

CUNEIFORM MONOGRAPHS I

**MESOPOTAMIAN PROTECTIVE SPIRITS
THE RITUAL TEXTS**

F. A. M. Wiggermann

SIYX&PP
PUBLICATIONS
GRONINGEN
1992

Copyright ©1992 F. A. M. Wiggermann
Copyright ©1992 STYX Publications, Groningen
Cover design: Klaas Meijer

ISBN 90 72371 52 6
CIP

STYX Publications
Postbus 1344
9701 BH GRONINGEN
THE NETHERLANDS
Tel. 050-717502
Fax. 050-733325

CONTENTS

PREFACE	ix
INTRODUCTION	xi
I TEXT I	1-40
<i>Šēp lemutti ina bīt amēli parāsu</i> , "to block the entry of the enemy in someone's house"	
A Manuscripts	1
B Reconstructed text and translation	5
C Text I.C.	33
<i>Di'a šibṭa mūtānī šutuqu</i> , "to make <i>di'u</i> -disease, stroke and plague pass by"	
D Fragments of similar rituals	34
I/2 <i>STT</i> 126	34
I/3 <i>STT</i> 350	34
I/4 <i>STT</i> 253	35
I/5 <i>CT</i> 51 102	37
I/6 Lenormant, <i>Choix des Textes</i> 25	37
I/7 Rm 40 Rev. = Leeper <i>CT</i> 35 Pl. 18	38
II TEXT II	41-104
Extracts from <i>šēp lemutti ina bīt amēli parāsu</i> and <i>di'a šibṭa mūtānī šutuqu</i>	
A Manuscript and comparison with text I	41
1 VAT 8228 = <i>KAR</i> 298	41
2 Collations	42
3 Additional material to text I. Inventory of figures	46
4 Regularities	58
<i>A Statues in the outer gate; the armed gods, the ugallū, and the dogs</i>	58
<i>B Statues in the private rooms; the apkallū, "sages"</i>	65
<i>C The rest of the house; monsters, laḥmu, Lulal and Latarak</i>	86
5 Differences between text I and text II	87
<i>A Different sequences of statues</i>	87
<i>B Other differences</i>	88
<i>C The second part of text II</i>	90
B Title and purpose; inventory of figures	91
1 Title and purpose of the ritual	91
2 Inventory of figures in text I/II	102

III	TEXT III	105–118
	<i>bīt mēseri</i>	
	A General observations	105
	B The text	106
	C The utukkū lemnūtu incantation Gurney AAA 22 76ff	113
	D Commentaries on related texts	115
	E Inventory of figures	116
	F A fragment of a related incantation	117
IV	TEXT IV	119–130
	Purification of a new house	
	A The text	119
	B General observations	127
	C Similar rituals	127
	D Inventory of figures	128
	E Text IV/1	129
V	TEXT V	131–140
	A building ritual	
	A The Text	131
	B Inventory of figures	139
	C The bird	140
VI	TEXT VI	141–142
	The ritual for the substitute king	
	A The text	141
	B Inventory of figures	141
VII	Inventory of Monsters. Brief discussions	143–187
	A Inventory of monsters	143
	B The army of Tiāmat and its history	145
	1 Unstructured origins and subsequent organization	147
	2 Association with gods. Monstrous servants and anthropomorphic masters	151
	3 The combat myth. Ninurta and Anzû; Marduk before Enūma Eliš	159
	4 Marduk and Enūma Eliš	163
	C Individual histories	164
	1 <i>lahmu</i> , “The Hairy One”	164
	2 <i>bašmu</i>	166
	a. u š u m/ <i>bašmu</i> , “Venomous Snake”, “Dragon”	166
	b. m u š - š à -tūr/ <i>bašmu</i> , “Birth Goddess Snake”	167
	3 <i>mušhuššu</i> , “Furious Snake”	168

4	<i>ugallu</i> , “Big Weather-Beast”, “Big Day”	169
5	<i>uridimmu</i> , “Mad Lion”	172
6	<i>kusarikku</i> , “Bison”	174
7	<i>girtablullû</i> , “Scorpion-Man”	179
8	<i>urmaḥlullû</i> , “Lion-Man”	181
9	<i>kulullû</i> , “Fish-Man”	182
10	<i>suhurmāšu</i> , “Carp-Goat”	183
11	Other apotropaic monsters	184
D	Survey of visual types	185
	Line drawings	188

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

189

PLATES

195

INDICES

A	Iconographical items and selected words	213
B	Subject index	221
C	Unpublished texts	224

PREFACE

This is the second edition of *Babylonian Prophylactic Figures. The Ritual Texts*, Free University Press, Amsterdam 1986. The first edition was my dissertation, of which only two hundred copies were printed. The second edition is a revised version of the first one, with substantial changes in Chapter VII.

I owe gratitude to all those who helped to bring this book into being: to M. Stol, K. R. Veenhof and M. van Loon, the promotor and referents, who read the manuscript and made pertinent remarks, to the Trustees of the British Museum (London) for their permission to study, copy and publish texts from their collection, to dr. L. Jakob-Rost and the Vorderasiatisches Museum (Berlin, DDR) for permission to collate (*KAR* 298), to W. G. Lambert, M. J. Geller and I. Finkel for references to unpublished texts in the collections of the British Museum, help with difficult passages, and information on details, to R. Borger for quickly informing me on a join made by him in text IV, to W. H. van Soldt for his collations of text VIII.B.7, to A. H. Green for discussions and ideas.

I owe even more gratitude to G. Haayer, who published the book out of his own free will, and to Maryam Setrodimedjo, who brought the struggle with the manuscript to an end.

Amsterdam, June 1992

of *ši-i*, “go out (evil)” and *er-ba*, “enter (good)”. Since all figures are made of wood, none of these inscriptions has been preserved on an actual figure.

The attributes held by the figures are the same as those of text I/II; there, however, it is the *kusarikku* and not the *urmahullû* that holds the *banduddû*, cf. II.A.4.C. The metal buckets from the Ninurta temple in Babylon (Rittig *Kleinplastik* 22.8.1–2) may have belonged to figures of wood but are not necessarily to be connected with the present ritual. The *kamsûtu*, “kneeling statues” (cf. II.A.4.B), of ritual I/II (II Rev. 11f.) hold syrup and butter; those of ritual V hold something else (broken) but “syrup and butter” are mentioned in their description (unclear).

VII INVENTORY OF MONSTERS. BRIEF DISCUSSIONS

A Inventory of monsters

		Rituals						Other texts (below B)									
		I	II	IV	IV/1	V	VI	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
1	<i>lahmu</i> ^e	1	2	1'	[]	+	—	2	[]	3	2	[]	[]	[]	[]		
2	<i>bašmu</i> ^a	2	5	[]	[]	+	3	1	+	1	1	[]	1'	[]	[]		
3	<i>mušhuššu</i> ^c	3	6	[]	[]	[]	—	— ^g	[]	2	3	[]	2'	[]	— ^g		
4	<i>ugallu</i> ^{bef}	[4]	1	[]	[]	[]	—	4	[]	4	—	1	3'	[]	[]		
5	<i>uridimmu</i> ^{ce}	5	[4]	[]	[]	+	1	5	[]	5	4	2	4'	5	[]		
6	<i>kusarikku</i> ^{de}	6	[3]	2'	[]	+	2	3	+	8	5	6	5'	6	1'		
7	<i>girtablullû</i> ^e	[7]	9	[]	[]	[]	—	—	[]	6	—	3	6'	[]	2'		
8	<i>urmahullû</i> ^e	[8]	10	[]	[]	[]	6	—	[]	—	—	[]	[]	[]	3'		
9	<i>kullû</i>	9	8	3''	2'	[]	—	6	[]	7 ^h	6	7 ^h	[]	7	[]	+	
10	<i>suhurmāšu</i>	10	7	[]	1'	[]	4	7	[]	—	7	8	[]	[]	[]		

^a Spelled MUŠ.ŠA.TUR in both MSS of I 185, MUŠ.Š]A.TUR in 8:7 (cf. Cooper *AnOr* 52 141⁴) and syllabically in all other texts.

^b Spelled U₄.GAL in all rituals and 11, U₄.GAL-*la* in 7 and 9, U₄.GAL-*lum* in 9 iii 32, U₄.[GAL]-*lu* in 12.

^c Spelled *ur-dim-me* in VI, UR.IDIM-(*me*) in 9, UR.IDIM.MA in 10 and UR.IDIM in all other texts.

^d Spelled syllabically in I, 7, 9 (iii 91: *ku₆-sa₄-rak-ki*), 10, GUD.DUMU.^dUTU (cf. II.A.3.18) in II, IV, V, VI, ^(d)GUD.ALIM in 8 (*ku-sa-rik-ki*, bilingual), 11, 12, 13, and GUD.DUMU.AN.NA (cf. II.A.3.18) in 14.

^e In rituals only *lahmu* is sometimes furnished with the determinative DINGIR (I 184 MS C, IV); in *Ee* (9) *lahmu* (here in the form *lahamu*) is always furnished with the determinative, and so is *mušhuššu* occasionally as well; 7, 8, 10 and 11 do not use determinatives at all (but the unpub. duplicate of 10, 79–7–8, 193, preserving only *lahmu* and *mušhuššu*, uses the determinative for both); 12 has only ^d*kusarikku* (GUD.ALIM), 14 apparently only ^d*urmahullû* (before GUD.DUMU.AN.NA the text is broken), and 13 gives all preserved figures the determinatives.

^f For further *ugallû* cf. I “437” and notes “435”^b, “437”^a; text I/4; II Rev. 35, III 13+h, 13+j.

^g In text 7 the *mušhuššu* appears in another context (iii 13) as Marduk’s mount (*ru-[ku-ub] / i-lu-ti-šû*); in text 14 the *mušhuššu* appears a few lines before the other monsters, but as Nabû’s ally rather than as one of the slain heroes (82:7, cf. also 86:15: *rākib mušhušši*, “who rides the m.”).

^h Spelled *ku₆-lû-lû* in 11 and *ku-li-li* in one MS of *Ee* (9, *KAR* 162 Rev. 4).

The comparison of ritual I/II with the other texts shows that we are dealing with a limited set of figures. The inscriptions prescribed for these figures in ritual II, in this respect more explicit than ritual I, are duplicated in other texts (IV/1, V; only VI prescribes different inscriptions but on figures of wood, not of clay) and apparently canonical, since they are matched by the inscriptions on actual clay figures. Until now two names of clay monsters from ritual I/II could not be read (numbers 3 and 4); above (II.A.3.18 and 17) we identified their names as *kusarikku* and *uridimmu* on the basis of a comparison with ritual I. Now that also the other texts have been adduced, it will be seen that these two figures are indeed the only candidates. Since both 3 and 4 have inscriptions prescribed, these new readings allowed their identification in art.

All figures of ritual II with inscriptions have been securely identified with figures of the *Kleinplastik*: *lahmu*, *bašmu*, *ugallu*, *uridimmu*, *kusarikku*, *urmahullû*, *kullû*, and *suhurmāšu*. For two monsters the text does not prescribe inscriptions: *mušhuššu* and

girtablullû. The identity of the *mušhuššu* could be established long ago by other means; as expected, the monster is attested also in the Kleinplastik (see below C.3), without inscription. Also the *girtablullû* is to be expected in the Kleinplastik, a monster partly scorpion (*girtab-*) and partly man (*-lullû*). Among the remaining unidentified figures of the Kleinplastik only one answers the description: *Kleinplastik* 7.1.1–2, “Genius mit Skorpionstachel” (figs. 24 and 25), without inscription. The palace reliefs as well include only one answering to the description “scorpion-man”: Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Type XI. The not very well preserved figure of the Kleinplastik and the figure of the palaces are sufficiently similar to consider them one type. Green *Iraq* 45 92f. voices misgivings about the identification of the figure from the palaces with the *girtablullû*; he restores a partly preserved figure from Nimrud (ND 7901, Pl. XIII, XIVb) after the “scorpion-man” of the reliefs, and notes that its inscription identifies the figure as the (the still unnamed) figure of text II Obv. 47f. Thus ND 7901 and Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Type XI, the “scorpion-man”, could not be the *girtablullû*, since this figure is described in II Rev. 8f. The correct reading of II Obv. 47f. (figure 4) as *uridimmu*, however, allowed a different but equally possible restoration of ND 7901: a lion’s tail instead of the sting of a scorpion, and the claws of a lion or dog instead of the talons of a bird of prey. Now the figure is in accordance with another figure of the reliefs (Kolbe Type XIX) and with the element *ur*, “lion”, “dog” in its name. Thus we save Kolbe Type XI/*Kleinplastik* 7.1.1–2 for the *girtablullû*.

Another figure answering to the description “scorpion-man” (Seidl *BaM* 4 XLIV) but not attested in the Kleinplastik or on the reliefs, is for that reason excluded from identification with the *girtablullû*. Since both the scorpion-man of the reliefs and of the Kleinplastik (*BaM* 4 no XLV) and the scorpion-man of other art appear on one object (NAss chair, cf. Hrouda *Kulturgeschichte* Pl. 15, 2), they are not variants of one type but distinct figures. Accordingly they must have different names but the name of the latter is still unknown.

The identification of all monsters with figures of the Kleinplastik greatly reduces the number of available candidates for the identification of the last two unidentified figures of clay without inscriptions, the gods Lulal and Latarak, one of them not completely anthropomorphic (cf. text I/5). Our arguments for identifying Lulal with the god with the raised fist and Latarak with the “Löwenmensch” are set out above II.A.4.A end.

If combinatory logic alone is not enough to establish the identity of the figures beyond doubt, the etymology of their names affords a check on the proposed identification (below C). It will be seen that the names of the monsters (including the *lahmu*) agree with their appearance; only in the case of the *ugallu*, where the element *u₄* does not have a definite bearing on its appearance, is this check lacking.

Although the sequence of monsters is not exactly fixed, certain regularities can be detected when groups of monsters are considered as units. For the relation between texts I and II we refer to the discussions in II.A.5.A.

	I	II	IV	VI	7	9	10	11	12	13	14
<i>lahmu-bašmu-mušhuššu</i> ^a	1	1	1'	3	1	1	1	[]	1	[]	[]
<i>ugallu-uridimmu</i>	2	3	[]	1	3	2	2	1	2	1'	[]
<i>kusarikku</i>	3	2	2'	2	2	5	3	3	3	2'	1'
<i>girtablullû-urmahlullû</i>	4	4	[]	5	—	3	—	2	4	[]	2'
<i>kulullû-suhurmāšu</i> ^b	5	5	3'	4	4	4	4	4	[]	3'	[]

^a The sequence inside the group is changed in 7, 9 and 10.

^b The sequence inside the group is changed in II and IV/1.

Ignoring text VI, all texts start with *lahmu-bašmu-mušhuššu* and continue with *ugallu-uridimmu/kusarikku*; only in 9 and 11 is *kusarikku* separated from *ugallu-uridimmu*, which forced us to make it a separate group. All texts end with *girtablullû-urmahlullû*, followed by *kulullû-suhurmāšu* (reverse order of groups in VI); exceptions again are 9 and 11 where the displaced *kusarikku* is accommodated after (9) or in between these groups (11).

Only the group *girtablullû-urmahlullû* can be omitted; of all other groups at least one member is always present; *bašmu*, *uridimmu* and *kusarikku* are present in all texts; *lahmu* and *kulullû* are present in all texts except VI; *mušhuššu* is omitted in texts where it is expressly mentioned as the symbolic animal of Marduk or Nabû; *ugallu* and *suhurmāšu* are omissible.

[Text 15, now published by A.R. George in RA 82 139ff., confirms these observations].

B The army of Tiāmat and its history

Sequences of monsters do not occur only in rituals. A number of other texts refer to the same set of monsters and give indications on their mythological background. The following texts have been used in the inventory above:

- Pinches 5 R 33 iv 50ff. (collations by W. van Soldt). Late copy of an inscription of Agum-kakrime, an early Kassite king, relating the return of Marduk to Babylon and the building of his temple by the king. Here Marduk is not yet the sole ruler of the universe (cf. i 5ff., vii 34ff.); the text does not reflect the theology of *Enūma eliš*. The *mušhuššu* (cf. above note g) is already Marduk’s symbolic animal and perhaps for that reason does not appear among the monsters laid in with gems in the wood of the doors of his cella. The text cannot be dated exactly and its authenticity remains a subject of discussion, cf. Brinkman *MSKH* I 95f. (and index), Sommerfeld *Der Aufstieg Marduks* 172⁴ (with previous literature), Schott *OLZ* 45 165f. [A new text, *VAS* 24 97, mentions Babylon and Esagil, and enumerates the monsters: *bašmu*, *mušhuššu*, *ugallu*, *uridimmu*, *kulullû* and *suhurmāšu*. The text is probably MB and comes from Babylon].
- W. G. Lambert, *The Chariot of Marduk*, *Symbolae Böhl* 275f. A fragment of a late copy of a bilingual text from the second Isin dynasty (?). Hymn of praise to the divine chariot. If Lambert’s date is correct, the imperfectly preserved collection of Monsters is dependent on *Enūma eliš*. Analogous to the monsters of Ninurta’s chariot in *Angim* 51ff., they can be understood as Marduk’s thropies. A further theriomorphic monster was probably mentioned in 11; it sticks out its tongue (cf. *mušhuš am-šè eme è-dè*, Gudea *Cyl. A* XXVI 24f.).
- W. G. Lambert, *Enūma Eliš. The Babylonian Epic of Creation. The Cuneiform Text*. I 133ff. // II 19f. // III 23ff. // III 81f. The monsters are created by mother Hubur / Tiāmat to fight at her side against the younger gods. The number is enlarged with *mušmahḥū*, *ušungallū* and *umū dabrūtu*, so that together with their general Kingu they total twelve. They bear unsparing weapons, are unafraid of battle (I 144 and parallels, cf. V 74) and terrifying (VI 115). In IV 116 they are *gallū*, “soldiers”. After their defeat by Marduk they are bound and trampled underfoot (IV 115ff.); Marduk breaks their weapons and installs their images (*salmū*) in the gate of Apsū (saying): “let this be a token; may it never be forgotten” (V 73ff., cf. Landsberger and Kinnier Wilson *JNES* 20 176, Frankena *Fs Brongers* 33f. ad *STC* II 67:5f., Lambert *Atra-hasis* 58:216f., 229f.). Berossos’ account of creation

contains a reference to Tiāmat's monsters set up (after defeat) in the temple of Bēl (S. Mayer Burstein *SANE* 1/5 14 2.2f.; the monsters of Berossos were adduced already by Delitzsch *AW* 99f.). Aššur advancing to battle against Tiāmat and the offspring of her womb (*nabnūt qerbiša*), "the beasts (*umāmānu*)", are engraved on the copper gate of Sennacherib's *akītu* house (*OIP* 2 139ff., cf. Pallis *akītu* 260ff.). These decorations are not preserved but they may be compared with the decorations on the bronze bands of the doors of Nabū's temple in Khorsabad (Loud-Altman *Khorsabad* II Pl. 49); they show a *kusarikku* (or perhaps an *uridimmu*, Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* 135), a *kulullū* and a *mušhuššu* (remainder not preserved). This temple may also have contained an *akītu*-complex (Postgate *Sumer* 30 51f.), but the representations and the *akītu* festival are not necessarily related. The fanciful collection of monsters (4 *kusarikku*, 4 *kulullū*, 4 *suhurmāšu* 2 *uridimmu*, 2 *girtabullū*) at the entrance of Sennacherib's "Ost-anbau" of the Aššur temple (Börker-Klähn *ZA* 70 258ff., esp. 260^{4,5} with previous literature; the four *kusarikku* of Sennacherib were replaced by Esarhaddon by two: Borger *Asarhaddon* 87 Rs. 4ff., Börker-Klähn *ZA* 70 266f.) have been prompted by architecture and apotropaic magic rather than by *Ee*.

The exact date of *Ee* within the MB period remains a subject of dispute, cf. Komoróczy *ActAntHung* 21 30f. and most recently Lambert *BSOAS* 47 1ff.

Fastening slain adversaries to buildings is a practice attested elsewhere:

- In the provincial version of the *Anzū* myth (cf. Wiggermann *Fs Kraus* 423ff.) *STT* 23 // 25 56' (Hruška *Anzu* 173), Ninurta fastens the slain Anzū to the front of the Ekur. The text explains the actual presence of apotropaic Anzū's at the gates of Mesopotamian temples (cf. Hruška *Anzu* 77f.).
 - After cutting the cedar and killing Ĥumbaba, Gilgamesh and Endiku return to Nippur with a door made out of the felled cedar and the head of Ĥumbaba (von Weier *BaM* 11 100f. // *EG* Pl. 19 K 3252). The door is a present for Enlil: *li-iḫ-du* [*ú-šu-um-gal*]^d *En-lil* ... [*li-ri-iš-šim* ^d*En-lil* (*TIM* 9 46:27f., OB), "may Enlil the ruler be pleased ... , may Enlil be jubilant about it (the door)"; indeed it arrives in Nippur where it is later bitterly addressed by Enkidu (tablet VII). What happens to the head of Ĥumbaba? In tablet VII Landsberger *R4* 62 103²² reads a broken line (*STT* 14 Obv. 8a) of Enkidu's speech to the door as: [*ina*] *ká-šú lu* [*u*]^š-*zi-za an-z[a-a]*, "In seinem (=des Enlil) Tore hätte ich den Vogeldämon aufgestellt". Anzū, however, is completely out of place here, he has nothing to do with the adventures of Gilgamesh and Enkidu. A reading ^d[*um-ba-ba*] is equally possible and solves the riddle of Ĥumbaba's destiny. The Sumerian forerunner of this part of the epic (van Dijk *GSL* 71 99ff.) relates how Gilgamesh and Enkidu enter Ekur and place the head of Ĥumbaba before Enlil. Another OB Sumerian text containing references to the Gilgamesh cycle speaks of Ĥumbaba as an *ur-sag dab₅-ba*, a "captured hero" (cf. Cooper *AnOr* 52 110); he is brought to Enil in Nippur and probably underwent the same fate as the captured heroes of Ninurta/Ningirsu (Cooper *AnOr* 52 141ff.), that end up as trophies on his chariot or temple (Klein *AOAT* 25 280:95ff.). Indeed, Ĥumbaba-heads are actually attested at the doors of Mesopotamian temples (cf. Th. Howard-Carter *Iraq* 45 69ff.) and elsewhere as an apotropaion against evil (cf. Moorey *Iraq* 37 88, Opificius *UAVA* 2 221ff., and generally Wilcke *RIA* 4 530ff.).
 - *Marduk Ordeal Text* (T. Frymer-Kensky, *JAOs* 103 133, 135): 20: "[the head w]hich they hang on the gateposts of the 'Mistress of Babylon': that is the head of the criminal who stood with him".
 - An especially clear case comes from *Nebuchadnezzar King of Justice* (W. G. Lambert, *Iraq* 27 5, 8): 6f.: "... (a criminal) .. they cut off his head and sent it through the land. They (also) cut off a stone head, made it into the likeness of that man's head, had the following inscribed on that man's head, and fixed it on the outer gate of that law court for all mankind to see: 'A man whose case has been judged, the tablet of whose verdict has been written, and whose tablet has been sealed, but afterwards he returns for judgement — in like manner shall his head be cut off'".
- 10 *Šurpu* 8 6f. // 79–7–8, 193 (unpublished; quoted by *CAD* B 141b), cf. Lambert *Afo* 19 122. The enumerated monsters are introduced as *šūt mē nāri u nābali*, "those of the water of the river and of the dry land"; together they are the "ūmu-demons (*u₄-mu*), which, in the presence of Bēl (*šá IGI EN*) [are filled with] terror, dread, and spl[endor]" (Lambert's translation *Afo* 19 122).
- 11 Craig *ABRT* I 56 Obv. 4ff., *lipšur* litany. The figures are enumerated in the suit of Ea and Marduk (^dASALLÚ.Ī). After *girtabullū* two (?) monsters are missing ([4], [5]). Between [5] and 6 the text has one extra figure: [AN.I]M.DUGUD^{mušēn} (*Anzū*). After *suhurmāšu* there is room for two more figures.
- 12 Ebeling *KAR* 312 7, cf. Lambert *Afo* 19 122. Probably a hymn. The figures enumerated belong in the suit of Marduk, as is proved by the presence of his *u d u g Nādin-mē-qāti* (5) and *Mukil-mē-balāti* (6) (*CT* 24 16:15f., 28:70f.).

- 13 Craig *ABRT* I 29 Obv. 15ff. Prayer of Ashurbanipal to Marduk, with allusions to *Ee*; cf. Borger *HKL* 1 68, Hruška *Anzu* 88 with note 231, Seux *Hymnes et Prières* 115ff. The enumeration of slain monsters starts with Anzū (15) and a monster whose name is broken. After a break, with room for approximately four monsters, the text names the *uridimmu*, the *kusarikku* and the *kulullū*. At the end of the line there is room for one more monster. The next line (17) starts with LUGAL, apparently introducing a different subject, since none of the names of the monsters starts with LUGAL. The defeat of Tiamat and Kingu is referred to in 20. In 37 ^d*Lāh-me* appears after Ea and [Damkin]; perhaps *lahmu* is therefore not to be restored as one of the slain monsters in 16.
- 14 Lambert *Fs Matouš* II 82:12. Hymn to Nabū. Text of first millenium origin. Nabū shares with Marduk the rulership of the cosmos, the *mušhuššu* as a symbolic animal, and the defeat of the monsters of chaos. Before the first preserved monster (*kusarikku*) there is room for a substantial restoration; the exact number of missing signs, however, cannot be determined.
- 15 BM 45619, unpublished, cf. Berger *AOAT* 4/1 68 and 322. NB text enumerating the monsters set up in Esagila. At least the *kulullū* is among them (Lambert *RIA* 6 324a). [Now published by A.R. George in *RA* 82 39ff.].

1 Unstructured origins and subsequent organization

The sources for the study of original monster formation are limited. Part of the ideas that shaped them is fixed in the names and appearances of the oldest monsters. They can be analyzed and combined with what is known or guessed about the early history of Sumerian religion and of religion in general. Even if the infusion with ideas on the development of religious thought succeeds in giving the results a ring of truth, it must be remembered that they are based on very few facts.

Analysis of Names. Concrete beginnings.

None of the names reveals the composite character of the named monster (see table p.150). The two exceptions, Scorpion-Man (4) and Carp-Goat (5), are not originally monsters. The scorpion is named Scorpion-Man only after it developed its human parts, the *m á š*-carp became a composite only after the element *m á š* in its name was understood as Carp. Bison (2), Bison(-Bull) (3) and Hairy-One (9) do not reveal the human parts, Furious-Snake (1) does not reveal the lion part, and Heavy-Cloud (6), Roaring-Day (7) and Big-Day (8) do not reveal any part of their composite denotations.

The names that reveal only part of the composition may be taken to have denoted originally only *that* part, a simple being not a composed one. Thus Furious-Snake originally denoted a snake, not a dragon. The element *ḫu š* in the name of the snake, translated throughout this book as "Furious," gives away the nature of the snake. Although the translation "Furious" is not incorrect, the word is better translated "awe-inspiring," since it is a quality not only of animate beings, but also of inanimate things such as gates and temples. The colour adjective *ḫu š* "red" is undoubtedly the same word. The snake then, denoted by Furious-Snake, is originally the awe-inspiring snake. The other words, Bison and Bison(-Bull) originally denoted a bison, and not a bison-human composite. We take it that the denoted bison was, like the snake, the awe-inspiring bison. The development from simple animal to monster, here derived from etymology, is observable fact in the cases of the scorpion(-man) and the carp(-goat).

The names that do not reveal any part of their composite denotation are clearly not in origin those of composite beings, but of the phenomena they denote. The imaginary monsters only serve to make these awe-inspiring natural phenomena visible.

Heavy-Cloud (6) and the fearsome Days (7, 8) are convincingly realized as lion/eagle composites.

Hairy-One, the name of the naked hero with curls, is a special case. The name is purely descriptive, and must have been given to the hero with curls after he had been realized. Since it is unthinkable that the realization (man with curls) of an imaginary being (spirit of streams) precedes its conception in language, the name Hairy-One cannot be the original name of the hero with curls. Its secondary nature is indicated as well by the fact that it is a Semitic name, and not a Sumerian one.

The awe-inspiring animals of the first group (1–5) are turned into monsters by the addition of animal and human parts, they are, so to speak, only half imaginary. The awe-inspiring phenomena of the second group (6–8) are expressed by composites that are completely imaginary. It is logical to conclude that the process of monster formation started with the half imaginary ones, and that the completely imaginary ones followed their example.

Analysis of composition. Abstraction and structure.

Although the awe-inspiring quality undoubtedly is rooted in observed fact, it was apparently not predicated to individual members of the species (snake, bison), but to the species as such, to an Exemplary Member (Snake, Bison), in other words, the awe-inspiring animals became abstractions.

The transition from Exemplary Member to monster that initiated the process of monster formation can only be explained from the demands of visual expression. Since simple representation of one member of a species does not adequately express the extraordinary qualities that are imputed to the abstract Exemplary Member, it follows that in order to express the qualities of Exemplary Member it has to be distinguished from the individual ordinary member. Monster form fulfils this demand.

Whereas the need to be precise about the abstract character of Exemplary Member could arise only from the demands of visual expression, it is regular artistic activity that is responsible for the creation of a commonly known and accepted art as the channel through which the novelty of monster form could spread and take a hold on public imagination. This implies that monsters in general are not older than the first recognizable art styles of the late Uruk period, and more specifically that first attestations can not be very far removed from invention.

Thus the Exemplary Members belong to the language of religion, and may be as old as Sumerian itself; the monsters belong to the language of art and are novelties depending on regular artistic activity and the development of style.

Since monsters did not exist in nature but were visible only in man-made reality, and since this reality must have been widely distributed and long lasting in order to create generally accepted monster images, the only alternative to art is religious practice, the cult. Although conceivably animal-human hybrids could be dressed up priests, the actual composition of the Bison beings (animal body and human face and hands) does not favour this theory. The fourth millennium Iranian hybrid Man-with-Mufflon-Head (Barnett *Syria* 43 259ff., Amiet *Syria* 56 333ff., *GS* 28f.) on the other hand could be a masked priest, and of cultic origin.

Among the Mesopotamian monsters the only one that possibly once was a priest is Hairy-One, the naked hero with curls (for a protoliterate example cf. Porada *JAOS* 103 477, and the drawing in D. Schmandt-Besserat ed., *The Legacy of Sumer*, Fig. 9a–b, p. 187). Indeed, nakedness is a prerequisite for officiating early third millennium priests, and priests with long hair are a well known phenomenon in the cult of Enki (Sjöberg *JCS* 21 278, Charpin *Le Clergé d'Ur* 349, add *VAS* 2 66 r. 11). If then in origin the naked hero was a priest, two curious facts would be explained: his completely human appearance and his secondary name.

After the priestly function was abolished, the figure would have lived on in art as a supernatural servant of Enki (with hair now symbolizing water), one that did not exist earlier and was named after his appearance "Hairy-One."

The theory of Exemplary Member presented above does not require that there was only one Exemplary Member. All through Mesopotamian history pluralities of monsters occur, and it is often unclear whether MONSTER NAME should be translated "a..." or "the...". In art human-faced bisons and bison-men regularly appear in pairs, and sometimes even Roaring-Day (PKG 14 137c), Furious-Snake (*VAR* 147), and Heavy-Cloud (*GMA*² no. 1263) are not single.

A further abstraction is implied by the inclusion of Heavy-Cloud (6) and the Days (7, 8) in the class of Exemplary Animal monsters. The awe-inspiring essence is recognized in completely different phenomena, abstracted, and expressed by the shared monster quality of the images. The difference between the phenomena they cover is expressed by the different composition of each individual monster image.

As unreal beings the monsters are not identical with the phenomena they cover, but the supernatural agents in some way responsible for them, their 'cause'. They are abstractions, but personified.

The abstractions that characterize the monsters can be derived from their (later) associations with certain gods, and from their behaviour in art and literature (see table p. 150). A simple set of elements with natural symbolic values gives each composite its definite character:

snake (1)	death
bison (2, 3)	firmness
eagle (6, 7)	agression, power (in the sky)
lion (1, 6, 7, 8)	agression, power (on earth)
carp (5)	knowledge
curls (water) (9)	life
human face (2)	watching
human hands (3, 8)	acting
human body (9)	independent activity

Two animal elements have been left out of consideration, the goat of the carp (-goat) and the scorpion of the scorpion(-man). The goat is based on ancient etymological speculation, and the composed being of which it forms part since Ur III is in origin a natural fish, a m á š -carp. The carp itself enters into other compositions (OB *kullullû*, Fish-Man; MB fish-*apkallû* also called "carps", cf II.A.4.B). The scorpion(-man) is in origin a simple mythological scorpion fulfilling, like the Egyptian *hpr*, "beetle," a cosmic task (watching over the rising and setting of the sun, VII.C.7d) with its pincers. It is not part of other composed beings, but the simple scorpion occurs as a symbol of marriage (Cooper *RIA* 4 267) and of the goddess Išhara (Lambert, *RIA* 5 176f.).

We conclude that monster formation was an ongoing process which started in the protoliterate period and continued throughout the third millennium and even later (*kullullû*, fish-*apkallu*, *uridimmu*, *urmahullû*).

Besides the tenacious monsters treated here the third millennium saw a number of others, short-lived and generally known either from art or from literature. Of ED III and Akkadian art the boat-god, (human-faced) lion, and bird-man remain nameless, but apparently played a part in the lost mythology of the period (cf. e.

g. Frankfort CS 67ff., Amiet *GMA*² Pl. 106ff. and comments). The Ninurta mythology gave birth to a fair amount of new monsters (see below II), and the most important of them, á - z á g, has the abstract character required by the theory (see below III).

Completely different from the monsters discussed so far is *Huwawa*. He appears generally as a face only (on seals; as mask), but sometimes the face is supplied with a body. In origin presumably he was indeed only a face, a repelling grin hung at the door post to deter evil. His name, otherwise not understandable, may be the sound he makes while grinning, *huwawa!* He was less powerful than other monsters, and contrary to them a mere mortal could defeat him, Gilgamesh. The iconography is treated by W.G. Lambert in A.E. Farkas ed., *Monsters and Demons in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds* (1987), 37–52 (see also VII.B.9 above).

Summary (concrete to abstract)

concrete		abstract
awe-inspiring phenomena	animal { snake bison scorpion carp }	earlier } become half imaginary later }
	weather { heavy cloud days water Hairy one }	} become completely imaginary
awe-inspiring phenomena of nature		Exemplary Members, agents, “causes”
only religious entities		also artistic entities
imagined in its own from		represented in monster from
different from gods		opposed to anthropomorphic gods

Summary of first stage

monsters					gods	
	VII.C	Character	Composition	Name ^a	associated	adversary
1	3	Violent Death	snake + lion	Furious-Snake	Ninazu	
2	6	Peace (Passive)	bison + human face	Bison	Utu	
3	6	Peace (Active)	bison + human hands	Bison(-Bull)	Utu	Utu
4	7	Cosmic Instrument	scorpion (+ man) ^b	Scorpion-Man	Utu	
5	10	Instruction	carp (+ goat) ^c	Carp-Goat	Enki	
6	11a	Ruling Power	eagle + lion	Heavy-Cloud	Enlil	Ninurta
7	11a	Destructive Power	lion + eagle	Roaring-Day	Iškur	
8	4	Aggression	lion + human hands	Big-Day	Iškur	Utu
9	1	Keeper of Life	curls + human body	Hairy-One ^d	Enki	

^a 1: *mušhuššu*, 2: a l i m, 3: *kusarikku*, 4: *girtablullā*, 5: *suhurmāšu*, 6: ^{an} a n_x (IM) – d u g u d / *Anzū*, 7: u₄-k a -d u ḫ- ḫ a, 8: *ugallu*, 9: *lahmu*. The other monsters of VII.C are either too late (*uridimmu*, *urmalhullā*, *kulullā*) or too unclear to be of use in a discussion about origins. ^b Earliest form a simple scorpion with raised pincers that become hands. ^c According to the texts originally a type of carp, a m á š -carp, later supplied with the goat part (m á š) as a consequence of ancient etymological speculation. ^d The only being with a Semitic name.

2 Association with gods. Monstrous servants and anthropomorphic masters

Anthropomorphism did not affect the whole pantheon at once, but was, like monster formation, an ongoing process. At least part of the pantheon is not anthropomorphic in origin. Utu, the Sun, and Nanna, the Moon, must once have had only their cosmic identities. The first deity for whom a human form can be assumed is Inanna, whether in origin Venus or not. The ideology of rulership in her city Uruk is based on the marriage of the ruler (e n) with the goddess, inconceivable without anthropomorphism. The Uruk Vase (*PKG* 14 Fig. 33) shows the e n bringing his gifts to the goddess (or her human representative) and receiving e n -ship (the sign EN) in return. It is the oldest attestation of the ideology of e n -ship, and dates to the Uruk IV period. From ED II onwards horned crowns distinguish gods from men, and one by one they become recognizable by their attributes. By the end of the Akkad period all important gods (Nanna, Utu, Inanna, Enki, Ninḫursag, Ninurta, Iškur) seem to have become anthropomorphic, although some of them (Enlil, An) have not yet been identified with certainty.

Yet even in the Akkad period not all gods were completely or only anthropomorphic. The god on the obverse of an early Akkadian sculptured stone from Ešnunna (Frankfort *OIP* 60 no. 331), probably Ninazu, is scaled. His successor, Tišpak, is green (*VAS* 17 4:2, OB inc.), and must have had a snake’s skin. An earlier anthropomorphic Ninazu on a *mušhuššu* occurs on an ED IIIb seal (Boehmer *UAVA* 4 Abb. 283, cf *RLA mušhuššu* 3.2). Later still the SB *Göttertypentext* (Köcher *MIO* 1 57ff.) gives the goddess Nintu “scales like a snake” (iii 49’). In art however, the goddess is completely anthropomorphic (cf. Stol, *Zwangerschap en Geboorte bij de Babyloniërs en in de Bijbel* 34ff.). A snake god with human upper body (Boehmer *UAVA* 4 102ff.) is well known from Akkadian seals, but later disappears, probably because he shed the snake part. There is reason to believe that he is the city-god of Der, Ištarān, and that the snake part became his symbolic animal, Nirah.

Their composed appearance defines the monsters as a group, and distinguishes them from the anthropomorphic gods. Although the process of anthropomorphism may have started earlier, or even much earlier than that of monster formation, the two become simultaneous and complementary at the end of the Uruk period, together gather speed during ED II, and culminate in the time of the Akkadian empire, when Furious-Snake (1) and Roaring-Day (7) get their classical forms, and art systematically contrasts anthropomorphic gods and their monstrous servants and opponents.

The establishment of formal complementarity reveals an essential characteristic of the monsters and the awe-inspiring phenomena they stand for. Contrary to anthropomorphic gods, monsters stand outside the normal order, they are supernatural freaks, unexpected extras, unpredicable, disquieting, threatening. This otherness determines the relations between gods and monsters until the end of Mesopotamian

civilization. Step by step these relations become more outspoken, step by step, while mythology develops, the part played by monsters is defined:

a *Associated with gods; servants.*

Each individual monster is associated with a god that operates in the same field of action, a part of nature, but while the god covers the whole, the monster represents only a slice (see table p. 150); and while the god is responsible for a stable, lasting background, the monster's responsibility is limited, it accentuates, emphasizes. The responsibilities of the monsters together circumscribe the essence of supernatural intervention in human affairs: the preservation of life (9), but also sudden, violent death (1); the protection of peace (2, 3), but also the disruptions of war and weather (6, 7, 8). The most important of all is Heavy-Cloud (6), hard-handed rule.

Generally the relations between god and monster are completely obvious: Furious-Snake is associated with Ninazu, 'Lord-Healer,' the ruler of the netherworld before Nergal, and king of the snakes (*RIA mušhuššu* 3.2); the fish (monster) Carp(-Goat) and Hairy-One, a spirit of streams, are associated with Enki, the 'Lord of the Earth' and master of rivers and streams; the stormy Days of war and destruction belong to the storm god Iškur, who tramples the land; the scorpion(-man), who watches over the mountain of sunset and sunrise, is associated with Utu, the sun god.

Less obvious is the relation between Bison and Utu. The two share an interest in a part of the world that is left alone by others, the distant fairy tale lands where Bison, the forebear of the *Ditnu*-nomads, was a kind of mythological sheik, and Utu, the only god who dared travel that far, his divine supervisor (see below b.). It is also Utu, who supplies Gilgamesh with seven monstrous 'warriors' to guide him to the cedar mountain (*Gilgamesh and Huwawa* 37ff., cf. Kramer *JCS* 1 36²¹⁷, Shaffer *JAOS* 103 307⁴).

Only *Anzû*'s ties with Ninurta are not obviously explained from a shared field of action in nature. *Anzû* is Heavy-Cloud, or at least an atmospheric phenomenon, Ninurta is "Lord of the Arable Land", son of Enlil and his warlike colonist. Below we will see that originally *Anzû* was associated not with Ninurta, but with Enlil. *Anzû*, Heavy-Cloud (or at least an atmospheric phenomenon), is naturally associated with Enlil, "Lord Ether," the hard-handed ruler of everything between heaven and the surface of the earth.

Association is the vaguest relation possible. It does not require a worked-out mythology that specifies a variety of functions and defines mutual obligations.

b *Rebels and defeated enemies.*

The art of the Akkad period gives precedence to subjects that were hardly treated before. One of them is the battle scene, depicting fights of gods with gods (Boehmer *RIA* 3 471ff.) or of gods with monsters. Although it cannot be totally excluded that Akkadian art finally found a way to depict a traditional subject of mythology for some reason avoided by earlier art, it is much more likely that the political innovations of the Akkadian empire gave rise to mythological adaptations, and that the gods became more imperious, and more sensitive to rebellion: "for men create the gods after their own image, not only with regard to form, but also with regard to their way of life"

(Aristotle, *Politics* i 2 7). A positive indication is that the Sumerian word *m e d d a*, which denotes specifically a weapon of gods, is a Semitic loanword (*maṭṭat*-).

For the monsters, outlaws by nature, it is only a small step from unpredictable servant to rebel, and from rebel to defeated enemy. The role of the god in their relation changes accordingly from master to rightful ruler, and from rightful ruler to victor. The geographical interpretation of this mythology unequivocally proves its relation to the politics of empire: the rebels live in the surrounding mountains, the traditional home of Mesopotamia's most feared enemies.

The obvious supervisor of distant regions is Utu, attested as such rarely in literature (cf. *EWO* 368 ff.), but abundantly in Akkadian art. Utu apparently controls the seven monstrous 'warriors' that are to guide Gilgamesh to the cedar mountain, and the scorpion-man, the guardian of the mountain through which he rises and sets, who assists him against enemies on an Akkadian seal (Porada *Ancient Art in Seals* Pl. II-20; rays extending from his lower body). Utu, or a member of his court (one has been identified as his vizier Bunene, cf. *JEOL* 29 14 C.3), breaks the resistance (mace) of rebellious mountain gods, sometimes assisted or watched by his sister Inanna/Venus (Boehmer *UAVA* 4 Abb.300ff., *RIA* 3 384). Thus Utu's occasional collisions with the *kusarikku* and the Akkadian forerunner of the *ugallu* fall into place. The *kusarikku* is one of the representatives of the mountains (VII.C.6a), and the *ugallu* accompanies war and foreign invasions. Akkadian seals show Utu fighting the *ugallu* always in connection with mountains, defeated mountain gods, or rebellious *kusarikku* (Green *BaM* 17 Pl. 2).

Utu as warrior does not outlive the Akkad period. He is replaced by Ninurta, Enlil's warrior and monster slayer at least from the time of Gudea onwards. Ninurta(/Ningirsu)'s enemies are listed by Gudea, and essentially the same list occurs in the Ur III myths *Lugal* and *Angim* (cf. Cooper *AnOr* 52 141ff., van Dijk *Lugal* 11ff., Lambert *CRAI* 32 56ff.). The only important addition of the two later lists is *Anzû* (see below). The political dimension now is entirely explicit: the monsters are referred to as 'captured warriors and kings,' and 'slain warriors' (*AnOr* 52 142), while *Lugal* 134 makes it clear that they were slain in the mountains (cf. also *Angim* 33ff., where *magillum* is the only one that is not from the mountains).

The texts give hardly any information on the kind of trouble caused by the monsters. The *u š u m /bašmum*, a kind of dragon, who lives in the "great fortress of the mountain" (*Angim* 33; cf. *UAVA* 4 Abb. 290), apparently feeds on cattle, since the result of Ninurta(/Ningirsu)'s intervention is that it can live in peace (Gudea *Frg.* 1 i, cf. van Dijk *Lugal* 11²⁵). A slightly later *u š u m g a l* dragon is "a weapon when he runs, death when he passes" (de Genouillac *Trouville* 1:1f.). SB dragons of older origin attack man (*CT* 13 33f., *muš[huššu]*) and beast (*KAR* 6, *ba[šmu]*). Similar evils may be imputed to "Six-Headed-Wild-Ram" and "Seven-Headed-Snake," neither of them known outside the list of Ninurta/Ningirsu's enemies, but the latter identified in art (Wiggermann *Tišpak* 128²⁷). In view of the context the mysterious *s a g - a r* (Gudea *Cyl.* A XXV 25) must be mount Saggār (Jebel Sinjār, cf. Stol *Trees* 75ff.), a rebel like mount Ebiḫ who was defeated by Inanna. The captured wild bulls and cows (cf. Lambert *CRAI* 32 57) are booty rather than aggressors (cf. *Angim* 101ff.).

Of the whole list of Ninurta/Ningirsu's enemies only *u š u m /bašmu* and *g u d - a l i m /kusarikku* have a mythological future (on *Anzû* see below). Most of

the others are ephemeral inventions serving only to expand the list.

The least transparent additions are *k u - l i - a n - n a* and *m á - g i - l u m*. Both seem to be associated with water (cf. VII.C9a; *Angim* 34). The latter is not only a monster, but also a kind of ship, real and mythological (Cooper *AnOr* 52 148, *CAD* M/1 *magillu, magišu*), and has a variant form (*HLC* 168 Pl. 104, see Heimpel *ZA* 77 38⁵²) *m á - a r - g i 4 - l u m*. The *m á* - part of the word suggests the ship it denotes, the *-ilum* ending on the other hand suggests an Akkadian loanword (type *t i - g i 4 - l u, g i r g i l l u*; many of these foreign *-il* words entered Sumerian by way of Akkadian with the ending *-um*). The variant discovered by Heimpel suggests that both are true and that the word is a compositum: Ship-*argilum*. The second part is probably identical with the foreign word (by way of Akkadian) *irgillu*, “(a locust),” attested in Hebrew in the form *hargol*. Whatever the exact denotation, boat nor monster can be older than the Akkadian period.

Etiological explanation of apotropaic features is another source of defeated enemies. “Head-of-the-Bison” (*s a g - a l i m a*) is a very unlikely enemy, but as “emblem of Utu” quite likely as an apotropaion (Gudea *Cyl. A* XXVI 4). ‘(King) Palm’ is difficult to imagine as a fearsome mountaineer (explicitly Gudea *Fig.* 1 ii, cf. van Dijk *Lugal* 11²⁵), but common in temples and at gates (cf. Howard-Carter *Iraq* 45 64ff., Weiss *BA* 48/1 10f.). There is even one on Ningirsu’s chariot (*PKG* 14 Abb. 111 a). The natural lion (*u r - m a h*) is found only in Gudea’s list. He is either in origin an apotropaic guardian of gates, or simply Ningirsu’s symbolic animal. The *Īuwawa* story (cf. above I) seems to be based on etiology as well.

“Strong Copper” and “Gypsum” come from the mountains, but as merchandise, not as enemies. They lose their monster nature in later mythology, but live on as apotropaia in magic.

Beside Ship-Locust and (King) Palm (and perhaps *k u - l i - a n - n a*) all monsters can well be imagined as inhabitants of the mountains. It is nowhere stated that they are the offspring of the mountains, like later the monsters are the offspring of Sea. Only once a different group of monsters is called ‘sons of one mother’ (*Gilgamesh and Īuwawa* 36). Their knowledge of the mountains is to guide Gilgamesh to *Īuwawa*, they are at home there, and the unnamed mother could be the mountain land.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and natural gods, outlawed freaks and rightful rulers, them and us. Just like anthropomorphism and monster form are general schemes distinguishing two groups of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation. Thus there is no need to look for one specific collision between a god and a monster more monstrous than the others to find the origin of the combat myth. The general scheme is the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is an inalienable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides generalities so very little is known about the personality of each individual monster, and that the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few myths that feature a monster explain special developments, the *Anzû-myth* how Ninurta came to be the master of *Anzû* instead of Enlil (see below), and the so-called *Labbu-myth* how Tišpak came to be master of the *mušhuššu*. The *bašmu-myth* (*KAR* 6) is too broken, and the *Asakku* myth (*Lugal*) is a complicated piece of theology that cannot be treated here (see provisionally below III).

This fundamental lack of precision has an important bearing on the interpretation of third millennium (and later) art. The collisions that are shown are not illustrations of specific myths, but examples of the general scheme with one or several variable players at both sides. Naturally the god that is chosen to play the part of the warrior is likely to be pitched against those monsters that are nearest to him by nature (above IIa). The scene, however, does not show his struggle on a specific occasion in the past, but visualizes the ongoing battle against the other side, rebellion, the forces of evil. What has been said about the monsters applies just as well to the mountain gods defeated by Utu and other gods (Boehmer *UAVA* 4 Abb. 300ff., *RLA* 3 471ff.). That these scenes do not depict specific battles against specific mountain gods, but visualize in a general manner the struggle against the outside enemy, is shown not only by the lack of distinc-

tion between the several mountain gods and between the scenes in which they appear, but also by the association of defeated mountains and mountain gods with defeated monsters (cf. e. g. *UAVA* 4 300, mountain god and *kusarikku*; *BaM* 17 Taf. 2:4, *ugallu*, Ninurta, mountain; 5 Utu on mountain throne, *ugallu*). One mountain is included in the list of Ninurta/Ningirsu’s enemies (*s a g - a r*). A specific struggle of a deity, Inanna, with a specific mountain, *Ebiḫ*, is described in a myth. Undoubtedly this myth reflects historical reality (cf. Steinkeller in McGuire Gibson ed., *Uch Tepe* 1 163ff.); it is not depicted on Akkadian seals.

The Ninurta/Ningirsu mythology emphatically associates the monsters with the mountains (*Lugal* 134) and consequently the gods with the lowlands. *Angim* 34, however, admits that *m á - g i 4 - l u m*, “Ship-Locust,” is an unlikely inhabitant of the mountains, and has him live in *Apsû*. In *Angim* 33 the *u š u m / b a š m u* lives in the fortress of the mountain, but another third millennium text presents an *u š u m g a l / p i r i g* that “roars in the flood” (de Genouillac *Trouvaille* 1:3, 11), while in the SB myth *KAR* 6 the *b a š m u* is a sea dragon. In *Angim* 35 the *g u d - a l i m / k u s a r i k k u* is brought forth by Ninurta from “his battle dust,” while the prologue of the SB *Anzû* myth alludes to his victory over the *kusarikku* “in the midst of the sea” (*JCS* 31 78:12). The *mušhuššu* (Furious-Snake), not among the defeated enemies of Ninurta/Ningirsu, but as a snake naturally at home in the earth, is associated with the sea in an unpublished Ur III incantation (Steinkeller *SEL* 1 6), in *Angim* 139 (Cooper *AnOr* 52 80), and in a SB myth of older origin (*CT* 13 33:6). Late reflexes of the Ninurta/Ningirsu mythology introduce Sea as one of his enemies (Sm 1875, see *WZKM* 57 10⁴⁶; *OrNS* 36 124:149). Other monstrous beings are suckled by her (*AnSt* 5 98:34). Beside Ship-Locust a number of monsters not among the enemies of Ninurta are associated with Enki, and naturally at home in *Apsû* (*lahmu, kulullû, suḫurmāšu*).

The sea, *Tiāmat*, is an Akkadian contribution to the Mesopotamian Pantheon. She is attested for the first time in the Akkad period (*Afo* 25 102), and contrary to the monsters (except *lahmu*) whose mother she was to become, her name is Semitic and not Sumerian. Her later history reveals a rebellious nature that is best explained by reference to the West, where the tension between the near-by sea and the ruling gods is naturally expected and attested (cf. Jacobsen *JAOS* 88 105ff., Charpin-Durand *RA* 80 174, Nougayrol *Ug* V 54, 58, 287). In the course of the second millennium Sea replaces the mountains as geographical focus of monster mythology. The shift is most clearly observable in the cases of *bašmu* and *kusarikku* (cited above), and confirms what was argued above, that in the third millennium no specific myths were connected with these beings. As in the case of *Anzû*, who is normally not among the children of *Tiāmat*, the existence of specific myths probably would have prevented such a shift. Thus both *Apsû* and *Tiāmat* shelter monsters before *Enūma Eliš* makes them into a cosmogonic pair and enemies of Marduk. Then, like the mountains before, she coincides with an enemy of Babylon (Marduk), Sealand (cf. Jacobsen in Goedicke ed., *Unity and Diversity* 76).

Since water is a well attested element in third millennium cosmogony (cf. Lambert *RLA* 6 218ff.), the association of monsters with water might be taken to imply a pre-*Ee* connection of monsters with the early cosmos. The only monster for whom such a connection can be proved is *lahmu* (Hairy-One).

Babylonian incantations reveal the existence of independent cosmogonic traditions with a genealogy of An that differs completely from the one recorded in the OB forerunner of the canonical god list (*TCL* 15

10:31ff.): *Dūri - Dāri, Laḥmu - Laḥamu, Alala - Belili* (cf. Lambert *OrNS* 54 190). The canonical god list *An-Num* (I 1ff.), that assimilates traditions of many different sources, inserts the independent list before the last pair of Anu's ancestors of the forerunner. The occurrence in Babylonian incantations, the Semitic words (*Dūri - Dāri*), and the importance of *Alala - Anu* in Hurrian cosmogony (cf. Güterbock *RLA* 6 327f.) point to a non-Sumerian (northern) background for this cosmogonic tradition. *Enūma Eliš*, that rebuilds mythology from the debris of previous ages, finds room for both traditions concerning *laḥmu*, for the cosmogonic god (formerly *laḥmu* B, cf. Lambert *OrNS* 54 189ff.), and for the humbler monster, once a servant of Ea, now among the soldiers of Tīamat (*laḥmu* A, cf. *JEOL* 27 94ff.). The fact that *Ee* recognizes both traditions shows that the cosmogonic god *Laḥmu* did not replace the servant *laḥmu*, and that the two existed side by side as separate entities.

Since the texts are silent on this point, the cosmic function of the cosmogonic *Laḥmu* can only be derived from art. It must be found in naked heros appearing in functions that can be interpreted as cosmic, but at the same time distinguish them from their peers, the non-cosmic *laḥmu*-servants/soldiers. Obviously the naked heros holding gate posts, the basis of Lambert's solution, do not meet these conditions. According to Lambert (*OrNS* 54 199) the gate posts or the naked heros keep heaven and earth separated, they are the pillars of the universe. The *laḥmū* of the deviant *Göttertypentext* might be adduced to support the view that *laḥmū* are atlantes, they certainly do not prove that gate posts or doors had a cosmic function. On the contrary, there is good evidence that they do not. Other beings that did not develop into cosmogonic gods hold gate posts or doors, e. g. the *kusarikku* (Amiet *GMA* 2 1300 B; *OIP* 78 109:11; Boehmer *UAVA* 4 Abb. 110, 113; doors: *GMA*² 819), the *mušhuššu* (*PKG* 14 119, vase of Gudea), and the two lower gods, door keepers of Utu (*UAVA* 4 Abb. 392ff.). Generally speaking, gate posts are (or once were) parts of doors (cf. *PKG* 14 Abb. 94a, Heinrich *Bauwerke in der Altsum. Bildkunst* Abb. 17), and monsters function at doors, which is why all of them, and even the gate posts (cf. II.A.4.B *urigallu*), stand watch at the gates of temples and private homes. Thus, although it cannot be excluded, gate posts, doors, and the deviant *laḥmū* of the *Göttertypentext* do not lead to a cosmogonic *Laḥmū* separating heaven and earth.

If then it is not the gate post that distinguishes the cosmogonic *Laḥmu* from his humbler namesake the door keeper, what is it? The conditions are met by a group of naked heros discussed by Amiet (*RA* 50 118f., *GMA*² 147ff., Pl. 111; cf. also Porada *Fs Reiner* 279ff.), especially those in horizontal position. On two OB seals (*GMA*² 1478, 1480) the horizontal heros indeed do contrast with the common servant hero. The bodies of the horizontal naked heros on the first seal are the water on which a ship sails, on the second a series of horizontal heros hold each other's feet, while above them, on a suspended floor, a more common scene with smaller figures is shown. These beings are literally water, perhaps the water of *Apsū* (properly a cosmic domain and not itself water), and certainly suitable beings to develop into cosmogonic gods. Equally distinctive is the swastika of heros grasping each other and surrounded by streams (cf. *JEOL* 27 100:2). Like the horizontal heros, they are obviously connected with the watery part of the cosmos. A connection of cosmic *laḥmu* not only with water, but also with the sky, is implied by a number of OB seals showing the distinctive horizontal *laḥmu*, or an upright one, with flowing vases and stars on either side of his head (Porada *Fs Reiner* 279ff. Figs. 1. 10, 12-14; Moortgat *VAR* 545). Earlier it was suggested (*JEOL* 27 100:2, 103:7) that two of the deviant *laḥmū* of the *Göttertypentext*, Onslaught and Struggle, who grasp each other and hold heaven and earth, retained something of the real *laḥmū*, who grasp each other in pairs or fours. That indeed real *laḥmū* sometimes held heaven, as the *Göttertypentext* indicates for the deviant ones, appears from a number of second millennium seals, but it is a function they share with many other demonic beings, and thus not the specific task of the cosmogonic *laḥmu* (cf. D.M. Matthews, *Principles of Composition in Near Eastern Glyptic of the Later Second Millennium B.C.* no. 450-485; singular is the seal Porada *AFO* 28 42 no. 23). Unfortunately the only text that tries to inform us on the nature of the cosmogonic *Laḥmu* (*KAV* 52 and dups., see *JEOL* 27 94) is completely understandable. To what use, if any, he was put in the cosmogonic hotchpotch of *Enūma Eliš* must remain undecided.

Beside the *laḥmu*, who became a cosmogonic god in a northern mythology, other monsters have cosmic functions as well (cf. Amiet *RA* 50 113ff. for *girtabullū*, a l i m a, and *kusarikku* in art), but there is nothing to prove a relation with cosmogony. *Anzū* (Heavy-Cloud) apparently plays a part in the early cosmos. In the *Lugalbanda Epic* (Wilcke *Lugalb.* 100:99ff.) he is the one that makes the decisions about the Tigris. The Eagle-Tree of Enki in which he lives is rooted in Utu's "seven-mouthed-river" (o.c. 92:23ff.). In the SB *Anzū-myth* *Anzū*'s birth provides clouds and the water for Euphrates and Tigris, already dug but still empty (Moran *JCS* 31 70, 92f., for mount Šaršar see now Lambert *JNES* 41 17). Later on he takes care of Enlil's bath (o.c. 80 iii

6). That *Anzū* was considered the source of the rivers is unequivocally demonstrated by two Kassite seals, on which streams flow from each of the heads of a two-headed lion-eagle (Porada *AFO* 28 52 no. 27, 53 Fig. o; the waters, contributed to by a mountain god, are guided by two *kullullū*). The universe is in a progressed state of development when two other monsters are born, the *mušhuššu* (designed by Enlil, brought forth by Sea and River, *CT* 13 33, cf. Wiggermann *Tišpak* 118f.), and the *bašmu* (*KAR* 6:1ff., created in the sea). They do not contribute anything to the cosmos, but are merely pests, devouring man and beast.

Among animals, objects and geometrical figures (*MSL* XI 107:387ff., OB *Hh* XXII) also monsters are identified with stars or constellations. The Ialumlum version of *Gilgamesh and Huwawa* (Shaffer *JAOS* 103 307⁴, Kramer *JCS* 1 36²¹⁷) seems to place the monsters that guide Gilgamesh to the cedar mountain as stars in heaven. In the *Labbu myth* (that cannot be younger than OB) the constellation *mušhuššu* is etiological explained as Enlil's design on the basis of which Sea and River created the actual monster (cf. Wiggermann *Tišpak* 125). Lambert suggests that the eleven defeated enemies of Ninurta together with their victor have 'astrological relevance one for each month of the year' (*CRAI* 32 58). Much too little is known about third millennium stars and constellations to speculate about the mythological notions that named them.

The view on monster mythology presented here was based on the assumption that during the third millennium a growing awareness of irrevocable differences between monsters and gods lead to successively sharper definitions of their mutual relations.

That in fact monsters were treated as collectives is shown by the repression of individual characteristics in order to achieve a coherent group mythology. Monsters are grouped as enemies, including the peaceful (King Palm; later *suhurmāšu* and *kullullū*), the passive (Strong Copper, Gypsum), and the purely apotropaic ones (King Palm, Head-of-the-Bison); monsters are grouped as mountaineers, including those that patently did not belong in the mountains (King Palm, Ship-Locust); the whole group shifts to Sea, including those that are not at home there (*kusarikku*, *mušhuššu*).

Until the end of Mesopotamian civilization the results of successive developments could exist side by side. *Enūma Eliš* recognizes two *laḥmū*, the one a cosmogonic god, the other a soldier of Tīamat. The *laḥmu* and the other soldiers of Tīamat are killed by Marduk, but in art they remain (with few exceptions) their traditional selves, alive and well. The *mušhuššu* is killed first by *Tišpak* (see below III), then by Marduk, but in art he remains what he was in the second half of the third millennium, the striding mount of its successive masters (cf. Wiggermann *Tišpak* 124). Generally speaking, monsters once servants remain servants in art, even when mythology has made them into defeated enemies.

Both the mythology of servants and that of defeated enemies serves well to cover the apotropaic use of representations of monsters. As servants they stand watch, or enforce the rule of their masters, as defeated enemies they scare off other evil (cf. VII.B.9).

Summary of oppositions

monster	god
composed	anthropomorphic
supernatural freak	representative of normal order
represents a phenomenon of nature	represents the whole to which the phenomenon belongs
intervenes in human affairs	affords background stability
unpredictable associate	master
rebel, pest	rightful ruler
defeated enemy	victor
associated with distant lands	associated with lowlands
associated with mountain/enemy	associated with rule from lowlands
associated with Sea	associated with dry land
limited cosmic functions	cosmogonic responsibility

More specific relations between the defeated enemies among each other, and between the group and the victor, are proposed by van Dijk *Lugal* 10ff. and *RIA* 7 134ff. Van Dijk observes similarities between Greek (the works of Heracles), Germanic (the cosmic tree) and Mesopotamian mythology, which, according to him, are the shattering remnants of a coherent prehistoric world view. King Palm, who has many other names in Mesopotamian mythology (Eagle-Tree, Cedar, *kiškanû*, *haluppu* etc.), is the cosmic tree in which Bird (*Anzû*) and Serpent (*bašmu*) live. Apparently they are enemies of vegetation (agriculture?), since their opponent is a warrior god married to a goddess of vegetation, on whose behalf he acts. Nevertheless, even in Mesopotamian mythology, not all heroic deeds of the warrior god are still organically related to this original concern. The very old god Pablisag of Larak is the first Mesopotamian protagonist of the myth. He, and his other forms Ninurta and Ningirsu, are armed with a bow.

Prehistoric connections have not been our concern in this chapter, but van Dijk's theory, true or false, implies separate origins for gods and monsters, and in this respect agrees with the views presented here. A completely different theory is put forward by Th. Jacobsen (*Treasures of Darkness* 9). According to Jacobsen, like sun and moon are the original forms of the later anthropomorphic Utu and Nanna, so the monsters are the earlier non-human forms of later anthropomorphic gods, specifically the *mušhuššu* of Ninazu (Jacobsen: Nigišzida, see *RIA mušhuššu* 3.2) and the 'thunderbird' *Anzû* of Ninurta/Ningirsu, the 'power in the thunderstorms' (*Treasures of Darkness* 128f., *The Harps That Once* 235¹). If this theory is applied to the monsters as a group, it cannot be upheld. Bison and Scorpion cannot be earlier forms of the sun. The personified Days are patently not identical with the weather god Iškur. In the Akkadian period Ninazu (or the god associated with the *mušhuššu*) himself is not yet (always) completely anthropomorphic, and as such coocurs with the *mušhuššu* (*OIP* 60 no. 331, cited above); the dragon cannot be the earlier non-human form when the god himself is still partly theriomorphic. The theory can be saved by considering the monsters not so much as earlier forms of the whole god, but as manifestations of the god in specific situations, for instance the scorpion as manifestation of the sun in the morning and in the evening. In this form the theory is similar to the one presented here (IIa), in which god and monster operate in the same field of action, and the god covers more of it than the monster. The difference is that in the weaker version of Jacobsen's theory the relation between god and monster is specified (monster represents part of god's activities), while it was left vague here (monster and god are associated).

Jacobsen explains the mythological battles between gods and monsters as expressions of the tension

between the anthropomorphic god and his earlier unworthy non-human form. The weaker form of the theory would explain the battles from a tendency to repress the more limited theriomorphic secondary form(s) in favour of one anthropomorphic principal form.

Although the weaker form of the theory cannot be disproved, it cannot be proved either. The facts that should go with it are lost in prehistory.

3 The combat myth. Ninurta and Anzû; Marduk before Enūma Eliš

Most early Mesopotamian myths are concerned with the explanation of the unexpected, of cultic or historical realities that deviate from the norm. The reasons for such deviations are found in the decisions and acts of gods, in their quarrels and marriages, and in the children they give birth to. One of the most powerful instruments of mythological explanation is the combat myth, that allows deviant reality to be analyzed into good and evil elements, rightful rulers and rebels. Monsters are the obvious adversaries of the anthropomorphic gods, and several early myths build their plots on their rebellion and defeat.

In the so-called *Labbu-myth* Enlil sends the *mušhuššu* to wipe out noisy mankind. The monster is defeated by Tišpak, who restores the nation to order. The myth translates history, the Old Akkadian overtake in Ešnunna, into mythology, and justifies Tišpak's kingship and the servitude of the *mušhuššu*, the animal of the former city god Ninazu, by presenting them as a consequence of Tišpak's liberation of the nation. It is a myth of local importance only (cf. Lambert *CRRAI* 32 56f., Wiggermann, *Tišpak* 124).

The most influential early combat myth is the *Anzû* myth (cf. Lambert *CRRAI* 32 56f.). The history of *Anzû*'s rebellion is complicated, and narrowly related to the rise of Ninurta.

Anzû, although his cry of woe makes the Anunna hide like mice in the earth (Wilcke *Lugalbanda* 100:82f.), is still a faithful servant of the gods in the Ur III *Lugalbanda Epic*, and not yet among the defeated enemies of Ninurta in *Gudea Cyl.* A Under orders of his father Enlil he blocks the entry of the mountain lands, "as if he were a big door" (Wilcke *Lugalbanda* 100:99f.). Thus it is no coincidence that *Anzû* is not among the defeated enemies of Ningirsu in *Gudea*; they fight at the same side against the same enemy, the mountain lands. On an Akkadian seal *Anzû* assists a warrior god against a rebellious mountain god (Frankfort *CS* Pl. XIXb). Two other Akkadian seals, although less unequivocal, can be understood in the same way (*UAVA* 4 Abb. 354f.).

In return for his blessings *Lugalbanda* promises *Anzû* to set up statues of him in the temples of the great gods, and to make him famous all over Sumer (*ibid.* 108:181ff., 110:198ff.). The poet would not have let *Lugalbanda* make such a promise, if he could not show his public that he kept it. Thus, when the *Lugalbanda Epic* was composed in the Ur III period, statues of *Anzû* were visible all over Sumer in the temples. With the simile cited above, the poet reveals that at least some of the *Anzû* statues he knew were apotropaic door keepers under orders of Enlil.

In fact *Anzû*'s occurred all over Sumer until well into the Ur III period: 'white-*Anzû*' is the name of a temple of Šara in Umma (Landsberger *WZKM* 57 20), Ur-Nammu supplied the gates of the Ekur in Nippur with *Anzû*'s (*ASJ* 11 45:25f.).

Composite emblems consisting of twice the same animal with an *Anzû* stretching out its wings above them are attested for a number of gods. Limited to Lagaš is the *Anzû* above two ducks/geese. (Fuhr-Jaepfelt *Materialien zur Ikonographie des Löwenadler Anzu-Indugud* 169ff.). The duck/goose is the symbolic animal of an unidentified

goddess, often called Bau (Opificius *UAVA* 2 211f.). An *Anzû* (or eagle, the head is broken, cf. Braun-Holzinger *RIA* 7 95) above gazelles appears on the sockle of an ED II statue from Tell Asmar (so-called Abu, *OIP* 44 Pl. 6). It might be the emblem of a local god, since the group is accompanied by a hydra (cf. Frankfort *CS* Text-fig. 27 and Pl. XXIIIj, both from Tell Asmar) on an ED III mace head of unknown origin (Frankfort *AnOr* 12 105ff.). An OB text from Ur (*UET* 6 105:10f., cf. Charpin *Le Clergé d'Ur* 287, 291) describes a gate with two *alima* (Charpin: *l u l i m*) and an eagle, in some way combined with a solar disc. The *alima* (human-headed bisons) and the solar disc belong to Utu. The stags under an *Anzû* on a copper relief from Ninḫursag's ED III temple in Ubaid (*PKG* 14 Pl. 97) are the symbolic animals of that goddess (Gudea *Cyl.* B X 4, *Frg.* 5 ii, cf. Heimpel *RIA* 4 420). The ibex belongs to Enki, who is called *dà r a - k ù - a b z u* (Gudea *Cyl.* A XXIV 21) and *dDà r a - a b z u* (*TCL* XV 10:77, cf. Green *Eridu* 194). Thus the symbolism of Entemena's silver vase (drawing *RIA* 7 95) becomes transparent. It shows three pairs of animals, each under an *Anzû*. The ibexes belong to Enki, in this time Ningirsu's father (cf. Falkenstein *AnOr* 30 91), the stags to his mother Ninḫursag, and the lions to Ningirsu himself, the god to whom the vase is dedicated. The *Anzû*'s belong to neither, but add something as yet undefined to the symbolism of each.

That not *Anzû* but the lion is the proper symbolic animal of Ningirsu, goes forth not only from the silver vase of Entemena, but also from the fragmentary Gudea stele in Berlin (Börker-Klähn *BaFo* 4 Taf. A, lion at the feet of the god to whom Gudea is introduced), and from the Ur III seal of Ur-DUN (Frankfort *CS* Text-fig. 38, lions from shoulders and at feet, cf. also Boehmer *OrNS* 35 373f., Gudea *Cyl.* A IV 19, Börker-Klähn *o. c.* ad 43). The composite emblem lions plus *Anzû* is extremely rare outside Lagaš (seal from Girtab, Frankfort *CS* Pl. XIIb). It appears in the hand of Ningirsu on the stele of the vultures (*PKG* 14 Abb. 90, for the lion's head cf. I. Winter, *Studies in the History of Art* 16 14¹⁸), on his chariot on the same monument (separated from the lions), and on a stele fragment of Gudea (*PKG* 14 111a/b). Although on a number of ED III monuments the composite emblem represents the god in a cultic scene (mace head, Fuhr-Jaepfelt *o. c.* Abb. 30; dedication plaques, *ibid.* p. 53ff), the emblem is not identical with the god, since the two can appear side by side (stele of the vultures).

Although objects dedicated to Ningirsu sometimes only have lions (dagger, Parrot *Tello* Fig. 26q; mace head, *ibid.* p. 101; lion protomes, Boese *UAVA* 6 218f.), there is a clear preference for the composite emblem. This is naturally explained from the wish to distinguish the symbolic lion of Ningirsu from that of other gods (*RIA* 7 91), and from the simple apotropaic lion (*RIA* 7 89). The Gudea texts are ambiguous about Ningirsu's emblem (*š u - n i r*). The one on his chariot (*Cyl.* A VI 22) corresponds to the lions plus *Anzû* on the stele fragment. The emblem of Ningirsu's clan, *dL u g a l - k u r - d ú b* (*Cyl.* A XIV 18, XVIII 13, B VII 22, cf. Lambert *RIA* 7 147), is patently not identical with *Anzû* (differently Landsberger *WZKM* 57 176⁴), since in *Angim* the latter is among the defeated enemies, while the former is an active associate of the god (*Angim* 67). Only once *Anzû* alone is the 'emblem of his (Gudea's) king (Ningirsu)' (*Cyl.* A XIII 22, cf. *RIA* 7 96).

On three ED III objects (Fuhr-Jaepfelt *o. c.* Abb. 46c, 77, 135) *Anzû* occurs together with the forerunner of the lion-dragon (Braun-Holzinger *RIA* 7 97:1) with its typically lowered head. The heraldic group *Anzû* plus two lion-dragon forerunners (Abb. 135) may represent Iškur.

In some way connected with the symbolism of Utu is the ED III scene of an *Anzû* attacking a human-headed bison (*RIA* 7 94). The more explicit pieces combine the scene with the boat god (Fuhr-Jaepfelt *o. c.* Abb. 86), Utu (Boehmer *UAVA* 4 79f.), or elements of the boat god scene (bird-man, plow, human-headed lion, scorpion, vessel, Abb. 77, 78, 109, 137). On one seal (Abb. 87) the *Anzû* attacks one of the mountains through which the sun rises, here in the form of a human-headed bison. Regularly all that remains of the distant habitat of the bison is a mountain with vegetation (Abb. 20, 48, cf. 77, 78; 46a, natural bull). Apparently the *Anzû* in this scene is evil, since once in its turn it is attacked by a bull-man and a naked hero, defending the human-headed bison (Abb. 78, cf. *RIA* 7 94). Twice *Anzû*'s occur in the boat god scene with other animals (Abb. 85, 112). In those cases they do not attack. *Anzû*'s attacking other animals than the human-headed bison are extremely rare (*GMA*² 1043).

The *Anzû* then is not Ningirsu's symbol, nor that of any of the other gods with whose symbolic animal it is combined. It represents another, more general power, under whose supervision they all operate. This higher power can only be Enlil, which is exactly what the Lugalbanda Epic and the *Anzû* myth (*JCS* 31 80 ii 25f., iii 1ff.) tell us. Thus the posture of the lion-headed eagle, wings stretched out above the symbolic animals of other gods, becomes understandable: it is neither that of attack, nor that of defense, but that of the master of the animals.

Notwithstanding his aggressive behaviour against the human-headed bison, *Anzû* still operates at the side of law in the early Ur III period (Gudea, *Lugalbanda* Epic). Shortly afterwards the situation changes. In the Ur III compositions *Angim* and *Lugal Anzû* is among the defeated enemies of Ningirsu/Ninurta (Cooper *AnOr* 52 141ff., van Dijk *Lugal* 11ff.). In Ur III art *Anzû* (but more often a natural eagle) is limited to a position between adorant and deity in introduction scenes (*RIA* 7 95); after that period he is relegated to the periphery.

The tension between *Anzû*, Enlil and Ninurta is the subject of a combat myth that must be dated to this period of change. Of the earlier Sumerian version only the middle is preserved (*UET* 6/1 2 and dups., see Alster *JCS* 24 120ff., Kramer *AulOr* 2 231ff.). *Anzû* has stolen the *m e*, apparently from Enki, their traditional guardian. After he is defeated by Ninurta, the *m e* slip from his hands, and return to their source. Enki wants to reward Ninurta with glory, a cult in *Apsû*, and eternal mastery over *Anzû*. Although Ninurta maddens Enki by wanting more, this is probably what happens in the end (not preserved). That the theft of the *m e* was not a local affair affecting only Enki, appears from 20, where Ninurta is promised: "your father Enlil will do what you say." The Babylonian myth (cf. Vogelzang *Bin šar dadmē*, with previous lit., Saggs *Afo* 33 1ff., Moran *Afo* 35 24ff.) relates how *Anzû* was born, came into the service of Enlil, took the opportunity to steal the tablet of destinies containing the *m e* */parsû*, gained universal power, and finally was defeated by Ningirsu/Ninurta with a trick of Ea. Ninurta is rewarded with what was promised to the victor, sanctuaries everywhere and universal glory. The gods make good their promise by equating Ninurta with a long list of other gods (*Afo* 33 25:127ff., OB kernel with SB additions).

With its results the myth reveals its purpose, to explain the growth of Ninurta's power and cult, at the expense of Enlil and other gods. The myth justifies Ninurta's rise to power by presenting it as the result of his victory over a rebel threatening divine establishment. By making *Anzû* into the culprit the myth solves another problem, that of *Anzû*'s position. Notwithstanding its aggressive behaviour against the human-headed bison, *Anzû* was the only monstrous mountaineer on the side of rightful rule; among the beings on Ningirsu's chariot *Anzû* was the only one that was not a defeated enemy

(PKG 14 111a/b, Ningirsu's chariot in the time of Gudea: two g u d - a l i m, King Palm, two u r - m a ḥ, *Anzû*). The myth makes him one among many, all monstrous enemies of the anthropomorphic gods.

In Lagaš Ningirsu was the warrior of Enlil (*AnOr* 30 90, *JNES* 32 28:8) before he became his son and was syncretized with Ninurta, at the latest in the time of Gudea (*AnOr* 30 90), and therefore prior to the *Anzû* myth. Although conceivably the local Ningirsu mythology contributed to the national Ninurta mythology, the *Anzû* myth cannot be a local affair, since it affects the nature of a national being. Thus, while the interpretation of local mythology (Ningirsu, Lagaš) in national terms (Ninurta, Nippur), had begun already in the time of Gudea, its justification in a national myth had to wait for the restoration of centralistic power in the Ur III period.

Strongly influenced by local (*Lagaš*) mythology is the myth Lugal (cf. van Dijk *RIA* 7 134ff.). Its protagonists are Ninurta/Ningirsu, and a monster, á - z á g *Asakku*, like the other monsters a warrior who lives in the mountains. Sumerian á - z á g characterizes disease (or the demon that causes it) in a general way; it does not denote a specific disease only, but diseases of a certain type (cf. van Dijk *Lugal* 19ff., with previous lit., Jacobsen *Fs Sachs* 225ff., Stol *Epilepsy*, forthcoming). The nature of the diseases it denotes is revealed by incantations and medical texts: *Asakku* is practically always paired with n a m - t a r (see provisionally *CAD asakku* A, *namtaru*), which denotes disease (and death) that is 'decided' by the gods, part of the rightful cosmos. From the observation that the pair *asakku* and *namtaru* fill a semantic field, it follows that *asakku* denotes what is not decided, disease that is not part of the rightful cosmos, suitably translated as 'disorder'. Diseases like n a m - t a r and á - z á g are combated by the physician goddess Bau, and those syncretized with her (Gula, Ninisina, Ninkarrak, cf. Römer *SKIZ* 244f., *AOAT* 1 279ff., 285:48, Civil *RA* 63 180 no. 14, Ali *Sumerian Letters* 138:20). That the á - z á g combated by her husband Ningirsu/Ninurta (and those syncretized with him, see below) is the same demon Disorder on a cosmic level, is clearly indicated by the myth *Lugal*. The whole myth is concerned with Ninurta deciding the fates; exactly when he sits down to do so, the message is brought of Disorder in the mountain. Disorder has to be defeated first, then Ninurta continues deciding the fates (n a m - t a r). In view of the artificial, abstract nature of the cosmic demon Disorder, it comes as no surprise that he is not represented in art (there is nothing to recommend van Dijk's arbitrary identification of a cyclopes on an OB plaque with *Asakku*, *Lugal* 20f., frontispiece = Opificius *UAVA* 2 no. 488). From Jacobsen's discussion (*Fs Sachs* 225ff.) it follows that even the myth that founded his existence did not have a clear picture of his appearance.

The OB Nippur god list (*SLT* 123 r. ii 11ff. //124 ii 2ff.) identifies six gods with Ninurta (and their wives with Bau). Similar lists occur in the MB hymn of Bullussa-rabi (Lambert *OrNS* 36 105ff.), in the SB *Anzû* myth (*Afo* 33 25:127ff.), and in a SB theological text (*KAR* 142 i 22ff., cf. *CT* 26 45 1f.), where they are called in a subscript the 'seven Ninurta's'. The most important Ninurta's are Ningirsu (protagonist of OB *Anzû* myth, and probably originally of Lugal, cf. van Dijk *RIA* 7 134), Zababa (Lambert *OrNS* 36 114, *JNES* 48 217, Cavigneaux *Texts from Babylon* I 137:1), Lagamal/Nergal (Cooper *AnOr* 52 146³, *KAR* 6), and Nabium (not in the OB list; *KAR* 142 i 25). The inclusion of m u š - s a g - i m i n in the list of defeated enemies of Nabium in the Converse Tablet (Lambert *Fs Albright* 335ff.) shows that the list is borrowed directly from Ninurta, and not from Marduk, since the dragon in question is not among the enemies of Marduk. The reconstruction of Nabium's mythology along the lines of *Ee* is attested in a hymn to Nabium (VII.B.14), in which his trophies are those of Marduk in *Ee*. Once the victory over *Anzû* is ascribed to Adad (King *BMS* 20:18).

Only one text attests to the association of a group of monsters (essentially that of *Ee*) with Marduk while not yet ruler of the universe, the inscription of Agum-kakrime (VII.B.7). Marduk had taken over the *mušhuššu* from Tišpak probably after Hamurabi's victory over Ešnunna; *lahmu*, *kulullû* and *suhurmāšu* were servants of Ea, and may have served his son Marduk as well. The *uridimmu* may have been Marduk's servant from the time of its invention onwards. Two monsters, *bašmu* (u š u m) and *kusarikku* (g u d - a l i m) were originally among the defeated enemies of Ninurta.

Although the text does not expressly state that the monsters at the door of Marduk's cella were his defeated enemies, this conclusion can hardly be escaped. The former enemies of Ninurta (*bašmu*, *kusarikku*) probably did not change their character, and the combat mythology of Ninurta that influenced so many city gods and even Marduk's son Nabium cannot have left Marduk untouched.

Since at this stage Marduk was not yet ruler of the universe, the mythology underlying the collection of enemies was certainly not of the same type as that of *Ee*, the justification of Marduk's cosmic rulership. Thus we do not expect Tiāmat as arch-enemy, the part she plays in *Ee* in order to counterbalance Marduk and make his victory important enough to justify his claim on universal rulership. Yet the stage was set for the introduction of the arch-enemy Tiāmat and a cosmic battle. Tiāmat was among the enemies of Ninurta, and both she and *Apsû*, the later cosmogonic pair, breed and shelter monsters (above IIB).

If Lambert is right (The History of the m u š - ḥu š in Ancient Mesopotamia In *L'Animal l'homme, le dieu dans le proche-orient ancien* 90) Tiāmat is represented by wavy lines on Marduk's seal (Wetzel *WVDOG* 62 Pl. 43f.). Berossus (S. Mayer Burstein *SANE* 1/5 14f., Lambert *JThS* 16 294f.) presents her both as a body of water and as a woman. In *Ee* she is water, but also a cow (? Landsberger *JNES* 20 175) or a goat; she has lower extremities (*išdu*, IV 129), a belly (*karšu*, I 23, IV 99, 101), udders (*sirtu*, V 57, cf. Oppenheim *Dictionary of Scientific Bibliography* XV 640⁶⁴; *AnSt* 5 98:34), a neck (*kišādu*, II 113, 115), insides (*libbu*, IV 100, V 63), blood and arteries (*ušlāt dāmi*, IV 131, *dāmu*, IV 32), spittle (*rupuštu*, V 47), a tail (*zibbatu*, V 59), a head (*qaqqadu*, V 53), a skull (*muḥḥu*, IV 130), a mouth (*pū*, IV 97, 100), lips (*šaptu*, IV 98), nostrils (*nahūru*, V 56), eyes through which Marduk releases the Euphrates and Tigris (V 55, Livingstone *Mystical Explanatory Works* 82:3), and a horn, cut off by Marduk (Livingstone *o. c.* 82:1, 13) and undoubtedly to be connected with the body of water called 'Horn of the Sea' (s i a - a b - b a), that enters the land from the Persian Gulf and gave its name to Borsippa (Oppenheim *o. c.* 655³¹).

4 Marduk and Enūma Eliš

Up to now Marduk's rulership was apparently felt to be sufficiently covered by the traditional model that made the ruling city-god an appointee of the divine assembly led by Anu and Enlil (so in the introduction of *CH*, and in other OB royal inscriptions, cf. Sommerfeld, *Marduk* 66ff., and for the model Jacobsen *Before Philosophy* 207ff.). At the end of the second millennium the old model, in which the power of the ruling city-god is checked by the divine assembly, was abolished. The justification of Marduk's rulership was changed: he was made independent of the decisions of a divine assembly, and promoted to sole ruler of the universe. *Ee* is the myth giving form to this new arrangement. It was composed at the occasion of the return of Marduk's statue to Babylon in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I (cf. Lambert in McCullough ed., *The Seed of Wisdom* 3ff.). In many details *Ee* shows its dependancy on the *Anzû*-myth and the Ninurta mythology (Lambert *CRAI* 32 56f.).

Implicit in Marduk's elevation is the elevation of his enemies and the promotion of the combat myth from good-versus-evil to Good-versus-Evil. Indeed, it seems that the collection of pre-existing enemies was restuctured along this line: Tiāmat, formerly only one of the enemies and a breeding place of monsters, is promoted to arch-fiend and cosmic power; the other monsters are made dependent of her as her children and soldiers. Their number is enlarged to eleven, twelve together with their leader Kingu, possibly to suggest a relation to a cosmic phenomenon.

The added monsters are *ušumgallû* (cf. VII.C.2.a.f), *ūmû dabrūtu* (cf. VII.C.4.f.),

and *mušmahhū*, all in the plural. The three of them may be related to the Ninurta mythology. For the *mušmahhu* and its identification in art with a seven-headed snake cf. Douglas van Buren *OrNS* 15 18f., Heimpel *Tierbilder* 480ff., Cooper *AnOr* 52 123, Landsberger *Fauna* 53:11ff., *MSL* 8/1 7:3 and forerunner *SLT* 51 iv 11, Frankfort *AnOr* 12 105ff. no 1 Figs. 1–4. The *mušhuššu*, in text 7 (stage III) still not more than Marduk's symbolic animal, is now added to the list of enemies; added also is the *girtablullū*. Omitted is the *suhurmāšu*, perhaps he was not considered a suitable soldier.

In some texts the list is expanded still further and includes Anzû (11, 13), a testimony to the continuing influence of the Ninurta mythology. The continuing influence of the Ninurta mythology appears also from late commentaries, explaining ritual affairs with references to mythology (cf. Hruška *Anzu* 87ff., van Dijk *Lugal* I 25f., Jacobsen *Unity and Diversity* 72 ff., Lambert *JSS* 13 110f.).

After defeat, Tiāmat's soldiers become Marduk's trophies. Thus from *Ee* onwards, the apotropaic use of representations of this group is covered by the fact that they are defeated enemies, an example not to be forgotten (cf. VII.B.9). The monsters are disarmed by Marduk (*Ee* V 73ff.), and indeed, (except for the *ugallu*) none of the monsters used apotropaically is armed, not in the texts and not in art.

The following terms are used for the members of Tiāmat's army as a group: *ūmū*, "weather-beasts" (VII.B.10, *Šurpu* 8:8), *umāmānu*, "beasts" (*OIP* 2 141:14), *gallū*, "soldiers" (VII.B.9, *Ee* IV 116), *šūt mē nāri u nābali*, "those of the water of the river and the dry land" (VII.B.10, *Šurpu* 8:6), *bīnūt apsi*, "creatures of Apsū" (text I 144), and, in apotropaic context, *sākip lemnūti ša Ea u Marduk*, "those that repel the evil ones, of Ea and Marduk" (text I 160f., 165f.). For ^d*Ešret-nabnissu* cf. Lambert *CRRAI* 32 58.

The determinative for gods is used only sporadically, like the horns of divinity in art: the monsters are kept separate from the gods. They are also kept separate from the demons (lower gods in a variety of functions, acting on behalf of the great gods or by themselves) and the spirits of the dead (*ešemmu*): they never cause disease. They do not appear in the diagnostic omens, and no incantations exist against them.

C Individual histories

1 *lahmu*, "the hairy one".

The *lahmu* was treated in *JEOL* 27 (1981–82) 90ff. to which we now add the following:

ad 95: for *lahmu* C, "(Opferspeise in Naturalienform . . .)", *NAss*, cf. Menzel *AT* 1 21ff., Postgate *Taxation* 73.

96: For the Nimrud "heroes" without the distinctive six spiral tresses but inscribed as the *lahmu* cf. now Green *Iraq* 45 91f. An interesting misread NB attestation of the *lahmū* in the service of Ea is Lambert *Atra-ḫasīs* 116:7, recurring, with variations, in 116:10, 118:5, 12, 19, 120:35 (cf. also 116:28). Just as Anu and Adad guard the upper regions, and Sin and Nergal guard the middle earth, so Ea on the command of Enlil guards "the bolt, the bar of the sea" together with his . . . : *qā-du X-mi-šu*. In his commentary (166f.) Lambert identifies the sign X as *Ú*, and hesitates between reading *ú-mi-šu* or *šam-mi-šu*; the sign may just as well be *lāh* and the resulting reading *lāh-mi-šu*, "his hairies" makes perfect sense. It seems that later Ea blames these *mašsarū tāmti*, "guards of the sea", for the escape of the fishes that feed the starving people, thus exonerating himself (118:20ff., 120:36ff.). Apparently they were killed for it. NB *Atra-ḫasīs*, perhaps not too far removed from OB *Atra-ḫasīs* and certainly reflecting pre-Ee mythology, hints

here at a story of mutinous *lahmū* punished by Ea. Mutinous *lahmū* are not implied by first millennium seals (Amiet *Akkadica* 28 31f.) showing a *lahmu*-like monster defeated by gods. This monster is apparently a successor of Humbaba. New is the reading of King *AKA* 389:11 (cf. Grayson *ARI* 1 43,154): *lāh¹(É)-ma AN.GUB-šu rabiš lultašib*, "and I gave the *lahmu*, its protective spirit, its eminent place" (MAss private building inscription). For a *lahmu* depicted on a potstand (OB) cf. now Durand *ARM* 21 222 48f. (*kannu ša la-aḫ-mi*) and 363³².

100⁴³: For the "Viermenschenradmotiv" cf. also Collon *AOAT* 27 59⁴, B. Teissier *ANECS* 173.

101: To the somewhat provisional collection of functions and attributes could be added:

3 The naked hero as a fisherman occurs also on a seal from the second half of the fifteenth century found in Thebes (Porada *Afo* 28 40 no 22).

9 With snakes: Franfort *SCS* 535 (ED); shell-inlay (ED): Weber *AO* 17 275, cf. for further ED examples Amiet *GMA*² 134; OB (Syrian): Noveck, *The Mark of Ancient Man* no 27; MB: van Buren *Iraq* 1 75f. Pl. XIb.

10 With goat and sprig in *apkallu*-like function: Layard *Mon* I 50/7 = Ravn *Afo* 16 244 (Nass., cf. above p. 77ff.).

105: Two apparently not independent recent studies connect the biblical Samson with the naked hero: R. Wenning - E. Zenger *Biblische Notizen* 17 (1982) 43ff. and R. Mayer-Opificius *Ufo* 14 (1982) 149ff. The same idea was put forward by Aleida G. van Dalen in her Dutch dissertation "Simson" (1966) 117f.

I summarize the results of *JEOL* 27 90ff.:

a *word*: Semitic (95); entered Sumerian in the Pre-Sargonic period (97) in the form *laḫama*. A more general use of the term is attested in the *Göttertypentext* (97ff.). An uncertain third millennium attestation is *ARET* V 6 ix 2: ^d*L[a-ḫa(?)]-ma* [AB(?)].ZU. [W. G. Lambert convincingly contested the existence of *lahmu* B, "the muddy one", *OrNS* 54 189ff.].

b *Identification*: naked hero. Proved in *JEOL* 27 (1981–82) 90ff.

c *Attestations*: from Early Dynastic (perhaps even Jemdet Nasr) period in art; from Gudea *Cyl. A* XXIV 26ff. in the texts (the loanword *laḫama* is even older).

d *Mythology*: the naked hero may originally have been a spirit of the rivers, mastering wild animals and taking care of the domesticated herds with his water (99f.). The water was symbolized by the hair that gave him his name. His Semitic name too points to a rural background, and his entry into the ordered pantheon of city gods may not have been peaceful; a deformed echo of mutiny is perhaps to be found in NB *Atra-ḫasīs* (above ad 96). Though furnished with the determinative more often than the other "monsters" (96f., 99, above VII.A note e), he never became completely divine and remains iconographically distinct from the gods with their horned tiaras. In Sumerian and later texts of older origin (or with passages reflecting pre-Ee mythology) the *lahmū* appear as a group of fifty servants of Enki (95f.).

Even later (MB, cf. above VII.B), when he enters the suit of Marduk and holds the spade (92, 101:5, above II.A.4), he remains associated with water (101:4).

- e *Apotropaic Representations*: representations of *lahmū* stand at the *du-b-lá* of Sumerian temples (95; since Gudea *Cyl.A XXIV 26f.*); the OAkk *lahmu* associated with a *kusarikku* (96) may also have been apotropaic. A monumental OAkk *lahmu* holding a gate post is the Bassetki statue (cf. Ayish *Sumer 32 69*). In a SB incantation of older origin (96:7) a *lahmu* is present in a private house (cf. Opificius *UAVA 2 221* for OB representations on clay plaques). MAss and later royal inscriptions describe *lahmū* at gates (91f., 102f.); a MAss private building inscription records the presence of a *lahmu*, “its protective spirit”, in a house with a well (AKA 389:11, cited above); the *lahmū* of the royal inscriptions and the rituals (VII.A) can be matched with the figures actually attested in palaces and houses (Rittig *Kleinplastik 51ff.*, Reade *BaM 10 38*, Kolbe *Reliefprogramme 96ff.*).
- 2 *bašmu*.
For the two Sumerian terms *ušum* and *muš-šà-tùr* Akkadian has only one: *bašmu* (spelled logographically MUŠ.ŠÀ.TUR/TUR). It is uncertain whether *ušum* and *muš-šà-tùr* denote two different iconographic types. If they do, and if the two types have not been confused in the course of history, Akkadian *bašmu* must refer to two different types of mythological snakes as well, and we will call them *ušum/bašmu* and *muš-šà-tùr/bašmu*.
- a *ušum/bašmu*, “Venomous Snake”.
- a *Word*: Sumerian *ušum* is an Akkadian loanword, derived from a postulated dialectical *wašm-*; Akkadian *wa-* becoming Sumerian *u-* is not without precedents (cf. Edzard *Genava 8 247⁴¹*), nor is the additional vowel in the proximity of a syllabic consonant (cf. *JEOL 27 97³*). Akkadian *š* < PS *t* is regularly rendered by Sumerian *-š-*. The Akkadian word goes back on PS *BTN/M* (cf. Landsberger *Fauna 58⁴*, Humbert *AfO 11 235ff.*). It is now attested also in Ebla (Fronzaroli *SEb 1 76* with further literature, *MEE 4 386 iii 9*, *ARET 5 no 4 i 3*).
- b *identification*: horned snake with forelegs (cf. Weidner *Gestirndarstellungen Pl. IX-X*, where the caption ^dMUŠ is a shortened spelling of MUŠ.ŠÀ.TUR = *bašmu*, historical *ušum/bašmu*).
- c *attestations*: in texts as the name of a specific monster (not as a general word for dragon) since Gudea *Cyl.A XXVI 29* (and Fragment 1 *TCL 8 Pl. 53*, cf. van Dijk *Lugal I 11²⁵*); the *ušum/bašmū* of *Angim 33* and *Lugale 129* stem approximately from the same time. In art only one doubtful attestation is known to me from OAkk (Douglas van Buren *OrNS 19 Pl. IX/2 = UAVA 4 Abb. 290*). All further attestations stem from the first millennium (seals like Moortgat *VAR 680, 681*).
- d *Mythology*: originally *ušum/bašmu* is perhaps nothing more than “Venomous Snake”, a natural enemy of man mythologized. Whether it was once associated with a chthonic god (Ninazu or Ningišzida)

cannot be established. In SB texts it is councillor or defeated enemy of Tišpak, and perhaps replaces the *mušhuššu* who fell into the hands of Marduk. From Ur III onwards it is attested as one of the “warriors” (*ur-sag*) slain by Ninurta (Cooper *AnOr 52 143*). The SB myth *KAR 6* describes a MUŠ *ba-[aš-mu]* (restored with Landsberger *Fauna 58³*, followed by *CAD B 141a*) created in the sea and devouring fishes, birds, wild asses, and men. His venom is mentioned in 37. Since “his feet” is certainly to be restored in 25, this *bašmu* is the *ušum/bašmu* rather than the feetless *muš-šà-tùr/bašmu*. The gods do not approve and send Nergal/Palil, the snake charmer (30), to subdue the monster. Nergal is not originally a dragon slayer, but here, as elsewhere (Cooper *AnOr 52 146³*), he replaces Ninurta. After Marduk’s usurpation of the *mušhuššu*, the *ušum/bašmu* became the symbolic animal of gods formerly associated with the *mušhuššu*.

- e *Apotropaic representations*: Gudea *Cyl. A XXVI 29*; in art: the dragon from the palace of Esarhaddon (Kolbe *Reliefprogramme Type XVIII*; Reade *BaM 10 40*) can hardly be anything else than apotropaic, and therefore, if the list of VII.A is complete, must be a *bašmu* (it can certainly not be a *mušhuššu*, the only other dragon of the list). The *ušum/bašmu* is not attested in the Kleinplastik.
- f *ušumgal*, rendered in Akkadian by *ušumgallu* and *bašmu*, is a derivative of *ušum* and literally means: “Prime Venomous Snake”. Its use is determined by inflation which made the far more generally used *ušumgal* oust simple *ušum*. *Ušumgallu* is like *ušum* used as a generic term as well, and occasionally replaces *mušhuššu* when the dragon of Nabû is referred to (4 *R² 20/3 Obv. 15f.*, *KAR 104:29*, *ABL 951 Obv. 12-13*, cf. Lambert *Fs Matouš 2 93*, Parpola *LAS 2 266 ad 16*), or the dragon of Ninurta (*Iraq 14 34 72-73*). The foremost quality of an *ušumgal* (and probably of an *ušum*) is being a determined killer, killing probably with its venom, and frightening even the gods (de Genouillac *Trouvaille 1*, Ur III incantation). It is this quality that makes *ušum(gal)* a suitable epithet for certain gods and kings. In *Ee* (cf. above VII.B.9) the number of monsters is enlarged with *mušmahhū*, *ušumgallū* and *umū dabrūtu*. This indicates that, if we have correctly equated the denotations of *ušum/bašmu* and *ušumgallu*, the *bašmu* of *Ee* is the *muš-šà-tùr/bašmu*. The use of *muš-šà-tùr* in the Sumerian version of a bilingual text enumerating apparently (some of) the same set of monsters (VII.B.8), and the correspondance of the *bašmu* of the rituals with the feetless snake of the Kleinplastik point in the same direction. The appearance of a clawed dragon on a relief corresponding to the same *bašmu* of the rituals, however, reminds us of the fact that in this thinly documented question no definite

results can be obtained.

- b muš-šà-tùr/*bašmu*, “Birth Goddess Snake”.
- identification*: horned snake. The snake of the Kleinplastik, proved to be the *bašmu* by its inscription (Klengel-Brandt *FuB* 10, 1968, 36; suggested earlier by Landsberger *Fauna* 56, 58, when the inscribed figures had not yet been published), does not have horns (Rittig *Kleinplastik* 122f., 216f.). However, since both types of *bašmu* are probably horned, since the snake without horns is securely identified with ^dNiraḥ and opposes on *kudurru*’s with a horned type, and since the Kleinplastik leaves off the horns of the *mušhuššu* and the *suhurmāšu* as well, we may safely supply the horns on the snake of the Kleinplastik, suspect them of having been omitted for practical reasons, and resolve the contradictory evidence.
 - attestations*: in texts as the name of a specific monster since Gudea (together with muš-ḥuš, Gudea *Cyl. A* XXVI 24f., *TCS* 3 41:416f., *BiOr* 30 362:49, cf. Frayne *JAOS* 102 512f.; all apotropaic representations). In art: Frankfort *Iraq* 1 Pl. IIIh (Oakk, uncertain); on NAss seals, represented as a rearing cobra with horns, attacked by a god armed with a bow (*VAR* 689ff. and other seals); on *kudurru*’s (Seidl *BaM* 4 155.). In NAss Akkadian *bašmu* is possibly used to denote the Egyptian uraeus (Lambert, *JIS* 33 62).
 - Of the *mythology* of this dragon little is known. In (OB) *Gilgamesh and Huwawa* 38 he is an u r - s a g, “warrior”, one of the seven monstrous sons of one mother given by Utu to Gilgamesh to assist him on the road to Huwawa; he is not one of the enemies of Ninurta, but appears on the chariot of Marduk in a late text of MB (?) origin and later as one of his adversaries in *Ee* and related texts.
 - Apotropaic representations*: in texts, together with *mušhuššu* (cf. above *attestations*) or other monsters (Heimpel *Tierbilder* 87.6); in the Kleinplastik: Rittig *Kleinplastik* 122f., Ismail *AfOB* 19 199.
- 3 *mušhuššu*, “Furious Snake”, “Aweful Snake”.
- Word*: Sumerian muš-ḥuš is attested as a loanword in Akkadian since OB (Lieberman *SLOB* 1 no 489).
 - Identification*: snake-dragon. Identified by Koldewey *MDOG* 19 (1903) 14ff. on the basis of a comparison of the figure on the gates of Babylon with the description of Nebuchadnezzar II (*KB* III/2 23 = *VAB* 4 72:21).
 - Attestations*: since Oakk. An earlier dragon with a lion’s head and without the talons is certainly a *mušhuššu* in ED IIIb, and probably already in the protoliterate period (cf. *RIA s. v. mušhuššu* § 3.1-2). The lion-parts are progressively replaced by snake-parts.
 - Mythology*: the *mušhuššu* originally serves the underworld god Ninazu, the king of the snakes; he is perhaps an angel of death, killing with his venom. In Ešnunna during the Oakk period Tišpak, a god of foreign origin, replaces Ninazu as city god, and takes over his symbolic animal. The

myth recording Tišpak’s victory over the symbolic monster of his predecessor seems to be preserved in *CT* 13 33f., cf. Wiggermann, Tišpak, his seal, and the dragon *mušhuššu* in O.M.C. Haex et al. eds., *To the Euphrates and beyond* (Fs M. N. van Loon) [1989] 117–133. In Lagaš Ningišzida, the son of Ninazu, is associated with the dragon; his proper animal, however, is the snake ^dNiraḥ. From MB onwards, probably as a consequence of Hammurabi’s conquest of Ešnunna, the city of Tišpak, the dragon is found associated with Marduk and his son Nabû. After Sennacherib’s conquest of Babylon the *mušhuššu* is usurped by Aššur. Ninazu and Tišpak become associated with other snakes and dragons (ušum/*bašmu*, *ušumgallu*). Though since Tišpak’s takeover in Ešnunna no longer the servant of an underworld god, the *mušhuššu* remains a fearless killer.

- Apotropaic representations*: since Ur III (Gudea *Cyl. A* XXVI 24f., *TCS* 3 41:416f., *BiOr* 30 362:49, cf. Frayne *JAOS* 102 512f.). Apotropaic use of representations of the *mušhuššu* can be understood from his function as a fearless warrior watching over the just rule of his masters and attacking evildoers (cf. Brinkman *PHPKB* 80:14). Rittig’s reservations about the identity of the clay figures, *Kleinplastik* 114ff. (cf. also Green *Iraq* 45 93), are unwarranted: the *suhurmāšu* also lacks its horns in the Kleinplastik, and the lowered tail may be inspired by practical considerations. Apotropaic *mušhuššu* are attested also on plaques (*BMQ* 36 136 and Pl. LVf, NAss) and palace reliefs (Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Type XVIII, Reade *BaM* 10 40). See now Wiggermann *RIA s. v. mušhuššu*, forthcoming.
- 4 *ugallu*, “Big Weather-Beast”, “Big Day”.
- Word*: Akkadian *ugallu* is a loanword from Sumerian u₄-ga₁, “big weather-beast”; since Sumerian u₄-ga₁ in bilingual texts is always translated as *ūmu rabū*, “big weather-beast”, and since the lion-demon called *ugallu* is attested only after the Ur III period, it seems that *ugallu* is an artificial, learned loanword, invented to give one standardized weather-beast a definite name. One attestation of u₄-ga₁ = *ūmu rabū* (UET 6 391 Obv. 16) was known to Sjöberg *OrNS* 37 240; the following ones can be added: *LKA* 77 Rev. iv 37 // *LKA* 78 Rev. 1’, *CT* 16 9 i 40f., *CT* 16 22 266f. (for this phrase cf. also the incantation *TIM* 9 62:8), *AnOr* 21 384:17 (cf. Tallqvist *AGE* 175 for the restoration of 18), *STT* 192 Obv. 7f., van Dijk *Lugal* I 105:424. The unilingual Sumerian attestations of u₄-ga₁ were recently discussed by Römer *SKIZ* 100, *Fs Kraus* 306f., Sjöberg *TCS* 3 100 (add: *SEM* 86 1, 2, *ZA* 63 2:6, *StOr* 49 184 *Sk* 11:2, 7, *CT* 17 7 v 5, *ArOr* 21 396:38 cf. *CT* 44 32 Rev. “v” 25’, *SbTU* 2 16 Rev. iii 1, *CT* 36 22 ii 1, *JAOS* 103 100³⁶). For ^dU₄-ga₁-ga₁, a name of Iškur, and for his temple é-u₄-ga₁-ga₁ cf. Renger *AfO* 23 73³ (and *STT* 20:8’); for the ship of his wife Šala, ^{gis}má-u₄-ga₁-ga₁, cf. *MSL* 5 178:322. That older Sumerian u₄-ga₁/*ūmu rabū* does not denote a specific being, but a being differentiated from simple u_d only by its stature (ga₁), follows from the fact that Iškur rides both an u_d and an u₄-ga₁

(CT 15 15:7f., cf. Römer *Fs Kraus* 303). The being denoted here by u d and u₄-g a l must be the lion-dragon, Iškur's mount and draught-animal since ED (cf. Abou Assaf *BaM* 14 43ff., 46f.). Although other sources as well give the impression that u₄-(g a l)/ūmu (*rabû*) denotes a specific being (Gudea *Cyl.* A XXV 9, apotropaic u d at the gate), or at least a being going on all fours (mount or draught-animal, see below d), this cannot be true, since one of the u d, the later u₄-g a l/ugallu, was imagined as an upright lion-demon, and since u d/ūmu is used to denote the whole group of monsters constituting the army of Tiamat (VII.B.10) as well as the different group of monsters attacking Sin in CT 16 19:1ff. Our neutral translation "weather-beast" rather than "storm-beast" is based on the observation that good u d do exist (below d) beside evil u d; the u d-beings are apparently neutral. Landsberger's "Geistertiere" (*Fauna* 75) stresses the unspecific denotation of ūmu, but seems too reserved as to the relation with u d/ūmu, "day", "storm". Heimpel's translation "Flügelöwe" is too narrowly restricted to one of the possible denotations (*Tierbilder* 113, cf. Römer *Fs Kraus* 306f.).

An UD.GAL^{mušen} is attested in SB (Weidner *Syria* 33 177 Rev. 1:6, cf. Landsberger *WZKM* 56 122³⁹) as one of the *passū naprušūtu*, "the winged 'puppets'" of a board-game.

Piriggallu in NAss royal inscriptions has nothing to do with *ugallu*. It denotes the "lion bases" of columns (cf. *BaM* 10 Pl. 11, Turner *Iraq* 32 76⁶¹, Landsberger *Fauna* 75).

- b *Identification*: lion-demon. Proved by Green *Iraq* 45 (1983) 90f. on the basis of the inscription on a lion-demon from Nimrud, matching the inscription prescribed for the *ugallu* in ritual II Obv. 41f. (cf. already Deller apud Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* 222, Wiggermann apud Stol *Zwangerschap en Geboorte* 112). The lion-demon is sometimes incorrectly identified with the *urmahullū* (Frankfort *CS* 175, Lambert *Iraq* 41 10). Once the *ugallu* is identified as the lion-demon, the restoration ^dU₄.[GAL] in the *Göttertypentext* MIO I 68 52' (quoted by Frank *MAOG* XIV/2 35 incorrectly as K 10064) can no longer be doubted. As usual, the monster described by the *Göttertypentext* deviates from the regular one. The *ugallu* has the head and the ears of a lion (UR.MAḤ), and human hands; in his right hand he holds a [MU]LUD.DA (? Collated) and in his left a hatchet (*qulmū*). These attributes are not attested in the hands of a lion-demon in art. His claws are perhaps described in 51', but the line cannot be restored. Frank *MAOG* XIV/2 35 apparently reads GİR] MUŠEN šá-kin, "furnished with the claws of a bird", but instead of MUŠEN the tablet clearly has RI (collated). A dagger (GİR) is in his belt. The door-keeper of the underworld, *Pētū* ("Nedu"), is described in the "Unterweltsvision" in a similar fashion (lion's head, human hands, claws of a bird); Frank *MAOG* XIV/2 35 convincingly associated *Pētū* with the unnamed clay figure of "one cubit" with a lion's head prescribed in the *etemmu* ritual *KAR* 227 i 24f. (misquoted by Ellis *Finkelstein Memorial Volume* 73).

- c *Attestations*: in art the lion-demon is attested since OB; earlier differently formed lion-demons (without talons or donkey's ears) may or may not be u d's — this type of beings is attested already in Fara (*SF* 1 vii 24f.) — but they are certainly not yet the exclusive denotation of u₄-g a l. The Oakk. lion-demon is an adversary of the Sun god (Seidl *BaM* 4 XLVI E.1, Boehmer *UAVA* 4 79), or an associate of Adad (*ibid.* 333). The later lion-demons sometimes attack human evil-doers (Seidl *BaM* 4 LXVI G, cf. also Lambert *Iraq* 41 10, Buchanan *Yale* 781, Frankfort *SCS* 906, Parker *Iraq* 37 28 15), cf. *SBH* 15 no. 7: 15f.: u₄ ka-ba mu-lu šu-ti-a, "Weather-beast, that holds the man in his mouth" (cit. TCS III 125, with duplicates). Once on an OB seal (Frankfort *CS* Pl. XXVI-IIc) a lion-demon appears together with a smaller lion-demon. Without sufficient reason Landsberger *WZKM* 57 8 considered them uncommon representations of Anzū and its young.

- d *Mythology*: in origin the u d/ūmu demon is the personified Day and its nature the manifestation of divine will. Since days of health and peace are what the gods need in order to be taken care of by their human servants, days of health and peace are what can be expected from them, the normal days. Thus Good Days (u₄-d ù g-g a) are worth mentioning only in contrast to the Evil Days that bring them to an end (*First Ur Lament AS* 12:190). The Days of exceptional splendor and plenty before the flood, a golden age, are personified as anthropomorphic Wise Ones (*ūmu-apkallū*, II.A.4.B). Divine discontent, however, may bring about change and cause good days to turn into days of war and destruction. By fusing effect and cause the Days become the instrument of divine decisions, the enforcers of divine will (especially clear in the Sumerian city lamets). They are manifestations of gods (Tallquist *AGE* 103f.), of their words (*AnOr* 52 60:17, cf. Langdon *Epic of Creation* 88⁵) or their weapons (*AnOr* 52 123f. ad 131, 132). The personified Days resemble the evil spirits (*utukkū lemnūtu*; cf. *AS* 12:400ff., *JCS* 30 132ff. 20). One of them is one's dying day, the (Evil) Day (*Ūmu lemnū*; ^dU d), the messenger of the underworld god Erra (*UET* 6 395 Obv. 12, *SEM* 117 ii 9); another is the day of the flood (*Gilg.* XI 91f., cf. also *ibid.* 118). Generally the bad Days are associated with Iškur/Adad, the storm god; they are "released from the sky" (a n-t a š u-b a r-r a, cf. e.g. *UET* 6 391 Obv. 16), howl and roar (*TCS* 3 100). These violent weather phenomena, roaring storms, are imagined as (at least partly) leonine monsters (interchangeable with *pirig*, "lion"; see also below 11a, lion-dragon u₄-ka-d u ḥ-ḥ a), mounts and draught-animals of gods (mount of Iškur: above a; mount of Ištar: *JNES* 33 234 VIII; chariot of Utu: *OrAnt* 8 42 ad 89ff., of Marduk: *Ee* IV 50; of Ninurta: Gudea *Cyl.* B XIII 19; of Gilgamesh: *Gilg.* VI 12). The u₄-g a l at first was not a specific being but simply a big u d (above a; translated into Akkadian as *ūmu rabū*). After the Ur III period u₄-g a l came to be used to denote a specific being, the lion-demon (translated into Akkadian as *ugallu*). As a specific monster it became one of Marduk's trophies, perhaps only to explain its use as an

apotropaion. The incantations and inscriptions (cf. VII.A.4 note f) define the *ugallu* as a fearless killer putting to flight evil and blocking the entry of the enemy (the human adversary on OB seals?). The history of the term *u d* indicates that executing divine orders is the basis of his existence.

- e *Apotropaic representations*: his presence on OB seals (attacking an evil-doer) is perhaps apotropaic. On *kudurru*'s: Seidl *BaM* 4 XLVI (with further literature). On reliefs: Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Type XV (cf. 222), Reade *BaM* 10 39. Clay and metal figures: Ellis *Finkelstein Memorial Volume* 67ff., Rittig *Kleinplastik* 103ff., 128 (21.2), Green *Iraq* 45 90f. On amulets: Lamaštu amulet 2, 49, 56. Together with a god raising his right fist (Lulal): above II.A.4.A end (reliefs, amulets, bronze bell; on the bronze bell the apotropaic *ugallu* is unarmed). For the texts cf. VII.A.4 with note f, *KAV* 74:10, *SBH* IX 147:2 (ina IGI^dU₄.GAL-lu, followed by ^dBa-aš-mu). For some further references to the lion-demon cf. Madhloom *Chronology* 109, Orthmann *Untersuchungen* 310ff., Frankfurt *CS* 174f., *SCS* 46, Collon *AOAT* 27 120³, Porada *CRRAI* 26 Pl. XIIIb, Delaporte *RA* 7 Pl. IV/4. See now Green *BaM* 17 141–254.
- f The *ūmū dabrūtu* defeated by Marduk in *Ee* (above VII.B.9) also belong here (“fierce weather-beasts”) and are perhaps related to the *ūmū šamrūtu*, “fierce weather-beasts”, lead away by one of the incarnations of Ningirsu/Ninurta in the Gula hymn *OrNS* 35 126:173.
- 5 *uridimmu*, “Mad Lion”.
- a *Word*: *uridimmu* is a loanword from Sumerian *ur-i-dim*; the elements of the Sumerian word are *ur*, “dog/lion”, and *idim*, “(howling) mad”, “wild”, “not domesticated” (Heimpel *Tierbilder* 351ff., von Soden *Symbolae Böhl* 351; glossed *i-d[i-im]* in *MSL* 8/2 14:94). The correct form of the Akkadian loanword is rather *urDimmu*: text VI Col. B 10 *ur-dim-me*, *MSL* 11 31 Sect. 10:8' // Cavigneaux *Texts from Babylon* I 105:4 ^{mul}*ur-i-dim* = [*u*]r-dim-mu (which also establishes the name of the constellation), and Weisberg *YOS* 17 345:6 (NB, offerings to) ^d*Ur-dim-mu*. Unfortunately the spellings with *-dim-* and *-dim-* do not allow us to establish the nature of the dental (D) and to date the loanword. The element *idim* can be used to determine imaginary beings (*ZA* 57 90: *ušumgal-idim*); thus the composition of the word does not allow us to determine whether the being denoted was real or imaginary. For UR.IDIM, the monster, and for UR.IDIM, the constellation (cf. *AHw* 1429b), the reading *ur(i)dimmu* is ascertained by text VI and *MSL* 11 31 (quoted above). It seems probable therefore that UR.IDIM = *ur(i)dimmu* the constellation was also imagined as a monster; if we may hold that the imaginary beings of heaven did not change their appearance after their invention, the heavenly *ur(i)dimmu* is the oldest attestation of this monster (it occurs in typologically older astrological texts and may go back to the third millennium, cf. van der Waerden, *die Anfänge der Astronomie* 54ff., Hunger-Walker *MDOG* 109 30:22). Perhaps Sumerian *ur-i-dim* also denoted a variety of *ur*, “dog/lion”, in Akkadian explained by, or

translated with *zibu*, “jackal” and *kalbu šegū*, “mad (/howling) ‘dog’ ” (*AHw* 1429b; *MSL* 8/2 14:95, van Dijk *Lugal* I 73:171). The relation between this real being and the monster remains unclear.

- b *Identification*: human-headed lion-man. Cf. above II.A.3.17 and VII.B.
- c *Attestations*: before SB *ur-i-dim* = *ur(i)dimmu* is not actually attested (VII.A.5). Occurrences in VII.B.7 and 9 go back to MB originals. Occurrences in lexical lists (*MSL* 8/2 14:94, *MSL* 11 31 quoted above) and typologically older astronomical texts may go back to the beginning of the second millennium. The constellation UR.IDIM = *ur(i)dimmu* may have been named in the third. In art the human-headed lion-man is extremely rare. The oldest example seems to be on a silver vase from Iran (Orthmann *Der Alte Orient* no 306) where he holds a crescent on a pole and accompanies a bull-man. The authorities date the piece to the last quarter of the second millennium (Amiet *Syria* 45 256, Orthmann *Der Alte Orient* 389f., Porada *Akkadica* 13 4, all with photographs). Of about the same date is the lion-man on a *kudurru* (Seidl *BaM* 4 42 Abb. 10, cf. 175; the tail is not visible, but Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* 134 gives him a scorpion's sting and dismisses him). Besides the apotropaic representations only a few uncertain NAss examples are known: one on the bronze bands of a door of Sargon II (Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* 135 with Seidl *BaM* 4 175; Reade, after the drawing, determines the being as a bull-man, *BaM* 10 40) one on a NAss seal, holding a sun-disk (?) on a pole (Ravn *Catalogue* no 142), and one on another NAss seal (Parker *Iraq* 24 37 Fig.2).
- d *Mythology*: about the earlier mythology of the *ur(i)dimmu* nothing is known. In the MB period he was included among the trophies of Marduk, and later became a member of Tiāmat's army. The magical text *KAR* 26 (cf. Ebeling *ZDMG* 69 96ff.) and its unpublished duplicates (*HKL* 2 55) give some information on the *ur(i)dimmu*, but the prayer to Marduk in this text (cf. Seux *Hymnes et Prières* 449ff.) makes it clear that the text does not predate *Ee* and the exaltation of Marduk. The ritual prescribes the fabrication of an *ur(i)dimmu* of cedar to be hung on a loop of gold and flax together with a (seal of, K 3268+) *hulūlu*-stone and inscribed as follows: ÉN^dASARI.ME.EN SIL₇ÉRIM.MA NÍG.AKA BAR.BAR.[RE².EN²](beginning restored after K 3268+11), “you are Marduk the expeller of evil, chase away sorcery”. Later, after offerings to Marduk and Šarpanitu, a long prayer is recited (Obv. 11ff.) in which Marduk is implored (46ff.) to give the *ur(i)dimmu* of cedar a (var. your) consignment of life (*ur-ta šá* T.L.A., var. K 5937: *u]r-ta-ka*) so that good health will accompany the sick man. A similar request is made to Šarpanitu (57, cf. Seux *Hymnes et Prières* 453³⁷), she is to make him well disposed (*milik damāqi*) towards protecting the life of the sufferer. The monster is called (Obv. 50) *šābit abbūti ana Marduk u Šarpanitum belišu*, “who intercedes with Marduk and Šarpanitum, his masters”, probably because as their gate keeper (Obv. 47) he was in the position to do so. The text on the figure, also recited later in the ritual to Mar-

duk and Šarpanîtu, may well contain his interceding words. Finally the *ur(i)dimmu* himself is addressed and reminded of the consignment of Marduk and the advice of Šarpanîtu (Rev. 28ff.). Thus in this text, the *ur(i)dimmu* is the gate keeper of Marduk and Šarpanîtu and intercedes with them on behalf of the sick man. He also is the guardian of their gate (Obv. 46), chases away evil (Obv. 48f.), and, ordered to do so by his masters Marduk and Šarpanîtu, helps the sick man to obtain health. The inscription on the *ur(i)dimmu* of text II (cf. II.A.3.17) characterizes him as serving the forces (DINGIR É, ^dLAMMA É) symbolizing the well-being and prosperity of the house, and as such resembles the consignment of life of KAR 26.

Two further bits of evidence are not very helpful: Lamaštu howls (?) like an UR.IDIM (cf. CAD L 38a, *labahu*) and Enlil is associated with the constellation *ur(i)dimmu* in “twelve times three” (MDOG 109 30:22) and 5 R 46 i 33.

e *Apotropaic representations*: in texts: VII.A.5, KAR 26, BBR 51:3 (so Zimmermann BBR 164, followed by von Soden AHw 1429b, Eilat BiOr 39 24 reads UR.M[AH².MEŠ²], OIP 2 142:21 (Sennacherib, Aššur temple), Weisberg YOS 17 345:6 (NB, mentioned in connection with the temple of Marduk together with ^dKakkabtu), CTN 3 95 B:4 (NAss., chapel of Marduk). On *kudurru*'s (together with *ugallu*): BaM 4 42 Abb. 10; on reliefs: Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Type XIX (holding a partly broken crescent on a pole: Pl. XIV/1), Reade BaM 10 40 (with an additional example, cf. also Reade Iraq 26 5f.; Reade calls the being *urmahullû*); in Kleinplastik: Green Iraq 45 92f. (with a different interpretation, cf. above II.A.3.17 and VII.A) and perhaps Rittig *Kleinplastik* 6.1 (cf. above p. 100f.). [Cf. Green Iraq 47 77].

6 *kusarikku*, “Bison”, “Bison(-bull)”.

a *Word/attestations/mythology*: Sumerian *alim* (1) and its free variant *gud-alim* denote, at least in Sumer (3), the bison (4). In art the bison is represented at first naturalistically, but later (from ED I onwards) generally with a human face (5). Perhaps under the influence of foreign images (6), the bull-man or rather bison-man was developed from a bison in upright position (an active variant) (7). Only the free variant *gud-alim* and the Akkadian loanword (8) *kusarikku* come, probably already in the Akkad period, to be associated with the bison-man (9).

The human-faced bison and the bison-man are associated with the sun-god (10), a feature that must go back to the time before they split into two separate figures. This association of the mythologized (11) (human-faced) bison(-man) with the sun perhaps goes back to the fact that the actual bison is at home in the hilly flanks of the Mesopotamian lowland (12), distant countries travelled only by the sun. Bisons even represent the mountains at the edge of the world through which the sun rises (13). The image of the bison as an inhabitant of distant hilly regions, a mountain himself, may have inspired bedouins to call the forebear of their tribe (**ditnu*) “Bison” (*Ditān*- 14), also the name of the “mountain of the

MAR.TU-bedouins” (15). While the recumbent (human-faced) bison is the apogee of unshakeable peace, the relations of the combative bison-man (16) with the sun-god (17) are not always peaceful. His defeat by Ninurta/Ningirsu (later Marduk) is known from NSum and later sources (18). The texts have nothing to tell on the nature of Ninurta/Ningirsu's quarrel with the *kusarikku*; the defeat of the *kusarikku* is perhaps only a by-product of Ninurta/Ningirsu's dealings with the mountains (19).

- 1) Syllabic spellings: ZA 58 3³, Kutscher AH 115; in lexical lists: MSL 14 54:568, 440:10', cf. CAD K 584a. In ^dIg-ALIM perhaps the sign ALIM has also the value *alim* a (Falkenstein GSGL 1 13). The Akkadian word for “bison” is *diānu* (CAD A/1 349b, D 165a) or *karšānu* (K 223b).
- 2) The variation *alim:gud-alim* is attested in the equations *alim = kusarikku* (<*gud-alim*), cf. CAD K 584a, and *gud-alim = alimbû* (<*alim* a), cf. CAD A/1 349a. Sumerian *gud-alim* certainly did not denote only the bison-man (cf. Heimpel *Tierbilder* 77, *OrNS* 43 331:10). From lexical lists where Sumerian *alim* is translated with Akkadian *kusarikku* (denoting only the bison-man) it could be concluded that Sumerian *alim* also denotes the bison-man, but no context cases have been found. Landsberger assumed (*Fauna* 93) that *gud* in *gud-alim* is the determinative; at least the “determinative” is not only graphical, since the loanword proves that it was actually spoken (cf. Heimpel *Tierbilder* 199f.). Without discussion a different solution is proposed by Heimpel *Tierbilder* 77: *alim* “Wisent” (both sexes), *gud-alim* “Wisentstier”. This distribution of the terms could nicely explain the choice of masculine *gud-alim* to denote the active, ostentatiously ithyphallic bison-man.
- 3) in Ebla *alim* is equated with *li-a-nu-um/nūm*, related to Akkadian *lū*, “bull”, and with *ù-gi-lum*, related to Semitic ^c*igl*, “calf” (*MEE* 4 282:73, 327:1192). The feminine form *alim-munus* is equated with *li-a-tum* (*MEE* 4 282:732) related to Akkadian *litu* and the Hebrew PN *Lē'ā*, “cow”.
- 4) The denotation “bison” was established by Landsberger *Fauna* 92ff. It is now supported by the identification of the *kusarikku* as the bison-man, and by toggle pins with bison(-men) heads corresponding to *sag-(gud)-alim-ma* in the texts (Klein ZA 73 270^{85f}).
- 5) Cf. with previous literature: Amiet *GMA*² 112f., 137f., Behm-Blancke *BaFo* 1 46ff., Boehmer *BaM* 9 18ff. From the Ur III period onwards (Boehmer *UAVA* 4 44, Amiet *GMA*² 1478) the human-faced bison is often furnished with the horns of divinity (for stone representations cf. Huot *Sumer* 34 104ff.). The only conceivable Semitic name for the divine (human-faced) bison is a theophoric element in Amorite names, (^d)*Ditān-* (CAD D 165a, Huffmon *APN* 184, Butz *WZKM* 65/66 3¹³, Gelb *AS* 21 295). If so, the *heros eponymos* (Edzard *ZZB* 39¹⁶⁸) of the *tidnu* Amorites was (perhaps under the influence of Mesopotamian conceptions) conceived as a bison. The name of the late successor of the human-faced bison, the NAss human-headed bull (Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Type 11a/b, Landsberger *Fauna* 89), is not yet established with certainty (see II.B.1.G, *šedu*; *aladlammû* ? Cf. CAD A/1 287, Turner *Iraq* 32 81f.).
- 6) Amiet *GMA*² 84a, Porada *BiMes* 4 115⁵¹.
- 7) Derivation of bison-man (bull-man) from (upright) bison and further developments: Hilzheimer *MAOG* II/2 11f., Amiet *GMA*² 49, 138, 147f., Boehmer *BaM* 9 20, *UAVA* 4 43¹⁸¹, Orthmann *Untersuchungen* 306ff., Klengel-Brandt *FuB* 10 24, *FuB* 20-21 216, Opificius *UAVA* 2 220f., Howard-Carter *Iraq* 45 67f., Porada *CRRAI* 25 166³⁰. The bison-man, often accompanied by a naked hero (*JEOL* 27 96, 103), fights lions, bisons, other animals, and the lion-dragon. He holds door posts and emblems, often a sun-disk but also other emblems. After the Oakk period he becomes rare, but never dies out completely.
- 8) *gud-alim > kusarikku* was proposed by Landsberger *Fauna* 93. For the interchange *r:l* that troubled Landsberger cf. now Sjöberg *OrSu* 10 6, *Afo* 24 41, Civil *JCS* 25 137f., Falkenstein *ZA* 45 34, Labat-Edzard *MDP* 57 26, *RGTC* 2 80 (*Hu'urti/Hulti*). The correspondance of Sumerian *ř* (the last consonant of the first element of the word, later changed into *d* but still present when the word was loaned in the Oakk period) to Akkadian *-s-* is attested elsewhere as well (Liebermann *SLOB* 1 434, 538, 647). Since Sumerian has a word for the bison-man that is certainly not borrowed from a third language (as proved by the omissible element *gud*; *alim* is not necessarily Sumerian, cf. Oppenheim *JNES* 4 170¹⁵⁰), it is hardly likely that Akkadian *kusarikku* is borrowed from a third language; in that case we should expect Sumerian (*gud*-*alim* to be borrowed from the same language (Salonen *Jagd* 207 derives *kusarikku* and its variants — cf. CAD K 584 — from a substrate word: **khusrig*).

- 9) In OAKK a number of *GUD-sà-ri-ku* (PBS 9 30:1) appear together with two *lahmus*; in view of the regular association of the bison-man and the naked hero, the denotation bison-man is probable in this case but cannot be proved. The *gud-alim* enemy of Ningirsu/Ninurta is certainly the bison-man (attested first in Gudea *Cyl. A XXV:13*); like the *gud-alim* of the texts (Cooper *AnOr* 52 148) he appears on the chariot of a god (Ningirsu?) on the stele of Gudea (Orthmann *Der Alte Orient* Figs. 111a, b, p. 220). In the hymnic introduction of the NAss *Anzû myth*, the *kusarikku* defeated by Ninurta can hardly denote anything else than the *kusarikku* of the contemporary rituals. The *kusarikku*, trophy of Marduk since MB, is the successor of the earlier *gud-alim/kusarikku* of the *Anzû myth*, the trophy of Ninurta/Ningirsu; the *kusarikku* of Marduk is directly related to the *kusarikku* of the late rituals and certainly a bison-man. The constellation *kusarikku* is attested already in OB (cf. *CAD K 584b*), and was named probably even earlier; C.B.F. Walker will prove (personal communication) that the later constellation *kusarikku* (GUD.ALIM) is the bison-man, constituting together with Šullat and Ḥaniš (the hind quarter, cf. *ŠL IV/2 no 240*) the constellation Centaurus. To the attestations noted by the dictionaries, Landsberger *Fauna* 92ff, and Heimpel *Tierbilder* 75ff, the following can be added: *OrNS* 43 331:30 (Sum. lit.), *ARM* 21 222:52f. (together with *lamassātu* on a *kannu*, “potstand”; OB), *KUB* 4 47 Rev. 10 (šigû prayer: ^dQa-aq-qa-ad ^dKu-nu-uš-<kad>-rù ^d[.....] ^dku-ša-ri-iḫ-ḫu DINGIR.MEŠ É[.....]), *MIO* 1 70:9 (uncertain). The being described could be a *kusarikku* and 70:9 could be read as [ku-][sa-][ri-ik-ku], *CT* 46 51 Obv. 36', ^dGUD.ALIM Rev. 20' “explained” as: *kab-tu* (=ALIM), “venerable” [*qar-ra-du*] (=GUD), “warrior”, *LKA* 133 Rev. 5 (SB inc.: I put you under the spell of ^dKu-sa-ri-ku šá ká é ^dé-a ad-ki, “the *kusarikku* at the gate of the house of Ea, your father”), *ZA* 71 110:5 (SB omens). The only attestation of *kusarikku* in a god list is *STT* 376 iv 17': [^dGUD.D]UMU.^dUTU among other gods represented by statues.
- 10) For the human-faced bison cf. Behm-Blancke *BaFo* 1 51, Frankfort *CS* 161. The *sag-alim*, “head of the (human-faced) bison”, is the šu-nir ^dUtu, “emblem of Utu”, in an enumeration of defeated enemies of Ningirsu (*Gudea Cyl. A XXVI 4*; cf. in 13: *gud-alim*). Such heads are actually attested and may have had an apotropaic function (Klein *ZA* 73 270^{85f.}, Amiet *GMA*² 137, Behm-Blancke *BaFo* 1 51³⁴⁰). An Ed IIIa mace head with human-faced bisons is dedicated to Utu (*UE* II pl. 183, cf. Sollberger *Iraq* 22 73:71) and suggests a relation between the animal and the god (cf. Frankfort *AnOr* 12 115f., Amiet *Sumer* 9 233, Behm-Blancke *BaFo* 1 51). For the bison-man cf. *UAVA* 2 85f., *CS* 161, Orthmann *Der Alte Orient* Pl. 248 (where he carries the throne of Šamaš). His relation to Utu is also recorded by the logogram GUD.DUMU.^dUTU (since OB, cf. above II.A.3.18 and for attestations in rituals VII.A.6; in Assyria since MAss); the attestations were collected by Frankena *Tākultu* 90 (add: *KAR* 137:10, Freydank-Saporetti *Nuove Attestazioni* 55, Menzel *AT T* 137B:3, and cf. Müller *MVAG* 41/3 28). The meaning of the logogram is not completely clear (cf. Borger *BAL*² 129). It must be noted that DUMU.^dUTU does not necessarily refer to Utu's physical fatherhood; it can also refer to a natural phenomenon described metaphorically as “son of Utu” (light, flame, wind², cf. van Dijk *HSAO* 249 ad *BASOR* 94 2ff:25f., Borger *WdO* 5 173, Geller *ZA* 73 115). The later canonical list replaces GUD.DUMU.^dUTU with GUD.DUMU.AN.NA (cf. above II.A. 3.18); since this spelling is attested only once as the logogram of *kusarikku* (VII.A.6 text 14), and since the two differ only slightly, we consider the latter a graphical development of the former [cf. now A.R. George *RA* 82 151]. Certainly not related to GUD.DUMU.^dUTU/GUD.DUMU.AN.NA or the bison (-man) is *gud-an-na/alû/lû*, the “bull of heaven” (cf. *CAD* A/1 377, Borger *RLA* 4 413f., *VAS* 17 10:21, 46, Castellino *Two Sulgi Hymns* 130, *JNES* 43 119), positively identified with the humped bull (Thureau-Dangin *RA* 16 156¹, Weidner *Gestirndarstellungen* 8f.; perhaps on a plaque, killed by Gilgamesh and Enkidu, cf. Opificius *UAVA* 2 227; for the animal see Douglas van Buren *Fauna* 29C). In less conservative contexts (late second and first millennium seals) the bull of heaven appears as a winged, human-faced bull (cf. the description of a winged *alû* in *AFO* 18 302:17ff., and for the seals with Gilgamesh and Enkidu fighting the bull of heaven W.G. Lambert in A.E. Farkas ed., *Monsters and Demons in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds* [1987] 48ff.). The term *alû*, however, is not used to refer to the apotropaic human-faced bulls of Assyrian palaces. They must have had another name (see ii.B.1.G, *šedu*). Whether the dying god ^dGu₄-gal-an-na (cf. Lambert *CRRAI* 26 62ff.), or the bull slain in a clearly mythological context on seals (Frankfort *CS* 126ff., Boehmer *UAVA* 4 60f., Vanel *l'Iconographie du Dieu de l'Orage* 26) has anything to do with the “bull of heaven” cannot be discussed here. The bull, the symbolic animal of Adad, is sometimes a humped bull (Abou Assaf *BaM* 14 51), but it is known in the texts only under the name of *bīru ekdu*, “fierce young bull” (*MDP* 2 90:17, *LKU* 31:3).
- 11) From OB onwards the bison-man generally is furnished with the horns of divinity.
- 12) Boehmer *BaM* 9 20, Behm-Blancke *BaFo* 1 47.
- 13) Barrelet *RA* 48 16ff., Amiet *GMA*² 138f., Boehmer *UAVA* 2 85, *BaM* 9 21, Behm-Blancke *BaFo* 1 51^{346f.}
- 14) Cf. above note 5 and for this complicated problem e.g. Astour *UFo* 5 36f., Diakonoff *CRRAI* 28 24⁴, Lipiński *Fs Loewenstamm* 91ff., Helzer *The Suteans* 1ff.
- 15) Falkenstein *AnOr* 30 52; *RGTC* 1 157, 2 30.
- 16) For his combativeness on seals cf. Amiet *GMA*² 147; the texts give only hints: in *Angim* 35 Ninurta brings the bison out of the “dust of battle”; *idim*, “the wild one” is equated with *kusarikku* in *MSL* 14 278:23 (*Aa* II/3).
- 17) Frankfort *CS* 100f., Boehmer *UAVA* 4 85.
- 18) Cf. Cooper *AnOr* 52 143, 148f. The introduction of the sea as the place where the *kusarikku* was defeated and as the enemy of Ninurta in two SB texts of MB origin (*Sm* 1875 = *WZKM* 57 10⁴⁶, Gula Hymn *OrNS* 36 124:149, for the date of this text cf. Lambert *ibid.* 109ff. The date of *Sm* 1875 cannot be established) points to the influence of ideas similar to those that helped to shape *Ee*, where all monsters are collected as children and soldiers of Tiāmat (cf. VII.B). Since in these texts the sea does not yet seem to have this organizing function, they reflect a stage prior to the theology of *Ee*.
- 19) Especially in *Lugale*, cf. Cooper *AnOr* 52 148 with further references.
- b *Identification*: bull-man (the traditional designation of the archaeological type; “bison-man” is historically more correct). Cf. above II.A.3.18 (and Wiggermann apud Green *Iraq* 45 92⁴⁵; apud Stol *Zwangerschap en Geboorte* 112). the complete equation is:
- (1) GUD.ALIM = (2) GUD.DUMU.^dUTU = (3) GUD.DUMU.AN.NA = (4) *kusarikku* = (5) bull-man. For (2) = (3) cf. also above 10. The following solutions were proposed previously:
- Smith *Chaldean Genesis* (1875) identified the naked hero and the bull man with Izdubar (now read Gilgamesh) and Heabani (now read Enkidu). This identification is totally unfounded, but has won almost universal acceptance until quite recently, see, with previous literature, W.G. Lambert, Gilgamesh in Literature and Art: The Second and First Millennia, in A.E. Farkas ed., *Monsters and Demons in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds* [1987], 37–52
- Langdon *AJSL* 31 (1914/15) 284, *Epic of Creation* (1923) 89⁷: (1) = (4) = “fish-ram” (Goat-fish). Langdon's identification was based on the spelling *ku₆-sa₄-rak-ki* in *Ee* III 91 (cf. *CAD* K 584a), which he read *KU₆.DĀR-rak-ki*. The misreading was noted and the proposal rejected by Landsberger *Fauna* (1934) 93.
- Landsberger *Fauna* (1934) 93: (1) = (4) = human-faced bison. The solution is based on *alim* = bison and *gud-alim* (*kusarikku*) = a mythological animal, therefore mythological bison, the human-faced bison. Landsberger's opinion is occasionally quoted in speculative contexts (Unger *Sumer* 8 196, Gadd *Iraq* 28 120, with modification) but does not seem to have won general acceptance, especially not where the late successor of the human-faced bison, the NAss human-headed bull, is concerned.
- Landsberger *Sam'al* I (1948) 96: (2) = bull-man. The identification is correct but was not yet proved. It was based on a general comparison of occurrences of GUD.DUMU.^dUTU in apotropaic contexts in NAss royal inscriptions with occurrences of the bull-man on orthostats in Sam'al.

Landsberger did not believe that GUD.DUMU.^dUTU was the original name of the bull-man, or even that the bull-man had a name at all. He thought that the naked hero (mistakenly identified with *apkallu*) and the bull-man were traditional apotropaic types of art, brought into the pantheon by equating them with traditional apotropaic figures of the texts (*apkallu* and GUD.DUMU.^dUTU; Landsberger, who did not yet know the Nippur forerunner of *Hh*, *MSL* 8/1 87:200, thought the latter was a traditional figure in the Assyrian pantheon only). This unfounded but at the time plausible position has had an impeding influence on the study of Babylonian art: it gave a respectable philological base to the thought that the figures and themes of art are related only in the most general manner to the figures and themes of literature. The present identifications show that this relation is less lax; yet complete correspondance is not to be expected.

Frankena *Tākultu* (1953) 90: (1) = (2) = (4). Frankena's correct equation was basis on the interchange of GUD.DUMU.^dUTU and GUD.ALIM/*kusarikku* in lists of monsters.

Gelb *MAD* 3 (1975) 153: "the Oakk spelling GUD-*za-ri-ku* suggests an ox-like" animal".

Reade *BaM* 10 (1979) 40: (4) = bull-man". Correct, but without proof ("evidently)."

The equation (1) ^dGU₄.UD = (2) GUD.DUMU.^dUTU = (3) *lahmu* discussed by O. Schroeder *OLZ* 1920 245 and D. D. Luckenbill *AJSL* 40 291 is disproved in the following way:

- 1 ≠ 2 cf. Kügler *Sternkunde in Babel* Glossar 270b.
- 2 ≠ 3 cf. *Tākultu* 25 i 28ff., *BiOr* 18 199 ii 5f. and the ritual texts in which both occur (text II, V).
- 1 ≠ 3 cf. *JEOL* 27 93f.

Laroche *JCS* 6 120 and *RHA* 84/85 78, followed by Güterbock *Yazilikaya*² 177, identified two bull-men standing on the hieroglyph for earth and holding up the hieroglyph for heaven, no 28/29 of the Yazilikaya rock relief, with *Šeriš* and *Ḫurriš*. There is no caption to prove this identification, nor can it be proved that *Šeriš* and *Ḫurriš* must be present at all. Some voiced misgivings about this identification (Otten *Anatolia* 4 34), but two other bulls then available for identification with *Šeriš* and *Ḫurriš* (*Yazilikaya*² 42a, 43a, cf. Haas *RLA* 4 507a) are now no longer available, since the caption of one of them has been deciphered, and the bull identified with the 'calf of Teššup' (Šarrumma, Güterbock *Yazilikaya*² 171, *Les Hieroglyphes de Yazilikaya* 12). We must reject the identification on the following grounds:

- It is improbable that two genuine Ḫurrian gods, could be represented by a thoroughly Mesopotamian figure.
- *Ḫurriš* and *Šeriš* draw the chariot of Teššup (*RLA* 4 506b). Never is the bull-man a draught-animal, and, unlike the bull-man, draught-animals go on all fours, including imaginary ones.

- There is good reason to think that *Ḫurriš* and *Šeriš* were real animals, not monsters: in *An-Anum* III 257ff. *Šeriš* is one of the two gud-^dIškur-ke₄, "bulls of Adad"; for GUD = *Šeriš*, cf. Ebeling *ArOr* 21 401, *OrNS* 23 126 ad 24, *CAD* K 29a; in a text quoted by Laroche *Glossaire de la Langue Hourrite* 115 and 227 *Šeriš* and *Ḫurriš* are GUD.ḪLA-ri, "bulls".
- Conceivably the two bull-men of Yazilikaya were present not as independent elements but only as atlantes separating (the ideograms of) heaven and earth.

It were perhaps similar arguments that lead Laroche in his *Glossaire de la Langue Hourrite* (1980) 228 to speak concerning *Ḫurriš* and *Šeriš* of "une interpretation peu vraisemblable de Yazilikaya, N° 28–29". Amiet (*RA* 50 117) suggests that *Ḫurriš* and *Šeriš* (Jour et Nuit) derive from the lying human faced bulls of third millennium Mesopotamian art, that sometimes replace the mountains through which the sun rises (see also *GMA*² 139).

- c *Apotropaic representations*: in texts: cf. above (9); like the trophies of Marduk, the trophies of Ninurta on his chariot or temple front must have discouraged evil. On a vase of Ibbi-Sin: *OrAnt* 23 39:19. In Mari on a potstand: *ARM* 21 222:25. In an OB incantation (Farber *ZA* 71 63 Rev. 5, cf. *AMT* 96/2 i 12 quoted by *CAD* K 584a, and cf. Ebeling *MAOG* V/3 11 for a similar text with *lahmu*) the crying baby wakes up (the god of the house and) the *kusarikku* who reacts: *ma-nu-um id-ki-a-ni ma-nu-um ú-ga-li-ta-ni*, "who woke me up, who startled me?", a domestic version of Enlil's anger at the noise of mankind. Certainly this *kusarikku* was present in the house, represented on an apotropaic clay plaque (Opificius *UAVA* 2 no 402ff., especially 402 found in context against the outer wall of the Ḫendursag chapel at OB Ur, Moorey *Iraq* 37 89f.), or as a statuette (in texts: cf. Landsberger *Fauna* 93). In M/NAss palaces and temples bull-men have not actually been found, but they are known to have been installed from the texts (cf. above note 9, *KUB* 4 47 Rev. 10, *CT* 46 51 Obv. 36', Rev. 20', *LKA* 133 Rev. 5, Menzel *AT* 2 T 134 IX 8, Frankena *Tākultu* 90, also with references to GUD.DUMU.^dUTU in NAAss royal inscriptions, Borger *AfOB* 9 87:4, cf. Börker-Klähn *ZA* 70 260⁴, 266f.). The bison heads on seals and toggle pins recall the later heads of Ḫumbaba and may well have been apotropaic (Amiet *GMA*² 137). On *kudurru*'s: Seidl *BaM* 4 XLVII. In the MB temple in Tell Rimah: Howard-Carter *Iraq* 45 64ff. and Pl. IIIa. In Syria: Orthmann *Untersuchungen* 306ff. In Kleinplastik (cf. VII.A.6): Rittig *Kleinplastik* 98ff., Ismail *CRRAI* 28 199, Green *Iraq* 45 92, generally with the prescribed (II.A.3.18) inscription: "go out death, enter life". The figure on the reverse of Lamaštu amulet 29 is a deviant *kusarikku* rather than a "local iconographical variant of Pazuzu" (Moorey *Iraq* 27 34); it fulfills the same apotropaic function as Pazuzu or the lion-dragon (amulets 27, 34, 35,) on other Lamaštu amulets.

7 *girtablullû*, “Scorpion-Man”.

- a *Word*: the composition of the word out of the elements *gír-tab*, “scorpion”, and *lú-ùlu*, “untamed man”, reveals the being denoted as partly man and partly scorpion. Above VII.A we gave reasons to identify this being with the scorpion-man of the palace reliefs and the Kleinplastik, rather than with Seidl *BaM* 4 XLIV or XLV, if the latter is indeed distinct from the scorpion-man of the reliefs (so Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* 82). Comparison with other names of monsters composed with *-lullû* (*urmahllullû*, *kullullû*) shows that the element *-lullû* denotes, at least from the second half of the second millennium onwards, a human upper body, which also excludes the armless *BaM* 4 XLIV from identification with the *girtablullû*. The *Göttertypentext MIO* 1 64 6f. may have given a description of a [GÍR.TAB.]LÚ.ÙLU-lu, but unfortunately only one word is preserved: *a-li-ku*, “in walking posture” (*CAD* A/1 347a). The Scorpion-man and -woman of the Gilgamesh Epic (IX ii-iv), guarding the gate in the mountain through which the sun rises and sets, are hardly an invention of the editor of the SB redaction of the epic. Their antiquity cannot exactly be established, but the appearance of a scorpion-man on an Oakk seal (Amiet apud Porada *Ancient Art in Seals* Fig. II-20), formally related to the scorpion-man of the reliefs rather than to *BaM* 4 XLIV or XLV, and like the *girtablullû* of the Epic of Gilgamesh an adjunct of the sun god (rays extend from his body; he supports Utu in an armed conflict), suggests that in the third millennium a scorpion-man/*girtablullû*, adjunct of the sun-god, existed already, see also Green *Iraq* 47 75⁹ (Seal), J. Börker-Klähn *BaFo* 4 Pl 26e (on standard, winged). Still earlier scorpion-men are associated with the sun as well, but are formally different (Amiet *GMA*² 133f., 155, Pl.95, Frankfort *CS* 68); they derive from a mythological scorpion manipulating heavenly bodies with its pincers. The pincers became hands and a head was added, the essentials of the human upper body of the scorpion-man. (Amiet *GMA*² 133f.).
- b *Identification*: cf. above, *Word*. Whether the scorpion-man Seidl *BaM* 4 XLV, different from the Scorpion-Man of the reliefs and seals and never associated with the winged disk (Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* 82), is a *girtablullû* as well must remain undecided (positively so Edzard *WdM* 100).
- c *Attestations*: since Ed IIIa (Lyre from Royal Graves in Ur, *UE* II Pl.105; Teissier, *ANECS* 335). The word is therefore genuine Sumerian, but the being cannot have been named before the pincers were understood as human hands
- d *Mythology*: The epic of Gilgamesh informs us on the activities of the *girtablullû* prior to the theology of *Ee*. The *girtablullû* here is accompanied by his wife, a curiosity that reappears in the rituals, where the *girtablullû* is the only figure of whom a male and a female statue are made. Together they guard the gate of mount *Māšû* (“Twin”) and watch over the rising and setting of the sun. They discuss Gilgamesh when he

arrives, ask him about his journey, and allow him to pass the gate (IX ii-iv). An Oakk seal (above, *Word*) shows that the association of the *girtablullû* with the sun god goes back to the third millennium.

- c *Apotropaic representations*: in rituals VII.A.7; in NAss royal inscriptions: *OIP* 2 145:21, *KAV* 74:5 (cf. Börker-Klähn *ZA* 70 258ff.). In Kleinplastik: Rittig *Kleinplastik* 78f., cf. 218; On reliefs: Howard-Carter *Iraq* 45 71f. and Pl. Vb (MAss, from Tell Rimah = *Iraq* 28 Pl. XXXIVb; not Pazuzu. On Pl. VI good photographs of BM 94941, a clay pot with two *girtablullû* = Layard Mon. I 95A, Unger *RIV* 8 Pl. 68c. For another object with a *girtablullû* cf. Thompson *AAA* 18 Pl. XXVII, NAss), Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Type XI (cf. Reade *BaM* 10 39, Meuszyński *EtTrav* 6 52ff., *Iraq* 38 Pl. XIV, Vorys Canby *Iraq* 33 Pl. XVIb). [Cf. also Green *Iraq* 47 75ff.].
- 8 *urmahllullû*, “Lion-Man”.
- a *Word*: composed out of *ur-mah*, “lion” and *lú-ùlu*, “untamed man”. The *urmahllullû* is extremely rare. It is omitted thrice in enumerations of the trophies of Marduk (VII.A.8), and its first appearance in art is on a MAAss seal (*ZA* 47 67 Abb. 30). Possibly, therefore, the loanword is a learned neologism, based on the analogy with *kullullû* or *girtablullû*.
- b *Identification*: unwinged lion-centaur. This identification was first proposed by Ellis *Essays Finkelstein* 74 on the basis of a badly broken lion-[centaur] (Rittig *Kleinplastik* 14.1.1) inscribed as prescribed for the *urmahllullû* of text II (II.A.3.20): *ta-par-ri-ik* SAG.ḪUL.ḪA.ZA (the editor, Klengel-Brandt, read the inscription slightly differently in *FuB* 10 26, but the photograph Taf. 5/2 shows that the correction proposed by Ellis is right). The identification was later confirmed by the appearance of the same text on a perfectly preserved monumental specimen from Ashurbanipal’s palace (Gadd apud Barnett *SNPAN* 40). Whether winged examples are also called *urmahllullû* cannot be decided (on seals: Frankfort *CS* Pl. XXXIVd, Beran *Afo* 18 273 abb. 25). The lion-demon (above 4) or the human-headed lion-man (above 5) are sometimes mistakenly identified as *urmahllullû* (Frankfort *CS* 175, Lambert *Iraq* 41 10, Reade *BaM* 10 40). There is no connection with priests clad in lion’s skins or wearing lion masks (Oppenheim *JAOS* 63 32, cf. recently W.Fauth *WdO* 11 24¹⁹ with further literature). Reade *BaM* 10 41 proposed *kuribu* for the unwinged lion-centaur.
- c *Mythology/Attestations*: the first attestation of an unwinged lion-centaur on a 13th century Assyrian seal (*ZA* 47 67 Abb. 30) predates its inclusion among the trophies of Marduk; it is not yet present in *Ee* (VII.B.9), telling, since this text enlarged the number of monsters with traditional names. Thus the lion-centaur does not seem to have had a function in traditional mythology. It was invented in the late second millennium, probably by analogy with the centaurs (not necessarily in Assyria, since a winged lion-centaur also existed in the South, Beran *Afo* 18 273 Abb. 25), named by analogy with *kullullû* or *girtablullû*, and functioning in mythology only after its inclusion among the trophies of Marduk.

- d *Apotropaic representations*: in texts: VII.A.8, probably also *RAcc.* 114:10 and *YOS* 6 3:3. In Kleinplastik: Rittig *Kleinplastik* 112f.; on reliefs: Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Type XVII, Reade *BaM* 10 41, Madhloom *Chronology* 98f. (winged: Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Type 12b). The position of the un-winged lion-centaur on reliefs and as a clay figure may correspond to the position prescribed in the ritual: in the bathroom (cf. above p. 98).
- 9 *kulullû*, “Fish-Man”.
- a *Word*: that *KU*₆.LÚ.ÛLU-*lu* is to be read *kulullû* appears from the *Göttertypentext* where the word is spelled *ku-lu-ul-lu* (*MIO* 1 80:12). A long -û is demanded by Sumerian lú-ùlu, from which *lullû* is borrowed, but none of the *lullû* words is spelled with an additional vowel indicating length, and thus, counter to etymology, actual usage indicates a short vowel (the dictionaries assume a short vowel). A by-form *kulil(l)u* is attested in *KAR* 162 Rev. 4 (*Ee*, spelled *ku-li-li*). This *kulil(l)u* is to be kept distinct from:
- a) ^d*Ku-li-li*, variant of ^d*Ki-li-li* (Landsberger *Fauna* 136, Frankena *Ta-kultu* 97, *CAD* K 357a), a female figure, possibly apotropaic as well (III.B.13+n).
- b) *kulilu* (Sum.: buṛu₅-íd-da), “dragonfly”.
- c) *ku-li-a-n-na* = *kuliltu*. The SB bilingual text of Angim 58 translates *ku-li-a-n-na*, “friend of heaven/An”, denoting one of the trophies of Ninurta/Ningirsu, with *ku-lil-ta*. What *ku-li-a-n-na* denotes in the OB text is not known; it was hardly Dumuzi, who is sometimes called “friend of An”. The later MAss MS has *ku₆-li-a-n-na*, and must have considered the denoted being some sort of (mythological) fish. The SB text apparently associates “friend of An” with the Akkadian loanword *ku-li-li-a-n-na*, “little bride of An” = Akkadian *kulil(ī)tu*, an insect since it appears among other insects in *Hh* (cf. Landsberger *Fauna* 136, Cooper *AnOr* 52 149). Although *kulil(ī)tu*, “little bride” (an insect) and *kuliltu*, “fish-woman” are not related linguistically, they may have been fused in the mind of the late translator of Angim. The existence of *kuliltu*, “fish-woman” (proving the by-form of the masculine word to have been *kulilu*), became apparent only recently from a NAss administrative document (*CTN* 3 95 B:28: *1-te ku-lil-te ... 2 ku-lil-a-te*) describing statues in the Ezida of Nabû in Kalḫu. The two “fish-women” are described after a *suḫurmāšu* and a *KU*₆.LÚ.ÛLU-*lu*. Monumental representations of apotropaic insects are unknown, and *kuliltu* here cannot have denoted such a being. In art the fish-man appears first in the OB period (Heuzey *RA* 5 131 Fig. C, Porada *CANES* 433, Delaporte *Louvre* II Pl. 76 A 251); thus, if the being was named in this period, *kulullû* is a learned neologism based on the analogy with *girtablullû*; alternatively, it may have been named earlier, before its first appearance in art, when Sumerian was still spoken. In that case *kulullû* is a genuine loanword.
- b *Identification*: fish-centaur. This identification was proposed earlier

- (Langdon *Epic of Creation* 1923 89⁶) but could not be proved until 1968, when Klengel-Brandt published a fish-centaur from Aššur (*FuB* 10 32 = Rittig *Kleinplastik* 9.1.2) carrying the inscription prescribed by ritual II (II.A.3. 23). An un-inscribed example from Aššur was correctly identified by Lutz in 1930 (*UCP* 9/7 383f.), but did not strictly constitute proof. The description of a *kulullû* in *MIO* 1 80:5ff. is, as usual in this text, divergent. Here the *kulullû* has a human upper body, hands, and the head of a *kissugu*, which, whatever it is, is not the head of a human being. Below the waist it is a *purādu*, “carp”. The *kulullû* is sometimes mistakenly identified with the fish-*apkallu* (Meissner *BuA* 2 205, Köcher *MIO* 1 95, Edzard *WdM* 100, Borger *JNES* 33 186, Komoróczy *ActAntHung* 21 143).
- c *Attestations*: in art from OB onwards. For more primitive forms, a human-headed fish with arms and a human-headed fish without arms (the latter attested also in OAss. art, cf. Özgüz *TTKY* 22 72, *TTKY* 25 43) cf. Collon *CS* III p.45. The SB texts in which the *kulullû* appears go back partly to MB (VII.B.7, 9). Kassite appearances have been briefly discussed by van Buren *OrNS* 23 23 (cf. also Flowing Vase Pl. XX 68, 69, 70) and Porada *Afo* 28 53. For later examples cf. below (apotropaic representations) and e. g. Parker *Iraq* 24 37 Fig. 2 (together with *kusarikku* and fish-*apkallu*), Ward *SC* 657ff., Delaporte *Bib. Nat.* 392, 543.
- d *Mythology*: already with its first appearance in OB, the fish-centaur is together with the *suḫurmāšu* associated with Ea and streams (*RA* 5 131 Fig. C, Collon *CS* III 73, 288). In the *Göttertypentext* *MIO* 1 80:12 he is “one of Ea” (*šūt Ea*) and the flowing vase he carries is called *hengallu*, “abundance”. The inscription prescribed in ritual II (cf. II.A. 3.23) for apotropaic representations of this being stresses its relation with bounty and divine benevolence: “come down produce of the mountain, enter intercession and compliance” it speaks. The late translator of Angim may have identified the female form (*kuliltu*) with *ku-li-a-n-na*, one of the trophies of Ninurta/Ningirsu, and so have imbedded her in tradition.
- e *Apotropaic attestations*: in rituals: VII.A.9; in NAss royal inscriptions: *OIP* 2 145:20, *KAV* 74:8 (cf. Börker-Klähn *ZA* 70 258ff.); ^dK. among Isin deities: *RA* 41 36:14; in an NAss administrative document giving measures of statues in the Nabû temple in Kalḫu in view of their covering in gold leaf: *CTN* 3 95 B:19 (*KU*₆.LÚ.ÛLU.L[U]), 28 (*ku-lil-te...ku-lil-a-te*, cf. above; also mentioned are 2 *SUḪUR.MÁŠ* in the same shrine). In Kleinplastik: Rittig *Kleinplastik* 94ff. (cf. 218 for identification, Green *Iraq* 45 Pl. XVb, photograph of *Kleinplastik* 9.1.3, and for another inscribed example, *Trésors du Musée de Bagdad* no 141 = IM 3337). Monumental examples: Mallowan *N & R* I 234f. Fig. 198 (outside the Nabû temple in Kalḫu) conforming to the text *CTN* 3 95 describing the same shrine. The female variant present here according to the same text has not been found, but for an example cf. Unger *RIV* 8 “Mischwesen” § 5. For further discussion of the colossi of the Nabû temple cf. Madhloom *Chronology* 99f., with further literature. [See now Green *Iraq* 48 25ff.].

10 *suhurmāšu*, “Carp-Goat”.

- a *Word*: the few examples of *suḥur-maš/máš*^{ku6} in Sumerian texts indicate that the being denoted was a real fish, rather than a monster (*EWO* 96 with the comments of Falkenstein *ZA* 56 62, Wilcke *Lugalbanda* 392ff., Falkenstein *SGL* 1 81:16). The Akkadian loanword *suhurmāšu* may have retained this denotation (in omens: *KAR* 300:15; in *OrNS* 30 3:32 where the duplicate *SbTU* 2 8 i 30 has *SUHUR*^{ku6}, cf. *CAD* S 352a where an emendation is proposed). Thus we cannot be certain that Akkadian *suhurmāšu* denotes the Carp-Goat in all cases. In art the goat-fish appears at the end of the third millennium (the constellation Carp-Goat may have been formed and named in the same period), and it may be suggested that it owes its form to an etymological interpretation of the fish name: *suḥur*, “carp”, and *maš/máš*, “goat”.
- b *Identification*: Goat-fish. On the basis of etymology this being was identified as the *suhurmāšu* by Jensen *ZA* 5 (1890) 129 and *Kosmologie* (1890) 73ff., 277³. Zimmern apud Frank *LSS* II/2 (1906) 11¹, 34 added the evidence of the Nazimaruttaš *kudurru*, where the goat-fish of Ea is named *su-ḥur-ma-šu* (*MDP* 2 Pl. 17 iv 5). Final confirmation came from the goat-fish published by Lutz in *UCP* 9/7 (1930) 383f., carrying the inscription prescribed by the ritual for the *suhurmāšu* (= Rittig *Kleinplastik* 10.1, for the inscription cf. II.A.24).
- c *Attestations*: since Ur III, cf. Seidl *BaM* 4 XLIX, and for the Ur III and Isin-Larsa periods also Collon *CS* II 412, Buchanan *Yale* 702.
- d *Mythology*: since its appearance in the Ur III period, the goat-fish is associated with water, flowing vases, and Ea. This association is confirmed by the texts (*LKU* 45:16, *MDP* 2 Pl. 17 iv 5). Especially interesting is a LB Sumerian text of MB origin, where he is called *sánga-maḥ-abzu-ke₄*, “the lofty purification priest (cf. *CAD* *mullilu* 2) of the ap-sú” (Lambert *Fs Albright* 346:25). Associated with seals is the Carp-Goat of a *bit mēseri* incantation (III.B.8 = *OrNS* 30 3:18ff. // *SbTU* 2 8 i 20ff., cf. Borger *JNES* 33 192) in which Piriggalabzu, the sage of Adab, hangs his seal on it, angers Ea, and gets killed (by a fuller) with the (same ?) seal in consequence. The inscription prescribed for representations of this being in ritual II (II.A.3.24) indicates intercessory activity. The *e’ru*-stick that the *suhurmāšu* carries (although he has no hands to hold it) in the rituals (cf. p. 84.12b) connects him with exorcism (p. 67f.). Generally the *suhurmāšu* is one of the trophies of Marduk (VII.A.10), but *Ee* leaves him out. Perhaps he was too thoroughly peaceful for the army of Tīamat.
- e *Apotropaic representations*: in rituals: VII.A.10; in Nass royal inscriptions: *OIP* 2 145:20 (cf. Börker-Klähn *ZA* 70 258ff.), *AfOB* 19 95:11; in an NB royal inscription: *VAB* 4 282:59; in a Nass administrative document enumerating statues in the Nabû temple: *CTN* 3 95 B:15 (cf. above *kulullû*). In *Kleinplastik*: Rittig *Kleinplastik* 97 (photograph also Green *Iraq* 45 Pl. XVa. Like the *bašmu* and the *mušḥuššu* of the *Kleinplastik* this *suhurmāšu* misses its horns). A goat-fish in front of a temple is de-

picted on a MAss seal (Moortgat *ZA* 48 43 Abb. 45a/b). On an object: Thompson *AAA* 18 Pl. XXVII. [see now Green, *Iraq* 48,25ff.].

11 Other apotropaic monsters.

- a Lion-Dragon. Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Type X, Reade *BaM* 10 42. The classical Akkadian lion-dragon (Braun-Holzinger *RLA* 7 97 Type 3a) is preceded in earlier art by a more leonine type (*ibid.* Type 1). Its development (addition of bird parts) is comparable to that of the *mušḥuššu*. The lion-dragon is Adad’s mount and called *u₄* (VII.C.4), “weather-beast”, and probably also *u₄-ka-duḥ-ḥa/ūmu na’iru*, “weather-beast-with-opened-mouth/roaring weather-beast” (cf. *CAD* N/1 150, K 35, *ŠL* IV/2 58f.). Originally *Anzû* was represented in art by the lion-headed eagle (VII.B.III, Braun-Holzinger *RLA* 7 94ff.). After the Ur III period the lion-headed eagle disappears from art, but representations of *Anzû* continue to be mentioned in the texts (cf. *CAD* A/2 155). Apparently, while Adad’s interests shifted from the lion-dragon to the bull, the lion-dragon came to represent *Anzû*. In the Neo-Assyrian period the lion-dragon was split into two beings (a similar split is attested for the *mušḥuššu* as well, cf. *RLA mušḥuššu* 3.5), one (with feathered tail, *RLA* 7 type 3a) the enemy of Ninurta, one (with scorpion’s sting, Type 3c) his mount. The monster on which Ninurta had his feet in the MB *Götterypentext* (*MIO* 1 66 i 59’, ii 9), that is before the split and therefore Type 3a, is called *Anzû*; the monsters that stand next to his throne in his temple in Kalḫu (*Iraq* 14 43 72f.) are referred to with the general term *ušumgallu* (VII.C.2.a.f; for the Nass iconography of Ninurta see Moortgat-Correns, *AfO* 35 117ff.). In the Ur III period *Anzû* was included in the list of defeated enemies of Ninurta/Ningirsu (above III). Later the victory over *Anzû* was ascribed also to other gods (cf. Cooper *AnOr* 52 153ff., Hruška *Anzu* 87ff., Nergal, Adad, Nabû), among them Marduk (VII.B.11, 13). A slightly different earlier Assyrian form of the lion-dragon/*Anzû* (Type 2) occurs on three Lamaštu amulets (27, 34, 35; MAss. cf. Pedersén *Archives and Libraries* I 120, 125) in the apotropaic function fulfilled on other amulets by Pazuzu or the *kusarikku* (amulet 29).
- b A lost slab from room F of Ashurbanipal’s North Palace shows, according to descriptions of Lodbell and Rassam (cf. Reade *BaM* 10 41), a being similar to the lion-dragon, only with a scorpion’s sting instead of a bird’s tail. Reade suggests identity with Pazuzu, but another well known iconographical type (cf. the drawing Seidl *RLA* 3 489 c, Braun-Holzinger *RLA* 7 98 Type 3c) seems a more likely candidate to be covered by the descriptions (Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* 72f.).
- c Rittig *Kleinplastik* 21.1 = Green *Iraq* 45 95 and Pl. XIIb. Figure with human and leonine faces. For this unique figure no identification can be proposed. The figure may not be covered by the apotropaic rituals discussed in this book.

D Survey of visual types

The visual types 1–11 correspond to the monsters discussed in VII.C. The other types are discussed elsewhere in this book, or added for contrast. A review of all monsters and non-anthropomorphic gods, including some that were not discussed here, will appear in *RIA* art. *Mischwesen* (A. Green - F.A.M. Wiggermann). Since for a variety of reasons the monsters in that article are numbered differently, we will refer to their *RIA* number here with M. + number.

- 1 (M. 1) *Lahmu*, “Hairy One”.
 - a Amiet *GMA*² 1599, cf Porada *JAOS* 103 477. Proto-literate forerunner.
 - b Boehmer *UAVA* 4 Abb. 232. Akkadian.
- 2 (M. 26) *Bašmu*, “Venomous Snake”.

The history of the *bašmu* is not yet completely clear. Positively *bašmu*'s are the snake of the *Kleinplastik* (without horns and forepaws, VII. C. 2b), and the snake-monster with forepaws (and wings) from the palace of Esarhaddon (VII. C. 2a; below c), see the discussion in *RIA mušhuššu* §6 (also for ^{mul d}MUŠ).

 - a Collon, *First Impressions* no. 850. Neo-Assyrian.
 - b Weidner, *Gestirn-Darstellungen auf Babylonischen Tontafeln* Pl. 9 (constellation Hydra^{mul d}MUŠ). Neo-Babylonian.
 - c Barnett - Falkner, *The Sculptures of Tiglath-pileser III*, Pl. CXII. Neo-Assyrian (Palace of Esarhaddon).
- 3 (M. 27) *Mušhuššu*, “Furious Snake”, “Aweful Snake”.
 - a Porada *CANES* 1. Proto-literate forerunner.
 - b Boehmer *UAVA* 4 Abb. 283. ED IIIb forerunner.
 - c Frankfort *OIP* no. 331. Akkadian forerunner (addition of snake's head).
 - b Boehmer *UAVA* 4 Abb. 570. Akkadian. Classical form.

For a full discussion and further variant types (one with wings, one with feathered tail), see *RIA mušhuššu*.
- 4 (M. 6) *Ugallu*, “Big Weather-Beast”, “Big Day”.

Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Pl. XII/3. Neo-Assyrian. The Akkadian forerunner has human feet.
- 5 (M. 5) *Ur(i)dimmu*, “Mad Lion”.

Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Pl. XIV/1 (holding crescent).
- 6 (M. 3) *Kusarikku*, “Bison”, “Bison(-Bull)”.

Amiet *GMA*² 820. ED I.

For the human-faced Bison (alim) see below no. 11g.
- 7 (M. 4) *Girtablullû*, “Scorpion-Man”.
 - a Amiet *GMA*² 1245.C. Scorpion with cosmic function. Ed II.
 - b Teissier *ANES* 335. Ed II/III (?). Seated at table.
 - c Porada *Ancient Art in Seals* Fig. II-20. Akkadian.
 - d Amiet *GMA*² 1246.C. Neo-Assyrian.

See also below 12 (Seidl *BaM* 4 Type XLV).
- 8 (M. 20) *Urmahullû*, “Lion-Man”.

D.M. Matthews, *Principles of Composition in Near Eastern Glyptic of the Later*

Second Millennium B.C. no. 393. Middle Assyrian.

- 9 (M. 22) *Kullû*, “Fish-Man”.

Matthews *ibid.* 141. Kassite.
- 10 (M. 23). *Suhurmāšu*, “Carp-Goat”.

Matthews *ibid.* 529. Middle Assyrian.
- 11 Lion-headed Eagle (M. 14; third millennium Anzud /Anzû), and Lion-Dragon (M. 25; u₄-ka-duh-ha /kaduhhû/ûmu na'iru. Second and first millennium Anzû).
 - a Amiet *GMA*² 1602 (M.A. Brandes *FAOS* 3/II Pl. 12). Protoliterate forerunner of Lion-headed Eagle (cf. Fuhr-Jaepfelt, *Materialien zur Ikonographie des Löwenadlers Anzu-Imdugud* 6ff., 87ff., *RIA Löwenadler* §1a)
 - b Amiet *GMA*² 1268. ED Lion-headed Eagle, *RIA Löwenadler* §1b Type A.
 - c Amiet *GMA*² 1278. ED Lion-headed Eagle, *RIA Löwenadler* §1b Type B.
 - d Amiet *GMA*² 1268. ED forerunner of Lion-Dragon, *RIA Löwendrache* §1.
 - e Amiet *GMA*² 1278. ED forerunner of Lion-Dragon, *RIA Löwendrache* §1.
 - f Boehmer *UAVA* 4 373. Akkadian and classical form of the Lion-Dragon. *RIA Löwendrache* §3a.
 - g Amiet *GMA*² 1268. Human-faced Bison (VII. C. 6, alim).

Note the addition of bird parts (talons, feathered tail) in the development of the *mušhuššu* (3), the Lion-headed Eagle, the Lion-Dragon, the Scorpionman (7), and the *ugallu* (4).
- 12 (M. 15) Scorpion-tailed Bird-Man. Identification uncertain, but possibly identical with 7 above.

Collon, *First Impressions* no. 356. Neo-Assyrian.
- 13 (M. 10) Pazuzu, see index.

Drawing from Saggs *AfO* 19 123ff. Fig. 3, and Lamaštu-amulet 40d.
- 14 (M. 31) Genie, see p. 79f., and II. A. 4. B *ûmu-apkallu* (I)

Collon, *First Impressions* no. 346. Neo-Assyrian.
- 15 (M. 9) Griffin-Demon, identified as the bird-*apkallu*, see II. A. 4. B (II).

Matthews *ibid.* 283. Middle Assyrian.
- 16 (M. 8) Fish-garbed figure, identified as the fish-*apkallu*, see II. A. 4. B (III)

Matthews *ibid.* 196. Kassite.
- 17 (M. 7) Lion-garbed figure, identified as Latarak, see index.

Ellis, *Finkelstein Memorial Volume* 76 Fig. 3. Neo-Assyrian.



SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations are those current in Assyriology, and can be found in R. Borger, *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur*, Band II (1975), or in the bibliographical lists of the *Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of the Chicago* edited by E. Reiner, and of the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* edited by D. O. Edzard. In addition to the less common abbreviations, we list here those bibliographical items that are of special importance to the present study, or not included in the bibliographies cited above.

AAA 22	see Gurney, O.R.
AASOR 24	see Porada, E.
ABZ	see Borger, R.
ANESCS	see Teissier, B.
Angim	see Cooper, J.S.
AOAT 27	see Collon, D.
BaFo	Baghdader Forschungen
4	see Börker-Klähn, J.
7	see Behm-Blancke, M.R.
BaM 10	see Reade, J.
BaMB	Baghdader Mitteilungen, Beiheft
Barnett, R.D.	<i>SNPAN</i> Sculptures from the North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Niniveh (1976)
Behm-Blancke, M.R.	Das Tierbild in der Altmesopotamischen Rundplastik, <i>BaFo</i> 7(1979)
BID	see Farber, W.
Bleibtreu, E.	<i>Flora</i> Die Flora der Neuassyrischen Reliefs (1980)
Boehmer, R.M.	Die Entwicklung der Glyptik während der Akkad-Zeit, <i>UAVA</i> 4 (1965)
Börker-Klähn, J.	Alt Vorderasiatische Bildstelen und vergleichbare Felsreliefs, <i>BaFo</i> 4 (1982)
Boese, J.	Altmesopotamische Weihplatten, <i>UAVA</i> 6 (1971)
Borger, R.	<i>HKL</i> Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur, Band I (1967), Band II (1975)
Borger, R.	<i>ABZ</i> Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste (1978)
Buchanan, B.	<i>Yale</i> Early Near Eastern Seals in the Yale Babylonian Collection (1981)
Cagni, L.	The Poem of Erra, <i>SANE</i> I/3 (1977)
CANES	see Porada, E.
Cavigneaux, A.	Textes scolaires du temple de Nabû ša Harê. Texts from Babylon I (1981)
Charpin, D.	Le clergé d'Ur au siècle d'Hammurabi (1986)

- Collon, D. The Seal Impressions from Tell Atchana/Alalakh, *AOAT* 27, (1975)
- Collon, D. CS II/III Catalogue of the Western Asiatic Seals in the British Museum. Cylinder Seals II. Akkadian - Post Akkadian-Ur III Periods (1982); Cylinder Seals III. Isin - Larsa and Old Babylonian Periods (1986)
- Cooper, J.S. CS CS II/III *Angim* The Return of Ninurta to Nippur, *AnOr* 52 (1978) see Frankfort, H. see Collon, D.
- Dunham, S. Dijk, J.J.A. van *Lugal* A Study of Ancient Mesopotamian Foundations (1980) LUGAL UD ME-LÁM-bi NIR-ĜÁL. Le récit épique et didactique des Traveaux de Ninurta, du Déluge et de la Nouvelle Création (1983)
- Engel, B.J. *Essays Wilkinson* Darstellungen von Dämonen und Tieren in assyrischen Palästen und Tempeln nach den schriftlichen Quellen (1987) Harper, P.O. and Pittman, H. eds., *Essays on Near Eastern Art and Archaeology in Honor of Charles Kyrle Wilkinson* (1983)
- EtTrav* Etudes et Travaux. Studia i prace / Centre d'Archéologie Méditerranéenne de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences
- FAOS* Farber, W. *BID* Freiburger Altorientalische Studien Beschwürungsrituale an Ištar und Dumuzi (1977) M. deJ. Ellis ed., *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein* (1977)
- Finkelstein *Memorial Volume* Cylinder Seals (1939)
- Frankfort, H. CS Stratified Cylinder Seals from the Diyala Region (1955)
- Frankfort, H. SCS *Fs* Festschrift
- Fs Kraus* Driel, G. van et al. eds., *Zikir šumim*. Assyriological Studies Presented to F.R. Kraus on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday (1982)
- Fs Lacheman* Morrison, M.A. and Owen D.I. eds., *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians in Honor of Ernest R. Lacheman* (1981)
- Fs Loewenstamm* Avishur, Y. ed., *Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East Presented to Samuel E. Loewenstamm on his Seventieth Birthday* (1978)
- Fs van Loon* Haex, O. ed., *To the Euphrates and Beyond*. Archaeological Studies in Honour of Maurits N. van Loon (1989)
- Fs Matouš* Hruška, B. and Komoróczy G. eds., *Festschrift Lubor Matouš* (1978)
- Fs Neumann* J. Tischler ed., *Serta Indogermanica*. Festschrift für G. Neumann (1982)
- Fs Reiner* Rochberg-Halton, F. ed., *Language, Literature, and History: Philological and Historical Studies Presented to E. Reiner* (1987)
- Fuhr-Jaepfelt, I. *Materialien zur Ikonographie des Löwenadlers Anzu-Imdugud* (1972)
- Geller, M.J. UHF Forerunners to Udug-hul, *FAOS* 12 (1985)
- Green, A. Neo-Assyrian Apotropaic Figures, *Iraq* 45 (1983) 87ff.
- Göttertypentext* see Köcher, F.
- Gurney, O.R. Babylonian Prophylactic Figures and their Rituals, *AAA* 22 (1935) 31ff.
- Heimerdinger, J.W. *SLFN* Sumerian Literary Fragments from Nippur (1979)
- Heinrich, E. *HKL* Bauwerke in der Altsumerische Bildkunst (1957) see Borger, R.
- Hrouda, B. Die Kulturgeschichte des assyrischen Flachbildes (1965)
- Hruška, B. Der Mythenadler Anzu in Literatur und Vorstellung des alten Mesopotamien (1975)
- Jacobsen, Th. The Treasures of Darkness. A History of Mesopotamien Religion (1976)
- Jacobsen, Th. The Harps that once... Sumerian Poetry in Translation (1987)
- JJS* Journal of Jewish Studies
- Klein, J. *ThSH* Three Šulgi Hymns (1981) see Rittig, D.
- Kleinplastik* Köcher, F. Der Babylonische Göttertypentext, *MIO* 1 (1953) 57ff.
- Kolbe, D. Die Reliefprogramme religiös-politischen Characters in neu-assyrischen Palästen (1981) see Wilcke, C.
- Kollationen* Kutscher, R. Oh Angry Sea (a - a b - b a - ḫ u - l u ḫ - ḫ a) (1975)
- Layard, A.H. *Mon.* Monuments of Niniveh I, II (1849, 1853)
- Lackenbacher, S. Le Roi Bâtitteur: les récits de construction assyriens des origines à Téglatphalasar III (1982)
- Lieberman, S.J. *SLOB* The Sumerian Loanwords in Old-Babylonian Akkadian I (1977)
- Livingstone, A. Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars (1986) see Dijk, J.J.A. van
- Lugal*
- Madhloom, T.A. The Chronology of Neo-Assyrian Art (1969)
- Mallowan, M.E.L. *N & R* Nimrud and its Remains I, II (1966)

Maqlû
 Mayer, W. *UFBG* see Meier, G.
 Untersuchungen zur Formensprache der Babylonischen
 "Gebetsbeschwörungen" (1976)
 McEwan, G.J.P. Priest and Temple in Hellenistic Babylonia, *FAOS* 4 (1981)
 Meier, G. Die Assyrische Beschörungssammlung Maqlû (1937)
 Menzel, B. Assyrische Tempel (1981)
 Muscarella, O.W. ed. Ladders to Heaven. Art Treasures from the Lands of the
 Bible (1981)

N & R
 Noveck, M. see Mallowan, M.E.L.
 The Mark of Ancient Man (1975)

Opificius, R. Das Altbabylonische Terrakottareliefe, *UAVA* 2 (1961)
 Orthmann, W. Untersuchungen zur Späthethitischen Kunst (1971)
 Orthmann, W. *PKG XIV* Der Alte Orient. Propyläen Kunstgeschichte Bd. XIV
 (1975)

Özgüz, N. *TTKY 22* The Anatolian Group of Cylinder Seal Impressions from
 Kültepe, *TTKY 22* (1965)
 Özgüz, N. *TTKY 25* Seals and Seal Impressions of Level Ib from Karum Kanish,
TTKY 25 (1968)

Parker-Mallowan, B. Magic and Ritual in the Northwest Palace Reliefs, *Essays*
Wilkinson (1983) 32ff.

Parpola, S. *LAS I/II* Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon
 and Assurbanipal. Part I (1970), Part II (1983)
 Pedersén, O. Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur (1986)
 Piccioni, S.A. Il Poemetto di Adapa (1981)
PKG XIV see Orthmann, W.

Porada, E. Seal Impressions of Nuzi, *AASOR* 24 (1947)
 Porada, E. *CANES* Corpus of Near Eastern Seals in North American Collec-
 tions I. The Pierpont Morgan Library Collection (1948)

Postgate, J.N. *FNALD* Fifty Neo-Assyrian Legal Documents (1976)
 Postgate, J.N. Taxation and Conscription in the Assyrian Empire (1974)

Reade, J. Assyrian Architectural Decoration: Techniques and
 Subject-Matter, *BaM* 10 (1979) 17ff.

Reiner, E. Šurpu, a Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incanta-
 tions (1958)

Rittig, D. Assyrisch-babylonische Kleinplastik magischer Bedeu-
 tung vom 13.-6. Jh. v. Chr. (1977)

RIV
 Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte (1924-1932)

Saggs, H.W.F. The Greatness that was Babylon (1968)
SANE 1/3 see Cagni, L.
SCS see Frankfort, H.

Seux, M.-J. Hymnes et Prières aux Dieux de Babylonie et d'Assyrie
 (1976)
SLFN see Heimerdinger, J.W.
SNPAN see Barnett, R.D.

Sommerfeld, W. Der Aufstieg Marduks (1982)
 Stol, M. Zwangerschap en Geboorte bij de Babyloniërs en in de
 Bijbel. Met een hoofdstuk van F.A.M. Wiggermann (1983)
Syncretism Hartman, S.S. ed., *Syncretism* (1967)

Šurpu see Reiner, E.

Teissier, B. *ANECS* Ancient Near Eastern Seals from the Marcopoli Collection
 (1984)
TTKY 22, 25 see Özgüz, N.

UAVA 2 see Opificius, R.
UAVA 4 see Boehmer, R.
UAVA 6 see Boese, J.
UFBG see Mayer, W.

Vogelzang, M.E. *Bin šar dadmē*. Edition and Analysis of the Akkadian
 Anzu Poem (1988)

Wiggermann, F.A.M. *Lamaštu* see Stol, M.

Wiggermann, F.A.M. *Tišpak* Tišpak, his Seal, and the Dragon *mušhuššu*, in *Fs van Loon*
 (1989) 117ff.

Wilcke, C. *Kollationen* Kollationen zu den Sumerischen Literarischen Texten
 aus Nippur in der Hilprecht-Sammlung Jena, *ASAW*
 65/4 (1976)