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The publication of the present work has a long and complicated history. When Ferris J. Stephens retired from the curatorship of the Babylonian Collection in 1962, and I arrived to take his place, one of the first problems confronting me was a large backlog of unfinished and half-finished manuscripts. These included dissertations written under the direction of Stephens or of Albrecht Goetze, and monographs and collections of copies prepared by former students and other collaborators. I therefore decided to bring the authors in question back to New Haven to finish their manuscripts where possible, or to enlist other collaborators for the same purpose where it was not. To this end, applications were successfully made to the National Endowment for the Humanities for summer grants—five in all during the period 1968–77—which eventually resulted in, or contributed materially to, the publication of a dozen monographs (BIN 3, YNER 4–7, and YOS 11–14 and 17–18, as well as B. Buchanan's ENES).

Richard L. Litke's *A Reconstruction of the Assyro-Babylonian God-Lists, AN=Anum and AN: Anu ša amēli* was not included in this program. Its problems were of a different order. Litke's copies were superlative, and his edition incorporated virtually all the published duplicates, notably those from the British Museum published by L.W. King in CT 24–25. He had the benefit of comments not only from Stephens, his advisor, but also from other experts, such as Benno Landsberger, as I can verify from my service as the latter's initial assistant (1954–56) under his Guggenheim Foundation grant. But the existence of numerous unpublished duplicates and the occasional resort to non-An=Anum parallels meant that his edition, however helpful as a first attempt, could not be regarded as definitive. For so crucial a testimony to the religions of antiquity, it seemed better to delay matters long enough to incorporate the balance of the relevant material.

The author himself had meantime withdrawn to private life in Walla Walla, Washington, where he was in no position to make the desired changes. Nor did he consider coming back to New Haven for the purpose. However, once located with the help of the late Warren C. Cowgill, my colleague in Linguistics, the author was more than willing to cooperate in any way possible to help others achieve it. Indeed, over the many years that have intervened, he has never failed to support each decision made here to this end.

The first of these was the preparation of an index to Litke's edition by Maria de Jong Ellis in 1970. The second was taken the following year, when, on the occasion of the XIX' Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (RAI) in Paris, my late colleague Jacob J. Finkelstein approached...
W.G. Lambert with the suggestion that he take on the task of bringing the edition up to date. This invitation, which I seconded, was duly accepted and, for the next ten years, Lambert prepared detailed commentaries on each of the first three tablets (chapters) of the series and sent them to me for review. The last of these submissions was in 1981.

From the first, the essential importance of the Litke edition was widely recognized, especially in connection with the Reallexikon der Assyriologie (RLA), which had resumed publication with volume 3 in 1957 under the general editorship, first of Ernst Weidner and Wolfram von Soden, then, from 1976 on, of Dietz Otto Edzard. Edzard requested and secured permission to receive a copy of Litke’s dissertation for the RLA (permission otherwise routinely denied), and the results are visible in RLA 4ff. More recently, the same courtesy was extended to Jacob Klein for the same purpose.

Subsequently it became apparent that other duties were preventing Lambert from completing his edition in the near future. In its admirably thorough coverage, moreover, it was turning from a straightforward edition into a major commentary on the text. Nevertheless, it was hoped that the original plan could be carried through to completion. That sentiment was conveyed to Lambert by letter of August 2, 1994, and in person by myself and Ulla Kasten, Museum Editor for the Babylonian Collection, on the occasion of the XLV RA in Berlin in 1994.

If it has now been decided to opt for another solution, it is in part because there were no new results from these exchanges of ideas, and in part because the progress of technology has made it feasible to reproduce the original manuscript without setting it anew in type.1 The book has been supplied with this foreword at one end and the index at the other, and with headers for ready identification of each tablet (chapter). Otherwise, Litke’s text appears here exactly as submitted in 1958. It is obvious that in the forty years that have intervened, the progress of Assyriology has been enormous. Hence any attempt at even the most partial updating of the material would be doomed to the same lengthy delays already experienced. It is hoped that with the publication of the dissertation, the author’s great patience and forbearance will be, to some extent, vindicated, and that an early completion of Lambert’s painstaking commentary will be stimulated.

The series Texts from the Babylonian Collection (TBC) was inaugurated in 1985 with a gift from the late Barbara Clay Debevoise, long a benefactress of the Collection, and is here carried forward with a grant from her daughter, Elizabeth Debevoise Healy. It is well suited for the purpose of presenting YBC 2401 to the scholarly world. The parallels from other collections incorporated in the edition have nearly all appeared in print elsewhere. In those few cases where unpublished parallels were utilized, this has been done with the permission of the appropriate authorities as indicated ad loc.

1. The alternative of converting the original typescript—with the exception of the preface, list of abbreviations, and introduction—to printed type by means of Optical Character Recognition (OCR) had to be rejected because of the expense and the considerable risk of errors entailed.

When Anton Deimel published the first great compendium of Mesopotamian divine names in 1914, he called it Pantheon Babylonicum. This edition of An-Anum could hardly be entitled “Pantheon Assyricum,” but like K. 4349, its duplicate in the British Museum, YBC 2401 is the work of one and the same Middle Assyrian scribe, Kidin-Sin, the son of the royal scribe called simply “the Sutean” (suti-ri). In K. 4349, both are called A. Ba, literally “abecedarian,” perhaps a hint that they could also write Aramaic on parchment or papyrus.2 Both may have been active in the time of Tiglath-pileser I (1114-1076 B.C.),3 but whether they worked for his library, or indeed whether there was such a library, has been questioned.4

Deimel counted 3300 discrete names of deities in 1914. By 1950, the second edition of his Pantheon brought the number up to 5580 (or 5367 after subtracting cross-references).5 YBC 2401 explains 2123 of these in its seven tablets; the addition of An-Anum ta amûlî brings the total to 2280, or more than 40% of those catalogued by Deimel. It truly deserves the designation of tupkalûl (dagballa) or “monster tablet” reserved for the prototypes of its London duplicate6 and of the “Tale of the Fox” and perhaps other fables.7 On the occasion of the XLY RAI, Litke’s edition is now finally offered to the entire field of ancient Near Eastern studies. It should open a whole new window on the scholars of the Middle Assyrian court, and on the invisible world about them as conceived by them, their predecessors, and their successors throughout ancient Mesopotamia.

William W. Hallo
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PREFACE

For a study of the religion and culture of the Assyro-Babylonians, the explanatory series An:4An-
numum possesses unique importance. Because it contains not only a systematic catalog of the
ancient pantheon of these peoples, but also an explanation of the relationships of the numerous
deities within the pantheon to one another, such a list is an invaluable aid to the proper
understanding of almost every type of written document that has come down from ancient
Mesopotamia.

Although a large number of duplicate texts of this ancient god-list have been published, the
imperfect condition of most of these texts has always caused some uncertainty as to the
arrangement of the material within the series; and the numerous lacunae in this important work
have often detracted from its general usefulness. From time to time, efforts have been put forth
to reconstruct the series, but the difficulties involved have limited such efforts. There has been,
therefore, a real need for texts of the series that are more complete and that can provide a means
of locating the position of the many texts that have already been published.

To meet this need, the text YBC 2401 (which is here presented for the first time) is of special
importance. Because it contains all of the canonical tablets of the series, written on one large
tablet, and because it is better preserved than most of the other duplicate texts of this work, YBC
2401 provides not only a suitable control for the location of the various fragmentary duplicates
of the series, but it also provides a means of restoring the greater part of the contents of this work.

It is the objective of the present report to present a fresh reconstruction of both An:4An-
um and the smaller list An: Anu ameli, based upon this new text and all other known
duplicates of the two series. It is hoped that such an undertaking will prove helpful in the
understanding of an ancient civilization among whom religion played such a dominant role.

It is a pleasure for the writer to express, at this point, his appreciation to all those who have
made this work possible. To Dr. Ferris J Stephens of Yale University, a special debt of gratitude
is owed for his constant interest and guidance during the period of research, as well as for his
numerous suggestions during the time of the final preparation of this report. Also, the writer
owes much to Dr. Landsberger of the University of Chicago, who so kindly gave much of his
valuable time to the reading of the preliminary copy of the text of the present reconstruction.
Their helpful counsel and valuable suggestions have immeasurably enriched the restoration
contained in the following pages (without being responsible in any way for errors that this work

xi
may contain). The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Mr. R. D. Barnett of the Department of West Asiatic Antiquities at the British Museum, for permission to quote from the unpublished texts K. 2110, K. 11194, and 45639. Finally, the writer expresses his thanks in a special way to his wife for the typing of the manuscript of this report.
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<td>American Journal of Archaeology</td>
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<td>American Schools of Oriental Research, Supplementary Series</td>
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<td>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</td>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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<td>Emeus Vocabulary, dimir : dingir : ilum (MSL IV 4–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlima-ellij</td>
<td>The Epic of Enlima-ellij (line numbering according to R. Labat and the restorations in ZA 47 1f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FarII</td>
<td>A. Delitz, Die Inschriften von Farra II (WVDOG 43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauna</td>
<td>B. Landsberger, Die Fauna Mesopotamiens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilg.</td>
<td>The Epic of Gilgameš (line numbering according to R. C. Thompson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haupt AV</td>
<td>P. Haupt Anniversary Volume</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

When portions of the series An : d A-nu-um were first published, the scope of the series involved was unknown. In the titles given to these texts, it was simply stated that they were "mythological" texts, and a more exact appraisal of their nature was left to future scholars. With the appearance of other duplicate fragments of this work, it became increasingly evident that these broken texts represented parts of a major series—a series that presented a systematic explanation of the Assyro-Babylonian pantheon, as worshiped in late Assyrian times.

The task of restoring this ancient document was greatly facilitated by the publication of CT 24 and 25. These were quickly followed by the helpful analyses by Meissner, which provided a means of properly placing many of the fragments published in CT 24 and 25. But it was not until the appearance of Zimmern's "Zur Herstellung der grosser babylonischen Göttelisten An = (ilu) Anum" that the actual scope and general arrangement of the series became clear. Zimmern based his reconstruction upon the discovery that the emesal god-list, K. 171 (II R 59), represents an abbreviated dialectal series that closely parallels the series An : d A-nu-um. With this smaller list as a guide, he was able to determine the position of many previously unlocated fragments of the larger work and to discover that the series was divided into approximately six tablets when complete.

The new text, YBC 2401, largely confirms the work of Zimmern (although some of his conclusions are subject to modification); and it now makes the reconstruction of the series attainable on a much wider scale than was formerly possible.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF GOD-LISTS IN MESOPOTAMIA

The earliest examples of god-lists that have yet been unearthed are to be found among the "school tablets" from Fara. Paleographically, these represent a period approximately during or

1. II R 54-56 and III R 67-69.
2. See especially CT 24 and 25, in which King not only republished the material that had previously appeared in II R and III R, but also included a large number of other texts of the series. A few other fragments have also appeared in other publications, e.g., cf. KAV 50, 51, et al.; RA 17 185 (Rm. 930) and 194 f. (KL 1904-10-9, 61); and SLT 121.
3. OLZ 12 197 ff.; OLZ 13 61 ff. and 97 ff.
4. BSGW 63 pp. 83 ff.
5. However, since Zimmern's reconstruction was presented only in outline form, its general usefulness has been quite limited.
just before the time of Ur--Nazi, indicating the great antiquity of the practice of compiling lists of gods. Written at a time when the Mesopotamian system of writing had only recently passed beyond the stage of simple pictographs, the Fara god-lists, nevertheless, exhibit an impressive array of deities that probably numbered over five hundred names.

The ancient lists from Fara, with their surprisingly imposing pantheon, have yet to be fully analyzed; in fact, many of the names therein can be read only with great difficulty because of the archaic nature of the script. There are certain features, however, of these ancient lists that may be linked with later inventories of divine names. For example, even at this early date, the custom of beginning each list with the name of Enlil seems to have been mandatory. The second place in the pantheon was occupied by the goddess Innanna, and Enki was listed third. The names of Nanna and Utu also appear near the beginning of these lists. The order of these important gods in the Fara texts compares favorably with the ranking of the same names in later lists; but, generally speaking, there seems to be no real traceable ties between the ancient god-lists from Fara and later traditions such as that contained in the series An: A-nu-um.

It seems safe to say that during the long interval of time between the period represented by the Fara texts and the time of the third dynasty of Ur, the compilation of god-lists was a practice not unknown to the people who inhabited Babylonia. Direct evidence for such activity must await the results of future excavations; but indirect evidence may be found in the fact that there were at least four different traditions of such lists in existence during the Isin-Larsa period. These are exemplified in the Nippur lists, the Old Babylonian list, the "Weidner god-list," and a small unpublished fragment of an Old Babylonian list, now in the possession of the Copenhagen National Museum.

At the present time, the relationship between these various traditions seems quite tenuous and difficult to analyze; nor does it seem possible to discover any demonstrable ties between them and the older Fara god-lists. The four lists doubtless reflect the local cult traditions in as many religious centers—possibly representing the ranking of the deities and sub-deities as worshiped in the respective religious centers. In this respect, since the various leading gods probably represent older patron deities of distinct political units, the ranking of the pantheon in these lists may ultimately reflect the play and counterplay of political fortunes in early Babylonia even more than the independent development of theological concepts.

At least one of these older lists, however, demonstrates clear ties with the series An: A-nu-um, for the Old Babylonian list AO. 5376 quite obviously belongs to the same tradition that produced the later series. A comparison of the two lists based upon a relative ranking of a few of the more important gods of the pantheon may convey the superficial impression that the two lists have little or nothing in common; but a more careful study of the various names that are grouped together in both lists quickly reveals the fact that AO. 5376 is in reality an Old Babylonian forerunner of An: A-nu-um.

Between the text AO. 5376 and the later canonical list, there must have been a number of intermediate lists; but texts of these intermediate forms of the series are not to be found among tablets that are currently available. In fact, even examples of the Babylonian copies of the final form of the series are scarcely represented among extant tablets. Practically all of the copies of the later series are texts written by Assyrian scribes, and it is probable that these represent copies made directly or indirectly from Babylonian originals that are, of course, now lost.

In its final form, the series An: A-nu-um represented a bulky list that was divided into six or more tablets. For purely practical reasons, some of these were subdivided by certain scribes, resulting in a larger total number of tablets in some temple or scribal collections. A late
development in the formation of the series was the addition of the material designated in the present work as Tablet VII—material not contained in either the Old Babylonian forerunner or in the parallel emerald list.\footnote{In YBC 2401, the smaller series is separated from the main series by a blank space of about five lines and two pairs of ruling lines.}

In its final state, the usual form of the series, obviously, was the collection of six or more single tablets, but there are two exemplars that contained the whole series on one large tablet. This type of text, of course, represents a highly useful tool in the work of restoring the series, because it preserves the traditional sequence of the various individual tablets much better than the single tablet editions whose important colophons are all too frequently unpreserved. YBC 2401 represents one of these larger tablets.\footnote{For the organization and contents of this list, see p. 15.} Because it was written in a much smaller script than usual and was copied upon a clay tablet of larger proportions than most clay tablets,\footnote{CT 24 54–56. It is possible that KAV 64 and CT 24 19 are also fragments of this same series. If so, CT 24 19 would constitute the initial section of the series. Other fragments that are possible duplicates of this series include CT 24 9 K. 11055; CT 24 49 K. 48408; and CT 25 8 obr.} this unusual text was able to accommodate the contents of all of the original tablets of the series and still maintain the original format of these tablets.\footnote{See pp. 3 ff.} The place where each of the original tablets ended is indicated in this text by the use of summaries and double ruled lines. A similar text of this type, containing the entire series on a single clay tablet, is the "Great God-List" of the British Museum.\footnote{See n. 23.} This text, however, does not completely follow the format of the original tablets. In order to include at least two other series in addition to An : d A-nu-um on this large tablet,\footnote{Note that in the colophon of YBC 2401 xii 95, the scribe states that he copied from the "older tablets" (ana} the scribe was forced to crowd his material. Whenever possible, therefore, he allotted two entries to each line and, as a rule, omitted dittos in the second half of the lines as well as certain minor explanatory details.

A number of fragmentary texts of other series have also been published.\footnote{See pp. 5 ff.} Unfortunately, however, it is probably still too early to envisage a practical reconstruction of most of these. In fact, it is not an easy task even to determine which fragments belong to which series. One of these series, An : Anu sa ameli, is so nearly completely preserved, however, that it seems feasible to include a restoration of it along with the present reconstruction of An : d A-nu-um.

The existence of this smaller series was suspected by Zimmerm;\footnote{Zimmern correctly based his supposition upon the colophon of CT 24 46 3–5, which states that in the "Great God-List," the scribe wrote (al-ta' tar") An : Anu sa ameli in combination with (if-a-ni) An : d A-nu-um. The beginning of this series is now given by YBC 2401, which finally clarifies its status and justifies its treatment as a separate series. A restoration of this list reveals that it is the result of a tradition that was completely independent from An : d A-nu-um; between the two series there seem to be no traceable ties.}\footnote{Especially in CT 24 56.43–49.} but, because the beginning of the series was unpreserved in the texts that were available to him, its status was somewhat obscure. Zimmern correctly based his supposition upon the colophon of CT 24 46 3–5, which states that in the "Great God-List," the scribe wrote (al-ta' tar") An : Anu sa ameli in combination with (if-a-ni) An : d A-nu-um. The beginning of this series is now given by YBC 2401, which finally clarifies its status and justifies its treatment as a separate series. A restoration of this list reveals that it is the result of a tradition that was completely independent from An : d A-nu-um; between the two series there seem to be no traceable ties.\footnote{See n. 23.} In the "Great God-List," there is evidence of the existence of still another series besides An : d A-nu-um and An : Anu sa ameli.\footnote{CT 24 54–56. It is possible that KAV 64 and CT 24 19 are also fragments of this same series. If so, CT 24 19 would constitute the initial section of the series. Other fragments that are possible duplicates of this series include CT 24 9 K. 11055; CT 24 49 K. 48408; and CT 25 8 obr.} Even though this third series is only partly preserved, it is clear that it belongs to the same stemma as An : d A-nu-um, although (as was the case with the text AO. 5570)\footnote{See pp. 3 ff.} the relative order of the various main deities and families may very slightly from the larger list. This series (which, for convenience, may be designated the "Smaller An : d A-nu-um") is less detailed than the main series, and often merely gives abbreviated summaries.\footnote{For the details as to the size of YBC 2401, see p. 16.} This may favor the possibility that the "Smaller An : d A-nu-um" represents a later extract series based upon the material in the larger series. However, the fact that the smaller series follows a slightly different tradition in the order of the main deities would seem to argue against this assumption and may point instead to the possibility that the "Smaller An : d A-nu-um" actually represents a transcript of one of the precursors of An : d A-nu-um, occupying a position about midway between the Old Babylonian list AO. 5570 and the later canonical series.\footnote{See Preface.} This third series may have been mentioned in the colophon of the "Great God-List,"\footnote{51 r. 35 gives "tablet 5" as the number of the section that corresponds to the third tablet in the other texts. KAV 51, therefore, probably represents a tradition that substituted two of the first three tablets. The so-called "ninth tablet" of the series, however, (CT 24 18) cannot be explained on this basis. It represents a fragment of an unrelated series, and has nothing to do with names of deities; see Zimmerm, BSWG 63 124 f.} which, provisionally, may be restored as follows:

1. SU.NIGIN DIS.DI.DI.DI. DIS. DIS. [10 x MU.BI An : d A-nu-um]
2. a-di An : d A-nu-um labiru/sehruru u
3. An : d A-nu-um An : Anu sa ameli "tu"
4. qaq-queru im-da' da'
5. it-ti-nis al-ta' tar"
of these other lists is unknown, and their scope is uncertain. Some of the fragments of these appear to belong to an elaborate series characterized by numerous explanations of the geographical relationships of various deities. This series, or type of series (which may be provisionally designated "type F," because of the emphasis it places upon foreign deities), exhibits a form closely resembling that of An : d A-nu-um, but the two traditions should be distinguished from each other. How many other separate series are involved in the numerous fragments published in CT 25 is, as yet, difficult to determine.

The INNER STRUCTURE OF THE SERIES AN : d A-nu-um

The series An : d A-nu-um can hardly be correctly classed as a lexical text for it makes no attempt to list Sumerian and Akkadian equivalents. It is, instead, an explanatory list that seeks to clarify the offices and relationships of the numerous members of the pantheon. Unlike most lexical texts, this series is not even Akkadian in its composition, but rather, Sumerian. Failure to recognize these facts has led some to make forced Akkadian translations of the Sumerian explanations and has sometimes obscured the meaning of these explanations.

The brief explanations contained in An : d A-nu-um characterize the deities in various ways. Sometimes, the explanation involves a descriptive statement of the family relationship of the deity with respect to a previous entry. In other instances, the occupation of a deity within the household of another god is elucidated. The explanations often amount to nothing more than simple identifications with other deities, or merely give alternate names (as indicated by dittos, unless only one entry is involved, in which case the main name of the deity may be repeated) by which these deities were also known.

The scribes obviously followed a general plan or outline in presenting the material contained in the series, although the plan was not inflexible. The nearly two thousand names contained in the series are generally presented as subordinate members within the circles of the more important gods, and the names of the greater gods thus form the major divisions in the series.

As each name appears in the list, it is followed by whatever alternate names that deity may have possessed. Usually, the name of the spouse of the god is given next; and after this, a list is given of any sons or daughters or servants the god may have had. If the name of the god becomes too far removed from any of the names of his wife, children or servants by the multiplicity of entries, his name is sometimes repeated (in a genitive construction) to avoid ambiguity. This latter type of explanation, however, should be distinguished from the entry in which an additional identification is appended to the explanation of the family relationship. Such an entry may be recognized by the omission of the genitive construction.42)

In detailing the members of the household of a god, the names of any children that the god may have may have possessed were usually placed by the scribes immediately after the name of the spouse. Usually, whatever servants the deity may have had in his household were listed next; although this procedure was not necessarily always followed. Occasionally, the chief servant of the household claimed the more important place, and his name was therefore registered before those of any of the children of the main god. In listing the various servants belonging to a god, the scribes do not appear to have followed any particular order, indicating the relative rank of titles used, nor have the scribes assigned the same types of servants to every deity. Chief in rank among the servants and officials in the retinues of the various gods was obviously the sukkal; but only important deities appear to have had a sukkal in their entourage.43 Other servants in the divine household included the gug.DU,B,44 the dingir.gub.ba,45 the ni.dub, 46 etc.

In giving the abbreviated details contained in the explanatory side of each column, the series makes use of certain forms that merit special attention. In particular, the sign MIN exhibits certain peculiarities that should be noted. In a broad sense, MIN corresponds to the modern ditto marks, and for this reason it is transliterated in the present work with ditto marks; but merely identifying MIN with ditto marks does not neatly explain all of the possibilities of this sign. Several problems of interpretation arise when one is confronted with a section like Tablet I 336–339:

| 336. dNin.ka.ls | dSîm |
| 337. dMEN.dn<t>1|<t>Sîm | |
| 338. dKA$ | | |
| 339. dKA$;GIN | | |

47. See Table I 332 where 4<sup>Ir.rag.a</sup> is not only explained as "her (of 4<sup>Nin.SAR</sup>) husband," but also is equated with "Nergal. See also the complex entries in Tablet I 239 (where 4<sup>Nin.nu</sup> is explained as the sister of 4<sup>Nin.urta</sup> as well as the wife of the deity in line 238) and Tablet I 241 (where 4<sup>NIT</sup> is explained as both the wife of 4<sup>Nin.man</sup> and the daughter of 4<sup>Ninsu</sup>). This usage explains the variants in Tablet I 326, where the text in D reads: 4<sup>Nin.NINDA+GUD</sup> | dam.bi | dIM. 4<sup>Nin.NINDA+GUD</sup> is her spouse (and is also) "IM." Here, text A varies with 4<sup>Nin.NINDA+GUD</sup> | dam.bi | dMK.4<sup>Nin.NINDA+GUD</sup> is his spouse, (and is) of dIM. These two texts thus vary in content as well as in form.

48. The sukkal does not appear in the series as a "messenger"; that function seems reserved for the l<sup>ha</sup>k<sup>in</sup>g<sup>ia</sup>.a. The office of the sukkal is amplified in Tablet I 29–41 where 4<sup>Nabu</sup> as the sukkal of An is portrayed under a number of different names and offices. In this section, 4<sup>Nabu</sup> is the "man of the double doors," "the sukkal who gives the staff," "the counselor of An," and "overseer of the house of An." From this, it appears that the sukkal was actually the "grand vizier" of his overlord, exercising great authority in his household.

49. Note that RAV 64 l 4 f. gives the Akkadian equivalent of gug.DU,B as su-ur-utu+dùsu "counselor." The exact function of the dingir.gub.ba is not clear. The verbal noun gub.ba may, of course, be passive in the sense of "stationed," "appointed," "set (at doing something)," etc.; but a translation of "the god who is stationed/ appointed etc." does not amplify the duties of such a functionary. Zimmer described such gods as "Standortgötter" (AGW<sup>ii</sup> 110 et al.).

50. The reading for the signs NI.GAB ("doorkeeper") has been variously as ni.dub, 4<sup>d</sup>u.dub, ni.dub, etc. I am indebted to Dr. Landsberger for the suggestion that his records lead him to the reading of ni.dub.
It is obvious that the dittos in the second half of these lines indicate that these names are alternate names for ^\text{\textit{\textsc{sm}}} (or gods that are identified with ^\text{\textit{\textsc{sm}}}). But what is the significance of the dittos before K\text{\textit{\textsc{as}}} and K\text{\textit{\textsc{as}}},^\text{\textit{\textsc{gig}}}? A comparison of similar contexts in the series discloses the simple and logical principle that dittos may be placed before a name or a sign to indicate that the pronunciation gloss of the previous line is to be repeated. Thus line 338 above should be read ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Siris}}, (\text{\textit{\textsc{Kas}}} and not ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Siris}}, (ka}}. The name in line 339 may be more complex, but the same principle applies.

A related usage of the sign for dittos is illustrated in Tablett II 159 f.:

\begin{verbatim}
159. ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Dugqa.bur}}}
160. ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Dugqa.bur}}}
\end{verbatim}

The dittos in the second half of the lines are clear; they simply indicate that these are names of En\text{\textit{\textsc{ki}}}. But the dittos before ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Dugqa.bur}}} may be difficult. Fortunately, texts outside the series clarify this line and help to elucidate the principle involved. In CT 25 487, the pronunciation of ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Dugqa.bur}}} (when applied to ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Ea}}}) is given as ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Num.ur.ra}}}. This should be placed with CT 12 21 93058 r. 1, which gives the pronunciation of this complex as num.ur.ra and again identifies the name with ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Ea}}}. This means, then, that the dittos in Tablett II 160 indicate that ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Dugqa.bur}}} is an ideogram for the name ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Num.ur}}}, and has the same pronunciation. A similar case is found in Tablett II 254 where ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Dukud}}}, clearly an ideogram for ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Ma-da-nu}}} of line 253, is as indicated by texts outside the series. In fact, wherever other texts provide a control for the names involved, ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Dugqa.bur}}} it seems clear that the general principle is to place dittos in front of an entry to show that it has the same pronunciation as the previous name. If the preceding name has a pronunciation gloss, this gloss is carried over and applied to the following name. If there is no gloss involved, the second name may be regarded as an ideogram for the first.

A related use of the dittos (and possibly an outgrowth of the previously mentioned usage) is exemplified by Tablett II 185 f.:

\begin{verbatim}
185. ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Asar.lu.bi}}}
186. ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Nam.ta.lu}}}
\end{verbatim}

52. Such a problem may at first seem quite elementary, but a more careful appraisal reveals several possible interpretations. Talpquist (AG 449) reads the name in line 338 as ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Siris.kas}}, and in line 339 as ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Siris}}, (\text{\textit{\textsc{kas}})}, although a different and more logical interpretation of the dittos is possible here. Since the dittos are used so often in the series to indicate the repetition of glosses, a misunderstanding of this basic usage could frequently lead to misread names.

53. E.g., cf. Tablett I 149–151; Tablett II 155 f., 307 f., 549 f., 352 f., et al.

54. One might reasonably question whether the entry is to be read ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Siris}, (\text{\textit{\textsc{Kas}}} and ^\text{\textit{\textsc{gig})}} or ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Siris}}, (\text{\textit{\textsc{Kas}}), (\text{\textit{\textsc{gig})}}. The latter reading may seem better because the dittos in front of ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Kas}}} may be used to show that ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Kas}}} continues to have the same value that it did in line 338. Arguing against this assumption, however, is the fact that the explanation half of the column indicates that ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Kas}}} and ^\text{\textit{\textsc{gig}}} are both identified with ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Sis}}} (read ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Siris}}}). This would point to the conclusion that ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Kas}}}, ^\text{\textit{\textsc{gig}}} should be regarded as an ideogram that has the same pronunciation as ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Kas}}} and ^\text{\textit{\textsc{gig}}}.

55. Note, however, that the complex ^\text{\textit{\textsc{Dugqa.bur}}} is used in the series as an ideogram for a number of other names—each time with a different pronunciation; see under Tablett II 26, 65, 156, 160; Tablett I 152 and 167.

56. This is controlled by KAV 63 ii 22 (which is restorable from its five-columned duplicate, KAV 47 ii 15).
The previous pronunciation gloss is to be repeated.

2. The pronunciation of the previous name is to apply to the name preceded by dittos (i.e., the name preceded by dittos is an ideogram for the previous name).

3. The name preceded by dittos is to be closely identified with the previous entry.

The sign SU, as used in this series, also presents certain difficulties. A typical example of its usage seems justifiable to regard the total Sumerian format of the sign SU (in Tablet I 70-72):

The usual interpretation of the sign SU, as used in this series, also presents certain difficulties. A typical example of its usage seems not to be made on either of these two assumptions.

It seem justifiable to regard the total Sumerian format of the sign SU (in Tablet I 70-72) as completely ideographic, certainly some portions of these explanations would be written in Akkadian. But this assumption is not without problem when applied to the series An 34-um where the signs are quite consistently presented as Sumerian in form (e.g., cf. the statement 2 gu4.DÚB | Nin-subur.kè4 in line 72 of the example quoted above). If SU is actually Akkadian (as it may well be), it would represent a borrowing from other more, strictly Akkadian contexts. Certainly, the entries would be more than familiar with its usage from its frequent occurrence in other explanatory or lexical series. Appearing, however, in a Sumerian work, the sign SU would then seem to be ideographic in its force—a scribal borrowing that reverses the usual process.

Instead of presenting Akkadian equivalents for Sumerian gods, the series is more concerned with (in spite of the somewhat misleading impression created by its opening line) the clarification of the relationships that existed between the various members of the pantheon, regardless of whether they were Sumerian or (as is more rarely the case) Akkadian deities. In fact, the series lists both Sumerian and Akkadian names together (although the latter are in the minority) with no apparent regard for their ultimate origin, nor any real regard for their Akkadian equivalents. If the explanations contained within the series were intended to be Akkadian (but written ideographically), certainly some portions of these explanations would be written in Akkadian. But the only Akkadian statements that appear are a few inserted gloss lines that explain in Akkadian the significance of a preceding Sumerian line as, for example, in Tablet I 35a, 36a, 37a, 38a, etc.

If the sign SU were used to indicate that the entry involved is to be pronounced as written, the perplexing situation arises in which numerous entries are explained with SU! that could hardly have been pronounced in any other way than that in which they are written (i.e., names that have accompanying pronunciation glosses, or that are written with unambiguous signs, or that are obvious Akkadian names). Other entries, on the other hand, that should be pronounced as written, or at least pronounced in Akkadian as in Sumerian, are not written with an expected SU. In fact, some entries with SU not only have glossed readings but also an Akkadian identification. The occurrence of such contexts seems to justify the raising of the question as to whether the significance of the sign is as yet fully understood. Although the exact force of SU in these contexts may be elusive, and a real understanding of its meaning must await further study, it may be helpful, nevertheless, to appraise some of its apparent usages in the present series.

The first and most important way in which SU is used involves lists of two or more names followed by a numerical summary. In such contexts, SU is practically mandatory in all duplicates of the series, whether the names are Sumerian or Akkadian. The lines quoted above from Tablet I furnish one example of this usage. A further example, which seems especially instructive, involves a list of four obvious Akkadian names in Tablet II 263–267:

263. Mina-a-kul-bel-li | MU  cümle.ilk.kè4
264. Mina-a-li-bel-li | SÉ. cümle.ilk.kè4
265. Mushk-il-me-br-lat-i | SU
266. Nin-in-me-es-qiti | cümle.ilk.kè4
267. 2 udug | cümle.ilk.kè4

In the case of the first two names, the sign SU apparently does not appear because each profession consisted of only one entry. But lines 265–267 represent a list of at least two names, which are summarized and, therefore, followed by SU. This particular example is interesting because of the obvious Akkadian derivation of the names involved, and because it seems to illustrate the principle that in such contexts (where a list of two or more entries is followed by a summary), the sign SU always occurs in this series. This principle seems to be independent of

11 75. This principle seems to be independent of
either the derivation or the pronunciation of the name in the entry. Because the majority of instances in which SU occurs in this series are to be found in just these summarized lists, this usage would seem to be quite important for the determination of its ultimate meaning. A few instances occur in which a summary is presented for only one name; these also contain the sign SU.75 It is probable, however, that this type of context is actually to be understood merely as a variant of the larger summarized lists.

A second important way in which SU is often used is illustrated by Tablet II 253, 254:

| 253. Ma-da-nu | gu.za.la | Mardu.k."ke | 4 |
| 254. DLKUD | SU |

These lines exemplify the format often used in presenting an entry that is an ideogram for the previous entry.77 In such cases, the explanatory section quite often contains SU (although, occasionally, dittos are given).78 In one respect, this type of entry may resemble the summarized list mentioned above. In neither context is there an appropriate detail of explanation that the scribe would have cared to record. He wished to make no statement that was peculiar to that line. In the summarized list, the explanation is made at the end of the list for all entries at one time. In the ideographic entry (as in line 254 above), the explanation that applies to the entry is already given in the previous line and needs no repetition. The previous explanation would still apply because the second name is equal to the first (this may explain why the scribes often used dittos in place of SU in such contexts79). But, although there was no explanatory detail that the scribes desired to place opposite such entries, they, nevertheless, scrupulously avoided blank spaces in the explanatory side of the column. In such places, where no appropriate identification nor explanation could be recorded nor dittos placed, the sign SU is always used.

However, the fact that the scribes manifested some uncertainty in such contexts as to whether the appropriate entry should be dittos or SU80 seems instructive. This would indicate that the scribes themselves felt some inherent relationship between the two signs—at least in contexts containing ideographic entries referring to the preceding name. When the scribe wrote the sign for dittos, he meant that the previous explanation applied equally to its ideogram. When he wrote SU, he apparently meant that there was no new explanation that could be made for the entry because the pertinent statement had already been made in the preceding entry.

A less common but possibly related usage of the sign concerns entries that have no explanations and are only loosely attached to the circle in which they are listed. Often, in fact, such entries show no discernible ties with the circle at all and no relationships with the entries that precede or follow (except, of course, with the name of a spouse or servant who may immediately follow). A typical context is found in Tablet V 46–52:

| 46. Ma-da-nu | gu.za.la | Mardu.k."ke | 4 |
| 47. DLKUD | SU |

In line 49, the god Za.ba 4 .ba 4 certainly represents an important deity within the pantheon; but the scribes give no identification here that equates him with any other deity, nor do they give any explanation of his function. His name is listed solely for its own value. His wife and sukkal, of necessity, receive explanations, but there is none for Za.ba 4 .ba 4 . Such entries, which are somewhat uncommon, at least have SU in the second half of the line; blank spaces in the second half of the column are carefully avoided.

A fourth and rarer use of SU is exemplified in contexts that have an additional (usually Akkadian) name in the explanatory side of the line. One such occurrence is found in Tablet III 268–270:

| 268. Ma-da-nu | SU |
| 269. DLKUD | SU |
| 270. DLKUD | SU |

The fact that such contexts are quite rare in the series,81 leads one to suspect that the extra names in these lines possibly represent late additions. This possibility seems stronger in contexts that (as in lines 268–270 above) exhibit Akkadian names. It seems evident that the question of the pronunciation of the entry is not involved in the explanatory side of such lines (in doubtful cases, as in lines 268–270 above, the exact pronunciation is taken care of by means of glosses). But what is the force of the extra name in such lines?

A closer study of such entries reveals that they usually represent names that are only remotely related to the contexts in which they are listed. Other examples where SU and dittos interchange are Tablet I 325, 329, 337; Tablet II 333; Tablet V 39, 39, 40, and 288 f.; see also under n. 78.

77. Other examples may be found in Tablet I 193, 337; Tablet III 267, 271–278; and possibly Tablet V 62. The context shows that Tablet III 267–278 actually form one unit.

81. See extracts from Tablets III and V above.
placed together, the additional designations were added. These may have even originally appeared as glosses, which later became part of the text.

Wherever such entries are repeated in the series in a more logical place (i.e., where they are not merely loosely attached to a given circle), the entry takes on a completely different form. For example, $\text{Sila d}(\text{na aq bu})$ in line 268 above, appears in Table II 168 as $\text{Sila d}(\text{na aq bu})$. In the latter context, the entry simply represents another name in the list of the names of $\text{Ea}$; therefore dittos are proper for the explanatory side of the line. In the former case, dittos could not be used because the entry occurs among a group of unrelated deities. $\text{SU}$ appears here to have been the most logical entry that could have been used. The addition of $\text{Ea}$ served, then, to indicate the circle to which the entry actually belonged.

It seems clear that the question of the meaning of the sign $\text{SU}$ should be re-examined. Merely listing the various types of contexts in which it may occur does not explain its ultimate meaning. At the same time, the fact that the general principles governing its usage may be listed, and the fact that these principles seem to have nothing to do with such details as whether the name in question is Sumerian or Akkadian, appear to throw some doubt upon the older interpretation that $\text{SU}$ means that "the name is to be pronounced as written," or that "the name is the same in Akkadian as in Sumerian." Whatever the real force of $\text{SU}$ may eventually prove to be, it would seem that its actual significance should be studied in the light of its usage in the large number of occurrences of $\text{SU}$ in the present series. It would thus have little to do with how the entry is to be pronounced.

In the present series, however, there are occasional examples of glosses that seem to have no direct bearing upon the pronunciation of the signs or names near which they are written. That is, glosses occur that not only fail to reflect any known value of the sign with which they are written, but that do not correspond to the signs in a duplicate text. It seems possible that many such glosses actually present evidence of a scribal desire to give alternate readings that were found in the various duplicate texts used by the scribes in making their copies. In the present series, therefore, scribal usage in the case of glosses, as well as in the case of dittos and the sign $\text{SU}$, merits careful study and may throw additional light upon scribal usage in other documents. At least, the numerous duplicates composing the present series and the connected text that is now possible should provide a helpful aid in determining the various principles of such usage.

**THE SERIES AN : ANU ŠÁ AMELI**

The form of the series An : Anu šá amelli differs greatly from that of the larger series An : Anu-num. The latter series is arranged as a purely Sumerian text with all explanations given as abbreviated Sumerian statements. But An : Anu šá amelli is more properly an Akkadian list. All the explanations that it contains are strictly Akkadian. The larger series is careful to clarify the status of each god within the pantheon and to explain the relationships of the various gods to each other. The smaller list, on the other hand, shows little interest in the status or relationships of the various gods with respect to each other. The difference between the two lists is especially marked as to the order in which the major deities are presented. An : Anu šá amelli follows an order that is completely different from that of the larger list. In fact, there seems to be no observable connection of any sort between the two documents.

The structure of the smaller series is simple. The first column presents a list of approximately 160 Sumerian gods. The second column gives a list of about twenty deities, with which the names in the first column are identified. The third column of the document reveals that each of the deities in the first column is identified with the deity in the second column only within the scope of certain relationships (expressed by šâ plus an Akkadian word in the genitive). Thus, the first three lines might be interpreted as follows:

85. For possible examples of such a practice, see under Tablet I 120, 188, 196, Tablet III 39; Table V 203; and Tablet VI 103.

86. See p. 4.

87. Ann and Enlil are, as might be expected, listed first in this smaller series; but the order of the other deities is completely different. The third place belongs to Ninlil, and Sin occupies the fourth. After these follow: Šînum-gal, Šamaš, A.a., A-adad, Šap. sukku, Šina-murta, and Šemagal. Istar is listed in the twelfth place; Marduk in the fifteenth place; and Ea in the seventeenth place.

88. This means that An : Anu šá amelli is less than a tenth of the size of An : Anu-num.

89. ŠA in text B (K. 4549); A (VBC 2461) writes ŠE.
written on both faces and contains twelve columns, of which the lower half of the last column is unused. The various columns (with the exception of the last) average about 185 lines in length. Column (1), which was obviously intended to aid the scribe in aligning his material. Throughout, the tablet, horizontal ruling lines are also used to separate larger units of material. Before the line that corresponds to the end of each of the original seven tablets, a double horizontal line is drawn, then a summary follows, and finally another pair of horizontal lines is drawn. At the close of the first series, a pair of horizontal lines is made, then a space large enough to contain about four or five lines is left blank, and finally another pair of horizontal lines is drawn. The end of both series is indicated by a pair of ruling lines superimposed by two Winkelhakens in the middle and the sign BAD at the end (the beginning of the lines may also have been superimposed by BAD, but this is not preserved). The surface of the tablet is dotted by a number of circular holes, which extend about 10 to 17 mm into the tablet and measure 1 mm in diameter.

Unfortunately, the tablet has not been perfectly preserved. Of unknown provenience, it was broken into a number of large fragments before it was acquired by the Babylonian Collection of Yale University some years ago. In a number of places these breaks have marred the surface and destroyed many lines. Fortunately, many of these broken sections are restorable with the aid of duplicate texts, but several large gaps in the tablet (and consequently in the series) remain.

At the close of the tablet, and separated from the last line of the series by a space that is equal to about fifteen lines, the scribe placed his colophon. This colophon, which is not as detailed as the one in CT 24 46:1-11, reads as follows:

95. 99. Especially: Tablet II 344-376; Tablet III 254-260; Tablet IV 9-41; 232-296; Tablet V 18-30; 260-280; Tablet VI 1-20; 37-42; 61-64; 73-75; 159-174; 197-215; 238-287; and 303-314.

The advantages of possessing a text that contains all the original tablets on a single tablet are obvious. The new text not only provides a useful control for the exact sequence of the various original documents composing the series, but it also provides a means of locating the position of numerous small fragments of the series, which could hardly have been placed otherwise. In addition to these controls, however, the new text also restores large sections of the series that were heretofore unknown. The new text, furthermore, contributes a large number of variant

1. "An is Anu of man.
2. "Di.me× is Anu of women.
3. "An is Anu of the king."

The relationship thus expressed may include concrete objects, but more often the emphasis is upon the abstract. For example, "Dur.an ki in line 17 is equated with "Enlil of kings," but "Dur.an ki in line 14 is "Enlil of decisions." A number of the explanations recur again and again. Thus, there is "Anu of the land" (line 6), "Enlil of the land" (line 13), "Ninlil of the lands" (line 22), etc. There is "Enlil of decisions" (lines 14-16) and "Sin of decisions" (line 25). Other terms that are repeated include: nap-ha-ri (lines 8, 18, and 19); ki-lat kāmē (line 11); kāmē (line 20); kāmē u-er-ti (lines 24, 88, and 120); ki-lat-ku-dū (lines 9 and 113); nī-dū (line 25); nī-ṣi (line 45); et al.

With its Akkadian explanations, this series exhibits a form that is unusual among god-lists. Only a few other texts resemble it in this respect, but these are not duplicates. One such text contains a Babylonian list of gods that are identified with Marduk. Another text contains a more elaborate format than An : Anu sā amēlī, because it adds a pronunciation column. The latter text may not be an exact duplicate, but it exhibits a number of ties with An : Anu sā amēlī that are so striking that they can hardly be accidental. For the most part, however, the series An : Anu sā amēlī is in a class by itself—an interesting class, but distinct.

THE NEW TEXT YBC 2401

The impetus for the present study has been largely provided by the unpublished text YBC 2401. On the basis of size alone, this huge tablet draws the attention and invites a careful study of its lengthy columns. But in addition to its striking dimensions, this text merits special consideration because of its contents, for it contains the entire series An : d A-nu-um, as well as the smaller series An : d A-nu-um, both in a class by itself—an interesting class, but distinct.

The text YBC 2401 is written upon a large baked tablet of reddish-brown clay that has been coated with a smooth cream slip. Its dimensions of approximately 12 x 15 inches (30.5 x 39.5 x 4.6 cm—tapering to 1.8 cm on the sides) make it one of the largest clay tablets known and in a class, along with its sister-tablet, K. 4349 (CT 24 20 ff.), quite apart from most other tablets. It is written on both faces and contains twelve columns, of which the lower half of the last column is unused. The various columns (with the exception of the last) average about 185 lines in length. Some idea of the excessively small size of the script used can be gained from the fact that about 22 lines of text are crowded to the inch.

Each of the twelve columns is separated from adjoining columns by a single vertical line, and is divided into two subcolumns by another vertical line. In addition, each column begins and ends with a vertical line (which is largely obscured by the initial and final wedges of each column), which was obviously intended to aid the scribe in aligning his material. Throughout the lengthy process of writing the tablet, horizontal ruling lines are also used to separate larger units of material. Before the line that corresponds to the end of each of the original seven tablets, a double horizontal line is drawn, then a summary follows, and finally another pair of horizontal lines is drawn. At the close of the first series, a pair of horizontal lines is made, then a space large enough to contain about four or five lines is left blank, and finally another pair of horizontal lines is drawn. The end of both series is indicated by a pair of ruling lines superimposed by two Winkelhakens in the middle and the sign BAD at the end (the beginning of the lines may also have been superimposed by BAD, but this is not preserved). The surface of the tablet is dotted by a number of circular holes, which extend about 10 to 17 mm into the tablet and measure 1 mm in diameter.

Unfortunately, the tablet has not been perfectly preserved. Of unknown provenience, it was broken into a number of large fragments before it was acquired by the Babylonian Collection of Yale University some years ago. In a number of places these breaks have marred the surface and destroyed many lines. Fortunately, many of these broken sections are restorable with the aid of duplicate texts, but several large gaps in the tablet (and consequently in the series) remain.

At the close of the tablet, and separated from the last line of the series by a space that is equal to about fifteen lines, the scribe placed his colophon. This colophon, which is not as detailed as the one in CT 24 46:1-11, reads as follows:

95. ana pi-i-tub.pale 96. LIBIR.RA.MES
96. 97. Ki-di-ni Su-ti-e 98. U.DUB.SAR
98. IN.SAR 97. IGI.KAR
99. 95. According to the text of the old tablets.
95. 96. Ki-di-ni Su-ti-e, the scribe. 96. Kimidi-bin Sin, the descendent of Sutie, the royal scribe.
96. 97. 98. wrote (and) collated (this tablet)."
readings for entries that were previously known, but which could profit from a fresh appraisal in the light of another text. Numerous sections that were mutilated in previously published texts are now restorable with the aid of YBC 2401.

Of special note is the fact that the new text contains numerous glosses, many of which are entirely new. Some of these new glosses produce new readings for the signs involved; others deal with the pronunciations of god names. One, in particular, reopens the question of the reading of the name "KA.DI" others modify older readings usually given to certain signs. In many respects, the new glosses provide significant material for further study in the Sumerian syllabary.

The text YBC 2401 presents an opportunity for a fresh approach to the problem of reconstructing the series An : dA-nu-um. In fact, it is safe to say that any extensive reconstruction of the series would have been impossible without the aid of this tablet or one similar to it. But, while the material in YBC 2401 answers many questions and settles some problems, it awakens new questions and creates different problems. It is hoped that the present work, however, may be of some use in helping to answer some of the many questions that still remain concerning the religious life of the Assyro-Babylonians.

CHAPTER II
A RECONSTRUCTION OF AN : dA-nu-um

The system of transliteration followed in the present work for designating Sumerian homophones is based upon that of Thureau-Dangin's Les homophones sumériens. Homophones not listed therein have been indicated with the index letter x and then followed by the most common value of the sign in parenthesis. For Akkadian values, the transliteration follows that of von Soden's Das akkadische Syllabar.

The lines of text which are contained in the various duplicates are indicated by the vertical lines at the left of the reconstructed text. Dotted sections in these vertical lines indicate omissions of the lines involved in the exemplar concerned.

In citing the various duplicates, capital letters have been used to designate those texts that appear to be duplicates of the series. Small single letters indicate excerpt tablets, and pairs of small double letters indicate texts of other series that are frequently quoted. The Old Babylonian forerunner is cited throughout as Ao, and the dialectal emesal god-list is cited as eme. The symbols used in designating the various texts are listed at the beginning of each tablet in the series.

100. Interesting examples of new glosses may be found in Tablet II 349, 352, 400, 494; Tablet III 37; Tablet V 247, 251, 281, 287, 290-292; Tablet VI 39, 58, 60-62, 76, 203-214, 220-227, and 244-256.
101. E.g., see Tablet II 349, 352, and 404.
102. See Tablet V 287.
103. E.g., see Tablet VI 205, 206, 208, and 209.

---

1. Cf. also CAD 6 p. v.
2. The line numbering of eme conforms to Dr. Landsberger's restoration of this text as contained in MSL IV.
Tablet I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES USED IN RECONSTRUCTING TABLET I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLET I**

| B C | 1. An | dA-nu-um |
| 2. An | An-tum |
| 3. An.ki | dA-nu-um u An-tum |

1. In this section, C is more convenient to follow than B, since B conserves space by omitting dittos and assigning two names to a line wherever possible. The line corresponds to text a i 1 (cf. p. 10 footnote 37). B add an extra name which was probably Ki-t[u[m]. This name (= ergerum) would identify Antum with the earth and represent her as the logical counterpart of Anum "Heaven." This would help explain the equation in the following line.

2. B i 3 writes dA-nu u An-[tu]. It is evident that C begins the list of the 21 an ama a.e. (see line 24 below) here, while B begins with the next line. Since the name in line 3 is essential to the summary in line 24 in order to make up the uneven number of "21," the arrangement of the text in C seems more logical. Without line 3, B actually contains only twenty names in this section, in spite of the summary in B i 14. C, on the other hand, has only nineteen names here, since lines 16 and 17 were omitted for some reason—possibly by scribal mistake. This section is much abbreviated in Ao, being represented only by Ao:32-34. Furthermore, these names are listed by Ao immediately after the name of Anu (Ao:i-50), which suggests the probability that these names were formerly (at least in the old Babylonian period) considered as merely representing additional names of Anu. In the section preceding the name of Anu, Ao gives a long list of names (Ao:1-50) which evidently is intended to represent the ancestors of Anu, but which in the present series appears immediately before the names of Umul (cf. lines 96 ff. below). The name An.ki seems to be a compound name corresponding to both Anum and Antum and representing the pair as a unit, i.e., "Heaven and Earth."

3. = Ao:34. Gloss only in text a i 2. The excerpt tablet a gives only the male names of the pairs in this section and identifies each one with dA-nu-um. This clarifies the dittos in C, indicating that for each of these names the reader is to understand either dA-nu-um or An-tum as the sense requires (cf. further under line 24 below). Text a adds dAn (= A-nu-um) dA-ni-k[1]-ri-bi (cf. Ao:3 203).

4. dAn.I3 (= dAn.ura) is certainly to be kept separate from dAn.I3 (= dAn.urta).

5. The names in this and the following lines appear to express cosmological concepts. For a few lines, there is a play upon An and Ki as complementary forces. Cf. text a i 3 which explains (An).sâr.gal as: dAn (= A-nu-um) dAn.I3. Note the omission of the determinative before AN in these lines.

6. Cf. CT 24 49 K. 4345:17 (a fragment of K. 4349) which belongs to the "Smaller An : dA-nu-um") which glosses An.âr with dA-nu, and equates the name with dCh.iII. An.âr is doubtless to be identified with the deity of the same name who figures prominently in U.Na-e[âr]. Text a i 4: An.âr dA-nu (G.III). In this line, text a seems to give An.âr a different description than that of An.âr.gal in a i 3, but the broken space (indicated by the gloss .bi) quite likely contained nothing more than the sign Ul (cf. a i 4), the dittos at the end of the line, therefore, would serve to indicate that the explanation in the previous line is to be repeated in a i 4.
whether to here ten contains and appear a.a role r.

A

Kingship in Heaven." (KUB 33 120:8, 12 et al.) See also Pope, El in the Ugaritic Texts 56 f. But the identification of dA.la.la with Mugal.du. KIng.ga in Toll 6 47:3 (= RA 16 145:3) and with dEn.ki in Toll 8 r. (lower right in the "picture," = RA 16 145) seems to be based on late cult speculations and is of little value here.

20. The arrangement of the text in C seems quite ambiguous. The force of the dittos is clearer in B and in text a i 9 f. However, it is not certain whether the dittos in lines 20 and 21 signify that ALAM, was regarded as an ideogram for the two names "dA.la.la and dBe.li.li", or whether the names involved here were dA.la.la,alam and dBe.li.li,alam. The name in CT 25 23 D. T. 115:5 is written d(A.la.la)"ALAM", which would favor the possibility that ALAM was merely an ideogram for the two names in lines 18 f. However, this possibility is weakened by the fact that this section of the series obviously reckoned lines 20 f. As distinct names essential to the total of the 21 en ama a.s (see line 24 below).


24. For the beginning of this list, cf. note 3 above. C exhibits the plural ending; A and B omit it. For a similar summary, cf. the list in the family of Enii in line 138 below and CT 16 13:25. The latter text follows with an Akkadian translation: be-el s-bi um-ê ëA 5"En.la.lil; but a duplicate text (46956, mentioned in CT 16 13 footnote 2) gives be-el instead of be-el (which may represent a late Assyrian nominal plural form of bêlum and thus may conform more closely to the basic Sumerian phrase involved). The sufficiency of the designation an ama (which has the Akkadian translation be-el/ii s-bi um-ê, is perhaps not as simple as it may at first appear. It has been generally assumed (cf. Zimmern, BSGW 63 107 et al.; Tallquist, AG 251) that this group of deities represents the Vater-Mutter of Anum (although Tallquist suggests the alternate possibility that the term involved "ältere Entwicklungsstufen" of Anum). If this interpretation is valid, then the word ama a.s must be regarded as being in apposition to the word en; and the actual translation of the line would be, "21 exalted ones, the fathers and mothers of Anum." Several other factors, however, complicate the picture. As is mentioned under line...
Tablet I

1. Above, these names (in a more abbreviated list) appear in Ao as additional names of Anum himself. In text 1, the male names of each of these pairs are also equated with Anum. In fact, this older tradition is still preserved in the present series by the use of the dittos in lines 4-22, which would indicate that these pairs are still all identified with the one pair, Anum and Antum. This suggests that line 24 intends to sum up "21 exalted ones, father and mother pairs who belong to the circle of (and are identified with) Anum" (the summary mentions only Anum, but the dittos in lines 4-22 reveal that Antum is to be included as well).

25. Gloss, only in Ao:10. The name is certainly a variant of d Belit-i-li, and NIN should be read Belit. The Sumerian form would be ctNin.dingir.e.ne (Tablet II 4). Hence, the spouse of Anu is here listed as d Belit.i.li = Dingir.ma4 (Tablet II 1) = d Ishtar (CT 25 30 r. 7, 10, 12; cf. lines 29 f. below). The present line corresponds to Ao:35, where the name is again written with LI (instead of an expected li). On the form of the genitive in Anna.ke 4, see Poebel, GSG par. 372.

26. d Nimmur.SAL.li. It is possible that this variation is the result of dittography—the scribe being influenced by the sign LI in the line above.

27. = Ao:36. The sign is, of course, K.IL X UAL. For the value Nammu, see CT 29 46:21. Nammu is doubtless to be kept separate from d KIL X SAL.ri, who appears in B r 36 (CT 24 96) among a list of tutukku deities. The name is certainly not to be equated with d É-a (as in AG 307); she is here clearly presented as the "mother of Enki." Hence, d Nimmur has this same epithet. It is not clear, however, whether she should also be identified with d KIL X SAL (= d Nazi) in Tablet III 67.

28. A and B abbreviate: d GA,ka. The force of the present line is to identify d Gà,ka with Nimmur in the specific function of "the one who holds the great scepter." C i 31 appears to have had 'giš. PA ma₃ù.dù.ka.

29. The dittos are not an essential part of the name, since they are omitted by C. Apparently, they identify this deity with d Gà,ka of line 32 above (thus possibly explaining the difficult line in CT 29 45:15). The name is then equated with d Pap.sukkal, who is also known to be identified with d Gà,ka (see Hallock, AS 7 16:26). Pap.sukkal appears again in the circle of d Za.ba₄.aba; see Tablet V 51.

30. C omits d Gà,ka and gives dittos instead. A i 36 then adds an illegible Akkadian translation (as in lines 35a, 36a, etc.).


32. The gloss (cf. CT 24 p. 12) indicates a reading of d Gà,ka. The name may be compared with one of the names of d Nin.kar.4.4.4.4.4.4 at which is similarly glossed (see Tablet V 146). However, these two identically written names must be kept separate. d Gà,ka here is probably to be identified with the sukkal of Anum in Enûma-eélis III 2. d Nin.4.4.4.4.4.4.4 is usually, as here, a member of the Anu circle (and consequently of Ishtar); but in Ao:413, he appears in the Nerigal section, while below in Tablet II 291, he appears again in the Enik circle.

33. The gloss (cf. CT 24 p. 12) indicates a reading of d Gà,ka. The name may be compared with one of the names of d Nin.kar.4.4.4.4.4.4 at which is similarly glossed (see Tablet V 146). However, these two identically written names must be kept separate. d Gà,ka here is probably to be identified with the sukkal of Anum in Enûma-eélis III 2. d Nin.4.4.4.4.4.4.4 is usually, as here, a member of the Anu circle (and consequently of Ishtar); but in Ao:413, he appears in the Nerigal section, while below in Tablet II 291, he appears again in the Enik circle.

34. a. The name is certainly a variant of d Belit-i-li, and NIN should be read Belit. The Sumerian form would be ctNin.dingir.e.ne (Tablet II 4). Hence, the spouse of Anu is here listed as d Belit.i.li = Dingir.ma4 (Tablet II 1) = d Ishtar (CT 25 30 r. 7, 10, 12; cf. lines 29 f. below). The present line corresponds to Ao:35, where the name is again written with LI (instead of an expected li). On the form of the genitive in Anna.ke 4, see Poebel, GSG par. 372.

35. The name is certainly a variant of d Belit-i-li, and NIN should be read Belit. The Sumerian form would be ctNin.dingir.e.ne (Tablet II 4). Hence, the spouse of Anu is here listed as d Belit.i.li = Dingir.ma4 (Tablet II 1) = d Ishtar (CT 25 30 r. 7, 10, 12; cf. lines 29 f. below). The present line corresponds to Ao:35, where the name is again written with LI (instead of an expected li). On the form of the genitive in Anna.ke 4, see Poebel, GSG par. 372.
Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>다는gal.la d'Inn.Subur =</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36a.</td>
<td>ma-lik =</td>
<td>ד-ניק</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>다바(ש.אר).kin d'Inn.Subur &amp; gal .4 An.ne.ke.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37a.</td>
<td>mu-r bit =</td>
<td>ד-니</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>다바,4.a d'Inn.Subur sukkel,dil.ri.ә.bi.de.4 ke.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38a.</td>
<td>suk-kel-lu a-bi-tz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>되난(bu,un)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>되난,4.ә.KU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>되난.Subur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>되난.Subur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. C: 다는gal.la. The dittos (in B and C) clearly represent 되난.Subur (as is evident from the arrangement in B). A, in fact, writes out 되난.Subur in this and in the following lines.

26a. The Akkadian gloss line appears in C i 40.

27. A and B omit E.

27a. Akkadian gloss line in C i 42.

28. The Sumerian explanation may be analyzed as: DI = dîmû "judgment"; RI = ә.bu "to seize"; A is a nominalizing ending; bi.4a is a conjunction; ke.4 is the genitive ending (which unreasonably may have been added under the influence of the Akkadian translation). A varies with: di.bi.ri.dא which seems less satisfactory than C. B gives the name as 다바,4.a.

28a. The Akkadian gloss line appears in C i 44.

29. B omits this line and the next here and inserts them a few lines later (= E i 31). The left half of the column is broken here in A, but it seems certain that A likewise omitted these two names at this point. The Akkadian gloss line appears in C i 44.

31. The dittos (preserved only in C) A probably had 되난.Subur are enigmatic here. They probably give a clue that the name is here actually an ideogram for another name such as 다바,4.atrat: cf. Abel and Winckler, אב 240 f., 10; K. 3179 + Sm. 1061. ii 22-24 (see OLZ 11 184).

42. A preserves the end of the line and is then broken for a few lines. C omits 되난.Subur sukkel.
of these “daughters” seems out of place. G omits the added explanation altogether. Quite probably this extra description, “gateman of An,” belongs to dNin.subur of the previous line.

52. Lines 52-56 = G:5-8.


64. In A, the traces of the last sign in the name appear to be those of a sign like AMN or AME.

67. Glosses in D. The sign NU is apparently a gloss in D; but in A, it appears as a part of the text. However, A seems to have too small a space in front of NU to accommodate the two large signs dU. The possibility must be reckoned with that A and D here preserve two separate traditions: dU, li.su, and [d].nu.su.

This gloss as a pronunciation gloss for LI (cf. Deimel, SL Lautwerte, 2d ed., no. 59:3 pp. 9, 120).

68. To read UD.DU here as è does not seem to offer any real help in the understanding of this strange name. A appears to have DI in place of UD.DU.

73. The name possibly represents an Akkadian loanword.

75. A i 70: dDùr.ru.na. The name may occur also in the Fara texts; cf. Dei1, Fara II no. 61 ii 3 (as dLI).


79. Gloss in D i 15.

80. D i 16 omits determinative; A i 75 is broken here, but it appears to have ample space for the expected determinative. This name calls to mind the ancient shrine in the territory of Lagash mentioned by Entemena; see BIN II 1:155.

81. A i 76: dKi.gul.la. The name appears among those of the sons of dEn.ki (see Tablet II 284 below) and also as the name of the wife of dNin in Tablet V 48. Probably, the latter deity is to be distinguished from the one in the present line.
Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>( \text{d} \text{Sag.kud} )</td>
<td>zebar.dib An.na.ke₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>( \text{d} \text{Nin.pa.mul.e.si} )</td>
<td>dam.bi.SAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>( \text{d} \text{Ninda.u₅,di.du} )</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>( \text{d} \text{En.du₅,kd.ta.ê.dê} )</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>( \text{d} \text{Nin.ki.Sér(ê),ra} )</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>3 mu₅hādīm(MU).gal</td>
<td>An.na.ke₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>( \text{d} \text{En.(ga-ra)arga(GA+NI)} )</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>( \text{d} \text{Subur.â.zi.da} )</td>
<td>An.na.ke₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>2 utul.gal</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>( \text{d} \text{Iglia&lt;77,g&gt;7} )</td>
<td>NU.GIS.GAR.gal An.na.ke₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>( \text{d} \text{En.nu.un.silim.ma} )</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>( \text{d} \text{Gis.(x.x).silim.ma} )</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>2 šn.tar.tar</td>
<td>An.na.ke₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>mu-še-du-u šá ( \text{d} \text{En.ki} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>( \text{d} \text{En.ki} )</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83. In ab ii 34, \( \text{d} \text{Sag.kud} \) is identified with \( \text{d} \text{Nin.urta} \). Cf. further KAV 46:12 (= KAV 63 i 46), which gives the pronunciation of \( \text{d} \text{Sag.kud} \) as sa.ag.ku.ud, and Kraus, JCS 375 note 30.

85. A i 79 appears to vary here, having \( \text{d} \text{Nin.(d'),(x)} \). Text = D i 21. E i 55 mistakenly writes QA after KU; but TA, as the lexica difficilis, is preferred here.

86. For the value MU = mu₅hādīm, cf. IVISL II p. 47 line 172 and Tablet V 222a below.

96. \( \text{d} \text{En.ki} \) of the present line corresponds to \( \text{d} \) En₂₄; and it is evident that in the older tradition reflected by Ao, the present section was considered as the list of predecessors for both Anu (Ao:31) and Enlil (Ao:36). In the later tradition, this section was removed from Anu and given to Enlil to make up his list of "fathers and mothers" (see line 26 above) that was more in harmony with the theology of the epic works. However, the older tradition represented by Ao seems quite consistent with Babylonian theology, since Enlil was certainly regarded as Anu's son (cf. even the famous vase inscription of Lugalzaggisi, OBI 87 iii 16). Considerable confusion has arisen from an attempt by some to equate the \( \text{d} \text{En.ki} \) of the present line with the more familiar \( \text{d} \text{En.ki} \) (= 45-a) of Kud. That this identification is not valid is seen from the fact that in both Ao (see Ao:76) and the present series, \( \text{d} \text{En.ki} \) (45-a) receives separate and full treatment, whereas the \( \text{d} \text{En.ki} \) of the present line represents merely a shadowy half-cosmological name that figures very briefly in this formal list of the "fathers and mothers" of Enlil; see also MSL IV p. 4 note 2. It would, therefore, be quite out of place to attempt to reconstruct an "Eridu" tradition out of the Ao list merely because Ao begins with the name of \( \text{d} \text{En.ki} \). Cf. also CT 16 13:11-25 for a comparable list of "fathers and mothers" of Enlil. The text UN 29-16-66 (published by Kramer in BASOR 94 5), which represents text "B" of the Sumerian "Death of Gilgamesh" (cf. ANET 51), also includes an abbreviated list of these "fathers and mothers" (lines 14-18) starting with \( \text{d} \text{En.ki} \) and \( \text{d} \text{En.ni} \). In spite of its abbreviated form, it seems to add one name not found in the present list: \( \text{d} \text{En.ni} \) (line 17). Similar abbreviated lists are found in VS II 11 r. 11 2-7 and in Smith, MSL pp. 11 f. lines 30-33. Some presents only two names of this list: \( \text{d} \text{En.ki} \) and \( \text{d} \text{En.ni} \). In contrast, \( \text{d} \text{En.ki} \) (56-57 f.) reverses the order here, giving \( \text{d} \text{En.ni} \) before \( \text{d} \text{En.ki} \) and \( \text{d} \text{En.ni} \). Before \( \text{d} \text{En.ni} \) and \( \text{d} \text{En.ki} \), cf. BA 10/1 84 r. 4+ and CT 16 12 ii 13 f. 98. Cf. EAK 4 r. 15 f. 100. \( \text{d} \text{En.ni} \) and \( \text{d} \text{En.ki} \) also occur in UN 29-16-66 (cf. under note 96 above) line 14 and VAT 55 + 171 etc. 7 (= SHB p. 85 no. 48). 105. The name occurs also in Deimel, Fara II no. 1 iii 7.
107. dNin.da

108. dEm.bulug

109. dNin.bulug

110. dEm.‘hal

111. dNin.hal

112. dNin.kur

113. dNin.ug

114. dNin.garaš3(GA+KAS)

115. dNin.garaš3

116. dNin.hal

117. dNin.egal

118. dNin.an.na

119. dNin.mur

120. dNin.kur

107. Certainly to be kept separate from the dNin.da that appears in line 317 below as a variant for dIr.da (see CT 24 3:5).


110. = Ao:15.

111. = Ao:16.

112. Corresponds to E ii 1.

113. To be kept separate from dNin.UG in the Samaš circle; see Tablet III 151.

114. E ii 3 preserves the traces of a gloss (possibly ‘ga’, ‘ra’). See Tablet III 36 for a similar gloss.

115. Not necessarily to be equated with the spouse of the son of dNin in Tablet III 36.

116. = Ao:17. Cf. line 10 above, where the name occurs among the "fathers and mothers of Anu. The name also occurs in the Fara texts (e.g., Deimel, Fara II no. 1 x 10) and in King, SPO 73 ii 1-5. The gloss is partly preserved in E ii 5, 116. = Ao:17 and E ii 1.

117. = Ao:19. E iii 3. dNin.(kur)kur. Since A i 99 and C ii 10 (and probably B i 74) agree with Ao, it is possible that the gloss in E represents more than a pronunciation gloss. The scribe may be indicating that he knew of the other tradition here; see p. 31 above.

118. = Ao:20.


120. = Ao:22. Distinguish from the dNin.UG in the Samaš list; see Tablet III 151.

121. = Ao:30. dNin.kur is to be distinguished from a deity with a similar name who appears in a dBe-lit-ili/Istar list (CT 25 3:5).

122. = Ao:17. E iii 5 gives the gloss as a.ma.s.

123. = Ao:18. dNin.garaš3 is paired with dNin.da.gurun in Ao:21 f. (i.e., Ao omits dNin.amas and dNin.da.gurun in Ao:21).

124. = Ao:25. Cf. under note 123. For the actual reading of the name, note the phonetic writing in de Genouillac, Kich II plate 14 no. C-72 14, where the name is written dNin.UG. The name is usually written (as here) dNin.da.GUD X GUD.GUD.ma; but, in the older texts, it appears as dNin.da.GUD X GUD.ma (e.g., cf. Ao:21). In UN 2618-2616 f. above under note 96), this pair occurs as dNin.UG.GUD X GUD.GUD. (although the reading of ninda seems suspect here in the
34

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133. ḍNin.da.surons₂.ma</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>ḍNin.da.surons₂.ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134. ḍEm.du₂.ku.ga</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>ḍEm.du₂.ku.ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135. ḍNin.du₅.ku.ga</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>ḍNin.du₅.ku.ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136. ḍEm.me.šár.ra</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>ḍEm.me.šár.ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137. ḍNin.me.šár.ra</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>ḍNin.me.šár.ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. 42 ám en.ama.a.a</td>
<td>ḍEm.lí1.lí1.ka₄</td>
<td>ḍEm.lí1.lí1.ka₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. ḍzi.sum.mu</td>
<td>ḍNibrur(EN.LÍL.KI).a</td>
<td>ḍNibrur(EN.LÍL.KI).a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

light of the present line) and ḍNin.‘da.‘HAB X OUD(1).ma. Cf. further CT 25 7 K. 7762:3; VS II no. 11 r. i 11; and CT 16 15 ii 17 f. But whether the present name is to be identified with a deity of the same name who appears as one of the doormen of ḍEm.me.šár.ka (KAR 142 iv 12) is not clear.

139. = Ao:23 and UM 29-16-86 (see above under note 96):15. As with ḍEm.da.surons₂.ma of line 132, the name of ḍNin.du₅.ku.ga occurs among the doormen of ḍEm.me.šár.ka in KAR 142 iv 12 f. and CT 16 15 ii 17 f. and Smith, MAF 12:32.


136. = Ao:29; UM 29-16-86 (see above under note 96):17; and CT 16 13 ii 23 f. This name represents a well-known deity. In late times, he appears to have been identified with Anu, Dumuzi, and Kingu (see TCL 6 47 and TuL 29). He appears occasionally as a deity in the underworld, but probably in the sense of a "captive" deity. See Thureau-Dangin, RA 16 147-151. Cf. further SBH p. 146:35, 42. Cf. also CT 16 13 ii 19 f. and Smith, MAT 12:32.


138. CT 16 13 ii 25 (see above under note 24) and UM 29-16-86 (see above under note 96):18. A 1 10 omits ḍNin.me.šár.ra. This means that ḍNin.me.šár.ra was the name of ḍNin.imma of line 139 and signifies "the outer" territory. O. 175:11, the name (with some variation) is explained as: ḍNin.imma. Na-tum gâmilat (SIG 2) napiAti (ZI) ḍA-nim; "ḍNin.imma. Na-tum, the mistress of Nippur, the one who gives the life of Anu." From this identification, it appears that ḍNin.imma was regarded as a goddess. In the second half of the present line, the name A may not be redundant (as might appear from AO. 6479:4, quoted above). It seems, instead, to be in opposition to a.ṣ̌a.bar. ra in line 141, and may mean here "the Nippur territory."

140. The first sign is not B (as it seems in King's copy of O. 110); in A 1 110, it is clearly aḍ(ZA-tenû) (see MSL III 97 line 6). This corresponds to AO. 6479 11 i 5 f.: aḍ(ZA-tenû).gir.pû.(1).ra. ke₄ = ḍNin.imma. Na-tum gâmilat (SIG 2); cf. line 139 and signifies "the outer" territory. O. 175:11, the name (with some variation) is explained as: ḍNin.imma. Na-tum gâmilat (SIG 2) napiAti (ZI) ḍA-nim; "ḍNin.imma. Na-tum, the mistress of Nippur, the one who gives the life of Anu." From this identification, it appears that ḍNin.imma was regarded as a goddess. In the second half of the present line, the name A may not be redundant (as might appear from AO. 6479:4, quoted above). It seems, instead, to be in opposition to a.ṣ̌a.bar. ra in line 141, and may mean here "the Nippur territory."
A C

142. dUr.bêd( ba.ad). 
  dumu(du,mu).

143. dUr.bêd.da.gub.gub.
  bu.

144. dSub.ba.gara.re.e.
  dumu.uru.gibil.ke4.

145. dê.bar.re.DU.DU.
  dumu.u3.30.kâm u4.
  na.a.

146. 7 âm dumu.me
  dEn.me,šarr.e,ke4.

Ht f. agrees with AO. 6479, but further identifies dEnu.me,gu
with dSin(BB); cf. under Tablet III 86.

142. A I 112: [d]"Ur.bêd. 'na." Text = C I 32 as
restored by AO. 6479 iii 9 which has: dUr.bêd. da en suuk.d
ke4: dUr.bêd. be-lu ša-šu-u. That is, he is identified
with dšIL, "the lofty lord." O. 175:12 similarly identifies
with dSin(E); cf. under Tablet III 86.

143. dUr.bêd.da.gub.gub.
  bu.

144. dSub.ba.gara.re.e.
  dumu.uru.gibil.ke4.

145. dê.bar.re.DU.DU.
  dumu.u3.30.kâm u4.
  na.a.

146. 7 âm dumu.me
  dEn.me,šarr.e,ke4.

AO. 6479 iii 9 which has: dUr.bêd. da en suuk.d
ke4: dUr.bêd. be-lu ša-šu-u. That is, he is identified
with dšIL, "the lofty lord." O. 175:12 similarly identifies
with dSin(E); cf. under Tablet III 86.

142. A I 112: [d]"Ur.bêd. 'na." Text = C I 32 as
restored by AO. 6479 iii 9 which has: dUr.bêd. da en suuk.d
ke4: dUr.bêd. be-lu ša-šu-u. That is, he is identified
with dšIL, "the lofty lord." O. 175:12 similarly identifies
with dSin(E); cf. under Tablet III 86.

143. dUr.bêd.da.gub.gub.
  bu.

144. dSub.ba.gara.re.e.
  dumu.uru.gibil.ke4.

145. dê.bar.re.DU.DU.
  dumu.u3.30.kâm u4.
  na.a.

146. 7 âm dumu.me
  dEn.me,šarr.e,ke4.

AO. 6479 iii 9 which has: dUr.bêd. da en suuk.d
ke4: dUr.bêd. be-lu ša-šu-u. That is, he is identified
with dšIL, "the lofty lord." O. 175:12 similarly identifies
with dSin(E); cf. under Tablet III 86.

142. A I 112: [d]"Ur.bêd. 'na." Text = C I 32 as
restored by AO. 6479 iii 9 which has: dUr.bêd. da en suuk.d
ke4: dUr.bêd. be-lu ša-šu-u. That is, he is identified
with dšIL, "the lofty lord." O. 175:12 similarly identifies
with dSin(E); cf. under Tablet III 86.
151. Text = C ii 41. A i 121 varies, giving a name ending with the sign SID. Whether any other signs preceded SID cannot be determined because of the broken condition of A at this point.

152. The complex DUG.QA.BUR appears among the names of other deities besides Enlil (e.g., Dingir.mab., Tablet II 26; dLil, Tablet II 65; and dEn.ki, Tablet II 156, 160, 162, 164); but these should all be carefully distinguished from each other. Note CT 12 21 59058:18 f., where this sign group is explained in successive lines as pa-qa-bi-bi "potter" and dEn.ni.l. This same Akkadian meaning plus the Sumerian reading ba.bar is given for the group and is identified again with Enlil in AO 7661 ii 48 (TOL 6 37 = AS no. 7 p. 43). Cf. also line 167 below. The scribe who wrote texts A and B regularly writes DUG.LI8.BUR for this sign group—the LI8 apparently serving as a graphic variant for QA in this complex.


155. Note that eme:5 presents dE.lum as the emesal for dEnlil in A i 126.

156. The traces in A i 128 indicate a sign like GIR or GUR, but hardly GU.

157. Possibly = Ao:46. For a similar gloss of um.bi.sag for ALAL, see Tablet VI 128, (where the gloss actually represents the sign name; cf. HSL II p. 75 line 562).

173. a Ué.àm.gi.na
174. [ ]‘x’ 
175. d Dam.gar
176. d Nin.lil.LI
177. d Nin.lil dam.bi.SAL
178. d SAL-KU(e.gi).tum
179. d SU.KUR.RU
180. 
181. d Nin.uru.mu.un.du
182. d Bur.6u.6al
183. d Bur.6u.sikil

A also seems to have one name less than B in this section of Enlil names.

176. = Ao:48 and eme:6. Cf. KAV 63 i 4 (= KAV 65 r. 1 4; see AFK 2 0 note 3) which explains dNin.lil as dNin-lil-tu. The form dNin.lil.LI seems to be only a variant form of dNin.lil (cf. An : Anu Sa amLli 22); but if it is a variant form, it is certainly a fuller form and such, it may lead one to raise a question as to the force of the added syllable. The sign LI may be explained as containing the Sumerian subject element (hence, dNin.lil.le), but the addition of such subject elements would seem to be an uncommon phenomenon among the names in the present series.

178. = Ao:49. Gloss in D ii 8, which also has SAL-KU instead of NIN (cf. the normal NIN in D ii 10). B i 108 gives NIN (probably making no distinction between NIN and SAL-KU). Cf. also An : Anu ã amÉli 23.

179. = Ao:50.

180. B i 109 contains both lines 179 and 180. If SU.KUR.RU has the value of sûd (as Scholtz suggests, ZA 41 304), this may explain why A omits line 179, and D, line 180.


182. The name occurs again among the names of d Dam.ki.na, spouse of d En.ki; see Tablet II 183. Cf. the gloss in Table II 111.

183. Also occurs among the names of d Dam.ki.na; see Tablet II 184.

B D
184. dSu.zi.an.na
185. d En.zi.kalam.ma
186. d Sig e.za.gin.na
187. d Maskim.ge6.lá.bar

A also seems to have one name less than B in this section of Enlil names.

184. = Ao:51. (See also note 150 above. In Ao, she occurs quite widely separated from the Enlil section, but still in context of some of the same names as are found here (see Ao:335).

185a. Represents a further explanation for d Su.zi.an.na, but the texts all vary slightly here. A i 153: um.me.ga dEn.<zu>.na; B i 112: um.me.ga.la dEn.zu.ke; D ii 14: um.me.da dEn.zu.na.ke; E iv 2 f.: tim.ga.la dEn.zu.na.ke. In this line, dEn.zi.kalam.ma appears as the name of the spouse of dNin.lil. This may represent another wife besides dNin.lil; hence she is listed here separately. See line 300 below, where she is identified with dNisaba. A i 154 and B i 113 have d En.lil.la.ke instead of d En.lil.la.ke. (which is found in D ii 15 and B iv 4).

186. Text = A i 175 and B ii 16. B ii 14 has Dingir.mab instead of d Be-lit-i-li; and E iv 5 gives d Be-lit-i-li. The latter form of the name is read by some d Be-lit-i-li (e. g., cf. AG 276 and ZA 20 101), identifying her with the “sister” of Dumuzi who is mentioned in CT 15 47:30. In the light of the other readings given for this line, it seems clear that BE in B is to be understood as an ideogram for BE (unless B should be emended to read dBe-lit-i-li). Texts in which the name has been read d Be-lit-i-li should possibly be re-examined from this standpoint. Certainly, a clear distinction is to be made between this name and d Be-lit-i-li in line 18 above. d Sig e.za.gin.na occurs also in Ao:51 (d Sig e.za.gin) and K. 13703:2 (CT 25 46).

187. = Ao:52. B ii 17: d Sul.pa.ē.s. Note EN 13 12 no. 5 where the name is written d Sul.pa.ē. For d Sul.pa.ē, see OLD 22 13 note 1; AG 437, 467 f.; ZA 38 85 (where Foebel
reads "A.Sul.kû.nû.ar.a); II R 47 45e (where a reading of u.e.pâ is given for this name); KAV 65 iii 47 (cf. Weldner, AAW 2 75; Tablet II 46 f.; and Tablet IV 269 (where the name occurs in the "Istar tablet" and is again identified with "A.Sul.kû.nû.ar.a"). The first name in the present line is desribed in K. 256:42 (CT 25 22; = Tablet VII 121 below): as i1a lim-num-um "the evil god." Cf. further OT 18 48:27cd; and OT 19 27 i 6. Both D ii 17 and E iv 6 f. give the name as dA.Sul.kû.ng.e 6 .lú.#ar.ra.na ). The first name in the present line is in the "Istar tablet" and is again identified with Maskim.

The old Babylonian list Ao:53, however, also has Lum.ma.îlû lim-nu-um "the evil god." Cf. further CT 18 48:27cd; and is given for this name) ; KAV 63 iii 47 (cf. Weidner, AfK 2 745 ff.; and Schöckel, Der Gott Dag an. Here dDa.gan is identified with dSa.la.as, as well as with several other deities. The resultant text produced some confusion as is seen in the explanation column of A i 162: [dam dNIN.KU.GI  (probably a corruption from *dNin.li dam dEn.lil.lâ.ke 4 )]. D ii 23 reverses the names of dNIN.KU.GI and dSa.la.as (of the next line), and explains: dem.bi dNin.[lli] this spouse, who is dNin.li. D also places dittos in the middle of dNIN.KU.GI to show that her name was an ideogram for dSa.la.as. The primacy of dNIN.KU.GI over dSa.la.as is inferred from Ao:56 where only the former name occurs; but the name must still be viewed as an ideogram for the latter; cf. ab i 34: dNIN.KU.GI | dSa.la.as. See further under note 195 below, and An : Anu 8â annâl 59. From ab i 34 (quoted under note 194 above), it appears that dSa.la.as is to be identified with dSa.la, and therefore also with the spouse of Adad; see Rm. I1,32 (CT 25 21) r. 7 f. (= Tablet III 240 below). Note that dNIN.KU.GI (ideogram for dSa.la.as, see under note 194 above) is also identified with dSa.la in line 59 of An : Anu 8â annâl 59. Further MAHG 1/3 pp. 9, 11, 14. 196. Text = B i 123. In the light of the way in which the name is written in B i 123, it seems that this word is the same as in B i 122, but may have been used by the scribe to indicate a textual variation among the texts available to him. This name occurs again among those of the spouse of Adad; see Tablet 3 241 (written without NIN).

197. Text = B i 123. In ab i 39, the name appears as dIN.KU.GI. B i 26 combines both readings as dIN.KU.GI | dSa.la.as. This represents a deified ruler from Uamazi (see Jacobsen, AS no. 11 98 f. line 190. = Ao:54 and a9:4. Jacobsen, AS no. 11 98 f. line 190. 2 udug é.kur. .ke 4. 191. = Ao:55. B i 118: [d]En.lil.za. If this ine is read as dSa.la as (of the next line), and explains: dem.bi dNin.[lli] this spouse, who is dNin.li. D also places dittos in the middle of dNIN.KU.GI to show that her name was an ideogram for dSa.la.as. The primacy of dNIN.KU.GI over dSa.la.as is inferred from Ao:56 where only the former name occurs; but the name must still be viewed as an ideogram for the latter; cf. ab i 34: dNIN.KU.GI | dSa.la.as. See further under note 195 below, and An : Anu 8â annâl 59. From ab i 34 (quoted under note 194 above), it appears that dSa.la.as is to be identified with dSa.la, and therefore also with the spouse of Adad; see Rm. I1,32 (CT 25 21) r. 7 f. (= Tablet III 240 below). Note that dNIN.KU.GI (ideogram for dSa.la.as, see under note 194 above) is also identified with dSa.la in line 59 of An : Anu 8â annâl 59. Further MAHG 1/3 pp. 9, 11, 14. 196. Text = B i 123. In the light of the way in which the name is written in B i 123, it seems that this word is the same as in B i 122, but may have been used by the scribe to indicate a textual variation among the texts available to him. This name occurs again among those of the spouse of Adad; see Tablet 3 241 (written without NIN).

197. Text = B i 123. In ab i 39, the name appears as dIN.KU.GI. B i 26 combines both readings as dIN.KU.GI | dSa.la.as. This represents a deified ruler from Uamazi (see Jacobsen, AS no. 11 98 f. line 190. = Ao:54 and a9:4. Jacobsen, AS no. 11 98 f. line 190. 2 udug é.kur. .ke 4. 191. = Ao:55. B i 118: [d]En.lil.za. If this ine is read as dSa.la as (of the next line), and explains: dem.bi dNin.[lli] this spouse, who is dNin.li. D also places dittos in the middle of dNIN.KU.GI to show that her name was an ideogram for dSa.la.as. The primacy of dNIN.KU.GI over dSa.la.as is inferred from Ao:56 where only the former name occurs; but the name must still be viewed as an ideogram for the latter; cf. ab i 34: dNIN.KU.GI | dSa.la.as. See further under note 195 below, and An : Anu 8â annâl 59. From ab i 34 (quoted under note 194 above), it appears that dSa.la.as is to be identified with dSa.la, and therefore also with the spouse of Adad; see Rm. I1,32 (CT 25 21) r. 7 f. (= Tablet III 240 below). Note that dNIN.KU.GI (ideogram for dSa.la.as, see under note 194 above) is also identified with dSa.la in line 59 of An : Anu 8â annâl 59. Further MAHG 1/3 pp. 9, 11, 14. 196. Text = B i 123. In the light of the way in which the name is written in B i 123, it seems that this word is the same as in B i 122, but may have been used by the scribe to indicate a textual variation among the texts available to him. This name occurs again among those of the spouse of Adad; see Tablet 3 241 (written without NIN).

197. Text = B i 123. In ab i 39, the name appears as dIN.KU.GI. B i 26 combines both readings as dIN.KU.GI | dSa.la.as. This represents a deified ruler from Uamazi (see Jacobsen, AS no. 11 98 f. line 190. = Ao:54 and a9:4. Jacobsen, AS no. 11 98 f. line 190. 2 udug é.kur. .ke 4. 191. = Ao:55. B i 118: [d]En.lil.za. If this ine is read as dSa.la as (of the next line), and explains: dem.bi dNin.[lli] this spouse, who is dNin.li. D also places dittos in the middle of dNIN.KU.GI to show that her name was an ideogram for dSa.la.as. The primacy of dNIN.KU.GI over dSa.la.as is inferred from Ao:56 where only the former name occurs; but the name must still be viewed as an ideogram for the latter; cf. ab i 34: dNIN.KU.GI | dSa.la.as. See further under note 195 below, and An : Anu 8â annâl 59. From ab i 34 (quoted under note 194 above), it appears that dSa.la.as is to be identified with dSa.la, and therefore also with the spouse of Adad; see Rm. I1,32 (CT 25 21) r. 7 f. (= Tablet III 240 below). Note that dNIN.KU.GI (ideogram for dSa.la.as, see under note 194 above) is also identified with dSa.la in line 59 of An : Anu 8â annâl 59. Further MAHG 1/3 pp. 9, 11, 14. 196. Text = B i 123. In the light of the way in which the name is written in B i 123, it seems that this word is the same as in B i 122, but may have been used by the scribe to indicate a textual variation among the texts available to him. This name occurs again among those of the spouse of Adad; see Tablet 3 241 (written without NIN).
section begins with a name corresponding to line 200. Igig.ara is here introduced as a member of the Enlil circle; but cf. Tablet III 279 (where she appears in the Adad circle); Tablet IV 276 (in the "Istar tablet"); and line 301 below (where, as dGag.gag, she is identified with dNisaba). Cf. further AF 12 1 ff.; EAV 45 i 31 (= EAV 45 i 12); EAV 46 ii 8.

200. = Ao:59, which has dGag.gag. Cf. line 301 below where she is equated with dNisaba.

201. In Ao:60, the name is written d Be-la-at-bi-ri. Note the writing of the name as d Be-lit-be-ri, Tablet IV 280 below, and possibly dNIN-bi-ri, PSBA 34 52. This and the next two lines are repeated later in Tablet IV 277 ff.

202. = Tablet IV 278. Cf. also A ii 127 has [dA.AN.BU.BU].

203. According to King's copy, it appears at first glance that D ii 33 has dA.AN.BU.BU. However, the old Babylonian prototype Ao presents at this point line 61) <d>An. bu; therefore D must be read <d>An.a.an..bu) b u. B i 127 has C<A.An]. r bu` dEN-bu-ul, in which the latter name (= dBel-bu-ul) probably represents an Akkadian explanation. B followed with a summary line which probably represents the end of a subtablet in one tradition. Since A ends Tablet I with the words dub 2 kam.ma (A ii 146), it is probable that A also represents a copy of the same tradition which divided Tablet I into two subtables. Cf. further D. 7 note 26 above.

204. = Ao:63 which has dU 4 .ta.GIGAL.lu. D ii 34: 'U 4 .URU.lu. On the signs involved in D ii 36 and B i 131, see OLZ 12 200 and OLZ 13 63. Cf. K. 2100 i 37 (CT 25 1) where $I X U is again glossed with du.bur.

205. = Ao:64 and ab iii 7; but cf. CT 25 25:15 (= Tablet III 110 below) where the name occurs in a Samaš list.

206. = ab ii 8. Ao:65: 3SA.BADU. On the signs involved in D ii 36 and B i 131, see OLZ 12 200 and OLZ 13 63. Cf. K. 2100 i 37 (CT 25 17) where $I X U is again glossed with du.bur.

207. = Ao:65: 3SA.BADU. On the signs involved in D ii 36 and B i 131, see OLZ 12 200 and OLZ 13 63. Cf. K. 2100 i 37 (CT 25 17) where $I X U is again glossed with du.bur.

208. Possibly an Akkadian name. In ab iii 10, the name occurs as dKur. da.r. Table I

209. = ab iii 9 which clearly has dGIR.UNU.gal. Attention has often been called (e.g., AK 2 12 note 8) to the fact that, in late times at least, the name dNin.urta was actually pronounced Inurta > Inuštâ (Enusta). However, there is evidence to support the possibility that the name was also pronounced as written: dNin.urta; cf. the phonetically written dNi.in.nu.ur.ta in ZA 45 36. This would present the possibility that there were two pronunciations of his name in vogue—much as was the case for Enlil, see lines 146 and 149 above.

210. The text can be restored from ab iii 13 and B i 133. 211. = ab ii 14.

212. = ab ii 14.

213. = ab ii 14.

214. = ab ii 14.

215. = ab ii 14.

216. = ab ii 14.

217. = ab ii 14.

218. = ab ii 14.

219. = ab ii 14.
A

213. d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{\textgreek{g}id,da}  \\
214. (d')\textit{Lugal}, \textit{\textgreek{s}a}, \textit{bar}, \textit{ra}  \\
215. d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{\textgreek{s}a}, \textit{ma}, \textit{ru}  \\
216. d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{\textgreek{GAM},ma}  \\
217. d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{\textgreek{s}a}, \textit{\textgreek{e}}  \\
218. d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{\textgreek{u}d,} (\textit{KA X} \textit{SU}, \textit{\textgreek{e}})  \\
219. d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{za}, \textit{ru}  \\
220. d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{\textgreek{m}a}, \textit{gur}, \textit{ra}  \\
221. d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{uru}, \textit{bar}, \textit{ra}  \\
222. d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{uru}, \textit{\textgreek{s}a}, \textit{\textgreek{e}}  \\
223. d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{ni}, \textit{ba}, \textit{du}  \\
224. d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{\textgreek{g}is}  \\

\textit{gi\textgreek{z}immar} (\textit{\textgreek{S}a}, \textit{\textgreek{e}})  \\
B

225. d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{\textgreek{e}}, \textit{\textgreek{KA}}, \textit{\textgreek{s}a}  \\

\textit{piris\textgreek{g}}

\begin{align*}
\text{SÁK may well be the prolongation of the determinative (cf. A ii 20), and this would indicate that no sign is missing in this name. One may cf. ab ii 27: \textit{\textgreek{S}a}, \textit{\textgreek{AR},ra} | \textit{\textgreek{s}a}, \textit{\textgreek{AN,ra}} | \textit{\textgreek{s}a}, \textit{\textgreek{AN,ra}} | \textit{\textgreek{s}a}, \textit{\textgreek{AN,ra}} | \textit{\textgreek{s}a}, \textit{\textgreek{AN,ra}}.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
214. \text{B i 135 has \textit{s}a instead of \textit{s}a. The term \textit{\textgreek{s}a}, \textit{\textgreek{bar},ra}}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
217. \text{A o:345 places this name in a different section.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
218. \text{The name occurs again in Tablet VI 87 (in the Nerigal section); cf. also Tablet V 265. In KAV 63 iiii 40 (= KAV 63 iii 17), the name appears both as d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{\textgreek{u}d,} (\textit{KA X SU}, \textit{\textgreek{e}}) \textit{\textgreek{e}} and d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{\textgreek{g}is}, \textit{\textgreek{u}d,} (\textit{KA X SU}). \textit{\textgreek{e}} On the value \textit{\textgreek{u}d,} (\textit{KA X SU}), see MSL II p. 57 nct\textgreek{e} 329.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
221. \text{A o:428.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
222. \text{A o:429, which gives d'\textit{Lugal}}, \textit{\textgreek{u}d,} \textit{\textgreek{s}a}, \textit{\textgreek{g}a}. \text{Text = A ii 14; D iiii 7: d'\textit{Lugal}}, \textit{\textgreek{u}d,} \textit{\textgreek{g}a}, \textit{\textgreek{ke},q}.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
223. \text{A ii 15: d'\textit{Lugal}, \textit{\textgreek{N}I}.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
225. \text{Text = A ii 17; D iiii 9 appears to end with \textit{\textgreek{G}AN,}, which may actually represent \textit{piris\textgreek{g} (i)} (or possibly a graphic variation of \textit{piris\textgreek{g}}).}
\end{align*}
Below seems strange. D iii 18 gives only one name for the daughter of dNin.urta: dNín.niç.gi.na. The arrangement of the text here = A ii 28 and 29.

237. dNin.niç.gi.na  
238. dKU(.),SUD(.),NUN.  
239. dNin.u₄.zal.le  
240. dNin.ma.ni.zi  
241. d([dul,]ni)KAL  
242. dNin.kar.nun.na  
243. = Ao:71. For the reading of the name, see under Tablet III 95. Here, dKU,SUD,NUN.KU.TU appears in the circle of dNin.urta only as the brother-in-law of dNin.urta. In Tablet III 95, he appears among the sons of dNIN.MAR.KI; in Tablet VI 230, he is equated with dMAR.TU; and in An : Anu 6â, he is identified with dSumuq_an(dGIR). d-KU.SUD.NUN.KU.TU was apparently viewed as an ideogram for dSumugan/Saman/Sab.an. Cf. CT 12 37:46a (= CT 12 35:29a), where the name is explained as: <d>Sum-man-nu Sâ GUD “Summanu of cattle.”

239. dNin.u₄.zal.le as the wife of dKU,SUD,NUN.KU.TU and the sister of dNin.urta. Here, dNun.man-su nu = “Summanu of cattle.”


241. = Ao:73. Gloss is partly preserved in D iii 22.

242a. A ii 33 ends the line with dNin.ma.ni.zi. This half line further identifies dNin.kar.nun.na as the brother of dNin.ma.ni.zi; hence eme:11 is to be restored to read [dUmun.kar].nun.na, and not [dGasan.kar].nun.na (cf. A 409 and MSL IV p. 4). dNin.ma.ni.zi and dNin.kar.nun.na are also closely associated together in astronomical texts. Cf. K. 7145;7 (OT 29 47).

243. A ii 75 and A ii 34 begin the name with URI instead of KINDA. These two signs are interchangeable in such contexts; see Kraus, JCS 3 80 f. note 50. Since dNinda.zi is the wife of the “barber of dNin.urta,” her own name of “the true hairdresser” seems quite fitting; cf. CT 29 12 20.

244. The dittos (in A ii 35; D ii 26 omits them) would indicate that dSU.I is here an ideogram for dNinda.zi. The name appears to denote an individual who “anoints the nose (with perfume?).” The significance of the name may be important for the understanding of the profession bara₂ sig₂.ga (see line 247 below) which is involved in the present entries. The name dKIR.Îr.Îr.ur also occurs in CT 24 35 x 6 (a section of K. 4549 but belonging to the “Smaller An : dA-na-um”). Read here dKIR.Îr.Îr.ur.

245. = Ao:78a: dNinda.zi.[ga:EN.LIL.KI]. The name also appeared in CT 24 35 x 7, which can be restored from the present line.

246. = CT 24 35 x 8, which can be restored from this line.
Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Tablet I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250. dNin.KA.ûr.ra</td>
<td>[dam.bi. hàl]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251. dNin.KA.ûr.ra</td>
<td>[dû]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252. dPA+TUG suk kal maβ</td>
<td>[tî]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253. dEn.lûl.lâ.ke₄</td>
<td>[tî]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254. d{En.sâ}.ga</td>
<td>[tî]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255. d{Sag.ga.û.â}.a</td>
<td>[tî]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256. d{PA+TUG}</td>
<td>[tî]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

250. = CT 24 35 x 10, which has ur₄ instead of ùr. The name should probably be read dNin.kir₂.ûr.ra; cf. line 245 above.

251. D iii 31 gives the explanation as: [x] x'.ga

dNin.lîl.lâ.ke₄.

252. dPA+TUG is to be read dEnšada/Enšadu when viewed as a Sumerian deity; as an Akkadian deity, the complex represents dNusku. In YEP 1 53:271, dPA+TUG is given the pronunciation [x'].sâ.û (Dr. Stephens has recently collated this line and tells me that the damaged sign could just as easily be read En₄ ci₃ IN) which should be compared with <d>(en.sâ.) dPA+TUG in CT 25 7:23, and dEn.šâ.û, in eee:12. In YEP 1 53:270, dPA+TUG is given the Akkadian pronunciation of [d]'u'-uš-ku, which should be compared with CT 11 17 iv 12, CT 25 7:22, and ZAV 63 1 5 (see AK 2 9). Apparently, dPA+TUG served as an ideogram for both names at an early date (note the old Babylonian forerunner Ao had two lines in this section devoted to dPA+TUG; see Ao:131 and 135). In the popular etymology of the Assyrians (CT 25 49 r. 4), his name was explained as: re-'u-ú a-kil tè-e-mi mu-sâ-pu-ú [J], in which, it appears that PA = aklu and KU/TUG = têmu, as well as PA+TUG = têmu, etc. (cf. OLZ 46 354 f.). Schneider, AnOr. 19 no. 499, is concerned about the relationship between dNusku and dNin.ûru; and, as Falkenstein, OLZ 46 354 f., has pointed out, there is little reason for such concern; the two deities were both regarded as sons of Nine, hence, brothers. Therefore, in such lists as the present one, dNusku often closely follows dNin.ûru; cf. further CT 25 50:16 (where the "number" of dNusku is given as "10"), Schneuermacher, AFO 9 46; Lewy, Or. 17 146 ff.; AG 422 ff.; and line 145 above.

253. = Ao:132, which writes the name dEn.lîl.lâ.ke₄.

254. Restored from Ao:133; = eme:15. The name appears somewhat later (line 147) in Ao.

255. = Ao:134; = eme:15. The restoration of the final name is completely conjectural. Another instance of a deified ancient king; see Jacobsen, AS no. 11 pp. 106-109 note 217. On the reading of the name, note that a musical instrument was later named after this king; and the pronunciation of this instrument is
269. \( d^\text{u}.\text{ma.ni.}d^\text{di} \)  
270. \( d^\text{u}.\text{KA.nu.n} \)   
271. \( \text{d}^\text{u}.\text{gu.} \text{DUB} \)  
272. \( \text{d}^\text{BALAG.e.diri} \)  
273. \( \text{d}^\text{Ad.du}.\text{nu} \)  
274. \( \text{d}(\text{a}(!)).\text{KAL X BAD} \)  
275. \( \text{d}(\text{ir}(!)).\text{ba.an}) \)  
276. \( \text{d}^\text{Alad}_X(X) \text{KAL X BAD} \)  
277. \( \text{d}^\text{Lamma}.\text{SA}.\text{ga} \)  
278. \( \text{d}^\text{Udug}(\text{!} \text{GA}) \)  

| B | 279. \( \text{d}^\text{Lamma}.\text{GA}.\text{GA} \)  
280. \( \text{u}^\text{du} \)  
281. \( \text{d}^\text{Kal} \text{Kal} \)  
282. \( \text{d}^\text{Nimin}(40) \text{min.tab} \)  
283. \( \text{d}^\text{Nimin.min.tab} \)  
284. \( \text{d}^\text{Ma.na.an} \)  
285. \( \text{d}^\text{t} \text{Za}.\text{TIR} \)  

279. \( \text{Ao:144} \) has \( \text{d}^\text{Lamma.ka.ka} \); therefore read \( \text{d}^\text{Lamma.ka.ka} \).  
280. \( \text{Ao} \) has only four of these utukku, omitting the equivalents of lines 276 and 277.  
281. This line corresponds to \( \text{Ao:308} \); hence this present section was given a different place in the old Babylonian forerunner. As to the pronunciation of the name, cf. the alternate spelling of \( \text{Ur}^\text{\text{K}a.\text{Kal}} \) (VS 16 103) which appears in VS 9 156 r 4 as \( \text{Ur.Ka.al.Ka.al} \). On the reading \( \text{ni.du} \) for \( \text{ni.GAB} \), see p. 15 note 51 above.  
282. Restored from \( \text{Ao:309} \) (which, however, writes \( \text{\text{t}ig.\text{dab} \text{zu}} \)).  
283. \( \text{Ao:310} \), which writes the name as \( \text{d}^\text{Nimin.min.tab} \).  

This and the following lines are very compressed in \( \text{B} \), which sometimes writes as many as three names to a line here.

284. \( \text{B} ^\text{ii} \text{III} \)  
285. \( \text{B} ^\text{ii} \text{III} \)  
286. \( \text{C} ^\text{ii} \text{iI} \)  
287. \( \text{C} ^\text{ii} \text{III} \)  
288. \( \text{C} ^\text{ii} \text{III} \)  
289. \( \text{C} ^\text{ii} \text{III} \)  

280. \( \text{Ao} \) has only four of these utukku, omitting the equivalents of lines 276 and 277.

281. This line corresponds to \( \text{Ao:308} \); hence this present section was given a different place in the old Babylonian forerunner. As to the pronunciation of the name, cf. the alternate spelling of \( \text{Ur}^\text{\text{K}a.\text{Kal}} \) (VS 16 103) which appears in VS 9 156 r 4 as \( \text{Ur.Ka.al.Ka.al} \). On the reading \( \text{ni.du} \) for \( \text{ni.GAB} \), see p. 15 note 51 above.

282. Restored from \( \text{Ao:309} \) (which, however, writes \( \text{\text{t}ig.\text{dab} \text{zu}} \)).

283. \( \text{Ao:310} \), which writes the name as \( \text{d}^\text{Nimin.min.tab} \). This and the following lines are very compressed in \( \text{B} \), which sometimes writes as many as three names to a line here.

284. \( \text{B} ^\text{ii} \text{III} \)  
285. \( \text{B} ^\text{ii} \text{III} \)  
286. \( \text{C} ^\text{ii} \text{iI} \)  
287. \( \text{C} ^\text{ii} \text{III} \)  
288. \( \text{C} ^\text{ii} \text{III} \)  

280. \( \text{Ao} \) has only four of these utukku, omitting the equivalents of lines 276 and 277.

281. This line corresponds to \( \text{Ao:308} \); hence this present section was given a different place in the old Babylonian forerunner. As to the pronunciation of the name, cf. the alternate spelling of \( \text{Ur}^\text{\text{K}a.\text{Kal}} \) (VS 16 103) which appears in VS 9 156 r 4 as \( \text{Ur.Ka.al.Ka.al} \). On the reading \( \text{ni.du} \) for \( \text{ni.GAB} \), see p. 15 note 51 above.

282. Restored from \( \text{Ao:309} \) (which, however, writes \( \text{\text{t}ig.\text{dab} \text{zu}} \)).

283. \( \text{Ao:310} \), which writes the name as \( \text{d}^\text{Nimin.min.tab} \). This and the following lines are very compressed in \( \text{B} \), which sometimes writes as many as three names to a line here.
Tablet I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>288.</td>
<td>dEszi-nu-ú</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289.</td>
<td>d'Ugal',[ki.sá.a]</td>
<td>[d]Ya.iA G E R T O S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289a.</td>
<td>dEnlil(BAD).lá</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290.</td>
<td>dNin.u6.[x.x]</td>
<td>[&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291.</td>
<td>dNin.kalam.zi.I</td>
<td>[&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292.</td>
<td>dIg.ku.ga</td>
<td>[&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293.</td>
<td>dYa.iA</td>
<td>[&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294.</td>
<td>dMIsaba(SE+NAGA)</td>
<td>dam.bi.SAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295.</td>
<td>dSE</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

289a. = A ii 75. B ii 13 included this half line with the material of line 289; but it is clear from the spacing in C iii 26 that C made this a half line by itself.
290. = A and B omit two of the names in this section. Since both have broken surfaces in the left column here, it is difficult to ascertain accurately which two of the names were omitted. However, B ii 14 retains the equivalent of line 292; and this would mean that A and B probably omitted either lines 290 and 291 or line 291 and 292. These omitted lines are arbitrarily assumed to be 290 and 291.
291. In C iii 28, the name seems to end with the traces of one more small sign, possibly Lá; but the space would prohibit a sign like Lj.
294. = Ao:322 and eme:21 (where she appears as dGašan, nisaba). The name is written dMIsaba in OA. 6479 iii 17-30 and dMIsaba in JRAS 1919 190 line 24. The older pronunciation apparently was dMIsaba; cf. CT ii 49:16. Here, she appears especially as the spouse of dYa.iA; seven of her other names are also listed. She is apparently to be identified as Anu: Anu Samâli 99.
295. = Ao:325. Tallquist, AG 344, rightly objects to the reading dIg.ku.ga which some (cf. ZA 36 180) have given this deity. Considerable confusion has surrounded this name (cf. Zimmern, BSGW 63 pp. 92, 109); and the exact status of this deity in the pantheon seems poorly understood. Text A now removes some of the uncertainty by revealing that dGašan represents one of the names of Nisaba. The appearance of dKu.sú in certain later cult texts as a male deity (e.g., cf. AO. 6479 iii 9, Kit. acc. p. 5 where dKu.sú is described as be-lu Sa-su-qu-u "the lofty lord") may be disregarded here in view of the clearer status which she now has in the present series. See also line 324 below where dKu.sú appears as the sangâr.su of Enlil.
300. = Ao:356. This name also is presented as a goddess, in spite of the initial EN (that EN may be used in female names is evident from the fact that in the Ur III tablets, high priestesses of Ušu were often given names beginning with EN; see Landsberger, OLZ 14 125); see also line 185 above where she appears as one of the wives of Enlil. Here, the name is given as one of the names of Nisaba.
301. In the light of line 200 above (where dKu.sú occurs as one of the names of Iâgara), the name should probably be dGas.gas. For more names of Nisaba, see lines 320 ff. below.
305. Cf. KAV 64 iv 13 (possibly = "Smaller An : dAnumum") where dYa.mun.an.an is described as a DUS.nita of Samâs.
| A | 304. | dNu.su.Dub | dNisaba.ke₄ |
| B | 305. | dKU.GI.ban.[da] | [ ] |
| C | 306. | dNin.immaₓ(SIG₇) | um.mi.a dEn.ili.lâ |
| E | 306b. | | kür(():)r.e.ke₄ |
| F | 307. | dGi₄.bur.mar.sul.sul | dNin.immaₓ(SIG₇) |
| G | 308. | dNin.tu.babbar.re | |
| H | 309. | dNâ₄.mé.gul.gul | |
| I | 310. | dSag.gul.gul | |

305. = Ao:319. Unfortunately, the title or function of dKU.GI.ban.da is broken away in C iii 41. He appears again in line 316 below as the husband of dNin.immaₓ(SIG₇). For the reading of the name, see An : Anu gâ améji 129.

306. = Ao:313 and eme:24. For the reading dNin.immaₓ instead of dNin.síg₅, see MSL II p. 63 line 404 and MSL IV p. 5 line 24. Note that the emesal reading (eme:24) is Gašan.nam.zu, a reading which corresponds favorably with dNin.immaₓ. Apparently, the name is to be distinguished here from male deities bearing the same name, e.g., KAV 63 iii 43 and CT 25 49 r. 2 (where the name is explained as: bel nāb-ni₄ bu-un-na₄-ni₄ bel nim-ma [Sun-Su]; cf. Ungnad, OLZ 14 153). That the name occurs in the dEn.zu list of K. 2114 (OT 25 42) :9 may be explained as a later development arising from the relationship described in line 306b below. Cf. further under line 139 above. Here, the name certainly represents a goddess, see lines 305b and 316 below.

306b. dNin.immaₓ(SIG₇) is presented here as the wet nurse of dNin.immaₓ(SIG₇). The appearance of dNin.immaₓ in this list of dNin.immaₓ(SIG₇) names elucidates an otherwise troublesome line in KAV 46:9 (= KAV 63 i 43) which seems to equate dZa.ba₄.bu₄ with dNin.immaₓ(SIG₇). Weidner, Ark 2 13 note 7, was correct in suspecting that the original tradition behind the text of KAV 46:9 certainly had nothing to do with dZa.ba₄.bu₄ (who appears later in Tablet V 49 below). The line in question is to be emended to read: li.ba₄ | ba₄.A₄ | ba₄.x₅ | Pi-za-an Min-ma-bi | dNin.immaₓ(SIG₇).

312. Text = Div 1. A ii 95 and B ii 25 both have sig₅ instead of sig₃; but D seems more convincing here in view of dNisaba.bu₄.síg₅ in the forerunner (Ao:318). The additional explanation in the right half of the line occurs only in D. The traces of the sign read 'X' at first remind one of il₄ and lead one to consider this entry as depicting the "sister of Ninlil" (cf. AG 441); but the phrase "sister of Ninlil" would be written nin dNin.lîl.lî.lâ.ke₄. More convincing would be a restoration of nin dNin."urta"ke₄.

313. Text = Div 2; A ii 96 has dNisaba. That the sign SAL is probably to be read here as munus is inferred from the corresponding emesal line (eme:26), which should be emended to read dNun.nu₄.re₉(NUNUZ).sâ(:).a, instead of dNun.nu₄.re₉.gún.a (see MSL IV p. 5 line 26).

314. Text = Div 3. A ii 97 and B ii 26 have dNin.UG. BI, but Ao:316 clearly has dNin.pirig; therefore the final BI in A and B must represent an old scribal error for the sign GA. A and B should be read dNin.pirig.ga(:).

315. D iv 4 omits NIN and gives dNin.pirig.Sâ. A ii 98 has dNin.pirig in place of dNin.pirig.Sâ. B ii 25 has dNin.pirig.Sâ. Therefore, the text of A and B must represent an old scribal error for the sign GA. A and B should be read dNin.pirig.Sâ(:).

316. = Ao:319. Of. also line 305 above. For the reading of the name, see under An : Anu gâ améji 129 (where he appears in a list of En.ki names). In the present line dKU.GI.ban.da is listed as the husband of dNisaba, but in Tablet IV 104, he appears as a servant in the household of Istar. The fact that dNin.immaₓ(SIG₇) is described here as having a husband is further proof that the deity is involved in this section as a goddess and is to be distinguished from other deities bearing this name. Cf. under line 306 and 306b above.
317. Text = A ii 100. D iv 5 presents dNin.da; but this is not to be preferred above the reading in A, since Ao:317 agrees with A. Note also that Ao includes the name among those of dNin.imma (SIG 4 = Ao:313-318). dNin.da (in D) is to be viewed as a simplex textual variant and not to be identified in any way with the dNin.da who appears among the ancestors of dEn.lil (cf. line 107 above).


318. = Ao:324. Note the popular etymology in CT 25 49 r. 3 which explains the name of dEn.nu.gi as "lord of the (under)world; lord of no return." In Tablet III 86, there is evidence of identification of dEn.nu.gi with dEn.zu.

319. = Ao:325, which has instead dES.gal. The gloss in the present line = D iv 8 and shows that the name is to be read dUrur.māš, while the name in Ao should be read dUrur.gal. D māš’ has dittos in the second half of the line instead of repeating the name as A ii 102 does. Cf. Tablet II 87 below where dUrur.māš appears in the household of dGēlit-lùlù.

320. Text = A ii 103, which varies from D here. D iv 9 omits the name of dNisaba and places dNisaba.ur.sag in this line instead. In the next line, A ii 104 identifies dNisaba.ur.sag with d<snisaba.gal, while D iv 10 identifiess dNisaba.gal with dNisaba.ur.sag by means of dittos. The arrangement of the lines as here presented is slightly emended to reflect these facts and to represent the probable original arrangement of the material here. This assumes (thus supporting Weidner, AFK 2 78 note 4) that dNisaba was also called d<snisaba.gal and dNisaba.ur.sag, and that she was the spouse of dEn.nu.gi as well as the guzāllu of Ninlil. D iv 9 was in the explanatory column; gu.zālùlù. dEn.lilùlù. lā.keù. This would seem to say that the goddess being described is represented as ‘his wife, namely of the guzāllu of Ninlil’, and this statement also would be true (cf. line 318). On this point, eme:22 agrees with A. For more on dNisaba, cf. note 294 above.

321. Cf. under note 320 above. Ao:327 presents d<snisaba.gal here, which indicates that the AN sign in A ii 104 is not to be taken as a determinative. Similarly, cf. EAV 65 iv 11 where d<snisaba.gal occurs in a line that corresponds with d<snisaba.gal in its duplicate, EAV 5 v 2 (see Weidner’s collation of this line in AFK 2 78 note 4). Cf. also Schroeder, ZA 53 138. The emesal text (eme:22) lists only this one name for the guzāllu of Ninlil.

322. The name seems to mean “maid of the holy shrine.”

323. The name seems to mean “maid of the holy shrine.”

324. = Ao:328. Cf. line 298 above where dKù.sù is included among the names of dNisaba. Note also BA 10/1 105: 4 where dKù.sù is similarly described as the sanga 2 .maag of dEn.lil.

325. In line 226, d<snin.NINDA X GUD is listed as the husband of the deity in the present line, while in Ao:329, he immediately follows dKù.sù indicating that in the forerunner also, he was regarded as the husband of dKù.sù. This fact points up the significance of the dittos in the present line, clearly revealing that GUD here is an ideogram for dKù.sù of line 324. Thus GUD in this line is a goddess, who is eventually to be identified with dNisaba (see line 298 above). As such, this name is to be distinguished from other deities written with the same ideogram (e.g., cf. Tablet VI 203-209). In the present line, the use of the sign SU (D iv 13 gives dittos in place of SU; but A ii 107 places the dittos in front of the ideogram instead) is interesting. On the usage of SU in such contexts, see also pp. 21, 25, 26 above.

326. = Ao:329 and eme:23. A ii 108 preserves a variant (and probably corrupt) tradition for this line, giving the explanation as, dNisaba.dù.kù.gal, "his spouse, namely of dKù.sù." The entry in eme:23 agrees with D iv 14 that d<snin.NINDA X GUD should be viewed as a male deity (the husband of dKù.sù) and identified with the weather god. For scribal practice involved in the organization of this line, see pp. 13 f. (espec. note 47). Zimmern (see BSGW 63 92 f.) was correct in deciding that the second half of the present line indicates
that dNin.NINDA X GUD is to be equated with dIM. But Zimmern was led into perplexity over this line by assuming that dKù. sù was a masculine dame and that dNin.NINDA X GUD was therefore "his" spouse. When confronted by the evidence that the present line identifies dNin.NINDA X GUD with dIM, an d that emes:23 gives the name a masculine reading in emesal. Zimmern too quickly dismissed the line as some sort of scribal confusion.

327. Text = A ii 109. D iv 15 has d KA X NUN.kù.ga. Dr. Landsberger suggested (in an oral communication) that he would prefer to find here EA X Sà ("sum", or, MSL II p. 56 line 319, = šaptu "lip") and would emend the name to read *dSum .ku.ga.

328. = emes:27. That the name is not d Nin.EZENfKESDA is seen from Ao:330 which clearly has dNin.SAR. Dr. Landsberger suggests a possible reading of dNin.mù. This name is to be distinguished from dNin.Aar (BAR), one of the names of the wife of Anu (cf. line 29 above).

329. The dittos indicate that d MU is an ideogram for dNin.SAR. To pick out only one sign of the preceding name and place it in the present line, making dNin.mù (as in AG 415; similarly, dNin.gir in AG 404) is to misunderstand the significance of dittos in this series. A ii 111 puts SU in place of the dittos in the second half of the line.

330. D iv 19: dGIR .ra.gal. On the reading of dGIR .ra.gal (on the reading, see K. 8220: 7 EA 17 159) is here described as the husband of dMin.SAR and is further equated with dNerigal. This explains the fact that dMin.SAR and dGIR .ra.gal are often listed together (cf. the astronomical text K. 7145:11 CT 29 47). A ii 115 (as in line 326 above) seems to present a corrupt variant by ending the line with ke₄. This would give an incorrect explanation that the deity of the present line is the husband of dNerigal (see also pp. 13 f. above, note 47). A ii 115 puts Su in place of the dittos in the second half of the line.

331. D iv 22: dUnu3.dù.dù. 332. = Ao:331. dir.ra.gal (on the reading, see K. 8220: 7 EA 17 159) is here described as the husband of dMin.SAR and is further equated with dNerigal. This explains the fact that dMin.SAR and dGIR .ra.gal are often listed together (cf. the astronomical text K. 7145:11 CT 29 47). A ii 115 (as in line 326 above) seems to present a corrupt variant by ending the line with ke₄. This would give an incorrect explanation that the deity of the present line is the husband of dNerigal (see also pp. 13 f. above, note 47). A ii 115 puts Su in place of the dittos in the second half of the line.

333. Text = A ii 116. D iv 25 varies completely, giving the name as dSA.NE. In A, the sign A is written oddly, having either a winklehaken or a diagonal stroke immediately following an otherwise regularly written ID.

334. The corresponding line in Ao (line 334) offers dPa.te.en.du₄, and places the name more directly in the circle of dNin.SAR. The name also occurs as dPa.te.en.du₄ in SHP p. 91:11 (+ p. 137:66) where it is similarly in context with dNin.ka.si. A ii 115 deviates here completely, giving dPA. AN.GÉ (which may be either dUgula.an.ke₉ or dGarza.gé). Concerning the gloss in D iv 22, cf. ULG 12 200. The second half of the line appears in A ii 115 as dU ni.sag(MUR).ke₄.

335. Text = A ii 116. D iv 25 varies completely, giving the name as dSA.NE. In A, the sign A is written oddly, having either a winklehaken or a diagonal stroke immediately following an otherwise regularly written ID.

336. = Ao:332 and emes:28. A ii 117 draws the sign SIM as though it were actually BI.IS. Perhaps the existence of a BI.IS (in such forms as BI.IS-ilu, see Clay, PN 167) should be re-examined in light of this. It is obvious from a comparison of A ii 117 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considerable confusion in the various traditions concerning dNin.ka.si and dSiris. Here they are identified with each other and portrayed as feminine (cf. emes:28 which has dGasan.ka.si); but in EB 11 17 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considerable confusion in the various traditions concerning dNin.ka.si and dSiris. Here they are identified with each other and portrayed as feminine (cf. emes:28 which has dGasan.ka.si); but in EB 11 17 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considerable confusion in the various traditions concerning dNin.ka.si and dSiris. Here they are identified with each other and portrayed as feminine (cf. emes:28 which has dGasan.ka.si); but in EB 11 17 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considerable confusion in the various traditions concerning dNin.ka.si and dSiris. Here they are identified with each other and portrayed as feminine (cf. emes:28 which has dGasan.ka.si); but in EB 11 17 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considerable confusion in the various traditions concerning dNin.ka.si and dSiris. Here they are identified with each other and portrayed as feminine (cf. emes:28 which has dGasan.ka.si); but in EB 11 17 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considerable confusion in the various traditions concerning dNin.ka.si and dSiris. Here they are identified with each other and portrayed as feminine (cf. emes:28 which has dGasan.ka.si); but in EB 11 17 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considerable confusion in the various traditions concerning dNin.ka.si and dSiris. Here they are identified with each other and portrayed as feminine (cf. emes:28 which has dGasan.ka.si); but in EB 11 17 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considerable confusion in the various traditions concerning dNin.ka.si and dSiris. Here they are identified with each other and portrayed as feminine (cf. emes:28 which has dGasan.ka.si); but in EB 11 17 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considerable confusion in the various traditions concerning dNin.ka.si and dSiris. Here they are identified with each other and portrayed as feminine (cf. emes:28 which has dGasan.ka.si); but in EB 11 17 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considerable confusion in the various traditions concerning dNin.ka.si and dSiris. Here they are identified with each other and portrayed as feminine (cf. emes:28 which has dGasan.ka.si); but in EB 11 17 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considerable confusion in the various traditions concerning dNin.ka.si and dSiris. Here they are identified with each other and portrayed as feminine (cf. emes:28 which has dGasan.ka.si); but in EB 11 17 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considerable confusion in the various traditions concerning dNin.ka.si and dSiris. Here they are identified with each other and portrayed as feminine (cf. emes:28 which has dGasan.ka.si); but in EB 11 17 f. that A intended BI.IS to be a simple graphic variant of SIM. D iv 24 omits dSIM, replacing it with Su, which should provide an instructive example of the use of Su cf. pp. 26 f. above. Apparently, there is considera...
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339. $d_a (= si.rî.is)_{KAS}$. *" 

GIG

340. $d_{Me,hûš.a}$. $SU$

341. $d_{Men.kû}$. $SU$

342. $d_{Mên.me.tê}$. $SU$

343. $d_{Ki, tuš.kà.zal}$. $SU$

344. $d_{Nu, šîlig(URU X IGÎ).ga}$. $SU$

345. $d_{5 dumu.meš}$. $d_{Nu, ka. si.ke₄}

346. $d_{Nin.mâ.da}$. $muš, la.b₄ (SU)_{KA X SU}$. $d_{dè An.na.kes₄}

$qSîris$. A reading of $qSîris.kâ$ for this line (cf. AG 449) results from a misunderstanding of dittos with glosses, cf. pp. 15 f. above. A omits this line possibly because it was merely another ideographic method of writing $qSîris$. For $dKAS$, cf. Poeschel, ZA 59 197. D iv 26 f. has $SU$ in the second half of these lines instead of the expected dittos. 339. Cf. under note 338 above. The dittos indicate again that the previous gloss of si.rî.is is to be repeated here. The entry, however, is not unambiguous. It might logically be read either as $dSîris_{(KA,GIG)}$ or $dSîris_{(Kâ).gi₄}$ (see p. 16 note 54 above). The former reading may be preferred here, since the explanatory column identifies all these entries (by dittos) with $dSîris$.

340. Here the list of the sons of $dNin.ka.si$ begins. Text = $B$ ii 47 (which is only partly preserved) and $D$ ii 28 (which abbreviates the name to $dMe,hûš$). For similar names ending in $hûš.a$, see Tablet VII 14, 69, 117. $A$ ii 119 gives the odd variant $dMe,hûš.sâ$, but this may be corrupt for $dMe,hûš.sâ$. The present entry is doubtless to be distinguished from another deity of the same name who is identified with $qIstar$ in K. 2109:8 (CT 25 30).

341. $d_{Nin.mà.da}$. $d_{dè An.na.kes₄}$

342. Text = $A$ ii 121, with which $B$ ii 48 probably agreed. $D$ ii 30 varies, giving the entry as $dXA X KE.(e.me), te.$

343. Text = $A$ ii 122b, 123b. D iv 32 gives the unconvincing total of "9" for the sons of $dNin.mâ.da$. It is not easy to determine the reason for this large total unless B went back to line 336 and included the names of $dNin.mâ.da$ herself as well.

344. $d_{Nin.mâ.da}$. $d_{dè An.na.kes₄}$ For the value $SU_{X SU}$, see MSL II p. 57 note 329.
354. d A. gû.b. ba  
Eridu (UNU.KI). ga.ke₄  
354A.  
355. dÉ.ta.e₇ (DUL-DU). dé  
dam.bi.SAL  
356. dÎG-lu-lim  
lâ.kâ.ga.ke₄  
357. dLâ. gi₇. sî. ga  
SU dU.GUR (= dNerigal)  
358. dLâ. Ën-nil-nil.lâ  
udug é.kî.lîr.ke₄  
359. dLâ. dNî-nil-nil.lâ  
udug é. kî.lîr.ke₄  
360. dLâ. dNî-nil-nil.lâ  
udug é. lú.kî.lîr.ke₄  
361. dLî. dà-TÔG  
udug é. me. lam. gu₄.a. ke₄  
362. dDâ.da.gu.la  
lâ. balاغ. ga. tu₄.a  
nam. ma.b. dingî.r.e  
tu. mu. un. tu₄.k. tu₄.a  

explained as: be-lît te-il-lî-ti GASAN a-il₄-kât su₄-lî-lî (see Ungnad, OLB 14 153). Cf. further ZA NF 5 260 note 1 and NYAG 1918/2 32. The gloss in the present line (a. ba₄ "sister") is in D iv 40. B ii 56: nin.bi dEn.lù.lù.ke₄.  
354. A ii 131 may be interpreted as dA. rû.b. ba instead of dA. rû.b. bal. The word sukkal is omitted by D iv 41. For the reading UD.UD = da₄ da₄, see TCL 6 iv 16 and Thureau-Dangin, Hom. 5 note 9.  
354A. The arrangement of this line is still indicated by the traces in D iv 41 f., which preserves the blank space at the beginning of the line.  
355. Corresponds to Ao:341: dÉ.ta.e₇ (DUL-DU). dé. D iv 43 preserves enough of the traces of the first sign to suggest the strong possibility that it too began with É; but A ii 132 and B ii 58 follow a textual tradition that began this name with A. This interchange between É and A occurs occasionally elsewhere in the present series (cf. line 145 above; cf. Tablet II 304 below). Here, the dittos indicate that dNar is ideographic for dDâ.da.gu.la.  
356. A ii 142 omits ra.  
357. For the second name, C iv 5 gives [d]É.ta.la. ak. In KAV 65 iii 34 (= KAV 65 iii 11), dDâ.da = dNîl₄ (i.e., dNînîrû). Cf. Tablet IV 157 below where where dDâ.da appears as one of the messengers of dNîhtar.  
360. A ii 136 omits é.  
361. A ii 138 omits the final a in the temple name.  
362. A ii 139 omits ga. The name occurs also in the old Babylonian list VAT 8084 (AfK 2 6) r. 6. In the present entry, he is given a compound epithet: "the man who sits at the harp (and) who plays it in a way befitting the majesty of god."  
363. To be distinguished from dNAR (= dDunga) who is equated with dEn.kî; cf. K. 4366:10 (CT 25 48) and Tablet II 304 below. Here, the dittos indicate that dNar is ideographic for dDâ.da.gu.la.  
364. A ii 142 omits ra.  
365. For the second name, C iv gives [d]É.ta.la. ak. In KAV 65 iii 34 (= KAV 65 iii 11), dDâ.da = dNîl₄ (i.e., dNînîrû). Cf. Tablet IV 157 below where where dDâ.da appears as one of the messengers of dNîhtar.  
367. For the second name, C iv 5 gives [d]É.ta.la. ak. In KAV 65 iii 34 (= KAV 65 iii 11), dDâ.da = dNîl₄ (i.e., dNînîrû). Cf. Tablet IV 157 below where where dDâ.da appears as one of the messengers of dNîhtar.  
370. C iv 7: 3 lû.si.gar. ra. ke₄.  
371. C iv 8. This is the "catch-line" for the next tablet.  
372. = C iv 9 plus the summary in A ii 146 and B ii 73. A omits in; B omits SU. The count according to B was 148 entries; A gives 149. Line 72 of B contains only the one sign BE = gamru "complete." A calls this dub 2 kâm.ma "the second tablet." This means that A followed a tradition which divided the first tablet into two subtablets. Cf. under line 204 above and see p. 7 note 26 above.

SOURCES USED IN RECONSTRUCTING TABLET II
A YBC 2401  
B K. 4349 (CT 24 20 ff.)  
C K. 4352 (CT 24 12-17)  
D VAT 10934 (KAV 150)
1. Tablet II begins with a long list of the names of Dingir.mād (that the DINGIR is not determinative is seen from eme:31 which has here "dim.me.er.mad"). The present line = Ao:113 and ab (= "Smaller An : dA-nu-um") iii 24. Col. i of aa presents a number of names from this present list and identifies them with both dBe-lit-i-li and Istar. In the second half of the present line, A ii 147 and B ii 74 write dBe-lit-DINGIR.MES.


3. = eme:33. C does not use dittos in this list, but gives consecutive numbers to the names instead.

4. In dMin.dingir.re.e.ne is doubtless to be seen the Sumerian prototype of dBe-lit-i-li. B ii 76 omits re.

6. ab iii 29 has an extra name here: dMin.du.PU.ra.


8. ab iii 32 ends the name with re. A ii 154 ff. preserves only the determinative and the traces of a few lines beginning with NIN for lines 8-21. B ii 78 ends the name with re. Concerning the signs AŠ(†).BAR in B, see CT 24 p. 18.

12. Possibly = Ao:118, which gives dMin.EZEN X KA'.EZEN X KA'. If the identification with Ao is correct, then the name in the present line should be read dMin.sag.EZEN.EZEN; but the equation is not certain.

14. The name appears in CT 24 36 x 36 (a portion of K. 4349, but belonging to the "Smaller An : A-nu-um") as an utukku of a deity whose name is missing. Quite probably two different deities with the same name are involved here.

15. Text = C i 12, which agrees with the old Babylonian forerunner Ao:117. B ii 81 varies, giving dMin.tu.tu.re.

16. Text = C i 13. B ii 81b agrees, but ends the name with re.

17. Text = C i 14. Concerning the gloss, see under note 21 below.
19. = Ao:116. Gloss in C 16. The gloss, as usual, may be a pronunciation gloss indicating a reading of dNin.tur(TU); but this cannot be controlled. Since G obviously is a fragment of a tablet giving more complete explanations in the right half of each line, it may not represent an actual duplicate. The present entry should correspond to eme:34; see MSL IV p. 6 note 34.


21. Gloss and Akkadian explanation in C 18. B ii 83 offers be-lit me-a-mi. The name also occurs phonetically written as dMin.me.en.[na] in Langdon, TAD no. 49:8, which raises a question as to the force of the gloss here. Such a gloss may be taken (as it usually is) to indicate the simple pronunciation of the sign involved, especially when this is unusual or different from the common value of the sign. This would lead to a reading for the present line of dMin'.mi(en).[na]. However, in the light of dMin.me.en.[na] (referred to earlier in this note), one might consider the possibility that the scribes occasionally used glosses to give only the first part of the pronunciation of the sign involved. This possibility might provide an explanation for a number of the entries in the present series, in which the gloss, as written, seems incomplete in giving the pronunciation of rather common signs; e.g., consider ba,:ab for UD in line 17 above, or for AN in line 41 below; for EDIR in line 286 below; as for SAG in Tablet III 95; e for NIN in Tablet III 85, et passim; mi for NIN in Tablet III 27, 28, et passim; etc. In fact, some entries remain quite enigmatic apart from some explanation such as this (e.g., see Tablet VI 309). It might be argued in all such cases that the scribe really did not possess a simple sign that could have been used for a pronunciation gloss. When, for example, he was confronted with the common sign NIN and wished to indicate that it had a reading of nin rather than ereš (or even egi, cf. MSL II p. 65 lines 419-422; MSL III p. 126 note 338-340;
27. In GT 29 46:5, \( ^d \)URUDU.NAGAR is glossed with ti.bi.
    ra; but it is possible that this gloss does not necessarily
    apply to the present line.
29. On the reading of LÚ.GISGAL.lu, cf. under Tablet I
    205; and note 32 below.
30. See line 114 below, where \( ^d \)Nagar.ság.a appears in
    the list of the children of Dingir.mah. Here, the name is
    identified with Dingir.mah herself.
32. C i 28 varies here, giving \( ^d \)Sa.º(ama).LÚ.GISGAL (cf.
    Tablet I 205).
33. = Ao:121. Beginning with the sign LÚ, this name
    seems strange in this list of the names of Dingir.mah, since
    female names in this series do not begin with the male deter-
    minative. Perhaps before LÚ, the name originally began with
    another sign which is now lost. For a few lines, the main
    contribution of E is the restoration of the dittos in the
    explanatory column.
35. Gloss in C i 31. The dittos in B ii 91 are puzzling,
    unless this name is to be understood as ideographic for
    the previous name.
36. C i 32 ends the name with me instead of ma. For the
    meaning of the name, see 2A 44 19.
45. Distinguish from Ma-mi-tum, the spouse of Ningal; see Tablet VI 3. The names of Dingir.mash.ek end here.

46. = Ao:122. Second half of the line = C i 42 (on the reading dam, see OLZ 12 201). A iii 9 and B ii 97 both present merely dam.bi. Poebel (ZA 38 85) would read 4dSul.kin. eq. a. Cf. further under Tablet I 3.

47. = Ao:123. Text = A iii 10 (restored with the help of B ii 97 and B:15). A list of the four other names of dSul.pa.e (which is elsewhere written dSul.pa.e.a) begins here. In astronomical texts, both dSul.pa.e and dSul.al.TAR are identified with Marduk; see III R 53 no. 2 (cf. ZA 45 140).


49. = Ao:125.

50. The names of dSul.pa.e end here.

51. A list of five "bennu" deities begins with this line. Apparently, these represent demons of some type of sickness, possibly epilepsy (see Driver and Miles, BD 1 p. 479). In the later contracts dealing with the transfer of slaves, the word occasionally occurs in assurances by the seller that the slave being sold is not afflicted with bennu (e.g., cf. Johns, ADD no. 208 r. 4; no. 211 r. 10, et passim). Even in Ol, there is a law which specifically states that a purchaser of a slave might return the slave if the affliction of bennu should befall (im-ta-qú-ut) the slave (par. 278). Note also Maglû ii 57, where the word is listed among a number of fearful plagues and is described as the "product" (ribûtu) of dunu. In fact, this section in Maglû seems to indicate that the "bennu" deities are actually forms of dSul.pa.e.a. This would mean that the list of "bennu" deities continues the list of names begun in line 47 above).

53. The name indicates some sort of a cipple or a monster; cf. Fauna 1806c.

54. In keeping with the meaning of bennu (see under note 51 above), this name possibly involves the idea of falling from a roof or a high place.

55. A iii 19 gives dSul.pa.e.ta.dar. =A[.], but Ao:296 makes it clear that C i 52 is correct in omitting the sign TA. B ii 102 agrees with A, but adds the sign II, which is probably to be emended (as Meissner, OLZ 12 202, observes) to indicate instead the mark of division.

56. Ao:297 shows that A iii 20 is nearer to the correct form here and that B ii 102 should be emended to read dSul.pa.e.amaš.

57. Ao:297 (with dSul.pa.e.amāš.a) shows that A iii 20 is nearer to the correct form here and that B ii 102 should be emended to read dSul.pa.e.amaš.

59. C i 54 varies, giving 3 Am <dingir>.gub.ba <d 60. = Ao:126, which give dBara₂.ul.lig.ar.ra. A iii 22 varies, giving dBara₂.ul.lig.ar. ra. The second name appears in a number of different orthographies, exhibiting, in particular, a number of various methods of writing nigin. The name in the present line = C i 55, which gives nigin₁(U-UD-KID). For this complex, B ii 104 writes U-UD+KID; and A i 11 22 has U-UD+KID. In ab ii 16, the complex is written UD+U+KID, while in an Akkadian translation line, ab ii 17 presents UD+KID. Note also line 84 below, where A iii 44 abbreviates the sign to UD. Evidently, all of these are to be regarded as graphic variants of nigin. The name possibly occurs also in KAV 63 i 12 (see AKF 2 72 note 2). In C i 55, the explanation is given as dumu.ni instead of dumu.ni. 61. Text = A iii 23, B ii 105 gives dBara₂.ul.lig.ar. ra, but this seems to be mere dittography.
This is certainly the same deity who is known also as dLil-lu. Cf. CT 25 12:21 where dLil-lu appears in a Ninurta list. C i 60 gives [dumu Dingir].mah.Ke₄.
The arrangement in C i 59-61 suggests that C may have listed still another son of Dingir.mah before the name of dLil.

The names of a number of deities were represented by the sign group DUG.QA.BUR (in B, the graphic variant LI₈ instead of QA occurs); and, apparently, a number of different readings are to be assigned to this complex, depending upon which specific deity it represents. Here, the dittos indicate that DUG.QA.BUR is ideographic for dLil/Lillu; and this must be compared with CT 12 21, where the complex has the gloss lil-lu. Similarly, the same gloss occurs for this complex in TCL 6 37 ii 50 (= AS no. 7 p. 43). In this is to be seen the illustration of an important function of dittos in the present series—indicating that the name which has dittos in front of it should be regarded as ideographic for the name of the preceding line. Note that in the Enki list below, this same sign group again occurs several times preceded by dittos (see especially note 160 below) and each time has a different value (controlled by glossed readings) appropriate to the context. Therefore the present DUG.QA.BUR (= dLil) is to be carefully distinguished from other deities written with these same signs. Cf. further Tablet I 152 and 167 (= in the Enki list) and Tablet II 26 (where the complex occurs as a component in one of the names of Dingir.mah); and lines 156, 160, 162, and 164 below (representing various names of Enki). For the second half of the present entry, D i 5 gives (dLil-lu) instead of SU.

See Tablet V 136 where the name appears as one of the names of dMin.kar.ra.ak.

For dMin.šir.gi, cf. MSL II p. 57 note 329, and note 99 below. The name is apparently written with either GI₄ or GI₈, cf. ab iii 13 f. and see under note 99 below. In CT 25 12:22, he is equated with dNin.ura. In Ao:128, the place where his name should occur (after dLil and before dGis.ur.an.ki) is occupied by dNin.sikil.la (see line 97 below). Possibly, therefore, these two deities are to be equated.

The complex dNE.SI₄ (or dNE.GUN) is now known to have the value dLisin. Weidner, AK 2 10 note 2) knew of the gloss in Harper, AB 14 no. 1449:2 (11.si), but apparently considered the gloss only from the angle that the second half of the gloss indicated a reading of ši₄ for GUN; and then he stopped with the enigmatic possible equation of 11 = NE. Thureau-Dangin (RA 19.178:27) treated the gloss as though the whole gloss indicated the reading of NE, and suggested dNis,gün. In keeping with the use of such glosses, however, it is apparent that the gloss li₄.si should apply to the whole name, either to indicate a reading of dLis₄.si₄ or to indicate that dNE.GUN is an ideogram which has a value of dLisin (similar to the way in which dU.GUR = dNerigal, etc.). Dr. Landsberger indicates (see MSL IV p. 8 note 37) that the equation dNE.SI₄ = li₄.si occurs also in the series "Proto-diril." Apparently this reading for the complex was known in Ur III; at least, this may be inferred from such spellings as dNE.SI₄.na, cf. Schneider, AmO 19. p. 40 no. 262. See also Kraus, Symbolae Koschaker 52 note 44 and Jacobsen, Cuneiform Texts in the National Museum, Copenhagen, p. 25.

Cf. also EAV 63 i 9 (= EAV 65 r. i 9).

Cf. CT 25 14:14. KU in this and the following three lines may actually be ṣe "rope," etc. The list of the sons of dLisin begins with this line.

Cf. OT 15 14:15.

On the analogy of the previous pair of names and the following name, the present line is probably to be emended to read dNin.sikil.la. EAV 65 r. i 9.

Cf. CT 25 14:15.

Cf. OT 15 14:15.

Cf. OT 15 14:15.
77. In the first line of J, the name was written [dKi. tuš].kiš.ki. This text also appears to add an extra name to each of these lines, which may have been either a further identification or possibly the name of the wife of each of these sons of dLisin. B ii 116 omits the expected KI from kiš.


80. J varies slightly here, making these the sons of the wife of dLisin (dMin.sikil.[lā.KE₄]). Then J (line 5) gave a second summary which obviously summed up the extra eight names which were given in the explanatory column beside each one of the sons of dLisin.

81. Text = J 6. Although the name is omitted by A and B, they both list the sukallu of this deity in line 85 below; hence the name must have been omitted here by scribal oversight.

84. A iii 44 abbreviates ngiš₃ to U–UD; cf. under note 60 above.

85. See note 81 above.

86. The traces (especially in A iii 46) are poorly preserved here. What is preserved resembles 'dGīš₃.bur.x.x', which reminds one of line 69 above (dGīš₃.kur.an.ki). But the traces do not favor this name.

87. = Ao:128 (cf. under note 68 above). Note that dUru₃. maš appears in Tablet I 319 in the household of Emil and is there identified with dEm.nu.gi₄ the throne-bearer of Emil and husband of Nisaba. However, the entry in Ao (line 325) which corresponds to Tablet I 319 gives that name as dUru₃. gal, while the present entry is given in Ao:128 as dUru₃. maš. In other words, the forerunner still distinguished between two separate deities (dUru₃. gal and dUru₃. maš) whose names in later times came to be both written alike. Therefore it is probable that the two deities should still be distinguished from each other: the one (Tablet I 319) = dEm.nu.gi₄ the husband of dNisaba; the other (the present entry) = the ngišgal of a deity whose name is missing (possibly Dingir.mab).
99. Also in ab ii 12-14. B ii 13 appears to write the first name as dSà.tùr.nun.KIDè; but in the light of A iii 58, the KID is to be corrected to TA; see also OLZ 12 202. Note that A iii 58 writes the last name as dAS.sir; but in A iii 30 (= line 68 above), the name is written dAS.sir.gi.

100. Also in ab ii 15-17, which renders the name [d4S].pa.dù 10 . A iii 59 writes nigin as U+UD+RU; see note 60 above. Note that ab translates the Sumerian gu 4. DUB with the Akkadian mu-un-dal-ku; cf. also p. 15 note 49 above.

101. = eme:35. The explanation sa-su-ru appears to give.

The pronunciation of both DINGIR.TÚR and dSÀ.TÚR (in the following line); see OLZ 12 202. This would indicate that the present DINGIR.TÚR is to be distinguished from dDINGIR.TÚR and dDINGIR.TÚR (TU) in lines 18 f. above (whose pronunciations are controlled by glosses). DINGIR.TÚR in the present entry may eventually prove to be the equivalent of the SÁM.TUR of the emesal list (see MSL IV p. 6 note 34) and probably has nothing to do with Dingir.map. In ab ii 18, the name is written DINGIR.TÚR. The sign DUN.TÚR is not made the same in A iii 60 f. as it is in A iii 58.

102. The ditto indicates that the pronunciation sa-su-ru is to be repeated for DINGIR.TÚR. Note that as:12 substantiates this conclusion by giving SÁM.TUR as a pronunciation gloss for dDINGIR.TÚR.

103. ab ii 20 renders the name as d3U X MU(sigu).JUL and then explains it as du-ul-lu. However, this variant and explanation is no less puzzling than the explanation su-ul-lu in the present line.

104. In ab ii 21 f., this name is explained as ní.te Dingir.map.ki with the Akkadian explanation pa-lih DUN. DINGIR.MES (< dDINGIR.MES). With this line, the names of the sixteen children of Dingir.map begin; see line 127 below.

105. The sign LÁ after ama.sk is puzzling in A iii 64. Possibly this should be omitted as may be seen from a similar line in ab ii 23 f. which gives: dDINGIR.TÚR/UR ama.sk.
A C F

112. dšā.su.māṭ
urudu.nagār kalam.

ma.ke₄

112a.

113. ḍušu(uš),šā.su(su)
dumu.SĀL dšīn.tu.d.

tu.ud.da

113a.

114. dNagar.šā.sā
ki.sikil.ša si.sī.ki

114a. mut-ta-ad-di-nā-

at-ar-da-a-ti

115. mu-da-me-[gā]t (=)

ki.sikil.ša sig₇.

116. "(= mu-da-me-gāt)

mu.sikil.ša sig₇.

117. <d>Am.me.a

gū.sī.sā tuš,a

117a.

gū.(xx tuš).r₄

118. dAma.é.a

sā ina nāp-ša-ri šā-

bu

118a.

119. dUr.gu.ru

me.a.tūm.tūm.₄₅

119a.

sā ina(AS) pār-₅ᵣ

Su-lu-ku

Tablet II

Tablet II

112a. The Akkadian translation of urudu.nagār is found in C ii 2b.

113. Glosses in C ii 3. In A iii 72, the name is written 'dšūš'.šā.su. The first part of the explanation in C is not well preserved, but the second half seems better than that of A (which gives dšīn.tu d.tu.ke₄) and F i 4 (which seems from the traces to agree with A). C ii 3b reads 'dšīn.tu() d.tu.ud.da'. The complete explanation should be "the daughter whom dšīn.tu bore."

113a. Represents the Akkadian version of the explanation in line 113.

114. In sa:10, this deity is identified with dšelit-IlI and dšītar (cf. also line 31 above), which is in keeping with the present entry, since both entries present her as a goddess. In this and the lines which follow, the Sumerian verb in the explanatory column of A iii 73 ff. is varied graphically, but apparently with similar phonetic values. C ii 5 and F i 5 have sum.sum.mu instead of si.sī.ki. Note that the Akkadian translation mutaddinaš = (114a below) is given in both A and C, confirming the equation si/su = nam.su. In C, the variant ki.sikil.T₄ instead of ki.sikil.ša is not as easy to explain, unless it represents a scribal mistake.

114a. This represents the Akkadian translation of the explanatory column in line 114. Text = C ii 6; in A, this material is written on the left side as a small half line crowded between A iii 73 and 74. A varies slightly, however, giving mut-ta-ad-[š]+(sa-št). The corresponding line in sa:10 is to be restored on the basis of the present entry.

115. Text = A iii 74. This represents a further appellative of dNagar.šā.sā and should be compared with sa:lla.

116. Text = A iii 75, which corresponds to sa:llb. Note the equation here of SIG 7 = damāqu.

117. Text = C ii 7. In A iii 76, the name is written dAm.me.a, which seems to be a corruption from <d>Am(a).me.a (for the sign A used as a gloss for AN, see notes 21 and 41 above). The variant in A thus gives a clue as to the probable reading of C and throws some doubt upon the reading dMe.a. In the light of A, the am.si.sā in C should be corrected to gu(š).sī.sā.

117a. Represents the Akkadian version of the explanation in line 117.

118. Text = C ii 7. In A iii 76, UR.SAG appears in place of qar-rad (in C iii 7). F i 8 writes ša instead of šā. In the light of the Akkadian explanation in 118a below, the second half of the line should possibly be restored to gu(š).nīn tuš,ša.

118a. Text = A iii 77a. In C ii 8, the name appears as aš ana(DIS) par-ši šu-lu-ku. The extra material at the end of the line in C represents the last part of a line otherwise omitted by C (= line 120a below).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACDF</th>
<th>ACDF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120. d'Ur.ra</td>
<td>124. d'Su.ki.gar.ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x.x'.tu.ud.da</td>
<td>Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120a.</td>
<td>125. d'Aš.an.ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. d'Ama.nir.an.na</td>
<td>126. d'Á.lú.e.gi.gar.ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ama.ša.tum.e.bi</td>
<td>Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. um-mu ša ina ger-be-te šu-pa-at</td>
<td>127. d'En.bar₂.gi.si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. 16 dumu.še₃</td>
<td>Dingir.ma₂.bi.ₜₐₖₐₜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

120. The end of the explanation was combined by C with that of line 119 (see under note 119 above). In A i i i 79, the first 'x' resembles URU with an illegible sign inserted. In the light of 120a below, one might expect to find ša₂₂ here (if one reads zu-un-ni "rain" instead of šu-un-ni "womb"), or possibly a phonetic variant such as URU X TU (= ša₂₂), but ša₂₂ is excluded by the traces, and ša₂₂ is doubled. One may also think of URU X IGI = ša₂₂ "fetus"? (see § 44, 4), if one reads line 120a with šu-un-ni instead of zu-un-ni; but the traces seem to fit URU X TU (= ša₂₂) better than URU X 231. The second 'x' is equally uncertain.

120a. Text = A i i i 79b and F i 11. C omits the line here, but combines the final part of it with line 119a (see under note 119a above), giving a slight variation: ana(ša₂₂) šu-un-ni šu-lu-du (the sign Ša₂₂ may represent here an attempt by the scribe to indicate the beginning of new material; or it may represent the preposition ana, as it does in C ii 5 = 119a above). The meaning of the present entry would be "the one who was born in the womb" (Dr. Landesberger suggested to me the alternate possibility of reading the entry as ša₂₂ ina zu-un-ni 'a-al-du "the one who was born in the rain") and the significance of C would be "who causes to be born in the womb" (or "who causes to be born in the rain").

121. Text = C ii 10. A i i i 81a writes phonetically tuₐₐ instead of tum. In A i i i 80 f., the material is slightly rearranged so that the name and the Sumerian explanation are all on the left side (= 80a and 81a) and the Akkadian translation on the right side (= 80b and 81b). The traces in F i 12 f. show that it followed this same arrangement. A i i i 81a seems to have 'ka' or 'ke₂₂' instead of bi. In the present line, the Sumerian explanation describes (in an inverted genitive construction) d'Ama.nir.an.na as "the mother, the one who brings forth (literally, "its bringer-forth") the one carried in the womb." In the light of 121 above, the explanation is written: um.mu ša ina ger-bi-ti šu-pa" the mother who causes to appear from the inner parts." This line obviously is intended to give an Akkadian translation of the Sumerian explanation in line 121 above, but the translation is quite free.

122. The list obviously contains names of both sons and daughters; e.g., cf. lines 113, 114, and 121. Since C omits several names in this list (cf. lines 118 and 120), its

summary (C ii 12) gives only "fourteen" children. D ii 3 agrees with A on the number "sixteen." In C, the explanation is varied slightly by writing Dingir.ma₂.bi.ₜₐₖₐₜ. D ii 4 appears to vary, giving what seems to be d'Sa₂₂.gu₂₂.ki.(gu₂₂).gEₐ. A iii 93 gives the variant d'En.ururu. A C F
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137. dGab.bi.bi</td>
<td>138. dZugal.ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139. dZugal.id da</td>
<td>140. dZugal.abzu(ZU, AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141. dEm.abzu</td>
<td>142. dNun.abzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143. dDara.abzu</td>
<td>144. dDara.dim (di.im)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145. dDara.dim7.dim7</td>
<td>146. dDara.nun.na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147. dDara.bbn.da</td>
<td>148. dAlim.nn.na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149. dAlim.bbn.da</td>
<td>150. dAlim.sI.ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151. dGeštu₂(GIŠ+TUG+ PI).abzu(ZU,AB)</td>
<td>152. dGeštu₂.lá</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

140. = Ao:82. 143. = Ao:77. 144. = Ao:78. In A iii 101, the name is written dDara₃ dim₄(BAD). B iii 2a is to be restored to dD(dim3). Cf. Tablet I 164 where dDara₃ dim occurs among the names of dEm.iii. 145. B iii 2b gives dD(dim3).dim. Cf. also Tablet I 165 where dDara₃ dim occurs among the names of dEm.iii. 146. = Ao:80. D iii preserves only meager remnants of this and the following entry. In ad:13, the name appears as dEm. dara₃ nun.(na). 147. = Ao:79. In ad:12, the name appears as dEm. dara₃ bbn.(da). 148. In A iii 105 and B iii 4, alim is written A+IŠI-IŠ, while in C ii 31, it appears as GIŠ(I) X A X IŠI. 150. Text = C ii 32. A iii 106 has dA=IŠI-IŠ,sl.ki, while B iii 4 presents dA=IŠI-IŠ,sl.ki. 152. B iii 5 varies by writing dGIŠ.PI.lá, in which GIŠ.PI may possibly be read gišgeštu or geštuₓ(GIŠ.PI).
the preceding line is to be brought down as in line 154 above. However, certain usages in the lines below (see especially note 160 below) lead to the conclusion that the complex DUG.QA.BUR actually was read in four different ways in this list of dÉ-a names, depending upon the function in which the deity was portrayed. This means that, as the god of incantations, aÉ-a as dDUG.QA.BUR should be read with the same pronunciation as En.nu.ru. See further under note 160 below.


158. The dittos indicate (as in line 160 below) that the present entry is an ideogram for the previous name; cf. pp. 16 f. above.

159. Note BA 10/1 42:14, 16 where dUn.ur.ru is called "the great potter of Anu" (pa-qa-ru GAL-ú Sa dAn-ni-m). See also An : Anu 66. amgli 125.

160. Note that in sq:7 (which gives pronunciations and explanations of various dÉ-a names) dDUG.QA.BUR is pronounced dUn.ur.ru and explained as dÉ-a "of potters." Note further CT 12 21 (35058) r. 1 where dDUG.QA.BUR is glossed with nun.ur.ru and identified with dÉ-a. The same glossed reading and identification is to be found also in AO. 7661 ii 49 (= TOL 6 37 - AS no. 7 45). This illustrates the significance of the dittos which appear in front of the four occurrences of dDUG.QA.BUR in this present list of dÉ-a names (lines 156, 160, 162, and 164). This usage must be compared with line 65 above where the complex DUG.QA.BUR has a value of lil/lillu (controlled by glossed readings) when applied to dÉ-a. These various occurrences of names preceded by dittos and known to have the glossed values of the preceding names further clarify one important way in which dittos are used in the present series (see also pp. 16 f. above). For other deities written with this sign group, see under line 156 above.

162. On the analogy of line 160 above, dDUG.QA.BUR is certainly to be understood here as an ideogram for the deity dUn.sâr.

163. Gloss in C ii 44 and A iii 119 (although A has ša instead of ša in the gloss). The dittos in the gloss, of course, indicate that the gloss is to be repeated in this reduplicated name.

164. As in line 160 above, the dittos indicate that this is an ideogram for the previous entry.

165. Thureau-Dangin, BA 31 84 ff. discusses the possible reading ebe4/ebib for En.ti. But this reading is not without its difficulties when applied to the present entry. dEn.ti seems instead to form a pair with dMin.ti of line 179 below. It is true that a phonetically written dEbib is known from such texts as L. 252 (III R 66) ii 15 and EAV 42 ii 6, 13; but these are not necessarily identified with dEn.ti of the present line. The presence of so many pronunciation glosses in C for oddly pronounced names would argue further against such a reading here, since C contains no such gloss for this line.

166. Text = C ii 46. In A iii 122, the name is written dGá.zi.sá, in which the dittos may show an identification with the name of the preceding line (cf. pp. 17 f. above).

167. Both A iii 125 and B iii 13 write dZi.zi.dá; but in C ii 47, the name appears as dNa.zi.dá. Either A and B go back to a common text that contained an early scribal error, or a scribal error is involved in C. In the latter text, the only difference between the writing of ZI and NAM is in one small wedge low in the sign NAM (cf. C ii 47); but in A and B, the sign NAM is usually somewhat more complicated than ZI and could scarcely be confused with it (cf. B iii 24, 34). This would seem to point to the probability that the name in C represents a scribal error.

168. The gloss in C ii 48 gives the pronunciation of dBAD when it applies to dÉ-a. This value, of course, is not valid when dBAD represents other deities. Cf. Tablet III 269 ff.

169. Gloss in C ii 49.
171. The gloss in C ii 51 appears to give the sign name (= "two-thirds" i.e., "two-thirds of sixty"), while the dittos indicate that this number is an ideogram for 4. On the ranking of deities by numbers within the sexagesimal system, cf. under Tablet I 150.

172. Text = C ii 52. In the broken second half of B iii 15, there was apparently a short summary or description of the names of 48-a similar to that which ends the names of Dam.ki.na in B iii 22.

173. = Ao:86. In EAV 63 ii 5 (see the collation of this line by Weidner, AEl 2 14 note 6), the name appears as Dam.gal.nun.an.an. However, the older form of the name was certainly Dam.gal.nun.an.an, as can be seen from Ao:86 and VAT 7759 ii 17 (= AEl 2 4 f.), which represents an old Babylonian duplicate of EAV 63.

174. AG 280 feels that the name is derived from Dam.ki.an.an, a form which actually occurs in EAV 63 ii 6 (see Weidner's collation, AEl 2 14). However, VAT 7759 ii 18 (= AEl 2 4 f.), the old Babylonian duplicate of EAV 63, gives Dam.ki.na. The fuller form is also seen in Thureau-Dangin, RIt. acc. 159:344; but this represents a late text and may, in fact, indicate that the more complete form is late rather than early.

176. Text = C ii 56. In A iii 131 and B iii 18, the name appears as Dam.me.zu, which may be read Dam.me.zu, abzu (for IG1 = 4, of Thureau-Dangin, RIt. acc. 80'note 7).

177. Text = A iii 132. See Tablet III 28 where the name appears among those of Nin.gal.

179. = Ao:97. See Tablet III 28 where the name appears among those of Nin.ti.

180. C ii 64b: dumu.sag Eridu(NUN).Ki.ga.ke

181. = Ao:88, which writes the name Dam.ki.an.an. In A iii 137, the name is written Gal.la.bal.ku, but this may represent a scribal mistake since B iii 21 clearly writes the name with An. Note that this name also occurs in line 132 above, among the names of Dam.ki.na.

183. = Ao:87. See Tablet III 28 where the name appears among those of Nin.gal.

184. The name also occurs among the names of Nin.me.zu, see Tablet I 183.

185. = Ao:89 and An : Anu 8 8AM 106. This rather common name of Marduk has been read in various ways. Falkenstein has published a syllabically written Sumerian text from Boghazköy (ZA NF 11 12:20, 21 and pp. 30 f.) which favors a reading of Asal.lú.b.i. However, this new reading of the name should not be taken as a final reading for URU X IGI in Marduk names. In line 188 below, it is clear that URU X IGI should be read asar rather than asal, which seems more cogent to the present list than the example from Boghazköy. The name Marduk itself is written 3MAR+UD in C ii 64, while in B iii 23 and A iii 140, it is written 3MAR+PIR. The latter seems to be merely a graphic variation of the former. On the meaning of the name, cf. Jeremias, NYAG 27/2 27 note 2 and Zimmer, ZA 54 194 note 3. For a shorter list of Marduk names, cf. CT 25 35:1 ff. (and its duplicate, CT 25 56:1 ff.). The present list of Marduk names (which totaled fifty entries when complete) may be compared with the list of the "fifty names of Marduk" contained in Enûma-eligible; however, the present list follows a slightly different order than that in Enûma-eligible.

185a. C ii 64b: dumu.sag Dam.ki.na.Ke

186. The dittos do not here indicate that the previous name of Asar.lú.4i is to be brought down to produce a name like Asar.lú.4i.nam.ti.la; nor do the dittos indicate that...
one may arbitrarily except merely the first sign of the pre-
ceeding name and read dAsar.nam.ti.la (as in A 265 and 388).
In the comparable list of Marduk names found in Enûma-eliš,
the present name occurs simply as dNam.ti.la (Enûma-eliš VI
152) and is explained as one of the alternative names of dAsar.
lú.bi. This indicates that the dittos in the present line and in the
two succeeding lines serve to identify the present
devity with the preceding name. In this may be illustrated
one important use of dittos in this series (see p. 18 above).
In C ii 66, another form of this name is listed as dNam.ti;
however, both dNam.ti.la and dNam.ti correspond to only
one name in Enûma-eliš, probably only one
name in Enûma-eliš should now be read mug-tâl as in A. In the light of the
resulting in aKA X LI.t'.
A and B omit the extra dNam.ti. The second half of
the present line is not given by C but is preserved in A iii
141.
187. = Ao:90, which presents the shorter form of the
name: dAsar. The gloss is found in C ii 68. The present
entry would seem to argue against reading asal for URU X IGI
in the present list of Marduk names; see under note 185 above.
188. In C ii 69, alim (cf. CT 18 50:20 and Fauna 53
to note 1) is written GÍR X A X IGI, but it is written A+GÍR+GÍR in A
iii 144. Cf. CT 25 34:10.
190. = Ao:91 (which writes the name dAsar.alim(GÍR X
Igi)(nun.na). Cf. CT 25 34:11 and ZA MP 5 256.
191. A iii 146: dAKAR+PIR; cf. under note 185 above.
192. The line as written in A iii 147 clarifies the reading of the difficult line in Enûma-eliš VI 138. The first
sign of the name in A is clearly MER, agreeing with B iii 27
and CT 25 34:12. Since MER = izzy and uzzu (cf. Deimel, SL
347, 5 f.), the readings SUDUN, SUDUN, and BÁRA, (cf. Böhl,
AfO 11 216 note 9) would seem to be excluded here. Further-
more, the signs usually read MER-RE in Enûma-eliš VI 138
should now be read muš-tâl as in A. In the light of the
explanation in the present line, e-ziz u muš-tâl should rep-
resent attributes or epithets of Marduk when he is called
dMer.sà.kúx.ù (for sÀ.kúx.ù = mustâlu, see Deimel, SL 384,
152c). Hence the corresponding line in Enûma-eliš should
also give these two epithets of Marduk ("the mighty one and the
counselor") following dMer.sà.kúx.ù. Needless to say,
this would make Enûma-eliš VI 138 conform more nearly to the
style of the other lines of this section of the epic, which
usually add several adjectival epithets to each one of the
names of Marduk. The present entry eliminates any need for
restoring a name in B iii 27b, since the broken section of
the line in B corresponds to the epithets in the second half of
A iii 147.
193. This seems to represent a battle epithet of Marduk;
194. Cf. Enûma-eliš VI 134. In B iii 29, the name
appears as dMa.ru.uk.ka(\).]
35. Cf. also dTu.tu, An : Anu ëi ammì lll.
197. The traces in B iii 3Ob agree with A iii 157 with
respect to the first sign, KA X LI. The traces of the second
sign in A may favor the restoration of a sign like TU,
resulting in dKA X LI."TU". See also Böhl, AFÖ 11 217 no.
16. The dittos in this and the following lines indicate (as
is shown by the corresponding section in Enûma-eliš VII 9.
ff.) that these names are variant names of Marduk as dTu.tu.
198. See note 204 below.
201. Cf. King, STC 61:26, which has: dNù.kù; ëa ëi-
pat-su el-lit "dNù.kù, whose incantation is pure."
204. dZi.ukkin here is to be distinguished from the name in line 198. In line 198, the name represents a variant name for dTu.tu; in the present line, it represents a variant name for dEn.bi.lu.lu. However, note that dZi.ukkin is listed only once in Enûma-ellî.Š and there (in VII 15) it occurs as a subname of dTu.tu.

205. As in Enûma-ellî VII 41.

206. As in Enûma-ellî VII 43.

207. From Sm. 78 + Sm. 1078 (CT 25 46):9-12; it is certain that each of the names in lines 206-209 of the present list ended with RIM. Sm. 78 + Sm. 1078 is not a duplicate of the present series, but contains an analogous list of Marduk names. For the corresponding section (which is badly preserved) in Enûma-ellî, see von Soden, ZA 47: 10-17 and Speiser, ANET 70 f.: 43 ff.

208. See under note 207 above.

209. See under note 207 above.

210. This line should correspond to B iii 37a, which is not preserved. It is restored from Sm. 78 + Sm. 1078 (CT 25 46) and Sm. 78 + Sm. 1078:13 (CT 25 46). This and the following lines of the Marduk list are poorly preserved in the various duplicate texts of the series. However, the total number of lines can be controlled reasonably well from A. For a collation of the broken spaces in B and C by Landsberger, see Ao 11 218. From the traces which are still preserved in A, B, B, and L, one may make a number of provisional restorations by comparing these traces with the names contained in the corresponding sections of Enûma-ellî. Additional aid may be obtained from other Marduk lists, such as Sm. 78 + Sm. 1078 (CT 25 46); Sm. 115 (CT 25 36); and K. 7658 (CT 25 46). These may not be exact duplicates of the present series, but at a number of places their readings coincide with this list and corroborate some of the restorations.

211. = PAP+E. Cf. Sm. 78 + Sm. 1078:14 (CT 25 46) and Enûma-ellî VII 61. The dittos, as in 212 below, indicate that the name

212. [d$mê,gål]  

L |
213. [d$mê, gål()]  

L |
214. [d$ir.sir]  

L |
215. [d$mê, lâbû]  

L |
216. [ ]  

L |
217. [d$il]  

L |
218. [d$il.mâ]  

L |
219. [d$il.mâ]  

L |
220. [ ]  

L |

In the present entry is a subname of dSm.bi.lu.lu (cf. pp. 17 f. above).

212. Both A. pa$=dun (line 211) and d$mê,gål appear in Enûma-ellî preceded by d$ (see von Soden, ZA 47:11 f.: 61, 64), indicating in each case an identification with d$ (= dSm.bi.lu.lu); cf. pp. 17 f. above. It is inconsistent to translate the first as Epa$ and the second as Embilulu-Gugal (as ANET 71:65). The correct form of the latter would be simply Gugal.

213. L i begins here with the traces of the final gâl. This text is a fragment of B (as may be seen from its museum number) and should join immediately under B iii 37; d$mê,gål, as a name of dMarduk, should be compared with Sm. 78 + Sm. 1078 (CT 25 46):13 and Enûma-ellî VII 65. See line 251 below where d$mê,gål appear as one of the names of the ab.$âm of dNa-bi-um. Perhaps the two entries refer to separate deities, since the present entry is equated with Marduk (who would hardly be represented later as a servant in the entourage of his son dNa-bi-um).

214. Since L is a fragment of B, it has two names to a line; hence the present line corresponds to the missing first half of L ii 2. The name is restored from Enûma-ellî VII 70; cf. ANET 71 note 137a.

215. L ii 2b; cf. Enûma-ellî VII 76.

216. L ii 3a. Apparently, this name is not found in the corresponding section of Enûma-ellî.

217. L ii 3b; cf. Enûma-ellî VII 78.

218. L ii 4a; cf. Enûma-ellî VII 80.

219. L ii 4b; cf. Enûma-ellî VII 82.

220. L ii 5a. Lines 220-222 in the present list contain three names, while the corresponding section in Enûma-ellî (VII 84 ff.) contains four names. It is therefore difficult to control the exact restoration of these lines. It is not even certain that lines 220-222 are to be restored with the names found in Enûma-ellî VII 84 ff., because line 221 ends with a sign which cannot easily be harmonised with any of the names in Enûma-ellî VII 84-89). It is possible
that \( \text{Lugal.ukin}, \text{Dir.ki} \) (\text{em}:44) may have been listed in this section.

221. = L ii 5b. The traces of the single sign preserved in L resemble a sign like \( \text{SU} \), \( \text{SI.D} \), or \( \text{SA} \). Since none of these can be harmonized with the names in \text{Enûma-elessa VII} 84-89, it is evident that the two traditions varied in this section. A name like \( \text{dA.gâ.ru} \) or \( \text{dNe.bi.ru} \) (\text{Enûma-elessa VII} 122, 124) may possibly be involved here.

222. = L ii 6a. 
223. = L ii 6b. Cf. \text{Enûma-elessa VII} 91 and \text{em}:46.
225. = L ii 7b. Cf. \text{Enûma-elessa VII} 95. After a long gap, A returns here with a long row of dittos which help to control the total number of names in the Marduk list.

226. = L ii 8a. For the restoration, cf. Sm. 115 (\text{CT} 25 38):5, where \( \text{dLugal.rum} \) comes between \( \text{dLugal.dûr.mab} \) and \( \text{dLugal.dûr.an.ki} \). It is evident that the present series not only follows a different tradition in the order of the remaining Marduk names than that of \text{Enûma-elessa}, but also occasionally includes different names than those in the epic list.

227. = L ii 8b. For the restoration, cf. Sm. 115 (\text{CT} 25 38):6 and \text{em}:45.
228. = L ii 9a.
229. = L ii 9b.
230. The reverse of E begins approximately with this line, as may be seen by comparing its entries with the few traces in A—especially A iii 185-187.

231. = A iii 186 and E r. 2. For the restoration, cf. \text{Enûma-elessa VII} 105.
Table II

237. = eme:47. See Zimmern, BSGW 63 98 and cf. CT 25 35:17. The names of lines 237 f. are not preserved in A iii 192, 193, but the space in A iv 1 ff., which is preserved, reveals that there were six entries in this list of the names of Marduk's wife.

238. = eme:49. See Zimmern, BSGW 63 98.

239. The traces of A iv 1 favor a name beginning with NIN.

241. = Ao:106. The use of d AG as an ideogram for Nabu appears to be late. It is interesting to note the position of Nabu in this series; elsewhere, he is more commonly represented as the son of Marduk.

242. = Ao:110. The ideogram d En.sag, who appears in the Nebu list CT 25 35:20 (= CT 35 36:19), however, the name should be distinguished from d En.sag ag who appears among the names of dNusku (cf. Tablet I 254).


244. = eme:54 (which should be restored to agree with the present entry).

Table II

249. d En.ki.im.du ab.gém d Na-bi-um ke
d250. d E.PA 5
d251. d En.zag
d252. d Ma.mi.a
253. d Ma-da-nu
254. d DI.KUD
255. d Ma-ag-rat-a-mat-su

245. = Ao:106. The use of d AG as an ideogram for Nabu appears to be late. It is interesting to note the position of Nabu in this series; elsewhere, he is more commonly represented as the son of Marduk.

246. = Ao:110. The ideogram d En.sag, who appears in the Nebu list CT 25 35:20 (= CT 35 36:19), however, the name should be distinguished from d En.sag ag who appears among the names of dNusku (cf. Tablet I 254).


248. = eme:54 (which should be restored to agree with the present entry).

249. Certainly not to be confused with Enkidu (as in AG 294 f.). The present line gives the name of Nabu's plowman.

250. The dittos seem to indicate that d AG is an ideogram for the preceding deity.

251. Cf. line 213 above.

252. A iv 14 clearly has NIN "sister" and not DAM "wife." Note that, in "Weidner's list," the name is written qAm.bitu. See VAT 6563 (AR 2 6) ii 4.

253. The position of this deity in the circle of Marduk (as the throne-bearer of Marduk) is now finally clarified by A iv 15. In "Weidner's list," the name is written qaM-da-nu; see KAV 63 ii 22 ff. Cf. also qaM-da-nu-ne (CT 25 11:2), who is equated with qAm.nu-ra.

254. The dittos are instructive here. They indicate that, in this instance, d DI.KUD is an ideogram for the previous name. Note KAV 47:15 (= KAV 65 ii 22) where the pronunciation of d DI.KUD is given as [ma]-da-an (see the collation of this line by Weidner, AR 2 16 note 2) and the name is equated with qMan-da-nu. However, the name should be distinguished from d DI.KUD only when the name refers to the throne-bearer of Marduk, for there were a number of other deities whose names were written with this ideogram. The present name should be distinguished from d DI.KUD who appears in Tablet V 288 as another ideogram for qAm, DI, and from d DI.kud in Tablet III 174 who appears among the judges of Sama. Note also d DI.KUD and even d DI.KUD.MES in such texts as: KAR III 142 i 24; KAV 42 i 43; KAV 43 i 25; Schell, BR 14 176 i 2; Landsberger, BR 14 7. From these it would appear that considerable caution is necessary when attempting to identify any particular d DI.KUD with another deity. Obviously, the name was ideographic and had different pronunciations depending upon the actual deity involved.

255. The dittos in the right column are obviously intended to show identification with the previous deity
Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>256.</td>
<td>( d\mathbf{G} X \mathbf{NUN.bé.du} 7 )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{SU} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257.</td>
<td>( d\mathbf{En.nun.dagal.la} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{SU} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258.</td>
<td>( 2 \mathbf{SU}_4.DÚB )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{d\text{Marduk.}ke}_4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259.</td>
<td>( \mathbf{dGasan.sud.x(KA} \ X ) ( \mathbf{SU})(._{an}na )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{SU} \mathbf{l} \mathbf{SU}_4.DÚB \mathbf{d\text{Ghar.-}} \mathbf{pa-ni-tum.}ke_7 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.</td>
<td>( \mathbf{d\text{qil-uš-}tāb} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{SU} \mathbf{l} \mathbf{SU}_4.DÚB \mathbf{d\text{Ghar.-}} \mathbf{pa-ni-tum.}ke_7 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261.</td>
<td>( \mathbf{d\text{ka.TUN.na}} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{ŠU} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262.</td>
<td>( 2 \mathbf{SAL.}Šu.i )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{d\text{par-pa-ni-tum.}ke}_4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.</td>
<td>( \mathbf{d\text{Mi-na-a-i-kul-}be-lī} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{MU} \mathbf{è.sag.}\mathbf{il.la}ke_4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264.</td>
<td>( \mathbf{d\text{Mi-na-a-i-lā-ti-}be-lī} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{SEM} \mathbf{è.sag.}\mathbf{il.la}ke_4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265.</td>
<td>( \mathbf{d\text{Mu-kil-me-e-ba-la-}tī} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{SU} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>266.</td>
<td>( d\text{Na-din-se-}s-qā-ti )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{ŠU} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267.</td>
<td>( 2 \mathbf{àm udug} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{è.sag.}\mathbf{il.la}ke_4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268.</td>
<td>( d\text{Ab.}ba )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{ŠU} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269.</td>
<td>( d\text{Ta.KU.na} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{ŠU} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270.</td>
<td>( 2 \mathbf{àm ni.dug} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{è.sag.}\mathbf{il.la}ke_4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271.</td>
<td>( d\text{Uk-ku-mu} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{ŠU} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272.</td>
<td>( d\text{Su-ku-ku} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{ŠU} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273.</td>
<td>( d\text{Il-ti-bu} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{ŠU} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274.</td>
<td>( 4 \mathbf{ur.zir} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{ŠU} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275.</td>
<td>( d(\text{id}1)\text{id} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{ŠU} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276.</td>
<td>( d(\text{id}1).\text{gal} )</td>
<td>( \mathbf{ŠU} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

without indicating that the pronunciation is the same (as was the case in line 254). For this Akkadian name, cf. Landsberger, MAOG 4 311 ff.

257. * eme:50. 258. * eme:51. For \( \mathbf{KA} \ X \mathbf{SU} = \mathbf{Sud.x} \), see MSL II p. 57 line 329.

260. Written \( d\text{Mi-ùš.HI} \). Gloss in C iii 11b. Cf. also KAV 47:11; 62:12; and 65 r. ii 11.

263. The name of Marduk's mulgaldim (for \( \mathbf{MU} = \mathbf{mubaldim} \), see MSL II p. 47 line 172) is written syllabically in C iii 13; but in A iv 23 and B iii 68, the name appears as \( \mathbf{d\text{Mi-na-a-KA} X \ NIG-be-li} \). The name is, of course, Akkadian: "What did my, lord eat?" In A and B, the explanation is written \( \mathbf{MU} \mathbf{è.sag.}\mathbf{il.la}ke_4 \); but in C, the explanation is written \( \mathbf{SEM} \mathbf{è.sag.}\mathbf{il.la}ke_4 \). This interesting parallel between it and \( \mathbf{il.la} \) would suggest that Falkenstein is correct in his contention that if may occasionally be read \( \text{ila} \) (see Falkenstein, AnOr. 28 16).

264. Text = C iii 14. Instead of \( \text{lā-tī} \), A iv 24 and B iii 69 write \( \text{NAG(KA} \ X \) \( \text{A} \) \). As in line 263 above, A omits \( \text{la} \) in the explanatory column. B abbreviates the explanation to \( \text{SEM} \text{è.sag.}\text{il.la}ke_4 \). (C see Falkenstein, AnOr. 28 16).

265. Text = C iii 15. A iv 25 writes \( \text{d\text{Mu-kil-MEŠ.TI}} \) \( \text{LA} \), while B iii 70 writes \( \text{d\text{Mu-kil-MEŠ.TI}} \).

266. Text = C iii 16. A iv 26 writes \( \text{dNa-din-A.MEŠ-qā-tim} \), while B iii 71 writes \( \text{dNa-din-A.MEŠ.SU} \).

267. A iv 25, 26 and B iii 70, 71 give 2 udug : \( \text{è.sag.} \text{il.la}ke_4 \); cf. under note 263 above.

268. Text = A iv 27 and B iii 72. C iii 17 writes \( \text{dAb.} \) \( \text{è} \). For the pronunciation of the name, see Tablet V 54.

270. A iv 27, 28 and B iii 72, 73 omit àm and \( \text{la} \) (as in line 263 above). For the reading \( \text{ni.dug(AB)} \), see p. 15 note 51 above.

272. Text = A iv 30 and B iii 74. In C iii 20, the name is written \( \text{dSuk-ku-lu} \).

273. C iii 21: \( \text{dIł-Su-da} \).

274. C iii 22: \( \text{dIł-te-bu} \).

275. C iii 22: \( 4 \mathbf{èm ur.zir} \). Some would see in these "4 dogs of Marduk" a reference to the four satellites of Jupiter (see ZA 43 133); but this implies an extraordinary eyesight on the part of the Babylonian astronomers. 

277. Gloss in C iii 24. The dittos in the gloss, of course, refer to the sign 16 of the preceding gloss. The usage of \( \text{SU} \) is instructive in these four lines which deal with the names of the river god. In C, \( \text{SU} \) is placed opposite only the first name. After each of the other names, C enters the numbers \( 2, 3, \) and \( 4 \) respectively. By this means, the scribe indicated that these names are all to be regarded as belonging to a series of four separate distinct deities (just as the four dogs of Marduk in lines 271 ff. were each distinct deities), rather than four names of one deity (in the latter case, dittos would have been used). However, it is evident
from other texts that these four names were not necessarily always distinguished from each other (cf., note 279 below; and note that dKi.ga in line 280 is listed ambiguously as "his wife"). Possibly C numbers each of these entries because there was no final summary of the four, as in the case of the four dogs in line 275.

278. Gloss in C iii 25.
279. Cf. KAV 218 A ii 17, 20, a bilingual text which gives this deity in the Sumerian line and □D (= dNam) in the Akkadian line. In KAV 65 ii 2, the name appears with an affixed Ki.
280. Cf. KAV 154 (a text which appears to list wives of various deities):10 where she is listed as the wife of dId and then possibly identified with dNasi (for dNasi, rather than dNansi, see Tablet III 67). Here, she is listed ambiguously as "his wife." Does this mean that the four river gods are thought of as a single deity here? Or is she merely the wife of the last one of the four? The latter possibility is more in keeping with the organization of the series. In KAV 65 ii 10 (= KAV 65 ii 3), she is equated with d].Ki. na, which possibly could be restored to d[Dam].Ki. na.

282. C iii 29 writes the last sign syllabically as mi-. On the restoration of B iii 81 (B[i], rather than 'BI'), cf. Weissner, OZL 12 202.
283. = Ao:108. With this line, a list of six sons of dEn.ki begins. These are in addition to Marduk, who, as the most prominent son, was treated first. The name of dDumu.zi.abzu, who played such an important part in the cult life of Babylonia, appears quite early. His name is mentioned even on the "Stele of the Vultures." (cf. SAK 18 r. vi 3).
284. Text = A iv 40 and B iii 82 as restored by C iii 31. The latter text actually presents d[ Ki].gu.la. In Ao: 109, the name appears as d]Y.Ki.gu.la, in which the first sign may represent 2U or some similar sign. Cf. Tablet I 81 where d[ Ki].gu.la appears as the name of a gu4, DUB of Anu.
285. Gloss in C iii 32.
293.  d\text{Ensi}.
\text{sa}p
294.  d\text{ig}.
\text{an}.
\text{na}.
\text{gál}.
\text{la}
295.  d\text{Lugal}.
\text{ki}.
\text{sur}.
\text{ra}
296.  d\text{ig}.
\text{an}.
\text{na}.
\text{ké}.
\text{š}.
\text{da}
297.  d\text{Lugal}.
\text{ni}.
\text{rál}
298.  d\text{Ara}.
\text{(ar}.
\text{ra})
299.  d\text{PAP}.
\text{SIG}.
\text{(i}.
\text{si}.
\text{mu})
\text{nú}.
\text{mi}.
\text{me}

293. = Ao:96. B iii 89 writes d\text{Ensi}.
\text{gal}.
\text{sa}p. For d\text{Mar}.
\text{tu}, cf. Tablet VI 228, 230, 236.
294. The name here given as the wife of d\text{Mar}.
\text{tu} differs from that given in Tablet VI 235 where she is called d\text{Ur}-\text{ba}.
\text{tum}.
295. In C iii 41, d\text{Sin} is written with the usual three
winkelhakens; but in B iii 91 (and possibly in A iv 50), the name is written with five horizontal strokes. In Tablet III 1, another variant is noted in which d\text{Sin} is written with four horizontal strokes. All these variants suggest that d\text{Sin} was regarded at this time as an ideogram, rather than a numerical symbol. Cf. further under Tablet III 3. The appearance here in the d\text{En}.
\text{ki} circle, of a name identified with d\text{Sin}, is inexplicable. In K. 4349+ 80-7-27,54#15 (CT 25 5), in the "Smaller An : d\text{A-nu-um}," d\text{Lugal}.
\text{ki}.
\text{sur}.
\text{ra} is identified with d\text{Sin}.
\text{ur}.
\text{ta}; but, in K. 2098 (CT 25 59):13, the name appears in a Merigal list.
298. Gloss in C iii 44 and in B iii 94 (surprising, since glosses in B are a great rarity!). In the explanatory column of C, d\text{Ara}(SA) is further identified with d\text{Us}.
\text{mu}.
\text{u}.
Note SIT 153 r. ii 2 (= SN 124 i 25) where d\text{Ara} occurs in the d\text{En}.
\text{ki} section. Also see KAV 63 ii 7 (note Weidner's collation in AFR 2 14 note 8) where d\text{Ara} is similarly identified with d\text{Us}.
\text{mu}.
\text{u}.
See also VAT 8084 (AFK 6:6):7. Cf. further Ungad, AFO 5 185 (who points out the close connection between the name of d\text{Usmi} and usumija "double-faced" in birth omens); Falkenstein, LÜU plate 17:16 and p. 18 note 7 (where the same occurs as d\text{As}.
\text{ia} = d\text{Usmi}ja); and Jacobson, AFO 12 365:54.
299. = Ao:98. Gloss in C iii 45. Here, the name is identified with d\text{Ara}(SA) (= d\text{Us}.
\text{mu}.
\text{u}.) of the previous line. The present entry seems to have been included at the end of B iii 94, but only the traces of this name are preserved in B.
104a. The Akkadian translation of the preceding explanatory line is given as a gloss line in C iii 50. The sign A, which appears as ŠU in C iii 50, replaces the ditto with ŠU.

305. Similarly, OT 29 45 gives a pronunciation gloss of du.un.ga 4SAÅ. Here, the explanatory column shows that this is another ideogram for the god of musicians. C iii 51 replaces the ditto with ŠU.

306. In B iii 99, the line is somewhat broken, but it is evident from the space that the name appeared in an abbreviated form, probably as dÁd.du.4ga. In H:4, the name seems to have the form d(ga)du.4ga.làl.bi.

307. Gloss in A iv 62. It appears that B iii 100 was copied from a text in which the gloss had become a part of the text (especially so in view of the fact that B rarely exhibits glosses). C iii 53 varies the explanation, giving dingir US.É.KU. In this, the extraneous sign A may be difficult to explain unless it serves as a phonetic complement to indicate that US.É.KU is to be read gelá. Note that An : Anu şa amëlì 131 explains dšum.bà as "(= du.un.ga) SAG" (cf. OT 25 48:11 where dšALAG is given the pronunciation dšum.bà and explained as dša.4ga.4SAÅ). In the present line, dšALAG is described as "the god of the kālû priest."

308. The line is certainly to be compared with KAR 60:14 (= Hit. acc. 20:14) in which dšALAG figures in the ritual text of the kālû priests.

309. dšALAG is preceded by dittos in order to show that the gloss of the previous line is to be brought down. This line is to be compared with OT 29 49:13 where dšGIR is glossed with "((= šu.un) E4.BÁ.DALAG)."

310. In H:5, the name appears as dšim.KÁ, which probably represents a scribal mistake for dšim.ESZN. It is difficult to ascertain the actual pronunciation of this and the following entries. The present entry may be read dšin.É.KÁ; but it may, of course, have had some other reading than this. Any identification, however, with other deities bearing similar names (such as dšin.É.KÁ 4šAR 4šAR, the wife of Anu; Tablet I 29; and dšin.SÁR, the šir.4a of Šum, Tablet I 328) seems tenuous and obscure.

311. Cf. under note 310 above. 312. Text = A iv 67. In B iii 103 and in A, the sign $U is written with four horizontal strokes, while in C iii 56 possibly had the more usual three winkelhakens; cf. under note 295 above. The gloss in the present entry is not without its difficulties. If the gloss indicates the reading of the last sign, it would infer that the consonant was omitted; however, this consonant seems elsewhere unattested for Sumerian. One might read the entry as $U.SÁ(ša)gā, but this would be contrary to scribal practice (one would expect the sign gā to be used in such a gloss). Perhaps the gloss may here indicate nothing more than a textual variant among the sources used by the scribe (see p. 31 above). Some evidence that textual variations did occur for this name is provided by C, which gives dšE(ša).gā. See also Tablet VI 212.

313. Both B iii 104 and A iv 68 omit the final gā. The name may be interpreted (in C iii 57, especially) as $U dšingir.balag.gā "the god of the harp." The dittos in the entry are found only in A and may reflect a scribal error. If they should prove correct, they would not necessarily imply that dšBalag(gā) is here ideographic for the previous name, because these two names are treated as totally separate deities (as may be seen from the summary in line 314). Probably, the dittos would merely signify a reading of $U dšBalag(gā). $U dšBalag.gā.

314. Since 0 omitted lines 310 and 311, it writes the summary (C iii 57): 2 dšgù.4DÚB etc. For the genitive of $U dšin.KL, see under note 269 above.

315. Text = C iii 56, which, in the light of the gloss, might be read dšE(ša).ru. If, on the other hand, the sign $E here corresponds to A (see under Tablet I 355), one might read the name simply as $E.A (or $E.A.4ru). However, it seems extraneous to read the name out of harmony with scribal practice to indicate that the sign A should be read a/4 by using 'a as a gloss—especially when the sign A is initial (since an initial /a/ would probably be pronounced /'a/ anyway). As a gloss, the sign A should here indicate an unusual pronunciation for the sign A, which may well be a here. The final reading of the name may remain open until the place of /a/ in Sumerian is clearer; but, tentatively, dšE(ša).ru would seem to commend itself as the reading. It may be argued that the gloss indicates a reading of the entry as a unit, i.e., $E.ÉDIN = erum; but, in as no. 7 16:41, the sign ÉDIN is said to
have the value ru when it occurs in the combination 4A,EDIN = dšar-pa-ni-tum (Ça dA(d šar-pa-ni-tum).EDIN). This would argue against taking the gloss as an indication of the pronunciation of 4A,EDIN as a single unit, and would point instead to the probability that the gloss refers to the signs individually. Note also that this latter reference identifies the present entry with 4šar-pa-ni-tum, the wife of Mar-duk; cf. line 256 above.

316. C iii 59 has dšA,EDIN, which seems corrupt. Ao:94 indicates that C should have copied 4šar/Ur.A_.EDIN (read as in lïne 315, 4šur.e,ru4). A iv 70 and B iii 106 have 4šur.e,ru8 (lAL).

317. C iii 59: 2 àm gu4..DÚB etc.

318. In this list of the names of the doormen of 4En.ki, note that each name contains either KA "mouth" or IGI "eye." This first name = Ao:102. Cf. K. 4147 (RA 17 152):7 and CT 16 47:199.


321. K:4 seems to have [dKa.ba.ni.nam.ti].AN : 4šSu | 4šIgi; but this variant may merely reflect a scribal mistake (ancient or modern) in which the signs TI,LA were miscopied—the final stroke of the sign TI becoming AN plus the sign of division, and LA becoming SU.

322. A iv 78b omits GA. C iii 67 inserts àm after the number 8. It is interesting to note the variation which exists in scribal practice regarding the writing of numbers. B iii 111 and A write the number 8 as 4 vertical strokes over
A
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338. The combination BAD.na should be compared with MSL II p. 86 line 773 and MSL III pp. 213 f.


344. A iv 95b gives the Akkadian equivalent gizilu "torch (for incense)," which indicates the reading of the Sumerian name. Cf. Sm 922+1287 (RA 28 140):12 f.

346. = Ao:471. It is evident from CT 25 48:8 that dSIMUG is merely ideographic for d Nin.â.gal, since d Nin.â.gal is there placed in the pronunciation column opposite dSIMUG. This would explain the dittos at the beginning of the present line. Note also that, in AS no. 7 21:173, the sign SIMUG is given the pronunciation d Nin.â.gal. In Ao:471, the scribe apparently began to write d Nin.â.gal, then erased and wrote d SIMUG.

349. Gloss in A iv 100. Since the next line also shares this gloss (as is indicated by the dittos) and both MUG and ŠAR are here given the pronunciation of gu.QI.im, this line explains the somewhat enigmatic gloss in CT 29 45:5, which should be read gu/en.di.îb/gim | ŠAR. According to this latter gloss, the name could be read either gu.gim or en. di.îb.gim. In the present line, the gloss gu.QI.im probably should be read gu.gi.QI.im (since /q/ is not in Sumerian; see under note 312 above), a pronunciation that would be in harmony with CT 29 45:5 and also with the parallel line in Tablet VI 224, which gives d(gu.sim)MUG, d(gasim)MUG (of this line and d Qa.gi(MUG) of line 352 below obviously form a pair and explain the occurrence of the two deities, who are listed in CT 12 12:16 f. (= Tablet VII of A : A : nāqu) simply as d MUG. 350. The dittos at the beginning of the line indicate that the preceding gloss is to be repeated. Cf. under note 349 above.

351. The sign 'x' looks more nearly like GIS than anything else. However, the lower horizontal stroke is crowded by the sign below it, making the reading doubtful. QA may be considered, although less convincing.

352. The gloss should be read ga.gi.x(QI).im (cf. under note 349 above and CT 29 45:6, which gives ga/ga.di.ib/gim, as a gloss for d ŠAR, who appears in line 353 below). In Tablet VI 225, the name is written d(gasii)MUG.

353. As in line 350, the dittos at the beginning of the line indicate that the gloss of the previous line is to be repeated here.

354. Lines 354-361 deal with various ideograms for the god of weaving; see also MSL III p. 103 line 80. That this deity is concerned with the clothier's trade may be seen from TCL 6 37 iv 28 (= AS no. 7 47) where TAG (cf. d TAG in line 357 below), with the pronunciation TU.KU, is explained as ma-ba-su sâ subâti(TUG). In this list, the dittos before each entry indicate that each one has the reading of the first name, d Ut.tu. This is clarified by a parallel section in Rm. 2,588 (ASSL 56 159 = Tablet V of Reciprocal ea : nāqu) r. v 31 f., which gives Ut.tu as the glossed reading of TAG X TUG (= line 355 below), with dittos (as here), carries this gloss down before each succeeding entry. This gloss in Reciprocal ea : nāqu probably should not be read Ut.tu, because one would expect a simple vowel sign such as U, Û, or Ū to be used in glosses to indicate the pronunciation U. This means that the present entry should be read d Ut.tu, not d ŠAR. The same name occurs again in Tablet VI 142.
371. With this line begin the names of the four deities of the Aššappu profession, "the four gods of the shoemaker." 376. C iv begins approximately here. The traces in C are badly preserved in this section; hence it is difficult to be dogmatic about the exact correlation between A and C. When better preserved duplicates appear, some revision of the correlation between the beginnings and the endings of these lines may become necessary; but it seems unlikely that the difference will prove to be more than a line or two off. The deities in this badly mutilated section obviously continued the list of patron gods of various professions.

361. Evidently, dŠIK did not have the same pronunciation as the preceding entries, although the name is still identified in the second half of the column with the god of weaving. Apparently, dŠIK in this context is to be distinguished from dŠIK in Tablet III 200 who is identified with dŠazađe/Sakkan, and from dŠIK who is identified with dGaza-a-a-a in OT 29 46:15.

362. Note the omission of an expected SAL after dam.bi. Since there are two deities involved in lines 363 and 364 (cf. the summary in line 365), the present entry cannot represent an ideogram for the previous deity. If it had been ideographic, only one actual deity would then have been involved. Here, the name may be regarded as dNin.nam.ri.bur.gul.

363. These represented the two gods of the jewelers.

364. Since the explanatory column contains ŠU, this entry with dittos may represent (on the analogy of line 364 above) dGig.nun.ıb. The sign read NUN appears in A iv 116 to have an extraneous horizontal head which may represent an erasure.

365. This line (as in line 367 above) may actually represent dGig.nun.ıb.tug. Apparently, lines 366-368 were intended to form a unit.

366. On the analogy of lines 364 and 367 above, the present line probably is to be read dA.ba.KA, forming a pair with dA.ba in line 369.
388. The sign 'X' in A iv 136 appears to be a sign like IL or SIN etc.
389. An ideogram for the preceding line.
390. The line seems to be omitted in C, but the exact correlation with A is uncertain here.
391. Dr. Landsberger suggested to me that the half legible gloss in C iv 16 may possibly be "sâ mul-li-ilim". The gloss should represent the Akkadian translation of the following line.
392. The restoration is based on a suggestion from Dr. Landsberger, who called my attention to the fact that this line corresponds to "a : A : назы IV 119 (= As no. 719). A list of five "gods of fruit" begins with this line.
393. The dittos indicate that this line corresponds to en : A : назы IV 119 (= AS no. 7 19). A list of five "gods of fruit" begins with this line.
394. The ideogram [d]GAS is here ideographic for the previous name.
395. Cf. Tablet I 92 where "Igi.sig7.sig7" is listed as the "chief gardener of Anu."
396. Here, [d]GAS is listed as an ideogram for "Igi.sig7.sig7." A iv 144b has the traces of SU in place of the second dittos which, more correctly, are exhibited by C iv 22.
397. Gloss in A iv 146.
398. First gloss in A iv 147, the second gloss in C iv 24. The second gloss represents the Akkadian translation of the summary in the next line.
399. Gloss in A iv 147.
400. [d]GAS is here ideographic for the previous name.
401. See under note 402 above.
402. The list of five SU.AA deities begins with this entry. In A iv 148 ff., these deities are listed (as here) as a series of five pairs of names, each pair consisting of one basic name followed by an ideogram. The summary (in line 412 below) indicates that only five deities are involved, although ten entries are given. In C iv 26-35, a slightly variant order may have been followed, although the exact order is difficult to restore. The first deity in this list probably corresponds to C iv 26, 27; the second, to C iv 26-31 (with three unpressed ideograms for the basic name in line 28); the third, to C iv 32, 33; the fourth, to C iv 34; and the fifth, to C iv 35. The last two names were apparently listed in C without any corresponding ideograms.
403. [d]GAS is here ideographic for the previous name.
404. Gloss in A iv 150.
405. The ideogram SU.AA is repeated four times in these lines (405, 407, 409, 411). Each time preceded by dittos. According to the summary, these lines with [d]SU.AA do not represent different or separate deities. Hence a reading of the type [d]SU.AA.SU.AA is excluded (this would imply that each of these entries represents a deity in its own right). These lines are to be understood as indicating instead that SU.AA is an ideogram which represents any one of these various gods of the SU.AA profession. For a similar situation in the list of dEn.ki names, cf. under note 160 above.
410. See under note 402 above.
413. ḏṣa.a Sū
414. ḏMUŠEN.DÙ Sū
415. ḏGīlam(ga.la.m.ḥar). Sū
416. ḏMUŠEN.DÙ Sū
417. ḏEn.ār(ar).ri Sū
418. ḏūR Sū
419. ḏNīn.ār.ri Sū
420. ḏūR Sū
421. 4 dingir Sū
422. [ḏaŠ.KI (=" Šarruma")] Sū
423. dub *2 kām.ma An ḏA-nu-um 6 Sū 21 mu.bi

413. Lines 413-420 contain eight entries, but only four deities are actually involved. As in lines 402-411 above, the present list gives a series of names, each followed by an ideogram.
414. Ideographic for the entry in line 413. For the stylistic principle followed here, cf. ḏSu,gā in lines 402-411 above (see under note 405 above).
416. Ideographic for the entry in line 415.
417. Gloss in A iv 162.
418. Ideographic for the entry in line 417.
419. Ideographic for the entry in line 419.
420. C iv 43 has "5" in its summary. Text = A iv 165b.

421. C iv 43 has "5" in its summary. Text = A iv 165b.

Obviously, C had an extra entry (with its ideogram) among these names of the gods of the mušen.ūl profession. For the total number involved, see under note 413 above.
422. This catch-line for the next tablet is partly preserved in C iv 44. On the reading ḏEn,īzu (instead of ḏSu,alum or ḏSu,anna etc.), see under Tablet III 2.
423. A iv 165 calls this: dub 3 kām.ma. For this difference in the numbering of the tablets, see p. 7 note 26 above. A omits the title An ḏA-nu-um, C iv 45 retains it. The summation of entries is given only by A.

SOURCES USED IN RECONSTRUCTING TABLET III
A YBC 2401
B K. 4349 (CT 24 20 ff.)
1. The tablet begins with a list of the names of dNanna.

For similar lists, see K. 2114 (CT 25 42):7 ff. and K. 2115 (CT 25 28) ii 2 ff. For the reading of dSin.KI, note the gloss na.an.na in CT 29 46:26 and K. 2115 (CT 25 28) ii 2. It was formerly thought that the name dNanna ended in -r, but Ungnad (ZA 22 11 footnote 1), Kramer (AJA 47 134), and Falkenstein (OLZ 46 354) have shown that this is untenable (although it would seem that dSin.KI was pronounced Sannar/Nannaru in Akkadian texts, e.g., cf. the bilingual text IV R 2nd ed. 9a:3, 6, 7, etc.). According to the "catch-line" of C iv 44 in Tablet II 422, the name in the second half of the column was dEn.zu in some textual traditions. A iv 167 has dES (written with four horizontal strokes; see under Tablet II 295). This part of the line is broken away in D. The corresponding section in Ao:148 ff. is naturally more abbreviated than here, giving only the most prominent of the names of dSin. The present line = Ao:149.

2. = Ao:148. The order in Ao:148 ff. (first, dEn.zu; then, dNanna) seems significant since it gives dEn.zu the chief place among the names of the moon god. For the pronunciation of dEn.zu, cf. the long-neglected pronunciation gloss in CT 29 46:27. Lines 26-28 of this latter text are to be restored as follows:

26. (na.an.na) dSin.KI
27. (en.zu) dEn.zu
28. (si-in-nu) dEn.zu

One would be ignoring the force of glosses if one interpreted the pronunciation *En.zu > En > Sin. One would expect that such a pronunciation would have been given as (En.zu) dEn.ZU. But if dEn.ZU is not to be read dEn.en, how can one explain the genitive form dEn.zu.na.ke (as in lines 29, 45, 46, 56, etc. below)? One may consider the possibility that the entries with dEn.zu.na.ke may reflect a scribal tendency to equate the Sumerian dEn.zu with the Akkadian dSin and to view dEn.zu as practically an ideogram for dSin. In this connection, note also the scribal variation for line 3 below, resulting in dEn.zu = d50 = d(si-in-nu)30. This seems to be in keeping with scribal flexibility when writing the name of the moon god.

3. The dittos (in A iv 169) indicate that the number "30" is here used as an ideogram for dEn.zu of the previous line. Instead of dittos, D:3 gives the gloss si-in-nu. This also the difference which A makes between "30" (three winklehakens) in this line and ES in line 1 above. This would seem to indicate that a distinction was made between dES as an ideogram for dSin/En.zu, and d50 as a numerical ideogram for dSin/En.zu. For the system of numerical ranking of the gods, see under Tablet I 150.

4. = Ao:151. The reading SIR = nu is based upon the fact that the temple name dgis.SIR.gal (with which the name of the present line is ultimately connected) appears in various phonetic writings which admit only a final reading of nu. The temple name is written with SIR (= nu) in D 68 i 30* (with a reading of nu.gal given in the margin); with nu in SBN p. 87.55 and CT 21 22:5; and with nu6 (NU) in UET I no. 169:9. Of. further Schuster, ZA 44 263 ff., note 10. This would make a reading of Sir for NU (as Kramer, AS no. 12 p. 16 line 14 et passim) improbable and points instead to a reading of nu, for SIR.

5. = Ao:152. This entry is probably to be compared with K. 8308 (CT 25 27)? where a has d(b.ka.rum) Ab.kar. D:6 varies, giving dAb.tir.

6. = Ao:154 (which varies, giving dMen.edu).
13. F i 4 provides the variant $dMi.sa.[a]$ This should doubtless be read $dGi.sa.[a]$, and may provide a clue for the reading of $GIL$ in this line and the previous line, indicating possible readings of $dGi.sa.an.na$ and $dGi.sa.an.n$ respectively (see Thureau-Dangin, Homophones p. 11 note 7 and King, CT 24 p. 17).

16. This entry appears to have been a name as troublesome for the ancient scribe as for the modern scholar. Apparently, the sign $KU$ (with its gloss gi) has here a value of $gE$—a value not usually met by the ancient scribe. In A iv 181, it is evident that the scribe began to write $KI$ (= gic/ge$7$), then changed it to $KU$ (the winkelhaken is still visible). It is so clearly separated from $KU$ that a reading of $KI$ (i.e., U+KU) seems excluded. In R:4, an erasure appears before the gloss, which suggests that the scribe had some difficulty here. In D:15, Schroeder has drawn considerable shading over a possible $KI$ (KAV 51:15); but in his earlier copy (ZA 31:102), the shading is absent—leaving the sign $KU$ with a clear but diminutive winkelhaken. Provisionally, the name might be read $dDumu.ge7$. This entry may be parallel to $dA.RU$ in CT 25 49 r. 6, where the following popular etymology explains: $dAk.U$ | $dSin[ES]$ $DUMU$ ru-[bu-u]. That is, $A = maru(DUMU)$ and $KU = rubû$; cf. Ungnad, OLZ 14 p. 154. Note CT 25 15:13 where $dDumu.KU$ is given also as one of the names of Adad.

17. Since this line appears in a group of lines that present $dSin$ as "lord," "exalted son," etc., the name can hardly be anything but $Lugal$. This means that the name is to be carefully distinguished from $dLUGAL$ (= $dYamidhi$) who appears among the names of Adad (see line 272 below). The sign $LUGAL$ would certainly be glossed here if any other pronunciation were involved.

18. This name here between $dU$ (= $dUnum$) and $dU$ which appears to be the numerical symbol of other deities (cf. CT 25 50 r. 16). The numerical symbol of $Sin$ is given in line 3 above.
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ABDP below, where the sign is more completely preserved in texts E and L.

which appears in older texts). On the restoration of GUD as names of the wife of the moon god; for a more detailed list of those names of the moon god; for a more detailed list of her various names, see CT 18 29:35a ff. In B iv 10, her name appeared in the variant form dNin.gal.1a.

29. B iv 12 has dAb.NIR.‘bu’. Perhaps this should be read dAb.nar.‘bu’; for even though nàr is an Akkadian reading of the inserted sign here instead of the older LA, see line 64 below. A v 6 varies here and represents a tradition that viewed lines 30-35 as various names of one single deity. However, A (unemended) lists all of these names as subentries for dAb.na.ar bu “the mother of dEnzu.” Since some of the names in the list begin with lugal, it is obvious that some emendation is necessary here. According to B iv 13, the present entry should be the initial line of a new section that is distinguished from the entry in line 29 (if line 30 represented a continuation of line 29, B would not have the traces of SU after this name). It would seem that A must be corrupt in placing dittos after this name. An emendation of d’umù dEn.zu.ka₄, or something similar, seems called for here. That this section represents subnames of a male deity is clearly indicated in line 36 below, where dNin. GA+KAS is described as “his wife.” The emendation of *dumu dEn.zu.ka₄ is made on the basis of such texts as OBI v 12 has dNin.EZEN X GUD is described as: Nin.EZEN X GUD dumù dEn.zu.ka₄ (published in transliterated form by von Soden, Syllabar p. 61). Therefore the name in the present entry may be read dNin.gara (GA+KAS), because abbreviated glosses generally seem to be used to indicate the readings of common monosyllabic signs (as NI for nin, BA for bar, A for an, etc.; see under Tablet II 21). Therefore the name in the present entry may be read dNin.gara (GA+KAS), although dNin.gara (GA+KAS) may not be completely ruled out. If the latter reading is used, the name should be carefully distinguished from the entry in Tablet I 115, where the name appears in the list of the “fathers and mothers” of Enlil.

30. = Ao:156. With this entry, B iv 13 obviously begins a new list of names, each of which originally must have had SU in the explanatory column (B still has the traces of SU after this first name). This means that B possibly represents a textual tradition that originally made a summary after line 35 below. A v 6 varies here and represents a tradition that viewed lines 30-35 as various names of one single deity. However, A (unemended) lists all of these names as subentries for dAb.na.ar bu “the mother of dEnzu.” Since some of the names in the list begin with lugal, it is obvious that some emendation is necessary here. According to B iv 13, the present entry should be the initial line of a new section that is distinguished from the entry in line 29 (if line 30 represented a continuation of line 29, B would not have the traces of SU after this name). It would seem that A must be corrupt in placing dittos after this name. An emendation of d’umù dEn.zu.ka₄, or something similar, seems called for here. That this section represents subnames of a male deity is clearly indicated in line 36 below, where dNin. GA+KAS is described as “his wife.” The emendation of *dumu dEn.zu.ka₄ is made on the basis of such texts as OBI v 12 has dNin.EZEN X GUD is described as: Nin.EZEN X GUD dumù dEn.zu.ka₄ (published in transliterated form by von Soden, Syllabar p. 61). Therefore the name in the present entry may be read dNin.gara (GA+KAS), because abbreviated glosses generally seem to be used to indicate the readings of common monosyllabic signs (as NI for nin, BA for bar, A for an, etc.; see under Tablet II 21). Therefore the name in the present entry may be read dNin.gara (GA+KAS), although dNin.gara (GA+KAS) may not be completely ruled out. If the latter reading is used, the name should be carefully distinguished from the entry in Tablet I 115, where the name appears in the list of the “fathers and mothers” of Enlil.

31. Landsberger, OLZ 34 132, tentatively suggested a restoration of dNin.[gā bu]r.ra for this line. However,
38. = Ao:165, where the name appears as dNin.SES.UNU.KI. The present entry is probably to be read simply dNin. uri2.

39. The gloss ga.ga (which appears in A v 15) can hardly indicate a new pronunciation for the sign ME. It is more probably a scribal indication of a textual variant in his copies (cf. p. 31 above). The line is to be understood in the light of Tablet V 159, 146, where both dMes.me and dGA.GA (glossed with ka.ka, hence, read dKà.kà) appear among the names of dInin.Ka-ra-ak. Since dMes.me and dKà.kà are, therefore, identified with each other, the gloss in the present entry points to the possibility that another textual tradition listed dKà.kà here as the name of dInin. gal. In E17, still another variant occurs: dJas.kin.

40. In E8 and text I, the name appears as dUru.s-gal. For E8 - UBU, see No 1122 p. 64 line 416a, and cf. note 22 above. The name should be compared with dUru.s-gal which appears among the names of Samsa in line 117 above.

41. A v 17: dAmar.za.zu. EAV 63 i 16 (= EAV 65 r. i 18) agrees with E9 and text I:2 in reading the name dAmar.za.zu, but a duplicate of EAV 63, VAT 7759 (= AEF 2 4):4 gives dAmar.za.zu. Cf. Tablet I 352a which gives the following variants: dAmar.za.zu, dAmar.za.zu and dAmar.zu.

42. = Ao:166, which gives the variant dAmar.za.zu.32.s.44. Apparently, this name is usually reserved for dInasme—at least in Ur; see Landaeger, OLB 34 131 and EK 72 note 4.

45. A v 20 at last gives the real reading for the otherwise enigmatic (see Landaeger, OLB 34 133) dSE.tsb.ba. A now shows that the sign SE in E:2 and text I:9 actually should be read ninu(40).

47. A v 22: dIL.la.bu.un.'du'.

49. Text = A v 29. T:1 gives dGi.áu.un.[na]. E:15 and text I:8 represent a variant tradition which has dGi.áu.un.[na] - Text = A v 29. T:1 gives dGi.áu.un.[na]. E:15 and text I:8 represent a variant tradition which has dGi.áu.un.[na].

50. Read dUri.za.zal. The name represents, of course, the deified third king of the third dynasty of Ur. See line 254 below, where he appears in the circle of dIN.

51. The variation in O:12, dSES.KI.balag.en.KI, points to a reading of bulug here, instead of the more usual usum. This name and the following one are listed in KAV 64 iv 16 f. (= "Smaller An : dA-nu-um") among the names of a group of servants of Samsa.

52. For this see E:12 above.

55. Cf. An : Anu sa améli where Hi.li.ba appears among the names of Anu. The present name appears to be a compound name, based upon both An and Hi:li:ba. In O:14, the name is given as dAn.na.hi:li:ba.

56. The museum no. of L (K. 4349B) indicates that this text is actually a fragment of B. L:1 corresponds to approximately lines 34 ff. of the gap in IV (this is evident from the fact that col. 1 of this fragment corresponds to approximately lines 58 ff. of the gap in I:11; see under Tablet II 213).
62. For the gloss in text I:19, see Meissner, OLZ 13 64. With its Akkadian emphatic, the gloss seems difficult to explain, occurring as it does in the middle of a Sumerian name. The name itself seems to mean simply "the weapon of the god BAD."

63. Text I:20: dU.m4.(tu) [x.x]. It is possible that the gloss in text I contained one more sign, such as, UK or KU; however, it seems unlikely that such a gloss would have been used to explain such a common sign as TUK. The loss suggests instead that the name in text I ended with TUG or possibly some other sign with the value TUG.

64. For dNin.EZEN X GUD, see under note 30 above.


66. The line is ambiguous in L:9 since the scribe who wrote L (= a fragment of B, see under note 58 above) constantly compressed his material. NA.ZI is certainly a gloss, as is seen from the fact that the next entry gives the same name written phonetically. Note also dENGUR without gloss in line 69 below. In SLT 122 iii 13 (= SLT 124 iv 4), the name dNa.zi occurs again in close proximity to (as here, see line 70 below) the name of dNin.mar.ki; but, in this latter text, the ideogram usually read dNanse appears immediately following dNa.zi instead of an expected dENGUR. In Ao:295 f., this same pair occurs together again. This points to an equation of dNa.zi = dENGUR = *dNanse and clarifies the partly broken gloss in CT 29 46:25 (where the pronunciation gloss for the ideogram usually read dNanse is to be restored to na.zi) Hence it seems probable that the deity whose name is usually read dNanse is not only to be identified with dENGUR/Nammu, but is to be read dNazi instead of dNanse (although it is not clear whether the present entry is to be identified with dNAMUN in Tablet I 27). In Ao:295, the name of dNin.dar.a follows that of dNa.zi/Nazi(NANSE), thus occupying the place of her spouse in Ao. This would seem to justify the emendation of "dam.bi.SAL dIN.dar.a.ken"—an emendation which is in harmony with line 274 of the myth "Enki and Ninsuragga" (see Kramer, BASOR NS no. 1 p. 20:274 and p. 30 note 92) where it is declared, "Let dNa.zi marry <d>U.nu.un.dar.a (= dNin.dar.a)."

69. For giskim(IGI+DUB), see CAD 598.

70. In the present line, dNin.mar.ki quite logically follows dNazi (= dNa.zi = dNANSE, see note 67 above), because dNazi was regarded as her mother (see SAK 60 5:8-10).

71. Although the organization of this section is ambiguous, the list of the children of dNin.mar.ki probably begins here. I regularly omit SU in the explanatory column; but this should be restored in these lines, as is evident from lines 80 ff. below.

72. Gloss in L:15. P:4 should be restored to read dTAG.(zi.iz). The name is dZizzil.

80. For ZA+KU = suba, see under note 249 below.

82. For the value bism.(SID X A), see 1SL II p. 51 note 238.
83. Gloss in J:4. It is possible that line 83 represents merely a variant name in J instead of the name in line 82 (which is found only in P). However, this would leave only twelve names in a list that calls for 13 children of dIN.mar.4. L ii 17 offers only one entry for the material in lines 82 and 83; and since it has no gloss for the line, it is ambiguous. Arbitrarily, L is assumed to agree with J here.


85. Glosses in P:9. J:5 writes US(:) instead of $U and omits SU. Apparently, the name is dIN.dZu. S (K. 2110) is an unpublished fragment in the British Museum. I am indebted to Dr. Landsberger for calling my attention to this fragment. Its first legible traces give \[1\] r gu 4 '.DÚB dNin. r mar'.[ki]. For the significance of the abbreviated gloss e (= eres) for NIN, see under Tablet II 21.

86. = Ao:168, which has d Ga-a-a-ú. J:6 agrees with Ao in giving the shorter form. Cf. CT 29 46:15, where d ga-a-a-ú appears as a gloss for d TUK and d r GANAM 4 . For dGANAM 4 , see line 87 below. For the second half of the line, L:19 gives sipa dEn.zu.na.ke4. This seems to point to a possible identification of dEnnu.gi with dEn.zu. Cf. under Tablet I 141.

87. G:7 gives kl.min; J:7 varies, giving SU. 

88. In view of the gloss (in J:13), the name may be provisionally read dsùs.abzu. In MSL II p. 51 line 248, Dr. Landsberger listed SU-US as one of the values of IS. However, in MSL III p. 199, he corrected this reading to KU-US, basing the correction on a new text from Nippur and on a fresh collation of the text in AS no. 7 Fl. V line 80 (in the photograph which Hallock published, the signs do look more like KU-US than SU-US; see AS no. 7 Fl 1). Since J:13 quite clearly presents SU-US, it would seem that the question of whether the reading of 13 should be reopened. Cf. further under lines 161 and 218 below. G:12 gives SU.ma instead of SU.

89. In view of the gloss (in J:15), the name may be provisionally read dAb.bu.ki. dES.KI.e.dU. J:15 presents the variant entry dAb.bu. ki.dES.KI.dU. As is pointed out in line 91 above, the dittos indicate that dGANAM 4 is here ideographic for dSU.numu, du.du. G:10 gives SU.ma instead of SU.

90. Instead of dGANAM 4 , G:11 presents the variant entry dAb.bu.ki.dES.KI.e.dU. The extra material in J (i.e., e.dU) may represent an old gloss; if so, it might indicate the pronunciation of AB in this name. G:8 gives SU.ma, instead of SU.

91. G:9 gives SU.ma, instead of SU. 

92. Instead of dGANAM 4 , G:11 presents the variant entry dAb.bu.ki.dES.KI.e.dU. The extra material in J (i.e., e.dU) may represent an old gloss; if so, it might indicate the pronunciation of AB in this name. G:8 gives SU.ma, instead of SU.

93. In view of the gloss (in J:13), the name may be provisionally read dsùs.abzu. In MSL II p. 51 line 248, Dr. Landsberger listed SU-US as one of the values of IS. However, in MSL III p. 199, he corrected this reading to KU-US, basing the correction on a new text from Nippur and on a fresh collation of the text in AS no. 7 Fl. V line 80 (in the photograph which Hallock published, the signs do look more like KU-US than SU-US; see AS no. 7 Fl 1). Since J:13 quite clearly presents SU-US, it would seem that the question of whether the reading of 13 should be reopened. Cf. further under lines 161 and 218 below. G:12 gives SU.ma instead of SU.

94. G:12 gives SU.ma instead of SU. 

95. Text = J:15. In G:14, the name appears as dKU.SAG, KU.LI.KI; and in H:2, it is given as dKU.SAG. KU.LI.KI. In J:15, the name appears as dKU.SAG, KU.LI.KI; and in H:2, it is given as dKU.SAG, KU.LI.KI. In
**Tablet III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>entence.g</td>
<td>106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>d(zam)</td>
<td>108.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>d(Bl.seeubble)</td>
<td>109.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>d(u)(ni.min.du)</td>
<td>110.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>d(Su.kur)</td>
<td>111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>d(XU)</td>
<td>112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>d(Bi.1gul)</td>
<td>113.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>d[X]</td>
<td>114.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>d(Su.sag.x)</td>
<td>115.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tablet III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>entence.g</td>
<td>106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>d(zam)</td>
<td>108.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>d(Bl.seeubble)</td>
<td>109.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>d(u)(ni.min.du)</td>
<td>110.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>d(Su.kur)</td>
<td>111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>d(XU)</td>
<td>112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>d(Bi.1gul)</td>
<td>113.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>d[X]</td>
<td>114.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>d(Su.sag.x)</td>
<td>115.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TUMIS.** The gloss in H:2 may provide some help in controlling the signs involved, but all of these variant forms of the name seem to have been regarded as ideographic for "Suzuqan; see under Tablet I 229 and An: Anu 84 amulu 106. G gives SU.m instead of SU.

**Note 96.** The last two lines of S (see under note 85 above) give:

| 97. | = Ao:171 and A v 66. Gloss in H:4. On the pronuncia-
| 98. | tion of the Sumerian name for the sun-god Utu, see 2A NF 11 36 and GLZ 46 355. The Samaa list naturally follows the names of the immediate household of "Sin because "Samaa was regarded as the son of "Sin; cf. EA 10/1 l:5 f.
| 99. | = Ao:172. For the reading SIR = nu_x, see under note 4 above.
| 100. | A has one more name in the Samaa list between A v 66 and 74, but what the extra name might have been cannot be determined. Arbitrarily, this extra name is placed here.
| 101. | = Ao:173. For the reading SIR = nu_x, see under note 4 above.
| 105. | which seems to vary, giving d(Nin.na)sa.a; this may represent either a scribal or a copiest's mistake. Concerning the abbreviated gloss ni for nin, see under Tablet II 21.

106. The traces of the beginning of ma appear in A v 75 and in Q r. 1. In the light of K. 4209 (OT 25 34) r. 8, the name is probably to be emended to "H.mk.ban.dan.ana "the little boat of An."

107. = A v 76.

108. = ac:S. Gloss in H:13. For the gloss(!) in Q r. 2, see GLZ 13 97.

109. To read the gloss in H:14 as ka.še.ba (as in AG 341) is not without difficulties. It would seem strange to find the sign ka having the value kaš in a gloss. For an indication of the reading kaš, one would expect to find the gloss kašša. In Q r. 3, the gloss appears as Mu.še.bi, which lessner, GLZ 13 97, would correct to Bl.še.bi. The fact that a number of deities are referred to as ULAK (especially in late cult texts, e.g., cf. III 66 1:15, 25, 27, 29, 32) renders the task of analyzing all such deities difficult. For one analysis of dALAK/galumu deities, see E. Douglas van Buren, Or. NS 10 65 ff. See also Tablet I 20 f. and Tablet IV 177.

110. Gloss in H:15. King's copy of H presents HI instead of 45, but this is doubtless to be emended. See also Tablet I 206 where the name occurs in a Minurta list.

111. Gloss in H:16.

112. = A v 81.

113. Text = H:17. A v 82 and B iv 61: d(Bi)22.[gul].


115. The sign "x" in H:19 may possibly have been a sign such as KAL.

**TUMIS.** The gloss in H:2 may provide some help in controlling the signs involved, but all of these variant forms of the name seem to have been regarded as ideographic for "Suzuqan; see under Tablet I 229 and An: Anu 84 amulu 106. G gives SU.m instead of SU.

**Note 96.** The last two lines of S (see under note 85 above) give:

| 14. | tion of the Sumerian name for the sun-god Utu, see 2A NF 11 36 and GLZ 46 355. The Samaa list naturally follows the names of the immediate household of "Sin because "Samaa was regarded as the son of "Sin; cf. EA 10/1 l:5 f.
| 15. | Cf. BT 12 3 r. 50. In this and the following lines, G:17 ff. have ki.min instead of the simple dittos.
| 16. | The dittos may indicate a double gloss here (i.e., "Samaa plus the sign name). Cf. BT 12 3 r. 16, where d20 (-"Samaa) has the gloss of "Samaa and the explanation "Samaa. Note ac:9, where d20 (in a Samaa list) has a gloss of bu.zu.ur; this should be compared with OT 12 3 r. 6, which pronounces the sign 20 as bu.zu.ur and then explains it as pu-uz-rù.
| 17. | A has one more name in the Samaa list between A v 66 and 74, but what the extra name might have been cannot be determined. Arbitrarily, this extra name is placed here.
| 18. | = Ao:173. For the reading SIR = nu_x, see under note 4 above.
| 22. | which seems to vary, giving d(Nin.na)sa.a; this may represent either a scribal or a copiest's mistake. Concerning the abbreviated gloss ni for nin, see under Tablet II 21.

106. The traces of the beginning of ma appear in A v 75 and in Q r. 1. In the light of K. 4209 (OT 25 34) r. 8, the name is probably to be emended to "H.mk.ban.dan.ana "the little boat of An."

107. = A v 76.

108. = ac:S. Gloss in H:13. For the gloss(!) in Q r. 2, see GLZ 13 97.

109. To read the gloss in H:14 as ka.še.ba (as in AG 341) is not without difficulties. It would seem strange to find the sign kaš having the value kaš in a gloss. For an indication of the reading kaš, one would expect to find the gloss kašša. In Q r. 3, the gloss appears as Mu.še.bi, which lessner, GLZ 13 97, would correct to Bl.še.bi. The fact that a number of deities are referred to as ULAK (especially in late cult texts, e.g., cf. III 66 1:15, 25, 27, 29, 32) renders the task of analyzing all such deities difficult. For one analysis of dULAK/galumu deities, see E. Douglas van Buren, Or. NS 10 65 ff. See also Tablet I 20 f. and Tablet IV 177.

110. Gloss in H:15. King's copy of H presents HI instead of 45, but this is doubtless to be emended. See also Tablet I 206 where the name occurs in a Minurta list. **Tablet II 21.**

111. Gloss in H:16.

112. = A v 81.

113. Text = H:17. A v 82 and B iv 61: d(Bi)22.[gul].


115. The sign "x" in H:19 may possibly have been a sign such as KAL.
Neither B iv 67 nor H:30 contains the expected dam. bi.SAL. Whether A v 94 had this explanation cannot be determined. B varies slightly, giving "(d)IN.kâr | d.A.a". Note E a 10/1 13 9 f., where d.A.a is described as the "bride" (of dSamaš). In K. 4349 (CT 25 9):17, dIN.kâr is also equated with dA.a; while in line 33 of the same text, d.A.a is identified with dštar. Cf. K. 7686 (CT 25 46):5 ff., which, if complete, would have given a number of her names. 127. = Ao:177 (which has dšš.NIR) and text V i 5. Gloss in A v 95. B iv 67b has še instead of šš. In view of the variant ways in which the name was written, dšš.NIR.dâ is probably to be read dšš.râ.dâ. Note that in An : Anu šš namši 45 her name appears as dšš.râ.dâ. See also K. 4349 (CT 25 9):27, where dšš.râ.dâ is similarly identified with d.A.a.

128. = Ao:180, which presents "UD". In B iv 66b, the sign name is added to the gloss: UD.mi.na.bi. "UD-doubled." In A v 96, the name may have been written d[U].mi.na.bi. 51.UD,UD); CT 25 10 i 28 may be compared here.

129. = text V i 6. Restored from CT 25 10 i 28, which adds the sign name involved: za.ab.û.tu. In A v 97, the dittos appear to have been placed just after the determinative.

130. Cf. CT 25 10 i 51, where it is clear that the reading kâm is to be preferred above šš. In A 1079, the name occurs as dšš.Tâ.râ.kâm. This may have represented dšš.Tâ.tu.kâm; hence the name dšš.UD.kâm is possibly to be read dšš.tu.kâm.

131. Cf. 1 ff., preserves the dittos of the explanatory column in these lines. The present line may be restored from CT 25 10 i 32 and Ao:178 (which has dšš.du.û.gâ). Cf. also CT 25 9:25: dšš.du.û.gâ. Text V i 7 shows that B iv 69b had a name ending in d.A.a.
134. = text V i 8 and CT 25 9:18. With this line the names of dA, the wife of dSamas, end.
135. Lines 135-137 may represent additional names of dUtu/Samas. The gloss is in A v 103. Concerning the gloss e for the sign A, cf. under note 120 above.
137. C:7b contains the last part of a puzzling gloss which ended with x's. Gki ga. Instead of dUtu in the explanatory column, C contains dittos.
138. C:8b contains the latter part of an unexplicable gloss ending with mu-se-nu-ú. This and the gloss in C:7 may have been glosses for entries having no exact equivalents in the other duplicates. At least for the present, since the left half of C is broken away, there seems to be little hope of adequately explaining these glosses.
140. = Ao:187. C:15 replaces kinda with GAL.UnKen(Uku X IIa) and follows this with the gloss mu-e-er.
143. = Ao:185. C:12 adds mit-lu-uuk (= sà.k-lù.kà). C:13 omits sukkal să.kù,ù.ke, and identifies Bu-ne-ne with dPa4.nun.na. Obviously, only one deity is intended in lines 142 and 143. Note EAV 63 i 32 f., where these two names are again given together. Weidner, AFK 2 12 note 4, draws attention to KUB 4 no. 11:6 f., where the Sumerian

Tablet III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134. dEn.uru₂</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135. dEn.gà.nà</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136. dNíg.gi.na</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137. dKi-it-tum</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. dIq-bi-da-mi-ia</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. dMa.mú</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140. dSi.si.ig</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141. dGù(šaš)šaš</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. dSu.na</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. dNi-nà</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
<td>= = = =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C:7b adds mit-lu-ruk' (= sà.kù,ù.lù). C:13 omits sukkal să.kù,ù.ke, and identifies Bu-ne-ne with dPa4.nun.na. Obviously, only one deity is intended in lines 142 and 143. Note EAV 63 i 32 f., where these two names are again given together. Weidner, AFK 2 12 note 4, draws attention to KUB 4 no. 11:6 f., where the Sumerian
Further explained by the Akkadian gloss a-mi-riš.

153. With this line, a list of 6 gu₄.DDS of d Utu begins.

157. King's copy of B iv 90 gives SAG instead of kú₅ (on the interchange between these two forms, see Meissner, OLZ 12 202).

160. Meissner, OLZ 12 202, felt that the sign DUL in B iv 92 was really gUL (so also AG 460), but the sign resembles DUL more than jUL.

161. Glosses in C:30. The gloss ku (for I₈) is actually written under the sign I₈ and is made quite small. The possibility that the gloss may actually be ŠU cannot be ruled out; cf. under note 95 above. The Akkadian gloss ki-uzu translates the Sumerian I₈ "groom, one in charge of horses."


165. In C:33, these "runners of Samaš" are given as the lú.kas₄. babbar.ke₄. That is, they are represented in C as belonging to the temple of Samaš rather than to the deity himself.


167. B iv 97b seems to omit one gi₄.

169. = C r. 3, B (characteristically laconic with explanations) omits this summary.

171. A list of "8 judges of Utu" begins here. The first three bear Akkadian names; the last, Sumerian. On the reading of the name, cf. diš-me-ka-ra-bu in K. 252 (III R 66) v 2. The same deity is probably to be seen in the Is-me-ka-ra-ba/bu listed in AO 390.


179. C r. 9 gives the total as "6," but this is not completely convincing. It is evident that lines 168 and 169
above form a pair, which may be excluded from the present list; but where can the dividing line be drawn in the three Akkadian names of lines 171-173? If it is assumed that there were only 68 judges and that these began with line 171, then line 176 must be separated from the names in lines 177 and 178 (with which line 176 certainly forms a group). It seems more satisfactory to regard all the names of lines 171-178 as belonging together; either emend C to read 8(i) or assume that C omitted two names (here arbitrarily assumed to be lines 177 and 178).

181. The same name is listed in KAV 64 iv 6 as <d> An.gi.ir (in the Samas section of the "Smaller An: An nu-un"). This may point to the probability that the present entry includes an older gloss and should be emended to read *<d> AnLa). gi.ir. The practice of omitting the determinative in front of names beginning with An is observable elsewhere in the series (as well as the practice of using the sign A as an abbreviated gloss to indicate that the sign AN is not serving as a determinative); see under Tablet II 41.

182. = KAV 64 iv 8. For ni.dul, see p. 15 note 51 above.

183. In this entry and in line 188 below, the sign read šagun(1) is actually written with the sign DUGUD in B iv 106 and 109. Although šagun(1) = 8amal nú is known (cf. Deimel, SL 428, 8), DUGUD,1â seems to appear in similar contexts (cf. Deimel, SL 445, 5; he quotes the unpublished VAT 9558 as also containing DUGUD,1â). Dr. Stephens tells me that he collated this text a few years ago, and his notes verify the reading DUGUD,1â. Since šagun and DUGUD resemble each other, there may have been some scribal confusion concerning them.

184. See under note 186 above.

185. This "god of dreams" is to be distinguished from the deity in line 149 above. C r. 18 preserves the traces of the last part of da.

190. Ideographic for the preceding name. This section (lines 191-200) lists the various ideograms for the god Sumuann/Sakkan and is to be compared with a similar list in CT 29 46:8 ff. In the present list, šagun = Šakkan is placed first as the main deity, while dūr šagun = Sumuann is placed second and the gloss of the latter is given to the succeeding entries by means of dittoes, but this order is reversed in CT 29 46:8 ff. For the deity Šakkan, see Lambert, EA 47 190 f.; Albright, JAOS 40 320 ff.; and Albright, AFC 3 181 ff.

192. In CT 29 46:8, the gloss is given as su.mu.uq.gâ. The name certainly corresponds to CT 29 46:10; and this correspondence should clarify the difficult PISAN X AS in that line. The dittoes here indicate (as in CT 29 46:10) that this is an ideogram for Sumuann/Sakkan. The explanation "dumul [ša.mu.aa.an] šagun(1)

193. = CT 29 46:12, where the name is written šagun(1) (the last sign is obviously written over an erasure). Maššu-kî in this reference is clearly a sign name and not a pronunciation gloss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>d(u)-li-a</td>
<td>(ba).KU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>d(s).A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>d( )A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>d(siki)/SIK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>d(siki).la.me.si</td>
<td>dam.bi.SAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>d(la.bar)/GANAM._</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>d(Nin.sik)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>d(Nin.tug.sud)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>d(Nin.du/ku.ga)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>d(is.kur)/IM</td>
<td>d(IN = d(Adad))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>E R 2a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>B iv 115a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>B iv 115b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>E R 2b.</td>
<td>B iv 116a may have varied here; but, since the line is broken in B at this point, this cannot be controlled. This entry corresponds to CT 29 46:14. Distinguish from dSIK in Tablet II 361.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>E R 189.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>To be distinguished from the names in lines 87 and 92 above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>In A v 163 and B iv 117, the name appears as d&quot;SIK (the dittos in this case refer to a name or a gloss not preserved in either text). Text = E R 4b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>A v 164: &quot;DU.KU.[ ]</td>
<td>This should perhaps be read (in the light of E R 5e) &quot;DUG.me.[aud].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Text = E R 5b. In A v 165 and B iv 118, the name appears as dBA.ku.ga; but this may represent an older tradition in which the signs DUL and BA were confused. dBA.ku.ga should probably be assigned to d&quot;DU.ku.ga, but should be distinguished from the dmu.ku.ga who is listed among the names of dIm.sukkal in An: Anu 86 amši 69 and also from the dmu.ku.ga who is listed among the names of &quot;Sabu in OT 25 35:2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>A o 190. E R 6b seems to repeat this entry (with dittos instead of the gloss). The significance of the repetition is not clear and is not found in the other duplicates. In A v 166, the gloss appears in the variant form is.ku. I am indebted to Dr. Landesberger for calling my attention to the unpublished text in the British Museum, no. 45639 (formerly 81-7-2,52), which begins with this line (= A). For a helpful study on IN, the storm god, see Schlobies, MAOG 1/3 1 ff. Text ab, although not a duplicate, gives many of the names of Adad (especially those foreign to Babylonia). For the present line, see ab i 34.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>d(mu-ur)</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>d(lil-me-er)</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>d(a-da-ad)</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>d(me-er-me-ri)</td>
<td>IM X</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>d(= me-er-me-ri)</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>d(nii.mi.gi.ri)</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>X EN + IM X IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>d(li.ta.mun)</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>X EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>d(li.ta.mun)</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>X EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>d(ii)</td>
<td>EN</td>
<td>X EN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tablet III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>E R 2a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>B iv 115a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>B iv 115b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>E R 2b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>E R 189.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>To be distinguished from the names in lines 87 and 92 above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>In A v 163 and B iv 117, the name appears as d&quot;SIK (the dittos in this case refer to a name or a gloss not preserved in either text). Text = E R 4b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>A v 164: &quot;DU.KU.[ ]</td>
<td>This should perhaps be read (in the light of E R 5e) &quot;DUG.me.[aud].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Text = E R 5b. In A v 165 and B iv 118, the name appears as dBA.ku.ga; but this may represent an older tradition in which the signs DUL and BA were confused. dBA.ku.ga should probably be assigned to d&quot;DU.ku.ga, but should be distinguished from the dmu.ku.ga who is listed among the names of dIm.sukkal in An: Anu 86 amši 69 and also from the dmu.ku.ga who is listed among the names of &quot;Sabu in OT 25 35:2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>A o 190. E R 6b seems to repeat this entry (with dittos instead of the gloss). The significance of the repetition is not clear and is not found in the other duplicates. In A v 166, the gloss appears in the variant form is.ku. I am indebted to Dr. Landesberger for calling my attention to the unpublished text in the British Museum, no. 45639 (formerly 81-7-2,52), which begins with this line (= A). For a helpful study on IN, the storm god, see Schlobies, MAOG 1/3 1 ff. Text ab, although not a duplicate, gives many of the names of Adad (especially those foreign to Babylonia). For the present line, see ab i 34.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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216. \(d(ni\cdot gi\cdot ir)^* \) EN X EN

217. \(d\text{lugal} . \) "EN X EN"

218. \(d\text{lugal} . \) [KU.\(u\cdot a\).]

\[\text{sud.sud}\]

219. \(d\text{lugal} . u_4 . \text{dè.eš} . \)

\[\text{dug}_4 . \text{ga}\]

220. \(d\text{lugal} . \) [\(\text{šen.sen.na}\).]

221. \(d\text{lugal} . \) [GD.\(ru\).\(ru\).\(gd\).]

222. \(d\text{lugal} . \) [\(\text{du.}\).]

\[\text{dubur}(\text{ŠAR X U})\]

223. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{gu}\).\(dé\).\(di\).]

217. B omitted either line 217 or 218, but just which cannot be determined because this line is broken away in B. Arbitrarily, the missing line is assumed to correspond to line 217 here. Text = E r. 11, where the dittos in the middle of the name refer to the previous gloss \(ri..a.mun\) in E r. 10 (see line 214 above). Since the gloss \(ri..a.mun\) in E r. 10 applies to the complex EN X EN, it is reasonable to conclude that it has this force in the present line also, resulting in a reading of \(d\text{lugal} . \) [\(ri..a.mun\).] The corresponding entry in Ao:192 gives \(d\text{lugal} . \) [\(\text{EN X EN}\) (in which the gloss IM hardly looks like a pronunciation gloss; it more likely was intended to indicate a variation in the texts from which Ao copied, see p. 31 above).

218. Text = N:10. The problem of the correct reading of \(\text{KU}\) comes up again with this line (see under note 95 above). In the photograph of N which Dr. Landsberger kindly placed at my disposal, the \(\text{KU}\) in the gloss is somewhat ambiguous. Since the lower horizontal is quite long and projects out to the left, the possibility that \(\text{SU}\) was intended cannot be ruled out. However, two vertical wedges do appear on the photograph, and this seems to make \(\text{SU}\) almost certain here.

219. Text = B iv 123b. N:11: \(d\text{lugal} . u_4 . \) [\(\text{deš} . \) (\(\text{UR}\)).\(dug\).\(ga\).]

220. Text = N:12.

221. Text = B iv 124b; E r. 13: \(d\text{lugal} . \) [\(\text{su} . \text{ru} . \text{ru} . \text{gú}\).] (with which U:6 agrees); N:12: \(d\text{lugal} . \) [\(\text{su} . \text{ru} . \text{ru} . \text{ga}\).]

222. Text = N:14. The same name with the same gloss appears in ab i 37. In U:7, the name ends with \(U_4\) (first part of the line not preserved).

223. = ab i 34. Gloss in U:8. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{gu}\).\(dé\).] appears to have been a fairly common name for Ašdâ; see An : Ašnu 86.

224. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{dé}.\) \(\text{a} . \text{a}\).]

225. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{dé}.\) \(\text{t} . \text{a}\).]

226. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{dé}.\) \(\text{k} . \text{t} . \text{a}\).]

227. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{r} . \text{a}\).]

228. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{a} . \text{a}\).]

229. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

230. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

231. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

232. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

233. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

234. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

235. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

236. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

237. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

238. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

239. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

240. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

241. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

242. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

243. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

244. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]

245. \(dU_4 . \) [\(\text{d} . \text{r} . \text{a}.\) \(\text{m} . \text{r} . \text{a}\).]
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234. dLugal.bé.gál.la

235. dLugal.dingir.ra

236. [dLugal].hé.nun

237. dLugal.ka.zal.la

238. dLugal.sag.il

239. dLugal.ú.sim.sul.sú

240. dSa.la
dam.bi.SAL

241. dMe.dim.áša

242. dSu.zabar.kú
dumú dIM.ke₄

243. dSUH.me.guš
dumú dIM.ke₄

244. dKIN.nu.SUM
dumú dIM.ke₄

245. dEn.me.LU.LU

246. dMi.ša.ru
dam.bi.SAL

247. dI-Mar-tum

248. dš-gur-a-mat-su

249. dSuba(ZA+MOŠ).num.na

250. dMi.num.e.si

251. dNa.MAŠ.MAŠ

252. 3 dumú.SAL
dIM.ke₄

253. dNim.gir

sukkāl dIM.ke₄

242. = CT 25 10:36. In the bilingual hymn to Anu, in ZA 41.16:10 f., the Sumerian line gives the name of the wife of dIM as dSu.zabar.kú, while the Akkadian line gives the name as dSa.la.

243. = CT 25 10:41. Instead of guš, G r. 16 presents BIR, but this seems to be merely a scribal or a copyist's mistake.

245. The appearance of a name beginning with an among the names of dSa.la, the wife of dIM, may at first seem strange; but female names beginning with an are not unknown in this series (cf. Tablet I 195; et al.). The name may actually be dEn.me.dib.dib.

246. Text I r. 14: dMe-ša-ru. The name appears in a number of different writings. Cf. dMi-ša-ru, KAV 42 i 24; dNl-ša-ru, KAR 43 i 15; dMe-ša-ru, KAR 214 i 25; dMe-ša-ru; etc. A vi 5 now makes it clear that dMi-ša-ru is the son of Adad and not the son of Šamaš as had been conjectured before.

247. Cf. CT 25.18 r. ii 5.


249. Text I r. 17 writes the name with SUH instead of MOŠ (cf. KAV 46 ii 3). For ZA-MUŠ (and ZA-SUBU = Suba), see CT 25 27:15; Weidner, AFK 2 11 note 1; and Falkenstein, ZA 42 148.

250. Text I r. 18: dMe.num.e.si.

251. Also in KAV 46 ii 2.

253. dNim.gir is otherwise known as the sukkāl of dIM, e.g., cf. the hymn to dIM in CT 15 15:20. In KAV 29 v 9, he appears to be equated with dMar.tu.
A
254. d\textsuperscript{4}Amar.d\textsuperscript{4}Em.zu.na SU
255. d\textsuperscript{4}PA+GANAM\textsubscript{4}ab(\textdagger).ba
256. 2 amar d\textsuperscript{4}IM\textsuperscript{4}.ke\textsubscript{4}
257. d\textsuperscript{4}Se.r\textsuperscript{4}.ri.\textsuperscript{4}is SU
258. d\textsuperscript{4}Ma-gi-ru SU
d\textsuperscript{4}IM\textsuperscript{4}.ke\textsubscript{4}
259. 2 gu\textsubscript{4}4 SU
260. d\textsuperscript{4}ZUR.gal SU
261. d\textsuperscript{4}Ur\textsuperscript{4}.ZUR.ra [SU]
262. d\textsuperscript{4}Pirig.g\textsuperscript{4}.du\textsuperscript{4}10.\textsuperscript{4}ga [SU]
263. d\textsuperscript{4}Ur\textsuperscript{4}.\textsuperscript{4}Sa\textsuperscript{4}.ni.[x] [SU]
264. d\textsuperscript{4}Dr X SID.m\textsuperscript{4}.mu.un. SU

D
265. d\textsuperscript{4}Ka.zal.kalam.ma SU
266. d\textsuperscript{4}G\textsuperscript{4}u\textsuperscript{4}.ku.DUB SU d\textsuperscript{4}IM.ke\textsubscript{4}
267. d\textsuperscript{4}Su.pa.su SU d\textsuperscript{4}IM
d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-a
268. d\textsuperscript{4}Nu.aq.bu)BAD SU d\textsuperscript{4}IM
d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a
269. d\textsuperscript{4}Ma-ni.\textsuperscript{4}is BAD SU d\textsuperscript{4}IM
d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a
270. d\textsuperscript{4}S\textsuperscript{4}u\textsuperscript{4}.ul.lat)PA SU d\textsuperscript{4}IM
d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a
271. d\textsuperscript{4}Na\textsuperscript{4}.ma-ni.\textsuperscript{4}LUGAL SU d\textsuperscript{4}IM
d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a
272. d\textsuperscript{4}I\textsuperscript{4}lu-mer)IM SU d\textsuperscript{4}IM
d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a
273. d\textsuperscript{4}Nu-ur-AN.MES\textsuperscript{4}LUGAL SU d\textsuperscript{4}IM
d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a
274. d\textsuperscript{4}I\textsuperscript{4}lu-me-er)URU X SU d\textsuperscript{4}IM
d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a

F
275. d\textsuperscript{4}I\textsuperscript{4}lu-me-er)URU X SU d\textsuperscript{4}IM
d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a
276. d\textsuperscript{4}I\textsuperscript{4}lu-me-er)URU X SU d\textsuperscript{4}IM
d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a
277. d\textsuperscript{4}I\textsuperscript{4}lu-me-er)URU X SU d\textsuperscript{4}IM
d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a

254. See line 51 above, where this deified king of Ur appears in the circle of 4Em.zu; there, the name is written without the final na. For the reading of 4Em.zu and 4Em.zu, na, see under note 2 above.

255. For the pronunciation of PA+GANAM, see K. 4349Q (CT 24 46:5), where this complex has a gloss of mu-la-\textsuperscript{\textdagger}. The sign AB(\textdagger) in A vi 13 has an extraneous horizontal stroke in the middle, which may be due to an erasure.

257. This deity is certainly to be identified with the name of one of the "bulls" of the Hittite/Hurrian storm god. Here, d\textsuperscript{4}Se.r\textsuperscript{4}.i\textsuperscript{4}is appears as one of the "bulls" of d\textsuperscript{4}IM.

258. The name occurs in Tablet I 73 among the servants of Anu.

259. Distinguish from the 6 gu\textsubscript{4}.DUB in line 266 below.

260. Lines 260 and 261 may be compared with CT 12 41b:46, 47, where ZUR\textsuperscript{4} is followed by the signs RA and GAL respectively, and is explained by the Akkadian ka-lu-u "priest." 263. On the reading ur.\textsuperscript{4}.\textsuperscript{4}Sa, for \textsuperscript{4}E\textsuperscript{4}Ar.DU, see RA 18 40d:30 and RA 10 81a:31 (cf. Kramer, Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur line 183). The name must mean something like "whose roar is . . ."

264. The traces of the inserted sign in A vi 20 hardly favor SU; on the tablet, they more nearly resemble SID. This would point to a reading of gu\textsuperscript{4}du (cf. MSL III p. 119 note 265a) "thunder." In A, the final sign in this name ends in a final diagonal stroke or a winkelhaken. In D r. 4, the sign begins with a horizontal stroke. These two traces would favor the restoration of GI in a reduplicated verb form. The signs 'GI,GI' in this entry would be phonetic for gi\textsuperscript{4}.gi\textsubscript{4}; cf. MSL III p. 119 note 265.

267. With this line, a section begins which explains a number of (often similarly written) names of d\textsuperscript{4}IM, d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-\textsuperscript{4}a, d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a, d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a, and d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a. The gloss in D r. 7 appears as na.aq.bu. This line corresponds to Tablet II 168.

268. Gloss = A vi 23. The gloss in D r. 7 appears as na.aq.bu. This line corresponds to Tablet II 168.

269. Gloss = A vi 24; D r. 8: su.ul.lat. In the second half of the line, A writes dU\textsuperscript{4}TU instead of d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsubscript{\textdagger}. 270. Gloss = A vi 25 and D r. 9.

271. Gloss = D r. 10; A vi 26: su.lu.ut (instead of an expected su.lu.\textsuperscript{\textdagger}). In the second half of the line, A writes dU\textsuperscript{4}TU instead of d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a.

272. Gloss = D r. 11 and A vi 27.

273. Gloss = D r. 12 and A vi 28. For Ilumer, see under note 208 above.

274. Gloss = A vi 29, which should be compared with the gloss nu-ur-\textsuperscript{\textdagger}-\textsuperscript{\textdagger} in dLUGAL in CT 29 45:25. In D r. 13, the gloss appears as nu-ur-ra. In the second half of the line, A and M r. 4 write dU\textsuperscript{4}TU instead of d\textsuperscript{4}Sa-ma\textsuperscript{4}a.

275. Text = D r. 14. A vi 30 gives the gloss as i-lu-\textsuperscript{\textdagger}me; F r. 2: i-lu-mi-\textsuperscript{\textdagger}. Cf. CT 29 45:26.

276. Gloss = D r. 16. In A vi 31, the gloss appears as d\textsuperscript{4}im.me.er.
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278. Gloss = F r. 3. In A vi 32 and D r. 17, the gloss is written nu-ur-AN.MES. Cf. CT 29 45:26.

279. Text = A vi 33. Cf. dGA X IS+U+RUM, AS no. 7 p. 24 line 264. D r. 18; d(iš-bu-ru)GA X GAR. In AS no. 7 p. 25 line 276, the ideogram for Išāru/Sisaba is given as dGA, while on p. 23 line 250, it is given as dGA X PA. F r. 5 adds a short gloss line, which (since it ends in EU) probably gave the name of the sign in F r. 4. In the second half of the present line, F r. 4 gives dIš-bu-ru' instead of dIšība. The deity Išāru/Išūra appears here loosely connected to the Ea/Samas/Adad circle, but note Tablet I 199 ff. (where she occurs in the household of Enlil) and Tablet IV 276 ff. (where she occurs in the "Ištar tablet"). Weidner proposed a restoration of KAV 65 iv 36 (on the basis of his collation; see AFK 2 77 note 2) as: dIš.ba-ra | mār[at dAdad]. If this conjecture is correct, it would provide an added reason why Išūra should appear in this section of the present series, although she is not here explained as dumu. SAL ḫIM.KA.

281. In the second half of the line, D r. 20 gives dIš-ba.ra, while F r. 7 has dištar(U+DAR). For a similar equating of Išūra with Ištar, see KAV 173:12. In the first half of the line, D gives dGA x GAR (as it does for line 279) instead of dGA x PA. D r. 22 adds a line: d(nu-ur-AN.MES)URU X IGI | dIštar(U+:DAR). F r. 8 f. adds two lines not in the other texts:
8. d(dig.i.r.sl.la.ku)GA X PA | "(dIštar)
9. d(nig.ga.na.ag.qu)NIGIN | "(dIštar)
These last two entries in F give the sign name in the gloss, and (with dittos) indicate that both dGA X PA and NIGIN are ideograms for dIšūra, who is equated with dIštar.

285. Text = F r. 10. Interestingly, A vi 37 and D r. 23 both go back to a common tradition which contained an old SOURCES USED IN RECONSTRUCTING TABLET IV

A YBC 2401
B K. 4349 (CT 24 20 ff.)
C VAT 13054 + VAT 10434 (KAV 73 + KAV 145)
C-1 VAT 13054 (KAV 73)
C-2 VAT 10434 (KAV 145)
D K. 4349N + K. 4349U (CT 24 50)
E K. 4349B (CT 24 48)
F VAT 10499 (unpublished; see under note 48 below)
G K. 4349L (CT 24 37)
H K. 4349Q (CT 24 46); see under note 194-231 below.
I K. 11228 (CT 19 38)
TABLET IV

1. Inanna(MÙS)
2. Nin.an.na
3. U1.r sig 7 '.ga
4. n.du . r ri'
5. r suba'( r ZA+  MM )

A

1. [d]Inanna(MØS)
2. [d]Nin.an.na
3. [d]Ul.'sig 7 '.ga
4. [d]Si.du.'ri'
5. [ ]'Suba'('ZA+ MØS)
6. [ ]

1. The 'Istar tablet' is the most poorly preserved of the various tablets in this series. Even with the aid of A, there still remain several large lacunae. However, A does control the total number of lines within the tablet and clearly gives the general organization of the tablet. In addition, A restores large sections of formerly missing material and points the way for future restorations in this important tablet. For the contributions of B v and its relationship to this tablet, see under notes 7, 42, 69, 95, and 117 below. In addition to A and B and the aid derived from Ao, b should also be mentioned as a future source of possible restorations. A number of fragments of other Istar lists have also been published; e.g., KAV 173:8 ff.; KAV 48; CT 25 45 (K. 2121); CT 25 29 (K. 2103 + K. 7636); CT 25 17 ii; and CT 25 44 (Sm. 1558). Although these are not exact duplicate texts, they can, at times, prove quite useful in controlling certain restorations. Text I provides a few traces at the beginning of this tablet. The present line = text I r. 14; A vi 40; and Ao:197 f.
2. = A vi 41. Since text I actually is a fragment of K. 4549 (i.e., text B; cf. under note 7 below), it conserved space by writing two entries to a line wherever possible; hence the present line = text I r. 15a, which is unpreserved.
3. = A vi 42 and text I r. 15b. Restored from b r. i 17; cf. dUl.'sig 7 '.ga in An: An Ñ Ñ amli 88.
4. = A vi 43. Conjectured restoration from b r. 1 19.
5. = text I r. 16b.

7. = text I r. 17b. The traces of 'x' resemble a sign like TI. Text I should actually prove to be a fragment of B iv, representing the very bottom of that column with probably not more than about five lines still missing from the end of the column (note that the "obverse" of text I, CT 25 8, is the beginning of a reverse column of B, representing a section of the "Smaller An: dA-nu-um"). Since text I crowds its entries, it is assumed here that the four lines of Tablet IV still preserved in text I plus the possible five lines missing at the extreme bottom of B iv account for about thirteen actual entries (Tablet IV 2-9 probably were compressed together in B and I). This means that *B v 1 (disregard King's line numbering of B v in CT 24 33) possibly corresponds here to Tablet IV 14. For more on the relationship of B v to the present tablet, see under notes 42, 69, 95, and 117 below.
10. In A vi 49, 'x' appears only as a final vertical stroke, which may be the end of the sign NIN, as in the following line.
11. = Ao:205.
14. In the name, 'x' ends in a winkelhaken.
16. The name may be compared with the dInaN.EN.LIL.ki who is explained in Tablet I 230 as the wife of Minurs.
Tablet IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>( \text{rd} \text{Nin}. \text{mi.nu.a} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>( \text{rd} \text{Nin}. \text{ki.ku.lu} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>( \text{rd} \text{Nin}. \text{en.ena} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>( \text{rd} \text{Nin}. \text{ka} 'X'.a )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>( \text{rd} \text{Nin}. \text{in.te} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>( \text{rd} \text{Nin}. \text{e} ) \text{suba(ZA+MUD)ma}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>( \text{rd} \text{Nin}. \text{e} ) \text{suba.kalam}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>( \text{rd} \text{Nin}. \text{gir.gi} ) \text{lu}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>( \text{[d]} \text{Nin}. \text{igi} . \text{g} u n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>( \text{[d]} \text{Nin}. \text{ka} . \text{a} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>( \text{[d]} \text{Nin}. \text{ka} . \text{a} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. = Ao:208, which gives \( \text{d} \text{Nin}. \text{mi.nu.a} \).
21. = Ao:207, which gives \( \text{d} \text{Nin}. \text{ki.ku.lu} \) \text{g}ar.
22. = Ao:211.
23. = Ao:212, which varies, giving \( \text{d} \text{Nin}. \text{in.te} \) \text{ma}.
24. = Ao:213, which varies, giving \( \text{d} \text{Nin}. \text{e} \) \text{MO}U.SA. With this line, the small fragment, text a, begins. For \( \text{ZA+MUD} = \text{Suba} \), see under Tablet III 249.
25. In the second half of the line, a:2 gives \( \text{d} \text{Suba} \) \text{KALAM}. \text{DU.NA} .

One wonders if the scribe in this instance meant \( \text{AG} \) \text{X} \text{ZAB} = \text{KA} \text{X} \text{ZAB} .
23. = Ao:216, which varies, giving \( \text{d} \text{Nin}. \text{in.te} \) \text{ma}.
24. = Ao:217, which varies, giving \( \text{d} \text{Nin}. \text{e} \) \text{MUD.SA}.

With this line, the small fragment, text a, begins. For \( \text{ZA+MUD} = \text{Suba} \), see under Tablet III 249.
25. In the second half of the line, a:2 gives \( \text{d} \text{SUBA} \). However, from the photograph of this text, which \( \text{Dr. Landsberger} \) kindly placed at my disposal, the signs \( \text{'DU.NA'} \) are quite open to suspicion. The broken traces at the end of the line could just as well favor the expected \( \text{MA} \) followed by another sign, which may be \( \text{AN} \). This text, therefore, may have had still another name at the end of the line.
26. = sme:82 and Ao:214 (which has \( \text{d} \text{Nin}. \text{gir.gi} \). \text{lu} ). a:3 contains the explanation \( \text{g}ir.gi \). \text{lu} \text{a} \text{X}'X' \text{[ in which the } \text{'X'} \text{may represent the initial part of } \text{U-DA} \text{r = 0} \text{STAR} \text{].}
27. The second half of the line may possibly be restored with the aid of a:4, which gives \( \text{d} \text{Nin} \). \text{igi} . \text{g} u n \) \text{a} \text{DU.NA} .
28. = Ao:218, \( \text{d} \text{Nin}. \text{ka}.7 \). Text a (being an excerpt tablet) skips lines 28-37.

30. = sme:83 and Ao:220.
31. = Ao:221. \( \text{Aratta.ki} \) is here written \( \text{LAN} \text{X} \text{KUR(1)} + \text{EU} + \text{EI} \).
32. = Ao:222.
33. = Ao:223.
34. = Ao:224, which writes the name more fully as \( \text{d} \text{Nin}. \text{mi} \).\text{u.un.du} .
35. = Ao:225.
36. = Ao:226 and a:5. In Ao, the name appears as \( \text{d} \text{Nin}. \text{BAD.diar.bar} \), which points to a possible emendation of the present name to read \( \text{d} \text{Nin}. \text{BAD.diar.bar} \).
37. = ao:6. Text a contains only the traces of \( \text{r} \text{Ib} \). \text{ra} \text{a} \text{X} \text{[ in the explanatory column of its next and final line. It is not clear which of the following entries should be equated with this 'r} \text{Ib} \). \text{ra} \text{a} \text{X} \text{].}
40. A vi 79 mistakenly writes \( \text{UR} \) \text{IB} ; the forerunner (Ao:229) gives \( \text{IB} \).
41. = Ao:228.
42. = Ao:229. Since \( \text{G} \) is a fragment of \( \text{K} \), 4349 (= B) that probably corresponds to \( \text{B} \) \text{V} 17-31 (cf. under Tablet III 37), it should be placed approximately here. However, \( \text{G} \) is poorly preserved and contributes little except to indicate...
43. dNin.xari'[su]
44. dNin.'bar-2'[g14]
45. dNin.'ra'[gab]
46. dNin.'x'[x.x]
47. dNin.
48. dNin.'x'.

that the lines which follow continued to have names beginning with nin.

43. = Ao:231.
44. = Ao:232 and eme:85.
45. = Ao:230.
46. The traces (in A vi 85) of the sign after nin favor a sign like SA.
47. The traces (in A vi 87) of the sign represented by 'x' may be some sign like NUN, E, or GA. It is possible that this list of Istar names beginning with nin continued through line 72 below. The names in this list are, of course, mostly lost; but some restorations may be suggested by eme and Ao.
48. The traces (in A vi 87) of the sign represented by rxi may be some sign like NUN, E, or GA. It is possible that this list of Istar names beginning with nin continued through line 72 below. The names in this list are, of course, mostly lost; but some restorations may be suggested by eme and Ao.
49. The unpublished fragment VAT 10499 (to which Dr. Landsberger has kindly drawn my attention) possibly represents a fragment that also is to be placed somewhere between lines 48 and 72.
50. Although its exact placement must await the appearance of other texts of the "Istar tablet," its readings are given here:
51. = Ao:231.
52. = Ao:232 and eme:85.
54. = E iii 2.
55. = E iii 3. 56. = E iii 4. The long list of Istar names that begin with nin probably ends with this line; see under note 48 above.
57. = E iii 5 and eme:88. With this line, a section begins which probably included a lengthy list of the lesser deities and servants in the household of Istar (see under...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet IV</th>
<th>Tablet IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74. (\text{d}^4\text{Nin.si.gar.un.na})</td>
<td>[\text{SU}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. (\text{2 gu}_4\text{.DUB})</td>
<td>[\text{\textsuperscript{2}Inanna.ke}_4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. (\text{d}^4\text{Nin.KA.}'\text{DU}')</td>
<td>[\text{SU}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. []</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. (\text{d}^4\text{Nin.KA.}'\text{x}')</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. []</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. (\text{d}^4\text{Nin.me.}'\text{x}')</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. []</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. (\text{d}^4\text{Nin.}'\text{x}')</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. []</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. (\text{d}^4\text{Nin.}'\text{x}')</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. []</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. (\text{d}^4\text{Nin.})</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. []</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. (\text{d}^4\text{Nin.}')</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. []</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. (\text{d})</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. []</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 69 above.** The present entry represents one of \(\text{2 gu}_4\). \(\text{DUB} \text{Inanna.ke}_4\); according to eme:87 f. \(\text{74.}=\text{eme:87}\). It is here assumed that E would crowd two entries to a single line; hence the present entry would correspond to the unpreserved second half of E iii 5. \(\text{75.}=\text{E iii 6}\). \(\text{76.}=\text{E iii 7}\). \(\text{77.}=\text{E iii 8}\). \(\text{78.}=\text{E iii 9}\). \(\text{79.}=\text{E iii 10}\). \(\text{80.}=\text{E iii 11}\). \(\text{81.}=\text{E iii 12}\). \(\text{82.}=\text{E iii 13}\).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet IV</th>
<th>Tablet IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104. d^Kǔ.GI.bān.da</td>
<td>$SU$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. 2 'x'.</td>
<td>d[^]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. d^Nīn.ḥab.ba</td>
<td>$[SU]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. d[^]</td>
<td>$[SU]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. d^PIš.āg.gāl</td>
<td>$[SU]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. d[^]</td>
<td>$[SU]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. d^KAL.da.'x.x'</td>
<td>$[SU]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. [ ] d[^] .ke[^]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. d^In.na.šāg ga</td>
<td>$[SU]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. [ ]</td>
<td>$[SU]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. d^Nī.gal.edīna</td>
<td>$[SU]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. [ ]</td>
<td>$[SU]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. 4 ni.dub</td>
<td>d[^] .ke[^]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. d^Inanna.unu(_{7}).ki</td>
<td>aš-[ka-i-tu]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104. See Tablet I 316 where he is listed as the husband of d^Nīn.līma\(_{5}\). For the reading of the name, see An : Anu šā anāl\(_{2}\). 105. = D ii 7b and 8b. The summary may be interpreted as either 2 'dingir'.[gub.baJ or 2 'gu\(_{4}\)'.[DUB]. The traces of 'x' would be favorable for either restoration. The deity in the second half of the line is probably d^Nīn.ē.gal, although d^Inanna may also be considered. 107. = D ii 9b. 109. = D ii 10b. 111. = D ii 11b. The name in the second half of the line was probably d^Inanna. 113. = D ii 12b. 115. = D ii 13b. 116. The name in the second half of the line was probably d^Inanna. For ni.dub, see p. 15 note 51 above. 117. For the relationship between B v 1 ff. (i.e., OT 24 33) and D, see under note 95 above. It is clear that the two should join at this point. The present section presents a list of the epithets which Ištar bore in her relationship to various geographical locations. For the present epithet of aš-[ka-i-tu], see LKU 51:2 (where the epithet appears as [d]aš'-ka-a-i-tum). 118. = B v 12, C-1 line 3, and C-2 obv.(:) (see Schröder, KAV p. 1X under no. 73) 2. For be-lit Ak-ka-di, cf. K. 252 (III R 66) iii 24 (= d^Nīn-uri\(_{1}\).ki); KAR 214 ii 31; and MVAG 41/3 iii 36. 127. The sign X appears as ZU in C-2 line 4, but this seems suspect (a name like d^Inanna.AB.ZU/SU may conceivably exist, but d^Inanna.AB.ZU seems ruled out; the latter would
appear as Inanna.ZU.AB). A reading of $A$ for $A$ seems clear in view of $B$ in the second half of the line (= bit).

133. A vi 164 corroborates Tallquist's (AG 429) restoration of line 6 (which should be read tal-la(:) and not ri-te).


137. $\text{Sa}-i-1a-ba-at$ $\text{SU}$

138. $\text{Si}$.bar.lú.ti $\text{SU}$

139. $\text{ka}$.ba.lú.8a $\text{SU}$

140. $\text{E}$.da $\text{SU}$

141. $\text{E}$.sa.pār $\text{SU}$

142. 5 $\text{inim}.bal.bal$ $\text{SU}$

143. $\text{Inanna}.ke_{4}$ $\text{SU}$

144. [d$\text{ab}$.ta.gi$_{4}$.gi$_{4}$] $\text{SU}$

145. [dKA.PAP.KA.KA] $\text{SU}$

146. $\text{Ub}.da.du.du$ $\text{SU}$

147. $\text{Da}.LU.du.du$ $\text{SU}$

148. $\text{a}$.sa.nu.gi$_{4}$.a $\text{SU}$

149. $\text{Da}.ra.nu.gi$_{4}$.a $\text{SU}$

150. $\text{Ama}.nu.ni$ $\text{SU}$

151. $\text{Ama}.\text{Su}_{d}(\text{KA X SU})$. $\text{SU}$

152. $\text{Ma}$.lak $\text{SU}$

153. $\text{Ma}$.ra.l1 $\text{SU}$

154. $\text{d}$(se$d$)KAL $\text{SU}$

155. $\text{d}$(ba$.as$.tum')KAL $\text{SU}$

156. $\text{d}$(la.ma.$su$)KAL $\text{SU}$

157. $\text{Da}$.[da] $\text{SU}$

represents one of these missing entries (it gives $\text{ki}$.[ ]). More likely is the possibility that the first three missing deities correspond to A0:243-245 (which not only represent three entries not occurring elsewhere in this series, but also represent entries that are listed by A0 between the last inim.bal.bal deity and the name of the first "messenger" deity found in A and B). Therefore, the present line is restored from A0:243.

144. Restored from A0:244; see under note 143 above.

145. Restored from A0:245; see under note 143 above.

146. A vi 172 and B v 24 (King's numbering). A0:246 writes the name as Ub.da.a.du.du.

147. The name may be Ub.da.dab.du.du. In A0:247, it appears as Ub.da.dab.du.du. Text = A vi 176.

148. A0:248: $\text{Gis}.ig.e.nu.gi$_{4}$.e.

149. A0:249: $\text{Za}.ra.e.nu.gi$_{4}$.e.

150. A0:250: $\text{Ama}.dag.si$

151. A0:251: $\text{Ama}.\text{Su}_{d}(\text{KA X SU})$. For KA X $\text{SU} = \text{Su}_{d}$. See MSL II p. 57 line 329.

155. See A0 No. 7 p. 25 line 292.

157. A0:252.
### Tablet IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158.</td>
<td>ḫu.dù</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159.</td>
<td>ḫr.'x'-</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>ḫIn.ni₇.'šár.mun'.na</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.</td>
<td>ḫIn.ni₇.UG'.a</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.</td>
<td>ḫIn.ni₇.UG,AB</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163.</td>
<td>ḫIn.ni₇.'šár.mun'.na</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td>ḫub.sahar(ra).lA</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165.</td>
<td>ḫub.lil.lA</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.</td>
<td>ḫUb.lī.a</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167.</td>
<td>ḫub.kalam.mA</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168.</td>
<td>ḫMūš.sagin.nA</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169.</td>
<td>ḫBe-lit-tu-ur-ri</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170.</td>
<td>ḫub.lil.lA</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td>ḫIn.ni₇.gal.an.mA</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.</td>
<td>ḫIn.ni₇.sagin.nA</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>ḫšubšu₂₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>ḫšubšu₂₂₂.pasikil</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.</td>
<td>ḫši₃₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176.</td>
<td>ḫTi₃₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td>ḫšALAM</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178.</td>
<td>ḫšši₃₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179.</td>
<td>ḫšA₃₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180.</td>
<td>ḫššA₃₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181.</td>
<td>ḫššA₃₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182.</td>
<td>ḫššA₃₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183.</td>
<td>ḫššA₃₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.</td>
<td>ḫššA₃₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.</td>
<td>ḫššA₃₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186.</td>
<td>ḫššA₃₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187.</td>
<td>ḫššA₃₂₂</td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

159. = A vi 187. B v 30b omitted the equivalent of either 159 or 160, but (since B is broken here) just which line was omitted cannot be determined.  
160. = A vi 188 and Ao:254.  
161. A vi 187b and B v 31 both agree in giving the number in the summary as "16," but both sources list only fourteen names (see under note 145 above). The additional four names were probably omitted by scribal oversight.  
162. B v 52: ḫIn.ni₇.'šár.mun'.na; A vii 1: ḫIn.ni₇.UG'.a.  
164. = Ao:255.  
167. = C-2 r.3: (1) 1 (The "Vs." of KAV 165 should be changed to Rs.; see Schroeder, KAV p. IX under no. 73).  
169. Ao:256: ḫBe-la-ša-at-ur-ri. 0-2 r.5: ḫIn.ni₇.be-lit-tu-ur-ri'.ru', which is probably to be explained as containing an older glossed reading; the original reading of the tradition represented by C-2 was certainly ḫIn.ni₇.ur.ru.  
170. Lines 170-172 correspond to 0-1 r.1-3.  
171. 0-2 r.5: ḫIn.ni₇.šal-gal. The present line should be compared with K. 6093 (CT 26 49); probably a duplicate of the excerpt tablet b, CT 25 31):5.  
172. = Ao:262; eme:89; and b r. ii 9.
188. = B v 47 and A vii 26. The first name is restored from Ao:265.
189. = B v 48a. Restored from b r. ii 19b.
190. = B v 48b (unpreserved). Restored from Ao:265. It is evident that Ao:263 should be placed in this section because $d$ll is given the pronunciation kab.ta (and is explained as TA. r gu-nu-u') in Ea : A : nagû IV (AS no. 7. p. 22):213.
191. = B v 50.
192. = B v 51.
193-231. (gap)
194-231. It seems evident from Ao:267 ff. that the next entries in this series should be concerned with $d$Dumuzi and his immediate circle. After this, one would expect to find $d$Na.na.a (= Ao:275 and eme:90) and her household. Unfortunately, the section devoted to these deities, who occupied such an important place in the cult life of Babylonia and Assyria, is poorly preserved. Probably K. 4349Q (CT 24 46) belongs here, representing deities belonging to the circle of $d$Na.na.a. However, the ten lines that make up the fragment K. 4349Q can account for only a small part of the gap between lines 194 and 231 (plus the practically missing lines 232-247). The exact restoration of lines 194-247 must await the appearance of better preserved duplicates of this section of the "Istar tablet," but one may tentatively, at least, propose that the gap included the following names from the Dumuzi section of Ao:267-274 (cf. the parallel sections in the "Smaller An : a-um") found in CT 24 19 ii 1-6 and CT 25 7 K. 7665 + K. 11035 ii 1-9):
267. $d$Dumuzi (= eme:76)
268. $d$Namíngir.sí (= eme:77)
269. $d$Amu.usum
270. $d$Usu.mgal.an.na
271. $d$Nu.mgal.an.na
272. $d$Usu.mgal.an.na
273. $d$Amu.ra.ta
274. $d$Alam

Following these names, Ao:275-278 devotes four lines to $d$Na.na.a and her circle:
275. $d$Na.na.a (= eme:90)
276. $d$Dug.dug'
277. $d$In.nin.su.na.gi
278. $d$Pa.a.ti

Somewhere after these names, the present series must have listed the entries represented by K. 4349Q (CT 24 46):
1. $d$[X].zajx
2. $d$Kid.kid
3. $d$Em.me.ur4.ur4 : SU $d$[dam],[bi.nita]
4. $d$Ta.tag
5. $d$mu.i.ti$PA.GANAM$ $d$[dam],[
6. $d$Ul.mu.un.$kA$
7. $d$Su.in.kur
8. $d$Kani.sur.ra
9. $d$A.ba
10. $d$A.ba.'gal

These latter entries are assumed to belong somewhere in this present gap because of $d$Kani.sur.ra (K. 4349Q:8), who is known elsewhere as a daughter of $d$Na.na.a (see AfK 2 11 note 5). However, the exact status of this fragment must remain rather uncertain until other duplicates provide a means of controlling this section.

232-247. For possible entries in this section, see under note 194-231 above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet IV</th>
<th>Tablet IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247.</td>
<td>264.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.</td>
<td>265.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249.</td>
<td>266.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.</td>
<td>267.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251.</td>
<td>268.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252.</td>
<td>269.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253.</td>
<td>270.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254.</td>
<td>271.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255.</td>
<td>272.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256.</td>
<td>273.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257.</td>
<td>274.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258.</td>
<td>275.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

249. Cf. V R 46 no. 1:9. Deimel, SL IV 359, 7, reads the name as dNe.sil.lâ. 250. The name may have been in b r. ii 1. 252. Possibly = b r. ii 3 and b r. ii 5. The gloss is in A vii 92. The sign represented by 'x' resembles the beginning of 'ŠU'. 253. Gloss in A vii 93. The sign represented by 'x' may be 'ŠU'. 254. The sign represented by 'x' may be 'ŠU'. For dNin. šar (BAR), see Tablet I 29, where she is equated with dJštarr. 255. See Cf 15 6 vii 6 where dJštarr is addressed as lšbatum dJštarr. See also An: Anu ša amēl 94. 260. The traces of 'x' resemble a sign like AN. 261. The gloss in A vii 101 may actually be [sa] 'šam'. 262. The gloss in A vii 102 resembles that of A vii 101 (see note 261 above). 263. The sign represented by 'x' may be NE, or it may represent [X] 'gš'. The sign SA may actually be 'KAR'. 264. The deity involved in this entry seems to be the same dGIR.GIR.E who figures in "The Myth of Inanna and Bilulu" (see JNES 12 169 and 174 f. line 90), but the gloss in A vii 104 would point to a reading of the name as dUl.ul x instead of dGir.gir.e. Since the final -e was probably not written in this entry as a part of the name, the -e of dGir.gir.e in JNES 12 174:90 should represent a grammatical element. It is obvious from line 259 above and from the lines that follow that the present section deals primarily with gods (and demons) of the EDIN. Note, however, that A vii 104 draws a ruling line under the present entry. 265. The name should be restored to something like ['SH].edin.lil.'lā' or [dAma].edin.lil.lâ (cf. JNES 12 168 note 28). 266. Possibly [dAma], 'edin'.[na]. 267. Of these six maškim (see line 273 below), three appear to be identified with other deities. The first name is, unfortunately, poorly preserved. 269. The same identification appears in Tablet I 187. 274. The final a(!) in A vii 114 appears to be written over an erasure. The name of dGaz.ba.a may be compared with dGas.ba.ba, who is known elsewhere as a daughter of dNa.na.a; see Zimmern, ZA 30 192 note 2; and Weidner, AfK 2 11 note 5.
276. dMe.me  
277. dBe-lit-bi-ri  
278. dE-ta-mi-tu  
279. dIš.ba.ra  
280. dTaš-me-si-ik-ru  
281. dSag,'gär'  
282. dHAR  
283. dAl.ma.nu  
284. dAš-ta-me-er  
285. dNin.hal  
286. dMe.Šu.nu.Šu.du₂  
287. dUru.al.Šár.ra  
288. dMa-an-gi-at  

276. dMe.me is listed in Tablet V 139 as one of the names of dMin.kar.ra.ak. For another list of the names of dIš.ba.ra, see Tablet I 199 ff.  
277.  - Tablet I 201.  
278. In Tablet I 202, the name appears as dE-ta-mi-tum.  
279. In Tablet I 203.  

281. Lines 281-283 list the names of a deity who is called "her husband." The goddess involved, at first glance, appears to be dIš.ba.ra. However, since dAl.ma.nu (line 283) is known elsewhere (see K. 260:29, RA 14 24) as the husband of dIš.ba.ra, it seems better to understand the description "her husband" as referring to dIš.ba.ra of lines 276-279 and not to dTaš-me-si-ik-ru.  
282. Lines 281 and 282 are to be compared with CT 29 45:7 ff., where dBAR and dSAĜ both have the pronunciation gloss sag,'gär.  

286. The epithet ši-lu-tu seems to represent an Akkadian explanation, but its significance here is uncertain. This line should be compared with II R 62:72c, where dMe.nu.Šu.du₂ similarly has a gloss of ši-lu-tu.  
287. This section is similarly given in b r. ii 6 ff.  

SOURCES USED IN RECONSTRUCTING TABLET V  
A YBC 2401  
B K. 4349 (CT 24 20 ff.)  
C K. 2597 + K. 2944 + K. 12832 + D. T. 355 (CT 25 1-6)  
D K. 4349A+81-7-27,51 (CT 24 47)  
E Ei. 1904-10-9,61 (RA 17 194 f.)  
F Rm. 11,289 (CT 25 29)  
G CBS 10805 (SLT 121)  
H K. 4349F (CT 24 20)  
I K. 4349D (CT 24 21)  
J VAT 9515 (KAV 69)  
K Rm. 930 (RA 17 183)
Tablet V

1. Lugal.bàn.da
2. Nin.sùn
3. (e)NIN.é.gâl (Slila)
4. TÚR X SAL (Slila).

kur

5. Nun滋.âb.âb.âr.ra
6. Ud(ud).nam.$î(ê) (Slila)
7. me.$î
8. M$.rib (ri.ib)
9. Numunâb.na
10. Numunâb.na
11. (e)NIN.é.gâl (Slila)
12. Nun滋.âb.âb.âr.ra
13. dNUN.âB.SAR.RA (Slila)
14. dNUN.âB.SAR.RA (Slila)
15. dLugal.bàn.da
16. dLugal.bàn.da
17. dKur.'x'.(x).

5. See Tablet VI 125.
6. In view of the gloss in G:6, one may wonder if $îsî in G represents a copyist's error for DIM; but the same name seems to be found also in Tablet IV 97.
7. One may compare dNumun.âb in Ao:406.
8. = G:8. A vii 142 is broken but seems to end in a sign which may be 'DUL'. After the name, G adds a puzzling gloss: 'ks.$î'.
9. Jean, Babyloniaca 13 70 f., seems doubly wrong in reading the name as dE.kal, and the gloss as UR.ib.
10. There is a broken place before TE in G:12, but there may be nothing missing, in which case, read dE.$î.âb.âr.ra.
11. The gloss 'x' appears to be a sign like SU. Jean, Babyloniaca 13 70 f., reads the name as $îsî-SA(-)al-ra, and the gloss as uru (placing it with al).
12. A vii 148 and G:15. See Tablet III 234 where dLugal.bàn.da = Adad; but in Ao:452, the name appears in a Nergal list.
13. In A vii 150, the sign after kur resembles either 'LiD' or 'MI'.

Tablet V

Ao Ao. 5376 (TOL 13 25 ff.)
eme Emešal list in MSL IV

TABLET V

1. dLugal.bàn.da
2. Nin.sùn
3. (e)NIN.é.gâl (Slila)
4. TÚR X SAL (Slila).

kur

1. = Ao:279; eme:92. A vii 135; and G:1 (for an earlier treatment of G, see Jean, Babyloniaca 13 70 f.). For the reading of the name, see Weidner, AK 2 14 note 1.
2. = Ao:280 and eme:94. In VAT 7759 (AK 2 4 f.) li 10, which represents an old Babylonian copy of KAV 46:16 (= KAV 65 i 50), the name is written dNin.sùn. Jean, Babyloniaca 13 70 f. misread the right side of G:2 as 1.
3. The sign NIN occurs frequently in this tablet with glosses of either e or ni. Usually, these glosses are considered as giving direct indications of the reading of the sign in each case (i.e., e, and ni, respectively), but the question may be raised as to how the scribes could have indicated in a simple way that the sign involved should be read nin rather than egi or eraš, and vice versa. In the case of uncommon signs, scribal practice generally was to write out the full indication of the pronunciation of the doubtful sign; but in the case of common signs which might be ambiguous, there is evidence that the scribes used merely an abbreviated gloss to suggest the correct reading (see under Tablet II 21). For the reading of the sign NIN, there was no need to write out the elaborate gloss ni.in, for the reader would already be acquainted with that reading. All the scribe needed to give was a brief hint as to which of the two (or three) common values of the sign should be applied, and the reader himself could then supply the full pronunciation of the sign (cf. further under Tablet II 21 and Poebel, ZA 39 142 note 1). This would mean, then, that the present entry should be read as either dEgi.$î.âb.âr.ra or dEraš.$î.âb.âr.ra, but not dE.$î.âb.âr.ra.
4. dG:4. TÚR X SAL (Slila). Of dTÚR X SAL.kur raft who appears in VAT 7949 (E. 152; cf. Eit. acc. 101) li 14, which suggests that the reading in A vii 135 is to be preferred to that of G:4. The sign ZA in G probably represents an old scribal error for KUR. The list of the "10 sons of Lugalbanda" begins with this line.

A G

5. dU4.nam.$î.âb.âr.ra
6. d(di)S$î.âb.âr.ra
7. dNumun.âb.âb.âr.ra
8. dUd(ud).nam.$î(ê)
9. dM$.rib
10. dNumun.âb.âb.âr.ra
11. dNumun.âb.âb.âr.ra
12. dNUN.âB.SAR.RA (Slila)
13. dNUN.âB.SAR.RA (Slila)
14. dLugal.bàn.da
15. dLugal.bàn.da
16. dLugal.bàn.da
17. dKur.x.x. (Slila)


20. Lines 20-22 are to be compared with (and restored from) CT 24 35:29-31 ("Smaller An : da-nu-um"). The present line is restored from CT 24 35:30; cf. SBE p. 139 line 157. For the restoration of the gloss (in A vii 153), see MS II p. 51 note 226.

23. Restored from line 52 below. Note that in KAV 46: 17 f. (see Weidner’s emendation in KAF 2 14 note 1), also, the names of dLugal.mara (AMAR).da and dNi.zu.an.na (see line 25 below) appear together (as here). This line = Ao:282.

For the distinction between dLugal.bàn.da and dLugal.mara (AMAR).da, see Weidner, AFK 2 14 note 1. d24. Probably represents another name for dLugal.mara (AMAR).da.

25. The name appears both as dNi.zi.an.na (as here) and as dNi.zu.an.na (as in line 29 below). Cf. the fact that in the old Babylonian text VAT 7759 (AKF 2 4) 11.12, the name appears as dNi.zi.an.na while KAV 46:18 (the later duplicate of VAT 7759) presents dNi.zu.an.na. The name appears in Ao:283 as dNi.zu.an.na, thus indicating that IM = ni in this name.

26. = Ao:284, which varies, giving dTúg.nam.en."na’.
27. = Ao:285. See also KAV 65 111 24 where dTúg.nun.na = dA-ri-tum (according to the collation of Weidner, AFK 2 72 note 10). In KAV 65 111 1, the name of the same deity is written [dTúg].nun.an.na.

28. Cf. dLugal.me in Tablet II 51.
29. dIl-li-mi-šar may represent the same deity as dIl-mi-še-ru and dMi-sà-ru, KAV 45 i 15, and dMi-ša-ru, Tablet III 286 (who is the "son of Adad"). For dNi.zu.an.na, see note 25 above.

30. dU.g.nir.si.sà
31. dSu.ni.dugud
32. 2 gu₄.ĐUB
33. dNin.(ni.kilim.im)kilim(PES)
34. dNin.kilim".ki.dù
35. dNin.gada(KAD).ki.dù
36. dNin.nig.ki.dù
37. dTúg.túg

38. Text = C i 4. A vii 167: [ ] r Nin. l gada.ki.dù.

39. Text in C i 2. A vii 165 uses the older form of dNin.kilim(PES). For the deities dNin.kilim(PES), see Zimmern, ZA NF 5 257 note 3. The name represents a goddess in this context (see line 38 below); but, in other texts, a male deity is involved; cf. II R 60 i 23. The present line should correspond to the poorly preserved line in Ao:286. For the abbreviated gloss ni for nin, see note 3 above.

40. Text = Ao:289; dNin.kilim. gi₄.dù().
41. Text = Ao:286; dNin.kilim. gi₄.dù().
42. Text = C i 2. A vii 167: [ ] N m."gada.ki.dù.
43. However, the dittos in the name in A are corrupt, as is seen from the corresponding entry in Ao:287: dNin.gada.ki.\(\times\).\(\times\). Instead of dittos, C gives SU in the explanatory column.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Tablet V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38. d(ni)Nin.mur (mu.ru),</td>
<td>47. d(ni.ta)Nita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(mu-ut)</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(Nin.kilim.ke₄)</td>
<td>dam.bi.SAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(Nin.kilim.ke₄)</td>
<td>d(Nin.kilim.ke₄)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.kilim.ke₄)</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
<td>dam.bi.SAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ki₄</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d(Nin.kilim.ke₄)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39. d(ni)Nin.(ur)₅,</td>
<td>d(Nin.kilim.ke₄)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘ki’</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ki₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40. d(ù.ungal (ù.un gal).</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41. d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42. d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43. d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44. d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45. d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46. d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47. d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48. d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49. d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50. d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51. d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52. d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d(ù.un gal)</td>
<td>sukkal d(Nin.‘mur(!)).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. Gloss in all texts. For the extraneous horizontal stroke in ù₄, see OLZ 1599.
48. Not necessarily to be identified with the son of Ea in Tablet II 284. Whether this name represents the same deity who appears in Tablet I 51 (as a su₄.dUB of Anu) can hardly be determined.
49. The pronunciation is given in EAV 40:6 (see Weidner's collation in AF 2 13 note 1) as 'za.ba,ba,ba,ba.

50. The name occurs also as dBa.ba (e.g., SMT 5:61; see Falkenstein, ZA NF 11 171 and Jacobson, AS no. 11 104 note 196) and possibly dBBu(EA)(see HLA I 4527 ff. and Pinkelstein, JCS 7 151). See also EAV 40:6 where the name appears (with a pronunciation) as [ba]₄.a₄.bu : dBa₄, bo. The alternate spellings have led some (e.g., Falkenstein, OLZ 46 352 f.) to read her name as dBa₄, bo₄ (note that Thureau-Dangin, RA 32 150, proposed that dBa₄, bo₄ be read bu₄). However, it seems just as likely that these alternate forms of the name merely indicate instead that the name was pronounced Ba₄, bu₄ (so also Kraus, JCS 3 67, 69, 74). This would eliminate the necessity of using the somewhat unusual value of bu₄ for U (which probably would be glossed in C if this value were intended). Ba₄, bo₄ appears here as the wife of dBa₄, ba₄, but, in line 58 below, she is listed as the wife of dBa₄, bo₄. For a helpful study on the relationship of dBa₄, bo₄ to dBa₄, bo₄, see Kraus, JCS 3 62-75.
51. Gloss in C i 20. dPap, sukkal is more usually associated with the circle of Anu; see Tablet I 53.
52. dPap, sukkal is more usually associated with the circle of Anu; see Tablet I 53.

43. Text = C i 12. A vii 175 gives the gloss as dBa₄, bo₄. C i 17 gives the gloss as dBBu(EA)(see HLA I 4527 ff. and Pinkelstein, JCS 7 151). See also EAV 40:6 where the name appears (with a pronunciation) as [ba]₄.a₄.bu : dBa₄, bo. The alternate spellings have led some (e.g., Falkenstein, OLZ 46 352 f.) to read her name as dBa₄, bo₄ (note that Thureau-Dangin, RA 32 150, proposed that dBa₄, bo₄ be read bu₄). However, it seems just as likely that these alternate forms of the name merely indicate instead that the name was pronounced Ba₄, bu₄ (so also Kraus, JCS 3 67, 69, 74). This would eliminate the necessity of using the somewhat unusual value of bu₄ for U (which probably would be glossed in C if this value were intended). Ba₄, bo₄ appears here as the wife of dBa₄, ba₄, but, in line 58 below, she is listed as the wife of dBa₄, bo₄. For a helpful study on the relationship of dBa₄, bo₄ to dBa₄, bo₄, see Kraus, JCS 3 62-75.
51. Gloss in C i 20. dPap, sukkal is more usually associated with the circle of Anu; see Tablet I 53.
52. dPap, sukkal is more usually associated with the circle of Anu; see Tablet I 53.
A F H
53. dši-šar-rat  
54. dAb.ú  
55. dGu.ia  
56. dMin.gir.su  
57. d’r  
58. dBa.ú  
59. d[  
60. dAb.ú  
61. dKal.kal.dBa.ú  
62. dša().tum₄.dug  
63. dšur.tur.šu,g  
64. dNab  

Tablet V

AEFH
65. [d]Nin.gú(.).en."na" [é]."ninnu".ke₄
66. [ ]
67. [ ]
68. "5 x".x.x
69. [ ]
70. [ ]
71. [ ]
72. [ ]
73. [ ]
74. [ ]
75. 2 suk kal
76. [ ]
77. [ ]
78. d[ ]

Tablet V

53. = Ao:355, which presents dši-šar-ra-at.
54. = Ao:358. Note CT 25 13:27 where dAb.ú is identified with dMin.urt. The name is also written as dAb.ba (e.g., cf. under Tablet II 268, where dAb.ba and dAb.ú appear as textual variants); but this may imply nothing more than a pronunciation of "Ayu/Aya, as in the case of dBa.ú (see under note 50 above). C i 29 adds a poorly preserved explanation at the end of the line: [ "Aύ" unless "Aý" is to be emended to SAL(!), in which case, the explanation could possibly be restored to (dumu).SAL(!)).
55. = Ao:360, which writes the name as dša.ú.4. For a helpful discussion on this deity, see Kraus, JOS 3 62-75. In line 137 below, she appears in the list of the names of dMin.i.si.in.na/dNin.kar-ra-sk.
56. = eme:95. Cf. SIT 118:4, where dMin.gir.su appears in a similar context with dBa.ú and dAb.ú.
58. See under note 50 above.
59. Represented an ideogram for "Ba.ú.
60. dAb.ú as "the mother of dBa.ú" is certainly to be distinguished from the deity in line 54 above.
61. On the reading of the name, cf. the similar name in Tablet I 281.
62. Wrongly written in R:16 as dšš.šum₄.dug. The size of the space before dBa.ú (in A viii 7?) and the absence of ke₄ at the end of the line hardly permit any other restoration than [SU]. This would indicate an identification of dšš.šum₄.dug with dBa.ú and agree with eme:96.
65. See Tablet II 14 where the name occurs among the names of Dingir.ma4/Belit-ili. The reverse of E corresponds to lines 213 ff. below. This would place the obverse approximately here. The exact place of the obverse, however, cannot be determined with absolute finality since this section is broken in all the other duplicates. Nevertheless, its actual position cannot be off more than a couple of lines from that which is assigned to it here. Tentatively, it is assumed that the vertical stroke appearing in E:1 corresponds to 'NA' at the end of dNin.gú.en. na. 
66. = E:12. 
67. = E:3a. 
68. = E:3b. In the photograph of this fragment, which Dr. Landsberger placed at my disposal, the traces favor the number '5' rather than '4'.
72. In the photograph, the numeral "a" is clear; but the traces of the signs which follow are uncertain. The traces suggest 'anše', nig.1₄ (cf. Oppenheim, JNES 4 172:360), but this does not fit this context. A reading of 'x.bur'.lā, ke₄ seems also possible. The final 'ke₄' may prove to be 'kimin' (as Meek has drawn it), but it is not clear.
75. = E:9b.
76. In the photograph, the sign represented by 'x' resembles 'E'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>79. 3 udug</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>176</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>e,a.ke₄</td>
<td>udug e,a.ke₄</td>
<td>[SU]</td>
<td>[SU]</td>
<td>[SU]</td>
<td>[x.x.ke₄]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e,a.ke₄</td>
<td>[SU]</td>
<td>[SU]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[SU]</td>
<td>[SU]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

79. = E:12b. In the photograph, there is no determinative before e,a; the "dingir" is a part of the sign UDUG.
80. The final 'x' resembles GIS or a sign that ends similarly (e.g., SIL). It seems strange that a fourth "Protective deity of the temple/house" should be placed here separately instead of being added to the group in lines 76-79.
81. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.
82. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.
83. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.
84. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.
85. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.
86. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.
87. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.
88. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.
89. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.
90. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.
91. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.
92. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.
93. = A viii 25. Lines 81-84 can be restored with the help of CT 24 36:37-40. The first name in this group, however, appears in CT 24 36:37 as dEm,sig,nun.

98. In A viii 39, the traces of the sign after ra resemble GIS rather than NU.
101. Text = C ii 12 and K:4. A viii 41: dGab,huš,bi, gI,bI.nu,bi, x.x. For PA,RA = zu,bi, see E. 14047 (CT 19 25):8 and CT 12 10:24b. The sign GAB is here given the abbreviated gloss ga; for similar abbreviated glosses, see under Tablet II 21.
102a. This gloss line for the entry in line 102 = C ii 12.
102. = CT 24 36:43, the name appears as d"Em,na,DI.
103. = CT 24 36:45b and C ii 2.
104. = CT 24 36:46b and C ii 2.
105. C37 rudugl d Ba.ú.ke₄ | 136x547
Table V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet V</th>
<th>Tablet V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>dSag.shu.nu.na.ba in ITT 3 4994.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>Gloss partly preserved in A viii 50 and C ii 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>The gloss in C ii 24 may refer to the reading of [x].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>In A viii 53, the signs indicated by 'x'.[x] may possibly represent the gloss 'a'.[lad]. The line corresponds to text 1:3 (which only preserves the second determinative) and C ii 24. dNin.[ti].mud may be restored from Ao:361. For a helpful study on dNin.tin.ug5.ga, see Kraus, JOS 3 70-75. For the reading of the name, see especially Pfeiffer, GA 39 140 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>According to the restoration of Kraus, JOS 3 71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>- Ao:362.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet V</th>
<th>Tablet V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>d[X].'âl(!)'âa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>d[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>dNin.tin.ug5.ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>dEn.â.nun da.sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>dNin.tin.ug5.ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>dPal.sag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>dNin.â.nun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>dLugal.am.ur5(ur).ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>dNin.â.nun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

120. = Ao:363 and text I:5a. 
123. = Ao:367. Gloss in C ii 32. See Kraus, JOS 3 76 f. 
124. Gloss in C ii 33. Kraus, JOS 3 77 calls attention to the fact that dEn.â.nun appears in an entirely different context in Ao:472 (almost loosely added at the end of Ao).  
124a. Akkadian gloss in line C ii 34. Lines 124 and 124a correspond to text I:8-10, which varies as follows: 8. d[En.â.nun] ama[ ] 9. is-ta-ra-nis sa-su-u 10. um-mi ri-mi ã. gu.la ama[ ] 11. = text I:5a. (Ao:366). For a detailed study of this deity in the context of A VI, see Pfeiffer, GA 39 140 ff. 
112. According to the restoration of Kraus, JOS 3 71. 
Involved in this section, see Kraus, JCS 3:64-74. Kraus (p. 69) assumes that the final -ak in the name dNin.kar.ra.ak represents the genitive ending ("the lady of the kar"). In support of this, he compares the name with the Elamite deity In.su.in.ak and the pair from Dilmun, dEn.s/za.ak and dMe.sikil.ak. Such an approach is not without its difficulties (the formula "dQueen/king/lord of x" certainly more normally appears without the full genitive ending. In fact, Kraus, JCS 3:64, produces a dNin.kar as an older form of dNin.kar.ra.ak which would seem to weaken any argument that dNin.kar.ra.ak represents an archaic form in which the final -ak represents a petrified genitive), but it seems more satisfactory than "Herrin von Karrak" (AG 409). The explanation of the name by Lambert (EA 47:36 f.) is based upon the older contention of Thureau-Dangin regarding the ending of the genitive; hence his arguments seem inconclusive. In the present line, the usual form of the name occurs, but see III R 66:13:7: dNin.kar as (not dNin.kar.ra.ak), which presents the signs used in this entry.

130. The dittos (in C ii 39) indicate that this entry represents an ideogram for dNin.kar.ra.ak. Following this name, C contains the gloss a-na e-re-es-in-dub-ka, which represents the names of the signs used in this entry.


132. Text = C ii 42. Text I:16 varies, giving dNIN.nig. KA X IM."x". The last sign of the name in text I may have been "ka", although "ak" has also been considered (cf. Meissner, OJS 12:201). Ao:372 has dNIN.nig.KA.ta, which seems to be closer to the form in text I than to C. For the abbreviated gloss e for NIN, see note 3 above.

133. Glosses in C ii 43.

134. = Ao:374.

135. = Ao:375. For the abbreviated gloss, see note 3 above.

136. = Ao:376.

137. = Ao:377. dNIN.uru.bi. The final bi in C ii 52 certainly represents an older gloss.
146. = Ao:379. See also under Tablet III 39. This entry is to be distinguished from that of Tablet I 32, where dKâ.kâ is given as a name of dNin.subur.


148. D i 3: [dUm.me], 'gâl'.zi.

149. = Ao:381. For the abbreviated gloss, see note 3 above.

150. = Ao:382. Glosses in C ii 61 and F ii 9 (for the abbreviated gloss e for NIN, see note 3 above). See also Tablet III 31. In A viii 87, the name seems to be given as dNin.kar.ra.ak.


152. = Ao:384. Gloss in C ii 61 and F ii 9 (for the abbreviated gloss e for NIN, see note 3 above). See also Tablet III 31. In A viii 87, the name seems to be given as dNin.gâ.ug5.ga.

153. A viii 90: dNin.gâ.ug5.ga, 'ZA'.LUL


155. In Ao:298, dDa-mu appears in a different context. See also Kraus, JCS 3 81 f. Probably represented an ideogram for dDa-mu.

156. = A viii 102. "X' appears to be the first half of KA or URU. One would expect the present line to contain the name of dGu.nu.ra (cf. Kraus, JCS 3 81 f.). In the corresponding section of Ao (392, 393), dGu.nu.ra is followed by dKâ. 'x'. This may justify a tentative restoration of the present line: dKâ.x dGu.nu.ra [dam dDa-mu.ke]. The reading of dGu.nu.ra as dGu.sir.ra (as Deimel, SL IV 924) is supported by the variant reading dGu.sir.ra (cf. Deimel, SL IV 924, 7); but this seems to be inconclusive, since it involves the most question of the reading of the signs involved, as nu and nux or sir4 and sir4 respectively; see further under Tablet III 4.

157. = A viii 103.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169.</td>
<td>d'Ur`-ma-aš</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>184.</td>
<td>d'Am.nun.gal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170.</td>
<td>d'a(- Ur`-ma-aš).ur</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>185.</td>
<td>d'Am.nur.ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td>d'Ur`-aš.bi.dug.gā</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>186.</td>
<td>d'Am.su.ša.bi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.</td>
<td>3 <code>sukkal</code></td>
<td>d'Gu.la.ke₄</td>
<td>187.</td>
<td>d'Am.(tu)K.a.an.ni.sī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>d'Nab.ma-aš</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>188.</td>
<td>5 dingir.(gub).ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>d'Su.ma-aš</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>189.</td>
<td>2 gu₄.DO-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.</td>
<td>d'Su.ša.bi</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>190.</td>
<td>d(e)NIN.zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176.</td>
<td>d'Sud₄(KA X ŠU).bi</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>191.</td>
<td>dBi-ir-du₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td>d'Bi.in.dug₄.ba.sha₆</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>192.</td>
<td>d'Ma.nun.gal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178.</td>
<td>5 udug</td>
<td>Šal.ma-aš.ke₄</td>
<td>181.</td>
<td>A viii 114: d'Ama.še</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179.</td>
<td>d'Igi.gi.nu.gi.nu</td>
<td>ni.dub</td>
<td>182.</td>
<td>Cr. RA 41 36 note 8; and line 189 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180.</td>
<td>d'En.zi.ni.sī</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>184.</td>
<td>Gloss in D 1 22 (see Kraus, JCS 3 76 note 32).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td>d'Ama.ša.la</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>186.</td>
<td>Since d'Ma.gal appears here as an interior deity in the household of d'Gu.la, she does not necessarily represent the same deity as the wife of d'En.zu; see Tablet III 27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.</td>
<td>d'Ama.ša.la</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>187.</td>
<td>= Ao:294; cr. KAR 16 r. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>d'Ama.ša.la</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>189.</td>
<td>It seems strange that this name should be singled out from the list in lines 180-185 above and repeated here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>d'Ama.ša.la</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>In C 3 ii 2, 'k' is given in place of šā.</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.</td>
<td>d'Ama.ša.la</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>190.</td>
<td>Text = C 3 ii 2; A viii 121: d'NIN.a.zu. The deity in the present entry, d(a)NIN.(a).zu, is probably to be distinguished from d'NIN.a.zu in line 239 below. For the abbreviated gloss e for NIN, see note 3 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176.</td>
<td>d'Ama.ša.la</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>191.</td>
<td>A viii 122: d'Bi-ir-du. Otherwise known as a Nerigal deity; see OT 25 36:63 (written d'Bi-ir-du), and OT 25 35 r. 25 (= OT 25 37:21), which gives the name with inexplicable glosses: [dBi]-ir.(ni)-du(b)u. Cr. also line 305 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td>d'Ama.ša.la</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>192.</td>
<td>= Ao:293; see MSL II p. 57 line 329.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178.</td>
<td>d'Ama.ša.la</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>193.</td>
<td>= Ao:394. Also known as d'Ur-ma-šum; see Kraus, JCS 3 82; Y 3 46:17b; and Weidner, AKE 2 17 note 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179.</td>
<td>d'Ama.ša.la</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>180.</td>
<td>The dittos cannot indicate here that &quot;Ur is an ideogram for d'Ur,mas; the summary in line 182 would exclude this possibility. The only alternative explanation for the dittos is found in reading the name d'Ur.mas.ur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180.</td>
<td>d'Ama.ša.la</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td>183.</td>
<td>Lines 173-178 are to be compared with CT 24 36:44-48 (where these same names are listed as the utukku of d'Gu.la). The present line corresponds to Ao:396 (d'Nam(mam)(mat)) and CT 24 36:44. Cf. also Tablet VII 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181.</td>
<td>= Ao:395 and CT 24 36:45. Cr. also KAR 16:23 f., where he is called &quot;the faithful šṵkallu of Egalma-aš.&quot;</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183.</td>
<td>= Ao:397. Cf. Tablet III 151. D i 20 explains the name as ni.dub.ke₄, but this seems corrupt. For the reading ni.dub, see p. 15 note 51 above.</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184.</td>
<td>= Ao:398: d'Nin.gal.</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.</td>
<td>= CT 24 36:47: d'Sud₄(KA X ŠU).bi.</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186.</td>
<td>= Ao:399: Cr. MSL II p. 329 line 329.</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

169. = Ao:394. Also known as d'Ur-ma-šum; see Kraus, JCS 3 82; Y 3 46:17b; and Weidner, AKE 2 17 note 9. The dittos cannot indicate here that "Ur is an ideogram for d'Ur,mas; the summary in line 172 would exclude this possibility. The only alternative explanation for the dittos is found in reading the name d'Ur.mas.ur. Lines 173-178 are to be compared with CT 24 36:44-48 (where these same names are listed as the utukku of d'Gu,la). The present line corresponds to Ao:396 (d'Nam\(mam\)\(mat\)) and CT 24 36:44. Cf. also Tablet VII 41.

174. = Ao:395 and CT 24 36:45. Cr. also KAR 16:23 f., where he is called "the faithful šṵkallu of Egalma\-aš."
Text = A viii 124. C iii 6 and D i 30a have dittos instead of the name in the second half of the line. dNun.gal also occurs in EAV 63 iii 25 (where, according to Weidner's collation in AFK 2 72 note 10, she is equated with dAr-ri-tum), but in VAT 7799 (AFK 2 4) iv 14 (the old Babylonian duplicate of EAV 63), the name is given as dSUN(1).nu.

194. The dittos (in C iii 7) before the name seem puzzling. They may have been intended to represent pronunciation gloss dittos (in this case, reaching back to the gloss in line 190) similar to those in lines 134-136 above. More strictly applied, the dittos would appear to indicate that the present entry represents an ideogram for the preceding name. There is, however, no compelling reason for applying this latter possibility to the present entry.

195. In A viii 126, the signs are drawn in such a way that one might read by mistake Mâ.as.dù. In C iii 8, the name is given as d"NIN.ŠDUG. For the dittos in C, cf. note 194 above.

196. Text = A viii 127. C iii 9: dNin.gú.bar.ar.an.na. In D i 32, dPa.bil.sag is given instead of maskim.sag. Since the signs BIL and MASKIM often resemble each other in late texts, it is possible that either dPa.bil.sag (in D i 32) or maskim.sag (in C iii 9) is a mistake for the other. The gloss (in C) may suggest that the entry seemed unusual to the scribe who wrote C. This may point to the possibility that the Vorlage of C also had dPa.bil.sag (see CT 25 13:33 f., where dMin.gú.bar.an.na and dPa.bil.sag again appear together, in a Ninurta list).

197. Cv. CT 24 36:49: dKur-ra.ti.HAL | udug dMa.nun.gal.ken.2

198. dDu-lum is doubtless the son of dMa.nun.gal rather than the son of the obscure deity in the preceding line. It must be admitted, however, that the arrangement here is ambiguous; although comparable arrangement is not without precedent (cf. line 125 above).

199. Lines 199 and 200 represent the Akkadian and Sumerian words, respectively, for louse; see Fauna p. 20 line 249.
213. The name is, of course, usually read *Eres-ki-gal (e.g., cf. AG 307). The reason for such a reading is based upon such syllabic writings of the name as *Ere-es-ki.i-ga.a.aal (Besold, EA no. 82:2). However, a reading of *Eres-ki-gal seems to represent, at best, merely an Akkadian form of the Sumerian *Nin.ki.gal. Such an Akkadian form, no doubt, would have its basis in the equation NIN = ere (e.g., cf. the fact that the sign name of NIN is ereš; see line 150 above) and may be related to the equation e-re-šu = šar-rat-um (D.T. 58 r. 13, CT 18 14). The eesmal form (emes:102), however, contains GÁSAN; and this would point to a Sumerian reading of 4Nin.ki.gal. The name, moreover, occurs in C iii 24 without any gloss (not even the abbreviated gloss e, which would be expected to exhibit such a gloss here if NIN were to be read ereš). In Akkadian texts, therefore, the name should doubtless be read *Eres-ki-gal, but there seems to be no compelling evidence for such a reading here nor in purely Sumerian texts. The name is written 4Nin.ki.gal.la in VAT 7759 (AFK 2 4) iv 17 (= KAV 65 iii 28 and KAV 65 iii 5). The present line corresponds to Ao:403, 404 (where the second name is written dAl-la-tum). 214. Gloss = C iii 25. See also line 297 below. 215. E r. 1 f. writes ki.min in place of dittos. 216. Cf. under note 213 above. 217. E r. 3 writes nita instead of nita. 218. = Ao:407, which omits ad.gi₄, gi₄. Evidently, ad.gi₄, gi₄ is only an epithet here. Cf. Tablet VI 254. 219. aNin.PA NIGIR 2 en. r x l. 220. dE.gu.bi.Ša₄₆. 221. dE+dım.ku. 222. dSad.[x.x] BAD. 222a. 223. dNin.ki.gal. 224. A 225. 2 ni.dub. 226. dUb₃.da. 227. dKI
228. d(er-ge-tu)KI
229. d(=am.ma)KUR
230. d(=am.ma)KI
231. dIr.kal.ta
232. dIGI.KUR.ZA
233. dIgi.kur
234. dDan-ni-na
235. dE-la-ma-tum
236. dMu-tum
237. dNam.úš
238. dSi-ta-tar-ru

228. = A viii 156. Beginning with this line and through line 234, E writes ki.min instead of dittos.
229. Cf. Tablet VI 249.
230. The dittos here before dKI indicate that the gloss am.ma is to be repeated.
232. See K. 8631 (RA 17 160) r. 4: IGI.KUR(ge.an.gir).
233. Text = E r. 19. It is clear from the number of lines which C iii 36-46 devotes to this section that C contained this entry. For IGI.KUR = biliib, see MAOG III/3 51:156. C iii 45 gives 8U instead of dittos.
235. E r. 20: [dE-la-ma]-tu.
236. Cf. ZA 43 16:43. At the end of the line, C iii 45 added the name of the deity whose retinue this messenger belongs. Perhaps the broken name in C should be restored to dNin[a] (ge.an.gir).
237. dNam.úš is here, obviously, the Sumerian equivalent of the preceding name. The dittos in the second half of the line reveal that only one deity is involved. If two separate deities were intended, a summary would have been given which would have read: 2 lú.kin.gi₄.a. These two entries should be compared with the unpublished VAT 9712 iii 9: (dBAD | mu-u-tu). Dr. Stephens kindly shared with me his collation of this line. E r. 21 gives ki.min in place of the dittos.
238. For the name in the second half of the line, A viii 166 gives 8u3-tu, in which the sign BAD is to be taken ideographically (cf. note 237 above).

239. = eme:103. dNin.a.zu in this line should be distinguished from d(NIN.(a).zu in line 190 above. The deity involved in the present entry represents the well-known god of Bānūna, who is also identified with Tispak; see Jacobsen, AS no. 6 20 ff. In a cult hymn regarding the temple of Tiskil of Bānūna (published by Zimmern, ZA NF 5 267 f.:7, 21 f.), dNin.a.zu is called "the king of Tiskil." In KAV 63 i 29 (cf. Weidner, AfK 2 11 ii.2), he is called "lord of the (under)world (dEN.e-re-ti)." While in CT 25 8:12, he is equated with Nin.urta. Cf. also AnOr. 12 195 f.
240. dMUS is here listed as an ideogram for Nin.a.zu and is carefully distinguished in this series from dNIN - dTispak (see under note 273 below); although dNin.a.zu is elsewhere equated with dMUS = dTispak (cf. under note 239 above). Note that C iii 52 writes dittos in place of 8U.
241. dMU8 is here listed as an ideogram for Nin.a.zu and is carefully distinguished in this series from dNIN - dTispak (see under note 273 below); although dNin.a.zu is elsewhere equated with dMUS = dTispak (cf. under note 239 above). Note that C iii 52 writes dittos in place of 8U.
242. = Ao:402: dGIR X GANA-tend.da. In the corresponding section of Ao (401), the name appears as dNin.gir X GANA-tend.da (which may be read dNin.gir-da, see MSL III p. 775 line 579). In eme:104, this entry appears as dNin.gir-da (cf. also line 222 above). A later form of dNin.gir X GANA-tend.da is given in CT 25 8:14. Cf. also dNin.gir in note 249 below.
This page contains a detailed study of a particular name, Nin.gis.zi.da, and its various forms and spellings. The text includes references to other names and concepts such as the Nerigal name Lugal.sud.de and the god Nin.a.zu. The study also discusses the possibility of Nin.gis.zi.da having two wives, A.ami.mia and A.ami.ru, and the presence of this deity in various contexts.

Key points from the text:
- Nin.gis.zi.da is introduced as a new name for a deity.
- The name appears in several contexts, including as a spousal name.
- Other names associated with Nin.gis.zi.da include A.ami.mia and A.ami.ru.
- The Nerigal name Lugal.sud.de is also mentioned.
- The study references other texts and authors, such as Falkenstein and Weidner, for further details.

The text is rich with references to other names and concepts, suggesting a complex and nuanced understanding of this deity's role and significance.
The restoration is conjectured from the arrangement in Ao:405, 406.

280. Cf. ZA 41 292.


282. Lines 281-283 list three ideograms for this one son of Tišpak: line 284 gives his name phonetically. For the present entry, the gloss = A ix 15. In C iv 1, the second half of the line is given as [dumu d] Tišpak’ a. ’ke₄.

288. dDI.KUD here represents an ideogram for d KA.DI (= is.ta.ra.an) and is to be distinguished from other deities designated by the ideogram dDI.KUD (cf. König, AFK 2 131 note 4).

289. C iv 10 adds the sign names involved (i-gi-su-ba-ku) and writes ditto in place of 8U.
A | C
---|---
291. d(qa-ad-ma)KUR | gu₄,DUB dKA.DI.ke₄
292. d(zi-za-nu)KUR | dumu.a.mi
293. d(Tür(tu.ur),ma | SU
294. d(I-tür-ma-ti-šu | SU
295. 2 dingir.gub.ba | dKA.DI.ke₄
296. d(lugal.GIR.ra | SU
297. d(Ki.an.ni.si | dam.bi.SAL
298. d(Mes.lam.ta.ē.a | SU
299. d(Ma-mi-tum | dam.bi.SAL

Akkadian names. For the meaning of the names, see CT 25 18:9 (where qa-ad-mu is listed as a synonym of i-[lu]); von Soden, Die Synonymenlisten 1 vi 50 (where qu-du-mu is equated with re-eši) and 2:366 (where qu-du-mu is equated with saq-ru).

291. A ix 25 has dittos in place of dKA.DI.ke₄. In C iv 12, the name is given as d(ra-a-zu). For the meaning of the name, see under note 290 above.

292. See Tablet VI 248. Cf. dzi-za-nu who is equated with dNin.urta in CT 25 11:35. The present entry probably deals with the son of dKA.DI, not the son of the deity in line 291. For comparable ambiguous entries, see note 198 above.

293. Text = A ix 27. In C iv 14, the name appears as d(Tür(tu.ur),DIM : (ma). The final gloss of this entry in C certainly represents a scribal desire to indicate the two variants in the textual traditions for this name.

294. In C iv 15, the name is written dI-tür-ma-ti-su. In C iv 15b, ba is omitted from the summary.

295. = Ao:410. Certainly a Nerigal name; cf. CT 25 35 r. 22, 26, 24, 22; and eme:115 (which Landsberger, MSL IV p. 10 line 115, reads dLugal.lig-ra).

296. The present entry seems to represent a variant tradition for the name dBi-i-ir-du, which is listed in line 214 above as one of the names of dMin.ki.gal. Such a variant tradition for the writing of the name existed even in old Babylonian times (as is evident from Ao:411 where the name is given as here, but with the gloss du₄.a.nu). In A ix 31, the name appears as dBi-i-ir-du and then repeats the gloss in the explanatory half of the line. For the significance of the gloss, see under note 303 below. The present entry should be compared with line 191 above, where dBi-i-ir-du (variant: dBi-i-ir-du) is listed as the husband of dMa.nun.gal.

297. Scribal practice seems to have been quite consistent in omitting the determinative before names beginning with the sign AN; see under Tablet II 41. The gloss in the present entry is obviously Akkadian, giving the dual form of the word for god.

298. = Ao:412. A Nerigal name; cf. CT 25 35 r. 23 (= CT 25 36 r. 29). In A ix 31, the name appears as dBi-i-ir-du. For an attempt to analyze this name, see Lambert, RA 47 169.

299. = Ao:419 and Tablet VI 3. In C iv 19, the name appears as dMa-ni-e.
Tablet V

Tablet VI

**SOURCES USED IN RECONSTRUCTING TABLET VI**

A YBC 2401

B K. 4349 (CT 24 20 ff.); see note 111 below.

**TABLET VI**

A

1. \(d\text{gir.unu}-\text{gal}\) | \(\text{SU}\)

1. \(\text{Ao:418}\) and \(\text{eme:106}\). The sign group \(d\text{gir.unu}-\text{gal}\) (and \(d\text{gir.unu}.\text{gal}\)), which served as the common ideogram for Nerigal (although largely replaced by \(d\text{u}+\text{gur}\) in late texts),
Table VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Tablet VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>[(d)]'La'.az</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>[(d)]'Ma'-mi-tum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>[(d)]'Ut', bu.bu.ul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. | [\(d\)]'Buš'.ki.a | \(d\)IA.b-
| 6. | [\(d\)]'I'-šar-ki-di-su | \(d\)US'.ki.a |
| 7. | [\(d\)]'La'-ga-ma-al | \(d\)I'-.sar-ki-di-su |
| 8. | [\(d\)]'Ir'.ra | \(d\)GÌR.UNU.GAL |
| 9. | [\(d\)]'Ir'.ra'.gal | \(d\)IN.(e)A.lá.[X].X |
| 10. | [\(d\)]'Ir'.ra'.kal | \(d\)IN.(e)A.ra.'x' |

has usually been read \(d\)IN.(e)Išš(a).gal by modern scholars. Dr. Landeberger, however, casts doubts upon this reading (see JJS 9 I21 note 4 and MSL IV p. 12 note 5). For the present, it seems best to view \(d\)GIR.UNU.GAL as an ideogram for this deity. The present tablet devotes considerable space to the names of Nergal and the various gods connected with his circle. Conspicuously absent is \(d\)IN.šš(a).gal, who appears separately in Tablet V 213 ff.

2. Cf. KAV 65 ii 41, where she is equated with \(d\)Ba.á.
3. \(=\) Ao:419. See also Tablet V 299.
4. \(=\) Ao:420 (which has \(d\)GIR.UNU.GAL). See also ab r. 20. The broken space at the beginning of the line in A ix 50, however, is not large enough to accommodate as large a sign as \(d\). The space and the traces favor the sign \(d\)U. In this case, \(d\)U would seem to be only a phonetic variant for \(d\). Cf. KAR 142 r. ili 30.
5. \(=\) Ao:422.
6. \(=\) Ao:422, which has \(d\)I'-šar-ki-di-is-su. Cf. also KAV 65 r. ii 17 (= KAV 63 ii 27).
7. \(=\) Ao:423, which has \(d\)GÌR.UNU.GAL. See also Tablet V 45; CT 24 36:36 (\(d\)GIR.UNU.GAL). See also ab r. 20. The broken space at the beginning of the line in A ix 50, however, is not large enough to accommodate as large a sign as \(d\). The space and the traces favor the sign \(d\)U. In this case, \(d\)U would seem to be only a phonetic variant for \(d\). Cf. KAR 142 r. ili 30.
8. See Tablet V 45; CT 24 36:36; KAV 65 ii 39 (cf. Weidner's collation, AFK 2 12 note 12), and KAV 46:5 ((\(d\)La')-gam-
9. The reverse of excerpt tablet A begins here (the "reverse," however, is wrongly designated, as may be seen from the colophon at the close of the "obverse"). For the restoration of the present entry, see CT 24 36:54; as r. 15; ab r. 21, and KAV 65 r. ii 22. For the reading of the name, see Schroeder, ZA 35 146 f. and Weidner, AFK 2 17 note 4.
10. Cf. Tablet I 352 where \(d\)Ir'.ra'.gal is described as the husband of \(d\)IN.šš(a) and is equated with \(d\)GIR.UNU.GAL.
11. Cf. KAV 65 ii 34 (see Weidner's collation, AFK 2 17 note 6) and as r. 16 (= ab r. 22).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet VI</th>
<th>Tablet VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. $\text{d} \text{Kun}_x (I+LU), \text{Á} \text{Á}, \text{ga}$</td>
<td>35. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.IGI,} \text{NAGAR,}$ $\text{a}$ $\text{SU}$ (ii, du)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. $\text{d} \text{dumu.SAL}$</td>
<td>36. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.gi,} \text{[x,x]}$ $\text{EN}$ e-la-a-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.aa.ab.ba}$</td>
<td>37. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.gi,} \text{[ur]}$ $\text{EN}$ gu-su-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.id.da}$</td>
<td>38. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.x,} \text{[x]} : \text{d} \text{X,x,} \text{guš}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.tilla,} \text{AN}$</td>
<td>39. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.igi,} \text{GIR}$ $\text{SU}$ (i.e, \text{GIR,li})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{AS.A.AN}$</td>
<td>40. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.ig,} \text{IGIR}$ $\text{g} \text{g, nu}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.DUBUR,an,na}$</td>
<td>41. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.ig,} \text{IGIR}$ $\text{g} \text{g, nu}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.ka,gi,na}$</td>
<td>42. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.aa.ab.ba}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.KA.gi,du,\gamma}$</td>
<td>43. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.IGIR,} \text{ur,ra}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.nig,\ Á, ga}$</td>
<td>44. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.aa.må,ru}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.e,pa,\gamma,ra}$</td>
<td>45. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.aa.nam,} \text{tar,ru}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{SU}$</td>
<td>46. $\text{d} \text{Lugal,} \text{na,} \text{r,} \text{ru,\a,}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. For the value kun, (I+LU), see MAOG 3/3 53:282; AF 12 55; and A4 41 230 ff.</td>
<td>47. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.aa.må,ru}$ $\text{EN}$ er-\text{ga-ti}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The deity whose name is missing in the explanatory column may have been $\text{GIR,SU$, but $\text{GIR,UNU,\gamma$ must also be considered.}$</td>
<td>48. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.sl,lim,ma}$ $\text{EN}$ \text{Su}-\text{mi}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. For $\text{d} \text{Lugal.aa.ab,ba, ef. Tablet V 311; Ao:416}$ $\text{Lugal.ab,ba;}$ and $\text{ems:107. The explanatory half of the line is broken away in both texts (except for traces of a vertical wedge in A ix 72), and the restoration is quite hypothetical.}$</td>
<td>49. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.aa.sl,lim,ga}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. For $\text{d} \text{Lugal.aa.ab,ba, ef. Tablet V 311; Ao:416}$ $\text{Lugal.ab,ba;}$ and $\text{ems:107. The explanatory half of the line is broken away in both texts (except for traces of a vertical wedge in A ix 72), and the restoration is quite hypothetical.}$</td>
<td>50. $\text{d} \text{Lugal.ur,ur,sl,lim,ga}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. = $\text{ems:108, where Landsberger (MSL IV p. 10 line 108) reads dLugal.IGI,da.}$</td>
<td>51. $\text{d} \text{Lugal,} \text{ki,} \text{,sl,lim,ga}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. = $\text{ems:426, d} \text{Lugal.AN,AN,AN.}$ Text I:8: $\text{d} \text{Lugal,AN,AN,AN.}$</td>
<td>52. $\text{d} \text{Lugal,} \text{x,} \text{aa,ab,ba}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Text = A ix 75. In text I:9, the name is written $\text{d} \text{Lugal.kur,an,na,na.}$</td>
<td>35. Text I:14: $\text{d} \text{Lugal.nin,} \text{IGI,} \text{XX,XX,}$ $\text{The traces in A ix 80 would also fit a restoration of dLugal.IGI,} \text{KU,}[\text{SU}].$ The gloss (in A ix 80) might favor either restoration; cf. MAOG 3/3 49:88-90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. = $\text{ems:450, Text I:10: d} \text{Lugal.KA.LI,} \text{x,XX,}$ $\text{In A ix 76b, there are traces of a small illegible gloss.}$</td>
<td>36. There were apparently two names for this line in A ix 85.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The explanatory gloss (in A ix 79) calls to mind the proposal by Thureau-Dangin (RA 29 24 f.) that the Sumerian word for &quot;canal&quot; was actually $\text{eg} &lt; \text{Akkadian iku, but that the final consonant would not usually be seen except when followed by a vowel (e.g., in the name Ur.e,ga). Here, the sign E is glossed with eg.}$</td>
<td>40. The name in A ix 85 may actually have been $\text{(dLugal.}$ \text{ig,il,} \text{[i,},] \text{g,nu,nu.}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. = $\text{ems:10, and ab r, 13.}$</td>
<td>36. = $\text{ems:7}$ and ab r, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Possibly $\text{d} \text{Lugal,} \text{ur,} \text{ur,sl,lim,ga}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Possibly $\text{d} \text{Lugal,} \text{ur,} \text{ur,sl,lim,ga}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
<td>52. Possibly $\text{d} \text{Lugal,} \text{ur,} \text{ur,sl,lim,ga}$ $\text{SU}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VI

53. dLugal.[uru].bar.ra
54. dLugal.[uru].šā.gā
55. dLugal.[uru].kū.gā
56. dLugal.[uru].pa.ē
57. dLugal.[šēš].UNU.₇ ki
58. dLugal.KUL.UNU.₇ ki
59. dLugal.I.si.in
60. dLugal.A.pi.ak.ki
61. dLugal.A.pi.šāl.ki
62. dLugal.AN.ZA.‘KĀR’
63. dLugal.e.na.bu.‘UL’
64. dLugal.igi.bur(šu).
65. dLugal.igi.kur.ra
66. dLugal.igi.kur.ra.
67. dLugal.igi.kur.ra.

= Ao:428.
= Ao:429.
= Ao:438 (which omits the final ki).
= Ao:433.
= Ao:439.
= Ao:438.
= Ao:441; as r. 4; ab r. 10; ac:7.
= Ao:434; as r. 8 and ab r. 14.
= Ao:437; as r. 21; ab r. 27; ac:16.
= Ao:450.
= Ao:444. Cf. EAV 63 iii 16. For šinig(GAD+SUM+IX) = bīnu, see MSL III p. 116 line 253.
= Ao:345. In Ao:434, the name appears in a different section. See also as r. 8 and ab r. 14.
= Ao:437; as r. 21; ab r. 27; ac:16.
= Ao:444. Cf. VAT 1193 (ZA 31 110) ii 8.
= Ao:448.
= Ao:451.

68. dLugal.Bād.URUDU.NAGAR.
69. dLugal.sag.nu.gi₄.a
70. dLugal.su.nu.gi₄.a
71. dLugal.giš.šinig
72. dLugal.GIŠ.A.’TU’.
73. dLugal.edin.na
74. dLugal.Gū.dug.a.ki
75. dLugal.BĀD.na
76. dLugal.Š.NUN.’NA’
77. dLugal.Š.NUN.’NA’
78. dLugal.sa.pār
79. dLugal.kū.nun.na
80. dLugal.kū.gula

= Ao:432.
= Ao:444. Cf. EAV 63 iii 16. For šinig(GAD+SUM+IX) = bīnu, see MSL III p. 116 line 253.
= Ao:434; as r. 8 and ab r. 14.
= Ao:437; as r. 21; ab r. 27; ac:16.
= Ao:444. Cf. VAT 1193 (ZA 31 110) ii 8.
= Ao:448.
= Ao:451.
Table VI

81. dLugal.an.né.pá.dá
82. dLugal.me.(du)dù
83. dLugal.me.sú.dù
84. dLugal.me.ur₄.ur₄
85. dLugal.me.lám.ma
86. dLugal.KA.dù.dù
87. dLugal.šú.x(KA X)
88. dLugal.ki.sur.ra
89. dLugal.ki.dun₄(BÚR)
90. dLugal.ki.sá(sa).a
91. dLugal.á.du₄.sá
92. dLugal.á.dib.dib
93. dLugal.nig.kas.(sa.an.'x').GA'[x]

83. = Ao:462.
84. For the relationship of D to B, see under note 111 below.
85. Dr. Landsberger has called my attention to the unpublished fragment E, 11194 (cited here as O), which begins at this point. Traces of the final ma are visible in O:1. The enigmatic gloss su.dù.bi in A ix 130 may not actually belong to this line, but to the next. Because the left half of the column is broken at this point in A, one can apply this gloss only with caution.
87. Cf. Tablet V 265. For KA X SU = šú.x, see MSL II p. 57 line 329.
89. = Ao:466. For BÚR = dum₄, see MSL II p. 89 line 805.
90. = Ao:311 and D ii 4a. D' being a fragment of B (cf. under note 111 below), obviously crowds two entries to a line here. Gloss in E:15. 0:6: [šú]Lugal.ki.sá.a.
91. 0:7: [šú]Lugal.á.du₄.sá
93. Gloss in E:16. The final sign in the gloss may be 'GA'. The traces of the final sign of the name in 0:9 resemble 'DU', but this is uncertain.
108. = A ix 142; N:13; C ii 31.
111. C ii 34: 424.úù.dù.a. The second name is to be compared with 424.-úù.su", KAR 142 i 39. The fragment K. 4349F (CT 24 35, cited here as J), which begins here, actually should prove to be a join to K. 4349A+81-7-25 (CT 24 47, cited here as D). From their museum numbers, both of these texts seem to be fragments of B. If so, they would seem to represent col. vii of the obverse of B (note that col. i of D contains material that precedes col. ii; hence this fragment cannot represent a part of the reverse). This would seem to indicate that the "great god-list." K. 4349, contained seven columns on each side, and that it was, therefore, somewhat larger than is indicated in CT 24 20 ff. I wrote to Mr. D. J. Wiseman of the British Museum about this possibility. But he was unable to find any physical join between K. 4349A+81-7-25,51 and the larger tablet; he felt that since col. v of K. 4349 is already tapering, the original tablet would only allow for six columns on each side. In view of this, exemplars D and J may not actually be fragments of B, after all (in spite of their museum numbers), but may, instead, represent still another large tablet of a similar nature.
114. Text = A ix 148. C ii 37 and K:4: 424.uk.ka.tab.ba, but this must represent a scribal mistake; the form 424.uk.ka.tab.ba appears later, in line 116 below. D ii 15 seems to follow a tradition that contained a similar mistake (D ii 15 and 16 are wrongly identical), giving 424.uk.ka.tab.ba.
J:3: 424.uk.ka(1).[uk(2)].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>Gloss in A ix 160. C ii 49 and L:7 (in the gloss) add the sign name: um-bi-sag-ga-ku; cf. MSL II p. 51 note 238; and Tablet I 156. C ii 49 gives SED instead of SED X A. For dAl-mu, cf. as r. 22; ab r. 28; ac:19; CT 24 36:66; and AS no. 7 p. 15 line 19. C writes only Su in the explanatory column.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>Gloss in A ix 161. In L:8, the gloss appears as a-la-mu. For dA-la-mu, cf. as r. 23; ab r. 29; and AS no. 7 p. 15 line 20 (which has dA-la-mu). C ii 50 writes only Su in the explanatory column.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>Possibly = c:1 r. Text c may be more than an excerpt tablet; but, because of its fragmentary size, its exact status can hardly be determined. Text d may be another fragmentary excerpt of this section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>= b ii 2; c:2; d:i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>= b ii 3; c:4; d:2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>= b ii 4; d:5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td>= b ii 5. Gloss in A ix 166. Read dSà.aš,šà₄₄.mu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>= b ii 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td>Cf. line 110 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>= b ii 7: dNÌ.TUK.'kt'.[ab.ba]. The name in the present entry is probably dLugal.Dilmun.ab.ba; but, in referring to &quot;Dilmun of the sea,&quot; this name seems to imply that there may have been at least two places by this name. Cf. under note 142 below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were singled out and designated in this way. In the present list, there appears a group of "the seven gods of Sumer" (lines 152-159), as well as groups of dImin.bi from Akkad (lines 160-167), from Guti (lines 168-175), etc. These divisions reflect geographical groupings; but, in other texts, various other methods of dividing into groups of seven were employed, for example, in KAR 142: "the seven Adads" (i 14-21), "the seven Nimurtas" (1 22-25), "the seven doormen of dIN.ki.gal" (r. iv 12-15), etc. For a discussion of dImin.bi, especially as they reflect "evil gods," see MAOG 4/2 116-119.  

152. The names in the explanatory column may be restored from the explanatory column of the Elamite deities in lines 186 ff. below. The Sumerian entries may have represented names concerned with places; e.g., the present entry may have been *dLugal.UNU.ki | GA-nu, etc.  

166. In A x 7, the traces of the partly preserved sign favor a restoration of the sign BAR.  

167. = A x 10b, 11b.
186a. = F:11. 186. G ii 11: dTb.na (with which F:12 probably agreed). 187. G ii 12: dSia.ab.na. 189. F:15 and G ii 14: <d>AN.KAL.da.ad.ra. Instead of dES, F gives dEn.na. Cf. dAN.KAL.da.ar.ra who is identified with dES in OT 25 32:10. 190. F:16 and G ii 15: Rab.ba.ku.us.bi. The same spelling of the name occurs in K. 4965 (OT 25 27):11, in a list of Samaš names. 191. F:17 and G ii 16: dSen.nu.d.kuš. 192. F:18 and G ii 17: dGestu_2. Instead of dMAS, F writes dMin.İ[urka]. 193. F:19 gives Dingir.ma4 instead of dNIN.AN.MES. The latter name is certainly ideographic for Belit-ili. 194. = d2a.am.ma.bu.un.di in line 185 above. Here, lam.zu is phonetic for lam.zú. 195. This and the following lines should be compared with OT 25 45:30 ff. where sa-bi-kum is given as the pronunciation gloss of two unreserved names. 197. dBI represents an ideogram for the previous name. This means that only one deity is involved in lines 196 and 197. 201. The summary reveals that only three actual deities are involved in lines 196-200. This corroborates the assumption that lines 197 and 199 represent ideographic entries for lines 196 and 198 respectively. 205. = AS no. 7 p. 20 line 134, where GUD is glossed with dIp.sar. 206. = AS no. 7 p. 20 line 140: ru.us.ban. 207. = AS no. 7 p. 19 line 125. Cf. Tablet III 35 and Tablet V 302. 208. For the significance of the Akkadian glosses in this and the following lines, see under Tablet V 290 (where the gloss is given as qu-ud-ma, as in line 226 below). The corresponding line in AS no. 7 p. 20 line 132 gives GUD-ud-ma, which might be read gu-ud-ma (although one would not expect to find gu- used as a syllable sign in Akkadian). 209. = AS no. 7 p. 21 line 178: ku.uk.ku.ka | ku.7. 211. = AS no. 7 p. 21 line 179: ka.ak.ku.ka | ku.7.
212. d(Eš-qa)\textsuperscript{KU}{\_}\textsubscript{7} SU

213. d(Eš-da)\textsuperscript{KU}{\_}\textsubscript{7} SU

214. d(ba.dili.āā)\textsuperscript{KU}{\_}\textsubscript{7} SU

215. d\textsuperscript{At.ti} SU

216. d\textsuperscript{E} SU

217. d\textsuperscript{NAGAR} SU

218. d\textsuperscript{ib-šUG} SU

219. d\textsuperscript{U+ME} SU

220. d(fīl.la)\textsuperscript{NAGAR} SU

221. d(al.la)\textsuperscript{NAGAR} SU

222. d(ga-a-a-u)\textsuperscript{NAGAR} SU

223. d(na.gar)\textsuperscript{NAGAR} SU

224. d(gu.gim)\textsuperscript{MUG} SU

225. d(ga.gim)\textsuperscript{MUG} SU

226. d(qu-ud-ma)\textsuperscript{KUD} SU

227. d(qa-ad-ma)\textsuperscript{KUD} SU

228. d\textsuperscript{Mar.tu} SU

The gloss seems to be Akkadian, in view of the emphatic letter; but it remains enigmatic. Dr. Stephens suggested to me the possibility that perhaps Eš represents an old scribal error for KUR and that the gloss might be read "mat-qa. This would bring the gloss into line with MSL III p. 144 line 228 where KU- is explained in Akkadian as mat-qu. The present entry, however, should be compared with Tablet II 312.

213. For the sign Eš in the gloss, cf. under note 212 above.

214. = AS no. 7 p. 21 180: ba.an.dili.āā.

216. The reverse of C contributes little in this section, preserving only the explanatory half of these lines.

224. See Tablet II 343.

225. See Tablet II 352.

226. Cf. note 208 above.

227. Cf. note 209 above.

228. See note 250 below.

229. d\textsuperscript{Lā.har,'x'} SU

230. d\textsuperscript{KU.SUD.NUN.KU.'Tu'} d\textsuperscript{Mar.tu}

231. d\textsuperscript{Mar.du.10.edin.an.} [na]

232. [ ] "

233. [ ] "

234. [ ] "

235. d\textsuperscript{Ur-ba-tum} dam.bi.SAL d\textsuperscript{Mar.tu}

236. d\textsuperscript{A-nu-bu} d\textsuperscript{Mar.tu}

237. d\textsuperscript{[KUR]} "

238. d\textsuperscript{Sa.'ba'.an} "

239. d\textsuperscript{[KUR]} "

240. d\textsuperscript{ŠAG} "

241. d\textsuperscript{Sa.han} "

242. d\textsuperscript{U+AN} "

243. d\textsuperscript{I-ki.'tum} dam.bi.SAL

244. d\textsuperscript{[Sa.ba.an][KUR]} SU

Although the name is given in eme:lll as d\textsuperscript{Lā.hur. šag}; the traces in A x 70 suggest the restoration d\textsuperscript{Lā.har. 'an}'.

230. See Tablet I 238; Tablet III 95; and An : Anu śamāl 106. For d\textsuperscript{Mar.tu}, see line 228 above; Tablet II 293; and An : Anu śamāl 102.

253. Gloss = C r. 18.

254. Gloss = C r. 19. Cf. CT 24 34 ix 7 (= "Smaller An : A-nu-um"). The name may have been (d\textsuperscript{Mar.tu,ša.an.kī}), cf. Tablet V 218 and 218a.

235. In Tablet II 294, the name of the wife of d\textsuperscript{Mar.tu} is given as d\textsuperscript{sa.an.na.ša.ša.la.}

237. Lines 237-239 should be compared with CT 29 44:16 ff. See also line 245 below.

239. See line 244 below.

240. = CT 29 44:13.

241. = CT 29 44:14.

242. = CT 29 44:15.

244. Cf. line 239 above and CT 29 44:16 ff.
245. Cf. line 237 above.
247. Cf. the variant text for Tablet V 291 which gives d(ra-a-zu)KUR.
248. See Tablet V 292.
249. I am especially indebted to Dr. Landsberger for the restorations of the glosses in this and the next four lines.
253. The broken spaces in the second half of the lines in A x 101 ff. are too small to accommodate any sign but SU or dittos. The appearance of "A-a-ra-[tum] in line 262 below is observable quite frequently in lists of wives and other goddesses; see Tablet II 236, 241; Tablet II 247, 248; Tablet III 128, 133; Tablet IV 276, 279; Tablet V 117, 122; et al.
257. For uúl = bibru, see Deimel, 8L 550, 2.
A d Me-tu-tu

282. [\(\text{d}^\text{X}\)].\(\text{di}\)
283. [\(\text{d}^\text{La-ša}\)].na-an
284. [\(\text{d}^\text{GIS}\)].\(\text{GIN}\).\(\text{MAŠ}\)
285. [\(\text{d}^\text{KAL}\)].TUK
286. [\(\text{d}^\text{GIS.BIL}\)].\(\text{ga}\).\(\text{mēš}\)
287. [\(\text{d}^\text{EM.ki}\)].\(\text{du}\)_{10}

302. [\(\text{d}^\text{X}\)].\(\text{li}\)
303. [\(\text{d}^\text{LaLSa}\)].\(\text{na-an}\)
304. [\(\text{d}^\text{GiS.BIL}\)].\(\text{r}\) \(\text{Gin}\).
305. [\(\text{d}^\text{LaLSa}\)].\(\text{na-an}\)
306. [\(\text{d}^\text{LaLSa}\)].\(\text{na-an}\)
307. [\(\text{d}^\text{LaLSa}\)].\(\text{na-an}\)
308. [\(\text{d}^\text{LaLSa}\)].\(\text{na-an}\)
309. [\(\text{d}^\text{LaLSa}\)].\(\text{na-an}\)

SOURCES USED IN RECONSTRUCTING TABLET VII

A Table VI

282. [\(\text{d}^\text{X}\)].\(\text{di}\)
283. [\(\text{d}^\text{La-ša}\)].na-an
284. [\(\text{d}^\text{GIS}\)].\(\text{GIN}\).\(\text{MAŠ}\)
285. [\(\text{d}^\text{KAL}\)].TUK
286. [\(\text{d}^\text{GIS.BIL}\)].\(\text{ga}\).\(\text{mēš}\)
287. [\(\text{d}^\text{EM.ki}\)].\(\text{du}\)_{10}

302. [\(\text{d}^\text{X}\)].\(\text{li}\)
303. [\(\text{d}^\text{LaLSa}\)].\(\text{na-an}\)
304. [\(\text{d}^\text{GiS.BIL}\)].\(\text{r}\) \(\text{Gin}\).
305. [\(\text{d}^\text{LaLSa}\)].\(\text{na-an}\)
306. [\(\text{d}^\text{LaLSa}\)].\(\text{na-an}\)
307. [\(\text{d}^\text{LaLSa}\)].\(\text{na-an}\)
308. [\(\text{d}^\text{LaLSa}\)].\(\text{na-an}\)
309. [\(\text{d}^\text{LaLSa}\)].\(\text{na-an}\)

283. = a:2.
285. Cf. Salonen, Wasserfahrzeuge 167:85: \(\text{GIS}\) \(\text{mēš}\).
286. = a:4, which gives \(\text{d}^\text{GIS.BIL}\) \(\text{mēš}\).
288. The entry \(\text{d}^\text{GiS.BIL}\) \(\text{mēš}\) is to be placed somewhere in this gap.
302. = A x 140.
304. The dittos indicate that this entry represents an ideogram for the partly preserved name in the previous line. In view of the gloss (in A x 146), a reading such as \(\text{d}^\text{GIS.BIL}\) \(\text{mēš}\) seems ruled out; see under note 117 above.
309. In a:6, the name is given as \(\text{d}^\text{Sā.sāk}\) \(\text{kin}\). Such a glossed reading may at first appear quite enigmatic. If the gloss indicates a value of \(\text{SAG}\) for \(\text{DIM}\), or a value of \(\text{AG}\) for \(\text{KIN}\), or a value of \(\text{SAG}\) for \(\text{DIXK IN}\), such an indication would be hapax and suspect. It would seem more reasonable to assume that the gloss merely presents an abbreviated indication of the total pronunciation of the name. For similar occurrences of abbreviated pronunciation glosses, see under Tablet II 21 and Tablet V 3.
310. Cf. Tablet V 228.
313. The catch-line for the next tablet is regularly omitted by A.
314. A x 151 actually has \(\text{d}^\text{ GIS.BIL}\) \(\text{mēš}\) and \(\text{d}^\text{ GIS.BIL}\) \(\text{mēš}\). Concerning this difference in the number of tablets, see p. 7 note 26 above.

SOURCES USED IN RECONSTRUCTING TABLET VII

A YBC 2401
B K. 4349 (CT 24 20 ff.)
C K. 204 (CT 25 40, 41)
D VAT 10813 (KAV 53)
13. The position of the second half of the lines in King's copy of B x 74 ff. is to be corrected. B x 74b should line up with B x 73a, etc. Elsewhere in the series, names which begin with the element Dingir usually omit the determinative; see under Tablet VI 117.

22. B x 79a: dNa₄.ušum.[x].
55. dSu.kés.da.ga
56. [dšu.kés].d'a.bi
57. dKu.bé.ti.la
58. [d]x.gal
59. dTu₆.maḥ
60. [d]Tu₆.ti.la
61. dTu₆.la.ti.la
62. [d]Tu₆.mi.ir.an
63. dTu₆.gal
64. dTu₆.ušum.gal
65. dTu₆.maḥ
66. dAsar.lú.pi
67. dSu.gá.gá dDi.ku₅
68. dSu.bi.gar
69. dDi.ku₅.gal
70. dDi.ku₅.ra
71. dBúr.ra
72. dA.diri.maḥ

55. C:4: [dbus.kés.da].[x'].BU.
56. The name was probably [dTy₃].gal.
57. "
58. Either line 62 or 63 was omitted by B x 100a (whether A xi 31 contained this entry or not cannot be
determined). It is here arbitrarily assumed that the missing
line in B would have corresponded to the present entry.
64. C:13: dTy₆.gal.gal.
65. The repetition of the name here (cf. line 59 above)
seems strange.
66. See Tablet II 185. B x 101 writes Asar as GIS.GAL X
IGI: C:15: KA X IG1.
68. B x 105a seems to have varied, giving d'Di'.[x.x].
71. 0:20: dBúr.gal.
72. Text = C:21. A xi 40 and B x 105a are based upon a
tradition which contains an old error of haplography: dA.
diri.di.ku₅ (= the beginning of the present line and the end
of line 74 below). This also explains the omission of line
75 by A and B.
76. In C r. 1 ff., še is written as the numeral 50. A
xi 42 ff. and B x 106b ff. clearly have še; see Meissner, OLZ
13 101. For the present entry, B x 106a gives dA.[x].
78. A xi 44 and B x 107a: dA.du.ku₅.<še>.maḥ.
79. C r. 4: dA.du.ku₅.<ušum>.gal.
88. A xi 54 and B x 112a: d"gal.
89. A xi 55 and B x 112b: d'guš.a.
Table VII

92. dNam.tar.su.ma₃
93. dAra.zu
94. dAra.zu.gal
95. dAra.zu.ma₃
96. dAra.zu.še.ga
97. dAra.zu.še.še.gal
98. dDingir.ba.ti.la
99. dPirig₃
100. dPirig₃.gal
101. dPirig₃.ma₃
102. dZi.kal.la
103. dZi.kal.la.ma₃
104. dZi.kal.la.ba
105. dZi.kal.la.še
106. dZi.ba.min
107. dZi.ba.min.gal
108. dZi.ba.ma₃
109. dZi.ba.an.DI
110. dZi.ba.an.tur
111. dZi.ba.an.ma₃
112. dZi.ba.an.gu
113. dZi.ba.an.še
114. dZi.ba.an.še.gal

102. B x 117a: <d>Dingir.ba.ti.la'; cf. under note 2 above.
99. C r. 24: [d]Pirig₂₃. B x 117b: [d]Pirig₂₃,pirig₂₃,
103. B x 119: dZi.kal.la<la>ma₃.
109. Text = B x 122b. Possibly to be read dZi.ba.an.sà.
A xi 75: dZi.ba.an.ki.

Table VII

115. dZi.ba.an.še.ma₃
116. dZi.ba.an.uṣum.gal
117. dZi.ba.an.še.uṣ.a
118. dZi.ba.an.engur
119. dZi.ba.an.engur.gal
120. dZi.ba.an.engur.ma₃
121. dZi.še
122. dZi.še.gal
123. dZi.še.ma₃
124. dZi.še.uṣum
125. dZi.še.ta
126. 'dub' 7 kám.ma' <An dA-nu-um> 2 SU 2 mu.bi

122. King's copy of B x 129a presents dZi.kur, but this should be corrected to dZi.še().
126. A xi 92 gives the number of this tablet as "8."
For this difference in numbering, see p. 7 note 26 above.
CHAPTER III

A RECONSTRUCTION OF AN : ANU SÂ ÂMÉLI

The system of transliteration used in presenting this
god-list and the method of indicating the duplicate texts of
the list are the same as those used in the larger series, An
: dA-nu-um (see p. 39 above). For the position and general
format of An : Anu sâ améli, see pp. 31 ff. above.

SOURCES USED IN RECONSTRUCTING AN : ANU SÂ ÂMÉLI

A  YBC 2401
B  K. 4349 (CT 24 20 ff.)
C  K. 11966 (CT 26 50)
aa  K. 4366 (CT 25 48)
ab  Rm. 483 (CT 25 47)

AN : ANU SÂ ÂMÉLI

A
1. An  Anu(AN)  *sâ améli(LÚ)
2. dBi.meš7  Anu  *sâ sinnisti(SAL)
3. dA-nu  Anu  *sâ šarrri(:)(LUGAL)
4. dMe.dara3  Anu  *sâ par-gi
5. dKur.sê6  Anu  *sâ nab-ni-ti

B
11. Šár.gal  Anu  *sâ mēti(KUR)
12. dUraš(IB)  Anu  *sâ ka-la-ma
13. dEn.līl.île  dEmilîl  *sâ nap-ba-ri
14. dDur.an.îki

6. Note the omission of an expected determinative in
lines 6-11; cf. under note 21 below.
8. Possibly a play on the similar-sounding ḫi.îli.ba and
Kilib3.
12. Probably to be identified with the deity in An : dA-
nu-um Tablet I 4. In B xi 2, An is written rdA-nu.
13. dEmilîl is written dBAD in A xi 109 and B xi 3 ff.
(cf. Weidner, AR 2 9 note 2). In A, mēA appears as KUR.
repeats dEmilîl(BAD) in each of these lines instead of using
dittos.
17. See An : dA-nu-um Tablet I 163.
18. Instead of dSig7, B xi 8 has dDIIRI.
21. Rather than an-na-ti, one would expect to find šu-
na-ti (cf. An 5 655:7). A xi 117 omits the determinative;
cf. note 6 above; An : dA-nu-um Tablet II 41 and V 305.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. dNin.lil.</td>
<td>dNin.lil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. dNIN.tum.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. dNanna(SEK.D)</td>
<td>dSin(ES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. dNun.mua</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Em.me.DU</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Uš.bar</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Mú.mú</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. 'Dingir'.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. [Dingir.Dl]</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. [X]'x'.ru</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. A xi 119 clarifies the reading of the traces of the signs at the beginning of B xi 13. B should be restored to [d]'NIN.tum():.ma.al. In view of An : dA-nu-um Tablet I 178, the sign NIN should be read egi. A xi 119 repeats the name dNin.lil instead of using dittos.

24. See An : dA-nu-um Tablet III 1. It is clear from A xi 132 ff. that A repeats the name dSin in these lines, instead of using dittos.

25. See An : dA-nu-um Tablet III 2. It is clear from A xi 132 ff. that A repeats the name dSin in these lines, instead of using dittos.

26. See An : dA-nu-um Tablet III 3. It is clear from A xi 132 ff. that A repeats the name dSin in these lines, instead of using dittos.

27. See note 29 above.

28. The sign AN is probably not used in this and the following line as a determinative; see under An : dA-nu-um Tablet VI 117.

29. The sign AN is probably not used in this and the following line as a determinative; see under An : dA-nu-um Tablet VI 117.

30. See note 29 above.

31. The traces of the second sign (in B xi 21) favor a sign like MU, ŠE, 21, etc. For uddaszallû, see JNES 8 254 note 31.

32. The name may be either dMen.dara..an or dMen.dara..dingir; see An : dA-nu-um Tablet III 9, 10.


39. Instead of dittos, A xi 137 ff. repeats dSama in each of these lines.

40. Instead of ni-ši, B xi 33 writes UN.MES.

41. For the reading of <d>Sèr.ri.da, see An : dA-nu-um Tablet III 127.

42. In B xi 37 f., the order of this line and the next appears to be reversed. A xi 142 f. repeats dA.a instead of using dittos.
47. Instead of $d\ U$, the name may be $<d \ I T$.
49. Instead of using dittos, A xi 144 ff. repeats the name $d\ Adad$ in each line.
50. B xi 40: $d\ UR$; perhaps this is to be emended to $d\ Pirig$.
51. A xi 146 omits the determinative. B xi 41 gives $d\ ad-pi-ti$.
52. Text = A xi 147; B xi 42: $d\ IM X IM$. For $d\ IM X IM$ and $d\ EN X EN$, see An: $d\ AMu-um Tablest III 210 f$. The last word in the line is given as a-ru-ur-ti in B.
53. B xi 43: $d\ Ru$. For $ur_5.\ Sa_4$, cf. An: $d\ AMu-um Tablest III 263$.
55. Of $d\ Adad-bi-qu$, MAOG 1/3 25.
56. See Schlobies, MAOG 1/3 pp. 11, 24.
58. A xi 153; $<d \ Ma.ru$.
59. Of: $d\ AMu-um Tablest III 240$. The word nam-se = nalse < našu "rain/dew."

62. Instead of $d\ Sukkal$, A xi 157 has $d\ Subur$; and in front of the dittos, A places the determinative.
63. Instead of pu-ru-se-e, A xi 156 has $d\ ES.BAR$ (= purussâ). It is interesting to note that in A xi 158, $d\ ES$ is made with three winkelhakens; but in A xi 152 ff. (= lines 56 ff. above), where $d\ ES$ appears in A as an ideogram for $d\ Si$, the sign is written with three horizontal strokes. In An: $d\ AMu-um Tablest III 3$, where $d\ 30$ as a numerical ideogram for $d\ Sin$ is written in A iv 167 with four horizontal strokes (contrast this with An: $d\ AMu-um Tablest III 1$, where $d\ 30$ is written with three winkelhakens in A iv 169). Apparently, $d\ ES$ is drawn in these three different ways by the scribe who wrote A (actually four ways, because the same scribe wrote $d\ ES$ with five horizontal strokes in B iii 91 = An: $d\ AMu-um Tablest II 295$).
64. Instead of a-šer-te, B xi 54 has $d\ er-ti$. A xi 159 ff. omits the determinative for lines 64-67.
65. Of: $d\ AMu-um Tablest III 1$, B xi 55: $d\ Subur$. Instead of $d\ Subur$, A writes $d\ MA$.
66. B xi 56: $d\ Ig(!).an.gub$ " $d\ er-ti$.
67. B xi 57 repeats $d\ er-ti$ (see note 66 above) instead of using dittos.
68. A xi 163: $d\ MA$, but this is probably to be emended to $d\ Adad-bi-qu$, KAV 57:4.
69. Of: An: $d\ AMu-um Tablest III 149$.
70. Of: An: $d\ AMu-um Tablest III 240$. The word nam-se = nalse < našu "rain/dew."
73. d\textsuperscript{a}Nu.nir | " | sâ me-ch-ri
74. d\textsuperscript{a}Ti\textsuperscript{a}s\textsuperscript{a}pak(SU$) | " | sâ ra-am-ku-ti
75. d\textsuperscript{a}SUR.SÊS | " | sâ qa-ul-ti
76. d\textsuperscript{a}StR.UN\textsubscript{U}GAL | d\textsuperscript{a}Nerigal(U. GUR) | " | sâ qa-ab-ri
77. d\textsuperscript{a}GUR | " | sâ ḥa-a-a-ṭî
78. [ ] | " | *sâ [ ]
79. d\textsuperscript{a}Su\textsuperscript{a}.k.i.a | " | sâ śi-ip-ti
80. d\textsuperscript{a}Ra-qi-bu' | " | sâ uṣ-ṣi
81. d\textsuperscript{a}J\textsuperscript{a}.ul.ga | " | sâ ri-a-a-ti
82. d\textsuperscript{a}J\textsuperscript{a}.x'.a | " | sâ ā-ti-ti
83. d\textsuperscript{a}La-qi-bu' | " | sâ ti-ti-1
84. d\textsuperscript{a}La-qi-bu' | " | sâ ti-ti-1
85. d\textsuperscript{a}Pa | " | sâ su-u-qi
86. d\textsuperscript{a}Sa-nu-ru | d\textsuperscript{a}Is-tar | " | sâ mētāte(KUR.KUR. MB3-te)
87. d\textsuperscript{a}Kar.Sul | " | sâ qar-ra-a-a-ḍi

73. See CT 25 11:28: "\textsuperscript{d}Nun.nir | " | (\textsuperscript{d}Nin.urta) sâ qab-
74. See CT 25 11:29: "\textsuperscript{d}(t)i\textsuperscript{a}s\textsuperscript{a}pak(SU$) | * | (\textsuperscript{d}Nin.urta) sâ ra-am-ku-ti. A xii 169 varies: "\textsuperscript{d}NAG | (\textsuperscript{d}Nin.urta)(MA3) | sâ KUR-ku-ti.
75. A xii 170: sâ qul-ti. Perhaps "\textsuperscript{d}SUR.SÊS is to be emended to "\textsuperscript{d}SUR/SUR.SÊS\textsuperscript{S}, in harmony with CT 25 12:19; II R Co\textsuperscript{a}10:4; and V IV 6:30 (cf. OLZ 12 201).
76. See An: "\textsuperscript{d}A-nu-um Tablet VI 1.
77. = C:4. The sign represented by 'x' ends in three horizontal wedges.
78. Instead of śi-ip-ti, C:5 gives ME.[ 1 ]
79. Cf. VAT 7759 (AIK 2 5) vii 13. Instead of ti-ti-ti', C:8 gives KUR.[ ]
80. Cf. CT 25 17 ii 24 and CT 25 30 i 15.
81. Instead of dittos, A xii 10 ff. has d\textsuperscript{a}Is-tar(U.GUR).

88. Cf. "\textsuperscript{d}Ul.si.ga, CT 25 30 r. i 17, and "\textsuperscript{d}[Ul]. \textsuperscript{r}sig\textsuperscript{a} in An: "\textsuperscript{d}A-nu-um Tablet IV 3. A xii writes the explanation as ñ\textsuperscript{a} An u EI.
89. For "\textsuperscript{d}Ul.ru.ru, cf. CT 25 30 r. i 18; KAV 48 ii 11; and KAV 173:15. The meaning of the explanation, sâ bi/kas-
90. A xii 13 appears to vary, giving [S\textsuperscript{K}]:\textsuperscript{a} x'.a. The traces of the half-preserved 'x' in A belong to a sign that ends in a vertical wedge.
91. In CT 25 30 r. 21, the name appears as d\textsuperscript{a}Ti.ba.lam. [ma], which may be better than the form in A xii 15 and B xii 80. A omits the final ma. B gives is-a-a-ti.
92. Cf. "\textsuperscript{d}Mi.nu.an[x], CT 25 30 r. i 22; d\textsuperscript{a}Me.a.ni, CT 25 17 ii 15; and d\textsuperscript{a}Me.nu.a.ni, CT 25 44:9.
93. For d\textsuperscript{a}Te-ba-tu, cf. CT 25 30 r. i 23, which gives "\textsuperscript{d}Mi.nu.'nim',[x].
94. Cf. "\textsuperscript{d}La-ba-tum in An: "\textsuperscript{d}A-nu-um Tablet IV 255; CT 25 17 ii 22; and KAV 173:17.
95. B xii 84 writes is-a-a-ra-te.
96. Cf. d\textsuperscript{a}Gu\textsuperscript{a}.s\textsuperscript{a}.a[x], CT 25 17 ii 9, and d\textsuperscript{a}Gu\textsuperscript{a}.s\textsuperscript{a}.a.tu, KAR 158 r. i 34.
97. The first name appears in A xii 19 as [\textsuperscript{d}Ta].\textsuperscript{r}ba. The name is possibly to be restored to [\textsuperscript{d}Ma], although this is not certain. The traces that remain of the second sign of the name end in two vertical strokes, which would fit the restoration 'da'.
Where the name (= KAV 65 iii 12).

In A xii 36, the A

110. See An:

111. See An:

112. See An:

113. See An:

114. See An:

115. See An:

116. See An:

117. See An:

118. See An:

119. See An:

120. See An:

middle column, A repeats the name in this and the following line.


100. See An: A-nu-um Table I 297. In A xii 21, the final nu is omitted.

101. See An: A-nu-um Table III 191 ff. +

102. See An: A-nu-um Table I 154 where "Kur.gal appears among the names of Enlil. In KAV 47:14 (= KAV 65 ii 21), the name is equated with 4Mar ту (cf. lines 102 f. below).

103. See An: A-nu-um Table VI 257. For the omission of the determinative in names beginning with An, see under An: A-nu-um Table II 41 and V 305.

104. Cf. A-nu-um Table I 238 and III 95; and Falkenstein, OLZ 46 355. For the reading of the epithet šā sum-ma-ni, cf. CT 12 32:46 (= OT 12 32:46).

105. For ÂMAR+PĪR, see under An: A-nu-um Table VII II 15 and II 189. For the sign PĪR, as drawn in B xii 96, see King, CT 24 p. 18. 

106. See An: A-nu-um Table II 185.

107. See under An: A-nu-um Table II 189.
121. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Nu.angur} \)]
122. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Nu.dim.mud} \)]
123. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Na.dim.mud} \)]
124. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Nin}.\text{igi.ku} \)]
125. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Nun}.\text{nu.ru} \)]
126. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Nin}.\text{ag} \)]
127. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Kin}.\text{DIM} \)]
128. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{X}.\text{gi.rim.m} \)]
129. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{KU.GI.ban.da} \)]

130. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Su.nam.ri} \)]
131. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Tum}.\text{ha} \)]
132. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Tum}.\text{ga} \)]
133. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Na}.\text{nu.ru} \)]
134. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Máa.\text{Su.gid}.a} \)]
135. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{ki} \)]
136. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{me} \)]
137. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{zu} \)]
138. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{x} \)]
139. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{.\text{kin}.kù} \)]
140. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{X}.\text{X}.\text{là} \)]
141. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{[\text{\text{M}}.\text{Sík.sír} \)] \)
142. [\( ^{\text{d}} \text{Du}.\text{[\text{ud}.\text{ru} \)] \)

121. = aa:3 (emend the end of aa:3 to r ZU -1 .[AB]).
122. = aa:4. See An: \( ^{\text{d}} \) A-nu-um Tablet II 135.
123. = aa:5.
124. = aa:6. See RA 46 34:34 where \( ^{\text{d}} \text{E-a} \) is called \( ^{\text{d}} \text{Nin}.\text{igi.ku} \).
125. = aa:7, where the name is given ideographically as \( ^{\text{d}} \text{DUG.QA.BUR} \) (see An: \( ^{\text{d}} \) A-nu-um Tablet II 160) and the pronunciation is given in the first column as nu:ur:ra. The second half of the line in A xii 48 gives \( ^{\text{LÚ}}\) .\text{DUG}.\text{QA.BUR} (for the interchange between QA and lu:ri, see under An: \( ^{\text{d}} \) A-nu-um Tablet II 156) as an ideogram for pa-pa-ri. It is evident from line 128 below that Lu:ri is to be restored in this line.
126. = aa:8. See An: \( ^{\text{d}} \) A-nu-um Tablet II 346. A xii 49 gives \( ^{\text{LÚ}}\).\text{DE} instead of nap-pa-ri.
127. = aa:9, which gives the pronunciation of DIM as mu:ða. A xii 50 gives \( ^{\text{LÚ}}\).DIM instead of i-din:ni. In aa: 9, the name appears as \( ^{\text{d}} \text{DIM} \) instead of \( ^{\text{d}} \text{Nin}\).\text{DIM}.
128. = ab:9. B xii 117 ff. omits the professional determinative in this and the following lines, but A xii 51 ff. preserves this sign. The name in the present line may be \( ^{\text{d}} \)\text{Em(i)}.\text{gi.rim.m}a, in which gi.rim.m has may represent a phonetic spelling of GI.gid.SAR.
129. = aa:15. Cf. An: \( ^{\text{d}} \) A-nu-um Tablet I 316. A xii 52 writes, ideographically, \( ^{\text{LÚ}}\).\text{EI.DIM} instead of \( ^{\text{LÚ}}\).\text{ku-ti-[im-mi]}.

In view of the first part of aa:15, the name in this line may have been read \( ^{\text{d}} \text{KU.GI.ban.da} \) instead of \( ^{\text{d}} \)\text{Su.kin.bàn.\text{da}}. If the latter pronunciation represented the pronunciation for the name, it seems that aa:15 would have given a form like \( ^{\text{Gu.uš.kin.bàn.\text{da}, instead of KU.gi.bàn.\text{da}}. \)
143. *lűš-ka-pi
144. *lűš-sa-si-ni
145. rē'ī ensi(SIPAD. Ú)
146. *lűš-ik-ka-ri
147. pu-kud-de-e
148. me-qı-ri
149. ma-gar-te
150. ḫa-βa-la-te
151. ḫa-βa-la-te
152. ma-si-tu LÚ.su
153. ma-mi-tu LÚ.su

143. = ab:ll. Cf. OLZ 14 385. The broken space in King's copy of B xı 132 hardly seems large enough for a large sign as KA. A comparison of this space, however, with the space similarly required in the lines which follow, creates the impression that the broken spaces in these lines (as drawn in CT 24 43:132 ff.) indicate a slightly shorter break than was actually on the tablet. Instead of as-ka-pi, A xı 66 gives LÚ.MUG; but this seems to represent a scribal mistake for LÚ.ASGAB because MUG seems to have had no ties with the askapu profession (for ASGAB, see MSL III p. 105 line 110.

144. The restoration is conjectured from the fact that the Sumerian sign for sasinnu "jeweler" is ZADIM.

145. The name seems to be a variant for ḡem.tur; cf. EAV 43 i 26.

146. = ab:13. A xı 68 gives LÚ.ENRAR instead of ik-ka-ri. The traces of the final sign in the name in B xı 155a resemble a sign like ŠU, or possibly MÚB. See Meissner, OLZ 13 102.

149. = ab r. 1. See Meissner, OLZ 13 102.
150. A xı 74: ma-me-tu.
151. The sign DIM is written RAB X GAN in lines 153-155, 157; but it becomes evident that RAB X GAN is merely a
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