March 8th, 1933.

Dear Professor Landshamer,

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 _mubarruma_ = _Seiler_ 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 as _IT_ (as nearly as I can represent it) and _mubarruma_ 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 _dr-ki-ka_ and _pa-ki-a_, these are parts of a description of (apparently) a tree: at its root a _____ serpent had its nest, at its top ZA had put his young, and the next line is "In the middle Re'ith had built a house."
To revert to the first line, I am inclined to translate it:

"The dyer(s) had not dyed his(?) leather with it" (-da-)

i.e. with some product of the tree, bark, berries, etc. such as are and always have been used. Does this seem too outrageous to you?

Later, Gilgamesh makes his 𒂔𒂗𒀀 (pukkû) out of the root (𒂕𒀁) of this tree, and his 𒇏𒂗𒀀 (minkû) out of its top (𒄿). But 𒇏𒂗 Hammu-Enum-Dingir says (RA XVII.28) is nois de galá. There is something very interesting 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.N. 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,

[signature]

J.J. Gadd