

Obv. 1952, 257

5'

BABYLONIAN WISDOM LITERATURE

BY

W. G. LAMBERT

5'

© Copyright Oxford University Press, 1960

Reprinted 1996 by Eisenbrauns
with the permission of the publisher
and the author
from the Oxford University Press edition published 1963

All rights reserved.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Lambert, W. G. (Wilfred G.)

Babylonian wisdom literature / W. G. Lambert.

p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 0-931464-94-3 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Assyro-Babylonian literature. I. Title.

PJ3941.L26 1996

892'.1—DC20

96-34017

CIP

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.Ⓜ™

CONTENTS

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY	xi
ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCES	xiii
CITATIONS FROM AKKADIAN TEXTS	xvii
TIME CHART	xix
1. INTRODUCTORY ESSAY: The Development of Thought and Literature in Ancient Mesopotamia	I
2. THE POEM OF THE RIGHTEOUS SUFFERER— <i>Ludlul bēl nēmeqi</i>	21
Introduction	
Literature	
Text and Translation	
3. THE BABYLONIAN <i>THEODICY</i>	63
Introduction	
Literature	
Text and Translation	
A Fragment of a Similar Work	
4. PRECEPTS AND ADMONITIONS	
(i) <i>Instructions of Šuruppak</i>	92
(ii) <i>Counsels of Wisdom</i>	96
(iii) <i>Counsels of a Pessimist</i>	107
(iv) <i>Advice to a Prince</i>	110
(v) <i>Varia</i>	116
all with Introduction	
Literature	
Text and Translation	
5. PRECEPTIVE HYMNS	
(i) A Bilingual <i>Hymn to Ninurta</i>	118
(ii) <i>The Šamaš Hymn</i>	121
each with Introduction	
Literature	
Text and Translation	

6. <i>THE DIALOGUE OF PESSIMISM</i>	139
Introduction	
Literature	
Text and Translation	
7. FABLES OR CONTEST LITERATURE	150
(i) <i>The Tamarisk and the Palm</i>	151
(ii) <i>The Fable of the Willow</i>	164
(iii) <i>Nisaba and Wheat</i>	168
(iv) <i>The Ox and the Horse</i>	175
(v) <i>The Fable of the Fox</i>	186
(vi) <i>The Fable of the Riding-donkey</i>	210
(vii) <i>Varia</i>	211
all with Introduction	
Literature	
Text and Translation	
8. POPULAR SAYINGS	213
Introduction	
Literature	
Text and Translation	
9. PROVERBS	
(i) Bilingual Proverbs	222
(ii) Babylonian Proverbs	275
Texts and Translations interspersed with Introductions, Literature, and Comments	
CRITICAL AND PHILOLOGICAL NOTES ON CHAPTERS 2-8	283
ADDENDA	343
INDEX OF PUBLISHED TEXTS	347
INDEX OF WORDS DISCUSSED	351
LIST OF CUNEIFORM TABLETS	353
CUNEIFORM TEXTS	<i>Plates 1-75</i>

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

OWING to the rapid increase in knowledge in this field books soon become antiquated, and there is in 1959 no adequate work in English. The promised new edition of the *Cambridge Ancient History* should supply this want. Of older works, the relevant chapters in Volume III of the old *Cambridge Ancient History* (Cambridge, 1925, 1929) are worth mentioning. Among recent publications, the chapters on Mesopotamia in J. Finegan's *Light from the Ancient Past* (Princeton, 1946) give an up-to-date, if very brief, account. In German there are three recent works:

A. Scharff and A. Moortgat, *Ägypten und Vorderasien im Altertum* (Munich, 1950), pp. 193 ff.

A. Moortgat and G. Furlani in *Historia Mundi II: Grundlagen und Entfaltung der ältesten Hochkulturen* (Bern, 1953), pp. 224-330.

H. Schmökel, *Geschichte des alten Vorderasien: Handbuch der Orientalistik*, ed. B. Spuler, II/3 (Leiden, 1957).

In French there is:

G. Goossens in *Histoire universelle*, ed. R. Grousset and É. G. Léonard (Paris, 1956), I, pp. 287-495.

All four give a generally reliable account.

CULTURAL BACKGROUND

H. Schmökel, *Das Land Sumer* (Stuttgart, 1955).

B. Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien* (Heidelberg, 1920-5).

RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

M. Jastrow, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (Boston, 1898).

M. Jastrow, *Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens* (Giessen, 1905-12).

É. Dhorme, *La Religion assyro-babylonienne* (Paris, 1910).

G. Furlani, *La Religione babilonese e assira* (Bologna, 1928-9).

C-F. Jean, *La Religion sumérienne* (Paris, 1931).

C-F. Jean, *Le Milieu biblique avant Jésus-Christ III: Les Idées religieuses et morales* (Paris, 1936).

É. Dhorme, *Les Religions de Babylonie et d'Assyrie* (Paris, 1945, 2nd ed. 1949).

F. M. Th. Böhl, *De Babylonisch-Assyrische Godsdienst*, in G. Van der Leeuw, *De Godsdiensten der Wereld*² I. 110-67 (Amsterdam, 1948).

S. N. Kramer, *Sumerian Religion*, in V. Ferm, *Forgotten Religions* (New York, 1950), pp. 45-62.

A. L. Oppenheim, *Assyro-Babylonian Religion*, in V. Ferm, op. cit., pp. 63-79.

N. Schneider, *Die Religion der Sumerer und Akkader*, in F. König, *Christus und die Religionen der Erde* II (Vienna, 1951), pp. 383-439.

F. M. Th. Böhl, *Die Religion der Babylonier und Assyrer*, in F. König, op. cit., pp. 441-98.

J. Bottéro, *La Religion babylonienne* (Paris, 1952).

S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London, 1953).

ABBREVIATIONS AND REFERENCES

(i) TABLET SIGNATURES

British Museum, London

BM British Museum

DT Daily Telegraph

K Kouyunjik

Rm Rassam

Sm Smith

(Tablets given a registration date only, e.g. 80-7-19, 289, are also British Museum tablets.)

Museum of the Ancient Orient, Istanbul

A Assur

Bo Boghazköy

Si Sippar

University Museum, Philadelphia

CBS Catalogue of the Babylonian Section

N- Nippur

UM University Museum

Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin

BE Babylon Expedition

VAT Vorderasiatische Abteilung Tontafel

Iraq Museum, Baghdad

IM Iraq Museum

Archaeological Museum, Ankara

SU Sultantepe-Urfa

(ii) PUBLICATIONS CITED BY INITIALS AND SHORT TITLES OF WORKS FORMING PART OF A SERIES

- AASOR* *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
AB *Assyriologische Bibliothek*
ABL R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*
ABRT J. A. Craig, *Assyrian and Babylonian Religious Texts* (= *AB* XIII)
AfO *Archiv für Orientforschung*
AGM *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin*
AJA *American Journal of Archaeology*
AJSL *American Journal of Semitic Languages*
AKA E. A. Wallis Budge and L. W. King, *Annals of the Kings of Assyria*
AKF *Archiv für Keilschriftforschung*
AMT R. Campbell Thompson, *Assyrian Medical Texts*

- ANET* J. B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*^{1,2}
- AnOr* *Analecta Orientalia*
- AO* *Der Alte Orient*
- AOTU* *Altorientalische Texte und Untersuchungen*
- ARM* *Archives royales de Mari* (texts in transliteration)
- ArOr* *Archiv Orientalní*
- AS* *Assyriological Studies*
- Asarhaddon* R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien* (= *Archiv für Orientforschung*, Beiheft 9)
- ASKT* P. Haupt, *Akkadische und sumerische Keilschrifttexte* (= *AB I*)
- BA* *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*
- Bab* *Babyloniaca*
- BASOR* *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (S(upplementary) S(tudies))
- BBK* *Berliner Beiträge zur Keilschriftforschung*
- BBR* H. Zimmern, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion* (= *AB XII*)
- BBSt* L. W. King, *Babylonian Boundary Stones*
- BE* *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania* (Series A unless otherwise indicated)
- Beer* L. F. Hartman and A. L. Oppenheim, *On Beer and Brewing in Ancient Mesopotamia* (*JAOs* Supplement No. 10)
- Belleten* *Türk Tarih Kurumu, Belleten*
- BIN* *Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies*
- BiOr* *Bibliotheca Orientalis*
- BMS* L. W. King, *Babylonian Magic and Sorcery*
- BRM* *Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*
- CAD* I. J. Gelb, T. Jacobsen, B. Landsberger, and A. L. Oppenheim, *The Assyrian Dictionary . . . of the University of Chicago*
- CRR 1, &c.* *Compte rendu de la première (&c.) rencontre assyriologique internationale*
- CT* *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*
- DP* *Délégation en Perse, Mémoires*
- Dreams* A. L. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East* (= *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, N.S., Volume 46, Part 3)
- Fauna* B. Landsberger, *Die Fauna des alten Mesopotamien* (= *Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Klasse der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Band 42, No. 6)
- GAG* W. von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik* (= *AnOr* 33)
- GCCI* *Goucher College Cuneiform Inscriptions*
- Gerichtsurkunden* A. Falkenstein, *Die neusumerischen Gerichtsurkunden* (*Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Abhandlungen*, N.F., Heft 39-40, 44)
- Glossar zu den Neubabylonischen Briefen* E. Ebeling, *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, Jahrgang 1953, Heft 1
- GSG* A. Poebel, *Grundzüge der sumerischen Grammatik*
- Hippologica* A. Salonen, *Hippologica Accadica* (= *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*, Ser. B, Tom. 100)
- HUCA* *Hebrew Union College Annual*

- IF* *Zeitschrift für indogermanische Forschungen*
JAOs *Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL *Journal of Biblical Literature*
JCS *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JEOl *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap, Ex Oriente Lux*
JNES *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JRAS *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
JSS *Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTVI *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*
KAH L. Messerschmidt and O. Schroeder, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts* 1, 11 (= *WVDOG* 16, 27)
KAJ E. Ebeling, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur juristischen Inhalts* (= *WVDOG* 50)
KAR E. Ebeling, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts* 1, 11 (= *WVDOG* 28, 34)
KAV O. Schroeder, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts* (= *WVDOG* 35)
KB *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*
KBo H. H. Figulla et al., *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* 1–VI (= *WVDOG* 30, 36)
KUB *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*
Landfahrzeuge A. Salonen, *Die Landfahrzeuge des alten Mesopotamien* (= *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*, Ser. B, Tom. 72/3)
LKA E. Ebeling, *Literarische Keilschrifttexte aus Assur*
LKU A. Falkenstein, *Literarische Keilschrifttexte aus Uruk*
LSS *Leipziger semitistische Studien*
LTBA *Die lexikalischen Tafelserien der Babylonier und Assyrer in den Berliner Museen*
MAD *Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary*
MAOG *Mitteilungen der altorientalischen Gesellschaft*
MCS *Manchester Cuneiform Studies*
MCT O. Neugebauer and A. Sachs, *Mathematical Cuneiform Texts*
MDOG *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*
MSL B. Landsberger et al., *Materialen zum sumerischen Lexikon*
MVAG *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft*
MVEOL *Mededeelingen en Verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap, Ex Oriente Lux*
OECT *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts*
OIP *Oriental Institute Publications* (Chicago)
OLZ *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*
Or *Orientalia*
PB A. Deimel, *Pantheon Babylonicum*
PBS *Publications of the Babylonian Section, University Museum, University of Pennsylvania*
Physiognomatik F. R. Kraus, *Texte zur babylonischen Physiognomatik* (= *Archiv für Orientforschung*, Beiheft 3)
PRT E. G. Klauber, *Politisch-religiöse Texte aus der Sargonidenzeit*
PSBA *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*
R H. C. Rawlinson et al., *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*
RA *Revue d'Assyriologie*

- RB* *Revue biblique*
RLA *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*
RSO *Rivista degli studi orientali*
SBH G. Reisner, *Sumerisch-babylonische Hymnen*
SEM E. Chiera, *Sumerian Epics and Myths* (= OIP xv)
ŠL A. Deimel, *Šumerisches Lexikon*
SLT E. Chiera, *Sumerian Lexical Texts* (= OIP xi)
SO *Studia Orientalia*
SSS *Semitic Study Series*
STC L. W. King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation*
STT O. R. Gurney and J. J. Finkelstein, *The Sultantepe Tablets*
STVC E. Chiera, *Sumerian Texts of Varied Contents* (= OIP xvi)
Tammuz-Liturgien M. Witzel, *AnOr* 10
TCL *Musée du Louvre, Département des antiquités orientales, Textes cunéiformes*
TDP R. Labat, *Traité akkadien de Diagnostics et Pronostics médicaux*
VAB *Vorderasiatische Bibliothek*
VS *Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler*
WO *Die Welt des Orients*
WVDOG *Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*
YOS *Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts*
ZA *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
ZDMG *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

CITATIONS FROM AKKADIAN TEXTS

EXCEPT where otherwise stated, quotations from the following works follow the line numbering of the following editions:

- Code of Hammurabi (CH)* A. Deimel, E. Bergmann, A. Pohl, and R. Follet, *Codex Hammurabi*³
Enūma Eliš/Epic of Creation R. Labat, *Le Poème babylonien de la Création*
Epic of Gilgameš R. Campbell Thompson, *The Epic of Gilgameš*
Era Epic F. Gössmann, *Das Era-Epos*
Maqlû G. Meier, *Die assyrische Beschwörungssammlung Maqlû* (= *AfO*, Beiheft 2)
Šurpu E. Reiner, *Šurpu* (= *AfO*, Beiheft 11)
Tukulti-Ninurta Epic E. Ebeling, *MAOG* XII/2 (see, however, *AfO* 18. 38–51 for a revision of the column numbers)

The following lexical texts are cited, with kind permission, from the editions of B. Landsberger, which are being published in the series *MSL*. Where the editions are as yet (1958) unpublished there can be no absolute guarantee that the line numbering will remain unchanged if new fragments should turn up. Where it has been possible to refer conveniently to a published copy, this has been given in addition to the tablet and line numbers. In some cases, however, such as where an unpublished text has been used, this has not been possible.

<i>á.A</i>	<i>Ea</i>	<i>Malku-šarru</i>
<i>Alam-lānu</i>	<i>Erim.ḫuš</i>	<i>Nabnītu</i>
<i>AN</i>	<i>Ḫargud (MSL v ff.)</i>	<i>OB. Lú</i>
<i>Antagal</i>	<i>Ḫarra (MSL v ff.)</i>	<i>Šumma izbu, Commentary</i>
<i>Á-Tablet</i>	<i>Izi-išātu</i>	
<i>Diri</i>	<i>Lú = amēlu</i>	

(For the full titles of these and the other lexical series see I. J. Gelb, *Standard Operating Procedure for the Assyrian Dictionary*, pp. 114–115. Note, however, that *OB. Lú* now replaces *LHC*.)

TIME CHART

B.C.	POLITICAL EVENTS	DEVELOPMENT OF LITERATURE	
3000	Arrival of Sumerians(?)		
2900		Invention of writing on clay tablets for business purposes	
2800			
2700			
2600			
2500	} Classical Sumerian period	The earliest traces of Sumerian literature	
2400			
2300	} Old Akkadian period	Semitic Old Akkadian written in Sumerian script	
2200			
2100	} The Guti invaders		
2000	} Third Dynasty of Ur	} Sumerian Renaissance: many new texts written	
1900			
1800	} Isin-Larsa period		
1800	} The Amorites settle in S. Mesopotamia		
1700	} Old Babylonian period (First Dynasty of Babylon)	} Most Sumerian literature known from copies of this period. Development and spread of Babylonian literature	
1600			
1500	Arrival of Cassites		
1400	} Cassite period	} Sifting and editing of old texts; Sumerian texts provided with Babylonian translations. Many new texts written, both Babylonian and bilingual	
1300			} Mitanni power in N. Mesopotamia and Syria } Hittite empire in Asia Minor
1200			
1100	} Second Dynasty of Isin Rise of Assyria	c. 1300. Copies of Babylonian texts from Hittite capital Boğhazköy	
1000	} Time of decline in the South } Aramaeans settle in S. Mesopotamia	} Rise of Marduk monolatry	
900			
800			
700	} Assyrian empire	} c. 1100. Middle Assyrian copies of Babylonian texts	
600			
600	} Late Babylonian empire	} c. 650. Library of Ashurbanipal. A few new compositions	
500	} Persian period		
400			
300	} Seleucid period	} Copies of traditional texts from Uruk and Babylon. No new compositions	
200			
100	} Parthian period	The last cuneiform tablets, from Babylon	
0			
A.D. 100			

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THOUGHT AND LITERATURE IN ANCIENT MESOPOTAMIA¹

WISDOM' is strictly a misnomer as applied to Babylonian literature. As used for a literary genre the term belongs to Hebraic studies and is applied to Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes. Here 'Wisdom' is a common topic and is extolled as the greatest virtue. While it embraces intellectual ability the emphasis is more on pious living: the wise man fears the Lord. This piety, however, is completely detached from law and ritual, which gives it a distinctive place in the Hebrew Bible. Babylonian has a term 'wisdom' (*nēmequ*), and several adjectives for 'wise' (*enqu*, *mūdû*, *ḥassu*, *etpēšu*), but only rarely are they used with a moral content (perhaps, e.g., *Counsels of Wisdom* 25). Generally 'wisdom' refers to skill in cult and magic lore, and the wise man is the initiate. One of the texts edited below begins, "I will praise the lord of wisdom", where Marduk is the lord, and his wisdom is skill in the rites of exorcism.

Though this term is thus foreign to ancient Mesopotamia,² it has been used for a group of texts which correspond in subject-matter with the Hebrew Wisdom books, and may be retained as a convenient short description. The sphere of these texts is what has been called philosophy since Greek times, though many scholars would demur to using this word for ancient Mesopotamian thought. Some of the works deal with ethics: practical advice on living (Chs. 4–5), others with intellectual problems inherent in the then current outlook on life (Chs. 2–3, and probably 6). Other types of literature not so intimately revealing thought patterns are included because they are conventionally classed as 'Wisdom': fables, popular sayings, and proverbs (Chs. 7–9). These are not discussed further in the present chapter, and the reader is referred to the introductions to the texts themselves. A case could be made for including many of the Babylonian epics in the Wisdom category, because they deal with cosmological problems. Their approach, however, is less direct, and they are clearly distinguished from the more openly rational attitude displayed in our texts. Since Wisdom as a category in Babylonian literature is nothing more than a

¹ This essay is not intended to replace the existing political and literary histories of ancient Mesopotamia, however inadequate they may be, but selects those matters which bear most directly on the Wisdom texts.

A certain basic knowledge of Sumerian and Babylonian civilizations is presumed.

² Cf. T. Fish's criticism of J. J. A. Van Dijk's book-title, *La Sagesse suméro-accadienne*, in *JSS* 1. 286–7.

group of texts which happen to cover roughly the same area, there is no precise canon by which to recognize them. In the present volume the writer has included all those works which obviously belong, but in the matter of border-line cases he has been compelled to use his own judgement.

The texts speak for themselves, but for a modern reader to gain anything approaching a full understanding it is necessary to know something of the intellectual world in which they were written. The attempt to supply this need is no light undertaking. The modern mind inevitably tries to fit ancient cogitations into the strait jacket of twentieth-century thinking, and any attempt to present the old *Weltanschauung* in modern terms can at the best be an inadequate introduction. Only by immersing oneself in the literature is it possible to feel the spirit which moves the writer. It must be made clear, too, that the only thought which can be recovered is that of a small group, presumably the intelligentsia of ancient society. Probably we shall never know how far the written forms of thought were understood and acknowledged by the mass of men and women. The handling of this written material—hymns, prayers, epics, &c.—has many pitfalls. Much Sumerian literature presents such difficulty to the translator that even the plain meaning of the words is often in question. Many texts are undated, and undatable. The ancients constantly rewrote old texts so that old and new stand side by side. We do not know how often in this process old words were reinterpreted to suit changed concepts. Even if a particular composition can be dated with certainty, can it be assumed that the outlook implied was characteristic of the age? Did individual authors hold views unorthodox in their age? One can only speculate whether further discoveries of contemporary documents would prove the existence of differing schools of thought. In addition to these problems the outlook and approach of the interpreter must inevitably result in a somewhat personal and subjective synthesis. The present attempt can make no claim to have escaped from these pitfalls, and the reader who is unable to make an independent evaluation of the conclusions offered is warned that other scholars might present a picture with quite substantial differences.

The first great civilization in Mesopotamia was that of the Sumerians. This people came from an uncertain region in the east or north-east and settled in the southernmost part of Mesopotamia. Their language has no known cognates, so that their origins are completely obscure. Territorially they did not expand beyond the southern end of the Tigris-Euphrates plain, and their system of government under city states prevented them from uniting to win an empire. Like the Greek city states, their chief contribution to mankind was cultural. In this sphere they established a pattern of civilization the influence of which lasted for many centuries after the Sumerians themselves had been absorbed into the infiltrating Semites. From the Sumerians the later Babylonians took over their system of writing, much of their religion, and some of their literature. It would, however, be a mistake to contrast Sumerian and Semite in the earliest historical periods, for so far back as our evidence reaches there is every indication of a peaceful symbiosis of the two stocks, though the Sumerians were culturally dominant. Nevertheless, the occurrence of Semitic

words in Sumerian from early times¹ must caution us against forgetting that there was a second element in Sumerian civilization. Native tradition offers confirmation in that the third king after the flood, according to the *Sumerian King List*,² bore the Semitic name Palâ-kînâtim.

Very few literary texts have been recovered from the Classical Sumerian period.³ Literature certainly existed, but probably much of it was oral, and no need was felt to write it down. There is no shortage of finds documenting the externals of religion—temples, names of deities, material of offerings, &c.—but they have little value for ascertaining the inner spirit, which is our concern. It is only from the period after the fall of the Semitic Agade Dynasty that literary documents are forthcoming. Under the Third Dynasty of Ur, Gudea, ruler of the town of Lagaš, made up for his lack of political independence by lavishing wealth on temples. Two large clay cylinders record in great detail his pious acts. From this Neo-Sumerian period, and from the following Isin-Larsa period, quite a number of works of literature have survived, though often in copies from the First Dynasty of Babylon: hymns, letters, parts of two codes of laws,⁴ literary debates, all of which contain unambiguous evidence of their date of composition. It is also in copies of the First Dynasty of Babylon that most of the surviving traditional Sumerian literature has been recovered. It may not be an accident of discovery that the only big finds of traditional Sumerian literature are of tablets written when Sumerian was almost dead as a spoken language; a study of the period as attempted below suggests the explanation. It is, however, certainly an accident that the excavations at Nippur have yielded most of the material. Other contemporary libraries must have existed, though they have not been found.

Many scholars doubt whether it is possible with present knowledge to reconstruct the pattern of Sumerian thought. Certainly any detailed exposition would be premature, but for our purpose it is sufficient to note certain similarities and contrasts between a Sumerian view of the universe and that which the Babylonians had adopted by 1000 B.C., and retained little altered until their ultimate extinction. It would, however, be misleading to present this contrast in purely ethnic terms. It is the result of a change and a development in Mesopotamian culture, and to what extent fresh immigrants can be considered responsible is a very difficult question. Our plan then is to describe the two ends of this development in broad terms, to sketch the process of development, and finally to elaborate certain aspects of the Babylonian view of life as reflected in the texts edited later in this book.

According to the Sumerians and Babylonians two classes of persons inhabited the universe: the human race and the gods. Pre-eminence belonged to the gods, though they were not all equal. At the lower end of the divine scale came a host of minor deities and

¹ The earliest may be *damgara* (*mkr) 'dealer, merchant', which occurs in the Fara texts (A. Deimel, *Die Inschriften von Fara* I, p. 53, no. 523; *ibid.* III, p. 5*; cf. A. Salonen, *SO XI/1*. 23¹), though its Semitic derivation has recently been doubted (A. Salonen, *Hippologica*, 247). For other certain Semitic loans see A. Salonen, *SO XI/1*. 23¹, and A. Falkenstein, *CRR II*. 13.

² *AS II*.

³ Cf. A. Falkenstein, *CRR II*. 18–19; G. A. Barton, *Miscellaneous Babylonian Inscriptions*, no. 1; S. N. Kramer, *From the Tablets of Sumer*, p. 106.

⁴ The codes are of Urnammu (S. N. Kramer and A. Falkenstein, *Or N.S.* 23. 40–51) and Lipit-Ištar (F. R. Steele, *AJA* 52. 425–50).

demons, while a trinity of great gods, Anu, Enlil, and Ea, stood at their head. A modern scholar will observe that many of these gods are personifications of parts or aspects of nature. The sun and moon gods are obvious examples. The goddess Inanna (Sumerian), or Ištar (Babylonian), personifies love and procreation. The great gods are no exceptions: An (Anu) is the Sumerian word 'heaven', and that was his sphere. Enki (Sumerian) or Ea (Babylonian) was lord of a subterranean lake, strictly to be distinguished from the underworld. Enlil's name means 'Lord Wind', so that his cosmic location was between that of the other two. In the beginning, according to Sumerian and Babylonian speculations, only the gods had existed. Man was a later creation, and was intended as a servant of the gods. He had therefore duties to perform to his divine lords, and could offend them. This was 'sin', and the offence might be transgressing a ritual taboo or oppressing the widow and orphan. There was no distinction such as we tend to make between moral sin and ritual omission. The unwitting ritual neglect was an abomination to the gods. The Sumerian, and later Babylonian, pantheon was the elaboration of the theologians. In historical times their task consisted in reducing to an ordered whole all the gods which had their cognizance. Despite the large amount of duplication, since each locality had its own gods, conservative feeling did not allow the rejection of any one. Gods of wide popularity, or gods of politically important cities, were put at the top of the hierarchy, and lesser ones followed, or even became the attendants of the greater. In some cases, however, a syncretism of similar gods from different sources of origin took place, in which the more important took over the names and attributes of the lesser. Also in the course of time a more recent god might gradually take over the rank of an older one. Ningirsu, a local god of the Sumerian city Lagaš, and also a god of war, was later swallowed up in Ninurta, the popular war god of the Babylonians.

Some of the items in the preceding paragraph may not apply to the earliest periods of Sumerian history, but that is of no consequence here, where the aim is to lay the foundations on which the Babylonians rested. The most profound change which took place within these general conceptions between 2000 and 1000 B.C. was in the nature of the gods. When two Sumerian city states went to war the gods of each side were also participants. If the one state prevailed and sacked the other city, the local god shared in the disaster. This outlook is found in the Sumerian lamentations over cities¹ in which the god or goddess participates in the grief for his or her plundered home. The attitude of the conquered citizens to the victorious deity is vividly portrayed in the document written by a loyal citizen of Lagaš after the sack of his town by the men of the neighbouring Umma. After lamenting the sacking he adds: "As for Lugalzaggisi, ruler of Umma, may Nidaba his goddess bear this guilt on her neck."² In later times the Assyrians, close imitators of their southern neighbours in most matters of culture, plundered Babylon. First, about 1220 B.C. under Tukulti-Ninurta I, who has left an account in the form of an historical

¹ Cf. *AS* 12, lines 46-47 = 63-64:

"Thy lamentation which is bitter—how long
will it grieve thy weeping lord?"

Thy lamentation which is bitter—how long
will it grieve thy weeping Nanna?"

² *VAB* I. 58, III. 11-IV. 3.

epic. At the beginning the writer portrays the gods of the Babylonian cities as angry with Kaštiliaš, the king, for his wickedness.¹ Consequently they forsake their cities, leaving them unprotected, so that an Assyrian victory follows. In the final battle of the campaign all the gods are on the side of Tukulti-Ninurta.² In this way was Babylon plundered. Also Sennacherib most savagely destroyed the city of Babylon. His successor Esarhaddon explains this disaster as follows:

They (the citizens of Babylon) oppressed the weak, and gave him into the power of the strong. Inside the city there was tyranny, the receiving of bribes; every day without fail they plundered each other's goods; the son cursed his father in the street, the slave [abjured] his master, [the slave girl] did not listen to her mistress . . . they put an end to offerings and entered into conspiracies . . . they laid hands on the property of Esagil, the temple of the gods, and sold silver, gold and precious stones to the land of Elam . . . Marduk, the Enlil of the gods, was angry and devised evil to overwhelm the land and destroy the peoples.³

In the quotations given we have cited for the Sumerians, the complaints of the conquered, and for the Babylonians, the judgement of the victors. However, it is abundantly clear that the Babylonians themselves would have accepted the second part of the judgement, that the gods were angry with them, even if they did not confess to the crimes with which they are charged. In the Babylonian *Era Epic* when the destructive god Era was planning to destroy mankind he persuades Marduk to vacate his shrine, so that the destruction planned received the consent of Marduk.⁴ A Late-Babylonian king, Nabonidus, freely mentions the gods' anger with Babylon, shown by their absenting themselves from their shrines.⁵

Thus between 2000 and 1000 B.C. the gods became more amicably disposed to each other, and learnt to act in unison. The same change is seen in the epic literature. The modern reader is immediately struck by the amoral character of the Sumerian gods in the epics. In one Inanna, goddess of Uruk, wishes to obtain certain things from Enki, so she visits him and together they enjoy a banquet, part of which was alcoholic. While he is under the influence of the food and drink Inanna easily obtains her wish, and at once makes off for Uruk with the spoils. On recovering Enki realizes his folly, and the remainder of the story is a contest between the cunning Enki, who tries to have the boat stopped, and Inanna, who evades all the attempts at stopping her and reaches her destination.⁶ In another epic, the *Paradise Myth*, Enki mates with the goddess Ninḥursag, from which union a daughter is born. Enki then mates with the daughter, and a granddaughter is born. The previous performance is repeated, but Ninḥursag warns the fourth generation, so that Enki's advances are now met with a demand for certain plants and fruits. Enki is able to supply these bridal gifts, and mating takes place. This union, however, produces plants, which the uninhibited Enki proceeds to taste. For this deed Ninḥursag curses him,

¹ *Afo* 18. 42. 33-46.

² *MAOG* XII/2. 7. 23 ff.

³ R. Borger, *Asarhaddon*, pp. 12-13. The translation is a combination of pieces from different inscriptions.

⁴ End of Tablet I.

⁵ *VAB* IV. 284, col. x.

⁶ See S. N. Kramer, *Sumerian Mythology*, pp. 64-68.

so that he starts to wither away, and it is only by the intervention of all the gods in council that Ninḫursag is ultimately persuaded to restore Enki to health.¹

When considering Babylonian epics it is necessary to bear in mind how much is directly owed to Sumerian forerunners. The *Descent of Ištar*, to take the obvious example, is nothing but a free rewriting of the Sumerian *Descent of Inanna*. Even where the actual story is not proved to be of Sumerian origin the motifs and phraseology can be strongly influenced by Sumerian. It will be understood that Babylonian epics are under a burden of tradition, for which their change in outlook is all the more remarkable. The nearest approach to Enki's libertinism in the whole range of Babylonian literature is in an incantation which describes how Sin, the moon god, fell in love with one of his cows called Geme-Suena ('Handmaid-of-Sin'), assumed the form of a bull, and secretly mated with her.² It is probably one of those old elements which have survived in incantations with their "fresh earthy pregnancy", to quote a phrase of Landsberger,³ and this metamorphosis of the god is better paralleled in Canaanite and classical Greek myths than in Mesopotamian sources.⁴ In general the gods of Babylonian epics are more respectable, if more dull. Era, as already noted, does not let loose destruction without first persuading Marduk and the other gods of its desirability. In the *Gilgameš Epic* Ištar wishes to send a destructive divine bull to earth for revenge on Gilgameš, who had insulted her. By correct etiquette she begs permission from her father Anu, who only grants it after making careful inquiry if his daughter's intemperate revenge may not lead to the extinction of mankind by famine. Ištar satisfies her father, and use of the divine bull is sanctioned.⁵ Another daughter of Anu, the demon Lamaštu, so provoked her father by her improper designs that he forthwith kicked her from heaven to earth.⁶ In divine families naughty children have to be punished just as among humans. Two Babylonian epics do centre on fighting among the gods: the *Zû Myth*, in which the demon god Zû steals the Tablet of Destiny (a literal cuneiform tablet laying down the *status quo*), and the *Epic of Creation*, in which the old generation of gods, angry with the younger for its noise, try to destroy them, but are themselves destroyed by Marduk. In both of these epics the main body of gods are assumed to be in the right. Zû, the irresponsible demon, has robbed them of a thing the loss of which could bring chaos on the universe. In the *Epic of Creation* a primeval monster is threatening extinction on the gods and has to be faced. The responsible gods sit in committee like a group of civil servants, until a junior member is prevailed upon to take up the cause.

Despite the odd misdemeanour, the Mesopotamian gods learnt the art of being good citizens by 1000 B.C. The very fact that many of the old myths, such as the *Paradise Myth*, were not passed on is evidence of the change of outlook.

Finally, the change is also seen in the attitude to personal gods and demons. Demons

¹ Edited by S. N. Kramer, *BASOR Supplementary Studies*, 1. Cf. also *ANET* 37-41 and H. Frankfort and others, *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*, pp. 157-60 = *Before Philosophy*, 170-4.

² *KAR* 196 rev. II and K 2413 rev. (*RSO* IV, Tav. II). Cf. E. Ebeling, *AGM* 14. 68; F. M. Th. Böhl,

JEOL IV. 202-4; S. Langdon, *Semitic Mythology*, p. 97.

³ *JNES* 14. 14.

⁴ *ANET* 139. v; Roscher, *Lexikon* II/I. 263 ff.

⁵ Tablet 6.

⁶ *BIN* IV. 126 = *Or* N.S. 25. 141-8.

in all periods were bent on ill. The problem of how to escape their attacks became easier as time passed. In early times no one could be certain of immunity. In the second millennium the belief arose that the personal god could protect from demons, in return for services, that is offerings, rendered:

One who has no god, as he walks along the street,
Headache [a disease demon] envelops him like a garment.¹

Though the personal god was necessarily a small god, he was able to take his client's case to the greater gods, and to see that it received attention.²

The three points listed—the nature of the gods' participation in the affairs of the world, the conduct of the gods to each other, and the restraining power of the personal gods—all reflect one fundamental change. The theology of the Sumerians as reflected in what seem to be the older myths presents an accurate reflection of the world from which they spring. The forces of nature can be brutal and indiscriminate; so were the gods. Nature knows no modesty; nor did the gods. This is not to deny that some Sumerian thinkers may have progressed beyond this stage, but many epics do reflect this outlook. It may seem primitive to a modern mind, but its abstinence from adding anything in interpretation gives it a permanent value. In contrast the Babylonians grappled with facts and tried to reduce the conflicting elements in the universe to parts of a harmonious whole. No longer using the analogy of natural forces, they imagined their gods in their own image, and tried to fit the universe into moral laws springing from the human conscience. Like all such attempts this raises intellectual and moral difficulties, and these are the background against which the texts here edited are to be set. First, however, the transitional period must be studied.

The years 1900–1700 were a period of political upheaval, ending in the establishment of the First Dynasty of Babylon over the whole of southern Mesopotamia. As a people the Sumerians had almost disappeared, though leaving a legacy of culture behind them. With our concern for the intellectual life we have to restrict consideration of these two centuries to the forces at work among the thinkers of the time. On the one hand there was a force favouring conservatism, on the other a force tending to change.

The conservative force was to be found in the scribal quarters of the old Sumerian centres. That of Nippur is best known,³ though other cities must have had their counterparts. Here, with centuries of tradition behind them, lived and worked the most learned men of their day. They had a virtual monopoly of learning since they and their pupils, who were trained in the *Edubba* ('Tablet-House'), were the only educated persons. Although the scribal art was not an hereditary right, if we may believe a Sumerian satire on school life,⁴ the length of the training could not but permeate the apprentices in this

¹ *CT* 17. 14, "O" 7–10; cf. *CT* 17. 19. 5–6 and 16/2. 14–19.
Šurpu VII. 19–20.

² See von Soden, *ZDMG* 89. 143–69.

³ University Museum, *Bulletin*, Philadelphia, vol. *JAOS* 69. 199–215.

⁴ Published by S. N. Kramer, *Schooldays* (*Museum Monographs*, University Museum, Philadelphia), and in

art with the spirit of their teachers. One point of organization on which we are regrettably ill-informed is the relation of the scribes to the temple. General considerations would lead us to suppose that the scribal schools were attached to a temple, but we are in no position either to affirm or to deny if all scribes of the schools were *ipso facto* priests. The satire on the *Edubba* suggests a very secular spirit, but schoolboy activities do not constitute a valuable criterion. Because of their traditions these scholars were guardians of Sumerian literature, and so ideas. Though this was a rearguard action it was no mere rattling of dry bones. The Third Dynasty of Ur and the Isin-Larsa period had been prolific in new Sumerian compositions of many types, and many traditional works which were probably written down for the first time in these periods show signs of lateness, though the material is doubtless early.¹ It may be that a sense of pending loss prompted the writing down of works which had previously been oral, just as the fall of Jerusalem was a factor in the production of a written Mishnah. Thus in producing new and revising old texts there was little occasion to consider a literature in the vernacular. Though there is no reason to suppose that the old Sumerian scribal centres actively opposed the creation of a Babylonian literature, the overwhelming percentage of Sumerian texts recovered from Old Babylonian Nippur shows where their real interests lay.

Politically the Sumerians gave way to Semites. The forces of reform in literature were also Semitic, though both an old and a new Semitic element combined before much impact on Sumerian civilization was possible. Some variety of Semites had been living peacefully among the Sumerians from the beginning, and, as already observed, made at least a small contribution to Sumerian civilization. Outside the Sumerian centres in southern Mesopotamia a Semitic culture was more free to develop, though it owed many things to the brilliance of the southern cities. An impetus to Semitic creativity was given by the Agade Dynasty, which made common use of Semitic Akkadian instead of Sumerian for royal inscriptions. Historians of art consider this dynasty a profound influence on later Mesopotamian productions.² In the matter of thought and literature we are ill-informed. The earliest surviving works of Babylonian literature show a maturity which presumes a long development. The beginnings must certainly go back to the Agade Dynasty period, if not earlier, and from this period a school exercise tablet has been found inscribed with part of an historical writing.³ The conquests of Sargon and Narām-Sin doubtless helped to spread Old Akkadian culture in the regions of the upper Euphrates and Tigris, but Mari on the middle Euphrates already had its own dialect of Old Akkadian,⁴ and a fine school of local artists.

A new wave of Semitic migration started about 2000 B.C., and the invaders, called Amorites, moved down the Euphrates valley first into the Old Akkadian culture of places like Mari, and eventually into the Sumerian centres. Though Semitic-speaking, they belonged to a different branch of the stock from the Old Akkadians. Their original

¹ See A. Falkenstein, *RCC* II. 12-27.

² e.g. H. Frankfort, *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient*, ch. 3.

³ I. J. Gelb, *MAD* I, no. 172.

⁴ *RA* 50. 1-10.

language can be recovered only from their personal names, since no documents written in Amorite have been found. The onomasticon reveals a Semitic dialect closely akin to Canaanite,¹ and their very name marks them as an offshoot of this group. It would be a mistake to regard their migration as a barbarian descent on Rome. These people had a culture of their own in the upper Euphrates area which owed something to the Sumerians, and their movement was gradual, so that when they reached the south they no longer spoke a kind of early Canaanite, but an Old Babylonian dialect. Unfortunately the details of this period in the crucial areas of the upper and middle Euphrates are unknown, which is particularly regrettable because it was a very significant phase for the Babylonian language, literature, and presumably thought. In script and language there is a great gulf between Old Akkadian and Old Babylonian. Old Akkadian script was a pioneer attempt at using Sumerian writing to express a totally different language. When the curtain of obscurity is lifted, the Old Babylonian culture appears fully developed, vast strides have been made towards perfecting cuneiform script as a means of writing Semitic Babylonian, and a brilliant classical literature is written in it.

As already commented, the Sumerian centres apparently remained aloof from this development. Several corroborative lines of evidence show that the rise of Babylonian literature took place outside the area where Sumerian traditions were strong. The tablets recovered from the library, if it was such, of Tell Harmal, in the Diyala region, can be contrasted with those of contemporary Nippur. In the literary texts from Tell Harmal there are about equal numbers of Babylonian and Sumerian tablets, and in addition there is a large group of bilingual tablets.² Another phenomenon is the obvious lack of any one cultural centre of Old Babylonian literature. The Diyala region writes literature in its own dialect.³ The towns of Mari⁴ and Babylon⁵ do the same. In far Cappadocia the Assyrian merchants of a century or two earlier had literature written in the Old Assyrian dialect.⁶ The impression is given of literary traditions springing up simultaneously in the regions where Sumerian literature was not strongly entrenched. The local traditions of writing seem strong, and show no sign of immaturity or experiment. There was certainly no opposition to Sumerian, for the odd Sumerian composition was written as far afield as Mari,⁷ and in religion some Sumerian was probably used. At least the liturgy of a Mari ritual has Sumerian titles.⁸ An incidental pointer to the origin and direction of reform comes from script. The history of Babylonian script, apart from a few archaizing tendencies, is the gradual introduction of signs to distinguish sounds which were not known, or not distinguished, in Sumerian script. Thus Babylonian writing at first did not

¹ The names have been studied by Th. Bauer, *Die Ostkanaanäer*, and by C-F. Jean in *Studia Mariana*, pp. 63-98.

² Reports on the excavations at Tell Harmal, and publications of texts, have appeared in the following volumes of *Sumer*: II. 19-30; III. 48-83; IV. 52-54, 63-102, 137-8; V. 34-86, 136-43; VI. 4-5, 39-54; VII. 28-45, 126-55; XI, pls. I-XVI, nos. 3, 4, 9, 10; XIII. 65-115.

³ *JNES* 14. 14-21; 17. 56-58; cf. *JCS* 9. 31-35.

⁴ *RA* 35. 1-13; 36. 12.

⁵ The dialect of Babylon is well known from the Hammurabi correspondence.

⁶ *JNES* 14. 17; *BIN* IV. 126 = *Or N.S.* 25. 141-8.

⁷ There is an as yet unpublished bilingual letter addressed to the king of Mari, a literary composition of course (*Syria* 20. 100).

⁸ *RA* 35. 1-13.

distinguish *g* and *q*. The introduction of separate signs for the *q* sound began first in Mari, Ešnunna, and Elam, and only later was this invention adopted in the more conservative Babylon. Being less bound by tradition, the peripheral areas were hot-beds of reform. As yet, however, this stream of ideas moving inwards had little impact on the Sumerian centres. The source of inspiration may well have been in the mingling of the Amorites with the long-established Old Akkadians. Cross-pollination in cultural matters is often the cause of increased fertility. Some of the dynamic achievements of the Amorites in politics are well known. An Amorite, Išbi-Era, "the man of Mari", took over when the Third Dynasty of Ur fell. Hammurabi united southern Mesopotamia under him, and ruled more territory and confirmed a longer dynasty than any known Sumerian dynasty. Wherever the Amorites settled they adopted the greater part of the conquered civilization, but since their introduction to southern Mesopotamia was through such places as Mari they arrived at their ultimate destinations with a good measure of Babylonian culture.

Old Babylonian literature is classical in every sense. It has vigour and freshness which was never matched later. Both the hymns and epics are outstanding, and even the omens, in which one does not look for beauty or style, promise a wider range of fates than the late-period texts. The two important questions in connexion with Old Babylonian literature are: (i) In what way does its outlook differ from Sumerian thought? (ii) To what are the changes to be attributed?

The chief differences are implicit in the change of conception about the gods which has already been described. So long as the gods were simple personifications of parts or aspects of nature a wonderful reality pervaded thought. But as soon as human reason tries to impose a man-made purpose on the universe, intellectual problems arise. The big problem in Babylonian thought was that of justice. If the great gods in council controlled the universe, and if they ruled it in justice, why . . .? All kinds of very real difficulties had to be faced, and the position must have been worsened by the growth of law codes, from the Third Dynasty of Ur onwards. If, in the microcosm, a matter could be taken to law and redress secured, why, in the macrocosm, should one not take up matters with the gods? The most common complaint is virtually about a broken contract. A man served his god faithfully, but did not secure health and prosperity in return. The problem of the righteous sufferer was certainly implicit from the time of the Third Dynasty of Ur. An Akkadian name of this period is *Mina-arni*, 'What-is-my-guilt?',¹ which implies the line of reasoning: I have suffered: I must have done wrong: What can it be? Suffering necessarily implies guilt. A Sumerian text is thought to deal with this problem more directly, though the difficulties of translation are considerable.² Two religious texts on tablets written during the First Dynasty of Babylon illustrate the problem. The first is a Babylonian dialogue between a man and his god, in which the man says, "The crime which I did I know not",³ the same thought as, "What is my guilt?" The second takes the matter a

¹ E. Chiera, *Selected Temple Accounts from Telloh, Yokha and Drehem* 29. vi. 12.

² Edited by S. N. Kramer in *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, vol. III. 170-82.

³ *RB* 59. 239-50, line 13. Since J. Nougayrol, the first editor, and others following him (e.g. Van Dijk, *La Sagesse*, pp. 120-1) have taken this text as "Une Version ancienne du 'Juste Souffrant'", some account

step farther. This is a bilingual Sumerian-Babylonian text in which the speaker says, "I have been treated as one who has committed a sin against his god".¹ Here the speaker evidently does not acknowledge any personal sin, though he finds himself beset with what should be the punishment for sin. Since two Sumerian texts, one being bilingual, know the problem of the righteous sufferer, it must have arisen in the Sumerian academies of at least the Isin-Larsa period, and perhaps under the Third Dynasty of Ur. It may then be a simple Mesopotamian development owing nothing to outside influences. No answers to this problem have yet been found in Old Babylonian texts, but so few texts have been recovered that this may well be an accident. The universal incidence of death seemed another injustice, since the ancient Mesopotamians looked for no rewards or bliss in the afterlife. The gods lived for ever, why not man? The Old Babylonian *Epic of Gilgameš* is written around this topic. Several Sumerian Gilgameš stories were taken, one of which, *Gilgameš and the Land of the Living*, describes how he was tormented by the thought of death and conceived a desire to achieve immortal fame by some outstanding deed. To this known Sumerian material the Semitic writer added much other legendary matter of uncertain origin and fused the whole together with the fear of death. In the end the inevitability of death has to be acknowledged, and Gilgameš is counselled on how to face life with this burden:

of it is demanded here. Nougayrol has certainly rendered a service in publishing this difficult text, and von Soden (*Or* N.S. 26. 315-19) has advanced the study of it with collations and his usual acumen. The present writer has also collated the tablet, but would hesitate to offer a complete edition for the reason of von Soden: only repeated collation of the original and prolonged study would yield even approximate results. In certain passages where Nougayrol and von Soden agree as to the reading, the present writer would hesitate to affirm its correctness. A number of von Soden's corrections were, however, seen independently by the writer, and he ventures to offer a further one for 26b: *ma-la al!-z[é! ?-nu ?-k]u?* "(I have forgotten neither the extent of your kindness to me nor) the extent of my blasphemy against you" (cf. note on *Counsels of Wisdom* 29). As to the general scope and purpose of the work, the writer suggests the following modifications of Nougayrol's views:

(i) After an introduction in narrative form (1-11) the sufferer seems to speak, and apparently continues until line 38. The strophe 39-47 is badly preserved, but 45-47 are again narrative and introduce the reply of the god, which follows in 48-67. The intermediary, a friend, which Nougayrol assumes, seems not to exist. *ru-i-iš* in the first line, if derived from *ru'um* 'companion', would mean not "pour son ami", but *amice* 'in a friendly fashion'. Van Dijk, however, loc. cit., has questioned this etymology. The only other passage which could imply a mediator is 43b as read by von Soden: *šū-li-ia₈-šū qà-qá-ar-šū* "lasst ihn aufsteigen zur

Erd(oberfläch)e". This could be a petition on behalf of the sufferer spoken by a friend or priest. Until the context of this line is recovered it would be unwise to build on it.

(ii) There is no evidence that this text deals with a righteous sufferer. Its being a dialogue between a man and his god proves nothing. Ashurbanipal in a famous text holds a discussion with Nābū, but not in the part of a righteous sufferer (*VAB* VII. 342-51). In 13 "the crime which I did I know not" can be an admission of sin, not a denial of it. The following line may also be a confession of sin. As seen by the writer 14 is to be read: *ʾúʾ!-[ka-ab-bi-i]s! an-zi-il-la-ka a-na-k[u i]k-ki-ba-am li-im-na-ma am- × [×] × × × ×* "I have trespassed against you, I have a wicked abomination". These lines could, of course, be interpreted as questions, but even so they would not necessarily imply a negative answer. Most probably, however, the sufferer is here admitting his sin in the hope of forgiveness, and so prosperity. The answer of the god also does not make absolutely clear if the suffering is a consequence of sin or not. The general theme is summed up in the words *li-ib-bu-uk la i-li-im-mi-in* "Do not be downhearted" (48). However, after a promise of health (61) the sufferer is enjoined to perform charitable deeds (62-65), which could be interpreted as a penance.

(iii) The last two lines read more like a liturgical formula than a catch-line.

¹ Unpublished, but the relevant lines are cited in *CAD*, vol. H, 208b. Cf. in later texts E. Ebeling, *Handerhebung*, p. 134. 68; *VAB* VII. 252. 15.

Gilgameš, where are you rushing?
 The life which you seek you will not find,
 For when the gods created mankind
 They assigned death to men,
 But held life in their keeping.
 As for yourself, Gilgameš, fill your belly,
 Day and night be happy,
 Every day have pleasure,
 Day and night dance and rejoice,
 Put on clean clothes,
 Wash your head, bathe in water,
 Gaze on the little one who holds your hand,
 Let your spouse be happy in your bosom. (Tablet 10, Old Babylonian
 version, col. III)

This philosophy has not one word about religion, and is a moderate hedonism. Among the letters which Babylonians wrote to their personal gods there is also found in this period a very demanding tone. Unless satisfaction is secured, the gods can expect to be dropped, and will then get no offerings. It is not known how widespread this truculent attitude was, but it does suggest an overhasty exploitation of the newly grasped concept of cosmic justice.

While internal development is certainly a factor in the growth of Mesopotamian thought, outside influence also has to be recognized. The most striking case is seen in the development of the Sumerian text *Gilgameš and the Land of the Living*. The feat which Gilgameš set himself was the cutting down of cedar-trees on a remote mountain which was guarded by an ogre. The Sumerian writer clearly had no information about this mountain. The name is not given, and it is presented as a veritable fairyland. When this story was incorporated into the Babylonian *Gilgameš Epic* this skeleton became covered with flesh and sinews. The mountain is expressly named as Mount Hermon in the Lebanon range, and the mention of the Euphrates reveals an exact knowledge of the way cedar logs would be brought from Lebanon to Babylonia. The Amorites had come from this general area of Syria and could fill in details that a Sumerian writer would be ignorant of. What is more, this Mount Hermon is said to be the seat of the Sumerian pantheon!¹ This is a completely Canaanite idea, for in the Canaanite myths from Ras Shamra, the ancient Ugarit, gods do in fact reside on Mount Hermon, just as Yahweh is associated with Sinai.

Another item of Old Babylonian civilization which is probably an Amorite importation is the *lex talionis* in the law code of Hammurabi.² Contrary to what might be expected from an oversimplified evolutionary approach, the *lex talionis* is a late-comer in Mesopotamian law. The Sumerian code of Urnammu (Third Dynasty of Ur) and the Babylonian

¹ *JNES* 16. 256 rev. 13 and 20; *Gilgameš* 5. 1. 6. The fact of the gods' dwelling on the mountain explains the dreams received by Gilgameš and Enkidu, and the

punishment which Enkidu suffered for his part in the exploit.

² §§ 196-201 (*ANET* 175).

laws of Ešnunna (c. 1850 B.C.) prescribe monetary payments for bodily injuries.¹ It is first in the *Code of Hammurabi* that the *lex talionis* appears, and its spirit pervades many laws not concerned with bodily injury, though it applies to free citizens only. The *Book of the Covenant* (Exodus 21–23) lays down “eye for eye, tooth for tooth”, and as this collection of laws is from the point of view of legal draftsmanship and social development less advanced than the *Code of Hammurabi*, its later date does not compel the assumption of possible dependence on the *Code of Hammurabi*. More probably Hammurabi depends on an old Amorite legal principle.

The reign of Hammurabi was politically important, but equally significant for culture. He destroyed Mari and unified control which had previously rested with many cities. Whether for this reason only, or for other reasons also, the diversity of Mesopotamian culture ended. The details of this presumably gradual process are lost, but when the obscure end of the First Dynasty of Babylon and the equally obscure beginning of the Cassite period are over, we find many of the old Sumerian cities such as Nippur and Uruk back as leaders of culture, but with the significant addition of Babylon. Henceforth they set the tone, and all deviations were provincialisms. Their culture was now Babylonian, though tradition died hard; old Sumerian texts continued to be copied, though now often with an interlinear Babylonian translation, and new Sumerian texts were even composed.

The age of the Cassite kings was the second and last great constructive period in the history of Babylonian literature. It is, therefore, all the more regrettable that so little is known about it. A new small king list of the following dynasty was published in 1956, and this necessitated considerable emendations in all the hitherto reconstructed lists for that period.² Knowledge of the preceding Cassite period is much the same. Some account of conditions can, however, be given. Compared with the hey-day of the First Dynasty of Babylon, the country was immeasurably poorer, and the foreign rulers had none of the glory of a Hammurabi. Though they may have arrived as barbarians, they soon settled down and began to ape the culture of the conquered land. That their rule should have lasted for about four centuries is proof either of their ability as rulers, or of the dispiritedness of the subjects. Perhaps both reasons contributed. A feudal organization existed, in which nobles were granted pieces of land, and in many ways the Cassite period can be considered the Middle Ages of Babylonian history. Politically the whole land seemed in a stagnant phase, but certain social changes certainly began in this time. ‘Guilds’, or ‘families’, were springing up. Those in a particular trade or profession used the name of a particular person in their calling much as we use our surnames: “X son of Y” in the Cassite period often refers to profession rather than to parentage. One of these families can be traced back to the fourteenth century. Others are shown to be Cassite period by their names. The importance of this institution for literature is that scribal ‘families’, using the name of a scribal ancestor, existed. Moreover, in Uruk and Babylon at least, the same names continued in use by scribes into Seleucid and Parthian times, so that the continuity

¹ Urnammu laws 17 and 18 (*Or N.S.* 23. 48); *Laws of Ešnunna* 42–48 (*ANET* 163).

² A. Poebel, *AS* 15.

of tradition is established. The great span of time involved makes it improbable that these 'families' multiplied by physical descent only. No doubt apprentices were adopted. Although the ancestors belonged to particular professions and cities, in time their descendants included many who neither lived in the original town, nor belonged to the guild. The Uruk scribal families are best documented. From the ninth to the second century B.C. the scribes of these families were officers of the temple, and since nothing of an *Edubba* is heard of after the First Dynasty of Babylon, learning must have been the handmaid of religion, whether or not this was the case earlier. The continuity of tradition suggests that in the Cassite period the same organization prevailed. The Cassite-period scholars then were clerics. Their activity was twofold: preserving their heritage, and continuing the tradition. In their first part they were transcribers and editors. Part of a catalogue has been preserved in the libraries of Ashurbanipal which gives a series of literary works, each of which is said to be "according to" an editor of a particular town. Several of the editors, or their 'fathers', have been identified as scribal ancestors. For example, the *Gilgameš Epic* is "according to Sin-liqi-unninni", an ancestor from Uruk.¹ The task of editing is not to be underestimated. It often involved recasting and rewriting. In some cases, like *Enuma Anu Enlil*, several editions circulated in late times, presumably the product of the Cassite-period scholars of several towns. Often, however, only a single *textus receptus* survived, but the reasons for such textual uniformity are not known. The original compositions of the Cassite period are quite different in spirit from the Old Babylonian works, in that the writers were conscious of the fine tradition to which they were heirs. They tended to live in the past, and lacked the inspiration of the earlier works. Even in language this is apparent. Middle Babylonian, the contemporary vernacular, is a development on Old Babylonian, but it was not generally used for literature. A special literary dialect, Standard Babylonian, was created during the Cassite period, which, so far as our knowledge goes, was never a spoken dialect. It appears to be the result of taking Middle Babylonian as a basis and attempting to restore certain Old Babylonian forms. It is a curiosity that some phonetic features are morphologically older than Old Babylonian! There is no possible confusion between Standard and Old Babylonian. As in language, so in style. Self-consciousness results in a striving for stylistic effect, and some Cassite-period compositions are overloaded with rare words. The authors betray their very academic background and training.

In matters of thought it is possible to give a reasonably complete survey of the outlook and doubts of Cassite-period scholars. It must be stressed that some parts of the whole may in fact go back to Old Babylonian times, though lack of evidence prevents a decision. The main differences between surviving Old Babylonian texts and works either written or edited in the Cassite period are (i) a fuller understanding of the problems involved in the traditional approach to the universe, (ii) less confidence and self-assertion.

To deal with the first. The basic assumption of the gods ruling the universe in justice is maintained. Thus all misfortune and suffering should be punishment for neglect. Either

¹ For more details on the subject of ancestors, both scribal and otherwise, see *JCS* 11. 1-14 and 112.

the great gods themselves could invoke punishment, or the personal gods would withdraw their protection so that evil demons rushed in. The existence of such powers seems never to have been doubted, and no moral difficulty was felt since the just gods exercised a firm control over them. In this way the whole system of magic was retained, though to a modern western mind there is something incompatible with just gods ruling the universe, yet demons having supernatural powers for ill. The intellectuals of the Cassite period probably understood all the magic rites for exorcizing demons as divinely given means of protection with efficacy only for those in the gods' care. Under this system of thought an individual's fate was in his own hands. If he kept on the right side of the gods, no ill could assail him. This same idea provided an interpretation of history, of which no examples have yet been found from Old Babylonian times. The best example from the Cassite period is perhaps the *Weidner Chronicle*.¹ This text selects a number of important rulers from the earliest times onwards and explains their successes and failures as a reflection of their having provided, or having failed to provide, certain fish offerings for the Esagil temple in Babylon. The *Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta* and the records of Esarhaddon quoted above further document this philosophy. Many parts of the Old Testament presuppose the same interpretation of history, and as a doctrine it is not questioned in any known cuneiform text. The historical knowledge of the Cassite-period scholars was too inadequate for them to see the difficulties. The modern scholar finds an anachronism in the *Weidner Chronicle* before he can consider the premisses upon which it is based. The early kings did not take offerings to Esagil, because it did not then exist.

In the personal sphere the idea of piety as the guarantee of prosperity was more vulnerable. The suffering of an apparently righteous man was an irrefutable occurrence. Two long works of literature deal with this problem: *I will praise the lord of wisdom* (Bab. *ludlul bēl nēmeqi*; abbreviated *Ludlul*), and the Babylonian *Theodicy* (see Chs. 2–3). The first is certainly Cassite period, the *Theodicy* may be a little later. They approach the problem from different angles. The writer of the first was a devotee of Marduk, and in his monologue the only real question is why Marduk allows his servant to suffer. The agents responsible for the suffering—the personal gods, the devils, the human persecutors—receive little attention, as though no responsibility rested with them. The *Theodicy*, on the other hand, pays much attention to the human oppressors, and is a document of social history.

A whole range of answers to the problems are given in texts either written or circulating in the Cassite period. The traditional idea was apparently not without its supporters, whatever the difficulties. The orthodox friend in the *Theodicy* never seems to tire of telling the unfortunate sufferer that piety brings prosperity. Unlike Job's friends he abstains from directly accusing his interlocutor of some abominable hidden crime (the two speakers maintain mutual respect to the end), though this must surely have occurred to him. In the end the *Theodicy* leaves the question unanswered. Logical support for the traditional view was often sought in a subtle elaboration of the doctrine of sin. The basis of this lay in the complaint going back to the Third Dynasty of Ur that the sufferer did not know for what

¹ Published by H. Güterbock, *ZA* 42. 47–57.

crime he was being punished. Also hymns since Sumerian times had emphasized the remoteness of the gods. Putting these two things together the Cassite-period theologians, or their predecessors, evolved the doctrine that man has no intuitive sense of sin, and only the gods could reveal it to him. Thus sins of ignorance were common, if not universal, and explain why a man without any consciousness of sin can nevertheless be guilty before the gods, and so suffer. The following passages illustrate the idea:

Mankind is deaf and knows nothing.
What knowledge has anyone at all?
He knows not whether he has done a good or a bad deed.¹

Where is the wise man who has not transgressed and [committed] an abomination?
Where is he who has checked himself and not ba[ckslided?]²

Who is there who has [checked] himself and not done an abomination?
People do not know their [. . .] which is not fit to be seen.
A god reveals what is fair and what is foul.
He who has his god—his sins are warded off.
He who has no god—his iniquities are many.³

So far as the writer of *Ludlul* attempts to answer the problems he has raised, he has a variation on this answer. He goes beyond the view that man can only learn right and wrong by divine revelation, and asserts that man can never distinguish good and bad because of the gods' remoteness. To him the logical explanation was that moral standards must be inverted with the gods as compared with men (II. 34-38). A similar outlook occurs in a prayer:

Mankind, as many as they be,
Of themselves, who knows (anything)?
Who has not transgressed? Which one has not offended?
Who knows the way of a god?⁴

The writer of *Ludlul* advances his theory without enthusiasm, and turns away in despair. No solution seemed adequate. By the end of the work an answer was achieved, though not in the direction which the writer had explored. In time the sufferings were ended and bliss followed. Strictly this is narrative, but it implies an answer: the sufferings of the righteous are only temporary. The Psalmist said the same of the prosperity of the wicked (Psalm 73).

To the writer of the *Theodicy* the problem was why some men oppress others. The sufferer rejects the idea that the personal god can provide protection. An idea on which

¹ IV R² 10, rev. 29-34 = OECT VI. 43.

² BA v. 640. 15-18 = OECT VI. 23.

³ a-a-ú it- × [×] × gil-la-tú la ub-lam
la i-da-nim-m[a ×] × -ši-na la na-aṭ-la
ša dam-qat ù [mas-]kàt ilu muš-kal-lim
ša i-šú-u il-šú [ku]š-šu-da hi-ṭa-tu-šú
ša il-šú la i-šú-u ma-'-du ar-nu-šú

(BA v. 394, K 3186 + 3419. 39-43. The writer has collated the tablet and constructed of it and other pieces a long hymn to Marduk, which he is planning to publish as "Hymns to Marduk in Paragraphs, No. 1", where these are lines 106-110.)

⁴ E. Ebeling, *Handerhebung*, p. 72. 8-11.

category. The adultery, slander, oppression, and fraud against which they inveigh are plainly stated to be abominations to the gods. The *Counsels of Wisdom* (Ch. 4) is less uniform in content. The advice not to marry a prostitute or give too much respect to a slave girl (66–80) reads like advice of a practical rather than a moral character. Also the warning to a vizier not to abuse his position of trust (81–94) is based on the dangers of being found out, rather than on the gods' displeasure. Another section, however (135–47), teaches orthodox religious duties. This diversity of outlook is certainly the result of the composite nature of the work. Two other of its topics deserve mention. The one, improper speech, occurs twice (26–30; 127–34) and the large vocabulary of approximate synonyms used both here and elsewhere in Babylonian literature (see note on line 28) shows the importance attached to this offence. It is difficult to define its exact nature in modern terms, since it included both slander and blasphemy. Even in private such speech was sinful, as line 132 explains. It belongs clearly to the realm of magic, as the utterance is *per se* effective. Since, once uttered, it could not be taken back, warning against the fatal word is particularly insistent. The second topic, found in lines 56–65, is in sharp contrast with the previous one, yet equally widespread. It teaches kindness to those in need, and does so with the authority of Šamaš, the god of justice. The number of approximate synonyms for 'poor man' is again considerable.¹ The antiquity of this theme is shown by the attention given to the widow and orphan in Sumerian texts. A hymn to the goddess Nanše mentions them, and traditions of rulership and justice regard them as persons needing protection.² The earliest reference is in the inscriptions of the first social reformer, Urukagina of Lagaš (c. 2400 B.C.), himself a testimony to the social conscience of the Sumerians. In Babylonian literature this Sumerian tradition is followed.³ The *Theodicy* shows a keen awareness of social injustice, and the *Advice to a Prince* (p. 112) urges him to rule justly in order to secure his own safety from the gods.

¹ The ordinary Akkadian words for 'poor' are *lapnu* and *katû*, which occur together in both lists (*RA* 25. 125. 13–14) and hymns (K 3600 + DT 75 (*ABRT* 1. 54; H. Winckler, *Sammlung von Keilschrifttexten* II. 3; *BA* v. 628) IV. 12). The less ordinary words are given in *Malku-šarru* IV. 44–49:

<i>la i-šá-nu-u</i>	=	<i>muš-ke-nu</i>
<i>ma-ak-ka-nu-u</i>	=	<i>a-ku-ú</i>
<i>lu-la-nu-u</i>	=	<i>lil-lu</i>
<i>dun-na-mu-u</i>	=	<i>en-šu</i>
„	=	<i>ú-la-lu</i>
<i>a-ši-šu-u</i>	=	„ (<i>LTBA</i> II. 1. XII. 75–80.)

The series *Erim.ḫuš* also gives as a group *ú-la-lu*, *en-šú*, and *dun-na-mu-u* (IV. 167–9 = *CT* 18. 42 rev. 6–8), and the list *CT* 37. 25, III. 26–32, has a longer selection, with one addition: *lil-lu*, *še-e-ṭu*, *la-la-nu-u*, *muš-ke-nu*, and *dun-na-mu-[u]*. In literary texts combinations from this group are common, with occasional additions: *dunnamû*, *ekûtu*, *enšu*, and *lā išānû* (*LKA* 49 obv. 15–16 = E. Ebeling, *Handerhebung*, 50); *dunnamû*, *enšu*, *akû* (K 8663 obv. 1. 14–15; *OECT* VI. 73 obv. 11); *enšu*,

dunnamû (*PSBA* 17. 138. 2); *dunnamû*, *ulālu*, *enšu*, *ḫubbulu*, *muškēnu* (*Šamaš Hymn* 132–3); *lillu*, *akû* (*Fable of Willow*, K 8413. 5); *lā šūšuru*, *ekû*, *enšu*, *lā le'û* (E. Ebeling, *Handerhebung*, p. 24. 20–21); *enšu*, *piṣnuqu*, *lā le'û*, *ulālu*, *maqtu*, *dunnamû* (*ZA* 4. 38. III. 13–16). It is certainly striking how many of these literary synonyms for 'poor' are in origin expressions for physical weakness: *enšu* (see note on *Theodicy* 19), *akû* 'cripple', *lillu* 'physically weak' and 'mentally defective'. Because of the attention given to this class of people by the gods they came to be considered as "the poor of this world, rich in faith", so that Nabopolassar considers himself one of them: *a-na-ku en-šu-um pī-iz-nu-qu* (*VAB* IV. 68. 19).

² A rendering of the hymn to Nanše is given by Kramer in University Museum, *Bulletin*, Philadelphia, vol. 16/2. 32–34. Urukagina (Cone B XII. 23–25), Gudea (Cylinder B XVIII. 6–7, Statue B VII. 42–43), and Urnammu (*Or* N.S. 23. 43, 162–3) all speak of care for widow and fatherless, cf. *RA* 48. 148–9.

³ See the passages quoted on obv. 13–14 of the Ninurta hymn edited below, p. 317.

Šamaš was the god particularly concerned with justice and morality in Babylonian literature, and his worship must have been a salubrious element in an otherwise unprogressive religion. Apart from the *Šamaš Hymn* itself, it is noteworthy that the *Theodicy* concludes with his mention, and the *Counsels of Wisdom* connects him with humanitarianism. Throughout Babylonian history and literature his name keeps recurring, though he never achieved a place right at the top of the pantheon.¹ There is evidence that respect for him did reach to the masses. The popular sayings edited in Chapter 8 mention him several times, and the spread of similar material into the Ahiqar collections carried his name outside the area of strong Babylonian influence.

Thus the moral standards of the Babylonians were of very mixed origin. Some of the precepts continue primitive rites and taboos. Others are the outcome of cosmological thinking. Still others are a testimony to the force of the human conscience. The majority of scholars consider that the actual moral tone of Babylonian society, bedevilled by cult prostitution as it was, must have been very low indeed. Probably this was so in certain periods, though evidence is lacking and overall generalizations will certainly be wrong in part. Changes in ethical values must have taken place, and one example can be given. The pig was no offence to the Sumerians, but several of the popular sayings from the later period (p. 215) show a typical Semitic revulsion for it.

After the Cassite period the amount of new literature written was not very great, nor, with some exceptions, of much value. In thought the changes are so slight as to be almost unnoticeable. One tendency may be remarked which had already begun in the Old Babylonian period. Once the existence of a moral purpose in the universe had been established, a tendency to henotheism naturally followed. A single purpose could best be conceived as the responsibility of one god, rather than of the whole Mesopotamian pantheon. From time to time and in different places there were attempts to raise one god above the level of the rest: Marduk at more than one time in the history of Babylon, Ninurta in Middle Assyrian times, and Nābû a little later in Assyrian history. Some texts even go so far as to explain the other gods as aspects of the great god. A hymn says of Marduk:

Sin is your divinity, Anu your counsel,
Dagan is your lordship, Enlil your kingship,
Adad is your strength, Ea your subtle wisdom.²

Ninurta is similarly praised,³ and still farther in this direction Marduk is explained as being the other gods through having their qualities.⁴ This certainly gives the impression of a striving for monotheism, but Babylon and its culture were extinguished before any such goal was reached.

The Assyrians have hitherto received no more than a passing mention. In matters of

¹ An attempt to elevate Šamaš is found in a hymn which speaks of his activities as essential to the operations of the other gods (*Or* N.S. 23. 209-16).

² E. Ebeling, *Handerhebung*, 14. 3-5.

³ *KAR* 102; translated in A. Falkenstein and W. von Soden, *Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebete*, pp. 258-9.

⁴ *JTVI* 28. 1-22; *CT* 24. 50 and p. 9.

culture they were completely under the influence of the Babylonians. As early as Ashur-uballit I (c. 1350 B.C.) a Babylonian scribe was in the pay of an Assyrian king,¹ and Tukulti-Ninurta I (c. 1220 B.C.) used his sack of Babylon for seizing large numbers of cuneiform tablets as booty.² Kings before and after him doubtless shared his interest in Babylonian literature, and most of the native compositions were written in Standard Babylonian, not in the vernacular. At the end of the period of Assyrian supremacy Ashurbanipal was more successful in collecting tablets and amassing libraries than in arresting the break-up of the Assyrian power. We, at least, have cause to be glad, for it is from his tablet collections that the majority of the texts here edited have been recovered.

¹ *HUCA* 25. 127 = H. Fine, *Studies in Middle-Assyrian Chronology and Religion*, p. 109.

² *AfO* 18. 44. 3-8.

THE POEM OF THE RIGHTEOUS SUFFERER

LU DLUL BĒL NĒMEQI

INTRODUCTION

Ludlul bēl nēmeqi is a long monologue in which a certain noble relates how he met with every conceivable calamity, and was eventually restored to health and prosperity by Marduk. Originally the poem seems to have consisted of four tablets constituting together 400–500 lines. Of the first tablet the beginning and end are missing. The second tablet is preserved complete. Much of the third is preserved. There is a general opinion that part of the fourth is contained in some fragments from Assur, now joined by a piece from Sultan-tepe, but a careful consideration of the surviving material throws doubt on this conclusion, and there is no certainty even that this section is part of the work.

The plot of the first three tablets so far as preserved is clear:

- [(a) Introduction (not preserved).]
- (b) The narrator is forsaken by his gods.
- (c) All his fellow men from the king to his slaves turn against him.
- (d) Every kind of disease afflicts him.
- (e) His deliverance is promised in three dreams.
- (f) He is freed of all the diseases.

* * * * *

The first problem arises from the loss of the introduction. Who is the speaker? The opening words, “I will praise the lord of wisdom”, i.e. Marduk, which are known from their use as the title, show the general atmosphere, and one presumes that, without in any way sparing praise, the speaker must eventually have introduced himself, and perhaps gave some biographical details. The only surviving section which provides information is (e), where, in the narration of the dreams, three names occur: Laluralimma, Urnindinlugga, and Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan. To anticipate our conclusion, it is Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan who speaks. It is clear that he was once a man of affluence and authority. He occupied several high offices (I. 60, 61, 103, 104), owned slaves and fields (I. 89, 101), had a family (I. 99), and even speaks of “my city” as though it belonged to him (I. 102). His whole personal bearing had been that of a man of authority (I. 70–78). At the same time he had been a model of piety both to the gods and to the king (II. 23–32). The three names quoted belong to the Cassite period (see the notes on III. 25, 39, 43), and we should probably conclude that the writer, who also belonged to this period, set the scene in the recent past. No doubt a modern author would have put such a story into the distant past,

but that is no criterion for judging an ancient poem. The author had sufficient learning to find old Sumerian names, had he wished, instead of employing names in current use. One may conjecture that Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan was a feudal lord ruling a city for the Cassite monarch.

When the text first becomes coherent this noble describes how he was forsaken by his whole pantheon (I. 41-46). This calls to mind the *Tukulti-Ninurta Epic*, where all the gods of Babylonia forsake their cities in their anger at the wickedness of Kaštiliaš (BM 98730 obv. 33-46, in *AfO* 18/1. 42-43). Just as Kaštiliaš discovered his plight by failure to obtain a good omen, so our noble is beset by ominous signs (I. 49-54). The fulfilment of these ensues. The king becomes irreconcilably angry, and the seven courtiers seize the opportunity to plot every kind of mischief against him (55-69). The result is a total eclipse of his previous position (70-76), and he becomes a social outcast, hated by his friends, abused by his slaves, and disowned by his family (77-92). In this situation his persecutors are public heroes, while any kindness to him meets with a fell reward (93-98). Meanwhile all his property is confiscated and his duties are taken over by others (99-104). At this the sufferer gives himself up wholly to lamentation (105-10), which we cannot follow since the text breaks off at this point.

The first tablet then, so far as it is preserved, deals with the narrator's suffering at the hands of his fellow men. The second tablet is quite different. The first few lines intimate that suffering from those supernatural agencies which were thought responsible for disease is the theme of this part of the work. First, however, the speaker complains that his consultation of those clergy who were concerned with the exorcizing of evil demons has been of no avail (4-9). Then by a quick change the writer leaves the field of magic and incantations and addresses himself to the problem of the suffering of the righteous—another clear indication that these people had no dichotomy of ethical and cultic values. The sufferer, assuming that the gods repay good and evil, complains at some length that he has met the fate of a wrongdoer (12-22), a sentiment expressed more succinctly elsewhere,¹ and then reassures himself by stressing the pious tenor of his past life (23-32). What solution then can he find? He takes hold of the old theologoumena about the remoteness and inscrutability of the gods, and turns them round to mean that all values must be inverted with the gods, so that what is considered right among men must be wrong with the gods, and vice versa (33-38). This in itself, however, is more a complaint than an answer, and he follows it up by pointing out the very uncertain nature of human existence, and the preponderating influence which circumstances, such as famine and prosperity, have in human conduct (39-47). In the face of all this the sufferer expresses blank resignation (48). He has, however, no time to ponder, for Disease, a theme with which the writer deals thoroughly *con amore*, is upon him.

There now follows a long section reminiscent of incantations. It begins with a recital of the diseases, conceived as evil spirits, which arrive from their several other-world dwellings (49-58), and then lists the many disabilities which they inflict upon him (59-

¹ See pp. 10-11.

107). The listing of the parts of the body affected begins apparently in the conventional Babylonian manner, commencing with the head downwards,¹ but after a few lines the desire to include a good selection of the stock phrases of the incantation literature necessitated a breaking off of this plan and several changes of metre. When the recital is over, the narrator again stresses the helplessness of the priests who were consulted and the gods who were petitioned (108–13), mentions the outrageous behaviour of those who exploited his downfall (114–18), and concludes the tablet with what seems to be a confession of faith in his ultimate recovery (119–20). This confession, if it be such, brings to mind Job's outburst, "I know that my redeemer liveth", but it must be observed that there are textual difficulties in both passages.

With the third tablet we reach the very heart of the work. The opening phrase, "His hand was heavy upon me", is of great importance for the understanding of the whole poem. Whose hand? The following lines repeat the "his" but offer no explanation. The writer gives dark hints, but avoids openly using the name Marduk in this connexion. Marduk, with whose praise the poem began, is not mentioned during the 200 lines describing the suffering. Yet it was not the king, the courtiers, household, slaves, or demons that were really responsible. The almighty Marduk was at the root of the trouble, and although the pious hero dare not openly expostulate with him, he cannot leave the subject without a guarded allusion to the cause of his sufferings. Next come the dreams (9–44). The first begins very abruptly, and there is cause for asking if these were really dreams, and not psychic experiences in a semi-conscious state. In the first and third phenomena Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan speaks to the visitant (17, 34), which was not usual in dreams.² Yet the second and third are expressly called dreams. The first experience is the appearance of a young man of superlative physique; his message is not preserved. In the second another young man appears, but in the part of an exorcist priest, who duly performs rites on the sufferer after announcing that Laluralimma of Nippur has sent him. The last dream begins with the appearing of a divine-looking young woman, who answers the sufferer's pleas with a message of consolation. Then in the same dream a man Urnindinlugga, from Babylon if the traces have been read correctly, appears. He is described as bearded, though this was usual in the Cassite period, and he is specifically called an incantation priest. Appropriately he carries a tablet, no doubt written with incantations. He announces that he is the messenger of Marduk, and that he has brought prosperity to Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan, thus giving the name of the hero of the poem. The two named figures are very arresting. We know of nothing that lends support to the idea that these were dead worthies who in their disembodied state cared for this unfortunate man. The shades of the Babylonians troubled the living if not provided with burial and offerings, but never helped them. It is probable that all five who appeared were, in the story, religious dignitaries of the time. The young woman may have been intended as an *entu*-priestess. The man from Nippur

¹ This procedure is found in the series *ana marši ina teḫēka* (Labat, *TDP*, pp. 18 ff.), *CT* 17. 9, and the hymn *KAR* 102. 10–33. Contrast Song of Songs vii. 1–5.

² For an exhaustive study of dreams in the ancient Near East see A. L. Oppenheim, *Dreams*.

who sent his representative may have been the author's ruse for calling in the help of the ancient sanctuary of Nippur without conceding any of Marduk's supremacy to Enlil, which would have happened if Enlil had sent the messenger. This also throws light on the nature of the dreams. A god may appear in a dream, but gods themselves did not perform ritual curing. This was the task of priests, and they did not normally practise their rites in other people's sleep. So the writer resorts to a succession of none too convincing dreams as a means of bringing the necessary priests to the sick man's bedside.

All these experiences are signs that Marduk's wrath is now appeased (50-53), another confirmation that he was held responsible. After a gap in the text the undoing of the evil begins, and each of the disease demons is sent away in the same florid style (Si 55 rev.). The text breaks off before this process is finished, but lines quoted in the cuneiform commentary allow us to follow it to the end, at least in excerpts (a-k). According to the next two lines (l, m) the healed man underwent the river ordeal, and then had his slave mark removed. However, we do not know if he had ever been sold into slavery, and it is probable that these lines are not to be interpreted more literally than q, which speaks of a lion which had been devouring him. Next he proceeds along the processional streets of Babylon to the temple of Marduk, declaring himself an example to all who have sinned against Marduk, a none too clear declaration. Marduk then begins to suppress his human enemies, and with this the Commentary breaks off.

Many scholars, following B. Landsberger (*apud* H. Zimmern, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 70/5. 45²), connect the three Assur and one Sultantepe fragments and regard them as part of Tablet IV (here cited as 'Tablet IV(?)'). The evidence offered is twofold: first it is claimed that two lines from this text are actually cited in the cuneiform commentary. If proved, this would be decisive. Then the suitability of the text as the ending of *Ludlul* is claimed. This may be granted in principle, but similarities of style and subject matter are so common in Babylonian literature that they are not usually compelling. Other compositions of the same kind as *Ludlul* may have existed. The lines claimed as identified are 13-14 of the text with q in the Commentary, and 15-[16] with r. A minute examination of the two passages shows that their identification is a mistake.¹

There are several lines of reasoning which bring to light objections against the idea that the Assur and Sultantepe fragments are the ending of *Ludlul*. An approximate estimate of the length of the entire work can be made. A general premiss is that a literary tablet normally contains more writing on the obverse than on the reverse, rarely the same amount,

¹ The first group of signs in 13 is three at the most, and while the last might be *i*, the first cannot be *ina*(aš); thus *ina pi-i* is excluded. The *girru* is certainly the same in both passages, but the last word of 13 begins with *za*, not *a*, and there is room for one sign only between this and [*i*]a. The only possible reconciliation is to emend and restore: *a!-[kil-i]a*, which results in peculiar grammar. In 14 ^a*marduk* at the end is the same as in r, but the preceding *-š]am-ma* can only be made to conform

to *nap-sa-ma* by assuming the rare value *sam*, or another form of *napsamu* with *š*. In the attempt to force 15-[16] into r, ^a*marduk* would have to stand under *ušaddi*, and then one is left wondering why *mu-ka-* is so far to the right, when only one sign (*ša*) would go between them; especially so when the following sign might be *á[š*, but not *š[i*, and then there is not enough room for the three signs *-ši-di-ia*. Landsberger's statement in *AfO* 18. 378⁵ does not answer these objections.

and very rarely less. The only complete tablet of *Ludlul* is II, of 120 lines. Of the manuscripts of III, q was a full-length tablet, and p, which contains roughly half of this, has exactly 60 lines, with a catch-line added. The only assumption possible is that the tablets extended for about 120 lines. The Commentary, which is written on a single tablet, changes from obverse to reverse just before dealing with the end of Tablet II. This suggests that four tablets is the maximum possible. Commentaries can be very erratic in the number of lines they select for comment, and this one is no exception in that in one place three consecutive lines are cited, and in another almost 20 lines are passed over. The general picture, however, is more reliable. In the first tablet one out of every seven lines receives a comment. In Tablet II, one out of every six. The first half of Tablet III, the dreams, did not offer similar scope, and only one out of every twelve has attention, but the driving out of the demons marks a return to one in six. On the obverse of the Commentary the broken-off portion covered some 40 lines of text, according to the computed line numbering of Tablet I. On the reverse there is no sign of compressing the writing to get all the lines on the tablet, and if on the obverse about seven individual lines were commented upon in the missing top portion, it follows that the corresponding bottom portion on the reverse can have dealt with no more, and probably dealt with fewer.

More evidence comes from j and k, which appear to be parts of one big tablet containing the whole work, though with rulings separating the sections which elsewhere occupy complete tablets. If our estimate of 120 lines a tablet is about correct, these two pieces allow the deduction from the material they contain of Tablet I that each column of this large tablet had about 90 lines. Parts of three columns of the obverse are preserved, which gives a total of six columns and a maximum of about 540 lines. This agrees very well with the deduction that the poem is of four tablets of about 120 lines each, a total of 480. If four columns each side were to be postulated for j and k, this would result in a total of not more than 720 lines, or six tablets. The small amount of missing space at the end of the Commentary seems decisively against this.

Another factor, connected with the MS. q, which contained the whole of Tablet III, at once disproves the simple idea that the text under discussion is Tablet IV. q lacks the first 21 lines on the obverse. If allowance is made for even a short colophon and a little blank space on the reverse it follows that less than 20 lines are now wanting at the end of Tablet III. Thus not all the 21 lines a–u excerpted by the commentator can belong to Tablet III. Probably the majority belong to Tablet IV. If the ratio of one in six—the lowest attested—is assumed, the surviving portion of the Commentary must cover the first 100 lines of Tablet IV. With only a few lines missing at the end of the Commentary, and with Tablet IV almost finished, where can the 100 lines of the text of the Assur and Sultantepe fragments belong? Was Tablet IV twice as long as the other tablets? Was there perhaps a Tablet V which was not used by the commentator? Only the recovery of more evidence can answer these questions, and for the present a scholarly reserve must be maintained.

Whatever uncertainties may arise about its connexions, this text lacks nothing in

interest. The narrator begins by declaring how Marduk has saved him (1-14). After a gap the citizens of Babylon, seeing his recovery, burst into acclamation of Marduk and his consort (29-48). After a further gap the sufferer passes through eleven gates of the Esagil temple complex in Babylon, and at each receives a blessing corresponding with the Sumerian names of the gates (77-90). Having arrived inside, the speaker supplicates his saviour, makes for him a veritable feast of fat things, at which the manuscripts end. The text, however, is not ended, for the last preserved line is a catch-line (on **u**; cf. **p** for a similar style of tablet). The suitability of this text for the end of *Ludlul* can readily be appreciated. It should, however, be pointed out that a plan does emerge from what is preserved of the first three tablets, and if this plan was carried through, further problems are raised. There is an orderly procedure through the departure of the gods to the persecutions, first by human, and secondly by demonic agencies. After the turning-point, the dreams, the writer starts to take up these topics in reverse order. First the diseases are driven out. Now surely he must pass on to the human tormentors: the estates and offices must be returned, the insulting slaves must bow again, the family must recognize the outcast, the courtiers must repent, and the king must receive him back. Next should come the return of the personal deities. If the author did follow out this scheme he must have written with a quite unusual brevity at the end.

The first attestation the poem receives is in the libraries of Ashurbanipal. Nine manuscripts come from this source, and the Commentary. The latter is listed on an Ashurbanipal tablet of literary titles (*mu-kal-lim-tú šá lud-lul bēl né-me-qi*, Rm 618. 19, *apud* Bezold, *Catalogue*). Late Assyrian copies from Assur and Sultantepe confirm that *Ludlul* was a classic of Babylonian literature in the seventh century B.C. The copies from Babylon and Sippar are probably later. The date of composition is almost certainly Cassite period. The three names do not permit an earlier date, and stylistic considerations are opposed to one later.

The whole work shows to an extreme degree the characteristics of Cassite-period scholarship (see p. 14). The range of vocabulary is far wider than in most religious texts, and *hapax legomena* or meanings not otherwise attested occur frequently. The author has certainly not coined these rare words himself. He was steeped in the magic literature and seems to have culled from it all the obscure phrases and recondite words. Even the extensive lexical work *Harra* does not know so many terms for parts of the body. As literature the originality of the work lies in the overall design rather than in its parts. Much of the material, even complete couplets, and the themes are traditional. The Babylonians had long been accustomed to mention or expatiate on their troubles both in letters addressed to their gods and in literary prayers. The first tablet seems to have drawn much inspiration from these two genres. The many lines devoted to the arrival and departure of the demons, however, are clearly based on incantations. Among these there are many examples of a story of healing: a man is set upon by a demon; he does not know how to be rid of it; the aid of Marduk is sought, who goes to his father Ea for advice; the prescription, a ritual, is given by which the sufferer will be made whole. The chief formal difference is that the

incantations are written in the third person. In individual cases there are very close parallels. The arrival of the demons reads just like *CT* 17. 12 or *Šurpu* VII. Their seizing parts of the body is told in the same style as, for example, *Maqlû* I. 97–102. At the point where, if *Ludlul* were an incantation, the prescriptions for the ritual would be found, the dreams occur in which the ritual is performed and an incantation priest presents himself. Though it is rare in incantations to find as much attention given to the clearing up of a malady as to its onset, there is a short piece directed against a sorceress which first gives the members affected, and then repeats the list as they are cured (*ZA* 45. 25–26).

One legitimate criticism of the style is that the abundance of verbiage blunts the edge of the argument. Some explanation comes from the general theme of the work. For a long time it has been customary to refer to *Ludlul* as “The Babylonian Job”, and so long as knowledge was restricted to the second tablet such a description was justified. Seen now in a more complete form it will not bear the title so readily. Quantitatively the greater part of the text is taken up with showing how Marduk restores his ruined servant, and only a small part with trying to probe the reason for the suffering of the righteous. In places the writer deliberately sheers away from plainly facing this problem because of its blasphemous implications. Perhaps “The Babylonian *Pilgrim’s Progress*” would be a better title. Under the surface, however, the writer is perplexed by the same problem as Job. The world is ruled by the lord Marduk, from whom justice is expected by his servants. Yet Marduk allows even the most devoted to suffer. The author of *Ludlul* finds no answer adequate to solve this mystery. All he can say is that though it be the lord who has smitten, yet it is the lord who will heal.

LITERATURE

TEXT WITH OR WITHOUT EDITION

- 1875 H. C. Rawlinson, *IV R¹* 67, no. 2 (text of B).
 1888 B. T. A. Evetts, *PSBA* 10. 478 and pls. I–II (text of K 2518).
 1891 [T. G. Pinches], *IV R²* 60* (text of B, E, K 2518).
 1902 V. Scheil, *Une Saison de Fouilles à Sippar*, no. 37, p. 105 (an extract from Si 37).
 1906 M. Jastrow, *JBL* 25. 135–91 (an edition using *inter alia* an unpublished copy of Si 37 by Messerschmidt).
 1910 R. C. Thompson, *PSBA* 32. 18–24 (text of q).
 1919 E. Ebeling, *KAR* 108 (= h) and 175 (= p).
 1923 E. Ebeling, *KAR* 326 (= n).
 1923 S. H. Langdon, *Bab* 7. 131–94 and pls. XIII–xv = *Babylonian Wisdom*, 3–66 and pls. III–V (text of K 3323, DT 358, F, C).

- 1937 O. R. Gurney, *AfO* 11. 367 and pl. IV, no. 2 (text of j).
 1952 R. J. Williams, *JCS* 6. 4–7 and pls. I–II (photograph of l).
 1953 W. von Soden, *BiOr* 10. 8–12 (transliteration of O).
 1954 W. G. Lambert and O. R. Gurney, *Anatolian Studies* IV. 65–99 (text of i and m).
 1957 O. R. Gurney, *STT* 1. 32–33 (revised copies of i and m).

EDITIONS, TRANSLATIONS, STUDIES

- 1882 J. Halévy, *Documents religieux de l’Assyrie et de la Babylonie*, pp. 195–7.
 1887 A. H. Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 535–6.
 1888 T. G. Pinches, *Academy* (London), 21 Jan., pp. 46–47.

- 1903 H. Zimmern, in E. Schrader, *Die Keilschriften und das alte Testament*³, pp. 385-7.
- 1904 A. Jeremias, *Monotheistische Strömungen*, pp. 40-42.
- 1905 H. Zimmern, *AO* 7/3. 27-31.
- 1907 P. Dhorme, *Choix de Textes religieux assyro-babyloniens*, pp. 372-9.
- 1909 A. Ungnad, in H. Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte zum alten Testamente*¹, pp. 92-93.
- 1910 F. Martin, *Journal Asiatique*, 16, X^e Série, 75-143.
- 1911 P. Landersdorfer, *Eine babylonische Quelle für das Buch Job?* (*Biblische Studien*, XVI/2).
- 1912 M. Jastrow, *Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens* II. 120-2.
- 1912 R. W. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*¹, pp. 164-9.
- 1913 A. Jeremias, *Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur*¹, pp. 330-2.
- 1921 R. Reitzenstein, *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium*, p. 253.
- 1922 C. J. Ball, *The Book of Job*, pp. 9-30.
- 1922 B. Landsberger, in E. Lehmann and H. Haas, *Textbuch zur Religionsgeschichte*², pp. 311-16.
- 1925 B. Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien* II. 140-1.
- 1926 E. Ebeling, in H. Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte zum alten Testament*², pp. 273-81.
- 1926 R. W. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*², pp. 164-9.
- 1929 A. Jeremias, *Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur*², pp. 420-4.
- 1935 M. Witzel, *Or* N.S. 4. 107-23 (edition of Tablet II).
- 1943 J. J. Stamm, *JEOI* IX. 99-107.
- 1946 T. Jacobsen, in H. Frankfort and others, *The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*, pp. 213-16 = *Before Philosophy*, pp. 228-31.
- 1946 J. J. Stamm, *Das Leiden des Unschuldigen in Babylon und Israel* (*Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, 10).
- 1950 R. H. Pfeiffer, *ANET*¹, pp. 434-7.
- 1955 R. H. Pfeiffer, *ANET*², pp. 434-7.
- 1956 A. L. Oppenheim, *Dreams*, pp. 217, 250.
- 1959 W. G. Lambert, in H. Franke (ed.), *Akten des vierundzwanzigsten Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses*, pp. 145-8.

COMMENTARY ONLY: TEXT

- 1884 H. C. Rawlinson, *V R* 47.
- 1923 S. H. Langdon, *Bab* 7, pls. XI-XIII = *Babylonian Wisdom*, pls. I-III.

TABLET IV(?), TEXT

- 1915 E. Ebeling, *KAR* 10 (= t) and 11 (= u).
- 1953 E. Ebeling, *LKA* 67 (= v).
- 1957 O. R. Gurney, *STT* I. 27 (SU 1952, 302).

TABLET IV(?), EDITIONS (when not included in the editions of the whole work)

- 1918 H. Zimmern, *Zum babylonischen Neujahrfest, Zweiter Beitrag* (*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 70/5). 45-48.

SUMMARY LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS
(Details are given in the lists for the separate tablets)

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Museum or Excavation Number</i>	<i>Tablet(s)</i>
A	K 2518+DT 358	II
B	K 3972	II
C	K 8396	II
D	K 3323+Rm 941	II
E	DT 151	II
F	Sm 1745	II
G	K 3291 (Commentary)	I, II, III, IV
h	VAT 10657	II
i	SU 1951, 32	II
j	BM 32214 (S+ 76-11-17, 1941)	I, II
k	BM 32694 (S+ 76-11-17, 2463+2478)	I, II
l	Si 37+881	II
m	SU 1951, 10	I
n	VAT 11100	I
O	K 9237	I
p	VAT 9954	III
q	Si 55	III
r	VAT 10601	II
s	VAT 10071 and VAT 10756 (Exercise Tablets)	I
[t	VAT 9303	IV?
u	VAT 9442	IV?
v	VAT 10538	IV?
w	SU 1952, 212+291 with 302	IV?]
X	K 10503+Sm 2139	I
Y	K 6935	II
z	VAT 11565	I

ADDENDA TO *LUDLUL*, TABLET I

WHILE this book was in press **z** (VAT 11565 = *KAR* 279) was discovered to be the lost ending of *Ludlul* I. It overlaps lines 110–12 and duplicates and restores the last four lines of the tablet as preserved on **j**. Since the original, VAT 11565, is mislaid in Berlin, Ebeling's copy is reproduced on Pl. 74.

110 trace

111	. . . <i>a-di-ra]</i> t <i>lib-</i> [<i>bi-ia</i>]
112	. . .] <i>pi-rit-tu</i> [× ×]
113	. . . <i>g]i?</i> <i>ri lu d[i?</i> × (×)]
114	. . .] <i>be ri i</i> [× ×]
115	. . . <i>ta]h?</i> <i>be di a kur</i> [× ×]
116	. . .] × <i>bu hu u s[u</i> × ×]
117	. . .] <i>ki-ma da</i> × [× ×]
118	. . .] <i>nap-ra-ku na-pa-lu-ú</i>
119	. . .] <i>iš-ši-ra</i> ^m <i>damiqtim</i> (sig ₅) ^{tim}
120	. . . <i>ú]-nam-me-ra</i> ^d <i>šamši</i> ^{ši}

(Illegible remains of a colophon appear on the bottom edge of **z**.)

Variants of **j**: 119 -š]i-ir 120 -na]m-mir

The new piece had rulings after every tenth line, like **p**, and ends on a tenth line, 120 according to our calculations. These calculations started from the assumption that the tablet was of 120 lines, and unless it is a coincidence that the new fragment ends at exactly 120, the evidence confirms the basis and accuracy of our calculations. It is then almost certain that Tablets I, II, and III all consisted of 120 lines. The author probably intended them to be construed as 60 couplets each, 60 being an important figure in Babylonian numerology, derived from their sexagesimal system. This result confirms our conclusions about the extent of *Ludlul*. There is every reason to assume that Tablet IV had 120 lines exactly, therefore the Commentary must have ended with this Tablet. The text here called Tablet IV(?) is either Tablet V or no part of *Ludlul* at all.

A further discovery too late to be incorporated in the text is the identification of K 10503 as a piece of *Ludlul* I, and its joining to Sm 2139. The obverse of the new piece has parts of lines 43–52, and its reverse follows Sm 2139 after a gap of four lines with parts of lines 86–91. The following new variants are offered:

44	^r <i>i</i> - <i>bé-eš</i> × [50	<i>d[r-</i>
48	- <i>r]i-is ta-ra-ni</i>	87	- <i>a]r-ras kak-ki</i>
49	- <i>da-a-ti</i>	91	- <i>t]u? i-m[e?-</i>

The variant in line 48 *ipparis* “has been cut off” seems preferable to the reading of **m** *ippariš*.

TABLET I

MANUSCRIPTS

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Obverse</i>	<i>Lines on Reverse</i>	<i>Plates</i>
Sultantepe				
m	= SU 1951, 10	38-72	73-104	1-2
Assur				
n	= VAT 11100	66-86	92-112	3
s	= VAT 10071 rev. 3-4, and VAT 10756 rev. 5-6 (The extracts on these exercise tablets can be taken together, since all the extracts run consecutively from the one on to the other.)		82-85	73
z	= VAT 11565 (see Addenda, p. 30)			
Ashurbanipal				
O	= K 9237	47-65	66-84	3
X	= Sm 2139*	..	75-81	3
G	= K 3291 (Commentary)	47, 48, 61, 69, 71, 78, 86, 87, 89, 93, 105, 106		15-17
Babylon				
k	= BM 32694 (S+ 76-11-17, 2463+2478)	Col. I? 48-54; 56-62	..	4
j	= BM 32214 (S+ 76-11-17, 1941)	Col. II? Last 4 lines	..	4
	(k and j are probably parts of the same tablet)			

Since the beginning is lacking the numbering has been computed from the assumed total of 120 lines (see Introduction), and the places at which the scribes of **m**, **n**, and **O** changed from obverse to reverse. The approximate numbering thus gained has been adjusted to the wedges marking each tenth line on **O**.

* Now joined to K 10503; see p. 30.

I *lud-lul bēl né-me-qí* [. . . (from the colophons)]

m	38 [× × ×] × × × [.]	
	39 [×] × × <i>niš^{meš}</i> <i>kit-ru-b</i> [a]	
	40 × -m/l/nat-su <i>da-me-eq-tú</i>	[.]
	41 [d]a- <i>liḫ-tam-ma</i> <i>be-lum</i>	[.]
	42 <i>ù qar-ra-du</i> ^d en.×	<i>pu-su</i> × [.]
	43 <i>id-dan-ni ili-i</i> ₁₄	<i>šá-da-šu i</i> -[mid]
	44 <i>ip-par-ku</i> ^d iš-tar- ^r i ₁₄	<i>i-bé</i> -[eš . . .]
	45 [i]s-li-it <i>še</i> -⟨ed⟩ <i>dum-qí</i>	<i>šá i-di</i> -[ia]
	46 <i>ip-ru-ud la-mas-si-ma</i>	<i>šá-nam-ma i-še</i> -'[e]
Gk	47 [i]n-ni- <i>ṭir ba-al-ti</i>	<i>du-ú-ti ú-tam-mil</i>
G	48 <i>si-im-ti ip-pa-ri-iš</i>	<i>ta-ra-na iš-ḫi-iṭ</i>
	49 <i>iš-šak-na-nim-ma</i>	<i>i-da-at pi-rit-ti</i>
	50 <i>uš-te-ši</i> ⟨ina⟩ <i>bīti-ia</i>	<i>ka-ma-a-ti ar-pu</i> - ^r ud ^r
	51 <i>dal-ḫa te-re-tu-ú-a</i>	<i>nu-up-pu-ḫu ud-da-kám</i>
	52 <i>it-ti</i> ^{lú} bārī(ḫal) <i>u šá</i> -' <i>i-li</i>	<i>a-lak-ti ul par-sat</i>
	53 <i>ina pi-i su-qí</i>	<i>le-mun egirru</i> (enem. <i>gar-ú</i>)- <i>a</i>
	54 <i>at-til-ma ina šat mu-šu</i>	<i>šu-ut-ti pár-da-at</i>
	55 <i>šarru šir ili</i>	^d šamši <i>šá niš^{meš}</i> -šú
k	56 <i>lib-bu-uš ik-ka-šir-ma</i>	<i>pa-ṭa-ru-uš lim-niš</i>
	57 <i>na-an-za-zu tés-li-tu</i>	<i>uš-ta-na-ad-da-nu elī-ia</i> ₅
	58 <i>paḫ-ru-ma ra-man-šu-nu</i>	<i>ú-šah-ḫa-zu nu-ul-la-a-ti</i>
	59 <i>šum-ma iš-ten-ma</i>	<i>na-piš-ta-šu ú-šat-bak-šu</i>
	60 <i>i-qab-bi šá-nu-ú</i>	<i>ú-šat-bi ter-tu-uš</i>
G	61 <i>šá ki-ma šal-ši</i>	<i>qip-ta-šú a-tam-ma-aḫ</i>
	62 <i>er-ru-ub bīt-uš-šu</i>	<i>rebū^u i-tam-mi</i>
	63 <i>ḫa-áš-šu pi-i ḫa-še-e</i>	<i>šu-bal-kut</i>
	64 <i>šeš-šu u si-bu-u</i>	<i>i-red-du-u še-du-uš-šú</i>
	65 <i>ik-šu-ru-nim-ma</i>	<i>ri-kis sibat il-lat-su-un</i>
n	66 [u ₄ -]mi-iš <i>la pa-du-u</i>	<i>ú-ri-kiš maš-lu</i>
	67 [u] <i>iš-ten še-er-šu-nu-ma</i>	<i>pa-a i-te-ed-di</i>

COMMENTARY (comments only)

[The first four preserved lines, of which little remains, seem to have dealt with lines of the text which have not been recovered.]

47 *du-ú-tu bu-un-n]a-nu-ú* 48 *ta-ra-nu šil-lu* 61 *ta-]ma-ḫu ša-ba-tum*

VARIANTS

49 k: *pi*]-rit-tum 50 k: *á*[r-p]u-du 53 O: e.sír k: -r]u *ú-a* 54 O: *at-til* k: *pár-*

I I will praise the lord of wisdom [. . .

- 41 The lord [. the] confusion
 42 And the warrior [.]
 43 My god has forsaken me and disappeared,
 44 My goddess has failed me and keeps at a distance.
 45 The benevolent angel who (walked) beside [me] has departed,
 46 My protecting spirit has taken to flight, and is seeking someone else.
 47 My strength is gone; my appearance has become gloomy;
 48 My dignity has flown away, my protection made off.
 49 Fearful omens beset me.
 50 I am got out of my house and wander outside.
 51 The omen organs are confused and inflamed for me every day.
 52 The omen of the diviner and dream priest does not explain my condition.
 53 What is said in the street portends ill for me.
 54 When I lie down at night, my dream is terrifying.
 55 The king, the flesh of the gods, the sun of his peoples,
 56 His heart is enraged (with me), and cannot be appeased.
 57 The courtiers plot hostile action against me,
 58 They assemble themselves and give utterance to impious words.
 59 Thus the first, "I will make him pour out his life."
 60 The second says, "I will make him vacate his post."
 61 On this wise the third, "I will seize his position."
 62 "I will take over his estate", says the fourth.
 63 The fifth
 64 The sixth and seventh will persecute
 65 The clique of seven have assembled their forces,
 66 Merciless like a demon, equal to . . .
 67 One is their flesh, united in purpose.

da-t]um 55 **m:** dingir.dingir O: dingir.meš 56 **k:** li-i]m-ni 57 O: na-an-za-zi
tés-lit **k:** elī-ia 58 O: ra-man-šú-nu **k:** n]u-ul-la-a-tú 59 O: na-piš-ta-šú **k:** [ú]-šat-
bak 60 **k:** t]e-er-tu-šú 61 **m:** qip-ta-[šú] G: a-tam-maḥ **k:** -ma]ḥ 62 O: i-t[a-
k: i-tam-m]u? 63 O: 5-šu 64 O: 6-šu 7-ú i-rad-du-u 65 O: ik-šur-nim-ma, si-bit
 66 O: pa-du-ú 67 O: [ú]?, uzu.meš-šú-nu-ma

	mnO		
		68	[li]bba na-ad-ru-nim-ma
G		69	tuš-šu u nap-ra-ku
		70	mut-tál-lu pi-ia
G		71	šap-ta-a-a šá it-ta-aš-ba-ra
		72	šá-pu-tum šá-gi-ma-ti
		73	šá-qa-a-tum ri-šá-a-a
	X	74	lib-bi kab-ba-ra-a
		75	ra-pa-áš-tum i-ra-a-ti
		76	ša-di-ḥa a-ḥa-a-a
		77	šá e-til-liš at-tal-la-ku
G		78	šar-ra-ḥa-ku-ma
		79	a-na rap-ši ki-ma-ti
		80	su-qa a-ba-'a-ma
	S	81	er-ru-ub ēkal-liš
		82	āli-i ₁₄ ki-i a-a-bi
		83	tu-šá-ma nak-ra-ti
		84	a-na a-ḥi-i
		85	a-na lem-ni u gal-le-e
G		86	na-al-bu-bu tap-pe-e
G		87	ki-na-a-ti qaq-dà-a
		88	ru-ù'-a ṭa-a-bi
G		89	šu-piš ina ṭpuḥri
		90	bi-ti mu/ik × × an
	n	91	i-mu-ra-ni-ma m[u-d]u-u
		92	a-na la širi ^{meš} -šú
G		93	a-na qa-ab ^{m1} dameqti(sig ₅)-ia
		94	mu-ta-mu-ú ṭa-pil-ti-ia
		95	da-bi-ib nu-ul-la-ti-ia
		96	× ša iq-bu-u a-ḥu-lap
		97	šá la amāta(inim) rig-ma i-te-me
		98	ul ar-ši a-lik i-di
		99	a-na ši-in-di u bir-ti
			na-an-ḥu-uz-zu i-šá-tiš
			ú-šam-ga-ru elī-ia ₅
			a-pa-tiš i-téš-'-ú
			ḥa-šik-kiš e-me
			šá-qum-meš × -še-[. .]
			ik-nu-uš qaq-qar-[šu]
			pi-rit-ti ú-tan-[niš]
			a-ga-áš-gu-u it-te'-[i]
			ki-la!-[a]t-ta i-taḥ-za
			ḥa-la-la al-mad
			a-tur ana re-e-ši
			e-te-me e-da-niš
			tur-ru-ša ú-zu-na-a-ti
			i-ša-pu-ra i-na-a-ti
			ni-kil-man-ni
			na-an-du-ur-tú ma-a-ti
			a-ḥi i-tu-ra
			i-tu-ra ib-ri
			ú-nam-gar-an-ni
			ú-mar-ras-s[u] ^{giš} kakki ^{meš}
			ú-kar-r[i]? na-piš-ti
			i ¹ -ru-ra-ni ar-di
			um-ma-ni ṭa-pil-ti iq-bi
			šá-ḥa-ti i-mid
			iš-ku-na-ni kim-ti
			pi-ta-as-su ḥaš-ti
			šá-kin ana re-e-ši
			ilu ri-šu-šú
			ḥa-muṭ-su mu-tú
			uballiṭ(ti.la) še-du-uš
			ga-me-lu ul a-mur
			zu-'-ú!-zu mim-ma-a-a

COMMENTARY

69 nap-ra-ku pi-ir-ku 71 [ša-ba-ru da-b]a-bu: ḥa-šik-ku suk-ku-ku: e-mu-u ma-šá-lu
 78 re-e-šu ^{lú}ardu 86 na-al-bu-bu ši-gu-ú 87 [ki]-na-ṭti¹? [d]a-mi ta-[li-mu] 93 ḥa-
 áš-tum šu-u[t-ta-tum]

VARIANTS

68 m: na-a[n-ḥu]-zu 70 n: a]-p[a]-a-tiš 72 n: -qu]m-m[iš] 73 O: šá-qa-a-ti

- 68 Their hearts rage against me, and they are ablaze like fire.
 69 They combine against me in slander and lies.
 70 My lordly mouth have they held as with reins,
 71 So that I, whose lips used to prate, have become like a mute.
 72 My sonorous shout is [reduced] to silence,
 73 My lofty head is bowed down to the ground,
 74 Dread has enfeebled my robust heart.
 75 A novice has turned back my broad chest.
 76 My arms, (though once) strong, are both paralysed.
 77 I, who strode along as a noble, have learned to slip by unnoticed.
 78 Though a dignitary, I have become a slave.
 79 To my many relations I am like a recluse.
 80 If I walk the street, ears are pricked;
 81 If I enter the palace, eyes blink.
 82 My city frowns on me as an enemy;
 83 Indeed my land is savage and hostile.
 84 My friend has become foe,
 85 My companion has become a wretch and a devil.
 86 In his savagery my comrade denounces me,
 87 Constantly my associates furbish their weapons.
 88 My intimate friend has brought my life into danger;
 89 My slave has publicly cursed me in the assembly.
 90 My house, the mob has defamed me.
 91 When my acquaintance sees me, he passes by on the other side.
 92 My family treat me as an alien.
 93 The pit awaits anyone who speaks well of me,
 94 While he who utters defamation of me is promoted.
 95 My slanderer slanders with god's help;
 96 For the . . . who says, "God bless you", death comes at the gallop.
 97 While he who utters a libellous cry is sustained by his guardian spirit.
 98 I have no one to go at my side, nor have I found a helper.
 99 My household has been enslaved,

75 n: *ra-pa-áš-tú* nO: *i-ra-ti* 76 O: *šá-di-ḫa* n: *šad-de-e-ḫa* á.II.me-a-a *ki-la!*- is an
 emendation of Xm: *ki-TA-at-ta* n: *KU-l[a?-* 77 O: *e-liš* 78 G(n)X: *a-na* 80 O:
su-qu 81 O: *e-ru-ub e-k[al-* n: *e-kal-liš-ma* 82 s: *uru* 83 n: *tu-šá-a-ma* s:
nak-ra-tum na-an-dur-ti 84 ns: *a-ḫe-e* 85 n: *lim-ni gal-l[e-* 86 n: *-bu-u]b* G:
ú-nam-ga-ra-an-ni 87 G: *ki-n]a-a[t?, [ú]-[mar]-[ra-áš giš].[tukul]* 89 G: *pu-uḫ-ri e-ru-*
ra-an-ni × ×[93 G: *ḫaš-tum* 94 n: *mu-[t]a-m[u-u]* 95 n: *nu-ul-la-te-[*
 96 n: *a-ḫu-l[a-p]i* 99 *zu-'-ú-zu* is an emendation of m: *ú-zu-'u-zu*

mn

	100	<i>ina-at ak-mu-ú</i>	<i>man di lu s[a]-ki-ka</i>
	101	<i>ina qir-bé-ti-ia</i>	<i>ú-šes-su-u^d a-la-la</i>
	102	<i>ki-i āl na-ki-ri</i>	<i>uš-qa-me-mu āli</i>
	103	<i>par-ši-ia</i>	<i>ú-šal-qu-u šá-nam-ma</i>
	104	<i>ina pil-lu-di-ia</i>	<i>a-ḫa-a uš-zi-zu</i>
G	105	<i>u₄-mu šu-ta-nu-ḫu</i>	<i>mu-šú gir-ra-a-ni</i>
G	106	<i>arḫu qí-ta-a-a-u-lu</i>	<i>i-dir-tú šat-t[ú]</i>
	107	<i>[ki-m]a su-um-me a-dam-mu-ma</i>	<i>gi-mir u₄-me-i[a]</i>
	108	<i>[ana za]-ma-a-ru</i>	<i>qu-ub-bi-ia ú-šá-aš-rap</i>
	109	<i>[ina bi]-tak-ke-e</i>	<i>šu-ub-ra-a inā¹¹-a-a</i>
	110	<i>[× × × di-m]a-ti</i>	<i>šur-ru-ḫu ú-suk-ka-a-a</i>
	111	<i>[.]-e</i>	<i>a-di-rat lib-b[i-ia]</i>
	112	<i>[.] ×</i>	<i>[pi-rit¹-t[i]]</i>

[For ending of Tablet I see Addenda, p. 30]

- 100 And the oxen which I
 101 They have excluded the harvest cry from my fields,
 102 And silenced my city like an enemy city.
 103 They have let another take my offices,
 104 And appointed an outsider in my rites.
 105 By day there is sighing, by night lamentation,
 106 Monthly—wailing, each year—gloom.
 107 I moan like a dove all my days;
 108 [For a] song I emit groans.
 109 My eyes [through] constant weeping,
 110 My lower eyelids are distended [through abundance of] tears.
 111 [.] . the fears of [my] heart
 112 [.] . panic [.]

COMMENTARY

105 *gir-ra-a-ni bi-[ki-tum]* 106 *qí-ta-a-a-ú-lu qu-ú-[lu]*

VARIANTS

100 n: *i-na-*[, *šá-k[i-* 101 n: *a-l[a]-la* 102 n: *[uš]-qam-me-m[u]* uru.mu 105 G:
mu-šú 106 G: *qí-ta-a-a-ú-lu*, *i-dir-tu* mu.an.[na 108 Landsberger (Lehmann-Haas, *Text-*
*buch*², p. 312): *[kīma lal-l]a-a-ru* 109 Von Soden (*BiOr* 10. 10): *[u₄-um? bi]-tak-ke-e*

TABLET II

MANUSCRIPTS

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Obverse</i>	<i>Lines on</i>	<i>Reverse</i>	<i>Plates</i>
Ashurbanipal					
A	= K 2518+DT 358	1-47		96-120	4
B	= K 3972	21-48		98-120	5
C	= K 8396	44-65		66-90	5
D	= K 3323+Rm 941	18-23		105-20	6
	(C and D are almost certainly parts of the same tablet)				
E	= DT 151	1-11		(Colophon)	6
F	= Sm 1745	3-9		..	4
Y	= K 6935	..		90-99	7
G	= K 3291 (Commentary)	3, 7, 9, 11, 21, 24, 43, 44, 53, 57, 61, 69, 70, 88, 90, 96, 97, 98, 100		101, 107	15-17
Assur					
h	= VAT 10657	..		82-94	6
r	= VAT 10601	63-74		..	6
	(h and r are probably parts of the same tablet)				
Sultantepe					
i	= SU 1951, 32	1-56; 61-72		73-83; 85-120	8-11
Babylon					
j	= BM 32214 (S+ 76-11-17, 1941)	Col. II? 1-17		..	4
k	= BM 32694 (S+ 76-11-17, 2463+ 2478)	Col. II? 16-33		..	4
	(j and k are probably parts of the same tablet)				
Sippar					
l	= Si 37+881	8-29; 37-48		76-120	6-7

A	E	i j	1	<i>akšud(kur-ud)-ma a-na ba-laṭ</i>	<i>a-dan-na i-te-eq</i>
			2	<i>a-saḥ-ḥur-ma</i>	<i>le-mun le-mun-ma</i>
G	F		3	<i>za-pur-ti ú-ta-ša-pa</i>	<i>i-šar-ti ul ut-tu</i>
			4	<i>ila al-si-ma</i>	<i>ul id-di-na pa-ni-šú</i>
			5	<i>ú-sal-li ^diš-tar-ri</i>	<i>ul ^Γú^Γ-šá-qa-a ri-ši-šá</i>
G			6	<i>^{lú}bārú(ḥal) ina bi-ir</i>	<i>ár-kàt ul ip-ru-us</i>
		l	7	<i>ina ma-áš-šak-ka ^{lú}šā'ilu(en.me.li)</i>	<i>ul ú-šá-pi di-i-ni</i>
			8	<i>za-qí-qu a-bal-ma</i>	<i>ul ú-pat-ti uz-ni</i>
G			9	<i>^{lú}mašmaššu ina ki-kiṭ-ṭe-e</i>	<i>ki-mil-ti ul ip-ṭur</i>
			10	<i>a-a-i-te ep-še-e-ti</i>	<i>šá-na-a-ti ma-ti-tan</i>
G			11	<i>a-mur-ma ár-kàt</i>	<i>ri-da-ti ip-pi-ru</i>
			12	<i>ki-i šá tam-qí-tum</i>	<i>a-na ili la uk-tin-nu</i>
			13	<i>ù ina ma-ka-le-e</i>	<i>^diš-tar-ri la zak-ru</i>
			14	<i>ap-pi la e-nu-ú</i>	<i>šu-kin-ni la am-ru</i>
		k	15	<i>ina pi-i-šú ip-par-ku-ú</i>	<i>su-up-pe-e tés-li-ti</i>
			16	<i>ib-ṭi-lu u₄-mu ili</i>	<i>i-še-ṭú eš-še-ši</i>
	D		17	<i>id-du-ú aḥ-šú-ma</i>	<i>mi-šu-nu i-mi-šu</i>
			18	<i>pa-la-ḥu ù it-'u-du</i>	<i>la ú-šal-me-du niš^{meš}-šú</i>
			19	<i>il-šú la iz-kur</i>	<i>e-kul a-kal-šú</i>
	B		20	<i>i-zib ^diš-tar-ta-šú</i>	<i>mas-ḥa-^Γtu^Γ la ub-la</i>
G			21	<i>a-na šá im-ḥu-ú</i>	<i>bēl-šú im-šu-ú</i>
			22	<i>niš ili-šú kab-ti</i>	<i>qal-liš iz-kur</i>
				<i>a-na-ku am-šal</i>	
			23	<i>aḥ-su-us-ma ra-man</i>	<i>su-up-pu-ú tés-li-ti</i>
G			24	<i>tés-li-ti ta-ši-mat</i>	<i>ni-qu-u sak-ku-ú-a</i>
			25	<i>u₄-mu pa-la-aḥ ili^{meš}</i>	<i>ṭu-ub lib-bi-ia</i>
			26	<i>u₄-mu ri-du-ti ^diš-tar</i>	<i>né-me-li ta-at-tur-ru</i>

COMMENTARY

3 *za-pur-tum ru-ub-[bu]* 7 *maš-šak-ku sur-qí-nu šá ^{lú}šā'ili(en.Γme.li^Γ)* 9 *kì-kiṭ-ṭu-ú né-pi-ši*
 11 *ip-pi-ri: [m]a-na-aḥ-tum: muršu* 21 *im-ḥu-ú ka-ba-tum* 24 *sak-ku-u par-ši*

VARIANTS

1 j: *a-da]n-nu i-ti-iq* i: *-]nu i-ti-[* 2 i: *a[s-ḥur-m]a* 3 EG: *za-pur-tum* Gi: *ú-ta-aš-ša-pa* G: *^Γi^Γ-šar-tum* j: *ú-šar-tú, ú-šu* 4 j: *]-nu pa-nu-uš* i: *pa-ni-[š]u* 5 i: *ú-[sal-l]a*
 E: *^diš-t[a-ri* A: *i-šaq-qa-a* i: *ri-ši-šu* j: *ri-ši-šú* 6 E(i): *bi-ri* i: *[a]r-ka-at* 7 G: *i-na maš-šak-ki* AF insert *u* before *šā'ilu*. i: *]×-^Γki^Γ šá-'-i-li* G: *i-šá-pi d[i-n]i* i: *di-nim*
 j: *di-in-šú-nu* 8 i: *za-[qí-q]ú a-BA.BI-(ras.)-ma* j: *ú-pat-ta uz-nu* 9 i: *ma[š-m]aš-šu*
 Gi: *kì-kiṭ-ṭe-e* l: *]-ṭe-^Γe^Γ* j: *ki-mil-tú* 10 Ei: *a-a-it* i: *ep-še-ti šá-na-at* l: *-š]e-t[u]*

- 1 I survived to the next year; the appointed time passed.
 2 As I turn round, it is terrible, it is terrible;
 3 My ill luck has increased, and I do not find the right.
 4 I called to my god, but he did not show his face,
 5 I prayed to my goddess, but she did not raise her head.
 6 The diviner with his inspection has not got to the root of the matter,
 7 Nor has the dream priest with his libation elucidated my case.
 8 I sought the favour of the *zaqīqu*-spirit, but he did not enlighten me;
 9 And the incantation priest with his ritual did not appease the divine wrath against me.
 10 What strange conditions everywhere!
 11 When I look behind, there is persecution, trouble.
 12 Like one who has not made libations to his god,
 13 Nor invoked his goddess at table,
 14 Does not engage in prostration, nor takes cognizance of bowing down;
 15 From whose mouth supplication and prayer is lacking,
 16 Who has done nothing on holy days, and despised sabbaths,
 17 Who in his negligence has despised the gods' rites,
 18 Has not taught his people reverence and worship,
 19 But has eaten his food without invoking his god,
 20 And abandoned his goddess by not bringing a flour offering,
 21 Like one who has grown *torpid* and forgotten his lord,
 22 Has frivolously sworn a solemn oath by his god,
 (like such an one) do I appear.
 23 For myself, I gave attention to supplication and prayer:
 24 To me prayer was discretion, sacrifice my rule.
 25 The day for reverencing the god was a joy to my heart;
 26 The day of the goddess's procession was profit and gain to me.

šá-na-ti j: šá-na-tum 11 i: a-mur a[r-k]a-te ri-da-ta l: -ka-]t[u G: ar-ka-t[um] ri-
 da-a-tum ip-pe-e-ri j: -t]um ri-da-tú ip-pi-r[i 12 i: tam-q[t-s]u j: dingir.meš 13 l:
 d15 i: diš-ta[r, iz-za-kar j: i-zak-ru l: iz- 14 i: e-nu-u, šu-[ki]n-na jl: šu-kin-nu j:
 am-ri 15 i: i[p-p]ar-ku-u su-pu-u tés-li-tú j: su-pe-e u l: su-pu-ú tés-^lli^l-t[u 16 k: ib-
 ti-la i: u₄-u]m j: dingir]r.meš i-še-e] eš-še-e-šu i: eš-še-šu l: ud.[è]š.è[š 17 A: aḥ-šú-
 nu l: me-šú-nu j:] × × × ^ldingir.meš i-me-e-šu^l i: me-e-šu-^lnu^l i-me-šu 18 i: pa-
 la-ḥa i[t-]ú-du k: u 19 i: iz-ku-ru i-^lku-lu^l l: ^li^l-ku-lu 20 l: i[z- i: iz-bu, -ḥ]a-
 [s]u A: mas-ḥas 21 i: ša im-ḥu-u be-la-šu [im]-šu-u G: be-la-šú 22 i: ni-iš, ^lkab^l-tú,
 i]z-qur l: -k]u-ru 23 i: ra-ma-ni,]-pu-u tés-li-tú B: -u]p-pu-u tés-^lli-tum^l l: -]u tés-
 l[i- 24 i: tés-li-tú ta-ši-ma-tú G: tés-li-tum ta-ši-ma-tum B: ta-ši-ma-^lti^l GB: ni-qu-ú
 l: -qu]-ú 25 Bi: ili 26 i: ri-du-ut B: né-me-la ta-at-tu-ru

	27	<i>ik-ri-bi šarri</i>	<i>ši-i hi-du-ti</i>
	28	<i>ù ni-gu-ta-šú</i>	<i>a-na da-me-eq-ti šum-ma</i>
	29	<i>ú-šar a-na māti-ia</i>	<i>mē^{meš} ili na-ša-ri</i>
	30	<i>šu-mi^d iš-tar šu-qur</i>	<i>niš^{meš}-ia uš-ta-hi-iz</i>
	31	<i>ta-na-da-a-ti šarri</i>	<i>i-liš ú-maš-šil</i>
	32	<i>ù pu-luḥ-ti ēkalli</i>	<i>um-man ú-šal-mid</i>
	33	<i>lu-u i-di ki-i it-ti ili</i>	<i>i-ta-am-gur an-na-a-ti</i>
	34	<i>ša dam-qat ra-ma-nu-uš</i>	<i>a-na ili gul-lul-tu[m]</i>
	35	<i>ša ina lib-bi-šú mu-us-su-kàt</i>	<i>eli ili-šú dam-qat</i>
	36	<i>a-a-ú ṭè-em ili^{meš}</i>	<i>qí-rib šamē^e i-lam-mad</i>
	37	<i>mi-lik šá^d za-nun-ze-e</i>	<i>i-ḥa-ak-kim man-nu</i>
	38	<i>e-ka-a-ma il-ma-da</i>	<i>a-lak-ti ili a-pa-a-ti</i>
	39	<i>šá ina am-šat ib-lu-ṭu</i>	<i>i-mut ud-de-eš</i>
	40	<i>sur-riš uš-ta-dir</i>	<i>za-mar uḥ-ta-bar</i>
	41	<i>ina ši-bit ap-pi</i>	<i>i-za-am-mur e-li-la</i>
	42	<i>ina pi-it pu-ri-di</i>	<i>ú-šar-rap lal-la-re-eš</i>
G	43	<i>ki-i pi-te-e ù ka-ta-mi</i>	<i>ṭè-en-ši-na šit-ni</i>
G	44	<i>im-mu-ša-ma</i>	<i>im-ma-a šá-lam-tiš</i>
	45	<i>i-šib-ba-a-ma</i>	<i>i-šá-an-na-na il-šin</i>
	46	<i>ina ṭa-a-bi i-ta-ma-a</i>	<i>i-li šá-ma-'i</i>
	47	<i>ú-taš-šá-šá-ma i-dab-bu-ba</i>	<i>a-rad ir-kal-la</i>
	48	<i>ana an-na-a-tú uš-ta-×</i>	<i>qí-rib-ši-na la al-tan-d[a]</i>
	49	<i>[u] ia-a-ti šu-nu-[hu]</i>	<i>i-(ri)-[id]-di mi-ḥu-u</i>
	50	<i>muṣṣu mun-ni-šú</i>	<i>elī-ia in-neš-ra</i>
	51	<i>im-ḥul-li [iš-tu i-šid]</i>	<i>šamē^e i-zi-qa</i>
	52	<i>[u]l-te i-rat eršetim^{tim}</i>	<i>i-ši-ḥa ṭi-'-i</i>
G	53	<i>[šu-ú^l-lu lim-nu</i>	<i>it-ta-ša-a ap-su-uš-šú</i>
	54	<i>[ú-tuk-ku l]a [ni]-'i</i>	<i>ú-ša-a ul-tu ēkur</i>
	55	<i>[la-maš-tu ú-ri]-da</i>	<i>ul-tu qí-rib šadīⁱ</i>

COMMENTARY

43 *u₄-mu ù mu-ši* 44 *[u]n-šu bu-bu-tum^l* 53 *šu-lum e-ṭim-mu*

VARIANTS

27 i: *ik-rib* 28 l:]^lsig₅-ti^l 29 Bik: *ú-šá-ri* i: *ana* B: *me-e* i: *n[a-š]a-ru*
 30 k: *šu-ú* i: *šu-ma^d iš-ta-ri^l* B: *šu-qu-ru* 31 i: *ta-na-da-at* Ai: *e-liš* 32 k: *u*
 k(i): *pu-luḥ-tú* A: *pu-luḥ-tu* i: *um-ma-nu* 33 A: *lu* k: *lu]-ú* i: *ilī^{meš} i-tam-ku-ra*

27 The king's prayer—that was my joy,
 28 And the accompanying music became a delight for me.
 29 I instructed my land to keep the god's rites,
 30 And provoked my people to value the goddess's name.
 31 I made praise for the king like a god's,
 32 And taught the populace reverence for the palace.
 33 I wish I knew that these things were pleasing to one's god!
 34 What is proper to oneself is an offence to one's god,
 35 What in one's own heart seems despicable is proper to one's god.
 36 Who knows the will of the gods in heaven?
 37 Who understands the plans of the underworld gods?
 38 Where have mortals learnt the way of a god?
 39 He who was alive yesterday is dead today.
 40 For a minute he was dejected, suddenly he is exuberant.
 41 One moment people are singing in exaltation,
 42 Another they groan like professional mourners.
 43 Their condition changes like opening and shutting (the legs).
 44 When starving they become like corpses,
 45 When replete they vie with their gods.
 46 In prosperity they speak of scaling heaven,
 47 Under adversity they complain of going down to hell.
 48 I am *appalled* at these things; I do not understand their significance.
 49 As for me, the exhausted one, a tempest is driving me!
 50 Debilitating Disease is let loose upon me:
 51 An Evil Wind has blown [from the] horizon,
 52 Headache has sprung up from the surface of the underworld,
 53 An Evil Cough has left its *Apsû*,
 54 The irresistible [Ghost] left *Ekur*,
 55 [The *Lamaštu*-demon came] down from the Mountain,

34 A: šá i: om. ana 35 A: šá i: om.(?) eli, [il]i-šu 38 i: a-lak-tú 39 i: i-]mu-
 ú-tu l: ʿúʿ-[de-eš 40 i: uš-ta-di-ru l: r]a? za-am-ra i: uḫ-tab-[bar 41 i: ap-pa
 i-za-mu-ra l: i-za-am-mu-ru 42 l: ú-ʿšarʿ-ra-pa i: lal-ʿlaʿ-[ri]š 43 A: pi-te i:
 pi-ti-e Ail: u G: ka-ta-me l: ʿè-em-[44 i: im-mu-ša-a-ma,]-IM-tiš 45 A: i-šib-
 ba-ma i: il-ši-in 46 i(A): i-na i: e-la-a 47 i: ú-ta-šá-šá[-, i-dab-bu-ub a-ʿriʿ-du
 48 B: ʿan-na-tiʿ l: ʿal-ta-anʿ-[da 49 C: me-ḫ[u-u 50 C: in-né-eš-ra 52 C: ʿi-ʿ-ú
 53 G: šu-lum C(G): zu.ab-uš-šú 54 C: niʿ-ʿ-i i: i[š-t]u 55 i: iš-tu

C	i	56 [.] e ₄ .la ₆		šu-ru-up-pu-u i-nu-šu
G		57 it-ti ur-qi-tum eršetim ^{tim}		i-pi-ši lu-'-tú
		58 [.] pu-ḥur-šú-nu		ištēniš ^{niš} iṭ-ḥu-ni
		59 [.] qaq-qa-d]u		i-te-'-ú muḥ-ḥi
	i	60 [bu-né-ia] i-ki-lu		i-na-i-lu inā ⁿⁱ -ia
G		61 la-ba-ni ʿe ^l -te-qu		ú-ram-mu-ú ki-šá-du
	r	62 [ir-ti] im-ḥa-ṣu		tu-le-e iṭ-te ₄ -ʿru ^l
		63 [ši-]ʿi ^l -ri il-pu-tú		ra-'i-ba id-ʿdu-ú ^l
		64 [ina r]e-eš lib-bi-ia		ip-pu-ḥu i-šá-t[u]
		65 qir-bi-ia id-lu-ḥu		ú-na-ti-ia ut-ti-[×]
		66 šu-u[d?-d]u?-u uḥ-ḥu		ú-la-'i-bu ʿḥa ^l -[še-e-a]
		67 meš-re-ti-ia ú-la-'-ib		ú-niš-šu pi-ʿit-ri ^l
		68 la-na zaq-ru		i-bu-tú i-ga-ri-iš
G		69 gat-ti rap-šat		ú-ru-ba-iš uš-ni-i-la
G		70 ki-i ú-lil-te an-na-bi-ik		bu-pa-niš an-na-di
		71 a-lu-ú zu-um-ri		i-te-di-iq ṣu-ba-ti
		72 ki-ma šu-uš-kal-li		ú-kàt-ti-man-ni šit-tú
		73 pal-ša-a-ma	ul i-na-aṭ-ṭal	i-na-a-a
		74 pi-ta-a-ma	ul i-šim-ma-a	uz-na-a-a
	i	75 kal pag-ri-ia	i-ta-ḥaz	ri-mu-tú
		76 mi-šit-tu	im-ta-qut	eli širi ^{meš} -ia
		77 man-gu	iṣ-bat	i-di-ia
		78 lu-'-tú	im-ta-qut	eli bir-ki-ia
		79 ma-šá-ma	na-mu-ši-šá	ši-pa-a-a
		80 [mi?-i]ḥ?-ṣu šuk-šu-du		ú-naṣ-paq ma-aq-t[i-i]š
	h	81 [×-]du-ud mu-tu		i-te-rim pa-ni-ia
		82 [i-ḥa]-ʿsa ^l -sa-ni-ma		šá-'i-li ul ap-pal
		83 [× ×]A i-bak-ku-u		ra-man ul i-ši
	i	84 ina pi-ia	na-aḥ-bal	na-di-ma
		85 ʿù ^l nap-ra-ku	si-ki-ir	šap-ti-ia
		86 [b]a-bi e-di-il		pi-ḥi maš-qu-u-a

COMMENTARY

57 lu-'-tum mur-ṣu
tum su-un-gir-tum

61 i-ti-qú: ra-mu-u: še-bé-ru

69 ur-ba-tu: gišur-ba-nu

70 ú-lil-

VARIANTS

57 G: ur-qi-ti ki-tum i-pi-iṣ-ṣu lu-'-tum
ú-la-'i-bu ú-niš-šú r: ú-la-i-bu

61 G: i-ti-qú

66 r: ú-la-i-]

67 i: meš-re-te-ia

68 i: la-a-ni r: zaq-]ra

69 ir: rap-šá-ta i: ur-ba-ti

- 56 Cramp set out [from] the flood,
 57 Impotence cleaves the ground along with the grass.
 58 [.] their host, together they came on me.
 59 [. . . .] head, they enveloped my skull;
 60 [My face] is gloomy, my eyes are in flood.
 61 They have wrenched my neck muscles and taken the strength from my neck.
 62 They struck [my chest,] drubbing my breast.
 63 They affected my flesh and caused convulsions,
 64 [In] my epigastrium they kindled a fire.
 65 They upset my bowels [.]
 66 Causing the discharge of phlegm, they brought on a fever in my [lungs.]
 67 They caused fever in my limbs and made my fat quake.
 68 My lofty stature they destroyed like a wall,
 69 My robust figure they laid down like a bulrush,
 70 I am thrown down like a bog plant and cast on my face.
 71 The *alú*-demon has clothed himself in my body as with a garment;
 72 Sleep covers me like a net.
 73 My eyes stare, but do not see,
 74 My ears are open, but do not hear.
 75 Feebleness has seized my whole body,
 76 Concussion has fallen upon my flesh.
 77 Paralysis has grasped my arms,
 78 Impotence has fallen on my knees,
 79 My feet forget their motion.
 80 [A stroke] has got me; I choke like someone prostrate.
 81 [. . .] . . . death, it has covered my face.
 82 The dream priest mentions me, but I do not respond.
 83 [. . .] . weep, but I have no control of my faculties.
 84 A snare is laid on my mouth,
 85 And a bolt bars my lips.
 86 My 'gate' is barred, my 'drinking place' blocked,

r: ur-ba-ti-i[š G: rap-šá-tu ur-ba-ti-iš uš-ni-il-lu₄ 70 G: ú-lil-tum r: [ú⁷-lil-ti i: ú-lil-tú
 an-na-bi-⁷ku⁷ bu-ba-ni-iš G: bu-up-pa-niš 71 i: a-lu-u 73 i: i-na-!a- 74 i: pi-
 ta-a, i-še-ma 75 i: ka-la 76 i: mi-šit-tú, e-lu 77 i: iṣ-ša-[bat 78 i: e-li
 79 i: ma-šá-a-ma nam-ši-[, še-pa-a-a l: še-pa-[80 i: šuk-šú-[l:]-nap-pa-qa i: ú-nap-
 paq ma-aq-tiš 81 i: mu-ú-[82 l: šá-e-lu 83 l: i-bak-ku-ú ra-ma-nu h: -]ú
 ra-ma-ni, i-šú 84 hl: -b]a-lu 85 l: u, sa-ki-ir h: si-kir 86 h: e]-dil, maš-qu-⁷ú⁷-[a
 i:]-ú-a

G	87	<i>[á]r-kat bu-bu-te</i>	<i>ka-tim ur-¹[ú]-[d]i</i>
G	88	<i>áš-na-an šum-ma</i>	<i>da-ad-da-riš a-la-'-ut</i>
G	89	<i>^dsiriš(šim) nap-šat niš^{meš}</i>	<i>elī-ia im-tar-šu</i>
G	90	<i>ap-pu-na-ma</i>	<i>e-te-rik si-le-e-tum</i>
G	91	<i>ina la ma-ka-le-e</i>	<i>zi-mu-ú-a it-ta[k-ru]</i>
G	92	<i>širi iš-taḥ-ḥa</i>	<i>da-mi iz-zu-[ba]</i>
G	93	<i>e-še-et-tum us-su-qat₆</i>	<i>a-ri-ma-at maš-[ki]</i>
G	94	<i>ši-ir-a-nu-ú-a nu-up-pu-ḥu</i>	<i>ú-ri-iq-tum maḥ-[ru]</i>
G	95	<i>a-ḥu-uš ^{giš}irši me-si-ru</i>	<i>mu-še-e ta-ni-ḥ[u]</i>
G	96	<i>a-na ki-suk-ki-ia</i>	<i>i-tu-ra bi-i-tu</i>
G	97	<i>il-lu-ur-tú ši-ri-ia</i>	<i>na-da-a i-da-a-a</i>
G	98	<i>maš-kan ram-ni-ia</i>	<i>muq-qu-ta še-pa-a-a</i>
G	99	<i>ni-ṭa-tu-ú-a šum-ru-ša</i>	<i>mi-ḥi-iš-tu dan-na-a[t]</i>
G	100	<i>qin-na-zu id-da-an-ni</i>	<i>ma-la-ti šil-la-a-tum</i>
G	101	<i>pa-ru-uš-šú ú-saḥ-ḥi-la-an-ni</i>	<i>zi-qa-ta dan-nat</i>
G	102	<i>kal u₄-mu</i>	<i>ri-du-ú i-ri-id-da[n-ni]</i>
G	103	<i>ina šat mu-ši</i>	<i>ul ú-nap-pa-šá-an-ni sur-riš</i>
G	104	<i>ina i-tab-lak-ku-ti</i>	<i>pu-uṭ-ṭu-ru rik-su-ú-a</i>
G	105	<i>meš-re-tu-u-a su-up-pu-ḥa</i>	<i>i-ta-ad-da-a a-ḥi-tum</i>
G	106	<i>ina ru-ub-ši-ia</i>	<i>a-bit ki-i al-ṣi</i>
G	107	<i>ub-tal-lil</i>	<i>ki-i immeri(udu.nitá) ina ta-ba-áš-ta-ni-ia</i>
G	108	<i>sakīki(sa.gig-ki)-ia</i>	<i>iš-ḥu-ṭu ^{lú}mašmaššu</i>
G	109	<i>ù te-re-ti-ia</i>	<i>^{lú}bārú(ḥal) ú-téš-ši</i>
G	110	<i>ul ú-šá-ṣi a-ši-pu</i>	<i>ši-kin mur-ši-ia</i>
G	111	<i>ù a-dan-na si-li-'-ti-ia</i>	<i>^{lú}bārú(ḥal) ul id-din</i>

COMMENTARY

88 *da-da-ru bu-'-šá-nu* 90 *ap-pu-na-ma ma-'-diš: si-le-e-tum: muršu* 96 *ki-suk-ku ki-lum*
 97 *^{giš}il-lu-ur-tum is-qa-tum* 98 *maš-kan: bi-ri-tum* 100 *qin-na-zu is-tuḥ-ḥu: šil-la-a-tum*
ka-ta-a-tum 101 *^{giš}pa-ru-uš-šú ^{giš}ḥaṭtu* 107 *ta-ba-áš-ta-nu: zu-ú ši-na-tum*

VARIANTS

87 l: sar (= arqat!) bu-bu-tum h: -k]àt bu-bu-ti, ru-['-ti 88 h: da-ab!-da-riš G: a-la-ut
 89 h: ilī^{meš} i: elī-ia₅ l: elī-ia 90 Y: i-te-r[i- h: i-te (erased) i-te-ri-ik i: i-ti-ri-ik
 l: i-te-[ri]k C: s[i-l]i-'-[91 l: i-na 92 h: š]e-i-ri i: ši-ri, i-[zu-ba Y: i]š-taḥ-ḥu

- 87 My hunger is prolonged, my throat stopped up.
 88 When grain is served, I eat it like stinkweed,
 89 Beer, the life of mankind, is distasteful to me.
 90 My malady is indeed protracted.
 91 Through lack of food my countenance is changed,
 92 My flesh is flaccid, and my blood has ebbed away.
 93 My bones have come apart, and are covered (only) with my skin.
 94 My tissues are inflamed, and have caught the-disease.
 95 I take to a bed of bondage; going out is a pain;
 96 My house has become my prison.
 97 My arms are stricken—which shackles my flesh;
 98 My feet are limp—which fetters my person.
 99 My afflictions are grievous, my wound is severe.
 100 A scourge has thrown me down, the *stroke* is *intense*.
 101 The crop pierces me and the spur is severe.
 102 All day long the tormentor torments [me,]
 103 Nor at night does he let me relax for a minute.
 104 Through twisting my sinews are parted,
 105 My limbs are splayed and knocked apart.
 106 I spend the night in my dung like an ox,
 107 And wallow in my excrement like a sheep.
 108 My complaints have exposed the incantation priest,
 109 And my omens have confounded the diviner.
 110 The exorcist has not diagnosed the nature of my complaint,
 111 Nor has the diviner put a time limit on my illness.

93 h: ʿe^l-še-en-te Y: -e]n-ti-i₁₄ i: e-še-en-ti us-su-q[at₆/q[àt a-ri-m]at 94 i: šír-a-nu-u-a,
 -r]iq-ta Y: ú-r[iq- 95 i: ir-ši Y: me-sír 96 i: KU?-suk-ki-ia, bi-i-ti G: bé-e-tu
 97 G: gišil-lu-ur-tu₄ i: uzu.meš-ia Y: uzu-ia 98 A: r[a- i: ra-ma-ni-ia G: muq-
 qu-tú Y: m[u-u]q-q[u- 99 i: šum-ru-šu me-ḫi-iš-ti 100 B(i): qin-na-zi G: ma-la-a
 i: ma-lat 101 G: gišpa-ru-uš-šú B: ú-saḫ-ḫi-il-an-ni G: zi-qa-tum il: zi-qa-ti 102
 i: u₄-me ri-du-u i-ri-da-[l: i-rad-[d]a-a[n-ni 103 i: ʿi^l-na[p- 104 l: i-na ú-tab-lak-ku-ti
 105 l: meš-re-tu-ú-a, a-ḫi-[t]i i: a-ḫa-ta 106 l: i-na, k[i]-ma gud 107 l: ki-ma, [t]a-ba-
 áš-ta-ni-iá 108 l: sa.[gi]g-iá, maš-maš-šú i: -ma]š-šú 109 l: u te-re-ti-iá, ú-t[a]š-š[ám]-ma
 110 l: a-ši-pa, gig-iá i: gig-ia 111 i: u a-dan-ni si-li-ti-ia l: a-dan-nu si-li-ti-iá

ABD 1 1

112	<i>ul i-ru-ša ilu</i>	<i>qa-ti ul iṣ-bat</i>
113	<i>ul i-ri-man-ni ^diš-ta-ri</i>	<i>i-da-a-a ul il-lik</i>
114	<i>pi-ti kimahhu</i>	<i>er-su-ú šu-ka-nu-u-a</i>
115	<i>a-di la mi-tu-ti-i-ma</i>	<i>bi-ki-ti gam-rat</i>
116	<i>kal ma-ti-ia</i>	<i>ki-i ha-bil iq-bu-ni</i>
117	<i>iš-me-e-ma ha-du-ú-a</i>	<i>im-me-ru pa-nu-šú</i>
118	<i>ha-di-ti ú-ba-as-si-ru</i>	<i>ka-bat-ta-šú ip-pir-du</i>
119	<i>i-di u₄-mu</i>	<i>šá gi-mir kim-ti-ia</i>
120	<i>šá qí-rib mu-de-e</i>	<i>^dšamas-su-un i-rim</i>

112 My god has not come to the rescue in taking me by the hand,
 113 Nor has my goddess shown pity on me by going at my side.
 114 My grave was waiting, and my funerary paraphernalia ready,
 115 Before I had died lamentation for me was finished.
 116 All my country said, "How he is crushed!"
 117 The face of him who gloats lit up when he heard,
 118 The tidings reached her who gloats, and her heart rejoiced.
 119 But I know the day for my whole family,
 120 When, among my friends, their Sun-god will have mercy.

VARIANTS

112 D: šu.ii 113 i: ^diš-tar-ri 114 l: ki-ma-hu BD: er-šu-ú i: er-[s]u-u il: šu-ka-nu-ú-a
 115 i: m[i-t]u-ti-ma l: mi-tu-tim-ma D1: bi-ki-tum 116 i: kur-ia l:]-iá il: ha-bil
 117 i: iš-me-ma ha-du-u-a l: im-mi-ru 118 l: ha-di-t]u i: ú-ba-si-ru D: -si-r]i il: ka-
 bat-ta-šá i: i]p-pir-[d]a 119 i: u₄-me 120 i(l): qir-bi

TABLET III

MANUSCRIPTS

Line 1 is preserved as the catch-line on the following manuscripts of Tablet II: ABDil.

Lines 1-61

<i>Symbol</i>		<i>Lines on</i>		<i>Plates</i>
		<i>Obverse</i>	<i>Reverse</i>	
Assur				
p	= VAT 9954 (a half-length tablet)	1-30	31-45, 47-61	12
Sippar				
q	= Si 55	22-54		13
Ashurbanipal				
G	= K 3291 (Commentary)		1, 25, 37, 40, 60	15-17

After a gap the 36 lines of the reverse of q follow (Pl. 14), of which 18, 19, 30, 31, 33 are contained on G.

For the rest of the tablet only the 21 lines quoted in G are preserved, which are not necessarily contiguous (the first and second pairs, however, seem to be). They have not therefore been numbered, but have been given the letters a-u for convenient identification. Some of these lines in fact doubtless belong to Tablet IV (see Introduction), but since the dividing-point cannot be ascertained they are all put under Tablet III.

ABD 1 1 p
G |||||

1	<i>kab-ta-at qāt-su</i>		<i>ul a-li-'-i na-šá-šá</i>
2	<i>[a]d-rat pu-luḥ-ta-šu</i>		<i>ú-[.]</i>
3	<i>[×]-nis-su ez-zi-ta</i>		<i>a-bu-ba-ma [.]</i>
4	<i>×-na-at tallakta(ki.gub-ta)-šú</i>		<i>i × × × [.]</i>
5	<i>×-nu murša kab-ta</i>		<i>ra-¹ma¹-[ni] la i × [× ×]</i>
6	<i>×-ru-ti ma-šá-ku</i>		<i>ú-šar-ḫa-du-ni [× ×]</i>
7	<i>[u]r-ra u mu-šú</i>		<i>iš-te-niš a-na-a[s-su-us]</i>
8	<i>šuttu(máš.ge₆) mu-na-at-tú</i>		<i>mal-ma-liš šu-um-r[u-ša-ku]</i>
9	<i>iš-ta-nu eṭ-lu</i>		<i>a-tir ši-kit-[ta]</i>
10	<i>mi-na-ta šur-ru-uḥ</i>		<i>lu-bu-uš-ta ud-du-[u]š</i>
11	<i>áš-šú ina mu-na-at-ti šID-du-šu</i>		<i>GAD ta zu b[i?] eš</i>
12	<i>¹mi¹-lam¹-me ḫa-líp</i>		<i>la-¹biš pu¹-ul-ḫ[a-t]i</i>
13	<i>[× ×] × ×</i>	<i>it-ta-zi-iz!</i>	<i>el[ī-i]a</i>
14	<i>[× × (×) m]a</i>	<i>iḫ-ḫa-mu-u</i>	<i>širu-u-[a]</i>
15	<i>[× × × (×)]</i>	<i>be-el-[t]u</i>	<i>iš-pur-a[n-ni]</i>
16	<i>[× × ×] ×</i>	<i>× × ×</i>	<i>× × [. . .]</i>
17	<i>[× (×)] × ma a-tam-ma-a [. . . .] × šú [. . . .]</i>		
18	<i>[×] × um-ma iš-pu-[r]</i>		
19	<i>i-qu-lu-ma ul i-[.]</i>		
20	<i>× ud iš na × × [.]</i>		
21	<i>áš-[n]i-ma</i>	<i>[šutta(máš.ge₆)</i>	<i>a-na-aṭ-ṭal]</i>
22	<i>ina šutti(máš.ge₆)</i>	<i>aṭ-[tu-lu</i>	<i>mu-ši-ti-ia]</i>
23	<i>iš-¹ta¹-nu eṭ-[lu]</i>		
24	<i>^{giš}bi-[nu] mu-u[l]-li-lu</i>		<i>ta-mi-iḫ ri[t-tuš-šú]</i>
25	<i>lāl-úr-alim-ma</i>		<i>a-šib nippuri^{ki}</i>
26	<i>a-na ub-bu-bi-ka</i>		<i>iš-pu-ra-an-[ni]</i>
27	<i>mē^{meš} na-šu-ú</i>		<i>elī-ia id-[di]</i>
28	<i>ši-pat ba-la-ṭi id-da-a</i>		<i>ú-maš-ši-' z[u-um-ri]</i>
29	<i>áš-lu-uš-ma</i>	<i>šu-ut-tu</i>	<i>a-na-aṭ-[ṭal]</i>
30	<i>ina šutti(máš.ge₆)</i>	<i>aṭ-ṭu-lu</i>	<i>mu-ši-t[i-ia]</i>
31	<i>ni-ši-iš batūlta(ki.sikil)</i>		<i>ba-nu-ú zi-[mu-šá]</i>
32	<i>šar-ra-at la × [bi]š/[ḫ]a ti</i>		<i>i-liš ma[š-lat]</i>

COMMENTARY

I *kab-tu dan-nu* 25 *ṭa-a-bi-ú-ṭú-ul-^denlil*(be)

VARIANTS

I G: *a-li-'i* D: *e-le-e na-šá-šú* i: *na-šá-šu*I2 Tablet: *¹mi¹-GIM-me*

I3 Tablet:

- 1 His hand was heavy upon me, I could not bear it.
- 2 My dread of him was alarming, it [. me]
- 3 His fierce [.] . . was a tornado [.]
- 4 His stride was . . . , it . . . [.]
- 5 . . the severe illness does not . . [. .] my person,
- 6 I forget . . . [. .] makes my mind stray.
- 7 Day and night alike I groan,
- 8 In dream and waking moments I am equally wretched.
- 9 A remarkable young man of outstanding physique,
- 10 Massive in his body, clothed in new garments—
- 11 Since in waking moments
- 12 Clad in splendour, robed in dread,
- 13 [. .] . . he stood over me,
- 14 [I . . .] and [my] body was numbed.
- 15 [“. . . .] the lady has sent [me]
- 16 [. . .] [“. . .”]
- 17 [. .] . . I said [.] . . [.]
- 18 [. . .] . . . sent [.]
- 19 They were silent and did not [.]
- 20 [.]
- 21 A second time [I saw a dream,]
- 22 And in [my night dream which] I [saw]
- 23 A remarkable young [man]
- 24 Holding in his hand a tamarisk rod of purification—
- 25 “Laluralimma, resident of Nippur,
- 26 Has sent me to cleanse you.”
- 27 The water he was carrying he threw over me,
- 28 Pronounced the life-giving incantation, and rubbed [my body.]
- 29 A third time I saw a dream,
- 30 And in my night dream which I saw—
- 31 . . . a young woman of shining countenance,
- 32 A queen of , equal to a god.

it-ta-zi-MA 23 q:] *ram*⁷-*ku ti*-x[This could have followed the text of p only if q were written
diš guruš; otherwise the two manuscripts must have diverged. 24 q: *mu*] *l-li-lu* 30 q: *i-*
n]a 31 p: *ba*-[*tul-tu* 32 p: (following *šarrat*) *u*[*n*

q p	33 <i>i-ru-ba-am-ma i-ta[š-ba?]</i>	× [. . .] × <i>ma-a</i> [. .]
	34 <i>qi-ba-a a-ḫu-la-pi</i>	[.] × × [. . .]
	35 <i>la ta-pal-laḫ iq-ba-a</i>	<i>ú-šá-×</i> [.]
	36 <i>me-mu-u šutta(máš.ge₆) i-ṭul</i> [.]	
G	37 <i>iq-bi-ma a-ḫu-la-pi</i>	<i>ma-gal šum-[ru-uṣ-ma]</i>
	38 <i>a-a-um-ma šá ina šat mu-ši</i>	<i>ib-ru-u bi-[ra]</i>
	39 <i>ina šutti(máš.ge₆) ^mur-nin-din-lug_x-ga</i>	「din?.tir」? [. . .]
G	40 <i>eṭ-lu ṭar-ru</i>	<i>a-pir a-ga-šú</i>
	41 <i>mašmaššum(maš.maš)-ma</i>	<i>na-ši li-「'」-[um]</i>
	42 ^d <i>marduk-ma</i>	<i>iš-pu-ra-an-[ni]</i>
	43 <i>ana ^mšub-ši-meš-re-e-^dšakkan(gir)</i>	<i>ú-bil-la ši-i[m-ra]</i>
	44 <i>ina qātē¹¹-šú ellēti^{meš}</i>	<i>ú-bil-la ši-i[m-ra]</i>
	45 <i>a-na mut-tab-bi-li-ia</i>	<i>qa-tuš-šú ip-q[í-id]</i>
	46 <i>[ina] mu-na-at-ti</i>	<i>iš-pu-ra ši-pi[r-ta]</i>
p	47 <i>it-tuš dam-qa-tu</i>	<i>niš^{meš}-ia uk-t[al-lim]</i>
	48 <i>ina si-li-tu 「i」?-ri-ku</i>	<i>muš × [-×-×]</i>
	49 <i>mur-ši ár-ḫi-iš ig-[g]a-mir</i>	<i>iḫ-ḫi-pi × [. . .]</i>
	50 <i>ul-tu šá be-li-ia</i>	<i>lib-ba-šú i-[nu-ḫu]</i>
	51 <i>šá 「^dmarduk」 rim-ni-i</i>	<i>ka-bat-ta-[šú] ip-p[a-áš-ḫu]</i>
	52 <i>[il-q]u-ú un-nin-ni-ia</i>	[.] × × [.]
	53 <i>[nu-um]-mur-šu ṭa-a-bu</i>	× [.]
	54 <i>[iq-bu-u] a-ḫu-la-pi</i>	<i>m[a-gal šu-nu-u]ḫ-ma</i>
	55 <i>[× × ×] a-na šu-pé-e × [.] × te</i>	
	56 <i>[× ×] × a-na du-lul 「ù」 [.] ×</i>	
	57 <i>[× ×] × ar-ni [.]</i>	
	58 <i>[× ×] × in-nit-ta [.]</i>	
	59 <i>[× ×] šèr-ti × [.]</i>	
G	60 <i>e-ga-ti-ia ú-šá-bil šāra</i>	
	61 <i>[×] mi id [.]</i>	

COMMENTARY

37 *a-ḫu-la-pi a-di ma-ti* 40 *ṭar-ru dan-nu* 60 *e-ga-a-ti ḫi-ṭa-a-ti*

VARIANTS

36 Text of p probably corrupt; q: × [×] *i-na mim-ma* [37 p: *iq-bu-u* G: *iq-ba-a a-ḫu-la-pi*

- 33 She entered and [sat down] . [. . .] . . . [. .]
 34 "Speak my deliverance [. . . .] . . [. . .]
 35 "Fear not," she said, "I [will]
 36 *Whatever of a dream saw* [.]
 37 She said, "Be delivered from your very wretched state,
 38 Whoever has seen a vision in the night time."
 39 In the dream Urnindinlugga, the *Babylonian* [. . .]
 40 A bearded young man with his turban on his head.
 41 An incantation priest, carrying a tablet,
 42 "Marduk has sent me.
 43 To Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan I have brought prosperity,
 44 From Marduk's pure hands I have brought prosperity."
 45 He (Marduk) had entrusted me into the hands of my ministrant.
 46 [In] waking hours he sent the message
 47 And showed his favourable sign to my peoples.
 48 In the protracted malady . . [. .]
 49 My illness was quickly over and [my *fetters*] were broken.
 50 After the mind of my Lord had quietened
 51 And the heart of merciful Marduk was appeased,
 52 [After he had] received my prayers [.] . . [. . . .]
 53 And his pleasant [smile] . [.]
 54 [After he had said,] "Be delivered, you [who are in great] toils!"
 55 [. . .] to extol . [.] . .
 56 [. .] . to worship and [.] .
 57 [. .] . my guilt [.]
 58 [. .] . my iniquity [.]
 59 [. .] my transgression . [.]
 60 He made the wind bear away my offences.

q: *a-hu-lap* G: *šu-nu-uh-ma* 39 p: om. ^m q: *ba?-[bi?]-lam?* For *bād* = *lug_x* cf. *MSL* II. 86¹.
 40 G: *ṭār-ru* p: *a-pi-[ir]* 41 p: *maš.maš-um-ma* 44 p: *šu.II.meš* [46
 p in error omits this line, which is reflected in the previous section, which should contain 10 lines,
 but has only 9. 49 p: *ṛár¹-hiš* 51 p: *ri-[me-ni-i* 53 q: *-mu]r-šú* 60 p: *[ú?]*
e-ga-[ti-ia

Si 55 (q), Reverse

1	[× × (×)] × [.....]	
2	[× × (×)] × × [.....]	
3	[× × (×)] <i>ki-ma</i> te × [.....] × [..]	
4	[uṭ-ṭè-e]ḥ-ḥa-am-ma ta-ʿa-šú	šá iʿ-[kas]-su-u × [...]
5	[ud-da]p-pir im-ḥul-la a-na i-rat eršetim ^{tim}	a-na i-šid šamé ^e ú-bi[l ṭi-'-a]
6	[uš-te]-riḏ ap-su-uš-šú	šu-ú-lu lim-[nu]
7	ú-ʿtukʿ-ku la ni-'i	ú-tir é-kur-ri-[iš]
8	is-kip la-maš-tu	šá-da-a uš-te-e[š-šir]
9	a-gu-ú ta-ma-tu	šu-ru-up-pa-a ú-šam-ḥ[ir]
10	i-šid lu-ú-tu	it-ta-saḥ ki-ma šam-m[i]
11	šit-ti la ṭa-ab-tu	ri-ḥa-a ṣa-la-[li]
12	ki-ma qu-ut-ru im-ma-lu-ú	šamé ^e uš-ta-r[iq]
13	'ù-ú-a a-a ú-šat-bi im-ba-riš	ni-'-u ni-še-eš eršetim ^{tim} uš-[× ×]
14	la-az-zu muruṣ qaqqadi	šá × -ú-iš KAB-×
15	is-suḥ ʿkiʿ-ma na-al-ši mu-[š]i	elī-ia uš-te-es-[si]
16	te-'-a-ti inā ⁿ -a-a	šá uš-téš-bi-iḥ ši-bi-iḥ mu-ú-[ti]
17	ú-šat-bi šār(im) bēra(danna)	ú-nam-mir niṭ-[li]
G 18	uznā ⁿ -a-a šá uṭ-ṭa-am-mi-ma	us-sak-ki-ka ḥa-šik-kiš
G 19	it-bal a-mi-ra-šin	ip-te-ti niš-ma-a-a
20	ap-pa šá ina ri-di um-mi	ú-naṣ-pi-qu ni-[pi-is-su]
21	ú-pa-áš-ši-iḥ mi-ḥi-iš-ta-šu-ma	a-naṣ-pu-uš [× × (×)]
22	šap-ta-a-a šá il-lab-ba	il-qa-a KAL-× -[×]
23	ik-pur pul-ḥat-si-na-ma	ki-šir-ši-na ip-[ṭur]
24	pi-ia šá uk-ta-at-ti-mu	ṣa-ba-riš áš-[ṭu]
25	[i]m-šu!-uš ki-ma qé-e	ru-šá-šú uš-[× (×)]
26	[ši]n-na-a-a šá it-ta-aṣ-ba-ta	ištēniš ^{miš} in-ni-i[b-ṭa]
27	[ip-]ti bi-rit-si-na-ma	ir-da-šin uš-tam-[× (×)]
28	[li]-šá-nu šá in-ni-ib-ṭa	šu-ʿtaʿ-bu-lu [l]a i-[li-'u]
29	[im-š]u-uš ṭu-ṭu-ʿušʿ-ta-šá-ma	ʿiḥʿ-da-ád at-mu-u-[a]
G 30	ur-ú-du šá in-ni-is-ru	ú-naṣ-pi-qu la-gab-biš

COMMENTARY

18 ḥa-šik-ku suk-ku-ku

19 a-me-ra ze-e uz-ni

30 la-gab-biš šá a-mat pag-ri

- 31 He restored, and let it *sing* songs like a flute.
 32 My wind-pipe, which was swollen so that it could not take [in air,]
 33 Its swelling diminished, and he opened its blockage.
 34 My [. . .] . which [.] . [. . .]
 35 [. . .] above . . [.] . . [. . .]
 36 [. . . which] was darkened like [.] . . [. . .]

Lines quoted in the Commentary

- a The greater intestine, which was always empty through lack of food, and was twined like a reed basket,
 b It receives food and takes drink.

 c My neck, which was prolapsed and slouched in the collar,
 d He erected it a mountain and set it up like a *pillar*.
 e He made my physique like that of one consummate in strength.
 f He made my finger nails scratch like the rash of . . .
 g He drove out their fatigue and put to right their . . .
 h My knees, which were fettered and [bound like] the *būṣu*-bird's,
 i The frame of my body he . . . [. . .] .
 j He wiped away the gangrene and purged its filth.
 k My gloomy appearance was filled with light.
 l Beside the River, where the judgement of the people is decided,
 m My brow was shaved and my slave mark removed.

 n [.] . . [. . .] . pity.

VARIANTS

- 31 G: *i-ra-ti-šá, uḫ-×-×-šá* 33 G: *la-ga-a-a-šá i-šír*

o	[ku-nu-uš-k]àd-ru [ku-n]u-uš-kàd-ru: sú-qi qat-nu	i-na pi-「šèr」-ti a-ba-'a
p	[šá] a-na é-sag-il e-gu-u e-gu-u ha-ṭu-u	ina qāti-ia li-mur
q	i-na pi-i gir-ra ākili(kú)-ia gir-ra: ur.maḥ nap-sa-mu: ma-ak-ša-ru ša pî sîšî	id-di nap-sa-ma ^d marduk
r	^d marduk šá mu-kaš-ši-di-ia i-kim as-「pa」-šú as-suk-ka-šú ú-saḥ-ḥir as-suk-ku [ku-u]b-tu: áš-pu uš-pu	
s	id-d[i.]-bir ki.ḥul-u bi-ki-tum	
t	× [.]× i-na-an-na	
u	[.]× tum × ru [.]bit [.]×	

o I proceeded along the Kunuš-kadru Street—redeemed!

p He who has done wrong in respect of Esagil, let him learn from my example!

q It was Marduk who put a muzzle on the mouth of the lion who was eating me.

r Marduk despoiled my pursuer of his sling and turned aside his slingstone.

TABLET IV(?)

For the literary problem of the relationship of the following lines to the work as a whole see the Introduction.

MANUSCRIPTS

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>Lines on</i>		<i>Plate</i>
	<i>Obverse</i>	<i>Reverse</i>	
Assur			
u = VAT 9442	1-15	87-101	18
v = VAT 10538	37-50	..	18
(v appears to be the bottom obverse portion of the same tablet as u)			
t = VAT 9303	24-46	76-97	18
Sultantepe			
w = SU 1952, 212+291 with 302	31-42	..	18

The line numbering may not be final despite the control which is provided by manuscripts divided into sections of ten lines. The difficulty is the gap on each side of the tablet. If it were possible to equate 14 and 15 by our numbering with 24 and 25, thus assuming an overlap of **u** and **t**, the numbers from 24 to 50 would have to be reduced by ten, and those from 76 to 101 by twenty. Considerations of space and content, however, exclude this idea, and the gap has to be assumed for the obverse, with a corresponding one for the reverse. Our assumption that the gap on the obverse is of eight lines may not be correct. It may be of 18 lines, in which case our numbers 24-50 would have to be increased by ten, and 76-101 by twenty.

u

- 1 [be-l]i ú-×-×-×-an-ni
 2 [be-l]i ú-ša-bit-an-ni
 3 [be-l]i ú-pat-t[in]-an-ni
 4 [be-l]i ú-bal-liṭ-an-ni
 5 [ina ḥaš-t]i e-kim-an-ni
 6 [ina ka-ra-]še-e id-^Γkan^{Γan}-ni
 7 [× × ×] ina ḥu-bur iš-du-da-an-ni
 8 [× × (×)]-ti qa-ti iṣ-bat
 9 [šá] im-ḥa-ša-an-ni
 10 [^dmard]uk ú-šá-qi ri-ši
 11 im-ḥa-aṣ rit-ti ma-ḥi-[ši]-ia
 12 ú-šad-di ^{giš}kakka-šu ^dmarduk
 13 × (×) × gir-ri za-[×-i]a
 14 [.] š]am-ma ^d[mard]uk
 15 [.]× mu ka × [. . .]

* * * * *

t

- 24 [× ×] × ti × [.]
 25 [(×)] × áš-na-an ^Γru-uš-šá-a^Γ [.]
 26 [u]l-tap-pit ḥa-šur-ri ṭāba(dùg.ga) eḷi-šu × [.]
 27 [qé]-re-e-ti mār bābili^{ki} mu-× [.]
 28 bit qí-bi-ri-šu e-pu-šu ina qé-re-e-t[i]
 29 i-mu-ru-ma ⟨mār⟩ bābili^{ki} ki-i ú-bal-la-tu [^dmarduk]
 30 pa-a-tu kāl(dù)-ši-na ú-šá-pa-a nar-bé-e-[šú]
 31 man-nu-um-ma iq-bi a-mar ^dšamši^{ki}-šú
 32 ina lib-bi man-ni ib-ba-ši e-te-eq sūqi(sila)-šú
 33 šá la ^dmarduk man-nu mi-tu-ta-šú ú-bal-liṭ
 34 e-la ^dšarpānītum(e₄.ru₆) ^diš-tar-tum a-a-i-tum i-qi-šá nap-šat-su
 35 ^dmarduk ina qab-ri bul-lu-ṭa i-li-'i
 36 ^dšar-pa-ni-tum ina ka-ra-še-e e-ṭe-ra am-rat
 37 e-ma šak-na-at eršetim^{tim} rit-pa-šu šamē^e
 38 ^dšamšu^{šú} uš-tap-pa-a ^dgirra in-nap-ḥu
 39 mu-ú il-la-ku i-zi-qu šá-a-ru
 40 šu-ut ^da-ru-ru ik-ru-šu ki-ri-is-si-in
 41 [š]á-ki-it-tu nap-šá-tu pi-ta-a pu-ri-du

VARIANTS

31 t: ^dšam-PI-šú

37 w: ša-ma-mi

38 v: iš-tap-pa-a

39 v: i-ziq-qu

w: im.meš

t vw

- 42 [a-pa]-a-tum ma-la ba-šá-a ^dmarduk dul-la
 43 [× ×] a ta bul × × šu-ut pa-a ku[n-na]
 44 [.] × [. k]al niš^{meš} li-bil-ma
 45 [. r]i-'i kal da-á[d-me]
 46 [.] × mīlī(e₄.la₆)^{meš} ina n[aq]-be
 47 [.] sal ilū^{meš} × × [(×)] ×
 48 [.] si-ḫi-ip šamē^e 'ù¹ [eršetim^{tim}]
 49 [.] × ri-iš-ša × × [(×)] ×
 50 [.] ši zu? nu šú šú šú

* * * * *

t

- 76 [× × (×)]-¹id-ma šá ina tés-li-ti-ia mu¹-× [.]
 77 [ina l]a-ban ap-pi ut-ni-ni ana é-sag-i[l]
 78 [šá ú-]ri-du qab-ri a-tu-ra ana ká ^du[tu.u₄.è]
 79 [ina k]á ḫé.gál ḫé-gál-la in-n[a-ad-na-an-ni]
 80 [ina k]á ^dlamma.ra.bi la-mas-si iṭ-ṭe-ḫ[a-an-ni]
 81 [ina k]á silim.ma šul-ma-na ap-pa-l[is]
 82 ina ká nam.ti.la ba-la-ṭu am-ma-ḫi-ir
 83 ina ká ^dutu.u₄.è it-ti bal-ṭu-ti am-ma-ni
 84 ina ká u₆.di.babbar.ra id-da-tu-ú-a im-me-ra
 85 ina ká nam.tag.ga.du₈.a i'-il-ti ip-pa-ṭir
 86 ina ká ka.tar.ra iš-ta-la pi-ia
 87 ina ká a.še.er.du₈.ù.da up-ta-ṭa-ra ta-ni-ḫi
 88 ina ká a.sikil.la me-e te-lil-te as-sa-li-iḫ
 89 ina ká silim.ma it-ti ^dmarduk an-na-mir
 90 ina ká ḫi.li.sù še-ep ^dšar-pa-ni-tum an-na-šiq
 91 ina su-pe-e ù te-me-qi ma-ḫar-šú-nu ú-tan-nin
 92 qut-rin-na ṭa-bu-ú-ti ma-ḫar-šú-nu ú-šá-aš-li
 93 ú-šam-ḫir ir-ba ṭa-'-ti igisê e-ta-an-du-te
 94 ú-pal-liq le-e ma-re-e uṭ-ṭab-bi-iḫ sap-di
 95 at-ta-naq-qi ku-ru-un-nu du-uš-šu-pá karāna [i]l-lu
 96 ¹šēdu(^dalād)¹ lamassu(^dlamma) angubbú(an.gub.ba.meš) li-bit é-sag-i[l]
- 97 [× (×)] × tam-qi-ti ka-bat-ta-¹šú-un¹ uš-par-di
 98 [ina ma-ka-l]e-e de-eš-šu-ti lib-ba-šú-un ú-¹šá-li¹-iḫ
 99 [sip-pu ši]-gar-ri me-di-il ^{giš}dalāti^{meš}
 100 [× ×] × el-la ḫi-ma-tú ṭuḫ-di áš-na-an
 101 [.] × zi da-¹mé¹-e parši(garza) bitī

VARIANTS

43 ku[n-na]: v: taš-ta-pa

44 v: li-be-el-ma

46 v: e₄.la₆

87-91 u reads a-na.

90 u: ḫi.li.gar gīr^{II}, -i]q

91 u: su-up-pe-e u te-m[i-

92 u: qut-rin-ni dūg.ga.meš

42 Mortals, as many as there are, give praise to Marduk!
 43 [. . .], who give utterance,
 44 [.] . [.] may he rule all the peoples,
 45 [.] shepherd of all dwellings.
 46 [.] . floods from the deep,
 47 [.] . the gods . . [. .] .,
 48 [.] the extent of heaven and earth.

* * * * *

76 [. . .] . . which in my prayers . . [.]
 77 [With] prostration and supplication [. . .] to Esagil.
 78 [I who went] down to the grave have returned to the “Gate of the [Sun Rise.]”
 79 [In the] “Gate of Prosperity” prosperity was [given me,]
 80 [In the] “Gate of the . . Guardian Spirit” a guardian spirit drew [nigh to me,]
 81 [In the] “Gate of Well-being” I found well-being,
 82 In the “Gate of Life” I was granted life,
 83 In the “Gate of the Sun Rise” I was reckoned among the living,
 84 In the “Gate of Splendid Wonderment” my omens were very plain,
 85 In the “Gate of Release of Guilt” I was released from my bond,
 86 In the “Gate of Worship” my mouth inquired,
 87 In the “Gate of Resolving of Sighs” my sighs were resolved,
 88 In the “Gate of Pure Water” I was sprinkled with water of purification,
 89 In the “Gate of Well-being” I communed with Marduk,
 90 In the “Gate of Exuberance” I kissed the foot of Šarpānītum.
 91 I persisted in supplication and prayer before them,
 92 Fragrant incense I placed before them,
 93 I presented an offering, a gift, accumulated donations,
 94 I slaughtered fat oxen, and butchered *fattened sheep*,
 95 I repeatedly libated honey-sweet beer and pure wine.
 96 The protecting genius and guardian spirit, divine attendants of the brickwork of
 Esagil,
 97 [. .] . libation I made their hearts glow,
 98 [With] the succulent [meals] I made them exultant.
 99 [The threshold, the bolt] socket, the bolt, the doors,
 100 [I . .] . oil, curds, and choicest grain.
 101 [.] the rites of the temple.

93 u: ʃa-ʹ-tú ʹgi-se-eʹ 94 u: li-ʹi am-re-e ʹúʹ-[95 u: -t]a-na-qi ku-ru-un-na da-ʹáš-šu-puʹ
 t: k[ù]ʹ? 96 u: li-ʹbitʹ-te é-sag-gil

Colophon of i

- 1 *egir-šú kab-ta-at qat-[s]u ul a-li-'[i] na-šá-šu*
 2 *gin₇ sumun-šú giš-ma bà-rì giš^mi-di-d^dmarduk(mes) [dumu] m^mta-×-×-a*
 3 *^{lú}šab.tur li-g[i-m]u-u š[a] m^ma.šú.u ^{lú}sanga*
 4 *ša ir^dnu-dím-mud lit-bal-šú ša ina šur-qu i-šá-ri-qi šá ina dan-na-nu e-kim*
 5 *^dlu[gal]-gìr-ra dan-dan dingir.meš kaš-kaš dingir.meš muš-mit dingir.meš*
 6 *ina giš.tukul.meš-š[ú ez-z]u-[t]u liš-gi-iš*
 7 *ina lal-ši^{md}30.pap.tu man^{kur}aš-šur ina^{itu}apin ud.3.kam*
 8 *lim-m[e^mha-ba-ni? ^{lú}š]á-kin^{uru}[tí]l-bar-s[i]-bi*
 9 *ner.gál.z[u na.a]n.ur^dtu-[tu]*

THE BABYLONIAN *THEODICY*

INTRODUCTION

THE *Theodicy* is an acrostic poem of twenty-seven stanzas of 11 lines each. It takes the form of a dialogue between a sufferer, who exposes the evils of current social injustice, and a friend, who tries to reconcile these facts with established views on the justice of the divine ordering of the universe. Nineteen of the stanzas are preserved either completely or sufficiently for the trend of the argument to be apparent. The other eight are either totally lost or inadequately preserved. The acrostic itself can, however, be restored completely, and it reads:

a-na-ku sa-ag-gi-il-ki-[i-na-am-u]b-bi-ib ma-áš-ma-šu ka-ri-bu ša i-li ú šar-ri

“I, Saggil-kīnam-ubbib, the incantation priest, am adorant of the god and the king.”

A fair number of manuscripts have turned up both from Assyria and Babylonia, and a commentary from Sippar confirms that this composition received much attention in learned circles of the late periods. The earliest datable manuscripts are from the Ashurbanipal libraries, and the latest is probably m, which gives the impression of being Seleucid or even Parthian. The text itself, as will be shown, was probably written about 1000 B.C. The manuscript tradition is nowhere perfect. Even the Ashurbanipal copies, which are usually impeccable, have two errors (D: 248; C: 276), while the copies from Assur and Babylonian cities have many more corrupt passages (a: 23, 24, 25, 28, 264, 268, 277, 279; f: 213; j: 217, 219; m: 285, 286, 288, 289, 290, 294). The Commentary alone seems to be free from error, apart from a trivial slip in the comment on line 1. It is indeed a very thorough piece of work, and one cannot but admire the consummate learning of its author and regret that it has not survived in its entirety. Apart from the manuscripts and Commentary, the poem is attested in two other places.

First, a Late Assyrian fragment of a catalogue of literary texts cites it:

1 [. *lu-]uq-bi-ka*

2 [*ša pī^m. mār^m.*]×-iddina(sum) lú.maš.maš lú.um.me.a din.tir.ki

1 [. let] me tell you”

2 [According to son of]×-iddina, the incantation priest, scholar of Babylon.

(K 10802, Pl. 19; Lambert, *JCS* 11. 11.)

Here the first line of the poem is given as the title, and this is followed by the ascription



Eisenbrauns
POB 275
Winona Lake, IN 46590

ISBN 0-931464-94-3
90000

9 780931 464942