

Chiasm in Sumerian-Akkadian

Robert F. Smith

The following remarks do no more than present a preliminary survey of evidence for short as well as extended inversions from a sampling of late Sumerian and Akkadian literary texts. Archaic and Old Sumerian literature are left unexamined (early 3rd millennium B. C.)¹, while much of what is presented here reflects the Neo-Sumerian (Ur III) and Sargonic Akkadian periods – though in versions prepared or copies made when Sumerian had become no more than a literary-scribal tool of Assyro-Babylonian culture. Having invented cuneiform script, the world's oldest method of writing, and having developed a rich literary tradition, the Sumerians and their culture passed entirely from the scene – leaving mainly an oral and written legacy for the remaining two millennia B. C.² **The**

Simple Chiasm

Simple direct parallelism is a well-known feature of Sumerian-Akkadian literature,³ though, as elsewhere, the formulae used differ somewhat between poetry and prose.⁴ Syntactic limitations make short, grammatical inversions rare in Sumerian; yet they do occur. The simplest Sumerian chiasms involve nominal bimembral exchanges, as in the following bicolon from the prologue to „Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld”⁵ (abc:bac’):

8 After *heaven* from earth had been moved, 9 After earth from *heaven* had been separated,

There are more elements, but less variation in the bicolon from the close of Sumerian “Enlil and Ninlil: The Begetting of Nanna,”⁶ abcd:cbad,

Lord of *heaven*, lord of abundance, and lord of earth you are, Lord of earth, lord of abundance, and lord of *heaven* you are.

This sort of nominal exchange also appears in Sumerian proverbs, such as Nippur 2.137,⁷

Like a *lord* build – – like a slave live; Like a slave build – –like a *lord* live

However, there can also be a simple verbal exchange, as in Nippur proverb 1.195,⁸

High he *has risen*, and does not allow (anyone) else to stay (down); Low he stays, and does not allow (anyone) else *to rise!*

An exchange of nouns, pronouns, and verbs takes place in a Sumerian tetracolon from “Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta,” where Enmerkar, under siege by Martu in Erech, pleads for help:⁹

If she (Inanna) loves the city, but *hates* me, Why should she link the *city* with me? If (However) she *hates* the city, but loves me, Why should she link me with the *city*?

More impressive, though, are examples wherein the verb or predicate is displaced from its standard position (characteristic of N. W. Semitic chiasm), as in Nippur proverb 2.133,¹⁰

Firewood *collecting* (is) for the strong; The weak on dry land he *makes wait* for him!

In contrast, and despite heavy Sumerian influence, N. E. Semitic literati instinctively sought for the roots of their own rhythmic syntax in order to create well-balanced chiasms. Lipin provides a couple of Akkadian examples of the variety ab:b'a,¹¹

I shall break *the doors*, *The bars* I shall crush!

My heart* became angry, *Inflamed (became) my liver!

Atrahasis I, v (A), contains a complete repetitive bicolon (abc:2cba):

366 He spoke with *his god*, 367 And that one, *his god*, with him spoke!

In another complete example there is variety in the parallels—Atrahasis I, viii (A), in abc:c'b'a',

385 Atrahasis received *the command*, 386 And *the elders* he gathered to his gate!

However, Akkadian chiasms are more often unbalanced and/or incomplete,¹² although they can rise to the level of the climactic tricolon: cf, Atrahasis II, ii, 16-19//30-33 (abc:da'cb':edb'c'),¹³

16 In the morning *a mist* may he rain down, 17 And may he furtively in the night rain down *a dew*, 19 So that the fields will furtively *grain* bear!

Such patterns, which developed during the 3rd millennium B. C. as part of the generalized hymnal-epic dialect of Old Akkadian, were carried over into Canaanite and Hebrew usage,¹⁴ and one may reasonably suggest that account be taken here, as well as in the extended inversions below, of the purposes or functions of the chiasm as brilliantly defined by Andersen,¹⁵ namely,

a. *emphasis* on synonymy,¹⁶ contemporaneity, reciprocity, concomitance, or integration,

b. *diminution* of antithesis (dual aspects of event), or creation of merismus,

c. *delay* of action and maintenance of suspense or contemplation in epic rhetoric,¹⁷

d. *intensification*—specific or climactic,¹⁸

e. *reinforcement* of negation or prohibition,

f. *description* of symmetrical arrangements,

g. *synopsis*, correlation, or knitting of units, and

h. *framing* or inclusion.¹⁹

Moreover, the chiasm is more elegant and of higher style²⁰ than ordinary parallelism, and is often merely an artistic device. Such functions may, of course, overlap – as one may see below. However, such chiasmic applications as I have listed above tend to occur via standard formulae and within set conditions, i.e., the type of parallel and word- or phrase-pairs employed in a given text shows up elsewhere under similar conditions and serve closely related purposes.²¹ **The Inclusion**

The frame or ABA-form is usually no more than what Dahood terms “distant parallelism,” and may be chiasmic or not in its A–A’ elements since it functions in poetry or prose (or in a combination of the two)²² mainly to enclose or frame units of widely varying size. As McEvenue sees it, a series of discontinuous parallel framing elements can be palistrophic,²³ and he refers to a short *aba*-structure at most as a “short-circuit inclusion,”²⁴ going on to demonstrate the binding effect of numerous inclusions in biblical contexts.²⁵ Yet Andersen has made it clear that when the A–A’ elements are themselves chiasmic, the B section may intervene between the clauses of *one complete sentence*,²⁶ and ordinary parallels strongly unify a section or pericope, though this is one step below “extended introversion.”²⁷

An example of the inclusion in Sumerian hymnal epic may be found in “Enki and Eridu: The Journey of the Water-God to Nippur.”²⁸ It must not be mistaken for part of an anadiploid chain, and that it contains a couple of chiasms is

A The lord of *the abyss*, the king Enki, Enki, the lord who decrees the fates, B Built his house of silver and lapis lazuli; Its silver and lapis lazuli, like sparkling light, A’ The father fashioned fittingly in *the abyss*.

Another example, one analogous to Genesis 1:1 – 2:4a, is evident in “Enki and Ninhursag: A Paradise Myth,” 75–88, in which Enki (A) impregnated Ninhursag, followed by (B) a nine-day period of gestation, and completed by (A’) the birth of Ninmu to Nintu (= Ninhursag).²⁹ A far simpler, yet more rhetorical ABA comes from the prologue of “Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld,”³⁰

1 In days of yore, in the distant days of yore, 2 In nights of yore, in the far-off nights of yore, 3 In days of yore, in the distant days of yore.

In the Sumerian “Dumuzi and Enkimdu: The Dispute Between the Shepherd-God and the Farmer-God,” one finds the arguments of Dumuzi (41-63) enveloped by the following obvious inclusion in the form of questions put to Inanna:³¹

40 The Farmer more than I, the farmer more than I, the farmer, what has he more than I?
* * * * * * * * * * 64 More than I, the farmer, what has he more than I?

A more ambitious inclusion seems to surround and to emphasize the „Golden Age Passage” (136–55) of “Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta,”³²

A 115–135 a 136–40 tripartite “Golden Age Passage,” each part B b 141–6 introduced by *u*₄-*ba*,
“on that day” c 147–55 A 187–207

Knutson recognized the ABA-symmetry of the 19th century B. C. Sumerian Code of Lipit-Ishtar:³³

The century later Akkadian Code of Hammurabi is quite similar, though it maintains an additional poetry-prose-poetry alternation:³⁴

Obv. I-V A Prologue (4 1/2 columns of poetry) V-rev. XXIII B Laws (40 columns of prose) XXIV-XXVIII A' Epilogue (5 columns of poetry)

Observing this Code's structure, Gordon has made the salient point that when biblical source critics apportion so many chapters, verses, and lines among their favorite well-defined documents according to dialectic, stylistic, and grammatical differences, they seldom take account of such a unified composition employing differing grammar, style, and dialect!³⁵

Epistles can also be symmetrical: During the 14th century B. C., King Shuppiluliuma I of Khatti sent an Akkadian letter to Niqmaddu II of Ugarit proposing a treaty or bond.³⁶

1-2 Introduction 3-50 Body (history and conditional promises) 51-2 Conclusion

Niqmaddu's detailed affirmative reply, also symmetrical, will be dealt with below.

In the Ashur rescension of the Akkadian "Descent of Ishtar to the Netherworld," one finds a legitimate inclusion in the words of the Queen of the Netherworld:³⁷

(rev. 38) "But if she does not pay to you her ransom, bring her back here!" (39-45) Seven articles of apparel returned to Ishtar as she ascends. (46) "If she does not pay to you her ransom, bring her back here!"

Another inclusion or ABBA appears in the same myth. Here on the obverse of the later Nineveh rescension from the library of Ashurbanipal:³⁸

obv. 1 To the land of no return, The land of *Ereshkigal*, 2 Ishtar, the daughter of Sin, turned her attention;
3 Yea, the daughter of Sin turned her attention 4 To the dark house, The dwelling of *Irkalla*;

There is a probable inclusion in the dual recitation of the exploits of Gilgamesh and Enkidu (Assyrian version):³⁹

X, 2 killed the *bull* 3 Killed the watchman 4 overthrew Humbaba 5 killed lions
----- 7 Kill the watchman 8 overthrow Humbaba
9 kill lions 10 kills the *bull*

It may be that the Bull of Heaven represented their most important conquest and for that reason was given emphasis here. However, it may as likely have been placed out of sequence by a careless scribe. My analysis of the entire epic, below, favors the former possibility.

There is an ABA-in-common at the center of Atrahasis III and Gilgamesh XI. Research has also disclosed frames or inclusions within these and other Sumero-Akkadian compositions. They will each be treated below as parts of grander designs. **La symétrie concentrique**

In narrowly maintaining that “the distinguishing feature of Hebrew poetry . . . is the rhythmical balancing of parts, or parallelism of thought,” James Robertson was quite wrong.⁴⁰ Indeed, Gordon has observed that biblical, Ugaritic, Phoenician, Mesopotamian, Anatolian, and Egyptian poetry all exhibit a similar poetic structure.⁴¹ He has also pointed out that lengthy recapitulation is a common characteristic of “ancient Egyptian, Semitic and classical literatures.”⁴² For his part, Kramer listed the devices employed in Sumerian (repetition and parallelism, metaphor and simile, chorus and refrain), and noted that most Sumerian literary works are poetic.⁴³ Whether or not one refers to these common traits as characteristic of a “generalized hymnal epic dialect,” one may find them in N. E. Semitic, N. W. Semitic, and in the Ionic (Mycenaean *koine*) of Homer. Gilgamesh and Odysseus have more in common than might be supposed at first glance.

At the same time, Kramer complains that Sumerian poets ramble on in a disjointed and monotonous fashion without the climax so typical of Semitic literature.⁴⁴ Can it be that he has misapprehended his own speciality? Perhaps he ought to have taken a hint from his own observation that some Sumerian compositions begin *and* end with mythological passages.⁴⁵ Clues to chiasmic structure are often discovered in just such disjointed and enveloping circumstances. It is of course quite true that simple repetitive symmetry can become monotonous, e. g., from the “Descent of Inanna,”⁴⁶

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------|
| 218 | Kurgarru 220 | Kalaturru 221 | Kurgarru 222 | Kalaturru |
| 223 | Kalaturru Kurgarru 267 | Kalaturru Kurgarru | | |

On the other hand, the Western mind might easily miss unfamiliar modes of expressing climax. Kramer scores detailed recapitulation of entire passages “very low in the scale of artistic technique,” though he finds it useful in reconstructing fragmentary tablets. Such a situation presents itself when a god or a hero sends out a messenger: The entire message must be repeated twice, i. e., when received and when delivered.⁴⁷ This characteristic has been very valuable elsewhere within cuneiform in uncovering chiasmus,⁴⁸ and ought to be given wider application. For one thing, symmetrical patterns of repetition could have been of great value in the memorization of hymnal epic.⁴⁹ For another, it satisfies aesthetic needs.

It is here, of course, that chiasm enters in its aspect as symmetrical concentricism, the strongest mnemonic device available,⁵⁰ and Lenglet finds this literary form in the widest possible range of texts: Biblical, Hittite, Egyptian, Greek, Latin, etc.⁵¹ Lund long ago attempted, without success, to demonstrate the existence of chiasm in cuneiform literature.⁵² Welch has since published a well-documented case for chiasmus in Ugaritic.⁵³ It now remains only to round out the case for its full-blown existence in ancient Mesopotamia. We may begin with a couple of short examples from the Sumerian “Journey of Nanna-Sin to Nippur”:⁵⁴

Open the house, gatekeeper, open the house,

Open the house, O protecting genie, open the house, Open the house, you who makes the trees to come forth, open the house, O . . . , who makes the trees to come forth, open the house! Gatekeeper, open the house,

O protecting genie, open the house! * * * * * Joyfully, The gatekeeper joyfully opened the gate; The protecting genie who makes the trees grow, joyfully, The

gatekeeper joyfully opened the gate; He who makes the trees grow, joyfully, The gatekeeper joyfully opened the gate; With Sin, Enlil rejoiced.

A more complex example is taken from Sumerian “Dumuzi and Enkimdu: The Wooing of Inanna,” with the Sun-god, Utu, appealing to Inanna on behalf of Dumuzi:⁵⁵

12 O my sister, let the shepherd marry you! 13 O maid Inanna, why are you unwilling? 14 *His oil is good,*
his milk is good; 15 The shepherd, everything his hand touches is bright; 16 O Inanna, let
the shepherd Dumuzi marry you! 17 O full of jewels and precious stones, why are you unwilling? 18
His good oil he will eat with you, 19 O protector of the king, why are you unwilling?

Note the emphasis on Inanna at the center as well as at the outer edges. This comports with biblical examples studied by Lund.⁵⁶ Elsewhere, one finds the emphasis only on the fringes.⁵⁷ In the Sumerian story of “Enki and the World Order,” for example, the city of Ur and the god Enki seem to be the main focus, although they enclose a listing of the finest qualities of Ur:⁵⁸

210 He proceeded to the *shrine Ur*, 211 Enki, the king of the Abyss, decrees its fate:
212 “City possessing all that is appropriate, Water-washed, firm-standing ox, 213 Dais of
abundance of the highland, Knees open, green like a mountain, 214 *Hashur*-grove, wide of shade – –
He who is lordly because of his might (?), 215 Has directed your perfect *me*’s,
216 Enlil, the ‘great mountain,’ Has pronounced your lofty name in the universe. 217 *City*
whose fate has been decreed by Enki, 218 *Shrine Ur*, may you rise heaven high!”

The third song of the “Lamentation Over the Destruction of Ur”⁵⁹ likewise has the city of Ur in its flanks (140–3//166–7), while emphasizing the divine Council and the Anunnaki-gods at the center (152–4). Between these extreme elements one finds straightforward parallels (145–51//155–61), all of which adds to chiasm in yet another genre of Sumerian literature, (ABCBA’).

In Akkadian too one finds such medium-sized chiasms. In answer to the simple ABA–structure from Shuppiluliuma I (laid out above), for example, King Niqmaddu II replied with a letter of fealty and bond in more complex form⁶⁰ – – though the letter was of the same length as that which he had received:

| | | | |
|-----|--|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1–2 | Titlature 3–16a | Historical prologue 16b–9 | Bond (<i>rikiltu</i>) clause 20– |
| 42 | Tribute list & instructions (stipulations) 43–6a | Historical epilogue 46b–8a | Bond |
| | (<i>rikiltu</i>) clause 48b–53 | Tablet clause/god list | |

Also covering entire compositions and pericopae, but on a much larger scale, one discovers the greatest chiastic achievements in Sumero-Akkadian literature. However, at every point, it must be borne in mind that more than one structural principle may have been simultaneously employed in the work of ancient literati.⁶¹ The overlays and embellishments common in multistructuring, though they can become heavy and confusing,⁶² do not invalidate the discernment of basic chiastic structures.⁶³

A very early Sumerian example, probably dating from around the close of the reign of Sargon I of Agade (24th century B. C.), claims to have been written by Sargon’s daughter, Enheduanna, high-priestess of Nanna at Ur. Called variously the “Exaltation of Inanna,”⁶⁴ “The Adoration of Inanna at Ur,”⁶⁵ and the „Hymnal Prayer of

Enheduanna,” it is an important theological exposition centering on Enheduanna’s complaints to, and then against Nanna (66–108). Indeed, she finally replaces him with Inanna! Following Hallo and van Dijk,⁶⁶ one can discern chiastic as well as non-chiastic elements. Enheduanna emphasized Nanna *and* Inanna by means of interweaving two structural techniques, and both of these techniques are placed in unified diagram as follows:

A. Exordium

| | | | |
|------|-----------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|
| I | Inanna and the <i>me</i> ’s | 1–8 | Hierodule of An, <i>me</i> ’s |
| II | Inanna and An | 9–16 | Inanna; <i>si</i> , “give” |
| III | Inanna and Enlil | 17–25 | |
| IV | Inanna and Ishkur | 26–33 | |
| V | Inanna and the Anunna | 34–42 | |
| VI | Inanna and Ebih (?) | 43–50 | |
| VII | Inanna and Uruk | 51–9 | |
| VIII | <i>Invocation of Inanna</i> | 60–5 | //112–4 <i>me</i> ’s |

B. Argument

| | | | |
|------|------------------------------|---------|--------|
| IX | Banishment from Ur | 66–73 | |
| X | Appeal to Nanna-Suen | 74–83 | Inanna |
| XI | Indictment of Lugalanne (?) | 84–91 | |
| XII | Curse of Uruk! | 92–99 | |
| XIII | Indictment of Nanna | 100–108 | |
| XIV | <i>Appeal to Inanna</i> | 109–21 | |
| XV | Exaltation of Inanna (theme) | 122–35 | |

C. Peroration

| | | | |
|-------|---------------------------|--------|--|
| XVI | Composition of the Hymn | 136–42 | |
| XVII | Restoration of Enheduanna | 143–50 | Inanna |
| XVIII | Doxology | 151–53 | <i>me</i> ’s; Inanna; <i>ba</i> , “bestow” Hierodule |

That this hymn is chiastic is based on several observations: It begins and ends with emphasis on the possession of *me*’s by Inanna (I//XVIII),⁶⁷ though in one of the Inanna panels surrounding the central section (VIII) *me*’s are again mentioned. The verbs describing the giving of these *powers* are likewise parallel (II//XVIII).⁶⁸ The name “Inanna” is used just four times: Only in the outer stanzas (II//XVII–XVIII) and in the central section (X).⁶⁹ The “Invocation” and “Appeal to Inanna” share specific parallels (VIII//XIV),⁷⁰ and these envelope the main complaints of Enheduanna, emphasize her bitterness at being banished from Ur, her vain appeal to Nanna (at the physical center), etc. There is a climax in the Curse of Uruk (XII), and the central stanzas conclude in the Indictment of Nanna (XIII).⁷¹

Yet Hallo and van Dijk focus their attention on the “Magnificat” of this piece, the “Exaltation of Inanna” (XV), as the climax of the *Argument*.⁷² Another climax comes with the „Restoration of Enheduanna” (XVII), and an “abrupt

turnabout in the mood of the poem is paralleled” there “by a syntactic reversal,”⁷³ i. e., a chiasm.

The Sumerian story of the “Descent of Inanna to the Netherworld”⁷⁴ is *not* chiasmic, but the Akkadian version of it is. This is particularly interesting since they each contain essentially the same elements. In the Sumerian version, however, the seven articles of apparel which constitute a major chiasmic element in the Akkadian “Descent of Ishtar” are simply repeated in direct parallel *before* the descent and not afterward (14–25//103–11//125–56).⁷⁵ Within the “Descent of Ishtar to the Netherworld” (again, the older Ashur version is superior),⁷⁶ one finds numerous points of chiasmic pivot. But the major sections may be summarized in ABBA fashion as follows:

Descent (obv. 42–62) Divine predicament (76–rev. 10) Divine resolution (12–37) Ascent (39–45)⁷⁷

Descent of Ishtar

obv. 19 “I will cause the dead to rise that they may eat as the living” 34 “the men who had to leave (their) wives behind!” 42–62 Ishtar enters the seven gates of the Netherworld and is relieved by the gatekeeper of her 1) great crown, 2) earrings, 3) necklaces, 4) breast ornaments, 5) birthstone girdle, 6) wrist and ankle bracelets, 7) breechcloth.

68 “Go, Namtar, lock her up in my palace.” 69–75 Namtar looses sixty maladies against Ishtar. 76 Ishtar has descended to the land of no return 77–80 propagation has ceased on earth (animals and man) rev. 2 Papsukkal, vizier of the gods, in mourning (weeps) 5 “Ishtar has descended to the Underworld, but she has not come up (again).” 6 Ishtar has descended to the land of no return 7–10 propagation has ceased on earth (animals and man)

12–37 the gods send Asnamer (Asushunamir), the eunuch, to the Netherworld to rescue Ishtar: 13 the land of no return 14 the land of no return 21 Ereshkigal enraged 23–8 harsh curse laid upon Asnamer by Ereshkigal 38 (34) Namtar sprinkles Ishtar with the “waters of life.” (Ashur) “Go, Namtar, take Ishtar away.”

39–45 7) breechcloth, 6) wrist and ankle bracelets, 5) birthstone girdle, 4) breast ornaments, 3) necklaces, 2) earrings, 1) great crown, restored to Ishtar by the gatekeeper (or Namtar) as she ascends from the Netherworld and exits its seven gates. 47 “As for Tammuz her youthful husband, . . .” 58 “Let the dead come up and smell the incense!”

For several reasons, Heidel saw tablet XII of the Epic of Gilgamesh as a later supplement to the original text. Most convincing, however, was the appearance of a feature which he found to be present in biblical literature as well,⁷⁸ i.e.,

the concluding passage of Tablet XI returns to the beginning of the epic and closes with almost the same words with which the proem ends, indicating that the wreath of myths and legends is complete.

The physical center and actual climax of the Gilgamesh Epic comes at the end of tablet VI with the slaying of the Bull of Heaven⁷⁹ (151–3) and, following aggravated insult to Ishtar, Enkidu’s fortune begins an immediate decline.

Simoons-Vermeer offers a differing bifurcation of the epic:⁸⁰ Part one she sees as encompassing everything up to the death of Enkidu (I–VIII, ii), part two being the story of a mourning Gilgamesh searching desperately and vainly for a way to escape the death which had overtaken his dear friend (IX–XI). Her focus being the Flood, one might suggest that this secondary structural view stems from an addition of the flood-story to the epic in the 12th century B.C.⁸¹

(I–VIII, ii),

| | | | |
|----------|---|---------------------|---|
| I, ii | Enkidu born | <i>Birth</i> II–III | Encounter & |
| | subsequent friendship of Gilgamesh and Enkidu | III–V | Humbaba (Huwawa) episode |
| VI | Bull of Heaven episode | VII | Demise of Enkidu; dismal picture of land of no return |
| VIII, ii | Enkidu dies | | <i>Death</i> |

| | | | |
|----------|---|----------------------|---|
| IX, i, 1 | Gilgamesh searching for immortality | <i>Endeavor</i> IX–X | long and |
| | dangerous journey from Uruk XI, 7 | | “How did you . . . obtain life everlasting?” (asked of Utnapishtim) XI, 9–196 |
| | Utnapishtim tells chiastic Flood Story. XI, 198 | | “How will you find the (everlasting) life which you seek?” (asked of Gilgamesh) XI, 256ff |
| 97 | Impossible for Gilgamesh to escape death | | long journey and return to Uruk XI, 287–
<i>Failure</i> |

I have found, however, that a differing and more detailed approach is warranted, and it is one which has very little (if anything) to do with the Flood. Thus, the chiastic structure of the entire Gilgamesh Epic:⁸²

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| I, i, 16–9 | “Climb upon the walls of Uruk and walk about; inspect the foundation terrace, and examine the brickwork; is not its brickwork of burnt brick? Did not the Seven (Sages) lay its foundation?” | I, ii, 1 | Two |
| | thirds of him is god, (and one-third of him is human). I, ii, 34 ff | | Enkidu created from <i>clay</i> by Aruru (Nintu); wanders over steppe II, v–vi |
| | Enkidu blocks gate to Gilgamesh and violence ensues | III, i–ii | |
| | Enkidu and Gilgamesh form friendship | III, i–V, iv | Journey to cedar forest and killing of Huwawa/Humbaba (incl. Assy. II, v; Hittite V, v–vi); ascent of mtn., etc. V, i, 1–2 |
| | dreams of Gilgamesh and Enkidu | VI, 1–80 | <i>height of cedar</i> V, i–iv |
| | Proposal of marriage by Ishtar rejection by Gilgamesh | VI, 151–3 | Proposal of marriage by Ishtar rejection by Gilgamesh |
| Enkidu VI, 153–5 | Heart of Bull offered to Shamash | VI, 158–9 | Bull of Heaven slain by Gilgamesh & Enkidu VI, 153–5 |
| | High of Bull thrown at Ishtar by Enkidu | VI, 189–92 | High of Bull thrown at Ishtar by Enkidu |
| death) VII, i, 1–16 | dream of Enkidu (Council of gods deciding his death) | | dream of Enkidu (Council of gods deciding his death) |
| VII, i, 41–3 | <i>height of the towering cedar</i> | VIII, i–ii | Journey to cedar forest recalled; mtns. ascended, etc. VIII, ii |
| | Gilgamesh and Enkidu separated by latter’s death | IX, i, 1–6 | |
| | Gilgamesh roams desert in contemplation of death | IX, ii, 16 | Two-thirds of him is god, one-third of him is man. X, i, 10ff |
| | Gilgamesh wanders over steppe (Assyr. i, 6, clad in pelts) (v, 5ff) (Sp. 299, i, 16–25, roams steppe like Enkidu; cf. iii, 7–35) | X, i, 15–22 (Assyr) | Siduri bars gate and Gilgamesh threatens to break it |
| X, ii, 12 (Assyr) | Enkidu had returned to <i>clay</i> (iii, 30; v, 21) | XI, 303–5 | “Urshanabi, climb upon the ramparts of Uruk and walk about; inspect the foundation terrace, and examine the brickwork; is not its brickwork of burnt brick? Did not the Seven (Sages) lay its foundation?” |

Gilgamesh (Sum. *Bilga-mes*, “Ancient-Hero”?; Hellenistic *Gilgamos*) is supposed to have been a post-diluvian king at Uruk/Warka,⁸³ and there may even have been a ruler of that name there ca. 2700–2600 B. C.⁸⁴ His heroic exploits mixed with the activities of quarrelsome gods, his splendid and dangerous wayfaring, the killing of Humbaba, and his return home, remind one of nothing so much as Homeric epic (esp. the *Odyssey*), which, just incidentally, also partakes of rough chiastic structure. The Mesopotamian myths were certainly known to the Greeks, and it is no more surprising to see similar stories there than among the Canaanites, Hebrews, *et alii*.⁸⁵ The Flood Story is an excellent example, though the Greek versions (Xisuthros; Deucalion) are noted here only in passing. The oldest Flood Story of all, that from Ebla, ought to prove most interesting when published. In recent public lectures, G. Pettinato has been pointing out the Eblaite similarities to the Sumerian-Akkadian versions and noting that the Palaeo-Canaanite version has the seven-day flood of the Mesopotamian versions.

I begin here with the latest of the Sumerian-Akkadian flood-stories, that contained in Gilgamesh XI, partly because this gives continuity with matters laid out immediately above, but primarily because it is the most *complete* version. However, as Hartmann has pointed out, tablet XI is “principally dependent on *Atra-Hasis*, (probably) through a Middle Babylonian version,”⁸⁶ and the fragmentary Sumerian version, as Simoons-Vermeer has shown, roughly conforms to the outline of the Akkadian versions.⁸⁷ Heidel justifiably goes much further in claiming not only that “the Babylonian and Hebrew versions are genetically related,”⁸⁸ but also that “the skeleton is the same in both cases” – despite obvious differences in “flesh and blood” and in “animating spirit.”⁸⁹

The “flesh and blood” to which Heidel refers ought probably to be extended to include the more complex and symmetrical nature of the Genesis Flood Story when it is compared with its Sumerian-Akkadian cousins. Of course, Albright argued that Gen 1 – 9 is largely a mixture of Hurrian and Sumerian-Akkadian background,⁹⁰ and this combination of Creation and Flood is certainly clear also in *Atrahasis* and in the Sumerian Flood Story. The reader may make his own comparison of chiastic structure among the various versions of the Flood presented below, and may also want to compare them with chiastic analyses of the Genesis Flood.⁹¹ The source critic will have his work cut out for him! My own documentary analysis shows that the traits usually separately assigned to J and P for Gen 6 – 9 are inextricably mixed in the Sumerian-Akkadian flood-stories, and Kessler concludes that, in Gen 7 at least, “there are no ‘seams,’” and that traditional, facile source analyses are not there supported by the evidence.⁹²

Gilgamesh XI Utnapishtim’s Version of the Flood

| 1–4
8,93 | Utnapishtim’s appearance
Embarkation 20–31
89–112 | Warning of Ea (Ae) (dream, cf. Berossus)
Storm begins 81–
113 | Warning of Ea (Ae) (dream, cf. Berossus)
81–
gods terror |
|--------------|---|---|--|
| 114 | gods fled | | |
| 115 | gods covered like dogs & crouched in distress | 116 | Ishtar cried like a woman in |
| travail; 117 | Lady of the gods lamented: | 118 | olden time has turned to clay, |
| 119 | because I commanded evil in assembly of gods. | 120 | How could I have |
| | commanded evil in assembly . . . ? | | |
| 121 | How could I have commanded war to destroy my people? | | |

122 For it is I who bring forth my people!

123 Like spawn of fish they fill the sea! 124

Anunnaki-gods wept with her;

125 gods sat bowed and weeping. 126

covered were their lips 129-53 Flood

subsides, Storm abates, and birds sent out 155 a Debarkation (155b-61, gods smell offering) (162-9, oath of Ishtar/ lapis necklace as sign) 186-7 Warning of Ea (Ae), dream (cf. Berossus)

189-96 Utnapishtim's apotheosis (blessing by Enlil)

This and the following outlines have profited somewhat from the analysis of the flood-stories by Simoons-Vermeer,⁹³ though of course she made no assertions of a chiasitic nature. The gods-Ishtar-gods sequence at the center here (113-26) is seen next in Atrahasis,⁹⁴

Atra-Hasis Viewpoint of the Gods

I, 1-197 Igigu-gods angry with Enlil -- so man to be created to work in place of Igigu-gods (i-iv). I, 198-305 Creation of man by Enki & Nintu (iv-vi) 1, 358-9 Mankind too noisy (vii); I, 360ff destruction sent by Enlil (vii)

II, 1, 7-8 Mankind too noisy (cf. Enuma Elish I, 21ff); II, i, 9ff destruction

II, vii-viii Tumultuous assembly of the gods-Flood decision made

II, vii, 38-42 Oath binding Enki & Anunnaki-gods (x rev. ii, 46-8; RS 22.421, obv. 10) II, viii,

34 *gamertam*, "total-destruction" (thrice only in story) III, i

Warning of Enki (i, 37, Flood

on 7th night) III, ii, 29-42

Embarkation III, ii, 48-iii, 23

Storm begins III, iii, 30-

1 The Anunnaki, the great gods, hunger & thirst

III, iii, 32-iv, 13 Mother-goddess, Nintu/Mami, the midwife of the gods, weeps in regret for her

agreement with the decision for the III, iii, 38

gamertam, "total destruction" of her offspring reached in

the assembly of the gods. III, iv, 15, 19-22

The gods wept and suffered hunger cramps

III, iv, 24

Storm lasts 7 days & 7 nights -----

----- (Storm ends?) (III, iv, 28-v, 29)

34-line gap

(Debarkation?) -----

-- III, v, 30-6

Creatures sent to four winds & offering made III, v, 44

gamertam, "total-

destruction" III, v, 46-vi, 4

Oath of Nintu III, vi, 5-6

Enlil angry at Igigu-gods

III, vi, 7-8 Oath of Anunnaki III, vi

Warning of Enki (recalled) III, vi, 44

Assembly of

gods-instruction to resettle case of mankind Completion of world III, viii

Igigu-gods praise Enlil due to hymn

on Flood (its destructive-creative gestalt)-(cf. Enuma Elish VI, 33, 47-50, on praise of Marduk, though Enki the creator).

As Simoons-Vermeer points out, the destruction-recreation sequence in Atrahasis is the primary motif,⁹⁵ and the whole violent affair is told from the point of view of the gods themselves.⁹⁶

The Sumerian Flood Story is shorter because more fragmentary.⁹⁷ Of the four tablets dealing with the flood-story, one can find an 80-line gap (more or less) in a total of about 120 lines. That is over two-thirds of the story! Even so, the story was plainly composed with strong chiastic elements:

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------|-------------------------|
| (iii) 143-4 | An and Enlil-oath of the gods | 145-7 | Ziusudra-a humble and reverent king | 150 | Conjured |
| | by heaven and underworld . . . | (iv) 154-60 | Warning of Enki-sentence of divine assembly | ----- | |
| | | | | (162-200) | (Embarkation?) |
| | approx. 40-line gap | ----- | | | |
| --- (v) 201 | All the destructive winds and gales were present, | 202 | | | The storm swept |
| over the capitals. 203 | Seven days and seven nights | 204 | | | The storm had swept the |
| country, 205 | And the destructive wind had rocked the huge boat in the high water. | 207- | | | |
| 10 | Debarkation | 211 | sacrifice of animals | ----- | |
| | | | | (212-50) | (Warning?) |
| | | | | approx. 40-line gap | ----- |
| | | | | ----- | |
| | | | | (vi) 251 | Be conjured by |
| heaven and underworld, . . . | 252 | An and Enlil, be conjured by heaven and underworld, . . . | 255 | | Ziusudra |
| prostrates himself before An and Enlil | 256-7 | Apotheosis of Ziusudra | | | |

Via Akkadian texts, some of which were from tablets contemporary with the early biblical period, and via Sumerian texts mostly from Nippur of the early 2nd millennium B. C., I have demonstrated herein the existence of chiasm in nearly the full range of genres of Sumerian literature (lexical, mathematical, economic texts, and the like, are not *literary*⁹⁸), though in a less broadly identifiable grouping of Akkadian texts. It has been suggested above that the existence of such a rhetorical figure served in oral tradition as a mnemotechnique.⁹⁹ Yet, as likely as this is, and though McEvenue,¹⁰⁰ Thompson,¹⁰¹ Dewey,¹⁰² and Radday¹⁰³ argue that it is an intentional and conscious creation, Clark asserts that such patterning can as easily be the result of cultural conditioning and psychological stimuli.¹⁰⁴

Whatever the case, it is clear that some documents place more emphasis on “parallel or concentric patterns,”¹⁰⁵ that a “more careful arrangement” of a text does not bespeak later development,¹⁰⁶ and that linear evolutionary patterns in the development and use of chiasm need not be assumed. If anything, chiastic style and usage varied in a cyclic fashion among the story-tellers and literati of the ancient world, and, as with other types of literary analysis, a comparison of these structures may help us to classify and understand the various sources and traditions.

I conclude from this survey that most of the essential features of chiastic form and function were available to Mesopotamian authors from the late 3rd millennium through the mid-1st millennium B. C., and that chiastic usage in Ugaritic and Hebrew should not be considered unique—except insofar as local eccentricities are exhibited. The cyclic waxing and waning of the strength and style of the epic figure during this long period should not be surprising, but too little evidence has as yet been gathered upon which to base such a generalization.

July 1977

FOOTNOTES

1 See Biggs, ZA, 61:193-207; Albright, YGC, p. 2.

2 Cf. Rowton, CAH, 3rd ed., I, 1 (1970), pp. 193-239, for the chronology.

- 3 Lambert, *Orientalia*, 40:93–4, on “The Exaltation of Ishtar,” III, 57–60; cf. Newman, *UCPSP*, I, 1 (1918), 57, 78, on the frequent use of parallelism in much of world literature—not the case, however, for English (pp. 60, 67); E. Gordon, *SP*, pp. 16–7; C. H. Gordon, *UTB*, 17.6, pp. 293–4; cf. Fisher, ed., *RSP*, II, VII & IX.
- 4 See Lipin, *Akkadian Language*, p. 161; C. H. Gordon, *UL*, p. 7; W. Whallon, *Formula, Character, and Context*, p. 189.
- 5 Kramer, *SM*, 36–7, pl. VIII, n. 37, citing UM Ni 14068, Istanbul 4429, and Chiera, *SEM*, 21; cf. the similar “Separation of Heaven and Earth” section in *SM*, 36, 40, 51, pl. IX, n. 39, citing Langdon, *PBS*, X, 4, 16 = UM Ni 13877:4–5, “Enlil and the Creation of the Pickax.”
- 6 Jacobsen, *Toward the Image of Tammuz*, p. 344, n. 41, citing Kramer, *SM*, 43–7, nn. 47–8, and *SLTN*, 19, rev. 1¹–10¹, with var. from *MBI*, 4, iv, end (pl. xxxiii), from Ni, UM 9205, etc.
- 7 E. Gordon, *SP*, p. 270, var. in UM 29–15–394 used here; Kramer, *Sumerians*, p. 225, #10; cf. Ni proverbs 1.20 (Gordon, *SP*, pp. 51, 455), and 1.55 (p. 68), for the same type of simple chiasmic exchange of parallel nouns.
- 8 E. Gordon, *SP*, p. 147 (in eme-sal dialect).
- 9 Kramer, *Sumerians*, p. 259; cf. Rev 10:9–10 for the same type of chiasm—Ford, *Revelation*, pp. 160, 165.
- 10 E. Gordon, *SP*, p. 17, terms it an example of “crossed antithesis”; cf. “Enki and Ninhursag: A Paradise Myth,” 75–6, in Kramer, *SM*, 56, n. 56, and *ANET*,³ p. 39, for abc:bca’, where c is the verb.
- 11 Cf. also Atrahasis II, iii, 4–6; Lipin, *Akkadian Language*, p. 155 (cf. p. 159)—in Akkadian prose the verb follows Sumerian syntax by being in final position; *lb//kbd*, “heart”/“liver,” is a common Ug.-Heb. parallel pair, Dahood, *Psalms*, III:451.
- 12 Cf. Atrahasis I, i, 7–8 (A), 18–9 (B); iv, 7–8; v, 10–1; viii, 34–5 (B, D); cf. also Gilgamesh XI, 1–2, as noted in C. H. Gordon, *UTB*, 17.6.
- 13 For this and other material from Atrahasis, I modify the translation of Lambert in Lambert & Millard, *ATRA-HASIS*; cf. Ginsberg, *Orientalia*, 5:161–98, for repetitive tricola in Hebrew and Ugaritic.
- 14 See Albright, *YGC*, pp. 4–8, and the literature cited there; it is yet too early to take account of Eblaite.
- 15 Andersen, *Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*, pp. 39–41, 45, 48, 67, 72, 105, 119–25, 128–9, 131–6, 139, 151, 158–61, 180–2, 186, 188–9.
- 16 Cf. Dahood in Bream, ed., *A Light unto My Path*, pp. 120, 122, 127.
- 17 Cf. Campbell in Bream, *op. cit.*, p. 93, citing L. Alonso-Schökel; McEvenue, *Narrative*, pp. 30, 34–5.
- 18 Cf. McEvenue, *Narrative*, pp. 29, 34–5, 41, 76–8, 114 (citing Lohfink), 157–9, 162–3, 175.
- 19 Cf. Thompson, *Matthew’s Advice*, pp. 27, 116, 123, 130, 161, 163 (citing Lagrange and Bonnard), 223.
- 20 Andersen, *Sentence*, pp. 39, 55, on chiasmic apposition as a feature of “epic.”

- 21 Cathcart, *CBQ*, 35:179–87; Hillers, *Lamentations*, AB 7A, pp. XXIX–XXX; Greenfield in Goedicke, ed., *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W. F. Albright*, pp. 253–68; Dahood, *Psalms 101–150*, AB 17A, pp. 445–56, and in *Festschrift Joseph Ziegler*, pp. 35–40; cf. Fisher, ed., *RSP*, I, II, and III; see next note.
- 22 Dahood in Fisher, ed., *RSP*, I, II: Intro 6, citing Boling, *JSS*, 14:122.
- 23 McEvenue, *Narrative*, pp. 29, 41, n. 18.
- 24 *Ibid.*, pp. 43–4, 52–3, 66.
- 25 *Ibid.*, pp. 30, 53–4, 76–8, 81, 85–6, 106 (n. 27).
- 26 Andersen, *Sentence*, pp. 45, 124–5, 136.
- 27 *Ibid.*, pp. 50, 53–4, 129; on the employment of inclusions in Isaiah, see Mowinckel, *ZAW*, 49:87–112, and Liebrich, *JQR*, 46:275–6, and 47:115ff.
- 28 Kramer, *SM*, 62–3; Falkenstein, *Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebete*, pp. 133ff.
- 29 Kramer, *SM*, 56, n. 56; *ANET*,³ p. 39; cf. Habel, *Literary Criticism of the OT*, pp. 69–70.
- 30 Kramer, *Sumerians*, p. 199; see n. 5, above.
- 31 Kramer, *SM*, 102; *ANET*,³ p. 42.
- 32 Cf. Alster, *RA*, 67:101ff.; Kramer, *Orientalia*, 39:103–10; van Dijk, *Orientalia*, 39:302–10.
- 33 Knutson, dissertation, p. 137; *ANET*,³ pp. 159–61; Kramer, *Sumerians*, pp. 336–40; Welch, *UF*, VI:426; cf. Dt 5–28.
- 34 Harper, *Code of Hammurabi*, p. xi; Welch, *UF*, VI:426; cf. Knutson, diss., pp. 137–8; cf. Dt 5–28.
- 35 C. H. Gordon, *UL*, pp. 7, 132; *Christianity Today*, 4:132; cf. also Job 1 – 47, with its prose frame.
- 36 *PRU*, IV, 17.132 (35); Welch, *UF*, VI:426; Knutson, dissertation, pp. 141, 195–6; in Fisher, ed., *RSP*, II, VI:4.
- 37 Cf. Heidel, *Gilgamesh*, 2nd ed., p. 127; *ANET*,³ pp. 107–8; the later (7th cent. B. C.) Nineveh rescension hasn't the first element of this inclusion, though the numbering here follows that version.
- 38 Heidel, *Gilgamesh*,² p. 121; Ereshkigal = Irkalla; lines 5–11 continue to describe the Netherworld and this leads to asymmetry here.
- 39 *Gilgamesh*, frag. Sp. 299, etc.
- 40 Robertson, *Poetry and Religion of the Psalms*, Croal Lectures for 1893–94, p. 160.
- 41 C. H. Gordon, *UTB*, 13.107 (p. 31), and n. 2.

- 42 *Idem*, *Before Columbus*, p. 62.
- 43 Kramer, in G. E. Wright, ed., *BANE*, p. 254.
- 44 *Ibid.*, and n. 11.
- 45 *Ibid.*, n. 12.
- 46 *Idem*, *ANET*,³ pp. 53–7.
- 47 *Idem*, *SM*, 31.
- 48 UT 137, displayed by Welch, *UF*, VI:429; cf. Ex 19:3–8, Josh 24:2–27.
- 49 Nielsen, *Oral Tradition*, pp. 19ff.; Albright asserted that such texts were being “sung or chanted to the accompaniment of” harp or lyre even before the 3rd millenium B. C. (*YGC*, p. 2).
- 50 Lund, *AJSL*, 46:112; Pierce, *Analog*, 87 (April 1971), 47ff.; Corballis & Beale, *Scientific American*, 224 (March 1971), 99, 103–4.
- 51 Lenglet, *Biblica*, 53:169–70; J. T. Clemons finds chiasm in Syriac literature (Buchanan, *To the Hebrews*, AB 36, p. XXVII, n. 5).
- 52 Lund, *CNT*, pp. 131–4; cf. Bowra, *Homer*, p. 59.
- 53 Welch, *UF*, VI:421–36; first studied in his 1970 master’s thesis, pp. 61–73.
- 54 Kramer, *SM*, 48; abc:cab, and abcbc’ba’.
- 55 *Ibid.*, 101; *ANET*,³ p. 41; cf. Jacobsen in *Intellectual Adventure of Man* (1946), pp. 166–8.
- 56 Lund, *CNT*, p. 41 (3).
- 57 *Ibid.*, (4).
- 58 Kramer, *SM*, 60; *Sumerians*, p. 178.
- 59 *Idem*, *ANET*,³ p. 458; abcba.
- 60 *PRU*, IV, 17.227 (40), translation and arrangement in Knutson, dissertation, pp. 126, 196–7, noting the “symmetrical” nature of the text, and comparing Ex 34:10–27; in Fisher, ed., *RSP*, II, VI:1 (n), 3; Welch, *UF*, VI:426, n. 35; cf. also RS 17.146 (154), 17.341 (48), 17.369 A (52); here we have abcb’a’.
- 61 Talbert, *CBQ*, 32:362–3, nn. 96–7.
- 62 *Ibid.*, p. 363, n. 98; Thiering, *JSS*, 8:199.

63 Cf. Radday, *LB*, 27–8:10, on statistical tests for chiasmus; Casey & Nagy, *Scientific American*, 224 (April 1971), 56–71, on pattern recognition via computer.

64 Hallo & van Dijk, *Exaltation of Inanna*.

65 *ANET*,³ pp. 579–82, for the 15th stanza.

66 Hallo & van Dijk, *op. cit.*, pp. 10, 44–63.

67 *Ibid.*, p. 49.

68 *Ibid.*, p. 48; line 14, *si*, “give”//152, *ba*, “bestow.”

69 *Ibid.*, p. 10; lines 12, 83, 145, 153; *nu-gig-an-na*, “Hierodule of An,” in line 3 would balance this pattern if allowed as an equivalent “name” // “Hierodule,” in line 151.

70 *Ibid.*, p. 53; lines 60–5//112–4.

71 *Ibid.*, p. 58; line 99 is climactic.

72 *Ibid.*, p. 59–60.

73 *Ibid.*, p. 63; inversion in line 146.

74 Kramer, *ANET*,³ pp. 53–7.

75 *Ibid.*, p. 54, n. 32, notes the inverted order of lines 24–5//110–1; this is probably scribal error.

76 *ANET*,³ pp. 107–8; Heidel, *Gilgamesh*,² pp. 121–8.

77 J. Schulz studies the artistic unity of Descensus and Anastasis in *ZKT*, 81:1–66 (cited in Nibley, *Vigiliae Christianae*, 20:20, n. 98).

78 Heidel, *Gilgamesh*,² pp. 13, 15–6; Speiser, *ANET*,³ p. 96, reached the same conclusion; cf. de Vaux, *Bible and the Ancient Near East*, p. 35, rightly suggesting that tablets XI and XII were both once separate from the epic.

79 Cf. *Gilgamesh X*, i, 2//10.

80 Simoons-Vermeer, *Numen*, 21:20–1.

81 *Ibid.*, 21–2.

82 See Speiser & Grayson, *ANET*,³ pp. 73–97, 503–7; cf. Kramer, *JAOS*, 64:7–23; the Old Babylonian is followed here with variants noted.

83 Sollberger, *Babylonian Legend of the Flood*, pp. 20–1; Schneider, *Gilgamesch*, p. 31.

- 84 Mallowan, *Iraq*, 26:67–8.
- 85 Kramer, *SM*, viii; C. H. Gordon, *UTB*, 17.14, etc., cited by Welch, *UF*, VI:428, and n. 42.
- 86 Hartman, *JBL*, 91:32, n. 27.
- 87 Simoons-Vermeer, *Numen*, 21:17–34.
- 88 Heidel, *Gilgamesh*,² p. 260; cf. Kikawada, *JBL*, 91:33; in Jackson & Kessler, eds., *Rhetorical Criticism*, p. 32, n. 22.
- 89 Heidel, *op. cit.*, p. 268; cf. Fisher, *CBQ*, 32:392–403.
- 90 Albright, *YGC*, pp. 79–86, and n. 101, citing Lambert & Millard, *CTBT*, 56: pl. 39, and Lambert & Walcot, *Kadmos*, 4:64–72; cf. Heidel, *Gilgamesh*,² pp. 260–9; Cassuto, *Commentary on Genesis*, I:288, citing Burrows, *JRAS*, 1925, 281–2.
- 91 See Lund, *CNT*, pp. 61–2, cited in Welch, thesis, pp. 25–7; cf. Radday, *BM*, 20–1:67–8; *LB*, 19:14–5; McEvenue, *Narrative*, pp. 24–82, 190 (esp. p. 40, and nn. 28, 31); cf also Andersen, *Sentence*, p. 40, and n. 1, on documentary analysis.
- 92 Jackson & Kessler, eds., *Rhetorical Criticism*, pp. 1–17.
- 93 Simoons-Vermeer, *Numen*, 21:20–1, 23–4.
- 94 *Ibid.*, 24, 26–7.
- 95 *Ibid.*, 18, 31–4; see also pp. 19–21.
- 96 *Ibid.*, 28.
- 97 Here following the translation of M. Civil in Lambert & Millard, *ATRA-HASIS*, pp. 140–5; cf. *ANET*,³ pp. 42–4; there are really only about 64 readable lines out of the 300 lines of the tablets (so Simoons-Vermeer); tablets i and ii deal with the creation of man, institution of kingship, and foundation of the five main cities -- the collection of tablets probably comes from Nippur of the Late Old Babylonian period (CBS 10673).
- 98 Kramer, *SM*, vii, ix, 9–18.
- 99 See nn. 49–50, above; cf. Thompson, *Matthew's Advice*, p. 81, n. 47, citing Lohr, *CBQ*, 23:403–35.
- 100 McEvenue, *Narrative*, pp. 49–50, 157–9.
- 101 Thompson, *Matthew's*, pp. 161, 163 (n. on P. Bonnard).
- 102 Dewey, *JBL*, 92:394–401.
- 103 Radday, *BM*, 20–1:54; *LB*, 9–10:22.

104 Clark, *LB*, 35:71–2; also in Bratcher, *et al.*, eds., *Understanding and Translating*, pp. 56–7.

105 Thompson, *Matthew's*, pp. 161, 163 (n. on P. Bonnard).

106 *Ibid.*, pp. 136, 148