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of si-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 urmahdullû 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 kamsâtu, “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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rituals</th>
<th>Other texts (below B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I       | II  
IV/1 | V  
VI | 7  
8 | 9  
10 | 11  
12 | 13  
14 | 15 |
| 1 | lahumû | 1  
2 | 3  
4 | 5  
6 | 7  
8 | 9  
10 | 11  
12 | 13  
14 | 15 |
| 2 | basmuû | 2  
3  
4 | 5  
6 | 7  
8 | 9  
10 | 11  
12 | 13  
14 | 15 |
| 3 | mulûdakkû | 3  
4 | 5  
6 | 7  
8 | 9  
10 | 11  
12 | 13  
14 | 15 |
| 4 | ɰalû | 4  
5  
6 | 7  
8 | 9  
10 | 11  
12 | 13  
14 | 15 |
| 5 | urûdimmû | 5  
6 | 7  
8 | 9  
10 | 11  
12 | 13  
14 | 15 |
| 6 | kusarikku | 6  
7  
8 | 9  
10 | 11  
12 | 13  
14 | 15 |
| 7 | girtabtullû | 7  
8 | 9  
10 | 11  
12 | 13  
14 | 15 |
| 8 | urmahdullû | 8  
9  
10 | 11  
12 | 13  
14 | 15 |
| 9 | ƙulullû | 9  
10  
11 | 12  
13 | 14  
15 |
| 10 | suhurmâsu | 10  
11  
12 | 13  
14 | 15 |

---

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 uridimmû 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: lahumû, basmuû, ɰalû, uridimmû, kusarikku, urmahdullû, ƙulullû, and suhurmâsu. For two monsters the text does not prescribe inscriptions: mulûdakkû and...
girtablullû. The identity of the mushušu 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 (gir-ta-) and partly man (-lullû). Among the remaining unidentified figures of the Kleinplastik only one answers to the description: Kleinplastik 7.1.1-2, “Genius mit Skorpionstachel” (figs. 24 and 25), without inscription. The palace reliefs as well include only one answer to the description “scorpion-man”: Kolbe Reliefprogramme Type XI. The not very well preserved figure of the Kleinplastik and the figure of the palace 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, XVb) after the “scorpion-man” of the reliefs, and notes that its inscription identifies the figure as 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 IA.4.A end.

If combinatoric 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 lašmu) agree with their appearance; only in the case of the ugallu, where the element u 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 IA.5.A.

---

5 Pinches 5 R 33 is 50ff. (collations by W. van Soldt). Late copy of an inscription of Agum-kakrime, an early Kassite king, describing 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 5f., vii 34f.); the text does not reflect the theology of Enuma elis. The mushušu (cf. above note g) is already Marduk’s symbolic animal and the main 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 195f. (and index), Sommerfeld Der Aufstieg Marduks 172f. (with previous literature), Schott OLZ 16 165f. [A new text, VAT 24 97, mentions Babylon and Eshil, and enumerates the monsters: basmu, mushušu, ugallu, uridimmu, kulsullû and sulurdu. The text is probably MB and comes from Babylon].

8 W. G. Lambert, The Chariot of Marduk, Supplement to Biblical Archaeology 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 Enuma elis. Analogous to the monsters of Ninurta’s chariot in Angin 51f., they can be understood as Marduk’s. A further theriomorphic monster was probably mentioned in 11; it sticks out its tongue (cf. mush̄u a m-e eme e-dē, Gudea Cyl. A XXVI 24f.).

9 W. G. Lambert, Enuma Elis. The Babylonian Epic of Creation. The Cuneiform Text. II 133ff. // II 119f. // III 23f. // III 51f. The monsters are created by mother Hubur / Tiamat to fight at her side against the younger gods. The number is enlarged with mushušu, usumgalu and umu debaštu, that together with their general Kings they total twelve. They bear impaling weapons, are unafraid of battle (I 144 and parallels, cf. V 34) and terrifying (V 115). In IV 116 they are gallû, “soldiers”. After their defeat by Marduk they are bound and trampled underfoot (IV 115ff.). Marduk breaks their weapons and installs their images (palmu) in the gate of Apalû (saying): “let this be a token; may it never be forgotten” (V 72f., cf. Landesberger and Kästner Wilson JNES 20 170, Frankena Ps Brongeres 33f. ad STC II 67ff., Lambert-Arena-Hitsch 58 216f., 229f.). Berossos’ account of creation...
contains a reference to Tiamat's monsters set up (after defeat) in the temple of Bel (S. Mayer Berenike, SNG 666, no. 14 22; the monsters of Berosus were added already by Delitzsch AW 99f.). Allur advancing to battle against Tiamat and the offspring of her womb (nabüli geritiši), "the beasts (unnumunu)", are engraved on the copper gate of Sittacherber's akītu house (IP 2 139ff., cf. Pallas 312f. and most recently Lambert IAT 25 29ff., esp. 295f.) with previous literature; the four kusarikku, which are not preserved, but they may be preserved for one more monster. The next line (17) starts with quálu, apparently introducing a different subject, since none of the names of the monsters starts with quálu. The defeat of Tiamat and Kingu is referred to in 20. In 37 "Lah-um appears after Ea and [Dānkīn]; perhaps lah-um is therefore not to be restored as one of the slain monsters in 16.

14 Lambert Ee Matouš II 82ff. Hymn to Nāabī. Text of first millennium origin. Nāabī shares with Marduk the rulership of the cosmos, the malšušu as a symbolic animal, and the defeat of the monsters of chaos. Before the first preserved monster (kaššurītu) there is room for a substantial restoration; the exact number of missing signs, however, cannot be determined.

15 BM 45919, unpublished, cf. Berber AOAT 4/1 68 and 322. NB text enumerating the monsters set up in Esagila. At least the kaššurītu is among them (Lambert IEA 6 6324a). [Now published by A.R. George in RA 82 9ff.].

1 Unstructured origins and subsequent organization

The sources for the study of original monster formation are limited. Part of the ideas that shaped them that came from the names and appearances of the oldest origins. 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, the sources suggest in giving the rings a right 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 below 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 māš-carp becomes a composite only after the element māš is 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 composite one. Thus Furious-Snake originally denoted a snake, not a dragon. The element h₃u in the name of the snake, traced 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 not only a spiritual being, but also of inanimate things such as gates and temples. The color adjective h₃u "red" is undoubtedly the same. 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 single 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 the phenomena they denote. The imaginary monsters only serve to make these awe-inspiring natural phenomena visible.
Hearty-One (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 fulfills 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 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 concisely animal-human hybrids could be dressed up priests, the actual composition of the Bison beings (animal human face and hands) does not favour this theory. The fourth millennium Iranian hybrid Man-with-Mufflon-Head (Barnett, Syria 56 333ff., GS 281) 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 LAGOS 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 as priest.

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 the 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 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 irreal 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONSTER NAME</th>
<th>DEFINITE CHARACTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>snake (1)</td>
<td>death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bison (2, 3)</td>
<td>firmness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eagle (6, 7)</td>
<td>aggression, power (in the sky)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lion (1, 6, 7, 8)</td>
<td>aggression, power (on earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carp (5)</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curls (water) (9)</td>
<td>life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human face (2)</td>
<td>watching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human hands (3, 8)</td>
<td>acting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human body (9)</td>
<td>independent activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 māšu -carp. The scorpion(-man) is in origin a simple mythological scorpion fulfilling, like the Egyptian hprr, "beetle," a cosmic task (watching over the rising and setting of the sun, VII.C.7.d) 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 Ḫbara (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 (kalullā, fīsh-apkallu, uridimmu, urmahlullû).

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. OFED 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. c.
summary of first stage

**Concrete to abstract**

Only a face, a repelling grin hung at the door post to deter evil. His name, otherwise not understandable, may be a face, a repelling grin hung at the door post to deter evil. His name, otherwise not understandable, may be, on seals; as mask, but sometimes the face is supplied with a body. In origin presumably he was indeed a mortal could defeat him, Gilgamesh. The iconography is treated by W.G. Lambe.

The amount of new monsters (see below ii), and the most important of them, $g$. Frankfort.

**VII.C** Character | Composition | Name | associated | adversary
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1 | Violent Death | snake + lion | Furious-Snake | Ninazu
2 | Peace (Pasive) | bison + human face | Bison | Utu
3 | Peace (Active) | bison + human hands | Bisor-(Bull) | Utu
4 | Cosmic Instrument | scorpion (+ man) | Scorpion-Man | Utu
5 | Instruction | carp (+ goat) | Carp-Gout | Enki
6 | Ruling Power | eagle + lion | Heavy-Cloud | Enlil
7 | Destructive Power | lion + eagle | Roaring-Day | Iskur
8 | Aggression | lion + human hands | Big-Day | Iskur
9 | Keeper of Life | curls + human body | Hairy-One | Enki

**Summary (concrete to abstract)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>concrete</th>
<th>abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>snake</td>
<td>earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bison</td>
<td>become half imaginary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scorpion</td>
<td>later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carp</td>
<td>become completely imaginary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy cloud</td>
<td>Exemplary Members, agents, &quot;causes&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days</td>
<td>also artistic entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>represented in monster from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairy one</td>
<td>opposed to anthropomorphic gods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VII.0** Character Composition Name associated adversary

1 2 a i m, 3: ksaarikkas, 4: girahililithi, 5: sulurmululis, 6: ma a la u (ep) – d α γ δ (Arzû, 7: uα k a d α h b α, 8: ugalli, 9: lašmu. The other monsters of VII.C are either too late (umahimma, umahibilithi, kalilithi) or too unclear to be of use in a discussion about origins. 6 Earliest form a simple scorpion with raised pinches that become hands. 2 According to the texts originally a type of carp, $m$ $a$ $k$ $a$ $l$ $a$ - carp, later supplied with the goat part (m $a$ $k$) as a consequence of ancient etymological speculation 4 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 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, Ninursag, Ninurta, Iskur) 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 Ešnuna (Frankfort OIP 60 no. 331), probably Ninazu, is scaled. His successor, Ššak, is green VAS 17 4:2, OB inc.), and must have had a snake's skin. An earlier anthropomorphic Ninazu on a mushussu occurs on an ED IIIb seal (Boehmer UAVA 324, el RIA mushussu 3.2). Later still the SB Götterpersönlichkeits (Köcher MIO 1 57ff) gives the goddess Ninu "scales like a snake" (jii 49). In art however, the goddess is completely anthropomorphic (cf. Stöl, Zwangerschap en Geboorte bij de Babyloniers en in de Bijbel 34). A snake god with human upper body (Boehmer UAVA 4 102ff.) is well known from Akkadian seals, but later probably because he shed the snake part. There is reason to believe that he is the city-god of Der, Ištarân, and that the snake part became his symbolic animal, Niraḫ.

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. Conversely to anthropomorphic gods, monsters stand outside the normal order, they are supernatural freaks, unexpected extras, unpredictable, 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 musḫuššu 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 Lškur, 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 (or at least a specific part of the Dimas-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 Hurriawa 37ff., cf Kramer JCS 1 36 217, Shaffer JAOS 103 307).

Only Anša's ties with Ninurta are not obviously explained from a shared field of action in nature. Anša 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 Anša was associated not with Ninurta, but with Enlil. Anša, 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 imposing, and more sensitive to rebellion: "for men create gods after their own image, not only with regard to form, but also with regard to their way of life" (Aristotle, Politics 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 (maṣṣat-).

For the monsters, outlawry in 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 viceroy 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 kusarikkuru and the Akkadian forerunner of the ugallu fall into place. The kusarikkurru is one of the representatives of the mountains (VILC.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 kusarikkurru (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 Lugals and Angim (cf. Cooper AnOr 52 141ff., van Dijk Lugal 11ff., Lambert CCRAI 32 30ff.). The only important addition of the two later lists is Anša (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 magilum 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 s u m /baṣmu/, 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 Prog. 1 1, cf. van Dijk Lugal 112). A slightly later u s u m /baṣmu/ is a "weapon when he runs, death when he passes" (de Genouillac Trouvalille 1:1f.). SB dragons of older origin attack man (CT 13 331l., musḫuššu) and beast (KAR 6, bašmuu). 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 (Wiegmann Ttipak 1287). In view of the context the mysterious s a g - a r (Gudea Čl. A XXV 25) must be mounted Saggar (Jebel Sinjār, cf. Stol Trees 75ff.), a rebel like mount Ebih who was defeated by Inanna. The captured wild bulls and cows (cf. Lambert CCRAI 32 57) are booty rather than aggressors (cf. Angim 101ff.).

Of the whole list of Ninurta/Ningirsu's enemies only u s u m /baṣmu/ and g u d - a l i m /kusarikkurru/ have a mythological future (on Anša see below). Most of
The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.

The mythology of combat and defeat naturally solves the tension between unnatural monsters and gods, outlawed fears 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 in the origin of the combat myth, to be a rebel is the indispensable property of every monster. Once this is established it comes as no surprise that besides general schemes defining their relation, the nature of his collision with the gods is not specified in a separate myth. The few collisions that are shown are not illustrations of different beings, so the combat myth is a general scheme defining their relation.
The universe is in a progressed state of development when two other monsters are born, the mushšušu (designated by Enlil, brought forth by Sea and River, CT 13 33, cf. Wiggermann Tšipak 118.), and the bsšmu (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 107:38ff., OB Hh XXII) also monsters are identified with stars or constellations. The lumulatum version of Gilgamesh and Huwawa (Shafkat IAOSt 103 307, Kasmer JCS 1 352) seems to place the monsters that guide Gilgamesh to the cedar mountain as stars in heaven. In the Labûlu myth (that cannot be younger than OB) the constellation mushšušu is etiologically explained as Enlil's design on the basis of which Sea and River created the actual monster (cf. Wiggermann Tšipak 125). Lambert suggests that the eleven defeated enemies of Nuna together with their vector have 'astrological relevance one for each month of the year' (CRRAT 52 6). 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 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 aššuršumšu and kuššušu, the passive (Sugun, Gypsum), and the purely apotropaic ones (King Palm, Head-of-the-Bison); monsters are grouped as mountainiers, including those that patently did not belong in the mountains (King Palm, Ship-Looset; the whole group shifts to Sea, including those that are not at home there (kusarlikku, mushšušu).

Until the end of Mesopotamian civilization the results of successive developments could exist side by side. Enûma Eliš recognizes two laḫmu, the one a cosmic god, the other a soldier of Tiâmat. The laḫmu and the other soldiers of Tiâmat are killed by Marduk, but in art they remain (with few exceptions) their traditional selves, alive and well. The mushšušu is killed first by Tšipak (see below III), then by Marduk, but in art he remains what he was in the second half of the third millennium, the stri- ing mount of its successive masters (cf. Wiggermann Tšipak 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).

6) That Anšu was considered the source of the rivers is unequivocally demonstrated by the 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 kuššušu). The universe is in a progressively state of development when two other monsters are born, the mushšušu (designated by Enlil, brought forth by Sea and River, CT 13 33, cf. Wiggermann Tšipak 118.), and the bsšmu (KAR 6:1ff., created in the sea). They do not contribute anything to the cosmos, but are merely pests, devouring man and beast.
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 Anzu; Marduk before Enûma 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 Labba-Myth Enil sends the mulušušu to wipe out noisy mankind. The monster is defeated by Tilpak, who restores the nations to order. The myth translates history, the Old Akkadian overtake in Elamuna, into mythology, and justifies Tilpak’s kingship and the servitude of the mulušušu, the animal of the former city god Ninazu, by presenting them as a consequence of Tilpak’s liberation of the nation. It is a myth of local importance only (cf. Lambert CRRAI 32 565f., Wiggermann, Tilpak 124).

The most influential early combat myth is the Anzu myth (cf. Lambert CRRAI 32 566f.). The history of Anzu’s rebellion is complicated, and narrowly related to the rise of Ninurta.

Anzu, although his cry of woe makes the Anunnas hide like mice in the earth (Wilcke Lugalbanda 100:82ff.), 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 Enil 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 Anzu 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 Anzu 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 (UAV 4 Abb. 354f.).

In return for his blessings Lugalbanda promises Anzu 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 Anzu were visible all over Sumer in the temples. With the simile cited above, the poet reveals that at least some of the Anzu statues he knew were apotropaic door keepers under orders of Enil.

In fact Anzu’s occurred all over Sumer until well into the Ur III period: ‘white-Anzu’ is the name of a temple of Sara in Umma (Landsberger WZKM 57 20). Ur-Nammu supplied the gates of the Ekur in Nippur with Anzu’s (ASJ 11 45 25ff.). Composite emblems consisting of twice the same animal with an Anzu stretching out its wings above them are attested for a number of gods. Limited to Lagal is the Anzu above two ducks/geese. (Fuhr-Jaeppelt Materialien zur Ikonographie des Löwen- Adler Anzu-Indugud 169ff.). The duck/goose is the symbolic animal of an unidentified
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 (Puhu-Jaspélet o. c. Abb. 86), Utu (Boehmer UAVA 4 476), 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, 410, 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 Ninigirsu'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 25ff., 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 the law in the early UR III period (Gudea, Lugalbanda Epic). Shortly afterwards the situation changes. In the UR III compositions Anûgim and Lugal Anzû is among the defeated enemies of Ninigirsu/Ninurta (Cooper AnOr 52 141ff., van Dijk Lugal 11ff.). In U 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 dup., see Alster ICS 24 120ff., Kramer Aub 2 231ff.). Anzû has stolen the me, apparently from Enki, their traditional guardian. After he is defeated by Ninurta, the me slip from his hands, and return to their source. Enki wants to reward Ninurta with glory, a cult in Anûgim, 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 me 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 sur dadûrin, with previous lit., SAGS AJO 33 1ff., Moran AJO 35 241ff.) relates how Anzû was born, came into the service of Enlil, took the opportunity to steal the tablet of destinies containing the me iparû, gained universal power, and finally was defeated by Ninigirsu/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 (AJO 35 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 exaltation. 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 mountainer on the side of rightful rule; among the beings on Ninigirsu's chariot Anzû was the only one that was not a defeated enemy
An Orkusarikku, servant from the time of its invention onwards. Two monsters, and may have served his son Marduk as well. The murabi’s victory over Esnunna; urta, 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
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The Lugal did not have a clear picture of his appearance. Identification of a cyclopes on an OB plaque comes as no surprise that he is not represented in art (there is nothing to recommend van Dijk’s arbitrary

with her (Gula, Ninisina, Ninkarrak, cf. Römer

cretized with him, see below) is the same demon Disorder on a cosmic level, is clearly indicated by the myth

The myth makes him one among many, all monstrous enemies of the anthropomorphic gods.

In Lagal Ninurta was the warrior of Enil (AnOr 30 50, JNES 32 28:8) before he became his son and was

synergized with Ninurta, at the latest in the time of Gudea (AnOr 30 50), and therefore prior to the Anzû myth. Although conceivably the local Ninurta mythology contributed to the national Ninurta mythology, the Anzû myth cannot be a local affair, since it affects the nature of a universal being. Thus, while the interpretation of local mythology (Ninurta, Lagal) 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 centristic power in the Ur III period.

Strongly influenced by local (Lagal) mythology is the myth Lugal (cf. van Dijk RIA 7 134ff.). Its protagonists Ninurta/Ningirsu, and a monster, dī-ṣa-ṭi akkuka, like the other monsters a warrior who lives in the mountains. Sumerian dī-ṣa-ṭi 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 Ps Sache 225ff., Stol Epiglyphe, forthcoming). The nature of the diseases it denotes is revealed by incantations and medical texts: Asakku is practically always paired with a n - m - t a r (see previously CADD akkuka, A, namthar), which denotes disease (and death) that is ‘decided’ by the gods, part of the rightful cosmos. From the observation that the pair akkuka/namthar fill a semantic field, it follows that akkuka denotes what is not decided, disease that is not part of the rightful cosmos, suitably translated as ‘disorder’. Diseases like a n - m - t a r and dī-ṣa-ṭi are produced by the physician goddess Bau, and those synergized with her (Gila, Ninanna, Ninkarrak, cf. Römer SKIZ 224ff., AOAT 1 279ff., 285-48, Civil IA 63 140 no. 14, Atl. Sumerian Letters 136-20). That the dī-ṣa-ṭi combat by her husband Ningirsu/Ninurta (and those synergized 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 by 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 akkuka, Lagal 20ff., frontispiece = Opificius.

Asakku, Lugal, like a woman. In

Lagos Ningirsu was the warrior of Enlil (AOAT 141:1), Lagamal/Nergal (Cooper

TAG), in the SB myth. Although conceivably the local Ningirsu mythology contributed to the national Ningirsu mythology, in Lagos Ningirsu was the warrior of Enlil (AOAT 141:1), Lagamal/Nergal (Cooper

TAG), in the SB myth.

Although the text does not expressly state that the monsters at the door of Marduk’s cells were his defeated enemies, this conclusion can hardly be escaped. The former enemies of Ninurta (basmu, 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 Tiâmat as archenemy, 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 archenemy Tiâmat and a cosmic battle. Tiâmat was among the enemies of Ninurta, and both she and Asāšī, the later cosmogenic pair, breed and shelter monsters (above IIb).

If Lambert is right (The History of the m u s - hu s in Ancient Mespotamia In L’Animal l’homme, le dieu dans le proche-orient ancien 90) Tiâmat is represented by wavy lines on Marduk’s seal (Wetzel WDOG 52 Pl. 43 f.). Berossus (S. Mayor Borsmti. S 15 12, Lambert/Thö 16 29f.) presents her both as a body of water and as a woman. In Ee she is water, but also a cow (?) Landsberger

IV 131, 100, V 63), blood and arteries (kuškū, dānum, IV 131, dānum, IV 32), spittle (nirži, V 67), a tail (šibatu, V 49), a head (qqaddu, V 55), a skull (šabû, IV 130), a mouth (šaxu, IV 97, 100), lips (šapta, IV 98), nostrils (nābītu, V 56), eyes through which Marduk releases the Enphants and Tigris (V 55, Livingston Mythical Exploration Works 823), and a horn, cut off by Marduk (Livingstone o. c. 821, 13) and associated with the body of water called ‘Horn of the Sea’ (š i a - a - b - a), that enters the land from the Persian Gulf and gave its name to Borsippa (Oppenheim o. c. 652ff.).

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 Enil (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 dependency on the Anzû-myth and the Ninurta mythology (Lambert CRRAI 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: Tiâmat, 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 usûngallu (cf. VII.C.2.a.f), ûmû dabrûtu (cf. VII.C.4.f),
and mausehātu, all in the plural. The three of them may be related to the Ninurta mythology. For the mausehātu and its identification in art with a seven-headed snake cf. Douglas van Buren OrNS 15 18ff., Heimpel Tierbilder 480ff., Cooper AnOr 52 123, Landsberger Tāna 53:11ff., MSL 8/1 7:3 and forerunner SLT 51 11, Frankfurt AnOr 12 105ff. no 1 Figs. 1-4. The mausehātu, 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 girahāhu. Omitted is the suhurmāhu, perhaps he was not considered a suitable soldier.

In some texts the list is expanded still further and includes Anzē (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 Suhurmasu, “those of the water of the river and the dry land” (VII.B.10, text 1 144), and, in apotropaic context, såbk limnītu ša Ea u Marduk, “those that repel the evil ones, of Ea and Marduk” (text 1 160f., 1655). For Eihur-nabnīsu 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 with their horned tiaras. In iconography distinct from the gods with their horned tiaras. In iconography the horns of divinity in art, the monsters are kept separate from the gods. They are kept separate from the demons as well as from the gods. They are kept separate from the demons.

The following terms are used for the members of Tiamat’s army as a group: sunū, “weather-beasts” (VIII.B.10, šarum 8:8), umanimate, “beasts” (TIF 2 141:14), gaddā, “soldiers” (VIII.B.9, Ex IV 116), šat me nē ni ša nūbullu, “those of the water of the river and the dry land” (VII.B.10, šarum 8:8), ādēati apēti, “creatures of Apēti” (text 1 144), and, in apotropaic context, såbk limnītu ša Ea u Marduk, “those that repel the evil ones, of Ea and Marduk” (text 1 160f., 1655). For erhur-nabnīsu cf. Lambert CRRAI 32 58.

The god gods is used only sporadically, like the horns of divinity in art, the demons are kept separate from the gods. They are kept separate from the demons. They are kept separate from the demons as well as from the gods.

C Individual histories

1 laḫmu, “the hairy one”.

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


96: For the Nimrud “heroes” without the distinctive six spiral tresses but inscribed as the laḫmu cf. now Green Iraq 45 91ff. An interesting misread NB attestation of the laḫmē in the service of Ea is Lambert Ata-hašis 116:7, recurring, with variations, in 116:10, 118:5, 12, 19, 120:35 (cf. also 116:28).

Just as Aunu 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, the sea” together with his . . . ša ḫa-X-mi-šu. In his commentary (166f.) Lambert identifies the sign X as U, and hesitates between reading a-mišu or ša-mišu; the sign may just as well be láh and the resulting reading láh-mišu, “his hairies” makes perfect sense. It seems that later Ea blamed these maṣarhi támēti, “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-hašis, perhaps not too far removed from OB Atra-hašis and certainly reflecting pre-Ee mythology, hints here at a story of mutinous laḫmē punished by Ea. Mutinous laḫmē are not implied by first millennium seals (Amiet Akkadica 28 31ff.) showing a laḫmu-like monster defeated by gods. This monster is apparently a successor of Humbaba. New is the reading of King AK 389:11 (cf. Grayson API 143, 154): láh-iš-ki-an-gur-ru-rabī būšāš, “and I gave the laḫmē, its protective spirit, its eminent place” (MAss private building inscription). For a laḫmē depicted on a potstand (OB) cf. now Durand ARM 21 222 48f. (kannu ša ta-ah-mi) and 3632.

10013: For the “Viermenschenradmotiv” cf. also Collon AOAT 27 596, B. Teissier ANECS 55.

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).


10 With goat and spirg in apkaliu-like function: Layard Mon 1 507 = Ravn AFO 16 244 (Nass., cf. above p. 77ff.).


I summarize the results of JEOL 27 90ff.:

a word: Semitic (95), entered Sumerian in the Pre-Sargonic period (97) in the form 1 a-ha m a. A more general use of the term is attested in the Götterspeiste (97ff.). An uncertain third millennium attestation is ARET V 9 2x.9 [a-ha(?)]-ma [ar?] zU. [ W. G. Lambert convincingly contested the existence of laḫmu B, “the muddy one”, OrNS 45 189ff.].


c Attestations: from Early Dynastic (perhaps even Jemdet Nasr) period in art; from Gudea Cyl. A XXIV 26ff. in the texts (the loanword 1 a-ha m a 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-hašis (above ad 96). Though furnished with the determinative more often than the other “monsters” (96f., 99, above VILA 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 laḫmē appears 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, above II.4), he remains associated with water (101,4).

e Apotropaic Representations: representations of laḫmu stand at the d u b - lá of Sumerian temples (95; since Gudea CyI.A XXIV 266); the OAkk laḫmu associated with a kusarikku (96) may also have been apotropaic. A monumental OAkk laḫmu giving a gate post is the Bassetti statue (cf. Ayish Sumer 32 69). In a SB incantation of older origin (96:7) a laḫmu is present in a private house (cf. Opificius UA 2 221 for OB representations on clay plaques). MAkk and later royal inscriptions describe laḫmu at gates (91f., 101f.); a MAkk private building inscription records the presence of a laḫmu, “its protective spirit”, in a house with a well (AKA 389:11, cited above); the laḫmu 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 58, Kolbe Reliefprogramme 96ff.).

2 bašmu.

For the two Sumerian terms ušum and mus-sa-tür Akkadian has only one: bašmu (spelled logographically Muš.SATUR.TUR). 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-sa-tür/bašmu.

a ušum/bašmu, “Venomous Snake”.

a Word: Sumerian ušum is an Akkadian loanword, derived from a postulated dialectical wasm-. Akkadian wa- becoming Sumerian u- is not without precedents (cf. Edzard Genava 8 247), nor is the additional vowel in the proximity of a syllabic consonant (cf. JEO 27 97). Akkadian s < PS š is regularly rendered by Sumerian š-. The Akkadian word goes back on PS BFN/M (cf. Landsberger Fauna 58, Humbert Afo 11 235f.). It is now attested also in Ebla (Franzaroli SEd 1 76 with further literature, MEE 4 386 iii 9, ARET 5 no 4 i 3).

b identification: horned snake with forelegs (cf. Weidner Gestim- darstellungen Pl. IX-X, where the caption Muš is a shortened spelling of Muš.SATUR = bašmu, historical ušum/bašmu).

c attestations: in texts as the name of a specific monster (not as a general word for dragon) since Gudea CyI.A XXVI 29 (and Fragment 1 TCL 8 Pl. 53, cf. van Dijk Lugal I 11 23); the ušum/bašmu of Angim 33 and Lagale 129 stem approximately from the same time. In art only one doubtful attestation is known to me from OAkk (Douglas van Buren OrNIS 19 Pl. IX/2 = UA 4 Abb. 290). All further attestations stem from the first millennium (seals like Moortgat VAF 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 Ningishzida) cannot be established. In SB texts it is councellor or defeated enemy of Tilšak, and perhaps replaces the mushšušu who fell into the hands of Marduk. From Ur III onwards it is attested as one of the “warriors” (u r - s a g) slain by Ninurta (Cooper AnOr 52 143). The SB myth KAR 6 describes a muš be-[al-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 footless muš-sa-tür/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 52 146), he replaces Ninurta. After Marduk’s usurpation of the mushšušu, the ušum/bašmu became the symbolic animal of gods formerly associated with the mushšušu.

e Apotropaic representations: Gudea CyI.A XXVI 29: in art the dragon from the palace of Esharhaddon (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 cannot certainly not be a mushšušu, only other dragon of the list). The ušum/bašmu is not attested in the Kleinplastik.

f ušumgal, rendered in Akkadian by usumgallu 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 ušumgalu a suit simple ušum. Usumgallu is like ušum used as a generic term as well, and occasionally replaces mushšušu when the dragon of Nabû is referred to (4 R² 20/3 Obv. 15f., KAR 104 29, ABL 951 Obv. 12-13, cf. Lambert Fr Matous 2 93, Parpola LAS II 266 ad 16), or the dragon of Ninurta (Iraq 4 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 (g a l) a suitable epithet for certain gods and kings. In Ee (cf. above VII.B.9) the number of monsters is enlarged with mushšušu, usumgallu and umu dabrût. This indicates that, if we have correctly equated the denotations of ušum/bašmu and usumgallu, the bašmu of Ee is the muš-sa-tür/bašmu. The use of muš-sa-tür in the Sumerian version of a bilingual text enumerating apparently (some of) the same set of monsters (VII.B.8), and the correspondence of the bašmu of the rituals with the footless 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 mushussu, "Birth Goddess Snake".

a Identification: horned snake. The snake of the Kleinplastik, proved to be the basmu by its inscription (Klengel-Brandt Plä 10, 1968, 36; suggested earlier by Landsberger Fauna 56, 58, when the inscribed figures had not yet been published), does not have horns (Rittig Kleinkleist 122f. 216f.). However, since both types of basmu are probably horned, since the snake without horns is securely identified with 4Nirah and opposes on kudurna's with a horned type, and since the Kleinplastik leaves off the horns of the mushussu and the suhumnasu 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.

b attestations: in texts as the name of a specific monster since Gudea (together with mushussu, Gudea Cyl. A XXVI 24f., TCS 3 41-416f., BIOR 36 362-49, cf. Frayne IAOS 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 689f. and other seals); on kudurna's (Seidl BaM 155f.). In NAss Akkadian basmu is possibly used to denote the Egyptian uraus (Lambert, JJS 33 62).

c Of the mythology of this dragon little is known. In (OB) Gilgamesh and Huwawa 38 he is an ur-sag, "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.

d Apotropaic representations: in texts, together with mushussu (cf. above attestations) or other monsters (Heimbel-Tierbilder 87f.); in the Kleinplastik: Rittig Kleinkleist 122f., Ismail AfOBF 19 199.

mushussu, "Furious Snake," "Aweful Snake."
b Identification: lion-monster. 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 Delifer apud Kolbe Reliefformulierung 222, Wiggermann apud Stol Zwangsschaf terentscheidungen 56 122 39 ) as one of the passi nappušatu, “the winged 'puppets'" of a board-game. 

Priggallu in NAss royal inscriptions has nothing to do with ugallu. It denotes the “lion bases” of columns (cf. BaM 10 Pl. 11, Turner Iraq 32 761, Landsberger Fauna 75).

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 ud-gal's — this type of beings is attested already in Fara (Sü 7 vi 24l) — but they are certainly not yet the exclusive denotation of ud-gal. 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.: ud ka-ba mu-it 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-IV) a lion-demon appears together with a smaller lion-demon. Without sufficient reason Landsberger WZKM 57 8 considered them uncommon representations of Anzû and its young.

d Mythology: in origin the ud-šumu 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 (ud-a d ú g-ga) 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 (šumu-apkallu, 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 (AmOr 52 60:17, cf. Langdon Epic of Creation 88f) or their weapons (AmOr 52 123f. ad 131, 132). The personified Days resemble the evil spirits (utukka lemmûtu; cf. AS 12:400ff., JCS 30 132f. 20). One of them is one’s dying day, the (Evil) Day (Šumu lemmû; 4 ud), the messenger of the underworld god Erra (UET 6 395 Obv. 12, SEM 117 ii 9); another is the flood-day (Gilg. XI 91f., cf. also ibid. 118). Generally the bad Days are associated with Iktur/Adad, the storm god; they are “released from the sky” (a n - t a s u - b a r - ū 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) leoine monsters (interchangeable with pirig, “lion”; see also below 11a, lion-dragon ud-ga ka-du-h-ḫ a), mounts and draught-animals of gods (mount of Istar: above a; mount of Iskur: JNES 33 234 VIII; chariot of Urta: Orcht 8 42 ad 59R, of Manduk: Ex IV 50; of Ninurta: Gudea Cyl. B XVIII 19; of Gilgamesh: Gilg. VI 12). The ud-gal a is first not a specific being but simply a big ud (above a; translated into Akkadian as šumu rabû). After the Ur III period ud-gal 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
apotropaeon. 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 ud indicates that executing divine orders is the basis of his
existence.

b Apotropaic representations: his presence on OB seals (attacking an evil-
doer) is perhaps apotropaic. On kudurru's: Seidl BaM 4, XLVI (with fur-
ther literature). On reliefs: Kolbe Reliefprogramme B'ype XV (cf.222),
Reade BaM 10 39. Clay and metal figures: Ellis Finkelstein Memorial
On amulets: Lamastu amulet 2, 49, 56. Together with a god raising
his right fist (Lulal): above IIA.4.A end (reliefs, amulets, bronze bell;
ion 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 10'14.0 GAL-bu,
followed by 2a-as-mu). For some further references to the lion-demon
cf. Madhloom Chronology 109, Orthmann Untersuchungen 310ff.,
Fortsch CF 174f., SCS 46, Collon AOAT 27 120f., Porada CRRAI 26 Pl.XIIb,
Delaporte RA 7 Pl IV/4. See now Green BaM 17 141-254.

c The ùmû dabrûtu defeated by Marduk in Ec (above VII.B.9) also be-
long here ("fierce weather-beasts") and are perhaps related to the ùmû
karmatu, "fierce weather-beasts", lead away by one of the incarnations of
Ningirsu/Ninurta in the Gula hymn OrN 35 126;173.

5 uridimmu, "Mad Lion",
a Word: uridimmu is a loanword from Sumerian ur i d i m ; the elements
of the Sumerian word are ur, "dog/lion", and i d i m , "(howling) mad",
"wild", "not domesticated" (Heimpel of the Sumerian word are ur, "dog/lion", and idimm, "(howling) mad",
"wild", "not domesticated" (Heimpel
b Mythology: about the earlier mythology of the ur(i)dimmu nothing is
known. In the MB period he was included among the trophies of Mar-
duk, and later became a member of Tiamet's army. The magical text
KAR 26 (cf. Ebeling ZDMG 69 96f.) and its unpublished duplicates
(HKL 2 55) give the name 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)idimmu of cedar to be hung
on a loop of gold and flax together with a seal (of, K 3268+) juldû-
stone and inscribed as follows: EN 4 ASAR.I.ME.ES.IN.SIL.Y E.R.U.M. MA
N.UN.GA.BAR.BAR, [RE'-EN]\" (beginning restored after K 3268 +11), "you are Marduk
the expeller of evil, chase away sorcery". Later, after offerings to
Marduk and Sarpanitum, 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 ša T.LLA, var. K 5937: ur-ta-ka) so that
good health will accompany the sick man. A similar request is made to
Sarpanitu (57, cf. Seux Hymnes et Prières 453f.), she is to make him
well disposed (milk damâtu) towards protecting the life of the sufferer.
The monster is called (Obv. 50) sabû, abâtâ ana Marduk u Sarpanitum bêl-
šu, "who intercedes with Marduk and Sarpanitum, his masters", prob-
able 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-
kusarikku, a tribe sent the mountains at the edge of the world through which the sun rises two separate figures. This association of the mythologized human-god, a feature that must go back to the time before they split into The human-faced bison and the bison-man are associated with the sun-gud-alim and the Akkadian loanword already in the Akkad period, to be associated with the bison-man. A bison in upright position (an active variant). Only the free variant generally with a human face. Perhaps under the influence of for-

Apotropaic representations: in texts: VII.A.5, KAR 26, BBR 51:3 (so Zimmerm BNR 164, followed by von Soden AHw 14298, Eliat IBor 39 24 reads UI.R.MAH3.MES3, OIP 2 142:21 (Senacherib, Asšur temple), Weisberg YOS 17 345:6 (NB, mentioned in connection with the temple of Marduk together with 4Kababba, CTS 395 B:4 (Nåss, chapel of Marduk). On kudurru’s (together with ugalu): BAu 4:12 Abb. 10; on reliefs: Kolbe Reliefprogramme Type XIX (holding a partly broken crescent on a pole: PI XIV/1), Reade BaM 10 40 (with an additional example, cf. also Reade Iraq 26 5f.; Reade calls the being urmaḫtilû); in Kleinplastik: Green Iraq 45 921. With a different interpretation, cf. above II.A.3.17 and VII.A.1 and perhaps Rittig Kleiner Plastik 6.1 (cf. above p. 100f. [CF. Green Iraq 47 77]).

kusarikku, “Bison,” “Bison(-bull)”.

Word/attestations/mythology: Sumerian al im (1) and its free variant gud-alim denote, at least in Sumer (3), the bison (4). In art the bison is represented at least naturallyistically, 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 Akkadian 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 beads to call the forebear of their tribe (“ditum”) “Bison” (Ditum-14), also the name of the “mountain of the MARTU-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 no less than four texts (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 35, Kutscher AH 115; in lexical lists: MSL 14 54:586, 440:10f. Cf. CAD K 584a. In 1g - alim perhaps the sign alim also has the value al im (cf. Falkenstein GSG 1 13). The Akkadian word for “bison” is ditum (CAD A/1 349h, D 165a) or kusarikku (K 2209). 2) The variation alim: gud-alim is attested in the equations alim = kusarikku (< gud-alim), cf. CAD K 584a, and gud-alim = alīmû (< al im), cf. CAD A/1 349a. Sumerian gud-alim certainly did not denote only the bison-man (cf. Heimpel Tiberiids 77, OrNS 43 331:10). From lexical lists where Sumerian al im 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 - alim 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 Tiberiids 91f.). Without discussion a different solution is proposed by Heimpel Tiberiids 77: alim “Wisent” (both sexes), gud-alim “Wiesentiere”. This distribution of the terms could nicely explain the choice of masculine gud-alim to denote the active, ostentatiously ithyphallic bison-man. 3) In Elba alim is equated with ila-mu-anûmû, related to Akkadian ãu, “bull,” and with ãg-anûmû, related to Semitic ãgîl, “bull” (MEE 428/73, 327:1192). The feminine form allaumûx is equated with ila-tum (MEE 428/732) related to Akkadian âtu and the Hebrew PN LE₂, “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 s a g - gud (gud-alim) - m a in the texts (Klein ZA 73 270f.). 5) Cf. with previous literature: Amiet GMA 112ff., 137f.; Belm-Biancke BaBu 44, Becher BaM 9 18f. From the Ur III period onwards (Boehmer BaM 9 18f.) the name of 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 by-product of Ninurta/Ningirsu’s dealings with the mountains (19). 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., iba; alimûûnûmû 7 cf. CAD A/1 287, Iraqi Iraq 32 81f.). 6) Amiet GMA 4 84a, Porada Biblès 4 115f. 7) Derivation of bison-man (bull-man) from (upright) bison and futher developments Hilzheimer MAoG 112ff., Amiet GMA 49, 138f., Becher BaM 9 20, U4A 4 43f., Orthmann Untersuchungen 306ff., Krienger-Brandl Fo 10 24, FoBu 20 216, Opificios U4A 2 220f., Howard-Carter BaBu 45 67f., Porada CRB 25 166f. The bison-man, often accompanied by a naked hero (ISBL 27 96, 103), fights lions, bison, 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 :1 that troubled Landsberger cf. now Sjöberg GMA 2 59, 138, 147f., Behm-Blancke BaM 32 81f., Falkenstein GSG 1 54 35, Lattab-Edzard MDPh 57 26, Oticlus 2 80 (flauria /flaûra). The correspondence of Sumerian gud-alim (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, 536, 647). Since Sumerian has a word for the bison-man that is certainly not borrowed from a third language (as proved by the osmissible element gud-alim), it is not necessarily Sumerian, cf. Oppenheim InES 4 170f. (30). 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 Ågfd 207 derives kusarikku and its variants — cf. CAD K 584 — from a substrate word: khusar).
9) In OAkk a number of
31:3).
8) The term kusarikku, tripod of Marduk since MB, is the successor of the earlier g u d - a l i m / kusarikku of the Anu myth, the trophy of Ninurta out of the “dust of battle”; 141m, “the wild one” is equated with kusarikku in MSU 14 278:25 (Ass III).
7) Frankfort CS 100ff., Behm-Blauwe 485.
6) Cooper An Or 52 148 with further references.
5) Ce. Cooper An Or 52 148.
4) For his combativeness on seals cf. Amiet GM A 147; the texts give only hints: in Assin 35 Ninurta brings the bison out of the “dust of battle,” 141m, “the wild one” is equated with kusarikku in MSU 14 278:25 (Ass III).
2) For his combativeness on seals cf. Amiet GM A 147; the texts give only hints: in Assin 35 Ninurta brings the bison out of the “dust of battle,” 141m, “the wild one” is equated with kusarikku in MSU 14 278:25 (Ass III).
1) Frankfort CS 100ff., Behm-Blauwe 485.

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 Iraj 45 92f.); apud Stol Zwangerschap en Geboorte 12).

The complete equation is:
(1) GUD ALIM = (2) GUD.DUMU 4 UTU = (3) GUD.DUMU.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 Izdubur (now read Gilgamesh) and Habubu (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 Final Version, in A.E. Farkas ed., Monsters and Demons in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds [1987], 37-52.

Landsberger Fauna (1934) 93: (1) = (4) = human-faced bison. The solution is based on al im = bison and g u d - a l i m (kusarikku) = a mythological animal, therefore mythological bison, the human-faced bison. Landsberger’s opinion is occasionally quoted in speculative contexts (Unger Siener 8 196, Gadd Iraj 26 120, with modification). but does not seem to have won general acceptance, especially not where the late successor of the human-faced bison, the NAs human-faced bull, is concerned.

Landsberger Sam’al (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 4 UTU in apotropaic contexts in NAs royal inscriptions with occurrences of the bull-man on orthostats in Sam’al.
Landsberger did not believe that GUD.DUMU₄dUTU 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 apakku) and the bull-man were traditional apotropaic types of art, brought into the pantheon by equating them with traditional apotropaic figures of the texts (apakku and GUD.DUMU₄dUTU; Landsberger, who did not yet know the Nippur forerunner of Hû, MSL 8/1 87:206, 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 correspondence is not to be expected.

Frankena Tâkultu (1953) 90: (1) = (2) = (4). Frankena's correct equation was based on the interchange of GUD.DUMU₄dUTU and GUD.ALM/KUSARIKU 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) GUD₄dUd = (2) GUD.DUMU₄dUTU = (3) laḫmu 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. Tâkultu 25 i 288, BIOR 18 199 ii 5f. and the ritual texts in which both occur (text II, V).
1 ≠ 3 cf. JEOL 27 95f.

Laroche JCS 6 120 and RH4 84/85 78, followed by Güterbock Yazilikaya² 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 Hûrriš. There is no caption to prove this identification, nor can it be proved that Šeriš and Hûrriš must be present at all. Some voiced misgivings about this identification (Otten Anatolia 3 48), but two other bulls then available for identification with Šeriš and Hûrriš (Yazilikaya² 42a, 43a, cf. Haas RIA 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 Têšûp' (Sarrumma, Güterbock Yazilikaya² 171, Les Héroïlyphes de Yazilikaya 12). We must reject the identification on the following grounds:
- It is improbable that two genuine Hurrian gods, could be represented by a thoroughly Mesopotamian figure.
- Hûrriš and Šeriš draw the chariot of Têšûp (RIA 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 Hurriš and Šeriš were real animals, not monsters: in An-Arعام III 257f. Šeriš is one of the two gods 'Huруд -kâ', "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 Hûrriš are GUD-ILFr-ru, "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 Hurriš and Šeriš of "une interpretation peu vraisemblable de Yazilikaya, N° 28-29". Amiet (RÅ 50 117) suggests that Hurriš and Šeriš (Jour et Nuit) derive from the lyin human faced bulls of third millennium Mesopotamian art, that sometimes replace the mountains through which the sun rises (see also GMA² 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 39-39:19. In Mari on a potstand: ARM21 222-25. In an OB incantation (Farber ZA 71 63 Rev. 5, cf. AMT 96/1 12 quoted by CAD K 584a, and cf. Ebeling MAOG V/3 11 for a similar text with laḫmu) 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 u-ga-li-to-ni, "who woke me up, who startled me?", a domestic version of Enil'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 402f., especially 402 found in context against the outer wall of the Hendursag chapel at OB Ur, Moorey Iraq 37 89f.), or as a statuette (in texts: cf. Landsberger Fauna 93). In MNA-Ass 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 2 134 IX 8, Frankena Tâkultu 90, also with references to GUD.DUMU₄dUTU in NASS royal inscriptions, Borger AFOB 9 87-4, cf. Börker-Klähn Za 70 260', 266f.). The bison heads on seals and toggle pins recall the later heads of Humbaba and may well have been apotropaic (Amiet GMA² 137). On kadutum's: Seidi BaM 4 XLVII. In the MB temple in Tell Rimah: Howard-Carter Iraq 45 64f. and PI. 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 (ILA.A.3) inscription: "go out death, enter life". The figure on the reverse of Lamaštû 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 Lamaštû amulets.


7 girtablullû, “Scorpion-Man”.

a Word: the composition of the word out of the elements gírt-á-tá-b, “scorpion”, and î-li-ú-u, “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 Reliefsprogramme 82). Comparison with other names of monsters composed with -ullû (urmahlullû, kulullû) shows that the element -ullû 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 Göttengütertext MIO 1 64 6’f. may have given a description of a [GR-TAB.Í-LU-U], but unfortunately only one word is preserved: a-li-ku, “in walking posture” (CAD A/I 347’a). 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 75” (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 Reliefsprogramme 82), is a girtablullû as well must remain undecided (positively so Edzard WiM 100).

c Attestations: since Ed IIIa (Lyre from Royal Graves in Ut, UE II Pl 105; Téssier, 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.

e Aporoplastic representations: in rituals VIIA.7; in NAss royal inscriptions: OIP 2 145.21, KAV 74:5 (cf. Börker-Klähn ZA 70 258ff.). In Kleinplastik: Rittig Kleinplastik 78ff.; cf. 218; On reliefs: Howard-Carter Iraq 45 7ff. and Pl. Vb (MAss, from Tell Rimah = Iraq 28 Pl. XXXVib; not Pazuzu. On Pl. VI good photographs of BM 94941, a clay pot with two girtablullû = Layard Mon. 1 95A, Unger RV 8 Pl. 68c. For another object with a girtablullû cf. Thompson AAA 18 Pl. XXVII, NAss), Kolbe Reliefsprogramme type XI (cf. Reade BaM 10 39, Meuszyński EtTrav 6 52ff., Iraq 38 Pl. XIV, Vorys Canby Iraq 33 Pl. XVIIb). (cf. also Green Iraq 47 75ff.).

8 urmahlullû, “Lion-Man”.

a Word: composed out of ur - m a h, “lion” and î - û - ú u , “untamed man”. The urmahlullû is extremely rare. It is omitted thrice in enumerations of the trophies of Marduk (VILA.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 kulullû 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 urmahlullû of text II (IIA.3.20): ta-par-ri-ik SAG.HUL.HA.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 BaM 9 41.30, Beran AFO 10 264). Whether winged examples are also called urmahlullû cannot be decided (on seals: Frankfort CS Pl. XXXIVf, Beran AFO 18 273 abb. 25). The lion-demon (above 4) or the human-headed lion-man (above 5) are sometimes mistakenly identified as urmahlullû (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 WiD 11 249 with further literature). Reade BaM 10 41 proposed kurbu 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 kudullû or girtablullû, and functioning in mythology only after its inclusion among the trophies of Marduk.

180
Apotropaic representations: in texts: VII.A.8, probably also RA 1.14:10 and YOS 6:3:3. In Kleinplastik: Rittig Kleinplastik 112f.; on reliefs: Kolbe Reliefsprogramme Type XVII, Reade BA 10:41, Madhloom Chronology 98f. (winged: Kolbe Reliefsprogramme 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 kalullû, “Fish-Man”.

a Word: that KU6.LÔ.UÂ.LUlu is to be read kalullû appears from the Göttertypentext where the word is spelled KU6.LÔ-ul-lu (MIO 180:12). A long -â is demanded by Sumerian 1û-î-lu, from which kalullû is borrowed, but none of the kalûu 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 kalilu is attested in KAR 162 Rev. 4 (Ec, spelled ku-li-li). This kalilu is to be kept distinct from:

b) ku-li-li, variant of 4Ku-li-li (Landsberger Fauna 136, Frankenka Têkalu 97, CAD K 357a), a female figure, possibly apotropaic as well (III.B.13+n).

c) ku-li-a-n-na = kaliltu. 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-li-li-ia. 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 KAAss MS has ku-li-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 kaliltu, an insect since it appears among other insects in Hb (cf. Landsberger Fauna 136, Cooper AnOr 52 149). Although kaliltu tu, “little bride” (an insect) and kaliltu, “fish-woman” are not related linguistically, they may have been fused in the mind of the late translator of Angim. The existence of kaliltu, “fish-woman” (proving the by-form of the masculine word to have been kaliltu), became apparent only recently from a NAAss administrative document (CTN 395 B:28; 1-te ku-li-li-te ... 2 ku-li-li-te) describing statues in the Ezida of Nabû in Kalhu. The two “fish-women” are described after a suhrumâtu and a KU6.LÔ.UÂ.LUlu. Monumental representations of apotropaic insects are unknown, and kaliltu here cannot have denoted such a being. In art the fishman appears first in the OB period (Heuzey RA 5 131 Fig. C, Porada CÂNES 433, Delaporte Louvre II PL 76 A 251); thus, if the being was named in this period, kalullû 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 kalullû is a genuine word.

b Identification: fish-centaur. This identification was proposed earlier (Langdon Epic of Creation 1923 89) but could not be proved until 1968, when Klengel-Brändt 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 uninscribed example from Aššur was correctly identified by Lutz in 1930 (UCP 973 383c), but did not strictly constitute proof. The description of a kalullû in MÖ 1 80:5ff. is, as usual in this text, divergent. Here the kalullû has a human upper body, hands, and the head of a kussugâ, which, whatever it is, is not the head of a human being. Below the waist it is a purâdû, “carp”. The kalullû is sometimes mistakenly identified with the fish-apkallu (Meissner BuA 2 205, Köcher MÖ 1 95, Edzard WdM 100, Borger JNES 33 186, Komoróczy ActAntHun 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 OAAss. art, cf. Özgüz TTKY 22 72, TTKY 25 43) cf. Collon CS III p.45. The SB texts in which the kalullû appears go back partly to MB (VILB.7, 9). Kasite appearances have been briefly discussed by van Buren OnôS 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 67f., Delaporte Bib. Nat. 392, 543.

d Mythology: already with its first appearance in OB, the fish-centaur is together with the suhrumâtu associated with Ea and streams (RA 5 131 Fig. C, Collon CS III 73, 278). In the Göttertypentext MÖ 1 80:12 he is “one of Ea” (šut 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 in- tercession and compliance” it speaks. The late translator of Angim may have identified the female form (kaliltu) with ku-li-a-n-nâ, one of the trophies of Ninurta/Ningirsu, and so have imbedded her in tradition.

e Apotropaic attestations: in rituals: VII.A.9; in NAAss royal inscriptions: OIP 2 145:20, KA 74:8 (cf. Börker-Klähn ZA 70 258f.); K. among Isin deities: RA 41 36:14; in an NAAss administrative document giving measures of statues in the Nabû temple in Kalhu in view of their covering in gold leaf: CTN 3 95 B:19 (KU6.LÔ.UÂ.LUlu), 28 (ku-li-li-te ... ku-li-li-te, cf. above; also mentioned are 2 suhrumâs 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 3537). Monumental examples: Mallowan N & R 1 234f. Fig. 198 (outside the Nabû temple in Kalhu) 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” 8 S. For further discussion of the colossi of the Nabû temple cf. Madhloom Chronology 99f., with further literature. [See now Green Iraq 48 25ff.]
suhurmasu, “Carp-Goat”.

a Word: the few examples of su h ur -m aš/m aška, 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, Willeke Lugabanda 392ff., Falkenstein SGL 1 81:16). The Akkadian loanword suhurmâsu may have retained this denotation (in omens: KAR 300:15; in OrNS 30 3:32 where the duplicate SûT 2 8 i 30 has Suhurâku, cf. CAD S 352a where an emendation is proposed). Thus we cannot be certain that Akkadian suhurmâsu 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: su h ur, “carp”, and m aš/m aš, “goat”.

b Identification: Goat-fish. On the basis of etymology this being was identified as the suhurmâsu by Jensen ZA 5 (1890) 129 and Kosmologie (1890) 73ff., 277*. Zimmer apud Frank LSS II/2 (1906) **, 34 added the evidence of the Nazimarutās Kudurru, where the goat-fish of Ea is named su-hur-ma-su (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 suhurmâsu (= Ritte Kleiplastik 10.1, for the inscription cf. II.A.24).

c Attestations: such as Ur III, cf. Scidil 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 (LKH 45:16; MDP 2 Pl. 17 iv 5). Especially interesting is a LB Sumerian text of MB origin, where he is called s a n g a -m a h -a b z u - k e a, “the lofty purification priest (cf. CAD mudûl 2) of the apsû” (Lambert Fs Albright 346:25). Associated with seals is the Carp-Goat of a bit meser inscription (III.B.8 = OrNS 30 3:18ff., cf. Littke JNES 33 192) in which Piriggalabzu, the sage of Adah, hangs his seal on it, angera 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 euru-stick that the suhurmâsu carries (although he has no hands to hold it) in the rituals (cf. p. 84.12b) connects him with exorcism (p. 67f). Generally the suhurmâsu is one of the trophies of Marduk (VII.A.10), but Ek leaves him out. Perhaps he was too thoroughly peaceful for the army of Tiamat.


Other apotropaic monsters.

a Lion-Dragon. Kolbe Reliefprogramme Type X, Reade BaM 10 42. The classical Akkadian lion-dragon (Braun-Holzinger RIA 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 mushûsu. The lion-dragon is Adad’s mount and called u 4 (VII.C.4), “weather-beast”, and probably also u 4 - k a - d u - h â-šûma nara’u, “weather-beast-with-opened-mouth/roaring weather-beast” (cf. CAD N/1 150, K 35, SL IV/2 58ff.). Originally Anûzû was represented in art by the lion-headed eagle (VII.B.3II; Braun-Holzinger RIA 7 94f.). After the Ur III period the lion-headed eagle disappears from art, but representations of Anûzû can 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 Anûzû. In the Neo-Assyrian period the lion-dragon was split into two beings (a similar split is attested for the mushûsu as well, cf. RIA mushûsu 3.5), one (with feathered tail, RIA 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 Göttentext (MIO 1 66 i 59’, ii 9), that is before the split and therefore Type 3a, is called Anûzû; the monsters that stand next to his throne in his temple in Kalhu (Iraq 14 43 72f.) are referred to with the general term mushûšu (VII.C.2.a.f.; for the NAss iconography of Ninurta see Moortgat-Correns, AFO 35 117ff.). In the Ur III period Anûzû was included in the list of defeated enemies of Ninurta/Ningirsu (above III). Later the victory over Anûzû was ascribed also to other gods (cf. Cooper Anûzû 52 153ff., Hruska Anûzû 87ff., Nergal, Adad, Nabû), among them Marduk (VII.B.11, 13). A slightly different earlier Assyrian form of the lion-dragon/Anûzû (Type 2) occurs on three Lamastû amulets (27, 34, 35; MAss.1 cf. Pedersen, 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 Scidil RIA 3 489 e, Braun-Holzinger RIA 7 98 Type 3c) seems a more likely candidate to be covered by the descriptions (Kolbe Reliefprogramme 72f.).

c Ritte Kleiplastik 21.1 = Green Iraq 45 95 and Pl. XLIb. 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) *Laḫmu*, "Hairy One".
   a  Amiet GMA² 1599, cf Porada JAOS 103 477. Proto-literate forrunner.

2  (M. 26) *Bašmu*, "Venomous Snake".
   The history of the *bašmu* is not yet completely clear. Positively *bašmu*’s are the snake of the *Kleinpastik* (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* maššušu §6 (also for mul dMUš).
   a  Collon, First Impressions no. 850. Neo-Assyrian.
   b  Weidner, *Gestimm-Darstellungen auf Babylonischen Tontafeln* Pl. 9 (constellation Hydra⁷/mul⁶(ûmu)), Neo-Babylonian.

3  (M. 27) *Maššušu*, "Furious Snake", "Aweful Snake".
   a  Porada CANES 1. Proto-literate forrunner.
   b  Boehmer UAVA 4 Abb. 283. ED IIIb forrunner.
   c  Frankfort OIP no. 331. Akkadian forunner (addition of snake’s head).
   For a full discussion and further variant types (one with wings, one with feathered tail), see *RIA* maššušu.

4  (M. 6) *Ugalu*, "Big Weather-Beast", "Big Day".
   Kolbe Reliefsprogramme Pl. XII/3. Neo-Assyrian. The Akkadian forrunner has human feet.

5  (M. 5) *Urûdimmu*, "Mad Lion".
   Kolbe Reliefsprogramme Pl. XIV/1 (holding crescent).

6  (M. 3) *Kasurakkû*, "Bison", "Bison(-Bull)".
   Amiet GMA² 820. ED I.

   For the human-faced Bison (a l i m) see below no. 11g.

7  (M. 4) *Girtabullûlu*, "Scorpion-Man".
   a  Amiet GMA² 1245.C. Scorpion with cosmic function. Ed II.
   c  Porada Ancient Art in Seals Fig. II-20. Akkadian.
   d  Amiet GMA² 1246.C. Neo-Assyrian.
   See also below 12 (Seidl BaM 4 Type XLV).

8  (M. 20) *Urmahluullûlu*, "Lion-Man".

9  (M. 22) *Kudullûlu*, "Fish-Man".
   Matthews *ibid.* 141. Kassite.

10  (M. 23) *Subarmâlu*, "Carp-Goat".
    Matthews *ibid.* 529. Middle Assyrian.

11  Lion-headed Eagle (M. 14; third millennium *Anzû* and *Anzû*), and Lion-Dragon (M. 25; u- k a d u ûmu na’iru. Second and first millennium *Anzû*).
    b  Amiet GMA² 1268. ED Lion-headed Eagle, *RIA* Löwenadler §1b Type A.
    c  Amiet GMA² 1278. ED Lion-headed Eagle, *RIA* Löwenadler §1b Type B.
    d  Amiet GMA² 1268. ED forrunner of Lion-Dragon, *RIA* Löwendrache §1.
    e  Amiet GMA² 1278. ED forrunner of Lion-Dragon, *RIA* Löwendrache §1.
    f  Boehmer UAVA 4 373. Akkadian and classical form of the Lion - Dragon.
    *RIA* Löwendrache §3a.
    g  Amiet GMA² 1268. Human-faced Bison (VII. C. 6, a l i m).
    Note the addition of bird parts (talons, feathered tail) in the development of the *maššušu* (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) Pauzuzu, see index.
    Drawing from *Saggs* 49/9 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 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 Chicago edited by J. 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 Teissier, B.
- **ANECS** see Cooper, J.S.
- **Angim** see Collon, D.
- **AOAT 27**

- **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. SNPAN** Sculptures from the North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Ninivich (1976)
- **Behm-Blancke, M.R. BaFo** 7(1979)
- **BID** see Farber, W.
- **Bleibtreu, E. Flora** Die Flora der Neuassyrischen Reliefs (1980)
- **Böhm, R.M. HKL** Die Entwicklung der Glyptik während der Akkad-Zeit, *UAVA* 4 (1965)
- **Boege, J. BaFo** Altmesopotamische Weihplatten, *UAVA* 6 (1971)
- **Borger, R. HKL** Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur, Band I (1967), Band II (1975)
- **Borger, R. ABZ** Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste (1978)
- **Buchanan, B. Yale** Early Near Eastern Seals in the Yale Babylonian Collection (1981)
- **Cagni, L. SANE** 1/3 (1977)
- **CANES** see Porada, E.
- **Cavigneaux, A. Yale** Textes scolaires du temple de Nabû à Harâ. Texts from Babylon I (1981)
- **Charpin, D. UAVA** 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  

Cooper, J.S.  
Angim  
The Return of Ninurta to Nippur, *AnOr* 52 (1978)

see Frankfort, H.

see Collon, D.

see Hartley, R.

Dunham, S.  
Lugal  

Dijk, J.J.A. van  
Lugal  
LUGAL UD ME-LÂM-bi NIR-GÂL. 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)


EtTrav  
Etudes et Travaux. Studia i prace / Centre d’Archéologie Méditerranéenne de l’Académie Polonaise des Sciences

FAOS  
Farber, W.  
BID  
Beschwörungsrituale an Istar und Dumuzi (1977)

Frankfort, H.  
Memorial Volume  
Cylinder Seals (1939)

Frankfort, H.  
SCS  
Stratified Cylinder Seals from the Diyala Region (1955)

Fs  
Kraus  

Fs Lacheman  

Fs Loewenstamm  

Fs van Loon  

Fs Matouš  

Fs Neumann  

Fs Reiner  

Fuhr-Jaepelt, I.  
Materialien zur Ikonographie des Löwenadlers Anzu-Im-dugud (1972)

Geller, M.J.  
UFH  
Forerunners to Udug-hul, *FAOS* 12 (1985)

Green, A.  
Gottertypentext  

Gurney, O.R.  

Materialien zur Ikonographie des Löwenadlers Anzu-Im-dugud (1972)

Heimerdlinger, SLFN  
J.W.  
Bauwerke in der Altsumerische Bildkunst (1957)

Heinrich, E.  
HKL  
Die Kulturgeschichte des assyrischen Flachbildes (1965)

Hrourda, B.  
Hruska, B.  
Der Mythenadler Anzu in Literatur und Vorstellung des alten Mesopotamien (1975)

Jacobsen, Th.  

Jacobsen, Th.  
The Harps that once... Sumerian Poetry in Translation (1987)

JJS  
Journal of Jewish Studies

Klein, J.  
ThSH  
Three Šulgi Hymns (1981)

Kleinplastik  
see Rittig, D.

Kocher, F.  
Die Kulturgeschichte des assyrischen Flachbildes (1965)

Kolbe, D.  
Die Reliefprogramme religiös-politischen Character in ne-assyrischen Palästen (1981)

Kollationen  
see Wilcke, C.

Kutscher, R.  
Oh Angry Sea (a - a b - b a - h u - l u h - h a) (1975)

Layard, A.H.  
Mon.  
Monuments of Niniveh I, II (1849, 1853)

Lackenbacher, S.  
Le Roi Bâtisseur: les récits de construction assyriens des origines à Teglatphalasar 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)

Lugal  
see Dijk, J.J.A. van

Malloum, T.A.  
Mallowan, N & R  
The Chronology of Neo-Assyrian Art (1969)

Matoug (Matous  
Fs Neumann  

Mephisto  
see Neumann, G. The Chronology of Neo-Assyrian Art (1969)

Mephisto  
Nimrud and its Remains I, II (1966)
see Meier, G.

Hymnes et Prières aux Dieux de Babylonie et d'Assyrie (1976)

see Heimerdinger, J.W.

see Barnett, R.D.

Der Aufstieg Marduks (1982)


see Reiner, E.


see Özgüz, N.

see Opificius, R.

see Boehmer, R.

see Boese, J.

see Mayer, W.


Seux, M.-J.

Hymnes et Prières aux Dieux de Babylonie et d'Assyrie (1976)

see Heimerdinger, J.W.

SNAPAN

see Barnett, R.D.

Der Aufstieg Marduks (1982)


Šurpu

see Reiner, E.

Teissier, B. ANECS


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.


Wiggermann, F.A.M.

Lamaštu

see Stol, M.

Wiggermann, F.A.M.

Tšispak


Willeke, C.

Kollationen