

Notes on the Old Babylonian Epics of Anzu and Etana

MICHAEL P. STRECK
UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG

The following notes are the result of a new edition of the Old Babylonian manuscripts of the epics of Anzu and Etana prepared for the project “Sources of Early Akkadian Literature” (SEAL). SEAL has been funded by the German-Israeli Foundation for Scientific Research and Development since 2007. This project, headed by N. Wasserman (Jerusalem) and the author, aims to create a systematic and comprehensive corpus of Babylonian and Assyrian literary texts from the third and second millennia B.C.E. This corpus will be published on the internet (www.seal.uni-leipzig.de) and as a separate monograph. It provides transliterations, English translations, short commentaries, bibliographies, and indices of all known epics, hymns, prayers, laments, love-lyrics, incantations, wisdom-literature, and some other genres of Akkadian literature from this period. The Old Babylonian (OB) manuscripts of Anzu and Etana have been edited by C. W. Hess and the author. Some remarks of the former are included here and marked by his name.

ANZU

Anzu OB II 3: *it-ta-at-ba-^fak¹ na-mu-ur-ra-tum ša-ki-in qú-lum*, “Fearsome splendor was poured out, silence emplaced.” Vogelzang 1988: 106 assumes an emendation of *na-mu-ur-ra-tum* to *ša-ḥu-ur-ra-tum*, “for it would contradict l. 5”; cf. *šá-ḥur-ra-tu₄tú* SB I 84 (Vogelzang 1988: 33; *AfO* 33: 7: 83). However, whereas l. 3 speaks about the fear poured out on the gods, l. 5 alludes to the splendor emanating from the shrine. Both can be *namurratum*. See already Foster 2005: 556, who translates *namurratum* in l. 3 by “panic,” in l. 5 by “divine splendour.”

Anzu OB II 4: *ú-te-eš₁₅-ši kúl-la-at ka-li-šu-nu l-gi-gi*, “Each and every one of the Igiḡ(-gods) was thrown into disarray.” Since the preceding line also has a passive (see above), I take *útešši* as Dt preterite and not D perfect, as argued by Hallo/Moran 1979: 103 (cf. also Foster 2005: 556). This interpretation also avoids the assumption of a change of subject without mentioning Anzûm again. The use of the preterite Dt despite the perfect forms in ll. 1, 3, and 5 does not present a problem; Dt-perfects are exceptional (Streck 2003: 13–16).

Anzu OB II 6: *i-lu ma-tim ip-ta-na-aḥ-ḥu-ru a-na ṭe-mi-im*, “One by one the gods of the land gathered for a plan.” For the iterative-pluralic, distributive meaning of the present tense with past reference see Streck 1995: 46 no. 46.

Anzu OB II 11: GÚ.GAL *iš-su-ú* DUMU AN.NA *ša-ki-in ṭe-mu a-na ša-ši is-sà-qar-šu[m]*, “They called for the Irrigator, the son of Anum. A report was delivered. (Then) he said to him.” Against the copies (Scheil 1938: 20; Vogelzang 1988: 92), the photo shows *iš-su-ú* instead of *iš-sú-ú*. Foster’s objections (2005: 577) to translating *ša-ki-in ṭe-mu* here and in subsequent lines as “the commander” or similar, on analogy to the administrative title *šākin ṭēmi* (e.g., Dalley 1989: 207, 227) still stand (C. W. Hess).

My sincere gratitude is due to Nathan Wasserman and Christian W. Hess for reading the manuscript, to the latter also for correcting my English.

Anzu OB II 12: x x BI TAR x a ti qá-bal-ka šu-^fub¹-ri-iq An-za-am i-na ka-^fki-ka¹, “. . . your battle, flash lightning on Anzûm with your weapon!” Reading of the beginning of the line according to the photo. Cf. the SB version CT 15: 39 ii 35 (= Vogelzang 1988: 34: 96): [^dIŠKUR ga-áš-]ru ^dIŠKUR da-pi-nu a-a i-né-’ qa-bal-ka “[O Adad, might]y one, Adad, victorious one, let your battle not waver.”

Anzu OB II 23: [iš-mu-ú qí-bi-i]s-^fsu¹ i-li is-sà-aḥ-ḥi-i[ḥ-ḥu], “[When they heard] his [wo]rd, the gods became more and more despondent.” Reading [qí-bi-i]s-su (sic, not -sú) instead of [qá-b]a-sú (Vogelzang 1988: 96; Annus 2001: 23) according to the photo. Note that Scheil 1938: 15 and Nougayrol 1952: 88 correctly read -su. Note also *ilī* instead of *ilū*; this may be a sandhi-spelling. *issahḥihḥū* is a Rtn-stem preterite.

Anzu OB II 24: [ip-si-il u]r-ḥa-am la a-la-kam iq-b[i], “[He turned around] on the way, refused to go.” Note that the transliteration in Annus 2001: 32 is wrong. Hallo/Moran 1979: 87: 97 (see also 84: 55, 76) translate the SB version of the line “He turned away, the journey refused to make.” In their commentary to the line (p. 99), they state that *pasālum* is intransitive and interpret the caesura after *ipsil* as “an abrupt and decisive disappearance into the assembly.” Nevertheless, they also consider a translation “he declined the journey.” It is clear from the parallel *ipsil urḥašuma lā alāka iqbišu* (Fuchs 1994: 153: 309; 331 n. 334. Fuchs even thinks that the Sargon reference is a quote from Anzu) and the meter that the caesura must be after *urḥam*; note the -ma! Therefore, also CAD P 217 *pasālu* 1c connects *urḥašuma* to *pasālu* and gives a transitive translation: “he obstructed(?) his course, he commanded him not to proceed.” However, a suitable subject can be found for neither the Anzu (see Hallo/Moran 1979: 99) nor the Sargon passage (see the translation of Fuchs 1994: 331). *pasālum* is construed here with an accusative *urḥam*. This accusative seems to belong to those dependent on verbs of motion described in GAG §144d as an accusative “der das nicht intendierte Obj. der Handlung bezeichnet.”

Anzu OB II 35: [id-da-a]r-ru-[ma iš-ši-qú] še₂₀-pí-šu, “[They ran tog]eth[er and kissed] his feet.” [iddar]rū[ma] (cf. *it-tar-ru-ma* of the SB version, Hallo/Moran 1979: 86: 109 with commentary pp. 99f.; Vogelzang 1988: 37: 168) not *darāru* N preterite (AHw 1550a), but in view of l. 42 ([a-n]a i-pi-iš pi-ša iḥ-du ^fi-lu ma-tim id-ru-ru-ma iš-ši-^fqú¹ še₂₀-pí-šu, “[A]t her utterance the gods of the land rejoiced. They ran together and kissed his feet.”) rather *darārum* G perfect.

Anzu OB II 38, 40: [ra-a]p-ša-am i-ir-tim mu-^fta¹-ab-bi-lu se-bé-tam qá-ab-li, “Broad of chest, who leads the seven combats.” *sebētum* might point to a rare verbal construction of the participle (Wilcke 1977: 157 n. to l. 10; GAG §148 c*). Another interpretation is favored by Lambert 1980: 84f., who connects *sebētam* with *sebēta* in Etana Morgan tablet i 10 (see commentary below) and other instances in which “the accusative *sebettam*” is “used to qualify a noun in another case.”

Anzu OB II 45: ma-^fḥar¹ A-nim ù ^dDa-gan te₉-lu-tim, “Before Anum and Dagan, the able ones.” I derive *te₉-lu-tim* from *tele’ú* “able, experienced” (AHw 1344; CAD T 327f.). **tele’útim* > *telútim*. For the vowel contraction cf. **tele’itum* > *telítum*.

Anzu OB II 49, 51: [^dEn-líl-lu-tam a-n]a a-ḥi-ia ù a-na A-nim šar-ru-ut ša-me-e uš-we-ed-di, “I had assigned [the Enlil-ship t]o my brother, and to Anum the kingship of heaven.” In view of l. 1 (^dEn-líl-lu-tam i-te-ki-im na-du-ú pa-ar-šú), restore ^dEn-líl-lu-tam (Vogelzang 1988: 97; Annus 2001: 34) rather than ^dEn-líl-ú-tam (Hallo/Moran 1979: 103).

Anzu OB II 50: [uš-ši An-zu-um šar-r]u-ut ^fuš¹-we-ed-du-ú a-na-ku, “[Anzûm has thrown into disarray the king]ship which I had assigned.” Hallo/Moran 1979: 103; Vogelzang 1988: 98; and Annus 2001: 34 restore [ú-te-eš-ši šar-r]u-ut . . . Vogelzang 1988: 103 translates “[He has confused the king]ship I assigned,” Foster 2005: 559 “The kingship that I

appointed [is overthrown].” This restoration is improbable because it implies an unannounced change of subject, either in l. 50 or, following Foster’s interpretation, in l. 51. Therefore, it seems safer to restore following the SB version, which mentions Anzû here (also noticed by Hallo/Moran 1979: 104): *ûtešši Anzû [šarrût ušmaddû (anāku)]*, Hallo/Moran 1979: 88: 9; Vogelzang 1988: 39: 207. But there doesn’t seem to be enough space for a restoration of the longer perfect *û-te-eš-ši* (see also Hallo/Moran 1979: 104). Therefore, I restore the preterite *ušši*, which yields a plausible restoration of 6 1/2 signs (compare the restoration of 6 1/2 signs in l. 49 and of 7 1/2 signs in l. 51).

Anzu OB II 51: [^d*En-líl-lu-tam i-te-k*]i-im a-ba-ka iš-še-er, “[He took] away [the Enlilship] from your father (and) became exalted.” For ^d*En-líl-lu-tam* see commentary to l. 49, above. Hallo/Moran 1979: 103f., followed by Annus 2001: 34, read *iz-zé-er* and reject a reading *iš-še-er* as well as a derivation from *ešērum* (Nougayrol 1952: 91: “j’ ai formé”). In favor of a derivation from *zērum* they state: “In this verb, the writing with *zé* is quite common (also in the periphery).” On p. 89 they translate in l. 11 “spurned.” Vogelzang 1988: 39, 47 (l. 209) and 98 and 103 (l. 51), follows this interpretation. Saggs 1986, 8 reads in l. 212 of his new SB manuscript *iš-šir_x* (NUMUN) and translates “has raised himself above your father.” On p. 10 he comments: “The problem for the gods was not that Anzu ‘spurned’ Enlil . . . but that he had set himself above Enlil. The reading and translation proposed . . . assume a form with infix -t- from *šīaru*.” Moran 1988: 24 defends a derivation from *zērum*, mainly on contextual grounds, but also for orthographic and grammatical reasons: *šīarum* would be “a verb of dubious existence . . . the stem is confined to the adjective, attributive and predicative state, and D-factitive,” and the sign-value *šir_x* would otherwise not be attested. He repeats the argument that *zé* “is well attested in Old Babylonian and later peripheral writings of forms of *zēru*.” Also Hecker 1994: 752 doubts Saggs’ analysis: “Die von Saggs vorgeschlagene Lesung *iš-šir_x* scheidert weniger an dem sonst unbelegten Lautwert *šir_x* als an der Interpretation der Funktion von Gt-Stämmen stativer Verben.”

I do not agree with Hallo/Moran and Hecker. In my view, the most important argument in favor of Saggs’ analysis is orthographic. From the references collected in von Soden/Röllig 1991: 19 no. 109, it is clear that the OB sign-value *zé* instead of the more common *zeli* is archaic and not confined to or even concentrated on a specific root. Decisive is only whether a specific text uses it or not. Anzu OB II never uses *ZÉ* for /ze/ or /zi/, but only *ZI*: see *An-zi-im* (ll. 33, 80), *zi-mi* (l. 67), *ta-ḫa-zi-im* (l. 74). On the other hand, /šil/ is consistently spelled with *ZÉ* in our text: see *pa-ar-ši* (l. 46), *šu-ši* (l. 67), *še-er* (l. 71). A reading /šir/ for NUMUN = *zir* in the SB version, although not hitherto attested, can be expected within the Akkadian syllabary. A prefixed form of the stative verb *šīarum*, though not definitely attested up to now, can be generated within the Akkadian verbal system without any difficulties. There is no need to assume a pret. Gt; *iššir* can well be a perf. G. To my mind, the contextual argument of Saggs also seems valid. However, differently from Saggs, I analyze *abāka* as the second object of *itekim*.

Anzu OB II 52: [*bi-ri-iq ur-ḫa-a*]m šu-ku-un a-na¹-da¹-am, “Flash lightning on the path, set the date(!).” Since the text never uses *úr*, I restore with Vogelzang 1988: 98 and Annus 2001: 35, and against Hallo/Moran 1979: 103 *ur-ḫa-am*. Vogelzang 1988: 81 derives *bi/bí-RIG* of the SB version (1988: 50: 1; Saggs 1986: 10: 1) from *parāku* and translates “bar the road.” She mentions a byform *barākum* of *parākum* based on the lexical attestation *ba-ra-ku* Idu II 297 (CAD P 153b); spellings with BAR = *pār* are ambiguous. The evidence for this byform is very weak and an idiom *urḫam parākum* or similar is not attested in the dictionaries. An alternative reading *bi-šim* “make” (Dalley 1989: 212, 227; Foster 2005: 577) is dubious because *bašāmum* is never attested with roads as an object. I follow Hallo/Moran

1979: 90 A 1; 103: 52; Saggs 1986: 10: 1; Hecker 1994: 753; Foster 2005: 559, 568 and derive the form from the verb *barāqum* “to flash.” Although it is basically wise to adhere to the principle of the *lectio difficilior*, *a-na¹-da¹-am* is almost certainly a mistake for *a-da-na-am* (cf. the SB version Saggs 1986: 10: 1; Vogelzang 1988: 39 catchline; 50: 1). A noun **an(n)ad(d)l(t)um* is completely unknown and the idiom *adannam šakānum* well attested (see CAD A/I 98f. *adannu* 1d).

Anzu OB II 53: [*a-na i-li-šu-ut a*] *b-nu-ú na-wi-ir-tam šu-ši*, “Make light come out for [the gods I] created!” Vogelzang 1988: 98 leaves open whether *šu-ut* is to be restored or not. Space easily permits the restoration (6 1/2 signs compared to 6 signs in the preceding line).

Anzu OB II 55, 79: [*šu-ub-ri-iq im-ḥul-l*] *i-^fka¹ li-GU-lu* HI SAG MU, “[Make] your [ill wind]s [flash]! . . .” and [*ú-ša-ab-ri-iq im-ḥul-l*] *i i-GU-lu i-lu* HI SAG MU, “[He made the ill wind]s [flash] . . .” L. 55 corresponds to the SB version II 4, which according to Saggs 1986, 10 reads (Annus 2001: 23 is wrong):

šub-riq im-ḥul-li-ka lil-li-ku UGU-šú (Saggs 1986: 10)

[*šu*] *b-^friq im-ḥul-li¹-[ka]* ^f*lil-li-ku e¹-li-šu* (STT 21 obv. i 4)

^f*šub-r¹[iq] im-^fḥul-li¹-ka lil-li-ku-e^f-li-šú¹* (LKA 1 obv. i 4)

“Make your ill winds flash. Let them go against him.”

The restoration of the first half of the line in OB II 55 and SB II 4, as presented in Nougayrol 1952: 92, 96, followed by Vogelzang 1988: 50, 98 and others (e.g., Annus 2001: 35; Foster 2005: 559 “Let [your seven ill winds] . . .” and 568 “Let your ill winds . . .”), is wrong (but correct in Hecker 1994: 753 “laß deine Sturmwinde blitzen . . .”).

The second half of the lines in the OB version is difficult. The reading HUR instead of HI , introduced by Nougayrol 1952: 92, 96, also followed by Vogelzang 1988: 98, 116f., as well as Annus 2001: 36, is not supported by either of the two copies (Scheil 1938: 21; Vogelzang 1988: 93). *li-GU-lu* and *i-GU-lu* do not make any sense; an emendation to *li-til-lu*, proposed by Vogelzang 1988: 117, does not yield any form of *elûm. i-lu* in l. 79 would be a striking (but not impossible) spelling for *ilû*. Annus 2001: 35 tacitly emends the text according to the SB version. I suppose that the scribe of the OB text somehow misunderstood an original *lil-li-ku* UGU-šú, reading GU for *li*, *lu* for *ku*, HI SAG for UGU and MU for *šu*.

Anzu OB II 57: [*ri-ḥi-iš* KI *ib-ba-nu*] *u-ú šu-pa-as-sú sú-uh-ḥi-i[h]*, “[Devastate the earth, where he was created, make tremble his abode!” The line corresponds to SB version II 6, which reads following Saggs 1986: 10f. (Annus 2001: 23 is wrong):

ri-ḥi-iš KI-*tu₄* *ib-ba-nu-u šu-bat-su su-uh-ḥi* (Saggs 1986:10)

^f*ri-ḥi¹-iš er-[še-tu₄ ib-b]a-nu-u šu-bat-^fsu¹ <su>-uh-ḥi* (STT 21 obv. 16)

[*r*]¹*i¹-iḥ-iš¹ er-še-^ftu₄ ib-ba¹-nu-ú šu-bat-su su-uh-ḥi* (LKA obv. i 6)

Therefore, the restoration of the beginning of the OB version, as still found in Vogelzang 1988: 98, is to be dismissed. Space easily allows a restoration of 6 1/2 signs, compared to the 6 signs in the preceding line. *eršet ibbanû* is an asyndetic relative clause. Whereas Saggs translates “Drench the earth which has been created” (followed by Hecker 1994: 753: “überschwemme die Erde, die erschaffen wurde”), Moran 1988: 24 gives “where he was formed” (followed by Foster 2005: 568: “Flood the earth where he was made”). The latter interpretation is followed here for the contextual reason given by Moran, although one would rather expect *ašar ibbanû*. The OB text uses the same verb *saḥāhum* as in l. 23. The SB version has instead the verb *sehû* D, “to bring chaos upon.”

Anzu OB II 58: [*ap-lu-uh-tum l*] *i-ir-ta-ḥu-ša e-li-š[u]*, “May [the armor] sway above h[im].” This line corresponds to the SB version II 7, which according to Saggs 1986: 11 and Moran 1988: 24 reads (cf. also Annus 2001: 23):

ap¹-luḥ-tú li-ir-ta-ṣi-na e-li-šú (Saggs 1986: 11)
 [a]p¹-luḥ¹-i[u₄]² li-ir-ta-ṣi-na¹ e-li-šú (STT 21 obv. i 7)
 [p]u²-luḥ¹-tu¹ li-ir-ta-aṣ¹-ṣi-na¹ e¹-li-šú¹ (LKA 1 obv. i 7)

“Let the armor (var. the fear?) clash against him.”

The verb is derived by both dictionaries from the poorly attested lemma *rahāšum*, “to mobilize(?), to set (oneself) in motion” (AHw 943b; CAD R 75b). The SB version has instead *lirtaššina*. An emendation of the OB text to *li-ir-ta-ṣi-na¹*, proposed by Saggs 1986: 11, is improbable because Anzu B II uses ZÉ, not ZI, for /ši/ (see commentary to l. 51 above).

Anzu OB II 59: [. . . *qá-ba-al-ka li-ir-ta-aḥ-ḥu-[ub-šum]*, “[May your . . . battle r]ag[e against him].” The line corresponds to SB version II 8, which according to Saggs 1986: 11 reads:

na-an-dur-tú qa-bal-ka li-ir-ta-'-ub-šú (Saggs 1986: 11; cf. also Annus 2001: 23)
 [n]a-an-dur¹-[t]ú qa-[bal-ka l]i²-ru¹²-ub-šú (STT 21 obv. i 8)
 [n]a-an-dur-tu qa¹-bal-ka¹ li-ir-ta-'-ub¹-šú (LKA 1 obv. i 8)

For translation, see Moran 1988: 24 and Foster 2005: 586: “Let his fierce battle keep raging against him.” Space, however, doesn’t allow a restoration [*na-an-du-ur-tum*] in the OB version but only a word consisting of about two or three signs.

Anzu OB II 76: *mu-um¹-m[i-la-at e]p-ri-im se-bé a-ša-am¹-š[a-tim]*, “(She who harnesses the seven storms,) which make [the du]st [dance], the seven sand sto[rms].” Cf. Saggs 1986: 13 for the grammatically correct restoration at the end of the line.

Anzu OB II 75–78: *mu-uš-ta-aṣ-mi-da-at 7 [im-ḥul-li]* ^{76f}*mu-um¹-m[i-la-at e]p-ri-im se-bé a-ša-am¹-š[a-tim]* ⁷⁷*[Dingir-maḥ . . .] mu-uš-ta-aṣ-mi-da-at 7 im-ḥul¹-li* ⁷⁸*[. . .] qá-ba-al-šu*, “She who harnesses the seven storms, (the winds) which make [the du]st [dance], the seven sand sto[rms], [Dingir-maḥ . . .], who harnesses the seven storms, [. . .] his battle.” Vogelzang 1988: 104 translates “The hitched-up seven [evil winds].” However, *mu-uš-ta-aṣ-mi-da-at* cannot be attributive to *im-ḥul-li* because the former is status constructus and the latter apparently never feminine. Therefore, Ebeling 1952: 31 (see also Nougayrol 1952: 93; CAD I 116b; Saggs 1986: 13; and Foster 2005: 561) already proposed that *muštašmidat* is attributive to the Mother Goddess, just mentioned in l. 73 and the only feminine noun in reach. I assume that her name is to be restored at the beginning of l. 77. In that case, in the OB version the Mother Goddess harnesses the storms, whereas in the SB version this is done by Ninurta himself. *mummilāt* in l. 76, however, according to the SB version, is attributive to *ašamšātim*.

Cf. Scheil 1938: 18 (see also Nougayrol 1952: 92, 97; Saggs 1986: 13) for the grammatically correct restoration at the end of l. 76. The MA manuscript LKA 1 obv. i 32, however, has *a-šam-šá-a-tú*; although it almost always preserves case vowels correctly, obv. ii 27//43 (= SB version II 65//80) also has *kap-pi* instead of *kappū*. In l. 77, instead of *gu¹-lu-li* (Scheil 1938: 18; Nougayrol 1952: 92; Vogelzang 1988: 98), the text, like the SB version, rather has *im-ḥul¹-li* (Ebeling 1952: 31; CAD I/J 116b; Saggs 1986: 13; Annus 2001: 36; Foster 2005: 560, 577).

Anzu OB II 79: See above commentary to l. 55.

Anzu OB II 81/III 1: *i-mu¹-[ur-šu-ma] A[n-zu-u]m i-ru-ba-aš-šu II [i-mu-ur-šu-ma] An-zu-um i-ru-ba-aš-šu*. For III 1 see the collation in Foster 2005: 577. For *i-ru-ba-aš-šu* (also in SB version II 36; see Vogelzang 1988: 52), three different verbs have been proposed: *erēbum*, “to enter” (Scheil 1938: 19: “ils entrèrent près de lui(?)”); Ebeling 1952: 31: “trat ein zu ihm”; Nougayrol 1952: 95: “qui s’avance vers lui”; Labat 1970: 87: “vers lui, s’avança”; Hruška 1975: 151: “er kam zu ihm”; Bottéro/Kramer 1989: 409: “s’avança vers lui”);

ra'ābum, “to become angry, to tremble” (in *CAD* R 1–3 divided in two verbs *ra'ābu* A “to become angry” and B “to tremble”; in *AHW* 932 only one verb “zittern, zürnen”; Vogelzang 1988: 63: “he raged at him”; see her commentary p. 84, where the verb is normalized as “*rābu*”; Hecker 1994: 755: “wurde er über ihn wütend”; Annus 2001: 47); *rābum* “to tremble” (Saggs 1986: 13: “he raged at him”; see also commentary; Dalley 1989: 225: “shook with rage at him”; Foster 2005: 560: “shook at(?) him (in fury)”; or do Dalley and Foster rather derive the verb from *CAD* *ra'ābu* B?). The missing indication of a medial aleph in all OB and SB manuscripts speaks against a derivation from the verb *ra'ābum*. This leaves us with a derivation either from *erēbum* or *rābum*. As *rābum* is never attested with a pronominal suffix, *erēbum* seems to be the best choice.

Anzu OB II 82/III 2: *ik-¹ṣu-uṣ¹ ki-ma UD-mi-im me-lem-ma-šu ṣa-di-i [u]ṣ-ta-al-wi*, “He gnashed his teeth like a demon of storms, enshrouded the mountains with his aura.” *melammašu* is not the subject of *uṣtalwī* (e.g., Vogelzang 1988: 104: “his melammu wreathed the mountains”; Foster 2005: 560: “his terrifying radiance enveloped the moun[tain]”), but one of two accusative objects. The same is true for *melammašu ṣadē iktum* SB version II 38 (Saggs 1986: 13; Vogelzang 1988: 52), which has to be translated “He covered the mountains with his aura.”

Anzu OB III 1: Cf. commentary on Anzu OB II 81, above.

Anzu OB III 2: Cf. commentary on Anzu OB II 82, above.

Anzu OB III 3: [*ut-ta-'a-ar*] *ki-ma la-¹bi-im¹ le-qi uz-z[i²]*, “[He kept roaring] like a lion, was carried away with anger.” Vogelzang 1988: 99 restores the beginning of the line [*An-zu-um . . .*] *ki-ma . . .*, but cf. SB version II 38: *utta'ar ki labbi* (Saggs 1986: 13; Vogelzang 1988: 52). For the present tense *utta'ar* see Streck 1999: 58 no. 1. Nougayrol 1952: 94 reads *la-bi il₅-le-qi*, which does not fit the broken signs as copied by Scheil 1938: 22 and Vogelzang 1988: 94 (see already Saggs 1986: 13). At the end of the line, Nougayrol 1952: 3 (followed by Vogelzang 1988: 99), reads *uz[-zi-iš]*. A terminative, translated “pride de rage” (Nougayrol 1952: 95) or “seized with anger” (Vogelzang 1988: 104), is grammatically difficult and is not confirmed by the SB version that has the accusative *uzza* (Saggs 1986: 13). The reading *uz-z[i²]*, based on the copy of Scheil 1938: 22, which shows a horizontal wedge which could belong to ZI, assumes a masculine plural obliquus *uzzi*, analogous to the feminine plural *uzzāiša* CH xxvii r. 101, and dependent on the stative *leqi* (cf. Moran 1988: 26 and SB II 38).

Anzu OB III 5: [*at-(ta-)bal-ma*] ¹*kūl-la-at¹ ka-li-šu-nu pa-ar-ṣ[i]*, “[I carried off] each and every one of the rites.” Restoration according to SB version II 40 (Saggs 1986: 13; Vogelzang 1988: 53; Annus 2001: 23). *CAD* P 200b translates “I organize all the divine powers,” which in the context hardly makes sense. The translation offered here rather follows Saggs: “I have borne away”; Vogelzang: “I have carried off”; Hecker 1994: 754: “Ich habe fortgetragen”; and Foster 2005: 560: “[I am] he [who carried off].”

Anzu OB III 6: [(*ša*) *a-na ta-ḥa-z[i-¹ia¹ ta-al-li-kam ṭe₄-e-em-ka [id-nam]*], “[You (who)] have come [to join battl]e with me, [give] an account of yourself!” Restorations according to SB version II 42 (Saggs 1986: 13; Vogelzang 1988: 53). However, space is lacking for a restoration [*man-nu-um at-taša*] at the beginning of the line (cf. *man-na at-ta šá* in the SB version). See also Foster 2005: 560: “You who] have come [for battle with me, account] for yourself!”

Anzu OB III 9: [*. . . a-na ta-ḥa-zi-ka*] *al-li-kam da-iš-ka*, “[. . . to join battle with you] have I come, treading down upon you.” Anzu’s speech might already end in this line and not in the following as assumed by Foster 2005: 560.

Anzu OB III 11: [*i-na še-mi-i*]-šū ¹*qer¹-bi-it* HUR.SAG *ik-ki-la-šu šam¹²-ra¹²-t[am²-m]a² iš-gu-um*, “[On hearing him], in the midst of the mountain he roared his furious(?) roar.” For the tentative reading *šamratamma* cf. the literature presented by Vogelzang 1988: 109 and Foster 2005: 577 (with a suggestion of W. R. Mayer). If correct, *ikkillum* would have a feminine singular (note the feminine plural *ikkillāte* (SB), *AHw ikkillum* 1f.). Saggs 1986: 14, reads *id¹-du¹* (see *id-di* in SB version II 49) instead of *iš-gu-um*, a reading not impossible in the copy of Scheil 1938: 22, but not favored by the new copy of Vogelzang 1988: 94 (see also the doubts of Moran 1988: 26).

Anzu OB III 12: [*šam-ra-at ap-luḥ-tum*] *da-mi i-ra-mu-uk*, [“Fierce was the armor’], bathing in blood.” The beginning of the line was restored according to SB version II 54:

ša[m- . . .] (Saggs 1986: 9)

¹*šam¹-[ra]t [a]p-¹luḥ¹-[. . .]* . . . (STT 21 obv. ii 54)

[*šam-rat a]p-luḥ-tú* . . . (STT 19 obv. 54)

¹*šam¹-rat ap-luḥ-tu* . . . (KA 1, 1 obv. ii 3)

Ebeling 1952: 32 tentatively reads LKA 1, 1: *tu[r]rat*, “Wieder(?) den Panzer,” which is obsolete. *CAD* A 177 reads *i-rat*, with translation “the breastplate of the armor,” neglecting the fact that, since the text generally has correct case vowels, we should expect instead of nominative *apluḥtu* rather genitive *apluḥti*. STT 19 also confirms the nominative. Nevertheless, the reading *i-rat* was followed by Vogelzang 1988: 54 and Foster 2005: 560, who restores the OB version: “[Armor’s surface],” but reads the SB version differently (see below). The Saggs manuscript clearly has the sign Ú, which leads Saggs 1986: 14 to a reading *šamrat* and a translation “The armour rages,” followed by Hecker 1994: 754 “Wild ist der Panzer.” Moran 1988: 26 proposes *ú-rat*, a D stative of *êrum* “to be awake,” and translates “aroused is the armor.” This reading found its way into Annus 2001: 24, 44 (but see *irat* on p. 37, which obviously picks up the variants on p. 24 still read *i-rat* but not booked in the glossary) and in Foster’s (2005: 569) translation of the SB version: “Battle array was on the move.” Since the only manuscript which clearly preserves the first sign, Saggs 1986: 9, has Ú, and two manuscripts confirm the nominative *apluḥtu*, I don’t see any basis for a reading *i-rat*. Since Moran can adduce only one parallel for the D-stem of *êrum* (only twice attested in the dictionaries) used with weapons, and on the other hand *šamārum/šamrum* is well attested with weapons of different kind (see *CAD* Š/I *šamāru* 2c for the Gt-stem and 5b for the Š-stem, as well as *šamru* b for the adjective), I prefer the reading *šamrat*, also to be restored in the OB version.

Anzu OB III 15: [*qanām*(GI) *ú-bi-i*] ₅-šum-ma *la iṭ-ḥi-a-am a-na An-¹za¹-a[m²]*, “[He let loose the reed-(arrow)] at him, but it did not come at all near to Anzu.” Both copies (Scheil 1938: 22; Vogelzang 1988: 94) clearly show ¹*za¹*- instead of the expected *-zi-* read by Scheil 1938: 22; Nougayrol 1952: 94; Vogelzang 1988: 99; and Annus 2001: 37. The following *-a[m²]*, however, is not clear from the copies. *Anzām* instead of *Anzīm* is a frozen form, also attested elsewhere (see Hallo/Moran 1979: 93; Vogelzang 1988: 83f.).

Anzu OB III rev. 6’: [*ša-di-ile qer-bi-it-sú-nu*] *ri-ḥi-iṣ du-ul-li-ih-ma*, “Destroy and disturb [the midst of the mountains]!” Restoration according to SB version II 137 (Vogelzang 1988: 60) or 140 (Saggs 1986: 19), respectively.

Anzu OB III rev. 7’: [*ša An-zi-im e t]e-ši-it na-ap-ša-as-sú*, “Do not spare the life [of Anzu]!” Scheil’s copy (1938: 23) shows a clear [*t]e-*, also read by Nougayrol 1952: 94 and *CAD* Š/II 342b. Vogelzang’s copy (1988: 95) shows a sign which, according to her commentary on p. 109, looks neither like *ta* nor like *te*. Nevertheless, she reads *ta²-ši-it* as

already in *AHw* 1221b, also adopted by Annus 2001: 37 and Foster 2005: 577. I follow the older copy.

Anzu OB III rev. 10': [*ki-ib-ra-tim er-bé-e*]t-tam ši-ta-ka-an ma-ḥa-zi-¹i¹-ka, "Establish your cult centers throughout the four [quarters]!" Vogelzang 1988: 100, followed by Annus 2001: 37, mistakenly restores *ki-ib-ra-tam*.

ETANA

Morgan Tablet i 1–2: *ra-bu-tum* ^dA-nun-na *ša-i-mu ši-im-tim uš-bu im-li-ku mi-li-ik-ša ma-a-ta-am*, "The great Anunna, who determine destiny, sat pondering about its (destiny's) decision concerning the land." Wilcke 1977: 156f. translates: "hielten Rat über es, das Land" and comments "Ich vermute in *mātam* einen Akk. der Beziehung, der das Suffix *-ša* näher erläutert, kann diese Figur aber sonst nicht nachweisen." *CAD M/I* 56a reads *milik ša mātam*. Kinnier Wilson 1985: 31 translates: ". . . made decision concerning the land" and on p. 30 rejects the older correction to *ma-a-ta-tim*¹. Haul 2000: 107 translates: ". . . berieten den Ratschluss für das Land" and follows in his commentary (p. 116) Wilcke's analysis with the addition "Das Suffix steht dabei in determinierender Funktion, ähnlich wie in der aufgelösten Annexion . . . , also: '. . . berieten den Ratschluss bezüglich des Landes.'" Foster 2005: 535 translates: "sat taking counsel with respect to the land" and comments on p. 554 "Is the *ša* distributive and paralleled in line 13?"

The analysis of Wilcke and Haul is problematic. *milkam malākum* in the meaning "to give advice to" (see *CAD M/I* 154f. *malāku* A 1b) or "to ponder, deliberate, to come to a decision concerning" (see *CAD M/I* 155f. *malāku* A 2b) is construed elsewhere either with a second accusative, with *ana*, or with the accusative *milik* + genitivus objectivus. If *-ša* refers to *mātam*, our line doesn't fit either of these constructions. The analysis of *CAD* is grammatically impossible (one would expect *milkam ša mātim*). What Foster means by "distributive" is unclear to me; he translates *nišiša* in l. 13 (p. 535) "their(?) people," but I don't see any noun to which this *-ša* could refer.

The accusative *mātam* in the OB version clearly shows that the text uses the construction with two accusatives. If one does not assume a faulty conflation of two constructions, the double accusative construction and the *milik* + genitivus objectivus construction, the suffix *-ša* cannot refer to *mātam* as has been assumed hitherto. But to whom else? I think that the SB version of the line offers a solution which fits Akkadian grammar as well as the meaning of the OB line. The SB version I i 10 reads: [*ušb*]ū *imtallikū milikšunu [ša māti]*, "(The great Anunna-gods) [sa] taking their counsel [concerning the land]." Here the suffix *-šunu* refers to the gods and is a genitivus subjectivus, in fact the only one recorded in *CAD malāku* in the construction with the inner accusative *milkam* (*CAD M/I* 154f. 1b, 155f. 2b, 157b 4b). I propose to see in the suffix *-ša* of the OB version a genitivus subjectivus, too. Then the only feminine noun *-ša* can refer to is *šimtum*, the destiny through which the gods decide about the land.

Morgan Tablet i 7 and 13: *i-na ši-à-tim la ka-aš-ra-at ku-ub-šum me-a-nu*, "Here had been bound neither turban nor tiara," and *ú-ul i-ba-aš-ši mi-it-lu-ku ni-ši-ša*, "No common counsel existed for its (the land's?) people." The simplest explanation for both pronouns *šīāti* and *-ša* (*ni-ši-ša*) might be that both refer to *mātum* in l. 2. The translation "in this (land)" = "here" avoids the difficulty posed by the hapax *ina šīāti* in a temporal or causal sense (Haul 2000: 120f.); the reference to *mātum* instead of *šarrūtum* in *nišiša* avoids the appeal to an anticipatory pronoun (C. W. Hess).

Morgan Tablet i 10: *se-bé-ta ba-bu ud-du-lu e-lu da-ap-nim*, "The seven gates were still barred against the mighty." This line is noteworthy for the form *sebēta*, which has been

discussed by Wilcke 1977: 157 n. 7; Lambert 1980; Haul 2000: 122f.; and others (see also the commentary on Anzu OB II 38, 40, above). In my opinion, Lambert is correct when he translates “seven gates,” although I do not follow him in his comparison with the *damqam inim* construction (see the justified criticism by Haul 2000: 123). At first glance, *sebēta* seems to be a status rectus in the accusative before the item counted, which itself is nominative, a construction which would still be unexplained. Another possibility is to connect *sebēta* with the form *ištāta* in Agušaya A iii 4: *i-ba-aš-ši iš-ta-ta qū-ra-du*, “There is a unique one, a hero,” and to analyze both forms as archaic absolute states in *-a*, for which see Streck 2000: 283–90 (C. W. Hess).

Morgan Tablet i 13: See the comment on Morgan Tablet i 7, above.

Morgan Tablet i 14: [šā]r-[r]u-tum *i-na ša-ma-i ur-da-am*, “Kingship(?) descended from the heavens.” Haul’s proposal (2000: 106, following Wilcke 1977: 157, who presents it only as a possibility) to restore [be]-^rel¹-tum at the beginning of the line depends on his interpretation of *-ša* in *nišiša*, Morgan Tablet i 13. But this *-ša* might rather refer to *mātum* (see the comment on Morgan Tablet i 7, above). Photo and copy rather support a reading [r]u of the second sign. Note that Novotny 2001: 15, 27, tentatively restores the SB version I 27 as LUGAL-ú-tu [*i-na AN-e ú-ri-dam-ma*], which if correct also favors the reading [šā]r-[r]u-tum.

Susa Tablet obv. 4’: *ma-mi-ta-am ut-ta-ma-am-mu-ú*, “They mutually swore (this) oath.” Cf. now CAD T 168a for the Dt-stem with reduplicated /m/ or Rt-stem, certainly not to be explained simply by “Inkonsistenzen des akkadischen Schriftsystems” (Haul 2000: 126) but a real form, although rare.

Susa Tablet obv. 6’: *i-na šíl-lí šé-er-bé-tim* ^rú¹-[l]i-id *šerrum*(MUŠ). “In the shade of the poplar did the serpent give birth.” The alliteration, already noted by Hecker 1974: 140 and Kinnier Wilson 1985: 44, may allude to the hissing of the snake.

Susa Tablet obv. 24’: [l]a t[a-ka-al a-bi . . .], “Don’t e[at, my father, . . .].” Thus according to the copy of Scheil 1927: 106, followed by Kinnier Wilson 1985: 34 and Novotny 2001: 30. Haul 2000: 110 has ^ra-bi¹ [la-ta-ka-al . . .], following the copy of Langdon 1931 pl. XIII. Note that the SB version II 47 (Novotny 2001: 30) also has the sequence *lā takkal abī*. The new photo (Marzahn et al. 2008: 337) is of no help here.

Susa Tablet rev. 8’: ^rx x x ^ršâ-ma-a-a [. . .], “. . . the heavens [. . .].” On the new photo (Marzahn et al. 2008: 337) the last sign before *šâ* doesn’t look like NIM as copied by Scheil 1927: 106.

Susa Tablet rev. 9’: [. . .] ^rx¹-ru-uš *i-ba-a*[k-ki . . .], “[The serpent] we[pt . . .] . . .” Kinnier Wilson 1985: 36, followed by Novotny 2001: 31, reads [m]a-ru-úš and translates the line “Sick at heart the serpent wept.” This reading was rightly rejected by Haul 2000: 128, who reads [ma-a]h-ru-uš, a reading already discussed and rejected by Langdon 1931: 22 n. 1. The new photo (Marzahn et al. 2008: 337) also doesn’t support [ma-a]h-ru-uš (compare for AḤ Susa Tablet obv. 2, rev. 15’).

Susa Tablet rev. 16’: *qí-in-ni šerrim*(MUŠ) *da-ma-mi-iš i-we*, “The serpent’s nest has turned to wailing.” Note that the snake speaks of itself in the 3rd person.

Susa Tablet rev. 17’: *šâ-al-mu at-mu-šu la-aš-šu-ú ma-ru-ú-a*, “His fledglings are healthy, while my young are no more.” Note the plene spelling *la-aš-šu-ú*, another instance of the stative flexion of otherwise uninflected *laššu*.

Morgan Tablet col. v 7’: *ut-ta-ši(-)* [. . .], “He spread(?) [. . .].” Haul 2000: 112 reads *ut-ta-si*₂₀-[iḥ²], which is improbable because of the sign value *si*₂₀. The same is true for *šir* (Kinnier Wilson 2007: 21), a sign value not attested in OB. Perhaps *uttasši*, perfect of *wuṣṣûm*, with object “wings”?

Morgan Tablet col. vi 9': *i-ni-ma 'šillum'* ('GIŠ'.GI₆) p[*i-t*]é *ka-ti-im-ti*, “My sight is shadow, open up what is hidden from me!” Kinnier Wilson 2007: 26f. proposes to read *i-ni-ma 'e'-mi-iš₆* [p*e-t*]i *ka-ti-im-ti* and translates: “Change (your speech) into a language! [Reve]al what is hidden from me!” I do not follow this proposal for the following reasons: The imperative of *enûm* should be *enī*, not *inī*. The sign read as *iš₆* doesn't look like GIŠ on the photo, and the sign value *iš₆*, though rarely attested in cuneiform, would be unexpected. The photo doesn't show enough space for a further sign [p*e*] before [t]i. Finally, the word *emum*, though attested in Akkadian, would be unexpected.

Kinnier Wilson 1985: 11 discusses the possibility that TIM 9: 49 belongs to the OB version of Etana, and in 2007: 15–17 similarly discusses the text TIM 9, 50. Since both texts are fragmentary and their affiliation to Etana is unsure, I do not treat them here. The same is true of some NA copies of the OB version which have been identified by Kinnier Wilson 2007: 15f., 25f.

REFERENCES

- Bottéro, J., and S. N. Kramer. 1989. *Lorsque les dieux faisaient l'homme*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Dalley, S. 1989. *Myths from Mesopotamia*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Ebeling, E. 1952. Eine neue Tafel des akkadischen Zû-Mythos. *RA* 46: 25–41.
- Foster, B. R. 2005. *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*. 3rd ed. Bethesda: CDL Press.
- Fuchs, A. 1994. *Die Inschriften Sargons II. aus Khorsabad*. Göttingen: Cuvillier.
- Hallo, W. W., and W. L. Moran. 1979. The First Tablet of the SB Recension of the Anzu-Myth. *JCS* 31: 65–115.
- Haul, M. 2000. *Das Etana-Epos*. Göttingen: Seminar für Keilschriftforschung.
- Hecker, K. 1974. *Untersuchungen zur akkadischen Epik*. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker.
- _____. 1994. Das Anzu-Epos. *TUAT* III/4, 745–59.
- Hruška, B. 1975. *Der Mythenadler Anzu in Literatur und Vorstellung des alten Mesopotamien*. Budapest.
- Kinnier Wilson, J. 1985. *The Legend of Etana*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- _____. 2007. *Studia Etanaica. New Texts and Discussions*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Labat, R. 1970. *Les religions du Proche-Orient asiatique*. Paris: Fayard-Denoël.
- Lambert, W. G. 1980. Line 10 of the Old Babylonian Etana Legend. *JCS* 32: 81–85.
- Langdon, S. 1931. The Legend of Etana and The Eagle or the Epic Poem “The City They Hated.” *Babyloniaca* 12: 1–56 and pls. I–XIV.
- Marzahn, J., et al. 2008. *Babylon: Mythos und Wahrheit*. Munich: Hirmer.
- Moran, W. L. 1988. Notes on Anzu. *AfO* 35: 24–29.
- Nougayrol, J. 1952. Ningirsu vainqueur de Zû. *RA* 46: 87–97.
- Novotny, J. R. 2001. *The Standard Babylonian Etana Epic*. Helsinki: Helsinki Univ. Press.
- Saggs, H. W. F. 1986. Additions to Anzu. *AfO* 33: 1–29.
- Scheil, V. 1938. Fragments de la légende du dieu Zû. *RA* 35: 14–25.
- Streck, M. P. 1995. *itašab ibakki* “weinend setzte er sich”: *iparras* für die Vergangenheit in der akkadischen Epik. *Or* 64: 33–91.
- _____. 1999. *Die Bildersprache der akkadischen Epik*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- _____. 2000. *Das amurritische Onomastikon der altbabylonischen Zeit, Band 1: Die Amurriter. Die onomastische Forschung; Orthographie und Phonologie; Nominalmorphologie*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- _____. 2003. *Die akkadischen Verbalstämme mit ta-Infix*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Vogelzang, M. E. 1988. *Bin šar dadmē: Edition and Analysis of the Akkadian Anzu Poem*. Groningen: Styx Publications.
- Wilcke, C. 1977. Die Anfänge der akkadischen Epen. *ZA* 67: 153–216.