

Markham J. Geller

Healing Magic and Evil Demons

Die babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen

Begründet von Franz Köcher

Herausgegeben von

Robert D. Biggs und Marten Stol

Band 8

Markham J. Geller

Healing Magic and Evil Demons

Canonical Udug-hul Incantations

With the Assistance of Luděk Vacín

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-1-61451-532-6
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-1-61451-309-4
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-1-5015-0015-2

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2016 Walter de Gruyter Inc., Boston/Berlin
cover image: kated6/123RF
Typesetting: Michael Peschke, Berlin
Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
♻️ Printed on acid free paper
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements — 1

Chapter One

Healing magic and Udug-hul Incantations — 3

History of the present text edition — 3

History of the Text of Udug-hul / Utukkū Lemnūtu — 5

UH Incipits and Manuscripts — 7

Ritual content of UH incantations — 21

Chapter Two

Survey of Mesopotamian Magic — 27

Legitimacy — 27

Formal vs. folk magic — 27

Magic as theory — 29

Incantation prayer, individual voice — 31

Magic and divination — 32

Chapter Three

Udug-hul as Healing Arts — 33

Exorcist as diagnostician — 38

Assyrian Court Memorandum — 41

Conclusion — 42

Chapter Four

Text Partitur of Udug-hul — 44

Udug-hul Tablet 1 — 44

Udug-hul Tablet 2 — 59

Udug-hul Tablet 3 — 89

Udug-hul Tablet 4 — 133

Udug-hul Tablet 5 — 174

Udug-hul Tablet 6 — 217

Udug-hul Tablet 7 — 249

Udug-hul Tablet 8 — 288

Udug-hul Tablet 9 — 302

Udug-hul Tablet 10 — 323

Udug-hul Tablet 11 (Marduk's Address to the Demons) — 340

Udug-hul Tablet 12 — 399

Udug-hul Tablet 13-15 — 434

Udug-hul Tablet 16 — 499

Chapter Five — 542

Collations and corrections of Forerunners to Udug-hul (Geller 1985) — 542

Appendix Ni 630 (UHF p. 140-145) — 543

Indices — 545

Museum numbers of Sources for Udug-hul — **545**

Concordance of K to P Numbers (CDLI) — **552**

Index to Chapters 1–3 — **556**

Bibliography — 559

Abbreviations — 564

Plates — 567

Acknowledgements

My very first encounter with the Series Udug-hul occurred in 1974, when D. J. Wiseman sent me off to the Student's Room of the British Museum with the number of an unpublished Middle Assyrian incantation tablet. There I first encountered the formidable W. G. Lambert, who immediately opened one of the heavy Rawlinson tomes to show me that editing a single tablet would not do, and that I had to edit all of the tablets in a Series having a specific rubric. What Lambert did not tell me (although he surely knew) was that this would be a life-long endeavor. It is now 40 years since this conversation took place.

My good fortune was having an office at UCL within a stone's throw of the British Museum, which I visited on a weekly basis. Aside from Lambert's considerable help (and allowing me access to his invaluable notebooks of transliterations), work on Udug-hul progressed enormously once Irving Finkel arrived from the Oriental Institute to take up his post as Assistant Keeper, with his impressive ability to recognise Udug-hul tablets in the Babylon Collection. At the same time, Erle Leichty allowed me access to his notes while cataloguing the BM Sippar Collection, and Christopher Walker was kind enough to allow me access to the British Museum Geers' Copies. Further progress was made possible by generous colleagues visiting the British Museum, such as Rykele Borger, W. Schramm, Walter Farber, J. Fincke, E. Jiménez, and others, as well as colleagues who informed me about tablets in other collections, such as Stefan Maul and Antoine Cavigneaux. In recent years, photographs of tablets from further afield were sent to me by Andrew George, Gianni Marchesi, and Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum.

I was greatly assisted in this work by the staff of various museums, and in particular the British Museum's (then) Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities (now Middle East Department), the Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin, and the Istanbul Archaeological Museum. The copies of all tablets in this volume are made with the permission of the Trustees of the British Museum, and similar permission was acquired from museums in Berlin and Istanbul. W. G. Lambert was kind enough to collate Sultantepe tablets for me since I was denied permission to work in Ankara.

So much for the textual work on the Series. I was invited to spend an academic year at the Netherlands Institute of Advanced Study (NIAS) in Wassenaar, in a research group on Magic and Religion in the Ancient Near East comprised of Frans Wiggermann, Tzvi Abusch, Karel van der Toorn, Shaul Shaked, and Wim van Binsbergen, and during this period the introduction and commentary to Udug-hul began to take shape, influenced by the discussions within this research group; working with Frans Wiggermann was particularly fruitful. In recent years, attention to explaining the text of Udug-hul was aided by my tenure at the Freie Universität Berlin (Topoi Excellence Cluster) as Professor für Wissenschaftsgeschichte.

The final editing and correcting of the readings extended over a considerable period, ably assisted by Luděk Vacín, who was Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter for the DFG-NEH (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and National Endowment for the Humanities) project *Bilinguals in Late Mesopotamian Scholarship* (in conjunction with Steve Tinney). Luděk read through every line of every manuscript with me and made useful corrections, as well as mounting the plates and contributing a copy of his own. The DFG has also contributed to the publication costs of this volume. Special thanks are also due to Andrew George for allowing me to include W. G. Lambert's edition of *Marduk's Address to the Demons*.

The editors of the BAM series, Robert Biggs and Marten Stol, provided extensive comments and criticism, for which I am extremely grateful. Technical assistance was also supplied by Jana Schmalfuß and Marie Lorenz. The staff of W. de Gruyter have been helpful, as always, in bringing the volume to press.

Last but not least, my assessment of Udug-hul has altered over the years. While working on the Sumerian forerunner to these incantations, I viewed the Series as representative of Sumerian *belles lettres*. The last stage of work on Udug-hul has been carried out during the initial stages of the ERC Project *BabMed*, and the resulting intensive work on Babylonian medicine has led to a completely different assessment of Udug-hul as healing incantations, intended specifically for patients. For this reason, this edition of the Udug-hul canonised text has been included within the series *Babylonisch-assyrische Medizin*, as an example of the complementary nature of Mesopotamian *Heilkunde* consisting of theoretical and practical approaches found within both magic and medicine.

Chapter One

Healing magic and Udug-hul Incantations

The bilingual incantations, known in Sumerian as Udug-hul-a-kam and in Akkadian as *Utukkū Lemnūtu* ‘(Incantations of) Evil Demons’ (hereafter UH), are attested among the very earliest of Mesopotamian incantations from the third millennium BCE down to the very latest cuneiform tablets with Greek transliterations. The original text consisted of a collection of Sumerian unilingual spells which were later edited into a much larger and mostly bilingual (Sumerian-Akkadian) incantation Series, although also containing substantial and lengthy Akkadian unilingual compositions without Sumerian precursors. It will be demonstrated below that one main purpose of UH incantations was to treat patients for illnesses borne by demons, rather than for more general types of misfortune.

History of the present text edition

A text edition and translation of UH was first published by R. Campbell Thompson in 1904 under the provocative title, *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, and to his credit, the book is still being reprinted and remains of value, partly because a number of texts in this two-volume work have never been re-edited or retranslated. In fact, the first publication of UH incantations in cuneiform copies dates back to the earliest days of Assyriology, when a steady stream of tablets from the Near East were arriving in the British Museum. The British Museum UH tablets were the first of this bilingual genre to be published, in 1875.¹

Campbell Thompson’s *Devils and Evil Spirits* appeared a year after the publication of the autograph copies of the tablets, in *Cuneiform Tablets in the British Museum* vol. 16 and 17, which provided a wealth of new Sumerian – Akkadian exorcistic incantations, with most of the known UH incantations appearing in CT 16. The problem with Campbell Thompson’s otherwise pioneering work, however, is that he combined the copies of various cuneiform sources into a single autograph copy, without regard as to whether individual cuneiform manuscripts were in Assyrian or Babylonian script, and his *apparatus criticus* was woefully inadequate. The actual characteristics of any individual manuscript were usually obscured by this method, which was adapted from Classical scholarship.

The present edition of these incantations contains much more material than was available to Thompson in 1903, including a collection of Sumerian unilingual UH incantations from second millennium sources (Geller 1985) as well as a large number of unpublished sources of canonical UH incantations (Geller 2007). The present work is a more comprehensive edition of all known UH Mss. corresponding to the canonical series which was known to Assyrian and Babylonian scholars in first millennium BCE academies and schools.² Not all UH Sumerian unilingual forerunner texts (from Geller 1985) have been included in the present work, but only those which were later redacted and translated into Akkadian by later Babylonian and Assyrian scholars. Furthermore, there are a few incantations designated as UH which are not included in this edition, despite bearing an ‘udug-hul-a-kam’ designated rubric, because there is no other obvious link to other UH incantations edited within this collection.³

Campbell Thompson’s title reflects his view of these incantations as a survey of the different types, categories, and functions of demons within Mesopotamian magic, and this oft-cited work had a major impact on all other studies of magical texts from the ancient Near East⁴ as well as subsequent studies of ancient magic, while bilingual UH incanta-

1 In 1875 H. C. Rawlinson published Tablets 5 and 16 of UH in his monumental work, *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*; the tablets were copied in the first instance by George Smith, but since T. Pinches corrected the tablet copies in the re-edition of Rawlinson’s fourth volume in 1891, it is likely that Pinches was also responsible for identifying at least some of the UH tablets later published by Campbell Thompson (cf. Thompson 1904: xii). UH incantations had an early impact on 19th century ethnography as soon as they became known, and translations from these incantations appeared in the classic work of Max Bartels (Bartels 1893: 12 and 34); Bartels takes his translations of UH from Jensen 1885.

2 Relevant earlier UH sources are also to be found in the present text edition, from recensions pre-dating canonisation. Texts are given in *Partitur*-format in which every line of every manuscript is written out in full; this allows the reader to assess critically the composite text given in the 2007 edition with all relevant variants and data.

3 E.g. incantations published in Ebeling 1953: 395-397.

4 Such as J. A. Montgomery’s edition of Aramaic incantation bowls (Montgomery 1913).

tions also afforded a far better understanding of Sumerian.⁵ Nevertheless, Campbell Thompson was unaware of a significant number of UH incantations dating from the Old Babylonian period, the so-called ‘Forerunners’, housed mostly in Istanbul, with smaller tablets in Philadelphia and Berlin. Adam Falkenstein’s ground-breaking Leipzig dissertation on *Haupttypen der sumerischen Beschwörung* (1931) set new standards for understanding the structures of UH and related Sumerian incantations, although Falkenstein had the disadvantage of working from poor photographs of the Istanbul tablets with no opportunity to make collations or work from the original tablets. In 1975, Prof. Burkhard Kienast supplied the present author with the Istanbul photographs upon which Falkenstein’s Leipzig dissertation had been based. Autograph copies of the Istanbul and Philadelphia tablets were eventually published (Geller 1985), and the full publication of the texts showed important features of inter-textuality with Sumerian mythology, such as *Inanna’s Descent to the Netherworld*. These Forerunner incantations, dating mostly from Old Babylonian archives, had even earlier Sumerian incantation antecedents from Nippur dating back to the Ur III period (van Dijk / Geller 2003), but surprisingly, there is little overlap between late Third Millennium BCE magic and the Sumerian tablets found in OB archives from some four centuries later; none of the Ur III incantations can be matched up with later OB UH incantations. The overall impression, however, is that demons were held responsible for disrupting everything within the world order, which is not quite the case with UH incantations.

Perhaps the most significant innovation of UH incantations is the focus on causing ill-health as the main goal of demonic activity.⁶ Of all the various kinds of misfortunes which befall people that can be ascribed to demons, certainly the most common would be illness, which will affect everyone at some time or another in their lives.⁷ Other kinds of catastrophic events, richly documented in omen literature such as in *Šumma ālu* omens, consisted of the dissolution of the household, divorce, loss of property, and similar occurrences (including plague), but demons were especially feared for their reputations as bearers of disease, more than for any other reason. This healing aspect of UH has until now been missed, and the intention of the present edition is to emphasise the relevance of UH incantations to therapy. In this regard, incantations in general have been seen as contributing to the patient’s mental health, by reducing anxiety or fear of what is perceived as supernatural, such as the presence of ghosts or witchcraft rites, or alternatively reducing the patient’s feelings of guilt or that gods are angry with him, but these uses of magic are common to many other types of Mesopotamian incantations as well, such as *Maqlû* and *Šurpu*, which are essentially very different. UH incantations, by contrast, often refer to the victim as a patient (*lú.tu.ra // maršu*), with the aim of removing disease-causing demons from the patient’s house, presence, or even body, and of course the psychological impact on the patient was the primary reason for the popularity of these incantations, which were consistently and faithfully copied for some two millennia. It is puzzling, however, that UH incantations are rarely cited in medical recipes, since it is common for incantations to be recited by the patient or healer as part of a prescription for various diseases. The reasons for this are not obvious, but one possible explanation is that UH was not part of folk medicine nor reflected the usual type of Akkadian incantations found in the medical corpus (see Collins 1999), since UH represented a more formal type of magic in its content and literary style, being mostly bilingual (with some important exceptions) and containing lengthy incantation narratives which would not necessarily have been suitable for accompanying applications of drugs and medical procedures.

Furthermore, UH incantations are more than simply applied magic, but they provide a more theoretical framework for comprehending the activities of demons within Mesopotamian cosmology. For one thing, the canonical UH series incorporated the lengthy text of *Marduk’s Address to the Demons*, which probably existed as an independent composition before being co-opted into UH (see Lambert 1999). The text is a hymn to Marduk in a formal literary style and it highlights a significant departure from older Sumerian UH incantations. It is clear from UH ‘Forerunners’ that the principal divine authority authenticating the power of the incantations was Enki / Ea, god of wisdom, whose role within Sumerian mythology was primary; it was Enki who established the world order in *Enki and the World Order*, it was Enki who saved mankind from the Flood, and it was Enki who had Inanna released from the world of the dead. Enki was assisted by his son Asalluhi, and this divine duo were seamlessly transformed into their Akkadian counterparts Ea and Marduk, whose

⁵ Already by 1874, F. Lenormant published the first translations of UH incantations which were to appear in Volume Four of Rawlinson’s work (see Lenormant 1874). The still-useful Sumerian grammar of Arno Poebel (*Grundzüge der sumerischen Grammatik*, Rostock 1923) relied heavily upon bilingual UH incantations.

⁶ This applies to other bilingual incantations as well, such as *Sag.gig* (‘headache’) and *Asag.gig.ga* (‘sacrilege’-disease), but these latter incantations (known from CT 17) lack OB forerunners.

⁷ This key feature of UH was not noted by Falkenstein in his seminal description of Sumerian incantations.

role within the incantations appears at first glance to have remained as before. However, one of the innovations of UH was the increased centrality of Marduk as the main god of healing, independent of Ea and no longer acting as Ea's emissary, which is the picture which emerges from *Marduk's Address to the Demons* (UH Tablet 11). At least three tablets of UH focus primarily on Marduk's role as the chief protagonist against demons bringing illness, which is a major departure from his traditional role as Enki's amanuensis.

History of the Text of Udug-hul / Utukkū Lemnūtu

The text of UH extends over two millennia, with individual incantations being known from Old Akkadian to Arsacid periods. The oldest known exemplar of UH is a few lines of what later became UH Tablet 13-15, recorded in an OAKK. tablet from Susa,⁸ although there is no certain evidence for the existence of UH at that time, nor is the text of UH represented in the incantations from Fara and Abu Salabikh.⁹ The same can be said for Ur III incantations, which betray no evidence of UH incantations in this archive, although some standard features, such as the Enki-Asalluhi Dialogue, are known in Ur III incantations (see Van Dijk / Geller 2003). The OB period left us a number of well-written UH tablets which conform to the general sequence of later canonical UH incantations.¹⁰ Among UH incantations which were preserved in Middle Babylonian copies, only one can be identified from Nippur,¹¹ while the others come from Emar¹², Boghazkoi¹³ and Ugarit.¹⁴ There is no evidence, however, at this stage that the tablets of UH were comprehensively collected into a series or a fixed recension. As for Middle Assyrian witnesses to UH, Tablet 13-15 is well represented in a large and well-preserved MA manuscript in a library-hand (BM 130660 + VAT 9833 [KAR 24]), and a smaller fragment (VAT 10785+); a tablet from Carchemish appears to be either early NA or late MA (KH.13.O.1178, see UH 10). UH was known to the inhabitants of the *Haus des Beschwörungspriesters* in Assur, as was an UH commentary (VAT 8286 = LKA 82).

The remaining UH manuscripts are mostly known from LA manuscripts from Ashurbanipal's Library, Sultantepe, and Nimrud, and from LB archives from Sippar, Babylon, Borsippa, and Uruk. These consist of large collections of incantations reflecting the final redaction of the UH Series, or alternatively extract tablets in which only a few lines from each tablet in sequence are cited. Other types of 'school texts' or extract tablets usually contain a few lines of UH together with another extract from a literary text, and usually having a lexical extract on the reverse (see Gesche 2001), or UH incantations can occur on single-column tablets containing only one incantation, probably representing an extract from UH in a school context (see Finkel 2000). Of particular interest are Kuyunjik manuscripts of UH tablets 11 and 13-15 in a very recognisable Babylonian script, remarkably similar in ductus to an administrative tablet dated to the time of Cambyses (see below); these Kuyunjik Mss. in Babylonian script have no colophons, all show signs of burning, and often appear in a two-column format.

There is considerable overlap between individual incantations which were incorporated into UH but also formed components of other series, such as Muššu'u (Böck 2007) or Bīt mēseri.¹⁵ There is also overlap between other bilingual incantations (best known from CT 17),¹⁶ zi-pà-incantations¹⁷, Ardat lilī incantations,¹⁸ and the Incantation to Utu.¹⁹ In each case, the parallel lines have been cited in the UH *Partitur*, for convenience, even if the duplicating lines actually

⁸ MDP 14 91, edited in Geller 1980: 24.

⁹ See Krebernik 1984, in which the incantations look quite unlike UH, especially in those cases where the major role is played by Enlil rather than Enki in healing the patient.

¹⁰ See Geller 1985: 6-9, although not included were BM 78253 + (UH 1 Appendix) and Amherst 068 (UH 7). By the OB period, the kernel of the UH series already existed, since many of the incantations were written down in the same sequence as we have them later, and at least one colophon suggests that an UH Series existed as such (see Geller 1985: 5).

¹¹ 12N 228 (UH 12).

¹² MSK 74102+ (UH 3) and MSK 74232i (UH 4).

¹³ KUB 37 100a (UH 5) and KUB 37 143 (UH 7).

¹⁴ RS 15.152 and 17.155 (UH2).

¹⁵ Although no modern edition is available, relevant data can be found in Wiggermann 1992, Walker and Dick 2001, and Ambos 2013.

¹⁶ See Schramm 2001 and 2008.

¹⁷ See Borger 1969.

¹⁸ See Lackenbacher 1971 and Geller 1988.

¹⁹ Alster 1991 and 1992; this incantation has important overlaps with UH 4-5.

belong to a different series. One other area of commonality between UH and these other bilingual incantations is the absence in all cases of any identifiable ‘ritual tablet’ which would provide some kind of context or instructions for the recitation or performance of the incantations.

The incipits, catchlines and colophons of tablets determine, as far as is possible, the sequence of UH incantations presented here. There are discrepancies, of course, between the incipits from of different libraries and archives, e.g. between Nineveh and Assur, but Nineveh colophons are given precedence. In cases where evidence is lacking, or colophons are missing, the sequences of UH tablets found on late extract tablets has been relied upon, since these always appear to cite UH incantations in the same sequential order, probably reflecting the recensions taught in scribal academies. It is clear from the Assur incipit catalogue (VAT 13723+, Geller 2000: 229) that a somewhat different order of tablets was used in Assur, but for the sake of consistency the Nineveh library order has been followed as closely as possible.

UH is one of the many *mašmaššutu* compositions listed in KAR 44, the Exorcism Manuel accredited to Esagil-kin-apli, who is said to have flourished in the eleventh century BCE (see Geller 2000: 244, 7). There is no evidence within UH to contradict this information, and it seems likely that during his period the UH incantations were canonised and collected into a Series.

The lack of a forerunner does not necessarily mean that a tablet was only composed at a late date. UH Tablet 16, for instance, is an independent composition which cites the lunar eclipse as the cause of potential misfortune and is the only UH tablet to refer to the king as the patient; it displays relatively well-written Sumerian and probably represented a first millennium copy of an early composition. Tablet 11 of UH is *Marduk’s Address to the Demons*, which may well have circulated as a separate composition (see Lambert 1999) and was adopted into UH, partly perhaps because of the resemblance of its subject matter to UH Tablet 10, a bilingual tablet on a very similar theme.

The MA tablet BM 130660, which was previously thought to represent UH Tablet 12 (Iraq 42, 43-44, see Geller 1980), has now proven to be a component of Tablet 13-15. This tablet from the British Museum is a non-physical join to a Vorderasiatisches Museum tablet VAT 9833 (KAR 24), which was previously assigned to Tablet 14 of the Series. As expected, UH 13-15 is extremely lengthy in comparison with other UH tablets, since it appears to have incorporated three tablets into one (as did Mīs pī Tablet 6-8).

It is possible that Ebeling’s so-called Gattung II incantations (Ebeling 1953: 379-395) belong to UH, although the rubrics are never designated as such. In fact, the incipit of Gattung II incantations, *én lugal nam-tar*, (cf. CT 51 106, OECT 6 No. 26) appears as a catchline in UH 13-15 from Assur, which suggests that there, in any case, Gattung II might have been incorporated into UH in some recensions. Furthermore, the incipit *én dingir hul* occurs as a catchline following UH Tablet 16, which is usually considered to be the last tablet in the UH series. The incipit *én dingir hul* refers to *zi-pà Beschwörungen* (Borger 1969), and these incantations could have been recited in conjunction with UH incantations, although not necessarily as part of the UH Series. This conjunction between UH and *zi-pà Beschwörungen* is also supported by the evidence of an extract tablet (CBS 8801), which contains UH incipits together with the incipit of the *zi-pà Beschwörungen*, which show many similarities (and even intertextuality) to UH and to Gattung II incantations.

It is useful to see further evidence for the construction of the series in the one incantation catalogue which preserves the UH incipits, namely VAT 13723+ (cf. Geller 2000: 229):

‘én’ a š[u-tag-ga-zu]	(UH 1?)
én ‘en-kù-[ga]	(UH 1?)
én gá-‘e’ lú-kù-g[a me-en]	(UH 1?)
én <i>pu-ṭur le[m-nu ina pān apkal ilī Marduk]</i>	(UH 2a)
[én] nam-tar lí[l-lá an-na mu-un-nigin-e]	(UH 3a)
‘én’ a-an-na a-[ri-a-meš dumu ki in-ù-tu-da-a-meš]	(UH 4a)
én ‘a’-za-ad ‘níg-šed,’-[du ₈ nigin-na ba-e]	(UH 5a)
én ‘udug’ [hul-gál gidim idim-kur-ra]	(UH 6a)
én u[duḡ hul sila-ba siḡ-ga á-úr-da gub-gub e-sír-ra šú-šú]	(UH 7a)

In a preceding section, other UH incipits appear, but under the rubric of Muššu'u incipits:

[én ^u z]à-hi-li ^u kur-ra[^{sar}]	(= Muššu'u Rit. Tab. no. 23, UH 13-15h) ²⁰
[én ^d e]n-ki-e- ^r ne ^r	(= Muššu'u Rit. Tab. no. 24, UH 13-15i)
[én u]dug hul ^r gidim ^r idim [kur-ra]	(= Muššu'u Rit. Tab. no. 25, UH 6a)
[én an ki ba lú ki ba]	(= Muššu'u Rit. Tab. no. 26, UH 5d)

Most of these incipits can be found in UH, except for those associated here with Tablet 1, which is not consistent with our other information.

UH Incipits and Manuscripts

Below are the known incipits from all the UH tablets recorded to date, together with the information from extract tablets regarding the order of the series. The incipits are given in the same sequence in which they occur, and the indented tablet numbers refer to those extract tablets which contain extracts from UH in the same order of tablets as in the Series, and thus provide us with useful independent evidence for the sequence of incantations.

Tablet 1:

The first tablet of UH has proven to be the most difficult to piece together from an assortment of fragments and individual incantations, and the character of the tablet as a whole remains uncertain, except for the fact that it is a mixture of Akkadian and bilingual texts. Since these incantations are not attested among the UH Sumerian 'forerunners', one is tempted to conclude that they are all late compositions and accretions to the UH Series, but matters may prove to be more complicated. The text given as an Appendix to UH 1 bears many resemblances to the other fragments, and at least one of the textual witnesses to the Appendix appears to be OB (Ms. c₁). Moreover, some of Mss. used here to help reconstruct UH 1 may actually belong to another Series, such as Muššu'u (see Böck 2007). The following sources belonging to Muššu'u may be relevant to UH 1:

Ms. A (KAR 34): This is not technically part of Udug-hul, since there are many minor sequences in which Ms. A differs from the other manuscripts.

Ms. B: Although in several places Ms. B overlaps with UH 1, and thus may look like a source, there are several reasons for rejecting it as actually belonging to UH. First, there are no UH rubrics in this NA tablet, but only rulings, which is unexpected in a Kuyunjik tablet. Second, the incantations are uncharacteristically short for UH. Third, the incantations which do overlap are probably reproduced in other incantations, such as zi-pà-incantations (Borger 1969), Muššu'u (Böck 2007), and Namburbî incantations, and cannot on this basis be ascribed to UH.

Ms. C partly duplicates Muššu'u 8: 103-105, cf. Böck 2007: 282-283.

Ms. E: Once again, as in Ms. B, the overlap between Ms. E and other UH tablets is extensive but not word-for-word, but this may be explained by the fact that the incantation itself, *anamdi mē*, is also known to appear in Muššu'u (see Köcher 1966: 28, and Finkel 1991: 100) and elsewhere.

Ms. J presents similar problems. It follows much of the other Mss. relatively closely, but again only has a ruling without any ka-inim-ma rubric. This suggests that the text is something other than UH. It has been kept in the *Partitur* for purely practical reasons, since so many lines can be restored through it.

Ms. m overlaps with UH 1 but is unlikely to be an UH tablet.

Ms. g is an extract tablet which cites two lines of UH 1 and helps establish the sequence of incantations within UH. Ms. h is also an extract tablet, citing lines from this tablet, which help to identify it with UH 1.

²⁰ The placing of this incipit is based on the assumption that it is to be restored in the break after l. 207 of UH 13-15.

The following are Tablet 1 incipits:

- a 5' [én a šu-tag-ga-zu]²¹
CBS 8802 ll. 18-22 = ll. 11'-13'
- b 31' én me-šè ba-da-ri ki-šè ba-da-záh me-šè gub-ba igi-mu nu-gub²²
- c 38' én ^dasar-alim-nun-na dumu sag eridu^{ki}-ga-ke_a a kù-ga a sikil-la a dadag-ga²³
- d 43' én tu₆ sil₇-lá én é-nu-ru ^dasal-lú-hi EN IDIM ŠU-ka šá TI.LA lu mah-rat
- e 54' én *anamdi mē šá mašmaš ilāni*
CBS 4507 ll. 11-18 = ll. 75'-82'
- g 84' én *pu-tur lem-nu šá ina pān apkal ilāni* ^dmarduk (catchline)

Two LB extract tablets from Philadelphia, CBS 8802 (PBS 12/1 6) and CBS 4507 (PBS I/2 116), come from the Khabaza collection. The UH quotations are taken from UH Tablet 1 (cf. UH 1: 11'-13' and 75'-82'), while other extracts on these two sources are from UH Tablets 1-4 and 1-8 respectively. CBS 4507 contains other extracts which do not relate to UH, i.e. the second quotation corresponds to five lines from the 'mouth-washing' ritual *Mis pī* (Walker and Dick 2001: 51, 200-203), while ll. 54-58 at the very end of the tablet are duplicated in Lambert 1960: 102, 62-66 (wisdom precepts); see Veldhuis 2014: 416.

Tablet 2:

The tablet consists mainly of a hymn to Marduk, specifically describing his role against demons. The tablet is thus parallel in some ways to UH Tablets 10 and 11 (= *Marduk's Address to the Demons*), in which the exorcist speaks in the first person, claiming to be Marduk ('I am Marduk'). In UH 2, Marduk is invoked in the language of praise characteristic of hymns. Although this tablet (also a curious mixture of Akkadian and bilingual text) is not attested among the 'forerunners' to UH, the original composition of UH 2 may have a second millennium BCE pedigree, since one exemplar from Ugarit shows the same features of an Akkadian unilingual format becoming Sumerian and then later lapsing into Akkadian once again; the Ugarit text cannot properly be considered bilingual, in contrast to later sources of UH 2. In any case, this Marduk hymn comprising UH 2 must have been popular in its own right, considering that its witnesses are numerous and are attested for more than a millennium, but it is not clear at what stage the hymn was included within the UH corpus.

It is an interesting question why Marduk is specifically highlighted here as the subject of the hymn, rather than the older generation of incantation deities, such as Enki (Ea) or Ningirimma. Marduk is clearly reflected in this tablet as supreme, which fits well with the history of the text, namely that the oldest exemplar only goes back to the MB period (Ugarit), by which time Marduk was well-established. The reference to Marduk with his name Enbilulu also reflects the traditions incorporated into *Enūma Eliš*, dating from this same period. Moreover, the 'function' of the tablet is to highlight the unique relationship between the exorcist and Marduk, a motif which appears throughout UH incantations. In this case, however, Marduk's prominence has eclipsed that of Ea, and Marduk has taken over the role as healer, rather than as intermediary between Ea and the patient. The tenor and contents of the tablet suggest that UH 2 was a late accretion to the corpus of UH incantations, which probably originally began with UH Tablet 3, for which we have ample OB evidence (see Geller 1985).

A further word should be added regarding the unusual 'forerunner' to UH 2 from Ugarit, originally published by J. Nougayrol in *Ugaritica* 5, No. 17, of which only the first 11 lines are relevant to our tablet; the tablet was re-edited by Arnaud 2007: 77.²⁴ The Ugarit tablet is a combination of Akkadian and syllabic Sumerian incantations, covering several different genres. Aside from the opening incantation which duplicates UH 2 (with all Sumerian lines being syllabic), the

²¹ Restored from Geller 2000: 229, 18'.

²² This incipit is quite commonly attested elsewhere. Cf. Böck 2007: 20, where this incipit appears in Muššu'u. Several of the Muššu'u incipits are the same as UH incipits, suggesting overlapping incantations.

²³ Borger 1969: 9 contains the identical incantation as here, although it is difficult to explain the nature of the overlap between the two incantations.

²⁴ Arnaud was unaware of the late duplicates and his edition contains some erroneous readings.

tablet also provides an early rendition of *simmu* incantations (the second extract), while another extract corresponds to the incantation series Sag.gig.

It is interesting that one of the extract tablets with UH excerpts, CBS 4507 (= PBS 1/2 116), omits reference to UH 2, although it contains extracts from tablets 1 and 3-8 in the expected order. This is quite significant information, indicating that the Marduk hymn was not considered in that particular recension to be part of UH.

UH Tablet 2 has the following incipits:

- a 1 én *pu-ṭur lem-nu ina* IGI ABGAL DINGIR.MEŠ ^d*marduk*
CBS 8802 rev. 1-5 = UH 2: 13-15
- b 19 én ^dé-a ÉN *i-man-nu* ^d*nin-girimma ta-a i-nam-di*
- c 31 én en gal kalam-ma lugal kur-kur-ra
CBS 11306 1'-5' = UH 2: 62-66
- d 81 én ^dnam-tar-líl-lá an-na mu-un-nigin-e (catchline UH 3)

Tablet 3:

The main theme of UH Tablet 3 revolves the *Legitimationstyp*-incantation (see Falkenstein 1931: 20-34), namely the incantation priest establishing his own credentials vis-a-vis the patient, in order to make the patient believe in the effectiveness of the incantations prescribed or recited. This is accomplished by announcing that the exorcist serves as the personal messenger of Ea, Damkina, and Marduk, and that Ea has placed his own incantation into the mouth of the incantation priest.

In the first instance, the exorcist must protect himself from the demons who have attacked the sick man's body, which emphasises the theurgic character of UH incantations. The exorcist adjures the demons against attacking him, in the same way that they are adjured against attacking the patient, by not being near him or entering his house or dwelling, or harming his person. The protection is reinforced by the statements that the exorcist is surrounded on all sides by protective deities, such as Šamaš and Sîn, Nergal and Ninurta, and the good *šēdu* and *lamassu* spirits.

For a brief survey of Emar manuscripts of UH, see Rutz 2013: 265.

This tablet is well represented in the late Series, both with catchlines which match both the previous and following tablets, but also by extract tablets which cite UH incantations in the 'correct' order. These come from Ur and Nippur, as well as from the Khabaza collection. UH is usually cited beginning with Tablet 3, which may have been in some recensions the beginning of UH, since it is the first UH tablet which is purely bilingual, without any unilingual Akkadian incantations, and it appears to be attested as the first UH tablet in the OB period (see Geller 1985). Furthermore, in the extract tablet CBS 8801, the UH quotation follows three other incantations which are of similar content, namely from sag-ba sag-ba (zi-sur-ra incantations, see Schramm 2001: 47-49), STT 168, and the Compendium (ka-inim-ma šah-tur-ra-kam, see Schramm 2008: 106-107), all of which may be components of a longer composition which cannot yet be identified. No less than seven extract tablets provide information regarding the sequence of these incantations within UH; two are from Ur (Mss. v and y = UET 6 391-3922), four from an unknown provenance or perhaps Sippar (see Veldhuis 2014: 190) (Ms. gg = CBS 4507, Ms. u = CBS 11306, Ms. v = 8801, Ms. ff = CBS 8802), and one is from Nippur (Ms. ii = N 1545+). One tablet (Ms. s = BM 37621) preserves excerpts from UH 13-15 on the rev. and may be a tablet of Qutāru-incantations (see below under UH 6).

The following incipits appear in UH Tablet 3:

- a 1 én nam-tar líl-lá an-na mu-un-nigin-e
UET 6/2 392, 1-7 = UH 3: 1-6
UET 6/2 391, 1-7 = UH 3: 6-12
CBS 8802 rev. 6-10 = UH 3: 9-11
- b 28 én e-ne-ne-ne maškim hul-a-meš
CBS 11306, 6'-11' = UH 3: 57-60

c	79	én ^d en-ki e-ne ^d nin-ki e-ne CBS 4507 19'-26' = UH 3: 94-100
d	100	én gá-e lú-mu ₇ -mu ₇ sanga-mah ^d en-ki-ga me-en CBS 4507 27'-28' = UH 3: 100 N 1545 + 1554, 1-6 = UH 3: 112-115
e	124	gá-e lú ^d namma me-en gá-e lú ^d nanše me-en CBS 8801, 17'-20' = UH 3: 124-125
f	147	én gá-e lú ^d en-ki-ga me-en
g	165	én níg gar-ra níg gar-ra níg-bi ki gar-gar-ra-e-dè
h	179	én ^d en-ki lugal abzu-ke ₄ sá-pà-da gēštu ^{II} dagal-la me-en
i	199	én a-ri-a-meš dumu ki in-tu-ud-da-meš (catchline UH 4)

Tablet 4:

The structure of this tablet is governed by descriptions of both demons and ghosts. The distinction between the two groups is clear in the tablet. The demons are malevolent by nature, since it is their role to disrupt mankind and the natural order of things.

The main connection with ghosts is that both demons and ghosts emanate from the Netherworld. Ghosts, by contrast, have been the victims of some unfortunate accident or untimely death, for which reason they return from the Netherworld to find some sort of satisfaction. The conscious adaptation of the myth of *Inanna's Descent to the Netherworld* is apposite here; Inanna has the role in the myth of a ghost *par excellence*, since she comes back from the Netherworld seeking a substitute for herself, and thus visits all her old acquaintances.

The tablet is well-represented in both early and late periods. The earliest tablets are OB, with forerunners from Nippur (Ni 623+) and from the Sippar collection in the British Museum (BM 78185); cf. Geller 1985. A MB exemplar of this tablet is known from Meskene (Arnaud 1985: 6/2 p. 539, Msk 74232i, 6/4 396 no. 790), and in an amulet published in Lambert 1976: 58-60. Other manuscripts come, as expected, from Kuyunjik and LB sites (Babylon and Sippar), although one Ms. is a commentary from Assur (VAT 8286 = LKA 82), and one from Kish (Ash 1931.237 = OECT 11 23). Ms. y appears to be identical with other Kuyunjik tablets in Babylonian script, and could have originally come from Kuyunjik but was mixed in with the 'Sippar' collection in the British Museum. It might, in fact, originally have come from Borsippa, since it is known from a letter (CT 22 No. 1) that tablets were brought from Borsippa to Nineveh.

The extract tablets providing further information regarding the sequence of UH 4 incantations are also known from UH 3, but it is interesting that most of the extracts from UH 4 come from the first incantation of this tablet.

The following incipits occur in Tablet 4:

a	1	én an-na a-ri-a-meš dumu ki in-ù-tu-da-a-meš CBS 8802 rev. 11-15 = UH 4: 7-9 UET VI 391 8-14 = UH 4: 6-12 UET VI 392 8-13 = UH 4: 1-6 CBS 11306 = UH 4: 42-44
b	67	én e-ne-ne-ne dingir nu-tuku-a-meš dumu ^d gu-la-a-meš CBS 4507 29-35 = UH 4: 67-70
c	118	én en-e an gal-ta ki-dagal-šè gēštu-ga-a-ni nam-gub N 1545 + 1554 7-12 = UH 4: 134'-141'
d	199	én a-za-ad níg-šed ₇ níg-šed ₇ -bi níg-nigin-na ba-e-dè (catchline UH 5)

Tablet 5:

This tablet carries on with the same themes introduced in UH Tablet 4, but adds a list of gods (ll. 45-66, 93-96, 114-122) which is found in the familiar *zi-pà* formulation as oaths taken by the names of a list of divinities; similar listings are known from Ebeling 1953, and Borger 1969. The invocation of these gods is intended to counteract the adverse affects of various demons mentioned in this tablet, such as the Namtaru as well as the ‘watcher’-demon (*hayyātu*), the Bailiff-demon and Sheriff-demon, all of which represent corrupt aspects of ancient bureaucracies. As in UH Tablet 4, the *ardat lilī* makes an appearance, but this time defended by her patron Ištar. Tablet 5 also returns to the theme of Tablet 3, in which the exorcist asks for protection for himself – as well as for the patient – against demons which can harm human bodies; the point of the passage is essentially medical, that demons affect the physical health of the victim (l. 102). UH 5 contains mostly descriptions of the demons, but without either the Enki-Asalluhi dialogue or any ritual instructions. The text is similar in several passages to UH 4.

There are at least three OB sources for this incantation, all to be found in UHF. One (Ni 631) is from Nippur, one (TIM 9 62) is from Tell Harmal, and one from Sippar (VAT 1343 +). A MB exemplar is known from Boghazkoi (KUB 37 100a). Of the first millennium tablets, most are from Nineveh, in both Assyrian and Babylonian script, with others from the British Museum Babylon and Sippar collections. Of these, at least one (Ms. e) was copied by Tanittu-Bēl (see Finkel 1991). Other tablets come from Tell Halaf (Ms. gg) and Uruk (Mss. cc).

There is some overlap with other texts and even genres. One incantation is cited in a medical commentary from Nippur (cf. Ms. aa = JNES 33 332), and one entire incantation appears in a medical text (Ms. Z = BAM 489 + BAM 508 iv 18-25). Finally, one incantation also appears in Ardat lilī incantations (Ms. T = Lackenbacher 1971: 146f.). Four extract tablets provide information regarding the sequence of these incantations within the series; two are from Ur (Mss. v and y = UET 6 391-392), one from an unknown provenance (Ms. ff = CBS 4507), and one is from Nippur (Ms. ii = N 1545+), but all from the first incantation of UH 5.

Of the first millennium sources, two manuscripts (Mss. u and w, probably parts of the same tablet) from Kuyunjik are written in an unusual LB script found in Kuyunjik which is typical for UH (see the discussion under Tablet 13-15 below). A number of school texts come from the British Museum Babylonian collection, while Sippar has provided three sources.

UH Tablet 5 incipits:

a	1	én a-za-ad níḡ-šed ₇ -šed ₇ ba-an-nigin-na ba-e
		N 1545+ 13-20 = UH 5: 60-65
		UET 6 391 15-21 = UH 5: 7-13
		UET 6 392 14-19 = UH 5: 1-7
		CBS 4507 35'-39' = UH 5: 28-32
b	76	én u ₄ -šú-uš im-hul díṃ-ma-a-meš
c	101	én nam-tar á-sâg kalam-ma zi-zi
d	124	én dingir/an ki ba lú ki ba ^a alad ki ba-e ²⁵
e	142	én níḡ-è níḡ-è níḡ-nam-ma ús-su ₁₃
f	151	én ur-sag imin a-rá-min-na-meš
g	167	én imin-na-meš imin-na-meš
h	183	én ki-sikil é-gal edin-na-ta udug hul mu-un-da-ru-uš
i	197	én udug hul-gál gedim idim kur-ra (catchline UH 6)

Tablet 6:

The tablet characterises the Utukku-demon in reference to other demons. It is noteworthy that the Ahhāzu, Lamaštu, and Labašu demons require no (hul // *lemnu*) adjective since they are all intrinsically evil. There are many similarities

²⁵ This incipit also refers to this same incantation being used for Qutāru and Muššu'u incantations, cf. Finkel 1991: 101, Böck 2007: 71-72, see also the Assur incipit catalogue VAT 13723+, cf. Geller 2000: 239.

between this tablet and the Namerimburruda incantation published in Knudsen 1965: 163ff. (= CTN 4 107), although the texts are not duplicates. This tablet returns to the theme of medical healing, since the victim is referred to specifically as a ‘patient’, and it is clear that the demons mentioned in this tablet affect the health of both humans and animals; veterinary medicine was also one of the fields of expertise within *mašmaššutu* / *āšipūtu* (see now Maul 2013).

UH 6 differs from previous tablets in that the first incantation consists of a litany describing the evil Utukku-demon. The second incantation consists mostly of another litany listing the demons and orders them, in every line, not to approach the victim. Such imperatives are typical of magical texts.

The only known OB forerunners are CBS 1532 and Ni 631, both of which are multi-columned tablets (cf. Geller 1985).

Of the first millennium sources, one manuscript (Ms. s) from Nineveh is written in an unusual Babylonian script found in Kuyunjik, of which many examples are attested in other UH tablets (see the discussion under UH 13-15 below). Other Kuyunjik tablets appear in the usual LA script associated with Assurbanipal’s Library. Various school tablets also come from the British Museum’s Babylonian Collection (Mss. ww, uu, and tt) and Sippar collection (Ms. w). Particular noteworthy is Ms. g (= BM 60886+), a lengthy composition combining incantations from UH 6 and UH 13-15, and the tablet itself most likely belongs to Qutāru-incantations used for fumigation, rather than being a manuscript of UH. Three tablets have been found in Sultantepe (Mss. E, F, and K), and one in Assur (Ms. H = KAR 369). The two extract tablets (CBS 4507 and N 1545+) cite UH 6 in the expected sequence (see above).

UH tablet 6 incipits:

- | | | |
|---|------|---|
| a | 1 | én udug hul-gál gidim idim kur-ra ²⁶ |
| b | 40 | én udug hul-gál nam-ba-te-ge ₂₆ -e-dè ²⁷ |
| | | N 1545 + 1554 21 = UH 6: 67 ²⁸ |
| c | 77 | én udug hul-gál šaga _x šè-ab-ak-ak |
| | | CBS 4507 ll. 40’-44’ = UH 6: 88-91 |
| d | | [missing] |
| e | 108’ | én udug hul-gál [.....] |
| f | 114’ | én udug hul-gál á-sàg edin-na |
| g | 130’ | én udug hul-gál gedim dalla edin-na |
| h | 141’ | én udug hul-gál gedim lú edin-na tag-ga-zu |
| i | 154’ | én udug hul-gál edin-na á ba-an-[da-an-gi ₄] |
| j | 190’ | udug hul sila-a ba-sig-ga á-úr-ta gub-gub e-sír-ra šú-šú (catchline UH 7) |

Tablet 7:

The central theme of this tablet is the demonic penchant for lurking and blocking the streets at night, which can only be counteracted by various rituals recommended by Ea to Marduk. The final tablet of *Mīs pī* incantations (Tablet 6-8, Walker and Dick 2001: 211f.) offers an interesting parallel to UH Tablet 7, since *Mīs pī* describes Marduk walking the streets (instead of the demons), and Marduk (somewhat like the KA.PIRIG-exorcist of the first tablet of the *Diagnostic Handbook*) notices men and women who have trod in unclean water or have unclean water on their hands, or are thereby bewitched.

Judging from the number of surviving manuscripts from various periods, it seems that UH 7 was a popular incantation, with no fewer than eight manuscripts from the second millennium BCE, but also attested in very late manuscripts (such as that from the Hellenistic Uruk scribe Iqīša), while one UH 7 incantation was incorporated into *Muššu’u* incantations as well (see Böck 2007).

²⁶ This incipit also refers to this same incantation being used for Qutāru and *Muššu’u* incantations, cf. Finkel 1991: 101, Böck 2007: 71-72, see also the Assur incipit catalogue VAT 13723+, cf. Geller 2000: 239.

²⁷ One Sultantepe source (Ms. K) ends this section with a catchline, egir-šú én sag-ba sag-ba giš-hur nu-zu-a, which is the incipit of the sag-ba incantations (Schramm 2001). It is unclear what the relationship is between these various incantations.

²⁸ The tablet is broken at this point, and probably contained some five or six lines of UH 6.

Among the eight OB manuscripts, two come from Nippur (Ni 631 and Ni 2676). Others are of unknown provenance, two from the Khabaza collection (CBS 561 and CBS 1532), one from the Lord Amherst collection (unpub.), and two from the Sippar collection (BM 92671 and BM 78375). One MB manuscript appears in Boghazkoi, namely KUB 37 143.

Apart from Kuyunjik, there are only a few first millennium exemplars from Babylon and Sippar, which are difficult to distinguish from Muššu'u tablets (see Mss. a, m, and y), the latter of which has also been copied by B. Böck since it overlaps with Muššu'u incantations. Two tablets of UH 7 were copied by the Hellenistic scribes, Tanittu-Bēl (Ms. y) of Babylon and Iqīša (Ms. t) of Uruk. Two LB Mss. come from Kish (u and x). There is some overlap with the so-called Compendium published in Schramm 2008 (cf. Ms. z). Two of the Nineveh Mss. (j and v). are written in the same recognisable Babylonian script which has already been noted for Kuyunjik-tablet fragments in UH 5 and 6, with prominent examples in UH 11 and 13-15 (see below).

Only one extract tablet, CBS 4507, contains a quotation from this tablet in the proper sequence with other UH incantations.

UH Tablet 7 contains the following incipits:

- | | | |
|---|-----|--|
| a | 1 | én udug hul sila-a si-ga á-úr-da gub-gub e-sír-ra šú-šú |
| | | CBS 4507 45-48 = UH 7: 13-16 |
| b | 27 | én udug hul a-lá hul lú-ge ₆ -sa ₉ -a-šè sila-a gib-ba |
| c | 69 | én udug hul a-lá hul gedim hul gal ₅ -lá hul kur-ta im-ta-è |
| d | 98 | én udug hul an-edin-na du-a |
| e | 128 | én udug hul a-lá hul lú-ra ba-gub-ba |
| | | (Muššu'u catchline: <i>šim-ma-tu₄ šim-ma-tu₄</i>) |
| f | 140 | én udug hul-gál [su lú-ka] mu-un-gál |
| g | 152 | udug hul edin-na-zu-šè a-lá hul edin-na-zu-šè ²⁹ |

Tablet 8:

This UH tablet is devoted to the unsavoury Alû demon, often described as a dark cloud (probably a metaphor for depression), although in this fuller description the demon is also a succubus / incubus (UH 8: 10), who appears to the victim in various disguises or nightmarish forms. The primary threat of this demon is psychological rather than physical. For a recent discussion of the Alû-demon, see Wiggermann 2011: 305, in which he describes this demon as a 'demonized atmospheric phenomenon', perhaps to be equated with the *alû* 'Bull of Heaven'.

There is only one known OB exemplar for this tablet, namely Ni 2676+ from Nippur [cf. UHF ll. 857-883], and only one extract tablet which quotes lines in sequence with other UH extracts (Ms. m = CBS 4507). The first millennium sources are mostly from Kuyunjik, including two Mss. in a characteristic Babylonian script (Mss. j and l). Only one tablet is known from the British Museum's Babylonian collection (Ms. d) and only one from the Sippar collection (Ms. n).

The tablet contains only one incantation, which mostly consists of a description of the Alû demon. UH Tablet 8 contains the following incipits:

- | | | |
|---|----|--|
| a | 1 | én hul-gál hé-me-en hul-gál hé-me-en |
| | | CBS 4507 ll. 49-53 = ll. 12-14 |
| b | 53 | [én]-na-àm-zi-ga, OB var.[én] x -ru á ¹ -zi-zi-da (catchline) |

The catchline which appears in the OB Ms. may not be a reliable witness for the missing first incipit of UH 9.

²⁹ This incipit is frequently cited in other incantations and medical texts, as in Iraq 22 224 (incantation vs. slander), Schramm 2008: no. 21, possibly SBTU II 19 rev. 26, and elsewhere.

Tablet 10:

This UH tablet and the following tablet (UH 11 = *Marduk's Address to the Demons*) are thematically similar, identifying the exorcist with Marduk by declaring, 'I am Marduk', with the crucial difference being that UH 10 is bilingual while UH 11 is Akkadian only. Despite this structural similarity, the texts of UH 10 and UH 11 show little in the way of intertextuality or mutual awareness, which probably indicates that these were originally separate compositions which were later redacted into the UH Series, and juxtaposed because of their thematic (rather than textual) congruities.

Another unusual feature of UH 10 is the inclusion of Akkadian ritual instructions at the end of the tablet, which is uncharacteristic for UH.

The tablet has a single forerunner from Carchemish, which appears to be late MA or early NA, but in any case represents an earlier recension of the tablet than that attested in later sources. The tablet consists primarily of a hymn of praise to Marduk, composed in the first person ('I am Marduk'), which associates the text thematically with the following tablet, UH 11 (*Marduk's Address to the Demons*).

The best evidence for where this tablet belongs within UH comes from the Assurbanipal colophon of Ms. A, which clearly states [dub] 10.kam udug-hul-meš. There are no other internal rubrics within the tablet to provide further evidence that this was an UH incantation, and the same applies to Tablet 11, further reinforcing the possibility that both of these tablets were originally independent compositions in which the speaker (now the exorcist) identifies himself with Marduk, and later to be incorporated into UH. This would match the evidence of Tablet 2 as well, which is another hymn to Marduk, which begins in Akkadian and then carries on as a bilingual composition.

The distribution of manuscripts in UH 10 is worth noting. There are relatively few Kuyunjik sources, only one of which is in LA script (Ms. A), while the others (b, c, d, j, and k, and y) are in the LB script, and in some cases in a characteristic Babylonian script typical for Kuyunjik copies of UH (see the discussion below under UH 13-15). There are three sources from Sultantepe. The tablet was widely copied within the school curriculum and quotations from it are preserved in extract tablets from Nippur (Ms. q), Babylon (Mss. e, n, o, r, s, t, u, w), Sippar (Mss. m, p, and x), and Uruk (Ms. i).

The only incipits for UH 10 come from catchlines:

- | | | |
|---|------|--|
| a | 05 | [én] ur-sag hul tu-ud-da ba-a[n-bùlug abzu-ta me-en..]
(catchline from UH 9) |
| b | 100' | [én] <i>dup-pir lem-nu še-e'-[du lem-nu]</i>
(catchline for UH 11 = <i>Marduk's Address to the Demons</i>) |

Tablet 11:

Marduk's Address to the Demons has been edited by W. G. Lambert and is now incorporated into the present edition, thanks to A. R. George, who allowed the text to be taken from the Lambert-*Nachlass*. The text is in Akkadian, which is another indication that it was an independent composition which was incorporated into UH. Some of the sources are extremely late, well represented within the 3rd century BCE archive of Tanittu-Bēl.

This tablet also consists of a litany, as if composed in the first person by the exorcist himself, who identifies himself with Marduk, similar to UH Tablet 10. The exorcist who speaks elsewhere in the first person in UH (e.g. in UH tablet 3) also claims to be Marduk, i.e. that it is Marduk himself who is performing the magic, thus supplanting Marduk's secondary role as Asalluhi, son of (and assistant to) Enki elsewhere in Sumerian and bilingual incantations. This contradiction within UH indicates an internal development within the Series, in which Marduk's role increases over time, replacing the paradigmatic Enki-Asalluhi partnership in healing the patient.

The composition changes dramatically in l. 108, in which it becomes a dialogue between Marduk and his vizier Nabû. Marduk addresses the evil *šēdu*-demon, providing a long list of descriptions of possible ways in which the demon might appear and cause harm to the patient. The structure of the list is similar to other lists in UH (as well as in the Incantation to Utu) of either ghosts or demons, i.e. 'whether you be' (the ghost or demon) who harms the patient. Finally, the demons are addressed with the statement, 'may Asalluhi remove you (pl.)' (cf. ll. 100-104 in Section II), and this determines the outcome.

The text contains no *én* marks of incantation incipits, nor any *ka-inim-ma* rubrics, which is an additional reason for assuming that it existed as a separate composition before being incorporated into UH. On the other hand, the format, structure, and even contents of Marduk's Address fit well into UH.

The tablet has no fewer than four commentaries on the text, from Assur, Babylon and Nineveh, discussed in the notes to UH 11. What is not clear, however, is the unbalanced distribution of hermeneutical texts, since other UH tablets generally lack ancient commentaries, compared to four rather extensive and significant ones for Marduk's Address. This might suggest that Marduk's Address was popular within the scribal curriculum or was subject to special scholarly attention, possibly because of the theological implications of Marduk's role within the Series.³¹

The only incipit is as follows:

- | | | |
|---|-----|---|
| a | 1 | <i>én dup-pir lem-nu še-e-du lem-nu a-lu-ú lem-nu</i> |
| b | 129 | <i>én udug hul edin-na dagal-la ara₃ bí-in-gi₄-dè amaš-šè bí-in-hul</i> |
- (catchline to UH 12)

Tablet 12:

Cf. Falkenstein 1931: 74-75 for a discussion of motifs categorized as 'mythological texts', similar to the themes discussed in this tablet.

Note that much of this tablet duplicates *Bit mēseri*, as noted in Wiggermann 1992 and already in Gurney 1935. Several individual tablets of *Bit mēseri* are included in the *Partitur* of this UH tablet. No up-to-date edition of *Bit mēseri* exists, in contrast to other incantation series, such as *Muššu'u* (cf. Böck 2007) or the so-called *Compendium* (Schramm 2008), which also contain incantations from UH.

The text itself overlaps with the series *Bit mēseri* to the extent that at least one incantation is common to both. Like *Muššu'u*, *Bit mēseri* probably represents another late compilation of incantations partially drawn from older compositions which were still in use. This practice may have been particularly apposite for UH incantations, which could be 'borrowed' into another series, since UH is not associated with any particular ritual tablet providing information regarding when and how UH incantations were to be recited, or what procedures might accompany them. Hence, at least some ritual applications for UH may have been provided by other compositions, such as *Muššu'u* and *Bit mēseri*, which utilised UH incantations.

This lengthy tablet has a Middle Babylonian forerunner (12N 228).

There is a relatively equal distribution of tablets in Late Assyrian and Late Babylonian script, although with some curious anomalies. Ms. U consists of extracts of individual lines of this tablet in the proper sequence, but with large gaps between the extracts, and often citing only a single line of text. Similar extract tablets exist for UH 11 (Marduk's Address) (Mss. T and TT = K 8804 and K 9478), which is another small bit of evidence for considering Marduk's Address to be part of UH, since the same unusual conventions were shared by these two consecutive tablets in the Series.

The other interesting feature of this tablet is the relationship between UH 12 and KAR 298. This has already been discussed in Wiggermann 1992: 113-114, in which he shows that the incipit *én udug hul edin-na dagal-la* was recited within the ritual described in KAR 298; it now turns out that this is also the opening incipit of UH 12, and is the same as the catchline at the end of Marduk's Address (UH 11). It seems clear that KAR 298 describes a ritual which became associated with this section of UH. It is striking that no separate ritual tablet for UH has ever been found, so that here again the probability suggests itself that UH incantations were deployed in later ritual compositions from the first millennium BCE, in a similar way to which Utu incantations were incorporated into the late *Bit rimki* series.

Several of the manuscripts are extremely late, probably of Seleucid origin (Mss. k and l). Kuyunjik tablets appear in both LA and LB script. One extract tablet (Ms. j) contains UH incantations from UH tablets 12 and 13-15, but in the opposite sequence.

³¹ Luděk Vaćin suggests (oral communication) that commentaries on UH 11 were popular because Marduk appears as a supreme deity here, exercising power and control over all demonic entities, which complements his image as the organizer and ruler of the 'normal' world in *Enūma eliš*.

The following incipits are found in Tablet 12:

- a 1 [én udug hul edin-na dagal-la ara₉ b]í-in-g[i₄-dè amaš-šè bí-in-hul]
BM 33889 = ll. 61-62
- b 154 én árhuš-gar-ra ka ba-ab-du₈
- c 171 én imin-bi an-na ha-la ba-an-ús gù du₁₁-ga-bi nu-sa₆
catchline UH 13-15

Tablet 13-15:

This tablet of at least 271 lines in the present edition (plus lines missing in gaps) is by far the lengthiest tablet of UH, nearly twice as long as any other tablet, and four times longer than the shortest tablets in the Series. The incipits and catchlines indicate the correct placing between UH 12 and 16, and two of the internal incipits are noted separately in the incipit catalogue as Muššu'u incipits (see Geller 2000: 227). For these reasons, we assume that the tablet itself actually comprises three separate tablets under a single heading, now labelled as UH 13-15. A similar solution was found for Šurpu Tablet 5-6, as well as for Mīs pī Tablets 1-2 and 6-8.

The variety of tablets from the first millennium BCE in this UH incantation allow us to compare writing conventions in both LA and LB scripts, to see how textual variants conform to different patterns determined by script conventions. On one hand, the standardized tablets in NA script from Assurbanipal's Library can be compared with LB Uruk (SBTU II no. 1 = W 22652) and other LB duplicates, and these in turn can be compared with K 111+ (copied here and in CT 16 42-47), a Kuyunjik tablet in a characteristic Babylonian script found elsewhere in UH (see remarks on tablets 5, 6, 8, and 10 above). The provenance of such LB tablets found at Kuyunjik has been the object of speculation, cf. S. Parpola 1983b: 7 and 11, but the origin of tablets such as K 111+ remains a mystery. The script is very distinctive and many exemplars of *Marduk's Address to the Demons* (UH Tablet 11) can also be found in this group of manuscripts.

One other paleographic feature of K 111+ is the fact that a similar script can be found on an administrative tablet dating to the time of Cambyses (BM 67199, information court. G. van Driel), which is surprising, since the Nineveh library was presumably destroyed (or at least not functioning) by this time. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that all Babylonian script tablets in this very recognisable script from Kuyunjik show extensive burning, and that not a single tablet of UH among this group contains a colophon. Finally, the usual convention of Kuyunjik tablets in Babylonian script was not to write the full incantation rubric (ka-inim-ma udug-hul-a-kam), but only use a single ruling to divide different incantations from each other. All of these details add to the mystery of where these Kuyunjik tablets came from.

The following comparison of all variants to K 111+ (Ms. b) within UH 13-15 reveals rather surprising results.

- One of the most consistent orthographic variants is the writing of the third person pronoun in K 111+ as *šu*, *šu-nu*, and *šu-nu-ti*, while all other late duplicates write *šú*, *šú-nu*, and *šú-nu-ti*. Many examples of this phenomenon can be found in the *Partitur* below.
- K 111+ tends to use plene orthography in contrast to all other duplicates:

	Ms. aa (Bab. Script)	other K-mss. (Assyr. script)	K 111+ (Bab. script)
58	<i>te-he-ma</i>	<i>te-he-ma</i> / <i>te-he-e-ma</i>	<i>te-he-e-ma</i>
60	<i>ši-rî</i>	<i>ši-ri</i>	<i>ši-i-ru</i> (see also l. 41)
65	<i>al-ka-ka-ti</i>	<i>al-ka-ka-ti</i>	<i>al-ka-ka-a-ti</i>
72	<i>iṭ-hu-ni</i>	<i>iṭ-hu-ni</i> / <i>iṭ-hu-ú-ni</i>	<i>iṭ-hu-ú-ni</i>
77	<i>i-šá-ti</i>	<i>i-šá-tú</i>	<i>i-šá-a-ti</i>
78	<i>šu-né-el</i>	<i>šu-né-el</i>	<i>šu-né-e-el</i>

This pattern; however; is not always sustained:

	Ms. aa (Bab. script)	other K-mss. (Assyr. script)	K 111+(Bab. script)
30	<i>im-šu-'u-ma</i>	<i>im-šu-'u-u-ma</i>	<i>im-šu-'u-ú-ma</i>
60	<i>pi-i-šú</i>	<i>pi-i-šú</i>	<i>pi-i-šu</i> (Ms. k: <i>pi-šú</i>)
68	<i>ma-ru</i>	<i>ma-a-ri / ma-ri</i>	<i>ma-ri</i>

But note the following variants:

	Ms. aa (Bab. script)	other K-mss. (Assyr. script)	K 111+(Bab. script)
62	<i>qu-ul-tu₄</i>	<i>qul-ti</i>	<i>qul-ti</i>
105	<i>qer-bi-šú</i>	<i>qé-reb-šú</i>	<i>qer-bi-šu</i>
106	<i>i-te-né-el-lu-ú</i>	<i>[i-t]e-né-'e-lu-ú</i>	<i>[i]-te-né-'e-lu-ú</i>
113	<i>ka-a-a-an</i>	<i>ka-a-a-an</i>	<i>li-iz-ziz</i>
114	<i>li-iz-ziz</i>	<i>li-iz-ziz</i>	<i>ka-a-a-an</i>

Nevertheless; even Sumerian orthography shows less agreement with K 111+ than between other LB and LA duplicates:

	Ms. aa (Bab. script)	other K-mss. (Assyr. script)	K 111+(Bab. script)
53	<i>húb-bu</i>	<i>húb</i>	<i>hu-ub</i>
54	<i>babbar-ra-ta</i>	<i>[babbar-r]a-ta</i>	<i>babbar-ta</i>
59	<i>ba-an-si-eš</i>	<i>ba-an-si-eš</i>	<i>ba-an-si</i>
77	<i>nu-te-ge₂₆-da-ke₄</i>	<i>ní-te-ge₂₆-da-ke₄</i>	<i>ní-te-ge₂₆-e-dè-ke₄</i>
80	<i>u₄-zal-le-da-ke₄</i>	<i>u₄-zal-da-da-ke₄</i>	<i>u₄-zal-e-dè-ke₄</i>
81	<i>ba-ni-in-gar-re-eš</i>	<i>ba-ni-in-gar-re-eš</i>	<i>hé-en-gub-bu-uš</i>
99	<i>^dnamma-(a-)ke₄</i>	-----	<i>^dnamma-àm</i>
109	<i>hu-mu-un-da-an-tar</i>	<i>hu-mu-un-da-an-tar</i>	<i>hu-mu-da-an-tar</i>

Furthermore, K111+ tends to realise the copula ending on verbs as base + a + meš, in contrast to Ms. aa (Uruk), which tends to reduplicate the final root consonant + /ameš/, e.g.

	Ms. aa (Bab. script)	other K-mss. (Assyr. script)	K 111+(Bab. script)
48	<i>dúr-ru-na-meš</i>	-----	<i>duru-na-a-meš</i>
50	<i>dul-la-meš</i>	-----	<i>dul-la-a-meš</i>
52	<i>la-ba-an-gál-la-meš</i>	-----	<i>la-ba-an-gál-la-a-meš</i>
55	<i>mu-un-gá-gá-meš</i>	-----	<i>mu-un-gá-gá-a-meš</i>

Similarly, Ms. aa (Uruk) tends to reduplicate the final root consonant before suffixes, e.g. *mu-un-sar-sar-re-e-dè*, in contrast to K111+, *mu-un-sar-sar-e-dè* (l. 53).

K 111+ also shows a marked tendency to normalise Sumerograms, preferring *šá-ad* to KUR (see ll. 53-54) and *er-še-ti* to KI-ti (ll. 48-49), in contrast to LB Uruk, but although occasionally agreeing with LA duplicates. These variants all indicate that K 111+, in Babylonian script from Kuyunjik, represents a completely independent text tradition which is not shared by duplicates from Babylon or Uruk, or even duplicates in LA script. It is not plausible, for instance, to conclude that Kuyunjik tablets in Babylonian script were only drafts, which were re-copied into Assyrian script and then discarded, since the text traditions and orthography differ considerably.

The rubrics are particularly noteworthy in this tablet. Unlike other incantations in UH which have the standard (ka-inim-ma udug-hul-a-kam) rubric, these incantations reflect their respective character as *Kultmittelbeschwörungen* through their rubrics, which reflect the ritual content of the incantations. The duplication with Muššu'u and Qutāru incantations is intriguing, since these other ritual-oriented incantations might eventually explain how *Kultmittelbeschwörungen* were introduced into Udug-hul.

Tablet 16:

This tablet concerns the gods who bring about an eclipse of the moon, with all the ominous consequences for the king, and for this reason the 'patient' in the UH tablet is the king, given as lugal dumu dingir-ra-na, *šar-ru* DUMU DINGIR-šú, 'the king son of his god' (see UH 16: 82-83 et passim). The tablet has implications for the Substitute King Ritual, as discussed by Parpola 1983: xxii-xxxii; see also Geller 2007: xvi-xvii. This tablet was previously translated in Azarpay and Kilmer 1978: 372-374, but for a recent lengthy study of this tablet, the so-called 'Eclipse Myth', see Wee 2014.

One interesting feature of UH 16 which differentiates it from other UH tablets is the fact that the Bailiff-demon (maškim // *rābišu*) is often omitted from the standard lists of demons beginning with the Utukku-demon (although the Bailiff-demon does appear in UH 16: 93 and 186'). There are many unique characteristics of UH 16 – such as the king as patient – which set it apart from the rest of UH, suggesting that this tablet was a later accretion to the Series.

Many of the signs drawn by Campbell Thompson in CT 16 in 1903 as fully preserved are now either damaged or completely lost on the tablets.

As for UH 16 manuscripts, two Kuyunjik Mss. in Babylonian script are both single column tablets which may have contained the entire text of UH 16. The first of these, Ms. i, has two other fragments belonging to it (Mss. hh and nn), and the second, Ms. g, is a small fragment probably belonging to Ms. y. Once again, these sources are all written in the characteristic Kuyunjik Babylonian script typical for UH, which also appears in tablets 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, and 13-15, similar to K 111+. See the discussion above.

Finally, K 9700 (Ms. X) gives a text similar to UH 16 but does not actually belong to the tablet. Here is a transliteration of the text, which begins with the well-known Marduk-Ea Formula:

- 1' [d^asal-lú-hi] a-na nu i-zu
- 2' [a-na níg gá-e nu i]-zu-a-mu
- 3' [gen-na dum]u-mu
a-lik ma-a-ri d^amardu[k]
- 4' [níg]-pa-è u₄-sakar-ra
MIN šá U₄-SAKAR-*r*[a]
- 5' níg-na gi-izi-lá [...]
MIN MIN MIN ul x [.....]
- 6' [inim] d^ananna d^autu-bi [.....]
[a]-mat ma-har d^a30^aUTU [.....]
- 7' [...] x nita na₄ sikil-la lú uru-bi t[i?]
[MIN MIN a-m]e-lu šá uru-šú l[e-qē]
- 8' [...] x šà-bi-ta [.....]
[... iš-tu] qer-bi-[šú] [.....]
- 9' (traces)

Translation: [Asalluhi,] what do you not know [is what I] do not know. [Go], my son Marduk: at the appearance of the new moon, ... the censer and torch. A word [is spoken] before Sîn and Šamaš. Take a male [...] and a pure stone, a man of his city, [...] from its midst [.....]

There are no OB forerunners to UH 16, although the subject matter is such that an older version of this tablet would not be surprising. This incantation-myth concerning the eclipse of the moon may have been a late accretion, since it does

practical application, since the perceived patient is referred to as NENNI A NENNI, as in Namburbî incantations, which suggests that a patient's proper name was to be inserted when the incantation was recited, for immediate effect. The UH incantations, by way of contrast, refer to the patient as lú-u₁₈-lu dumu dingir-ra-na, 'man son of his god', without any reference to an actual patient or name.⁴² The relationship between UH incantations and the ritual objects mentioned in the text may be similar to that found in *Kultmittelbeschwörungen*, in which the ritual objects themselves are the subject of the incantations. In the latter case, the purpose and use of the incantation is also not clear, since rituals do not normally accompany these types of incantations.

Despite the lack of a 'ritual tablet', ritual objects and ritual acts appear frequently within the UH incantations. The important consideration is whether the verbal forms mentioning these objects occur in an imperative form or not, which suggests usage rather than mere reference; the imperative features strongly in magic and is one of the primary indications of magical instructions, as opposed to the 2 p. s. form of instructions which occur in medical recipes. However, the Sumerian verbal forms differ slightly from their Akkadian translations. The tendency throughout UH is for the Sumerian verbs to appear in a straightforward declarative mode (with prefix /u-/), stating a fact that the objects were to be used, while the Akkadian translation appears in an imperative mode, directing the uses of the objects for healing the patient.

Tablet 1: The use of water occurs frequently in this tablet (and elsewhere), as in UH 1: 39', a imin a-rá imin ^{id}idigna ^{id}buranun a ba-ni-sù a ba-[ni]-siki-la a ba-ni-dadag // A.MEŠ IMIN a-di IMIN A.MEŠ i-di-ig-lat A.MEŠ pu-rat-ti KÛ.MEŠ šu-luh u[l-li]l-šu ub-bi-ib-šu-ma, 'purify him (the patient) and cleanse him seven times over with a hand-washing ritual of water, namely with Tigris and Euphrates water'.

Tablet 2: There is no ritual content in this tablet.

Tablet 3: This tablet has the first reference in UH to the divine sceptre, frequently employed by the exorcist:

66 ^{giš}ma-nu ^{giš}tukul mah an-na-ke₄ šu-mu mu-un-da-an-gál
e-ri kak-ku ši-i-ri šá ^da-nim ina qa-ti-ia na-šá-ku

I hold the mighty e'ru-wood sceptre of An in my hand.

This sceptre, as we shall see, will be one of the central *Kultmittel* used in UH. The exact same phrase is repeated again later (l. 153), but in a somewhat different context:

152 h ^{giš}hur ^den-ki-ke₄ šu-mu mu-un-da-an-gál
h ú-šu-rat ^dé-a ina qa-ti-ia ba-šá-a
153 h ^{giš}ma-nu ^{giš}tukul mah an-na-ke₄ šu-mu mu-un-da-an-gál
154 h ^{giš}pa-gišimmar garza gal-gal-la šu-mu mu-un-da-an-gál
h a-ra (var. ^{giš}šim-ma-ri) šá par-šu rab-bu-tú ina qa-ti-ia na-šá-ku

With Ea's master-plans being in my possession, I am holding Anu's exalted
e'ru-wood scepter in my hand;
I am holding the date-palm frond of the major rituals in my hand.

The significance here is that the e'ru-wood sceptre is equated both with Enki's plan or design of the universe, which seems here to have been some sort of an object with a drawing, which the priest can hold in his hand, and the sceptre is also accompanied by the date-palm used for major rites. The lines suggest that the incantation priest held these ritual objects in his hand in a bid to convey power against the demons, and all of which will feature later again in UH incantations.

Tablet 4: There is no ritual content in this tablet.

⁴² Exceptions to this rule occur in UH 1 and 16. In the appendix to UH 1, the phrase [NENNI A NE]NNI šá DINGIR-šú NENNI ^diš₈-tar-šú NENNI-t[u₄] (Appendix 29) appears, while in UH 16 the 'patient' is actually the king (LUGAL) rather than a man (LÚ).

Tablet 5: There is no ritual content in this tablet.

Tablet 6 employs a simile in which the demon is to be smashed like a pot and poured out like water (ll. 120', 133', 146'). There is a possibility that the simile is actually based upon some type of sympathetic ritual, which involves the magical act of smashing a pot or pouring out its liquid contents. The image is again repeated in l. 139', but this time the demon is to be smashed like the sherd of a 'porous' potters' bowl in the street. Tablet 6, however, contains no explicit ritual instructions, nor any Marduk-Ea dialogue.

Tablet 7 contains much information which might partially allow us to reconstruct a ritual used with this incantation. Early on in this tablet, we encounter a ritual anzamma (*assammû*)-vessel from which water is poured out, after which two common ritual plants, tamarisk (^{giš}šinig // *bīnu*) and the plant ^uin-nu-uš (*maštakal*) are applied to the patient, who is then sprinkled with water. A torch is taken out from a censer. Finally, a ritual bell (urudu-níg-kalag-ga) is used to make a frightening noise, presumably to scare off the demons, and all of this is being done while the appropriate incantations are being recited.

A second type of ritual vessel, a ^{dug}huš-sakar, is employed from which water is sprinkled around the patient's bed, and a torch is again taken from a censer and used (ll. 42-45). The urudu-níg-kalag-ga bell is again employed to frighten off the demons with its fearsome noise (ll. 47-48), after which zisurra-flour is scattered around the gate, and zidubba-flour is scattered around the doors and threshold of the house (ll. 49-51).

A similar ritual follows in ll. 82-84, in which the waters of both the Tigris and the Euphrates (described as 'angry' or 'red' waters) are sprinkled on the patient, again with tamarisk and *maštakal* being placed on him, and the torch is again taken out of the censer. The purpose of the ritual is sympathetic, since the Namtar demon is thus ordered to flow or drip out of the man's body. Yet again, the urudu-níg-kalag-ga bell is used to create noise (l. 87). A magic circle consisting of two kinds of flour (*kibtu* and *šegūšu*) is drawn in a circle around the bed, as a 'taboo' (or prohibited space) against ghosts (ll. 89-90). Finally, an *e'ru*-wood sceptre (or mace) is placed at the man's head (l. 92), for some apotropaic purpose. The same sceptre occurs in the following incantation (l. 133), but no new information is provided regarding its use.

In the subsequent ritual, perfumed oil of cedar is taken and applied to the patient's body, and the incantation priests are called upon to bind the patient with a pure bandage (ll. 107-109) containing the precious oils. Fumigation is then performed with a torch burning mountain incense (l. 111).

The remarkable feature of this tablet is the number of ritual references contained in it, as well as the considerable overlap with Muššu'u incantations.⁴³ On the other hand, these UH incantations are well represented in OB tablets, before there is any hard evidence for the existence of Muššu'u. It seems likely, therefore, that because UH 7 contained so much useful ritual information, the incantations were co-opted into Muššu'u, along with other incantations which have no relation to UH.

The final ritual instructions in Tablet 7 involve commanding the ghosts to take leather pouches (*naruqqu*) and food offerings, as well as food and drink specially given to ghosts (i.e. *kispu* offerings), in order for the ghosts to be satisfied with these and not disturb the patient. Presumably, the general instructions were recited in conjunction with a *kispu*-type ritual which encouraged the ghosts to stay away. One cannot describe such a procedure as sympathetic, since it reflects a more literal type of approach in which food offerings are actually given to the ghosts in the usual way in which these *kispu*-rites were performed.

Tablet 8: After enumerating a long list of different types of evil Alû demons affecting the patient, this tablet reverts to a *Legitimationstyp* format in which the incantation priest claims to have been personally instructed by Ea, and that Ea's incantation has been placed in the exorcist's mouth (ll. 30-31). The priest then reports that he held 'seven censers of the pure rite' in his hand, with a raven in his right hand and a falcon in his left hand (ll. 32-34). Following this, the incantation states that he dressed himself against 'you' (i.e. the demon) in red garments and hung a mouse from the architrave of the gate and a thorn bush on a peg, and that he whipped the demon with a whip like the body of a stray donkey (l. 35-39). The ritual content of this tablet has been discussed by Parpola (1983: 162). See also the notes to UH 8: 27-40.

⁴³ Three Mss. contain the catchline *šim-ma-tum šim-ma-tum* (cf. the note to l. 127), which is typical of Muššu'u rather than UH.

Tablet 9: The ritual references in this rather fragmentary tablet concern themselves with building structures. The incantation priest credits himself with bringing peace of mind (*tanēhtu*) of the god and goddess and protective spirits (*lamassu*) to the domestic environment, i.e. the house, ritual huts (*šutukkū*), and shrines (*ešrēti*) (l. 9'), after which he deposits the pure water and food of Ea in them for the inhabitants (l. 10'-12').⁴⁴

Ritual type flours and materials are then associated with certain gods in this incantation. Ningirrimma has a ritual laver (*egubbū*, l. 42'), Girra has his torch (l. 43'), Kusu his incense (l. 44'), while Nisaba has the various flours and grains, namely *arsuppu*, *šegūšu*, *inninu*, *kibtu*, *kunšu*, *halluru*, *kakkū*, and *kiššanu* (l. 45'), all of which have associations in other texts with rituals and/or *materia medica*. Lisi is associated with mineral substances such as *uhūlu*, *kibritu*, and horn of the gazelle, as well as the common plants *ninū*, *azupiru*, and *sahlū*, which also appear frequently in medical recipes (l. 46'). Finally, the goddess Nunurra heats all the ingredients together in her oven (l. 47'), which has further ritual connotations. The urudu-níg-kalag-ga bell is then summoned to frighten off the demons (l. 48'), and the door of the house is sealed with pitch (l. 51'). There follows a gap in the text, after which the threshold of the door is sealed with pure fat and pitch, to prevent the demons from entering.

The next ritual, which unfortunately is only fragmentary, refers to the use of a pig as a substitute (l. 64'), which is also known from other incantations (cf. Schramm 2008: No. 3, 86). After a further gap, the same cereals as before (l. 73' = l. 45') are again scattered, as well as 'flour of the curse', which is drawn in a circle (l. 74'), and the threshold of the house is then sealed with gypsum (l. 75'). All of these instructions are addressed in the second person to the demon, so that the incantation itself consists primarily of recited ritual instructions.

Tablet 10: There appears to be the remains of a ritual at the end of this tablet, although it is not clear whether it actually belongs to the tablet or not. There is no *kikiṭṭū*-rubric preserved, nor is there any other instance in UH of an Akkadian ritual following the incantation, as one often finds in other incantation compositions. The ritual consists of pouring out beer and scattering flour and dates, but no exact duplicate is known to the present author.

Tablet 11: No rituals are referred to in this tablet.

Tablet 12: The rituals are explicitly referred to several times (ll. 39, 42, and 53), although the first occasion is the most revealing:

39 kīd-kīd-bi a-rá in-ga-zu gá-e ba-an-tar-re-eš-àm
ep-še-e-ti-šū-nu al-ka-ka-a-ti-šū-nu la-ma-da ia-a-ši i-ši-mu-ni

'They (the gods) decided about me that I should learn their rituals and
their ways'.

After the usual consultation between Ea and Marduk, the latter is told (l. 60ff.) to make an offering in the daytime (or before the sun-god), invoking the patient's personal god. The patient is then purified with a 'scapegoat', which is a black goat, a knobbly horned sheep or a mountain goat with a coloured face (ll. 65-98), and an incantation is recited. The complex ritual consists of wrapping multi-coloured cords (presumably goat hair) around the bed together with an incense censer and the use of the already familiar noisy copper bell. The patient, lying on reeds, is encircled with a magic circle of flour and a liquid derived from clay, which are also put around the gate, presumably of the patient's house. Finally, the scapegoat is placed next to the patient's body, to receive his illness. After the scapegoat ritual is performed, the evil demons are commanded to depart from the patient's body, and subsequently another ritual is prescribed, in which the scapegoat's hide is removed from the patient's body and from the vicinity (lit. street). After the scapegoat ritual is concluded, seven figurines, each given a name, are fashioned by the incantation priest and positioned at the patient's head, which is rubbed with the pure fat and milk of a cow (ll. 120-137). Finally, two further figurines of wrestlers grappling with each other are positioned on the threshold, and an offering is made to Šamaš (l. 140-151).

⁴⁴ There is likely to be a reference here to the 'food of life' and 'water of life' which were brought by Enki's magical figures into the Netherworld to save Inanna.

A second scapegoat ritual and incantation are subsequently prescribed, in which the scapegoat is tied to the patient's head, near his sickbed in the patient's house, where the ritual is to be carried out. A reed standard (*urigallu*) is set up at the patient's head, along with cow's milk and fat, and the exorcist then sacrifices the black goat with its multi-coloured face and lays the goat's body onto the patient's body, to transfer the illness from one to the other.

It is clear to see that much of UH 12 is taken up with elaborate ritual instructions which involve a scapegoat, figurines, and other accoutrements (the urudu-kalag-ga bronze bell as well as a silver saw). Despite the lack of a ritual text for UH, the present tablet gives the most information yet regarding the types of rituals which were likely to have been conducted together with the recitation of the incantations themselves. The fact that one exemplar of this incantation comes from a second millennium manuscript is significant, since it suggests that these rituals were original with UH, and not a later accretion based upon other types of ritual texts, such as Bit mēseri or Bit rimki.

The ritual objects mentioned in UH 12 also appear in a Namburbî incantation which gives the following ritual instruction: 'you purify that house' with máš-hul-dúb-ba urudu-níg-kalag-ga kuš-gu₄-gal še-numun-meš *qu-ta-ri*, 'with a scapegoat, copper bell, bull's hide drum, seeds, and fumigation' (Maul 1994: 448).

Tablet 13-15: The first ritual we encounter in this tablet occurs, as expected, after the first Marduk-Ea dialogue, after Ea says, 'go, my son, Marduk' (l. 73). The incantation priest (acting in the role of Marduk) is asked to apply fire to the tip and base of *e'ru* wood, the *hultuppû*-wood rod, along with reciting the purification incantations of Eridu (l. 76). The incantation priest is then instructed to place the torch (lit. fire) at the patient's head, day and night, especially at night while the patient sleeps, and the god Girra is invoked, as in Maqlû incantations (l. 83). The rubric for this incantation is not the usual UH rubric, but rather, ka-inim-ma ^{giš}ma-nu sag-lú-tu-ra gá-gá-dè, 'incantation for placing the *e'ru*-wood on the sick man's head' (l. 94).

The following incantations in this tablet could qualify as *Kultmittelbeschwörungen*. The first (l. 95ff.) has the incipit én eridu^{ki} giš-kin-ge₆ è ki-sikil-ta mú-a, 'the black *kiškanû* tree grew up in Eridu, created in a pure place'. The *kiškanû* has ritual significance, although not in UH itself, and it is only occasionally referred to in medical texts (cf. CAD K 453b). The second *Kultmittelbeschwörung* refers to the date-palm, which frequently features in incantations. The incipit of this incantation (l. 122) is én súhuš dalla kù-ga pú-kiri₆-ta gar-ra, 'the lofty pure date-palm planted in the orchard', and the rubric is similarly fitting for this type of incantation but is not a standard UH rubric: ka-inim-ma suhuš gišimmar lú-tu-ra kēš-kēš-da-kám, 'incantation for binding the young date-palm on the patient' (l. 144).

The next incantation refers to a straightforward prophylactic ritual and is known from its incipit: én mu hul-lu-bi sar-a mu hul-lu-bi dí-ma (l. 146), 'it was named for evil, its name was reckoned for evil', and like that which immediately follows in UH 13-15, is mentioned in Muššu'u as well (cf. Köcher 1966, Böck 2007: 72-74). The incantation priest is instructed (l. 158) to draw the patient's 'fate' in flour by the bed, presumably referring to an image of the fate-demon. He must then place *e'ru*-wood and date-palm heart at the patient's head (l. 159), then split the date-palm frond and bind the patient's limbs with it. The rubric says simply, ka-inim-ma udug hul-a-kám pa ^{giš}gišimmar lú-tu-ra á-šu-giri-bi kēš-da-kám, 'an Udug-hul incantation of binding the patient's limbs with date-palm fronds' (l. 166).

The incantation which comes next in this tablet also contains a ritual. The incipit is én su₈-ba ki kù-ga tūr amaš nam-mi-in-gub, 'the shepherd has erected the pen and sheepfold in a pure place'. The brief incantation refers to Dumuzi the shepherd, who tended both goats and lambs, and 'threaded the white and black hair of a virgin lamb and kid' (ll. 169-170). The white and black thread of a virgin kid are ritual objects, as indicated by the rubric of the incantation, ka-inim-ma udug hul-a-meš síg-kir₁₁ giš nu-zu síg MUNUS.ÁŠ.GÀR giš nu-zu giš-nú lú-tu-ra nigin-na-ke₄, 'incantation of Udug-hul in which the hair of a virgin lamb and kid is to be placed around the patient's bed' (ll. 182-183). Some ritual instructions are to be found within the incantation, i.e. the incantation priest is instructed to purify the patient with water and then pass a censer and torch over him (ll. 175-176).

In the succeeding incantation, which bears the incipit én an-bàra gig-ga ki-a mu-un-zi, 'the extended heavens have summoned illness to the land' (l. 184), the incantation priest is told to set up a reed hut (*šutukku*) for the patient at his bed and wrap the patient with a belt of black goat hair. He must then drive in a peg of *e'ru*-wood and bind the patient (with the thread) (l. 198-200).

The incipit of the next incantation in this tablet is lost, but the likelihood is that it invokes the *sahlû*-plant which grows in the steppe. The *Kultmittelbeschwörung* invokes the sulphur (*kibrîtu*) which was created in the Apsû, as well as the pure salt (*tabtu ebbêtu*) and horned alkali (*uhûlu qarnānu*) brought down from the mountains, and the *azupîru* plant

cultivated in the garden; all of these substances are common ingredients in rituals. Together with ‘horn of a stag’ (*qarnu lulime*), they were used to purify the patient, then scattered among coals (l. 218), applied to the patient, and passed through the house (l. 219), presumably for purposes of fumigation. The rubric at the end of this incantation is explanatory, *ka-inim-ma udug hul i-bí lú-tu-ra sar-sar-ke₄*, ‘an incantation of Udug-hul, the (incense) fumigation of the patient’ (l. 231). This rubric is also known from Qutāru incantations, which suggests that, like Muššu’u, these incantations were used both in UH and perhaps later incorporated into a separate ritually-based series of incantations. The main theme of this incantation – burning incense – fits well into the framework of Qutāru-incantations, which primarily deal with purification by this same means.

The final incantation in UH 13-15 is also known from Muššu’u, with the incipit being *én^d en-ki e-ne^d nin-ki e-ne*, ‘they are Enki’s, they are Ninkī’s’ (l. 232’), and the rubric for this incantation (citing fumigation) is identical to the previous one (l. 270’ = 231’). The ritual content of this incantation is elaborate and involves taking *sahlû* with a pure hand and mixing it with sulphur (*kibritu*) and horn of a stag (ll. 240’-242’). The incantation priest is then ordered to mix alkali, pure salt, and *azupiru* plant, as in the previous incantation, which are then scattered into the coals and burned at the bedside of the sick man (l. 245). Once again, fumigation is the main ritual act here. The priest must then cleanse the shrine and deposit (the residue) in the ‘grove of Eridu’. Next, the incantation priest must approach the patient’s bed holding *e’ru*-wood and *hultuppû*-wood in his left hand, and a date-palm frond in his right hand, with which he strikes the patient’s bed (ll. 248’-252’). The incantation priest must then shout in a frightening voice, to scare off the demons (l. 253’). After this, the priest is to draw a circle with flour at the side of the bed, declaring the doors and windows of the house to be taboo to the demons (ll. 256’-259’).

Tablet 16: The ritual content of this tablet is an important factor in relating the text to the rest of UH, since the contents of the tablet itself is quite different from other UH incantations. The ritual, however, is similar to that in UH 12 (see above).

The ritual instructions in this tablet occur immediately after a broken section, but it seems clear that the instructions do not result from the conventional Marduk-Ea formulaic dialogue. The ritual is described as follows (ll. 80-82)

Spin a double-strand thread in the palace gate,
spin a multi-coloured cord of hair of a virgin kid and virgin lamb,
and bind the limbs of the king, son of his god.

After another fragmentary section, the incantation priest is told to place the *e’ru*-wood sceptre on the king’s head, and recite the Eridu incantation, as in earlier UH incantations. The priest then takes a censer and torch with a ritual laver and water of purification, with which he purifies the king (ll. 90-92). Here again is the same type of ritual known from earlier UH incantations, e.g. Tablet 7.

The incantation priest is twice more ordered to take the copper bell (*urudu-níg-kalag-ga*) together with the *e’ru* wood sceptre (ll. 120’-121’, ll. 147’-148’) and recite another Eridu incantation, once again as in earlier UH tablets (cf. especially Tablets 7 and 12 above).

The fourth incantation in Tablet 16 is devoted to the pure marsh reed, which is invoked along with the divine altar and ‘axe-reed’ (ll. 178’-189’). As in Tablet 9, the incantation priest claims that he has applied pitch to the threshold, ‘so that the god should dwell in the temple’ (ll. 183’-184’).

The brief *Kultmittelbeschwörung* which occurs (in ll. 190-199’) refers to the ‘yellow hair of a goat and female kid, from Dumuzi’s pen and sheepfold’, which is similar to ritual objects mentioned in the previous tablet (see above).

The rituals referred to in UH 16 therefore fit well into the general themes of the rest of the series. The myth of the eclipse is combined with several *Kultmittelbeschwörungen*, which are probably reminiscent of the rituals intended to accompany the recitation of the incantations themselves.

Chapter Two

Survey of Mesopotamian Magic

A comprehensive study of Mesopotamian magic needs to be written, since it differs fundamentally from other kinds of ancient magic known from the Mediterranean region, both from Greece and Egypt.⁴⁵ The differences result from the fact that Mesopotamian magic is far more extensive and better attested than that of its neighbours, being preserved in Sumerian, Akkadian, and even Aramaic over some three millennia.⁴⁶ Early Egyptian magic, by way of contrast, is predominantly funerary in nature, aimed at easing the passage into the Netherworld, whereas Greek magic deals with curses, love potions, amulets, and aggressive spells, with the result being that magic had a relatively poor reputation among doctors.⁴⁷ Greek magic is supplemented by Greek magical papyri from Egypt, but the syncretistic nature of Greek-Demotic spells renders them difficult to comprehend. This points to the second major difference between Mesopotamian magic and that of its neighbours, namely legitimacy: Sumero-Akkadian incantations and magical rituals were often aimed at healing, repairing, and soothing an unhealthy body and mind, without the negative connotations of Greek *mageia*. Magic was utilised by priests who were exorcists, but also by physicians and diviners, since incantations were used in many kinds of rituals and medical recipes, and to counteract evil omens. In effect, magic was a form of conflict-resolution between men and gods and at the same time functioned to reduce levels of anxiety in the human psyche.

Legitimacy

There is no actual Sumerian or Akkadian word corresponding to Greek *mageia*. Akkadian *kišpū* comes closest in some respects, although this term refers to ‘witchcraft’, a type of aggressive magic which was clearly illegitimate. In all societies, witchcraft and related practices are seen as harmful, dangerous, and threatening, and are often outlawed.⁴⁸ Defensive or legitimate magic in Mesopotamia bore the Akkadian labels *āšipūtu* or *mašmaššūtu*, which are difficult terms to translate but correspond roughly to ‘exorcism’ or ‘therapy’;⁴⁹ the main feature of these terms is that they refer to a curriculum or learned corpus of magical incantations and ritual practices designed to alter specific realities, such as defending against demons and ghosts, human witches, or whimsical gods and their decisions. Over centuries, these general categories subsumed under *āšipūtu* / *mašmaššūtu* encroached upon other disciplines, such as liturgy and medical therapy, with the result that clear boundaries between various professions (e.g. priests and doctors) and their respective literary canons became obscured.

Formal vs. folk magic

The very earliest incantations from Mesopotamia come from the ancient sites of Ebla and Shuruppak (Fara), in a mixture of Sumerian and Semitic expressions which remain difficult to decipher, but rudimentary themes of healing gods versus demons are discernible (see Krebernik 1984). Early Sumerian incantations also focused on common fears, such as snakebite or scorpion-sting (Cunningham 1997: No. 10, 26, 27, 58, 63, 66, 67), but by the end of the third millennium BCE Sumerian incantations begin to take a recognisable form, such as identifying a problem caused by demons while invoking healing gods to handle the threat and deal with the problem (see Falkenstein 1931). Two general character-

⁴⁵ Only limited syntheses of the large corpus of magical texts are available. See Cunningham 1997 for a useful bibliography, for an overview of Sumerian incantations see Geller 2002, Geller and van Koppen 2007 and for witchcraft, see Schwemer 2007.

⁴⁶ Aramaic magical bowls deserve to be mentioned in passing as representing the latest phase of Mesopotamia’s magical patrimony.

⁴⁷ The author of the Hippocratic treatise *On the Sacred Disease* certainly had this situation in mind when he equated the *magoi* and purifiers with charlatans and quacks. See Collins 2008: 54-56.

⁴⁸ Deut. 18, 10-12 is a case in point.

⁴⁹ The best-known Akkadian term for exorcist is *āšipu*, who practiced *āšipūtu*, literally the ‘art of exorcism’. This may not, however, have been the most popular title in antiquity, since the exorcist was also known as a *mašmaššu*, who practiced *mašmaššūtu* (another term for the ‘art of exorcism’); this latter title was used regularly throughout the first millennium BCE. The exorcist stands in opposition to the *asû*-physician and apothecary, who practiced *asûtu*, the ‘art of healing’, or medicine.

istics can be seen among early incantations from the third millennium. First, incantations comprised individual or independent short compositions which were not compiled or edited into a ‘series’, and second, there is a distinction between formal Sumerian incantations, referring to recognisable gods and demons, and the earliest Akkadian incantations which appear to be composed in a more vernacular style of expression, usually dealing with popular themes of love magic or childbirth.⁵⁰

Typical of the earliest strata of Sumerian incantations is a standard dialogue between two gods, Enki (god of wisdom and the most benevolent god of Sumerian mythology) and his son Asalluhi, who noted the patient’s plight and reported it to his father. According to this scenario, the foremost challenge to powerful demons were the even more powerful gods who created and guided them, to whom the exorcist could turn by eavesdropping on a conversation between two august divinities. The upshot of this dialogue was a recommendation by the foremost gods of healing for the use of a specific ritual, which the exorcist could then cite to impress his patient:

When (Asalluhi) spoke a second time (saying),
 ‘I do not know what I should do about this; what (can relieve the patient)?
 Enki answered his son Asalluhi,
 ‘My son, what do you not (already) know, and what can I add to it?
 Asalluhi, what do you not know and what (can I add to it)?’
 Asalluhi took note.
 ‘Whatever I know, you also know. Go, my son, Asalluhi,
 fill a ... -vessel, bring the holy water-basin of Enki,
 recite the Eridu-incantation.’⁵¹

By the second millennium BCE, this standard dialogue now appears in bilingual Sumerian-Akkadian form in which the Akkadian god Ea is equated with Enki, while the emerging god Marduk has become Asalluhi (see Geller 1985: 12-15). This formal schematic structure of the dialogue was amazingly durable, surviving well into the Hellenistic period and was essentially never abandoned as a standard type of incantation motif.⁵²

Aside from the Enki-Asalluhi (Ea-Marduk) dialogue, another characteristic of later formal bilingual incantations is a customary listing of demons, illnesses and misfortunes, all appearing in a fixed sequence, which became universally quoted in many different types of incantations. The demons are not all easily identifiable as to their functions, but they include the generic evil *utukku*-demon, the evil ghost, the evil god, an evil bailiff-demon (*rābišu*) and sheriff-demon (*gallū*), who represents the demonic equivalent of a corrupt powerful official. The listing also enumerates *liliths* (both incubus and succubus), diseases (e.g. headache), and various kinds of witchcraft.⁵³

In addition to being mentioned in formal Sumerian-Akkadian bilingual incantations described above, the same demons are mentioned in at least two other major Akkadian incantation compositions, each designed for a specific purpose. The classic text dealing with Mesopotamian witchcraft is Maqlū, a compendium of spells against witches

⁵⁰ For an example of love incantations, see J. Westenholz and A. Westenholz 1977 and for Lamaštu incantations (against babies), see Michel 1997. The Akkadian incantations tend to be short and less formulaic than Sumerian counterparts, as can be seen in an Old-Assyrian childbirth incantation (cf. Michel 2004).

⁵¹ Geller 1985: 68-69, noting that the fullest form of this dialogue appears in Old Babylonian (‘forerunner’) incantations from the second millennium BCE, while later editions of the same incantations tend to abbreviate this dialogue, possibly because it was so well-known and frequently cited. This particular version of the Enki-Asalluhi dialogue, for instance, is not duplicated in full in canonical UH.

⁵² See Cunningham 1997: 79, 120f. There are a number of bilingual incantations from the second and first millennia which incorporate the characteristics of the Marduk-Ea dialogue and standard listing of demons, although the most important of these texts have been published in Schramm 2001 and 2008, and Geller 2007. These incantations are essentially exorcistic, without much in the way of ritual, adjuring the demons to depart from the presence or house of the client. There is, however, little Sumerian or Akkadian evidence for demonic possession, (as described in the New Testament), i.e. a demon inhabits his victim’s body and speaks through the victim’s mouth. Mesopotamian demons attack their victim by grabbing or seizing him, standing next to him, or otherwise attaching themselves to him, but they never possess his body in terms known from elsewhere; see Stol 1993: 51-52. By the same token, the most effective means of removing such demons from the victim’s presence was to exorcise them through direct appeals to divine powers or adjurations in the names of various gods.

⁵³ Cf. de Jong 1959, in which he classifies different demons according to various groupings consisting of Utukkū (a generic term for demons, pp. 33-39), ghosts (pp. 39-60), demons of the *utukku*-group (which include various demons associated with corrupt police and officials, pp. 61-68), demons of the *lil*-group (which include Lilith and which represent incubus/succubus demons, pp. 68-70), and demons associated with Lamaštu (child-strangling demons affecting mothers in childbirth and new-born children, pp. 70-78).

which became popular in the first millennium BCE. An assortment of different kinds of witches is identified, with spells addressed directly to the witch to stay away, or for the spell to rebound back onto the witch who cast it in the first place. The entire genre of anti-sorcery incantations is quite extensive (see Schwemer 2007: 23-68) and many short incantations also circulated individually rather than as part of a large incantation 'series', such as the following example:

The witch has performed against me her evil witchcraft,
 She has fed me her no-good drugs,
 She has given me to drink her life-depriving potion,
 She has bathed me in her deadly dirty water,
 She has rubbed me with her destructive evil oil,
 She has had me seized by her evil illness, 'seizure of a curse',
 She has given me over to the roving ghost of a stranger who has no family.⁵⁴

The fear of being behexed was commonplace in the ancient world, and the rich Akkadian literature devoted to this theme shows how prominent was this fear in Mesopotamia. One had to be constantly on guard against the evil tongue (gossip), the evil eye (envy), and the curse of others, as well as rumours which could 'devour one into pieces'.⁵⁵ The Maqlû incantations and rituals offered protection against these unseen and ubiquitous fears.

In his role as priest, one surmises that the exorcist had an interest in moral dilemmas and ethical questions which may have vexed his client. This interest becomes more clearly portrayed in a series of incantations and associated rituals known as Šurpu, which probably became popular only in the first millennium BCE.⁵⁶ The incantations are a study in guilt, consisting of a long list of confessions which the client needed to recite in order to merit protection from gods or even from his own personal protective god. These incantations were presumably intended for the hapless client suffering from reverses of fortune, no doubt undeserved and unmerited. The sagacious exorcist probably suspects that his client suffers from (subconscious) feelings of guilt, completely unrelated to his present troubles, and the incantation is designed to alleviate anxiety and guilt through confession and various sympathetic rituals, such as peeling away the skin of an onion or wiping the patient down with flour, which is then tossed into the fire. The magic provides assurances that while human misery usually results from divine displeasure, even if caused unintentionally, the proper recitations and rituals are capable of appeasing angry gods and reversing misfortune. The psychological impact of magic on the client was a crucial factor in its effectiveness.

Magic as theory

There was a well-established Mesopotamian literary tradition of the righteous sufferer, who complains about his unfortunate and unmerited fate:

As I turn around, it is terrible, it is terrible,
 My ill luck has increased, and I do not find the right.
 I called to my god but he did not show his face,
 I prayed to my goddess, but she did not raise her head.
 The diviner with his inspection has not got to the root of the matter,
 Nor has the dream priest with his libation elucidated my case.

⁵⁴ Translation Abusch 2002: 12 (= BRM 4 18).

⁵⁵ Sumerian and Akkadian writings tend to designate abstract notions in concrete imagery, so that the 'evil tongue' serves as a metaphor for gossip and slander, while the 'evil eye' suggests envy of others, both of which were regarded as pernicious and needed to be countered through magical means. The details, however, are more complex than this statement suggests. Although incantations frequently call for the 'evil tongue (*lišānu lemnu*) to stand aside', the more precise Akkadian word for 'gossip' (*egirru*), which can be either good or bad, is the same term used for 'kledon' in oracle contexts. Although references to the 'evil eye' in Akkadian are relatively uncommon, one incantation refers specifically to the 'restless evil eye' which brings trouble and evil through its look (Schramm 2008: 54-56). Far more common in Mesopotamian magic, however, is the 'evil face' (*pānu lemnu*) as the purveyor of paranoid anxiety, performing a similar function to the evil eye of other societies (see Geller 2003).

⁵⁶ See Laessøe 1955: 101, for an opinion regarding the date of fixing the canonical text of Šurpu.

I sought the favour of the *zaqīqu*-spirit, but he did not enlighten me,
And the incantation-priest with his ritual did not appease the divine wrath against me.⁵⁷

This plea of the righteous sufferer highlights one of the dilemmas of the Mesopotamian cosmos, namely explaining what causes bad luck. Because illness was arguably the most commonly attested form of human misery, medicine and magic formed complementary strategies for treating sickness and disease.

One main difference between Mesopotamian medicine and its counterparts in both Greece and Egypt is the lack of any elaborated theory; for instance, there is no Akkadian healing principle comparable to the theory of four humours.⁵⁸ One reason for this is that Mesopotamian medicine (whether practiced by exorcist or physician) relied upon magic for its theoretical basis. Magic offered acceptable explanations for causes of disease which a patient could easily comprehend, as mentioned above: profound feelings of guilt expressed as divine anger, or paranoid fear of unseen or unknown aggressors (witches), or simply fear of random harm (demons). Specially feared was the ghost who whispers into the ear of his victim, thereby causing neurotic or psychotic states (Scurlock 2006: 14). While medicine tried to alleviate the symptoms and distress of disease, magic was required to elucidate the nature and causes of illness, in the form of petulant gods, havoc-causing demons, vengeful ghosts, or simply nature herself in the form of snakes, scorpions, or rabid dogs, all of which had to be treated with magical incantations and rituals. This partly explains the complementary character of Mesopotamian magic and medicine.

Historians of medicine often comment on the fact that Mesopotamian medicine was heavily dependent upon magic, although the interdependence tends to be misunderstood. The presence of incantations within medical prescriptions does not imply that magic and medicine were indistinguishable and that medicine should simply be classified as ‘therapy’. The vague or simplistic imagery, general brevity, and banal motifs of many ‘medical’ incantations (i.e. occurring within prescriptions) compare badly with the formal Sumerian-Akkadian incantations of Mesopotamian magic. Medical incantations are often mumbo-jumbo, pseudo-Sumerian, or simply jejune spells typical of folk magic (see Collins 1999). Within the medical corpus, the stereotypical dialogue between Ea and Marduk (Enki and Asalluhi) is hardly ever to be seen, as well as the standard listing of demons (i.e. *utukku*-demons, ghosts, bailiff-demons, evil gods, etc.), which is so prominent within formal magic. In fact, the general character of incantations within the magical and medical corpora is so diverse that it appears likely that respective incantations were composed under completely different conditions and by different practitioners. Here is an example of a medical incantation:

Incantation. Who will heal the eye of the lad which is sore, the eye of the maiden, or the eyes of the lad and maiden?
You send (a message) and they send you pure date-palm heart, which you break up with your mouth and twist in your hand,
You bind up the lad and maiden at their temples (with it) and both lad and maiden will get better. Incantation spell.⁵⁹

Since incantations such as these add relatively little to the medical prescriptions, which can consist of complex procedures involving many different types of applied *materia medica*, we are often left wondering how and why such medical incantations were thought to enhance the treatment. This type of incantation is very different from the elaborate healing incantations to be found in UH.

Nevertheless, magic can be considered the touchstone for divine intervention within human affairs, especially when concerning disease and illness. In the same way that magic is an avenue for communicating with gods, incantations provide something of the numinous in medical prescriptions. The question remains whether the medical incantations were intended for the patient or for the physician, since there is little evidence that a patient either could or would have read a prescription. The two obvious possibilities are either that the physician recited the incantation on the patient’s behalf, or that the incantations were intended for the physician himself, to bolster his courage by convincing himself that his treatments had divine backing and approval, since there was little scientific knowledge to rely upon for sup-

⁵⁷ See Lambert 1960: 38-39, ll. 2-9.

⁵⁸ The absence of any such statement in Akkadian does not necessarily prove the lack of theory, since theoretical treatises were not part of the literary canon. We may still yet discover hints of theoretical thinking hidden within Mesopotamian *Listenwissenschaften*.

⁵⁹ Translation from the cuneiform text of BAM 510 iv 2-3 and duplicates, BAM 513-514, also edited and translated by Collins 1999: 220-221.

port.⁶⁰ Although from our perspective the use of magic diminishes the rational aspects of medical treatment, even Greek medicine was not immune from recognising divine influence on the healing arts, since no less than Galen recognised divine aspects of medicine (cf. Schiefsky 2007).

Healing, however, is not the only social function which is impacted by magic, since magic also overlaps significantly with liturgy, especially within a genre of Mesopotamian texts known as ‘incantation prayers’ (cf. Mayer 1976 and Lenzi 2011: 24-35). We now turn to the thorny problem of how to distinguish between two similar forms of approaches to the divine.

Incantation prayer, individual voice

The difference between an incantation and a prayer is not always easy to detect within Mesopotamian texts, except for a formal distinction that incantation literature belonged to the exorcist, while liturgy was the province of the *kalû*, another temple functionary who was responsible for prayers, a genre known as *kalûtu* (Lenzi 2011: 56). A second variant is a contextual one, since temple liturgy, presumably recited on a daily basis to accompany offerings, usually takes the form of hymns designed to praise the deity (*ibid.* 12). To our surprise, even as late as in Seleucid Babylonia these temple prayers continued to be recited in a liturgical dialect of Sumerian known as Emesal, which is not the Sumerian of incantation literature (see Maul 1988: 4-8 ; Gabbay 2014: 15-35); many of these prayers consisted of laments and penitential psalms aimed at appeasing an angry god, which resemble the aims of incantations. Akkadian also served as the second language of liturgy, providing a vernacular voice for penitence with the main theme being admissions of guilt, even if the exact nature of the sin is unknown to the penitent; the line between prayer and incantation in this context remains far from clear.⁶¹ The same can be said for another common genre known as *šuilas*, often referred to as incantation prayers, which even allow for naming the penitent by referring to him as ‘So-and-So’, with the actual personal name to be inserted when the prayer is recited. A *šulla*-prayer is regularly addressed to an individual god of high rank, usually as a petition for divine intercession.⁶² Although *šulla*-prayers were originally composed in Emesal Sumerian, presumably by the *kalû*-priest for liturgical purposes, they were later adapted to literary Sumerian and more commonly to Akkadian, probably this time by the exorcist; this points to language and dialect as factors distinguishing liturgy from incantations.⁶³ A second distinction is also a formal one, namely that incantations always open with the Sumerian-logogram label ÉN (‘incantation’), and often end with a formal Sumerian rubric, KA.INIM.MA ŠU.ÎL.LÁ + divine name, ‘šulla-incantation of DN’.⁶⁴ Technically, any composition with these formal characteristics should be considered as an incantation rather than a prayer, since they are used in conjunction with rituals and on special occasions, rather than serving as hymns to be recited on a regular basis throughout the calendar year.

Prayer approaches the deity through praise, acknowledging divine authority and human dependence. Incantations employed divine praise as a legitimate strategy for achieving divine favour, but usually identifying specific problems (e.g. demonic attack, disease, suffering, etc.) or special needs, e.g. blessing the brick mould for building a shrine or temple, or recitations accompanying mouth-washing and hand-washing rituals,⁶⁵ protective amulets, or rituals against

⁶⁰ See, for example, in a long and complicated text dealing with amulet stones to be collected in a leather bag, the practitioner is given a number of incantations to recite either three or seven times over the amulet stones before they are to be hung around the patient’s neck, although it is not clear who actually recites the incantation. It may seem logical to assume that the healer does the reciting, but in one instance a magical text clearly states, ‘You make a gift / payment to the incantation priest’, in which ‘you’ can only refer to the patient; for the text, see Schuster-Brandis 2008: 247-264 (No. 6).

⁶¹ See van der Toorn 1985: 117-124, discussing two types of Akkadian prayers known as *šigû* and *dingiršadabbû* prayers, both of which seeking to appease angry gods on behalf of penitent sinners. The important characteristic of the prayers is their context, since they were recited in conjunction with sympathetic magical rituals on certain propitious days, reflecting the professional interests of the exorcist rather than the *kalû*-liturgist.

⁶² See Lenzi 2011: 25ff. Formal Sumerian-Akkadian bilingual compositions do not normally refer to the potential client as ‘So-and-so’ (with the proper name to be supplied during recitation), which indicates a basic difference in how these texts were perceived.

⁶³ I.e. Emesal Sumerian representing liturgy on one extreme with Akkadian ‘prayers’ on the opposite end of the spectrum.

⁶⁴ Incantations within the medical corpus add another common feature, namely a final logogram *tu,én*, ‘incantation-spell’.

⁶⁵ ‘Mouth-washing’ rituals could be used with royal rituals (inaugurating a king), as well as with a divine image, which had its mouth washed before giving an oracle, but a person would also have his mouth cleansed before reciting penitential incantations or even a *namburbî*-incanta-

ghosts,⁶⁶ and numerous other occasions. In both liturgy and magic, the goal is to achieve divine favour, although the precise means and literary structures can differ considerably.

Magic and divination

Another sphere in which magic plays a key role is in the field of divination, although not in the way often thought. Divination itself has no connection *per se* with magic, since the influence of the gods over oracles and divination bears no resemblance to their magical powers. Divination is the means of processing warnings about the future, and omens are meant to be interpreted by humans in order to conform to divine will. The most common form of state divination consisted of examining the liver of a sheep or goat, usually to determine major future events affecting king and country, such as war, pestilence, or famine, although terrestrial omens drawn from household events (e.g. the presence of a snake or scorpion) were probably relevant to ordinary persons as well as inhabitants of the palace. The typical pattern of such omens was casuistic, ‘if x, then y may happen’, and this is where magic comes in. When faced with an ominous prediction, a person could resort to a special type of magic, known as a *namburbî* ritual and incantation, which were designed to avert a bad forecast or omen. The *namburbî* magic clearly shows that omens were predicated on probabilities and were not predetermined outcomes, since the predictions and forecasts could be effectively annulled through a magical *namburbî* countercharm (see Maul 1994 on *Löserituale*).

The many facets of Mesopotamian magic are not easily summarised, because each of the numerous magical rituals and incantations have their own specific characteristics and functions which do not necessarily resemble other aspects of the broad spectrum of magical instruments at the disposal of the exorcist. Many of these activities are unique to Mesopotamia and hence not easily comparable to magical practices from elsewhere in the ancient world, although it may be the case that Mesopotamian magic was arguably the best documented system of magic which we have from antiquity; many of the same practices from other regions may have simply escaped our notice, having not been recorded in a legible manner on durable materials.

tion negating bad omens occasioned by the sighting of a snake. See Walker and Dick 2001: 10-11 and Ambos 2013.

⁶⁶ Some magical rituals involving ghosts are quaintly picturesque, such as an anti-slander ritual consisting of a model boat and two sets of seven tongues and figurines, all made from clay from both river banks, which are then floated downriver (to the Netherworld), accompanied by appropriate anti-slander spells; cf. Scurlock 1995: 95.

Chapter Three

Udug-hul as Healing Arts

There is a logic behind UH incantations being published within *Die Babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen*, a series of volumes created by F. Köcher devoted primarily to medical texts. Many tablets copied by Köcher within the BAM volumes were described by him as ‘magisch-medizinisch’,⁶⁷ reflecting the rather hazy border separating therapeutic medicine from theurgic magic (see Abusch-Schwemer 2011). There is ample evidence within UH demonstrating that these particular incantations were not designated for use to counter general malaise, misfortune, or simply bad luck, but rather to assist a victim or a patient who suffers from ill-health or disease. This feature of UH is borne out by the specific reference to illness within these incantations, in contrast to other major incantation compositions, such as Šurpu or Maqlû. Below is a selection of passages in which the demonic victim is, in fact, a patient (lû-tu-ra or gig // *maršu*):

UH 2: 61	may the <i>patient's</i> illness depart from him
UH 3: 47-48	evil spell, hex, magic, evil practices which are found in the <i>patient's</i> body
UH 3 63	(a demon) attacking the limbs is in the <i>patient's</i> body
UH 3 128	the <i>patient</i> whom Fate has seized, upon whom the Asakku (causes) stroke
UH 5: 43	Asakku, you are not to approach the <i>patient</i> whom you (normally) approach
UH 6: 35-36	(addressed to the evil demon) you are not to approach the <i>patient</i> or return to the <i>patient</i>
UH 7: 123	Fate who dwells in the house of your <i>patient</i>
UH 12: 157-158	(incantations are recited) so that the Lord (i.e. Marduk) might improve the (<i>patient's</i>) limbs and learn about the <i>patient</i>
UH 13-15: 77	the Seven (i.e. Sibitti) are not to approach the <i>patient</i>
UH 13-15: 132-133	With the effective incantation (the exorcist) placed (the date-palm fronds) on the <i>patient's</i> head, he bound up the limbs of that man, son of his god.
UH 13-15: 157	as for the <i>patient</i> whom Fate seized and Asakku bound
UH 13-15: 215	(the <i>materia magica</i>) (all) cleanse the <i>patient</i> (see also l. 219)
UH 13-15: 235	they noticed and approached the <i>patient</i> son of his god ⁶⁸

The description of the victim as patient also occurs within incantation rubrics in Tablet 13-15:

UH 13-15: 94	(incantation rubric): incantation for putting <i>e'ru</i> -wood (sceptre) on the <i>patient's</i> head
UH 13-15: 121	(incantation rubric): incantation for putting black <i>kiškanû</i> -wood (sceptre) on the <i>patient's</i> head
UH 13-15: 144	(incantation rubric): incantation for binding a young date-palm on the <i>patient</i>
UH 13-15: 166	(incantation rubric): Udug-hul incantation for binding date-palm fronds on the <i>patient's</i> limbs
UH 13-15: 182-3	(incantation rubric): Udug-hul incantation for placing hair of a virgin lamb and hair of a virgin kid around the <i>patient's</i> bed
UH 13-15: 231	(incantation rubric): Udug-hul incantation for fumigating the <i>patient</i> (also l. 270)

Moreover, in the same tablet the ritual instructions specifically refer to the victim as patient:

UH 13-15: 198	(ritual instruction) set up (a reed hut) at the <i>patient's</i> bed
UH 13-15: 245	(ritual instruction) fumigate the <i>patient</i> beside his bed from head to foot
UH 13-15: 248	(ritual instruction) you approach the <i>patient's</i> bed
UH 13-15: 252	(ritual instruction) you strike the <i>patient's</i> bed

⁶⁷ BAM V, note to No. 437 (p. xiii), *et passim*, and Köcher also described many texts as addressing the effects of witchcraft and magic or even the ‘Folgen von Zaubermanipulation’ (BAM IV, note to No. 33 p. xii), the ‘hand of the ghost’, and other causes which could be ascribed to the realm of *āšipūtu*. Elsewhere, Köcher refers to the use of amulet-stones as ‘Verwendung in der magisch-medizinischen Behandlungspraxis’ (BAM IV, note to No. 344, p. xiii). It is clear from Köcher’s descriptions that his view of the medical corpus as published in BAM included many texts which relate to magic (e.g. *ušburruda*-texts) rather than limiting the medical corpus to prescriptions which only treated physical illness and symptoms, without reference to magic.

⁶⁸ This specific example is instructive, since the expression lû-tu-ra dumu dingir-ra-na // *marši mār ilišu* replaces the common designation of the demonic victim as lû-u₁₈-lu dumu dingir-ra-na // *amēlu mār ilišu*, ‘man son of his god’.

In a similar vein, the third tablet of UH concerns itself with the exorcist visiting the patient at home to offer a medical examination:

UH 3: 10-16

When I approach the *patient*,
 when I entered the *patient's* house,
 my hand was present at his head
 and I studied the sinews of his limbs.
 When I cast the Eridu spell,
 when I cast the spell over the *patient*,
 may the good genius be present at my side.

This passage is reiterated a bit later on in the same tablet,

UH 3: 103-107

When I go to the *patient*,
 when I push open the door of the [house],
 when I call out at his gate,
 when I cross the threshold,
 when I enter the house ...

See also

UH 3: 111-112

when I approach the *patient*, and lay my hand on the *patient's*
 head, may the good spirit and good genius be present at
 my side.

The exorcist also describes his own healing abilities:

UH 3: 84-85

In order to cure the *patient* of his illness, the great lord Ea has
 sent me.

UH 3: 125

I am the incantation priest who heals the land

UH 3: 129-137

when I approach the *patient*,
 when I study the *patient's* flesh,
 and when I examine his limbs,
 when I sprinkle the 'water of Ea' on the *patient*,
 when I frighten the *patient*,
 when I slap the *patient's* cheek,
 when I call out over the *patient*,
 when I cast the Eridu incantation,
 may the good spirit and good genius be present at my side.

And finally, 'Wherever I go, may I be safe, may the man whom I touch be well' (UH 3: 187-188).

The exorcist also takes pains to ensure his own safety while approaching the patient, and he repeats the following formulae which are designed to protect the exorcist from the same demons who preside over a patient's illness (UH 2: 12-18):⁶⁹

⁶⁹ It should be emphasised that there is no reference in this passage to contagion from disease, i.e. that the exorcist who treats an ill patient, such as for fever, might contract the same illness. The notion of disease contagion arrives relatively late within the history of medicine, while the Babylonians considered disease to be spread not by the disease itself but by the *causes* of disease, namely demons, who were by their very nature impure.

Whatever evil, whatever is not favourable, whatever is not good (for me), whatever is not in order,
 which is (aimed) at my unwell flesh or unfit body,
 which is (aimed) at my unwell or abnormal belly –
 by the command of Ea will I drive you out.

Marduk sent me, so that the window may block terrors, so that whatever is evil and whatever is not good in your
 body, flesh, or sinews may get out.

May the wise leader, exorcist of the gods, uproot that illness, may Asalluhi son of the sage Ea remove (it) from
 your body.

And in the following tablet (UH 3: 18-25):

‘Evil Utukku, Alû, ghost, Sheriff-demon, god, and bailiff-demon,
 – they are evil!

May they not approach my body,
 nor harm my face,
 nor walk behind me,
 nor enter my house,
 nor clamber up to my roof,
 nor enter my living-room.’

The exorcist also needs to protect his own environment, after having treated the patient (UH 3: 73-76):

may evil ones not approach my body;
 may they not cause harm to my face,
 may they not go behind me, nor enter my house,
 and may they not clamber up to my roof, nor slip into [my] living room.⁷⁰

And again (UH 3: 93-97):

May the Fate-demon (Namtar), ‘sacrilege’ (*asakku*)-disease, magic rites, or
 [whatever] evil [(magical) practices],
 be removed from the distraught man’s body.
 May they not approach my body (as well) but stand aside,
 nor may they follow behind me.

At one point, the exorcist actually identifies himself with Marduk, and in fact Marduk (in his own role as exorcist) also
 seeks divine protection while healing the patient (UH 3 165-177):⁷¹

70 The same message is repeated later on in UH 3: 153-162:

I am holding Anu’s exalted *e’ru*-wood scepter in my hand;
 I am holding the date-palm frond of the major rituals in my hand.
 May they not approach my body,
 may you not cause harm to my face,
 nor may they go behind me.
 May they not follow the tracks of where I stand
 You may not stand where I stand,
 nor may you sit where I sit,
 may you not go where I go,
 nor enter where I enter.

71 The exorcist’s identification with Marduk is reinforced elsewhere in UH but most clearly in UH 10 and 11, in which he declares, ‘I am Mar-
 duk’.... However, references to Marduk as the exorcist *par excellence*, sent by Ea, occur repeatedly in UH, as in UH 6: 28-36:

I am the incantation priest and high-priest of Ea,
 the lord (who) sent me,
 the prince of the Apsû (who) commissioned me.
 You (demons) must not clamour behind me,
 nor may you shout behind me,

He who calms and soothes everything, who soothes everything with
 his incantation,
 the great lord Ea who calms and soothes everything, who soothes everything
 with his incantation,
 when I approach the patient, he soothes everything.
 I am the exorcist born in Eridu,
 I am the one spawned in Eridu and Ku'ar.
 When I approach the patient,
 may Ea, lord of the Apsû, protect me.
 May the standard of the purification priest of Eridu
 be present both before and behind me.
 May [.....] protect me.
 May Ningirimma, sister of Anu, be present on my right.
 May Namma, lady of the pure laver, be present on my left.
 May Marduk, son of Eridu, ward off this illness, and introduce a
 substitute (figurine).⁷²

In addition to 'patient', another designation of the victim of demons was the 'distraught man' (lú-u₁₈-lu pap-hal-la // *amēlu muttalliku*), which implies someone suffering from psychic distress or angst who constantly walks around (*mut-talliku*) because he finds no comfort. There is no doubt that the distraught man is also a patient suffering from physiological as well as psychic illness (UH 3: 36-45):

(Demons) have approached the distraught man,
 they deposited 'sacrilege' (*asakku*)-disease in his body.
 Since there was (already) an evil oath in his body,
 they deposited harmful blood in his body.
 Since a bad fate was (already) in his body,
 they deposited harmful poison in his body.
 Since an evil curse was (already) in his body,
 they deposited the bad effects of sin in his body.
 Since the poison of iniquity was (already) upon him,
 they wrought evil.

Other statements within UH reinforce the same idea: '(may the demons) be removed from the body of the distraught man' (UH 3: 94). In some the patient's discomfort is attributed to his being spattered with bile (UH 7: 5-8):

As for the distraught man whom (demons) paralysed like a storm and sprinkled him with bile,
 that man is constantly out of breath, he churns (within) like a wave.
 He can eat no food nor drink any water,
 and he has been spending the day in woe.

Similar physical symptoms are associated with the 'distraught' patient, such as the statement that (the Alû demon) 'trapped the distraught man, destroyed his limbs and made his jaw twitch' (UH 12: 31-32). There is little doubt that disease is afflicting the 'distraught man', despite the fact that the demonic victim is referred to as either 'man' (lú-u₁₈-lu // *amēlu*), or 'man son of his god' (lú-u₁₈-lu dumu dingir-ra-na // *amēlu mār ilīšu*), both expressions being neutral in regard to disease and cannot be translated as 'patient'.

you, O evil one, must not seize me,
 nor must you, evil Utukku-demon, seize me.
 You must not approach the patient,
 nor may you return to the patient.

72 Cf. also UH 3: 193-194, 'Marduk is the one who keeps me well, may wherever my path is be safe.'

Nevertheless, there are other reasons for assuming that the basic problem which UH intends to address is illness, rather than general misfortune, judging by the following explicit references to disease:

aphasia and seizure (UH 3: 50-53):

The evil activities which bind the mouth,
the evil spells which seize the tongue,
and epilepsy, the evil deity
head straight for that man on the high street.

pain, infection, 'jaundice' (UH 3: 141-42):

evil Fate (Namtar), dangerous 'sacrilege' (*asakku*)-disease, magic rites, illness
not improving, evil rites,
headache, chills, cramp, weakness, infection, jaundice,

symptoms of psychological distress (UH 7 34-40):

(The demon) approached that man and touched his hand,
and chased after him, went to his house,
and made him neglect (Sum. they destroyed) his body (lit. limbs).
His eyes are open, but he sees no one,
his ears are open, but he hears no one.
That man is miserably depressed by the hand of Fate (Namtar)
the *asakku*-disease has overwhelmed him gravely (lit. bitterly).

general illness (UH 13-15: 184-186):

The extended heavens have summoned illness to the land,
and to the limbs of mankind.
An illness pertaining to man is a physical illness which burns like fire.

Moreover, the Akkadian composition *Marduk's Address to the Demons* (UH Tablet 11) significantly adds to the bilingual evidence above, since references to diseased patients is a dominant motif in this text, which refers to demons (UH 11: 25-36):

who constantly stand before a patient (LÚ.GIG)
Or who constantly sit before a patient,
Or who constantly walk before a patient,
Or who eat with him when he eats,
Or who drink with him when he drinks,
Or who constantly frighten the so-and-so patient,
Or who constantly scare the so-and-so patient,
Or who constantly terrify the so-and-so patient,
Or who constantly obstruct before a patient,
Or who constantly wrinkle the nose before a patient,
Or who bare the teeth before a patient,
Or who constantly sit before a patient.

These phrases represent an expansion of a common UH theme, that demons are present when the patient eats, drinks, dresses, or anoints himself (e.g. see UH 4: 158'-169'). The problem however is medical, not just some general notion of misfortune, caused by demons who surround the victim in his or her daily life.

Exorcist as diagnostician

The exorcist's role in UH as diagnostician (see above) raises the question regarding the relationship between UH incantations and the *Diagnostic Handbook*, which belongs to the genre of *mašmaššūtu* / *āšipūtu* 'exorcism' rather than strictly to medicine. The *Diagnostic Handbook*, for the most part⁷³ a lengthy listing of all medical prognostic and diagnostic symptoms, much of which is organised from head-to-foot, was no doubt useful for the *asû*-physician / apothecary, but it is clear from colophons that the text resulted from the work of the exorcist (in this case known by the Sum. logogram KA.PIRIG), who was the healer assigned to visit the patient at home, to determine the nature and extent of the disease. It is well established from *Diagnostic Handbook* incipits and colophons that the one who attends to the patient at home, either to diagnose his illness or offer a prognosis, is an exorcist: *e-nu-ma* (var. UD-*ma*) *ana* É GIG KA.PIRIG GIN-*ku*, 'when the KA.PIRIG-exorcist goes to the patient's house' (Labat 1951: 2, 6, Heeßel 2001-02: 28). Might this KA.PIRIG be the same exorcist or have a similar role as the exorcist whose voice is heard in UH 3, speaking in the first person about his own experience in visiting the patient at home? Some evidence relating UH to the *Diagnostic Handbook* can be found in a unique Assur bilingual incantation (VAT 8803 = KAR 31):

- 1 [én g]á-e lú-kin-gi₄-a dingir gal-gal-e-ne me-en
[ma]r šip-ri ša DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ *ana-ku*
- 2 [den-k]i^dasal-lú-hi gal-bi á mu-un-da-an-ág
[d]é-a ù^d *marduk gal-iš ú-ma-'a-i-ru-in-ni*
- 3 tu₆-tu₆-šè al-du ki silim-ma šu-mu uš-en
i-na šip-ti al-lak a-šár šu-ul-me qa-ti um-mad
- 4 tu₆ kù-ga-bi ka-mu-ta mu-un-da-gál
ši-pat-su-nu KÛ-tu na-šá-ku ina pi-ia
- 5 ^dutu-u₁₈-lu ur-sag dingir-re-e-ne-ke₄
^dNINNU-urta qar-rad DINGIR.MEŠ
- 6 ^dnin-girimma gašan tu₆-bi nam-ti-la-ke₄
^dMIN *be-el-tu₄ šá tu-ú šá ba-la-tu*
- 7 igi egir zi-da á gùb-bu-da
pa-na ar-ka im-na u šu-me-la
- 8 lú hul ba-an-sar-re-eš ki-ús-sa-mu ùri ak-eš
lem-na i-ṭār-ra-du i-na-ša-ru kib-si
- 9 igi gal₅-lá ki-kúr-šè ba-an-gar-re-eš
pa-an gal-le-e ana áš-ri šá-nim-ma i-šak-ka-nu
- 10 ki nam-ti-la-ke₄ á-mu-ta ba-an-gub-bu-uš
i-na qaq-qar ba-lá-ṭi i-da-a-a iz-za-az-zu
- 11 an-ta ki-ta ki silim-ma ba-ra-ab-gá-gá-aš
e-liš u šap-liš a-šár šu-ul-mi iš-ku-nu
- 12 tu₆ kù-ga-bi ba-ra-ab-sum-mu-uš
ši-pat-su-nu KÛ-tu₄ id-di-nu-nim-ma
- 13 inim mu-un-da-ab-du₁₁-ga-aš an-da-ab-ak-a me-en
a-mat i-qab-bu-u-ni ep-pu-uš
- 14 nam-mah-e-ne pa-è-ak me-en
nàr-ba-šu-nu ú-šá-pi-ma
- 15 udug sig₅-ga ^dlamma sig₅-ga hé-en-da-su₈-su₈-ge-eš
še-ed dum-qí la-mas-si dum-qí lit-tal-la-ku it-ti-ia
- 16 a-lá maškim ^dlugal-ùr-ra an-ta-šub-ba-ta šub-ba sag-hul-ha-za
- 17 lú hul lú-ra lú-lú-šà-šè lú-šà-a
lem-nu ka-mu-ú hab-bi-lu šag-gi-šú

73 Excluding the first two tablets, which are similar to terrestrial omens.

- 18 ^dnam-tar lú hul nu-du₁₀-ga ba-an-gub-ba
^dMIN šá le-mut-ti u la ʔa-ab-ti iz-za-az-zu
 rev.
- 19 níg-nam su lú-ka gál-la un-kalam-ma ba-ab* *coll.
 mim-ma šum-šú šá ina zu-mur ni-ši šak-nu-ma ni-iš ma-a-ti
 ú-na-áš-šá-ru
- 20 sil₇-lá sil₇-lá bad-rá bad-rá gaba-zu tu-lu-ub
 pu-ʔur^d ʔup-pir i-si re-e-qí i-rat-ka ne-ʔe
- 21 šu-zu tùm-ma-ab gír-zu zì-ga-ab
 ta-bal qat-ka u-su-uh še-ep-ka
- 22 ki-kúr-šè gen-na* a-ga-zu-šè gi₄-bí-ib *coll.
 a-na áš-ri šá-nim-ma at-lak ana ár-qí-ka tu-ur* *coll.
- 23 sil₇-lá igi-mu-ta sil₇-lá egir-mu-ta
- 24 sil₇-lá ázi-da-mu-ta sil₇-lá á gùb-bu-mu-ta
- 25 an-ta ki-ta nam-mu-un-DU-nigin-e
 e-liš u šap-liš e ta-as-sah-ra
- 26 gá-e lú-kin-gi₄-a ^den-ki ^dasal-lú-hi me-en
 mar šip-ri šá ^dé-a u ^dmarduk ana-ku
- 27 mu-pad-da-bi-šè záh-ab
 ana zi-kir šu-me-šú-nu na-ár-qí
- 28 zi ^dutu-u₁₈-lu ní ù-bí-ta nam-mu-un-da-te-gá-e-dè
 ni-iš ^dMIN pi-làh-ma la te-ʔe-eh-ha-a
-
- 29 ka-inim-ma gal₅-lá maškim ^dlugal-ùr-ra sag-hul-ha-za a-lá hul
 an-ta-šub-ba mim-ma šum-šú ana MAŠ.MAŠ NU TE-e
-
- 30 DÙ.DÙ.BI^{sim.d}MAŠ NITA u MUNUS SÚD ina LÁL u Ì.NUN.NA HI.HI
- 31 e-nu-ma ana LÚ.GIG te-ʔè-eh-hu-ú ra-man-ka DIŠ-niš ŠÉŠ-ma
 ana LÚ.GIG te-hi mim-ma lem-nu NU TE-ka

colophon:

LIBIR.RA.BI.GIM SAR BA.AN.È

ŠU^{md}Na-bi-um-be-sun

DUMU^{md}Ba-ú-šuma(MU)-ib-ni MAŠ.MAŠ É kiš-šú-ti

tābil(TŪM) ʔuppi(IM) šuāti(BI) ^dnabû u ^dnisaba EN.MEŠ È-mu-um-me

ʔu-mu-mi-iš i-šim-mu-šu

- 1 [Incantation]. I am the messenger of the great gods,
 Ea and Marduk have instructed me comprehensively.
 In (my) incantation, I will go where I encounter safety.⁷⁴
 I orally render their pure incantation.
- 5 Ninurta, hero of the gods,
 (and) Ningirimma, mistress of the life-giving incantation,
 in front, behind, right and left,
 drive away the evil (and) protect my tracks,
 and direct the Sheriff-demon elsewhere.
- 10 They are present at my side in a healthy place,

⁷⁴ Lit. ‘where I touch my hand to a place of safety’. The Sum. also differs: ‘I go to the incantations, in a safe place (where) I can touch my hand.’

above and below they established a safe haven.

They gave me their pure incantation,

I carry out the words they say.

I made manifest their greatness.

15 May the benevolent spirit and good genius go with me.

As for the Alû, Bailiff-demon, epilepsy, 'falling sickness', stroke, accessory to evil-demon,

villain, felon, robber, murderer,

the Fate-demon, with whom evil and ill-will are present,

rev.

(or) whatever its name (is), which is found in the bodies of people and diminishes the population of the land,

20 disperse, withdraw, step back, be distant, turn your back!

Take your hand and remove your foot,

go somewhere else, turn away,

withdraw from before me, withdraw from behind me,

withdraw from my right side, withdraw from my left side,

25 do not turn aside, either above or below.

I am the messenger of Ea and Marduk:

hide away at the invocation of their names.

Respect the oath of Uta'ulu and do not approach.

Incantation so that the Sheriff-demon, Bailiff-demon, epilepsy, the accessory to evil-demon, the Alû-demon, 'falling illness', and whatever else that should not approach the exorcist.

Its ritual: Grind up male and female *nikiptu*-plant, mix it in honey and ghee,

when you will approach the patient, you first anoint yourself,

(so that) in order to approach the patient, nothing bad will approach you.

(row of 8 triangular holes)

(colophon:)

Written according to its original (source) and checked.

Possession of Nabû-bessun, son of Baba-šuma-ibni, priest of the main temple (of the capital).

As for the one who carries off this tablet, Nabû and Nisaba, lords of the *bīt mummi*,

will decree that he be made dumb.

Towards the end of this short incantation, the exorcist refers again to his role as messenger of Ea and Marduk, and the incantation rubric (crucial for contextualising the text) provides a list of demons and associated diseases (epilepsy, seizure, and stroke) for which this incantation provides protection for the exorcist. In other words, first the exorcist protects himself, then treats the patient, and the incantation acts as a type of oral vaccination against illness. What follows next is a short ritual, in which *nikiptu*-plant, mixed with honey and ghee, is employed as a skin cream (almost like a modern sun-screen) to protect the exorcist, and the ritual instructs the exorcist to rub himself first with this concoction, even before getting near the patient, in order to avoid anything bad happening to *him*,

when you will approach the patient, you first anoint yourself,

(so that) in order to approach the patient, nothing bad will approach you.

The repetition in these two lines is intended to emphasise that proximity to illness can be dangerous for the exorcist as well as for anyone else. Not only is the incantation of KAR 31 similar in many respects to the aims of UH 3, which also instructs the exorcist to protect himself first (before meeting the patient), but the ritual of this unique Assur tablet also resembles a colophon of the second tablet of the *Diagnostic Handbook* (Labat 1951: 18-19, n. 27; Heeßel 2001-02: 37):

DIŠ ana GIG ina TE-ka EN ÉN ana NÍ-ka ŠUB-ú ana GIG NU TE-hi,

‘if you are to approach a patient: until you cast the spell on yourself, you should not approach the patient.’

To return to the question whether the exorcist of UH Tablet 3, who speaks in the first person, is meant to be the same person as the KA.PIRIG-exorcist and diagnostician who features in the *Diagnostic Handbook*, the final clauses in KAR 31 make this connection more plausible, since in all cases the initial task of the exorcist is to protect himself against the demons, before he actually examines the patient. All this explains why the *āšipu* refers to himself as KA.PIRIG (UH 3: 127).

Assyrian Court Memorandum

The relationship between Udug-hul’s *mašmaššu*-exorcist and the KA.PIRIG-exorcist of the *Diagnostic Handbook* is further reinforced by a chance notation appearing in a memorandum from the Assyrian court scholars, SAA 11: No. 156 (= ABL 447), dating from 675 BCE (edition and translation from Fales and Postgate 1995):

- 1 ^mEN-PAP-AŠ
- 2 ^mšal-la-a-a
- 3 an-nu-te 2
- 4 ša li-gìn-nu
- 5 i-qab-bu-ú-ni
- 6 ^mšá-^dPA-šu-ú [la] qur-bu
- 7 dul-lu ina IGI ^mú-ku-me e-ta-mar
- 8 ^{md}MAŠ.ŠU DUMU LÚ.GÚ.EN.NA
- 9 ÉŠ.GÀR ug-da-mir
- 10 si-par-ri AN.BAR šá-kin
- 11 ina É-re-du-te
- 12 ina IGI ^mba-a-nu-ni pa-aq-qid
- 13 dul-lu ina SU.2-šú la-áš-šú
- 14 ^mku-dúr-ru
- 15 ^mku-na-a-a
- 16 UDUG.ḪUL.A.MEŠ
- 17 ug-dam-me-ru
- 18 ṭè-en-šú-nu
- 19 ina IGI ^msa-si-i

rev.

- 1 ^{md}AMAR.UTU-LUGAL-a-ni
- 2 ^msu-la-a-a
- 3 ^mba-la-ṭu
- 4 ^mna-ši-ru
- 5 ^{md}30-ŠEŠ-SUM-na
- 6 ^mri-mu-tu
- 7 ^mAŠ-PAP.MEŠ
- 8 ^mEN-ú-še-zib
- 9 ^{md}PA-LUGAL-PAP.MEŠ-šú
- 10 an-nu-te 9
- 11 ša TA* um-ma-a-ni
- 12 iz-za-zu-ú-ni dul-lu
- 13 ša É LÚ.GIG

- 14 *ep-pa-šu-ú-ni*
 15 ^{md}UTU-SUM-na
 16 ^mpe-er-'u
 17 ^mEN-DÛ-uš
 18 *an-nu-te* 3
 19 *ša a-di ʔup-pi-šú*
 20 *ÉŠ.GÀR ú-gam-ma-ru-ni*

1-2 Bel-aha-iddin, Šallaya,

3-5 these two are reciting from the tablets.

6-7 Ša-Nabû-šû is [not] present. He has been checking on the work assigned to Ukume.

8-13 Ninurta-gimilli, the son of the *šandabakku* has completed the Series and has been put in irons. He is assigned to Banunu in the Succession Palace and there is no work for him at the present.

14 Kudurru and Kunaya have completed 'Evil Demons'. They are at the command of Sasî.

rev

1-9 Marduk-šarrani, Sulaya, Balaʔu, Naširu, Sîn-aha-iddin, Remuttu, Iddin-ahhe, Bel-ušezib, Nabû-šar-ahhešu;

10 these nine have been serving with the scholars and are working on the 'Sick Man's House'.

15-17 Šamaš-iddina, Per'u, Bel-epuš;

18 these three are finishing the Series *according to* its (original) tablet.

The latest discussion of this memorandum (Frahm 2011b: 513), follows earlier opinions which agree that scholars mentioned in this text, including Ninurta-gamil (a better reading of the personal name) and Kudurru, from Nippur and Babylon respectively, were captives (lit. put in irons) in Nineveh and were forced to copy tablets, such as the series Udug-hul. Frahm suggests that this remark reflects the Assyrian hunger for Babylonian culture which was possessed by Babylonian dignitaries. It is far more likely, however, that it was the *tablets* and not the scholars which were being 'put in irons', since handcuffed scholars would hardly be optimal for acquiring copies of literary works; the expression *ÉŠ.GÀR ug-da-mir si-par-ri AN.BAR šâ-kin*, 'the Series was completed and put in iron chains' is much more likely to be a metaphor for the tablets of a series being fixed into a canon, i.e. 'put in irons', thereby excluding any non-canonical textual additions. Furthermore, the only other text aside from UDUG.HUL.A.MEŠ mentioned in this memorandum – being worked on at the same time – was labelled as *ša É LÛ.GIG*, which is a clear and transparent reference to the incipit of the *Diagnostic Handbook* noted above: *e-nu-ma ana É GIG KA.PIRIG GIN-ku*, 'when the KA.PIRIG(-exorcist) goes to the house of the sick man'. The point about this text is that scribes in the NA court were working on two related texts, namely the UH series and the *Diagnostic Handbook*, and it is no coincidence that these two genres are being worked on at the same time. Both texts attest to diagnosis and magical treatment of patients as components of *āšipūtu*, and the thematic similarities of these genres was why both texts were being copied and edited at the same time and place by teams of scholars. The diagnostic duties of the healer visiting the patient at home is reflected in another late bilingual incantation, which reads: *[é-šè ku₄-ra-n]i-t[a gi]z kim-bi nu-un-zu-a // ana É ina e-[re-b]i-šú it-ta-šú ul ú-ta-ad-du*, 'when (the exorcist) enters the house, (the patient's) symptoms (lit. signs) are not (yet) recognised', which is yet another an allusion to diagnostic omens being employed by the exorcist (Schramm 2008: No. 3, 13-14).

Conclusion

One of the puzzles surrounding UH incantations as primarily healing magic is the fact that UH incipits are rarely cited within medical prescriptions, since we might have expected recipes to rely upon UH as a potentially rich source whenever a medical recipe calls for the recitation of an incantation. This is not the case. Although UH incantations are occasionally to be found within other incantations or rituals, it is not usual to find them within medical recipes *per se*, as in the following exceptional case: *[ÉN] UDUG.HUL.A.MEŠ ŠID-nu*, 'recite Udug-hul incantations' (BAM 150: 13, a prescrip-

tion against fever, see also Geller 1985: 5).⁷⁵ So how do we assess UH as a major work of magic and evaluate its role in relation to medical texts? The confrontation between magic and medicine is perhaps the most complicated issue we face in the study of Babylonian healing arts.

One way of attacking this problem is to view the entire genre of magic from the patient's perspective, and for this we can begin with Ludlul (Lambert 1960). The first tablet of Ludlul is about the writer's guilt; he speaks in the first person, and after acknowledging his shortcomings, he sees his own position threatened by enemies everywhere. The second tablet differs markedly from the first: the writer proclaims his innocence but complains about chronic ill-health, which no professional healer or diviner can diagnose or cure. Finally in tablet three, the writer receives the image of Marduk in his dream announcing his cure, reminiscent of the way in which patients in various Aesclepiea were healed through their dreams in Greek contexts. The text of Ludlul provides important clues regarding the end-uses of magical incantations.

There are three major categories into which the formal magical compositions fall, and all can be seen in Ludlul. First is the theme of guilt, which is what the text of Šurpu and associated *ili ul idi* incantations are all about: guilt (see Lambert 1974). The patient admits to his *arnu* and *šertu*, his guilt, even when he does not know exactly what he has done wrong. The next major issue is one of bewitchment and witchcraft, which can encompass all kinds of misfortune, such as loss of money, influence, potency, and other problems, apart from illness and neurotic anxiety. The third major category of magic highlights illness, most often attributed to demons and ghosts; these are the agents most closely associated with disease (both physical and mental) who also generate pathological impurities that can spread between persons. The most complete source for descriptions of such demons and ghosts is UH, and this is also where UH differs from the other major formal incantation texts. UH pays little attention to either personal guilt or witchcraft, but disease in UH is brought about by the purely random and uncontrolled activities of demons and ghosts. Perhaps because of the unpredictable nature of its occurrences, disease was viewed as the most intractable and difficult of human problems, which is also why illness became the focus of such a lengthy and complex magical composition like UH. As the text of UH explains (UH 6: 77-90):

Incantation. As for the evil robber Utukku-demon,
the evil Bailiff-demon, who lurks in the corner,
or the evil ghost and Sheriff-demon who do not sleep,
they are the evil ones who wander about in the city.
They slaughter the cattle in the pen,
they slaughter the sheep in the sheepfold.
They seize the one lying in his wife's room,
having taken the son from the nursemaid's lap.
They murder the father and children together,
and they spear the mother together with children like fish in the water.
They know neither prayer nor supplication,
they harass the man in the street.
Deafness has covered (the victim) and his eyes have become dimmed,
the symptoms of that man are unknown.

⁷⁵ We cannot determine which parts of the very lengthy UH series was prescribed here for recitation against fever, although it should be noted as well that patients in medical texts are normally not advised to recite the full range of Šurpu or Maqlû incantations.

Chapter Four

Text Partitur of Udug-hul

NB All manuscripts from the British Museum and Vorderasiatisches Museum zu Berlin and University Museum have been collated. () indicate sources which do not actually belong to UH but duplicate lines of the text.

Sigla: capital letters = Assyrian script
small letters = Babylonian script

Note that many tablet fragments belong to pieces copied by R. Campbell Thompson in CT 16, and in many cases only the joined tablets are copied.

Udug-hul Tablet 1

* = copied (M)G

A	=	VAT 10144 (previous publication: KAR 34); ll. 38' – 41'; 43' – 53'	pl. 135
*B	=	Rm 2 153; ll. 1' – 4'; 7' – 15'; 39' – 45'	pl. 1
(C)	=	81-7-27, 75 (obv. 9-11 = Muššū'u VIII 103-105); ll. 31' – 37'	pl. 2
*D	=	K 3316 + K 13953; ll. 30' – 40'	pl. 3
*E	=	K 9329 + 9943 + 16350; ll. 47' – 63'; 67' – 68'; 70' – 84'	pl. 4
*F	=	Sm 497 (cited F. Köcher 1966: 20); ll. 48' – 59'	pl. 3
*g	=	CBS 8802 (PBS 12/1 6 ll. 18-22) (extract tablet) [coll. 8-9-87]; ll. 11' – 13'	pl. 5, 136
h	=	CBS 4507 (PBS I/2 116 ll. 11-18) (extract tablet) [coll. 30-9-87] (some signs are now lost on the tablet); ll. 75' – 82'	pl. 139-140
i	=	K 2900 (court. R. Borger); (extract; rev. lex.); ll. 1' - 3' = ll. 19' – 20'; ll. 4'-7' = UH 3 (Ms. y) ll. 51' – 54'	pl. 28
*J	=	Sm 725; ll. 20' – 26'; 64' – 79'	pl. 6
*k	=	BM 35544 (court. I. L. Finkel); ll. 27' – 39'; 69' – 84'	pl. 6
*L	=	K 5155; ll. 5' – 9'	pl. 7
*m	=	BM 35733 (rev. not identified); ll. 48'; 50'; 53' – 63'	pl. 7
(O)	=	K 239 + 2509 + 3261 (previous publication: BAM 489 + BAM 508: 11-17 = AMT 38 iv 11-17, cited Köcher 1966: 19 n. 19); ll. 31' – 37'	
(P)	=	VAT 9305 (previous publication: KAR 20 ii 2-8 = Or NS 40 140); ll. 31' – 37'	
*q	=	BM 50958; ll. 17' – 23'; 29' – 39'	pl. 8
*r	=	BM 48017 (not an UH Ms.); ll. 12' – 16'	pl. 7
*S)	=	BM 134594 (1932-12-12, 589); (includes a ritual); ll. 31' – 33'	pl. 7
(v)	=	K 157 + 2788 2'-5' (previous publication: Or NS 40 140, pl. iii); ll. 32'; 34'; 36'	
(w)	=	BM 45393 + 46277 + 46331 (Qutāru, court. I. L. Finkel); ll. 31' – 37'	

Appendix

a _i	=	CBS 11304 (JCS 31 218-19); ll. 1 – 26; 31 – colophon
b _i	=	BM 38586 (CT 51 142); ll. 1 – colophon

Appendix OB Ms.

c ₁	=	BM 78253 + (= CT 44 33 iii 5 - iv 9'); ll. 1 – 5; 9 – 19; 38 – 43
----------------	---	---

- 1' B [.....]ṣ^ṣ-a
 2' B [.....]ṣ^ṣ-ud
 3' B [.....]ṣ^ṣ-te
 4' B [.....]a]d₆
 B [.....]m]i²-ṣ^ṣtu²

Large GAP

- 5' L [š^u-b]a tag-ga-zu a [.....]
 L [..... ME]š li-pit qat-ka lu-u [.....]
 6' L [..... luga]l-la ^den-bi-lu-lu g[ú-gal dingir gal-gal-e-ne-ke₄]
 L [..... š]ar-ru ^dMIN g[ú-gal DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ]
 7' B ^den-ki-ke₄ en šir-ra ab-ak-dè
 L [..... š]ir-ra ab-ak-dè
 B ^dé-a be-el te-lil-ti
 L ^dé^ṣ-[.....]
 8' B ^dnin-gir-sag gùn-nu ki numun sù-sù
 L [.....]ṣ^ṣgùn^ṣ-nu ki numun [.....]
 B ^dMIN ba-ni-tu₄ šá ze-ra uš-ra-áš-šú
 L [.....-n]i-tu₄ šá ze-r[a]
 9' B sag an-ṣ^ṣè^ṣ mi-ni-in-íl
 L [.....] mi-ni-[.....]
 B [re]-e[š-š]á ki-ma AN-e ul-li
 L [.....-m]a AN-[.....]
 10' B [^dmarduk sa]g an-šè mi-ni-in-íl
 B [^dmarduk ana š]á-[mu-ú] re-šá-a-šú šá-qa-a

Prayer and adjurations

- 1'-4' (broken)
 5' [.....] your ritual act [.....]
 6' [.....] of the lord, Enbilulu, canal-[keeper of the great gods]
 7' Enki, lord of purification
 8' The beautiful Ningirsag, for whom seed causes joy,
 9' raised her head like (Sum. to) heaven.
 10' [Marduk] lifted his head towards heaven.

1'-4' These line fragments are all that remain of the first column of Ms. B, which probably contained the opening incantation of Tablet 1, including the incipit. The opening incantation remains unidentified.

6' Restored after K 9041 (unpub.), a Sumerian unilingual incantation fragment which reads in the first three lines:

én ^den-ki lugal gu-la [.....]

dingir-bi-ne-ne-àm ki-a [.....]

^den-bi-lu-lu gú<gal> dingir-gal-gal-e-n[e]

The god Enbilulu also occurs in UH 2 21 as an epithet for Marduk.

7' The Sum. differs for this line, not associated with purification (Akk. *tēliltu*), but rather that 'Enki performs as master of the song.'

10' Marduk is restored in the translation of this line because of the 3.m.s. suffix, but this is far from certain.

- 11' B [tùr ama]š kù-ga dadag-ga-ke₄
 g [... a]maš kù-ga dadag-ga-ke₄
 B [šá tar-ba-ša su-pu-r]a ul-la-lu ub-ba-bu
- 12' B [.....-g]in₇ mu-un-kar-kar-re
 g [^dnin ga]l ^dutu-gin₇ mu-un-kar-kar-re
 B [.....-m]a ^dUTU i-te-neṭ-ṭi-ru
 g [be-el]-ti GAL-tú šá ki-ma ^dUTU i-te-neṭ-ṭi-ru
 r [.....^dUT]U 'i-te-neṭ-ṭi'-[..]
- 13' B [.....-gi]n₇ mu-un-kar-kar-re
 g [^dnin-in-s]i-na an-ki-gin₇ mu-un-kar-kar-re
 r [..... m]u-un-kar-kar-r[a]
 B [..... A]N u KI i-te-né-eṭ-ṭi-ru₄
 g [^dg]u-la šá GIM AN-e u KI-tì i-te-neṭ-ṭi-ru
 r [..... A]N-e u KI-tì i-te-neṭ-ṭi-[ru]
- 14' B [.....-g]in₇ ma-ra-ab-sikil-la
 r [.....]-ra-ab-sikil-l[a]
- 15' B [.....] 'dadag' lugal 'abzu-ke₄
 r [..... lu]gal abzu-k[e₄]
 B [..... L]U[GAL ap-si-i]
 r [^dé-a mu-n]am-^rmir^r KI-ti 'LUGAL' ABZ[U]
- 16' r [.....] ki-gin₇ 'hé-en-gá^r-[gá-dè]

GAP

- 17' q (traces)
- 18' q [.....] hé-[...]
- 19' q [..... kur-k]ur-ra-ke₄ hé-[bu]
 i šèg-^rna-na^r [.....]
 i zu-un-ni-ku-nu^r 'šá^r [..... ina ma-ta-ti li-in-na-si-ih]
- 20' J níg-^rhul-lu^r-b[i]
 q [.....-gi]n₇ kur-kur-ra-ke₄ hé-b[u]
 i níg-^rhul-lu-bi zi-^rga^r-g[in₇]
 J ki-ma lum-^rnu^r [.....]
 i ki-ma lum-nu šu-ú in-^rna^r-s[i-ih ina ma-ta-ti li-in-na-si-ih]

- 11' She who purifies and cleanses the (cattle)-pen [and fold],
 12' the great [goddess] who, like Šamaš, constantly saves (victims),
 13' [Gula] who, like Heaven and Earth, always saves (victims),
 14' purified (it for you) like [.....].
 15' [May Ea] who brightens earth, lord of the Apsû
 16'-18'
 19' May your rain which [.....] of the lands be removed.
 20' Just like that evil was removed, may it be removed from the lands,

15' Ea is restored in the translation of this line rather than Marduk, who is normally cited as 'chief son of the Apsû' (e.g. UH 2: 30) rather than 'lord of the Apsû'. See UH 13-15: 260, in which Ea is 'king of the Apsû'.

- 21' J níg-hul su lú-^ru₁₈⁷ [lu-ke₄]
 q [.....-l]u-ke₄ he-b[u]
 J lum-ni šá ina zu-mur [a-me-li] li-in-na-si-i[h]
 22' J lú-u₁₈-lu-bi dum[u dingir-ra-na]
 q [..... hé-en-sikil-la] hé-en-dadag-ga
 J a-me-lu šu-ú D[UMU lil-lil li-bi-ib]
 23' J šu sig₅-ga dingir-ra-na-[šè hé-en-ši-in-gi₄-gi₄]
 q [.....-e]n-ši-in-gi₄-g[i₄]
 J a-na ŠU^{II} dam-q[a-ti šá DINGIR-šú lip-pa-qid]

- 24' J én a-^rnam-di ÊN⁷ [.....]
 25' J a-na ^rx⁷ [.....]
 26' J ^ra-na⁷ [.....]

GAP

- 27' k [u]d⁷-ba [.....]
 28' k gim an-n[a]
 29' k gim ud-d[a-.....]
 q [.....] x x
 30' k ina qí-bit ^dr⁷é⁷-[a]
 q [.....]-^ra⁷ ^dUTU ^dmarduk ru-be DINGIR.MEŠ G[AL.MEŠ]
 D [.....] ^rd⁷asal⁷-l[ú-hi]

- 31' k én me-šè ba-^rda⁷-[ri]
 (S) én me-šè [.....] me-šè gu[b]
 (C) [.....] x [.....] ^rigi-na⁷ an-n[a ...]
 q [..... b]a-da-ra ki-šè ba-da-[.....] gu[b]-ba igi-na nu-gub
 D [.....-r]i ki-šè ba⁷-d[a-.....] i[gi-mu nu-^rna -gub⁷
 (O) én me-šè ba-da-ri ki-šè ba-da-záh me-šè gub-ba igi-mu n[u-.....]
 (P) én me-^ršè⁷ b[a-.....] me-^ršè⁷ gub-bé [.....]
 (w) [.. m]e-e-[šè ba-da-ri] ^rki⁷-šè ba-da-záh me-šè ba-gub-ba igi na-an-gub-ba

- 21' (and) may the evil which is in the victim's body be removed.
 22' May that man, son [of his (personal) god, be cleansed] and purified,
 23' may he be entrusted into the benevolent hands of his (personal) god.

- 24' Incantation. I recited the incantation [.....],
 25'-29' (broken)
 30' by the command of Ea, Šamaš, and Marduk, divine prince.

- 31' Incantation. Where do (you) fly? Do (you) flee to earth? Where being present—not present before me?

31' For the incipit me-šè ba-da-ri as an incantation of Muššu'u Tablet 9, cf. Böck 2007: 64-65 (cf. also Köcher, 1966: 17: 19, 22, 26, and Finkel 1991: 100); for Namburbî incantations in which this incipit appears, cf. Maul 1994: 356 7-10. Horowitz (1998: 210-212) attempts to assign cosmological meaning to this incantation but his reading 'ba-da-dal' is contradicted by Ms. q, which reads 'ba-da-ra'. On the other hand, cf. the discussion of im-dal-a (rather than im-ri-a) below, note to UH 13-15: 229.

- 32' k an imin ki imin im ʿimin ʿi[m-]
 (S) [.....] izi imin [.....]
 (C) [.....] gal imin izi imin igi imin bar imin ʿbarʿ-[.....]
 q ʿanʿ imin ki imin im imin im gal imin izi imin igi [imin b]ar imin bar-ta imin bar-ta igi imin
 D [..... iz]i imin igi imin bar imin bar-t[a] igi imin
 (O) an imin ki imin im imin im gal imin izi imin igi imin bar imin bar-ta ig[i]
 (P) [.....] im imin im gal imin [.....]
 (v) an imin ki imin im imin [.....]
 (w) [.. im]in ki imin im imin i[m-..... iz]i imin igi imin bar imin bar-ta imin
- 33' k zi-an-na h[é-...]
 (S) zi-a[n-.....]
 (C) ʿzi-an-na hé-pàʿ-an zi-ki-a hé-p[à-an]
 q zi-an-na hé-pà z[i]
 D [.....] zi ki-a hé-pà
 (O) zi an-na hé-pà zi ki-a hé-p[à]
 (P) zi an-na hé-pà [.....]
 (w) zi an-[.....-p]à zi ki-a hé-pà
- 34' k mušen an-gin₇ [.....]
 (C) ʿmušenʿ a[n-.....]-la
 q [muše]n an-gin₇ ha-ba-dal-[..]
 D [..... h]a-ba-dal-e
 (O) mušen an-gin₇ ha-ba-dal-en
 (P) mušen an-gin₇ ha-ba-dal-[..]
 (V) mušen an-gin₇ ha-ba-dal-[..]
 (w) [.....]-aʿ-gin₇ ha-ba-dal-e[nʿ]
- 35' k i-bí-gin₇ an-n[a]
 (C) i-bí-gin₇ an-na ha-ba-ʿni-e₁₁ʿʔ-[..]
 q ʿiʿ-bí-gin₇ an-na ha-ba-e₁₁-d[è]
 D [.....]-ba-è-dè
 (O) i-bí-gin₇ an-na ha-ba-ni-i[n-....]
 (P) i-[.....]
 (w) [....]-gin₇ an-na ha-ba-r[aʿ-....]-dè
- 36' k muru₉-gin₇ ki-[a] [.....]
 (C) ʿmuru₉-gin₇ ki-a haʿ-ba-ni-in-šub
 q [mu]ru₉-gin₇ ki-a ha-ba-ni-in-[..]
 D [.....]-ba-ni-in-šub
 (O) muru₉-gin₇ ki-a ha-ba-ni-i[n-....]
 (v) muru₉-gin₇ ki-a ha-ba-a[n-.....]
 (P) [.....] ki-a ha-ba-ni-in-šub
 (w) muru₉-gin₇ ki-a [...-b]a-ni-in-šub

32' heaven: 7; earth: 7; wind: 7; gale: 7; fire: 7; front: 7; back: 7; back-to-front: 7.

33' Be adjured by heaven, be adjured by earth.

34' May you (the demon) fly away like a high bird,

35' may you ascend in heaven like smoke.

36' May (the demon) be tossed on the ground like a storm cloud,

35'-36' The line sequence between various manuscripts is not entirely consistent, but this may be because not all the sources for this line originally belonged to UH but contain a duplicating passage which is helpful for the reconstruction of our text.

- 37' k tu₆-du₁₁-ga en-g[al] eridu^{ki}-ga-ta na[m]
 (C) tu₆-du₁₁-ga en-galrd[.....] eridu^{ki}-ga-ta nam-mu-un-da-an-búr-re^rtu₆^r-[én]
 q [...-d]u₁₁-ga en-gal^den-ki-ga-k[e₄]-^rta nam^r-[.....-u]n-da-an-búr-^rte^r-[én]
 D [.....] eridu^{ki} nam-mu-un-da-^rbúr^r
 (O) tu₆-du₁₁-ga en gal^den-ki-[...] eridu^{ki}-ga-ke₄ nam-mu-un-da-an-búr-ra t[u₆-.]
 (P) tu₆-du₁₁-ga en gal^d[.....]
 (w) ^rtu₆^r-[.....^d]^ren-ki-ga-k[e₄] ^ren^r eridu^{ki}-ga-ke₄ nam-mu-un-da-an-búr-re te-én
-
- 38' k én^dasar-alim-nun-na [dumu sag] a kù-ga a sikil-[.....]
 D [.....] eridu^{ki}-ga-ke₄ [.....-l]a a dadag-ga
 q [.....-k]e₄ a si[kil-la] ^ra^r kù-ga a d[adag-ga]
 k ^dmarduk DUMU reš-tu-^rú^r [.....] A.MEŠ eb-b[u-ti]
 D [.....] ša eri₄-du₁₀ A.MEŠ nam-ru-ti
 A (om.) A.MEŠ el-lu-ti A.MEŠ eb-bu-ti A.MEŠ nam-ru-ti
- 39' A a imin a-rá imin^{id}idigna^{id}buranun a ba-ni-sù a ba-[ni]-sikil-la a ba-ni-dadag
 D [.....] ^{id}buranun [.....] ba-ni-in-dadag
 k a imi[n]
 q [.....bura]nun^{rki} [.....-d[adag]
 A A.MEŠ IMIN a-di IMIN A.MEŠ i-di-ig-lat A.MEŠ pu-rat-ti KÙ.MEŠ u[l-li]l-šu ub-bi-ib-šu-ma
 D [.....-la]t A.MEŠ pu-rat-ti [.....]-bi-ib-šu-m[a]
 B [.....] ^rA.MEŠ pu-rat^r-[.....]-^rlil^r-šú ub-bi-ib-š[u-...]
- 40' A maškim hul^rha-ba-ra-è^r-dím bar-ta-bi-šè ha-ba-ra-an-gub
 B ^rmaškim hul ha-ba-ra^r-è bar-ta-bi-šè ha-ba-ra-gub-[ba]
 D [.....]-^rra-è^r [.....]
 A ra-bi-šu lem-nu [li]-ši-ma ina a-ha-ti li-iz-ziz
 B ra-bi-šu lem-nu li-ši-ma ina a-ha-ti li-iz-ziz
- 41' A udug-sig₅-ga^dlamma sig₅-ga hé-en-su-su-ge-eš
 B udug sig₅-ga^dlamma sig₅-ga sag-gá-na hé-en-su₈-ge-eš gá-la na-an-dag-dag-ga
 A UDUG dum-qí^dALAD dum-qí i-da-šú lu ka-a-a-an
 B (om.) ina re-ši-šú lu ka-a-a-an a-a ip-par-ku-u
- 42' B zi-an-na hé-pà zi-ki-a hé-pà
-

37' may (the demon) not be able to dispel the magic formula (coming) from the great lord Enki of Eridu.

Purification incantations

- 38'-39' Incantation. Marduk (Asaralim-nunna), foremost son of Eridu, sprinkle, cleanse and purify him 7 times 7 times with pure water of the Tigris and Euphrates.
- 40' May the evil Bailiff-demon go out and stand aside,
- 41' may the good spirit and good genius be present at his head / side, may they not cease.
- 42' Be adjured by heaven, be adjured by earth.
-

38'-42' These same lines also appear in so-called 'zi-pà-incantations' (see Borger 1969: 9 146-157), which is hardly coincidental, since there are many duplicating passages in zi-pà-incantations and in UH; see already Falkenstein's monumental study (1931: 34-35). Moreover, the catchline of the final known UH tablet (UH 16: 214') reads én dingir hul, which alludes to the incipit of zi-pà-incantations (see below, note to UH 16: 214'). Moreover, the zi-pà-incantation catchline ('lugal nam-tar') also appears in the colophon in one Ms. (BB) of UH 13-15 (see l. 207), reading lugal nam-tar dumu^den-líl-lá; this incipit is also found in 'Gattung II' (Ebeling 1953: 379-380), suggesting some further connections between all these incantations.

- 43 A (om.) ^dasal-lú-hi [... ID]IM ŠU-ka šá TI.LA lu mah-rat
 B én tu₆ sil₇-lá én é-nu-ru ^dasal-lú-hi EN IDIM ŠU-ka šá TI.LA lu mah-rat
- 44' A ^dasal-lú-hi [... É]N T[U₆]-ka lu mah-rat
 B ^dasal-lú-hi EN ÉN TU₆-ka lu mah-rat
- 45' A TU₆-ka IDIM šá ^dé-a EN ERIDU^{ki} TU₆-ka lu mah-rat¹ ÉN
 B TU₆-ka IDIM šá ^dé-a EN eri₄-du₁₀ TU₆-ka lu mah-rat TU₆.ÉN
-
- 46' A ^rtu₆⁷-dug₄ ^dasal-lú-hi A.MEŠ A.AB.BA ta-ma-ti DAGAL-ti
 47' A A.MEŠ ^{id}HAL.HAL A.MEŠ ^{id}pu-rat-ti KÙ.MEŠ
 E ^rA.MEŠ ^{id}[.....]
 48' A šá iš-tu kup-pi a-na ^{kur}ha-šur a-šu-ni
 E šá iš-tu ^rkup-pi ana ^{kur}ha⁷-[.....]
 F šá i[š-.....]
 m [šá i]š-t[u]
 49' A a ^{id}buranun a kù-ga ^{id}buranun
 E ^{id}buranun ^{id}bur[anun]
 F ^{id}bur[anun]
 50' A a dadag-ga me-en a kù-ga ^{id}buranun
 E a kù-ga [.....]
 F a kù-ga ^{id}bu[ranun]
 m [.....] a kù-ga ^{id}bu[ranun]
 51' A A KÙ.GA ^dasal-lú-hi ú-tal-lil GIG
 E A KÙ.GA ^dasal-lú-hi [.....]
 F a kù-ga me-en a sikil-l[a me-en]
 52' A a kù-ga me-en a sikil-la me-en a šen-šen-na me-en
 E a kù-ga m[e-e]n a [sikil-la me-en] a šen-šen-na me-en a [dadag-ga me-en]
 F a kù-ga [.....]

- 43' Incantation. Removal spell. Incantation (Enuru). Asalluhi lord of the source,
 may your hand of life-giving be foremost,
 44' Asalluhi, lord of incantations, may your spell be foremost.
 45' Your spell is the source of Ea lord of Eridu, may your spell be foremost. Incantation-spell.
-

- 46' The spell, Asalluhi, is the water of the seas of wide oceans,
 47' the water of the Tigris, pure water of the Euphrates,
 48' which go out from the well to Mount Hašur,
 49' Euphrates water, pure Euphrates water,
 50' you are the cleanser of water, pure water of the Euphrates,
 51' Asalluhi has cleansed the illness with pure water.
 52' You are purifier of water, cleanser of water, purger of water, you are the filterer of water,

41'. Note variant translations: 'at his side (var. head, may they not cease)'.

45' After l. 45', Ms. B adds a ruling at this point, indicating the end of the incantation, which is not the case in Ms. A.

47' The name ^{id}hal-hal is another name for the Tigris, as is clear from SBTU 2: 5, 6, ^{id}hal-hal-la // i-di-ig-la-at.

50'-52' The order of the last few lines of this incantation differs in all manuscripts, but Mss. A and E are closer to each other than to either Mss. F and m.

- 53' A A KÛ.GA ^dasal-lú-hi ú-tal-lil GIG
 F A KÛ.GA ^dasal-lú-hi ú-ta[l-.....]
 E A KÛ.GA ^{id}BURANUN A K[Û.GA ^dasal-lú-hi] ú-tal-lil mar-ša
 m [.....] ú-tal-lil mar-š[a]
-
- 54' E én a-nam-di A.MEŠ šá ma[š-.....]
 F én a-nam-di A.MEŠ šá maš-maš [.....]
 m én a-nam-di A.MEŠ šá maš-maš DIN[GIR.MEŠ]
- 55' E [t]a-a a-man-nu [.....]
 F ta-a a-man-nu šá ^dmarduk DUMU ^rd[é-a]
 m ta-a a-man-ni šá ^dmarduk [.....]
- 56' F ul-lal É qa-q-a-r[a]
 E ul-lal ^rÉ [.....]
 m ul-lal É qa-q-a-ra [.....]
- 57' F a-nam-di ÉN a-na pa-ṭ[a-ri]
 E a-nam-di É[N]
 m a-nam-di ÉN ana pa-ṭ[a-ri]
- 58' F as-kup-pu šur-bi-ba i-ga-a[p-pu-uš]
 E as-kup-pu š[ur-.....]
 m as-kup-pu šur-bi-b[a]
- 59' E mim-ma lem-nu n[am-.....]
 F ^rmim-ma lem^r-nu nam-maš-ti ^rqa-q-a-r[u]
 m mim-ma lem^r-nu^r nam-maš-ti [.....]
- 60' m ^dALAD ú'-šár-bu-^rú^r [.....]
 E ^dALAD ú'-šár-[.....]
- 61' E GAL₅.LÁ MAŠKIM [.....]
 m GAL₅.LÁ MAŠKIM UDUG H[UL]
- 62' E [L]ÍL.LÁ [.....]
 m ^rLÍL.LÁ^r ^mLÍ[L.LÁ KI.SIKIL.UD.DA.KAR.RA]
- 63' m [.....] x G[EDIM?]
 E [mu]^r²-š[u]

53' Asalluhi has cleansed the patient with pure water.

- 54' Incantation. I cast the waters of the incantation priest of the gods.
 55' I recite the spell of Marduk son of [Ea],
 56' I purify the house-plot
 57' I recite the incantation, in order to break? [the spell].
 58' 'Soften' the lintel; it swells.
 59' Whatever evil, creatures of the land.....
 60' (and) spirits extolled [.....],
 61' Sheriff and Bailiff demons, evil spirit ...
 62' male and female Liliths
 63'

63'ff. The gap can partially be filled by the very broken reverse of Ms. m, which is hardly legible.

Large GAP (see rev. of Ms. m)

- 64' J [.....] x [...]
 65' J [.....] u lik-[-.]
 66' J [.....] ug-giš
 67' J [.....] ṛi-rat-ka
 E [.....] x [.....]
 68' J [....] x lem-nu pa-ra-aš-tin-nu
 E [.....] lem-nu [.....]
 69' J [LÍL.LÁ^{mi}LÍL.LÁ KI.SIKIL.UD.D]A.KAR.RA
 k [.....] x
 70' E ṛa-a i-ṛba-ṛ-i [.....]
 k [.....-l]u-ti
 J [.....] a-me-lu-ti
 71' E [a]-ṛa i-ti-iq [.....]
 k [.....] a-a i-ti-iq
 J [.....]-ṛa i-ti-iq
 72' E [a]-ṛa i-ba-ṛ-i [.....]
 k [..]-ṛa i-ba-ṛ ku-ru-u
 J [.....]-ṛi ku-ru-ú
 73' E [d]up-pir ar-ku pu-ṭu[r]
 k [.....] p]u-ṭur ku-ru-ú
 J [.....] ku-ru-ú
 74' E [d]up-pir šá pa-da-ni pu-ṭu[r]
 k [.....-n]i pu-ṭur šá ṭu-du
 J [.....] šá ṭu-ú-di
 75' E dup-pir šá pa-ni-ia pu-uz-ra a-hu-u[z]
 k [.....]p]u-uz-ra a-hu-uz šá EGIR-ia
 J [.....-u]z šá EGIR-ia
 h ṛpu-ṭur lem-nu šá pa-ni-ia uk-kiš a-a-bi šá ár-[ki-ia]

- 64'
 65'
 66'] angrily?
 67' [..... puts] you to flight,
 68' evil [.....]
 69' May the evil [.....]... *paraštinnu*-demon,
 70' not come along [.... among] mankind,
 71' [maynot] pass by, may [.....] not pass by,
 72' may a dwarf not come along.
 73' Withdraw, tall one, clear off, dwarf,
 74' withdraw from the path, clear off the thoroughfare,
 75' withdraw, who is before me, take refuge, who is behind me!

63'ff. The gap can partially be filled by the very broken reverse of Ms. m, which is hardly legible.

- 76' E ^dasal-lú-hi maš-maš DINGIR.MEŠ EN TI.LA ir-ru-b[a]
 k [.....D]INGIR.MEŠ EN ba-la-ṭi ir-ru-ba ana É
 J [.....-r]u-^rba^r a-na É
 h ^dasal-lú-hi maš-maš DINGIR.MEŠ EN ba-la-ṭu ir-ru-bu [....]
- 77' E ^rdⁿnin-urta qar-rad DINGIR.MEŠ ir-ru-b[a]
 k [.....] DINGIR.MEŠ KU₄-ba KI-šu
 J [..... it-t]i-šú
 h ^dnin-urta UR.SAG DINGIR.MEŠ ir-ru-bu ^rit^r-[...]
- 78' E [h]ul-dúb zi-an-na hé-pà zi-ki-[.....]
 k [.....]-an-na hé-pà zi-ki-a hé-pà
 J [.....-p]à
 h ^rhul^r-dúb zi-an-na hé-pà zi-ki-a hé-[..]
- 79' E [l]ú-líl-lá zi-an-na hé-pà [.....]
 k [.....]-pà zi-ki-a hé-pà
 h lú-líl-lá zi-an-na hé-pà zi-ki-a hé-[..]
 J (trace)
- 80' E [k]i-sikil-líl-lá zi-^ran-na^r hé-pà [.....]
 k [.....]-na hé-pà zi-ki-a hé-pà
 h ^rki^r-sikil-líl-lá zi-an-na hé-pà zi-ki-a hé-[..]
- 81' E [k]i-sikil-ud-da-kar-ra zi-an-na hé-pà ^rzi^r-[.....]
 k [.....-n]a hé-pà zi-ki-a hé-pà
 h ki-sikil-ud-da-kar-ra zi-an-na hé-pà zi-ki-a hé-[..]
- 82' E [em]e hul-gál bar-šè h[é-.....]
 k [..... h]é-em-ta-gub
 h eme hul-gál bar-šè hé-[.....]

83' E ka-inim-ma u[dug-hul-a-kam]
 k (ruling only)

84' E pu-ṭur ^rlem-nu^r š[á]
 k [..... ina IGI ABGAL DINGIR.M]EŠ ^dmarduk

76' Asalluhi, exorcist of the gods, lord of life, will enter into the house,
 77' and Ninurta, hero of the gods, will enter with him.
 78' Huldub-demon, be adjured by heaven, be adjured by earth,
 79' Lilû-demon, be adjured by heaven, be adjured by earth,
 80' Lilîtu-demon, be adjured by heaven, be adjured by earth,
 81' Ardat lilî, be adjured by heaven, be adjured by earth,
 82' may the evil tongue stand aside!

83' It is an Udug-hul incantation.

84' (catchline of Tablet 2)

APPENDIX

- 1 c₁ é_n é-nu-ru
b₁ [é]n é-nu-ru
a₁ [.....]-nu-[-..]
- 2 c₁ an imin ki imin im imin im-gal imin izi imin igi imin
b₁ an imin ʾkiʾ imin [.....]
a₁ [..] imin k[i] imin izi ʾiminʾ [.....]
- 3 c₁ bar imin [...]-t[a]
b₁ bar imin bar-ta imin bar-ta igi imin
a₁ [..] imin bar-ʾtaʾ [...] bar-ta igi [...]
- 4 b₁ *dī-ú-um mu-ur-šu šu-ru-up-pu-ú ha-mi-tu*₄
a₁ [.....] *mu-ur-šu šu-ru-up-pu-u ha-mi-t[u]*₄
c₁ ʾdīʾ-[-.....]
- 5 b₁ *e-ṭe-em-mu mu-ut-ta-ag-gi-šu*
a₁ [....-e]m-mu mu-ut-ta-ag-gi-šu
c₁ ʾeʾʾ-[-.....]
- 6 b₁ *ša-ag-ga-a-šu ša-ga-aš-ti* DINGIR.HUL.A.MEŠ
a₁ [..-a]g-ga-a-šu ša-ga-aš-tiʾ DINGIR.HUL.A.MEŠ
- 7 b₁ *dī-e-um a-hi-a-ti ši-ip-ṭi a-hi-a-ti mur-ši a-hi-a-ti*
a₁ [d]i-e-em a-hi-a-tim [..-i]b-ṭi a-hi-a-tim mur-ši a-hi-a-ti
- 8 b₁ *šu-ru-up-pu-u a-hi-a-ti*
a₁ [š]u-ru-up-pi-ʾiʾ a-hi-a-ti
- 9 b₁ *a-pi-a-at* ^dIM *ša iš-tu ša-me-e ur-dam*
a₁ *a-pi-a-at* ^dIM [š]a ʾiš-tuʾ ša-me-e ur-dam
c₁ *a-pi-at* ^dIMʾ [.....]
- 10 b₁ *a-pi-a-at* ^dNĒ.IRI₁₁.GAL *ša li-ib-bu ma-a-ti*
a₁ *a-pi-a-at* ^dNĒ.IRI₁₁.GALʾ *ša li-ib-bu ma-a-ti*
c₁ *a-pi-at* ^dNĒʾ.IRI₁₁ʾ.GAL *ša i-na li[b-.....]*
- 11 b₁ *ši-ip-tu ša ŠU* ^dMAŠ.TAB.BA
a₁ *ši-ip-tu ša ŠU* ^dMAŠ.TAB.BA
c₁ *ši-ip-tum ša*ʾ MAŠ.[.....]

Appendix

- 1 Incantation.
2 Heaven: 7; earth: 7; wind: 7; gale: 7; fire: 7; front: 7,
3 back: 7; from back: 7; from back-to-front: 7,
4 headache, illness, chills, sand-fly,
5 restless ghost,
6 male and female murderer (are) evil gods.
7 Strange fevers, strange plagues, strange diseases,
8 strange chills
9 the *blurred vision* of Adad which came down (here) from heaven,
10 the *blurred vision* of Nergal from the middle of the mountains,
11 the spell of the Hand of the Twin gods,

Appendix l. 7 The first word in this line (*dī-e-um* < *dīʾu*), a type of headache / fever, appears only three lines earlier as *dī-ú-um*, but the distinction between the two forms is not clear.

Appendix l. 9-10 The disease *apiātu* occurs in a list of diseases, CAD A/2 168 (ref. court. M. Stol).

- 12 b₁ *hi-mi-iṭ še-e-ti ši-bi-iṭ ša-a-ri*
 a₁ *hi-mi-iṭ še-e-ti ši-bi-iṭ ša-a-ri*
 c₁ *hi-mi-iṣ³ še-tim² ù ši-[bi-iṭ] [.....]*
- 13 b₁ *ši-bi-it LÍL.EN.NA ù MÍ.LÍL.EN.NA*
 a₁ *ši-bi-it LÍL.EN.NA ù MÍ.LÍL.EN.NA*
 c₁ *ši-bi-it li-i-na ù li-i-na-[ti]*
- 14 b₁ *^dšu-la-ak ša mu-un-ze-e-ti*
 a₁ *^dšu-la-ak ša mu-un-ze-e-ti*
 c₁ *šu-la-ak ša² si²-i-t[i]-ia*
- 15 b₁ *e'-e-li ah-ha-zù lem-nu ha-a-a-aṭ ša-ag-ga-šu*
 a₁ *e'-e-lum ah-ha-zù lem-nu ha-a-a-tú ša-^rag-ga-šu^r*
 c₁ *e'-e^r-lu ha-ia-a-tú az za ba x*
- 16 b₁ *qit-mu šap-ta-šu ka-lu-ú pa-nu-šu*
 a₁ *^rqit^r-mu šap-ta-šu ka-lu-ú pa-[..]-šu*
 c₁ (om) *ka-lu-ú pa-nu-š[u]*
- 17 b₁ *šum-šu mi-iq-tu lem-nu ki-ša-as-si ni-ra-a-hu*
 a₁ *šum-šu mi-iq-tu₄ lem-[n]u ki-ša-as-su mi-ra-[..]-hu*
 c₁ *^ršum²^r-šu mi-iq²-tum ki-ša-a[s] x mi-ra-a-[..]*
- 18 b₁ *^ra-tál^r-lu-uk-ku hur¹-ba-a-šu šu-ru-up-pu-ú bu-da-a-šú*
 a₁ *a-tál-lu-uk-ku hur-ba-šu šu-ru-up-pu-u ^rbu-da^r-a-šu*
 c₁ *[.....] ^ra x x uk^r šu-^rru^r-[.....]*

- 12 ‘sun-fever’, distension,
 13 the seizing of *Lilû* and *Lilîtu*,
 14 (and) Šulak of the toilet,
 15 the binding of the evil Jaundice-demon, the murderous Inspector-demon:
 16 his lips are black, his face is yellow ochre.
 17 Its name is Evil Stroke, its (lit. her) neck is a snake,
 18-19 you – even his travelling mother – bore in the depths

Appendix I. 14 This god is also found in Muššu'u 4: 21 (Böck 2007: 154) and Sag.gig 7: 21.

Appendix II. 16ff. M. Stol has drawn attention to YOS 11 10 as a partial duplicate to these texts, and has kindly offered some improved readings (Stol 1993: 11 n. 61). The YOS 11 text is not similar enough to be regarded as a duplicate, although many of the same phrases occur, in a somewhat different order.

- 1' [... š]a-ap-ta-š[u] (cf. l. 16)
 2' [ka]-lu-ú pa-nu-šu-ú (cf. l. 16)
 3' x mi-ra-hu-um ka-šu-^rú^r (cf. l. 17)
 4' [m]i-iq-tum a-ta-al-lu-[k]u
 5' [h]u-ur-ba-š[u]-ú (cf. l. 17-18)
 6' šag-šu-ú mi-iq-tum
 7' šu-ru-pu-um bu-da-šu (cf. l. 18)
 8' [t]ul-da-šu-ú šu¹-pu-ul-ma (cf. l. 19)
 9' um-ma-a-šu mu-^rwa^r--tum (cf. l. 19)
 10' [i]š-ta-ka-a[n] i-še-ri-im (cf. l. 20)
 11' [a-š]a-ma-ša-t[a] i-li-ba-l[i-im] (cf. l. 20)
 12' [i]š-ta-ka-an tu-qú-um-ta

Appendix I. 18: Despite grammatical difficulties, M. Stol has suggested the reading *a-tál-lu-uk-ku* (for *atalluku*), which is confirmed by the parallel text YOS 11 10: 4, which has the reading *a-ta-al-lu-[k]u* (see above).

- 19 a₁ *tu-ul-da ina šu-pu-ul-ma um-ma-š[u] a-ši-im-tu₄?*
 b₁ *[...-u]l-da ina šu-pu-ul-ma um-ma-šu a-lit-ti*
 c₁ (traces)
- 20 a₁ *i-na še-e-ri iš-ta-na-ak-ka-n[u] ṛa⁷-šam-ša-a-ti*
 b₁ *[...-n]a še-e-ri iš-ta-na-ak-ka-nu a-šam-šá-a-tú*
- 21 a₁ *ṛi⁷-na ŠĀ URU iš-ta-na-ak-ka-[... l]em-ne-ti*
 b₁ *[...-n]a lîb-bi URU iš-ta-na-ak-ka-nu lem-ne-t[u₄]*
- 22 a₁ *ṛáš⁷-si-ka a-na ú-pu-ṛun⁷-t[i]-ka*
 b₁ *[...-s]i-ka a-na ú-pu-un-ti-[...]*
- 23 a₁ *[u]-pu-un-ta-ka mu-[hu]-ṛur⁷*
 b₁ *[u-p]u-un-ta-ka mu-hu-[ur]*
- 24 a₁ *[a]r-[k]i ú-pu-un-ti-ka ṛa⁷-[lik-ma]*
 b₁ *ṛar⁷-ki ú-pu-un-ti-ka x [...]*
- 25 b₁ *ú-tam-me-ki DINGIR.DINGIR.GAL.GAL ša ša-me-e ṛù⁷ [er-še-ti]*
 a₁ *[...]ka [...]m]e-e [...]*
- 26 b₁ *^dA.NUN.NA.MEŠ e-lu-ti ^dA.NUN.NA.MEŠ š[a-ap-lu-ti]*
 a₁ (traces)
- 27 b₁ *ku-bi LUKUR.MEŠ u NU.GIG.[MEŠ]*
- 28 b₁ *[ši-biṭ ša]-a-ri u bu-ú-[šá-nu]*
- 29 b₁ *[NENNI A NE]NNI ša DINGIR-šú NENNI ^diš₈-tar-šú NENNI-t[u₄]*
- 30 b₁ *[...] e TAG e ta-ás-niq-šu*
- 31 b₁ *[...]m]a e ta-ba-a⁷*
 a₁ *[...] ṛe ta-ba-a⁷*
- 32 b₁ *[...] e te-ru-ub*
 a₁ *ṛa-na Ê-šu⁷ e [t]e-ru-ub*
- 33 a₁ *a-na Ê te-ru-bu e ṛta⁷-tu-u[r]*
 b₁ *[...]r]u-bu e ta-tu-ur*

- 18-19 restlessness, shivers and chills in his shoulders.
- 20 Dust storms were constantly present in the steppe,
- 21 evils were constantly present in the middle of the towns.
- 22 I called you to your (ritual) flour-offering:
- 23 Receive your (ritual) flour-offering,
- 24 go away behind your (ritual) flour-offering.
- 25 I adjured you by the great gods of heaven and [earth]
- 26 (by) the Anunna gods above and the Anunna gods below,
- 27 (by) the miscarriage of *nadītu*-priestesses and hierodules,
- 28 (by) flatulence and *būšānu*-disease,
- 29 [So-and-so son of] So-and-so, whose personal god and goddess is
 Such-and-such a god and goddess,
- 30 [May you not], may you not attack, may you not approach him,
- 31 [may you not] and may you not pass by,
- 32 may you not enter his house,
- 33 (if) you enter the house, may you not return.

Appendix I. 27 Although *kūbu* could be thought of as a demon in this context, it seems more likely that the term refers to a miscarriage or even abortion of priestesses who were not expected or allowed to give birth, and the illicit nature of the foetus became a subject for (black?) magic.

34	a ₁	<i>a-šar ši-ip-tam ad-du-ú la t[a]-sa-ni[q]</i>
	b ₁	<i>ʾa-šar ši-ip-tam ad-du-ú la ta-sa-niq</i>
35	a ₁	<i>lu-ú ta-pa-ṭār lu-ú te-re-eq</i>
	b ₁	<i>lu-ú ta-pa-ṭār lu-ú te-re-eq</i>
36	a ₁	<i>lu-ú ta-na-sùh lu-ú tu-ṛdap-ṛpár</i>
	b ₁	<i>lu-ú ta-an-na-sùh lu-ú tu-dap-pár</i>
37	a ₁	<i>lu-ú te-ne-es-sì lu-ú ta-at-tál-lak</i>
	b ₁	<i>lu-ú te-né-es-sì lu-ú ta-at-tál-lak</i>
38	a ₁	<i>ar-ki ú-pu-un-t[i]-ka</i>
	b ₁	<i>ar-ki ú-pu-un-ti-ka</i>
	c ₁	<i>[.....-t]i-ʾkaʾ</i>
39	a ₁	<i>níg-gar níg-gar níg nu-gar-ʾraʾ</i>
	b ₁	<i>níg-gar níg-gar níg nu-gar-ra</i>
	c ₁	<i>[..]-gar níg-gar níg nu-gar-ra</i>
40	a ₁	<i>ta-ta-àm-me ge₆-a-du-du</i>
	b ₁	<i>ša-ga-àm-me ge₆-a-du-du</i>
	c ₁	<i>[šaga]-me-en ge₆-a-du-du</i>
41	a ₁	<i>dab-da-zu-dè gîri-zu ús-sa-ab</i>
	b ₁	<i>dab-da-zu-dè gîri-ʾzuʾ [..]-sa-ab</i>
	c ₁	<i>[..]-da-zu-dè [....]-ʾzuʾ ús-sa-ab</i>
42	a ₁	<i>ʰutu maš-tab-ba igi mi-ni-in-bar-re</i>
	b ₁	<i>ʰutu maš-tab-ba igi mi-ni-ʾinʾ-bar-re</i>
	c ₁	<i>[tu₆] ʾénʾ é-nu-ru</i>

43	a ₁	<i>ka-inim-ma šá gaba-ri udug-hul-a-kam</i>
	b ₁	<i>ka-inim-ma šá gaba-ri udug-hul-a-meš</i>

	c ₁	<i>[.....] ʾáʾ [.....]</i>
--	----------------	----------------------------

34	Do not approach where I have cast a spell,
35	may you desist, may you be distant,
36	may you be removed, may you withdraw,
37	may you be far away, may you go away
38	(following) after your flour-offering.
39	One who calms and soothes everything,
40	you are the robber who walks around at night:
41	stride forth to your capture!
42	Šamaš takes notice of the Twins.

43 Incantation of an exemplar of Udug-hul.

Appendix I. 39: See UH 3: 165.

Appendix I. 42: Cf. the final line of a *Kultmittelbeschwörung*: ʰutu igi bar-ra (Farber and Farber 2003: 102, 15).

Appendix I. 43: The rubric records that the present incantation is a copy (gaba.ri) of an Udug-hul incantation, although this formulation is not common. See also CT 17: 18, a 2-line rubric also placing the incantations within 2 different series, namely both Sag.gig and UH:

én sag-gig an-edin-na ì-du₇-du₇ im-gin₇ mu-un-ri-ri (= catchline for Sag.gig 4: 1)

im-dub 24 šir-nam-nar èš-gàr udug-hul-meš nu al-til

See also Hunger 1968: 123 No. 421.

colophons:

- a₁ 44 mu-bi-im
 GABA.RI LIBIR.RA EN E^{ki} *ina* IM BAL IGI.LÁ
 ʾIM.GÍDʾ.DA ^{md}MAŠ-*ga-mil* A ^{md}šamaš(UTU)-*zēra*(NUMUN)-*iqīša*(BA)-*a*
 [... Š]AMAN.MĀL.LÁ ^{LÚ}MAŠ.MAŠ *šéh-ri*
- b₁ ÉN *i-sah-ʿhur* *li-ša-ba-at-ka*
 GABA-RI E^{ki} *k[i-ma]* *la-bi-ri-šú šá-ṭi-ir-ma ba-ár* IM
^{md}*marduk*(ŠÚ)-*balat*(TIN)-*su-ʿiqbi*(E)ʾ DUMU ^m*da-bi-bi* MAŠ.MAŠ

Appendix I. 44 For the colophon in Ms. b₁, cf. PNAE 358, citing a prominent late Babylonian Dabibi family known to include scribes. This colophon preserves the surname of the scribe Dabibi, whose ‘house’ or ‘school’ also known from the colophon of a Nippur medical commentary (Civil 1974: 337, 28, l. 24 *pir-su bul-ṭu É da-bi-bi*). A scribal patronymic Dabibi also appears in a Neo-Babylonian incantation copied from older originals, cf. Michalowski 1981: 16, and it seems likely that the Nippur tablet may have been copied from a Babylonian original, perhaps also reflected in Ms. b₁. The scribe Dabibi appears again in the colophon to UH 13-15 Ms. f₁ (see below), and in the colophon to a LB Mīs pî ritual (Walker and Dick 2001: 73, 68).

Udug-hul Tablet 2

* = copied MJG

*a	=	BM 45392 + 45398 + 45399 + 45404 + 45407 + 45408; ll. 1 – 35; 42 – 67; 69 – 82	pl. 9-10
B	=	K 2962 + 3120 + 3418 (Prev. publ. 4 R ² 29 No. 1, see OECT 6, 58-60; BA 5 334-5); ll. 26 – 67; 69 – 73; 77 – 80	
*C	=	Sm 1535 (Previous publication: Thompson 1900: No. 277g, transliteration only); ll. 24 – 29; 69 – 73	pl. 11
*d	=	K 2758 (+) Rm 2 372; ll. 3; 5 – 18; 56 – 67; 69 – 77	pl. 12
e	=	BM 38447 (80-11-12, 330) (cf. CT 16 40); ll. 6 – 17; 75 – 82	
*F	=	K 17814 (+) Rm 256; ll. 8 – 15; 58 – 60	pl. 11
*G	=	DT 254 (+) BM 99138 (Ki 1904-10-9, 168); (ruled); ll. 36 – 40; 71 – 75	pl. 8
*J	=	K 4612 + 4646 + 5056 (join MJG); ll. 12 – 30; 45 – 54; 56 – 57	pl. 13
k	=	AUAM 73.2857 rev. (Cohen 1976: 143); [obv. = Akk. inc.]; (ll. 43 – 55)	
L	=	STT II 182 (+) 183 + fragment (note of Gurney 29-11-79); ll. 35 – 47; 49 – 65; 67 – 70; 72 – 74; 76 – 79	
m	=	BM 37997; ll. 66 – 67; 69 – 70	
*n	=	BM 50660 + 50988 + 53844; ll. 11 – 26; 28 – 67; 69 – 76	pl. 14-15
O	=	STT I 54 (rev. unidentified); ll. 1 – 6	
*p	=	CBS 8802 (previous publication PBS 12/1 No. 6 rev. 1-5, coll. 17-9-87); ll. 13 – 15	pl. 5, 136
q	=	BM 36681 + 37849 (80-6-17, 413 + 1606); (extract, also lex. and En. El.); copy Lambert 2013 pl. 7, Ms. q, Gesche 2001: 274; ll. 10 – 12	
r	=	BM 42440 (publication Finkel 2000: 198, fig. 51), ll. 19 – 24	
s	=	BM 36284 (extract, copy Gesche 2001: 231); ll. 58 – 62	
*U	=	K 9329 (catchline UH 1)	
*v	=	BM 47827 + BM 47838 (ident. & join I. L. Finkel) + BM 47845; ll. 1 – 12; 16 – 42; 46 – 67; 69 – 74; 77 – 82	pl. 16-17
w	=	BM 42569 + 43216 + 43771 + 43776 (81-7-1, 328 + 980 + 1532 + 1537); (previous publication Finkel 2000: 197, fig. 50); ll. 1 – 9; 15 – 18	
*y	=	BM 43440 (ll. 9-11); ll. 7 – 11	pl. 15
*z	=	BM 45401 (81-7-1, 362) + BM 46329 + 46333 + 46353 + 46477 (81-7-28, 203) + 46512 (81-7-28, 238) + 46517 (81-7-28, 243) + 46560 (several fragments were also identified and joined by I. L. Finkel); ll. 4 – 32; 48 – 53; 55; 57 – 67; 69 – 72; 75 – 77	pl. 18-19
bb	=	BM 59314 (ll. 1-2; 46-49); ll. 1 – 2; 46 – 49	
*CC	=	K 11777 (court. WGL); ll. 31 – 34; 52 – 59	pl. 8
ee	=	BM 37974 (extract, very damaged); date on top of tablet: ^{iti} gu _a ud.23.k[am]; (ll. 54 – 55)	
*hh	=	CBS 11306 (extract): ll. 1 – 5 on tablet = ll. 62 – 66	pl. 16
jj	=	BM 38027 (published: Gesche 2001: 317f.); ll. 52 – 55	
KK	=	K 7587 (court. E. Jiménez); ll. 18 – 21	

Second millennium source

gg = RS 15.152 and RS 17.155 = (published: *Ugaritica* V, plates = pp. 377-378, edition Text No.17:1-11, p. 30-31); ll. 1 – 18.
See also Arnaud 2007: 23, 77

Commentary

*DD = VAT 8286 (published: LKA 82); l. 47 pl. 137

- 1 a [ÉN] *lem-nu* ina IGI AB[GAL]
 O [..... AB]GAL DINGIR.MEŠ ^d*ma[rduk]*
 U *pu*-*ṭur* *lem-nu* in[a]
 v [É]N *pu*-*ṭur* *lem*-[*nu*]
 upper edge: [ana EN u EN]-*ti-ia*₅ *liš-lim*
 w ÉN *pu-ṭur lem-nu ina IGI A*[BGAL]
 bb [.....] *lem-nu* [.....] ^d*marduk*
 gg [.....] *HUL* ina IGI ^{ab}ABGAL DINGIR^{lim} ^d*marduk*
- 2 a [.....]-*nu* ina IGI *te-e šá é-a u asal-lú-hi i-na* IGI ABGAL DI[NGIR.....]
 O [..... AB]GAL DINGIR.MEŠ ^d*marduk*
 v *dup*-*pir* *lem-nu* ina IGI *te-e* [.....]
 w *dup-pir lem-nu ina IGI te-e šá é-a* [.....]
 BB [.....] ^d*marduk*⁷
 gg *dú-up<-pir> NAM.HU*[L] *ina IGI šá asal-lú-hi ina IGI* ^{ab}ABGAL DINGIR^{lim} ^d*marduk*.
- 3 a [....]-*i* *rat-ka mim*-*ma* *lem-nu* [a *le*]*m-nu* T[U₆-*k*]*a šá ba-la-ṭu* ^d*m[arduk]*
 O [.....] *šá TI.LA* ^d*marduk*
 v *né-i-i GABA-ka mim-ma lem-nu* [.....]
 w *né-i-i GABA-ka mim-ma lem-nu* TU₆-*k*[*a*]
 d (traces)
 gg *mi-ri i[r-ta-ka] mim-ma HUL tu-ú-ka TI.LA* ^d*marduk*
- 4 a [š]*i*-[*pa*]*t-ka šá šá-l*[*a-m*]*u asal-lú-hi* [.....] *ba-la-ṭu* ^d*marduk*
 d [..... TU₆-*k*]*a šá TI.LA* ^d[.....]
 O [.....-*l*]*a-ṭu* ^d*marduk*
 v *ši-pat-ka šá šá-la-mu asal-lú-hi* [i]
 w *ši-pat-ka šá šá-la-mu asal-lú-hi* EN [.....]
 z (traces)
 gg TU₆-*ka SILIM-m*[*a*] ÉN *tu-ú-ka TI.LA* ^d*marduk*

Marduk's powers

- 1 Incantation. Let go, O evil, before Marduk, sage of the gods!
 2 Depart, O evil, before the incantation of Ea and Asalluhi, before Marduk, sage of the gods.
 3 Whatever evil, turn your back (on) the healing incantation of Marduk.
 4 Your incantation of well-being (belongs to) Asalluhi, the owner of your healing spell is Marduk.

1 A similar motif is found in Muššu'u 5: 90 (Böck 2007: 200), *pu-ṭur lem-nu la TE-šú uk-kiš a-a-bi la ta-sa-niq-šú*, 'Remove the evil, that you not come near him, turn away the fiend, that you not approach him.'

2 The phrase seems to distinguish between the deities Asalluhi and Marduk, since the former is associated with Ea (Enki) while Marduk is then referred to as the divine exorcist. Cf. Geller 1985: 12-15. It is worth noting that in the oldest version of this incantation from Ugarit, Ea's name is omitted, while Asalluhi and Marduk could be construed as parallel and synonymous.

- 5 a [n]a-du-ú ši-^rpat^r-ka šá šá-la^r-mu ^dasal^r-lú-hi man-nu ^ršá-nin-ka^r maš-maš DINGIR šá MIN
ABGAL ^rDINGIR^r.MEŠ ^dmarduk
O [.....]
ABGA]L ^rDINGIR^r.MEŠ MIN
v na-du-ú ši-pat šá-la-mu ^dasal-[.....]
z [.....] šá-la-mu ^rasal-lú-hi^r man-nu šá-nin-ka^r maš-maš DINGIR [.....]
w ^rna-du^r-[.....] DIN ^dasal-lú-hi man-nu šá-ni[n-.....]
d [.....] šá-nin-ka maš-maš [.....]
6 a UŠUMGAL ^rAN^r-e u KI-^rtì^r [tu-u-šú] ^dmarduk^r
d ú-šum-gal AN-e [.....]
e [.....] ^dmarduk
O [.....] x šá-la^r-me^r
z [.....] šá-l]a-mu ^dmarduk
v ^rUŠUMGAL^r AN-e u KI-t[ì]
w [.....]-^re^r u KI-tì [.....] ^dmardu]k
gg ^rú^r-šu-gal AN-e u KI-t[im]
7 d DINGIR šá TU₆-šú TI.LA T]U₆-]
a DINGIR.MEŠ šá TU₆-šú TI.LA T[U₆-šú] šá-la-mu TU₆-šú ^ršá^r-nin-na la i-šu-^rú^r
e [.....] ^rla^r i-šu-ú
z DINGIR.MEŠ šá TU₆-šú TI.LA TU₆-šú šá-la-[.....] šá^r-nin-na la i^r-[.....]
v [.....] šá TU₆-šú ba-la-tu TU₆ šá-la-mu [.....]
y [.....] x [.....]
w [.....]-šú^r DIN TU₆-šú šá-la-mu^r TU₆-šú šá-ni-na la i-^ršu-ú^r
gg DINGIR^{lim} <te->eš-ša TI u SILIM^r ta x x šá<-ni>-ina N[U TU]KU

- 5 Your incantation of well-being is cast, O Asalluhi; who can rival you, O divine exorcist, who can surpass Marduk, the sage of the gods?
6 The dragon of heaven and earth is [the healing incantation] of Marduk.
7 The god, whose incantation is healing and whose incantation is well-being, has no rival.

5 The line is completely omitted in the older Ms. gg (Ugarit), which may indicate that this line was a later addition. The writing *mi-ri* in Ms. gg (Ugarit) is an imperative of *wāru*, corresponding to *né-'i-i i-rat-ka* in the later duplicates.

6 Cf. l. 25 below, in which Marduk is described as the divine ušumgal.

7 Ms. gg (Ugarit) is difficult to reconcile with later versions of this same line. The restoration <te->eš-ša is understood as a defective writing for *te-e-šu* (given as TU₆-šú in late duplicates).

- 8 a hul-^rgál^r sil₇-lá igi-mu-ú-^rta^r
d hul-gál sil₇-lá igi-m[u-.....]
e [..... ig]i-^rmu^r-ta
F hul-gál s[il₇]
y [.....si]l₇-lá [.....]
z [.....-l]á igi-^rmu-ta^r
v [....-gá]l sil₇-lá [.....]
w [..... i]gi-mu-ta
gg hul-g[ál] si^r-il-lá i-gim²-ut-ta
a *lem-nu^r dup^r-pír ina^r pa^r-ni-ia*
e [..... in]a^r IGI-ia^r(?)
F *lem-nu dup-pi[r] i[na]*
y [.....] ina p[a-.....]
v *lem-nu dup-p[ir ... p]a-ni-[..]*
z *lem-nu dup-pír ina pa^r-ni^r-ia*
w [..... p]a-ni-ia
9 a gá-e me-en ur-sag^dasal-lú-hi
d gá me-en ur-sag^da[sal-.....]
e [..... u]r-^rsag^r^dasal-lú-hi
F gá-e me-en ur-sag^d[.....]
z gá-^re^r [.....]-^rlú-hi^r
y [.....] ^{gloss: ta} ur-sag^r^da[sal-.....]
v [.... m]e-en [.....]
w [.....] ^rasal-lú-hi^r
gg ka me-en^r ka^r me-en l[ú]-ur₅-sag^da[sal-lú-hi]
a *a-na-ku šá qar-ra-du^dmarduk*
e [..... qar-ra]-du^dmarduk
y [.....] šá qar-ra-du^r^d[.....]
z *ana-^rku^r šá qar-ra-du^dmardu[k]*
v *ana-ku šá qar-ra-d[u]*
q *^rana^r-ku šá qa[r-.....]*
F *a-na-ku ša qar-r[a-.....]*

The exorcist derives his powers from Marduk

- 8 O evil, depart from before me!
9 I belong to the hero Marduk,

8 The gim sign in Ms. gg (Ugarit) is typical of other defective and phonetic writings in this tablet, which may indicate that the scribe did not understand the Sum. he was copying.

9 The phonetic writing in Ms. gg (Ugarit) of ka (or gù?) for gá appears to disregard the nasalization.

- 10 a dumu sag ^den-ki-^rke₄ an-^rki-a diri-ga
d dumu-sag ^den-ki-ke₄ an-k[i-.....]
e [..... a]n-ki-a ^rdiri-g[a]
F dumu-sag ^den-ki-^rke₄ an-[.....]
y [.....-k]i an-ki-a diri-[..]
z [.....]-^rki-ke₄ an-ki-a diri-ga
q [.....-k]e₄ [.....]
v [.....^de]n-ki-ke₄ [.....]
a *ma-ri reš-tu-ú šá* ^rd^rIDIM *šá ina AN-e u KI-tì šu-tu-ru*
e [.....] ^rAN-[u] KI *šu-tú-^rru*
q [*ma-r*]i *reš-tu-ú šá* ^d^r*é*-[a]
F *ma-ru reš-tu-u šá* ^rd^r[.....]
y [.....]-^rú *šá* ^dIDIM *šá ina AN-e* [.....]
z ^r*ma-ri reš-tu-ú šá* ^d^rIDIM [.....-t]ì *šu-tu-ru*
v *ma-ri* [.....]
- 11 a nun šà-la-sù dumu sag ^reridu^{ki}-ga-ke₄
d nun šà-la-sù dumu sag er[idu^{ki}.....]
n ^rnun šà-l[á]
e [..... dum]u ^rsag ^reridu^{ki}-ga-k[e₄]
q [nu]n šà-lá-sù dumu sag [.....]
F nun šà-lá-^rsù du[mu]
z [.....-s]ù dumu sag eridu^{ki}-ga-ke₄
v [.....-k]e₄
y [..... sa]g er[idu^{ki}.....]
gg ta-mu-zi-ig i-ri-du-ka-ak-ku
a *ru-bu-ú reme-nu-ú ma-[ri]* ^r*reš-tu-ú šá eri₄-du₁₀*
e [.....] *m[a-.....]-ú šá eri₄-du₁₀*
q *ru-bu-ú reme-nu-ú ma-ri* [.....]
F *ru-bu-u re-mé-nu* [.....]
z *ru-bu-ú reme-nu-ú ma-r[i]-^rú šá eri₄-du₁₀*
v *ru-bu-^rú* [.....]

10 foremost son of Ea, who is supreme in heaven and earth,

11 the merciful prince, foremost son of Eridu.

11 The Ms. gg (Ugarit) reading ta-mu-zi-ig i-ri-du-ka-ak-ku is phonetic for dumu sag eridu^{ki}-ga-ke₄.

- 12 a níg-nam hul níg nu-sig₅-ga níg nu-du₁₀-ga-mu ʾnigʾ n[u]-ʾsi-sáʾ
d níg-nam hul níg nu-sig₅ :
n ʾnig namʾ-h[ul]
e [.....] nu si-s[á]
q níg-nam hul [.....]
F níg-nam h[ul]
z ʾ níg-namʾ.....-g]a-[m]u [.....]-ʾsi-sáʾ
v (traces)
gg níg nu-ʾhulʾ níg nu-si-ga níg nu-ti-il-laʾ ag-ga
a *mim-ʾma lemʾ-nu ʾmimʾ-ma la ʾdamʾ-qa ʾmim-maʾ la ʾta-ʾa-bi mim-ma la iʾ-šá-ri*
q *mim-ma lem-nu mim-ma [.....] la [.....]*
F *mim-ma [.....]*
e [.....]- x *man-ma ʾla iʾ-[šá-ri]*
z [...-m]a *lem-nu mim-ma lem-nu la dam-qa mim-ma la ʾta-a-bi mim-ma la iʾ-šá-riʾ*
J [...-m]a ʾ*lemʾ*-[.....]
- 13 a su nu-du₁₀-ga-mu [su] nu-sig₅-g[a-...]
d su nu-du₁₀-ga-mu su nu-s[ig₅-ga-....]
J ʾsuʾ nu-du₁₀-ʾgaʾ-[.....]
n ʾsuʾ nu-du₁₀-[.....]
e [.....] su nu-ʾsig₅ʾ-[.....]
F níg ʾnu-du₁₀ʾ-g[a]
p [.....-g]a-mu su nu-si[g₅-....]
z [.....-m]u
gg su nu-dú-ga
a *šá a-na ši-i-ʾru la ʾta-aʾ-bi a-na zu-mur ʾla damʾ-qa*
J *šá ana ši-i-ri l[a]*
e [.....-n]a *zu-ʾumʾ-ri ʾlaʾ* [.....]
z [..... š]i-ri la ʾta-a-bi a-na z[u-.....]

12 Whatever evil, whatever is not favourable, whatever is not good (for me), whatever is not in order,

13 which is (aimed) at my unwell flesh or unfit body,

12 Only the late-Babylonian Mss. have the full text of this line. It is unclear how to interpret the older variant from Ugarit, níg nu-ti-il-laʾ ag-ga of Ms. gg, but one might hazard a guess: ‘whatever causes one not to live’.

13 The *la ʾtābu* demons here (which cannot be distinguished from the *la damqu* demons) correspond to the Aramaic *lṭby*-demons of the incantation bowls (see Levene 2003: 32, 4).

- 14 a ʿšà nu-du₁₀-ga-mu ʿšà nu-si-[sá]
d šà nu-du₁₀-ga-mu šà nu-si-s[á]
J šà nu-du₁₀-ga-m[u]
p [.....-g]a-mu šà nu si-[sá]
n ʿšà nu-du₁₀-g[a]
e [.....] šà nu-si-s[á]
z šà nu-du₁₀-ga-mu šà [nu]-<si->sá
a ʿšá a-na lîb-bi ʿla ʿta-a-bi ʿana lîb-bi ʿla i-šá-ri
J šá ana lîb-bi l[a]
p šá ana lîb-bi la ʿta-a-bu ana lîb-bi la i-ša-ru
e [.....] lîb-bi la i-šá-[-..]
z šá ana lîb-bi la ʿta-a-bi ana l[îb-bi] la i-ʿšá-ri
n [.....]-ʿbi la ʿ[.....]
- 15 a [du₁₁-g]a ʰen-ki-ke₄ a-ra ga-[.....]
d ʿdu₁₁-ga ʰen-ki-ke₄ a-ra [.....]
J du₁₁-ʿga ʰe[n-.....]
n [.....] ʰen-ki-ʿke₄ ʿ[.....]
p [..-g]a ʰen-ki-ke₄ a-ra ga-ra-ab-zi
e [.....] [a]-ra ga-ra-[.....]
z [...-g]a ʰen-ʿ[...-g]a-k[e₄.....]
w [..... g]a-r[a-.....]
gg <tu->-ga an-gíd-ki-ik-k[i a-r]a ka-rab-gub
a ina qí-ʿbit ʰIDIM a-na-as-sah-ka
p ina qí-bit ʰé-a a-na-as-sah-ka
J ina qí-b[it]
e [.....] x ʿa-na-a[s]- x [....]
w [..... ʰIDI]M ʿa-na-as-ʿsah-[-..]
- 16 a [ʰasal-l]ú-hi mu-un-š[i-.....]
d ʰasal-lú-hi mu-un-ši-gen-n[a]
J ʰasal-l[ú-.....]
n [ʰa]sal-lú-hi [.....]
e [..... m]u-un-ši-in-[-..]
z [ʰen-ki-ke₄ ʰas]al-ʿlú-hi ʿmu-un-ši-in-gen-na
v [ʰasa]l-lú-[.....]
w [.....] mu-un-ši-in-bar
a ʰmar[duk] ʿiš-ʿpur-ʿan-ni
J ʰ[.....]
e [.....]-ʿpur-ʿan-ni
z ʰé-a u ʰmarduk iš-pur-an-ni
w [.....] iš-pur-an-ni

- 14 which is (aimed) at my unwell or abnormal belly –
15 by the command of Ea will I drive you out.
16 Marduk sent me

15 Sum. a-ra, corresponding to the Akk. suffix -ka, is likely to be a variant for za(-e)-ra. The reading in Ms. gg (Ugarit) is phonetic for the Sum. text of our line, although replacing the verbal root with gub rather than zi.

- 17 a [ap-t]i lim-hur pá-r-du-ú li-[it-ta-š]i mim-ma ʿlem-ʿ-*nu* mim-ma NU DU₁₀G[A..... S]A.MEŠ-[.....]
 J ap-tu [.....]-ši mim-ma lem-[..... N]U DU₁₀GA šá ina SU-[..... b]a-šú-ú
 n ʿap-tiʿ [.....] mim-[m]a lem-*nu* mim-m[a.....]
 e [.....]-ú [.....]
 d ap-tu lim-hur pá-r-du-[.....] ʿmim-ma lem-*nu* mim-ma la ʿtaʿ-[.....]
 v [...t]i [...h]ur ʿpá-r-du-úʿ [.....] ina zu-um-ri-ka UZU [.....]
 z [.....]-ʿú li-itʿ-[.....] šá ina SU-ka UZU.MEŠ ʿùʿ SA.MEŠ-ka ba-šú-ú
 w [.....-h]ur pá-r-du-ú li-še-šu mim-m[a] UZU.MEŠ-ka SA.MEŠ-ka ʿba-šúʿ-[ú]
 gg ap-tu li-IŠ-ma par-du-ú li-še-ši [...m]a HUL mim-ma NU DU₁₀ ša ina UZU-ka u sa-a-ka GÁL-ú
 18 a [l]i-i[s]-[su]h mur-šu šu-a-ti en-qu ʿmas-suʿ-*u* maš-maš DINGIR.MEŠ ʿasal-lú-[..] m[ar.....]
 [.....]-ʿkaʿ [..... T]E.ʿÉNʿ¹⁷
 J li-su[h]-ʿtu₄ʿ en-q[u]-hi dumu ʿ[.....]
 [.....É]N
 d [.....] x [.....]
 n [i-is-s]uh mur-šu šu-a-ti e[n.....]
 v li-is-suh mur-šu šu-a-t[u₄.....] DUMU ʿé-a ABGAL
 ʿina zuʿ-[um-ri-ka]
 z [..... š]u-a-ti en-q[u] ʿʿasal-lú-hi DUMU ʿIDIM ʿABGALʿ¹⁸
 ina SU-ka li-is-suh TE.ÉN
 w [..... m]ur-šu šu-a-ti ʿen-qaʿ DINGIR mas-su-ú ʿmaš-mašʿ [.....] ʿʿasal-lú-hi DUM[U] ʿIDIM ABGAL
 ina SU-[..] li-is-suh TE.ÉN
 KK [.....] ʿmaš-maš DINGIR.MEŠʿ [.....]
 gg (om.) [e]n-qí [mas-s]ù-ú maš-maš DINGIR^{lim ab}ABGAL ʿasal-lú-hi ina SU-ka li-ʿisʿ-sù-u[h]
-
- 19 a [ÉN] ʿé-a ÉN i-man-nu ʿnín-girimmaʿ [...] i-nam-di
 J ÉN ʿ[.....-na]m-di
 n ÉN ʿʿéʿ-a ÉN ʿiʿ-[.....]
 z É[N] ʿʿé-aʿ É[N] ʿiʿ-man-nu ʿnín-g[irimma-na]m-di
 v ÉN ʿé-[aš]ip-tu₄ ʿiʿ-[.....]
 r ÉN ʿé-a ÉN i-man-nu ʿnín-girimma ta-a i-nam-du
 KK [.....] ÉN ŠID-nu ʿnín-[.....]

17 so that the window may confront terrors, so that whatever is evil and whatever is not good in your body, flesh, or sinews may get out.

18 May the wise leader, exorcist of the gods, uproot that illness, may Asalluhi son of the sage Ea remove (it) from your body. Incantation spell.

Power derived from the Apsû

19 Incantation. Ea recites the incantation, Ningirimma casts the spell:

17 The incantation reverts to an Akkadian unilingual text. In Ms. gg (Ugarit), *sa-a-ka* is from Akk. *sû*, ‘date-palm fibre’, used metaphorically as a part of the body (tendon), but in the later text SA is a logogram for *šer’ānu*.

19 The dialogue between Enki(Ea) and Ningirimma is reminiscent of early third-millennium incantations, cf. Krebern timer 1984: 126.

- 20 a *i-mat* ^dIDIM *ši-pat* ^dIDIM *ru-’-ut* ^dIDIM [.....] ^rdIDIM [’]šá [.....] *la i-šu-ú*
 J *i-mat* ^rd[.....] ^dé-*a ina q[í-.....]-’ú*
 n *i-mat* [^dé-*a ši-pat* ^rd[.....]]
 z [*ma*]t ^dé-*a ši-pat* ^dé-*a ru-’-ut* [.....] ^rdé-*a šá pa-ši-ri la i-šu-ú*
 v *i-mat* ^dé-*a ši-pat* [.....] ^rru-’- [.....]
 r *i-mat* ^dé-*a ši-pat* ^dé-*a ru-’-ut* ^rdé-*a qí-bit* ^rdé-*a šá ba-š[á-mu] la i-’- [šu-ú]*
 KK [.....] *-pat* ^dé-*a ru-’-ut* [.....] ^ra [’]ša *pa-ši-ri la i-’- [šu-ú]*
 21 a *dup-pir* ^rmu-kil’ *reš* HUL-tì *mim-ma lem-nu* NU TE’ [.....] ^dŠÀ-ZU [.....] ABGAL ^rma-ri’ [.....]
 J *dup-* [.....] ^rE-šú ^{šá} ^d[.....] ^rš[.....] ^šu-ú
 n *dup-pir* [m]u-kil *reš* [.....] ^{šá} ^den- [.....] ^ru m[a-ri] [.....]
 v ^rdup-*pir* [m]u-kil *reš* H[UL-t]ì [.....] ^{šá} ^den-b[i-l]u-lu ^dŠÀ.ZU DUMU ^rd[.....]
 z *du[p-... m]u-kil* *reš* HU[L-t]ì [mim]-*ma lem-n[u] N[U ..]* ^dŠÀ.ZU DUMU ^dIDIM [i]-š[.....] ^ru-ú
 r [du]p-p[ir] ^rmu-kil’ *re-eš* H[UL] *mim-ma lem-nu* NU TE’ ^dŠÀ.ZU [ABGAL] ^š[á] ^den-bi-lu-lu DUMU [.....]
 KK [.....] HU[L-t]ì *mim-ma lem-nu* [.....]
 22 a *nun gal*’ *nun gal*’ ^re-ne’ *nun gal* [.....]
 J [.....] ab]zu
 n *nun-gal* [.....]
 v *nun-gal* *nun gal-e-ne* [.....]
 z *nun [... n]un gal-e-ne* [nu]n *gal* [.....]
 r *nun-’gal*’ x x *nun-gal* *nun gal-e-’-n[e]* *nun-gal* *abzu*
 a *ru-bu-ú* *ra-bu-ú ina* ^di-gí-gí *ru-bu-ú* ^rra-’-b[u-ú ..] ^rap-’-si-i
 J [.....] ^di-gí-gí [.....] ^rs[i-i]
 v *ru-bu-ú* *ra-bu-ú ina* [.....]
 z ^rru-’-b[u] [.....] ^rbu-ú ^rra-’-bu-’- [.....]
 r *ru-bu-ú* *ra-bu-ú ina* ^di-gí-gí *ru-bu-ú* ^rra-bu-ú *ina* ^rap-’-si-i

- 20 ‘Ea’s poisonous spittle, Ea’s incantation, Ea’s saliva, Ea’s command, for which there is no counter-measure’.
 21 Depart, accessory to evil, whatever evil should not approach him, for whom the wise god Enbilulu (Marduk), the son of Ea, is available.
 22 The great prince, the great prince among the Igigi, the great prince in the Apsû,

20 The var. *bašāmu* in Ms. r appears to be for penitential sackcloth, a graphic image for a countermeasure.

21 Although Enbilulu is usually identified as Marduk, Ms. r treats them separately in this line. For Šazu as a name for Marduk (‘he who knows the insides’), in childbirth contexts, see Stol 2000: 72. Ms. J shows a ruling following this line.

22 Cf. STT 172 7-8 (and dupl.), *nun gal* ^den-ki en ka-inim-ma-bi // *ru-bu-u ra-bu-u* ^dé-*a* EN ÉN, although in our line *nun gal* refers to the Anunnaki. An interesting description of the Igigi in a Samsuiluna bilingual reads, [nun-g]al-e-ne-er [g]ù-mur in-ak-eš-a-aš // *qar-du-tim i-na i-gí-gí* (var. *i-gí-gí*), (Sollberger 1969: 33, 5), translated (*ibid.* 39) as ‘the valiant ones among the Igigi’, but by Civil (1984: 294-295) as the ones ‘who shout the loudest’, i.e. the heroic ones. See now Frayne 1990 (RIME 4): 385, No. 7 (ref. court. M. Stol).

- 23 a nu₁₁ gal ʳnu₁₁-gal-e-ʳ-ne [.....]
 J [..... a]bzu
 v nu₁₁ gal nu₁₁-gal-e-ne [.....]
 z nu₁₁ g[al n]u₁₁-gal-e-ne ʳnu₁₁-[.....]
 r nu₁₁¹(sign: pirig) gal nu₁₁-gal-e-ne
 n n[u₁₁]
 a nu-úr GAL-ú n[u-úr-]
 J [.....]-šú-nu [.....-s]i-i
 v nu-ú-ri ra-ʳbuʳ-[.....]
 z nu-ú[r ZĀ]LAG-ri šá ap-si-[i]
 r nu-ú-ri ra-bu-ú ZĀLAG.GAL u ZĀLAG-šú-nu KI.MIN šá ap-si-i
- 24 a [ma]š-maš nun-[gal-e-n]e á-[gál] ʳa-nun-na-ki-ʳ-e-ʳ-ne
 C [..... nu]n-ʳgal-ʳ-e-ne á-gál ʳa-nun-na-ke₄-e-ne
 J [.....-k]e₄-e-ne
 v maš-maš ʳnun-gal-e-ne [.....]
 z maš-maš [.....]-gal-e-ne [.....]
 n [.....]-gal-ʳe-ʳ-[.....]
 a maš-ma-šú ʳí-g[í-.....]
 C [.....-š]ú ʳí-gì-gì tu-kul-ti ʳa-nun-na-ki
 v maš-maš ʳí-gì-gì [i₄]
 z maš-m[a-.....]-ʳkiʳ
 J [.....-n]a-ki
- 25 a [ʳ]asal-lú-hi ušum[gal] an-ki-[bi]-ʳdaʳ-ke₄
 J [.....-k]e₄
 C [.....-l]ú-ʳhiʳ ušumgal an-ki-bi-da-ke₄
 v ʳasal-lú-hi ušumgal [.....]
 z ʳas[al-l]ú-ʳhiʳ ušumgalʳ [.....]
 n [.....] u[šumgal]
 a ʳmarduk ʳúʳ-[.....]
 C [ʳmardu]k ʳUŠUMGALʳ AN-e u KI-tî
 v ʳmarduk ú-šum-gal-l[u]
 z ʳ[.....]

23 the great light—their great light—the great light of the Apsû,

24 the exorcist of the Igigi, the support of the Anunna (is he),

25 Marduk, dragon of heaven and earth,

23 The Akk. of Ms. z uses a logogram (ZĀLAG-ri) for *nūru*, which is an unusual orthography in UH, while Ms. r mixes syllabic and logographic orthographies for this word.