

# The Organization of the Universe

## *The Splitting of Heaven and Earth*

Other than *Enūma Eliš*, there is no systematic treatment of cosmology in Sumero-Babylonian literature. The longest literary text dealing with any aspect of this topic is the Atra-ḫasis Epic, but this has rightly been called “a Babylonian history of mankind,”<sup>1</sup> for it begins with the universe in essentially its present form and takes up the circumstances which led to the creation of man, with subsequent history up to the flood. But this does not mean that *Enūma Eliš* presents all that is known of Babylonian cosmology. On the contrary, the Epic uses only a selection of the wealth of available material, as will be seen in the case of the theogony (see pp. 405–426). Here, too, parallels to Marduk’s work have to be collected from allusions and incidental comments.

Marduk’s first creative act was the severing of Tiāmat’s body (IV 137ff.). The upper part became the heaven, the lower part the earth. Certain refinements on this basic division, which will be discussed later, conclude the 4th Tablet. In Tablet V, the heavens and the earth are taken up in turn. Lines 1–46 deal with the heavenly bodies, lines 47–52 with meteorological phenomena, and lines 53–62 with the earth.

The idea that originally heaven and earth had been joined, or were closely connected, is very widespread in world mythology. This is not the place to pursue every attestation of the idea, and attention will be restricted to those expressions of the idea which could have been a factor in the intellectual background of the author of the Epic.

The earliest Sumerian occurrences occur in UD.GAL.NUN orthography apparently in literary texts:

an UNU-ta bad ki an-ta bad  
OIP 99 136 iii 2–3

UD UNU-ta LAGAB ki UD-ta LAGAB  
UD UNU-ta LAGAB  
OIP 99 113 ii 7–9

... to separate heaven from earth, to separate earth from heaven ...

See the present writer in OA 20 (1981) 90. The tablets are of Early Dynastic date.

1. J. Laessøe, *BiOr* 13 (1956) 89.

Three passages in Sumerian myths deal with the matter. First, the introduction to *Gilgameš*, *Enkidu*, and *the Nether World*:

u<sub>4</sub>-ri-a u<sub>4</sub>-sù-DU-ri-a  
 gi<sub>6</sub>-ri-a gi<sub>6</sub>-bad-DU-ri-a  
 mu-ri-a mu-sù-DU-ri-a  
 u<sub>4</sub> ul níg-du<sub>7</sub>-e pa è-a-ba  
 u<sub>4</sub> ul níg-du<sub>7</sub>-e mí zi dug<sub>4</sub>-ga-a-ba  
 èš kalam-ma-ka ninda šú-a-ba  
 im<sup>š</sup>u-rin-na kalam-ma-ka ninda tab-ak-a-ba  
 u<sub>4</sub> an ki-ta ba-da-bad-DU-a-ba  
 ki an-ta ba-da-sur-ra-a-ba  
 mu nam-lú-u<sub>18</sub>-lu ba-an-gar-ra-a-ba  
 u<sub>4</sub> an-né an ba-an-de<sub>6</sub>-a-ba  
<sup>d</sup>en-líl-le ki ba-an-de<sub>6</sub>-a-ba

AS 10, p. 3 restored by Kramer in *Gilgameš et sa légende* (ed. P. Garelli; Paris, 1960), p. 66, and further restored from A. Shaffer, *Sumerian Sources of Tablet XII of the Epic of Gilgameš* (1963) ll. 1–12

In former days, in distant former days,  
 In former nights, in remote former nights,  
 In former years, in distant former years,  
 After the early days had brought into being the established order,  
 After the early days had carefully nurtured the established order,  
 After bread had been (set/thrown down) in the houses of the land,  
 After bread had been baked in the ovens of the land,  
 After heaven had been separated from earth,  
 After earth had been severed from heaven,  
 After the name of mankind had been established,  
 After An carried off heaven,  
 After Enlil carried off earth . . . . .

The beginning of the Myth of the Pickax provides the second example:

en-e níg-du<sub>7</sub>-e pa na-an-ga-àm-mi-in-è  
 en nam-tar-ra-na šu nu-bal-e-dam  
<sup>d</sup>en-líl numun kalam-ma ki-ta è-dè  
 an ki-ta bad-DU-dè sag na-an-ga-àm-ma-an-sum  
 ki an-ta bad-DU-dè sag na-an-ga-ma-an-sum

SRT 19 and dupls., see *JNES* 5 (1946) 135<sup>12</sup> and CT 44 10. There are a number of variants which do not affect the present interest in the passage.

The lord brought into being the established order,  
 The lord, whose decrees cannot be altered,  
 Enlil, to produce the seed of the land from the earth,  
 Made great haste to separate heaven from earth,  
 Made great haste to separate earth from heaven.

The third example is the first line of the Unilingual/Bilingual Account of Creation; see p. 352.

The first of these extracts pictures the separation of heaven and earth like a pair of “sitting ducks” being bagged each by a different hunter and being carried off in opposite directions. The second makes it a kind of surgical operation on twins born joined, performed by Enlil singlehanded. The third suggests that while the pair had been together originally, they were nevertheless two, not one. The three witnesses combined fail to give any indication that the separation was the last stage of an epic combat. Though this is only an argument from silence, the silence is too powerful to ignore. The Sumerian myth begins with a joined heaven and earth at a time too remote for any speculation about prior events. Also, the thing separated is a solid mass, not a body of water, as is Tīāmat’s body in *Enūma Eliš*, at least on some occasions. The Hittite *Song of Ullikummi* contains an allusion to such a severing, for when the gods have the problem of dealing with a stone monster, Ea suggests using the instrument, probably a saw, with which heaven and earth had been cut asunder in the beginning (JCS 6 [1953] 29 52–54).

There seems to be no Mesopotamian parallel to the Epic’s concept of a separation of cosmic waters, but the idea of water above and below is attested:

[én an-na] ní-bi-ta tu-[ud-da-àm]  
 [šamû]<sup>u</sup> ina ra-ma-ni-šú-nu [ib]-ba-ni  
 [ki-a] ní-bi-ta tu-ud-da-àm  
 er-še-tum ina ra-ma-ni-šá-ma [i]b-ba-ni  
 [an idi]m-àm : šamû<sup>u</sup> naq-bi eršetim<sup>tim</sup> naq-<sup>r</sup>bi<sup>r</sup> : ki idim-àm  
 STT 199 obv. 1–5

Heaven was created by itself; earth was created by itself.

Heaven was the abyss; earth was the abyss.

(This plainly contradicts the idea that the two were originally joined.) The same doctrine underlies the analysis of the word “heaven” (šamê) into “of water” (ša mê) in the series *i-NAM giš-ḫur an-ki-a* (CT 25 50 17 = A. Livingstone, *Mystical and Mythological Works* [Oxford, 1986; repr. Winona Lake, 2007] p. 33). The aetiological basis of this doctrine is clear. All water known to man either comes down from the sky or up from the ground. Hence, the sky must be water. The first chapter of Genesis provides the closest parallel to the division of cosmic waters. On the second day of the week of creation, God put a “firmament” between the upper and the lower waters, which corresponds to the “skin” in *Enūma Eliš* IV 139. In Phoenician mythology, reflected in some forms of Orphic cosmogony, the separation of heaven and earth appears in the doctrine of the world egg.<sup>2</sup> In Egypt, there is the myth of the pushing apart of Nut (heaven) and Geb (earth) as two solid bodies, but no dividing of the cosmic waters is known.<sup>3</sup> The account of Kronos’ emasculation of his father Heaven in Hesiod’s *Theogony* (ll. 147–87) may also belong to the myths of the separation of heaven and earth.

2. A summary of Phoenician cosmogony with literature is given in H. W. Haussig (ed.), *Wörterbuch der Mythologie* I 309–10 (Stuttgart, 1965). On Orphic and other Greek cosmogonies, see W. Staudacher, *Die Trennung von Himmel und Erde* (Tübingen, 1942); the papers of Eissfeldt and Schwabl in *Éléments orientaux dans la religion grecque ancienne*, Pauly-Wissowa Supplementband 9 1433–1582 (H. Schwabl, *Weltschöpfung*). Earlier literature is quoted in these works.

3. See most recently R. Anthes, *JNES* 18 (1959) 169–211.

## ***The Organization of the Heavens***

The ordering of the heavens in *Enūma Eliš* proceeds on what might at first sight seem astronomical principles. More careful study shows that the real interest of the author lay in fixing the calendar rather than in astronomy per se. The stars with which he deals fix the year, then he passes to the moon, by which the month is fixed, and he concludes this part of his work by treating the sun, the regulator of the day. This orderly treatment and the neglect of anything else astronomical shows where his real interests lay. A contrast is offered by the account of Berossus, according to which Bēl stationed the stars, sun, moon, and the five planets. The planets offer no guide to fixing the calendar. The same phenomenon occurs in chaps. 72–82 of the Book of Enoch, which, despite the title “Book of the Courses of the Luminaries of Heaven,” is, like its prototype Genesis chap. 1, concerned mainly with the sun and moon. Another noteworthy feature of this part of *Enūma Eliš* is the scientific treatment of the whole topic. Very little mythology is present. Somehow, the author managed to deal with the function of the moon without so much as a mention of the name Sîn.

Seven passages in cuneiform texts may be compared with that of *Enūma Eliš*:

- (a) A Sumerian inscription of Kudur-Mabug.
- (b) *The Exaltation of Ištar*.
- (c) A statue inscription of one of the Kurigalzus.
- (d) Two paragraphs used as an introduction to *Enūma Anu Enlil*.
- (e) A single paragraph used for a similar purpose.
- (f) Two fragments of a highly technical account.
- (g) A fragment of uncertain character.

They will be discussed in turn.

(a) RIME 4 p. 220 4–6 is from a Sumerian dedication inscription of Kudur-Mabug. In the opening Nanna is described:

dingir-zi u<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>6</sub>-bi ḫé-ḫé/ḫe-ḫe iti gi-en-gi-en mu silim-ma

The reliable god, who interchanges day and night, who establishes the month, and keeps the year intact.

This is not of course cosmology but a description of the activities of the moon-god. It is included, as it shows the same outlook as *Enūma Eliš*. Whether considered from the standpoint of original creation or of continuing divine activity, observation of the proper sequence of day, month, and year was a matter considered vital by the Babylonians. Thus, any detailed account of creation must include an explanation of the calendar.

(b) *The Exaltation of Ištar*, or nin-maḫ ušū-ni gîr-ra, to use the proper title, is a bilingual epic from the late Cassite period, if linguistic and other criteria give the correct impression. Its purpose is to explain how Ištar reached her exalted position among the gods. In Tablets III, IV, and V, Anu, Enlil, and Ea express themselves on the question of her elevation. Anu's speech shows how much Ištar's identification with the planet Venus was involved in this promotion. He proposes that she be put on the same level as Sîn and Šamaš and prefaces this suggestion with an account of how these two gods achieved their positions:

- te-me-en da-rí an-ki-ke<sub>4</sub> giš-ḥur gi-na ðim-me-er-e-ne-ka-a-t[a]  
 ina da-ru-ti te-me-en šamê<sup>e</sup> u eršetim<sup>tim</sup> ú-šu-rat ilāni<sup>mes</sup> ki-na-a-t[i]  
 sag-tab an<sup>d</sup>en-líl<sup>d</sup>en-ki-ke<sub>4</sub> níg-ḥal-ḥal-la ba-an-bà-a-ta  
 50 šur-ru-ú<sup>d</sup>a-nu<sup>d</sup>en-líl u<sup>d</sup>é-a ú-za-<sup>2</sup>i-zu zi-za-a-tim  
 Rev. 1 [dingir min-n]a-bi en-nu-un an-ki-a<sup>giš</sup>ig an-na gál-la-ar  
 ana ilāni<sup>mes</sup> ki-lal-la-an ma-aš-šar šamê<sup>e</sup> u eršetim<sup>tim</sup> pe-tu-ú da-lat<sup>d</sup>a-nu  
<sup>d</sup>nanna<sup>d</sup>utu-ra gi<sub>6</sub><sup>gi</sup> u<sub>4</sub>-da šu-ta-ta an-né-ši-í-b-si  
 ana<sup>d</sup>šîn(30) u<sup>d</sup>šamaš u<sub>4</sub>-mu u mu-ši ma-al-ma-liš ba-šim-ma  
 5 an-úr-ta an-pa-šê<sup>šú</sup> á-dà-a-bi im-ta-an-zu-zu-ne  
 iš-tu i-šid šamê<sup>e</sup> ana e-lat šamê<sup>e</sup> a-da-šú-nu ú-ta-ad-du-nu  
 ab-sín<sup>si</sup>-gim ì<sup>i</sup>-dúr-dúr-re-eš-àm mul an zà-til-bi  
 ki-ma šî-ir-<sup>2</sup>i su-un-nu-qu kak-kab šamê<sup>e</sup> gi-mir-šú-un  
 gu<sub>4</sub>-gim ús ba-ab-sì-sì-ga-eš-àm ðim-me-er umbi-sag-gá-ar  
 10 ki-ma al-pi ú-sa šu-ḥu-zu ilāni<sup>mes</sup> šu-ut maḥ-ri

RA 11 (1914) 141ff. = TCL 6 51 47ff.

At the eternal foundation of heaven and underworld, the sure plans of the gods,  
 Anu, Enlil, and Ea began to assign lots.  
 For the two gods, guards of heaven and underworld, who open the gates of Anu,  
 For Šîn and Šamaš night and day respectively were created.  
 Their work was assigned from the base of heaven to the height of heaven,  
 To muster all the stars of heaven (in a straight line) like a furrow,  
 To keep the leading gods on a (straight) path like an ox.

Anu's proposal to put Ištar on a level with Šîn and Šamaš reflects the situation shown in the arrangement of the divine symbols on boundary stones. Commonly, three astral symbols appear close together at the top of the stones. The grouping of the deities in the written curses on the same stones in contrast rarely puts these three together. Two aspects of this excerpt merit comparison with *Enūma Eliš*. The first is that *The Exaltation of Ištar* still has the great triad in command. Marduk's name does not occur in the surviving portions. The second is that while both presume that an astral sergeant major must be responsible for the orderly marching of the stars across the heavens, the bilingual text makes Šîn and Šamaš joint holders of this office, but *Enūma Eliš* assigns this function to Nēberu, Marduk's star, alone.

(c) The excavations at Dūr-Kurigalzu yielded fragments of a diorite statue of one of the Kurigalzus with an inscription of some length carved on it. The language is Sumerian of considerable difficulty, and this only multiplies the problems of trying to settle the arrangement of the pieces. The tenor of the composition is to explain the duties of members of the pantheon as assigned to them by the Igigi, and it is much more of a myth than a royal inscription. One deity at a time is dealt with, and after the functions have been assigned, the formal investiture is stated in a refrain. For the present purpose, Nanna is the only relevant deity so dealt with. Column vii of Fragment A contains the end of the refrain for him, and this can be restored from the parallel passages as follows:<sup>4</sup>

4. The following extracts use the text as copied in Kramer in *Sumer* IV/1 (1948) 1ff. See also his translation in *ANET* 57ff., and Baqir, *Iraq Suppl.* (1945) 13.

[é-u-gal an-na ki an dagal-zu-ù-ta <sup>d</sup>nun-gal-a-ne-er me-a-àm  
 za nu-un-ša-ša a-ne-ne-ne lugal gù-silim-me-éš dingir kù-kù]-ga-  
 me-éš ki <sup>d</sup>en-líl <sup>d</sup>nin-líl-bi-ta <sup>d</sup>nun-gal-a-ne-er me-a-àm za  
 nu-un-ša-ša a-ne-ne-ne lugal gù-silim-me-éš dingir-me-gi-na-me-éš  
 šà-zu-ù-ta <sup>d</sup>nanna-ir-ra šu-luḥ si mu-na-DI-iš

In lofty Eugal from learned An to the Igigi . . . . .  
 “They are kings of loud voice, they are pure gods.” From Enlil  
 and Ninlil to the Igigi . . . . . “They are kings of loud voice,  
 they are gods of the unalterable *mes*.” In wisdom  
 they inaugurated the purification rites for Nanna.

The sense of the passage is considerably obscured by the difficult *me-a-àm za nu-un-ša-ša*, but the meaning seems to be that first Anu and then Enlil and Ninlil commission the Igigi, and they in turn invest one after the other of the gods with their offices. The absence of Ea is noteworthy. It may be that there was no shrine of his in Dūr-Kurigalzu. The preceding column of Fragment A, column vi, does not contain any unambiguous reference to the moon. Indeed, the name Utu occurs in line 7. However, column v does mention Nanna, so it must be assumed that at least v–vii were occupied with the moon. None of the earlier columns has any allusion to Nanna, but the second and third columns of the second face of Fragment B do treat of him. The other two columns on this face, i and iv, lack plain indications as to which deity is being handled. The position of Fragment B in relation to A depends entirely on the shapes of the pieces. On A, the vertical columns run from left to right along two sides of the stone, and column iv is written on the curving surface of the edge connecting the two sides. Thus, column v, the first one dealing with Nanna, is the first column on the second side of the stone. The arrangement of Fragment B is quite different. There are two faces at different angles. Our interpretation is that Fragment B contains the top portions of the columns of which the lower portions are found on Fragment A. B is probably a piece of the right shoulder of the statue. The inscription began on the flat surface of the back and continued around the relatively sharp edge onto the arm. Here, however, the columns began close to the neck and ran down the shoulder and the side of the arm. Thus, the first column on the arm ran along the top lines of the earlier columns, on the shoulder. According to this placing of the fragments, the two columns dealing with Nanna on Fragment B are the top portions of columns vi and vii of Fragment A. On this basis, the following fragments of text are ordered:

- A v . . . ]-da-kù-ga-bi nu-mu-ni-in-te-eš-àm an-pa an-ka  
 ba-ra-an-sum-mu-uš <sup>d</sup>nanna gi<sub>6</sub> zalag-ge-da ud-da ug-gá  
 ku-ku-da gizkim gi<sub>6</sub>-a [zu]-zu-da [mu]-ni-[in . . .  
 . . . ] its pure . [ . . ] they did not bring near but set them  
 apart in the height of heaven . . That Nanna should shine in  
 the night, lie down like a lion during the day and make known the signs  
 of the night, [they gave order (?) . . .
- Bb ii . . . ] an-úr an-pa-a-aš sag-gig-ga me-lám-a-ni šu<sub>4</sub>-šu<sub>4</sub>-a  
 en-nu-un tur-tur tu-tu-da-aš iti ur-a x-ki/DI u<sub>4</sub>-30-kam giš  
 ḥur-ḥur-[r]e-da [ . . .

. . . ] whose splendour in the base of heaven and the height  
of heaven covers the black-headed ones, to give birth to the  
junior watchers, to organize 30 days in a complete month . .  
[ . . .

A vi . . . ] á-bi-ne-ne-a tab-ba lukur nu-gig tu lál-a-ša-ga  
di<sup>d</sup>utu-kam gizkim íb-dug<sub>4</sub>-ga-e-a en i-si-iš lál-a  
im-si-si-ig-ga-bi nam-mu<sub>10</sub>-ús-sá mu-ni-in-ak-éš tu-ra a-nir-ra  
[zú]-ra-aḥ [ . . ] AG [ . . .  
. . . ] taking in their arms. The nun, the cult-prostitute, the abbess, the midwife—  
it was a judgment of Utu which was decreed—while  
he was sated with laughter and joy they brought marriage gifts. Illness, sighs,  
cries [ . . ] , [ . . .

Bb iii . . . ] x [ . . ] pa-ʿè<sup>ʿ</sup> ḏaš-ím-babbar an uraš-ta si-bi  
šu<sub>4</sub>-šu<sub>4</sub>-a an uraš šilig-ge kalam-ma bar dagal-la sag-gig-ga  
kár-kár an x [ . . .  
. . . ] . [ . . ] shining, Šamaš, whose rays cover heaven and earth,  
the majestic one in(?) heaven and earth, to shine on the land,  
to light up the black-headed ones.

Only a few provisional remarks can be made about this fragmentary and obscure text. The general similarity which exists between it and the section of *Enūma Eliš* is due, of course, to nothing but the common topic. The most striking difference is the mythological content of the Sumerian text. In Bb ii, Nanna is made the father of the “junior watchers.” In *The Exaltation of Ištar*, as just quoted, Sîn and Šamaš are called “watchers,” so their juniors are presumably the stars. The laughter and marriage gifts in A vi are also far removed from the spirit of Marduk’s silent operations in *Enūma Eliš*. The last three words of A vi, things about which men complain to gods, have a parallel in Tablet V 25 of the Epic, which will be discussed later, as will the mention of Utu within the section devoted to Nanna. The general impression of the statue inscription is that in outlook it is closer to *The Exaltation of Ištar* than to the Epic.

(d) *Enūma Anu Enlil*, the Babylonian corpus of omens derived from heavenly bodies and meteorological phenomena, in late times had a couple of introductory paragraphs. The first one, in Sumerian, describes the appointment of Sîn; the second one, prefaced with *šanīš* “variant,” describes similarly, but in Akkadian, the appointment of Šamaš. This very curious arrangement probably had the following origin. As the series stands, there are first 22 tablets of omens derived from the moon (according to the numbering of the Nineveh edition), then a group of tablets dealing with the sun, followed by tablets dealing with lesser heavenly bodies. Originally, these groups circulated separately; only later were they gathered into one large collection. While still separate, or when they were put together, the two major groups of omens—those on the sun and those on the moon—were each supplied with an introductory matching paragraph. They were written in bilingual form following the example of other astronomical or quasi-astronomical texts such as the menology attached to the “astrolabe” (KAV 218 “A”) and the introduction to the star-list CT 33 9. Later, when the series as a whole was well established, the introduction to Šamaš, which had stood at the beginning

of Tablet 23, was transferred to the beginning of the series, but since it had a remarkable similarity to the introduction to Sîn, which already stood there, the Akkadian of the Sîn paragraph and the Sumerian of the one on Šamaš were suppressed, leaving what is now preserved. The grammar of the Sumerian is corrupt, and the Akkadian is extraordinarily ambiguous, so the translations are given with reserve. The last word of the Akkadian paragraph has caused much difficulty because the purpose of the whole thing has been forgotten. *uštamû* means “talked together” or “took counsel,” and the omens following on this word were the results of these deliberations.

u<sub>4</sub> an-na <sup>d</sup>en-líl-lá <sup>d</sup>en-ki dingir-[gal-gal-la]  
malga-ne-ne gi-na-ta me gal-gal-la  
má-gur<sub>8</sub> <sup>d</sup>en:zu-na mu-un-gi-ne-eš  
ud-sakar mú-mú-da iti ù-tu-ud-da  
ù gizkim an-ki-a mu-un-gi-ne-eš  
má-gur<sub>8</sub> an-na im pa-è ak-a-dè  
ša an-na igi bar-ra-ta-è

When An, Enlil, and Enki, the [great] gods,  
In their sure counsel had established  
The great *mes* (and) the barque of Sîn,  
That the crescent moon should grow and give birth to the month,  
That it should establish signs in heaven and earth,  
That the barque should be sent forth shining in the heavens,  
It came forth in heaven.

ša-ni-iš  
e-nu-ma <sup>d</sup>a-num <sup>d</sup>en-líl <sup>d</sup>é-a  
ilāni<sup>meš</sup> rabûti<sup>meš</sup> ina mil-ki-šú-nu ki-i-nu  
u<sub>4</sub>urāt(gi<sub>3</sub>š-<sub>2</sub>hur<sup>meš</sup>) šamê<sup>e</sup> u eršetim<sup>tim</sup> iš-ku-nu  
a-na qātē<sup>II</sup> ilāni<sup>meš</sup> rabûti<sup>meš</sup> ú-kin-nu  
u<sub>4</sub>-mu ba-na-a ar<sub>2</sub>hu ud-du-šú šá tāmarti(igi-du<sub>8</sub><sup>meš</sup>)  
a-me-lut-tum <sup>d</sup>šamaš ina libbi bāb šītī(è)-šú i-mu-ru  
qí-rib šamê<sup>e</sup> u eršetim<sup>tim</sup> ki-niš uš-ta-mu-ú

When Anu, Enlil, and Ea,  
The great gods, in their sure counsel  
Had fixed the designs of heaven and earth,  
Had appointed in the hands of the great gods  
The bright day and the new moon for mankind  
To behold, had seen the sun in the gate from which it sets out,  
(Then) in heaven and earth they took counsel faithfully.

STC II xlix; Virolleaud, *ACh Sin*, 1. See A. Heidel, *Babylonian Genesis*<sup>2</sup> (Chicago, 1963) p. 73<sup>70</sup> and AfO 14 (1941/44) 193<sup>93</sup> for literature. VAT 7827 (AfO 14 [1941/44] Taf. IV) comments on some of these lines.

A very similar bilingual passage occurs on Rm II 535 (Pl. 42). Another witness to the Akkadian text, and much earlier in the date of the copy, comes from Emar: D. Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d'Aštata*. *Emar* VI/2 p. 553 = VI/4 p. 263, 80–82:

[enūma anu] <sup>d</sup>en-líl <sup>d</sup>é-a  
ilānu<sup>meš</sup> rabûtu ina mil-ki-šú-nu

u<sub>4</sub>urāt(giš-ḫur) [šamê u eršetim iš-ku-nu]  
 [x zal]ag-ga ana na-[ma]-ri sin ú-kin-nu  
 u<sub>4</sub>-ma ba-na-a arḫa ud-du-šu  
 [ma-g]u-ur šamê[e] x x x x [ . . .

[When Anu], Enlil and Ea,  
 the great gods by their counsel  
 [had fixed] the designs [of heaven and earth],  
 they established the bright [ . . . ] so that Sîn would shine,  
 that the day should be bright, and the moon renewed,  
 the barge of heaven . . . [ . . .

Here again there is no specific connection between these paragraphs and *Enūma Eliš*, though their spirit is perhaps a little closer to that of the Epic than was the case with *The Exaltation of Ištar* or the Kurigalzu statue.

(e) The following paragraph is also involved in the history of *Enūma Anu Enlil*. In an Assur tablet, it is written at the end of what is Tablet XXII in the Nineveh edition. Two Nineveh fragments preserve parts of it; on K 5981, it precedes some omens which could, but need not be, Tablet XXIII of *Enūma Anu Enlil*. On K 11867 what follows is almost certainly not this.

e-nu<sup>d</sup> a-nu<sup>d</sup> en-líl u<sup>d</sup> é-a ilāni<sup>meš</sup> rabûti<sup>meš</sup>  
 šamê<sup>e</sup> u eršeta<sup>ta</sup> ib-nu-ú ú-ad-du-ú gis-kim-ma  
 ú-kin-nu na-an-za-za [ú-š]ar-ši-du gi-is-gal-[la]  
 ilāni<sup>meš</sup> mu-ši-tim ú-[ad-du]-<sup>r</sup>ú<sup>r</sup> ú-za-i-zu ḫar-ra-ni  
 kakkabāni<sup>meš</sup> tam-ši-l[i-šú-nu uš-š]i-ru lu-ma-a-[ši]  
 mūša urra(u<sub>4</sub>-<sup>r</sup>zal<sup>r</sup>) ú-za-<sup>r</sup>i<sup>r</sup>-[zu im-du-d]u arḫa u šatta ib-nu-[u]  
 ana 30 u 20 su[m]<sup>r</sup> x [ ( . . ) purussê šamê<sup>e</sup> u eršetim<sup>tim</sup> iprusu<sup>s</sup>[<sup>u</sup>]

K 5981 and K 11867 (AfO 17 [1954/56] pl. V; both Pl. 42 in the present volume);  
 VAT 9805+9808 14ff. (AfO 17 pl. IV). Cf. AfO 17 89 and JNES 20 (1961) 172.

When Anu, Enlil and Ea, the great gods,  
 Created heaven and underworld, distinguished them,  
 Established stations, founded positions (for the stars),  
 Appointed the gods of the night, divided the courses,  
 Drew the constellations, the patterns of the stars,  
 Divided night from daylight, [measured] the month and formed the year,  
 For Moon and Sun . . [ . . . ] they made the decrees for heaven and underworld.

This bears by far the closest resemblance to *Enūma Eliš* of all the seven accounts. The first four lines in particular are in the same poetic metre and use the same words and ideas, and line 5 is almost identical with *Enūma Eliš* V 2. Direct borrowing, on whichever side, or dependence on a common source or tradition would equally well explain the phenomenon. The chief difference is that this paragraph keeps the great triad in command while Marduk commands in *Enūma Eliš*. This paragraph certainly offers the older tradition, for in a number of passages Anu, Enlil, and Ea are said to have created and organized the heavenly bodies. The earliest is from Boğazköy (KUB IV 47 rev. 37–38 = Weidner, *Alter und Bedeutung*, p. 17); later texts expressing the same idea are KAR 69 obv. 9–10; LKA 58 rev. 2–3; STT I 72 obv. 2–3 (cf. K 2588); Bu 91-5-9, 155 rev. 8–9.

(f) Two fragments of text have been put together under this section, though there is no external proof of any connection. An examination of the originals suggests that they are not pieces of the same tablet. However, both are from accounts of the organization of the heavens, and even if future discoveries should show that two such accounts are involved, the preserved pieces have much in common. If they do belong to the same work, K 7067 certainly comes before K 10817+11118. Their characteristic is a love of technical detail. The great gods engage in geometrical calculations before laying out the heavens, and every little detail of the watches of the day and night<sup>5</sup> was exposed. If this text were preserved complete, it would certainly be a most important contribution to our knowledge of ancient science. Though it is much more technical than *Enūma Eliš*, one must not draw conclusions from this as to relative age. The author of the Epic might have had access to equally detailed ideas but lacked the interest to draw on them more fully.

## K 7067 (CT 13 31)

- 1 <sup>r</sup>dé-a ina aṣṣî<sup>1</sup> [ . . .
- 2 ilāni<sup>me</sup> rabûti<sup>me</sup> im-tal-ku-ma x x [ . . .
- 3 kakkabāni<sup>meš</sup> tam-šil zi-im bu-un-n[a-né-e . . .
- 4 šamê<sup>e</sup> rap-šu-ti [ . . .
- 5 ištu šīt šamši (dutu-è) adi er[ēb] šamši (dutu-š[ú-a] [ . . .
- 6 pūtu(sag) ù šiddu(uš) uš-ta-ki-lu [ . . .
- 7 ši-ip-ta ù purussâ [ . . .
- 8 ilāni<sup>meš</sup> ú-za-<sup>2</sup>i-zi-m[a . . .
- 9 ina man-za-az mìn-da-a-[ti . . .
- 10 mūša ūma x [ . . .
- 11 [u<sub>4</sub>-m]i ana UB [ . . .
- 12 [ x ] mìn-da-x [ . . .
- 13 [x m]a<sup>2</sup>-na x [ . . .

## K 10817+11118 (Pl. 42)

- 2, 3 . . . ]-ma
- 4 . . . ]HI-ma
- 5 . . . ] x<sup>meš</sup>
- 6 . . . ] x x ir-tak-su
- 7 . . . ] x-ta-ši
- 8 . . . ]<sup>meš</sup> ú-šá-pu-ú
- 9 . . . ] uš-ši-ru
- 10 . . . ištu išid šamê] adi elât šamê (an-pa)
- 11 . . . ] x uš-zi-zi
- 12 . . . ] a-na na-da-ni
- 13 . . . ]GAR-ra-šú-nu i<sup>2</sup>-ad-du-ú
- 14 . . . ul-ta-n]am-za-az-šú-nu-t[i]
- 15 . . . ú]-<sup>r</sup>a<sup>1</sup>-li-du-m[a]
- 16 . . . ] x

5. On the watches on the night in ancient Mesopotamia, see O. Neugebauer, *Isis* 37 (1947) 37–43.

17 ... ] ú-man-di-d[u]  
18 ... ]<sup>r</sup>a<sup>1</sup>-na ištēn manê maṣṣarta ú-kin-n[u]  
19 ... i]na man-za-zi ušzīzu(gub-z[u])  
20 ... ]<sup>r</sup>ú<sup>1</sup>-ad-du-<sup>r</sup>ú<sup>1</sup>  
21 ... ] x ištu maṣṣarti namārīti(u<sub>4</sub>-zal-l[i])  
22 ... ]<sup>r</sup>ú<sup>1</sup>-kaṣ-ši-[bu/ru]  
23 ... ] x x x mu x x [ x ]

1 Ea in the Apsû [ . . .  
2 The great gods took counsel [ . . .  
3 Stars like the appearance of the forms [ . . .  
4 The wide heavens [ . . .  
5 From east to west [ . . .  
6 They multiplied the breadth and the length [ . . .  
7 A judgement and a decision [ . . .  
8 They divided the gods [ . . .  
9 At measured stations [ . . .  
10 Night and day . [ . . .  
11 Day (?) to . [ . . .  
12 [ . ] measurements [ . . .

6 they bound; 8 they created; 9 they designed; 10 [ from the base of heaven] to the height of heaven; 11 they set up; 12 to give; 13 they . . . their . . ; 14 constantly keeps them in position; 15 they begat; 17 they measured; 18 they appointed a watch for one mina; 19 they set (them) at (their) stations; 20 they assigned; 21 from the morning watch.

(g) This piece is of limited use in its present condition. What appears to be the obverse of K 3213 contains an account of the gods taking counsel about the appointment of heavenly bodies. Curiously, many of the verbs are in the present, and though they are rendered here as English presents, they could equally well be given as futures. The other side of K 3213 belongs to an astrological text, known also from K 12108+13396 (perhaps part of the same tablet as K 3213), K 9594+20284 and VAT 9427. It consists of sections ending *an-ni-tum giz ki m šá . . .* VAT 9427 is a complete tablet, but lacks anything of the heavenly counsel. Probably, this counsel, which alone is dealt with here, comes from paragraphs like those associated with *Enūma Anu Enlil*, which have been dealt with above. Only K 9594 has been published previously, in ZA 4 (1889) 249.

1 ... ] x ma x x [ ...  
2 ... *puru*]ssâ (eš)-bar)-šú-nu ana mātāti(kur-kur) ú-ki[n-nu]  
3 ... ]-nu su-un-qí ù bubūti(su-kú)

- 4 ... ] *ana mātāti(kur-kur) ú-kan-nu*  
 5 ... ]-*nu ana apkalli iš-ru-ku*  


---

 6 ... ] *x-šum-ma uš-tam-mu-ú*  
 7 ... ] *ú-šá-ap-pu-ú*  
 8 ... ] *i-šak-ka-nu*  
 9 ... -šú-n] *u ù man-za-zi-šú-nu*  
 10 ... *ul-t]ú 'ud-1-kám adi' ud-30-k[ám]*
- 2 ... ] they established their decree for the lands  
 3 ... ] . distress and hunger  
 4 ... ] they establish for the lands  
 5 ... ] . they presented to the sage.  


---

 6 ... ] . him/it they discuss  
 7 ... ] they bring into being  
 8 ... ] they appoint  
 9 ... ] their [ ... ] and their stations  
 10 ... ] from the first to the thirtieth day

### The Thirty-Six Stars

Thus, the surviving accounts of the organization of the heavens bear little specific relationship to that of *Enūma Eliš*, and further light must be sought from a study of the relevant lines of the Epic in the context of the development of Babylonian astronomy generally. This is no easy task, since *Enūma Eliš* has, of course, no contact with the abundantly documented mathematical astronomy of the Babylonians which reached such a high degree of perfection in the Greek period. Knowledge of earlier astronomy is much more scanty, and for the most part only late undated copies of texts survive. The aim of this investigation is, first, to cast light on the concise narrative of *Enūma Eliš*, which is far from self-explanatory. Second, it is to place *Enūma Eliš* within the historical development of Babylonian astronomy, a much more difficult task.

The creation of the stars is stated in Tablet V 1, where they are described as “stations for the great gods;” then, in the following line, their grouping in constellations is stated. Next, Marduk fixes the year by assigning three stars to each of the twelve months, ll. 3–4. This “Zwölfmaldrei,” as the Germans call it, is well known from a number of other texts.<sup>6</sup> From the brevity with which the concept is stated here and from the lack of any list of the stars involved, we shall hardly be wrong in concluding that the author is drawing upon well-known matters rather than creating a totally new system.

It should be stated that the Babylonian term “star” covers individual stars, including planets and constellations, for at least as early as the Old Babylonian period the ancient astronomers had given names to certain groups of stars in which they saw the pattern of, say, an animal. The system of classification on which *Enūma Eliš* is dependent presumes in the first place the division of the heavens into three zones, one each assigned to Enlil, Anu, and Ea. The fullest statement of this division occurs in the First Tablet of the series <sup>mul</sup>APIN (Weidner, *Handbuch*, pp. 35–37), which lists 33 Enlil stars, 23 Anu stars, and 15 Ea stars. This is a serious astronomical attempt to list the major stars in the three

6. On this whole subject see B. L. Van der Waerden, *JNES* 8 (1949) 6–26.

zones, and while there are considerable problems of identifying certain ones, a sufficient number are identifiable so that the general system is clear. The sky visible to the Babylonians was divided into three zones, that of Enlil being the sky nearest the pole, that of Ea being nearest the equator, and the middle band being that of Anu. The date of <sup>mul</sup>APIN is uncertain, except that it is unlikely to be so old as Old Babylonian, and the division of the sky which it presumes is first attested in a prayer to the gods of the night from Boğazköy, so c. 1300 B.C. (KUB IV 47 rev. 46–48 = Weidner, *Handbuch*, pp. 60f.). Another version of this text from the library of Ashurbanipal, published by Oppenheim in *AnBib* 12 (1959) 282ff., also contains this reference, but two Old Babylonian copies (see ZA 43 [1936] 305ff. and RA 32 [1936] 179ff.) do not have it.

A mere listing of the stars in each zone, such as <sup>mul</sup>APIN offers us, has little value in itself for the calendar or astrology. For these purposes selections of the totals were made for specific ends. The system incorporated in *Enūma Eliš* takes one star from each zone for each of the twelve months, thus using 36 from the total number of stars.<sup>7</sup> Outside the Epic this system is stated in the so-called astrolabe, of which the most elaborate and best-preserved copy comes from the library of Tiglath-pileser I (c. 1100 B.C.). It was first published in translation with a full edition by Weidner in his *Handbuch* pp. 62ff., and the cuneiform text was given later by Schroeder in KAV, no. 218. It contains, inter alia, a list of 36 stars (rev. “C”) divided into three columns of twelve each, which correspond with the months of the year. Thus, each line across the three columns contains three stars. The first is “of Ea” (*šu-ut* <sup>d</sup>*é-a*), the second “of Anu” (*šu-ut* <sup>d</sup>*a-nim*), and the third “of Enlil” (*šu-ut* <sup>d</sup>*en-líl*). So far as the use of this system is concerned, no ancient text offers us any explanation, but very probably the heliacal risings of the three stars for each (lunar) month were supposed to mark the first, tenth, and twentieth day.<sup>8</sup> This is a schematic thing which was never in fact used to regulate the Babylonian calendar so far as our knowledge goes, and too little is known of it to ascertain if it would in fact have served its purpose. At least there is no question that this system is alluded to in V 3–4.

In addition to the list on KAV 218, there is also a menology (“A”) and a commentary on the list (“B”). This commentary explains the mythological aspect of the arrangement of the heavens and the selection of stars. The three zones, as already noted, are assigned to Ea, Anu, and Enlil, or Enlil, Anu, and Ea. This unusual order of the great triad results from conceiving of the 36 stars as an army marching across the sky under its officers. The commander-in-chief, Anu, is in charge of the central battalion, and his two associates, Enlil and Ea, go at either side of him. Thus Anu’s precedence is maintained by his zone’s being the central one. The commentary explains that the Ea star for the first month of the year, Nisan—namely, Ikû—is “leader of the Ea stars.” Ea’s star itself happens to be that of the last month. The other ten in the zone are described as “in front,” “behind,” “to the right,” or “to the left” of Ea. Thus the arrangement within each zone expresses the rank of the god after whom it is named. The Anu zone is similar, though not quite identical. Again there is a leader, the star for the month Nisan, but this happens to be Dilipat, Venus, and no doubt due to her prominence in the

7. The caution must be interposed that star names are apparently not stable, so that the same name in two texts or two periods will not necessarily refer to the same star. The “astrolabe” will not necessarily agree with <sup>mul</sup>APIN, but may be derived from a similar but distinct source.

8. Diodorus II 30 6 describes Babylonian astrology as using 30(!) stars divided into two groups, of which one star transfers from the lower to the upper group each ten days. This seems to be a confused reflection of the system of the “astrolabe.”

sky and her marital status as wife of Anu, she is called “the great star” as well as “leader of the Anu stars.” Anu’s star itself is that of the tenth month, and most of the others are said to be in front or behind him. An exception is the star of the last month: “the red star, which, in the south, when the gods of the night are finished, stands in the ‘centre’ of the heavens, that star is Nēberu, Marduk.” Nothing is said of his position in the entourage of Anu. The Enlil zone is similarly organized, except that no leading star occurs, since Enlil’s own star is the one for the month Nisan. Since he controlled that zone in any case, a ceremonial leader of the group could be dispensed with. Thus, the commentary shows the mythological interpretation of the 36 stars, and this in turn reveals a much closer connection with *Enūma Eliš* than the list itself would have shown.

The author of *Enūma Eliš* needed, of course, to have Marduk as commander-in-chief of the heavens. The only change therefore was the suppression of Anu and his replacement with Marduk. Since Marduk’s star was already in Anu’s zone this was a very simple matter, and V 5–8 expresses this clearly. Only two matters require further elaboration, the identity of Marduk’s star<sup>9</sup> and other modifications of the so-called astrolabe similar to that of the Epic.

The lines of the Epic already referred to make Nēberu Marduk’s star. In Tablet VII 124–32, Nēberu is Marduk’s 49th name, with strongly astronomical connections. Attempts at identifying the star have not yet led to any agreed result. The passage in Tablet VII, which was probably not composed by the author of the Epic, offers more details, which, as A. Schott first pointed out, agree with the descriptions of this star given by the commentary on the “astrolabe” and <sup>mul</sup>APIN Tablet I:

I kakkabu sāmu(sa<sub>5</sub>) ša ina tīb(zi) šūti(tu<sub>15</sub>-u<sub>18</sub>-lu) arki  
ilāni<sup>meš</sup> mūšūti<sup>ti</sup> ug-da-mi-ru-nim-ma šamê<sup>e</sup> BAR-ma izzīz<sup>iz</sup>  
kakkabu šū(bi) <sup>d</sup>nē-bé-ru <sup>d</sup>marūtuk

KAV 218 “B” II 29–32

The red star, which in the south, when the gods of the night  
are finished, divides the heavens and stands there.  
That star is Nēberu, Marduk.

ki-ma kakkabāni<sup>meš</sup> šu-ut <sup>d</sup>en-líl ug-dam-mi-ru-ni (I) kakkabu  
rabū šīt(ud-da)-su da-<sup>2</sup>mat šamê<sup>e</sup> BAR-ma izzīz<sup>zu</sup> kakkab  
<sup>d</sup>marūtuk nē-bé-ri I <sup>mul</sup>sag-me-gar manzās(ki-gub)-su  
unakkir(kúr-kúr)<sup>ir</sup> šamê<sup>e</sup> ib-bir

CT 33 2 36–38 = AfO Bh. 24 28

When the stars of Enlil are finished, a big star shining dimly  
divides the heavens and stands there. It is the star of Marduk, Nēberu.  
Jupiter has changed his station and is crossing the heavens.

The similarity of these passages needs no comment, but the differences must not be forgotten. The “astrolabe” is dealing with the last of the 12 Anu stars, <sup>mul</sup>APIN with the 33 stars of Enlil. Thus, Marduk’s star enjoyed a position of centrality in the sky, as is also implicit in Tablet VII 124–32 of the

9. Schott, ZA 43 (1936) 124–45 is still the best contribution on this subject. Further references can be found in ŠL IV/2 nos. 260 and 311. More recent discussions are those of E. Unger, WdO 2 (1954) 454–64, who takes Nēberu as the Milky Way, and of Kinnier Wilson and Landsberger, JNES 20 (1961) 172–74, who prefer the Pole Star. See TIM I no. 4 15 for an early occurrence.

Epic, though this knowledge cannot readily be turned into a simple identification with a star known to modern astronomy.

The modification of the “astrolabe’s” scheme in *Enūma Eliš* is only one chapter of what was probably a long and complicated history. What is known of other chapters can conveniently be summarized here to illustrate the phenomenon in the Epic. Two other sets of thrice twelve stars are known. CT 33 9 = Weidner, *Handbuch*, pp. 102–6 offers twelve stars each for Enlil, Anu, and Ea, apparently selected from <sup>mul</sup>APIN or a related source. While it employs some of the same stars as the “astrolabe,” it is generally speaking a totally different arrangement, though presumably it was meant to serve the same purpose. Another list offers twelve stars each for Elam, Akkad, and Amurru. Only late copies are known.<sup>10</sup> From Ashurbanipal’s library K 250 (CT 26 41 v = Weidner, *Handbuch*, p. 16) preserves two of Akkad and a full list of Amurru; K 8067 (CT 26 44 = Weidner, *Handbuch*, p. 21) has seven of Amurru, the full dozen of Akkad, and two of Elam; K 11267 (CT 26 49 = Weidner, *Handbuch*, p. 13) has some of the Akkad stars and part of a third Elamite one. A Late Babylonian fragment from Babylon (LBART 1500) contains some of the Amurru stars. Thus, ten of the Elamite stars are missing in CT 33 9, but the rest are preserved. Since there is an indubitable connection between the “astrolabe” and this set of “geographical” dozens, they are set out in full.

## CT 33 9

| Month | Elam                       | Akkad                  | Amurru              |
|-------|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1     | [ <i>dili-pát</i> ]        | apin                   | <i>ikû</i>          |
| 2     | [mul-mul]                  | <i>a-nu-ni-tum</i>     | šu-gi               |
| 3     | [ur-gu-la]                 | sipa-zi-an-na          | muš                 |
| 4     | [maš-tab-ba]               | u <sub>4</sub> -al-tar | kak-si-sá           |
| 5     | [ban]                      | mar-gíd-da             | maš-tab-ba-gal-gal  |
| 6     | [uga]                      | šu-pa                  | bir                 |
| 7     | [en-te-na-bar-LUM]         | <i>zi-ba-ni-tum</i>    | nin-maḥ             |
| 8     | gír-tab                    | ur-idim                | lugal               |
| 9     | [u <sub>4</sub> -ka-duḥ-a] | ùz                     | <i>šal-bat-a-nu</i> |
| 10    | gu-la                      | Á <sup>mušen</sup>     | al-lu <sub>5</sub>  |
| 11    | n[u-muš-da]                | da-mu                  | ším-maḥ             |
| 12    | [ku <sub>6</sub> ]         | <i>né-bé-rum</i>       | ka <sub>5</sub> -a  |

Middle Assyrian Copy of the Astrolabe  
(KAV 218 “C” 1–12)

|   | Ea            | Anu             | Enlil              |
|---|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 1 | <i>ikû</i>    | <i>dili-pát</i> | apin               |
| 2 | mul-mul       | šu-gi           | <i>a-nu-ni-tum</i> |
| 3 | sipa-zi-an-na | ur-gu-la        | muš                |
| 4 | kak-si-sá     | maš-tab-ba      | šul-pa-è           |

10. According to van der Waerden, Weidner has “unpublished texts of the same kind, different in some respects from the known texts” (JNES 8 [1949] 12<sup>15</sup>).

|    |                     |                          |                               |
|----|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 5  | ban                 | maš-tab-ba-gal-gal       | mar-gíd-da                    |
| 6  | <i>ka-li-tum</i>    | uga                      | šu-pa                         |
| 7  | nin-maḥ             | <i>zi-ba-ni-tum</i>      | en-te-na-bar-SIG <sub>4</sub> |
| 8  | ur-idim             | gír-tab                  | lugal                         |
| 9  | <i>ṣal-bat-a-nu</i> | u <sub>4</sub> -ka-duḥ-a | ùz                            |
| 10 | gu-la               | <i>al-lu-ut-tum</i>      | Á <sup>mušen</sup>            |
| 11 | nu-muš-da           | ším-maḥ                  | da-mu                         |
| 12 | [k]u <sub>6</sub>   | <sup>d</sup> marūtuk     | ka <sub>5</sub> -a            |

Note: u<sub>4</sub>-al-tar and šul-pa-è (month 4) are different names of the same star, as are *né-bé-ru*m and *marūtuk* in month 12. The differences bir/*ka-li-tum* (month 6) and al-lu<sub>5</sub>/*al-lu-ut-tum* (month 10) are purely orthographic.

Where preserved, the “geographical” listing CT 33 9 has the same three stars for each month, but often not in the same column. So, since the Akkad and Amurru stars are completely preserved, those of Elam can be restored from the “astrolabe.” Clearly, the two documents are based on the same materials, but the one, to serve the aim of fixing the calendar, arranges the stars by the zones of the sky; the other, with unknown purpose, uses the same three for each month, but arranges them into different dozens. There is certainly nothing to suggest, as some scholars have held, that the “astrolabe” is a later document which has simply rearranged the stars of the other list.

Although the other lists existed and were handed down among scribes, the “astrolabe” is still the best-known to us. Ashurbanipal’s library has yielded three fragments in diagrammatic form; two appear to be parts of the same tablet, see CT 33 11–12 and Weidner, *Handbuch*, pp. 62ff. The heavens are shown on what corresponds to a polar projection as three concentric circles, with lines radiating like the spokes of a wheel to mark off the twelve segments of the three zones. Enlil’s is the central band, Anu’s the middle, and Ea’s the outer. The month name in each segment is written just inside the outer circle, and the star-names are written in their respective compartments. In the outer bands, numbers, whose significance is outside the purpose of the present study, accompany the names. The ten preserved names agree with the list in KAV 218 except that the tenth star of the Ea circle is Ur-Gula, not Gula, probably due to a scribal error. Externally, this is simply a rearrangement of the material so that the 36 stars are presented in concentric circles rather than in parallel columns. Yet, with the information obtained from the commentary on the “astrolabe” we are justified in asking if any theological aspect is altered by the different presentation. The common order with Anu in the middle, by its very deviation from the sequence of the great triad in other contexts, compels the assumption that it was chosen expressly to indicate the preeminence of Anu. But this only holds when the 36 stars are presented in parallel columns. The arrangement in circles, which more accurately portrays what was conceived than a dome-shaped heaven, gives expression to a different hierarchical order. The centre of power has now moved to the Enlil zone as the pivot on which all revolve. Theologically, this is understandable, since Anu’s supremacy was always somewhat nominal. Enlil in practice wielded greater power.

Two Late Babylonian copies of lists of the “Zwölfmaldrei” have survived. One, TCL 6 13 (cf. ZA 32 [1918] 69–72) is from the Seleucid period and is said to come from Uruk. The tablet is broken and it is not clear just why the 36 stars are listed. Those of Ea are completely gone. The Anu list is

damaged in the middle, at the very point where it certainly differed from KAV 218, though the stars involved do not suggest that any great importance is to be attached to the divergence. The Enlil list is complete. There is one difference from the version of KAV 218 that should be mentioned: Marduk's star has changed places with the corresponding star in the Enlil zone. Theologically, this is nothing unexpected. The whole trend is to put Marduk in place of Enlil in Late Babylonian times. So long as the "astrolabe" was interpreted in favour of Anu, Marduk could stay in that zone, but once the emphasis was placed on Enlil, Marduk's position had to be transferred to the highest zone. The other Late Babylonian text is from Babylon itself: *LBART* 1499,<sup>11</sup> also from the Seleucid period. This gives a list like KAV 218, except that numbers accompany the stars, the same numbers that appear for the two outer zones in the Ashurbanipal fragments, and there is no mention of Anu, Enlil, or Ea. Knowledge of the gods presiding over the zones is no doubt presumed. After the list, a series of 36 omens follow, one for each star. This second occurrence of each star name is useful as it permits a couple of scribal errors to be corrected. As between this list and the Middle Assyrian one, there are two differences. The first is that Marduk's star and the corresponding one of the Enlil zone have been switched, exactly as in the Uruk text. The second is that the stars in the zones of Anu and Enlil have all been pushed one month forward. A theological explanation again suggests itself. Traditionally, Enlil had led in his own zone, since his star was the one for the month Nisan. When his zone became the leading one, his prominence was all the greater for this fact. The leading star in the Anu zone, Venus or Ištar, was also a great power in the religious world of the time. By moving round the two groups of stars to the next month, at one stroke Enlil and Ištar were removed from their leading positions and Marduk took Enlil's.

It must be admitted that the interpretation of the changes in the various copies of the "astrolabe" just offered are not susceptible of proof. There are no commentaries on the late copies, and even if there were, they would certainly not explain the differences from earlier texts. But circumstantially the case is strong. The commentary on the earliest copy puts beyond doubt the mythological significance of the precise arrangement of the 36 stars. *Enūma Eliš* very clearly takes over this scheme and makes one small modification by which Marduk replaced Anu as the leader of all. Astronomically, there is no explanation of the changes in the later copies. Little is known of the details of the astronomical basis for this use of 36 stars, so our inability to explain the changes on astronomical grounds is not fatal. But the schematic nature of the whole thing, and the lack of evidence that it ever served its intended purpose, invite consideration of other approaches. If the calendar was not in fact regulated by this scheme, it would be natural for the ancient scholars to take more interest in its religious aspects, and since virtually all the changes affect points involving theology, this is the most reasonable explanation of them. If there were some other motivation, it would have to be considered a remarkable coincidence that Marduk's star principally was involved.

The Epic itself shows one other way of exalting Marduk within this scheme. One small fragment of Tablet V, K 13774, has been corrected from an astronomical standpoint differing from that of the author of the Epic. In line 8, he replaced Ea with Anu, making Marduk leader of the Ea zone. Reasons

11. This is presumably one of the two sources from which Pinches in *JRAS* 1900 571ff. restored the Ashurbanipal copies, but, if so, it is curious that he made no mention of its big divergence from the other copies. Another Late Babylonian text contains some of the 36: A 3427 in *ZA* 51 (1955) 238ff. This is from Uruk and agrees with the copy from Babylon so far as it can be compared.

for such a change are not hard to conceive. As son of Ea, Marduk inherited the traditions of Eridu, and all our sources name Ikû the leading star of Ea's zone. That star is commonly explained as the heavenly Babylon in astrological texts. No doubt the scribe responsible for the text of K 13774 made other alterations too in his thrice twelve, but they are unknown to us.

### The Phases of the Moon

After the year was fixed by the organization of the 36 stars, Marduk next turned his attention to the month. Nannar, the moon-god, was appointed and given instructions in Tablet V 15–26. For the first six days, the moon is to shine with “horns” until, on the 7th, his crown is half-size. The next day mentioned is the 15th of the month (*šapattu*), the day of the full moon, when opposition with the sun takes place. When this happens, the moon is instructed to go through its previous growth in reverse. The next day mentioned is the *ūm bubbulum*, here probably the 29th, when the moon is to approach the path of Šamaš again, so that on the 30th a second meeting takes place.

Nature of course only provides one dividing point in the month, the day of the full moon, and all kinds of further divisions were in use at one time or other in ancient Mesopotamia. It would be pointless to list them here when they are so well dealt with by B. Landsberger in his *Kultische Kalender*. There are, however, three formal expositions of the phases of the moon, which deserve consideration: (a) a theological paragraph found in two contexts; (b) the series *i-NAM giš-ḫur an-ki-a*; and (c) a paragraph on an astrological tablet from Late Babylonian times.

(a) This paragraph occurs as a section of an astrological compendium, K 250+ (CT 26 41 vi 16ff.; see Weidner, *Handbuch*, 17–18 and AfO 19 [1959/60] 110 for a more nearly complete text). Also, it appears within a fragment of a god-list, K 2074. The published copy, III R 55 no. 3, does not indicate that this is a right-hand portion of a tablet of more than one column each side, and it omits the remains of the first two preserved lines:

|                                                  |                                        |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| [šū.nigin . . ] x 4 mu <sup>meš</sup> d[ . . . ] | [Total of . . ] . 4 names of [ . . . ] |
| [šá] <sup>d</sup> a-nu-ú-ti-[šú]                 | [of his] Anuship.                      |

This is the summing-up of the preceding god's names; cf. CT 25 9 11 and 10 33 for the style. III R also omits the ends of three lines of another column on the left, all of which offer whole or part of “30”, no doubt to be restored [d]30, “Sîn”, the right-hand sub-column of a god-list. The published portion clearly heads a list of Sîn names, which shows that the fragment is a reverse piece. The theological paragraph precedes the beginning of a conventional list of Sîn names, agreeing so far as preserved—the first four—with An = *Anum* (KAV 51). This fragment of a god-list is somehow related to another similar piece, K 2115 (CT 25 28), a fragment which probably belong to the same tablet as K 4338b (CT 24 19)+15160 (dup. K 7663+11035, CT 24 9 and 25 7). K 2115 also offers the remains of the beginning of a Sîn list, but the last line of the theological paragraph is inserted as the second line. The following is the text of the paragraph from K 2074, with the variants—purely orthographic—of K 250+ at the end:

[I 3]0 ina tāmarti (igi-lá)-šú ta ud-1-kam en ud-5-kam  
 ʾ5' u<sub>4</sub>-mi u<sub>4</sub>-sakar(SAR) <sup>d</sup>a-nu-um

ta ud-6-kam en ud-10-kam 5 u<sub>4</sub>-mi  
 ka-li-tum <sup>dé-a</sup>  
 ta ud-11-kam en ud-15-kam  
 5 u<sub>4</sub>-mi aga taš-ri-iḫ-ti ip-pir-ma <sup>dēn-līl</sup>  
<sup>d30</sup> <sup>d</sup>a-nu <sup>dēn-līl</sup> u <sup>dé-a</sup> par-šu-šu  
 (<sup>d</sup>a-num; ka-li-tú; <sup>d</sup>a-num; omit u; par-šu-šú; kám passim)

During Sîn's visibility, from the 1st to the 5th day—five days—he is a crescent, Anu. From the 6th to the 10th—five days—he is a kidney, Ea. From the 11th to the 15th day—five days—he wears a glorious crown, Enlil. Sîn's functions are Anu, Enlil, and Ea.

One purpose of this paragraph is to give the names of Sîn for the 3 five-day periods specified, and this is how it came to be incorporated in a god-list. A passage in an inscription of Nabonidus quoted below expressly calls one of the phrases Sîn's name. But exactly what are the names? Landsberger in his *Kultische Kalender* 97<sup>3</sup> construed the phrases after each specification of "five days" as the names. No doubt this is correct in its delimiting the names, but the grammatical construction of them is not given. With Weidner it is best to construe them as appositions: "A crescent—Anu", "A kidney—Ea", "He wears a glorious crown—Enlil". The first part of each describes the appearance of Sîn during the specified period; the second is the name of the deity whose function (*paršu*) Sîn assumes during the periods. The two together are names of Sîn for these periods. The concept of a god changing his name with the changing seasons, days, or even hours is well attested elsewhere; for example, the names of Marduk on the way to the Akītu house (see RA 91 [1997] 79–80, dup. BM 38706+39843 on Pl. 41).

The importance of this fragment for *Enūma Eliš* lies both in its showing another possibility of dividing the first half of the month—the second half is neglected in both cases—and in the fact that K 13774, apparently a fragment of Tablet V, substitutes Anu for Ea in line 8 and inserts the theological fragment, save for the opening and closing phrases, after line 16. Unfortunately, the fragment breaks off before one can observe if this was a simple insertion, or if lines 17 and 18 were suppressed. The date of the theological paragraph cannot of course be determined with accuracy. Weidner, following Schott, was of the opinion that the whole category of texts to which it belongs was compiled in Sargonid Assyria. Though there is no question that the same techniques were known and used in Sargonid Assyria, we prefer to regard the text as Babylonian in origin, and would not exclude a date as early as 1000 B.C.

(b) The series *i-NAM giš-ḫur an-ki-a* was likewise considered a product of Late Assyrian scribes by Schott, Weidner, and van der Waerden. Though its lateness is not in dispute, the present writer prefers to regard it as a Babylonian work, and the existence of a Late Babylonian fragment, unknown to these authors, can be quoted in favour of this idea. See now A. Livingstone, *Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works* (Oxford, 1986; reprinted, Winona Lake, 2007), pp. 17–33. Like many other late mystical texts, it is a compilation of diverse yet related paragraphs. If one of our suggestions made below is correct, in the edition from the school of Nabû-zuqup-kēna, it consisted of four chapters (*pirsu*), of which the second and fourth are badly preserved, while the first and third are all but gone. The second chapter is published and edited by Weidner in *Babyloniaca* 6 (1912) 8ff. and is devoted in its entirety to explaining the phases of the moon. It begins by citing the first line of Tablet XIV of

*Enūma Anu Enlil*, the tablet devoted to the waxing and waning of the moon (see AfO 14 [1941/44] 317–18). Lines 2–10 describe the phases of the moon but are badly broken. The days of the month listed are: 7th, 14th, 15th, 21st, 27th, 28th, and *ūm bubbulum*, probably the 29th.<sup>12</sup> This, it will be observed, agrees with *Enūma Eliš* rather than with the astrological fragment, though it is more detailed. The following sections take up certain days in detail. The 7th first receives attention:

- 11 ud-7-[kám agû ma-á]š-la bar = bā(30); bā = za-a-zu bā = pa-r[a-su]  
 12 bā = [ba-an-t]u; bā = mi-šil; bā-bā = mi-šil meš-[li]  
 13 30(bā) [a-rá 30] = 15; 15 a-rá 4 = 60; 60(1) = <sup>d</sup>a-num; im-bi = GURUN [ ( . . )]

Here, we have the reason why *i-NAM giš-ḥur an-ki-a* agrees with *Enūma Eliš*: it quotes V 17 and so is directly dependent. The aim of the exposition here is to show that the days of the month used in *Enūma Eliš*—the 1st, 7th, and 15th—have a mystical connection. It starts from the 7th day, the “half crown” according to the Epic. The ordinary equivalent of *mašlu* would be bar, but since this refers to Sîn, the expositor takes the variant form bā, which also happens to be the numeral 30, Sîn’s mystical number. Next, he quotes two lexical passages showing, first, that bā means “divide” or “separate,” and second, that it also means “half.” Then, whether from the two equivalents of bā quoted, or from common knowledge that two halves make a whole, he sets down “half, half,” and by using the Semitic construct state interprets this as “half of half.” This half is already the number 30, so the result of the division is 15. Thus 7 is related to 15, *quod erat demonstrandum*. Now if half of half is 15, the whole is  $4 \times 15 = 60$ . The numeral 60 is also the numeral 1. Anu’s mystical number is 60, and on the first day of the month, according to a later statement of this text, Sîn is Anu. Thus, the first day is connected with the 7th and the 15th. The final equation gives a phonetic writing on *inbu* “Fruit” (a title of Sîn) and the ideographic writing of the same title. Probably, we are to restore GURUN (*bēl arḫim*). This would identify Sîn on the first night of the month with Anu, since Anu has already been equated with “one,” and “Fruit” as a title of Sîn occurs particularly in the name of a series “Fruit, lord of the (new) month.”

- 15 bu-ūm-bu-[l]i; bu (gíd) = na-sa-ḥu  
 16 ūm (ud) = ū-mu; bu-lì = šu-ta-as-su-ḥu  
 17 ta-as-su-uh-tum = ta-lit-tum  
 18 u<sub>4</sub>-mu i-lit-ti <sup>d</sup>30 ki-i dug<sub>4</sub>-ga-ú

In the first case, by taking the root ná from the Sumerian equivalent for *bubbulum*, the expositor shows that it means: “the day of the renewal of Sîn, the firstborn of Enlil”. In the second case, the syllables with which the Akkadian word is written are taken as Sumerian roots and *bubbulum* is shown to mean: “the day of the birth of Sîn”. This explanation is cited from an unnamed source.

The final chapter of *i-NAM giš-ḥur an-ki-a* is preserved on K 170+. <sup>13</sup> It was a small, oblong tablet and the beginnings of each line are broken off. Only the first section (ll. 1–4) interests us here. A

12. According to *Inbu bēl arḫim* (Landsberger, *Kultische Kalender* 141) the 28th is the *bubbulum* of Nergal and the 29th that of Sîn. However, from the lines of the Epic one can only deduce that it was earlier than the 30th day. A later text, quoted below, puts the combined activity of Sîn and Šamaš on the 27th. From the title of a Sumerian text quoted in an Old Babylonian catalogue (WZJ 6 [1954/55] 389 10): u<sub>4</sub>-30 u<sub>4</sub>-ná-a, it seems that the *bubbulum* was the 30th day in earlier times.

13. The copy of King in CT 25 50 should be compared with that of Delitzsch, *Lesestücke*<sup>1</sup> pp. 39–40.

rubric (line 5) explains . . . ] x mu-didli <sup>d</sup>en:zu-na-ke<sub>4</sub> “. . . ] the names of Sîn”. The question is raised whether the catch-line of the third chapter, which is preserved on K 2670 (III R 2 xxii; cf. Bezold, *Catalogue*) is not to be restored as the beginning of the last chapter, which will in that case be the fourth. The catch-line reads: I gurun <sup>r</sup>d30' áš-šú [. . . “Fruit means Sîn because [. . .”, and this can be restored as the beginning of K 170+:

- 1 [ I gurun <sup>d</sup>en:z]u mu <sup>d</sup>a-num im-bu-ú mu-<sup>r</sup>ni' mu ib an' a ne  
[gi]š' bi ki-lal-la-an i-gi-du<sub>8</sub>-a ud-1-kam u<sub>4</sub>-sakar <sup>d</sup>a-num
- 2 . . . ]aḫ-pa ár-ḫu; li-iḫ-ḫu ár-ḫu; liḫ-ḫu maš-l[um]. ka-ra ga-na-te-nu-ú;  
ka-ru = ṭa-pa-la; ga-na = a-šà. maš-lu<sub>4</sub> aga ud-7-kam ka<sub>15</sub>-lit <sup>d</sup>é-a
- 3 . . . <sup>d</sup>3]0 en eš-bar; e-šú = 30, 2; e-ni = be-el; [3]0 a-rá 30 = 15; a-pa-ru  
aga ud-15-kam šu<sub>4</sub> <sup>d</sup>en-líl
- 4 . . . <sup>d</sup>B]E' ta-lim <sup>d</sup>é-a. na-an-nu = šeš; t[a]-lim = šeš; íd = na-a-ru; na-a-ra = <sup>d</sup>BE

If the restoration of the first line is correct, the section begins clearly enough. At the beginning of the month, Sîn is called “Fruit” (*inbu*) “because Anu called (*imbû*) his name”. Lines 1–3 each end with a combination of the days of *Enûma Eliš* (1st, 7th, and 15th) and the descriptions of Sîn from the theological paragraph, though in their original context these refer to five-day periods, not to single days. So much is clear; the rest is partly obscure. No doubt the middle of line 1 leads from “Fruit” (if correctly restored) to “crescent” (*uskaru*, *askaru*), but it is obscure. The “both” might refer to the two horns of the crescent, but the preceding sign but one does not seem to allow a reading [s]i-bi “its horns”. Line 2 leads from “crescent” to “half crown”. The second part is clear. The latter part of *uskaru*, *karu*, leads to the sign KÁRA (sign-name: *ganatenû*, “diagonal gána”), then the sign value kára is repeated with the rendering *ṭa-pa-la* (“to damage”). This is a reputable lexical equation, perhaps taken from *Aa* or *Ea* (MSL XIV 186). Next, the Sumerian gána “field” and its Akkadian rendering *eqlu* are given. This is cheating by modern standards, since only the sign gána, not diagonal gána, has this meaning. But such things did not disturb the ancient mind, and since “field” also means “area” in geometry, the “damage of the area” as applied to Sîn’s crown is, apparently, the technique of reaching “half crown”: a damaged crown. From this second part of the line, one might expect the first half to deal with the syllable *us-* or *as-*, but if so it is not apparent how the surviving words are derived from it. There are equations based on *liṭṭu* and *arḫu*. The former word is of unknown derivation and meaning, but evidently there was a play on the homophones *arḫu* “(first of the) month” and *arḫu* “half-brick”, as seems to occur in another text of this genre: . . . ] x ár-ḫa-a-tú : ár-ḫi : iti : sig<sub>4</sub> (BM 37055 obv. 4). Thus *arḫu* “half-brick” served to connect *arḫu* “first of the month” with the 7th day, the day of Sîn’s half crown.<sup>14</sup>

14. The play on “half” as a name of Sîn is already presumed in Tablet II of *Ea* in the Middle Assyrian copy:

|         |    |   |                 |
|---------|----|---|-----------------|
| I si-in | 30 | = | <sup>d</sup> 30 |
| I ba-a  | 30 | = | KI.MIN mi-iš-lu |

MSL XIV 254 165–67, cf. 284 169–71

There is no conceivable reason why the value bā with the meaning “half” should be connected with Sîn apart from number speculation. In this context, “20” for Šamaš precedes and “40” for Ea follows, so there is no doubt. The Old Babylonian examples of the name Sur-Sunabu show that the mystical numbers of the gods were already in use. It occurs in column iv of the *Meissner Fragment* of the *Gilgameš Epic* written *su-ur-su-na-bu*, and the late edition writes it <sup>m</sup>ur-40, a writing explained in V R 44 iii 48 as <sup>m</sup>amēl-<sup>d</sup>é-a. The very name-type itself requires the name of a deity, and *sunabu* is another spelling of *šanabi*, <sup>2</sup>/<sub>3</sub> (of 60), i.e., 40.

Line 3 leads up to the 15th day, but its starting premise is lacking. In what is left, a description of Sîn as “lord of the decision” is the basis for reaching the number 15. The gap is bridged by taking the numerical value of the sign EŠ, “30”, and dividing it by 2. This is a repetition of the technique of lines 12–13 of an earlier section of this work (see above), and again it is not really clear how the 2 is obtained. Also, the point of explaining the sign EN as *bēl* is unclear. Thus, the first three lines connect 1st, 7th, and 15th. The last line of the section is probably connecting the three gods who have been identified with Sîn. The surviving part is based on what is probably a quotation: “Enlil (?) brother of Ea”. This makes sense since both gods are, in different contexts, described as “son of Anu”. Next, the compiler has probably invented a pair of lexical equations, the latter of which is clear in that two words for “brother” are identified. The first apparently explains Sîn’s name Nanna by equation with the Sumerian *šeš*. This may be a perversion of ŠEŠ.KI, the common Sumerian writing of the name Nanna. The last two equations of the line seem to identify Ea and Enlil. “River” (Sum. *íd*, Akk. *nāru*), which suggests Ea, god of the waters, can in the Akkadian term be equated with *Narru*, a name of Enlil (BWL 88 276 and note on p. 310).

A passage in a Harran inscription of Nabonidus is related to the theological paragraph and its development in *i-NAM giš-ḫur an-ki-a*:

- 14 . . . <sup>d</sup>30 *bēlu šá ilāni<sup>meš</sup> šá ina ud-1-kám*  
 15 KU <sup>d</sup>a-num *zi-kir-šu šamē<sup>e</sup> ta-laḫ-pa-tú*  
 16 *u eršetim<sup>tim</sup> ta-ḫe-ep-ḫu-ú ḫa-mi-im paraš(garza)*  
 17 <sup>d</sup>a-nū-ú-tú *mu-gam-mi-ir paraš(garza) <sup>d</sup>en-líl-ú-tú*  
 18 *le-qu-ú pa-ra-aš <sup>d</sup>é-a-ú-ti . . .*

AnSt 8 (1958) 60, text of H2.A; variants of H2B: *bēl ili; ud-1-kam; zi-kir-šu; ta-ḫe-ep-ḫu-u; <sup>d</sup>a-nū-tú; mu-gam-mi-ru pa-ra-aš; le-qu-u garza <sup>d</sup>idim-ú-tu.*

- 14 . . . Sîn, lord of the gods, whose name on the first day  
 15 is “Crescent (?), Anu”, which /you who disturb heaven and  
 16 shatter earth/underworld, who holds the function of  
 17 Anuship, who controls the function of Enlilship,  
 18 who lays hold on the function of Eaship . . .

(The sign KU in 15, as seen by von Soden apud Röllig, ZA 56 [1964] 231, must stand for *uskaru*, though there seems to be no other evidence of this. The two phrases in the subjunctive are difficult in having either a third-person feminine or second-person masculine subject of the verbs. Either Sîn is suddenly addressed in the second person, or perhaps *uskaru* is here feminine.)

This passage agrees with *i-NAM giš-ḫur an-ki-a* against the theological paragraph in assigning to Sîn the function of Anu on the first day, not for the first five days, but the spelling out of Sîn’s appropriation of the functions of Anu, Enlil, and Ea reads like a paraphrase of the last line of the theological paragraph, which is lacking from *i-NAM giš-ḫur an-ki-a*. Either the learned compiler of this royal inscription had access to both these texts, or he used documents which no longer survive.

This series *i-NAM giš-ḫur an-ki-a* is of course posterior to *Enūma Eliš*, though some at least of this kind of speculation goes back quite a long way. It is valuable as showing how *Enūma Eliš* was used by the ancient scholars and also as illustrating the significance attached to the division of the month.

(c) The obverse of TCL 6 14 lacks the beginning but sets in with the end of a section dealing with the phases of the moon. The text is given followed by the translation of A. Sachs (JCS 6 [1952] 67):

. . . ká]m bar ḪAB-rat ud-[ . . .  
 . . . ] ud-28-kám ud-ná-a ḪAB-rat i-[ra-bi]  
 . . . ] x ud-8-kám bar ḪAB-rat ud-16-kám ḪAB-rat x [ (x) ]  
 . . . ḪAB-ra]t ud-28-kám ud-ná-a ḪAB-rat i-ra-b[i]  
  
 . . . (on) the . . . ]th day: half of the lunar disc. (On) the [ . .th] day : [ . . .  
 . . . ] (On) the 28th day, the day-when-the-moon-disappears: the lunar disc is not [visible].  
 . . . ] (On) the 8th day: half of the lunar disc. (On) the 16th day: the lunar disc . [ . ]  
 [ (On) the . . th day: half of the lunar] disc. (On) the 28th day, the day-when-the-moon-disappears:  
 the lunar disc is not visible.

The striking thing here is the use of the 8th and 16th instead of the 7th and 15th days, as in the sources hitherto examined. In a civilization lacking means for precise measurement of the lunar disc, the phenomenon is not surprising, but mathematically it is unexpected. Half of 30 is 15, not 16.

The three sources just examined show that a variety of systems of the phases of the moon were in use in ancient Mesopotamia, and we do not know why the author of *Enūma Eliš* chose the 1st, 7th, and 15th days. Cultic reasons may have been a factor. During the Third Dynasty of Ur, these three days were èš-èš festivals, and by the Old Babylonian period, the 25th had been added to them (see *CAD eššešu*). The Old Babylonian *Atra-ḫasis* (I 206–7) reports Enki as proposing to establish a “washing” on the 1st, 7th, and 15th (*i-na ar-ḫi se-bu-ti ù ša-pa-at-ti*), and an Old Babylonian letter-writer instructs his correspondent: “observe the 1st, 7th, and 15th as you have been shown” (*ar-ḫa-am se-bu-ta-am ù ša-pa-at-tam ki-ma ku-ul-lu-ma-a-ta šu-ul-li-im*: TCL 1 50 28–31). From an earlier period (probably), the Lugalannemundu text in the course of describing the building and fitting out of a temple mentions the same three days in a broken list (*iti ud-7 ud-15-kam gál x x* [: PBS V 75 iii 7 = ZA 42 [1934] 42). Presumably, the reference is again cultic. Thus, whatever the reason of the author of *Enūma Eliš*, there are plenty of precedents.

The instruction about the phases of the moon conclude with details of Šîn’s activity with Šamaš at the time of the conjunction (V 23–26). Together, they were to act as judges in the underworld and to issue decrees which could also affect the living. This remarkable idea is found elsewhere. First, a Sumerian lament in which a son wishes his father well in the underworld:

<sup>d</sup>utu en’ gal a-ra-li-ke<sub>4</sub>  
 ki ku<sub>10</sub>-ku<sub>10</sub> u<sub>4</sub>-šè ù-mu-ni-in-ku<sub>4</sub> di-ku<sub>5</sub>-zu ì-ku<sub>5</sub>-dè  
<sup>d</sup>nanna-a u<sub>4</sub>-ná-a nam-zu ḫé-tar-re

Kramer, *Two Elegies on a Pushkin Museum Tablet* (Moscow, 1960) 18 88–90

Utu, great lord of the nether regions,  
 After turning the dark places to daylight will judge your case.  
 May Nanna decree your destiny on “the day of rest”.

It is not certain that the activities of the two gods were looked upon as contemporaneous, but certainly Nanna’s work alluded to here is the same as spoken of in the Epic. A later example occurs in an Akkadian *šulla*:

*bubbulu*(ud-ná-àm) u<sub>4</sub>-um ta-mit-ti-ka pi-riš-ti ilāni<sup>meš</sup> rabûti<sup>[meš]</sup>  
 Ebeling, *Handerhebung* 6 17

The *bubbulu* is the day or your oracle, a secret of the great gods.

A combined judgment of Sîn and Šamaš is known from a few passages, e.g.: “[At the] appearing of Sîn the gods assemble and kings bring their pure offerings and make obeisance. They wait for Nannaru-Sîn to settle or overthrow the lands, to set at peace or war. Apart from Sîn and Šamaš no other god in heaven answers ‘Yea’. Sîn without Šamaš does not . . . in heaven. Without Šamaš sceptre, throne, and rule . . . is not given to a king and his land” (KAR 19 obv.(!) 6ff. = Or. NS 23 [1954] 210). An Old Babylonian copy of a Sumerian hymn to Enlil uses the terms *i-dutu* and *i-dnanna* as cries of the oppressed (ZA 50 [1958] 78<sup>2</sup>), and the lexical series *Izi* = *išātu* lists the two in the same section with Akkadian translation, *iutû* and *inannû* (MSL XIII 161 22–28). These passages, it is true, do not limit the judgments to a particular time of the month, but when Sîn and Šamaš together are concerned, the middle or the end of the month seems the only possible time. A passage in Esarhaddon’s inscriptions probably assumes meetings of the two deities on both occasions:

<sup>d</sup>[sîn u <sup>d</sup>šam]aš ilāni<sup>meš</sup> maš-šu-û-te áš-[šu d]e-en kit-te ù  
 mi-šá-ri a-n[a māti] u niši<sup>meš</sup> šá-ra-ku arhi-š[a]m-ma ḥar-ra-an  
 kit-te ù mi-šá-ri šab-tu-ma ud-[x]-kám ud-14-kám ú-[s]a-di-ru ta-mar-tú  
 Borger, *Asarhaddon* 2 31–38

[Sîn and] Šamaš, the twin gods, to grant just and righteous  
 judgment to the peoples took the road of justice and righteousness  
 monthly and coordinated their appearance on the [x]th and the 14th days.

A variety of aspects of judgment is expressed in the passages quoted: judgment of the dead, decisions affecting the course of human history, and answers to the petitions of individual sufferers. The lines of the Epic are so damaged that no sure decision can be taken, but from what remains it seems that only the last aspect was used. This is not surprising since the dead have no part in the Epic, and to allow the sun and moon to decree the course of history would have taken something from Marduk’s prestige.

### ***The Duties of the Sun***

These were set forth in lines 27–46 of Tablet V, apart from the activity with Sîn just discussed. Unfortunately, only the beginnings of the lines remain, and all that can be learned is that the watches of day and night were dealt with.

### ***The Organization of the Earth***

The section dealing with Marduk’s arrangement of the lower part of Tiāmat’s body is both briefer than that about heaven, and fewer parallels can be adduced. This is a not unexpected phenomenon, as the organization of heaven was a traditional topic of mythology, as demonstrated, though none of the examples has any connection with Tiāmat’s body. Thus, in *Enūma Eliš* the only part of the body named in connection with the heavens is Tiāmat’s belly (*kabattu*: V 11), where Marduk located the height of heaven. The organization of earth was much more an invention of the author of the Epic, and here all the parts of Tiāmat’s body turn up: head, eyes, nostrils, udder, and tail. So far as the present writer has been able to find, only the eyes are mentioned elsewhere. According to V 55

of the Epic, the Euphrates and Tigris flow from Tiāmat's eyes. The expository text KAR 307, which has verbal reminiscences of the Epic, offers the extra detail as to which river came from which eye: <sup>id</sup>idiglat(hal-hal) inē<sup>II</sup> imitti(15)-šá <sup>id</sup>purattu<sup>ki</sup> inē<sup>II</sup> šumēli(150)-šá (rev. 3). An astronomical text in speaking of Cancer also knows that on the astral plans the Tigris is "right" and the Euphrates "left": I <sup>mul</sup>al.lu<sub>5</sub> nār <sup>d</sup>nin-gír-su kakkab-šú mahṛú<sup>u</sup> šá imitti(15) <sup>id</sup>idiglat šá šumēli(150) <sup>id</sup>purattu (VAT 9436 ii 8–9: AfO 14 [1941/44] pl. xvi). Since there is every reason to suppose that expository writers were conversant with the astronomical literature, it is quite possible that the passage in KAR 307 is a combination of *Enūma Eliš* and the astronomical datum. If this is so, it constitutes no independent testimony to the sources' identification with the eyes of Tiāmat.

## The Organization of the Pantheon

Marduk's organization of the gods is presented in the Epic as no less an achievement than his creative work. First, the Anunnaki are divided into two groups: 300 are assigned as guards in heaven, and 300 in the underworld, a total of 600 (VI 39–44). In gratitude, the Anunnaki build Babylon for Marduk, and when this is finished, the scene of his final glorification is set by the 50 great gods taking their seats therein and by the appointment, or confirmation, of seven destiny-decreeing gods (VI 80–81). So far as the Epic is concerned, there are two flies in the ointment. The first is that VI 69 offers a divergent number and nomenclature of the main groups. It ascribes "300 Igigi" to heaven, and "600" (sc. Anunnaki) to the Apsû, a total of 900. The difficulty is solved in that the offending line must be deleted as a gloss. It is a single line in a context written solidly in couplets, and it has no metre. Also, its source is known: it is based on the topography of Babylon which records that the city contained "300 daises for the Igigi and 600 for the Anunnaki": 5 gîš bára <sup>d</sup>gî-gî u 600(geš'u) bára an-nun-na-ki (BTT p. 68, 85).

A difficulty not so easily dealt with is the conflicting terminology in lines whose authenticity is in no doubt. To take one example only, and from the same tablet, Marduk in VI 20 asks the Anunnaki who was guilty of provoking the conflict, and in VI 27 "the Igigi, the great gods," reply. Light on this problem can only come from a historical study of similar material.

The closest approach to the organization of the pantheon in the Epic occurs in an Emesal litany as known from both unilingual and bilingual late copies:

|                                                                                                                                 |                                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| đim-me-er an-na đim-me-er ki-a<br><i>ilāni<sup>meš</sup> šá šamê<sup>e</sup> ilāni<sup>meš</sup> šá eršetim<sup>[tim]</sup></i> | Gods of heaven, gods of underworld, |
| đim-me-er gal-gal-la ninnu-ne-ne<br><i>ilāni<sup>meš</sup> rabûti<sup>meš</sup> ha-am-šat-su-nu</i>                             | The 50 great gods,                  |
| đim-me-er nam-tar-ra imin-ne-ne<br><i>ilāni<sup>meš</sup> ši-ma-a-ti si-bit-ti-šú-nu</i>                                        | The seven gods of destinies,        |
| <sup>d</sup> a-nun-na an-na mu-uš-5-bi<br><i><sup>d</sup>a-nun-na-ki šá šamê<sup>e</sup> 5 šu-ši</i>                            | The 300 Anunnaki of heaven,         |
| <sup>d</sup> a-nun-na ki-a mu-uš-10-bi<br><i><sup>d</sup>a-nun-na-ku ša er-se-tum ne-e-er-šú-nu</i>                             | The 600 Anunnaki of underworld.     |
| SBH p. 135 III 23ff. restored by p. 92 21ff. and p. 87 32ff. = SBP 164 32ff.                                                    |                                     |

The only difference from *Enūma Eliš* is that the lower group, as in the topography, number 600. This is, of course, a traditional text, so that no precise date of composition can be ascertained. There is, however, one Old Babylonian copy, and for the lines quoted it offers only:

|                                           |                                         |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| dīm-me-er an-na dingir ki-a               | Gods of heaven, gods of underworld,     |
| <sup>d</sup> a-nun-na an-na súg-súg-ge-eš | The Anunnaki of heaven are present,     |
| <sup>d</sup> a-nun-na ki-a súg-súg-ge-eš  | The Anunnaki of underworld are present. |

CT 42 pl. 5 v 40–42

Thus, it is only the post-Old Babylonian form of this litany which comes so close to *Enūma Eliš*.

In religious texts generally, mentions of the 50 great gods and the seven destiny-decreeing gods are rare. The only others known to the present writer occur in the Sumerian myth of Enlil and Ninlil:

|                                 |                              |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| dingir-gal-gal ninnu-ne-ne      | The 50 great gods,           |
| dingir-nam-tar-ra imin-na-ne-ne | The seven gods of destinies. |

H. Behrens, *Enlil and Ninlil* (Rome, 1978) ll. 56–57

and in a Late Old Babylonian copy of an incantation:

dingir-gal-gal-e-ne ninnu-<sup>r</sup>a<sup>1</sup>-ne-ne, dingir nam-tar imin-ne-ne  
OECT V 19 36–37

The “fifty gods” are mentioned in two broken and unhelpful Akkadian contexts: a small religious fragment from Ashurbanipal’s libraries ( ] <sup>r</sup>a<sup>1</sup>-šīr ilāni<sup>meš</sup> ḥa-<sup>r</sup>am<sup>1</sup>-šat-su-nu ina x [: Rm 401 3) and a Late Babylonian fragment of an expository text (ilāni<sup>meš</sup> ḥa-am-šat-su-nu gi-mir dū-a-bi-<sup>r</sup>šū-nu<sup>1</sup> x [: BM 46372 rev. 2). The same seven gods of destinies are almost certainly meant by “the Seven great Anunnaki” (*ra-bu-tum* <sup>d</sup>a-nun-na-ku si-bi-it-tam) in *Atra-ḫasīs* I 5, though it is less certain that “the Anunnaki, the seven judges” (<sup>d</sup>a-nun-na di-ku<sub>5</sub> imin-bi: JCS 5 [1951] 8 163) in the Sumerian *Descent of Inanna* are the same seven. The Old Babylonian personal name *se-ba-di-gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>* (*Bagh. Mitt.* 4 [1968] pl. 43 no. 66) is also relevant.

The problems of the Igigi and Anunnaki are more complex and extensive, covering their numbers and identities. Articles by Falkenstein and Kienast in *AS* 16 127ff. and 141ff. have presented much of the evidence and offered interpretations. Two articles by von Soden (*CRRA* XI [1964] 102ff. and *Iraq* 28 [1966] 140ff.) are more concerned with interpretation. The Sumerian evidence is clear and unambiguous: the Anunnaki are all the great gods generally, while Sumerian passages for Igigi (<sup>d</sup>nun-gal-e-ne), being late and few, are probably under Akkadian influence. The Akkadian evidence is not uniform, and its interpretation is still disputed. At first, in the Old Babylonian period, “Anunnaki” is used in the Sumerian sense to cover all the major deities of the pantheon, but later it is certainly restricted in some cases at least to the underworld gods. Igigi, according to Kienast and others, is first a synonym of Anunnaki, but later, when contrasted with Anunnaki as underworld gods, it is used for the gods of heaven. There are many middle and late passages which present Igigi and Anunnaki in parallelism, and Kienast tends to interpret them as offering synonymous parallelism when there is no clear indication of a distinction between them. Von Soden holds that Igigi and Anunnaki are often to be distinguished in the Old Babylonian period, and he suggests that at this time the Igigi may be a small group of from eight to ten of the most important members of the pantheon while later they are often a large group, the gods of heaven.

The evidence for a small group of Igigi is not extensive or convincing. The clearest item is the lexical equation of Igigi and *iširtum* (“the Ten”); see the note on *Enūma Eliš* I 103. However, this is immediately preceded by the equation of Kuribba and Iširtum, and there seems to be no other evidence whatsoever to support this. Elsewhere, the name <sup>d</sup>kur-ra-í-b-ba (with orthographic variations) is the name of a single deity. Also, the lexical entry was misunderstood even in the ancient world, since it is taken over in *Malku* = *Šarru* in a context of words for “shrine”. Thus, one cannot use this passage as evidence that generally in Akkadian texts the Igigi numbered ten. All kinds of rare and exotic items are attested in lexical texts only. Two passages in *Antagal* are even less sure evidence:

ú-sa      8    =   <sup>d</sup>ḫ-[gì-gì]  
 [i-]lim    9    =   <sup>d</sup>a-nun-na-ki  
                  MSL XVII 197 59–60

<sup>d</sup>6 : <sup>d</sup>7            =   a[n-nun-na-ki]  
<sup>d</sup>ZA.ZA (8)    =   <sup>d</sup>ḫ-gì-gì  
                  MSL XVII 218 218–20, cf. *Enūma Eliš* II 121 v.l.

It is highly probable that these are the mystical numbers of the two groups, not the numbers of members in each group, so that to take the latter alternative would be like postulating the existence of 30 moon-gods from Sîn’s number “30”. The longest list of these mystical numbers of individual gods is given in *i-NAM giš-ḫur an-ki-a* (A. Livingstone, MMEW, pp. 30–33) which deals with all the tens from 60 downwards and with 15, 11, and 6. The number 7 was in use (not as a mystical number) for the divine Heptad, so 8 and 9 were in fact available for use as in *Antagal*. If one insists nevertheless that the numbers are meant to give the number of members of the group, it must be observed that this seems to be the only evidence for 9 Anunnaki, so there is no assurance that 8 Igigi have wider validity. Of the literary passages quoted in favour of a small group, only one has some force: Panigin-garra is called “brother of the Anunnaki, the gods his brothers” (*ta-a-lim e-nu'-na-ki' i-li aḫ-ḫi-i-[š]u: JRAS Cent. Supp. [1924] pl. vi 8, copy e-U-na-DI*). It is difficult to suppose that—*si vera lectio*—300 or 600 brothers are meant. However, it is purposeless to draw attention to the 12 deities invoked in the curses of the *Code of Hammurabi* with the observation that if the 3 goddesses are identified the resulting total is 10. In more passages of Old Babylonian date, Kienast’s identification of Igigi and Anunnaki is correct. The Prologue to Hammurabi’s laws states that Anu and Enlil “exalted him (Marduk) among the Igigi”. An inscription of Samsu-iluna tells how the same two gods “called him (Marduk) with an exalted name among the Anunnaki” (RIME 4 p. 381, opening period). In the Old Babylonian *Atra-ḫasis* I 232–33, Nintu summons “the Anunnaki, the great gods”, whereupon “the Igigi, the great gods” do what is required. In III vi 6–7 of the same work, there is a similar deliberate equation of the two terms. Enlil, discovering that some humans had survived the flood, “was filled with anger at the Igigi” and said, “All we great Anunnaki decided together on an oath. . . .” He was angry with the great gods generally since only one of them (not one of another group) could have been responsible for this misfiring of the divine plan.

In general Kienast’s view holds for the Old Babylonian evidence, but the present writer is inclined to see in the ambiguous middle and late passages more often antithetic than synonymous parallelism, so that they will conform to the distinction: Igigi of heaven, Anunnaki of underworld. In Assyria, this distinction is first clearly observable in the royal inscriptions of Adad-nīrāri I, c. 1300 B.C.: “Igigi of

heaven, Anunnaki of underworld” (<sup>d</sup>i-gi-gu ša šamê<sup>e</sup> <sup>d</sup>a-nun-na-ku ša er-še-ti: RIMA I p. 134, 49–50). Dated Babylonian evidence is unhelpful. Burnaburiaš III calls Šamaš “lofty judge of the Anunnaki” (di-ku<sub>5</sub> maḥ <sup>d</sup>a-nun-na-ki: I R 4 no. 13), which could refer to all the major gods, or more probably to the underworld judges alone. An inscription of Kurigalzu II uses Igigi without casting light on their precise composition (quoted on p. 267, 2). Fragments of a stone statue of the same king quoted above use <sup>d</sup>nun-gal-a-ne(-er) in the refrain referring to gods associated with Anu and Enlil, then in Fragment C column iv <sup>d</sup>a-nun-na-ke<sub>4</sub>-ne occurs in connection with Nergal, though the value of this is diminished by the immediately following mention of Enlil and Ninlil. It is possible that the Anunnaki here are the underworld gods generally, but this does not guarantee that this inscription conformed to the late distinction between Igigi and Anunnaki throughout. The description of Enlil as “king of the Igigi” (lugal <sup>d</sup>nun-gal-e-ne) in an inscription of Kadašman-Turgu (BE 1 63) is equally uninformative. The evidence of the following Second Dynasty of Isin is not more helpful, but the *Erra Epic*, which most probably dates from about 900 B.C. (AfO 18 [1957/58] 400), consistently and certainly subscribes to the late distinction between the two groups.

So far as numbers go, 300 Igigi and 600 Anunnaki are found in the bilingual litany, the topography of Babylon and the related line of *Enūma Eliš*, as already quoted, and also in the expository text KAR 307, quoted below. This view has claim to be considered the orthodox Middle Babylonian view. In late royal inscriptions and late copies of literary texts, Igigi is often written <sup>d</sup>i-gì-gì with a plain numerical basis: i(á)-gí(š)-gí(š), or 5×(60+60) = 600, and less commonly <sup>d</sup>gíš-u: 60×10 = 600 (Kienast, op. cit. p. 142). The same writing <sup>d</sup>gíš-u also occurs in late texts and copies for “Anunnaki” (Kienast p. 143<sup>16</sup> and IV R<sup>2</sup> 33 iii 46: ABRT I 30 26; Ebeling, *Handerhebung* 28 13; *Erra* V 3 v.l.). Evidently, the concept of 300 above and 600 below began to yield in the first millennium to the more balanced idea of 600 above and the same number below. In respect of numbers, *Enūma Eliš* stands alone.

So far as the names go, *Enūma Eliš* is internally quite inconsistent, but this merely reflects its composite nature and the diverse uses of these terms over the course of Babylonian history. The main exposition of the pantheon in Tablet VI 39–46 uses Anunnaki in the Sumerian and Old Babylonian sense, of the major gods of heaven and underworld, and the term Igigi does not appear. Earlier in Tablet VI, 20–27, Marduk addresses the Anunnaki, and the Igigi reply. This is a deliberate equation of the two terms exactly as in the Old Babylonian *Atra-ḫasis*. In II 121 and V 85–86, both terms occur where, in the latter case especially, they seem intended as two separate groups. In the comments on Marduk’s sixth name (VI 143–146), not from the author of the Epic, but incorporated by him, the “dividing of stations” between the Igigi and Anunnaki is an indisputable example of the late usage.

### ***The Organization of the Heavenly Bodies***

The organization of the heavens and the earth already dealt with is only one of two schemes which the author of the Epic combines. The first one resulted from clearing up the debris of battle and supplied the heavenly bodies, the surface of the earth, and the atmospheric phenomena between them. The second scheme had the aim of housing the gods and of supplying the widest possible cosmic setting in which the city Babylon could be founded. This scheme is based on the cosmic locations of Anu, Enlil, and Ea as the three main levels of the universe, and it is introduced in Tablet

IV after the splitting of Tiāmat's body. The lowest level of the three was of course Ea's, and the Apsû had been there all the time and served as the model for the other two levels. Anu's level at the top is represented as the upper half of Tiāmat's body: at this point, the author is making a join of the two schemes. Both heaven, as Anu's abode, and Ešarra, which Marduk made for Enlil, are trimmed to match the Apsû, and the last two lines of Tablet IV state the result as a three-decker universe. When Marduk announces his plan to build Babylon in Tablet V, its location is stated in terms of this tripartite division of the universe. While the generalities are clear, the terminology has given much trouble in the past and needs careful study. The word *ašratu* in IV 141 and V 121 must be a fem. sing., as the suffix *-šá* in the latter case proves. The former line offers a parallelism which suggests that in some way it indicates heaven, and this makes excellent sense in Tablet V. There is a word *ašru* = *šamû* in VII 135 and both Commentaries, and apparently it is a fem. form of that. An incantation quoted below (p. 505) mentions clay taken from the *ašratu* of the Apsû. According to Babylonian conceptions, clay forms the roof of the Apsû, being that into which one digs down from the surface of the earth. It is therefore to the Apsû what the heavens are to the universe. The second difficult word is *ešgallu* in IV 144–45. Literally “big house,” it is used for the underworld in two lexical texts cited *sub voce* in CAD. Since the author never equipped his universe with an underworld, he allows some interchange in terms for Apsû and underworld, as when in V 125 the underworld gods are invited to come up from the Apsû. Thus, *ešgallu* refers to the Apsû, used in IV 143–44 for elegant variation. A comparison of IV 145 with V 119–21 leaves no doubt on this point. Finally, Ešarra has been the biggest puzzle. The ancient commentator took it up at its first occurrence (IV 144): “the house which, as a replica (*meh[ret]*) [of the Apsû] is set [ . . . ] the earth.” Only two alternatives exist for the second missing word, “on” or “above.” The chiastic order of the couplet IV 145–46 shows that Ešarra was the abode of Enlil, located between those of Anu above and Ea beneath. Tablet V 119–21 confirms this general location and adds the detail that Marduk's own abode, Babylon, was to be likewise above the Apsû, below the heavens, and *mehret* (“a replica of”? or “opposite”?) Ešarra. Since these lines are locating the future Babylon, “opposite” is clearly correct, though the other sense occurs elsewhere in the Epic. But “opposite” in which sense? Ešarra was the name of the Enlil temple in Nippur, and Nippur and Babylon could perhaps be conceived as opposite. But this is excluded by the further occurrence in Tablet VI 66, where Marduk is seated in Esagil and looks up at its pinnacles *šuršiš ešarra*, “toward the base of Ešarra.” Thus, Ešarra is above Esagil and is a lower heaven, Anu's being the higher.

Confirmation of this interpretation comes from the only other account of the levels of the Babylonian universe. It is incorporated in one of the Late Syncretistic Texts, KAR 307 obv. 30ff., and one of the sources used in its compilation survives intact in another late compilation, AfO 19 (1959/60) pl. XXXIII iv 20–22. These two texts are distinguished here as A and B:

- A *šamû<sup>ú</sup> elûti<sup>ti</sup> na<sup>4</sup>lu-lu-da-ni-tú ša<sup>d</sup>a-nim*  
 B [*šamû<sup>ú</sup>] elûtum<sup>tum</sup> na<sup>4</sup>lu-lu-da-ni-tum šá<sup>d</sup>a-nim*  
 A 5 *gîš<sup>d</sup> gî-gî-gî ina lib-bi ú-š[e-šib]*  
 A *šamû<sup>ú</sup> qablûti<sup>ti</sup> na<sup>4</sup>sag-gil-mut ša<sup>d</sup>í-gî-gî*  
 B [*šamû<sup>ú</sup>] qablûtum<sup>tum</sup> na<sup>4</sup>sag-gil-mut šá<sup>d</sup>í-gî-gî*  
 A *be-lum ina libbi paramahhi i-na lib-<sup>r</sup>bi<sup>1</sup> i-na parak uqnî*  
*ú-šib<sup>giš</sup> bu-ši-<sup>(in)</sup> na<sup>4</sup>el-me-ši ina libbi ú-nam-mir*  
 A *šamû<sup>ú</sup> šaplûti<sup>meš</sup> na<sup>4</sup>aš-pu-u ša<sup>d</sup> <kakkabāni<sup>meš</sup>>*

- B ṣamū<sup>u1</sup> ṣaplūtum<sup>tim</sup> na<sup>4</sup>aš-pu-u šá kakkabāni<sup>meš</sup>  
 A mul<sup>lu</sup>-ma-ši ša ilāni<sup>meš</sup> ina muḥḥi e-ṣir  
 A [ina dan]nat(ka) la-ga eršetim<sup>tim</sup> elīti zi-qi-qu amēlūtu(nam-lú-u<sub>18</sub>-lu) ina libbi ú-šar-bi-iš  
 A [ina dann]at(-ga) eršetim<sup>tim</sup> [qabl]ītu<sup>tu</sup> dea(diš) abī-šú ina libbi ú-še-šib [ . . . ] x si-ḥu ul ú-maš-ši  
 A [ina dannat eršetim]<sup>tim</sup> ṣaplūtu<sup>u1</sup> nēr(geš<sup>u</sup>) d<sup>r</sup>a-nun-na-ki<sup>1</sup> [ina] lib-bi e-sir [ . . . ] bu x x [ . . . ]  
 šá na<sup>4</sup>aš-pu-u

The upper heavens are *luludānītu*-stone, of An,  
 he [settled] the 300 Igigi therein.

The middle heavens are *saggilmūt*-stone, of the Igigi,  
 Bēl sat therein on the lofty dais in the chamber of lapis lazuli,  
 he lit a wick of *elmešu*-stone.

The lower heavens are jasper, of the stars,  
 he drew the constellations of the gods thereon.

[On the base] of the upper earth he made frail humanity to lie down.

[On the base] of the middle earth he settled his father Ea [ . . . ] . he did not distinguish . .

[On the base] of the lower [earth] he confined the 600 Anunnaki [ . . . ] . . [ . . . ] of jasper.

The basic scheme here is of three heavens and three earths (“earth” in Babylonian also means “underworld”). The three heavens in A combine two separate traditions, the first of which appears independently in B. This names the different precious stones of which the three tiers were composed and incidentally parallels *Enūma Eliš* V 119, which states that the Apsū was made of such a stone (see the note ad loc.). The occupants of the three heavens in the two traditions are:

|           |                    |
|-----------|--------------------|
| Anu       | The 300 Igigi      |
| The Igigi | Bēl                |
| The Stars | The Constellations |

Basically, these differ from *Enūma Eliš* only in terminology. It calls the highest level simply “heaven”, the middle level “Ešarra”, and the level of the stars is described but has particular designation. Only one tradition for the three “earth” is given, and their occupants are:

|                                     |
|-------------------------------------|
| Mankind                             |
| Ea (i.e., the Apsū)                 |
| The Anunnaki (i.e., the underworld) |

This tradition which offers all six cosmic levels can be compared with *Enūma Eliš*. It appears that both rest on a common foundation which can be reconstructed as follows: Anu, Enlil, Stars, Earth (in our sense), Apsū, Underworld.

That Anu belonged to the highest heaven is in no doubt. *Enūma Eliš* and the briefer syncretistic tradition directly so affirm. The other syncretistic tradition probably included Anu in the 300 Igigi, for reasons which will appear below. The “heavens of Anu” are often mentioned in religious texts, and *Gilgameš* XI 115 proves that it was the highest, because at the time of the flood the gods in terror “ascended to the heavens of Anu.” Enlil’s abode in a lower heaven is plainly taught by *Īt Mēseri* II 43–44 (AfO 14 [1941/44] 142):

šamē<sup>e</sup> ša-lal-ti-šū-nu šu-ut d<sup>a</sup>-nim šu-ut d<sup>en</sup>-líl šu-ut d<sup>é</sup>-a

The three heavens, of Anu, of Enlil, of Ea.

If Anu's is on top, Enlil's cannot but be lower. Our interpretation similarly makes Ešarra in *Enūma Eliš* a lower heaven for Enlil. The fuller syncretistic tradition assigns Marduk to the middle heaven, replacing of course Enlil. The Epic and both syncretistic traditions put the stars on the third level. It is uncertain if *Bīt Mēseri* intended the lowest heaven in its literal sense to be Ea's, or if by an extension of meaning the Apsû is the "heaven" of Ea. It may be relevant that the ENGUR sign, which normally refers to the Apsû, is explained as "heaven" in lists with the pronunciation *zi-ku-um* (II R 50 27 cd) and '*zi-ku*'-mu (MSL XIV 215, 236). There is a little confusion at the bottom of the reconstructed prototype because *Enūma Eliš*, as already explained, has no underworld and the gods who should dwell there are most commonly assigned to the Apsû, but a few times, apparently by inadvertence, the term "underworld" (*eršetu*) is used. There are, indeed, other evidences of the abode of the shades and of subterranean cosmic waters being mixed up in Mesopotamian thinking, but if one clearly distinguishes between them and asks which comes above and which beneath the other, the only possible answer is that the Apsû is on top, since springs of water were conceived to be supplied from the Apsû. While, then, the syncretistic tradition on this point stands alone, there is no reason to suspect that it was aberrant.

This organization of the cosmos which we have just reconstructed must have been current in Babylon at the end of the second millennium, and it is instructive to note how the two derived forms of it express Marduk's supremacy. The syncretistic tradition, probably later than *Enūma Eliš*, excludes both Anu and Enlil from mention, though the former may conceivably be included in the 300 Igigi. Marduk is put in Enlil's place, even though this is only in the second heaven. Ea is kept in the Apsû, but, contrary to *Enūma Eliš*, his position there was assigned to him by Marduk. The Epic rather strangely keeps Anu, Enlil, and Ea just where they were in tradition. Marduk's position is on earth in Esagil, and this is probably the author's most shocking innovation. Quite generally in ancient Mesopotamian religion, the gods were conceived to have an other-worldly home, above or beneath the world of men, and their occupation of temples on the earth did not affect this in any way. The Israelite parallel of Yahweh, who lived in the heavens yet set his name in Jerusalem, is fully valid for Babylonian religion. Yet the scheme of *Enūma Eliš* gives Marduk no other home than Esagil. He resided there, at the central point of the whole universe, to which from time to time the gods from above and below would assemble. This conception gave to the city of Babylon a prestige which no other city could then match. Thus, the whole purpose of the author in describing the various parts of the universe is to lead up to Babylon, though the scheme copies Enlil and Nippur of earlier times.

Just as the heavens (of Anu) and Ešarra were trimmed to match the Apsû in Marduk's work at the end of Tablet IV, so when the gods built Esagil for their master, it too was patterned on the Apsû (VI 62). This doctrine became officially accepted for the royal inscriptions of the Sargonids of Assyria and the Late Babylonian kings, with, however, two qualifications. Just as Nabû had by this time attained equality with his father, his city and temple, Borsippa and Ezida, shared the cosmic status of Babylon; and with the decline of Enlil in the face of the rising power of Marduk and Nabû, Ešarra became just a synonym for heaven in general. The following passages show the position:

|                                                                                 |                                      |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <sup>uru</sup> <i>bār-sipa</i> <sup>ki</sup> <i>a-na šá-ma-mi ki-i ma-ši[l]</i> | How Borsippa is like the heavens,    |
| <i>šin-na-at šá é-šár-ra šá-qu-ú é-zi-da</i>                                    | Lofty Ezida is the double of Ešarra. |
| ZA 53 (1959) 237 1–2                                                            |                                      |

ma-aṭ-lat apsî      tam-šil é-šár-ra  
mé-eḥ-ret šu-bat <sup>d</sup>é-a      tam-šil <sup>mul</sup>ikû(dil-gán)

Borger, *Asarhaddon* p. 21, Ep. 26 A; cf. *AnBib* 12 (1959) 265

(Esagil) a reflection of the Apsû, the likeness of Ikû.

The parallelism here is very revealing, though one may doubt whether the star Ikû and Ešarra are fully synonymous. In astrology, Ikû is the heavenly Babylon. A prayer addressed to Esagil during the New Year rites of Late Babylonian times begins:

<sup>mul</sup>ikû é-sag-il tam-šil šamê u eršetim  
Thureau-Dangin, *Rit. acc.* 136 274

Ikû-Esagil, the likeness of heaven and underworld.

Other passages of the royal inscriptions give the counterparts separately. Etemenanki is “a replica of Ešarra” (gaba-ri é-šár-ra: VAB IV 62 iii 19 = WVD OG 59 [1967] 43 iii 28) according to Nabopolassar, and Esagil “a replica of the Apsû” (gaba-ri ap-se(-e): VAB VII 300 10; AfO 13 [1940] 205 14), according to Ashurbanipal. Thus, in late times the doctrine of *Enūma Eliš* has been both accepted and modified. *Tintir* offers these two items together: Esagil is gaba-ri zu-ab, and Etemenanki gaba-ri é-šár-ra: IV 1–2.

### **Babylon as the First City<sup>15</sup>**

The concept of Babylon as the first city arose quite naturally in the Cassite period. There was a tradition of first cities among the Sumerians, but, consonant with their greater tolerance, a list of five is given in the Sumerian prototype of the Atra-ḥasīs Epic and in some copies of the Sumerian King List. Eridu heads the list, followed by Badtibira, Larak, Sippar, and Shuruppak. A reflection of this tradition is seen in the use of the title uru ul = *āl šāti*, “primeval city,” which is used of Sippar in the 43rd year name of Hammurabi (ed. Horsnell, *Year-Names*), in an inscription of Samsu-iluna (RIME 4 p. 376 8–9); the *Erra Epic* IV 50; and in a religious text of uncertain date (KAR 109 obv. 9). This same title is used of Babylon by one of the Kurigalzus (RA 29 [1932] 98 4). Babylon had taken over the tradition that previously belonged to Eridu. This is certain because even the name Eridu is used for Babylon. The clearest evidence is contained in the series *Erim-ḥuš* V 25: eri<sub>4</sub>-du<sub>10</sub> = *ba-bi-il-ú* (MSL XVII 68). When Nebuchadnezzar I calls himself “regent of Eridu” (*šakkanak* eri<sub>4</sub>-du<sub>10</sub>: BBSt p. 31 3), he means of course Babylon. Similarly, in a catalogue of texts and authors two members of one of the best known scribal families of Babylon are described as “scholar of Eridu” (<sup>lu</sup>um-me-a eri<sub>4</sub>-du<sub>10</sub>: JCS 16 [1962] 67 VII 2, 4). Already in 1911, Pinches had made this deduction from the use of NUN<sup>ki</sup> for Babylon (PSBA 33 [1911] 161 and 35 [1913] 154), and no doubt the use of Eridu in late colophons, as in “original of Eridu” (gaba-ri eri<sub>4</sub>-du<sub>10</sub><sup>ki</sup>: TDP pl. XXXIX), is to be explained in the same way. Finally, a creation myth juxtaposes Eridu and Esagil, a fact which has caused unnecessary difficulties (see p. 367).

15. For further literature on this general topic, see TCS 3 p. 58, note on 41; W. W. Hallo, JCS 23 (1971) 57–67; BTT pp. 251–53.

Other expressions of the supremacy of the city Babylon circulated in ancient Mesopotamia but were not taken up in the Epic. What was called the Weidner Chronicle, but is now known to be a literary composition in the form of a letter from one king to another, is relevant. See the latest edition in J. J. Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles* (Atlanta, 2004) pp. 263–68. The damaged opening refers to a temple (presumably Esagil) and Babylon at the beginning of history, with, of course, Marduk in charge, though Anu and Enlil still appear to have overall control. Similarly, the topography of Babylon includes, as one of its titles, “creation of Enlil” ([n]am-mud [G]UD<sup>har</sup> = *bi-nu-tu* <sup>d</sup>*en-líl*: *Tintir* I 42).<sup>16</sup> The antiquity of the idea that Enlil had some connection with Babylon is proved by the names of the two city walls of Babylon, the inner being Imgur-Enlil, the outer Nēmet-Enlil (*Tintir* V 57–58 and *BTT* pp. 343–51). The two names are first attested only in Late Assyrian times, but part of one survives from the Second Isin Dynasty (*dūr im-gur*-[ (BE 1 148 II [cont.] 7), and such names are likely to be of great antiquity. If they were late inventions the name of Enlil would not have been chosen. Still more remarkable is a passage in a hymn of praise to the city of Babylon:

|   |                                                       |                                                      |
|---|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| 6 | nibru <sup>ki</sup> uru <sup>d</sup> <i>en-líl-lá</i> | <i>ni-ip-pu-ru ál</i> <sup>d</sup> <i>enlil</i> (BE) |
|   | tin-tir <sup>ki</sup> ša-ge-túm-ke <sub>4</sub>       | <i>ba-bi-lu bi-bíl lib-bi-šú</i>                     |
| 8 | nibru <sup>ki</sup> tin-tir <sup>ki</sup>             | <i>ni-ip-pu-ru ba-bi-lu</i>                          |
|   | umuš-bi dili-àm                                       | <i>tè-em-šu-nu ištēn-ma</i>                          |

W. G. Lambert in M. de J. Ellis (ed.), *Nippur at the Centennial* (Philadelphia, 1992), p. 123

Nippur is the city of Enlil, Babylon is his delight,  
Nippur and Babylon are as one.

This spirit of co-existence is far from the sophisticated polemic of *Enūma Eliš*, whose author could have looked on it only with disgust. The existence of such ideas in his time may explain one curious phenomenon. Despite the importance he placed on the centrality of Babylon, a whole class of terms expressing the idea is lacking from the Epic. The topography, for example, has “bond of the lands” (*dim-kur-kur-ra*<sup>ki</sup> = *ri-kis ma-ta-a-ta* : *Tintir* I 51) and “bond of the heavens” (*sa-an-na*<sup>ki</sup> = *mar-kás šamê*: *ibid.* I 6). Such terms originally belonged to Nippur and were connected—rightly or wrongly—with the myth according to which Nippur was the last point at which heaven and earth were joined. The lack of such expressions from the Epic, when they would have suited it so appositely, suggests that the author consciously avoided them as associated with the hated Nippur. He was following the traditions of Eridu.

The cosmic centrality of Babylon is asserted in a letter from a Babylonian official to an Assyrian counterpart about the imminent arrival of the king of Assyria (Esarhaddon?) in Babylon:

*ki-i šá a-na ká-dingir-ra*<sup>ki</sup> *i-ter-ba qabla šá kur-kur ik-ta-ba-as*  
ABL 588 obv. 10–12

When he has entered Babylon he will have trodden on the centre of the lands.

16. Collated. The reading of GUD as *har* is also attested in *Ea* and *Aa*, see MSL XIV 360 130–31 and 380 13–15. However, the citation of <sup>d</sup>*nin-EZEN*×GUD is whimsical, when it is to be read *Nin-gublaga*, and the gloss *ba har*, though it fits Enlil, might be nothing but an attempt to explain the otherwise unknown GUD as a name of Enlil.

# Babylonian Creation Myths

W. G. Lambert

Winona Lake, Indiana

EISENBRAUNS

2013

© Copyright 2013 Eisenbrauns

All rights reserved.  
Printed in the United States of America.

www.eisenbrauns.com

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Enuma elish. English.

Babylonian creation myths / W. G. Lambert.

pages cm. — (Mesopotamian civilizations ; 16)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-57506-247-1 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Creation. 2. Cosmology, Babylonian. 3. Akkadian language—Texts. I. Lambert, W. G. (Wilfred G.) II. Enuma elish. III. Title.

PJ3771.E5.E3 2013

892'.1—dc23

2013020960