

Divine Assemblies in Early Greek and Mesopotamian Narrative Poetry

Bernardo Ballesteros Petrella

Balliol College

D.Phil in Classical Languages and Literature

University of Oxford

Trinity Term 2017

## Abstract

### Divine Assemblies in Early Greek and Mesopotamian Narrative Poetry

Bernardo Ballesteros Petrella, Balliol College

D.Phil in Classical Languages and Literature

Trinity Term 2017

This thesis charts divine assembly scenes in ancient Mesopotamian narrative poetry and the early Greek hexameter corpus, and aims to contribute to a cross-cultural comparison in terms of literary systems. The recurrent scene of the divine gathering is shown to underpin the construction of small- and large-scale compositions in both the Sumerian-Akkadian and early Greek traditions. Parts 1 and 2 treat each corpus in turn, reflecting a methodological concern to assess the comparanda within their own context first. Part 1 (Chapters 1-4) examines Sumerian narrative poems, and the Akkadian narratives *Atra-ḫasīs*, *Anzû*, *Enūma eliš*, *Erra and Išum* and the *Epic of Gilgameš*. Part 2 (Chapters 5-8) considers Homer's *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, the *Homeric Hymns* and Hesiod's *Theogony*. The comparative approaches in Part 3 are developed in two chapters (9-10). Chapter 9 offers a detailed comparison of this typical scene's poetic morphology and compositional purpose. Relevant techniques and effects, a function of the aural reception of literature, are shown to overlap to a considerable degree. Although the Greeks are unlikely to have taken over the feature from the Near East, it is suggested that the Greek divine assembly is not to be detached from a Near Eastern context. Because the shared elements are profoundly embedded in the Greek orally-derived poetic tradition, it is possible to envisage a long-term process of oral contact and communication fostered by common structures. Chapter 10 turns to a comparison of the literary pantheon: a focus on the organisation of divine prerogatives and the chief god figures illuminates culture-specific differences which can be related to historical socio-political conditions. Thus, this thesis seeks to enhance our understanding of the representation of the gods in Mesopotamian poetry and early Greek epic, and develops a systemic approach to questions of transmission and cultural appreciation.

Word-count: *ca.* 99,800 words.

## Acknowledgments

First I wish to thank my parents for their support and encouragement. This work has benefited from several Balliol College maintenance grants, from the Roy Skinner Fund, the Domus Fund, the Derby Fund, the Brand Fund, and the Balliol Society Bursary scheme. I am grateful to the Faculty of Classics, Ms Juliane Kerkhecker, Balliol College and Dr Adrian Kelly for opportunities to teach as MILC Language Instructor and Teaching Assistant in ancient Greek and Latin. The Faculty of Classics funded my participation to the Venice International Seminar in the Humanities (2015-16), and to conferences in Naples, Leeds and Nijmegen through a T.W. Greene award and DGS grants. I wish to thank audiences there and in Oxford (on several occasions) for helping me develop and sharpen my thoughts.

My supervisors Dr Adrian Kelly and Dr Frances Reynolds have been invaluable for their scholarly thoroughness and personal support, and incredibly patient with my English. The Faculty of Classics and the Oriental Institute provided an ideal environment for pursuing the present interdisciplinary attempt. I studied Akkadian with Dr Frances Reynolds and Sumerian with Dr Jacob Dahl and Dr Marie-Christine Ludwig, to all of whom I am deeply grateful. I also profited from the Cuneiform Reading Group convened by Dr Christopher Metcalf, who gave initial directions and punctual advice during these years. Dr Marie-Christine Ludwig gave crucial help with the Sumerian material treated in Chapter 1; Prof Robert Parker kindly read and commented on Chapter 10. I had fruitful conversations with Dr Stephanie Dalley and, on Sanskrit epic, with Dr Krešimir Vuković and Dr Nick Allen.

Thanks are due to the following scholars for providing me with forthcoming or unpublished works: Dr Stephanie Dalley, Dr Adrian Kelly, Dr Christopher Metcalf, Dr Min Suc-Kee and Dr Selena Wisnom. For their timely comments and suggestions, I am grateful to my assessors for the Transfer of Status, Dr Bruno Currie and Prof Richard Rutherford, and for the Confirmation of Status, Dr Felix Budelmann and Dr Jacob Dahl. I am entirely responsible for the contents of the thesis, and for any remaining infelicities and shortcomings.

My final thanks are for Irene, who read every word, and without whom this would have been impossible, to say the least.

## Contents

Conventions.....	i
Introduction .....	1
PART 1: THE MESOPOTAMIAN TRADITION .....	10
Preliminary remarks .....	10
Chapter 1: Sumerian poems.....	13
§1. Divine narratives.....	14
§1.1. Final exaltation.....	15
§1.2. Halfway through the plot.....	17
§1.3. <i>Lugale's</i> structuring assemblies.....	18
§2. Human narratives .....	20
§2.1. Lugalbanda's offering.....	20
§2.2. The Sumerian Adapa.....	21
§2.3. Death of Bilgames .....	24
§2.4. The Sumerian <i>Flood Story</i> .....	28
§3. City-Laments .....	31
§4. Concluding remarks: narrative function and scene structure.....	33
Chapter 2: <i>Atra-ḫasīs</i> .....	35
§1. Manuscript tradition and synopsis .....	35
§2. Narrative theology and the Sumerian tradition.....	37
§3. Divine assemblies .....	39
§3.1. Igīgū's revolt (OB 1).....	40
§3.1.1. Rebellion (1.39-69).....	40
§3.1.2. Enlil's reaction (1.70-165) .....	40
§3.1.3 Crisis and resolution (1.166-248) .....	42
§3.2. Mankind's destruction (OB 1-2).....	45
§3.2.1. Enlil's three measures (OB 1.354-2.iv).....	45
§3.2.3. Assembly for the Flood (2.v-vii).....	48
§3.3. The Flood (OB 3).....	52
§3.3.1. The Gods above the Flood (3.iii-iv) .....	52
§3.3.2. <i>Atra-ḫasīs'</i> assembly (3.vi-viii).....	54
§4. Concluding remarks .....	57
Chapter 3: <i>Anzû, Enūma eliš, Erra and Išum</i> .....	58
§1. <i>Anzû</i> .....	58
§1.1. Manuscript tradition, synopsis .....	58
§1.2. Cultural and literary context.....	60

§1.3. Divine assemblies.....	62
§1.3.1. Considering Anzû (SB 1.21-60).....	62
§1.3.2. Appointing Ninurta (SB 1.87 - 2.29 ≈ OB 1.6 - 2.74).....	63
§1.3.3. Fetching Ninurta (SB 3.24-48).....	65
§1.3.4. Fourth assembly?.....	65
§1.4. Concluding remarks .....	66
§2. <i>Enūma eliš</i> .....	66
§2.1. Manuscript tradition, synopsis, dating .....	66
§2.2. <i>Chaoskampf</i> , genealogy and collective context .....	69
§2.3. Divine assemblies.....	71
§2.4. Concluding remarks .....	74
§3. <i>Erra and Išum</i> .....	74
§3.1. Manuscript tradition .....	74
§3.2. Erra and the gods, synopsis .....	75
§3.3. Divine assemblies.....	77
§3.3.1. Restoring Marduk's apparel (2.1-115).....	78
§3.3.2. Erra's return (5.1-21) .....	81
§3.4. Concluding remarks .....	82
Chapter 4: <i>Gilgameš</i> .....	83
§1. The manuscript tradition .....	83
§1.1. Synopsis of SB <i>Gilgameš</i> .....	83
§1.2. Old Babylonian evidence .....	85
§1.3. Middle Babylonian evidence.....	86
§1.4. Standard Babylonian evidence .....	86
§2. Suffering, knowledge, civilisation .....	87
§3. Divine assemblies .....	89
§3.1. Creation of Enkidu (SB 1.79-104) .....	89
§3.2. Death of Enkidu (SB 7.[1-25 <sup>?</sup> ]).....	94
§3.3. Ūta-napišti's assembly (SB 11.161-205).....	97
Concluding Remarks to Part 1 .....	101
PART 2: EARLY GREEK EPIC .....	103
Preliminary Remarks .....	103
Chapter 5: <i>Iliad</i> .....	106
§1. Book 1: Divine strife (1.533-611).....	108
§2. Book 4: Divine pacts (4.1-74).....	110
§3. Book 5: Diomedes' aristeia (5.367-430, 868-906).....	111
§4. Book 7: The Achaean wall (7.442-63).....	113

§5. Book 8: Zeus in action (8.1-46, 438-84).....	114
§6. Book 15: Here's last attempt (15.84-150).....	116
§7. Book 20: Divine harmony and the <i>Theomachy</i> (20.4-31).....	117
§8. Book 20: Aineias' fate (20.114-52; 291-320). .....	120
§9. Book 22: Hektor's doom (22.166-87) .....	121
§10. Book 24: The ransom of Hektor (24.22-82; 98-120).....	122
Concluding remarks .....	125
Chapter 6: <i>Odyssey</i> .....	127
§1. Foundational perspectives ( <i>Od.</i> 1.16-96).....	129
§1.1. Setting the scene (1.11-28).....	129
§1.2. The long dialogue (1.28-96).....	130
§2. Sending Hermes (5.1-49) .....	134
§2.1. Setting the scene: the end of the Telemachy (4.624-847).....	136
§2.2. The short dialogue (5.1-27).....	137
§2.3. Zeus' predicting command (5.28-41) .....	140
§3. About Hephaistos' bed (8.304-59) .....	141
§3.1. Summons and address (8.304-20) .....	142
§3.2. The divine reaction (8.321-43).....	143
§3.3. Poseidon the arbiter (8.344-59).....	144
§4. The cattle of Helios (12.374-90).....	144
Concluding remarks .....	147
Chapter 7: Homeric Hymns .....	149
§1. <i>Hymn to Apollo</i> .....	151
§1.1. Exordium: arrival with bow (1-13) .....	153
§1.2. The caring goddesses (92-108) .....	155
§1.3. Second exordium: arrival with <i>kitharis</i> (182-206).....	155
§1.4. Here and Typhoeus (305-55).....	156
§2. <i>Hymn to Hermes</i> .....	159
Concluding remarks .....	162
Chapter 8: <i>Theogony</i> .....	164
§1. Zeus and the Muses ( <i>Th.</i> 68-75) .....	166
§2. Zeus and the breed of Styx ( <i>Th.</i> 383-403) .....	167
§3. Zeus and the Hundred-Handers ( <i>Th.</i> 639-64) .....	170
§3.1. Setting the scene (639-43).....	172
§3.2. An easy agreement? .....	172
§4. Distributing the <i>timai</i> (881-85) .....	175
Concluding Remarks to Part 2.....	178

PART 3: COMPARATIVE APPROACHES .....	180
Chapter 9. The Encounter of Traditions: a Formal Comparison .....	180
§1. Beginnings .....	186
§1.1. Standard Assemblies: Unmarked, Perception, Arrival.....	189
§1.2. Gathering Assemblies .....	193
§1.3. Combinatory flexibility .....	194
§2. Core.....	195
§2.1. Patterns of speech.....	195
§2.2. Narrative interventions.....	199
§3. Outcomes .....	201
§3.1. Accomplished Assemblies .....	201
§3.2. Departure Assemblies .....	202
§4. Structural connections.....	203
§4.1. Successive Assemblies.....	204
§4.2. Large-scale structural connections .....	205
§5. The question of transmission .....	211
§5.1. Direct imitations? .....	212
§5.2. Greek divine assemblies: a borrowing? .....	214
§5.3. Near Eastern interfaces.....	217
Chapter 10: On Cosmic Order .....	228
§1. Greek <i>timai</i> and Zeus' order.....	231
§2. Mesopotamian divine powers, destinies, divine kingship .....	239
§3. Family matters .....	248
§4. The socio-political background .....	251
§5. Gilgameš and Akhilleus.....	256
Concluding remarks .....	260
Conclusion .....	263
Bibliography .....	271
Abbreviations, sigla, editions.....	271
References.....	274

## Conventions

Transliterated or normalised Sumerian words are in upright format (unken), Akkadian in italics (*puḫru*). The transliteration of cuneiform texts in different languages has been uniformed by deploying diacritics instead of index-numbers (è not e<sub>3</sub>), as is customary in Akkadian studies. Readings of Old Babylonian signs for Sumerian follow Mittermayer and Attinger (2006). Conventions for the transliteration of the cuneiform passages quoted in the main text follow the practice in George (2003). Note however that partially legible signs appear under upper half brackets, not crossed by a square bracket (<sup>1</sup>lu not [l]u), though the latter use may appear in the footnotes if a scholar's reading is being cited.

The footnotes provide critical discussion and document cases where my reading differs from the reference edition. A catalogue of abbreviations, sigla and reference editions stands at the end of the thesis, though note that abbreviations for Greek and Latin authors not in that list generally follow those of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (4th edition). Translations are my own unless otherwise specified, although my debt to editors and standard translations (especially ETCSL and Foster 2005) will be felt throughout. Greek words are occasionally transliterated, without marking vowel-length. Most of the Greek names follow the Greek of archaic epic (Akhilleus and Here, not Achilles and Hera, though note e.g. Helen, not Helene). The term *epos* is meant to encompass the surviving early Greek hexameter poetry, including the Homeric poems, the *Homeric Hymns*, Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, the Hesiodic fragments and what remains of the *Epic Cycle*.

## Introduction

This thesis analyses the scenes of divine assembly in ancient Mesopotamian narrative poetry and the early Greek hexameter corpus, and aims to contribute to the cross-cultural comparison of ancient poetry in terms of literary systems.

After a foundational phase of extensive parallel-collection and framing of questions, championed by W. Burkert and M. L. West,<sup>1</sup> current scholarship on the literary relations between archaic Greece and the Near East confronts crucial issues on the mechanisms of transmission and the significance of comparative readings.<sup>2</sup> With the exception of the Hebrew Bible, most of the surviving Near Eastern literature (Babylonian, Hurro-Hittite, Levantine) was composed in the Bronze Age. On the other hand, we have lost the Phoenician, Aramaic and Anatolian products which the Greeks possibly heard (and/or read) while the Greek epic corpus took shape in the early first millennium.<sup>3</sup> The gaps outnumber the remains; hence the very different approaches of contemporary scholarship.

The current debate seems largely to have overcome the limits imposed by a focus on individual parallels within simplistic models of direct reception. Strong criticisms have been directed against Burkert and West's tendency to overlook the indigenous traditional context of the Greek comparanda (Kelly 2008), as well as the interpretative value of a

---

<sup>1</sup> Burkert (1983); (1984) = (1992); (1999) = (2004); and his collected *Orientalia* (2003); West (1997).

<sup>2</sup> For a history of scholarship see still Burkert (1991), cf. López-Ruiz (2014) 154-59. A list of important recent works, with abundant bibliography, must include Bremmer (2008), Kelly (2008), (2014), Rutherford (2009), López-Ruiz (2010), (2014), Loudon (2010), Haubold (2013), Metcalf (2015a), Scully (2015) 50-68; Bachvarova (2016), Currie (2016) 147-222.

<sup>3</sup> Thus at least two contexts, by no means mutually exclusive, are theoretically possible for the transmission. Stress on the LBA e.g. in Gordon (1955); Stella (1955) 188-205, (1978); Webster (1956), (1958); Walcot (1969), (1970) and (1972), and recently Kelly (2008), López-Ruiz (2010); on the EIA: e.g. Heubeck (1955); Burkert (1984) = (1992), Rollinger (1996), (2001), (2012), cf. also Rollinger and Ulf (2004), Rollinger and Truschnegg (2006), Ulf and Rollinger (2011), Bachvarova (2016); on both possibilities cf. e.g. West (1988) 167-72 and (1997) 586-630, Patzek (2003a-b), (2011), Haubold (2013) 23-24, López-Ruiz (2014).

comparative reading beyond (often questionable) claims of direct influence (Haubold 2002).<sup>4</sup>

Thus the most recent attempt at establishing a comparative discourse from intertextual perspectives takes a broader view. Treating divine toilet-and-seduction and complaint scenes in Sumerian, Akkadian, Hurro-Hittite, Ugaritic and Greek sources, Currie (2016) reckons with the necessity of postulating written or oral intermediate versions in Phoenician or Aramaic.<sup>5</sup> From the perspective of this thesis, the major progress is the detailed focus on poetic technique, and a treatment that goes beyond the individual parallel to consider a constellation of scenes with thematic and structural connections.<sup>6</sup>

Albeit somewhat diffuse, the links envisaged by this model must be sufficiently close for the Greek versions recognisably to be drawing on surviving Near Eastern sources, even if through lost mediating texts. The same necessary premise underpins the conclusions of Bachvarova (2016) concerning Syro-Anatolian influence on the *Iliad* through oral traditions. Her stance is less directed at a close reading, and the grounding model sees Greek epic as part of a long standing literary system spanning different languages and cultures.<sup>7</sup> As will be seen, this thesis shares such a broadly-based perspective, but differs considerably in the approach to the literary sources.

One salient aspect of Bachvarova's book is a thorough archaeological enquiry into collective ritual contexts on the eastern shores of the Iron Age Mediterranean, where a long-term process of transmission is likely to have taken place.<sup>8</sup> Less satisfactory is the literary treatment: the hypothesis of an oral transmission is not grounded on a comparative

---

<sup>4</sup> See however Kelly (2008) 291-92, 301-02, distinguishing between Burkert and West's approaches; more recently Haubold (2013) 1-33, (2014), Kelly (2014), López-Ruiz (2014), Metcalf (2015a), (2017).

<sup>5</sup> Currie (2016) 163-64, 198-200. On lost intermediate phases cf. e.g. Burkert (1992) 32, West (1997) 606-09, 626-27, Rollinger (2012).

<sup>6</sup> Though I was not persuaded by the contention that the Mesopotamian poetics of allusion influenced the ways in which allusion developed in an early Greek context, already advanced in Currie (2012).

<sup>7</sup> For a similar perspective cf. López-Ruiz (2010), a valuable work focusing on the Levantine connections of Greek cosmogonies, but sharing the archaeological interest with Bachvarova. Further literature on the Eastern-Mediterranean *koine* above n. 3, cf. Ch. 9§5.3.

<sup>8</sup> Bachvarova (2016) 129-330.

assessment of orally-derived features, and, as one critic puts it, the discussion of parallels "presupposes, rather than demonstrates, the necessity of literary influence".<sup>9</sup> Nor does the (largely unconvincing) claim of a pervasive Syro-Anatolian influence on the *Iliad* appear to enhance the interpretative appreciation of any of the texts under discussion.

More rewarding in this perspective is Haubold's approach. Rather than looking for signs of influence, the comparative endeavour focuses on broader patterns to explore the literary construction of common visions.<sup>10</sup> Detailed comparisons of key passages within an assessment of shared concepts of mythical history and of man's place therein illuminate, for instance, Greek and Mesopotamian conceptions of death, or the consolatory value of narrative poetry. Yet the price to pay for these powerful insights is the setting aside of the question of transmission;<sup>11</sup> and it becomes less clear how these common visions came to be shared, and what is the historical role of literature (if any) in construing these ties.

The main challenge today, and what this thesis seeks to achieve, is to provide a historically grounded and exegetically productive comparative reading of our sources, and to combine it with an advancement in perspectives on the question of transmission. Metcalf's treatment of hymns in praise of gods has offered the first full-scale and detailed treatment of a sufficiently vast (though rigorously circumscribed) corpus.<sup>12</sup> A stream of tradition, inheritance and elaboration is visible between OB Mesopotamian and Hittite hymns, but the process did not proceed beyond the Late Bronze age. In Metcalf's view, the significance of a comparative reading can hardly exceed the limits of a heuristically contrastive comparison, when influence cannot be proved.<sup>13</sup> This much-needed cross-

---

<sup>9</sup> Metcalf (2017) 5.

<sup>10</sup> Haubold (2013) 1-72.

<sup>11</sup> Haubold (2013) esp. 10, 18, 71: "the precise modalities of transmission and influence may not be as important as the questions actually raised in our texts"; though cf. 20-25, where the terms of the question are limpidly set out.

<sup>12</sup> Metcalf (2015a).

<sup>13</sup> Metcalf (2015a) 171-219 identifies two such punctual cases of Near Eastern influence, one in Aphrodite's birth in the *Theogony* (partly indebted to the astral character of Inana/Ištar), one at *Il.* 1.62-63a (going ultimately back to an OB Sumerian hymn). For a structural parallel to Akhilleus' proposal in an 8th c.

cultural treatment of hymns is likely to become standard. Yet one wonders how far the negative conclusions reached on this genre should be extended to narrative poetry, to which the vast majority of the similarities identified by previous scholarship belong.

Narrative poetry is the subject of this thesis, and the treatment of the gods is surely not a surprising choice, given that it is here that the Greek material is most clearly comparable to the Near Eastern traditions.<sup>14</sup> Yet no detailed comparative assessment is to be found on the treatment of the gods in narrative compositions. Partly, the present research responds to a continuous interest in the literary representation of the divine in early Greek epic.<sup>15</sup> As explained below, however, it is the focus on scenes of divine assembly that has permitted a systemic comparison. A study, that is, encompassing individual poems and traditions, and permitting a comparative discourse directed both at questions of transmission and of cultural interpretation.

Divine assembly scenes recur in several Near Eastern corpora, and scholars have long drawn conclusions on the derivative nature of this feature in the Greek sources.<sup>16</sup> However, little is to be found in the way of a detailed comparison beyond the selection of similarities offered by M. L. West, who connects various aspects of the Greek divine gathering to Biblical, Ugaritic, Hittite and Mesopotamian texts.<sup>17</sup> The possible extent of a Near Eastern influence on the Greek material is treated in Chapter 9§5, but the divine assembly was

---

Canaanite narrative cf. below Ch. 9§5. For the heuristically analogical approach cf. Kelly (2014), Haubold (2017).

<sup>14</sup> Famously, and with customary assertiveness, West (1988) 169 claimed that "the whole picture of the gods in the *Iliad* is Oriental". Most comparative scholarship, indeed, deals with the divine, possibly because, unlike the early Greek hexametric corpus, the overwhelming majority of surviving Near Eastern narrative poetry is centred on the gods, whilst the Greek system of heroes is not paralleled beyond the Aegean.

<sup>15</sup> Recently Kearns (2004), Graziosi and Haubold (2005) 65-84, Allan (2006), Heitsch (2008), Marks (2008), Yasumura (2011), Elmer (2013) 143-73, Graziosi (2016), Clauss, Cuypers and Kahane (2016). For an assessment of contemporary tendencies beyond the literary see Harrison (2015). Pironti and Bonnet (2017), containing a valuable chapter on divine assemblies, appeared after this thesis was submitted.

<sup>16</sup> See Ch. 9§5.2.

<sup>17</sup> West (1997) 177-81, cf. Romano Martín (2009) 21-24. Sporadic comparative references to the topos include e.g. Webster (1956) 114, Stella (1978) 83, Burkert (1992) 117.

chosen as the subject of a detailed cross-cultural analysis mainly because it could lead to a systemic comparison of poetic and narrative techniques as well as of theological conceptions. Choosing to concentrate on Mesopotamia accords with this aim, as it provides the most ancient, long-standing and largest surviving corpus of narrative poetry in the ancient Near Eastern panorama.<sup>18</sup>

It was deemed best to adopt a rather broad definition of divine assembly: a poetic situation where a plurality of gods (more than two) is found together. There are cases where the gathered gods do not speak at all, and meetings where decisions are not at stake. Thus, divine "gathering", "collective scene" and sometimes "council" are the terms used throughout this work.<sup>19</sup> One risk is that too much material is potentially included in the definition: too much, that is to say, to allow for a detailed assessment in each case. But it is a risk worth taking if one is to avoid forcing variegated evidence into too strictly preconceived patterns.<sup>20</sup> The milder the rule, the greater the rigour.

These scenes are construed according to flexible but recognisable traditional techniques that were passed on through generations of poets: this is visible in Mesopotamia (where we possess an incomparably longer record) as in early Greek poetry. Such techniques, systematised in Chapter 9, extend from the construction of the scene to the structural function of the system of scenes within the individual poem. A consideration of the divine assemblies spanning the narrative structure of a poem permits us to gain a synoptic

---

<sup>18</sup> On the 2nd-millennium westward spread of Mesopotamian literature see Ch. 9§5, where Hurro-Hittite, Ugaritic and Biblical comparanda are also discussed (see below). These corpora have not been granted detailed treatment for reasons of competence and time. Perhaps unfortunately, this thesis conforms to the general comparative trend among Classicists not to set Egyptian literature on the same footing as other NE traditions; e.g. West (1997) vii, Metcalf (2015a) 8. A major exception is Rutherford (2015), contributions to which, however, concern Greek sources from after 500 BC. A prominent role of the divine assembly, the "Ennead" acting as tribunal, can be especially seen throughout the famous divine narrative *Horus and Seth* (preserved in a 12th-c. papyrus, transl. Lichtheim 2006, II, 214-23), compared to Hesiod, Vedic and Hurro-Hittite material by Mondì (1990) 151-57.

<sup>19</sup> See further the Preliminary Remarks to Parts 1 and 2.

<sup>20</sup> This is one problem in the treatment of Romano Martín (2009) 1-72: Homer's scenes often fail to fit the author's scheme (e.g. pp. 37-38, 43, 45), and many important gatherings are left aside. Cf. the Preliminary Remarks to Part 2.

standpoint on the work's compositional and theological design.<sup>21</sup> Thus, this study aims to offer new insights into the formal and conceptual functions of the so-called "divine machinery" (*Götterapparat*), a term of Homeric criticism that has found its way into the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* in a somewhat indirect manner.<sup>22</sup>

Two thirds of the thesis consider the divine assembly scenes within individual poems, a section being devoted to each literary tradition (Part 1: Mesopotamian; Part 2: early Greek). In terms of literary forms, Parts 1 and 2 focus on the persistent conventions within the two traditions and on the function played by the scene of divine assembly as a device to structure the narratives and theological discourses of the individual poems according to coherent authorial designs. This discrete treatment is partly motivated by the lack of a comprehensive assessment of divine assemblies in both Assyriological and early Greek epic scholarship.<sup>23</sup> Thus, Part 1 (Chapters 1-4) provides a contextual treatment of the literary pantheon of Sumero-Akkadian narrative poetry; Part 2 (Chapters 5-8) discusses the role of the gods in the Homeric poems based on the system of divine assemblies, and considers the role of the topos in the narrative shaping of the longer *Homeric Hymns* and in Hesiod's *Theogony*.

Although OB Sumerian poetry occupies a separate chapter, the overall treatment attempts to stress its tight conjunction with the Akkadian material on the literary level. Hence, this thesis refers to the Sumero-Akkadian as the "Mesopotamian tradition" as a whole.<sup>24</sup> Concerning Akkadian poems, a selection was made to cover the most important and well known (among ancient and moderns alike), privileging those where a system of

---

<sup>21</sup> This has been seen, for the Greek side, by Marks (2008) 159-66, and Romano Martín (2009), (cf. esp. Bannert 1987 on human assemblies in the Homeric poems), cf. now Marks (2016); for Mesopotamia, see, on *Atra-hasīs*, Moran (1987), Kilmer (1996); Bartash (2010) on *Enūma eliš*. Cf. further the Preliminary Remarks to Part 1 and Part 2.

<sup>22</sup> Sallaberger (2004a) 295: the word, quoted from a remark by the religious historian B. Gladigow, refers to the structure of the pantheon and is not restricted to literary representations; on the term in Homeric criticism (Eng. "divine machinery"), cf. Bremer (1987) 31-33.

<sup>23</sup> The useful work of Romano Martín (2009), whose interests focus primarily on the Latin tradition, is only a partial exception, cf. above n. 20. On the Mesopotamian side, Cassin (1975) deserves mention.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. the Preliminary Remarks to Part 1.

divine assemblies is at work. Among the major narrative poems with mythological subject, only *Etana* and *Adapa* have been left out of the picture, although relevant divine scenes (collective or not) are occasionally considered. The same goes with OB *Adad* and *Agušaya*, as well as with other minor mythological narratives and introductions to disputations or incantation series.<sup>25</sup> As for the Greek corpus, the fragmentary Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* and the largely lost poems of the Epic Cycle are not treated in detail. We gather that divine collective scenes occurred here too, but none has survived from the Cyclic Epics, whilst the difficult [Hes.] fr. 204 M.-W. has received a valuable recent treatment.<sup>26</sup>

The considerable time-span of the Mesopotamian tradition (late-3rd/early-2nd to mid-1st millennium BC) permits, to a certain extent, a diachronic assessment of the literary corpus in terms of conscious reworking of specific models. Treating divine assemblies within the Hellenic corpus, no compelling evidence was found for direct literary borrowings between Greek poems in terms of specific techniques.<sup>27</sup> Thus, the perspective adopted in this thesis privileges the Greek composers' use of traditional elements according to an orally-derived poetic craft.<sup>28</sup> This is not to preclude the possibility of literary imitation in an early Greek context, as explored, in a variety of ways, by valuable recent works in a long exegetical tradition.<sup>29</sup> But the stress falls on the early Greek epic extant

---

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Ch. 9; on *Adapa* see Ch. 1§2.2.3.

<sup>26</sup> Ormand (2016) with previous literature. On the gods in Cyclic Epic see now Tsagalis (2016), and cf. Ch. 9 nn. 687, 734, Ch. 10 n. 860.

<sup>27</sup> See Ch. 6§1, 7§1.4, 8§3. Punctual imitations are possible (cf. perhaps Ch. 6§2.3: Zeus' predictions at *Il.* 8, 15 and *Od.* 5), but this hardly extends to the traditional compositional elements underlying the structure of the scene, on which see Ch. 9. Cf. also Ballesteros Petrella (in prep.2).

<sup>28</sup> My own (present) position on the "Homeric question" is rather mainstream in conceiving of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as composed with the aid of writing by different singers, both well-practiced in the art of oral poetry, sometime between the late 8th and the 7th c. Little in this thesis depends on this, except perhaps for the recognition of a conscious authorial intention underlying the design of each of the surviving hexameter poems, though cf. Ch. 7 on *HAp.*

<sup>29</sup> E.g. Tsagalis (2008), Danek (2010), Burgess (2012), Currie (2016); see also, differently, Kelly (2012).

works as the product of a system of traditional poetry. It is worth noting that the picture of the divine system is among the strongest *traits d'union* in this sense (see Chapter 10).<sup>30</sup>

From a comparative perspective, on the other hand, the structure of this thesis reflects a methodological concern to assess the comparanda within their own traditional context before proceeding to drawing them together.<sup>31</sup> Once a systematic picture has been provided for each poem and tradition, Part 3 presents two comparative approaches. Chapter 9 draws a close formal comparison of the scene's morphology by paying particular attention to the audience-directed effects which stem from the interplay with the semantic background represented by the tradition. This hermeneutical method is known among Homerists as the "Traditional referentiality" approach developed by J. M. Foley.<sup>32</sup> Foley addressed comparisons of unrelated traditions so as to extrapolate the grammar of oral poetry. Chapter 9 demonstrates that similar methods are equally applicable to appreciating aspects of the compositional practices of Mesopotamian poetry, long composed (in all likelihood) with the aid of writing.<sup>33</sup> This can be best explained by the fact that poems in both traditions were primarily meant to be experienced through performance; hence the possibility of a formal comparison. The analysis shows that the compositional elements of the scene, their effects, and the ways in which Mesopotamian and Greek poets used them to govern the course of the plot overlap to a remarkable degree. The concluding discussion in Chapter 9 explores the many implications of this for a nuanced approach to the question of transmission, taking into account the diffusion of the topos in Hittite, Ugaritic and first-millennium Levantine sources. A consideration of select Indo-European parallels (Eddic and Sanskrit) helps better frame the origin of Greek divine assemblies.

---

<sup>30</sup> Cf. esp. Clay (2006), Graziosi and Haubold (2005) 65-75, Allan (2006), Kelly (2007) 421-25, Claus, Cuypers and Kahane (2016).

<sup>31</sup> Compare Metcalf's (2015) treatment of hymnic traditions.

<sup>32</sup> Esp. Foley (1990), (1991). On Homer cf. esp. Foley (1999), Kelly (2007) part. 1-14, and Ch. 9. Currie (2016) 1-36, 223-28 discusses this approach vis-à-vis exegetical practices directed at fully literate poets.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. esp. Ch. 9, pp. 181-84.

Chapter 10 departs from questions of poetic form and transmission, but maintains the systemic approach to assess the literary articulation of the pantheon as a political system. Drawing on the interpretative results of Parts 1 and 2, the chapter compares Mesopotamian and early Greek poetic constructions of divine kingship. In spite of a similar narrative and conceptual focus on the preservation of cosmic order, important culture-specific differences emerge which can be related to historical socio-political conditions.

This thesis thus offers a systematic treatment of the dynamics of collective divine representation in the surviving narrative poetry in the Sumero-Akkadian and early Greek traditions, hoping to contribute to the literary appreciation of the individual poems as well as of the distinctive poetical physiognomy of each tradition. In a comparative perspective, the work attempts to show the advantages of a comparison between compositional systems; the emerging hypothesis is that a long process of oral transmission and interaction was fuelled by a structural homology of compositional features. Finally, the application of this framework to the narrative representation of the divine will permit us to compare the culture-specific manifestations of common religious and theological conceptions, and to enhance our appreciation of the relationship between Mesopotamian and early Greek literature and culture.

## PART 1: THE MESOPOTAMIAN TRADITION

### Preliminary remarks

The textual record of the poems assessed in the following chapters spans from the early second to the late first millennium BC. However, none of the works here considered was composed after the fall of Nineveh in 612 BC, while part of the examined Sumerian material possibly goes back to the third millennium.

Sumerian compositions are treated as a separate group (Ch. 1) for obvious linguistic reasons and because of their relatively short chronological compass, limited to the Old Babylonian period. The Sumerian tradition, nevertheless, does not necessarily precede the Akkadian (Chs. 2-4), for both languages and literary cultures coexisted during the third millennium, and it is in the OB period that both Sumerian and Akkadian literary texts become archaeologically conspicuous. The examined Akkadian works, however, had a longer living history. *Atra-ḫasīs*, *Anzû*, and *Gilgameš*, first attested in the OB period, continued to be edited (and reworked) throughout the second millennium and into the first; *Enūma eliš* is likely to be a late second-millennium product, while *Erra* is dated to the first millennium.

Despite such diachrony, the conservative nature of the Mesopotamian tradition preserved the essential structural features of the literary pantheon.<sup>34</sup> One remarkable instance is Enki (Akk. Ea), the god of wisdom and sweet waters, who fosters or thwarts the goals of the pantheon leaders, the sky-god An (Akk. Anu) and the earthly ruler Enlil.<sup>35</sup> Especially relevant for our enquiry is the presence of the gods as a group, variously

---

<sup>34</sup> Overviews of the Mesopotamian pantheon include e.g. Bottéro (2001) 44-113, Sallaberger (2004a), Groneberg (2004).

<sup>35</sup> On Enki/Ea see e.g. Jacobsen (1976) 110-16, Kramer and Maier (1989), Groneberg (2004) 130-49, recently Espak (2015) esp. 139-88.

labelled Anu(n)na(kū/kī) and/or Igigū/gī,<sup>36</sup> and of the mother-goddess, whose names include Ninmah "great-lady", Nintu(r) "lady-of-the-(birthing-)hut", Aruru, Bēlet-ilī (Akk."lady-of-the-gods"), Mami.<sup>37</sup> Ea, the divine group and the mother-goddess remain prominent in *Enūma eliš* and *Erra*, where the king of the gods is Marduk, while Enlil is virtually absent.

Such a pantheon appears in its full-grown form in the earliest substantial literary evidence, having probably reached this shape during the Early Dynastic (ED) period in connection with political developments. Crucial in this process may have been the so-called "Kiengi (i.e. Sumer) league", a loose unity between ED city-states, with a core on the religious centre of Nippur, city of the chief god Enlil.<sup>38</sup> Local ED rulers would have gathered in Nippur, like the gods do in literary sources, perhaps to bestow kingship on the supra-local ruler as *primus inter pares*; the city-state groups of divinities would have progressively merged into a common pantheon centred on Enlil. Relevant ED evidence is slight, and the model might in fact antedate the leading ideological role of Nippur and Enlil, best attested for the Sargonic and Ur III unified kingdoms.<sup>39</sup> In any event, this *Reichspantheon*, accompanying and justifying the divinisation of Sargonic and Ur III rulers, left a strong mark in the divine assembly as found in Sumerian and Akkadian literature.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Both groups appear only in literature (i.e. no cult attested); see still Falkenstein (1965), Kienast (1965), (1976/80), Edzard (1976/80); recently Lambert (2013) 193-96.

<sup>37</sup> On these deities and their syncretism see e.g. Jacobsen (1976) 104-09, Krebernik (1993/97), Michalowski (2002), Black (2005), Asher-Greve and Westenholz (2013).

<sup>38</sup> See esp. Jacobsen (1957) 105-12; Wilcke (1974) 202-32, (1975) 39-53, (2007) 161-64; Selz (1992); Steinkeller (1993); Pomponio and Visicato (1994) 10-20; Frayne (2008) 7-8; on the reading(s) of ki-en-gi see Steinkeller (1994) 542-43, Wencel (2015), Cooper (2016) 2-5.

<sup>39</sup> The theory is accepted in standard handbooks: Liverani (2014) 106-07, Van De Mieroop (2016) 54-56; *contra* e.g. Cooper (2001), Rubio (2009) 33.

<sup>40</sup> On the "Nippur pantheon" and the role of Enlil in connection with (especially Ur III) royal ideology see e.g. Lieberman (1992); Selz (1992); Tinney (1996) 58-62; Sallaberger (1997), (2004a) 299.

Consequently, the Mesopotamian divine assembly has mainly been studied as possibly reflecting secular institutions.<sup>41</sup> In the literary evidence, T. Jacobsen saw the surviving traces of earliest political structures, a Mesopotamian "primitive democracy" which, in the long run, would have degenerated into kingship.<sup>42</sup> Whilst this evolutionary theory is now generally rejected, third-millennium human assemblies remain difficult to assess, being significantly attested only in literary texts.<sup>43</sup> Concerning the second and first millennia, however, the documentary record (especially for the OB and LB periods) shows that several collective bodies acted within and outside the larger urban contexts, spanning several layers "in the interstices of the royal apparatus" (Seri 2005, 1), and being subordinate in varying degrees to the central royal institution.<sup>44</sup>

Though this picture provides a substantial background of *realia*, if variegated and fragmented, this enquiry is essentially concerned with literary structures and conventions, with their recurrence and variation as a function of the artistic aim. Thus, the scene of divine assembly, or gathering, is here defined as a poetic situation where the gods are found together as a group, whether or not the terms for "assembly" (Sum. *unken*, Akk. *puḫrum*) occur.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Jacobsen (1943), (1957) esp. 99-109, Evans (1958), Komoróczy (1976a), Metzler (1995), most recently Bartash (2010), Seltz (2012) 74-77. Cassin's (1975) evaluation of the poetic material represents, as noted, a felicitous exception.

<sup>42</sup> Jacobsen (1943), (1957) 99-120, (1976) 183-86.

<sup>43</sup> On the debate concerning Jacobsen's theory see e.g. Pettinato (1994), Van De Mieroop (1997) 133-39, Ridley (2000), Römer (2001) 11. On third-millennium assemblies e.g. Selz (1998), Glassner (2000) 43-48, Westenholz (2002) 27-29, Fleming (2004) 203-11, Seri (2005) 161-64, Wilcke (2007) 160-64, Kõiv (2011) 106-16, Solans (2014) 29-33. On Ur III assemblies at the highest levels of power see notably van Dijk (1969), Wilcke (1974) 182-83, (1975) 51-53, (2007) 163, Van De Mieroop (1997) 123-24.

<sup>44</sup> In general: Liverani (1993), Van De Mieroop (1997) 118-41, Solans (2014) 29-58. OB period: Larsen (1976), (2000a) (Old Assyrian), Fleming (2004) (Mari), Seri (2005) esp. 159-80; 1st millennium: Dandamayev (1995), (1997); Larsen (2000b); Barjamovic (2004); Holtz (2009).

<sup>45</sup> On nouns and verbs for assembly(ing) see Ch. 9§1.

## Chapter 1: Sumerian poems

The vast majority of Sumerian literary tablets does not antedate the OB period, when Sumerian had most likely died out as a mother-tongue.<sup>46</sup> OB texts have mostly been recovered from relatively small places of learning whose activity ran parallel to the major scribal centres within temples and palaces.<sup>47</sup> In all likelihood, part of this corpus represents a phase of the written literary tradition reaching back at least to the Ur III period.<sup>48</sup> These works, however, were copied and studied in the same cultural milieu in which the first significantly attested Akkadian large-scale poems emerge (such as OB *Atra-ḫasīs* or *Gilgameš*).<sup>49</sup>

This chapter concentrates on Sumerian narrative poetry. We will first consider compositions about gods (hereafter "divine narratives", §1), then poems centred on legendary figures, often super-human and semi-divine, such as Lugalbanda or Bilgames ("human narratives", §2).<sup>50</sup> Both groups display an impersonal narrator, direct speeches

---

<sup>46</sup> Some contend vernacular Sumerian died already during the Ur III period, notwithstanding the administrative documents being in Sumerian: recently Michalowski (2006); Rubio (2006), (2009) 15, (2016) 233-34; Cooper (2010), (2016) 5-6; for the other view (early second millennium) see e.g. Sallaberger (2004b), (2011); Woods (2006); Keetman (2010); Durand (2012) 165-67.

<sup>47</sup> These small schools are conventionally known as *é-dub-ba-a*. Peterson (2015) brings supporting evidence to Waetzoldt and Cavigneaux's (2009) 295 conclusion that our small find-spots were called *é-um-mi-a* "house of the master (teacher)". The traditional rendering of *é-dub-ba-a* is "tablet-house" (Akk. *bīt tuppī*); a more correct translation is "house where tablets are distributed", cf. Volk (2000) 2-5, Attinger (2011) 223 n. 4, Peterson (2015) 81 n. 16; *contra* Rubio (2016) 246 n. 37. On the *edubba'a lato sensu* see Sjöberg (1976), Cavigneaux (1999), Volk (2000), Robson (2001), George (2005a), Ludwig (2009) 4-8, Waetzoldt and Cavigneaux (2009). On the "curricular approach" and related debate on how far our texts reflect the OB scribes' effort to recover, reshape, or indeed re-create a Sumerian literary corpus see Tinney (1999), Veldhuis (2004) 58-66, with Attinger (2011) 223-24; recently Tinney (2011), Delnero (2010), (2012b), (2016), Michalowski (2012), Delnero and Lauinger (2015), Crisostomo (2016), Rubio (2016) 246-52.

<sup>48</sup> This applies especially to Ur III royal hymns, cf. recently Lämmerhirt (2012) 19-22, Metcalf (2015a) 18-19, Ludwig (2015) 256-61. Rubio (2000/2005), (2009) 37-39 overviews the alleged (mostly unpublished) Ur III literary evidence: see Ludwig (2015) 257-58 on the doubtful reliability of paleographic criteria in the absence of clear stratigraphical contexts. On the elusive interface between oral and written transmission from the Ur III to the OB period see Civil (1999-2000), Delnero (2012a) 92-95. Historical outlines of Sumerian literature include Falkenstein (1951); Hallo (2010) 57-84; Krecher (1978); Edzard (1987/90), (2004); Michalowski (1995); Pettinato (2001) 47-52; Veldhuis (2003); Rubio (2009).

<sup>49</sup> For a "contextual" overview of OB Akkadian literature see recently Hess (2015) 257-60.

<sup>50</sup> The name Bilgames is conventionally adopted hereafter in Sumerian contexts, cf. George (2003) 71-91, Nurullin (2012); *contra* Rubio (2012).

and a well-defined sequence of events, a plot qualifying them as narratives.<sup>51</sup> This is not precisely the case for *City-Laments* (§3), in some of which, however, the divine assembly plays a central theological and compositional function.

### §1. Divine narratives

Sumerian divine narratives tend to be aetiological, and to praise the god whose culturally significant deeds are narrated. All surviving text-ends display a laudatory (zà-mim) doxology of the type "praise be to DN" or "DN, your praise is sweet".<sup>52</sup> Most scenes of divine assembly contribute to this praise, as the gathered gods perform an intra-diegetic exaltation of the protagonist. Based on the scenes' position, we can assess their diegetic role, *viz.* their function within the plot.

When the feature occurs, divine narratives contain a single gathering scene, the exception being *Lugale*, displaying four assemblies. *Lugale* is also exceptional in length (ca. 730 lines), the other compositions ranging between 126 (*Enki's Journey to Nippur*) and 208 lines (*Angim*).

---

<sup>51</sup> "Narrative poetry" is the label preferred by Black (1992) 71 n. 1 and ETCSL; German-writing scholarship tends to use "Epik/Epen". The narrative character and plot are the main criteria for this and similar groupings, cf. e.g. Wilcke (1976) 248-50, Krecher (1978) 115, Edzard (1987/90) 38-41, Streck (2002) 191, Holm (2005), Michalowski (2010). "Narratives" or "Hymns" are labels that reflect modern arrangements of the ancient corpus into literary genres, cf. e.g. Vanstiphout (1986), (2003a) 11-12; Black (1998) 20-49; Veldhuis (2004) 29-30; Rubio (2009) 46-72; Volk (2015) x-xi. Aspects of native conceptions can be inferred from a number of literary "catalogues", mainly Old Babylonian (ETCSL 0.1.2.1-13), cf. Vanstiphout (2003b) with previous literature at n. 23, Rubio (2009) 26-27, Delnero (2010) esp. 41-49. The assumed Ur III dates of two further catalogues (ETCSL 0.1.1-2) is not unproblematic, cf. Lämmerhirt (2012) 19 n. 27, and Ludwig (2015) 256-57. The catalogues partly conform to modern conceptions of genre, but it remains unclear to what degree such ancient taxonomies reflect scribal curricula, thematic content, or the performance modes and contexts attested through scribal notations within (rubrics) or at the end of the text (subscripts, indicating the type of composition), cf. Wilcke (1976) 252-92, Ludwig (1990) 28-40, Kilmer (1993/97), Tinney (1996) 16-18, Black (1998) 24-28, Rubio (2009) 22-25, Shehata (2009) 223-406, Metcalf (2015a) 19-22.

<sup>52</sup> *EJN* 126, *EnNinm* B.113, *EnSud* 175 (restored Civil 1983: 58), *EnNinl* 153-54, *Angim* 207, *Lugale* 725. The word zà-mim, meaning "praise" is connected to <sup>giš</sup>zà-mim, a chord instrument "lyre, harp", cf. Shehata (2009) 2 n. 3, Metcalf (2015a) 20 n. 16.

### §1.1. Final exaltation

When a collective exaltation occurs toward the end of the poem, the gathering scene represents the culmination of the praise narrative.

*Enki's Journey to Nippur (EJN)* belongs to the so-called *Götterreisen* narratives, relating a deity's journey to the dwelling of a major god.<sup>53</sup> Often river trips on sacred barges, such journeys provide the visitor with a sanction of his/her role and prerogatives.<sup>54</sup> In *EJN* Enki builds his temple in Eridu and pays a visit to the chief god Enlil's Ekur temple in Nippur. The banquet scene compounds the composition's last part and culminates with Enlil's praise-speech before the gathered gods (*EJN* 115-20).

Approaching the *geguna* shrine of Ekur, Enki stocks up on plenty of beer and other alcoholic drinks (93-100), and then proceeds to seat the diners according to hierarchy (101-07).<sup>55</sup> After drinking and libations (108-10), the company seemingly moves to Ubšu'unkena, the assembly chamber of the temple.<sup>56</sup> The change of setting preludes to Enlil's official sanction of the temple's construction, a major cultural achievement of Mesopotamian rulers from earliest times (111-20).<sup>57</sup>

Lines 121-24, praising the Eridu temple before the final doxology (125-26), recall the narrator's praise at 4-17. Therefore, unlike previous editors, Ceccarelli attributes them to the narrator, not to Enlil.<sup>58</sup> This choice finds support in a structural parallel in *Lugale*,

---

<sup>53</sup> Ed. Ceccarelli (2012).

<sup>54</sup> Cf. e.g. Sjöberg (1957/71), Al-Fouadi (1969) 4-68, Pettinato (2001) 305-07, Wagensooner (2007); compare the king's barge-journey in *Šulgi B*.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Michalowski (1994a) 34: "here the ceremonial of a greeting banquet...is used as an occasion to reaffirm the relative ranking of the gods". Gudea's banquet for Ningirsu (*Gudea Cyl. B* 19.18-21) displays identical phraseology, cf. below §2.1. On the divine banquet see Michalowski (1994a), Ermidoro (2015) 72-82.

<sup>56</sup> At line 112 (é-ta ġiri-bi-a ba-ra-ġar-ra-ta) Ceccarelli (2012) 105 tentatively renders "*auf ihre FüÙe stellen*", but *LN* 81 is a possible parallel for ġiri...ġar + abl., cf. *Lexique* 64 "s'en aller loin de". On Ubšu'unkena see Krebernik (2014).

<sup>57</sup> Michalowski's (1994a) 35 suggestion that Enki "having gotten Enlil and the Anuna drunk and satiated, tricked them into blessing his new home" finds little support in the text.

<sup>58</sup> Ceccarelli (2012) 112.

whose conclusion provides a further example of a praising divine assembly constituting a poem's final narrative moment.

In *Lugale* (cf. below §1.3), a triumphant Ninurta, returning among the gods in his barge, is met by the Anuna gods, who pay homage with typical submission gestures and with brief praise (*Lugale* 674-80 ETCSL).<sup>59</sup> His father Enlil's speech sanctioning Ninurta's prerogatives before the gods concludes the narrative action of the poem (*Lugale* 681-97), this praise being followed by that of the narrator (698-711). Similarly, Enlil's speech in *EJN* would be followed by the singer's concluding praise of Enki's achievement.

*Enlil and Sud* (*EnSud*), where Enlil marries the goddess Sud, offers a third example.<sup>60</sup> The plot's several stages lead to the marriage and to Enlil's final speech (*EnSud* 152-175), where he assigns divine prerogatives to Sud and their daughter Nisaba/Ašnan, and changes Sud's name to Ninlil. The addressees of Enlil's speech are left implicit (*EnSud* 150-51), his words being introduced through the verb *nam...tar* "to cut (*sc.* establish) the destiny" (as in *Lugale* 681).<sup>61</sup> Enlil begins by proclaiming Sud's divine prerogatives in the third person (152-58), before switching to the second person when addressing Nisaba/Ašnan, goddess(es) of scribal art and grain (159-68/9).<sup>62</sup> The initial third person shows that Enlil proclaims Sud's destiny to an internal audience that should be identified with the gods gathered for the wedding.

According to this pattern, thus, the assembly scene contains the final exaltation, crowning the aetiological narrative through the sanction of the protagonist's prerogatives.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Various forms of prostration (bowing down, rubbing the nose/lips to the ground, feet-kissing) are common in divine collective scenes cf. e.g. *Enlil A* 7, *Inana B* 116, *Inana C* 5, 104, 109, *Lipit-Eštar C* 24, *Nungal A* 35.

<sup>60</sup> The poem, ed. Civil (1983), is preserved in about 30 mss., mostly from OB Nippur. Some NA mss. with interlinear Akkadian attest to its fortune. See e.g. Vanstiphout (1987), Bottéro and Kramer (1989) 123-28, recently Asher-Greve (2013) 145-48, Gadotti (2014b) 35-37.

<sup>61</sup> Civil (1983) 60-61 seems to have Enlil's speech begin only at 156 (so ETCSL) or 159. Differently, as here, Michalowski (1994b), Fritz (2008) 81.

<sup>62</sup> See Michalowski (1994b). In principle, *EnSud* 169 could refer to Nisaba/Ašnan or to Sud/Ninlil.

<sup>63</sup> The preserved text of the very fragmentary *Enki in Nippur* (Ludwig 2006) concludes with an address to the Anuna, possibly by Enlil.

## §1.2. Halfway through the plot

Divine gatherings in the middle of the poem constitute a boundary in the development of the plot. The narrative focus of the composition may change altogether as the gods gather (*Enki and Ninmah*), or there may be a switch in the action's setting after the assembly (*Enlil and Ninlil, Angim*).

The first part of *Enki and Ninmah* (*EnNinm*) narrates the creation of man as substitute for the gods, who grow tired of labouring.<sup>64</sup> After the goddesses, supervised by Enki, perform the task, Enki's surpassing intelligence and craft are exalted in a banquet (*EnNinm* B.8-15). The poem might well have finished with this collective praise.<sup>65</sup> Instead, as the spirits of Enki and Ninmah rise, the banquet becomes the setting of a disputation between them, a creation contest in fact. The gathering scene, while providing a conclusive praise of Enki's accomplishment, marks the beginning of the narrative's second part.

Similarly, a collective exaltation occurs towards the middle of *Angim*, a composition about Ninurta whose narrative progression is interwoven with hymnic parts.<sup>66</sup> A triumphant Ninurta returns to Nippur, but his arrival frightens the gods, this topos delaying his arrival (76-101).<sup>67</sup> As Ninurta enters Ekur's Kiur chamber, the gods pay homage to him and his mother Ninlil delivers a praise speech (99-112). This gathering scene concludes the first half of the narrative, and becomes the occasion for Ninurta's own self-praise speech (113-74). Thereafter, he exits Ekur and is further exalted by the chief of his warriors and, until the end of the composition, by the narrator.

---

<sup>64</sup> Attested in OB and bilingual NA mss., ed. Ceccarelli (2016).

<sup>65</sup> Indeed, Jacobsen (1987) 151 thought *EnNinm* connected two previously independent stories; *contra* Westenholz (2010), Lambert (2013) 334.

<sup>66</sup> Ed. Cooper (1978), 23-29 on the poem's structure.

<sup>67</sup> The collective depiction of frightened gods often exalts a warrior deity's fearsomeness, generally Inana or Ninurta, see Falkenstein (1965) 136-38, Cooper (1978) 115. In *Lugale* (below §1.3) the gods' fear does highlight Ninurta's prowess, but is due to cosmic upheaval; compare the divine helplessness at *CA* 209-11 (with Cooper 1983: 253), or *Urnamma* A 8-14, with Flückiger-Hawke (1999) 164. Cf. below Chs. 2§3.3, 3§1.3.2, §2.2-2.3.1-2, §3.3.3 (Akkadian narratives).

This pivotal function of the assembly is most evident in *Enlil and Ninlil* (*EnNinl*), also displaying two parts.<sup>68</sup> Enlil, a young bachelor, rapes Ninlil and engenders the moon-god Nanna; he is therefore exiled from Nippur by the gods' judgment (*EnNinl* 52-63). Enlil and Ninlil, then, start a Netherworld journey resulting in the birth of Nergal, Ninazu and Enbilulu. Again, the assembly scene demarcates the plot's internal boundaries.

It is remarkable that Enlil is judged and condemned by the assembly. Here is "a play on the theme of Enlil's immutable command, of which he himself becomes a victim".<sup>69</sup> The unnamed gods decreeing the chief god's exile are probably the Anuna. A possible parallel is *Inana's Descent* (*InD*): the goddess is condemned to stay in the Netherworld as "the Anuna, the seven judges, rendered a verdict against her", which marks *InD*'s turning point.<sup>70</sup>

### §1.3. Lugale's structuring assemblies

The action's beginning in Sumerian narratives, often after a proem or narrative prologue, generally concentrates on the protagonist(s), less often on the setting; divine assemblies do not typically occur in such contexts.<sup>71</sup> A notable exception is *Lugale*, relating how Enlil's son Ninurta restored cosmic order by defeating the monstrous Asag.<sup>72</sup>

*Lugale*'s four assembly scenes structure the account of Ninurta's victory. The first follows the hymnic proem and starts the plot: Ninurta sits at his festival among the gathered gods, drinking with An and Enlil, listening to petitions, decreeing destinies (*Lugale* 17-23). This order is disrupted as Ninurta's speaking weapon Šarur alerts him of

---

<sup>68</sup> Both in *EnNinm* and *EnNinl* the assembly comes after about one third of the composition. On *EnNinl* see most recently Gadotti (2009) 78-82, (2014b) 29-31; Zgoll (2011); ed. Attinger (2015b).

<sup>69</sup> Cooper (1980) 182.

<sup>70</sup> <sup>d</sup>a-nun-na di-ku<sub>5</sub> umun<sub>7</sub>-bi igi-ni-šè di mu-un-da-ku<sub>5</sub>-ru-ne (*InD* 167, Katz 2003: 403-04 notes the parallels). di...ku<sub>5</sub> ("pronounce a verdict") expresses Inana's conviction, but Urnamma's death is lamented as an "established destiny": *Urnamma A* 17 nam ur-<sup>d</sup>namma mu-un-tar-šè, cf. *EnNinl* 57, 61-62. For the assembly giving verdicts see esp. *Šulgi B* 221-29, cf. e.g. *EWO* 18; *HymnIn* 7-8; *Inana A* 16-17; *Inana C* 202-6, *Išme-Dagan Q* 12-15. On the divine assembly judging on life and death cf. below §2.3, §3.

<sup>71</sup> On the exordia of Sumerian narratives see Streck (2002).

<sup>72</sup> Ed. van Dijk (1983), new findings listed in Wisnom (2014) 44 n. 31. Over 200 mss. from OB to Seleucid times preserve the poem; Seminara (2001) studied its Akkadian translations.

the menace Asag represents (24-69). The gods are at a loss and disperse (70-74), but Ninurta sets out to confront the enemy, while a general cosmic upheaval accompanies his departure (75-95).

Despite Šarur's advice, Ninurta hastens to battle, and Asag overwhelms him. When the narrative tension reaches its climax through the cosmic clash (168-81), the gods are portrayed collectively in dread and helplessness, until Enlil addresses Ninlil to lament his son's absence (182-90). Though the ensuing lines are fragmentary, it is clear that Šarur reaches Nippur and talks to Enlil, who promises help and possibly gives instructions (191-224), so that Ninurta is eventually able to defeat Asag. Thus, this collective depiction represents the climax of the crisis within the divine community and prepares for Enlil's decisive intervention.

After Asag's defeat, the gods of the Land gather around the triumphant hero: Šarur delivers a speech of praise, and Ninurta renames Asag and his club (304-33).<sup>73</sup> This collective exaltation concludes the poem's first part on Asag, and starts the account of Ninurta's culturally significant deeds. He first blocks the Tigris' excessive overflow and secures agriculture (334-67), but most of *Lugale's* second half relates Ninurta's assignment of names and functions to the "stones" resulting from the smashing of Asag (411-644). As seen above (§1.1), a second collective praise, the fourth divine assembly of the poem, concludes the composition's narrative.

Thus, *Lugale's* divine gathering scenes articulate the progress of the plot: traditional collective praises stand at the end of the poem's two parts, while the topos of divine fear highlights the greatness of Ninurta's exploit as the crisis begins (70-74) and reaches its

---

<sup>73</sup> Reading *din[gi]r kala[m]-ma* "the gods of the Land" at *Lugale* 306 (so ETCSL, Heimpel and Salgues 2015: 49), though *n[a<sub>4</sub> kala[m]-ma* "the stones of the Land" cannot be excluded, cf. van Dijk (1983) II.95.

climax (182-90). The poem-structuring system of assemblies will prove relevant for this thesis, not least since *Lugale* enjoyed great diffusion in the second and first millennia.<sup>74</sup>

## §2. Human narratives

Divine assemblies are relatively rare in Sumerian narratives with semi-divine and legendary protagonists. Important evidence comes from the recently published poem about the mythical Eridu priest Adapa (*SumAdapa*), and from the *Sumerian Flood Story* (*Flood*). Concerning compositions centred on legendary Urukian kings (Enmerkar, Lugalbanda and Bilgames), only the *Death of Bilgames* (*DB*) features a full-scale divine gathering scene. *Lugalbanda and the mountain cave* (*Lugalb. I*), however, displays a relevant scene of sacrificial offering which will be treated first.

### §2.1. Lugalbanda's offering

This scene (*Lugalb. I.371-93*) is remarkable, first, for the importance of its position within the poem's plot, which falls into three parts:<sup>75</sup> (1) Lugalbanda, one of king Enmerkar's commanders, is left in a cave, mortally ill, during the army's expedition against Aratta (*Lugalb. I.1-147*); (2) Helped by the astral gods Utu, Nanna, and Inana, Lugalbanda (re-)discovers fire, baking and cooking, prepares a sacrifice and recovers (248-394). Thereafter the text is very fragmentary: (3) the hero and the gods Utu and Inana participate in a seemingly well-resolved battle between good and bad spirits (395-499). The end of the narrative is not preserved. Our scene at 371-93 sanctions the hero's achievements resulting in his recovery and concludes the second part of the narration.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> E.g. Cooper (1978) 9-10, Seminara (2001) 30, Groneberg (2004) 81; on *Lugale's* Akkadian reception see now Wisnom (2014) 57-66 and *passim*, below Ch. 3§1.2.

<sup>75</sup> See Hallo (2010) 496-97, Vanstiphout (2003a) 99-103. Ed. Wilcke (1969), Hallo (2010) 495-516, Vanstiphout (2003a) 97-131, cf. Wilcke (2015b).

<sup>76</sup> On the narrative significance of this banquet-scene, attested in the Ur III *Lugalb. I* tablet (Wilcke 2015a: 42) see Vanstiphout (2002) 268.

Lugalbanda's sacrifice (*Lugalb. I.371-76*) provides a further example of a banquet-scene involving the major gods of the pantheon, displaying stock-expressions and a disposition of traditional motifs similar to *EJN 103-06*, *EnNinm B.8-11*, and *Gudea Cyl. B 19.18-21*.<sup>77</sup> The divine banquet type-scene is here deployed in the context of a sacrifice prepared by the human protagonist; Lugalbanda seats An, Enlil, Enki and Ninḫursaĝ, who take delight in the pleasant smell of the smoke (*Lugalb. I.382-85*). Their closeness thanks to the offering preludes to Lugalbanda's elevation.<sup>78</sup> This pattern finds its way into *Atra-ḫasīs* and *Gilgameš*.<sup>79</sup>

Our three remaining poems are even closer to the Akkadian tradition. The second half of *SumAdapa* displays essentially the same narrative as the Akkadian *Adapa* stories; Enkidu's death and funeral in tablets 7-8 of SB *Gilgameš* (Ch. 4§3.2) appear to be connected to *DB; Flood* has much in common with *Atra-ḫasīs* (Ch. 2).

## §2.2. The Sumerian Adapa

*SumAdapa* (mid-18th century) antedates by about four centuries the first Akkadian witness to the *Adapa* story (from Tell el-Amarna in Egypt, hereafter Akk. B).<sup>80</sup> Attested by two mss. from the same Meturan house plus a small Nippur fragment, *SumAdapa* betrays

---

<sup>77</sup> Above §1.1-2 and n. 55. The sequence runs: (a) setting (place or time) *Gud. Cyl. B.19.17* (é gibil-na); *EJN 101* (èš-e nibru<sup>ki</sup>-a); *Lugalb. I 371* (<sup>d</sup>utu nam-ta-è-aš); (b) X sets out the banquet/meal (lit. "bread" ḡišbun/inda) for Y and/or makes Y(+WZ etc.) sit therein (tuš/durun): *Gud. Cyl. B.19.18-21*; *EJN 102-6*; *Lugalb. I 372-75*; (c) details of drinks/liquids: *Gud. Cyl. B.20* broken; *EJN 107-11*; *Lugalb. I 376-79*. *EnNinm* stands out as it fails to make (a) explicit, lacks the tuš/durun element in (b) (*EnNinm B.9-11*), and delays (c) (*EnNinm B.16*) until after the collective praise.

<sup>78</sup> On Lugalbanda's elevation see Vanstiphout (1998), (2002).

<sup>79</sup> As noted by Hallo (2010) 526-27; cf. Ch. 2§3.3., Ch. 4§3.3.

<sup>80</sup> *SumAdapa* ed. Cavigneaux (2014), adding the Nippur MB fragment in Peterson (2017); Annus (2016) offers a treatment of the mythical sage, and an English translation of *SumAdapa*. Akkadian versions: ed. Picchioni (1981), Izre'el (2001), whose sigla are adopted here. Millstein (2015a-b), (2016) 77-108 reassesses the poems, and views the Akkadian versions as developing from the Sumerian material. On the Meturan (modern Tell Haddad) house and its literary, magical and liturgical texts see Cavigneaux (1999), Delnero (2012a) 82-84, Millstein (2015b) 192-94, Annus (2016) 14-15. On the linguistic difficulties in these texts see below n. 101.

several Akkadianisms. The possibility remains that this is a Sumerian version of an Akkadian composition, instead of a corrupt Sumerian poem.<sup>81</sup>

The first half, unparalleled in the Akkadian sources, provides a cosmic background including the establishment of kingship after the flood and a cosmic catastrophe.<sup>82</sup> Adapa, Enki's priest in Eridu, powerful in magic, breaks the South Wind's wing, which had caused his fishing boat to capsize. An(u) summons Adapa to heaven. Enki/Ea instructs his protégé to secure An(u)'s benevolence, and to refuse the food and drink the sky-god will offer him. As Adapa complies, An(u) smiles and sees Enki/Ea's action behind Adapa's behaviour. The end of the story diverges according to the versions. In the Amarna text, Anu seemingly sends Adapa abruptly back to earth or to the netherworld (*ana qaqqarišu*, B 70, the last readable line). In NA Akk. D Adapa is possibly kept in heaven and granted immortality.<sup>83</sup> Quite remarkably, unlike Akk. B, both *SumAdapa* and Akk. D (the first-millennium version) conclude with Enki/Ea's utterance of an incantation to avert the disease caused by the South Wind.<sup>84</sup>

Before the recovery of *SumAdapa*, scholars had suspected that a divine assembly was involved in the final heavenly scene.<sup>85</sup> Indeed, Anu speaks in the first person plural at Akk. B.59b-61; as Anu recognises Ea's action behind what happened, a certain opposition emerges between Ea and the divine community, resulting in a momentary impasse.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Cavigneaux (2014) 36 "Des versions différentes sur certains points ont dû coexister dans les deux langues".

<sup>82</sup> Cavigneaux (2014) 35-36, Millstein (2015a) 32, Annus (2016) 15.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. e.g. Picchioni (1981) 138-40, Izre'el (2001) 42, Annus (2016) 81-85.

<sup>84</sup> On the function of the incantation and its difficult details see Oppenheim (1977) 267; von Soden (1976) 433; Picchioni (1981) 139-41; Izre'el (2001) 42-44; Cavigneaux (2014) 33-34, 39-40; Millstein (2015b) 209; Annus (2016) 71-77.

<sup>85</sup> E.g. Hooke (1963) 58, Izre'el (2001) 31, Picchioni (1981) 65. Cf. Hallo (2004) 273: "tribunal of the great gods", 274: "the gods take counsel".

<sup>86</sup> Compare *Adapa D 5 ma-an-nu an-ni-tam* ʾša la<sup>1</sup> d<sup>d</sup>en-ki i-ip-pu-uš "Who but Enki could have done this?" with OB *Atra-ḫasīs* 3.vi.14 *man-nu ki-a-am ip-pú-[ús]* "who could have acted thus?" (cf. SB *Gilgameš* 11.179). Further parallels with *Atra-ḫasīs* in Picchioni (1981) 37-40, Millstein (2016) 85 n. 25; on the relations between Adapa and the flood-hero see now Annus (2016) 16-18. In both situations, a priest beloved by Enki/Ea faces the divine community after a deed related to his master that displeases the chief god (Enlil/Anu). This configures an opposition between the latter and the man's protector. In both cases a broader cosmic issue (mankind's fate/South Wind's absence) relates to the hero's mortality.

However, only *SumAdapa* presents a divine assembly. Moreover, while the Akkadian texts focus on Adapa's fate, the gathered gods of *SumAdapa* seemingly ignore Adapa, and concentrate on the South Wind (*SumAdapa* 173-79):<sup>87</sup>

an-né unken-na diġir gal-gal-e-ne gù mu-un-dé-e  
a-da-ba tumu-ùlu pa na-aš me-<sup>l</sup>ḥaš<sup>1</sup>  
diġir <sup>l</sup>gal<sup>1</sup>-[gal]-e-ne an-e enim mu-un-na-<ni>-ib-<sup>l</sup>gi<sup>4</sup><sup>1</sup>-[gi<sup>4</sup>] 175  
tumu-ùlu pa-a-bi bi-ib-si-sá ur<sub>5</sub> mu-un-da-zi-ga  
<sup>d</sup>en-ki-ke<sub>4</sub> saġ-du <sup>l</sup>níġ<sup>1</sup>-níġin-na-a-ba  
á-ġá bi-lu-da me an-na-ke<sub>4</sub> kur-ra è-dè  
<sup>d</sup>en-ki tumu-ùlu gù mu-un-na-dé

An set out to address the great gods in the assembly:  
"Why did Adapa break (! tablet: "did you Adapa break") the South Wind's wing?"  
The great gods replied to An: 175  
"As for the South Wind, once its wing is fixed, it will raise itself thereby".  
Enki, after pondering (in) his mind,  
in order to make the commands, lordship and regulations of An go out upon the Land,  
Enki addressed the South Wind:

Enki's speech, starting with the intention to proclaim the Wind's destiny (nam...tar 180), includes, in my view, the final incantation – the enactment of his task.<sup>88</sup> Contrary to the Adapa-centred focus of the Akkadian tradition, the heavenly scene is directed towards his final intervention.<sup>89</sup> The divine assembly comes to the fore as the ceasing of the Wind's blow has caused a cosmic crisis: in the poem's prologue, the gods (*SumAdapa* 11, 24) set the process of civilisation and organisation of the world in a path from instability and chaos to order and regulations. At the end of the composition, they concentrate on restoring the South Wind and, hence, cosmic order.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>87</sup> Composite text after Cavigneaux (2014) 23. My translation implies that (a) at 174 An addresses the gods as the speech introduction indicates (173), and not Adapa as in Akk. B 48' (so Cavigneaux and Annus 2016: 110); me-<sup>l</sup>ḥaš<sup>1</sup> for the expected mu.n.ḥaš is very difficult here, cf. Millstein (2015) 33 and below n. 101 on verbal person confusion in the Meturan texts; (b) the gods' reply is one line long, as is An's question (so too Annus 2016: 110): Cavigneaux understands 177-78 as part of the collective speech, but Enki's pondering is usually reported by the narrator, cf. e.g. *EnNinm* 24-29, esp. 27 <sup>ġcs-tu</sup>ġeštu i-ni<sub>10</sub>-ni<sub>10</sub>-e lit. "he was turning his ear"; *NinTurtle* B 31-32 (ETCSL); *Flood* 142, *DB* 236, providing the best parallel for saġ-du níġin "to revolve one's mind".

<sup>88</sup> For Cavigneaux (2014) 38 and Annus (2016) 110 Enki pronounces only 180, but nam...tar introduces the assembly's final speech at *EnSud* 150-51 and *Lugale* 689 (above §1.2). Compare Nintu's incantations after performing her task at *Atra-ḥasīs* OB 1.289 ff.

<sup>89</sup> The doxology (190) praises the god. Cf. Millstein (2015a-b), (2016) 101-2.

<sup>90</sup> Note the South Wind's positive effect at *SumAdapa* 35.

*SumAdapa* displays an assembly pattern that is widespread in Akkadian narratives: the divine community faces an impasse, and Enki performs the decisive action. Here, An raises the issue, the great gods indicate the solution, and Enki's act perfects the world's organisation as An's decrees reach earth.

### §2.3. Death of Bilgames

A very complex example of divine assembly appears in *DB*, again attested at Nippur and Meturan. The Meturan text (M), far more complete than the Nippur one (Ni), was recovered from the same house as *SumAdapa* and shows the same linguistic problems.<sup>91</sup>

*DB* belongs among the Sumerian poems about Bilgames/Gilgameš, which never merged, as far as we know, into a unique Sumerian narrative, although it has been recently argued that most of them were treated as a coherent series ("Cycle") in the OB period.<sup>92</sup> The poetic material on which our OB Sumerian poems are based most likely goes back to the third millennium, but the alleged Ur III dating of some of our mss. is not unproblematic.<sup>93</sup> During the OB period, independent written versions in Sumerian and Akkadian coexisted, and our Sumerian witnesses are contemporary with the first evidence for a *Gilgameš* poem in Akkadian (OB *Gilgameš*). It is difficult to establish in what measure OB *Gilgameš*, a (most likely) unified and coherent poem of which we possess only parts, drew on the Sumerian poems we know (or vice-versa), and how far both might be influenced by centuries of Akkadian and Sumerian oral traditions.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> Ed. Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi (2000), add Veldhuis (2001) 146, Peterson (2011) 69-70 and see George (1999) 195-208, Veldhuis (2001), Katz (2003) 187-88, Wilcke (2004), Zgoll (2006a), Sallaberger (2012) 127-30, Artemov (2014) 38-40.

<sup>92</sup> Gadotti (2014a) 83-108; Attinger (2015d) 236-38 remains sceptical.

<sup>93</sup> On palaeographic grounds, Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi (1993) 101 date to Ur III a ms. of *GBH* (Ni 13230) which in CDLI (P343555) is classified as OB; two alleged Ur III fragments were made known to George (2003) 7 n. 16 by G. Rubio, cf. above n. 48. For an Ur III dating of the poetic material, see e.g. Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi (2000) 10 on the (Ur III) burial practices and royal ideology reflected in *DB*, cf. Katz (2003) 183 n. 180, 224 n. 80; Sallaberger (2012), however, frames such depictions within an Isin-Larsa ideological context, dating *DB* to the OB period.

<sup>94</sup> On the genesis of the Akkadian material see below, Ch. 4§1.

The literary relation between the first-millennium SB *Gilgameš* and *DB* manifests itself in a significant shift: it is not Gilgameš's death (as in *DB*), but Enkidu's that is depicted at SB *Gilgameš* 7-8, reflecting Enkidu's different role in the Akkadian tradition vis-à-vis the Sumerian poems. The (possibly accidental) lack of relevant OB Akkadian evidence for the death of Enkidu and this remarkable shift may strengthen the case for an Akkadian recasting of the Sumerian tradition represented by *DB*.<sup>95</sup>

*DB* provides an aetiology of Bilgames' position as judge of the dead and, in part, of a number of funerary rituals, not least the construction of statues for the future remembrance of rulers. The text begins with Bilgames lying on his death-bed; after a lacuna, he enters the divine assembly in a dream, where the gods decree that he must die in spite of his merits and his divine mother; however Bilgames will reign among the dead, receive offerings, and join a glorious company as ruler. The dream is repeated *verbatim* and interpreted.<sup>96</sup> After a second substantial lacuna, the course of the Euphrates is diverted, a stone tomb is built where Bilgames enters carrying offerings for the Underworld gods. Public mourning takes place as the Euphrates is returned to its course. Though Bilgames is unhappy in the Netherworld,<sup>97</sup> the poem concludes, funerary rituals and buildings permit the survival of memory. The divine assembly stands at the core of the poem: it establishes that Bilgames must die, but shows that the funerary rituals give a further significance to the ineluctable destiny. The assembly proceedings are, if not confrontational, at least problematic, due to Bilgames' exceptional status, but eventually the gods provide a form of compensation, and sanction the everlasting importance of funerary rituals.

---

<sup>95</sup> So Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi (2000) 10-11, Anthonioz (2012), Currie (2012). However Keetman (2008) 164 n.18 holds that *DB* was possibly composed "in Anlehnung an akkadische Erzählungen", and note Gadotti's (2014a) 89 suggestion that the episode of Enkidu's death may have been part of the Sumerian tradition. Cf. below Chs. 4§3.2, 10§5.

<sup>96</sup> Veldhuis (2001) maintains that the repetition represents the narrative enactment of the dream; differently Zgoll (2006a) 125-26, Sallaberger (2012) 128 n. 22.

<sup>97</sup> Though cf. Veldhuis (2001) 140 on the ambiguity of M 297.



They set out to communicate the will of (An and) Enlil to Enki<sup>102</sup>  
 An and Enlil replied to Enki:<sup>103</sup>  
 "In those days, in those distant days,  
 in those nights, in those distant nights, 70/160  
 in those years, in those distant years,  
 when the assembly had made the flood sweep over  
 so that we could indeed annihilate the seed of mankind,  
 in our midst you were alone, and life it was,  
 the-only-one-reaching-life (Ziusudra), (that was) the name of man, and life it was! 75/165  
 On that day *we* did take an oath by Sky and Earth,  
 on that day *we* swore that there would not be (eternal) life for man."<sup>104</sup>  
 Now, *they turned their eyes onto* Bilgames:<sup>105</sup>  
 "We cannot save him on account of his mother.  
 Bilgames, among the spirits, departed from earth, 80/170  
 let him be the governor of the Netherworld, let him be the foremost of the spirits."<sup>106</sup>  
 When he (Enlil?) rendered the verdict, *they sanctioned* the decision:<sup>107</sup>  
 "Your speech will be important (as) the word of Ningišzida and Dumuzi".

Enki, thus, was willing to save Bilgames, and the previous speech listing the king's achievements made a strong point in that direction. But the king must die, and An and Enlil must preserve cosmic order. They resort to a juridical precedent, an account of the

<sup>102</sup> Zgoll (2006a) 123 would read 'An-ra', and make this line refer to the previous speech, uttered, in her interpretation, to An by Enlil and Enki. However, both 'a-rá' and 'en-ki-<sup>1</sup>ra' are reasonably clear in Al-Rawi's hand-copy (Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi 2000: fig. 8). This line is absent from Ni<sub>1</sub> (Peterson 2011: 70), which may signal that it doubles 68 (see following footnote).

<sup>103</sup> Previous interpretations of Enki as the speaker here, Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi (2000), Zólyomi in ETCSL, Veldhuis (2001), Katz (2003), still Espak (2015) 186-87, or of An as the *only* speaker (Zgoll), are now obsolete in light of the new join to Ni<sub>1</sub> iv, restoring the parallel line an 'en-líl-bi-da 'en-<sup>1</sup>ki<sup>1</sup>-ke<sub>4</sub> ba-ni-ib-gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>-ne (Peterson 2011: 70), cf. Sallaberger (2012) 128.

<sup>104</sup> On 74-77//164-67 see Zgoll (2006a) 122-23, gathering all the (different) main translations to date, add Sallaberger (2012) 128. On 74-75//164-65 I follow Zgoll (2006a) 122 and, more closely, Sallaberger, whose translation preserves to some extent the word- and scribal play on Ziusudra's name: zi-ús-DIŠ (Me<sub>2</sub>) - which can be read zi-ús-dili (dili meaning "one, unique"), and possibly also zi-ús-rù (Zgoll) - evokes the name of the flood-hero zi-u<sub>4</sub>-sù-rá; Me<sub>11</sub> here has zi-u<sub>4</sub>-DU-[...] (= zi-u<sub>4</sub><-sù>-rá?): see further Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi (2000) 41. A quotation from the divine utterance to Ziusudra is seen here by Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi (2000) 56 (74//164) and Veldhuis (2001) 142 (74-75//164-65), so that 74//164 would be "you are the only man to live in our midst", but it might be easier to imagine a direct reference to Enki's isolation in breaking the divine oath.

I render the next couplet, where the verbal persons are unclear, with George (1999) 199. I tend to assume (with Veldhuis 2001: 142, Zgoll 2006a: 122, Sallaberger 2012: 128) that there is no change in that respect across the two difficult pà.d forms, though Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi (2000) 56 have (Enki speaking) "(166)...tu<sup>1</sup> m'as fait jurer... / (167) ... Je l'hai juré (?)" Zgoll renders (An speaking): "(166) ... hat er (Enki oder Enki) ... geschworen / (167) ... hat er (Enlil) ihn (Enki) schwören lassen ...". A first person singular is seen here by Veldhuis (Enki) and Sallaberger (Enlil). Considering the speech introduction (above nn. 102-03), An and Enlil should still be speaking jointly and recalling to Enki their (common) binding act.

<sup>105</sup> Similarly Veldhuis (2001) 142, but to most translators this and the following lines are still part of the previous speech, e.g. George (1999) 199 "now we look on Bilgames"; tentatively Sallaberger (2012) 128 "*blickte dies auf dich*", with "dies" proleptic of 79//169.

<sup>106</sup> Or "Let his spirit be foremost!", so e.g. Sallaberger (2012) 128, but it is difficult to explain the ablative kitim-bi-ta in M 80/170, unless -ta stands for /da/ (cf. possibly M 83).

<sup>107</sup> With Veldhuis (2001) 142, this line is understood as demarking the transition to the direct, final address to Bilgames, but most scholars see the phrases as referring to Bilgames' Netherworld prerogatives, e.g. Sallaberger (2012) 128: "um nach der Entscheidung im Prozess den Schiedsspruch zu treffen".

cosmic foundation of the current state of things. The typical Sumerian cosmological exordium ("in those days...")<sup>108</sup> introduces the narrative re-enactment of the *unique* apotheosis of the flood-hero Ziusudra. "In those days" Enki guaranteed the survival of mankind against the divine oath, by helping his favourite Ziusudra, who was granted immortality. Thereby, however - so the gods remind Enki and the audience - another oath was sworn that this should be exceptional. The second oath established the indissoluble nexus between the "unique life" of the flood-hero, and the "life" thereby accorded to mankind (74-75//164-65), which (it is implied) is permitted to survive as long as it is mortal.

Whether or not the final verdict and sanctions are pronounced in different, successive speeches,<sup>109</sup> the divine discussion shows a tripartite structure. First, the case against Bilgames' death (M 52-66//143-56); second, the denial of this possibility on account of the historical precondition of the current world-order (M 67-79//157-169). The preceding claims about the king's extraordinary deeds are not dismissed; An and Enlil do not touch upon the hero before the final sentence (M 80-83//170-173), the third moment which acknowledges, within the limits established, that Bilgames' merits should outlast his death.

#### §2.4. The Sumerian *Flood Story*

The episode recalled by An and Enlil in *DB* belongs to the myth of the flood, known from OB *Atra-ḫasīs* and SB *Gilgameš* 11; *Flood* represents a version in Sumerian.<sup>110</sup> The earliest witnesses of *Atra-ḫasīs* date to the late 18th century; *Flood* is preserved on a six-column tablet from Nippur, dated to c. 1600 BC in the light of its linguistic peculiarities,

---

<sup>108</sup> See Streck (2002) 194-202, adding *SumAdapa* 1-3.

<sup>109</sup> Above nn. 105, 107.

<sup>110</sup> Ed. Civil (1999), whose continuous line numbering (after Kramer 1955) is adopted here. See further Jacobsen (1981), Kramer (1983), Cavigneaux (1993), Pettinato (2001) 146-51, ETCSL.

aligning it with *SumAdapa* and *DG*.<sup>111</sup> An edition of one Isin-Larsa (20th/19th centuries) fragment belonging to the beginning of the composition is forthcoming.<sup>112</sup>

The catastrophic deluge motif had hardly achieved a systematic mythological shape (such as in *Atra-ḫasīs*, *Flood* and SB *Gilgameš*) before the Isin-Larsa period.<sup>113</sup> As far as reading is possible, the deluge episode (*Flood* iii-vi) overlaps with *Atra-ḫasīs* and SB *Gilgameš*, whereas what precedes seems to differ considerably.<sup>114</sup> Of the cases here considered, *Flood* seems (on present evidence) the least likely to have influenced its Akkadian counterpart (*Atra-ḫasīs*).<sup>115</sup>

The fragmentary state of preservation impedes ascertaining how many scenes of assembly the poem contained. When columns iii-iv become legible, the mention of the divine oath binding the gods to the Flood decision at 143-44 may signal that a relevant assembly scene had taken place. Ziusudra is seemingly occupied with some ritual activity when he is alerted by Enki (145-53),<sup>116</sup> who comments on the oath taken in the divine assembly at 155-59:<sup>117</sup>

na-de <sub>5</sub> -ga-ḡu <sub>10</sub> ḡessal <sup>sal4</sup> [ḡé-em-ši-ak]	155
DAG-me-a a-ma-ru <sup>u</sup> ugu <sub>6</sub> KAB- <sup>r</sup> du <sub>11</sub> <sup>1</sup> -[ga ...] ba- <sup>r</sup> ūr <sup>1</sup> -[...]	
nuḡun nam-lú-ùlu ḡa-lam-e- <sup>r</sup> dè <sup>1</sup> [nam-bi ba-tar]	
di-til-la enim pu-úḡ-ru-[um-ma-ka šu gi <sub>4</sub> -gi <sub>4</sub> nu-ḡál]	
enim du <sub>11</sub> -ga an <sup>d</sup> en-[líl-lá-ka šu bal-e nu-zu]	
 [Pay] heed to my advice!	 155

<sup>111</sup> Civil (1999) 138, Jacobsen (1981) 513. In reconstructing *Flood*, Jacobsen used a further late OB fragment from Ur (*UET* VI.61) and a NB bilingual (CT 46 no. 5, cf. already Civil 138), neither of which is likely to belong to *Flood*, cf. Jacobsen (1981) 514, Kramer (1983) 116.

<sup>112</sup> Schøyen MS 3026 (CDLI P252032), assigned to K. Volk.

<sup>113</sup> Civil (1999) 138, Alster (2005) 32-33, Chen (2012), (2013).

<sup>114</sup> Recently Kvanvig (2011) 85-89.

<sup>115</sup> Independent compositions according to Lambert (1983) 35-36; Kvanvig (2011) 89; Chen (2013) 234-37, 247, 250-51; Bottéro and Kramer (1989) 530, however, see a genetic relation stemming from OB *Atra-ḫasīs*.

<sup>116</sup> The oath is mentioned again (151) in these difficult lines. In Jacobsen's (1981) 521-22 reconstruction, a vision appears to Ziusudra where the gods enter Ki'ur and swear the oath, whereafter Enki intervenes by sending his instructions. The sending of the instructions is paralleled at OB *Atr.* 3.i.15ff., but the preceding lines are illegible, cf. now also the "Ark tablet" 1 ff. (Finkel 2014: 358). Jacobsen's reading requires much hypothetical restoration, whilst the very mention of the Ki'ur at 151 is uncertain, cf. Civil (1999) 171, Kramer (1983) 119 n. 28.

<sup>117</sup> 155-56 with Civil, 157-59 restored with Jacobsen (1981) 522 from *LSUr* 364-65 (see below §4), cf. Kramer (1983) 120 and ETCSL.

Over the ..., the flood shall [sweep] over the ....  
to annihilate the seed of mankind, [its fate has been decreed],  
the sentence, the word of the assembly [cannot be opposed]  
the word pronounced by An and Enlil [knows no overturning]

The instructions are lost in the ensuing lacuna; as the text resumes (col. v), the flood rages, ceases, and Ziusudra comes out of his boat. He prepares an animal sacrifice, whose details and immediate outcomes are lost in the next lacuna, most likely containing the gods' gathering at the sacrifice and their ensuing discussion.<sup>118</sup> The text resumes (col. vi) with a speech-end of doubtful attribution: again an oath is mentioned, possibly sanctioning the unique vicinity of Ziusudra to the gods (251-52).<sup>119</sup> The hero prostrates himself before An and Enlil, is made immortal and, in the last preserved line, transferred to the island of Dilmun (Bahrein).

Though no complete divine assembly is discernible in *Flood*, the insistence on the concept that the catastrophe was decided by the assembly is remarkable. The deluge stems from a collective oath at 144 and (possibly) 150; in Enki's message, more forcefully, the decision is called the assembly's sentence (di-til-la 158), a synonym for the "word of An (and) Enlil" (159). After the deluge, an oath is mentioned in connection with Ziusudra (251-52), where one should see, with Jacobsen, not the oath for the flood, but the one sanctioning Ziusudra's unique fate. Thus, *Flood* 251-52 may represent the only textual referent of *DB M 75-76//165-66*, where the gods recall the second oath.<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> Jacobsen (1981) 524-25.

<sup>119</sup> The couplet is difficult due to the unusual Sumerian. Jacobsen (1981) 524-25 draws on the parallels in *Atr.* and *SB Gilg.* 11 and sees here the end of Enki's speech concluding the divine discussion; to Cavigneaux (1992a), Ziusudra sanctions here mankind's survival through a word-play touching the oath's subject, the disappearance of nig<sub>2</sub>-GILIM, meaning both "vermin" (viz. wretched humanity) and "catastrophe" (Akk. *šahluqtu*).

<sup>120</sup> The second oath might well belong in the lacuna at *OB Atr.* 3.vii-viii, though *SB Gilgameš* does not mention it (nor the first) during the hero's apotheosis.

### §3. City-Laments

The five extant City-Laments, seemingly composed during the 20th century, reflect the destructions accompanying the Ur III dynasty's fall at the end of the third millennium, and the subsequent rise of the Isin dynasty.<sup>121</sup> The likelihood of a shared cultic setting, visible in the compositions' conclusions, their consecutive presence in some literary catalogues, and a common structure with threnodic sections labelled *kirugu*, all qualify City-Laments as an "ethnic" genre.<sup>122</sup> Other types of *Klagelieder* were copied in the first millennium, but the five City-Laments are not attested beyond the OB period.<sup>123</sup> Abounding in litanies, City-Laments are not strictly narrative in character. Nevertheless, they do unfold a path from chaos and devastation back to (an at least contemplated) restoration of stability.<sup>124</sup> Within this framework, the divine assembly is portrayed as ultimately responsible for the destruction, and capable of restoring order.

The communal action of the gods is structurally prominent already in the *Curse of Agade*, a probably earlier composition which accounts for the destruction of the city of Agade (or Akkad) as a result of king Narām-Suen's impiety.<sup>125</sup> The kingdom's idyllic prosperity (CA 1-56) is suddenly subverted: the city's approaching doom is sanctioned, as the major gods forsake it in succession (64-76). After Narām-Suen's reckless pillaging of Ekur, all the gods gather around a fasting Enlil (209-13). Their long collective curse (214-71) and its briefly described enactment (274-80) conclude the composition.

---

<sup>121</sup> On dating see now Samet (2014) 5-9: *Lament for Sumer and Ur (LSUr)* and *Lament for Ur (LUr)* share many features among which the reference to the armies to which Ur III fell, and seem comparatively earlier than *Lament for Nippur (LNi)* and *Lament for Uruk (LW, fragmentary)*, mentioning king Išme-Dagan of Isin (reigning c. 1953-35). *Lament for Eridu (LE)*, extremely fragmentary, appears closer to *LUr* and *LSUr* than to *LN* and *LW*.

<sup>122</sup> On the genre see especially Krecher (1980/83); Cooper (1983) 20-6, (2006); Vanstiphout (1986); Michalowski (1989) 4-9; Tinney (1996) 11-52; Wilcke (2000); Cavigneaux (2013) 4, 15-16; Samet (2014) 3-13.

<sup>123</sup> On emesal *Klagelieder* see now Löhnert (2009) 3-87, part. 3-10 on these compositions vis-à-vis City-Laments.

<sup>124</sup> E.g. Löhnert (2009) 7: "In Gegensatz zu Balaḡs, Eršemmas und Eršaḡuḡas [i.e. emesal lamentations] wird in den Städteklagen jedoch eine Peripetie ersichtlich"; cf. Vanstiphout (1986) 8.

<sup>125</sup> Ed. Cooper (1983), earliest mss. possibly dating to Ur III.

The *Lament over Sumer and Ur* first portrays divine agency in two successive sections listing major gods enacting destruction (*LSUr* 22-26, 58-64).<sup>126</sup> The incontrovertible decision, *enim du<sub>11</sub>-ga an<sup>d</sup> en-líl-lá(k)* "the word pronounced by An and Enlil", is mentioned before the second of these sections, in the lines which syntactically govern the entire preceding litany (*LSUr* 55-57).<sup>127</sup> Identical phrasing recurs in a central position within the poem, as Enlil rejects the supplication of his son Nanna, Ur's principal deity. Enlil's aloof response, identifying the "word of An and Enlil" with the "sentence of the assembly",<sup>128</sup> and stressing the ephemeral nature of human kingship, mark the turning point towards the climax of the tragedy (*LSUr* 364-69).<sup>129</sup> Finally, "the pronouncement of An and Enlil" concludes Enlil's yielding to his son's second supplication, and sanctions the Land's restoration under Nanna's patronage (460-74). Thus, although no divine assembly scene is staged, the assembly's theological importance is highlighted by the structuring function of its mention throughout the composition, marking beginning, climax and final resolution of the destruction narrative.

Collective divine representations are structurally prominent in the narrative/mythological section of the fragmentary *LW* (*kirugus* I-III).<sup>130</sup> The composition opens as the gods, dissatisfied with overpopulation (a topos well-known from *Atra-ḫasīs*, cf. Ch. 2§3.2), create a monstrous being that makes them marvel (*LW* I.1-13), and whose

---

<sup>126</sup> Ed. Michalowski (1989), with Attinger (2015a).

<sup>127</sup> On the syntax cf. Michalowski (1989) 12.

<sup>128</sup> The same identification, as we have seen, stands at *Flood* 158-59, whether or not one accepts Jacobsen's (1981) 522 "formulaic" restoration of these lines from *LSUr* 364-65. Chen (2013) 234-5 views this intertext in terms of a borrowing from the City-Lament, but a common traditional pattern is certainly possible. Chen (2013) 223 also notes the consonance between *LSUr* 22, 56-57 and 364-65, without addressing its compositional function.

<sup>129</sup> On this famous speech see e.g. Michalowski (1983), (1989) 14-15; Tinney (1996) 35; Dahl (2011) 67; Samet (2014) 21, cf. Ch. 10§4.

<sup>130</sup> Ed. Green (1984), cf. Cavigneaux (2013).

destructive capacity is evoked by Enlil in the third *kirugu* as he decrees destruction, possibly addressing the gods.<sup>131</sup>

One diegetic depiction of a divine assembly in the City-Laments stands in the *LUR*.<sup>132</sup> The scene (*LUR* 152-62) concludes the goddess Ningal's protracted lamentation song. Like the dialogue between Nanna and Enlil at *LSUR* 340-70, this scene precedes the climax of the crisis by portraying the supplication's failure. Though Ningal tries twice to persuade An and Enlil, the assembly is mentioned only during her second attempt, as part of an accumulation strategy enhancing the goddess's pathos as she faces the assembly verdict's inalterability.<sup>133</sup> Ningal's lament and the *kirugu* conclude with her sombre remark on An and Enlil's unchangeable pronouncement: the standard phraseology (*LUR* 168-69 ~ *LSUR* 56) acquires pathetic force after the narrative enactment of that pronouncement, and just before the destruction is fully described in the next *kirugu*.<sup>134</sup>

Thus, *LSUR* and *LUR* identify the word of An and Enlil with the word of the divine assembly. The "irreversible decision" works both as a theological principle justifying destruction and as a poetic device to create pathos (supplication scenes) and organise the peripeteia, for the decision *does* revert.

#### §4. Concluding remarks: narrative function and scene structure

The assemblies' diegetic function has been assessed according to their position within their own poems. Some of the patterns observed in divine narratives apply to human narratives too: *DB* stands out as the repeated dream of the assembly occupies most of the poem (*DB* 45-216 out of about 305 lines), but *SumAdapa* concludes with a resolving

---

<sup>131</sup> We saw divine creation as (positive) cosmic resolution in *EnNinm* (§1.2), but the topos is widespread: e.g. *InD* 222-23 (*IsD* 91-92), *OB Atr.* 1.174-249 (Ch. 2§3.1), *Agušaya* A v.22'-28', *Ee* 6.1-38, *SB Gilg.* 1.79-104 (Ch. 4§3.1); for a comparison with Hesiod's Woman/Pandora scenes cf. Ballesteros Petrella (in prep.3).

<sup>132</sup> Ed. Samet (2014), with Attinger (2015c).

<sup>133</sup> Note the use of *ki-saĝ-ki* (*LUR* 152, cf. *DB* 140//49, above n. 98) to stress the imposing assembly setting.

<sup>134</sup> On the scene cf. still Jacobsen (1976) 86-91, now Samet (2014) 21-22.

assembly akin to the collective praises crowning divine narratives. Other assemblies mark plot boundaries in divine narratives (and in *LUR*) as in *Lugalb. I*. In *Flood*, the position of the assembly's two oaths is significant: the deluge oath appears to stand about halfway (*Flood* iii-iv), while that for Ziusudra seemingly concludes the composition (*Flood* vi). This structural role recurs in *Lugale* and *LSUR*, where the mention of the assembly's decision articulates the lamentation's development, whilst a collective creation starts *LW*.

The scenes are not particularly long, especially in divine narratives. They generally begin with the gods already gathered, except *Lugalb. I*, and possibly *Flood* vi, where they convene to receive the offering; sometimes the scene starts as a particular god (*EJN*, *EnNinl*, *Angim*, *Lugale* 674 ff.) or man (*DB*, *SumAdapa*) enters the assembly. The banquet, when present, constitutes the core of the assembly (*EnNinm*, *EJN*). In divine narratives, the scene is always exhausted with final speeches of praise, be it one (*EnNinm*, *EnSud*, *EJN*) or two (*Lugale* 304 ff., 674 ff., *Angim*); the same applies in *EnNinl*, with the gods' verdict on Enlil.

Assemblies in *Lugale*, human narratives, and *LUR* display more complex structures, which may be analysed as tripartite. *Lugale*'s first scene displays a presentation (peaceful assembly, 17-23), a disruption/crisis (Šarur's speech, panic 24-74), and a resolution (Ninurta sets out 75-95). The preserved part of the second assembly, too, has an introduction (divine panic 182-86), a crisis point (Enlil's cry to Ninlil 187-90), and a resolution (Šarur's arrival 191 ff.). The *SumAdapa* assembly presents three speeches (problem, suggestion, implementation); that in *DB* develops through thesis (first speech), antithesis (An and Enlil's reply) and synthesis (the verdict). Compare also *LSUR*, with Ninlil's supplication (154-59), An and Enlil's negative reply (160-64) and the goddess' disillusioned conclusion (165-69).

## Chapter 2: *Atra-ḫasīs*

### §1. Manuscript tradition and synopsis

*Atra-ḫasīs*' manuscript tradition extends from the OB to the LB period.<sup>135</sup> Its geographical diffusion is attested by fragments found at Boğazköy/Hattusa (14th-13th c.),<sup>136</sup> and quite possibly at Ras-Shamra/Ugarit (13th c.).<sup>137</sup>

The OB "main recension" of the poem was recognised by Lambert and Millard (1969, hereafter L-M) in a three-tablet series from Sippar (mss. A, B, C), written by the scribe Ipīq-Aya around 1635 BC.<sup>138</sup> This constitutes the basis for the reconstruction of the poem, the remaining evidence being assessed in reference to Ipīq-Aya's text.<sup>139</sup> Besides the above-mentioned peripheral evidence, the late second millennium features only one source, from Nippur.<sup>140</sup> Numerous first-millennium manuscripts, however, attest to some extent of textual standardisation. Most LA Nineveh fragments, four tablets from Sippar (SB Si) and two from Babylon (L-M ms. x and MM 818) constitute the "Standard

---

<sup>135</sup> Mss. of *Atra-ḫasīs* are listed by Shehata (2001) 192-98; add Spar and Lambert (2005) 195-201 and George (2009) 16-22. Overviews in George and Al-Rawi (1996) 147-48, Foster (2005) 278, Spar and Lambert (2005) 196; Wisnom (2014) 48-52.

<sup>136</sup> Siegelová (1970): KUB 36.74, in Hittite, corresponding to *Atr.* OB 1.146-57, possibly part of a bilingual tablet-series; KBo 36.26, in Akkadian. KUB 8.63+KBo 53.5 belongs to a Hittite translation of a Hurrian version: the passage, where Kumarbi plays the part of Enli, has no Akkadin parallel, see Archi (2007) 186.

<sup>137</sup> Kämmerer (1993), with previous literature: the content of this fragment, possibly from a bilingual tablet, does not match any portion of the Babylonian narrative and perhaps represents an Ugaritic version of *Atra-ḫasīs*. A further fragment containing the dove-sending, thus possibly belonging to the *Gilgameš* epic, in Cavigneaux (2007).

<sup>138</sup> Relevant colophons in L-M 32; on the scribe's name see Wilcke (1999) 68-69 n. 9, cf. van Koppen (2011). Two further OB mss. (D and E) attest to the main recension, unlike F, G and the OB fragment in Lambert (1991), cf. L-M 31-34; the OB fragment in Groneberg (1991) seems to belong to the main recension, and might belong to B, cf. van Koppen (2011) 145. Note that ms. y ("Neo-Late Babylonian" according to L-M 41), is currently considered OB, cf. Shehata (2001) 193 n. 138. MS 5108 in the Schøyen Collection (George 2009) is the oldest witness so far (18th c.), attesting to a different edition from that current in Sippar. See also the early OB "Ark tablet" in Finkel (2014) 357-68, which he considers (298-308) a mnemonic support for performance.

<sup>139</sup> No updated edition is available and Shehata (2001) is a fundamental critical tool. According to Foster (2005) 228, the three tablets of the OB poem contained "1245 lines, of which about 60 per cent are preserved in whole or in part". Foster's (2005) 227-80 translation is critically founded, but add Spar and Lambert (2005) 195-201 and George (2009) 16-22. Unless otherwise specified, the ensuing discussion and quotations refer to the OB text in L-M, supplemented by Shehata's collation, following their sigla and line-numbering.

<sup>140</sup> L-M 126-27, though cf. Lambert (1991) 411 for LA K 13347 as possibly MB.

Babylonian" version, broadly corresponding to Ipīq-Aya's OB text.<sup>141</sup> The existence of an Assyrian recension might be attested by some more Nineveh fragments displaying Assyrianisms and minor plot differences.<sup>142</sup>

The OB poem's content, reconstructed in conjunction with the later evidence, is easily outlined following the three tablets.<sup>143</sup>

(Tablet 1) The proem provides a cosmic framework: Anu governs the sky, Enlil the earth and Enki/Ea the abyss below.<sup>144</sup> The Igigū gods, tired of labouring on the earth, revolt against Enlil. The divine assembly decides to create mankind as a workforce: the mother-goddess Nintu (also called Mami and Bēlet-ilī) does so with Ea's help. As mankind multiplies, its uproar disturbs Enlil's sleep, who plans a disease through the plague-god Namtar. However, Ea advises his favourite Atra-ḫasīs ("Exceedingly-Wise"): ritual procedures are changed to appease Namtar, and Enlil's plan is thwarted.

(Tablet 2) The same happens with the second provision, the drought: the storm-god Adad is appeased and releases rain. Enlil's third resolution involves a more carefully planned starvation. Ea cannot communicate directly with Atra-ḫasīs, the famine rages over several years, but eventually the sea, guarded by Ea, releases abundant food. Enlil accuses Ea and binds the gods by a new oath concerning the flood.

(Tablet 3) Ea sends dreams to Atra-ḫasīs, who has the ark built. During the flood, the gathered gods (except Enlil) are distraught with horror, thirst and hunger. After the flood, Atra-ḫasīs prepares a sacrifice, for which the gods convene: Nintu accuses Enlil; Enlil arrives and is confronted by Ea: Atra-ḫasīs is made immortal, and Nintu and Ea establish

---

<sup>141</sup> This group's textual content proves highly homogeneous when comparison permits, though its arrangement (columns and lines per tablet) varies. SB Si: George and Al-Rawi (1996); LA fragments in Shehata (2001) 194-95, "jungbabylonisch", from Nineveh; MM 818: Böck and Rowe (1999/2000).

<sup>142</sup> Cf. Shehata (2001) 196-97 ("neuassyrisch"): a LB/Achaemenid period fragment (Spar and Lambert 2005: 195-201) seems close to the latter group.

<sup>143</sup> Shehata's (2001) 4-22 outline addresses the relationship between different sources and the narrative's obscure points.

<sup>144</sup> Ipīq-Aya (alone) systematically writes <sup>d</sup>en.ki. As this might be logogrammatic for "Ea" (Lambert 1980: 74 *ad* 1.204), we adopt the Akkadian name throughout, though leaving L-M's <sup>d</sup>en-ki.

measures against overpopulation, such as birth-diseases, sterility and taboo women. The poem's conclusion is largely lost, but the final praise of Enlil is preserved.

## §2. Narrative theology and the Sumerian tradition

*Atra-ḫasīs* constructs a mytho-historic aetiology of the current world order, in which the human and the divine dimensions are interdependent.<sup>145</sup> *Atra-ḫasīs*, the man, achieves reconciliation and mankind's survival thanks to his piety and close contact with the god Ea, who, in turn, is able to counterbalance Enlil's destructive action precisely through his intimacy with mankind's representative.

The interdependency between gods and men, literally ingrained in mankind's mixed matrix (OB 1.212-13), is decisively sanctioned through man's preparation of sacrifice. However, the opposition between the two dimensions, and its dramatic enactment leading to the final resolution, unfolds on a purely divine level, where Enlil's unilateral perspective is opposed by Ea and Nintu, mankind's creators. The chief god's characterisation is crucial: Enlil's stubborn and reckless attitude permits Ea and Nintu's positive counteraction. This characterisation becomes particularly visible by considering *Atra-ḫasīs*' deployment of literary paradigms present in Sumerian literature. A more complex literary theology emerges, which articulates the narrative to an unprecedented extent by questioning the judgment of the supreme god.

In *Atra-ḫasīs*, Enlil faces two distinct moments of opposition, the revolt of the Igiḡū and Ea's thwarting wiles. Both counter-movements gain the upper hand, achieving the end of the Igiḡū's intolerable work through the creation of man, and the perpetuation of mankind

---

<sup>145</sup> Cf. OB 1.1 *inūma ilū awīlum* "when the gods (were) man", see Oden (1981) 207-10, Wilcke (1999) 94-95, and now Ziegler (2016). Among the vast bibliography on the poem (see Oden 1981: 197-98 n. 4, Shehata 2001: 166-86), I have profited most from Pettinato (1968), Moran (2002) 33-86, Kilmer (1972) 160-78, (1996), von Soden (1979), Bottéro (1982), Wilcke (1999), Alster (2002); most recently Kvanvig (2011) 13-82 and Chen (2013) 197-252.

in spite of the decreed annihilation. Both patterns occur in Sumerian literature, notably in *Enki and Ninmah* and the City-Laments.<sup>146</sup> *EnNinm*'s narrative backbone corresponds in a fairly precise way to the first part of *Atra-ḫasīs*. The labouring gods complain and stop working, the sleeping chief is alerted, the birth-goddesses collaborate to create mankind. But *Atra-ḫasīs* elaborates considerably on the revolt, with its successive phases increasing the sense of crisis and Enlil's helplessness. In *EnNinm*, the one who is awakened is not Enlil, but Enki. Unlike Enlil in *Atra-ḫasīs*, Enki keeps his temper, and finds the appropriate strategy to enact his mother's proposal (*EnNinm* A.24-37). Enki's capacity and authority (unlike Enlil's) are not in doubt, and the crisis is easily solved by his reassuring actions, exalted by the gods and praised by the singer (*EnNinm* B.12-15, 113).

Both the City-Laments and *Atra-ḫasīs*' second part revolve around the ultimate outcome of Enlil's destructive decision. The City-Laments never question Enlil's authority: the gods favouring mankind and praying for salvation do not *act* against his decision, their vain appeals stressing, rather, the proverbial ineluctibility of the divine resolution (eventually altered in fact). The pantheon leaders have an absolute discretion to destroy the earthly order, or spare it. In *Atra-ḫasīs*, conversely, when it comes to Enlil's resolutions, the audience have come to know him as an obstinate god unable to solve the crisis, whilst Ea's remarkable role has prepared for his active intervention against Enlil. Moreover, Ea's relationship with *Atra-ḫasīs*, through the god's benevolence and the man's patience and piety, enables mankind to provide for its own salvation through a massive collective effort. In the City-Laments, the king's efficiency in restoring the temple accompanies the expected divine relenting; in *Atra-ḫasīs* mankind's survival is achieved through a collective human action directed by Ea against Enlil's command.

---

<sup>146</sup> Ch. 1§1.2, §3. Valuable discussions of *Atra-ḫasīs*' relationship to Sumerian literature include Komoróczy (1976b); Lambert (1992), (2013) 364; Moran (1987); Wilcke (1999) 68-72; Chen (2013) esp. 234-37, 247, 250-51; Lisman (2013) 330-46.

The final sacrifice demonstrates the cosmic interdependency on which the world order is grounded. Enlil sanctions the new situation, and still governs the world. Eventually, he heeds Ea's advice, and guarantees man's place on earth as advocated by the mother-goddess who accused him openly. The present cosmic order, thus, is shaped through a divine dialectic that nuances and ultimately confirms Enlil's rule, whilst emphasising mankind's active and everlasting stature.

### §3. Divine assemblies

The poem's narrative is shaped by its theological discourse on Enlil, who faces opposition, and the divine proceedings concerning mankind. In *EnNinm* Enki ponders alone what is to be done, and the gods gather only when creation is to be performed; similarly, in the City-Laments, the decision to annihilate mankind is either taken for granted or briefly proclaimed as a common resolution.<sup>147</sup> Detailed collective scenes showing the decision-making process are absent. By contrast, *Atra-ḫasīs* is structured through long and pervasively distributed scenes of assembly.<sup>148</sup> We may analyse the assemblies through the poem's three parts:

#### Igigū's revolt (OB 1) (§3.1.)

1. 1.39-62: rebels' assembly.
2. 1.99-248: ruling gods' assembly (+ rebels' second assembly), mankind's matrix created.

#### Enlil's destructive plans (OB 1-2) (§3.2.)

3. 1.356-60 (+ short lacuna, 2/3 lines?): Enlil decrees the disease.
4. 2.i.5-22 (+ lacuna, conclusion of Enlil's speech lost): Enlil decrees the drought.
5. 2.ii.36 ff. (OB lost, cf. SB Si 5.47-58): Enlil provides for the famine.
6. 2.v-viii (add Schø. *Atr.*): Enlil accuses Ea, oath, flood decreed.

#### The Flood (OB 2-3) (§3.3.)

7. 3.iii-iv: divine reaction to the flood.
8. 3.v-vii: gods convene for sacrifice, final resolutions.

---

<sup>147</sup> Ch.1§3.

<sup>148</sup> Cf. Moran (1987) 246, distinguishing seven assemblies, Kilmer (1996) 129, Wilcke (1999) 103-04.

### §3.1. Igigū's revolt (OB 1)

#### §3.1.1. Rebellion (1.39-69)

After describing the gods' work (1.21-32), the poet recalls the proem through the two key words *šupšikkum* "forced labour" and *dullum* "hardship" (1.34-38, cf. 1.2).<sup>149</sup> Then, the worker-gods convene (1.39-40):<sup>150</sup>

[(x)<sup>?</sup> *wa-aš*]-*bu-ma i-ik-ka-lu ka-ar-ši* 40  
[*ut-ta(-az)*]-*za-mu i-na ka-la-ak-ki*

[Having sat] down, they were pressing charges, 40  
they [were complaining] in the ditch.

The rebels' speeches follow (1.41-62): though a gap occurs at 1.50-57, and later preserved versions are both fragmentary and mutually divergent, it is clear that there were two speeches.<sup>151</sup> The first, collective speech is entirely extant (1.41-46), expressing bad intentions toward Ninurta and Enlil: Ninurta should "take off the heavy burden" from them (1.41-42),<sup>152</sup> and they want "to remove (Enlil) from his dwelling" (1.43-46). The rebels' leader perhaps nuanced their purposes, though later versions possibly showed his more violent intentions.<sup>153</sup> The workers set fire to their tools and march against Enlil's palace, as the scene turns to Ekur (59-69).

#### §3.1.2. Enlil's reaction (1.70-165)

Enlil's distance from the dramatic events is stressed both by his sleep and by the threefold chain leading to his eventual awareness (1.70-79: Kalkal wakes Nuska, who

---

<sup>149</sup> 1.2: *ub-lu du-ul-la iz-bi-lu šu-up-ši-ik<sup>1</sup>-ka*. The pair is periodically recalled in crucial moments: cf. 1.1-2; 35-38; 149-150≈162-163; 177; 190-91; 196-97; 240-41.

<sup>150</sup> 1.39 restored through MM obv. 4': *aš-bu-ma ik-ka-lu kar-ši*, see Böck and Rowe (1999/2000) 169, 173.

<sup>151</sup> Shehata (2001) 35-37.

<sup>152</sup> Cf. Pettinato (1970) 78, who proposes [<sup>d</sup>*nin-urt*]a for the missing first word at 1.41, where *gu.za.lá* refers to Ninurta (cf. 1.9).

<sup>153</sup> George and Al-Rawi (1996) 158-59, 185; Foster (2005) 231 n. 2.

wakes Enlil).<sup>154</sup> The ruler's reaction is passive: he just tells his vizier Nuska to bar the gate and take weapons, and it is Nuska who proposes summoning an assembly in Ekur; Anu and Ea should be called, which Enlil does (1.91-104). Enlil's address is one of shock and impotence, where a fierce rage betrays a persisting fear (1.107-10):<sup>155</sup>

*ia-a-ši-im-ma* <sup>r</sup>it<sup>1</sup>-[te-bū]-<sup>r</sup>ū<sup>1</sup>  
*ta-ḫa-za e-ep-pu-uš ša* [...] 110  
*i-ni mi-na-a a-mu-ur a-<sup>r</sup>na<sup>1</sup>-ku*  
*qá-ab-lum i-ru-ša a-na ba-bi-<sup>r</sup>ia<sup>1</sup>*

Against me [have they revolted]?  
 Should I make battle [...]  
 What did I see with my very own eyes?  
 Combat run right up to my gate! 110

Anu answers by pressing for a diplomatic solution, and Nuska is sent to the rebels. For the second time Enlil acts only after a suggestion. However, a significant shift occurs between Anu's proposal and Enlil's command, for the first sensibly seeks to ascertain the reasons of the rebellion (1.113-15), whilst Enlil, under pressure, wants to know who the "leader of combat" is (*be-el ta-ḫa-zi*) (1.120-31). The strategy is obviously ineffective, and the rebels' collective reply shows their cohesion (1.144-52, where 146-52 ≈ 159-65):<sup>156</sup>

*i-na* [pu-úḫ-ri i-pu-lu <sup>d</sup>i-gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub> (?)] 145  
*ib-<sup>r</sup>ba<sup>1</sup>-[al-ki-tu ḫu-u-up-šum x x x]*  
*ku-ul-la-<sup>r</sup>at<sup>1</sup>-[ni-ma ni-is-sà-qar tu-qú-um]-<sup>r</sup>tam<sup>1</sup>*  
*ni-iš-ku-<sup>r</sup>un<sup>1</sup> [pu-ḫu-ur-ni]*  
*i-na <sup>r</sup>ka<sup>1</sup>-[la-ak-ki]*  
*šu-up-ši-ik-[ku at-ru id-du-uk-ni-a-ti]*  
*ka-bi-it du-[ul-la-ni-ma ma-a-ad ša-ap-ša-qum]* 150  
*ù ku-ul-<sup>r</sup>la<sup>1</sup>-[at ka-la i-li-ma]*  
*ub-la pí-i-ni [qa-ab-la-am it-ti <sup>d</sup>en-líl]*

in [the assembly answered the Igiḡū]  
 they [were defiant, the labour-gang (...)].  
 "All and every [one of us who has declared battle],  
 we have established [our assembly]

<sup>154</sup> On Enlil's weakness here cf. e.g. Moran (1971) 59-61, Wilcke (1999) 76-77; *contra* Jacobsen (1976) 120-121. On his sleep see below n. 171.

<sup>155</sup> 1.107 restored with von Soden (1978) 58 (cf. CAD T.315-16 for this use of *tebū*); differently L-M 48 and George and Al-Rawi (1996) 160, preferring durative forms of *epēšu(m)*: LA ms. L 2' yields <sup>r</sup>it<sup>1</sup>-te-né-<sup>r</sup>IB<sup>1</sup>-[...], whence L-M *it-te-né-<sup>r</sup>ep<sup>1</sup>-[pu-uš]* "it is being done" (Ntn), George and Al-Rawi *it-te-né-<sup>r</sup>ep<sup>1</sup>-[pu-šu-(ú)-ni?]* "dare they behave" (Gtn).

<sup>156</sup> 1.144-48 restored after SB Si, cf. George and Al-Rawi (1996) 168, 185-86; 1.148-51 after 162-65. Tentatively *qa-<sup>r</sup>ab-la<sup>1</sup>-am* at 1.152 with Pettinato (1970) 78, see further Shehata (2001) 54.

in the [ditch].  
 [Excessive] forced-labour [has killed us],  
 [our hardship] was heavy, [the misery too much],  
 and so every single [one of (us) gods]  
 has resolved on [*battle* with Enlil]!" 150

### §3.1.3 Crisis and resolution (1.166-248)

Enlil's difficulties had already become apparent, but he resorts to retreat only after Nuska reports the rebels' discourse. In tears, Enlil resigns his duty to Anu so that it may fall on some other god (1.166-73):<sup>157</sup>

*iš-[me] a-wa-tam šu-a-ti*  
<sup>d</sup>*en-líl* <sup>r</sup>*il<sup>1</sup>-la-ka di-ma-šu*  
<sup>d</sup>*en-líl i-[ta-da]-ar a-wa-as-su*  
*is-sà-<sup>r</sup>qar<sup>1</sup> [a-na] <sup>r</sup>qú<sup>1</sup>-ra-di a-nim*  
*e-te-el-li iš-ti-ka a-na ša-ma-i* 170  
 [*pa-ar-ša-am ta-ba-al-ma li-qí id-ka*  
*aš-bu<sup>d</sup> a-nun-na-ki ma-ḥar-ka*  
*i-lam iš-te-en ši-si-ma li-id-du-šu pa-ar-ši]*

He [heard] that word  
 Enlil, his tears were flowing down  
 Enlil's mood [darkened] at his (*viz.* Nuska's) word  
 He said [to the] warrior Anu:  
 "I shall ascend<sup>158</sup> with you to heaven:  
 [take off the office, *take hold of your power*;<sup>159</sup>  
 the Anunnakī are seated here before you:  
 summon one god, that they cast down on him my office." ]<sup>160</sup> 170

<sup>157</sup> 1.167 with Pettinato (1968) 191, cf. SB Si 2.53; 1.171-73 are not preserved in any OB manuscript: see Shehata (2001) 55-56, and footnotes below.

<sup>158</sup> 1.171 *e-te-el-li*, besides a 1<sup>st</sup> p.s. Gt present of *elû(m)*, cf. Pettinato (1968) 191, von Soden (1978) 63, Wilcke (1999) 77, may also be a vocative of *etellu(m)* "prince, lord" (*AHW* 260a; *CAD* E.381a): so e.g L-M 53, George and Al-Rawi (1996) 168, Foster (2005) 234. In favour of the verb are 1.13, 17 *elû(m)* + *ša-me-e-ša* ( $\approx$  *a-na ša-ma-i* in 170). See further Kouwenberg (2010) 363 ff. on OB Gt-stems.

<sup>159</sup> 1.171b with L-M "take your power", from M's <sup>r</sup>*li-qé<sup>1</sup>* x [...] and L's [...]x <sup>r</sup>*ID<sup>1</sup>-ka*, but cf. George and Al-Rawi (1996) 186 *ad loc.*, and Shehata (2001) 55-56 for other possibilities.

<sup>160</sup> Previous readings of 1.173b are obsolete, considering SB Si 2.60 and a new collation of M (CT 46.11), cf. George and Al-Rawi (1996) 168 and 186. *pa-ar-ši* is accepted by Wilcke (1999) 77 n. 25, Shehata (2001) 56, Foster (2005) 234. *i-lam iš-te-en* "one god" must refer to one of the Anunnakū mentioned in the previous line: cf. already Pettinato (1970) 79, and note the same procedure (same verbs) at 1.189 *wa-aš-<sup>r</sup>ba-at<sup>1</sup> <sup>d</sup>be<sup>1</sup>-le-et-ì-lí* "Bēlet-ilī is seated" and 1.192 *il-ta-am is-sú-ú* "they summoned the goddess" (*sc.* Bēlet-ilī) echoing 1.173a *ilam iš-tēn šisīma* "summon one god" (the two expressions being separated by 11 lines only, cf. George and Al-Rawi 1996: 161-62). Similarly, *paršu*, framing 1.171-73, must have the same meaning in both lines: the "divine office" at issue is Enlil's, cf. Wilcke (1999) 77 n. 25, "mein Amt". On the verb, see George and Al-Rawi (1996) 186, with Wilcke (1999) 77 n. 25, correctly seeing OB *Anzû* 2.1 (= SB 1.171) as a false parallel, though his correction *li-ì[d-d]i-<nu>-šu* "sie sollen ihm geben" seems unnecessary: for *nadû(m)* in this sense, cf. *bīt mēseri* - Meier (1941-45) 142 ll. 40-41: *al-si-ka...aq-ri-ka...ultu šamē ša Anu tuk-ki ad-di-ku*: "I have called you...I have summoned you... from Anu's heaven I have made a proclamation directed to you" (*CAD* N.I.95). Note however SB Si 2.60 <sup>r</sup>*li<sup>1</sup>-i[d-d]i-šu* < *edēšu* "that they renew the offices/my office" (isolated reading).

After Enlil's resignation, Ea decisively proposes summoning the mother-goddess to create mankind as a working substitute (1.174-97).<sup>161</sup> She agrees, if Ea helps her (1.198-203), and the crafty god gives thorough instructions (1.198-216). These being executed, mankind's matrix is created with the help both of the Anunnakū and the Igiḡū (1.221-34). Nintu gives a final, triumphant speech (1.235-43), and the whole divine community exalts her (1.244-48).

As crisis and division end up in final unity through mankind's creation, Enlil disappears from the scene. Ea and Nintu's cooperation, on the other hand, needs the agreement of the divine groups (Anunnakū and Igiḡū): the Anunnakū summon the mother-goddess after Ea's proposal (1.192-93), and sanction Ea's instructions with the juridical formula *anna apālu(m)* (lit. "to say yes", 1.218).<sup>162</sup> As Cassin saw, the Igiḡū gods achieve the status of "great gods" (*ilū rabūtum*, a designation thus far reserved for the Anunnakū) when, together with the Anunnakū, they give the final touch to the creation of mankind's matrix (1.231-34).<sup>163</sup> Nintu's final speech addresses "the great gods" (*i-li ra-bu-ti*, 1.236), all of them, and the aetiological conclusion brings pacification and union to completion, as the goddess is re-named (1.247) "Mistress-of-all-the-gods" *Bēlet-kala-ilī*.

The first section of the poem is an almost continuous divine assembly, from the moment when the crisis starts as the Igiḡū rebel (1.39), to Bēlet-ilī's exaltation (1.248). The sense of crisis deepens through the interplay between the rebels' assembly "in the ditch"

---

<sup>161</sup> Ea is the speaker in our only OB witness for 1.175 (G.ii.2'). All later mss. give Anu, but note the fluctuation in speech-attribution across the later evidence at OB 1.118 (Enlil) = SB Si 1.104' (Anu) = SB Si 2.5 (Enlil) = S.ii.8 (Anu) = L 10' (Enlil), cf. below Ch. 4§3.1.

<sup>162</sup> Cf. CAD A.II.134, 163-65. 1.192-93 respond to 1.172-73 (above n. 160), clarifying that the approving gods are the Anunnakū.

<sup>163</sup> Cassin (1975) 95-96, though note the variant *ilānī(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> rabūti(gal)<sup>mes</sup>* at S.ii.10 (Lambert 1980: 73) for *'ka<sup>1</sup>-la i-li-ma* at 1.134 (A, cf. SB Si 1.108'). Remarkably, the content of 1.231-34 was not in Ea's instructions, while 1.221-30 correspond to Ea's indications (but see Moran 1970: 49 n. 3). Concerning the unexpected presence of the Igiḡū here, scholars suspected a second message being sent to the Igiḡū after 1.173 (L-M 55, Moran 1970: 52 n. 12), in light of the "Assyrian recension", where S.ii.7 = OB 1.173, but S.ii.8-27 ≈ OB 1.118-45. This seems now excluded by SB Si 2.

and that of the great gods in Ekur. The scene-shift during Nuska's embassy represents a caesura which, while showing Enlil's failure and preparing his resignation, separates two "sessions" of the divine assembly.

Both may be analysed as threefold patterns. The first (1.99-133), after the gods convene, displays Enlil's address, Anu's reply and Enlil's (ineffective) resolution. As Nuska returns, the second "session" (1.154-248) presents the rebels' reported speech, Enlil's resignation and Ea's effective solution. For this to be enacted, complex proceedings and collaboration are required: a new "triplet" starts with the Anunnakū summoning Nintu, develops through her acceptance with reservation, and concludes with Ea's instructions.<sup>164</sup> Finally, these instructions are carried out, Nintu proclaims restoration and pacification, and the gods exalt her and rename her:<sup>165</sup>

1.39-69	1.99-133	1.134-53	1.154-91	1.192-216	1.218-48
Igigū	Enlil	Enlil (Nuska)	Igigū (Nuska)	Anunnakū	proceedings
chief rebel	Anu	Igigū	Enlil	Nintu	Nintu
	Enlil		Ea	Ea	all the gods

The Ekur assemblies show threefold patterns, the rebels' gatherings only two moments (collective + chief's speech; Nuska's speech + reply). The threefold structure seen in Sumerian literature has the third element synthesising the preceding two;<sup>166</sup> thus here Enlil accepts Anu's proposal to investigate, but changes the substance of the message by contaminating it with his fear, expressed in the first speech. Ea accepts both the rebels' claim and Enlil's proposal to "summon one god"; his instructions display the co-operation requested by Nintu.

Ea's typically decisive intervention in the assembly, seen in *SumAdapa*, recurs here, while the gathering's conclusion around Nintu before she and Ea retire to the "House of

<sup>164</sup> Note however that in BM 22714 b (94-1-15 6a), Lambert (1991) 411-12, Nintu replies directly to the gods and delivers the instructions herself.

<sup>165</sup> Compare Moran's (1970) 48 scheme on 1.192-228, emphasising the symmetry around Ea's central instructions; also Cancik-Kirschbaum (2009).

<sup>166</sup> Cf. Ch.1§4.

Destiny" to complete their task, combines two *topoi* present in Sumerian literature: the submission of the gods and the significant renaming of the goddess. The first is often associated with Inana;<sup>167</sup> we have encountered the name-aetiology in *EnSud* (Ch. 1§1.1), where Enlil's renaming of Sud represents the culmination of the narrative. At *Lugale* 396-97 Ninurta renames his mother at a relatively short distance from the mention of the working-gods in the context of the desperate agricultural conditions which Ninurta solves (*Lugale* 334-46).<sup>168</sup> Thus, *Atra-ḫasīs* presents a case of "final assembly exaltation" akin to those we have observed in Ch. 1§1.1, the new name "Mistress-of-all-the-gods" sealing an overturning of the poem's beginning, when the Anunnakū imposed work upon the Igigū (1.5-6).<sup>169</sup>

### §3.2. Mankind's destruction (OB 1-2)

#### §3.2.1. Enlil's three measures (OB 1.354-2.iv)

Enlil decrees his three measures before the final flood in three successive scenes of assembly.<sup>170</sup> Contrasting the complex collective proceedings leading to mankind's creation, these three scenes comprise a single speech by Enlil, a function of the unilateral nature of his edicts which Ea's machinations will thwart. Reflecting the escalating violence leading to the flood, Enlil's commands reveal a progressive widening of the cosmic means involved to cause destruction.

---

<sup>167</sup> The topos is widespread in hymns; on Inana/Ištar cf. e.g. *Inana B* 116, *Inana C* 109, cf. *InEb* 33-34 = 93-94 ≈ 158-59, in Akkadian cf. *Ištar A* 29-31 (OB), *HQN* IV 18-22 (MB?), *SPIš*, KAR 306 obv. 28-29 (LA), cf. Frank (1939) 37-39, Foster (2005) 679.

<sup>168</sup> On name-explanations in Mesopotamia see esp. Oppenheim (1977) 194, Lambert (1982) 210-11, Radner (2005), Gabriel (2014) 307-312, Metcalf (2015a) 172-75.

<sup>169</sup> Note that *EnNimm* A.9 differs from the beginning of *Atra-ḫasīs*, cf. Ceccarelli (2016) 143-44. On the difficulties of *Atr.* OB 1.5 cf. Shehata (2001) 25-26. See Charpin (1987) esp. 37-38 on the "restoration" (*andurārum*, 1.243) operated by Mami, and Komoróczy (1976b) on the OB *andurārum* practice as background here.

<sup>170</sup> The first scene at OB 1.356-63 is fragmentary, but most of it can be safely recovered from the well-preserved beginning of the second (1.356-59 = 2.i.5-8), of which about two thirds survive (2.i.5-22). No OB evidence for the third remains, but we rely on SB *Si* 5.45-54 and x.rev.1-11.

The three scenes begin with identical lines describing how human clamour (*rigmu*) reaches Enlil and disturbs his sleep, whereupon he addresses the gods.<sup>171</sup> The assembly for the first scourge, pestilence, sets the tone for the forthcoming ones (1.354-61):<sup>172</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*ma*<sup>1</sup>-[*tum ki-ma li*]-<sup>1</sup>*i i-ša*<sup>1</sup>-*ap-pu*  
*i-na* [*hu-bu-ri-ši-na*] <sup>1</sup>*i-lu it-ta-'a-da*<sup>1</sup>-*ar*  
 [<sup>d</sup>*en-líl iš-te-me*] *ri-gi-im-ši-in*<sup>1</sup>  
 [*is-sâ-qar a*]-<sup>1</sup>*na*<sup>1</sup> *i-li* <sup>1</sup>*ra-bu*<sup>1</sup>-*tim*  
 [*ik-ta-ab-ta*] <sup>1</sup>*ri-gi-im*<sup>1</sup> *a-wi-lu-ti*  
 [*i-na hu-bur-ri-ši*]-<sup>1</sup>*na*<sup>1</sup> *ú-za-am-ma* <sup>1</sup>*ši-it*<sup>1</sup>-*ta*  
 [*qi-bi-a-ma šu*]-<sup>1</sup>*ru*<sup>1</sup>-*up-pu-ú li-ib-ši* 360  
 [*li-ši ri*]-<sup>1</sup>*gi*<sup>1</sup>-*im-ši*-<sup>1</sup>*na nam-ta*<sup>1</sup>-[*ru*]  
 (2 lines lost)

The [land] was bellowing [like a bull]  
 the god's mood darkened because of [their (*viz. the people's*) uproar]  
 [Enlil heard] their clamour  
 [and spoke] to the great gods:  
 "The clamour of humankind [has become burdensome to me],  
 [because of their uproar] I am losing sleep.  
 [*Command*] that there be disease, 360  
 [let a plague diminish their clamour].  
 (2 lines lost)

Comparison with the "Assyrian recension" (S rev. iv.1-12) and the shortness of the ensuing lacuna make it clear that no god answered Enlil's speech at 1.356-60. The conciseness of the divine scene is countered by the human assembly Atra-ḥasīs is to summon to carry out Ea's instructions: Namtar, the plague-god, should receive a baked loaf, and he will relent (1.384-410). Thanks to Ea, the human assembly overturns Enlil's command.

<sup>171</sup> It is debated whether mankind's *rigmu* "noise" has the same origin as the *rigmu* of the revolting Igiḡū at 1.77 (*viz.* a revolt against excessive workload), or the clamour simply originates from a thriving mankind, the parallelism being only formal, cf. Oden (1981) 204-08, Moran (1987) 251-55, Shehata (2001) 14-15, Kvanvig (2011) 72-74. While the two hypotheses are not incompatible *per se*, the lacuna preceding Enlil's reaction impedes ascertaining how mankind's thriving was described; yet the preserved text hardly points to a dissatisfied mankind in revolution. The sleeping god topos is widespread in the ancient Near East; cf. Batto (1987), McAlpine (1987) 181-200, and recently Korpel and de Moor (2011) esp. 256-61, with Dijkstra (2013). It is perhaps to be connected to the quietness and seclusion the god must enjoy in his cella's recess. As a narrative device, it permits the development of events behind the sleeper's back, which he will have to counter: compare *EnNimm* and Zeus' sleep in *Il.* 14 (cf. Ch. 5§6).

<sup>172</sup> 1.360-61 tentatively restored with Pettinato (1968) 184, after S.rev.iv.9-10 (L-M 106-107), cf. Shehata (2001) 89-90.

The second episode (drought) begins with the same lines concerning mankind's growth and uproar (OB 1.352-60 = 2.i.1-9). This time, however, Enlil turns directly to his measures (2.i.7-21), and expands the cosmic range of his directions. From above, the storm-god Adad shall stop the rain; water is not to flow from below, so that no products may come from Nisaba, who guarantees the earth's fertility. As the second attempt is equally frustrated, more and major gods will be involved.

Although the OB evidence is quite fragmentary for the third episode (famine, 2.ii.36 ff.), the pattern of crisis and resolution appears more complex here. Tensions within the divine world gain prominence, and it becomes harder for Atra-ḥasīs. Ea, it appears, is now unable to speak directly to his servant, as Atra-ḥasīs says during the famine (OB 2.iii.7-8):<sup>173</sup>

[i-tam]-[ma<sup>1</sup>-a i-li ta-mi-ma  
[te-ma] i-ša-ak-ka-na i-na šu-na-a-ti

My god [would speak to me], (but) he is under oath:  
he shall give (me) [*counsel*] in dreams.

It is possible, however, that this divine oath did not involve Ea's silence, as commonly assumed, but only the divine agreement upon the destructive task, since an oath had already been mentioned by Ea, addressing Atra-ḥasīs during the drought (SB Si 5.3-4//OB 2.ii.[6-7]):<sup>174</sup>

[it<sup>1</sup>-ti-šem-me di-nu šá-kin pu-uh-ri  
ub-lam pi-i-šu-nu i-lu ma-a-mi-tam

the case has been heard, the assembly convened  
the gods have resolved on an oath.

Ea cannot speak to Atra-ḥasīs during the third scourge because he is now involved directly. Indeed, Enlil's third instructions reveal an unprecedented cosmic amplitude (SB

<sup>173</sup> Restored with Moran (1987) 251, cf. *Gilg.* SB 11.19; see further Shehata (2001) 108. SB Si lacks these lines, cf. George and Al-Rawi (1996) 189 *ad* SB Si 5.61-2.

<sup>174</sup> SB Si 5.3-4 = SB Si 5.21-22 ≈ Q rev. 13-14.

Si 5.49-58).<sup>175</sup> He apportions his orders entrusting a pair of gods to guard each of the three cosmic zones so that no food-providing element should pass from anywhere. The plan is committed to the major divinities: both Anu and Ea have their helpers in their domains (respectively Adad and the *lahmū*, Ea's attendants in the Apsû); as for earth, Enlil entrusts his sons Sîn and Nergal. The proem's tripartition of the cosmos is recalled here.<sup>176</sup> As at OB 1.13-16, sky and the middle earth deserve one verse each, but two are used for Ea's domain and for the "bolt/net of the sea" (*šigaru naḥbalu tâmti*):<sup>177</sup> on this region depends mankind's survival.

### §3.2.3. Assembly for the Flood (2.v-vii)

The main OB recension for this episode is principally represented by ms. D, where it occupies three columns, all of which are so damaged that we lose about half of each.<sup>178</sup> Parallel passages in ms. x.rev.ii help to reconstruct the content of some gaps and the narrative progression.<sup>179</sup> The publication of Schø. *Atr.*, the epic's oldest tablet so far, adds to our knowledge but complicates the picture.<sup>180</sup>

The deities appointed to the three cosmic regions of heaven, earth, and sea/abyss should have cooperated to impede nourishment. However, the "bolt of the sea" that was Ea's responsibility has been released. As our divine scene begins, an enraged Enlil addresses the gods, recalls his previous command and points to the culprit (OB 2.v.13-21):<sup>181</sup>

*li-ib-ba-ti ma-<sup>r</sup>li<sup>1</sup> [ša<sup>d</sup>en-ki]<sup>?</sup>*

<sup>175</sup> George and Al-Rawi (1996) 176-77 and 183-84 ("Ea" misprinted for "Adad" at 5.55); cf. Wilcke (1997) 114-15.

<sup>176</sup> On the tripartite cosmos in *Atra-ḫasīs* see esp. L-M 166-67, Groneberg (1991) 406-08, Wilcke (1997) 115.

<sup>177</sup> On which see Horowitz (1999) 236-37.

<sup>178</sup> L-M 80-87 (D, though vii.37-54 are also preserved in B) + Groneberg (1991) 401-03, 409 (H).

<sup>179</sup> L-M 118-19. A plausible plot reconstruction was attempted by Klein (1990).

<sup>180</sup> See George (2009) 17-18 for preliminary remarks on how it fits with the previous evidence.

<sup>181</sup> Composite text from D and H, score in Groneberg (1991) 401. Line 2.v.13 with von Soden (1994) 633, Foster (2005) 244, though L-M's [*ša<sup>d</sup>i-gi-gi*] "at the Iḡigū" (cf. 3.vi.6) remains possible; on 2.v.16 see Wilcke (1997) 115, George (2009) 23 *ad* ii.3; on 2.v.21 Shehata (2001) 122-23. I see no reason why Nuska should be the speaker here, as Groneberg (1991) 401 n. 30 thinks.

*ra-bu-tum-mi*<sup>d</sup> *a-<sup>r</sup>nun<sup>1</sup>-[na ka-lu-ni]*  
*ub-la pí-i-ni iš-ti-ni-<sup>r</sup>iš<sup>1</sup> [ma-mi-tam]* 15  
*iš-šú-ur a-nu<sup>d</sup> adad(iškur) e-le-nu*  
<sup>r</sup>*a-na-ku<sup>1</sup> aš-šú-ur er-<sup>r</sup>še<sup>1</sup>-tam ša-ap-li-ta*  
*a-ša-ar<sup>d</sup> en-ki<sup>r</sup> il<sup>1</sup>-li-ku-ma*  
<sup>r</sup>*ip<sup>1</sup>-tú-ur ul-<sup>r</sup>la an<sup>1</sup>-du-ra-ra iš-ku-un*  
<sup>ú</sup>*-<sup>r</sup>ma<sup>1</sup>-aš-<sup>r</sup>še<sup>1</sup>-[er a-na] ni-ši mi-še-er-ta* 20  
<sup>iš-<sup>r</sup>ku<sup>1</sup>-un [(x?)-ta?-na] <sup>r</sup>i<sup>1</sup>-na aš-qú-la-lu ša-am-ši</sup>

He was filled with anger [*at Ea*]  
 "[All we] great Anunna  
 have resolved together [on an oath]:  
 Anu stood guard over Adad above 15  
 I stood guard over earth below  
 where Ea went (instead)  
 he released the yoke, he established restoration:  
 he let loose produce [for] the people 20  
 he established [...] *the glare* of the sun".

Straightaway messengers are summoned (2.v.22-27),<sup>182</sup> to whom Enlil repeats *verbatim* the accusation against Ea, but using the second person as if addressing him (2.v.28-32+[1'-3'] ≈ 2.v.14-21). Though the text breaks (for about 25+10 very fragmentary lines), it seems therefore very likely that Enlil's speech was sent as a message to Ea. This is supported by ms. x.rev.ii.2-43, where this same speech is first uttered by Enlil (x.rev.ii.2-6 ≈ OB 2.v.16-20), and then repeated to Ea (x.rev.ii.9-13) by messengers. The rest of x.rev.ii relates Ea's reply to one messenger: the "guards of the sea" (*ma-aš-ša-ru tam-ti*, 24) broke the bolt, but Ea has punished them (16-27). This is reported to Enlil (28-43), who immediately proposes to take an oath on the flood. Anu swears, Enlil and his sons swear, and the tablet ends (44-48).

Returning to the OB main recension, the text resumes (2.vi.10-32) with the end of an account, most probably by Enlil, of how the people recovered from the famine; the narrator relates Ea's reaction (see just below), and Enlil utters yet again the same accusatory speech (2.vi.23-30 = 2.v.28-32+[1'-3'] ≈ 2.v.14-21); the column ends as Ea is

<sup>182</sup> Reading the first halves of 2.v.24/26 <sup>r</sup>*še-na<sup>1</sup> [i-na ma]-<sup>r</sup>ri<sup>1</sup>* ("two of my sons") with Klein (1990) 79 n. 4, cf. Foster (2005) 245. Differently Donbaz *apud* Groneberg (1991) 402 n. 36 at 2.v.24: *mu-na-<sup>r</sup>DU/UŠ<sup>1</sup> ma-ri, mu-na-<sup>r</sup>DU/UŠ<sup>1</sup>* being an otherwise unattested epithet of Nuska.

about to reply. As it happens, Schø. *Atr.* col.i parallels OB 2.vi.11-22, helping us better grasp this confrontation between Enlil and Ea (OB 2.vi.13-22):<sup>183</sup>

[i-ik]-ka-la-nim te-ni-še-šu  
 [i]-<sup>r</sup>te<sup>1</sup>-ep-pí-ra-nim nu-<sup>h</sup>u-uš ni-ši<sup>d</sup> nissāba(naga)  
 [i]-lu! i-ta-šu-uš a-ša-ba-am 15  
 [a]-na pu-ú<sup>h</sup>-ri šá i-li ši-i<sup>h</sup>-tum i-ku-ul-šu  
 [<sup>d</sup>en-ki] i-ta-šu-uš a-ša-ba-am  
 [a-na pu]-<sup>r</sup>ú<sup>h</sup><sup>1</sup>-ri šá i-li ši-i<sup>h</sup>-tum i-ku-ul-šu  
 [i-<sup>h</sup>u-us<sub>4</sub>-s<sup>f</sup>] te-ki-ta i-na wá-né-šu-ú  
 (two illegible lines)  
 [...] x <sup>r</sup><sup>d</sup>en-ki ù <sup>d</sup>en-líl<sup>1</sup> 22  
 [ra-bu-tum-mi<sup>d</sup> a-nun]-<sup>r</sup>na<sup>1</sup> [ka-lu-ni]  
 (...) (24-30 = 2.v.29-32+[1'-3'] etc.)  
 [<sup>d</sup>en-ki pí-a-šú] i-<sup>r</sup>pu-ša-am-ma<sup>1</sup> 31  
 [is-sà-qar a-na] <sup>r</sup>qú<sup>1</sup>-ra-[di]<sup>r</sup><sup>d</sup>en-líl<sup>1</sup>

His (*Ea's?*) humankind were eating,  
 feeding themselves on barley, the people's abundance."  
 The god grew annoyed with sitting there 15  
 a bitter laughter consumed him (directed) [at] the gods' assembly.  
 [Ea] grew annoyed with sitting there,  
 a bitter laughter consumed him (directed) [at] the gods' assembly.  
 [He became] defiant in his stubbornness,  
 (two illegible lines)  
 [...] Ea and Enlil: 22  
 "[All we great Anunna]  
 (...)" (24-30 = 2.v.29-32+[1'-3'] etc.)  
 [Ea] opened [his mouth] 31  
 [and spoke to] the hero Enlil:

As the text stands, the scene is in the assembly.<sup>184</sup> We may assume that in the preceding lacuna (about 35 lines) Enlil's message reached Ea, and Ea joined the divine gathering.<sup>185</sup> There, he listens impatiently to Enlil's regretful report on mankind's recovery, and then again to his accusation. We recover Ea's reply, and the introduction to Enlil's answer, from Schø. *Atr.* ii.1-18:<sup>186</sup> similarly to x.rev.ii.30ff., Ea casts the blame on his attendants, whom

<sup>183</sup> Text with George (2009) 23, but leaving D's *te-ni-še-šu* "his (*Ea's?*) humankind" at 13 where he emends *te-ni-še-[t]u!* after Schø. *Atr.* i.5: Enlil is not yet addressing Ea directly.

<sup>184</sup> George (2009) 17 assumes that the scene shows the message being delivered to Ea, but Schø. *Atr.* i.7-11 = OB 2.vi.15-18 describe Ea's reaction, while sitting, to (*ana*) the assembly. Moreover, the scene ends with Ea addressing Enlil (OB 2.v.31-2). On the polysemic *ših<sup>h</sup>tum* "laughter/distress" cf. George (2009) 23; "laughter" was chosen on account of the literary parallels of *šâhu(m) + ana*, esp. *Gilgameš* OB 3.201-02; *Adapa* B 66, cf. further *CAD* Š.64-65.

<sup>185</sup> So Klein (1990), though how far this worked as in ms. x remains uncertain, since Ea's justification in Schø. *Atr.*ii differs slightly from that in x.ii.rev.16-27 etc., and is communicated to Enlil *viva voce* (i.e. within the assembly) rather than through messengers (as in x.rev.ii.30-43).

<sup>186</sup> Text George (2009) 20, signalling (p. 23) that Schø. *Atr.*ii.1-2 "may be matched with" OB 2.vi.31-2. In fact, it seems likely that the lost second half of Schø. *Atr.*i (about 20 lines) paralleled OB 2.vi.23-30: note

he would have persecuted. Enlil's reply is lost in the lacunae of Schø. *Atr.* ii-iii and OB 2.vii (about 30 lines): judging from what follows, it must have contained the proposal for the flood, and possibly the divine oath (cf. x.ii.rev.44-48). The text resumes with the end of a speech where the creation of mankind is recalled (OB 2.vii.31-36), while Ea is asked to submit to the oath (OB 2.vii.37-47):<sup>187</sup>

*ši-[i] li-tu-ur a-na up-[...]*  
*i ʿnu-ta<sup>1</sup>-am-mi!(tablet -mu-ni) ma-áš-x [...]*  
<sup>d</sup>*en-ki ni-iš-ʿši<sup>1</sup>-[ka]*  
<sup>d</sup>*en-ki pí-a-šu i-pu-[ša-am-ma]* 40  
*i-sà-qá-ra-am a-na i-[li aḥ-ḥi-šu]*  
*a-na mi-nim tu-ta-am-ma-ʿni<sup>1</sup>[...]*  
*ú-ub-ba-al qá-ti a-na ʿni<sup>1</sup>-[ši-ia-ma]*  
*a-bu-bu ša ta-qá-ab-ʿba<sup>1</sup>-[ni-in-ni]*  
*ma-an-nu šu-ú a-na-ku [ú-ul i-di]* 45  
*a-na-ku-ma ú-ul-la-da [a-bu-ba]*  
*ši-pí-ir-šu i-ba-aš-ši it-[ti <sup>d</sup>en-líl]*

let it (the rule?) turn to [...]  
 let us bind by an oath [...]  
 prince Ea."  
 Ea opened his mouth, 40  
 and spoke to the gods, [his brothers]:  
 "Why will you bind me by an oath (...)?  
 Should I lay my hand on [my own people]?  
 The flood that you are commanding [me],  
 who is it? I [do not know!] 45  
 Should I create [a flood]?  
 That task is [Enlil's].

Ea is replying to the gods (2.vii.41), but it is likely that the previous speech was uttered by Nintu (the right deity to recall man's creation), who later regrets having submitted to the oath.<sup>188</sup> Ea stands against the resolution, but eventually gives the instructions for the flood as he concludes his speech and the assembly (2.vii.48-53, cf. Schø. *Atr.* iii.7'-20'), after which the scene turns to Atra-ḥasīs on earth (OB 2.ii.vii.48-53, and Schø. *Atr.* iii.21'-23').

---

that (a) the text in Schø. *Atr.*i. presents three more lines (1-2, 4) than its equivalent in D; (b) to single lines in D often correspond two lines in the parallel Schø. *Atr.* i. (8/9, 11/12, 13/14), and once one line plus an indented one (6/7); (c) in general, the scribe of Schø. *Atr.* (unlike D's) wrote many indented lines throughout the tablet and many lines containing a single poetic word.

<sup>187</sup> On 2.vii.38 see von Soden (1994) 636, restoring *ma-ás-s[á!-am]* "Anführer".

<sup>188</sup> Cf. von Soden (1994) 635; and note that 2.vii.33 "entspricht wörtlich 1.239", Shehata (2001) 128.

Considering this section against the previous assemblies, Enlil continues on the path of his unilateral edicts: he blames Ea, and nobody replies to him (2.v). As, however, he is to respond to an internal threat, the poet re-activates a narrative strategy deployed in the revolt episode, namely the message-delivery (2.v-vi), which again generates confrontation as the scene comes back to Enlil's place. But while in Tablet 1 the maintenance of cosmic order passed through the hands of Ea, Nintu and the assembly at the cost of Enlil's momentary withdrawal, here Enlil goes firmly on to establish the flood, with (most likely) Nintu's endorsement, and it is Ea who finds himself in isolation.<sup>189</sup> Thus, even if we miss Enlil's speech and its outcomes, lost in the 2.vii-lacuna, the deliberative process here clearly engages with that in Tablet 1 by opposing Enlil's decreed annihilation to the positive task of creating mankind.<sup>190</sup>

### §3.3. The Flood (OB 3)

#### §3.3.1. The Gods above the Flood (3.iii-iv)

After Ea's advice and the building of the ark (2.viii-3.i-ii), columns 3.iii-iv describe the flood. Although the text is quite fragmentary, a chiasmic structure is visible: the flood on earth (3.iii.1-19 and 3.iv.24 ff.) frames the divine reaction (3.iii.20-iv.23). The earthly parts (only the first of which is entirely preserved) describe the physical effects of the catastrophe, but its cosmic significance emerges from the central divine scene. This runs symmetrically too, since the poet frames the two central speeches by Nintu (3.iii.34-54, iv.5-11) between two collective depictions of the gods that constitute transitions from and

---

<sup>189</sup> Note that even in his yielding, Ea manages to undermine Enlil's authority (for the audience at least): he himself must give the instructions for the Flood, but he proclaims, ironically enough, that this is "the task of Enlil"! This ineffectual *recusatio* at 2.vii.47 reverses the effectual one of Nintu at 1.201.

<sup>190</sup> The scene in Tablet 1 (above §3.1.3.) is useful to assess this scene's structure in spite of the text's fragmentary state. There we had Nuska's report, Enlil's resignation and Ea's proposal; here we would have (2.vi-vii) Enlil's report and accusation, Ea's justification and Enlil's proposal (lost); the oath possibly contained in the lacuna (cf. above) would parallel Nintu's appointment by the Anunnakū at 1.192-97, after which, in both instances, come Nintu's appeal to Ea and his reply.

to the earthly scene (3.iii.18-33, iv.15-25). As the collective reaction stresses the effects of the disappearance of men (the gods are afraid, and suffer severely from thirst and hunger), Nintu's motherly regret develops a theological opposition against Enlil. Thus, the scene foreshadows the poem's resolution thanks to Atra-ḫasīs' sacrifice, leaving to Nintu the first explicit charges against the chief god.

Once again, earth and the divine world are connected through "clamour", *rigmu*,<sup>191</sup> this time deriving from the divinely ordered catastrophe. The gods gather in fear, and sit helplessly (3.iii.20-31):<sup>192</sup>

[i-lu ip-la-ḫu ri-gi]-im a-bu-bi	20
[i-na ša-ma-i pu-uz]-ra <sup>1</sup> [i]-ḫu-zu	
[i-na ka-ma-ti uš]-bu	
[ip-la-aḫ-ma a-num] ri-gi-im a-[bu]-bi <sup>1</sup>	
[li-ib]-bi i-li uš-ta-ka-ra <sup>1</sup>	
[ <sup>d</sup> en-ki] ra <sup>1</sup> iš <sup>1</sup> -ta-ni te <sub>4</sub> -e-em-šu	25
[x] ma-ru-šu ub-ra <sup>1</sup> bu <sup>1</sup> -ku	
[i]-ra <sup>1</sup> ma-aḫ-ri-šu	
[ <sup>d</sup> nin <sup>1</sup> -tu be-el-tum ra-bi-tum	
[pu]-ul-ḫi-ta ú-ka-la-la ša-ap-ta-ša	
[ <sup>d</sup> a-nun-na i-lu ra-bu-tum	30
[wa-aš]-ra <sup>1</sup> bu <sup>1</sup> i-na šú-mi ù bu-bu-ti	
[The gods became afraid of the clamour] of the flood,	20
they took [refuge in heaven]	
they [sat down outside (the door)].	
[Anu too became afraid] of the clamour of the flood	
it made throbb the [heart] of the gods.	
[Ea(?)], his judgment became upset,	25
[for] his sons had been carried away	
[before] him.	
Nintu, the great lady,	
her lips were covered with affliction.	
The Anunna, the great gods,	30
[were seated] in thirst and hunger.	

The poet adapts the typical depiction of a divine banquet, where the great gods Anu, Enlil, Ea and Nintu are listed before the Anunna.<sup>193</sup> Ea's presence here is uncertain, but the

<sup>191</sup> Moran (1971) 55 n. 26.

<sup>192</sup> 3.iii.20-23 restored with Wilcke (1999) 89-90, cf. *Gilg.* SB 11.114-16; 3.iii.24 with von Soden (1994) 640, cf. Foster (2005) 250, 280; Shehata (2001) 147-48 on 3.iii.29.

<sup>193</sup> Above Ch. 1§2.1.

absence of Enlil is significant.<sup>194</sup> While such depictions are typically joyful, here we find the fear of Anu, a helpless Ea, and Nintu's pain.<sup>195</sup> Instead of the usual lavish banquet, the audience finds the gods deprived of food and drink.

In this context, Nintu recognises the folly of the divine decision, and casts the blame on Enlil (3.iii.32-45).<sup>196</sup> The mother-goddess now sees that the assembly's outcome has gone against her, and reconsiders the decision-making process as one where Enlil's will was imposed upon her (*ú-ša-aq-bi* "he made decree"). As she points Enlil's absence out to Anu (3.iii.51-54), she defines Enlil "he who did not take counsel with himself" (*ša lā imtalkūma*); a major charge for the gods' *māliku(m)* "counsellor" (e.g. OB 1.8).<sup>197</sup>

### §3.3.2. Atra-ḥasīs' assembly (3.vi-viii)

The audience knows that, thanks to Ea, all is not lost. The text resumes after a gap containing the end of the flood (3.iv.24-v.29). Atra-ḥasīs' sacrifice is ready: immediately, the hungry gods gather around it, and consume the offering in the second elaboration on the "divine repast" motif.<sup>198</sup> Addressing the gathering, Nintu repeats and varies the previous complaint, again questioning Enlil's absence whilst pointing to the collective responsibility (3.v.34-54). She then dedicates her necklace, made of lapis lazuli stones called "flies", which Anu has brought, as a token to guarantee an everlasting memory of the flood (2.v.46-vi.4). The dedication stresses the tragic nature of the event, as the flies symbolise

---

<sup>194</sup> 3.iii.25-27 restored with the vast majority of scholars; Wilcke (1999) 90 restores [*Anu i*]š-ta-ni te<sub>4</sub>-e-em-šu / [*i-lu*] ma-ru-šu up-<sup>r</sup>pu<sup>1</sup>-qú / [*i*]-<sup>r</sup>na<sup>1</sup> ma-aḥ-ri-šu "Anu- sein Verstand veränderte sich (= war ganz von Sinnen), / Die Götter, seine Kinder waren zusammengeballt vor ihm", with *uppukū* (D *epēkum* "St. ist überwachsen" *AHW* 222); von Soden (1994) 640 restores [Enlil] at 25 after Pettinato (1970) 81, who changed his mind to [Ea] in Pettinato (2005) 344.

<sup>195</sup> *Lugale* 182-85 (Ch. 1§1.3) represents a significant antecedent.

<sup>196</sup> 3.iii.39-41 with Moran (1981) 44 n. 3, cf. Wilcke (1999) 91-92, Shehata (2001) 149-50. On *gamertum* (38) cf. Metzler (1995); *Gilg.* SB 11.120 has *lemutta*(ḥul) "evil".

<sup>197</sup> See Wilcke (1999) 93-95 and n. 58.

<sup>198</sup> Cf. Ch. 1§2.1.

the dead.<sup>199</sup> Indeed, the poet likens the gods themselves to "flies" as they approach the offering (3.v.35), precisely when the human and divine dimensions come together.<sup>200</sup> Though Nintu's act sanctions a renewed consideration for humankind, the divine strife is still in need of resolution.<sup>201</sup>

At this moment, Enlil sees the ark. Enraged at the gods, he asks how life could escape destruction (3.vi.5-10, where 5-8 = 2.v.28-31 etc.). Anu immediately points to Ea, the only one who could have done so (3.vi.11-15). Ea's answer (3.vi.16-40) is severely fragmentary. He seemingly remarks again on Enlil's "lack of counsel" in decreeing the flood (3.vi.21-22). Most noteworthy, however, is his strategy to address Enlil's decisions. After criticising the chief god, Ea indicates the right direction: only the culprits deserve punishment. Crucially, this indication passes through a sanction of Enlil's authority, and the mention of the divine assembly (vi.25-27).<sup>202</sup>

[be-el ar]-<sup>1</sup>nim<sup>1</sup> šu-ku-un še-re-et-ka  
 [x] <sup>1</sup>a<sup>1</sup>-iu-ú ša ú-ša-<sup>1</sup>as<sup>1</sup>-sà-ku a-wa-at-ka  
 [...]-nu pu-úh-ra [...]

Impose your penalty [on the criminal].  
 [For] who is it that could make your word ineffective?  
 [...] the assembly [...]

There is a degree of irony here, for Ea did thwart Enlil's designs. Nevertheless, for the first time, Enlil will promote an effective crisis resolution. When the text resumes, Enlil addresses Ea (3.vi.41-44):

[en-líl] <sup>1</sup>pr<sup>1</sup>-a-šu i-pu-ša-am-ma  
 [is-sà]-qar a-na <sup>d</sup>en-ki ni-iš-ši-ki  
 [ga-na ša]-<sup>1</sup>as<sup>1</sup>-sú-ra <sup>d</sup>nin-tu ši-si-ma

<sup>199</sup> Lambert (1980b) 56-57, Kilmer (1987); the section echoes Nintu's lamentation where the dying peoples were likened to flies (3.iii.44-45) and mayflies (3.iv.5-6), see Wilcke (1999) 93 n. 59; cf. *Gilg.* SB 10.312-15, 11.122-23.

<sup>200</sup> Cf. Wilcke (1999) 94-95. In *Gilg.* SB 11.167 the necklace is Anu's wedding present. On this as an aetiology of the goddess' cultic jewellery cf. L-M 163-4.

<sup>201</sup> On the final confrontation cf. Wilcke (1999) 96-97, 104-05.

<sup>202</sup> According to Wilcke (1999) 96, Ea suggests summoning the assembly. Some translators connect 3.vi.26 with what precedes, e.g. L-M 101 "[and] whoever disregards your command", cf. von Soden (1994) 643.

[at]-<sup>1</sup>ta<sup>1</sup> ù ši-i mi-it-li-ka i-na pu-uḫ-ri

[Enlil] opened his mouth,  
[and] spoke to Ea the prince:  
"[Come], summon the birth-goddess, Nintu,  
[you] and she, take counsel with one another in the assembly".

The assembly proceedings recall the crisis of Tablet 1: again Nintu is to be summoned to perform the decisive task with Ea. For the second time she is called "birth-goddess" (*sassuru*, lit. "womb" cf. 1.190). Then, Enlil was unable to take provisions and resigned his duty; later he proved to be "he who did not take counsel with himself", *ša lā imtalkūma* in Nintu's words at 3.iii.53 and v.42, in Ea's at 3.vi.21-22. Now, instead, Enlil heeds Ea's advice, and appoints the two creator gods, to "take counsel with one another" (*mitlikā*). So they do indeed, and the new world order is established by preventing overpopulation (3.vi.45-viii).

The joint effort of Enlil, Ea and Nintu sanctions the beginning of a new cosmic phase. After achieving mankind's survival, Ea has also made it possible that the new order should pass through the approval of the chief god. By confirming Enlil's authority after the crisis, the poem asserts the ultimate stability of the divine order after the flood. Atra-ḫasīs' apotheosis, narrated in *Gilgameš*, is not preserved in any OB source.<sup>203</sup> In fact, the final words of the poem exalt Enlil among the gods, while the typical hymnic mention of the Igiḡū overturns the divine unbalance with which the poem began (3.viii.9-19).<sup>204</sup>

ki-ma ni-iš-ku-[nu a-bu]-<sup>1</sup>ba<sup>1</sup>  
a-wi-lum ib-lu-<sup>1</sup>tū<sup>1</sup>[i-na ka-ra-ši] 10  
at-ta ma-li-ik i-[li ra-bu-ti]  
te-re-ti-iš-ka  
ú-ša-ab-ši qá-<sup>1</sup>ab<sup>1</sup>-[la]  
ša-ni-it-ti-iš-[ka]  
an-ni-a-am za-ma-[ra] 15

<sup>203</sup> Besides *Gilg.* SB 11.199-206, see also *Flood* vi and the LB *Atra-ḫasīs* fragment in Spar and Lambert (2005) 198-99.

<sup>204</sup> Cf. von Soden (1994) 645, suggesting that a final divine assembly sanctions Enlil's restored authority. It is unclear whether all these lines are uttered by the same *persona*, perhaps a god claiming authorship (Mami to L-M 165), cf. Shehata (2001) 21 n. 128. To Wilcke (1999) 104-5, Ea's speech ends in 3.viii.17. The last word of 3.viii.13 is difficult; cf. von Soden (as above), Foster (2005) 280: "*ga[bra]m(?)* 'rendition, copy'(?), but this is very doubtful."

*li-iš-mu-ma* <sup>d</sup>*i-gi-ṛgu*<sup>1</sup>  
*li-iš-ší-ru na-ar-bi-ka*  
*a-bu-ba a-na ku-ul-la-at ni-ši*  
*ú-za-am-me-er ši-me-a*

how we established [the flood]  
 (and) man survived [destruction]. 10  
 You (are) the counsellor of the [great] gods!  
 At your command  
 I have produced *battle*  
 For [your] praise  
 this song 15  
 may the Igiḡū listen,  
 let them be attentive to your great deed,  
 (for) of the flood to all the peoples  
 I have sung: listen!

#### §4. Concluding remarks

Divine assemblies structure the narrative and theological discourse of *Atra-ḫasīs*. From the divine revolt to the final praise, the problematic balance of power and prominence within the divine community makes the narrative progress according to periodically recurring patterns of crisis and resolution. The new cosmic order emerges as the product of a collaborative effort reflecting the interdependence between gods and men, where the rule of the chief god is confirmed only when flanked by the principles of human reproduction (Nintu) and craft (Ea).

In contrast to the Sumerian evidence (§2), *Atra-ḫasīs* problematises the narrative of mankind's creation and its planned destruction by casting doubts on the chief god's capacities. Considering *Lugale* (Ch. 1§1.3), however, neither Enlil's helplessness nor the assemblies' structuring function is utterly novel, though both elements become more prominent in *Atra-ḫasīs*. In *Lugale*, where mankind plays no relevant part, Enlil's helplessness permits the exaltation of his warrior son Ninurta, who becomes the pantheon's saviour. In the following chapter, we shall look at three divine narratives built upon the latter pattern, where, again, the divine assembly fulfills important narrative and conceptual functions.

### Chapter 3: Anzû, Enūma eliš, Erra and Išum

This chapter considers three major Akkadian narratives devoted to the divine world. While *Erra* inverts the established pattern, *Anzû* and *Enūma eliš* are straightforward *Chaoskampf* narratives, viz. stories where the central hero protects his social context by fighting and defeating the threatening "other", thus (re)establishing order.<sup>205</sup> According to an ideology visible from sources dating back to ED times, this represents one mythological projection of the Mesopotamian monarchs' prestige-rewarding duty.<sup>206</sup> The poems' relative chronology follows our title's order, and it is well established in scholarship to read these texts in connection.<sup>207</sup> Our study of the assembly scenes will focus on how the assembly's political role evolves in conjunction with the changing character and function of the warrior god. The increasing pre-eminence of the main hero transforms the role and function of the assembly, progressively subordinating its prerogatives to the power of the central protagonist.

#### §1. Anzû

##### §1.1. Manuscript tradition, synopsis

The ancients probably knew this poem as *bīn šar dadmē* ("Son of the king of the inhabited world" from SB 1.1, referring to the protagonist Ninurta).<sup>208</sup> An OB fragment,

---

<sup>205</sup> This is a biblical scholarship term, Gunkel (1895), cf. e.g. Day (1985), Wazana (2008), often adopted by Assyriologists, see now Scurlock and Beal (2013).

<sup>206</sup> In general on the continuity of Mesopotamian kingship ideology and self-representation in connection to the divine see e.g. Postgate (1995), Westenholz (1998), Selz (2008), Šašková, Pecha and Charvát (2010), Liverani (2014) 106-09, 509-11, Steinkeller (2017); cf. Ch. 10§4; divine mountain-battle in Sumerian literature: Karahashi (2004); connected to third-millennium politics: Wilcke (1993); on the threatening *other* e.g. Haas (1980), Steiner (1982), Pongratz-Leisten (2001), Poo (2005) esp. 80-84, offering a comparative perspective.

<sup>207</sup> Cf. esp. Lambert (1986), (2013) 202-47, Annus (2001) xxi-xxiv, Machinist (2005), Wisnom (2014), Haubold (2017). Each composition's date is discussed below; on the divine ruler see Ch. 10.

<sup>208</sup> Most recent critical edition: Annus (2001), whose text we follow; see also Vogelzang (1988), Saggs (1986) with Moran (1988), Hallo and Moran (1979). Foster's (2005) 555-78 line numbering differs slightly from Annus'.

another of OB/MB origin and two further MA witnesses date the composition to the OB period and attest to its early diffusion.<sup>209</sup>

The two tablets attesting to the OB version are written in Middle or Neo-Babylonian script, but most probably represent copies of an older text.<sup>210</sup> The preserved OB *Anzû* (157 lines) roughly corresponds to SB 1.82-3.9. The more fully preserved SB version, containing at least 576 lines (based on Annus' edition) in three tablets, will be used for discussing the poem.<sup>211</sup> Differences between the two versions show that the composition, though expanded, did not undergo major changes in substance and order.<sup>212</sup> Its content can be outlined as follows.<sup>213</sup>

(*Proem*: SB 1.1-14). The hymnic exordium exalts Ninurta focusing especially on his relationship with his father Enlil and his mother Mami/Bēlet-ilī, and his prowess as warrior god, also responsible for agriculture.<sup>214</sup>

(*Problem*: 1.15-86). The action starts in a primordial setting. Still without shrines,<sup>215</sup> the gods gather to communicate the birth of Anzû, a demonic bird with leonine features, to Enlil.<sup>216</sup> As Enlil is surprised, Ea recommends that Anzû be assigned to guarding Enlil's cella. Anzû, however, steals Enlil's regalia, including the Tablet of Destinies which underpins Enlil's power, and flies away. Stillness is sovereign, the world order is overthrown, Enlil disappears from the scene.

---

<sup>209</sup> Respectively: an unpublished Yale tablet known to Lambert (2013) 442 n. 11; Di 2258: van Lerberghe (1991) 74, from Sippar, MB according to Vogelzang (1988) 32, OB to Cavigneaux (2000) 19: possibly a school exercise; Assur 21506w: LKA 1-4 and BM 121087: CT 46, 37 (Nineveh). For the *Anzû* manuscripts cf. Annus (2001) xxv-xxvii, adding Lauinger (2004).

<sup>210</sup> So Vogelzang (1988) 11, 14-15; cf. Foster (2005) 577.

<sup>211</sup> Cf. Vogelzang (1988) 144 n. 3; Wisnom (2014) 30.

<sup>212</sup> See Cooper (1977), Vogelzang (1986), (1988) 190-201. It should be noted that in the OB version the hero is called Ningirsu, in SB Ninurta.

<sup>213</sup> Cf. Vogelzang (1988) 133-44; Feldt (2013) 24.

<sup>214</sup> Wilcke (1977) 175-79; Hallo and Moran (1979) 71-74; Vogelzang (1988) 206-08 and *passim* part II on the programmatic function of the proem; Annus (2001) x; Wisnom (2014) 60-62.

<sup>215</sup> Compare, in Akkadian literature, e.g. *BAC* 10, *FE* 1, Foster (2005) 494 (*PfG* 2-3).

<sup>216</sup> On Anzû in Mesopotamian iconography and mythology see most recently Wazana (2008) 113-16, with previous literature.

(*Long assembly*: 1.87-2.29) The gods gather to make a plan. Anu tries to persuade three deities in turn to set out against Anzû, but all of them refuse. As the gods are at a loss, Ea knows what to do. He has the gods summon and exalt Mami; she summons and instructs her own son, Ninurta, who sets out against the monster.

(*Battle*: 2.30-3.21) At first Ninurta fails; his speaking battle-mace Šarur comes back to seek Ea's help. Ea devises a trick concerning the arrow's feathers,<sup>217</sup> and Ninurta kills Anzû.

(*Return and exaltation*: 3.21-3.181) Enlil/Dagan rejoices,<sup>218</sup> sends for the god Birdu, who approaches Ninurta and asks him to return with the Tablet. Perhaps Ninurta refuses: the text breaks off; when it resumes, Ninurta is being exalted and assigned "lordship", new names and prerogatives. The poem's final lines are not preserved.

## §1.2. Cultural and literary context

The poem's success is especially perceptible in the first millennium. Aside from allusions to it in other poems, especially *Enūma eliš* and *Erra*, Anzû (or its story) was possibly referred to in various types of compositions, including Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions.<sup>219</sup> The paradigmatic role of Anzû in Neo-Assyrian ideology can be related to the intertextual relationship it entertains with *Lugale* and other Sumerian narratives about the exploits of Ninurta/Ningirsu (especially *Angim*),<sup>220</sup> insofar as the figure of Enlil's warrior son stands as a true metaphor for the Mesopotamian king.<sup>221</sup>

Anzû shares with *Lugale* its basic narrative shape. Divine kingship, hence cosmic order, is at stake because of a monster in the far mountains. The warrior sets off to defeat the

---

<sup>217</sup> See Studevent-Hickman (2010).

<sup>218</sup> Several times Anzû has the name Dagan when Enlil is expected (e.g. 1.200; 3.24, 27). On Dagan's syncretism with Enlil see esp. Crowell (2001) 38-40 and Feliu (2003) 396-98. The expression "Anu and Dagan" is commonplace from the MB period to indicate the two ruling gods.

<sup>219</sup> Literary allusions: Machinist (2005), Wisnom (2014). Inscriptions: Annus (2002) 94-101.

<sup>220</sup> On Anzû and the previous tradition cf. Wisnom (2014) 56-89.

<sup>221</sup> On Ninurta in third-millennium royal ideology cf. Wilcke (1993) 59-63; Ninurta and Assyrian kings and ideology Streck (1998/2001) 515-20; Maul (1999) esp. 208-11; Annus (2002).

enemy and restore the previous situation; he fails at first, but then succeeds thanks to the wise advice of a major divinity, conveyed by Šarur. Though not immediately, Ninurta comes back, is praised and rewarded by the extraordinary powers and offices attributed to him. One major novelty affecting this framework is the expanded depiction of the divine society around the hero. In *Lugale* the divine reaction to the menace (helplessness of Enlil, fear of the gods, the hero departing straightaway) stands all in the relatively short confines of *Lugale* 70-76, whereas in SB *Anzû* the desperation in Ekur occupies most of Tablet 1. This expansion is achieved thanks to more articulated assembly scenes, exploiting the nexus of relations within Ekur to a greater extent than in *Lugale*; even Anzû, before proving to be the distant and "other", becomes part of the divine order: unlike Asag, Anzû subverts the cosmos from within Ekur, after finding his place among the gods' community.<sup>222</sup>

The following contrast is the most decisive: when the action starts in *Lugale* Ninurta is already an acclaimed, king-like figure (*Lugale* 17-21), whereas *Anzû* narrates *how* he became that figure.<sup>223</sup> The major emphasis on the depiction of the deprived and impotent divine community's efforts enhances the glory of the saviour, and truly makes him worthy of lordship. However, Ninurta does not replace Enlil, and the alertness and cunning of Ea (absent from *Lugale*) are the decisive factors behind the warrior.<sup>224</sup> Ea's solution to appoint Ninurta when sovereignty is lost calls into action the complex assembly proceedings involving the mother-goddess; it is here that *Anzû* displays its major contact points with *Atra-ḫasīs*, establishing itself firmly within the Akkadian literary tradition.

---

<sup>222</sup> Anzû's positive role in the Lugalbanda Cycle is worth recalling: he claims (*Lugalb. II* 100-02) that Enlil deputed him to bar the mountain's entrance, just as in *Anzû* he is to bar Enlil's cella, cf. Annus (2001) ix.

<sup>223</sup> Vogelzang (1988) 160.

<sup>224</sup> Cf. Feldt (2013) 25.

### §1.3. Divine assemblies

*Anzû*'s divine assemblies are more clearly represented as decision-making institutions than those in *Lugale*, reflecting the different nature of the issues confronted: the first assembly (§1) involves cosmic organisation, the second and third (§2-3) a sovereignty crisis. As in *Lugale* and *Atra-ḫasīs*, the assemblies structure the plot by marking its crucial moments: the gods confronting *Anzû*'s birth, the major crisis, Ninurta's re-appropriation of the Tablet of Destinies. A fourth and last assembly is likely to have concluded the poem with Ninurta's final exaltation.

#### §1.3.1. Considering *Anzû* (SB 1.21-60)

When the cosmos is yet to be perfected, the Igiḡū gather around Enlil (1.21-23); the assembly concludes (1.60) when Enlil agrees that *Anzû* guard his own cella, as Ea suggested, after which he proceeds to distribute the cosmic prerogatives. The scene's tripartite structure includes the long (and largely fragmentary) speech of the Igiḡū describing the turmoil caused by *Anzû*'s birth (1.24-41); Enlil's perplexed reaction (1.42-46); Ea solving the chief god's impasse by giving a role to *Anzû* (1.47-59).

The *dramatis personae* are introduced in an ominous way. Considering the ensuing turmoil caused by the creature, the gods' delight in telling Enlil the news (1.24-27) appears ironic. The exchange between Enlil and Ea displays the ruler's helplessness and the consequent necessity of Ea's experienced counsel: both features foreshadow the major assembly after the actual crisis, but also the problematic battle, where again Ea will play the decisive role.<sup>225</sup>

---

<sup>225</sup> That the cunning god *par excellence* makes such a disastrous suggestion is a function of the plot, and another instance of Ea's widespread tendency to undermine Enlil's authority: Ea *is* involved in the birth of *Anzû*, as far as the Apsû gods (SB 1.51) are under his responsibility, and he knows how the monster came into being (1.50-53). On Ea in *Anzû* cf. esp. Vogelzang (1988) 157-62, Kramer and Maier (1989) 140-42, Feldt (2013).

§1.3.2. Appointing Ninurta (SB 1.87 - 2.29 ≈ OB 1.6 - 2.74)

Preserved also in the OB version (cf. §1.1), this is *Anzû*'s longest and most complex assembly. The mechanisms leading to Ninurta's election as champion invite comparison with those in *Atra-ḫasīs* OB 1 (Ch. 2§3.1). Indeed, the similarities are such that one cannot exclude the possibility of a conscious elaboration.<sup>226</sup>

Deprived of his regalia, Enlil remains silent. As in *Atra-ḫasīs*, he is unable to confront the crisis; but whilst during the gods' revolt Enlil was able to act (initially at least) within the assembly, in *Anzû* he is altogether uninvolved. This is partly due to the crises' different nature, since the *Atra-ḫasīs* rebels had not deprived Enlil of kingship; but it is also a function (in *Atra-ḫasīs*) of the major role Enlil is to play in the rest of the poem and (in *Anzû*) of the prominence Ninurta is to gain at the expense and behest of his father.

In Enlil's latency, Anu takes the lead as the gods gather in despair, and vainly seeks to appoint a champion. The threefold pattern of (1) *impasse*, (2) *attempted solution* and (3) *failure* is repeated three times to increase the sense of helpless crisis.<sup>227</sup> The initial failure corresponds to the embassy episode in *Atra-ḫasīs*, the assembly's first and unsuccessful resolution. As in *Atra-ḫasīs*, Ea's counsel after the crisis point proves superior to Anu's (and Enlil's), and involves the summoning, exaltation and re-naming of the mother-goddess.<sup>228</sup> Again, Mami performs the decisive task; in both poems this process receives the approval of the divine community sanctioning Ea's advice and Mami's pre-eminence.

As seen above, the collective approval in *Atra-ḫasīs* articulates the re-establishment of harmony after the revolt, as the goddess involves both the Anunnakū and the Igiḡū in her creation. In *Anzû*, instead, the stress falls on the significance of Ninurta's appointment, while the collective approval of Ea's idea and of Mami's pre-eminence seems little more

---

<sup>226</sup> For previous comparisons see Hallo and Moran (1979) 68-69, Wisnom (2014) 75-77.

<sup>227</sup> The refusal-pattern is found three times with identical words (SB 1.94-114 ≈ 115-135 ≈ 136-156). For a comparison of the repetition patterns across the OB and SB versions cf. Vogelzang (1986), (1988) 192-234.

<sup>228</sup> The name aetiology (where *Anzû* SB 1.181-82 = *Atra-ḫasīs* OB 1.246-47, cf. above Ch. 2§3.1.3) is absent from the OB version, see Hallo and Moran (1979) 68-69.

than a bureaucratic matter.<sup>229</sup> What matters here is Mami's status as the mother of Enlil's son. Her task here is not a creation act, but the performance of the decisive appointment speech. Where Anu had failed, she succeeds by stressing the familiar and cosmic ties connecting Ninurta to Enlil, signified by the structure of her speech, which concludes the assembly. It presents three parts: her own pre-eminence in the world order which is at stake (1.200-10), central instructions (2.1-20), and final promises of reward (2.21-26). The latter evoke Anu's promises so as to surpass them (2.24-27 = 1.100-03, 121-24, 142-45), the main variation being the line "Let the divine regulations return [to the] father who begot you" [*a-na*] *a-ḫbi* [*a*]-*li-di-ka li-tu-ru par-ši* (2.23). Conversely, her (ineffective) instructions foreshadow, and will be surpassed by, the (effective) ones from Ea after Ninurta's first attempt proves unsuccessful (2.17-27 = 113-23 = 135-45).<sup>230</sup> Her exordium, however, does not engage with other speeches: Mami delineates the power structure that has been overturned. Her account is remarkably centred on herself, reflecting the pre-eminence just achieved in the assembly: she is the mother of all the gods, she granted supremacy (*Enlilūtu*) to her brother Enlil, she appointed Anu to heaven. Only Ninurta, the son she had with Enlil, can restore that situation.<sup>231</sup>

Thus, the motif of Ea's decisive intervention in collaboration with the mother-goddess highlights Ninurta's unique position, since he "sets out against Anzu, not so much as champion of the gods, as the loyal and obedient son who is to avenge his parents".<sup>232</sup> In effect, Ninurta becomes the assembly's champion precisely on account of his filial ties. As

---

<sup>229</sup> Concerning the minor prominence of the collective body in *Anzū*, note that only in the SB version do the Iḡiḡū summon Mami (SB 1.169-79, as in *Atra-ḫasis* OB 1.192-97), which the OB version leaves to Ea (OB 2.36).

<sup>230</sup> The (decisive) variation here concerns the use of the bow (2.10 ≈ 111), cf. Kramer and Maier (1989) 140-42.

<sup>231</sup> On the importance of kinship here, recalling the proem (above n. 214), see esp. Hallo and Moran (1979) 67-69, Vogelzang (1988) 222-23 n. 4, Moran (1988) 24.

<sup>232</sup> Hallo and Moran (1979) 68.

the son of the chief god and of the supreme mother-goddess, he represents that continuity which, alone, can preserve cosmic order.

### §1.3.3. Fetching Ninurta (SB 3.24-48)

Immediately after Anzû's defeat and Ninurta's seizing of the Tablet of Destinies, Anzû's feathers go to Ekur as Ea predicted, and Enlil/Dagan summons all the gods in joy. This transitional assembly's content is limited to the summoning and sending of a messenger to Ninurta, who should return with the Tablet. Our text breaks after the first line of Enlil's speech to the messenger Birdu (3.48); when it resumes Ninurta is speaking to Birdu.<sup>233</sup>

The fact that one god (most probably Ea) should repeat and confirm Enlil/Dagan's plan to send a messenger (3.33-39) might be a sign of the chief god's still shaky rule. On the other hand, the complex proceedings (Nuska is not sent directly to Ninurta, but to fetch the messenger god Birdu) emphasise the importance of Ninurta's return, whether or not he refuses to return the Tablet.<sup>234</sup>

### §1.3.4. Fourth assembly?

The poem's last extant portion displays a praise of Ninurta by a god (or the narrator), including the celebration of Ninurta's new divine names and corresponding functions (SB 3.113-181). The collective context of the closely related passage in *Enūma eliš* 6 and 7 (esp. 6.94-96, 121), and the several precedents in Sumerian literature (especially in *Lugale*, above Ch. 1§1.1) lead one to suspect that the name-exaltation was made in the assembly's official context.

---

<sup>233</sup> Annus (2001) 27 states that the break is 4 lines long, probably drawing on the assumption in Saggs (1986) 24 of a "not less than 2 no more than 5" missing lines. One should however judge by analogy with the preceding message-delivery episodes in SB 2, where the messenger's speeches are quoted *in extenso* (though not *verbatim*), both when Šarur learns and delivers the message (SB 2.72-85 ≈ 89-100; 105-123 ≈ 127-145). Because Enlil's speech in Birdu's voice is at least 8 lines long (SB 3.61-68), at least 8 lines should be allowed in the lacuna, without including, that is, the "tell him" line(s) (cf. 2.71; 103-104), nor the (possibly) three "departure-and-arrival" lines (cf. 2.86-88 ≈ 124-126).

<sup>234</sup> So Vogelzang (1988) 16-17, followed by Foster (2005) 575. *Contra* Annus (2001) xiii; Wisnom (2014) 59 n. 39.

#### §1.4. Concluding remarks

The assemblies' structural function shapes the entire poem's development from Anzû's birth to Ninurta's final exaltation. The assembly constitutes the spatial centre of the poem, which develops through the centripetal and centrifugal movements of the antagonist and the protagonist: Anzû enters divine society but is bound to abandon it; Ninurta sets out and is bound to return.

The crisis of the ruler which we saw in *Atra-ḫasīs* becomes even more prominent as the world's command is overturned; as in *Atra-ḫasīs*, it is the divine assembly, through its major exponent Ea, that ultimately preserves cosmic order. Rather than opposing Enlil, however, the assembly directs Ninurta's action and configures his role as the preserver of his father's rule.

## §2. Enūma eliš

### §2.1. Manuscript tradition, synopsis, dating

*Enūma eliš* is the Akkadian poem attested by the largest number of manuscripts (86 Assyrian, 98 Babylonian).<sup>235</sup> The oldest pieces may be 7 Assyrian tablets from Assur, possibly of ninth-century date.<sup>236</sup> All other Assyrian witnesses align with the Nineveh material in belonging to the time of Aššurbanipal's library. The Babylonian evidence does not antedate the Neo-Babylonian Empire, while the latest testimonies may belong to the Parthian period. All manuscripts except one (Assyrian BM 98909) consistently present the text in seven two-column tablets. No evidence for different recensions of the poem has

---

<sup>235</sup> Figures in Gabriel (2014) 30-31. Unless otherwise specified, composite text and translations follow Lambert's (2013) edition. On the manuscript tradition see Kämmerer and Metzler (2012) 23-35, Lambert (2013) 2-17, Gabriel (2014) 29-70.

<sup>236</sup> Köcher *apud* Lambert (2013) 4, on paleographic grounds; so too, however, Maul *apud* George (2005/2006) 87 n. 15 dates KAR 317 to before "die Wende vom 2. zum 1. Jt." Cf. Gabriel (2014) 34-35, 102.

emerged, excluding a group of Nineveh and Assur tablets where the Assyrian chief god Assur replaces Marduk.<sup>237</sup>

The poem, about 1,100 lines long, starts from the primeval beings, a personified Apsû and his wife Tiāmat (Akk. "sea").<sup>238</sup> They give birth to two couples: Laḫmu and Laḫamu, Anšar (Sum. "whole sky") and Kišar (Sum. "whole earth"). From the latter Anu is born, and from Anu Ea. Responding to Anu and Ea's clamour (*rigmu*), Apsû resolves to destroy them, supported by his vizier Mummu and in spite of Tiāmat's opposition. Ea prevents him and kills him: Apsû becomes his abode, wherein Marduk is born. Tiāmat creates a host of monsters, and appoints Qingu as leader by entrusting to him the Tablet of Destinies (Tablet 1). Ea consults Anšar, and is sent against Tiāmat. He turns back, and Anu does the same. The gods, assembled in Anšar's abode, are at a loss, but Ea bids his son Marduk offer himself as champion before Anšar. Marduk promises to defeat Tiāmat, but Anšar is first to summon a divine assembly to give Marduk the power of "decreeing destinies" (2). Preparations are made for this assembly, and the great gods, led by Laḫmu and Laḫamu, gather in Anšar's abode to eat and drink (3). The great gods proclaim Marduk's word unalterable: he sets out, kills Tiāmat, binds Qingu and recovers the Tablet of Destinies. He splits Tiāmat's body to use it to fashion the universe (4). That done, he gives the Tablet to Anu. The assembled gods exalt him, professing obeisance. Marduk proposes the construction of Babylon (5). Marduk and Ea create mankind from Qingu's blood; the gods are divided between heaven and earth, and build Babylon. A final assembly of the great gods occurs in Esagil, Babylon's temple, where Marduk is enthroned. Anšar, Laḫmu and Laḫamu utter Marduk's first nine names (6). The assembled gods then pronounce the

---

<sup>237</sup> On this editorial operation see Lambert (1997); (2013) 4-5; Frahm (2010) 8-13; Kämmerer and Metzler (2012) 26-33.

<sup>238</sup> The conventional reading *Tiāmat* is adopted hereafter, but see Borger (2008) 272-73 and Kämmerer and Metzler (2012) 388 for the problematic rendering of *ti-géme*.

remaining names, save the last one uttered by Ea, and the narrator's doxology concludes the composition (7).

Because the poem extols the supremacy of the god of Babylon and his city, there is little doubt that it originated in a Babylonian environment, with likely connections to the cult of Marduk.<sup>239</sup> Seleucid-period sources famously attest to the poem being recited during the New Year festival (*akītu*) in Babylon.<sup>240</sup> Although the *akītu* was in place long before the poem was composed, most scholars today agree that the poem's contents indicate that its deployment in the *akītu*-festival is secondary.<sup>241</sup> Concerning the date of composition, Lambert used Marduk's rise within the Babylonian pantheon to pinpoint where the composition of the poem fits in this process.<sup>242</sup> He influentially pressed the case for Marduk's official elevation to be attributed only to the reign of Nabuchadnezzar I (*ca.* 1125-1104), after the god's statue was recovered from the Elamites: this circumstance would provide a plausible context for the poem's composition. Though such an exact date cannot be proved, a (late) MB period dating is generally accepted.<sup>243</sup>

---

<sup>239</sup> E.g. Dietrich (2006), Lambert (2013) 439, full discussion in Gabriel (2014) 70-107.

<sup>240</sup> Text Thureau-Dangin (1921) 136, ll. 279-84; in general on the *akītu* rituals, variously attested since Sargonic times across several cities, see esp. Sallaberger (1998/2001), Pongratz-Leisten (1998/2001), Bidmead (2002) with a history of interpretations at 17-38, Zgoll (2006b) Cohen (2015) 99-107, 389-407.

<sup>241</sup> On the poem and the *akītu* see recently Bidmead (2002) 66-69, Zgoll (2006b) 48-53, Kämmerer and Metzler (2012) 42-45, Lambert (2013) 459-62, Gabriel (2014) 70-71, and *passim* 70-106, Cohen (2015) 392. The poem's ritual recitation is attested in other occasions and elsewhere, cf. Zgoll (2006b) 50-51, Gabriel (2014) 87-90.

<sup>242</sup> Lambert (1964), (2013) 248-77; Sommerfeld (1982); Dalley (1997).

<sup>243</sup> See now Lambert (2013) 439-44; Kämmerer and Metzler (2012) 16-21 are sceptical and envisage an evolutionary scenario for the poem's formation. Concerning the poem's language, textual variations (Lambert 2013: 9-17) including line-omissions, scribal mistakes, and orthographic and dialectal differences occur "quite haphazardly throughout all the late copies" (12) so that "the precise forms of the words may have originated in the scribal schools of the mid-first-millennium B.C. and represent what can properly be called 'Standard Babylonian'" (17).

## §2.2. *Chaoskampf*, genealogy and collective context

*Enūma eliš* extols Marduk by exploiting a vast amount of traditional material, poetic and theological.<sup>244</sup> One remarkable aspect is the combination of the genealogical succession pattern with the *Chaoskampf* motif we observed, associated with Ninurta, in *Lugale* and *Anzû*.<sup>245</sup> Asag and Anzû were, from the moment of their extraordinary birth, outsiders from divine society.<sup>246</sup> Tiāmat, instead, is the mother of all. But as soon as she assembles her demonic host and illegitimately enthrones Qingu, she becomes the threatening outsider, just like Asag and Anzû in the Ninurta mythology. The *Chaoskampf* motif alienates Tiāmat from the legitimate line of succession culminating in Marduk.<sup>247</sup>

Considering the heroes, fundamental differences lie in the premises and outcomes of the recovery of the Tablet, connected to the different significance the genealogical discourse acquires in *Enūma eliš* and to the divine assembly's different role. Ninurta, whose accession is unaccomplished, is not to become king of the gods, nor will he replace his father Enlil. In fact, Ninurta needs a decisive intervention by Enlil (in *Lugale*) and Ea (in *Anzû*) to win his battle; his unaccomplished accession is foregrounded as he delays in returning the Tablet to Enlil. The genealogical discourse is indeed important for Ninurta's triumph in the second divine assembly of both *Lugale* and *Anzû* (Ch. 1§1.3, Ch. 2§1.2, §1.3.2). There, however, Ninurta emerges as the victorious champion *insofar as* he can restore Enlil's order.

In *Enūma eliš*, Enlil's absence and the related long-term genealogy are from the beginning a function of Marduk's decisive accession, which is clearly granted before the battle through a clear and universal genealogical recognition. Before Marduk's

---

<sup>244</sup> On these sources see Lambert (2013) Parts II-IV; on borrowing, allusion and intertextuality in *Ee* cf. e.g. Jacobsen (1976) 167-68, Lambert (1986), Machinist (2005), Seri (2012), (2014), Wisnom (2014) 38-39; 90-198.

<sup>245</sup> On the role of genealogy in the poem's succession narrative see Gabriel (2014) 317-54, Haubold (2017) 25-30, also below Ch. 10§4.

<sup>246</sup> Cf. especially Enlil's perplexity at *Anzû* SB 1.42-47 (above §1.3.1).

<sup>247</sup> Haubold (2017) 23-24 stresses Tiāmat's (and Apsû's) *otherness* in respect to the other gods.

intervention, both Ea and Anu have to fail, and the hero's intention, promoted by his father, is approved by the assembly of the great gods, "his (Marduk's) fathers" (*ab-bé-e-šú*: 4.2, 27, cf. 20),<sup>248</sup> convened by Anšar, who fetches Laḫmu and Laḫamu, the eldest surviving deities excluding Tiāmat. As a result, Marduk is happy to consign the Tablet to Anu. Genealogy marks also the structure of the divine society legitimising Marduk's rise, as is clear in the distinction between a larger group of "gods" and the more restricted and hierarchically superior group of "the great gods (his fathers)".<sup>249</sup>

Thus, by combining the external enemy slaying motif (*Chaoskampf*) and the long-term genealogical recognition (absent from the Ninurta mythology), *Enūma eliš* concentrates on Marduk's unchallenged and legitimate preeminence. Once this is achieved, and the enemy defeated, the second half of the poem presents an utterly expanded focus on communal exaltation.

The structural and conceptual teleology leading to Marduk's rise is reflected in the divine assembly's function, which does not choose the hero, but sanctions his supremacy. Thus, Ea's typical intervention to solve the communal impasse does not happen within the assembly, but in an "aside" communication (*Ee* 2.127-34), so that it is Marduk who not only proposes himself to Anšar as a champion, but asks that an assembly be summoned for him. Unlike in *Anzū*, the decisive assembly before the fight gathers not to find a solution

---

<sup>248</sup> On *abu* in *Ee* cf. Haubold (2017) 29-30 n. 38.

<sup>249</sup> See Bartash (2010) 1096-105, with terminology, occurrences and diagrams. "Gods": generally *ilānī*(dingir)<sup>mes</sup>/(dingir.dingir); "Great Gods" *ilū/ilānī*(dingir)<sup>mes</sup>/(dingir.dingir) *rabūti*(gal)<sup>mes</sup>/(gal.gal) (being fifty in 6.74 and 80, cf. 7.136-40, and including the "seven gods of destinies": 6.81, 7.122). An identification between "the gods, his fathers" and "the great gods" is here maintained, although at 5.153 the larger group of gods call Marduk "our son", which, however, might just reflect the previous words by the senior ones (5.153-54 ≈ 5.109-10); otherwise the identification is not contradicted by the occurrences of the expression "the gods, his fathers" in reference to Marduk, for which see Bartash (2010) 1098. Still, the distinction between Igiḡī and Anunnakī remains problematic, cf. Lambert (2013) 193-96. Bartash (2010), esp. 1097-98 conjectures that the Anunnakī belonged to Tiāmat's host (cf. esp. 6.20, 40, 47, 59, 68, where only the Anunnakī appear in the context of man's creation, granted freedom and Babylon's building), while the Igiḡī would originally have represented the 50 great/senior gods, but later redactions would have blurred this distinction.

and a champion, but to entrust royal prerogatives; nor is it centred on the intervention of praiseworthy deities (Ea, Mami) acting within the collective context, but on Marduk, who elevates himself above the divine community.

### §2.3. Divine assemblies

Eight divine gatherings may be distinguished:<sup>250</sup>

No.	Lines	Events
[1]	1.33-54	Apsû deliberates with Tiāmat and Mummu.
[2]	1.57-62	Divine helplessness, Ea's quick reaction.
[3]	1.109-62 <sup>251</sup>	Tiāmat's assembly, Qingu given command.
[4]	2.121-3.66	Anšar's assembly, helplessness, Marduk steps forward, Kaka sent.
[5]	3.129-4.60	Marduk is given command before setting out.
[6]	5.75-158 <sup>252</sup>	Marduk's exaltation.
[7]	6.17-58	Creation of mankind.
[8]	6.67-end	Esagil scene, enthronment and utterance of Marduk's names.

These scenes articulate narrative progression through the poem's two parts, before and after the central battle in Tablet 4.<sup>253</sup> The gatherings of the first part symmetrically establish the main opposition in the divine world whereby Tiāmat becomes the *other*, and highlight the contrast between Qingu's illegitimate and Marduk's legitimate leadership. First, Apsû's fatal decision, emerging from the restricted council [1], is opposed to Ea's quick reaction as the gathered gods are at a loss [2].<sup>254</sup> Tiāmat's assembly with Qingu's illegitimate enthronment [3] recurs three times after the narrator's account: 2.11-48, Ea to Anšar (where 2.15-48 = 1.129-62) = 3.15-52, Anšar to Kaka = 3.73-110, Kaka to Laḥmu and Laḥamu. These repetitions, first, show the utmost gravity of a crisis encompassing the

<sup>250</sup> Bartash's (2010) structural analysis of the poem's divine assemblies remains valuable even without accepting his assumption, derived from T. Jacobsen, that the poem can be taken as "historical evidence" of an evolution from primitive democracy to absolute kingship (on this see the Introductory Remarks to Part 1 above). Bartash distinguishes seven assemblies: (1.132-62; 2.121-62; 3.129-4.34; 5.85-156; 6.17-58; 6.67-94; 6.95-end). This analysis includes the two previous, shorter scenes in Tablet 1, and assesses differently some assemblies' beginnings and the boundary between Tablets 5 and 6.

<sup>251</sup> The repeated accounts start from 1.129 (= 2.15, 3.19, 3.77).

<sup>252</sup> Though the major gods accompanied Marduk (4.63-64, cf. 4.134), at 5.75 we learn that Marduk and the major gods are in Apsû; at 5.85-87 that the minor gods had gathered.

<sup>253</sup> For a compositional analysis highlighting the poem's *Parallelstruktur* see Gabriel (2014) 182-248.

<sup>254</sup> The juxtaposition between antagonist assemblies recalls *Atr.* OB 1.99-165. Bartash's (2010) 86-87 exclusion of 1.33-54 as an assembly is unpersuasive.

whole divine hierarchical genealogy (Anšar being unable to overcome it, as his son Anu and his grandson Ea fail). Significantly, Marduk's crucial self-proposal to Anšar [4] is framed by the two sets of repeated passages relating Qingu's illegitimate appointment. The reiteration of Tiāmat's anti-assembly underscores the contrast with Marduk's rightful appointment by the assembly of the "great gods" in Anšar's abode [5], thereby legitimising his unconventional request.<sup>255</sup>

In the poem's second half, after Tiāmat's defeat and Marduk's cosmic activities, an almost continuous assembly leads to the poem's conclusion. The vertical hierarchy ("the gods" under "the great gods" under Marduk) is exploited to unfold the collective proceedings, which in turn are framed and paused by Marduk's deeds and the building of Babylon. The following table shows the complementary and different roles of both divine groups in [6]:

Lines	Subject	Terms in the text	Action
5.75-84	Great gods	"The gods"... "his fathers": Laḥmu, Laḥamu, Anu, Enlil, Ea, Damkina	Joy, gifts, hailing
5.85-88	Gods	Anunnakī and Igiḡ	Doing obeisance
5.89-106	Marduk	Marduk	Kingly apparel
5.107-10	Great gods	Laḥmu, Laḥamu, others? (cf. 5.107, broken)	Sanction of M.'s kingship by addressing the Igiḡ
5.111-16	Gods	"all of them" ( <i>pu-ḥur-šū-un</i> )	Approval of kingship, doing obeisance
5.117-30	Marduk	Marduk	Proposing the building of Babylon
5.131-44	Great gods	"[The gods], his fathers"	Approval
5.145-50 (fragm.)	Marduk	?	?
5.151-58	Gods	"the gods"	Approval, exaltation

<sup>255</sup> One macroscopic opposition between [3] and [5] is that between the foes' hatred and the great gods' merriment. Note also the expansion whereby Marduk's power in establishing destinies is tested in the creation and annihilation of a constellation (4.21-28), whereas Qingu proclaims his host's destiny with a brief utterance (1.159-62). Marduk gains the power *šū-uš-qu-ú* *ù šū-uš-pu-lu* "to elevate and lay low", 4.8; Qingu's rise was resumed by the narrator with the phrase *qin-gu šū-uš-qu-ú* "Qingu had been elevated" 1.159a. Comparing the two exaltations (1.153-62, 4.3-28), though some important elements are shared (esp. 1.158 ≈ 4.7b+9a), a contrast between Tiāmat's artificial effort and the legitimate solidity of Marduk's election emerges, for instance, through the use of the causative Š stem in the first person in Tiamat's speech, underlining her role (1.153-54), which does not occur in the great gods' utterance, where assertive staves and infinitives prevail (cf. 4.3-6, 9, 21). See further Ch. 9§4.2.

The continuity of the collective scene is first interrupted at the beginning of Tablet 6 with the "aside" of Ea and Marduk concerning the creation of mankind (6.1-16), mirroring their preceding "aside" in [3] (2.129-135), which led to Marduk's self-appointment as champion. The other pause is the building of Babylon by the Anunnakī (6.59-67), leading to a change of setting and to the final scene in Esagil [8].

The organisation of the larger group of "gods" is perfected through mankind's creation [7], the consequent establishment of their freedom (6.26, 34),<sup>256</sup> and their labour on Esagil and their own shrines (6.49-68). The final Esagil scene [8] is dominated by "the great gods, his fathers". First Marduk makes them sit in the lofty place the Anunnakī had built (6.70-75);<sup>257</sup> the regulations established beforehand for the "gods" are now confirmed by the "great gods" (*te-re-e-ti* 6.45, 78); he then assigns positions to the "great gods" as well: he gives seats to the "fifty great gods" and creates the college of the "seven gods of destiny" (6.80). After performing the catasterism of Marduk's bow, Anu establishes Marduk's throne in the midst of the assembly (6.82-94): now the "great gods" gather to do obeisance to Marduk (6.95-96, cf. 5.85, where the lesser gods did the same), and everything is ready for the utterance of Marduk's names.

This last, climactic operation occupies the end of Tablet 6 and the whole of Tablet 7. Here, too, we can observe the genealogical procedure. It is Anšar, together with the eldest survivors Laḥmu and Laḥamu, who begins with the first nine names (6.101-157) before encouraging "the gods, their sons" (6.158) to do the same. The general utterance is defined as the product of "their council" (*mil-kàt-su-un*), held in "the place of assembly" Upšukkinaku (6.162). The final name, however, will be that of Ea, pronounced by Marduk's father himself (7.137-42). The narrator's gloss to the long name-utterance (7.143-

---

<sup>256</sup> Bartash (2010) 1092 n.14 notices the connection between these lines and 7.27-29. On the resonance with the *Atra-ḥasīs* tradition on mankind's creation see e.g. Jacobsen (1976) 180-81, Dietrich (1991), Kämmerer and Metzler (2012) 15, Seri (2012) 17, Wisnom (2014) 169-75.

<sup>257</sup> 6.70-71 to be translated with Kämmerer and Metzler (2012) 261, taking, that is, the Anunnakī mentioned in lines 6.59, 69 as subject of the relative clause at 6.70.

44) clarifies that the fifty "great gods", by assigning fifty names (fifty being Enlil's number),<sup>258</sup> resign their power into Marduk's hands.

## §2.4. Concluding remarks

The long-term genealogical framework, crucial for Marduk's accession, articulates the assembly scenes both before and after Tīāmat's defeat. In the composition's first part the assemblies build the contrast between Qingu's illegitimate appointment and the rightful one of Marduk. Comparison with *Anzū* illuminates how Marduk's pre-eminence causes the divine assembly to play a less active role, as the initiative comes from Marduk himself. This does not entail, however, a diminution in the prominence of the collective body, which remains essential both as the framework of Marduk's legitimisation and as the major focus of his provisions in the poem's second half.

## §3. *Erra and Išum*

### §3.1. Manuscript tradition

The latest poem in our Babylonian corpus, *Erra and Išum* was composed between the tenth and the mid-seventh century by Kabti-ilānī-Marduk, who is presented as the author at the end of the poem, with which he was inspired by a divinely-sent dream (5.42-43).<sup>259</sup> The poem's 46 published manuscripts range temporally from the Neo-Assyrian to the Neo/Late-Babylonian period, and geographically from southern Ur to Sultantepe.<sup>260</sup> The poem comprised five tablets, totalling about 800 lines.<sup>261</sup> Tablets 1, 4 and 5 are almost

---

<sup>258</sup> Cf. Röllig (1957/71) 500, Lambert (2013) 167-68.

<sup>259</sup> Attempts at connecting the composition to precisely determined historical events are problematic, but see still Gössmann (1955) 85-90: reign of Sennacherib (early 7th century); Lambert (1958) 396-98 and 400: first half of the 9th c., followed e.g. by Cagni (1969) 37-45, (1977) 20-21, Bottéro (1977/1978) 140-47, Frahm (2010) 7; von Soden (1971), (1987) 67-69: mid-8th, *ante* 763, followed by Beaulieu (2001) 25-29; Franke (2014): reign of Esarhaddon (681-69).

<sup>260</sup> On the manuscript tradition see Cagni (1969) 13-23, 50-54; Hruška (1974) 355-58, below n. 263. The damaged obverse of ms. GM1 from Tarbišu, containing extensive portions of the poem, is unpublished, cf. Saggs (1986) 1-2.

<sup>261</sup> See now George (2013) 66 n. 4, Wisnom (2014) 39-40.

entirely extant. Tablet 3 has three major gaps at present, but is well preserved in a ms. awaiting publication.<sup>262</sup> Tablet 2 remains very difficult to follow in spite of ms. IM 121299 (hereafter W), displaying the whole text but with many fragmentary or illegible lines.<sup>263</sup>

### §3.2. Erra and the gods, synopsis

The poem may be read as an allegorical reflection on war and its consequences,<sup>264</sup> but presents much of theological interest too. In terms of mythical chronology, the events are set after *Enūma eliš*, which ends with Marduk as king of the gods and guarantor of order. The composition engages with the poetic tradition on cosmic order and disorder, particularly *Anzū* and *Enūma eliš*.<sup>265</sup> Traditionally, the external agent of chaos was to be contrasted with a champion god acting on account of the divine assembly, to which he triumphantly returned and which (re-)established order around the central hero. The crucial difference here is the absolute isolation of Erra, a god from within the pantheon who becomes both the agent of chaos, being indeed chaos itself, and the central (anti-)hero of the poem. Erra subverts the divine order, causes utter devastation on earth, and is appeased only when he can perceive the divine community's submission. The role of his lieutenant Išum, who vainly tries to restrain the wrathful god and eventually appeases him by showing that the cosmos is indeed subdued, stresses Erra's distance from the gods: constantly at the side of Erra, Išum does not act on the assembly's account as Ea did in *Anzū*. In effect, Erra's detachment from the communal dimension is a dominant keynote that can be followed throughout the poem's architecture.

---

<sup>262</sup> Known to George (as in n. above) from photographs by Al-Rawi.

<sup>263</sup> Al-Rawi and Black (1989), which, together with minor recoveries in Lambert (1980a) and Saggs (1986) 29, supplements the standard critical edition by Cagni (1969). Foster (2005) 891-911 translates the poem using the entire published evidence. Unless otherwise stated, we follow Cagni's (1969) edition and Foster's (2005) line-count.

<sup>264</sup> See most recently George (2013).

<sup>265</sup> Gössmann (1955) 81-82, Cagni (1969) 28-30, Machinist (2005) 46-49, Foster (2007) 108, Frahm (2010) 6-8, Wisnom (2014) 208-86.

Far from being a composition "with weak narrative line",<sup>266</sup> Kabti-ilānī-Marduk's masterpiece displays a transparent concentric structure leading the audience from an initial situation of precarious stability (Tablet 1) to the reestablishment of order (Tablet 5) through the central crisis and devastation (Tablets 2-4).<sup>267</sup> As the narrative starts in Tablet 1, Erra stands idle in his temple Emeslam; the action begins as he decides to reach Marduk's Babylonian dwelling after a restricted meeting where he is counselled for the worse by his demonic personified weapons, the *sebettu* ("heptad"), and for the better by Išum, whose words Erra despises.<sup>268</sup>

In the one-to-one dialogue with Marduk in Esagil (1.125-91), Erra persuades the divine king to take leave so that his neglected statue may be refurbished, promising to maintain order in the meantime. The dialogue subverts the traditional pattern whereby the minor deity consults the senior one before showing his/her power in a particular exploit, most notably at *Ee* 2.136-53 (Marduk and Anšar).<sup>269</sup> The minor god is traditionally invested with authority and praised by the divine assembly both before leaving and at his return from his heroic exploit. But the anti-hero Erra goes nowhere, skilfully takes over Marduk's position, causing chaos to ensue as the gods stand by helpless. And even after Marduk's statue is refurbished, Erra finds himself aloof in Emeslam, deaf to the divine pleas (Tablet 2).

During the central devastations (2.C<sub>2</sub>.40'-4.35), only Erra and Išum are on the scene; the gods figure only in their dialogue, as victims of Erra's designs. The pair's contrasting perspectives on Erra's rule mark the peak of the crisis at the poem's centre: for Erra,

---

<sup>266</sup> So Powell (2007) 84.

<sup>267</sup> Thus showing a typical "withdrawal, devastation and return" pattern, on which cf. Chs. 6§1.1, 7§1.2, §1.4; on the poem's structure see especially Cagni (1969) 31-37 and *passim* in his commentary, Machinist-Sasson (1983); on its style Foster (2007) 106-09.

<sup>268</sup> Compare the council at *Ee* 1.34-54.

<sup>269</sup> Cf. Ballesteros Petrella (in prep.1).

Marduk's withdrawal justifies his devastation (3.C.38-56);<sup>270</sup> for Išum, Erra should be appeased precisely because he is in full power, and is causing the gods' fear and respect (3.D.2-15).

Išum's complex speech that finally appeases Erra (3.D-4.127) symmetrically portrays the chaos across several Mesopotamian cities (Babylon, 4.1-49; Sippar, 50-51; Uruk, 52-62; Dūr-Kurigalzu, 63-64; Dēr, 65-103). Išum reports several speeches, a typical feature of Sumerian lamentations vividly dramatising the wide-ranging effects of destruction.<sup>271</sup> Those by Marduk in Babylon (4.40-49) and by Ištaran, the city-god of Dēr (4.66-103), frame the section, sanction the accomplished destruction, and ultimately stress Erra's irresistible power. In this way, Išum is able to enact before Erra's eyes the divine submission already described generically (3.D.7-13).

Before restoring order (Tablet 5), Erra inverts his initial and enduring isolation by proclaiming his appeasement among all the gods. One should note, however, that there is no collective reaction to Erra's speech. With a final twist, the poet directs the expected divine praise to the everlasting worth of his own composition (5.45-47). This does unite Erra and the gods, but only in the extra-diegetic dimension.<sup>272</sup>

### §3.3. Divine assemblies

The assemblies' structural function develops around the climactic central devastation. The divine community is unable to find a resolution to the crisis along traditional lines: its role is not to be saved, and then to support and exalt the central hero. To no avail does the gathering seek for a solution after Marduk's withdrawal (§3.3.1). Indeed the gods are

---

<sup>270</sup> The structural importance of this speech emerges as it answers the same question Išum asks before Erra takes his decision in Tablet 1 (1.102-3 ≈ 3.C.36-7), cf. Cagni (1969) 220-1.

<sup>271</sup> Ch. 1§3. On *Erra* and the City-Laments see Wisnom (2014) 262-86.

<sup>272</sup> 5.47: *ilānī(dingir)<sup>meš</sup> nap-ḫar-šú-nu i-na-ad-du it-ti-sú* "the gods, all of them, were praising (the song) with him". Compare the harmony between Enlil and the Igiḡu concluding *Atra-ḫasīs*, Ch. 2.§3.3.2.

utterly helpless when facing Erra's terrible aloofness, both before and after devastation is completed (§3.3.2).

### §3.3.1. Restoring Marduk's apparel (2.1-115)

The first two-thirds of Tablet 2 relate the consequences of Marduk's withdrawal. Despite the fragmented evidence, a structure of three successive collective sessions is perceptible.

(*narrator*) 2.1-11. As Marduk leaves his dwelling, disaster and darkness ensue (Šamaš and Sîn avert their gaze), as predicted at 1.170-78.

(*first divine discussion*) 2.12-43. Someone comments on Marduk's apparel (12-18, unclear); then we find instructions concerning Šamaš and Sîn's return and Ea's role in perfecting the refurbishment (19-24). A line refers to Erra and anger (25), and a quatrain, possibly by the mother-goddess, laments the fate of mankind (26-29). It is unclear whether 12-29 present two or more speeches.<sup>273</sup> However, Ea speaks next (30-44): though Erra impedes any communication with Marduk's chamber, where the refurbishment is in fact completed, Ea will speed things up.<sup>274</sup>

(*narrator*) 2.45-50. Marduk's image is restored (45-47), Šamaš is mentioned (48), brilliance re-established (49-50).

---

<sup>273</sup> Al-Rawi and Black (1989) 114-15 take 2.25 as a transitional line between two speeches, seemingly assuming that Erra speaks next. This is difficult, since the ensuing lines concern Erra. To Bottéro and Kramer (1989) 690, Erra has sought Ea's help to achieve the restoration of Marduk's apparel; if so 2.25 could be the narrator's remark on Erra's concluded speech. Foster (2005) 891 takes the line as the first of a new speech; one may consider restoring 2.25 (K + W) *lib-ba-a-ti im-ta-li [šá qu]-ra<sup>1</sup>-du<sup>d</sup>èr-ra* "(s)he became filled with anger at the warrior Erra" (cf. *Atr.* OB 2.v.13, 3.vi.6): the line would introduce the speech by the mother-goddess, perhaps Innina; compare her authoritative role at 2.C<sub>2</sub>, and cf. below n. 279 for the attribution of 2.26-29 to the mother-goddess. Although divine problem-solving discussions are usually started by a male god, generally Anu (e.g. *Atr.* OB 1.111-7, SB Si 2.61-74 ≈ OB 1.174 ff., OB 3.vi.11-5; *Anzû* OB 1.7-15 ≈ SB 1.88-103; *Gilgameš* SB 7.1[ff.], though Al-Rawi and Black 1989: 112 here propose Anu, Enlil or the same Ea), one should not exclude an initial collective speech (as in *Anzû* SB 1.21 ff. or *Gilgameš* SB 1.78 ff.) starting at 2.12.

<sup>274</sup> So with Foster (2005) 891-92; Cagni (1969) 85 and Bottéro and Kramer (1989) 691 (unaware of W), take 2.37 ff. as uttered by the narrator, thus making Erra a judicious guardian of Marduk's door.

(*second divine discussion*) 2.51-73. In the context of the gathering (51), Erra has a close dialogue with Marduk. The first may be showing respect and congratulating Marduk, whilst Marduk, mentioning destruction, (possibly) blames Erra.<sup>275</sup>

(*narrator*) 2.74-79. These lines seemingly describe the reaction to the preceding dialogue: something heard by Anu and Antu causes their disheartenment in heaven; Antu retires into her chamber; Enlil is mentioned.

(*gap*) (perhaps 7 lines, 2.80-86).<sup>276</sup>

(*narrator*) 2.C<sub>1</sub>.1'-9'. The gods are gathered; Erra and his father Enlil are mentioned, whilst the gods observe(?) the stars: Erra's star (Mars) is especially bright, the other stars indicate conflict among the gods.

(*third divine discussion*) 2.C<sub>1</sub>.10'-28'. A deity speaks (10'-16' Marduk?):<sup>277</sup> the sparkling of Erra's star is connected to his fury. Innina (Ištar) speaks to the gathered gods (17'-23'), inviting them to retire and respect Marduk's decision. Severely fragmentary or illegible lines follow (24'-28'): possibly the end of Innina's speech (who, after this discussion, will vainly try to appease Erra, 29'-35')<sup>278</sup> or a reply.

The poet deploys traditional patterns as the gods seek a solution to the crisis. In the first collective section (2.12-43), mankind's fate is regretfully considered in terms reminiscent of the mother-goddess' lament at *Atr.* OB 3.iv,<sup>279</sup> and Ea's intervention is called for in

---

<sup>275</sup> 2.52-60 perhaps two speeches: Erra addresses Marduk (52-55), but then is mentioned (56), after which Marduk is congratulated for the successful repair (57-60). 2.61-67 Marduk replies, possibly blaming Erra; 2.68-69 Erra replies, possibly showing respect for Marduk's command; 2.70-72 Marduk replies again, mentioning Erra's destructive action/plans. 2.73 perhaps Erra's final reply (actually two lines, illegible).

<sup>276</sup> 2.80-84 (= W obv.ii.39-42) illegible and broken + about 2 broken lines (W rev.iii.[1-2]?, cf. Al-Rawi and Black 1989: 114-21, George 2013: 66 n. 4).

<sup>277</sup> Enlil seems excluded as he is referred to at the end of the speech (2.C<sub>2</sub>.16').

<sup>278</sup> So Al-Rawi and Black (1989) 119.

<sup>279</sup> Ch. 2.§3.3.1, cf. Kvanvig (2011) 173, Wisnom (2014) 244-46.

relation to the refurbishment.<sup>280</sup> However, the restoration of Marduk's statue will not be sufficient. Comparable climactic patterns occur at the beginning of *Anzû*, when Ea solves Enlil's uncertainty by integrating the outsider monster, and in *Enūma eliš* Tablet 1, when Ea defends the younger gods by slaying Apsû. In both cases, as in *Erra*, Ea's intervention provides an illusory sense of resolution before the deepest crisis of the narrative, but here Ea's initiative will bear no fruit. The rather obscure central dialogue (2.50-73) results in a typical divine disheartenment (2.75-79), signalling the increasing gravity of the situation.<sup>281</sup> But it is the sparkling radiance of Erra's star that sanctions the fearful god's dominion as inevitable.<sup>282</sup> Innina/Ištar, upholding Marduk's elucidation in the third collective scene (2.96-104), restrains the gods' reaction and vainly tries to appease Erra in Emeslam.

The increasing sense of imminent catastrophe, triggered first by Ea's illusory solution, and then by astral omens, may also be seen through a repeated reference to the "appointed time" (*adannu*, meaning the time of destruction) first mentioned by the mother-goddess (?) (2.27), then by Innina/Ištar (2.C<sub>1</sub>.22),<sup>283</sup> and culminating as the wrathful Erra addresses Išum to proclaim destruction (2.C<sub>2</sub>.12-13):

*tu-da pe-te-ma lu-uš-bat ḫar-ra-nu*  
*u<sub>4</sub>-mu iq-ta-tu-ú i-te-ti-iq a-dan-nu*

Open the way, that I may take the (war)path!  
 The days have come to an end, the appointed time has come to pass.

<sup>280</sup> 2.23 (K + W) *áš-šú šip-ri šá-a-šu é-a* <sup>r<sup>d1</sup></sup>[...] *it<sup>2</sup>-peš* "Concerning that work, Ea [...] is expert" can be compared with *Atr.* OB 1.201 *it-ti<sup>d</sup> en-ki-ma i-ba-aš-ši ši-ip-ru* "(the ability to perform) the work (of creation) lies with Ea", *Anzû* OB 1.31 [<sup>d</sup>en.ki] *et-pu-šum<sup>1</sup>*, cf. *Ee* 1.59-62.

<sup>281</sup> On the general pattern cf. Ch. 1 n. 67; for the gods hearing and/or retiring to heaven cf. *Atr.* OB 3.iii.20-33, *Gilg.* SB 11.114-16; compare esp. Antu's reaction (2.77) *an-tum um-mi ilāni*(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> *ú-šaḫ-ri-ir* "Antu, the mother of the gods, was paralysed" with *Anzû* SB 1.84 *it-ta-at-bak ša-ḫur-ra-tum* "paralysis spread about", cf. *Ee* 2.6, 86.

<sup>282</sup> Al-Rawi and Black (1989) 112-3; Cooley (2008) 184-85.

<sup>283</sup> 2.C<sub>1</sub>.22 (W obv.iii.22) *a-di ūmū(u<sub>4</sub>)<sup>mes</sup> i-ma-lu-ú it-ti-qu* [*a-dan-nu*] restored with Foster (2005) 894: "Until the days are drawn to a close, until the [appointed time] passed". On *adannu etēqu(m)* in astronomical literature cf. Cooley (2008) 185-86.

### §3.3.2. Erra's return (5.1-21)

As Išum defeats the Land's invaders, chaos on earth draws to an end. The final tablet opens as Erra addresses the gods to acknowledge his recklessness and Išum's worth (5.5-15). Išum stresses the divine submission to Erra, and the god, for the first time, rejoices (5.16-21). For the first time, too, Erra stands in his abode together with the divine community.<sup>284</sup> The depiction of the collective attitude opening the scene stresses the gods' enduring fear (5.1-4):

*ul-tu* <sup>d</sup>*èr-ra i-nu-ḥu ir-mu-ú šu-bat-su*  
*ilānī(dingir)*<sup>mes</sup> *gi-mir-šú-nu i-na-aṭ-ṭa-lu pa-nu-uš-šú*  
<sup>d</sup>*í-gì-gì u* <sup>d</sup>*a-nun-na-ki kul-lat-su-nu ú-zu-zu pal-ḥiš*  
<sup>d</sup>*èr-ra pa-a-šú ipuš(dù)-ma a-na kal ilānī(dingir)*<sup>mes</sup> *i-ta-mi*

After Erra was calmed down and took up his own abode  
the totality of the gods was gazing at his face,  
the Igiḡi and the Anunnakī, all of them, were standing in fearful reverence.  
Erra opened his mouth, to speak to all the gods

The poet here plays with the tradition: the hero's return from his perverse exploits does not encounter joy and exaltation.<sup>285</sup> Still, Erra is quite pleased at Išum's observations on the fear he inspires (5.17-21).<sup>286</sup> In fact the poem's resolution is not accomplished in the collective scene: Erra proclaims the restoration of the Land after the assembly, in a final private colloquium with Išum (5.22-38). The assembly scene has a *ritardando* effect, predicting the final denouement. Išum's longest speech that finally appeased Erra had first stressed the divine community's submission to him (3.C.9-13), enacting it thereafter through reported speeches (4.44-103). Now Erra sees this submission with his own eyes.

---

<sup>284</sup> Cf. 1.5 and 2.C2.8, with Cagni (1969) 206-07 on the thread concerning Erra's presence in Emeslam.

<sup>285</sup> Gössmann (1955) 81 and Wisnom (2014) 238-9 recall *Ee* 4.1ff. and 6.17ff. On "triumphant arrival" conventions see further below Ch. 9§1.1. Comparing *Ee*, one may add that the gods look at the tangible symbols of Marduk's victory on his return (*Ee* 5.77) and at the product of his skill when Esagil is built (*Ee* 6.82-85), whereas in *Erra* the object of the collective divine gaze is Erra himself (5.2).

<sup>286</sup> Erra's reaction to Išum's remark on the gods' submission to his wrath (*Erra* 5.20-21) recalls that of Marduk as the gods propose building his dwelling (*Ee* 6.55-56).

### §3.4. Concluding remarks

Structurally speaking, the scenes of assembly occur in symmetry, occupying an intermediate position within the narrative climax (Tablet 2) and anti-climax (Tablet 5) around the peak of the crisis in Tablet 3. The gods' reaction after Marduk's withdrawal increases the sense of forthcoming disaster, while the final collective scene seals Erra's satisfaction just before the final restoration of order. Even if the assembly scenes preserve a structural function within the compositional architecture, the poem overturns the traditional centrality of the divine community. Facing Erra's irresistible power, the assembly and its decision-making leader Ea cease to play an active role in promoting an effective crisis-resolution as in *Anzû*. This was already visible in *Ee*, where, however, the divine community did close ranks around the central hero, legitimising Marduk's rule and triumph. The antagonism and isolation of Erra, both the ruler and the disturbing force that opposes the gods,<sup>287</sup> make it impossible for the divine assembly to face the challenge, and the narrative's resolution does not portray an exaltation nor a joyful reconciliation, but the gods' submission.

---

<sup>287</sup> Cf. Išum's ineffectual words at crucial points (1.102, cf. 3c.36): *be-lum ʿd1èr-ra mìn-su ana ilānī(dingir) [meš lemutti(hul)]<sup>ti</sup> tak-[pu-ud]* "Lord Erra, why did you [plot evil] against the gods?".

## Chapter 4: *Gilgameš*

### §1. The manuscript tradition

Manuscripts preserving the Akkadian poem of *Gilgameš* are conventionally classified into Old, Middle and Standard Babylonian sources, according to the relevant period and dialect.<sup>288</sup> The high degree of textual variation among the earlier groups make it impossible to refer, for instance, to *the* Middle Babylonian recension of the poem. Only in its mature form does the poem appear to have reached a sufficient fixity in the scribal tradition, allowing us to speak of *the* Standard Babylonian (SB) *Gilgameš*.<sup>289</sup> The older evidence must be assessed in view of the SB version, which is by far the best attested.

#### §1.1. Synopsis of SB *Gilgameš*

SB *Gilgameš* was consistently handed down in twelve tablets during the first millennium. There is evidence for two ancient titles: *iškar(éš.gàr) dGIŠ-gím-maš* ("series of Gilgameš") and *ša naqba imuru* "he who saw the deep", the first hemistich of SB 1.1.<sup>290</sup> Only Tablets 1, 6 and 11 are preserved almost completely. Tablet 12, a prose translation of part of the Sumerian *BilgNeth*, is not integral to the epic for reasons of narrative content, style and metre; the date and rationale for its addition to the eleven-tablet epic are uncertain.<sup>291</sup> Therefore, it is omitted from the summary.<sup>292</sup>

Gilgameš, king of Uruk, son of the goddess Ninsun and of the hero Lugalbanda, is treating his people recklessly. Heeding the city's cry for help, the gods create Enkidu as a match for Gilgameš. Enkidu grows up among animals in the steppe. He is civilised by the prostitute Šamḥat, who tells him about Gilgameš and Uruk (Tablet 1). She leads Enkidu to

---

<sup>288</sup> Manuscripts are labelled after George (2003); quoted lines from *Gilg.* follow his edition.

<sup>289</sup> The classic account of the poem's diachronic development in a literary perspective is Tigay (1982), but see George (2003) 3-54 for a more updated treatment, though the date and process of canonisation resulting in the SB version envisaged there remains problematic, cf. esp. George (2007c) 75, Sallaberger (2008) 59-82, Dalley (2017) 120-21.

<sup>290</sup> Both are found in colophons of SB tablets, the first is also attested in a NA literary catalogue, and in two inventories of accession to Assurbanipal's library (George 2003: 28-29).

<sup>291</sup> See George (2003) 47-54, with further literature.

<sup>292</sup> George (2003) 444-530 offers a detailed synopsis of the SB poem.

the city, where the heroes wrestle and become friends; Enkidu is adopted by Ninsun. Gilgameš wants to set out to the Cedar Forest, despite the guardianship of Ĥumbaba, a monster appointed by Enlil. The heroes discuss with the city assemblies; Ninsun secures the aid of Šamaš for her son (2-3). The heroes reach the Forest (4).<sup>293</sup> They fight and slay the monster (5). Gilgameš refuses Ištar's marriage proposal, she goes up to heaven, complains to her father Anu, and obtains the Bull of Heaven to kill Gilgameš. The Bull devastates Uruk, but the heroes kill it, reaching thereby the peak of glory (6). Enkidu dreams of his death, curses those who civilized him, is then rebuked by Šamaš and blesses Šamĥat before dying (7). Enkidu's funerary rites are prepared and celebrated (8). Gilgameš cannot accept his friend's death and departs to find Ūta-napišti, "He-who-found-life", by which name Atra-ĥasīs is called in *Gilgameš*.<sup>294</sup> He reaches the Mountain-of-Sunrise, goes through the Path-of-the-Sun and comes to a wonderful garden at the ocean's edge (9). Before perilously crossing the waters, he meets the innkeeper Šiduri and Ūta-napišti's boatman Ur-šanabi. At length he reaches Ūta-napišti and asks for an end to his toils. The sage's long reply (10.267-321) deals with kingship and death (10). Gilgameš asks how Ūta-napišti could find immortal life, and the flood-hero tells how, with his wife, he was made immortal by Enlil after the flood. The sage concludes by asking Gilgameš who will convene a divine assembly to immortalise him. After this first disillusionment, Gilgameš fails to remain awake for a week, and then loses the plant of rejuvenation he was permitted to take from Apsû. The poem ends when Gilgameš and Ur-šanabi arrive at Uruk: the hero gazes at its walls, and proudly points them out to his companion (11).

---

<sup>293</sup> On the division between Tablets 4 and 5 see now Al-Rawi and George (2014) 69-72.

<sup>294</sup> Except at SB 11.49, 197. Ūta-napišti is an Akkadian rendering of Sumerian Ziusudra. See George (2003) 152-53 and cf. Ch. 1§2.3.

## §1.2. Old Babylonian evidence

It is unlikely that Sumerian poems about Gilgameš ever merged into a single major composition in Sumerian.<sup>295</sup> This appears instead to have been an achievement of Akkadian literature in the OB period.<sup>296</sup> While the origins of OB *Gilgameš* possibly lay in an Akkadian oral tradition, it has long been noticed that the deeds narrated in the Sumerian compositions, copied and studied in OB schools, constitute the backbone of the Akkadian poem's major episodes.<sup>297</sup>

We currently possess the remains of five OB "library" tablets and of seven single-column tablets.<sup>298</sup> The most famous OB manuscripts are the Pennsylvania and Yale tablets, OB 2 and 3 respectively, in the same hand, attesting to a series of tablets of which the first has not been recovered, but probably started with a version of the hymn we find in SB 1.29-46, as the colophon concluding OB 2 makes clear.<sup>299</sup> The remaining OB witnesses attest that different versions of the epic were current. However, remarkable similarities between OB Schøyen<sub>2</sub> and OB 3 suggest a certain consistency of the OB *Gilgameš* tradition. Episodes attested include the taming of Enkidu and preparations for the expedition to the Cedar Forest (OB 2-3, OB UM and OB Schøyen<sub>1</sub>), and Gilgameš's quest for immortality and search for the flood-hero (OB VA+BM). All the single-column tablets contain the journey to the forest and the slaying of Ḫuwawa (OB spelling of Ḫumbaba).

---

<sup>295</sup> Ch. 1 §2.3.

<sup>296</sup> Cf. Tigay (1977) and (1982) 39-54.

<sup>297</sup> Kramer (1944), Matouš (1960), Tigay (1982) 23-38, George (2003) 17-23, Fleming and Millstein (2010) cf. Ch. 1 §2.3, and Henkelman (2006) on oral traditions.

<sup>298</sup> "Library" tablets: OB 2-3, OB VA+BM, OB UM, OB Schøyen<sub>1</sub>. Single-columned: OB Schøyen<sub>2,3</sub>, OB Nippur, OB Harmal<sub>1,2</sub>, OB Ishchali, OB IM. See George (2003) 22-24 and 159-286; add now George (2009) 29-41 (nn. 5-6: improved OB Schøyen<sub>2</sub> + the new OB Schøyen<sub>3</sub>). A number of OB Nineveh fragments (Dalley 2001) might contain versions of *Gilgameš* stories, *contra* George (2003) 23.

<sup>299</sup> George (2003) 180. This version is therefore also known as *šūtur eli šarrī* ("supreme above kings"); cf. Shaffer *apud* Wiseman (1975) 158 n. 22, Tigay (1982) 49, George (2003) 23.

### §1.3. Middle Babylonian evidence

This group constitutes "a disparate group of tablets that hold little in common" (George 2003: 24). Many come from outside Mesopotamia, thus attesting to the diffusion of the poem in the Late Bronze Age. When comparison is possible, MB texts generally differ from both the OB and the SB evidence in varying degrees and different ways.<sup>300</sup>

Those texts that will be relevant to our discussion deserve mention. The late MB school exercise tablets from Nippur (MB Nippur<sub>1-3</sub>, probably 13<sup>th</sup> c.) prove, when comparison is possible, to be relatively close to the SB text, though certainly not representing an identical edition. From Boğazköy, a fragmentary prose abridgement in Hittite (13<sup>th</sup>/early 12<sup>th</sup> c.) is extant.<sup>301</sup> A late MB Akkadian tablet from Ugarit has been recently published (MB Ug<sub>1</sub>, early 12<sup>th</sup> c.) which, corruptions aside, shows important similarities to the SB text, but also remarkable differences, especially in line-(dis)placement.

In addition to episodes already represented in the OB evidence, MB texts attest also to the proem (MB Ug<sub>1</sub>), the Bull of Heaven episode (MB Boğ<sub>1-2</sub>, MB Emar<sub>2</sub>) and Enkidu's sickness and death (MB Boğ<sub>1</sub>, MB Ur, MB Megiddo).

### §1.4. Standard Babylonian evidence

This label refers to those manuscripts attesting to the standardised version current in Assyria and Babylonia from the 7<sup>th</sup> to the 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries and conventionally attributed to the

---

<sup>300</sup> See George (2003) 24-27 and 287-375, adding now Arnaud (2007) 130-38, with George (2007a) (MB Ug<sub>1-2</sub>) and George (2007c) (MB Priv<sub>1</sub>).

<sup>301</sup> There is no consensus on the history of the Hittite version (CTH 341.III), whose manuscripts do not represent a single, consistently laid out redaction. It may have had Akkadian sources (but it has little in common with the extant Akkadian fragments from Boğazköy), be based on a Hurrian version (it shows many stylistic similarities with the Kumarbi cycle), or have drawn on both traditions. See Friedrich (1930), Otten (1958), Kammenhuber (1967), Laroche (1968), Del Monte (1992), Beckman (2001), (2003), Klinger (2005), Haas (2006) 272-77; critical edition Rieken *et al.* (2009). Six little understood fragments of the poem in Hurrian are attested (CTH 341.II): see Salvini (1988) 157-160, Salvini-Wegner (2004) 16-17, 31-37, Haas (2006) 276-77, Nakamura (2007), with further literature.

editorial work of *Sîn-lēqi-unninnī*, possibly a scribe in the Kassite period.<sup>302</sup> By the time of George's edition, seventy-three manuscripts were known to him, of which the majority had been put together from fragments coming from Assurbanipal's library in Nineveh (thus none being later than the Nineveh's fall in 612 BC). He could also rely on about 30 Late Babylonian manuscripts (generally post-Assyrian, that is, from the 6<sup>th</sup> c. on).<sup>303</sup> Since then, the major new discovery has been a tablet in Neo-Babylonian script of unknown exact provenance (SB V ff).<sup>304</sup> Though considerably improving our knowledge of SB 5, it hardly alters George's figures whereby "about 20 per cent of the poem is still completely missing" and, given the damaged state of many of the extant lines, "it is probably fair to write that so far we have about two-thirds of the poem at our disposal" (George 2003: 418-19).

## §2. Suffering, knowledge, civilisation

The SB proem helps the audience understand the extraordinary experiences of Gilgameš that will be narrated.<sup>305</sup> It concentrates on the knowledge Gilgameš achieved (SB 1.1-8), on his pain and how he settled down in Uruk and wrote his labours (9-10), and on his building of the city-walls (11-12). The audience is immediately led through a visual tour of these walls (13-23), an astonishing achievement, so as to admire the whole city (SB 1.22-23):

[šár] ʿālu(uru)<sup>1</sup> [šár <sup>šis</sup>]kirātu(kiri<sub>6</sub>)<sup>1</sup> šár es-su-ú pi-tir<sup>1</sup> bī(é) <sup>d</sup>ištar(15)  
[3 šár] ù pi-ti-ir ʿuruk(unug)<sup>ki</sup> tam-ši-ḥu

<sup>302</sup> In the relevant entry, a NA literary catalogue (Lambert 1962: 66, vi.10) reads *iškar(éš.gàr) <sup>d</sup>GIŠ-gím-maš : ša pi-i <sup>md</sup>sîn(30)-le-qí-un-nin-ni* "Series of Gilgameš: from the mouth of *Sîn-lēqi-unninnī*". See the discussion in George (2003) 28-33, with references.

<sup>303</sup> George (2003) 379-431.

<sup>304</sup> SB V ff is published in Al-Rawi and George (2014). Further Assyrian mss. have been discovered by S. Maul, who used them for his translation of the poem – Maul (2005) 11; e.g. 47-48 (SB 1), 104 (SB 7), 129-30 (SB 10) – to my knowledge, the relevant fragments remain unpublished.

<sup>305</sup> The following remarks are indebted to Jacobsen (1976) 195-219, Tigay (1982) 140-49, Moran (1991), (1996), George (2003) 32-33, 444-46, 504-08, 526-28. Recent assessments include George (2007b), (2012), Altes (2007), Dickson (2009), Zgoll (2010).

[One *šār*]<sup>306</sup> the city, [one *šār*] the date-groves, one *šār* the clay-pit, half a *šār* is Ištar's temple, [three *šār*] and a half is Uruk, (its) measurement

The totality of human activities and civilisation is contained within the walls: dwellings, sustenance, the possibility of craftsmanship, and of course the temple precinct of Uruk. The transition to the hymn (31-46) comes in the famous exhortation to the audience (1.24-28):<sup>307</sup>

[*pi-te-ma*] <sup>gīs</sup>*tup-šen-na šá* <sup>gīs</sup>*erēni*(erin) 25  
 [*pu-uṭ-ter*] *ḥar-ga-li-šu šá siparri*(zabar)  
 [*pi-te*]-<sup>r</sup>*ma*<sup>1</sup> *bāba*(ká) *šá ni-ṣir-ti-šú*  
 [*i*]-<sup>r</sup>*šam*<sup>1</sup>-*ma* *ṭup-pi* <sup>na4</sup>*uqni*(za.gin) *ši-tas-si*  
 [*mim*]-<sup>r</sup>*mu*<sup>1</sup>-*ú* <sup>d</sup>*GIŠ-gím-maš ittallaku*(DU.DU)<sup>ku</sup> *ka-lu mar-ša-a-ti*

[Open] the tablet-box of cedar,  
 [release] its clasps of bronze, 25  
 [open] the door of its secret,  
 pick up the tablet of lapis lazuli and read out  
 all that Gilgameš went through, each of his sufferings.

The "secret" (*niširtu*, also meaning "treasure") of 1.26 is revealed in 1.28 as consisting of what Gilgameš found in his wandering: trouble and suffering. At the peak of despair, deluded and feeling that he has done nothing for himself, or for anyone else (especially 11.311-18), the hero will come back to Uruk. The poem is rounded off when in its final lines Gilgameš proudly points out to his companion the greatness of his city, using almost the same words with which the audience was addressed in the proem (11.323-28 ≈ 1.18-23). In the end, Gilgameš comes back to the starting point of his journeys with a new awareness of his limits. He finds that, in spite of his mortal nature, the city he leads as king, and the achievements of civilization it contains, will not perish, but stand as monuments of human greatness. The knowledge he achieved in his encounter with *Ūtanapišti* (*ṭēmu ša lām abūbi* "lore from before the flood" 1.8) concerns the duties of kingship, which cannot be exercised without awareness of human mortality. Gilgameš's

<sup>306</sup> The *šār* in Neo-Babylonian times is a surface measure roughly equivalent to 4 km<sup>2</sup>; cf. George (2003) 782.

<sup>307</sup> 1.24, 25, 27 now restored after MB U<sub>g</sub> 22-24, cf. George (2007a) 248.

knowledge is achieved through pain, but then results in his playing properly a leading role in the enduring achievements of civilization.

### §3. Divine assemblies

These scenes shape the SB narrative by moving the action forward and marking fundamental turning points for the plot. At the same time, they provide pivotal inputs for Gilgameš's development. Thus, it appears meaningful that the decisions of the assembled gods are responsible for what is beyond, and behind, the hero's reach: the birth (SB 1) and death of Enkidu (SB 7), and human doom in general (SB 11). Three divine gatherings may be singled out from SB *Gilgameš*.<sup>308</sup> Only the first comes in the narrator's voice (SB 1), the others being narrated by Enkidu (a dream: SB 7), and Ūta-napišti (as part of his tale: SB 11).

#### §3.1. Creation of Enkidu (SB 1.79-104)

The SB text does not yield such a detailed description of divine procedures as in the Akkadian poems examined previously. Moreover, textual damage hampers a correct understanding of the lines introducing the heavenly scene (SB 1.79-80), and leaves open to interpretation the name of the deity who takes the decisive initiative (SB 1.93). Nevertheless, the scene leading to Enkidu's creation fits perfectly into the traditional pattern of the divine assembly facing a problem solved by an appointment and/or an act of creation.<sup>309</sup> This, combined with the evidence offered by MB Ni<sub>1</sub> and MB Ug<sub>1</sub>, can help to shed light on the scene's structure, which is problematic as it stands in SB 1.

---

<sup>308</sup> A fourth heavenly scene occurs in SB 6.81-114, displaying the dialogue between Anu and Ištar, who asks the Bull of Heaven. Although the scene is crucial in showcasing the momentousness of the hero's divinely-directed offense, this is not considered a divine assembly here. Despite the mention of Antu in 6.83 (absent from the antecedent version in MB Emar<sub>2</sub>), the scene represents a typical one-to-one dialogue where a minor deity makes a request to the chief god. On this traditional typology and the scene's relation with *Il. 5* see Ballesteros Petrella (in prep.1).

<sup>309</sup> Tigay (1982) 192-97; George (2003) 289-90, 788.

Gilgameš "behaves with fierce arrogance" *i-kád-dir še-<sup>r</sup>riš<sup>1</sup>* (1.69) toward his people (1.63-77).<sup>310</sup> Ištar heeds the city-women's cry for help (1.77-78), and suddenly the scene turns to heaven (1.79): a plurality of gods, defined as *bēl(en) zik-<sup>r</sup>ri<sup>1</sup>* "lords of initiative", start a speech, whose addressee is lost in the illegible line 1.80.<sup>311</sup> The gods complain to the addressee (1.81): "have you bred indeed a savage wild bull in Uruk the sheepfold!" *<sup>r</sup>tul<sub>5</sub><sup>1</sup>-tab-ši-ma-a ri-ma kád-ra [i]-<sup>r</sup>na<sup>1</sup> uruk(unug)<sup>ki<sup>1</sup></sup> su-pú-rù*, and then report the city's situation, repeating the relevant words by the narrator (1.82-93 ≈ 1.65-78, except 1.73-74, not repeated). At once the assembly acts (1.94-104):<sup>312</sup>

*<sup>d</sup>a-ru-ru is-su-ú rabītu(gal)<sup>ú</sup>*  
*at-ti <sup>d</sup>a-ru-ru tab-ni-[i amēla(lú)]* 95  
<sup>r</sup>e<sup>1</sup>-nin-na bi-ni-i zi-kir-šú  
*ana u<sub>4</sub>-um lib-bi-šú lu-u ma-<sup>r</sup>hir<sup>1</sup>?*  
*liš-ta-an-na-nu-ma uruk<sup>ki</sup> liš-tap-<sup>r</sup>ših<sup>1</sup>*  
<sup>d</sup>a-ru-ru an-ni-ta ina še-me-šá  
*zik-ru šá <sup>d</sup>a-nim ib-ta-ni ina <sup>r</sup>lib-bi-šá<sup>1</sup>* 100  
<sup>r</sup>d<sup>a</sup>-ru<sup>1</sup>-ru im-ta-si qātī(šu)<sup>min</sup>-šá  
*ti-ṭa ik-ta-ri-iš it-ta-di ina <sup>r</sup>šēri(edin)<sup>1</sup>*  
*ina šēri(edin) <sup>d</sup>en-ki-dù ib-ta-ni qu-ra-du*  
*i-lit-ti qul-ti ki-šir <sup>d</sup>nin-urta*

Aruru they summoned, the great one,  
 "It was you, Aruru, who gave shape [to man], 95  
 now give shape to his initiative.  
 Let him *be equal* to the storm of his (viz. Gilgameš's) heart,  
 Let them rival each other, and may Uruk thereby find rest."  
 Aruru, when she heard this,  
 gave shape in her heart to Anu's initiative, 100  
 Aruru washed her hands,  
 a pinch of clay she took, she cast it down into the steppe;  
 in the steppe she gave shape to Enkidu, the hero,  
 offspring of silence, knot of Ninurta.

<sup>310</sup> The details of Uruk's oppression have been much debated, cf. Tigay (1982) 178-91 and George (2003) 448-49, 785-86, 898-900, with further references.

<sup>311</sup> MB Ug<sub>1</sub> 14 shows us that *<sup>r</sup>iš<sup>1</sup>-[te-nem]-ma-a* in SB 1.78 (≈ *il-te-né-mi* MB Ug<sub>1</sub> 14) must be singular + ventive and its subject Ištar. As the SB text stands, although 1.80 doubtless contained a speech introduction, the communication chain (1.77-81) resulting in the gods' attention is unclear. The "beautifully wrought unit of poetry" at MB Ug<sub>1</sub> 14-15 (where 14 ≈ SB 1.78) *ta-zi-im-ta-ši-na il-te-né-mi <sup>d</sup>iš<sub>8</sub>-<sup>r</sup>tár<sup>1</sup>/ rig-mu mar-šu ik-ta-na-ša-da ana šamē(an)<sup>e</sup> anim(an)<sup>nim</sup>* "Ištar keeps listening to their complaint, / the terrible clamour reaching Anu's heaven" (George 2007a: 240-41), may well have expressed the scene transition. Since the SB text is damaged at this point (consider especially how K merges lines 79-80 into one), and the narrative sequence is not particularly limpid, it seems possible that MB Ug<sub>1</sub> 15 was lost at some point in the tradition. One should note, in this respect, that the human *rigmu* (noise, clamour) reaching heaven is a typical transitional element introducing divine scenes (Ch. 9§1.1), cf. esp. *Atr.* OB 1.354-59 (Ch.2§3.2.1), same phraseology at 356 [<sup>d</sup>en-lil iš-te-me] *ri-<sup>r</sup>gi-im-ši-in<sup>1</sup>*, and *ToilBab* 7-13, with 10/11 *<sup>r</sup>a<sup>1</sup>-na ta-az-zi-im-ti-ši-na ina ma-a-a-li / ú-ul u-qat-ta ši-it-ta* "because of their complaints he could not sleep soundly in bed" (Lambert 2013: 306-07).

<sup>312</sup> 1.95 restored after MB Ni<sub>1</sub> 7.

As the text stands, only in 1.100 do we learn that the decisive move (*zikru* "word, command, idea", cf. 1.79) alluded to in 1.96 was made by Anu. By working backwards from 1.100, indeed, George posits Anu as the addressee of the gods' first speech (1.80 ff.). Doubts arise, first, from the variant <sup>d</sup>*en-líl* in ms. n at line 1.100; and even if Anu should be the absolute protagonist of our scene, the fact remains that when addressing Aruru in their second collective speech the gods refer to Anu's "idea, initiative" (96) as if it had been introduced or expressed.<sup>313</sup> The impression that something is missing is hardly avoidable.

The MB fragment Ni<sub>1</sub>, altogether preserving seven lines of a direct speech, is the only other Akkadian source for this episode. Although the speech-introduction is lost, the lines appear to preserve precisely the missing link between the two collective divine speeches (MB Ni<sub>1</sub>, after George 2003: 290):

[<sup>d</sup>*a-ru-ru li*]-*is-su-ú ra-bi-[tam]*  
 [š*i-i ib-ni*]-<sup>r</sup>*ma<sup>1</sup> a-wi-lam ma-a-da*  
 [*li-ib-ni ma-ḥir?*]-š*u lu da-an e-mu-qa*  
 [*it-ti-šu li*]-<sup>r</sup>*iš<sup>1</sup>-ta-an-na-an-ma uruk<sup>ki</sup> li-iš-<sup>r</sup>tap<sup>1</sup>-ši-iḥ*  
 [<sup>d</sup>*a-ru-ru is*]-<sup>r</sup>*su<sup>1</sup>-<ú> a-ḥa-tam* 5  
 [<sup>d</sup>*a-num* (or <sup>d</sup>*en-líl*) *a-na šá?*]-*ti-ma iz-za-qar-ši*  
 [*at-ti-ma*] <sup>r</sup>*d<sup>1</sup>a-ru!(A)-ru tab-ni-i a-wi-lam*

"[Let] them summon [Aruru], the great one,  
 [she is the one who gave shape] to numerous mankind.  
 [Let her give shape] to his [*opponent*], that he be mighty in strength:  
 let him confront [with him], and may Uruk thereby find rest."  
 [Aruru they summoned], the(ir) sister, 5  
 [Anu (or Enlil)] spoke to her:  
 "[It was you], Aruru, who gave shape to man ≈ SB 1.95

Compare the structure of this assembly with those in *Atra-ḥasīs* OB 1 and *Anzû* SB 1 (above Chs. 2§3.1, 3§1.3.2 respectively):

<sup>313</sup> Some have taken *zi-kir-šú* in 1.96 to mean "his (viz. Gilgamesh's) replica, image" (so *CAD* Z.116b), but this seems excluded by 100, and by the parallel in *IšD* 91-92, cf. also *Anzû* SB 1.161, *Gilg.* SB 11.179, George (2003) 788-89.

	Standard sequence	OB <i>Atra-ḫasīs</i>	SB <i>Anzû</i>	<i>Gilgameš</i>
[1]	Intolerable situation	Divine revolt, crisis (1.63-167)	Theft of Tablet of Destinies, crisis (1.76-158)	Gilgameš's arrogance in Uruk (SB 1.63-77)
[2]	Ea suggests solution	Gods should summon Mami to create mankind (1.173-87)	Gods should summon Mami, to whom Ea will reveal his plan (1.159-75)	Gods should summon Aruru to create a counterpart (MB Ni <sub>1</sub> )
[3]	Goddess summoned	1.192-97	1.176-79	SB 1.94-98
[4]	Goddess enacts solution	Mami creates mankind with Ea (1.198-305 ff.)	Mami summons Ninurta (1.194-2.27)	Aruru creates Enkidu (SB 1.99-104)

Tigay interprets the *Atra-ḫasīs* scene as the source of SB *Gilgameš*, which, one might add, would be aptly signalled by the gods' words at 1.94-95.<sup>314</sup> Given the structural analogies, on the other hand, George suspects that SB *Gilgameš* is here abridging an originally longer scene, where the one who gave the idea was Ea.<sup>315</sup> In support of this hypothesis, it is worth noting that the deity addressed by the gods at SB 1.81-91 is likely to be Ea. Indeed, the god is accused of "having created" Gilgameš; according to SB 1.49-50 Gilgameš was shaped by the mother-goddess, *bēlet-ilī*(dingir.maḥ), and Ea, <sup>r</sup>*nu*<sup>1</sup>-*dīm*-[*mud*].<sup>316</sup> Because she comes to the fore only later as she is summoned, Ea remains the most likely candidate.<sup>317</sup> On these grounds, one may speculate that at some point in the tradition our scene might have had the following structure:

- (a) earthly trouble and lament (e.g. SB 1.65-76);
- (b) Ištar heeds, as the clamour reaches heaven (e.g. MB Ug<sub>1</sub> 14-15);

<sup>314</sup> Tigay (1982) 192-97.

<sup>315</sup> George (2003) 788.

<sup>316</sup> The mother goddess appears with this name (Aruru) in *BAC* rev. 18, in the context of mankind's creation (Lambert 2013: 358-59, 511). On Aruru see Black (2005).

<sup>317</sup> Concerning the shifting names of the protagonists (cf. the variants at SB 1.100), note that Ea's role is taken over by Anu also along the diachrony of the *Atra-ḫasīs* tradition: in the parallel scene, the only OB ms. for this section (G.ii.2' = OB 1.175) has Ea proposing to summon the mother goddess, all the first-millennium manuscripts yielding Anu's name, cf. above n. 161.

- (c) gods complain to Ea, as the one who bred Gilgameš (e.g. SB 1.80-93 ≈ 1.65-93);
- (d) Ea makes his proposal (e.g. MB Ni<sub>1</sub>);
- (e) mother-goddess is summoned and performs her act (e.g. SB 1.94-104).

Enkidu's birth is portrayed as the outcome of a divine assembly also in the poem's second-millennium Hittite prose version (CTH 341.III.1.13-31).<sup>318</sup> Although the text is not in an excellent state of preservation, and has been restored relying heavily on the SB parallel, one may note at least that the narrative backbone coincides: reacting to Uruk's oppression, the gods summon the mother-goddess, who creates Enkidu. Note, in particular, the recurrence of the literary technique whereby the assembled gods (most probably) repeat the words of the narrator to account for Gilgameš's misbehaviour (CTH 341.III.1.13 = 26; SB 1.65-76 ≈ 82-91). A special focus on the goddess' creative act, albeit quite shortened in the Hittite text (CTH 341.III.1.28), appears to be shared as well.

Still, some differences emerge in the proceedings of the assembly. In the Hittite scene the mother-goddess has a greater part than in the Akkadian one, being given prominence before the assembly scene starts. It appears that she witnesses Gilgameš's misbehaviour and is thereby enraged (16-17); a mention of the "place of assembly" *tu-li-ya-aš* <sup>1</sup>*pē*<sup>2</sup>- [*dī*]<sup>2</sup> which she enters, possibly summoned (18-19), is noteworthy.<sup>319</sup> (There may be some connection with Ištar's role at SB 1.78 and MB Ug<sub>1</sub> 14-15, where she connects the earthly and heavenly scenes.) No mention of any major male god is preserved. While the pivotal speech after the goddess' entrance (21-23) is reminiscent of SB 1.95-96, especially in the stress on creation,<sup>320</sup> the speech introduction is lost and the details of its content are obscure. As only the second verb (22) shows a clear person marker (the first), it is possible that the words are by the mother-goddess. Note, however, that in the Hittite version she

<sup>318</sup> Hittite text and translation Rieken *et al.* 2009, English translation Beckman (2001) 158.

<sup>319</sup> On the Hittite assembly (including the divine one) see Beckman (1982); Hoffmann (1984) 79-80; Tischler (1994) 429-31, with possible IE etymologies; Singer (1996) 149-54, below Ch. 9§5.3.

<sup>320</sup> Compare the verbs in SB 1.95-96 *tab-ni-[i] / bi-ni-i* "you created / create!" with CTH 341.III.1.21-22 <sup>1</sup>*ša*<sup>1</sup>-*am-ni-ya-at*-<sup>1</sup>*te*<sup>2</sup>-[*en*]<sup>2</sup> / <sup>1</sup>*ša*<sup>1</sup>-*am-ni-ya-nu*-<sup>1</sup>*un*<sup>1</sup> "you<sup>2</sup> created / I created".

apparently takes no part in Gilgameš's creation, performed instead (at least) by the Sun-god and by the Storm-god, the Hittite pantheon's leaders (CTH 341.III.1.2-6).<sup>321</sup>

These differences notwithstanding, the Hittite version clarifies that the narrative role and the significance of the episode within the *Gilgameš* narrative were clearly established in Late Bronze Age Anatolia. The first divine assembly is pivotal for the plot to begin, as the birth of Enkidu is the innovation that unlocks the poem's action. On a deeper level, the divine action aims at establishing a limit for Gilgameš: Enkidu is created to confront him, so that Uruk may find rest. The divine assembly responds to a political issue with an act of creation. The deployment of the typical assembly repertoire, notably the *rigmu* "clamour" reaching the gods, clarifies that the crisis is one which disrupts the cosmic order the gods are to preserve. The divine power over life is set in motion so as to affect the urban life of men.

### §3.2. Death of Enkidu (SB 7.[1-25<sup>?</sup>])

No Akkadian source preserves this episode, excluding line 7.1, attested as the catch-line concluding Tablet 6. Thanks to this line we know that the lost beginning of Tablet 7 contained the account of the divine assembly which Enkidu witnessed in his dream (SB 6.181-7.1):

<i>ʽú<sup>1</sup>-tu-ul-ma<sup>d</sup> en-ki-dù šu-na-ta i-na-át-ṭal</i>	
<i>it-bé-e-ma<sup>d</sup> en-ki-dù šu-na-ta i-pa-šar</i>	
<i>iz-zak-ka-ra a-na ib-ri-šú</i>	6.183
<i>ib-ri áš-šú me-na-ma-a im-tal-li-ku ilū(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> rabûtu(gal)<sup>mes</sup></i>	7.1

Enkidu, lying down, was seeing a dream.	
Enkidu arose to reveal the dream,	
saying to his friend:	6.183
"My friend, for what reason were the great gods taking counsel?"	7.1

---

<sup>321</sup> On this as a distinctive touch of the Hittite version see most recently Beckman (2003) 43, Klinger (2005) 117-18, Haas (2006) 274. Yet the content of CTH 341 III.1.4-5 does not appear so different in essence from SB 1.49-50.

The Hittite prose version provides an answer to Enkidu's question, although it is difficult to ascertain to what extent the Anatolian product may reflect what stood in the lacuna of about 25 lines at the beginning of SB 7.<sup>322</sup> CTH 341 III.3.1-22 reads:<sup>323</sup>

[While] we [s]leep,  
the dawn c[ame].  
En[k]idu [started to] speak to Gilgameš:  
"My [bro]ther,  
the drea[m] which [I saw] this night! 5  
Anu, Enlil, Ea and the Sun god of Heaven [were making a council?],  
and Anu ad[d]ressed Enlil:  
"Why did they kill the Bull of Heaven?  
[and why] did they kill ̄Huwa[wa]  
who made the mountains thick with cedars?" 10  
so Anu said:  
"Between them [one must die]!"  
And Enlil said (in turn):  
"Let Enkidu die,  
but let Gilgameš not die!" 15  
The Sun god of Heaven started to reply to the hero Enlil:  
"Did they not kill them heeding to your word, the Bull of Heaven and ̄Huwawa?  
and should then innocent Enkidu die?"  
Enlil became angry with the Sun god of heaven:  
"Why do you accompany them daily like a comrade?" 20  
E[nkidu] lay down to sleep before Gilgameš,  
and his tears [flowed] forth like canals.

The sequence is easily analysed in three parts: the chief gods Anu and Enlil pose the issue and decree the solution; Šamaš tries to intercede for Enkidu; Enlil's reply abruptly concludes the discussion. Characterisation, as far as one can tell from the Hittite text, is consistent with the rest of the Akkadian epic.<sup>324</sup> Anu guarantees a correct balance, as he did in the first assembly and in the heavenly scene at 6.81-114. As in ̄Uta-napišti's tale in 11, Enlil's utterance is unalterable and beyond comprehension, and we are given a glimpse into his reckless rage. Šamaš protects the heroes as he did during the ̄Humbaba adventure, and he will do more for Enkidu before his death.

Šamaš's futile intervention enhances pathos by stressing the proverbially unchanging nature of Enlil's command, and develops a theological problem. Protesting against Enlil's

<sup>322</sup> Cf. George (2003) 634 on the length of the lacuna.

<sup>323</sup> Text: Rieken et. al. (2009), transl. after Rieken *et al.* (2009) and Beckman (2001) 163.

<sup>324</sup> Beckman (2003) 43.

decreed, Šamaš stresses that the heroes killed ̄uwawa and the Bull following Enlil's command (*tu-e-ta-za me-mi-ya-na-az* "by your word"). The theological problem would involve some ambiguous or deceiving command which would have tragically led the heroes to their error. However, since nowhere in the extant text of *Gilgameš*, nor in the Sumerian *BH*, does Enlil encourage the heroes, editors of the Hittite text have emended the second person of the pronoun *tu-e-ta-za* into a first person *am-me-e-da-za*.<sup>325</sup> Accordingly, the argument of Šamaš's intervention would consist of a protest concerning his own role, at once silenced by Enlil with spurning words. Although it is certainly possible that somewhere in the lost portions of either the Akkadian *Gilgameš* texts or *BH* Enlil may have encouraged the heroes,<sup>326</sup> in both traditions it is the contrast between the helpful Sun god (*BH* A.13-47 ETCSL, OB *Gilgameš* 3.216-21, SB 3.37-115), and Enlil, to whom they vainly dedicate the monster's head (*BH* A.181-92 ETCSL), which qualifies the heroes' enterprise as "un exemple d'hybris, qui vaut un drame grec" (van Dijk 1960: 81). Thus the emendation is not entirely unjustified. In either case, Enlil's answer expresses a viewpoint that deepens the chasm between mortals and immortals: why should Šamaš get involved with those two like a companion? Had he not done so, he would have little to protest against.

Aside from the theological discourse, the scene's pathos is enhanced by the fact that Enkidu witnesses the debate, as he sees it in a dream.<sup>327</sup> We have seen that *Death of Bilgames*, where it is the king who likewise dreams the assembly discussing his death, represents a possible source for this episode.<sup>328</sup> Significant differences emerge from a similar pattern, modified and adapted to a new structural and conceptual function within

---

<sup>325</sup> Emendation by Schott (1958) 60, still accepted by Beckman (2001) 163; *contra* Stefanini (1969) 43-44. Mouton (2007) 111 and Rieken *et al.* (2009) print the line as preserved.

<sup>326</sup> Stefanini (1969) 43-44.

<sup>327</sup> Zgoll (2006c) 273-75 and (2014) 305-06 deals with Enkidu's second dream in SB 7.163-221+, stressing that "we should understand (...) [Enkidu's words] as an account of something that really happened".

<sup>328</sup> Cf. Ch. 1§2.3.

the Akkadian poem. The neat tripartition of the Sumerian scene is preserved, although the advocate's speech comes first in *DB* (Enki), second in the Hittite source (Šamaš), and crucially so, because in both cases the first speech is the one whose essential point is accepted in the final resolution (though Bilgames is not immortalised, his extraordinary worth *is* acknowledged and rewarded). Indeed, while the final part of the Sumerian assembly is the longest and achieves a positive (if sombre) synthesis for the hero, the Hittite scene concludes abruptly, without a discussion leading to a final sanction of the decision.

This might be explained by considering that the *DB* scene is a self-contained unit exhausting the entire composition's theological content. Instead the assembly for Enkidu's death marks a decisive turning point, after the peak of the heroes' glory at the end of Tablet 6, and unleashes Gilgameš's existential crisis: again, the divine assembly leads Gilgameš to face a limit by its power over life and death. A meaningful resolution is not to be found here, but only at the end of the poem, in the last divine assembly which, like that in *DB*, involves the pivotal episode of Mesopotamian mythical history, the flood story.

### §3.3. Ūta-napišti's assembly (SB 11.161-205)

In his tale, Ūta-napišti explains what the gods established after the flood, clarifying that those circumstances whereby the gods assembled and granted immortality to him and his wife are unique and will not apply in Gilgameš's case (cf. above Ch. 1§2.3 on *DB*). The complete account of the divine assembly after the flood concludes Ūta-napišti's narration. It represents both the climactic point of his story and the answer to Gilgameš's question (SB 11.7):

[at]-<sup>r</sup>ta ki-ki-i<sup>1</sup> ta-az-ziz-ma ina puḥur(unken) ilī(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> ba-la-ṭa téš-ú  
How was it you attended the divine assembly, and found life?

Gilgameš's dialogue with Ūta-napišti consists of two parts. In the first the sage delivers a sapiential speech (10.267-322), the second being the narration of his own story (11.8-205). The mention of a divine assembly concludes both parts: the last words of Ūta-napišti's first speech before Gilgameš's question refer to a divine decision concerning mankind and mortality (SB 10.312-22):

*im-ma-ti-ma nāru(íd) iš-šá-a mīla(illu) ub-lu*  
*ku-li-li <iq>-qé-lep-pa-a ina nāri(íd)*  
*pa-nu-šá i-na-aṭ-ṭa-lu pa-an<sup>d</sup>šamši(utu)<sup>š</sup>*  
*ul-tu ul-la-nu-um-ma ul i-ba-āš-ši mim-ma* 315  
*šal-lu ù mi-tum ki-i pí(ka) a-ḥa-meš-ma*  
*šá mu-ti ul iš-ši-ru ṣa-lam-šú*  
*lullâ(lú.u<sub>18</sub>.lu)<sup>ú</sup> amēlu(lú) e-dil : ul-tu ik-ru-bu-[x x] (thus K)*  
*or lullâ(lú.u<sub>18</sub>.lu)<sup>d</sup> mītu(lú.u<sub>g7</sub>) ul ik-ru-ba ka-ra-bi ina māti(kur) (thus bf)*  
*<sup>d</sup>a-nun-na-ki ilū(dingir)<sup>meš</sup> rabûtu(gal)<sup>meš</sup> paḥ-ru*  
*<sup>d</sup>ma-am-me-tu<sub>4</sub> ba-na-at šim-ti itti(ki)-šú-nu šī-ma-tú i-<sup>Γ</sup>šim<sup>1</sup>-[ma]* 320  
*iš-tak-nu mu-ti u ba-la-ṭa*  
*šá mu-ti ul ud-du-ú ūmī(u<sub>4</sub>)<sup>meš</sup> -šú*

At some time the river rose, it brought the flood,  
the mayfly was floating on the river:  
its face was gazing at the face of the Sun,  
then, all at once, nothing was there. 315  
The captive and the dead, how alike they are!  
They cannot draw a picture of death.  
Mortal man is imprisoned. / After blessing [me]<sup>?</sup>, (thus K)  
or The dead do not greet man in the land. (thus bf)  
The Anunnakī, the great gods, were assembled,  
Mammītu, creatress of destiny, decreed a destiny with them: 320  
death and life they did establish,  
the days of death they did not reveal.

The content of 10.318 is uncertain, and it is unclear whether the assembly referred to is the one which took place after the flood and will be narrated more fully in Tablet 11, thus foreshadowing that account.<sup>329</sup> In their context the words in K give a divine sanction to the metaphor of the mayfly (cf. Ch. 2§3.3), which in turn concludes and synthesises Ūta-napišti's discourse on death, and possibly the existential message of the whole poem: not to reveal "the days of death" *šá mu-ti...ūmī(u<sub>4</sub>)<sup>meš</sup> -šú* signifies that death is unavoidable,

<sup>329</sup> The classic treatment by Lambert (1980b) 56-58, rejecting bf's reading, has been persuasively challenged by George (2003) 876-77.

unforeseeable and inscrutable.<sup>330</sup> The implications of the divine decree remain the same even if we understand, as we should, this assembly as having taken place when mankind was created.<sup>331</sup>

Ūta-napišti's tale in Tablet 11 is paralleled in the fragmentary text of OB *Atra-hasīs* 3.<sup>332</sup> It thus appears that, apart from minor changes (e.g. Ninurta in SB 11.177 for Anu in *Atr.* OB 3.vi.11), both the narrative sequence and the divine characterisation are maintained in the divine assembly scene (11.161-205). Again we find the hungry gods gathering around the sacrifice "like flies", the mother-goddess wailing for her creatures, Enlil arriving enraged, another god stating that Ea must be responsible for sparing mankind, a discussion between Ea and Enlil, and Enlil's final blessing of the hero.

Though Ūta-napišti omits the reasons why the gods sent the flood, he emphasises two fundamental points: the conflict among the gods concerning mankind and the dramatic intervention of Ea, who saves humanity by being in special contact with Ūta-napišti. The flood-hero represents humankind, and with his impeccable offerings makes the gods reckon with the fact that they do need mankind. The wisdom god triumphs in the divine debate: Enlil does not answer his accusations and blesses Ūta-napišti and his wife. The tale stops here, however, and does not include the further divine decrees to avoid overpopulation occurring in *Atra-ḥasīs*. This omission is understandable in the *Gilgamesh* context, as the tale's focus is not cosmic balance, but a single hero's lot in contrast with the protagonist's, and the necessity of death as part of the human condition.<sup>333</sup> Ūta-napišti was granted immortality due to his exceptional situation: he was indeed the focal point around which the gods found a new cosmic agreement concerning mankind.

---

<sup>330</sup> The expression has been interpreted as either referring to the infinity of death as opposed to limited life, as in "the (span of) days of death" by Jacobsen (1980) 21, cf. Lambert (1980b) 55, 57, or as referring to the moment of death, e.g. Schott (1958) 85, George (2003) 699, Maul (2005) 137.

<sup>331</sup> George (2003) 876-77. The parallel OB VA+BM iii.3-5, where the decision comes "when the gods created man", seems decisive; cf. also Katz (2015).

<sup>332</sup> See Tigay's (1982) 214-40 detailed comparison.

<sup>333</sup> Katz (2015) 69.

Yet not all of Ūta-napišti's experiences happened in vain for Gilgameš, though the hero does not understand at once. The major achievement of the flood-hero does not lie in his immortality. He made possible mankind's survival and perpetuation, and Gilgameš will find an answer in his role as king of a city which perpetuates human activities beyond the life-span of the single individual. Again the divine assembly sets a limit for Gilgameš, again involving life and death. It is not possible for him to find life. However, by conceding the survival and perpetuation of men, the gods, and the reactivation of the *Atra-ḥasīs* assembly, set the ground for the political and humanistic answer to Gilgameš's quest.

#### §4. Concluding remarks

Primarily, the divine assemblies in *Gilgameš* are used as a literary device that makes the plot advance from crisis points, by tying up different narrative blocks. According to a prominently human focus, and unlike in *Atra-ḥasīs* and in the poems we have analysed so far, the assemblies do not develop a narrative thread within the divine world, but structure the course of the narrative by directing the action from above. Thereby, these scenes deal with the major themes of the epic, which make Gilgameš's conscience develop in its political and existential aspects. The gods are concerned about the welfare in Uruk and about Gilgameš's misbehaviour as a king. By decreeing Enkidu's doom, they make Gilgameš face death abruptly, at the peak of the glory he shared with his friend, possibly in excess. Finally, they concede eternal life to one man only, but they grant the survival of mankind as a whole.

## Concluding Remarks to Part 1

The divine assembly is a widespread and fundamental topos for the construction of Mesopotamian narrative poetry. The prominent diegetic role of these scenes is visible already in the Sumerian tradition, although only *Lugale*, as the sole large-scale divine narrative, appears to deploy several assembly scenes articulating its plot. All the Akkadian works examined, the bulk of the surviving tradition of mythological poetry in that language, present several gatherings scattered throughout, structuring and organising the composition's narrative content, at the same time shaping its theological discourse.

In essence, all these scenes constitute moments where the divine community confronts some event which is of particular relevance to the overall plot. The event may be a positive one, in which case the gods rejoice and ratify its significance: this applies to Enki's building of the Eridu temple in *EJN* as to Marduk's defeat of Tīāmat in *Ee*. Most often, however, the gods face an obstacle that has to be overcome: whether they succeed (thanks to Ea) or not (e.g. *Erra* Tablet 2), the plot always receives a forward impulse.

The collective depiction allows the poems to characterise the gods' community and their power-relations, in moments of both joy and difficulty. The basic narrative pattern of crisis and restoration of cosmic order consistently highlights a tension between the ruler and the divine community. The emerging picture is fundamentally one in which the chief god is unable to achieve the maintenance of order without the support of the divine community or, more precisely, of one of its more prominent representatives. The latest poem *Erra* delineates this situation most clearly, but already in *Lugale* did Enlil need his son Ninurta, and in *EnNinl* he is even exiled by the council after committing transgression. The fundamental non-self-sufficiency of the ruler underscores, in *Atra-ḫasīs*, the general divine dependence of the gods on mankind. In *Chaoskampf* narratives, on the other hand, it triggers the triumph of the young god, whether this is still heavily mediated by the senior

gods (*Anzû*), becomes a function of Marduk's absolute accession (*Ee*), or turns against the divine community itself (*Erra*). Finally, it is worth remarking that *Gilgameš* is the only poem featuring several divine assemblies whose main narrative content does not revolve around the divine world, and, therefore, the closest to the Homeric poems, to which we now turn.<sup>334</sup>

---

<sup>334</sup> One may add that the fragmentary *Etana Epic* begins with a divine assembly (OB 1.1-15, SB 1.1-27), and the text breaks as Etana enters heaven (SB 3.138-144). Considering parallels with other entrances at the assembly (compare *Etana* SB 3.102 ≈ 3.139 and *N&E* 261, 320, 351; *Etana* SB 3.138 and *Adapa* B.37', cf. West 1997: 141 n. 175) it is possible that a divine assembly scene stood at this crucial juncture of the poem.

## PART 2: EARLY GREEK EPIC

### Preliminary Remarks

The following chapters consider the compositional and narrative function of the divine assemblies (as defined in the *Introduction* and in reference to the Mesopotamian tradition) in the Homeric poems, the *Homeric Hymns* and Hesiod's *Theogony*. Unlike human assemblies, the gods' gatherings in early Greek epic have not been the subject of a detailed, separate treatment.<sup>335</sup> Only recently have they been scrutinised as type-scenes.<sup>336</sup> Early Greek divine gatherings lack the recurrent formalities that mark the Homeric assemblies of the Achaeans as constituting an "institutional setting".<sup>337</sup> They rather tend to resemble what have been called "informal group conversations",<sup>338</sup> which is undoubtedly connected to the Greek gods' condition as an enlarged family of almost permanent guests in the house of Zeus.<sup>339</sup>

The term "assembly", therefore, must here be understood through its distant etymology (eng. *assembly* < fr. *assemblée* < fr. *assemble* "together" < lat. *ad* + *simul*), deprived of its political and decisional connotations. A divine meeting is never labelled βουλή in Homer: we should not therefore mistake them for "councils"; they are rather "gatherings", as the Greek ἀγορή clarifies.<sup>340</sup>

---

<sup>335</sup> Already in Arend (1933) 116-121 divine assemblies are grouped together with human ones, cf. Kelly (2007) 68-75; Beck (2005) 191-229 and Raaflaub (2011a) deal with human assemblies only, Bannert (1987) 30 includes some divine gatherings in his chart, and Flaig (1994) 18 n. 16 identifies seven of them for the *Iliad*.

<sup>336</sup> On Homeric assemblies as type-scenes see the literature in Edwards (1992) 311 and Kelly (2007) 68 n. 1, adding Marks (2008) 159-66 and Romano Martín (2009) 15-78 on divine gatherings.

<sup>337</sup> See Arend (1933) 116-21, Edwards (1980) 26 and recently Beck (2005) 191-229: the Achaean formal assembly is always summoned and dismissed, while speakers stand up to speak and sit down thereafter. On the (more chaotic) Trojan assemblies see Mackie (1996) 21-26, and Nagler (1974) 119-30 on the looser patterns of human "convening" in the *Odyssey*.

<sup>338</sup> Beck (2005) 194-95, 202-04, 228-29, and her Ch. 6, on patterns common to other formal gatherings (games, laments).

<sup>339</sup> On the gods as Zeus' guests cf. Graziosi and Haubold (2005) 59, 69-71; as a family see still Calhoun (1935), Graziosi (2016); on their varying dwellings Lanza (2005).

<sup>340</sup> West (1997) 177. On the isolated ἀγών at 18.376 (though cf. 7.298, [Hes.] *Scut.* 105) see *LfgreE* I.134-36 (Mette), Kirk (1990) 273-74, Coray (2016) 154-55. Hesiod does denote the divine *consessus* by the word

In fact, whenever the semantic range of ἀγείρω and the act of "convening" is stressed, decisions involving the divine community and/or human affairs are consistently at stake (e.g. *Il.* 4.1, 8.2, 20.4-16, *HHerm.* 326).<sup>341</sup> However, the scenes in *Il.* 22 and 24, as the gods decide upon crucial issues (Hektor's death and the rescue of his body), do not contain any term referring to the act of gathering. Besides, when the relevant scene starts, the gods are often found simply drinking (e.g. *Il.* 15.86), or watching (*Il.* 4.1-4, 7.443-44, 22.166-67).

One may wish to consider only those instances in which "all the gods" are said to be together,<sup>342</sup> still, Zeus' absence is conspicuous at *Il.* 15.84-150, while at *Il.* 5.360-420, for example, Ares and Apollo are on earth.<sup>343</sup> Thus neither the presence of a gathering term nor the presence of all the gods works as a unifying criterion to identify a divine assembly.

Nor can we say that these scenes are characterised by a single motif. One could look at drinking/cups,<sup>344</sup> or at the sitting/seats motif,<sup>345</sup> but neither occurs in every divine gathering. All these elements can be variously combined, but none of them is found in every instance.

The common trait of all the scenes, then, is simply the depiction of the gods in a communal context. The early Greek epic divine assembly can be thus defined as a scene where more than two gods are together and detached from mortals, which may or may not lead to a decision, measure or intervention on earth. In Homer, all these scenes,

---

βουλή (*Th.* 802), though never when staging a divine assembly. Indeed, the context (*Th.* 802-04) makes clear that, for him, the divine communality includes βουλή, δαίτες, and εἶραι (cf. below n. 572).

<sup>341</sup> At *Il.* 15.84-85: ἵκετο [*sc.* Ἥρη] δ' αἰπὸν Ὀλυμπον, ὀμηγερέεσσι δ' ἐπῆλθεν / ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι Διὸς δόμῳ (15.84-85), the adjective does not signal the *act* of gathering, but the *fact* the gods are together; the same goes for 24.99 (≈ 24.84). The word θῶκος ("seat" > "council place") also signals a decisional gathering (*Od.* 5.3, cf. *HAp.* 345, [Hes.] fr. 1.6 M-W), cf. below n. 467, Ch. 9§1.

<sup>342</sup> Thus Romano Martín (2009) 24.

<sup>343</sup> It remains true that starting the collective scene poets do tend to mention either "all the gods": *Il.* 1.533-5, 8.4, 15.85-86, 22.166, 24.99-100, *Od.* 8.305, *HAp.* 92, 312, *Th.* 390-91, or "the gods" *Il.* 4.1, (≈) 7.443, 8.437-39, 20.114, 292 (at 5.367 ≈ 5.868 only θεῶν ἕδος, which need not imply presence *per se*), *Od.* 5.3, 12.376 ("the immortals"), *HAp.* 2, 187, *HHerm.* 326 ("the immortals"), *Th.* 881.

<sup>344</sup> Drinking/cups: *Il.* 1.584, 596-98; 4.2-4; 15.84-88; 24.101-02, *HAp.* 10-11, cf. *Th.* 639-43 (eating, cf. West 1966: 342).

<sup>345</sup> Seat/sitting: *Il.* 1.533-36, 569, 581; 4.1; 7.443; 8.439; 15.86, 100, 124, 141; 20.11, 15 (cf. 20.149-52); 24.99-100, *Od.* 5.3, *HAp.* 3-4.

nevertheless, develop the poet's narrative by revealing at least some of the gods' perspectives on the events unfolding on the human plane, and very often by directing these events and connecting previous and forthcoming actions. As we will see, this narrative-directing function, already crucial in the *Iliad*, becomes most prominent in the *Odyssey*. In the *Homeric Hymns* and in the *Theogony*, on the other hand, the assemblies' diegetic function must be qualified in accordance with these compositions' specific deployment of narrative material.

Nevertheless, as this section attempts to show, the divine scenes of assembly are of crucial importance to hold all these poems together, in compositional and conceptual terms. The demonstrated similarity with the Mesopotamian tradition in this respect will invite, in Part 3, a closer comparison of specific techniques and theological conceptions thereby revealed.

## Chapter 5: *Iliad*

In the *Iliad*, divine interactions compound a well-defined narrative thread, whose ultimate function is that of shaping the course of events.<sup>346</sup> A sketch of this divine narrative is provided first, whilst this chapter's core analyses the Iliadic system of divine assemblies to demonstrate their contribution to the development of this compositional design.

The *Iliad* is a poem about conflict, and so conflict constitutes a fundamental aspect of the Iliadic divine narrative. The contrast between the fated destiny of Troy and Zeus' plan to inflict defeat upon the Achaeans in the poem generates a current of *stasis* between the chief god and the powerful pro-Achaean deities, whose development and resolution is a function of the poet's general plan. This thread starts as early as Book 1, when it becomes clear that instability and conflict obtain on Olympos just as they do on earth. The first depiction of divine society, in Akhilleus' request to Thetis, delineates a situation of endemic Olympian strife (1.396-409). It is this situation that grounds the success of Akhilleus' plan, while the mythological digression highlights, proleptically, the opposition between the major pro-Achaean deities, Here, Poseidon and Athene (1.400), and Zeus.<sup>347</sup>

The development of the poem's plot acquires part of its dramatic force through the varying degrees of awareness between the heroes, the gods, Zeus and the audience about what will happen. The balance varies as the poem goes on, with the audience and the characters, human and divine, being deceived, facing unexpected results, and finally

---

<sup>346</sup> While every monograph on Homer treats the gods, among the classic works Finsler (1906), deserves mention (despite his radically analytical views), discussing previous scholarship at pp. 55-56; Calhoun (1935), (1937), (1939), (1940), Reinhardt (1960) 16-36, Schadewaldt (1938) *passim*, esp. 109-19 remain fundamental. On the Iliadic theology see, among many others and recently, Erbse (1986), Schäfer (1990), Graf (1991), Slatkin (1991), Janko (1992) 1-7, Taplin (1992) 128-43, Flaig (1994), Morrison (1997), Clay (1999a), Graf apud Latacz *et al.* (2000) *Proleg.*: 115-32, van Erp (2000), Pucci (2002), Kearns (2004), Allan (2006), Kelly (2007) 422-25, Wilson (2007), Heitsch (2008), Hirschberger (2008), (2011), Minchin (2011), Elmer (2013) 146-73, Ahrendorf (2014) 25-73, Graziosi (2016), (2017). Marks (2016), following the course of Zeus' plan across (some of) the poem's divine assemblies, appeared when this Chapter was completed.

<sup>347</sup> Kullmann (1956) 14-16, cf. Kelly (2007) 422. On mythological *paradeigmata* see Willcock (1964), (1977), Austin (1966), Lohmann (1970) here 80-95, Braswell (1971), Lang (1983), Andersen (1990), Alden (2000); recent work collected by Alden (2011).

acknowledging that things have gone as they must.<sup>348</sup> Only the narrator and Zeus (for the most part) firmly grasp the handling of events. Zeus' plan could not contemplate the utter defeat of the Achaeans. But the large scale narrative creates precisely that intradiegetic impression on the human and divine characters.

For the thread of divine conflict to unfold across the poem, Homer develops an important narrative discourse around the secrecy of Zeus' plan, precluding and accompanying his temporary withdrawal from the divine company.<sup>349</sup> The conversation with Thetis should be kept secret (1.522-23) and Zeus would not reveal a word of it to an angered Here (1.545-46). For a long time the gods do not know the details of his plan, and when, in anger, Zeus does speak (8.469-84), his prophecy includes only the bad news for the Achaeans, leaving aside what comes after the death of Patroklos.

The peak of divine conflict is reached in Books 13-15, when Poseidon and Here succeed in challenging Zeus' ban on divine intervention. But just after Zeus is temporarily defeated and put to sleep by Here, he talks about concord with his wife (15.49-52) and finally reveals to her his entire plan: he will indeed cause Troy to fall (15.69-77).<sup>350</sup> Shortly thereafter, he achieves Poseidon's withdrawal from the battlefield, which is made more difficult because of his unawareness: the god is still afraid that Troy might not be destroyed (15.212-17).<sup>351</sup>

After Book 15, in effect, *stasis* ceases to be the divine narrative's keynote,<sup>352</sup> and in the poem's final part (Books 20-24), with Zeus' promise to Thetis fulfilled, the pro-Achaean

---

<sup>348</sup> As recently highlighted, in reference to the *Iliad* theology, by Heitsch (2008).

<sup>349</sup> This is matched, when he starts to enact his plan from Book 8, by the verbal οὐκ ἀλέγω thread (below n. 359), cf. Kelly (2007) 97, 346. On Greek divine withdrawals cf. below Chs. 6§1.1, 7§1.2, §1.4.

<sup>350</sup> On Zeus' prophecies cf. Schadewaldt (1938) 110-13, Taplin (1992) 136-43, Allan (2006) 8-9, Marks (2016) 65-68, 73.

<sup>351</sup> One may note that, while describing the opposition between Zeus and Poseidon during the central battle (13.447-50), the narrator has to remind the audience that Zeus is *not* planning utter defeat for the Achaeans.

<sup>352</sup> As seen e.g. by Calhoun (1940) 263-63, cf. Schadewaldt (1938) 114-15, also de Roguin (2007) 103-22, who goes too far, in my view, in seeing the *Dios apate* as a milestone in cosmic history (i.e. beyond the *Iliad*); below §7.

gods' conflict with him disappears. In a certain sense, there is a return to the situation of Books 2-7, when the Achaeans managed well enough against the Trojans, and Zeus, before starting to act in favour of the Trojans, was agreeable with the pro-Achaean deities.<sup>353</sup> After Akhilleus' return, thus, divine politics proceed smoothly for Zeus toward the end of the poem, although the pro-Achaean gods' hatred continues to fuel the narrative. Zeus' authority, though, is never questioned, which allows him, in the divine scenes concerning Hektor's death and burial, to preserve the subtle balance between divine concern for mortals and the preservation of cosmic order.

Most of this divine narrative is developed through collective scenes among the gods; the following paragraphs analyse how these episodes construct it.

#### §1. Book 1: Divine strife (1.533-611)

The first assembly concludes Book 1, and portrays a quarrel between Zeus and Here, settled by Hephaistos only when Zeus, put on the spot, threatens to resort to violence.<sup>354</sup> The lame god's intervention restores peace on Olympos: after a banquet gladdened by Apollo and the Muses, Zeus and Here go to bed together.

Famously, this quarrel parallels the one between Agamemnon and Akhilleus, while Hephaistos' mediating role mirrors that of Nestor.<sup>355</sup> Both Agamemnon and Zeus, the highest authorities, are asked for something that cannot be refused (to enact Thetis' request, to return Chriseis), which unleashes a latent authority conflict with a powerful

---

<sup>353</sup> On the analogies between Books 4-6 and 20-22, where Zeus governs divine interventions in the battlefield from on high see Erbse (1961) *passim* and esp. 184-85, with previous literature 170 n. 19, Lenz (1975) 194-200; so (e.g.) Aphrodite's ascent and lament in Book 5 is paralleled by Artemis' in 21 (5.373-74 ≈ 21.509-10), Athene recalls to Ares the earlier episode (21.396-98); cf. Reinhardt (1960) 27, Erbse (1961) 160, Kirk (1990) 99, Andersen (1997) 34.

<sup>354</sup> On this thread see Synodinou (1987).

<sup>355</sup> To the references in Latacz *et al.* (2000) 176 add e.g. Wilamowitz (1916) 250-251, Segal (1971b), Davies (1981) 59-60, Pulleyn (2000) 246-274, Romano Martín (2009) 26-29, Elmer (2013) 146-47, Marks (2016) 61-62.

figure.<sup>356</sup> Unlike Nestor, Hephaistos restores harmony, and scholars tend to interpret this divine scene as a light-hearted counterpart to the violent human strife, wherein Olympic mirth, music and serenity drive the audience momentarily away from human grief, at the same time stressing the gods' detachment from human sorrow.<sup>357</sup>

And yet, although Hephaistos manages to confirm Zeus' authority, the audience is again reminded of the ever-present possibility of divine strife: Hephaistos' paradigmatic tale of divine instability (1.590-94) is added to the one narrated by Akhilleus (1.397-406), to Zeus' concerns (1.518-21), and to the just-seen quarrel.<sup>358</sup> The increasingly bitter exchange at 1.540-68, and its roots in Zeus' elusiveness, establish the subtle, deceptive mood of the marital quarrels that will continue through the poem until the fulfilment of Zeus' promise. Here is cunning and tricky, and the poet stresses the chief god's aloofness and proleptic detachment from the divine community.<sup>359</sup>

Thus the divine quarrel and its very resolution, whilst permitting a contrast by portraying Olympic serenity, prepare for the conflicts to come. The change in Zeus' plan causes the first Iliadic enactment of endemic Olympian instability. Though Here and Zeus go to bed together, he is unable to sleep, and thinks about his plan (1.609-2.4).<sup>360</sup> For the

---

<sup>356</sup> For the general bad terms of Agamemnon and Akhilleus cf. e.g. 1.176-78, 287-91. As for Zeus, his first words in the poem are for Here (1.517 ff.): he is upset (μέγ' ὀχθήσας, cf. Chantraine (1968-80) 844, Scully (1984), *Lfgre* III.903-04 (Nordheider), Kelly 2007: 224-25, with occurrences), because he is worried about Here's permanent (αἰεὶ) quarrelsomeness concerning the war, manifesting itself within the collective Olympian dimension (ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι, on which cf. below n. 518). The audience (and Zeus) have just been reminded of the Briareos episode (1.503, referring to 1.396-406, cf. e.g. Latacz *et al.* 2000: 163).

<sup>357</sup> E.g. Burkert (1985) 122, Pulleyn (2000) 33-34, Romano Martín (2009) 29, Marks (2016) 62; better Schadewaldt (1938) 147 "der Ernst den Scherz anzieht", cf. Erbse (1986) 207, Schäfer (1990) 43; recently on the limits of *Götterburleske* approaches see Graziosi and Haubold (2005) 65-75, Allan (2006), Kelly (2007) 421-25.

<sup>358</sup> Indeed, the gods' mirth is not generated by this tale, but when Hephaistos becomes the lame cupbearer (1.597-600), replacing the more charming Ganymede or Hebe. Cf. Griffin (1978) 6, Edwards (1991) 319, Pulleyn (2000) 274, Latacz *et al.* (2000) 181.

<sup>359</sup> Here asks though she is aware (1.536b-40), Zeus falls into the trap and reacts violently (1.561-67), for his hopes (recall 1.522-23) are dashed precisely when he realises that he has been duped in the discussion. On the exchange see esp. Erbse (1986) 206-08 and Latacz *et al.* (2000) 169-76. Zeus' aloofness and secrecy, apart from here (1.541-43), is a keynote of the whole episode, cf. Latacz *et al.* (2000) 162 *ad* 498. The thread is pursued, as Zeus' enacts his plan, at 8.477-82, 11.80, until 15.106 through οὐκ ἀλέγω expressions (cf. on the human plane 1.160, 180), see Latacz *et al.* (2000) 85, Kelly (2007) 346.

<sup>360</sup> A perceived inconsistency between καθηῦδ' (1.611) and Δία δ' οὐκ ἔχε νήδυμος ὕπνος (2.2) has been variously discussed and explained (already Σ bT *ad* 2.2): to Wilamowitz (1916) 260 and West (2011) 99 it

moment, he sends the οὔλος ὄνειρος, and deceives Agamemnon by portraying a false harmony among the gods, who, persuaded by Here, would all be agreed upon their determination to destroy the Trojans (2.13-15): this is of course precisely the opposite of what happens in the actual divine gatherings which follow. The task of Zeus, for a while at least, is to cause loss to the invaders (2.3b-4 ≈ 1.558b-59).<sup>361</sup>

## §2. Book 4: Divine pacts (4.1-74)

In fact, the poem takes a somewhat different path, and the audience have to wait until Book 8 before Zeus really starts to enact his plan on the level of the actual battle. Until then, the course of the war seems to reproduce the stalemate that has been going on for the past nine years. In Books 2 to 4, in particular, the *Iliad* presents several episodes which would fit better at the beginning of the war than in its tenth year.<sup>362</sup> It is in this context that we find the next divine assembly, which starts Book 4.<sup>363</sup>

In Book 3, the armies swore oaths that a duel between Menelaos and Paris should settle the war. In spite of Aphrodite's last-minute abduction of Paris, the result of the duel is clear enough: Menelaos had the upper hand.<sup>364</sup> The war cannot end right now, of course, as men were hoping.<sup>365</sup> The narrative function of this assembly is to explain why it does not: Zeus hastens down Athene, who prompts the wounding of Menelaos by Pandaros, the act which breaks the truce and nullifies the agreement. Beside its basic function of moving the plot

---

signals a *caesura* between rhapsodic recitations, cf. Schadewaldt (1938) 147 n. 4; differently e.g. Taplin (1992) 287, for whom the pause should be sought at 1.492. Σ bT understand disturbed sleep as opposed to utter insomnia (οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι παννύχιοι εὔδον, ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς οὐ παννύχιος), cf. Kirk (1985) 115. καθεύδω is probably to be taken as "lie down (to sleep)" as surely is εὔδω at *Od.* 15.5, cf. Filsner (1906) 40-41, *Lfgre* II.771-72 (O'Sullivan), and Latacz *et al.* (2003) 12 for further discussion and references.

<sup>361</sup> On this repetition cf. Latacz *et al.* (2003) 13, with references.

<sup>362</sup> See e.g. Schadewaldt (1938) 154-55, Kullmann (1992) 219-24, Taplin (1992) 83-109, Di Benedetto (1998) 255-70, Mackie (2013), and Rutherford (2013) 44 n. 2 with further literature.

<sup>363</sup> On the scene see most recently Flaig (1994), van Erp (2000), Pucci (2002), Heitsch (2008) 8, Romano Martín (2009) 29-32, Elmer (2012), (2013) 147-50, Kelly (2014) 37-38, Marks (2016) 63-64.

<sup>364</sup> 3.439, 457; 4.13, cf. Heitsch (2008) 8.

<sup>365</sup> The poet emphasises the hopes and the unawareness of the anonymous soldiers for the sake of pathos (3.111-12, 319-24, 4.81-85). Cf. e.g. de Jong (1987) here 70-73, Pucci (2002) 24, Elmer (2012).

forward by opening the depiction of actual battle that will end in Book 22,<sup>366</sup> the assembly portrays the divine agreement on Troy's destruction, "a re-enactment of the negotiations which, at some time in the past, sealed the fate of Troy".<sup>367</sup>

Again, the scene is developed through a discussion between Zeus, who pities the Trojans, and Here, who has been long labouring against them. In the previous scene Zeus was put on the spot by his wife, but this time he is in full control of the situation and leads the discussion precisely where he wants, while pretending to yield.<sup>368</sup> By showing Athene and Here together as a front of opposition (4.20-24), a foretaste is offered of what would happen if Zeus were to act against the Achaeans.<sup>369</sup> Although the conflict is temporarily settled, the poet has carried on the undercurrent of potential divine instability.

### §3. Book 5: Diomedes' aristeia (5.367-430, 868-906)

In the interval between this agreement and his first move to actively help the Trojans, Zeus tends to favour the pro-Achaean deities, and his rule, as long as he stands on Olympus without intervening in the battlefield, remains unchallenged. It is on this note that the three Olympian scenes spanning the structure of Book 5 portray Zeus' attitudes to the gods' interventions (5.367-430, 711-66 and 5.868-906).<sup>370</sup> The first and the last of these narrate the arrival and complaint of two pro-Trojan gods, Aphrodite and Ares, both wounded by Diomedes thanks, respectively, to the counsel and support of Athene.

---

<sup>366</sup> Cf. Ch. 9§4.2.

<sup>367</sup> van Erp (2000) 399.

<sup>368</sup> Recently West (2011) 139-40, Kelly (2014) 37-38. Note that the discussion in Book 1 started as Here spoke κερτομίωσι to Zeus (1.539); now it is he who teases Here κερτομίωις ἐπέεσσι (4.4-6). On epic κερτομ- see most recently Latacz *et al.* (2000) 170 (*ad* 1.539), and variously Clay (1999b) ≈ (2003) 111-13, here 112, Clarke (2001), Lloyd (2004), Vergados (2013) 276. Gottesmann (2008) makes important points on the authority-strengthening function of these speeches, but goes too far, in my view, in reconstructing an institutionalised social setting for them.

<sup>369</sup> Note however that the goddesses' reactions are carefully distinguished, as they are when identical lines recur at 8.457-61. On this repetition see Reinhardt (1961) 151, Kelly (2007) 342-43.

<sup>370</sup> On the shaping of Book 5 see especially Erbse (1961), Andersen (1978) 47-87; on its *Götterhandlung* Schäfer (1990) 15-33.

A quiet detachment on Zeus' part emerges from his smile at Athene's mocking of Aphrodite (5.418-26). He is harsher on Ares, but then hands his son to the divine physician Paion and lets him sit in glory beside himself (5.888-906). Between these two scenes, Zeus allows Athene to intervene against Ares, after Here had duly asked him for permission (5.753-66). Such temperate conditions in Olympian politics under Zeus' rule as he favours the Achaeans are epitomised at the end of the book (5.907-09): Here and Athene return to the house of Zeus, having stopped Ares with Zeus' agreement; but Ares himself, we have just been told (5.906), is glamorously sitting beside his father.

Nevertheless, again the poet reminds the audience of his narrative thread of divine conflict. At the beginning of her consolatory answer to Aphrodite, Dione identifies divine conflict as the source of human-inflicted pains (5.383-84),<sup>371</sup> a concept that Ares repeats in the parallel scene (5.873-74). At the centre of his enraged reply (5.892-94), Zeus states that it is Ares' partaking of Here's μένος, whom he can hardly control with words, that makes him hateful, which reminds the audience of an opposition between Here and Zeus in the chief god's perspective.<sup>372</sup>

Zeus' rage is generated by Ares' complaint against the privileged status of Athene (5.875-80). Zeus is affected by Ares' point, not least because it was he himself who, modifying Here's proposal and foreseeing Ares' pains, had suggested unleashing Athene (8.764-66). He affirms his own authority by casting all the blame on Here and, by connecting mother and son, on Ares himself.<sup>373</sup> On a deeper level, by tackling Athene's privileges, Ares challenges the order presided by Zeus, which his daughter guarantees.<sup>374</sup> Through the maternal bond extending beyond war partisanships, such a threat makes Zeus

---

<sup>371</sup> On Dione's speech cf. e.g. Erbse (1961) 161-62, Fenik (1968) 41, Lohmann (1970) 53, Andersen (1978) 61-70, (1997) 33-34, Alden (2000) 123-28.

<sup>372</sup> Zeus' words at 5.890-91 echo 1.178-79 (Agamemnon to Akhilleus).

<sup>373</sup> Cf. Andersen (1978) 83-85, Erbse (1986) 197, Kirk (1990) 152.

<sup>374</sup> On Athene's unique position in the Olympian mythology as guarantor of Zeus' power and on the Iliadic exploitation of this background see Reinhardt (1960) 26-27, now Kelly (2007) 422-24; also Yasumura (2011) 86-96; cf. below §6, n. 391, Chs. 7§1.4, n. 542, 10§3.

connect Ares to Here, who is confirmed as the source of instability *par excellence*. This heated reaction (compare the threats at 1.560-67) manifests Zeus' political and domestic difficulties, as well as the importance of having Athene at his side. In this way, Here, Athene and Ares are cast in different ways in the light of a potential *stasis*, while everything in Olympos, as yet, proceeds to the benefit of the pro-Achaean deities.

#### §4. Book 7: The Achaean wall (7.442-63)

Among the three pro-Achaean deities named by Akhilleus at 1.400, Poseidon is granted remarkably little space in the *Iliad's* first half.<sup>375</sup> The divine gathering at 7.442-64 presents a dialogue between Poseidon and Zeus which justifies the destruction of the Achaean fortification after the war, narrated at 12.3-33, and stresses the importance of that construction for the poet's plans.<sup>376</sup>

Poseidon laments that the Achaeans have offered no "proper hecatombs" before starting the work (7.448-50). The collective context of the assembly allows Poseidon to start his protest by amplifying the effects of this alleged fault, as though it signified men's universal carelessness for the gods (7.446-47). He concludes by implying that it would be outrageous if, as things stand, this impiously conducted construction should outlast the glory of the walls of Troy, built by himself and Apollo (7.451-53).

Zeus sees clearly that Poseidon's protests involve above all his personal glory, praises him as outstanding among the gods and ensures his benevolence by adapting his words (7.451 ≈ 458). Finally, he grants Poseidon his share of glory, allowing him to destroy the wall, but ensuring that it stands as long as it is needed. Indeed, the wall constitutes the poetic central focus of the reverse siege to the Achaean camp in which Zeus' plan to help

---

<sup>375</sup> Erbse (1986) 104 stresses that Poseidon's appearances in the first part of the poem prepare for his major intervention during the central battle.

<sup>376</sup> Cf. Scodel (1982), Boyd (1995), Maitland (1999), Porter (2011), Haubold (2014) 335-37.

Akhilleus finds its realisation.<sup>377</sup> The fact that the fortification is also a function of this plan explains Zeus' disturbed reaction to Poseidon's complaint (τὸν δὲ μέγ' ὀχθήσας, 7.454, above n. 356). As in Book 5, Zeus is at ease governing the other gods' whims. Once again, however, his irritation signals the risk of contrast with a major pro-Achaean god. Zeus' authority stands firm, but the undercurrent of *stasis* about his plan has been recalled to the audience (significantly so with the hitherto virtually absent, but most powerful, Poseidon) as the chief god is finally about to intervene.

#### §5. Book 8: Zeus in action (8.1-46, 438-84)

As Eustathius notes, Book 8 is the only Book of the *Iliad* whose narrative space encompasses an entire daytime, from dawn to dusk.<sup>378</sup> This is the day when Zeus finally puts his plan in motion. As Agamemnon shall remark that evening (9.17-25), it is Zeus who caused the Greeks' desperation. In compliance with the dynamic character of Book 8, its divine scenes are strewn throughout to scan the battle phases.<sup>379</sup>

Zeus summons the gods at dawn, and forbids anyone's intervention in the fight in threatening tones (8.1-27).<sup>380</sup> Only Athene dares to answer: while acknowledging his superiority and confirming that the gods will obey, she states they will inspire the Achaeans, lest they should utterly perish (8.30-37). Zeus, in his superior knowledge of his

---

<sup>377</sup> E.g. Reinhardt (1961) 267-69, recently Clay (2011a) 59 n. 46.

<sup>378</sup> Eust. 693.31-41 (II.509 van der Valk).

<sup>379</sup> For groundwork on Book 8 see still Schadewaldt (1938) 96-127 and Reinhardt (1961) 149-211; more recently Willcock (1995); see now Kelly (2007) and Cook (2009); focus on the *Götterhandlung*: Finsler (1906) 29-34, Schäfer (1990) 59-73. The Book's character is thus synthesised by Kirk (1990) 293: "It is characteristic of the Book as a whole that most of its actions and initiatives, whether divine or human, are soon abandoned or reversed. Only Zeus' initial determination is ultimately maintained, to produce the sense of crisis needed to motivate the Embassy in bk. 9".

<sup>380</sup> On this speech see esp. Lohmann (1970) 36-37 and Kirk (1990) 295-306.

long-term plan, smiles at Athene, reassures her in vague terms and departs immediately to the peak of Ida to direct, alone, the course of battle.<sup>381</sup>

When the Achaeans are at a loss as Zeus actively supports the Trojans, Here tries to stir Poseidon to rebellion, but Zeus' brother, along the lines of concord established at 7.442-63, refuses to intervene (8.198b-211). It is Athene, previously so deferential to her father, whom Here persuades (8.350-80). Athene's critical intervention against the *Dios boule* receives due prominence through her jealous speech of exasperation (8.357-80).<sup>382</sup> The goddesses arm themselves and set out for earth (8.381-96), as in Book 5, but here they are not asking Zeus for permission.<sup>383</sup> He sees them, and has Iris direct them back to Olympos straightaway (8.397-437): Zeus remarks that Athene's intervention troubles him more than Here's, and Iris exceptionally modifies Zeus' message by adding insults to Athene, yet another signal of the importance of her rebellion.<sup>384</sup> When Zeus returns, he sits on his throne, provokes the goddesses, silences Here's protests and specifies his plan up to the death of Patroklos, leaving the gods and the audience to wonder what may happen thereafter (8.470-76). Dusk comes, and the poet's focus abruptly turns to human assemblies, the Trojan one concluding Book 8, the Greek one starting Book 9.<sup>385</sup>

The major facts on the divine level, thus, are the convening of the assembly, the prohibition of intervention and the abortive rebellion that leads a raging Zeus to reveal part of his plan in what may be seen as the accidental prosecution (and conclusion) of the

---

<sup>381</sup> 8.28-40, athetised by Aristarchus ( $\Sigma$  A *ad* 8.28-40) have generated strong suspicion, cf. Ameis and Hentze (1887) 87-88, Leaf (1900) 335, Kirk (1990) 299-301; discussion and exegesis in Kelly (2007) 387-88, cf. 45-46, with previous literature.

<sup>382</sup> Reinhardt (1961) 143-44, Lohmann (1970) 149-50, Schäfer (1990) 70, Kelly (2007) 60.

<sup>383</sup> 8.381-83  $\approx$  5.719-21; 8.384-88 = 5.733-37; 8.389-96 = 5.745-52, cf. esp. Arend (1933) 87-88, Schadewaldt (1938) 100 n. 3, Erbse (1961) 181-84, Diller (1965), Kelly (2007) 60 n. 251, cf. 92-96 on chariot-journeys.

<sup>384</sup> 8.421-24 should be kept, *pace* West (2001) 200 who athetises after Aristarchus ( $\Sigma$  A *ad* 8.420-24); see Reinhardt (1961) 147, Erbse (1986) 54-55, Kelly (2007) 388-89, cf. 322-29.

<sup>385</sup> See Kelly (2007) 75 on the clustering of divine, Achaean and Trojan assemblies.

assembly scene started at the beginning of the Book.<sup>386</sup> Besides shaping the battle phases, this book's divine narrative does "demonstrate that he [Zeus] is capable of enforcing his ban",<sup>387</sup> but concludes on a note of instability which prepares for the longer-lasting divine rebellions during the central battle.<sup>388</sup>

#### §6. Book 15: Here's last attempt (15.84-150)

The next divine assembly is encapsulated between the two scenes in which Zeus comes to terms with Here (15.1-79), and Poseidon (15.157-219), both of whom defied his non-intervention edict: Poseidon caused an Achaean recovery through his disguised intervention in Book 13; Here succeeded in seducing Zeus and putting him to sleep in Book 14.

One notable feature of this assembly is the absence of Zeus, who has withdrawn from Olympus at the start of Book 11; yet the scene again revolves around his plan. The political nature of the gathering, and the fact that Zeus' authority will be at issue, are signalled by the role of Themis in 15.87-91.<sup>389</sup> The assembly's factual outcome (Iris and Apollo are sent to Ida to receive Zeus' instructions) could well have been achieved in much shorter compass (i.e. excluding 15.87-142), but the poet wanted to develop some essential and ongoing political themes in his divine narrative.

Here's attempt to subvert Zeus' prohibition shows her cunning reaction to failure, since she provokes Ares while proclaiming as foolish any attempt against Zeus' will (15.87-

---

<sup>386</sup> Romano Martín (2009) 34 "[Here y Atenea] regresan al palacio olímpico, donde la asamblea seguía reunida". Flaig (1994) 18 n. 16 and Kelly (2007) 68 consider 8.1-40 and 8.438-84 as constituting two different assemblies. See Ch. 9§4.1 on "consecutive assemblies".

<sup>387</sup> West (2011) 199, cf. 167.

<sup>388</sup> See e.g. Schadewaldt (1938) 114-18, Reinhardt (1961) 155-60, Kelly (2007) 64. This reflects the general shape of Book 8 as "eine Art Vorklang der grossen Niederlage Λ-O" (Schadewaldt 1938: 102, cf. 114 on the gods' rebellion).

<sup>389</sup> Winter (1956) 132-33, Janko (1992) 238-39, Muellner (1996) 5-9, Romano Martín (2009) 36-37, West (2011) 301.

112).<sup>390</sup> The unrest of the divine community due to Zeus' excluding policies, merely signalled at 11.75-83 to stress Zeus' mighty aloofness, is here portrayed dynamically. In the dramatic confrontation between Ares and Athene (15.113-147), the difficult confirmation of Zeus' authority passes through his daughter's intervention, which builds a significant contrast with the earlier episode in Book 8, when Athene sided with Here.<sup>391</sup>

In this context, the "loss of a son" motif enters into the divine assembly.<sup>392</sup> Ares' impetuous reaction, provoked by Here's mention of his son Askalaphos' death, is halted by Athene, but the divine concern for a mortal whose death cannot be avoided will henceforth be exploited in divine discussions (especially in 16.431-58 and 22.168-85, cf. 24.104-05). Thus, the motif's first occurrence in a divine assembly comes in conjunction with the rebellion's resolution, a threefold confirmation of Zeus' authority involving Here, Athene and Poseidon, and his exposition of his complete plan to Here, which dispels all doubts about the outcome of the chief god's initiatives.<sup>393</sup>

#### §7. Book 20: Divine harmony and the *Theomachy* (20.4-31)

No deity defies Zeus' edict after Book 15: the course of events smoothly follows his plans, while the poem's action revolves around Hektor's delusion, the deaths of Sarpedon

---

<sup>390</sup> Leaf (1902) 112: "a masterpiece worthy of Mark Antony". See Erbse (1986) 201, Janko (1992) 236-43; on her ambiguous smile (15.101b-103) cf. Latacz (1966) 224, Schäfer (1990) 97.

<sup>391</sup> Athene's role as preserver of Zeus' order (cf. above n. 374) is here developed through a discourse on yielding. In this respect, note that Hephaistos (1.571-94) and Athene's (15.127-41) role as mediators widely parallels that of Nestor at *Il.* 1.247-84. The verbal resonances 1.574 ≈ 1.127 and 1.581b ≈ 1.280a are noted in Latacz *et al.* (2000) 176, cf. above §1; on Athene's speech cf. Janko (1992) 241-42, and note that μεθέμην χόλον occurs only at 1.283 and 15.138 in *epos*. The "cease your anger" motif pervading the poem's discourse on Akhilleus, cf. e.g. 1.80, 191, 224, 283; 9.157 (~ 261, 299), 260, 459; 19.67, has just emerged in Zeus' preceding speech (παύω χόλον 15.72) in connection with Akhilleus' anger (15.74, cf. 15.68 χολωσάμενος ... δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς), and will emerge in Iris' conversation with Poseidon (where 15.203 echoes Phoenix's words at 9.513-14, cf. below n. 416).

<sup>392</sup> On the motif hitherto cf. esp. 13.643-59 (Harpalion's death, cf. Griffin 1980: 113); on the divine level, the forthcoming death of Sarpedon (mentioned by Zeus at 15.67), has been most probably alluded to already in 12.403 (Hainsworth 1993: 360); Askalaphos' death at 13.521-25 proleptically focuses on Ares' unawareness, cf. Thalmann (1984) 45, Janko (1992) 111-12.

<sup>393</sup> Although Poseidon is crucially unaware (15.212-17), cf. above n. 351. Zeus' second prophecy (15.56-77) has been wholly or partially athetised since antiquity. Despite the manuscript tradition's flawlessness, West (2000) 69 (cf. West 2001: 230-31) secludes 15.64-71, but see Janko (1992) 234-35, and above n. 350.

and Patroklos, and Akhilleus' return. Instead of focusing on divine instability and unrest concerning the plan of Zeus, Books 16-19 develop a divine reflection on the heroes' deaths, exploring such themes as the gods' pity toward men, the loss of a son, the value of the funeral, and the contrast between immortality and human destiny. The supreme god is the main protagonist of these reflections, particularly in his pitying monologues about the fate of Hektor (17.198-208) and Akhilleus' horses (17.441-55).

Possibly more noteworthy for the state of divine politics is that Here stands at his side when he expresses reservations about Sarpedon's death (16.430-57), and when the battle concludes (18.356-68).<sup>394</sup> Though questions of authority and latent tension have not disappeared, Zeus' relenting in Book 16 and his mildly ironic compliments in Book 18 (Here had, in 18.239-42, slightly hastened the schedule on which Zeus had resolved in 17.453-55), show the different tones of these one-to-one dialogues when compared with the previous altercations in the assemblies and at 15.13-46 (where, however, Zeus significantly ends up smiling and longing for concord).<sup>395</sup> Agamemnon's mythological digression in Book 19 begins with a scene of divine assembly falling outside the poem's temporal limits (19.100-114).<sup>396</sup> The episode portrays the only instance in the *Iliad* where Here achieves a long term success against Zeus, and concludes the undercurrent of references to the *stasis* between Zeus and Here regarding Herakles by portraying its origin.<sup>397</sup> Interestingly, it also constitutes the last moment of mutual opposition among the

---

<sup>394</sup> To Calhoun (1939) 22, 18.356-68 seal the end of Here's anger against Zeus (cf. Coray 2016: 145), to Edwards (1991) 188, the end of his support for the Trojans. On this scene's mild tone and irony cf. Erbse (1986) 59, Schäfer (1990) 108-09, Coray (2016) 145-46.

<sup>395</sup> Above p. 107. Note the speech-introductions to Zeus' words to Here in both passages: "Ἡρην δὲ προσέειπε κασιγνήτην ἄλοχόν τε (16.432 = 18.356, only here in *epos*). For the nexus κασιγνήτην ἄλοχόν τε cf. *Hymn.* 12.3 and *HAphr.* 40 (genitive). The contexts clarify that the formula signals the personal and cosmic bond between the deities, cf. Càssola (2010) 569, and *Il.* 15.49-52; to Coray (2016) 146, following Edwards (1970) 15-16, here it anticipates 18.364-66.

<sup>396</sup> On Agamemnon's paradigm cf. e.g. Kullmann (1956) 25-26, Reinhardt (1961) 19, Erbse (1986) 11-17, Schäffer (1990) 120-25, Edwards (1991) 249-52, Coray (2009) 55-71.

<sup>397</sup> On Herakles in the *Iliad* see variously Kullmann (1956) 25-35, Lang (1983), Sbardella (1994), Alden (2000) 38-42; most recently Coray (2009) 55-56, 80, Kelly (2010), here 275-76, Barker and Christensen (2014) here 270. For Herakles generating opposition between Here and Zeus cf. 1.590-94 (with Σ A *ad*

divine couple, while in the poem's main narrative this has just ceased to be the case (18.356-68). Indeed, there has been no doubting that Zeus' long-term plans are consonant with those of the pro-Achaean deities. His promise to Thetis fulfilled, Zeus prompts Athene to reinvigorate Akhilleus (19.340-48).

When at dawn both sides are ready for the poem's last battle (20.1-3), Zeus summons the divine assembly (20.4-31).<sup>398</sup> The scene is the counterpart of that in Book 8, where Zeus prohibited divine intervention: here he encourages it, so that Akhilleus may not seize Troy before the appointed time (20.26-30).<sup>399</sup> The divine interventions of Books 20-21 give a cosmic dimension to the decisive battle, and sanction the superiority of the pro-Achaean deities as Akhilleus heads towards the final duel with Hektor.<sup>400</sup>

The introduction to the assembly stresses Zeus' centrality, his name occurring five times in ten lines (20.4, 6, 10, 11, 13), whilst Themis' role in summoning the deities signals the rightful political horizon of the gathering.<sup>401</sup> In Book 8 Zeus was the first speaker, and his dialogue with Athene showed deceptions and omissions. Now the discussion starts with Poseidon's enquiry into Zeus' thoughts concerning the battle (20.16-18). The audience has not heard anything about Poseidon since his withdrawal from the battlefield in Book 15. Through his question, Poseidon indirectly reminds Zeus that he has not forgotten his conditions (15.212-17): if he is alluding to Zeus' previous unpopular decisions, this is a polite reminder.<sup>402</sup> Zeus' answer is even more peaceful,<sup>403</sup> and stresses Poseidon's

---

1.590), 14.249-69, 15.18-30, and lastly at 18.117-19, on which cf. Barker and Christensen (2014) 275. On 8.362-69 (Athene to Here) see Kelly (2010) 275.

<sup>398</sup> The massive participation sanctioning the restoration of concord mirrors 19.42-45, cf. Edwards (1991) 240, 288, Romano Martín (2009) 26. As seen by Arend (1933) 120, only here does the poet's technique deploy the full-scale summons typical of human assemblies.

<sup>399</sup> The structural connection between the two assemblies has long been noted, see Σ bT *ad* 20.16, cf. e.g. Wilamowitz (1916) 81, Schadewaldt (1938) 116.

<sup>400</sup> On the gods in Books 20-21 see e.g. Reinhardt (1961) 446-50, Bremer (1987), Schäfer (1990) 116-23, Edwards (1991) 287-90, Richardson (1993) 51-52, 85-86, de Roguin (2007) 149-51, Graziosi (2016).

<sup>401</sup> See Σ bT *ad* 20.4c, appropriately referring to *Od.* 2.69: ἦ τ' ἀνδρῶν ἀγορὰς ἡμὲν λύει ἠδὲ καθίζει [viz. Θέμις] ≈ Eust. 4.356.1-6 van der Valk; cf. Edwards (1991) 288 and above n. 389.

<sup>402</sup> 20.17: ἦ τι περὶ Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν μερμηρίζεις; Among the gods, μερμηρίζω is always used in the *Iliad* in reference to some pivotal decision, particularly of Zeus, cf. 2.3 (how to honour Akhilleus); 14.159

*knowledge* of his will (20.20: ἔγνωσ, Ἐννοσίγαιε, ἐμὴν ἐν στήθεσι βουλήν): a remarkable contrast with the long-developed thread of underhand machinations and differentiated knowledge of the future. At the same time, the twofold reference to the *Dios boule*, one in the speech-introduction 20.15b (cf. *Od.* 13.127b), one in Zeus' reply, prepares the audience for the thematic disclosure announced by the chief god's statement (20.21b-30: divine intervention, Achilles to be delayed).<sup>404</sup>

§8. Book 20: Aineias' fate (20.114-52; 291-320).

As Zeus stands on high, peacefully watching the battle (20.155), two divine collective scenes frame and give emphasis to the duel between Aineias and Akhilleus in Book 20.<sup>405</sup> Here, worried that Akhilleus might be scared away by Apollo, summons the (pro-Achaean) gods to take counsel (20.115-31). Poseidon calms her down, as there is no need for the gods to intervene: they will effectively do so if necessary - later on (20.291-320), instead, he successfully takes the initiative to save Aineias without Here joining him.

As Poseidon takes the lead *in loco Iovis* (20.145b ἡγήσατο κυανοχαίτης),<sup>406</sup> these scenes display the positive aftermaths of the divine conflict against Zeus' will. Although Here does not fail to remark that she and Athene would never spare any Trojan, Poseidon preserves Aineias' destiny as the perpetuator of the Trojan race and fosters the will of Zeus (20.301-08) along the lines established at 20.20-30.<sup>407</sup>

---

(Here, when she is about to usurp Zeus' position) and 16.647 (when should Patroclus die). Cf. Arend (1933) 106-15, Russo (1968) 288-94, *Lfgre* III.152-53 (Führer).

<sup>403</sup> Schäfer (1990) 189: "friedliche Atmosphäre".

<sup>404</sup> This is one case where "il narratore fa da spalla al personaggio", cf. Di Benedetto (1998) 5-10.

<sup>405</sup> Lenz (1975) 184-99, Schäfer (1990) 124-28, Edwards (1991) 309, Kelly (2007) 102-03.

<sup>406</sup> To Schäfer (1990) 127 the poet is signalling that Poseidon "aus der Konfrontation mit Zeus in den Gesängen 13-15 'gelernt' hat". Poseidon here performs his role as the highest authority in Zeus' absence, cf. Erbse (1986) 181, Lenz (1975) 186-91, Edwards (1991) 325, West (2011) 371 and cf. *Od.* 8.344-59 (below Ch. 6§3.3).

<sup>407</sup> The *Theomachy* in Book 21, indeed, portrays the state of Olympian politics according to the standardised pro-Achaean perspective that fits this stage of the poem. The pro-Achaean deities prove superior, not least in their statements of authority at 21.410-11a (Athene to Ares); 21.439-40 (Poseidon to Apollo); 21.487b-8a (Here to Artemis = 1.185b-86a, Agamemnon to Akhilleus). Zeus stands above the gods who clash in couples: his detached amusement is prominent when the poet announces the divine battle

§9. Book 22: Hektor's doom (22.166-87)

The climax leading to Hektor's death finds a crucial delaying moment in this swift assembly scene, which fills the time-lapse necessary for Achilles to chase Hektor three times around the walls.<sup>408</sup> The scene exploits the same register as 16.431-61, where Zeus considered Sarpedon's death in a dialogue with Here.<sup>409</sup> All the gods, however, are present here (22.166), and the broadening of the internal audience's horizon enhances the momentous importance of the event in order to sanction the duel's awaited outcome. In addition, the presence of the divine community accounts for the differences between the two scenes both in terms of Zeus' initial doubts and of his yielding.

Considering Zeus' sorrow for his son in Book 16, his pity for Hektor here is expanded by the description of the effects his gazing has on his heart: ἐμὸν δ' ὀλοφύρεται ἦτορ (22.169). In the case of Sarpedon, Zeus' affliction resulted in an internal debate that seemed to concern himself alone, whereas in the Book 22 assembly this is explicitly declared to the gods.<sup>410</sup> Zeus invites views without provocation or deceit (contrary to 4.14 ≈ 22.174), and, in spite of his lamenting heart, demonstrates that he is ἦπιος to Athene (22.183-84 = 8.39-40): he was not *truly* intentioned to save Troy and Hektor.<sup>411</sup> In this way, the poet brings to a conclusion the thread of divine narrative concerning Zeus and

---

(21.385-90), and his laughter concludes the entire episode (21.507b-8); back in Olympos, the gods sit around Zeus (21.518-20a).

<sup>408</sup> Cf. Schadewaldt (1959) 309; de Jong (2012) 101.

<sup>409</sup> On the scene in Book 22 see esp. Reinhardt (1961) 457-60, Erbse (1986) 288-90, Schäfer (1990) 149-50, Richardson (1993) 125-27, Kelly (2007) 71 n. 13, de Roguin (2007) 201-02, Heitsch (2008) 18-19, de Jong (2012) 101-06.

<sup>410</sup> 16.345-38: διχθὰ δέ μοι κραδίη μέμονε (...) ἦ μιν (...) θείω, ἦ (...) δαμάσσω. Zeus' doubts in Book 16 are shaped through the monologue form (16.433 ὃ μοι ἐγών), and the mention of his suffering is left to Here (16.450). In that scene the monologue form constitutes the first half of a dialogue; by contrast, when Zeus is in fact addressing Hektor and Akhilleus' horses, the poet says that he speaks to himself (17.200-201a ≈ 442-43a). Besides Zeus, Thetis is the only deity to have a monologue in the *Iliad*, lamenting Patroclus (18.54). On Homeric monologues see Schadewaldt (1938) 61-63, Fenik (1978), Medda (1983) 11-57, Di Benedetto (1998) 159-70. In all instances the motif signals that neither decision will be completely satisfactory: cf. Pattoni (1998), esp. 8-15 on 16.431-38, and Aceti (2008) 103-06.

<sup>411</sup> On this repetition see esp. Reinhardt (1961) 153, 459-60, Kelly (2007) 92, 387-88.

Athene in a manner concordant with the Trojan war's teleology, and ennobles Hektor's death through the pathos of the chief god.<sup>412</sup>

#### §10. Book 24: The ransom of Hektor (24.22-82; 98-120)

The divine assembly of the last Book is the longest in the *Iliad*. In diegetic terms, the Olympian scene sets the ground for the Book's content, which is well summarised in Zeus' words at 24.75b-76: ὤς κεν Ἀχιλλεὺς / δῶρων ἐκ Πριάμοιο λάχῃ ἀπό θ' Ἐκτορα λύσῃ.<sup>413</sup> The assembly has two parts (cf. below Ch. 9§4.2), the first being decision-making (24.31-76), the second executive (98-120).

The gods quarrel for twelve days about the possibility of sending Hermes to rescue Hektor's corpse from Akhilleus' savagery (24.23-30), but only the final, decisive discussion is portrayed. This comes with a tripartite structure displaying thesis, antithesis, and synthesis which is typical of juridically-oriented divine assemblies.<sup>414</sup>

Apollo's initial speech against the pro-Achaean deities (24.33-54) shows a divine concern for humankind phrased in distinct ethical terms,<sup>415</sup> particularly when the god accuses Akhilleus through the expressions ὀλοῶ Ἀχιλλῆϊ (24.39), (οὔτ' ἄρ) φρένες ...

---

<sup>412</sup> The convergence of these two strands may account for such contrasting comments on the scene as Edwards (1991) 127: "detached and stilted quality"; and Schäfer (1990) 150: Zeus powerfully shows "seine unerbittliche Gerechtigkeit und seine menschenfreundliche Fürsorge". Marks (2016) 68-69, 71-72 downplays the importance of Zeus' poignant involvement.

<sup>413</sup> See e.g. Reinhardt (1961) 471-74; Lohmann (1970) 152-54; Segal (1971a) 57-60; Davies (1981); Macleod (1982) 14-15, 32-33; 87-100; Erbse (1986) *passim* - see 314; Schäfer (1990) 153-56; Taplin (1992) 260-66; Richardson (1993) 272-73, 276-88; de Roguin (2007) 160-67; Brügger (2009) 22-63.

<sup>414</sup> Cf. *Od.* 8.305-59 (Ch. 6§3), *HHerm.* 322-96 (Ch. 7§2), and the tripartite structure of such debates as *Il.* 7.345-79 (Antenor, Priam, Paris), *Il.* 9.9-79 (Agamemnon, Diomedes, Nestor), 15.100-142 (Here, Ares, Athene). For a comparison with the Mesopotamian practice seen in Part 1 see Ch. 9§2.

<sup>415</sup> Apollo made the plot begin (1.32-54), and it is appropriate for him to set its conclusion in motion (Richardson 1993: 5-6). Apollo is both destructor and preserver - on the god in *epos* see e.g. Càssola (2010) 79-104; Tsagarakis (1977); *LfgrE* I.1095-106, *Il.*: 1102-03. (Mathiessen); Burkert (1985) 143-49; Erbse (1986) 169-84. He took care of Sarpedon's body, healed Hektor in Book 15, helped him uncountable times and protected him as long as he could (cf. 22.213b); and he will kill Akhilleus (e.g. 21.277-78; 22.359-60). Apollo has not taken part in the divine strife and has shown remarkably little interest in mortals, cf. 5.440-42, with Griffin (1978) 19, 21.462-67. Apollo's detachment emphasises, by contrast, his role in presenting pity and respect as the ultimate values of humankind, even more than his pro-Trojan stance.

ἐναΐσιμοι (40) and (οὔτε) νόημα / γναμπτόν (40-41).<sup>416</sup> However, Apollo's own compassion for humans plays a very limited part in his argument:<sup>417</sup> he asserts the necessity of the funeral in rather juridical terms.<sup>418</sup> The discourse on Akhilleus stresses that the infringement of the nexus between ἔλεος and αἰδώς (24.44), "pity and respect ... the keynotes of the whole of this Book" (Richardson 1993: 281), as a result of personal loss equals de-humanisation. Thus Apollo defines "endurance" (τλημοσύνη) as an essential human virtue (24.46-49). The consolation paradigm recurring through the divine narrative (losses of Ares 15.139-40 and Zeus 16.448-50) finds here a universal definition for mankind.

But Here is not to be easily persuaded by Apollo, and her answer (24.56-63) displays an inflexible hatred toward the Trojans.<sup>419</sup> She replies that Hektor cannot deserve the same treatment as Akhilleus, son of a goddess whom Here herself nurtured,<sup>420</sup> and undermines Apollo's authority by recalling his attendance at the wedding of Thetis and Peleus.<sup>421</sup>

Zeus masterfully plays the judge's part (24.65-76), accepting Apollo's point that Hektor deserves a burial, but reassuring Here about the different honours pertaining to the two heroes: precisely on account of Thetis, he states, there is no question of snatching away the

---

<sup>416</sup> Cf. Richardson (1993) 280 on ὄλοϜ Ἀχιλλῆϛ. Note, for νόημα / γναμπτόν, Phoenix's words in 9.513-14: ἀλλ' Ἀχιλεϛ πόρε καὶ σὺ Διὸς κούρησιν ἔπεσθαι / τιμὴν, ἣ τ' ἄλλων περ ἐπιγνάμπτει νόον ἐσθλῶν. Compare, on the divine plane, Iris' answer at 15.203: ἦ τι μεταστρέψεις; στρεπταὶ μὲν τε φρένες ἐσθλῶν. On further divine ramifications of this discourse on yielding see above n. 391.

<sup>417</sup> Note (24.36-37) the shift from the touching private dimension of the οἶκος (Andromache, 24.36) to the political sphere (λαοί, 24.37), passing through Hekabe (closer to Andromache), Astyanax (right at the centre, his persona implying both aspects, cf. 6.401-03; Kirk 1990: 212-13; Stoevesandt 2008: 130-31; Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 192) and Priam, his father and king. Compare Hektor's words referring the funeral's public aspect (22.242-43). The dualism between private and public is elsewhere exploited for the sake of pathos (besides Hektor's and Andromache's dialogue in Book 6, note the final words of her lament at 22.513-14): here the funeral is seen as a consolation encompassing the familiar and public dimensions.

<sup>418</sup> The gods who support Akhilleus are δηλήμονες (24.33). Δηλήμων is *hapax* in *epos*, though δηλέομαι is found often enough (8x *Il.*): in general it signals a "devastation/ruin", either physical or metaphorical (1.156, 14.102, 23.427), but in five instances it assumes a juridical value, signalling the breaking of oaths: 4.67, 72, 236, 271 in the formulaic nexus (πρότεροι) ὑπὲρ ὄρκια δηλήσασθαι / δηλήσαντο, cf. 3.107b Διὸς ὄρκια δηλήσῃται.

<sup>419</sup> Richardson (1993) 283. Here receives the present speech-introductory line (24.55, χολωσαμένη) only when reproaching Artemis at 21.280.

<sup>420</sup> The poet himself is possibly undermining her position, if Here's mention of Hekabe's mortal breast (24.58) recalls the queen's moving gesture at 22.79-80.

<sup>421</sup> On Here's allusion to Apollo's music at Thetis' wedding and *Aesch.* fr. 350 Radt see Burgess (2004).

body. Thus, Zeus preserves human and divine order. He is firm to Here that she should not be aggressive to the gods (24.65), but straightaway reassures her (24.66). Part of this characterisation which accommodates authority and agreeableness is that he does not mention here the divine anger against Akhilleus, but only later while instructing Thetis 24.113-15.<sup>422</sup> Similarly, Zeus' sanction of the values asserted by Apollo occurs only in his instructions to Iris directed to Priam (24.156-58 = 185-87, cf. Hekabe at 24.750), while his care emerges only in Iris' and Hermes' words to the old man (24.173a-74; 422-23).<sup>423</sup>

Compassion plays a major role in the second, executive part of this divine gathering (24.98-120), after Thetis' arrival. It is, in fact, a compassion among the gods which seals the divine narrative by concluding the undercurrent of *stasis* that began in Book 1. Thetis' inclusion in Olympos, albeit temporary, permits a portrayal of divine harmony and consolation, which make her journey worthwhile despite her initial reluctance (24.90-91). The divine narrative, which begins with Thetis coming secretly to Olympos and causing Here's rage, concludes with the Nereid's mournful return to the house of Zeus, this time among the gods (24.98-99), to be instructed by a sympathetic Zeus, given the seat beside him by Athene, and to be consoled by Here.<sup>424</sup>

A doleful harmony concludes the last divine strife of the *Iliad*, which does not obscure the persistence of the opposing divine forces. Apollo's speech does not silence the pro-Achaean deities, of whose hatred the poet has constantly been reminding us.<sup>425</sup> Zeus does achieve a compromise for the ransom to be carried out, but the cathartic role of Hektor's funeral, ultimately possible thanks to the divine intervention, cannot be separated from its

---

<sup>422</sup> Note the veiled way in which Zeus utters his order at 24.74: εἴ τις καλέσειε θεῶν "if one of the gods could just call...", a variation on the βάσκ' ἴθι commands, signalling urgency, he normally gives to Iris, cf. Kelly (2007) 324-25, and contrast esp. 8.399 and 15.158, tackling Here's rebellion and its effects.

<sup>423</sup> Cf. Lynn-George (1996) 9-10.

<sup>424</sup> Differently Griffin (1978) 12, for whom the poet is contrasting a deep mourning with divine frivolity. However, the handing of a cup (unless it is collective and reciprocal, 4.3-4) is always a divine gesture of friendship and solace and is always directed to Here, cf. 1.584-85 (Hephaistos) and 15.86-88 (the gods offer their cups, she accepts only Themis'). Cf. below Ch. 9§4.2.

<sup>425</sup> Here: 16.440-49, 18.360-67, 20.313-17; Poseidon: 20.16-18; Athene: 22.178-81; and esp. 24.25-30, on which see Reinhardt (1960) 16-36, Davies (1981), Wehr (2006), Mackie (2013).

role as a symbol of Troy's fall, which, again, is never forgotten as being the work of the gods. So too, while Zeus accords κῦδος to Akhilleus on account of Thetis (24.110, note Here's claim on his deserved τιμή), this is not divorced from his oncoming doom at the hands of Apollo (24.104-05). Thus, the chief god does grant the performance of the civic ritual at Troy and indirectly enables Akhilleus to demonstrate his ἔλεος and αἰδώς, but the gods remain divided and, as Akhilleus recognises (24.525-48), the ultimate source of grief.

### Concluding remarks

The grounding division between pro-Achaean and pro-Trojan deities, stemming from the *Parisurteil*, acquires a new dimension after Akhilleus' wrath and Thetis' request oblige Zeus to temporarily favour the Trojan side, and to stand in the way of Poseidon, Here and Athene. The manifold declensions and evolutions of this unexpected divine *stasis* constitute the backbone of the divine narrative we have attempted to reconstruct across the poem's numerous divine collective scenes.

At the same time, these assemblies play a fundamental role in signalling and directing the short-term goals of the narrative, by determining a divine intervention (or its preconditions), particularly in Book 4 (breaking of the truce), 5 (phases of Diomedes' *aristeia*), 8 (Achaean defeat), 15 (Trojan recovery), 20 (delaying Akhilleus, saving Aineias), 22 (Hektor's doom) and 24 (ransom of Hektor).

The determination of long-term events, even falling outside the *Iliad's* narrative boundaries, comes to the fore in Book 7 (the Achaean wall's destruction), foreshadowing the fortification's crucial role in the "reverse siege". The case of the Book 1 assembly is perhaps comparable, its main function being to highlight the importance of divine *stasis* for the development of the *Dios boule* (long-term goal), whilst the Olympian proceedings do not have an immediate consequence, as the deceptive dream is unconnected to the

divine assembly. That these are not mutually exclusive functions is shown by the Book 4 assembly, having both a short-term goal (Athene's intervention), and broader scope in sealing (again) the fate of Troy, something the audience is to keep in mind in view of Zeus' forthcoming and temporary subversion of this aim.

A fundamental aspect of the poet's handling of these assemblies is how they hold the entire course of the poem together through long-distance connections. First, the assemblies in Book 8 and 20 signal the beginning and end of Zeus' withdrawal and ban on divine intervention which mark his help of the Trojans. Those in Book 4 and 22, then, signal the beginning and the end of the fight depicted in the poem, and connect the fate of Troy to the fate of Hektor. Finally, the scenes in Books 1 and 24, both featuring Thetis (even *in absentia*), mark the beginning and end of the entire plot. Some of these connections, including verbal parallels, have emerged during this chapter. As we focus more deeply on poetic technique (Chapter 9), it will be seen that these structural connections extend to and are reinforced by precise and recurring compositional patterns. But let us first turn to the overall narrative and compositional function of the divine assemblies in the *Odyssey*, and in the rest of early Greek *epos*.

## Chapter 6: *Odyssey*

Scholarship is recalibrating the established idea that the *Odyssey* offers a radically different picture of the gods from that in the *Iliad*, especially in its conception of divine justice.<sup>426</sup> The *Odyssey* does not attest to a conceptual or spiritual evolution from amoral and selfish gods to moral avengers who punish the wrong-doers. The important differences at work, instead, are best appreciated when connected to the poet's choices concerning the subject of his large scale representation.<sup>427</sup> Just as the *Odyssey* differs from the *Iliad* in subject-matter, structure, and ethos, so do the two poems' narrative theologies.

In the *Iliad*, the clash between conflicting divine agendas throughout the poem interacts with the war on earth, as the Iliadic gods are split pretty evenly according to their favoured side. Through its imposing divine machinery and numerous divine scenes, the *Iliad* gives a cosmic framework fitting the monumental proportions of the Trojan war, as conflict in Olympus generates a semi-autonomous line of discourse that constantly conducts the general action.

The *Odyssey* presents us with a far simpler cast of divine characters, whose interactions do not generate a divine sub-plot in the Iliadic sense. Moreover, strife among the gods is virtually absent, as the poet avoids a direct clash between the deities' conflicting interests.<sup>428</sup> When conflict surfaces, it is easily settled. Zeus allows Athene to set Odysseus' *nostos* moving by stating that Poseidon's opposition will not constitute a major issue henceforth (1.76-79). When the two brothers finally meet (Book 13), *le jeux sont faits*, as Poseidon deferentially acknowledges (13.132b-33): there is nothing left to do

---

<sup>426</sup> Jaeger (1926) 73-74 and Pasquali (1929).

<sup>427</sup> Though this case was made earlier, notably by Rutherford (1986) 147-48, see now Allan (2006) 15-27, with previous literature, and cf. e.g. Marks (2008) 21, Louden (2010) 14-15, Saïd (2011) 344-54, Versnel (2011) 151-79, Bakker (2013) 114-34, M. L. West (2014) 48-50.

<sup>428</sup> "Nicht einmal die Rivalen, nicht einmal Athene und Poseidon stoßen aufeinander." So Reinhardt (1948) 47. Athene's words at 13.339-43 are the explicit manifesto of this attitude: this is not in itself an Odyssean innovation (e.g. *Il.* 8.208-10, 14.244-48, 21.499-98), but the avoidance or immediate resolution of divine conflict is systematic in the *Odyssey*: even Hephaistos and Ares must find a legal settlement.

against Odysseus. In the *Apologoi*, Helios' threatening request to Zeus (12.374-90) smoothly becomes a function of the chief god's plan: by effecting Odysseus' ultimate separation from his doomed comrades, Zeus sanctions the hero's innocence, thereby compensating the consequences of his encounter with Polyphemos.<sup>429</sup> Odysseus does suffer, but this will ultimately lead to his homecoming in safety and richness according to the plan of Zeus. In this way, the consequences of Poseidon's hatred are integrated into the chief god's overarching plan.

This divine agreement matches the poem's prominent focus on *tisis* and restoration: all the divine dialogues are concerned with matters of compensation, human or divine, which is always granted.<sup>430</sup> Zeus' unstirred and peaceful control over cosmic balance and Olympian harmony remains consistent throughout the poem, which is only highlighted by the threatening tone of Helios' request. While paying each god his share, Zeus is able to ensure the fulfilment of what must happen without most of the intra-Olympian obstacles he faced in the *Iliad*.<sup>431</sup> And indeed, as Demodokos' second song in Book 8 shows, a proper balance is established even in Zeus' absence. Thereby, the divine machinery sanctions the poem's ethical foundations.

There are only six Olympian scenes in the *Odyssey*, occurring in Books 1, 5, 8, 12, 13 and 24. Apart from the scene in Book 8, which relates events falling outside the poem's narrative scope, all these dialogues present only two speakers: a deity (Athene, Helios or Poseidon) raises a complaint to Zeus, who assents to a course of action that satisfies the

---

<sup>429</sup> See Bakker (2013) 114-34.

<sup>430</sup> Except, of course, in the cases of the suitors' relatives in Book 24. In the *Iliad*, the idea of peace and order in Olympos is contemplated as a pendant to the ongoing conflict: so is *tisis* also, which is not always possible to achieve in the context of war. Thus, Ares must "cease his anger" (15.138 μεθέμεν χόλον), which implies that *tisis* for his dead son (15.116) cannot be achieved. In the *Odyssey*, Poseidon too will have to "cease his anger" 1.77-78 (μεθήσει / ὄν χόλον), but this does not imply that his *tisis* is unfulfilled (13.144: σοὶ δ' ἔστι καὶ ἔξοπίσω τίσις αἰεὶ, says Zeus to him).

<sup>431</sup> Cf. Rüter (1969) 56-7: "Während hinter dem Geschehen der Ilias von Angang an und immer wieder der Götterstreit steht, zeigt die Odyssee die grösste Eintracht unter den Göttern (...) Der Krieg beherrscht die ganze Ilias, die Odyssee dagegen wendet sich vom Kriege ab; er ist vorüber, und es geht um die Überwindung seiner Folgen, um Heimkehr und Wiederherstellung von Ordnung und Frieden."

interlocutor.<sup>432</sup> Only the scenes in Books 1, 5, 8, and 12 may be termed divine assemblies: those at 13.125-69 and 24.472-87 are in one-to-one dialogue form, with no hint at all whether the conversation is to be imagined among the other gods, or apart from them. This chapter considers the four scenes of assembly, and examines how they contribute to the construction of the plot as well as to the poem's theodicy.

### §1. Foundational perspectives (Od. 1.16-96)

The first is also the longest divine scene of the poem. Though all the gods except Poseidon are present (1.26-27), only Zeus and Athene talk, each making two speeches. The absent figure, however, is evoked both in the scene-introduction (1.20-26) and in the ensuing dialogue (1.68-79).

After a detailed introduction (1.16-28), the scene first presents the *Odyssey's* theodicy with the Aigisthos-exemplum (1.29-47, σφῆσιν ἀτασθαλίησιν at 1.37 echoing σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίησιν at 1.7, on the crew). Athene (1.48-62) and Zeus (1.65-75) then inform the audience about the theological reasons for the hero's current condition. Finally, Athene announces the divine course of action, coinciding with the narrator's plan (1.84-95). The preparation and departure sequence moves the scene to earth (1.96-102).

#### §1.1. Setting the scene (1.11-28)

The ten-line proem is connected to the divine assembly, the poem's first scene, by a concise account of Odysseus' current state (1.11-15) and of the underlying theological circumstances (1.16-21). The divine assembly constitutes a detailed expansion of these two elements.

---

<sup>432</sup> Hölscher (1988) 76, cf. Marks (2008) 159-66. Also in Book 8 the complaint is made to Zeus (8.306), though he is absent from the scene.

Poseidon's absence permits the gods to set things in motion.<sup>433</sup> In these transitional lines, the poet connects Odysseus' isolation with that of his divine opponent Poseidon, who alone obstructs the hero's return.<sup>434</sup> The temporary isolation of a main character, human or divine, typically triggers early Greek epic narratives.<sup>435</sup> Zeus' isolation in the *Iliad* opened the path of divine *stasis*, but Poseidon's isolation here, matched by his physical absence,<sup>436</sup> constitutes the precondition for the unanimous resolution. When the assembly scene is finally presented, the gods are defined as being everyone "other" than Poseidon (1.26-28).<sup>437</sup>

### §1.2. The long dialogue (1.28-96).

The divine conversation informs the audience on three points.<sup>438</sup> First we learn how the gods regard reckless humans who ignore divine advice, and what happens to them (1.28-47),<sup>439</sup> second, we learn about where Odysseus is at present and why (1.48-75); third, and most crucially, we are told how the gods, especially Athene, will handle his return and set the ground for it (1.76-95). All this is given under the cover of a very carefully constructed dialogue. The tone of Zeus' initial remark on Aigisthos appears almost casual,<sup>440</sup> but

---

<sup>433</sup> Cf. Σ c in 1.16: ὁ καιρὸς παρεγένετο (M<sup>a</sup>). ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ (1.16a), a most common formula (figures in Latacz *et al.* 2000: 161), usually signals some climactic turning point, cf. e.g. Di Benedetto (1998) 227-29, 278-79. In a divine context cf. e.g. *Il.* 1.493 = 24.31 (introducing the first and last Olympian scenes); 8.23 (Zeus) "But if I truly wanted to..."; *Od.* 5.55 (turning point in Zeus's prophecy); *HHerm.* 10 (Hermes is born), marking a similar transition between the proem and the narrative.

<sup>434</sup> Cf. Rüter (1969) 39-43, 53. (11) ἐνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες ... (13) τὸν δ' οἶον... // (19) θεοὶ δ' ἐλέαιρον ἄπαντες ... (20) νόσφι Ποσειδάωνος.

<sup>435</sup> *Iliad*: Akhilleus (and Zeus); *Odyssey*: Odysseus (and Poseidon); *HDem.* Persephone (and Demeter); *HAp.*: Leto; *HAphr.*: Aphrodite (and Anchises); *HHerm.*: Maia (and Hermes). This need not necessarily be part of a thorough "withdrawal, devastation and return" pattern, on which see esp. Lord (1960) 186-97, M.L. Lord (1967), Nagler (1974) 131-66, cf. Kelly (2007) 97, above n. 349, below Ch. 7§1.2, §1.4.

<sup>436</sup> The "travel to the Ethiops" motif is also exploited at *Iliad* 1.423-25 with an opposite (delaying) function. See e.g. Rüter (1969) 55-56, Latacz (1991), S. West (1988) 74-75, Scodel (2007).

<sup>437</sup> Compare how the *Iliad*'s first assembly (1.533-35) is introduced by stressing the opposition between Zeus and *all* the gods, see further below Ch. 7§1.2.

<sup>438</sup> Cf. Danek (1998a) 41, de Jong (2001) 10, Romano Martín (2009) 54-56.

<sup>439</sup> Among the many treatments of this famous speech and its implications see especially Jaeger (1926), Dodds (1951) 31-33, 52 n. 21; Lord (1960) 159-60; Lloyd-Jones (1983) 28-36; Fenik (1974) 209-18; Clay (1983) 215-28; Erbse (1986) 237-41; S. West (1988) 76-80; Olson (1995) 24-42; Danek (1998a) 41-42; de Jong (2001) 11-14; Schmidt (2001); Allan (2006) 16-17; Marks (2008) 17-35.

<sup>440</sup> Cf. S. West (1981) 189 ≈ (1988) 74-75.

Athene draws his attention to Odysseus by stressing her personal care for the hero, and lingering on an empathic description of his sorrowful condition and well-known (she claims, cf. Danek 1998a: 43) piety.<sup>441</sup> Zeus' subsequent account of Poseidon, halfway between an apology and a rebuke to his impatient daughter, his dismissal of the potential divine trouble, and his collective invitation at 1.76-77a, all give way to Athene, who is finally able to expose her plan.<sup>442</sup> Her plan, in turn, whilst foreshadowing how Odysseus' return will be set in motion, eventually introduces Telemachos, thus beginning in effect the Telemachy.

It has long caused concern that the first part of Athene's plan (Hermes should be sent to Ogygie, 1.84-87), is not carried out until the start of Book 5. In spite of the gods' weaving, the return is again postponed as the focus turns to Ithaca and Telemachos. Analysts considered this leap an oddity betraying the intervention of later hand(s) that would have woven the Telemachy into the "original" poet's design.<sup>443</sup> Such perspectives have largely been abandoned, as the poet's reshaping of traditional techniques preparing for the postponement has been recognized, especially by A. Heubeck.<sup>444</sup> Even so, it is still worth

---

<sup>441</sup> The *iunctura* μοί...δαίεται ἦτορ (1.48) aligns with those expressions of distress over someone else's difficulties, whether or not an intervention eventuates, often with ὀλοφύρομαι, the closest being *Il.* 16.450b = 22.184b ὀλοφύρεται ἦτορ, cf. (divine distress) *Il.* 8.33 = 464, 8.202, 8.245 = 17.648, 15.144, 16.450, 18.72, *Od.* 4.719, 10.157.

<sup>442</sup> Concluding his speech (1.76-79), Zeus proposes collective deliberation by picking up the contrast between all the gods and Poseidon: they are able to decide without (and against) Poseidon as he cannot oppose the divine community *as a whole*. Contrast *Il.* 8.18-27 (above Ch. 5§5), where Zeus claims *he* would be able to deal easily with all the gods together, should they dare go against him (for this motif cf. also *Od.* 21.369-75). As for Zeus proposing collective deliberation, cf. *Il.* 4.14-19 and 22.174-76: in both cases the chief god clearly knows where he is heading. In the *Odyssey*, instead, there is more room for Athene to establish her own plan, of course under her father's supervision, cf. 5.23-24 = 24.479-80; below n. 470.

<sup>443</sup> E.g. Kirchhoff (1879) 167-68, Wilamowitz (1927) 1, von der Mühl (1940) 701-02, more analytical literature in Heubeck (1954) 50 n. 74, Page (1955) 73; the last significant attempt seems to have been Schadewaldt (1958), for a thorough response to whom see Hölscher (1988) 77-86. Cf. below §2.1.

<sup>444</sup> Heubeck (1954) 40-52: the poet applies to an unprecedented scale the "doppelsträngige Überleitung" technique visible, in divine contexts, in *Il.* 15 and 24. See Rüter (1969) 95-98 and Hölscher (1988) 82-84 for further comparison with the Iliadic technique, and further below §2.1. on Zielinski's law. Heubeck envisaged the parallel in terms of *aemulatio*, but this is unnecessary: cf. M. L. West (2011) 91 for other examples; on a smaller scale, Rüter (1969) 101-02 notes that the apparently forgotten (but in fact postponed) effectuation of the first part of the plan here belongs to a narrative strategy which is consistently visible in other major Odyssean postponements (4.594-623, 15.56 ff. and 7.237 ff., 9.16 ff.), cf. Hölscher (1988) 79-80. The technique had not been understood as such by Analysts, e.g. Kirchhoff (1879) 190-93 (on 4.598 ff., on which see e.g. Hölscher 1939: 25-26, Bona 1966: 215-19) and 277-79, 502-04 (on 7.237-39), whose argument here

considering the narrative mechanisms at work here, as it is by this drastic but carefully worked out narrative choice that the poet surprised his audience.

The Telemachy describes the intolerable situation in Ithaca, and demonstrates the suitors' injustice (Books 1-2, 4.566-end); then (3.1-4.624) it gives the audience a broader perspective on the *nostoi* and marks Telemachos' growth as he, under Athene's guide, comes into contact with his father's peers Nestor and Menelaos, both of whom condemn the suitors.<sup>445</sup> Crucially, the injustice of the suitors and the punishment awaiting them is divinely sanctioned throughout the Telemachy.<sup>446</sup>

Besides starting the Telemachy, however, the first assembly also sets the ground for the entire *Odyssey*. Therefore, the poet takes care to give as much information as possible about Odysseus and his return, for the audience would not hear the enactment of his *nostos* until after a long interval. Indeed, the extra- (or pre-) Ithacan material ("external *nostos*"), occupies the central two-thirds of the conversation (1.48-87).<sup>447</sup>

While considering that the two lines of discourse are treated separately and that the "home" theme ("internal *nostos*") frames the details about Odysseus,<sup>448</sup> it is worth noting the different quality of the relevant information provided. Zeus' paradigmatic narrative on

---

is picked up by M. L. West (2014) 189 n. 67 in a Unitarian perspective. One may add that it is typical, in messenger-sending scenes, for the "relay to be employed as a binding technique for widely disparate events" (Kelly 2007: 325, e.g. Hektor's journey to Ilion in *Il.* 6, Patroklos stuck with Eurypylos during *Il.* 11-16), though in these cases (unlike in the *Odyssey*'s assembly) the precise instructions are immediately given by the sender.

<sup>445</sup> On the function of the Telemachy see esp. Klingner (1944) and Reinhardt (1948) 37-51; more recently e.g. S. West (1988) 51-66, Patzer (1991), Heath (2001), Rengakos (2002), Schmidt (2003), Saïd (2011) 132-49, M. L. West (2014) 102-113.

<sup>446</sup> A selection from the pervasive chain of passages sanctioning the gods' intentions in different ways is 1.267-69a, 299-300 (Athene to Telemachos); 378-80, 390 (Telemachos alludes to the gods as helpers, whom he may invoke); 2.143-76 (Telemachos invokes the gods, Zeus sends the eagles to sanction his help, Halitherses interprets the omen correctly); 281-84 (Mentor/Athene sanctions the suitor's injustice and foreshadows their doom); 372 (Telemachos tells Eurykleia a god is with him); 3.205-38 (Telemachos laments to Nestor, the old man hints at Athene's help, but Telemachos is discouraged: Mentor/Athene rebukes him); 4.795-841 (Iphthime's *eidolon*, sent by Athene, comes to reassure Penelope). On how the poet works out the sanction of the suitor's injustice add esp. Rüter (1969) 204-24 and Erbse (1972) 113-42 to the literature in the preceding footnote.

<sup>447</sup> Of the whole exchange (1.32-95), Odysseus' situation concerned verses 48-87, Aigisthos' paradigm verses 32-47, Ithaca and Telemachos verses 88-95.

<sup>448</sup> Schadewaldt (1958) 23 writes about "äussere" and "innere Heimkehr". The thematic "encircling" visible here is typical, cf. (on divine scenes) Lohmann (1970) 150-56. For a different perspective cf. de Jong (2001) 10-11 ("domino form").

Aigisthos is self-contained, and connected to the Ithacan context only indirectly.<sup>449</sup> Athene's concise reply maintains this generic, indefinite tone (1.45-46), although it sounds most ominous in its lapidary conclusion (1.47).<sup>450</sup> Only at the very end of the conversation does she deal with Ithaca and the suitors (1.87-95). Her speech has a catalogue form and expository function, paralleled by Zeus' "prophecy" in 5.32-42 (below §2.3).<sup>451</sup> Strikingly, the suitors are here denoted by one and a half lines only, which, incidentally, do not seem aimed at putting them in the darkest light possible (1.91b-92 οἱ τέ οἱ αἰεὶ / μῆλ' ἀδινὰ σφάζουσι καὶ εἰλίποδας ἔλικας βοῦς). While the Telemachy is aptly summarized right before its beginning, the audience is not given details on its significance.

On the other hand, Athene's description of the hero's piety and suffering as well as Zeus' detailed treatment of Poseidon's anger give a strong, memorable perspective on the "external *nostos*". Clearly, the poet wanted his audience to keep in mind the news about Odysseus, to whom he would return only after the Telemachy. Instead the injustice of the suitors, which constitutes the main theological point developed in the Telemachy, is only hinted at allusively at the beginning of the conversation – because it is about to be accounted for in detail.<sup>452</sup>

This should be understood as an aspect of poetic technique, possibly related to the conditions of epic performance. Note, for instance, that in introducing the divine assembly the poet takes care to stress that Poseidon labours against Odysseus (1.20b-21), but he does not tell his audience why: this is left to Zeus (1.68-75). Similarly, the poet tells his

---

<sup>449</sup> See above n. 439.

<sup>450</sup> ὡς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι. cf. Σ *ad* 1.27: ἐμφαίνει [*viz.* Athene] τοὺς μνηστῆρας.

<sup>451</sup> Cf. e.g. Schadewaldt (1958) 17; de Jong (2001) 15-16.

<sup>452</sup> On the gods and the suitors in the Telemachy cf. above nn. 445-46. Cf. e.g. Krischer (1971) 104: "Der Hörer soll wissen, dass die Handlung nun in zwei getrennten Strängen verläuft, damit er, während der erste Strang abläuft, den zweiten *erwartet*." (my emphasis). For Danek (1998a) 47 this "knappe Nennung der Freier" is telling of the ancient audience's awareness of the suitor's traditional role in the story.

audience that Odysseus is with Kalypso, "who desired him as husband" (1.15b), but leaves it to Athene to comment on what this means for the hero (1.48-59).<sup>453</sup>

The plans of Athene and of the narrator are both twofold and developed in two "branches", to be ultimately put again together with the encounter between a more experienced Telemachos and a finally returned Odysseus. Both Athene and the narrator will take care of this. The first assembly scene is constructed in a way which strongly points to a conscious attempt at focusing primarily and more extensively on those events and themes to be dealt with much later. As we are about to see, the same technique recurs, with a mirroring inversion, in the second assembly, as Zeus finally gives way to the return of Odysseus.

## §2. Sending Hermes (5.1-49)

The *Odyssey's* second divine assembly has long attracted scholarly criticism.<sup>454</sup> The transition between the Telemachy and Odysseus' homecoming was considered by some to be at best poorly achieved, and the assembly an unnecessary repetition of the first one, where the sending of Hermes had already been established. Moreover, in light of Zielinski's law, the narrative blending seemed remarkably unnatural, the unproven assumption being that the two assemblies were meant to be seen as contemporary, or at least two consecutive parts of a single event, since Telemachos' journey (Books 2-4) and Odysseus' wanderings from Ogygia to Scheria (Books 5-13) occurred simultaneously.<sup>455</sup> Thus, the suspicious assembly proved the (incompetent) insertion of the Telemachy,<sup>456</sup> and

---

<sup>453</sup> Cf. Harden and Kelly (2014) 10-11: "the actual point of beginning [of the plot] need not follow directly on the material outlined in the advertisement [section of the epic proem]".

<sup>454</sup> The first analytical treatment of the two scenes seems to have been Müller (1824) [(1836)<sup>2</sup> 108-110], the most influential Kirchhoff (1879) 196-97.

<sup>455</sup> Interestingly, Zielinski wanted to explain the poet's technique without condemning it: cf. Zielinski (1899-1901) 444-45 on the temporal relation between our two scenes.

<sup>456</sup> E.g. Wilamowitz (1927) 1-2; Focke (1943) 74-78; further analytical literature in Hainsworth (1988) 253.

continued to be regarded as faulty even after a separate origin for Books 1-4 ceased to be widely accepted.<sup>457</sup>

Concerning Athene's speech in 5.7-20, which is construed with lines occurring elsewhere, careful study of Homeric *iterata* (especially in the *Odyssey*) has shown that there is really nothing extraordinary therein.<sup>458</sup> As to the managing of narrative time, a more nuanced picture has emerged which takes the techniques of oral performance into account.<sup>459</sup> Thus, recent scholarship is not troubled by the temporal gap between Athene's departure in Book 1 and Zeus' order to Hermes in Book 5, whether the application of Zielinski's principle to this case is accepted or not.<sup>460</sup> I align with those who think the divine assembly is clearly meant to happen several days (six) *after* the first one, which would not have disturbed an ancient audience.<sup>461</sup>

The assembly's content, though, has received less attention, as the judgments of Analysts and the debate on Zielinski's principle influenced critics into thinking that the two scenes were one, or, as a recent monograph puts it, "conceptually the same".<sup>462</sup> In fact, the assembly is best understood as being neither a repetition nor a kind of rhetorical "repair

---

<sup>457</sup> E.g. Page (1955) 52-81, part. 70-73.

<sup>458</sup> Apthorp (1977).

<sup>459</sup> On Zielinski's "law" (better "rule"), based on Zielinski (1899-1901) see, more or less favouring it: Delebecque (1958), Fenik (1968) 37-39, Krischer (1971) 91-129, Whitman and Scodel (1981), Hainsworth (1988) 251-53, Richardson (1990) 90-92, Olson (1995) 91-119, Graziosi (2013) 18-23. More or less radical reassessments: Patzer (1990), Rengakos (1995) and (1998), Danek (1998b), Nünlist (1998), de Jong (2001) 589-90, Scodel (2008b), Bakker (2011).

<sup>460</sup> E.g. Latacz (1996) 142, de Jong (2001) 123-24, Marks (2008) 38, Scodel (2008b) 115, M. L. West (2014) 111-13. Cf. already Reinhardt (1948) 87-89; on the temporal sequence see also Dyson (1970) 5-7.

<sup>461</sup> de Jong (2001) 587-88 and M. L. West (2014) 112-13 tabulate the *Odyssey's* days. If Odysseus' return begins when Telemachos is already in Sparta, the latter's stay there (never accounted for by the narrator) lengthens up to a month; but it would be lengthy enough even if Hermes' and Athene's departures were contemporary.

<sup>462</sup> Marks (2008) 37; cf. Bakker (2011) 878 "the divine assembly is duplicated"; *contra* e.g. de Jong (2001) 124, M. L. West (2014) 111, 176.

mechanism", but as effectively fulfilling a necessary function in narrative and theological terms.<sup>463</sup>

### §2.1. Setting the scene: the end of the Telemachy (4.624-847)

To contextualize the scene we must consider the end of Book 4.<sup>464</sup> At 4.624-25, the focus turns to Ithaca, and the end of the book shifts continuously from the suitors to Penelope and *vice versa*.<sup>465</sup> Penelope reaches a peak of anxiety as the suitors plot her son's death and Medon makes her aware of his absence. Rather sinisterly, the Telemachy concludes with the suitors lying in ambush at night. A thread concerning the divine response to human expectations underpins this narrative, which finds its first resolution in the divine assembly.

With opposing intentions, Zeus is twice invoked concerning Telemachos' return, by Antinoos (4.667-68) and Medon (4.699). The suitors cannot realise which side Zeus will favour, just as they were blind to his signals during the Ithacan assembly (2.141-211). Their plot becomes the most patent sign of their injustice, already made clear to the audience, in terms of impiety, in the first part of Book 2. Concerning Telemachos, Penelope (and the audience) finds positive responses first in Eurykleia's advice to pray and trust the gods (4.750-57), then with the dream sent by Athene. However, Penelope's anxiety and the audience's curiosity about Odysseus are not settled by the goddess' elusiveness: the poet will not yet let her talk about the matter (4.836-37).

The ironic deployment of the divine element through varying degrees of awareness between the audience and the characters, thus, contributes to rounding off the theme of the suitors' injustice developed in the Telemachy, raising, at the same time, expectations about

---

<sup>463</sup> Quote from Bakker (2011) 878. Valuable discussions of the scene's function beyond the sending of Hermes are Reinhardt (1948) 87-89; Heubeck (1954) 40-54; Dyson (1970); Erbse (1972) 127-31; Hölscher (1988) 78-93; de Jong (2001) 123-27.

<sup>464</sup> Cf. Hölscher (1939) 30-31 on the importance of Penelope's dream, part "jenes größeren Szenenwechsels, den die zweite Götterversammlung markiert: von Ithaka zu Odysseus".

<sup>465</sup> On this "interlace technique" cf. de Jong (2001) xiv n. 25.

Odysseus. Such expectations are partly fulfilled by the ensuing Olympic scene, which starts the hero's return.

## §2.2. The short dialogue (5.1-27)

The assembly's dawn start (5.1-2) signals that the crucial moment has finally come.<sup>466</sup> The exceptional expression defining the assembly (θῶκος 5.3, "seat" hence "council place") indicates the decision-making nature of the gathering.<sup>467</sup> Here we find two speeches; as Athene starts the dialogue, Zeus has the last word, finally setting the *nostos* in motion. This represents a first inversion on the pattern of the Book 1 assembly, displaying four consecutive speeches, where Zeus began and Athene concluded. In both cases, nonetheless, the speech stems from memory (μνήσατο γάρ 1.29, μνησαμένη 5.6). Zeus' remembrance introduced the Aigisthos paradigm (internal *nostos*, "Ithaca theme"), Athene's introduces Odysseus' "many cares" (external *nostos*, "pre-Ithaca theme").<sup>468</sup> Both subjects are thus straightforwardly connected to the events to be narrated after the assembly. And yet, just as the first scene focused more on the external *nostos* than on the suitors (as we may have expected), so too here Athene's *rhexis*, whilst urging her interlocutors to consider Odysseus, works in effect as a summary of the main points established in the Telemachy, particularly concerning Ithaca and the suitors.<sup>469</sup> In the first assembly introducing the Telemachy, the Ithaca theme was treated in a relatively short

---

<sup>466</sup> Cf. Dyson (1970) 5-7, Hainsworth (1988) 254, de Jong (2001) 124; see Kelly (2007) 69-70 on assemblies and times of the day. Compare *Il.* 8.1ff., just as Zeus finally picks up the thread of his plan against the Achaeans, and *HHerm.* 326, where Hermes finally reaches Olympos.

<sup>467</sup> θῶκος ("seat" hence "council place") is only here used in *epos* for a divine gathering, though cf. *HAp.* 345 and [Hes.] fr. 1.6 M-W (above n. 341), Ch. 9§1. The term is absent from the *Iliad*, but the Odyssean parallels point to a restricted body, defined in opposition with larger gatherings (2.26 and 15.468, in contrast to ἀγορή and the δήμοιο φῆμις respectively); for this distinction in the *Iliad* cf. Raaflaub (2011a).

<sup>468</sup> On the connection with Zeus' speech in Book 1 cf. Pucci (1987) 19-23. On μμνήσκομαι in *epos*, a key word for the act of poetry, see Moran (1971), (1975), *LfgreE* III.216 (Schmidt), Metcalf (2015a) 142-50, Nikkanen (2015). μνησαμένη, used absolutely, complies with the fact that everything she is about to relate was covered in the Telemachy, adding a touch of pathos in Athene's concern: when the middle aorist participle is found equally isolated at verse-start, it always explains the cause for the emotion expressed, which is always pain derived from recalling to one's memory distant people or events. Cf. *Il.* 19.314; *Od.* 12.309; 19.118; most explicitly *Od.* 4.106 (μνωομένη); cf. *HAp.* 150.

<sup>469</sup> de Jong (2001) 125. Cf. Hainsworth (1988) 254 on λέγε at 5.5.

compass, and without detail; it is here that the divine conversation gives significance to the (now fully depicted) situation in Ithaca. Indeed, Zeus' reply (now) explicitly condemns the suitors by sealing their destiny (5.23-24),<sup>470</sup> while reassuring the audience about Telemachos.<sup>471</sup>

Athene's *rhexis* is threefold, touching on Ithacan politics (5.8-12), Odysseus stuck in Ogygie (5.13-17), and the suitors' plot (5.18-20). The lines on Odysseus himself stand between those on Ithaca and Telemachos:<sup>472</sup> the first assembly displayed (on a larger scale and across several speeches) the same "encircling", but the divine evaluation centred on Odysseus' state; in Book 5 it centres on Ithaca.<sup>473</sup>

The cento nature of Athene's speech casts the Telemachy under the light of the suitors' injustice. The Ithacan assembly (5.8-12) is evoked through the words that defined the social corruption in Ithaca as irrecoverable on present conditions; Telemachos' journey is connected to the suitors' murderous plans (5.18-20).<sup>474</sup> On the other hand, Odysseus' condition, soon to become the focus of the narrative, is here treated in a shorter compass and in a matter-of-fact manner (i.e. without expounding on its significance, but only to

---

<sup>470</sup> To de Jong (2001) 126 here "Zeus is irritated." However, irritation is not prominent in the speeches starting with *ποιῶν σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων* (3.230, 19.492, 21.168, 23.70). It is different in the *Iliad*, but there the speaker's mood is signalled through the speech-introduction (*Il.* 4.349-50 = 14.82-83). Better Reinhardt (1960) 71 "leicht erstaunte Frage", which however obscures Zeus' superior awareness. On the benign irony of these lines cf. Marks (2008) 38-39, rightly comparing the scene in Book 24 (as civil strife is about to explode in Ithaca, Athene asks Zeus what are his plans, where 5.21, 23-24 = 24.477, 479-80): "In both scenes Zeus downplays his own role in the formulation of a workable plan by declaring Athene to be the guiding force, even as he takes control of the situation." Virtually the same happens in the *Iliad*, where Zeus' answer to a complaining Athene is *verbatim* repeated at two crucial points: when Zeus starts to put his plan in motion and when Hektor's doom is sanctioned (*Il.* 8.38-40 = 22.182-84). Cf. Chs. 5§9, 10§4, and note that *ἔρξον ὅπως ἐθέλεις* at *Od.* 24.481a ≈ *ἔρξον ὅπη δὴ τοι νόος ἔπλετο* at *Il.* 22.185a, both phrases following the repeated couplet. On the special bond between Zeus and Athene when it comes to handling the course of events cf. Kelly (2007) 422-24; also Elmer (2013) 159-61.

<sup>471</sup> Note, as part of this strategy, the insistence on the Athene's ability: *δύνασαι γάρ* in 5.25b carries on the conceptual thread developed in 4.753 (Eurykleia) and 4.827b (*δύναται γάρ*, Iphtime on Athene).

<sup>472</sup> Σ HOP<sup>1</sup>T in 5.3: *ἐν μέσῳ δὲ κατετέθη τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως*.

<sup>473</sup> Cf. Reinhardt (1948) 88: "die Sorge um Telemachos hier ebenso hinausgeschoben wird wie nach dem ersten Götterrat die Sorge um Odysseus".

<sup>474</sup> 5.8-12 = Mentor's words in 2.230-34, the last rightful speech at the assembly: note that Mentor's reasoning has been recently recalled by Penelope's wary address to Medon (4.685-95). Athene herself has been disguised as Mentor during the Telemachy (as she will be in the poem's conclusion, cf. 24.548), remarkably so after Mentor's speech in the assembly; 5.18-20 = Medon's words to Penelope at 4.700-02, with the apt variation 4.700 ≠ 5.18.

inform the audience): the lines on Odysseus repeat Proteus' news to Menelaos (5.14-17 = 4.557-60). Athene (as previously Proteus/Menelaos) relates facts, not interpretations: contrast 1.48-62, where her empathetic discourse, as we have seen, focuses on the hero's feelings.

We can see, therefore, that the same technique governs the disposition of the contents of the two father-daughter conversations. What is soon to be treated in detail (in Book 1: the Ithaca theme; in Book 5: the external *nostos*) is discussed in an informative but concise manner. What is reserved, instead, for the moment when the narrator will reintroduce that thread (in Book 1: the external *nostos*; in Book 5: the Ithaca theme), is treated more fully and expounded in its significance.

Still, there is a major difference between the two assemblies. In spite (or by virtue) of the careful "encircling" structure, the facts in Ithaca and Odysseus' return were not connected to each other in the first assembly. Here, however, Athene's catalogue of the κήδεα πόλλ' Ὀδυσῆος becomes a summary of the Telemachy: the two thematic threads that were separated in the first assembly are here brought together, for Athene's argument in favour of Odysseus' return revolves *in toto* around the situation in Ithaca.<sup>475</sup> The Ithacans "do not remember" Odysseus (οὔ τις μέμνηται); Athene does, and by connecting this line of discourse with the hero's distance from Ithaca (ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν νήσῳ κεῖται 5.13), points to the solution.<sup>476</sup> Thus, Athene's speech makes the poet's plan explicit: the Telemachy has made the return of Odysseus as urgent and necessary as it could be. The busy goddess who was not in the position to reassure Penelope that her son and husband were both returning (4.836-37), has now brought the case in its fully-rounded form before

---

<sup>475</sup> Note Odysseus' perspective in 5.19-20: Telemachos (the παῖδ' ἀγαπητὸν) is himself returning (οἴκαδε νισόμενον).

<sup>476</sup> Note here that in Penelope's prayer Athene was asked to "remember" Odysseus' pious offerings (4.765a τῶν νῦν μοι μνησαί).

Zeus and the gods.<sup>477</sup> And Zeus, condemning the suitors through Athene's *noos*, will finally set things in motion.

### §2.3. Zeus' predicting command (5.28-41)

The long-awaited command to Hermes deserves two lines (5.29-30). However, Zeus' speech goes on in the form of a prediction to inform the audience.<sup>478</sup>

Although scholars generally compare Zeus' words to Here at *Il.* 15.54-71,<sup>479</sup> another excellent parallel lies in *Il.* Book 8, where Zeus' prophecy (*Il.* 8.470-76) concludes the divine collective scene and, as in the *Odyssey*, does not cover the entire poem's content, but only its course up to a decisive turning point. In the *Iliad*, this was Patroklos' death (*Il.* 8.476), here it is Odysseus' landing on Ithaca (5.36-42). As much as Zeus focused on Achaean losses (in his attack on Here) in the *Iliad*, so little does he linger here on Odysseus' future difficulties (only *πήματα πάσχων* at 5.33b, with no mention of Poseidon).<sup>480</sup> This is not to be explained, as in the *Iliad*, in terms of character-interactions, but as a further example of the technique observed above, whereby what is soon to be narrated at length is only concisely signalled beforehand, while distant events deserve more detail, such as, here, the Phaeacians' magnificent *πομπή* (5.36-40).

Thus, with the "home" background to Odysseus' return laid out by the narrator, and its ethical terms sanctioned by the gods, the dialogue opens the way to the new and principal narrative thread, which is actually started off, as in the *Iliad*, by Zeus' predicting command.

---

<sup>477</sup> Cf. e.g. Erbse (1972) 127: "komplex ist die Einführung des 5. Buches, in der beide Themenkreise sich wieder treffen: Athene erinnert die Götter an Odysseus und Telemach, da jetzt beide durch ähnliche Schicksale verbunden seien. Beide weilen fern von Ithaka, beiden drohen ernste Gefahren". Erbse (127-29) rightly frames Athene's speech in the context of "Die Schuld der Freier".

<sup>478</sup> de Jong (2001) 126-27 ("table of contents speech"). Cf. above n. 350.

<sup>479</sup> E.g. M. L. West (2014) 176. *Il.* 15.54-61, indeed, displays the same overlapping between the sending of the addressee (Here/Hermes) and the prediction.

<sup>480</sup> Contrast how in Book 1 Odysseus' troubles were described, both at home (1.18-19a, narrator) and abroad (1.68-75, Zeus).

### §3. About Hephaistos' bed (8.304-59)

The third divine assembly of the *Odyssey* is not part of the poem's plot, nor does it come, strictly speaking, directly from the narrator's voice, being instead the second part of Demodokos' second song "on the love affair of Ares and Aphrodite" (8.267).<sup>481</sup> As the story goes (8.266-366), Hephaistos builds a trap in his bed for his wife Aphrodite and her lover Ares, to catch them *in flagrante*. The trap works beautifully; Hephaistos calls on Zeus and the gods to come over and see, and the male gods gather (8.321-27). After the gods react to the spectacle, Poseidon manages to reach an agreement: Ares is to pay compensation to Hephaistos. The lovers are freed and flee, and the song concludes in Cyprus with Aphrodite's allurementscene.

Heavily suspected by Analysts, Demodokos' piece has also found several perceptive defenders and interpreters,<sup>482</sup> and many scholars have treated its connections with the immediate context of Book 8 and the *Odyssey* as a whole.<sup>483</sup> The adultery theme recalls Penelope and Odysseus, Agamemnon and Klytemnestra, as well as Helen. The compensation theme and the settling of the quarrel are also part of the reconciliation between Odysseus and Alkinoos' son Euryalos, and look forward to the same issue after the suitors' slaughter. The parallel between Odysseus and Hephaistos stresses the importance of *metis*. Finally, this exemplum from the realms of Olympian ease builds a contrast with earthly conditions, where *moicheia* is regularly punished by death.<sup>484</sup>

---

<sup>481</sup> Demodokos' performances are not in direct speech. Of the four songs performed in the *Odyssey* by Phemios and Demodokos, only those of the Phaeacian singer are actually reported, and only this is related *in extenso*; further, this song stands out for length and for the absence of any intervention by the main narrator, conspicuous in the report of his third song (8.514, 519). Cf. Garvie (1994) 249 *ad* 8.62-82, Beck (2012) 139-54, here 147-52.

<sup>482</sup> Burkert (1960), with Analyst literature p. 132 nn. 3-4, Hainsworth (1988) 345, M. L. West (2014) 135 n. 83.

<sup>483</sup> Edinger (1980), Braswell (1982), Newton (1987), Hainsworth (1988) 363-72, Brown (1989), Olson (1989), Garvie (1994) 293-312, Alden (1997), de Jong (2001) 206-09.

<sup>484</sup> Especially Alden (1997) 525-28, similarly Burkert (1960) 134-37, who draws the parallel with the contrasts in *Il.* 1, on which see above Ch. 5§1.

The second part of the scene has not been considered as a divine assembly.<sup>485</sup> This is no divine council concerning the human plane, but a summoned divine gathering treating a problematic (and amusing) matter of divine politics. We may divide the relevant section in three parts: (1) summons and address/request (8.304-20) (2) gathering and twofold reaction (8.321-44); (3) resolution (8.345-59). This is the typical tripartite pattern of decisional assemblies we have recognised (in Greek epic) in *Il.* 24 (Ch. 5§10), and will again see in *HHerm.* (Ch. 7§2).<sup>486</sup>

### §3.1. Summons and address (8.304-20)

As his *techne* yields its fruit, the lovers being inextricably trapped (8.294-299), Hephaistos calls the gods to witness (8.304-05). Though his battlefield shout (σμερδαλέον δ' ἔβόησε 305a) has certainly something comic to it here,<sup>487</sup> Akhilleus' summoning of the Achaeans σμερδαλέα ἰάχων (*Il.* 19.40-41) offers important structural parallels. Both are upset: Akhilleus, endowed with μένος πολυθαρσές (19.37), will be moderated by Odysseus (*Il.* 19.146-237), as Hephaistos is here by Poseidon. In both cases, a great summoning shout corresponds to a great gathering (*Il.* 19.42-53).

Surely Hephaistos does not summon the gods to become himself the subject of mockery.<sup>488</sup> This, however, is no reason to reject the manuscripts' unanimous reading (ἔργα γελαστά) at 8.307 in favour of ἔργ' ἀγέλαστα, preferred by later grammarians.<sup>489</sup> In fact, Hephaistos has much to gain from arousing laughter in the other gods he calls as witnesses. In the *Iliad*, he caused laughter to re-establish harmony (*Il.* 1.584-600; 1.599 = *Od.* 8.326); here he shames the adulterers to vindicate his rights. His self-pity (8.308-12)

---

<sup>485</sup> Except in Marks (2008) 165, who however deals with it very briefly, as Zeus plays no part and the assembly does not fit in the author's proposed typology. It is not treated by Romano Martín (2009) 48-56.

<sup>486</sup> For Mesopotamian comparisons cf. Ch. 9§2.

<sup>487</sup> Garvie (1994) 301; on σμερδαλέον see Kelly (2007) 134-35.

<sup>488</sup> So Garvie (1994) 301-02, de Jong (2001) 208-09.

<sup>489</sup> Discussion e.g. in Garvie and de Jong (preceding footnote). The scholia's reading (cf. *Eust.*, *EtM*) has a point beyond the paleographical ambiguity: γέλαστος is *hapax* (except Baiter's conjecture to Babrius 45.12, cautiously rejected by Luzzato-La Penna 1986: 46), whereas ἀγέλαστος occurs in *HDem.* 200 (though in an active sense, and only there in *epos*).

stresses his ability, thanks to which, in the second half of his speech (8.313-20), he is able to claim his ἔεδνα back from Zeus. Demodokos establishes two points: the context is most amusing and comical, but the juridical issue is a serious one, and involves the chief god.<sup>490</sup>

### §3.2. The divine reaction (8.321-43)

Seven lines describe the large gathering, focusing on Poseidon, Apollo and Hermes, and stressing the goddesses' discreet absence (8.321-27).<sup>491</sup> The reaction is accounted for in 8.326-27: the gods laugh, and the comic effect is linked to Hephaistos' ability.<sup>492</sup> The ensuing dialogues (8.328-42) detail a twofold divine reaction, framed by laughter (8.326-27, 343). First the conventional and serious, where a "τίς speech" draws the plain moral of the story as Hephaistos wanted it (8.328-33); then a grain of divine salt comes in the exchange between Apollo and Hermes (8.334-43).

The proverbial truth that wrongdoers pay for their guilt (8.329a) is confirmed by the vision of the slow outdoing the fast (8.329b-332a, picking up 8.308-12): Hephaistos' claim is accepted by the divine group (8.332b).<sup>493</sup> However, by expressing a willingness to put themselves in Ares' position, Apollo and Hermes trivialise his anger, which brings the second round of laughter, and minimise Hephaistos' triumph.

---

<sup>490</sup> On the ἔεδνα and Homeric marriage cf. Finley (1954), Lacey (1966), Snodgrass (1974), Cantarella (1979) 172-82, Wagner-Hasel (1988), Lyons (2003), 65-73 on the *Odyssey*, also Lyons (2011), and *Lfgre* II.396-97 (Schmidt). For a juridical perspective on this scene see Brown (1989), also Allan (2006) 22. It might be of interest here to recall an OB Sumerian court procedure text concerning a (most likely fictional) divorce (ms. IM 28051, 12-20, transl. Greengus 1969: 35): "he caught her upon a man; to the body of the man on the bed he tied her (and) carried her to the assembly. The assembly, because with a man upon her (*sic*) she was caught, his/her divorce money ... (they) *decided*". Greengus (1969) 37 perceptively notes the Homeric parallel.

<sup>491</sup> Garvie (1994) 305.

<sup>492</sup> It is pointless to discern the "causal" or "temporal" value of εἰσορόωσι (e.g. Brown 1989: 286; Garvie 1994: 306), cf. K-G §485, *GH* II. §475, and 8.314b.

<sup>493</sup> Differently de Jong (2001) 208.

### §3.3. Poseidon the arbiter (8.344-59)

But in Poseidon's view there is little to laugh at. Playing the part of Zeus, who would hardly have been impartial here, Poseidon achieves a settlement and the scene's resolution.<sup>494</sup> His authoritative action causes a shift from Hephaistos' initial request for compensation (ἔεδνα): the onus of compensation is to rest on the culprit (or Poseidon in his place).<sup>495</sup> The assemblies in *Il.* Book 20 (Ch. 5§8) may indicate that Poseidon's role *in loco Iovis* is traditional, but it is noteworthy that the guarantor of justice here should be the same god who persecutes Odysseus.<sup>496</sup>

In the divine realm, thus, the problem of wrongdoing and *tisis* finds a peaceful solution. Divine agreement is here sanctioned by the leading role of Poseidon, through a synthesis between two previously seen positions (Hephaistos/others and Apollo/Hermes): the husband will be compensated and Ares' public humiliation is brought to an end.

### §4. The cattle of Helios (12.374-90)

The proem (1.6-9) signals the ethical and narrative importance of the Thrinakia adventure, after which Odysseus remains alone, as he is in reaching Ogygie, Scheria and Ithaca. His solitude is, we learn, the outcome of the companions' guilt, matching Aigisthos' and the suitors' *athastaliai*.<sup>497</sup> The crew's fate is foreshadowed, delayed, and finally accomplished within the limpid religious framework of failing to heed divinely given

---

<sup>494</sup> On Zeus' cosmic distance from Aphrodite and Hephaistos cf. Graziosi (2017) 51.

<sup>495</sup> See Pötscher (1990), noting (38 n. 28) that the scholiasts' and Apollodoros' assumption that Poseidon is acting with an aim to favour Ares (cf. Σ *ad* 8.344) misses the point. It is however true that his intervention is prepared by the brothers' exchange.

<sup>496</sup> Drawing on Fenik (1974) 209-32 (discussing Helios and Poseidon as "doublets"), Pötscher (1990) 30-33 recalls that Odysseus attributes to Zeus the storm raised by Poseidon (5.303-05), and draws a parallel between Zeus and Poseidon's sanctions of Aigisthos' (1.32-43) and Ares' (8.347-48, 356) *tisis* respectively. One may add the well known "duplicated wrath" at 9.526-36, 550-55, where Poseidon heeds Polyphemos (cf. 1.69-75), but Zeus does not accept Odysseus' sacrifice, both reactions ultimately leading to the same result. On this see Reinhardt (1948) 85-86; Fenik (1974) 229-30, quoting Focke (1943) 161; Heubeck (1989) 40-41; de Jong (2001) 248-49; Allan (2006) 18-19. Referring to 6.266, de Jong (2001) 207 states that "presumably (...) Demodocus wants to reserve a central role for the patron god of his listeners."

<sup>497</sup> See Hölscher (1939) 51-52, Reinhardt (1948) 111-18, cf. below n. 500.

advice, transgression and divine punishment; Odysseus, however, is innocent and survives.<sup>498</sup> Still, the hero's narrative enactment of the events shapes this sequence as a tragic adventure, for in the context of Odysseus' tale, the episode becomes a dreadful experience.<sup>499</sup> He sees his guard frustrated, as the impiety of his crew, after a month's endurance, eventuates as if it were inevitable. Odysseus realizes this just to see his companions die and his ship dashed by Zeus' storm, the ultimate climax of the *Apologoi*.<sup>500</sup>

A *unicum* in the *Apologoi*, this Olympian scene confirms the importance, for the poet, of sanctioning the crew's injustice and the hero's piety.<sup>501</sup> In this respect, it is crucial to consider its position within the account of the entire episode. While the crime takes the form of a perverted ritual on the shore (12.339-65),<sup>502</sup> Odysseus lies fast asleep inland, as the gods sent sleep to him, though he had asked for some wind (12.333-38). The Olympian episode could well have been narrated here, but the audience follow him as he wakes, returns and comes across "the sweet smell of fat" (12.336-69). At once he understands, and desperately invokes the gods (12.370-73) with a lament acknowledging the divine necessity, in the form of an *ate*, lying behind what happened. The divine scene

---

<sup>498</sup> 11.105-113b (Teiresias), 12.127-141 (Kirke), 270-76 (Odysseus), 298-304 (oath).

<sup>499</sup> Cf. Fenik (1974) 208-30, Clay (1983) 236-39; on Odysseus as narrator see esp. Suerbaum (1968), de Jong (1992), (2001) 221-27, Bakker (2009).

<sup>500</sup> On the *Apologoi*'s structure cf. Most (1989) 22-24, with previous literature, and recently Hopman (2012). The fact that the unmistakable sequence of conscious guilt and punishment comes within a framework of divinely-led necessity has caused much discussion, cf. e.g. Focke (1942) 247-49, Heubeck (1954) 72-78, Schadewaldt (1960), Andersen (1973), Fenik and Clay (previous footnote), Friedrich (1987), Segal (1992), Schmidt (1996), Danek (1998a) 261-63, Allan (2006) 22-23, Bakker (2013) 114-34. The literature shows a steady tendency to overcome the supposed contradiction between a primitive conception of the reckless divinity and a more refined theodicy.

<sup>501</sup> Odysseus the narrator must give due justification for his knowledge of divine proceedings (12.389-90): he was told by Kalypso, who was told by Hermes. This detail, however, is absent when Hermes and Kalypso converse at length in Book 5. This caused problems to Analysts, but cf. Suerbaum (1967) 157-62, Danek (1998a) 264-65, Zekas (2017) 733-36. For this very common manipulation of the past in Homer cf. Andersen (1990), Di Benedetto (1998) 55-69, Kelly (forthcoming). The mention of Kalypso here signals the soon-to-come conclusion of the wanderings.

<sup>502</sup> The use of oak leaves and water instead of barley and wine (12.357-58, 362-63) disrupts the type-scene, cf. Arend (1933) Tafel 4 Schema 8, Nagler (1974) 205-07, Heubeck (1988) 138. See further Vernant (1979), Vidal-Naquet (1983) 54-56, Loudon (2010) 233-34 (usefully comparing *Exodus* 32.6). Differently e.g. Fenik (1974) 213: "they preserve all the ritual of sacrifice as far as they can."

immediately follows the invocation, connecting Odysseus' perception of the gods to his account of the Olympian conversation. In this way, the narrative arrangement of the scene's introduction stresses Odysseus' distance from the impious crew, and his relative closeness to the gods.<sup>503</sup>

A messenger turns the focus to Olympos. Helios' daughter Lampetie, who guards his cattle (12.131-36), brings the bad news to her father, who straightaway addresses Zeus and the gods (12.374-76). The speed of the proceedings (374: ὠκέα δ' / 376: αὐτίκα δ') does not leave space for a description of the assembly setting, nor the name of the speaker. We may assume Helios is on Olympos when he brings to Zeus his angry request for *tisis* (12.376-83). What for Odysseus is a matter of divinely sent *ate*, on Olympos is revealed to be a compensation issue (τεῖσαι 378, τεῖσουσι 382). Helios' final menace delineates a most serious cosmic framework: the Sun threatens to illuminate Hades, leaving heaven and earth.<sup>504</sup> Zeus promptly reassures the god without losing his detached composure (12.385-90).<sup>505</sup> Once again, his words give the audience an anticipation of the forthcoming events, casting under a sinister light the ominous prodigies in the second part of the crew's impious banquet (12.394-98), which the divine assembly interrupts and brings to its fullest ramification.<sup>506</sup> When Odysseus reaches the crew, rebukes them, and comments that "there was no remedy / that we could find" (12.392b-93a), the audience sees, with Odysseus the narrator, the whole implications of this fatalism, and awaits to hear the enactment of Zeus' punishment.

---

<sup>503</sup> Odysseus' and Helios' invocations are introduced by the same line (Ζεῦ πάτερ ἦδ' ἄλλοι μάκαρες θεοὶ αἰὲν ἔοντες, 12.371 = 377), which strengthens the hero's righteous connection with the gods. This hexameter (exclusively Odyssean) recurs in the first speech of every divine assembly of the poem (except the first, where Zeus speaks first, cf. 5.7, 8.306), and the deity who pronounces it is always given satisfaction.

<sup>504</sup> The threat (and tone) is of course exceptional in the *Odyssey* context, but not in *epos*, as Zekas (2017) 729-31 maintains, cf. at least *Il.* 14.260-61, *HDem.* 310-13. Compare Ištar's threat to Anu in *Gilg.* SB 6.96-100, with *N&E* 317-18 and *IšD* 19-20 (= *Gilg.* SB 6.99-100), cf. Lapinkivi (2010) 46-49. See M. L. West (1997) 417 n. 43 with literature, Louden (2010) 20-21 and 236-37.

<sup>505</sup> Zeus promises to act quickly (τάχα, 387): when this adverb appears in a divine statement of purpose, the action is in fact delayed: *Il.* 8.11, *Od.* 1.85 and cf. 6.289-90; this instance is no exception.

<sup>506</sup> Cf. de Jong (2001) 309.

## Concluding remarks

Just as in the *Iliad*, the Olympian scenes of the *Odyssey* direct the audience and structure the large-scale course of events by signalling the beginning and the end of narrative sections. At these crucial junctures, Zeus and his control come to the fore.<sup>507</sup> The assemblies in Books 1 and 5 mark the beginning of narrative lines ("Telemachy" and "homecoming" respectively), while Helios', Poseidon's and Athene's complaints in Books 12, 13 and 24 provide denouements. The Helios episode completes the process of separation between Odysseus and his crew, while the smashing of the ship climactically prepares the end of the Apologoi. The courteous exchange between the sons of Kronos in Book 13, on the other hand, concludes the first half of the poem, when Odysseus finally lands in Ithaca as Scheria and Poseidon disappear from the narrative. Finally, the brief exchange between Zeus and Athene in Book 24 is the precondition for the satisfactory conclusion of Odysseus' deeds in Ithaca.<sup>508</sup>

More than in the *Iliad*, however, the divine assemblies are fundamental for the poet to set apart and then pick up again the different narrative strands. They are essential for the poet's massive program of *Parallelhandlungen*. Again, we must connect this to a well-known fundamental difference between the poems: "In der Ilias gibt es eigentlich nur *ein* Geschehen (...) In der Odyssee setzt sich die Gesamthandlung aus mehreren, deutlich voneinander getrennten Einzelhandlungen zusammen".<sup>509</sup> A further difference is crucial in this context: in the *Iliad*, as we saw, Zeus' elusiveness generates different degrees of awareness about the course of events, while the narrative is steadily disclosed as the poem proceeds. From the very beginning of the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, the essential lines of plot and outcomes are both straightforwardly clear and tightly connected to an almost

---

<sup>507</sup> On Zeus' role in this perspective see Marks (2008).

<sup>508</sup> On the significant position of the Olympian scenes for the poem's architecture see Loudon (1999) 69-105 and Marks (2008) 159-66. On the connection between Helios and Poseidon's complaints see Danek (1998a) 266-68.

<sup>509</sup> Hellwig (1964) 126, 128, quoted by de Jong (2002) 77-78, with previous literature.

unanimous divine design. Odysseus must return, everyone agrees on that; the question, as Zeus puts it, is how (1.77). And as such divine plans coincide with the narrator's, the narrative-directing function affects the divine scenes more pervasively than in the *Iliad*, especially those in Books 1 and 5.

Finally, we have seen that the prominence of *tisis* in the Olympian realm provides the conceptual content which fleshes out the assemblies' orientating function. As the Telemachy is connected to the plot's main thread through the Suitors' injustice, their guilt is sealed by the two framing divine assemblies, first introducing it allusively (Book 1), then emphasising its significance (Book 5). While Demodokos' interlude presents an amusing Olympian paradigm developed along the thread "*metis - tisis - compensation*" that preserves order, Helios' *tisis* in Book 12 forcefully provides the ethical and theological sanction of Odysseus' solitary return, highlighting his piety and endurance. In Book 13, Poseidon diverts his *tisis*-motivated anger towards the Phaeacians, and disappears from the narrative by accepting Odysseus' (accomplished) return according to Zeus' plan. The poem concludes as Zeus interrupts the chain of vengeance to complete the restoration of the hero's rule (Book 24). In these ways, the Olympian scenes of the poem, without creating a narrative thread on their own right, orchestrate the divine aspect to the return of Odysseus and his vengeance.

## Chapter 7: Homeric Hymns

Of the thirty-three hexameter Hymns of varying length, provenance and dating that constitute this anthology, only six (2-5, 7, 19) contain narrative sections concerning the praised deity.<sup>510</sup> Among them, the hymns to Apollo (3, *HAp.*) and Hermes (4, *HHerm.*) present scenes of assembly.<sup>511</sup> Along with those to Demeter (2, *HDem.*) and Aphrodite (5, *HApr.*), these are the longest hymns in the collection. Though it is still debatable whether the long hymns should be regarded as *prooimia*, namely compositions in praise of a deity introducing longer epic recitations,<sup>512</sup> they certainly partake of the same narrative poetic tradition as Homer's and Hesiod's poems. It is not surprising, thus, that we can assess the divine assemblies in these hymns through the same lens as those we use for Homer.<sup>513</sup> However, differences emerge that relate to the different prominence and function of narrative in the hymnic context in respect to heroic *epos*.<sup>514</sup>

The *Hymns*, long or short, aim to praise the given deity, and to make his/her worth and function among gods and men manifest to the audience. Even the longer hymns presenting extensive narrative sections do not depart from the relevant structural framework.<sup>515</sup>

Specifically, the narration of the deity's deed(s), when present, belongs in the "middle

---

<sup>510</sup> On the formation of the collection see now the overview by Faulkner (2011b). Scholarship on the *Hymns* is flourishing: see the contributions to Faulkner (2011); Bouchon, Brillet-Dubois and Le Meur-Weissman (2012); Faulkner, Vergados and Schwab (2016). Fresh commentaries have appeared on *HApr.* by Faulkner (2008); *HAp.*, *HHerm.* and *HApr.* by Richardson (2010); *HHerm.* by Vergados (2013) (I have not been able to consult Nobili 2008), whilst others on *HAp.* are forthcoming by Chappell, cf. Chappell (2012) 177 n. 1, and by K. Bonnell, DPhil candidate at Oxford University.

<sup>511</sup> Also *Hymn.* 19 (to Pan) and 28 (to Athene) contain assembly scenes of interest: see below §1.1 nn. 528, 530, 536.

<sup>512</sup> On the dating of the major hymns (all from the Archaic period, i.e. before 500 BC) see the commentaries and Faulkner (2011a) 7-16. The *prooimia* theory was proposed by F. A. Wolf, on the basis of Pind. *Nem.* 2.1-3 and Thuc. 3.104 (cf. Quint. 4.1.1-2). The theory is well grounded, though some find it hardly applicable to the major hymns. Cf. e.g. Allen and Halliday (1936) lxxxiii-xcv; Càssola (2010) ix-xxix; Clay (2006) 3-16 and (1997); Faulkner (2011a) 17-19; Harden and Kelly (2014) 17-18 n. 38.

<sup>513</sup> In terms of literary appreciation and recognition of the *Homeric Hymns'* place in the epic tradition, Clay (2006) certainly represents a hallmark, though see the reservations by Faulkner (2008) 7-19, Furley (2011).

<sup>514</sup> On the risks of viewing the major hymns as just "miniature epic narratives" cf. Richardson (2015). Against the artificial dichotomy between "cultic, ritual" and "theological, Homeric" hymns, restated e.g. in Clay (2011b), (2012) 316-20, see now Metcalf (2015a) 106-10.

<sup>515</sup> See the structural observations by Janko (1981) 11-15, Calame (2011), Metcalf (2015a) 111-28, with further literature.

section", or "laudes", where narration in the past tense alternates with "attributive" sections praising the deity's features in the present tense.<sup>516</sup> While clearly central in the case of the longer hymns, the narration, always aetiological, is structurally and conceptually subordinate to the praise of the deity on a timeless and iconic dimension.

Crucially, the divine assembly topos does not occur only in the narrative sections, but is deployed to describe the deity's timeless features as well. As a result, the assemblies do not govern the course of events as they do in Homer. Nevertheless, as we shall see, they retain a remarkable structuring function in compositional terms.

It is noteworthy that the topos is absent from *HDem.* and *HApr.* Both hymns account for the regulation of the sexual status of important female deities (Aphrodite, Persephone), a crucial issue for the maintenance of Zeus' order in early Greek epic.<sup>517</sup> Indeed, these hymns' complex narratives revolve around the will of Zeus, but such sexual regulations are depicted in rather private terms (a matter between Zeus and Aphrodite/Demeter), and resolved outside of the collective context. Nevertheless, the collective dimension to which the goddesses belong represents a fundamental background to these narratives of temporary withdrawal. The poets, however, are content with signalling this by means of formulaic expressions referring to the divine community as a whole, equally used at important points of the narrative. They signal (in *HApr.*) the separation of the divine and human realms, and (both in *HApr.* and in *HDem.*) the cosmic necessity for the goddesses to return to the divine communality after their separation.<sup>518</sup> Significantly, in *HDem.* the

---

<sup>516</sup> A prominent exception is the exordium of *HApr.*, cf. below §1.1.

<sup>517</sup> Cf. §1.3, Ch. 10§3.

<sup>518</sup> The expression (μετὰ) φῦλα θεῶν "among the tribes of the gods" and its cognates are particularly revealing of the centripetal tension towards Olympos. Cf. West (1966) 224, with attestations, adding (perhaps) [Hes.] fr. 162, 10 Most (103 Hirschberger, not in M-W); cf. Richardson (1974) 160, Faulkner (2008) 203. Note the distribution of such expressions at *HApr.* 48 (μετὰ πᾶσι θεοῖσιν, prelude to separation), 95b-96a (θεοῖσι / πᾶσιν temporary separation), 129 (ἀθανάτων μετὰ φύλ', return of Hermes), 203 (ἴν' ἀθανάτοισι μετείη, Ganymedes joins the gods), 239 (ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν, Anchises is not to join the gods), 247 (ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν, return), 249-50 (πάντας / ἀθανάτους prelude to separation), 253 (μετ'ἀθανάτοισι, return), 261 (μετ'ἀθανάτοισι, future: nymphs connecting human and divine dimension). *HDem.* 36 (φῦλα θεῶν, separation), 322 (μετὰ φῦλα θεῶν, return sought) 325b-26a (θεοὺς αἰὲν ἔόντας /

assembly of the gods, a symbol of the community's unity, is mentioned when Demeter withdraws from the divine company (92 νοσφισθεῖσα θεῶν ἀγορῆν καὶ μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον), and when she finally returns with her daughter (484 βάν ῥ' ἴμεν Οὐλύμπον δὲ θεῶν μεθ' ὀμήγουριν ἄλλων).

Unlike *HAp.* and *HHerm.*, *HApfr.* and *HDem.* do not begin from the birth of the praised deities, but concentrate on a particular episode that defined their roles and prerogatives within the pantheon and on earth. At the end of this chapter we will see that the birth-theme and the depiction of divine assemblies in *HAp.* and *HHerm.* are to be connected, but it is first necessary to examine the assemblies' role in these hymns' design.

### §1. *Hymn to Apollo*

Much of the scholarship on *HAp.* concerns its unity.<sup>519</sup> Structural studies, however, have firmly established the interconnection between the Delian part, narrating Apollo's birth, and the Pythian part, accounting for his establishment of the Delphic cult-centre. Indeed, each micro-section of the first part finds its mirroring correlative in the second movement of the hymn.<sup>520</sup> This does not prove that the poem was conceived and composed at once as a unity, but it does enhance our appreciation of the transmitted composition in those terms.<sup>521</sup>

The hymn's Olympian scenes are possibly the best studied cases in this perspective, having helped critics to interpret the significance of Apollo's emergence against the more

---

πάντας, return sought), 328 (μετ' ἀθανάτοισι, return sought), 366 (μετ' ἀθανάτοισι, separation), 443 (μετὰ φύλα θεῶν, return sought, successfully).

<sup>519</sup> Ruhnken (1782) defined the hymn as blending two originally independent poems. Wilamowitz (1916) 440-62 thought the Pythian part was composed to be attached to the Delian one, thus mirroring it, whilst West (1975), (2003) 9-12, held the opposite view. For Miller (1986) and Clay (2006) 17-94, only the hymn's unity permits to fully understand the composition, cf. Janko (1991), Richardson (2010) 9-17. However, Chappell (2011), praised by Bernabé (2012), makes an excellent case against Clay's less text-based views favouring a decisive thematic unity. Critical surveys in Càssola (2010) 97-102, Förstel (1979) 20-59, Miller (1986) ix-xii, 111-17, Clay (2006) 18 n. 1, Chappell (2011).

<sup>520</sup> Most recently Richardson (2010) 10-12 and Heiden (2013).

<sup>521</sup> E.g. Miller (1986) 111-17, also Clay and Richardson as in n. 519.

general background of epic theology.<sup>522</sup> Here's configuration as the god's highest (if indirect) opponent decisively contributes to the hymn's narrative depth, by stressing Apollo's importance for Zeus' order, which Here traditionally attempts to undermine.<sup>523</sup>

There are four divine assemblies in the poem:

(1) *HAp.* 1-13. The hymn begins with Apollo's fearsome entrance into the gods' presence in Zeus' halls, but concludes with a standard situation of divine harmony: Zeus greets him with a cup, and Leto rejoices at her glorious son.

(2) 92-108. A group of major goddesses are gathered in Delos around a labouring Leto. They are defined in opposition to Here, who is absent and whose designs constrain the birth-goddess Eileithyia in Olympos. They send Iris to fetch Eileithyia from the Olympian halls, so that Leto may give birth to Apollo.

(3) 186-206. At the outset of the Pythian part, Apollo joins the gods in Olympos; a scene of divine music and dance is described where the god plays the *kitharis* under the satisfied eyes of Zeus and Leto.

(4) 309-48. In the context of Apollo's killing of the *drakaina* at Delphi, this digression narrates how Here, enraged at Zeus because of his solitary conception of Athene, in turn conceived the monster Typhoeus and handed it to the *drakaina* to nurse. This embedded narrative starts with a divine assembly scene (309-31), after which Here withdraws from the divine company, appeals to Gaia, Ouranos and the Titans, and remains aloof in her temple during her pregnancy (332-48).

Both parts of the poem open with a scene in Zeus' halls where Apollo shows himself as archer (1) and musician (3).<sup>524</sup> The peace of Olympos is sanctioned by the quiet presence

---

<sup>522</sup> Particularly on Apollo's entrance scenes: e.g. Bethe (1929) 24, Jacoby (1933) 720, Deubner (1938) 248, Niles (1979), Miller (1986) 67-69, below Ch. 9§1.1. On the hymn and epic theology cf. Clay (2006) 19-74, with Chappell (2011) 74-81.

<sup>523</sup> Below §1.2, §1.4.

<sup>524</sup> Apollo's first words after his birth (*HAp.* 135) vindicate the *kitharis* and the bow as his prerogatives. So too in the *Odyssey* the hero is first portrayed as an *aoidos*, then as merciless archer.

of Leto beside Zeus, both being happy at Apollo's persona. Despite some dynamism (arrivals and bow-deposit, music-making) both scenes are essentially static in portraying a timeless serenity.

The scenes involving Here, significantly absent from (1) and (3), are wholly dramatic in conception and development. In (2) Here remains in the background; neither the goddesses' assembly nor the swift Olympian part of the episode have directly reported dialogues. Here's second appearance (4), instead, comes in a full assembly scene showing her hostile speech. Both times Here is an indirect antagonist, representing a disruptive element to the order otherwise assumed among the gods.<sup>525</sup> The overcoming of Here's opposition is necessary for the god to be born (2), but the connection of the Typhoeus digression (4) to the Pythian narrative is looser, as Apollo's heroic achievement is the killing not of Typhoeus, but the Pythian serpent who nourished him.<sup>526</sup> Both (2) and (4), however, show Here being upset by a child of Zeus conceived aside from her; the birth of the child, representing the furtherance or the strengthening of the Olympian order, prevails over Here's capacity to undermine Zeus. By connecting the *drakaina* to Here's past attempt against Zeus, the episode marks Apollo's triumph as part of the victory of his father's order.

### §1.1. Exordium: arrival with bow (1-13)

Recently-born Greek deities typically enter the divine assembly: the pantheon greets the newcomers as or after they show their character and thus establish themselves within the community.<sup>527</sup> Apollo's entrance, instead, precedes the narration of the god's birth, which

---

<sup>525</sup> For Apollo and Here's bad terms cf. *Il.* 24.55-63, and 21.479-513 (Here against Artemis).

<sup>526</sup> Cf. Miller (1986) 82-83, below §1.4.

<sup>527</sup> Cf. *Th.* 53-79 (Muses), 201-02 (Aphrodite), with West (1966) 179; cf. e.g. *Hymn.* 6.1-18 (Aphrodite), 19.35-47 (Pan); 28.4-16, providing the best parallel, though Athene, who is born from Zeus in Olympos, does not enter the assembly. Neither does Hermes enter Olympos as soon as he is born, which is essential for the narrative (cf. below §2). On divine arrivals to Olympos in the *Hymns* see Chappell (2012) 179, 182; Graziosi (2017) 47-48.

is thereby prepared by focusing on Leto, who sits beside Zeus (*HAp.* 5). After the scene ends with her (12b-13), the poet proceeds to a praise of Apollo's mother (14-18) before actually beginning his *laudes*.

This arrival scene is typically encapsulated between entrance (2-3) and sitting down (9b-12b).<sup>528</sup> The initial fear is released as Leto remains quiet (5) and disarms her son (6-9a). Zeus' cup-handing, again typical, seals the serenity of the scene.<sup>529</sup>

The incipit position lends an impression of everlasting activity to the dynamic arrival scene. Apollo enters in majesty and sits down in peaceful glory as he may be doing at any time, though the fear of the gods is to be referred to his first appearance in Olympos.<sup>530</sup> The combined effect derives from an alternation of present and past tenses which, whilst causing much discussion among critics, is in fact paralleled in early Greek *epos*, though certainly not to this extent.<sup>531</sup>

---

<sup>528</sup> Arend (1933) 56; on arrivals at the assembly see Ch. 9§1.1. This is the only case in *epos* where the gods stand up in fear; cf. Zeus' entrance at 1.533-43 (deference) and Here's at 15.84-86 (deference and surprise), Jacoby (1933) 727, West (1975) 163, Förstel (1979) 173, Miller (1986) 12-16, Clay (2006) 20 n. 3, Richardson (2010) 82.

<sup>529</sup> See Richardson (2010) 83-84, and compare e.g. *Il.* 9.196, *Od.* 4.59 for this use of δεικνόμενος ("cheering, greeting"), analogous to various forms under the "δη-/δειδέχεται" umbrella, on which cf. Chantraine (1968-80) 270-71 and *Lfgre* II.226-28 (Schmidt). On gods and cups cf. above nn. 344, 424.

<sup>530</sup> Cf. esp. *Hymn* 28, portraying Athene's first appearance among the gods. Athene frightens them and causes cosmic upheaval (28.4-12); as in *HAp.* calm is restored as her armour is taken off her shoulders (cf. also *Il.* 15.125-27). Miller (1986) 13-16 compares also *Hymn* 27, to Artemis (no collective scene). On *Hymn* 28 see also Fröhder (1994) 223-50, esp. 223 n. 2 and 245-48 in comparison with *HAp.*'s exordium, Richardson (2010) 82, Felson (2011). Allen and Halliday (1936) 422, 424 unnecessarily think that *Hymns* 27 and 28 were influenced by *HAp.* Nor is there reason to believe that *Hymn* 28 is imitating Stesichorus (F 270b D-F = Σ in *Ap.Rh.* 4.1310), cf. [Hes.] fr. 343.19 M-W, Càssola (2010) 421, also Davies and Finglass (2014) 559-61.

<sup>531</sup> West (1975) 163: "a peculiar business". Bibliography in Clay (2006) 23-28 nn. 15-33, adding now Bakker (2002), Richardson (2010) 82-84 and Chappell (2012). It is easier to explain the alternation of present (timeless feature) and past tense (narration) at *Th.* 1-21, 35-76 (West 1966: 154-55, Clay 2006: 27-28), and at *HDem.* 484-89 (Richardson 1974: 315-16). Here the main problem remains that historical present is nowhere found in *epos*, cf. e.g. *K-G* 134, Miller (1986) 12 n. 26, unlike atemporal (or gnomic, or injunctive) aorists and imperfects - e.g. West (1966) as above, Förstel (1979) 102, West (1989), Clay (2006) 26; on *Od.* 7.103-31 (Alkinoos' garden) see West (2000). Some therefore deny that this is intended to represent Apollo's first arrival: Richardson (2010) 82, Chappell (2012) 181, cf. e.g. Kirk (1981) 167, against e.g. Dornseiff (1933) 10, Heubeck (1972) 133. But cf. e.g. Hermann (1806) *ad HAp.* 4, Wilamowitz (1916) 442 n. 2, Jacoby (1933) 728-29, van Groningen (1958) 35 n. 2, Janko (1981) 17, Clay (2006) 27-29, variously recognising the poet's choice to represent both Apollo's first entrance (dramatic impact) and his eternal condition (standard hymnic introductory practice) as the powerful god of archery in peaceful Olympos.

### §1.2. The caring goddesses (92-108)

The scene presents the goddesses already around Leto, listing them in opposition to the absent Here (92b-95). All of them belong to the previous or same generation as Here, all being connected to Zeus' order.<sup>532</sup> After their instructions to Iris, reported by the narrator (102-06), she departs for Olympos (107-08).<sup>533</sup> The definition of the assembly in opposition to the absent, hostile figure recurs in the *Odyssey*: compare *HAp.* 95 (ἄλλαι τ' ἀθάναται, νόσφιν λευκωλένου Ἥρης) and *Od.* 1.26b (οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι, cf. above Ch. 6§1.1). Indeed, the νόσφιν ("aside, away") semantics underpin both situations: the gods decide behind Poseidon's back (*Od.* 5.286-87), all of them pitying Odysseus νόσφι Ποσειδάωνος (*Od.* 1.20). To make Apollo's birth possible, the caring goddesses fetch Eileithyia "behind Here's back" (νόσφιν 105), as Here stands "apart" (νόσφιν) from them (95).<sup>534</sup>

### §1.3. Second exordium: arrival with kitharis (182-206)

Preceding the poet's announcement of his main theme (the establishment of the Pythian oracle, 207-15), this scene begins the second half of the hymn, exalting Apollo as musician among the gods. Despite the narrative detail that Apollo comes to Olympos on its way to Pytho (182-84), the timeless dimension of this Olympian scene is absolute: only the present tense is used in the description of the divine performance. A careful construction avoids a static result by combining dynamism and iconicity.<sup>535</sup>

---

<sup>532</sup> On Dione and Themis as part of Zeus' order and in opposition to Here cf. *Il.* 5.390 ff. and 15.84 ff. (above Ch. 5§3.1, §6), cf. *Th.* 11-21; Rheia is Zeus' mother, and the Nereid Amphitrites is Poseidon's wife at *Th.* 930. On Themis here cf. Clay (2006) 40-41.

<sup>533</sup> On the indirect speech here cf. Richardson (2010) 98, compare *HDem.* 261-62, with Richardson (1974) 261-62, and see further below Ch. 8§2.

<sup>534</sup> See further below §1.4.

<sup>535</sup> See the passage's treatments by Kakridis (1937), Miller (1986) 67-69, Clay (2006) 54-56, Evans (2001) 86-88, Richardson (2010) 111-14, also pointing out the relationships between Olympian and human music as seen in the Delian festival (*HAp.* 146-78).

In terms of typical epic repertoire, this is another arrival scene.<sup>536</sup> Similar to the first entrance is the shift from Apollo's movement (186, 201-03) to the perennial joy of the onlookers (204-06). In Homer, the divine gaze in the assembly is collective, and what is looked upon has a disruptive effect which prompts discussion; thus, it is commonly used to introduce the assembly.<sup>537</sup> No collective gaze occurs here: only Zeus and Leto delight in "seeing their son", in accordance with the hymn's emphasis on this divine couple.<sup>538</sup> The gaze that normally begins a scene here seals it off: far from signalling disruption, it contributes to the sense of eternal beatitude that Olympos enjoys thanks to Apollo.<sup>539</sup>

#### §1.4. Here and Typhoeus (305-55)

The Typhoeus digression, condemned by Analysts, is embedded in a strict ring structure.<sup>540</sup> The episode is composed as the beginning of a typical "withdrawal, devastation and return" narrative, where only the withdrawal section, in two parts, is portrayed: after a quick introduction the audience hears Here's outburst in the divine assembly and her departure (308-31), then her second, successful plea to Ouranos, Gaia, and the Titans, her solitary gestation and her delivery of Typhoeus to the *drakaina* (332-55). The narrative is interrupted as the *drakaina* comes again to the fore, rounding off the connection with the main narrative. The audience, well acquainted with Typhoeus, do not

---

<sup>536</sup> The closest parallels here, considering the perfect balance between arrival description (187) and collective reaction (188) are the arrivals of Here (*Il.* 15.85-87) and Hermes (*HHerm* 322-26). Compare also *Hymn.* 19.42-47 (to Pan, see now Thomas 2011), where the narrative concludes with a concise collective scene, Hermes entering and sitting beside Zeus (42-44).

<sup>537</sup> Cf. *Il.* 4.4, 5.418 (introducing a second round of discussion) 7.444, 22.166, 24.23, *Od.* 8.327 (beginning discussion after Hephaistos' speech), *Hymn.* 28.6b-7a. See further below Ch. 9§1.1.

<sup>538</sup> Suffice it to note that they are coupled at the beginning, here at the edge between the two halves, and at the very end (*HAp.* 5, 205, 545). Compare the mentions of Zeus in *HHerm.*, below §2.

<sup>539</sup> Compare however Zeus' gaze at *Il.* 8.53 (on the battlefield), concluding the divine scene, and *HHerm.* 389 (on his witty son) at the end of the assembly.

<sup>540</sup> See e.g. Förstel (1979) 259-60, Miller (1986) 82-83, comparing *Od.* 19.392-466, Richardson (2010) 127, Yasumura (2011) 124. Analyst literature in Miller (1986) 82 n. 212. On this as a specimen of the withdrawal theme cf. Kelly (2007) 97-98.

need to hear how the monster was defeated and how Here (presumably) returned to sit beside Zeus.<sup>541</sup>

A relative clause suitable for a proem (ὄν ποτ' ἄρ' Ἥρη ἔτικτε χολωσαμένη Διὶ πατρὶ 305) clarifies the nexus between Typhoeus and Here, and introduces an Olympian dimension far from Pytho and Apollo: the issue is between Zeus and Here, concerning the birth of Athene, the most powerful child of Zeus besides Apollo.<sup>542</sup> The Olympian setting hardly needs specification, being implied by the speech-introduction line (310). Here's exordium (311 κέκλυτέ μοι πάντες τε θεοὶ πᾶσαί τε θέαιναι), recurring at *Il.* 8.5 and 19.101, introduces a confident speech to the divine assembly, where the intentions of the speaker are consistently challenged, immediately and/or in the longer term.<sup>543</sup>

Here's speech contains several references to the divine community, signalling the collective and cosmic implications of her challenge to Zeus' order. Unlike the tension toward the divine community such expressions signal in *HApfr.* and *HDem.*, here they are primarily referred to excellence and, hence, dominion over the family that rules the cosmos. Athene, says Here, "is foremost (μεταπρέπει) among all the blessed gods" (315), and contrasts sharply with Hephaistos, whom she made "halting among all the gods" (316):

---

<sup>541</sup> This is not to say that the poet necessarily presupposes a current, fixed narrative about Here's withdrawal and return, but, at the same time, we should not be too prone to see our (too few) different mythical accounts as resulting from literary combinations from one or more well-defined sources. Our main background here is Hesiod, where Typhoeus' birth from Gaia (*Th.* 820-22), not from Here, is not connected in terms of narrative necessity to Athene's birth from Zeus, after which Here gives birth to Hephaistos in retaliation (*Th.* 886-900, 924-29, cf. [Hes.] fr. 343.1-3 M-W). We cannot be certain that the hymnic poet is here modifying and combining Hesiod's accounts: so e.g. Janko (1982) 119, Miller (1986) 85, Clay (2006) 66. Stesichorus too (fr. 273 D-F), on the other hand, has Typhoeus being born from Here. Again it may be simplistic to state, with Richardson (2010) 127, that Stesichorus "followed the genealogy of the hymn."

<sup>542</sup> On Athene's importance for Zeus' rule cf. above Ch. 5§3, n. 374, §6, n. 391, 10§3. Other accounts of her birth (*Th.* 886-900, *Hymn.* 28) are on Olympos, except [Hes.] fr. 343.4-19 M-W; all stress that the event is potentially disruptive.

<sup>543</sup> *Il.* 8.1: Zeus utters his ban on divine intervention; 19.101: Zeus boasts of Herakles, who shall rule (he thinks) over all mortals. On κέκλυτέ μοι appeals see Kelly (2007) 76 and further below Ch. 8§3.2. In spite of the content similarities with *Il.* 19 (birth of Zeus' extramarital child), the scene in *HAp.* is compositionally closer to *Il.* 8.1-52: we have a dominantly long speech from the reproachful god, who then withdraws from the assembly; at *Il.* 19.100-16 the first confident speech takes as many lines as Here's reply, and it is not the first speaker who departs.

Thetis, his nurse, might well have done "other service to the blessed gods" (321).<sup>544</sup> Here will counter this by begetting a son of her own, "one who might be foremost (μεταπρέποι) among the immortal gods" (326). There is of course an important difference between the μεταπρέπειν of Athene and the son desired by Here: unlike Typhoeus, "stronger as Zeus is stronger than Kronos" (339), Athene (like Apollo) is indeed foremost but cannot threaten Zeus.<sup>545</sup> To challenge his order, Here detaches himself from the community ruled by Zeus, and resorts to the older deities whom Zeus has recently defeated: she will still "be among the immortal gods" (330), but separate from Zeus.<sup>546</sup>

Here's withdrawal after a threatening speech to the assembly can be compared to Zeus' in *Il.* 8, although Zeus encountered one reply (*Il.* 8.28-37). We find here yet another declension of the pervasive νόσφιν theme, already developed in the Delian part (above §1.2). In *HAp.* Zeus has conceived Athene *aside* from Here (νόσφιν ἐμεῖο 314): so will she conceive Typhoeus "*aside* from Zeus" (νόσφι Διός 338).<sup>547</sup> With Athene's birth *aside* from Here, Zeus interrupts the cycle of successions and guarantees the stability of his own supremacy. For when Zeus denies his spouse a worthy offspring from himself, Here becomes unable to play the crucial role previously held by Rhea and Gaia as begetters of the next King in Heaven and, therefore, as arbiters of the future of the cosmos.<sup>548</sup>

---

<sup>544</sup> Clay (2006) 68-69 and Yasumura (2011) 125 see here a reference to Thetis as potential begetter of a son more powerful than Zeus (*Cyp.* fr. 2 Bernabé, Pind. *Isth.* 8.27-37).

<sup>545</sup> Cf. Ch. 10§3. Compare the explanation of Here's ζηλοσύνη at *HAp.* 100: Leto is about to generate a υἱὸν ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε.

<sup>546</sup> Cf. Clay (2006) 70 n. 164, Richardson (2010) 129.

<sup>547</sup> On divine withdrawals cf. Ch. 6§1.1, n. 435; above §1.2. The stress on the communal dimension Here forsakes (344-46, deviser of wills beside Zeus in the assembly) displays the same syntax of *Il.* 1.490-92 (on Akhilleus). Here's isolation in her temple (347-48) is to be compared with Demeter's at *HDem.* 355-56, cf. Richardson (2010) 131, and *HDem.* 27-29 (detached Zeus); on the *nosfin* semantics of *HDem.*, plausibly entailing symbolic connections to the Eleusinian mysteries, e.g. Scarpi (1976) 9-46 and *passim*, Brumfield (1981), Parker (1991), Richardson (2011) 50-53, cf. *HDem.* 4, 27-9, 71-3, 90-2, 114-5, 302b-04, with Segal (1981) 131-33, Clay (2006) 222 n. 68, Richardson (2010) 131

<sup>548</sup> On the disruptive role of female deities in the structures of Olympian succession see in general Bonnafé (1985), Kelly (2007) 420-24, Graziosi (2017); here esp. Miller (1986) 82-88, Clay (2006) 63-74, Felson (2011), Yasumura (2011) 124-29; cf. below Ch. 10§3.

Considering the general role of the assembly scenes in the hymn, Apollo's two entrances connect the two parts of the composition by displaying the everlasting harmony the god bestows upon Olympos. The archer may frighten the gods, but his presence is positive inasmuch as Leto's presence beside Zeus seals the joy of Olympos (1). A picture of absolute harmony, then, comes at the outset of the Delphic part, as Apollo manifests himself as musician (3). The goddesses' gathering around Leto (2) and Here's speech in the Typhoeus digression (4), instead, stress the divisions in Olympos and delineate the situation of transitional cosmic instability due to Here's opposition in which the audience is to situate the significance of Apollo's birth and deeds. Both scenes build a significant counterpart to the timeless stability Apollo's presence granted to Olympos in (1) and (3), underlining thereby his importance for Zeus' order.

## §2. Hymn to Hermes

Being probably the latest among the major *Homeric Hymns*, this composition stands out because of its comic element, fitting Hermes' character as the Olympian trickster.<sup>549</sup> Nevertheless, it does not fail to show a fundamentally theological focus on the process whereby the praised deity reaches his present condition among mortals and gods. The difficulties, as so often, arise from the god's origin as a result of Zeus's extramarital activities.<sup>550</sup> In contrast to *HAp.*, however, Hermes' cosmic status is not construed in an opposition to Here. Instead, Hermes will show his worth at the expense of Apollo, with whom he is traditionally on excellent terms.<sup>551</sup> The hymn, indeed, relates how their

---

<sup>549</sup> On the humour and dating of *HHerm.* see the recent treatments, including previous literature, by Vergados (2011) 87-98, (2013) 26-39 (humour) and 131-47 (dating, not departing from the traditional late 6th century, see further Faulkner 2011a: 12-13). For a linguistic and formular analysis with a dating aim see still Janko (1982) 133-50, cf. Richardson (2010) 23-25; Vergados (2013) 40-64 takes a more descriptive stance.

<sup>550</sup> The exordium shows the expected semantics of detachment and secrecy; for λήθων ἀθανάτους τε θεοῦς said of Zeus (*HHerm.* 9) cf. Vergados (2013) 228, comparing *Hymn.* 1.67 and 17.3-4; add *HApr.* 40.

<sup>551</sup> Cf. *Od.* 8.334-42 (Ch. 6§3.2). At *Il.* 21.497-501 Hermes refuses to confront Leto. Cf. Clay (2006) 100-01; on Apollo and Hermes in *HHerm.* see Thomas (2017).

friendship came into being. The central divine assembly has a decisive structural role in the development of the plot, effectively sealing the preconditions for Hermes' integration, and constituting a large-scale (and delayed) elaboration of the "arrival after birth" topos.<sup>552</sup>

Critics have often faulted this *Hymn* as narrative, for a lack of structural unity.<sup>553</sup> In fact, a geometric principle underlies the poem. Hermes' first act as soon as he is born is to create the *phorminx* (A 20-64a). He then proceeds to steal Apollo's cattle, thus demonstrating his cunning (B 64b-141). In spite of his outstanding rhetoric (C 142-396), Hermes has to return the cattle (B<sup>1</sup> 397-414a), and then is able to gain Apollo's friendship by giving him the *phorminx* (A<sup>1</sup> 414b-502).<sup>554</sup>

Hermes' entrance to Olympus and the ensuing assembly (322-96, the longest in the *Hymns*) constitute the poem's central scene.<sup>555</sup> The assembly's remarkably long and elaborated introduction (322-29) is construed around the central collective reaction to the arrival (325-26).<sup>556</sup> In each case thus far we have observed the arrival as an entry into an already gathered assembly.<sup>557</sup> The notable difference here is that the gods are said to gather

<sup>552</sup> Richardson (2010) 196.

<sup>553</sup> Analyst treatments in Clay (2006) 95 n. 3. To West (2003) 12 the composer shows "many narrative inconsistencies and redundancies and no command of the even tempo of appropriate storytelling".

<sup>554</sup> On the hymn's structure see Radermacher (1931) 213-17, Humbert (1936) 111-12; most recently Richardson (2007) 84-95, (2010) 17-19; Calame (2011) 348-49; Vergados (2013) 124-29, whose scheme I have paraphrased (p. 124, adding 'Proem' 1-19 and 'Coda' 503-80), cf. Radermacher (1931) 214.

<sup>555</sup> Cf. Radermacher (1931) 215: "Nicht zu entbehren als Drehpunkt des Ganzen ist die Szene vor Zeus im Olympus und als deren Vorbereitung der Streit der Brüder".

<sup>556</sup> † εὐμυλία † δ' ἔχ' Ὀλυμπον ἀγάννιφον, ἀθάνατοι δὲ / ἄφθιτοι ἠγερέθοντο μετὰ χρυσόθρονον ἠῶ. On the crux cf. Allen and Halliday (1936) 323-24, Càssola (2010) 533, Zanetto (1996) 274, Richardson (2010) 196 and Vergados (2013) 455-56. Neither εὐμυλία (M) or εὐμυλία (*cett.*) is attested elsewhere. εὐμυλία could be explained as "good/fine/cheerful assembly" (i.e. -μυλ-, cf. lat. *miles* and sskr. *milati* "to assemble, unite", cf. Allen and Halliday 1936: 323); εὐμυλία as a more specific "cheerful humming" (Allen 1895: 261; Humbert 1936: 129, comparing Ar. *Eq.* 10 μῦμῦ, and μυλιόωντες in *Op.* 510, cf. μύω). Proposed conjectures include words for/qualifying an assembly, e.g. σὺμυλία for ὀμυλία (Allen and Halliday, unattested), εὐωχία "feasting" (West 2003: 140, praised by Richardson 2010: 196); or describing speech, στῶμυλία (D'Orville *apud* Allen 1897: 255, cf. Ar. *Ra.* 1069, Ov. *Am.* 9.40), συλλαλιή "un gran parlare" (Càssola, extremely late attestations only), αἰμυλία "wheedling" (Heine, accepted by Vergados, cf. *HHerm.* 317, αἰμύλος being common enough in *epos*), hinting at the ensuing subtleties.

At at 326b several mss., including M, yield ποτὶ πτόχας Οὐλύμποιο. Vergados (2013) 456 deems these variants possibly rhapsodic. No modern editor prints ποτὶ κτλ. Still, that the gods are already on Olympus (Vergados) is hardly decisive: cf. e.g. *Il.* 20.4-16. This reading may or may not constitute a repetition of 325a, but it is true that the gathering at dawn traditionally signals decisive moments (*Il.* 8.1, *Od.* 5.1-3, cf. above n. 466), cf. Allen and Halliday (1936) 324.

<sup>557</sup> Cf. below Ch. 9§1.1.

(ἠγγερέθοντο 325) after the gods arrive.<sup>558</sup> The two traditional patterns of "arrival" and "gods gathering" (which as a rule follows a call by a deity) are here combined, as the divine and external audience are made to share the delight on the debate. The ensuing amused question by Zeus (330-32) introduces the trial whilst establishing the mild and ironic tone of the scene.

Apollo's speech of accusation (334-64) is almost twice as long as Hermes' reply (368-86); Zeus' final verdict (389-94) is reported by the narrator.<sup>559</sup> Thus, this assembly constitutes a further example of that typical tripartite structure we have previously identified as pertaining to the juridically-oriented divine discussions: accusation, defence and resolution.<sup>560</sup>

The assembly's outcome, coinciding with Zeus' decision that the brothers should solve the issue ὁμόφρονα θυμὸν ἔχοντας "with a concordant mind" (391b), leads to the poem's resolution. Hermes returns the cattle following Zeus' will, then gives his lyre to Apollo: Apollo grants Hermes' *timai*, with Zeus' corroboration. Zeus' will, in effect, governs the entire narrative: his plan (10, Διὸς νόος) triggers Hermes' birth; after this decision at the assembly, Zeus' joy is stressed at 506-07, when he unites his sons in friendship as soon as

---

<sup>558</sup> The epic imperfect of ἠγγερέθομαι consistently indicates the act of gathering (cf. *LSJ* s.v. and add *Il.* 2.304, 19.304, 24.783, *Od.* 17.34, 65, 18.41, 19.542, 24.468, *Scut.* 184) not the state of being gathered, which is instead expressed (in the imperfect as well) by ἀγοράομαι, cf. *Il.* 4.1, *Hdt.* 6.11, see further below Ch. 9§1. *Il.* 12.83 οὐδὲ ... ἠγγερέθοντο "they did not remain assembled" seems to be the only exception. *HHerm.* 326 is the only occasion where the verb is used for the divine assembly.

<sup>559</sup> His three-line question to Apollo represent Zeus' only direct speech in the *Hymns*, though note *Hymn.* 1.10-12, where the triplet ends a lost longer speech granting honours to Dionysos. On speech in the *Hymns* (far less prominent than in Homer), cf. Richardson (2010) 197, Faulkner (2015).

<sup>560</sup> Above Ch. 5§10, 6§3, below Ch. 9§2. As in *Il.* 24, the defence speech is considerably shorter than the accusation. Both times the accuser is Apollo, and both times he gets the better of it, though Zeus does not fail to acknowledge the rights of the second speaker. The same applies in Hephaistos's case in *Od.* 8 (above Ch. 6§3). Valuable rhetorical assessments of the speeches of the *HHerm.* assembly can be found in Richardson (2010) 196-202; Vergados (2013) 24-25, 457-89. Vergados (2013) 459-60 seems disappointed by Apollo's speech, and thinks it puts him in a bad light; but Hermes' brilliant rhetoric does not need Apollo's to be bad to stand out, cf. Richardson (2010) 197-99. On some juridical aspects of this scene see esp. Görgemanns (1976), Heiden (2010), Richardson (2010) 21, Thomas (2017) 69-72.

they come back to Olympos. Finally, at the end of the hymn, the chief god seals Apollo's granting of Hermes' *timai* (575b).<sup>561</sup>

From the point of view of Hermes' *Bildung*, his delayed arrival at the assembly allows him to show his worth to his father, the crucial step in Hermes' plan to acquire *timai* as communicated to Maia at 166-73.<sup>562</sup> But it is Zeus who directs Hermes' integration through his sons' agreement. The brothers' concord, expressed through the formula Διὸς περικαλλέα τέκνα ("most beautiful children of Zeus" 323b), encircles the divine assembly (323b, arrival; 397, departure). The formula last occurs at 503, at the beginning of the poem's *coda*, when the brothers head again to Olympos.<sup>563</sup> This is the same punctuating repetition used in *HDem.* 92 and 484, again in reference to the deity's spatial relationship to the collective dimension, and in *HAp.* 5, 205, 545 to stress Leto's closeness to Zeus.<sup>564</sup>

### Concluding remarks

In the Homeric poems, scenes of assembly placed at crucial moments structure the monumental narrative by directing the course of events. Without qualification, the same cannot be said of the major *Homeric Hymns*. The narratives of both *HApshr.* and *HDem.* are directed by the will of Zeus without divine assemblies, although the constant reference to the communal dimension is a driving force governing the goddesses' temporal withdrawal. Similarly, in *HHerm.*, the course of events is not held together by assemblies, but by the

---

<sup>561</sup> As it stands, the final scene is not configured as a divine assembly. Most editors however assume a lacuna after 568, filled by a speech by Zeus that would end at 568-74, but see Richardson (2010) 222-23 and Vergados (2013) 579. Vergados thinks 574-75 repeat the content of 506b-07a. There is in fact a relation, cf. Clay (2006) 150-51: as οὔτω and the aorist at 574 make clear, the poet does not refer to Apollo's love generically, but to the grants just given. At the same time, the mention of Zeus prepares the final eulogy, cf. Richardson (2010) 223. On Zeus in this hymn cf. Clay (2006) 149-50, going too far, in my view, in reconstructing his final speech.

<sup>562</sup> Note Hermes' stress on his father, particularly in the initial *captatio* (366-69) and in the final appeal (386b), cf. Vergados (2013) 475-76.

<sup>563</sup> Cf. Richardson (2010) 196; Vergados (2013) 126, 453.

<sup>564</sup> Above nn. 518, 538: this non-formulaic repetition in *HDem.* involves the two only mentions of the divine assembly; compare the formulaic resonance, with in reference to Persephone: (μετὰ) φῦλα θεῶν *HDem.* 36, 322.

mentions of Zeus and his plan. Nevertheless, single assemblies can in fact be central to the hymnic narrative agenda. In *HHerm.* the only assembly connects the preceding and forthcoming events in a Homeric manner, and represents the central denouement of the plot. So too, in *HAp.*, the goddesses' gathering (§1.2) is crucial to the narrative of the Delian part, permitting Apollo's birth through the overcoming of Here's opposition.

Whilst two of the assemblies in *HAp.* (§1.2, §1.4) develop the narrative of Here's antagonism, Apollo's two entrances (§1.1, §1.3) are in fact best assessed as iconic representations belonging to the "arrival after birth" topos. As such, they are not connected diegetically to the narrative developed in the hymn. By assuming, however, the completion of his rise to power, these scenes present a purely Olympian background to, or perhaps the fulfilment of, the earthly narratives on the god. Apollo's first arrival precedes the account of his birth, and the depiction of Olympian music and harmony precedes his defeat of the chthonic monster, and the establishment of his oracle. Although the interconnected assemblies of *HAp.* do not, taken together, direct the entire course of events, they do structure the shaping of the hymn.

In general, we have recognised similar techniques to those deployed by Homer, inasmuch as the divine assemblies articulate, in a more limited manner, the narrative course of the rest of the poem. The goddesses' gathering in *HAp.*, where speech is not performed but reported, is a noteworthy exception, conforming to the generally inferior prominence of speech in the *Hymns*. Together with other features observed in this chapter, especially the "arrival after birth" topos, this will be relevant to our discussion of Hesiod's *Theogony*, which, again, shows the application of techniques known to Homer in a different type of poetry.

## Chapter 8: *Theogony*

Although Hesiod's language and poetic technique is that of traditional Greek hexameter poetry, the *Theogony* should not be regarded as a narrative poem in the sense we use the term of the Homeric epics.<sup>565</sup> Nor does it work as the longer *Homeric Hymns*, which alternate diachronic narrative and timeless, or iconic, praise sections.<sup>566</sup> The *Theogony* shapes its narrative material through a tight interplay between the genealogical thread, attracting more or less long "out-of-time" narratives such as the Prometheus story (521-614), and the forward-looking design developing the emergence and stabilisation of Zeus' rule, the so-called succession-myth.<sup>567</sup> It is however misleading to consider the latter as the actual narrative guiding principle ("the backbone of the poem"),<sup>568</sup> and to label, consequently, the narrative sections stemming from the genealogical catalogues as *prolepses*.<sup>569</sup>

A sense of narrative progression is indeed elicited by the parallel development of the succession myth (154-210, 459-506, 617-731, 820-85) alongside the genealogies' thread. Genealogies are, in turn, narratives in their own right, inasmuch as they start ἐξ ἀρχῆς (115-16) and are distributed according to a consistent diachronic plan of progression. However, this straightforward picture is considerably complicated by the intervention of narratives connected with certain characters in the course or at the end of the genealogical

---

<sup>565</sup> On Hesiod's style and language see especially Sellschopp (1934), Troxler (1964), West (1966) 72-101, Edwards (1971), Leclerc (1993) esp. 1-80, Cassio (2009), Hunter (2009), Pucci (2009) 39-41.

<sup>566</sup> Some scholars, though, interpret the whole *Theogony* as a hymn to Zeus, most famously Cornford (1952) esp. 202-49; see now Scully (2015) 30-49.

<sup>567</sup> On the subject see, among others, Philippson (1936), West (1966) 16-39, Schwabl (1970), Schmidt (1988) 39-54, Hamilton (1989), Muellner (1996) 52-93, Arrighetti (1998) 291-95, Clay (2003) 13-15 and *passim*, Stoddard (2004) esp. 126-61, Nünlist (2004) 25-31 and (2007) 39-48, Rengakos (2009) 203-12.

<sup>568</sup> West (1966) 18, cf. 31: its "flesh and blood" are the genealogies; I would prefer, with Pucci (2007) 15, to picture the issue in opposite terms.

<sup>569</sup> I align with the scepticism of Nünlist (2007) 40-41 and Rengakos (2009) 209 on the approach of Clay and Stoddard (above n. 567), cf. Scully (2015) 38: "numerous flash-forwards ... out-of-sequence". By "sequence" here the succession-myth is meant, but for an ancient audience the Prometheus episode would have represented no disruption, for it smoothly stems from the other sequence represented by the genealogical catalogues.

branches.<sup>570</sup> We may find it useful to call these sections "out-of-time digressions", but this may conceal an error of perspective which downplays the strong compositional nexus between these narratives and the genealogical structure of the poem.<sup>571</sup> The complex intertwining between those narrative sections which are naturally attracted to the genealogical thread and the episodes of the succession myth configure the *Theogony's* account of Zeus' accession as a conceptually continuous but diegetically discontinuous process. The divine gatherings of the poem, in this context, cannot structure the development of a sequential plot as they do in Homer.

Aside from the depiction of the collective divine dimension in the Muses' *prooimion* (§1), two main divine collective scenes are discernible, one concerning the sons of Styx (§2), and the other the Hundred-Handers (§3). It is clear that §2 and §3 frame the Titanomachy, the central episode of Zeus' accession, the first relating the origin of the war and the latter precluding the final battle. Crucially, however, the positioning of §2 is not dictated by narrative reasons, that is, the episode's compositional *raison d'être* is not to foreshadow the forthcoming main account: indeed, it bears no diegetic links (in terms of the succession-myth) with what precedes or follows - at that point of the genealogical progression, Zeus is not even born. The passage stands there because the genealogical thread had reached Styx, and that was the appropriate place to talk about her sons.

Nevertheless, for Hesiod, who seems well acquainted with the traditional techniques relevant to divine gathering scenes, these scenes are fundamental for depicting the emergence of Zeus' rule. All these episodes portray Zeus at their centre, contribute to

---

<sup>570</sup> Moreover, Hesiod will often pursue a genealogical branch until its end, so that, as he moves to the next branch, the diachronic progression is suspended, cf. e.g. West (1966) 38, Clay (2003) 13.

<sup>571</sup> So for instance, in spite of their obvious different weight within the poem's economy, there is no difference in essence between the brief account of Herakles' killing of Hydra (*Th.* 316-18), which follows the latter's birth and has little relevance to Hesiod's conception of Zeus' rule (313-15), and the Prometheia, placed after the sons of Iapetos are listed (510-20). The same proceeding is at work, of course, in the narrative of Aphrodite's birth (188-206), on the sons of Styx (below §2), or in the Hecate section at 414-52.

shaping a well-defined concept of the nature of his power, and culminate in the collective acclamation of Zeus after his triumph in the Titanomachy (§4).<sup>572</sup>

#### §1. Zeus and the Muses (*Th.* 68-75)

Halfway through the proem, Hesiod displays the first genealogical account of the *Theogony*, concerning the Muses' birth (53-74).<sup>573</sup> As previously seen, the description of the recently-born deity's entrance to Olympos is a widespread hymnic topos, and poets gain remarkable effects by elaborating on this basic sequence.<sup>574</sup> The arriving god often faces and is exalted by the divine community, an important marker of the newcomer's public recognition.<sup>575</sup> The Muses' arrival on Olympos in the *Theogony* elaborates on this traditional background.

The Muses are born to Mnemosyne, quite close to Olympos (55-62); their abode resounds with lovely music (63-67), as they "sing, of all the immortals, the prerogatives and cherished usages" (πάντων τε νόμους καὶ ἤθεα κεδνὰ / ἀθανάτων κλείουσιν 66-67), just as they do throughout the proem (and the poem).<sup>576</sup> However, when it comes to their awaited arrival to Olympos, it is just said that their feet are "going to their father" (71b): the divine community is not mentioned. The subject of their song is not, as previously, the gods, but Zeus (68-75). Both songs (the one in their abode, the other in the presence of

---

<sup>572</sup> One should add that the episodes of Gaia addressing her sons at 164-73 (below n. 582), Prometheus and Zeus discussing in the banquet-scene at Mekone (535-61), and the creation of woman (esp. 585-89), all presuppose a collective context, cf. Ballesteros Petrella (in prep.3). The mention of the divine *consessus* at 800-04, as βουλή, δαίτες, and εἶραι "speaking places", cf. Σ D in *Il.* 19.531 (529 van Thiel), *Lfgre* II.482 (van Bennekom), typically occurs in describing a divine separation from the community (cf. *HDem.* 92, *HAp.* 345-46).

<sup>573</sup> On the beginning of the *Theogony* as a hymnic *pro-oimion* see still Friedländer (1914). Pucci (2007) devotes an excellent commentary to the whole section.

<sup>574</sup> Cf. Chs. 7§1.1, §1.3, §2; 9§1.1.

<sup>575</sup> So too in the case of Hesiod's Aphrodite, as signalled by the expression θεῶν τ' ἐς φῶλον (202b), on which see above n. 518; compare *Th.* 585-89, the just-shaped Woman being introduced to the presence of gods and men.

<sup>576</sup> Note that hyperbaton stressing the all-encompassing range of praised gods. For the syntax of these lines, cf. West (1966) 178; Pucci (2007) 95-96. The Muses sing of the gods at 11-21 and 37-47, whilst at 104-15 Hesiod invokes them for that purpose.

Zeus) exalt the distribution of the gods' prerogatives (νόμους καὶ ἤθεα 66 ≈ 74 νόμους καὶ ... τιμάς), but the second one focuses on Zeus as the architect of this order.<sup>577</sup>

Although there is no collective representation of the gods witnessing Zeus' greeting of the Muses, the gods as a whole are made present, first on their own, as the objects of the Muses' song resounding from their abode (66-67), and then, from the house of Zeus, as representing the ordered *kosmos* over which the chief god presides (73-74). When narrating the Muses' birth, Hesiod is developing his proemic design whereby the Muses' songs foreshadow his own poetic program.<sup>578</sup> The expected depiction of the divine community greeting the new-born deities is directed to that end: taking over the expected role of the narrator, it is the song of the Muses that evokes the divine community as they enter Zeus' presence, an evocation centred on the chief god's rightful distribution of *timai*.<sup>579</sup>

## §2. Zeus and the breed of Styx (Th. 383-403)

Styx is the most powerful of the Okeanides (προφερεστάτη ἐστὶν ἀπασέων, 361).<sup>580</sup> When the genealogical thread comes to her children, we learn that their names are Pride, Victory, Power, and Strength (Ζῆλος, Νίκη, Κράτος, Βίη), and that they are constantly beside Zeus, being essential to his rule.

---

<sup>577</sup> διέταξε νόμους at 74, in West's text, is van Lennep's easy correction for mss. -εν ὁμῶς, also in *IT*<sup>13</sup>. A reasonable defence of the tradition is to be found in Pucci (2007) 100, and the parallelism between the two songs stands in any case. The nexus between Zeus and the Muses is carried on, after the catalogue of the Muses' names, into the lines connecting Hesiod's poetry, the exaltation of Zeus, and human kings (81-92), on which cf. esp. Wilamowitz (1916) 476-77, Solmsen (1949) 42, Duban (1980), Vox (1984), Brillante (1994), Laks (1996) 83-91, Rudhardt (1996) 34-35, Arrighetti (1998) 320-23, Blössner (2005), Pucci (2007) 104-16.

<sup>578</sup> On the programmatic nature of Hesiod's representation of the Muses' songs therein, see Clay (1988), with references to previous literature, (2003) 68-69; Rudhardt (1996); Arrighetti (1998) 311-12, 317-19; Pucci (2007) 45-48, 81-82; Johnson (2008); Rengakos (2009) 205-08; Graziosi (2017) 43-46.

<sup>579</sup> On the significance of these lines for Hesiod's political theology see e.g. Schlesier (1982) 155-58; Raaflaub (1988) 216-20, (2000) 36; Rudhardt (1996) 35; Pucci (2007) 97-101; Scully (2015) 34-35.

<sup>580</sup> On the widespread technique of emphasising a character's role at the end of a catalogue-section see now Faraone (2013), here 304-07 (though his analytical approach identifying multiple versions and the hands of "later performers" should be treated with caution); also Humar (2016).

After the account of their birth, an "out-of-time" aetiological narrative (Zeus' birth has not been narrated yet) explains the origin of this state of things. Incidentally, this narrative, the first about Zeus in the poem, provides the only indication about the beginnings of the war between Olympians and Titans.<sup>581</sup>

For Hesiod, it was Styx who decided that her sons should live beside Zeus (389), when he summoned all the gods to Olympos (390-91) to join his side against the Titans. With consummate political skill, Zeus guaranteed that whoever should join him being already in possession of honours would maintain them, whilst promising honours to those lacking them (392-96). Styx, together with her children, was the first to join Zeus; in exchange, he established that she should be the sacred oath of the immortals, and took her children by his side (397-41). A final couplet seals the account, returning to its premises, namely Zeus' power as connected to Styx's children (402-03, cf. 387-89).<sup>582</sup>

The introductory couplet (390-91) shows the well-established pattern of the summoned gathering.<sup>583</sup> The expected massive participation is expressed in πάντας ... ἀθανάτους ... θεοῦς. The absence of the word for assembly, unlike in more explicit instances,<sup>584</sup> and the fact that καλέω is commonly used without implying an assembly (e.g. *Il.* 1.270b, 24.74) could make one think that πάντας (...) ἐκάλεσσε need not imply an ensuing assembly, very much as in *Il.* 1.402, where only Briareos is called to Olympos, and no mention is then

---

<sup>581</sup> On this passage see especially Solmsen (1949) 32-34, Walcot (1958) esp. 9-11, Fränkel (1975) 99-101, West (1966) 272, Blickman (1987), Schmidt (1989) 28-34, Arrighetti (1998) 340-41, Clay (2003) 22, 106, Scully (2015) 35-36.

<sup>582</sup> Walcot (1958) 10 compares Ouranos's emasculation at *Th.* 162 ff. That scene is indeed a collective one, though it lacks a relevant introduction allowing the audience to identify it as a divine scene of assembly. Note, still, that after Gaia's speech the gods fall silent in fear, but eventually one speaks (167-69) - compare *Il.* 8.28-30, with West (1966) 216-17 and Kelly (2007) 87-88, cf. above Ch. 5§5, and below Ch. 9§5.3 p. 222 n. 757. Kronos then expresses his indifference toward his father through the οὐκ ἀλεγιζῶ motif (171-72); cf. Kelly (2007) 346, above n. 359.

<sup>583</sup> Cf. *Il.* 8.1ff., 20.4 ff., 20.114 ff., *Od.* 8.305 ff., below Ch. 9§1.2.

<sup>584</sup> Cf. *Il.* 1.54 ἀγορήνδε καλέσσατο λαὸν Ἀχιλλεύς, 19.34, 20.4 (cf. 20.16), *Od.* 1.90, 279, *Od.* 3.137, *HDem.* 296.

made of gathered gods.<sup>585</sup> One may ask, further, whether Zeus' reported utterance is meant as an expansion of ἐκάλεσσε, or if the audience is rather to figure it as made in Olympos, in an assembly scene.

Epic convention never leaves the means of a distance communication enacted by a deity implicit: the sending of a messenger is always related.<sup>586</sup> By contrast, aside from the numerous occurrences of ἀγορήνδε καλεῖν, one passage at least (*Od.* 7.188-90) displays the semantics of καλέω alone to include the act of gathering, "to summon (and gather)".<sup>587</sup> An ancient audience, it seems, would have naturally thought of Zeus speaking face to face to the summoned gods. The absence of more context is not surprising considering the scene's compressed execution, something also indicated by the use of the indirect speech, for which one may compare the assembly at *HAp.* 102-06 (above Ch. 7 §1.2).<sup>588</sup>

Styx's reaction (arrival) is paratactically connected to the speech-verbs, as the latter were to the verb for summoning: ἐκάλεσσε ... εἶπε δ' ... τὸν δ' ἔφαθ' ... ἦλθε δ' ἄρα πρώτη Στυξ ἄφθιτος Οὐλυμπόνδε. The force of the particles in the phrase ἦλθε δ' ἄρα πρώτη

---

<sup>585</sup> *Il.* 402: ὄχ' ἐκατόγχειρον καλέσασ' ἐς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον, compared e.g. by Solmsen (1949) 23, Fränkel (1975) 99, West (1966) 273. Similarities include: (1) καλέω + ἐς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον, cf. Latacz *et al.* (2000) 141, (2) it is a summoning to receive aid and, (3) as a result of his help Briareos/Aigaion sat beside Zeus (*Il.* 1.405).

<sup>586</sup> Which is all the more remarkable since sometimes the singer does not need to account twice for the message to be delivered, as most famously at *HDem.* 314-24, on which see Richardson (1974) 261-62 and Beck (2001) 68-69 - but what she calls an "assembly on Olympos" (*HDem.* 325-35) relates in fact the various gods' repeated attempt at persuading Demeter to *return* to Olympos, cf. *HDem.* 302-04. On instruction-delivery see Kelly (2007) 325-31.

<sup>587</sup> *Od.* 7.189 ff. (Alkinoos to the elders): ἠῶθεν δὲ γέροντας ἐπὶ πλέονας καλέσαντες / ξεῖνον ἐνὶ μεγάροις ξεινίσσομεν ἠδὲ θεοῖσι / ῥέξομεν ἱερὰ καλά κτλ. Compare (many participants) ἐπὶ πλέονας καλέσαντες and *Th.* 390-91 πάντας Ὀλύμπιος ἀστεροπητῆς / ἀθανάτους ἐκάλεσσε θεοῦς.

<sup>588</sup> Where, again, we find an invitation to come and a promise. On epic *oratio obliqua* cf. e.g. de Jong (2004) 114-18, Richardson (1990) 71-74, 77-78 on Homer, Beck (2001) on *HDem.* and Faulkner (2015) on the *Hymns*; Beck (2012) 79-106, on Homer, provides the most comprehensive study to date: her main contribution being on "character-presented" indirect speeches; previous work on Homeric indirect speeches reported by the narrator shows that they are generally quite brief and represent orders, cf. further Huitink (2013). A thorough study of Hesiod's practice is lacking, though cf. Leclerc (1993) 83-107. In speech-act theory terminology, both *HAp.* 102-06 and *Th.* 392-96 are "commissive" speeches, *viz.* speech acts that commit the hearer to some future action by means e.g. of promises and oaths; see recently Kissine (2013) 148-65. Beck includes only "assertive" and "directive" speech-acts.

highlights the fact that Styx's arrival depends on Zeus' speech.<sup>589</sup> Just as the assembly had no explicit setting, so it is not explicitly dismissed before its effects are enacted.<sup>590</sup>

From this tight sequence, Zeus emerges as a most skilful fetcher of allies, who will win his war by organising the divine *timai*, because he fulfils his promises. Styx's response is immediate, and her place must be special in this respect as she *is* the oath of the gods: *hence* she is the first to come, διὰ μήδεα πατρός.<sup>591</sup> The result is that Pride, Victory, Power, and Strength will never leave Zeus, Styx herself becoming an unavoidable instrument of divine stability. The aetiological scene, thus, adds a narrative depth (in the Titanomachy context) to the conception of Zeus as rightful distributor of *timai* developed in the proem. This is achieved through a further deployment of the divine-arrival-after-birth pattern which exceptionally comes *after* the scene of assembly.

### §3. Zeus and the Hundred-Handers (Th. 639-64)

The Titanomachy narrative (617-717) comes when Hesiod is through with the Titans' genealogies. Hesiod picks up his thread *in mediis rebus*, in the tenth year of uninterrupted battle.<sup>592</sup> Two parts can be distinguished: preliminary information leading to a war-council

---

<sup>589</sup> West (1966) 275 comments on ἄρα: "the particle here acknowledges fulfilment of that for which the listener has already been prepared (in 389)." In general see Denniston (1954) 32-33, and *LfgreE* I.1158-59 (Grimm-Nordheider-Brammdt): in our passage (among others) the particle signals "Folgen u(nd) Auswirkungen unmittelbar vorher oder früher genannter Sachverhalte."

<sup>590</sup> Hesiod's loose (for us) approach to chronological restraints has long been acknowledged; cf. Nünlist (2007), and above n. 567. Here as elsewhere Hesiod wants his audience to see the same event from two different, juxtaposed perspectives, thus creating apparent (for us) chronological and spatial inconsistencies. Zeus' ability is first displayed (speech 392-96), then effectuated (397-401) in Styx's arrival, which we might have expected after the summons and before the speech in the assembly. Compare the outcomes of Ouranos' castration (181-92), also in two parts: to postpone Aphrodite's birth, Hesiod "sets back the clock" by one year (so Nünlist 2007: 40-41, though cf. Graziosi 2017: 47-49); accounting for Zeus' birth (477-84) Rhea's arrival in Krete seems repeated, the first passage (377-80) focusing on Gaia, and in general of Rhea's parents, the second (381-84) on Zeus' mother. Cf. Arrighetti (1998) xxxiii-iv and esp. (2001), with further examples. Arrighetti builds on Fränkel (1975) 96-108 and on the 'multiple approaches' theory of Rowe (1987), usefully shifting the emphasis from an enquiry concerning forms of thought to one concerning poetic technique.

<sup>591</sup> On Zeus' promise here and Styx's traditional role see especially Solmsen (1949) 32-33 and Blickman (1987) 350-51. Hesiod's treatment of the divine oath (775-805) comes after the Titanomachy.

<sup>592</sup> The motif of course is typical of the Trojan saga, though compare *Th.* 803. See e.g. West (1966) 341, Arrighetti (1998) 353-4.

(617-64), and the battle proper (664-17).<sup>593</sup> The protagonists are Zeus and the monstrous Hekatonkheires. The three Hundred-Handers had been imprisoned in Gaia's depths by their father Ouranos on account of their inconceivable strength, appearance and size (617-20; cf. 147-53). Following Gaia's prediction that they would win only with these creatures' help, Zeus and the Olympians bring the Hundred-Handers back to light, in exchange for which they grant him their help. The Olympians win the battle and imprison the Titans, who will be guarded in Tartaros precisely by the Hekatonkheires. The helpful monsters thus receive a share in the world order which in fact confines them to their chthonic dimension, in keeping with the notion of Zeus' rule as a continuation and simultaneous ending of the previous systems.<sup>594</sup>

There has been considerable debate and much exercise in verse-excision during the battle scene.<sup>595</sup> Nowadays it is however generally accepted that the fighting proceeds along compositional lines well known from Homeric battle narratives. The respective roles of the Hekatonkheires and Zeus therein are seen as effectively complementary, rather than contradictory or puzzling.<sup>596</sup> On the other hand, the preceding assembly scene has always been recognised as a piece of good traditional poetry, exalting Zeus' abilities as a ruler and his policy of including earlier generations into the new order.<sup>597</sup>

---

<sup>593</sup> So e.g. Kirk (1960) 81, differently Schwabl (1966) 85, Mondi (1986) 27.

<sup>594</sup> Cf. Ch. 10§1; here e.g. Muellner (1996) 87-88, Clay (2003) 25: the Hundred-Handers "both serve Zeus' order and are removed as potential menaces to its realisation." West's (1966) 363 notion that after the Titanomachy "Zeus must have banished them" seems isolated.

<sup>595</sup> Some analytical conclusions in Blaise and Russeau (1996) 215 n.13.

<sup>596</sup> See especially West (1966) 636-8, Schwabl (1966) 85-96, Saïd (1977), Mondi (1984), (1986), Schmidt (1989) 22-28, Blaise and Russeau (1996), Arrighetti (1998) 353-56, Pucci (2009) 62-64.

<sup>597</sup> So for instance in the heavily analytical article by Kirk (1960) the section is praised: "Indeed the parley with the hundred-handed giants at 644 ff. is remarkably fluent" (81, cf. 91-94).

### §3.1. Setting the scene (639-43)

After accounting for their release, the poet does not bother to tell us how they arrived at Olympos. Rather, the scene proper starts with a note on shared food, which in Greek hospitality practice is always preliminary to the discussion at issue (639-43).<sup>598</sup>

The partaking of the divine food is stressed twice (640, 642). First (639-41) comes the act of *offering*, and the effect (rousing of a θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ) looks forward to the battle.<sup>599</sup> The subsequent act of *consuming the offer* (642 ἐπάσαντο) points to the ensuing conversation which will seal the alliance.<sup>600</sup> Without describing the Hekatonkheires' arrival, Hesiod depicts the peaceful setting of the conversation, foreshadowing its harmonious tone and warlike outcome. By freeing the monsters and making the gruesome guests partake of Olympian food, Zeus is well underway towards their integration in his order. Comparing the arrival of Styx and her children, note that Zeus' bestowing of the benefit here precedes his allies' agreement to help: this inversion generates the narrative suspense leading to the dialogue.

### §3.2. An easy agreement?

Seemingly, the dialogue runs quite smoothly for Zeus and the Olympians. Zeus begins by describing the war in terms familiar to the audience (646-48 ≈ 635-38): the long fight is

---

<sup>598</sup> Almost proverbially Nestor at *Od.* 3.89 ff., cf. Kakridis (1975), Reece (1993) 26, 28 and *passim*. There is no exact parallel in *epos* for a divine banquet preceding the conversation, though cf. *Il.* 4.1-4, where the gods are drinking and watching the battlefield. For the invitation to drink as a welcoming gesture to the arriving god cf. *Il.* 15.84-88 and 24.98-102, above Ch. 5§10.2.

<sup>599</sup> θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ signals "Mut, heldenhafter oder kühner Sinn", *Lfgre* I.64 (Risch). Cf. especially, with a focus on the savage element, *Il.* 12.300 and 24.42-43; and note that, other than here, ἀγήνωρ occurs in the *Theogony* only as epithet of Phorkys (237), who bears monstrous progeny. For the link between θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ and warrior fury cf. e.g. *Il.* 10.220, 20.174, *Od.* 18.61. On this *Wortfeld* cf. Graziosi and Haubold (2003).

<sup>600</sup> Compare the "later comes first" technique observed in the *Odyssey's* assemblies (above Ch. 6 §§1-2). On the epic use of πάσ(σ)ασθαι to signify the fostering of social ties compare, besides the formulaic *πλάγχνα πάσαντο* in sacrifice scenes, *Th.* 802 and *HDem.* 49-50, where Demeter does *not* partake of *nektar*, and cf. *Lfgre* III.1030-31 (Beck). The text of the mss. is sound, cf. Arrighetti (1998) 34, Most (2006) 54. Contra West (1966) 342-43, accepting Guyet's athetesis of 642, the main reason being that two successive temporal clauses referring to the same event would hardly be paralleled, as would the disruption of the ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ... δὴ τότε sequence by the ὅς. Yet there are many cases in *epos* where second part of an ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ construction is delayed by some other clause (most often relative ones) to which the "responsive" part attaches, cf. *Il.* 5.774-7, 780-84, 6.243-51, *Il.* 7.186-90, 9.553-96 (!), *Od.* 17.204-12.

continuous and without solution; he wants them to show their strength in battle against the Titans (649-50); they should be remindful of the favour received (651-53, cf. 621-26). Kottos answers straightaway (αἶψ' αὖτις 654, compare Kronos' answer to Gaia at 169), and two-thirds of his speech praise Zeus: the Hundred-Handers know well Zeus' supreme intelligence, his role as commander of the gods in this war, and in their release (658-60). Thus, he concludes, they will certainly help Zeus against the Titans (661-63). The meeting concludes with a general praise by the Olympians (664: ὧς φάτ'· ἐπήνησαν δὲ θεοὶ δωτῆρες ἑάων), the typical *epainos* of assemblies with a positive outcome.<sup>601</sup>

Although Zeus' strategy is successful, scholars have sometimes felt a strangeness in the characterisation emerging from this dialogue.<sup>602</sup> The impression is that Kottos' praise is excessive, and some irony undermining Zeus' authority may lie behind it. A prominent issue here concerns who is in fact responsible for the Hundred-Handers' release. The narrator (624-29) is quite clear that it was Gaia's idea (Γαίης φραδμοσύνησιν 626, cf. 160, 475, 494, 891), and that Zeus acted alongside the other immortals: with the monsters' help, says Gaia *to them* (627), the gods would be victorious.<sup>603</sup> When Zeus accounts for the same issue (651-53), however, Gaia is not even mentioned; the god uses the ambiguous expression ἡμετέρας διὰ βουλάς, which could be plural, or a *pluralis maiestatis* (653, the last line of his speech); Kottos attributes the Hektonkheires' relief to Zeus alone (σῆσι δ' ἐπιφροσύνησιν 658).<sup>604</sup> These shifts in emphasis are of course not enough in themselves to point to any deconstructive strategy on Hesiod's part.<sup>605</sup> On the contrary, one should argue that the emphasis on Zeus' own role grows as his political action progresses toward his

<sup>601</sup> E.g. *Il.* 7.344, 9.710, 18.32, 23.539 etc. See Elmer (2013) 23-47 and *passim*.

<sup>602</sup> Mondì (1986) 37-38, quoting Schwenn (1934) 13 n. 4; cf. Schmidt (1989) 27-28.

<sup>603</sup> On the role of Gaia in the *Theogony*, especially in view of her threat against Zeus as she gives birth to Typhoeus, see the bibliography in Clay (2003) 26 n. 43, Ch. 10§3 n. 841.

<sup>604</sup> Cf. Mondì (1986) 37.

<sup>605</sup> Mondì (1986) 37 holds that "with this effusive praise [Hesiod] can distract the audience's attention from [the story's] most embarrassing details", namely that Zeus is not responsible for the Hekhatonkheires' release nor is he truly the ἀλκτῆρ ... ἀρῆς ... κρυεροῖο that Kottos claims.

success. Nevertheless, two traditional elements of the dialogue make a general pattern of uncertainty emerge, whose effects call for explanation.

First, Zeus' exordium. "Hearken to me" (κέκλυτέ μοι) appeals are common in *epos*, common enough in assembly scenes. "Speeches so introduced are allotted to figures of particular authority, and contain proposals which are usually carried out (...) and reveal the speaker's delusion" (emphasis added).<sup>606</sup> The beginning of Kottos' reply adds to this uncertainty about the outcome of Zeus' intentions: his very first word, indeed, by which Zeus is addressed in a not exactly deferential way (δαιμόνι'), prepares the audience for disagreement in the reply, if not open opposition.<sup>607</sup> Furthermore, the audience is led to hesitate about a positive outcome by the use of the typical "(well) I know (by myself) that" pattern (655-56). Whenever such an expression is used in response and in reference to a preceding utterance, there is always disagreement and an alternative course of action is proposed.<sup>608</sup>

Thus, the ancient audience would have listened to Kottos' long acknowledgement of Zeus' ability and cleverness at 655-60 awaiting an *ἀλλά*, a sudden adversative turn signalling opposition to Zeus' proposal. Hesiod, of course, could not have led the narrative

---

<sup>606</sup> Kelly (2007) 76, analysing Iliadic instances. We have encountered the pattern at *Il.* 8.5, 19.101, *HAp.* 311, delusion always following eventually (above Ch. 7§1.4). The referential pattern obtains for the *Odyssey* as well, though sometimes it is not an authoritative figure who speaks, and not always a proposal is made - the essential point (the delusion) is however consistent: cf. *Od.* 7.186 ff. (the Phaeacians will gather, but Odysseus will not leave), cf. 8.26 ff. Once, the poet has the hero ironically manipulate the addressee's expectations; the delusion does involve what he says, but not to his real intention: 17.468 ff. (Antinoos shall pay for beating a poor man, though it would not be a problem if Antinoos had been violent in a fight for possessions); cf. 18.351 ff. (Eurymachos mocks the beggar, who "must have come with a god!"); 21.275 ff. (they will leave the bow to the beggar, but there shall be no second attempt on the next day). Unfortunately Schoineus' speech at [Hes.] fr. 75.14 ff. M-W is too fragmentary, and the following narrative is lost - though presumably Schoineus did not expect his daughter Atalanta to be won over at the race he was proposing.

<sup>607</sup> West (1966) 345 comments: "oddly used in addressing Zeus". In the *Iliad*, it is used by an upset Zeus addressing Here: *Il.* 1.561, 4.31 (the only other occurrences in divine dialogues in *epos*). Quite often this address introduces an explicit rejection of the preceding speech, e.g. *Il.* 2.190, 3.399, *Od.* 4.774, 23.264. Intense disagreement is always present, though milder tones (as West notes) occur in the marital dialogue at *Il.* 6.407, 486 and 521. Add *Od.* 23.166, 174 and 264.

<sup>608</sup> See Kelly (2007) 88; compare esp. *Il.* 8.32 (Athene) = 8.463 (Here): the goddess opposes Zeus' authoritative proposal (8.4-5 = *Th.* 644-45). Schmidt (1989) 26-28 assumes an "Anspielung" on Hesiod's part, but the pattern seems too common to allow for a direct relationship. It is to be noted, though, that there are cases where after the "(well) I know (by myself)" we find a linear consequence ("therefore") instead of a twist ("but"), though in these instances the known element does not stem from the preceding speech: cf. esp. *Il.* 23.889 ff. and *Od.* 23.174 ff. displaying a similar ambiguity raising suspense.

to a different outcome, namely a failure of Zeus' attempt.<sup>609</sup> But he did construct the scene so as to increase the tension of this dramatic moment, which is released by Kottos' concluding triplet, and leaves its marks in the final collective *epainesis*: the military (and dramatic) ground is set for the spectacular battle scene.

#### §4. Distributing the *timai* (881-85)

The final collective scene of the poem seals the triumph of Zeus' order after the defeating of Typhoeus. The gods prompt Zeus to rule: the poet illustrates, again, the relation between his command and the collective dimension which is regulated by the right apportionment of *timai* (881-85):

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥα πόνον μάκαρες θεοὶ ἐξετέλεσσαν,  
 Τιτῆνεςσι δὲ τιμάτων κρίναντο βίηφι,  
 δὴ ῥα τότε ᾧτρυνον βασιλευμένῃ δὲ ἀνάσσειν  
 Γαίης φραδομοσύνησιν Ὀλύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν  
 ἀθανάτων· ὁ δὲ τοῖσιν ἐν διεδάσσατο τιμάς. 885

But after the blessed gods had thus finished their toil,  
 (and) settled their struggle for honours with the Titans by force,  
 then they pressed to reign and rule,  
 through Gaia's machinations, the Olympian, far-sounding Zeus  
 over the immortals: and well among them he distributed their honours. 885

Zeus' distribution after the battle is the first consequence of his now-sealed status and, at the same time, constitutes the very act whose correctness guarantees his rule. We are bound to compare at least Neleus' distribution of the cattle after the Pylians' victory at *Il.* 11.704-05: this is the final act of the assembly scene starting at dawn with the heralds' summons (*Il.* 11.685-705).<sup>610</sup> As the *Iliad* makes especially clear, it is the rulers' correct apportionment of *timai* which holds society together, and Hesiod is here showing that the same

---

<sup>609</sup> For Mondi (1986) 36-38, the disproportion between this dialogue's weight and the Hekatonkheires' actual action in the battle would signal Hesiod's creation of an untraditional role of Zeus, as the "traditional" battle would have featured only the Titans and the Hekatonkheires; Schmidt (1989) 22-28 holds the opposite view, cf. Arrighetti (1998) 356. There is very little evidence here to ascertain what was *the* traditional "legend" behind Hesiod's lines.

<sup>610</sup> Cf. van Wees (1992) 299-310, with other parallels at 305, cf. also n. below.

principle governs divine order. The apparent difference with Homer's depiction of Poseidon's biased account of the original distribution of divine *timai* (*Il.* 15.185-95, division by lot, cf. *HDem.* 85-87), shows Hesiod's design to "make the rule of Zeus 'constitutional' and yet at the same time to give him absolute power."<sup>611</sup>

Hesiod insists on this point through the collective scenes. In the proem, as the recently-born Muses join Zeus, his eternal rule becomes the subject of their third song, and the expected mention of the (greeting) divine community becomes a praise of their *timai* as being well attributed by the chief god. Thereby, alongside the subsequent praise of the just kings, Hesiod signals the political focus of his entire account.

Beyond this hymnic dimension, the assemblies framing the Titanomachy show that the same grounding principle of Zeus' rule, the guarantee of a fair distribution of prerogatives, is backed by the remarkable political skill (as effective fetcher of allies) which is appropriate to a chief warrior. Thus, Zeus achieves the attributes of kingship represented by the figures of Ζῆλος, Νίκη, Κράτος, Βίη. Before the final battle of the Titanomachy, Zeus' political shrewdness again reveals itself in the reciprocity of a fair exchange, which guarantees victory, elicits the *epainos* of the Olympians and permits the integration of the monsters into a cosmic order that subsumes the previous generations.<sup>612</sup> In this respect, the support of the primeval Gaia is essential for the fetching of the Hundred-Handers, and is duly mentioned in the description the gods' acclamation (884a). This final scene, portraying triumph (881-82), general acclamation (883-84), and correct distribution (885), crowns the previous collective depictions and recalls the proem's third song (triumph and

---

<sup>611</sup> Solmsen (1949) 15 n. 21; see further Kelly (2008) 265-71, showing that Hesiod's account in fact "does not rule out Poseidon's" (since the division presided by the ruler does not preclude an ensuing casting of lots), and below Ch. 10§1 n. 714.

<sup>612</sup> The war alliance, indeed, rests on this background when, later on after the battle, Hesiod accounts for the dwelling and role of πιστοί Hundred-Handers (734-35). On the authenticity of these lines cf. Schwabl (1966) 97-101, Northrup (1979) 24-6, Clay (2003) 25; *contra* e.g. West (1966) 358, 363; on the absence of firm criteria to ascertain what is interpolated in the Tartaros section see Arrighetti (1998) 358-60, Johnson (1999).

attributes 71b-73a; correct distribution 73b-74). Hesiod's poem has developed so as to coincide with the Muses' praise of Zeus' rule. Thus, even though the collective depictions do not structure the poem's *diegesis*, which is instead articulated by the genealogical backbone, they are crucial to delineate the nature and emergence of Zeus' rule, according to a coherent design running from the hymnic proem to the final acclamation.

## Concluding Remarks to Part 2

In the chapters of this second part of the thesis we have seen that the divine scenes of assembly are consistently employed throughout early Greek epic texts. It is possible to identify two aspects of their function. The first we may label formal (or structural), the second conceptual (or content-related). The formal function affects the compositional organisation of the works. The study of divine assemblies, in fact, has allowed us to gain a synoptic viewpoint over the structure of the Homeric poems, *HAp.* and *HHerm.*, and Hesiod's *Theogony*. The structuring function of these scenes can be variously qualified according to the degree to which a diegetic principle governs the composition (which in turn depends on the sub-genre of *epos*), but remains consistent.

In both Homeric poems, the divine assemblies are principally meant to direct the course of events; they indicate narrative turns to the audience or give them a cosmic sanction by opening, resuming or closing narrative threads. The directive purpose is achieved and reinforced as divine scenes are scattered throughout so as to encompass the narrative of the entire poem.<sup>613</sup> The assembly in *HHerm.* is most "Homeric" in this sense, since it constitutes the composition's central denouement. But even when the *diegesis* is subordinate to timeless praise (*HAp.*) and to a genealogical thread (*Theogony*), these scenes constitute essential pillars of the composition's architecture. In *HAp.* they provide the cosmic backdrop against which Apollo's feats are to be assessed, which is timeless in the case of his two entrances; in the *Theogony* they punctuate Hesiod's discourse on Zeus' management of the *timai*, thus foregrounding the political aspect to his rise to power.

The conceptual function is naturally related to each composition's poetic programme. The *Iliad* presents a complex divine narrative centred on conflict, and stages the

---

<sup>613</sup> The *Odyssey* for theological and content-related reasons (absence of divine conflict, limited cosmic import of Ithacan affairs, straightforward course of events), does not need plenary sections after Odysseus' return to Ithaca, but only one-to-one dialogues, whose structuring function remains visible (Book 13, Odysseus return, Poseidon and Zeus; Book 24, final resolution, Athene and Zeus).

problematic limits of heroism and mortality. The *Odyssey's* divine scenes sanction the justice of Odysseus' vengeance by focusing on *tisis* and restoration. In the *Hymns*, these scenes show how the praised god is integrated into the divine system presided by Zeus. The *Theogony's* assemblies, in turn, define the emergence and nature of Zeus' rule. Despite this context-related variety, however, the conceptual function of the divine gatherings always draws on, and contributes to define, the general divine system of early Greek epic, as will be explored in Chapter 10 in comparison with the Mesopotamian system.

The assemblies' structuring and conceptual functions obtain in both the Mesopotamian and early Greek traditions. The following chapter will show that the structural similarities reflect a partly shared poetic technique, whose examination permits us to systematise our compositional analysis and to address the question of the historical relation between these traditions.

## PART 3: COMPARATIVE APPROACHES

### Chapter 9. The Encounter of Traditions: a Formal Comparison

This chapter compares the divine assembly's poetic morphology in Mesopotamian and early Greek poetry, and demonstrates that the analogy in their large-scale structuring function we have observed reflects an analogy in traditional techniques extending to smaller compositional elements. Such comparison is fundamental to addressing the question of influence and transmission that concludes the chapter.

The analysis individuates and systematises the traditional formal patterns recurring in both corpora and their consistent correlations with patterns of function. Because the recurring functions (x always generates/signifies y) were expected effects for an ancient audience familiar with the tradition, the specific arrangements and variations become for us the visible traces of the poet's endeavour.

In various theoretical declensions, this framework is well known to Homerists, nor is it alien to critics of Mesopotamian epic.<sup>614</sup> As it holds that the single element is best elucidated against the background of the entire system, it is not dissimilar from the ancient principle Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν ("to clarify Homer from Homer").<sup>615</sup> More recently, J. M. Foley has developed it into one method of literary criticism ("Traditional Referentiality") that adapts aspects of the reader-response literary theory to the context of traditional oral or oral-derived poetry. In this view, the traditional element (be it a formula,

---

<sup>614</sup> One prominent example is Alster's (1990) essay on the Lugalbanda Cycle, "inspired by the approach to heroic poetry introduced at Harvard by Milman Parry" (71).

<sup>615</sup> Thus phrased in Porph. *Quaest. Hom.* 1.56.3-4 Sodana, cf. similarly Σ D *ad Il.* 5.385 attributing the method to Aristarchus; discussions e.g. in Pfeiffer (1968) 225-27, Porter (1992) 70-80, Montana (2015) 134-37. The phrasing is given a mantic twist by Nagy (2003) x-xii.

a type-scene or a story-pattern) acquires its contextual communicative force from the fact that it presupposes and evokes the semantic background of the tradition as a whole.<sup>616</sup>

Every text (*lato sensu*) presupposes and works for an horizon of expectations, and does so through those codes that are supposed to be shared by the two poles of the communicative process. Traditional poetry, however, is meant to be performed and heard, and calls for an especially close interaction between the performer(s) and the audience.<sup>617</sup> The taste for the typical and for the repetition of inherited codes is primarily a function of this factor, whatever the role such features may play in the compositional process.<sup>618</sup>

Foley's studies, whose intellectual genealogy reaches back to M. Parry and A. B. Lord, concentrate on what he qualifies as oral (or oral-derived) poems. His comparative works, especially focused on the South-Slavic, Old English and Homeric traditions, engage with poetry composed in performance or, when writing has intervened (oral-derived), by composers well and primarily trained in the oral compositional art. The present comparison must adopt a different perspective. Foley compared historically unrelated oral traditions in order to extrapolate the general grammar of oral poetry, although each tradition's instantiations of this grammar differ substantially. Here we will compare remains of early Greek epic, namely the work of poets trained in the process of oral composition, with a Mesopotamian corpus that (as far as is known) is the product of literate poets. Moreover, we will show that these traditions adopt similar strategies for the same type-scene: the referential instantiation overlaps to a considerable degree. Finally,

---

<sup>616</sup> Esp. Foley (1990), (1991), (1999), reviews listed in Kelly (2007) 5 n. 20. Specifically on early Greek epic, cf. e.g. the work of Danek, esp. Danek (2002), Graziosi and Haubold (2005), Kelly's (2007) monograph and subsequent articles, I. Rutherford (2012), R. Rutherford (2013) 30-31, Barker and Christensen's joint articles, most recently Barker and Christensen (2014); also Currie (2016) 4-9.

<sup>617</sup> Cf. Foley's (1991) 38-60 discussion of W. Iser and H. Jauss' interpretative frameworks, while their application to Mesopotamian traditional literature was separately invoked by Michalowski (1992) 230-31.

<sup>618</sup> As Mueller (2009) 32 puts it, commenting on Arend (1933): "what emerges from this survey confirms the reader's sense that Homeric narrative displays rather than conceals its conventional elements."

this comparison will then discuss the role of the ancient Near Eastern traditions in the rise of Greek epic.<sup>619</sup>

Concerning oral compositional techniques, the application of the Parry-Lord theory to the surviving Mesopotamian texts has proved to be far from straightforward.<sup>620</sup> Though more comprehensive and updated research is certainly needed, B. Alster and K. Hecker's studies on formulaic and traditional patterns in Sumerian and Akkadian poetry respectively came to negative conclusions about their ability to indicate oral composition.<sup>621</sup> Crucially, moreover, when Mesopotamian literary texts mention compositional activity, they usually make reference to writing.<sup>622</sup> For example, some famous if difficult passages in hymns for king Šulgi of Ur (reigned c. 2094-47) clearly signal the collaboration between scribe and singer.<sup>623</sup> That a singer was involved also in narrative poetry is made clear in a number of epilogues, often referring to an universal audience as, most famously perhaps, *Atr. OB 3.viii.18-19* "Of the Flood to all the peoples / I have sung: listen!".<sup>624</sup> In fact, there is little doubt that this poetry was meant to be performed, and should be studied as such by the literary critic.<sup>625</sup>

---

<sup>619</sup> For the same reasons, our approach differs also from Lord's (1990) comparison of narrative motifs found in SB *Gilgameš*, the *Iliad*, *Odyssey* and *Beowulf*.

<sup>620</sup> For a still valid overview on the problem see Cooper (1992) 122 n. 33 with previous literature; see further the other contributions to Vogelzang and Vanstiphout (1992); more recent works in Metcalf (2015a) 143 n. 32, adding now Haul (2016) 48-57.

<sup>621</sup> Alster (1972) 15-27, (1992) 27-28, Hecker (1974) 65-67, 192-93, both postulating however an oral background preceding the written tradition.

<sup>622</sup> As Metcalf (2015a) 143-45 has recently reminded us; cf. further Cooper (1992) 113-14.

<sup>623</sup> *Šulgi B* 309-14, *Šulgi E* 20-22, 248-52; cf. Klein (1981) 19-21, (1989), interpreting the lines as stating that the court poet composed the hymns and then instructed the singer, cf. Klein and Sefati (2014), Metcalf (2015a) 143-46. Alster (1992) 45-49 suggests other possibilities and remarks that *Dumuzi's Dream* (1.4.3 ETCSL) suggests "that the same person could be both a singer and a scribe". This is surely the case for the "chief-singers" (*nargallū*) whose private house in NA Assur contained several hymns, epics and lexical lists, cf. Pedersen (1986) 34-40, Westenholz (1992) 152-53, George (2003) 34-35.

<sup>624</sup> The passage is quoted above Ch. 2§3.3.2. Compare esp. *Ee* 7.147-48, 157-58, *Erra* 5.49-64, both making reference to writing and to an aural destination. Further examples are collected by West (1997) 593-602, whose picture remains valid, if nuanced by George (2003) 55-56 and Metcalf (2015a) 142.

<sup>625</sup> Such is the unanimous conclusion of the contributors to Vogelzang and Vanstiphout (1992), see further Metcalf (2015a) 19-22 on OB hymns; naturally, this does not preclude that narrative poems in Mesopotamia could have also other functions as written texts, especially in educational contexts.

As this chapter presents a formal comparison of a type-scene between Mesopotamian and early Greek poetry, we should explain what a type-scene is in this context. The recurrence in Homer of repeated patterns in sections having a similar content was first systematically studied by W. Arend in 1933, but he did not relate it to oral composition. This is what Homerists have done since M. Parry reviewed Arend's book.<sup>626</sup> Parry and Lord preferred the term "theme" to "scene", while M. Nagler, for one, wrote of "motif-sequence".<sup>627</sup> The floating terminology betrays the wide variety of elements currently included under the "typical scene" critical umbrella, which is not restricted to cases of schematic and largely *verbatim* repetitions in the sense of Arend and Parry.<sup>628</sup>

Divine assemblies are episodes within the narrative discourse, most often staging a conversation, where content variety is naturally the rule. This is a "typical scene" in Mesopotamian and early Greek narrative poetry inasmuch as it recurs in most poems as part of a narrative sequence. It is a "type-scene" because it displays recurring elements that our analytical abstraction depicts as constituting a "type", though one must be clear that "Type-scenes may be said to be composed of a structure of certain elements in sequence. But there is no "standard" form of a type-scene from which a given example deviates more or less."<sup>629</sup>

One particular aspect of Homeric type-scenes that has been sparsely remarked upon by scholars is crucial for our discussion. The specific positioning of and the relation between examples of the same type-scene within a given poem is semantically and structurally

---

<sup>626</sup> Parry (1936) on Arend (1933); for a history of scholarship on Homeric type-scenes see Edwards (1992), cf. Foley (1990) 240-45, Clark (2004) 134-37.

<sup>627</sup> Nagler (1974) esp. 112 .

<sup>628</sup> Lord (1938), (1951), (1960) 68-98. Cf. Edwards's (1992) 285-87 terminological discussion. While Taplin (1992) 9 and *passim* prefers the labels "recurrent scene-shapes" or "recurrent scenes", Kelly (2007) 14 chooses to "avoid the problematic terms 'formula' and 'theme'" and distinguishes "sequences of actions", "episodes", "motifs".

<sup>629</sup> Edwards (1992) 287.

significant for the entire composition's conceptual and narrative design.<sup>630</sup> After Arend, the composition by theme (or type-scene) has often been taken as a "test of orality".<sup>631</sup> In our case, the recurrence and function of the divine assembly type-scene should not *per se* be taken as proof of oral composition in Homer, and certainly not for the Mesopotamian texts under scrutiny. An Assyriological perspective may be relevant here: discussing other structures, J. Black and H. Vanstiphout have shown that typical recurrences and symmetric patterning are a function of the poems' aural reception. Thus, "markers that are regularly associated with particular points of a composition (...) serve to 'flag' structural features for the listener"; the same applies to "the use of repetition as a means of demarcating sections".<sup>632</sup> This is precisely what we have observed in Parts 1 and 2 concerning the role of divine assemblies. Thus, the following discussion is to be understood against the shared background of an aural literary culture. What this all may or may not mean for the question of transmission, however, is best assessed after considering the structural consonances.

Before comparing the assemblies' large-scale structuring function, this analysis proceeds according to the scenes' beginning, core and resolution, all of which display the recurrence of traditional conventions.<sup>633</sup> The following tables and labels, referring to the

---

<sup>630</sup> Cf. Edwards (1992) 287 "Comparison of different examples of the same type-scene can throw light upon the poet's methods and intentions", though he does not refer to large-scale connections; important research on such aspects has been conducted, from an oralist perspective, by Nagler (1974) esp. 119-30 on human assemblies in the *Odyssey*, Lowenstam (1993), Marks (2008) esp. 159-66 on Odyssean divine assemblies; grounding on the Unitarian tradition but stressing the performance context, cf. e.g. Krischer (1971), Bannert (1987) on human assemblies, (1988), Taplin (1992) esp. 74-82, Di Benedetto (1998) esp. 177-231, 271-311, Heiden (2000), Kelly (2012). Currie (2016) 193-98 discusses the problematic interface between conceptions of orality and literacy when it comes to the cross-cultural analysis of type-scenes; but his sensible objections (cf. also Currie 2016: 254-58) are directed to a reductionist and mechanical (strictly Parryan) concept of "type-scene" which is not adopted here nor by the works listed above.

<sup>631</sup> So Edwards (1992) 289.

<sup>632</sup> Vanstiphout (1992), Black (1992), here 72. These works invite comparison with those of the Hellenists above (n. 630), yet in general Assyriologists have seldom used the type-scene critical category; Hecker (1974) 61 was surely too quick to write that "[die] typische Szene...ist in der akkadischen [Epik] weitgehend unbekannt", for he clearly had in mind the mechanical conception of type-scene that does not apply in our case, cf. Hecker (1974) 180, and above n. 630. The category is instead fairly common in West-Semitic research since Alter (1978), cf. recently Kim (2011) 18-25 with references; on the West Semitic divine assembly as type-scene cf. below §5.3.

<sup>633</sup> For this approach cf. Kelly (2007) 68-75, distinguishing "introduction", "*contio*" and "resolution", cf. below n. 645 and, for literature on Homeric assemblies, the *Introductory Remarks* to Part 2.

main assemblies we have studied, should be a useful tool for orientation during the following discussion.

Sumerian poems

Label	Lines	Subject
<i>EJN</i>	93-120	Eridu temple sanctioned
<i>EnSud</i>	150-75	Enlil's marriage sanctioned
<i>EnNinm</i>	B.8-15	Mankind's creation sanctioned
<i>Angim</i>	99-174	Ninurta's return
<i>EnNinl</i>	52-63	Enlil condemned
<i>Lugale(1)</i>	17-80	Asag's appearance
<i>Lugale(2)</i>	182-224	Ninurta's defeat
<i>Lugale(3)</i>	304-33	Ninurta's victory (first exaltation)
<i>Lugale(4)</i>	674-97	Ninurta's return (second exaltation)
<i>Lugalb. I</i>	371-93	Divine repast
<i>SumAdapa</i>	173-88	Adapa and the South Wind
<i>DB</i>	49-125	Bilgames' death
<i>LUr</i>	152-62	Ur's fate

OB *Atra-ḫasīs*

<i>Atr.(1)</i>	1.39-69	Igigū rebel
<i>Atr.(2)</i>	1.99-133	Embassy to be sent
<i>Atr.(3)</i>	1.134-53	Igigū reject embassy
<i>Atr.(4)</i>	1.154-248	Creation of man
<i>Atr.(5)</i>	1.354-60+	Pestilence
<i>Atr.(6)</i>	2.i.5-22+	Drought
<i>Atr.(7)</i>	[2.ii.36 ff.]	Famine
<i>Atr.(8)</i>	2.v.13-vii	Flood
<i>Atr.(9)</i>	3.iii.20-iv.23	Flood's effects
<i>Atr.(10)</i>	3.v.34-viii	Final resolutions

SB *Anzû*

<i>Anzû(1)</i>	1.21-60	Anzû's appearance
<i>Anzû(2)</i>	1.87-2.29	Choosing the champion
<i>Anzû(3)</i>	3.24-48+	Ninurta's delay
<i>Anzû(4)?</i>	3.+113-81	Ninurta's return

*Enūma eliš*

<i>Ee(1)</i>	1.33-54	Apsû's plot
<i>Ee(2)</i>	1.57-62	Ea sets out
<i>Ee(3)</i>	1.109-62	Qingu enthroned
<i>Ee(4)</i>	2.121-3.66	Marduk steps forward
<i>Ee(5)</i>	3.129-4.60	Marduk appointed
<i>Ee(6)</i>	5.75-158	Marduk's return
<i>Ee(7)</i>	6.17-58	Creating mankind
<i>Ee(8)</i>	6.67-end	Marduk enthroned

*Erra and Išum*

<i>Erra(1)</i>	2.1-2.C <sub>1</sub> 28	Marduk's withdrawal
<i>Erra(2)</i>	5.1-21	Erra's return

SB *Gilgames̄*

<i>Gilg.(1)</i>	1.79-104	Enkidu's birth
<i>Gilg.(2)</i>	7.[1-25']	Enkidu's death
<i>Gilg.(3)</i>	11.161-205	Ūta-napišti's fate

*Iliad*

<i>Il.</i> (1)	1.533-611	Zeus' quarrel with Here
<i>Il.</i> (2)	4.1-74	Troy's fall
<i>Il.</i> (3.1)	5.367-430;	Aphrodite's wound
<i>Il.</i> (3.2)	868-909	Ares' wound
<i>Il.</i> (4)	7.442-63	Achaean fortification
<i>Il.</i> (5.1)	8.1-46;	Divine battle forbidden
<i>Il.</i> (5.2)	438-84	Divine battle forbidden
<i>Il.</i> (6)	15.84-150	Zeus' ban
<i>Il.</i> (7)	20.4-31	Divine battle permitted
<i>Il.</i> (8.1)	20.114-52;	Aineias's fate
<i>Il.</i> (8.2)	291-317	Aineias's fate
<i>Il.</i> (9)	22.166-87	Hektor's doom
<i>Il.</i> (10.1)	24.22-82;	Hektor's body
<i>Il.</i> (10.2)	98-120	Hektor's body

*Odyssey*

<i>Od.</i> (1)	1.26-102	Odysseus' return
<i>Od.</i> (2)	5.1-49	Odysseus' return
<i>Od.</i> (3)	8.304-59	Ares and Aphrodite
<i>Od.</i> (4)	12.374-90	Helios' cattle

*Hymn to Apollo*

<i>Ap.</i> (1)	1-13	Apollo's arrival
<i>Ap.</i> (2)	92-108	Leto's labour
<i>Ap.</i> (3)	186-206	Apollo's arrival
<i>Ap.</i> (4)	308-31	Here's retaliation

*Hymn to Hermes*

<i>Herm.</i>	322-96	Hermes' trial
--------------	--------	---------------

*Theogony*

<i>Th.</i> (1)	389-403	Zeus and Styx's children
<i>Th.</i> (2)	639-64	Zeus and the Hundred-Handers
<i>Th.</i> (3)	881-85	Zeus' distribution of honours

§1. Beginnings

The scene's beginning allows the audience to recognise that the assembly is about to start, the specific presentation being significant for the scene's immediate and broader context within the poem. Both traditions present similar ways of starting divine gatherings, and analogous strategies whereby such exordia engage with the tradition. Thus, the recurrent patterns of beginning are helpful to draw a common typology of assemblies.<sup>634</sup>

One might expect poets to mention the assembly at the outset of the scene, but a display of the relevant noun (unken, *puḗrum*, ἀγορή) is not the rule. Whenever the noun is used as

<sup>634</sup> Kelly (2007) 68, below n. 645.

the scene starts, nevertheless, it signals the gathering's decisional function, stressing the importance of the resolutions taken. Though assemblies need not begin with the noun "assembly" to be deliberative, the relevant noun is never found when the meeting does not involve a decision. This simple pattern, whereby the presence of the noun represents a marker of the assembly's deliberative nature, recurs consistently both in the Sumero-Akkadian and early Greek traditions.<sup>635</sup> Standard nouns aside, both the Sumero-Akkadian *para*<sub>10</sub> *maḥ* > *para(m)māḥu* "great dais/throne" and the Greek θῶκος "seat" > "council place" are associated with decisions when they occur at the outset of an assembly.<sup>636</sup>

Generally, however, poets are more inclined to begin with verbs related to the relevant root (*paḥāru(m)*, ἀγοράομαι/ἀγείρω/ἠγερέθομαι). As with nouns, it is not necessary to start an assembly by using such verbs.<sup>637</sup> Unlike with nouns, the semantic *discrimen* here is not between presence and absence (markedness/unmarkedness); rather, the verbs' aspectual behaviour illuminates a grounding dichotomy by signalling either the gods' condition as being assembled when the scene starts, or their act of convening.<sup>638</sup>

In both the Mesopotamian and Greek traditions, assembly-verbs tend to stress the gods' condition as being gathered more often than their act of gathering. In this respect, the Akkadian verb makes productive use of the stative of *paḥāru(m)*, expressing precisely this

---

<sup>635</sup> Sumerian (unken or Akk. loan *puḥrum*): *LUR* 151 (*puḥrum*: sparing Ur or not); *SumAdapa* 173 (unken: Adapa's fault and cosmic crisis), *DB* 49 = 140 (should Bilgames die?). Akkadian (*puḥrum*): *Atr.* OB 1.122 = 134 (how to confront the rebellion?), *S* rev. iv.4 = 37 ≈ SB *Si* 5.47 (plague assemblies), *Ee* 3.132 (Marduk entrusted with military authority). Compare the mythological exordium of *SoS* 1, where the gods "in their assembly" (*i-na pu-uh-ri-šú-nu*) create the cosmos. Greek (ἀγορή): *Il.* 8.2, 20.4 (should the gods intervene?), *Od.* 5.1 (θῶκος, cf. n. 636). *HAp.* 187 εἶσι Διὸς πρὸς δῶμα θεῶν μεθ' ὀμήγηριν ἄλλων "he goes to Zeus' abode, among the others' company", introduces a scene without deliberation, but ὀμήγηρις denotes the *company* of the gods, not their *assembly* (ἀγορή) as a confrontational or decisional arena. The referential spectrum of θεῶν μεθ' ὀμήγηριν (ἄλλων) (cf. *Il.* 20.142, *HDem.* 484, *HHerm.* 332) clarifies that ὀμήγηρις is always used to express the centripetal force of Olympus, and the necessity for the gods to return to its stability, cf. Ch. 7§1.

<sup>636</sup> Compare *Lugale* 17, *Ee* 6.70-71 (Marduk enthroned in Babylon), *BAC* 10, and *Od.* 5.1 (*nostos* set in motion), cf. *HAp.* 345, [Hes.] fr. 1.6 M-W, above Ch. 6§1.

<sup>637</sup> One can find either the noun (e.g. *Atr.* SB *Si* 5.47, *Il.* 8.2), the verb (e.g. *Anzû* SB 1.21, *Il.* 4.1), or neither of them, e.g. *Erra*(2), *Od.*(1). Only once, it seems, one finds both, though at some distance: *Il.* 20.4 (ἀγορήνδε) and 20.13 (ἀγηγέρατ').

<sup>638</sup> West (1997) 178 notices that Homeric and Near Eastern gods are often together when the scene starts, whilst sometimes it is the chief god who summons them. Cf. below n. 645.

condition of "being gathered".<sup>639</sup> Considering the scenes starting with the verb *paḥāru(m)*, the stative *paḥrū(ma)* "were (indeed) in the state of having assembled" gets the first prize.<sup>640</sup> Only two cases show a different (fientive) form of *paḥāru(m)*, illustrating the act of gathering.<sup>641</sup> The "condition of being gathered" prevails in Greek scene introductions too, though there is balance considering exclusively finite verbal forms.<sup>642</sup> The "stative" situation, in fact, is generally expressed by adjectival constructions where the adjective (or mediopassive participle), usually belonging to ἀγερ- stem,<sup>643</sup> refers to the gods.<sup>644</sup>

Such aspectual distribution underscores a formal distinction between types of assembly, which permits us to draw a typological comparison according to a scale of complexity in the means used to introduce the scene. For both traditions the fundamental distinction, accordingly, is between scenes starting with the gods being already gathered and those where the act of gathering is described. We label the first type, far more common, *Standard Assembly*; the second, *Gathering Assembly*.<sup>645</sup>

---

<sup>639</sup> The Akkadian "stative" is an inflectional verbal form which "belongs to a cross-linguistically common category of deverbal adjectives ("past participles")" and, when derived from a verb, "denote[s] the state that results from the event expressed by the fientive form of the verb", with a lack of tense distinction: Kouwenberg (2010) 161, 168. Though there exists a Sumerian verb "to gather/assemble" (gú...ġar lit. "set the totality"), it does not occur in our divine assembly scenes, though cf. *B&A* 9, 18 and *EnmEns* 127 where the "participial" construction unken ġar-ra "the assembly being set" closely matches the Akkadian statives.

<sup>640</sup> Cf. *Atr.* OB 3.v.34, *Anzû* SB 1.21, *Ee* 2.121, 5.85 and [6.69], *Erra* 2.51.

<sup>641</sup> *Anzû* OB 1.6 *ip-ta-na-aḥ-ḥu-ru* ("they would come together continuously" Gtn durative) and *Gilg.* SB 11.163 *ip-taḥ-ru* ("they gathered" G perfect). Cf. *Lugale* 305 mu-un-na-su<sub>8</sub>-ge-eš "they presented themselves before him".

<sup>642</sup> To *Il.* 4.1 ἠγορόωντο "they were gathered" and *Il.* 20.13 ἀγγέρατ' "they had convened" respond *Od.* 8.321 ἀγέροντο "they did gather" and *HHerm.* 326 ἠγερέθοντο "they were assembling".

<sup>643</sup> On which cf. Chantraine (1968-80) 9 and Beekes (2009) 10, s.v. ἀγείρω; on the root in Linear B cf. Aura-Jorro (1985) 37-39.

<sup>644</sup> Cf. *Il.* 15.84-85 Here ὀμηγερέεσσι δ' ἐπῆλθεν / ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι "came over to the immortal gods / gathered together"; *Il.* 24.99, the gods εἶαθ' ὀμηγερέες "were sitting gathered together"; *Od.* 1.27 the gods ἄθροοι ἦσαν "were crowded together"; *HAp.* 310 Here speaks ἀγρομένοισι μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν "among the assembled immortals".

<sup>645</sup> The following categorisation draws on Kelly (2007) 68-75: examining Iliadic assemblies (human and divine), he distinguishes "*ab initio*", i.e. "from gathering to dissolution", and "transitional", lacking gathering act and introduced by some arrival or a collective observation: both categories show 12 instances. When it comes to the gods, however, "transitional" assemblies are far more numerous (9 vs. 2 in the *Iliad* according to his count). Because this applies in Greek epic as a whole, and in our Mesopotamia corpus, our *Standard Assembly* (gods already gathered) includes and articulates Kelly's "transitional" divine cases.

### §1.1. Standard Assemblies: Unmarked, Perception, Arrival

It is indeed standard practice for the Mesopotamian and Greek poets to make the assembly begin *in mediis rebus*, often without explaining why or how the gods had gathered.<sup>646</sup> The basic mode, thus, is simply to portray the gods being already together, or assume they are, which may or may not be signalled explicitly. For narrative purposes, the timeless condition of the gathered divine community is always to be disrupted, be the disruption positive or (more often) negative. Consequently, the beginnings of *Standard Assemblies* are shaped according to the nature of the disruptive element.

Often, the gods talk or act straightaway, as the narrative focus turns to the communal divine setting. This basic type of *Standard Assembly* we may call *Unmarked Standard Assembly*. In these cases, even if there is a description of the gods' mood, it is a speech or initiative that elicits the narrative momentum.<sup>647</sup>

More often the disruptive element is external to the assembly dimension: poets are keen to mark a *Standard Assembly* by drawing an effective connection with what precedes. One method, used in narratives where the gods respond to human events on earth, is that of signalling the divine perception of what will constitute the subject of the gathering (*Perception Assemblies*). Here the shared poetic technique highlights a well-known cultural difference, namely the Mesopotamian focus on hearing as the privileged sense for knowledge, as opposed to the Greek emphasis on sight.<sup>648</sup> Thus in *Atr.*(5), (6), (7) and in

---

<sup>646</sup> Cf. Kurz (1966) 52 *apud* Latacz *et al.* (2000) 169, Edwards (1980) 26, West (1997) 178; also Kelly (2007) 75: "the gods are generally assumed to be in a semi-permanent state of assembly on Olympus".

<sup>647</sup> Examples include: Enlil's proclamation in *EnSud*, the gods' verdict in *EnNinl*, Enlil's speech at *Lugale*(2), An's question in *SumAdapa*, the chief rebel's speech at *Atr.*(1), the Igiḡu's news at *Anzû*(1), Ea's reaction at *Ee*(2), the gods' request at *Ee*(3), Marduk's initiative at *Ee*(4), Anu's utterance at *Gilg.*(2), Apollo's protest at *Il.*(10.1), though cf. below §1.3, Zeus' and Athene's utterances at *Od.*(1) and (2) respectively, Here's outburst at *Ap.*(4), Zeus' speech at *Th.*(2), his collective acclamation at *Th.*(3). Cf. also *Etana* SB 1.1-8, *N&E* 1-4 (Amarna); *DSG* 28-36, *BAC* 7-11, *SoS* 1-7.

<sup>648</sup> The Sumerian and Akkadian words for knowledge, ḡeštu and *uznu*, primarily mean "ear", see recently Westenholz (2014); contrast Greek οἶδα "I know←I have seen". One may compare the stock expressions *rapšu/rapaš uzni, uznu rapaštu* "vast (in) intelligence", applied to a variety of gods (esp. Nabû and Marduk, cf. *CAD* R.165-66) with Zeus' epithet εὐρύοπα, possibly to be understood as "of vast sight"; see Σ D in *Il.* 1.498, 5.265; cf. esp. *Il.* 24.331 - though the majority of the instances where a context-related semantic

*Gilg.*(1) the assembly starts as the gods hear the earthly *rigmu* ("clamour") which prompts discussion.<sup>649</sup> Similarly in the *Iliad*, a number of assemblies start with the gods looking onto the Troad, *Il.*(2), (4), (9).<sup>650</sup> Once, *Il.*(8.2), it is Poseidon who "keenly noticed" (ὀξὺ νόησε) Aineias' peril, which formula always indicates sight-perception.<sup>651</sup> By portraying the gods as an audience, poets stress the importance of the event at stake. What is heard or seen (the disruptive element) is perceived by the gods as demanding immediate action.<sup>652</sup> Quite remarkably, the effects of the divine reaction in *Perception Assemblies* involve the *longue durée* of the poem's narrative discourse.<sup>653</sup>

However, by far the most common way of marking the beginning of a *Standard Assembly* is the arrival of one character who enters the gathering (*Arrival Assemblies*). The arrival too constitutes a dramatic element of disruption, as the arriving one, and/or the news (s)he brings (or does not bring) become the main subject of discussion. In both traditions we may distinguish two kinds of *Arrival Assemblies*, according to whether the scene does or does not belong to the subgenre of praise narrative poetry, including Sumerian *zà-mim* narratives (Ch. 1§1), Akkadian triumphant returns in *Chaoskampf* narratives (Ch. 3), and some *Homeric Hymns* (Ch. 7).

---

nance is discernible seem to favour the other possibility "of vast voice", i.e. thunder-god: so Chantraine (1968-80) 387, Kirk (1985) 106; *contra LfgrE* II.802 (Führer), Latacz *et al.* (2000) 162; Frisk (1960-72) 592 and Beekes (2009) 483 favour "broad-sighted", not mentioning the other possibility.

<sup>649</sup> See the parallels above Ch. 4§3.1, and *Adad* 3-4: an OB narrative beginning with a collective divine speech where the gods claim they *hear* Adad's pernicious acts, whereupon Enlil addresses the assembly asking that Bēlet-ilī be summoned to him. On this assembly, and that in *Agušaya A*, v-vii see Metcalf (2015a) 64-71.

<sup>650</sup> On the divine gaze at *Il.* 24.23 and *Od.* 8.327 cf. below §1.3.

<sup>651</sup> Cf. *LfgrE* III.410 (Führer): "Im Auge haben"; for the formula in the *Iliad*, cf. Kelly (2007) 132-34; add *Th.* 838 (Zeus sees Typhoeus).

<sup>652</sup> On the onlooking gods of Homer, cf. Griffin (1978); for a broader perspective on the Graeco-Roman tradition, cf. Lovatt (2013) 29-77. The outlined prominence of "hearing" in Mesopotamian divine scenes does not imply that sight is unimportant, for also *igi.gál* (Akk. *igigallu*) lit. "great sight" means "wisdom": *Anzû*(3) begins as Enlil/Dagan sees Ninurta's sign; note further (the assembly being already underway) *Atr.*(8): Nintu sees the effects of the Flood before she starts her lament; *Ee*(4): Anšar sees Marduk approaching; *Ee*(5) the gods see Marduk's trophies; *Erra*(2): the gods gazing at Erra's fearsome appearance. For comparisons of the poetics of sight in Homer and SB *Gilgameš* see Haubold (2012), (2013) 33-44.

<sup>653</sup> *Atr.*(5), (6), (7) concern mankind's destruction, *Gilg.*(1) the birth of Enkidu, *Il.*(2) Troy's destruction, *Il.*(4) the Achaean fortification as opposed to the Trojan wall, *Il.*(9) the death of Hektor, whose doom foreshadows Troy's fall.

Starting from the latter cases, some instances have been compared by scholars, particularly *Ap.*(1), (3) and *Angim*.<sup>654</sup> In Mesopotamian literature, the arrival and praise motif is related to the protagonist's achievement, most commonly the victory over the element of Chaos. There is thus a thread connecting Ninurta's fearsome arrivals at *Lugale*(4) and *Angim* and Marduk's triumphant return in *Ee*(6), to which one should add the postulated beginning of *Anzû*(4) (Ch. 2§1.3.4). The triumphant warrior enters the assembly to be praised and rewarded. While Ninurta's unaccomplished accession entails that he is a potential threat for the divine order, Marduk, who is proclaimed king, represents permanent stability. Erra's return at *Erra*(2) inverts the pattern, for his deeds have been destructive for the gods, and as he achieves the community's submission, his arrival generates no joy, but only fear.

Turning to Apollo's arrivals at *Ap.*(1) and *Ap.*(3), all the Greek praise-directed *Arrival Assemblies* belong in the *Homeric Hymns* and are a function of a general focus on the praised one's integration within the Olympian communal dimension (Ch. 3§1.1). The basic form sees the god(dess) entering the assembly right after his/her birth, which is generally far from Olympus. The essential difference, thus, is that the stress is not, as in Mesopotamia, on the deity's achievements, but on his/her essential features.<sup>655</sup>

Following Sumerian prototypes, the Mesopotamian scenes of arrival and communal praise constitute the apex (often the conclusion) of the narrative. On the contrary, this Greek arrival does not acquire much diegetic significance, even if it is temporally determined as happening after the deity's birth, and in spite of the strong narrative character of *HAp*. Unsurprisingly, closer comparanda come from the Mesopotamian

---

<sup>654</sup> Penglase (1994) 99-103 uses a number of Sumerian passages about Ninurta to argue that Apollo's two arrivals at *Ap.*(1) and *Ap.*(3) are "in effect the same", a conclusion unsupported by the Greek text; cf. West (1996) esp. 659. West (1997) 354-55 lists further Near Eastern parallels to Zeus' fearsome entrance at *Il.*(1).

<sup>655</sup> On Apollo and Ninurta cf. Ch. 10 §3.

Hymnic tradition, where, as in the *Homeric Hymns*, it is the essential character of the deity (not his narrated deeds) that generates the assembly's awe.<sup>656</sup>

Still, in *HHerm.* the arriving Hermes does present the community with his remarkable achievement, the theft of Apollo's cattle. Unlike Apollo, or Ninurta, Hermes' feat is not related to battle; so too in *EJN* the arriving Enki is not praised by the chief god on account of his warlike performance, but for his culturally significant deed, the building of the Eridu temple. Thus, praise narratives of both traditions feature *Arrival Assemblies* where the prominence of the entering deity is publicly sanctioned because of his deeds.

No general narrative background, instead, underlies the remaining *Arrival* cases, all of which have a specific diegetic significance. Again the arriving deity (or the news he brings / fails to bring) becomes the focus of the assembly. While in praise narratives (s)he is usually radiant, if fearsome, and ultimately causes joy (except in *Erra(2)*), here the deity is usually upset, or brings upsetting news, thus generating the instability the assembly has to confront.<sup>657</sup>

Concerning compositional details, West notes that the Greek topos of the gods standing up as someone enters the assembly is amply paralleled in ancient Near Eastern literatures.<sup>658</sup> Apart from this, however, the Greek tradition's idiosyncratic arrival type-

---

<sup>656</sup> Cf. esp. *Utu the hero* 8-12, Cavigneaux (2009) 7-11; cf. Metcalf (2011) 171. A prominent topos here is the "*elatio*: the elevation of the individual god by one or several of the chief gods": Metcalf (2015a) 37-40, here 37. This is generally very brief and rarely includes an assembly scene, hardly ever an arrival, cf. e.g. *Inana C* 1-17, 69-70, 205-06, mentioning the pu-úh-rum at 104-15; *Iddin-Dagan A* 25-33. Metcalf (forthcoming) publishes a duplicate which "shows that [*Išme-Dagan W*'s] "segment B" can stand on its own" as a hymn to Ninurta: a divine assembly where the Anuna grant cosmic powers to Ninurta stands at lines 12-30 Metcalf (corresponding to Ludwig 1990: 103-04, ll. 5 ff.).

<sup>657</sup> Cf. *DB* (where the king's fear is signalled by the ki-saġ-ki epithet at *DB* 49//140, cf. Ch. 1§2.3), Nuska's embassies at *Atr.*(3),(4), a disturbed Apsû's arrival at *Ee*(1), Namtar's several journeys to Heaven in *N&E* (SB [62-66] ≈ 176-79 ≈ 337-39, cf. 84-86); Zeus troubled by his task at *Il.*(1) and by the goddesses' rebellion at *Il.*(5.2); Aphrodite and Ares are wounded at *Il.*(3.1), (3.2); Here is "distressed" at *Il.* 5.759 (ἐμοὶ δ' ἄχος), and "distraught" (ἀτυζομένη 15.90) at *Il.*(6); at *Il.*(10.2) Thetis comes πένθος ἄλαστον ἔχουσα (24.105) "bearing insufferable grief"; at *Od.*(4) the fury is directly Helios', as the narrative pace of Odysseus the narrator does not allow for the characterisation of the messenger Lampetie (Ch. 6§4, below n. 660).

<sup>658</sup> West (1997) 354-55, but the conjunction of bowing and standing is also attested in the OB period, cf. *Atr.* OB 1.123.

scene is unparalleled in Mesopotamia.<sup>659</sup> Constant elements are entrance and taking of a seat (though Aphrodite does not sit down, but falls at Dione's knees at *Il.*(3.1), 5.370), which is generally immediate, but delayed at *Il.*(3.2), (6) and *Ap.*(1), so that arrival and sitting encapsulate, respectively, the dialogues with Zeus and Themis and Leto's intervention. Between the two elements, the gods do stand up, but only when the figure is particularly authoritative or fearsome: *Il.*(1), (6), *Ap.*(1); not, e.g., at *Il.*(10.2), Thetis.<sup>660</sup>

### §1.2. Gathering Assemblies

According to the outlined aspectual dichotomy, sometimes poets tell the audience how the gods assembled. In Greece, there is normally one deity who gathers them (usually Zeus).<sup>661</sup> The rule obtains in Mesopotamia too, although there are cases in which the gods gather autonomously.<sup>662</sup> Another Mesopotamian specificity is the topos of the gods gathering to attend a pious man's sacrificial offering, which precludes his elevation.<sup>663</sup>

Because the summoning deity always has a reason to gather the gods, the scene focuses on his/her handling of the matter, and on the degree to which the assembly abides by his/her intentions; thus, it constitutes a test of his/her capacities. For instance, having created mankind, Enki is duly praised in *EnNinm* as he sets up the divine banquet; when they summon an assembly, Enlil, Marduk and Zeus are always obeyed, at least *prima facie*. But when Here summons the gods at *Il.*(8.1), her suggestion is abandoned, and

---

<sup>659</sup> Cf. Arend (1933) 56.

<sup>660</sup> At *Il.*(5.2) Poseidon's welcoming of Zeus replaces the standing up, though the poet elaborates on Athene and Here's sitting apart (8.444b-45a). The gods do not stand up when Hermes enters Olympos with his son Pan, though he does sit down (*Hymn.* 18.41-47). Hymnic arrivals lack the sitting down when a depiction of a timeless feature of the incomer follows (the Muses and Apollo's music: *Th.* 53-79, *Ap.*(3); Aphrodite's desire-awakening beauty: *Hymn.* 6.14-18). The absence of arrival details at *Od.*(4) due to narrative urgency is paralleled at *N&E* 350-52: Namtar delivers the threatening message of Ereškigal, the alarmed great gods direct Namtar to Anu's courtyard, and, unlike in the poem's parallel scenes (above n. 657), we find him immediately within, searching for Nergal, without any entrance-description.

<sup>661</sup> *Il.*(5.1), *Il.*(7), Zeus: divine intervention forbidden/permitted; *Il.*(8.1) Here: Aineias' fate; *Od.*(3) Hephaistos: compensation; *Th.*(1) Zeus: fetching allies.

<sup>662</sup> God summoning: Enki at *EJN*, Enlil at *Atr.*(2) and *Atr.*(5), (6), (7) in the SB version, Enlil/Dagan at *Anzû*(3), Marduk at *Ee*(5), (7); autonomous gathering: *Lugalb*(3), *Atr.*(9), *Anzû*(2); compare the isolated instance of Greek gods coming together un-summoned at *HHerm.* 326 (ἡγερέθοντο).

<sup>663</sup> *Lugalb. I.*, *Atr.*(10), *Gilg.*(3).

Poseidon emerges as the promoter of Zeus' will; at *Od.*(3), Hephaistos' request is granted after a slight modification by Poseidon. This discourse on the authoritative figure underlies the two Akkadian autonomous gatherings: the gods assemble in a frantic and distressed state, which always underscores, and is caused by, Enlil's deficiency as a ruler.<sup>664</sup>

Considering compositional techniques, there is a rather generic correspondence between the Greek and Akkadian expressions for "summoning an assembly": ἀγορήν(δε) καλεῖν "summon/call (to) the assembly" and *puḫra(m) šakānu(m)* "establish/summon the assembly".<sup>665</sup> But the two traditions differ as to the elements typically substantiating the summons: Mesopotamian poems normally present a banquet for the summoned gods; the Greek tradition normally gives details on their arrival.<sup>666</sup> Still, the referential deployment of such details coincides: when the summoning one's intentions will be countered or thwarted, poets refrain from describing the banquet or the arrival after the summons.<sup>667</sup>

### §1.3. Combinatory flexibility

Although poets tend to keep the outlined means separate, they can combine them to develop the scene further. Naturally, also in Mesopotamia an arrival/gathering description may follow the summons, as in *Atr.*(2), (10), *Ee*(5), *Gilg.*(3).<sup>668</sup> Conversely, in *EJN* the banquet scene, the typical Mesopotamian eventuation of the summoning, comes after the arrival of Enki which begins the scene.

<sup>664</sup> On the ruler and the assembly, cf. Ch. 10.

<sup>665</sup> On the Greek see Ch. 8§2. The expression *puḫra(m) šasû(m)* matches perfectly ἀγορήν καλεῖν, both *šasû(m)* and καλέω meaning "to call, summon, name", both being used for "summoning" in literary phraseology, cf. *CAD* Š II.154-56, *Lfgre* II.1292-94 (Beck). It possibly occurs at *Gilg.* OB 3.173 (restored), cf. *Anzû* SB 3.25. For the more common *puḫra(m) šakānu(m)* cf. e.g. *Atr.* OB 1.147 = 161 (restored after SB Si 2.34), *Atr.* S rev. iv.4 = 37 ≈ SB Si 5.47, *Ee* 2.158, *DPT* c.3, *EST* 212, *GerUnt* obv.iii.20.

<sup>666</sup> Food is consumed after the summons at *EJN*, *Lugalb. I*, *Atr.*(10), *Ee*(5), (7), *Gilg.*(3); arrivals are described at *Il.*(7), *Od.*(3), *Th.*(1).

<sup>667</sup> Mesopotamian summons without food → injunctions countered/unsuccessful: *Atr.*(2), and *Atr.*(5), (6), (7) (SB version), and quite possibly *Anzû*(3), cf. above Ch.2§1.3.3 and compare the Hekatonkheires' repast at *Th.*(2), above Ch. 8§3; Greek summons without arrival description → injunctions countered/unsuccessful: *Il.*(5.1), (8.1). For a comparison between *Il.*(5.1) and *Atr.*(5) see below §5.1.

<sup>668</sup> The summons leading to *Ee*(5), starting at 3.129 with the gods' arrival, lengthens so as to consist of the long message-delivery scene, reporting Qingu's appointment and Marduk's proposal, which occupies most of Tablet 3. Šarur's arrival at *Lugale*(1) is part of the introduction of an *Unmarked Standard* assembly.

Furthermore, the Mesopotamian topos of the helpless (frightened/frantic) gods, which is typical of *Unmarked Standard Assemblies*, can be maintained in *Arrival Assemblies*.<sup>669</sup> In two cases, as seen above (*Anzû(2)*, *Atr.(9)*), it starts *Gathering Assemblies*. In SB *Atr.(5)*, (6), (7) Enlil's summons was added to the OB plain *Perception Assembly*. One may compare how at *Il.(10.1)* the focus turns to Olympos through the collective gaze (*Il. 24.23*), but the proper assembly scene (after twelve days) begins with an abrupt speech, i.e. an *Unmarked Standard* (*24.32*). *Od.(3)* presents Hephaistos' summons, collective arrival and onlooking element (*Od. 8.326-27*); in *Herm. (Arrival)*, the entrance of Zeus' sons causes the gods to gather (*HHerm. 325-26*).

## §2. Core

Speeches constitute the assembly's core, although the narrator often intervenes to describe divine acts or movements. As in both traditions poets are at considerable liberty to develop the assembly at length or compress it, it is again convenient to approach the comparison by degrees of complexity. We shall first assess patterns of speech, and then see how they combine with the narrator's interventions.

### §2.1. Patterns of speech

First come those assemblies where no speech is staged and divine acts are generally described briefly. Mesopotamian examples include the gathering at the sacrifice at *Lugalb. I (Gathering Assembly)*, *Ee(2)*, depicting Ea's prompt departure against Apsû, and the proem of OB *Etana*.<sup>670</sup> In agreement with the minor prominence of speech in the *Homeric Hymns* and Hesiod *vis-à-vis* the Homeric epics, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* do not feature this

---

<sup>669</sup> Helpless gods starting *Unmarked Standard: Lugale(2)*, *Ee(2)*, (3), (4), possibly *Erra(1)*; after (i.e. because of) the arrival: *Lugale(4)*, *Angim*.

<sup>670</sup> *Etana* OB 1-15, text Haul (2000) 106-07.

type, which occurs in Apollo's entrances, *Ap.*(1), (3), and in Zeus' election, *Th.*(3), though *Th.* 883-85a could be a case of indirect speech.<sup>671</sup>

In the relatively rare one-speech assemblies, the speech is always *assertive* or *directive*: it sanctions deeds or enforces orders that do not require discussion, be they positive or negative for the community.<sup>672</sup> In Sumerian divine praise narratives (Ch. 1§1), Enlil or Enki's joyous speeches crown the assemblies at *EJN*, *EnSud*, *EnNinm*; on the other hand, only one (collective) speech is needed to condemn Enlil at *EnNinl*. As in *EnNinl*, in Akkadian and Greek narratives the single-speech assembly always portrays an enforcement. In this respect, Enlil's summoned assemblies and his *directive* speeches at *Atr.*(5), (6), (7) can be compared with Zeus' order to Thetis at *Il.*(10.2), his summons at *Th.*(1) (indirect speech), the goddesses' instructions to Iris at *Ap.*(2) (indirect speech), and Here's statement of purpose at *Ap.*(4).<sup>673</sup> As we will see, the single (*assertive* or *directive*) speech is often combined with other structures.

However, the point of departure for the construction of complex speech-sequences in Homer is what we may call *simple exchange* (*viz.* utterance and reply).<sup>674</sup> Here we find the general principle whereby the final speech outweighs the preceding one(s), whether it is to enforce a decision on the course of events or to sanction something given. The *simple exchange* is the most common pattern in Greek epic, and is quite well represented in Mesopotamia too.<sup>675</sup>

---

<sup>671</sup> On indirect speech in Greek assemblies cf. above Chs. 7§1.2, 8§2.

<sup>672</sup> The speech-act theory terms *assertive* and *directive* are as in the classic definition by Searle (1975), without implying that speeches thus labelled are exclusively *assertive* or *directive*. Here's speech at *Ap.*(4), e.g., could be seen as *assertive*, *expressive* and *commissive*.

<sup>673</sup> Add Anu's order to the messenger at *N&E* 1-6 (Amarna version) and at SB 412-20.

<sup>674</sup> On the *Redenpaar* cf. still Lohmann (1970) *passim* and esp. 131-56. Structurally, there is little difference between a private *simple exchange* in a one-to-one dialogue, and one in the divine assembly. Nevertheless, the contextual significance of the collective framework always achieves semantic importance: Cf. above Ch. 5§9 on *Il.*(9) and *Il.* 16.431-61, and Ballesteros Petrella (in prep.2) on *Il.*(4) and *Od.* 13.125-61 (private dialogue). For the Mesopotamian tradition cf. Ch. 4§3.1. n. 308.

<sup>675</sup> Mesopotamia: *Angim* (Ninlil + Ninurta), *Lugale*(1), (3) (Šarur + Ninurta), *Lugale*(4) (collective + Enlil), *LUR* (Ninlil + An and Enlil, reply in indirect speech), *Atr.*(1) (collective + chief rebel), (3) (Nuska + collective), *Gilg.*(1) (collective + collective, but see following footnote), *Erra*(2) (Erra + Išum); Greece:

The next pattern in terms of complexity consists of a combination of the single *assertive* or *directive* speech and the *simple exchange*, there being two speakers: speaker A sets forth his/her position, B replies and A gets the final word, again according to the "last speech - most weighty speech" principle. Thus Enlil's order at *Atr.*(2) does not benefit from Anu's sensible point, nor is Zeus moved by Athene's plea at *Il.*(5.1).<sup>676</sup>

The *assertive/directive speech* + *simple exchange* pattern may in turn be preceded by one more *assertive/directive* speech. Thus Athene's exchange with Zeus at *Od.*(1), where her *directive* speech (*Od.* 1.44-61) is followed by Zeus' reply (62-79) and by Athene's final statement (80-95), is preceded by his *assertive* appraisal of Aigisthos (29-43) introducing the theme under discussion. So too Enlil's exchange with Šamaš at *Gilg.*(2) follows Anu's *assertive* and Enlil's *directive* speeches (Ch. 4§3.2). At *Il.*(3.1) the pattern is reversed, for the Dione-Aphrodite-Dione sequence (*Il.* 5.372-415: *simple exchange* + *assertive speech*) is followed, rather than preceded, by Athene's *assertive* speech concerning Aphrodite (420-25), while the assembly ends with a further *assertive* speech by Zeus directed to Aphrodite (427-30).

The latter examples illuminate the generative potentials of the combinatory compositional process. Thus the *simple exchange* can be simply doubled into two series of statement and reply, as at *Ee*(4) (*Ee* 2x Marduk, Anšar) where Anšar's last reply (*Ee* 3.1-66) is in effect a *directive speech* to Kaka. The doubled *simple exchange* can in itself be preceded by an *assertive/directive* speech, as at *Il.*(2), with Zeus' provocation causing his debate with Here (2x Here-Zeus), or followed by one, as with Hephaistos' intervention at

---

*Il.*(3.2) (Ares + Zeus), (4), (7) (Poseidon + Zeus), (8.1-2) (Here + Poseidon, Poseidon + Here), *Od.*(4) (Helios + Zeus), *Th.*(2) (Zeus + Kottos).

<sup>676</sup> Cf. *Lugale*(2): Enlil's lament, Šarur's arrival and request and Enlil's order in response; *Anzû*(3): Enlil's exultation, Ea's (?) proposal and Enlil's implementation; *Gilg.*(1) as reconstructed above Ch. 4§3.1: collective statement of problem, Ea's proposal and collective implementation; *Il.*(5.1) is mirrored at (5.2) with Here replying to Zeus instead of Athene; *Il.*(9): Zeus' statement of doubt, Athene's reply and Zeus' implementation.

*Il.*(1).<sup>677</sup> The structure of the *Il.*(2) dialogue fosters its deeply ironic character, for after Zeus' first *assertive* speech (*Il.* 4.5-19) there comes an A + B + A dialogue (Here, Zeus, Here, 4.24-67 = *assertive* + *simple exchange*), where Here seems to gain the upper hand; however, it is Zeus who enforces the final order (4.68-72), which the audience (unlike the gods) understand to be a function of his long-term plan rather than a concession to Here.<sup>678</sup>

The examples at *Gilg.*(2), *Il.*(1) and (3.1) bring us to assemblies staging more than two speakers. Simplest here is the *threefold pattern* displaying a thesis-antithesis-synthesis series, where the content of the third speech subsumes and integrates elements from the first and the second.<sup>679</sup> Like the *simple exchange*, the *threefold pattern* can also be repeated or combined with other elements. The assembly leading to mankind's creation at *Atr.*(4) develops through three consecutive *threefold patterns* (Ch. 2§3.1.3); at *Gilg.*(3) the *threefold* Enlil-Ninurta-Ea, which culminates with Ea justifying his acts (*Gilg.* SB 11.174-98), gets the central position, being framed between Nintu's *assertive* (11.164-71) and Enlil's *directive* (201-05) speeches.<sup>680</sup> Four speakers appear also at *Il.*(6), where the *threefold pattern* (*Il.* 15.103-41: Here, Ares, Athene) follows a *simple exchange* (89-99, Themis-Here) and is followed by Here's final *directive* speech instructing Iris and Apollo (145-48). Six are involved at *Od.*(3): Hephaistos' *directive* summons (8.305-20), the *tis-god's assertive* comments (348-52), a *simple exchange* (334-42: Apollo-Hermes) and a

---

<sup>677</sup> One can of course consider *Od.*(1) as constituting a doubled *simple exchange*, although, unlike Anšar or Zeus' first speeches at *Ee*(4) and *Il.*(1), Athene's first utterance there does not simply reply to what precedes, but *assertively* sets forth the specific subject of the ensuing debate (Odysseus' return); the same goes for Enlil's verdict at *Gilg.*(2), and Here's protest at *Il.*(2): not just the duel's result, but (her part in) Troy's destruction as a whole.

<sup>678</sup> Above Ch. 5§2.

<sup>679</sup> See Chs. 1§2, 2§3.1.3, 3§3.1, 5.§10, 6§3, 7§2; cf. *SumAdapa* (Anu, the gods, Enki), *Anzû*(1) (Igiġū, Enlil, Ea), *Ee*(1) (Apsû, Tiāmat, Mummu), *Il.*(10.1) (Apollo, Here, Zeus), *Herm.* (Hermes, Apollo, Zeus).

<sup>680</sup> The text's fragmentary state impedes certainty, but it is not unlikely that a threefold pattern (Enlil-Anu-Ea) followed Nintu's initial speech also at *Atr.*(10); concerning *Atr.*(8), we saw (Ch. 2§3.2.3) that Nintu's(?) endorsement of Enlil's plan and Ea's final instructions were possibly preceded by a collective oath; before this hypothetical *threefold* surely came Enlil's *assertive speech* (2.vi.22-30), followed by a *simple exchange* between Ea and Enlil.

*doubled simple exchange* (346-58: 2x Poseidon-Hephaistos). Such complexity, we are about to see, is governed by the narrator's interventions.

## §2.2. Narrative interventions

In both traditions a speaker can deliver two or more consecutive speeches, interrupted by the narrator's account of the speaker's act, or of the internal audience reaction to his/her speech or act; with Beck, we may label such instances *successive speeches*.<sup>681</sup> In Greek divine assemblies, *successive speeches* are always two (Hephaistos at *Il.*(1) and Zeus at *Od.*(2)), just as Nintu's at *Atr.*(9), and those of the senior gods Anšar, Laḥmu and Laḥamu, and then of all the gods at *Ee*(8).<sup>682</sup> However, at *Anzû*(2) Ea delivers three of them (two in the OB version), and the gathered gods speak four times to extol Marduk at *Ee*(5), just as Tiāmat does for her demonic army and for Qingu at *Ee*(3).<sup>683</sup> The narrator's interventions here are generally concise, ranging from a minimalist signalling of the addressee change (e.g. *Od.* 5.28, *Ee* 1.159-60), to a brief description of an act (e.g. *Il.* 1.584-85, *Ee* 1.157, 4.19-20, 29-30) and/or reaction (*Anzû* SB 167-68, 176-80, *Ee* 25-28a) that is significant for the ensuing speech. The narrator's interventions between *successive speeches* do not differ from those between speeches delivered by different characters; in the latter cases, however, the intervention may play a structural role in developing the most complex assemblies.

One possibility here is to describe a (generally negative) reaction before a decisive intervention. At *Atr.*(8) Ea's dissatisfaction with Enlil's accusation (*Atr.* OB 2.vi.15-22) precedes their *simple exchange* where the Flood is proposed; at *Anzû*(2), after Anu's attempts have failed, the gods' disheartened reaction (*Anzû* SB 1.155-61) precedes Ea

---

<sup>681</sup> Beck (2005) 29.

<sup>682</sup> Note the symmetric effect at *Ee*(8): Anšar and Ea's proclamations are the first and last speeches of the assembly; the intervening pair of *successive speeches* mirror each other: the elder gods Anšar, Laḥmu and Laḥamu start by proclaiming the first nine names (*Ee* 6.123-56), then exhort the rest of the gods (6.159-60); the gods agree (6.163-64) and then proclaim the names (7.1-136).

<sup>683</sup> *Ee*(3) and *Ee*(5) both consist of *successive speeches* only; cf. §4.2.

entering the debate; the description of Greek gods' turmoil caused by Zeus' attitude precludes Hephaistos' mediating intervention at *Il.*(1), and Here's provocative speech at *Il.*(6) (*Il.* 1.568-71, 15.100-03; 1.570 ≈ 15.101); the same technique applies with Here and Athene's dissatisfied reactions at *Il.*(2), (5.1), (5.2) (4.20-24 = 8.457-61, 8.28-30).

In all these cases the narrator's intervention marks boundaries within the dialogue structure: at *Anzû*(2) it separates Anu's three *simple exchanges* from Ea's decisive series of *successive speeches*; at *Il.*(1) the doubled *simple exchange* between Zeus and Here is separated from Hephaistos' two *successive speeches*; at *Il.*(6) the narrator separates the *simple exchange* Iris-Here from a *threefold pattern* Here-Ares-Athene; at *Il.*(2), (5.1), (5.2), Zeus' *assertive/directive speech* is separated from the *simple exchanges* it generates (doubled at *Il.*(2), though cf. above §2.1).

Although arrivals generally happen as the assembly begins, structural demarcations occur if the narrator inserts a decisive arrival between speeches, generally after a summons. Nintu/Aruru is summoned at *Atr.*(4), *Anzû*(2), *Gilg.*(1). On the other hand, Šarur arrives unexpectedly after Enlil's helpless exclamation at *Lugale*(2); Enlil joins the gods after Nintu's speech at *Atr.*(10) and *Gilg.*(3).<sup>684</sup> The gods' arrival at *Od.*(3) and Styx's at *Th.*(1) follow Hephaistos' and Zeus' speeches respectively. One may also compare Thetis' ascent between *Il.*(10.1-2), although Iris' intervening journey actually separates two scenes of assembly (below §4.1).

Finally, whilst both traditions present detailed introductions to the assembly deserving more space than the conversation,<sup>685</sup> Mesopotamian poems give greater prominence to the acts performed in the core of the assembly (having to do with ritual, magic, divination), such as the accurately described rituals for the creation of mankind at *Atr.*(4) and *Ee*(7);

---

<sup>684</sup> One might compare Poseidon's delayed arrival at *Il.*(7), though this is still part of the assembly's introduction.

<sup>685</sup> Esp. *Il.*(7), where *Il.* 20.4-18 (arrival), 19-30 (dialogue); e.g. *EJN* 93-113 (arrival and acts), 114-120 (speech).

Tiāmat's spells and acts at *Ee*(3), mirrored by the gods' ritual proclamation and testing of Marduk's capacities at *Ee*(5); the acts sanctioning Marduk's triumph at *Ee*(6) and the construction of Esagil at *Ee*(8); the observation of the stars at *Erra*(1).

### §3. Outcomes

The assembly's outcome depends on its diegetic function, within the poem as a whole and, in longer compositions with several assemblies, within the narrative section where the assembly is situated. The scene's conclusion therefore enables the audience to discern whether the assembly rounds off a given narrative section (or indeed the composition as a whole) or triggers further narrative developments. In the first case the resolution of the assembly does not require implementation (*accomplished* assemblies). In the second case the resolution does require implementation: all such scenes conclude with a departure, normally of a single character (*departure* assemblies). The latter are more common in the Greek tradition, though this might be due to the overwhelmingly heroic setting of the surviving narratives.<sup>686</sup>

#### §3.1. Accomplished Assemblies

*Accomplished* assemblies are of course an ideal means of conclusion, and indeed many Mesopotamian poems close with a divine assembly. The topos may well derive from the Sumerian divine praise narratives concluding with the deity extolled by the divine community and/or the chief god (Ch. 1§1). The same happens at *SumAdapa*, *Atr.*(10), *Anzû*(4), *Ee*(8), and we have seen that *Erra*(2) significantly alters the pattern by avoiding a collective praise.

---

<sup>686</sup> The *departures* ratio is 50% Mesopotamia, 66% Greece.

No extant early Greek poem ends with a divine assembly<sup>687</sup> but, among *accomplished* assemblies, *Il.*(1) concludes the poem's first narrative block,<sup>688</sup> *Il.*(5.1) and (5.3) conclude different sections of Diomedes' *aristeia*,<sup>689</sup> *Il.*(7) runs parallel to the construction of the wall exhausting the truce, *Il.*(8.2) concludes the day of battle, *Th.*(3) crowns the account of Zeus' accession to power. Similarly, *Lugale*(3) concludes the Asag part of the poem, *EnNinm* brings the divine revolt episode to an end, Lugalbanda's illness ends with the assembly (*Lugalb. I*), the assembly at *LUR* closes the *kirugu* and the goddess' lamentation, *Anzû*(1) concludes Enlil's (disastrous and provisional) organisation of the divine prerogatives, *Erra*(1) brings to an end the long prologue to Erra's action, and *Gilg.*(1) (temporarily) concludes the discourse on Gilgames' arrogance.

Even if *accomplished* assemblies are never followed by a divine intervention outside of (and prompted by) the gathering, the ensuing narrative may nonetheless be influenced by the assembly proceedings.<sup>690</sup> Occasionally the effects are postponed, or even absent (more commonly in the Greek material).<sup>691</sup>

### §3.2. Departure Assemblies

*Departure* assemblies, where the departing god may or may not be a messenger, sometimes stand at the beginning of, and thus prompt, an altogether new narrative section; otherwise they orientate the course of an event already ongoing before the assembly scene.

---

<sup>687</sup> A possibility exists (Wagner 1891: 252), that *Il. pers.* ended with an Olympian scene where Athene plotted the Achaean fleet's destruction, cf. West (2013) 243; this is based on Proclus' possibly misplaced reference to this plotting at *Il. pers.* arg. 266-67 Severyns, on which see West (2013) 238-39, Finglass (2015) 348 n. 25.

<sup>688</sup> A departure from Olympus at *Il.* 2.3-16 triggers the action of Book 2, but this follows the assembly rather than concluding it. On the *caesura* between Books 1-2, cf. Ch. 5§1.

<sup>689</sup> Ch. 5§5.

<sup>690</sup> *Lugalb. I*: hero's elevation → cosmic battle; *Ee*(1): Apsû's plot → Ea's reaction; *Ee*(3): Tiāmat's assembly → gods' reaction (Tablet 2); *Ee*(6): Marduk exalted → mankind's creation (Tablet 6); *Erra*(2): divine helplessness → Erra unleashing destruction; *Gilg.*(1): divine creation → birth of Enkidu; *Il.*(1): Zeus upset because of his plan → sends dream to Agamemnon; *Th.*(3): Zeus exalted → generates offspring as king.

<sup>691</sup> Effects postponed: *DB*: death decreed, but funerary provisions come first; *Anzû*(1): decision on Anzû, but further regulations before theft of Tablet-of-Destinies; *Gilg.*(2): death decreed, but internal conflict first; *Il.*(4): wall not yet to be destroyed; *Il.*(5.2): more Achaean losses, but only after the embassy to Akhilleus; *Od.*(4): Zeus intervenes after six days. No obvious effect: *Lugale*(3), *LUR*, *Il.*(3.1), (3.2), *Ap.*(1), (3).

Considering assemblies starting a new section *ex nihilo*, Ninurta's departure in *Lugale*(1) may be compared with Athene's at *Od.*(1), both starting the poems' actions, both being *Standard Assemblies*.<sup>692</sup> Instead Šarur's final departure at *Lugale*(2) orientates Ninurta's (already ongoing) fight with Asag; similarly, Athene's departures at *Il.*(2) and (9) determine the outcome of the duels between Paris and Menelaos, and Akhilleus and Hektor.<sup>693</sup>

Whether triggering or orientating the course of events, *departures* may well constitute also the conclusion of the preceding section, thus working as a narrative hinges, which also applies to some *accomplished* assemblies. As seen throughout Parts 1-2, this junctural function is a prominent aspect of the assemblies' diegetic purpose.<sup>694</sup>

#### §4. Structural connections

The Mesopotamian and Greek traditions, thus, present similar ways to begin, construe and conclude the assembly scene, so that the structural morphology of the type-scene is essentially coincident. We will now see that both traditions display analogous ways of connecting the assemblies with one another, which contributes to the structuring function observed in Parts 1-2.

---

<sup>692</sup> Cf. *EnNinl*, departure starting second half of the narrative; *Atr.*(1), *en masse* departure against Ekur, the revolt starts; *Atr.* (7) (extant only in SB Si 5.55-58), depicting the gods in the positions assigned by Enlil; the end of *Atr.*(6) is not preserved; in *Atr.*(5) (preserved in NA ms. S (L-M 106)) Namtar is *not* depicted as departing, although the assembly requires implementation: plague is straightaway on earth; *Anzû*(2), Ninurta's departure begins fight section; *Anzû*(3), sending of Birdu begins discourse on Ninurta's return; *Ee*(2), Ea's departure begins fight section; *Ee*(4), sending of Kaka prompts Marduk's appointment; *Ee*(5), Marduk's departure begins fight section; Kaka's departure at *N&E* 6-8 (Amarna version), triggers the entire narrative; *Il.*(5.1), Zeus starts his intervention; *Il.*(7), Akhilleus returns, *en masse* departure towards battlefield; *Il.*(8.1), *en masse* departure beginning Akhilleus-Aineias episode; *Il.*(10.1-2), departures direct Hektor's ransom; *Od.*(2), *nostos* finally set in motion; *Ap.*(4), birth of Typhoeus; *Th.*(2), *en masse* departure begins fight section.

<sup>693</sup> Compare *Angim*, Ninurta departs to be further praised; *Atr.*(2), (3), Nuska's departures shape the course of the rebellion; *Atr.*(4), Ea and Nintu retire to complete mankind's creation; *Erra*(2), Erra's departure stands halfway through the poem's final resolution; *Il.*(6), Apollo and Iris' departures will orientate the course of the battle; *Il.*(8.2), Poseidon's departure determinates the outcome of the duel; *Ap.*(2), the sending of Iris determinates successful birth-giving; *Herm.*, with the gods' departure the dispute comes to its resolution.

<sup>694</sup> See the Concluding Remarks to Parts 1-2.

But first it may be noted that in the human-focussed *Atr.* and *Gilg.* we find juxtapositions of human and divine assemblies at crucial points in the poems, with important characterisation effects. This clustering phenomenon has been well studied in Homer.<sup>695</sup> In *Atr.*, after each of Enlil's destructive assemblies, the pious ruler summons the elders and delivers salvific instructions. In *Gilg.* SB 11.48-86, men gather to build the boat, and counter the divine assembly's decision. After the gods establish Enkidu's death in Tablet 7, Tablet 8 presents the collective funerary rituals. Although the Urukian assemblies before the heroes leave (*Gilg.* SB 2.100-3.12, cf. OB 3.173-end) are relatively distant from the gods' gathering at *Gilg.*(1), a structure of human assemblies is perceptible (Tablets 2-3, 8, 11) which parallels the Homeric practice.<sup>696</sup>

#### §4.1. Successive Assemblies

As a rule, the scenes of divine assembly are discretely positioned throughout the poem, that is, they are generally distant from each other. However, just like *successive speeches* (§2.2), assembly scenes can succeed one another, after an intervening narrative section, at a relatively short distance. In these cases, the assembly setting tends to remain the same until the narrative thread is picked up again, though there may also be a change of location announced at the end of the first assembly with an *en masse* departure (e.g. *Ee*(7-8) or *Il.*(8.1-2)), or indeed substantial narrative progress between the scenes in question (e.g. *Atr.*(2-4), *Ee*(6-8), *Il.*(10.1-2)). Notwithstanding the separation, the sense of unity is strengthened by the identical subject of discussion and frequently by parallel or symmetric structures highlighting contrast.

Thus, *Atr.*(2) and *Atr.*(4) surround the second rebel assembly *Atr.*(3): Nuska leaves and returns to the gathered gods. Both *Atr.*(2) and *Atr.*(4) begin with Enlil's helpless speech,

---

<sup>695</sup> Cf. Kelly (2007) 75.

<sup>696</sup> On which see esp. Bannert (1987).

and the ensuing suggestions by Anu (ultimately ineffective) in *Atr.*(2) and by Ea (effective) in *Atr.*(4) contrast with each other. Enlil's final and self-referential order at *Atr.*(2) is countered in *Atr.*(4) by the collective summoning of Nintu. Similarly, *Ee*(5) and *Ee*(6) surround Marduk's military and cosmogonic exploit, both presenting four collective speeches and Marduk's central act in *Ee*(5), or speech in *Ee*(6). *Ee*(6), on the other hand, starts Marduk's final exaltation which develops through three consecutive scenes of assembly (Ch. 3§2.3), interrupted first by the Ea-Marduk dialogue leading to mankind's creation, then by the construction of Esagil.

In the *Iliad*, both *Il.*(3.1-2) and *Il.*(5.1-2) frame large portions of battle while keeping the same setting. At *Il.*(3.1-2) Aphrodite and Ares arrive wounded, but the love goddess is quietly and briefly advised by Zeus, Ares is bitterly rebuked at some length.<sup>697</sup> Zeus' mild, brief and vague reply to Athene at *Il.*(5.1) contrasts with the harsher and longer disclosure of his plan to Here at *Il.*(5.2).<sup>698</sup> *Il.*(8.1-2) encircle the encounter between Aineias and Akhilleus, again displaying an inversion: at *Il.*(8.1) Here proposes intervention, Poseidon refuses, no action is taken; at *Il.*(8.2) Poseidon proposes intervention, Here refuses, Poseidon intervenes. Thetis' ascent constitutes an interval between *Il.*(10.1-2): the contrast here is conceptual, from conflict to concord. On a larger scale, *Od.*(1-2) frame the Telemachy, inversely emphasising the situation in Ithaca *vis-à-vis* Odysseus' state (Ch. 6§1-2).

#### §4.2. Large-scale structural connections

Specific deployments and positioning of traditional compositional elements and related typologies within the individual poems signal their poets' choices, and contribute to the assemblies' large-scale structuring function observed in Parts 1 and 2 of this thesis.

<sup>697</sup> Note 5.367 ≈ 5.868, θεῶν ἔδος "the place of the gods" only here in the *Iliad*, cf. *Od.* 6.42, *HAp.* 109.

<sup>698</sup> *Il.*(5.1) and (5.2) display an identical structure of speeches (above §2.1), cf. further Kelly (2007) 63 nn. 300-01, and note 8.32-7 = 8.463-68, though West's athetesis of 8.466-68 finds support in the manuscript tradition.

Containing several assemblies, *Atra-ḫasīs*, *Enūma eliš* and the *Iliad* connect them thematically and structurally in a large-scale deployment of the *successive assemblies* technique which encompasses the entire composition.

Thus, the only summoned assemblies in *Enūma eliš* are those where Marduk is first appointed king, *Ee(5)*, and where his kingship receives definite sanction, *Ee(7)*, (8). *Ee(5)* and *Ee(7)* frame Marduk's military and cosmogonic exploits; after summoning the gods, *Ee(7)*, he proves to be a worthy ruler and administrator by creating mankind as workforce and having the grateful Anunnakī build Esagil. In the *Iliad*, the only assemblies summoned by Zeus are those that mark the beginning and end of his ban, and, therefore, of his intervention against the Achaeans as promised to Thetis, *Il.(5.1)*, (7).<sup>699</sup>

With regard to their internal structure, *Il.(5.1)* and (7) display a symmetric opposition: at *Il.(5.1)* Zeus speaks first and is evasive to Athene, at *Il.(7)* Poseidon speaks first and Zeus stresses his brother's knowledge of his intentions.<sup>700</sup> The opposition between *Ee(3)*, Qingu's appointment, and *Ee(5)*, Marduk's election (Ch. 3§2.3), is borne out by a similar structure of *successive speeches*, where at *Ee(3)* the speaker is Tiāmat, at *Ee(5)* the divine community.<sup>701</sup>

The *Iliad's* complex system of divine assemblies holds together through further connections involving typology. Thus, while all three instances of *Perception Assemblies* deal with annihilation, the nexus between *Il.(2)* and *Il.(9)* in particular is noteworthy, for they start and conclude, with Pandaros' shot and Hektor's death, the poem's depiction of actual battle. Only in these two instances does Zeus invite views from the gods (4.14 ≈

---

<sup>699</sup> Cf. above Ch. 5 n. 399.

<sup>700</sup> Kelly (2007) 71 notes that *Il.(7)* breaks the Iliadic rule whereby the summoning character speaks first.

<sup>701</sup> Tiāmat's first brief speech to the monsters and the narrator's detailed description of her incantation (1.139-40 + 141-51) is reflected and opposed by the gods' first detailed speech to Marduk followed by the narrator's brief note (4.3-18 + 19-21); then, Tiāmat's unilateral entrusting of the Tablet of Destinies to Qingu (two *successive* speeches 1.153-56 + 158) is matched by the gods' testing of Marduk's ability to make a constellation disappear and appear (two *successive* speeches 4.21-24 + 28b). On manuscript fluctuation concerning who delivers the last speech of *Ee(3)*, cf. Kämmerer and Metzler (2012) 150 n. 2.

22.174),<sup>702</sup> and only these Iliadic assemblies end with Athene's departure. Both scenes show Zeus' special care for the besieged, and provide a further cosmic connection between Hector's doom and the fate of Troy.

A narrative and formal thread develops through the Iliadic *Arrival Assemblies* at the beginning, centre and end of the divine narrative, as Zeus, *Il.*(1), Here, *Il.*(6), and Thetis, *Il.*(10.2), arrive. Beyond typical arrival patterns (§1.1), *Il.*(1) and (6) display specific connections. The discussion arises as the protagonist is asked to account for what happened before his/her arrival; the asking deity shows a certain awareness (1.536-39, 15.90-91), answers are elusive (1.550 ≈ 15.93); the protagonists' reaction to the query generates divine discontent,<sup>703</sup> which in both cases is signalled right after Here sits (1.569-70, 15.100-01; 1.570a = 15.101a). Furthermore, in both scenes the crisis is solved by a mediating figure who thereby confirms Zeus' authority (Hephaistos, Athene): the two scenes frame the broad narrative line on Here's discontent at Zeus' excluding policy, Book 15 staging the last depiction of divine *stasis* against Zeus' plan to help the Trojans. Indeed, Zeus has finally disclosed his plans to Here, just as she wished in *Il.*(1) (*Il.* 1.531-43).<sup>704</sup>

Moving to *Il.*(10.2), the arrival of Thetis concluding the poem's divine narrative is construed to highlight concord among the gods through a contrast with her first arrival on Olympus (*Il.* 1.533-35, 24.98-99):

ἤϊρεν δ' εὐρύοπα Κρονίδην ἄτερ ἤμενον ἄλλων  
ἀκροτάτῃ κορυφῇ πολυδαιράδος Οὐλύμποιο·

and she (*viz.* Thetis) found the wide-sounding son of Kronos sitting apart from the others on the highest peak of many-ridged Olympus

ἤϊρον δ' εὐρύοπα Κρονίδην, περὶ δ' ἄλλοι ἅπαντες  
εἶαθ' ὀμηγερέες μάκαρες θεοὶ αἰὲν ἑόντες.

---

<sup>702</sup> Romano Martín (2009) 43 notes this connection and highlights (misleadingly, in my view) the fact that at *Il.*(9) Zeus is again trying to provoke the gods: cf. Ch. 5§9, 10§5.

<sup>703</sup> Connection noticed by Romano Martín (2009) 37 n. 4; phraseological resonances include 1.550 ≈ 15.93; 1.570a = 15.101a.

<sup>704</sup> Ch. 5§6.

and they (*viz.* Thetis and Iris) found the wide-sounding son of Kronos, and around all the others sat gathered together, the blessed gods who are forever.

The reversal of Zeus' proleptic solitude (Ch. 5§1) reflects the now stabilised situation under his firm (and flexible) rule, which permits the respectful and empathetic gestures of Athene and Here.<sup>705</sup>

The formal and conceptual ties between *Il.*(1), (6) and (10.2), encompassing the beginning, development and resolution of the narrative thread about Zeus' plan, invite comparison with the connections between *Atr.*(4), (8) and (10). These are the assemblies where mankind is created, the Flood ordained, and the final resolution achieved, and the only ones whose protagonists are Enlil, Ea and Nintu. First, Ea and Nintu create mankind responding to Enlil's helplessness; as the Flood is established, Ea's isolated opposition is highlighted, as Nintu, to her subsequent regret, endorses Enlil's plan. The final resolution is achieved, again, by the joint effort of Nintu and Ea, this time according to Enlil's word.

As in the *Iliad*, the conceptual line of discourse is matched by formal correspondences. Though *Atra-ḥasīs*'s fragmentary state invites caution, important structural similarities were noted earlier between *Atr.*(4) and (6).<sup>706</sup> Unfortunately most of the proceedings in *Atr.*(10) following Enlil's invitation are lost, but we do see, at least, that they begin with Ea's instructions (*Atr.* OB 3.vi.45-vii.11), just like in *Atr.*(4) (1.204-17).<sup>707</sup>

The symmetric effect of the deliberate macrostructural connections in the *Iliad* may be seen from the following diagram:<sup>708</sup>

---

<sup>705</sup> Zeus is "found" by divine visitors also at 5.753-54 (Athene and Here) and 15.152-53 (Iris and Apollo), always in solitude.

<sup>706</sup> Ch. 2§3.2.3, also above n. 680.

<sup>707</sup> Note also the verbal echo between 1.190 and 3.vi.43, cf. above Ch. 2§3.3.2 As further cases of structural correspondences between assemblies at the beginning and end of compositions one should note *Lugale*(1), (3) and (4), Ninurta honoured in the assembly, see below on *N&E*.

<sup>708</sup> Only 7 assemblies out of 15 are included, albeit those that are often considered as the main (or the only) divine assemblies of the poem, cf. Flaig (1994) 18 n. 16, (implicitly) Latacz *et al.* (2000) 169, Romano Martín (2009) 25.

<b>(Assembly) Book</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Typology</b>
(1) Book 1	Zeus' plan against the Achaeans	<i>Arrival (Zeus)</i>
(2) Book 4	Troy's destiny	<i>Perception</i>
(5.1) Book 8	Divine intervention forbidden	<i>Gathering</i>
(6) Book 15	Zeus' plan on divine intervention forbidden	<i>Arrival (Here)</i>
(7) Book 20	Divine intervention permitted	<i>Gathering</i>
(9) Book 22	Hektor's doom	<i>Perception</i>
(10.2) Book 24	Zeus' plan: Akhilleus and Hektor's funeral	<i>Arrival (Thetis)</i>

An analogous symmetry based on typology can be perceived in *Atra-ḫasīs*, again considering the major assemblies.<sup>709</sup> Thus, the assembly of the great gods in Tablet 1, *Atr.*(2), summoned by Enlil, is mirrored and reversed by the last assembly summoned by *Atra-ḫasīs*, *Atr.*(10). In *Atr.*(2) Enlil proves unable to heed Anu's advice and confront the crisis, in *Atr.*(10) he does listen to Ea and contributes to the final resolution, accepting the survival of mankind and fostering the new order. The intervening (*Perception*) assemblies relating to mankind's annihilation display an identical structure (§2.2) marking the ruler's self-referential policy:

<b>(Assembly) Tablet</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Typology</b>
(2) Tablet 1	Divine Rebellion	<i>Gathering</i>
(5) Tablet 1	Pestilence	<i>Perception</i>
(6) Tablet 2	Drought	<i>Perception</i>
(7) Tablet 2	Famine	<i>Perception</i>
(10) Tablet 3	Final Resolutions	<i>Gathering</i>

<sup>709</sup> It should be remembered that the beginning of *Atr.*(8) is not preserved.

Finally, let us briefly consider the symmetry of the assembly system in *Nergal and Ereškigal*, relating how Nergal became the spouse of the Queen of the Netherworld:<sup>710</sup>

Amarna version (ms. C, c. 14th century)

Assembly (lines)	Subject	Typology
<b>a.</b> (1-4)	Banquet in Heaven, messenger sent to the Netherworld.	<i>Standard Unmarked</i>
<b>b.</b> (7-14)	Namtar (Ereškigal's representative) enters the gathering, Nergal does not stand up.	<i>Arrival</i>
<b>b<sub>1</sub>.</b> (28-33)	Namtar re-enters the gathering, but cannot find a disguised Nergal	<i>Arrival</i>
<b>a<sub>1</sub>.</b> (41-rev. 8)	In Heaven, Ea prepares Nergal's descent to the Netherworld.	<i>Standard Unmarked</i>

SB version (mss. A (NA) + B (LB)):

<b>a.</b> ([1-20])	Banquet in Heaven, Anu's utterance to Kaka.	<i>Standard Unmarked?</i>
<b>b.</b> ([61-69])	Namtar ascends, Nergal does not stand up.	<i>Arrival</i>
<b>c.</b> ([75]-135)	Namtar ascends, Ea creates Nergal's duplicate and instructs him.	<i>Arrival</i>
<b>d.</b> (260-66)	Nergal returns to Heaven, Ea makes him unrecognisable in the assembly.	<i>Arrival</i>
<b>b<sub>2</sub>.</b> (319-41)	Namtar ascends, reports Ereškigal's threat, but cannot find Nergal	<i>Arrival</i>
<b>c<sub>1</sub>.</b> (357-85)	Namtar ascends, another vain search; discussion between Nergal, Namtar and Ea, who eventually instructs Nergal before his final journey.	<i>Arrival</i>
<b>a<sub>1</sub>.</b> (412-20)	Anu's utterance to Kaka, sanctioning Nergal's presence in the Underworld.	<i>Standard Unmarked</i>

Starting from the Amarna version, the central episodes (b, b<sub>1</sub>) stress Nergal's distinctiveness in relation to the divine community, whilst in the first and last assemblies (a, a<sub>1</sub>) the heavenly gods elicit communication between the two realms, first by triggering Namtar's ascent, then by making Nergal descend. The disposition of these scenes is a function of the aetiology guiding the narrator's design. Nergal's peculiar character (b, b<sub>1</sub>), ultimately assimilates him to Ereškigal, who cannot join the gods (a), just as Nergal, as a result of his behaviour, is bound to leave Heaven (a<sub>1</sub>). Thus, the audience is encouraged to focus on Nergal's distinctiveness, which takes him to his Netherworld dwelling.

<sup>710</sup> Line numbering and sigla according to Ponchia and Luukko (2013). On the poem see esp. Hutter (1985), Reiner (1985) 50-60, Saporetti (1994), Chiodi (1998), (2000), Pettinato and Chiodi (2000), Foster (2005) 506-24.

The SB version maintains a very neat structure, but adds parallelism to symmetry.<sup>711</sup> Nergal's two descents parallel Namtar's four ascents: after a first journey where Ereškigal's envoy gets the worse of it (b lack of homage, b<sub>1</sub> being tricked), Nergal descends at Namtar's second try (c, c<sub>1</sub>). In both cases, the descent is reached through the typical pattern of divine crisis and resolution thanks to Ea's initiative in the assembly: his major trick (he makes Nergal cross-eyed, lame and bald) deserves the central position (d).

Thus, both traditions make use of large-scale structures of assemblies which hold the poems together, guiding the audience through the highlights of the divine narrative by means of symmetry, parallelism and ring composition.

#### §5. The question of transmission

The structural analysis shows that the techniques whereby Mesopotamian and early Greek divine assemblies are composed and connected to each other overlap to a remarkable degree. An awareness of the similarities' formal nature permits a focus on some divergences which reflect the different shapes of the literary pantheon.

Thus, collective divine speeches, frequent in Mesopotamia, do not occur in Greek epic.<sup>712</sup> The greater prominence of the Mesopotamian divine collectivity is further reflected, for example, in the collective "acts" performed in the core of the assembly (especially exaltation and creation), whereas in Greece speech tends to prevail (§2.2). One fundamental and specifically Mesopotamian divine act is the "proclaiming of destinies" operated collectively and/or by the chief gods.<sup>713</sup> Assemblies where one mortal is present

---

<sup>711</sup> On parallelism and symmetry see especially Hutter (1985) 35-38. The paucity of our evidence, alongside the textual and contextual peculiarities of C (a school exercise in 14th-c. Egypt), discourages us from assessing the genesis of the SB version as an expansion and modification on the pattern of the Amarna text, cf. Gurney (1960) 107, Lambert (1973) 356-57, Hutter (1985) 18-19, 55-64.

<sup>712</sup> The (partial) analogue is the epic *tis*-speech, cf. de Jong (1987), occurring only at *Od.*(3) in a divine context.

<sup>713</sup> Cf. Ch. 10§2, §5.

(equally absent in Greece), respond to the same framework, for the gods assign the hero a destiny, generally of elevation.

Some cultural differences will be explored in the next chapter; for now, one conclusion is crucial to assess the historical import of the uncovered formal analogies: all the shared techniques are widespread and deeply embedded in the traditional and orally-derived poetic system of Greek epic.

### §5.1. Direct imitations?

One tendency in Graeco-Mesopotamian comparative criticism is to see direct connections between individual Near Eastern and Greek passages, assessing them in terms of intertextual imitations or allusions operated by the Greek poets.<sup>714</sup> It appears that only one case of divine assembly has been considered in this perspective: according to West, the assembly for Hektor's death, *Il.*(9), would be modelled on *Gilg*(2), the divine discussion about Enkidu.<sup>715</sup> This conclusion largely depends on the cumulative case for a direct relationship between the two poems (see Ch. 10§5 on this topic and further on this parallel). In fact, Homer's scene appears to be entirely construed according to Greek epic patterns: beyond a generic situational similarity (a divine discussion establishing the death of one protagonist), there is little overlapping in detail. Traditional elements include: the onlooking gods (§1.1), Zeus inviting views (cf. *Il.* 4.14-16, *Od.* 1.76-77), the simple exchange (§2.1), and the *Departure* (§3.2). The *Gilgameš* scene, as far as the surviving Hittite prose version goes, comes in a dream where the hero faces the assembly (a likely elaboration on *Death of Bilgames*, this feature being absent from extant Greek epic),<sup>716</sup>

---

<sup>714</sup> Burkert (1992) 88-114; West (1997) *passim*, especially concerning SB *Gilgameš*, Currie (2012); see the discussion in Kelly (2008), Ballesteros Petrella (in prep.1); Currie's (2016) 147-222 model allows for allusion, though not necessarily from the written Near Eastern surviving texts, but possibly from oral or lost written versions, cf. *Introduction*.

<sup>715</sup> West (1997) 179-80, 343-44. On *Il.*(3.1.) and SB *Gilg.* 6.80-114 cf. Ballesteros Petrella (in prep.1), differently Currie (2016) 173-78, 193-98.

<sup>716</sup> Ch. 4§3.2.

presents a thesis-antithesis-synthesis pattern of speeches, and concludes abruptly (*Accomplished*). If Homer did imitate *Gilgameš* here (which should not simply be granted by default), the imitation cannot be discerned from the poetic technique relating to the divine assembly, which is entirely exemplified in the extant Greek practice.

The same conclusion emerges from a further parallel where the structural convergence is stronger. Zeus' threatening summons at *Il.*(5.1) and his prohibition, dictated by a will to bring loss to the Achaeans, have invited comparison with Enlil's "plague" assemblies, *Atr.*(5-7). The introductions coincide in signalling a summoned assembly: Zeus ἀγορὴν ποιήσατο "got the assembly made" (*Il.* 8.2), Enlil *il-ta-kan pu-ḫur-šū* "established his assembly" (*Atr.* S rev. iv.4 = 37 ≈ SB Si 5.47 *iš-ta-na-kan*).<sup>717</sup> Both expressions stress the force of the chief god's imposed edicts and highlight his self-referential policy through a variation on standard phraseology: the Akkadian by adding the pronominal suffix -*šū* ("his"), the Greek by using a middle form of ποιέω instead of the expected καλέω.<sup>718</sup>

The indigenous context of each expression shows that for an ancient audience (Mesopotamian or Greek) this (identical) effect originated through variations upon the *native* traditional background. The two scenes are similarly shaped, but this is far better explained as the result of similar poetic syntaxes than as the product of imitation. The expression "to summon an assembly" is widespread in Greek epic, and if Homer were the first Greek poet to apply it to the divine gathering (which would be hazardous to suppose) he would surely have done so by drawing on his repertoire of summoned human assemblies, not as an imitation of *Atra-ḫasīs*.<sup>719</sup>

These being the closest parallels in our corpus of divine assemblies, we may conclude that the evidence does not speak for cases of imitation, but for a widespread web of

---

<sup>717</sup> Cf. West (1997) 178.

<sup>718</sup> Above §1.2. The expression ἀγορὴν ποιήσατο, highlighting Zeus' authority at *Il.* 8.2 is then repeated for Hektor summoning the Trojans at 8.489 to the same effect.

<sup>719</sup> Summoned human assemblies in the *Iliad* are listed and discussed by Kelly (2007) 68-70; on the *Odyssey* see Bannert (1987), cf. §5.2.

similarities in the poetic syntax of these scenes; this syntax is as deeply rooted in the Greek as it is in the Mesopotamian poets' repertoire and, therefore, individual parallels should not be attributed to a processes of direct imitation.<sup>720</sup> It is the shared poetic syntax, as we are about to see, which may be attributed to long and deep interactions with Near Eastern poetry.

#### §5.2. Greek divine assemblies: a borrowing?

It is often assumed that, as a literary topos, the divine council came to early Greek epic from the Near East.<sup>721</sup> This view needs to be corrected on several grounds. First, the closest structural parallels to the divine assembly in Greek epic come from scenes of human assembly in the same tradition.<sup>722</sup> Burkert places the divine assembly among Orientalising Period imports, but it is perhaps significant that the ἀγερ- stem occurs in Linear B tablets.<sup>723</sup>

Most crucial, however, is the fact that in advanced polytheisms it appears to be natural to think of the gods coming together like humans do. Thus, the "divine assembly" deserves an entry in Thompson's *Motif-Index of Folk Literature*, where the range of examples quoted (mostly from modern folk narratives of South-Eastern Asia) is surely conservative.<sup>724</sup> Of particular interest for our purposes are two traditions that pass unnoticed in Thompson's *Index*, Icelandic mythological poetry and Sanskrit epic, both

---

<sup>720</sup> Similar conclusions were reached after comparing Ištar and Aphrodite's ascents in SB *Gilg.* 6 and *Iliad* 5, cf. Ballesteros Petrella (in prep.1); cf. Mondì (1990), Kelly (2008), Haubold (2013) 20-33.

<sup>721</sup> Cf. e.g. Stella (1978) 83-84, 130-34, 366; Burkert (1992) 117, (2001) 27; West (1988) 67, (1997) esp. 112, 177; Romano Martín (2009) 21-24; Scully (2015) 33, (2016) 45.

<sup>722</sup> See especially Kelly (2007) 68-75, and further literature above *Introductory Remarks* to Part 2, where we noted that the main difference lies in the minor prominence of institutional settings in Olympus. Though the informal setting of divine gatherings is widespread in Mesopotamia (above §1.1), several Mesopotamian divine assemblies display detailed procedures, especially in the (not only initial) summons and in the performed acts, cf. e.g. *EJN, Atr.*(4), *Anzû*(2), *Ee*(5),(6),(8).

<sup>723</sup> Burkert (2001) 27; by contrast, for Stella (1978) 130-34, the Near Eastern parallels support a Mycenaean origin of the Iliadic divine system, cf. below §5.3, and above n. 643 on ἀγερ- in Linear B.

<sup>724</sup> Thompson (1955) 93-94, §A167, cf. §§A168-A169.1.

products of oral traditions, both commonly used in attempts to reconstruct Indo-European poetics.

Divine assembly scenes are relatively common in Eddic mythological narrative poetry, whose surviving representatives are comparable in length to our Sumerian divine narratives (Ch. 1§1).<sup>725</sup> Dronke, listing the most remarkable instances, highlights that "in each of these cases the *þing* [Old Norse "assembly"] is held because of some fearful happening: Baldr has had dreams of death; Þorr's hammer has been stolen; the gods are growing old because Iðunn has been abducted."<sup>726</sup> This is the familiar role of the assembly depicting (the peak of) an impasse involving the divine community and providing a way towards its resolution.<sup>727</sup> The assembly begins *Baldrs draumar*, triggering the entire narrative, and stands about halfway through the plot of *Haustlǫng* and *Brymskviða*, providing the input for the crucial denouement.

In *Voluspá* (the cryptic cosmic history), the gods' deliberative gatherings punctuate the early phases of cosmic formation. They are described with stock-lines (*Vsp* 6/1-4 = 9/1-4 = 23/1-4 = 25/1-4), which "the poet uses as a refrain to link together distinct episodes of the gods' history".<sup>728</sup> The final account of Ragnarok is then framed by two references to the gods in assembly (*Vsp* 47/8, 57). Comparably, in *Hymiskviða*, where Thor fetches the cauldron for making the beer for the divine banquets, a gathering comes at the beginning and then concludes the composition as the hero returns (*Hym* 1, 39).<sup>729</sup>

---

<sup>725</sup> Most Eddic material is first preserved in the mid-13th c. AD *Codex Regius*, some compositions being dated to as early as the 9th c.; critical text and commentary of some important mythological compositions (including *Voluspá*) in Dronke (1997), (2011); a full-scale (almost complete) commentary with extensive bibliography is von See *et al.* (1997-). For *Haustlǫng* see North (1997).

<sup>726</sup> Dronke (1997) 117, referring to *BDr* 1 = *Thrym* 14, *Haustl* 10.

<sup>727</sup> Cf. von See *et al.* (1997) 547.

<sup>728</sup> Dronke (1997) 37.

<sup>729</sup> For a descriptive discussion of the motif cf. von See *et al.* (2000) 397-404.

Divine assemblies recur in Sanskrit epics too, and the *Rāmāyaṇa* is a good example.<sup>730</sup> The monumental epic narrates how king Rāma is exiled and recovers his wife Sītā and his kingdom by destroying Rāvaṇa, Sītā's abductor and king of the demonic *rākṣasas*. Rāvaṇa, having received a boon from the chief god Brahmā whereby he could not be killed by any divine being, wreaks havoc in the cosmos; Rāma is destined to kill him, and the gods, before his birth, establish that he should be an incarnation of the god Viṣṇu. The tension between the hero's human and divine status, whilst causing much exercise in analytical criticism, is a fundamental thread in the epic, and accounts for its divine machinery.<sup>731</sup>

As the text stands, the two most important scenes of divine assembly come at the beginning and end of the narrative. Before the hero's birth (*Rm.* 1.14.4-17.1), the gods establish that Rāma should be an incarnation of Viṣṇu so that Rāvaṇa may be defeated.<sup>732</sup> After Rāvaṇa's death and the couple's reunion, the assembled gods reveal to Rāma that he is Viṣṇu, thereby impeding Rāma's repudiation of Sītā, suspect of infidelity (6.105-108.17).<sup>733</sup> One difference with the Greek material here is that the gods gather on earth to attend rituals and speak directly to the heroes (in the first scene the gods gather as rituals are being performed for Rāma to be conceived, in the second as they take Sītā's fire ordeal as a sacrificial rite). This is paralleled in *Lugalb. I, Atr., Gilg.* (and perhaps *Th.* 534-61, cf. below §5.3 on *Keret*), but in Near Eastern human narratives, as in Homer, the divine

---

<sup>730</sup> This orally-derived poem in seven Books, attributed to the sage Vālmīki, reached its present form between perhaps 700 BC and 300 AD (opinions vary within this range). Critical edition: Bhatt and Shah (1960-75); scholarly translation with several critical essays and commentary: Goldman *et al.* (1984-2017).

<sup>731</sup> Many modern scholars believe that passages attesting to Rāma's divinity should be athetised, or at least considered as additions to the original "archetype". For literature cf. e.g. Goldman (1984) 60-81 (on Book 1, *Bālakāṇḍa*, containing several divine scenes); Brockington (1998) 48-52, 63-67, 377-97, (2001) 218-50. The fundamental defence of this thread's importance is Pollock (1991) 15-54; *contra* González-Reimann (2006), but see Goldman and Sutherland Goldman (2009) 17-42.

<sup>732</sup> Goldman (1984) 74-77 agrees with previous scholarship that the scene is part of a later addition.

<sup>733</sup> González-Reimann (2006) 213-14 doubts this passage's authenticity although "it can be said to have sufficient textual support to be considered part of the early version". On the scene as the culmination of the epic cf. Goldman and Sutherland Goldman (2009) 39-41.

assemblies directing the course of action are typically held on high.<sup>734</sup> In fact, the *Rāmāyaṇa* does not present an articulated system of divine gatherings in the Mesopotamian or Greek sense, that is, one governing every fundamental juncture of the course of action. There is, however, one aspect that is typical in Homer but absent in Mesopotamia, namely that of the gathered gods looking over human exploits (§1.1); sometimes they come down to earth to do so, at other times they remain aloof.<sup>735</sup>

A detailed comparative study of the divine machinery in Greek, Near Eastern and Sanskrit epics, including of course the *Mahābhārata*, would be worth pursuing, but is beyond the scope of this thesis. Nevertheless, this brief discussion of Sanskrit and Old Norse materials clearly suggests that it is unlikely that the Greeks learned about the divine assembly from the Near East. It seems more probable that the topos originated independently, possibly within an Indo-European background.<sup>736</sup>

### §5.3. Near Eastern interfaces

But neither do these comparisons suggest that the Greek scenes should be viewed in isolation from Near Eastern neighbouring traditions, nor do they preclude a relevant interaction. Indeed, the case of the divine assembly lends support to a model that regards Greek native (or inherited) literary features as having undergone a process of fertilisation through Near Eastern contacts.<sup>737</sup> This model simplifies complex processes that are ultimately difficult to reconstruct, but has the merit of accounting, on the one hand, for an independent origin of the divine assembly topos and, on the other, for the pervasive

---

<sup>734</sup> Compare the human attendance to the assembly (*SumAdapa*, *DB*, perhaps *Etana*); also the Greeks, though, envisaged a time when "banquets were common" ([Hes.] fr. 1.6-7, fr. 204.102-03), cf. *Il.* 24.62-63, *Cypr.* arg. 86-87 Severyns. In Homer they do banquet with the Aethiopians and the Phaeacians (*Od.* 7.201-03).

<sup>735</sup> Cf. e.g. *Rm.* 1.75; 3.22.26-27.30; 5.1.20-27, 71-74, 122-33; 6.23-33, 90.25, 96.18-19, 30, 97.28.

<sup>736</sup> West (2007) 150-51 notes that the topos occurs in both Near East and Indo-European traditions, without clarifying what this means; on this kind of aporia cf. Allen (2007), Kelly (2008) 264 n. 20, Metcalf (2015a) 223 n. 4.

<sup>737</sup> Cf. Mondì (1990) 147-57, 187-89 (on the succession myth); López-Ruiz (2014) 163-64, Metcalf (2015a) 222-24.

structural analogies we have highlighted in the Near Eastern material. Such a structural nexus must be viewed against the wide-ranging cumulative evidence for other consonances between early Greek and Near Eastern literatures, which in turn constitute an important (if elusive) part of the centuries-long cultural contacts between the Aegean and the Eastern Mediterranean.

The decisive factor for understanding the nature of the literary cross-over is that the structural role of the divine assembly type-scene is best seen as the product and a function of the aural reception of literature. Our morphological comparison led to this conclusion, which is further corroborated by the evidence from Old Norse and Indic orally-derived material. Because the elements shared by Mesopotamian and early Greek poetry are profoundly ingrained in both repertoires, and the Hellenic texts build on a long-standing indigenous oral tradition, the best hypothesis (endorsed by most scholars in the field who believe in a historical poetic nexus) is that interaction happened on the level of oral performance, over a more or less long period of time, in the Eastern Mediterranean.<sup>738</sup>

Earlier in this chapter, we saw that stylistic studies on Mesopotamian poetry came to negative conclusions concerning the texts' oral background. To be sure, the parallel existence of Mesopotamian oral traditions is often postulated, but the interface between the latter and our surviving texts, products of scribal education, remains elusive.<sup>739</sup> The same goes for the westward transmission of literature during the Late Bronze Age. Texts travelled with experts in the scribal arts and were used for educational purposes; the visible traces of literary transmission to Hatti and Ugarit are therefore studied in their scribal context.<sup>740</sup> The assessment of performance-directed poetic techniques with a view to

---

<sup>738</sup> Cf. variously Mondì (1990) 150-51, S. Morris (1997), West (1997) 590-610, Henkelman (2006), Kelly (2008) 292-93, 301-04, López-Ruiz (2010), (2014), Bachvarova (2016), Currie (2016) esp. 163-64, 198-200; López-Ruiz and Currie do not exclude a written transmission.

<sup>739</sup> See above n. 620, cf. Cohen (2016).

<sup>740</sup> In general on transmission to the "Western periphery", with further literature, see Sassmannshausen (2008), Cohen (2013), Viano (2016); on Hatti in particular Weeden (2011a-b), Metcalf (2011), (2015b), Shai

uncovering levels of literary transmission and reception beyond the scribal is still in its infancy.<sup>741</sup>

With the collapse of the Late Bronze Age political systems early in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, cuneiform virtually disappears from the Eastern-Mediterranean panorama; when literary texts resurface in the Levant (10<sup>th</sup>/9<sup>th</sup> century), they are in linear alphabetic scripts.<sup>742</sup> While Phoenician literature has not survived, most specialists agree that the cradle of literary traditions that would crystallise into the Hebrew Bible stemmed from and had long been largely transmitted through an oral culture during the Iron Age.<sup>743</sup> As we are about to see, the topos of the divine assembly was part of this Levantine process.

It is surely important to "resist the temptation to postulate *ad hoc* 'oral traditions' wherever a gap happens to appear in our textual record".<sup>744</sup> But there is no denying that the poetry attested in our sources was meant to be performed; and the divine assembly type-scene represents a story-telling feature which does appear to be ubiquitous, crossing the fault-lines of the structurally fragmented history of written transmission. We are confronting an inherent feature of mythological story-telling which, by reason of its common diegetic function and fundamental analogies in theological conceptions, lent itself to absorbing and carrying a variety of traditional elements among the interconnected cultures of the Near East. Though culturally-specific aspects are of course to be discerned, the resulting picture is one of overall structural homogeneity.

In conjunction with the historically attested cultural contacts with the Near East, the morphological comparison strongly suggests that the divine assemblies in the Hellenic oral

---

(2015); on Ugarit Dietrich (1996), (2009), Hawley (2008), van Soldt (2011). On *Gilgameš* at Hattusa cf. Ch. 4§3.2.

<sup>741</sup> Archi (2007), (2009), Bachvarova (2016) 35-46; more detailed studies on poetic texture are certainly needed.

<sup>742</sup> For overviews, cf. Pitard (2009) 305-11 (Phoenician) and Kottsieper (2009) 408-10 (Aramaic).

<sup>743</sup> Cf. recently Carr (2011), Miller (2011), (2012), Smith (2014) esp. 234-307, Dobbs-Allsopp (2015) 233-325, contributions to Schmidt (2015).

<sup>744</sup> Metcalf (2015a) 146.

tradition that preceded our texts became part of this process. A view over what remains of the stream of tradition across Hittite, Ugaritic and first-millennium Levantine texts strengthens the case.

In the "Old Anatolian" Hittite myths portraying a deity's withdrawal and consequent cosmic crisis, scenes of divine assembly mark the crisis-point indicating resolutions, and then signal the return of order.<sup>745</sup> The assembly is also prominent in the Hurro-Hittite narratives constituting the so-called *Kumarbi Cycle*, well known to Hellenists for its analogies with Hesiod's succession myth.<sup>746</sup>

The texts' fragmentary state mostly impedes assessing narrative designs comprehensively, but the assemblies' structuring function is perceptible in the *Song of Ullikummi*, the most fully preserved composition of the *Cycle*. As the basalt-monster Ullikummi is conceived to be a threat to the chief god Tessub, his father Kumarbi summons the Irsirra goddesses and gives him to them to rear, giving instructions concerning Ullikummi's growth (CTH 345.i.1.129-72). After unsuccessful attempts at defeating Ullikummi, Tessub resorts to Ea; an assembly is held where effective measures are taken (345.i.3.1.152-92): Ea travels and addresses the Former Gods, to obtain the cutting copper tool to cut Ullikummi off from the support which makes him invincible (345.i.3.1.195-236). That deed performed, Tessub and the gods hear, take courage and assemble before the (presumably) final battle (345.i.3.1.257-64).

The institutional centrality of the assembly emerges, for example, as Ea dethrones LAMMA and blames his carelessness in not having summoned any assembly;<sup>747</sup> in a fragment dealing with Silver's rise to power, the narrator mentions the arrival of all the

---

<sup>745</sup> These compositions are commonly considered of Old Hittite origin and Hattian background, contrary to Akkadian or Hurrite-derived texts, cf. Haas (2006) 96-120. Cf. *DTel* 42-112(?), crisis and attempted solutions→196-201, resolution; *DStG* 54-129+, crisis and attempted solutions→144-50+, resolution (where *DTel* 42-47 = *DStG* 54-59 = *FrLFD* 16-18); *DSunG* 62-106+ (attempted solutions).

<sup>746</sup> *Status quaestionis* in Rutherford (2009), cf. López-Ruiz (2010) 84-129, van Dongen (2011), Metcalf (2015a) 176 n. 13; also below Ch. 10§3.

<sup>747</sup> CTH 343.1.95 as restored by Hoffner (1998) 47.

gods for that occasion.<sup>748</sup> (Both LAMMA and Silver are opponents of Tessub connected to Kumarbi). Ea's role as the guarantor of order in Mesopotamia is preserved in the Hurro-Hittite songs: he speaks to the gods condemning the destruction of mankind caused by the conflict between Tessub and Kumarbi's ally Hedammu.<sup>749</sup> If Ea's concern is paralleled in *Atr.*(10) and *Gilg.*(3),<sup>750</sup> his appeal to mankind's sacrificial piety recalls Zeus' regret at *Il.*(2),(9). Divine travels and visits are quite common: whilst the bowing-down is typical in Mesopotamia, the personal offer of food/drink and seat-taking are closer to the Greek type-scene, the Mesopotamian equivalent being, instead, the collective banquet (§1.1-2).<sup>751</sup>

Turning to the Levantine coast, consonances between the depiction of deities in Ugaritic and Homeric poetry have long been studied.<sup>752</sup> Works on Ugaritic traditional poetic diction have established, if not the texts' orally-derived nature, certainly their recitative character and the likely existence of an oral tradition behind them.<sup>753</sup> Ugaritic divine assemblies (*p̄hr*, cognate with Akk. *puḫru(m)*) constitute prominent type-scenes.<sup>754</sup>

A good case-study is *Keret* (KTU 1.14-16),<sup>755</sup> where overarching narrative structures are clearer than in the more fragmentary *Baal Cycle*.<sup>756</sup> Heirless Keret, king of Hubur, is

---

<sup>748</sup> CTH 364.5.8-9.

<sup>749</sup> CTH 348.i.1.52-71, also 345.i.3.1.250-52.

<sup>750</sup> Both Babylonian narratives are attested in Hattusa in Akkadian and Hittite versions, cf. Ch. 4, and Haas (2006) 272-79.

<sup>751</sup> Note however the arrival and offering in *SumAdapa* (Ch. 1§2.2). Bowing down: e.g. CTH 345.i.3.1.93-97, 109-12, 242; personal offer of food, drink and seat: e.g. CTH 345.i.1.65-70 (Kumarbi), 234-51 (Sun god); 348.i.1.93-98 (Sea), i.5 (Ištar).

<sup>752</sup> Gordon (1955); Stella (1955) 105-22, 188-205 and (1978) *passim*; Webster (1956), (1958) esp. 64-90; Walcot (1969), (1970), (1972); Considine (1969); West (1997) *passim*; Loudon (2006) 149-285, (2010) 20-23; López-Ruiz (2010) *passim*; Ballesteros Petrella (in prep.1).

<sup>753</sup> Esp. Whitaker (1969), Aitken (1987), (1989a-b), Lloyd (1992), Watson (1999), cf. Pardee (2012) 26.

<sup>754</sup> Attestations in Suc Kee (2007) 261 n. 4; the equation *p̄hr ilm* = <sup>d</sup>*pu-ḫur ilāni*(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> is attested in Ugaritic versions of Babylonian god lists, cf. Mullen (1980) 268-69, del Olmo Lete (1999) 308-09. On the Ugaritic/Canaanite divine system see Mullen (1980), Handy (1994), Wyatt (1998a), del Olmo Lete (2014) 33-66; Lloyd (1992) and Suc Kee (2003) 95-126 on the divine banquet and assembly as type-scenes at Ugarit.

<sup>755</sup> The name *krt* is also vocalised /kirta/, e.g. Greenstein (1997), whose translation I have used, Pardee (2012). For a critical history of the epic see Margalit (1999) though his satirical interpretation is unpersuasive; on *Keret's* divine assemblies Mullen (1980) 248-52.

<sup>756</sup> Nevertheless, assembly scenes occur at crucial junctures within each of the *Cycle's* three identifiable thematic blocks (Smith 1997: 82, Gibson 1999: 193-96): (a) Baal vs. Yamm (KTU 1.1-2): 1.1.iv (summoned assembly to exalt Yamm), 1.2.i.19-48+ (Yamm's messengers enter the assembly, reactions); (b) Baal's abode (KTU 1.3-4): 1.3.i (Baal's victory banquet), 1.4.v.44.-vi.15→vi.38-end (*successive assemblies*: arrival,

granted offspring by the chief god El after following El's suggestion to besiege the city of Udim and marry the local princess. Keret makes vows to El's spouse Asherah in case of success, but then forgets. Nevertheless, the gods gather for a banquet offered by Keret after he obtains his wife, and El blesses the birth of eight children. When they grow up, Asherah takes revenge: the king falls ill, his land suffers a drought. A second divine assembly occurs at the peak of crisis: El asks the gods to dispel disease several times, but nobody replies. He himself thus creates a female disease-dispeller Shataqat. She does her job, but Keret's son Yassib lays claims on the throne, whereupon *Keret* concludes with the king cursing his son.

Beyond the usual structuring function, both the gathering for an offering with consequent elevation (§1.2) and the assembly for a crisis then solved by creation are familiar from Mesopotamia. Specifically, El's unattended requests (KTU 1.16.v.9-22) recall Anu's vain appeals in *Anzû(2)*, and Anšar's in *Ee* Tablet 2;<sup>757</sup> El's creation through soil in his fingers and clay-pinching (v.28-30) are closely paralleled in Mesopotamian creation assemblies, e.g. *Atr.(4)*, *Gilg(1)*.<sup>758</sup>

The Late Bronze Age Hurro-Hittite and Ugaritic texts were produced in areas having close political and cultural ties, Ugarit having fallen under Hittite overlordship by 1340.<sup>759</sup> Kerret/Kirta is a Hurrian name, and one famous poem in Hittite, *Elkurniša and Ašertu* (CTH 342), adapts a Canaanite divine myth.<sup>760</sup> Aspects of the Hurro-Hittite compositional

---

discussion, construction and inauguration banquet, cf. *Ee(7)-(8)*; (c) Baal vs. Mot (KTU 1.5-6): 1.5.iv (context unclear, Baal enters the assembly); 1.6.i.32-55 (after Baal's death, the assembly chooses a new ruler, unsuccessfully).

<sup>757</sup> Cf. Wyatt (1998b) 235 n. 270, Suc Kee (2003) 101, with other instances of the motif.

<sup>758</sup> Versions of *Gilgameš* and (probably) *Atra-ḫasīs* are attested at Ugarit, cf. Chs. 2§1, 4§1; if Margalit's (1999) 230 reading of KTU 1.16.v.45-46 "[the soul] of a god and the blood of a [human]" is correct, the parallel with *Atr.(4)* and *Ee(7)* is stronger.

<sup>759</sup> For a history of Ugarit see Singer (1999); on the Late Bronze Age *koine* esp. Liverani (1990), (2001), Podany (2010), Van De Mieroop (2010), Aruz, Graf and Rakic (2013), Cline (2014); on Ugarit's wide-ranging commercial networks, cf. McGeough (2007).

<sup>760</sup> Keret's name: Greenstein (1997) 9; on CTH 342 cf. Haas (2006) 213-16, Pardee (2012) 73 n. 65; Bachvarova (2016) 34 for a comparative perspective; for Hurrian and Hittite texts at Ugarit, cf. Dietrich and Mayer (1999); on Hurrian religious influence, del Olmo Lete (2014) 63-66.

patterns of divine arrival, bowing down and sitting down (observed above in connection with Babylonian and Greek parallels) occur at Ugarit too.<sup>761</sup>

There is considerable Bronze Age evidence for contacts between the Aegean and the Levant and Anatolia, political (Hatti), commercial (Levant, often mediated via Cyprus) and artistic ("international style" luxury objects).<sup>762</sup> Notoriously, Linear B texts have yielded no literature, but the existence of Mycenaean poetry is scarcely a controversial postulate. Besides the (not undisputed) linguistic and lexical archaeology of the epic hexameter, indirect material evidence comes from Bronze Age Aegean artistic depictions of musicians, singers, instruments, as well as fragments of the instruments themselves.<sup>763</sup> Considering how ingrained the shared features we have identified are within the long-standing Greek epic tradition, the distinct possibility remains that they may be signs of Bronze Age cross-cultural literary encounters.

Of course, interactions in the Dark Ages, the crucial formative phase of the Greek epic tradition, are hardly less important. Greek contacts with the Levant and Cyprus never ceased despite the Bronze Age palatial structures' systemic collapse, and are increasingly visible from the mid-10th century.<sup>764</sup> Burkert's model of itinerant specialists (*Od.* 17.382-86) is in accordance with archaeological evidence for this period, particularly concerning

---

<sup>761</sup> Ferrara and Parker (1972), Lloyd (1992) 182; cf. Smith and Pitard (2009) 35-40.

<sup>762</sup> Relevant Hittite texts, with literature, collected in Beckman, Brice and Cline (2011); Aegean trade and Levantine networks e.g. Cline (1994), (2012), Burns (2010); "international style": Feldman (2006); on the 18th-17th c. Minoan fresco at Tell Kabri cf. Cline and Yasur-Landau (2007).

<sup>763</sup> On residual Bronze Age (and earlier) features in the hexameter (whose shape may not go back to the Bronze Age) cf. variously West (1988) 151-56, (2007) 45-51, Magnelli (1995), Latacz (2004) 259-63; Hackstein (2002) 5-16 and Haug (2002) 39-68 are sceptical, but cf. Hewson (2005) 182 and Janko (2012) 23 n. 4; Barnes (2011), Ruijgh (2011), Bachvarova (2016) 458-64; for Bronze Age Greek music and poetry, cf. esp. Stella (1978) 279-305, Morris (1989), Younger (1998), (2007).

<sup>764</sup> On the archaeology of the Dark Ages and Near Eastern contacts as an important factor in the 8<sup>th</sup>-century "Greek Renaissance", the pioneering works by Snodgrass (2000), Desborough (1972), Coldstream (2003) remain fundamental. For a catalogue of Proto-Geometric Near Eastern imports in the Aegean (mostly from Lefkandi) and Greek Pottery in the Levant (mostly in Tyre), cf. Lemos (2002) 226-29. On historico-cultural implications e.g. Morris (1992) 101-49, Dickinson (2006) 196-218, Mazarakis-Ainan (2006) 193-95, Osborne (2009) 55-60; Demand (2011) 220-56; Kōiv (2016) 316-18.

metal-workers.<sup>765</sup> His view of wandering (possibly bilingual) poets as vehicles of transmission has been developed further, extending the potential temporal span of this process back into the Protogeometric period.<sup>766</sup> Beyond itinerant poets, one recent model grants more importance to elite interaction in the Iron Age, with Cyprus and Cilicia as mediating territories with a Greek presence, partially preserving and re-shaping Bronze Age cultural heritages.<sup>767</sup> On the other hand, Burkert's concept of direct literary imitation through written texts in the late-8<sup>th</sup>/early-7<sup>th</sup> centuries is problematic, and not applicable to divine assembly structures, if we are correct in seeing them as long standing.<sup>768</sup> Less relevant to our treatment of divine scenes, therefore, are recent discussions of cross-cultural contacts in the period when (or even after) the fixation in writing of Greek epic took place, thanks to adapted Levantine writing technology and in coincidence with the Assyrian empire's westward expansion.<sup>769</sup>

Given the paramount importance of interactions with the Levant, it is appropriate to note that the literary topos of the divine assembly survived the end of the Bronze Age political collapse. The motif of the divine council in the Hebrew Bible is well known to represent a prominent case of permanence of Canaanite narrative traditions.<sup>770</sup> The case of the Book of Job is particularly famous: Yahweh's council being gathered, Satan's teasing

---

<sup>765</sup> Burkert (1992); cf. Popham (1994), West (1997) 609-11, Mazarakis-Ainan (2006) 194; literature on resident "foreign" craftsmen in Ulf (2014) 541 n. 95.

<sup>766</sup> West (1997) 606-16, López-Ruiz (2010) 23-47, Ulf (2014), Bachvarova (2016), cf. *Introduction*.

<sup>767</sup> Bachvarova (2016) 129-330: her work on Iron Age elite-interaction and festivals (cf. Morris 1997: 622-23) builds a plausible model for the transmission of literary motifs, but her assessment of strong Syro-Anatolian influences on the shaping of the *Iliad*, a process the author situates in Western Anatolia, is far less thoroughly substantiated: cf. *Introduction*, and Metcalf (2017). For recently developed model(s) capable of accounting for several different levels and contexts of cultural interactions see Ulf (2014), esp. 533-44, where receptivities in "open contact zones" and "zones of intense contact without dominant partner" seem especially relevant here.

<sup>768</sup> Burkert (1992) 88-114 *passim*, esp. 95, (2011); see Kelly (2008), Haubold (2013) 20-33.

<sup>769</sup> E.g. Lanfranchi (2011), Patzek (2011), (2014), Rollinger (2011), envisaging signs that Homer came himself in contact with Near Eastern poetry. On the Schøyen and Würzburg copper plaques as further evidence to date the borrowing of the alphabet to the late 9th cf. Woodard (2014); a preceding *status quaestionis* is Wilson (2009).

<sup>770</sup> See the comprehensive treatment, including Phoenician royal inscriptions mentioning the divine assembly, by Mullen (1980) part II; cf. also Suc Kee (2003) part II, and (2007) with further literature; also West (1997) 177.

first triggers the action (*Job* 1.6-12), then again the second phase of the protagonist's disgraces (*Job* 2.1-6).

Against the almost complete loss of Iron Age Levantine literature beyond the Hebrew Bible, a precious source comes from the Deir 'Alla plaster inscriptions, found in the Jordan valley in 1967 and currently dated to the first half of the 8th century.<sup>771</sup> According to Lemaire, "although their language has been much discussed, there is more and more agreement that they represent some kind of archaic Aramaic".<sup>772</sup> The best preserved part of the recovered text relates how Baalam, an authoritative figure (cf. *Numbers* 22-24), is alerted in a dream by El of an impending disaster; he summons an assembly and reports that (lines 7-9):<sup>773</sup>

"The gods have banded together;  
the Shaddai-gods have established a council (*mw'd*)  
And they have said to [the goddess] Shagar:  
'Sew up, close up the heavens with dense cloud,  
that darkness exist there, not brilliance,  
*obscurity and not clarity*;  
so that you instill dread in dense darkness

This will cause turmoil on earth (9-13), but Balaam is apparently able to avoid this by making diviners, augurs and other figures intervene to propitiate the goddess (13-18). The narrative pattern is amply paralleled in *Atra-ḫasīs* ("plague assemblies" Ch. 2§3.2), and partially in the plague episode in *Iliad* Book 1, where, however, Apollo is not prompted by the divine assembly.<sup>774</sup>

There are no obvious elements to consider the Baalam story as a "missing link" between *Atra-ḫasīs* and the *Iliad*. This is, instead, a further fragment of a cross-cultural stream of tradition, where our sources do not enable us to see how far similarities should be

---

<sup>771</sup> Edited by Hoftijzer and Gerrit van der Kooij (1976), cf. Levine (2000).

<sup>772</sup> Lemaire (2015) 31-32, with literature.

<sup>773</sup> Transl. Levine (2000) 142-43.

<sup>774</sup> Metcalf (2015a) 191-219 suggests that the expression of Akhilleus' request to summon specialists at *Il.* 1.62-64 may ultimately derive from a Sumerian prototype through an Hittite intermediary text and Anatolian divinatory practices; this Levantine passage displays a similar motif in a narrative context more closely comparable to the *Iliad*. Compare also Sam. 1.5-6 (Metcalf 2015: 204 n. 32).

considered products of a literary transmission, rather than signs of a long-standing cultural nexus that fostered further communication over a long period.<sup>775</sup>

To conclude: the comparison of Greek and Mesopotamian corpora shows that divine assemblies are similarly constructed and play identical narratological functions. We have found no signs – though others perhaps will – of specific adaptations from or allusions to any of the considered Near Eastern texts. Moreover, Indo-European parallels show that the motif was not borrowed *tout court* from the Near East.

Nevertheless, the assessed structural similarities and the spread of the pattern in Hurro-Hittite, Ugaritic, and first millennium Levantine sources, within the general context of well-known historical and cultural contacts, indicate that Greek epic divine assemblies should be assessed in an Eastern-Mediterranean literary context. Because the shared structures are a function of aural reception, and deeply embedded in the Greek orally-derived poetic system, this specific cross-over can be situated within a process of oral contact and communication that was made possible through a shared relevant poetic syntax in the first place. We may here quote C. Ulf's phrase about mechanisms of cultural and material transfer in "open contact zones", namely contact contexts heterarchically structured (*viz.* no group dominates the other) where the recipient group "is characterised by *weak network ties and a relatively undeveloped social identity*".<sup>776</sup> This is the situation envisaged for 10th- to early 8th-century Greece:

External goods and ideas, while appearing intrinsically desirable, only acquire a specific significance by being incorporated into a code that is determined by the social framework of the recipient(s).<sup>777</sup>

---

<sup>775</sup> Haubold (2013) assesses similarities both as signs of and in the light of shared cultural premises. A recent synthesis on cultural interactions from Mesopotamia to the Aegean in the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium is Tonussi (2007); cf. also Demand (2011) on earlier connections.

<sup>776</sup> Ulf (2014) 534.

<sup>777</sup> Ulf (2014) 536.

Turning to the literary level, we could say that "foreign" literary structures that appeared to be commensurate could interact with and partly enter the recipient literary code only insofar as they could fit with and be put to productive use within that pre-existing code (Greek, in our case), as determined by its own performance and cultural framework.

The literary evidence does not allow us, it seems, to go further than this; and while the formative period of Greek epic in the "Dark Ages" represents a plausible context, we do not know just how far back these processes should be traced, and we should bear in mind that several contact points existed in time and space. What our texts have allowed, however, is a systemic comparison of shared poetic techniques and effects, to the exegetical benefit, it is hoped, of Hellenists and Assyriologists. Such results constitute a good basis to assess the literary construction of specific but commensurate world-visions. Our final chapter will be devoted to this endeavour, with reference to the divine systems in Greek and Mesopotamian narratives.

## Chapter 10: On Cosmic Order

Des ensembles polythéistes, en général, on peut dire, d'une part, qu'ils constituent des systèmes de classification de puissances et de pouvoirs; de l'autre, que ces sont des modes de pensée étroitement intriqués dans l'organisation et le fonctionnement du social et du politique. (Detienne 1986: 49)

In *Enūma eliš* Tablet 6, Marduk creates mankind and divides the Anunnakī between heaven and the netherworld (*Ee* 6.1-53). Then the poet proceeds to the gods' grateful building of Esagil with the following couplet (*Ee* 6.45-46):

*ul-tu te-re-e-ti nap-ḥar-šī-na ú-ma-i-ru*  
*ana<sup>d</sup> a-nun-na-kī šá šamē(an)<sup>e</sup> u eršetim(ki)<sup>-tim</sup> ú-za-i-zu is-qat-su-un*

After he (viz. Marduk) had directed the totality of the assignments  
(and) distributed their allotment among the Anunnakī of heaven and earth

This invites comparison with Hesiod's account of the aftermath of Zeus' victory (*Th.* 881-85, Ch. 8§4):

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥα πόνον μάκαρες θεοὶ ἐξετέλεσαν,  
Τιτῆνεςσι δὲ τιμάτων κρίναντο βίηφι,  
δὴ ῥα τότε ὄτρυνον βασιλευέμεν ἠδὲ ἀνάσσειν  
Γαίης φραδμοσύνησιν Ὀλύμπιον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν  
ἀθανάτων· ὁ δὲ τοῖσιν εὐ διεδάσσατο τιμάς. 885

But after the blessed gods had thus finished their toil,  
(and) settled their struggle for honours with the Titans by force,  
then they pressed to reign and rule,  
through Gaia's machinations, the Olympian, far-sounding Zeus  
over the immortals: and well among them he distributed their honours. 885

Both passages summarise a significant enterprise, and relate a consequent cosmic distribution operated by the ruling god.<sup>778</sup> But the Greek enterprise is collective, the Babylonian one is Marduk's; his allocation is one part of his restructuring of the cosmos,

---

<sup>778</sup> On the Greek traditional background of Hesiod's passage cf. Ch. 8§4; West (1997) 108 correctly sets this parallel in a broader Mesopotamian context: cf. esp. Enlil's distributions at SB *Anzû* 1.61-62: *ma-ḥa-za i-ta-ḥa-az<sup>1</sup> [x x x] / ù te-re-e-ti šá ilānī(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> ka-li-šū-nu ú-ḥma-a<sup>1</sup>-[ir]* "the shrine [he] took up [...] / and he directed the assignments of all the gods".

while Zeus' correct distribution fulfils the promise that made his triumph and kingship possible.<sup>779</sup>

The direction of this chapter's enquiry departs from questions of transmission, to focus on what concepts of the cosmos underlie this and other parallels, and how such concepts shape the different Mesopotamian and early Greek poetic depictions of the pantheon. As explained below, our study of the divine assembly can offer privileged viewpoints in this perspective.

No large-scale comparison is available on these themes, it seems, which is remarkable considering that W. Burkert, the modern pioneer of Greek/Near Eastern comparativism, was probably the greatest ancient religious historian of his generation.<sup>780</sup> How far this neglect related to skepticism toward French structuralist methods or to a more acute interest (as a religious historian) in ritual- and cult-related mythemes than in literature, need not concern us here.<sup>781</sup> The fact is that Burkert mostly explained similar representations of the gods by Near Eastern and Greek poets as the result of a process of (conscious) literary reception. Such intertextual discourses, however, tend to exhaust the heuristic potential of the parallel in the mere recognition of the borrowing (where, moreover, the borrowing itself is often questionable). This leaves little space for improving our historical appreciation of the cross-cultural phenomenon.<sup>782</sup>

---

<sup>779</sup> Ch. 8§4. From a compositional perspective, Hesiod's passage marks the culmination of Zeus' accession: as such, it stands alone in the narrative discourse of the *Theogony*, preceding the final marriages and mirroring *Th.* 71-74. The *Enūma eliš* couplet belongs to a chain of related (and similarly phrased) sections punctuating Marduk's progressing operations after his victory: *Ee* 5.37-38 (after sky and stars) → 67-68 (after sky and waters) → 6.45-46. The chain concludes with the confirmation (*kānu*) of these cosmic regulations in Esagil (6.78-79); but the poem's culmination lies in the final collective assignment of destinies/names to Marduk.

<sup>780</sup> West's (1997) 107-10 cursory comparison of divine kingship and allotment systems is useful, though differences and conceptions are not his concern. Mondi (1990) 161-87 offers an excellent comparative discussion of Greek mythical structures on cosmic order in a Near Eastern context, cf. below nn. 831, 834.

<sup>781</sup> On Burkert's intellectual development see Arrigoni (2001); cf. Burkert (1985) 217 "the danger of this [structuralist] approach is, of course, that the historically given reality will perforce be curtailed for the sake of the system and its logical structure." See further Versnel (2014) 120-23; below n. 785.

<sup>782</sup> Cf. the Introduction, Ch. 9§5.1.

The virtual separation between the study of ancient texts as literature and as sources of ancient religion has recently been the subject of sensible criticism in the case of Greek hymnic poetry: the dichotomy between "cultic" and "literary" hymns turns out to be artificial and misleading.<sup>783</sup> In the field of Assyriology, this tendency can be felt in L. Oppenheim's solomonic admonishment that Mesopotamian mythological poems should not be studied as sources for a history of Mesopotamian religion, but be the sole province of the literary critic.<sup>784</sup> Treating traditional and sophisticated texts, this thesis adopts the instruments of literary analysis. But our comparison involves the mythological depiction of the divine world, and so we should not, if we are to profit from a systemic comparison, refrain from enriching our tool-kit through some concepts drawn from the historical study of ancient polytheisms.

One of the fundamental principles here is that polytheism can be said to function as a language, at least to the extent that the single deity is not to be assessed in isolation, but must be understood in its syntagmatic relation with the other gods.<sup>785</sup> It is in narrative literature that the definition of each deity in respect to the others is frequently most visible. Works of poetry, of course, are not simple vehicles for such structures; rather, they deploy and construe them for artistic purposes. Relevant narrative elaborations should be regarded as moments of active articulation, reflecting both the intellectual effort of the composers, and centuries of poetic tradition responding to diachronically and synchronically varying horizons of expectations concerning the gods.

Whilst such processes are at work throughout each poem's narrative, the scenes of divine assembly represent their highlights, since by depicting the gods collectively they

---

<sup>783</sup> Metcalf (2015a) 106-08. Graziosi (2017) 41 advocates the value of literary interpretation for the study of Greek religion.

<sup>784</sup> Oppenheim (1977) 177.

<sup>785</sup> This approach was established by Dumézil, whose intellectual framework reaches back to E. Durkheim, and is cognate with the methods of C. Lévi-Strauss and, on the ancient Greek side, of L. Gernet and, thus, J.-P. Vernant and *l'école parisienne*; cf e.g. Vernant (1974) 232-237 and Detienne (1986) 50-51 on Dumézil. See further Dubuisson (2006) 7-104; Nagy (2014).

dramatise the mutual definition of these characters in the most explicit way. Thus, the divine assembly offers an ideal point of departure for a comparison of the structure of the Mesopotamian and early Greek literary pantheons, all the more so since, as observed in the preceding chapters, these scenes display a strong resemblance in their poetic morphology.

For this reason, it seems appropriate to conclude this thesis by drawing on the exegetical results of Parts 1 and 2 to extend the systemic approach used for poetic morphology to a treatment of the Mesopotamian and Greek divine worlds as systems of power. The profound similarities, signs of a common religious framework, will highlight meaningful differences that constitute opposing refractions of the human political sphere. To explore how this reflects on the divine treatment of the mortal condition, the chapter concludes by comparing relevant divine assemblies in *Gilgameš* and the *Iliad*.

#### §1. Greek *timai* and Zeus' order

In Greece and Mesopotamia, the divine powers represent, articulate and guarantee the functioning of the universe. Gods are many, as many as the aspects whose integration constitutes the world order. As among men some rule and some obey, so are some gods more powerful than others. The resulting hierarchical division of spheres of influence, however, is never exclusive, and often questioned.<sup>786</sup> Dumézil remarked that "dans le signalement d'une divinité, la définition de son mode d'action est plus caractéristique que la liste des lieux de son action, des occasions de ses services".<sup>787</sup> This insight grounds contemporary methodological approaches to ancient polytheisms (especially Greek).<sup>788</sup> But how did ancient poets conceptualise the question of the gods' spheres of activities?

---

<sup>786</sup> On comparable Near Eastern and early Greek concepts of divinely-ordained kingship see West (1997) 132-37; Launderville (2003) is to be treated with caution, cf. Rubio (2005).

<sup>787</sup> Dumézil (1974) 186, cf. e.g. Detienne (1986) 51.

<sup>788</sup> The archetypical application of this framework to Greek religion is Vernant (1963). On the validity and limits of structuralist approaches see Parker (2011) 84-98, Versnel (2011) 23-36.

Unlike modern scholars, early Greek epic does not conceptualise the gods' "modes d'action"; the evidence speaks in terms of divine *timai* (sing. *time*), a complex term broadly meaning "honours", which in the context of divine order is to be also understood as "prerogatives" or "spheres of influence".<sup>789</sup> A stable division of *timai* is necessary, but the matter is essentially not straightforward, and tensions among the gods are inevitable. The formulaic expression for "receiving *time*" (ἔμμορε τιμῆς, lit. "(s)he received/took part of *time*") shows that *time* is not an entire and self-contained entity.

Poseidon's argument for resisting pressures to obey Zeus in *Iliad* Book 15 is that, ever since each of the three sons of Kronos "took part of *time*" (ἔμμορε τιμῆς), the earth (and Olympos) has been common to all of them (ξυνή πάντων): Poseidon deems himself "of equal *time*" (ὁμότιμος) to Zeus. He does obey eventually (*Il.* 15.185-199), but Homer does not say that Poseidon yields because Zeus is the ruler - we will return to this omission.

Zeus *is* the ruler, distributor of *timai* and guarantor of order. This is no easy task, but he always succeeds, and hence rules for ever more. The theorist of his rule is Hesiod, the treatise the *Theogony*. In Homer and the *Hymns* we find episodes that presuppose, illuminate and explore aspects of Zeus' status, but only Hesiod accounts systematically for his coming to power and management of the cosmos.<sup>790</sup>

From Hesiod we learn that the divine *timai*, and a relevant system, existed before Zeus' rule: we have seen that in the Styx episode Zeus makes the most of this circumstance (*Th.*

---

<sup>789</sup> On divine *timai* see esp. Rudhardt (1981) 227-33, Clay (2006), Parker (2011) 84-86; on the word in *epos* (with literature) cf. Riedinger (1976), *Lfgre* III.518-28 (Nordheider), Scodel (2008a) 1-32, Cairns (2011a-b).

<sup>790</sup> Hesiod's picture is consistent with Homer and the *Homeric Hymns*, the major difference being the relative age of Poseidon and Zeus at *Il.* 15.157-219 and *Th.* 453-500 (the superlative at *Od.* 13.142 is inconclusive, cf. Bowie 2013: 121). It is difficult to say whether Homer and Hesiod followed different traditions, or one of them (possibly Hesiod) departed from the mainstream for the purpose of his episode, cf. Janko (1992) 182-83, 247. On the *dasmos* and *Atr.* OB 1.7-15 see Mondt (1990) 160-66, Burkert (1992) 89-91, Kelly (2008) 265-71, Gysemberg (2013), above Ch. 8§4. Whether or not there is an Babylonian echo here, Poseidon seems to be referring to the primeval *dasmos* (e.g. *Th.* 425, *HDem.* 85-87, see below), deliberately ignoring that Zeus did (later on?) gain control over the correct exertion of powers.

392-96, Ch. 8§2). This discourse is further exploited in the subsequent description of Hekate's prerogatives (*Th.* 421-28):

ὅσσοι γὰρ Γαίης τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἐξεγένοντο  
καὶ τιμὴν ἔλαχον, τούτων ἔχει αἴσαν ἀπάντων·  
οὐδέ τί μιν Κρονίδης ἐβιήσατο οὐδέ τ' ἀπηύρα,  
ὅσσ' ἔλαχεν Τιτῆσι μετὰ προτέροισι θεοῖσιν, 425  
ἀλλ' ἔχει, ὡς τὸ πρῶτον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔπλετο δασμός.  
οὐδ', ὅτι μουνογενής, ἦσσαν θεὰ ἔμμορε τιμῆς  
καὶ γεράων γαίῃ τε καὶ οὐρανῷ ἠδὲ θαλάσσῃ,  
ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον, ἐπεὶ Ζεὺς τίεται αὐτήν.

For of all those who came forth from Gaia and Ouranos  
and received honour as their portion, of all of these she has a share;  
and neither did Kronos' son use force against her nor did he deprive her  
of anything that she had received as her portion among the Titans, the earlier gods,  
but she is still in possession according to the division as it was made at first from the beginning. 425  
Nor did the goddess, just because she is an only child, receive a lesser part of honour  
and privileges on earth and in sky and sea,  
but far more instead, for Zeus honours her.

(transl. after Most 2006)

Elsewhere, Hesiod posits a direct nexus between Zeus' kingship and the quality of his management of *timai* (*Th.* 72-74, 881-85). In the Styx episode (Ch. 8§2) and in the "hymn" to Hekate (*Th.* 411-52), this modality defines his order in terms of a continuity and amelioration of previous conditions.<sup>791</sup> Though he might have done otherwise (423), Zeus allots *timai* to Hekate in a way that is both consistent with (425) and improving upon (428) the previous order. Zeus takes charge of distributing *timai*, and his skilled and correct behaviour secures a smooth transition to the new order.

This order is the setting of the narrative *Hymns* and the Homeric poems, which confirm Hesiod's concept of Zeus' ability. During the encounter with the Hundred-Handers, Hesiod plays with narrative tension (Ch. 8§3), but otherwise Zeus' strategy concerning *timai* encounters no difficulties. Similarly, in *HHerm.*, he mediates between his sons, and is happy that Hermes gains his *timai* by confronting Apollo (Ch. 7§2). *HDem.*, however,

---

<sup>791</sup> On Hekate's praise see e.g. Clay (1984), (2003) 22-24, Rudhardt (1993), Tsagalis (2009) 135-38. Her extraordinary position may be understood as part of Zeus' neutralisation of female reproductive forces, cf. §3.

shows that Zeus nearly caused disaster by honouring Hades. Moreover, this is the Homeric hymn where the word *time* occurs most often, and instructively so.<sup>792</sup>

Zeus enrages Demeter by giving Persephone to Hades (δῶκεν *HDem.* 3, cf. 79).<sup>793</sup> Though sympathetic, all-seeing Helios stresses that Hades is a fitting marriage: as with Poseidon in the *Iliad*, the worth of Hades' *time* lies in that primeval division among the sons of Kronos (*HDem.* 83b-87, cf. 366-68).<sup>794</sup> Demeter is not impressed: away from the divine community, she endangers cosmic order by stopping crops from growing. Zeus sends Iris and then all the gods in turn to offer her gifts and "whatever *timai* she might want to take among the immortal gods" (*HDem.* 228) – to no avail: his customary strategy will not do until Demeter sees her daughter.<sup>795</sup> He finally orders Hermes to call Persephone back; then, intervening again to seal a compromise, he sends Rhea to renew the promise of *timai* on the same terms as before. Demeter accepts, and the earth blossoms again (*HDem.* 441-73).

This narrative underscores the value of *time* as compensatory retribution. In Hesiod, the gods will conserve and obtain *timai* if they fight for Zeus (*Th.* 392-96); if Demeter returns, she can have the *timai* she wishes. This connection between *time* and reciprocity emerges from the word's meaning as "compensation, penalty, retribution", where τιμή is cognate with the verb τίω "to honour, estimate, appreciate", whose other derivatives include the verb τίνω "pay a price, repay, atone", and the noun τίσις "retribution, vengeance".<sup>796</sup>

---

<sup>792</sup> See esp. Rudhardt (1981) 233-44.

<sup>793</sup> The form δῶκεν is one regular expression associated with *time*-bestowal among gods. Cf. Richardson (1974) 263, with occurrences.

<sup>794</sup> Above n. 790.

<sup>795</sup> M's text for *HDem.* 328 τιμὰς θ' ἄς κ' ἐθέλοιτο μετ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἐλέσθαι is problematic as "the middle of ἐθέλειν is nowhere found": so Richardson (1974) 264, accepting Hermann's conjecture ἄς κεν ἔλοιτο μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι (cf. *HDem.* 444). Càssola (2010) 62 and West (2003) 58 retain the infinitive and prefer Allen's κε βόλοιτο. West's (1966b) 149 deletion of the copula θ' ἄς > τάς, equating the *timai* to the δῶρα of 327, is tempting in light of *Th.* 412, but cf. Richardson (1974) 263.

<sup>796</sup> Cf. Chantraine (1968-80) 1119-20, 1123, *LfgreE* III.518, 546-51 (Nordheider), Beekes (2009) 1485-86, 1490.

The framework of reciprocity surrounding the gods' management of *timai* is not limited to the divine sphere, but crucially extends to humans. As Richardson puts it, "A god's τιμή is allotted to him by the gods, and held amongst them, although it is dependent also on the payment of what is due to him by men."<sup>797</sup> Reciprocally, men honour the deity for the benefit bestowed on them. Hesiod's passage on Hekate displays this twofold dimension, for Zeus bestows gifts and *timai* on her, and in turn Hekate permits that *time* should reach him whose sacrificial invocation she accepts (*Th.* 411-20).<sup>798</sup> This system of relations recurs with similar phrasing in Hades' utterance of Persephone's *timai* (*HDem.* 364b-69):

ἔνθα δ' ἐοῦσα  
 δεσπόσσεις πάντων ὅποσα ζῶει τε καὶ ἔρπει, 365  
 τιμὰς δὲ στήσῃσθα μετ' ἀθανάτοισι μεγίστας,  
 τῶν δ' ἀδικησάντων τίσις ἔσσειται ἥματα πάντα  
 οἷ κεν μὴ θυσίσαισι τεδὸν μένος ἰλάσκωνται  
 εὐαγέως ἔρδοντες ἐναΐσιμα δῶρα τελοῦντες.

by being here,  
 you will be mistress of everything that lives and moves, 365  
 and have the greatest honours among the immortals,  
 while there will ever be punishment (*tisis*) for those who act unrighteously  
 and fail to propitiate your fury with sacrifices,  
 in holy performance, making due offerings.  
 (transl. after West 2003)

The concrete sense of *timai* as what gods take from men emerges at *HDem.* 305-13: by destroying humankind, Demeter would deprive the gods "of their glorious honour of privileges / and sacrifices" (γεράων τ' ἐρικυδέα τιμῆν / καὶ θυσιῶν, 311-12, cf. 353-54a).

Three interlacing dimensions of divine *timai* can be discerned. First, cosmic management, the province of Zeus, who can bestow *timai* and take them away, even if they predate his rule; second, the cosmic exercise of *time* (e.g. Demeter's agricultural function); third, *time* as what men owe to the gods. *HDem.* illustrates that one deity can use her control over her cosmic exercise to endanger the entire system; but Zeus had the good

<sup>797</sup> Richardson (1974) 264.

<sup>798</sup> This sacrifice need not be performed to Hekate specifically, for her function is that of the "crucial intermediary between gods and men": Clay (1984) 37.

sense to retrace his steps (and to seal the agreement with an extra apportion of *timai*). That is to say, the system works as long as Zeus does things properly; after all, Hesiod's central point is the nexus between Zeus' kingship and the appropriateness of his management of honours. Indeed, Zeus' ability to juggle these competing *timai* is the constant determinant in all our texts.

The Homeric poems' divine narratives show just what happens when the designs of Zeus interfere with the prerogatives of other gods, at a time when the attribution of *timai* has been accomplished. Hesiod praises Zeus' correct apportioning of *timai*, but stresses that the factual basis of his power lies in his superior strength (*Th.* 69b-74):<sup>799</sup>

ὁ δ' οὐρανῷ ἐμβασιλεύει,  
αὐτὸς ἔχων βροντὴν ἠδ' αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν, 70  
κάρτει νικήσας πατέρα Κρόνον· εὖ δὲ ἕκαστα  
ἀθανάτοις διέταξε νόμους καὶ ἐπέφραδε τιμάς.

He is king in the sky,  
himself having the thunder and the flaming thunderbolt, 70  
for he defeated in strength his father Kronos; and well in each respect  
he distributed ordinances and assigned honours to the immortals.

First his thunder and *kratos*, both fundamental to defeat the Titans and Typhoeus. In the *Iliad*, indeed, Zeus resorts to menaces several times to keep Here and Athene in control while he pursues a design that displeases them.<sup>800</sup> We have seen that he does so until his plan is nearly accomplished and hence entirely disclosed to them in its actual short-term dimension: his intention is not really to save Troy (Ch. 5 above). The fear of Zeus' superior strength grants the success of the "mediating" gods: Hephaistos (1.584-94), Poseidon (8.208-11), Iris (8.413-25, 15.201-04), Athene (15.127-42). In these contexts, paradigmatic stories of past coercions are recalled. The *Iliad* may give the impression that Zeus' rule is not too solid, but this is so only while his plan to favour Akhilleus is being accomplished.

<sup>799</sup> *Th.* 74 with West (1966) 180, accepting van Leep's διέταξε νόμους for mss. διέταξεν ὁμῶς "distributed equally".

<sup>800</sup> Notably *Il.* 1.565-67, 8.10-17, 402-06, cf. 454-56, 15.16-17. The climax of menaces in Book 8 is significantly connected with the beginning of Zeus' intervention, cf. Ch. 5.

Concerning his Iliadic management of divine prerogatives, Zeus' behaviour is superb. He cannot refuse to favour Thetis, for she had helped him when Athene, Here and Poseidon had revolted, and he would make her "the most un-honoured deity of all" (μετὰ πᾶσιν ἀτιμοτάτη θεός *Il.* 1.516).<sup>801</sup> If the assembly in Book 8 is a "tour de force" of threatening violence, that in Book 4 is surely one of political expediency: by sealing the destruction of Troy, Zeus confirms Here's status and authority, whilst carrying on his own plan. In Book 5, he rises above Athene's malicious comments and gives a definition of Aphrodite's sphere of action; he is spiteful to Ares, but lets him sit in glory at his side. He restrains Poseidon's resentment for his personal *kleos* in Book 7; as with Here in Book 4, he finds a compromise that fosters his own plan. When his plan is about to bear fruits in Book 16, he follows Here's admonishment and lets Sarpedon die; and so he does with Hektor, giving way to Athene in spite of his pity (Book 22). Finally, Zeus' will leads us to the end of the poem in Book 24, effectively mediating between Apollo and Here concerning the different honours due to Akhilleus and Hektor.<sup>802</sup>

Thus, Homer's divine machinery is consistent with Hesiod's paradigm inasmuch as Zeus achieves his design through (threatened) force and ability in handling questions of prerogatives. With the difference that open divine conflict is absent and therefore the *tisis* theme is more prominent, the same applies in the *Odyssey* (Ch. 6). Zeus is careful to set things going (Books 1) and to plan Odysseus' return (Book 5) when Poseidon is absent; for the sake of the hero, he is willing to grant *tisis* to Poseidon (Book 13) and Helios (Book 12), both affected in their *time* by mortals;<sup>803</sup> and again, he brings the poem to its

---

<sup>801</sup> This phrase is the decisive one: Zeus kept silent when Thetis' argument on *time* and *tisis* revolved around Akhilleus (1.505-10). Briareos' help (1.396-406) is in line with Hesiod's account of the Hekatonkheires' role (Ch. 8§2); cf. Latacz *et al.* (2000) 139.

<sup>802</sup> Cf. below §5.

<sup>803</sup> Zeus' words to Poseidon at *Od.* 13.141-45 are comparable to Hades' at *HDem.* 364-69 (quoted above), and again particularly revealing of the interlacing levels of *time* in terms of reciprocity: Zeus reassures Poseidon that no god would ever damage him in his *time* (ἀτιμάζειν): this implies Zeus' own consent that action (τίσις) be taken against the mortals who do not honour (τίειν) Poseidon.

conclusion by striking a balance, not between gods, but between factions in a civil strife, to secure the human king's stability (Book 24).

In its entirety, therefore, early Greek epic reflects from a number of perspectives on the modalities of Zeus' rule, which guarantee and justify the world order. Together with his superior strength, it is the management of *timai* in their entwined dimensions that makes him the worthy ruler of the cosmos. Just as the *timai* are potentially subject to change and consistently depicted in terms of the dynamic processes of reciprocity, so is his rule: Zeus takes the greatest share of honour (ὄς τε μέγιστός τ' ἐστί, μέγιστης τ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς, *HAphr.* 37, *pace* Poseidon!), the "time of kingship" (βασιληίδα τιμήν, *Th.* 892, cf. 462, 488-91).

He is the king, but his kingship is not a given. It appears throughout these works that it is Zeus who gives stability to an otherwise unstable situation. Poseidon, Here, and Athene could revolt against him and put him into fetters: only the intervention of one of the trustworthy (πιστοί *Th.* 735) Hundred-Handers saves him; Poseidon can claim to be *homotimos* and initially refuse to obey, and we saw that Homer does not say that he yielded on account of Zeus' status as king. Unlike Hesiod, indeed, Homer never calls Zeus βασιλεύς.<sup>804</sup> When his status is pointed out, he (and only he) is said to rule (ἀνάσσειν) over gods and men, whilst the noun "ruler" (ἄναξ) is applied to other gods as well: in the definition of his status, acts count more than the institution.<sup>805</sup> Zeus is a firm ruler, as much as the institution of divine kingship, or at least its surrounding conditions, are not as firm as he is.

---

<sup>804</sup> Calhoun (1935).

<sup>805</sup> Cf. *LfgreE* I.781-90 (Grimm, s.v. ἄναξ), 793-97 (Radt, s.v. ἀνάσσω); cf. also Palaima (2006), Schmidt (2006).

## §2. Mesopotamian divine powers, destinies, divine kingship

When literary texts appear in third-millennium Mesopotamia, the hierarchy of the pantheon is well established around An and Enlil. In literature, this remains so all the way down to the first-millennium versions of *Atra-ḫasīs*, *Anzû*, and *Gilgameš*, though the rise of Marduk to Enlil's office is reflected in the theology of *Enūma eliš* (and *Erra and Išum*). It is convenient to start this comparative discussion from the Mesopotamian syntax of divine prerogatives and functions, and specifically from the Sumerian concept of "me", which we may loosely translate "(divine/cosmic) essence, force, power".

The Greek gods are manifest and praised by poets through their *timai*; these "honours" are expression at once of their power and of their action in the world. Comparably, the Mesopotamian gods are manifest and praised for their "divine powers" (Sum. *me*, Akk. *paršū*). Beginning Hekate's praise, Hesiod says that "above all others / Zeus honoured (τίμησε) [her], he gave her splendid gifts" (*Th.* 411-12); and concludes with "and these are her honours" (αἱ δέ τε τιμαί, *Th.* 452b). One may compare En-ḫedu-ana's address to Inana in the Sumerian hymn *Lady of the Uncountable Divine Powers* (nin-me-šara, or *Inana B* 62-65):<sup>806</sup>

gal-zu igi-ĝál nin kur-kur-ra  
zi-ĝál ùĝ lu-a šir kú-zu ga-àm-du<sub>11</sub>  
dĝir zi me-a túm-ma gal-bi du<sub>11</sub>-ga-zu maḥ-àm  
šà sù-rá munus zi šà dadag-ga me-zu ga-mu-ra-ab-du<sub>11</sub>

Wise and sage, lady of all the foreign lands,  
life-force of the teeming people, I will recite your holy song!  
True goddess fit for divine powers, your splendid utterances are magnificent.  
Deep-hearted, true woman with a radiant heart, I will recite your divine powers for you!

---

<sup>806</sup> Text Zgoll (1997) 8, transl. after ETCSL. En-ḫedu-ana, daughter of Sargon of Akkad (reigning c. 2335-2279), was the *en* (leading) priestess of Nanna at Ur. She is the poetic *persona* in a number of Sumerian hymns known from OB copies whose language is hardly that of 23rd-century Sumer. Zgoll (1997) accepts her authorship and dates the composition to the Akkad period; for a sceptical position and OB dating see Black (2002).

The poet comes to the divine powers ("me") of Inana that most interest her towards the end of the composition (*Inana* B 122-33): they are all related to the goddess' violent and warlike character, for En-ĥedu-ana is asking her to avenge a personal outrage. Such "me" are neither abstract qualities nor specific provinces, but manifestations of Inana's power that the prayer seeks to activate.<sup>807</sup>

The praised deity's possession of "me" is a prominent topos in OB Sumero-Akkadian hymns. Similarly to Greek *timai*, they "are sometimes allotted by the chief gods in the *elatio*; at other times they are simply attributes held by the deity".<sup>808</sup> In Hymns, poets are hardly specific about how the "me" are made manifest; they are generally said to be "all", "many", "eternal", "supreme": En-ĥedu-ana's hymn stands out in this respect.

The narrative *Inana and Enki* is expressly concerned with "me". Inana allures herself and sets out to Eridu, where she parties with Enki: the drunk major god grants her all the "me"; she loads them in her boat towards her city Uruk; vainly does Enki try, seven times, to recover them through his vizier Isimud.<sup>809</sup> These "me" are listed and can be transported as material objects: as such Inana brings them to Uruk for dedication in her temple, and to be praised thereby; they are described as abstractions of institutions and activities.<sup>810</sup>

At the beginning of *LSUr* it is stated that the gods ordained destruction "to overturn the "me" of Sumer" (me ki-en-gi-ra šu-bala ak-de<sub>3</sub>), which include everything whose physical destruction is then evoked, the reign's abode, the city, the temple, the cattle pen, the fields (*LSUr* 3-20). According to a recent definition, "the *me* are thus essences, forces, divine

---

<sup>807</sup> Zgoll (1997) 67-70.

<sup>808</sup> Metcalf (2015a) 41-42, with examples.

<sup>809</sup> Ed. Farber-Flügge (1973), ETCSL 1.3.1.

<sup>810</sup> On the "me" in *Inana and Enki* see Farber-Flügge (1973) 97-115, with Alster (1975); Cavigneaux (1978) 182-83 objected that the institutions brought by Inana do not coincide with the "me", of which they would constitute hypostaseis, but see Zgoll (1997) 68 n. 270.

powers held by the gods, they represent all that exists in the world, both concrete and abstract."<sup>811</sup>

We can start distinguishing similarities and differences with the Greek *timai*. Considering the gods' mutual relations, "me", like *timai*, contribute to the pantheon hierarchy through their top-down bestowal.<sup>812</sup> The *me/paršū* and the *timai* are equally analogous in their being both precondition and expression of the divine in the universe. Mankind and Zeus must honour Demeter so that the earth may yield products; Ur's inhabitants and Nanna must pray Enlil to revert his decision to "overturn the "me" of Sumer". As Poseidon feels depreciated in his *time* if mortals fail to honour him, so would Ningirsu's "me" be diminished (lá) if his regular offerings (sá-du<sub>11</sub>) should be revoked (*Gudea St. B* i.13-20).<sup>813</sup> Both *timai* and "me", thus, encompass and hold together the entire spectrum of the cosmos, human, natural and divine.

But here the substantial difference emerges. Whether or not "me" is to be connected with the Sumerian copula "to be" (*me/-am<sub>3</sub>*), the unifying, holistic character of the "me" lies in their immanence.<sup>814</sup> Unlike *timai*, "me" are present in material objects (and material objects are "me"), which "symbolize the capability of actualizing an archetype".<sup>815</sup> A Greek god or human can receive material objects that signify *time* (e.g. *HDem.* 311-12), but Demeter's *time* is not represented as lying *in* the crops, but in the goddess' faculty to make them grow.

In *HDem.*, cosmic order is overturned as Demeter ceases to exercise her *time*: this is caused and resolved by Zeus' management of *timai* in terms of reciprocal obligations and

---

<sup>811</sup> Biga-Capomacchia (2008) 182 (transl.). On the subject see esp. Castellino (1959), van Dijk (1967), (1971-72) 440-42, Farber-Flügge (1973) 116-164, Alster (1975) 33-34 n. 32, Jacobsen (1976) 84-86, Cavigneaux (1978), Farber (1987/90), Zgoll (1997) 66-75, Mander (2009) 51-52, Bonnet and Slobodzianek (2015), Fink (2015) 181-83.

<sup>812</sup> Cf. Metcalf (2015a) 37-49: An and Enlil are never themselves object of *elatio*.

<sup>813</sup> Text Edzard (1997) 31, cf. Cavigneaux (1978) 183.

<sup>814</sup> On the possible connection with the verb cf. Farber-Flügge (1973) 118, Cavigneaux (1978) 183-84, Farber (1987/90) 611.

<sup>815</sup> Alster (1975) 34 n. 33.

retributions. In the Sumerian and Akkadian poems *InD/IšD*, the goddess goes to the Netherworld craving for "me".<sup>816</sup> Because, as Enlil says, "the "me" of the Netherworld [are] "me" that should not be craved" (me kur-ra me al nu-di-da, *InD* 193a = 207a), she ends up deprived of her own prerogatives, being stripped, whilst crossing each of the Netherworld seven gates, of her seven amuletic garments embodying her seven "me". As a result, she is kept as dead in the "Land-of-no-return", to be saved only by Enki/Ea's intervention. In the Akkadian version, her absence causes every animate reproductive activity on earth to cease (*IšD* 76-80 ≈ 86-90).

The resolution of an analogous cosmic crisis through the intervention of a major god (Zeus and Enki/Ea) sets these Greek and Mesopotamian narratives on an equal footing.<sup>817</sup> The poetic treatment of divine prerogatives, however, highlights the fact that Demeter's *timai* need to be activated through the keeping of correct relations of reciprocity. In the Mesopotamia texts, the crisis emerges as Inana/Ištar's divine powers are taken away and absconded (in the figures of her garments and then of the goddess herself). Thus, Zeus achieves restoration through socially conceived acts, for Enki it is enough to bring Inana back (though *she* will have to bargain her return).

Both *timai* and "me" represent the divine control over the universe, at the same time enabling mankind to communicate with the gods and to ensure that it continues its course. In Greek *epos*, however, such communication is granted through the essentially relational nature of *time*, whilst in Mesopotamia this happens through the immanence of "me". This is not to say that the necessity to provide for the gods is less strong in Mesopotamia than in

---

<sup>816</sup> The reason for her journey is not explicit in *IšD*, cf. below n. 821.

<sup>817</sup> For comparisons see esp. Penglase (1994) 126-58, Pettinato and Chiodi (2000) 23-29; literature in Currie (2016) 91 n. 63.

Greece; but in literature at least the conception of the divine activity emerges as strictly social in one case, more markedly metaphysical in the other.<sup>818</sup>

This is reinforced by the different semantic and syntagmatic associations of the two words: divine *timai* are often complemented by *gera* ("prize, select honour"), and associated with *dora* ("gifts"); the most commonly associated verbs are *porein*, *didonai*, *ofellein* ("bestow, give, owe"); when they are "held" (*echein*) this is the result of *lachos* "attribution" or *dasmos* "division", all of which confirms their relational dimension.<sup>819</sup> Similarly, "me" are bestowed, granted, given, distributed (ba, saĝ(-e-éš) - rig<sub>7</sub>, šúm, ḫal-ḫa(l)).<sup>820</sup> Thus, the reciprocity of Zeus' distributions are comparable to Anu's promises in *Anzû* (Ch. 3§2.3.1).

Unlike *time*, however, the word "me" is connected with a set of nouns relating to the immanent organisation and order of the universe, especially *ĝarza* "rite, cultic ordinance" (an Akkadian loanword from *paršu*, which also renders the concept of "me" in turn),<sup>821</sup> *billuda* "rituals, customs" (< Akk. *belūtu* "rulership"), *šu-luḫ* ("cleansing ritual"): in their mundane dimension, "me" denote the "cultic ordinances".<sup>822</sup> But the most important association from our perspective is that with *ĝiš-ḫur* (Akk. *uṣurtu*) "plan, design (of the cosmos, city, temple etc.)". For the "me" are expressions of the world order's essential, well and minutely planned, ideally immutable features.<sup>823</sup>

One related word that is crucial for the pantheon syntax is *nam* "being, nature, way of being", again most likely connected with the verb "to be", whilst it is very productively

---

<sup>818</sup> Thus Castellino (1959) explains "me" by analogy with the Platonic forms, cf. Fink (2015) 182-83; Alster (1975) 32-33 with Vedic *Ṛta*; Selz (1997) 194 with Polynesian *mana*.

<sup>819</sup> Richardson (1974) 263, *Lfgre* III.518-28 (Nordheider).

<sup>820</sup> Verbal associations in Farber-Flügge (1973) 130-53.

<sup>821</sup> *CAD* P 195-96; on the etymological connection cf. Farber-Flügge (1973) 167, Farber (1987/90) 610-12. According to Cavigneaux (1978) 183 "si la traduction *paršu* est passée à me, c'est peut-être surtout à cause de l'embarras des Akkadiens pour distinguer des notions propres aux Sumériens". Note how in the Sumerian *InD* the Netherworld gatekeeper's replies form a couplet that includes both "me" and "ĝarza" (*InD* 142-43 etc.), where *IšD* displays a single line having only *paršū(ĝarza)<sup>mes</sup>-šá* (*IšD* 44 etc.).

<sup>822</sup> Farber-Flügge (1973) 153-202.

<sup>823</sup> On me and *ĝiš-ḫur* cf. Black - Green (1992) 130.

used as an abstractive prefix, so that, e.g. the Sumerian word for "kingship" is *nam-lugal* ("destiny-king"), "divinity" is *nam-dingir* ("destiny-god"): such constructions convey the materialisation of the "me" that Inana takes from Enki.<sup>824</sup> The Akkadian equivalent to *nam*, *šīmtu* ("what is fixed", "destiny"), again highlights permanence and fixity, deriving from the root *š'm*, whence the verb *šāmu(m)* "to fix, decree".<sup>825</sup> Greek gods hold *timai* as a result of attribution or division, and *timai* are assigned/confirmed by Zeus in exchange for help, or at least to secure the world order and his own power. In Mesopotamian literature, however, the gods *establish* the destiny (*nam...tar, šīmta(m) šāmu(m)*) of other deities (as well as of objects), thereby sanctioning an immutable cosmic role perceived to be immanent in the order of things - although, of course, myths relate how this state of things came into being.<sup>826</sup>

Beyond the significant analogies, both the literary dynamics of the divine systems and the emerging concept of divine kingship comply with the difference between the prominently relational and changing dimension of *time* and the immanent and fixed nature of *me/paršū* and *nam/šīmtu*.

The centrality of the "established destiny" emerges clearly from its being the constant focus of Mesopotamian divine assemblies, as well as the aetiological goal of most divine narratives.<sup>827</sup> This is not the case in Greek *epos*, where these scenes focus on Zeus' ability to maintain and justify his leading position through his skilled management of *timai*.

---

<sup>824</sup> LTL 135: "être, nature, manière d'être", cf. Krecher (1987) 71, Farber (1991) 88-89, ELS 157, Jagersma (2010) 118; on *nam* < /\*ana-àm/ "was ist es" cf. Falkenstein (1959) 35, SL §57, ELS 157; *contra* Edzard (1976) 71-72, 93-94, Diakonoff (1983) 84 n. 5.

<sup>825</sup> CDA 373, cf. CAD Š II.11-20. The personal dimension and idiomatic associations with death (one man's *šīmtu*), is often explained by analogy to Homeric *moira*, e.g. Oppenheim (1977) 201-04, Lawson (1994) 132-33 (drawing valuable distinctions), Groneberg (2004) 68. Cf. §5.

<sup>826</sup> On *šīmtu* as connected with cosmic *uṣurtu* cf. e.g. Lawson (1994) 79-81, 132; Groneberg (2004) 67-68.

<sup>827</sup> This applies equally to the "me" of Enki's temple (*EJN*), to Sud's renaming (*EnSud*), to Ninurta, Marduk and Erra's prerogatives (*Lugale, Anzû, Ee, Erra*), to the birth of Enlil's Netherworld offspring (*EnNinl*), as to the fate of Sumer (*LSUr, LUr, LW*), of mankind (*EnNinm, Atr.*), of the South Wind (*SumAdapa*), and of Lugalbanda (*Lugalb. I*), Bilgames (*DB*), and the flood-hero (*DB, Flood, Atr., Gilg.*).

*Enūma eliš* concludes with the gods proclaiming Marduk's destinies (his names), the *Theogony* by relating how Zeus secured his rule through a set of strategic marriages.

Considering Tiāmat's and Typhoeus' defeats at the hands of Marduk and Zeus, neither of them wins in isolation.<sup>828</sup> Zeus needs the weapons the Cyclopes provide him with (bolt, thunder and lightning), grateful as he freed them from Ouranos and Gaia (*Th.* 501-06). In the long process leading to Marduk's departure (Tablets 2-4) the expression *šīmta(m)* *šāmu(m)* ("fix the destiny") recurs seven times (discounting repeated lines), before the decisive proclamation and testing (4.1-34).<sup>829</sup> Only thereafter is Marduk able to fashion his weapons and to put the winds at his service (4.35-64). Where the *Theogony* highlights reciprocity, *Enūma eliš* stresses the necessity to "fix a destiny". Zeus receives his weapons, Marduk is assigned a destiny that permits him to create them.

To the necessity to "fix a destiny" corresponds the institutional stability of the Mesopotamian divine kingship, which can be taken away precisely thanks to its firm, objectified nature. Just as the "me" in possession of Enki can be taken by Inana, and just as her own "me" are stripped away from her in the Netherworld, so can divine kingship be *seized*, for it can be named (nam-<sup>d</sup>en-líl, Akk. <sup>d</sup>*Enlilūtu* "Enlilship"), and it is embodied in the Tablet of Destinies. Šarur's alarmed advice to Ninurta contains no metaphoric language (*Lugale* 54-55):

ur-saĝ nam-lugal-zu tùm-dè tar-tar-ra mu-un-ĝál  
<sup>d</sup>nin-urta me abzu-zu šu si sá-bi ĝiškim i-im-ti

hero, there have been consultations with a view to taking away your kingship  
Ninurta, it (i.e. the Asag) is confident that it can lay hands on the "me" received by you in the Apsû

We have seen throughout Greek epic that Zeus' rule rests on his strength and managing ability, not on the institutional fixity of his *basileis time* "royal honour" (*Th.* 462, 892). The

---

<sup>828</sup> West (1997) 300-02, stressing analogies; see further §3 on Typhoeus and Tiāmat.

<sup>829</sup> Cf. *Ee* 2.61, 63, 158-60 (etc.), 3.11, 130, 139, 4.33.

menaces to Zeus' rule portrayed in the *Iliad* are bound to fail because of his opponents' inferior strength and because he is ultimately granting everyone his share. There is no depiction of Zeus losing his status in *epos*.

Things are different in Mesopotamia. While the Greek narratives on divine kingship portray how Zeus confirms his rule against every challenge (often through his sons), but never loses it, the Mesopotamian tradition portrays how divine kingship is effectively challenged, sometimes even *taken away*, and then recovered. The Iliadic divine *stasis* is ineffective because none is stronger than Zeus. Nor is anyone cleverer - not even Prometheus, eventually outwitted. The more serious and preceding (but equally fruitless) challenge represented by Typhoeus and portrayed in the *Theogony* and *HAp.* is similarly based on a presumption of superior strength: Here hopes that her son should defeat Zeus as Zeus did with Kronos (*HAp.* 337-39). The Mesopotamian challenge to divine kingship, on the other hand, is based on the physical possession of the divine ordinances, the immanent archetypes, as Anzû's monologue and its result demonstrate (SB *Anzû* 1.71-76, 81-82):

*an-zu-ú it-ta-aṭ-ṭal-ma a-bi ilānī(dingir)<sup>mes d</sup> dur-an-ki*  
*uk-kuš<sup>d</sup> en.líl-ú-ti iṣ-ša-bat ina lib-bi-šú*  
*lul-qé-e-ma ṭūpšimāta(dub.nam.meš) ilānī(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> a-na-ku*  
*ù te-re-e-ti šà ilānī(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> ka-li-šu-nu lu-uḫ-mu-um*  
*lu-uḫ-mur-ma<sup>gis</sup> kussâ(gu.za) lu-be-li par-ši* 75  
*lu-ma-à-ir ka-li-šu-nu<sup>d</sup> i-gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub>*  
 (...)

*ṭūpšimāta(dub.nam.meš) ik-šu-da qa-tuš-šu* 81  
*<sup>d</sup>en.líl-ú-ta il-te-qé na-du-<sup>r</sup>ú<sup>1</sup> [par-ši]*

Anzû would constantly look at the father of the gods, Duranki (*viz.* Enlil), in his heart he thought of seizing sovereignty ("Enlilship").  
 "I myself will take the gods' Tablet of Destinies,  
 and gather (in my hand) the assignments of the gods.  
 I will win the throne, be master of the divine powers. 75  
 I will give command to each and all the Igiḡ!"  
 (...)
 the Tablet of Destinies he reached with his hand: 81  
 he took the sovereignty ("Enlilship"), the divine powers were suspended!

The seeming paradox is that the *position* of the Mesopotamian divine king is precarious as much as the *institution* of kingship is fixed and stable, almost external to the person of

the ruler. This is in perfect symmetrical opposition to the Greek situation, where it is the personal strength and ability of Zeus that make *his* rule a lasting one.

This perspective is helpful to better understand the behaviour of Enlil who, during the climax of the crisis, resigns from his office by surrendering his *paršu* (*Atr.* OB 1.171-73, above Ch. 2§3.1), of which in *Anzû* he is utterly deprived. Just as Marduk is present in his statue, and was restored to Babylon by Nabuchadnezzar I as the king recovered his cultic image from the Elamites, so in *Erra* does Marduk lose effective power as his statue is taken away to be cleansed, according to *Erra*'s devices.

The structural weakness of the divine ruler's persona in Akkadian narratives, contrary to Zeus' strength in Greece, is compensated by Enki/Ea. As we have seen, it is the wisdom god, and never Enlil, who solves cosmic crises and grants compensation.<sup>830</sup> Poseidon can at times behave *in loco Iovis* (Ch. 5§8, 6§3), but it is Zeus' task to maintain cosmic order. It is important to acknowledge that *Enûma eliš*, where Ea entrusts king Marduk with the management and administration of all the powers and decrees (*paršû* and *têrêtû*, *Ee* 7.141-42), represents an exception in Mesopotamian narrative poetry.<sup>831</sup> Even in *Erra*, which presupposes the theology of *Ee*, the herald of cosmic order is not a tricked Marduk, nor the reckless substitute chief god holding all the *paršû* (*Erra* 3.D.9), but his positive counterpart Išum (Ch. 3§3).

---

<sup>830</sup> Zeus' compensation of Demeter (*HDem.*) and Helios (*Od.* 12) as the latter threaten cosmic order, can be paralleled by Enki/Ea's behaviour with Inana (*EWO*, *InŠuk*) and Ereškigal (*N&E*); Anu's compensation of Ištar in *SB Gilg.* 6 derives from Sumerian prototypes (*BBH*, *InEb*); on this thread across Near Eastern and early Greek poetry cf. Ballesteros Petrella (in prep.1). For Ea as manager of *me/paršû* and *nam.meš/šimātû* cf. e.g. *EWO* 61-80 (entrusted by Enlil), *InEn* B.9, *SB Anzû* 2.44-46.

<sup>831</sup> On *Enûma eliš*'s "new theology" see now Katz (2011), Gabriel (2014) esp. 357-92, Haubold (2017) 33-34. On Marduk, Yahweh and Zeus as subsuming the "transcendent authority" and the "executive imminence" see Mondì (1990) 167-77, cf. below n. 834. Still, the role of Ea remains fundamental: his final speech stands as the culmination of a thread developing from Marduk's birth in Apsû and through the two structurally fundamental father-and-son dialogues that result in Marduk's appointment as champion and in mankind's creation (Ch. 3§2.3). While Marduk's complete elevation contrasts with *Lugale* and *Anzû*, where Ninurta's triumph always remains connected to his enterprises for Enlil (esp. *Lugale* 48, 187-90, *Anzû* SB 2.23, 3.121-24), note that Marduk accuses Tiamat of having illegitimately elevated Qingu "to the office of Anuship" (4.82 *ana pa-ra-aš<sup>d</sup> e-nu-ti*, var. <sup>d</sup>AN<sup>1</sup> and <sup>d</sup>a-), which preludes to his giving back the Tablet to Anu (5.69-70); on the assembly's importance in the poem cf. Ch. 3§2.3. Finally, it is worth reminding that the hyperbolic praise including the assignment of "all the divine powers" is conventional in hymns; cf. Metcalf (2015a) 40-49, 76-77.

### §3. Family matters

Still, Zeus is not alone in his difficult task. Apart from the generally loyal Poseidon, he counts on powerful offspring, notably Athene and Apollo, who foster his plans and guarantee his power.<sup>832</sup> Enki/Ea may be said to complement the Mesopotamian chief god's rule, but Apollo is to be compared with Ninurta, Enlil's son.<sup>833</sup>

Apollo is fundamental for Zeus' order (Ch. 7§1 on *HAp.*); in the *Iliad*, he, alone, executes the final part of Zeus' plan to help the Trojans (Books 15-17). Ninurta, however, effectively takes the place of a fundamentally helpless Enlil. This raises the question whether the younger warrior should become himself the king of the gods (*NinTurt*, *Anzû*, compare the fear of the gods in *Angim*), which does happen with Marduk in *Ee*.<sup>834</sup> This would be difficult in Greece: in a well-known myth, as Apollo kills the Cyclopes (Zeus had killed Asklepios, Apollo's son) Zeus condemns his son to a one-year service.<sup>835</sup> One may compare Ninurta's maltreatment as he considered keeping the Tablet of Destinies in *Ninurta and the Turtle*; crucially, however, it is Enki (not Enlil) who tricks him.

The text of *NinTurt* breaks halfway through an appeal by the mother-goddess Ninmena (most likely to be the Ninurta's mother here) against Enki's measure. This brings us to the different role of divine motherhood in the two systems. Except from Gaia (see below) and Rhea, both of earlier generations and rather in the background during Zeus' regime, there is no "mother-goddess" in Greek epic. On one side stands Here, the legitimate consort of

---

<sup>832</sup> Calhoun's (1935) criticism of Nilsson, esp. Nilsson (1932) 221-51, cf. Nilsson's (1999) 382 response, are still instructive on the co-presence of aspects of patriarchy and kingship in the Homeric gods' hierarchy; compare, recently, Scully's (2015) "political" reading and Graziosi's (2016) "patriarchal" analyses of the *Theogony*. The Mesopotamian comparison, at least, confirms that the political and familiar dimensions are not *per se* mutually exclusive.

<sup>833</sup> Cf. above (Ch. 9§1.1) on their entering the assembly and previous literature.

<sup>834</sup> In terms of mythological structures, the dualism Enlil-Ninurta (cf. Anu-Enlil in *Atr.*, Ea-Marduk in *Ee*, El-Baal at Ugarit etc.) is that between "the hoary *auctoritas* of the wise and aged patriarch and the intimidating physical vigor of a younger executive deity", Mondì (1990) 168, see also Annus (2002) 109-23, 171-86.

<sup>835</sup> [Hes.] fr. 51, 54 M.-W., Pind. *Pyth.* 3.14-58, cf. Eur. *Alc.* 1-8; the myth is alluded to at *Il.* 2.766, cf. Kirk (1985) 241, Latacz *et al.* (2003) 249. A similar punishment may underlie Apollo and Poseidon's work for Laomedon πὰρ Διὸς ἐλθόντες (*Il.* 21.444a), cf. Σ T *ad loc.*, Edwards (1991) 91, Parker (2007) 51.

Zeus whose children (Ares, Hephaistos, Eileithyia) do not lay claim to divine kingship.<sup>836</sup> On the other side stand the many goddesses that bore most of Zeus' mortal and immortal offspring. Here is jealous of this progeny, for she would have liked to beget the successor to divine kingship as Gaia and Rhea had done (*HAp.* 305-54, Ch. 7§1.3). Zeus' extramarital activities, thus, account for Here's traditional hostility to him, exploited throughout the *Iliad* and recalled by its paradigmatic references to Herakles, persecuted by Here (Ch. 5§7).

Athene, according to Hesiod (*Th.* 886-900), is born from Zeus after he swallows Metis ("Cunning"), who was destined to bear more powerful a son than his father; her birth is thus part of Zeus' neutralisation of the dangers of female reproduction.<sup>837</sup> Athene's importance for Zeus' rule make all the more potentially momentous her temporary alliance with Here (*Il.* 8) and her later sanction of Zeus' authority (*Il.* 15). Zeus helps Hektor through Apollo, and brings the hero to death through his "dear daughter" (*Il.* 22).

Unlike Here or Metis, the Mesopotamian mother-goddess' reproductive capacity does not threaten divine kingship (or at least not directly and explicitly so). Mami/Bēlet-ilī prompts her son Ninurta: "let the divine powers return to the father who begot you" ([a]-<sup>1</sup>na<sup>1</sup> a-<sup>1</sup>bi a<sup>1</sup>-li-di-ka li-tu-ru par-ši, SB *Anzû* 2.23).<sup>838</sup> She is fundamentally benign (in *Atra-ḫasīs*, she accepts Enlil's command and then duly repents), and constantly helps Ea in her realm of competence, creation, precisely where Here is ineffective.<sup>839</sup>

The Mesopotamian young warrior can lay claims to divine kingship. Ninurta, born from Enlil and the mother-goddess, proves to be stronger than his father. Marduk's success in *Enūma eliš* crucially passes through a genealogical discourse (Ch. 3§3.2): he succeeds against Tīāmat where his grandfather Anu and his father Ea had failed. Zeus, on the other

---

<sup>836</sup> On Zeus' hostility to Ares cf. Ch. 5§3.

<sup>837</sup> On Zeus' "gender policy" cf. Ch. 7§1.3.

<sup>838</sup> Masetti-Rouault's (2014) 134-35 interpretation of Ninurta as external to Enlil's household in *Anzû* overlooks this speech (and the proem), cf. Ch. 3§2.3.2.

<sup>839</sup> Ch. 4§3.1.

hand, has not engendered a son more powerful than himself. The menace that the feminine reproductive force represents for his rule is central in Greek epic theology, and its neutralisation is reflected in the figures of Apollo and Athene. These children secure Zeus' rule without being able to usurp his position, whereas Ninurta tends to, and Marduk manages to, obtain divine kingship.<sup>840</sup>

Tiāmat's role in *Enūma eliš* seems closer to a Greek conception: she is the primeval mother (*Ee* 1.4), and endangers cosmic order as Gaia does in the *Theogony*;<sup>841</sup> Tiāmat would represent that threatening female reproductive force which is scarcely prominent in the rest of Mesopotamian narratives.<sup>842</sup> The Babylonian poem, however, does not stress this as the crucial aspect. Tiāmat behaves like the typically benign mother-goddess when trying to dissuade her spouse Apsû from harming "those whom we created" (*šá ni-ib-nu-ú*, *Ee* 1.45).<sup>843</sup> After Apsû's destruction she becomes the external enemy typical in the *Chaoskampf*, effectively alienating herself from the entire genealogy of the gods, all the way up to Laḫmu and Laḫamu (Ch. 3§2.2). Though she does create a host of monsters, she is dangerous because she has illegitimately entrusted Qingu with the Tablet of Destinies, not because, like Gaia or Here, she begets a putatively stronger successor. Traditionally, indeed, the menaces to the Mesopotamian divine order come from outside the divine family. Zeus, instead, is challenged from within his *oikos*: aside from the ineffective strife with Here, Athene and Poseidon in the *Iliad*, the most telling evidence here is *HAp.*, attributing to Here the birth of Typhoeus that in Hesiod belongs to Gaia.<sup>844</sup>

---

<sup>840</sup> For comparisons between *Enūma eliš*'s and Hesiod's teleological genealogies cf. esp. West (1997) 280-83, van Dongen (2011), Haubold (2017), below n. 845.

<sup>841</sup> On Gaia see most recently Peigney (2015), Pironti (2015), Graziosi (2016).

<sup>842</sup> Thus Scully (2015) 61-62, (2016); Jones (2005) 337 and Sonik (2012) seem likewise to be overinterpreting when envisaging an implicit textual strategy to avoid Marduk marrying Tiāmat.

<sup>843</sup> West (1997) 282 compares Gaia's behaviour with Ouranos (*Th.* 159-75): "the father hates them [i.e. the children] and wishes to suppress them, but the mother opposes him"; yet Gaia is not preoccupied for her children, but for her own status of constriction, cf. Graziosi (2016) 40-43.

<sup>844</sup> The Gigantomachy, as a virtual doublet of the Titanomachy (the Giants too being born from Ouranos and Gaia) makes no exception. On the Typhoeus myth and the Near East cf. esp. West (1997) 300-04.

Family is central in both systems, but it is more prominent in the Greek challenges to divine kingship (ineffectual in the case of Zeus). Zeus' marriage policy is fundamental for him to remain the strongest, thus constituting a further keystone of his unconquerable status. Comparatively speaking, the absence in Mesopotamia of such a preoccupation for the dangers deriving from female reproduction is noteworthy.<sup>845</sup> The fact that Ninurta is born from Enlil *and* the powerful and benign mother-goddess is certainly decisive in his replacement of Enlil as the most powerful god, which could never happen with Apollo. The result of such a framework is Marduk's accomplished rise to supreme power in *Enūma eliš*. Whilst Gaia is positively decisive for Zeus' success, and then neutralised, feminine help and reproduction play no part in Marduk's accession.

This picture is consistent with the different firmness of the chief gods' positions. Zeus, wary of female reproduction, succeeds by terminating the reproductive chain. The Mesopotamian chief god engenders the young warrior from the mother-goddess: this son counterbalances his weakness, and eventually replaces him.

#### §4. The socio-political background

The following remarks assume that, in Greek epic, the gods' representation engages with the picture of human/heroic society, which does not necessarily reflect any specific historical situation, but needs to reflect traditional conventions.<sup>846</sup> Still, it remains legitimate to surmise that the epic discourses on political fragmentation we are about to see

---

<sup>845</sup> Concerning Inana/Ištar, her position in the divine family varies according to different theologies, cf. in general Wilcke (1976/80), Westenholz (2007). Her strength and ambition is the focus of a number of compositions, but she is absent from most of the poems considered in this thesis. Like Ereškigal, she can threaten cosmic order if not accorded what she wants (cf. *Gilg.* SB 6.99-100 = *N&E* 318-19), but not on account of her reproductive capacity.

<sup>846</sup> The social definition of Homeric power, and above all the degree to which we may attach the picture emerging from the poems to a historical society, are of course the subject of endless debate. Foundational points of reference remain Finley (1977), Adkins (1960), (1971); assessments of scholarship include van Wees (1992) 26-28, I. Morris (1997a-b); Raaflaub (2006), (2011b-d), adding now Brown (2016), Sherratt and Bennet (2017).

spoke to the concerns of Homer's contemporary audience.<sup>847</sup> Many historians endeavour in the difficult task of making the poems' structures dovetail with historical reconstructions of late-8<sup>th</sup>/early-7<sup>th</sup>-c. Greek society.<sup>848</sup> Yet it is risky to dismiss all that cannot be readily shown to be consistent with that picture as the product of "epic distancing".<sup>849</sup> Caution is important here, as any mythological discourse on divine society will perforce tend to be even more removed from audience realities than one concerning human structures.<sup>850</sup>

Our comparison of divine powers in connection with the institution of divine kingship has brought out fundamental differences. The Greek *timai*, which may have been allotted "from the beginning" or bestowed by Zeus, are not self-contained or stable entities, for their boundaries can be blurred and called into question - and this applies also to Zeus' *basileïs time*, contested by Poseidon. Indeed, just as *timai* are foundation and product of relations of reciprocity (among gods and between gods and men), so is Zeus' rule made possible by his careful management and preservation of the relations of power and favour-exchange among the gods, of divine bestowal toward mankind, of mankind's offering to the gods.

By contrast, the Mesopotamian *me/paršū* represent the order immanent in the essence of things: they ground and belong to a stable and carefully planned world order which is reflected in the institutional fixity of divine kingship, embodied, in turn, in its objectification in the Tablet of Destinies. Against the backdrop of a stable institution of

---

<sup>847</sup> Cf. e.g. Osborne (2009) 149, Raaflaub (2011c) 360-61. Naturally, such themes continued to speak to later audiences, and, at the same time, they reflect the epic shaping of cosmic history as described by Haubold (2005).

<sup>848</sup> Along these lines, with varying degrees of recognition of older historical strata visible in the epics, see Donlan's (1999) collected work, Morris (1986), (1997a-b), (2009), Ulf (1990), (2009), van Wees (1992), (1999), Raaflaub (1991), (1997), (1998), (2006), (2011b), Crielaard (1995). The consideration of a Mycenaean background of political *realia* is rather discredited, cf. e.g. Cook's (2006) review of Shear (2004), Davis and Lynch (2017). For a balanced assessment cf. Osborne (2009) 143-44, (2004).

<sup>849</sup> The expression appears in Morris (1986), cf. e.g. Crielaard (1995) 273-74, Raaflaub (2011c) 360.

<sup>850</sup> For example, the importance of the Greek female goddesses to achieve divine kingship (§3) hardly reflects the patrilinear principles known from historical Greece, cf. e.g. Snodgrass (1974) on human marriage settlements and transmission of property (also above Ch. 6§3); Finkelberg (2005) 65-89 connects "matrilinear" heroic genealogies to the Bronze Age.

kingship, the Mesopotamian divine ruler can lose his office; the more fluid Greek situation, instead, calls for an authority that is in constant need of confirmation or exemplification, where it is the unique abilities and behaviours of Zeus that guarantee his everlasting status as ruler.

The apparently counterintuitive result is that the archaic Greek chief god's rule is in effect stronger than the Mesopotamians', who preserved the institution of kingship as the foundation of the world order for their entire history, from the moment "when kingship descended from heaven", [nam]-lugal an-ta e<sub>11</sub>-dè-a-ba (*SKL* 1).<sup>851</sup> Of course, the contradiction is only superficial, for it is precisely the stability of the Mesopotamian concept of kingship as an office, i.e. its being profoundly distinct from the *person* of the king, that permits the changes to which it is subject.

The Mesopotamian awareness of the ephemeral nature of a kingship's "term" (Sum. bala) is best expressed by Enlil's answer to Nanna at *LSUr* 364-69:<sup>852</sup>

di-til-la enim pu-úh-ru-um-ma-ka šu gi<sub>4</sub>-gi<sub>4</sub> nu-ĝál  
 enim du<sub>11</sub>-ga an<sup>d</sup>en-líl-lá-ka šu bal-e nu-zu 365  
 uri<sub>5</sub><sup>ki</sup>-ma nam-lugal ha-ba-šúm bala da-rí la-ba-an-šúm  
 u<sub>4</sub> ul ùĝ ki ĝar-ra-ta zà ùĝ lu-a-šè  
 bala nam-lugal-la saĝ-bi-šè è-a a-ba-a igi im-mi-in-du<sub>8</sub>-a  
 nam-lugal-bi bala-bi ba-sud<sup>r</sup> e-ne ba-kúš-ù-dè-en

The verdict, the word of the (divine) assembly cannot be opposed,  
 the word pronounced by An and Enlil knows no overturning. 365  
 At Ur, kingship was certainly granted, an eternal term (of reign) was not granted!  
 Since distant days, when the people were settled, until the people multiplied,  
 who has ever seen a term of kingship that should take precedence (for ever)?  
 Its kingship, its term (of reign), have been removed: why should you care?

In the world of early Greek epic power is viewed as a far more personal matter. Because the divine world represents a projection of earthly conceptions, it is easy to see

<sup>851</sup> On Mesopotamian kingship, its ideology and (divine) self-representation see variously, and e.g., Seux (1980/83), Postgate (1995), Lambert (1998), Westenholz (1998), Michalowski (2008), Šašková, Pecha and Charvát (2010), Brisch (2011) 706-24, Sallaberger (2012), Wilhelm (2012), Vacín (2015), Finn (2017).

<sup>852</sup> See Ch. 1§3. Text Michalowski (1989) 58, with Attinger's (2015a) 17 translation and notes: E-NE at 369 is not the ending of the preceding verb (Michalowski's ba-ĝíd-e-dè), but stands for a-na (parallels in Civil 2000/2005: 20 and Attinger 2004); on the final verb cf. Wilcke (1974) 222.

that Zeus represents the *ideal* ruler, whose power cannot be effectively challenged because of his unmatched strength and political ability.

In *epos*, explicit statements about the nature of kingship are often preoccupied to stress the necessity of a unique and firm rule, or the qualities attached to the person of the ruler, as shown in Odysseus' speech on the necessity of having *one* commander (*Il.* 2.203-06). When Agamemnon is, again, not quite behaving with determination and authority, old Nestor politely reminds the king of his status (*Il.* 9.69-73). The power of the Homeric *basileus* is based on his prestige, his status being socially defined by the degree of honour (*time*) he enjoys in the community. Such honour is represented both materially and symbolically: because it is a profoundly interpersonal feature that ultimately depends on the individual's ability to correctly secure (and bestow) *time*, it is inherently unstable, and therefore, as van Wees has shown, competition for honour, which ideally equals excellence, functions as the true engine of Homeric society.<sup>853</sup>

The *Iliad*, staging a conflict over prerogatives, goes to the heart of the structural problems such a system presents. Yet unlike Agamemnon, Zeus is always able to ensure both the maintenance of his own firm authority in the divine assembly, and a proper satisfaction of cosmic *timai*. For he is stronger, and wiser, than Agamemnon is.<sup>854</sup> The Mesopotamian concept of divine kingship is less dependent on the personal abilities of the ruler, as Homeric society presents a socio-political system that is incomparably less centralised than that of any historical Mesopotamian state where the literature here considered was produced.<sup>855</sup>

---

<sup>853</sup> Thus Redfield (1975) 95: "In Homeric society, authority is secured by the exercise of authority, and status by the display of status". Cf. esp. Ulf (1990) esp. 4-41, 85-98, van Wees (1992) 61-125; further literature on epic *time* above §1.

<sup>854</sup> On Homer's contrasting pictures of Agamemnon and Zeus cf. Ch. 5§1.

<sup>855</sup> This does not exclude that the Homeric ruler's status is both institutionalised and inheritable (though this is hardly a straightforward process), cf. Ulf (1990) 223-31 and van Wees's (1992) 281-94, qualifying Finley's too fluid picture; more recently Carlier (2006), van Wees (2011). We must therefore distinguish between the violent genealogical usurpation in the Hurro-Hittite, West Semitic and Hesiodic succession myths and the Mesopotamian seizing of divine kingship, a menace coming from *outside* the genealogical

Zeus represents the ideal ruler, and certainly a (largely unattainable) model for his earthly counterparts. In Mesopotamia, the failures of the divine king make his position more complex in this respect. The Akkadian narratives tend rather to stress the necessity for the ruler to rely on wise and moderating directions (Enki/Ea's, or Išum's). Even Marduk, whilst representing perfection as the son of Ea, still needs to inscribe his rule in the institutional framework of the divine assembly (Chs. 2-3). The fact that both Zeus and Marduk are destined to kingship from birth is inessential to the different underlying conceptions of what their position as rulers means. Kronos is a fool, says Hesiod, for he does not see that his son "soon, having conquered him with hands and strength, / would drive him out of his *time*, and rule himself over the immortals", μιν τάχ' ἔμελλε βίη καὶ χερσὶ δαμάσσας / τιμῆς ἐξελάειν, ὃ δ' ἐν ἀθανάτοισι ἀνάξειν (*Th.* 490-91). Zeus gains his *time* thanks to his strength, in the context of an internecine competition for supremacy (esp. *Th.* 490-91), and he will have to lead, carefully but firmly, a turbulent world that follows the same rules. Marduk, instead, is conceived in Apsû, "in the chamber of destinies, the room of archetypes", *ina ki-iṣ-ṣi šimāti(nam)<sup>meš</sup> at-ma-an uṣurāti(ḡiṣ.ḫur)<sup>meš</sup>*: he is born to bring the cosmos to perfection, to actualise, that is, those *uṣurāti* (archetypical designs) that represent the world's immanent order.

And here, in sum, lies the difference between Zeus' and Marduk's distributions, with which this discussion started. Zeus' kingship is a function of, and remains permanent because of, his correct apportion. For the Greek gods, this distribution is not something for which to be thankful, but the necessary retribution for their siding with Zeus. The Babylonian gods, instead, have established Marduk's kingship as a destiny before his

---

thread; in *Enūma eliš*, the sequence Anu-Ea-Marduk is not violent in the first place, nor is it viewed in terms of a succession in charge, for it is Anšar who holds effective power after Tiamat's "alienation": structurally speaking, Anu and Ea are "young warriors" who prove unsuccessful. For views stressing analogies cf. recently Haubold (2013) 52-53, Scully (2015) 55-62, (2016); on *Ee*'s specificities here see now Haubold (2017) 25-30.

triumph (esp. *Ee* 4.21-33), a destiny manifest in his victory and perfected cosmic organisation, for which the gods are grateful.<sup>856</sup>

## §5. Gilgameš and Akhilleus

One final point worth exploring is how the outlined differences affect the gods' depiction when it comes to the divine/human interface. Haubold shows that the central question of life and death is addressed in similar terms by SB *Gilgameš* and the *Iliad*: both consciously produce a discourse universal in scope, which presupposes the mutual definition between gods and men and envisages a response in tragic acceptance.<sup>857</sup> Some observations on the two poems' divine assemblies help further explore similarities and specificities. This comparison is especially pertinent to this thesis because, among the entire corpus, the divine syntax of *Gilgameš* is the closest to the Homeric poems: unlike most of the Mesopotamian works treated above, but like the Homeric poems, *Gilgameš* is enacted on the human plane.<sup>858</sup>

West compared the divine assembly in *Gilg.* Tablet 1 and the Homeric heavenly scenes at the poems' beginning, recognising this as a widespread pattern in Near Eastern poetry.<sup>859</sup> In fact, as we saw, initial gatherings inform the assembly-system encompassing a poem's entire composition which is common to both traditions (Ch. 9).

---

<sup>856</sup> Scully (2015) 62, (2016) 58, and Raaflaub (2016) 26-27 (valuably noting the inverse order of appointment and distribution) view Marduk as the absolute ruler reflecting Babylonian kingship and Zeus as *primus inter pares* reflecting "the rise of shared governance in the early Greek *polis*" (Scully 2016: 58). Such frameworks show the persistence of the Herodotean paradigm opposing free Greece to an absolutist Orient; cf. however Liverani's (1993) discussion, the *Introductory Remarks* to Part 1 on Mesopotamian collective institutions, and Haubold (2013) 73-126 on Herodotus and Babylon. But Marduk's perfect rule is an exception in the Akkadian literary panorama (§3), while Scully's teleological reading is unconvincing, for nowhere in Greek epic is Olympic governance a "shared" matter (*pace* Elmer 2013: 146-173).

<sup>857</sup> Haubold (2013) 44-51, cf. Patzek (2003a).

<sup>858</sup> On *Gilgameš* and Homer, the highlight of Graeco-Mesopotamian comparisons, see esp. Petriconi (1964), Schneibner (1967), Gresseth (1975), Beye (1984), Wilson (1986), Burkert (1992) 96-100, Vetta (1994), Andersen (1997), West (1997) esp. 336-47, 402-17, Di Benedetto (1998) 312-18, Burgess (1999), Abusch (2001), Bakker (2001), George (2003) 54-57, Patzek (2003a), (2011), Currie (2012), (2016) 147-222, Haubold (2013) 18-72, Bachvarova (2016) esp. 78-110, Dalley (2017), Ballesteros Petrella (in prep.1).

<sup>859</sup> West (1997) 173-74.

West, again, notes that the establishment of Enkidu's death parallels the Olympic discussion on Hektor's doom.<sup>860</sup> It is worth adding, in terms of theological discourses, that in both scenes the disagreement between deities highlights the tragic opposition between the merits and glorious civic duty of the hero and a cruel divine reward (Ch. 4§3.2, 5§9). This generates Gilgameš's exhausting quest for life, and Akhilleus' outrage against Hektor's body. In the divine assembly, however, the merits of the soon-to-die heroes are not expressed in the civic terms elsewhere used by the narrators. The audiences know that Hektor (even if his choice is not strategically the best) is protecting Troy, and that the deaths of Humbaba and the Bull of Heaven meant the enrichment and safety of Uruk; the protecting deities's discourse, however, revolves on the divine dimension: Hektor's sacrifices to Zeus, Enkidu's acting "by the word of Enlil". The gods' distance enhances the heroes' isolation and tragedy.

In the poems' final assemblies (*Gilg.* 11, *Il.* 24), divine confrontations result in a humanistic response to the problem of death. Such responses are expressed by the main characters (not by the gods), and, to be sure, revolve around different perspectives. Gilgameš returns to Uruk having achieved awareness of his limits (unlike Ūta-napišti, he will not achieve immortality) and civic wisdom (Ch. 4§3). Akhilleus yields to Zeus' command, but remains threatening to Priam (*Il.* 24.559-70), and his characterisation does not change.<sup>861</sup> But thanks to the encounter with the enemy king, impossible without the gods' intervention, he does allow Hektor's funeral to take place, and by connecting Priam's

---

<sup>860</sup> West (1997) 179-80, 343-44, inferring imitation: Homer would have first adapted the scene to fit 16.440-62, then transferred it after deciding to have Zeus condemn Hektor rather than Patroklos. There is no justification (or need) for this reconstruction. On the level of poetic technique there is nothing extraordinary in the scene's doubling (on its significance see Ch. 5§9, cf. Ch. 9§5.1): the repeated lines (16.441-43 = 22.179-81) may well have been traditionally associated with similar scenes (e.g. *Aeth.* arg. 189-90 Severyns, cf. Rengakos 2015: 307-08, 315-16). The similarity of the "pattern" (West 1997: 344) diminishes substantially considering the inversion between advocate and condemner (Zeus/Šamaš ≠ Enlil/Athene), on which more below. Imitation, of course, is not impossible, but depends on the cumulative case for (consciously) systematic links between Homer and *Gilgameš*, see the literature above n. 858, cf. Ch. 9§5.1.

<sup>861</sup> For literature and readings of Akhilleus' complex characterisation throughout the encounter see esp. Taplin (1992) 266-79, Richardson (1993) 334, Clarke (2001) 338 n. 48; on Akhilleus in Book 23, see Kelly (2017).

wretchedness to that of his own father, he does express the tragic conclusion that mankind, universally, must endure its fate (*Il.* 24.527-48).

Two aspects are however common. One is the indirect manner in which the gods determine the protagonist's expression of the universal answer: the Babylonian divine assembly cannot deal with Gilgameš (*Gilg.* 11.207-08), nor do the Greek gods invite Akhilleus to pity Priam (Ch. 5§10). Still, both assemblies create the conditions for the heroes' responses, one through Ūta-napišti's *exemplum*, the other by opening a communication channel with the enemy.

The second aspect is that, although the gods do not induce the protagonist's answer, both divine assemblies establish that the gods do promote the achievement of civilisation constituting the factual answer to the tragic problem: in *Gilgameš*, the civic dimension means a collective effort under the guidance of the pious ruler; in the *Iliad*, the performance of public funerary rituals. Both achievements ensure the permanence of memory beyond the individual's death.<sup>862</sup>

Still, the synthesis between the gods' conflicting positions achieved by these assemblies, whilst perfectly functional to the narrative resolution, leaves untouched, and indeed confirms, the underlying conflicts that prompted the tragic situation in the first place. Ūta-napišti is made immortal, mankind has survived, but Gilgameš cannot achieve "life". Hektor's funeral does take place, but it foreshadows Troy's destruction, while both Patroklos' death and Akhilleus' own doom loom large as Peleus' son yields to Zeus and pities himself and Priam.

This permanence is reflected in the permanence of divine conflict, for the gods opposing one another project onto the cosmic level the opposing forces determining mankind's condition. Apollo obtains Hektor's ransom, but he will kill Akhilleus; Here

---

<sup>862</sup> Haubold (2014) discusses the two poems' focus on the permanence of individual and poetic memory in response to different principles of cosmic destruction (flood, war).

remains hostile to the Trojans, and will achieve her ends - all of which is granted by Zeus (Ch. 5§10). Enlil elevated Ūta-napišti, but was not moved by Šamaš (*Gilg.* 7), nor by Enki in the Sumerian assembly on Bilgames' death (*DB*).<sup>863</sup>

We may conclude by considering the distinctions drawn in this chapter about the chief gods' position. The fact that Hektor is "long since doomed by fate" (πάλαι πεπρωμένον αἴση, 22.179b = 16.441b on Sarpedon) does not prevent Zeus from raising the possibility that he may be saved. The apparent contrast between Zeus and fate is resolved by his yielding to Athene (and Here at *Il.* 16.458, cf. 4.68). This surely enhances pathos and drama (Ch. 5§9), but the audience knows that Athene is but fostering a long-term design granted by Zeus himself (*Il.* 4.37-38, 15.68-71); it is part of Zeus' *time* to agree with the gods, from time to time, and say "do as you wish" (*Il.* 4.37, 22.185, *Od.* 13.145 – to Here, Athene, and Poseidon). And indeed, it is Zeus who conducts the poem's resolution in Book 24 through a balance in a difficult negotiation involving *timai*: "Zeus' compromise is masterly".<sup>864</sup> We recognise the power of the supreme god in his ability to negotiate.

Homer enhances drama because Zeus *could* intervene against what is πεπρωμένον αἴση, fate being here depicted "as a power parallel to that of the gods" (Lawson 1994: 133); but the Mesopotamian "fate" (*nam/šīmtu*) coincides with the divine pronouncement, in this case Enlil's, which "knows no overturning" (šu bal-e nu-zu, *LSUr* 365, Ch. 1§3).<sup>865</sup> Thus, discussing the death of Bilgames/Enkidu, Enlil is the inflexible condemner: no mediation

---

<sup>863</sup> The assemblies at SB *Gilg.* 7 and 11 disjoint themes present in *DB*: the conflict among the gods is not settled, but reaches an afflictive synthesis (*Gilg.* 7) while the ineluctability of Bilgames/Gilgameš's doom is expressed by contrast with the Flood hero's unique destiny (*Gilg.* 11). On intertextuality here cf. Ch. 1§2.3, 4§3.2.

<sup>864</sup> Taplin (1992) 262, cf. esp. van Wees (1992) 144, Ch. 5 §10.

<sup>865</sup> The Mesopotamian destiny is "established" (*šīmtu*<*šāmu*), it represents the divine word and conforms to the cosmic design (*giš-ḫur/ušurtu*); μοῖρα and αἴσα mean "portion/share" and are "allotted" (\*πόρω) - though cf. θεόσφατόν ἐστι "it is fated (god-said)". Gods (and men) have foreknowledge of fate, which is thus *external* to both, even if men associate Fate with the gods, and personify it; on the Indo-European female goddesses "spinning" destiny cf. West (2007) 379-86. On the effects of this dissociation between Fate and the gods in Homer cf. esp. Burkert (1985) 129-30, Janko (1992) 3-7, Allan (2006) 7-8, Versnel (2011) 163-79; for literature see further *Lfgre* III.244 (Nordheider), Edwards (2011a-b). On Mesopotamian fate (with literature) see recently Lämmerhirt and Zgoll (2009), cf. Gabriel (2014) 249-67, 307-15. Comparative readings above n. 825.

is possible. Similarly, the futility of Gilgameš's quest for life emerges through the contrast with the *established fate* of the Flood hero (so already in *DB*). Nevertheless, Atrahasis/Īta-napišti's immortality and the survival of mankind were achieved after an overturning of Enlil's command (Ch. 2§3.3.2): the Mesopotamian chief god had to be thwarted, corrected and guided by Ea.

Both scenes confront death's ineluctability, but the Mesopotamian stress falls on what is (and should be) established and immutable, while the *Iliad* highlights Zeus' freedom to negotiate. Zeus' flexibility and capacities are a function of his ultimate control, whilst Enlil's inflexible command had to be corrected to grant mankind's survival - a correction which could only result in the perfected, immutable cosmic order, which the gods will not change for Gilgameš. Nor did Zeus change Hektor's fate, but, unlike an inaccessible Enlil, he preserves the world order by drawing near to the stance of the hero, his city and his protector Apollo, as well as to the interest of his deathly enemies, Akhilleus, Here and Athene.

### Concluding remarks

This chapter has approached a systemic comparison of divine kingship in our corpora. Although the system of attributes is similarly conceived as the result of dynamic processes of top-down bestowal and distribution (a function of hierarchy), the specific character of Greek divine narratives on Zeus' order is best seen in the light of the essentially relational nature of Greek *timai*. Conversely, the Mesopotamian concept of the *office* of divine kingship is tightly connected with the immanent character of the Mesopotamian "divine powers" (*me/parṣū*).

Central in the Greek discourse, therefore, is the management of *timai*, while it is the problematic possession of attributes and offices that triggers Mesopotamian narratives. The

person of the ruler is more prominent in Greece: the order of Zeus is permanent because of his strength and ability. In Mesopotamia, divine kingship and the faculty to decree destinies can be objectified and thus subtracted, and the depiction of utterly helpless chief gods is typical.

In this context, Marduk's rise to supreme power in *Enūma eliš* parallels that of Zeus: both gods supersede past generations of chief gods by subsuming and bringing the previous order to perfection. But whilst this image of Zeus' rule is constant throughout early Greek epic, *Erra and Išum* demonstrates the persistence of the Mesopotamian literary image of a helpless and distant divine ruler beyond the exceptional theology of *Enūma eliš*. The syntax of the divine family complies with this opposition: Zeus is able to neutralise the threatening female reproductive force, while the Mesopotamian chief god's status can be seriously put into question by his young son. Ninurta, born from Enlil and the mother goddess, is the paradigm here.

From a socio-historical perspective, the firmness of Zeus' rule and Enlil's weakness can be viewed against the background of the different surrounding conditions, which in turn reflect an opposition between the Mesopotamian centralisation around kingship and the competitive fragmentation of Homeric society. Zeus gives cohesion to a structurally unstable system; Mesopotamian divine kingship can be lost, but it is always restored thanks to institutional force of the divine assembly, which guarantees that the "divine powers" may return to the hands of the rightful occupier of the seat of kingship.<sup>866</sup>

A comparison of divine assemblies in the *Iliad* and *Gilgameš* shows that these profound differences affect the poetic modalities through which epic achieves a definition of human mortality. Analogous discourses on the question of life and death are shaped by the different attitudes of the chief gods. Both the Mesopotamian and Greek assemblies seal the

---

<sup>866</sup> *Erra* complicates this discourse (but operates within the same framework) by avoiding the expected ending (Ch. 3§3).

ineluctability of a destined death and (indirectly) set the ground for a civic response. Yet for Homer this is the result of Zeus' concession (*Il.* 22) and negotiations (*Il.* 24); the Mesopotamian focus falls on a destiny proclaimed by Enlil, in accordance with a cosmic design that, however, had been established after an overturning of his will. The divine distance defining mortality does not preclude a humanistic answer, which is performed by the collective scenes of *Gilg.* 11 (civic construction of the ark) and *Il.* 24 (funerary rituals). But the divine advocacy of civilisation is achieved, in Mesopotamia, through a correction of Enlil's plan; in Greece, through Zeus' supreme ability.

## Conclusion

As seen in the Introduction, scholarship engaged in a comparison of early Greek *epos* in a Mediterranean/Near Eastern context appears to have entered a new phase. The pursuit of the impressive parallel (W. Burkert) and the effort to build a cumulative case for pervasive influence (M. L. West) have left room for more reflective developments. Recent studies, thus, set out to account for the sources' indigenous context, and contemplate purposes and modalities of comparison beyond the recognition of a Greek indebtedness to the Near East. Due to the scope of the enterprise, which is as vast as it could be, this general tendency to a more committed reading is still reflected in the variety of subjects, related approaches and aims. This can be seen from the five relevant monographs published in the present decade, each of which appears to pursue its own avenue to improve our appreciation of the value (and limits) of a Near Eastern-Greek comparative discourse.<sup>867</sup> This thesis is no exception, and undoubtedly bears the expected marks of a still exploratory field.

It may be true that, in comparative literature, "it is not the "what" but the "how" that is of importance",<sup>868</sup> but in our case, it seems, the "what" has largely determined the enquiry's direction and the shape in which its results are presented. Scenes of divine assembly lend themselves to several levels of analysis of increasing scope. Starting from the individual scene's form and significance, the presence of a system of assemblies permits consideration of the compositional and theological design of the poem as a whole. As poems in the same tradition share in and elaborate on relevant poetic techniques and theological discourses, a larger-scale approach becomes possible that can encompass, with careful assessment of contextual individualities, the tradition in its entirety. The presentation of the evidence of such systemic and indigenous pictures in Parts 1 and 2 was

---

<sup>867</sup> López-Ruiz (2010), Haubold (2013), Metcalf (2015a), Bachvarova (2016) and Currie (2016).

<sup>868</sup> Tötösy de Zepetnek (1998) 15, quoted by Haubold (2017) 18 n. 5.

a necessary precondition for a comparison between literary traditions. But the value of our separate treatments of the Sumero-Akkadian and early Greek sources, it is hoped, does not lie exclusively in their being prodromes to our comparison. Precisely because the divine assembly allows for a holistic treatment of each text's compositional and theological agenda within its tradition, Parts 1 and 2 have sought to contribute to the exegesis and understanding of the divine in Mesopotamian and early Greek narrative poetry.

The profound diachrony of the presented Mesopotamian sources does not obscure the permanence of the poetic structures which were passed on and adapted to fit new contexts. The relatively simple function of Sumerian divine assemblies, generally one per composition (Chapter 1), finds more complex realisations in *Lugale*, the first poem displaying a system of assemblies structuring the narrative. The theological discourse of *Atra-ḫasīs* (Chapter 2) calls into question the chief god's authority and ability. This is not to be disconnected from tendencies perceptible in OB Sumerian human narratives such as the *Sumerian Adapa* (where Enki solves a cosmic impasse for the assembly presided over by An) and, of course, in poems related to the flood story (*Flood, Death of Bilgames*). However, the Akkadian poem's unprecedented (as far as we know) focus on internecine divine conflict is best assessed in contrast to related Sumerian depictions of mankind's creation (*Enki and Ninmah*) and of divinely-ordained destruction (City-Laments). Although in the OB period it is difficult to make definite cases for processes of Akkadian adaptation of Sumerian sources, it is at least clear that different theological discourses are developed through changing (but recognisably cognate) poetic structures. A thorough consideration of intertextual phenomena in our Mesopotamian sources was beyond this thesis' scope,<sup>869</sup> but the assessment of three Akkadian *Chaoskampf* narratives in Chapter 3 has enabled us to perceive aspects of the evolution of this sub-genre of Mesopotamian

---

<sup>869</sup> Progress in that direction has been made by Wisnom (2014).

narrative poetry. The changing relations between the main protagonist and the divine community appear to reflect historical developments in religious history, notably the rise of Marduk to which *Enūma eliš* bears witness. In Chapter 4, it was seen that the divine scenes of the SB *Epic of Gilgameš* again display processes of thoughtful adaptation of pre-existing patterns. More than *Atra-ḫasīs*, this work reveals how a system of assemblies can fuel a narrative decidedly centred on earthly protagonists and events.

The structuring functions (diegetic and theological) of the divine assembly seen in the Mesopotamian tradition are widely paralleled in early Greek hexameter poetry, where, however, they find specific realisations according to each poem's programme and to the diegetic necessities dictated by the sub-genre. The *Iliad*'s pervasive depiction of turbulent divine politics reflects the earthly conflicts and partial resolutions (Chapter 5). The *Odyssey*, on the other hand, while presenting a rather straightforward divine machinery characterised by the avoidance of open divine conflict, develops complex means for the divine assemblies to direct the shaping and clarify the significance of Odysseus' return (Chapter 6). Addressing the *Homeric Hymns*, it was seen that besides the usual diegetic role, divine collective scenes are crucial for the poets to clarify the praised gods' role within the pantheon, and how they fit in the order presided by Zeus (Chapter 7). The divine assemblies in the *Theogony*, finally (Chapter 8), are crucial for Hesiod to frame his account of Zeus' accession by focusing on the god's managing of divine prerogatives (*timai*).

Both the Mesopotamian and the early Greek narrative tradition give considerable prominence to the scenes of divine assembly as means of structuring their narrative and theological discourses. While Parts 1 and 2 have shown the continuous processes of re-shaping and adaptation of the techniques pertaining to each tradition, Chapter 9 sought to offer a systemic comparison of the formal aspects underpinning the assemblies' shape and

function. The working model adopted to assess these techniques considers both the recurrent patterns of the type-scene and its role in shaping the narrative as functions of the aural reception of literature, to be assumed for both traditions on other grounds. The divine assembly seems best assessed as an infrastructural compositional feature through which Mesopotamian and early Greek poets construed their narratives, and through which their audiences received them. This permits us to recover poetic effects and intentions through a (partial) awareness of the audience's expectations, an awareness that comes to us readers from examining the tradition as widely as possible. Such an exegetical framework (Traditional Referentiality) was developed to assess oral or orally-derived literary cultures, but in this thesis it has been possible to deploy it in a Mesopotamian context, where a compositional interaction with the written word must be accounted for. This is not to ignore cultural specificities, but to provide a tool to bear productive comparative insights without downplaying compositional processes.

The descriptive conclusion of our formal comparison is that the underlying Mesopotamian and Greek structures and functions overlap to a remarkable degree. Clearly, this cannot imply that the compositional processes were one and the same in each culture. Yet important questions arise, whose answers exceed this thesis' coverage, but may constitute an important target for future research. A fundamental fact that is rarely remarked upon is that the Near Eastern written evidence shows that signs of oral recitation and aural reception do *not* necessarily reflect processes of oral composition (*viz.* improvisation or re-composition in performance). In fact, an in-depth cross-cultural discourse on such features (which must include updated and comparative studies on formulaic patterns) could have crucial implications for our understanding of early Greek

epic, where the interface between oral delivery and written composition represents a major crux in the Homeric question.<sup>870</sup>

Another important conclusion of Chapter 9 is that no clear evidence has emerged for a cross-cultural imitation between *individual* poems. There are several reasons for this, and as many implications. The techniques the Greek poets share with the Mesopotamian are profoundly embedded in a long-standing Hellenic poetic system. In principle, one could think that the poet of the *Iliad* (if this is indeed the most ancient preserved Greek poem) adapted Near Eastern techniques, and that his art was subsequently imitated by the poet of the *Odyssey* (if this was not composed by the *Iliad's* author), by Hesiod and by the hymnsts.<sup>871</sup> But the conventional techniques are too diffuse, and the contriving of genetic stemmata arbitrary, particularly when it comes to the scenes in question. On the balance of probabilities, thus, and without excluding cases of punctual imitation between Greek texts, this seems a less likely scenario than one in which the Greek authors drew, each with his own agenda and results, on the common tradition.

As has often been noted in this thesis and elsewhere, comparative attempts at individuating specific Graeco-Mesopotamian intertexts have tended to isolate the supposedly borrowed feature from its traditional context; but when one considers it against a Greek background, the case for imitation or allusion becomes, in most cases, far less convincing (Kelly 2008, Metcalf 2015). The case was made, instead, for the possibility of a diffuse influence that precedes the composition of the surviving Greek texts. Contrary to current perspectives, however, Greek epic is unlikely to have borrowed the idea or the

---

<sup>870</sup> A quick Graeco-Akkadian comparative survey on formulaic patterns is Burkert (1992) 115-16; West's (1997) 220-42 miscellaneous analysis spans several traditions, but does not consider metre and compositional function. Metcalf (2015a) 149-50 does not seem to envisage the Babylonian and Homeric compositional processes as radically incompatible, in spite of crucial differences in conceptions. Much is to be gained (for Homerists and Assyriologists) from engaging with recent developments in Biblical comparative research into the oral/written interface in the Iron Age, cf. the literature above n. 743.

<sup>871</sup> E.g. Kirk (1962) 328 (quoted by Romano Martín 2009: 24): "it seems probable that it was the poet of the *Iliad* who raised them [*viz.* elaborate divine councils] to the level of a major narrative and dramatic element". Kirk does not justify this impression.

topos of the divine assembly wholly and solely from the Near East; Indo-European parallels were selectively considered here, especially from Eddic and Sanskrit narrative poetry. Nevertheless, the assessed structural similarities, in the general context of well-known historical and cultural contacts of various kinds, appear to indicate that Greek epic divine assemblies should be considered as part of a Near Eastern-Mediterranean literary *koine*, as shown through Hittite, Ugaritic, 8th-c. Canaanite and Biblical comparanda. If we allow for a cross-over on the basis of the similarities' strength and of the surrounding historical connections, this need not presuppose a direct engagement with the Mesopotamian texts we happen to possess; but the process did require a supporting background of shared structures in the first place. The seed needs already fertile soil, and the well established, but hardly substantiated hitherto, model of a long-term process of oral contact and communication seemed best to fit our case-study.

All of the other traditions of mythological poetry glimpsed in the final part of Chapter 9 attest to the variegated existence of complex literary representations of the gods across many traditions. The literary evidence for each of these cultures, indeed, bears invaluable witness to the (poetic) shape of each pantheon. Chapter 10 left questions of historical transmission and poetic technique aside, to ask what a comparison of the structures of the Mesopotamian and early Greek literary pantheons could teach us about culturally-specific conceptions. The task is chiefly one of literary interpretation, but the target involves the study of divine representations as historico-religious phenomena.

A choice was made to concentrate on the figure of the divine ruler and the organisation of divine hierarchies and prerogatives. It was deemed best to start from the crucial indigenous categories qualifying the latter aspects, namely the divine "powers" or "prerogatives" (*me/parṣū* and *timai*). Against the background of shared conceptions whereby such prerogatives are desired and bestowed, and ultimately governed by the

chief-god(s), the analysis uncovered important differences in conceptions and related implications. Mesopotamian divine powers are conceived as immanent and potentially immutable constituents of the world order. In *epos*, by contrast, divine *timai* are not entire wholes, but their extent and attribution is subject to negotiations within a framework of reciprocity. This entails a major stability of the Mesopotamian office of divine kingship, whereas in Greece it is the ability of the ruler that secures his position. Conversely, the literary representations dramatise the instability of the Mesopotamian ruler in terms of his *persona* (not the office), whereas Zeus, whose office is viewed in much less institutionalised terms, emerges as constantly capable of ensuring his position thanks to his personal skill. Hence the paradoxical picture whereby the Greek chief god appears to be firmer than the Mesopotamian, where Marduk in *Enūma eliš* represents, as it were, the exception that proves the rule. Assuming that the representation of the divine constitutes a reflection of socio-political conditions, it was possible to connect these phenomena, on the one hand, to the centralised and long-institutionalised kingship of urban Mesopotamia, and, on the other, to the personalised and inherently unstable (because in constant need of re-confirmation) condition of human rulers as depicted in the Homeric poems. Finally, it was shown that an understanding of the cosmic features of the chief god in each tradition, in connection with related conceptions of fate, can contribute to a heuristic comparison between divinely-sanctioned conceptions of life and death as seen in thematically close divine assemblies in SB *Gilgameš* and the *Iliad*.

Thus, it is hoped that our treatment of the dynamics of collective divine representation in Sumero-Akkadian and early Greek narrative poetry may contribute to the literary appreciation of the individual poems as well as of the distinctive poetical physiognomy of each tradition. The scenes of divine assembly, in both literary cultures, develop large-scale narrative designs and convey the poems' theological import - a device whose *longue durée*

extends, through Latin poetry, to Tasso and Milton's works.<sup>872</sup> In a comparative perspective, this thesis demonstrates the value of a systemic approach which starts from an in-depth consideration of the conventional mechanisms at work in each poem and in each corpus and ultimately aims at achieving a broader picture. In effect, the divine assemblies have offered an excellent case to compare, not individual instances or poems, but the literary traditions as a whole. Thus, this test-case validates the application to both corpora of the same critical methods, centred on the analysis of the recurrence, transmission and adaptation of traditional techniques. Such a framework has enabled us to combine close contextual readings with a historical enquiry into a process of transmission that may have been fuelled by analogous mechanisms of composition and reception in the context of shared world visions. In the end, it is the common poetic technique that can help us illuminate the literary constructions of commensurate (and distinct) views of the divine.

---

<sup>872</sup> A. Barchiesi is currently working on a large-scale study of the divine council encompassing Classical, Medieval and Modern epic narratives (private communication, Venice, November 2015).

## Bibliography

### Abbreviations, sigla, editions

The Mesopotamian titles adopted mostly reflect modern conventions (often fluctuating). All Sumerian works are given their ETCSL number, though many compositions are now transliterated (some are translated) in CDLI at <<http://cdli.ucla.edu/tools/scores/partitur-index.html>>. Hittite texts (CTH) are quoted according to the online editions at <<http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/CTH/>>. Further editorial details are to be found in the footnotes to passages quoted or discussed. For the occasionally used abbreviations identifying specific tablets, please refer to CAD. All online resources accessed 21/09/2017.

*Adad* = *A Hymn to Adad* = ed. Schwemer (2001) 420-21.

*Aeth.* = *Aethiopsis* = cf. Bernabé (1987) 65-71.

*Agušaya A-B* = ed. Groneberg (1997), cf. M.P. Streck in SEAL, and Streck (2010).

*AHw* = *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* = Meissner and von Soden (1965-81).

*Angim* = *Ninurta's Return to Nippur* = ed. Cooper (1978), ETCSL 1.6.1, cf. Attinger and Glenn (2017).

*Anzû* = ed. Annus (2001).

*Atr.* = *Atra-ḫasīs* = eds. Lambert and Millard [1969] (1999).

*B&A* = *Bilgames and Agga* = ed. Katz (1993), ETCSL 1.8.1.1

*BAC* = *A Unilingual/Bilingual Account of Creation* = ed. Lambert (2013) 350-60, 510-11.

*BBH* = *Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven* = eds. Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi (1993), ETCSL 1.8.1.2.

*BDr* = *Baldrs draumar* = ed. Dronke (1997).

*BH A* = *Bilgames and Huwawa* version A = ed. Edzard (1990-91), ETCSL 1.8.1.5.

*BilgNeth* = *Bilgames, Enkidu and the Netherworld* = ed. Gadotti (2014a), ETCSL 1.8.1.4.

*CA* = *The Curse of Agade* = ed. Cooper (1983), ETCSL 2.1.5.

*CAD* = *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* = Gelb *et al.* eds. (1956-2011).

*CDA* = *Concise Dictionary of Akkadian* = Black, George and Postgate (2000)

*CDLI* = *The Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative* = <<http://cdli.ucla.edu>>

*CTH* = *Catalogue des textes Hittites* = Laroche (1971)

*Cyp.* = *Cypria* = cf. Bernabé (1987) 36-64.

*DB* = *The Death of Bilgames* = eds. Cavigneaux and Al-Rawi (2000), ETCSL 1.8.1.3

*D-F* = Davies and Finglass (2014)

*DPT* = *The Debate between the Tamarisk and the Palm* = ed. Lambert (1996) 151-64, 328-30

*DSG* = *The Debate between Sheep and Grain* = eds. Alster and Vastiphout (1987), ETCSL 5.3.2

*DStG* = *The Disappearance of the Storm God* (CTH 325) = Eng. transl. Hoffner (1998)

*DSunG* = *The Disappearance of the Sun God* (CTH 323) = Eng. transl. Hoffner (1998)

*DTel* = *The Disappearance of Telipinu* (CTH 324) = Eng. transl. Hoffner (1998)

*ED* = Early Dynastic

*Ee* = *Enūma eliš* = eds. Kämmerer and Meltzer (2012); Lambert (2013)

*EIA* = Early Iron Age

*EJN* = *Enki's Journey to Nippur* = ed. Ceccarelli (2012), ETCSL 1.1.4

*ELS* = Attinger (1993)

*Enlil A* = ETCSL 4.05.01, cf. Metcalf (2015) 228.

*EnmEns* = *Enmerkar and En-suḫkeš-ana* = ed. Wilcke (2012), ETCSL 1.8.2.4

*EnNinl* = *Enlil and Ninlil* = ed. Behrens (1978), ETCSL 1.2.1, cf. Attinger (2015b)  
*EnNinm* = *Enki and Ninmah* = ed. Ceccarelli (2016), ETCSL 1.1.2  
*EnSud* = *Enlil and Sud* = ed. Civil (1983), ETCSL 1.1.2  
*Enūma eliš* = see *Ee*  
*Erra* = *Erra and Išum* = ed. Cagni (1969), add Al-Rawi and Black (1989)  
*EST* = *Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty* = eds. Parpola and Watanabe (1988) Text 6.  
*Etana* = *The Etana Epic* = ed. Novotny (2001), cf. Haul (2000)  
ETCSL = *The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature* = <<http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk>>  
*EtM* = *Etymologicum Magnum* = Gainsford, T. (1848) *Etymologicum Magnum*. Oxonii. repr. Amsterdam 1965.  
Eust. = *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii in Homeri Iliadem et Odysseam* = ed. van der Valk (1971-87): *in Iliadem*; Stallbaum (1825-26): *in Odysseam*.  
*EWO* = *Enki and the World Order* = ed. Vanstiphout (1999), ETCSL 1.1.3  
*FE* = *The Founding of Eridu* = ed. Lambert (2013) 366-75.  
*Flood* = *The Sumerian Flood Story* = ed. Civil [1969] (1999), ETCSL 1.7.4  
*FrLFD* = *Fragments of Narratives on Lost and Found Deities* (CTH 335) = Eng. transl. Hoffner (1998)  
*GerUnt* = *Eine Gerichtssitzung in der Unterwelt* = ed. Ebeling (1931) 9-19  
*GH* = *Grammaire Homérique* = Chantraine (1942-53)  
*Gilg.* = *The Epic of Gilgameš* = ed. George (2003)  
*Gud. Cyl.* (A, B) = *Gudea, Cylinders* = ed. Römer (2010), ETCSL 2.1.7  
*HAp.* = *The Homeric Hymn to Apollo* = ed. Càssola (2010)  
*HApr.* = *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* = ed. Càssola (2010), cf. Faulkner (2008)  
*Haustl* = *Haustlong* = ed. North (1997)  
*HDem.* = *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* = ed. Càssola (2010), cf. Richardson (1974)  
[Hes.] = *Hesiodic Fragments* = eds. Merkelbach and West (1967)  
*HHerm.* = *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes* = ed. Càssola (2010), cf. Vergados (2013)  
*HQN* = *Hymn to the Queen of Nippur* = ed. Lambert (1982)  
*Hym* = *Hymiskviða* = ed. Dronke (2011)  
*Hymn.* = *Homeric Hymn(s)* = ed. Càssola (2010)  
*HymnIn* = *A Hymn to Inana* = ed. Sjöberg (1988), Geller (2002), ETCSL 4.07.a  
IE = Indo-European  
*Il.* = *Iliad* = ed. West (1998-2000)  
*InAn* = *Inana and An* = ed. van Dijk (1998), ETCSL 1.3.5  
*Inana A* = ed. Sjöberg (1977) 16-27, ETCSL 4.07.1  
*Inana B* = ed. Zgoll (1997), ETCSL 4.07.2, cf. Metcalf (2015) 229.  
*Inana C* = ed. Sjöberg (1975), ETCSL 4.07.3, cf. Metcalf (2015) 229.  
*InD* = *Inana's Descent to the Netherworld* = ed. Attinger (2016), ETCSL 1.4.1  
*InEb* = *Inana and Ebiḫ* = ed. Attinger (1998), ETCSL 1.3.2  
*InEn* = *Inana and Enki* = ed. Farber-Flügge (1974), ETCSL 1.3.1  
*InŠuk* = *Inana and Šukaletuda* = ed. Volk (1995), ETCSL 1.3.3  
*IšD* = *Ištar's Descent to the Netherworld* = ed. Lapinkivi (2010)  
*Išme-Dagan Q* = ed. Sjöberg (1973) 16-24, ETCSL 2.5.4.17, cf. Metcalf (2015) 231.  
*Ištar A* = ed. Thureau-Dangin (1925)  
K-G = Kühner, R. - Gehr, B. (1890-1904) *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Hannover.  
*Keret* = KTU<sup>3</sup> 1.14-17 = Eng. transl. Greenstein (1997)  
KTU<sup>3</sup> = *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit* = Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (2013)

LA = Late Assyrian  
 LBA = Late Bronze Age  
 LB = Late Babylonian  
 LE = *Lament for Eridu* = ed. Green (1978), ETCSL 2.2.6  
 Lexique = P. Attinger, *Lexique sumérien-français*. <<http://www.arch.unibe.ch/atinger>>  
 LfgrE = *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* = Snell et al. eds. (1955-2010)  
 Lipit-Eštar C = ed. Römer (1965) 10-17, ETCSL 2.5.5.3.  
 L-M = Lambert - Millard [1969] (1999).  
 LNi = *Lament for Nippur* = ed. Tinney (1996), ETCSL 2.2.4.  
 LSUr = *Lament for Sumer and Ur* = ed. Michalowski (1989), ETCSL 2.2.3.  
 Lugalb. I = *Lugalbanda and the Mountain Cave* = ed. Vanstiphout (2003a), ETCSL 1.8.2.1.  
 Lugalb. II = *The Return of Lugalbanda* = ed. Vanstiphout (2003a), ETCSL 1.8.2.2.  
 Lugale = *Ninurta's Exploits* = ed. van Dijk (1983), ETCSL 1.6.2.  
 LUr = *Lament for Ur* = ed. Samet (2014), ETCSL 2.2.2.  
 LW = *Lament for Uruk* = ed. Green (1984), ETCSL 2.2.5.  
 MA = Middle Assyrian  
 MB = Middle Babylonian  
 M-W = Merchelbach and West (1967).  
 N&E = *Nergal and Ereškigal* = eds. Ponchia and Luukko (2013), cf. Pettinato and Chiodi (2000).  
 NA = Neo-Assyrian  
 NE = Near East / Near Eastern  
 NinTurt = *Ninurta and the Turtle* = ed. Alster (2006), ETCSL 1.6.3.  
 Nungal A = ed. Attinger (2003), ETCSL 4.28.1.  
 OB = Old Babylonian  
 Od. = *Odyssey* = ed. van Thiel (1991).  
 Op. = *Hesiod's Works and Days* = ed. West (1978).  
 Pfg = *Providing for the Gods* = ed. Borger (1973), cf. Foster (2005) 494.  
 Rm. = *Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa* = eds. Bhatt and Shah (1960-75).  
 SB = Standard Babylonian  
 Schø. = Schøyen Collection  
 Scut. = [Hes.] *Scutum* = ed. Solmsen, F. (1970) *Hesiodi Opera*. Oxonii.  
 SEAL = Sources of Early Akkadian Literature = <<http://www.seal.uni-leipzig.de/>>  
 SKL = *The Sumerian King List* = ETCSL 2.1.1.  
 SL = Thomsen (1984).  
 SoS = *Series of the Spider* = ed. Jiménez (2017) 291-317.  
 SPIš = *Self-Praise of Ištar* = ed. Frank (1939) 36-42, cf. Foster (2005) 679  
 Šulgi B = ed. Castellino (1972), ETCSL 2.4.2.02.  
 SumAdapa = *The Sumerian Adapa* = ed. Cavigneaux (2014).  
 Th. = *Hesiod's Theogony* = ed. West (1966).  
 ThDunnu = *The Theogony of Dunnu* = ed. Lambert (2013) 387-95.  
 Thrym = *Þrymskviða* = ed. Helgason (1955).  
 ToilBab = *The Toil of Babylon* = ed. Lambert (2013) 301-10.  
 Urnamma A = ed. Flückiger-Hawke (1999), ETCSL 2.4.1.1  
 Vsp = *Voluspá* = ed. Dronke (1997).  
 Σ = *scholia* = cf. Erbse (1969-88): *vetera in Iliadem*; van Thiel (2014): *D in Iliadem*; Dindorf (1855): *in Odysseam*; Pontani (2007-15): *in Odysseae libros I-VI*.

## References

- Abusch, T. (2001) "The Epic of Gilgamesh and the Homeric Epics" in Whiting, R.M. (ed.) *Mythology and Mythologies: Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences*. Helsinki: 1-7.
- Abusch, T. ed. (2002) *Riches Hidden in Sacred Places: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen*. Winona Lake.
- Abusch, T. - Huehnergard, J. - Steinkeller, P. eds. (1990) *Lingering over Words. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran*. Atlanta.
- Aceti, C. (2008) "Sarpedone fra mito e poesia" in Aceti, C. - Leuzzi, D. - Pagani, L. (eds.) *Eroi nell'Iliade. Personaggi e strutture narrative*. Roma: 1-269.
- Adkins, A.W.H. (1960) *Merit and Responsibility. A Study in Greek Values*. Oxford.
- Adkins, A.W.H. (1971) "Homeric Values and Homeric Society" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 91: 1-14.
- Ahrensdoerf, P.J. (2014) *Homer on the Gods and Human Virtue*. Cambridge.
- Aitken, K.T. (1987) "Formulaic patterns for the passing of time in Ugaritic literature" *Ugarit-Forschungen* 19: 1-10.
- Aitken, K.T. (1989a) "Oral formulaic composition and theme in the Aqhat narrative" *Ugarit-Forschungen* 21: 1-16.
- Aitken, K.T. (1989b) "Word pairs and tradition in an Ugaritic tale" *Ugarit-Forschungen* 21: 17-38.
- Alden, M.J. (1997) "The Resonances of the Song of Ares and Aphrodite" *Mnemosyne* 50: 513-29.
- Alden, M.J. (2000) *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad*. Oxford.
- Alden, M.J. (2011) "Paradigms" in Finkelberg, M. (ed.): 624-26.
- Al-Fouadi, A-H.A. (1969) *Enki's Journey to Nippur: The Journeys of the Gods*. PhD diss. University of Pennsylvania.
- Allan, W. (2006) "Divine Justice and Cosmic Order in Early Greek Epic" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 126: 1-35.
- Allen, N.J. (2007) Review of West (2007), *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2007.10.53.
- Allen, T.W. (1895) "The text of the Homeric Hymns. IV" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 17: 241-67.
- Allen, T.W. (1897) "Notes on the Homeric Hymns by J.P. D'Orville" *Journal of Philology* 25: 250-60.
- Allen, T.W. - Halliday, W.R. (1936) *The Homeric Hymns. Edited by T.W. Allen, W.R. Halliday and E.E. Sikes*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Al-Rawi, F.N.H. - Black, J.A. (1989) "The second tablet of 'Išum and Erra'" *Iraq* 51: 111-22.
- Al-Rawi, F.N.H. - George, A.R. (2014) "Back to the Cedar Forest: The Beginning and End of the Standard Babylonian Gilgameš Epic" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 66: 69-90.
- Alster, B. (1972) *Dumuzi's Dream. Aspects of Oral Poetry in a Sumerian Myth*. Copenhagen.
- Alster, B. (1975) "On the Interpretation of the Sumerian Myth 'Inanna and Enki'" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 64: 20-34.
- Alster, B. (1990) "Lugalbanda and the Early Epic Tradition in Mesopotamia" in Abusch, T. - Huehnergard, J. - Steinkeller, P. (eds.): 59-72.
- Alster, B. (1992) "Interaction of Oral and Written Poetry in Early Mesopotamian Literature" in Vogelzang, M.E. - Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (eds.): 23-69.
- Alster, B. (2002) "*ilū awīlum - we-e i-la*, "Gods : Men" versus "Man : God". Punning and the Reversal of Patterns in the Atrahasis Epic" in Abusch, T. (ed.): 35-40.
- Alster, B. (2005) *Wisdom of Ancient Sumer*. Bethesda.
- Alster, B. (2006) "Ninurta and the Turtle: On Parodia Sacra in Sumerian Literature" in Michalowski, P. - Veldhuis, N. (eds.): 13-36.
- Alster, B. ed. (1980) *Death in Mesopotamia*. Copenhagen.
- Alster, B. - Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1987) "Lahar and Ashnan. Presentation and Analysis of a Sumerian Disputation" *Acta Sumerologica* 9: 1-43.
- Alter, R. (1978) "Biblical Type-Scenes and the Uses of Convention" *Critical Inquiry* 5: 355-68.

- Altes, L.K. (2007) "Gilgameš and the power of narration" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 127: 183-93.
- Ameis, K.F. - Hentze, C. (1887) *Anhang zu Homers Ilias. Schulausgabe von K.F. Ameis. III. Heft, Erläuterungen zu Gezang VII-XI von Prof. Dr. C. Hentze*. 2. Aufl. Leipzig.
- Andersen, Ø. (1973) "Der Untergang der Gefährten in der Odyssee" *Symbolae Osloenses* 49: 7-27.
- Andersen, Ø. (1978) *Die Diomedesgestalt in der Ilias*. Oslo.
- Andersen, Ø. (1990) "The Making of the Past in the *Iliad*" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 93: 25-45.
- Andersen, Ø. (1997) "Diomedes, Aphrodite, and Dione: background and function of a scene in Homer's *Iliad*" *Classica et Mediaevalia* 48: 25-36.
- Andersen, Ø. - Haug, D. eds. (2012) *Relative Chronology of Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Cambridge
- Annus, A. (2001) *The Standard Babylonian Epic of Anzû*. Helsinki.
- Annus, A. (2002) *The God Ninurta in the Mythology and Royal Ideology of Ancient Mesopotamia*. Helsinki.
- Annus, A. (2016) *The Overturned Boat: Intertextuality of the Adapa Myth and Exorcist Literature*. Helsinki.
- Anthoiz, S. (2012) "De la mort qui sépare à celle qui unit: le message et la formation de l'épopée de Gilgameš" in Römer, T. - Durand, J.-M. - Hutzli, J. (eds.) *Les vivants et leurs morts*. Göttingen: 79-92.
- Apthorp, M.J. (1977) "The Language of *Odyssey* 5.7-20" *Classical Quarterly* 27: 1-9
- Archi, A. (2007) "Transmission of Recitative Literature by the Hittites" *Altorientalische Forschungen* 34: 185-203.
- Archi, A. (2009) "Orality, Direct Speech and the Kumarbi Cycle" *Altorientalische Forschungen* 36: 209-229.
- Arend, W. (1933) *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*. Berlin.
- Arnaud, D. (2007) *Corpus des textes de bibliothèque de Ras-Shamra-Ougarit (1936-2000) en sumérien, babylonien et assyrien*. Barcelona.
- Arrighetti, G. (1998) *Esiado. Opere*. Torino.
- Arrighetti, G. (2001) "Esiado e le convenzioni dell'epos" *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 19: 131-57.
- Arrigoni, G. (2001) "Walter Burkert e la religione greca in Italia" preface to W. Burkert, *La Religione Greca*. 3rd ed. 2010: 13-53.
- Artemov, N. (2014) "Belief in Family Reunion in the Afterlife in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean" in Marti, L. (ed.): 27-43.
- Aruz, J. - Graf, S.B. - Rakic, Y. eds. (2013) *Cultures in Contact. From Mesopotamia to the Mediterranean in the Second Millennium B.C.* New Haven.
- Asher-Greve, J.M. (2013) "Facets of Change" in Asher-Greve, J.M. - Westenholtz, J.G. (eds.): 137-46.
- Asher-Greve, J.M. - Westenholtz, J.G. eds. (2013) *Goddesses in Context: on divine power, roles, relationships and gender in Mesopotamian textual and visual sources*. Göttingen.
- Attinger, P. (1993) *Eléments de linguistique sumérienne. La construction de du<sub>11</sub>/e/di «dire»*. Göttingen.
- Attinger, P. (1998) "Inana et Ebiḫ" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 88: 164-195.
- Attinger, P. (2003) "L'Hymne à Nungal" in Sallaberger, W. - Volk, K. - Zgoll, A. (ed.) *Literatur, Politik und Recht. Festschrift für Claus Wilcke*. Wiesbaden: 15-34.
- Attinger, P. (2004) "Les "verbes composés" en sumérien" *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2004/79: 79-82.
- Attinger, P. (2011) Review of Veldhuis (2004), *Archiv für Orientforschung* 52: 222-29.
- Attinger, P. (2012) "Une nouvelle édition de la correspondance royale d'Ur. Review of Michalowski (2011)" *Orientalia* 81: 355-85.
- Attinger, P. (2014) *La lamentation sur Ur*. <<http://www.arch.unibe.ch/atinger>>
- Attinger, P. (2015a) *La lamentation sur Sumer et Ur*. <<http://www.arch.unibe.ch/atinger>>
- Attinger, P. (2015b) *Enlil et Ninlil*. <<http://www.arch.unibe.ch/atinger>>

- Attinger, P. (2015c) "Une nouvelle édition de la Lamentation sur Ur" Review of Samet (2014) *Orientalia* 84: 41-74.
- Attinger, P. (2016) *La descente d'Innana dans le monde infernal*. <<http://www.arch.unibe.ch/attinger>>
- Attinger, P. (2015d) Review of Gadotti, A. (2014), *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 105: 235-49.
- Attinger, P. - Glenn, A. (2017) *Angim dimma* <<http://www.arch.unibe.ch/attinger>>
- Aura-Jorro, F. (1985) *Diccionario Micénico*. Vol. 1, Madrid.
- Austin, N. (1966) "The Function of Digression in the Iliad" *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 7: 337-54.
- Bachvarova, M. (2016) *From Hittite to Homer: The Anatolian Background of Ancient Greek Epic*. Cambridge.
- Bakker, E.J. (2001) "The Greek Gilgamesh, or the Immortality of Return" in Païsi-Apostolopoulou, M. (ed.) *Eranos. Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on the Odyssey*. Ithaca: 331-52.
- Bakker, E.J. (2002) "Remembering the God's Arrival" *Arethusa* 35: 63-81.
- Bakker, E.J. (2009) "Homer, Odysseus, and the narratology of performance" Grethlein, J. - Rengakos, A. (eds.) *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Berlin: 117-36.
- Bakker, E.J. (2011) "Time" in Finkelberg, M. (ed.): 877-79.
- Bakker, E.J. (2013) *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the Odyssey*. Cambridge.
- Ballesteros Petrella, B. (in prep.1) "Asking the Chief God: a *Gilgameš* parallel in Homer and its traditional context"
- Ballesteros Petrella, B. (in prep.2) "Poseidon and Zeus in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*"
- Ballesteros Petrella, B. (in prep.3) "Fashioning Pandora: Near Eastern Creation Scenes and Hesiod" in Kelly, A. - Metcalf, C. (eds.) *Divine Narratives in Early Greece and the Ancient Near East*. Cambridge.
- Bannert, H. (1987) "Versammlungszenen bei Homer" in Bremer, J.M - de Jong, I.J.F. - Kalff, J. (eds.): 15-30.
- Bannert, H. (1988) *Formen des Wiederholens bei Homer: Beispiele für eine Poetik des Epos*. Wien.
- Barjamovic, G. (2004) "Civic Institutions and Self-Government in Southern Mesopotamia in the Mid-First Millennium BC" in Dercksen, J.G. (ed.) *Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Morgens Trolle Larsen*. Leiden: 47-98.
- Barker, E. - Christensen, J. (2014) "Even Heracles had to die: Homeric «heroism», mortality and the epic tradition" *Trends in Classics* 6: 249-277.
- Barnes, T.G. (2011) "Homeric ANΔPOTHTA KAI HBHN" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 131: 1-13.
- Bartash, V. (2010) "*Puḫru*: Assembly as a Political Institution in *Enūma eliš* (Preliminary Study)" in Kogan, L. *et. al.* (eds.) *Language in the Ancient Near East*. Vol. 1, Part 2, Winona Lake: 1083-108.
- Bassino, P. - Canevaro, L. - Graziosi, B. eds. (2017) *Conflict and Consensus in Early Greek Hexameter Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Batto, B.F. (1987) "The Sleeping God: An Ancient Near Eastern Motif of Divine Sovereignty" *Biblica* 68: 153-77.
- Beaulieu, P. (2001) "The abduction of Ištar from the Eanna temple" in William, W. - Winter, I. (eds.) *Historiography in the Cuneiform World*. Bethesda: 29-40.
- Beck, D. (2001) "Direct and Indirect Speech in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 131: 53-74.
- Beck, D. (2005) *Homeric Conversation*. Washington.
- Beck, D. (2012) *Speech Presentation in Homeric Epic*. Austin.
- Beckman G.M. (1982) "The Hittite Assembly" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102: 435-42.
- Beckman G.M. (2001) "The Hittite Gilgamesh" in Foster, B. (ed.) *The Epic of Gilgamesh*. New York: 157-65.

- Beckman G.M. (2003) "Gilgamesh in Ḫatti" in Beckman, G.M. - Beal, R. - McMahon, G. (eds.) *Hittite Studies in Honor of H. Hoffner*. Winona Lake: 37-57.
- Beckman, G.M. - Bryce, T.R. - Cline, E. (2011) *The Ahhiyawa Texts*. Atlanta.
- Beekes, R. (2009) *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. 2 vols. Leiden.
- Behrens, H. (1978) *Enlil und Ninlil. Ein sumerischer Mythos aus Nippur*. Roma.
- Bernabé, A. (1987) *Poetae epici graeci: testimonia et fragmenta*. Vol I. Lipsiae.
- Bernabé, A. (2012) Review of Faulkner ed. (2011), *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2012.06.07
- Bethe, E. (1929) "Der homerische Apollonhymnos und das Prooimion" *Berichte über die Verhandlung der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 81: 1-40.
- Beye, C.R. (1984) "The Epic of Gilgameš, the Bible, and Homer: some narrative parallels" in Evjen, H.D. (ed.) *Mnemei: Classical Studies in Memory of Karl K. Hulley*. Chico, CA: 7-19.
- Bhatt, G.H. - Shah, U.P. eds. (1960-75) *The Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa: Critical edition*. 7 vols. Baroda.
- Bidmead, J. (2002) *The Akītu Festival. Religious Continuity and Royal Legitimation in Mesopotamia*. Piscataway, N.J.
- Biga, M.G. - Capomacchia, A.M. (2008) *Il politeismo Vicino-Orientale: introduzione alla storia delle religioni nel Vicino Oriente antico*. Roma.
- Black, J.A. (1992) "Some Structural Features in Sumerian Narrative Poetry" in Vogelzang, M.E. - Vanstiphout, H.J.L. (eds.): 71-101.
- Black, J.A. (1998) *Reading Sumerian Poetry*. London.
- Black, J.A. (2002) "En-ḫedu-ana not the composer of the temple hymns" *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2002/4: 2-4.
- Black, J.A. (2005) "Songs of the goddess Aruru" in Sefati, Y. et al. (eds.): 39-62.
- Black, J.A. - Greene, A. (1992) *Gods, demons and symbols of ancient Mesopotamia : an illustrated dictionary*. London.
- Black, J.A. - George, A.R. - Postgate, J.N. (2000) *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*. 2nd (corrected) printing. Wiesbaden.
- Blaise, F. - Judet de La Combe, P. - Rousseau, P. eds. (1996) *Le Métier du Mythe: Lectures d'Hésiode*. Lille.
- Blaise, F. - Rousseau, P. (1996) "La Guerre (*Théogonie* v. 617-720)" in Blaise, F. - Judet de La Combe, P. - Rousseau, P. (eds.): 213-33.
- Blickman, D. (1987) "Styx and the Justice of Zeus in Hesiod's *Theogony*" *Phoenix* 41: 341-55.
- Blössner, N. (2005) "Hesiod und die 'Könige'. Zu *Theogonie* 79-103" *Mnemosyne* 58: 23-45.
- Böck, B. - Rowe, I.M. (1999) "MM 818: A New LB Fragment of Atra-ḫasīs I" *Aula Orientalis* 17: 167-77.
- Bona, G. (1966) *Studi sull'Odissea*. Torino.
- Bonnafé, A. (1985) *Eros et Eris: Mariages divins et mythe de succession chez Hésiode*. Lyon.
- Borger, R. (1973) "Tonmännchen und Puppen" *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 30: 176-83.
- Borger, R. (2008) "Zur neuen Schulausgabe des babylonischen Weltschöpfungsepos mit Bemerkungen zu neueren elektronischen Keilschrift-Fonts" *Orientalia* 77: 271-85.
- Bottéro, J. (1977-78) "Antiquités assyro-babyloniennes" *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, IVe Section, sciences historiques et philologiques* 1977-78: 107-164.
- Bottéro, J. (1982) "La creation de l'Homme et sa nature dans le Poème d'Atrahasīs" in *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff*. Warminster: 24-32.
- Bottéro, J. (2001) *Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Chicago.
- Bottéro, J. - Kramer, S.N. (1989) *Lorsque les dieux faisaient l'homme: mythologie mésopotamienne*. Paris.
- Bonnet, C. - Slobodzianek, I. (2015) "De la steppe au bateau céleste, ou comment Inanna accomplit son destin entre mythe et rite" in Belayche, N. - Pirenne-Delforge, V. (eds.) *Fabriquer du divin. Constructions et ajustements de la représentation des dieux dans l'Antiquité*. Liège: 21-40.
- Bouchon, R. - Brillet-Dubois, P. - Le Meur-Weissman, N. eds. (2012) *Hymnes de la Grèce antique. Approches littéraires et historiques*. Lyon.
- Bowie, A.M. (2013) *Homer: Odyssey Books XIII and XIV*. Cambridge.
- Boyd, T.W. (1995) "A Poet on the Achaean Wall" *Oral Tradition* 10: 181-206.
- Braswell, B.K. (1971) "Mythological Innovation in the *Iliad*" *Classical Quarterly* 21: 16-26.

- Braswell, B.K. (1982) "The song of Ares and Aphrodite. Theme and relevance to Odyssey 8" *Hermes* 110: 129-137.
- Bremer, J.M. (1987) "The So-Called "Götterapparat" in *Iliad* XX-XXII" in Bremer, J.M. - de Jong, I.J.F. - Kalff, J. (eds.): 31-46.
- Bremer, J.M. - de Jong, I.J.F. - Kalff, J. eds. (1987) *Homer Beyond Oral Poetry: Recent Trends in Homeric Interpretations*. Amsterdam.
- Bremmer, J.N. (2008) *Greek religion and culture, the Bible, and the ancient Near East*. Leiden.
- Brillante, C. (1994) "Poeti e re nel proemio della Teogonia Esiodeo" *Prometheus* 20: 14-26.
- Brillante, C. - Cantilena, M. - Pavese, C.O. eds. (1981) *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale*. Padova.
- Brisch, N. (2011) "Changing Images of Kingship in Sumerian Literature" in Radner, K. - Robson, E. (eds.): 706-24.
- Brisch, N. ed. (2008) *Religion and Power: Divine Kingship in the Ancient World and Beyond*. Chicago.
- Brockington, J.L. (1998) *The Sanskrit Epics*. Leiden.
- Brockington, J.L. (2001) *Epic Threads: John Brockington on the Sanskrit Epics*, ed. G. Bailey and M. Brockington. Oxford.
- Brown, B. (2016) *The Mirror of Epic: The Iliad and History*. Berrima.
- Brown, C. (1989) "Ares, Aphrodite and the laughter of the gods" *Phoenix* 43: 283-93.
- Brügger, C. (2009) *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar (Basler Kommentar/ BK) herausgegeben von Anton Bierl und Joachim Latacz. Band VIII: 24 Gesang. Faszikel II. Kommentar von Claude Brügger*. München.
- Brumfield, A.C. (1981) *The Attic Festival of Demeter and their Relation to the Agricultural Year*. Salem.
- Burgess, J.S. (1999) "Gilgameš and Odysseus in the otherworld" *Échos du monde classique* 18: 171-210.
- Burgess, J.S. (2004) "Apollo at the Wedding of Thetis and Peleus: Four Problematic Cases" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 102: 21-40
- Burgess, J.S. (2012) "Intertextuality without text in Early Greek Epic" in Andersen, Ø. - Haug, D. (eds.): 168-83.
- Burkert, W. (1960) "Das Lied von Ares und Aphrodite. Zum Verhältnis von Odyssee und Ilias" *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 103: 130-44.
- Burkert, W. (1983) "Oriental Myth and Literature in the Iliad" in Hägg, R. (ed.) *The Greek Renaissance of the Eight Century B.C.: Tradition and Innovation*. Stockholm: 51-56.
- Burkert, W. (1984) *Die orientalisierende Epoche in der griechischen Religion und Literatur*. Heidelberg.
- Burkert, W. (1985) *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*. transl. J. Raffan. Oxford.
- Burkert, W. (1991) "Homerstudien und Orient" in Latacz, J. ed. (1991): 155-81.
- Burkert, W. (1992) *The Orientalizing Revolution. Near Eastern influence on Greek culture in the early archaic age*. transl. M.E. Pinder. Cambridge, MA.
- Burkert, W. (1999) *Da Omero ai Magi: influssi orientali nella cultura Greca*. Venezia.
- Burkert, W. (2001) "La religione greca all'ombra dell'Oriente. I livelli dei contatti e degli influssi" in Ribichini, S. - Rocchi, M. - Xella, P. (eds.) *La questione delle influenze vicino-orientali sulla religione greca: stato degli studi e prospettive della ricerca*. Roma: 21-30
- Burkert, W. (2003) *Kleine Schriften II: Orientalia*. Göttingen.
- Burkert, W. (2004) *Babylon, Memphis and Persepolis: Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture*. Cambridge, MA.
- Burkert, W. (2011) "Varianten der Kulturbegegnung im 8. und 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr." in Ulf, C. - Rollinger, R. (eds.): 410-23.
- Burns, B.E. (2010) *Mycenaean Greece, Mediterranean Commerce, and the Formation of Identity*. Cambridge.
- Cagni, L. (1969) *L'epopea di Erro*. Roma.
- Cairns, D. (2011a) "Honour" in Finkelberg, M. (ed.): 367-69.
- Cairns, D. (2011b) "Timê" in Finkelberg, M. (ed.): 879.
- Calame, C. (2011) "The Homeric Hymns as Poetic Offerings" in Faulkner, A. (ed.): 334-57.

- Calhoun, G.M. (1935) "Zeus the Father in Homer" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 66: 1-17.
- Calhoun, G.M. (1937) "Homer's Gods: Prolegomena" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 68: 11-25.
- Calhoun, G.M. (1939) "Homer's Gods: Myths and Märchen" *American Journal of Philology* 60: 1-28.
- Calhoun, G.M. (1940) "The Divine Entourage in Homer" *American Journal of Philology* 61: 257-77.
- Cancik-Kirschbaum, E. (2009) "Reinigung und Vermischung: eine altorientalische Vorstellung über die Natur des Menschen (Atramḥasīs I, 192-245)" in Malinar, A. - Vöhler, M. - Seidensticker, B. (eds.) *Un/Reinheit. Konzepte und Praktiken im Kulturvergleich*. München 2009: 141-50.
- Cancik-Kirschbaum, E. - van Ess, M. - Marzahn, J. eds. (2011) *Babylon: Wissenskultur in Orient und Okzident*. Berlin.
- Cantarella E. (1979) *Norma e sanzione in Omero. Contributo alla protostoria del diritto greco*. Milano.
- Carlier, P. (2006) "Ἀναξ and βασιλεύς in the Homeric poems" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. - Lemos, I.S. (eds.): 101-09.
- Carr, D. (2011) *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. Oxford.
- Cassin, E. (1975) "Note sur le *puhru(m)* des dieux" in Finet, A. (ed.): 111-19.
- Cassio, A.C. (2009) "The Language of Hesiod and the Corpus Hesiodeum" in Montanari, F. - Rengakos, A. - Tsagalis, C. (eds.): 179-201.
- Càssola, F. (2010) *Inni Omerici*. 2nd ed. Milano.
- Castellino, G. (1959) "Il concetto sumerico di "ME" nella sua accezione concreta" *Analecta Biblica* 12: 25-32.
- Castellino, G. (1972) *Two Shulgi Hymns (B, C)*. Roma.
- Cavigneaux, A. (1978) "L'essence divine" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 30: 177-85.
- Cavigneaux, A. (1993) "Les Mots qui lient, ou comment l'humanité a été sauvée" *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 31: 97-101.
- Cavigneaux, A. (1999) "A Scholar's Library in Meturan?" in Abusch, T. - van der Toorn, K. (eds.) *Mesopotamian Magic, Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspectives*. Groningen: 251-73.
- Cavigneaux, A. (2000) "Anzu dans la rue" *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2000/19: 20.
- Cavigneaux, A. (2007) "Les oiseaux de l'arche" *Aula Orientalis* 25: 319-20.
- Cavigneaux, A. (2009a) "Deux hymnes sumériens à Utu" in Faivre, X. *et al.* (eds.) *Et il y eut un esprit dans l'Homme. Jean Bottéro et la Mésopotamie*. Paris: 3-18. *errata in Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2009/73: 96-97.
- Cavigneaux, A. (2013) "Le monstre du troisième acte dans la "Lamentation d'Ur"" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 103: 4-15.
- Cavigneaux, A. (2014) "Une version sumérienne de la légende d'Adapa (Textes de Tell Haddad X)" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 104: 1-41.
- Cavigneaux, A. - Al-Rawi, F.N.H. (1993) "Gilgameš et Taureau de Ciel (šùl-me-kam): Textes de Tell-Haddad VI" *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 87: 97-129.
- Cavigneaux, A. - Al-Rawi, F.N.H. (2000) *Gilgameš et la Mort. Textes de Tell Haddad VI : avec un appendice sur les textes funéraires sumériens*. Groningen.
- Ceccarelli, M. (2012) "Enkis Reise nach Nippur" in Mittermayer, C. - Ecklin, S. (eds.): 89-118.
- Ceccarelli, M. (2016) *Enki und Ninmah: eine mythische Erzählung in sumerischer Sprache*. Tübingen.
- Chantraine, P. (1942-53) *Grammaire homérique*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Chantraine, P. (1968-80) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. 4 vols. Paris.
- Chappell, M. (2011) "The Homeric Hymn to Apollo: the Question of Unity" in Faulkner (ed.): 59-81.
- Chappell, M. (2012) "The Opening of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo" in Bouchon, R. - Brillet-Dubois, P. - Le Meur-Weissman, N. (eds.): 177-82.

- Charpin, D. (1987) "Les Décrets Royaux à l'Époque Paléo-Babylonienne, à propos d'un Ouvrage Récent" *Archiv für Orientforschung* 34: 36-44.
- Charpin, D. - Joannès, F. eds. (1991) *Marchands, diplomates et empereurs: études sur la civilisation mésopotamienne offertes à Paul Garelli*. Paris.
- Chen, Y.S. (2012) "The Flood Motif as a Stylistic and Temporal Device in Sumerian Literary Traditions" *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 12: 158-89.
- Chen, Y.S. (2013) *The Primeval Flood Catastrophe: Origins and Early Developments in Sumerian and Babylonian Traditions*. Oxford.
- Chioldi, S.M. (1998) "Studi Mesopotamici I: Nergal un dio doppio" *Rivista di Studi Fenici* 25: 3-20.
- Chioldi, S.M. (2000) "Rapporto cielo, terra, inferi nel mondo mesopotamico" in Graziani, S. (ed.) *Studi sul Vicino Oriente antico dedicati alla memoria di Luigi Cagni*. Vol 1, Napoli: 119-27.
- Civil, M. (1983) "Enlil and Ninlil: the Marriage of Sud" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103: 43-66.
- Civil, M. (1999) "The Sumerian Flood Story" in Lambert, W.G. - Millard, A.R.: 138-45, 167-74.
- Civil, M. (1999-2000) "Reading Gilgamesh" *Aula Orientalis* 18: 179-89.
- Civil, M. (2000/2005) "Modal prefixes" *Acta Sumerologica* 22: 29-42.
- Civil, M. (2013) "Remarks on AD-GI<sub>4</sub> (A.K.A. "Archaic Word List C" or "Tribute")" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 65: 13-68.
- Clark, M. (2004) "Formulas, metre and type-scenes" in Fowler, R. (ed.): 117-38.
- Clarke, M. (2001) "'Heart-Cutting Talk': Homeric κερτομέω and Related Words" *Classical Quarterly* 51: 229-38.
- Clauss, J.J. - Cuypers, M. - Kahane, A. eds. (2016) *The Gods of Greek Hexameter Poetry. From the Archaic Age to Late Antiquity and Beyond*. Stuttgart.
- Clay, J.S. (1983) *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Clay, J.S. (1984) "The Hecate of the *Theogony*" *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 25: 27-38.
- Clay, J.S. (1988) "What the Muses Sang: *Theogony* 1-115" *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 29: 323-33.
- Clay, J.S. (1997) "The Homeric Hymns" in Morris, I. - Powell, B. (eds.): 489-507.
- Clay, J.S. (1999a) "The Whip and Will of Zeus" *Literary Imagination* 1: 40-60.
- Clay, J.S. (1999b) "*Iliad* 24.649 and the Semantics of KERTOMEΩ" *Classical Quarterly* 49: 618-21.
- Clay, J.S. (2003) *Hesiod's Cosmos*. Cambridge.
- Clay, J.S. (2006) *The Politics of Olympus. Form and Meaning in the major Homeric Hymns*. 2nd ed. London.
- Clay, J.S. (2011a) *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision and Memory in the Iliad*. Cambridge.
- Clay, J.S. (2011b) "The Homeric Hymns as Genre" in Faulkner (ed.): 232-53.
- Clay, J.S. (2012) "Theology and Religion in the Homeric Hymns" in Bouchon, R. - Brillat-Dubois, P. - Le Meur-Weissman, N. (eds.): 315-22.
- Cline, E. (1994) *Sailing the Wine Dark Sea: International Trade and the Late Bronze Age Aegean*. Oxford.
- Cline, E. (2012) "Aegean-Near East Relations in the Second Millennium B.C." in Aruz, J. - Graf, S.B. - Rakic, Y. (eds.): 26-33.
- Cline, E. (2014) *1177 B.C.: The Year Civilization Collapsed*. Princeton.
- Cline, E. - Yasur-Landau, A. (2007) "Poetry in Motion: Canaanite Rulership and Aegean Narrative at Kabri" in Morris, S. - Laffineur, R. (eds.): 157-65.
- Cohen, M.E. (2015) *Festivals and Calendars in the Ancient Near East*. Bethesda.
- Cohen, Y. (2013) *Wisdom from the Late Bronze Age*. ed. by A.R. George. Atlanta.
- Cohen, Y. (2016) Review of Bachvarova (2016), *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2016.11.14.
- Coldstream, J.N. (2003) *Geometric Greece: 900-700 BC*. 2nd ed. London.
- Considine, P. (1969) "The Theme of Divine Wrath in Ancient East Mediterranean Literature" *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 8: 85-159.
- Cook, E.F. (2006) Review of Shear (2004), *American Journal of Archaeology* 110: 666-67.
- Cook, E.F. (2009) "On the "importance" of *Iliad* 8" *Classical Philology* 104: 131-61.
- Cooley, J. (2008) "'I want to dim the brilliance of Šulpae!' Mesopotamian celestial divination and the poem of Erra and Išum" *Iraq* 70: 179-88.

- Cooper, J.S. (1977) "Symmetry and repetition in Akkadian Narrative" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 97: 508-12.
- Cooper, J.S. (1978) *The Return of Ninurta to Nippur*. Roma.
- Cooper, J.S. (1980) Review of Behrens (1978), *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 32: 175-88.
- Cooper, J.S. (1983) *The Curse of Agade*. Baltimore.
- Cooper, J.S. (1992) "Babbling on: Recovering Mesopotamian Orality" in Vogelzang, M.E. - Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (eds.): 103-21.
- Cooper, J.S. (2001) "Literature and History: The Historical and Political Referents of Sumerian Literary Texts" in Abusch, T. - Noyes, C. - Hallo, W. - Winter, I. (eds.) *Historiography in the Cuneiform World*. Bethesda: 131-47.
- Cooper, J.S. (2006) "Genre, Gender, and the Sumerian Lamentation" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 58: 27-38.
- Cooper, J.S. (2010) "'I have forgotten my burden of former days!'" Forgetting the Sumerians in Ancient Iraq" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130: 327-35.
- Cooper, J.S. (2016) "Sumerian Literature and Sumerian Identity" in Ryholt, K. - Barjamovic, G. (eds.): 1-18.
- Coray, M. (2009) *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar (Basler Kommentar/ BK) herausgegeben von Anton Bierl und Joachim Latacz. Band VI: 19 Gesang. Faszikel II. Kommentar von Marina Coray*. München.
- Coray, M. (2016) *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar (Basler Kommentar/ BK) herausgegeben von Anton Bierl und Joachim Latacz. Band XI: 18 Gesang. Faszikel II. Kommentar von Marina Coray*. München.
- Cornford, F.M. (1952) *Principium Sapientiae: The Origins of Greek Philosophical Thought* (ed. W.K.G. Guthrie). Cambridge.
- Crielaard, J.P. (1995) "Homer, History and Archaeology: some remarks on the date of the Homeric world" in Crielaard, J.P. (ed.) *Homeric Questions: Essays in Philology, Ancient History and Archaeology*. Amsterdam: 201-88.
- Crisostomo, C.J. (2016) "Writing Sumerian, Creating Texts: Reflections on Text-building Practices in Old Babylonian Schools" *Journal of Near Eastern Religions* 15: 121-42.
- Crowell, B. (2001) "The development of Dagan: a Sketch" *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 1: 32-82.
- Currie, B. (2012) "The *Iliad*, *Gilgamesh*, and Neoanalysis" in Montanari, F. - Rengakos, A.-Tsagalis, C. (eds.): 543-80.
- Currie, B. (2016) *Homer's Allusive Art*. Oxford.
- Dahl, J. (2011) "The Statue of Nin-e'iga" in Barjamovic, G. *et al.* (eds.) *Akkade is King*. Leiden: 55-65.
- Dalley, S. (1997) "Statues of Marduk and the Date of *Enūma eliš*" *Altorientalische Forschungen* 24: 163-71.
- Dalley, S. (2001) "Old Babylonian tablets from Nineveh; and possible pieces of early *Gilgamesh* Epic" *Iraq* 53: 155-67.
- Dalley, S. (2017) "Gilgamesh and Heroes at Troy: Myth, History and Education in the Invention of Tradition" in Sherratt, S. - Bennett, J. (eds.): 116-34.
- Dandamayev, M. (1995) "Babylonian popular assemblies in the first millennium B.C." *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 30: 23-29.
- Dandamayev, M. (1997) "The composition of the citizens in first millennium Babylonia" *Altorientalische Forschungen* 24: 135-47.
- Danek, G. (1998a) *Epos und Zitat: Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee*. Wien.
- Danek, G. (1998b) "Darstellung verdeckter Handlung bei Homer und in der südslawischen Heldenlied-Tradition" *Wiener Studien* 111: 67-88.
- Danek, G. (2002) "Traditional referentiality and Homeric intertextuality" in Montanari, F. - Ascheri, P. (eds.) *Omero tremila anni dopo*. Roma: 3-19.
- Danek, G. (2010) "The Homeric Epics as Palimpsests" in Alexander, P.S. - Lange, A. (eds.) *In the Second Degree: Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and its Reflections in Medieval Literature*. Leiden: 123-36.

- Davies, M. (1981) "The Judgment of Paris and Iliad Book xxiv" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 101: 56-62.
- Davies, M. - Finglass, P.J. (2014) *Stesichorus, The Poems. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary by M. Davies and P.J. Finglass*. Cambridge.
- Davis, J.L. - Lynch, K.M. (2017) "Remembering and Forgetting Nestor: Pylian Past Pluperfect?" in Sherratt, S. - Bennett, J. (eds.): 54-74.
- Day, J. (1985) *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea*. Cambridge
- Deger-Jalkotzy, D. - Lemos, I.S. eds. (2006) *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean palaces to the age of Homer*. Edinburgh.
- Del Monte, G. (1992) "Epopoea Ittita" in Pettinato, G. (ed.) *La Saga di Gilgamesh*. Milano: 287-94, 382-97.
- Delebecque, É. (1958) *Télémaque et la structure de l'Odyssée*. Aix-en-Provence.
- Delnero, P. (2010) "Sumerian Literary Catalogues and the Scribal Curriculum" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 100: 32-55.
- Delnero, P. (2012a) *The Textual Criticism of Sumerian Literature*. Boston.
- Delnero, P. (2012b) "Memorization and the Transmission of Sumerian Literature" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 71: 189-208.
- Delnero, P. (2016) "Literature and Identity in Mesopotamia" in Ryholt, K. - Barjamovic, G. (eds.): 18-50.
- Delnero, P. - Lauinger, J. eds. (2015) *Texts and contexts: the circulation and transmission of cuneiform texts in social space*. Boston.
- Demand, N.H. (2011) *The Mediterranean Context of Early Greek History*. Oxford.
- Denniston, J.D. (1954) *The Greek Particles*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Desborough, V.R. d'A. (1972) *The Greek Dark Ages*. London.
- Detienne, M. (1986) "Du polythéisme en général" *Classical Philology* 81: 47-55.
- Deubner, L. (1938) "Der homerische Apollonhymnus" *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 24: 248-77.
- Di Benedetto, V. (1998) *Nel laboratorio di Omero*. 2nd. ed. Torino.
- Diakonoff, I. (1983) "Some Reflections on Numerals in Sumerian" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103: 83-93.
- Dickinson, O. (2006) *The Aegean from Bronze Age to Iron Age. Continuity and Change Between the twelfth and eighth centuries BC*. London.
- Dickson, K. (2009) "The wall of Uruk: iconicities in Gilgamesh" *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 9: 25-50.
- Dietrich, M. (1991) "Die Tötung einer Gottheit in der Eridu-Babylon Mythologie" in Daniels, D.R. et al. (eds.) *Ernten, was man sät. Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. Neukirchen: 49-73.
- Dietrich, M. (1996) "Aspects of the Babylonian impact on Ugaritic literature and religion" in Wyatt, N. - Watson, W.G.E. - Lloyd, J.B. (eds.) *Ugarit: Religion and Culture*. Edinburgh: 33-47.
- Dietrich, M. (2006) "Das *Enūma eliš* als mythologischer Grundtext für die Identität der Marduk-Religion Babyloniens" in Dietrich, M. - Kulmar, T. (eds.) *The Significance of Base Texts for the Religious Identity*. Münster: 135-65.
- Dietrich, M. (2009) "Der mesopotamische Schöpfergott Enki/Ea in der ugaritischen Literatur. Ein Fallbeispiel für regionale Differenzierung und Transformation mesopotamischer Gottesvorstellungen in Ugarit" in Naumann, T. - Hunziker-Rodenwald, R. (eds.) *Diasynchron. Beiträge zur Exegese und Rezeption der Hebräischen Bibel*. Stuttgart: 73-100.
- Dietrich, M. - Mayer, W. (1999) "The Hurrian and Hittite Texts" in Watson, W.G.E. - Wyatt, N. (eds.): 58-75.
- Dietrich, M. - Loretz, O. - Sanmartín, J. eds. (2013) *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und anderen Orten. Dritte, erweiterte Auflage*. Münster.
- van Dijk, J. (1960) "Le denouement de 'Gilgames au Bois de cedres' selon LB 2116" in Garelli, P. (ed.): 69-81.
- van Dijk, J. (1967) "Einige Bemerkungen zu sumerischen religionsgeschichtlichen Problemen" *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* 62: 229-47.

- van Dijk, J. (1969) "Les contacts ethniques dans la Mésopotamie et les syncrétismes de la religion sumérienne" in Hartman, S. (ed.) *Syncretism*. Stockholm: 171-206.
- van Dijk, J. (1971-72) "Sumerische Religion" in Asmussen, J.P. - Læssøe, J. - Colpe, C. (eds.) *Handbuch der Religionsgeschichte*. Vol. 1, Göttingen: 431-96.
- van Dijk, J. (1983) *LUGAL UD ME-LÁM-bi NIR-ĜÁL texte, traduction et introduction par J. van Dijk*, 2 vols. Leiden.
- van Dijk, J. (1998) "Inanna raubt den "grossen Himmel". Ein Mythos" in Maul, S.M. (ed.) *Eine Festschrift für Rykle Borger zu seinem 65. Geburtstag: tikip santakki mala bašmu...* Groningen: 9-38.
- Dijkstra, M. (2013) "Let Sleeping Gods Lie?" in Becking, B. (ed.) *Reflections on the Silence of God. A Discussion with Marjo Korpel and Johannes de Moor*. Leiden: 71-87.
- Diller, H. (1965) "Hera und Athena im achten Buch der Ilias" *Hermes* 93: 137-47.
- Dindorf, W. (1855) *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam, ex codicibus aucta et emendata edidit Guglielmus Dindorfius*. 2 vols. Oxonii.
- Dobbs-Allsopp, F.W. (2015) *On Biblical Poetry*. Oxford.
- Dodds, E. (1951) *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley.
- van Dongen, E. (2011) "The "Kingship in Heaven"-Theme of the Hesiodic Theogony: Origin, Function, Composition" *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 51: 180-201.
- Donlan, W. (1999) *The Aristocratic Ideal and Selected Papers*. Wauconda, Ill.
- Dorleijn, G.J. - Vanstiphout, H.L.J. eds. (2003) *Cultural Repertories. Structure, Function and Dynamics*. Louvain.
- Dornseiff, F. (1933) *Die archaische Mythenerzählung. Folgerungen aus dem homerischen Appollonhymnos*. Berlin.
- Dronke, U. (1997) *The Poetic Edda. Volume II: Mythological Poems*. Oxford.
- Dronke, U. (2011) *The Poetic Edda. Volume III. Mythological Poems II*. Oxford.
- Duban J.M. (1980) "Poets and Kings in the *Theogony* Invocation" *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 33: 7-21.
- Dubuisson, D. (2006) *Twentieth Century Mythologies: Dumézil, Levi-Strauss, Eliade*. 2nd ed. London.
- Dumézil, G. (1974) *La religion romaine archaïque. Avec un appendice sur la religion des Étrusques*. 2nd éd. revue et corrigée. Paris.
- Durand, J.-M. (2012) "Réflexions sur un fantôme linguistique" in Mittermayer, C. - Eckin, S. (eds.): 165-91.
- Dyson, M. (1970) "The second assembly of the gods in the *Odyssey*" *Antichthon* 4: 1-12.
- Ebeling, E. (1931) *Tod und Leben nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier. I. Teil: Texte*. Berlin.
- Edinger, H.G. (1980) "The lay of Demodocus in context" *Humanities Association Review* 31: 45-52.
- Edmunds, L. ed. (2014) *Approaches to Greek Myth*. 2nd ed. Baltimore.
- Edwards, G.P. (1971) *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context*. Oxford.
- Edwards, M.W. (1970) "Homeric Speech-Introductions" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74: 1-36.
- Edwards, M.W. (1980) "Convention and Individuality in *Iliad* 1" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 84: 1-28.
- Edwards, M.W. (1991) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume IV, Books 17-20*. Cambridge.
- Edwards, M.W. (1992) "Homer and Oral Tradition: the Type-Scene" *Oral Tradition* 7: 284-330.
- Edwards, M.W. (2011a) "Fate" in Finkelberg, M. (ed.) 288-89.
- Edwards, M.W. (2011b) "moira" in Finkelberg, M. (ed.) 526-27.
- Edzard, D.O. (1976) "Zum sumerischen Eid" in Lieberman, S.J. (ed.): 66-98.
- Edzard, D.O. (1976/80) "[Igiġū], Anunna und. A. Nach sumerischen Quellen." in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 5: 37-40.
- Edzard, D.O. (1987/90) "Literatur", §3 "Überblick über die sumerische Literatur" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 7: 35-41.
- Edzard, D.O. (1990) "Gilgamesh und Huwawa A. I. Teil" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 80: 165-203.

- Edzard, D.O. (1991) "Gilgamesh und Huwawa A. II. Teil" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 81: 165-233.
- Edzard, D.O. (1997) *Gudea and His Dynasty*. Toronto.
- Edzard, D.O. (2004) "Altbabylonische Literatur und Religion" in Charpin, D. - Edzard, D.O. - Stol, M. (eds.) *Mesopotamien: Die altbabylonische Zeit*. Göttingen: 481-640.
- Ehrlich, C.S. ed. (2009) *From an Antique Land: An Introduction to Ancient Near Eastern Literature*. Lanham.
- Elmer, D.F. (2012) "Building Communities across the Battle-Lines: The Truce in *Iliad* 3 and 4" in Wilker, J. (ed.) *Maintaining Peace in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Berlin: 25-48.
- Elmer, D.F. (2013) *The Poetics of Consent: Collective Decision Making and the Iliad*. Baltimore.
- Erbse, H. (1961) "Betrachtungen über das 5. Buch der *Ilias*" *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 104: 156-89.
- Erbse, H. (1969-88) *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera)*. 7 vols. Berlin.
- Erbse, H. (1972) *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Odyssee*. Berlin.
- Erbse, H. (1986) *Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Götter im homerischen Epos*. Berlin.
- Ermidoro, S. (2015) *Commensality and Ceremonial Meals in the Neo-Assyrian Period*. Venice.
- van Erp Taalman Kip, A.M. (2000) "The gods of the *Iliad* and the fate of Troy" *Mnemosyne* 53: 385-402.
- Espak, P. (2015) *The God Enki in Sumerian Royal Ideology and Mythology*. Wiesbaden.
- Evans, G. (1958) "Ancient Mesopotamian Assemblies" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 78: 1-11.
- Evans, S. (2001) *Hymn and epic. A study of their interplay in Homer and the Homeric Hymns*. Turku.
- Falkenstein, A. (1951) "Zur Chronologie der sumerischen Literatur" in *Compte rendu de la seconde Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*. Paris: 12-27.
- Falkenstein, A. (1959) *Das Sumerische*. Leiden.
- Falkenstein, A. (1965) "Die Anunna in der sumerischen Überlieferung" in Güterbock, H. - Jacobsen, T. (eds.): 127-40.
- Fantuzzi, M. - Tsagalis, C. eds. (2015) *A Companion to the Epic Cycle*. Cambridge.
- Faraone, C. (2013) "The Poetics of the Catalogue in the Hesiodic *Theogony*" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 143: 293-323.
- Farber, G. (1987/90) "me (ġarza, paršu)" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 7: 610-13.
- Farber, G. (1991) "Konkret, Kollektiv, Abstrakt?" *Aula Orientalis* 9: 81-90.
- Farber-Flügge, G. (1973) *Der Mythos "Inanna und Enki" unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Liste de me*. Roma.
- Faulkner, A. (2008) *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite. Introduction, Text and Commentary*. Oxford.
- Faulkner, A. (2011a) "Modern Scholarship on the *Homeric Hymns*: Foundational Issues" in Faulkner, A. (ed.): 1-25.
- Faulkner, A. (2011b) "The Collection of the *Homeric Hymns*: from the Seventh to the Third Centuries BC" in Faulkner, A. (ed.): 175-205.
- Faulkner, A. (2015) "The Silence of Zeus: Speech in the *Homeric Hymns*" in Faulkner, A. - Hodkinson, O. (eds.): 31-46.
- Faulkner, A. ed. (2011) *The Homeric Hymns. Interpretative Essays*. Oxford.
- Faulkner, A. - Hodkinson, O. eds. (2015) *Hymnic Narrative and the Narratology of the Greek Hymns*. Leiden.
- Faulkner, A. - Vergados, A. - Schwab, A. eds. (2016) *The Reception of the Homeric Hymns*. Oxford.
- Feldman, M. (2006) *Diplomacy by Design: Luxury Arts and an "International Style" in the Ancient Near East, 1400-1200 BC*. Chicago.
- Feldt, L. (2013) "Myths and Narratology. Narrative Form, Meaning and Function of the Standard Babylonian Epic of Anzû" *Bulletin for the Study of Religion* 42: 22-29.
- Feliu, L. (2003) *The God Dagan in Bronze Age Syria*. Leiden.

- Felson, N. (2011) "Children of Zeus in the *Homeric Hymns*: Generational Succession" in Faulkner, A. (ed.): 254-79.
- Fenik, B. (1968) *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Technique of Homeric Battle Description*. Stuttgart.
- Fenik, B. (1974) *Studies in the Odyssey*. Wiesbaden.
- Fenik, B. (1978) "Four monologues in the *Iliad*: stilization and variety" in Fenik, B. (ed.) *Homer: Tradition and Invention*. Leiden: 68-90.
- Ferrara, A.J. - Parker, S.B. (1972) "Seating Arrangements at Divine Banquets" *Ugarit-Forschungen* 4: 37-40.
- Finet, A. ed. (1975) *La voix de l'opposition en Mésopotamie*. Bruxelles.
- Finglass, P. (2015) "Iliou Persis" in Fantuzzi, M. - Tsagalis, C. (eds): 344-54.
- Fink, S. (2015) *Benjamin Whorf: die Sumerer und der Einfluss der Sprache auf das Denken*. Wiesbaden.
- Finkel, I. (2014) *The Ark Before Noah: Decoding the Story of the Flood*. London.
- Finkelberg, M. (2005) *Greeks and Pre-Greeks: Aegean Prehistory and Greek Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Finkelberg, M. ed. (2011) *The Homer Encyclopedia*. 3 vols. Oxford.
- Finley, M.I. (1954) *Marriage, sale and gift in the Homeric world*. Washington [= Shaw, B.D. - Saller, R.P. eds. (1982) *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece*. New York: 233-45].
- Finley, M.I. (1977) *The World of Odysseus*. 2nd ed. London.
- Finn, J. (2017) *Much ado about Marduk. Questioning discourses of royalty in First Millennium Mesopotamian Literature*. Boston.
- Finsler, G. (1906) *Die Olympischen Szenen der Ilias, ein Beitrag zur homerischen Frage*. Bern.
- Flaig, E. (1994) "Das Konsensprinzip im homerischen Olympe: Überlegungen zum göttlichen Entscheidungsprozeß Ilias  $\Delta$  1-72" *Hermes* 122: 13-31.
- Fleming, D.E. (2004) *Democracy's Ancient Ancestors: Mari and Early Collective Governance*. Cambridge.
- Fleming, D.E. - Milstein, S.J. (2010) *The Buried Foundation of the Gilgamesh Epic. The Akkadian Huwawa Narrative*. Leiden.
- Flückiger-Hawker, E. (1999) *Urnamma of Ur in Sumerian Literary Tradition*. Freiburg.
- Focke, F. (1943) *Die Odyssee*. Stuttgart.
- Foley, J.M. (1990) *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*. Berkeley.
- Foley, J.M. (1991) *Immanent Art. From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*. Bloomington.
- Foley, J.M. (1999) *Homer's Traditional Art*. University Park.
- Förstel, K. (1979) *Untersuchungen zum homerischen Apollonhymnus*. Bochum.
- Foster, B. (2005) *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*. 3rd ed. Bethesda.
- Foster, B. (2007) *Akkadian literature of the Late Period*. Münster.
- Fowler, R. ed. (2004) *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Cambridge.
- Fränkel, H. (1975) *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy. A history of Greek epic, lyric, and prose to the middle of the fifth century*. transl. M. Hadas and J. Willis. Oxford.
- Frahm, E. (2010) "Counter-texts, Commentaries, and Adaptations: Politically Motivated Responses to the Babylonian Epic of Creation in Mesopotamia, the Biblical World, and Elsewhere" in Tsukimoto, A. (ed.) *Conflict, Peace and Religion in the Ancient Near East*. Tokyo 2010: 3-33.
- Frank, C. (1939) *Kultlieder aus dem Ishtar-Tamüz-Kreis*. Leipzig.
- Franke, S. (2014) "Der Zorn Marduks, Erras und Sanheribs. Zu Datierung und Funktion von 'Erra und Išum'" in Neumann, H. (ed.) *Krieg und Frieden in Alten Vorderasien*. Münster: 315-28.
- Frayne, D. (2008) *The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Early Periods 1: Presargonic Period (2700-2350 BC)*. Toronto.
- Friedländer, P. (1914) "Das Prooimion der Theogonie" *Hermes* 49: 1-16.
- Friedrich, J. (1930) "Die hethitischen Bruchstücke des Gilgamesh-Epos" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete* 39: 1-82.
- Friedrich, R. (1987) "Thrinakia and Zeus' ways to men in the *Odyssey*" *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 28: 375-400.

- Frisk, H. (1960-72) *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. Heidelberg.
- Fritz, M. (2008) "'Mach auf, Herrin, mach auf...!' Die Hochzeitsbräuche der sumerischen literarischen Texte um Dumuzi und Inanna als Übergangsriten" in Heininger, B. (ed.) *An den Schwellen des Lebens. Zur Geschlechterdifferenz in Ritualen des Übergangs*. Berlin: 76-82.
- Fröhder, D. (1994) *Die dichterische Form der homerischen Hymnen untersucht am Typus der mittelgrossen Preislieder*. Hildesheim.
- Furley, W.D. (2011) "Homeric and Un-Homeric Hexameter Hymns. A Question of Type" in Faulkner, A. (ed.): 206-31.
- Gabriel, G. (2014) *enūma eliš - Weg zu einer globalen Weltordnung. Pragmatik, Struktur und Semantik des babylonischen "Lied auf Marduk"*. Tübingen.
- Gadotti, A. (2009) "Why It was Rape: The Conceptualization of Rape in Sumerian Literature" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 129: 73-82.
- Gadotti, A. (2014a) *Gilgamesh, Enkidu and the Netherworld and The Sumerian Gilgamesh Cycle*. Boston.
- Gadotti, A. (2014b) "The Feminine in Myth and Epic" in Chavalas, M. (ed.) *Women in the Ancient Near East: A Sourcebook*. London: 28-58.
- Garelli, P. ed. (1960) *Gilgameš et sa légende*. Paris.
- Garvie, A.F. (1994) *Homer Odyssey VI-VIII*. Cambridge.
- Gelb, I.J. et al. eds. (1956-2011) *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. 21 vols. Chicago.
- Geller, M.J. (2002) "The Free Library Inanna Prism Reconsidered" in Abusch, T. (ed.): 87-100.
- George, A.R. (1999) *The epic of Gilgamesh: the Babylonian epic poem and other texts in Akkadian and Sumerian*. London.
- George, A.R. (2003) *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic. Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- George, A.R. (2005/2006) "The Tower of Babel: archaeology, history and cuneiform texts" *Archiv für Orientforschung* 51: 75-95.
- George, A.R. (2005) "In search of the é.dub.ba.a: The ancient Mesopotamian school in literature and reality" in Sefati, Y. et al. (eds.): 127-37.
- George, A.R. (2007a) "The Gilgameš Epic at Ugarit" *Aula Orientalis* 25: 237-54.
- George, A.R. (2007b) "The Epic of Gilgamesh: Thoughts on genre and meaning" in Azize, J. - Weeks, N. (eds.) *Gilgamesh and the World of Assyria*. Leuven: 37-66.
- George, A.R. (2007c) "The civilizing of Ea-Enkidu: an unusual tablet of the Babylonian Gilgamesh epic" *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 101: 59-80.
- George, A.R. (2009) *Babylonian Literary Texts in the Schøyen Collection*. Bethesda.
- George, A.R. (2012) "The Mayfly on the River: Individual and collective destiny in the Epic of Gilgamesh" *Kaskal* 9: 227-42.
- George, A.R. (2013) "The poem of Erra and Ishum: A Babylonian Poet's View of War" in Kennedy, H. (ed.) *Warfare and Poetry in the Middle East*. London: 39-72.
- George, A.R. - Al-Rawi, F.N.H. (1996) "Tablets from the Sippar Library VI: Atra-ḫasīs" *Iraq* 58: 147-90.
- George, A.R. - Oshima, T.M. eds. (2016) *Ancient Mesopotamian Religion and Mythology: Selected Essays by W.G. Lambert*. Tübingen.
- Gibson, J. (1999) "The Mythological Texts" in Watson, W.G.E. - Wyatt, N. (eds.): 193-202.
- Glassner, J.-J. (2000) "Les petits Etats mésopotamiens à la fin du 4e et au cours de 3e millénaire" in Hansen, M.H. (ed.): 35-53.
- Goldman, R.P. (1984) *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki. An Epic of Ancient India. Volume I: Bālakāṇḍa. Introduction and Translation by R.P. Goldman and Sally J. Sutherland*. Princeton.
- Goldman, R.P. et al. (1984-2017) *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki. An Epic of Ancient India*. 7 vols. Princeton.
- Goldman, R.P. - Sutherland Goldman, S.J. (2009) *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki. An Epic of Ancient India. Volume VII: Yuddhakāṇḍa. Translation and Annotation by R.P. Goldman, S.J. Sutherland Goldman and V.A. van Nooten. Introduction by R.P. Goldman and S.J. Sutherland Goldman*. Princeton.

- González-Reimann, L. (2006) "The divinity of Rāmā in the *Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki*" *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 34: 203-20.
- Gordon, C.H. (1955) "Homer and the Bible: the origin and character of East-Mediterranean Literature" *Hebrew Union College Annual* 26: 43-108.
- Görgemanns, H. (1976) "Rhetorik und Poetik im homerischen Hermeshymnus" in Görgemanns, H. - Schmidt, E.A. (eds.): *Studien zum antiken Epos*. Meisenheim am Glan: 113-28.
- Gössmann, F. (1955) *Das Era-Epos*. Würzburg.
- Gottesmann, A. (2008) "The Pragmatics of Homeric 'Kertomia'" *Classical Quarterly* 58: 1-12.
- Graf, F. (1991) "Religion und Mythologie im Zusammenhang mit Homer: Forschung und Ausblick" in Latacz, J. ed. (1991): 331-62.
- Graziosi, B. (2013) "The poet in the *Iliad*" in Hill, J. - Marmodoro, A. (eds.) *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*. Oxford: 9-38.
- Graziosi, B. (2016) "Theologies of the family in Homer and Hesiod" in Eidinow, E. - Kindt, J. - Osborne, R. (eds.) *Theologies of Ancient Greek Religion*. Cambridge: 35-61.
- Graziosi, B. (2017) "Divine Conflict and the Problem of Aphrodite" in Bassino, P. - Canevaro, L. - Graziosi, B. (eds): 39-61.
- Graziosi, B. - Haubold, J. (2003) "Homeric Masculinity: HENOREH and AFHNOREH" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 123: 60-76.
- Graziosi, B. - Haubold, J. (2005) *Homer: The Resonance of Epic*. London.
- Graziosi, B. - Haubold, J. (2010) *Homer Iliad Book VI*. Cambridge.
- Green, M.W. (1978) "The Eridu Lament" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 30: 127-67.
- Green, M.W. (1984) "The Uruk Lament" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 104: 253-79.
- Greengus, S. (1969) "A textbook case of adultery in ancient Mesopotamia" *Hebrew Union College Annual* 40: 33-44.
- Greenstein, E.L. (1997) "Kirta" in Parker, S.B. (ed.): 9-48.
- Gresseth, J.K. (1975) "The Gilgamesh Epic and Homer" *Classical Journal* 70/4: 1-18.
- Griffin, J. (1978) "The divine audience and the religion of the *Iliad*" *Classical Quarterly* 28: 1-22.
- Griffin, J. (1980) *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford.
- Groneberg, B. (1991) "Atramhasis Tafel II iv-v" in Charpin, D. - Joannès, F. (eds.): 397-410.
- Groneberg, B. (1997) *Lob der Ištar: Gebet und Ritual an die altbabylonische Venusgöttin*. Groningen.
- Groneberg, B. (2004) *Die Götter des Zweistromlandes: Kulte, Mythen, Epen*. Düsseldorf.
- van Groningen, B.A. (1958) *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque*. Amsterdam.
- Gunkel, H. (1895) *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen. 1 und Ap. Joh. 12*. Göttingen.
- Gurney, O.R. (1960) "The Sultantepe Tablets. VII. The Myth of Nergal and Ereshkigal" *Anatolian Studies* 10: 105-31.
- Güterbock, H.G. - Jacobsen, T. eds. (1965) *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on his 75<sup>th</sup> Birthday*. Chicago.
- Gysembergh, V. (2013) "Le tirage au sort des provinces divines chez Homère (15, 185-199) et ses antécédents mésopotamiens: un état de la question" *Revue des études grecques* 126: 49-64.
- Haas, V. (1980) "Die Dämonisierung des Fremden und des Feindes im Alten Orient" *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 41: 37-44.
- Haas, V. (2006) *Die hethitische Literatur. Texte, Stilistik, Motive*. Berlin.
- Hackstein, O. (2002) *Die Sprachform der homerischen Epen. Faktoren morphologischer Variabilität in literarischen Frühformen: Tradition, Sprachwandel, sprachliche Anachronismen*. Wiesbaden.
- Hainsworth, J.B. (1988) = Heubeck, A. - West, S.R. - Hainsworth, J.B. (1988).
- Hainsworth, J.B. (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume 3: Books 9-12*. Cambridge.
- Hallo, W.W. (1976) "Towards a history of Sumerian literature" in Lieberman, S. J. (ed.): 181-203 = (2010) 57-84.
- Hallo, W.W. (1983) "Lugalbanda Excavated" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103: 165-80 = (2010) 495-516.

- Hallo, W.W. (1987) "The Origins of the Sacrificial Cult: New Evidence from Mesopotamia and Israel" in Miller, P.D. (ed.) *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Philadelphia: 3-13 = (2010) 517-28.
- Hallo, W.W. (2004) "Adapa Reconsidered: Life and Death in Contextual Perspective" *Scriptura* 87: 267-77.
- Hallo, W.W. (2010) *The World's Oldest Literature: Studies in Sumerian Belles-Lettres*. Leiden.
- Hallo, W.W. - Moran, W.L. (1979) "The First Tablet of the SB Recension of the Anzu Myth" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 31: 65-115.
- Halpern, B. - Sacks, K.S. eds. (2016) *Cultural Contact and Appropriation in the Axial-Age Mediterranean World: a Periplos*. Leiden.
- Hamilton, R. (1989) *The Architecture of Hesiodic Poetry*. Baltimore.
- Handy, L.K. (1994) *Among the host of heaven: the Syro-Palestinian pantheon as bureaucracy*. Winona Lake.
- Hansen, M.H. ed. (2000) *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-States Cultures*. Copenhagen.
- Harden, S. - Kelly, A. (2014) "Proemic convention and character construction in early Greek epic" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 107: 1-34.
- Harrison, T. (2015) "Beyond the polis? New approaches to Greek religion" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 135: 165-80.
- Haubold, J. (2002) "Greek Epic: A Near-Eastern Genre?" *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 48: 1-19.
- Haubold, J. (2005) "The Homeric *Polis*" in Hansen, M.H. (ed.) *The Imaginary Polis*. Copenhagen: 25-48.
- Haubold, J. (2012) "Visualisation in Homer and *Gilgamesh*" *KASKAL* 9: 123-36.
- Haubold, J. (2013) *Greece and Mesopotamia: Dialogues in Literature*. Cambridge.
- Haubold, J. (2014) "Kulturkontakt aus der Sicht des Homerlesers" in Rollinger, R. - Schnegg, K. (eds.): 325-42.
- Haubold, J. (2017) "Conflict, Consensus and Closure in Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Enūma eliš*" in Bassino, P. - Canevaro, L.G. - Graziosi, B. (eds.): 17-38.
- Haug, D. (2002) *Les phases de l'évolution de la langue épique: trois études de linguistique homérique*. Göttingen.
- Haul, M. (2000) *Das Etana-Epos. Ein Mythos von der Himmelfahrt des Königs von Kiš*. Göttingen.
- Haul, M. (2016) *Stele und Legende. Untersuchungen zu den keilschriftlichen Erzählwerken über die Könige von Akkade*. Göttingen.
- Hawley (2008) "On the Alphabetic Scribal Curriculum at Ugarit" in Biggs, R.D. - Myers, J. - Roth, M.T. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 51st Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*. Chicago: 57-67.
- Heath, J. (2001) "Telemachos πεπνυμένος: Growing into an Epithet" *Mnemosyne* 54:129-57.
- Hecker, K. (1974) *Untersuchungen zur akkadischen Epik*. Neukirchen.
- Hecker, K. - Sommerfeld, W. eds. (1986) *Keilschriftliche Literaturen*. Berlin.
- Heiden, B. (2000) "Thematic Resonance in the *Iliad*" *Symbolae Osloenses* 75: 34-55.
- Heiden, B. (2010) "Truth and personal agreement in archaic Greek poetry: the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*" *Philosophy and Literature* 34: 409-24.
- Heiden, B. (2013) "Coordinated sequences of analogous topics in the Delian and Pythian segments of the *Hymn to Apollo*" *Trends in Classics* 5: 1-8.
- Heimpel, W. - Salgues, E. (2015) "Lugale oder wie Ninurta dem Tigris mehr Wasser schuf" in Volk, K. (ed.): 33-67.
- Heitsch, E. (2008) *Erzählung und Theologie in der 'Ilias': eine Skizze*. Stuttgart.
- Helgason, J. (1955) *Eddadigte. vol. II Gudedigte*. Copenhagen.
- Hellwig B. (1964) *Raum und Zeit im homerischen Epos*. Hildesheim.
- Henkelman, W.F.M. (2006) "'The Birth of Gilgamesh' (Ael. NA XII.21): a Case-Study in Literary Receptivity" in Rollinger, R. - Truschnegg, B. (eds.): 807-56.
- Hermann, G. (1806) *Homeri Hymni et Epigrammata*. Lipsiae.
- Hess, C. W. (2015) "Songs of Clay. Materiality and Poetics in Early Akkadian Epic" in Delnero, P. - Lauinger, J. (eds.): 251-84.
- Heubeck, A. (1954) *Der Odysse-Dichter und die Ilias*. Erlangen.

- Heubeck, A. (1955) "Mythologische Vorstellungen des alten Orients im Archaischen Griechentum" *Gymnasion* 62: 508-25.
- Heubeck, A. (1972) "Gedanken zum homerischen Apollonhymnos" in *Festschrift K.I. Merenitis*. Athens: 131-46.
- Heubeck, A. (1989) = Heubeck - Hoekstra (1989).
- Heubeck, A. - West, S.R. - Privitera, G.A. (1981) *Omero, Odissea. Volume I (Libri I-IV) Introduzione generale di Alfred Heubeck e Stephanie West. Testo e commento a cura di Stephanie West. Traduzione di G. Aurelio Privitera*. Milano.
- Heubeck, A. - West, S.R. - Hainsworth, J.B. (1988) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume I, Books I-VIII*. Oxford.
- Heubeck, A. - Hoekstra, A. (1989) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume II, Books IX-XVI*. Oxford.
- Hewson, J. (2005) Review of Haug (2002), *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 33: 180-86.
- Hirschberger, M. (2008) "Die Parteinungen der Götter in der *Ilias*: Antike Auslegung und Hintergründe in Kult und epischer Tradition" *Wiener Studien* 121: 5-28.
- Hirschberger, M. (2011) "Götter" in Rengakos, A. - Zimmermann, B. (eds.) *Homer Handbuch. Leben, Werk, Wirkung*. Stuttgart: 278-91.
- Hoffmann, I. (1984) *Der Erlass Telipinus*. Heidelberg.
- Hoffner, H.A., Jr. (1998) *Hittite Myths*. 2nd ed. Atlanta.
- Hoftijzer, J. - Gerrit van der Kooij, G. (1976) *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Alla*. Leiden.
- Holm, T. (2005) "Ancient Near Eastern Literature: Genres and Form" in Snell, D.C. (ed.): 269-88.
- Hölscher, U. (1939) *Untersuchungen zur Form der Odyssee. Szenenwechsel und gleichzeitliche Handlungen*. Berlin.
- Hölscher, U. (1988) *Die Odyssee: Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman*. München.
- Holtz, S.E. (2009) *Neo-Babylonian Court Procedure*. Leiden.
- Hooke, S.H. (1963) *Middle-Eastern Mythology*. London.
- Hopman, M. (2012) "Narrative and Rhetoric in Odysseus' Tales to the Phaeacians" *American Journal of Philology* 133: 1-30.
- Horowitz, W. (1998) *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography*. Winona Lake.
- Hruška, B. (1974) "Zur letzten Bearbeitung des Erraepos" *Archív Orientální* 42: 354-65.
- Huitink, L. (2013) Review of Beck (2012), *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2013.10.57.
- Humar, M. (2016) "Kataloge und Ringkomposition in Hesiods 'Theogonie'" *Hermes* 114: 384-400.
- Humbert, J. (1936) *Homère, Hymnes*. Paris.
- Hunter, R. (2009) "Hesiod's Style: Towards an Ancient Analysis" in Montanari, F. - Rengakos, A. - Tsagalis, C. (eds.): 253-69.
- Hutter, M. (1985) *Altorientalische Vorstellungen von der Unterwelt. Literar- und religionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu "Nergal und Ereškigal"*. Göttingen.
- Izre'el, S. (2001) *Adapa and the South Wind. Language Has the Power of Life and Death*. Winona Lake.
- Jacobsen, T. (1943) "Primitive democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 2: 159-72.
- Jacobsen, T. (1957) "Early political development in Ancient Mesopotamia" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 52: 91-140.
- Jacobsen, T. (1976) *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion*. New Haven.
- Jacobsen, T. (1980) "Death in Ancient Mesopotamia" in Alster, B. (ed.): 19-24.
- Jacobsen, T. (1981) "The Eridu Genesis" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100: 513-29.
- Jacobsen, T. (1987) *The Harps that once... Sumerian Poetry in Translation*. New Heaven -London.
- Jacoby, F. (1933) "Der homerische Apollonhymnos" *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 15: 682-751.
- Jaeger, W. (1926) "Solons Eunomie" *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1926: 69-85.
- Jagersma, A.H. (2010) *A Descriptive Grammar of Sumerian*. PhD diss. Leiden.
- Janko, R. (1981) "The Structure of the *Homeric Hymns*. A Study in Genre" *Hermes* 109: 9-24.
- Janko, R. (1982) *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge.

- Janko, R. (1991) Review of Clay (1989) [= (2006)], *Classical Review* 41: 12-13.
- Janko, R. (1992) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume IV: Books 13-16*. Cambridge.
- Janko, R. (2012) "πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν ἀεΐδειν: relative chronology and the literary history of the early Greek epos" in Andersen, Ø. - Haug, D. (eds.) *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Cambridge: 20-43.
- Jiménez, E. (2017) *The Babylonian Disputation Poems. With Editions of the Series of the Poplar, Palm and Vine, the Series of the Spider, and the Story of the Poor, Forlorn Wren*. Leiden.
- Johnson, D.M. (1999) "Hesiod's Description of Tartarus (*Theogony* 721-819)" *Phoenix* 53: 8-28.
- Johnson, W.A. (2008) "Hesiod's *Theogony*: reading the proem as a priamel" *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 48: 231-35.
- Jones, P. (2005) "Divine and non divine kingship" in Snell, D.C. (ed.): 330-42.
- de Jong Ellis, M. ed. (1992) *Nippur at the Centennial*. Philadelphia.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (1987) "The voice of anonymity: *tis*-speeches in the *Iliad*" *Eranos* 85: 69-84.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (1992) "The Subjective Style of Odysseus' Wanderings" *Classical Quarterly* 42: 1-11.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2001) *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2002) "Developments in Narrative Technique in the *Odyssey*" in Reichel, M. - Rengakos, A. (eds.) *Epea pteroenta. Festschrift W. Kullmann*. Stuttgart: 77-91.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2004) *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. 2nd ed. London.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2012) *Homer Iliad book XXII*. Cambridge.
- de Jong, I.J.F. - Nünlist, R. - Bowie, A. eds. (2004) *Narrators, Narratees and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Leiden.
- de Jong, I.J.F. - Nünlist, R. eds. (2007) *Time in Ancient Greek Narrative*. Leiden.
- Kakridis, J.T. (1937) "Zum homerischen Apollonhymnos" *Philologus* 92: 104-08.
- Kakridis, J.T. (1975) "Griechische Mahlzeits- und Gastlichkeitsbräuche" in Cobet, J. - Leimbach, R. - Neschke-Hentschke, A.B. (eds.) *Dialogus* (Fs. H. Patzer). Wiesbaden: 13-21.
- Kammenhuber, A. (1967) "Die hethitische und hurrische Überlieferung zum 'Gilgameš-Epos'" *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 21: 45-58.
- Kämmerer, T.R. (1993) "Das Sintflutfragment aus Ugarit (RS 22.421)" *Ugarit-Forschungen* 25: 189-200.
- Kämmerer, T.R. - Metzler, K.A. (2012) *Das Babylonische Welterschöpfungsepos Enūma eliš*. Münster.
- Karahashi, F. (2004) "Fighting in the Mountain: Some Observations on the Sumerian Myths of Inanna and Ninurta" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 63: 111-18.
- Katz, D. (1993) *Gilgamesh and Akka*. Groningen.
- Katz, D. (2003) *The Image of the Netherworld in the Sumerian Sources*. Bethesda.
- Katz, D. (2011) "Reconstructing Babylon: recycling traditions toward a new theology" in Cancik-Kirschbaum, E. - van Ess, M. - Marzahn, J. (eds.): 123-34.
- Katz, D. (2015) "When was natural death created or why did Gilgameš go to Ūta-napišti?" *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2015/2: 68-69.
- Kearns, E. (2004) "The Gods in the Homeric Epics" in Fowler, R.L. (ed.): 59-73.
- Keetman, J. (2008) "Der Kampf im Haustor. Eine der Schlüsselszenen zum Verständnis des Gilgameš-Epos" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 67: 161-73.
- Keetman, J. (2010) "Enmenkar und Sulge als sumerische Muttersprachler nach literarischen Quellen" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 100: 15-31.
- Kelly, A. (2007) *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer, Iliad VIII*. Oxford.
- Kelly, A. (2008) "The Babylonian Captivity of Homer: The Case of The Διὸς Ἀπάτη" *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 151: 259-304.
- Kelly, A. (2010) "Hypertexting with Homer: Tlepolemus and Sarpedon on Herakles (*Il.* 5.628-98)" *Trends in Classics* 2: 259-76.
- Kelly, A. (2012) "The Mourning of Thetis: 'Allusion' and the Future of the *Iliad*" in Montanari, F. - Rengakos, A. - Tsagalis, C. (eds.): 221-65.
- Kelly, A. (2014) "Homeric Battle Narrative and The Ancient Near East" in Cairns, D. - Scodel, R. (eds.) *Defining Greek Narrative*. Edinburgh: 29-54.

- Kelly, A. (2017) "Achilles in Control? Managing Oneself and Others in the Funeral Games" in Bassino, P. - Canevaro, L. - Graziosi, B. (eds): 87-108.
- Kelly, A. (forthcoming) "Homer's rivals? Internal narrators within the *Iliad*" in Ready, J.L. - Tsagalis, C. (eds.) *Telling Homer, Telling in Homer: New Perspectives on Homeric Performance*. Austin.
- Kienast, B. (1965) "Iḡigū und Anunnakū nach den akkadischen Quellen" in Güterbock, H.G. - Jacobsen, T. (eds.): 141-58.
- Kienast, B. (1976/80) "Iḡigū, Anunnakkū und. B. nach akkadischen Quellen" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 5: 40-44.
- Kilmer, A. (1972) "The Mesopotamian Concept of Overpopulation and its Solution as Represented in the Mythology" *Orientalia* 41: 160-77.
- Kilmer, A. (1987) "The Symbolism of the Flies in the Mesopotamian Flood Myth and Some Further Implications" in Rochberg-Halton, F. (ed.) *Language, Literature, and History: Philological and Historical Studies Presented to Erica Reiner*. New Haven: 175-80.
- Kilmer (1993/97) "Musik, A, I: In Mesopotamia" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 8: 463-82.
- Kilmer, A. (1996) "Fugal Features in Atra-ḥasīs: The Birth Theme" in Vogelzang, M.E. - Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (eds.) *Mesopotamian poetic language: Sumerian and Akkadian*. Groningen: 127-39.
- Kim, K. (2011) *Incubation as a Type-Scene in the 'Aqhatu, Kirta and Hannah Stories*. Leiden.
- Kirchhoff, A. (1879) *Die Homerische Odyssee*. 2 umgearb. Aufl. Berlin.
- Kirk, G.S. (1960) "Structure and Aim of Hesiod's *Theogony*" in von Fritz, K. - Reverdin, O. (eds.) *Hésiod et son influence*. Genève: 61-107.
- Kirk, G.S. (1962) *The Songs of Homer*. Cambridge.
- Kirk, G.S. (1981) "Orality and Structure in the Homeric 'Hymn to Apollo'" in Brillante, C. - Cantilena, M - Pavese, C.O. (eds.): 163-82.
- Kirk, G.S. (1985) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume I: Books 1-4*. Cambridge.
- Kirk, G.S. (1990) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume II: Books 5-8*. Cambridge.
- Kissine, M. (2013) *From Utterances to Speech-Acts*. Cambridge.
- Klein, J. (1981) *The Royal Hymns of Šulgi King of Ur: Man's Quest for Immortal Fame*. Philadelphia.
- Klein, J. (1989) "From Gudea to Šulgi: Continuity and Change in Sumerian Literary Tradition" in Behrens, H. - Loding, D. - Roth, M.D. (eds.) *DUMU-E<sub>2</sub>-DUB-BA-A: Studies in Honor of Åke Sjöberg*. Philadelphia: 289-301.
- Klein, J. (1990) "Notes to Atram-Ḥasīs, Tablet II: (b) The Old Babylonian Version of the "Messenger" Motif" *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 1990/3: 78-79.
- Klein, J. - Sefati, Y. (2014) "The "Stars (of) Heaven" and Cuneiform Writing" in Sassmannshausen, L. - Neumann, G. (eds.): 85-102.
- Klinger, J.W. (2005) "Die hethitische Rezeption mesopotamischer Literatur und die Überlieferung des Gilgamesh-Epos in Ḫattusa" in Prechel, D. (ed.) *Motivation und Mechanismen des Kulturkontaktes in der späten Bronzezeit*. Firenze: 103-27.
- Klingner, F. (1944) *Über die vier ersten Bücher der Odyssee*. Leipzig.
- Köiv, M. (2011) "Egalitarianism and hierarchies: Early Greek polis in the context of Ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean city-state culture" in Kämmerer, T.R. (ed.) *Identities and Societies in the Ancient East-Mediterranean Regions. Comparative Approaches*. Münster: 105-51.
- Köiv, M. (2016) "Communities and Rulers in Early Greece: Development of Leadership Patterns in Euböia and Argolis (12<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> Centuries BC)" in Kämmerer, T.R. - Köiv, M. - Sazonov, V. (eds.) *Kings, Gods and People. Establishing Monarchies in the Ancient World*. Münster: 293-354.
- Komoróczy, G. (1976a) "Das Pantheon im Kult, in den Götterlisten und in der Mythologie" in *Études sur le Panthéon systématique et les Panthéons locaux*. Roma: 80-86
- Komoróczy, G. (1976b) "Work and Strike of the Gods, New Light on the Divine Society in the Sumero-Akkadian Mythology" *Oikumene* 1: 9-36.
- van Koppen, F. (2011) "The Scribe of the Flood Story and his Circle" in Radner, K - Robson, E. (eds.): 140-66.
- Korpel, M. - de Moor, J. (2011) *The Silent God*. Leiden.

- Kottsieper, I. (2009) "Aramaic Literature" in Ehrlich, C.S. (ed.): 393-444.
- Kouwenberg, N.J.C. (2010) *The Akkadian Verb and its Semitic Background*. Winona Lake.
- Kramer, S.N. (1944) "The Epic of Gilgamesh and its Sumerian Sources: A Study in Literary Evolution" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 64: 7-23.
- Kramer, S.N. (1955) "The Deluge" in Pritchard, J. B. (ed.) *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton. 2nd ed.: 42-44.
- Kramer, S.N. (1983) "The Sumerian Deluge Myth. Reviewed and Revised" *Anatolian Studies* 33: 115-21.
- Kramer, S.N. - Maier, J.R. (1989) *Myths of Enki, the crafty god*. Oxford.
- Krebernik, M. (1993/97) "Muttergöttin" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 8: 502-16.
- Krebernik, M. (2014) "Ubšu'ukkina" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 14: 268-69.
- Krecher, J. (1978) "Sumerische Literatur" in Röllig, W. (ed.) *Altorientalische Literaturen*. Wiesbaden: 101-50.
- Krecher, J. (1980/83) "Klagelied" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 6: 1-8.
- Krecher, J. (1987) "Morphemeless syntax in Sumerian as seen on the background of word-composition in Chukchee" *Acta Sumerologica* 9: 67-88.
- Krischer, T. (1971) *Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epik*. München.
- Kullmann, W. (1956) *Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias*. Berlin.
- Kullmann, W. (1992) *Homerische Motive: Beiträge zur Entstehung, Eigenart und Wirkung von Ilias und Odyssee*. Stuttgart.
- Kurz, G. (1966) *Darstellungsformen menschlicher Bewegung in der Ilias*. Heidelberg.
- Kvanvig, H.S. (2011) *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical and Enochic: An Intertextual Reading*. Leiden.
- Lacey, W.K. (1966) "Homeric *Hedna* and Penelope's *Kyrios*" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 86: 55-69.
- Laks, A. (1996) "Le double roi: remarques sur les antécédents Hésiodiques du philosophe-roi" in Blaise, F. - Judet de la Combe, P. - Rousseau, P. (eds.): 83-91.
- Lambert, W.G. (1958) Review of Gössmann (1955) *Archiv für Orientforschung* 18: 395-401.
- Lambert, W.G. (1962) "A Catalogue of Texts and Authors" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 16: 59-81.
- Lambert, W.G. (1964) "The Reign of Nabuchadnezzar I: A Turning Point in the History of Ancient Near Eastern Religion" in McGullough, W.S. (ed.) *The Seed of Wisdom. Essays in Honour of T. J. Meek*. Toronto: 3-13.
- Lambert, W.G. (1973) "Studies in Nergal" *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 30: 355-63.
- Lambert, W.G. (1980a) "New Fragments of Babylonian Epics" *Archiv für Orientforschung* 27: 71-82.
- Lambert, W.G. (1980b) "The Theology of Death" in Alster, B. (ed.) *Death in Mesopotamia*. Copenhagen: 53-66.
- Lambert, W.G. (1982) "The Hymn to the Queen of Nippur" in Van Driel, G. et al. (eds.) *Zikir Šūmim: Assyriological Studies Presented to F.R. Kraus on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Leiden: 173-218.
- Lambert, W.G. (1983) "The Flood in Sumerian, Babylonian and Biblical Sources" in *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 5: 27-40 [= George - Oshima (2016) 235-44].
- Lambert, W.G. (1986) "Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation" in Hecker, K. - Sommerfeld, W. (eds.): 55-60.
- Lambert, W.G. (1991) "Three New Pieces of Atra-Ḫasīs" in Charpin, D. - Joannès, F. (eds.) 411-14.
- Lambert, W.G. (1992) "The Relationship of Sumerian and Babylonian Myths as Seen in Accounts of Creation" in Charpin, D. - Joannès, F. (eds.) *La circulation des biens, des personnes et des idées dans le Proche-Orient ancien*. Paris: 129-35.
- Lambert, W.G. (1996) *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*. Winona Lake (repr. Oxford 1960).

- Lambert, W.G. (1997) "The Assyrian Recension of Enūma eliš" in Waetzoldt, H. - Hauptmann, H. (eds.) *Assyrien im Wandel der Zeiten*. Heidelberg: 77-79.
- Lambert, W.G. (1998) "Ancient Mesopotamian Kingship" in Day, J. (ed.) *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Sheffield: 54-70.
- Lambert, W.G. (2013) *Babylonian Creation Myths*. Winona Lake.
- Lambert, W.G. - Millard, A.R. (1999) *Atra-ḫasīs: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*. Winona Lake. (repr. Oxford 1969).
- Lämmerhirt, K. (2012) *Die sumerische Königshymne Šulgi F*. Wiesbaden.
- Lämmerhirt, K. - Zgoll, A. (2009) "Schicksal. In Mesopotamien" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 12: 140-52.
- Lanfranchi, G.B. (2011) "The Expansion of the Neo-Assyrian Empire and its peripheries: Military, Political and Ideological Resistance" in Ulf, C. - Rollinger, R. (eds.): 225-39.
- Lang, M. (1983) "Reverberation and Mythology in the *Iliad*" in Rubino, C. - Shelmerdine, C.W. (eds.) *Approaches to Homer*. Austin: 140-64.
- Lanza, D. (2005) "Le dimore degli dèi omerici" *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 80: 11-24.
- Lapinkivi, P. (2010) *The Neo-Assyrian Myth of Ištar's Descent and Resurrection*. Helsinki.
- Laroche, E. (1968) "Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription. II. Mythologie étrangère" *Revue hittite et asianique* 82: 121-38.
- Laroche, E. (1971) *Catalogue des Textes Hittites*. Paris.
- Larsen, M.T. (1976) *The Old Assyrian City-State and its Colonies*. Copenhagen.
- Larsen, M.T. (2000a) "The Old Assyrian City-State" in Hansen, M.H. (ed.): 77-87.
- Larsen, M.T. (2000b) "The City-States of the Early Neo-Babylonian Period" in Hansen, M.H. (ed.): 117-27.
- Latacz, J. (1966) *Zum Wortfeld "Freude" in der Sprache Homers*. Heidelberg.
- Latacz, J. (1991) "Zeus' Reise zu den Aithiopen (Zu Ilias I, 304-495)" in Latacz, J. (ed.) *Homer: Die Dichtung und ihre Deutung*. Darmstadt: 515-51. [= Kurtz, G. et al. (eds.) *Gnomosyne* (Fs. W. Marg). München 1981: 53-80].
- Latacz, J. (1996) *Homer: His Art and His World*. transl. J.P. Holoka. Ann Arbor.
- Latacz, J. (2004) *Troy and Homer: Towards the Solution of an Old Mystery*. transl. K. Windle and R. Ireland, Oxford.
- Latacz, J. ed. (1991) *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung. Rückblick und Ausblick*. Stuttgart.
- Latacz, J. et al. (2000) *Homers Ilias : Gesamtkommentar 1, Erster Gesang: (A). 2 Kommentar/ von Joachim Latacz, René Nünlist, und Magdalene Stoevesandt*. München.
- Latacz, J. et al. (2000) *Proleg. = Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar / auf der Grundlage der Ausgabe von Ameis-Hentze-Cauer (1868-1913) hrsg. von Joachim Latacz. Prolegomena von Fritz Graf, Irene de Jong, Joachim Latacz, René Nünlist, Magdalene Stoevesandt, Rudolf Wachter und Martin L. West*. München.
- Latacz, J. et al. (2003) *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar / auf der Grundlage der Ausgabe von Ameis-Hentze-Cauer (1868-1913) hrsg. von Joachim Latacz. 2, Zweiter Gesang: (B). 2 Kommentar/ von Joachim Latacz, René Nünlist, und Magdalene Stoevesandt*. München.
- Lauinger, J. (2004) "A New Fragment of the Epic of Anzû in the Antakya Museum" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 94: 80-84.
- Launderville, D. (2003) *Piety and Politics: The Dynamics of Royal Authority in Homeric Greece, Biblical Israel, and Old Babylonian Mesopotamia*. Cambridge.
- Lawson, J.N. (1994) *The Concept of Fate in Ancient Mesopotamia. Towards an Understanding of Šimtu*. Wiesbaden.
- Leaf, W. (1900-1902) *The Iliad. Edited with Apparatus Criticus, Prolegomena, Commentary and Appendices by W. Leaf*. London.
- Leclerc, M.-C. (1993) *La parole chez Hésiode: à la recherche de l'harmonie perdue*. Paris.
- Lemaire, A. (2015) "Levantine Literacy ca. 1000-750 BCE" in Schmidt, B.B. (ed.): 11-45.
- Lemos, I.S. (2002) *The Protogeometric Aegean. The Archaeology of the Late Eleventh and Tenth Centuries B.C.*. Oxford.
- Lenz, L. (1975) *Der homerische Aphroditehymnus und die Aristie des Aineias in der Ilias*. Bonn.
- van Lerberghe, K. (1991) *Sippar-Amnānum: the Ur-Utu archive*. Volume 1. Ghent.

- Levine, B.A. (2000) "The Deir 'Alla Plaster Inscriptions (2.27) (The Book of Balaam, son of Beor)" in Hallo, W. (ed.) *The Context of Scripture. Volume II: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*. Leiden: 140-45.
- Lichtheim, M. (2006) *Ancient Egyptian Literature*. 3 vols. Berkeley.
- Lieberman, S.J. (1992) "Nippur: City of Decisions" in de Jong Ellis, M. (ed.): 127-36.
- Lieberman, S.J. ed. (1976) *Sumerological Studies in Honor of Thorkild Jacobsen*. Chicago.
- Lisman, J.J.W. (2013) *Cosmogony, Theogony and Anthropogony in Sumerian Texts*. Münster.
- Liverani, M. (1990) *Prestige and Interest: International Relations in the Near East ca. 1600-1100 B.C.* Padova.
- Liverani, M. (1993) "Nelle pieghe del despotismo. Organismi rappresentativi nell'antico Oriente" *Studi Storici* 34: 7-33.
- Liverani, M. (2001) *International relations in the Ancient Near East, 1600-1100 BC*. London.
- Liverani, M. (2014) *The Ancient Near East: History, Society, and Economy*. London.
- Lloyd, J.B. (1992) "The Banquet Theme in Ugaritic Narrative" *Ugarit-Forschungen* 22: 169-93.
- Lloyd, M. (2004) "The politeness of Achilles: off-record conversation strategies and the meaning of *Kertomia*" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 124: 75-89.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1983) *The Justice of Zeus*. 2nd ed. Berkeley.
- Lohmann, D. (1970) *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*. Berlin.
- Löhnert, A. (2009) "Wie die Sonne tritt heraus!": eine Klage zum Auszug Enlils mit einer Untersuchung zu Komposition und Tradition sumerischer Klagelieder in Altbabylonischer Zeit. Münster.
- López-Ruiz, C. (2010) *When the Gods Were Born: Greek Cosmogonies and the Near-East*. Cambridge, MA.
- López-Ruiz, C. (2014) "Greek and Eastern Mythologies: A Story of Mediterranean Encounters" in Edmunds, L. (ed.): 154-99.
- Lord, A.B. (1938) "Homer and Huso II. Narrative Inconsistencies in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song" *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 69: 439-45.
- Lord, A.B. (1951) "Composition by Theme in Homer and Southslavic Epos" *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 82: 71-80.
- Lord, A.B. (1960) *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA.
- Lord, A.B. (1990) "Gilgamesh and Other Epics" in Abusch, T. - Huehnergard, J. - Steinkeller, P. (eds.): 371-80.
- Lord, M.L. (1967) "Withdrawal and Return: An Epic Story-Pattern in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* and the Homeric Poems" *Classical Journal* 62: 241-48.
- Louden, B. (1999) *The Odyssey: Structure, Narration and Meaning*. Baltimore.
- Louden, B. (2006) *The Iliad: Structure, Myth and Meaning*. Baltimore.
- Louden, B. (2010) *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East*. Cambridge.
- Lovatt, H. (2013) *The Epic Gaze: Vision, Gender and Narrative in Ancient Epic*. Cambridge.
- Lowenstam, S. (1993) *The Scepter and the Spear: Studies on Forms of Repetition in the Homeric Poems*. Lanham.
- Ludwig, M.-C. (1990) *Untersuchungen zu den Hymnen des Ishme-Dagan von Isin*. Wiesbaden.
- Ludwig, M.-C. (2006) "'Enki in Nippur': Ein bislang unidentifiziertes, mythologisches Fragment" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 58: 27-38.
- Ludwig, M.-C. (2009) *Literarische Texte aus Ur: Kollationen und Kommentare zu UET 6/1-2*. Berlin.
- Ludwig, M.-C. (2015) Review of Lämmerhirt (2012), *Archiv für Orientforschung* 52: 254-69.
- Luzzatto, M.J. - La Penna, A. (1986) *Babrii Mythiambi Aesopaei, ediderunt Maria Jagoda Luzzatto et Antonius La Penna*. Leipzig.
- Lynn-George, M. (1996) "Structures of care in the *Iliad*" *Classical Quarterly* 46: 1-26.
- Lyons, D. (2003) "Dangerous Gifts: Ideologies of Marriage and Exchange in Ancient Greece" *Classical Antiquity* 22: 93-134.
- Lyons, D. (2011) "Marriage" in Finkelberg, M. (ed.): 499-500.
- Machinist, P. (2005) "Order and disorder: some Mesopotamian reflections" in Shaked, S. (ed.) *Genesis and regeneration: essays on conceptions of origins*. Jerusalem: 31-61.

- Machinist, P. - Sasson, J.M. (1983) "Rest and violence in the poem of Erra" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103: 221-26.
- Mackie, C.J. (2013) "Iliad 24 and the Judgement of Paris" *Classical Quarterly* 63: 1-16.
- Mackie, H.S. (1996) *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad*. London.
- Macleod, C.W. (1982) *Homer Iliad Book XXIV*. Cambridge.
- Magnelli, E. (1995) "Studi recenti sull'origine dell'esametro: un profilo critico" in Fantuzzi, M. - Pretagostini, R. (eds.) *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco*. Vol. 2, Roma: 111-37.
- Maitland, J. (1999) "Poseidon, Walls, and Narrative Complexity in the Homeric *Iliad*" *Classical Quarterly* 49: 1-13.
- Mander, P. (2009) *La Religione dell'antica Mesopotamia*. Roma.
- Margalit, B. (1999) "The Legend of Keret" in Watson, W.G.E. - Wyatt, N. (eds.): 203-33.
- Marks, J. (2008) *Zeus in the Odyssey*. Washington.
- Marks, J. (2016) "Herding Cats: Zeus, the Other Gods, and the Plot of the *Iliad*" in Clauss, J.J. - Cuyper, M. - Kahane, A. (eds.): 60-75.
- Marti, L. ed. (2014) *La famille dans le Proche-Orient ancien: réalités, symbolismes et images*. Paris.
- Masetti-Rouault, M.G. (2014) "Fathers and Sons in Syro-Mesopotamian Pantheons: Problems of Identity and Succession in Cuneiform Traditions" in Marti, L. (ed.): 133-40.
- Matouš, L. (1960) "Les rapports entre la version sumérienne et la version akkadienne de l'épopée de Gilgamesh" in Garelli, P. (ed.): 83-94.
- Maul, S. (1999) "Der assyrische König: Hüter der Weltordnung" in Watanabe, K. (ed.) *Priests and Officials in the Ancient Near East*. Heidelberg: 201-14.
- Maul, S. (2005) *Das Gilgamesch-Epos. Neu Übersetzt und Kommentiert von Stefan M. Maul*. München.
- Mazarakis-Ainan, A. (2006) "The archaeology of "basileis"" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. - Lemos, I.S. (eds.): 181-211.
- McAlpine, T. (1987) *Sleep, Divine and Human, in the Old Testament*. Sheffield.
- McGeough, K.M. (2007) *Exchange Relationships at Ugarit*. Leuven.
- Medda, E. (1983) *La forma monologica: ricerche su Omero e Sofocle*. Pisa.
- Meier, G. (1941-45) "Die Zweite Tafel der Serie Bīt mēseri" *Archiv für Orientforschung* 14: 139-52.
- Meissner, B. - von Soden, W. (1968-81) *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. 3 vols. Wiesbaden.
- Merkelbach, R. - West, M.L. (1967) *Fragmenta Hesiodica ediderunt R. Merkelbach et M.L. West*. Oxford.
- Metcalf, C. (2011) "New Parallels in Hittite and Sumerian Praise of the Sun" *Die Welt des Orients* 41: 168-76.
- Metcalf, C. (2015a) *The Gods Rich in Praise. Early Greek and Mesopotamian Religious Poetry*. Oxford.
- Metcalf, C. (2015b) "Old Babylonian religious poetry in Anatolia: From solar hymn to Plague Prayer" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 105: 42-53.
- Metcalf, C. (2017) "The Homeric Epic and the Anatolian Context" (Review of Bachvarova 2016), *Classical Review* 67: 3-5.
- Metcalf, C. (forthcoming) *Literary Sources on Old Babylonian Religion*. Bethesda.
- Metzler, K.A. (1995) "Gamertum: Göttliche Beschlussfassung im Atram-Ḫasīs-epos" *Ugarit-Forschungen* 27: 355-69.
- Michalowski, P. (1983) "History as Charter: Some Observations on the Sumerian King List" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103: 237-48.
- Michalowski, P. (1989) *The Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur*. Winona Lake.
- Michalowski, P. (1992) "Orality and Literacy in Early Mesopotamian Literature" in Vogelzang, M.E. - Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (eds.): 227-45.
- Michalowski, P. (1994a) "The Drinking Gods: Alcohol in Early Mesopotamian Ritual and Mythology" in Milano, L. (ed.) *Drinking in Ancient Societies: History and Culture of Drinks in the Ancient Near East*. Padua: 27-44.
- Michalowski, P. (1994b) "Enlil and Ninlil 2 (The Marriage of Sud), lines 157-164" *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 1994/51: 45-46.

- Michalowski, P. (1995) "Sumerian Literary Traditions: An Overview" in Sasson, J.M. (ed.): 2277-89.
- Michalowski, P. (2002) "Round about Nidaba: On Early Goddesses of Sumer" in Parpola, S. - Whiting, R.M. (eds.) *Sex and Gender in the Ancient Near East*. Helsinki: 413-22.
- Michalowski, P. (2006) "The Lives of the Sumerian Language" in Sanders, S.L. (ed.): 157-82.
- Michalowski, P. (2008) "The Mortal Kings of Ur: A Short Century of Divine Rule in Ancient Mesopotamia" in Brisch, N. (ed.): 33-45.
- Michalowski, P. (2010) "Maybe Epic: The Origins and Reception of Sumerian Heroic Poetry" in Konstans, D. - Raaflaub, K. (eds.) *Epic and History*. Oxford: 7-25.
- Michalowski, P. (2011) *The Correspondence of the Kings of Ur: An Epistolary History of an Ancient Mesopotamian Kingdom*. Winona Lake.
- Michalowski, P. (2012) "Knowledge and its Avatars: A Reconsideration of the Place of Literacy in Early Mesopotamian Culture" in van Egmond, W.S. - van Soldt, W.H. (eds.) *Theory and Practice of Knowledge Transfer. Studies in School Education in the Ancient Near East and Beyond*. Leiden: 39-57.
- Michalowski, P. - Veldhuis, N. eds. (2006) *Studies in Sumerian Literature in Honor of Stip (H.L.J. Vanstiphout)*. Leiden
- Miller, A. (1986) *From Delos to Delphi. A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. Leiden.
- Miller, R.D. II (2011) *Oral Tradition in Ancient Israel*. Eugene.
- Miller, R.D. II (2012) "Orality and Performance in Ancient Israel" *Revue des sciences religieuses* 86: 183-94.
- Milstein, S.J. (2015a) "The Origins of Adapa" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 105: 30-41.
- Milstein, S.J. (2015b) "The 'Magic' of Adapa" in Delnero, P. - Lauinger, J. (eds.): 191-213.
- Milstein, S.J. (2016) *Tracking the Master Scribe: Revision through Introduction in Biblical and Mesopotamian Literature*. Oxford.
- Minchin, E. (2011) "The words of gods: divine discourse in Homer's *Iliad*" in Lardinois, A. et al. (eds.) *Sacred Words: Orality, Literacy, and Religion*. Leiden: 17-35.
- Mittermayer, C. - Attinger, P. (2006) *Altbabylonische Zeichenliste der sumerisch-literarischen Texte. Unter Mitarbeit von Pascal Attinger*. Fribourg.
- Mittermayer, C. - Eckin, S. eds. (2012) *Altorientalische Studien zu Ehren von Pascal Attinger*. Göttingen.
- Mondi, R. (1984) "The Ascension of Zeus and the Composition of Hesiod's *Theogony*" *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 25: 325-44.
- Mondi, R. (1986) "Tradition and Innovation in the Hesiodic Titanomachy" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 116: 26-48.
- Mondi, R. (1990) "Greek Mythic Thought in the Light of the Near East" in Edmunds, L. (ed.) *Approaches to Greek Myth*. 1st ed. Baltimore: 142-98.
- Montana, F. (2015) "Hellenistic Scholarship" in Montanari, F. - Matthaios, S. - Rengakos, A. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship. Vol. 1: History, Disciplinary Profiles*. Leiden: 60-183.
- Montanari, F. - Rengakos, A. - Tsagalis, C. eds. (2009) *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*. Leiden.
- Montanari, F. - Rengakos, A. - Tsagalis, C. eds. (2012) *Homeric Contexts: neoanalysis and the interpretation of oral-poetry*. Berlin.
- Moran, W.L. (1970) "The Creation of Man in Atrahasis I 192-284" *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 200: 48-56 = (2002) 75-86.
- Moran, W.L. (1971) Review of Lambert - Millard (1969), *Biblica* 52: 51-61. = (2002) 33-45.
- Moran, W.L. (1981) "duppuru (dubburu) tuppuru too?" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 33: 44-47.
- Moran, W.L. (1987) "Some Considerations of Form and Interpretation in *Atra-ḥasīs*" in Rochberg-Halton, F. (ed.) *Language, Literature, and History. Philological and Historical Studies Presented to Erica Reiner*. New Haven: 245-55 = (2002) 46-58.
- Moran, W.L. (1988) "Notes on Anzû" *Archiv für Orientforschung* 35: 24-29.
- Moran, W.L. (1991) "The Epic of Gilgamesh: A Document of Ancient Humanism" *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 22: 15-22 = (2002) 5-11.

- Moran, W.L. (1996) "The Epic of Gilgamesh: A Masterpiece from Ancient Mesopotamia" in Sasson, J.M. (ed.): 2327-36 = (2002) 12-22.
- Moran, W.L. (2002) *The Most Magic Word. Essays on Babylonian and Biblical Literature*. (ed. R.S. Hendel). Washington.
- Moran, W.S. (1971) Μιμνήσκομαι in Homer. PhD diss. University of Michigan. Ann Arbor.
- Moran, W.S. (1975) "Μιμνήσκομαι and 'Remembering' Epic Stories in Homer and the Hymns" *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 20: 195-211.
- Morris, I. (1986) "The use and abuse of Homer" *Classical Antiquity* 5: 81-138.
- Morris, I. (1997a) "Periodization and the Heroes: Inventing a Dark Age" in Golden, M. - Toohey, P. (eds.) *Inventing Ancient Culture*. London: 96-131.
- Morris, I. (1997b) "Homer and the Iron Age" in Morris, I. - Powell, B. (eds.): 535-59.
- Morris, I. (2009) "The Eighth-Century Revolution" in Raaflaub, K. - van Wees, H. (eds.): 64-80.
- Morris, I. - Powell, B. eds. (1997) *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden.
- Morris, S. (1989) "A Tale of Two Cities: The Miniature Frescoes from Thera and the Origins of Greek Poetry" *American Journal of Archaeology* 93: 511-35.
- Morris, S. (1992) *Daidalos and the Origin of Greek Art*. Princeton.
- Morris, S. (1997) "Homer and the Near East" in Morris, I. - Powell, B. (eds.): 599-623.
- Morris, S. - Laffineur, R. eds. (2007) *EPOS: Reconsidering Greek Epic and Aegean Bronze Age Archaeology*. Liège.
- Morrison, J.V. (1997) "Kerostasia, the dictates of fate, and the will of Zeus in the *Iliad*" *Arethusa* 30: 273-307.
- Most, G.W. (1989) "Structure and Function of Odysseus' *Apologoi*" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 119: 15-30.
- Most, G.W. (2006) *Hesiod. Vol. 1. Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*. Cambridge, MA.
- Most, G.W. (2007) *Hesiod. Vol. 2. The Shield, Catalogue of Women, Other Fragments*. Cambridge, MA.
- Mouton, A. (2007) *Rêves Hittites. Contribution à une histoire et une anthropologie du rêve en Anatolie ancienne*. Leiden.
- Mueller, M. (2009) *The Iliad*. 2nd ed. London.
- Muellner, L.C. (1996) *The Anger of Achilles. Mēnis in Greek Epic*. Ithaca.
- Mullen, E.T. (1980) *The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature*. Chico, CA.
- von der Mühl, P. (1940) "Odyssee" in *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. 7. Stuttgart: 696-768.
- Müller, J.L.W. (1836) *Homerische Vorschule. Eine Einleitung in das Studium der Ilias und Odyssee*. Zweite aufl. Leipzig.
- Nagler, M.N. (1974) *Spontaneity and Tradition. A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley.
- Nagy, G. (2003) *Homeric Responses*. Austin.
- Nagy, J.F. (2014) "Hierarchy, Heroes and Heads: Indo-European Structures in Greek Myth" in Edmunds, L. (ed.): 200-44.
- Nakamura, M. (2007) "Ein bisher unbekanntes Fragment der hurritischen Fassung des Gilgameš-Epos" in Groddek, D. - Zorman, M. (eds.) *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge. Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: 557-59.
- Newton, R.M. (1987) "Odysseus and Hephaestus in the *Odyssey*" *Classical Journal* 83: 12-20.
- Nikkanen, A. (2015) "A Note on Memory and Reciprocity in Homer's *Odyssey*" <<http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/4616>>
- Niles, J.D. (1979) "On the Design of Hymn to Delian Apollo" *Classical Journal* 75: 36-39.
- Nilsson, M. (1932) *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*. Cambridge.
- Nilsson, M. (1999) "Mycenaean and Homeric Religion" in de Jong, I.J.F. (ed.) *Homer: Critical Assessments*. Vol. 2, London: 369-83 [= Nilsson, M. (1952) *Opuscula Selecta II*. Lund: 683-704 = *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 33 (1936)].
- Nobili, C. (2008) *L'inno omerico a Hermes e le tradizioni poetiche locali*. Milano.
- North, R. (1997) *The Haustlong of Þjóðólfr of Hvinir. Edited with Introduction, Translation, Commentary and Glossary*. London.
- Northrup, M. (1979) "Tartarus Revisited: A Reconsideration of Theogony 711-819" *Wiener Studien* 13: 22-36.

- Novotny, J.R. (2001) *The Standard Babylonian Etana Epic*. Helsinki.
- Nünlist, R. (1998) "Der Homersiche Erzähler und das sogenannte Sukzessionsgesetz" *Museum Helveticum* 55: 1-8.
- Nünlist, R. (2004) "Hesiod" in de Jong, I.J.F. - Nünlist, R. - Bowie, E. (eds.): 25-34.
- Nünlist, R. (2007) "Hesiod" in de Jong, I.J.F. - Nünlist, R. (eds.): 39-52.
- Nurullin, R. (2012) "The name of Gilgameš in the light of line 47 of the first tablet of the Standard Babylonian Gilgameš epic" in Kogan, L. *et al.* (eds.) *Babel und Bibel* 6. Winona Lake: 209-24.
- Oden, R.A. (1981) "Divine Aspiration in Atrahasis and in Genesis 1-11" *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentische Wissenschaft* 93: 197-216.
- del Olmo Lete, G. (1999) "The Offering Lists and God Lists" in Watson, W.G.E. - Whyatt, N. (eds.): 305-54.
- del Olmo Lete, G. (2014) *Canaanite Religion According to the Liturgical Texts of Ugarit. Second English Edition, thoroughly Revised and Enlarged*. transl. W.G.E. Watson. Münster.
- Olson, S.D. (1989) "Odyssey 8: Guile, Force and the Subversive Poetics of Desire" *Arethusa* 22: 135-45.
- Olson, S.D. (1995) *Blood and Iron. Stories and Storytelling in the Odyssey*. Leiden.
- Oppenheim, A.L. (1977) *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization*. Review ed. completed by Erica Reiner. Chicago.
- Ormand, K. (2016) "Divine Perspective and the Plots of Zeus in the Hesiodic Catalogue" in Clauss, J.J. - Cuyppers, M. - Kahane, A. (eds.): 43-59.
- Osborne, R. (2004) "Homer's Society" in Fowler, R. (ed.): 206-19.
- Osborne, R. (2009) *Greece in the Making: 1200-450 BCE*. 2nd revised edition. London.
- Otten, H. (1958) "Die Erste Tafel des hethitischen Gilgameš-Epos" *Instambulische Mitteilungen* 8: 93-125.
- Page, D.L. (1955) *The Homeric Odyssey*. Oxford.
- Palaima, T.G. (2006) "'Wanaks' and related power terms in Mycenaean and later Greek" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. - Lemos, I.S. (eds.): 53-71.
- Pardee, D. (2012) *The Ugaritic Texts and the Origins of West Semitic Literary Composition*. Oxford.
- Parker, L.P.E. (2007) *Euripides, Alcestis. Edited with introduction and commentary by L.P.E. Parker*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. (1991) "The Hymn to Demeter and the Homeric Hymns" *Greece and Rome* 38: 1-17.
- Parker, R. (2011) *On Greek Religion*. Ithaca.
- Parker, S.B. ed. (1997) *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*. Atlanta.
- Parpola, S. - Watanabe, K. (1988) *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*. Helsinki.
- Parry, M. (1936) Review of Arend (1933), *Classical Philology* 31: 357-60 [= (1971) 404-07].
- Parry, M. (1971) *The Making of the Homeric Verse. The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (ed. A. Parry). Oxford.
- Pasquali, G. (1929) "La scoperta dei concetti etici nella Grecia antichissima" *Civiltà Moderna* 1: 343-62 = id. (1935) *Pagine meno stravaganti*. Firenze: 67-90.
- Pattoni, M.P. (1998) "ὃ μοι ἐγὼ (τί πάθω;). Una formula omerica e i suoi contesti" *Aevum antiquum* 11: 5-49.
- Patzek, B. (2003a) "Götter und Helden im Alten Orient und in den homerischen Epen: Homers Ilias und das Gilgameš-Epos" in Heedemann, G. - Winter, E. (eds.) *Neue Forschungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasiens*. Bonn: 1-9.
- Patzek, B. (2003b) "Homer and the Near East: the case of Assyrian historical epic and prose narrative" *Gaia* 7: 63-73.
- Patzek, B. (2011) "Altorientalische 'Textvorlagen' für die Ilias?" in Ulf, C. - Rollinger, R. (eds.): 391-407.
- Patzek, B. (2014) "Die *orientalisierende* Kultur Griechenlands und die homerischen Epen: Kulturelles Lernen jenseits der Peripherie des assyrischen Reiches" in Rollinger, R. - Schnegg, K. (eds.): 383-401.
- Patzer, H. (1990) "Gleichzeitige Ereignisse im homerischen Epos" in Eisenberger, H. (ed.) *Hermeneumata. (Fs. H. Hörner)*. Heidelberg: 153-72.
- Patzer, H. (1991) "Die Reise des Telemach" *Illinois Classical Studies* 16: 17-35.

- Pedersén, O. (1986) *Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur. A Survey of the Material from the German Excavations, Part II*. Uppsala.
- Peigney, J. (2015) "Γαῖα (Gaia) et l'action humaine dans la Théogonie" *Gaia* 18: 187-96.
- Penglase, C. (1994) *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia. Parallels and Influence in the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod*. London.
- Peterson, J. (2011) *Sumerian literary fragments in the University Museum, Philadelphia*. Madrid.
- Peterson, J. (2015) "An archive of simple ledgers featuring the e<sub>2</sub> um-mi-a(k), "House of the Master", at old babylonian Nippur: the daily rosters of a scribal school?" *Aula Orientalis* 33: 79-113.
- Peterson, J. (2017) "A Middle Babylonian Sumerian Fragment of the Adapa Myth from Nippur and an Overview of the Middle Babylonian Sumerian Literary Corpus at Nippur" in Feliu, L. - Karahashi, F. - Rubio, G. (eds.) *The First Ninety Years: A Sumerian Celebration in Honor of M. Civil*. Berlin: 262-83.
- Petriconi, H. (1964) "Das Gilgamesh Epos als Vorbild der Ilias (Der Tod des Helden I)" in Crisafulli, A.S. (ed.) *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Helmut A. Hatzfeld*. Washington, DC: 329-42.
- Pettinato, G. (1968) "Die Bestrafung des Menschengeschlechts durch die Sintflut" *Orientalia* 37: 165-200.
- Pettinato, G. (1970) Review of Lambert - Millard (1969), *Oriens Antiquus* 9: 75-83.
- Pettinato, G. (1994) "Il bicameralismo a Sumer: un topos letterario assunto a realtà storica" *Rendiconti dell'accademia dei Lincei* 9/5: 47-85.
- Pettinato, G. (2001) *Mitologia Sumerica*. Torino.
- Pettinato, G. (2005) *Mitologia Assiro-Babilonese*. Torino.
- Pettinato, G. - Chiodi, S.M. (2000) *Nergal ed Ereškigal. Il poema assiro-babilonese degli Inferi*. Roma.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1968) *History of Classical Scholarship: from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford.
- Philippson, P. (1936) *Genealogie als mythische Form. Studien zur Theogonie des Hesiod*. Oslo. [= Heitsch, E. ed. (1966) *Hesiod*. Darmstadt: 651-87.]
- Picchioni, S.A. (1981) *Il poemetto di Adapa*. Budapest.
- Pironti, G. (2015) "La Gaia di Esiodo: cosmogonia e mito di successione" in Bettini, M. - Pucci, G. (eds.) *Terrantica. Volti, miti e immagini della Terra nell'Antichità*. Milano: 62-79.
- Pironti, G. - Bonnet, C. eds. (2017) *Les dieux d'Homère. Polythéisme et poésie en Grèce ancienne*. Liège.
- Pitard, W.T. (2009) "Canaanite Literature" in Ehrlich, C.S. (ed.): 255-312.
- Podany, A.H. (2010) *Brotherhood of Kings: How International Relations Shaped the Ancient Near East*. Oxford.
- Pollock, S.I. (1991) *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki. An Epic of Ancient India. Volume III: Aranyakāṇḍa. Introduction, Translation and Annotation by S.I. Pollock*. Princeton.
- Pomponio, F. - Visicato, G. (1994) *Early dynastic administrative tablets of Šuruppak*. Napoli.
- Ponchia, S. - Luukko, M. (2013) *The Standard Babylonian myth of Nergal and Ereškigal: introduction, cuneiform text and transliteration with a translation, glossary and commentary*. Helsinki.
- Pongratz-Leisten, B. (1998/2001) "Neujahr(sfest). B. Nach akkadischen Quellen" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 9: 294-98.
- Pongratz-Leisten, B. (2001) "The Other and the Enemy in the Mesopotamian Conception of the World" in Whiting, R.M. (ed.) *Mythology and Mythologies: Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences*. Helsinki: 195-231.
- Pontani, F. (2007-15) *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam*. 3 vols (*I ad libros α-β; II ad γ-δ; III ad ε-ζ*). Roma.
- Poo, M.-C. (2005) *Enemies of Civilization. Attitudes toward foreigners in Ancient Mesopotamia, Egypt and China*. Albany.
- Popham, M.R. (1994) "Precolonization: early Greek contact with the East" in Tsetschladze, G.R. - de Angelis, F. (eds.) *The Archaeology of Greek Colonization*. Oxford: 11-34.

- Porter, J. (1992) "Hermeneutic Lines and Circles: Aristarchus and Crates on the Exegesis of Homer" in Lamberton, R. - Keanney, J.J. (eds.) *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes*. Princeton: 67-114.
- Porter, J. (2011) "Making and Unmaking: The Achaean Wall and the Limits of Fictionality in Homeric Criticism" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 141: 1-36.
- Postgate, J.N. (1995) "Royal Ideology and State administration in Sumer and Akkad" in Sasson, J.M. (ed.): 395-411.
- Pötscher, W. (1990) "Die Götterburleske als Deutungsansatz für die religiöse Weltanschauung des Odyssee-Dichters (*Od.* 8. 266 ff.)" *Grazer Beiträge* 17: 27-47.
- Powell, B. (2007) *Writing and the Origins of Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
- Pucci, P. (1987) *Odysseus Polutropos. Intertextual Readings in the Iliad and the Odyssey*. Ithaca.
- Pucci, P. (2002) "Theology and poetics in the Iliad" *Arethusa* 35: 17-34.
- Pucci, P. (2007) *Inno alle Muse. (Esiodo, Teogonia 1-115)*. Pisa.
- Pucci, P. (2009) "The Poetry of the *Theogony*" in Montanari, F. - Rengakos, A. - Tsagalis, C. (eds.) 37-70.
- Pulley, S. (2000) *Homer Iliad. Book One*. Oxford.
- Raaflaub, K. (1988) "Die Anfänge des politischen Denkens bei den Griechen" in Fetscher, I. - Münkler, H. (eds.) *Pipers Handbuch der Politischen Ideen. Vol. I: Frühe Hochkulturen und europäische Antike*. München: 189-271.
- Raaflaub, K. (1991) "Homer und die Geschichte des 8. Jh.s v. Chr." in Latacz, J. ed. (1991): 205-56.
- Raaflaub, K. (1997) "Homeric Society" in Morris, I. - Powell, B. (eds.): 624-48.
- Raaflaub, K. (1998) "A Historian's Headache: How to Read Homeric Society" in Fisher, N. - van Wees, H. (eds.) *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*. London: 169-93.
- Raaflaub, K. (2000) "Poets, Lawgivers, and the Beginnings of Political Reflection in Archaic Greece" in Rowe, C. - Schofield, M. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Cambridge: 23-59.
- Raaflaub, K. (2006) "Historical Approaches to Homer" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. - Lemos, I.S. (eds.): 449-62.
- Raaflaub, K. (2011a) "Assembly" in Finkelberg, M. (ed.): 104.
- Raaflaub, K. (2011b) "Aus dem Streitwagen des Sängers: die Suche nach einer historischen 'epischen' Gesellschaft" in Ulf, C. - Rollinger, R. (eds.): 341-74.
- Raaflaub, K. (2011c) "Historicity of Homer" in Finkelberg, M. (ed.): 359-61.
- Raaflaub, K. (2011d) "Society, Homeric" in Finkelberg, M. (ed.): 810-13.
- Raaflaub, K. (2016) "Zeus and Prometheus: Greek Adaptations of Ancient Near Eastern Myths" in Halpern, B. - Sacks, K.S. (eds.): 17-37.
- Raaflaub, K. - van Wees, H. eds. (2009) *A Companion to Archaic Greece*. Oxford.
- Radermacher, L. (1931) *Der homerische Hermeshymnos*. Wien.
- Radner, K. (2005) *Die Macht des Namens. Altorientalische Strategien zur Selbsterhaltung*. Wiesbaden.
- Radner, K. - Robson, E. eds. (2011) *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*. Oxford.
- Redfield, J. (1975) *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*. Chicago.
- Reece, S. (1993) *The Stranger's Welcome. Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Ann Arbor.
- Reiner, E. (1985) *Your Thwarts in Pieces, Your Mooring Rope Cut. Poetry from Babylonia and Assyria*. Ann Arbor.
- Reinhardt, K. (1948) *Von Werken und Formen: Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Godesberg.
- Reinhardt, K. (1960) *Tradition und Geist: gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung* (ed. K. Becker). Göttingen.
- Reinhardt, K. (1961) *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* (ed. U. Hölscher). Göttingen.
- Rengakos, A. (1995) "Zeit und Gleichzeitigkeit in den homerischen Epen" *Antike und Abendland* 41: 1-33.
- Rengakos, A. (1998) "Zur Zeitstruktur der Odyssee" *Wiener Studien* 111: 45-56.
- Rengakos, A. (2002) "Zur narrativen Funktion der Telemachie" in Hurst, A. - Létoublon, F. (eds.) *La mythologie et l'«Odysée»: hommage à Gabriel Germain*. Genève: 87-98.

- Rengakos, A. (2009) "Hesiod's Narrative" in Montanari, F. - Tsagalis, C. - Vergados, A. (eds.): 203-18.
- Rengakos, A. (2015) "Aethiopsis" in Fantuzzi, M. - Tsagalis, C. (eds.): 306-17.
- Richardson, N.J. (1974) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Edited by N.J. Richardson. Oxford.
- Richardson, N.J. (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume VI: Books 21-24*. Cambridge.
- Richardson, N.J. (2007) "The Homeric Hymn to Hermes" in Finglass, P.J. - Collard, C. - Richardson, N.J. (eds.) *Hesperos. Studies in Ancient Greek Poetry presented to M.L. West on his Seventieth Birthday*. Oxford: 83-91.
- Richardson, N.J. (2010) *Three Homeric Hymns. To Apollo, Hermes and Aphrodite*. Cambridge.
- Richardson, N.J. (2011) "The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Some Central Questions Revisited" in Faulkner, A. (ed.): 44-58.
- Richardson, N.J. (2015) "Constructing a Hymnic Narrative: Tradition and Innovation in the Longer Homeric Hymns" in Faulkner, A. - Hodkinson, O. (eds.): 19-29.
- Richardson, S. (1990) *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville.
- Ridley, R.T. (2000) "The Saga of an Epic: Gilgamesh and the Constitution of Uruk" *Orientalia* 69: 341-67.
- Riedinger, J.-C. (1976) "Remarques sur la τμή chez Homère" *Revue des études grecques* 89: 244-64.
- Rieken, E. et al. (2009) hethiter.net/: CTH 341.III.3 (TX 2009-08-27).
- Robson, E. (2001) "The tablet house: a scribal school in Old Babylonian Nippur" *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 95: 39-67.
- de Roguin, C-F. (2007) "...et recouvre d'une montagne leur cité!" *La fin du monde des héros dans les épopées homériques*. Göttingen.
- Röllig, W. (1957/71) "Götterzahlen" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 3: 499-500.
- Rollinger, R. (1996) "Altorientalische Motive in der frühgriechischen Literatur am Beispiel der homerischen Epen" in Ulf, C. (ed.) *Wege zur Genese griechischer Identität. Die Bedeutung der früharchaischen Zeit*. Berlin: 156-210.
- Rollinger, R. (2001) "The ancient Greeks and the impact of the ancient Near East: textual evidence and historical perspective (ca. 750-650 BC)" in R.M. Whiting (ed.): 233-64.
- Rollinger, R. (2011) "Homer und der 'Orient'" in Ulf, C. - Rollinger, R. (eds.): 31-43.
- Rollinger, R. (2012) "Altorientalische Einflüsse auf die homerischen Epen" in Rengakos, A. - Zimmermann, B. (eds.) *Homer-Handbuch*. Stuttgart: 213-27.
- Rollinger, R. - Ulf, C. eds. (2004) *Griechische Archaik: interne Entwicklungen, externe Impulse*. Berlin.
- Rollinger, R. - Truschneegg, B. eds. (2006) *Altertum und Mittelmeerraum: Die antike Welt diesseits und jenseits der Levante*. Stuttgart.
- Rollinger, R. - Schnegg, K. eds. (2014) *Kulturkontakte in antiken Welten: vom Denkmodell zum Fallbeispiel*. Leuven.
- Romano Martín, S. (2009) *El tópico grecolatino del concilio de los dioses*. Hildesheim.
- Römer, W.H.P. (1965) *Sumerische 'Königshymnen' der Isin-Zeit*. Leiden.
- Römer, W.H.P. (2001) *Hymnen und Klagelieder in sumerischer Sprache*. Münster.
- Römer, W.H.P. (2010) *Die Zylinderinschriften von Gudea*. Münster.
- Rowe, C.J. (1983) "Archaic Thought in Hesiod" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 103: 124-35.
- Rubio, G. (2000/2005) "On the Orthography of the Sumerian Literary Texts from the Ur III period" *Acta Sumerologica* 22: 203-25.
- Rubio, G. (2005) Review of Launderville (2003), *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 340: 88-90.
- Rubio, G. (2006) "Shulgi and the Death of Sumerian" in Michałowski, P. - Veldhuis, N. (eds.): 167-79.
- Rubio, G. (2009) "Sumerian Literature" in Ehrlich, C.S. (ed.) *From an Antique Land: An Introduction to Ancient Near Eastern Literature*. Lanham: 12-71.
- Rubio, G. (2012) "Reading Sumerian Names, II: Gilgamesh" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 64: 3-16.

- Rubio, G. (2016) "The Inventions of Sumerian: Literature and Artifacts of Identity" in Ryholt, K. - Barjamovic, G. (eds.): 231-70.
- Rudhardt, J. (1981) "À propos de l'Hymne Homérique à Déméter. La répartition des τιμαί, articulation centrale des systèmes mythiques grecs. Le rapt de Perséphone considéré comme un épisode de cette répartition" in Rudhardt, J., *Du mythe, de la religion grecque et de la compréhension d'autrui*. Genève: 227-44. [= *Museum Helveticum* 35 (1978): 1-17].
- Rudhardt, J. (1993) "À propos de l'Hécate hésiodique" *Museum Helveticum* 50: 204-13.
- Rudhardt, J. (1996) "Le préambule de la Théogonie. La vocation du poète, la language des Muses" in Blaise, F. - Judet de la Combe, P. - Russeau, P. (eds.): 25-37.
- Ruhnken, D. (1782) *Epistola Critica I. In Homeridarum Hymnos et Hesiodum ad virum clarissimum Ludov. Casp. Valckenarium*. Lugduni Batavorum. (2nd ed., cf. Càssola 2010: 619).
- Ruijgh, C.J. (2011) "Mycenaean and the Homeric Language" in Duhoux, Y. - Morpurgo-Davies, A. (eds.) *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World*. Vol. 2, Leuven: 252-98.
- Russo, J.A. (1968) "Homer Against his Tradition" *Arion* 7: 275-95.
- Rüter, K. (1969) *Odyseeinterpretationen: Untersuchungen zum 1. Buch und zur Phaiakis*. Göttingen.
- Rutherford, I.C. (2009) "Hesiod and the literary traditions of the Near East" in Montanari, F. - Rengakos, A. - Tsagalis, C. (eds.): 9-35.
- Rutherford, I.C. (2012) "The 'Catalogue of Women' within Greek epic tradition: allusion, intertextuality and traditional referentiality" In Andersen, Ø. - Haug, D. (eds.): 152-67.
- Rutherford, I.C. ed. (2015) *Graeco-Egyptian Interactions: Literature, Translation and Culture, ca. 500 BC - AD 300*. Oxford.
- Rutherford, R.B. (1986) "The Philosophy of the *Odyssey*" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106: 145-62.
- Rutherford, R.B. (2013) *Homer*. 2nd ed. Cambridge.
- Ryholt, K. - Barjamovic, G. eds. (2016) *Problems of Canonicity and Identity Formation in Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia*. Copenhagen.
- Saggs, H.W.F. (1986) "Additions to Anzu" *Archiv für Orientforschung* 33: 1-29.
- Saïd, S. (1977) "Les Combats de Zeus et le problème des interpolations dans la Théogonie d'Hésiode" *Revue des Études Grecques* 90: 183-210.
- Saïd, S. (2011) *Homer and the Odyssey*. Oxford.
- Sallaberger, W. (1997) "Nippur als religiöses Zentrum Mesopotamiens im historischen Wandel" in Wilhelm, G. (ed.) *Die orientalische Stadt: Kontinuität, Wandel, Bruch*. Saarbrücken: 147-68.
- Sallaberger, W. (1998/2001) "Neujahr(sfest). A. Nach sumerischen Quellen" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 9: 291-94.
- Sallaberger, W. (2004a) "Pantheon. A. I. In Mesopotamien" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 10: 294-308.
- Sallaberger, W. (2004b) "Das Ende des Sumerischen. Tod und Nachleben einer altmesopotamischen Sprache" in Schrijver, P. - Mumm, P.A. (eds.) *Sprachtod und Sprachgeburt*. Bremen: 108-40.
- Sallaberger, W. (2008) *Das Gilgamesch-Epos: Mythos, Werk und Tradition*. München.
- Sallaberger, W. (2011) "Sumerian Language Use at Garšana. On Orthography, Grammar, and Akkado-Sumerian Bilingualism" in Owen, D.I. (ed.) *Garšana Studies*. Bethesda: 335-72.
- Sallaberger, W. (2012) "Der Tod des göttlichen Königs. Die Krise des Menschenbilds in altbabylonischer Zeit" in Fieger, M. - Weder, M. (eds.) *Krankheit und Sterben. Ein interprofessioneller Dialog*. Berlin: 245-71.
- Salvini, M. (1988) "Die Hurritische Überlieferung des Gilgameš-Epos und der Kešši Erzählung" in Haas, V. (ed.) *Hurriter und Hurritisch*. Konstanz: 157-72.
- Salvini, M. - Wegner, I. (2004) *Die mythologischen Texte*. Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler I/6. Roma.
- Samet, N. (2014) *The Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur*. Bethesda.
- Sanders, S.L. ed. (2006) *Margins of Writing, Origins of Culture: New Approaches to Writing and Reading in the Ancient Near East*. Chicago.
- Saporetti, C. (1994) "Appunti sul poemetto 'Nergal ed Ereškigal'" *Orientalis Antiqui Miscellanea* 1: 25-38.

- Šašková, K. - Pecha, L. - Charvát, P. eds. (2010) *Shepherds of the black-headed people: the royal office vis-à-vis godhead in ancient Mesopotamia*. Plzen.
- Sassmannshausen, L. (2008) "Babylonische Schriftkultur des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. in den Nachbarländern und im östlichen Mittelmeerraum" *Aula Orientalis* 26: 263-93.
- Sassmannshausen, L. - Neumann, G. eds. (2014) *He Has Opened Nisaba's House of Learning: Studies in Honor of Åke Waldemar Sjöberg on the Occasion of His 89th Birthday on August 1st 2013*. Leiden.
- Sasson, J.M. ed. (1995) *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*. 4 vols. New York.
- Sbardella, L. (1994) "Tracce di un epos di Eracle nei poemi omerici" *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 33: 145-62.
- Scarpi, P. (1976) *Lecture sulla religione classica: l'inno omerico a Demeter*. Padova.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1938) *Iliasstudien*. Leipzig.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1958) "Der Prolog der Odyssee" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 63: 15-32.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1959) *Von Homers Welt und Werk. Aufsätze und Auslegungen zur homerischen Frage*. Stuttgart.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1960) "Der Helios-Zorn in der Odyssee" in Rostagni, A. et al. (eds.) *Studi in onore di L. Castiglioni*. Firenze: 859-76.
- Schäfer, M. (1990) *Der Götterstreit in der Ilias*. Stuttgart.
- Schlesier, R. (1982) "Les Muses dans le prologue de la "Théogonie" d'Hésiode" *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 199: 131-67.
- Schmidt, B.B. ed. (2015) *Contextualizing Israel's Sacred Writings: Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production in the Southern Levant*. Atlanta.
- Schmidt, J.-U. (1988-89) "Die Aufrichtung der Zeusherrschaft als Modell. Überlegungen zur Theogonie des Hesiod" *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 14: 39-68; 15: 17-37.
- Schmidt, J.-U. (1996) "Schuld der Opfer, Versagen der Führung oder Grausamkeit der Götter? Der Rinderfrevler auf Thrinakia und die theologischen Intentionen des Odysseedichters" *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 21: 49-77.
- Schmidt, J.-U. (2001) "Die Gestaltungen des Athridenmythos und die Intentionen des Odysseedichters" *Hermes* 129: 158-72.
- Schmidt, J.-U. (2003) "Die sogenannte Telemachie und die Theologischen Intentionen des Odysseedichters" *Wort und Dienst* 27: 71-86.
- Schmidt, M. (2006) "Some remarks on the semantics of ἄναξ in Homer" in Deger-Jalkotzy, S. - Lemos, I.S. (eds.): 439-47.
- Schneibner, G. (1967) "Klassische Dichtung im Alten Orient und in der Antike: Gilgamesh Epos und Homer" in Doehle, B. - Nickel, H.L. (eds.) *Das Probleme der Klassik im alten Orient und in der Antike*. Halle: 124-40.
- Schott, A. (1958) *Das Gilgameš Epos. Neu übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Albert Schott, durchgesehen und ergänzt von Wolfram von Soden*. Stuttgart.
- Schwabl, H. (1966) *Hesiods Theogonie: eine unitarische Analyse*. Köln.
- Schwabl, H. (1970) "Hesiod" in *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, suppl. 12: 434-86.
- Schwemer, D. (2001) *Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen*. Wiesbaden.
- Schwenn, F. (1934) *Die Theogonie des Hesiods*. Heidelberg.
- Scodel, R. (1982) "The Achaean Wall and the Myth of Destruction" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 86: 33-50.
- Scodel, R. (2007) "The Gods' Visit to the Aethiopians in Iliad 1" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 103: 83-98.
- Scodel, R. (2008a) *Epic Facework. Self-presentation and social interaction in Homer*. Swansea.
- Scodel, R. (2008b) "Zielinki's Law Reconsidered" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 138: 107-25.
- Scully, S. (1984) "The Language of Achilles: the OXΘΗΣΑΣ Formulas" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 114: 11-24.

- Scully, S. (2015) *Hesiod's Theogony: from Near Eastern Creation Myths to Paradise Lost*. Oxford.
- Scully, S. (2016) "The Theogony and Enuma Elish: City-States Creation Myths" in Halpern, B. - Sacks, K.S. (eds.): 38-59.
- Scurlock, J. - Beal, R.H. eds. (2013) *Creation and Chaos. A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaaskampf Hypothesis*. Winona Lake.
- Searle, J.R. (1975) "A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts" in Gunderson, K. (ed.) *Language, Mind, and Knowledge*. Minneapolis: 344-69.
- von See, K. et al. (1997-) *Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda*. 7 vols. Wiesbaden.
- von See, K. et al. (1997) *Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda*. Bd. 2 *Götterlieder (Skírnismál, Hárbardðlióð, Hymiskviða, Lokasenna, Prymskviða)*. Wiesbaden.
- von See, K. et al. (2000) *Kommentar zu den Liedern der Edda*. Bd. 3 *Götterlieder (Völundarkviða, Alvíssmál, Baldrs draumar, Rígsþula, Hyndlolióð, Grottasǫngr)*. Wiesbaden.
- Sefati, Y. et al. eds. (2005) "An Experienced Scribe who Neglects Nothing". *Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein*. Bethesda.
- Segal, C. (1971a) *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad*. Leiden.
- Segal, C. (1971b) "Nestor and the Honour of Achilles" *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 13: 90-105.
- Segal, C. (1981) "Orality, Repetition and Formulaic Artistry in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*" in Brillante, C. - Cantilena, M. - Pavese, C.O. (eds.): 107-62.
- Segal, C. (1992) "Divine Justice in the *Odyssey*: Poseidon, Cyclops and Helios" *American Journal of Philology* 113: 489-518.
- Sellschopp, I. (1934) *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod*. Hamburg.
- Selz, G.J. (1992) "Enlil und Nippur nach präargonischen Quellen" in de Jong Ellis, M. (ed.): 189-225.
- Selz, G.J. (1997) "The holy drum, the spear and the harp" in Finkel, I.L. - Geller, M.J. (eds.) *Sumerian Gods and Their Representations*. Groningen: 167-213.
- Selz, G.J. (1998) "Über mesopotamische Herrschaftskonzepte. Zu den Ursprüngen mesopotamischer Herrscherideologie im 3. Jahrtausend" in Balke, T.E. et al. (eds.): *dubsar anta-men. Studien zur Altorientalistik* (Fs. W.H.Ph. Römer). Münster: 281-344.
- Selz, G.J. (2008) "The divine prototypes" in Brisch, N. (ed.) 13-32.
- Selz, G.J. (2012) "Götter der Gesellschaft - Gesellschaft der Götter. Zur Dialektik von Abbildung und Ordnung" in Neumann, H. - Paulus, S. (eds.) *Wissenskultur im Alten Orient. Weltanschauung, Wissenschaften, Techniken, Technologien*. Wiesbaden: 61-85.
- Seminara, S. (2001) *La versione accadica del lugal-e: la tecnica babilonese della traduzione dal sumero e le sue regole*. Roma.
- Seri, A. (2005) *Local Power in Old Babylonian Mesopotamia*. London.
- Seri, A. (2012) "The role of creation in *Enūma eliš*" *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 12: 4-29.
- Seri, A. (2014) "Borrowings to Create Anew: Intertextuality in the Babylonian Poem of "Creation" (*Enūma eliš*)" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 134: 89-106.
- Seux, M.-J. (1980/83) "Königtum" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 6: 140-73.
- Shai, G. (2015) *Hittite Scribal Circles: Scholarly Tradition and Writing Habits*. Wiesbaden.
- Shear, I.M. (2004) *Kingship in the Mycenaean World and its Reflections in the Oral Tradition*. Philadelphia.
- Shehata, D. (2001) *Annotierte Bibliographie zum altbabylonischen Atramḫasīs Mythos Inūma ilū awīlum*. Göttingen.
- Shehata, D. (2009) *Musiker und ihr vokales Repertoire: Untersuchungen zu Inhalt und Organisation von Musikerberufen und Liedgattungen in altbabylonischer Zeit*. Göttingen.
- Sherratt, S. - Bennett, J. eds. (2017) *Archaeology and Homeric Epic*. Oxford.
- Siegelová, J. (1970) "Ein Hethitisches Fragment des Atra-Ḫasīs Epos" *Archiv Orientální* 38: 135-39.
- Singer, I. (1996) *Muwatalli's prayer to the assembly of gods through the storm-god of lightning (CTH 381)*. Atlanta.

- Singer, I. (1999) "A Political History of Ugarit" in Watson, W.G.E. - Wyatt, N. (eds.): 603-733.
- Sjöberg, Å. (1957/71) "Götterreisen. A. Nach sumerischen Texten" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 3: 480-83.
- Sjöberg, Å. (1973) "Miscellaneous Sumerian hymns" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 63: 1-55.
- Sjöberg, Å. (1975) "in-nin šà-gur<sub>4</sub>-ra: A Hymn to the Goddess Inanna by the en-Priestess Enheduanna" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 65: 161-253.
- Sjöberg, Å. (1976) "The Old Babylonian Eduba" in Lieberman, S.J. (ed.): 159-79.
- Sjöberg, Å. (1977) "Miscellaneous Sumerian Texts, II." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 29: 3-45.
- Sjöberg, Å. (1988) "A Hymn to Inana and her Self-Praise" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 40: 165-86.
- Slatkin, L. (1991) *The Power of Thetis. Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad*. Berkeley.
- Smith, M.S. (1997) "The Baal Cycle" in Parker, S.B. (ed.): 81-180.
- Smith, M.S. (2014) *Poetic Heroes. Literary Commemorations of Warriors and Warrior Culture in the Early Biblical World*. Grand Rapids, MI.
- Smith, M.S. - Pitard, W.T. (2009) *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle Volume II. Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU/CAT 1.3-1.4*. Leiden.
- Snell, B. et al. eds. (1955-2010) *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. 3 vols. Göttingen.
- Snell, D.C. ed. (2005) *A Companion to the Ancient Near East*. Oxford.
- Snodgrass, A.M. (1974) "An Historical Homeric Society?" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 94: 114-25.
- Snodgrass, A.M. (2000) *The Dark Age of Greece. An archaeological survey of the eleventh to the eighth centuries BC*. Edinburgh. (repr. 1971).
- von Soden, W. (1971) "Etemenanki vor Asarhaddon nach der Erzählung vom Turmbau zu Babel und dem Erra-Mythos" *Ugarit-Forschungen* 3: 253-63.
- von Soden, W. (1976) "Bemerkungen zum Adapa-Mythos" in Eichler, B. et al. (eds.) *Kramer Anniversary Volume: Cuneiform Studies in Honor of Samuel Noah Kramer*. Kevelaer: 427-33.
- von Soden, W. (1978) "Die erste Tafel des altbabylonischen Atramḥasīs-Mythos. 'Haupttext' und Parallelversionen" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 68: 50-94.
- von Soden, W. (1979) "Konflikte und Ihre Bewältigung in babylonischen Schöpfungs- und Fluterzählungen. Mit einer Teil-Übersetzung des Atramḥasis-Mythos" *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 111: 1-33.
- von Soden, W. (1987) Review of Bottéro, J. (1985) *Mythes et rites de Babylone*. Paris, *Archiv für Orientforschung* 34: 66-69.
- von Soden, W. (1994) "Der alt-babylonische Atramḥasīs-Mythos" in Hecker, K. et al. (eds.) *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten-Testaments*. III, 4. Gütersloh: 612-45.
- Solans, B. (2014) *Poderes colectivos en la Siria del Bronce Final*. Barcelona.
- van Soldt, W.H. (2011) "The Role of Babylon in Western Peripheral Education" Cancik-Kirschbaum, E. - van Ess, M. - Marzahn, J. (eds.): 197-211.
- Solmsen, F. (1949) *Hesiod and Aeschylus*. Ithaca.
- Sommerfeld, W. (1982) *Der Aufstieg Marduks. Die Stellung Marduks in der babylonischen Religion des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr.* Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Sonik, K. (2012) "The Tablet of Destinies and the Transmission of Power in Enūma eliš" in Wilhelm, G. (ed.): 387-95.
- Spar, I. - Lambert, W.G. (2005) *Cuneiform Texts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art II*. New York.
- Stallbaum, G. (1825-26) *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*. 2 vols. Leipzig. (repr. 1970 Hildesheim).
- Stefanini, R. (1969) "Enkidu's Dream in the Hittite 'Gilgamesh'" *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 28: 40-47.
- Steiner, G. (1982) "Der Gegensatz 'Eigenes Land': 'Ausland, Fremdland, Feindland' in der Vorstellung des Alten Orients" in Kühne, H. et al. (eds.) *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn*. Berlin: 633-64.
- Steinkeller, P. (1993) "Early Political Development in Mesopotamia and the Origins of the Sargonic Empire" in Liverani, M. (ed.) *Akkad: The First World Empire: Structure, Ideology, Traditions*. Padova: 107-29.

- Steinkeller, P. (1994) Review of Marzahn, J. (1991) *Altsumerische Verwaltungstexte aus Girsu/Lagaš*. Berlin, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 115: 540-43.
- Steinkeller, P. (2017) *History, Texts and Art in Early Babylonia: Three Essays*. Berlin.
- Stella, L.A. (1955) *Il poema di Ulisse*. Firenze.
- Stella, L.A. (1978) *Tradizione micenea e poesia nell'Iliade*. Roma.
- Stoddard, K. (2004) *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod*. Leiden.
- Stoevesandt, M. (2008) *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar (Basler Kommentar / BK) herausgegeben von Anton Bierl und Joachim Latacz. Band IV: 6 Gesang. Faszikel II.2 Kommentar*. München.
- Streck, M.P. (1998/2001) "Ninurta/Ningirsu" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 9: 512-22.
- Streck, M.P. (2002) "Die Prologe der sumerischen Epen" *Orientalia* 71: 189-266.
- Streck, M.P. (2010) "Notes on the Old Babylonian Hymns of Agušaya" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130: 561-71.
- Studevent-Hickman, B. (2010) "Language, Speech, and the Death of Anzû" in Stackert, J. et al. (eds.) *Gazing on the Deep. Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Tzvi Abusch*. Bethesda: 273-92.
- Suc Kee, M. (2003) *A Study of the Heavenly Council in the Ancient Near Eastern Texts, and Its Employment as a Type-scene in the Hebrew Bible*. PhD diss. University of Manchester.
- Suc Kee, M. (2007) "The Heavenly Council and Its Type-Scene" *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31: 259-73.
- Suerbaum, W. (1968) "Die Ich- Erzählungen des Odysseus. Überlegungen zur epischen Technik der Odyssee" *Poetica* 2: 150-77.
- Synodinou, K. (1987) "The Threats of Physical Abuse of Hera in the Iliad" *Wiener Studien* 100: 13-22.
- Taplin, O. (1992) *Homeric Soundings: the Shaping of the Iliad*. Oxford.
- Thalmann, W.G. (1984) *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Baltimore.
- van Thiel, H. (1991) *Homeri Odyssea. Recognovit Helmut van Thiel*. Hildesheim.
- van Thiel, H. (2014) *Scholia D in Iliadem. Proecdosis aucta et correctior 2014 secundum codices manu scriptos edita ab Helmut van Thiel*. Köln (electronic resource <<http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/id/eprint/5586>>).
- Thomas, O. (2011) "The Homeric Hymn to Pan" in Faulkner, A. (ed.): 151-72.
- Thomas, O. (2017) "Sparring Partners: Fraternal Relations in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes" in Bassino, P. - Canevaro, L.G. - Graziosi, B. (eds.): 62-83.
- Thompson, S. (1955) *Motif-index of folk-literature: a classification of narrative elements in folktales, ballads, myths, fables, medieval romances, exempla, fabliaux, jest-books, and local legends. Revised and enlarged edition*. Vol. 1, Copenhagen.
- Thomsen, M.L. (1984) *The Sumerian Language: an Introduction to its History and Grammatical Structure*. Copenhagen.
- Thureau-Dangin, F. (1921) *Rituel Accadiens*. Paris.
- Thureau-Dangin, F. (1925) "Un hymne à Ištar" *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 22: 169-77.
- Tigay, J.H. (1977) "Was There an Integrated Gilgamesh Epic in the Old Babylonian Period?" de Jong Ellis, M. (ed.) *Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein*. Hamden: 215-18.
- Tigay, J.H. (1982) *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*. Philadelphia.
- Tinney, S. (1996) *The Nippur Lament*. Philadelphia.
- Tinney, S. (1999) "On the Curricular Setting of Sumerian Literature" *Iraq* 61: 159-72.
- Tinney, S. (2011) "Tablets of Schools and Scholars: A Portrait of the Old Babylonian Corpus" in Radner, K. - Robson, E. (eds.): 577-96.
- Tischler, J. (1994) *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar. III.10 T,D /3. Mit Beiträgen von Günter Neumann und Erich Neu*. Innsbruck.
- Tonussi, M. (2007) *Dall'Eufrate allo Scamandro. Contatti e scambi nel III millennio a.C.* Padova.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, S. (1998) *Comparative Literature. Theory, Method, Application*. Amsterdam.
- Troxler, H. (1964) *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods*. Zurich.

- Tsagalis, C. (2008) *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics*. Washington, D.C.
- Tsagalis, C. (2009) "Poetry and Poetics in the Hesiodic Corpus" in Montanari, F. - Rengakos, A. - Tsagalis, C. (eds.): 131-79.
- Tsagalis, C. (2016) "The Gods in Cyclic Epic" in Clauss, J.J. - Cuypers, M. - Kahane, A. (eds.): 95-117.
- Tsagarakis, O. (1977) *Nature and Background of Major Concepts of divine power in Homer*. Amsterdam.
- Ulf, C. (1990) *Die homerische Gesellschaft: Materialien zur analytischen Beschreibung und historischen Lokalisierung*. München.
- Ulf, C. (2009) "The World of Homer and Hesiod" in Raaflaub, K. - van Wees, H. (eds.): 81-99.
- Ulf, C. (2014) "Rethinking Cultural Contacts" in Rollinger, R. - Schnegg, K. (eds.): 509-64 [= *Ancient West and East* 8 (2009): 81-132].
- Ulf, C. - Rollinger, R. eds. (2011) *Lag Troia in Kilikien? Der aktuelle Streit um Homers Ilias*. Darmstadt.
- Vacín, L. (2015) "Tradition and Innovation in Šulgi's Concept of Divine Kingship" in Archi, A. (ed.) *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient Near East*. Winona Lake: 179-92.
- van der Valk, M. (1971-87) *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes, ad fidem codicis Laurentiani edidit Marchinus van der Valk*. Leiden. 4 vols.
- Van De Mieroop, M. (1997) *The Ancient Mesopotamian City*. Oxford.
- Van De Mieroop, M. (2010) *The Eastern Mediterranean in the Age of Ramesses II*. Oxford.
- Van De Mieroop, M. (2016) *A History of the Ancient Near East, ca. 3000-323 BC*. 3rd ed. Chichester.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1986) "Some Thoughts on Genre in Mesopotamian Literature" in Hecker, K. - Sommerfeld, W. (eds.): 1-11.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1987) "Un carrè d'amour sumérien, or Ways to Win a Woman" in Durand, J.-M. (ed.) *La femme dans le Proche-Orient antique*. Paris: 163-78.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1992) "Repetition and Structure in the Aratta Cycle: Their Relevance for the Orality Debate" in Vogelzang, M.E. - Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (eds.): 247-64.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1998) "Reflections on the dream of Lugalbanda (A typological and interpretative analysis of LH 322-365)" in Prosecký, J. (ed.) *Intellectual Life of the Ancient Near East*. Prague: 397-412.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (1999) "De Enki-Administratie, of waarom de wereld zo in elkaar zit" *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 77: 5-51.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (2002) "Sanctus Lugalbanda" in Abusch, T. (ed.): 259-90.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (2003a) *Epics of Sumerian Kings: The Matter of Aratta*. Ann Arbor.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (2003b) "The Old Babylonian Literary Canon" in Dorleijin, G.J. - Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (eds.): 1-28.
- Veldhuis, N. (2001) "The Solution of a Dream: a New Interpretation of Bilgames' Death" *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 53: 133-48.
- Veldhuis, N. (2003) "Sumerian Literature" in Dorleijin, G.J. - Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (eds.): 29-43.
- Veldhuis, N. (2004) *Religion, Literature, and Scholarship: The Sumerian Composition Nanše and the Birds. With a Catalogue of Sumerian Bird Names*. Leiden.
- Vergados, A. (2011) "The Homeric Hymn to Hermes, Humour and Epiphany" in Faulkner, A. (ed.): 82-104.
- Vergados, A. (2013) *The 'Homeric Hymn to Hermes' Introduction, Text and Commentary*. Berlin.
- Vernant, J.-P. (1963) "Hestia-Hermès. Sur l'expression religieuse de l'espace et du mouvement chez les Grecs" *L'Homme. Revue française d'anthropologie* 3: 12-50. [= id. (1985) *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs. Études de psychologie historique. Nouvelle édition revue et augmentée*. Paris: 154-201].
- Vernant, J.-P. (1974) "Raisons du mythe" in id., *Mythe et société en grèce ancienne*. Paris: 195-250.
- Vernant, J.-P. (1979) "Manger au pays du Soleil" in Detienne, M. - Vernant, J.-P., *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec*. Paris: 239-49.

- Versnel, H.S. (2011) *Coping with the Gods. Wayward Readings in Greek Theology*. Leiden.
- Versnel, H.S. (2014) "What's Sauce for the Goose is Sauce for the Gander: Myth and Ritual, Old and New" in Edmunds, L. (ed.): 86-151.
- Vetta, M. (1994) "La saga di Gilgamesh e l'epica greca fino all'arcaismo" *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 47: 7-20.
- Viano, M. (2016) *The Reception of Sumerian Texts in the Western Periphery*. Venezia.
- Vidal-Naquet, P. (1983) "Valeurs religieuses et mythiques de la terre et du sacrifice dans l'*Odyssee*" in id. *Le Chasseur noir. Formes de pensée et formes de société dans le monde grec*. Paris: 39-68.
- Vogelzang, M.E. (1986) "'Kill Anzû': On a Point of Literary Evolution" in Hecker, K. - Sommerfeld, W. (eds.): 61-70.
- Vogelzang, M.E. (1988) *BIN ŠAR DADMĒ: Edition and Analysis of the Akkadian Anzû Poem*. Groningen.
- Vogelzang, M.E. - Vanstiphout, H.L.J. eds. (1992) *Mesopotamian Epic Literature: Oral or Aural?* Lampeter.
- Volk, K. (1995) *Inanna und Šukaletuda: zur historisch-politischen Deutung eines sumerischen Literaturwerkes*. Wiesbaden.
- Volk, K. (2000) "Edubba'a und Edubba'a-Literatur: Rätsel und Lösungen" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 90: 1-30.
- Volk, K. ed. (2015) *Erzählungen aus dem Land Sumer*. Wiesbaden.
- Vox, O. (1984) "L'onore regale: Zeus neonato e i re musaici della Teogonia" *Materiali e Discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 12: 163-67.
- Waetzoldt, H. - Cavigneaux, A. (2009) "Schule" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 12: 294-309.
- Wagensonner, K. (2007) "Götterreise oder Herrscherreise oder vielleicht beides?" *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 97: 541-59.
- Wagner, R. (1891) *Epitoma Vaticana ex Apollodori Bibliotheca. Accedunt Curae Mythographae de Apollodori fontibus*. Lipsiae.
- Wagner-Hasel, B. (1988) "Geschlecht und Gabe: zum Brautgütersystem bei Homer" *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 105: 32-73.
- Walcot, P. (1958) "Hesiod's Hymns to the Muses, Aphrodite, Styx, and Hecate" *Symbolae Osloenses* 34: 5-14.
- Walcot, P. (1969) "The comparative study of Greek and Ugaritic literatures" *Ugarit-Forschungen* 1: 111-18.
- Walcot, P. (1970) "The comparative study of Greek and Ugaritic literatures II" *Ugarit-Forschungen* 2: 273-75.
- Walcot, P. (1972) "The comparative study of Greek and Ugaritic literatures III" *Ugarit-Forschungen* 4: 129-32.
- Watson, W.G.E. (1999) "Ugaritic Poetry" in Watson, W.G.E. - Wyatt, N. (eds.): 165-92.
- Watson, W.G.E. - Wyatt, N. eds. (1999) *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Leiden.
- Wazana, N. (2008) "Anzu and Ziz: Great Mythical Birds in Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Rabbinic Traditions" *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 31: 111-35.
- Webster, T.B.L. (1956) "Homer and Eastern Poetry" *Minos* 4: 104-16.
- Webster, T.B.L. (1958) *From Mycenae to Homer*. London.
- Weeden, M. (2011a) *Hittite logograms and Hittite scholarship*. Wiesbaden.
- Weeden, M. (2011b) "Adapting to New Contexts: Cuneiform in Anatolia" in Radner, K. - Robson, E. (eds.): 597-17.
- van Wees, H. (1992) *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History*. Amsterdam.
- van Wees, H. (1999) "Homer and Early Greece" in de Jong, I.G.F. (ed.): 1-32.
- van Wees, H. (2011) "Kingship" in Finkelberg, M. (ed.): 436-38.
- Wehr, O. (2006) "The Judgment of Paris in Homer: re-examining *Iliad* 8,448-452 and 24,27-30" *Journal of Ancient Civilization* 21: 41-60.
- Wencel, M. (2015) "'The place of the native lords': notes on gi<sub>7</sub>, ki-en-gi and the DN<sup>d</sup> nin-ki-en-gi-ŠE<sub>3</sub>" *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2015/4: 149-52.

- West, M.L. (1966) *Hesiod, Theogony. Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary by M.L. West.* Oxford.
- West, M.L. (1966b) "Conjectures on 46 Greek Poets" *Philologus* 110: 147-68.
- West, M.L. (1978) *Hesiod, Works and Days. Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary by M.L. West.* Oxford.
- West, M.L. (1975) "Cynaethus' Hymn to Apollo" *Classical Quarterly* 25: 161-70.
- West, M.L. (1988) "The Rise of Greek Epic" *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108: 151-77.
- West, M.L. (1989) "An Unrecognised Injunctive Usage in Greek" *Glotta* 67: 135-38.
- West, M.L. (1996) Review of Penglase (1994), *Gnomon* 68: 657-62.
- West, M.L. (1997) *The East Face of Helicon: West-Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth.* Oxford.
- West, M.L. (1998-2000) *Homerus, Ilias. Recensuit, testimonia congressit M.L. West.* Lipsiae.
- West, M.L. (2000) "The gardens of Alcinoos and the oral dictated text theory" *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 40: 479-88.
- West, M.L. (2001) *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad.* Leipzig.
- West, M.L. (2003) *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer, edited and translated by M.L. West.* Cambridge, MA.
- West, M.L. (2007) *Indo-European Poetry and Myth.* Oxford.
- West, M.L. (2011) *The Making of the Iliad. Disquisition and Analytical Commentary.* Oxford.
- West, M.L. (2013) *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics.* Oxford.
- West, M.L. (2014) *The Making of the Odyssey.* Oxford.
- West, S.R. (1981) = Heubeck, A. - West, S.R. - Previtiera, A. (1981).
- West, S.R. (1988) = Heubeck, A. - West, S.R. - Hainsworth, J.B. (1988).
- Westenholz, A. (2002) "The Sumerian City-State" in Hansen, M.H. (ed.) *A Comparative Study of Six City-State Cultures.* Copenhagen: 23-42.
- Westenholz, A. (2010) "Enki and Ninmah: an Interpretation" in Horowitz, W. - Gabbay, U. - Vukosavovic, F. (eds.) *Woman of Valor. Jerusalem Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Joan Goodnick Westenholz.* Madrid: 201-04.
- Westenholz, J.G. (1992) "Oral Traditions and Written Texts in the Cycle of Akkade" in Vogelzang, M.E. - Vanstiphout, H.L.J. (eds.): 123-54.
- Westenholz, J.G. (1998) "The King, the Emperor, and the Empire: Continuity and Discontinuity of Royal Representation in Text and Image" in Aro, S. - Whiting, R.M. (eds.) *The Heirs of Assyria.* Helsinki: 99-125.
- Westenholz, J.G. (2007) "Inanna and Ishtar in the Babylonian World" in Leick, G. (ed.) *The Babylonian World.* London: 332-47.
- Westenholz, J.G. (2013) "Plethora of Female Deities" in Asher-Greeve, J.M. - Westenholz, J.G. (eds.): 29-135.
- Westenholz, J.G. (2014) "The Ear and Its Wisdom" in Sassmannshausen, L. - Neumann, G. (eds.): 281-97.
- Whitaker, R.E. (1969) *A Formulaic Analysis of Ugaritic poetry.* PhD diss. Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Whiting, R.M. ed. (2001) *Mythology and Mythologies: Methodological Approaches to Intercultural Influences.* Helsinki
- Whitman, C.H. - Scodel, R. (1981) "Sequence and Simultaneity in *Iliad* N, Ξ, O" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 75: 1-15.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. (1916) *Die Ilias und Homer.* Berlin.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1927) *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus: neue homerische Untersuchungen.* Berlin.
- Wilcke, C. (1969) *Das Lugalbandaepos.* Wiesbaden.
- Wilcke, C. (1974) "Zum Königtum der Ur-III Zeit" in Garelli, P. - Thureau-Dangin, F. (eds.) *Le palais et la royauté. Archéologie et civilisation.* Paris: 177-232.
- Wilcke, C. (1975) "Politische Opposition nach sumerischen Quellen: Der Konflikt zwischen Königtum und Ratsversammlung. Literaturwerke als politische Tendenzschriften" in Finet, A. (ed.): 37-65.

- Wilcke, C. (1976) "Formale Gesichtspunkte in der sumerischen Literatur" in Lieberman, S.J. (ed.): 205-316.
- Wilcke, C. (1976/80) "Inanna/Ištar (*Mesopotamien*)" in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 5: 74-87.
- Wilcke, C. (1977) "Die Anfänge der akkadischen Epen" *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 67: 153-216.
- Wilcke, C. (1993) "Politik im Spiegel der Literatur, Literatur als Mittel der Politik im älteren Babylonien" in Raaflaub, K. - Müller-Luchner, E. (eds.) *Anfänge politischen Denkens in der Antike, die nahöstlichen Kulturen und die Griechen*. München: 29-75.
- Wilcke, C. (1997) "Kleine Notizen zu Atram-ḫašīs" *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 1997/4: 112-15.
- Wilcke, C. (1999) "Weltuntergang als Anfang. Theologische, anthropologische, politisch-historische und ästhetische Ebenen der Interpretation der Sintflutgeschichte im babylonischen Atram-ḫašīs-epos" in Jones, A. (ed.) *Weltende, Beiträge zur Kultur- und Religionswissenschaft*. Wiesbaden: 63-112.
- Wilcke, C. (2000) "Vergegenwärtigung des Schreckens um 2000 vor Christus. Strategien verbaler Bewältigung kollektiver Vernichtung in sumerischen Klagegedichten" in Hoffmann, D. (ed.) *Vermächtnis der Abwesenheit. Spuren traumatisierender Ereignisse in der Kunst*. Rehbürg-Loccum: 65-80.
- Wilcke, C. (2004) "Der Schluß von "Gilgamesh's Tod" in der Version von Me-Turan (Tall Haddad)" *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 2004/4: 99-101.
- Wilcke, C. (2007) *Early Ancient Near Eastern Law: A History of Its Beginnings (The Early Dynastic and Sargonic Periods)*. 2nd revised ed. Winona Lake.
- Wilcke, C. (2012) *The Sumerian Poem Enmerkar and En-suḫkeš-ana: Epic, Play, Or? Stage Craft at the Turn of the Third to the Second Millennium B.C. With a Score-Edition and a Translation of the Text*. New Haven.
- Wilcke, C. (2015) "Vom klugen Lugalbanda" in Volk, K. (ed.): 203-72.
- Wilhelm, G. ed. (2012) *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East*. Winona Lake.
- Willcock, M. (1964) "Mythological Paradeigmata in the Iliad" *Classical Quarterly* 14: 141-54.
- Willcock, M. (1977) "Ad hoc Invention in the Iliad" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 81: 41-53.
- Willcock, M. (1995) "The importance of Iliad 8" in Andersen, Ø. - Dickie, M. (eds.) *Homer's World. Reflection, Tradition, Reality*. Oslo: 113-21.
- Wilson, J. (2007) "Homer and the Will of Zeus" *College Literature* 34, 2: 150-73.
- Wilson, J.-P. (2009) "Literacy" in Raaflaub, K. - van Wees, H. (eds.): 542-63.
- Wilson, J.R. (1986) "The Gilgamesh epic and the Iliad" *Échos du monde classique* 30: 25-41.
- Winter, F.J. (1956) *Die Kampfszenen in den Gesängen MNO der Ilias*. Frankfurt.
- Wiseman, D.J. (1975) "A Gilgamesh epic fragment from Nimrud" *Iraq* 37: 157-63.
- Wisnom, L.S. (2014) *Intertextuality in Babylonian Narrative Poetry: Anzû, Enûma Elish, and Erra and Ishum*. DPhil diss. University of Oxford.
- Woodard, R.D. (2014) *The Textualization of the Greek Alphabet*. Cambridge.
- Woods, C. (2006) "Bilingualism, scribal learning, and the death of Sumerian" in Sanders, S.L. (ed.): 95-124.
- Wyatt, N. (1998a) "Understanding Polytheism: structure and dynamic in a west Semitic pantheon" *Journal of Higher Criticism* 5: 24-63.
- Wyatt, N. (1998b) *Religious Texts from Ugarit. The Words of Ilumilku and His Colleagues*. Sheffield.
- Yasumura, N. (2011) *Challenges to the Power of Zeus in Early Greek Poetry*. Bristol.
- Younger, J.G. (1998) *Music in the Bronze Age*. Jonsered.
- Younger, J.G. (2007) "The Mycenaean Bard: The Evidence for Sound and Song" in Morris, S. - Laffineur, R. (eds.): 71-78.
- Zanetto, G. (1996) *Inni Omerici, a cura di Giuseppe Zanetto*. Milano.
- Zekas, C. (2017) "Odysseus as Storyteller. Narrator and Speech Formulation in the Thrinacia episode" *Mnemosyne* 70: 721-39.

- Ziegler, N. (2016) "Aqba-Ḥammu et le début du mythe d'Atram-ḥasīs" *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 110: 107-26.
- Zgoll, A. (1997) *Der Rechtsfall der En-ḫedu-Ana im Lied nin-me-šara*. Münster.
- Zgoll, A. (2006a) Review of Cavigneaux, A. - Al-Rawi, F.N.H. (2000), *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 96: 120-27.
- Zgoll, A. (2006b) "Königslauf und Götterrat. Struktur und Deutung des babylonischen Neujahrfestes" in Blum, E. - Lux, R. (eds.) *Festtraditionen in Israel und im Alten Orient*. Gütersloh: 11-80.
- Zgoll, A. (2006c) *Traum und Welterleben im antiken Mesopotamien*. Münster.
- Zgoll, A. (2010) "Monumentum aere perennius - Mauerring und Ringkomposition im Gilgameš-Epos" in Shehata, D. - Weiershäuser, F. - Zand, K.V. (eds.) *Von Göttern und Menschen: Beiträge zur Literatur und Geschichte des Alten Orients. Festschrift für Brigitte Groneberg*. Leiden: 443-70.
- Zgoll, A. (2011) "Enlil und Ninlil. Vom Schrecken des Kanalbaus durch Stadt und Unterwelt" in Vacín, L. (ed.) *u<sub>4</sub> du<sub>11</sub>-ga-ni sá mu-ni-ib-du<sub>11</sub>. Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of Blahoslav Hruška*. Dresden: 287-99.
- Zgoll, A. (2014) "Dreams as gods and gods in dreams. Dream-realities in Ancient Mesopotamia from the 3<sup>rd</sup> to the 1<sup>st</sup> Millennium B.C." in Sassmannshausen, L. - Neumann, G. (eds.): 299-313.
- Zielinski, T. (1899-1901) "Die Behandlung gleichzeitiger Ereignisse im antiken Epos" *Philologus* Suppl. 8: 405-99.