



## Philological Notes on the First Tablet of the Standard Babylonian Gilgameš Epic\*

Rim Nurullin

Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow

**1. Lines 15–16** *ša-bat-ma* <sup>gis</sup>*simmilta*(KUN<sub>4</sub>) *ša<sub>2</sub> ul-tu ul-la-nu // qit-ru-ub ana E<sub>2</sub>.AN.NA šu-bat* <sup>d</sup>*Ištar*(15) ‘Take the stairway, which is from of old, // approach Eanna, the dwelling of Ištar.’

The reading of the logogram <sup>gis</sup>KUN<sub>4</sub> (l. 15) as *simmiltu* ‘staircase’ is widely accepted in the recent translations of the Epic<sup>1</sup> and seems to be preferred to the more traditional <sup>gis</sup>KUN<sub>4</sub> = *askuppatu* ‘threshold.’<sup>2</sup> According to George, “what is meant is <...> a stairway on the wall, which the reader is invited to climb so that he can go up on to it” (George 2003:781). However, it is not clear how one, having ascended the city wall, could come nearer to Eanna. George explains this as follows: “Though E-anna is situated in the middle of Uruk, the topography of the town is such that there are stretches of city wall that take one nearer to the temple area” (ibid.). But as a glance on the plan of Uruk shows (v., for instance, Roaf 2000: 60), there are hardly any stretches of the wall which could be considered significantly closer to the temple area than the others.

George’s interpretation of this passage depends closely on his treatment of the previous lines as dealing with the wall of Uruk: “The next couplet introduces Gilgameš’s one great concrete achievement, the wall of Uruk, which the epic thus holds up as an enduring monument of his fame (11–12) <...> The conceit is that, rapt in admiration for the wall, one will climb on to it (13–21) ...” (George 2003:446).

---

\* I wish to thank L. Kogan who discussed with me many of the problems dealt with in the present article. I am also grateful to B. Alexandrov who provided me with some research materials otherwise inaccessible to me. My thanks go to PГHΦ/RFH for its financial support (project No. 09-04-00234a).

<sup>1</sup> ‘Prends donc l’escalier’ (Tournay–Shaffer 1994:40); ‘mount the stone stairway’ (Foster 2001:3); ‘take the stairway’ (George 2003:539); ‘nimm doch die Treppe’ (Maul 2008:46); ‘nimm doch die Treppe’ (Röllig 2009:35).

<sup>2</sup> For the details v. Tournay–Shaffer 1994:41; George 2003:781.

However, lines 11–12 are commonly taken to mean that Gilgameš built the wall of Uruk *and* the wall of Eanna: [up-pi]š dūra(BAD<sub>3</sub>) ša<sub>2</sub> uruk(UNUG)<sup>ki</sup> su-pu<sub>2</sub>-rī<sup>7</sup> // ša<sub>2</sub> E<sub>2</sub>.AN.NA qud-du-ši šu-tum<sub>4</sub>-mi el-tim<sup>7</sup> ‘He built<sup>3</sup> the wall of Uruk, the sheepfold, // (and) of the holy Eanna, the pure storehouse.’<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The form *uppiš* in a Kuyunjik tablet (MS B<sub>3</sub>) is restored by means of the Babylonian manuscript h:  $\lceil u_2 \lrcorner pi \lrcorner šu_2 \rceil$  (v. George 2003:779f.). According to George, in this case the D-stem may have an intensive function: “perhaps the building of a city wall, which would best be begun in several places at once, was in itself an intensive activity” (George 2003:780). George also cites another passage where *dūru* ‘wall’ is an object of the verb *uppušu*: BAD<sub>3</sub> ša RN<sub>1</sub> RN<sub>2</sub> RN<sub>3</sub> RN<sub>4</sub> RN<sub>5</sub> DUMU RN<sub>6</sub> ab-ba-ia u<sub>2</sub>-up-pi<sub>2</sub>-šu-ni e-na-ah-ma ‘The wall which RN<sub>1</sub>, RN<sub>2</sub>, RN<sub>3</sub>, RN<sub>4</sub>, RN<sub>5</sub>, son of RN<sub>6</sub>, my forefathers, had built had become dilapidated’ (Grayson 1987:101, ll. 5–8). The D-stem *uppušu* in this passage is commonly explained as expressing plurality of the subject (CAD E 232a; Kouwenberg 1997:148); note that the G-stem of *epēšu* is used in the same inscription when the subject is in the singular: iš-tu uš-še-šu a-di ša-ap-ti-šu e-pu-uš ‘I rebuilt (the wall) from top to bottom’ (Grayson 1987:102, ll. 10–11); ru-ba-u<sub>2</sub> ur-ki-u<sub>2</sub> e-nu-ma <...> e-ep-pu-šu ‘a future prince, when <...> he rebuilds (the wall)’ (ibid., ll. 12–14). Kouwenberg notes that the use of the D-stem in this passage “is connected with the remarkable structure of the subject, a series of five coordinated nouns, and has distributive meaning: it underlies that the action is performed by different subjects on successive occasions” (1997:148). Similarly, the D-stem has a tendency to indicate plurality of the object “if the plural constituent is not simply a plural noun, but consists of a series of coordinated nouns” (ibid. 170). The following example cited by Kouwenberg (ibid. 148, No. 91) illustrates such a use of *epēšu* D: ni-ik-ka-as-si<sub>2</sub> LU<sub>2</sub>.LU<sub>2</sub><sup>mes</sup> E<sub>2</sub>.GAL-lim u<sub>3</sub> LU<sub>2</sub><sup>mes</sup> mu-uš<sub>2</sub>-ke-nim u<sub>2</sub>-up-pi<sub>2</sub>-iš-ma ‘I have settled the accounts of the personnel of the palace and of the *muškēnu*’s’ (ARM 27, 100:22f.). Kouwenberg explains the use of the D-stem in this passage as follows: “its use here might be caused by the fact that two different actions are involved, one for each category of personnel” (ibid. 148). Now, the presence of *epēšu* D in l. 11 of the first tablet of the Epic may find a similar explanation: it is used with two coordinated direct objects (the wall of Uruk and the wall of Eanna) and describes two different actions (the construction of each of these walls).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. for instance ‘He built the wall of Uruk, the enclosure, // Of holy Eanna, the sacred storehouse’ (Heidel 1949:16); ‘Die Mauer um Uruk-Gart lies er bauen, // Um das heil’ge Eanna, den strahlenden *Hort*’ (Schott-von Soden 1988:15); ‘Er baute die Mauer von Uruk, der Hürden(umgehen), // die des hochheil’gen Eanna, des reinen Schatzhauses’ (Maul 2008:46). Note, however, the following comment on these lines in Gardner–Maier 1984:62: “‘of holy Eanna’ is a variation of ‘Uruk of the Sheepfold’ in the previous line and so designates the whole of the city.” One may wonder, therefore, whether the translations cited above should also be understood in this sense. In Foster’s translation, the second object of *uppušu* ‘to build’ is *šutummu ellu* ‘the lustrous treasury’: ‘He built the walls of ram-

George's rendering of these lines is probably based on the interpretation put forward by P.-A. Beaulieu. In Beaulieu's view, E<sub>2</sub>.AN.NA (to be read as *ayakku* in Akkadian) in l. 12 "stands in apposition to Uruk, as an alternative name for the city <...> *Ayakku* is evidently a metonymy for Uruk" (Beaulieu 2002:39). If Beaulieu's hypothesis is accepted, it is indeed conceivable that the wall around the temple area is not mentioned at all in the Epic of Gilgamesh.

Beaulieu's treatment of E<sub>2</sub>.AN.NA(= *ayakku*) in our passage is based on the evidence from the Basetki inscription of Narām-Sîn (Frayne 1993: 113f.), where Eanna's name clearly substitutes the name of Uruk. This inscription lists the gods which were asked by the citizens of Akkade to make Narām-Sîn the god of their city. The name of each god is accompanied by the name of the city where he/she was worshiped. The only exception is Ištar whose name heads the list: instead of the name of the city of Uruk we find Eanna (v. Beaulieu 2002:38f.). It is possible, however, that this usage is an *ad hoc* peculiarity of the Basetki inscription. As Beaulieu himself correctly observes, Narām-Sîn was deified because he succeeded to subdue the Great Revolt. Now, one of the main centers of this revolt was Uruk ruled by Amar-girid. In the Basetki inscription, as well as in other inscriptions of Narām-Sîn, the victory is imputed to the interference of Ištar (v. Beaulieu 2002:38). It seems reasonable to suppose that the author of the Basetki inscription did not want to associate the name of the goddess with the rebellious Uruk and replaced it by the name of her temple. Thus, the substitution of Eanna for Uruk in the Basetki inscription can hardly be used as supporting evidence for a new interpretation of the present passage from the Epic.

An interpretation similar to Beaulieu's has been recently proposed by A. Zgoll (2010:453ff.). She is also of the opinion that Eanna in the passage under discussion is metonymically used for Uruk, but her arguments are different from those put forward by Beaulieu. Zgoll's conclusion is based primarily on the fact that in the prologue to the Epic the name of Uruk and that of Eanna are found either in parallel passages or just comparatively close to each other: "Der Anfang des *Gilgamesch-Epos* spricht zwei-

---

parted Uruk, // The lustrous treasury of hallowed Eanna!' (Foster 2001:3). However in three out of four extant manuscripts *šutummu ellu* is in the genitive: *šutum<sub>4</sub>-mi e[l-lim]* (B<sub>3</sub>); [...] *el-tim*<sup>∩</sup> (F<sub>3</sub>); *e[l<sup>l</sup>]-tim*<sup>∩</sup> (d<sub>1</sub>) (cf. *ša<sub>2</sub> E<sub>2</sub>.AN.NA qud-du-šu šutum<sub>3</sub>-mu [...]* in MS h). It seems more likely, therefore, that *šutummu ellu* 'the pure storehouse' is an attribute of E<sub>2</sub>.AN.NA *quddušu* 'the holy Eanna,' which is in the genitive because of the preceding nota genitivi *ša*.

mal vom Išartempel Eana, einmal in 1:12 und einmal in 1:16. An beiden Stellen zeigt sich der Tempel Eana begleitet und in Parallele zur Stadt Uruk” (ibid. 453). In the first case (l. 12), where Uruk and Eanna are mentioned in syntactically parallel passages, Eanna may—but certainly need not—be taken as a synecdoche for Uruk. However, there is definitely no obvious link between the name of the temple in l. 16 and that of the city in l. 18, and the mere fact that they occur not too far from one another is not sufficient to support Zgoll’s hypothesis.

A more important piece of evidence, strangely disregarded by both Beaulieu and Zgoll, comes from another passage from the first tablet of the Epic, where Šamḥat invites Enkidu to go to Uruk (ll. 209–210): *al-ka lu-[t]ar-ru-ka ana libbi(ŠA<sub>3</sub>)<sup>bi</sup> uruk(UNUG)<sup>ki</sup> su-pu<sub>2</sub>-ri // a-na bīli(E<sub>2</sub>) ʿel<sup>ʿ</sup>Im mu-šab<sup>d</sup>a-nim u<sup>d</sup>iš-tar* ‘Come, let me lead you to Uruk-the-Sheepfold, // to the pure temple, the dwelling of Anu and Ištar.’<sup>5</sup> In this passage, it is indeed quite conceivable that Eanna is used as an alternative designation of the city. This suggestion becomes even more probable when one realizes that in Enkidu’s response to Šamḥat (l. 217) only the temple’s name is mentioned.

All in all, the assumption that Eanna in the prologue to the Epic *may* be equivalent to the city of Uruk as a whole is probably not completely groundless. However, it does not help us to solve the problem raised in the beginning of this note: was it indeed possible ‘to approach Eanna’ by climbing ‘the wall of Uruk’?<sup>6</sup>

As long as the traditional reading of l. 12 is accepted, the next two lines (13–14) can be easily interpreted as referring to the wall of Eanna: *a-mur du-ur-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub> ki-ma qe<sub>2</sub>-e ni-ib-[i<sup>2</sup>] // i-tap-la-as sa-me-ta-šu ša<sub>2</sub> la u<sub>2</sub>-maš-ša<sub>2</sub>-lu mam-ma* ‘Behold its (i. e. Eanna’s) wall which is like a shining copper,<sup>7</sup> // gaze at its parapet which nobody can replicate.’<sup>8</sup> In that case, the

<sup>5</sup> Note that MS cc from Uruk adds two more lines (ll. 210a–210b in George’s edition): *[...]ma ana libbi(ŠA<sub>3</sub>) uruk(UNUG)<sup>ki</sup> su-pur // [ana E<sub>2</sub>.AN.N]A qud-du-šu<sub>2</sub> mu-ša<sub>2</sub>-bu ša<sub>2</sub> dīštar(15)* ‘[...] to Uruk-the-Sheepfold, // [to] holy [Eann]a, the dwelling of Ištar.’

<sup>6</sup> Note also that within Beaulieu’s interpretation the use of the name of Eanna turns out to be inconsistent in this—very short and structurally homogeneous—segment of the prologue: in l. 12 Eanna substitutes Uruk, but in l. 16 it stands for its own.

<sup>7</sup> For this reading see the following note.

<sup>8</sup> To be sure, this interpretation of ll. 13–14 is not entirely new. One can mention Schott’s discussion about outer (*dūru*) and inner (*samītu*) walls of Eanna (Schott 1934:93f.); cf. also Wiseman’s account of these verses: “The reader is in-

stairs (l. 15) are probably to be considered as leading up to the top of the ziggurat of Eanna. Only after having visited the sanctuary (ll. 15–17), the reader is supposed to climb on the city wall and walk around (l. 18).

Within such a reading, the fragment under discussion is organized chiasmically. First, the wall of Uruk is mentioned ([*uppi*]<sub>3</sub> *dūra ša Uruk*, l. 11), after that, the wall of Eanna ([*uppi*]<sub>3</sub> *dūra ... ša* E<sub>2</sub>.AN.NA, l. 12). In the following lines the attention of the reader is drawn first to the wall of Eanna (ll. 13–14) and to the temple itself (ll. 15–17) and then to the wall of Uruk (ll. 18–21) and to the city as a whole (ll. 22–23).<sup>9</sup>

---

vited <...> to look at the walls of the unrivalled sanctuary of Eanna and at the outer walls of the city of Uruk which Gilgamesh as king of Uruk had built” (Wiseman 1975:157). Among recent translations, this reading is adopted by Maul, as far as one can judge from his note on l. 11: “Denn mit der in I, 11 und 18–21 gerühmten Mauer von Uruk bot Gilgamesch <...> den in der Stadt lebenden Menschen den <...> notwendigen Schutz vor äußeren Feinden ...” (Maul 2008:154).

<sup>9</sup> Chiasitic structure can be recognized in two other passages from the prologue. The first passage describes the wall of Uruk (ll. 19–21): *te-me-en-nu hi-i-ma* (A) *libitta*(SIG<sub>4</sub>) *šu-ub-bu* (B) // *šum-ma libitta*(SIG<sub>4</sub>)-*šu<sub>2</sub> la a-gur-ṛat* (B) // *u uš-šu<sub>2</sub>-šu<sub>2</sub> la id-du-u<sub>2</sub>* 7 *ṛmun-tal-ku* (A) ‘Examine the foundation document (A), inspect the brickwork: (B) // Is not its brickwork of kiln-fired brick? (B) // And did not Seven Sages lay its foundations? (A).’ For *temmennu* in l. 19 as ‘foundation-deposit,’ ‘foundation-document’ cf. Wiseman 1975:157f. (i. e., upon reading the foundation inscription one may learn that the foundation of the wall of Uruk was laid by the Seven Sages). The second passage (ll. 31–34) comes from the “old” prologue. It describes Gilgamesh’s ability to attack an enemy and also to defend his people. These qualities are first depicted in rather straightforward terms (ll. 31–32): *ašaridu* ‘leader’ (A), *tukulti aḥḥēšu* ‘the trust of his brothers’ (B). After that, a few metaphoric descriptions are used and the order of the qualities is reversed (ll. 33–34): *kibru dannu* ‘mighty bank’ (B), *agū ezzu* ‘violent flood-wave’ (A). For *agū* ‘wave’ used metaphorically to describe a destructive force v. Streck 1999:105, No. 124; *ibid.* 112, No. 143, with further references. ‘Bank’ (*kibru*) as a metaphor for protection is poorly attested. George explains it as follows: “the imagery is drawn from riverine navigation, in which the bank offers safe haven in a storm or other difficulty” (George 2003:783). He compares it with *kibru* in personal names (e. g. *Ilī-kibrī* ‘My god is my bank’). However, *kibru* in these names may rather be related to the West Semitic root *k-b-r* ‘to be big, great’ (v. Streck 1999:105; 2000: 267, 269). A more interesting parallel favoring George’s interpretation comes from the hymn to Nabû, where *agū* ‘wave’ and *kibru* ‘bank’ are also used side by side. In this text, the victim of Nabû’s fury is likened to a person who is drowning in the stormy water, the safe riverbank being too far from him: *ina gi-piš e-de-e na-di-ma a-gu-u<sub>2</sub> e-liš it-ta[k-kip]* // *kib-ri ru-uq-šu<sub>2</sub> ne<sub>2</sub>-si-iš na-ba-l[u]* ‘He is swept away by the onrush of the tide, a wave overwhelms him; // the bank is remote from him, the dry land is at distance’ (von Soden 1971:52, ll. 49f.).

**2. Line 13** *a-mur du-ur-šu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>2</sub> ki-ma qe<sub>2</sub>-e ni-ib-t[i<sup>2</sup>]* ‘Behold its wall which is like a shining copper.’

The second half of this line has been variously interpreted. Ever since Ebeling 1932–1933, the last word in the line was generally read as NI-IB-*h*[*u-šu*], identified with either *nēbehu* ‘belt,’ ‘frieze’ (with a phonetic variant *nebhu*)<sup>10</sup> or *niphu* ‘flash,’ ‘blaze,’ ‘rising (of celestial bodies).’<sup>11</sup> As George (2003:780) points out, this reading seems very unlikely for two reasons. First, on a Babylonian tablet (MS h) there is space for only one sign after NI-IB. Second, the traces of this sign in the manuscript F<sub>3</sub> seem to exclude the reading *h*[*u*] (as well as *h*[*a*] or *h*[*i*]). The rendering of the word in question thus crucially depends on one’s interpretation of the last sign in the sequence NI-IB- $\overline{\text{X}}$ . The preceding word is to some extent problematic as well, for one has to choose between two homonyms: *qû* ‘thread’ or *qû* ‘copper.’

George restores the last word of the line as *nipšu* (*ni-ip-š[u<sup>2</sup>]*) ‘combed wool,’ ‘tuft of wool,’ ‘fluff’ (CAD N<sub>2</sub> 248)<sup>12</sup> and opts for *qû* ‘thread’: ‘See its wall which is like a *strand of wool*’ (George 2003:539). George’s interpretation implies that a cord or belt could be used as an image of the wall. For George, the evidence for such imagery comes from an inscription of Nabopolassar where the wall of Babylon is described as *e-bi-iḫ dannum* ‘a mighty cincture’ (Al-Rawi 1985:10 ii 41; George 1991a; 1991b; 2003:781). However, with Farber 1991, it seems more convincing to interpret *e-bi-iḫ* in this passage as the name of the mountain Ebiḫ.<sup>13</sup> Another piece of evidence is thought to come from Lugabanda Epic II where “the wall of Uruk is compared with the drawstring of a bird snare

<sup>10</sup> Cf., for instance: ‘... deren *nibhu* (Fries) wie Kupfer ist!’ (Ebeling 1932–1933:226); ‘... qu’entoure une frise pareille au cuivre’ (Tournay–Shaffer 1994: 40). The following translations try to clarify the meaning of the simile by explaining the *tertium comparationis*: ‘... deren Friese wie Bronzeschalen scheinen!’ (Schott–von Soden 1988:15); ‘... whose facing gleams like copper’ (Foster 2001:3).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Heidel’s translation: ‘... whose brightness (*ni-ip-h*[*u-šu*]) is like (that of) copper!’ (Heidel 1949:16).

<sup>12</sup> George defines this word as follows: “The word *nipšu* appears to signify one of the strands that are the result of pulling apart (*napāšu*) a tuft of wool (*itqu*), and thus a stage in the process of turning raw wool into woolen thread” (George 2003:781).

<sup>13</sup> An ultimate association between the mountain’s name and the word *ebihu* ‘belt’ has been surmised, however (Farber 1991; Vanstiphout 1991).

stretched out over the plain” (George 2003:781). But this comparison is conditioned by the specific context of that passage, where the wall of Uruk is described as a barrier against the Amorite invasion: **ki-en-gi ki-uri niġin<sub>2</sub>-na-a-ba mar-tu** <...> **ĥu-mu-zi bad<sub>3</sub> unu<sup>ki</sup>-ga gu-mušen-na-gin<sub>7</sub> eden-na ĥe<sub>2</sub>-ni-la<sub>2</sub>-la<sub>2</sub>** ‘In all Sumer and Akkad the *Martu*-people <...> had arisen, (but) the wall of Uruk stretched out on the plain like a bird snare’ (Wilcke 1969:118, ll. 303–305; 124, ll. 369–371). Thus, the point of the simile is that the wall of Uruk acted as a snare and blocked the invasion.<sup>14</sup> An image of this kind is quite unlikely to be used to describe the wall in the prologue of the Epic, especially if we assume that the line under discussion refers to the wall of Eanna rather than to the wall of Uruk (see the preceding note).

Last but not least, the semantic link (*tertium comparationis*) between the wall (*dūru*) and the thread of (combed/plucked) wool (*qê nipši*) is rather hard to imagine, and it is by no means surprising that George himself regards this image as “not wholly convincing.”

I propose to read the last sign of the line as DI<sup>15</sup> and to interpret the word in question as *nibtu* ‘shine.’ The genitive in the phrase *qê nibti* is to

<sup>14</sup> Note that a physical similarity between the wall and the bird snare is also conceivable: “The image is of a long net, of a type used for snaring low-flying birds, extended across the open country. The point here is the length of the wall, and its effectiveness, which are interpreted as a symbol of Unug’s security and power” (Black 1998:105). It is highly important, however, that the wall described in Lugalbanda Epic is probably not to be identified with the city wall of Uruk. As rightly acknowledged by Black, “historically it is an image appropriate to the <...> period of the Third Dynasty of Ur (ca. 2168–2060 B. C.), when such long cross-country walls were actually built to keep the incursive Marḫu (Amorite) tribes out of Sumer. <...> It seems that the image is drawn from such a cross-country wall, and not from a wall encircling a city” (ibid. 105f.).

<sup>15</sup> On the basis of Haupt’s copy (1884–1891:6, No. 1f.) as well as on his own impression (George 2003, pl. 41, MS F<sub>3</sub>) George describes the traces of this sign as follows: “a sign beginning with two horizontals, the lower preceding the upper” (ibid. 2003:780). To my eye, the lower “horizontal” wedge may also be taken for the beginning of an angle wedge, while the upper one may be the top of a vertical wedge, so that the whole is to be identified with the first two elements of the sign DI. A similar conclusion was reached by R. C. Thompson. On his copy (Thompson 1930, pl. 1) the angle wedge and the lower part of the vertical wedge are seen (the sign was read by Thompson as š1). The remains of the sign on a Babylonian tablet (George 2003, pl. 48, MS h, absent from Pinches’s copy, CT 46, No. 17) could be interpreted as the beginning of a lower angle wedge which characterizes the sign DI and similar signs in this manuscript, cf., for example, DI in lines 102 ([i]-[i]-[i]-[i]), 286 (*i-de*), and KI in lines 11 (UNUG<sup>ki</sup>), 293 (*ki-ma ki-šir*).

be understood as an attribute of *qû* ‘copper’: ‘the copper of shining’ meaning ‘the shining copper.’<sup>16</sup> Thus the wall of Eanna is depicted as shining like copper.<sup>17</sup> Shining edifices are frequent in Mesopotamian building inscriptions.<sup>18</sup> Cf. for instance the following passage from Nabonid’s inscription where the root *n-b-ṭ* also occurs: *ekurra*(E<sub>2</sub>.KUR) *šū-a-ti ul-tu te-me-en-ni-šu a-di gabadibbî*(GABA.DIB)<sup>hi</sup>-*šu e-eš-ši-iš ab-ni-ma* <...> *kaspa*(KU<sub>3</sub>.BABBAR) *u<sub>3</sub> ḫurāša*(KU<sub>3</sub>.SI<sub>22</sub>) *igārātī*(E<sub>2</sub>.GAR<sub>8</sub>)<sup>mcs</sup>-*šu u<sub>2</sub>-šal-biš-ma u<sub>2</sub>-ša<sub>2</sub>-an-bi-iṭ* <sup>d</sup>*šasšāniš*(UTU.ŠI)<sup>nīs</sup> “I rebuilt this temple from its foundation to its parapet <...> I coated its walls with silver and gold and made (the walls) shine like the sun” (Schaudig 2001:419, Text 2.12 11 ii 4ff.).<sup>19</sup>

**3. Line 220** *a-na-ku lu-ug-ri-šum-ma da-an-n[iš] lu-gab-ṭbir<sup>2</sup>-šu<sub>2</sub><sup>7</sup>* ‘I, myself, shall fight him and overpower him by force.’

<sup>16</sup> It remains to be determined whether there are any restrictions on the use of attributive genitive in Akkadian. According to von Soden, the choice between an adjectival noun phrase and a genitive one is based on stylistic grounds (GAG<sup>3</sup> § 136f and 186c). For some observations on this question see further Buccellati 1976.

<sup>17</sup> Brightness is undoubtedly one of the prototypical qualities of copper in the ancient Mesopotamian literary language. In the lexical lists *qû* ‘copper’ is coupled with *namru* ‘bright’; *ebbu* ‘polished,’ ‘shining’; *ellu* ‘clean’; *mušālu* ‘mirror’ (v. CAD Q 291a *qû*, lex. section). There are also passages in which a man’s purity is compared to the polished copper. Cf. for example: *ameḷu*(LU<sub>2</sub>) *mut-tal<sub>2</sub>-li-ku ina ni-iq re-e-me u šul-me ki-ma qe<sub>2</sub>-e maš-ši lim-ma-šiš* ‘May the restless man be polished like polished copper through a sacrifice to obtain mercy and well-being’ (Borger 1969: 15, ll. 271f.). One cannot exclude that *qê nibṭi* ‘shining copper’ in our passage also refers to polished copper.

<sup>18</sup> A bright coating material (like silver or gypsum) is often mentioned as the reason for the shining (cf. the passage from Nabonid’s inscription cited below).

<sup>19</sup> Finally, it should be noted that the interpretation suggested here is consonant with a rendering of the line under discussion by a few other scholars. To the renderings of this line collected in fnn. 10 and 11 one may add Maul’s recent translation: ‘Sieh an dessen Mauer, die wie *Kupfer glänzt!*’ (Maul 2008:46, the italics are Maul’s). It is not clear to me what reading of the end of the line stands behind Maul’s translation. Obviously, it differs from *ni-ip-ḫ[u-šu]* (v. fn. 11), as well as from *ni-ib-š[u]* (suggested by M. Kovacs, v. George 2003:780), since both these readings have been convincingly rejected by George (ibid. 780f.). Cf. also the rendering of the end of the line by P. Haupt (1901:12): ‘his ... which [shines] like brass’ (one may observe, in passing, that Haupt also managed to restore *[iš]dī māti* in the first line of the Epic, a reading which was recently confirmed by the discovery of the fragment Rm 956, v. George 2003: 392, 778).

Ever since Jensen 1900, the verbal form in the end of the line is commonly restored as *lu-qab-[bi-ma]*.<sup>20</sup> The form is preserved in the last line of the fourth column of a Kuyunjik tablet (MS P in George's edition). To judge from George's copy (George 2003, pl. 45), the tablet has suffered deterioration, and as a result the last signs of the line are now almost indiscernible. But on the earlier copies the signs LU and GAB are clearly visible.<sup>21</sup>

The restoration *lu-qab-[bi-ma]* is questionable. The form *luqab[bi]* is generally parsed as 1st person precative of the D-stem of *qabû* 'to say, speak,' translated as 'I shall speak' (cf. the renderings of the line collected in fn. 20). Within this interpretation, one is forced to disregard the fact that the D-stem of *qabû* is virtually unattested: the only relatively reliable example comes from the Old Babylonian prayer to Anûna ([x x] x *un-ne<sub>2</sub>-e-ni ša-nu-[ji-iš u<sub>2</sub>-q[a<sub>2</sub>]-ab-ba* 'Exhausted he laments ...,' cited from Lambert 1989:327, l. 97).<sup>22</sup> From this passage one might infer that *qubbû* meant something like 'to lament,'<sup>23</sup> but such a meaning would scarcely fit the context of the line under scrutiny.

---

<sup>20</sup> a-na-ku lu-uk(k)-ri-šum-ma da-an-[niš] lu-kaḅ-[bi-ma] 'Ich will ihn *laden* und will mächt[ig] ruf[en und] ...' (Jensen 1900:128f. iv 47; according to Jensen (ibid. 128, fnn. 7 and 8), one may also restore *da-an-[nu]* 'Gewaltiger' and *lu-qab-[bi-šu]* 'ihm (zuschreien?)'). Cf. Thompson's reading of the line: a-na-ku lu-uk-ri-šum-ma da-an-n[iš] l]u-kaḅ-[bi-ma] (Thompson 1930:14 iv 47). Cf. also: 'I, I will summon him and [will] speak bold[ly]' (Heidel 1949:22); 'Moi, je veux le provoquer, lui lancer un défi' (Tournay-Shaffer 1994:57, with the reading *lu-ug-ri-šum-ma da-an-[niš] lu-qab-[bi-ma]*, ibid. fn. 61); 'I myself will challenge him, [I will speak out] boldly' (Foster 2001:9).

<sup>21</sup> V. Haupt 1884–1891:12, No. 3 iv 47; Thompson 1930, pl. 5 iv 47. Note that in George 2003:550 the second half of the line is read as *da-an* x x x x. George does not take into account the reading *lu-qab-[bi-ma]*, but makes the following remark on the reading *lu qab-[lu]* suggested by von Soden (1959:222): "The traces at the end of the line (MS P) do not appear to allow *lu qab-lu*" (George 2003:800).

<sup>22</sup> Note that according to the copy (PBS 1/1, 2 iii 46) the verb is to be read *u<sub>2</sub>-qa<sub>2</sub>-ab-<sup>Γ</sup>ba<sup>Γ</sup>*.

<sup>23</sup> This meaning may find a confirmation in the well-attested substantive *qubbû* 'lamentation.' Note also Moran's reading of EA 11:5 (and cf. l. 11): [*ultru aššat*] *abika qu-ub-ba-tu<sub>4</sub>* 'After your father's wife have been mourned' (Moran 1984:301; 1992:22, nn. 1 and 5). The form *tu-qab-ba* in a grammatical text (5R, 45 viii 32) is not pertinent for establishing the meaning of *qubbû*. On the possible relation between the meanings of *qabû* ('to say, speak') and *qubbû* ('to lament') v. Kouwenberg 1997:178 (sub *nabû* D), 283.

An alternative restoration was proposed by W. von Soden: *lu qab-[lu]* ‘(dann) sei Kampf!’ (von Soden 1959:222).<sup>24</sup> However, the occurrence of the first-person precative (*lu-ug-ri-šum-ma*) in the first hemistich plainly suggests that the signs LU-GAB must also belong to a precative verbal form.

In my view, the most probable restoration is *lu-gab-ṛbir<sup>2</sup>-šū<sup>2</sup>* ‘I will overpower him.’<sup>25</sup>

The verb *gubburu* (*guppuru*) ‘to overpower’ is rare, but its meaning is more or less uncontroversial.<sup>26</sup> What seems to be particularly attractive in this restoration is that in the previous line (219) we find the verb *gutaššuru*.<sup>27</sup> Now, in Explicit *malku* = *šarru* I 146f. the verbs *guppuru* and *gutappuru* are equated with *guššuru* and *gutaššaru* (v. Hrůša 2010:158, 435).<sup>28</sup> Thus, Enkidu intends to treat Gilgameš (*lugabbiršu*) in the same way as Gilgameš himself treats (*ugdašsar*) the menfolk of Uruk.

The line in question presents still another difficulty. The adverb *dannis<sup>29</sup>* in this passage is commonly interpreted as an adverb of manner (‘mächtig,’

<sup>24</sup> Cf. also: ‘... heftig tobe der Kampf!’ (Schott-von Soden 1988:22).

<sup>25</sup> The traces of an angle wedge seen in George 2003, pl. 45 (in Thompson 1930, pl. 5 it looks like the beginning of a horizontal wedge) may be interpreted as the beginning of the sign BIR, while the upper part of the vertical wedge seems to be identified with ŠU<sub>2</sub>.

<sup>26</sup> Thus, in an incantation against Lamaštu *gubburu* occurs in parallelism with *nuppušu* ‘to crush, smite’: [*g*]u-ub-bu-ru u<sub>2</sub>-gab-bar [*n*]u-up-pu-šu u<sub>2</sub>-nap-pa-šu ‘She (Lamaštu) indeed overpowers, she indeed smites’ (PBS 1/2, 113 i 15, cited from CAD G 118a).

<sup>27</sup> u<sub>3</sub> ki-i rīmi(AM) ug-da-aš<sub>2</sub>-ša<sub>2</sub>-ru eli(UGU) ṛ<sup>2</sup>lūti(GURUŠ)ṛ<sup>mes</sup> ‘And like a wild bull he (Gilgameš) acts overbearingly towards men.’ On the meaning of *gutaššuru* v. Kouwenberg 1997:322. Note that this line clearly echoes I 64: *ug-da-aš<sub>2</sub>-ša<sub>2</sub>-ar ri-ma-niš ša<sub>2</sub>-qu-u<sub>2</sub> re-e-[šī]* ‘He acts overbearingly like a wild bull, head held high.’ Both lines seem to allude to athletic contests in which the menfolk of Uruk is forcibly involved (v. Tigay 1982:185; Klein 2002:190).

<sup>28</sup> Cf. also Explicit *malku* = *šarru* I 140f.: *ga-ab-rum*, *ga-ap-rum* = *ga-aš-[rum]* (Hrůša 2010:158, 435, on the repetition of *ga-ab/p-ru* v. ibid. 284, with further literature); Explicit *malku* = *šarru* I 144: *mu-un-ga-ab-rum* = *mu-ug-da-[aš-rum]* (ibid. 158, 435). Note also a similar (reciprocal) use of *gutaššuru* and *gutabburu* in the following two passages: *šar-ḥa<-tu> nišū*(UG<sub>3</sub>)<sup>mes</sup> *ug-da-ša<sub>2</sub>-ra a-na a-ma-ri ka-a-ta* ‘proud people vie with each other to look at you’ (Mayer 1976:492, l. 8; for the restoration *šar-ḥa<-tu>* v. Kouwenberg 1997:326); *et-lu ug-ta-ap-pa-ru ki ša* (text: *ša ki) ar-ka-tim* ‘the men vie with each other like lance-bearers’ (VAS 10, 214 iii 1f. (Agušaya A); the reading is adopted from Metzler 2002:730, for a different interpretation of this passage v. Groneberg 1981:119f.).

<sup>29</sup> Note that in George’s view there is probably “too much space on MS B, between *da-an* and the trace, to read *da-an-n[iš]* with Thompson, and such a reading is in any case unlikely on orthographic grounds” (George 2003:800). George’s argu-

‘boldly,’ etc.), but such a use of *danniš* is hardly ever attested elsewhere:<sup>30</sup> normally, this word functions as an adverb of degree (‘very’). That means that *danniš* can only be used with verbs whose meaning can be intensified, but this is not the case of either *gubburu* ‘to overpower’ or *qubbû* (if the meaning to ‘speak’ is accepted).

There seem to be three possible approaches to the interpretation of *danniš* in the present line.

Perhaps the easiest solution is to stick to an adverb of manner, as actually done in the renderings collected in fn. 20.

Another possibility is to abandon the very reading *danniš* and to restore instead a form of the adjective *dannu* ‘strong,’ ‘mighty,’ as proposed by Jensen (v. fn. 20).<sup>31</sup> But from the copies of Thompson and George it is clear that the sign following *da-an-* begins with an angle wedge.<sup>32</sup> Hence, the readings *da-an-n[u]*, *da-an-n[a]*, *da-an-n[i]* as well as *da-an-n[am]* must be ruled out. What is left, then, is *da-an-n[um]*, but in the Standard Babylonian version of the Gilgameš Epic the sign NIM is hardly ever used to render case endings.<sup>33</sup>

The third possibility is to assume that Enkidu’s speech needs not be grammatically blameless. At this point of the narrative, Enkidu is on the way to becoming a civilized man, but he is still more a wild creature than a fully civilized human. It is, indeed, the first time that he says something at all and it is conceivable that his speech could be intentionally depicted

ments are undoubtedly weighty, but probably not sufficient to reject the reading *da-an-n[iš]*. Thus, in another line of the same manuscript (l. 241) there is also some space between the signs DINGIR and UD, but the reading <sup>d</sup>*Samaš*(UTU) seems indisputable. What is likely meant by “orthographic grounds” is that in Akkadian texts of the first millennium *danniš* (as well as *dannu*, *dannatu*, etc.) is regularly spelled with the sign KAL(*dan*). Indeed, in late texts such spellings as *dan-nu* or *dan-niš* became prevalent. However, the writings with *da-an-* are also found: cf. *da-an-nu* (SBH 77, 44:15); *da-an-ni* (KAR 119:14); *da-an-na-ta-a-nu* (ABL 633:15).

<sup>30</sup> To my knowledge, outside the present line from the Epic there is only one instance of *danniš* functioning as an adverb of manner: *ta-an-ni-iš tētešanni* ‘PN *u mimmama lā taddinanni* ‘You have mistreated me by not giving PN or anything at all to me’ (HSS 14, 27:3, cited from CAD D 92b). Needless to say, this example from a Nuzi document can scarcely be taken into consideration in order to ascertain the good Akkadian usage of this adverb.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. also Ungnad’s translation: ‘Ich selbst will ihn fordern, will *den Mächtigen herbeirufen*’ (Ungnad 1921:73, the italics are Ungnad’s).

<sup>32</sup> Thompson 1930, pl. 5 iv 47; George 2003, pl. 38; absent from Haupt’s copy (Haupt 1884–1891:12, No. 3 iv 47).

<sup>33</sup> To be precise, there is no evidence of NIM being used with the values *ni<sub>7</sub>* or *nu<sub>3</sub>*, but cf. *a-mur-din-nim-ma* in XI 248, with mimation preserved before *-ma*. Note also that NIM is commonly used to write the divine name <sup>d</sup>*a-num*/<sup>d</sup>*a-nim*.

as not yet fully developed: Enkidu intends to say that he will beat Gilgameš *by force*, but chooses the wrong word (*danniš*) to express his idea.<sup>34</sup>

There is hardly any need to emphasise that our hypothesis, presupposing that the author of the Epic could purposely introduce grammatical and stylistic infelicities into Enkidu's speech (ll. 216–223), must be taken with utmost caution. In order to justify such an assumption, this segment of the text has been scanned for further possible parallels.

Enkidu's first speech runs as follows<sup>35</sup>:

216. *al-ki* <sup>f</sup>*šam-ḥat* *qi<sub>2</sub>-ri-i[n-n]* *i ia-a-ši*  
 217. *a-na* *bīti*(E<sub>2</sub>) *el-lim* *qud-du-ši* *mu-šab* <sup>d</sup>*a-nim* <sup>d</sup>*riš-tar*<sup>7</sup>  
 218. *a-šar* <sup>d</sup>GIS-*gim<sub>2</sub>-maš* *gūt<sub>2</sub>-ma-lu* *e-mu-qi<sub>2</sub>*  
 219. *u<sub>3</sub> ki-i rīmi*(AM) *ug-da-aš<sub>2</sub>-ša<sub>2</sub>-ru* *eli*(UGU) <sup>r</sup>*ellūti*(GURUŠ)<sup>7</sup><sup>m[es]</sup>  
 220. *a-na-ku* *lu-ug-ri-šum-ma* *da-an-n[iš]* *lu-gab-*<sup>r</sup>*bīr<sup>2</sup>-šu<sub>2</sub>*<sup>7</sup>  
 221. [*lul-tar*(?)]-*ri-iḥ ina libbi*(ŠA<sub>3</sub>) *uruk*(UNUG)<sup>ki</sup> *a-na-ku-mi* *dan-nu*  
 222. [...] *-um-ma* *ši<sup>2</sup>-giš<sup>2</sup>-tu<sub>2</sub>* *u<sub>2</sub>-nak-kar*  
 223. [*ša<sub>2</sub> i-n*] *a šēri*(EDIN) *i'-al-du* [*da-a*] *n i-mu-qi<sub>2</sub>-i-šu*

216. 'Come, Šamḥat, invite me  
 217. to the pure temple, the holy dwelling of Anu and Ištar,  
 218. where Gilgameš is perfect in strength,  
 219. and like a wild bull acts overbearingly towards men.  
 220. I, myself, shall fight him and overpower him *by force*!  
 221. [I shall vaunt] myself (?) in Uruk, (saying) "I am the mightiest!"  
 222. [*The migh*]ty will change (the course of) the *fighting*,  
 223. [the one] born in the wild is mighty in strength!"

Strictly speaking, only five of the eight lines belong to Enkidu (ll. 216, 220–223), whereas the remaining ones merely repeat the words addressed to him by Šamḥat (ll. 207–212).<sup>36</sup> Except for *danniš*, no further mistakes can be reliably detected in the speech of Enkidu.<sup>37</sup> Still, there is

<sup>34</sup> As long as the wrong use of *danniš* in Enkidu's speech is admitted as a possibility, it need not be taken as an *ad hoc* literary device invented by the writer: this kind of mistake may well be familiar to him (and other native speakers of Babylonian) from the speech of foreigners.

<sup>35</sup> A few philological notes on ll. 216, 222, 223 are collected in the Appendix.

<sup>36</sup> 217 // 210 (cf. also l. 210b in MS cc); 218–219 // 211–212. One may wonder whether these lines were added to the present passage by the compiler(s) of the first-millennium version. His/their inclination to the monotonous repetitions can best be illustrated by the comparison of the dream episodes in the Standard Babylonian (I 245–297) and Old Babylonian (OB II 1–43) versions of the epic (v. Cooper 1977; Tigay 1982:82ff.; this part of the Epic is now also known from a tablet of the Middle Babylonian period, v. George 2007).

<sup>37</sup> The use of *qerû* in l. 216 seems peculiar (see Appendix), but this is probably due to our limited knowledge of the Akkadian lexicon.

nothing to detract from the fact that the speech is stylistically rather idiosyncratic.

Thus (with Gardner–Maier 1984:80, 83), one may observe a fairly dense concentration of the first person independent pronoun (ll. 216, 220, 221), apparently intended to put emphasis on Enkidu’s “I” (GAG<sup>3</sup> § 41a).

Another point of interest is the change from the first to the third person in l. 223.<sup>38</sup> While similar examples are not completely unknown from Akkadian literature,<sup>39</sup> their significance has never been ascertained, although it is hard to believe that they are pragmatically neutral.

The expressiveness of Enkidu’s speech can be further recognized against the context of his dialogue with Šamḫat. Enkidu’s reaction to her words (ll. 207–212) is not fully adequate, as she did not actually invite him to rival Gilgameš.<sup>40</sup> In what follows, Šamḫat apparently tries to correct Enkidu, declaring that he does not yet know life (l. 233) and that Gilgameš, the god’s favorite (ll. 241–242), is stronger than him (l. 238). In such a context, Enkidu’s speech can easily be perceived as baseless boasting. A certain redundancy of Enkidu’s style is thus in agreement with his excessive vanity. Similarly, the wrong use of *danniš* might be intended to reveal at once that Enkidu is actually no more than a barbarian whose pretentious words sound rather ridiculous. From l. 240 one may also infer Šamḫat’s ironic attitude toward Enkidu’s ardor: <sup>d</sup>*en-ki-du<sub>3</sub> nu-uk-ki-ra še-ret-ka* ‘O Enkidu, change your *sinful intention*.’ Whatever the exact meaning of *šertu* may be,<sup>41</sup> the D-stem of *nakāru* may well be seen as a mocking echo of *unakkar* in the speech of Enkidu (l. 222): [...]-*um-ma ši<sup>2</sup>-giš<sup>2</sup>-tu<sub>2</sub> u<sub>2</sub>-nak-kar* [*The migh*]ty (i. e. Enkidu himself) will change (the

<sup>38</sup> Or in l. 222, see Appendix.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. the following passage from the Old Assyrian Sargon Legend (ll. 4–7): *Adad dannūtam iddiššum-ma ištu šīt šamšim adi erāb šamšim mātam ašbat-ma* ‘Divine Adad gave **him** strength and as a result **I** took possession of the land from East to West’ (translation from Dercksen 2005:108).

<sup>40</sup> As observed by George (2003:451), Enkidu’s response is also hardly compatible with the statement that ‘his wise heart was seeking a friend’ (*mūdū libbašu iše’a ibra*, l. 214).

<sup>41</sup> *šertu* normally means ‘misdeed, sin’ or ‘punishment.’ None of these meanings seems to fit the context of the line. In the modern translations of the Epic *šertu* in this passage is generally taken to designate the evil intent of Enkidu: ‘... get rid of your sinful intention’ (George 2003:553); ‘... lasse ab von deinem frevelhaften Plan!’ (Maul 2008:54). However, other interpretations are also possible, cf. ‘... wandle deinen Zorn!’ (Jensen 1900:131, with commentary on pp. 340f.); ‘... change your boorish ways’ (CAD Š<sub>2</sub> 324b).

course of) the *fighting*.<sup>42</sup> Šamḥat seems to advise Enkidu that it would be better for him to change his wrongful thinking.<sup>43</sup>

### Appendix: Philological notes on ll. I 216, 222, 223

**Line 216.** This line corresponds to l. 209, where Šamḥat address Enkidu: *al-ka lu-[t]ar-ru-ka ana libbi(ŠA<sub>3</sub>)<sup>bi</sup> uruk(UNUG)<sup>ki</sup> su-pu<sub>2</sub>-ri* ‘Come, let me lead you to Uruk-the-Sheepfold.’ In view of the parallelism *itarrû* (l. 209)<sup>44</sup> || *qerû* (l. 216), many translators render *qerû* as ‘to take along,’ ‘to escort.’<sup>45</sup> Such a meaning of *qerû* is, however, otherwise unattested,<sup>46</sup> whereas the ordinary meaning of this verb (‘to call,’ ‘to invite’)<sup>47</sup> does not fit the context very well, as it is not clear why it is necessary for Enkidu to wait for Šamḥat’s invitation to come to Uruk (besides, she has, in fact, already invited him in ll. 209ff.). No obvious solution for this problem suggests itself at present.

**Line 222.** The first word of this line is commonly restored either as the first person singular pronoun ([*a-na-ku*]-*um-ma*)<sup>48</sup> or as a form of *erēbu* ‘to enter.’<sup>49</sup> One may suggest, alternatively, that Enkidu is speaking of

<sup>42</sup> See further below in the Appendix.

<sup>43</sup> The pun was probably understood by M. Kovacs (1989:11), who translates: ‘Enkidu, it is your wrong thoughts you must change!’ Cf. her translation of l. 222: ‘Lead me in and I will change the order of things’ (ibid. 10).

<sup>44</sup> The verbal form in l. 209 is usually interpreted as a G-stem form of (*w*)*arû*, cf. *lu-[u]-ru-[u]-ka* (Jensen 1900:128 iv 36); *lu-u(?) -ru-ka* (Thompson 1930:14 iv 36); *lu-ru<sub>2</sub>-ru-ka* (CAD A<sub>2</sub> 314a). According to George (2003:799), the most probable reading of the broken sign is TAR (*lu-[t]ar-ru-ka*, presumably from (*w*)*arû* Gt).

<sup>45</sup> Cf., for instance: ‘Come, O prostitute, take me ...’ (Heidel 1949:22); ‘Viens, fille de joie, escorte-moi ...’ (Tournay–Shaffer 1994:57).

<sup>46</sup> According to CAD Q 242f., *qerû* with the meaning ‘to take away, along, to lead away’ can also be found in the passages where *ilû* ‘gods’ appear as its subject, more concretely, in the phrase PN *ilû-šu/ša iqterû-šu/ši* ‘PN—his/her gods have called him/her’ (a euphemism for dying). This interpretation is based on the comparison with *ūm šimātūša itarrâši* ‘when her fates lead her away’ in UCP 10, 173, No. 105:7f. (cited from CAD Š<sub>3</sub> 17b). However, the supposedly parallel use of *tarû* ‘to lead away’ in this passage is not sufficient for establishing the meaning of *qerû* in the formulaic phrase under scrutiny, which can still be easily read as ‘(im To-de) abberufen’ (AHw. 918b).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. ‘Auf, Freudenmädchen! Lade (mich,) mich ...’ (Jensen 1900:129, the italics are Jensen’s; cf. also his commentary on p. 430); ‘Komm, Hure, lade du mich ein!’ (Schott–von Soden 1988:22); ‘Komm, Schamchat, mich lade ein ...’ (Maul 2008:53).

<sup>48</sup> Cf., for instance, Thompson 1930:14. Note that *anāku* with non-etymological mimation before *-ma* is also found in SB Gilg. XI 123.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. [*er-ru*]-*um-ma* ‘ich werde eintreten und’ (von Soden 1959:222; cf. already Jensen 1900:128); [*lu-ru*]-*um-ma* ‘I will enter’ (CAD Š<sub>3</sub> 13a).

himself in the third person, as is undoubtedly the case in the following line. The damaged word ([...]um-ma) may then be interpreted as a noun in the nominative case (with mimation preserved before *-ma*), by means of which Enkidu describes himself.

As far as the second word is concerned, ever since Jensen 1900:128 the reading *ši-ma-tu<sub>2</sub>*, generally interpreted as *šimātu* ‘fates,’ ‘customs,’<sup>50</sup> has been usually taken for granted.<sup>51</sup> However, a look at the copies of Haupt (1884–1891:5, l. 22) and George (2003, pl. 38, MS B<sub>1</sub>, fragment K 2756) reveals that this reading is far from certain: on Haupt’s copy one can find the signs PI GIŠ UD,<sup>52</sup> whereas on George’s copy the signs IGI<sup>53</sup> GA<sub>2</sub> UD are seen. Evidently, the passage is in need of collation, but a new—of necessity preliminary—interpretation of the line can still be ventured.

Combining the evidence of the two copies, the difficult word can be read as *šigištu* (*ši-giš-tu<sub>2</sub>*), whose only attestation recognized hitherto comes from § 47 of the Laws of Eshnunna:

*šumma awīlum ina šigištim awīlam IG-te-el 10 šiqil kaspam išaqqal*

‘If a man has wounded (?) a man in a fight (?), he shall pay 10 shekels of silver.’

This section belongs to the provisions dealing with bodily injuries. It is preserved on a tablet from Eshnunna (Tablet A in Goetze’s edition, v. Goetze 1956:3) as well as on a fragment from Tell Haddad (Al-Rawi 1982, v. also Roth 1990). Both the noun *šigištu* and the verbal form *IG-te-el* are difficult to interpret. While the root of the verbal form is not attested anywhere else,<sup>54</sup> *šigištu* is with all probability derived from *šagāšu* ‘to murder, to slaughter.’ However, the meaning ‘killing, slaughter’ does not fit the context: the mildness of the penalty (10 shekels), as well as the occurrence of *risbatu* ‘brawl (?)’ in the next section of the fragment from

<sup>50</sup> Cf., for instance, [*lūr*]umma *ši-ma-tu<sub>2</sub> unakkar* ‘I will enter (Uruk) and change the customs’ (CAD Š<sub>3</sub> 13a). However, as rightly observed by George (2003:800), “the spelling *ši-ma-tu<sub>2</sub>*, if correctly read,” may also be “taken as an example of a literary singular, *šimatu*.”

<sup>51</sup> Thus, the copies of Thompson (1930, pl. 6 v 2) and Parpola (1997:7, l. 205) both show a clear MA.

<sup>52</sup> Cf., however, Haupt’s note to the copy: “Könnte allenfalls auch IGI MA UD sein.”

<sup>53</sup> The initial angle wedge of the sign IGI is probably placed too high.

<sup>54</sup> *IG-te-el* seem to represent the perfect of a middle weak verb, cf. Al-Rawi 1982:120; Roth 1990:70f.

Tell Haddad,<sup>55</sup> make it likely that § 47 of the Laws of Eshnunna should be seen as a parallel to § 206 of the Laws of Hammurapi:

*šumma awilum awilam ina risbatim imtaḥaṣ-ma simmam ištakanšu awilum  
šū ina ūdū lā amḥaṣu itamma u asām ippal*

‘If a man struck a man in a brawl (?) and inflicted upon him a wound, that man shall swear, “I did not strike purposely,” and he shall pay the physician.’

It seems probable that both texts refer to a mitigating circumstance of the injury. Given the fact that *risbatu* is commonly interpreted as a designation of fight of which both parties are equally guilty,<sup>56</sup> also *šigištu* is likely to be taken to mean ‘fight, brawl.’<sup>57</sup>

With due caution, l. 222 can be read as follows: [...] *-um-ma ši-giš-tu<sub>2</sub> u<sub>2</sub>-nak-kar* ‘[The migh]ty (i. e. Enkidu) will change (the course of) the fighting.’ What is meant is probably not merely a brawl, but rather athletic contests between Gilgameš and the menfolk of Uruk which were reported to Enkidu by Šamhat (l. 212//219, v. fn. 27).<sup>58</sup> As is well known, these contests are portrayed in the Epic as oppressing the citizens of Uruk (Tigay 1982:184ff.; Klein 2002:190f.; George 2003:449). So far, Gilgameš could permanently triumph over his subjects, but now the course of the events may, for the first time, be changed.<sup>59</sup>

**Line 223.** Here we are faced with a unique combination of two stock phrases. The first half of the line ([*ša in*]*a šēri i”aldu*) recalls the frequent description of Enkidu as born in the wild, cf. *wa-al-da šērim*(EDIN) *mi-it-lu-kam i”-l[e]-i* ‘The wild-born was able to give counsel’ (OB Harmal<sub>2</sub> 47); *wa-al-dam še’-ri-im* *mi-it-lu-ka-am i-le-’i<sub>3</sub>* ‘The wild-born was able to give counsel’ (OB IM 19); [*ša<sub>2</sub> i’-al-dam-ma ina* *š[ēri*(EDIN) *mit-lu-ka i-le-’i*] ‘[The one] who was born in the w[ild] was able to give counsel’ (SB IV 26, and cf. IV 107). In all these passages, it is Enkidu’s cleverness that is associated with the fact that he was born in the wild (v. George 2003:819). In our case, however, it is rather his strength that is in issue.

<sup>55</sup> This section is absent from the Tablet A. It is, however, more likely that it was omitted from this source rather than added to the fragment from Tell Haddad (Yaron 1988:28f.).

<sup>56</sup> V., for example, Driver–Miles 1952:412 and Westbrook 1992:61ff., where similar provisions from Exodus and the Hittite Laws are also discussed.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Al-Rawi 1982:118 (‘brawl’), Roth 1990:70 (‘fray (?)’).

<sup>58</sup> As regards the provisions from the Laws of Hammurapi and the Laws of Eshnunna cited above, one may wonder whether the meaning ‘wrestling, contest’ for *risbatu* and *šigištu* could fit the context better than ‘brawl, affray.’

<sup>59</sup> Cf. also the interpretation of I 216–223 in Tigay 1982:186 and Klein 2002:190.

The epithet *dan emūqīšu* ‘mighty in strength’ is found in the Epic as a part of the stock couplet *ina māti dan emūqīšu // kīma kišri ša Ani dunnunā emūqāšu* ‘In the land he is mighty in strength, // his strength is as mighty as a rock from the sky’ (v. George 2003:793).

The spelling *e-mu-qi<sub>2</sub>-i-šu* in tablets from Kuyunjik (I 223, MS P; I 269, 292 MS B<sub>1</sub>) is usually taken to comprise *emūqu* ‘strength’ and *išū* ‘to have’: *emūqī išū*.<sup>60</sup> This interpretation is corroborated mainly by the spelling *e-mu-qa i-[šu<sub>(2)</sub>]* on a Babylonian tablet (I 292, MS o). It may also be indirectly confirmed by the fact that *emūqu* is often attested in combination with *išū*.<sup>61</sup> A piece of conflicting evidence comes from another Babylonian tablet where we read *e-mu-qi<sub>2</sub>-šu<sub>2</sub>* (I 269, 292, MS h). According to George (2003:803), this spelling “may be a witness to a different tradition, rather than an example of crasis or a mistake.” Read in this way, *emūqīšu* is to be combined with the stative form *dan*. The phrase *dan emūqīšu* seems to represent the *tamyīz*-construction recently discussed at length by N. Wasserman (2003:29ff.). Wasserman’s definition of *tamyīz* is as follows: “the specific bicomponental construction comprising a noun in the accusative case accompanied by a predicative stative <...> The noun in the accusative denotes a POSSESSUM to which a specific, inherent and inseparable quality is attributed by the stative form, i. e. QUALIFIER <...> although *T*. is formally a bipartite construction, logically it involves *three* constituents in the following collocation: ‘As for X [POSSESSOR], his Y (POSSESSUM)—which relates to him inalienably—is qualified as Z (QUALIFIER)’” (ibid. 29f.). Thus, *dan emūqīšu* can be rendered as ‘he (Enkidu) is mighty in strength.’ The spelling *e-mu-qi<sub>2</sub>(-)-i-šu* in the Kuyunjik manuscripts B<sub>1</sub> and P is therefore ambiguous. I prefer to read *emūqīšu*, since this reading has a striking parallel in Gilg. MB Nippur<sub>1</sub> 3, where a singular form of *emūqu* is used: *lu da-an e-mu-qa* ‘let him (Gilgameš’s rival, i. e. Enkidu) be mighty in strength.’<sup>62</sup>

<sup>60</sup> Cf., for instance ‘Der Stärkste im Land ist er, Kräft hat er’ (Schott-von Soden 1988:19); ‘Mightiest in the land, he possesses strength’ (George 2003:545).

<sup>61</sup> Cf., for instance *dan-na e-mu-qa e-li-ka i-ši* ‘he is stronger than you’ (SB Gilg. I 238); *e-ru-u<sub>2</sub> <...> ki-ma ne<sub>2</sub>-ši-im na-e-ri e-mu-qa<sub>2</sub>-am i-šu* ‘the eagle <...> gained strength like (that of) a raging lion’ (Haul 2000:113f. vi 3’-4’).

<sup>62</sup> *e-mu-qa i-[šu<sub>(2)</sub>]* in MS o (I 292) is thus to be considered a secondary development, apparently under the influence of passages like Gilg. SB I 238 cited above.

## References

- Al-Rawi 1982 Al-Rawi, F. N. H. Assault and Battery. *Sumer* 38:117–120.
- Al-Rawi 1985 Al-Rawi, F. N. H. Nabopolassar's Restoration Work on *Imgur-Enlil* at Babylon. *Iraq* 47:1–13.
- Beaulieu 2002 Beaulieu, P.-A. *Ayakkum* in the Basetki Inscription of Na-rām-Sîn. *NABU* 2002/36.
- Black 1998 Black, J. *Reading Sumerian Poetry*. Ithaca.
- Borger 1969 Borger, R. Die erste Teiltafel **zi-pa<sub>3</sub>**-Beschwörungen (ASKT 11). Dietrich, M.; Röllig, W. (eds.). *Lišān mitĥurti. Festschrift Wolfram Freiherr von Soden*. Kevelaer–Neukirchen-Vluyn. Pp. 1–22.
- Buccellati 1976 Buccellati, G. On the Akkadian “Attributive” Genitive. *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 3:19–27.
- Cooper 1977 Cooper, J. S. Gilgamesh Dreams of Enkidu: The Evolution and Dilution of Narrative. Ellis, M. de J. (ed.). *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein*. Hamden. Pp. 39–44.
- Dercksen 2005 Dercksen, J. G. Adad is King! The Sargon Text from Kültepe (with an appendix on MARV 4, 138 and 140). *JEOL* 39:107–129.
- Driver–Miles 1952 Driver, G. R.; Miles, J. C. *The Babylonian Laws*. Vol. 1. *Legal Commentary*. Oxford.
- Ebeling 1932–1933 Ebeling, E. Review of Thompson 1930. *Afo* 8:226–232.
- Farber 1991 Farber, W. The City Wall of Babylon: A Belt-cord? *NABU* 1991/72.
- Foster 2001 Foster, B. R. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*. New York.
- Frayne 1993 Frayne, D. R. *Sargonic and Gutian Periods (2334–2113 B. C.)*. Toronto.
- Gardner–Maier 1984 Gardner, J.; Maier, J. *Gilgamesh, Translated from the Sin-leqi-unninnī Version*. New York.
- George 1991a George, A. R. Seven Words. *NABU* 1991/19.
- George 1991b George, A. R. The City Wall of Babylon: A Belt Cord. *NABU* 1991/101.
- George 2003 George, A. R. *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic. Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts*. Oxford.
- George 2007 George, A. R. The Civilizing of Ea-Enkidu. An Unusual Tablet of the Babylonian Gilgameš Epic. *RA* 101:59–80.
- Goetze 1956 Goetze, A. *The Laws of Eshnunna*. New Haven.
- Grayson 1987 Grayson, A. K. *Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia B. C. (to 1115 B. C.)*. Toronto.
- Groneberg 1981 Groneberg, B. R. M. Philologische Bearbeitung des Agušayahymns. *RA* 75:107–134.
- Haul 2000 Haul, M. *Das Etana-Epos. Ein Mythos von der Himmelfahrt des Königs von Kiš*. Göttingen.
- Haupt 1884–1891 Haupt, P. *Das babylonische Nimrodepos*. 2 vols. Leipzig.

- Haupt 1901 Haupt, P. The Beginning of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic. *JAOS* 22:7–12.
- Heidel 1949 Heidel, A. *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*. Chicago.
- Hruša 2010 Hruša, I. *Die akkadische Synonymenliste malku = šarru* (AOAT 50). Münster.
- Jensen 1900 Jensen, P. *Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen und Epen*. Berlin.
- Klein 2002 Klein, J. A New Look at the “Oppression of Uruk” Episode in the Gilgameš Epic. Abusch, T. (ed.). *Riches Hidden in Secret Places. Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of Thorkild Jacobsen*. Winona Lake. Pp. 187–201.
- Kouwenberg 1997 Kouwenberg, N. J. C. *Gemination in the Akkadian Verb*. Assen.
- Kovacs 1989 Kovacs, M. G. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*. Stanford.
- Lambert 1989 Lambert, W. G. A Babylonian Prayer to Anūna. George, A. R.; Finkel, I. L. (eds.). *DUMU-E<sub>2</sub>-DUB-BA-A. Studies in Honor of Åke W. Sjöberg* (OPSNKF 11). Philadelphia. Pp. 321–336.
- Maul 2008 Maul, S. M. *Das Gilgamesch-Epos. Neu übersetzt und kommentiert. Vierte, durchgesehene Auflage*. München.
- Mayer 1976 Mayer, W. R. *Untersuchungen zur Formensprache der babylonischen “Gebetsbeschwörungen.”* Rome.
- Metzler 2002 Metzler, K. A. *Tempora in altbabylonischen literarischen Texten*. Münster.
- Moran 1984 Moran, W. L. Additions to the Amarna Lexicon. *Or* 53: 297–302.
- Moran 1992 Moran, W. L. *The Amarna Letters*. Baltimore.
- Parpola 1997 Parpola, S. *The Standard Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh*. Helsinki.
- Roaf 2000 Roaf, M. *Cultural Atlas of Mesopotamia and the Ancient Near East*. Oxford.
- Röllig 2009 Röllig, W. *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*. Stuttgart.
- Roth 1990 Roth, M. T. On LE §§ 46–47A. *NABU* 1990/92.
- Schaudig 2001 Schaudig, H. *Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Großen*. Münster.
- Schott 1934 Schott, A. Zu meiner Übersetzung des Gilgameš-Epos. *ZA* 42:92–143.
- Schott–von Soden 1988 Schott, A.; von Soden, W. *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*. Stuttgart.
- Streck 1999 Streck, M. P. *Die Bildersprache der akkadischen Epik*. Münster.
- Streck 2000 Streck, M. P. *Das amurratische Onomastikon der altbabylonischen Zeit*. Münster.
- Thompson 1930 Thompson, R. C. *The Epic of Gilgamish*. Oxford.
- Tigay 1982 Tigay, J. H. *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*. Philadelphia.
- Tournay–Shaffer 1994 Tournay, R. J.; Shaffer, A. *L’épopée de Gilgamesh*. Paris.
- Ungnad 1921 Ungnad, A. *Die Religion der Babylonier und Assyrer*. Jena.
- Vanstiphout 1991 Vanstiphout, H. L. J. A Further Note on Ebiḫ. *NABU* 1991/103.

- von Soden 1959      von Soden, W. Beiträge zum Verständnis des babylonischen Gilgameš-Epos. *ZA* 53:209–235.
- von Soden 1971      von Soden, W. Der grosse Hymnus an Nabû. *ZA* 61:44–71.
- Wasserman 2003      Wasserman, N. *Style and Form in Old Babylonian Literary Texts*. Leiden.
- Westbrook 1992      Westbrook, R. The Trial Scene in the Iliad. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 94:53–76.
- Wilcke 1969          Wilcke, C. *Das Lugalbandaepos*. Wiesbaden.
- Wiseman 1975      Wiseman, D. J. A Gilgamesh Epic Fragment from Nimrud. *Iraq* 37:157–163.
- Yaron 1988          Yaron, R. *The Laws of Eshnunna*. 2nd rev. ed. Jerusalem–Leiden.
- Zgoll 2010          Zgoll, A. *Monumentum Aere Perennius*—Mauerring und Ringkomposition im Gilgameš-Epos. Shehata, D.; Weierhäuser, F.; Zand, K. (eds.). *Von Göttern und Menschen. Beiträge zu Literatur und Geschichte des Alten Orients. Festschrift für Brigitte Groneberg*. Leiden–Boston. Pp. 443–470.