

THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE  
*of*  
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

ASSYRIOLOGICAL STUDIES

JOHN ALBERT WILSON  
*and*  
THOMAS GEORGE ALLEN  
*Editors*



GILGAMESH AND THE *HULUPPU*-TREE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

---

THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY  
NEW YORK

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
LONDON

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA  
TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO, FUKUOKA, SENDAI

THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LIMITED  
SHANGHAI

THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE *of* THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
ASSYRIOLOGICAL STUDIES, NO. 10

---

GILGAMESH AND THE *HULUPPU*-TREE  
A RECONSTRUCTED SUMERIAN TEXT

*By*

SAMUEL N. KRAMER



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PUBLISHED APRIL 1938

---

PRINTED IN GERMANY  
BY J. J. AUGUSTIN, GLÜCKSTADT-HAMBURG-NEW YORK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	ix
TEXT AND TRANSLATION .....	1
PROBLEMS IN THE TRANSLATION OF SUMERIAN .....	11
COMMENTARY ON THE GILGAMESH TEXT .....	31





## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- ABL* Harper, Robert Francis. Assyrian and Babylonian letters belonging to the Kouyunjik collection of the British Museum (14 vols.; London, 1892–1914).
- AJSL* American journal of Semitic languages and literatures (Chicago etc., 1884—).
- AO* Paris. Musée national du Louvre. Antiquités orientales. (Followed by catalogue number.)
- AOF* Archiv für Orientforschung (Berlin, 1923—).
- AS* Chicago. University. Oriental Institute. Assyriological studies (Chicago, 1931—).
- AS* No. 8 Kramer, Samuel N. The Sumerian prefix forms *be-* and *bi-* in the time of the earlier princes of Lagaš (1936).
- ASKT* Haupt, Paul. Akkadische und sumerische Keilschrifttexte (Leipzig, 1881–82).
- BE* Pennsylvania. University. The Babylonian expedition of the University of Pennsylvania. Series A: Cuneiform texts, ed. by H. V. Hilprecht (Philadelphia, 1893–1914). Volume VI, Part 2. Poebel, Arno. Babylonian legal and business documents . . . chiefly from Nippur (1909). Volume XXXI. Langdon, S. H. Historical and religious texts from the temple library of Nippur (1914).
- CT* British Museum. Cuneiform texts from Babylonian tablets, &c., in the British Museum (London, 1896—).
- DPr* Allotte de la Fuÿe, Maurice François. Documents présargoniques (3 vols.; Paris, 1908–20).
- GSG* Poebel, Arno. Grundzüge der sumerischen Grammatik (Rostock, 1923).
- HAV* Hilprecht anniversary volume (Leipzig, 1909).
- JAOS* American Oriental Society. Journal (Boston etc., 1849—).
- K* British Museum. Kouyunjik collection.
- MBI* Barton, George Aaron. Miscellaneous Babylonian inscriptions (New Haven, 1918—).
- OECT* Oxford editions of cuneiform inscriptions (London, 1923—). Volume I. Langdon, S. H. Sumerian and Semitic religious and historical texts (1923).
- OLZ* Orientalistische Literaturzeitung (Berlin, 1898–1908; Leipzig, 1909—).
- PBS* Pennsylvania. University. University Museum. Publications of the Babylonian section (Philadelphia, 1911—). Volume I, Part 2.

## ABBREVIATIONS

- Lutz, H. F. Selected Sumerian and Babylonian texts (1919). Volume IV, Part 1. Poebel, Arno. Historical texts (1914). Volume V. Poebel, Arno. Historical and grammatical texts (1914). Volume X, Part 1. Langdon, S. H. Sumerian epic of paradise, the flood and the fall of man (1915). Volume X, Part 2. Langdon, S. H. Sumerian liturgical texts (1917). Volume X, Part 3. Langdon, S. H. The epic of Gilgamish (1917). Volume X, Part 4. Langdon, S. H. Sumerian liturgies and psalms (1919).
- R** Rawlinson, Sir Henry. The cuneiform inscriptions of Western Asia (5 vols.; London, 1861-84).
- RA* Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale (Paris, 1884—).
- SAI* Meissner, Bruno. Seltene assyrische Ideogramme (Leipzig, 1910).
- SAK* Thureau-Dangin, François. Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königsinschriften (Leipzig, 1907).
- SBH* Reisner, G. A. Sumerisch-babylonische Hymnen nach Thontafeln griechischer Zeit (Berlin, 1896).
- SEM* Chiera, Edward. Sumerian epics and myths (Chicago, 1934).
- SRT* Chiera, Edward. Sumerian religious texts (Upland, Pa., 1924).
- TCL* Paris. Musée national du Louvre. Textes cunéiformes (Paris, 1910—). Volume VI. Thureau-Dangin, François. Tablettes d'Uruk à l'usage des prêtres du temple d'Anu au temps des Séleucides (1922). Volumes XV-XVI. Genouillac, Henri de. Textes religieux sumériens du Louvre (1930).
- U** Joint Expedition of the British Museum and of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania to Mesopotamia. Ur collection.
- VAS* Berlin. Staatliche Museen. Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler (Leipzig, 1907—). Heft 2 und 10. Zimmern, H. Sumerische Kultlieder aus altbabylonischer Zeit, 1. und 2. Reihe (1912).
- W-B** Oxford. University. Ashmolean Museum. H. Weld-Blundell collection.
- ZA* Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete (Leipzig, 1886—).

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The text of a Sumerian tablet from Ur containing part of a Gilgamesh epic which has recently been published in the *Revue d'assyriologie* (XX 127 ff.) has hitherto presented so many difficulties that the painstaking student has left it with a sense of having missed the very essence of the story, although it seems to tell of simple and concrete incidents in a style that is straightforward and direct. However, the recent publication of *SEM*, Nos. 21 and 22, which permit a more intelligent use than has hitherto been possible of two other partial duplicates (*HAV*, No. 12, and *SRT*, No. 39) known from earlier publications, enables us to reconstruct a text which not only intelligently motivates the incidents described in the first twenty-one lines of the Ur tablet, but also clarifies the more obscure and misunderstood lines in that passage. Dated approximately at 2000 B. C. and going back to copies that are no doubt a good deal earlier, this reconstructed poem, which very possibly gives us the origin of the term "weeping willow," presents the earliest known version of the "Slaying of the Dragon" myth. In brief, the contents are about as follows:

After heaven and earth had separated and man had been created; after Anu, Enlil, and Ereshkigal had taken charge of heaven, earth, and nether world; after Enki had set sail for the nether world and the sea had raged and foamed in honor of its lord; "on that day" a *huluppu*-tree (very likely a willow) which had been planted on the bank of the Euphrates and nourished by its waters was uprooted by the South Wind and carried off by the Euphrates. A goddess wandering along the bank seized the floating tree, and at the word of Anu and Enlil she brought it to Inanna's (i. e., Ishtar's) garden in Uruk. Inanna tended the tree carefully and lovingly, hoping to have made of its wood a throne and bed for herself.

After ten years had passed and the tree had matured, Inanna, to her chagrin, found herself unable to realize her hopes. For in the meantime a dragon had set up its nest at the base of the tree,

the Zu-bird had placed his young in its crown, and in its midst the demoness Lilith had built her house. But Gilgamesh, informed of Inanna's distress, rushes to her aid. Making light of his weighty armor, the giant slays the dragon with his huge bronze ax, seven talents and seven minas in weight. Thereupon the Zu-bird flees with his young to the mountain, while Lilith, terror-stricken, tears down her house and escapes to the desert. After Gilgamesh had uprooted the liberated tree, his followers, the men of Uruk, cut down its trunk and gave part of it to Inanna for her throne and bed. Of the remainder of the tree, Gilgamesh makes for himself the *pukku* and *mikkû*, two wooden objects of magic significance.

The reconstructed text follows:<sup>1</sup>

1. ....
2. mu-ri(?) .....
3. u(?) UL níG ..... -a-b[a]  
Aft[er] .....
4. .... níg-du<sub>7</sub>-e ..... dug<sub>4</sub>-ga-a-ba  
After .....
5. .... [ka]lam ..... -a-ba  
After .....

<sup>1</sup> The reconstruction is based on the following texts:

Lines	Text	Published as
1-56	A	<i>SEM</i> , No. 21 obv. and rev.
39-73	B	<i>SRT</i> , No. 39 obv. and rev. (ll. 57-61 of our text belong in the break between obv. and rev.).
55-72	C	<i>HAV</i> , No. 12 rev.
57-101	D	<i>SEM</i> , No. 22 rev. (obv.?) and obv. (rev.?) to l. 20.
64-80	E	<i>HAV</i> , No. 12 obv. (The remarkable fact that obv. and rev. of <i>HAV</i> , No. 12, duplicate each other [both use the eme-SAL dialect] remains as yet inexplicable.)
81-103	F	U 9364 obv. 1-23.
88-101	G	<i>BE XXXI</i> 55 obv. 1-15.

For the sake of consistency and because no thorough investigation of the problem has yet been made, all final consonants (except those of such words as *u<sub>4</sub>*, "day," and *ša*, "heart," for which the shorter transcription is more or less accepted by Assyriologists) are reproduced in the transliteration

6. . . . . šu-rin(?) -na(?) kalam-ma . . . . -ag-a-ba  
After . . . . . ,
7. [u<sub>4</sub> a]n-ki-ta ba-ra-bad-du-a-ba  
After [hea]ven had moved away from earth,
8. [ki]-an-[t]a ba-da-sur-r[i](!)-a-ba  
After [earth] had been separated [f]rom heaven,
9. [m]u(?) -nam-lú-GÁL.LU ba-gar-ra-a-ba  
After the [na]me(?) of mankind had been fixed,
10. u<sub>4</sub> an-ni an ba-an-DU-a-ba  
After Anu had carried off unto himself the heaven,
11. <sup>d</sup>en-líl-li ki ba-an-DU-a-ba  
After Enlil had carried off unto himself the earth,
12. <sup>d</sup>ereš-ki-gal-la kur-ra sag-rig<sub>7</sub>-ga-šè i[m]-ma-ab-rig<sub>7</sub>-a-ba  
After Ereshkigal had been presented(?) as a gift(?) to(?) the  
nether world,
13. ba-u<sub>5</sub>-a-ba ba-u<sub>5</sub>-a-ba  
After he had set sail, after he had set sail,
14. a-a kur-šè ba-u<sub>5</sub>-a-ba  
After the father for the nether world had set sail,
15. <sup>d</sup>en-ki kur-šè ba-u<sub>5</sub>-a-ba  
After Enki for the nether world had set sail,
16. lugal-ra tur-tur ba-da-an-ri  
For(?) the king the small ones stormed(?),
17. <sup>d</sup>en-ki-ra gal-gal ba-da-an-ri  
For(?) Enki the large ones stormed(?).

of the Sumerian, despite the numerous indications that even in the more or less artificial Sumerian of the early post-Sumerian period by no means all the final consonants were pronounced. The only exceptions are in connection with those verbal roots ending in a consonant which are characterized by the fact that they form their present-future from the reduplicated root, but only after the latter has completely given up its final consonant; wherever such present-future verbal forms are found in our text, the final consonant of the verbal root has not been transliterated.

It is also to be especially noted that the signs BI, GI, NI, etc. are transliterated bi, gi, ni, etc. despite the fact that we now have proof that they actually represent the syllables be, ge, ne, etc. Cf. the present writer's recent monograph, *AS* No. 8, dealing with this and related problems in Sumerian phonetics.

18. [tur-tu]r-bi na<sub>4</sub>-šu-kam  
Its [small o]nes, being . . . -stones,
19. [gal-gal-bi] na<sub>4</sub>-zi-ga(?)-ud(?)-da-a-kam  
[Its large ones,] being . . . -stones,
20. [úr-m]á-t[ur]-ri-[<sup>d</sup>]en-ki-ga-ke<sub>4</sub>  
At [the keel of the *tur*-]boat of Enki
21. [še-en-KA+LI-]na [u<sub>4</sub>]-du<sub>7</sub>-àm ì-šú-šú  
. . . like a raging storm fall.
22. lugal-ra a-[<sup>g18</sup>má]-sag-gá-ke<sub>4</sub>  
For the king the water at the head of the [boat]
23. ur-bar-ra-gim [ur] mu-na-kú-e  
Like a jackal devours(?);
24. <sup>d</sup>en-ki-ra a-[<sup>g18</sup>]má-egir-ra-ke<sub>4</sub>  
For Enki the water at the rear of the boat
25. [ur-m]aḥ-gim sag-giš im-ra-ra  
Like a [li]on strikes down.
26. [u<sub>4</sub>-bi-a gi]š-diš-àm <sup>g18</sup>ha-lu-úb-diš-àm giš-diš-àm  
[On that day] a tree, a *huluppu*-tree, a tree —
27. [gú-<sup>id</sup>bu]ranuna-kug-ga-ka dù-a-bi  
On the [bank of] the pure Euphrates it had been planted;
28. [<sup>id</sup>]buranuna a-na<sub>8</sub>-na<sub>8</sub>-da-bi  
[The E]uphrates (was) its drinking water —
29. [á <sup>tn</sup>]gàl-lu úr-ba mu-ni-sír pa-ba mu-ni-dar  
[Mightily(?)] the South Wind plucked at its base, tore at its  
crown;
30. [<sup>id</sup>bu]ranuna a im-ma-ni-ib-ra  
[The E]uphrates on(?) (its) waters carried it off.
31. [munus] enem-an-na-ta n[í-te-a DU]  
[A lady walking(?) in f]ear at the word of Anu,
32. enem-<sup>d</sup>en-líl-l[á-]ta n[í-te-a] DU  
Walking(?) [in f]ear at the word of Enlil,
33. giš šu-na mu-un-díb unuk<sup>ki</sup>-šè ba-ni-in-tu  
Seized the tree in her hand (and) brought it to Uruk:
34. kiri<sub>8</sub>-gi-[rin-kug]-<sup>d</sup>inanna-šè im-ma-ni-in-tu-ri-en  
“To pu[re] Inanna’s holy garden thou(?) shalt bring it.”
35. munus-e giš [šu-na-a] LI-bí-in-[du gir]-ni-ta bí-in-gub  
The lady ten[ded(?)] the tree [with her hand], she let it  
stand(?) at her [foot(?)];

36. mu[nus]-e giš [š]u-na-a LI-bí-in-[du gir-n]i-ta bí-in-gub(!)  
The la[dy] ten[ded(?)] the tree with her [ha]nd, she let it stand(?) at [her foot(?)].
37. me-na-àm <sup>giš</sup>gu-za-gi-rin ba-ni-[tuš-ù-dè]-en bí-in-dug<sub>4</sub>  
“When at last (shall I have) a holy throne that I may [sit] on it?” concerning it she said;
38. me-na-àm <sup>giš</sup>ná-gi-rin ba-ni-[ná-dè]-en bí-in-dug  
“When at last (shall I have) a holy bed that I may [lie] on it?” concerning it she said.
39. [g]iš ba-gur<sub>4</sub> sū-bi nu-mu-[un-da-d]ar<sup>2</sup>  
[The t]ree grew large, (but) she could(?) not cut off(?) its bark(?).
40. úr-bi-a muš-tu<sub>6</sub>(?)-nu-zu-e gùd im-ma-ni-ib-us  
At its base the snake who knows no charm(?) had set up for itself a nest,
41. pa-[bi-]a <sup>mušen d</sup>[IM-dugu]d<sup>mušen</sup>-dè amar im-ma-ni-ib-gar<sup>3</sup>  
In [its] crown the [Zu]-bird had placed (his) young,
42. šab-bi-a ki-sikil-lil-lá-ke<sub>4</sub> é im-ma-ni-ib-dù  
In its midst Lilith had built for herself a house.
43. ki-sikil gù-dè-dè šà-ḥúl-ḥúl  
The ever shouting(?) maid, the rejoicer of all hearts,
44. kug <sup>d</sup>inanna-ke<sub>4</sub> ír e-NE ba-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub>  
The pure Inanna, how(?) she weeps!
45. [u<sub>4</sub>-]zal-li-da an-úr-zalag-gi-da  
At the break of [day], as the horizon became light,
46. SIM(?) -u<sub>4</sub>-zal-li KA gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>-da  
.....
47. .... é(?) -nun-ta ..... a-ni  
.....
48. [munus(?)] ..... <sup>d</sup>inanna(?) -ke<sub>4</sub>  
[The lady(?)] .... Inanna(?)
49. [<sup>d</sup> <sup>giš</sup>gi(b)il-ga-mes(?)]-ra gù-mu-na-dé-e  
To Gilgamesh(?) speaks:

<sup>2</sup> B: nu-da-dar.<sup>3</sup> This line is omitted in A.

50. . . . [m]u(?)-ri-a [ka-na]-ág ba(?) . . . . .-ba  
 “ . . . . . ,
51. u<sub>4</sub> he-gál(?) -la ka-na-ág ba-e-zal-la-RI  
 After(?) the land had been saturated(?) with floodwaters(?),
52. u<sub>4</sub> an-ni an ba-an-ir-ra-ba  
 After Anu had carried off unto himself the heaven,
53. <sup>d</sup>[m]u-ul-lil-li(!)<sup>4</sup> ki ba-an-ir-ra-ba  
 After [En]lil had carried off unto himself the earth,
54. <sup>d</sup>er[eš]-ki(!)-gal(!)-la(!) kur-ra sag-rig<sub>7</sub>-ga-šè im-ma-ab-  
 rig<sub>7</sub>-[ga-ba]  
 [After Eresh]kigal had been presented(?) as a gift(?) to(?)  
 the nether world,
55. ba-u<sub>5</sub>-[a-ba ba-u<sub>5</sub>-a-ba]  
 [After he had] set sail, [after he had set sail],
56. a-a kur-š[è] ba-[u<sub>5</sub>-a-ba]  
 [After] the father [f]or the nether world [had set sail],
57. <sup>d</sup>am-an-ki kur-šè ba-u<sub>5</sub>-a-[ba]  
 [Af]ter Enki for the nether world had set sail,
58. ù-mu-un-ra tur-tur ba-an-da-[ri]  
 For(?) the lord the small ones [stormed(?)],
59. <sup>d</sup>am-an-ki-ra gal-gal ba-an-da-ri  
 For(?) Enki the large ones stormed(?).
60. tur-tur-bi na<sub>4</sub>-šu-k[am]  
 Its small ones, be[ing] . . . -stones,
61. gal-gal-bi na<sub>4</sub>-zi-ga(?)-ud(?)-da-[a-kam]  
 Its large ones, [being] . . . -stones,
62. úr-má-tur-ri<sup>5</sup>-<sup>d</sup>am-an-ki-ga-kam  
 At the keel of the *tur*-boat of Enki
63. še-en KA+LI-na u<sub>4</sub>-du<sub>7</sub>-àm ì-šú-šú  
 . . . like a raging storm fall.
64. ù-mu-un-ra a-má<sup>6</sup>-sag-gá-ke<sub>4</sub>  
 For the lord the water at the head of the boat
65. ur-bar-ra-gim ur mu-un-na-kú[-e]  
 Like a jackal devours(?);

<sup>4</sup> The -lá in A is certainly an error for -li in this case.

<sup>5</sup> B: úr-má-tur-ra.

<sup>6</sup> B and D add the determinative giš before -má.



66. <sup>d</sup>am-an-ki-ra a-má<sup>6</sup>-egir-ra-ke<sub>4</sub>  
For Enki the water at the rear of the boat
67. ur-maḥ-gim sag-giš im-ra-ra  
Like a lion strikes down.
68. u<sub>4</sub>-bi-a mu-ki-ta-àm <sup>g</sup>1<sup>8</sup>ḥa-lu-úb-k[i]-ta-[àm] <sup>g</sup>1<sup>8</sup>KU(?)  
ki-ta-à[m]<sup>7</sup>  
On that day a tree . . . ., a *huluppu*-tree . . . ., a tree . . . .—
69. gú <sup>id</sup>buranuna-kug-ga-ka dù-a-bi<sup>8</sup>  
On the bank of the pure Euphrates it had been planted;
70. <sup>id</sup>buranuna a-na<sub>8</sub>-na<sub>8</sub>-da-bi  
The Euphrates (was) its drinking water—
71. á gál-lú<sup>9</sup> úr-ba mu-ni-in-sír pa-ba mu-ni-in-dar<sup>10</sup>  
Mightily(?) the South Wind plucked at its base, tore at its  
crown;
72. <sup>id</sup>buranuna a im-ma-ni-ib-ra  
The Euphrates on(?) (its) waters carried it off.
73. nu-nuz e-ne-èṃ-an-na-ta ní-te-a DU  
(I), a lady walking(?) in fear at the word of Anu,
74. e-ne-èṃ-<sup>d</sup>mu-ul-líl-lá-ta ní-te-a DU  
Walking(?) in fear at the word of Enlil,
75. mu šu-mà mu-un-díb unuk<sup>ki</sup>-šè ba-ni-in-tu<sup>11</sup>  
Seized the tree in my hand (and) brought it to Uruk:
76. kiri<sub>6</sub>-gi-rin-kug-ga-ša-an-na-šè im-ma-ni-in-tu-ri<sup>12</sup>  
'To pure Inanna's holy garden thou(?) shalt bring it.'
77. nu-nuz-e<sup>13</sup> mu šu-na LI-bí-in-du<sup>14</sup> me-ri-ni-ta<sup>15</sup> bí-in-gub  
The lady tended(?) the tree with her hand, she let it stand(?)  
at her foot(?);

<sup>7</sup> B: u<sub>4</sub>-ba mu-ki-ta-àm <sup>g</sup>1<sup>8</sup>ḥa-lu-úb . . . . . ;  
D: . . . . . ta-àm <sup>g</sup>1<sup>8</sup>ḥa-lu-úb-diš-àm giš-diš-àm . . . . .

<sup>8</sup> D seems to read du-a-bi(!).

<sup>9</sup> B and D have the determinative tu<sub>15</sub> before gál-lú.

<sup>10</sup> D also probably reads mu-ni(!)-in-dar(!).

<sup>11</sup> D: ba-an-ni-tu.

<sup>12</sup> The end of the line in E, which is partly broken, undoubtedly read im-ma-ni-in-tu-ri-en.

<sup>13</sup> E: nu-nuz DU(?). Note that according to the duplicates ll. 15 and 16 of E should precede ll. 13 and 14.

78. <sup>d</sup>[ga]-ša(!)-an-na-ke<sub>4</sub>(?)<sup>13</sup> mu šu-na LI-bí-in-du<sup>14</sup> me-ri-ni-ta<sup>15</sup> bí-[in-gub]  
Inanna tended(?) the tree with her hand, she [let it stand(?)] at her foot(?).
79. me-na-àm<sup>16</sup> <sup>gi</sup>gu-za-gi-[rin] ba-ni-tuš-ù-dè-en<sup>17</sup> bí-[in-dug<sub>4</sub>]  
'When at last (shall I have) a [ho]ly throne that I may sit on it?' concerning it [she said];
80. me-na-àm<sup>16</sup> <sup>gi</sup>ná-gi-rin [ba-ni]-ná-dè-en<sup>17</sup> bí-in-dug<sub>4</sub>  
'When at last (shall I have) a holy bed that I may lie [on it]?' concerning it she said.
81. mu ba-gur<sub>4</sub> sū-bi nu-mu-un-da-dar<sup>18</sup>  
The tree grew large, but she could(?) not cut off(?) its bark(?).
82. úr-bi-a muš-tu<sub>6</sub>(?)-nu-zu-e gùd im-ma-ni-ib-us<sup>19</sup>  
At its base the snake who knows no charm(?) had set up for itself a nest,
83. pa-bi-a <sup>mušen</sup> <sup>d</sup>IM-dugud<sup>mušen</sup>-dè amar im-ma-ni-ib-gar  
In its crown the Zu-bird had placed (its) young,
84. šab-ba-bi-a<sup>20</sup> ki-sikil-líl-lá-ke<sub>4</sub> é im-ma-ni-ib-dù  
In its midst Lilith had built for herself a house.
85. ki-sikil gù-dè-dè šà-ḥul-ḥul  
The ever shouting(?) maid, the rejoicer of all hearts,
86. kug <sup>d</sup>ga-ša-an-an-na-DU<sup>21</sup> ír e-NE<sup>22</sup> ba-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub>  
The pure Inanna, how(?) she weeps!"
87. SAL+KU-a-ni inim in-na-an-dug<sub>4</sub>-ga<sup>23</sup>  
In the matter concerning which his sister had spoken to him,

<sup>14</sup> D: LI-bí-dug<sub>4</sub>.<sup>15</sup> D: gir-ni-ta.<sup>16</sup> D, despite the copy, probably also reads me-na-àm.<sup>17</sup> D omits the final -en.<sup>18</sup> D: la-ba-dar-dar. Note that D obv.(!) 1, which reads mu-5(?) àm mu-10(?)-[àm] ba-e-zal-la-DAR, is found in this text only.<sup>19</sup> The omission of -ma- in D (obv.[!] 3) is probably an oversight.<sup>20</sup> F: šab-ba-bi.<sup>21</sup> D: k[u]g-ga-[ša]-an(!)-na.<sup>22</sup> F: e-NE-NE.<sup>23</sup> D omits this entire line.

88. šeš-a-ni<sup>24</sup> ur-sag<sup>d</sup> gi(b)il-ga-mes inim-bi ba-dè-du<sup>25</sup>  
 In that matter her brother, the hero Gilgamesh, stood  
 by her.
89. tûg<sup>26</sup> íb-bà-ru ninnu-ma-an-àm<sup>27</sup> íb-ba-na<sup>28</sup> ba-kar<sup>29</sup>  
 Armor(?) (weighing) as much as fifty minas he fastened(?)  
 at his waist —
90. ninnu-ma-na-àm<sup>30</sup> ušù-gín ba-ši-in-ag  
 That which (weighed) as much as fifty minas he treated(?)  
 like(?) thirty shekels.
91. uruduḥa-zi-in-na-ni<sup>31</sup> ḥar-ra-an-na-ka-ni<sup>32</sup>  
 His bronze ax, his (ax) of the road,
92. imin-gú-imin-ma-na-ka-ni<sup>33</sup> šu-ni-a ba-an-díb  
 His (ax) of seven talents (and) seven minas, he seized in his  
 hand.
93. úr-bi-a muš-tu<sub>6</sub>(?)-nu-zu-e sag-giš ba-an-ra<sup>34</sup>  
 At its base he smote the snake who knows no charm(?);
94. pa-bi-a mušen<sup>d</sup> IM-dugud<sup>mušen</sup>-dè amar-bi šu-ba-an-ti  
 In its crown the Zu-bird took its young
95. ḥur-sag-šè ba-an-tu<sup>35</sup>  
 (And) brought it to the mountain;
96. šab-bi-a ki-sikil-líl-lá-ke<sub>4</sub> é im-ma-ni-in-zal<sup>36</sup>  
 In its midst Lilith destroyed her house

<sup>24</sup> Šeš-a-ni is omitted in D and F.

<sup>25</sup> F: ba-e-dè-du.

<sup>26</sup> The determinative is omitted in G.

<sup>27</sup> D and G insert the complex šà-ba after íb-ba-ru; G, however, omits the -ma-na- of ninnu-ma-na-àm, while it is possible that D omits the -àm of this complex.

<sup>28</sup> G: íb-ba-ni; does D read [íb]-ba-bi?

<sup>29</sup> D: ba-[an]-du; G: ba-an-dù.

<sup>30</sup> G: ninnu-àm.

<sup>31</sup> F: uruduḥa-....-an-na.

<sup>32</sup> F: ḥa-ra-an-ka-ni. Are the signs in D to be restored to ḥa-ra-an-na(!)-ka-ni?

<sup>33</sup> F: diš-gú-ninnu-ma-na-ka-ni.

<sup>34</sup> F: -ba-a-an-ra (or is it -ba-àm-ra?).

<sup>35</sup> F: ba-e-e<sub>11</sub>-dè.

<sup>36</sup> F: im-ma-ni-ib-za<sub>4</sub>-li-NE.

97. a-ri-a-ri-eš<sup>37</sup> šu-ba-an-kar-kar-ri<sup>38</sup>  
 (And) escapes to the desert places.
98. giš úr-ba mi-ni-in-sír pa-ba<sup>39</sup> mi-ni-in-dar<sup>40</sup>  
 The tree, he plucked at its base, he tore at its crown;
99. dumu-uru-na-mu-un-da-súg-eš-àm<sup>41</sup> pa<sup>42</sup> mu-un-ši-tar-ru-ne<sup>43</sup>  
 The sons of his city who had accompanied him cut down its crown.
100. kug-dinanna-ra gišgu-za-ni-šè mu-na-ab-sim-mu  
 Unto the pure Inanna for her throne he gives it,
101. gišná-ni-šè mu-na-ab-sim-mu  
 For her bed he gives it.
102. e-ne úr-bi gišellag-a-ni-šè ba-ab-dim-e  
 He, its base into his *pukku* he makes,
103. pa-bi giš[E.A]G-ma-ni-šè ba-ab-dim-e  
 Its crown into his *mikkû* he makes.

---

<sup>37</sup> F: e-ri . . . . a. Are the signs on D to be restored to . . . . ri-ri-éš; i. e., is the first part of the sign GA really the sign ÉŠ and its second part the sign ŠU, which belongs to the verbal form šu-ba-an-kar-[kar]-ri-eš?

<sup>38</sup> G: šu(!)-ba-an-kar-kar-ri-eš; D: šu(!)-ba-an-kar-kar-ri-eš (cf. preceding note).

<sup>39</sup> D: pa-bi.

<sup>40</sup> D: mu-[u]n-ni-dar; G: mi(!)-ni-in-dar.

<sup>41</sup> D: [mu-un-d]è-súg-eš-a; E: mu-un-dè-súg-eš-a.

<sup>42</sup> D and G add -bi after pa.

<sup>43</sup> D and G: ì-tar-ru-ne. G adds KA ba-an-sir-ri-ne.

## PROBLEMS IN THE TRANSLATION OF SUMERIAN

It cannot be too strongly stressed that the translation of those Sumerian texts for which no Akkadian translations or parallels have as yet been located is so complex a process and presents so many treacherous possibilities that unless the translator is cognizant of and alive to the intricacies involved and unless he fully realizes where the sources of error are most likely to be situated, so that he may guard against them, it is quite likely that the work will prove to be not only scientifically untrustworthy but positively harmful to those who for one reason or another may be compelled to utilize the results uncritically. Thus, to mention only a few of the difficulties, there is the major problem presented by those Sumerian words in any given text for which no Akkadian equivalents have yet been located, or whose Akkadian equivalents are themselves so little understood that they are of little help in determining the meanings of their Sumerian counterparts.

But frequently even the meanings of those Sumerian words for which we have intelligible Akkadian equivalents can be only vaguely apprehended, since much of the syllabary material which is the source of these equations is inherently inadequate for a more exact definition. When, for example, the syllabaries equate a Sumerian verbal root with an Akkadian verbal root, the latter very often does not represent the meaning of the given Sumerian root, bare and unmodified as it appears of necessity in that syllabary; it may, and frequently does, render the meaning of the Sumerian root only when the latter is qualified either by the thematic particle prefixed to it, or by an accompanying infix, or even by some substantive or noun complex which is so closely related to it grammatically that they form a sort of inseparable compound. Indeed, it is partly due to this inherent deficiency caused by the frequently misleading brevity of much of the syllabary material that we find so large a number of Akkadian equivalents for not a few Sumerian roots. These equivalents are by no means all synonyms; they are at times strikingly dissimilar

in meaning, since they frequently render, not the original root, but its meaning only after it has been modified in one way or another.

This brings us to another major difficulty, namely, which of the numerous equivalents known for any particular Sumerian word is to be employed in translating that word in a given Sumerian passage which has no Akkadian translation or parallel? If the translator starts with a definite bias as to the meaning of the passage, it will often enough be not too difficult to find an equivalent for the particular word involved which after a superficial examination can be made to fit the sense anticipated.

If to the difficulties involved in establishing the meaning of Sumerian words we add the problems raised by the fact that the principles of Sumerian grammar varied according to period and locality and that, moreover, the systems of orthography even at any one time or any one place were far from uniform, it will not surprise the reader to note how frequently, in the commentary which follows, the present writer has found it necessary not only to state the reasons which influenced him in choosing a particular transliteration and translation, but also to analyze and evaluate numerous other possibilities which a more profound insight into the extant material or the future discovery of additional material may prove to be the more valid.

In order to illustrate some of the problems hinted at in the preceding paragraphs, I shall proceed to give the transliteration and translation of U 9364 reverse, lines 57ff., whose grammatical construction, in spite of and, remarkably enough, even because of the fortunate existence of an Akkadian parallel text,<sup>44</sup> presents so many ambiguities that, unless the greatest care is exercised, numerous erroneous conclusions concerning Sumerian grammar may result.

In this connection the present writer deems it proper and even necessary to point out once again to students of Sumerian the invaluable character and complete dependability of the Sumerian

<sup>44</sup> Assyrian Gilgamesh Epic xii 9ff.; cf. Gadd's correction of the line numeration in Thompson's edition, where l. 10 is wrongly numbered as l. 14.

grammatical principles adduced and articulated by Poebel in his *Grundzüge der sumerischen Grammatik* and in his preceding and succeeding Sumerological contributions. What places these works on a plane entirely apart from attempts at Sumerian grammatical formulation made by other scholars is the fact that they present a collection of principles and laws organically integrated which if properly applied will satisfy completely any individual instance falling within their sphere of control. If, therefore, a translator of a Sumerian text should stumble upon an isolated example which seems to run counter to one of the Sumerian grammatical laws as formulated by Poebel, he must realize that, before any general conclusion is drawn from this isolated example whose contradictory evidence seems on the surface undeniable, a careful and profound re-examination of the problems raised is absolutely essential, since what this isolated case is contradicting is not just another isolated case but a principle based on numerous examples and one which, moreover, is so intertwined with related principles that all will be adversely affected in one way or another. Thus, to anticipate with an illustration: Because, in the text soon to follow, the Sumerian verbal form *ba-e-NE-ninni-dè-eš* corresponds to *ipahhuruka* and *ilammuka* in the Akkadian parallel text, the superficial conclusion has been drawn that the particle *-e-NE-*, with the reading *-e-ne-*, is the accusative pronominal infix for the second person singular. Now there is much that is still uncertain concerning the accusative personal elements, especially when the verbal form ends not with the verbal root but with a subject element (§§ 517<sup>45</sup>ff.), and any additional information concerning them would be most welcome. But what makes this conclusion uncertain a priori is the fact that a form *-ene-* should represent a *singular* second person pronominal element; this is against the system of pronominal elements used in the verbal form (§§ 447, 487, 491, 494, 517). And indeed, as will be shown below, *-e-NE-* is not an accusative personal element but a dimensional infix consisting of the second person singular pronominal element *-e* and the dimensional postposition *-da*, which became *-de* under the influence of vowel harmony (§ 509).

<sup>45</sup> All paragraph numbers refer to *GSG*.

The transliteration and translation of U 9364 reverse, lines 57-71, follow. However, in order that the reader may have a clearer view of the numerous differences in idiom between the Sumerian text and the parallel Akkadian version, each Sumerian line with its literal translation is followed by the corresponding Assyrian line with its literal translation.

57. túg-tán-tán-na-z[u na]-an-mu<sub>4</sub>-mu<sub>4</sub>  
 Thy clean garments [do not] put on,  
*šu-ba-ta za-ka-a [la tallab(b)iš]*  
 A clean garment [do not be clothed with],
58. GIR<sub>5</sub>-gim ši-ra-I].AN.UD-[d]è-eš  
 (Or) like a stranger they too will [cr]y out (?) against thee.  
*ki-ma ú-ba-ra-ta-ma ... ú-a .....*  
 (Or) surely as if thou wert a stranger .....
59. ìa-[dùg(?)<sup>d</sup>]-<sup>uk(?)</sup>bur-ra na-an-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub>  
 The [good(?)] oil of the *bûru*-vessel do not pour (over thyself),  
*ša-man bu-ú-ri ta-a-ba la tap-pa-ši-i[š]*  
 The good oil of the *bûru*-vessel do not be anointed with,
60. ir-sim-zu-šè ba-e-dè-[ni]nni-dè-eš  
 (Or) at thy smell they will [wa]lk round and round alongside  
 of thee.  
*a-na i-ri-ši-šu i-paḥ-ḥu-ru-ka*  
 (Or) at its smell they will gather about thee.
61. <sup>gi</sup>gešpu kur-ra nam-m[u-u]n(?)-sig-gi  
 A *tilpanu* into the nether world do not hurl,  
*til-pa-na a-na iršitim(KI<sup>ti</sup>m) la ta-na-suk*  
 A *tilpanu* into the nether world do not hurl,
62. lú-<sup>gi</sup>gešpu-ra-a ba-e-dè-[nin]ni-dè-eš  
 (Or) they (against whom) a *tilpanu* has been hurled will  
 [wal]k round and round alongside of thee.  
*ša i-na til-pa-na maḥ-šu i-lam-mu-ka*  
 (Or) they who have been struck down by a *tilpanu* will  
 surround thee.
63. <sup>gi</sup>[m]a-nu šu-za nam-mu-un-gá-gá  
 A staff in thy hand do not place(?),  
*sab-bi-tu ana qâtél(šU<sup>min</sup>)-ka la ta-na-áš-ši*  
 A staff unto thy hands do not lift,



64. gid[im ba(?)]-e-dè-ur<sub>4</sub>-ri-en  
 (Or) the spir[its] will tremble before thee.  
*e-dim-mu i-ar-ru-ru-ka*  
 (Or) the spirits will tremble before thee.
65. <sup>kuš</sup>e[-s]ir gîr-z[a] nam-mu-un-?  
 A s[and]al (or s[and]als) [at] thy foot (or feet) do not . . . .,  
*še-e-ni a-na* (var.: *ina*) *šêpê(GÎR<sup>min</sup>)-ka la ta-še-ni*  
 Sandals at thy feet do not fasten,
66. kur-ra gù nam-mu-un-gá-gá  
 In the nether world do not make a sound;  
*ri-ig-ma a-na* (var.: *ina*) *iršitim(KI<sup>tim</sup>) la ta-šak-kan*  
 A sound in the nether world do not make;
67. dam-ki-aga-zu NE na-an-su-ub-bi  
 Thy beloved wife do not press(?) on(?) the . . . (?),  
*aš-šat-ka ša ta-ram-mu la ta-na-šiq*  
 Thy wife whom thou lovest do not kiss,
68. dam-ḥul-gig-ga-zu níg nam-mu-un-ra-ra  
 At thy hated wife do not wield anything;  
*aš-šat-ka ša ta-zi-ru la ta-maḥ-ḥaš*  
 Thy wife whom thou hatest do not strike;
69. dumu-ki-aga-zu NE na-an-su-ub-bi  
 Thy beloved son do not press(?) on(?) the . . . (?),  
*ma-ra-ka ša ta-ram-mu la ta-na-šiq*  
 Thy son whom thou lovest do not kiss,
70. dumu-ḥul-gig-ga-zu níg nam-mu-un-ra-ra  
 At thy hated son do not wield anything;  
*ma-ra-ka ša ta-zi-ru la ta-maḥ-ḥaš*  
 Thy son whom thou hatest do not strike;
71. I.AN.UD kur-ra ba-e-díb-bi  
 (Or) a wail in the nether world will seize thee.  
*ta-zi-im-ti iršitim(KI<sup>tim</sup>) i-šab-bat-ka*  
 (Or) the wail of the nether world will seize thee.

This text represents all but the first three lines (too fragmentary to be utilized) of an address by Gilgamesh to Enkidu, who in a speech immediately preceding (ll. 51–53) has offered to descend to the nether world in order to recover the *pukku* and

*mikkû* which have fallen into the nether world. The speech of Enkidu in which he thus comforts Gilgamesh, who has been bewailing his loss, is preceded by an introductory line (l. 50) which reads: arad-da-ni <sup>d</sup>en-ki-du<sub>10</sub>-e gù-mu-un-na-dé-e, "Enkidu, his servant, speaks to him." It is because no such introductory line separates Enkidu's speech from that of Gilgamesh (the former ends with l. 53 and the latter begins with l. 54) that Gadd was led to assume that lines 54ff. continued Enkidu's address, although it is hardly intelligible why Enkidu should warn Gilgamesh to refrain from certain specific acts in going down to the nether world, when it is Enkidu who was to make the descent. Moreover, the Assyrian version, as Gadd so well notes, does have a line which separates the two speeches. However, this line, which begins with the word "Gilgamesh" (the remainder is broken away), is not a continuation of Enkidu's address to Gilgamesh, but is the line which introduces the answer of Gilgamesh; it should be restored (with Thompson) to a sentence which reads approximately as follows: <sup>d</sup>*gilgameš ana šašûma izakkara ana <sup>d</sup>enkidu ardišu*. Perhaps because the context was clear and obvious to the scribe of U 9364 he did not feel it necessary to indicate that Enkidu had stopped speaking and that Gilgamesh had begun; he therefore omitted the Sumerian counterpart of this line altogether. The introductory line to Enkidu's speech, on the other hand, was necessary, since Enkidu's presence was mentioned here for the first time in the entire text. If we now examine this speech line by line, we note as follows:

*Line 57.* — The Sumerian complex *túg-tán-tán-na-zu*, "thy clean garments," in which the idea of plurality is conveyed by the reduplication of the intransitive verbal adjective (§ 146), corresponds to the Akkadian *šubata zakâ*, which is singular and which, moreover, leaves the possessive pronoun *zu*, "thy," untranslated.

The verbal form *na-an-mu<sub>4</sub>-mu<sub>4</sub>* is to be analyzed grammatically as *na-(i-)n-mu<sub>4</sub>-mu<sub>4</sub>(-e(n))*, i. e., the negated precative of the second person singular introduced by the particle *na-*, which, like its positive counterpart, is combined with the present-future of the verbal form if the latter has an active-transitive meaning (§ 670). As the parentheses indicate, the thematic prefix *i-* is absorbed

by the preceding vowel of the particle *na-* (§ 538); the final *n* of the personal affix *-en* is dropped (§ 483); the initial vowel, *e*, of the same affix is absorbed by the preceding vowel of the root (§ 466). Note that the verb *mu<sub>4</sub>*, "to dress," forms its present-future not according to the usual scheme *i-LAL-en*, but belongs to that class of verbs which forms the present-future from the reduplicated root. The *n* which appears before the reduplicated root *mu<sub>4</sub>-mu<sub>4</sub>* is not, of course, the pronominal element of the third person singular which is prefixed to the root to form the preterit of the transitive verbal form; it is the causative transitive particle, which, especially in the present-future, appears even before verbal roots that in themselves have or seem to have a transitive meaning. Note that in the verbal form [*na*]-*an-mu<sub>4</sub>-mu<sub>4</sub>* our scribe omits the *n* of the second person singular affix *-en* but writes the causative particle *-n-*, although it too is a final consonant; compare the comment to *ba-ni-in-tu* on page 46. For the probability that the equivalent of *na-an-mu<sub>4</sub>-mu<sub>4</sub>*, an active verbal form, is to be restored in the Akkadian version as *la tallab(b)iš*, a *IV<sub>1</sub>* form, compare the present form *illabbiš*<sup>46</sup> and the imperative *la tappašiš* (l. 59). The *IV<sub>2</sub>* form in *ittalbiš* (var.: *ittalbiša*) *zakūtišu*,<sup>47</sup> on the other hand, is used in the preterit only. Note, however, that in the *Old Babylonian* version "he put on a garment" is *ilbaš libšam*;<sup>48</sup> like the Sumerian, it uses the *active* verbal form.

*Line 58.* — *GIR<sub>5</sub>-gim*, "like a stranger," has as its counterpart in the Akkadian version *kîma ubaratama*, "surely as if thou wert a stranger," or perhaps "as if thou too wert a stranger"; the latter probably corresponds not merely to the Sumerian substantive complex *GIR<sub>5</sub>-gim*, but, as will be shown immediately, includes part of that which the Sumerian idiom expresses in its verbal form *ši-ra-[I].AN.UD-[d]è-eš*, "they too will cry out against thee." If the restoration is correct, *ši-ra-I.AN.UD-dè-eš* is to be analyzed grammatically as *ši-(i-e-)ra-I.AN.UD-(e)d-eš*, i. e., the third person plural intransitive present-future introduced by the conjunc-

<sup>46</sup> *ABL*, No. 24 obv. 14; No. 956 rev. 4; etc.

<sup>47</sup> Assyrian Gilgamesh Epic vi 3.

<sup>48</sup> *PBS X*, Part 3, iii 26.

tive particle *ši-*, “likewise,” “too” (§ 406).<sup>49</sup> The latter is followed by the thematic prefix *i-*, which, as the parentheses indicate, is absorbed by the final *i* of *ši-*; the thematic prefix is followed by the dative infix of the second person singular, *-e-ra-*, whose initial vowel is also absorbed by the final vowel of *ši-*. As the grammatical transliteration indicates, *ši-ra-I.AN.UD-dè-eš*, if the restoration of the last sign but one proves correct, is a present-future of an intransitive verb which even in our post-Sumerian text forms its present-future stem, as was regularly the case with intransitive verbs in classical Sumerian, by adding the particle *-ed* to the root.<sup>50</sup> Unless, therefore, the short vowel *e* of the particle *-(e)d* was dropped as a result of syncope (cf. § 728a), which is not very likely, it must be assumed that the root represented by *I.AN.UD* ended in a vowel which absorbed the *e* of the particle *-ed*.<sup>51</sup> The subject of this verbal form as well as of *ba-e-dè-ninnì-dè-eš* of line 60 is undoubtedly either the denizens of the underworld as a whole or a particular group among them; it seems, however, to be unexpressed, unless there is some mention of it in the broken parts of lines 54–56.

*Line 59.* — The first half of the line is restored to *ìa-[dùg-<sup>d</sup>]<sup>uk</sup>-bur-ra* because (a) there seems to be room for a small sign between *NI* and the partly broken sign which follows, and since the Akkadian equivalent reads *šaman būri tāba* the word to be restored is *dùg*; (b) the partly broken sign after *NI* may have been *GA*, *BI*, or *DUK*; the last is the most likely in this case, since it is used regularly as a determinative before the sign *BUR* when the latter means “*būru*-vessel.” The entire complex *ìa-dùg-<sup>duk</sup>bur-ra* is probably a genitive construction and represents grammatically *ìa-dùg-<sup>duk</sup>bur-ra(-k)*; the *k*, being a final consonant, has been dropped by the scribe.

The verbal form *na-an-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub>*<sup>52</sup> is grammatically *na-(i)n-še<sub>8</sub>-*

<sup>49</sup> For the reading *ši-* instead of *igi-*, note that the conjunctive particle *ša-* seems to be merely a variant; cf. AO 17602 (*RA XXXII 90f.*) vii 19f.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Poebel in *AJSL* L 153.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. comment to *ba-e-dè-ninnì-dè-eš* on p. 22.

<sup>52</sup> At this period the sign *ERIN* has not yet been differentiated into the two signs *siki-nunnaku* and *siki-lammaku*.

še<sub>8</sub>(-e(n)), i. e., the negated precative of the second person singular introduced by the particle na-, which is combined with the present-future of the verbal form. The phonetic changes which caused the grammatical na-(i-)n-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub>(-e(n)) to become na-an-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub> are, as the parentheses indicate, as follows: the thematic prefix i- is absorbed by the preceding vowel of the particle na-; the final n of the personal affix -en is dropped; the initial e of the same affix is absorbed by the preceding root vowel. The n which appears before the reduplicated root še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub> is the causative transitive particle. The form na-an-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub>, therefore, is a perfect parallel to the form na-an-mu<sub>4</sub>-mu<sub>4</sub> of line 57. Moreover, like the root mu, "to dress," the root šeš, which is used in the compound ia—šeš, "to anoint," and in the compound ír—šeš, "to cry," forms its present-future not according to the usual scheme i-LAL-en, but belongs to that class of verbs which forms the present-future from the reduplicated root. However, if the verbal root ends in a consonant, this consonant is dropped and the root is treated as if it ended in a vowel (§ 446c). The present-future of the root šeš, therefore, is grammatically not i-šeš-en etc. but i-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub>-(e)n etc.<sup>53</sup>

The Sumerian form na-an-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub>, an active verbal form with the meaning "thou shalt not pour (oil over thyself)," corresponds to the Akkadian *la tappašiš*, "thou shalt not be anointed with," the IV<sub>1</sub> form of *pašášu*. Note, however, that in the Old Babylonian

<sup>53</sup> There is no difficulty in the fact that thus far only the longer form, šeš, not the shorter form, še<sub>8</sub>, is equated in the syllabaries with *pašášu*; the reasons for the preference of syllabaries, especially those of a late date, for equating the longer form of a Sumerian root with its Akkadian equivalent are discussed by the present writer in *Archiv orientální* VIII 24f. Note, moreover, that when it is equated with *bakú* the root is found written both in its longer form, šeš (*RA IX 77 ff.*), and in its shorter form, še<sub>8</sub> (Yale Syll. 182). It is especially important from the lexicographical angle to note that while the syllabaries equate both *pašášu* and *bakú* with the Sumerian root šeš, whose original meaning must have approximated "to cause to flow," in reality neither of these verbs is its equivalent; for the exact equations, which would read ia—šeš = *pašášu* and ír—šeš = *bakú*, have been contracted by the omission of the direct object. These two equations, therefore, furnish an excellent example of the treacherous character of some of the syllabary material and the dangers involved in utilizing it uncritically.

version "he anointed himself with oil" is *šamnam iptāšaš*;<sup>54</sup> compare the comment to na-an-mu<sub>4</sub>-mu<sub>4</sub> (l. 57).

*Line 60.* — The phrase ir-sim-zu-šè, "at thy smell," corresponds to the Akkadian *ana irišišu*, "at its (i. e., the oil's) smell." It is quite possible, therefore, that the latter goes back to a Sumerian version which read ir-sim-bi-šè.

The verbal form ba-e-dè-ninni-dè-eš, "they will walk round and round with thee," is grammatically ba-e-da-ninni-(e)d-eš, i. e., the third person plural intransitive future with the second person singular dimensional infix -e-da-, whose -da-, in the post-Sumerian period, may become -de- under the influence of retrogressive assimilation (§ 509). The only clear examples of this phenomenon at the time *GSG* was published were such forms as ba-e-di-ḫu-luḫ-e, "she (Ninlil) trembles before thee," where the syllable -de- is written with the sign DI. In Chiera's recent volume, *SEM*, however, text No. 1 contains several examples of the same phenomenon; i. e., as in our case, the -da-, which becomes -de- in the second person singular dimensional infix, is written with the sign NE. The text involved<sup>55</sup> reads:

ᵀutug-šag<sub>5</sub>-ga-me na[m-ba-]e-dè-gub-ba  
 Our kindly *utukku* shall not stand at thy side,  
 ᵀamma-šag<sub>5</sub>-ga-me nam-ba-e-dè-gin-na  
 Our kindly *lamassu* shall not walk at thy side;  
 [k]i-gub-ba-me-a nam-ba-e-dè-gub-bu-nam  
 In our standing-place they (i. e., the *utukku* and the *lamassu*)  
 shall not stand at thy side,  
 ki-tuš-a-me-a nam-ba-e-dè-tuš-ù-nam  
 In our dwelling-place they shall not dwell at thy side.

If the interpretation of the context is correct, these four lines are addressed to Lugalbanda by a group of friends whom he has admonished not to accompany him to LAM.KUR.RU<sup>ki</sup>, whither he must travel all alone to deliver Enmerkar's message to the latter's sister, Inanna. The first two verbal forms, as the translation indicates, are to be analyzed as na-ba-e-da-gub-e and na-ba-e-

<sup>54</sup> *PBS X*, Part 3, iii 24.

<sup>55</sup> *SEM*, No. 1 v 37 ff.

da-gin-e, i. e., the negated precativè introduced by the particle na- and combined with the third person singular present-future of the intransitive, which in this post-Sumerian grammatical system was formed not from the stem LAL-ed (i. e., root plus the present-future element -ed), but, like the present-future of the transitive verb, from the root alone.<sup>56</sup> The change of -e, the regular third person singular present-future ending, to -a is strange; possibly it is an example of the phenomenon described in § 476. Nevertheless, a difficulty remains, for there seems to be no reason why these two verbal forms should not end with the emphasizing enclitic -àm, since they seem to be parallel to the verbal forms nam-ba-e-dè-gub-bu-nam and nam-ba-e-dè-tuš-ù-nam in the two lines following. These two verbal forms seem to be grammatically na-ba-e-da-gub-en(e)-àm and na-ba-e-da-tuš-en(e)-àm, i. e., the negated precativè forms introduced by the particle na- and combined with the third person plural of the present-future of the intransitive roots gub and tuš. For the change of the first e of the personal element -ene to u when following a labially characterized consonant, compare § 470; the final e of -ene, if the analysis is correct, is absorbed by the a of the syllable -àm, although it must be admitted that this assumption presents a serious difficulty, since the second e of the ending -ene, unlike the first e, is or at least originally was a long vowel.

As indicated above, the context is not altogether clear; the meaning of the lines immediately following is quite obscure. But there is little question concerning the dimensional infix -e-dè-, for the duplicate<sup>57</sup> reads:

<sup>d</sup>utug-šag<sub>5</sub>-ga-me nam-mu-da-gub-bu-nam

<sup>d</sup>lamma-šag<sub>5</sub>-ga-me nam-mu-da-gin-na-àm.

If we consider the verbal form of the second line first, we note that it is grammatically na-mu-(e-)da-gin-(e)-àm and that it corresponds to na-ba-e-da-gin-e, the grammatical form of nam-ba-e-dè-gin-na<sup>58</sup> in all important details, the only differences being that the latter uses the thematic particle ba- instead of mu- and that

<sup>56</sup> Poebel in *AJSL* L 170.

<sup>57</sup> W-B 162 (*OECT* I, Pls. 5 ff.) ii 39 ff.

<sup>58</sup> *SEM*, No. 1 v 38.

the former ends with the emphasizing particle -àm while the latter omits it, at least in the orthography. For the fact that in the post-Sumerian period the *e*- of the infix -e-da- is absorbed at times by the *u* of the preceding thematic particle mu- but is not absorbed by the *a* of the preceding thematic particle ba-, compare § 505. Unless the form read above as nam-mu-da-gin-na-àm really is to be read nam-mu-da-du-na-àm, the verbal form in the preceding line would be expected to read nam-mu-da-gub-ba-àm instead of nam-mu-da-gub-bu-nam, which contains an inexplicable *n*. Despite the difficulty, there is little doubt that the first part of the verbal form is grammatically na-mu-(e-)da-gub-, which corresponds to na-ba-e-da-gub-, the first part of the grammatical form of nam-ba-e-dè-gub-ba of *SEM*, No. 1 v 37.

To return to ba-e-dè-ninnì-dè-eš of our text, it is, as the grammatical analysis ba-e-da-ninnì-(e)d-eš indicates, the third person plural present-future of an *intransitive* verb which even in the post-Sumerian of our text forms its present-future stem by adding the particle -ed- to the root.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, as the dropping of the vowel *e* of the particle -(e)d- shows, the verbal root represented by the sign NIGIN must have ended in a vowel, unless the elision is due to syncope.

For the subject of the verbal form, compare the comment to šì-ra-[I].AN.UD-[d]è-eš (l. 58). As for the use of the thematic particle ba- in the verbal form ba-e-dè-ninnì-dè-eš, it is not at all unlikely that, although our text is of the post-Sumerian period, the choice of that particular particle was due to the fact that, as its original composition bi-a- indicates, it had a dimensional as well as a reflexive meaning (§§ 598 ff.), in which case a more literal translation of the verbal form would be: "because of it (i. e., because of the oil's smell — the dimensional relationship is expressed by the particle bi-) they will walk round and round with thee for themselves" (or some similar dimensionally reflexive idea expressed by the reflexive particle -a-).

<sup>59</sup> Cf. comment to šì-ra-[I].AN.UD-[d]è-eš (l. 58). Note that the Semitic equivalent for ba-e-dè-ninnì-dè-eš is the future verbal form *ipahhuruka*, "they will gather about thee"; the -ka at the end is the dative suffix, not the accusative.



*Line 61.* — The restoration nam-m[u-u]n-sig-gi meets with two difficulties: (a) The unbroken part of the third sign would suggest E rather than UN. (b) If, as the restoration assumes, there are only five signs to the form, there seems to be no reason why the scribe should place the first sign, NAM, so far to the left and not in the same position as the NAM which introduces the verbal forms in lines 63, 65, 66, 68, and 70. If, nevertheless, the restoration should prove correct, the form is to be analyzed grammatically as na-(i)mmi-n-sig-e(n), i. e., the negated precativè of the second person singular introduced by the particle na-, which is combined with the present-future of the verbal form. For the absorption of the first *i* of -immi- by the preceding *a* of the particle na-, compare § 596; for the dropping of the final *n* in the personal ending -en and the writing of the causative particle -n- before the verbal root, compare the comment to ba-ni-in-tu on page 46. It is very important to realize that the final *i* of the prefix immi-, which at times is subject to syncope,<sup>60</sup> may at other times become *u* under the influence of the preceding *m*, and that therefore in the verbal forms nam-m[u-u]n-sig-gi (l. 61), nam-mu-un-gá-gá (l. 63), nam-mu-un-? (l. 65), gú nam-mu-un-gá-gá (l. 66), and nam-mu-un-ra-ra (ll. 68 and 70) the part of the verbal form which follows the negative particle na- begins with the dimensionally characterized prefix immi-, not with the prefix mu-, as one might be led to assume from a merely superficial examination of these forms. For each of these verbal forms is preceded by a locative complex: kur-ra (gram.: kur-a, l. 61); šu-za (gram.: šu-z(u)-a, l. 63); gír-za (gram.: gír-z(u)-a, l. 65); kur-ra (l. 66); dam-ḥul-gig-ga-zu (gram.: dam-ḥul-gig-ga-zu(-e), l. 68; same complex with dumu in l. 70); these locative complexes are recapitulated by the locative chain contained in the prefix immi- (§ 591). On the other hand, where no such locative complex prefix precedes, the verbal forms following the negative particle na- begin with the simple prefix i-; compare [na]-an-mu<sub>4</sub>-mu<sub>4</sub> (l. 57) and na-an-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub> (l. 59).<sup>61</sup>

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Poebel in ZA XXXVI 265.

<sup>61</sup> For the verbal form na-an-su-ub-bi (ll. 67 and 69) cf. the comment to l. 67.

*Line 62.* — In the complex  $g^{18}gešpu-ra-a$ , which corresponds to the phrase *ša ina tilpana maḥsu* in the Akkadian version, the grammatical relationship between  $g^{18}gešpu$  and *ra-a* is not of a dimensional character, as one might be tempted to assume from the Akkadian equivalent. The former is the direct object of the infinitive *ra-a* (cf. the comment to *nam-mu-un-ra-ra*, l. 68), here used in apposition to *lú*. Literally, the phrase is to be translated as “the man (against him) a *tilpanu*-throwing” (§ 716). The grammatical relationship between the antecedent and the infinitive used in apposition (in our case expressed in English by “against” or “at”) is regularly left unstated in Sumerian (§ 719).

For *ba-e-dè-[nin]ni-dè-eš* compare the comment to the same verbal form in line 60. Note that the corresponding Akkadian verbal form is *ilammuka*, “they will surround thee”; i. e., the Akkadian verb *lamû*, construed with a direct object, is the equivalent of the Sumerian verb *ninni*, construed with a dimensional object. However, the compiler of an Akkadian-Sumerian syllabary of the type in which the Sumerian root is equated with the Akkadian root (and not the complete Sumerian verbal form with the complete Akkadian verbal form) would be compelled to equate *ninni* with *lamû*. This equation is indeed actually found in the syllabaries and, unless critically examined with the aid of connected texts, will prove quite misleading.

*Line 63.* — The verbal form *nam-mu-un-gá-gá* is grammatically *na-(i)m-mi-n-gá-gá(-e(n))*, i. e., the negated precative of the second person singular introduced by the particle *na-*, here followed by the present-future form of the verb *gar*, which, like the verbs  $mu_4$  and *šéš* discussed above, belongs to that class of verbs which forms the present-future from the reduplicated root. Moreover, as noted above, it is a characteristic of these verbal roots that, if they end in an consonant, this consonant is dropped and the root is treated as if it ended in a vowel; but while in the case of the verb *šéš* the scribe wrote the reduplicated root, even after the consonant had been dropped and the pronunciation had become *še-še*, with the same sign that is used for the longer value *šéš*,<sup>62</sup> in the case of the verb *gar* the scribe, in consonance with the

<sup>62</sup> If, therefore, it were not for the deduction that, since the verbal form written *na-an-šéš-šéš* must be analyzed as *na-an-šéš-šéš(-e(n))*, the

usual practice, writes the reduplicated root with the signs which have the shorter value *gá-gá* only. For the problem raised by the fact that in this verbal form too the scribe drops the final *n* of the personal element *-en* but retains the causative transitive particle *-n-*, compare the comment to *ba-ni-in-tu* on page 46. For the analysis of *nam-mu-* as *na-(i)mmi-*, compare the comment to *nam-mu-un-sìg-gi* (l. 61). Note, moreover, that the Akkadian *šabbiṭu ana qátēka la tanašši*, "do not lift a staff to thy hands," is by no means a literal translation of the Sumerian, whose more exact translation is "do not place a staff in thy hand," unless the Sumerian root for *našú*, which is usually rendered as *gur*, was pronounced *gar* by our scribe.

*Line 64.* — If the restoration is correct, [ba]-e-dè-ur<sub>4</sub>-ri-en is to be analyzed grammatically either as (a) *ba-e-da-ur<sub>4</sub>-ene*, i. e., the third person plural present-future of an intransitive verb which forms its present-future according to the scheme *i-LAL-en*,<sup>63</sup> or (b) *ba-e-da-ur<sub>4</sub>-(e)d-eš*, i. e., the third person plural present-future of a verb which forms its present-future according to the scheme *i-LAL-ed-en*.<sup>64</sup> If the first analysis is correct, the form on our tablet would have been expected to read *ba-e-dè-ur<sub>4</sub>-ri-ne*; if the second analysis is correct, the expected form would read *ba-e-dè-ur<sub>4</sub>-ri-dè-eš*. The form which actually appears on our tablet, i. e., *ba-e-dè-ur<sub>4</sub>-ri-en*, is undoubtedly due to some scribal confusion. For the use of the prefix *ba-*, compare the comment to *ba-e-dè-ninnì-dè-eš* on page 22. For the change of the infix *-da-* to *-dè-*, compare the comment to the same verbal form on pages 20 ff.; and note the form *mu-un-da-ur<sub>4</sub>-ur<sub>4</sub>*,<sup>65</sup> "it (i. e., heaven) trembles before him (<sup>d</sup>IM)." Note that the Akkadian translation reads *iarruruka*, "they will tremble before thee"; the *-ka* is the dative, not the accusative, suffix.

*Line 65.* — It is difficult to restore the verbal form in this line; the more or less obvious restoration *nam-mu-un-si-ga*, unless it is

---

pronunciation of at least the second *šéš* must have been *še*, the orthography would offer no criterion for the reading.

<sup>63</sup> Post-Sumerian System A; cf. Poebel in *AJSL* L 170.

<sup>64</sup> The scheme used in the Old Sumerian period; cf. Poebel in *AJSL* L 170.

<sup>65</sup> IV R 28, No. 2, l. 9.

due to a scribal error, seems impossible. For if the root of the verb is sig, the expected form would read nam-mu-un-si-gi, i. e., grammatically na-(i)m-mi-n-sig-e(n).<sup>66</sup>

*Line 66.* — If the translation *ana* (or *ina*) *iršitim* of the Akkadian version is correct, there was no sign originally between kur and ra, although it must be admitted that the spacing on the tablet points to the opposite conclusion.

The verbal form gù nam-mu-un-gá-gá is grammatically gù na-(i)m-mi-n-gá-gá(-e(n)); compare the comment to line 63.

*Line 67.* — Dam-ki-aga-zu is a complex consisting of a substantive, a passive participle, and a possessive pronoun. The Akkadian version, however, uses a relative clause instead of the passive participle. For the comparatively infrequent use of the relative clause in Sumerian and the preference of Sumerian for the passive participle construction, compare § 279.

For the combination of NE with the verbal root sub, compare gaba im-ma-an-tab NE im-ma-an-su-ub<sup>67</sup> and gaba im-ma-an-tab NE im-ma-ni-in(!)-su-ub.<sup>68</sup> While the meaning of these lines is still obscure, it is at least reasonably certain that NE is related to the verbal root sub as gaba is related to the verbal root tab. Moreover, it is quite possible that the second half of lines 4, 7, and 24 of column iii of the same text from which the above quotations are taken is to be read as NE nu-mu-un-su-ub-bi, although here too the meaning is still uncertain.<sup>69</sup> If we add the fact that it seems altogether unreasonable for our text to speak of dam-ki-aga-zu and dumu-ki-aga-zu as plurals while it treats the exactly parallel complexes dam-ḥul-gig-ga-zu and dumu-ḥul-gig-ga-zu as singulars, it becomes obvious that the word division of line 67 should be not dam-ki-aga-zu-ne na-an-su-ub-bi but dam-ki-aga-zu NE na-an-su-ub-bi. Nor does the fact that NE has been separated

<sup>66</sup> For the grammatical analysis of na-mu- as na-(i)m-mi-, cf. comment to nam-m[u-u]n(?) -sig-gi (l. 61).

<sup>67</sup> *PBS* X, Part 1, No. 1 iii 12.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, l. 32; the sign IN is on the tablet according to Dr. Chiera's collation.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. *SEM*, No. 23 iii 11, where NE begins the line in the verbal form NE mu-un-su-ub-ba.

by the scribe from the rest of the verbal form present any difficulty. In lines 60 and 62, in writing the verbal form *ba-e-dè-ninni-dè-eš*, he separated the first part of the verbal form from the remainder; in line 66 the scribe has separated the substantive *gù* from the rest of the verbal form *gù nam-mu-un-gá-gá*, to which it properly belongs. The scribe — and this is true especially of lines 55 ff. — was interested in preserving the symmetrical arrangement of the tablet. This he did in two ways: (a) He kept the two halves of each line as evenly divided as was possible under the circumstances. (b) He began the second part of each line, which in the majority of cases was introduced by the grammatical particle *na-*, at the same distance from the left-hand side of the tablet. The right half of the tablet from line 55 to the end thus showed a regular, column-like arrangement. Had the scribe in lines 67 and 69 placed the sign *NE* with the verbal form to which it properly belongs, the trimness of the arrangement would have been endangered, since, in addition to breaking up the vertical formation just described, the right and left parts of the line would have been quite out of proportion, for the latter would have had too few signs and the former too many. In lines 60, 62, and 66 the unusual arrangement of the signs comprising the verbal form is due to similar reasons. In lines 68 and 70, however, the scribe placed the sign *NIG* with the verbal form to which it is grammatically related, since the first half of the line is quite crowded with signs. On the other hand, the arrangement of the second half of line 71 seems to be quite arbitrary; for some reason the scribe placed the sign *BA* under and even partly to the left of the sign *NIG* of line 70 and spread out the remaining signs in a manner that is hardly in conformity with the arrangement of the preceding lines.

If in order to determine its literal meaning we attempt to analyze the expression *NE na-an-su-ub-bi*, which corresponds to *la tanaš(š)iq* in the Akkadian version, the most likely possibility, at least on the surface, would seem to be that *NE* is the direct object of the action intended by the verbal root *sub*, while the complex *dam-ki-aga-zu* is related dimensionally to the verbal form and should be analyzed grammatically as *dam-ki-aga-zu-*

(-e). If we assume, therefore, for purposes of illustration only, a meaning such as “to press” for the root *sub* and a meaning such as “lip” or “cheek” for the word represented by the sign *NE*, the literal translation of *dam-ki-aga-zu NE na-an-su-ub-bi* would be: “At thy beloved wife do not press the lip.” However, the fact that the verbal form *na-an-su-ub-bi* (gram.: *na-(i)-n-sub-e(n)*) uses the simple prefix instead of a dimensionally characterized prefix such as *immi-* seems to indicate that the complex *dam-ki-aga-zu* is an accusative complex. This would mean that the scribe of our text construed the verb *su-ub* with a double accusative and that the literal translation of the line should therefore be: “Do not press(?) thy beloved wife the lip(?).”<sup>70</sup>

<sup>70</sup> Nor do the other instances in which the combination of *NE* with the verb *sub* occurs clarify the matter. Thus we find *NE mu-un-su-ub-bi* (*PBS X*, Part 1, No. 1 iii 4, 6, 23), where the verbal form is in no way dimensionally characterized. In the same text we read in l. 12 *gaba im-ma-an-tab NE im-ma-an-su-ub*, but in l. 32 (preceded and followed by passages identical with those which precede and follow l. 12) *gaba im-ma-an-tab NE im-ma-ni-in(!)-su-ub*, where the verbal form seems to contain the locative infix *-ni-*; note also *NE im-ma-ni-in-su-ub* in the duplicate text *TCL XVI*, No. 62 obv. 14 and rev. 67. Cf., moreover, *NE-bi na-mu-un-[su-ub]* (*MBI*, No. 4 ii 6) and *NE-bi na-su-ub* (*ibid.* ii 8) with *NE.EN im-ma-ni-in-su-ub* (*ibid.* iii 33); the latter seems to contain the locative infix *-ni-*. Note also the phrase *šu-um-du-um mu-ni-su-ub* in *BE XXXI*, No. 28, l. 1, where *šumdum*, “lip,” seems to be used with the verbal root *sub* and where again the verbal form seems to contain the locative infix *-ni-*.

Similar difficulties present themselves if one attempts to analyze the complex *KA-ki-su-ub* in the expression *KA-ki-su-ub ba-tum* (*PBS V*, No. 1 v 10, vi 7). For, in spite of the fact that the meaning “he prostrated himself” for the latter is hardly to be questioned (cf. *PBS IV*, Part 1, p. 59), the literal translation is by no means obvious, since the grammatical relationships are quite obscure. Should *su-ub* prove to be an infinitive (for the expected *sub-a*), the complex *KA-ki-su-ub* may mean, literally, “pressing the mouth at the ground” (grammatically, therefore, *KA-ki(-e)-su-ub*). If this should prove to be the case, *KA* might correspond to *NE* in our tablet; this would again point to such a meaning as “lip,” “cheek,” “nose,” or some other organ used in kissing, a possibility which is corroborated by *PBS X*, Part 1, No. 1 iii 12 and 32 (cited above), where *NE* seems to be used as a parallel of *gaba*, “chest.” Finally, an examination of the late Sumerian bilinguals leaves the question quite as unsettled. Thus in the sentence *da-nun-na-ke<sub>4</sub>-e-ne ki-a mu-un-su-ub-su-ub* = *da-nun-na-ki qa-q<sub>4</sub>-ru u-*

*Line 68.* — Dam-ḥul-gig-ga-zu is grammatically dam-ḥul-gig-a-zu(-e); i. e., as the locative postposition -e, which in our example is absorbed by the preceding vowel (§ 344a), indicates, the grammatical relationship between this substantive complex and the verbal form nam-mu-un-ra-ra (gram.: na-(i)mmi-n-ra-ra(-e(n))) is not that of a direct object, as one might be led to conclude from the Akkadian version, which reads *aššatka ša tazîru la tamaḥ-ḥaš*, but, as the use of the dimensionally characterized prefix *immi-* in the verbal form clearly shows, is locative in character and is to be translated literally as “at thy hated wife.” The literal meaning of the verbal root *ra*, therefore, approximates English “to wield,” and the construction is X-e Y ra, “to wield Y (the hand, a weapon, etc.) at X (a person, an object, etc.).” Compare *ama dumu-ni níḡ nu-ma-ni-ra*, grammatically *ama(-e) dumu-ni(-e) níḡ nu-(im)ma-ni(-n)-ra*, “a mother wielded nothing against her child,”<sup>71</sup> and especially *nin-a-ni igi-na níḡ nu-mu-na-ni-ra*, grammatically *nin-ani(-e) igi-n(i)-a níḡ nu-mu-na-ni(-n)-ra*, “her mistress wielded nothing against her (the maid’s) face,”<sup>72</sup> where the locative postposition -a in the complex *igi-n(i)-a* shows clearly that the relationship between the latter and the verbal form is of a dimensional character. The Akkadian verb *maḥāṣu*, however, approximates English “to strike” and is construed as follows: X *ina* Y *maḥāṣu*, “to strike X (a person, object, etc.) with Y (the hand, a weapon, etc.).”

The verbal form *nam-mu-un-ra-ra*, as indicated above, is grammatically *na-(i)mmi-n-ra-ra(-e(n))*. Compare the comment to the verbal form *nam-mu-un-gá-gá* (l. 63), to which it is exactly parallel in construction; the only difference is that the verb *gar* ends in a consonant, which is dropped in the reduplicated form used to express the present-future (hence the writing *gá-gá*), while the verb *ra*, which also forms its present-future from the

---

*na-šá-qu* (IV R 9 a, ll. 59 f.), *ki-* seems to be related dimensionally to the verbal form, but the expected accusative *KA* is omitted altogether. On the other hand, in the equation *KA-ta-su-ub = na-šá-qu* (II R 47 e and f, l. 33) it is the *KA* which seems to be related dimensionally to the root *sub*.

<sup>71</sup> Gudea Statue B iv 12.

<sup>72</sup> Gudea Cylinder A xiii 9.

reduplicated root, ends in a vowel (§ 446*d*). In the preterit, on the other hand (cf. the Gudea examples cited in notes 71 and 72), the simple root is used.

*Lines 69 and 70.* — Compare the comments to lines 67 and 68.

*Line 71.* — As the translation “a wail in the nether world will seize thee” shows, I.AN.UD kur-ra ba-e-díb-bi has been analyzed grammatically as I.AN.UD(-e) kur-a ba-e-díb-e. That is:

a) I.AN.UD(-e), “a wail,” is the subject of the active verbal form ba-e-díb-e, “(it) will seize thee.” Note that, if this analysis proves correct, the Sumerian word represented by the signs I.AN.UD, as the absorption of the following -e indicates, ended in a vowel; compare also the comment to ši-ra-[I].AN.UD-[d]è-eš (l. 58).

b) Kur-a is a locative complex meaning “in the nether world.” The entire expression I.AN.UD kur-ra corresponds to *tazimti ir-sitim*, “the wail of the nether world,” in the Akkadian version. If this is a literal rendering of the Sumerian, the conclusion follows that the Akkadian translator took the Sumerian expression to be a genitive construction and analyzed it grammatically as I.AN.UD-kur-ra(-k). Since this complex, however, is the subject of a transitive verb, the correct form would read I.AN.UD-kur-ra-ke<sub>4</sub>, i. e., I.AN.UD-kur-ra-k-e (§ 350). There is, of course, always the possibility that the scribe was careless of his grammatical construction; but, since the scribe of our text uses correctly the postposition -e in other cases where the complex is the subject of a transitive verb, the possibility of an error by the scribe should not be too readily assumed.

c) Ba-e-díb-e, literally, “it will seize thee unto itself,” is the third person present-future active with the infixed accusative second person singular pronominal element -e-; it furnishes the first clearly recognized example of the use of infixed accusative pronominal elements with the present-future (which is characterized by affixed subject pronominal elements), corresponding to the use of affixed accusative pronominal elements with the preterit (which is characterized by prefixed subject pronominal elements).<sup>73</sup>

<sup>73</sup> Concerning the -e- of such verbal forms as nam-ba-e-RU-E (*VAS*, Heft 2, No. 79 rev. 25), nam-ba-e-díb-bi (*VAS*, Heft 10, No. 204 rev. ii 2 and 11), and nam-ba-e-sì-gi as well as nam-ba-e-šub-bi (*ibid.* l. 20), because of the obscurity of the text a definite statement is as yet impossible.



## COMMENTARY ON THE GILGAMESH TEXT

*Lines 1-6.* — Too fragmentary for translation. Compare the comment to lines 50 and 51 below. In line 6, instead of rin the sign after šu may of course be read nigín.

*Lines 7-9.* — The verbal form ba-ra-bad-du-a-ba is grammatically ba-(n)-ra-bad-a-ba, i. e., the third person singular preterit of the intransitive verb bad, “to move away”; for the infix -n-ra-, with the meaning “away (from something),” “out of (something),” etc., compare § 497 (note that the pronominal element -n- in the infix -n-ra- is not written, even in the latest period; cf. § 502*b*); for the postpositive element -a-ba which is used as an adverbial conjunction and gives a pluperfect meaning to the verbal form to which it is attached, compare *PBS* IV, Part 1, pp. 38 ff. As will be seen by comparing the grammatical form with the actual writing ba-ra-bad-du-a-ba, the latter has a vowel *u* following the verbal root which seems to be grammatically unjustified; this *u* obviously is not to be taken as one of the present-future endings.<sup>74</sup> It is not impossible that the explanation of this phenomenon is

<sup>74</sup> There is the possibility, of course, that the scribe conceived the particle -a-ba as a postposition which was to be added to the nominalized clause (§ 455). In other words, ba-ra-bad-du-a-ba (l. 7), ba-da-sur-ri-a-ba (l. 8), ba-gar-ra-a-ba (l. 9), etc. are to be analyzed as barabadda-aba, badasurra-aba, bagarra-aba, etc. Cf., however, the writings ba-si-si-ga-ba, ba-an-da-gul-la-ba, ba-dim-dim-ma-ba, im-mi-in-ne-eš-a-ba, á-mu-un-ág-eš-a-ba (*TCL* XVI, No. 40 ii 137-42, and the duplicate *PBS* X, Part 4, No. 11 iii 42-47), and ba-zal-la-ba (*PBS* X, Part 2, No. 6 iv 18). In all these cases, at least to judge from the orthography alone, the clause to which -a-ba is added is not nominalized. Cf. also nam-ba-tar-ra-ba (*OECT* I, No. 1 i 1) with its duplicate nam-pa(!)-tar-ra-a-ba (*TCL* XVI, No. 94, l. 1), im-ma-an-íl-la-ba (*OECT* I, No. 1 iii 4; duplicate, *PBS* I, Part 2, No. 105 rev. 5, where the last sign is to be corrected to ba) with im-ma-an-íl-la-a-ba (*TCL* XVI, No. 94, l. 68). Note, however, that even the latter text writes ki-im-dar(!)-a-ba (*ibid.* l. 3), while the duplicate (*OECT* I, No. 1 i 3) writes ki-in-dar-a-ba.

as follows: The root of this verbal form was not *bad* but a syllable whose pronunciation approximated *badw*; the grammatical form, therefore, was in reality *ba-ra-badw-a-ba*, and the writing *bad-du* merely represents an attempt on the part of the scribe to reproduce the semivowel of the root. Similarly in the verbal forms written *ba-an-bad-da-eš* alongside of *ba-an-bad-du-uš* = *issû*, "they fled" (cf. the comment on these forms in §§ 459 and 474), and in the forms *bad-du* alongside of *bad-da* = *isi*, "move away" (cf. § 678), the variant writings may be the result of attempts on the part of some scribes to reproduce in the orthography the actual sounds heard. As for the use of the prefix *ba-* in this and the following two lines, it probably helps to indicate the intransitive and passive meaning of the verbal forms which it introduces.<sup>75</sup>

*Ba-da-sur-r[i](!)-a-ba* (l. 8) is grammatically *ba-(n)da-sur-a-ba*, i. e., the third person singular preterit of the root *sur*, "to cut off," "to separate"; for the omission of the pronominal element *-n-* before the dimensional particle *-da-* in the infix *-n-da-*, compare § 502*b*. A comparison of the grammatical form *ba-(n)da-sur-a-ba* with the actual writing *ba-da-sur-ri-a-ba* shows the seemingly unjustified presence of the vowel *i* following the root. If we reason by analogy with the conclusion drawn from the writing *ba-ra-bad-du-a-ba* for the grammatical *ba-(n)ra-bad-a-ba*, we might be led to assume that the root was really *surî* and that the scribe in writing *ba-da-sur-ri-a-ba* was merely attempting to reproduce the actual pronunciation of the grammatical *ba-(n)da-surî-a-ba*. Since, however, we find no other example of this phenomenon in connection with the root *sur*, the more probable conclusion is that the insertion of the semivowel *i* is the result of an attempt to retain the rhythmic parallelism of these two verbal forms and especially of the syllables following the verbal root. Thus . . . -bád-d ũ - ā - b ā and . . . -sūr- rī-ā-bā (i. e., the second part of each verbal form) are both rhythmically  $\acute{ } \cup - -$ . It is perhaps this same feeling for rhythmic evenness that is responsible for the writing *ba-gar-ra-a-ba* (gram.: *ba-gar-a-ba*) in the line following; the superfluous *a* after the root actually represents a

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Poebel in *AJSL* L 168.

sort of half-vowel which was added to harmonize with the rhythmic form  $\text{a} \cup \text{---}$  found in the second part of each of the two preceding forms (the three lines containing these forms characterized by their rhythmic parallelism form a unit corresponding to those formed by lines 10–12 as well as lines 13–15 of our text).

If we now return to the writing *ba-da-sur-ri-a-ba*, the problem still unsolved is why the semivowel *i* was chosen in connection with the root *sur*. For, while the semivowel *u* written after the root *bad* may be justified by the labial character of its final consonant, and while the half-vowel *a* after the root *gar* is to be expected because of the vowel *a* of the root, there seems to be no similar justification for adding the semivowel *i* after the root *sur*. The solution to the problem is no doubt to be sought in an analysis of the character of the vowel of the root, which in the transliteration as well as in the preceding discussion has been transliterated without question as *sur*. For, as the gloss *si*<sup>76</sup> indicates, the sign *SUR* could be read not only *sur* but also *sir* — a conclusion which is borne out by the following additional facts: (a) The Sumerian root for Akkadian *zamáru* is written with the sign *SAR*, which is expressly stated to have the value *si-ir*, as well as with the sign *SUR* (no reading given). (b) Similarly, the Sumerian root for Akkadian *šarâhu* is written with the sign *SUR* as well as with the sign *SAR*. (c) The Sumerian root for Akkadian *enêšu* and *zarâbu* is written with the sign *SUR* as well as with the sign *SÍR*. Moreover, that neither the vowel of the Sumerian root written with the sign *SUR* nor its final *r* had any labial characteristics (as was the case with the final *r* of the roots *tar*, “to cut,” *kur*, “to change,” etc.) is shown by the fact that when the root *SUR* is followed by a grammatical ending beginning with a vowel the latter is never changed to *u*. It is not at all unlikely, therefore, that the root in our verbal form *ba-da-sur-ri-a-ba* was pronounced *sir* rather than *sur*, and it is for this reason that the semivowel *i* rather than the semivowel *u* was inserted between it and the following *-a-ba*.

The use of the infix *-(n-)da-* with the meaning “from it” (i. e., “from heaven”) instead of the expected *-(n-)ta-* presents some

<sup>76</sup> K 4368 (*CT* XIV 5) obv. b 24.

difficulty. If the sign DA is actually intended to be read as da and is not merely a variant orthography for ta, the change from the voiceless *t* to the voiced *d* may be due to the influence of the *b* of the immediately preceding prefix ba-. However, it must be pointed out that the entire problem of voiced and voiceless consonants in Sumerian is one of great difficulty and complexity, and that to date it has remained almost wholly uninvestigated.

Mu-nam-lú-GĀLLU<sup>77</sup> (l. 9) is grammatically nam-lú-GĀLLU, i. e., a genitive complex whose final *k* is dropped as an amissible consonant, since it is not followed by a grammatical particle beginning with a vowel (cf. §349). Since it is the subject of a passive verbal form, it is not followed by the subject element -e (cf. § 153).

*Lines 10-12* (cf. ll. 52-54). — An-ni (gram.: an-e) is the subject of the transitive verb ba-an-DU-a-ba. The reading of the verbal root which is written with the sign DU is most likely tum; lines 52 and 53, which use the eme-SAL dialect, read ir. Note, too, the difference in the orthography of eme-KU and eme-SAL in regard to the writing of the postpositive element -a-ba. The former writes it "etymologically"; i. e., even if it follows a verbal root ending in a consonant, the form -a-ba is kept intact in the orthography (cf. DU-a-ba and rig<sub>7</sub>-a-ba). The latter, on the other hand, writes -a-ba "phonetically"; i. e., when following a root ending with a consonant, the -a of -a-ba is combined with the preceding consonant (cf. ir-ra-ba and rig<sub>7</sub>-[ga-ba]; the restoration of the last two signs in B obv. 17 is quite certain).

<sup>d</sup>En-lil-li (gram.: <sup>d</sup>en-lil-e) is the subject of the transitive verbal form ba-an-DU-a-ba; compare above. It is to be noted that, according to the tradition represented by this poem, it was Enlil (i. e., "the lord [of] the air") who carried off the earth, although one might expect that this should have been accomplished by Enki, since, at least to judge from his name (i. e., en-ki(-k)), he was regarded as the "lord of the earth." If, in view of our text, we are to assume that Enlil usurped Enki's powers, the mythological tales which must have been current among the Sumerians and

---

<sup>77</sup> For the possibility of reading the signs GĀLLU as lu<sub>6</sub> cf. Falkenstein in *OLZ*, 1933, cols. 302f.

Akkadians in regard to this battle of the gods are as yet quite unknown to us.

If the translation of line 12 should prove correct, the grammatical analysis of the line is as follows:

a) <sup>d</sup>Ereš-ki-gal-la<sup>78</sup> is the subject of a passive verbal form.

b) Kur-ra is a dative complex.

c) Sag-rig<sub>7</sub>-ga-šè<sup>79</sup> is a dimensional complex consisting of the complex sag-rig<sub>7</sub>-a, literally, "the presented gift," and the postposition -šè.

d) Im-ma-ab-rig<sub>7</sub>-a-ba (gram.: imma-b-rig<sub>7</sub>-a-ba) is the third person singular preterit of the passive verbal form; the *b* which precedes the root is the causative transitive particle (cf. §§ 522-24). For the use of the prefix imma- (as well as the prefix ba-) with the passive verbal form, compare § 605. However, the principles which governed the preference of imma- to ba- in any given case are as yet unknown.

It must be admitted, however, that the translation given, despite a seemingly superficial correctness, is not quite satisfactory. Because of its parallelism with lines 10 and 11, one might

<sup>78</sup> For a detailed analysis of this name, cf. the writer's study, "Inanna's Descent to the Nether World," which is to appear in the *RA* (cf. note 83).

<sup>79</sup> The Sumerian verbal form for "to present (something) as a gift" is a compound consisting of the noun sag, "gift," and the verbal root rig<sub>7</sub>, with the approximate meaning "to bring before (someone)," "to present"; cf. Poebel in *AOF* IX 291. The noun sag may be treated as an accusative in apposition to the name(s) of the object(s) presented; cf. sag-im-mi-ib-rig<sub>7</sub>-gi, "(the objects listed) he presents there as a gift" (Gudea Cylinder B xiv 12), me-sag-rig<sub>7</sub>-ga-ni (lit.: "her gift-presented *paršú*"), "the *paršú* which had been presented to her" (*PBS* V, No. 25 obv. i 35, ii 35, rev. iv 55). Usually, however, the noun sag is related dimensionally to the root rig<sub>7</sub> by the postposition -šè or -eš; cf. sag-šè im-mi-rig<sub>7</sub>, "he presented (the persons mentioned) as a gift there" (Gudea Statue D iii 12), sag-e-eš mu-ni-rig<sub>7</sub> (*VAS*, Heft 10, No. 199 obv. i 28; *SRT*, No. 1 i 22), sag-e-eš mu-ni-rig<sub>7</sub> (*SRT*, No. 15 rev. 48), and the nonfinite forms sag-e-eš-rig<sub>7</sub>-ga (*PBS* I, No. 7 rev. iv 103) and sag-e-eš-rig<sub>7</sub>-ga (*MBI*, No. 3 obv. i 10). In our case the verbal root rig<sub>7</sub> is preceded not by the noun sag alone but by the complex sag-rig<sub>7</sub>-ga (lit.: "the presented gift"), which is related dimensionally to the verbal form by means of the postposition -šè.

have expected the contents of line 12 to read approximately as follows: "After Ereshkigal had taken charge of the nether world." It is therefore not impossible that (a) the verb *rig*<sub>7</sub> has here a meaning other than "to present";<sup>80</sup> (b) the -še in the complex *sag-rig*<sub>7</sub>-*ga-še* is the same -še which is found in such compound expressions as *giš-gaz-še*,<sup>81</sup> and the entire complex *sag-rig*<sub>7</sub>-*ga-še* is the direct object of the verbal form *im-ma-ab-rig*<sub>7</sub>-*a-ba*; (c) *kur-ra* is a locative complex (gram.: *kur-a*). A literal translation of the line might therefore approximate: "Ereshkigal performed(?) the *sag-rig-ga-še* on the nether world," i. e., "she took charge (or some related idea) of the nether world."<sup>82</sup>

The word *kur* used in this poem refers, of course, to the nether world, although obviously the latter term can furnish only an approximate and imperfect idea of what *kur* actually denoted to the Sumerian and the Akkadian. It is the place into which the *pukku* and the *mikkû* fell, the place to which Enkidu descended, and from which he was unable to ascend after he had broken its rules and had acted in a manner unmindful of the feelings of the shades who dwelt there. In the Sumerian version of the *Descent of Ishtar*<sup>83</sup> the word used regularly for the nether world is *kur*, while the corresponding text in the Semitic version has *kur-nu-gi*<sub>4</sub>-*a* (or *kur-nu-gi*<sub>4</sub>), a phrase which in the Sumerian version is used by the chief gatekeeper when inquiring of Inanna the reason for her unusual request to enter the "land of no return." This passage in the Sumerian version of the *Descent of Ishtar*, containing the colloquy between Inanna and the gatekeeper, enables us to localize

<sup>80</sup> Cf. among others such meanings as *gi-bu-ú*, "to speak," *ri-e-ú*, "to pasture," "to govern," *na-du-ú ša šu-ub-tim*, "to put up," said of a dwelling-place (*PBS* V, No. 106 obv. a 17ff.).

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Poebel in *AOF* IX 256.

<sup>82</sup> An additional possibility is that <sup>d</sup>*ereš-ki-gal-la* is the object, and that <sup>d</sup>*en-lil-li* of the preceding line is the subject; the meaning therefore might be "after he (i. e., Enlil) had presented Ereshkigal as a gift to the nether world." The subject might even be not Enlil but Enki, who is mentioned three lines below.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. the writer's reconstructed text of this version, together with a translation and commentary, to appear in the *RA* under the title "Inanna's Descent to the Nether World."

the kur more definitely than has hitherto been possible, and indicates that the latter lies in a direction opposite to that of Mount Dilmun.

As regards the relationship between kur, "nether world," and ki-gal, if, as is likely, the name of the goddess was ereš-ki-gal before she had been placed in charge of the kur, it is obvious that ki-gal cannot have meant "nether world"; more probably it is a cosmic term designating perhaps that part of the earth which is below the earth's surface and above the *apsû*. The kur, to judge from the fact that one had to descend in order to reach its interior, was probably conceived to be part of the ki-gal. Hence, when man had been created and the kur had been set aside to receive his shade (*edimmu*) after his death, it was the mistress of the ki-gal who was placed in charge of it.

*Lines 13-15* (cf. ll. 55-57). — Ba-u<sub>5</sub>-a-ba is a third person preterit intransitive verbal form; the subject in each instance is of course Enki, who is not mentioned by name, however, until line 15. For the use of the prefix ba- compare the comment to ba-ra-bad-du-a-ba (l. 7).

A-a (l. 14) is a frequently used title for Enki. Whether it is merely titular in this poem or whether the poet actually means to say that Enki is the father of Ereshkigal, it is impossible to decide. And quite as obscure is the reason for Enki's journey to the kur, which he seems to have undertaken only after Ereshkigal had been placed in charge there.

*Lines 16-21* (cf. ll. 58-63). — It seems reasonably certain, both from the phrase u<sub>4</sub>-du,-àm, "like an attacking storm," within this passage and from the content of the lines immediately following, that the poet is describing the tempestuous state of the body of water which Enki had to traverse on his journey to the kur. A serious problem is presented by the fact that the reduplicated adjectives tur-tur and gal-gal (ll. 16 and 17) do not seem to be preceded by any substantive which they might qualify. It seems quite likely, however, that the tur-tur and gal-gal of the complexes tur-tur-bi and gal-gal-bi in lines 18 and 19 are merely repeated from lines 16 and 17. Unless the -bi of tur-tur-bi and gal-gal-bi is the particle used for forming an adverb from a sub-

stantivized adjective (§ 394) or is the demonstrative pronoun, it is to be taken as the possessive pronoun, and *tur-tur-bi* and *gal-gal-bi* are to be translated as “its small ones” and “its large ones” respectively. There still remains the difficulty of finding its antecedent. However, if the antecedent is to be sought in one of the lines preceding those containing the possessive pronoun, only the substantive *kur* (ll. 14 and 15) seems to fit the situation, and *tur-tur* and *gal-gal* would then refer to stones which belonged(?) to the *kur*.

If in lines 16 and 17 we now examine the verbal form *ba-da-an-ri*, we note that it is probably a preterit third person singular passive with infix *-(n-)da-*. It may, therefore, have the meaning: “they (i. e., “the small stones” or “the large stones” respectively) were hurled against him (i. e., Enki).” For the use of a *singular* predicate with a plural subject when the plurality of the latter is indicated by the reduplication of the modifying adjective, compare § 146. However, since the third person singular preterit of the intransitive passive verbal form has no pronominal element prefixed to the root,<sup>84</sup> and since, on the other hand, the *n* of the infix *-n-da-* is usually written in the post-Sumerian period (cf. § 502*b*), one would expect the verbal form to read *ba-an-da-ri* instead of *ba-da-an-ri*. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the former reading is the one actually given by the tablets on which lines 58 and 59 of our reconstructed text are based.<sup>85</sup> The complex *lugal-ra* (l. 16) and its parallel *den-ki-ra* (l. 17) would then be datives of reference; that is, the sea and the elements raged in honor of Enki.

Lines 18 and 19, according to the interpretation outlined above, describe in greater detail the *tur-tur* and *gal-gal* of the preceding lines, which had been purposely left rather vague and undefined in order to add to the effectiveness of the passage by the momentary suspense, a stylistic mannerism characteristic of Sumerian poetry. *Na<sub>4</sub>-šu-kam* (l. 18) seems to be a genitive construction

<sup>84</sup> Cf., however, the post-Sumerian system A outlined by Poebel in *AJSL* L 170.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. also the writing *ba-an-da-ri* in *BE* VI, Part 2, Nos. 28 (l. 4) and 57 (l. 3), with *ba-da-an-ri*, *ibid.*, Nos. 4 (l. 6) and 24 (l. 5).



followed by the identifying particle -àm (§ 195*a-b*), i. e.,  $na_4\text{-}\check{s}u\text{-}k\text{-}\grave{a}m$ , and may mean “stones of the hand,” “stones which can be grasped(?) by the hand.” Similarly,  $na_4\text{-}zi\text{-}ga(?)\text{-}ud(?)\text{-}da\text{-}a\text{-}kam$  seems to be a genitive construction followed by the identifying particle -àm, though both the reading and the meaning of the complex are quite obscure. The two complexes (each consisting of an entire line)  $tur\text{-}tur\text{-}bi\ na_4\text{-}\check{s}u\text{-}kam$  and  $gal\text{-}gal\text{-}bi\ na_4\text{-}z\grave{i}\text{-}ga(?)\text{-}ud(?)\text{-}da\text{-}a\text{-}kam$  are subjects of the verbal form  $\grave{i}\text{-}\check{s}\acute{u}\text{-}\check{s}\acute{u}$  (l. 21), which is perhaps best analyzed grammatically as  $\grave{i}\text{-}\check{s}\acute{u}\text{-}\check{s}\acute{u}\text{-}(-e)$ , i. e., the third person singular present-future of the intransitive root  $\check{s}\acute{u}$ , “to be thrown,” “to fall.” The indirect object of  $\grave{i}\text{-}\check{s}\acute{u}\text{-}\check{s}\acute{u}$ , “they fall (at or upon somebody or something),” consists of the locative complex forming line 20,  $\acute{u}r\text{-}m\acute{a}\text{-}tur\text{-}ri\text{-}^d\acute{e}n\text{-}ki\text{-}ga\text{-}ke_4$ , which is grammatically  $\acute{u}r\text{-}m\acute{a}\text{-}tur\text{-}a(?)\text{-}^d\acute{e}n\text{-}ki\text{-}k\text{-}ak\text{-}(-ak)\text{-}e$ , “at the keel of the . . . boat of the lord of the earth,” i. e., a triple genitive construction followed by the locative particle -e (for the regular omission of one of the genitive particles in case of a triple genitive construction cf. § 370). As for the writing  $^d\acute{e}n\text{-}ki\text{-}ga\text{-}ke_4$  instead of the expected  $^d\acute{e}n\text{-}ki\text{-}ka\text{-}ke_4$ , it is to be noted that, while in the Sumerian periods only the latter is used, for some unknown reason the former is the more frequent in the post-Sumerian periods. The complex  $m\acute{a}\text{-}tur\text{-}ri$  (as the  $m\acute{a}\text{-}tur\text{-}ra$  of variant B [l. 62] indicates, the final  $i$  of  $m\acute{a}\text{-}tur\text{-}ri$  may simply be due to the slurring of the final  $a$ , especially after the liquid consonant  $r$ ) is quite likely merely a variant form for  $m\acute{a}\text{-}tur$  (*SAI* 2385), whose Akkadian equivalent is the loan word *maturru*. Whether our  $m\acute{a}\text{-}tur\text{-}ri$  bears any relationship to the  $m\acute{a}\text{-}dara\text{-}abzu\text{-}^d\acute{e}n\text{-}ki\text{-}ka$  mentioned in the date formulas,<sup>86</sup> it is impossible to say. Finally,  $u_4\text{-}du_7\text{-}\grave{a}m$  (l. 21) may be a complex consisting of the noun  $u_4$ , the intransitive participle  $du_7$ , and the identifying particle -àm, i. e., “like a raging storm.” One might perhaps have expected, however, the reduplicated  $du_7\text{-}du_7$  instead.<sup>87</sup> As for the relationship between the phrase  $u_4\text{-}du_7\text{-}\grave{a}m$  and the immediately preceding  $\check{s}e\text{-}en\text{-}KA + LI(?)\text{-}na$ , it is impossible to say anything very definite, since both the reading and the meaning of the latter are in doubt.

<sup>86</sup> *SAK*, p. 234.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. *PBS* X, Part 4, No. 3 obv. i 28; *CT* XVI, Plate 19, l. 1.

It will be quite obvious to the reader that the translation of the passage comprising lines 16–21, as explained in the preceding paragraphs, is far from satisfactory. Not only does the interpretation given sound forced, despite a more or less superficial correctness, but, since the interpretation of almost every line offers more than one possibility, it is not unlikely that the translation chosen may be altogether erroneous. Thus, to mention only a few instances, *tur-tur* and *gal-gal* (ll. 16 and 17) may not refer to stones at all; indeed, it is not absolutely impossible to assume that each modifies the preceding *-ra* if the latter had some such meaning as “wave,” although the parallelism of *lugal-ra* and <sup>d</sup>*en-ki-ra* in lines 16 and 17 and in lines 22 and 24 makes this very unlikely. The root of the verbal form *ba-da-an-ri* may have some other meaning than “to storm against”; the *-bi* of lines 18 and 19 may refer to something other than the *kur*; etc.

*Lines 22–25* (cf. ll. 64–67). — The postposition *-ra* of *lugal-ra* (l. 22) and <sup>d</sup>*en-ki-ra* (l. 24) governs a dative of reference; compare the comment to these complexes on page 38.

*A-gi<sup>s</sup>má-sag-gá-ke<sub>4</sub>* (lit.: “the water of the head [of] the boat”) and *a-gi<sup>s</sup>má-egir-ra-ke<sub>4</sub>* (lit.: “the water of the rear [of] the boat”) are two parallel subject complexes. Note the use of the subject element since they are subjects of transitive verbal forms. Moreover, they represent *single* genitive constructions, not, as in English, *double* genitive constructions. That is, the Sumerian does not say “the head of the boat” and “the rear of the boat,” but “the boat, the head,” and “the boat, the rear,” etc.; for an analysis of this construction compare Poebel in *ZA* XXXVI 248.

The translation of *ur mu-na-kú-e* as “(he) devours” merely represents an attempt to arrive at the meaning of the compound verb *ur—kú* by comparing it with the parallel *sag-giš im-ra-ra*.<sup>88</sup>

*Sag-giš im-ra-ra* (l. 25) is grammatically *sag-giš im(mi)-ra-ra(-e)*, i. e., the third person singular present-future of the compound

<sup>88</sup> Cf. also *ur mu-kú-e* (Gudea Cylinder B xvii 4) and *ur im-da-kú-e* (*PBS* X, Part 2, No. 19 obv. 13; the sign before the last is *kú* according to Dr. Chiera’s collation); in neither case is the meaning certain. The phrase *ur-bi i-kú-e* (*TCL* XVI, No. 40, l. 185; *BE* XXXI, No. 3 obv. 2) seems to involve the same compound *ur—kú*.

verb *sag-giš—ra*, which forms its present-future from the reduplicated root; in regard to tense, therefore, it agrees with the parallel verbal form *mu-na-kú-e* (l. 23). Note that the present-future ending *-e* contracts with the vowel *a* of the reduplicated root *ra-ra* but remains uncontracted after the vowel *u* of the verbal form *mu-na-kú-e*; for this phenomenon compare §§ 467ff. Note that the thematic particle in this verbal form is not *i-*, as a superficial examination of the verbal form might lead one to conclude, but the dimensionally characterized thematic prefix *immi-*; the unstressed final *i* of this prefix has disappeared through syncope.<sup>89</sup> For whether the compound verb *sag-giš—ra* is to be analyzed as *sag-ki-š(è)—ra*, “to hurl the . . . to the ground,” or as *sag(-e)-giš—ra*, “to throw the weapon(?) upon the . . . ,”<sup>90</sup> the designation of the person or object against whom the action is directed would be followed by a locative postposition,<sup>91</sup> and the thematic prefix of the finite verbal form would therefore be expected to be one of the thematic particles containing a locative element: *bi-* or *immi-*, *ba-* or *imma-*.<sup>92</sup>

*Lines 26–30* (cf. ll. 68–72). — If *u<sub>4</sub>-bi-a*, “on that day” (note the writing *u<sub>4</sub>-ba*, i. e., *u<sub>4</sub>-b(i)-a*, in B; the *i* of the pronoun may or, for some as yet uninvestigated reasons, may not contract with the locative *-a*; cf. §§ 217f.), refers to the time immediately after Enki had set sail for the nether world, it is possible that the poem purports to relate the two facts. That is, it may have been as a result of Enki’s journey to the nether world that the South Wind raged and uprooted the *huluppu*-tree, while the waters of the Euphrates became turbulent and washed it away.

The reading *giš-diš-àm* <sup>813</sup>*ḫa-lu-úb-diš-àm giš-diš-àm*<sup>93</sup> is found only in line 26, i. e., in the *eme-ku* part of our reconstructed text, which up to line 39 is based on A only. The rhythmic effect produced by the threefold repetition of *diš-àm* is in consonance

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Poebel in *ZA XXXVI* 265.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Poebel in *AOF IX* 256.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. comment to *muš-tu<sub>6</sub>(?) -nu-zu-e* (l. 40).

<sup>92</sup> Thus with the compounds *giš—ra*, “to measure out(?),” and *giš—tag*, “to sacrifice,” the prefix regularly used in classical Sumerian is *bi-*.

<sup>93</sup> For the use of the numeral *diš* cf. § 291.

with that produced by each of the three-line couplets comprising lines 7–15. The reading of the corresponding eme-SAL line (l. 68) is unfortunately uncertain; however, B and D seem to agree with C and E (on which the reconstruction of that line is based) in reading mu-ki-ta-àm  $g^{18}h_a$ -lu-úb instead of  $g^{18}d_{i\check{s}}$ -àm  $g^{18}h_a$ -lu-úb at the beginning. The first sign, MU, is, of course, the eme-SAL for the sign  $g^{18}$  of line 26. As for the meaning of ki-ta-àm,<sup>94</sup> perhaps ki-ta corresponds to the complex sig-ta in the following sentence: sig-ta  $g^{18}h_a$ -lu-úb . . . . mu-ra-ta-e<sub>11</sub>-dè igi-nim-ta  $g^{18}$ erin . . . . ma-ra-an-TUM,<sup>95</sup> “from below I (Ningirsu) shall bring up for thee the *huluppu*-tree. . . . , from above I shall bring thee the cedar. . . .”<sup>96</sup>

$g^{18}H_a$ -lu-úb is usually translated as “willow” (*Salix babylonica*); whether there is any relationship etymologically or in meaning between  $g^{18}h_a$ -lu-úb and Hebrew ערבה (usually identified with the poplar [*Populus euphratica*]) remains problematical. While the seed and flower of the  $g^{18}h_a$ -lu-úb are used, though quite infrequently, for medicinal purposes, it is interesting to note that in at least two omen passages<sup>97</sup> its presence is interpreted as an evil omen; and it is not impossible that there is some connection between this fact and the mishaps that befell the *huluppu*-tree, as narrated in our poem.

Gú-<sup>id</sup>buranuna-kug-ga-ka (l. 27) is grammatically gú-<sup>id</sup>buranuna-kug-ak-a; the *k* of the genitive element is not dropped, since it is followed by the locative particle -a. The writing U<sub>4</sub>.KIB-nu-na would seem to indicate the pronunciation buranuna (rather than buranun) at this period, a development which may be due to analogy with the frequently accompanying idigna.

<sup>94</sup> A correction to di-ša-àm, which would then correspond to the diš-àm of l. 26, seems out of the question, since, at least according to the copies, there is no doubt about the sign TA in any of the duplicates.

<sup>95</sup> Gudea Cylinder A xii 3 ff.

<sup>96</sup> It is not impossible, however, that ki-ta-àm is really identical with diš-àm; i. e., that ki is a phonetic variant for gi, which may be the eme-SAL for “one,” and that instead of àm the scribe added the postpositive element ta-àm, which, when used alongside of a cardinal number, regularly expresses the distributive relationship.

<sup>97</sup> CT XXXIX, Pl. 11, ll. 43 and 51.

Dù-a is the infinitive of the root dù, here used in the sense of *zaqâpu*, "to plant"; for the infinitive used in the sense of a passive participle compare §§ 701 ff. Note that while the simple infinitive is used to describe the single past action "having been planted,"  $na_8na_8$ -da (i. e.,  $na_8$ - $na_8$ -(e)d-a) in the following and parallel line is a present-future infinitive. The latter is used in our case to denote the timeless character of the action involved in the continued absorption by the *huluppu*-tree of the water of the Euphrates from the time it had been planted up to and including the present moment (i. e., when it was attacked by the storm); for the differentiation in use between the simple and the present-future infinitive compare §§ 682 ff. The possessive pronoun bi of the complexes dù-a-bi and  $na_8$ - $na_8$ -da-bi points back to the three appositional complexes  $giš$ - $diš$ -àm <sup>g18</sup> $ha$ -lu-úb- $diš$ -àm  $giš$ - $diš$ -àm, each of which is in reality an anticipatory genitive (§ 161). That the complexes are not followed by the genitive particle is due to the fact that the enclitic -àm cannot be followed by a postpositive element, although it is quite likely that the genitive postposition would in any case not be written, since at this period the anticipatory genitive was usually treated as a kind of absolute case; compare § 377.

The exact meaning and grammatical construction of á (l. 29) is not certain. Assuming that a meaning such as "force" or "violence" is correct in this case, one might be inclined to consider the complex á-<sup>tu</sup><sub>1</sub> $gàl$ -lu<sup>98</sup> as a genitive construction, "the force of the South Wind"; the difficulty is that, since this complex is the subject of the transitive verbal forms *mu-ni-sír* and *mu-ni-dar*, the complex should be followed by the subject element -e, and hence it should have appeared as á-<sup>tu</sup><sub>1</sub> $gàl$ -lu-ke<sub>4</sub>. Perhaps, therefore, it is best to analyze the complex á <sup>tu</sup><sub>1</sub> $gàl$ -lu as á(-a) (or á(-e)) <sup>tu</sup><sub>1</sub> $gàl$ -lu(-e), i. e., "in violence the South Wind," in which both the locative postposition -a (or -e) and the subject element -e have been absorbed by the immediately preceding vowels (cf. §§ 344 and 347).

Úr-ba and its parallel complex pa-ba are grammatically úr-

<sup>98</sup> Or is one to read the signs GÀL.LU in this complex also as lu<sub>6</sub>? Cf. n. 77.

b(i-)a and pa-b(i-)a; the possessive pronoun *bi* here as in lines 27 and 28 points back to the three anticipatory genitives of line 26. The meanings "crown" and "base" for *pa* (= Akkadian *aru* or *artu*[?]) and *úr* (= Akkadian *išdu*) seem to give the most satisfactory sense in the context. The combination of the two descriptive phrases, "plucked at its base, tore at its crown," results in a pregnant expression for "uprooted it."

The verbal forms *mu-ni-sír* and *mu-ni-dar* are grammatically *mu-ni(-n)-sír* and *mu-ni(-n)-dar*, i. e., third person singular preterit *transitive* verbal forms with the infix *-ni-*, which takes up the locative complexes *úr-ba* and *pa-ba* respectively. Note that the writings found in line 29, *mu-ni-sír* and *mu-ni-dar* instead of *mu-ni-in-sír* and *mu-ni-in-dar*, are based on A alone, whereas all the duplicates which contain the corresponding line 71 of our reconstructed text write the fuller forms; compare also line 98. It is difficult to see what influenced the scribe of A to omit the pronominal *-n* in these two cases, especially since he regularly writes it in the other third person singular preterit transitive verbal forms.

<sup>1d</sup>*Buranuna* (l. 30) is probably the subject of the transitive verbal form *im-ma-ni-ib-ra*. It should therefore be followed by the subject element *-e*; if, as has been stated already, the pronunciation of the word was *buranuna* at this period, the subject element may have been absorbed by the immediately preceding *a*. The word *a*, "on the waters," if the translation should prove correct, is *a(-e)* or *a(-a)*. The verbal form *im-ma-ni-ib-ra* is to be analyzed grammatically as *imma-ni-b(-n)-ra*, i. e., the third person preterit of the root *ra*, "to seize and carry off,"<sup>99</sup> with the causative transitive element *-b* and the locative infix *-ni-*. Note that all the texts, including those on which line 72 is based, agree in prefixing *imma-* (classical *e-ma-*; cf. § 613) to this verbal form, while on

<sup>99</sup> For this meaning of the root cf. Poebel in *AOF* IX 266f. There is some possibility, of course, that the root *ra* has here its customary meaning, "to hurl." If so, the translation of the line should read: "the Euphrates flooded it with water" (lit.: "the Euphrates, on its part, hurled water against it"). In this case *a*, "water," is the direct object of *im-ma-ni-ib-ra*; the locative infix *-ni-*, "against it," contained in the verbal form, refers to the tree; the prefix *imma-* expresses the idea "on its part."

the other hand they all use the prefix *mu-* in the verbal forms *mu-ni-(in-)sír* and *mu-ni-(in-)dar* of the preceding and parallel line; cf. § 599*a*.

*Lines 31–34* (cf. ll. 73–76). — The question of the identification of the goddess described laconically as *munus*, so important for the proper understanding of this poem, must remain unsettled as yet. Since Inanna is the goddess who in the extant so-called “enem literature” laments the havoc and destruction caused by the word of Anu and Enlil which seeks her out, one might suppose that Inanna is the deity in question. This, however, seems to be rather unlikely in view of such a statement as that attributed to this goddess in line 34: “To pure Inanna’s holy garden thou(?) shalt bring it.” Moreover, the deity designated by this word *munus* is certainly the same who informed Gilgamesh of Inanna’s plight (cf. comment to ll. 45–49). When, therefore, in the course of her speech, she refers to herself, as is clearly the case in line 75, she uses the first person both in the pronominal and in the verbal forms. In lines 76–80, however, which in all likelihood refer to Inanna, she uses the third person throughout — a fact that at least on the surface certainly seems to indicate that the speaker and Inanna were not identical.

The exact meaning of *ní-te-a DU* remains obscure as long as the reading and meaning of the last sign are uncertain. The translation assumes it to be the *nomen agentis* of the intransitive verb *gin* or *du* = *aláku*.

*Giš* (l. 33), as expected, is written *mu* in the corresponding *eme-sal* line 75. The verbal form *mu-un-díb* (l. 33) is grammatically probably *mu-n(-n)-díb*; i. e., the causative transitive particle is written, while the subject element *-n* is omitted (cf. § 529). In line 75, however, where the verbal form is preceded by the complex *šu-mà*, “in *my* hand,” the former obviously must be a *first* person singular preterit and is therefore to be analyzed grammatically as *mu-n(-ʾ)-díb*; again the causative transitive particle is written, while the *-ʾ*, which is the pronominal element prefixed to the root in the first person preterit, is as usual not indicated in the orthography. Similarly, the verbal form *ba-ni-in-tu* in line 33 is to be analyzed as a third person singular preterit, i. e., *ba-ni-n(-n)-*

tu(r), literally, "she caused it to enter there alongside of her"; in line 75, on the other hand, it is a *first* person preterit, i. e., it is grammatically ba-ni-n(-<sup>3</sup>)-tu(r). Note the use of the prefix ba- in lines 33 and 75 in ba-ni-in-tu, while the parallel verbal form mu-un-díb in the very same lines begins with the prefix mu-; in the former case, as the literal translation indicates, the prefix ba- is used to denote the reflexive nuance "alongside of herself." Instead of ba-ni-in-tu D reads ba-an-ni-tu; it would seem that the grammatical ba-ni-n(-<sup>3</sup>)-tu(r) was accented by this scribe on the first syllable; he therefore doubled the *n* of the infix -ni- immediately following and omitted the final *n* of the middle syllable, which was no doubt slurred to some extent in the pronunciation. Note that the scribe of this tablet is the same one who omits the pronominal -n- in LI-bí-dug<sub>4</sub><sup>100</sup> and in mu-[u]n-ni-dar<sup>101</sup> as well as the final *n*'s in the unstressed final syllables of the verbal forms im-ma-ni-in-tu-ri-en (l. 34; cf. n. 12), ba-ni-tuš-ù-dè-en (ll. 37 and 79), and ba-ni-ná-dè-en (ll. 38 and 80).

Moreover, at least in regard to the latter phenomenon, it is obvious that the scribe of D agrees with the scribe of U 9364<sup>102</sup> in the treatment of the *n* of the affix -e(n). For an examination of the verbal forms in that part of U 9364 which has been treated on pages 12-30 shows that this scribe too regularly omitted the affix -e(n); thus he writes na-an-mu<sub>4</sub>-mu<sub>4</sub> (l. 57) for the grammatical na-(i-)n-mu<sub>4</sub>-mu<sub>4</sub>-(e(n)); na-an-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub> (l. 59) for the grammatical na-(i-)n-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub>-(e(n)); nam-mu-un-sìg-gi (l. 61) for the grammatical na-(i)mmi-n-sìg-e(n); nam-mu-un-gá-gá (ll. 63 and 66) for the grammatical na-(i)mmi-n-gá-gá-(e(n)); na-an-su-ub-bi (ll. 67 and 69) for the grammatical na-(i-)n-sub-e(n); nam-mu-un-ra-ra (ll. 68 and 70) for the grammatical na-(i)mmi-n-ra-ra-(e(n)). In all these examples the antepenult is a long syllable, since its vowel is followed by two consonants, and therefore in all probability received the stress. The same is true

<sup>100</sup> Written LI-bí-in-du in the duplicates; cf. p. 50.

<sup>101</sup> Written mi-ni-in-dar in the duplicates; cf. pp. 62f.

<sup>102</sup> The tablet whose first twenty-three lines constitute source F for the last part of our poem.



of the verbal form *immaninture(n)*; in the form *banitušude(n)*<sup>103</sup> too the stress was undoubtedly on the antepenult, i. e., on the root syllable, rather than on either of the two following syllables, whose vowels are short and so indefinite that they frequently change from *e* to *u* in accordance with the nature of the preceding root vowel. If, therefore, the scribe of D omits the final *n* in these two verbal forms while the other scribes retain it in their orthography, this fact may indicate that two different scribal practices had developed in the post-Sumerian orthography in regard to a grammatically justified final *n*: the one scribal school wrote it only when the stress was favorable to its pronunciation; the other wrote it without regard to stress.

The complex *kiri<sub>6</sub>-gi-rin-kug-<sup>d</sup>inanna-šè* (lit.: "to the holy garden of the pure queen of heaven") represents grammatically *kiri-girin-kug-<sup>d</sup>inanna-k-a(k)-šè*, in which the first *-ak* is the genitive particle of the complex *<sup>d</sup>(n)in-an-a(k)*, "the queen of heaven," i. e., the Sumerian name for Ishtar, while the following *-a(k)* is the postpositive element which indicates the genitive relationship between the complex *kiri<sub>6</sub>-gi-rin* and *<sup>d</sup>inanna*. In classical Sumerian, therefore, the complex would have been written *kiri<sub>6</sub>-girin-kug-<sup>d</sup>inanna-ka-šè*; in the post-Sumerian period, however, the genitive element is regularly omitted after proper names when followed, as in our case, by a postposition (cf. § 375). Note that line 76, quite as expected, has the eme-SAL form *kug-ga-ša-an-na-šè* instead.

*Im-ma-ni-in-tu-ri-en* is assumed to represent grammatically *im ma-ni-n-tur-en*, i. e., the second person present-future of the root *tur*, "to enter"; the prefix *imma-* indicates the reflexive nuance "along with," the locative infix *-ni-* recapitulates the locative complex *kiri<sub>6</sub>-gi-rin-kug-<sup>d</sup>inanna-šè*, while the *-n-* following is the causative transitive element. Note that in the verbal form *ba-ni-in-tu* (l. 33) the *r* of the root is omitted; it is not omitted in

<sup>103</sup> In the form *baninade(n)* it is true that the stress is on the penult. In omitting the final *n*, the scribe of D may have been influenced by the preceding and parallel *ba-ni-tuš-ù-dè*, although it is quite possible that the vowel in the syllable *-na* of the form *ba-ni-ná-dè* was diphthong-like in character (note that it is grammatically *ba-ni-ná-(e)d-e(n)*).

im-ma-ni-in-tu-ri-en, however, since it is followed by a grammatical element beginning with a vowel. On the other hand, as is to be expected in the orthography of the post-Sumerian period, the final *n* of the present-future pronominal ending -en is written, although it is not followed by a grammatical element beginning with a vowel. Even this final *n*, however, is omitted in duplicate D; compare the comment to ba-ni-in-tu above. As for the use of the prefix ba- in ba-ni-in-tu and the prefix imma- with exactly the same meaning in im-ma-ni-in-tu-ri-en, it must be admitted that at least as far as our present knowledge goes, the two seem to be used altogether indiscriminately even in the classical period; compare the comment to im-ma-ab-rig<sub>7</sub>-a-ba (l. 12).

The statement "to pure Inanna's holy garden thou(?) shalt bring it" seems to be made directly to the goddess described as munus (l. 31) who brought the *huluppu*-tree to Uruk; is it perhaps part of the "word" of Anu and Enlil mentioned in the preceding lines? Note that im-ma-ni-in-tu-ri-en can also be translated "I shall bring it"<sup>104</sup> as well as "she brought thee" (gram.: imma-ni-n(-n)-tur-en, with -en as the accusative suffix attached to the third person singular of the preterit; cf. § 517) or even "I brought thee" (gram.: imma-ni-n(-')-tur-en).

*Lines 35-38* (cf. ll. 77-80). — Because of the laconic style which characterizes the narration of the incidents described in our poem from line 35 to the end, the meaning of this part of the text is not at all certain, especially since the verbal forms in lines 35 (cf. l. 77), 36 (cf. l. 78), and 39 (cf. l. 81), which are crucial for a proper understanding of the narrative, present numerous difficulties in analysis and interpretation. Most likely the course of events is to be understood as follows: Inanna joyfully received the uprooted *huluppu*-tree which had been brought to her garden and hopefully awaited the

<sup>104</sup> In other words, the contents of this line, "to pure Inanna's holy garden I shall bring it," would constitute a direct statement made by the munus. But whom is she addressing? Is she addressing herself? Moreover, instead of kug.<sup>d</sup>inanna-še, the eme-SAL form kug-ga-ša-an-na-šè might have been expected, since this is the same munus who brought the *huluppu*-tree to Uruk, and therefore the same deity whose speech in ll. 50-86 is written in the eme-SAL dialect; cf. comment to ll. 45-49.

moment when she would be able to utilize its wood for the making of her throne and bed. And indeed, after a period of ten years had elapsed (according to D; see p. 52), the *huluppu*-tree had grown large and strong. To Inanna's dismay, however, she was unable to get at the tree, for the snake, the Zu-bird, and Lilith had taken possession of it as their abode. Thereupon Gilgamesh came to the rescue of the weeping Inanna; he uprooted the tree, and after the men of Uruk had cut off its crown he gave part of it to Inanna for her throne and bed.

As the translation indicates, the assumption is that the divinity to whom the word *munus* of the complex *munus-e* in line 35 applies is Inanna. What is strange, however, is the fact that, although it is characteristic of Sumerian poetry that two repeated lines forming a couplet differ only in that the first gives a descriptive title of the deity concerned, while the second line gives the actual name, lines 35 and 36 of our text are exactly alike, both beginning with *munus* instead of the name of the deity. However, in the case of the corresponding lines 77 and 78 the first begins with *nu-nuz* (the *eme-SAL* form for *munus*), and the second gives the name of the goddess; for although D, the tablet on which the beginning of line 78 is based (according to E even l. 78 begins with *nu-nuz*), is fragmentary, the restoration of the first part of the line to <sup>d</sup>[ga]-ša(!)-an-na-ke<sub>4</sub> (a contracted form for <sup>d</sup>ga-ša-an-an-na-ke<sub>4</sub>, occasionally to be found in place of the longer form) is quite possible. Note the correct use of the subject element *-e* in the complex *munus-e* as well as in the corresponding *nu-nuz-e* of line 77 and in <sup>d</sup>ga-ša-an-na-ke<sub>4</sub> of line 78, since these complexes are the subjects of the transitive verbal forms *LI-bí-in-du* and *bí-in-gub*.

Instead of the word *giš* found in lines 35 and 36, lines 77 and 78, as expected, have the *eme-SAL* form *mu*. The possessive pronoun of the complex *šu-na* (i. e., *šu-n(i)a*), "with her hand," refers of course to Inanna, no matter who the divinity described as *munus-e* should finally prove to be. Strangely enough, A, on which lines 35 and 36 are based, reads *šu-na-a* instead of *šu-na*; if not merely an oversight, the writing seems altogether unjustified, unless the rkythm of the line influenced the scribe in some manner which we are as yet unable to recognize.

The meaning "fondled" for the verbal form LI-bí-in-du is merely a guess based on the context. As yet only the Akkadian verb *zamáru* has been found equated with LI—du.<sup>105</sup> The reading of the sign LI in the verbal form LI—du is, moreover, uncertain; thus in the verbal form LI—tar, which seems to be a compound parallel in formation to LI—du, the sign LI has been proved to have the value èn.<sup>106</sup> However, in spite of the preceding, it must be noted that there is at least the possibility that LI-bí-in-du is to be analyzed grammatically as nu-bí-n-du(g)<sub>4</sub>, literally, "she did not put it (i. e., the tree) there (i. e., in her hand)"; for the change of the negative particle nu- to li- before the prefix bí-, compare § 634. The root dug<sub>4</sub>, which has a meaning approximating "to put," "to place," might perhaps be the same as that used in the compound verb šu—dug<sub>4</sub> (= Akkadian *lapātu*), "to place the hand"; whether this root is merely a variant pronunciation of the root tag (note that šu—tag also is equated with Akkadian *lapātu*) is a matter for future investigation. For the omission of the pronominal -n- in D, which writes LI-bí-dug<sub>4</sub>, compare the comment to the verbal form ba-ni-in-tu (l. 33) and to bí-in-gub immediately below. Note the correct use of the dimensional prefix bí-; it recapitulates the locative complex šu-na.

The translation "at her foot" for the complex gir-ni-ta<sup>107</sup> is probably correct, though the translation may fail to render some nuance expressed by the postposition -ta. Indeed, the sense of the expression "she let it stand at her foot," if the translation is correct, is not clear; its meaning should in some way parallel that of the first half of the line. As expected, lines 77 and 78 write the corresponding eme-SAL form me-ri, although even in this case duplicate D writes the sign GIR. The verbal form bí-in-gub (lit.: "she caused it to stand there") is grammatically probably bí-(n-)n-gub; for the omission of the causative transitive particle when

<sup>105</sup> Also written LI—du<sub>11</sub> and LI-du<sub>12</sub>; in our text E writes DU, while D uses KA, i. e., du<sub>11</sub>.

<sup>106</sup> Poebel in ZA XXXIX 82.

<sup>107</sup> It is quite possible that, as the eme-SAL form meri indicates, the word for "foot" was giri rather than gir; hence the possessive pronoun for "his" was ni rather than ani.

followed by a vowelless subject element compare § 528. Note once again the correct use of the dimensional prefix *bí-*; it recapitulates the locative complex *gir-ni-ta*. None of the duplicates, not even D, fails to write the pronominal *-n-* before the root in the verbal form *bí-in-gub*, although in the very same line D omits it in the verbal form *Lr-bí-dug<sub>4</sub>*, where it is perhaps the final consonant in a syllable *following* the stressed syllable;<sup>108</sup> compare the comment to *ba-ni-in-tu* (for which D has the variant *ba-an-ni-tu*) of l. 33.

For *me-na-àm* as the emphatic form of an interrogative pronoun, with the meaning “when,” “when at last,” compare § 247. Note that a *gí<sup>s</sup>ná-gi-rin* is mentioned in *PBS X*, Part 2, No. 9 rev. i 9,<sup>109</sup> and in *HAV*, No. 9 rev. 30. A *múná-gi-rin* is found in *SBH*, No. 47 rev. 15, where the preceding line begins with *gí<sup>s</sup>gu-za*, which is unfortunately followed by a break. A *gí<sup>s</sup>gu-za-gi-rin* is found in *SRT*, No. 1 rev. vi 21, where the final *-ba*, in accordance with the duplicate *HAV*, No. 2 rev. 63, is to be corrected to *-na*. Note also that a *gú-za-gi-rin* is brought as a gift to Nanshe according to *DPr*, No. 70.

The verbal forms *ba-ni-tuš-ù-dè-en* (l. 37), literally: “I shall sit upon it,” and *ba-ni-ná-dè-en* (l. 38), literally: “I shall lie upon it,” are grammatically *ba-ni-tuš-ed-en* and *ba-ni-ná-(e)d-en* respectively. For the formation of certain intransitive present-future verbal forms in the post-Sumerian periods by the addition of the element *-ed* to the root, compare § 625; for the change of the *e* of *-ed* to *u* (e. g., in *ba-ni-tuš-ù-dè-en*) when the latter follows a verbal root containing the vowel *u* and ending in a labial consonant,<sup>110</sup> compare § 726; for the absorption of the *e* of *-ed* (e. g., in *ba-ni-ná-dè-en*) by the immediately preceding vowel of a root ending in a vowel, compare § 725. Note that D omits the final *n* of the present-future ending and writes [ba-ni-tuš-ù-d]è and [ba-]ni(!)-ná-dè, exactly as it writes *im-ma-ni-in-tu-ri* instead of *im-ma-ni-in-tu-ri-en* (cf. comment to the latter on pp. 47f.).

In the verbal form *bí-in-dug<sub>4</sub>*, “she said concerning it,” note once again the correct usage of the prefix *bí-*; for other instances

<sup>108</sup> That is, the scribe of D stressed the antepenult, LI.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. its duplicate *TCL XV*, No. 9 obv. iii 13, for the correct reading.

<sup>110</sup> The *š* of certain Sumerian words is treated as a labial sibilant.

illustrating the varied dimensional nuances of this prefix, compare the examples cited in § 591.

*Lines 39-42* (cf. ll. 81-84). — As note 18 indicates, the line on D that corresponds to our line 81 is preceded by one found in that text alone and most likely reading *mu-5-àm mu 10-[àm] ba-e-zal-la-DAR*, the probable translation being “after a full (= àm) five, a full ten years had passed”; for a discussion of the verbal form compare the comment on line 51. D’s extra line furnishes an excellent introduction to lines 39 and 81.

Instead of the *giš* of line 39, the *eme-SAL* form *mu*, as expected, is to be found in line 81. *Ba-gur<sub>4</sub>* is the endingless third person preterit of the intransitive root *gur<sub>4</sub>*, whose Akkadian equivalent is *kabâru*, “to grow large.” The meaning of *su* in the complex *su-bi* is quite uncertain; the translation “bark” is hardly more than a guess. The verbal form *nu-mu-un-da-dar* may perhaps be analyzed as *nu-mu-n-da(-n)-dar*, i. e., the third person singular preterit with the infix *-n-da-* (lit.: “with her”), “she (was) able.” The variant *la-ba-dar-dar* in D, which does not contain the infix *-(n-)da-* but which reduplicates its root, suggests, however, the possibility that the sign *da* of *nu-mu-un-da-dar* is a phonetic writing for *dar*.<sup>111</sup>

Moreover, it is important to note that, at least as far as our present knowledge goes, quite a different translation of the entire line is possible. Thus, if we read the *LAGAB* sign as *ḥab* (instead of as *gur<sub>4</sub>*), whose Akkadian equivalent is *bîšû*, the sentence *mu ba-ḥab* would mean “the tree rotted” instead of “the tree grew large.” The root *dar* may have a meaning approximating “to produce (grain etc.),” “to fructify”;<sup>112</sup> the sentence *su-bi nu-mu-un-da-dar* (gram.: *nu-mu-n-da(r)-dar*) may therefore mean “it did not continue to fructify its bark(?),” in which the reduplicated root expresses repeated action (hence “continue”). It must be admitted, however, that it seems hardly likely that Gilgamesh would present to Inanna the crown of a tree which, according to this translation of the line, had rotted away.

In the complexes *úr-bi-a* and *pa-bi-a* (ll. 40 and 41) the vowel *i*

<sup>111</sup> Cf. Kramer in *JAOS* LIV 408.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. *HAV*, No. 13 rev. v 27.

of the possessive pronoun *bi* is not absorbed by the locative *-a* immediately following, although in lines 29 and 71 we find *úr-ba* (i. e., *úr-b(i)-a*) and *pa-ba* (i. e., *pa-b(i)-a*); for this seemingly indiscriminate treatment of the final vowel of the possessive pronoun *bi*, compare the comment to *u<sub>4</sub>-bi-a* (l. 26).

The final *-e* of the complex *muš-tu<sub>6</sub>(?) -nu-zu-e*, like that of the two parallel complexes *<sup>d</sup>IM-dugud<sup>muš<sub>en</sub>-dè</sup>* (gram.: *<sup>d</sup>IM-dugud-muš<sub>en</sub>-e*) and *ki-sikil-líl-lá-ke<sub>4</sub>* (gram.: *ki-sikil-líl-ak-e*), is the subject element added to a complex when it is the subject of a transitive verb, although it is to be noted that usually the subject element is absorbed by the immediately preceding vowel if it follows a word ending in a vowel (as does *zu* here); compare § 344. Note, however, that the final *-e* of the same complex in line 93 is probably the *locative* element, since it is likely that the object of the verbal form *sag-giš ba-an-ra*, “he smote,” is in Sumerian followed by the locative particle; compare the comment to *sag-giš im-ra-ra* (l. 25). As for the reading *tu<sub>6</sub>* of the sign following *muš*, it is assumed that the sign included in the *KA* is that which in later Assyrian is written not with *ŠE* but with *LI*.<sup>113</sup> The descriptive title “the snake who knows no charm” may imply that he does not understand the priest’s incantations and his magic ritual and therefore, oblivious to the priest’s commands to depart, he continues his unwelcome stay in the place where he has intruded.

The three verbal forms *im-ma-ni-ib-us* (l. 40), *im-ma-ni-ib-gar* (l. 41), and *im-ma-ni-ib-dù* (l. 42) are grammatically *imma-ni-b(-n)-us* (lit.: “he set it up there for himself”), *imma-ni-b(-n)-gar* (lit.: “he placed it there for himself”), and *imma-ni-b(-n)-dù* (lit.: “she built it there for herself”). Note that each of the three verbal forms begins with the reflexive prefix *imma-* followed by the locative infix *-ni-*, which recapitulates the locative complexes *úr-bi-a* (l. 40), *pa-bi-a* (l. 41), and *šab-bi-a* (l. 42) respectively; moreover, they all agree in writing the causative transitive particle *-b* in preference to the subject element *-n* (cf. § 529).

<sup>113</sup> It must be admitted that only A and D (both Chiera’s copies) lend some probability to this assumption. F, on the other hand, has very clearly *KA+ŠE*, while in G the sign is not well preserved.

Instead of šab-bi-a (l. 42), the corresponding eme-SAL line 84 writes šab-ba-bi-a; it is not impossible that this writing is due to the fact that the eme-SAL pronunciation of the word for "heart," according to the tradition of some scribes, was šaba rather than šab. The writing šab-ba-bi in F, however, still presents a difficulty in that it omits the locative -a; if not merely an oversight, perhaps the complex is to be analyzed as šaba-bi(-e).

*Lines 43 and 44* (cf. ll. 85 and 86). — The descriptive title gù-dè-dè (variant for gù-dé-dé(?)) is used of Inanna in the long hymn to that goddess published in *PBS X*, Part. 4.<sup>114</sup> Note that the reduplication of the root in this complex, which consists of an active participle and a preceding accusative, expresses the repetition of the verbal action (cf. § 446a). In the parallel complex šà-ḥúl-ḥúl, however, the reduplication of the root probably expresses the fact that the same action was performed on a plurality of objects and, as the translation indicates, has the added connotation of totality (cf. § 446).

Kug <sup>d</sup>inanna-ke<sub>4</sub> (l. 44; gram.: kug <sup>d</sup>(n)in-an-ak-e) is the subject of the transitive verbal form ba-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub>. While line 86, as expected, writes the eme-SAL form, kug <sup>d</sup>ga-ša-an-an-na, it adds an ambiguous DU to the complex; compare note 13 for another example of this phenomenon. Strange too is the fact that D seems to have only k[u]g-ga-[ša]-an-na, without any subject element. The reading and meaning of the particle e-NE are also quite uncertain; the translation "how!" is hardly more than a guess to suit the context. F reads e-NE-NE, and it is quite impossible to decide whether the last -NE is merely a scribal error or represents some modified form of e-NE. The verbal form ba-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub> is taken in the translation as grammatically ba-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub>(-e), literally: "she sheds (tears) for herself"; for a more detailed discussion of the compound verb ír—še<sub>8</sub>(š) compare the comment to na-an-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub> on pages 18f. But ba-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub> may be grammatically ba-še<sub>8</sub>-še<sub>8</sub>(-en), "I shall shed (tears)" or "thou wilt shed (tears)"; and if the sign DU of line 86 is to be read as the enclitic -men, the meaning of lines 85 and 86 (and perhaps also ll. 43 and 44) might be either "I, who am the ever shouting(?) maid, the rejoicer of all hearts, the pure

<sup>114</sup> No. 3 obv. 15; the last sign in that line is to be corrected to DÈ.



Inanna, how long(?) shall I weep?" or "thou, who art . . . , how long(?) wilt thou weep?" Which of the three interpretations outlined above is the correct one, it is as yet impossible to decide; the first has been incorporated in our translation as the most probable. However, a deeper insight into the material at hand or the discovery of additional texts may prove the second or even the third to be the correct interpretation.

*Lines 45-49.* — It is most unfortunate that just at this crucial point both A and B are too fragmentary to enable us to reconstruct their contents with any degree of certainty. However, to judge from the fact that Gilgamesh comes to the aid of Inanna (l. 87) after he has been informed of her difficulties in words (ll. 50-86) almost identical with those in which the poet himself has related them (ll. 1-44), it is reasonable to assume that the intermediate passage (ll. 45-49) contains a statement to the effect that at dawn, with the rising of the sun, X seeks out(?) Gilgamesh and speaks to him (the words contained in lines 50-86). The difficulty now lies in identifying X. That she is the same munus (l. 31) who brought the *huluppu*-tree to Uruk (l. 33) is obvious from her statement, "(I) seized the tree in my hand and brought it to Uruk" (l. 75). According to the comment on munus on page 45, it is rather unlikely that she is to be identified with Inanna. But whoever this deity proves to be, it is certain that she is one of those goddesses whose direct speech is quoted in the eme-SAL (cf. § 4), since lines 50-86 consistently use the eme-SAL dialect, while lines 1-49, which contain straight epic narrative, are written in the eme-KU dialect; compare the following table (the numbers give the lines according to our reconstructed text):

dU (10, 11)	ir (52, 53)
ᵀen-líl (11, 32)	ᵀmu-ul-líl (53, 74)
ᵀen-ki (15, 17, 20, 24)	ᵀam-an-ki (57, 59, 62, 66)
lugal (16, 22)	ù-mu-un (58, 64)
giš (26, 33, 35, 36, 39)	mu (68, 75, 77, 78, 81)
munus (31, 35, 36)	nu-nuz (73, 77, 78 [so E])
enem (31, 32)	e-ne-èᵀm (73, 74)
ᵀinanna (34, 44)	ᵀga-ša-an(-an)-na (76, 86)
[gir] (35, 36)	me-ri (77, 78)

The complex  $u_4$ -zal-li<sup>115</sup>-da is probably to be analyzed as consisting of the substantive  $u_4$ , the infinitive zal-a (used appositionally as an intransitive participle), and the dimensional postposition -da (the change of the vowel *a* of the infinitive to *e* is not uncommon; cf. § 721); the literal meaning therefore approximates “with daylight breaking through,” i. e., “at the break of day.” Similarly, the parallel complex an-úr-zalag-gi-da<sup>116</sup> probably consists of the substantive complex an-úr (for the appositional instead of the genitival construction cf. the comment to <sup>g</sup>18 má-sag-gá-ke<sub>4</sub> [l. 22]), the infinitive zalag-a, and the postposition -da. Whether the  $gi_4$ - $gi_4$  of the complex KA  $gi_4$ - $gi_4$ -da in line 46 is also to be analyzed as an infinitive ( $gi_4$ - $gi_4$  <  $gi_4$ - $gi_4$ -e <  $gi_4$ - $gi_4$ -a) is uncertain, since the meaning and even the reading of that line are quite obscure. Note, moreover, that according to the form alone zal-li-da and zalag-gi-da as well as  $gi_4$ - $gi_4$ -da may be future infinitives, i. e., zal-ed-a, zalag-ed-a, and  $gi_4$ - $gi_4$ -(e)d-a.

*Lines 50 and 51.* — These lines begin the address to Gilgamesh, which in lines 52–86 repeats practically word for word (in the eme-SAL dialect, however) the passage contained in lines 10–44; it is not clear why the contents of the lines preceding 10 are not repeated, although the fragmentary condition of the latter makes it impossible to say whether or not lines 50 and 51 correspond to at least two of those lines. Line 50 is too fragmentary for translation; the -ba at the end may be the remnant of an -a-ba whose -a- had been joined in the orthography to the preceding final consonant of the root. If the restoration and translation of line 51 are correct, then ka-na-ág (note the eme-SAL orthography, and cf. kalam in ll. 5 and 6) is the subject of the intransitive verb ba-e-zal-la-RI,<sup>117</sup> while  $\text{ḫe-gál-la}$  is grammatically  $\text{ḫe-gál-a}$  (i. e., the -a is the dimen-

<sup>115</sup> Really *le*; cf. AS No. 8, pp. 8f.

<sup>116</sup> Or is the reading -dág or perhaps the as yet unattested -lag<sub>7</sub>, which may represent but a variant pronunciation for -lah<sub>7</sub> and -dág, to be preferred for the sign UTU?

<sup>117</sup> Note the writing ba-e- for ba-; for additional examples of this as yet unexplained phenomenon cf. ba-e-til = *gam-rat*(!), “it has come to an end” (ASKT, No. 21 obv. 61; for the Akkadian the copy has the impossible form *gam-mar*); ba-e-tuš = *wa-ši-ib*, “he dwells” (IV R 26b, ll. 50 ff.); ba-e-e<sub>11</sub>-dè, “he ascends” (U 9364 obv. 15); ba-e-e<sub>11</sub>, “it arose” (W-B 162 [OECT I, Pls. 5 ff.] i 19).

sional postposition). What the exact meaning of *he-gál* (if the restoration proves correct) in our poem is, it is difficult to say; in the translation it is assumed that it refers to an extraordinary flooding of the earth with water, perhaps to prepare it for productivity. Note the inexplicable *-RI* at the end of the verbal form *ba-e-zal-la-RI* instead of the expected *ba-e-zal-la-ba*, and compare line 1 of the obverse(!) of D, whose verbal form seems to read *ba-e-zal-la-DAR*.<sup>118</sup>

*Lines 52-86.* — Compare the comments to lines 10-44.

*Lines 87 and 88.* — The first word in line 87 (cf. F obv. 7) is *SAL+KU*, not *nin*, as is obvious from the following line, which begins with the complex *šeš-a-ni* (omitted in F but written in G). The Sumerian word for “sister” probably ended in a consonant; otherwise the complex would have read *SAL+KU-ni* instead of *SAL+KU-a-ni* (cf. § 212). The translation of lines 87 and 88 is based on the following analysis:

a) Were it not for the scribe’s desire to place *SAL+KU-a-ni* at the beginning of the line, parallel with *šeš-a-ni ur-sag<sup>d</sup> gi<sup>g18</sup>(b)il-ga-mes* in the line immediately following, the word order of line 87 would have been *inim SAL+KU-a-ni in-na-an-dug<sub>4</sub>-ga*, which is to be analyzed grammatically as *inim SAL+KU-a-ni(-e) i-na-n-dug<sub>4</sub>-a(-e)*; i. e., the entire line is a locative complex, consisting of (1) the substantive *inim*, “matter,” (2) a qualifying relative (better, substantivized) clause *SAL+KU-a-ni(-e)* (the subject element *-e* is absorbed by the preceding vowel) *i-na-n-dug<sub>4</sub>-a*, “(concerning which) his sister had spoken to him,”<sup>119</sup> and (3) the locative postposition *-e*,<sup>120</sup> which has been absorbed by the immediately preceding *-a* of the relative clause (cf. § 344).

<sup>118</sup> Note too the strange *u<sub>4</sub>-zal-zal-la-RI* in IV R 28, No. 4 rev. 45. Perhaps in each of these three verbal forms the last sign is to be read *da* and considered merely a variant writing for the postposition *-da*, “with,” which when placed after a substantivized verbal form (or passive participle) may have the meaning “at the time when.”

<sup>119</sup> The case relationship between the antecedent *inim* and the verbal form of the qualifying relative clause *in-na-an-dug<sub>4</sub>-ga*, which in English is expressed by the phrase “concerning which,” is not expressed in Sumerian; cf. § 269.

<sup>120</sup> If this clause is considered to be merely in apposition to *inim-bi* of the line following, there is no need to assume a locative postposition *-e*.

b) This complex, consisting of the antecedent *inim* + a relative clause + a locative postposition, is taken up again in the locative complex *inim-bi(-e)* (l. 88), where the demonstrative pronoun *bi* takes the place of the relative clause; in other words, the construction is exactly the same as in those instances, quite frequent in occurrence, in which a complex consisting of the antecedent *u<sub>4</sub>*, “day,” + a relative clause + the postposition *-a* is taken up again by the complex *u<sub>4</sub>-bi-a*, “in that day” (cf. § 113).

c) The locative element *-e* of *inim-bi(-e)*, with a meaning approximating “in,” expresses the case relationship between that complex and the verbal form *ba-dè-DU*, “he stood by her.” An excellent example of a slightly varied form of this construction occurs in Gudea’s prayer: *inim-ba ḥa-mu-da-DU*,<sup>121</sup> “May she (Nanshe) stand by me in this matter (the building of the *e-ninnu*).” Strangely enough, unlike this quotation from a Gudea cylinder, none of the duplicates utilized for our reconstructed text uses the locative postposition *-a* in this construction; they all seem to use the postposition *-e* instead.

d) The verbal form *ba-dè-DU* is grammatically *ba-(n-)da-DU*. It is impossible to decide whether the root is *gub* (cf. Akkadian *idā nazāzu*) or *gin* (or *du*), “to walk (alongside of someone).” For the omission of the pronominal *-n-* of the infix *-n-da-* even in the post-Sumerian period, compare § 502*b*. What is very strange about the verbal form *ba-dè-DU*, however, is the fact that the dimensional element *-da-* has become *-de-* for no very apparent reason,<sup>122</sup> although if the root is *gin* there is the possibility of assuming that in this period the *a* of *da-* might be assimilated to the vowel of the root. Note the variant *ba-e-dè-DU* in F; for the writing *ba-e-* instead of *ba-*, compare note 117.

If these two lines are taken absolutely literally, then it follows that Inanna herself had addressed Gilgamesh in lines 50–86; and, despite the difficulties discussed above,<sup>123</sup> Inanna is the munus who had brought the *huluppu*-tree to Uruk. It may well be, however,

<sup>121</sup> Gudea Cylinder A i 25, iii 24.

<sup>122</sup> Cf., however, the comment to *mu-un-da-súg-eš-àm*, variant *mu-un-dè-súg-eš-a* (l. 99).

<sup>123</sup> Cf. p. 45.

that the "matter concerning which his sister had spoken to him" (l. 87) refers not to a direct address by Inanna but rather to one by someone who spoke for Inanna — perhaps the deity who had brought the *huluppu*-tree to Inanna's garden and now brought the latter's complaint to "her brother," Gilgamesh. If, finally, it should prove that Gilgamesh is the brother not of Inanna but of the munus who had brought the *huluppu*-tree to Uruk, it would follow of course that the words "his sister" of line 87 as well as the two pronouns "her" of line 88 refer not to Inanna but to this same munus.

*Lines 89 and 90.* — Possibly <sup>túg</sup>íb-ba-ru is merely a variant for <sup>kuš</sup>e-íb-uru<sub>12</sub>,<sup>124</sup> note the variant writing <sup>kuš</sup>e-bu-uru<sub>12</sub>.<sup>125</sup> There is also some possibility that this phrase should be read <sup>túg</sup>íb ba-šub, which might perhaps be analyzed as consisting of the substantive <sup>túg</sup>íb, "girdle(?)," and the transitive(?) verbal form ba-šub, (gram.: ba(-n)-šub, with a meaning approximating "he put on," although the fact that all the duplicates omit the pronominal -n in this case speaks against this analysis of ba-šub. The second part of the line forms another sentence, consisting of (a) the complex ninnu-ma-na-àm, "that which (weighed) as much as 50 minas" (perhaps referring to a very heavy armor-like garment suitable for combat), which is the direct object of the predicate; (b) the locative complex íb-ba-na, "at his waist" (G gives the variant íb-ba-ni, perhaps to be analyzed as íb-ba-ni(-e), i. e., with the locative element -e absorbed by the immediately preceding vowel); (c) the verbal form ba-kar (gram. perhaps ba(-n)-kar, with a meaning approximating "to fasten"). Instead of ba-kar G reads ba-an-dù,<sup>126</sup> the root dù in this case is perhaps the equivalent of Akkadian *ritû*, "to fasten"; note that the pronominal -n- is not omitted in these variants. Finally, the duplicates D and G insert the words šà-ba, whose exact meaning in the context is not clear.

That the complex ninnu-ma-na-àm is related dimensionally to the verbal form seems to be indicated by the sentence gi-gu<sub>x</sub>(UNU)-

<sup>124</sup> W-B 162 (*OECT* I, Pls. 5ff.) ii 28.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.* rev. iv 12.

<sup>126</sup> D seems to have the orthographic variant -du for -dù.

na-aš ušù-gín ba-ši-in-ag (*BE XXXI*, No. 1, l. 20),<sup>127</sup> where the complex gi-gu<sub>x</sub>-na, which corresponds grammatically to the ninnu-ma-na-àm of our text, is followed by the postposition -š(e). In our case the postposition may have been omitted because of the enclitic -àm. The combination ušù-gín—ag is also found in a lamentation concerned with the destruction of Ur (*TCL XVI*, No. 40, l. 244; cf. the duplicate *PBS X*, Part 4, No. 11 v 48-49). In all three cases a meaning such as “to hold in light esteem,” “to treat with contempt,” for ušù-gín—ag (literally perhaps: “to make 30 shekels”) seems to fit the context.

*Lines 91 and 92.* — Each of the complexes <sup>urudu</sup>ḥa-zi-in-na-ni (gram.: <sup>urudu</sup>ḥazin-ani), ḥar-ra-an-na-ka-ni (gram.: ḥaran-ak-ani; it is assumed that the substantive ḥazīn governing this genitive is to be understood), and imin-gú-imin-ma-na-ka-ni (gram.: imin-gú-imin-mana-k-ani; the same assumption holds for this complex) is a direct object of ba-an-dīb, literally “he seized for himself.” For the writing of the locative complex as šu-ni-a (instead of šu-na, for which see e. g. l. 33), compare the comment to u<sub>4</sub>-bi-a (l. 26).

*Lines 93-97.* — For the analysis of the beginnings of lines 93, 94, and 96, compare the comment to lines 40, 41, and 42. For a possible analysis of the verbal form sag-giš ba-an-ra, compare the comment to sag-giš im-ra-ra (l. 25). While the verbal form šu-ba-an-ti is found in all the duplicates of this passage, the texts vary with regard to the verbal form which follows the locative complex ḥur-sag-šè. Thus D and G read ba-an-tu, literally “he caused it to enter for himself,” which is grammatically either ba-n(-n)-tu(r) or ba-(n-)n-tu(r); i. e., either the subject element -n- or the causative transitive particle -n- is omitted in the orthography. F, on the other hand, reads ba-e-e<sub>11</sub>-dè, which is grammatically probably ba-e<sub>11</sub>-(e)d-e, i. e., the third person *present-future* of the verb e<sub>11</sub>, “to ascend,” which usually forms its present-future stem by adding the particle -ed to the root. For the contraction of the e of -ed with the immediately preceding vowel of the root, compare § 725; for the writing ba-e instead of ba, compare note 117. As for

<sup>127</sup> For the problems involved in connection with the final consonant of the verbal root ag, cf. *AS* No. 8, pp. 28 f.

the change of tense involved in the use of the verbal form *ba-e-e<sub>11</sub>-dè* (cf. with the preterit *ba-an-tu* of the duplicates and with the immediately preceding *šu-ba-an-ti*), very likely this is due to the character of the action denoted by the root *e<sub>11</sub>*; the process of ascending is one of continued movement, and unless the fact that the action took place in the past is to be stressed the tendency is to use the present-future stem.

The verbal form *im-ma-ni-in-zal*, literally "she, on her part, destroyed it there (i. e., in the midst of the tree)," is grammatically either *imma-ni-n(-n)-zal* or *imma-ni-(n-)n-zal* (i. e., either the subject element *-n-* or the causative transitive particle *-n-* is omitted in the orthography); for the root *zal* with the meaning *na'butu* (hence the transitive *n-zal* with the meaning *abātu*) compare *TCL VI*, No. 35 rev. ii 18. The variant form in F, however, which reads *im-ma-ni-ib-za<sub>4</sub>-li-NE*, presents numerous problems. If the reading of the last sign is *-dè*, the form would seem to be grammatically *imma-ni-b-zal-ed-e*, i. e., the third person singular present-future of *b-zal*, the transitive form of the root; although the change of tense to the historical present is not unjustifiable in this case, it would seem rather strange that the present-future of the transitive form of the root should be formed by means of the present-future element *-ed*, which is reserved to form only intransitive present-future forms. If, on the other hand, the last sign is to be read *-ne*, the verbal form would be the regular third person plural present-future; but if the subject, as seems indisputable, is the singular complex *ki-sikil-líl-lá-ke<sub>4</sub>*, the use of the plural is quite inexplicable. Moreover, the matter becomes even more confusing upon analysis of the verbal form *šu-ba-an-kar-kar-ri* in the line following, whose subject seems to be the same complex *ki-sikil-líl-lá-ke<sub>4</sub>*. The last-named verbal form seems to be grammatically *šu-ba-n-kar-kar-e*, i. e., a third person singular present-future transitive verbal form (the *-n-* is, no doubt, the causative transitive particle), with a meaning approximating "she saves (her life) for herself," i. e., "she escapes."<sup>128</sup> The verbal

<sup>128</sup> It is as yet impossible to determine the literal meaning of the compound verb *šu—kar*, which is equated with Akkadian *šuzūbu* (cf. *TCL VI*, No. 35 obv. i 2), although it is not improbable that the construction originally was

form šu-ba-an-kar-kar-ri, therefore, is parallel to im-ma-ni-ib-za<sub>4</sub>-li-NE if the NE is read -dè and if, in spite of the difficulty mentioned above, the form with NE should prove to be a third person singular present-future. Remarkably enough, however, the singular verbal form šu-ba-an-kar-kar-ri is found only in F, i. e., in the same text which has the ambiguous im-ma-ni-ib-za<sub>4</sub>-li-NE; the duplicates D and G, on the other hand, which in the preceding line read the unequivocally singular (but preterit) form im-ma-ni-in-zal, have the variant šu-ba-an-kar-kar-ri-eš, i. e., the third person *plural* preterit. Because of all these confusions and because, moreover, the meanings of the root zal and the compound šu—kar may be quite different from those here chosen, not to mention the fact that there is even some possibility that the subject of šu-ba-an-kar-kar-ri may be Gilgamesh (or the men of Uruk, if the variant šu-ba-an-kar-kar-ri-eš is correct), it is impossible to say which of the variants is the more trustworthy; those chosen for our reconstructed text seem, at least on the surface, to be the more satisfactory, in that they correspond in number, if not in tense.

The complex a-ri-a-ri-eš (l. 97), “to desert places” (i. e., Lilith flees to those places where she really belongs), seems to be a reduplicated form of the word a-ri, “ruin”; for the reduplication of a substantive to form its plural, compare §§ 142 f. F seems to read e-ri-[e-ri-]a; the first part might therefore be merely an orthographic variant for a-ri-a-ri, while the locative -a may be a variant for -eš; there are so many other possibilities, however, that it is best to leave the matter undecided, especially since the duplicate D seems to have a reading which ends in -ri-ri-ga, although it is possible that the sign GA is a miscopy for the signs ÉŠ and ŠU,<sup>129</sup> in which case the reading ends in -ri-ri-éš.

*Lines 98-103.* — Note the use of giš at the beginning of line 98, since this line is part of the straight narrative of the epic. For the verbal forms mi-ni-in-sír and mi-ni-in-dar, compare the comment to line 29. For the occasional change of the prefix mu- to

šu-ta-kar, “to snatch from the hand”; note that the prefix ba- in our case makes the verbal form the equivalent of the Akkadian reflexive, i. e., the III<sub>2</sub> form in this case.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. n. 37.



mi- before the infix -ni-, compare § 568. Note that the scribe of D writes mu-[u]n-ni-dar; i. e., exactly as in the case of LI-bí-dug<sub>4</sub>,<sup>130</sup> he stresses the antepenult and therefore omits the -n- which is written before the root by the duplicates.

The entire complex dumu-uru-na(gram.: dumu-uru-n(i-)a)-mu-un-da-súg-eš-àm is the subject of the transitive verbal form mu-un-ši-tar-ru-ne. The subject element -e is omitted, since the enclitic -àm cannot be followed by a postposition; for the use of the singular of a substantive with plural meaning, compare § 132. Mu-un-da-súg-eš-àm has the interesting variant mu-un-dè-súg-eš-a, in which not only is the enclitic -àm replaced by the substantivizing -a, but also the vowel of the infix -da- seems to have become *e*, perhaps under the influence of the plural ending -eš, which was stressed in this form because of the following -a.<sup>131</sup>

The verbal form mu-un-ši-tar-ru-ne is grammatically mu-n-ši-tar-ene, i. e., the third person plural of the present-future; for the change of the *e* of -ene to *u* when following a root ending in certain labially characterized consonants, although the root itself does not contain the *u* vowel, compare § 471. As for the infixed complex -n-ši-, "at it," very probably it qualifies dimensionally the action of the verb in relation to its object, pa: "they cut down the crown *at it* (at the root)"; in the corresponding English idiom this becomes "they cut down its crown." It is the exact equivalent of this last that we find in the variant pa-bi ì-tar-ru-ne; what still remains obscure, however, is the reason for use of the prefix i- instead of mu- in the latter.

After pa-bi ì-tar-ru-ne duplicate G adds KA-ba-an-sìr-ri-ne, a statement which is found in another Gilgamesh fragment;<sup>132</sup> the meaning is quite uncertain.

Lines 100 and 101 present no difficulties. For the change of the present-future ending -e to -u in the verbal form mu-na-ab-sim-

<sup>130</sup> Cf. the comment to LI-bí-in-du (ll. 35-36) and to ba-ni-in-tu (l. 33).

<sup>131</sup> Or, though it is rather unlikely, perhaps the reading súg for the two superimposed DU signs is incorrect; i. e., the root may have contained an *e* vowel, to which the *a* of the infix -da- was assimilated (cf. the comment to ba-dè-DU [l. 88]).

<sup>132</sup> SEM, No. 23 rev. ii, in which ll. 5 and 6 duplicate ll. 99 and 100 of our text.

mu (gram.: mu-na-b-sim-e), compare § 470. For the use of the causative transitive particle with verbs which in themselves have a transitive meaning, compare § 522. Similarly, the grammatical analysis of lines 102 and 103 offers no difficulties;<sup>133</sup> the significance of the lines, however, must remain vague until the meaning of the terms *pukku* and *mikkû* is settled.<sup>134</sup>

<sup>133</sup> Note that G seems to have úr-ba for úr-bi in l. 102, although because the following sign is broken this is by no means certain; the tablet may have had -bi; cf. pa-bi in the line following. However, G does seem to omit the -a- after <sup>g18</sup>ellag.

<sup>134</sup> Cf. Sidney Smith in *RA XXX* 153-68.

