

DEPARTMENT OF
EGYPTIAN AND ASSYRIAN ANTIQUITIES,
BRITISH MUSEUM,

LONDON: W.C.1.

March 8th. 1933.

Dear Professor Landberger,

Many thanks for the trouble you have taken in answering my enquiry, and for the information you give me. I am glad to hear that you do not consider mulbarime = Seiber possible, for my own suggestion would be quite different.

As for the reading, I think there can be no doubt about ET; on the tablet I have it is ET (as nearly as I can represent it) and mu-ba-x is written as a group at the beginning of the line, with a gap of about 18 mm. before the next sign. It is indeed surprising, as you say, but I do not see any other explanation for it.

As to ir-bi-a and PA-bi-a, these are parts of a description of (apparently) a tree: at its root a-----serpent had its nest, at its top Zû had put his young, and the next line is
"In its middle Lilit had built a house"
šab-ba-bi ki-siil-lil-la-ge é im-ma-ni-ite-dû

To revert to the first line, I am inclined to translate it

'The dyer(?) had not dyed his(?) leather with it' (-da-) i.e. with some product of the tree, bark, leaves, etc. such as are and always have been used. Does this seem too outrageous to you?

Later, Gilgameah makes his $\text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭}$ (pukku) out of the root ($\text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭}$) of this tree, and his $\text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭}$ (mikkū) out of its top (𒀭). But $\text{𒀭} \text{𒀭} \text{𒀭}$ is = HU-ra-tum which Mureau-Dangin says (RA. XVII. 28) is noix de galle. There is something very interesting ~~in~~ here, but I do not at present profess to understand it, and do not wish to be fantastic.

There is, in the recently appeared number of the B.M. Quarterly, a short general summary of the contents of this tablet: I have not, unfortunately, any copies of my own, but if it is accessible to you I think you might be interested: it ends with the beginning lines of the Assyrian XII Tablet as we have it. Yours very truly,
C. J. Gadd.