštu amulet which also contains an incantation from Hulbazizi. The first five lines survive intact, and the next two are partially preserved.

Fragments of ‘You, Tamarisk’ are preserved on four tablets. Part of the incipit and some signs from the next two lines are known from KAR 165 (26’-28’). Fragments of the last thirteen lines are preserved on K. 2467+ (II 1’-11’), 80-11-12, 176 (1’-13’) and SpTU V 242 (r. 1’-6’).⁷² The last of these can now be certainly identified as Tablet III of recension β. Von Weiher was unsure of this tablet’s place in the series and so did not offer an identification of the lines. Considering the number of incantations belonging to this Tablet, it must originally have been a four column tablet, of which the start of Column I and the end Column IV survive. The verso of the tablet preserves several broken lines, including the otherwise lost final lines, of IIIa (**Nin** Ib) ‘I hold the torch’ - not one of the burning ritual incantations of **Nin** VI as suggested by von Weiher.⁷³ Only the incipit, possibly written over two lines, is not preserved. This is followed by a ruling, then a broken line in which two or three signs from the incipit of IIIb (**Nin** VIa) ‘Like this garlic’ are discernible. The recto begins with 6 very fragmentary lines, followed by a ruling, after which IIIq and IIIr, ‘I have trodden on you’ and ‘Ea did it, Ea undid it’ are written, separated from one another by a ruling. The final incantation is followed by a double ruling, then the catchline áš.ḫul gal₅.lá.gin₇ lú.ra GIM [LIBIR.RA], a broken subscript declaring the tablet part of *Šurpu*, and a colophon. As this precisely follows the order described in **Cat** we have no hesitation in identifying the fragmentary incantation as IIIp ‘You, Tamarisk’.

All the other incantations are much more fully preserved. *ni-i’-šū ni-iḫ-lu* ‘Sneeze, catarh’ has been tentatively identified by van der Toorn.⁷⁴ Although an uncertain number of lines, including the incipit of the incantation are missing, the identification can be confidently accepted. In the first place, *at-ti túb-qin-nu* ‘You, corner’, the next incantation in **Cat** unambiguously follows the broken incantation. In addition, as noted by van der Toorn,⁷⁵ the content of the putative *ni-i’-šū ni-iḫ-lu* supports its identification. From what survives of the text it appears to have been a plea to Bēlet-Šēri for release, in which the patient declares that he ‘cr[ies] unto you a *šigū* for life.’⁷⁶ This fits very well with the ritual instructions in **SpTU**, which specified that the incantation was to be recited before a statue of Bēlet-Šēri.

It is conceivable, based on the line ‘I cry unto you a *šigū* for life’, that this incantation does not in fact represent the first incipit of this tablet. A *šigu* is a type of penitential prayer, and since the patient claims to have cried one, it is possible that the *šigū* itself was titled *ni-i’-šū ni-iḫ-lu*. Equally, the *šigū* could have been the lost first

⁷² An edition of these tablets has appeared. Abusch and Schwemer 2016: 157-166. (= CMAwR 8.20)

⁷³ von Weiher 1998: 35.

⁷⁴ van der Toorn 1985: 138-9

⁷⁵ van der Toorn 1985: 138

⁷⁶ van der Toorn 1985: 139, 5’.

section of the current incantation. Neither of these suggestions is likely, however, as this line does not imply the existence of a separate prayer. As van der Toorn points out, ‘crying (*šasû*) of *šigû* was credited with nearly magical power by which guilt was removed.’⁷⁷ Thus, the word itself acted as a performative utterance⁷⁸ - crying the word *šigû* was an action in itself, comparable to the words ‘I will’ in a marriage ceremony. As such, although a longer text was possible – in the same way as are personalised wedding vows - it was not compulsory.

Van der Toorn’s hesitancy in definitely assigning the incipit to this incantation was due to his impression that ‘the order of the *Šurpu* prayers is not uniform.’⁷⁹ While this is true to a certain extent, in that there are three recensions of the text, there is no evidence that *at-ti túb-qin-nu* ‘You, corner’ ever followed a different incantation, and in light of the content of the incantation his reluctance seems unnecessary.

The next incantation, *at-ti túb-qin-nu* ‘You, corner’, is a short incantation formed on the same lines as the burning incantations of Tablet V. In these, the various ailments of the patient are magically transferred into certain objects – garlic, wool, goat’s hair &c. – which are then burnt, thereby eradicating the problem. In this incantation the patient’s problems are magically transferred into the corner, along with an appeal that those who step in the corner will collect them and take them away from him. It is worth noting that the problems listed, assuming the restoration is accepted, are identical to those listed in each burning incantation and in ‘I light the torch.’

As stated above, *gu dŠakkanna* ‘Thread of Šakkan’, is almost certainly identical with **Nin** VIi ‘[Uttu took] the thread.’ In this incantation, the patient’s offences are wound into a thread by [Uttu] and Ištar. This thread is used to bind his head, hands and feet. It is then ripped off, taking the sins with it. Uttu in Reiner’s edition of **Nin** VIi is restored from an incantation in a first millennium ritual for the consecration of priests of Enlil, first published by Borger, with a duplicate published by Löhnert.⁸⁰ George has recently published an Old Babylonian compilation tablet apparently also for use in a consecration ritual, one incantation of which bears strong similarities to the relevant part of the text published by Borger and Löhnert.⁸¹ It is not at all certain, however, that these incantations are closely related to **Nin** VIi. In the first place, the direct parallels between the consecration texts and **Nin** VIi are limited to the first three bilingual lines, which are badly broken in the *Šurpu* text and, where they are preserved, are by no means identical. Moreover, the purposes of the incantations are completely different. Both consecration texts are intended to purify a cloak used in the consecration rituals while the *Šurpu* text describes a magical binding and releasing ritual. It should also be noted that an incantation from *Utukkū Lemnūtu* XIII-XV⁸² bears closer similarities in terms of content to **Nin** VIi than does either consecration text, but is not a direct parallel. In the absence of clear evidence that **Nin** VIi and the consecration texts are as closely connected as has been supposed,⁸³ and given the relatively unambiguous evidence of **SpTU**, there seems little reason to accept the restoration of Uttu.

at-ti Ú.KI.KAL ‘You, grass’ survives almost intact. It lacks an incipit, but the fact that the most complete manuscript KAR 165 1’-25’, also contains three other *Šurpu* incantations argues strongly for its identification and the content of the incantation corroborates this. A small fragment is also preserved on BM 76986, (1’-6’)

⁷⁷ van der Toorn 1985: 117.

⁷⁸ Austin 1962.

⁷⁹ van der Toorn 1985: 138.

⁸⁰ Borger 1973: 167-168 & 173, II 41-51; Löhnert 2010: 186-187.

⁸¹ George 2016: 71-72.

⁸² Geller 2016: 478-481.

⁸³ George 2016: 71-72; Borger 1973: 175.

but this does not provide any extra detail. The text is particularly interesting in that the thought behind it is clear to us. It describes the digestion of a sheep, culminating in defecation on the grass. The grass is said to ‘take away every evil’, referring to the decomposition of the sheep dung, the nutrients from which encourage the growth of new grass. By analogy, the grass is asked to take away the evil afflicting the patient, which will then be passed to the ‘roaming creatures of the plain’ as they eat it. The identification of the incantation is supported by the ritual instructions in **SpTU**, which dictate that after reciting this incantation the king is to release a bound sheep.

Three distinct versions of *ak-tab-sa-ka šá-ad-dak-ka* ‘I have trodden on you, I am pulling you out’ are known from five manuscripts. SpTU V 242 and K. 2467+ contain the shortest version in which the patient declares that he has trampled and pulled up tamarisk, maštakal and date palm. This is followed by a line listing the patient’s problems, a line praying that the day, month and year that have passed will take them away, and a final line praying that the next day month and year will be prosperous. KAR 78 contains an extra line listing the patient’s problems but is otherwise identical. KAR 226 IV adds six lines detailing the problems, including a line concerning witchcraft and another two concerning dreams and omina. It should be noted, however, that KAR 226 is certainly not a *Šurpu* tablet, but a Middle Akkadian *Sammeltafel*.

If we assume, as seems reasonable from the surviving manuscripts, that the incantations of Tablet VIII followed the order of recension **β**, with the addition of ‘Thread of Šakkan’ between ‘You Corner’ and ‘Oath, Daughter of Anu’, we are able to summarise the missing Tablet quite effectively. It opened with a prayer to Bēlet-Šēri, in which the patient pleaded for release from his affliction. This was followed by two magical transfer rituals, in which the patient’s evils were passed to a corner and a thread respectively. At this point, a break disrupts the Tablet. After the break, three incantations concerning plants are recited. The first, to the grass, appears to be a magical transfer rite, in which the patient’s woes are passed to the grass and thence to the animals of the plain. The next, is a plea, presumably addressed to the tamarisk, to remove the patient’s problems. The third is a prayer, addressed to nobody in particular, but accompanied by the destruction of the tamarisk and soapwort. The Tablet closes with a common formula by which the whole set of rituals is given Ea’s blessing, though there is a chance that it continues with several more incantations as K.2467+ preserves the opening lines of the *Maqlû* incantation *attunu mû* ‘you water.’

Place of Tablet VIII in *Šurpu*

The content of this Tablet fits perfectly into so-called canonical *Šurpu*. Indeed, its presence solves a number of inconsistencies in Reiner’s text. In order to demonstrate this, we must examine the basic structure of the text.

As we have discussed above, *Šurpu* opens with a set of purification rituals, followed by the lighting of the fire. Once these preliminary considerations have been dealt with, the ritual itself begins with Tablet II, a long incantation listing the various offences the patient may have committed to bring down a curse upon himself, coupled with a plea to a wide array of gods to absolve him. This is followed, in Tablet III, by a second long list, this time of sanctions under which he is suffering for misconduct involving various subjects.⁸⁴ A refrain requesting Asalluhi remove the sanction is repeated at the end of every line. Tablet IV is mostly composed of a lengthy panegyric to Marduk, coupled with a request that he fix the patient’s problems. Following this, on the same Tablet, is a much shorter incantation that lists several gods and asks them each to perform an appropriate action on the patient’s behalf.

⁸⁴ See below, Commentary II.43-70.

At this point, the start of Tablet V, the patient having confessed his guilt and besought aid from the gods, the burning ritual begins. It opens with a conversation between Marduk and Ea – a common element in Mesopotamian incantations. In the incantation, Marduk goes to his father Ea seeking help in solving the patient’s problems. Ea tells Marduk that he already knows how to do it, but nonetheless explains the solution to him – in this case, the instructions describe the incantations that accompany the burning ritual, which follows immediately. The patient burns various items – garlic, wool, goat’s hair &c. – in an act of magical transference. The sin, or offence, or sanction of the patient is equated with each of the items, which are then burned, one after the other, while incantations are read detailing how each one will never meaningfully exist. Each incantation ends with the same formula – ‘invocation, sanction, retaliation, questioning; the pain of my hardship, sin, transgression, crime, error; the sickness that is in my body, my flesh, my veins; may [they] be removed⁸⁵ like this X;⁸⁶ may the fire consume them entirely today; may the sanction leave so that I may see the light!’ After everything is burnt there is a single incantation involving magical transfer without fire – ‘Thread of [Šakkan]’, discussed above. After this, the fire is extinguished as two fire-extinguishing incantations are recited.

After the fire is extinguished, a second conversation between Marduk and Ea is recited. This is Reiner’s Tablet VII. As usual, Marduk approaches Ea asking for help in curing the patient. This time, Ea’s instructions do not concern the burning ritual, but rather a ritual involving transfer of the curse to bread which is then left out in the desert. In addition, Ea mentions several other deities, such as Bēlet-Šēri and Ninkilim, who will help the patient according to their individual talents.

In Reiner’s edition, the next Tablet, her VIII our IX, opens with a long list of gods and divine forces, which we have named the *Kultgötterbeschwörung*, accompanied by an invocation litany. After these, the lists from Tablets II and III are partially reprised, with a request that the great gods may absolve the patient. The Tablet closes with a few lines explaining that the patient’s sin has been washed away by Marduk, and detailing a purification ritual involving an *egubbû*-vessel, after which the water is discarded, taking the patient’s problems with it. This is followed by the final Tablet, containing the so-called *Kultmittelbeschwörungen*, in which various items are praised so as to evoke their magical power. The fire god, representing the fire itself; water; incense; and various plants, including the tamarisk and soapwort, are all objects of these brief incantations. This Tablet closes with a *z a g . t i l . l a . b i . š è* ‘completed’.

This précis of the text allows us to see at a glance a number of irregularities in the text. These lead to the appearance, as noted by Reiner,⁸⁷ of a great deal of the text having been included simply for the purpose of padding out a relatively short ritual. The most blatant of these irregularities is the incantation *buru₅ š à . a b z u . t a i m . t a . è . a . n a* ‘the *dimītu*-disease had come out from the midst of the Abzu’ - the second conversation between Marduk and Ea. In the canonical text as it stands, this incantation is wholly unnecessary. The two have already spoken once, Ea has explained how to fix the problem through a burning ritual, and the ritual has been completed. The advice offered by Ea goes unheeded in any case, as the text immediately proceeds to an apparently unrelated incantation invoking dozens of different divine figures.

Likewise, Reiner’s Tablet IX, the *Kultmittelbeschwörungen*, makes little sense. The purpose of such a text is to enhance the magical properties of objects used in the ceremony, but several of the items in Tablet IX have played no role in *Šurpu*. Indeed, apart from a brief allusion in the last few lines of the preceding Tablet, many

⁸⁵ Different verbs are used in each incantation

⁸⁶ Garlic, wool, goats hairs &c.

⁸⁷ Reiner 1958: 6.

of the items are not even mentioned elsewhere – most notably the tamarisk and soapwort, which are the subjects of the first two incantations of Tablet IX.

g[u ^dŠakkan.n]a, ‘Thread of Šakkan’, the first incantation following the burning ritual of Tablet VI is also hard to understand. In the first place, it is bilingual despite being entirely surrounded by unilingual Akkadian incantations. It is one of just two examples in Reiner’s *Šurpu* in which a magical transfer ritual not involving burning is carried out, the other being the purification ritual involving the *egubbû*-vessel. It is not connected to the rituals surrounding it – the burning ceremony precedes it, two incantations for extinguishing the fire follow it. In addition, it is the only incantation in the entire text of **Nin** to be accompanied by an explanatory subscript – *inim.inim.mamam.eri mbur.ruda.ke₄* ‘Conjuration to undo the oath.’

Despite appearances, these sections of the text were not merely added to bulk out the ritual, but were an integral part of the series. The majority of the inconsistencies in the text can be resolved through the reintroduction of Tablet VIII.

The second Ea-Marduk dialogue was intended to introduce the text of Tablet VIII, as detailed above. With the Tablet of rituals following it, the dialogue ceases to be meaningless and becomes crucial – it explains the purpose of the rituals. This is clear not only from the analogy of the first Ea-Marduk dialogue and the burning ritual, but also from the content of the text itself. The dialogue is preceded by a brief description of the nature of the problem – the Dimitu-disease, the Ahhazu-demon and the Māmītu-demon have all made their way to earth and are each spreading their respective forms of chaos, notably weakening the patient with cough, phlegm, spittle and foam. Marduk notices and asks Ea how to fix it. Ea, after deferring to his son’s great wisdom, lists the steps required. In the first place, he tells Marduk to string seven loaves on a bronze skewer, cap it with carnelian and wipe the patient with it. The patient is then made to spit on the skewer, which has the ‘spell of Eridu’ cast on it, before being taken to the desert and left under a thorn bush. Once this has been achieved, five gods are to help solve the problem – Bēlet-Šēri, Ninkilim, Damu, Gula and Marduk himself, who is told to loosen the patient’s bonds through his pure spell. Finally, the man is to be cleaned and entrusted to Šamaš.

Though not every element of this can be explained, the parallels with Tablet VIII are very clear. The symptoms listed at the beginning of the Tablet are almost identical to those listed in the incipit to ‘Sneeze’. Though the start of this incantation is lost, we may reasonably assume that it opened with a description of the problems the patient was facing, especially as Ea suggests that Bēlet-Šēri, the goddess mentioned in the surviving section of the incantation, will help. The reference to Ninkilim, a deified mongoose connected with the creatures of the plain is seen reflected in ‘You Grass’ where the creatures of the plain carry off the patient’s sin. Likewise, Marduk’s loosening of the patient’s bonds is to be connected with ‘Thread of Šakkan’ in which he is said to rip off the thread binding the patient. It is not clear where ‘You corner’ or the two incantations dealing with tamarisk and soapwort fit into this. Nor can we suggest how Gula and her son Damu – two important healing gods – fit into Tablet VIII, except that they may play a role in the two lost incantations from the middle of the Tablet, or in other potential incantations belonging to the Tablet. Overall, though, the picture is striking. The Ea-Marduk dialogue and the incantations of Tablet VIII are two halves of the same set of rituals – a set of rituals which, with the burning rituals of Tablet VI, form the core of *Šurpu*.

It is easy to see that the problem of pointless *Kultmittelbeschwörungen* is radically diminished with the reintroduction of the incantations. Tamarisk and soapwort are now the key components of a set of rituals, and as such the incantations designed to increase their power are now useful. It must be confessed that several of the

incantations still refer to objects which were not, as far as we are aware, used in *Šurpu*. Some of these were presumably used in the broken incantations, and some were perhaps used in actions for which no incantation was required. This, admittedly, could explain all the seemingly unnecessary *Kultmittelbeschwörungen*, but it is likely, and has now been demonstrated, that at least some of the objects used in the ceremony would be mentioned in its text.

The irregularities surrounding ‘Thread of Šakkan’ do not entirely disappear with the introduction of Tablet VIII. However, two of the main difficulties are solved when it is accepted that the incantation is a misplaced element of Tablet VIII. It was not originally designed to accompany the burning rituals but was moved there from its original location. As such, it is perfectly understandable that it does not seem connected to its neighbours. This, moreover, offers an explanation for the subscript - the isolated character of the inscriptions was presumably even clearer to the ancient scholars than to us, and so the subscript was included as an explanatory gloss of an unexpected incantation. In its original context, Šakkan, a god connected to both wool and the wild creatures of the plain,⁸⁸ linked the incantation (and the woollen thread) to Ninkilim – as required by Ea’s introduction. Stripped of this context, it was necessary to explain its presence. The fact that the incantation is bilingual is hard to explain. All manuscripts so far discovered containing Tablet VIII are in unilingual Akkadian, and there is no clear reason that this incantation should buck the trend. It is possible, though it does not seem especially likely, that the passing similarity of this incantation with the consecration texts and the incantation from *Utukkū Lemnūtu* mentioned earlier⁸⁹ played a role in this, as all the first millennium examples are bilingual. Nonetheless, as discussed above, the similarities between these texts and **Nin** VI have been somewhat overstated and there is no clear reason that they should have been able to exert such influence over it.

Overall, then, it is clear that Tablet VIII belongs in *Šurpu*. First, it is described by the catalogues of two recensions, as well as the catchline of Tablet VII. This alone would be sufficient proof had a single complete manuscript or colophon of the Tablet survived. In the absence of such a tablet, however, the confirmation provided by comparing the contents of the incantations with those of the canonical text is all but conclusive.

This is not to say that there are no difficulties with the new Tablet. It is by no means certain whether all the incantations we have listed actually belong to the canonical text. ‘Thread of Šakkan,’ for instance, though presumably belonging to the Tablet in recension **α** cannot have belonged to it in **Nin**, as it appears separately in Tablet VI. It is possible that some of the other incantations listed in **Cat** were also excluded from the canonical text, but we have no way of knowing. The subscript of Reiner’s Tablet IX, naming it the ninth and final Tablet, is another difficulty, as it means there is no space for the new Tablet VIII in the canonical text. This, however, is not such a problem.

Subscript of IX explained

There are two possible solutions to the lack of space implied by the subscript to Reiner’s Tablet IX. It is possible that Tablets VIII and IX shared a tablet, and therefore a subscript, in the same way as V and VI seem to have. This theory is severely hampered by a lack of evidence – no tablet containing both VIII and IX seems to have survived, and so we cannot prove that one existed. That said, it is certain from **Cat** and **VAT** that the two were written on a single tablet in recension **β**. No manuscripts have yet been identified of this either, so the lack of evidence need not crush the suggestion. It should be borne in mind, however, that when Tablets of a fixed

⁸⁸ Wiggermann 2011-2012: 308-309.

⁸⁹ See page 16.

series were brought together in one manuscript, the original rubrics and Tablet numbers were generally maintained.

Alternatively, there is a chance that the subscript does not belong to the canonical text. The subscript number is preserved in only a single manuscript and it is possible that this manuscript belongs to a different recension. It has already been established that there are three recensions of *Šurpu* – **α**, **β**, and **Nin**. **β** is irrelevant here, as we know that Reiner’s Tablet IX was numbered VI, and in general we are able to recognise tablets belonging to this recension. The numbering of **α**, however, is not so clear-cut. While the order of the text is clear, no Tablet numbers are written in any of the catalogues. In addition, it is not possible to use the evidence of subscripts, as the manuscripts are effectively indistinguishable from those of **Nin** - each includes the same incantations in almost the same order. That said, it is possible to work out a reasonable system of numeration based on the known order of incantations:

Table 4 – Recension α

α Tablet no.	First Incantation	Nin Tablet number
I	I am a pure man	I
II	Be it released great gods	II
III	Any oath	III
IV	An evil disease like the Gallu demon	V
V	Like this onion	VI
VI	The Dimitu disease had come out	VII
VII	Sneeze	VIII
VIII	I am raising my curved sticks	IX
IX	Tamarisk, lone tree	X?
Ritual	N/A	No canonical form preserved

It must be stressed that this is only one of several possible reconstructions of the Tablet numbers for recension **α**. It is, however, a defensible guess. It will be noted that ‘Tamarisk, lone tree’ is Tablet IX, and so the problematic colophon could belong to this recension. If this is accepted, the sole remaining sticking point for the acceptance of Tablet VIII as part of canonical *Šurpu* disappears. As such, we can reasonably renumber Reiner’s VIII and IX. The last two Tablets of the canonical text should be IX and X.

Incidentally, this method cannot be used to explain away the colophon to Reiner’s Tablet VII. No manipulation of the sources, short of separating the burning rituals from one another, can cause the Ea-Marduk dialogue to be numbered higher than VI in recension **α**. The presence of *epiš risbi* as Tablet IV of **Nin** makes the canonical text the only possible home for the colophon to VII.

Conclusion

This examination of the evidence of the catalogues and subscripts, as well as the internal structure of the text, allows us to present a revised version of the text of *Šurpu*. Tablet I can be almost entirely restored, Tablets V and VI can be separated, and Tablet VIII can be reintroduced to the text. The complete reconstruction of the text is as follows:

Table 5 – Šurpu

Tablet no.	First Incantation	Reiner Tablet number
I	I am a pure man	No complete tablet preserved Appendix = close analogue
II	Be it released great gods	II
III	Any oath	III
IV	It rests with you Marduk	IV
V	An evil disease like the Gallu demon	V-VI
VI	Like this onion	V-VI
VII	The Dimitu disease had come out	VII
VIII	Sneeze	No complete tablet preserved Fragments of many incantations have been identified, which are not in Reiner's edition
IX	I am raising my curved sticks	VIII
X	Tamarisk, lone tree	IX
Ritual	N/A	No canonical form preserved I = different recension

Comparison of recensions

Having established the text as fully as is possible without further manuscripts, it is of some interest to compare the recensions with one another.

By far the most balanced and fully-rounded version of the text is recension **α**. After some opening remarks, there are two lists of possible problems, two Ea-Marduk dialogues, each prescribing its own set of ritual actions, and two lists designed to bolster the success of the ceremony – one to the objects used, the *Kultmittelbeschwörungen*, and one to the gods involved – which we would like to call the *Kultgötterbeschwörungen*.

Nin is comparatively overbalanced. Instead of two lists of problems there are three, one of which doubles as a hymn to Marduk. The list-hymn provides no additional information, but simply reprises the content of the other two lists. In addition, the relocation of ‘Thread of Šakkan’ not only denudes the incantation of its context, but also interrupts the flow of the burning ritual. In the other recensions, the fire is lit, the transference and burning is performed, the fire god is invoked, and then the fire is extinguished. In **Nin**, an unrelated ritual involving binding the patient’s head and legs is interposed between the burning of the objects and the extinguishment of the fire.

The arrangement of **Nin** appears to demonstrate a marked shift in outlook. In recension **α**, *Šurpu* is a ceremony intended to secure, more or less in equal measure, the support of every god. In **Nin** the support of Marduk is paramount. The sole function of the list-hymn is to praise Marduk at length. This is emphasised by the relocation of ‘May Anu and Antu stand by.’ In **α** this brief incantation is recited immediately after the second list of evils, and serves to bring the attention of all the great gods to bear on the situation. In **Nin** the 12 line incantation follows the 87 line list-hymn in praise of Marduk, which follows the second list. Thus, the sanctions enumerated in Tablet III cease to be the indiscriminate concern of all the gods, but are addressed to Marduk

first, and only very much later to the rest of the pantheon. Likewise, the only plausible explanation for the relocation of 'Thread of Šakkan' is that it was intended to disrupt the burning rituals addressed to Gibil. Marduk is the saviour in this incantation – it is he who rips the evil threads from the patient's body. Its placement in the canonical text serves to diminish the dominance of Gibil at the crucial moment of the ceremony.

Chapter 2

Tablet IX

Having established the text of *Šurpu* as a whole, the logical thing would be to produce a comprehensive re-edition of the text. Unfortunately, it is not possible within the confines of a PhD thesis to do justice to the entire series, and so it has been decided instead to focus on a single Tablet. While in light of the argument presented in chapter one Tablet VIII is the most reasonable candidate, it has been decided instead to focus on Tablet IX.⁹⁰ This has been decided on a number of grounds. In the first place, the known manuscripts of Tablet VIII do not constitute anything approaching the complete text. Until new duplicates are found, only a very partial edition could be made, and the vast majority of this has been presented recently by Abusch and Schwemer.⁹¹ Tablet IX, on the other hand, is very nearly complete. In addition, a new join made by the present writer (**Bab1A**) has added significantly to the text. Finally, Tablet IX is perhaps the least understood part of the series in terms of content, and therefore the extensive commentary which follows (Chapter 3) constitutes a substantial desideratum.

Tablet IX consists of a single incantation of around 80 lines: ÉN *ašši gamlīya apaṭṭarakka apaššarakka* ‘Incantation: I am raising my curved sticks, I release you, I undo you.’ This incantation is composed of three sections. The first (ll. 1-35) is an embedded list of gods, in which each group of gods is separated by rulings and followed by the phrase *lipturuka lipšuruka aš[ši gamlīya apaṭṭarakka apaššarakka]* ‘may they remove you, may they absolve you. I am ra[ising my curved sticks, I release you, I undo you.]’ This is almost invariably abbreviated KIMIN KIMIN ‘ditto ditto.’

The second section (ll. 36-75) opens with an invocation to Amurru, bearer of the *gamlu*-stick mentioned in the incipit and in the refrain of the first section. This is followed (ll. 37-42) by a list of evils that should be removed. Next (ll. 43-70) comes a lengthy list of *māmītu*-sanctions which should also be removed. This list largely mirrors those of Tablets II and III. The list is followed (l. 71) by an invocation to the gods in general to help the patient, and then (ll.72-75) by a shorter list of the different kinds of evil that may be to blame for the patient’s condition. The shorter list resumes that of ll. 37-42.

The final section (ll. 76-83) describes the cleaning and purification of the patient using an *egubbû*-vessel. The vessel is not explicitly mentioned, but can be inferred from the text, in which water gathered from various sources, along with water infused with the essences of precious materials, is poured on the ground. The principle here is one of transference – the water is supposed to carry away the stain of sin which has blighted the patient. The incantation closes with a final exhortation that the *gamlu*-stick will cure the patient.

The whole incantation works as a sort of *Šurpu* in miniature – the patient’s sins are listed, they are undone with ritual action and the stain they left is washed away. The exact nature of the ritual action is not clear as the only copy of a Ritual Tablet for *Šurpu* is broken and so does not preserve the details of Tablet IX. However, several elements are clear from the incantation itself and from the Ritual Tablets of the other series in which *ašši gamlīya* is incorporated. In section 1, the priest gives a *gamlu*-stick to the patient and has him recite the incantation.⁹² This brings divine support by enlisting the help of all the gods, though it is unclear what action is taken with the stick. Section 2, as it follows Tablets II and III closely, presumably utilises similar ritual

⁹⁰ In the following discussion, all manuscripts are referred to by the sigla given in my new partitur transliteration.

⁹¹ Abusch and Schwemer 2016: 157-166 (Text 8.20). See note 42, above.

⁹² Ambos 2013: 171, l. y+30^o; Maul & Strauß 2011: 88, no. 39, l. 10^o.

techniques to those detailed for these Tablets.⁹³ According to the Ritual Tablet of *Šurpu*, these consist of wiping the patient with flour then burning it, and then sprinkling the patient with water.⁹⁴ The ritual instructions for KAL 4, 39 also dictate that the patient should touch a fermenting vat and stand, and be fumigated with censer and torch before being washed with water from an *egubbû*-vessel.⁹⁵ Unfortunately, as this text is quite badly damaged, it is not possible to be certain that these instructions are related to the incantation *ašši gamlīya*. This is particularly uncertain as the Ritual Tablet of *Bīt šalā' mē* also calls for contact with a fermenting vat, but follows this with an incantation addressed to the brewing god Siris.⁹⁶ Contact with a beer vat and stand are, however, standard tools of purification in *Namburbi* texts,⁹⁷ while fumigation with torch and censer is ubiquitous. This is presumably their function in KAL 4, and it is certainly possible that they played the same role in *Šurpu*. The action involving flour is plainly another example of transference – the flour absorbs each of the sins as they are listed, then is burned, taking the sin with it. The water is presumably to remove whatever flour is left, as well as for general purification. This leads neatly to section 3 in which the patient is washed with special water which is then poured on the ground, carrying all the problems with it. This is a sensible conclusion to the ceremony as it not only removes whatever sin-laden flour could not be wiped off, but, by virtue of using special water, it is efficacious in its own right.

This incantation has been poorly understood owing to an editorial decision made by both Reiner and Borger. Both editors adopted AŠ1, the sole exemplar of the text from Aššur, as their base text. This was a sound decision from one perspective – this is the only tablet to offer a relatively unbroken text for the first 30 lines, and, when Reiner was writing, several lines were preserved nowhere else. Unfortunately, AŠ1 offers a very inferior text, subject to several omissions, interpolations and errors. This has resulted in a number of misapprehensions regarding the text, the most important of which are as follows:

- The sections separated by rulings have been treated as separate incantations
- The first five lines of the text have been garbled
- The line divisions and line numbering do not reflect the text as it is usually preserved
- Several gods' names have been incorporated in error

The majority of these will be discussed in the line by line commentary below, but one point that has already been touched upon should be mentioned here. We have described Tablet IX as consisting of a single incantation, which is at odds with Reiner's edition. The basis for her reading is AŠ1. After each ruling in the first section, the Aššur text begins the next line with the incantation marker, ÉN. One result of this has been that the incantation *ašši gamlīya*, which is also prescribed as part of several other rituals, has been generally understood to consist of the first five lines only.

That the text does not consist of several very short incantations is clear from a number of observations. In the first place, it makes little sense for each short list to be treated as a separate incantation. Each list consists of around a dozen deities and the litany phrase exhorting their assistance and describing the ritual action of the priest with the *gamlīya*-sticks. If the lists are separate incantations, it should be possible to excerpt them for use in other contexts, and to refer to them by incipit in incantation catalogues. There is no evidence that any of the

⁹³ There is a chance that the items listed in line 36 are utilised in some way for section 2. See commentary l. 36.

⁹⁴ Reiner 1958: 11, ll.10-13.

⁹⁵ Maul and Strauß 2011: 88-89, ll. 12'-14'.

⁹⁶ Ambos 2013: 171, l. y+32'-y+33'

⁹⁷ Caplice 1967: 23, l. 9; Caplice 1971: 143, l. 24.

short lists was ever treated in such a way, which speaks strongly against their having been recognised as separate. This is underlined by the evidence of **XX1**, a school text listing the first one or two names from each of the divisions. These are not listed as incipits with the incantation marker, but simply as a list of names.

Perhaps more fundamentally, apart from the Aššur manuscript only one other manuscript (**Ur1**), a late Babylonian school text, starts each list with ÉN. The relevant lines are preserved on seven other manuscripts (**Nin1**, **Nin2**, **Nin4**, **Nin7**, **Nin8**, **Ur2** and **X1**) none of which contain the incantation marker. The Nineveh tablets are good library copies, and generally very reliable as would be expected. **Ur2** is a school text containing only a brief extract from the incantation. It prefaces each list with DIŠ KIMIN, indicating that the scribe understood the text to be more closely related to lexical or omen texts, in which the item marker DIŠ is commonly used. **X1** is Late Babylonian and includes a number of variations and omissions from the other manuscripts. The absence of the incantation marker in this relatively diverse selection of manuscripts is very strong evidence that the sign is superfluous.

A final point against the text consisting of separate incantations is the context in which *ašši gamlīya* appears elsewhere. ‘I am raising my curved sticks’ is the final incantation prescribed in the Ritual Tablet to *Maqlû*:⁹⁸

178’ [arkišu ÉN ašši] *gamlīya tamannūma* [Afterwards] you recite [the Incantation “I am raising] my curved sticks,”

179’ *mê tasalla*’ you then sprinkle water.

As discussed above, we should take the sprinkling of water to be the ritual action which accompanies the reading of the incantation, as the purpose of the Ritual Tablet is to provide such direction. Water plays no evident role in the five lines which would constitute *ašši gamlīya* if the text is composed of several short incantations, and so the direction makes little sense. As has already been described, however, the final section (ll. 75-83) consists of a bathing and purification ritual in which water is poured on the ground. It is an obvious conclusion that this is the reason *Maqlû* calls for the sprinkling of water at this point.

As a result of taking **Aš1** as the base text, Borger’s partitur edition of this Tablet is unwieldy. Since the majority of tablets do not present the same line divisions as the Aššur tablet, his text is littered with arrows and duplications. For this reason, coupled with the identification of two new fragments,⁹⁹ a new partitur has been produced. In creating this partitur, all British Museum fragments have been re-examined at first hand, resulting in one new direct join (BM 33636 + BM 33855 = **Bab1A**), and one indirect join (BM 33636+ (+) BM 33584 = **Bab1B**). There is a gap of approximately half an inch which prevents a direct join. It has not been possible to examine **Kiš1**, **Aš1** or **Ur1** in person, in lieu of which the published hand copies have been relied upon, coupled with the photograph of **Kiš1** available through CDLI.

The partitur is followed by an eclectic transliteration, a normalised Akkadian text and an English translation. In the eclectic transliteration and normalisation **Aš1** has been ignored except where it is supported by other evidence and where there is no alternative, though its variants are discussed in the relevant lines of the commentary. **Nin1** has been used as the base text as it preserves the majority of the text with relatively few lacunae. It would perhaps have been preferable to use one of the other **Nin** texts, as the line divisions of **Nin1**, especially within the *Kultgötterbeschwörungen* section, are often at odds with all other manuscripts. However,

⁹⁸ Abusch 2016: 378.

⁹⁹ BM 33584 and BM 33636. My thanks are due to Christopher Walker for the references..

no other manuscript is even nearly as complete as **Nin1** and the differences in line division are usually due to a single name written at the end of a line rather than the start of the following line. The unfortunate effect of this is that the partitur transliteration still suffers from an excess of arrows, though far fewer duplications. It is thus substantially easier to read.

The sigla used in the partitur and discussion are detailed in the following table. These follow Borger's usage, denoting the city from which each tablet came. Borger did not follow this sigla for **Bab1**, of which he only knew BM 33855, presumably due to the uncertain provenance of tablets in the Babylon collection. However, the Rm. 4 collection, to which all 3 fragments of **Bab1** belong, was shipped at a date when the only excavation work in progress was in Babylon itself and so we can be fairly confident that the tablet was originally from the city.¹⁰⁰ The collections to which **X1**, **X2** and **XX1** belong are not so clear cut. Both **X1** and **XX1** are from Rassam's excavations in Babylonia, but could be from practically any city. **X2** was purchased from the antiquities dealers Spartali and co. when they went bust, so could be from anywhere.¹⁰¹

In addition to giving the tablet number and the lines preserved on each text, the table attempts to provide a complete publication history for each fragment. The CDLI number and Reiner's sigla are listed where they exist. The column headed Zim./Lam. lists two unrelated things combined in a single column purely to save space. Zim, denoted by a superscript Z, refers to the plate number of hand copies in Zimmern's edition. Lam., denoted by a superscript L., refers to the folio number of Lambert's transliteration notebooks. The final column lists any other publication in which a copy or transliteration, whether whole or partial, has appeared. References to tablets which do not include either a copy or transliteration have not been included.

The line by line commentary is as extensive as seemed useful. It does not discuss well-known gods or address orthographic variants. Rather, the focus is on elucidating the less immediately intelligible meaning in the text – obscure gods are discussed at length, as are the ideas underlying the list of *māmītu*.

¹⁰⁰ Reade 1986: xxix.

¹⁰¹ Reade 1986: xxx-xxxi.

Table 6 - Šurpu IX Sigla

Sigla	Tablet number	Lines preserved	CDLI number	Zim. / Lam.	Reiner	Other
Nin1	K. 2866 + K. 8174 + ^{RB} K. 18633 + ^{RB} K. 18792	13-end	394723	^Z Pl. 16 (8174)	A (2866+8174)	Smith 1887: Pl. 17-19 (2866)
Nin2A	K. 3415	21-69	395000 (no photo)	-	H	
Nin2B	79-7-8, 193	2-9	451879	^L 9280	-	CAD B: 141b Lambert 2013: 226
Nin3	K. 3890 + ^{WGL} K. 7989 + K. 13452 + ^{WGL} K. 17045 + ^{WGL} K. 18168 + ^{RB} K. 21412	37-68	395292 (no photo)	^Z Pl. 16 (13452)	I (3890) E (7989+13452)	
Nin4	K. 10758	26-36	398871	-	D	
Nin5	K. 14718	55-60	400949	-	F	King 1914: 123, 1269
Nin6	K. 15261	61-67	401274	-	G	
Nin7	Sm. 1717	1-7	426067	-	J	
Nin8	Rm. 2, 166	1-10; Colophon	424969	-	B	Zimmern 1915-1916: 201
Nin9	82-3-23, 130	15-27; 77-end	452152	-	C	
Aš1	VAT 9726 = KAR 30	1-33; 65-83	369014 (no photo)	-	k	Ebeling 1919: 326 & Pl. 30
Kiš1	Ashm. 1924-2042 = OECT 11, 41	41-48	348927	-	-	Gurney 1989: Pl. 41
Ur1	UET 6/II 408	9-46	346448	-	-	Gadd and Kramer 1966: Pl. 296
Ur2	UET 6/II 409	18-23	346449	-	-	Gadd and Kramer 1966: Pl. 297
Urk1	W. 22730/4 = SpTU II, 15	40-59	348620 (no photo)	-	-	von Weiher 1983: 77-78 & 251
Bab1A	BM 33636 + ^{FS} BM 33855 = Rm. 4. 192 + Rm. 4. 415+418	8-80	-	^L 9356 (33855)	-	33636 unpublished
Bab1B	BM 33584 = Rm. 4. 140	15-20	-	-	-	Unpublished
X1	BM 76211 + BM 82990 + BM 83043 = 83-1-18, 1576 + 1581 + 1586 + 83-1-21, 153 + 206	17-42	-	^L 9287-9288	p (extracts)	Pinches 1893: 194 (extracts) Pinches 1904: 53-54 (extracts)
X2	BM 77646 = 84-2-11, 389	43-46; 73-75	-	^L 10032 & 10203	-	
XX1	BM 42552 = 81-7-1, 311	Catalogue 9-36	-	^L 10100	Page 59	Pinches 1926: 216-217

Partitur

1	Nin7 1	[]	<i>a-paṭ-ṭa-rak-ka</i> [<i>a-paš-ša-rak-ka?</i>]
	Nin8 1	ʿén íl ^{šil} ^d <i>gam-li-ia a-p</i> [<i>aṭ-ṭa-rak-ka a-paš-ša-rak-ka?</i>]		
	Aš1 1	[é]n íl ^{šil} <i>gam^l-li-ia a-paṭ-ṭa-ra[?]-x</i> [...]		
2	Nin2B 1'	[]	^d <i>r</i> amar ^r -[utu ...] (ruling)
	Nin7 2	[]	en <i>šá</i> ti-la ^{gis} tukul <i>lab-bi-[bu[?]...]</i>
	Nin8 2	^d <i>asal-lú-ḥi</i> lugal <i>šá</i> dingir ^{mes} ^d amar-utu en <i>šá</i> ti-[la ...]		
	Aš1 2	^d <i>asal-lú-ḥi</i> lugal <i>šá</i> dingir ^{mes} ^d MES en [...]		
	Aš1 3	^{gis} tukul <i>la-bu</i> gal-meš-te ^l du ₈ -meš-ka búr-m[eš-ka ...]		
3	Nin2B 2'	[]	<i>re-mé-nu</i>]- ^r u ^r ^d amar-utu <i>muš-te-š</i> [<i>ir</i> ...]
	Nin7 3	[]	^d amar-utu <i>muš-te-š</i> [<i>ir</i> ...]
	Nin8 3	<i>e-zi</i> ù <i>pa-šir</i> <i>re-mé-nu-u</i> ^d amar-[utu ...]		
	Aš1 4	<i>muš-te^l-šir ḥab-li ḥa-bíl-tú</i> →		
4	Nin2B 3'	[]	<i>šib-ṭu</i> ^d nam -tar →
	Nin7 4	[]	<i>ša</i>]m-ru <i>šib-bu šib-ṭu</i> [...]
	Nin8 4	^{gis} tukul <i>la pi-du</i> ^{gis} tukul <i>e-z-zu</i> • <i>šam-r</i> [u ...]		
	Aš1 4	← ^{gis} tukul <i>la p</i> [<i>i-du</i> ...]		
	Aš1 5	<i>šib-bu šib-ṭu</i> nam-t[a]r →		
5	Nin2B 3'	← im x[...]		
	Nin7 5	[]	<i>lip-ṭu-ru</i>]-ka <i>lip-šu-ru-ka[?]</i> áš-[<i>ši</i> ^d gamlīya <i>apaṭṭarakka?</i>]
	Nin8 5	im ^{mes} <i>u</i> nim-gír ^{mes} <i>šam-ru-ti</i> <i>lip-ṭu-ru-ka</i> li[<i>p-šu-ru-ka</i> ... [?]]		
	Aš1 5	←im nim-gír <i>ša</i> ^d MES [...]		
<hr/>				
6	Nin2B 4'	[]	<i>ba</i>]-aš [?] -mu ^d lāḥ-mu ^d muš-[<i>ḥuš</i> ...]
	Nin7 6	[]	<i>ba-a</i>]š-mu <i>lā</i> [<i>ḥ-mu</i> ...]
	Nin8 6	<i>šu-ut</i> a ^{mes} íd <i>na-ba-li</i> <i>ba-aš-m</i> [u ...]		
	Aš1 6	én <i>šu-ut</i> a ^{mes} íd <i>u na-ba-li</i> <i>ba</i> -[<i>aš-mu</i> ...]		
	Aš1 7	<i>ur-idim-ma</i> →		
7	Nin2B 5'	[]	^d i]m.dugud <i>na-^ri-ru</i> →
	Nin7 7	[]	<i>suḥur-má</i>]š ^{ku6} [...]
	Nin8 7	<i>ku-sa-rik-ki</i> ku ₆ -lú-u ₁₈ -lu <i>suḥ</i> [<i>ur-más^{ku6}</i> ...]		
	Aš1 7	← <i>ku-sa-rik-ku</i> ku ₆ -lú-u ₁₈ -lu <i>suḥur</i> -[<i>más^{ku6}</i> ...]		
8	Nin2B 5'	← <i>u₄-m</i> [u ...]		
	Nin8 8	<i>u₄-mu</i> <i>šá</i> igi ^d +en <i>pu-luḥ-ta ḥur-ba-šu</i> n[<i>am-ri-ri</i> ...]		

	Aš1 8	<i>u₄-mu šá igi en pu-luḫ-tú ḫur-ba-šu nam[ri-ri ...]</i>	
	Aš1 9	<i>na-din-a^{mesš}-šu^{II} du₈-[meš-ka ...]</i>	
	Bab1A 1'	[ki]- ^r min ^r [...]
9	Nin2B 6'	[ma]-ḫa-zu ši-i-ru [...]
	Nin8 9	<i>é-sag-íl šá-qu-ú r[a-áš-bu ...]</i>	
	Aš1 10	<i>én é-sag-íl šá-qu-u ra-áš-bu ma-ḫ[a-zu ...]</i>	
	Ur1 1	[én é-sag-íl] šá-qu-ú re-eš ma-ḫa-zu ši- ^r i ^r - ^r ru ^r ṣu ^r -bat dingir ^r ₂ ^{mesš} gal ^[mesš]	
	Bab1A 2'	[](space) dingir ^r ₂ ^{mesš} gal ^r ₂ ^{mesš?}
	XX1 1	<i>é-sag-íl šá-qu-ú ra-áš-bu</i>	
10	Nin8 10	<i>be₂-let₂ é₂-sag₂-íl₂ ša[r-rat ...]</i>	
	Aš1 11	<i>be-let é-sag-íl šar-rat é₂-sag-íl [...]</i>	
	Aš1 12	<i>be-let tin-tir^{ki} šar-rat tin^r-tir^{ki} [...]</i>	
	Ur1 2	[^d be-let-é-sa]g-gíl ^d šar-rat-min ^d kal-lat-min ^d be-let-tin-tir ^{ki} ṣar-rat-min ^d +en ^r [...]	
	Bab1A 3'	[be-let tin-tir ^{ki} šar-rat tin-tir ^{ki}]
11	Aš1 13	<i>ul-mu šu-ta-ḫu im nim-gír šá^d ME[S² ...]</i>	
	Ur1 3	[šu]-tá-ḫu šá ^d amar-utu lip-ṭur-ú-ka u lip-šu-ru-ka áš-sú ^{gis} zubi-ia a-[paṭṭarakka]
	Bab1A 4'	[](space) ki-min ki-[min]
12	Aš1 14	<i>én aḫ-bi-tum e-bi-tum ma-ag-rat-inim-s[u ...]</i>	
	Aš1 15	<i>gu-za-lu-ú^d di-ku₅ →</i>	
	Ur1 4	[... ^d a]ḫ-bi-tum ^d ia-bi-tum ^d ma-ag-rat-a-mat-su ^d en-nu-gi gu-za-lá ^d di-ku ₅ →	
	Bab1A 5'	[] ^d di-k[u ₅] (space)
	XX1 2	<i>^daḫ-bi-ta^d ia-a-bi-tum</i>	
13	Nin1 1'	[^d zar-pa-ni]- ^r tum ^r AG ^r taš-me-tum ^d uraš ^d [nita...]
	Aš1 15	← ^d MES ^d numun-dù-t[ú ...]	
	Aš1 16	<i>^duraš^d nita^d za-ba₄-ba₄ →</i>	
	Ur1 4	← ^d [amar-utu]	
	Ur1 5	^r d ^r zar-pa-ni-tum ^d +AG ^d taš-me-tum ^d uraš ^d nita ^d u za-ba ₄ -ba ₄ →	
	Bab1A 6'	[^d za-ba ₄]-ba ₄ << ^d >> →
14	Nin1 2'	[] ^d lugal-bàn-da ^d lugal-dìm-me-er-[an-ki-a ki-min]
	Aš1 16	← ^d bad-bàn-d[a ^r ...]	
	Aš1 17	<i>^dlugal-dìm-me-er-an-ki-[a ...]</i>	
	Ur1 5	← ^d +en-líl-bàn-da ^d lugal-bàn-da ^d [lugal-dìm-me-er-an-ki-a ki-min ki-min]	
	Bab1A 6'	← ^d +en-líl-bàn-d[a] (space)	
	Bab1A 7'	[](space) ki-min ki-[min]

Ur1 8	← ^d zi ^ˀ - ^r za ^ˀ - ^r an ^ˀ -[nu ^ˀ]
Ur1 9	^d šar-rat-ib-rat ^{d2} be-let-edin ^{d2} be-let qab-lu u mē ki-min k[i-min]
Ur2 8	← ^d zi-za-nu ^d gašan-ib-ri ^d gašan-edin ^d gašan-<mur>ub ₄
Ur2 9	(space) _{x-li-ip-tu-x-x} ta-ħa-zu min min
Bab1A 11'	[^d nin-šen-šen]-na ù ta-ħa-zi ki-min ki-min
Bab1B 4'	[^d ib-ri ^d be-let-ed[in ...]
X1 3'	[^d šar ^ˀ -rat- ^d ib-rat ^d be-let-edin ^d nin-šen-šen-na [...]

20	Nin1 8'	^d na-bi-um ^d AG ^d li ₉ -si ₄ ^d li-bur-dan-nu ^d pa-bil-[sag]
	Nin9 6'	[^d li-b]ur-dan-nu ^d pa-bi[l-sag]
	Aš1 23	én ^d na-bi-um ^d AG ^d li ₉ -si ₄ [...]
	Ur1 10	[é]n ^d na-bi-um ^d +AG ^d li ₉ -si ₄ ^d li-bur-dam-qu ^d pa-bil-sag →
	Ur2 10	DİŠ ki-min ^d na-bi-um ^d +AG [^d li] ₉ -si ₄ ^d li-bur-dan-nu ^d pa-bil-sag
	Bab1A 12	[^d pa-bi]l-sag →
	Bab1B 5'	[^d li ₉ -s[i ₄ ...]
	X1 4'	^d na-bi-um ^d +AG ^d en ^ˀ ^d li ₉ -si ₄ ^d li-bur-dan-nu ^d pa-b[i]l-s[ag] →
	XX1 5'	^d na-bi-um ^d AG

21	Nin1 9'	^d hendur-sag-gá ^d iškur ^d nin-urta ^d PA ^d LUGAL ^d ú-šur-inim-su ^d mi-šar-[rum ...]
	Nin2A 1'	^d [...]
	Nin9 7'	[^d ú-šur-inim-s[u] ^d mi-šar-rum k[i-min]
	Aš1 24	^d hendur-sag-gá ^d iškur ^d nin-urta ^d PA ^d [LUGAL ...]
	Ur1 10	← ^d [hendur-sa]g-gá ^d iškur ^d [...]
	Ur1 11	^d PA ^d LUGAL ^d ú-šur-a-mat-su ^d me-šá-ru ^d ga-ga u ^d en-kur-kur ki-min ki-min
	Ur2 11	(space) ^d hendur-sag-gá ^d iškur ^d nin-urta ^d PA u ^d LUGAL ^d ú-šur-a-mat-su
	Ur2 12	(space) ù ^d mi-šá-ri lip-tu-ur-ru-ka lip-šu-ur-ru-ka
	Bab1A 12'	← (space) ^d hendur-sag-gá
	Bab1A 13'	[^d mi-šá]-ri (space) ki-min ki-min
	X1 4'	← [broken]
	X1 5'	[^d nin-urta ^d PA u ^d LUGAL ^d ú-šur-a-mat-su u ^d mi-šá-ri]

22	Nin1 10'	^d kù-sù ^d NINDAxGU ₄ ^d müš LÀL ^d nin-SARxGU ₄ ^d nuska ^d pap-sukkal ^d utu ^d a-a ^d [bu-ne-ne]
	Nin2A 2'	^d kù-sù' [...]
	Nin9 8'	[^d pap-sukkal[al ^d]utu ^d a-a ^d bu-ne-n[e]
	Aš1 25	én < ^d >kù-sù ^d NINDAx[GU ₄] ^d müš LÀL ^d n[in-EZENxGU ₄ ...]
	Aš1 26	^d utu ^d a-a ^d bu-ne-ne →
	Ur1 12	én ^d kù-sù ^d NINDAxGU ₄ ^d +müš LÀL ^d nin-EZENxGU ₄ ^d nuska ^d nin-šubur ^d utu ^d a-a ^d bu-ne-ne
	Ur2 13	DİŠ ki-min ^d kù-sù ^d NINDAxGU ₄ ^d +müš LÀL ^d nin-EZENxGU ₄ ^d nuska ^d pap _ˀ -sukkal _ˀ
	Ur2 14	(space) ^d utu ^d a-a ^d bu-ne-ne →
	Bab1A 14'	[^d pap-s]ukkal ^d utu ^d a-a (space) ^d bu-ne-ne

X1 6'	^d kù-sù ^d NINDA _x GU ₄ ^d LÀL ^d nin- ^r EZEN _x GU ₄ ^d nuska ^d pap-sukkal ^d utu ^d [a-a ...]
XX1 6'	^d kù-sù ^d NINDA _x GU ₄
23	
Nin1 11'	^d iš ₈ -tár-mul-meš ^d lú-ḫuš-a ^d IGI-DU • ^d lugal-GÌR-r[a] • [...]
Nin2A 3'	^d iš ₈ -tar-mul-me[š ...]
Nin9 9'	[^d IGI-D]U ^d lugal-GÌR-ra k[i-min]
Aš1 26	← ^d iš ₈ -tá[r-mul-meš ...]
Ur1 13	^d nin-si ₄ -an-na ^d lú-ḫuš ^{giš} KU-AN u ^d lugal-GÌR-ra ki-min ki-min
Ur2 14	← ^d iš ₈ -tar-mul ^d lú-ḫuš
Ur2 15	(space) ^d IGI-DU ^d lugal-GÌR-ra u ^d mes-lam-ta-è-a _{min} [...]]
Bab1A 15'	[^d mes]-lam-ta-è-a (space) ki-min ki-min
X1 7'	[^d]XV-mul ^r - ^r meš ^d lú-ḫuš ^d IGI-DU ^d lugal-GÌR-ra u ^d mes-la[m-ta-è-a ...]
<hr/>	
24	
Nin1 12'	^d NE-GI ^d GÌR ^d tu-tu ^d imin-bi ^d na-ru-da ^d èr-ra-gal ^d a-ri- ^r tum] [...]
Nin2A 4'	^d giš-bar ^d GÌR ^d tu-tu ^d imin ^r - ^r bi ^r [...]
Nin9 10'	[^d èr-ra-gal ^d a-ri-tum be-let ^r mè [?]]
Aš1 27	én ^d giš-bar ^d GÌR ^d tu-tu ^d imin-b[i ...]
Aš1 28	[^d]èr-ra-gal ^d a-ri-tum ^d be-lat-u[ru [?] ...]→
Ur1 14	[én ^d][^d NE _r -GI ^d GÌR ^d tu-tu ^d imin-bi ^d na-ru-du ^d èr-ra-gal ^d a-ri-tum
Ur1 15	[broken] →
Bab1A 16'	[^d èr]-ra-gal ^d a-ri-tum
Bab1A 17'	[broken] →
X1 8'	[^d]NE-GI ^d GÌR ^d tu-tu ^d imin-bi ^d na-ru-du ^d èr-ra-gal[l ...]
X1 9'	^d nin-mè [?] →
XX1 7'	^d NE-GI ^d GÌR
25	
Nin1 13'	^d nin-urta ^d nin-gír-su ••• ^d ba-Ú u ^d gu-la ^r [...]
Nin2A 5'	^d nin-urta ^d nin-gír-su ^d ba- ^r Ú] [...]
Nin9 11'	[^d gu-la k[i-min]
Aš1 28	← [broken]
Ur1 15	← ^d . _{nin} -urta ^d nin-gír-su ^d ba-Ú u ^d gu-la ki-min ki-min
Bab1A 17'	← [^d g]u-la ki-min ki-min
X1 9'	← ^d nin-urta ^d nin-gír-su ^d ba-Ú u ^d gu-l[a ...]
<hr/>	
26	
Nin1 14'	^d u-gur ^d i-šum ^d šu-bu-lá ^d lugal- ^{giš} asal ₂ ^d ma-mi-tu[m] ^d lú-là[l]
Nin2A 6'	^d u-gur ^d i-šum ^d šu-bi [?] -lá ^d lugal- ^{giš} a[sal ₂ ...] →
Nin4 1'	^d u-gur ^d i ^r -[šum ...]
Nin9 12'	[^d m]a-mi-tum ^d lú-làl →
Aš1 29	én ^d u-gur ^d i-šum ^d šu-bu-Ú ^d lugal-[^{giš} asal ₂ ...]
Aš1 30	^d lú- ^r làl →

Ur1 16	[^d i]-šum ^d šu-bu-lá ^d lugal- ^{gis} <a>sal ₂ ^d ma-am-mi-tum ^d lú-là[l]
Bab1A 18'	[^d ma-am-mi-tum ^d lú-làl
X1 10'	^d nè-eri ₁₁ -gal ^d i-šum ^d šu-bu-lá ^d lugal- ^{gis} <asal ₂ ^d ma-a[m [?] -mi-tum]
X1 11'	[^d lú-làl →
XX1 8'	^d nè-eri ₁₁ -gal
<hr/>	
27	
Nin1 15'	^d la-ta-rak ^d šar-ra-ḫu ^d mas-su-ú ^d kà-kà u ^d +en-kur-kur • ki-[min]
Nin2A 6'	← [broken]
Nin2A 7'	< ^d >šar-ra-ḫu ^d mas-su-ú ^d ga-a-g[i ...]
Nin4 2'	^d la-ta-ra[k ...]
Nin9 12'	← ^d la-ta-r[ak]
Nin9 13'	[^d kà-kà u ^d +en-kur-kur k[i-min]
Aš1 30	← ^d la-GA-rak ^d EZEN-ra-ḫ[u ...]
Ur1 17	[^d šar-ra-ḫu ^d mas-su-ú ^d kà-kà u ^d en-kur-kur k[i-min ...] (end)
Bab1A 19'	[<< ^d >> ^d +en-kur-kur ki-min ki-min
X1 11'	← ^d la-ta-ra-ak-a ^d šar-ra-ḫu ^d mas-su-ú ^d kà-kà [...]
<hr/>	
28	
Nin1 16'	^d lugal-marad-da ^d IM-zu-an-na ^d nin-imma ₃ ^d šu-zi-an-na ^d šul-pa-è-a ₁
Nin2A 8'	^d lugal-marad-da ^d IM-zu-an-na ^d nin-imma ₃ ^d [...] →
Nin4 3'	^d lugal-marad-d[a ...]
Aš1 31	[é]n ^d lugal-marad-da ^d IM-GÍR-an-n[a ...]
Aš1 32	^d šul-pa-è →
Ur1 18/r.1	[^d tu ^d IM-zu-an-na ^d nin-imma ₃ ^d šu-zi-an-na ^d šul ₁ -[pa-è-a]
Bab1A 20'	[^d šul-pa-è-a
X1 12'	^d lugal-marad-da ^d IM-zu-an-na ^d nin-imma ₃ ^d šu-zi-an-na ^d šul ₁ -UD ₁ -DU ₁ -[...] →
XX1 9'	^d lugal-marad-da
<hr/>	
29	
Nin1 17'	^d sa-dàr-nun-an-na ^d be-let-dingir-dingir ^d SU-KUR-RU ^d ŠIM u ^d [nin-giš-z]i-da ki-min [?]
Nin2A 8'	← [broken]
Nin2A 9'	be-let dingir ^{mes} ^d SU-KUR-RU ^d ŠIM [...]
Nin4 4'	^d sa-dàr-n[un-na ...]
Aš1 32	← ^d sa-dàr-nun-na ^d [...]
Aš1 33	^d ŠIMxA ^d nin-gi-iz-zi-da [...]
Ur1 19/r.2	[^d sa-dà]r-nun-na ^d be-let-dingir ^{mes} ^d si-mu [?] -ud [?] ^d ŠIM [?] u ^d nin [?] -[giš-zi-da ...]
Bab1A 21'	[^d nin-giš-zi-da ki-min ki-min
X1 12'	← [broken]
X1 13'	[^d be-let-dingir ^{mes} ^d SU-KUR-RU ^d ŠIM u ^d nin-giš ₁ -[zi-da ...]
<hr/>	
30	
Nin1 18'	^d pa ₄ -nigar ^{gar} -ra ^d +en-ká-gal ^d +en-ki-im-du ^d li ₉ -si ₄ [^d nin-é-gal
Nin2A 10'	^d pa ₄ -nigar ^{gar} -ra ^d +en-ká-gal ^d +en-ki-im ₁ -[du ...] → [?]

	Nin4 5'	^d pa ₄ -nigar[^{gar} -ra ...]
	Aš1 34	[é]n ^d pa ₄ -nigar ^{(ugly)gar} -ra ^d en-ká-ga[l ...]
	Aš1 35	[^d]nin-é-gal →
	Ur1 20/r.3	'én' [^d pa ₄]-nigar ^{gar} -ra en ká-gal ^d + ¹ en-ki-im-du ^d li ₉ -si ₄ ^d nin-é-ga[l] →
	Bab1A 22'	[^d n]in-é-gal →
	X1 14'	' ^d pa ₄ -nigar ^{gar} -ra en ká-ga[l] [^d .en [?] - ^r ki [?] -im [?] -du ₁ ^d li ₉ - ^r si ₄ ^d [nin] [?] - ^r é [?] -[gal] [?] →
	XX1 10	' ^d pa[₄ -ni]g[^{gar}]- ₁ ra ₁
31	Nin1 19'	^d gu-la ^d la-aḥ-mu ^d ram-ma-nu ri-iḥ-ṣu ^d nisaba ^d ereš- ^r ki ^{-r} gal ^d lugal-gú-du ₈ -a ^{ki} ki-min
	Nin2A 10'	← [?] [broken]
	Nin2A 11'	ri-iḥ-ṣu ^d nisaba ^d ereš-ki-ga[l ...]
	Nin4 6'	^d gu-la ^d [a [?] -aḥ-mu ...]
	Aš1 35	← ^d gu-la ^d la-a[ḥ-mu ...]
	Aš1 36	[^d ri-iḥ-ṣu ^d nisaba ^d ereš-ki-[gal ...]
	Ur1 20/r.3	← [broken]
	Ur1 21/r.4	^d ba-áš-mu ^d lāḥ-mu ^d ram-ma-nu ^d ri-iḥ-ṣu ^d nisaba ^d ere[š-ki-gal]
	Ur1 22/r.5	^d lugal-gú-du ₈ -<a> ^{ki} ki-min ki-min
	Bab1A 22'	← ^d gu-la
	Bab1A 23'	[^d luga]l-gú-du ₈ -a ^{ki} ki-min ki-min
	X1 14'	← [broken]
	X1 15'	[^d la]- ₁ ḥa [?] - ^d ra-am-ma-nu ^d ri-iḥ-ṣu ^d nisaba ^d ereš-ki-gal ^d [lugal-gú-du ₈ -a ^{ki} ...]
32	Nin1 20'	^d lugal-a-ab-ba ^d lugal-íd-da ^d la ₁ - ^r gu ^{-r} -da ^d en-zag ^d meš-ki-lag
	Nin2A 12'	^d lugal-a-<ab>-ba ^d lugal-íd ^d la-gu-da ^d [en-zag ...] →
	Nin4 7'	^d lugal-a-[ab-ba ...]
	Aš1 37	[én ^d]lugal ₁ - ^a ₁ - ^a ₁ - ^a ₁ -[b]a ^d lugal-[íd ...]
	Ur1 23/r.6	én ^d lugal-a-ab-ba ^d lugal-íd-da ^d la-gu-du ^d ez-zi-ka u ^d meš-ki-lig
	Bab1A 24'	[broken] →
	X1 16'	^d lugal-a-ab-ba ^d lugal-íd-da ^d la-gù-dé ^d en-zag ^d meš-ki-l[ag] →
	XX1 11	^d lugal-a-ab-[ba]
33	Nin1 21'	^d ḥé-dim-me-kug ^d lugal-du ₆ -kug-ga ^d i ₁ - ^š em ⁻ mi-ti-ik-la-šú ^d lugal-abzu ^d ARA u ^d ḥa-si-su ki-min
	Nin2A 12'	← [broken]
	Nin2A 13'	^d i-šem-mi-i-ti-ik-la-šú ^d lugal-a [?] -[ab-ba? ...]
	Nin4 8'	^d ḥé-di[m-me-kug ...]
	Aš1 38	[^d]lugal-[du ₆ -kug-ga ...]
	Ur1 24/r.7	^d ḥé-dim-me-ku ^d lugal-du ₆ -kug-ga ^d i-šem-mu ^d ti-ik-la-áš ^d lugal-a-ab-ba
	Ur1 25/r.8	^d še-mu-ú < ^d >ḥa-si-su ki-min ki[m]in
	Bab1A 24'	← ^d ḥé-dim-me-kug
	Bab1A 25'	[^d ḥa-si-si ki-min ki-min

X1 16'	← [broken]
X1 17'	[^d lugal-du ₆ -kug-ga ^d i-šem-me-ti-[ik'-la-šú ^d lugal-abzu ^d ARA u [...]
<hr/>	
34	Nin1 22' ^d ILLAT ^d ILLAT ^d ILLAT ^d ILLA'T ^d ILLAT a-ši-bu kur ^{meš} e-lu-ti re-šá-an e-la-a-ti
	Nin2A 14' ^d ILLAT ^d ILLAT ^d ILLAT ^d ILL[AT ...]
	Nin4 9' ^d IL[LAT ...]
	Ur1 26/r.9 ^{én} ^d ILLAT ^d ILLAT ^d ILLAT ^d ILLAT ^d ILLAT a-šib kur ^{meš} e-lu-ti re-šá-an e-la-a-ti
	Bab1A 26' [^d ILLAT ^r a]-[šib]u ^r kur ^{meš} ^r kug ^{meš} re-šá-an e-la-tum
	X1 18' [^d ILLAT ^d ILLAT ^d ILLAT ^d ILLAT a-ši-bu kur ^{meš} kug ^{meš} re-šá-an e-la-a-tum →
	XX1 12 ^d ILLAT ^d [IL]LAT
<hr/>	
35	Nin1 23' ^{kup} [!] -pu na-ah ₂ -lu kur ^{meš} íd ^{meš} a-ab-ba ^{meš} • gal-la-a-ti ki-min
	Nin2A 15' kup-pu ^{íd} na-hal ma-ha-zi kur ^{meš} A-ENGUR ₂ [^{meš} ...]
	Nin4 10' kup-p[u ...]
	Ur1 27/r.10 ^r kup'-pu na-ah ₂ -lu' [ma-h]a- ₂ zu kur ^{meš} [íd] ^[meš] t[a-m]a-ti gal-la-tum ki-min ki-[m]in
	Bab1A 27' [^r ma-ha]-zi [kur] ^{meš} íd ^{meš} ta-ma-a-tum gal-la-a-tum ki-min ki-min
	X1 18' ← qup-pu na-[...]
	X1 19' [kur ^m] ^{es} íd ^{meš} ta-ma-a-ti gal-la-a-ti m[in ...]
<hr/>	
36	Nin1 24' [^d ma]r-tu ^d dingir-mar-tu na-áš gam-li ba-an-du ₈ -du ₈ ^e mul-li-lu muš-ši-pu
	Nin2A 16' ^d [...] (traces) [...]
	Nin4 11' ^d [mar-tu ...]
	Ur1 28/r.11 ^{én} ^d kur-gal ^d dingir-'kur'-[gal ba-an]-du ₈ -du ₈ ^e mu-ul-li-lu muš-ši-pu
	Bab1A 28' [^d 'dingir-mar-tu na-ši zu[bi ba]-'an'-du ₈ -du ₈ ^e mul-lil-lu muš-ši-pu
	X1 20' [...?] ^d mar-tu < ^d >dingir-mar-tu na-ši zubi ba-an-du ₈ -du ₈ ^e mul-lil-lum muš-ši-pu →
	XX1 13 ^d mar-tu
<hr/>	
37	Nin1 25' [... a]n-e ù ki-tim u ₄ -mu iti u mu-an-na nu-bat-ti ud-èš-èš ud-7-kam ud-15-kam ud-19-kám
	Nin2A 17' (traces) →
	Nin3 1' [^r nu-ba]t [?] - ^r ti' ^r ud [?] - ^r èš [?] -[èš ...]
	Ur1 29/r.12 šá an-e u ki-tim u ₄ -mu 'iti] [^r eš-še?]-e [?] -šú u[d]-[7'-kam ud-15-kám [...]
	Bab1A 29' [^r ki-t]'im u ₄ -mu iti u mu-an-na nu-bat-tum u[d]-èš-èš ud-7-k[am] ud-15-kam ud-20-lá-1-kám
	X1 20' ← an-e [...]
	X1 21' [^r] iti u mu-an-na nu-bat-tum ud-èš-èš ud-7-kam ud-15-kam ud-20-lá-1-kam →
<hr/>	
38	Nin1 26' ud-20-kam ud-25-kam ud-ná-àm ud rim-ki ud-ḫul-gál ud-30-kam a-ra-an-ka ma-mit-ka
	Nin2A 17' ← [broken]
	Nin2A 18' a-ra-an-ka ma-[mit-ka] →
	Nin3 2' [^r ud' ^r rim'-'ki' ud-ḫul-gál ud-[30-kam ...]
	Ur1 30/r.13 ud-20-kam ud-25-kam ud-n'á-à' ^m ud]-'ḫul-'gál' ud-30-kam →

- Bab1A 30'** [ud-25-kam ud-ná-àm ud-tu₅-a 'ud-ḥul-gál' ud-₃₀-k[am a-r]a-an-ka ma-mit-ka
X1 21' ← ud-20-kam ud-25-kam ud-ná-a <ud> rim-ki ud-[...]
X1 22' [a-ra]-an-ka ma-mit-ka →
- 39** **Nin1 27'** ḥi-ṭi-it-ka gíl-lat-ka ni-iš-ka mu-ru-uš-ka ta-ni-iḥ-ka kiš-pu ru-ḥu-u ru-su-u
Nin2A 18' ← [ḥi-ṭi-it]-ka [...]
Nin3 3' [ni-iš-k]a mu-ru-uš-ka ta-ni-iḥ-ka' [...]
Ur1 30/r.13 ← ni-ši mu-ru₅-uš-[ka[?] ...]
Ur1 31/r.14 kiš-pi ru¹-ḥe-e ru-[su-u ...]→
- 40** **Nin1 28'** up-šá-šu-u ḥul^{mes} šá lú^{mes} šá a-na ka-a-šá a-na é-ka a-na numun-ka a-na nunuz-ka
Nin2A 19' up^{??}-šá^{??}-šu^{??}-ú^{??} ḥul^{??mes??} šá[?] a-me-lu-t[um[?] ...]
Nin3 4' [šá a-na ka-a-šá a-na é-ka a-na 'numun'-[ka nunuz-k]a
Ur1 31/r.14 ← [lem-n]u-ti šá a-me-lut-tú šá ana ka-a-šá ana é'-[ka ...]
Ur1 32/r.15 ana numun-ka ana nunuz-ka' →
Urkl II 1' [...]-x-[... ḥu]l^{mes} [...]
Urkl II 2' [broken] →
- 39a** **Bab1A 31'** [ḥi-ṭi-it-k]a gíl-lat-ka ni-iš-ka gig-k₅'a₅ u[?] ta-n₅[i[?]-iḥ-ka ...]KUR[?] dingir^{mes}
X1 22' ← ḥi-ṭi-it-ka gíl-lat-ka ni-iš-ka gig-ka ta-ni-iḥ-ka ár-ni ḥi-x[...]
- 40a** **Bab1A 32'** [ru]-ḥu-ú ru-su-ú up-šá-šu-ú [... á[?]]^{mes} giškim^{mes}
X1 23' [kiš-p]u ru-ḥu-ú ru-su-ú up-šá-šu-ú ḥul^{mes} šá a-[me]-lu-ut-tum ḥul^{mes} šá máš-gi₆^{mes} šá₅ ud₅[?][^{mes} ...]
- 40b** **Bab1A 33'** [máš[?].gi₆^{mes} ḥa-ṭa-a-tum par-da-a-tu[m] 'la ṭ[a-ba-a-tum ... par[?]/ma[?]]-du-tu ḥul^{mes}
X1 24' [ḥa[?]-ṭa[?]-a[?]]-tú₅[?] par-da-a-ti la ṭa-ba-a-tú ḥ[u]l^{mes} ní-g-a[k][?]-r[?]a[?][^{mes} ...]
- 40c** **Bab1A 34'** [GÁ]L^{mes} šá a-na ka-a-šú a-na é-ka a-n[a ...] →
X1 25' [ka][?]-[a₅[?]-su[?] ana é-ka ana numun-k[a nunuz]-ka] →
- 41** **Nin1 29'** it-ta-nab-šu-ú • it-ta-nap-ri-ku • it-ta-na-an-ma-ru
Nin2A 20' it-ta-nab-šu-ú it-ta-nap₅-[ri-ku ...] →
Nin3 5' [it]-[ta₅-nap-ri-ku it-ta-[na-an-ma]-ru
Kiš1 1' [i]t-t[a- ...]
Ur1 32/r.15 ← 'it-ta-[nab]-šu-[u it]-ta₅-na-an-ma-ru it-ta-nap-ri-ku →
Urkl II 2' ← [it-ta-na]b-šu-ú it-ta-nam-[ma-ru ...] →
Bab1A 34' ← [it-ta-nab[?]-šu[?]-[u[?]]
Bab1A 35' [it-t][?]a-nam-ma-ru it-ta-nap-ra-ku →
X1 25' ← .it₅[?]-[...]
X1 26' (broken) →

42	Nin1 30'	<i>lu-u pa-aṭ-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-áš-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-as-sa-nik-ka</i>
	Nin2A 20'	← [broken]
	Nin3 6'	[<i>lu-u pa-áš-ra-nik-ka lu-u</i>] [pa-as]-sa-nik-ka
	Kiš1 2'	[<i>lu'-ú' pa'-aṭ'-ra'-nik-ka</i> [...] (end)
	Ur1 32/r.15	← <i>duḡ'-meš'-[ka?...] x [...]</i>
	Urk1 II 2'	← [broken]
	Urk1 II 3'	[<i>lu-ú pa-as-sa-[nik-ka ...]</i>] (end)
	Bab1A 35'	← <i>lu-ú paṭ-[ra-nik-ka ...]</i>
	X1 26'	← <i>lu-u paṭ-ra-[nik-ka ...]</i>

43	Nin1 31'	ki <i>ma-mit</i> a-šà ^{giš} kiri ₆ é sila <i>su-lu-ú ib-ra-tum</i> ù <i>né-mi-di-šá</i>
	Nin2A 21'	ki <i>ma-mit</i> a-šà ^{giš} kiri ₆ é sila [...]
	Nin3 7'	[<i>su-lu</i>]-u <i>ib-ra-tum</i> ù' <i>né-mi-di-šá</i>
	Kiš1 r.1	[k]i <i>ma-mit</i> E a-šà ^{giš} kiri ₆ é [...]
	Ur1 33/r.16	[ki <i>ma-mi</i>]t a-šà ^{giš} kiri ₆ é <i>su-ú-qu</i> [<i>né-mi-di-šú</i>]
	Urk1 III 1	[k]i <i>ma-mit</i> a-šà ^{giš} kiri ₆ é sila <i>su-la-a i[b-ra-tum ...]</i>
	Bab1A 36'	[<i>a-šá</i>] a-šá ^{giš} kiri ₆ é sila <i>su-la-a ib-ra-tu[m ...]</i>
	X2 1	[ki] <i>ma-mit</i> a-šà ^{giš} kiri ₆ é sila <i>su-q[a?]-...</i>

43a	Nin1 32'	<i>lu-u pa-aṭ-ra'-nik-ka lu-u pa-áš-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-as-sa-nik-ka</i>
	Nin2A	Ø
	Nin3 8'	[<i>pa-áš-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-as-sa-nik-k[a]</i>]
	Kiš1	Ø
	Ur1	Ø
	Urk1	Ø
	Bab1A	Ø
	X2	Ø

44	Nin1 33'	ki <i>ma-mit</i> ^{giš} gi ^{giš} tir gi <i>ḥa-ša-bu šam-me</i> ^ú ki-kal zi- <i>ḥu</i> min min min
	Nin2A 22'	ki <i>ma-mit</i> [...]
	Nin3 9'	[<i>ḥa-ša-b</i>]u <i>šam-me</i> ^ú ki-kal z ^r i- <i>ḥu</i> min min min
	Kiš1 r.2	[k]i <i>ma-mit</i> <<giš>> ^{giš} gi ^{giš} tir g[i ...]
	Ur1 34/r.17	[<i>a</i>]-pi ^{giš} tir <i>qa-nu-ú</i> [<i>a-sa-ḥi</i>]
	Urk1 III 2	[ki, <i>ma-mit</i> ^{giš} gi ^{giš} tir <i>qa-nu-ú ḥa-ša-bu šam-m</i>]u [...]
	Bab1A 37'	[<i>m</i>]a-mit ^{giš} gi ^{giš} tir gi <i>ḥa-ša-bu</i> _{šam} - _m [e?...]]
	X2 2	[^g] ^{iš} tir u gi <i>ḥa-ša-bi šam-mu</i> [...]

45	Nin1 34'	ki <i>ma-mit</i> ^{giš} apin ^{giš} tukul <i>ḥar-bu šir-</i> ^u mi-iš-ru ku-dúr-ru u mu-sa-re-e min min min
	Nin2A 23'	ki <i>ma-mit</i> [...]

	Nin3 10'	[<i>mi</i>]-iṣ-ru ku-dúr-ru u mu-[sa-r]e-e min min min
	Kiš1 r.3	[k]i ma-mit <<giš>> [gi]ṣ [?] apin kak-ki ḥ[a]r-b[i [?] ...]	
	Ur1 35/r.18	[^{giš} apin ₁ ^{[gi]ṣ} tukul ḥar-bu šir- 'i m]u-sa-r[e-e]
	Urk1 III 3	[k]i ma-mit ^{giš} apin ^{giš} tukul ḥar-bu ší-ri-i` mi-šir `NÍG`-[DU ...]	
	Bab1A 38'	[m]a-mit ^{giš} apin ^{giš} tukul ḥar-bu ab-sín mi-š[ir	
	X2 3	[₁ x ₁ tukul ₁ ḥar [?] -bú [?] -u [?] š[ir [?] - 'u [?] ...]
46	Nin1 35'	ki ma-mit e pa ₅ ti-tur-ru mé-ti-qu a-lak-ti u ḥar-ra-ni min min min	
	Nin2A 24'	[broken]	
	Nin3 11'	[mé-ti-q]u a-lak-ti u ḥar-[ra-n]i min min m[in]
	Kiš1 r.4	[k]i ₁ ma ₁ -mit ₁ e ₁ ₁ PAB ₁ [?] -E ti-tur-[ri ...]	
	Ur1 36/r.19	[]'PAB'-E ti-tur-ru me-ti-[ḥar]-ra-nu [min [?] min [?] min [?]] (end)
	Urk1 III 4	[k]i ma-mit i-ki pal-gu ti-tur-ru me-te-q[u ...]	
	Bab1A 39'	[k]i ma-mit e pa ₅ ti-tur-ru me-te- ₁ q][ú [?] ...]	
	X2 4	[₁ x ₁ ₁ x ₁ [...]
47	Nin1 36'	ki ma-mit ^{giš} má íd ka-a-ri ^{giš} má-diri-ga ši-lum u a-me min min min (end)	
	Nin2A 25'	[broken] (end)	
	Nin3 12'	[] ši-lum u a-[me] min min m[in]
	Kiš1 r.5	[^{giš}][má ₁ íd ka-[a-ri ...]
	Urk1 III 5	'ki ma-mit ^{giš} má ina íd ka-a-ri né-bi-ri šu-l[u [?] ...]	
	Bab1A 40'	[k]i ma-mit ^{giš} má ina íd ka-a-ri né-bi-[ri ...]	
48	Nin1 r.1	ki ma-mit ba-li-ḥe-e kup-pu na-aḥ-lu u ma-ḥa-zi	
	Nin2A r.1	ki ma-mit ^d KASKALxKUR [...]	
	Nin3 13'	[m]a-ḥa-zi min min m[in]
	Kiš1 r.6	[ba-l]i-ḥe-e ₁ kup ₁ -[pu. ...]
	Urk1 III 6	ki ma-mit bi-li-ḥe-e kup-pi na-ḥal u ma-ḥa-[zi ...]	
	Bab1A 41'	[₁ ba-li-ḥe-e kup-pu [...]
48a	Nin1 r.2	lu-u pa-aṭ-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-áš-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-as-sa-nik-ka	
	Nin2A	Ø	
	Nin3	Ø	
	Urk1	Ø	
	Bab1A	Ø	
49	Nin1 r.3	ki ma-mit du-ú-tum uru é ^{giš} gidru še-bé-ru tur-tú ma-mit u ku-un-ni níg-ka ₉ min min min	
	Nin2A r.2	ki ma-mit du-ú-tum [?] 'uru [?] [...]	
	Nin3 14'	[tur]-tú ma-mit u ku-un-ni níg-ka ₉ min min min
	Urk1 III 7	ki ma-mit du-ú-tú a-lu é ^{giš} níg-gidru še-bé-ri tur-tum ma-m[it ...]	

- Nin2A r.9** ki *ma-mit*^{túg}siki *ba-ta-[qu ...]*
- Nin3 r.5** [gír-an-ba]r *ša-la-pu* min [min min]
- Nin5 2'** []^{túg}sik[i ...]
- Urk1 III 14** []^{túg}siki *ba-ta-qu u gír(space)-a[n-bar ...]*
- Bab1A r.8** [k]i *ma-mi*[t ...] (traces) [k]i-[min ...]
- 57**
- Nin1 r.11** ki *ma-mit* [ina^{giš}]bán tur *na-da-nu ina*^{giš}bán gal-i ti-e min min min
- Nin2A r.10** ki *ma-mit* ina^{giš}bán tur-ti na'-[da-nu ...]
- Nin3 r.6** [ga]l-i ti-e min [min min]
- Nin5 3'** []^rma'-mit ina^{giš}bán [...]
- Urk1 III 15** []^{gi}šbán tur-ti *na-da-nu ina*^{giš}bán gal-t[im[?] ...]
- Bab1A r.9** ki₁ *ma-m*[it ...] (traces) []ki-min ki-m[in ...]
- 58**
- Nin1 r.12** ki *ma*-[mit gín]n • tur *na-da-nu ina* 1 gín gal-i ti-e min min min
- Nin2A r.11** ki *ma-mit* ina 1 gín tur *na-da-[nu ...]*
- Nin3 r.7** [ga]l-i ti-e min [min min]
- Nin5 4'** []₁ma₁-mit ina 1 gín tur [...]
- Urk1 III 16** [gín] *ša-ḥar na-da-nu ina* 1 gín gal-[i ...]
- Bab1A r.10** ki *ma*^(very faint)-[mit ...] (traces) []ki-min ki-min [...]
- 59**
- Nin1 r.13** ki₁ *ma*-[mit ma]-na tur *na-da-nu ina* 1 ma-na gal-i ti-e min min min
- Nin2A r.12** ki *ma-mit* ina 1 ma-na tur *na-da-[nu ...]*
- Nin3 r.8** [ga]l-i ti-e min m[in min]
- Nin5 5'** []₁ma₁-mit ina 1 ma-na tur [...]
- Urk1 III 17** []₁ša²-ḥar *na-da-nu ina* 1₁ma₁-[...]
- Bab1A r.11** [...] (traces) [] ki-min ki-min [...]
- 60**
- Nin1 r.14** ki₁ []^{giš}zi-b)a-nit la kit-ti *ša-ba-tú* kug¹-babbar la kit-ti ta-mu¹-u ti-e min min min
- Nin2A r.13** ki₁ *ma*₁-mit₁ ^{giš}zi-ba-ni-tu la kit-[...]
- Nin3 r.9** []ta-mu-u ti-e min min [min]
- Nin5 6'** []₁^{giš}zi₁-ba₁-[...]
- Bab1A r.12** [...] (traces) [] ki-min ki-min [...]
- 61**
- Nin1 r.15** ki []₁geme₂ en u gašan • *na-za-ru na-ka-ru* min min min
- Nin2A r.14** ki *ma-mit* arad geme₂ be-lí gašan n[a²-za-ru ? ...]
- Nin3 r.10** [na-k]a-ru min min min
- Nin6 1'** [... ma]-^rmit] [...]
- Bab1A r.13** [...] (traces) [] ki-min ki-min [...]
- 62**
- Nin1 r.16** ki^r[]₁kù₁-bi šá ereš-dingir-ra lukur^{munus}nu-gig u kul-ma-ši-tú min min min

- Nin2A r.15** ki *ma-mit* dumu-munus dingir^{meš} *kù-bi šá* x[...]
- Nin3 r.11** []^rlukur^r nu^r-[g]ig u *kul-ma-ši-tú* min min min
- Nin6 2'** [... *ma*]-mit dum[u-munus ...]
- Bab1A r.14** [...] (traces) [] *kul-ma-ši-t*u[?] ki-min ki-min [...]
- 63** **Nin1 r.17** ki *ma-m*[it]*šak-nu šá-pi-ru u da-a-a-nu* min min min
- Nin2A r.16** ki *ma-mit* dingir lugal idim u nun *ša*[*k-nu* ...]
- Nin3 r.12** [] *šá-pi-r*]u u *da-a-a-nu* min min min
- Nin6 3'** [... *ma*]-mit dingir lugal^r [...]
- Bab1A r.15** [...] (traces) [] ki-min ki-min k[i-min]
- 64** **Nin1 r.18** ki *ma-mit* ^é[tùr] abul a-šà ^{giš}kiri₆ u *ma-na-ḥa-a-ti* min min min
- Nin2A r.17** ki *ma-mit* ^étùr *saḥ[?]-ḥu[?]* a[bul ...]
- Nin3 r.13** [] a]-^ršà ^{giš}kiri₆ u *ma-na-ḥa-a-ti* min min min
- Nin6 4'** [... *ma*]-mit ^étù[r ...]
- Bab1A r.16** [...] (traces) [] ki-min ki-min [...]
- 65** **Nin1 r.19** ki *ma-mit* *ás-šá-^rti^r ḥi*-[*ir-t*]i ap-lu na-za-ru u na-ka-ru min min min
- Nin2A r.18** ki *ma-mit* dam *ḥi-ir-tu* ibil[a ...]
- Nin3 r.14** [] *n*]a-za-ru u na-ka-ru min min min
- Nin6 5'** [... *ma*]-mit *ás-šá-ti* [...]
- Aš1 r.1'** DIŠ ^rki[?] ^rma[?]-[mi]^t [...] (ruling)
- Bab1A r.17** [...] (traces) [] ki-[min ...]
- 66** **Nin1 r.20** ki *ma-mit* *ḥi-du-ti šu-ú^r-ḥi qa-bu-u e-nu*([?])u *la-na-da-nu* min min min
- Nin2A r.19** ki *ma-mit* *ḥi-du-ti šu-ú^r-[ḥi* ...]
- Nin3 r.15** [] *e*]-*nu*([?])u *la na-da-nu* min min min
- Nin6 6'** [... *ma*]-mit *ḥi-du-ti* [...]
- Aš1 r.2'** DIŠ ^rki[?] ^rma^r-[mi]^t [...] (ruling)
- Bab1A r.18** [...] (traces) [] ki-m]in
- 67** **Nin1 r.21** ki *ma-mit* ^{giš}dih^{giš}kiš₁₆ ^{giš}šinig^{giš}gišimmar *zi-ḥu* min min min
- Nin2A r.20** ki *ma-mit* ^{giš}dih^{giš}kiš₁₆ ^{giš}[šinig ...]
- Nin3 r.16** [] *zi-ḥu* min min min
- Nin6 7'** [] ^{giš}dih [...]]
- Aš1 r.3'** DIŠ ki *ma-mit* ^{giš}d[iḥ ...] (ruling)
- Bab1A r.19** [] ki-m]in^r k[i-min ki-m]in
- 68** **Nin1 r.22** ki *ma-mit* udun *la-ap-ti ti-nu-ri* KI-NE KI-UD-BA u *nap-pa-ḥa-tú* min min min
- Nin2A r.21** ki *ma-mit* udun *la-ap-tu t*[*i-nu-ri* ...]

	Nin3 r.17	[], _{mi} n ₁ [...]
	Aš1 r.4'	DIŠ ki <i>ma-mit</i> udun [...] (ruling)	
	Bab1A r.20	[[ki-mi]n ¹ k[i-mi]n [ki-mi]n
69	Nin1 r.23	ki <i>ma-mit</i> ùr <i>na-an-ša-bu sip-pu</i> si-gar ^{giš} ig ^{giš} sag-kul <i>u dak₁-kan-nu</i> min min min	
	Nin2A r.22	ki <i>ma-mit</i> ùr <i>na₁-an₁-ša₁-[bu ...]</i>	
	Aš1 r.5'	DIŠ ki <i>ma-mit</i> ùr x[...] (ruling)	
	Bab1A r.21	[ki]-min k[i-min ki]-min
70	Nin1 r.24	ki <i>ma-mit</i> giš ¹ pan ^{giš} gi gir gir-an-bar <i>u</i> giš ¹ šukur <i>ta-m[u]₁-u₁</i> min min min	
	Aš1	Ø	
	Bab1A r.22	[ki]-min ki-min ki-[min]
71	Nin1 r.25	<i>ina</i> ud-me an-ni-i dingir ^{meš} gal ^{meš} a-ši-bu an-e ^d a-nim <i>ina</i> ukkin-šú-nu lip-tu-ru-k[a] [lip ₁ -š ₁ u-ru-ka	
	Aš1 r.6'	<i>i-na</i> ud-mi šeš ¹ dingir ^{meš} [...]	
	Aš1 r.7'	(space) <i>i-na₁</i> [...] (no ruling)	
	Bab1A r.23	(traces)	
72	Nin1 r.26	níg-gig an-zil-lu ár-ni šèr-tú gíl-la-tú hi-ṭi-tú tur-tú • u ¹ m ¹ [aš ² -al ² -tu ²]	
	Aš1 r.8'	níg-gig an-zil-lu á[r-ni ...]	
	Bab1A r.24	(traces)	
73	Nin1 r.27	<i>mi-iḫ-ru la ṭa-a-bu li-is-su-ú li-re-qu ni-šu ma-mit ár-ni ḫi²-[...]</i>	
	Aš1 r.9'	<i>mi-iḫ-ru</i> nu [...]	
	Aš1 r.10'	<i>ni-šu ma-mit ár-ni</i> [...] → ²	
	Bab1A r.25	(traces)	
	X2 r.1'	(traces)	
	X2 r.2'	[ár] ² -nu ² ḫI ² -AŠ-DIŠ-ša dingir ^{meš} →
74	Nin1 r.28	š ₁ u-kun-né-e dingir <i>u</i> d ¹ iš ₈ -tár ḫul kiš-pi ru-ḫe-e ru-se-e up-šá-še-e ḫul-[...]	
	Aš1 r.10'	← ² (broken)	
	Aš1 r.11'	<i>ru-su-ú</i> u[p]-š[a ² -še ² -e ² ...]	
	Aš1 r.12'	š ₁ u-kun-né-e din[gir ...] → ²	
	Bab1A r.26	(traces)	
	X2 r.2'	← š ₁ u-kun-né-e din[gir ...]	
75	Nin1 r.29	<i>ina</i> ud-mi an-né-e lu-u pa-aṭ-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-áš-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-a[s-sa-nik-ka]	
	Aš1 r.12'	← ² (broken) (no ruling)	
	Bab1A r.27	(traces) (ruling not clear)	
	X2 r.3'	[... ud]-mu an-ni-i lu-u paṭ-ra-nik-ka lu-u ¹ pa]-[áš-ra-nik-ka]	

X2 r.4'	(space) <i>lu-u pa-as-[sa-nik-ka]</i> (end)
76	Nin1 r.30 <i>ú-tal-lil ú-tab-bi-ib ur-tam-mi-ik um-te-es-si uz-z[ak-ki]</i> Aš1 r.13' <i>ú-tal-lil ú-tab-[...]</i> Bab1A r.28 (traces)
77	Nin1 r.31 <i>ina a^{meš} id; idigna id^{id}buranun^{ki} kug^{meš} a^{meš} a-ab-ba ta-ma-ti [...]</i> Nin9 r.1' [...]a-a[b-ba ...] Aš1 r.14' a ^{meš} id du ^{meš} a ^{meš} [...] Aš1 r.15' x (space) [...] Bab1A r.29 (traces)
78	Nin1 r.32 a ^{meš} kug-babbar kug-GI urudu an-na a-bár ^{na4} gug ^{na4} za-gìn ^{na4} nír ^{na4} m[uš-gír] Nin9 r.2' [] ^{na4} za-[gìn...] Aš1 r.16' a ^{meš} kug-[babbar] kug-GI urudu ¹ [...] Aš1 r.17' ^{na4} [muš]-gír → Bab1A r.30 (traces)
79	Nin1 r.33 ^{na4} babbar-dili ^{na4} babbar-min ^{na4} àb-aš-mu ^{na4} en-gi-sa ^{na4-d} lamma ^{na4} dúr-[mi-na ?] Nin9 r.3' [] ^{na4} en-gi-sa] ₆ ^{na4-d} la[mma ...] Aš1 r.17' ← ^{na4r} babbar ^r -[dili ^{na4b}]abbar-mi[n ₅ ...] Aš1 r.18' [^{na4}] _{4-d} lamma ^{na4} dúr [?] -m[i]- ^r na ^r → Bab1A r.31 (traces)
80	Nin1 r.34 [ⁿ] ₄ PA ^{na4} zi [!] -é ^{giš} šinig ^ú in-nu-uš ^{giš} gišimmar-tur ^{giš} šul- ^{hi} ú ^{sikil} gišb[ú]r Nin9 r.4' [] ^{giš} gišimmar-t]ur ^{giš} šul- ^{hi} ú [?] [sikil ...] Aš1 r.18' ← ^{na4} PA ^{na4} z[i [?] -é ...] Aš1 r.19' [^{giš}] ₅ [giš]immar-tur ^{giš} šul-<hi> ^ú s[i]kil ^{giš} b[úr [?] → Bab1A r.32 (traces)
81	Nin1 r.35 [i]na qí-bit maš-maš dingir ^{meš} abgal dingir ^{meš d} amar-utu en ba-lá-[t]i Nin9 r.5' [] dingir] ^{meš d} amar-utu en [?] [ba]- ^r la ^r -t[i] Aš1 r.19' ← (broken) Aš1 r.20' [e]n ša ti-[l]a →
82	Nin1 r.36 [i]t-ti a ^{meš} šá su-ka • u mu-sa-a-ti • • šá šu ^{II} -ka Nin9 r.6' []mu-sa-a-ti šá šu ^{II} -ka Aš1 r.20' ← ki a ^{meš} šá su-k ^r a u m[u-sa-a-ti ...]

83	Nin1 r.37	[liš]-šá-ḫi-iṭ-ma ki-tim [li-b]il ^d gam-lum a-ra-an-ka lip-ṭur
	Nin9 r.7'	[^d]gam-lum a-ra-an-ka lip-ṭ[ur]
	Aš1 r.21'	liš-šá-<ḫi>-iṭ-ma ki-tum lit-bal gam [?] -l ^r u a-r[a-an-ka ...] (double ruling)
<hr/>		
84	Nin1 r.38	[é]n ^{giš} šinig giš-[AŠ a]n-edin ₂ -[na] mú-a
	Nin9 r.8'	[₂]an-edin-na mú-[a]
	Aš1	Ø
	Nin1 r.39	[...] šur-pu é-[gal...][an ₂ -šár ^{ki}
	Nin1 r.40	[... ^d]n ₂ -líl [...]
	Nin1	[Colophon Aššurbanipal C?]
	Nin8	Colophon Aššurbanipal C
	Nin9 r.9'	[₂]an]-[šár ₂ -dù ₂ -a lugal kiš-šá-t[i] [lugal ₂ kur ₂ [...]
	Nin9	[Colophon Aššurbanipal C?]
	Bab1A r.39'	(traces)
	Bab1A r.40'	(traces)

- 1 $\acute{e}n \acute{i}l^{si} \textit{d} gam-li-ia a-pa\acute{t}-\acute{t}a-rak-ka$ [*a-paš-ša-rak-ka* ?]
šiptu ašši d gamlīya apaṭṭarakka [*apaššarakka* ?]
- 2 $\textit{d} asal-lú-ḥi lugal šá dingir^{mes} \textit{d} amar-utu en šá ti-la^{giš} tukul lab-bi-[bu^? ...]$
Asalluḥi šarru ša ilī Marduk bēlu ša balāṭi kakku labbi[bu^? ...]
- 3 $e-zi \acute{u} pa-šir re-mé-nu-u \textit{d} amar-utu muš-te-š[ir-ḥablim^? ...]$
ēzi u pašir rēmēnū Marduk muštē[šir-ḥablim^? ...]
- 4 $\textit{d} tukul la pi-du^{giš} tukul ez-zu šam-ru šib-bu šib-ṭu \textit{d} nam-tar$
kak lā pīdu kakku ezzu šamru šibbu šibṭu namtaru
- 5 $im^{mes} u nim-gír^{mes} šam-ru-ti lip-ṭu-ru-ka lip-šu-ru-ka^? aš[-ši \textit{d} gamlīya apaṭṭarakka apaššarakka^?]$
šārū u birqū šamrūti lipṭurūka lipšurūka a[šši gamlīya apaṭṭarakka apaššarakka ?]
-
- 6 $šu-ut a^{mes} \acute{i}d na-ba-li ba-aš-mu \textit{d} lāḥ-mu \textit{d} muš-[ḥuš] ur-idim-ma$
šūt mē nāri nābali Bašmu Laḥmu Mušḥuššu Uridimma
- 7 $ku-sa-rik-ki ku_6-lú-u_{18}-lu suḥur-[má]š^{ku6} [u^? \textit{d} a]nzû na- ' -i-ru$
Kusarikku Kulullu Suḥurm[aš]û [u A]nzû nā 'iru
- 8 $u_4-mu šá igi \textit{d} +en pu-luḥ-ta ḥur-ba-šu n[am-ri-ri ma-lu-u kimin ?]$
ūmu ša maḥar Bēl puluḥtu ḥurbāšu nam[rirri malū^? kimin]
-
- 9 $\acute{e}-sag-íl šá-qu-ú ra-aš-bu ma-ḥa-zu ši-i-ru šu-bat dingir^{mes} gal^{mes}$
Esagil šaqū rašbu māḥāzu šīru šubat ilī rabūtī
- 10 $be-let \acute{e}-sag-íl šar-rat \acute{e}-sag-íl kal-lat \acute{e}-sag-íl be-let tin-tir^{ki} šar-rat tin-tir^{ki} \textit{d} +en[... tin-tir^{ki} ?]$
bēlet Esagil šarrat Esagil kallat Esagil bēlet Bābili šarrat Bābili d bēl[... Bābili^?]
- 11 $ul-mu šu-tá-ḥu šá \textit{d} amar-utu kimin$
ulmu šutāḥū ša Marduk kimin
-
- 12 $\textit{d} aḥ-bi-tum \textit{d} ia-a-bi-tum \textit{d} ma-ag-rat-a-mat-su \textit{d} en-nu-gi gu-za-lá \textit{d} di-ku_5 \textit{d} amar-utu$
Aḥbitum Ayyabitum Magrat-amatsu Ennugi guzalū Madānu Marduk
- 13 $\textit{d} zar-pa-ni-tum \textit{d} AG \textit{d} taš-me-tum \textit{d} uraš \textit{d} nita u \textit{d} za-ba_4-ba_4$
Zarpānītum Nabū Tašmētum Uraš Nita u Zababa
- 14 $\textit{d} +en-líl-bàn-da \textit{d} lugal-bàn-da \textit{d} lugal-dim-me-er-an-ki-[a] kimin$
Enlilbanda Lugalbanda Lugaldimmerankia kimin
-
- 15 $\textit{d} a-nu-um an-tum \textit{d} +en-líl \textit{d} nin-líl \textit{d} \acute{e}-a \textit{d} sin \textit{d} utu \textit{d} iškur \textit{d} amar-utu dingir^{mes} gal^{mes} en n[am^{mes^?}]$
Anum Antum Enlil Ninlil Ea Šîn Šamaš Adad Marduk ilī rabūtī bēl ši[māti]
- 16 $\textit{d} \acute{i}d u \textit{d} ki-ša_6 \textit{d} nammu u \textit{d} nanše \textit{d} MÚŠ \textit{d} nin-a-zu \textit{d} nin-girim_3 \textit{d} HARxGIM$
Id u Kiša Nammu u Nanše Tišpak Ninazu Ningirim Endibgim
- 17 $\textit{d} tir-an-na \textit{d} man-za-át kimin$
Tiranna Manzāt kimin
-
- 18 $\textit{d} i-šar-ki-di-su \textit{d} la-ga-ma-al \textit{d} KA-DI \textit{d} MUŠ \textit{d} ma-nun-gal \textit{d} QUD$
Išar-kidissu Lāgamāl Ištarān Irḥan Manungal Qudmu

- 1 Incantation: I am raising my curved staffs, I release you, [I undo you?]
- 2 May Asalluhi, king of the gods, Marduk, lord of life, the raging[?] weapon [...],
- 3 angry and forgiving is merciful Marduk, (the weapon) Mušteš[ir-Hablim ...]
- 4 the unrelenting weapon, the furious and savage weapon, blaze-disease, gale-disease, the death demon
- 5 savage winds and savage lightning release you, may they undo you. I am rai[sing my curved staffs, I release you, I undo you?]
-
- 6 Those of the river waters and the dry land: the Hydra, the Laḫmu-monster, the Dragon, the Savage Dog,
- 7 the Bull-man, the Fish-man, the Fish-goat, [and[?]] bellowing Anzu
- 8 Demons which are [filled[?]] with fear, dread and terror in the presence of Bēl. Ditto.
-
- 9 The high, awesome Esagil, august sanctuary, throne of the great gods,
- 10 Lady of the Esagil, Queen of the Esagil, Bride of the Esagil, Lady of Babylon, Queen of Babylon, [...of Babylon[?]]
- 11 The double axe of Marduk. Ditto.
-
- 12 Aḫbitum, Ayyabitum, Magrat-amatsu, Ennugi, the throne-bearer Madānu, Marduk
- 13 Zarpanitum, Nabu, Tašmētum, Uraš, Nita and Zababa
- 14 Enlilbanda, Lugalbanda, Lugaldimmerankia. Ditto.
-
- 15 Anum, Antum, Enlil, Ninlil, Ea, Sin, Šamaš, Adad, Marduk – the great gods, lords of f[ate[?]]
- 16 Id and Kiša, Nammu and Nanše, Tišpak, Ninazu, Ningirim, Endibgim
- 17 Tiranna, Manzat. Ditto.
-
- 18 Išarkidišu, Lagamal, Ištarān, Irhan, Manungal, Qudmu

- 19 ^dzi-za-nu šar-rat IB-ri be-let še-ri be-let qab-li u ta-ḥa-zi kimin
Zizanu šarrat epri bēlet šēri bēlet qabli u tāḥāzi kimin
-
- 20 ^dna-bi-um ^dAG ^dli₉-si₄ ^dli-bur-dan-nu ^dpa-bil-sag
Nabium Nabû Lisi Libūr-dannu Pabilsag
- 21 ^dḥendur-sag-gá ^diškur ^dnin-urta ^dPA ^dLUGAL ^dú-šur-a-mat-su ^dmi-šar-rum kimin
Ḥendursagga Adad Ninurta Šullat Ḥaniš Ušur-amatsu Mišarum kimin
-
- 22 ^dkù-sù ^dNINDA_xGU₄ ^dmùš ^dLĀL ^dnin-EZEN_xGU₄ ^dnuska ^dpap-sukkal ^dutu ^da-a ^dbu-ne-ne
Kusu Indagara Alammuš Ningublaga Nuska Papsukkal Šamaš Aya Bunene
- 23 ^diš₈-tár-mul-meš ^dlú-ḥuš-a ^dIGI-DU ^dlugal-GĪR-ra kimin
Ištar-kakkabē Luḥušû Pālil Lugalgirra kimin
-
- 24 ^dNE-GI ^dGĪR ^dtu-tu ^dimin-bi ^dna-ru-da ^dèr-ra-gal ^da-ri-tum be-let m[è[?]]
Girra Šakkan Tutu Sebeti Naruda Erragal Arītum bēlet t[āḥāzu[?]]
- 25 ^dnin-urta ^dnin-gír-su ^dba-Ú u ^dgu-la kimin
Ninurta Ningirsu Bau u Gula kimin
-
- 26 ^du-gur ^di-šum ^dšu-bu-lá ^dlugal-^{gr}is₂ asal₂ ^dma-mi-tum ^dlú-lál
Nergal Išum Šūbula Šaršarbatī Māmītum Lulal
- 27 ^dla-ta-rak ^dšar-ra-ḥu ^dmas-su-ú ^dga-ga u ^d+en-kur-kur kimin
Latarak Šarraḥu Massû Kakka u Enkurkur kimin
-
- 28 ^dlugal-marad-da ^dIM-zu-an-na ^dnin-imma₃ ^dšu-zi-an-na ^dšul-pa-è-a
Lugalmaradda Ninzuanna Ninimma Šuzianna Šulpaea
- 29 ^dsa-dàr-nun-na ^dbe-let-dingir^{meš} ^dSU-KUR-RU ^dŠIM u ^dnin-giš-zi-da kimin
Sadarnunna Bēlet-ilī Sud Siris u Ningišzida kimin
-
- 30 ^dpa₄-nigar^{gar}-ra ^d+en-ká-gal ^d+en-ki-im-du ^dli₉-si₄ ^dnin-é-gal
Panigarra Enkagal Enkimdu Lisi Ninegal
- 31 ^dgu-la ^dla-aḥ-mu ^dram-ma-nu ri-iḥ-šu ^dnisaba ^dereš-ki-gal ^dlugal-gú-du₈-a^{ki} kimin
Gula Laḥmu Rammānu riḥšu Nisaba Ereškigal Lugalgudua kimin
-
- 32 ^dlugal-a-ab-ba ^dlugal-íd-da ^dla-gu-da ^den-zag ^dmeš-ki-lag
Lugalayabba Lugalidda Laguda Enzag Meskilag
- 33 ^dḥé-dim-me-kug ^dlugal-du₆-kug-ga ^di-šem-mi-ti-ik-la-šú ^dlugal-abzu ^dARA u ^dḥa-si-su kimin
Ḥedimmekug Lugaldukuga Išemmi-tiklašū Lugalabzu Usmû u Ḥasisu kimin
-
- 34 ^dILLAT ^dILLAT ^dILLAT ^dILLAT ^dILLAT ^dILLAT a-ši-bu kur^{meš} e-lu-ti re-šá-an e-la-a-ti
^dILLAT ^dILLAT ^dILLAT ^dILLAT ^dILLAT ^dILLAT āšibū šadē elūti rešān elāti
- 35 ^dkup-pu na-aḥ-lu kur^{meš} íd^{meš} a-ab-ba^{meš} gal-la-a-ti kimin
kuppū naḥlū šadē nārātu tāmātu gallāti kimin
-
- 36 ^dmar-tu ^ddingir-mar-tu na-áš gam-li ba-an-du₈-du₈^e mul-li-lu muš-ši-pu
Amurru Il-Amurrim nāš gamli banduddē mullilu muššipu

- 19 Zizanu, Queen of the dust, Lady of the steppe, Lady of battle and combat. Ditto.
-
- 20 Nabium, Nabu, Lisi, Liburdannu, Pabilsag
- 21 Hendursanga, Adad, Ninurta, Šullat, Haniš, Ušuramatsu, Mišarum. Ditto.
-
- 22 Kusu, Indagara, Alammuš, Ningublaga, Nuska, Papsukkal, Šamaš, Aya, Bunene,
- 23 Ištar-kakkabē, Luhuš, Pālil, Lugalgirra. Ditto.
-
- 24 Girra, Šakkan, Tutu, the Sebettu, Naruda, Erragal, Aritum, Lady of co[mbat[?]]
- 25 Ninurta, Ningirsu, Bau and Gula. Ditto.
-
- 26 Nergal, Išum, Šubula, Šaršarbatī, Māmītum, Lulal,
- 27 Latarak, Šarrahū, Massû, Kakka and Enkurkur. Ditto.
-
- 28 Lugalmaradda, Ninzuanna, Ninimma, Šuzianna, Šulpaea
- 29 Sadarnunna, Belet-Ili, Sud, Siris and Ningišzida. Ditto.
-
- 30 Panigarra, Enkagal, Enkimdu, Lisi, Ninegal,
- 31 Gula, Lahmu, devastating Rammanu, Nisaba, Ereškigal, Lugalgudua. Ditto.
-
- 32 Lugalabba, Lugalidda, Laguda, Enzag, Meškilag,
- 33 Hedimmekug, Lugaldukuga, Išemmi-tiklašū, Lugalabzu, Usmû and Hasisu. Ditto.
-
- 34 ILLAT, ILLAT, ILLAT, ILLAT, ILLAT, dwellers in the high mountains, the high peaks.
- 35 catchwaters, mountain streams, mountains, rivers, roiling seas. Ditto.
-
- 36 (By) Amurru (and) Ilī-Amurru, bearers of the *gamlu*-stick, the *banduddu*-bucket, the *mullilu*-sprinkler, and the *muššipu*-exorciser,

- 37 *šá an-e ù ki-tim u₄-mu iti u mu-an-na nu-bat-ti ud-èš-èš ud-7-kam ud-15-kam ud-19-kam*
ša šamê u eršeti ūmu arḥu u šattu nubatti ūm eššeši 7-ūmu 15-ūmu 19-ūmu
- 38 *ud-20-kam ud-25-kam ud-ná-àm ud rim-ki ud-ḥul-gál ud-30-kam a-ra-an-ka ma-mit-ka*
20-ūmu 25-ūmu ūm bubbuli ūm rimki ūmu lemnu 30-umu aranka māmītka
- 39 *ḥi-ṭi-it-ka gíl-lat-ka ni-iš-ka mu-ru-uš-ka ta-ni-iḥ-ka kiš-pu ru-ḥu-u ru-su-u*
ḥiṭtka gillatka nīška muruška tānīḥka kišpū ruhū rusū
- 40 *up-šá-šu-u ḥul^{meš} šá lú^{meš} šá a-na ka-a-šá a-na é-ka a-na numun-ka a-na nunuz-ka*
upšašū lemnūti ša amēlūti ša ana kāša ana bītika ana zērika ana pir'ika
- 39a *ḥi-ṭi-it-ka gíl-lat-ka ni-iš-ka gig-ka ta-ni-iḥ-ka ár-ni ḥi-x[...]KUR[?] dingir^{meš} [kiš-p]u ru-ḥu-ú ru-su-ú*
ḥiṭtka gillatka nīška muruška tānīḥka arni ḥi-[...]KUR[?] ilī kišpū ruhū rusū
- 40a *up-šá-šu-ú ḥul^{meš} šá a-[me]-lu-ut-tum ḥul^{meš} šá gi₆^{meš} šá ud[?][^{meš} šá[?] á[?]]^{meš} giškim^{meš}*
upšašū lemnūti ša amēlūti lumun ša mūšī ša ūm[[?] šá[?] idāt]e ittāte
- 40b *[máš[?]-gi₆^{meš}] ḥa-ṭa-a-tum par-da-a-tum la ṭa-ba-a-tú ḥul uzu^{meš} níg-a[k][?]-a[?] [...[?] par/ma[?]]-du-tu ḥul^{meš}*
[šunāt]i[?] ḥaṭātum pardātum lā ṭābātu lumun šīrē upī[š]u[?] [... par/ma]dutu lemnūti
- 40c *[...GÁ]L^{meš} šá a-na ka-a-šu ana é-ka ana numun-ka nunuz-ka*
[...GÁ]L^{meš} ša ana kāšu ana bītika ana zērika ana pir'ika
- 41 *it-ta-nab-šu-ú it-ta-nap-ri-ku it-ta-na-an-ma-ru*
ittanabšū ittanaprikū ittananmarū
- 42 *lu-u pa-aṭ-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-áš-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-as-sa-nik-ka*
lū paṭrānikka lū pašrānikka lū passānikka
-
- 43 *ki ma-mit a-šá^{giš} kirí₆ é sila su-lu-ú ib-ra-tum ù né-mi-di-šá* [min min min]
itti māmūt eqli kirí bīti sūqi sulū ibratu u nēmedīša [min min min]
- 43a *lu-u pa-aṭ-ra¹-nik-ka lu-u pa-áš-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-as-sa-nik-ka*
lū paṭrānikka lū pašrānikka lū passānikka
- 44 *ki ma-mit^{giš} gi^{giš} ūr gi ḥa-ša-bu šam-me^u ki-kal zi-ḥu* min min min
itti māmūt api qišti qanē ḥašābu šammē sassati nasāhu min min min
- 45 *ki ma-mit^{giš} apin^{giš} tukul ḥar-bu šír-[?]u mi-iš-ru ku-dúr-ru u mu-sa-re-e* min min min
itti māmūt epinni kak ḥarbi šir'i mišru kudurru u musarē min min min
- 46 *ki ma-mit e pa₅ ti-tur-ru mé-ti-qu a-lak-ti u ḥar-ra-ni* min min min
itti māmūt iki palgi titurru mētiqū alakti u ḥarrāni min min min
- 47 *ki ma-mit^{giš} má íd ka-a-ri^{giš} má-diri-ga ši-lum u a-me* min min min
itti māmūt elippi nāri kāri nēbiri šīlum u ame min min min
- 48 *ki ma-mit ba-li-ḥe-e kup-pu na-aḥ-lu u ma-ḥa-zi* min min min
itti māmūt balīḥē kuppū naḥlu u māḥāzi min min min
- 48a *lu-u pa-aṭ-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-áš-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-as-sa-nik-ka*
lū paṭrānikka lū pašrānikka lū passānikka

- 37** (by) those of Heaven and Earth, (by) day, month and year, (by) evening festival, festival day, 7th day, 15th day, 19th day
- 38** 20th day, 25th day, day of the new moon, washing day, very evil day, 30th day; may your punishment, your sanction,
- 39** your error, your sacrilege, your sworn oath, your disease, your fatigue, sorcery, *ruhû*-magic, *rusû*-magic
- 40** the evil doings of men which against you, against your house, against your offspring, against your descendants,
- 39a** your error, your sacrilege, your sworn oath, your disease, your fatigue, sin, 𐎧𐎢-[...] -KUR[?], gods,
- 40a** the evil doings of men, the evil of nights, of day[s][?], [of] ^{40b} defective, frightening, unfavourable ^{40a}[sign]s[?], omens,
- 40b** [dream]s[?], the evil of [...] [?] nume]rous[?]/[frighte]ning[?], evil entrails, machinations, [...] [?]
- 40c** [...GÁ]L^{2mes} which against you, against your house, against your offspring, against your descendants
- 41** constantly emerge, which repeatedly obstruct, repeatedly occur,
- 42** be released for you, may they be dispelled for you, may they be erased for you.
-
- 43** Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to field, orchard, house, wide street, narrow street, the open-air altar or its cult platform ditto, ditto, ditto.
- 43a** May they be removed for you, may they be dispelled for you, may they be erased for you
- 44** Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to cutting reed thicket, forest (or) reeds, ripping up *šammû*-grass (or) Sinai meadow grass ditto ditto ditto
- 45** Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to seeder plough, share of the subsoil-plough, furrow, boundary, boundary stone or inscription ditto, ditto, ditto
- 46** Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to ditch, canal, causeway, path, road or highway ditto, ditto, ditto
- 47** Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to boat, river, mooring-place, ferry, *šilum*-boat[?] or raft ditto, ditto, ditto
- 48** Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to ponor, catchwater, mountain stream or reservoir ditto, ditto, ditto
- 48a** May they be removed for you, may they be dispelled for you, may they be erased for you

- 49 ki *ma-mit du-ú-tum* uru é ^{gis}gidru *še-bé-ru tur-tu ma-mit u ku-un-ni níg-ka*₉ min min min
itti māmūt dūtum āli bīti haṭṭu šebēru tūrtu māmīt u kunni nikkassi min min min
- 50 ki *ma-mit mi-ḫi-ir-ti* gu₄ u₈-udu-ḫi-a a-me-lu-ti a-ma-ru u ma-ḫa-ru min min min
itti māmūt miḫirti alpī šēnī amēlūti amāru u mahāru min min min
- 51 ki *ma-mit* šeš *it-ba-ri ru-u⁷i tap-pu-u ú-ba-ri* dumu uru *na-za-ru u na-ka-ru* min min min
itti māmūt aḫi itbari rū⁷i tappū ubāri mār āli nazāru u nakāru min min min
- 52 ki *ma-mit* šeš gal-i nin₉ gal-ti ad u ama *na-za-ru u na-ka-ru* min min min
itti māmūt aḫi rabī aḫāti rabīti abi u ummi nazārum u nakāru min min min
- 53 ki *ma-mit* ^{gis}banšur *še-bé-ru* ^{dug}gú-zi *ḫe-pu(-⁷)u* mu dingir *za-ka-ru* min min min
itti māmūt paššūri šebēru kāsi ḫepū u⁷ šum ili zakāru min min min
- 54 ki *ma-mit* ^{gis}gu-za ki-tuš ^{gis}ná ki-ná(-⁷)u *ta-mu-ú* min min min
itti māmūt kussī šubti erši mayyālu u⁷ tamū min min min
- 55 ki *ma-mit* ^{tug}gú-è *na-ka-su du-di-it-tú* *še-bé-ru u di-da ba-ta-qu* min min min
itti māmūt naḫlapti nakāsu dudittu šebēru u dīda batāqu min min min
- 56 ki *ma-mit* ^{tug}siki *ba-ta-qu u gír-an-bar ša-la-pu* min min min
itti māmūt sissikti batāqu u patri šalāpu min min min
- 57 ki *ma-mit ina* ^{gis}bán tur *na-da-nu ina* ^{gis}bán gal-i ti-e min min min
itti māmūt ina sūti šeherti nadānu ina sūti rabīti leqē min min min
- 58 ki *ma-mit ina* 1 gín tur *na-da-nu ina* 1 gín gal-i ti-e min min min
itti māmūt ina šiqḷu šehri nadānu ina šiqḷu rabī leqē min min min
- 59 ki *ma-mit ina* 1 ma-na tur *na-da-nu ina* 1 ma-na gal-i ti-e min min min
itti māmūt ina manī šehri nadānu ina manī rabī leqē min min min
- 60 ki *ma-mit* ^{gis}zi-ba-nit *la kit-ti ša-ba-tú* kug-babbar *la kit-ti ta-mu-u ti-e* min min min
itti māmūt zibānīt lā kitti šabātu kasap lā kitti tamū leqē min min min
- 61 ki *ma-mit* arad géme en u gašan *na-za-ru na-ka-ru* min min min
itti māmūt ardi amti bēli u bēlti nazāru u nakāru min min min
- 62 ki *ma-mit* dumu-munus dingir^{mes} *kù-bi šá ereš-dingir-ra* lukur^{munus} *nu-gig u kul-ma-ši-tú* min min min
itti māmūt mārāt-ilī kubī ša bēlet-ili nadītu qadištu u kulmašītu min min min
- 63 ki *ma-mit* dingir lugal idim u nun *šak-nu šá-pi-ru u da-a-a-nu* min min min
itti māmūt ili šarri kabti u rubē šaknu šāpiru u dayānu min min min
- 64 ki *ma-mit* ^étūr *sah⁷-ḫu⁷* abul a-šà ^{gis}kiri₆ u *ma-na-ḫa-a-ti* min min min
itti māmūt tarbaši saḫḫi⁷ abulli eqli kirī u mānaḫāti min min min
- 65 ki *ma-mit* áš-šá-ti *ḫi-ir-ti ap-lu na-za-ru u na-ka-ru* min min min
itti māmūt aššati ḫīrti aplu nazāru u nakāru min min min
- 66 ki *ma-mit* *ḫi-du-ti šu-ú-ḫi qa-bu-u e-nu-⁷u* la *na-da-nu* min min min
itti māmūt ḫidūti šūhi qabū enū u⁷ lā nadānu min min min

- 49 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to secret place, city, house, breaking a sceptre, restitution, *māmīt*-oath or certifying an account ditto, ditto, ditto
- 50 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to *seeing and receiving* income, cattle, sheep or slaves ditto, ditto, ditto
- 51 Together with the sanctions for cursing brother, associate, friend, partner, foreign guest, (or) fellow citizen and denying it ditto, ditto, ditto
- 52 Together with the sanctions for cursing elder brother, elder sister, father or mother and denying it ditto, ditto, ditto
- 53 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to breaking a table, smashing a cup and[?] invoking the name of a god ditto, ditto, ditto
- 54 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to *swearing by chair, seat, bed or[?] couch* ditto, ditto, ditto
- 55 Together with the sanctions for ripping a cloak, breaking a pectoral or cutting off *didu*-undergarments ditto, ditto, ditto
- 56 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to cutting a hem or drawing a dagger ditto, ditto, ditto
- 57 Together with the sanctions for giving with a small *sutu*-vessel and taking with a large *sutu*-vessel ditto, ditto, ditto
- 58 Together with the sanctions for giving with a small shekel-weight and taking with a large shekel-weight ditto, ditto, ditto
- 59 Together with the sanctions for giving with a small mina-weight and taking with a large mina-weight ditto, ditto, ditto
- 60 Together with the sanctions for handling an untrue balance, taking, under oath, untrue silver ditto, ditto, ditto
- 61 Together with the sanctions for cursing slave, slave girl, master or mistress and denying it ditto, ditto, ditto
- 62 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to the daughter of a god, (or) the foetus of high priestess, *Nadītu*-woman, *Qadištu*-woman or *Kulmašitu*-woman ditto, ditto, ditto
- 63 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to god, king, magnate or prince, governor, commandant, or judge ditto, ditto, ditto
- 64 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to cattle pen, meadow[?], gate, field, orchard or tilled field ditto, ditto, ditto
- 65 Together with the sanctions for cursing wife, wife of equal status, (or) eldest son and denying it ditto, ditto, ditto
- 66 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to joking, laughter, retracting a promise or[?] not fulfilling a promise ditto, ditto, ditto

67	<p>ki <i>ma-mit</i> ^{giš} <i>dīḥ</i> ^{giš} <i>kiš</i>₁₆ ^{giš} <i>šinig</i> ^{giš} <i>gišimmar zi-ḥu</i> min min min <i>itti māmūt balti ašāgi bīni gišimmari nasāḥu</i> min min min</p>
68	<p>ki <i>ma-mit</i> <i>udun la-ap-ti ti-nu-ri</i> KI-NE KI-UD-BA <i>u nap-pa-ḥa-tú</i> min min min <i>itti māmūt utūn lapti tinūri kinūni</i> KI.UD.BA <i>u nappāḥātu</i> min min min</p>
69	<p>ki <i>ma-mit</i> <i>ūr na-an-ša-bu sip-pu si-gar</i> ^{giš} <i>ig</i> ^{giš} <i>sag-kul u dak-kan-nu</i> min min min <i>itti māmūt ūri nanšabu sippu šigaru dalti sikkuri dakkannu</i> min min min</p>
70	<p>ki <i>ma-mit</i> ^{giš} <i>pan</i> ^{giš} <i>gigir gír-an-bar u</i> ^{giš} <i>sukur ta-m[u]-u</i> min min min <i>itti māmūt qašti narkabti patri u sukurri tamū</i> min min min</p>
71	<hr/> <p><i>ina ud-me an-ni-i dingir</i> ^{meš} <i>gal</i> ^{meš} <i>a-ši-bu an-e</i> ^d <i>a-nim ina ukkin-šú-nu lip-ṭu-ru-k[a] lip-šu-ru-ka</i> <i>ina ūmi annī ilī rabūtī āšibū šamē</i> ^d <i>Anim ina puḥrišunu liṭturūka lipšurūka</i></p> <hr/>
72	<p><i>níg-gíg an-zil-lu ár-ni šèr-tú gíl-la-tú ḥi-ṭi-tú tur-tú u</i> ^r <i>m[aš²-al²-tu²]</i> <i>ikkibu anzillu arni šèrtu gillatu ḥiṭṭu tūrtu u</i> ^r <i>m[ašaltu²]</i></p>
73	<p><i>mi-iḥ-ru la ṭa-a-bu li-is-su-ú li-re-qu ni-šu ma-mit ár-ni</i> ḤI²-AŠ-DIŠ <i>ša dingir</i> ^{meš} <i>miḥru lā ṭābu lissū lirīqū nīšu māmūt arni</i> ḤI-AŠ-DIŠ <i>ša ilānī</i></p>
74	<p><i>šu-kun-né-e dingir u</i> ^d <i>iš₈-tár ḥul kiš-pi ru-ḥe-e ru-se-e up-šá-še-e ḥul</i> ^{meš} <i>šá² a-me-lu-ut-tum²]</i> <i>šukunnē ili u ištari lumun kišpī ruḥē rusē upšašē lem</i> ^r <i>[nūti² šá² amēlūti²]</i></p>
75	<p><i>ina ud-mi an-né-e lu-u pa-aṭ-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-áš-ra-nik-ka lu-u pa-as-[sa-nik-ka]</i> <i>ina ūmi annī lū paṭrānikka lū pašrānikka lū passā[nikka]</i></p> <hr/>
76	<p><i>ú-tal-lil ú-tab-bi-ib ur-tam-mi-ik um-te-es-si uz-z[ak-ki]</i> <i>ūtallil ūtabbib urtammik umtesssi uzz[akki]</i></p>
77	<p><i>ina a</i> ^{meš} <i>idigna</i> ^{id} <i>buranun</i> ^{ki} <i>kug</i> ^{meš} <i>a</i> ^{meš} <i>a-ab-ba ta-ma-ti [...]</i> <i>ina mé Idiglat Purattu ellūti mé ayabba tāmāti</i> ^r <i>[rapašti²]</i></p>
78	<p><i>a</i> ^{meš} <i>kug-babbar ku-GI urudu an-na a-bár</i> ^{na4} <i>gug</i> ^{na4} <i>za-gìn</i> ^{na4} <i>nír</i> ^{na4} <i>m[uš]-gír</i> <i>mē kaspi ḥurāši erī annaki abāri sāmti uqnī ḥulāli m[uš]šari</i></p>
79	<p>^{na4} <i>babbar-dili</i> ^{na4} <i>babbar-min</i> ^{na4} <i>āb-aš-mu</i> ^{na4} <i>en-gi-sa</i> ^{na4-d} <i>lamma</i> ^{na4} <i>dūr-mi²-na²</i> <i>pappardillī papparmīni abašmī engisī lamassi turminī</i></p>
80	<p>^{na4} <i>PA</i> ^{na4} <i>zi-é</i> ^{giš} <i>šinig</i> ^ú <i>in-nu-uš</i> ^{giš} <i>gišimmar-tur</i> ^{giš} <i>šul-ḥi</i> ^ú <i>sikil</i> ^{giš} <i>b[ú]r</i> <i>ayyarti zibīti bīni maštakal gišimmari qan-šalāli sikilli iṣ-pišri</i></p>
81	<p><i>ina qí-bit maš-maš dingir</i> ^{meš} <i>abgal dingir</i> ^{meš} ^d <i>amar-utu en ba-lá-[t]i</i> <i>ina qibīt mašmaš ilī apkal ilī Marduk bēl balāṭi</i></p>
82	<p><i>it-ti a</i> ^{meš} <i>šá su-ka u mu-sa-a-ti šá</i> ^{II} <i>šu-ka</i> <i>itti mé ša zumrika u musāti ša qātēka</i></p>
83	<p><i>liš-šá-ḥi-iṭ-ma ki-tum li-bil</i> ^d <i>gam-lum a-ra-an-ka lip-ṭur</i> <i>liššahīṭma eršetum litbal gamlum aranka liṭṭur</i></p> <hr/>
84	<p><i>én</i> ^{giš} <i>šinig</i> <i>giš-AŠ an-edin-na mú-a</i> <i>ÉN</i> ^{giš} <i>ŠINIG GIŠ-AŠ AN.EDIN.NA MÚ.A</i></p>

- 67 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to ripping up camelthorn, yanqout, tamarisk, datepalm ditto, ditto, ditto
- 68 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to kiln, barley oven, oven, brazier, cultic brazier[?], or bellows ditto, ditto, ditto
- 69 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to cattle-shed, drain-pipe, door-jamb, bolt, door, lock, or bench ditto, ditto, ditto
- 70 Together with the sanctions (for misconduct) related to swearing (by[?]) bow, chariot, dagger or spear ditto, ditto, ditto
-
- 71 On this day, may the great gods, dwellers in the heaven of Anu, release you, absolve you in their assembly
-
- 72 Taboo, abomination, sin, misdeed, sacrilege, error, retribution, in[terrogation[?]]
- 73 adversity, malevolence, may they withdraw, may they depart. Sworn oath[?], sanction, punishment, HI-AŠ-DIŠ of the gods
- 74 blasphemy (against[?]) god or goddess, the evil of sorcery, *ruḥu*-magic, *rusu*-magic, the evil doin[gs of[?] men[?]]
- 75 On this day, may they be removed for you, may they be dispelled for you, may they be erased for you
-
- 76 He was purified, cleansed, bathed, washed, cleaned
- 77 in water of the pure Tigris and Euphrates, water of the [XX] sea and ocean
- 78 water of silver, gold, copper, tin, lead, carnelian, lapis lazuli, black and white banded agate, sardonyx,
- 79 single-striped stone, double-striped stone, green *abašmu*-stone, *engisû*-stone, pink-red chalcedony, black breccia
- 80 cowrie shell, seashell, tamarisk, *maštakal*, date-palm, *šalalu*-reed, sea squill, *iš-pišri*-plant.
- 81 Upon the command of the exorcist among the gods, the expert among the gods, Marduk, Lord of life
- 82 together with the water from your body and the bidet-water from your hands
- 83 let it be washed away so that the earth takes it away. May the *gamlu*-stick remove your sin.
-
- 84 Incantation: Tamarisk, lone tree growing in the steppe

Commentary

1-35 This section is by far the most striking feature of Tablet IX. In just 35 lines, over 150 gods, temples and divine powers are invoked to ‘release you and undo you.’ The ‘you’ in question is the patient, as is clear from line 83, but what precisely he is to be released and undone from must be inferred from context. The majority of the names in this section are relatively obscure – some are known only from *Šurpu*. This fact has served to disguise the purpose of the Tablet. However, when analysed more closely, most of the more obscure names can be understood as representing better known gods or their courts. The gods represented fall into three broad categories: warrior gods, netherworld gods, and Abzu gods.

The idea that most clearly unites these groups is the ability to control demons. Warriors fight demons, while the netherworld and the Abzu are the places from which the majority of demons are said to come. The gods of these realms are therefore the figures responsible for controlling their demonic inhabitants. If this is accepted as the underlying principle connecting the listed deities, the force from which the patient pleads to be released must be the demon or demons who are infesting him. This point is discussed at greater length below (ll. 43-70), but it will be helpful to note some evidence here which supports this suggestion. The opening lines of *Šurpu* VII describe the mythological background to the ritual as a whole:

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | ÉN buru ₅ šà abzu.ta im.ta.è.a.na | Incantation: When <i>Dimītu</i> -demon came out from the heart of the Abzu |
| 2. | <i>Dimītu ultu qereb apsī ittašā</i> | <i>Dimītu</i> -demon came out from the heart of the Abzu |
| 3. | nam.erim ₂ šà.an.na.ta im.ta.e ₁₁ .d[è] | <i>Māmītu</i> -demon came down from the midst of heaven |
| 4. | <i>Māmītum ultu qereb šamê urda</i> | <i>Māmītu</i> -demon came down from the midst of heaven |
| 5. | dù.dù ú.šim.gim ki.a mu.un.dar | <i>Aḥḥazu</i> -demon broke through the ground like vegetation |
| 6. | <i>Aḥḥazu kīma urqīti eršeta ipešša</i> | <i>Aḥḥazu</i> -demon broke through the ground like vegetation |

This is the opening of the second Ea-Marduk dialogue in *Šurpu*, in which Marduk asks his father how to help and Ea gives instructions for ritual and incantation. The Sumerian in line 1 literally refers to ‘locust’ instead of *Dimītu*-demon. This is presumably a metaphorical name referring to the *Dimītu*-demon’s effects, though it is conceivably literal. In any case, the important point to note is that the three demons are said to come respectively from the Abzu, heaven, and through the ground. As will be discussed later (ll. 43-70) the *māmītu*-demon comes from heaven because it is a divine curse. The *Aḥḥazu*-demon’s origin is not explicitly stated, but coming through the ground demonstrates that it must be either the netherworld or the Abzu. Thus we can see that the demonic forces from which the patient of *Šurpu* suffered belonged to the demesnes of the gods invoked – the Abzu and the underworld – while the warriors could fight them all. A further consideration is that the *gamlu*-stick which the exorcist or patient wields during the recitation of the incantation was a sort of weapon. While not attested in war, the stick is well known from the iconography of the god Amurru.¹⁰² It is a large curved stick, apparently associated with the Amorites. While we cannot establish the use to which the stick was put during the ritual, it is at least possible that it was used to attack the demons which were causing the problems.

1-5 As mentioned in the introduction, these lines have been garbled in AŠ1. Following the text given in AŠ1 produces an uneven paean to Marduk, interrupted by a version of the litany phrase *lipṭurūka lipšurūka* ‘may release you, may absolve you’, followed by a brief list of divine forces ‘of Marduk’, and presumably closed with a reiteration of the litany phrase, though this is not preserved. The scribe of AŠ1 seems to have understood these lines as representing two

¹⁰² Beaulieu 2005: 36.

separate lists – the first simply Marduk, the second some assorted divine forces. The traces of a ruling following the second line in **Nin2B** suggests that this was not unique to **Aš1**, but as neither **Nin7** nor **Nin8** (both of which are more neatly written than **Nin2B**) shows any evidence of this reading, and as **Aš1** does not include a ruling at this point, it has not been followed here.

Following the reading in **Aš1** would present a number of difficulties. Chief among these is that the resultant text presents a stark contrast to the following 13 sections. As will be discussed below, these uniformly present brief lists of divine figures and close with a litany. The celebration of Marduk at the beginning has no parallel elsewhere in the text of the incantation. While it could be argued that uniformity should not be expected, or that the lack of it is due to the fact that these lines constitute an introduction, their stylistic shortcomings make this unappealing. If the idea were to open with a hymn of praise the litany phrase in line 3 should not be included – it breaks the flow of the text and is immediately repeated two lines below.

A comparison with the other manuscripts for these lines demonstrates that **Aš1** offers at best a non-standard text. Unfortunately, all witnesses to this section are fragments from the left side of the tablet, meaning that the ends of the lines are not preserved. Nonetheless, enough survives to understand the idea of the lines. This section gives an enumeration of the powers and forms of Marduk and a single instance of the invocation litany. While not exactly mirrored by the following 13 sections, this is much closer to what we should expect – a defined group of divine forces invoked together to remove the patient’s problems.

1 The form *gamlīya* is either dual or plural. Note, however, that only one *gamlu*-stick is used in all cases where the ritual instructions prescribe the raising of a curved staff during the recitation of this incantation.¹⁰³

The restoration of *apaššarakka* at the end of the line is tentative. The text distribution in **Nin7** indicates that one more word followed after *apaṭṭarakka* and this follows the pattern of *liṭturūka liṣšurūka*.

2 Asalluhi, though originally a distinct god, is a very common form of Marduk. The epithets given to both Asalluhi and Marduk in this line mark the names of Marduk out as worthy of particular attention. Few other gods in this incantation receive similar treatment. This is presumably the root of the garbled reading in **Aš1**.

The restoration ^{giš}tukul *lab-bi-[bu?]* in **Nin7** is based on the sense of the passage. The *labbibu*-knife is known from the synonym list Malku=Šarru III:¹⁰⁴

9. *labbibu* MIN (*patru, arru*)

labbibu is one of several words equated with both *patru*, meaning ‘knife’ or ‘dagger’, and *arru*, the principal meaning of which is ‘blazing’, but which is also known as an epithet of weaponry.¹⁰⁵ The word *labbibu* comes from the root *l-b-b* ‘to rage’, thus is an appropriate name for a weapon of Marduk.

An alternative possibility is to follow the reading of **Aš1**, *kak labu rabbūti liṭturūka liṣšurūk[a? ...]* ‘The great lion weapon, may remove you, may dispel you’. As already discussed, the second half of this is an unwarranted interruption resulting from the scribe’s confusion. The ‘great lion weapon,’ assuming this is the correct reading, unattested elsewhere, but gains some measure of support from the presence of Muštēšir-Hablim in line 3. In both Tintir II¹⁰⁶ and the Late Babylonian Kislimu ritual¹⁰⁷ Muštēšir-Ḫablim is associated with the god Madānu. In Tintir,

¹⁰³ Ambos 2013: 171, l. y+30’; Maul and Strauß 2011: 88, no. 39, l. 10’.

¹⁰⁴ Hrůša 2010: 74.

¹⁰⁵ Lambert 1960: 178, r. 14.

¹⁰⁶ George 1992: 50-51 ll. 7-8 and 53-54 ll.33’-34’.

17. *pa-tar-ri šu-uš-šá-an-ni*

be removed, let me suffer!’

A particularly interesting feature of this text is that the tablet upon which it is written is shaped like an axe head. In Streck’s estimation this symbolises the weapon which threatens those who break the oath.¹¹⁷ If this is accepted, we should probably understand *Mušēšir-ḥablīm* to be an axe, and therefore definitely distinct from the dagger mentioned in line 2 following the reading we have adopted.

4 The diseases here enumerated are part of Marduk’s arsenal. The inclusion of diseases and death is surprising, but this line is probably to be compared with ll.6-8, where various fierce monsters are also under the control of Marduk.

5 **Aš1** writes *im nim-gír ša* ^dMES... ‘wind and lightning of Marduk...’. **Nin8** disagrees, and the **Aš1** repeats the phrase, again without corroboration, on line 11. It seems likely that **Aš1** has conflated the last lines of the sections dealing with Marduk and his weapons. Line 5 should have *im nim-gír*, while line 11 should have *ša* ^dMES. The wind and lightning are nonetheless more of Marduk’s weapons.

The repetition of the initial phrase at the end of the incantation is indicated by **Nin7** *lip-šu-ru-ka áš-[šⁱ ...]*. This is reinforced by line 11, in which **Ur1** gives the phrase *lip-šu-ru-ka áš-šú* ^{gis}*zubi-ia a-[paṭṭarakka ...]*. As **Ur1** contains only an extract from the incantation, line 11 is the first instance in which the invocation line occurs. In following lines, as in all other tablets, the invocation litany is indicated by the use of ditto marks. It is not completely certain, therefore, that the entire phrase was repeated at the end of each section.

Considering the internal logic of the text, the repetition of the phrase seems very likely. Each section lists several gods and invokes them to help. If this is the end of the section, the *gamlu*-stick which the patient holds plays very little role in the action – it is mentioned once at the start, once in the middle as a tool of Amurru, and once at the end as a tool to remove the patient’s sins. This does not seem likely as the stick is the chief focus of the ritual insofar as we are aware of it. Both *Bīt sāla’ mē* and the ritual in KAL 4 indicate that a *gamlu*-stick must be used while reciting the incantation.¹¹⁸ If we understand the initial phrase to have been repeated at the conclusion of each list, a far more coherent ritual becomes apparent – the gods listed are invoked to help, and the exorcist uses the stick to dispel and remove the problems himself on their behalf.

The suggestion receives a measure of support from the use of ditto marks in the surviving manuscripts. Both **Bab1A** and **Ur1** routinely use ‘*ki-min ki-min*’ to indicate the repetition. *Ki-min* is generally used to indicate the repetition of a whole phrase rather than a single word. If the intention in these texts were to repeat only *liṭṭurūka lipšurūka* we should expect ‘*min min*’ instead. Thus, both manuscripts seem to indicate that two phrases be repeated, which can hardly refer to anything other than the line as we have restored it here. In **Nin1** and **Nin9**, a single *ki-min* is written. As there is no limit on the length of phrase to which the word can refer, this does not contradict the evidence of **Bab1A** and **Ur1**. **Bab1A** in particular seems to be conscientious about the use of *ki-min*. The litany changes to *lū paṭṭānikka lū pašrānikka lū passānikka* following line 42. From this point on **Bab1A** writes *ki-min ki-min ki-min*, reflecting the fact that three phrases are to be repeated.

It must be noted that **Ur2** does not include the incipit as part of the litany. The scribe of this tablet writes *liṭṭurūka lipšurūka* once (l. 21) and *min min* twice, (ll. 19 and 23, though the latter is broken) once with a gloss. This is not

¹¹⁷ Streck 1983: 63.

¹¹⁸ Ambos 2013: 171, l. y+30’; Maul & Strauß 2011: 88, no. 39, l. 10’.

especially problematic, however, as **Ur2** is a very short extract written on a school exercise tablet, and is therefore not to be relied upon too heavily.

6-8 This list consists of monsters associated with Marduk. Lambert has discussed this section in detail alongside a great deal of comparable material¹¹⁹ and Oshima has also discussed the group.¹²⁰ There is little to be gained from repeating their arguments here. The central points bear mentioning, however. The list is replicated in 11 other texts, always associated with Marduk. No additional names are known from the other lists, so despite the incomplete state of the tablets preserving this section, we can be fairly sure no names are missing.

These monsters must have been under Marduk's control, and could, therefore, like the diseases and weapons listed in lines 3-5, be invoked to help the patient.

6 The phrase *šūt mē nāri nābali* 'Those of the river waters and the dry land' is a summary of the following list of monsters. It hardly seems fitting for the monstrous bird Anzû, but such small oversights are not of major concern.

7 It is possible that we should understand *nā'iru* as a separate figure –'the raging-demon.' As none of the lists collected by Lambert include the word, however, we have interpreted it as an epithet.

8 **Aš1** preserves an additional name after the list of monsters, *Nadīn-mê-qātē*, a minor deity associated with menial activities in the court of Marduk. Specifically, as his name suggests, he is responsible for the provision of water for washing hands. He is universally paired with another figure *Mukil-mê-balaṭi*, who was responsible for the provision of drinking water, and so Lambert restores the name in the gap at the end of **Aš1 8**.

These names have not been included in the composite text or translation as they are not known from any other witness. This is possibly an accident of preservation as no text bears the end of the line, but as **Aš1** writes the preserved name on a new line, it seems unlikely that there would have been space for the names on **Nin8**. In addition, the two deities are mentioned in only two of the similar list of monsters while nine do not include them. The other texts to include the two figures are prayers to Marduk and the Gods of Esagila,¹²¹ and both reverse the order, presenting the gods first followed by the list of monsters. Given the propensity of **Aš1** to interpolate related material, there is a strong possibility of contamination from these prayers. Until more evidence comes to light it does not seem sensible to include the two deities.

The word *ūmu* 'demons' is understood as a summary of the preceding list, in line with the opening of line 6. The restoration *malû* is suggested by Lambert¹²² and fits the context well. The monsters were originally conquered foes of Marduk but are now subservient to him and so are filled with fear, dread and terror in his presence. Nonetheless, the restoration cannot be certain without corroborating evidence.

9-11 For these lines it is necessary to rely chiefly on the inferior tablets **Aš1** and **Ur1**. These do not agree with one another, particularly regarding line division. As the less unreliable of the two, we have followed **Ur1**, which also agrees with the meagre remains of the lines on **Bab1A**.

¹¹⁹ Lambert 2013: 225-229.

¹²⁰ Oshima 2011: 202-203.

¹²¹ Oshima 2011: 198-204 and 275-281.

¹²² Lambert 2013: 226.

The group consists of Marduk's temple, variations on the title of Marduk's wife, and one of Marduk's weapons. This is in keeping with the lists up to this point, all of which are Marduk-centric.

9 **XX1** is a lenticular school exercise tablet containing the opening words of each section of the *Kultgötterbeschwörung* from this point forwards. It was first edited in 1926¹²³ but only recognised as belonging to Šurpu in Reiner's edition. It is not clear why such a text should exist.

10 The last name cannot be restored convincingly. Based on the progression *bēlet, šarrat, kallat*, 'lady, queen, bride' in the first half of the line, we would expect *kal-lat tin-tir*^{ki} 'bride of Babylon'. Only **Ur1** preserves traces, however, and these do not permit such a reading.

11 Just **Aš1** and **Ur1** preserve this line, and they do not agree. As discussed above, *im nim-gír* is an apparent contamination from line 5, and so has been omitted in the composite text.

The phrase *ulmu šutāhu* can be literally translated 'matched/paired axe', which must mean double axe. It is tempting, given the possible identification of Muštēšir-Ḫablim as an axe (l. 2) to identify the two. Without more evidence, however, this can only be a suggestion.

12-14 The rationale behind this group is unclear. The bulk of the names can be taken as forms, or relatives, of the gods Marduk or Ninurta, and so understood as warriors. This is not the case with either **Aḫbītum** or **Ayyabītum**, or with **Ennugi**, though the latter can at least be understood as a divine warrior.

It is possible that the first two names were taken into this text from the Lipšur Litany in which they appear without too much consideration of the intention of this section. More likely, though, is that nuances of the characters of these little known goddesses are lost to us. It may be worth noting that **Ayyabītum**, as a form of Inanna, was presumably a warrior goddess, though it is not known whether this role was still held by her as a netherworld goddess.

12 **Aḫbītum** and **Ayyabītum**

The article on **Aḫbītum** in the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* consists solely of a direction to the article on the underworld god **Nergal**, which does not include any reference to the name. This is an oversight, however, as **Aḫbītum** is a rarely-attested wife of **Nergal**, as demonstrated in the *List of Stars and Deities* VR, 46, 1:¹²⁴

18. ^{mul}*nin-šar u d'èr-ra-gal = dU.GUR u d'ah-bi-tum*

^dU.GUR is a common logogram for **Nergal**, while **Erragal** as discussed below (l. 24) is usually to be understood as a form of the underworld god.

Aš1 reads *e-bi-tum* for **Ayyabītum**, which is either a regional variation or a mistake. *An=Anum* IV 129 gives **Ayyabītum** as the equivalent of **Inanna-a-ab-ba**^{ki} 'Ištar of the Sealand'. It has been persuasively argued on the basis of a corpus of texts from the early second millennium, when the Sealand Dynasty was at its peak, that **Ayyabītum** is to be understood as 'the Sealander.'¹²⁵ This is very unexpected in the current list, in which **Ištar** is barely attested. An explanation, can be found in the Lipšur Litanies type II/2:¹²⁶

¹²³ Pinches 1926: 216-217.

¹²⁴ Wee 2016: 162, l. 32. Collated from photos kindly provided by Jeanette Fincke.

¹²⁵ Boivin 2016: 24-25.

¹²⁶ Reiner 1956: 173.

15 *Aḥbītum Ayyabītum*

Aḥbītum Ayyabītum

16 *šaršarbatī rākīb Idiglat u Purattu*

Šaršarbatī, who travels on the Tigris and the Euphrates

Šaršarbatī is a name of Nergal (l. 26), and Aḥbītum, as just discussed is a wife of Nergal. In this position, Ayyabītum can scarcely be anything but another name of Nergal's wife. A possible, though speculative, explanation for this apparent dual-faceted nature is related to the fall of the Sealand Dynasty. This took place in the mid-second millennium, probably several hundred years before the so-called canonical texts of the first millennium were written. The link between Ayyabītum and Inanna-a-ab-ba^{ki} was evidently remembered by the compiler of *An=Anum*, but there is no guarantee that the name was still associated with the long extinct dynasty. Presented with the name, it would perhaps have been more natural to assume that a-ab-ba^{ki} 'Sealand' was an unusual way of writing a-ab-ba 'sea.' If this were the case, the goddess may have been understood as the feminine form, and therefore the wife, of the god Lugal.a.ab.ba 'Lord of the sea,' (l. 32) an underworld deity linked with Nergal. Presumably the similarity of the names Aḥbītum and Ayyabītum strengthened the identification.

Speculation aside, the line in the Lipšur Litany is strong evidence that Ayyabītum should be understood here as a name for Nergal's wife.

Magrat-amatsu and Madānu

Magrat-amatsu is a name of Madānu according to *An=Anum* II 255. This is confirmed by the description of him Lipšur Litany II/2 26-30¹²⁷ which calls him *guzalū* 'thronebearer' and links him with the Esagil temple. Madānu bears the title here, and is well-known as Marduk's thronebearer. Both names presumably appear here in connection with Marduk and his court.

While the epithet *guzalū* 'thronebearer' can be held by either Madānu or Ennugi, the line divisions indicate that, at least in **AŠ1** it is to Madānu that the title is applied here. This also makes sense from the point of view of avoiding confusion, as Madānu is written ^ddi.ku₅ which can refer to three different deities (see 1.18). The epithet clarifies the meaning as, of the gods written ^ddi.ku₅, only Madānu is a *guzalū*. That said, **AŠ1** is eccentric in its line divisions and this cannot be taken as firm proof.

Ennugi

This god is best known as the *guzalū* 'thronebearer' of Enlil, as recorded in *An=Anum* I 304-306. In the present context, however, this is unlikely to be the role intended. A more likely possibility is found in *Šurpu* IV:

103. *lizziz^dennugi bēl iki u palgi asakku likmu* May Ennugi, Lord of ditch and canal stand by, may he bind the
Asakku-demon

The mythological background to this is unknown, though it may be related to Ennugi's inclusion among the sons of Enmešarra.¹²⁸ In any case, it gives a clear identification of Ennugi as a warrior god, and this is likely to be his purpose here.

13 Zarpānītum is the wife of Marduk, Nabu is their son and Tašmētum is his wife. Uraš, Nita and Zababa are all well-attested forms of the warrior god Ninurta.

¹²⁷ The most recent transliteration of this section is still Zimmern 1915-1916: 202 n.3.

¹²⁸ Lambert and Millard 1969: 147-148. Lambert 2013: 213ff.

14 **Enlilbanda**

This is apparently only known as a name of Ea, as in *An=Anum* II 134. It can be translated ‘Enlil Junior’ and thus serves to denote the seniority of Enlil. In the present case, however, it is possible that the name should be understood as meaning ‘son of Enlil’, i.e. Ninurta. Without further examples this can only be a suggestion, but the placement of the name following Uraš, Nita and Zababa and preceding Lugalbanda, all of whom are known as forms of Ninurta, makes it at least plausible.

Lugalbanda

Lugalbanda was the third king of the dynasty of Uruk and the father of Gilgamesh. In the third and early second millennia he was doubtless a middle-ranking god in his own right, but later on he seems to have been simply a form of the warrior god Ninurta.¹²⁹ The Weidner god list equates him with Ninurta¹³⁰ and this is presumably his role here.

Lugaldimmerankia

This name can be translated ‘King of the gods of heaven and the netherworld’ and is held by both Marduk and Nabu. Lambert has suggested that the present occurrence should be taken as representing the latter,¹³¹ but there seems no particular reason for this. Given that almost the entire Tablet to this point is concerned chiefly with Marduk, it is more likely that this is the identity intended.

15-17 Following an initial list of the chief gods in the pantheon, this section lists 5 paired names. The significance of the selection is not entirely clear, though it seems likely that the gods were chosen on the basis of their very great antiquity in mythology. Id, Kiša, Nammu and Nanše, are all very ancient, if not primordial, watery gods. Ningirrimma is similarly ancient, and as the goddess most associate with the *egubbû*-vessel, also associated with water. The reason that the gods of the rainbow belonged with these early figures is unclear. Tišpak is less ancient than the others, but is regularly equated, and here paired, with Ninazu who was known as the inventor of agriculture, at least according to the Sumerian myth *How Grain Came to Sumer*, and so presumably was understood to belong to the very distant past.

15 This is a list of the senior gods of the pantheon. It should be noted that the collective epithet at the end of the line is plainly applied to this list and not to the following two gods. **Aš1** moves the epithet to the start of the following line and thereby leaves this unclear, but **Nin9**, **Ur1** and **Bab1A** are united in writing the phrase at the end of the line of important gods.

There is variation in the specific epithet, and as it is preserved on none of the more reliable tablets it is not clear which reading is to be preferred. **Aš1** and **Bab1A** have dingir^{mes} *qardūti* ‘the valiant gods’, while **Ur1** has dingir^{mes} gal^{mes} en n[am^{mes}?] ‘the great gods, lord(s) of f[ates?]. Either reading is plausible, and neither materially changes the content of the text.

16 **Id and Kiša, Nammu and Nanše**

These names can be dealt with together as they represent the same concept of primordial water. Lambert has recently

¹²⁹ Lambert unpublished: V 1.

¹³⁰ Weidner 1924-1925: 14 l. ii 14.

¹³¹ Lambert 1987-1990: 132-133.

discussed these gods at great length and it is not necessary to repeat his reasoning here.¹³² It is worth mentioning, however, that Nammu and Ningirrimma are regularly associated, and so Nammu at least must have been in some way connected to incantations.

Tišpak and Ninazu

These are two forms of the same god, city god of Eshnunna. Ninazu is the son of Ereshkigal and both he and Tišpak are chthonic snake gods. In general terms, these fit in neatly with the content of the *Kultgötterbeschwörung*, as evidenced by the similar god Ištarān, most of whose court is mentioned in lines 18-19. The two are mentioned together in the Weidner godlist,¹³³ followed by Ningirrimma, though there as here, the connection between the three is not clear.

Ningirrimma

Ningirrimma is the goddess of purification and incantation *par excellence*. Her appearance here must, if not due solely to her great antiquity, be related to this role.

Endibgim[?]

The name Endibgim is very rare, and it is by no means certain that it is the name written here. Nonetheless, a tentative case can be made for the reading. The name is preserved on just two manuscripts of *Šurpu*: **Ur1** and **Bab1A**. In Borger's transliteration he reads (**Ur1**)^dBIR-GAM and (**Bab1A**)^dBIR-x(GIM[?] DAR/GÜN[?])-NU.¹³⁴ Neither of these leads anywhere as no known name can be understood from them. Two options appear possible.

The first is that while BIR-GAM is apparently clearly written in **Ur1**, it should in fact be read as a Late Babylonian

writing of HAR.¹³⁵ Late Babylonian BIR, as it is ostensibly written on **Ur1**, is  and GAM is . HAR can be

written . While these are plainly distinct signs, Late Babylonian writing is essentially cursive and substantial variation is to be expected. 3 then 4 vaguely diagonal wedges followed by a downwards-ish vertical and a wedge at the bottom of it are all that is necessary and this matches what is written on the tablet.

This leaves us with the problem of the writing on **Bab1A**. This line of the tablet is closely written, not to say cramped, and so it is not easy to read. There are several possibilities. One is that the BIR is in fact to be read HAR¹, written as

above (), the last two wedges being either faint or missing. The following sign for which Borger suggested GIM[?] or DAR/GÜN[?] is slightly damaged, but seems to consist of a *Winkelhaken* (though this could be part of the BIR/HAR before it), then 4 horizontals (of which the top and bottom ones are big and stick out further), leading into a vertical. Underneath the horizontals there is a hard to read mess which is perhaps composed of two oblique wedges.

Roughly, the sign appears to be written . In fine library tablets, the sign GIM is written , while other

attested¹³⁶ Neo-Assyrian writings are  and . The sign on **Bab1A**, while not a precise match to any of

these, gives the gist of the sign and is certainly possible. The sign DAR/GÜN, on the other hand, is written ,

¹³² Lambert 2013: 427-436.

¹³³ Cavigneaux 2981: 82, ll.26-28.

¹³⁴ Borger 2000: 78.

¹³⁵ Labat 1976: 186, no. 401.

¹³⁶ Labat 1976: 198-199, no. 440.

which is wholly unlike **Bab1A**. However, a Middle Babylonian writing recorded by Labat¹³⁷ is , which is very much closer. The apparent *Winkelhaken* at the start of the sign in **Bab1A** could certainly be a horizontal wedge, and the absence of a second oblique stroke at the bottom of the sign is not necessarily damning. Either sign, then, is possible. If we read BIR as HAR^1 we should, however, understand GIM as a phonetic gloss, as no sense can be made from HAR^1 .DAR. The final sign, NU, produces no sense following HAR^{gim} and the sign is unclearly written. NU should be , but the signs on **Bab1A** could be understood as the separation marker ‘:’ written . In this case, we should read the whole complex as $^d\text{HAR}^{\text{gim}}$:. This seems unlikely as the separation marker serves no clear purpose. Conceivably it indicates that the following word should begin a new line, as indeed it should if **Nin1** is to be believed. However, **Bab1A** frequently differs from the other manuscripts in the matter of line division¹³⁸ and in no other instance is a separation marker written. Nor is the marker used in any other exemplar of *ašši gamlīya*. Moreover, it seems quite likely that **Nin1** starts a new line after HAR due only to a lack of space. No other manuscript (**Nin9**, **Aš1**, **Ur1** and **Bab1A**) follows the practice, and **Nin1** uses eleven so-called ‘firing holes’ in blocks of seven and four apparently as space fillers in the extra line. No other line in **Nin1** has more than four holes, and in only two other instances (ll. 25 and 82) are two or more holes next to each other.

A second alternative is to read BIR as ELLAG_2 , taking the entire complex to be *ellag₂-gùn-nu*, a word attested in several lexical texts:

Erimhuš = *anantu* II:¹³⁹

220 $\text{ellag}_2\text{-gùn}$ *pi-in-na-ru*

221 $\text{ellag}_2\text{-gùn-gùn}$ *pi-in-na-na-ru*

Canonical Izi = *išātu* text J:¹⁴⁰

6 $\text{BIR}^{\text{el-la-ág-gu-nu}}\text{GÙN}$ ‘x’-[...]¹⁴¹

7 $\text{ellag}_2\text{-gùn-nu}$ ¹⁴² *hi-pi-in-du-ú*

8 $\text{ellag}_2\text{-gùn-gùn-nu}$ *pi-in-na-na-rum*

There are two difficulties with this suggestion. The first is that it produces a reading that is at odds with that of **Ur1**. This in itself is not necessarily fatal – neither **Bab1A** nor **Ur1** are especially reliable, and an obscure name could have been mistaken by either text. The second problem is that there is no known god Ellaggunu. This could be due to the paucity of our sources, but it militates against the reading, particularly when the equivalents given in Izi and Erimhuš are examined. CAD translates *pinnaru* as ‘a cheese’¹⁴³ and *hipindû* as ‘a stone bead’ (shaped like a kidney).¹⁴⁴ While the former is known as a personal name,¹⁴⁵ neither a deified cheese nor a deified kidney-shaped bead is attested.

A final possibility is that the entire complex represents a single sign - HARxGIM . In this case the BIR is simply the

¹³⁷ Labat 1976: 90, no. 114.

¹³⁸ e.g. ll. 20-21, 24-25 and 30-31.

¹³⁹ Cavigneaux, Güterbock & Roth 1985: 36.

¹⁴⁰ Civil 1971: 212.

¹⁴¹ Scheil’s copy (1916: 136) suggests *p[i-in-na-ru]*.

¹⁴² Landsberger reads ELLAG_x . He also notes that one manuscript has HAR for ELLAG_2 .

¹⁴³ CAD P: 384. This is based on a single line of the commentary series Murgud (see Stol 1993-1995: 198) where the word is listed among dairy products. This is not substantial evidence, however, as Murgud, in common with other commentary literature, is prone to stretching definitions and inventing new ones based on the internal logic of the text. More likely is that *pinnaru*, like *hipindû*, is another of the kidney shaped beads listed in $\text{HAR.ra} = \text{hubullu}$ XVI. (Jay Chrisostomo, personal communication). These beads are scattered throughout the list (Landsberger & Reiner 1970: *passim*). For a convenient collection see, CAD T, *sub voce tukpītu*.

¹⁴⁴ CAD H: 185.

¹⁴⁵ CAD P: 384.

first part of 𒀠, while the NU is the end of it, with the GIM written within. In this case, GIM is still a hint to the pronunciation, but is not a gloss. Rather, the sign should be taken as an unambiguous writing of the reading of 𒀠 which involves GIM. This possibility is considerably less problematic than either of the alternatives presented above. It removes the troublesome separation marker, as well as the necessity to emend BIR to 𒀠!, and it produces a reading that harmonises with that of **Ur1**. Nonetheless, the sign 𒀠xGIM is apparently otherwise unattested and so cannot be taken as a certainty.

While Ellagunu is possible, as it is otherwise unknown as a god's name we can go no further. The readings 𒀠^{gim}; and 𒀠xGIM, on the other hand, both lead to known deities. 𒀠 is a logogram for several different names. In Late Babylonian personal names,¹⁴⁶ as well as in some Old Babylonian texts from Mari,¹⁴⁷ it is used for the god Bunene, vizier of the sun god.¹⁴⁸ 𒀠 is also the logogram for ^dSaggar, which Stol identifies as the deified mountain range Jebel Sinjār.¹⁴⁹ The two column version of the Weidner godlist¹⁵⁰ gives ^dAMAR-*re-e*, for which Weidner suggest reading ^dzur-*re-e*. Neither of these is otherwise known. None of these readings need concern us, however, as they do not involve a GIM sound. There are four readings which do contain GIM. These are preserved in the explanatory god list BM 46559,¹⁵¹ which is possibly a late version of proto-Diri:¹⁵²

5. *gu : en-di-ib-gim* ^d𒀠
 6. *ga : ga-di-ib-gim* ^d𒀠
 7. *sag-gar* ^d𒀠

Saggar is the mountain range mentioned above. Both Litke and Stol understand the separation marker in lines 5 and 6 as a ‘/’.¹⁵³ That is, as a way of avoiding writing two nearly identical names twice. Litke correctly interprets the lines as follows:

5. *Gu/Endib-gim* = ^d𒀠
 6. *Ga/Gadib-gim* = ^d𒀠

These lines give four names, therefore:

Gugim
Gagim
Endibgim
Gadibgim

The alternative to this reading would be to understand *dibgim* as a constant part of the name, i.e. *Gu/En-dibgim*. This would not work for line 6, however, as it would produce a reading *Ga/Ga-dibgim*, giving two identical names. It should be noted that Borger¹⁵⁴ reads ^dIM for GIM, as well as reading the name *Gudibdim* from the lines quoted above. *Gudibgim/dim* is impossible, as just stated, while ^dIM is unlikely on the evidence of *An=Anum II*.¹⁵⁵

349 ^{d.gu.QI.im}MUG ŠU Gu-QI-im Same

¹⁴⁶ Tallqvist 1905: 241b.

¹⁴⁷ Birot 1974: 240. Stol (1979: 75) has emphasised that 𒀠.RA = Bunene is distinct from 𒀠 = Saggar, but this distinction is disputed by Durand (1987: 8) who demonstrates that 𒀠.RA is at least sometimes to be read Saggar in Mari texts.

¹⁴⁸ See line 22.

¹⁴⁹ Stol 1979: 77.

¹⁵⁰ Weidner 1924-1925: 18, l. iii 27.

¹⁵¹ King 1910: 44-47. The extract with which we are concerned is from pl. 45.

¹⁵² Lambert 1957-1971: 475.

¹⁵³ Litke 1998: 108, n. 349; Stol 1979: 77.

¹⁵⁴ Borger 2010: 480 ‘Endibdim’; 482 ‘Gadibdim’; 487 ‘Gudibdim’

¹⁵⁵ Lambert Unpublished: II 349-353 = Litke 1998: 108-109.

350	d.MIN	ḪAR	ŠU	Gu-QI-im	Same
351	d	nin- ^r x ^ˀ	dam.bi.munus	Nin-x	His wife
352	d.ga.QI.im	MUG	ŠU	Ga-QI-im	Same
353	d.MIN	ḪAR	ŠU	Ga-QI-im	Same

Litke argues that the sign QI should be read GI_x here as Sumerian does not have the phoneme /Q/.¹⁵⁶ As the voiced velar plosive /G/ and the voiceless velar plosive /Q/ are regularly written with the same signs, this seems no great leap. DI_x, which would be required for Borger's reading, is possible, as the phonetic values of signs are not entirely predictable, but is less likely.¹⁵⁷

An=Anum also demonstrates that Gugim and Gagim have a second logographic writing, MUG. This logogram is preserved in Reciprocal Ea¹⁵⁸ as a name of Uttu:

237	ut-tu	TAGxTÚG	dTAGxTÚG
238	MIN	dMUG	MIN
239	MIN	dMUG-gunû	MIN

MUG is a Sumerian word for cloth¹⁵⁹ and is therefore a reasonable pairing to the weaving goddess Uttu. In *Enki and the World Order*¹⁶⁰ MUG-cloth is explicitly associated with the goddess. This presumably explains the position of ḪAR in An=Anum II, immediately preceding Uttu. Gugim and Gagim are repeated as glosses for MUG in An=Anum VI.¹⁶¹

224	d.gu-gim ^r	MUG ^ˀ	ŠU	Gugim	Same
225	d.ga-gim ^r	MUG ^ˀ	ŠU	Gagim	Same

A further instant of MUG in this context, though unfortunately broken, is found in Ea = Á *naqu* VIII:¹⁶²

116	[zé-ed]	MUG	ša ^ˀ nin-zé-ed Š[U-ma]
117	[gu ^ˀ -gim ^ˀ]	MUG	dMUG [ŠU-ma]
118	[ga ^ˀ -gim ^ˀ]	MUG	dMUG [ŠU-ma]
119	[x-u]g	MUG	nu-up-p[u-šu]
120	[mu-u]g	MUG	mu-u[k-ku]

The first of these is not relevant here, but states that the sign MUG, when written in the name Ninzed, is to be read ZED. Civil restores Gugim and Gagim in lines 117-118, presumably on the strength of An=Anum II. This is likely correct as no other names are attested for dMUG. Lines 119-120 refer to other logographic uses of MUG - *napāšu* is a verb meaning 'to comb and clean wool'¹⁶³; *mukku* is low quality wool or a garment made of such wool.¹⁶⁴

The other two names, Endibgim and Gadibgim, do not appear to be attested elsewhere, though Lambert¹⁶⁵ notes a pair of lines in Diri IV:¹⁶⁶

65	en-di-ib	EN.ME.MU	<i>endibbu</i>
66			<i>nuḫatimmu</i>

¹⁵⁶ Litke 1998: 108 n. 349.

¹⁵⁷ The personal name *Gu-di-im*¹ is recorded in field sale contract from Terqa (Rouault 1979: 3, l. 4) but there is no evidence that this name is related to the names under discussion.

¹⁵⁸ Civil 1979: 529 ll. 238ff.

¹⁵⁹ ePSD *sub voce* mug.

¹⁶⁰ ETCSL I. 381.

¹⁶¹ Litke 1998: 216.

¹⁶² Civil 1979: 480. The lines are repeated in Aa Á = *naqu* VIII/2: 94-98 (MSL 14: 500).

¹⁶³ CAD N/1: 291.

¹⁶⁴ CAD M/2: 187.

¹⁶⁵ Lambert Unpublished: II 327-331.

¹⁶⁶ Civil 2004: 152.

The sense of these lines is repeated twice in the profession list LÚ=ša:¹⁶⁷

I 157d EN.ME^{en-dub}MU = [nuḫatimmu]
II iv 2'' [endub] = [e]n-du-bu

Both *endibbu* and *nuḫatimmu* are words for a cook, the former specifically a temple cook according to CAD¹⁶⁸ though the justification for this is unclear given that the only references are the lists just quoted. Lambert suggests this makes Endibgim a cook god, but this is unlikely. The entry in Diri is to be understood as comprising (I) Sumerian pronunciation (II) composite sign (III) Akkadian translations, while LÚ = ša gives a pronunciation gloss and Akkadian translation to the same composite sign. Thus, these lines simply state that the sign group written EN.ME.MU is to be pronounced endib/endub and means ‘cook.’ While Endibgim is superficially similar to endib/endub, the words are not the same. Moreover, Gadibgim is clearly not connected.

As is clear, the names represented by ^dḪAR are not well enough attested to provide helpful information regarding the name in *Šurpu*. The logogram itself, however, does offer a possible explanation. In the Weidner godlist, the following sequence is recorded:¹⁶⁹

92 Išum
93 Ninmug
94 Ninmaš
95 ^dḪAR
96 Šullat
97 Haniš
98 Ebiḫ
99 ^dMES
100 ^dGU₄
101 ^dGU₄
102 ^dGU₄
103 ^dGU₄

It is not clear which reading of ^dḪAR is meant here. Based on the surrounding names, there are several possibilities: Ninmug could indicate that the names given to ^dMUG are intended; the deified mountain range Ebiḫ¹⁷⁰ suggests ^dSaggar; the repeated ^dGU₄ signs are faintly reminiscent of the ^dAMAR-*re-e*, GU₄ meaning bull and AMAR meaning ‘calf’. Both the first and last of these are very unlikely, however. As Lambert points out, there is no evidence equating Ninmug with ^dMUG.¹⁷¹ Moreover, Ninmug is almost certainly present in this list as spouse of Išum, vizier of the underworld god Erra. Išum in turn is present as the section immediately preceding this selection lists a number of underworld gods, including Erra. While the Sumerian words GU₄ and AMAR are semantically linked, there is no evidence whatsoever that the gods involved are connected. In the case of AMAR-*re-e*, it is not even certain that the name has been correctly read.

The proximity of Ebiḫ to ^dḪAR is far more striking. If Stol is correct in his identifications, these are the deities of

¹⁶⁷ Civil 1969: 100 & 121.

¹⁶⁸ CAD E: 162.

¹⁶⁹ There is no comprehensive edition of the Weidner list, manuscripts of which are published in over 50 books and articles, but for present purposes Cavigneaux 1981 is sufficient. The sequence is included in copies of the list from all periods.

¹⁷⁰ Stol 1979: 77.

¹⁷¹ Lambert Unpublished: II 327-331

neighbouring mountain ranges – Jebel Sinjār and Jebel Ḥamrīn.¹⁷² Nonetheless, the two are separate in the list, and Šullat and Haniš, twin gods in the court of Adad, are not known to have any particular links to mountain ranges. Moreover, in the double column version of the Weidner list Ebiḥ is equated with Adad, indicating that his appearance in the list is due to his association with Šullat and Haniš. While it is possible that ḫAR and Ebiḥ are intended to bookend the twin gods, this is not clearly demonstrated.

A more appealing possibility is that ḫAR is associated with Ninmaš, who immediately precedes him. Ninmaš is a goddess of incantations, and as such is associated with Ningirimma,¹⁷³ the goddess immediately preceding ḫAR in *Šurpu*. Gods and goddesses written consecutively in the Weidner list, and in *Šurpu*, are quite often married, and this is plausible for ḫAR and Ninmaš. The husband of Ninmaš is Nin-PIRIG, who has two distinct fields of responsibility. As the spouse of Ninmaš he is involved in incantations and purification, while elsewhere he is a vizier of the sun god.¹⁷⁴ The latter role adds a layer of complication to the argument as it is also the job of Bunene, another reading of ḫAR. This is compounded by Nin-PIRIG's appearance in the Mari god list:¹⁷⁵

104. ^dnin-pirig₃

105. ^dnin-ḫar-ra

The context in which these names occur is, in Lambert's estimation, that of 'a «lexical» group within a «theological» god list.'¹⁷⁶ This means that the names are arranged solely on the basis of the NIN sign which begins them. Nonetheless, in this case at least there appears to be a theological element involved. As discussed above¹⁷⁷ ḫAR-ra in Mari texts often refers to Bunene, and as Nin-PIRIG and Bunene share the same role it is logical to assume that the names in the god list are not together purely by chance. Assuming the Mari god list associates the two on this basis, it is perhaps not too great a leap to assume that ḫAR could be understood as either a writing or a form of Nin-PIRIG. This would explain the sequence ^dNinmaš ḫAR in the Weidner list neatly – they are simply a married couple.

If this, admittedly speculative, suggestion is accepted we arrive at a meaningful interpretation for the name in *Šurpu*. ḫAR, however the name is to be read, is to be understood as the male counterpart to Ningirimma. Ningirimma is not known to have other forms or a family of her own and so in order to follow the theme of the line, in which each god is paired with a counterpart – Id and Kiša, Nammu and Nanše, Tišpak and Ninazu, Tiranna and Manzat – it was necessary to name another god associated with the same sorts of responsibility.

To conclude, due to the paucity of our sources it is not possible to draw firm conclusions regarding this name, but a tentative chain of reasoning does produce a logical result. The least problematic reading of the wedges of **Bab1A**, ḫARxGIM, indicates one of Gu/Ga/Endibgim. Whether or not this is accurate, **Ur1** gives ḫAR fairly unambiguously. The evidence of the Weidner list indicates that a god ḫAR is associated with Ninmaš, who, while distinct from Ningirimma, shares the same sphere of activity. The nature of the association between ḫAR and Ninmaš is possibly that of husband and wife, though this is somewhat speculative. If all of this is accepted, we can understand Gu/Ga/Endibgim as a name or form of Nin-PIRIG, and by extension, as an appropriate partner for Ningirimma. His position in *Šurpu*, then, is simply due to his association with Ningirimma.

¹⁷² Stol 1979: 77.

¹⁷³ Cavigneaux & Krebernik 1998-2000c: 469

¹⁷⁴ Cavigneaux & Krebernik 1998-2000d: 482.

¹⁷⁵ Lambert 1985: 183, l. 104-5

¹⁷⁶ Lambert 1985: 187 n.63-106.

¹⁷⁷ See page 61.

17 Tiranna and Manzat are respectively the Sumerian and Akkadian names for the goddess of the rainbow. **Bab1A** writes Man-za-za without a divine determinative. This is perhaps a regional name for the rainbow. The lack of a divine determinative might indicate that the name was understood in this manuscript as a description, i.e. ‘Tiranna, the rainbow.’ Alternatively, it is a simple mistake.

As just discussed, **Nin1** is alone in starting a new line for these two names, apparently for reasons of space. Originally an Elamite goddess, Manzat was taken into the Akkadian pantheon and her name became the word for rainbow. Apart from her role as the rainbow, votive offerings found in Elam indicate that she may have been a protectress of pregnant women, presumably against Lamaštu.¹⁷⁸

Little else is known of her as a goddess in her own right, but she shares a number of shrines with the Elamite god Šimut, and is therefore thought to be his wife.¹⁷⁹ Šimut is equated with Nergal in both the Weidner godlist¹⁸⁰ and, if Lambert’s restoration is correct, a list from Aššur of exotic gods paired with Babylonian counterparts.¹⁸¹

In strophe XIV of the Sumero-Akkadian hymn of Nana,¹⁸² Manzat is the spouse of Ištaran. This is otherwise unrecorded, but no other wife is known for Ištaran except Šarrat-Dēri ‘Queen of Dēr’,¹⁸³ and Dēritum,¹⁸⁴ which simply feminise the name of Ištaran’s cult centre.

Ištaran and Šimut were not, as far as we know, equated by the ancient syncretisers, but Manzat’s remarriage could be explained by the obscurity of Šimut in Mesopotamia. That he was little known is evident from his presence on the exotic godlist, the point of which seems to have been to identify rare foreign gods.¹⁸⁵ As a chthonic god from the east, Ištaran would have been a natural substitute. Moreover, Ištaran is remarkable in that he has both chthonic and celestial aspects – his name shows him to have been originally ‘a kind of Ištar’¹⁸⁶ and therefore Venus, and another of his names, an.gal ‘*Anu rabū*’ can be translated as ‘Great Heaven’. Manzat as both goddess of the rainbow and wife of an underworld deity shares this unusual characteristic, making them an ideal pair.

18-19 This group consists of underworld gods. The majority of the group belong to the court of Ištaran, the ophidian god of Dēr.

18 **Išarkidiššu**

An=Anum (VI 6) identifies this god with Nergal, as does the double column version of the Weidner god list (III 12). In the Weidner list, Išarkidiššu is grouped with four other names beginning Išar: Išarališšu, Išarmatiššu, Išarneriššu and Išarpadda. All but Išarališšu and Išarpadda are also mentioned in the Nippur godlist (II. 149-151).

Though all sources that syncretise him agree that Išarkidiššu is equated to Nergal, one source (CT 25 1 13) equates Išarneriššu with Ninurta, and another (BA 5, 655, 19 = DT 46 (god list, check BCM) equates Išarališšu and Enlil. Lambert believes the former to be no contradiction, as Nergal and Ninurta are often syncretised, but the latter to be a ‘different opinion.’¹⁸⁷ In any case, only Išarkidiššu is of interest here, and he is universally treated as an underworld deity.

¹⁷⁸ Koch 1995: 1960.

¹⁷⁹ Lambert 1987-1990c: 344.

¹⁸⁰ Weidner 1924-1925: 72, I. iv 16

¹⁸¹ Lambert 2007: 178, I. rev. 2

¹⁸² Reiner 1974: 232.

¹⁸³ Grayson 1975b: 168, 21 iv 7

¹⁸⁴ *Šurpu* II 160

¹⁸⁵ Lambert 2007: 172.

¹⁸⁶ Wiggerman 1997: 48. See also Lambert 1969: 103. Jacobsen proposes a different etymology, (1987: 59), but this is unconvincing.

¹⁸⁷ Lambert 1976-1980a: 173.

The traces on **Bab1B** do not seem to fit with this name, but too little survives to suggest an alternative.

Lagamal

An=Anum (VI 8) equates this god with Nergal, as does the Weidner god list (II 9). His name means ‘no mercy’, which is fitting for an underworld god.

Ištaran

The majority of manuscripts give either ^dKA-DI or an.gal here, both common names for Ištaran. **Ur2** has di.ku₅, which Borger renders *Madānu*. Borger’s reading is faulty as ^ddi.ku₅ can refer to 3 different deities – Ištarān (*An=Anum* V 288), Madānu (*An=Anum* II 254) and one of the 8 Judges of Šamaš, ^dDi.ku₅ (*An=Anum* III 174). The last of these is simply the Sumerian word di.ku₅ (Akk. *dayānu* ‘Judge’) deified. In the present context, ^ddi.ku₅ is certainly Ištarān.

Ištaran is the city god of Dēr (modern Tel-Aqar) on the border between Sumer and Elam. As discussed above (l. 17), he is a chthonic deity and is included among the chthonic death gods in *An=Anum* (V 287-9). As the writing di.ku₅ implies, he is an arbiter of divine justice. His character is otherwise relatively little known, due chiefly to the fact that his home city has not been excavated. One piece of new evidence can be mentioned, however. In a Hurrian-Akkadian bilingual copy of the Weidner godlist, Ištarān is very likely equated with the god Kumarbi.¹⁸⁸ From what we know of each god, this appears to be an equation built on the rough similarity of their characters. Both were netherworld gods.¹⁸⁹ Both were known, to at least some extent, as ‘Father of the Gods’ and ‘King of the Gods.’ Kumarbi is given the former epithet in the Song of Ulikummi,¹⁹⁰ while his kingship is the subject of the Hurrian myth preserved in the Hittite Kumarbi cycle.¹⁹¹

Ištarān is not explicitly referred to with either title, but this is almost certainly due to the paucity of sources dealing with him. Both titles are used to describe ^dMUŠ. The former is preserved in a prayer to Nisaba, known in copies from Nimrud and Nineveh, which contains the line ^dMUŠ *a-bu ilāni*^{meš} ‘MUŠ, father of the gods.’¹⁹² The latter is seen in a Kassite period personal name MUŠ-*šar-ilāni* ‘MUŠ, king of the gods.’¹⁹³ ^dMUŠ most commonly denotes Irhan, Ištarān’s vizier or messenger but a Late Babylonian commentary on the omen series Šumma Ālu from Nineveh has the equation ‘^dMUŠ = Ištarān.’¹⁹⁴ MUŠ is Sumerian for snake, and both Irhan and Ištarān are snake gods.¹⁹⁵ However, while Irhan is otherwise known only as a relatively minor god, Ištarān is commonly named AN.GAL ‘Great Anu/God.’ Although we have too few sources to understand his character more clearly, this implies that he was, as Lambert says, ‘on a very high level in the pantheon.’¹⁹⁶ It seems likely, therefore, that MUŠ in these contexts was understood at least at some point to mean Ištarān, as has been argued in similar contexts by Woods.¹⁹⁷

In a ritual connected with the Ekur temple in Nippur, Ištarān is said to have died and he is equated with the dying god Dumuzi, an equation which recurs elsewhere.¹⁹⁸ While Kumarbi is not known to have died, he is overthrown as king of

¹⁸⁸ Simons 2017b: 3, obv. 8’.

¹⁸⁹ Hoffner 1998: 41. Wiggermann 1997: 42-44. Also, note the monolingual Emar copy of the Weidner list in which Ištarān is equated with the netherworld god Nergal (^dU-gur⁷¹ Arnaud 1987: 34 l. 39’; ^dU-L’UH’ Gantzert 2011: 48 l. 74).

¹⁹⁰ Güterbock 1951: 147 l. 4.

¹⁹¹ Hoffner 1998: 40-80.

¹⁹² Lambert 1999-2000: 153, l. 18.

¹⁹³ CBS 3781. Clay 1912: 135 (as *Šir-šar-ilāni*).

¹⁹⁴ Jiménez 2016: l. 38.

¹⁹⁵ Wiggermann 1997: 42-44.

¹⁹⁶ Lambert 1976-1980c: 211.

¹⁹⁷ Woods 2004: 68, esp. n.235.

¹⁹⁸ Livingstone 1986: 136-7.

the gods in the Kumarbi cycle. This is a common theme in myths detailing the deaths of gods,¹⁹⁹ and it is possible that Ištaran's death was related to such a myth.

Niraḥ

Both Niraḥ and Irḥan are possible readings of ^dMUŠ,²⁰⁰ However, **Ur2** gives the phonetic spelling here as Ni-ra-ḥu. This is, in any case, to be preferred. Wiggermann has recently asserted that the two figures were completely separate, and that the ^dMUŠ connected to Ištaraḥ is Niraḥ.²⁰¹ The possibility raised above that ^dMUŠ in some contexts should be understood as Ištaraḥ is probably not relevant to this instance.

Manungal

This is another name for Nungal, according to *An=Anum* V 192-194. Nungal is an underworld goddess, daughter of Ereškigal. The goddess also appears in *Šurpu* III 77 where she is called *šabbūtū* 'snatcher.' This is in keeping with Nungal's well attested role as a prison warden.²⁰²

Qudmu

This is the vizier of Ištaraḥ according to *An=Anum* V 290.²⁰³ The logographic writing of his name is generally read ^dKUD,²⁰⁴ but given the god's name and the fact that the same sign can be read QUD, there seems little reason to persist in this reading. In any case, Reiner's ^dTAR is unlikely.

19

Zizanu

This is the son of Ištaraḥ according to *An=Anum* V 292.

Bēlet-Šarrat-Ibri

This name does not appear to be otherwise attested. It is to be translated 'Lady/Queen of the dust.' Dust here is to be understood as a synonym for the netherworld, as in the phrase *būt eprī* 'house of dust,' a phrase for the underworld mentioned in *Gilgamesh* VII 192, 193 and 198. Bēlet-ibrate, which appears in *An=Anum* IV 151 as a name of Inanna is not related, but is connected rather to the open air altar which is mentioned in l. 43, a fact which is not noted by Cavigneaux and Krebernik.²⁰⁵ We must therefore understand this name as representing a netherworld goddess.

Bēlet-Šēri

The literal translation of Bēlet Šēri is 'Lady of the Steppe,' a goddess well attested throughout *Šurpu*.²⁰⁶ It is a common writing of the name Geštinanna, who is known as the sister of Dumuzi, the wife of Ningišzida, and, most important here, the scribe of the netherworld, *Gilgamesh* VII.²⁰⁷

204 [^dbēlet-š]eri ṭupšarrat erseti maḥarša kamsat Bēlet-Šēri, scribe of the netherworld, sqatted before her

¹⁹⁹ For example in *Enūma Eliš* (Lambert 2013: 45-135).

²⁰⁰ McEwan 1983: 215-218.

²⁰¹ Wiggerman 2001: 570-572. See also Peterson 2009b: 51-52.

²⁰² Cavigneaux and Krebernik 1998-2000f: 615-618.

²⁰³ See further Krebernik 2006-2008a: 190.

²⁰⁴ E.g. George 1992: 413.

²⁰⁵ Cavigneaux and Krebernik 1998-2000a: 335.

²⁰⁶ See chapter 1.

²⁰⁷ George 2003: I 644-645.

The ‘her’ in question is Ereškigal, queen of the netherworld. Bēlet-Šēri is therefore a relatively senior figure in the hierarchy of the underworld.

Bēlet-Qabli u Taḥazi/Ninšenšena

Ninšenšena, written in **Ur2** and **X1** is commonly written Bēlet-Qabli or Bēlet-Taḥazi, or as here, a combination of the two.²⁰⁸ The name is to be understood as something like ‘Lady of war and battle.’ Generally speaking this is not the name of an underworld god, but, as the name suggests, of a warrior and form of Inanna.²⁰⁹ Given the present context, it is difficult not to imagine a chthonic dimension to the name – perhaps as war and battle result in death and destruction there was such a link. This goddess apparently reappears in l. 24.

20-21 The gods in these lines are likely grouped as warriors.

20 Nabium and Nabu

These are two names of the same god. Nabu is multi-faceted. He was a god of writing and a vizier and son of Marduk. He is not noted as a warrior, but in the early first millennium he was promoted to co-head of the pantheon.²¹⁰ In this role, he naturally absorbed many of Marduk’s characteristics. In addition, when Marduk was promoted to head of the pantheon, his son naturally absorbed the characteristics of Ninurta, the son of Enlil.²¹¹ Given the rest of the list, we should understand a Ninurta-esque warrior god to be intended.

Lisi

Two apparently distinct deities share this name. The first is a third millennium mother goddess and the second a first millennium warrior god, equated with Ninurta.²¹² *An=Anum* II 68-77 combines the two traditions, and thereby presents a confusing picture. The connections between the two have been investigated by Lambert,²¹³ but no clear conclusions were reached. This is of little concern for the present line however, where Lisi is certainly to be understood as a warrior god, and therefore as a form of Ninurta or Nabû.

Liburdannu

The god is known only here – the name literally means ‘May the strong one endure.’ **Ur1** reads Liburdamqu ‘May the beautiful one stay firm.’ This is presumably a mistake. In any case, Liburdannu is a very plausible name for a warrior god.

Pabilsag

This god, though originally separate, was syncretised with the warrior god Ninurta from at least the Old Babylonian period.²¹⁴ He is, therefore, to be understood in the present context as a warrior god.

²⁰⁸ Sigrist 1984: 148.

²⁰⁹ Cavigneaux and Krebernik 1998-2000e: 487

²¹⁰ Lambert 2013: 275ff.

²¹¹ Lambert 1971: 337.

²¹² Michalowski 1987: 32-33.

²¹³ Lambert Unpublished: II 68-69.

²¹⁴ Krebernik 2003-2005a: 165.

Hendursanga

This is the Sumerian name of the god Išum, best known as the underworld god Erra's vizier. In the present context, however, it is likely that he is to be understood as a night watchman. That he held this role has recently been convincingly demonstrated by George.²¹⁵ It is not necessary to repeat George's arguments here, but we should consider the implications of the role. George 'pictures the Babylonian night watchman on his rounds after dusk, bearing aloft a burning torch and perhaps even tending the flames of oil-lamps left out by conscientious householders in the more respectable neighbourhoods.'²¹⁶ There is undoubtedly much truth in this image, but the purpose of a night watchman is rather more than a sort of mobile street light. A night watchman must surely be compared more closely with a policeman or a bodyguard. He was responsible for ensuring the safety of the populace, and thus was, in all likelihood, understood as being physically powerful, and therefore an apt figure to defend the patient against demonic infestation.

Adad is the god of storms, and so naturally, given the destructive power of storms, often understood as a warrior god. Ninurta is the warrior god *par excellence*.

Šullat and Haniš

These are twin gods belonging to the circle of Adad. Their specific characteristics are not especially clear, but, as would be expected of Adad's most notable subordinates, they are prominent figures in the flood myth. In both Atrahāsis II:²¹⁷

vii 49. ^dsullat u [^dhaniš]⁵⁰ lilliku ina [maḥri] Let Šullat and [Haniš] go at the [fore]

and Gilgamesh XI:²¹⁸

100. ^dsullat u ^dhaniš illaku ina maḥri Šullat and Haniš were going at the fore

These lines describe the thunderstorm which caused the flood, and which Šullat and Haniš were leading. They should, then, be understood simply as warriors of Adad here.

Ušuramatsu and Mišaru

These are sons of Adad according to *An=Anum* III 224-225, and this is generally consistent throughout literary texts.²¹⁹ Mišaru is also known, along with Kittu, as a vizier of Šamaš in *An=Anum* III 127-128, but given the inclusion here of other gods from Adad's circle, and particularly of Ušuramatsu who is not connected to Šamaš, we should definitely understand his role here as the son of Adad.

Ur1 writes Kakka and Enkurkur here, but this is certainly a contamination from line 27. Presumably this due to the similarity of Šarrahu and Massû, the names preceding Kakka and Enkurkur in line 27, and the preceding gods in the present line, Ušuramatsu and Mišaru. The names are of relatively minor, though probably unrelated, deities, and **Ur1** is a school text. It would appear from this that the more obscure deities were not household names even in the ancient world.

²¹⁵ George 2015b: 1-8.

²¹⁶ George 2015b: 8.

²¹⁷ Lambert and Millard 1969: 86-87.

²¹⁸ George 2003: 708-709.

²¹⁹ Beaulieu 2014-2016: 511-512.

22-23 The grouping criteria for this section are not clear. Several of the gods (Alammuš, Ningublaga, Palil, Luhušû, Nusku) are connected to the underworld, but this does not seem to be a general theme. We can offer no convincing suggestion for the idea behind this group.

The commentary on Kusu is disproportionately extensive, and so in the interests of coherence it has been thought best for this to be presented separately.

22 **Kusu and Indagara**

See excursus, pp. 112-132

Alammuš and Ningublaga

The standard ideogram for Alammuš is ^dlâl.²²⁰ lâl is TAxHI, which bears a formal similarity to the ideogram of the unrelated god Kabta, ta-gunû. Lambert²²¹ has already demonstrated that the two are distinct, and this has been restated by Borger,²²² but the misapprehension concerning the name is still widespread.²²³ The accuracy of Lambert's argument is confirmed by the lexical list *Ea* 4: 225-228:²²⁴

	Sumerian Pronunciation	Sign	Sign name	Akkadian translation
225	ga-an-zèr	ta-gunû	ta g[u]-nu-[u]	e-tû-tum
226	kab-ta	ta-gunû	min min	^d kab-ta
227	a-lam-muš	lâl (=TAxHI)	ša ta-ta-ku DU.GA I.GUB	šu-ma
228	la-al	lâl	min min min	diš-pú

Lines 225-226 show that the sign now called ta-gunû, also so named by the compilers of *Ea*, can be pronounced ganzer as well as kabta, which correspond to eġûtum 'darkness' and ^dKabta in Akkadian. Lines 227-228 show that what we call lâl or TAxHI, whose ancient name is ša tatakū ðuga ġub 'ta with an inscribed dÛg', can be pronounced alammuš and lal, corresponding to Akkadian šu-ma 'the same' (i.e. ^dAlammuš)²²⁵ and dišpu 'honey.' Thus, two different signs refer to two unrelated gods – Alammuš is no more Kabta than darkness is honey. It is worth noting that the name TAxHI for the lâl sign does not agree with ancient usage, in which DÛG was evidently a more natural reading than HI. In keeping with this, it seems logical that the sign should be read TAxDÛG.

The writing in the present line, also attested in *Udug-hul* 4:95',²²⁶ is AN.MÛŠ.LÀL, which has been rendered by various editors as ^dNanna-Lal,²²⁷ ^dMÌM-Lal, ^dInnin-Lâl;²²⁸ and ^dInanna-lâl.²²⁹ Each of these is inaccurate, the majority due to the confusion with Kabta, who is a spouse of Inanna. Given the fact, as evidenced above, that lâl has two readings, it is safe to assume that the innin sign preceding it is simply a pronunciation gloss. That is to say, MÛŠ.LÀL is the reading of LÂL that involves a MÛŠ sound. Thus, the name should be transliterated ^{d.müs}lâl, to be understood as

²²⁰ Elements of this examination of the god Alammuš have appeared in the journal NABU (Simons 2016: 8-10 & Simons 2017a: 8-13).

²²¹ Lambert 1966: 73.

²²² Borger 2010: 288, no. 170.

²²³ See e.g. Geller 2016: 151, note 95'.

²²⁴ Civil 1979: 364. Aa IV/3: 311-315 (Civil 1979: 383) (mis)quoted by Geller, is broken, but what remains agrees with the text of *Ea* quoted above. One recension of *Proto-Ea* (Civil 1979: 114: 10) broadly agrees, but uses the variant spelling a-lam-mu-u[š].

²²⁵ That ŠU-ma here refers to the Sumerian pronunciation column, rather than to the previous entry in the Akkadian column, i.e. *Alammuš* not *Kabta*, is consistent with the general principles of lists (see e.g. Litke 1998: 10), and is in any case certain from comparable entries in *Ea* (e.g. *Ea* 1: 337; *Ea* 1: 348 manuscript A. Civil 1979: 194). To read *Kabta* here we must have MIN 'ditto.'

²²⁶ Geller 2016: 151.

²²⁷ Zimmern 1901: 41, 10.

²²⁸ Borger 2000: 79.

²²⁹ Reiner 1958: 40, 25.

Alammuš.

The character of Alammuš is very poorly understood. He appears in the OB Nippur god list, and another OB god list from Nippur, but not in a helpful context.²³⁰ In three sources, *Udug-ḫul* 4:95,²³¹ *An=Anum* III 37,²³² and an Ikribu-prayer to Sîn,²³³ he is said to be the *sukkal.maḫ* ‘grand vizier’ of Sîn. *An=Anum* III 38 informs us that his wife is Ninuri ‘Mistress of Ur,’ about whom even less is known. The *sukkal* ‘Vizier’ of Alammuš is named ^dUrugal in *An=Anum* III 38,²³⁴ and apparently known nowhere else. It is worth noting that *uru-gal* ‘great city’ is a common word for the underworld, the significance of which will become apparent during the course of the following discussion.²³⁵ His only other consistent association is with the god Ningublaga, usually written ^dnin.EZENxGU₄. In *An=Anum* III 30-37²³⁶ and *Šurpu* IX 25,²³⁷ the association is simply that Alammuš and Ningublaga appear together. However, *mul.apin* I i 6²³⁸ pairs the two as the constellation *maš.tab.ba.tur.tur* ‘The Little Twins’, commonly equated to ζ and λ Geminorum (the knees of Pollux) and surrounding stars.²³⁹ In this text, they are immediately preceded by the chthonic gods Lugal-irra and Meslamtaea, *maš.tab.ba.gal.gal* ‘The Great Twins’, α and β Geminorum (Castor and Pollux) and surrounding stars.²⁴⁰ It is possible that the parallel between the names of the two constellations, as well as their astronomical proximity to one another,²⁴¹ implies that the activities and influences of the gods involved were in some way related. If so, we may be justified in understanding Alammuš and Ningublaga as having a chthonic aspect. Further, the explicit relationship between Alammuš and Ningublaga in *Mul.apin* explains their appearance together in the present line. They are not, as has been suggested,²⁴² married - they are brothers.²⁴³

The idea that these gods have a chthonic aspect gains some measure of support from the mention of the two gods together on a *kudurru* from the reign of Marduk-apla-iddina I. Editors of this text - Scheil,²⁴⁴ Borger²⁴⁵ and Paulus²⁴⁶ - have taken ^dlāl here as ^dKabta (Scheil: ^dLil), but in light of the above analysis Alammuš is certainly intended. A total of 47 deities are included in the *kudurru* list and the order is theological – gods are grouped with their families and courts, and according to their areas of responsibility. Not all of this list concerns us here, but V 35 – VI 4 is of interest: V.35 Nergal, V.36 Lâš, VI.1 Išum, Šubula, VI.2 Lugal-irra, Meslamtaea, VI.3 Šaršarbatī, Mamītu, VI.4 Alammuš, Ningublaga, Tišpak, Ištaran.²⁴⁷

The deities surrounding Alammuš and Ningublaga here are overwhelmingly associated with death and the netherworld. As the god list in the *kudurru* inscription is arranged along theological, rather than lexical lines, we can be confident that this implies a chthonic aspect to the gods under discussion. It should be noted that Alammuš and Ningublaga mark

²³⁰ Peterson 2009: 16, 197 & 87 iii 3.

²³¹ Geller 2016: 151.

²³² Litke 1998: 121 reads a.la.x.x, but this line is not damaged in Lambert’s unpublished edition, III 36. Kabta is given by Litke as the equivalent of ^dLāl in a restored line of *An=Anum* 4: 190 [^dLĀL] = [^dKabta]. (Litke 1998: 162 restored from TCL 15: 25) This in fact reads ‘[^dTA-gunū] = [^dKabta].’

²³³ Perry 1907: 25 ii 9 & Langdon 1915: 192, 10. Perry reads ^{ilu}DIŠPU and Langdon has ^{ilu}LĀL, but later translators (Seux 1976: 479; Foster 2005: 759, 23) have corrected this to Alammuš.

²³⁴ Lambert Unpublished: III 39 = Litke 1998: 122, III, 40

²³⁵ ePSD *sub voce* irigal ‘underworld’.

²³⁶ Litke 1998: 120-121.

²³⁷ Reiner 1958: 40.

²³⁸ Hunger and Pingree 1989: 19.

²³⁹ Hunger and Pingree 1989: 137

²⁴⁰ *ibid.*

²⁴¹ Koch 1993: 194 offers an alternative identification of *maš.tab.ba.tur.tur* as Procyon and Gomeisa, α and β Canis Minoris (the entire modern constellation). The important point for our purposes, however, is that the Little Twins were a pair of stars fairly close to the Great Twins. Canis Minor is the next closest pair after ζ and λ Geminorum.

²⁴² Geller 2016: 151, note 95 & Lambert’s unpublished edition of *An=Anum* III 30.

²⁴³ The fraternal relationship of Alammuš and Ningublaga is also concluded by Cavigneux and Krebernik (2000: 375).

²⁴⁴ Scheil 1905: 6, 38 (though he was uncertain of the reading, as indicated in the footnotes)

²⁴⁵ Borger 1970: 25b

²⁴⁶ Paulus 2014: 434, VI 4 (misnumbered VI 6 in AOAT) & 439.

²⁴⁷ After Paulus 2014: 434.

a dividing line in the list between Nergal, along with his family and avatars, and the distinct group of chthonic snake gods represented by Tišpak and Ištaran.²⁴⁸ It is not clear in which of the two groups, if either, we should class our subjects. The fact that they share a line with the ophidian group may be significant, but this could equally be due to the space available on the stone. The fact that Ningublaga is a bull-related god²⁴⁹ speaks against any close connection with snakes, but the *mùš* element of Alammuš (homophonous with *muš*₁ ‘snake’) may imply the reverse. It is also possible that they represent a third group of chthonic gods not closely affiliated with Nergal or with the serpent group.

Further support regarding the chthonic nature of these gods can be found in the *List of Stars and Deities* VR, 46, 1.²⁵⁰ This text has been edited four times since the schematic copy was published by Rawlinson and Pinches, most recently by Wee.²⁵¹ Lines 4-7 are of interest to us:²⁵²

4	^{mul} maš.tab.ba.gal.gal.la	^d lugal.gìr.ra u ^d mes.lam.ta.è.a	The Great Twins	Lugal-irra and Meslamtaea
5		^d 30 u ^d u.gur		Sîn and Nergal
6	^{mul} maš.tab.ba.tur.tur	^{d+muš} lâl u ^d nin-EZEN×GU ₄	The Little Twins	Alammuš and Ningublaga
7		^d igi.du u ^d nin-EZEN×GU ₄		Palil and Ningublaga

In the first place, it is worth noting that Alammuš and Ningublaga are, as in *Mul.Apin*, neighbours of the underworld gods Lugal-irra and Meslamtaea. More important, however, Alammuš is equated to Palil, a god relatively well attested as a form of Nergal (see I. 23). Krebernik has argued that this equation is an error based on confusion with the preceding line and that Palil is in fact to be equated with the established underworld god Lugal-irra. He supports this with reference to *Šurpu* IX 23, in which the sequence Palil Lugal-irra appears. This is unnecessary, however, as well as unlikely. In the first place, as just discussed Alammuš was probably an underworld god in his own right. Second, the sequence in *Šurpu* is part of a larger list and both Alammuš and Palil are included in the same section.

Alammuš is mentioned in a number of Ur III period offering texts:

TCL 5, 6053²⁵³ is a long list from Umma. It seems to be arranged along broadly theological lines. Though it is far too long to properly examine here, a short extract (disregarding the details of the offerings) is worth mentioning:

ⁱ²⁷Alammuš, ⁱ²⁸Ninurimma, ⁱⁱ¹Nin-[...], ⁱⁱ²Ningublaga, ⁱⁱ³Nina[zu], ⁱⁱ⁴Nin-gìr[?]-[ri[?]-da[?]], ⁱⁱ⁵Ningišzida, ⁱⁱ⁶Nin-a-zi-[mu[?]-a[?]], ⁱⁱ⁷Gilgamesh, ⁱⁱ⁸Ninšubur, ⁱⁱ⁹Meslamtaea.

We should perhaps restore Nine’igara, wife of Ningublaga as the third name. CDLI has Nin-da-a-[...] for our tentative restoration of Ninazu’s wife Ningirida[?]. Ninazimua is the wife of Ningišzida and there seems little reason not to restore the name. The importance of this list for our purposes is that the gods following Ningublaga are all connected with the underworld. Without further examination of the list the importance of this order should not be overstated, but it is nonetheless suggestive in the light of the other evidence so far presented.

UET 3, 72²⁵⁴ is a short offering list in which Alammuš, Ninurimma, Ninazu, Ninka and Nin-túl-ga-na are listed together. The connection between these gods, indeed even the identity of the last named, is not clear, except insofar as Alammuš and Ninurimma are a pair, and the underworld god Ninazu is listed with them as in TCL 5, 6053.

²⁴⁸ Wiggerman 1997: 34ff.

²⁴⁹ Cavigneux & Krebernik 2000: 374-376.

²⁵⁰ Rawlinson and Pinches 1909: 46,1 = BM 42262 (1881-07-01, 4).

²⁵¹ Wee 2016: 161-165, though note that the text has not been collated by any of the editors since Pinches. Wee describes his version as ‘not so much a new edition, but an updated and convenient reference.’ For the earlier transliterations see Wee 2016: 164 n. 247.

²⁵² Collated from photographs kindly provided by Jeanette Fincke, who will produce a full new edition in the near future.

²⁵³ Genouillac 1922: Pl. XL. See http://cdli.ucla.edu/search/archival_view.php?ObjectID=P131767 for pictures and a transliteration, though note ^dlâl is mistakenly read ^dbappir₃[?].

²⁵⁴ Legrain 1937: Pl. 78. See http://cdli.ucla.edu/search/archival_view.php?ObjectID=P136388 for transliteration.

UET 3, 149²⁵⁵; 161²⁵⁶ and 164²⁵⁷ are nearly identical lists in which Alammuš is grouped with Nanna, Nanna-mu-ri-a-na-ba-ak, Nine'igara and Nisaba. Hall has argued²⁵⁸ that the underlying connection between the last two of these and Alammuš is that they are connected with food production – Nisaba is a grain goddess, Nine'igara's name translates to 'Lady of the house of butter and cream',²⁵⁹ and the logogram LĀL means 'honey/syrup' as well as Alammuš. While this is plausible, it should be noted that Nine'igara is Ningublaga's wife according to *An=Anum* III 35,²⁶⁰ and so a close connection between the two is not unexpected.

UET 3, 378²⁶¹ groups Alammuš with just Nanna and Nanna-mu-ri-an-a-ba-ak, each receiving a copper vessel.

While individually these texts tell us relatively little, taken together they present a strong case that Alammuš and Ningublaga were understood as deities connected to the netherworld. The exact nature of this connection is still unclear, but a likely explanation is the association between the *ūm bubbulu* 'day of the new moon' and the *ūm kispi* 'day of funerary offerings.'²⁶² This association indicates that the disappearance of the moon was connected with the dead and, by extension, with the underworld. It is reasonable to assume that at least some of his court would therefore belong in the underworld as is reflected in the evidence presented.

To conclude, it is likely that we should understand the presence of these gods in the present list as due to their connections to the netherworld.

Nuska

Nuska is the god of the lamp,²⁶³ occasionally identified with Girra who appears in line 24. Just as Girra is understood as a warrior god here, so we should understand Nuska.

Papsukkal/Ninšubur

This is vizier god *par excellence* and the son of Zababa, a form of Ninurta. Ninšubur, as written in **Ur1**, was the most common name for the vizier god in earlier periods, but by the first millennium Papsukkal had mostly supplanted it.²⁶⁴ It is likely that the reason for his inclusion here is his connection with Zababa, though as the rationale behind this section is unclear we cannot be certain. Enkagal in line 30 is possibly a name for Papsukkal.

Šamaš, Aya and Bunene

Šamaš is the sun god, and Aya is his wife and Bunene is his son or vizier. Each of these gods is well-known, but the reason for their appearance here is unclear. Perhaps Šamaš appears as a warrior god with his family in tow, but the major figures of the pantheon are not especially well attested in this list (apart from line 15), which is mostly comprised of more obscure gods, so this is by no means certain.

Alternatively, the fact that Nuska, Papsukkal and Alammuš, all vizier gods, appear in this line might have warranted the inclusion of Bunene, who could hardly be mentioned without reference to Šamaš.

²⁵⁵ Legrain 1937: Pl. 149. See http://cdli.ucla.edu/search/archival_view.php?ObjectID=P136466 for transliteration.

²⁵⁶ Legrain 1937: Pl. 161. See http://cdli.ucla.edu/search/archival_view.php?ObjectID=P136478 for transliteration.

²⁵⁷ Legrain 1937: Pl. 164. See http://cdli.ucla.edu/search/archival_view.php?ObjectID=P136481 for transliteration.

²⁵⁸ Hall 1985: 351-353.

²⁵⁹ Stol 1993-1995: 189-190.

²⁶⁰ Lambert Unpublished: III, 35 = Litke 1998: 121, III, 36.

²⁶¹ Legrain 1937: Pl. 378. See http://cdli.ucla.edu/search/archival_view.php?ObjectID=P136700 for (incomplete) transliteration.

²⁶² See del Olmo Lete 2005: 48 and the references there.

²⁶³ Streck 2001b: 630.

²⁶⁴ Wiggermann 1998-2000b: 491.

Ištar-kakkabe

This name can be translated ‘Ištar of the stars’ and should be understood as the deified planet Venus. The deity was also known as Ninsianna, as is written in **Ur1**. Presumably her role here is as a warrior goddess, though as with Šamaš in the preceding line, Ištar is otherwise apparently unrepresented in the *Kultgötterbeschwörung* so her presence here is surprising.

Luhušû

This is a form of the god Nergal, as evidenced by the so-called Archive of Mystic Heptads, KAR 142:²⁶⁵

iii 33’ ^dlú.huš ^du.gur šá kiš^{ki} Luhušû = Nergal of Kish

This text gathers groups of 7 gods who share a common characteristic. In this case, they are all forms of Nergal.

Palil

This god is relatively well attested as a form of Nergal.²⁶⁶ His name can be translated ‘Leader’, as can the name Massû in 1.27, who is apparently also a form of Nergal. It is not clear why ^{giš}KU-AN ‘Weapon’ is written in **Ur1**, but as with Papsukkal/Ninšubur in 1.22, we should probably understand it as another name for the god. Palil is discussed slightly more in the examination of Alammuš in line 22.

Lugal-irra

It is unusual for this well-attested netherworld god to appear without his brother Meslamtaea. Indeed, in **Ur2**, **Bab1A** and **X1**, Meslamtaea is mentioned, but as neither **Nin9** nor **Ur1** include him, and as there does not seem to be enough space for the name in the small break in **Nin1**, he has not been included in the eclectic text or translation.

Elsewhere, Lugal-irra appears alone in a corpus of Old Babylonian texts from the first Sealand dynasty,²⁶⁷ though not in a helpful context. In the present list he is simply a representative of the underworld, and while the absence of his brother is unusual, it does not materially affect the sense of the line.

24-25 This group is composed of warrior gods.

Girra

This is the deified fire, and so represents fire in all its aspects. As such, the god is regularly understood as a warrior, as for instance in *Maqlû III*:²⁶⁸

59 ^dgirra qurādu rikiski lihpe May Girra, the warrior, break your bond.

This is the way in which he should be understood here.

Šakkan

This god was chiefly responsible for wild animals, though he also had an underworld aspect and several other notable

²⁶⁵ Pongratz-Leisten 1994: 224.

²⁶⁶ See Krebernik (2003-2005b: 281). *Maqlû 7*: 156 & 158 (Abusch 2016: 186) should be added to the references given by Krebernik, as should three references in *SAA 2 - 2*: VI 19; 6: 519; 9: r.20 (Parpola and Watanabe 2014: 13, 51 & 67).

²⁶⁷ Dalley 2009: 61, n. 3.

²⁶⁸ Abusch 2016: 305

characteristics. This has been thoroughly investigated by Lambert and it is not worthwhile to repeat his arguments here.²⁶⁹ His role in the present line is presumably related to his stewardship of wild animals, in which capacity he absorbed many of their characteristics. As such, we should understand him as a sort of animal warrior here.

Tutu is a well attested name of Marduk.²⁷⁰

The Sebettu and Narudu

The Sebettu, literally ‘Seven’ are a group of demons regularly attested in incantations and elsewhere. They are fierce warriors and this is undoubtedly their role here. Narudu is their sister who often accompanies them and shares the same basic traits. A thorough study of the Sebettu has recently been completed by Konstantopoulos.²⁷¹

Erragal

The god Erragal is attested over two dozen times in literary, incantatory, divinatory, astronomical, lexical, and administrative texts, but the longest published study of his character and associations occupies merely half a paragraph in the Reallexicon entry for the god Nergal.²⁷² In this, Wiggermann asserts that while Erragal is sometimes a name of the underworld god Erra, himself a form of Nergal, he was ‘not originally a kind of Erra.’ This is broadly correct, but Wiggermann makes very little attempt to flesh out the ‘original’ character of the god.

That Erragal was understood as a form of Nergal is completely certain. This is clearest from several first millennium god lists in which the two are explicitly equated. A representative selection is presented here. In *An=Anum* Erragal appears twice in different contexts. The first has already been briefly discussed in our investigation of the goddess Kusu,²⁷³ *An=Anum* I:²⁷⁴

312	^d nin.šar	gír.lá é.kur.ra.ke ₄	Ninšar	Butcher of Ekur
		[<i>ta-bi-ḥ</i>]u šá é-kur		[Butche]r of Ekur
313	^d .MIN	MUḤALDIM	MIN	Ninšar ditto
314	^d .MIN	GÍR	MIN	Ninšar ditto
315	^d unú.dù.dù	MIN	Unududu	ditto
316	^d r.ra.gal	dam.bi ^d nè.eri ₁₁ .gal	Erragal	Her Husband, Nergal
317	^d .MIN	ŠUL	MIN	Erragal Ditto

As discussed earlier, lines 313, 314 and 317 represent logographic writings of the names in 312 and 316 respectively. In each case, the logogram describes an attribute of the deity: muḥaldim ‘cook’, gír ‘knife’, šul ‘hero’. George has described these as ‘epithet names’.²⁷⁵ Erragal here is clearly described as a form of Nergal and as the spouse of Ninšar. This is partially reiterated in the god’s second appearance in *An=Anum*.

An=Anum VI:²⁷⁶

1	^d nè.eri ₁₁ .gal	ŠU	Nergal	the same (Nergal)
2	[^d]’la’.az	dam.bi.munus	Laz	His wife

²⁶⁹ Lambert 2013: 513-523.

²⁷⁰ Richter 2014: 241.

²⁷¹ Konstantopoulos 2015.

²⁷² Wiggermann 1998-2000a: 218.

²⁷³ See excursus

²⁷⁴ Lambert Unpublished = Litke 1998: 60-61, I 328-333.

²⁷⁵ George 2015: 8

²⁷⁶ Litke 1998: 200-201, VI 1-13.

3	[^d] ^r ma [˘] -mi-tum	^d la.az	Mamitum	Laz
4	[^d] ^r u ₄ [˘] .bu.bu.ul	^d nè.eri ₁₁ .gal	Ububul	Nergal
5	[^d] ^r huš [˘] .ki.a	MIN	Huškia	ditto
6	[^d] ^r i [˘] -šar-ki-di-su	MIN	Išarkidisu	ditto
7	^d [gu ₄].nu.un.gi ₄ .a	MIN	Gunungia	ditto
8	^d la [˘] -ga-ma-al	MIN	Lagamal	ditto
9	^d ir [˘] -ra	MIN	Erra	ditto
10	^d ir [˘] .ra.gal	MIN	Erragal	ditto
11	^d ir [˘] .ra.kal	MIN	Errakal	ditto
12	^d en. [˘] lil [˘] .kur.ra	MIN	Enlilkurra	ditto
13	^d ad-mu	dam.bi.munus	Admu	His wife

Again, Erragal is a form of Nergal, one of a long list. His spouse here is Admu, though Nergal also has Laz, another of whose names is Mamitum, as a wife. Mamitum, also known as Mamma and Mammi, is also recorded as the wife of Erra in Erra and Išum.²⁷⁷ The difference in spouse is a good indication that two traditions have been conflated in *An=Anum*. It is plain that the ancient editor of the list did not envisage two separate gods named Erragal as both entries are equated with Nergal, but equally Erragal must have been thought of as having a distinct identity.

A similar list of Nergal's names is to be found in the Neo-Assyrian explanatory god list K. 29. The relevant section is as follows:²⁷⁸

r.i.20 [˘]	^d ù-bu-bu-ul	MIN	Ububul	ditto
r.i.21 [˘]	^d ir-ra	MIN	Erra	ditto
r.i.22 [˘]	^d ir-ra-kal	MIN	Errakal	ditto
r.i.23 [˘]	^d ir-ra-gal	MIN	Erragal	ditto

The name which heads this list is unfortunately lost in both copies which preserve the list of Nergal names, but there is no question that it was Nergal. Though not included here as they are not germane to our discussion, twenty three names are preserved which are given the same equivalent, and though many are rare and some unique, both Ububul²⁷⁹ and Erra are well known as forms of Nergal. The explicit equation is also made in the Neo-Assyrian two column copy of the Weidner god list from Aššur:

VAT 10173 ii 31-34²⁸⁰

31	[^d nè-eri ₁₁ -gal]	^d U+GUR	Nergal	Nergal
32	[^d ir]-ra	^d U+GUR	Erra	Nergal
33	[^d ir].ra.gal	^d U+GUR	Erragal	Nergal
34	[^d ir].ra.kal	^d U+GUR	Errakal	Nergal

The restorations in the first column are certain as the Weidner list survives in dozens of copies from across Mesopotamia and the Western Periphery, spanning all periods from Old Babylonian to Hellenistic. While there are differences between the manuscripts, there are very few lacunae in the text as a whole for any period. For our purposes, the only important point to be made here is that Erragal is explicitly equated with Nergal.

²⁷⁷ Wiggermann 1998-2000a: 220.

²⁷⁸ King 1909: 36. Duplicated by Rm. 610 (King 1909: 35). Transliteration after Peterson, DCCLT.

²⁷⁹ Krebernik 2014: 269.

²⁸⁰ = KAV 63 (Schroeder 1920: Pl. 63). The text here takes account of Weidner's collations described in his composite edition of the god list (Weidner 1924-5: 17 notes 4-6). There is no satisfactory edition of the whole text, and so line numbers are given according to KAV 63. The text given here is roughly ll.85-88 of the text.

Erragal's other consistent association is with the storm god Adad. An Old Babylonian administrative tablet held in St. Louis provides the clearest evidence of this:²⁸¹

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | 27.0.0 še gur | 27 gur of barley |
| 2. | ^{giš} bán ^d ir.ra.gal <i>me-še-qum</i> | measured in the standard measure of Erragal |
| 3. | <i>ša i-na</i> 10½ (sila) 1 (sila) <i>ha-ar-šú</i> | according to which 1 sila is deducted from the 10½ |
| 4. | ša.ba še ^d ir.ra.gal | from among the grain of Erragal |
| 5. | <i>u</i> ^d IM | and Adad |
| 6. | <i>ša</i> ^{uru} šu- <i>ha-tum</i> ^{ki} | of the city Šuḫatum |

The city Šuḫatum is otherwise unknown and is not mentioned in the Répertoire géographique des textes cuneiforms. Nonetheless, this text provides clear evidence that Erragal and Adad were closely linked – at the very least they shared some grain and presumably the temple to which it belonged.

This association is probably mirrored in the Hurrian-Akkadian bilingual version of the Weidner god list found at Emar:²⁸²

ii 19' [^dèr-ra₂-[gal² = ^dta²-a]r²-^rḫu-un²-[ta²]

Tarḫun(ta) was a Hittite storm god and a bull god, syncretised with, and used as a subordinate name for, the Hurrian storm god Tešsub by the middle of the fifteenth century.²⁸³ This is a clear equation between Erragal and a storm god though the restoration is not certain.

A further hint of the identity of Erragal as a form of the storm god can be found in the late explanatory compendium CBS 6060:²⁸⁴

44. urudu.níg.kalag.ga = ^dnin-šar u ^du.gur Gong = Ninšar and Erragal

While ^du.gur is usually Nergal himself, the connection with Ninšar, who as we have seen is the wife of Erragal, means we should understand Erragal here. The two are paired with the urudu-níg-kala-ga, literally 'powerful copper thing,' which has been variously identified as cymbals,²⁸⁵ a drum,²⁸⁶ and most commonly as a type of bell, a specific example of which is thought to be represented by the item VA 2517 in the Berlin Museum.²⁸⁷

Apart from the association with Erragal, urudu.níg.kala.ga is known from a handful of apotropaic rituals in which it makes a loud noise to scare off the demons that are causing trouble, or to purify generally. The major qualities of the instrument are exemplified in Udug.Hul:²⁸⁸

VII 15 urudu.níg.kala.ga ur-sag an-na-ke Powerful copper, hero of the heavens

MIN-u qarrādu ^danim Ditto, hero of An

VII 19 urudu.níg.kala.ga ur-sag an-na-ke za-pa-ág me-lam-a-ni hu-mu-ra-ab-dah-e

MIN-u qarrādu ^da-nim ina rigim [melammišu lišib]

May the powerful copper, hero of the heavens (Akk. An), increase its awesome thunder

A further important description is found in Bit Meseri II:²⁸⁹

120 ... urudu.níg.kala.ga ša pīšu dannu Powerful copper, whose voice is strong

²⁸¹ Freedman 1975: 188.

²⁸² Simons 2017b: 3, obv 19'.

²⁸³ Schwemer 2008: 22.

²⁸⁴ Livingstone 1986: 179, l. 44 and 191, l. 13. Discussed at greater length below, II. 78-80.

²⁸⁵ Livingstone 1986: 179.

²⁸⁶ CAD *sub voce* nignakkû

²⁸⁷ Panayotov 2013: 85.

²⁸⁸ Geller 2016: 253-254.

²⁸⁹ Meier 1941-1944: 146-147.

121 *naši^d adad bēl birqi ...* carried by Adad, lord of lightning.

The evidence of these texts shows a common theme. The urudu.níg.kala.ga is a ‘warrior of the heavens,’ ‘carried by Adad, Lord of Lightning’, which produces ‘awesome thunder’ with its ‘strong voice.’ This describes an instrument capable of producing a booming bass note to mimic the sound of thunder.

The bell in Berlin is 11cm high and has a diameter of 6cm. While its decoration demonstrates that it was used for apotropaic purposes, it is impossible to imagine that a glorified cowbell could produce the ‘awesome thunder’ of the urudu.níg.kala.ga.

A further consideration is the *e’ru*-wood *hultuppu*-rod, which is often mentioned alongside the powerful copper. The clearest instance of this is in *Udug-hul*.²⁹⁰

XII 83 urudu.níg.kala.ga^{gis} ma-nu^[gis] hul-dúb-ba ur-sag an-na-ke₄
ruq[qu ēru^{gis} hultuppu qarrādu^d anim]

Sum. The powerful copper and the *e’ru*-wood rod, hero of the heavens

Akk. The hammered cop[per] and the *e’ru*-wood rod, hero of An]

XII 84 [udug hul.gál.e] ‘gaba’ an-gi₄-gi₄-àm
[muterrū]ti šēdū lemnūtu

that turn away the evil spirits.

Geller understands *ruqqu* in l. 83 to mean ‘copper vessel’ following the first meaning in CAD, and in the belief that the instrument was represented by the bell in Berlin. As we have established, this is an unlikely identification, and so the second meaning in CAD ‘hammered metal’ has been adopted. The *e’ru*-wood rod is also attested together with the powerful copper in an unpublished apotropaic ritual, K. 5152:²⁹¹

16. dù.dù.bi šipti annīti ana muḥḥi ari ēri šalšīšu tamannuma ina qātīka tanašši[?] ma mimma ul iṭe[ḥḥi]šu
Its ritual: Recite this incantation before the *Ara*-stick and the *E’ru*-stick and wield them in your hand.

Everything will not approach.

18. [...a]na muḥḥi šalam nigkala[gē taman]nu
[...i]n front of the image of the powerful copper you recite.

The incantations connected to these ritual instructions aim to exorcise demons, which is also the purpose of the two objects in the *Udug.Hul* incantation, as is clear from XII 84. Elsewhere in the unpublished text the *e’ru*-stick is set alight.

The *e’ru*-stick is called a *hultuppu* in *Udug-hul*, and an item labelled *hultuppu* is actually known. BM 91452 is an inscribed lapis lazuli ‘mace head.’²⁹² The stone would originally have been attached to a shaft, perhaps made of *e’ru*-wood.

The evidence, then, describes a copper instrument which made a booming bass sound akin to thunder to scare off demons, and which was associated with a wooden stick with a stone head. Taken together, this strongly indicates that the ‘powerful copper’ should be understood as a sort of gong, and the *e’ru*-wood rod as the beater with which it was struck. This understanding fits neatly with the use of the word *ruqqu* ‘hammered metal’ in the Akkadian translation of *Udug.Hul*, and, more importantly for our purposes, links the powerful copper with storms. Thus, Erragal’s association with the gong is good evidence for his identity as a type of storm god.

²⁹⁰ After Geller 2016: 414-415.

²⁹¹ This text, with duplicates, is to be published in a forthcoming article by Henry Stadhouders and myself, provisionally entitled ‘The Charred Drumstick and the Thunder Gong.’

²⁹² Grayson 1975a: 69.

A final curiosity regarding the powerful copper is a medical text, BAM 240.²⁹³

26 DIŠ MUNUS Û.TU-*ma ši-im-rat u IM ud-du-pat SAḪAR* ^{urudu} NÍG.KALA.GA *tu-še-še-en-ši-ma ina-eš*
If a woman gives birth and subsequently becomes distended and is inflated with “wind,” if you have her
smell dust from a thunder-gong she should recover

This is evidently an example of associative magic – if a woman is puffed up with wind, she should sniff the instrument that creates thunderous roars, allowing her to create thunderous roars of her own thereby alleviating her inflation.

More hints of Erragal’s identity as a storm god are found in Tablet 45 of the omen series Enuma Anu Enlil, which deals with thunder omens. Several lines are relevant, but as they are very similar in content one will suffice:²⁹⁴

v3 18’ DIŠ min ^dtir.an.na *šá MÚŠ-šá ma-diš* sig₇ ta im.u₁₈ *ana im.si gib ^dir-ra-gal ‘x’ na ina kur gál*

If ditto a rainbow which is very green in its appearance arches from south to north, Erragal... will be in the land
This follows the general pattern of the omens in this Tablet, in which various phenomena are interpreted and prognoses given. In many cases, Adad, to be understood as ‘storms’, ‘will be in the land.’ Several lines predict ^du.gur ‘will be in the land’ which has been understood to mean Nergal and so ‘plague’ or ‘death’. In light of the evidence presented so far, and especially given the line just quoted, it is perhaps worth considering that we should instead understand Erragal, and ‘(a type of) storm’ or ‘thunder.’ This requires substantially more investigation if it is to be accepted, which is outside the scope of the current study.

A final group of references worth considering are found in mythological texts. In both Atrahāsīs and Gilgameš XI, Errakal is specifically associated with the destruction caused by the flood when he is said to ‘tear up the mooring poles.’²⁹⁵ In the Epic of Gulkishar the same sentiment is found:²⁹⁶

- 20’. [ki-i GU₄] ‘at’-‘ta’-‘kip’-‘ma’ ‘a’-‘x’ [...] [Like a wild bull] I will continuously charge and I will [...]!
21’. [ki-i] ‘^dèr-ra-kal a-ša-‘ak’-[kan ...] [Like] Errakal, I will est[ablish ...]
22’. [ú²-na²]-ap-pa-áš ki-i a-gi-i ú-[...] [I] will demolish like the flood; I [...]!
23’. [a-q]a-am-mi ki-i ‘^dBIL’¹.GI ka-a-ra ‘x’ [...] [I] will burn like Girra! The mooring-place [...]!

While the breaks mean Errakal is not precisely said to cause the flood, the idea is clearly similar to that of Gilgamesh and Atrahasis. This is also echoed in Erra and Išum, in which Erra is said to smash rudders and tear down masts and rigging.²⁹⁷ In this poem Erra also threatens ‘Him whom the prince has not struck down, Adad will wash away,’²⁹⁸ though as this is part of a list of ways in which Erra will destroy the world, it is perhaps not very significant.

The distinction between Erragal and Errakal is difficult to define, presumably due to their early syncretism, but it is possible that they were equated. This gains support from the fact that one manuscript of the Gilgameš Tablet has [^dèr²-ra²]-gal for Errakal.²⁹⁹ In any case, as has been shown, it is very likely that both were in some way connected with storms and the destruction they wrought.

²⁹³ Scurlock 2014: 610-614.

²⁹⁴ Gehlken 2012: 57.

²⁹⁵ Lambert and Millard 1969: 87, III vii 51 and 125, U rev. 15; George 2003: 708–709, XI 102.

²⁹⁶ My thanks are due to Elyze Zomer, who is due to publish this newly discovered royal epic, for the reference

²⁹⁷ Cagni 1977: 56, ll. 118–120.

²⁹⁸ Cagni 1977: 54, ll. 81.

²⁹⁹ George 2003: 708.

All of this is germane to the present line because the group in this section does not seem to be related to the underworld, as might have otherwise been expected of Erragal. We should understand Erragal here in his storm god/warrior aspect.

Aritum

This name is otherwise known in just two texts – The Weidner godlist and the Great Star List (K. 250). These appear to give contradictory evidence concerning the identity of the deity. In the Weidner list she is equated with Siris and with Tugnunna, though neither name seems likely here. The Great Star List writes:³⁰⁰

32 ^{mul}*a-ri-tum* = ^d*iš-tar be-let* kur.kur The Aritum Star = Ištar, Lady of all lands

This is more likely, given the context of the present list, as Ištar is a warrior goddess. However, a more likely explanation still is that the name is simply a deified noun. *Aritum* can be translated ‘shield’ or ‘shield bearer’, and so we should simply understand the divine figure Aritum, apparently a goddess judging by the figures with whom she is equated, as a deified shield or shield bearer. This fits very neatly with rest of the list.

Nin-mè?

This name is not clearly preserved on any tablet. We have followed the best preserved text, **X1**, but even this is not certain. **Nin9** seems to write *Bēlet-m[è?]*, which is an unexpected combination of Sumerian and Akkadian, as well as lacking the divine determinative. **Aš1** has *Bēlet-Ur[u?]*, ‘Lady of the city’ which is a name of Manzat (l. 17). The lack of a determinative raises the possibility that the name should be understood as an epithet of Aritum but this is unlikely. In the first place, the omission of divine determinatives in names beginning with *bēlet* is quite common in this text, as is clear in lines 10 and 19, and moreover, in both **X1** and **Aš1** the determinative is used. Further, in **X1**, as well as in both **Bab1A** and **Ur1** assuming they both included it, the name is written at the start of the following line. While this does not preclude an epithet, it makes it less likely.

As for the purpose of the name in this list, unlike in line 19, the aspect intended here is probably that of the warrior goddess.

25 Ninurta and Ningirsu are two names of the same god, the warrior god *par excellence*. Bau and Gula are healing gods, but are more likely included here as the wives of Ninurta and Ningirsu respectively.³⁰¹

26-27 This list is composed principally of underworld gods.

26 Nergal is the king of the underworld. Išum is his vizier and Šubula is his son. Šaršarbatī is a name of Nergal and Mamitum is the wife of Meslamtaea, an underworld god often syncretised with Nergal.³⁰²
Lulal belongs with Lataarak and Šarrahu and so will be discussed in the next line of commentary.

27 **Lulal, Lataarak and Šarrahu**

The first two of these are regularly paired, and often equated with one another. Lulal is also known as Lugal-edinna

³⁰⁰ Koch-Westenholz 1995: 188.

³⁰¹ Streck 2001a: 512-515.

³⁰² Wiggermann 1998-2000a: 219-222.

‘Lord of the Steppe.’³⁰³ All three are mentioned together in *Šurpu* III:

177 ^dlugal.edin.na ^dla-ta-rak ^dšar-ra-ḫu lip-tu-ru May Lugal-edinna, Latarak and Šarraḫu release
Lulal and Latarak also appear in the *List of Stars and Deities* VR, 46, 1.³⁰⁴

22 ^{mul}lú.làl u ^dla-ta-rak = ^d30 u ^du.gur Lulal and Latarak = Sîn and Nergal

In this text, the two are equated with Sîn and Nergal, though, as Lambert points out, this is partly due to the relatively low number of paired gods with which they could be equated.³⁰⁵ Nonetheless, Nergal is also known as Lugal-edinna in the Neo-Assyrian explanatory godlist CT 25, 35:³⁰⁶

r.i 8. ^dlugal.edin.na = MIN Lugal-edinna = Ditto (Nergal)

In light of these equivalences, and the apparent theme of this section, it seems likely that all three of these gods are either forms or associates of Nergal in the present context.

Massû

This name is apparently known only here. It can be translated as ‘The Leader.’ This is also the meaning of Palil (l. 23), who is a form of Nergal. This is, of course, not evidence of such a link between Maššu and Nergal, but is nonetheless worth mentioning. Given the other names in this list, it seems likely that Massû is closely associated with Nergal.

Kakka

This god was a messenger of Anu generally equated with Ninšubur and Papsukkal.³⁰⁷ He does not seem to have any close connections to the underworld and so his appearance in this list is puzzling. A convoluted connection can be found in that the Sumerian goddess Ninšubur, who was eventually syncretised with the Akkadian god Ninšubur, was married to a death god.³⁰⁸ In addition, the same goddess is featured on Old Babylonian seal inscriptions in association with Nergal, Išum and Meslamtaea, though not exclusively.³⁰⁹ The chain seems too long to convincingly defend, and it is not clear what purpose Kakka served here.

Enkurkur

According to the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, this is a name of Ninurta or Enlil.³¹⁰ Given the context, it seems more likely that it is a name of Nergal. This also makes sense in terms of the meaning of the name assuming we take KUR to mean ‘underworld.’ This is supported by the evidence of an unpublished god list on a school exercise tablet (EAH 249) in which we read:³¹¹

3.	^d U.GUR	Nergal
4.	^d EN.KUR	Lord Underworld

Enkur is evidently a short form of the present name, and given the proposed translation could hardly be anyone other than Nergal.

³⁰³ Lambert 1987-1990b: 163-164.

³⁰⁴ Rawlinson and Pinches 1909: 46,1 = BM 42262 (1881-07-01, 4).

³⁰⁵ Lambert 1987-1990b: 163.

³⁰⁶ Peterson DCCLT

³⁰⁷ Steinkeller 1982: 290.

³⁰⁸ Wiggermann 1998-2000b: 495.

³⁰⁹ Wiggermann 1998-2000b: 495.

³¹⁰ Ebeling 1938: 382.

³¹¹ Soon to be published with comparable texts by myself, Henry Stadhouders and Elyze Zomer.

28-29 The organisation of this section is entirely unclear. Many of the deities listed seem to have no connection to the underworld, the abzu or martial prowess. A group within this list are occasionally described as mother goddesses, though how this could be related to the purpose of the text as a whole is unclear, and most of the list could not be connected to the idea in any case.

Several of the figures are from the court of Enlil at Nippur, and it is possible that the little understood groups of gods known as the Enlils and the Sons of Enmešarra are involved. Certainly Šuzianna, Siris and Ninimma all belong to these groups, and the other members (Kusu, Ennugi, Nusku, Gula and Ninšar) are also all present in the *Kultgötterbeschwörung*. However, these groups are very little understood and as the names are spread throughout the *Kultgötterbeschwörung* it is difficult to argue that they were understood here as a coherent group. It is more likely that the characters of the divine figures in this section are too little known to us to understand the selection.

As no coherent sense can be made of this section, comment has been kept to a minimum.

28 **Lugalmaradda and Imzuanna**

This is a husband and wife pair, the tutelary deities of the town Marda. Lugalmaradda was syncretised with Ninurta at a very early date.

Ninimma

This goddess is equated, presumably mistakenly, with Zababa in the triple-column Weidner god list II 11b. In An=Anum I 312 she is described as ‘Sister of Ninurta’. In the myth Enki and Ninmah I 32 she appears together with Šuzianna in a list of birth goddesses.³¹² Any of these could explain her presence here to some degree, but nothing particularly seems likely.

Šuzianna

This goddess is usually the concubine of Enlil, but in the triple column version of the Weidner godlist II 20 she is equated with Gula as the wife of Ninurta.³¹³ Perhaps she is here for this connection.

Šulpaea is the husband of Bēlet-Ili and so will be discussed together with her in the next line.

29 **Sadarnunna**

This is the wife of Nuska, who is mentioned in line 22. It is possible that she appears here due to her association with him, though as the meaning of this section is opaque, she could be here in her own right or for any other reason.

Bēlet-Ili and Šulpaea

Bēlet-Ili’s only notable role is as a mother goddess. She is perhaps included in the present line for this reason, as several other mother goddesses are also listed here. Šulpaea is her husband.

Sud

³¹² Lambert 2013: 336-337.

³¹³ Weidner 1924-1925: 14.

Originally the goddess of Šurrapak, Sud was syncretised with Ninlil at a very early stage, becoming the wife of Enlil. The reason for her appearance in the present line is not known, though Ninlil was occasionally recognised as a mother goddess, so she is perhaps linked with Bēlet-Ili.

Siris and Ningišzida

These are deities associated with alcohol. Siris is the god of beer, while Ningišzida is a chthonic snake god, apparently with responsibility for wine.³¹⁴ In *Šurpu* VI, Siris is described as *pašir ilī u amēlī* ‘releaser of gods and men.’ Presumably this is a reference to the effects of alcohol, but it also links the god with the general idea of the current incantation.

30-31 This section is not entirely clear. There are several warrior gods and some underworld gods, but no particular theme is apparent.

30 Panigarra

Panigarra is a warrior god equated with Ninurta, and should be understood as such here.³¹⁵

Enkagal

The god Enkagal ‘Lord of the great gate’ is otherwise unattested. *An=Anum* I 46³¹⁶ gives Ninkagal ‘Lady of the Great Gate’ as a name of the wife of Ninšubur, and so we should perhaps understand Enkagal to be a name of Ninšubur himself. Ninšubur in this context is to be understood as the form of the god syncretised with Papsukkal, rather than the much older goddess who is vizier of Inanna.³¹⁷ Papsukkal is the son and vizier of Zababa, a well attested form Ninurta (l. 13). Thus, we should probably understand this god to be a form of Ninurta’s vizier. Papsukkal himself is listed in line 22.

Enkimdu

Enkimdu is a god of farming, initially in the court of Enlil. Following the promotion of Marduk and Nabu, Enkimdu was brought into the court of Nabu. Lambert explains this move as being due to the need for Nabu to absorb the chief facets of Ninurta’s character. As Ninurta was an agricultural as well as a martial god, there was a necessity for Nabu to develop an agricultural side, met by his adoption of Enkimdu.³¹⁸ We should thus understand Enkimdu here as a member of Nabu’s court, included in the list due to this connection.

Lisi

This god is also mentioned in l. 20. It is not clear why he is included twice in the list. It is possible that either this reference or the earlier one refers to the mother goddess discussed in l. 20, but this is far from clear.

Ninegal

³¹⁴ Lambert 1990a: 300.

³¹⁵ Krebernik 2003-2005c: 326.

³¹⁶ Lambert Unpublished: I 46.

³¹⁷ Wiggermann 1998-2000b: 494.

³¹⁸ Lambert Unpublished: II 239-241.

This goddess is well established as the wife of Uraš, a form of Ninurta.³¹⁹ She is presumably included here in this capacity.

31 **Ur1** writes ^d*bašmu* in place of Gula as the first name in this line, but this is certainly contamination from line 6 where Bašmu precedes Lahmu.

Gula

This is the most usual name of the healing goddess, but given the context of the *Kultgötterbeschwörungen*, we should perhaps understand her here, as in 1.25, as the wife of the warrior god Ninurta. Owing to the uncertainty about the grouping principle for this list, however, it is possible that she is here in her own right.

Laḥmu

This is very unlikely to be identical with the Laḥmu-monster mentioned in 1. 6. Instead, as Wiggermann has established, we should understand this name, to be translated ‘hairy’, as representing the ‘naked hero’ known from iconography.³²⁰ Whether this figure is the same as the monster or not, it is clearly to be understood as a warrior, as the iconography demonstrates.

Rammānu

An=Anum includes the name in the middle of the section on the god Amurru:

VI 246 ^{d.ra-ma-nu}·KUR’ = ŠU Rammānu = The same

This makes him a warrior god, as the epithet Riḥšu (if this is not a name, see below) implies.

Riḥšu

Nin1 and **Nin2A** omit the divine determinative before this word, while **Aš1**, **Ur1** and **X1** all write it. It is therefore not certain whether a name or an epithet is intended. Evidently the tradition outside Nineveh considered it a name, but as this edition has generally followed the Ninevite text except where unavoidable, we have translated it as an epithet. In either case, the meaning is not substantially different. As an epithet, we read ‘devastating’, while as a name Riḥšu is a form of the storm god Adad according to the explanatory godlist CT 25, 16:

31 ^dGÍR.BALA-*u* = min Riḥšu = ditto (Adad)

In either case, the name implies a warrior dimension to this list, as it can scarcely mean anything else.

Nisaba

This is a name of the grain goddess, discussed further in the examination of Kusu (see excursus). The reason she is grouped with the gods listed here is unclear. She is occasionally to be understood as the wife of Nabu, perhaps this is the nuance intended here.

Ereškigal

This is the well-attested queen of the underworld, wife of Nergal.

³¹⁹ Behrens and Klein 1998-2000: 346. See paragraph 4.1 for details and references.

³²⁰ Wiggermann 1981-1982: 1-17.

Lugaludua

This name can be translated ‘king of Kutha’, the city of Nergal. Thus the name is simply a form of the underworld god Nergal.

32-33 This section consists of gods related to the Abzu, the sweet waters below the earth.

32 Lugalabba

As mentioned above (l. 12), this god is generally associated with Nergal. The arguments for this have been set out by Lambert³²¹ and there is no need to repeat them here. It seems likely, given the general principle of this section, that Lugalabba was understood here at least as having a connection to the Abzu. At the very least, his name ‘Lord of the Sea’ coupled with his underworld connections would make him easy to group with Abzu gods.

This is clear from the following line in which **Ur1** and possibly **Nin2A** write Lugalabba for Lugalabzu.

Lugalidda

Much like Lugalabba, this name is apparently dual purpose. In *An=Anum* VI 28 it follows Lugalabba as a name of Nergal, while in *An=Anum* II 129 it is given as a name of Ea. This adds substantial support to our understanding of Lugalabba as an Abzu god in the present context.

Laguda, Enzak and Meskilag

This god appears in *An=Anum* II:³²²

224 [d¹la.gu.da] = ŠU NI.TUK^{ki} Laguda = The same. Dilmun.

This is restored from the unpublished text Anšar=Anum. The line follows 50 names of Marduk, and precedes the names of Marduk’s wife, so is evidently intended to be understood as a form of Marduk involved with Dilmun. This is doubtful, however, as Lambert has pointed out,³²³ because of Laguda’s appearance in Marduk’s Address to the Demons:³²⁴

30. *ana-ku^d asal-lú-ḫi šá ina ti-amti šap-li-ti ú-šar-bu-šú^d la-gu-da*

I am Asalluḫi, whom Laguda exalts in the lower sea.

Laguda cannot be Marduk here as he is exalting Marduk. The lower sea here is the Persian Gulf, not the Abzu, thus supporting the link to Dilmun, modern Bahrain. We should understand Laguda as a watery god linked to Dilmun, and later syncretised with Marduk. This is noteworthy when it is considered that the following name in the present section, Enzak, was the patron deity of Dilmun. In the myth Enki and Ninhursanga,³²⁵ Enzak is said to be the child of Enki, the Sumerian equivalent of the Akkadian god Ea. In several Eršema prayers,³²⁶ Enzak is a name of Marduk, who, as a son of Ea, is an obvious choice for syncretism.

Thus, we have two gods, both linked to Dilmun and syncretised with Marduk. Laguda is associated with water and Enzak is explicitly the son of Enki. It seems very likely, therefore, that they are mentioned in the present list in their

³²¹ Lambert 2013: 241-247.

³²² Lambert unpublished: II 224.

³²³ Lambert 1980-1983: 430-431

³²⁴ Geller 2016: 348, l. 30.

³²⁵ ETCSL I. 280.

³²⁶ Gabbay 2016: 368 for references.

capacity of associates or relatives of Ea, and thereby deities connected to the Abzu.

Meskilag is the wife of Enzak, as well as being, under the name Nin-sikil-la, a daughter of Enki according to Enki and Ninhursanga.³²⁷

33 Hedimmekug is attested as a daughter of Ea in *An=Anum* II 274. Lugaldukuga is a name of Ea, as is Lugalabzu ‘Lord Abzu.’³²⁸ Išemmi-tiklašū is apparently known only here. The name means ‘he hears, trust him.’ Given the rest of the list, this deity must be related to the Ea or Abzu in some way. Usmu and Hasisu are the viziers of Ea and his wife Damkina respectively.

Ur1 has ^dše-mu-ú for Usmu, presumably reflecting a pronunciation. Usmu is also known as Isimu,³²⁹ and Šemū is not too far removed from this. In addition, **Ur1** separates Išemmi-tiklašū into two names, the first of which ^di-šem-mu could easily be a writing of Isimu. It is also possible that both of these variant writings are errors.

34-35 This section is a logical successor to lines 32-33. It is concerned with water sources, initially deified ponors, and then above ground water sources, thus there is a progression from Abzu (underground), to ponor (under and overground) to rivers, streams and seas (overground).

Nonetheless, the point of these lines is unclear. The list in line 48 is comparable, but the purpose is certainly different, the later list being related to the *māmītu*-sanction for misconduct related to the items enumerated.

The present lines comprise the final section of the *Kultgötterbeschwörung* and it is noteworthy that they deal chiefly with non-divine items. Perhaps the idea here is related to cleaning. Just as water cleans and purifies the body physically, so it could have been felt to be effective against demons

34 ^dILLAT is the logographic writing of several different names. Reiner lists *Baliḫu*, *Alba*, and *Alḫa*. While these may be accurate translations, without evidence regarding the order, or, indeed, knowledge of the last two names, translating would be guesswork at best. As discussed below (l. 48), ^dILLAT is the logographic writing of a type of partially underground stream known as a ponor. There were presumably several of these in Mesopotamia. We should perhaps understand *Baliḫu*, *Alba* and *Alḫa* as especially prominent examples, which therefore gave their names to the principle as a whole.

The epithet phrase describing the five ILLATs as ‘dwellers in the high mountains, the high peaks’ is presumably a relatively accurate description of the phenomenon. Ponors form only where a karst system exists. That is to say, they are the result of a landscape made of soluble rocks such as limestone. In such a setting, cracks in the bedrock can be steadily eroded by water, resulting in the formation of a drainage system beneath the rock. Landscapes composed of limestone are often very hilly, and so it is natural to describe ponors as dwellers in the high mountains.

35 This line is mirrored in line 48. The idea seems to be to list different natural phenomena, mostly linked to water. *Gallati*, translated ‘roiling’ here is in fact untranslatable. It is only known as a word describing the sea but it is not clear what precisely is implied about the sea from its use.³³⁰

³²⁷ ETCSL.

³²⁸ Lambert 1987-1990a: 133.

³²⁹ Lambert 1976-1980b: 179.

³³⁰ e.g. Leichty 2011: 16, ii 67; Koch 2005: 112, 3.34.

- 36-42 This section consists chiefly of catch-all lists designed to cover every possible divine force and every possible problem that will hopefully be removed after the patient has performed the ritual, including witchcraft, omens, and problems brought on by the patient's own actions. It is, to a large extent, repeated in ll. 72-74 below.
- It is important to note that the subject of the litany phrase from here onwards is no longer the gods but rather the sanctions that the patient hopes they will remove. This makes the first few lines of this section quite confusing, as the gods and days mentioned are not apparently connected to any verbs. In order to make sense of this section with the minimum emendation, it is necessary to incorporate prepositions into the text. The assumption in the translation is that Amurru is the main focus of the litany, but that all the other gods are also addressed, as indicated by the opening phrase of line 37. The list of days are also invoked by the litany.
- 36 Amurru, as this line makes clear, is an exorcist as well as the god most closely associated with the *gamlu*-stick that plays such an important role in this text. The translation adopted here understands each of the words following *nāš* 'bearer(s)' as a separate item. This offers a plausible explanation for the presence of both forms of Amurru in this line – 4 items is more than a single god can carry.
- The point is to demonstrate that Amurru is the best equipped god to help clear away the problems facing the patient. It seems likely, though there is no evidence beyond this line, that the officiant of the ritual took the role of Amurru at this point and used the items named to purify the patient.
- 37 The opening phrase of this line is to be understood as a blanket address to all divine figures. It is paralleled in line 6, above, in which the creatures of the rivers and dry lands are addressed, though they are then enumerated. It is also paralleled in *Maqlû I*:³³¹
- 63 *ša šamê qūlā ša eršeti šimâ* Those of the heavens, pay heed! Those of the netherworld, listen!
- This is a simple catch-all term to address any divine figure that might be helpful but has not been addressed by name. The rest of the line is devoted to a list of specific days. Livingstone describes this list as 'a catch-all list of days of the month and festivals.'³³² The point is that these days are invoked in just the same way as the gods listed above. They are lucky or unlucky days, and possess their own powers to act on the patient's behalf.
- 38 This line continues the list of days and begins the list of problems. Both are simply comprehensive lists of their subjects.
- 39 The list of problems continues on this line.
- 40 This line lists all the conceivable targets of the problems faced by the patient.
- 39a-40c These lines are found only on **Bab1A** and **X1**, and are possibly adapted from the similar list in ll. 72-74. Alternatively, they may simply represent the expansion of the original idea preserved in l. 39-40, no doubt due to the multitude of magical texts in which these or similar lines occur.³³³
- Due to the relatively formulaic nature of these lines, it has been possible to suggest restorations for most of the broken

³³¹ After Abusch 2016: 286.

³³² Livingstone 1999: 133-135

³³³ CMAwR *passim*.

sections, but two such breaks cannot be convincingly filled, 40c [...GÁ]L^{2meš}, just a single wedge of which is preserved, and 39a 𒀭²-x[...]-KUR² which is apparently duplicated in line 73 as 𒀭²-AŠ-DIŠ, for which no meaning can be found.

41 This line is self-explanatory, but it bears pointing out that the verbs in it are all in the Ntn-stem, and so the problems are all understood as being persistent.

42 From this point the litany phrase changes. The *gamlu*-stick is not apparently included in the new phrase, possibly because the exorcist now wields four different tools of purification, as detailed in l. 36.

43-70 This section consists of a list of *māmītu* and a request that they be undone. The concept of *māmītu* is crucial to developing an understanding of *Šurpu*. As well as the present list, Tablet III consists almost entirely of a list of *māmītu* and a prayer that ‘[Asalluhi], exorcist among the gods, will undo,³³⁴ and throughout the incantations *māmītu*, and its Sumerian equivalents *nam.irim₂* and *sag.ba*, recur frequently. Reiner translates all three terms simply as ‘oath.’ She supports this on the grounds that it is the ‘first meaning of the word, and is clearly its meaning in the first thirteen lines of (Tablet III).³³⁵ This is not convincing. In the first place, there is no reason to suppose that the ‘first’ meaning should be correct. In the second place, as will be discussed below (ll. 51-52), the first thirteen lines are not related to an oath.

It is easily demonstrated that ‘oath,’ is an inadequate translation for most instances of *māmītu* in the text. Five lines drawn more or less at random from Tablet III are representative of the general inapplicability of the translation:³³⁶

III 56	<i>māmīt itê iliti ētequ</i>	the ‘oath’: to transgress the limitation set by a god
III 58	<i>māmīt šīr šurqi akālu</i>	the ‘oath’: to eat stolen meat
III 87	<i>māmīt rābišē muttaggišūti</i>	the ‘oath’ of the lurking-demons who sneak around
III 50	<i>māmīt ḥarrāni amēlu šabātu</i>	[the ‘oa]th’ that a man has set out on a journey ³³⁷
III 45	<i>māmīt šēdi u lamassi</i>	[the ‘oa]th’ of protective spirit or protecting goddess

Over a hundred similar examples could be found with no difficulty. Reiner suggests that many of the *māmītu* could best be explained as ‘something evil,³³⁸ but this makes little sense unless we understand *māmītu* as nothing more than a label.

CAD gives two definitions for *māmītu*: ‘oath (sworn by the king and the gods)³³⁹ and ‘curse (consequences of a broken oath attacking the person who took it, also as demonic power).³⁴⁰ Geller has argued for a nuanced and shifting definition within *Šurpu*. In his view, three types of *māmītu* should be distinguished:³⁴¹

1. Oaths or curses of/by family, friends and deities
2. Taboo or prohibited acts
3. Oaths or imprecations sworn by inanimate objects.

He ties these together by arguing that the concept of *māmītu* ‘refers to a theoretical oath ostensibly taken by an

³³⁴ Reiner 1958: III, 2.

³³⁵ Reiner 1958: 55, III, 1.

³³⁶ Reiner 1958: 18-21.

³³⁷ Following Reiner’s translation, but see below l. 46 for a more likely interpretation.

³³⁸ Reiner 1958: 55, III, 1.

³³⁹ CAD M Part 1: 189.

³⁴⁰ CAD M Part 1: 189.

³⁴¹ Geller 1980: 183-4.

ancestor, or even seven generations of ancestors, which forbids the swearer or his progeny from committing various private acts.³⁴² There are several difficulties with this line of argument. In the first place, there is no evidence whatsoever for the theory of a belief in theoretical ancestral oaths. More fundamentally, however, Geller's categories of *māmītu* are based on the same misunderstanding as Reiner's translation. The entries in *Šurpu* III and IX are almost always abbreviated. This will be seen regularly in the following commentary by comparison of the lines in *Šurpu* IX with those with similar content in *Šurpu* III and other texts, but a single example will demonstrate the problems:

III 46	<i>māmīt bīni u gišimmari</i>	<i>Māmīt</i> of tamarisk or datepalm
III 121	<i>māmīt balti u ašāgi</i>	<i>Māmīt</i> of camelthorn or yanqout
IX 67	<i>māmīt balti ašāgi bīni gišimmari nasāhu</i>	<i>Māmīt</i> of ripping up camelthorn, yanqout, tamarisk or datepalm.

These lines are discussed more thoroughly below (l. 67). For now the key point is that they clearly describe the same, or similar, ideas. This is important because in Geller's system, the lines from Tablet III are examples of oaths sworn by inanimate objects, whereas that of IX is an example of a taboo act. As the majority of lines do not have counterparts elsewhere, and as many that do are no more explicit, it is impossible to categorically disprove Geller's argument. However, it is logical to assume that as many of the lines describing types of *māmītu* are abbreviated, the rest may be as well. If this is accepted, Geller's categories 1 and 3 cease to exist – each type of *māmītu* can be seen to be related to a taboo or prohibited act, or more broadly to misconduct involving the objects described.

We should not stop here, however, as understanding each line to be a description of a taboo suffers from the same shortcomings as Reiner's 'something evil' - it relegates *māmītu* to little more than a generic categorisation. *Šurpu* III 1-3 makes clear that the list is more than that:

1. ÉN *māmīt kalāma ša amēlu mār ili[šu iṣbātu]* Incantation: Any *māmīt* the man, son of [his] god [is seized by]
2. *upaššar mašmaššu ilī Asalluḫi* Asalluḫi, exorcist of the gods, will undo.
3. *māmīt abi u umma amēlu ṣabati* The man is seized by the *māmīt* of father and mother

The restoration in line 1 is made from line 3 and seems certain. The point is that the patient is clearly suffering from having been 'seized by' the *māmīt* and it is the seizure that Asalluḫi is expected to undo. The *māmītu* enumerated in *Šurpu*, therefore, must be taken as the consequences of breaking a taboo, not as the mere taboo itself. As van der Toorn has made clear, in the Mesopotamian worldview the concepts of crime, guilt and punishment were logically connected. Thus, just as *arnu* means both 'sin' and 'punishment for sin',³⁴³ we might understand *māmītu* to mean both 'misconduct involving X' and 'sanction (for misconduct) involving X'. This is unnecessary, however. As every example used by Geller to reach the definition 'taboo' was drawn from the two lists of *Šurpu*, and as this is now clearly insufficient, we can simply jettison the definition and take *māmītu* to mean only 'sanction (for misconduct) involving X.'

This gains support also from *Maqlû* I.³⁴⁴

38. ^d*Gilgameš bēl māmītikunu* Gilgamesh is the enforcer of your *māmīt*

Abusch translates 'oath' and understands this line to refer to the implicit oath of all members of a society, including the witches with whom the line deals, to live within its bounds.³⁴⁵ The phrase *bēl māmīti* is also known elsewhere as an epithet of Adad and Šamaš, Sîn, Išhara (as GAŠAN *māmīti*) and the gods generally.³⁴⁶ Following our argument, we

³⁴² Geller 1990: 113.

³⁴³ van der Toorn 1985: 52.

³⁴⁴ Abusch 2016: 284

³⁴⁵ Abusch 2002: 273.

³⁴⁶ See CAD *sub voce* *māmītu* 1e.

can instead understand *māmīt* as ‘punishment (for misconduct).’ The description of Gilgamesh as the enforcer (lit. ‘lord’) of the punishment is perfectly in accord with his character - as a divine judge he is naturally to be understood as an enforcer of divinely imposed sanctions (for misconduct). This is also the case for Adad and Šamaš,³⁴⁷ as well as the gods generally.³⁴⁸ Sîn and Išhara are not generally known as divine judges, though as the text which describes them as *bēl māmīti* is from Hattuša, there is perhaps a Hittite dimension to be considered.

There are several advantages to our proposed definition. In the first place it accords more harmoniously with the definition given by the CAD ‘curse (consequence of a broken oath)’ than does Geller’s, though there is still a difficulty with the parenthetical element, which will be discussed below. Another point in favour of the new reading is that it diminishes the apparent semantic homogeneity of *māmītu*, *arnu* and *ikkibu*, each of which are generally understood to define a group of prohibited actions, but with substantial overlap.³⁴⁹ If *māmītu* is understood rather as the sanction for committing a prohibited action, it can be removed from the group of words approximating the modern concept of ‘taboo.’ This has the added effect of removing a layer of apparently pointless repetition from *Šurpu*. As has been stated frequently, Tablet II and Tablet III are very similar in terms of content. Tablet II is a list of misconduct which the patient may have committed and many of the entries are repeated almost verbatim in Tablets III and IX, the major difference being that they are described as *māmītu* in the latter two. We should, according to the interpretation presented here, understand the list in Tablet II as representing actions committed by the patient, while those of Tablet III and IX enumerate the sanctions accrued by these, or similar, acts.

There is a major difficulty with the argument as presented. The chief meaning given to *māmītu* by CAD is ‘oath, sworn agreement,’ and there is ample evidence for the validity of this definition. The second meaning in CAD, with which our proposal broadly accords, is ‘curse (consequences of a broken oath attacking the person who took it, also as demonic power)’. The argument we have presented, however, contains no oaths. Geller’s proposal of theoretical oaths sworn by ancestors is possible, but as mentioned above, there is no evidence for such a belief. Maul has argued along similar lines that the behaviour banned by *māmīti* was understood as embodying an oath with the gods,³⁵⁰ which is broadly in agreement with Abusch’s proposal mentioned above.³⁵¹ Again, however, there is no evidence for belief in such an oath. A more likely solution can be found through a re-evaluation of the definition.

Several dozen examples are given in CAD to support the meaning ‘curse (consequence of a broken oath),’³⁵² most of which are drawn from *Šurpu*. A small number of the examples demonstrate the accuracy of the definition:

ma-mit ilāni ... ša ētiqū ... ikšudanni jāti the oath by the gods which I have broken has caught up with me³⁵³
ma-mi-it itmû awīlam šabtat the oath he took has seized the man³⁵⁴

In these instances *māmīt* clearly refers to the consequences of having broken an oath that has been sworn. The vast majority of the examples given by CAD, however, rely wholly on inference to produce a connection to an oath. A handful of examples will suffice:

arnu ma-mit ša ana šuzzuq amēlūti iššaknu Punishment and *m.* that were created to torment mankind³⁵⁵

³⁴⁷ Lambert 2009: 1-5.

³⁴⁸ Krebernik 2006-2008b: 358.

³⁴⁹ See e.g. Geller 1990: 115ff.

³⁵⁰ Maul 2004: 87.

³⁵¹ Abusch 2002: 173.

³⁵² CAD M: 193.

³⁵³ Leichty 2011: i 23.

³⁵⁴ Goetze 1947: 51 iv 29.

³⁵⁵ *Šurpu* IV 88.

<i>māmīt ilim awīlam šabtat</i>	The <i>m.</i> of a god has seized the man ³⁵⁶
<i>arnu ma-mīt ... nīš ilāni ... bulluṭu ... ittikama</i>	It is in your power (Marduk) to heal (from the consequences of) sin, <i>m.</i> and <i>nīšu</i> -oath ³⁵⁷

Although each of these is plainly concerned with a punishment or curse, in no instance is a *māmītu*-oath implied. A simple solution presents itself. While the concept of a *māmītu*-oath is well-established,³⁵⁸ and while it is evidently sometimes responsible for the *māmītu*-curse which is common in *Šurpu* and elsewhere, we should not understand the curse chiefly as the consequence of the oath. Rather, we should reverse the order of entries given in CAD so that the curse is paramount. Following this, we should understand the *māmītu*-curse as the sanction (for misconduct), and the *māmītu*-oath as a type of oath which, if broken, results in a *māmītu*-curse.³⁵⁹ If this is accepted, the complexity of the concept of *māmītu* disappears – it refers universally to the divine sanction resulting from misconduct, occasionally with specific reference to behaviour against which an oath has been sworn.

A final factor that must be taken into consideration is the manifestation of the *māmītu*-sanction as a demonic figure. It is probable that *māmītu* in these lines should in fact be understood as the demon, rather than simply as the abstract divine sanction which it represents. It does not seem to be the case that the demon and the sanction were understood as identical. This is evident from the bilingual Tablet VII of *Šurpu*:

3.	nam.erim ₂ šà.an.na.ta im.ta.e ₁₁ .d[è]	Nam.erim ₂ came down from the midst of heaven
4.	<i>māmītum ultu qereb šamê urda</i>	<i>Māmītu</i> came down from the midst of heaven
27	mu sag.ba adda.bi tab.tab.e.dè	Oath (and) sag.ba have set his body aflame
28	<i>nīšu māmīt pagaršu uššarrip</i>	Oath (and) <i>māmīt</i> have set his body aflame

Context makes clear that the first pair of lines refer to the demonic manifestation of *māmītu*, while the second pair refer to the divine sanction. While the Akkadian does not differ, the Sumerian uses nam.erim₂ for the demon and sag.ba for the sanction. These literally translate to something like ‘enemy-ness’ (nam.erim₂) and ‘on its head’ (sag.ba), which offers a logical explanation for the division – the demon is the manifestation of an enemy, while the sanctions are an infliction which could be understood as having been brought down on the victim’s head. Judging by the exemplars in CAD, the distinction seems to be routinely made. Although it is not clear whether nam.erim₂ is used exclusively for the demon, whenever the demon is unambiguously meant nam.erim₂ is the Sumerian used.³⁶⁰

In the present list there are no Sumerian translations, but a parallel from elsewhere in *Šurpu* offers a hint:

V 50	tu ₆ .dug ₄ .ga nam.erim ₂ ^d En.ki.ga.ke ₄	By the incantation of Enki, nam.erim ₂
V 51	<i>māmīt ina tuduqqî ša Ea</i>	By the incantation of Ea, <i>māmītu</i>
V 52	sum.sar.gim hé.en.zil	May be peeled like garlic
V 53	<i>kīma šūmī liqqalip</i>	May be peeled like garlic

This is from the end of the Ea-Marduk dialogue which immediately precedes the burning ritual. The reference to garlic describes the burning, in which various items, beginning with garlic, are broken up and burnt as an act of sympathetic magic. Each of the burnings is accompanied by an incantation, the last line of which reads:

VI 13	<i>māmīt littašīma anāku nūra lūmur</i>	May the <i>māmītu</i> leave and I become free ³⁶¹
-------	---	--

³⁵⁶ King 1898: 6:68

³⁵⁷ Reiner 1958: 26, l.56

³⁵⁸ CAD *sub voce* *māmītu* definition 1.

³⁵⁹ This broadly accords with Schwemer’s argument (2007: 162), though he did not go so far.

³⁶⁰ CAD *sub voce* *māmītu*.

³⁶¹ VI 13 = Reiner V-VI 72. The line is repeated throughout tablet VI. ‘Become free’ = lit. ‘see the light’ for *nūra lūmur* as an idiomatic

The form of *māmītu* intended here is not made clear – both the demon and the sanction could be thought of as leaving. In light of the lines just quoted, however, it is very likely that the demon is intended. This is important as it establishes a common theme for the incantation as a whole, as the burning ritual and the present list were very likely aimed at the same target. As discussed above (II.1-35), the gods invoked in the *Kultgötterbeschwörung* are chiefly united in that they are those figures most able to fight demonic forces. The *māmītu*-demon is presumably at least one of their targets. Nonetheless, given it is not certain that *nam.irim*₂ is an unambiguous reference to the *māmītu*-demon, it has been considered most sensible to translate the term ‘sanctions (for misconduct) related to X.’ As these sanctions doubtless included demonic infestation, the meaning is at least implied. A translation ‘Sanction-demon related to (misconduct involving) X’ might be more accurate, though no less clumsy.

Following this reading, the meaning of this list and that of *Šurpu* III is much clearer – the patient is suffering from the ill-effects of having committed an act of misconduct involving any of a number of subjects. The litany requests that these ill-effects be removed. Some lines explain the type of misconduct in some detail, while others simply list groups of subjects. It is possible that no specific action was meant for the latter type of line – any type of misconduct regarding a field, for instance, could have breached a taboo and simply listing the subject covers all of these. It was perhaps more sensible to ask that the ‘sanctions (for misconduct) related to a field’ be removed than the ‘sanctions related to pushing a cow in a field while wearing a hat’ – the second (purely fictional) is subsumed within the first.

In the following commentary, an attempt has been made to elucidate the more explicit lines. The other lines are not discussed at length unless comparable lines from elsewhere warrant an examination of the type of taboo that may have been implied. In these cases there is no reason to suppose that the taboo discussed is the only one implied by the text.

Individual lines contain clearly connected groups of subjects,³⁶² but while a few lines seem semantically linked with their neighbours, there is no evident organisational principle in the list as a whole and so this is not discussed.

The chief source for comparable material is Tablet III of *Šurpu*, which duplicates, in either expanded or contracted form, several of the lines written here. Often *māmīti* written together in Tablet IX are presented separately in Tablet III, so though the present list is not quite as extensive as the other list, there are more. Other relevant lists are found in a Namburbi partially published in transliteration by Frankena,³⁶³ and in an incantation belonging to the fifth house of the Bīt rimki ritual series.³⁶⁴

43 The grouping principle in this list is that of domesticity. Each of the places listed is connected with civilised life. A wide array of activities related to these places must have been prohibited, and so we should understand this as a catch-all list.

Šurpu III has a comparable line, but is no more explicit:

83. *māmīt ibрати u nēmedīša* Sanctions (for misconduct) related to the open-air altar or its cult platform.

A similar list is presented in a different context in *Maqlû* V:³⁶⁵

36. *ēpišti u muštēpišti* My sorceress and the woman who instigates sorcery against me,

phrase see CAD *amāru* 21a.

³⁶² e.g. boat, river, mooring place (l. 47); path, road, highway (l. 46).

³⁶³ The tablet number is A 185. Frankena 1960: 174.

³⁶⁴ ‘Šamaš, judge of heaven and earth, who tames² the widespread earth.’ Laessøe 1956: 57-58.

³⁶⁵ Abusch 2016: 329.

37. *libalkissi sūqu u sulû* May wide street and narrow street turn against her,
 38. *libalkissi ibratu u nemedīša* May open-air altar and its cult platform turn against her,
 39. *libalkitūšima ilū ša šēri u ali* May the gods of the steppe and the city turn against her,

The image is of the sorceress being cast out of civilisation, which demonstrates the grouping principle here. The inclusion of field and orchard in this line is to be contrasted with their appearance in line 64 where a different principle is intended.

43a This line is present only in **Nin1** and **Nin3**. It repeats line 42, presumably as that line is followed by a ruling and thus marks the close of a distinct block of text. Evidently, the scribes of these two tablets felt that the litany phrase should not pass through the ruling.

44 This line follows the same pattern as line 67. The meaning behind this line is not immediately obvious. Reeds were a crucial material in Mesopotamia, and cutting them cannot have been universally worthy of sanction. Likewise, both *šammu* and *sassatu*-grass had to be removed from farmland and so their removal must have been acceptable.³⁶⁶

There are parallels to this line in both *Šurpu* III and Bīt rimki:

Š.III 25/B.R. 82 *māmūt šammē ina šēri nasāhu* Sanction for ripping up *šammu*-grass in the steppe

Š.III 26/B.R. 85 *māmūt qanê ina appari hašābu* Sanction for cutting reeds in the marshland

This clarifies the situation to a certain extent, at least for the grasses. The injunction against pulling up the grass applies specifically to the plains, and so weeding fields is not included. The reasoning behind this is also understandable. *Šammû* has not yet been identified, but Civil has identified *sassatu*-grass with *Poa Sinaica*, for which he gives the common names ‘meadow grass’ and ‘bulbous bluegrass.’³⁶⁷ The common names are inaccurate. The former is the common name for all species of *Poa*, while the latter is for a distinct species *Poa Bulbosa*. Bluegrass is the common name for *Poa* in America, but again this is not specific to *Poa Sinaica*. The most widely accepted English common name for *Poa Sinaica* is ‘Sinai meadow grass.’³⁶⁸ The important point, however, is that *Poa Sinaica*, and presumably *šammû*-grass as well, is an extremely valuable pasture plant.³⁶⁹ Sheep and goats were a major strand of Mesopotamian agriculture, and good pasture was therefore crucial. The destruction of such a useful plant in land that was not needed for farming would diminish the quantity of productive pasture available for grazing and so the injunction against such an action is understandable.

The logic is not so clear in the case of the reeds. In the first place, reeds can only be cut in the marshland as this is where they grow, so the line in *Šurpu* III cannot be taken literally. Moreover, unless cut back regularly, reed beds eventually dry up due to the accumulation of plant litter, at which point scrubland and eventually forests encroach.³⁷⁰ As with the grasses, young reeds could be used as pasture, while old reeds were useful as fodder.³⁷¹ As reeds were also useful materials for construction and agriculture³⁷² the watchword must have been management. Perhaps the line indicates not that reeds must not be cut, but rather that some restraint should be shown in cutting reeds – removing the

³⁶⁶ Civil 1987: 48.

³⁶⁷ Civil 1987: 48.

³⁶⁸ Ibrahim, Hosni & Peterson 2016: 135 no. 200.

³⁶⁹ Guest 1966: 71.

³⁷⁰ White, Self and Blyth 2013: 27.

³⁷¹ Civil 1987: 44.

³⁷² See, e.g. Civil 1999: 259.

entirety of a reed bed would not be wise. We should probably also understand this in reference to the forests mentioned in this line, though with no comparable material from elsewhere this can only be a suggestion.

45 The theme for this line is farming. As with line 43, there were presumably any number of taboos to be broken involving the objects listed here and so we should not be too concerned with trying to choose one. That said, *Šurpu* III offers some slightly expanded parallels:

III 54	<i>māmīt kudurru u nukkuru</i>	Sanction for fixing a boundary stone and then moving it
III 60	<i>māmīt udē mišri u kudurru</i>	Sanction (for misconduct) relating to marking a boundary or boundary stone

Moving a boundary stone once established is understandably taboo. Kudurru stones bore curses threatening anyone who tampered with them as they were so important. It is difficult to imagine any action relating to a kudurru stone other than moving or damaging it, and so we should perhaps understand this as the only taboo referred to here.

The meaning of ^{giš}tukul ‘*kak*’ in this line is not entirely clear. Plainly it refers to a part of the plough, and the most likely candidate is the blade/share. However, a similar line occurs three times in the Lamaštu series:³⁷³

II 103	<i>nīš kakki ḥarbi u³ epin zēri</i>	By the power of the handle of a <i>ḥarbu</i> -plough and ³ a seeder-plough
II 117/III 40	<i>suggin kakki ḥarbi epin zēri teleqqe</i>	you take a splinter from the handle of a <i>ḥarbu</i> -plough and a seeder-plough

The context is that the splinters, along with a plethora of other materials, are tied into the cord of an apotropaic amulet against Lamaštu. Farber translates handle without explanation. It is likely that the ploughshare of a subsoil plough was at least partially made of copper, though perhaps around a wooden core to save on expense. *Suggin* ‘splinter’ can also rarely refer to copper shavings so does not tell us much.³⁷⁴

In Lamaštu it is unclear whether the *kak* of one or both ploughs is involved. Judging by the word order, *kak* qualifies only the subsoil plough in *Šurpu*, which implies that the share rather than the handle is meant as the handles of the two types of plough are not distinct whereas their blades differ. There is no need to single out the subsoil plough except if the ploughshare is the distinguishing feature.

It seems likely that the misconduct here revolves around damaging the valuable ploughs, in particular the large (copper³) blade of the subsoil plough. In the absence of further evidence, however, it is not possible to be confident. It is not clear what actions were considered misconduct in relation to the furrow.

46 The grouping principle of this line seems to be that the subjects are all types of channel. The line is repeated with only minor variants in the Namburbi published by Frankena:³⁷⁵

A.185 57	<i>ina iki palgi titurri meteq[i] alaka ḥarran min min</i>	for ³ ditch, canal, causeway, path, road, highway ditto, ditto
----------	--	--

Unfortunately, as Frankena did not publish the entire text, the context of the line is not entirely clear. Since the text repeats many lines from this list and that of *Šurpu* III it is likely that the same idea was intended. In any case, as it stands, this does not add materially to our understanding of the line.

³⁷³ Farber 2014: 172-175 & 189.

³⁷⁴ CAD S: 378 *sub voce sumkinnu*

³⁷⁵ Frankena 1960: 174.

More helpful are three lines of *Šurpu* III:

III 49	<i>māmīt palgi u titurri</i>	Sanction (for misconduct) related to canal or causeway
III 50	<i>māmīt ḥarrāni amēlu ṣabātu</i>	Sanction for seizing a man on the road
III 57	<i>māmīt palgi pitē sekēru</i>	Sanction for damming up an open ditch

The first of these offers no help, but the other two detail specific instances of the sort of misconduct that might incur a sanction. ‘Seizing a man on the road’ must refer to something like the actions of a footpad. Naturally this is worthy of divine (and profane) punishment. Presumably the misconduct related to the various thoroughfares revolved around the same sort of concepts, though damaging a road is also conceivably implied in this line.

Damaging a ditch is certainly what is meant in III 57. A *palgu* was an irrigation ditch or canal, and therefore provided crucial water for farms. Damming it would prevent the flow of water and thereby harm the crops. The same idea is presumably to be understood for the *iku*, a larger irrigation canal, though as the latter could also act as a boundary line, there may also be a connection with the idea enumerated in line 45.

47 The grouping principle is clear, the line deals with riverine craft and places associated with them.

Parallels are found in both *Šurpu* III and the Namburbi published by Frankena, though nothing more explicit than the present line:

III 47	<i>māmīt elippi u nāri</i>	Sanction (for misconduct) related to boat or river
III 48	<i>māmīt kāri u nēbiri</i>	Sanction (for misconduct) related to mooring-place or ferry

A. 185 58b *ina nāri kāri nēbiri min min* for² river, mooring-place, ferry ditto, ditto

Presumably a wide range of activities related to boats and rivers could be considered misconduct, but we are not in a position to suggest any examples.

The word *šīlum* is known only here and in a broken line from the Dispute of Tamarisk and Date Palm,³⁷⁶ and the latter is not certain. It has been assumed that it represents a river boat, though it could just as easily be something else connected to travel on rivers. Assuming the line in the dispute does contain the word *šīlum*, we should perhaps understand it to be a sort of boat made from either date-palm or tamarisk. Boats made of tamarisk wood are known from Abydos, but perhaps more likely is an early form of *Shasha* – a traditional fishing craft of the United Arab Emirates made using every part of the date palm.³⁷⁷ This is more fitting with the context of the dispute poem, as ‘the object is to Gunga Din your neighbour, I’m a better man than you’s the acid test.’³⁷⁸ While a tamarisk boat could be made of some tamarisk, a palm boat needed every part of the date palm and so would be a better boast. This is, of course, entirely speculative and cannot be proven on current evidence.

48 The theme in this line is fresh water sources. CAD describes a *kuppu* as ‘a man-made enlargement of a spring for the purpose of ensuring water supply.’³⁷⁹ A mountain stream and a reservoir need no further explanation.

The word *balihu* is confusing, however. Reiner translates ‘the Baliyu river’, a river in northern Syria. As no other line mentions a specific place, however, this is to be discarded. In fact, as Gordon has demonstrated, *balihu*, and more

³⁷⁶ Lambert 1960: 136. IM 539461. 8. This has not been included in any of the many re-editions of the composition.

³⁷⁷ <http://www.thenational.ae/news/uae-news/shasha-heritage-in-sturdy-hands>

³⁷⁸ Flanders and Swann, Sounding Brass (Parlophone PCS 3052).

³⁷⁹ CAD K: 551.

especially its logogram ^dKASKALxKUR which is written in **Nin2**, is a word for a kind of underground water course known as a ponor.³⁸⁰ This, as a source of fresh water, accords perfectly with the rest of the list.

There are no exact parallels to this line, though some comparisons should be made. In the first place lines 34-35 of the present Tablet are concerned with the same group. As discussed above, however, the intention of these lines is different.

More relevant are two lines from *Šurpu* III:

63. *māmīt nāri šānu u nāri kā'a* Sanction for urinating in a river or vomiting in a river
64. *māmīt nāri² salihu u nāri* Sanction for spattering² a river (with something unpleasant²) or
(for misconduct relating to) rivers

The second line here is difficult, partly owing to the fact that only one *Šurpu* tablet preserves these lines, though line 64 is also recorded on an ancient commentary.³⁸¹ The first *nāri* in line 64 is restored from this commentary.³⁸² Reiner reads ^{id}*Salihu u nāri* 'the river Salihu and (other) rivers,' and is reluctantly followed by Frahm.³⁸³ This is very unlikely, however, for two reasons. First, there is no known river Salihu, and second, as with Balihu in the present line, the lists in Tablets III and IX are not concerned with specific geography. The idea of the lists is to be as non-specific as possible, thereby covering the widest possible pool of sanctionable offences. The translation presented above assumes that the same idea is presented in each line – that of contaminating the river. Line 63 lists two specific examples of contaminants, while line 64 is apparently more general, first listing any sort of contamination, and then simply any sort of misconduct. CAD gives the secondary definition 'to spatter (with venom, saliva, blood, urine)' for *salāhu* and this has been followed here.³⁸⁴

The relevance to the present line is not assured as rivers are specifically the objects of the contamination in *Šurpu* III. However, as sources of fresh water are evidently the focus, it is not unreasonable to assume that this is the sort of misconduct that was imagined.

48a This line is present only in **Nin1**. It is the second line on the reverse of the tablet and the preceding line does not contain ditto marks. The scribe was fastidious in making sure that the ditto marks on this tablet had a clear object.

49 The principle in this list is civic and financial misconduct, though some elements are unclear. No parallel lines can be adduced from the usual sources. The precise meaning of the first half of the line is particularly difficult. Two options seem possible 'secret place of city (and) house' or 'secret place, city, house'. The latter has been adopted as the rest of the line consists of a list of essentially independent clauses, and as it removes the necessity to emend the text by adding *u* 'and'. In either case, the meaning is not apparent. Considering the rest of the line, it seems likely that business or civic matters are implied. 'Misconduct related to the city' is easy enough to reconcile with this, but neither 'secret place' nor 'house' fit as neatly.

Unfortunately, although CAD lists two other texts in which *dūtum* is defined as 'secret place' neither is helpful. The

³⁸⁰ Gordon 1967: 80 (JCS 21)

³⁸¹ CAD mentions an unpublished tablet from Khorsabad (CAD *sub voce* *šānu*: 409b). I have asked John Brinkman about this, who has initiated a search in Chicago. Martha Roth has found a typed transliteration made by Erica Reiner of a tablet from the OI collection containing a 20-line excerpt from *Šurpu*, which parallels III 54-73. On the typescript, the introduction indicates: "There is no number on the tablet and the provenience and source are unknown." On the top of the typescript there is a handwritten note "Khorsabad" added by Reiner. There is no tablet among the Chicago Khorsabad materials which matches the transliteration. Susanne Paulus is initiating a search among other tablets in the OI collection to see whether the tablet can be located. (Personal communication, John Brinkman, 7/3/17).

³⁸² KAR 94, l. 51'. <http://ccp.yale.edu/P369075>.

³⁸³ <http://ccp.yale.edu/P369075>. Note 25.

³⁸⁴ CAD S: 87a.

An almost identical enumeration is found in *Maqlû* IV:³⁸⁹

80	ÉN attīmannu kaššāptu ša zikurruda ippuša	Incantation: Whoever you are, O witch, who performs <i>Zikurruda</i> magic against me
81	lū ibru lū tappû	Whether equal or partner
82	lū aḫu lū itbāru	Whether brother or associate
83	lū ubāra lū mār āli	Whether foreign guest or fellow citizen

While the list is the same, the concept of these lines differs from that of the present line. In *Maqlû* the list describes those who may have attempted to harm the patient, while in *Šurpu* IX the list describes those the patient may have harmed.

52 This line follows the pattern of lines 51, 61 and 65. As with these lines, little explanation is necessary here – cursing one’s family and lying about it is not the done thing. Parallels are apparently to be found in *Šurpu* III and in the Bīt Rimki incantation:

Š.III 3	māmīt abi u ummi lu šabāti	Sanction (for misconduct) relating to father and mother which possesses him
Š.III 4	māmīt abi abi u ummi ummi	Sanction (for misconduct) relating to grandfather and grandmother
Š.III 5	māmīt aḫi u aḫāti	Sanction (for misconduct) relating to brother and sister
B.R. 72	[lū] māmīt abiya lū māmīt ummiya	[Whether] sanction (for misconduct) relating to my father or sanction (for misconduct) relating to my mother
B.R. 73	[lū] māmīt aḫiya lū māmīt aḫātiya	[or] sanction (for misconduct) relating to my brother or sanction (for misconduct) relating to my sister

While grandparents are not mentioned in the present line, and while brother and sister are specified as ‘elder’ brother and sister, the concept here is evidently the same. As with line 51, the lines in *Šurpu* III and Bīt rimki should be taken as generalised forms of the line in Tablet IX.

šabāti ‘which possesses him’ describes the divine sanction, as discussed above (ll.43-70).

53 The line as we understand it is fairly straightforward - it describes an injunction against swearing in irritation, i.e. damning by a god when one drops a cup. There is a difficulty with our reading of this line, however. This is that we should expect *u* ‘and’ to be written between *ḫepû* and *šum*. A similar problem exists in lines 54 and 66. It is possible that here, as well as in those lines, we should understand the writing *ḫe-pu-u šum* in **Nin1** and **Nin3** as *ḫe-pu u šum*. Alternatively, it is possible that the missing *u* is simply a haplographic error. The reading is supported by the writing in **Urk1**, which gives *ḫa-pu-ú² u*, thereby removing any doubt regarding the errant *u*.

The line is paralleled in both *Šurpu* III and Frankena’s *namburbi*:

III 19.	māmīt kāsi u paššuri	Sanction (for misconduct) related to cup or table
A.185 48	[...p]aš[šuri š]ebēru kāsi ḫepû šum ili zakāru	[...b]reaking a [t]ab[le], smashing a cup and ² invoking the name of a god

³⁸⁹ After Abusch 2016: 322.

Neither of these is helpful, however. The *Šurpu* line is too abbreviated, while the namburbi does not vary in any meaningful way from the text as it appears here.

- 54 The line as we have translated it follows the pattern of line 70 but with a different subject – furniture. Evidentially swearing by certain items was governed by a code of practice. There is a difficulty with this line, which is that there is an errant *u* in both **Nin1** and **Urk1**, and probably in **Nin3**. In addition, there is a missing *u* ‘or’ between the last two items in the list. A similar problem is found in lines 53 and 66. In our reading we have assumed an error of transposition, though it must be said that the number of tablets on which the same error apparently occurs makes this a slightly unsatisfactory solution. There are parallels in both *Šurpu* III and Frankena’s namburbi:

III 20. *māmīt erši u mayāli* Sanction (for misconduct) related to bed or couch

A.185 60b *ina erši mayāli kussī tam[û min min]* For[?] swearing by bed, couch, (or[?]) chair ditto, ditto

The namburbi line supports the reading adopted here in that it omits the *u* between *kussī* and *tamû*, but it also omits the *u* between *mayāli* and *kussī*.

In the absence of any better explanation, we should read the line as translated.

- 55 The theme of this line appears to be the aggressive removal of women’s clothing. The line is paralleled in Frankena’s namburbi, though this does not add any information:

50. *[ina nahlapti na]kāsī du[dittu šeb]ēru* [for[?] ri]pping [a cloak, brea]king a pec[toral] or cutting off a
u dādi batāqu min [min] *dādu*-undergarment ditto, [ditto]

The variant *dādu* for *didu* is Old Akkadian according to CAD,³⁹⁰ though as the text was apparently excavated at Aššur and is likely to be from the first millennium it is likely just a regional variant.

It is suggested in CAD that the idea of this line is the complete removal of a woman’s clothes.³⁹¹ This is unlikely, however, judging by the format of the other lines in this list. The majority of lines refer to several distinct actions, and so *u* must be translated ‘or’ not ‘and’. This is also more in keeping with the idea of generalisation – if we translate ‘and’ the patient has to have completed three separate actions to be covered by the appeal, with ‘or’ each of the actions is covered individually.

Cutting, ripping and breaking a woman’s clothing is obvious misconduct in almost any circumstance, so there is little mystery about this line.

- 56 This line is very unclear. It is paralleled, though not helpfully, in Frankena’s namburbi:

56. *ina sissikti batāqu [u] patri šalāpu min [min]* for[?] cutting a hem or drawing a dagger ditto, ditto.

Some clarity is brought with the knowledge that ‘to cut the hem’ is a euphemism for divorce.³⁹² A wide array of misconduct related to divorce is imaginable, though as none is specified we will not speculate here.

It seems likely on the basis of the first half of the line that ‘to draw a dagger’ is a euphemism for another kind of lawsuit, but to the best of my knowledge, no such euphemism is attested elsewhere. The use of a dagger as a divine symbol in judicial contexts is known,³⁹³ however, and it is possible that there is a connection to this.

³⁹⁰ CAD *dīdu*: 135b.

³⁹¹ CAD *dīdu*: 135b.

³⁹² See CAD *sissiktu*: 322 for many examples.

³⁹³ See CAD *patru*: 283 for examples.

57-59

These lines and line 60 describe sharp business practice. They are paralleled by a line in *Šurpu* II:

II 37 *ina šeḫerti ittadin ina rabīti imtaḫar* He sold with a small (measure), he bought with a large (measure)

There is no generic term for ‘a measure’ in Akkadian. The present lines list three of the most common weights and measures, while the line in Tablet II is non-specific. The practice described is less common now than in the past due to the standardisation of measurements. In the ancient world measuring vessels and weights could differ substantially in size while retaining the same name. Thus a ‘small *silā*’ and a ‘large *silā*’ would give different quantities, but both would give 1 *silā*. The use of this practice by unscrupulous businessmen is commonly attested.³⁹⁴

The Great Šamaš Hymn gives an idea of the consequences for this activity:³⁹⁵

112 *šābit sūti ēpiš ši[lipti]* The merchant who practices trickery as he holds the *sūtu*-vessel

113 *nādin šīqāti ana biri`yi mušaddin atra* Who lends by the medium *šīqu*-measure (but) collects by the larger one

114 *ina la ūmešu arrat nišē ikaššassu* The curse of the people will overtake him before his time.

The benefits of not indulging in this sort of misconduct are also found in the Great Šamaš Hymn:

ŠH 118 *ummānu kīnu nādin še`im ina [kabr]i* The honest merchant who weighs out barley with the large *pāni* *ušattar dumqu* *pān*-measure increases good fortune.

ŠH 119 *īāb eli Šamaš balāta uttar* It is pleasing to Šamaš, and he will prolong his life

60

This line is similar in tone to lines 57-59, again describing sharp practice. Parallels to the first clause can be found in *Šurpu* II and in the Old Testament:

Š II 42 *zibānīt la ketti iṣṣab[at zibānīt² ketti² ul² iṣba]t²* He us[ed] an untrue balance, [he did not use a true balance]e?

Prov 11:1 A false balance is abomination to the Lord, but a just weight is his delight.

Using a false balance, much like using differently sized weights, would allow the merchant to lie about the weight of his products and his customers’ payment. This would allow the unscrupulous merchant to overcharge for goods.

As with lines 57-59, the Great Šamaš Hymn demonstrates the consequences for this sort of practice:

107 *šābit zibā[nīti] ēpiš ši[lipti]* The merchant who [practices] trickery as he holds the bala[nce]

108 *muštēnū [ab]ān kīsi uzaqqar ušappal* Who raises or lowers the pan of the balance by substituting weights³⁹⁶

109 *uštakaššab ana nēmelima uḫallaq kīsa* He is disappointed in the matter of profit and loses his capital

As well as the benefits of acting appropriately in this regard:

110 *ša kīni šābit zibānīti ma`d[a...]* The honest merchant who holds the balance, (has) much [profit²]

111 *mimma šumšu ma`d[i] qīšaššu [...]* Much of everything is presented to him [...]

That scrupulous business practices are preferred to unscrupulous ones by the gods is unsurprising, but as Šamaš is occasionally known as *bēl māmiti*,³⁹⁷ we should perhaps think of the consequences listed in the hymn as representative of the sanctions which the participant in the *Šurpu* ritual hopes to have absolved.

There are presumably dozens of ways to falsify a balance, but an example from (relatively) modern times is represented

³⁹⁴ See e.g. Lambert 1960: 331, n. 107-108.

³⁹⁵ After Lambert 1960: 132-133, as are all quotes from this hymn for the commentary on lines 57-60.

³⁹⁶ CAD *Šapālu*: 425a. An unpublished duplicate (found by Lambert) is quoted to restore the line which is broken in his edition. This is presumably the unnumbered BM tablet that is mentioned in the index to Lambert’s notebooks as being collated on page 1592. Unfortunately, this page is not yet available so cannot be checked.

³⁹⁷ See above commentary to ll. 43-70.

by a phrase my grandmother was used to when she worked in a butcher’s shop in the early 1940s. The butcher, when he thought he could get away with it, would hand her cuts of meat saying “Elacs etnews.” This was back-slang for ‘swing the scale’, meaning to throw the meat on the scale and pick it up quickly before the scale could settle so that the customer believed the meat to be heavier than it really was.

That this practice was worthy of divine sanction is not a surprise, though my grandmother was very young at the time.

The second clause is also paralleled in *Šurpu* II:

43 *kasap lā ketti ilteqi ka[sap ketti ul il]qi* He took dishonest silver, he [did not take honest?] sil[ver]

This line is not at all certain, chiefly because it does not make sense. A prohibition against taking dishonest money is perfectly logical, but it is hard to see the point of a prohibition against not taking honest money. It is also hard to believe that anyone ever refused to take honest money. If the restoration is correct, we should perhaps understand silver as wages, and the honesty or dishonesty as referring to the job for which it was paid. That is to say ‘He took wages for dishonest work, he did not take wages for honest work.’ This is speculative however, and the present line is substantially less difficult in any case. Taking false silver under oath is a reference to either shady business dealings or theft, depending on how *lā ketti* ‘false’ is interpreted.

61 This line follows the pattern of lines 51, 52 and 65. Unlike lines 51 and 52, however, it does not appear to be paralleled elsewhere in *Šurpu*. Nonetheless, the idea of the line is clear – to curse someone and deny it is an offence, irrespective of the social stature of the victim.

62 This line is not straightforward. Fortunately, parallels from *Šurpu* III, two non-canonical Lamaštu incantations,³⁹⁸ and a text related to *Udug-ḥul* I:³⁹⁹

III 116. *māmīt nadītu u qadištu* Sanction (for misconduct) related to *Nadītu*-woman or *Qadištu*-woman

III 117. *māmīt^d kūbi enti* Sanction (for misconduct) related to the foetus of a high priestess

Lam. ND 11 [...*uta*]mmīki kūbī enēti [... I conj]ure you by the foetuses of high priestesses

Lam. ND 12 [...*k*]ūbī nadāti [...the fo]etuses of *Nadītu*-women

Lam. ND 13 [*utammīki k*]ūbī *Narām-Sîn Šarru-kīn* [I conjure you by the f]oetuses of *Narām-Sîn* (and) *Sargon*

Lam. Ug 8 *utammīki kūbī en[ē]ti [nadāti u qa]diš[ti]* [... I conj]ure you by the foetuses of high priestesses, [*Nadītu*-women and *Qa]diš[ti*-women]

Lam. Ug 9 *utammīki kūbī Narā[m-Sîn] u Šarru-k[īn]* I conjure you by the foetuses of *Narā[m-Sîn]* and *Sarg[on]*

UH 27 *kūbī nadītu u qadiš[ti]* (I adjure you by) the foetus of *Nadītu*-woman or *Qadištu*-woman

The idea is still not completely without difficulty, as ^dKubu can also be a demon, but it seems likely that the line is an injunction against impregnating certain classes of priestess. It is clear that *kubu* ‘foetus’ in the present line must refer to the entire following list, not just to the *Entu* ‘high priestess.’ The lines regarding the foetuses of *Narām-Sîn* and *Sargon* are not clear, but probably are not relevant in this context.

We should probably understand the present line as having two clauses. The first is ‘sanction for misconduct involving

³⁹⁸ Farber 2014: 294-297.

³⁹⁹ Geller 2016: 65.

a daughter of god,' i.e. a priestess. The second is more specific, 'sanction for misconduct involving the foetus of any of several classes of holy woman.' In the latter clause, we should perhaps understand foetus as a synonym for impregnation.

63 The grouping principle here is clear – the upper echelons of society, from god to judge. There are no parallels for this line in the usual lists, but the group is represented in two unrelated texts. The first half of the list can be found in a prayer to Marduk contained in an anti-witchcraft ritual:⁴⁰⁰

40 *ila šarra kabta u rubâ ušashirūninni* They have caused god, king, magnate, and prince to turn away from me.
 'They' are witches who have cursed the person reciting the text. Plainly, one would not want this group to turn away. The second half of the list is written, with one addition, in a royal inscription from the reign of Aššur-etel-ilāni:⁴⁰¹

11 *šumma rubê šû lū šaknu lū šāpiru lū dayānu* If that prince or governor or commandant or judge
 12 *lū šakkanaku* or viceroy

The context of these lines is that the king has repatriated the body of a Chaldean leader and placed it in a tomb. The people listed are warned not to disturb the tomb lest Marduk and Nabu destroy them.

Neither of these add materially to our understanding of the present line, but as it is relatively self-explanatory this is no great misfortune.

64 The theme of this line is farming. There are no parallel lines for this list, but it is not difficult to imagine prohibited actions related to farms, as evidenced by the existence of the modern Country Code.

The word *sahhu* 'meadow, waterlogged land' is preserved on only one manuscript, and the signs are not clear. The reading is possible from the signs and the context of the line makes it likely.

65 This line follows the pattern of lines 51, 52 and 61. Unlike lines 51 and 52, however, it does not appear to be paralleled elsewhere in *Šurpu*. Like line 51, the idea is that cursing one's family and denying it is a bad idea. Whereas line 51 is concerned with the patient's birth family, however, the present line is focussed on his marital family.

66 The idea behind this line seems to be related to frivolous speech. Inappropriate joking and laughter along with the failure to fulfil a promise are obvious forms of misconduct. There is a difficulty with our reading of this line, however. This is that both *enû* 'retract' and *lā nadānu* 'did not give/fulfil' apply to the same word - *qabû* 'speech, promise.' While this is possible, we should expect *u* 'and, or' to be written between *enû* and *lā*. A similar problem exists in lines 53 and 54. It is possible that here, like in those lines, we should understand the writing *e-nu-u la* in **Nin1** and **Nin3** as *e-nu u la*. Alternatively, it is possible that the missing *u* is simply a haplographic error. Several parallels lend support to our translation. *Šurpu* III has:

Š III 55 *māmīt qabê u enê* Sanction for promising and retracting

This demonstrates that the sanction could be applied for misconduct not involving *lā nadānu*. In both a Dingir-ša-dib-ba incantation⁴⁰² and a Lipšur Litany we read the following line:⁴⁰³

DŠ 124 *[aq]bima ēni utakkilma ul addin* [I p]romised and then reneged, I gave my word but then did not pay

⁴⁰⁰ Abusch and Schwemer 2016: 225.

⁴⁰¹ Frame 2016: <http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/rinap/rinap5/Q003861/>

⁴⁰² Lambert 1974: 280-281.

⁴⁰³ Reiner 1956: 142-143.

L II/1 53 *aqbima ēni utak[kilma] ul addin* I promised and then reneged, I gav[e my word] but then did not pay
 The context is an apology for improper actions, offered to Šamaš in the Lipšur text and to the personal god in the Dingir-ša-dib-ba incantation. The line is particularly helpful because, while *qabû lā nadānu* could be understood as ‘not giving a promise’, the word *utakkilma* is from *takālu* ‘to make a promise’ and therefore specifies that the promise has already been given. As such, *lā nadānu* must refer to the failure to fulfil a promise, rather than the failure to give one.

The phrase is also apparently written in the wisdom text known as the Counsels of Wisdom:⁴⁰⁴

CW 163 [...] *tukkulu nadû* [...] to create trust and then to abandon
 CW 164 [*qabû² e³*]-*ni la nadānu ikkib Mardu[k]* [to ret]ract² [a promise³], not to fulfil (a promise)² is an
 abomination to Marduk

If the restoration is correct, the *u* is lacking again, but in this case neither haplography nor a movable *u* is available to solve the problem. The restoration is by no means certain, however, and on balance the reading we have suggested seems safe.

It is worth noting that going back on one’s word is evidently abhorrent to both Šamaš and Marduk, as well as the personal god, and therefore a fitting cause for sanction.

67 The meaning of this line is not immediately obvious. Parallels can be found in *Šurpu* III, the namburbi published by Frankena, and the incantation from Bīt rimki:

Š III 46 *māmīt bīnu u gišimmari* Sanction (for misconduct) relating to tamarisk and date palm
 Š III 121 *māmīt baltu u ašāgu* Sanction (for misconduct) relating to camelthorn and yanqout

A.185 53 [*ina bal*]tu *ašāgu bīnu gišimmaru* [for³] ripping up [camel]thorn, yanqout, tamarisk, date palm
nasāḥu mi[n min] ditto, ditto

B.R. 81 *māmīt baltu u ašāgu* Sanction (for misconduct) related to camelthorn or yanqout

These do not help to understand the line, except insofar as they demonstrate that the two weeds and the two trees were dealt with separately in III.

Yanqout (*Prosopis Farcta*) is a voracious weed with medium-sized edible, if unappealing, fruit and thorns. Camelthorn (*Alhagi Maurorum*) is similar. Both have extensive and deep root networks and can regrow quickly from small pieces of root left in the soil. In modern farming both are extremely problematic. Why, then, should it be an offence to cut them away?

A likely answer to this is to be found in farming techniques which persisted in Iraq until the mid-20th Century. In his description of yanqout, Guest writes:

P. Farcta is usually an indicator of good agricultural land – deep well-drained alluvial soil with not too high a table-water. It has a very deep root system ... It lies dormant and leafless in the winter and ... it does not shoot again until the early summer after winter crops have been harvested. It thus protects fallow land to some little extent against the fierce dry heat of summer while driving its own moisture and nourishment from the sub-soil water many metres below the surface. In December its leaves are shed again adding some hummus to the parched impoverished soil... it is

⁴⁰⁴ Lambert 1960: 106.

of the utmost importance to the shepherd since it covers immense tracts of barren land throughout the summer after the annual herbs have died down and when grazing is very scarce.⁴⁰⁵

This description offers several advantages to the presence of yanqout. As the roots reach down to the water table, it does not compete with crops, it improves the fertility of the soil by dropping leaves and it provides useful fodder for shepherds. Most importantly, however, it shields the fields from the sun, thereby preventing evaporation leading to increased salinity. Camelthorn is described in similar terms. These facts cannot have been unknown to an agricultural civilisation. Though no specific evidence is available from ancient sources, a study of farming techniques in Iraq from 1900-1960 makes clear that the benefits of these two weeds were well established:

Russel was puzzled that no intertillage of row crops was carried out after sowing despite the work done to prepare the land etc., "They pull a few weeds and they clip grasses to an extent with hand sickles. They do not use hand hoes, or wheat hoes, or any type of animal drawn cultivators. They will argue heatedly that it is not good to kill the weeds"⁴⁰⁶

If, as seems likely, the same understanding of the benefits of these weeds were understood in ancient times, the fact that ripping them up was a sanctionable offence is completely understandable.

Another possible consideration in the case of both camelthorn and tamarisk is that they are prominent sources of the sweet sap known as manna.⁴⁰⁷ There is no firm evidence for the ancient use of manna, but there are several words for resin and it is possible that one represents the sweet edible variety. Campbell Thompson has discussed the evidence for manna, but his study is now antiquated.⁴⁰⁸ In the absence of a wider study it is not possible to be certain that manna was gathered, though it is an appealing possibility.

Irrespective of manna, the sanction for ripping up tamarisk and date palm is more immediately understandable – both provide a wide array of crucially important materials for everyday life. These are detailed extensively in the Debate between Tamarisk and Date Palm.⁴⁰⁹ The majority of these materials - including fruit, leaves, resin, and twigs - can be gathered from the trees without destroying them, and so to rip them up would be a wasteful and destructive act.

Nonetheless, it must have been necessary to a certain extent for fields to be weeded, or else camelthorn and yanqout would have turned them into briar patches. Likewise, occasionally the trees must have been chopped down for timber. We should presumably understand this line in the same way as line 44 – the proper management of plants was fine, but mismanagement would incur divine sanction.

The translation of *ašāgu* as yanqout needs justification. As early as 1937, Landsberger⁴¹⁰ identified the plant in question as *Prosopis Stephaniana*, and this identification has since been confirmed by Civil.⁴¹¹ Since Landsberger's note, however, confusion has set in - *ašāgu* has been identified variously as *Lycium Barbarum*,⁴¹² *Prosopis Stephaniana*, *Prosopis Farcta*,⁴¹³ Arabic 'Šōk,⁴¹⁴ 'a kind of acacia,'⁴¹⁵ 'false carob,'⁴¹⁶ and 'mesquite.'⁴¹⁷

⁴⁰⁵ Guest 1974: 41.

⁴⁰⁶ Charles 1990: 54.

⁴⁰⁷ Guest 1974: 496-499.

⁴⁰⁸ Campbell Thompson 1949: 270ff.

⁴⁰⁹ Most recently translated by Cohen 2013: 177ff.

⁴¹⁰ Landsberger 1937-1939: 139-140, n. 26.

⁴¹¹ Civil 1987: 47.

⁴¹² Campbell Thompson 1949: 182ff.

⁴¹³ Civil 1987: 47; Maekawa 1990: 124.

⁴¹⁴ Stol 1988: 181.

⁴¹⁵ CAD A/2 *ašāgu*; Veldhuis 1997: 108. Also CAD *passim*

⁴¹⁶ Maekawa 1990: 124; Civil 1991: 40; Heeßel and al-Rawi 2003: 237 i 27; Robson 1999: 163 n. 82; Molina & Such-Gutiérrez 2004: 9 (with a question mark); Freedman *Šumma Ālu* 55, l. 2. (Available on academia.edu)

⁴¹⁷ Civil 1991: 40.

The Linnaean names here cause no difficulty. *Lycium Barbarum*, better known as Goji berry or Wolfberry, is in fact to be identified with *edettu*, which is written with the same logogram, ^{gis}Ú.GÍR, as *ašāgu*.⁴¹⁸ *Prosopis Stephaniana* and *Prosopis Farcta* are synonymous with each other and with the Arabic *Šōk*.

The common English names, however, are problematic. Both CAD⁴¹⁹ and the ePSD translate *ašāgu* as ‘a kind of acacia,’ and this error is regularly repeated.⁴²⁰ Five distinct species of acacia are native to Mesopotamia:

- *Faidherbia Albida*, Winter Thorn,
- *Vachellia Gerrardii*, Red Thorn or Grey-haired Acacia
- *Vachellia Nilotica*, Egyptian Thorn or Gum-Arabic tree
- *Vachellia Tortillis*, Umbrella Thorn
- *Vachellia Oerfota* (syn. *Nubica*), Green-barked Acacia⁴²¹

None of these are now scientifically classified as *Acacia* owing to the 2005 segregation of this genus, in the light of phylogenetic studies, into five distinct genera.⁴²² Scientifically speaking, acacia should be reserved for the overwhelmingly Australian genus, which comprises 981 species just 10 of which are native to other countries. For our purposes, however, acacia can be taken to mean these five. Neither *Faidherbia* nor any species of *Vachellia* can be identified with *ašāgu*. The root of this misidentification seems to be a brief note by Meissner.⁴²³ In this note, Meissner offers an ingenious logical chain based on an entry in Uruanna I:⁴²⁴

163 ^ú*samtu* = ^{gis}Ú.GÍR *ša Meluḥḥa* *Samtu*-plant = ^{gis}Ú.GÍR of Egypt

Meissner equated *samtu* with Arabic *sanṭ* ‘acacia’ (*Vachellia Nilotica*), and inferred that both words descended ultimately from Egyptian *šnd.t* ‘acacia.’ As ^{gis}Ú.GÍR is most commonly used as the logogram for *ašāgu*, and as *ašāgu* heads this section of Uruanna, the identification of the logogram was taken as proof of the identity of the Akkadian word. As has already been noted, however, ^{gis}Ú.GÍR was used logographically for at least two completely different plants – *edettu* ‘goji-berry’ and *ašāgu*.

The name ‘false carob’ appears to have been invented by Assyriologists. No such plant is listed in the databases of Kew Gardens or the Royal Horticultural Society, and a search on Google returns almost exclusively Assyriological publications. It is nonetheless frequently used in translating *ašāgu*, often without further detail.⁴²⁵ Those who do elaborate include the Linnaean name,⁴²⁶ mesquite,⁴²⁷ the Arabic *Šōk*,⁴²⁸ or a combination of these names.⁴²⁹ The use of false carob in translating *ašāgu* is presumably due to the fact that the seeds of the plant were named *ḥarub* in several ancient sources, not least Uruanna.⁴³⁰ *Ḥarubu* is the etymological root of the modern word carob, but as with ^{gis}Ú.GÍR, it was used for the fruit of a number of plants. We should probably understand it to mean ‘legume.’

Apart from the fact that it is not attested outside Assyriological literature, false carob is a poor choice of common name

⁴¹⁸ CAD E *edettu*

⁴¹⁹ CAD A/2 *ašāgu* and other volumes *passim*; ePSD *sub voce* *kišig*.

⁴²⁰ eg. Abusch and Schwemer 2011: 468; Veldhuis 1997: 108; Freedman 1998: 81, l. 52; Reiner 1995: 37, n. 153 (especially confusing as Reiner also gives the Linnaean *Prosopis Farcta* and the Arabic *Šōk*, neither of which are names of acacia).

⁴²¹ The common name is given in Dharani 2006: 122 but is elsewhere the name of several other varieties of *Vachellia*.

⁴²² Murphy 2008: 10ff.

⁴²³ Meissner 1903: 266-267.

⁴²⁴ Köcher Unpublished: I. My thanks to H. Stadhouders for this reference.

⁴²⁵ e.g. Heeßel & al-Rawi 2003: 237; Robson 1999: 163; Molina & Such-Gutiérrez 2004: 9; Freedman *Šumma Ālu* 55, l. 2 (available on academia.edu).

⁴²⁶ Held 1965: 397.

⁴²⁷ Maekawa 1990: 123.

⁴²⁸ CAD E: 23b.

⁴²⁹ Civil 1991: 40.

⁴³⁰ There is a possibility that false carob is taken from the Spanish *algarroba*, the name given to both the carob and to *Prosopis Juliflora*, honey mesquite, due to the superficial resemblance between them. *Prosopis Farcta* is not so known, however.

for *Prosopis Farcta*. In the first place, there is practically no similarity between the carob and *Prosopis Farcta*. The former is a large, imposing thornless tree, while the latter is a knee-height, thorny, pernicious weed. Moreover, when the name is given without elaboration it is easily confused with a number of other species

Among the very few non-Assyriological references to the false carob identifies it with *Cercis Siliquastrum*, the Judas tree.⁴³¹ The identification is made on the basis that the scientific name of carob is *Ceratonia Siliqua*, and *Siliquastrum* is a 'pejorative term' describing the false version. While this is accurate to a certain extent, the inference that the Judas tree is the false carob is not. As Dalla Francesca notes, both *Siliqua* and *Siliquastrum* have the common Latin root *siliqua* 'pod', the difference being that the Judas tree also bears the suffix *-aster* which expresses incomplete resemblance. Thus, the carob is named for its pods, while the Judas tree is named for its almost-pods. Another possible source of confusion is the *Robinia Pseudoacacia*, the false acacia, or black locust tree. The fruit of the carob is also known as the 'locust bean',⁴³² and the two are frequently confused on this basis. As *Robinia* is known as false acacia and easily mistaken for the carob, the name 'false carob' is certain to lead to misunderstanding, despite the fact *Robinia* is native to America and was not introduced to the Old World until the 17th Century.⁴³³

As a weed native to no English speaking countries, *Prosopis Farcta* does not have a common English name in any real sense. It is called Syrian mesquite by the United States Department of Agriculture,⁴³⁴ on the basis that it is a member of the same genus as the native American *Prosopis* 'mesquite.' This is a misnomer in several ways, however. In the first place, 'mesquite' should be reserved for species belonging to the section *Algarobia* of the *Prosopis* genus. There are 44 known species of *Prosopis*, divided taxonomically into five sections. 30 species, all of which are native to the Americas, belong to section *Algarobia*. There are three old world species of *Prosopis*, all of which belong to section *Prosopis* and none of which have generally accepted vernacular names.⁴³⁵ Further, though present in Syria, *Prosopis Farcta* is relatively uncommon. In Jordan, Iran and Central Asia, on the other hand, it is extremely common.⁴³⁶ In simple terms, to paraphrase Voltaire,⁴³⁷ Syrian Mesquite is neither Syrian nor Mesquite.

As Syrian Mesquite will not do, and no other English common name is apparent, it is necessary to find a new common name. A professional botanist with an extensive history of research into *Prosopis* advised me to gather a list of common names in the languages of countries to which *P. Farcta* is native.⁴³⁸ This list eventually consisted of 44 different names in 17 languages, but unfortunately offered no clear favourite. As the plant currently has no acceptable common name, however, he selected the Arabic name *Yanqout*⁴³⁹ on the basis that it belongs to the most common language in the regions to which the plant is native, and is not ambiguous in that, as far as is known, it refers only to *Prosopis Farcta*.

An interesting side note can be made concerning the identification of ḡis'Ú.GÍR.ḤAB. This plant is listed in Uruanna I :

178 ḡis'Ú.GÍR.ḤAB = ^úda-da-nu ḡis'Ú.GÍR.ḤAB = Dadānu

As discussed above, ḡis'Ú.GÍR is a more or less generic marker for thorny plants bearing a resemblance to yanqout. ḤAB is to be translated 'malodourous.' While it cannot be demonstrated beyond doubt, a likely candidate for a

⁴³¹ Dalla Francesca 2016: 235.

⁴³² OED *sub voce* Locust II 5.

⁴³³ If this is doubted, it should be noted that the current writer spent over an hour perplexed at the apparent presence of *Robinia* in Mesopotamia before lighting upon the entry in CAD E.

⁴³⁴ <https://plants.usda.gov/core/profile?symbol=PRFA2>

⁴³⁵ Pasiecznik 2001: 20.

⁴³⁶ Pasiecznik, N. personal communication.

⁴³⁷ 'The Holy Roman Empire is in no way Holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire.'

⁴³⁸ Pasiecznik, N. personal communication. The list is due to be published in the Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International's Invasive Species Compendium (<http://www.cabi.org/isc/>).

⁴³⁹ Though *Tamūr al-Fakira* 'Poor woman's dates' was a close second. The hint of a pun in Dr Pasiecznik's choice of the name Yanq-Out for an undesirable weed is, as far as I know, unintentional, but I noticed it several days later and not to draw attention to it would be remiss.

stinking thorn plant similar to yanqout, is *Vachellia Oerfota* (syn. *Nubica*), ‘green-barked acacia.’ This is a plant native to east Africa and Arabia, with a range extending into southern Iraq. It is described as having a very unpleasant odour when cut.⁴⁴⁰

- 68 The grouping principle behind this list is fire. Parallels are found in *Šurpu* III, Frankena’s namburbi, and *Maqlû*
- | | | |
|----------|--|--|
| III 15 | <i>māmīt nappāḥātu u kinūni</i> | Sanction (for misconduct) related to brazier and bellows |
| III 32 | <i>māmīt KI.UD.BA ana pān amēlu sakānu</i> | Sanction for placing the cultic brazier in front of a man |
| A 185 52 | [<i>ina utūn l</i>]apti tinūri kinūni [KI.UD.BA u]
<i>nappāḥāti min</i> [min] | [for? kiln, b]arley oven, oven, brazier, [cultic brazier or] bellows ditto, ditto |
| M IV 23 | <i>ana utūni lapti tinūri kinūni KI.UD.BA u</i>
<i>nappāḥāti tapqidā`inni</i> | You have handed me over to kiln, barley oven, oven, brazier, cultic brazier or bellows |

The majority of these do not materially add to our understanding of the line, but *Šurpu* III 32 offers a hint as to the type of action that could be considered misconduct. The reason that placing a KI.UD.BA in front of somebody was prohibited is not clear, though a comparable statement is to be found in the Diagnostic and Prognostic series Sakikku:⁴⁴¹

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| I 3. DIŠ KI.UD.BA | <i>īmur marṣu šu māmītu iṣbatsu</i>
<i>uzabālma imāt</i> | If he sees a cultic brazier, that person is suffering from a <i>māmītu</i> -sanction, he will languish and die |
|-------------------|---|--|

The translation cultic brazier is made on the basis of three commentaries to the line in Sakikku which demonstrate that the KI.UD.BA was some type of cultic fixture connected with sacrificial offerings and purification.⁴⁴² The context of the present line indicates that it must have been connected with fire, which is in any case to be expected when both sacrificial offerings and purification are involved.

The purpose of the first Tablet of Sakikku is to list the prognoses for a patient’s recovery based on what the exorcist sees on the journey to the patient’s house. In this case, seeing a cultic brazier means the patient is doomed. This prognosis is presumably based on the same idea as the prohibition against placing the cultic brazier in front of somebody. Evidently, the cultic brazier had a negative connotation that has not been clearly identified.

The fact that *māmītu*-sanction is mentioned in the diagnostic portion of the line is notable. The prognosis that the patient will languish and die is presumably to be understood as the final form taken by the sanction. It seems entirely possible that *Šurpu* would have been recited to help such a patient.

The remainder of the items in the present line are too ubiquitous for the references to them to yield useful information, and so the line must simply be understood as embodying the general message that playing with fire is a bad idea.

- 69 The theme of this line is not entirely clear. Several of the items (door, bolt, lock door-jamb) share an obvious theme, but it is not clear how the others (cattle shed, drainpipe, bench) are connected to this. One possibility is that the type of misconduct imagined is the same for all items in the list. This gains some support from the parallels in *Šurpu* III and Frankena’s namburbi:

- | | | |
|--------|-------------------------------------|---|
| III 70 | <i>māmīt dalti u sikkuri napāša</i> | Sanction for breaking down door or lock |
|--------|-------------------------------------|---|

⁴⁴⁰ Dahrani 2006: 122.

⁴⁴¹ George 1991: 142-143.

⁴⁴² George 1991: 146-147.

A 185 51 [ina sippu] šigaru daltu sik[kuru tak]kannu [for²] destroying [door-jamb], bolt, door, lo[ck, be]nch
 lapātu min m[in] ditto, dit[to]

The namburbi is especially helpful here in that it lists not only the obvious group of door and door furniture, but also the less clearly related bench. The prohibited action in both the namburbi and *Šurpu* III is the destruction of the items. George has established that *nanšabu* ‘drain pipes’ were made of short lengths of tapered clay pipe which slotted together.⁴⁴³ Such pipes must have been fairly easy to destroy by digging in the right place, which would presumably cause the same sorts of difficulties faulty plumbing causes in modern homes. The most obvious reason that the destruction of doors, locks and plumbing would be prohibited is that this line refers to something along the lines of deliberate vandalism or breaking and entering. In the absence of clearer evidence, however, it is perhaps best not to overinterpret, and in any case, the principle of a general list of items which could be involved in misconduct makes an explicit explanation unnecessary.

70 The group in this line is clear - weaponry. The use of *tamû* ‘to swear’ at the end of the line is difficult, but the most likely explanation is, as Reiner translates, that the line relates to the swearing of an oath by the various weapons. The misconduct involved is presumably to do with having broken the oath.

Parallels are found in *Šurpu* III:

27	<i>māmīt qāšti u narkabti</i>	Sanction (for misconduct) related to bow or chariot
28	<i>māmīt patar siparrim u sukurri</i>	Sanction (for misconduct) related to bronze dagger or spear
29	<i>māmīt asmarê u tilpānu</i>	Sanction (for misconduct) related to lance or <i>tilpānu</i> -weapon

A variant to line 28 has *patri* ‘dagger, sword’ instead of *patar siparrim* ‘bronze dagger, sword’, which is closer to the present line but immaterial as the idea is the same.

A line in Frankena’s namburbi, while not paralleling the present line, is related to line 29 of *Šurpu* III:

A 185 49 [...⁸]GAG.T[I *asmar*]ê u *tilpānu* min [min] [... a]rrow, lance or *tilpānu*-weapon ditto, [ditto]

Though bearing a completely different list, we should nonetheless understand this line to be based on the same principle as the present line.

Another namburbi text is relevant to this line:⁴⁴⁴

1. [...n]amburbu lumun qāšti mimma Namburbi to undo the evil of every bow

This line is followed by a ritual to be performed in order to avert the portended evil. While not certainly related to the present line, the idea of evil portended by types of bow is very similar in essence to the idea of sanctions related to misconduct with types of weapon. Unfortunately, even assuming a connection, this does not materially increase our understanding of the present line.

71-75 This section is a catch-all list of the problems that will hopefully be removed after the patient has performed the ritual, including both witchcraft and problems brought on by the patient’s own actions. It resumes much of the list in ll. 39 and 39a-40c, and is more or less a standard refrain in Mesopotamian magical texts.⁴⁴⁵ The exact wording varies, but the concept, and indeed most of the specific details, remains the same.

⁴⁴³ George 2015: 83.

⁴⁴⁴ Caplice 1970: 117, l.1.

⁴⁴⁵ See, e.g. Abusch & Schwemer 2011: *passim*; Abusch & Schwemer 2016: *passim*.

- 71 The gods invoked here are presumably those listed in the *Kultgötterbeschwörung*, though it is possible that only the chief gods, or perhaps those known as *bēl māmīti*, are intended. In any case, the line asks, once again, that the sanctions listed in the preceding section be lifted.
- 72 The list is a standard one, and not worth thorough investigation here. *mašaltu* ‘interrogation’ has been restored from many sources.
- 73 The same list continues in this line. Two points are worth particular attention here. *Māmītu* is evidently to be understood in the same sense as in the preceding section, that is, sanctions for misconduct, and *arnu* is to be understood likewise as ‘punishment’ rather than ‘sin’. It seems likely that *nīšu* ‘oath’ is to be understood in a similar manner, which is in keeping with the general Mesopotamian understanding of crime and punishment, as noted by van der Toorn and discussed above.⁴⁴⁶
X2 writes 𒀭[?]-AŠ[?]-DIŠ[?] which is presumably reflected in **Nin1** 𒀭[?]-[...]. We can suggest no reading for this, though it is probably repeated in l. 39a, in which **X1** has 𒀭-x[...] and **Bab1A** has [...]-KUR[?].
- 74 The list continues in much the same vein in this line. The restoration *ša amēlūti* ‘of men’ is again based on numerous sources.⁴⁴⁷
- 75 This line simply restates the thesis of l. 71 – that the problems should be dismissed immediately.
- 76-83 The final action of the ritual is described in these lines. This is a cleaning and purification using specially sanctified water. Upon its completion, the patient should be both physically and spiritually clean.
- 76 This list of synonyms is presumably simply for emphasis, but a parallel in Astrolabe B deserves brief consideration:⁴⁴⁸
- | | | |
|-------|---|--|
| ii 23 | ... 𒄠 ^{gīš!} su.nir.ne.ne | ... The divine emblems |
| ii 24 | kù.kù mu nam.lú.ùlu ^{lu} umun in.dadag | are sanctified. The oath of the people and prince is cleared |
| ii 31 | <i>šubātu ūtallalā</i> | The shrines are purified |
| ii 32 | <i>nīšū u rūbu ūtabbabū</i> | The people and the prince are cleansed |
- The Akkadian lines roughly translate the Sumerian, and so for line 32 we should probably understand the cleansing of the people and prince to involve a mu or *nīšu*-oath. That this is not written is perhaps due to haplography – *nīšu nīšū* is easily omitted. The importance in the present instance is that some of the same of words for cleaning and purifying are used, in a roughly similar context. Evidently, the nuance of spiritual purification was well established for the word *ūtabbib*.
- 77 There is a small break at the end of this line in which we have restored *rapašti* ‘vast’ from *Šurpu* VI:⁴⁴⁹
131. *ittika linūh ayabba tāmātu rapašti* May the vast sea and ocean calm down with you
- This is likely on the basis of the comparison with the other half of the line, in which both Tigris and Euphrates are

⁴⁴⁶ II. 43-70.

⁴⁴⁷ Abusch & Schwemer 2011: *passim*; Abusch & Schwemer 2016: *passim*.

⁴⁴⁸ Horowitz 2014: 35

⁴⁴⁹ = Reiner V-VI 190.

described as *ellūti* ‘pure.’

AŠ1 writes a^{mes} íd du^{mes} [...] ‘running river water,’ in place of Tigris and Euphrates, but perhaps these were mentioned in the break.

78-80 These precious materials are the ingredients required for the creation of an *egubbû*-vessel full of sanctified water. Though not clear from the present text, the vessel would have been filled with water and these materials, then left overnight in a *bû Kusi* ‘House of Kusu’ where it could be purified by fumigation. The creation of an *egubbû*-vessel is part of the Mis-pî ritual and is described more fully by Walker and Dick,⁴⁵⁰ as well as by Maul.⁴⁵¹ The important point for our purposes is simply that such a vessel is the subject of these lines.

The entire list of materials is also written in the explanatory text CBS 6060,⁴⁵² in very nearly the same order, though the plants appear before the stones, date palm comes before *maštakal*, and an additional stone, ^d*mār-bīti šá ma-lak*, is included between *engisû*-stone and pink-red chalcedony. In the text, each item is equated with a deity, though the nature of these equations is not always clear. Schuster-Brandis’ assertion⁴⁵³ that this text describes the materials necessary for performing the entire ceremony of *Šurpu* is certainly possible given the fact that an unknown amount of material is missing from Tablet VIII.⁴⁵⁴ However, several items mentioned in CBS 6060, such as a goose (l. 58) and rancid oil (l. 61) are not known from *Šurpu*, and those that are known – the stones and plants, coloured wool (l. 38) and even the living sheep (l. 49) which must have been required judging by the incantation ‘You grass’ in Tablet VIII – were presumably required in a number of ceremonies, and so we cannot certainly take CBS 6060 to be related to *Šurpu* in particular.

Concerning the specific ingredients, little can be added to the work of Schuster-Brandis,⁴⁵⁵ though some brief notes seem worthwhile.

Schuster-Brandis notes that *turminû* must be a dark stone since it is described in the following terms in the stone list *Abnu Šikinšu*:

87.	NA ₄ GAR-š <u>u</u>	gim a-[r]i ² -b[u] ² mušen	na ₄ ˘DUR˘.MI˘.NA	MU.[NI]
	The stone	like a crow ² ,	Turminû	is its name.

She supports this with reference to a copy of Hh XVI from Ugarit, which describes *turminû* as *aban mūši* ‘stone of the night.’⁴⁵⁶ This is all very sensible, but Schuster-Brandis does not offer an identification. Livingstone identifies *turminû* as breccia.⁴⁵⁷ This gains a great deal of support from the line in Hh XVI, if we take ‘night’ to mean ‘night sky.’ Breccia is a rock composed of broken fragments of other rocks cemented together with fine gravel. This very often results in stones that are dark black with spots of white, mimicking, rather neatly, the night sky.

Substantially more speculative, possibly even silly, is a remark that can be made about *zibītu*. This is identified as a kind of seashell by Schuster-Brandis.⁴⁵⁸ Given this identification, is it possible that *É/bītu* in the shell’s name is to be understood as house?

Finally, the identification of ^u*sikil.la* as sea squill (*Drimia Maritima*) was made by Maddalena Rumor in a paper at the

⁴⁵⁰ Walker and Dick 2001: 54-56

⁴⁵¹ Maul 1994: 41-47.

⁴⁵² Livingstone 1986: 176-177.

⁴⁵³ Schuster-Brandis 2008: 438.

⁴⁵⁴ See chapter 1.

⁴⁵⁵ Schuster-Brandis 2008: 391ff.

⁴⁵⁶ Landsberger & Reiner 1970: 421. 140.

⁴⁵⁷ Livingstone 1986: 177, 124.

⁴⁵⁸ Schuster-Brandis 2008: 456, no. 116.

61st Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. *Maštakal* is apparently to be understood as a type of squill as well, though the precise identification is not known.

- 81 This line links the ritual activity taking place to Marduk, thereby giving divine support to the action.
- 82 The meaning of *mê ša zumrika* ‘water of your body’ is not certain. Probably it refers to water in which the patient has bathed, but according to line 77, the water in which the patient was cleaned has just been listed, meaning that *itti* ‘together with’ at the start of this line is redundant – the various types of water listed should be identical with the ‘water of your body.’ An alternative possibility is that the phrase refers to urine. This would be more in keeping with following phrase *musāti ša qātēka* ‘washwater from your hands’ which, as George has pointed out,⁴⁵⁹ must refer to the water used for cleaning oneself after going to the toilet – liberally translated ‘bidet water’ here. Either option is possible, but the point remains the same – all the various types of water should have absorbed the patient’s problems.
- 83 This line describes the final elements of the ritual. In the first half, the water which has been used to wash the patient is poured away, thereby releasing the patient through an act of magical transfer. The water, which has absorbed the patient’s problems during the preceding lines, is absorbed by the ground and the problems go with it. The second clause refers to the *gamlu*-stick which was used in the *Kultgötterbeschwörung*. Presumably the final act in the ritual involved use of the stick, either on the wet ground, or on the now clean patient. Without ritual instructions, it is impossible to say.
- 84 This is the catchline for Tablet X of *Šurpu*, which consists of *Kultmittelbeschwörungen* designed to enhance the effectiveness of the materials used. It seems illogical that such incantations should follow, rather than precede, the performance of the ceremony, but such considerations require a far deeper study than is possible here.

⁴⁵⁹ George 2015a: 86.

Excursus – Kusu

Despite being relatively well attested in the corpus of ritual and incantation literature, Kusu is nonetheless a source of considerable confusion. There has been a great deal of debate among scholars concerning whether the name refers to one or two deities, and whether it should be understood as male or female, or as one of each. No fully acceptable consensus has yet been reached, and so we must examine the evidence in detail.

Kusu occurs in four contexts:

1. As *šangamahhu* ‘purification priest’ of Enlil
2. As a grain goddess
3. As the deified censer
4. As one of the sons of Enmešara

While Michalowski has argued for a single goddess Kusu,⁴⁶⁰ and Ambos for a single god Kusu⁴⁶¹ it has been relatively common practice⁴⁶² to distinguish two Kusus - one female, a grain goddess identified with Nisaba, the other male, the deified censer and *šangamahhu* of Enlil, by virtue of which he is included among the craftsman gods. The connection with the sons of Enmešara has been largely ignored, as will be the case here since an effective investigation of the topic would take far more space than is available.

This division cannot be accepted on the evidence of An=Anum I 308-311:

308 ^d kù.sù	sangá.maḥ ^d en.líl.là.ke ₄	Kusu	Chief Purification Priest of Enlil
309 ^d .MIN GUD	A: šu B:MIN	Kusu	A: The same B: Ditto
310 ^d indagara (NINDÁ x GUD)	dam.bi ^d iškur	Indagar	Her Husband, Iškur
311 ^d šùdu.kù.ga ⁴⁶³	dumu.munus ^d kù.sù.ke ₄	Šudkuga	Daughter of Kusu ⁴⁶⁴

To deal with the simpler elements of this first, Indagara, the ‘divine breed-bull’⁴⁶⁵ is certainly masculine, as is demonstrated by his identification here with the storm god Iškur, as well as with Haia, husband of the grain goddess Nisaba, in the Old Babylonian hymn to that god.⁴⁶⁶

Šudkuga is, to the best of the writer’s knowledge, known otherwise only from the Mari god list:

- 37 ^[d]nin-urt[ta]
38 ^dza-b[a₄-ba₄]
39 ^dnin-gír-su
40 ^dnammu
41 ^dku-ús
42 ^dšùd.kù
43 ^dx-[L]U/zu
44 ^dnuska

⁴⁶⁰ Michalowski 1993: 138; 1998-2000: 576a. In both Michalowski argues that Kusu as a grain goddess is simply the result of confusion regarding an epithet.

⁴⁶¹ Ambos 2004: 28, n. 204.

⁴⁶² Krecher 1966: 133; Conti 1997: 256-7; Lambert 1985: 186; Lambert 1997: 6-7; George & Taniguchi 2010: 103.

⁴⁶³ Lambert transliterates ^dšud_x.kù.ga. CT 24 3-11 r. ii. 14 has ^dhundun(KA x NUN).kù.ga. Landsberger (Litke 1998: 60 n. 327) suggested that this was a mistake for KA x SA = sum₄ (= su₆). In light of the evidence of the Mari God list (l. 42, see below) it is more likely a mistake for KA x ŠU = šùdu, as is written in the Middle Assyrian *dubgallu* tablet, YBC 2401 ii 109 (Litke 1998: pl. 7).

⁴⁶⁴ The transliteration is according to Lambert’s unpublished manuscript, but the translation is my own.

⁴⁶⁵ George & Taniguchi 2010: 103.

⁴⁶⁶ Charpin 1986: 344-6, l. 18; Kramer 1977: 46, l.18-19.

45 ^dsa-dâr-nun-na⁴⁶⁷

The first three names here are those of warrior gods and sons of Enlil, understood elsewhere - and possibly in this text - as forms of a single god. Lambert understands Nammu here as a dialectal variant of ^dnin-imma, ‘Enlil’s scholar, scribe, and wet-nurse for Sîn.’⁴⁶⁸ Nuska is Enlil’s vizier, Sadarnunna is Nuska’s wife. Ku-ús is plainly a spelling of Kusu, and Šudku must be a spelling of Šudkuga. Apart from confirming her connection to Kusu and the court of Enlil, this gives us no further information concerning her identity.

The interpretation of An=Anum I 309 is more complicated. In the translation we have understood MIN in the god’s name as a phonetic gloss for the following logogram. That is ‘the sign GUD, to be pronounced Kusu.’ The variant readings of the second half of the line are therefore to be interpreted as, respectively: šu ‘the same (as the gloss i.e. Kusu) and MIN ‘Ditto (Chief purification priest of Enlil).’ An alternative is that the god’s name is to be read ^dMIN-gu₄ ‘Ditto (i.e. Kù.sù)-gu₄’ giving the name Kusugu. In this case, šu in the second column should be understood as ‘the same (i.e. Kusugu)’ and MIN would still mean ‘Ditto (Chief purification priest of Enlil).’ A third possibility, ^dMIN^{gud} ‘The signs KÙ-SÙ, to be pronounced Gud’ is unlikely as the signs are in the wrong order. For this reading we should rather expect either ^dKÙ^{gu-ud}SÙ or ^{d.gud}MIN.

While the second reading is grammatically possible, it results in Enlil having two chief purification priests, and breaks the passage up strangely. In this reading Indagara is the husband of Kusugu, not Kusu, but the pair are interpolated between Kusu and his daughter. As such the first reading is to be preferred: Kusu, written either ^dkù-sù or ^dGUD, is the wife of Indagara and mother of Šudkuga, as well as being the chief purification priest of Enlil.

That GUD ‘ox’ should be a sign for Kusu is no doubt related to the fact that Indagar is a cattle god – the most commonly used logogram for his name, NÍNDA x GUD, features the same sign. Thus, according to An=Anum, Kusu in her role as *šangamahhu* of Enlil is certainly feminine.

In An=Anum I 285⁴⁶⁹ Kusu is said to be a form of Nissaba.

281 ^d nissaba	[d]am.bi.munus	Nissaba	His (Haia’s) wife
282 ^d MINŠID	MIN	Nissaba	Ditto
283 ^d ul.šár.ra	MIN	Ulšarra	Ditto
284 ^d nin.bar.še.gùn.nu	MIN	Nunbaršegunu	Ditto
285 ^d kù.sù	MIN	Kusu	Ditto
286 ^d ama.me.dib	MIN	Amamedib	Ditto
287 ^d en.zi.kalam.ma	MIN	Enzikamma	Ditto
288 ^d dà.dà	MIN	Dada	Ditto

It is worth noting here that line 282 agrees with our reading for line 309 above - the MIN in the second column demonstrates that ^dMINŠID was the wife of Haia, and therefore indisputably a form of Nissaba, written with the ŠID sign but read Nissaba, and not an independent deity. That Kusu must be female in this role is self-evident, and so we must accept, at least according to the evidence of An=Anum that at least two of the facets of Kusu’s identity are female.

⁴⁶⁷ Lambert 1985: 182.

⁴⁶⁸ Lambert 1985: 186.

⁴⁶⁹ Lambert unpublished.

Evidence from elsewhere, however, does present a problem with this argument. *Šangamaḥḥu* is the Akkadianised form of Sumerian *sanga.maḥ*. In Sumerian, which does not distinguish grammatically between feminine and masculine, there is no difficulty in understanding the role to have been held by a female. In Akkadian, however, *šangamaḥḥu* is evidently masculine, and for a female holder of the role we should expect to read **šangamaḥḥatu*. That the feminine form is not known in any of the many occurrences of the title⁴⁷⁰ gives some cause for concern. Likewise, in an Egalkura spell, we read *^dkù-sù mul-li-lu ti-bi KI-ia = Kusu mullilu tibi ittiya* ‘Kusu, the purification priest, stands ready with me,’⁴⁷¹ *mullilu* ‘purification priest’ is masculine. It is instructive to consider the analogous case of Ninšar. An=Anum I mentions Ninšar twice:

28	^d nin. ^{ša.ar} BÁRA	an-tum ^d iš-tar	Ninšar	Antu (and) Ištar
...			...	
312	^d nin.šar	gír.lá é.kur.ra.ke ₄	Ninšar	Butcher of Ekur
		[<i>ta-bi-ḥ</i>]u šá é-kur		[Butche]r of Ekur
313	^d .MIN ^{MIN} MUḤALDIM	MIN	Ninšar	ditto
314	^d .MIN ^{MIN} GÍR	MIN	Ninšar	ditto
315	^d unú.dù.dù	MIN	Unududu	ditto
316	^d ir.ra.gal	dam.bi ^d nè.eri ₁₁ .gal	Irragal	Her Husband, Nergal
317	^d .MIN ^{MIN} ŠUL	MIN	Irragal	Ditto

Lines 313, 314 and 317 once again demonstrate the same form as line 309. In each case, the alternative name sign describes the deity: *muḥaldim* ‘cook’, *gír* ‘knife’, *šul* ‘hero’. Unududu can be translated ‘Preparer of good food’ and so is also relevant to Ninšar as butcher, but as it was not written with a single sign, it was presumably not possible to treat it in the same way. The key point to note here is that Ninšar is unquestionably a feminine deity – she is equated with Antu, wife of Anu, and Ištar, and is said to be married to Irragal, a form of Nergal. Her role in line 312, *gír.lá*, being Sumerian does not have a grammatical gender. When translated into Akkadian, however, *gír.lá* becomes either *tābiḥu* ‘butcher’, as in the gloss to line 312, or the more literal *nāš patri* ‘knife carrier’, as in Gattung II iv 78, discussed below. Both of these are masculine. Lambert offers the solution to this contradiction: ‘The term *nāš patri* may have been unchangeably masculine in Akkadian because among humans the profession was exclusively male.’⁴⁷² If this reasoning is accepted, there is no reason not to expand it to cover the chief purification priest as well, thereby removing the difficulty of a female *šangamaḥḥu*.

A question remains whether to understand the two feminine Kusu names presented in An=Anum as one deity or two. Their separation in An=Anum is due to the organisation of the list – Nissaba has to appear where she does, as does Enlil’s *šangamaḥḥu*. As such, it is not useful to draw conclusions from their positions in the list. However, in the Middle Babylonian forerunner to An=Anum, CBS 331, the organisation had not yet been so fully realised.⁴⁷³

⁴⁷⁰ *Utukku Lemnutu* IX 44’ (Geller 2016: 309); *Bū sala’ mē* (Ambos 2013: 220, 19’), *Mis Pī* (Walker and Dick: 95, 29; 96, 54; 110, 27-28; 151, l. 89/90) building rituals (Linsens 2004: 303, l. 36; Lambert 2013: 380 l. 36); priest purification ritual (Borger 1973 168, III 1’; 169, III 19’; 170 IV 21 & 26; Ishtar and Dumuzi Incantation (Farber 1977: 60, 58); Gattung II (Ebeling 1953b: 394, 79-86).

⁴⁷¹ My thanks to H. Stadhouders for alerting me to this text. *tibi* is for *tebi*, stative of *tebū*

⁴⁷² Lambert Unpublished commentary to An=Anum I, 28.

⁴⁷³ Veldhuis⁹ (<http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/ckst/pager>) transliterates:

r.ii.15 ^dkù-sù ^dNISABA

r.ii.16 ^dku-^{su?}GUD

r.ii.17 ^dr-indagara’ ^dIŠKUR

r.ii.15 ^d kù-su ₁₁	^d NISABA	Kusu	Nisaba
r.ii.16 ^{d.ku-sú¹} GUD		Kusu	
r.ii.17 ^d indagara (NÍNDAXGU ₄)	^d IŠKUR	Indagara	Adad

Two points should be noted here. R.ii.16 offers support to our reading of An=Anum I 309 – MIN is here replaced with ku-sú¹ confirming that this is meant by the ‘ditto’ of the later source. While this does not preclude a reading kusugu(d), in light of the analogous forms in lines 313, 314 and 317 discussed above, Kusu is by far the most likely reading. More importantly for the question at hand, however, it is clear that Kusu as Nisaba and Kusu as wife of Indagara were understood to be the same deity. It is, of course, not clear whether Kusu was understood as *šangamaḥḥu* in this text, but as Indagara is identified with Adad in both texts it seems reasonable to assume that her credentials were likewise identical.

A possible bolster to the identification of the grain goddess with the *šangamaḥḥu* is to be found in an Old Babylonian Sumerian text against field pests:

1 maš.maš edin gu i.ni.in.lá	The exorcist, in the steppe he sets the snares
2 edin ki-su ₈ -ba/ki-šu-up-pa ⁴⁷⁴ gu i.ni.in.lá	In the steppe, the shepherd place/the uncultivated place, he sets the snares
3 edin ki da.ḡal.lá gu i.ni.in.lá	In the steppe, the vast place, he sets the snares
4 edin ki ḤI.ba gu i.ni.in.lá	In the steppe, the ... place, he sets the snares
5 ša.tu.um ša.tu.um edin gu i.ni.in.lá	In the hills, in the hills of the steppe, he sets the snares
6 AḤ.ru.um AḤ.ru.um edin gu i.ni.in.lá	In the valleys, [?] in the valleys [?] of the steppe he sets the snares
7 a.ri.ta gu i.ni.in.lá	Away from the fruitful place [?] he sets the snares
8 nu.ri.ta gu i.ni.in.lá	Away from the fertile place [?] he sets the snares
9 eme.ḥa.mu.na edin gu i.ni.in.lá	Despite (lit. in) the mutually opposed languages, in the steppe he sets the snares
10 dal.ḥa.mun.na edin gu i.ni.in.lá	Despite (lit. in) the whirlwinds, ⁴⁷⁵ in the steppe he sets the snares
11 dub.sar.an.na.ke ₄ edin(.na) gu i.ni.in.lá	The scribe of heaven, in the steppe s/he sets the snares
12 šáḡa.maḥ.e edin(.na) gu i.ni.in.lá	The chief purification priest, in the steppe s/he sets the snares
13 šáḡa.gal.e edin(.na) gu i.ni.in.lá	The high priest, in the steppe s/he sets the snares
14 e.zi.na.am ku.ús.sù ni.ib.ri.mi gu im.lá.lá.e.ne	Ezinu, Kusu and Ninpiriḡ, [?] They set the snares. ⁴⁷⁶

Both sets of half brackets are superfluous – the signs are completely preserved in the photograph of the tablet (http://cdli.ucla.edu/search/search_results.php?SearchMode=Text&ObjectID=P257777). Veldhuis’ sù in l. 15 is a mistake for su₁₁. l. 16 reads ^{d.ku-ba}GUD. BA here must be a defective writing of ZU, for which we understand sú.

⁴⁷⁴ The manuscripts differ for this word, but the sense remains the same – the land used by shepherds is the uncultivated land.

⁴⁷⁵ Eme ḥa.mu.un ‘mutually opposed tongues’ is probably a phrase describing the many languages spoken in and around Sumer. According to Sumerian Temple Hymn 1, line 153 (Sjöberg 1969: 26) the *mašmaššu*, the subject of this part of the text, is supposed to be master of these. Dal.ḥa.mu.un literally translates to ‘mutually opposed blowing’ and so is equated with whirlwind in several wordlists (Sjöberg 1969: 83). Cavigneaux and al-Rawi (2002: 39-40) translate ‘Le maître des correspondances verbales tendit des rets dans la steppe’ and ‘Le maître des dissonances tendit des rets dans la steppe.’ This is followed by Wasserman 2010: 345).

While this is plausibly defended in their commentary, it requires substantial emendation of the text. Instead, we understand the locative ending –a, subsumed by the adjectival qualifier, to mean something along the lines of ‘In the face of’. This gives a clearer sense of the line without emendation. The point seems to be that the exorcist is adept at staving off the confusion and disorder endemic to the steppe.

⁴⁷⁶ After Cavigneaux & al-Rawi 2002: 24-25, 12-14., and their commentary 37-41. Note two duplicates recently published as CUSAS 32 nos. 9 and 16 (George 2016: Pl. 32, iv 8-26 & Pl. 51, v 15-23). Unfortunately, neither duplicate is particularly helpful regarding the remaining problems with this section of the text.

The evidence offered by this text is by no means clear cut. It is not certain whether the deity referred to is Kusu or Ezinu-Kusu. Ezinu (Akk. Ašnan) is a form of the grain goddess, and Kusu is possibly an epithet of her here. We have assumed, with Cavigneaux and al-Rawi, that two goddesses are named, but there is ample evidence of a single goddess Ezinu Kusu, Ezinu-Kusu is perfectly possible.⁴⁷⁷ This need not concern us unduly, however, as whether epithet or avatar, it is clearly to the grain goddess with whom Kusu is associated that the text refers.⁴⁷⁸ Cavigneaux and al-Rawi defend their reading of Ninpiriḡ on phonetic grounds, but the significance of the name here is not clear. The authors suggest that the connection may be with Ninmaš, with whom Ninpirig is regularly associated, as a deity connected to magic, though this seems very tenuous.⁴⁷⁹ Ninpirig is best known as a *sukkal.maḥ* ‘grand vizier’ of Šamaš,⁴⁸⁰ though the name also appears as a form of Ninimma.⁴⁸¹ Ninpirig is certainly masculine,⁴⁸² while Ninimma is almost invariably female.⁴⁸³ Lambert sees the association of the two as an error on the part of the editors of An=Anum.⁴⁸⁴ In any case, no convincing connection between Šamaš’ grand vizier or Ninimma and the subject of the text is obvious. It seems most likely that Ninpirig is not the correct reading of the name, though we can offer nothing better.

The crucial point for the question at hand, however, is the juxtaposition of *šangamahḥu* and Kusu as the grain goddess. One possibility is that the gods named are to be equated with the titles in the preceding lines. That is to say, Ezinu is understood as the *dub.sar.an.na.ke*, Kusu is the *šangamahḥu* and Ninpiriḡ[?] is to be identified with the *šangagallu*. While this is not certain, it should be remembered that the grain goddess Nisaba is also a goddess of writing, and so ‘scribe of heaven’ is not an unexpected title. Likewise, Ninpiriḡ[?], if correctly read, though not known elsewhere as *šangagallu* is frequently involved with incantations by virtue of his connection with Ninmaš,⁴⁸⁵ and so the role is not unlikely.

This reading is likely in any case, as the poetic characteristics of the text seem to demand it. Lines 1-13 make use of the phrase *edin gu ì.ni.in.lá* ‘supervises the nets in the steppe’ or *gu ì.ni.in.lá* ‘supervises the nets’ as a refrain. Line 1 introduces the idea – the exorcist watching the nets in the desert. Lines 2-4 expand on this as a triplet, apparently describing the dimensions of the steppe. Lines 5-6 add height and depth to the steppe, and 7-8 contrast the steppe with settled land, while 9-10 describe the qualities of the exorcist. These are self-evidently couplets. Lines 11-13 are evidently a triplet, and cannot reasonably be understood to refer to the exorcist – while it is possible that *šangamahḥu* and *šangagallu* are synonymous titles a *maš.maš* could hold, it is hard to see how he could be *dub.sar.an.na.ke*. As there is no suggestion in the text that further officiants are involved, they must refer to gods. If line 14 is interpreted as suggested, it forms a natural pair for the triplet, and a neat conclusion to this section of the text. This is emphasised by the grammatically required alteration of the verb to *im.lá.lá.e.ne* in line 14.

⁴⁷⁷ There are several references to this goddess in literary texts, listed in Krecher 1966: 132, to which can be added a neo-Babylonian Eršemma (Gabbay 2015: 82, 10) and a recently published Old Babylonian incantation from the Schøyen collection (George 2016: 86, 46 rev. 16’ & 87, 12f 4). Although George understands Ašnan and Kusu, context makes it clear that Kusu is simply an epithet of the grain goddess.

⁴⁷⁸ Michalowski 1993: 159.

⁴⁷⁹ Cavigneaux & al-Rawi 2002: 40.

⁴⁸⁰ An=Anum III 129

⁴⁸¹ An=Anum I 300.

⁴⁸² Lambert unpublished: commentary to III 129

⁴⁸³ Ninimma’s otherwise unattested equation in the *Šumma Ālu* commentary, K. 1 r. 36 with ‘Ea of the Scribe’ (Jimenez 2016: <http://ccp.yale.edu/P237754>) is unlikely to be relevant as it is known only from a single tablet written around a thousand years after the text in question. Likewise, her equation with Zababa in the triple-column edition of the Weidner godlist (Weidner 1924-1925: II 11b) is likely a mistake.

⁴⁸⁴ Lambert unpublished: commentary to III 129.

⁴⁸⁵ See commentary l. 16 Endibgim.

If this, admittedly tentative, interpretation is accepted, this text offers a clear suggestion that the grain goddess is to be identified with the *šangamahhu*.

Another text which offers support to the idea that the grain goddess should be identified with the *šangamahhu* is an incantation recently published by Geller in the introduction to his edition of Utukku Lemnutu. Geller states that the incantation is ‘not specifically related to UH nor can the text be identified.’⁴⁸⁶ While this is true, it is worth noting that two lines are exactly paralleled in a Muššu’u/sag.gig.ga.meš incantation.⁴⁸⁷ Muššu’u Tablet IV is sag.gig.ga.meš Tablet VII,⁴⁸⁸ and so the incantation in question belongs to both series. It is not necessary to quote either incantation in full here, but as the Muššu’u incantation is useful in restoring the incantation published by Geller, the duplicated lines are as follows:

BM 35321 (Geller 2016: 14)

6’ ^r d ¹ MIN ^d gibil ₆ ^d šakkan ^d kù-sù ^d aš-na-a[n...	God-ditto, Girra, Šakkan, Kusu, Ašna[n...
7’ [k]i.min ^d asal-lú-hi sa-kip ha-a-a-ṭu mu-ṭ[er-ri gi-mil-li...	Ditto, Asalluhi who fends off the ‘watcher’ demon and is avenger of [...

Muššu’u IV/g

81 ^ú -tam-mi-ku-nu-ši ^d gibil ₆ ^d šakkan ^d kù-sù ^d aš-na-an ^d siraš u ^d nin-giš-zi-d[a]	I adjure you by Girra, Šakkan, Kusu, Ašnan, ⁴⁸⁹ Siris and Ningišzid[a]
....	...
86 ki.min (<i>utammikunuši</i>) ^d asal-lú-hi sa-kip ha-a-a-ṭi mu-kil SAG.ḪUL-tim	Ditto (I adjure you by) Asalluhi, who fends off the ‘watcher’ -demon and ‘holder of evil’-demon ⁴⁹⁰

The remaining parts of these two incantations match in tone, but not in content. The principle is clearly the same in each, but only these two lines are duplicated. The traces at the end of line 7’ appear to support a reading *k[il]*, so we can restore this confidently in place of Geller’s reading. The exact sequence of gods in lines 6’ & 81 is otherwise unparalleled, though Gattung II offers a comparable list, which we shall examine in a moment. Ašnan is the Akkadianised version of the grain goddess Ezinu, and so Kusu here could be understood simply as a grain goddess. However, Girra is the deified fire and is therefore chiefly a god of purification, so could be expected to be associated with the *šangamahhu*. In addition, in both texts Ningirimma, another purification goddess, plays an important role. As such, Kusu’s role here is unclear, and she could reasonably be understood to be both grain goddess and *šangamahhu*. The evidence of Gattung II offers some support for this interpretation.

Gattung II is one of several related but distinct exorcistic texts in which ‘all the members of the pantheon are listed in theological order so as to drive away demons with their help.’⁴⁹¹ These texts are therefore quasi-godlists. Gattung II is known from Late Assyrian and Late Babylonian copies, the relevant manuscript is one of

⁴⁸⁶ Geller 2016: 14.

⁴⁸⁷ Böck 2007: 165, 81 & 166, 86. Incantation IV/g

⁴⁸⁸ Linton 1976: 130ff.

⁴⁸⁹ A single manuscript, BM 45405+, presumably defective, has ^dna-na in place of Ašnan, Böck 2007: 166, though note that the line numbers do not match the copy, for F 12’ read F 13’.

⁴⁹⁰ Böck 2007: 165, 81 & 166, 86

⁴⁹¹ Lambert 1957-1970: 478b

the latter.⁴⁹² As Ebeling's edition of the text is often antiquated, and occasionally inaccurate, it has been re-edited here.

77 zi ^d nin-šar gir-lá é-ku[r-ra-ke ₄ h́é]	Be exorcised by Ninšar, butcher/knife carrier of
78 niš ^d MIN na-áš paṭ-ri šá é-k[ur]	E[kur]
79 zi ^d kù.sù šanga.maḥ [^d en.líl.lá.ke ₄ h́é]	Be exorcised by Kusu, chief purification
80 niš ^d MIN šá-an-gam-ma-ḥu šá ^d MIN	priest [of Enlil]
81 zi ^d ŠIM muhaldim.gal ^{dl} [an.na.ke ₄ h́é]	Be exorcised by Siris, great cook of An
82 niš ^d MIN nuḥatimmi (muhaldim) rabî (gal) šá ^d a-nim	
83 zi ^d nin.ma.da ^l šùd ^{dl} [an.na.ke ₄ h́é]	Be exorcised by Ninmada, worshipper of An
84 niš ^d MIN ka-rib ^d a-nim	
85 zi ^d nisaba nin nig.nam.ma.ke ₄ šu.sikil.[la.ke ₄ h́é]	Be exorcised by Nisaba, lady who keeps
86 niš ^d MIN be-el-ti mu-š[a-li-mat mím-ma šum-šu]	everything safe and he[althy]
87 zi ^d ḥa-ià bulug an-sal-me-me gi-na ₂ -k[e ₄ h́é]	Be exorcised by Haya, who expands the
88 niš ^d MIN mu-kin pu-lu-[uk-ki šá šamê rapšūti]	boundaries of[f] vast heaven
89 zi ^d la-ma an-e-da-[x h́é]	Be exorcised by Lamassu, xxx[...]
90 niš ^d MIN an-na[m ² /mu ^d]	
91 zi ^d +en.líl.lá an.na.ke ₄ [h́é]	Be exorcised by Enlil, (lord ³) of heaven[...]
92 zi ^d nin.líl.lá an.na ₂ -k[e ₄ h́é]	Be exorcised by Ninlil, (lady ³) of heave[n...]
93 ₂ zi ^d ma.mi an ₂ -n[a.ke ₄ h́é]	Be exorcised by Mami (lady ³) of hea[ven...]
94 niš ^d be-lit [šá šamê]	/The Lady, (lady ³) [of heaven...]

(CBS 13858a, ll. 7-24 = PBS 1/2, 115, ll. 77-95)⁴⁹³

The list is superficially dissimilar from that in the Muššu'u incantation, but they share an underlying rationale. The first three gods in this list, Ninagal, Ninkurra and Ninzadim, are known from a number of texts, notably Mīs Pī as members of a group of *ili mārē ummāni* 'gods of the craftsmen.'⁴⁹⁴ As they usually appear together, two other members of the group, Guškinbanda⁴⁹⁵ and Ninildu, were probably written in the gap which precedes this fragment. A number of other deities, including Kusu and Girra, are often associated with them, especially in the Mīs Pī ritual in which they are responsible for the manufacture of the statue which must be purified by the purification deities. More importantly, the transliteration of a unilingual Sumerian version of Gattung II found on the Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary website restores Girra, as well as Nusku and Ninildu, in the break before the start of this fragment.⁴⁹⁶

The equivalence of Ninšar and Šakkan is not completely clear, but in light of the fact that goddesses of grain and beer are mentioned in these lists, it seems likely that the connection is the provision of food. Ninšar is the divine butcher, and as such is responsible for the preparation and provision of meat. Šakkan is in charge of wild animals, and can therefore be understood as responsible for the provision of meat as well.⁴⁹⁷ This is provided some measure of support by the unilingual Sumerian version, in which Ninšar is preceded by Ninamaškuga,

⁴⁹² Lambert 1957-1970: 478b.

⁴⁹³ After Ebeling 1953b: 393-395 but note in particular, line 80, Ebeling read, following Lutz's copy (1919: 115) *niš^dMIN šá-an-gam-ma-ḥu šá^da[-nim]*. The photograph reveals Lutz's A as MIN, and so we have restored Enlil, as would be expected.

⁴⁹⁴ Walker and Dick 2001: 76 & 81, 58.

⁴⁹⁵ Previously read Kusibanda, but see Lambert 2013: 377.

⁴⁹⁶ http://psd.museum.upenn.edu/PSD/html/uniss/incantation/Gattung_II.htm Lines 101ff. No information seems to be available concerning the authorship or sources for this transliteration, and so it cannot be checked. It is referred to in the discussion here, but no firm arguments can be based on its evidence alone.

⁴⁹⁷ Wiggermann 2011-2012: 308-309.

who is ‘Enlil’s Shepherd’ according to both An=Anum⁴⁹⁸, and a mythological commentary to a ritual for curing a sick man.⁴⁹⁹ As divine shepherd, Ninmaškuga is unquestionably responsible for the provision of meat, especially when in association with Ninšar. Šakkan is, to all intents and purposes, shepherd of the wild animals, and so his role must be the same here.

Nisaba is the most common form of the grain goddess in the first millennium, and Haya is her husband. Ninmada is the brother of Ninazu in the Sumerian myth ‘How Grain Came to Sumer’,⁵⁰⁰ where he is also said to be ‘worshipper of An.’ Ninazu is the father of Ningišzida,⁵⁰¹ and the two are very regularly grouped together as chthonic snake gods, and Ninmada is described in An=Anum as muš.laḫ₄ šud_x.dè an.na.ke₄ ka-ri-ib ^da-nim ‘snake charmer, worshipper of An.’⁵⁰² In Lambert’s view⁵⁰³ this is a conflation of two different Ninmada’s – a male worshipper of An and a female snake charmer. He provides no evidence for this however, and in light of the fact that the worshipper of An is said to be the brother of Ninazu in the Sumerian myth, it seems unlikely. Wiggermann has argued persuasively that there is just one Ninmada.⁵⁰⁴ Ningišzida occurs earlier in Gattung II,⁵⁰⁵ and presumably the compiler did not wish to repeat him. This seems, however, to undermine the point of the text. Ningišzida, as Lambert has demonstrated,⁵⁰⁶ was very likely associated with alcoholic drinks – specifically wine – and so was a good pairing for Siris. Ninmada has none of the same connotations and so the point is lost. The unilingual Sumerian version does not suffer from the same problem as it does not name Siris, but rather an obscure god Tíbir (TAGxŠÛ). This god is distinct from Tibira, a smith who is mentioned in CT 29 46 4’ and the partial duplicate CT 25 46 4’, which are fragments of an explanatory godlist. No other reference to this god is known to the writer, but the word tibir is Sumerian for ‘hand’⁵⁰⁷ so we should perhaps imagine a deified hand. Gattung II describes Tíbir as muhaldim.gal an.[n]a.ke₄ ‘great cook of An.’⁵⁰⁸ The Late Babylonian version of the text describes Siris in the same way, though this role is otherwise unattested for her. It is possible that Ninmada’s role in bringing grain to Sumer makes him a reasonable partner for Siris as either brewer or cook, or Tíbir as a cook – without grain there is no beer or bread. His placement immediately before Nisaba in the list supports this, though this seems a rather arbitrary choice of grain god. Ninmada, as far as we are aware, was not an important grain god and as Nisaba fills the role in any case, must have been superfluous. An alternative possibility is that Ninmada has an alcoholic aspect which is not clearly evidenced. Katz⁵⁰⁹ has suggested that the myth of bringing grain to Sumer may be aetiological of Ninazu’s character as a dying god. That it might also cover the origins of alcohol inherent in Ninmada, while not yet evidenced, is not beyond the realms of possibility.

As such, while the names are different, the deities in Gattung II are plainly based on very similar organisational principles:

⁴⁹⁸ Lambert Unpublished: I 333.

⁴⁹⁹ Livingstone 1986: 172-173, 7.

⁵⁰⁰ ETCSL 1.7.6; Streck 2016: 531.

⁵⁰¹ Van Buren 1934: 63 and note 11.

⁵⁰² Lambert Unpublished: I, 329.

⁵⁰³ Lambert 1985: 187, 73.

⁵⁰⁴ Wiggermann 1989: 122.

⁵⁰⁵ Ebeling 1953b: 393, 64.

⁵⁰⁶ Lambert 1990a: 300; Lambert 1990b: 105.

⁵⁰⁷ ePSD and references there.

⁵⁰⁸ ePSD line 111 has muhaldim-gal-an-[n]a-ke₄. In light of the LB version, the god An, rather than heaven is more likely.

⁵⁰⁹ Katz 2004: 37

Table 7 - Feast gods

	Muššu'u &c.	Gattung II
Preparation/comfort	Girra	Fire and Craft gods
Meat providers	Šakkan	Ninšar
Grain/šangamahhu	Kusu	Kusu
Grain	Ašnan	Nisaba (& Haya)
Brewer/cook	Siris	Siris/Tíbir
Snake god/Wine god	Ningišzida	Ninmada

A third text makes this organisation explicit. The incantation *enuma^d anu ibnū šamê* ‘When Anu had created the heavens’, was recited as part of the rites for renovating a temple. In essence it is a paean to the mythical first brick, describing the various divine and natural forces created by the god Ea to create and serve the brick:⁵¹⁰

24. <i>e-nu-ma^d a-nu ib-nu-ú šamê^e</i>	When Anu had created the heavens,
25. <i>^dnu-dím-mud ib-nu-ú apsâ šu-bat-su</i>	When Nudimmud had created the Apsû, his abode,
26. <i>^dé-a ina apsî ik-ru-ša ti-ṭa-[am]</i>	Ea nipped off clay from the Apsû,
27. <i>ib-ni^d kulla ana te-diš-ti-[ki]</i>	He created Kulla to renovate [you],
28. <i>ibni^{giš} apa(gi) u^{giš} qīšta ana šī-pir nab-ni-t[i-ki]</i>	He created reed bed and forest for the task of [your] creation,
29. <i>ib-ni^d nin-ildú^d nin-simug u^d a-ra-zu ana mu-šak-lil šī-pi na[b-ni-ti-ki]</i>	He created Ninildu, Ninsimug and Arazu to be those who perform the task of [your creation],
30. <i>ib-ni ša-dī-i ù ta-ma-a-ti ana mim-ma šum-šu₁₄ du-u[š-šá-a]</i>	He created mountains and seas to make all things [abound],
31. <i>ib-ni^d guškin-bàn-da^d nin-á-gal ^dnin-zadim u^d nin-kur-ra ana ep-še-t[i-ki]</i>	He created Guškinbanda, Ninagal, Ninzadim and Ninkurra to [... your] rituals
32. <i>ù ḥi-šib-šu-nu du-uš-šá-a ana nin-da-bé-ki ra-bu-ti x [...]</i>	and to make their wealth abound for your great food-offerings [...]
33. <i>ib-ni^d aš-na-an^d la-ḥar^d siris (ŠIM) ^dnin-giš-zi-da^d nin-šar^d a-da[g ...]</i>	He created Ašnan, Laḥar, Siris, Ningišzida, Ninšar and Ada[g...]
34. <i>ana mu-deš-šu-ú sa-at-[tuk-ki-ki]</i>	to be those who supply in abundance [your] regular offerings,
35. <i>ib-ni^d umun-mu-ta-àm-gu₇ ^dumun-mu-ta-àm-nag ana mu-kil nin-da-[bé-ki ra-bu-ti]</i>	He created Umunmutamgu and Umunmutamnag, who maintain [your great] food-offerings,
36. <i>ib-ni^d kù-sù šānga(GA.MÁxSIG₇)-maḥ</i>	He created Kusu, chief purification priestess of the great

⁵¹⁰ Lambert 2013: 380-381, with slight emendation to the translation of lines 29 and 36 (Ninsimug for NinSIMUG; priestess for priest).

ilāni^{meš} rabûti^{meš} ana mu-šak-lil gods, to be the performer of your rites [...]
par-ši-ki x [...]

37. [*i*]b-ni šarra ana za-ni-nu [...] He created the king to be the provisioner of [...]
 38. [*ib-n*]i a-me-lu-ti ana i-tab-bu-l[u ...] He created mankind to bear [...]

The gods listed here, excluding Kulla who has responsibility for bricks,⁵¹¹ are exactly equivalent to those discussed so far. Ninildu, Ninsimug, Guškinbanda, Ninagal, Ninzadim and Ninkurra are the craftsmen gods. As the name is otherwise unattested, Lambert reads NinSIMUG and points out that the similar ^dSIMUG is read ^dNinagal, a fact he considers problematic due to the close proximity of the two.⁵¹² The name means ‘Lord Smith’, and while this is also Ninagal’s role, the duplication is not unduly troubling. Ninsimug is grouped together with Ninildu and Arazu as a creator of the brick, while Ninagal is grouped together with gods who provide luxurious resources. The two are performing different types of metalwork, and therefore must either represent different gods or different names of the same god. In either case, it was necessary for the sense of the text to include a smith god in both groups, and the method used avoids unnecessary repetition. The reverse of the tablet muddies the waters somewhat by listing Guškinbanda, Ninsimug, Ninzadim and Ninkurra, in which list we should expect Ninagal. While we might expect slightly greater standards of consistency, the two names are evidently interchangeable and, considering the polynomialism inherent in Mesopotamian religion, this should not be a cause for concern. As such, we read Ninsimug.

Arazu is otherwise known only in a set of incantations designed to exorcise Kulla from a house once it was built.⁵¹³ Lambert argues that this is an unusual spelling of Amarazu, a daughter of Sîn,⁵¹⁴ but this is not certain. Regardless, in both the current text and the exorcistic incantation, the context in which the name occurs makes clear that it represents a craftsman deity. In light of the fact that carpentry and metalwork are already represented in the guises of Ninildu and Ninsimug, we might assume that Arazu has a special responsibility to those working with clay.

Lahar is a sheep god and, according to the Theogony of Dunnu, the son of Šakkan.⁵¹⁵ In the Sumerian Debate between Sheep and Grain,⁵¹⁶ Lahar and Ašnan (Sum. U₈ and Ezinu) are paired, arguing about which of them is most important. Ada[g... is known otherwise only from a small fragment, apparently in Istanbul but currently lost, which was copied by Geers.⁵¹⁷ This fragment also names Lahar, Ašnan and Ninšar, but is otherwise too broken to be of much use. The two gods Umunmutamgu and Umunmutamnag, whose names mean ‘What has my lord eaten?’ and ‘What has my lord drunk?’ appear under the Akkadian equivalents *Minâ-īkul-bēlī* and *Minâ-ištī-bēlī* in An=Anum II 253-254,⁵¹⁸ where they are called MUHALDIM ‘cook’ and ŠIM ‘brewer’ of the Esagil respectively.

At this point it is instructive to return to our table:

⁵¹¹ Lambert 2013: 377.

⁵¹² Lambert 2013: 378.

⁵¹³ Ambos 2004: 94ff.

⁵¹⁴ Lambert 2013: 378.

⁵¹⁵ Lambert 2013: 393, 15.

⁵¹⁶ Alster and Vanstiphout 1987: 9-21; Black et al. 2004: 225-230

⁵¹⁷ Si. 902 or Si. 909. Lambert 2013: 379.

⁵¹⁸ Lambert Unpublished: II 253-254.

Table 8 – Feast Gods redux

	Muššu’u &c.	Gattung II	Brick incantation
Comfort	Girra	Fire and Craft gods	Craft gods
Meat providers	Šakkan	Ninšar	Lahar and Ninšar
<i>šangamahhu</i> /Grain	Kusu	Kusu	Kusu
Grain goddess	Ašnan	Nisaba (and Haya)	Ašnan
Brewer/cook	Siris	Siris/Tíbir	Siris, Umunmutamgu and Umunmutamnag
Snake god/Wine god	Ningišzida	Ninmada	Ningišzida

Apart from the slight expansion to the list in the brick incantation, the only notable difference is the absence of a fire god. This is easy to understand when we consider the purpose of each text. The brick incantation is concerned with the provision of a ritual meal – the comfort of the brick is not important provided the food offerings are complete and so fire is omitted. This is clear from the role given to Guškinbanda, Ninagal, Ninzadim and Ninkurra: ‘to make their wealth abound for your great food-offerings...’ These four are responsible for gold, metalwork, seals and precious stones respectively. Their products were valuable and could therefore be sold to provide food, but their intrinsic congeniality was not considered. Fire could not be sold for food and so is not relevant, though we are perhaps justified in imagining that cooked food offerings would be more appealing to the brick. The other two texts, however, are exorcistic and the gods involved are invoked to command the demons to leave. The gods of food will not support the demon if it remains, and neither will those responsible for the pleasant things in life – warmth from the fire gods, goods from the craftsmen.

The three texts are nonetheless clearly based along the same lines. Gattung II offers an expanded version of the Muššu’u list introduction of the craft gods, presumably due to their association with Girra and Kusu, and the exchange of Ninmada for Ningišzida. The fact that the grain goddess does not appear in the same place in the two lists is possibly further evidence that Gattung II has missed the point of the list. In *Muššu’u*, Kusu is playing the role of the grain goddess, and so is grouped with Ašnan. In Gattung II, she is chiefly playing the role of *šangamahhu*, and as such Nisaba need not be grouped with her so closely. This is not certain, however, and if the unilingual Sumerian version is accepted as evidence, the order of Gattung II was presumably settled much earlier than the Late Babylonian version might lead us to believe. The craft gods may have been simple embellishment, as would be expected in the switch from a one line list to a 25 line list. The separation of Kusu and Nisaba could be seen as no more than a stylistic decision, perhaps to allow the inclusion of Haya without interrupting the flow too much.

It is perhaps worth noting that several of the gods mentioned also appear together in the ‘Divine Directory’ of the Nippur Compendium.⁵¹⁹ While there are several groupings within this text, perhaps the most interesting in

⁵¹⁹ George 1992: 156-159.

this context is that in lines 15-16: ¹⁵Kusu, Urmah, Nuska, Ninimma, Šuzianna, ¹⁶Bēlet-šēri, The Sibittu, Bēl-āliya, Sirāš, Ningišzida.’ Urmah is a deified lion who shares a *šubtu* ‘seat’ with Šakkan in the É-šarra at Aššur: ur.máš.tūr ‘Pen of Lions and Wild Beasts.’⁵²⁰ Belet-šeri is a title of Geštinanna, wife of Ningišzida.⁵²¹ The idea behind this text is, however, different to that behind the lists discussed. The gods listed here are ten of *I4^{dm} ilū^{meš} bīt d^gu-la* ‘14 gods, the house of Gula’, presumably statues housed together in this specific temple. That said, however, this section of Gattung II has a Nippur-ish bent. Not only are the gods discussed found together in the Nippur compendium, but Enlil and Ninlil, chief god of Nippur and his wife, are found in lines 90-91. For our purposes, however, the important question is the role of Kusu. Irrespective of the original intent of the text, it is very likely that Kusu is a grain goddess in *Muššu’u* - her position in the list, between Šakkan and Ašnan, and the lack of any explanatory gloss labelling her the *šangamahhu* make it impossible, without reference to the other texts, to think of her as anything but the grain goddess. On the other hand, she is certainly *šangamahhu* in Gattung II and the brick incantation, as it is stated explicitly. On balance, though not absolutely clear-cut, these texts speak in favour of the identification of the two Kususes as a single goddess.

One further text offers information concerning the separation or identity of the two female Kususes.

The Mari god list presents two difficulties in understanding Kusu as a single goddess. Both forms of Kusu are mentioned in the list, but are separated by several lines. Moreover, the *šangamahhu* form is not spelt as we should expect:

40 ^dnammu
 41 ^dku-ús
 42 ^dšud.kù
 43 ^dx-[L]U/zu
 ...
 57 ^dnisaba
 58 ^dkù-[s]ù
 59 ^dNI[SABA-gal]

The separation of the two names is easily explained in the same way as their separation in An=Anum – the list is arranged on theological grounds, and therefore Nisaba and her avatars are kept apart from the section dealing with the rest of Enlil’s court.⁵²² The variant spelling in line 41 warrants further discussion. Lambert understands this as a phonetic spelling, and links it to a personal name from Old Babylonian Ur, *ku-ùs-ra-bi*.⁵²³ This is very likely correct in view of the evidence of the Old Babylonian Nippur recension of the lexical list DIRI=(w)atru:

11.30 [^d kù-sù	^d KÙ.SUD	<i>ku-us-sú</i>
11.31 [^d indagara _x	^d NÍNDAxAŠ	<i>in-da-ga-[r]a</i> ⁵²⁴

The purpose of DIRI=(w)atru was to elucidate difficult logograms – in particular, signs whose pronunciation and meaning could not be discerned by the sign form. In its canonical form, Diri featured four parallel subcolumns:

⁵²⁰ George 1992: 188-189, 31’ & 170, 31’; George 1993: 156, 1183.

⁵²¹ Lambert 1990: 299.

⁵²² Lambert 1985: 186 n.40-45.

⁵²³ Lambert 1985: 186; Ormsby 1972: 97, 23, 3.

⁵²⁴ Civil 2004: 38

1. Sumerian pronunciation
2. Logogram
3. Sign name
4. Akkadian translation

The Old Babylonian Nippur recension does not feature the third of these, and in the lines under consideration, the first is broken. We have restored it according to the sense of the line, though the actual signs may have been different. The presence of Indagar confirms the identity of this Kusu as the feminine form. The Akkadian translation *ku-us-sú* is therefore instructive. While it is not identical with the Mari form *ku-ús*, the emphasis on the u in the context of an Akkadian gloss to an unusual word must be understood as a guide to pronunciation.⁵²⁵ As the logogram in the second column is simply the common spelling *kù-sù*, we should understand the Mari form as an abbreviated version of the Akkadian pronunciation, and not as a different god.

The evidence is therefore, if not unequivocal, at least strongly suggestive. In the absence of any definite evidence to the contrary, and in light of the clues in the evidence just discussed, we can feel reasonably confident in identifying *šangamahhu* Kusu and grain Kusu as different aspects of one and the same goddess.

We must now investigate Kusu's connection with the *nignakku* 'censer.' Kusu's association with the censer is common in the ancient sources; it is often mentioned alongside her. A question remains, however, as to whether this constitutes the identification of Kusu as the numinous force within the censer, as Michalowski has implied,⁵²⁶ or simply pairs the goddess with her most notable object. The available evidence inclines heavily towards the latter. On a number of occasions it is certainly impossible that Kusu and the censer are understood as one and the same. Utukku Lemnutu 9 44⁵²⁷ is unfortunately broken, but enough survives of the line to be certain that Kusu cannot have been understood as the censer:

^dkù-sù sanga₆-mah ^den-líl-lá-ke₄ na-izi ʾnirʾ[...]
^dMIN šá-an-gam-ma-hu šá ^dMIN ina si-riq ʾqut-rin ʾna šá x [...]
 Kusu, šangamahhu-priest of Enlil, when sprinkling the incense of [...]⁵²⁸

Plainly, if Kusu were the censer she could hardly be said to be 'sprinkling' the incense. The verb *sarāqu* 'to sprinkle' is regularly used to describe the action of filling a censer with incense,⁵²⁹ and can scarcely apply to any action undertaken by the censer itself. In a similar vein, a *Mis Pi* incantation associates Kusu with the censer in a manner that cannot have been intended to conflate the two:⁵³⁰

[^d]kù-sù sanga₄-mah-[^d]ʾen-líl-lá-ke₄ ʾnig-n]a ʾgi-izi-lá ba-ni-fb-è
^dMIN MIN-hu ša ^dMIN MIN MIN-ú uš-bi-ʾu-ma
 Kusu the chief exorcist of Enlil swung the censer and the torch

If Kusu is intended to be understood as the censer this line is nonsensical – the censer cannot swing itself, and far less can it swing the torch. Moreover, this line associates Kusu equally with a second implement, the *gizillû*-

⁵²⁵ It is worth noting that the name is written *ku.ús.sù* in the Sumerian pest incantation discussed earlier (p.116, l. 14), and *ku-ús-sa* in an Old Babylonian incantation against scorpion sting (George 2016: 116, r. 3).

⁵²⁶ Michalowski 1985: 222 n.9. & Michalowski 1993: 159.

⁵²⁷ Geller 2016: 309.

⁵²⁸ After Geller 2016: 309.

⁵²⁹ See below, note 567

⁵³⁰ Walker and Dick 2001: 106 & 110 ll.27-28.

torch. This association is repeated elsewhere in *Mis Pi*.⁵³¹

^{89a} d_{kù}-sù sanga₆-mah₄ d_{en-líl-lá-ke} a-gúb-ba

^{89b} d_{MIN} MIN šá₄ d_{MIN} ina a-gub-bé-e

^{90a} ní-g-na gi-izi-lá šu-kù-ga-a-ni-ta sikil-bi

^{90b} NÍG.NA GI.IZI.LÁ ina ŠU^{II}-šú KÙ.MEŠ ul-lil

Kusu, the chief purification priest of Enlil, has purified it with a holy-water-basin, censer, and torch with her pure hands

While none of these instances absolutely preclude the identification of Kusu as the numen of the censer in other circumstances, they do offer a reasonable alternative which should not be rejected without good reason. Kusu is associated with the censer simply as a notable item. A comparable case can be seen in the incantation *Marduk bēl mātāti šalbābu rašubbu* ‘Marduk, lord of (all) the lands, raging, terrifying,’ one of a number of incantations required in an apotropaic anti-witchcraft ceremony for the *anḫullū*-plant published most fully by Abusch and Schwemer as CMAwR 8.28:⁵³²

⁸⁶ libbībūninni nignakku gizillū ša Girra u⁵³³ Kusu

May the censer (and) torch of Girra and Kusu cleanse me

Girra is a fire god, closely linked with Nuska, the torch god. As this line suggests, in order to fulfil his duties Girra possessed or at least used the torch but it would be wrong to say that he is its numen. This is clear from the use of šá ‘of’, but is emphasised by the content of a broken line from Utukku Lemnutu 9:⁵³⁴

d_{gibil}₆ gi-izi-lá izi izi-izi-k[e₄ ...]

d_{MIN} ina gi-izi-le-e i-šá-ti ‘gir’-[ri-nu-ri ...]

Girra, [applying] fire and flame to the torch [...]

As the fire god, it makes good sense for Girra to be lighting the torch. Likewise, the censer belongs to Kusu who uses it in her role as *šangamahḫu*. As these texts suggest, the two are regularly associated with one another, as well as with the *egubbū* ‘holy water vessel’, the numen of which is almost invariably the goddess Ningirrimma. This is known from many sources, but a single example from Utukku Lemnutu 9 will suffice:⁵³⁵

^{42a} d_{nin-girimma} nin ‘a-gúb’-[ba...]

^{42b} d_{MIN} be-let e-gup-pe-e el-lu x [...]

Ningirrimma mistress of the *egubbū*-vessel...

It is worth examining two apparent exceptions to this standard identification, however, as Lambert has recently presented them inaccurately.⁵³⁶ In Utukku Lemnutu 3 the goddess Nammu is given Ningirrimma’s usual title:⁵³⁷

^{175a} d_{nin-girimma} ‘nin’ d_{+e}[n-líl-lá-ke₄] ‘á’-zi-da-mu hé-‘gub’

^{175b} d_{MIN} a-hat d_{MIN} [ina im-ni]-ia li-iz-ziz

^{176a} d_{nammu} nin a-gúb-ba dadag-ga-ke₄ á-gùb-bu-mu hé-‘gub’

^{176b} d_{nammu} be-let A.GÚB.BA-e el-lu ina šu-me-li-ia li-iz-ziz

May Ningirrimma, sister of Enlil, be present on my right.

⁵³¹ Walker and Dick 2001: 143 & 151 ll.89-90. Walker and Dick read ‘his pure hands.’

⁵³² Schwemer and Abusch 2016: 243, l. 86.

⁵³³ This word is only present in one of the two manuscripts.

⁵³⁴ Geller 2016: 309.

⁵³⁵ Geller 2016: 309. Geller translates ‘lady of the pure censer’, but this is certainly incorrect.

⁵³⁶ Lambert 2013: 431-432.

⁵³⁷ After Geller 2016: 127.

May Nammu, mistress of the pure *egubbû*-vessel, be present on my left.

Geller reads m[u₇-mu₇-ke₄] in place of our ^d+e[n-líl-lá-ke₄] based on a duplicate text from Emar. The Emar tablet, however, as is common with material from the western periphery, frequently contains variants from the standard text. In this case, as is clear from the Akkadian translation of line 175b, we should expect the name of a god, specifically the brother of Ningirimma, rather than an epithet. Geller translates the Akkadian line as ‘sister of Anu’ in line 175, presumably following Lambert’s translation.⁵³⁸ Lambert’s version, based only on a single manuscript though another was certainly known to him as it was published in a book he edited,⁵³⁹ is due to a misreading of the second MIN sign as *a*-[*nim*], a mistake likely derived from Campbell’s Thompson’s erroneous copy in CT 16.⁵⁴⁰ Examination of a photograph of K. 224+⁵⁴¹ proves both m[u₇...] and *a*-[*nim*] to be incorrect. ^d+e[n...], while only slightly preserved, is a plausible reading for Geller’s m[u₇...] and has the added virtue of being attested elsewhere – Ningirimma is the sister of Enlil in both An=Anum⁵⁴² and in the unpublished Sumerian incantation, K.10111.⁵⁴³

Lambert argues that Nammu here is no more than a type of Ningirimma, though this seems unlikely as the two gods are supposedly standing on opposite sides – a fact omitted from Lambert’s version as the second half of each line is broken off in the manuscript he followed. It is more likely that Nammu, as a watery goddess, could be matched with the *egubbû* when Ningirimma was otherwise engaged. The two are also mentioned together in Gattung II⁵⁴⁴ and so were presumably thought of as being closely connected.

In An=Anum I the *egubbû* is not, as Lambert states, a name of Ningirimma, but a separate god. To argue this, Lambert follows Litke’s version:

^d nin-girimma	=	nin ^{a-hat} ^d en-líl-lá-ke ₄
^d a-gúb-ba	=	šu sukkal daddag-ga NUN ^{ki} -ga-ke ₄
Ningirimma	=	Sister of Enlil
Egubbû	=	The same (i.e. Ningirimma). Pure vizier of Eridu. ⁵⁴⁵

In his own unpublished edition, however he reads:

³³⁵ ^d nin.girimma (A.ĤA.KUD.DU)	=	nin ^{a-hat} ^d en.lil.lá.ke ₄
^{336a} ^d a.gúb.ba	=	šu.luḥ daddag.ga eridu ^{ki} .ga.ke ₄
^{336b}		<i>mu-ub-bi-ib</i> ṽ <i>šu-luḥ</i> ṽ <i>hi šá</i> eri ₄ .ṽ <i>du</i> ₁₀
³³⁷ ^d a.ta.e ₁₁ .dè	=	dam.bi.munus
Ningirimma	=	Sister of Enlil
Egubbû	=	Purifier of the <i>šuluhhu</i> -purification rites of Eridu
Ata’ede	=	His wife. ⁵⁴⁶

While the sign in question can be read as either SUKKAL or LUḤ, that the second of these is correct is certain both from the Akkadian translation in line 336b, and from the fact that Ata’ede is said to be the preceding god’s wife – impossible if Egubbû is simply a form of the female Ningirimma. The fact that the *egubbû* has a separate

⁵³⁸ Lambert 2013: 431. Lambert also translates ‘lady of the pure censer.’ It is incorrect here too.

⁵³⁹ Geller 2005: 136-141.

⁵⁴⁰ Campbell Thompson 1911: Pl. 7, l. 254.

⁵⁴¹ <http://cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P393797.jpg>

⁵⁴² Lambert Unpublished: I 335.

⁵⁴³ Lambert 2013: 432.

⁵⁴⁴ Ebeling 1953b: 384 1-6, but see Lambert 2013: 428 for a better version of these lines.

⁵⁴⁵ Lambert 2013: 432.

⁵⁴⁶ Lambert Unpublished: I 335-337.

entry in An=Anum, however, need not concern us – both the *nignakkû*-censer and the *gizilla*-torch are given their own entries in the text,⁵⁴⁷ the latter of which certainly has a specific numinous deity, Nusku.

Ningirimma's identification with the *egubbû* is germane to the discussion of Kusu because Kusu's connection to the *egubbû*-vessel is as strong as is her connection to the censer. Apart from the lines quoted above, three more instances are known to the writer, two from *Mīs Pī* and one from a version of the ritual for reskinning a kettledrum:

šipta egubbû ša dKusu u dNingirim

You recite the incantation: "Holy-water-vessel of Kusu and Ningirim."⁵⁴⁸

mê sebet egubbê tasâbma ina bît Kusu tukân

You draw water (for) seven holy-water-basins, and you place it in the chapel of Kusu.⁵⁴⁹

[2^{duḡ}] 'A'.GÚB.BA *a-na* dKÛ.SÛ u dNIN.GÌRIM (A.ĤA.KUD.DU) GUB-*an*

You will set up [2 holy water]-basins for Kusu and Ningirim.⁵⁵⁰

The first of these refers to an incantation that is not extant, though the last 4 lines are possibly preserved on STT 208 (+) 209.⁵⁵¹ As in the line from CMAwR 8.28 discussed above, the use of *ša* 'of' demonstrates that the text does not equate the *egubbû* with either goddess, but it does associate it equally with each of them. The second reference mentions the 'house of Kusu,' which is also known from elsewhere in *mīs pī*, and from the *bît rimki* 'House of Bathing' and *bît salā' mê* 'House of Sprinkling' rituals, as well as in other texts.⁵⁵² This is a small, temporary reed structure in which purification takes place, presumably through treating objects with incense, fire, water and incantations. The *egubbê* here are simply being prepared – Kusu's connection is minimal. The final reference belongs to the preparatory stages of the ritual for reskinning a kettledrum. Purification of everything involved is a very important element of this, and the *egubbê* are apparently set up for the use of Kusu and Ningirimma. That is to say the holy water vessels are to be utilised by the purification goddesses. Again, there is no suggestion here that either goddess is the numen of the *egubbû*, but nor is one more closely associated with it than the other. Were it not for the fact that many other texts equate Ningirimma and the basin, we would not be justified in identifying her as the numen of the *egubbû*.

The same reasoning should apply to Kusu's equation with the censer. There is no evidence whatsoever that Kusu was understood as the god of the *gizzilû*-torch or the *egubbû*-vessel – these were Nusku and Ningirimma respectively – but she is regularly mentioned in association with them both. Her connection with these implements is no slighter than is her association with the censer, and so we should understand all three as being connected to her in the same way. That the three deities Kusu, Girra and Ningirimma⁵⁵³ are regularly spoken of together is not surprising – all three purify by means of the implements they possess without necessarily becoming a shorthand reference for the items themselves.

The most logical conclusion we can come to is that as *šangamahhu* 'Chief Purification Priest' of Enlil, Kusu role required all three implements. The ritual instructions at the end of the anti-witchcraft ceremony mentioned

⁵⁴⁷ Lambert Unpublished: II 322-323.

⁵⁴⁸ Walker and Dick 2001: 56, l. 44. Nineveh Ritual text.

⁵⁴⁹ Walker and Dick 2001: 74 & 78, l. 15. Babylonian Ritual text.

⁵⁵⁰ Linssen 2004:252 & 256, l. 16.

⁵⁵¹ Walker and Dick 2001: 109, l. x+1-x+6.

⁵⁵² e.g. van Dijk, Goetze & Hussey: 1985.

⁵⁵³ These 3 or a subset of them appear together 7 times in *Mīs Pī* (Walker and Dick 2001: 53, 11; 60, 105; 64, 146; 67, 202; 75&79, 27; 76&81, 58; 149, 43), twice in Esarhaddon's royal inscriptions (Leichty 2011: 137, 49'; 324, 9'-10') twice in the consecration rituals for a priest of Enlil (Borger 1973: 169 & 173, ll. III 17'-20'; 170 & 174, ll. IV 21-22), and once in a Namburbi incantation (Caplice 1967a: 19 & 20, 12. Caplice reads Kubu for Kusu). This is not an exhaustive list.

above provide a good example of this. The officiant is instructed as follows:

¹¹⁴*kīma annā ana muḥḥi anḥulli taqtabû* ¹¹⁵*ina kišādīšu tašakkan ana libbi šamni ša ina napšalti taskarinni šaknu* ¹¹⁶*ÉN ezzēta šalāšīšu tamannū-ma kayyān taptannaššaš* ¹¹⁷*ina ūmēšu-ma egubbâ nignakka gizillâ tušba' šu-ma* ¹¹⁸*ila usalla utnēnšu mimma lemnu ul iḥḥēšu* ¹¹⁹*šumšu ana damiqti izzakkar*

¹¹⁴As soon as you have spoken this over the *anḥullu*-necklace, ¹¹⁵you put it around his neck. ¹¹⁶You recite the incantation “You are furious” three times ¹¹⁵over the oil that is in the boxwood bowl ¹¹⁶and you rub him repeatedly (with it). ¹¹⁷At the appropriate time, you move the holy water vessel, ⁵⁵⁴censer (and) torch past him, and ¹¹⁸he will appeal to (his) god and pray to him. No evil will approach him; ¹¹⁹he will be spoken of with favour. ⁵⁵⁵

Ignoring the specifics, this exactly mirrors Kusu’s behaviour in *Mis Pî* discussed above – the priest moves the basin, torch and censer past the patient. This is coupled with the recitation of incantations, which, as another *Mis Pî* incantation demonstrates, were also part of Kusu’s repertoire:

²⁹ ^dkù-sù sanga₄-maḥ₄-^den-líl-lá-ke₄ gi-ùri-gal ḥé-x
³⁰ [ka-inim-m]a mu-un-dù-dù nam-šub [ba-an-sum]
³¹ [mu]-un-sikil-la mu-un-dadag-ga
²⁹ May Kusu, the chief exorcist of Enlil, ... the *urigallu*-reed-structure.
³⁰ She will perform the [incantatio]n, recite the conjuration,
³¹ purify and cleanse (the *urigallu*-reed-structure) ⁵⁵⁶

This roughly précises the activity of the ritual instructions in the previous quote – recite incantations, purify and cleanse. This is Kusu’s sphere of activity and in her performance there is no reason to assume that she takes on the guise of the censer, any more than she takes on the guise of the torch, the *egubbû* or the incantations.

There is a strong argument, then, that Kusu and the censer are distinct entities. There are, however, two texts which appear to contradict this. The first of these is relatively straightforward. It is an esoteric commentary to a ritual for curing a sick man: ⁵⁵⁷

nignakku (níg.na) *gizillû* (gi.izi.lá) *šá ina bīt* ^{lú}*marši šak-ni*
:*nignakku* (níg.na) ^d*kù-sù gizillû* (gi.izi.lá) ^d*nusku*

The censor ^{sic} and torch placed in the house of the sick man.

:The censor ^{sic} is Kusu. The torch is Nusku. ⁵⁵⁸

The purpose of this text is to provide a mythological explanation for a set of ritual practices which were carried out to treat an illness. The first line gives the ritual action, and the second provides a theological justification – in this case, a torch and censer were used as part of the ritual. They are identified with their gods – Kusu and Nusku. As has already been mentioned, Nusku is certainly the numen of the *gizillû*-torch and as such it is difficult to see how this text can be describing Kusu as anything other than the numen of the censer. The purpose of the text should be remembered, however. It is one of a group of very learned commentaries in which ‘there is usually in addition to the artificial connection between the items a genuine connection. The genuine

⁵⁵⁴ This is omitted from one manuscript.

⁵⁵⁵ Abusch and Schwemer 2016: 244, ll. 114-119.

⁵⁵⁶ Walker and Dick 2001: 92-93 & 95, ll. 29-31.

⁵⁵⁷ Livingstone 1986: 172, 8. Kusu is unnecessarily emended to Kušu in the following discussion (pp. 174 & 184). This is misleading as Kušu is a completely unrelated figure. He is one of the Asakku-demons, and equated with the scapegoat in CBS 6060, 48 (Livingstone 1986: 179, 48).

⁵⁵⁸ Livingstone 1986: 172-3, line 8.

connection is speculative, or arises from the basic meaning of the items... there are genuine connections between the myths and rituals associated in the present texts, as well as the artificial connection based on symbolism.⁵⁵⁹ This provides a reasonable explanation for the text – Kusu is associated with the censer elsewhere and so, when trying to find a mythological parallel for its use in the ritual, the author fixed upon her.

The second text which appears to identify Kusu as the numen of the censer is the anti-locust incantation, *Zuburudabbeda* 17.⁵⁶⁰ This is not altogether straightforward, as it is necessary to examine several of the *Zuburudabbeda* texts before the meaning becomes clear. *Zuburudabbeda* 17 contains a prayer addressed to *belum* ^d*Kù* ^ʿ*[sù]* ‘Lord Kusu.’ In this incantation, Kusu is seated on a throne⁵⁶¹ and requested to guard a field against the privations of locusts and other pests. This is an unexpected role for Kusu – it does not seem to match any of the contexts in which we usually find the deity, and, more fundamentally, the sex of the deity is different. This apparent peculiarity is almost certainly due to the fragmentary state of the manuscript. Much of the beginning of the incantation, including the incipit, is lost, as is the context in which it is to be recited. The evidence of two further *Zuburudabbeda* incantations, 21 and 24,⁵⁶² offers a hint at the intention of the text. Neither of these texts is completely preserved, but enough survives that a logical idea of the situation can be gleaned. In text 24, the officiant is instructed to build a ‘house of Kusu’ *ina qabli* (murub₄) *eqli* (a.šà) ‘in the middle of the field.’⁵⁶³ He must then bury four cakes of *zidnušumnu*-flour at the corners of the house, set up a juniper censer facing the sun and libate *mihhu*-beer. At this point, according to George’s restoration, [*ana pān* (igi) *bīt* (é)] ^d*kù-su*₁₃ *nignak* (níg.na) *burāši* (li) *ana a-lu-lu ta-sār-raq* ‘sprinkle (incense) [before] Kusu’s [house] on the censer of juniper for Alulu.’⁵⁶⁴ We would prefer to restore [*ina muhhi* (ugu) *bīt* (é)] ^d*kù-su*₁₃ ‘on top of Kusu’s house’ or [*i-na ūr* (ūr) *bīt* (é)] ^d*kù-su*₁₃ ‘on the roof of Kusu’s house’ in line with the usage in incantation 21.⁵⁶⁵ Further, as demonstrated convincingly by Mayer,⁵⁶⁶ the rest of the line should be read *nignakka burāša ana alulu tasarraq* ‘you sprinkle the censer with juniper for Alulu.’⁵⁶⁷

The censuring is followed by another libation and the recitation of an incantation of Alulu, which does not concern us here. The next stage of the ritual opens with KIMIN ‘ditto’, presumably referring to the construction and preparation of the house of Kusu, after which the text is not completely intact. After some unclear action involving the presentation of four grubs to Kusu, an incantation addressed to a god is to be recited. The incipit of the incantation is lost, but as the action immediately preceding it involves Kusu and takes place *ina* ^ʿ*mu* ^ʿ*šī* ‘in the night’⁵⁶⁸ it seems plausible that the incantation to be recited is that discussed above, preserved in *Zuburudabbeda* 17. The incipit of this is also lost, but the ideas expressed in the text fit very closely with what we might expect. As mentioned above, in this incantation Kusu is seated on a throne and it is requested that he

⁵⁵⁹ Livingstone 1986: 169.

⁵⁶⁰ George & Taniguchi 2010: 103ff.

⁵⁶¹ George & Taniguchi 2010: 103-104, ll. 7-9. It should be noted that ‘throne’ here is restored.

⁵⁶² George & Taniguchi 2010: 116, 9-10 and 128, 8-9.

⁵⁶³ George & Taniguchi 2010: 128, 8.

⁵⁶⁴ George & Taniguchi 2010: 128 & 133, 11-12.

⁵⁶⁵ George & Taniguchi 2010: 116 & 117, 9’-10’

⁵⁶⁶ Mayer 1994: 114-115. Mayer has convincingly argued that the commonest variant of this expression, NÍG.NA ŠIM.LI GAR-*an*, ought to be normalized as *nignakka burāša tašakkan*, being a case in point of the verb *šakānu* with 2 acc. The variant of the expression as exemplified in this text is a corner-stone of his hypothesis.

⁵⁶⁷ My thanks to Henry Stadhouders for bringing Mayer’s note to my attention.

⁵⁶⁸ George & Taniguchi 2010: 128 & 133, 14-15.

I maššarat (en.nun) [*mūši* (gi₆)? *ti-šab-ma*?] ‘[sit there] for one watch [of the night³].’⁵⁶⁹ There follows a graphic description of the action that the god should take when the ‘great dogs [of Ninkilim]’⁵⁷⁰ (i.e. locusts and other pests) arrive. He is instructed to

‘¹⁰ Seize their backsides and mount them! ¹¹ Drive them off and chase them away! ¹² Smite their skulls, turn them back! ¹³ May they not return by the way they go, ¹⁴ may they not come back by the road they take! ¹⁵ May they move with the wind, may they travel with the storm! ¹⁶ Seize their road and cut off their path! ¹⁷ Seize their teeth, seize their tongues, seize their weapons! ¹⁸ Seize them by the hand and take them away!’⁵⁷¹

After this, Kusu’s role in the rituals is over. The situation described, insofar as it is germane to our focus, is therefore as follows:

A structure is set up in the middle of a field, on which is placed a censer. In the censer juniper and cedar are burned, and Kusu is incited to chase away pests through the night.

Censing is usually intended to purify, by means of pleasant odour, whatever it is applied to. In this case, however, we should not understand a simple purification ritual, but a practical attempt to rid the field of pests. Cedar and juniper contain an essential oil which is deadly to many insects. Pliny the Elder states that papyrus was often brushed with cedar oil to keep worms away, in the early modern era cedar blanket boxes were used to prevent moths from damaging fabrics, and cedar oil based pesticides are commonly used by modern gardeners to protect plants. When the wood is burned, the scent of the oil is carried in the smoke, which, while pleasing to humans, is repellent to insects. This is doubly effective as smoke, whether cedar scented or not, repels most insects and is a common method used by modern farmers to ward off swarms of locusts.⁵⁷² Perhaps more important, there is clear evidence that fumigation with juniper was used as a method to deal with locusts in a letter from a governor of Aššur, Ṭab-šilli-Ešarra, to Sargon II:

‘Write where the locusts have laid eggs! They shall fumigate (these areas) with juniper powder (*ZÌ du-[p]ur-a-[ni] ka-ṭi-ra*)! At the moment of their hatching they shall overthrow them!’⁵⁷³

This is evidently describing a slightly different action than our text, in that the juniper smoke is applied to the eggs rather than the swarm. The intention in the letter appears to be to have the eggs hatch – perhaps this hints at an effort towards capturing the live locusts, drowsy from the smoke, in order to eat them. In any case, it is clear that fumigation with juniper was used as a method to deal with insects in Mesopotamia. This provides the key to understanding Kusu’s role in the *Zuburudabbedā* texts.

The ‘house of Kusu’ was placed in the middle of the field, and then a censer of juniper and cedar was placed on top of it. It is likely that this as the action referred to in line 7’ of the Kusu invocation: ‘I seat you [on a throne

⁵⁶⁹ George & Taniguchi 2010: 103 & 104, 9’. The restoration is not mentioned in George’s commentary, but seems plausible from the point of view of sense. *Zuburudabbedā* incantations aim to stop infestation by field pests, many of which, notably locusts, generally travel at night.

⁵⁷⁰ George & Taniguchi 2010: 104, 8’.

⁵⁷¹ George & Taniguchi 2010: 104, 10’-18’.

⁵⁷² <http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2015/jan/27/madagascar-locusts-united-nations-food-agriculture-organisation>. Note the last picture especially.

⁵⁷³ SAA 103 II. 7-13, Radner 2003: 75.

otherwise occupied – here he was identified with gypsum, opposed to the Asakku-demon identified with bitumen. Uraš, however, is not mentioned in the text.

Livingstone suggests that Ninurta's equation 'may be connected with theories in which rites are explained by myths of the defeat of enemy gods, since Ninurta is the warrior god par excellence.'⁵⁸⁰ In the light of Kusu's role in the *Zuburudabbeda* texts, this also seems a reasonable explanation of Uraš's connection to the censer, which Livingstone left unexplained. Ninurta/Uraš as the warrior god who chases demons away is a logical identification as the deified censer, the purpose of which is precisely that. As such, we are perhaps justified in understanding the censer Kusu as a form of Ninurta, and therefore necessarily male.

The development of Kusu might be understood as follows:

1. An epithet of the grain goddess Ezina, ^{sb}PA.SIKIL, to be understood ^{sb}kusu or ^{su}kusu,⁵⁸¹ meaning something like 'spangled with shining purity.'
2. A grain goddess in her own right due to the deification of the epithet
3. A deity of purification owing to the connotations of her name
 - a. Female *šangamahhu* of Enlil, married to Indagar.
 - b. (Rarely) God of the censer, reinterpreted as masculine possibly due to the identity of Ninurta with the censer.

To summarise the preceding discussion, it is fairly clear, as has almost always been supposed, that there are two Kusus, one male and one female. The wrong aspect of Kusu has been marginalised, however. The grain goddess is, in all likelihood, simply another aspect of the *šangamahhu*. That is not to say that the grain goddess was the chief purification priest, per se, but rather that both roles were held by one and the same goddess. This can perhaps be more easily understood if we consider the analogous case of Ninurta, who was simultaneously the warrior god par excellence, and a god of farming and agriculture. Both roles were his, but the two were not enacted together.

Kusu's other role – the numen of the censer – is not, it seems, as important as has been thought. There is very little reason to believe that Kusu was generally understood to be the god of the censer. While occasional identification of Kusu as the deified censer is undeniable, this must have been very limited. The only texts that make the link either confuse Kusu's sex or are based on artificial symbolism. The evidence for Kusu's relationship with the *nignakku*-censer is much more readily understood as associating the goddess with her most notable tool, often together with the *gizillû*-torch and *egubbû*-basin, which were of equal utility in the performance of her purifying duties. As such, while there are technically two Kusus, we should almost certainly understand the female version to be intended wherever the name is used.

⁵⁸⁰ Livingstone 1986: 183.

⁵⁸¹ Michalowski 1993: 159.

Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to make the text of *Šurpu* more intelligible. By far the most significant step in this direction is the proposed reconstruction of the text discussed in the first chapter, in which, alongside sundry smaller details, it is demonstrated that an entire Tablet has been omitted from all previous editions of the text. Through reinstating this missing Tablet, it has been possible, for the first time, to get a good sense of the text as a whole. The knowledge that *Šurpu* is a four stage ritual not only adds substantially to the text of the series, but also allows an understanding of parts of the text that previously appeared meaningless, or at least highly repetitious. Thus, Tablets VII and X can now be appreciated as integral parts of a coherent text. This will doubtless continue to improve as additional fragments are discovered, but the argument presented in chapter one provides the first clear explanation of the logic of *Šurpu*.

From chapter two, the focus switches from the general to the particular. To this end, a new edition of Tablet IX in partitur, eclectic text and translation is presented. This new edition undoes several misconceptions about the nature of the text. It is demonstrated that the Tablet consists of a single long incantation and not a string of very short ones, improving our understanding not only of *Šurpu*, but of *Maqlû* and *Bīt Sala' Mé* as well. The ceremonies detailed in these and other ritual texts were evidently more extensive than they have been considered, and this will necessarily alter our understanding of the texts. In addition, a number of restorations are made which demonstrate the essential unity of the text, notably the litany phrase *liṭturūka liṣsurūka ašši gamlīya apaṭṭarakka apaššarakka*. The edition benefits from the inclusion of new manuscripts, including one new join made by the present writer.

The line-by-line commentary in chapter three and the excursus provides the first thorough attempt to explain a *Šurpu* Tablet. It is, in effect, a wide-ranging study of *realia*, in which an array of deities, plants, geographical features, social mores, and a host of other things are examined. Particularly notable elements of this study are the discussions of the gods Kusu and Erragal, which have unravelled the apparently conflicting picture presented in the ancient source material and enabled us to understand these deities as relatively clear cut figures, and the new interpretation of the word *māmītu*, which has facilitated a far clearer understanding of the concepts underlying the lists both here and in Tablet III.

The text of *Šurpu* is now substantially complete and can be understood as a coherent and logically consistent work. Tablet IX has been thoroughly examined and the vast majority of the difficulties it presents have been cleared up. While some problems remain with individual lines, and although the remaining Tablets have not yet been thoroughly investigated, the fundamental basis of the text is now clear and the groundwork has been laid for future research.

Bibliography

- Abusch, T. (2002) Mesopotamian Witchcraft (AMD 5), Leiden.
- Abusch, T. (2016): The Magical Ceremony *Maqlû* (AMD 10), Leiden.
- Abusch, T. & D. Schwemer (2011): Corpus of Mesopotamian Anti-witchcraft Rituals I (AMD 8/1), Leiden.
- Abusch, T. & D. Schwemer (2016): Corpus of Mesopotamian Anti-witchcraft Rituals II (AMD 8/2), Leiden.
- Alster, B. & H. L. J. Vanstiphout (1987): Lahar and Ashnan. Presentation and Analysis of a Sumerian Disputation. In: *Acta Sumerologica* 9. 1-43.
- Ambos, C. (2004): Mesopotamische Baurituale aus dem 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr., Dresden.
- Ambos, C. (2013): Der König im Gefängnis und das Neujahrsfest im Herbst, Dresden.
- Ankarloo, B. & S. Clark (2001): General Introduction. In: B. Ankarloo & S. Clark (eds.) *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Biblical and Pagan Societies*, Philadelphia, xi-xvii.
- Arnaud, D. (1987): Recherches au pays d'Aštata, Emar VI/4: Textes de la bibliothèque, transcriptions et traductions, Paris.
- Austin, J. L. (1962): *How to Do Things with Words*, Oxford.
- Baker, H. D. (2004): The Archive of the Nappāḫu Family (AfO Beiheft 30), Horn.
- Beaulieu, P-A. (2005): The God Amurru as Emblem of Ethnic and Cultural Identity. In: W. H. van Soldt (ed.) *Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia (48th RAI Proceedings)*, Leiden, 31-46.
- Beaulieu, P-A. (2014-2016): Ušur-awāssu. In: *RIA* 14, 511-512.
- Behrens, H. & J. Klein (1998-2000): Ninegalla. In: *RIA* 9, 342-347.
- Bezold, C. (1889): *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection I*, London.
- Bezold, C. (1891): *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection II*, London.
- Bezold, C. (1893): *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection III*, London.
- Bezold, C. (1896): *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection IV*, London.
- Bezold, C. (1899): *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection V*, London.
- Biot, M. (1974): *Lettres de Yaqqim Addu (ARMT 14)*, Paris.
- Black, J. et.al. (2004): *The Literature of Ancient Sumer*, Oxford.
- Boivin, O. (2016): On the Origin of the Goddess Ištar-of-the-Sealand, *Ayyabītu*. In: *NABU* 2016/1, 24-26.
- Böck, B. (2007): *Das Handbuch Muššu`u 'Einreibung'* (BPOA 3), Madrid
- Borger, R. (1970): Vier Grenzsteinkunden Merodachbaladans I. von Babylon, *AfO* 23, 1–26.
- Borger, R. (1973): Die Weihe eines Enlil-Priesters. In: *BiOr* 30, 163-176.
- Borger, R. (2000): *Šurpu* II, III, IV und VIII in "Partitur." In: A.R. George & I. L. Finkel (eds.) *Wisdom, Gods and Literature (FS Lambert)*, Winona Lake, 15-90.
- Borger, R. (2010): *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexicon, Second Edition (AOAT 305)*, Münster.
- Bottéro, J. (1976-1977): Rapports sur les conférences: antiquités assyro-babyloniennes. In: *AEPHE* 1976/7, 93-149.
- Çağırğan, G. & W. G. Lambert (1991-1993): The Late Babylonian Kislimu Ritual for Esagil. In: *JCS* 43, 89-106.
- Cagni, L. (1977): *The Poem of Erra (SANE 1/3)*, Malibu.
- Campbell Thompson, R. (1949): *A Dictionary of Assyrian Botany*, London.
- Caplice, R. (1967): Namburbi Texts in the British Museum II. In: *OrNS* 36, 1-38.

- Caplice, R. (1970): Namburbi Texts in the British Museum IV. In: OrNS 39, 111-151.
- Caplice, R. (1971): Namburbi Texts in the British Museum V. In: OrNS 40, 133-183.
- Cavigneaux, A. (1981): Textes scolaires du temple de Nabû ša harê, Bagdad.
- Cavigneaux, A. & F. al-Rawi (2002): Liturgies exorcistiques agraires (Textes de Tell Haddad IX). In: ZA 92, 1-59.
- Cavigneaux, A. & M. Krebernik (1998-2000a): Nin-BÀD-<bar?>-ra. In: RIA 9, 335.
- Cavigneaux, A. & M. Krebernik (1998-2000b): Ningublaga. In: RIA 9, 374-376.
- Cavigneaux, A. & M. Krebernik (1998-2000c): Nin-maš. In: RIA 9, 468-469.
- Cavigneaux, A. & M. Krebernik (1998-2000d): Nin-PIRIG. In: RIA 9, 481-483.
- Cavigneaux, A. & M. Krebernik (1998-2000e): Nin-šenšena. In: RIA 9, 487 .
- Cavigneaux, A. & M. Krebernik (1998-2000f): Nungal. In: RIA 9, 615-618.
- Cavigneaux, A., H. G. Güterbock & M. T. Roth (1985): The Series Erim-ḫuš = anantu and An-ta-gâl = saqû (MSL 17), Rome.
- Charles, M. P. (1990): Traditional Crop Husbandry in Southern Iraq 1900-1960 A.D. In: BSA 5, 47-64.
- Charpin, D. (1986): Le Clergé d'Ur au Siècle d'Hammurabi (HEO 22), Geneva
- Civil, M. (1969): The Series lú = ša and Related Texts (MSL 12), Rome
- Civil, M. (1971): Izi = išātu, Ká-gal = abullu and Níg-ga = makkūru (MSL 13), Rome.
- Civil, M. (1979): Ea A = nâqu, Aa A = nâqu with their Forerunners and Related Texts (MSL 14), Rome.
- Civil, M. (1987): Feeding Dumuzi's Sheep: The Lexicon as a Source of Literary Inspiration. In: F. Rochberg-Halton (ed.) Language, Literature and History (FS Reiner, AOS 67), New Haven, 37-55.
- Civil, M. (1991): Ur III Bureaucracy: Quantitative Aspects. In: M. Gibson & R. Biggs (eds.) The Organization of Power: Aspects of Bureaucracy in the Ancient Near East (SAOC 46), Chicago, 35-45.
- Civil, M. (1999): Of Reed Fences and Furrows. In: H. Klengel & J. Renger (eds.) Landwirtschaft im Alten Orient (BBVO 18), Berlin, 259-264.
- Civil, M. (2004): The Series DIRI = (w)atru (MSL 15), Rome.
- Clay, A. (1912): Personal Names from Cuneiform Inscriptions of the Cassite Period (YOSR 1), New Haven.
- Cohen, Y. (2013): Wisdom from the Late Bronze Age (WAW 29), Atlanta
- Conti, G. (1997): Incantation de l'eau bénite et de l'encensoir et textes connexes. In: MARI 8, 253-272.
- Craig, J. A. (1897) Assyrian and Babylonian Religious Texts, Vol. II, Leipzig.
- Dalla Francesca, M. R. (2016): Biodiversity, Conviviality and Herbs in the Mediterranean *Genus Loci*. In: D. F. Romagnolo & O. I. Selmin Mediterranean Diet: Dietary Guidelines and Impact on Health and Disease, New York, 229-238.
- Dalley, S. (2009): Babylonian Tablets from the First Sealand Dynasty in the Schøyen Collection (CUSAS 9), Bethesda.
- de Genouillac, H. (1923): Grande liste de noms divins sumériens, RA 20, 89-106.
- del Olmo Lete, G. (2005): Halma of Emar and GLMT of Ugarit: a 'Dark' Deity.' In: Kogan, L. et. al. (eds.) Memoriae Igor M. Diakonoff, Winona Lake, 47-59.
- Dharani, N. (2006): Field Guide to the Acacias of East Africa, Cape Town.
- Durand, J-M. (1987): Noms de dieux sumériens à Mari. In: NABU 1987, 7-8.
- Ebeling, E. (1919): Keilschrifttexte aus Assur Religiösen Inhalts, Leipzig.

- Ebeling, E. (1938): Enkurkur. In: RIA 3, 382.
- Ebeling, E. (1953a): Literarische Keilschrifttexte aus Assur, Berlin.
- Ebeling, E. (1953b): Sammlungen von Beschwörungsformeln. In: ArOr 21, 357-423.
- Falkenstein, A. (1931): Die Haupttypen der sumerischen Beschwörung (LSS NF 1), Leipzig.
- Farber, W. (1977): Beschwörungsrituale an Ištar und Dumuzi, Wiesbaden.
- Farber, W. (2014): Lamaštu (MC 18), Winona Lake.
- Foster, B. (2005): Before the Muses³, Bethesda.
- Frankena, R. (1960): Review of 'Erica Reiner, 1958, Šurpu.' In: BiOr 17, 172-174.
- Frayne, D. (1990): Old Babylonian Period (RIME 4), Toronto.
- Freedman, R. D. (1975): The Cuneiform Tablets in St. Louis, PhD Thesis, Columbia University.
- Freedman, S. (1998): If a City is Set on a Height I (OPSNKF 17), Philadelphia
- Gabbay, U. (2016): The Eršema Prayers of the First Millennium BC (HES 2), Wiesbaden.
- Gadd, C. J. & S. N. Kramer (1966): Ur Excavations Texts VI/2, London.
- Gantzer, M. (2011): The Emar Lexical Texts. Vol. 1-3, Maastricht.
- Gehlken, E. (2012): Weather Omens of *Enūma Anu Enlil* (CM 43), Leiden.
- Geller, M. J. (1980): The *Šurpu* Incantations and Lev. V.1-5. In: JSS 25, 181-191.
- Geller, M. J. (1990): Taboo in Mesopotamia: A Review Article. In: JCS 42, 105-117.
- Geller, M. J. (2000): Incipits and Rubrics. In: A.R. George & I. L. Finkel (eds.) *Wisdom, Gods and Literature* (FS Lambert), Winona Lake, 225-258.
- Geller, M. J. (2005): Documents of the Incantation Priest: *Utukku Lemnūtu*. In: I. Spar & W. G. Lambert (eds.) *Literary and Scholastic Texts of the First Millennium B.C.* (CTMMA 2), New York 134-154.
- Geller, M. J. (2007): Evil Demons: Canonical *Utukkkū Lemnūtu* Incantations (SAACT 5), Helsinki.
- Geller, M. J. (2016): Healing Magic and Evil Demons (BAM 8), Berlin.
- George, A. R. (1991): Babylonian Texts from the Folios of Sidney Smith: Part Two: Prognostic and Diagnostic Omens, Tablet I. In: RA 85, 137-167.
- George, A. R. (1992): Babylonian Topographical Texts (OLA 40), Leuven.
- George, A. R. (1993): House Most High (MesCiv. 5), Winona Lake.
- George, A. R. (2003): The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic. Vol. 1, Oxford.
- George, A. R. (2015a): On Babylonian Lavatories and Sewers. In: Iraq 77, 75-106.
- George, A. R. (2015b): The Gods Išum and Ḫendursanga: Night Watchmen and Street-lighting in Babylonia. In: JNES 74, 1-8.
- George, A. R. (2016): Mesopotamian Incantations and Related Texts in the Schøyen Collection (CUSAS 32), Bethesda.
- George, A. R. & J. Taniguchi (2010): The Dogs of Ninkilim Part 2: Babylonian Rituals to Counter Field Pests. In: Iraq 72, 79-148.
- Gesche, P. (2000): Schulunterricht in Babylonien, Münster.
- Goetze, A. (1947): Old Babylonian Omen Texts (YOS 10), New Haven.
- Gordon, E. I. (1967): The Meaning of the Ideogram ^dKASKALxKUR = "Underground Water-Course" and Its Significance for Bronze Age Historical Geography. In: JCS 21, 70-88.
- Grayson, A. K. (1975a): Two Fragmentary Assyrian Royal Inscriptions. In: Iraq 37, 69-74.

- Grayson, A. K. (1975b): *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, Locust Valley.
- Guest, E. (ed.) (1966): *Flora of Iraq I: Introduction*, Baghdad.
- Guest, E. & C.C. Townsend (eds.) (1974): *Flora of Iraq III: Leguminales*, Baghdad.
- Gurney, O. R. (1973): *Middle Babylonian Legal Texts and Other Documents (UET 7)*, London.
- Gurney, O. R. (1986): *Lexical Texts in the Ashmolean Museum*. In: M. Civil (ed.) *Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon Supplementary Series I (MSL SS I)*, Rome, 45-71.
- Gurney, O. R. (1989): *Literary and Miscellaneous Texts in the Ashmolean Museum (OECT 11)*, Oxford.
- Gurney, O. R. & J. Finkelstein (1957): *The Sultantepe Tablets, Vol. 1 (STT 1)*, London.
- Gurney, O. R. & B. Hulin (1964): *The Sultantepe Tablets, Vol. 2 (STT 2)*, London.
- Güterbock, H. G. (1951): *The Song of Ullikummi: Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth*, JCS 5, 135–161.
- Halévy, J. (1882): *Documents Religieux*, Paris.
- Hall, M.G. (1985): *A Study of the Sumerian Moon God, Nanna Suen*, PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- Heeßel, N. & F. al-Rawi (2003): *Tablets from the Sippar Library XII. A Medical Therapeutic Text*. In: *Iraq* 65, 221-239.
- Held, M. (1965): *Studies in Comparative Semitic Lexicography*. In: H. G. Güterbock & T. Jacobsen (eds.) *Studies in Honour of Benno Landsberger on his 75th Birthday (AS 16)*, Chicago, 395-405.
- Hoffner, H. A. (1998): *Hittite Myths (Second Edition) (SBL WAW 2)*, Atlanta.
- Horowitz, W. (2014): *The Three Stars Each: The Astrolabes and Related Texts (AfO Beiheft 33)*, Horn.
- Hrůša, I. (2010): *Die akkadische Synonymenliste *maliku* = *šarru* (AOAT 50)*, Münster.
- Hunger, H. (1976): *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk I (SpTU I)*, Berlin.
- Hunger, H. & Pingree, D. (1989): *Mul.Apin (AfO Beiheft 24)*, Horn.
- Ibrahim, K. M. H. A. Hosni & P. M. Peterson (2016): *Grasses of Egypt*, Washington.
- Jacobsen, T. (1987): *The Harps that Once... Sumerian Poetry in Translation*, New Haven.
- Jensen, P. (1884): *De Incantementorum Sumerico-Assyriorum Seriei Quae Dicitur *Šurbu* Tabula VI, I*. In: *ZK* 1, 279-322.
- Jensen, P. (1885a): *De Incantementorum Sumerico-Assyriorum Seriei Quae Dicitur *Šurbu* Tabula VI, II*. In: *ZK* 2, 15-61.
- Jensen, P. (1885b): *Nachträge zur Erklärung der Tafel *surbu* VI, I*. In: *ZK* 2 306-311
- Jensen, P. (1885c): *Nachträge zur Erklärung der Tafel *surbu* VI, II*. In: *ZK* 2 416-425.
- Jensen, P. (1886): *Nachträge zur Erklärung der Tafel *surbu* VI, III*. In: *ZA* 1, 52-68.
- Jiménez, E. (2016): K.1 on: <http://ccp.yale.edu/P237754>.
- Katz, D. (2004): *TMH NF* 3, no. 5. In: *NABU* 2004/2, 37.
- King, L. W. (1897): *Review of Zimmern, Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion*. In: *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 13, 142-148.
- King, L. W. (1898): *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum* 5 (CT 5), London.
- King, L. W. (1909): *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum* 25 (CT 25), London.
- King, L. W. (1910): *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum* 29 (CT 29), London.
- King, L. W. (1914): *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum, Supplement*, London.

- Knudsen, E. E. (1957): A Version of the Seventh Tablet of *Šurpu* from Nimrud. In: *Iraq* 19, 50-54.
- Koch, H. (1995): Theology and Worship in Elam and Achaemenid Iran. In: J. M. Sasson (ed.) *Civilisations of the Ancient Near East III*, New York, 1,959-1,971.
- Koch, J. (1993): Das Sternbild ^{mm}maš-tab-ba-tur-tur. In: H. D. Galter (eds.) *Die Rolle der Astronomie in den Kulturen Mesopotamiens*, Graz, 185-198.
- Koch, U. (2005): *Secrets of Extispicy (AOAT 326)*, Münster.
- Koch-Westenholz, U. (1995): *Mesopotamian Astrology (CNI 19)*, Copenhagen.
- Köcher, F. (1954): Zur zweiten und dritten Tafel der Beschwörungsserie *Šurpu*. In: *MIO* 2, 218-244.
- Köcher, F. (Unpublished): *Uruanna*.
- Konstantopoulos, G. (2015): *They Are Seven: Demons and Monsters in the Mesopotamian Textual and Artistic Tradition*, PhD Thesis, University of Michigan.
- Kramer, S. N. (1977): The Ur Excavations and Sumerian Literature. In: *Expedition Magazine* 20.1, Philadelphia, 41-47.
- Krebernik, M. (2003-2005a): Pabilsag(a). In: *RIA* 10, 160-169.
- Krebernik, M. (2003-2005b): ^dPalil (IGI.DU). In: *RIA* 10, 281.
- Krebernik, M. (2003-2005c): ^dPa(p)-niğara. In: *RIA* 10, 325-326.
- Krebernik, M. (2006-2008a): Qudma (Qudumu), Qadma. In: *RIA* 11, 190-191.
- Krebernik, M. (2006-2008b): Richtergott(heiten). In: *RIA* 11, 354-361.
- Krebernik, M. (2014): Ububu(l). In: *RIA* 14, 269.
- Krecher, J. (1966): *Sumerischer Kultlyrik*, Wiesbaden.
- Labat, R. (1976): *Manuel d'Épigraphie Akkadienne*, Paris.
- Laessøe, J. (1955): *Studies on the Assyrian Ritual and Series bīt rimki*, Copenhagen.
- Lambert, W. G. (1957-1970): Götterlisten. In *RIA* 3, 473-479.
- Lambert, W. G. (1959-1960): Two Notes on *Šurpu*. In: *AfO* 19, 122.
- Lambert, W. G. (1960): *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, Oxford.
- Lambert, W. G. (1966): Ancient Near Eastern Seals in Birmingham Collections. In: *Iraq* 28, 64-83.
- Lambert, W. G. (1969): The Reading of the God Name ^dKA.DI. In: *ZA* 59, 100-103.
- Lambert, W. G. (1971): The Converse Tablet: A Litany with Musical Instructions. In: H. Goedicke (ed.) *Near Eastern Studies in Honour of William Foxwell Albright (FS Albright)*, Baltimore, 335-354.
- Lambert, W. G. (1974): Dingir.šà.dib.ba Incantations. In: *JNES* 33, 267-322.
- Lambert, W. G. (1976–1980a): Išar-āliššu, Išar-kidiššu, Išar-mātiššu, Išar-NERiššu. In: *RIA* 5, 173.
- Lambert, W. G. (1976–1980b): Isimu (Us(u)mû). In: *RIA* 5, 179.
- Lambert, W. G. (1976–1980c): Ištarān. In: *RIA* 5, 211
- Lambert, W. G. (1980-1983): Laguda. In: *RIA* 6, 430-431.
- Lambert, W. G. (1985): A List of Gods' Names Found at Mari. In: J-M. Durand & J. R. Kupper (eds.) *Miscellanea Babylonica (FS Birot)*, Paris, 181-189.
- Lambert, W. G. (1987-1990a): Lugal-dimmer-ankia. In: *RIA* 7, 132-133.
- Lambert, W. G. (1987-1990b): Lulal/Lātarāk. In: *RIA* 7, 163-164.
- Lambert, W. G. (1987-1990c): Manzi'at/Mazzi'at/Mazzât/Mazzêt. In *RIA* 7, 344-346.
- Lambert, W. G. (1990a): A New Babylonian Descent to the Netherworld. In T. Abusch et al. (Eds.) *Lingering*

- over Words (FS Moran), Atlanta, 289-300.
- Lambert, W. G. (1990b): Tears of Ningišzida. In: NABU 1990/4, 105.
- Lambert, W. G. (1997): Sumerian Gods: Combining the Evidence of Texts and Art. In: I. L. Finkel & M. J. Geller (eds.) Sumerian Gods and their Representations (CM 7), Groningen.
- Lambert, W. G. (1999–2000): Literary Texts from Nimrud, AfO 46–47, 149–155.
- Lambert, W. G. (2007): An Exotic Babylonian God-List. In: M. Roth et. al. Studies Presented to Robert D. Biggs (AS 27), Chicago, 167-172.
- Lambert, W. G. (2009): Babylonian Oracle Questions (MC 13), Winona Lake.
- Lambert, W. G. (2013): Babylonian Creation Myths (MC 16), Winona Lake.
- Lambert, W. G. (Unpublished): An=Anum I, II, III and V.
- Lambert, W. G. & A. R. Millard (1969): *Atra-ḫasīs*, Oxford.
- Landsberger, B. & E. Reiner (1970): The Series *ḪAR.ra = hubullu* XVI, XVII, XIX (MSL 10), Rome.
- Langdon, S. (1913-1923): *Miscellanea Assyriaca* III. In: *Babyloniaca* 7, 93-99.
- Langdon, S. (1915): A Fragment of a Series of Ritualistic Prayers to Astral Deities in the Ceremonies of Divination. In: RA 12, 189-192.
- Langdon, S. (1931): Assyrian Syllabaries and Other Texts. In: RA 28, 117-141.
- Legrain, L. (1937): Business Documents of the Third Dynasty of Ur (UET 3), London/Pennsylvania.
- Leichty, E. (2011): The Royal Inscriptions of Esarhaddon, King of Assyria (680-669 BC) (RINAP 4), Winona Lake.
- Linssen, M. J. H. (2004): The Cults of Uruk and Babylon (CM 25), Leiden.
- Linssen, M. J. H. (2008): Unpublished Fragments from the Burning Ritual Series (*Šurpu*) in the British Museum. In: R. J. van der Spek (ed.) *Studies in Ancient Near Eastern World View and Society* (FS Stol), Bethesda, 47-52.
- Linton, D. (1976): The Series *Sag.gig.ga.meš* and Related Incantations, PhD Thesis, University of Birmingham.
- Litke, R. (1998): A Reconstruction of the Assyro-Babylonian God-Lists, *An : ^dA-nu-um* and *An : Anu ša amēli* (TBC 3), New Haven.
- Livingstone, A. (1986): *Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*, Oxford.
- Livingstone, A. (1999): The Magic of Time. In: T. Abusch & K. van der Toorn (eds.) *Mesopotamian Magic* (AMD 1), Groningen, 131-138.
- Lutz, H. F. (1919): *Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts* (PBS 1/2), Pennsylvania.
- Maekawa, K. (1990): Cultivation Methods in the Ur III Period. In: BSA 5, 115-145.
- Maul, S.M. (1994): *Zukunftsbewältigung: Eine Untersuchung altorientalischen Denkens anhand der babylonisch-assyrischen Löserituale (Namburbi)*, Mainz am Rhein.
- Maul, S. M. (2004): Lösung von Bann. In: M. Horstmanshoff & M. Stol (eds.) *Magic and Rationality in Ancient Near Eastern and Graeco-Roman Medicine* (SAM 27), Leiden, 79-96.
- Maul, S. M. & R. Strauß (2011): *Ritualbeschreibungen und Gebete I* (KAL 4), Wiesbaden.
- Mayer, W. (1994): Akkadische Lexikographie: "CAD" Š/1. In: OrNS 63, 111-120.
- McEwan, G. J. P. (1983): ^dMUŠ and Related Matters. In: OrNS 52, 215-229
- Meier, G. (1941-1944): Die Zweite Tafel der Serie *bīt mēseri*. In AfO 14, 140-152.

- Meissner, B. (1896)
- Meissner, B. (1903): Meluḫḫa. In: OLZ 6, 266-267.
- Michalowski, P. (1985): On Some Early Sumerian Magical Texts. In: OrNS 54, 216-225.
- Michalowski, P. (1987): Lisin. In: RIA 7, 32-33.
- Michalowski, P. (1998-2000): Nisaba A. In: RIA 9, 575-579.
- Michalowski, P. (1993): The Torch and the Censer. In: M. Cohen, D. Snell and D. Weisberg (eds.) *The Tablet and the Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo*, Bethesda, 152–162.
- Molina, M. & M. Such-Gutierrez (2004): On Terms for Cutting Plants and Noses in Ancient Sumer. In: JNES 63, 1-16.
- Murphy, D. J. (2008): A review of the classification of Acacia (Leguminosae, Mimosoideae). In: *Muelleria* 26/1, 10-26.
- Myhrman, D. W. (1911): *Babylonian Hymns and Prayers* (PBS 1/1), Pennsylvania.
- Ormsby, D. L. (1972): An Old Babylonian Business Archive of Historical Interest. In: JCS 24, 89-99.
- Oshima, T. (2011) *Babylonian Prayers to Marduk* (ORA 7), Tübingen.
- Panoyotov, S. (2013): A Copper Bell to Expel Demons? In: NABU 2013/3, 80-87.
- Parpola, S. & K. Watanabe (1988): *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths* (SAA 2), Helsinki.
- Pasiecznik, N. (2001): *The *Prosopis Juliflora-Prosopis Pallida* Complex: A Monograph*, Coventry.
- Paulus, S. (2014): *Die babylonischen Kudurru-Inschriften von der kassitischen bis zur frühneubabylonischen Zeit* (AOAT 51), Münster.
- Perry, E. G. (1907): *Hymnen und Gebete an Sin*, Leipzig.
- Peterson, J. (2009a): *Godlists from Old Babylonian Nippur in the University Museum, Philadelphia* (AOAT 362), Münster.
- Peterson, J. (2009b): A Sumerian Literary Fragment Involving the God Irḫan. In: NABU 2009/2, 51-52.
- Pinches, T. G. (1893): The New Version of the Creation Story. In: E. D. Morgan (ed.) *Transactions of the Ninth International Congress of Orientalists, Volume II*, London, 190-198.
- Pinches, T. G. (1904): Sapattu, the Babylonian Sabbath. In PSBA 26, 51-57.
- Pinches, T. G. (1926): Assyriological Trifles by a Handicapped Assyriologist. In: C. Adler & A. Ember (eds.) *Oriental Studies dedicated to Paul Haupt*, Baltimore.
- Pongratz-Leisten, B. (1994): Ina Šulmi Irub (BaF 16), Mainz.
- Radner, K. (2003): Ritual Locust Control in SAA 1 103. In: NABU 2003/3, 74-76.
- Rawlinson, H. C. & Norris, E. (1866): *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* (II R), London.
- Rawlinson, H. C. & Smith, G. (1875): *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* (IV R¹), London.
- Rawlinson, H. C. & Pinches, T. (1891): *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* (IV R²), London.
- Rawlinson, H. C. & Pinches, T. (1909): *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia* (VR), London.
- Reade, J. (1986): Introduction. In: E. Leichty, *Tablets from Sippar 1* (CBT 6), London, i-xxxvi.
- Reiner, E. (1956): Lipšur Litanies. In: JNES 15, 129-149
- Reiner, E. (1958): *Šurpu* (AfO Beiheft 11), Graz.
- Reiner, E. (1974): A Sumerian-Akkadian Hymn of Nanâ. In: JNES 33, 221-236
- Reiner, E. (1995): *Astral Magic in Babylonia* (TAPS 85/4), Philadelphia.
- Richter, T. (2014): Tutu. In: RIA 14, 241-242.

- Robson, E. (1999): *Mesopotamian Mathematics, 2100-1600 B.C.* (OECT 14), Oxford.
- Roth, M. T. (1997): *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor, Second Edition* (WAW 6), Atlanta.
- Rouault, O. (1979): *Les Documents Épigraphiques de la Troisième Saison*. In: SMS 2/7, 1-12.
- Sandowicz, M. (2012): *Oaths and Curses* (AOAT 398), Münster.
- Scheil, V. (1905): *Textes Élamites-Sémitiques* (MDP 6), Paris.
- Scheil, V. (1916): *Notules*. In: RA 16, 125-142.
- Schroeder, O. (1920): *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur Verschiedenen Inhalts* (KAV), Leipzig.
- Schuster-Brandis, A. (2008): *Steine als Schutz- und Heilmittel* (AOAT 46), Münster.
- Schwemer, D. (2007): *Abwehrzauber und Behexung*, Wiesbaden.
- Schwemer, D. (2008): *The Storm-Gods of the Ancient Near East: Summary, Synthesis and Recent Studies*. Part 2, JANER 8/1, 1-44.
- Scurlock, J. (2014): *Sourcebook for Ancient Mesopotamian Medicine* (WAW 36), Atlanta.
- Seux, M.-J. (1976): *Hymnes et prières aux dieux de Babylonie et d'Assyrie*, Paris.
- Sigrist, R. M. (1984): *Les *sattukku* dans l'Ešumeša durant la période d'Isin et Larsa* (BiMes 11), Malibu.
- Simons, F. (2016): *The God Alammuš^d LĀL / ^{d.mùš} LĀL*. In: NABU 2016/1, 8-10.
- Simons, F. (2017a): *Alammuš Redux*. In: NABU 2017/1, 8-13.
- Simons, F. (2017b): *A new join to the Hurro-Akkadian version of the Weidner God List from Emar* (Msk 74.108a + Msk 74.158k). In: AoF 44, 1-17²
- Sjöberg, Å. W. & E. Bergmann (1969): *The Collection of the Sumerian Temple Hymns*, Locust Valley.
- Smith, G. (1870): *Babylonian and Assyrian Libraries*. In: *The North British Review* 51/102, 161-169.
- Smith, S. A. (1887): *Miscellaneous Assyrian Texts of the British Museum*, Leipzig.
- Steinkeller, P. (1982): *The Mesopotamian God Kakka*. In: JNES 41, 289-294.
- Stol, M. (1979): *On Trees* (EOL 21), Leiden.
- Stol, M. (1988): *Old Babylonian Fields*. In: BSA 4, 173-188.
- Stol, M. (1993-1995): *Milch(produkte) A*. In: RIA 8, 189-200.
- Streck, M. P. (1983): *Kudurrus Schwur vor Muštēšir-Ḫabli*. In: ZA 83, 61-65.
- Streck, M. P. (2001a): *Ninurta/Ningirsu A*. In: RIA 9512-522.
- Streck, M. P. (2001b): *Nusku*. In: RIA 9, 629-633.
- Streck, M. P. (2014-2016): *Vegetationsgott(heiten) A I*. In: RIA 14, 531-532.
- Talbot, W. H. F. (1873): *On the Religious Beliefs of the Assyrians III*. In: *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeologists*, 2, 50-79.
- Tallqvist, K. (1905): *Neubabylonisches Namenbuch*, Helsinki.
- Thomsen, M. L. (2001): *Witchcraft and Magic in Ancient Mesopotamia*. In: B. Ankarloo & S. Clark (eds.) *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Biblical and Pagan Societies*, Philadelphia, 1-95.
- van Buren, E. D. (1934): *The God Nigizzida*. In: Iraq 1, 60-89.
- van der Toorn, K. (1985): *Sin and Sanction in Israel and Mesopotamia*, Maastricht.
- van Dijk, J. A. Goetze and M. I. Hussey (1985): *Early Mesopotamian Incantations and Rituals* (YOS 11), New Haven.
- Veldhuis, N. (1997): *Elementary Education at Nippur*, Groningen.
- von Weiher, E. (1983): *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk II* (SpTU 2), Mainz am Rhein.

- von Weiher, E. (1988): Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk III (SpTU 3), Mainz am Rhein.
- von Weiher, E. (1998): Uruk: Spätbabylonische Texte aus dem Planquadrat U. 18 (SpTU 5), Mainz am Rhein.
- Walker, C. & M. Dick (2001): The Induction of the Cult Image in Ancient Mesopotamia (SAALT 1), Helsinki.
- Wasserman, N. (2010): From the Notebook of a Professional Exorcist. In: D. Shehata et al (eds.) Von Göttern und Menschen (FS Groneberg, CM 41), Leiden, 329-350.
- Wee, J. Z. (2016): A Late Babylonian Astral Commentary on Marduk's Address to the Demons. In: JNES 75, 127-167.
- Weidner, E. (1924-1925): Altbabylonische Götterlisten. In: AfK (AfO) 2, 1-18 & 71-82.
- Weidner, E. (1945-1951): Ein neues Bruchstück der Serie *Šurpu* Tafel IV. In: AfO 15, 80.
- White, G., Self, M. & Blyth, S. (2013): Reed management handbook: Bringing reed beds to life – creating and managing reed beds for wildlife. Sandy.
- Wiggermann, F. A. M. (1981-1982): Exit Talim! Studies in Babylonian Demonology I. In: JEOL 27, 90-105.
- Wiggermann, F. A. M. (1989): Tišpak, His Seal and the Dragon Mušhuššu. In: O.M.C. Haex et al (eds.) To the Euphrates and Beyond: Archaeological Studies in Honour of Maurits N van Loon, Rotterdam, 117-133.
- Wiggermann, F. A. M. (1997): Transtigradian Snake Gods. In: I. L. Finkel & M. J. Geller (ed.), Sumerian Gods and their Representations (CM 7), Groningen, 33-55.
- Wiggermann, F. A. M. (1998-2000a): Nergal A. In: RIA 9, 215-223.
- Wiggermann, F. A. M. (1998-2000b): Nin-šubur. In: RIA 9, 490-500.
- Wiggermann, F. A. M. (1998-2000c): Nirah, Irhan. In: RIA 9, 570-574.
- Wiggermann, F. A. M. (2011-2012): Sumuqan. In: RIA 13, 308-309.
- Woods, C. (2004): The Sun-God Tablet of Nabû-Apla-Iddina Revisited. In: JCS 56, 23-104.
- Zimmern, H. (1896): Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion, Erste Lieferung, Leipzig.
- Zimmern, H. (1901): Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion, Leipzig.
- Zimmern, H. (1914): Zu den *Maqlû*, *Šurpu* und *Šuila* Beschwörungen. In: ZA 28, 67-74.
- Zimmern, H. (1915-1916): Zu den «Keilschrifttexten aus Assur Religiösen Inhalts». In: ZA 30, 184-229.