

9. Obwohl als Ergänzung auch [Ša-ba]-nu-tim möglich wäre (dieser PNF in V, 23), ergibt sich aufgrund der zu veranschlagenden Breite des zerstörten Randes (gemäß Z. 3') eher die obige Rekonstruktion. Hierfür spräche auch die in der gleichen Zeile erwähnte Lamassi, da sie die Frau ist, die zusammen mit Qannuttum am häufigsten aufgelistet wird.

10. Herrn Prof. K. Hecker danke ich vielmals für die Erlaubnis, aus von ihm erstellten unpubl. Texten zitieren zu dürfen.

11. Diese Angabe läßt offen, ob es sich bei den 10 Sequel Silber um das Gewicht oder den Wert der Gewandnadel handelt.

12. Zur Familie des Pūšu-kēn vgl. M. T. Larsen, OACC, S. 82f. Eine umfassende Untersuchung zur Familie des Pūšu-kēn wird von K. R. Veenhof vorbereitet.

13. Zu den Verwandtschaftsverhältnissen der oben genannten Personen vgl. C. Michel, ITPA I, 1991, S. 147.

14. Zur Beteiligung von Frauen am Kültepe-Handel mittels *tadmīqtum* s. K. R. Veenhof, AOAT, S. 110f.

Thomas STURM (07-05-95)

Hermann-Treff-Weg 8

D-48167 MÜNSTER, ALLEMAGNE

**38) Question mark retrieval** – The uncertainty concerning the identification of the relationship between the signs  $N_1$  and  $N_8$  in the archaic numerical system for area measures, signaled by a question mark in *Frühe Schrift* p. 97, cannot, despite the best efforts of W. Heimpel in *NABU* 1995: 12, be resolved. The final entry of line two of the text in question, *MSVO* 1, 2, is in fact, as I discovered during a visit to Oxford in November of 1987 and confirmed on the occasion of the Erlenneyer exhibit in Berlin in the summer of 1990, undisturbed and the notation  $7N_8$  unambivalent. This notation, cited by Heimpel, and that of *MSVO* 1, 4 obv. 5d,  $1N_1 7N_8$ , prompted M. Powell at the 1988 meeting in Berlin of the Concept Development in Babylonian Mathematics group to suggest that the sign  $N_8$  in the archaic  $GAN_2$  system might correspond to  $1/8 N_1$ , comparable to the reasonably inferred pre-Sargonic and Sargonic practice (see his remarks and table in *ZA* 62, 193-195 and 218-219). Whether in this context  $N_8$  equals  $1/8$  of  $N_1$  or rather  $1/10$ , as has been generally believed since the edition of *MSVO* 1, 2 (*OECT* 7, 100), by C. Allotte de la Fuyé in *RA* 27 (1930) 65-71 (compare S. Langdon, *OECT* 7, p. 66, no. 457), cannot be demonstrated with final certainty. For two reasons: in the first place, the calculations of the Jemdet Nasr field accounts *MSVO* 1, 1-6 – no like computations are preserved on texts from other sites –, exhibit what would at face value appear to be numerous slight, and several major errors, which would strain the credibility of a text reconstruction based on high precision. Assuming that in all cases the first entry following registration of length and width of the fields recorded in these texts contains a notation representing the size of an agricultural field, and an eventual second entry peripheral, possibly wooded land strips (GIŠ KI BAR), these are:

<i>MSVO</i> 1, 2 obv.	1a-d	$290 \times 100$ (ninda) = 16 (būr) / 2 (iku) <sup>1</sup> (text : $2N_{22} = 12$ (iku))
	2a-d	$312 \times 90 = 15$ (būr) / $10^{8/10}$ (iku) <sup>1</sup> (text : $N_{22} 4N_1 7N_8 = 10 + ?$ (iku))
	3a-c	$290 \times 93 = 15$ (būr) less $3/10$ (iku) <sup>1</sup> (text 15 (būr))
	4a-c	$290 \times 62 = 10$ (būr) less $2/10$ (iku) <sup>1</sup> (text 10 (būr) $2N_8 = ?$ (iku)?)
	5a-d	$300 \times 110 = 18$ (būr) / 6 (iku) <sup>1</sup> (text $N_{14} 2N_{22} = 30$ (iku))
2 rev. i	3	$N_{14} 2N_{22} 5N_1 = 35$ (iku) GIŠ KI BAR (text corrected : $2 + 10^{8/10} + 6 = 18^{8/10}$ (iku), as is : $12 + 10 7N_8 + 30 = 52$ (iku) $7N_8$ (?)
3 obv.	4a-d	$36(+ ?) \times 100 = 2$ (būr) / ? (iku) (text $4N_8$ ; s. rev. i 3)
4 obv.	1a-d	$320 \times 42 = 7$ (būr) $8^{4/10}$ (iku) (text 7 (būr) [ ])
	3a-d	$355 \times 37 = 7$ (būr) / $5^{3.5/10}$ (iku) <sup>1</sup> (text 5 (iku))
	4a-d	$355(?) \times 37 = 7$ (būr) / $5^{3.5/10}$ (iku) <sup>1</sup> (text 5 (iku), 7 (būr) omitted)
	5a-d	$300(+ ?) \times [ ] = 3$ (būr) / ? (text 1 (iku) $7N_8$ )
4 rev. i	3	$2N_{14} 2N_1 1N_8 = 38$ (iku) $1N_8$ GIŠ KI BAR (text corrected : $8^{4/10} + 36 + 5^{3.5/10} + 5^{3.5/10} + ? = 55^{1/10} + ?$ (iku), as is : [ ] + $36 + 5 + 5 + 1 7N_8 = 47$ (iku) $7N_8$ (+ ?))

In the second, the attestations of  $N_8$  as part of an archaic area notation in these texts have, unfortunately, not aided in its identification. Those numerical notations which seem promising, namely, those contained in the entries *MSVO* 1, no. 2 obv. 2d, 4c, no. 3 obv. 4d, and no. 4 obv. 5d and rev. i 3, are in all cases unclear. The understandable temptation to assume, at the exclusive level of  $N_8$ , an addition  $[4N_8] + 7N_8 = (1N_1) + 1N_8$  in the text *MSVO* 1, 4, must be weighed against the unlikelihood that, based on the resultant determination  $N_8 = 1/10 N_1$ , the extra  $4N_8$  in *MSVO* 1, 3 obv. 4d, was derived from a multiplication including  $4/10$  of the basic length unit (later 'ninda') in the first case of the line, since no fraction of this unit is attested in the archaic corpus. The more probable division of the length measure would be simply  $N_8 = 1/2 N_1$  as was otherwise known from the sexagesimal system, resulting in  $4N_8 = 1/2$ , or  $N_8 = 1/8 N_1$  in the area system, as Powell hazarded! I believe that, taken together, these notations are best understood as approximations, at least insofar as the peripheral areas are concerned. Although the evidence from area notations would despite such objections tend to support the relationship  $10N_8 = N_1$ , and remembering that a tenth division of the basic unit

is known from the metrological system used to quantify measures of liquids and semi-liquids, according to which  $N_8$  (Uruk IV) //  $N_2$  (Uruk IV/III) =  $1/10 N_1$  (jar ; s. ATU 2, 129-131), still a small leap of faith would have to precede removal of our question mark.

Robert K. ENGLUND (10-05-95)  
 Vorderasiatische Altertumskunde  
 FU Berlin, Bitterstr. 8-12  
 D-14195 BERLIN, ALLEMAGNE

**39) Janus Parallelism Clusters in Akkadian Literature** – Janus Parallelism is a literary device in which a lexeme parallels in a polysemous way both the preceding and following lines. The polysemy can occur either in two stichs (« asymmetrical Janus Parallelism ») or in three (« symmetrical Janus Parallelism »).<sup>1</sup> Though the device is known primarily from the Hebrew Bible, this writer has discovered it in Akkadian literature as well,<sup>2</sup> and in the last two years, at least four more examples have been published.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to the regular appearance of Janus Parallelism, there is what I prefer to call a « Janus Parallelism Cluster, » i.e., a more sophisticated version of the feature in which several Janus Parallelisms appear in close proximity.<sup>4</sup> The result is a text that challenges the reader and gives cause for contemplation of its interpretation. To illustrate such a cluster I turn to the Epic of Gilgameš XI: 16-20 :

16. *malikšunu qurādu* <sup>d</sup>Enlil  
 Their counsellor was the hero <sup>d</sup>Enlil  
 17. *guzalāšunu* <sup>d</sup>Ninurta  
 Their Chairbearer was <sup>d</sup>Ninurta  
 18. *gugallāšunu* <sup>d</sup>Ennugi  
 Their Canal Inspector was <sup>d</sup>Enuggi  
 19. <sup>d</sup>Nin-ši-kù <sup>d</sup>Ea ittišunu ta-me-ma  
<sup>d</sup>Niššiku, <sup>d</sup>Ea, swore an oath with them.  
 20. *amassunu ušannā ana kikkišu*  
 So he repeated their words to the reed house.

Of interest here is line 19: <sup>d</sup>Nin-ši-kù <sup>d</sup>Ea ittišunu ta-me-ma which contains no less than three polysemous elements: *niššiku*, which can be read both as an epithet of <sup>d</sup>Ea and as the noun « prince »;<sup>5</sup> *ittišunu*, both as « with them » and « their sign »;<sup>6</sup> and *tamēma* « he swore an oath,<sup>7</sup> » which also can be read *tašibma* « you (Uta-napištim) sat.<sup>8</sup> » Such polysemy imbues the composition with multiple possibilities for reading including « <sup>d</sup>Niššiku, <sup>d</sup>Ea, spoke a sign, » or « <sup>d</sup>Niššiku, <sup>d</sup>Ea, swore an oath with them, » « You (Uta-napištim) sat with the prince <sup>d</sup>Ea, » and/or « You (Uta-napištim) sat with the <sup>d</sup>Niššiku, <sup>d</sup>Ea. » Note how the latter harks back to the answer to Gilgameš's question in XI: 7: « How is it that you have stood in the assembly of the gods and have found life? »

The type of triple polysemy here functions as a series of Janus Parallelisms. As « <sup>d</sup>Niššiku, <sup>d</sup>Ea, swore an oath with them, » the line points ahead to *amassunu ušannā ana kikkišu* « So he repeated their words to the reed house, » and as « You (Uta-napištim) sat with the prince <sup>d</sup>Ea, » the line faces back to the list of occupations, i.e., *malikšunu*, *guzalāšunu*, and *gugallāšunu*, by reference to <sup>d</sup>Ea as a « prince. » Note that as « you sat » (*tašibma*) the line also parallels *guzalāšunu* « their Chairbearer, » by reference to one who brings an item on which one sits. Moreover, if we read <sup>d</sup>Niššiku as an epithet for <sup>d</sup>Ea, it parallels <sup>d</sup>Ea which follows immediately upon it. Finally, a word must be said about *ittišunu* which when read as « with them » parallels the list of gods present in the assembly, and as « omen, sign, » it parallels « their words » (*amassunu*) in the following line.

Another example of a Janus Parallelism Cluster appears in the Descent of Ištar lines 89-92.

89. *itil eḫlu ina kummišu*  
 The young man lies in his chamber  
 90. *itil ardatum ina aḫiša*  
 The young woman lies on *aḫiša*  
 91. <sup>d</sup>Ea ina emqi libbišu ibtani [zik]ru  
 Ea in the wisdom of his mind, made a *zikru*  
 92. *ibnīma* Asu-šunamir <sup>lu</sup>assinnu  
 He created Asu-šunamir, a castrated male servant.

Lines 90 and 91 of the Descent of Ištar contain a Janus Parallelism Cluster. Both *zikru* and *aḫiša* can be read in two ways: the former as « man » and « penis »<sup>9</sup> and the latter as « her quarters (lit. her side) » and « her chaperones (lit. brothers).<sup>10</sup> » The polysemes here allow the poet to charge the lines with allusion. As « man » *zikru* is a befitting parallel for the preceding mention of *aḫiša* as « her brothers. » As « penis » *zikru* parallels (humorously?) *assinnu* « a castrated male servant »<sup>11</sup> in the following verse. Similarly, *aḫiša*, when read as « her brothers » parallels *zikru* as « man, » but when read as « her chambers » it parallels *kummišu* « her