



---

The Song of Ullikummi Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth

Author(s): Hans Gustav Guterbock

Source: *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (1951), pp. 135-161

Published by: The American Schools of Oriental Research

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1359008>

Accessed: 27/10/2009 06:11

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=asor>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



The American Schools of Oriental Research is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE SONG OF ULLIKUMMI  
REVISED TEXT OF THE HITTITE VERSION OF A HURRIAN MYTH

HANS GUSTAV GÜTERBOCK

Oriental Institute, University of Chicago  
Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

The Song of Ullikummi is a Hittite literary text, found at Boğazköy and belonging to a group of mythological compositions in which the Hurrian god Kumarbi plays a leading rôle. Like the other texts of this group, it is merely a Hittite version of a Hurrian epic. That the Hittite Kumarbi texts go back to Hurrian originals is learned from the fact that some still unpublished Hurrian fragments were found in Boğazköy, and also becomes clear from the Hurrian names of gods and places mentioned in the texts. Although most of the Kumarbi texts were already known through the combined efforts of several hittitologists<sup>1</sup>, a new rendering has now become necessary through the publication of additional fragments<sup>2</sup>. I hope to be able to publish the new version of all pertinent texts<sup>3</sup>—or at least of the larger and better preserved compositions—but for technical reasons this work has to be divided into separate articles of which this is the first<sup>4</sup>. The Song of Ullikummi, it is true, deals with events that were considered to have taken place after those related in other epic compositions. In spite of this it was selected as the first

text to be republished for the simple reason that it is the best preserved and most easily understood of the whole group.

Reconstruction of the Text

The constitution of the text is now clear in most parts. The Song of Ullikummi has come down to us in several fragmentary copies each of which covers several tablets. The division of the text in tablets was not standardized in Hittite times; it rather depended upon the size of the actual clay tablets and of the handwriting, which allowed the writing of more or fewer lines on one tablet<sup>5</sup>. The size of the writing sometimes varies even within one tablet. This and the fact that in some places one copy omits phrases occurring in another or expresses the same idea in a shorter form, make an exact calculation of the length of the text originally written on one tablet difficult, sometimes even impossible.

There seems to be one copy which is characterized by small handwriting. It is called here "copy A". Of this copy A, we have the greater part of the first tablet, pieced together from many

<sup>1</sup> Apart from isolated pieces known previously, the main publications are the following: The bulk of the texts was published in cuneiform by H. Otten in *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi* (abbr. KUB), Vol. XXXIII (Berlin, 1943) (quoted here as "XXXIII" or simply by text numbers). Based upon these texts was my reconstruction and German translation which appeared under the title *Kumarbi, Mythen vom churritischen Kronos . . . (Istanbuler Schriften Nr. 16, Zürich-New York, 1946)* (abbr. *Kum.*). A short English outline was published in the *American Journal of Archaeology* (AJA) LII (1948) pp. 123-134: "The Hittite Version of the Hurrian Kumarbi Myths: Oriental Forerunners of Hesiod". A. Goetze gave a full English translation of the two main compositions in J. B. Pritchard's collection *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton, 1950) (abbr. ANET) pp. 120 f.

("Kingship in Heaven") and pp. 121-125 ("The Song of Ullikummi").

<sup>2</sup> H. Otten, *Mythen vom Gotte Kumarbi. Neue Fragmente* (Berlin, 1950) (abbr. MGK). Valuable contributions are found in the following reviews of my *Kumarbi*: E. H. Sturtevant, JCS I (1947) pp. 353-357; E. Laroche, RHA VIII 47 (1947-48) pp. 20-24; A. Goetze, JAOS 69 (1949) pp. 178-183.

<sup>3</sup> I wish to express my thanks to H. Otten for having limited his MGK to the publication of the new fragments, thus leaving to me the task of giving a revised form of my *Kumarbi*.

<sup>4</sup> The Editor of this Journal has been kind enough to consider later publication of all the texts in offprint form under one cover.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. A. Götze, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš* pp. 4 ff.; the same author, *Language* XI (1935) p. 186 n. 3; *Kum.* p. 46.

fragments published individually<sup>6</sup>. To the same copy seems to belong KUB XXXIII 106, a large fragment which is called here "third(?) tablet of copy A" for reasons that will be discussed later.

The first tablet of copy A had, according to the situation of the thickest point which marks the middle of the tablet, about 68 lines in col. iii and 72 in col. iv, whereas the obverse with slightly larger writing may have had somewhat fewer, perhaps 60 to 65, lines in each column (cols. i and ii). The whole tablet thus contained about 260-270 lines.

Nr. 106 (third(?) tablet of copy A) seems to have been written by the same hand; the writing is of the same small size as that of the reverse of the first tablet. But the columns of Nr. 106 had approximately 90 lines each, with an un-inscribed space of about 20 lines for the colophon in col. iv, which brings the total of this tablet to about 340 lines.

Among the fragments with larger writing there are two which seem to show the same handwriting and, therefore, may belong to one and the same copy of the epic. This copy is called here "copy B". The extant parts belong to its first and second tablets.

Since the middle of the first tablet of copy B is not preserved, the exact number of lines in its columns cannot be determined. The fact that the beginning of B col. ii corresponds to A ii 13 and the end of B col. iii to A iv 5' (*i.e.*, about line 18 of the reconstructed col. iv), can be understood if it is remembered that B has in many cases a shorter version than A (see the footnotes to the text). In other words, the shorter version B needed less space for narrating the same events than did the fuller version A.

In the second tablet of copy B, the middle of the tablet and its lower edge are preserved. According to these data, each column had approximately 50 lines<sup>7</sup>. The fact that the colophon is

written on the left edge shows that col. iv was inscribed to the very end. Thus, the second tablet of copy B contained about 200 lines of text.

Since both cols. iii and iv<sup>8</sup> of the second tablet deal with preparations for the great battle fought by Tešub and his companions against the stone-monster Ullikummi<sup>9</sup>, it seems logical to place XXXIII 106, where this battle is described in col. i, immediately after the second tablet. The tablet number of Nr. 106 is not preserved. The observation just made, that it seems to follow the preparations for battle described in the second tablet, is the reason for our counting it as "third(?) tablet".

As stated above, this "third(?) tablet" (Nr. 106) belongs to copy A of the epic with small handwriting and long columns. No second tablet of this copy A has turned up. That it once existed is, however, clear from the fact that the 200 lines of the second tablet of copy B are by far too much for the gap of only about 30 lines at the beginning of Nr. 106. Thus, we have to reckon with the existence of a second tablet of copy A which, to judge from the length of the first and third(?) tablets of the same copy (A) with about 260-270 and 340 lines respectively, was considerably longer than our second tablet of copy B with only 200 lines. In other words, here again B seems to represent a shorter version than A. We have, in fact, a longer version of one part of the text contained in tablet II of copy B; it is preserved in XXXIII 92 col. iv (D), a fragment of a copy in which the division of the text into tablets was different from the other copies. Its col. iii corresponds to (copy) A (tablet) I (col.) iv (lines) 14'-38'; in the small fragment MGK 11 (D<sub>2</sub>), part of its fourth column seems to be preserved, corresponding to A I iv 44'-52', whereas col. iv of the main fragment D (Nr. 92) corresponds to B II i with considerable additions (see footnotes to the text). I cannot say how the text was dis-

<sup>6</sup> The sigla are explained at the beginning of the transliteration. For the reconstruction of copy A of the first tablet see *Kum.* pp. 45 f.; Laroche, RHA fasc. 47 pp. 21-23 (correction of join); Otten, MGK p. 13 (new fragments).

<sup>7</sup> The text of this tablet has become known only through the efforts of Otten who successfully pieced some published and some unpublished fragments together, MGK pp. 18-24.

<sup>8</sup> Part of col. iv of this tablet can be reconstructed from a combination of KUB XXXIII 113, MGK 12 and 14, as noted in my reviews of MGK (*Bibliotheca Orientalis* VII [1951] p. 93 and *Oriens* IV [1951] 138) and, independently, by Laroche in his review of MGK (RA 45 [1951] p. 96).

<sup>9</sup> It is necessary to mention some details of the contents of the text already here in the discussion of its reconstruction. For a summary of the contents see below.

tributed on the lost obverse of D. There are three possibilities: (1) D (with small writing) had more lines per column than A; (2) it had, in its lost first part, a shorter text than A; (3) it was, on the contrary, a much longer version, so that Nr. 92 is really the second tablet of copy D. In the extant part of col. iii, Nr. 92 corresponds exactly to A: 24 lines in A and D with no major variants, so that it is hard to choose between these possibilities.<sup>10</sup>

To sum up, we may state that the text of the Ullikummi Epic as presented here is based on the fuller version of copy A for the greater part of the first and for the whole of the third(?) tablet, but on the shorter version B for the second tablet. Since it can be seen, however, from those passages where both versions are preserved, that the variants do not affect the course of the narrative<sup>11</sup>, the fact that our second tablet belongs to the short version is of no great importance for the understanding of the epic as a whole.

A few words have to be added about the other copies.

(1) First tablet, copy C (XXXIII 102 + 104 + MGK 9): Medium-sized writing; length of columns cannot be determined. The text is fuller than that of B in some places, but seems to be shorter than that of A. The lines are considerably shorter than those of A, so that in C more lines than in A are required for a corresponding passage. For the position of C ii // B ii with regard to A ii, I have now adopted the view expressed by Otten, MGK pp. 13 f., to the effect that they are parallel in spite of the variants. In copy C the first tablet ends a few lines earlier than in A; the last three lines of C have no counterpart in A.

(2) Second tablet, copy B<sub>2</sub> (MGK 13): For this fragment cf. Otten, MGK p. 18 n. 4. I have called it "B<sub>2</sub>" in view of its similarity to B, stated by Otten, *l.c.* Whether B<sub>2</sub> really is part of B remains, however, doubtful; it seems to be too long for the broken beginning of B col. i and might,

therefore, rather represent another copy.

(3) Third (?) tablet, copy E (MGK 15): As can be seen from the footnotes to third (?) tablet col. ii, this is again a shorter version than A. Whether it is part of one of the copies B, C or D of the first two tablets seems doubtful in view of Otten's description of its handwriting as "shallow"<sup>12</sup>. The fact that the extant fragment seems to be part of the reverse (MGK pp. 24 f.) but corresponds to col. ii of A, is not decisive.

(4) Third (?) tablet, copy E<sub>2</sub> (XXXIII 101): In MGK p. 25, Otten noted that this fragment seems to be written by the same hand as MGK 15 (our E, see preceding paragraph). Otten's attempt, however, to fit both fragments into the context of the epic as parts of one and the same tablet, meets with certain difficulties:

(a) In 101 ii 1 the name Upelluri occurs. If 101 iii corresponded to A ii, as proposed by Otten, this would mean that this name was mentioned at a point of the narrative where there is, according to our knowledge, no room for it.

(b) Otten's restoration of 101 iii on the basis of A I iii 19' ff. and A III iv 26' ff. is certainly correct. But <sup>DU</sup> <sup>DA</sup> a-aš(-) . . . in 101 iii 4' can best be understood if <sup>DU</sup> is taken as vocative (for details see commentary, last section). The whole passage, thus, seems to be a speech directed to Tešub, and the speaker seems to be the Stone (line 2'). This recalls the situation of the end of col. iv of the third (?) tablet.

On these grounds I propose to take Nr. 101 as the continuation of MGK 15, *i.e.*, as the next tablet of the same copy rather than part of the same tablet; hence I call it "E<sub>2</sub>". Nr. 101 ii 1 may correspond to A iii 40', in which case 101 i 1 ff. (beginning of tablet) would fall into the lacuna between cols. ii and iii of A, and the speech of the Stone in 101 iii would be the continuation of his words in A iv. This implies, of course, that the end of our third (?) tablet of copy A (Nr. 106) is not the end of the whole epic; we shall discuss this point later.

<sup>10</sup> Assuming that D<sub>2</sub> really is part of D and using the position of the thickest point of D (at iii 2' and iv 7') as well as the correspondences D iii 24' = A iv 38', D<sub>2</sub> iv 1' = A iv 44', I tried to compute the length of the gap between D<sub>2</sub> iv 10' and D iv 1'. Since this did not lead to clear results, neither for the question under discussion here nor for the determination of the gap between our

first tablet of copy A and second tablet of copy B, I do not go into details.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Otten, MGK pp. 13 f.

<sup>12</sup> MGK p. 24 n. 3: "mittelgrosse, flache Schrift" against the entry "klein" in the table on p. 38. Privately, Otten adds that the writing is similar to, but smaller than, that of copy C.

(5) Third (?) tablet, copy F (XXXIII 107 + MGK 17): Extremely large writing, part of col. i (?). It is not clear whether this fragment belongs to our epic at all and to the particular place proposed here. It seems to tell of the Storm-God's arrival before Ea, but the mention of "all gods" makes one think of an assembly of gods. Since an assembly is mentioned in A III iii 5' (see summary below), the fragment may still belong somewhere in the large gap of A. Another possibility is that it has to be combined with the other fragments dealing with an assembly, which will be discussed later on. In view of its small size, the question whether or not this fragment belongs to our third (?) tablet is of no great importance.

#### Summary of the Epic

It seems advisable to give an outline of the contents of the Ullikummi Epic at this point. For a better understanding it is necessary to recall the general situation. As is learned from another epic<sup>13</sup>, there was a Heavenly Kingship that passed from one generation of gods to the next, the sequence being Alalu, Anu, Kumarbi and the Storm-God Tešub. The episode dealt with in the Song of Ullikummi takes place at a time when Tešub is already king. The dethroned old ruler, Kumarbi, resents this change and tries to regain power by creating an adversary to Tešub.

At this point our epic begins with a proem in which the poet expresses his intention to "sing of Kumarbi, the father of all gods". Note the difference between these words of the proemium and the title of the epic, "Song of Ullikummi", which is taken from the name of the stone-monster which Kumarbi creates against Tešub<sup>14</sup>. This difference reflects the fact that, although Ullikummi plays the main part in the plot, it is Kumarbi who directs his actions. The following lines give the theme: Kumarbi determines to raise a rebel against the Storm-God.

<sup>13</sup> XXXIII 120 = *Kum.*, text 1 a = "Kingship in Heaven" in Pritchard's handbook, cf. note 1.

<sup>14</sup> Tešub is the Hurrian name of the Storm-God. Our Hittite version uses his Hittite name . . . -*una(s)* (complete reading still unknown; some scholars think of *Hamuna* which is, however, not certain). In the same way, Ištar is not called by her Hurrian name *Šauška* but by her Hittite name <sup>D</sup>IŠTAR-*li-*; the same is true of the Sun-God (<sup>D</sup>UTU-*uš* = Hitt. *Istanu(s)*, against Hurr. *Šimegi*) and the Moon-God (<sup>P</sup>XXX-*aš* = Hitt.

After this introduction we learn that Kumarbi leaves his hometown Urkiš (probably east of the Tigris, *i.e.*, in the easternmost part of the Hurrian realm) and goes to a place where he meets a huge rock. Kumarbi has intercourse with this rock. At this point the first column of the first tablet breaks off.

After a gap there follows, in col. ii, an episode the significance of which for the story as a whole still escapes us. We find the deified Sea (probably a male god, see commentary to tbl. IA ii 10) in conversation with his vizier Impaluri. He dispatches him to Kumarbi with an invitation to visit him, which Kumarbi accepts. After a feast, Kumarbi sends his own vizier, Mukišanu, to the Waters with a message the words of which are lost. New gap.

In col. iii the Rock bears a child to Kumarbi. In a scene which follows a well-known pattern<sup>15</sup> the divine midwives put the child on Kumarbi's knees and the latter gives him the name Ullikummi and decrees his duties, namely, to fight against Tešub and the gods who are his companions. In a second speech Kumarbi considers a way to hide his son lest the gods harm him while he is still small. In order to achieve this, he sends Impaluri to call the Irširra-gods. After Impaluri has carried out this mission, Kumarbi orders the Irširras to take the child, carry it to the earth and deposit it on the shoulder of a god named Upelluri who is, as we learn from tablet III (?), an Atlas-like giant who carries Heaven and Earth and consequently, as we may conclude from the following, the sea, too. This the Irširras do, but on their way they first show the child to Enlil<sup>16</sup> who immediately understands the situation. In this connection we learn that the child's body is made of stone. Only after this intermezzo do the Irširras put the child on Upelluri's shoulder. There Ullikummi grows, in the sea, with tremendous speed until he reaches the sky. The first of the gods to

*Arma(s)*, against Hurr. *Kušuḫ*) as well as of the Fate-Goddesses (Hitt. <sup>D</sup>GUL-*šuš*, Hurr. *Ḫutena*) and the Mother-Goddesses (Hitt. <sup>D</sup>MAḪ.ḪI.A-*uš*, Hurr. *Ḫutel-lurra*).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Goetze, JAOS 69 p. 180 sub (d); for KUB XXIV 7 and 8, quoted by Goetze in note 16, see now Friedrich, ZA 49 pp. 220 f. and 232 f.

<sup>16</sup> The mention of Enlil in our epic shows that our poet did not make the equation Kumarbi = Enlil known from other sources; see *Kum.* pp. 94 and 99.

see him there is the Sun-God, who then goes to visit the Storm-God in order to tell him what he has seen. He is so excited that he does not touch the food which is offered him by Tešub and his brother Tašmišu.

At this point the first tablet of our copy A ends. At the beginning of the second tablet of copy B we find the Sun-God still as Tešub's guest. The words in which he informs his host of the terrible sight he has just beheld are still missing; that such information was given we should not only have to suppose for the story's sake but can also infer from the first fragmentary lines of tablet II of copy B and from Tešub's allusion to the Sun-God's report in D iv 15' (see the variants of the second tablet). Although infuriated by the news, Tešub first persuades his guest to accept the food offered to him. But later on, after the Sun-God's departure, Tešub and Tašmišu set out from their abode in order to see the monster with their own eyes. On their way they are joined by their sister Ištar, and together with her they climb Mount Ḫazzi (Semitic Zaphon, Greek *Kasion oros*) at the mouth of the Orontes in North Syria, from where they see the Stone standing in the sea. Overwhelmed, the Storm-God sits down and cries. Ištar tries to console him. Her words are fragmentary, and there follows a gap.

In col. ii Ištar tries to enchant Ullikummi by her womanly charms and by music, very much as she succeeds in doing in the story of the Dragon Ḫedammu<sup>17</sup>. This time, however, she is informed by a wave which rises from the sea that her attempts are vain because the stone-monster Ullikummi is deaf and blind. So she gives up and goes back to her brother Tešub.

The Storm-God then apparently decides to fight Ullikummi. For after a new gap we find him, in col. iii, giving orders to Tašmišu to the effect that the latter prepare his war-cart and his two sacred bulls. Tašmišu carries out this order. After another lacuna, more preparations for battle are described in col. iv of the second tablet.

In the next fragment (which we count as third (?) tablet for this very reason, see above) the battle itself is described. In the fragmentary first column, the Storm-God is not mentioned. We

learn that on his side seventy gods, headed by the warrior-god Aštabi, take part in the battle against Ullikummi. But they are powerless against him. Ullikummi succeeds in reaching Kummiya, Tešub's residence in the mountains of south-eastern Anatolia, and so even endangers Ḫebat, Tešub's wife. Ḫebat, fearing for her husband, sends out her maid-servant Takiti to search for him, but Takiti turns back without success.

After a gap, we find Tašmišu climbing a tower and breaking the sad news of Tešub's defeat to Ḫebat, who is on the roof of her palace (col. ii). Tašmišu then proposes to his master Tešub that they go for help to Ea, the always helpful god of wisdom and witchcraft who lives in the *apsû*, the subterranean sweet-water ocean which our text has transformed into a town called Apsuwa. This plan is carried out, but just at the point where Tešub and Tašmišu reach Ea's house there is a large lacuna in our text.

After this gap, in col. iii, we read that somebody leaves an assembly, a detail to which we shall come back later. Ea then first visits Enlil and afterwards Upelluri. He asks both whether they have not heard about the stone-monster. Enlil's reply is broken, but Upelluri's is well preserved. He says that just as he noticed nothing when Heaven and Earth were built on him and cut apart, so he does not now know of whom Ea speaks; he has only noticed something on his shoulder. So Ea has to turn the shoulder around in order to show Upelluri the monster which had grown on it. Ea then orders the "Former Gods"—the gods of old generations who live in the Nether World just like Upelluri and Enlil—to produce the ancient tool with which Heaven and Earth had once been cut apart, and with this tool he cuts Ullikummi off "under his feet"; that is, by separating him from the body of Upelluri on which he has grown, he magically breaks his power.

In the last column, after a gap, Ea tells Tašmišu to inform the gods that he has thus broken the Stone's force and that they, therefore, may fight him again. Upon this, the Storm-God engages in a new battle. The Stone addresses him. From the boastful tone of Ullikummi's speech in which he repeats what his father Kumarbi had decreed for him in the first tablet, it seems that the Stone is not aware of the fact that Ea has already weakened his strength.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *Kum.* pp. 116-118; full text now in Friedrich, *AOr.* XVII 1 (1949) pp. 230-254.

At this point our third (?) tablet becomes fragmentary, and a few lines later it ends. Before the boastful speech of Ullikummi had become clear through the reconstruction of the parallel passage in the first tablet, I thought that the last fragmentary lines of the third (?) tablet might have contained the end of the story, namely, the final victory of the Storm-God over the Stone, in a very short form. This assumption has now lost its probability. For the elaborate style in which the speech of one of the two combatants is given at length, is hardly compatible with a very short statement of the result of the struggle. Furthermore, if our attempt to fit the fragment Nr. 101 into the context (above, third (?) tablet, copy E<sub>2</sub>) is correct, we would have one copy which actually went on after the end of our third (?) tablet of copy A. Therefore, it seems safer to assume that the story did not end here but that there followed a fourth tablet with an elaborate account of the final battle. It is true that it seems strange (1) that nothing of such a fourth tablet has been found, and (2) that the final battle alone should have filled a whole tablet. The first may be due to accident, and, as for the second point, we cannot know how elaborate the description of the battle was, what other details or episodes the last tablet may have contained, or how long it was. However this may be, the few lines 41'-45' (40' is still part of a speech) seem to be too short for the end of the story.

As far as the contents are concerned, I still think that the end of the story must have been the final victory of the Storm-God over the Stone. For Tešub could not have been the ruling god of the Hurrian pantheon had he not won the victory over all his adversaries. Ea's words by which he encourages the gods to fight again point in the same direction; for it is unthinkable that Ea should have deceived the gods. If the fragment XXXIII 97 could be interpreted as telling of the Storm-God's final victory, it might be part of the lost "fourth tablet". But this seems unlikely because (1) the fragmentary state of the text leaves it open who wins<sup>18</sup>; (2) the style is closer to

the so-called Theogony than to the Ullikummi Epic<sup>19</sup>; (3) clay and handwriting are different from all known copies of our epic (*Kum.* p. 49). Therefore, I have not even included this fragment in the present reconstruction of the text.

However the end of the epic may have looked when it was complete, we may say that the story just retold makes good sense. Apart from the symposium scene in the second column of the first tablet which remains enigmatic as long as the gaps before and after it are not filled, the rest of the epic shows a clear development from Ullikummi's conception and birth, on through his first victory, to Ea's magic and the final battle.

#### Isolated Fragments

If the above summary is compared with the previous translations, it will be noticed that some fragments which were formerly included are now left out. A few words must be said here about their relation to our epic.

Most of these fragments deal with an assembly of the gods: XXXIII 99 (*Kum.* p. 20, frgm. b), 110 (*Kum.* pp. 21 f., frgm. d) and 103 with its duplicates (*Kum.* pp. 21 f., frgms. c and e)<sup>20</sup>. That they can no longer be considered parts of the second tablet, as proposed in *Kumarbi*, has become clear through the rediscovery of the real second tablet. At one stage I tried to place them in the large gap between cols. ii and iii of Nr. 106, because it was tempting to put the description of the assembly just before the line (Nr. 106 iii 5') where it is said that someone left the assembly. The combination of all these texts, namely, Nr. 106 and the three assembly fragments, with the second tablet, proposed in *Kum.* pp. 51 ff. and carried out in *AJA* 52 pp. 128 ff., and (in part) by Goetze, in *Pritchard* pp. 123 ff., was, of course, only possible before Otten's publication of the second tablet and accordingly has to be given up. Still one might ask whether the three fragments dealing with the assembly could not be placed in the lacuna of Nr. 106. But this, too, is impossible now, since Laroche noticed that XXXIII 116 ii is a duplicate of Nr. 100 and Nr. 103 ii<sup>21</sup>.

<sup>18</sup> Text and translation in *Kum.*, IIIrd tablet a, pp. \*24 and 23 f., with commentary on pp. 49 and 75 f.

<sup>19</sup> In addition note now that the bull Hurri is mentioned in Nr. 97, whereas our epic uses a different name for this bull, Tella; cf. below, commentary on second tablet col. iii.

<sup>20</sup> XXXIII 115 (*Kum.* pp. 22 f., frgm. f) certainly does not belong to our epic. A duplicate is now MGK 18 and 18 a; cf. MGK pp. 27 ff.

<sup>21</sup> First known to me through a private communication of Laroche's; see now *RA* 45 (1951) p. 96 and Otten, MGK p. 26.

This means that the text dealing with the Sea's visit to Kumarbi (XXXIII 116 // 122 // XII 65, *Kum.* pp. 32 f., text 4 a) belongs to the same text as the largest of the assembly fragments. And the combined text of Nr. 103 and XII 65 *etc.* is by far too large to fit in the gap or gaps of our third (?) tablet<sup>22</sup>. Consequently, Otten proposed another arrangement (MGK p. 26): between the second tablet and Nr. 106, so that XII 65 + XXXIII 103 *etc.* would be the "third" tablet and Nr. 106, consequently, would have to have a higher number. This, however, has become improbable through the reconstruction of col. iv of the second tablet, made by Laroche and myself after the publication of MGK, according to which the preparations for battle begun in col. iii are continued in col. iv. As stated before, this is the reason for our putting Nr. 106 immediately after the second tablet and counting it as third (?).

If the fragments dealing with an assembly, the Sea's symposion with Kumarbi and the fear of the gods do not belong between the second and our "third (?)" tablet, they can either be put after the end of our third (?) tablet, thus representing part of the missing fourth tablet (see above, end of summary), or else they have to be completely kept apart from our epic. The latter view was expressed by Laroche<sup>23</sup>. It is hard to decide between these two possibilities. It is true that the mention of the *kunkunuzzi*-Stone in Nr. 100 iii 2' and of the "rebel" in Nr. 110, 14 is not decisive and that the reference to mankind in Nr. 103 ii seems to distinguish this text from the epic which elsewhere pays no attention to the fate of man (Laroche, *l.c.*). It may be added that the description of the fear of the gods (Nr. 103 iii) seems odd at a late point of the story where the gods already know that the Stone has been weakened by Ea. On the other hand, the allusions to the Stone and the "rebel" do exist, and the consideration for mankind could have been brought up by Ea as a new argument even if it does not appear

elsewhere in the epic. The symposion is a counterpart to that of our first tablet, and as long as the connection of the latter with the rest of the story remains obscure it is impossible to decide whether the new visiting scene has anything to do with our epic. The external evidence seems to speak in favor of the connection, for XII 65 has the same handwriting as our copy A, and Nr. 122 is close to our copy B. This, too, is, of course, not decisive, since these texts could have been written by the same scribes even if they did not form part of the same literary work. There also exists the possibility considered by Laroche, *l.c.*, that the fragments under discussion represent a different composition parallel to the Ullikummi Epic. The fragment Nr. 94 + 109 (*Kum.* p. 33, text 4 b) which tells of Kumarbi and a daughter of the Sea, might also belong to such a different version of the myth<sup>24</sup>.

In view of these problems these isolated fragments are left aside now; they may be treated on a later occasion.

#### Form of the Epic

Our epic is called "Song of Ullikummi". The word "song", written with the logogram SĪR (read probably *išhamaiš* in Hittite), suggests that we have before us a poetic text. The fashion in which the tablets are written, however, makes it hard to see whether the text has a metrical form. In most cases the sentences run through the lines just as in prosaic texts. For this reason I stated in AJA 52 pp. 133 f. that our texts were written in prose. I now think that this was wrong and that the question has to be reconsidered. It must be remembered that, whereas in Sumerian and Akkadian poetry each verse is written in a separate line, the scribes of Ugarit, for example, did not follow this method so familiar to us but wrote their epics, although they definitely are in verse, in a form that does not show the structure. Thus, the question arises whether the practice of the

<sup>22</sup> Whereas the passage dealing with an assembly (26 lines according to Nr. 100 + MGK 16) would still find place in the large gap of Nr. 106 ii-iii, there is no room, in Nr. 106, for the 30 lines of the symposion scene (Nr. 122 ii 1'-5' + XII 65 iii 1'-24') plus the description of the gods' fear (7 lines in Nr. 103 iii). A collation of Nr. 116 by Mrs. Hatice Kızılyay in Istanbul showed that this fragment is close to the upper edge (about 7 lines missing before ii 1' and about 2 lines missing after iii 13'). This

means that the gap between the assembly and the symposion is large, whereas the latter comes close to the description of the fear. These two passages (symposion and fear, 30 + 7 lines) fit neither into the gap between cols. ii and iii nor into that at the beginning of col. iv (about 23 lines) of Nr. 106.

<sup>23</sup> In his review of MGK, in RA 45 p. 96.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Otten, MGK p. 30; Laroche, RA 45 p. 94 bottom.



Hittite scribes did not conform to that of their colleagues in Ugarit and whether the method applied by modern scholars, namely, to print the verses in our way without regard to the lines of the original, would not, for our texts, yield the same result as it does for the Ugaritic epics. The best way to find an answer to this question is to try this method out. This I did, taking each syntactical clause (whether main or subordinate) as a unit and writing it as a separate line. Furthermore, in order to bring out the rhythm as far as possible, I had to make a "transcription" of the text instead of a "transliteration"<sup>25</sup>, *i.e.*, write each word as a whole, without regard to the syllabic spelling of the original. For the same purpose, I had to put in the Hittite readings for logograms wherever they are known. It is true that this "transcription" still represents our conventionalized reading rather than the real sound of Hittite words which has vanished with their speakers<sup>26</sup>, and that in many cases the reading of a logogram is still unknown. But even in this form the transcription serves our purpose. I am very much indebted to the Editor of this Journal for his kindness in printing the transcription in a separate column between the syllabic transliteration and the translation, in spite of the costs involved. I think that the expense is justified by the result: this way of presentation brings out the structure of the text more clearly, and if the transcription is read aloud it will be noticed that the text is in fact written in verse or at least in a form that comes close to verse. It will even be seen that there are many cases where the lines of the original actually correspond to the verses<sup>27</sup>. It is not easy to describe these "verses" in detail or to establish anything like a metrical pattern. Should one count syllables or word stresses? If stresses, which words have a stress and which do not? If syllables, what about vowels that may only appear in writing but not in speech? What

<sup>25</sup> I use these terms according to I. J. Gelb, *Memorandum on Transliteration and Transcription of Cuneiform* (Chicago, 1948, mimeographed).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Gelb, *l.c.* pp. 2-3, esp. §10.

<sup>27</sup> This is the case wherever in our transcription the line-number appears at the beginning of a continuous series of verses. In order to avoid double numbering, I have not numbered the verses but have used line-numbers according to the original tablets throughout.

about elision? Such questions will have to be investigated in the future and on the basis of more texts; even then it may be that no answer can be found. We shall, however, with all these reservations in mind, attempt to make some provisional statements.

It will be noticed that the clauses or verses are of different length. In spite of the above-mentioned difficulties in counting either stresses or syllables, it can be stated that there is a majority of verses that may be called of "normal" length, with usually four stresses and about 12-17 syllables. Beside these, there are short verses with only 4-10 syllables and two to three stresses, and long clauses with around 22 syllables. Verses of different length appear rather freely mixed.

As is well known, the Hittite scribes used horizontal lines to separate the different sections of their texts, a device also known from other areas and periods of cuneiform writing. In some cases it seems as if in our epic such lines were used to separate stanzas. Thus, *e.g.*, the beginning of the epic is written, in copy A, in groups of 4 + 4 + 2 + 6 verses; these groups may well be stanzas. Accordingly, it is tempting to try to find such stanzas even in those cases where the number of verses between two horizontal lines is larger. In some instances this attempt seems justified by the results. However, the stanzas thus obtained do not always have an even number of verses; besides groups of 2, 4, 6 or 8 verses there are also some of 3, 5 or 7.

In this connection it may be asked whether the introduction of speeches, "X began to speak the words to Y," should be counted as a verse of the stanza or rather be considered as a separate unit (where it is preceded by the clause "When X heard the words" or a similar one, the two sentences together may form a stanza of two verses). For instance, Kumarbi's speech to Impaluri in A I iii 38' ff. seems to consist of the following groups: 2 ("listen to my words") + 2 ("take staff and shoes") + 2 ("go to the Irširras and give them my message") + 4 verses (the message itself). Here, as in other cases, one might take the introductory line 37' as separate. To give one more example for many: Kumarbi's monologue, *ibid.* 16' ff., consists of 4 + 8 verses preceded by the introductory line 15'. In some instances, however, the phrase "X began to speak to Y" seems

to be the last verse of a stanza. This is marked by a horizontal line in C I iii, after line 19', where we have the following situation: Introductory verse (9: Impaluri spoke to the Irširras); a stanza of 4 verses (end of 10 to 13: message); then probably a stanza of 6 verses (14–19: reaction of the Irširras), of which the phrase "Kumarbi spoke to the Irširras" seems to be the last. After a horizontal line, Kumarbi's speech follows with 5(!) + 2 + 2 verses. Comparable cases with no horizontal line are: (a) A I iv 33'–36'. Of these six verses, the phrase "The Sun-God spoke to himself" is the fourth, so it might be taken as the last of a stanza of four, followed by two verses of speech. (b) A III(?) ii 10–16. Here again, "Tasmisu spoke to the Storm-God" is the fourth verse of a group beginning clearly in line 10 b; the following speech of Tasmisu comprises 5(!) verses. The passage that follows immediately presents another aspect of the same problem; for here (A III(?) ii 17–19), "Tasmisu spoke again to the Storm-God" seems to be the first verse of a stanza of four, as seems to be confirmed by the fact that just these four phrases are omitted in copy B.

This brings us to the question of how the variants affect the metric structure. Here are some examples:

(a) Tablet I copy C ii 17–21: Stanza of five verses in C. Copy B omits two of them and thus has a stanza of three verses. Odd number in both copies!

(b) Tablet I, beginning of col. ii: Copy A seems to have the introductory line (9 f.) "Impaluri replied to the Sea," his speech being a stanza of four. After the horizontal line, there are two verses (A 14–15): "When the Sea heard the words, he replied to Impaluri". His speech may have three or four verses (see below). Copy C cuts down Impaluri's speech to one (!) line, omits the phrase "When the Sea heard . . ." and uses only one verse for the command to listen well, so that the Sea's reply consists of only two verses. In total, C has five verses instead of the ten to eleven of A.

Our example (b) involves the question as to how addresses in the vocative are treated. It seems obvious that a single name in the vocative is too small a unit to be taken as a separate verse. But what about an address consisting of two words, like "Impaluri, my vizier" in our case<sup>28</sup>? It is true that *Impaluri SUKKAL-mi uddar-ta kwe memiskimi* could still be one verse, but it could

also be two. If it were two we would have a stanza of four in our example (b).

Other very short syntactical units occur, too. Where two short phrases stand together, they may form one verse, for instance *eku-ma-wa nu-wa-za hassik* in B II i 7'. A similar question presents itself with regard to very long phrases. In Kumarbi's second monologue (A I iii 26'–35'), the strophic structure of which seems fairly clear, there occur (in 33' f.) one very short and one very long phrase one after the other. Since this is the only case of such a close meeting of the two extremes, it would be dangerous to assume that part of the long second phrase had to be combined in one verse with the preceding short one. It seems safer to split the long phrase as indicated in the transcription. Splitting of a long phrase seems also indicated in C I ii 13–15. Here, the seemingly superfluous repetition of *menahhanda* may indicate that the poet intended to write two verses and wanted to give each of them sufficient weight. An interesting case is the variant reading of lines 9–10 of col. i of the first tablet. Here, copy B has one phrase of 22 syllables, whereas A splits the phrase in two by introducing an extra verb (restored) and the sentence-connective *nu* (in *nat*). Is it possible that the writer of A consciously corrected the metric structure of the first draft represented by B? On the other hand, verses of about 22 syllables occur elsewhere and may, therefore, not have been considered as against the metre.

In the transcription I have used indentation to indicate cases of the nature here discussed, *i.e.* both when I thought that two short units might have to be taken together and when I had to split a long clause.

Turning back to the assumed strophic structure, we notice that the length of the verses was apparently not taken into consideration. Whereas in Babylonian poetry the length of the verses increases toward the end of a stanza, we find in our epic cases where the last verse is the shortest (*e.g.*, in the second stanza of the text) or where the flow of long verses is interrupted by a short one (*e.g.*, A I iii 21').

Parallelismus membrorum is not a characteristic feature of our epic, although it is occasionally used. If our text is compared with Biblical or Ugaritic poetry the difference is evident.

<sup>28</sup> Restored here according to the space in A, see footnote on transliteration; but *cf.* "Mukisanu, my vizier" later on in the same column.

There are cases where two or more verses seem to rhyme, for example in the second and third stanza from the beginning. But here, as in other Hittite texts<sup>29</sup>, the apparent rhymes consist of a sequence of morphologically identical forms. It is true that morphological rhyme is used in some literatures, as for instance in Turkish; but elsewhere it is not considered as real rhyme and even avoided<sup>30</sup>. The fact that even the cases of morphological rhyme are isolated in our epic seems to indicate that there was no notion of rhyme as a poetic device and that the sequence of identical verb-forms in some places is accidental.

In conclusion we may state that our epic is not written in very good verse. Whether the shortcomings are due to the fact that the poet had before him a Hurrian original and thus was confronted with the same difficulties as anyone who makes metric translations, is hard to say. One would have to know the Hurrian original—maybe the unpublished Hurrian Kumarbi fragments do contain part of our epic.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, one has to compare poetic texts that were originally composed in Hittite. Since it is obvious that one cannot judge Hittite poetry from our epic alone, I transcribed, for my own use, some other texts in the same way. The result was a very clear strophic structure of the hymnic introduction of the Cow Story<sup>32</sup> which belongs to the same group of “translated” Hurrian literature as our epic. For the originally Hittite texts, however, the result was even less satisfactory than for the Song of Ullikummi, so much so that it seems to me that myths like that of Illuyanka or Teli-pinu are actually written in prose. I refrain from going into details and from making a more definite general statement. The presentation of one epic in metric transcription in this article is only a beginning. For this one epic we may state that its designation as “Song” seems justified in so far as a certain degree of metrical and even strophical

structure can be observed. It is possible that only the Hurrian original was written in real verse and that our Hittite version only reflects the structure of the original; if a poetic text is translated sentence by sentence, even a translation in prose will preserve some of its poetical form. The term “Song” would, in that case, have been simply taken over from the Hurrian epic. The question whether this is the case or whether the Hittite version is a free rendering and was intended to be metrical itself, can only be answered by comparison with the Hurrian version. As far as the word-order is concerned, the occasional position of the subject and/or object after the verb (*e.g.*, “And he stood up, Kumarbi” C I ii 17) may be regarded as poetic.

In the translation I have tried to follow the original as closely as possible. In order to imitate what may be called the “inner rhythm”, I even followed the Hittite word-order as far as the English idiom would allow<sup>33</sup>. I am aware of the danger involved. Whereas the position of the verb at the end of the clause is normal in Hittite throughout (and in our epic, too; the above-mentioned poetic inversion is relatively rare) and, therefore, does not constitute a characteristic of poetry, it certainly does so in English. The danger, thus, exists that a rendering like “Kumarbi wisdom unto his mind takes” creates too strong an impression of poetry. The reason for my using this form of translation is first that I wanted also to avoid an English version that sounded too prosaic, and second that I wished to reproduce the “inner rhythm” by giving the words in the same sequence in which they stand in the original (that this has to be taken *cum grano salis* and that there are cases where the word-order had to be changed goes without saying).

A literary evaluation of our epic may better be postponed till after the completion of the new rendering of all the Hurrian-Hittite Kumarbi texts. Suffice it to say that our epic, as has been stated, has a clear structure, the narration proceeding logically from one step to the next. The general characteristics of the epic style which it shares with the epic literature of the Sumerians, Akkadians, Ugaritians and Greeks, have already

<sup>29</sup> Cf. H. Th. Bossert, “Gedicht und Reim im vor-griechischen Mittelmeergebiet”, in *Geistige Arbeit*, 5. Jahrg. Nr. 18 (Berlin, 1938) pp. 7–10.

<sup>30</sup> As B. Landsberger pointed out to me, morphological rhyme is avoided in Akkadian.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Laroche, RA 45 p. 94.

<sup>32</sup> KUB XXIV 7. The introduction is omitted in Friedrich’s rendering of the story, ZA 49 pp. 224–233; for a paraphrase of the introduction see Götze, *Die Ann. des Murš.*, pp. 262 f.

<sup>33</sup> I wish to thank my colleague Ralph Marcus for the trouble he took in correcting my English, not only in the translation but throughout this article.

been mentioned<sup>34</sup>.

With regard to the comparison of its contents with myths of other peoples I have little to add to my previous statements<sup>35</sup>. The new material published by Otten and incorporated in the present version has added, among others, the scene where Ištar tries to cajole the Stone-monster. This is an oriental motif just like the rôle which Ea plays in the story. The whole spirit of the epic is, of course, oriental, to use this vague term for the mixture of Babylonian, Hurrian and other elements of its cultural background. I am the last to deny the difference between this spirit and the Greek. But this has nothing to do with the possibility that Greek mythology may very well have drawn motifs from oriental sources. In this sense I am convinced that the Greek tradition according to which Typhon originated in Cilicia

finds support in two essential points of our epic: Typhon arises as opponent to Zeus at the same point of the mythological events at which Ullikummi stands up as Tešub's adversary, namely, after the new ruler's triumph over the old. And secondly, the great battle takes place on Mons Casius = Mount Hazzî in both traditions. The common core of both myths is this: A monster sent by the old powers fights the new ruler on Mount Casius; the differences affect the details and, of course, the spirit.

Before proceeding to the transliteration, transcription and translation of the epic<sup>36</sup> I wish to express my gratitude to Albrecht Goetze and Heinrich Otten, who both read a first draft of the manuscript and made a number of valuable suggestions which have been incorporated in the text with their names.

<sup>34</sup> AJA LII p. 134; Goetze, JAOS 69 pp. 179-181. For details of language and style see Otten, MGK pp. 33-35.

<sup>35</sup> *Kum.*, pp. 100-115, concerning the Greeks (100-105), the Babylonians (105-110, with reference to E. A. Speiser's article in JAOS 62 [1942] pp. 98-102), and the Phoenicians (110-115); AJA LII pp. 130-133.

<sup>36</sup> The transliteration is given in the usual form with all variants. Parentheses between brackets [( . . .)] indicate portions preserved in the duplicate(s).

In the transcription, words preserved in any copy are given without brackets; in some cases the brackets have also been omitted if the restoration can be considered as certain. Logograms of unknown reading are rendered by capital X (with the exceptions of StG. for

DU "Storm-God" and IŠTAR); lower case x stands for illegible signs. Roman characters in the transcription indicate uncertainty of reading, whether as a result of mutilation or of our insufficient knowledge of the Hittite reading of a logogram.

In the translation, brackets mark restorations as in the transcription; parentheses, additions required by the English idiom. Uncertainty of translation is marked by italics; italics are also used for Hittite words that were left untranslated.

The footnotes marked by letters belong to both transcription and translation. They contain short explanations and those variants which constitute a different wording.

## Transliteration

## First Tablet

A = XVII 7 + XXXIII 93 + 95 + 96 + MGK 7a + 7b;

B = XXXIII 98 + MGK 8;

C = XXXIII 102 (+) 104 + MGK 9;

D = XXXIII 92 + MGK 10;

D<sub>2</sub> = MGK 11.

Col.I (text according to A, variants in B, few traces in C)

1 [.....]x x[.....]

2 [...-k(án) ku(-e-da-n)i] ZI-ni an-da n[a-aš-kán(?) ZI-ni(?)]

3 ḥ[a<sup>2</sup>-at-ta-tar(?) an-da(?) d]a-aš-ki-iz-zi<sup>1</sup> da-pí-i[a<sup>2</sup>-aš<sup>2</sup> (DINGIR.MEŠ)-aš<sup>3</sup> (ad-da-an)]4 <sup>D</sup>Ku-m[(ar-b)]i-in iš-ḥa-mi-iḥ-ḥi<sup>4</sup>5 <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-iš-za<sup>5</sup> ḥa-at<-ta>-tar<sup>6</sup> ZI-ni pí-an<sup>7</sup> da[(-aš-ki-iz-zi)]6 nu ḤUL-lu-un UD.KAM-an LÚ.ḤUL-an<sup>8</sup> šal-la[(-nu-uš-ki-iz-zi)]7 nu<sup>9</sup> <sup>D</sup>U-ni IGI-an-da<sup>10</sup> i-da-la-wa-tar<sup>11</sup> ša-an[-ḥi-iš-ki-iz-zi]<sup>12</sup>8 nu <sup>D</sup>U-ni<sup>13</sup> :tar-pa-na-al-li-in<sup>14</sup> šal-la-nu[(-uš-ki-iz-zi)]9 <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-iš-za ZI-ni pí-an ḥa-a[(t-ta-tar) da-aš-ki-iz-zi]<sup>15</sup>10 na-at <sup>NA</sup>ku-un-na-an ma-a[(-an iš-ga-ri-iš-ki-iz-zi)]<sup>16</sup>11 ma-a-an-za <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-iš ḥ[a-at-ta-tar ZI-ni pí-an da-a-aš]<sup>17</sup>12 na-aš-kán <sup>GIŠ</sup>ŠÚ.A-az<sup>18</sup> ša-ra-a<sup>19</sup> [(ḥu-u-da-ak a-ra-iš)]13 ŠU-za <sup>GIŠ</sup>PA-an da-a-aš<sup>20</sup> I]-NA ĜIR.MEŠ-ŠU-ma-za <sup>KUŠ</sup>E.SIR.ḤI.A-uš]<sup>21</sup>14 li-li-wa-an-du-uš IM.M[EŠ-uš<sup>21</sup> (šar-ku-it)]<sup>22</sup>15 na-aš-kán <sup>URU</sup>Ūr-ki-ša[(-az URU-za ar-ḥa i-ia-an-ni-iš)]16 na-aš i-ku-un-ta<sup>23</sup> [l[u<sup>2</sup> (-ú<sup>2</sup>-li-kán an-da a-ar-aš)]<sup>24</sup>(B 13 b) nu-kán [x x] i-ku-un-ta lu-ú<sup>2</sup>[-li a]n-da<sup>25</sup>14 šal-li-iš <sup>NA</sup>pí-ru-na[-aš] ki-it-ta-ri

15 na-aš da-lu-ga-aš-ti 3 KAS.ĜÍD pal-ḥa-aš-ti[-ma-aš x KAS.ĜÍD]

16  $\frac{1}{2}$  KAS.ĜÍD-ia kat-ta-kán ku-it ḥar-zi nu-kán [...(?)]<sup>26</sup><sup>1</sup> Lines 2-3 tentatively restored after B which reads:(1) [x x x x]x-za-an iš[-ḥa-mi-iḥ-ḥi(?) x x x-k]án (2) [kú<sup>2</sup>-e<sup>2</sup>-da-n]i ZI-ni an-da ḥa-at-ta-tar-x<sup>2</sup> ZI-ni-kán(?) (3) [k]ú<sup>2</sup>-iš(??) da-aš-ki-iz-zi. Reading ZI-ni-kán(?) in 2 after Otten and photo; the first word of 3 is written over erasure and damaged; Otten proposed an-da(??). See commentary.<sup>2</sup> B 3: ḥu-u-ma-an-ta-aš.<sup>3</sup> B 3: DINGIR.MEŠ-x-x (two signs by second hand, broken); -aš required by context.<sup>4</sup> išḥamihḥi omitted here in B; B seems to have the verb at the beginning, cf. iš[-...] in B 1, note 1. No horizontal line in B.<sup>5</sup> B 4: nu-za (over erasure) <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-iš.<sup>6</sup> B 4: GALGA-tar. <sup>7</sup> B 5: kat-ta-an.<sup>8</sup> This part of the phrase reads in B 5: UD.KAM-an ku-iš LÚ.ḤUL-an.<sup>9</sup> B 6: nu-za. <sup>10</sup> B 6: me-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-da.<sup>11</sup> B 7: ḤUL-tar over erasure.<sup>12</sup> B 7: da-aš-ki-iz-zi.<sup>13</sup> B 7: + me-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-da.<sup>14</sup> B 8 without 'Glossenkeil'.<sup>15</sup> Restored after A 5.<sup>16</sup> For 9-10, B 9-10 reads: nu-za <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-iš ZI-ni kat-ta-an ḥa-at-ta-tar <sup>NA</sup>NUNUZ ma-a-an (10) iš-ga-ri-iš-ki-iz-zi. No horizontal line in B.<sup>17</sup> B 10: ZI-ni pí-an GALGA-tar ME-aš.<sup>18</sup> In B 10a omitted. <sup>19</sup> B 10a: UGU.<sup>20</sup> This phrase omitted in B.<sup>21</sup> For restoration see commentary.<sup>22</sup> This phrase reads in B 11: GAM-an <sup>KUŠ</sup>E.SIR.-ḤI.A-uš šar-ku-it.<sup>23</sup> In B 12 with 'Glossenkeil'.<sup>24</sup> lu<sup>2</sup>-ú<sup>2</sup>- based on Otten's combination of traces in A 16, B 12 and B 13. In B no horizontal line. MGK 8 begins here (B). Text hereafter according to B. Cf. Otten, MGK p. 14.

Transcription  
First TabletTranslation  
First Tablet

Col. I (A)

(1) [.....]  
 (2) [ . . .-kan kwedani] *istanzani anda*  
 n[as-kan istanzani] (3) [ḥattatar, anda] *daskizzi*  
*dapiy[as siunas addan]* (4) *Kumarbin ishāmihhi<sup>a</sup>*

(5) *Kumarbis-za<sup>b</sup> ḥattatar istanzani piran<sup>c</sup> daskizzi*  
 (6) *nu idalun siwattan ḥuwappan sallanuski<sup>d</sup>*  
 (7) *nu(-za) StG.-ni menaḥḥanda idalawatar san-*  
*ḥiskizzi<sup>e</sup>*  
 (8) *nu StG.-ni<sup>f</sup> tarpanallin sallanuski<sup>g</sup>*

(9) *Kumarbis-za istanzani piran ḥattatar [daskizzi]*  
 (10) *nat kunnan mān iskariskizzi<sup>h</sup>*

(11) *mān-za Kumarbis ḥattatar istanzani piran dās*  
 (12) *nas-kan kishiyaz<sup>b</sup> sara ḥudak arais*  
 (13) *kessaraz X-an dās<sup>i</sup>*  
 X-sas-ma-za X-us (14) *liliwandus ḥuwandus*  
*sarkwit<sup>j</sup>*  
 (15) *nas-kan Urkisaz ḥappiraz arḥa iyannis*  
 (16) *nas ikunta luli-kan anda ar(a)s*

(B 13 b) *nu-kan [ . . . ] ikunta lu[li a]nda<sup>k</sup>* (14) *sallis*  
*perunas kittari*  
 (15) *nas dalugasti 3 X*  
*palḥasti[-mas 1 X] (16) ½ X-a*  
*katta-kan kwit ḥarzi*

<sup>a</sup> The first section reads in B:

(1) [ . . . . . ] . . .-zan is[ḥam- Of the [ . . . . . I shall] si[ng],  
 ihbi]  
 [ . . . . .]-kan (2) [kwe]dani is- in whose mind there is  
 tanzani anda [ . . . . .]  
 ḥattatar-x istanzani-kan (3) (and) who takes (also) wis-  
 kwis daskizzi dom into his mind,  
 ḥumandas siunas (4) addan Kumarbi, father of all the  
 Kumarbin gods.

<sup>b</sup> B: *nu-za Kumarbis* “And Kumarbi”.

<sup>c</sup> B: *kattan*.

<sup>d</sup> B: *siwattan kwis ḥuwappan sallanuski<sup>z</sup>* “who raises  
 a ‘day’ as evil (being)”.

Col. I

[Who . . . . .]  
 (and) in [whose] mind there is [ . . . . . ],  
 [into his mind wisdom] he takes.  
 Of Kumarbi, father of all the gods, I shall sing.<sup>a</sup>

Kumarbi<sup>b</sup> wisdom unto his mind takes,  
 and a bad ‘day’ as evil (being) he raises.<sup>d</sup>  
 And against the Storm-God evil he plans,<sup>e</sup>

and against<sup>f</sup> the Storm-God a *rebel* he raises.

Kumarbi wisdom unto his mind [takes],  
 and like a bead he sticks it on.<sup>g</sup>

When Kumarbi wisdom unto his mind had taken,  
 from (his) chair<sup>h</sup> he promptly rose.  
 Into (his) hand a staff he took,<sup>i</sup>  
 upon his feet as shoes the swift winds he put.<sup>j</sup>

And from (his) town Urkiš he set out,  
 and to *ikunta luli* he came.

And [ . . . . . ] in *ikunta luli* a great rock lies.<sup>k</sup>

Her<sup>l</sup> length is three leagues,  
 but her width is [one league] and a half league.  
 What below she has,

<sup>a</sup> B: *daskizzi* “takes”.

<sup>f</sup> B adds: *menaḥḥanda* “against”.

<sup>g</sup> This section reads in B: (9) *nu-za Kumarbis istanzani*  
*kattan ḥattatar kunnan mān* (10) *iskariskizzi* “And  
 Kumarbi sticks wisdom unto his mind like a bead”.

<sup>h</sup> *kishiyaz* “from (his) chair” omitted in B.

<sup>i</sup> This line omitted in B.

<sup>j</sup> This line reads in B: *kattan X-us sarkwit* “Below,  
 the shoes he put on”.

<sup>k</sup> In A 17-18, this passage reads: (17) *mān-kan Ku-*  
*mar[bis . . . . . ]* (18) [nast]a *iku[nta luli . . . . . ]*  
 “When Kumarbi [arrived, there lay in] *ikunta [luli*  
 . . . . . ]”; rest broken.

<sup>l</sup> The rock’s; as the following lines show, the rock is  
 considered a female being.

<sup>25</sup> A 17-18 has more: *ma-a-an-kān* <sup>D</sup>*Ku-mar[-bi-iš*  
 . . . . . ] (18) [na-aš-t]a(?) *i-k[u-un-ta . . . . . ]*;  
 then broken.

<sup>26</sup> Small space at end of line. Otten, MGK p. 14 n. 4,  
 suggests [še-šu-wa-an-zi] according to XXXIII 108 ii 4.  
 Possible if the word was partly written upward between  
 the vertical lines.

- 17 ZI-an-za pa-ra-a wa-at-ku-ut na-aš-za-aš<sup>NA4</sup>p[i-ru-ni]  
 18 [kat]-ta-qn še-eš-ta nu-uš-ši-kán LÚ-na-tar an-da[-an(?)]  
 19 [. . . . . na-a]n-za-an-kán 5-ŠU da-a-aš  
 20 [nam-ma-ma-an(?)-z]a-an-kán 10-ŠU da-a-aš

- 21 [. . . . .-]ku<sup>2</sup>-pa-e-ni d[a-a-a]š  
 22 (traces, then broken)  
 (About 30–32 lines lost, except worthless traces in C i 24 ff.)

Col.II (text first according to A, then C; variants (C and) B)  
 (Lines 1–5 lost)

- 6 [. . . . .<sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-i]š D[INGI]R.MEŠ-aš ad-da-aš e-eš-zi  
 7 [. . . . .]x<sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-in a-uš-ta  
 8 [. . . . .] a-ru-ni i-ia-an-ni-eš

- 9 [(nu<sup>D</sup>Im-pa-lu-ri-iš)] INIM.MEŠ-ar a-ru-ni EGIR-pa<sup>27</sup>  
 10 [(me-mi-iš-ki-u-w)a-an (d)]a-a-iš EN-IA-mu-kán ku-il  
 11 [. . . . .]-at nu-za-kán a-ru-na-an ta-pu-ša<sup>28</sup>  
 12 [. . . . .]-kán x-x<sup>29</sup> ša-ku<sup>2</sup>-wa-ia-nu-un  
 13 [. . . . .<sup>D</sup>K]u-mar-bi-iš DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ad-da-aš e-eš-zi<sup>30</sup>

- 14 [ma-a-an a-ru-na-aš<sup>D</sup>Im-pa-l]u-ri-ia-aš INIM.MEŠ-ar IŠ-ME<sup>31</sup>  
 15 [(nu a-ru-na-aš<sup>D</sup>Im-pa-lu-ri)-i]a<sup>32</sup> EGIR-pa me-mi-iš-ki-u-wa-an da-iš<sup>33</sup>  
 16 [(<sup>D</sup>Im-pa-lu-ri) SUKKAL-IA (?)]<sup>34</sup> INIM.MEŠ]-ar-ta ku-i-e  
 17 [me-mi-iš-ki-mi nu-mu INIM.MEŠ-aš] GEŠTUK-an pa-ra-a  
 18 [la-ga-a-an ḥar-ak(?)]<sup>35</sup> nu(?) i-il(?) ki]-i<sup>2</sup> da-aš-ša-u-wa  
 19 [INIM.MEŠ-ar A-NA<sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi pi-an] me-mi<sup>36</sup>  
 C 7 nu i-it A-NA<sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-b[(i me-mi)] ku-wa-at-wa  
 8 É-ri IGI-an-da<sup>37</sup> ka[r-tim-mi-i]a-u-wa-an-za<sup>38</sup> ú-it  
 9 nu-wa É-ir kat-kat-te<sup>39</sup>[-ma-aš e]-ep-ta SAG.GÌM.ÌR.MEŠ-ia  
 10 na-aḥ-ša-ra-za<sup>40</sup> e-ep[-(ta tu)]-uk-wa IGI-an-da  
 11 GIŠ<sup>41</sup>ERIN-pi ka-ru[-ú du-wa]-ar-na-an  
 12 UTÚL.ĪI.A-ia-at-ta I[GI-an-da]<sup>41</sup> ka-ru-ú za-nu-wa-an  
 13 [(tu-uk-ma)-w]a<sup>42</sup> IGI-an[-(da UD.KAM)]-ti MI.KAM-ti-ia  
 14 LÚ.MEŠ<sup>43</sup>NAR-m[a(?)]<sup>43</sup> (GIŠ)].<sup>D</sup>IN[(ANNA.ĪI.A)]<sup>44</sup> me-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-da

<sup>27</sup> C col. ii begins here.

<sup>28</sup> Otten, MGK p. 13 n. 2.

<sup>29</sup> Traces after -kán according to Otten (private communication); these three signs added above the line.

<sup>30</sup> For A 10b to 13, C 3 reads: <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-iš-wa-kán [GIŠ]ŠÚ<sup>1</sup>.A.ŠU<sup>1</sup> (?) e-eš-zi DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ad-d[a-aš]; B ii 1 (beginning of column) has: DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ad-da-aš.

<sup>31</sup> Line omitted in B and C.

<sup>32</sup> B 1, C 4: A-NA<sup>D</sup>Im-pa-lu-ri.

<sup>33</sup> B 2: da-a-iš; C 4: me-mi-iš-ki-iz-zi.

<sup>34</sup> Restored after MGK 25 iv 1 (Otten p. 32) and to fill the space in A; omitted in B and C.

<sup>35</sup> For A 16b–18a, B 3 and C 5 read: <sup>D</sup>Im-pa(-al)-lu-ri ke-e-mu ud-da-a-ar iš-ta-ma-aš.

<sup>36</sup> For A 18b–19, B 4 and C 6 read: na-at i-it A-NA<sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi pi-ra-an da-aš-ša-nu-ut, the last word in B

(erroneously?) aš-ša[-nu-ut]. In B and C horizontal line. Text hereafter according to C.

<sup>37</sup> B 6: me-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-da; A 21: É<sup>2</sup>-IA pi-an EGIR-pa (Otten, MGK p. 14).

<sup>38</sup> B 6: TUKU.TUKU-an-za. <sup>39</sup> B 7: -ti-.

<sup>40</sup> A 22: [. . . É]-ir na-aḥ-ša-ra-za (Otten, *l.c.*).

<sup>41</sup> B 10: me-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-da.

<sup>42</sup> B 11: tu-uk-ma-aš-ši(!); cf. Kum. p. 59.

<sup>43</sup> B 12: LÚ.MEŠ<sup>43</sup>NAR-ma-ši(!); cf. *ibid.* In C, traces after NAR, read m[a] according to B, but no space for next sign.

<sup>44</sup> A 27: [. . . GIŠ].<sup>D</sup>INANNA<sup>2</sup>.ĪI.A (Otten, p. 13); for C 11 ff., A differs: (A 22 see note 40) (23) [. . . am]-mu-ug-qa-wa-kán (24) [. . . ]x-nu-ut (25) [. . . ]-nu-ut (26) [. . . ] e-ep-pi-ir (27) [. . . GIŠ].<sup>D</sup>INANNA<sup>2</sup>.ĪI.A (corresp. C 14) (28) [. . . ]x-uš tu-uk (29) [. . . ] an-da (30) [. . . ] x-x-an; then broken.

*nu-kan* [. . . (?)] (17) *istanza para walkut*  
*nas-zas peruni* (18) *kattan sesta*  
*nu-si-kan X-natar anda[n]* (19) [. . . . .]  
 [na]n-zan-kan 5-anki dās  
 (20) [namma-man-z]an-kan 10-anki dās

(2 lines fragmentary, about 30–32 lines lost)

Col. II (A)

(Lines 1–5 lost)

(6) [. . . . . *Kumarbi*]s *siunas attas eszi*  
 (7) [. . . . .] *Kumarbin austa*  
 (8) [. . . . .] *aruni iyannis*

(9) *nu Impaluris uddar aruni appa* (10) *memiskiw-*  
*wan dais*  
*ishas-mis-mu-kan kwit* (11) [. . . . .]-*at*<sup>o</sup>  
*nu-za-kan arunan tapusa* (12) [. . . . .]<sup>o</sup>  
 [. . . . .]-*kan x-x sakuwayanun*<sup>o</sup>  
 (13) [kishiya-ma-kan *K*]umarbis *siunas attas eszi*<sup>p</sup>

(14) [*mān arunas Impal*]urideas *uddar istamasta*<sup>q</sup>  
 (15) *nu arunas Impaluriya appa memiskiw-*  
*dais*<sup>r</sup>  
 (16) *Impaluri* [X-mi]<sup>s</sup>  
*uddar-ta kwe* (17) *memiskimi*<sup>t</sup>  
 [*nu-mu uddanas*] *istamanan para* (18) [*lagan*  
*hark*]<sup>t</sup>  
 [nu it kē] *dassawa* (19) [*uddar Kumarbiya piran*]  
*memi*<sup>u</sup>

(C 7) *nu it Kumarbiya memi*  
*kuwat-wa* (8) *piri menahhanda*<sup>v</sup> *kartimmiyawanza*  
*uit*  
 (9) *nu-wa pir katkattimas epta*  
 X-a (10) *nahsaraz epta*<sup>w</sup>  
*tuk-wa menahhanda* (11) *erimpi karu duwarnan*  
 (12) X-a-ta *menahhanda karu zanuwan*  
 (13) *tuk-ma-wa menahhanda siwatti ispanti-ya*  
 (14) *kinirtalles*[-ma] *hunzinara menahhanda*  
 (15) *tissan harkanzi*

<sup>m</sup> Usual expression for sexual excitement.

<sup>n</sup> Meaning: “must remain seated”; see commentary.

<sup>nn</sup> The Sea’s vizier.

<sup>o</sup> These three verses omitted in C.

<sup>p</sup> C: *Kumarbis-wa-kan kishi-si eszi siunas attas* “Kumarbi is seated (= must remain seated) on his chair, the gods’ father. See commentary.

<sup>q</sup> This line omitted in B and C.

<sup>r</sup> C: *memiskizzi* “spoke”.

upon this [. . . . .] (his) mind sprang forward,<sup>m</sup>  
 and with the rock he slept,  
 and into her his manhood [*flowed*].  
 And five times he took her,  
 [*and again*] ten times he took her.

(2 lines fragmentary, about 30–32 lines lost)

Col. II

(Lines 1–5 lost)

[. . . . . *Kumarbi*], the gods’ father, *is seated*.<sup>n</sup>  
 [. . . . .] *Kumarbi* (accus.) he saw.  
 [. . . . .] to the Sea he went.

And Impaluri<sup>nn</sup> the words to the Sea again began  
 to speak:  
 “What my lord me [. . . . .]ed,<sup>o</sup>  
*close to the Sea* [. . . . .],<sup>o</sup>  
 [. . . . .] I . . . . .ed.<sup>o</sup>  
 [*On (his) chair*] *Kumarbi*, the gods’ father, is  
 seated.”<sup>p</sup>

[When the Sea] Impaluri’s words heard,<sup>q</sup>  
 the Sea to Impaluri again began to speak:<sup>r</sup>

“O Impaluri[, my vizier]!<sup>s</sup>  
 The words which to thee I speak,<sup>t</sup>  
 [to my words] (thine) ear [hold inclined]!<sup>t</sup>

[*Go (and) these*] strong [words before Kumarbi]  
 speak!<sup>u</sup>

“Now go (and) to Kumarbi speak:  
 ‘Why against (my) house<sup>v</sup> in anger camest thou,

(so that) trembling the house seized  
 and fear the servants seized?<sup>w</sup>  
 For thee, cedar(-resin) has long been broken,  
 dishes for thee have long been cooked,  
 for thee by day and night  
 the singers the *lutes* hold set.

<sup>s</sup> Title omitted in B and C; restored in A, see note 34 to translit.

<sup>t</sup> For these two verses, B and C read: *Impaluri kē-mu uddar istamas* “O Impaluri! These my words hear!”.

<sup>u</sup> This verse reads in B and C: *nat it Kumarbiya piran dassanut* “go (and) confirm them before Kumarbi!”.

<sup>v</sup> A has: *parni-mi piran appa* “to my house back and forth”.

<sup>w</sup> A has: *pir nahsaraz [epta]* “fear the house [seized]”.



- 15 *ti-iš<sup>45</sup>-ša-an ḥ[(ar-kán-zi ša-r)]a-a ti-i-ia*  
 16 *nu I-NA É-IA a[(r-ḥa e-ḥu)]*  
 17 *na-aš ša-ra-a ti[(-i-ia-at <sup>D</sup>Ku)]-mar-bi-iš*  
 18 *nu-uš-ši <sup>D</sup>Im-pa<sup>46</sup>-lu-r[(i-iš pí-ra-an i-ia-at-ta-at)]*  
 19. <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-iš(-)ma [ . . . . . ] x x [ . . . . . ]<sup>47</sup>  
 20 *na-aš i-ia-an-ni-ia[-at] <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar[-bi-iš]<sup>48</sup>*  
 21 *na-aš-kán a-ru-na-aš [(É)]-ri an-da [(pa-it)]*
- 
- 22 *nu a-ru-na-aš IQ-BI A-NA <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-wa*  
 23 <sup>GIŠ</sup>ḥa-aš-ša-al-li [(a)]<sup>49</sup>-ša-an-na ti-ia-an-du  
 24 <sup>GIŠ</sup>BANŠUR-un-ma-w[a-aš-š]<sup>i50</sup> pí-ra-an ti-ia-an-du  
 25 *a-da-an-na-wa-aš-š[i a]-ku-wa-an-na ú-da-an-du<sup>51</sup>*  
 26 *KAŠ-eš-šar-ma-wa<sup>52</sup>-aš-š[(i a-k)] u-wa-an-na ú-da-an-du*  
 27 <sup>LÚ.MEŠ</sup>MU<sup>53</sup> UTÚL.ḪI.A [(ú-te)]-er <sup>LÚ.MEŠ</sup>QA.ŠU.DU<sub>8</sub>.A-ma-aš-ši GEŠTIN.KU<sub>7</sub><sup>55</sup>  
 28 *a-ka-wa-an-n[(a ú-t)]e-er 1-ŠU e-ku-ir 2-ŠU e-ku[-ir]*  
 29 *3-ŠU e[-ku-ir] 4-ŠU e-ku-ir 5-ŠU e-ku-ir*  
 30 *6-ŠU [(e-ku-ir ?)]-ŠU e-ku-ir nu <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-iš*  
 31 *A-NA [(<sup>D</sup>Mu-ki-ša)]-nu <sup>LÚ</sup>SUKKAL-ŠU me-mi-iš-ki-u-wa-an [da-a-iš]<sup>56</sup>*  
 32 <sup>D</sup>M[u-ki-ša-nu <sup>LÚ</sup>SUKKA]I-IA<sup>57</sup> me-mi<sup>58</sup>-an-da ku-in me-ma-a[(ḥ-ḥi)]  
 33 *n[(u-mu G)ÉŠTUK-an pa-ra-a] e-ep ŠU-za <sup>GIŠ</sup>PA-an da-a<sup>59</sup>*  
 34 *[I-NA GĪR.MEŠ-KA-ma-za <sup>KÚŠ</sup>E.SIR<sup>1</sup>.ḪI.A-uš šar-ku-i nu i-i[t]*  
 35 *[ . . . . . ] nu-kán A.ḪI.A-na-aš an-d[a . . . . ]*  
 36 *[nu-kán(?) ke-e ud-da-a]-ar A.ḪI.A-aš pí-ra-an [me-mi (or: da-aš-ša-nu-ut)]*  
 37 *[ . . . . . ] <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi[(-) . . . . ]*  
 (Broken; little or nothing lost till end of col. II of A)

Cols. III-IV (text according to A, where preserved; restorations and variants from B, C, D and D<sub>2</sub>)  
 (About 20 lines lost)

- 1' [ . . . . . ] x [ . . . . . ]  
 2' [ . . . . . ] x [ . . . . . ]  
 3' [ma-]q-an MI-a[z<sup>1</sup> . . . . ]  
 4' [ḥa]-a-li t[i-ia-at<sup>1</sup> . . . . ]  
 5' [t]i<sup>2</sup>-ia-at Ú[- . . . . ]  
 6' NA<sub>4</sub><sup>?</sup>-aš NA<sub>4</sub>-an na[- . . . . ]  
 7' na-an ḥa-aš-ša-nu-uš[- . . . . ]  
 8' NA<sub>4</sub> pí-ru-na-aš ar-ḥa [ . . . . ]

<sup>45</sup> B 13: -eš-. <sup>46</sup> B 16: + -al-

<sup>47</sup> Goetze, JAOS 69 p. 182 restored: [IŠ-TU] É-x [pa-ra-a ú-it]. For x, one expects ŠU which is (according to Otten) only possible if written over erasure. The space before É fits [IŠ-TU] but is too large for . . . -ma[kán] É- . . . ; this is against a reading É-ir[-za] or the like.

<sup>48</sup> Two lines C 19-20 omitted in B.

<sup>49</sup> Here and in the following lines the gap is smaller than shown in cuneiform copy.

<sup>50</sup> B 20: -ma-aš-ši

<sup>51</sup> B 21: [nu-u]š-ši (erasure) a-da-an-na ú-da-an-du.

<sup>52</sup> B 22 omits -wa-. <sup>53</sup> B 23: <sup>LÚ</sup>MU.ḪI.A.

<sup>54</sup> B 23 omits MEŠ.

<sup>55</sup> See Goetze, JCS V pp. 67 ff.

<sup>56</sup> B 27: A-NA <sup>D</sup>Mu-ki-ša-nu [IQ-BI].

<sup>57</sup> Address omitted in B 28.

<sup>58</sup> B 28: + [-i]a-. <sup>59</sup> B breaks off.

<sup>1</sup> Restored by Otten (private communication).

<sup>2</sup> Otten, MGK p. 15 n. 1.

sara tiya

- (16) *nu parni-mi arḥa eḥu*  
 (17) *nas sara tiyat Kumarbis*  
 (18) *nu-si Impaluris piran iyattat*  
 (19) *Kumarbis-ma parn[az-set para uit]<sup>x</sup>*  
 (20) *nas iyanniyat Kumarbis<sup>x</sup>*  
 (21) *nas-kan arunas piri anda pait*

- (22) *nu arunas memiskizzi*  
*Kumarbiya-wa* (23) *ḥassalli asanna tiyandu*  
 (24) *X-un-ma(-wa)-si piran tiyandu*  
 (25) *adanna-wa-si akuwanna udandu<sup>y</sup>*  
 (26) *sessar-ma(-wa)-si akuwanna udandu*  
 (27) *X-es X-us uter*  
*ekuttares-ma-si mitgaimin<sup>z</sup> wiyanan* (28) *aku-*  
*wanna uter*  
*1-anki ekuir 2-anki ekuir*  
 (29) *3-anki ekuir 4-anki ekuir*  
*5-anki ekuir* (30) *6-anki ekuir 7-anki ekuir*

- nu Kumarbis* (31) *Mukisanui X-si memiskiwan*  
*dais<sup>aa</sup>*  
 (32) *Mukisanu X-mi<sup>bb</sup>*  
*memiyan-ta kwīn memaḥḥi*  
 (33) *nu-mu istamanan [para] ep*  
*kessaraz X-an dā*  
 (34) *[X-tas-ma-za] X-us sarkwi*  
*nu it* (35) [. . . . .]  
*nu-kan wetenas anda* [. . . . .]  
 (36) *[nu-kan kē udd]ar wetenas piran [memi (or:*  
*dassanut)]*  
 (37) [. . . . . *Ku]marbi[. . . . .]*  
 (Broken; little or nothing lost till end of col. II  
 of A)

Cols. III–IV

- (About 20 lines lost; A III 1–2 fragmentary)  
 (3) *[m]ān ispanta[z . . . . .]*  
*[maḥḥan-ma istarniya]* (4) *[ḥ]ali t[iyat]*  
*[. . . . .]* (5) *tiyat*  
*[. . . . .]* (6) *X-as X-an*  
*na[. . . . .]*  
 (7) *nan ḥassanus[kanzi . . . . .]*  
*[. . . . .]* (8) *perunas arḥa* [. . . . .]

<sup>x</sup> These two verses omitted in B.

<sup>y</sup> B (better!): *[nu]-si adanna udandu* “and to eat they shall bring him”.

<sup>z</sup> Reading and translation according to Goetze, JCS V pp. 67 ff.

Get up,

- and to my house come! ”  
 And he got up, Kumarbi,  
 and Impaluri before him went.  
 And Kumarbi [*out of his*] house [*came*],<sup>x</sup>  
 and he traveled, Kumarbi,<sup>x</sup>  
 and into the Sea’s house he went.

And the Sea spoke:

- “For Kumarbi a stool to sit they shall set,  
 a table before him they shall set!  
 To eat (and) to drink they shall bring him,<sup>y</sup>  
 and beer to drink they shall bring him!”  
 The cooks dishes brought,  
 and the cup-bearers sweet<sup>z</sup> wine to drink brought  
 him.  
 Once they drank, twice they drank,  
 three times they drank, four times they  
 drank,  
 five times they drank, six times they drank,  
 seven times they drank.  
 And Kumarbi to Mukišanu, his vizier, began to  
 speak:<sup>aa</sup>  
 “O Mukišanu, my vizier!<sup>bb</sup>  
 The word which I speak to thee—  
 to me (thine) ear hold [out]!  
 Into (thy) hand a staff take,  
 [upon they feet] the shoes put!  
 Now go (and) [. . . . .],  
 and in(to) the waters [. . . . .].  
 [And these wor]ds before the waters [speak (or:  
 confirm)]:  
 [‘. . . . .] Kumarbi [. . . . .’ ”]  
 (Broken)

Cols. III–IV

- (About 20 lines lost; A III 1–2 fragmentary)  
 When *by* night [. . . . .]  
*[When the middle ni]ght-watch c[ame]<sup>a</sup>*  
*[. . . . .] came.*  
*[. . . . .] the stone (nom.) the stone (acc.).*  
 And [. . . . .]  
 And [*they*] br[ought] him to birth, [. . . . .].  
 [. . . . .] the Rock away [. . . . .]

<sup>aa</sup> B has only: *[nu] Kumarbis Mukisanui [memiskizzi]* “And Kumarbi to Mukišanu spoke”.

<sup>bb</sup> Address omitted in B.

<sup>a</sup> Lit.: “When it (=time) came to the middle night watch”; for restoration and translation see commentary.

9' DUMU <sup>P</sup>Ku-mar-bi la-lu-x[. . .

10' *ha-aš-ša-nu-e-ra-an* SAL.M[EŠ . . .

11' *nu* <sup>P</sup>GUL-šu-uš <sup>P</sup>M[AḪ.ḪI.A-uš DUMU-an *kar-pi-ir*<sup>3</sup> *na-an-kán A-NA* <sup>P</sup>K[u-m[ar-bi]<sup>4</sup>

12' *gi-nu-wa-aš ha-la-a-i[r* <sup>P</sup>Ku-mar]-bi-iš-za a[-ši] DUMU.NITA-an

13' *du-uš-ki-iš-ki-u-wa-an da-a[-iš na]-an ku-un-ke-eš-ki-u-wa-an d[a-a-iš]*

14' *nu ša-ne-ez-zi ŠUM-an* [ x x<sup>5</sup> p]é-eš-ki-u-wa-an da-a-iš<sup>6</sup>

15' <sup>P</sup>Ku-mar-bi-iš-za PA-NI Z[I-ŠU *me-mi-i*]š-ki-u-wa-an da-a-iš

16' *ku-it-wa-aš-ši-kán ŠUM-an* [te<sup>7</sup> - eh-ḫi<sup>7</sup> <sup>P</sup>]GUL-šu-uš-wa-mu <sup>P</sup>MAḪ.ḪI.A-uš

17' *ku-in* DUMU-an SUM-ir *nu-wa-r[a-aš-kán(?) NÍ.TE-az ar-ḫa* <sup>G18</sup>ši-ia-tal

18' *ma-a-an wa-at-ku-ut pa-id-d[u-wa-aš(-ši?)]-ša-a]*n<sup>8</sup> <sup>P</sup>U-li-kum-mi ŠUM-an e-eš-du

19' *nu-wa-ra-aš-kán ne-pi-ši* [LUGAL-iz-na]-an-ni<sup>9</sup> UGU *pa-id-du*

20' *nu-wa-kán* <sup>URU</sup>Kum-mi-ia-an URU[-an ša-n]e-ez-zi-in GAM *ta-ma-aš-du*

21' <sup>P</sup>U-an-ma-wa GUL-ah-du *nu-wa-r[a-an i]z<sup>2</sup>-za<sup>2</sup>-an<sup>10</sup> GIM-an ar-ḫa pu-uš-ša-id-du*

22' *la-la-ku-e-ša-an-ma-wa-ra-an[-kán<sup>2</sup> GIM<sup>2</sup>-an] GİR-it an-da pa-ši-ḫa-id-du*

23' <sup>P</sup>Ta-aš-mi-šu-un-ma-wa *ḫa-ah-ḫa[-ri-in<sup>11</sup> G]I-an ma-a-an ar-ḫa za-ah-re-eš-ki-id-du*

24' DINGIR.MEŠ-ma-wa-kán *ḫu-u-ma-an-du-uš* [ne-pi-š]a-az GAM<sup>12</sup> MUŠEN<sup>12</sup>.ḪI.A GIM-an *iš-ḫu-wa-a-ú*

25' *nu-wa-ra-aš dan-na-ru-uš* DUG.UTÚL.ḪI.A-u[š GIM-an] *ar-ḫa du-wa-ar-ni-eš-ki-id-du*

26' *ma-a-an* <sup>P</sup>Ku-mar-bi-iš INIM.MEŠ-ar *me-m[i-ia-u-wa-an-z]i zi-i[n-ni]-it<sup>13</sup>*

27' *nu-za* PA-NI ZI-ŠU *me-mi-iš-ki-u-wa-an* [da-a-iš *ku-e-d*]a-ni-wa-ra-an

28' *pi-ih-ḫi a-ši* DUMU-an *ku-iš-wa-ra-an-za-an* [da-a-i<sup>14</sup> *nu-wa-ra*]-an

29' *up-pi-ia-aš-šar* DÛ-zi *nu-wa-ra*[-. . . . .] x x [x<sup>2</sup>] x x x x

30' *nu-wa-ra-an-ká*[n MI-i] KI-pi-ia *an-d[a ku-iš(?) pi-e-d]a<sup>2</sup>-i<sup>2</sup>[. . . (?)]<sup>15</sup>*

31' *nu-wa-ra-an* [ne-pi-ša]a-aš <sup>P</sup>UTU-uš <sup>P</sup>[XXX-aš-ša<sup>16</sup> l]e-e *ú-wa-a[n-z]i*

32' *le-e-m[a-wa-ra-an a-uš]-zi* <sup>P</sup>U-aš <sup>URU</sup>Kum-m[i-ia-aš] UR.SAG-li-uš LUGAL-uš

33' *nu-w[a-r]a-an-kán le-e ku-en-zi le[-e-wa-ra]-an a-uš-zi*

34' <sup>P</sup>IŠTAR-iš <sup>URU</sup>Ni-nu-wa-aš SAL.LUGAL-aš *tar-x-x-kán-ta-aš SAL-aš*

35' [n]u-wa-ra-an *ḫa-ah-ḫa-ri-in* GI-an G[I]M-an *ar-ḫa le-e*

36' *z[a-a]ḫ-ḫu-re-eš-ki-iz-zi*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A iv 8-9. Or *da-a-ir*, cf. A iii 46, C iii 20 and A iv 7.

<sup>4</sup> Otten, MGK p. 15; cf. A iv 9 f. New arrangement of fragments (Laroche, RHA 47 pp. 21 ff.) begins here: 11 left + 22 right, etc.

<sup>5</sup> Space for two signs; -še-et or DUMU-li?

<sup>6</sup> Middle of tablet.

<sup>7</sup> Rather so than *pi-ih-ḫi* because of the *-kan*. Cf. XXIV 8 iii 7, 13 (Friedrich, ZA 49 p. 220) and contrast our line 14.

<sup>8</sup> For restoration cf. XXIV 8 iii 10, 14, 16 (Friedrich, l.c.).

<sup>9</sup> Restored by Otten, MGK p. 15 n. 6, after XXXIII 106 iv 26 = tbl. III (?).

<sup>10</sup> See commentary. <sup>11</sup> Restored after line 35.

<sup>12</sup> Over erasure.

<sup>13</sup> Restored from context; cf. Otten, MGK p. 15 n. 9, and tbl. III (?) ii 11; last sign over erasure.

<sup>14</sup> Goetze, JAOS 69 p. 182.

<sup>15</sup> KUB XVII 7 iii and MGK 7a iii begin here; cf. MGK p. 16 n. 2 and Goetze, l.c. Traces in XVII 7 iii 1 could be [pi-e-d]a-i, but the space requires one more short word.

<sup>16</sup> Otten, MGK p. 16 n. 4.

<sup>b</sup> See commentary.

<sup>c</sup> The Storm-God's residence, somewhere in the mountains bordering Mesopotamia to the north.

<sup>d</sup> The Storm-God's brother.

[. . . . .] (9) *Kumarbiyas X lalu*[-. . . . .]

(10) *ḥassanuer-an* [ḥasnupalles . . . . .]  
 (11) *nu X-sus* [X-us X-an *karpir* (or: *dair*)]

[*nan-kan K*]um[*arbiya*] (12) *genuwas ḥalair*  
*Kumarbis-za asi X-an* (13) *duskiskiwan dais*  
*nan kunkeskiwan dais*

(14) *nu sanezzi laman*[-set (or: X-*li*)] *peskiwan dais*

(15) *Kumarbis-za istanzani-si piran memiskiwan dais*

(16) *kwi-wa-si-kan laman* [teḥḥi]  
 X-sus-wa-mu X-us (17) *kwin X-an pier*  
*nu-war[-as-kan] twekkaz arḥa siyattal* (18) *mān watkut*

*paiddu*[-wa-si-sa]n Ullikummi laman esdu  
 (19) *nu-war-as-kan nepisi ḥassueznanni sara paiddu*

(20) *nu-wa-kan Kummiyan ḥappiran sanezzin katta tamasdu*

(21) StG.-an-ma-wa walḥdu  
*nu-war*[an ez]zan<sup>b</sup> mān arḥa pussaiddu  
 (22) *lalakwesana-ma-war-an*[-kan mān] X-it anda pasihaiddu

(23) *Tasmisun-ma-wa ḥaḥḥarin X-an mān arḥa zahreskiddu*

(24) *siunius-ma-wa-kan ḥumandus nepisaz katta X-us mān isḥuwau*

(25) *nu-war-as dannarus X-us* [mān] arḥa duwar-neskiddu

(26) *mān Kumarbis uddar memiyawanzi zinnit*

(27) *nu-za istanzani-si piran memiskiwan dais*

[*kwed*]ani-war-an (28) *piḥḥi asi X-an*

*kwis-war-an-zan* [dai]

[*nu-war*]-an (29) *uppiyassar iyazi*

*nu-war*[-an . . . . .]

(30) *nu-war-an-kan dankuwai* daganzipi-ya anda [kwis ped]ai

(31) *nu-war-an* [nepis]as Istanus [Armas-a] le uwanzi

(32) *le-ma*[-war-an aus]zi StG.-as Kummiyas ḥas-talius ḥassus

(33) *nu-war-an-kan le kwenzi*

*le-war-an auszi* (34) IŠTAR-is

*Ninuwas ḥassussaras tar-x-x-kantas X-as*

(35) *nu-war-an ḥaḥḥarin X-an mān arḥa le* (36) *zahḥureskizzi*

[. . . . .] Kumarbi's son . . . [ . . . . . ]

They brought him to birth, [*the midwives*, . . . . .].  
 And the Fate-Goddesses and [*Mother-Goddesses*  
 the child lifted (or: took)],  
 [and] on Kumarbi's knees they placed him.  
 Kumarbi over this son to rejoice began,  
 and to *fondle* him he began,  
 and [his] dear name (or: the dear name [to the  
 child]) to give he began.

Kumarbi to his own mind began to speak:

“What name shall I [put] on him,  
 on the son whom the Fate-Goddesses and *Mother-*  
*Goddesses* gave me?  
 Out of the body like a *blade*<sup>b</sup> he sprang.  
 He shall go! Ullikummi be his name!  
 Up to Heaven to kingship he shall go,

and Kummiya,<sup>c</sup> the dear town, he shall press  
 down!

But the Storm-God he shall hit,  
 and like *salt*<sup>b</sup> he shall pound him,  
 and like an ant<sup>b</sup> with (his) foot he shall crush him!

But Tašmišu<sup>d</sup> like a . . . . . reed he shall *break*<sup>b</sup> off!

All the gods down from Heaven like birds he shall  
 scatter,  
 and like empty vessels he shall break them!

When Kumarbi the words had ceased to speak,  
 to his own mind he began to speak:

“To whom shall I give him, this son?

Who will [take] him

and *treat* him as a *gift*?

And [who will . . . . . him . . . . . ],

and to the [dark] earth [*who will carr*]y him?

And the Sun-God of Heaven [and the Moon-God]  
 shall not see him!

He shall not see him, (he) the Storm-God, the  
 brave king of Kummiya,

and he shall not kill him!

She shall not see him, (she) IŠtar,

the queen of Nineveh, the . . . . . woman,

and she shall not like a . . . . . reed *break* him off!?”



(37) *Kumarbis Impaluriya memiskiwan dais*  
 (38) *Impaluri uddar[-ta] kwe memiskimi*  
 (39) *nu-mu uddanas istamanan para lagan ĥark*  
*kessaraz* (40) *X-an dā*  
*X-tas-ma-za X-us liliwandus* (41) *ĥuwandus sarkwi*  
*[nu] Irsirras kattan it*  
 (42) *nu kē dassawa uddar Irsirras piran memi*  
 (43) *uwatten*  
*ĥalzessai-wa-smas Kumarbis siunas attas* (44)  
*siunas parna*  
*memiyani-ma-wa-smas kwedani ĥalzessai*  
 (45) ..[.....]<sup>e</sup>  
*nu-wa ĥudak uwatten*

(46) [nan-za Irsirri]us danzi X-an  
*nan apus* (47) [pedanzi dankuwa]i daganzi  
*Irsirrius-ma-kan* (48) [.....] X-us  
*natta-mas sallayas* (IV 1) [.....]  
 (C III 4) [nu mān] *Impaluris* (5) [uddar istamasta]  
*kessaraz X-an [dās]*  
 (6) [X-sas<sup>g</sup> X]-us sarkwit  
 (7) [nas-kan para iya]ttat *Impaluris*  
 (8) [nas-kan Irsir]ras anda ar(a)s

(9) [nu Impaluris] uddar Irsirras (10) [appa  
*memiski]wan dais*  
*uwatten-wa*  
 (11) [ĥalzessai-wa-sm]as Kumarbis siunas at-  
*tas*  
 (12) [ĥalzessai]-ma-wa-smas kwedani memiyani  
 (13) [nu-war-an] natta sak[te]n  
*nu-wa nuntarnutten uwatten*  
 (14) *nu mān Irsirrius uddar istamassir*  
 (15) [nat nuntarnuir] liliwahĥir  
 (16) [nat kishiyaz sara ara]er  
*nat 1-anki* (17) *sarrir*  
*[nu-kan] Kumarbiya kattan erir*  
 (18) *nu Kumarbis Irsirras* (19) *memiskiwan dais*

(20) [kun-wa-za X-an] datten  
*nu-war-an upressar* (21) [iyatte]n  
*nu-war-an dankuwai daganzi pedatten*  
 (22) *nuntarnutten-wa liliwahĥen*  
 (23) *nu-war-an-kan Upelluriya* (24) *kunni paltani*  
*siyattal tiyatten*

<sup>37</sup> Traces in A iv 1' (XXXIII 95 iv 1) probably [ . . . -p]é-e[- . . . ] of this name.

<sup>38</sup> A iv 2': [G1]šši-ia-tal; cf. Laroche, RHA 47 p. 22; Otten, MGK p. 13 n. 4.

<sup>39</sup> A 2': ti-x[ . . . ]; x seems to begin with two 'Winkelhaken' (surface damaged, Otten).

Kumarbi to Impaluri began to speak:  
 "O Impaluri! The words which I speak to thee,  
 to my words (thine) ear hold inclined!  
 Into (thy) hand a staff take,  
 upon thy feet as shoes the swift winds put!  
 And to the Irširra(-god)s go,  
 and these strong words before the Irširras speak:  
 'Come!

He calls you, Kumarbi, the gods' father, to  
 the gods' house!

But the matter about which he calls you  
 [.....]<sup>e</sup>  
 Now come promptly.'

"[And the Irširra]s will take him, the child,  
 and they [will carry] him to the [dark] earth.  
 But the Irširras [.....],  
 but not to the great [*gods will*] he [*be visible*]."<sup>f</sup>  
 [When] Impaluri [*the words heard*],  
 into (his) hand the staff he took,  
 [upon his feet the shoes he put].<sup>g</sup>  
 [And forth] he [tra]veled, Impaluri,  
 [and] to the Irširras he came.

[And Impaluri] the words to the Irširras [again]  
 began to [spe]ak:

"Come!

[He calls y]ou, Kumarbi, the gods' father!

But the matter about which [he calls] you,  
 [that] *ye knew* not.  
 Now hurry, come."

When the Irširras the words heard,  
 [they hurried], hastened,  
 [and from their chair] they [*ros*]e.

And at once they covered the way,  
 and to Kumarbi they came.

And Kumarbi to the Irširras began to speak:

"[This child] take,  
 and as a gift [*treat*] him,  
 and to the dark Earth carry him!

Hurry, hasten!

And on Upelluri's<sup>h</sup> right shoulder as a *blade* put  
 him!

<sup>e</sup> Apparently not parallel to line C iii 13 below! See note 20 to translit.

<sup>f</sup> Free restoration; cf. above, A iii 31 ff. In C less room.

<sup>g</sup> Or: "[and below, the shoes he put on". cf. fn. 29.

<sup>h</sup> An Atlas-like giant who carries Heaven and Earth.

25' [(I-NA UD.1.KAM-wa-ra-aš AM-MA)]-DU pár-ga-u-e-e[(š-kad-da-ru)]<sup>40</sup>

26' [(I-NA ITU.1.KAM-ma-wa-ra-aš IK)]U-an pár-ga-u-e[(-eš)-kad-d(a-ru)]<sup>40</sup>

27' [(SAG.DU-i-ma-wa-aš-ši-kán k)]u-iš NA<sub>4</sub>-aš<sup>41</sup>

B III 18' wa-al-ḥa-an-ni-iš-kat-ta-ri

19' nu-wa-ra-aš IGI.ḪI.A-i wa-aš-ši-ia-at-ta-ru<sup>42</sup>

A IV 6' nu GIM-an <sup>D</sup>Ir-ši-ir-r[u-uš IN]IM.MEŠ-ar iš-ta-ma-aš-šir<sup>43</sup>

7' nu-kán A-NA <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-b[i DUMU-an] gi-nu-wa-az ar-ḥa da-a-ir <sup>D</sup>Ir-ši-ir[-ru-uš-ma(?)]

8' DUMU-an kar-pi-ir nu-u[š-ma-ša-an-k]án<sup>44</sup> <sup>U</sup>Z<sup>V</sup>GAB-i an-da TÚG-an GIM-an

9' ta-ma-aš-ši-ir na-an<sup>45</sup> IM.M[EŠ(?) GIM-a]n(?) kar-pi-ir na-an-kán A-NA <sup>D</sup>El-le-el

10' gi-nu-wa-aš ḥa-la-a-ir nu <sup>D</sup>[El]-la-al-lu-uš IGI.ḪI.A-wa kar-ap-ta

11' nu-za DUMU-an ša-ku-iš-ki-iz-z[i] DINGIR-LIM-an-ni-ia-aš pi-an a-ra-an-za

12' NÍ.TE-aš-ma-aš-ši NA<sub>4</sub>-aš <sup>N</sup>A<sub>4</sub>ku[-un-k]u-nu-uz-zi-ia-aš DŪ-an-za

13' nu-za <sup>D</sup>El-li-lu-uš PA-NI Z[I-Š]U me-mi-iš-ki-u-wa-an da-a-iš

14' ku-iš-wa-ra-aš a-ši<sup>46</sup> DUMU-aš ku[-in] nam-ma šal-la-nu-e-er <sup>D</sup>GUL-šu-uš

15' <sup>D</sup>MAḪ.MEŠ-uš ku-iš-wa-ra-aš [nam-ma]<sup>47</sup> uš-ki-iz-zi šal-la-ia-aš DINGIR.MEŠ-aš

16' da-aš-ša-u-e-eš za-aḥ-ḥa<sup>47a</sup>-u[š nu-w]a(?) Ū-UL ku-e-el-qa

17' ŠA <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-pát-wa-ra-a[t i-da]-lu-tar<sup>48</sup> <sup>D</sup>Ku-mar-bi-iš-wa GIM-an <sup>D</sup>U-an

18' šal-la-nu-ut IGI-an-da-ma-wa-a[š-ši (ka)]-a-an<sup>49</sup> <sup>N</sup>A<sub>4</sub>ku-un-ku-nu-uz[-zi](-in)

19' tar-pa-na-al-li-in šal-la[-nu-ut]

20' ma-a-an <sup>D</sup>El-li-lu-uš INIM[.MEŠ-ar<sup>50</sup> me-mi-ia-u-wa-an-zi zi-in-ni-it(?)]<sup>51</sup>

21' nu-kán DUMU-an A-NA <sup>D</sup>Ū-pé-e[(l-lu-r)]i ZAG-ni <sup>U</sup>Z<sup>V</sup>ZAG.LU-ni <sup>G</sup>IŠ[ši-ia-tal ti-i-e-er(?)]<sup>52</sup>

22' šal-li-iš<sup>53</sup>-ki-iz-zi-ia-aš <sup>N</sup>A<sub>4</sub>ku-un-ku-nu-uz-zi-iš na-an da-aš-ša-mu-uš

23' x x (x<sup>2</sup>)<sup>54</sup> [(š)al-la-nu-uš-kán-zi INA<sup>55</sup> UD.1.KAM-ia-aš 1 AM-MA-DU pár-ki-iš-kat-ta-ri

24' [(I-NA ITU.1.KAM-ma-aš 1 IKU-an)] pár-ki-iš-kat-ta-ri SAG.DU-ma-aš-ši-iš-ša-an

25' [(ku-iš NA<sub>4</sub>-aš wa-al-ḥi)-i]š<sup>56</sup>-ki-it-ta-ri na-aš IGI.ḪI.A-wa-aš

26' [wa-aš-ši-ia-at-ta]-ri<sup>57</sup>

27' [(ma-a-an I-NA UD.15.KAM ti)-ia-at(?) n]u NA<sub>4</sub>-aš pár-ki-iš-ta na-aš-kán a-ru-ni gi-nu-wa-aš

28' [(<sup>G</sup>IŠ[ši-ia-tal G]IM-an ar-ta-a)t ú-i-te-na-za-aš-kán ar-ḥa ú-it NA<sub>4</sub>-aš

<sup>40</sup> A 3' and 4': na-iš-ki-it-ta-ru.

<sup>41</sup> C iii breaks off; next two lines according to B.

<sup>42</sup> A 5': na-at IGI.ḪI.A-wa-aš wa[-. . . . .]; horizontal line in A, end of col. iii in B.

<sup>43</sup> In A, fragment XXXIII 93 iv ("1") begins here.

<sup>44</sup> Restored according to space which is too large for -ma-aš (JAOS 69 p. 182).

<sup>45</sup> In A, fragment MGK 7b begins here.

<sup>46</sup> D iii begins here (1').

<sup>47</sup> For this restoration cf. tbl. II i 32.

<sup>47a</sup> D 3: + -a-.

<sup>48</sup> D 4': ḪUL-tar.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. a-pa-a-an KUB XXI 42 ii 3 (Friedrich, *Heth. Elem.* I §120 a; Otten, MGK p. 34, against Goetze's criticism JAOS 69 p. 182).

<sup>50</sup> D 6': ud-da-a[-ar].

<sup>51</sup> Restored from context (cf. above, note 13); traces in 93 iv 15 not clear.

<sup>52</sup> Restored from context (cf. above, C iii 24 with note 38); traces in 93 iv 16 not clear.

<sup>53</sup> D 8': -eš-; in D, MGK 10 begins here. Middle of tablet in copy A.

<sup>54</sup> In *Kum.* pp. 68 and \*16, I proposed DINGIR.MEŠ-e<sup>2</sup>-eš; Goetze, JAOS 69 p. 182, suggested A.ḪI.A; traces in 95 iv 23 not clear. Last line in 95 and MGK 7b (A).

<sup>55</sup> Written AŠ in A; D 9': I-NA.

<sup>56</sup> D 11': -eš-.

<sup>57</sup> Restored according to B iii 19 (with note 42, above). D 11' has: [w]a-aš-ši(-)ki[-. . .] (in MGK 10; spacing Otten's).

<sup>i</sup> The rendering of the measures is only intended to give an approximate idea.

<sup>j</sup> A: naiskittaru. <sup>k</sup> A: nat.

<sup>1</sup> So A here and in iv 25; B: meni "face"?

<sup>m</sup> These two enigmatic verses are perhaps an allusion to the stone-monster's blindness; cf. tbl. II col. ii 12 f.

<sup>n</sup> Enlil is the supreme god of the Sumerians and be-

- (25) *1-edani-war-as siwatti gipessar pargaweskattaru*<sup>i</sup>  
 (26) *1-edani-ma-war-as X-i X-an pargaweskattaru*<sup>i</sup>  
 (27) *ħarsani-ma-wa-si-kan kwis X-as* [28] *walħanniskattari*  
 [29] *nuwaras<sup>k</sup> sakuwas<sup>l</sup> wassiyattaru*

- (A IV 6) *nu mĀn Irsirrus uddar istamassir*  
 (7) *nu-kan Kumarbiya [X-an] genuwaz arħa dair Irsir[rus-ma]* (8) *X-an karpir nu[-smas-an]-kan X-i anda X-an mĀn* (9) *tamassir nan ħuw[antes mĀn] karpir nan-kan Ellilui* (10) *genuwas ħalair nu Ellillus sakuwa karpta*  
 (11) *nu-za X-an sakwiskizzi siuniyanni-yas piran aranza*  
 (12) *twekkas-ma-si X-as kunkunuzziyas iyanza*

- (13) *nu-za Ellilus istanzani-si piran memiskiwan dais*  
 (14) *kwis-war-as asi X-as kwin namma sallanuer X-sus* (15) *X-us kwis-war-as [namma] uskizzi sallayas siunas* (16) *dassawes zahħaus [nu-w]a natta kwelka*  
 (17) *Kumarbiyas-pat-war-at idalutar Kumarbis-wa mahħan StG.-an* (18) *sallanut menahħanda-ma-wa-si kĀn kunkunuzzin* (19) *tanpanallin sallanut*

- (20) *mĀn Ellilus udd[ar memiyawanzi zinnit]*  
 (21) *nu-kan X-an Upelluriya kunnĭ paltani s[iyat-tal tier]*

- (22) *salleskizzi-yas kunkunuzzis nan dassamus* (23) *... sallanuskanzi 1-edani-as siwatti 1-an gipessar parkeskattari*  
 (24) *1-edani-mas X-i 1-an X-an parkeskattari ħarsani-ma-si-sĀn* (25) *kwis X-as walħiskittari nas sakuwas* (26) *[wassiyatta]ri<sup>2</sup>*

- (27) *mĀn 15 siwatti ti[yat] nu X-as parkesta nas-kan aruni genuwas* (28) *siyattal m[Ān arta]t wetenaz-as-kan arħa uit X-as*

longs to the older generation of gods. Although he is sometimes equated with Kumarbi, he is considered a different person in our epic.

<sup>o</sup> A kind of stone, exact nature not known; see com-

In one day a *yard*<sup>i</sup> he shall grow!

but in one month a *furlong*<sup>i</sup> he shall grow!

*But the stone which is thrown at his head, (his) eyes shall cover!*<sup>m</sup>

When the Irširras (these) words heard, from Kumarbi's knees [the child] they took.

The Irširras the child lifted,

and unto their breast like a garment they pressed him.

And [*lik*]e *win*[ds] they lifted him,

and on Enlil's<sup>n</sup> knees they placed him.

And Enlil his eyes lifted,

and the child he saw.

Before the deity it was standing,

but its body of stone, of *kunkunuzzi*,<sup>o</sup> was made.

And Enlil to his own mind began to speak:

"Who is he, this child,

whom they raised again, the Fate-Goddesses and Mother-Goddesses?

Who will [any longer] endure<sup>p</sup> them, the great gods' strong battles?

Of no one

but of Kumarbi is this an evil (plan).

(Just) as Kumarbi the Storm-God raised,

so against him this *kunkunuzzi* as *rebel* he raised."

When Enlil the words [had ceased to speak],

the child upon Upelluri's right shoulder [as a *blade* they put].

He grew up, the *kunkunuzzi*,

and the strong. . . . raised him.

In one day one *yard* he grew,

but in one month one *furlong* he grew.

*But the stone which was thrown at his head, his eyes [cover]ed.*<sup>r</sup>

When the fifteenth day came,<sup>s</sup>

the Stone had grown high.

And in the sea on (his) knees like a *blade* he [stood].

Out of the water he stood, the Stone,

mentary.

<sup>p</sup> Lit.: "see". <sup>q</sup> D: [w]assi(-)ki[-. . .].

<sup>r</sup> For an explanation, see above, note m.

<sup>s</sup> Lit.: "When it (= time) came to the fifteenth day".



- 29' [(na-aš pár-ga-aš-ti pí)-. . . .]x ma-a-an nu-uš-ši-kán a-ru-na-aš  
 30' [. . . . (iš-ḥu-uz-zi-ia-aš pí-d)]i TUG-aš ma-a-an an-da pé-e-da-an-za<sup>58</sup>  
 31' [(ma-al-da-ni-ša-aš GIM-an k)a]r-pé-eš-ki-it-ta-ri NA<sub>4</sub>-aš nu-kán ne-pí-ši UGU  
 32' [(É.MEŠka-ri-im-nu-uš ku-un)]-tar-ra-an-na an-da ú-e-mi-iš-ki-iz-zi
- 
- 33' [(nu-kán DUTU-uš ne-pí-ša-az) kat-ta š]a-ku-wa<sup>59</sup>-it nu-za DUL-lu-kum-mi-in ša-ku-iš-ki-iz-zi  
 34' [(DUL-lu-k)um-mi-ša<sup>2</sup>-za(?) (ne-pí-ša)]-an<sup>60</sup> DUTU-un ša-ku-iš-ki-iz-zi nu-za DUTU-uš  
 35' [PA-NI ZI(-ŠU me-mi-iš-ki-u-wa)-an da-a-iš<sup>61</sup> (ku-iš-w)]a-kán DINGIR-LUM nu-tar-ri-ia-aš<sup>62</sup> a-ru-ni an-da<sup>63</sup>  
 36' [ar-ta-ri(?) (nu-wa-aš-ši NÍ.TE.MEŠ-aš x)-. . .]x DINGIR.MEŠ-aš Ū-UL ta-ak-ki
- 
- 37' [(ne-pí-ša-aš DUTU-uš) . . . . .<sup>64</sup> (wa-aḥ-nu-u)]t na-aš-kán a-ru-ni pa-ra-a<sup>65</sup> pa-it<sup>65</sup>  
 38' [(nu ma-q)-an DUTU-u]š<sup>66</sup> [a-ru-ni<sup>67</sup> pa(-ra-a a-ar-a)]š DUTU-za ŠU-an SAG.KI-iš-ši pí-an e-ep-ta  
 39' [. . . . .]x x[. . . . .]x nu-uš-ši TUKU.TUKU-at-ti pí-an  
 40' [x x] ta-me-u[m-ma-aḥ-ta-at](or: -u[m-me-eš-ta])
- 
- 41' [GIM-a]n(?)<sup>68</sup> ne-pí-ša[aš DUTU-uš NA<sub>4</sub>-an] a-uš-ta nu DUTU-uš kal-ma-ru-uš  
 42' [d]a<sup>69</sup>-a-an EGIR-p[a . . . . . pa/ša]-ra-a i-ia-an-ni-eš  
 43' na-aš DU-ni GAM-an i-i[a-at-ta-at<sup>70</sup> nu ma-a-an(?)] DUTU-un IGI-an-da a-uš-ta  
 44' nu D<sup>T</sup>a-aš-mi-šu-uš<sup>71</sup> [72 me-mi-iš-ki-u-wa-a(n da-a-i)]š<sup>73</sup> ku-it-wa-ra-aš  
 45' ú-iz-zi AN-aš DUTU-u[(š KUR-e)-aš LUGAL-uš(?)] (ú-iz-zi)-m]a<sup>74</sup>-wa-ra-aš ku-e-da-ni  
 46' me-mi-ia-ni nu-wa me-mi-ia-a[(š)] n[a-ak-ki-iš(?)]<sup>75</sup> Ū-UL-m]a-wa-ra-aš ar-ḥa p[é-e]š-ši-ia-u-wa[(-aš)]<sup>76</sup>  
 47' da-aš-šu-uš-wa-ra-aš ḥal-lu-wa-iš da-aš-šu-uš[-ma-wa-ra-aš] za-aḥ-ḥa-a-iš<sup>77</sup>  
 48' ne-pí-ša-aš-ma-wa-ra-aš<sup>78</sup> ḥar-nam-ni-ia-aš-ḥa-aš ŠA [(KUR-TI-ma)]-wa-ra-aš ka<sup>79</sup>-aš-za aq-qa-tar-ra<sup>80</sup>

<sup>58</sup> D 15': [. . . .]-zi.

<sup>59</sup> D 18': + -a-. For 33b-35a see MGK p. 16 n. 8 (text according to D).

<sup>60</sup> [. . . .]-an in A; D 19' has ne-pí-ša-aš.

<sup>61</sup> So D 20'; A was shorter, according to space; probably me-mi-iš-ki-iz-zi.

<sup>62</sup> D 21' inserts ki x|x before nu-tar-r]i-aš.

<sup>63</sup> D 21': an-ta.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. "KAL-Myth" A iii 19' (XXXIII 112 + MGK 2d iii 19, Otten p. 11 n. 11) where, however, the object is broken as here. Restore IGI.ḪI.A-in? Vertical wedge in 112 = m[e-e-ni-in]?

<sup>65</sup> Erasure.

<sup>66</sup> Restored from context; trace in 96 iv 1 probably this uš.

<sup>67</sup> Restored according to context and space in D 24' (last line of D).

<sup>68</sup> For lines 41-46 cf. Laroche, RHA 47 p. 23.

<sup>69</sup> For reading [d]a-a-an instead of [m]a-a-an see commentary.

<sup>70</sup> So Otten (priv. comm.) instead of IK[-ŠU-UD], Kum. p. \*17 g 6.

<sup>71</sup> C = XXXIII 104 iv begins here.

<sup>72</sup> Otten p. 16 with n. 11 adds u|d-da-a-a(rDU-ni . . . ),

which seems too long for the space in A but fits the space in C 2'. Traces in D<sub>2</sub> 1' might be [ud-da-a-a]r D[U-ni] (so Otten) or [D<sup>T</sup>ašmišu-u]š D[U-ni]. What is the trace in A, 96 iv 7?

<sup>73</sup> C 3' inserted something, according to space; perhaps: DU EN-IA.

<sup>74</sup> C 4' omits -ma-.

<sup>75</sup> Or da-aš-šu-uš with Laroche, l.c.; Otten p. 17 leaves it open. Trace in 96 iv 9 undecisive.

<sup>76</sup> C 6': pí-iš-ši-ia-u-wa-aš. C inserts (7') [. . . . .]-ni(?) (Otten, priv. comm.); horizontal line after C 7'. In A, MGK 7a iv begins here.

<sup>77</sup> C 8' f.: da-aš-šu-ia-wa-ra-at (9') [. . . . .].

<sup>78</sup> C 9' (with MGK 9): [ŠA]-ME-E-wa-ra-aš.

<sup>79</sup> C 10': + -a-.

<sup>80</sup> No horizontal line in C and D<sub>2</sub>. C inserts here-after:

(11') [aqqatarra x<sup>2</sup>-d]a-ma-x DU-aš me-mi-ia-an

(12') [x x x x-z]i pí-ra-an ša-ra-a-wa-aš-ma-aš

(13') [x x x x] a-ra-an-ta-ri

(End of tablet in C)

Can one read in line 11': [an-d]a-ma-aš (?) or [d]a-ma-ī(?)? Both az and i possible according to Otten (priv. comm.).

(29) *nas pargasti pi*[- . . . ]x *mān*  
*nu-si-kan arunas* (30) [ . . . ] *iṣḥuzziyas pidi X-as*  
*mān anda pedanza*

(31) *maltanis-as mān karpeskittari X-as*  
*nu-kan nepisi ser* (32) *karimnus kuntarran-a anda*  
*wemiskizzi*

(33) *nu-kan Istanus nepisaz* [katta] *sakuwait*  
*nu-za Ullikummin sakwiskizzi*

(34) *Ulluk*[ummis-a-za] *nepisas*<sup>t</sup> *Istanun sakwis-*  
*kizzi*

*nu-za Istanus* (35) *istanzani-si piran memiskiwan*  
*dais*<sup>u</sup>

*kwis-wa-kan siunis nutarriyas aruni anda* (36)  
 [artari]

*nu-wa-si twekkas* [ . . . ] *siunas natta takki*

(37) *nepisas Istanus* [menin] *wahnut*  
*nas-kan aruni para pait*

(38) *nu mān* [Istanu]s [aruni pa]ra ar(a)s  
*Istanus-za kessaran ḥanti-si piran epta*

(39) [ . . . . . ]  
*nu-si kartimmiyatti piran* (40) [ . . . ] *tameum-*  
 [maḥtat/mesta]<sup>v</sup>

(41) [mā]n *nepisa*[s Istanus X-an] *austa*  
*nu Istanus kalmarus* (42) [d]ān *appa* [zais]<sup>v</sup>

[nu-kan . . . . . pa/ša]ra *iyannis*

(43) *nas* StG.-ni *kattan iy[attat]*

[nu mān] *Istanun menaḥḥanda austa*

(44) *nu Tasmisus* [<sup>w</sup>memiskiwan] *dais*<sup>x</sup>

*kwiṭ-war-as* (45) *uizzi nepisas Istanus utne*[yas  
 ḥassus]

*uizzi(-ma)-war-as kwedani* (46) *memiyani*

*nu-wa memiyas* [nakkis (or: dassus)]

[natt-m]a-war-as *arḥa pessiyawas*

(47) *dassus-war-as ḥalluwais*

*dassus*[-ma-war-as] *zahḥais*<sup>y</sup>

(48) *nepisas(-ma)-war-as ḥarnamniyaṣas*  
*utneyas-ma-war-as kasza akkatar-a*<sup>z</sup>

and his height was like [ . . . ],

and the sea [up] to the place of the belt like a  
 garment reached.

Like a . . . . he was lifted, the Stone,  
 and up in Heaven the temples and the chamber he  
 reached.

The Sun-God [down] from Heaven looked,  
 and Ullikummi he saw.

And Ullikummi [,too,] saw the Sun-God of Heaven.

And the Sun-God to his own mind began to  
 speak:<sup>u</sup>

“What *swift* god in the sea [is standing]?

His body is not like (that of) the [ . . . . . ] gods!”

The Sun-God of Heaven [his face] turned,  
 and out to the sea he went.

And when [the Sun-God] came out [to the sea],  
 the Sun-God (his) hand unto his forehead held.

[ . . . . . ],  
 and from anger his [ . . . . . ] became altered.<sup>v</sup>

[When the Sun-God of Heaven saw [the Stone],  
 the Sun-God the mountains for the second time  
 again [crossed].<sup>v</sup>

[And . . . . . u]p (or: fo)rth he traveled,  
 and to the Storm-God he went.

[And when] he saw the Sun-God coming,

Tašmišu [<sup>w</sup>] began [to speak]:<sup>x</sup>

“Why does he come, the Sun-God of Heaven, the  
 land[’s king]?

The matter about which he comes,

(that) matter is [grave],

it is [not] to be cast aside!

Strong it is, the struggle,

strong it is, the battle!<sup>y</sup>

Heaven’s uproar it is,

the land’s hunger and death it is!”<sup>z</sup>

<sup>t</sup> So D; A has [nepis]an.

<sup>u</sup> So D; A probably [memiskizzi] “spoke”.

<sup>v</sup> See commentary.

<sup>w</sup> D (and C) seem to add: [udda]r St[G.-ni] “the words to the Storm-God”.

<sup>x</sup> C perhaps added: [StG. iṣḥa-mi] “O Storm-God, my lord!”

<sup>y</sup> C: *dassu-ya-war-at* [ . . . ] (broken noun in the neuter) “and strong it is, the [ . . . ]” (a different noun, lost).

<sup>z</sup> C inserts:

(11) . . . . . (see n. 80 to . . . . . the Storm-  
 translit.) StG.-as *memi-* God’s word (accus.)  
*yan* (12) [ . . . ]-zi [ . . . . . ]  
*piran sara-wa-smas* (13) Before them [the . . . ]  
 [ . . . . . ] *arantari* stands up.”

(End of tablet in C).

49' <sup>D</sup>U-aš A-NA <sup>D</sup>Ta-aš-mi-šu[[-uš]] me-mi-iš-ki-u-wa-an da-a-i[(š a)]-ša-an-na-aš-ši <sup>GIŠŠŪ</sup>.A-an  
 50' ti-ia-an-du a-da-an-na-ma-aš-ši <sup>GIŠ</sup>BANŠUR-un ú-nu-wa[-an]-du

51' ku-it-ma-an e-ni-eš<sup>80a</sup>-ša-an me-mi-iš-ki-ir <sup>D</sup>UTU-uš-ma-aš-ma-aš [x x]<sup>81</sup> ti-ia-at  
 52' a-ša-an-na-aš-ši<sup>82</sup> <sup>GIŠŠŪ</sup>.A-an ti<-i-e-er)<sup>83</sup> na-aš-za Ū-UL [e-ša]-at a-da-an-na-aš-ma-aš-ši  
 53' <sup>GIŠ</sup>BANŠUR-un ú-nu-e-er nu-kán pa-ra-a Ū-UL ša-li[-ik-t]a GAL-in-ši  
 54' pí-e-er nu-uš-ša-an pu-u-ri-in Ū-UL da-a - iš

55' [n]a-aš <sup>!!</sup> <sup>D</sup>U-aš<sup>84</sup> <sup>D</sup>UTU-i EGIR-pa me-mi-iš-ki-u-wa-an da-a-iš <sup>LŪŠĀ</sup>.TAM [-x<sup>?</sup> <sup>Ĥ</sup>UL]-lu-uš<sup>85</sup> [<sup>GIŠŠŪ</sup>.A-an(?)]  
 56' [ku-i]š da-a-iš nu-za UL e-ša-at LŪ.BANŠUR-aš <sup>Ĥ</sup>UL-lu-uš [<sup>GIŠ</sup>BANŠUR-un(?) ku-iš]  
 57' [da]-a-iš nu-za Ū-UL e-za-at-ta <sup>LŪ</sup>QA.ŠU-DU<sub>g</sub>.A-aš <sup>Ĥ</sup>UL-l[u-uš GAL-in(?)]  
 58' ku-iš pa-a-iš nu Ū-UL e-ku-ut-t[a]

(End of tablet in A)

Colophon: A (95 left edge): (1) DUB.1.KAM SĪR <sup>D</sup>Ul-li-kum-m[i . . . (?)]

(2) [. . .]x-ma<sup>2</sup>-ú<sup>2</sup>

C (MGK 9 IV 14): DUB.1.KAM <sup>D</sup>Ul-li-ku[m-mi . . . . . ]

<sup>80a</sup> D<sub>2</sub> 9: iš.

<sup>81</sup> Neither [kat-ta-a]n nor [GAM-iš-m]i according to traces in MGK 7a which look like [n]i according to Otten (priv. comm.). Restoration [pár-n]i doubtful.

<sup>82</sup> D<sub>2</sub> breaks off.

<sup>83</sup> Text has ti-ia-an-du, erroneously repeated from line 50.

<sup>84</sup> Erasure; in view of na-aš, <sup>D</sup>U-aš might be considered as deleted.

<sup>85</sup> Traces of -lu-uš in last line of MGK 7a iv.

(49) StG.-as *Tasmisui memiskiwan dais*  
*asanna-si kishiyān* (50) *tiandu*  
*adanna-ma-si X-un unuwandu*

(51) *kwitman enessan memiskir*  
*Istanus-ma-smas [parn]i tiyat*  
 (52) *asanna(s)-si kishiyān tier*  
*nas-za natta esat*  
*adannas-ma-si* (53) *X-un unuer*  
*nu-kan para natta salikta*  
*X-in-si* (54) *pier*  
*nu-san purin natta dais*

(55) *nas* (StG.-as)<sup>aa</sup> *Istanui appa memiskiwan dais*

*haminas [ida]lus*  
 [kishiyān] (56) [kwi]s *dais*  
*nu-za natta esat*  
*X-as idalus*  
 [X-un kwis] (57) [d]ais  
*nu-za natta ezzatta*  
*ekuttaras idalus*  
 [X-in] (58) *kwis pais*  
*nu natta ekutta*

(End of tablet in A)

Colophon:

DUB.1.KAM SĪR <sup>D</sup>*Ullikummi* [UL QATI]

<sup>aa</sup> Perhaps erased.

The Storm-God to Tašmišu began to speak:  
 “For his sitting a chair they shall set up,  
 for his eating a table they shall lay!”

While thus they were speaking,  
 the Sun-God [at] *their* [house] arrived.  
 For his sitting a chair they set up,  
 but he did not sit down.  
 For his eating a table they laid,  
 but he did not reach out.  
 A cup they gave him,  
 but (his) lips he did not put to it.

And he (*the Storm-God*),<sup>aa</sup> to the Sun-God again  
 began to speak:

“Is the chamberlain bad  
 who set up the chair,  
 (so that) thou satest not down?  
 Is the steward bad  
 who set the table,  
 (so that) thou atest not?  
 Is the cup-bearer bad  
 who gave (thee) the cup,  
 (so that) thou drankest not?”

(End of tablet in A)

Colophon:

First tablet of the Song of Ullikummi. [(Text) not  
 finished].

[to be continued]