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Chapter Three

KAR 26 and BMS 12

A. Principles and Problems

Before we proceed to the next group of texts, it will be of some value to summarize a few of the more general results which have emerged thus far from our study.

By examining texts related to KAR 226 IV and to M VII 119-146, we noticed the existence of actually extant representatives of different stages of development of these two compositions. Our detailed study of the latter group (M VII 119-146) demonstrated that changes introduced into a composition in the course of its development may lead to the emergence of logical, structural and/or contextual anomalies in a specific recension or representative of that composition and that these anomalies are explicable therefore in terms of that development.

This demonstration tends to validate two rather obvious though rarely applied principles: (1) It is to be assumed that every magical text, regardless of its present state, was at one time coherent. While this is perhaps not actually true of every text, the burden of proof is always on the scholar who wishes to deny its applicability to a specific text. (2) Since there is an unfortunate absence of correspondence between texts which contain internal difficulties and texts for which we possess forerunners, parallels and variant manuscripts, it is both proper and necessary to seek a "higher critical" solution of internal textual problems even when, or perhaps especially when, the aforementioned types of witnesses are not extant. This is, of course, not to say that the results reached through a purely internal analysis partake of the same degree of certainty as those reached through a comparison of actually extant texts. But, then, the results of literary criticism, analysis and interpretation never partake of any real certainty, and they can only be evaluated in terms of their likelihood and of their contribution to understanding.

In contrast with the previously examined text group in which the evils were enumerated in list form, the text group to which we
now turn comprises prayers in which the evils, including witchcraft, encountered by the sufferer are enumerated and their actions and/or effects described in verbal sentences. These sentences jointly form a lament. These laments present a “scene” in which several “events” take place; and the presentation posits, implicitly or explicitly, a relationship of contemporaneity, identity or causality among its members. However, all too often the presentation appears disjointed and incoherent, and the absence of a clear definition of the relationship existing among all the members, generally, and between witchcraft and the other members, specifically, creates problems of a linguistic, literary and religious nature. How are we to explain the apparent lack of unity and the occasional presence of internal contradiction in these laments?

It seems reasonable to assume that these texts, just as the texts of our earlier group, underwent change and that these changes are responsible for the present appearance of the laments. That this is, in fact, the case and that textual evidence attesting to development and change exists also for this group are evident in varying degrees from a comparison, for example, of KAR 23 II 9ff. and LKA 40a with LKA 57:16ff.; of BMS 22:11ff. with LKA 56 obv. 11f.; and of STC II 75ff. with its Boghazkoi forerunners recently edited by Reiner and Güterbock. These changes may be due to different causes and may serve different purposes. To take just one example: it is clear from the first comparison that witchcraft has been secondarily inserted into the text of a prayer which originally dealt with illness and that this illness has been redefined as having been caused by witchcraft.

While it would be most instructive to compare the variant manuscripts of compositions belonging to this group, very little purpose would be served by this in the context of the present study. For the purpose of this study is to provide examples of several different modes of critical analysis of incantations and prayers (and not to solve all problems of interpretation created by the occurrence of witchcraft terms), and we have already provided an example of the comparative mode. We propose, therefore, to leave an examination of the variant manuscripts of this group for another occasion and

57See JCS 21 255ff.
to concentrate instead on two well known prayers to Marduk for which, as far as we are aware, manuscript evidence of change does not exist.

Although both *KAR 26* and *BMS 12* are known from several examplars, these examplars present, as it were, a united front and are of no real assistance in resolving difficulties found in these compositions. Thus, these compositions can only be analyzed, their history reconstructed and the difficulties found in them resolved by means of a purely internal analysis. These prayers exemplify, as we shall see, diametrically opposed developments: the one, *KAR 26*, a prayer originally concerned with the effects of witchcraft, has been changed into one which has universal applicability and which regards the anger of the gods as the source of the sufferer’s difficulty; the other, *BMS 12*, has been reworked so as to have a primarily anti-witchcraft concern. Yet, while each text developed in a direction opposite to that of the other, the configuration in each of internal and contextual phenomena representative of the development parallels that of the other and therefore confirms the analysis of the other.
B. KAR 26

1. Lament

*KAR* 26\(^{58}\) obv. 35-42 read:

35 \([su\text{-}[lim\(^{59}\) DINGIR.MU ze-ni-i u dU.DAR.MU ze-ni-tú šá kam-lu lib-ba-šú-nu-ma ze-nu-u KI-ia
36 ina su\text{-}hù\text{-}ur pa-ni u ma-le-e lib-ba-te UŠ.MEŠ\text{-}ni
37 kiš-pi ru-he-e ru-se-e up-šá-še-e lem-nu-tí šá a-me-lu-tí
38a ina pa-an DINGIR u dU.DAR řú\text{-}šá-šá\text{-}řki\text{-}nu-in-ni
38b AN.TA.ŠUB.BA dLUGAL.ÜR.RA ŠU.DINGIR.RA ŠU.dINANNA ŠU.GIDIM\text{-}1.MA
39 ŠU.NAM.ERÍM ŠU\text{-}1.NAM.〈LU〉.U.X.LU SAG.PA.RIM u NU DÜG.GA UZU.MEŠ it-hu-nim-ma a-na-su-sa
u₄-me-šam-ma

---

\(^{58}\) An edition of *KAR* 26 was published by Ebeling, *ZDMG* 69 96ff. and improved upon by Meissner, *ZDMG* 69 413f.; von Soden, *SAHG*, pp. 306ff., translated the main prayer to Marduk. For previous discussions of different parts of *KAR* 26, see Kunstmann, *LSS* 2 71 and 96f., *SAHG*, pp. 396f. and *AS* 16 294f.

*KAR* 26 is duplicated by *AMT* 96/7 (= *KAR* 26 obv. 1-10) // *Em* 2, 171 (obv. = *KAR* 26 obv. 1-16; rev. = part of a colophon) (+) *Th*. 1905-4-9, 117 + K 3268 + 8176 + 6033 (lower part of obv. and upper part of rev. = *KAR* 26 obv. 55 - rev. 25) // K 5937, (= *KAR* 26 obv. 40-55). All the unpublished fragments were already identified as duplicates in the margins of Geers' copies, and some have already been quoted in the dictionaries. For K 6033, see already Kunstmann, *LSS* 2 97. Kunstmann, *ibid.*, treated *AMT* 96/7 in conjunction with K 2832 (= *BMS* p. XIX) and concluded that it "ist vielleicht bloß eine Variante" to *KAR* 26. As for the new joins: in the margin of Geers' copy of K 3268 + 8176 (before it was joined to 6033) there is a note (written probably by G. Meier, if we may judge from the handwriting) that it "gehört viel. zur gleich Tafel wie *Em* 2, 171." This was confirmed by Mr. C. Walker of the British Museum, to whom we communicated this information. Mr. Walker also confirmed our suggestion that *Th*. 1905-4-9, 117 joins K 3268 + and informed us that K 3268 + and K 5937 are written in different scripts.

\(^{59}\) This restoration is based on Meissner's comment, *ZDMG* 69 413, that 35 "muss am Anfange ungefähr ergänzt werden: "(Versöhnt mich mit) meinem zürnenden Gotte"; cf. also *SAHG* p. 308: "[Versöhn] meinen zürnenden Gott ...." Compare similar passages in *CAD Z* s. zenû adj. a2'.

\(^{60}\) For this emendation, see *CAD A* 1/10 and *AHw* s. parāku N1b.
In its present form, this lament contains the mention of a large number of evils (e.g., anger of the personal gods, witchcraft, the Hand of the god, of the goddess, of the ghost, of the oath and of mankind, evil signs, etc.); and these evils appear to be strung out helter-skelter. To understand this lament we must determine its original form.

Let us begin with 38b-39. Kunstmann, LSS nf 2 96f., has already suggested that our prayer had “vielleicht durch Einfügung von Z.38b und 39 aus dem allgemeinen š.-i. Nr. 10 entstanden.” Kunstmann’s suggestion that 38b-39 are secondary is confirmed by the fact that the long list of evils in these lines breaks up the sequence 37-38a and 40, which seems to belong together. The unity of this sequence is suggested by several texts in which lines comparable to 37-38a and 40 occur in a contiguous and effectual relationship:

*AMT* 87/1 rev. 1ff. (cf. *BAM* 315 II 42ff.):

DIŠ NA <EN INIM-šú>⁶² HUL.GIG ZI.KU₅.RU.DA DI.BAL.A KA.DIB.BI.DA ú-pi-šú HUL.MEŠ

<EN INIM-šú>⁶³ NIGIN-šu-[ma]

ina IGI DINGIR LUGAL IDIM u NUN šu-uš-kun-[{(ma)]⁶⁴

UGU IGI-šú GIG (= eli ōmērišu maruš)

⁶¹ For this emendation, see *JAOS* 59 16.  
⁶² *AMT* 87/1 rev. 3 incorrectly places EN INIM-šú immediately before NIGIN-šu-[ma]. *BAM* 315 II 42 preserves the correct order, and we have corrected the word order in *AMT* accordingly.  
⁶³ See above note 62.  
⁶⁴ ⁴ R 55/2:4f. and *AMT* 87/1 rev. 4 suggest a restoration for M IV 64; instead of ina pa[ţn ............] -zi u bāb bīti ma-[ .... ] of the present edition, read: ina IG[I DINGIR LUGAL/XX IDIM NUN (TIRU) na-an-za]-zi u KÁ É.GA[L tušaškininni ?].
The propriety of drawing a comparison between these texts, which center on the activities of an adversary, and ours is indicated not only by the obvious similarities between them, but also by the sequence of entries in 48ff. and 53ff. (See below Sec. B, 2, Prayer.) Moreover, the series of afflictions in 38b-39 and in 54b-55 itself provides internal support for the contention that these lines are secondarily inserted; for ŠU.NAM.LÚ.Uₓ.LÚ (qāt amēlūti), which is part of the series in all its occurrences (obv. 2, 38b, 55, rev. 8, 32) refers to acts of witchcraft initiated by an adversary. Accordingly, this entry is rendered superfluous by 1. 37, and therefore both entries may be presumed to have originated from different hands.

Accordingly, 38b and 39 and their repetition in 54b-55 must be regarded as additions to the text of this prayer. Omitting then 38b and 39 as secondary, we would translate 37, 38a and 40 as follows:

---


66That qāt amēlūti refers to acts of witchcraft initiated by an adversary is clear, for example, from the overall context of the aetiological diagnosis STT 256:11: NA.BI ŠU.NAM.LÚ.Uₓ.LÚ [UGU]-[šū GĀL-šī]. Note that the description of the patient’s misfortunes begins with “DIŠ NAʾ EN HUL-ti [TUKU] (1) (cf. 17: UGU EN KA-šū <ana> GUB-zi) and that the ritual itself is directed against a warlock and a witch (34: ... 2 NU LÚ.US₁₂.ZU u MI.US₁₂.ZU ša IM DÜ-[uš] who are referred to as kūr.kūr: nakara in one of the accompanying incantations (41ff.). See Part Two, notes 35 II 1) and 115.
Witchcraft, charms, spells and evil machinations performed by people have come athwart of me, have caused me to be dismissed from before your great divinity and from before god and
dismissed from before your great divinity and from before god and
dismissed from before your great divinity and from before god and
dismissed from before your great divinity and from before god and
dismissed from before your great divinity and from before god and
dismissed from before your great divinity and from before god and

Elsewhere, we will discuss upšāšū.

napruku refers to a confrontation by ominous happenings which portend and cause a negative chain of events. The ominous force of certain witchcraft phenomena will be discussed elsewhere. Note that napruku here and NIGIN in AMT 87/1 rev. 3 and 4 R 55/2:4 (cf. also KAR 80 obv. 6; AMT 89/1 II [we have joined this tablet to AMT 87/5 – confirmed – and so II = rev. col. V] 11, 16, 19 [duplicate: KMI 51, bottom: K 249 + VI 8, 14, 17]; TCS II 64 [LKA 102] :23) refer to two aspects of the same event: an enemy encircles (NIGIN) his victim with potentially ominous objects/events, and these objects/events then confront (napruku) his victim.

Our translation of uṣaškinū’inni is based on the meaning “to cause to be dismissed” proposed by Jacobsen, MSL IV 45* and 48*, for ṣuskunu. Jacobsen (45*) has already cited AMT 87/1 rev. 4 in this connection and has translated that line as “he is dismissed from (service) before god, king, maginate and prince.” For different translations of ṣuskunu in the passages cited in our text, see ZDMG 69 100 and SAHG, p. 308 (KAR 26); ArOr 17/1 188, CAD Z 86 and AS 16 290 (4 R 55/2); RA 26 84 (AMT 87/1). Note that also in 4 R 55/2, “god, king, ...” are probably in the accusative (in spite of nanzāzu); and that line should be translated approximately “they (= the witchcraft) have caused god, king, ... to move away from me.”

While there is a slight difference in perspective between ila ... ittišu uṣaškinūma (4 R 55/2) and ina pān ili ... uṣaškinū’inni (KAR 26), that difference is nonessential and is comparable to the equally nonessential difference between ila ... ittiya uzannū (M I 109; KAR 80 rev. 6) and itti ili ... uzennū’inni (AfO 18 293:68). The local force of ṣuskunu is comparable to that of ṣussū (nesū) in iliya u ʾitariya uesisu eliya (M I 6) and uesisi iliya u ʾitariya ina zumriya (M III 16). ṣuskunu in this meaning is virtually synonymous with ṣusuru in such a passage as KAR 26:40 and with kišāda suhhuru in AfO 18 293:68 (see above note 65).

It seems to us that the referent of ṣuskunu is not dismissal from service, but rather the dismissal of a petitioner by the powers to whom he turns with a request and from whom he does not receive satisfaction. Such statements in the magical corpus as STT 256:10, which is part of a description of a patient’s misfortunes beginning with [DIŠ NA] EN HUL-ti [TUKU] (1), exemplifies this type of dismissal. STT 256:10 reads: i-na Š.GAL GIN.GINl-ak NU IGI-šū i-qab-bi-ma ul i-šem-[mu-šū], “Whenever he goes to the palace, he is not welcome (?); and when he speaks, no one pays any attention to him.” (The reading of IGI-šū in this line is either mahrāšu or mahrāššu; this is required by AfO 18 298: 16f., BAM 315 III 4 // 316 II 7f., and STT 95 III 133 // Bu 91-5-9, 214:6', all of which are quoted below; our translation, however, remains uncertain.) (A further example is KAR 26:7, which is a reflex of KAR 26:40. Contra AS 16 291, KAR 26:7, which must be compared to STT 256:10, should be translated:
“God, king, magnate and prince treat him contemptuously; he speaks but no one grants him anything.”) The opposite of the dismissal described in STT 256:10 is found in the statement of purpose of the ritual of this text: Û.MA-šú a-na ka-šá2 di7 i-na Œ.GAL-šú šak-meš a-na GIN.GIN-ki [ ... ] (16) (cf. ArOr 17/1 186ff.:6ff., 10ff., 13 and 190:3ff., 6ff.).

Line 40 of this text is most revealing in this regard. According to this line, the ritual will result in KL-Iti GLNA.MEŠ t-fam-mu-u. Since this Verheissung predicts the results to be expected from a performance of the ritual, the meaning of this line must reflect the statement of purpose of the ritual found in 14ff., as well as the situation to be rectified by the ritual. Accordingly, this prediction should be taken to mean that those to whom the patient will address his requests will grant them, will turn them into “established facts” and will allow the patient to realize his needs or desires; and it should be translated approximately “They will say ‘so be it’ to him” (compare annu kinnu and Hebrew kēn). The prediction [...] ŠÁ].ŠÉ.SÉ.KI(šuššmīra) KUR-ad KL-šú GI.NA.MEŠ i-tam-mu-u in l. 23 of the related text 4 R 55/2 clearly supports this interpretation, since ittišu GI.NA.MEŠ itammū is closely associated there with the statement “He will attain the desired ends.” It must be emphasized that a translation “They will speak truthfully to him” for ittišu GI.NA.MEŠ itammū in either STT 256 or 4 R 55/2 would be meaningless.

[Note that when a suppliant prays for kittu to be placed in his mouth or for his utterances to be kittu, he is not asking the god for moral or ethical direction. Rather, he is expressing the wish that whatever he seeks will be realized; cf., e.g., KAR 92 rev. 31 // LKA 144 obv. 23 // Rm 247 rev. 11’: mim-ma ma-la a-qab-bu-u kit-tú(LKA: -ti) lib-ši, and see especially AGH 64:12f. and 106:13f.: ema ušammaru/akappudu lukšud šuškin kitti ina piya (šubši amāt damiqtī ina liššiya tiru u manzázu liššu damiqtī). Note also the use of ittimmu in an address to Šamas in his capacity of judge in an anti-witch incantation patterned on a court trial: KAR 80 obv. 24 // RA 26 40:13(B): i-xi»-zo-ma [wa](B: + -ti)-ka li-za-kir kit-tu(B: -ti). Here the petitioner is asking Šamas to support his cause.]

The opposite of ittišu GI.NA.MEŠ itammū is dābib ittišu kitta lā idabbub. (Contra AS 16 290 n. 7, da-bi-bi in da-bi-bi ittišu ..., 4 R 55/2 obv. 3, should be interpreted as dābib and not as da-bi-bu. The final “i” vowel is due to the first “i” of ittišu [sandhi]. Cf., e.g. STT 247:9, K 2562 obv. 6 and the parallel texts Bu 91-5-9, 214:4’, BAM 316 II 6’ and STT 95 III 131.) The translation “if whoever speaks to him (is supposed to) speak nothing but untruths” (AS 16 290) is unacceptable, and this line should be translated: “the one who speaks to him does not say ‘so be it’ (i.e., does not agree to his requests).” Note especially the association of this statement with the statement that people are angry with the patient or hold him in contempt: cf., e.g., STT 247:9f. (JNES 26 190): dābib ittišu kitta lā idabbub eli āmirišu marīš, and STT 275 obv. I 6f.: IGI.DU₄.A-šú [n]ē-ke₂₃-lu₂₂ u KA.KA KI-šú kit-tu la KA.KA-ub.

In support of our interpretation of the type of dismissal referred to by šuškunu, we must emphasize that the setting of such passages as AMT 87/1 rev. 1ff., 4 R 55/2 obv. 1ff., STT 256:1ff. and (the original setting of) KAR 26:35ff. is that of
goddess and have caused god, king, magnate and prince to turn away from me.

Lines 41-42, which immediately follow the lines just translated and which form the last two lines of the lament, contain a series of nouns referring to various evils. This series, which we previously encountered in the General Namburbi group of the JAOS 59 13 group and in texts dependent upon them, is itself followed by the relative pronoun ša governing a verb in the subjunctive. Lines 41-42, therefore, do not contain an independent finite verb. Since all the other entries in our lament, in contrast to the entries in the lists of evils in the aforementioned Namburbi group, form syntactically complete and independent sentences, lines 41-42— if they are to conform to the pattern of the text, be integrated into its structure, and not stand, as it were, in limbo and be suspended in an incomplete state—must stand in relation to a finite verb and must be either the subject or object of that verb. Since these lines form the last entry in the lament, the only option open to us is that these lines are the object of a subject and verb found in the preceding line(s).

And, in fact, von Soden (SAHG, p. 309) took line 40 as containing that subject and verb and translated lines 40-42 as follows:
Gott (und) König, Einflussreicher und Fürst liessen mich umgeben sein von bösen Kräften, bösen, gar nicht guten Vorzeichen, Eingeweidebefunden, die voller Fehler, erschreckend, schlimm (und) gar nicht gut waren, von ..., die Hindernisse vor mir auftürmte!

However, this translation, although commendable insofar as it represents an attempt at understanding the text, glosses over a number of difficulties. For not only is the causal relationship between "god, king, etc." and "evil signs, etc." posited by it unparalleled—to the best of our knowledge—elsewhere, but also—and even more important—"god, king, etc." cannot (have) be(en originally) the subjects of ušashirūninni, and the nouns in 41-42 cannot (have) be(en originally) the objects of that verb. For, as we have seen above, the subjects of this verb are (/were originally) "witchcraft, charms, spells, etc." found in 37, and "god, king, etc." are (/were originally) the objects of this verb.\(^{71}\)

Therefore, lines 41-42 neither contain nor are themselves the subject or object of a finite verb. Since these lines are not integrated grammatically into the text (or, if they are integrated, it is a secondary and anomalous integration), they must be regarded as an intrusive addition to the text. Furthermore, since the entries in these lines recur without finite verbs as part of the Namburbi group mentioned earlier and since they reflect the interest in "signs" of these texts, these texts may be regarded as the source from which our lines were drawn.

So far we have seen that of lines 37-42, only 37-38a and 40 were original to the lament and that the lament, therefore, originally centered on witchcraft. Further support for this latter assertion is found elsewhere in the text. Before examining these supporting passages, we must first complete our survey of the lament and examine lines 35-36. These lines are introduced by an imperative and contain the request that the angry gods be reconciled with

\(^{71}\) The insertions placed within parentheses are intended to cover the possibility that von Soden's translation is correct for the present redaction of the prayer. Let it be said, however, that we consider this possibility to be highly unlikely.
the petitioner.\textsuperscript{72} While it is suggestive that the anger of the gods mentioned in these lines is due to events only described in later lines (38a and 40), this in itself is insufficient to impugn the originality of 35-36. However, considerations of literary form do suffice to establish their secondary nature; for, properly speaking, the kind of requests contained in 35-36 should be in the \textit{Bitte} and not in the \textit{Klage}. That this consideration constitutes legitimate evidence of the secondary nature of these lines is indicated by the absence of any other requests in 35-42. And it must be emphasized that our argument is in no way affected (perhaps, it is even supported) by the existence of requests in the preceding lines, 31-34. For, since the requests in 31-34 constitute an appeal to Marduk and Erua to be present\textsuperscript{73} and to listen to the plaint, not only are the requests in 31-34, in contrast to those in 35-36, in their proper place, but also the two sets of requests are qualitatively different and those in 35-36 cannot be considered a continuation of those in 31-34.

Since 35-36 do not conform to the expected literary pattern and are the only lines in the lament to contain a request, they may justifiably be regarded as secondary. These lines are the expression of an attempt to make the anger of the god primarily responsible for the various evils encountered in the text – an attempt which is, in fact, contradicted by the original kernel of the lament (37-38a and 40) –, and it is for this reason that these lines were inserted at the beginning of the lament.\textsuperscript{74}

\textsuperscript{72}Assuming, of course, that the restoration \textit{[su]-[lim]} in 35 is correct; see above note 59.

\textsuperscript{73}In 32 perhaps read [K]-\textit{ka al-si!?(text: \textit{ka}) (Ebeling, \textit{ZDMG} 69 97, reads \textit{[al]-ka al-ka}; von Soden, \textit{SAHG}, p. 308, does not translate this part of the line), and compare 31b-32 (\textit{[al]-[s]u-ka bêlum ina qereb mušti [i]tîka ašš} \textsuperscript{4} \textit{Eru'a hîrîtu naramtaka rabîtu} with, e.g., M I 1f.: \textit{ašš}kunûši ili mušti ittikunu ašši muššû kallatu kuttumtu.}

\textsuperscript{74}Possibly the use of imperatives and precatives in 31-34 supported the choice of this position.
2. Prayer and Scribal Framework

Our analysis thus far has revealed that the original lament centered on, and was concerned only with, witchcraft and its effects, but that it was reworked so as to include a number of other evils and to make the anger of the god the ultimate cause of all the difficulties. These conclusions, as well as the analysis upon which they are based, are supported, on the one hand, by the importance of witchcraft in the rest of the prayer and, on the other hand, by its virtual absence in the surrounding scribal framework, where, instead, the very evils which were inserted into the lament and the anger of the god which was made primarily responsible for them are of supreme importance. That is to say: whereas the basic prayer, though it has undergone significant revision, still reveals the intent of the original author, the surrounding scribal framework (in this case: the statement of purpose, the description of symptoms and circumstances and the accompanying amuletic prayer), which may, in principle, be treated as temporally posterior to the main prayer contained therein, expresses clearly the purpose for which the prayer has been revised and, therefore, the new purpose of the ritual.\footnote{We take the following to be axiomatic:}

\begin{itemize}
\item [(1)] unless there is irrefutable evidence to the contrary, it must be presumed that if a prayer or incantation contains two (or more) major elements which can be shown to be redactionally distinct and if the scribal framework (ritual, statement of purpose, etc.) agrees with one of these, that one with which the scribal framework agrees is chronologically the later and expresses the purpose for which the prayer or incantation has been reworked;
\item [(2)] the scribal framework expresses accurately the purpose for which the prayer or incantation contained therein was recited at the time when that framework was written. If the connection between the prayer or incantation and scribal framework is not apparent or if the scribal framework seems to be partially or wholly contradicted by the prayer or incantation, it follows that either the prayer or scribal framework has been misunderstood by the modern interpreter or that the prayer has undergone revision and adaptation.
\end{itemize}
attributes describing the amuletic dog used in the ritual (48-50), the actions requested of it (53-54a) and the wishes found at the end of the prayer (rev. 1).

The attributes describing the dog are most instructive, for they point to its function and, therefore, to at least part of the function of the prayer. In KAR 26 obv. 48-50(A) // K 5937(B) we read:

48a [t[a]-r]îl-\(\text{du}\) lem-nu GAL\(_5\).LÁ\(^{76}\) u a\(^{77}\).a-ba(B: -bi)
48b na-sti-hu kiš-pi BŪR\(^{78}\) r[u].he-e ru-se-e up-šá]-šé-e
     HUL.MEŠ šá a-me-[l[t]-t]i](B: LÛ-ti)
49 mű-sal-lim DINGIR ze-ni-i \(^{d}\)XV! (restored from B)
     ze-ni-\(\text{[}\text{tu}_4\text{]}\) (B: -ti)
50 ša-bit a-bu-ti a-na \(^{d}\)AMAR.UD u \(^{d}\)A.EDIN
     (B: [\(^{\text{d}}\)sar-pa]-ni-\(\text{tu}_4\)) be-lšu

The description of the dog in 48a-49 (the attribute in 50 is not germane to the question under study and need not be considered) clearly indicates that its function is to chase away the enemy, to uproot and release witchcraft and to reconcile the angry personal gods. This function must, of course, reflect the function of the prayer and the situation which has called forth the prayer. In fact, not only does the description set out the basic concern of the original prayer, but it does so in an order which reflects the chain of events which has brought the suppliant to his present state: the enemy (used) witchcraft (and thereby provoked) the personal god to be angry with his human ward.

The first two elements in this description of the dog, the enemy and witchcraft, recur in the same order and in the lead position among the actions requested of this same dog in obv. 53ff., and this recurrence confirms the impression gained from 48-50. In fact, the mention of the enemy in both these sequences and, especially, the initial position which he occupies in both support the propriety of our earlier analysis of obv. 37-40 on the basis of the comparison

\(^{76}\) Contra AHw s.v., gallû in this line refers not to a demon but to a human enemy. Note that gallû is omitted in 53 (lemma ajjāba kišpī ...).

\(^{77}\) So clearly B; in A we should probably read u! a'-a-ba.

\(^{78}\) The break up of the stereotype kišpī ruhé rusē ... is strange. Could BŪR derive from an ancient misreading of the ru- of ru-he-e?
drawn between those lines and \textit{AMT} 87/1 rev. 1ff. / 4 \textit{R} 55/2 obv. 1ff.; for \textit{AMT} 87/1 rev. 1ff. and 4 \textit{R} 55/2 obv. 1ff. are concerned with acts, including witchcraft, initiated by an enemy.\footnote{Considering the occurrence of the enemy at the head of the sequence in both 48ff. and 53ff., we would not be at all surprised if the text originally had a line referring to the human enemy who practiced (or incited the practice of) witchcraft, in place of the present 35-36. Remnants of this line might be found in Uš.MEŠ-\textit{ni} at the end of 36. The occurrence of this word in its present context is somewhat surprising, for, while gods turn away in anger, we can recall no other instance within a prayer of the disenchanted personal god actively persecuting (\textit{redû}, lit. pursues) his human ward in anger. (Moreover, it is possible that this line contains a further internal difficulty in that there seems to be a contradiction between the literal meaning of its first part and that of its verb: \textit{ina su-tu\textsuperscript{-}tum\textsuperscript{-}ur pa-\textit{ni}} (\textit{u ma-le\textsuperscript{-}e lib-ba\textsuperscript{-}te}) Uš.MEŠ-\textit{ni}, "they pursue me with ‘turning away of the face’ ...". While it is of course possible to eliminate this contradiction by translating the line idiomatically ["They pursue me in anger ..."], is it correct to do so?)}

Apropos of an alleged persecution of a human ward by his personal god, a further passage requires some comment. Meier, \textit{AfO} 14 143, followed by \textit{CAD E} 394ff. and I 95, translated \textit{AfO} 14 142:38-39 (\textit{ana up\textsuperscript{-}sâšâ \textit{sa ili u il amêli \textit{sa ana sütüqi \textit{sa annanna apil annanna qabû}) as "gegen die Machenschaften seitens eines Gottes und des Schutzgottes des Menschen, denen doch befohlen ist, (sie) an dem so und so, Sohne des so und so, vorbeigehen zu lassen, ...", and thus assumed that the personal god actively performed (or initiated the performance of) witchcraft against his ward. A number of objections must be raised against this translation: (1) As far as we know, there is no other instance of the explicit allegation that the personal god performed (or initiated the performance of) witchcraft against his ward. (2) The qualification that the gods are in fact acting in opposition to their own mandate ("denen doch befohlen ist,"), is, to say the least, most unusual. (3) If these lines form the final entry in the list of evils which began in l. 34, \textit{ana} should not occur at the beginning of 38, since \textit{ana}, in the meaning "against (the evils)," occurs at the beginning of the list (34) and is nowhere else repeated. (4) The generic concluding entry \textit{mimma i-ba-\textsuperscript{-}u \textsuperscript{-}at the end of 37 argues against taking 38-39 as part of the list of evils.

The following alternative translation of these lines within the context of 34-40 may, therefore, be suggested: "Against (here follow various evils) ..., I have invoked you Lugalgirra by means of the magic of the god and of the personal god of the man, who have been commanded (or perhaps: who have commanded) to avert (the evils) from so and so, the son of so and so." Our translation assumes that \textit{ana} is used in the meaning of \textit{ina} and that \textit{ana up\textsuperscript{-}sâšâ \textit{sa ili u il amêli} is more or less equivalent to \textit{ina up\textsuperscript{-}sâšâ \textit{sa Asalluhi} (so restore \textit{KAR} 355:2 [contra Mullo Weir, \textit{LAP} s. \textit{up\textsuperscript{-}sâšâ}: \textit{[ina nar\textsuperscript{-}bi(-e) sá d\textsuperscript{-}â] [\textit{Asal\textsuperscript{-}lu-hî}]}).

It might be argued in support of Meier's translation that since 37 in his translation (36b-37: "jegliche 'Hand des Totengeistes', von seiten des väterlichen Schutz-
The occurrence and importance of witchcraft in the description of the dog and among the actions requested of it in the main prayer are the more striking and significant by contrast with the absence of any mention of witchcraft in the direct address to this same dog found outside the main prayer in rev. 28ff.

**Scribal Framework.** This striking contrast calls for an examination of the scribal framework of our prayer. We immediately notice that (with the exception of ŠU.NAM.LÚ.Uₓ.LU in the series of afflictions which was previously encountered as a secondary insertion in the prayer) witchcraft is mentioned neither in the description of circumstances and symptoms in obv. 1-10, in the address in rev. 28ff., nor in the rubric in rev. 7-8. In the light of this absence, it is significant that that series of afflictions which is restricted to inserted lines within the prayer (38b-39, 54b-55) occurs in the rubric, in the description of circumstances and symptoms (1-2) and in rev. 32 and that the generic HUL Á.MEŠ GISKIM.MEŠ, which headed the inserted Namburbi list (41) and is found nowhere else in the prayer, occurs also in the rubric. This rubric, Rm 2, 171 (+) Th. 1905-4-9, 117 + K 3268 + 8176 + 6033 rev. 6-8(A) // KAR 26 rev. 7-8(B), deserves closer attention:

\[
\text{INIM.INIM.MA } \text{ki}-\text{mil-}t\text{i}^{80} \text{DINGIR(B adds: .MEŠ) ĐÙ.A.BI BÛR.-ri AN.TA.ŠUB.BA dLUGAL.ÜR.RA ŠU.DINGIR.RA ŠU.đINNANA ŠU.GIDIM.MA ŠU(B omits}^{81} \text{).NAM.ERÍM.MA(B omits: .MA) ŠU.NAM.LÚ.Uₓ.LU HUL Á.MEŠ GISKIM.MEŠ }a-na \text{ NA NU TE-e}
\]

\[\text{gottes und der mütterlichen Schutzgöttin, alles was es gibt, ...”) imputes unstated evil actions to the personal god of the father and mother, it is reasonable to expect 38-39 to develop this thought. However, 36b-37 should, perhaps, be translated differently: “every (?) (attack of) ‘Hand of a Ghost’ of the ghost of the father and the ghost of the mother (il abi u ıстал ummi), every (evil) which exists, ....”}^{80}\n
\[\text{INIM.INIM.MA ki-mil-ti is clear in A; B has ana? } \text{?x(x)}\text{?ti. In view of the reading in A, it probably should be presumed that B also had } \text{kimitti, although it is presently unrecognizable in the traces in the copy. Note that Yalvaç, } \text{AS 16} \text{331 n.5, restores here ana }\text{?sì-ib-ta?ti. Unless his reading is based on a collation, it must be regarded as unlikely.}^{81}\n
\[\text{B omits the ŠU in this ideogram also in obv. 55, but has it in obv. 2 and 39.}^{81}\]
The text to release the anger of all the gods so that AN.TA.ŠUB.BA ... not attack the man.

This rubric is especially revealing, for, in contrast to the prayer, it is explicit in making the anger of the god primarily responsible for the various evils.

3. Summary

To sum up: The main prayer to Marduk was originally concerned with attacks of witchcraft and the evil results thereof. This prayer has been reworked essentially by means of insertions. Through this reworking, the prayer has been "universalized" and adapted for use against a large number of unrelated evils, and the anger of the gods has been made primarily responsible for all the sufferings of the suppliant. The scribal framework expresses the new use to which the prayer has been put and evidences a clear verbal connection with those sections of the prayer which have been inserted, but very little connection with the original prayer.
C. BMS 12

1. Strategy

In examining KAR 26 we studied first the lament in the main prayer to Marduk and only afterwards the scribal framework. Since it is conceivable that this procedure colored our analysis and results, let us attempt an approximate reversal of that procedure in examining BMS 12 and study first the scribal framework and only then the lament in the main prayer to Marduk.

2. Scribal Framework and Prayer

Scribal Framework. The scribal framework in BMS expresses in unambiguous terms the anti-witchcraft purpose of the text. This is evident from the following:

(1) According to the statement of purpose found in the first line of the text, the purpose of the ritual is: ana HUL.GIG DI.BAL.A ZI.KU₅.RU.DA KA.DIB.BI.DA KA.HI.KUR.RA ana LÚ NU TE.⁸²

⁸²For editions of the whole or part of this text, see King, BMS 54ff., Hehn, BA 5/3 349ff., Ebeling, AGH 74ff. and von Soden, Iraq 31 82 and 84ff. See SAHG, pp. 302ff. (and 396) for a translation and Kunstmann, LSS nî 2 71. A further duplicate of BMS 12 (or part of a related text) may be the small fragment Sm 2149, which reads: 1' [... Š][IM.LI / 2' [...] an-nu-ti / 3' [...] AN].HÚL.MEŠ / 4' [... GIŠ].MEŠ DU-us / 5' [...] a?¹ GIŠ.SUR.MÍN HI.HI / 6' [...] [x][[(x)][x(x)]]. The following correspondences between Sm 2149 (A) and BMS 12 (B) may be suggested: A 1' // B 9; A 3' // B 11; A 4' // B 12; A 5' // B 15. Note, however, that we have been unable to place A 2', that, if the other correspondences are more or less as suggested, A 5' should have corresponded to B 13 or to B 14 rather than to B 15, and, finally, that B 15 has ina GIŠ.SUR.MÍN instead of a?¹ GIŠ.SUR.MÍN found in A 5' (we hesitate to read [...A.KA]L in A 5' because a hit šurmeni is unknown to us).

⁸³HUL.GIG is to be read ziru or, possibly, zērūtu (see CAD Z 137) rather then lumun murši (AGH 74:1). Note that a variant writing for HUL.GIG is HUL.GIG/K(.KI): thus KAR 35 obv. 17! (= Ebeling's rev. 27) reads KI.ÁG.GÁ HUL.GIG DI.BAL.A, for which the parallel text KAR 36:10f. + 261:1 has [KI!],[ÁG.GÁ HUL.GIG DI.BAL.A. (Our reading of KAR 36 + assumes that Ebeling's line count in KAR 261 is incorrect and that there should be another line somewhere between his 2 and 5 which has left no traces in the copy. This assumption is based on the certain correspondence[s]: KAR 261:7 + 36:17: ⁴DIŠ dUTU [...] and 261:6 + 36:16, if the referent of the statement in HKL 97
This series of afflictions, as we already observed in regard to KAR 26:54a, is almost exclusively associated with witchcraft.

(2) The short independent incantation (105ff.) which was recited over an amulet after the recital of the main prayer is primarily concerned with witchcraft. Our understanding of this incantation is confirmed by the marked similarity between it and M VIII 90ff. (the last incantation in Maqû) and KMI 76: K8505:17ff.,

s. 35 etc. ("n.36 16 entspricht n.261 6, lies šat-šu; Mitt. von vSoden") is the present 261:6 (whose sign min von Soden would then be reading as šal) rather than 261:5[(ina)] and the probable correspondence: KAR 36:10-11 + 261:1-2: ...

\[\text{K[I]}.[ÅG.GÅ HU]L!GIG [DI].BAL.A ZI.KURU₅,DA [KA].[DIB(BI).DA ŠÜR.H]UN!GÅ.\] Note that our interpretation of KAR 35 obv. 17! is not affected if our reading of KAR 36 + is wrong.) This allows us to read BAM 214 III 11' as šHUL!IK.KI rather than as the more dissatisfying IG[I].NIK.N, ik-ki. We are uncertain of the phonetic implications, if any, of this ideogram. (We have assumed that it should not be emended to HUL.<G/KI> IG/K(.KI.) Note also the Alalakh writing ū.hul.ki.ga.a cited CAD Z 137(now, MSL 10 112, note to l. 124). KAR 35 and BAM 214, a Middle Assyrian copy, have other deviant writings: in the former note K.A.DIBI.DA (14) for normal K.A.DIBI.DA and, in the latter note, e.g., NĪG.NAM for what must be NĪG.NA, and cf. also III 4'f. and 12'f., discussed below.

KA.HI (= DIM.MA).KŪ.R.RA is probably šinīt šēmī; cf. Šurpu, p. 58 and AHw 147b. It must be noted, however, that BAM 214 III 12'f. read: DĪM.MA.KŪ.R-e u ši-ni-it šē-mi. While we hesitate to posit an additional Akkadian value for KA.HI.KŪ.R.RA on the basis of BAM 214, because u šinīt šēmī there might conceivably be a misunderstood gloss (note II 7: li-pī ḫ[U]DU and the ditography of I 8f. in 11-13), still the phonetic complement in DĪM.MA.KŪ.R-e is unexpected if this ideogram represents šinīt šēmī, and this complement is, therefore, most suggestive.

The incantation KMI 76: K8505:17ff. is part of a witchcraft ritual which begins in 12' and whose purpose is given in 15'. The text reads:

12' DĪS LŪ ME.DĪM.BI i-i [ta]-[na-aš-pa-ka
13' ŠÀ-sú i-i-ta-na-aš [it]-[ta-na-ru
14' o-si-id ZAG-sú ū [zaq-gat-su
15' ana ip-ši HUL.DIDL IL-NA L(U NU TE
16' ana ši-š-i/SU ša ŠÀ kal-li [ ... (ĒN attā šīli ]
17' at-ta ba-aš-ti at-ti d.LA[MĀ
18' at-ta šú-li GAL at-ta A[LÀD
19' e tam-hur ša-ga-aš-tu₄ e tam-hur na-[kas napišti
20' e tam-hur ul[text: e]-pi-ši u rik-si lem-nu-ti [ı
21' [mim]-[ma] HUL a-a iš-hi-a-ka ina qṭl(text: ku)-b[it
22' [GIM an]-[ni] a-am tāq-ta-bu₄ u a [ı
23' [xx] [x] t[ım] na diš ma ra ki šu? [ı
24' [ ... ] ina [x] [ı
unquestionably directed against witchcraft.

(3) The incantation ez-ze-tú, which in various forms is usually associated with witchcraft rituals, is recited at the end of the ritual (117).

**Prayer.** Turning to the main prayer to Marduk in this text, we immediately notice that while witchcraft is, in fact, mentioned

---

**Notes**

12'-14': A duplicate of 12'-14' (which provides more restorations than those given in our transliteration) is to be found in *STT* 89, which is a collection of diagnoses. These diagnoses are, at least in part, extracted from texts which contain the full diagnosis and ritual. Thus, for example, compare *STT* 89:18-22 with *AMT* 90/1 rev. III 13ff. (Note further that *STT* 89:23-27 is a duplicate of *AMT* 90/1 rev. III 24ff.) The duplicate of our text is found in *STT* 89:38-42:

38 [DÍS] [NA] ME.DÍM.BI [it]-ta-na-aš-[pa]-[ka (x)] KÜ-sú
39 [x]-šu UZÚ?] (or: bi [x]) ku ku \* ku DIB-sú [SÁ]-šú \* t̲a
38 [DÍS] [NA] ME.DÍM.BI [it]-ta-na-aš-[pa]-[ka (x)] KÜ-sú
39 [x]-šu UZÚ?] (or: bi [x]) ku ku \* ku DIB-sú [SÁ]-šú \* t̲a


15': For the restoration, see already *CAD* I 169.

16': The reading šil-li was suggested by W. L. Moran.

16': *ŠÁ kal-li* since the preparations in this type of ritual usually involve a burzigālu (cf. *Maqlû* IX 188, the ritual for VII 90ff. [Tallqvist, *Maqlû*, II p. 93: K 7586: DUG.BUR.ZI.GAL.SAR; K 8879, Meier, *Maqlû*, p. 64 n. 2: [DUG].BUR.ZI.GAL], and *BMS* 12:14) and since *kalal* is equated with DUG.BUR.ZI.GAL in *MSL* 7 90:268, the signs ša kal li should probably be read libbi kal-li and translated “inside a k.-bowl.”

17': For the restoration, see already *CAD* B 143.

20': The emendation is based on the frequent association of *upšu* with *riksu*, which we will discuss elsewhere. For the time being, cf. *BMS* 12:109 (= *Iraq* 31 89): e [tam-hur] (we delete von Soden’s question marks) *uš-pš kiš-pi lem-nul-ti* (cf. *BMS* 12:62). It is possible that the emendation is unnecessary and that *epšu* is a phonetic variant of *upšu*; cf. the bilingual texts quoted in *CAD* E 191 s. *epšu*, where we find níg.a.g.a: *e-pš šu* instead of normal níg.a.g.a: *upšu*.

21'-22': For the emendation and restoration in *ina qil-b[i]t ... GIM an1₁*n1₁*a-am*, cf. *BMS* 12:114f.

85For the use of this incantation in witchcraft rituals, see *AMT* 85/1 rev. VI (= obv. III) 14, *AMT* 86/1 III 5ff., *Maqlû* V 139ff. (// *PBS* 1/1 13:48, *BBR* no. 26 V 75), *RA* 18 162:27 (?), *KAR* 298 rev. 42 // *K* 9873 rev. left col. 5'. For its use in different contexts, see *AMT* 95/2 II 16ff., *AMT* 97/1 8ff. and *BAM* 221 III 26ff.
Babylonian Witchcraft literature

a number of times (54-56, 62f., 81-83) it constitutes only one of the several concerns of the prayer (illness, witchcraft, sin, anger of god and man, evil omens). This is both surprising and perplexing in view of the clear and consistent anti-witchcraft character of the scribal framework, and this situation calls for a closer and more specific comparison between the scribal framework and the main prayer. This comparison reveals that:

(1) None of the witchcraft evils mentioned in either the statement of purpose (1) or in l. 108 of the independent address to the amulet occur in the main prayer itself.

(2) In the main prayer, the description of the results to be attained by means of the aforementioned amulet (67ff.) does not include any mention of witchcraft. This absence contrasts sharply with the importance of witchcraft in the independent incantation (105ff.) which was addressed to that same amulet after the recital of the main prayer.

We notice immediately that the contrast in BMS 12 between the section dealing with the amulet in the main prayer and the independent incantation addressed to that same amulet found outside the main prayer is typologically comparable to the contrast in KAR 26 between the section dealing with the amuletic dog in the main prayer and the independent incantation addressed to that same amuletic dog found outside the main prayer (rev. 28ff.). In view of this parallel set of contrasts and of our experiences with KAR 26, the absence of agreement between the scribal framework and the main prayer to Marduk in BMS 12 strongly suggests that the prayer was originally not used (primarily) against witchcraft and that the scribal framework expresses not the original purpose of the prayer contained therein, but a new purpose to which this prayer has been applied.

3. Lament

The worth of this reconstruction is dependent simply upon how well it serves the purpose of explaining the aforementioned absence.

These results derive, in part, from the materials from which the amulet is constructed.
of agreement. Since this absence would be understandable if the present use of the prayer against witchcraft was secondary, the reconstruction fulfills its function more than adequately, and it therefore stands on its own merit. This is not, however, tantamount to final verification. Implicit in the reconstruction is the possibility that the prayer was reworked for that purpose which it now serves, i.e. combatting witchcraft. The reconstruction must depend, therefore, for its final verification upon the demonstration that if there is a significant mention of witchcraft in the main prayer, that mention is secondary and was not part of the original prayer. Since it can be demonstrated that the original lament (49-58) was not concerned with witchcraft and that the section dealing with witchcraft in the present text of the lament (54-55 +(? ) 56b) was only secondarily inserted, this demonstration constitutes the aforementioned verification of the reconstruction and thereby of the explanation for the absence of agreement between the scribal framework and the main prayer.

We may best establish this point by closely examining lines 54-56 within their immediate context. Lines 49-57\textsuperscript{87} read:\textsuperscript{88}

49 muruš marsāku\textsuperscript{89}...
50 sahpanni kīma šeti kutt[u]manni kīma sa]pāri
51 alū dihu u tānihu la'bu ... [ ... ] minātiya
52 muršu lā ūba nišu u māmīt usah[m]ū širēya

\textsuperscript{87}Cf. von Soden's edition of 49-55 in \textit{Iraq} 31 87.
\textsuperscript{88}For variants, see the editions.
\textsuperscript{89}See \textit{Iraq} 31 87. If von Soden's reading of B as [mur-š]u and his deduction that NĪ.GIG in A should, therefore, be read muruš are correct—and on the face of it they seem reasonable—, we would suggest that NĪ.GIG, e.g., in \textit{AGH} 16:19, 120:7, 108:8 and \textit{TuL} 128:18, all of which attest the usage: anāku ... (ša/ša: \textit{AGH} 16:19, 120:7) NĪ.GIG ( ... ) imhurannima ..., also be read muršu. In fact, if we require these lines to be syntactically identical, we could suggest that the two occurrences (\textit{AGH} 108:8 and \textit{TuL} 128:18) which apparently omitted the relative pronoun really read šā GIG. (If this is correct, it would confirm the reading of NĪ.GIG in these contexts as muršu.) It has already been noted by von Soden, \textit{Iraq} 31 88, that while \textit{BMS} 12 has NĪ.GIG for muršu in l. 49, it has GIG for it in l. 52. Similarly, \textit{AGH} 16ff., for example, has NĪ.GIG in 16:19 but GIG in 16:20.24 and in 18:27.29. (While we prefer to regard this interchange as proof of von Soden's aforementioned deduction, the possibility must be admitted that it might call it into question.)
The acts of witchcraft described in 54-55 are directly (54a, 55a) or indirectly (54b, 55b) due to the actions of a subject who has practiced witchcraft. Furthermore, these acts assume a human, and not a non-corporeal, subject. The illnesses and demons listed in the previous lines can therefore not be that subject.\textsuperscript{91} Since we have every right to expect the explicit mention at some point of the nominal or pronominal subject of these acts, its absence suggests that the lines within the lament dealing with witchcraft were secondarily inserted.\textsuperscript{92} To determine whether this suggestion is, in fact,
correct, we must examine the surrounding lines in order to determine the extent of the alleged insertion and to ascertain whether the lines surrounding the insertion take on a more unified and meaningful appearance when the lines dealing with witchcraft are treated as an insertion and are excluded.

The occurrence of *ina ipši lemnūti ša amēlāti* in 56b would seem to indicate that the insertion extends through the end of 56. However, it is difficult to simply treat 54-56 as a unit, because (a) 56 is considerably longer than either 54 or 55, and it neither parallels nor develops their poetic form; and (b) more important, the enclitic *-ma* at the end of 56c places the last two verbs (*lubbašku u lupputākuma*) in 56 in a causal relationship, expressed accurately by "so dass" (*SAHG*, p. 304), with 57a, and there is no apparent reason to exclude 57a as secondary. This difficulty calls for a closer examination of 56 and especially of its last two verbs.

The first person stative form of the last two verbs in 56 and the fact that their referent is the pathological-physical state of the suppliant and not acts of witchcraft committed against him lead to the important observation that these verbs contrast sharply with those in 54-55, but are formally and semantically similar to those in 53 (... *la'būma litbušāku ... lubbašku u lupputākuma* ...). Especially in view of the *-ma* connective linking 56c with 57, the formal and semantic connections between 53 and 56c and the contrast between these lines and 54-55 indicate that 56c is not part of the insertion, highlight the intrusive nature of the lines dealing with witchcraft and

---

93 In 54-55 the verbs stand in a chiastic arrangement:

*ilqū ... šunullū*

×

... *šabsū ... leqā*

i.e., 54 begins and 55 ends with a form of *leqā* and the two middle verbal forms begin with š and end with ū.

94 Note the first person stative form in both lines; the use of *la’ābu* in the G theme in 53 and in the D in 56; the consistent occurrence of *l-b/p* verbs and the association here, as elsewhere, of *lapātu* with *la’ābu/lu”ubu* (for a complementary association, as here, cf. K 3394 *[Gray, SRT VII*] obv. 28‘, quoted below in note 117; for *lapātu* as a replacement of *la’ābu*, cf. *JCS* 21 4:29, where one MS reads *ilputušu* instead of *il’ibušu* common to the other MSS).
thereby support the contention that 54-55 (and probably 56b: ina ipši ... amēlūti) are an insertion.95

That these conclusions are correct can be finally and irrefutably demonstrated by the existence also of an inner connection between 53, 56a, 56c and 57a, of a direct development of a line of thought in these lines and of a unity of concern in these lines. This unity and the connection between these lines, as well as the very meaning and inner logic of the lament, follow from an understanding of the previously misunderstood nature of the supplicant's affliction described in lines 53 and 56c. The crucial word in these lines is la'ābu, which has traditionally been translated "to be/make feverish."96 In line with this understanding of the word, l. 53, for example, has been translated: "meine Leibesgestalt ist (in) Fieber (versetzt), ...,"97 or "... halten meinen gut gewachsenen Leib in (schwerem) Fieber, ...."98 That fever, however, is not the crucial concern here is apparent from the comparison drawn in this line between the effects of the disease upon the body (šultulti pagriya la'būma) and covering the body with a garment (litbusāku kīma šu-bat). Especially since a similar simile is applied to the effects of leprosy (saharšubbā kīma šubāti pagaršu lilabbišma99), the simile applied in 53 indicates that the line is describing the effects of a disease syndrome which severely disfigured the skin and that la'ābu is the disease action resulting in that effect.100 This interpretation is supported by

95 Further support for our argument that 54-55 are inserted may conceivably be found in the writing of the copula with u in MS B of l. 54 (see Iraq 31 87:54). As far as we can ascertain from the published copies and the editions, the copula in all its other occurrences in this text is written with u. (Whether and to what extent orthographic features may be used as evidence in a "higher critical" study of SB prayers remains unclear to us and obviously requires a very detailed study.)

96 Cf. Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, II, pp. 227f. Also la'bu-li'bu have usually been translated as "fever" (see ibid.). More recently, however, it has been recognized that the referent of li'bu is "eine schwere Hautkrankheit" (AHw s.v.). For other and more recent translations of la'ābu, see below note 100.

97 AGH 79.

98 Iraq 31 88.

99 For this and variant formulations, see JCS 2 205-207, CAD § 224 b2' and RA 60 49.

100 (1) Our discussion of la'ābu and the conclusions reached therein are intended to necessarily deny neither the association of this illness with heat or with a burning sensation nor the possibility that fever may occur in crisis periods of
Šurpu VII 25f.,¹⁰¹ CT 39 2:95¹⁰² and paragraphs 148-149 of the Code of Hammurabi.¹⁰³ The skin effect of this disease probably involved both skin eruptions¹⁰⁴ and a pus-like secretion.¹⁰⁵

As we mentioned above, the suppliant’s physical condition as described in 53 is similar to the physical condition of the leper, and it is this similarity which ultimately leads to an understanding of the connection between 53/56c and 57a and allows us to define the exact force of the enclitic -ma which connects 56c and 57a. For the similarity between these diseases in terms of their physical effects suggests that we examine the social consequences or situations resulting from these effects.¹⁰⁶ In curses in which Sin is asked to bring about the affliction of leprosy, we find: “Que (Sin) leur fasse ainsi perdre leur

---

¹⁰¹ See below note 105.
¹⁰² See below.
¹⁰³ See below.
¹⁰⁴ That the effects of this disease included skin eruptions may be inferred from the fact that dih, which is translated by la’bu, li’bu and la’ābu, is also translated by ašū ša ziqti (CAD s. ziqtu) and from the equation of li’bu with ziqti (AHw s. li’bu).
¹⁰⁵ We base this guess on Šurpu VII 25f., which in Reiner’s edition and translation read: [stu] na im.mi.in.dih.eš šé.ta ba.an.sù.sù: [zu]-mur-šu il-i-bu-ma mar-ta iz-za-ar-qu-šu. “They ... covered his body with scab, sprinkled gall on him.” Since in this passage “to sprinkle gall” on a person’s body is best interpreted as a figurative way of saying that the body is covered with a yellow-green liquid substance, that is, with a pus-like secretion, it may be inferred from the association in this passage of la’ābu with “sprinkling gall” that the effects of the disease action to which la’ābu refers include a pus-like secretion. The possibility may also be noted that la’bu, when associated with the lungs, may refer to a phlegm-like excretion: AMT 55/2:4f.: [DÍŠ NA HA]R.MEŠ-šu NE.MEŠ-šu la-ša ba SI.A volução [Ü[H ina?] pšu?] ... NA.BI HA]R.MEŠ GIG UŠ₁₂ DIB-uš, “[If a man’s lungs are congested/inflamed and are full of phlegm(?), his spittle [ ... ; that man] is sick in the lungs, (because) witchcraft has seized him (i.e., he has eaten witchcraft).”
¹⁰⁶ For the social consequences of leprosy, see JCS 2 207f. and RA 60 49 and n. 4.
position au temple ou au palais,”\textsuperscript{107} or “May Sin, the luminary of heaven and earth, clothe you in leprosy and (thus) not permit you to enter the presence of god and king; ...”\textsuperscript{108} Thus leprosy results in the rejection of the leper by god and man, and for obvious reasons.

Turning to our own passage, we read: \textit{šukulti pagriya la'būma litbusāku kīma șubāt ... lubbāku u luppūtakuma šibsāt ili u amēlūti bašā eliya.} Here also we find the anger of god and man mentioned alongside the effects of a skin disease. In view of the -\textit{ma} connective and on the analogy of leprosy, there can be no question that also here the two are intimately related, that the function of the -\textit{ma} of \textit{luppūtakuma} is to express the existence of a causal relationship between them and that the physical effects of the skin disease action \textit{la'ābu}, whose description begins in 53 and continues in 56c, led to the rejection of the sufferer by god and man (“... I have been afflicted and so the anger of god and man is incited against me”). These socio-religious results are probably due here, as with leprosy, not only to the effects of the disease upon the appearance, but also to its contagious nature; and Ungnad was therefore undoubtedly on the right track when he identified the disease from which the wife was suffering in the situation described in paragraphs 148-149 of the \textit{Code of Hammurabi} as “Aussatz.”\textsuperscript{109}

Our examination of lines 53-57a has revealed that while 53 and 56c-57a logically and continuously develop the theme of the sufferings of a suppliant who was afflicted with a skin disease which severely marred his appearance, lines 54-55 and 56b, which center upon acts of witchcraft, develop an entirely different theme and therefore introduce a logically discordant element into an otherwise coherent narration. When we combine the discordant quality of the lines dealing with witchcraft with the formal and semantic contrasts

\textsuperscript{107}This is Nougayrol’s \textit{(JCS} 2 207) translation of \textit{BRM} 4 50:18, the first word of which he reads \textit{mal-za-sa-šul-nu} (n. 15). \textit{CAD} E 72, however, reads \textit{zāirkunu īštu libbi É.KUR É.GAL luhalīq [ ... ]}, and translates “may your enemy (?) annihilate [you?] from temple and palace.” What does \textit{CAD} do with the \textit{giš} sign before \textit{za}?

\textsuperscript{108}\textit{ANET} \textsuperscript{3} 538:419f.; we owe the reference to the original publication to \textit{RA} 60 49 n. 4.

\textsuperscript{109}We learned of Ungnad’s identification from Driver and Miles, \textit{op. cit.}, II, p. 227. However, we can obviously not agree with their judgment that “nor is it anything so specific as Aussatz (Ungnad), which has no philological support.”
between these lines and those dealing with the skin disease, with the absence of the mention of an explicit subject for the acts of witchcraft and with the fact that the lines dealing with witchcraft are surrounded by lines dealing with a different and unified theme, it must be regarded as established that 54-55 (and probably 56b) are intrusive and were inserted secondarily into the text and that through this insertion the parts of an otherwise coherent and consecutive narration describing the various effects of a skin disease were separated from each other.

These conclusions find further internal support in the fact that they allow us to place 56a in proper perspective and thereby to explain one further anomaly in the text, viz. the unexpected construct form šu-bat at the end of 53. Since baštī tablatu (56a) occurs between the two explicit witchcraft entries, 54-55 and 56b, one might be inclined to construe it as part of the series found in 54-55.² However, this is immediately suspect because 56a differs in kind from the entries in 54-55: while the latter refer to mechanical techniques used by the witch,¹¹¹ baštī tablatu refers to a physical effect.¹¹² In fact, the loss of baštū, “a fine outer demeanor,” is explicitly and understandably associated with laʾābu; thus, in CT 39 2:95 we read: ina zumur belišu baštū innessima ḍLAMA-šú išannīma illaʾib, “dignity will be removed from its (the dog’s) master, and his looks will change and he will suffer from the laʾbu-disease.”¹¹³ Accordingly, baštī tablatu is to be understood as a direct continuation of 53 and as the link between 53 and 56c.

Although we recognize that it is not completely unobjectionable, we would even go so far as to see the insertion of 54-55 as breaking a (secondary) construct. In view of our previous reasons for treating 54-55 as an insertion and 56a as a clear continuation of 53, the occurrence of the otherwise inexplicable construct form šubāt at the end of 53 and the existence of the substantive šubāt baštī are most suggestive and would seem to point to the possibility that šubāt in 53 and baštī in 56 formed at one time a construct šubāt baštī, which

¹¹⁰ So, for example, SAHG, p. 304.
¹¹¹ Cf., e.g., KAR 80 obv. 30ff. and passim in the witchcraft corpus.
¹¹² This entry should not be confused with M VII 60 and 68.
¹¹³ The text and translation of CT 39 2:95 are quoted from CAD B 142.
was broken by the insertion of 54-55. However, there are several objections against the assumption that the construct was original. The most formidable technical difficulty is the feminine form of the verb *tablatu*\(^\text{114}\) since it is not in concord with *šubāt*, a masculine noun. Since we are unprepared, under the circumstances, to treat *šubāt* as a pure result of chance, we must seek a solution to this problem. There are several conceivable solutions.\(^\text{115}\) However, in view of the fact that a skin disease which covers the body is normally simply compared to *šubātu* and not to *šubāt baštī* and that the loss of *baštī* is associated with *la'ābu* in *CT* 39 2:95, quoted above, it seems preferable (albeit highly conjectural) to reconstruct the following three stages of development:

1. ... *litbuṣāku kīma TŪG (šubāti)*; *baštī tablat* ....
2. A scribe seeing TŪG followed by *baštī* construed the two as forming the construct *šubāt baštī* and changed *tablata* to *tablātu* because of the *kīma*. The mutual association of these three words in this scribe’s mind might have been reinforced by his knowledge of such a line as *ittabal šubāt baltī ša zumriša; ammēni* ... *tatbal šubāt baltī ša zumriya*.\(^\text{116}\)
3. Finally, the insertion of 54-55 broke the construct chain, but left vestiges of it in the construct form *šubāt* and in the -u of *tablatu*.

On the supposition that 66b, *ina ipšī lemnūti ša amēlūti*, is secondary,\(^\text{117}\) the original form of the text may be tentatively reconstructed as:

\(^\text{114}\)The subjunctive ending -u by itself would not constitute a formidable objection, for it might be due to the introductory *kīma*.

\(^\text{115}\)E.g., *litbuṣāku kīma šubāt baštī <kīma baštū/ī> tablatu* (haplography); *murçu lā ṭābu ... sukluṭtī pagriya la’bûna litbuṣāku kīma šubāt baštī tablatu* (sic), “a sore illness, ... have covered my unblemished body with sores so that I am clothed (with them) as one is clothed whose good garment has been taken away (and who wears rags instead),” (the feminine form of *tablatu* would then be explained as an erroneous feminine due to concord with *baštī*, the second half of the construct); etc.


\(^\text{117}\)Although this supposition remains perforce unproved because of M VI 116 and K 3394 (Gray, *SRT VII*) obv. 27f., we still regard it as legitimate. In fact, we are prepared to venture the guess that the secondary association evident in our text between the skin disease action described by the verb *la'ābu* and witchcraft is ultimately responsible for the images in M VI 116 and K 3394 obv. 27f. Note that K 3394 obv. 23'-29' are now complete as a result of our having joined K 3394
Šuklulti pagriya laʾbūma / litbušāku kīma šubātī! <u?>118 bašṭī tablat!
lubbāku u lupputākuma / šibsāt ili u amēlūti bašā eliya

A sore illness ...

have covered my unblemished body with sores119 so that I am
covered with them as with a garment (and?)
my good looks are taken away;
I am so covered with sores119 and afflicted that the anger of god
and man is incited against me.

to K 9866 (confirmed):
23’ ar-ka-ti la par-[sa]-ku at-ma-ârâ la kul-la-ku
24’ dal-ha-ku dul-lu-ha-ku laʾ-šā-ku par-da-ku ha-ma-ku da-ma-ku e-šā-ku
25’ mar-ša-ku aš-ka-ku na-da-ku na-as-[sa]-ku u šu-ud-lu-pa-ku
26’ at-ta-nâʾa-ša-ta ū u-ša-ba-la e-[te-nį]-r-ru-pu e-ti-nē-ęš-tu-šu
27’ at-ta-nak-ta-mu ina US₁₂ US₁₂ UŠ₁₂ up-[ša]-še-e HUL.MES NU DÛG.MEŠ
28’ luʾ-ša-ku lu-up-pu-ta-ku DINGIR-utška [GAL]-šum ZU-u 4UTU
atat-ma ZU-u
29’ ana-ku NENNI ARAD-ka ana-pu-[š]-ür kiš-pi-ia
(end of obv.; a full edition will appear elsewhere.) It may be of some significance
for our study that the duplicate LKA 155 (which, we believe, joins 154; a further
duplicate, which we have identified, is LKA 157) rev. 12-17 has a somewhat
divergent text. On the assumption that the coordination of the fragments in the
copy is correct, that text reads:
12 [E]GIR.MU la pa[r-ša-ku atmāa] [la] kul-la-ra ku
13 [e][šā]-ku [x] [ ... ] US₁₂ US₁₂ NENNI [ ... 
14 [ ... ] ū-šu [x] [ ... ] (perhaps: [ ... luʾ-ša-ku] lū-[up]-[pu-ta-ku]
15 [ ... ] kuš]Šu DINGIR mām-ma NU ZU-u [ ... 
16 [ ... at-ta]-ma ti-di 4UTU ana-ku ši-ka [ ... ] (=? NENNI!) [ ... 
17 [ ... a]-na pu-š-šur kiš-pi-ia US₁₂ [ ... 

Even if our supposition is disregarded and these passages are interpreted as
supporting the primacy of BMS 12:56b, it must also be recognized that these
passages support our argument that 54-55 are secondary, for they do not associate
laʾābu with specific mechanics of witchcraft.

It seems to us that 56b, regardless of whether it is primary or secondary,
was to be found in our text prior to the insertion of 54-55 and may, in fact,
have attracted these lines. This chronology would explain, on the one hand, the
separation of the lines dealing with witchcraft into two distinct sections (54-55; 56b) by bašṭī tablatu and, on the other hand, the choice of this awkward position
for the insertion of 54-55.
118 It may be preferable to place bašṭī tablat at the beginning of the second line.
119 "Sores" is used to convey the general force of the verb rather than its precise
meaning (? sores, pimples, rash, etc.).
It would seem that the witchcraft entries were inserted into the lament in order to make witchcraft responsible for the illness and, therefore, indirectly responsible for rejection by god and man.

We neither need nor intend to extend our detailed analysis beyond these few lines of the lament, though eventually this should be done. Here we would only remark that the first part of the request (60ff.) would seem to support our analysis. The suppliant first asks Marduk to eliminate the illness and to reconcile god and man with him. Only after these two requests, which parallel the core of the lament which we have reconstructed, is witchcraft mentioned (62f.). Thus, witchcraft does not appear in the same relative position in the request as in the lament. Moreover, the witchcraft request is formulated in apotropaic form (*aj ishtā*). While this perspective agrees with that of the statement of purpose of the text (*BMS* 12:1) and of the prayer recited over the amulet (105ff.), it does not agree with the general import of the lament, for there the effects of witchcraft are viewed as already having been actualized. This discrepancy is due to the redactor's attempt to integrate witchcraft structurally and causally into the original lament, rather than to simply affix it as he did in the request, and therefore the context of the lament in which the witchcraft entry was to be embedded determined its form and meaning.

**D. Conclusion**

In examining *KAR* 26 and *BMS* 12 we discovered that the same type of relationship obtains in both these texts between the scribal framework and the main prayer to Marduk, that the scribal framework expresses not the original purpose of the prayer to Marduk contained therein, but rather the purpose for which that prayer has been reworked and that the framework agrees with the very lines which were secondarily inserted. Thus the scribal framework in *KAR* 26 expresses the "universal" purpose for which a prayer which originally centered on witchcraft and its effects was revised, and the scribal framework in *BMS* 12 expresses the anti-witchcraft purpose for which a prayer which originally centered on a skin disease and
its effects was revised. Although the development of the intention of these two texts is in opposite directions, the dynamics and formal expression of the development are essentially similar. The parallel configurations of the two texts confirm therefore the pattern and development we claim to have identified in each.

* * *

It is more than possible that a number of points made in our study of these Akkadian incantations and prayers will prove to be wrong. We hope, however, that our examination of these few texts will have provided some further, albeit limited, insight into the process of growth of Akkadian incantations and prayers and will have supported the claim that the understanding of these texts may often depend on an understanding of their literary history.