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PREFACE

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

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(Berlin, DDR) for permission to collate (KAR 298), to W. G. Lambert, M. J. Geller and I. Finkel for references to unpublished texts in the collections of the British Museum, help with difficult passages, and information on details, to R. Borger for quickly informing me on a join made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

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

Amsterdam, June 1992
INTRODUCTION

The Babylonian scientific and religious texts reveal the names of over three thousand gods and demons, members of local and national pantheons. Most, if not all, play a part in cult or magic, and must have been represented in some form. Gods and demons, cult and magic, are the main subjects of Babylonian art, but generally texts and art cannot be combined. Captions and parallelism between text and representations on boundary stones and other monuments allowed the identification of a number of divine symbols; the Lamaštu ritual texts matching the Lamaštu amulets allowed the identification of the demons Lamaštu and Pazuzu, and of objects playing a part in the ritual. Two texts, the “Göttertypentext” and the “Unterweltssvision”, describe the visual appearance of a number of supernatural beings, but both are atypical and can be used only with extreme caution. More promising was a group of texts containing descriptions of prophylactic figures, gods and demons, but efforts to combine the described figures with the actually excavated ones were hampered by the fragmentary state of preservation of K 2987B+ (below text I) and bit mēseri (below text III).

Thus texts and art remained largely separated. Philology retired and the explanation of Mesopotamian art was left to archaeologists and art historians. The conviction gained ground that this state of affairs was necessary rather than accidental: there was indeed but a loose connection between the imaginary world of the texts and that of the objects. Scribes and artists expressed different theologies on the basis of a less specified common culture. Observations by the famous German assyriologist B. Landsberger supported this theory. Landsberger adduced arguments to indentify the naked hero and the bull man, two traditional figures of art, with the apkallu, “sage”, and the GUD.DUMU.dUTU, the “Bull-Son-of-the-Sun”. He noted, however, that beside the naked hero other figures were called apkallu, and that the GUD.DUMU.dUTU was limited to texts stemming from Assyria. He concluded that the traditions of art and those of the texts were separate, but that on occasion the figures of art could receive the names of similar figures of the texts.

Landsberger’s identifications and conclusions, however, cannot be upheld. His identification of the naked hero as apkallu was based on a sign miscopied by E. Ebeling and a fragmentary duplicate from London. Collation and new duplicates revealed the true name of the naked hero: laḫmu, “the hairy one” (IEOL 27 91). History and connotation of “laḫmu” perfectly match the history of the naked hero, and there is no longer any reason to suspect separate origins.

Landsberger’s equation GUD.DUMU.dUTU = bull man was based on etymology and the justified expectation that the bull man under some name occurs in the texts. The equation could be proved only now (below VII.C. 6), and it is evident that GUD.DUMU.dUTU is a logographic spelling of kusarikku, “bison”, a term well known throughout Babylonia in various other spellings. Again the history of “kusarikku” matches the history of the bull man, and again there is no reason to suspect separate origins.

Since a separation of texts and art cannot be maintained in the case of these two most prominent figures (others could be added), the theory of independent origins

xi
and development loses its supporting argument. The observed gap between art and texts is accidental, not necessary.

It remains, however, that art expresses theological development less clearly than the written sources. The types of art and their contexts were fixed in the third millennium, and only minor changes are allowed through time. Most of the supernatural beings treated in this book become defeated adversaries of gods at some point in their history, but they are never represented as such in art. Other theological changes are expressed by omitting certain features or contexts, rather than by adding new ones.

The identities and histories of Mesopotamian monsters are the subject of this book. It is an expanded version of “Studies in Babylonian Demonology II”, announced in *JEOL* 27 90ff., dealing with the *lahmu*. Here the *lahmu*, the “hairy one”, reappears in its proper setting between the other apotropaic gods and monsters of the rituals. The expansion is due to the recovery of new textual material.

The texts treated are rituals for the defence of the house against epidemic diseases, represented as an army of demonic intruders. The gates, rooms, and corners of the house are occupied by prophylactic figures of clay or wood, that the texts describe in detail. The clay figures have been found in excavations, and the importance of these texts for iconography lies in linking descriptions with archaeological fact.

Fortunately the archaeological material corresponding to our texts has been collected and discussed in two recent monographs: D. Rittig, *Assyrisch-babylonische Kleinplastik magischer Bedeutung vom 13.-6. Jh. v. Chr.* (1977), and D. Kolbe, *Die Reliefprogramme religiöss-mythologischen Characters in neu-assyrischen Palästen* (1981). Both authors tried to match the archeological types with the figures of the ritual texts, then still fragmentary.

The main text K 2987B+ (parts of it were edited previously by O. R. Gurney in *AAA* 22 42ff.) and the better preserved extracted *KAR* 298 are edited and collated below as text I and II, and considerable progress could be made in their reconstruction.

A third text containing similar material is *bū mēseri* which has been treated here as text III.

Differing somewhat is the “Ritual for the Substitute King”. A new manuscript has been edited here as text VI.

Three completely new rituals containing pertinent material could be added to the corpus: text IV, text IV/1 and text V. Finally, chapter VII collects the monsters and tries to describe them in their historical and theological context. Much here is, of a necessity, speculative.

Although the identities and the histories of the monsters are the main subject of the present study, the information supplied by the texts on other facets of iconography could not be totally ignored. In the commentary on text II paragraphs on gods, sages, and attributes have been inserted. Here the correspondance of the texts with the archaeological material is less straightforward, and our results remain tentative.
NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1 The Lamaštu amulets have been collected by W. Farber, *RLA* 6 441 (see also his discussion in *Language, Literature, and History*, F. Rochberg-Halton ed. Fs E. Reiner, 1987 85ff.). To Farber's list the following can now be added:

64 Wiggermann in M. Stol, *Zwangerschap en Geboorte bij de Babyloniërs en in de Bijbel*, no. 62, with photograph p. 97. The original has disappeared, and only one side is known.
65 J.V. Kinnier-Wilson in D. Brothwell - T. Sandison, *Diseases in Antiquity* 195 Fig. 1, see also 194. Only one side has been published (reference courtesy A.R. Green).


3 Since *lahmu*, “the hairy one”, names the naked hero (hero with six curls) after his visual appearance, art must have played a part in the early formation of the supernatural world. In the case of *kusarikku*, “(mythological) Bison”, the artistic expression (bull-man) is secondary.
Šēp lemutti ina bit amēli parāsu, “to block the entry of the enemy in someone’s house”.

A Manuscripts

Four manuscripts of šēp lemutti ina bit amēli parāsu are known:

MS A:

- K 2987B+
- K 3189+
- K 3727+
- K 5829+
- K 6068+
- K 7014+
- K 7823+
- K 7860+
- K 8620+
- K 8788+
- K 9383+
- K 15720+
- K 16367+
- K 17093(+)  
  AAA22 Pl. XIV
  BBR 41, AAA 22 Pl. XIV
  Fig. 5 (F. Wiggermann)
  Fig. 3 (R. Borger)
  BBR 45, AAA 22 Pl. XI.
  Cf. C. Bezold Catalogue 760 (ii 1–15).
  BBR 41, AAA 22 Pl. XIII
  BBR 50, AAA 22 Pl. XII (O.R. Gurney, cf. Zimmern BBR 157 note μ)
  AAA 22 Pl. XII (S. Langdon, cf. Zimmern ZA 35 1531)
  Fig. 2
  BBR 41, AAA 22 Pl. XIV
  Fig. 3
  Fig. 3 (J. Reade)
  Fig. 5 (F. Wiggermann). Cf. R. Borger HKL 2195 (bit mēseri I ?).
  K 9968+
  AAA22 Pl. XIII
  BBR 46
  Fig. 2
  K 11858+
  K 13252+
  K 18835(+)
  Fig. 2 (W.G. Lambert)
  K 11812(+)
  K 14829

The places of the constituent parts are shown on the map Fig. 1. The sources of joins and additions are noted after the numbers. The source of older joins is generally not known (for K 7860 and K 7823 cf. Gurney AAA 22 31); for later joins we can only refer to R. Borger HKL 231ff. and AfO 28 365ff.

K 9968+ was suspected to belong to MS A by H. Zimmern BBR 152 and by O.R. Gurney AAA 22 32, 425. K 9968+ with K 11585 and K 18835 later joined to it touches K 2987B+, but can still not be joined; that it belongs to MS A, however, is now certain: the division lines in col. ii match, the contents match (101–117), the place of K 9968+ in col i is as expected from the parallel text KAR 298 Obv. 2–11 (cf. note to 55), and both pieces show a distinctive handwriting differing from later Niniveh texts.
K 11812 was mentioned by R. Borger in HKL 2 195 as comparable to KAR 298 Rev. 17ff., and turned out to be the missing piece at the end of col. iii (193–201, cf. Gurney AAA 22 543).

K 14829 was identified by me and certainly belongs to MS A. The content is as expected from the parallel KAR 298 Obv. 5–10 and from the correct restoration of 55. Both pieces show the same unmistakable handwriting briefly commented upon above.

The text was written by a junior scribe in 750 BC, under the eponymy of Bēl-dan, the chief cup-bearer (see colophon).

**MS B:**

- K 8753+  
  Sm 670+  
  Sm 711(+)  
  Sm 2122  

  BBR 42  
  BBR 42  
  Fig 8 (F. Wiggermann)  
  BBR 42

For the relative positions of both pieces, see Fig. 9.

Sm 711 was mentioned by R. Borger in JNES 33 188 and HKL 2 195 as possibly belonging to bit mêsêri I.

That the two pieces K 8753+ and Sm 2122 are treated as parts of one MS (so already Gurney AAA 22 42f.9) is acceptable for the following reasons: both pieces have the same colour, handwriting and thickness. I quote Zimmern’s descriptions of BBR 47 and 42 respectively:


Secondly from Sm 2122 the first line of the fourth column of the MS to which it belongs can be deduced: Sm 2122 i starts with line 34 of text I. This implies that the corresponding line in column ii (5’ = text I 130) was preceded by some 33 lines in the same column, and that the last line of column i was 96 of the text (130 – 33 = 97 the first line of col. ii). Therefore, col. iv of this MS should start approximately with line 289 of the text (3 × 96 = 288, last line of col. iii). The deduced figure 289 corresponds very well with the actual beginning of K 8753+ “Andere Seite”: 290.

A colophon is not preserved. The sign-forms are Neo-Assyrian.

**MS C:**

- DT 186  
  Fig. 7

This MS was quoted by CAD § 84b and L 42a. It was incorporated in HKL 2 91 as a duplicate of MS A. The curvature of the underside indicates that the remaining text on the observe belongs to columns i and ii, and that the remaining text on the reserve belongs to columns v and vi. The last line of column i is line 91 of the text, the last line of column ii is line 188/189 of the text. The first line of col. v therefore should begin with a line between 365 (4 × 91 = 364) and 379 (2 × 189 = 378). In fact, however, MS A ends with line 356 approximately (due to gaps, this figure cannot be exact), and the text of MS C col. v is to be expected at 344ff. The difference between the figure deduced ((356/379) and the “actual” figure (344; figure based on internal
considerations) can be explained by assuming shorter columns iii and iv (each at least some 11 lines shorter than the preceding columns), or by assuming textual differences. Neither assumption can be proved or disproved at the present time. Col. vi contains further material similar to, but probably not part of, text I ("430"-"441"). A colophon is not preserved. The sign-forms are Neo-Assyrian.

**MS D:**

- K 13980  Fig. 5

This MS contains traces of unidentified signs in its right column, and 323ff. of the reconstructed text in its left column. The sign-forms are Neo-Assyrian.

For a possible fifth MS, see below text I/2 STT 126.

The only treatment of the text as a whole is O.R. Gurney, Babylonian Prophylactic Figures and their Rituals, *AAA* 22 (1935) 31-63 and plates XI-XIV. Twelve new pieces of MSS A and B, the addition of two new MSS, and a number of new readings and interpretations justify a new treatment.

S. Smith *JRAS* 1926 695ff. already, and later Gurney *AAA* 22 31ff. treated this text, or parts of this text (Smith), together with its *nišu* from Assur *KAR* 298 (below text II), and tried to use both texts for the identification of prophylactic figures found in museums or excavations. Recent studies on the identification and function of prophylactic figures (see below II A for further information) have neglected text I in favour of the better preserved text II. It will appear that a careful combination of text I and II enables the student to fill gaps, and isolate facts useful for a better understanding of “Babylonian prophylactic figures and their rituals”.

Beside Smith and Gurney, H. Zimmern as well translated large, but still disconnected parts of the text. For the convenience of the reader I tabulate their efforts here.

Transliterations and translations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>Translator/Author</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>H. Zimmern</td>
<td><em>BBR</em> 152f.</td>
<td>(BBR 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Smith</td>
<td><em>JRAS</em> 1926 701f.</td>
<td>(translation only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-54</td>
<td>H. Zimmern</td>
<td><em>BBR</em> 156f.</td>
<td>(BBR 46-47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>S. Smith</td>
<td><em>JRAS</em> 1926 702</td>
<td>(translation only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-87</td>
<td>S. Smith</td>
<td><em>JRAS</em> 1926 701</td>
<td>(translation only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-94</td>
<td>H. Zimmern</td>
<td><em>BBR</em> 154f.</td>
<td>(BBR 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-96</td>
<td>O.R. Gurney</td>
<td><em>AAA</em> 22 42f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106-114</td>
<td>O.R. Gurney</td>
<td><em>AAA</em> 22 46f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-143</td>
<td>H. Zimmern</td>
<td><em>BBR</em> 158f.</td>
<td>(BBR 46-47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138-151</td>
<td>H. Zimmern</td>
<td><em>BBR</em> 154f.</td>
<td>(BBR 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138-216</td>
<td>O.R. Gurney</td>
<td><em>AAA</em> 22 46f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183-216</td>
<td>H. Zimmern</td>
<td><em>BBR</em> 162f.</td>
<td>(BBR 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184-214</td>
<td>S. Smith</td>
<td><em>JRAS</em> 1926 704</td>
<td>(translation only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207-214</td>
<td>S. Smith</td>
<td><em>JRAS</em> 1926 704</td>
<td>(translation only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231-318</td>
<td>O.R. Gurney</td>
<td><em>AAA</em> 22 56f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231-336</td>
<td>H. Zimmern</td>
<td><em>BBR</em> 146f.</td>
<td>(BBR 41-42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Textual problems will be treated in the notes to the reconstructed text; problems concerning purpose, content, and form will be treated below in connection with text II.

The ritual begins with a long introduction stating its purpose: to block the entry of evil in someone’s house (cf. II.B.1 for a detailed discussion). Then seven lines are lost; they may have prescribed measures to prevent evil from attacking the exorcist. After the break, probably on the first day of the ritual, the action has moved to the wood, where the cornel (e’nu) wood for the first group of statues is prepared. Then we return to the city (44) where the first group of statues, the seven ūmu-apkallu, is made.

Apparently in the morning of the second day — the text is lost in a break — the exorcist returns to the wood (?) and prepares the tamarisk (bīnu) wood for seven (groups of) statues (67–87) to be made after return to the city (restored, 88) and described in detail (88–143).

On the next day, the third day, the action moves to the clay pit, where the clay for seventeen (groups of) statues is bought from the clay pit (144–169); the exorcist returns to the city (restored, 169), and makes the statues described in 170–205.

In the night following on the third day, he brings all statues he has made to the bank of the river, waits till morning, purifies the statues (restored, 216), and possibly performs an opening-of-the-mouth (pūt pi) ritual on them (lost in the break 217ff.). Then, probably on the same morning, the statues are brought to the house of the threatened family (231) and ritually cleansed (233f.) In the evening of the same day, offerings are brought to several groups of deities, and during (at least part of) the night the house is ritually cleansed (234–259).

On the morning of the fifth day (260) before sunrise, the house is swept and the sweepings are thrown into the river. The incantation “go out, evil” concludes the purification of the house (265). Then, still on the fifth day, the statues are purified a last time (266–267), the incantations are recited to them, and one by one they are buried in their appropriate places (information supplied by text II, cf. II.A.3).
1 [lu] UDUG HUL lu A.LÁ HUL lu GIDIM HUL
   [lu] GAL5.Á HUL lu DINGIR HUL lu MAŠKIM HUL
   [lu] ta-maš-tum lu la-ba-su lu aḥ-ḥa-zu
   [lu] LILÁ lu MUNUS.LILÁ lu KI.SIKIL.UD.DA.KAR.RA

5 [lu] ŠU.DINGIR.RA lu ŠU, l/a.TAŠUB.BA
   [lu] 5.LUGAL.ÜR.RA lu 5.LUGAL.AMAŠ.PA.É
   [lu] 4.NAM.TAR lu SAG.HUL.ḤA.ZA lu mu-tu
   [lu k] ib-bu lu ẖi-in-tu lu kā-ti-šu-ḫu
   [lu G] IDIM kim-ḫi lu GIDIM BAR-i lu mim-ma HUL

10 [ma-l] a GÁL-u lu mim-ma NU DUG.GA šá MU NU SA₄-u
   [lu NA] M.ŪŠ.MEŠ lu šag-ga-sú lu šib-[ṣu]
   [lu li-ḥu-ul] lu ḫi-bi-tu lu ṣi-tu
   [lu mim-ma lem-nu] a [ṣa] ana GISKIM b HUL ina ELU
   [x x x GUB-zu-ma GÜ.D] É.MEŠ

15 [up-ta-nar-ra-du up-ta-na-al-la]-ḫu
   [u-šam-ra-ṣu i-duk-ku i-ḥab-bi-lu] a
   [u-sat-ba-lu u-še-su-u ......]
   [HUL-šú ana ELU NU TE] a
   [u GĪR HUL-ti ina ELU KUD-ši] a

20 [DŪ. DŪ.BI] a

7 lines completely missing

28 [e-nu-ma NU.MEŠ Û₆ MA.NU ta-ban-nu-ú] a
   [ina še-rim GIM dUTU É ana Û₆ TIR GIN-ма] a

30 TŪN KŪ.SI₂2 ŠUM.GAM.ME [KŪ.BABBAR a TI-qt₄] b
   ina NĪ.GA.NI.ZI.LA.A [GUB BA Û₆ MA.NU] a
   tu-qad-dāš PAD Ṛx ana UGU Û₆ M[A.NU GAR-an] a
   IGIDUTU KI SAR A KŪ SUD [Û₆ DUB₈ GUB-an]

UDU.NĪTAH SĪKUR BAL-qt UZ[U.ZAG.UD]U UZU [ME.HE]

35 UZU.KA.ŠEG₄ [lu]-taḥ-ḫa a
   ZŪ.LUM.MA ZĪD.EṢA [DUB-ak] NINDA.Î.ĐE.A
   LÂL.Î.NUN.NA GAR-an [dUG.A.D] A.GURU₅ GUB-an
   NĪ.GA.NI.ZI.LI GAR-an [KĀŠ.SAG] BAL-qt-MA tuš-kin
   ina IGIDU₆ MA.NU GUB-az-MA

40 [ĒN] [UDUG] HUL EDIN.NA DAGAL.LA SĪD-nu a
   ina TŪN KŪ.SI₂ SUM.GAM.ME KŪ.BABBAR Û₆ MA.NU TAG-ma
   ina qu-l-mi-i₃ KUD-ES šu-luḫ-ḫu b tu-rab-ba-MA
   KEŠDA DUB₈-ma tuš-kin Û₆ MA.NU KĪD-MA

Ana URU E₁₁-ma VI NÚ.MEŠ a Û₆ MA.NU a-gi-e b

45 Nī-šu-nu a ap-ru lu-bu-uḫ ra-ma-ni-šu-ru lab-šu
   ina a ZAG.UDU-šu-nu Û₆ MA.NU ša b ap-pa u ŠUḪUŠC IZI
   kab-bu na-šu-ū ina GAB-šu-nu GABA [MEŠ]-šu-nu
tam-šu MU.NE Neh ina MAŠ.SIL GAB-šu-nu SAR-ăr
1 [Wh]ether it be an evil spirit, or an evil alû, or an evil ghost,
   [or] an evil constable, or an evil god, or an evil deputy,
   [or] Lamaštu, or Labašu, or the robber
   [or] Lîlâ, or Lîlitu or Handmaid-of-Lîlâ,
5 [or] Hand-of-god, or Hand-of-a-goddess, or Fallen-down-from-heaven
   [or] Lugalura, or Lugalamašpae,
   [or] Fate, or Supporter-of-evil, or Death,
   [or] Burning, or Scorching, or Kattillu,
   [or a ghost of the family, or a ghost of a stranger, or anything evil,
10 [whatsoever there be, or anything not good that has no name,
   [or] plague, or the murderer, or stroke,
   [or] disease, or damage, or loss,
   [or whatever evil] that [stands] in someone's house
as a sign of evil, [and constantly screams,
15 [that causes constant terror and fright,
   [illness, death, damage,]
   [theft and losses, ...... ;]
   [(and) its evil; to prevent them from approaching someone's house]
   [and to block the entry of the enemy in someone's house.]

20 [its ritual:

28 [When you make the statues of cornel wood]
   [in the morning at sunrise you shall go to the wood,]
30 [you shall take] a golden axe and a [silver] saw,
   with censer, torch and [holy] water you shall consecrate
   [the cornel tree], a kusāpu loaf of ... [you shall place] on the cornel tree,
   in front of Šamaš you shall sweep the ground, sprinkle clear water,
   [set up a folding table,
   sacrifice a sheep and offer the shoul[der], the fatty [tissue]
35 and the roast,
   [scatter] dates and fine meal,
   set out a cake made with syrup and butter, set out a [ada] gurru-container,
   set up a censer with juniper wood, pour out [first class beer,] kneel down,
   and stand up in front of the cornel tree, and
40 recite [the incantation] “Evil [spirit] in the broad steppe”.
   With the golden axe and the silver saw you shall touch the cornel tree and
   cut it down with a hatchet; you shall damp it with? washing water?
   then remove the set-out material, kneel down, break the cornel tree
   into pieces, and
   go to the city; then seven statues of cornel wood, crowned with their
45 own tiara, clad in their own garment,
   holding in their right hand a cornel(-stick) charred at both ends
   and with their left clasping their breasts,
   — their names you shall write on their left shoulder blade;
the first statue is clad in red paste for his uniform,
the second one is clad in white paste, the third one is clad in white paste
and water is drawn on with black paste,
the fourth one is clad in black paste, the fifth one is clad in yellow paste,
and water is drawn on with black paste, the seventh one is clad in
orange paste; the statue that is clad in red paste, ["day of life,]
offspring of Ur" is the name of the statue; the statue that is clad
in white paste, "day of plenty, son of Nippur, good one"
is the name of the statue; the statue that is clad in white paste, "day off
[spendor, who grew up in Eridu]" is the name of the statue; the statue that
is clad in black paste, "good day, who appeared in Kullab" is the name of
[the statue;]
the sixth statue is clad in blue paste, [the seventh one] [is clad in]
[orange paste; the statue that is clad in red paste, ["day of life,]
offspring of Ur" is the name of the statue; the statue that is clad]
in white paste, "day of plenty, son of Nippur, good one"
is the name of the statue; the statue that is clad in white paste, "day off
[spendor, who grew up in Eridu]" is the name of the statue; the statue that
is clad in black paste, "good day, who appeared in Kullab" is the name of
[the statue;]
the sixth statue is clad in yellow paste, "fair faced day,"
[is clad in brown paste, ["righteous day,]
exalted judge of Lagas" is the name of the statue; the statue that is clad]
in orange paste, "day that gives life to the slain,"
[shade of Suruppak" is the name of the statue; — you shall make.]

[As soon as] you have done this,
[when you make the statues of tamarisk wood]
in the morning at sunrise you shall go to the woods,
you shall take a golden axe and a silver saw,
[with censer, torch and holy water you shall consecrate]
the tamarisk, . . . . . you shall place on the tamarisk, in front of Šamaš you
shall sweep the ground,]
spinkle clear water, set up a folding table, sacrifice a sheep,
offer the shoulder, the fatty tissue and the roast,
scatter dates and fine meal,
set out a cake made with syrup and butter,
set up a censer with juniper wood, pour out first class beer,
kneel down, purify the tamarisk with censer, torch and holy water,
and in front of Šamaš as follows shall you speak:
Incantation: Šamaš, great lord, exalted judge, entrusted with the care
of all heaven and earth, the one who gives good guidance to the living
and the dead
you are. The bone of divinity, the consecrated tamarisk,
the holy wood for the image of the statues that
will stand in the house of NN son of NN to throw back the evil ones,
I have cut before you. May what I do
be profitable, may it prosper.

This you shall say, and with the golden axe and the silver saw
you shall touch the [tamarisk and cut it down with a hatchet;
you shall go the city; then] [seven] statues of Sebettu crowned with their
own tiara, clad in their own garment, you shall place them on a pedestal of tamarisk in a walking pose; they are clad in red paste over their uniform; hold in their right hands a hachet of bronze, and in their left [hands] a dagger of bronze, are bound around their waist with a [girdle] of bronze, bound around their heads with a [headband] of bronze, furnished with [horns] of bronze, and bows and quivers hang [at] their [sides] ; — you shall make.

Four statues of Lugalgirra of tamarisk, [crowned] with [their own] tiara, clad in their own garment, [you shall place] them [on a pedestal in a walking pose;]

[they are clad in ... paste for their uniform;] [hold ] [in] their [right hands] bows, and in their left hands arrows, are bound around their waist with a girdle of bronze,] bound around their heads with a headband of bronze,] you shall ... their heads] with a sundisk [of bronze?]

[Four statues of] Lugalgirra of tamarisk, [crowned] with [their own] tiara, clad in their own garment, [you shall place] them [on a pedestal in a walking pose;]

[they are clad in ... paste for their uniform;] [hold ] [in] their [right hands] bows, and in their left hands arrows, are bound around their waist with a girdle of bronze,] bound around their heads with a headband of bronze,] you shall ... their heads] with a sundisk [of bronze?]

Seven statues of the weapon-men of tamarisk, crowned with their own tiara, clad in their own garment, you shall place them on a pedestal in a walking pose; they hold in their right hands maces, and in their [left] hands bound around their waist with a girdle of bronze, bound around their heads with a headband of bronze, furnished with horns of bronze; a crescent [of bronze] you shall ... on their head; they are clad in white paste for their uniform; — you shall mak[e].

One statue of tamarisk of “one cubit is his length”, crowned with his [own tiara, clad in his own] garment, bound with a [girdle of bronze] around his waist; [bound around his head with a headband of bronze] [holding a dagger of bronze seven fingers long] [in his right hand, an axe of bronze in his left hand;]

[Four statues of Meslamtaea of tamarisk, crowned with]

[their own tiara, clad in their own garment,]

[you shall place them on a pedestal in a walking pose,]

[you shall clad them] in black paste and in blue paste [for their uniform;] [they are furnished with] horns of bronze [mounted] in gold,] [bound with a] headband of bronze around [their head],

[bound with] a girdle of bronze around [their waist], [with]
GIR.MEŠ ZABAR šá KÙ.S[122 uḫ-ḫu-zu in ŠU.MEŠ XV sá-nu] 
šáš-TUK.[KUL.SA]G.NA4 šá KÙ.S[122 uḫ-ḫu-zu ina CI sú-nu b]
šáš-TUK.[KUL.ZA.][HA.DA] šá KÙ.S[122 uḫ-ḫu-zu na-šu-ù DŪ-us b]
[IV] [NU.MEŠ šá d] LUGAL.GIR.RA [ ... ]
135 [IV] * šá d MES.LA.M.TA.[E].[A ... ]
[ ] MEŠ [ ]
[ ] x a
[NU d Na-ru-da b šINIG IM. ]SÁ5 b
ina til-li-e šá lab-šá-tu ú-šur-ta šá IM.KAL.LA
140 GIM hu-ša-an-ni MÚRÜ-šá te-šir [aug BAR.SIG SÁ5 ap-rat tim-bu-ut-taš ina A GÁB-šá tal-lal
NU DINGIR a É šá šINIG DŪ-us b
GIM NU.MEŠ an-nu-ti bi-nu-ut AN-e IGI d UTU tuk-ti-nu-[d] a

145 [ ... ] e-nu-ma NU.MEŠ bi-nu-ut ABZU ta-ban-nu-[u]
[ ... ]
in a še-rım GIM d UTU.E ana KI.GAR GIN-ma KI.GAR tu-qad-[dáš] a
Nh. NA GI IZ.I.LÁ A.GÜ.BA KI.GAR tu-[hab] a
VII šE KÙ.BABBAR VII šE KÙ.SI22 NA4 GUG NA4 N[Ir]
ana KI.GAR ŠUB-di-ma KEŠDA ana d UTU tara-[kás]
Nh. NA ŠIM.LI GAR-AN KÄ.SAG BAL-ql-ma tuš-k[ín]
150 GUB-az-ma ÉN KI.GAR MIN a ŠID-nu
[ ... ]
EN KI.GAR MIN a kul-lat d A-nim u d EN.LÍL.[LÁ] b
KI.GAR d É.A EN IDIM KI.GAR DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ at-tu-ma
[e] a nam tab-ni-i ana b e-nu-ti LUGAL tab-ni-i ana b LUGAL-[tí]
NUN tab-ni-i ana b la-bar UD.MEŠ ru-qu-tu
155 KU.BABBAR.MEŠ-ki SUM-nu-uk-ki mah-ra-[ri]
Nh. BA-ki mah-ra-ti-ma ina še-rım a ina ma-har d UTU IM NENNI A [NENNI]
akar-ri-is lu né-mé-lum-ma mim-mu-u DŪ šú liš-lím
[ ... ]
[ ... ]
GIM an-na-a ŠID-ú ina IGI d UTU kám DUG4.GA [x] a
[NU] MEŠ-a-ki “[HUL.MEŠ šá d É.A u d ASAL.LU.ḪI
160 [ana] a ZI-aḫ GİR HUL-IM ina É NENNI A [NENNI]
[ ... ]
[ ... ]
GIM an-na-a taq-ta-bu-ú [ina IGI x x x x a]
[kar] a-am DUG4.GA KI.[A] a [x x x x x x]
[ ... ]
165 NU MEŠ [ ... ]
an za-aḫ [GİR HUL-IM ina É NENNI A NENNI] a
šu-uz-zu-ži IGI-ka IM šú-nu ... ] a
[ ... ]
an-na-a DUG4.GA-ma [IM ta kar-ri-ıš ... ] b
daggers of bronze [mounted] in gold; they hold in their right hands
a [face with a head of stone [mounted] in gold, and in their left]
a [battle axe [mounted] in gold; — you shall make].

[The four] [statues of] Lugalgirra

A statue of Narudda of [tamarisk,] clad in red [paste]
over her uniform; you shall draw a design with yellow paste
representing a sash around her waist; she is crowned with a red head gear;
you shall hang a harp at her left side;
— (and) a statue of the god of the house of tamarisk you shall make.

As soon as you have manufactured these statues, the creatures of heaven,
before Šamaš with appropriate care,

when you make the statues, creatures of Apsû,
in the morning at sunrise you shall go to the clay pit and consecrate the
clay pit; with censer, torch and holy water you shall [purify] the clay pit,
seven grains of silver, seven grains of gold, carnelian, hu[l][u-stone]
you shall throw into the clay pit, then prepare the setting for Šamaš,
set up a censer with juniper wood, pour out first class beer, kne[el down,]

stand up, and recite the incantation Clay pit, clay pit.

Incantation: Clay pit, clay pit, you are the clay pit of Anu an Enlil,
the clay pit of Ea, lord of the deep, the clay pit of the great gods;
you have made the lord for lordship, you have made the king for kingship,
you have made the prince for future days;
your pieces of silver are given to you, you have received them;
your gift you have received, and so, in the morning before Šamaš, I pinch off
the clay of NN son of NN; may it be profitable, may what I do prosper.

[As soon as] you have recited this, you shall speak before Šamaš as follows:
[statues] of Ea and Marduk, repelling the evil ones,

[to] be placed in the house of NN son of NN [to] expel the foot of evil,
I [pinch off] their clay before you <in> the clay pit.

[As soon as] you have said this, [in front of . . . . .]
you shall speak as follows:[bank ??] [of the river??

statue[s]

to be placed [in the house of NN son of NN] to expel [the foot of evil]
[I mix their clay with water before you at the bank of the river ?? ? ?]
170 VII NU.MES NUN.ME.MEŠ a šá IM-šú-nu [DUH.LAL] b [ba-al-lu PA.MEŠ c]
ù a IGI MUŠEN GAR-nu ina ŠU.MEŠ XV-šú-nu [I.L.DÜB b]
inA ŠU.MEŠ CL-šú-nu BA.AN.DU₈.DU₈ a na-šú-[ú]
IM.BABBAR lab-šú u a kap-pi MUŠEN.MEŠ b ina te-gí-[e]-[l]-[l] c
es-ḫu DÛ-uš VII NU.MEŠ NUN.ME.MEŠ šá IM DÛ-uš [š] a
IM.BABBAR ina til-li-šú-nu a lab-šú BAR KU₆ šá IM.GI₆
UGU-šú-nu a tu-uš-ša-ára ina ŠU.MEŠ XV-šú-nu
IL.DÜB b ina ŠU.MEŠ CL-šú-nu BA.AN.DU₈,DU₈ [š] b
na-šu-ú VII NU.MEŠ NUN.ME.MEŠ a šá IM DÛ-uš [š]
IM.BABBAR lab-šú BAR KU₆ es-ḫu ina ŠU.MEŠ XV-šú-[nu] a

180 [ša] šaGIŠIMMAR a na-šu-u ina CL-šú-nu b GABA.MEŠ NI-šú-nu c tam-[ḫu]
VII NU.MEŠ NUN.ME.MEŠ a šá IM b DÛ-uš BAR KU₆ es-ḫu [ina X] v-[šú-nu
GUR.GA

II NU.MEŠ [lāh-me] a MEŠ IM.BABBAR [lab-šú] a A.[MEŠ ina IM.GI₆ ū-šuru b]
185 DÛ-uš II NU MUŠ.ŠA.TUR a II NU MUŠ.ḪUŠ II N[U U₄.GAL b]
II NU UR.IDIM.MEŠ II NU.MEŠ a ku-sa-rik-ku b II NU [GIR.TAB.LU.ULU-tc e]

NTAḪ₄ u MUNUS šá IM šá IM.KAL.LI lab-šú a [II NU UR.MAH.LU.ULU-tu b]
II NU dLUL.LAL šá IM a šá IM.SIG₇,SIG₇ [lab-šú x x x x(x x x)] b]
II NU dLa-ta-ra-ak šá IM šá IM.GI₆ la[b-šú x x(x x x) a]
190 [II] NU KU₆.LU.ULU-tu II NU S乌鲁.MĀŠ šá IM.BABBAR a]

[lab]-šu BAR KU₆ es-ḫu D[U-uš X NU.MEŠ UR.GI₇.MEŠ šá a]
[IM] DÛ-uš II IM.BABBAR II [IM.GI₆ II IM.SA₅ a]
[II IM.SIG₇,SIG₇ tu-la-[ba-as b x(x)] [u-aIIII] [šú-nu']

[ina I]M.GI₆ IM.[x x x] [x] tu-bar-ra[m] a
195 [MU.N]E.NE i [na BAR.SIL-šú-nu a S|AR-ár MU I-e[n]
[UR BABBAR] e [tam-a-li]k e-pu-uš KA-k[a] a
[MI I]-I-[i] e tam-ta-lik ú-šuk at-i[a7] a
MU I-en [UR] GI₆ a-nu-ur H[IM₄₅] a
MU II-[l] d a a-an rI.GI₆-[a] b
200 MU I-[en U]R.GI₇ GI₈ a-ra-id Á.[SÅG b]
M[U II-]I ka-šid a-[a-bi] a
MU I-en [UR SIG₇.SIG₇ sa-kip GABA lem-ni a]
MU II-[mu-na-ši-ku ga-ri-šú a]
MU I-en UR.GI₇ GUN.GUN mu-še-ri-bu SIG₅.MEŠ a
205 MU II-[mu-še-su-u HUL.MEŠ a]
GIM an-na-[a] [te-te-ep-šu] a
that has not been entered you shall [...] kneel down, [go to the city and]
seven statues of sages whose clay is [mixed] with [wax,] furnished with [wings]
and the face of a bird, holding in their right hands a [cleaner,]
in their left hands a bucket; they are clad in white paste, and endowed with
feathers by hatchings in the wet paste; — you shall make. Seven statues of sages
of clay you shall make,
clad in white paste over their uniform; you shall draw fish scales on them
with black paste; in their right hands they shall hold
a cleaner, and in their left hands a bucket.
Seven statues of sages of clay you shall make,
clad in white paste, endowed with fish scales by hatchings, holding in their
right hands
an offshoot of the datepalm, and with their left clasping[ing] their breasts.
Seven statues of sages of clay you shall make, endowed with fish scales by
hatching, holding
[a standard in their right], and with their left clasp[ping] their breast.
As soon as [you have made these] statues of sages,

two statues of [hairies clad] in white paste and water drawn on in black paste
you shall make, two statues of Viper, two statues of Furious-Snake,
two statues of Big-Weather-Beast
two statues of Mad-Lions, two statues of Bison, two statues of [Scorpion-Man,]
males and females, of clay, clad in yellow paste, [two statues of Lion-Man]
two statues of Lulal of clay, [clad in blue paste]
two statues of Latarak of clay, [clad in black paste]

[two] statues of Fish-Man, two statues of Carp-Goat of clay, clad [in white
paste,] endowed with fish scales by hatchings;
— you shall make. Ten statues of dogs
of [clay] you shall make; you shall clad two
in white paste, two [in black paste,]
[two in red paste,]
[and two in] blue [paste]; you shall colour [the sides] of [two]
[with] black paste; [...] paste]

the [ir names] you shall write on their shoulder blade; the name of the first
[white dog:] “do not [reconsider,] speak up”;
[the name of the second: “[do not reconsider, bite yo[u]” ];
the name of the first black [dog]: “destroy [his] life”;
the name of the second: “[st]rong is his bark”;
the name of the first red dog:
the name of the second: “who chases away the a[sakku]”

the name of the second: “who overcomes the enemy”;
the name of the first [blue dog: “who repels the chest of evil”]
the name of the second: “[who bites his foe”];
the name of the first [multicolored dog: “[who lets enter the good ones”];
the name of the second: “[who makes the evil ones go out”].
As soon as you have [done this],
210 GIM dUTU.È IG\dUTU_KI SAR [A] [KU SUD]  
a\na dUTU u dASAL\L.U.HI [III [B]DU\BU [AN\  
\a\a UDU.NITAH.SIZKUR BAL-qi UZU.Z AG UZU.ME.HÈ  
[UZU].KA.\SEG6 tu-tah-ха ZÙ.LUM.MA Z [ID.ES\A DUB-ak  
[NINDA].I.D.E.A LÀL.I.NUN.NA GAR-an [A.DA.GURU\BU GUB-\  
215 [NIG.NA SIMLI GAR-an KAŞ.SAG [BAL-qi\-ma tuš-kin]  
\a\a [MEŞ] šu-nu-ti A.GUB.BA NIG.NA [GI.IZI.LA tu-\hab]  
[x].[MEŞ]  
\12 lines completely broken away.a  
230 [GIM][B] [NU.MES šá GIŞ.MES šá IM ma-la DÜ-šáb  
ana ÈT\TI-q[\ti ...  
ina UGU [B]KID.MA\H DÜR-š\[u-nu\-ti ...  
ana dUTU.È GAR-an A.GUB.BA [NIG.NA GI.IZI.LÀ  
tušba-šu-nu-ti GIM dUTU.Ş.À [È][ ... ]  
235 KEŞDA ana dAMAR.UTU tara-kâs UDU.SIZKUR [BAL-qi]  
UZU.ZAG UZU.ME.HÈ UZU.KA.\SEG6 [u-tah-ха  
ZÙ.LUM.MA ZID.ÈSA DÙ [B-ak  
NINDA.Î.D.E.A LÀL.Î.NUN.NA [GAR-an  
\a\a A.DA.GURU\BU GUB-\BU KURUN (KAŞ. GE\STIN) LÀ [L.GA.Î.GIŞ]  
\a\a BAL-qi ana dA-nim dBE dÈ.A dM [AŞ]  
IV [B]DU\BU GUB-\BU IV UDU.NITAH.SIZKUR BAL-qi KEŞDA [DU\B]  
\a\a dKU.ŞU [NIG.\GIRIM II [B]DU\BU GUB-\BU  
\a\a UDU.SIZKUR BAL-qi KEŞDA ŞU.BL.DILI.ÀM  
ana [DINGIR È] dXV È U dLAMMA È III [B]DU\BU GUB-\BU  
245 III UDU.NITAH.SIZKUR BAL-qi KEŞDA ŞU.BL.DILI.ÀM  
GIM KEŞDA.MEŞ [tuk-[\ten]-nu-ù] ESIR IM.BABBAR I.KUR.RA  
LÀL.Î.NUN.NA Î.DUG.GA I BUR A.GUB.BA VII NIG.NA  
VII GI.IZI.LÀ UB.MEŞ È.MEŞ ZAG.DU\BU MEŞ  
TÜR ÜR nüg-bé-e-ti AB.MEŞ TAG.MEŞ  
250 GIM tul-tap-pi-tùa VII MÀŞ.HUL.DÜB.MEŞ  
VII MÀŞ.GI.IZI.LÀ.MEŞ VII UDU.TI.LA.MEŞ  
VII ŞAH.TUR.MEŞ VII URUDU.NIG.KALAG.GA.MEŞ  
VII KUŞ.GUD.GAL.MEŞ ter-ka LILIZ ZABAR  
TÜG SAŞ kUSAN [A]DU.GAZ.MEŞ ŞE.ÉSTUB  
255 ŞE.MUŞŞ ŞE.IN.U.NA IŞE.GIŞ ŞE.ÁS.ÀM  
GÜ.GAL GÜ.TUR GÜ.NIG.HAR.RA ZID.DUB.DUB-bè-e  
é tu-kap-par-ma tak-pi-rat È a-na (erasure) KÀ  
[È] x ana UB-ŞU GUR-MA ÉN AB. [TA x x]  

16
the statues of wood and those of clay, as many as you have made
at night you shall take them to the river, and place them there
you shall make them face the east, [... ] in the morning
at sunrise in front of Šamaš you shall sweep the ground, [sprinkle holy] water, and [set up three folding tables] for Ea, Šamaš and Marduk,
sacrifice three sheep, offer the shoulder, the fatty tissue and the roast, [scatter] dates and fine meal,
set out a cake made with syrup and butter, [set out an adaguru-container,]
set up a censer with juniper wood, [pour out] first class beer, [kneel down,]
[and purify] these statues with holy water, censer, [and torch.]

[as soon as] [you have ......the statues of wood and those of clay as many as you have made,]

you shall take them to the house [
set them down on a reed mat[ make them face]
the east, move holy water, [censer and torch]
past them, at sundown [you shall ...] the house,
prepare the setting for Marduk, [sacrifice] a sheep,
offering the shoulder, the fatty tissue and the roast,
s[etter] dates and fine meal,
[set out] a cake made with syrup and butter,
set out an adaguru-container, pour out kurunnu-beer, [syrup, milk, oil,]
sacrifice four sheep, [then] remove the set out material.

You shall set up two folding tables for Kusu and Ningirim,
sacrifice two sheep, — (further ritual) set up as before —.
To the god of the house, the goddess of the house and the lamassu of the house
you shall set up three folding tables,
sacrifice three sheep, — (further ritual) set up as before —.
After you have prepared the ritual material with appropriate care, with crude bitumen, gypsum, naphta, syrup, butter, fine oil, oil-of-the-pot, holy water, seven censers and seven torches you shall touch the corners of the rooms, the doorposts of the court, the roof and the attic rooms, and the windows.
When you have touched them all, with seven goats-that-hit-evil,
seven goats-for-the-torch, seven ‘living-sheep’,
seven little pigs, seven ‘strong-copper’s,
seven hide-of-the-great-bull’s, a drumstick, a copper kettledrum,
a red cloth, a whip, half-sila containers, arsuppu-grain,
šeguššu-grain, inninu-grain, wheat, emmer,
hallatu-peas, lentils, vetch, heaps of flour,
you shall rub the house, and the material used for rubbing [you shall remove]
through the gate, and [...] return to its corner. The incantation “You shall not enter [for him] through the window” you shall recite.
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260 [... in the mor]ning before sunrise
you shall sweep [the house that you rub]bed with half-sila containers,
heaps of grain, and heaps of flour
and throw them into the river, then
with censer, torch and holy water you shall purify the house and
265 recite the incantation "Evil go out".

[As soon as] you have don[e thi]s, you shall move these statues past
censer, [torch] and ho[ly] water, and
[before the statue of tamarisk of “one] cubit is his length”
and before the statues of Lugalgirra [and Mes]lamtaea
270 you shall set up three folding tables, sacrifice sheep,
offer them the [shoulder], the fatty tissue and the roast,
scatter dates and fine meal,
set out a [cak]e made with syrup and butter, [set out an adagur]-container,
and pour out for them kurunnu-beer, syrup, milk,
275 oil[ from a] lahannu-bottle.
[Then the incantations] you shall recite [before th]em: before the statue of
tamarisk you shall recite as follows:
[Incantation: you are the statue that re]pels the evil one and the enemy,
[the one that dropped down from heaven, strong among the stron]g, perfect,
powerful among the gods,
[that] is endowed [with lof]ty [radiance;]
280 [from the beginning] you stay [before] Ea your father;
[guard your right and your left,] do not fail [at yo]ur [watch.]
[Whether it be Fallen-down-from-Heaven, Hand-of-a-G]host, or anything evil
[that is present in my house and constan]tly scares me,
284/285 [may its evil on the command of Ea and Mard]uk not approach me nor my
house,
[may it move away from my body 3600 “miles”; a]s smoke may it rise to heaven,
[as an uptooted tamarisk,] may it not return to its pl[ace.

[As soon as] you have recited [this in front of] the statue of tamarisk of
[“one cubit is his l]ength”,

290 [in front of the four statues of M]eslamtaea
you shall recite as follows: [Incantation: you are the statues of] Meslamtaea
Maštabba, the twin gods,
[... ] strong [sons] of Anu,
whose [dwelling]s in the clear heavens are exalted,
295 whose thrones are well founded in the broad earth (underworld),
[gods of] the watch, who kill the evil ones,
who overcame the enemy [and chase away] Fate,
who have taken hold of the regulations of the broad earth (underworld),
[t]he foremos[ ] of the Anunnaku-gods.
300 Because of anything evil that stands in the house of NN, son of NN, with evil
intent, that constantly screams, that causes constant terror and fright, illness, death, damage, theft, and losses — to tear it out, I have placed you <in> the house of NN son of NN, right and left in the gate.
May anything evil and anything not good recede 3600 "miles" for fear of you.

[As soon as you have recited this], in front of the seven statues of Sebettu, the seven (statues) that [hold] daggers and hatchets in [their] hands,

310 and (in front of the statue of) Naruddi
a) on a fire you shall roast, scratch (it),
b) set up a [censer] with juniper wood before them,
c) gi]ve] and

310' r[ecite as follows:]
[Incantation: you are the statues of Sebettu, the great god[s], the son[s of Enmešarra, who hold] furious [weapons], having girl[t a quiver (on the side), holding a d]agger level[ling the mountains ......]

315 killers, [tireless ...]
Because of the evil ones [that in the house of NN son of NN]
[his] life[
ced[ar

As soon as you have recited this, [in] front of the seven statues of

320 Lugalgirra that [hold] bows
and quivers [i]n their [hands,] you shall recite as follows:
Incantation: you are the statues of Lugalgirra, the fierce [gods]
[ strong [......]s who overtake?] their [e]nemies

325 the gods [ the steppe?
who cause [ evi]?, who tear out I have placed] them
[ the gate of the house.

As soon as you have recited this, in front of] the statues of

330 the weapon[-men] you shall recite as follows:
[Incantation: you are the statues of those holding] weapons, [gods,] strong, [( )] fierce, [ ( )overbearing,
[ r]aging

335 [ whose knees are tire]less( )][...[
[ strength ......[ ]
[ whose arms[
[ ]feet[
[ ]...[ ]
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GIM  an-na-a šID-nu-u ana IGI NU DINGIR É kám šID-nu\(^a\)

[DINGIR É ú-ṣur É-ka\(^a\)]

[u SUH\(u\)]

GIM  an-n[a-a šID-nu-u ana IGI NU MEŠ dĂh-mu. MEŠ MUŠ.ŠA.TUR]

MUŠ.HU[§ U₄.GAL UR.IDIM ku-sa-rik-ku GİR.TAB.LŪ.ŪLU- lu SUHUR.MAŠ]

KU₆.LŪ.[LŪ-lu dLŪ.LĀL dLa-ta-ra-ak u UR.MAḪ. LŪ.ŪLU-lu kám šID-nu\(^a\)]

ÉN at-tu-[nu NU MEŠ]

350 ša ina IM [ABZU]\(^7\)[e-pu-šú-ku-nu-ti-ma\(^a\)]

ina Ś[U]

353/355

MS A: Colophon

1' [\(x\)]\(^a\)

[\(x\)]

[\(x\)]

[\(x\)]

[GIM BE-šú šá-tif-ma] IGI. [KĀR]

5' [SAR\(^a\) PN₁ ŠÂM] AN.LÂ TUR

[DUMU PN₂\(^{la}\) SÁ [SAG]]

[šá '\(\times\times\times\times\)\(^a\)]

[dÉ.A\(^a\) d]UTU d ASAL.LŪ.HI lit-ba-šu

[\(\times\times\) šID NU TUM ik-kib \(^{\text{dp}}\) EN GI-tup-pi

10' dûNE.NE.GAR UD XXVIL.KAM

lim-mu \(^{ld}\) EN-[KALAG]-an \(^{ld}\) GAL.KAŠ.LUL
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[As soon as you have recited this, in front of the statue of the god of the]
[house you shall recite as follows:]

[God of the house, guard your house]
[and the foundation]

as soon as [you have recited this in front of the statues of the hairies,]
[Birth-Goddess-Snake,]
Furious-Snake, [Big-Weather-Beast, Mad-Lion, Bison, Scorpion-Man,
Carp-Goat,]
Fish-Man, Lulal, Latarak, and Lion-Man, you shall recite as follows:

Incantation: you are the statues of
whom from the clay of [Apsû] [I have made
in the hand]
NOTES TO TEXT I.B

8a *kattilla* is understood by J. Klein *ThSH* 111 as *qattila*, murderous. Alternatively it can be understood as a Sumerian loan word, with k a as its first element. Cf. *CAD* K 307b for Sumerian terms with k a translated as *kattilla*.

12a See collation Fig. 2, the sign may well be -*ulm, di'u* is expected in this context (cf. II.B.1) and attested in this anachronistic spelling elsewhere (cf. *CAD* D 165ff., K 2481:9', unpublished, quoted below ad text II Rev. 40).

13a For this restoration cf. 282 and 300.
  b See collation Fig. 2; both Zimmern and Gurney copied IGI LÚ.

14a Restorations after 301ff.

16a A gap of 16 lines.

18a For this restoration cf. II.B.1.

19a Restored after text I 1, cf also II.B.1.

20a Restored after text II 2.

28a Restored after 144; *91MA.NU* here cannot be replaced by *bīnūt šamē*, parallel to *btūt apš* in 144, since this designation refers only to "these statues" and probably not to the statues made the day before.

29a Restored after 145 and the parallel in the incantation *AA* 22 88:150 (text III C).

30a Restored after 86.
  b Restoration guessed.

31a Restored after 70f. (cf. note 70a) and 145f. There is no room for a verb between A.GÚ.BA and *91MA.NU* . Cf. also *bi₃ mēṣerī l/iv 21’ where the same statues are made of *91MA.NU* qud-du₃-ši* (see text III.B.9).

32a Restoration and translation are based on a presumed but uncertain parallel to 147ff., the buying of the clay from the clay pit. A reading X NINDA, however, cannot be excluded.

35a So A; B: *-hi*.

40a For this incantation see text III C.

42a So A; B: *-me₃ ZABAR*.
  b So A; B: *-ha*.

44a Text II Obv. 2 adds NUN.ME after NUN.MEŠ, cf. also text II Obv.11.
  b For 44–66 cf. text II Obv. 2–11.

45a So A; B: *ra-ma-ni₃-sā-nu*.

46a So A; B: *[i₃-na] ...*
  b The tablet has VII (collated).
  c Cf. text II Obv. 3: *Ša KA u SUHUŠ* (collated).

51a Cf. Text II Obv. 6 and note to 184 below; **LI₃-šaru** is a mistake for **u₃-šaru**.

52a So text I: text II Obv. 8: 1M.KAL.LA.

54a Restored after context and text II Obv. 9.

55a The remains of *ul* and *ŠES* are as copied by Zimmern (collated).
  b 55–65: Restored after the parallel from the *nābu* text II Obv. 5–10, cf. also *AA* 22 88f. (below text III.C) and *bi₃ mēṣerī* (below text III.B.9) for the same group of sages. While in text II each description of a statue is followed immediately by the name to be written on it, text I describes the statues first, and adds the names thereafter. A similar difference between text I and text II can be observed in 191–205, where text I adds the names of the dogs after their description. The restoration of the names of the *apkalīlū* here, at first based on the correct reading of 55 and on a comparison with text II, was confirmed by the discovery of K 14829, certainly part of MS A but not joining to it. The restorations and the piece K 14829 also serve to fix the position of K 9968+ in MS A col.1. The correspondence with text II, where only one group of figures is made of *ɛ₃-nu*, and the lack of space at the end of column 1 before the beginning of the tamarisk section, have lead us not to reserve room for a hypothetical second (group of) figure(s) of *ɛ₃-nu*.

64a Text II Obv. 10: *ša ana šag-ši* (collated).

65a In accordance with text II and with the space available in text I, only one group of statues of *91MA.NU* has been restored (cf. 55b). The remaining space of I can be plausibly filled with the beginning of the ritual preparation of the tamarisk wood for the statues of tamarisk; 67 is restored after the structural parallel 144, the introduction of the ritual preparation of the clay for the statues of clay.

68a Restored after 145.

69a Restored after 30 (preparation of *comel*), cf. 86, where the axe and the saw are used to touch the tamarisk, analogous to 41, where the axe and the saw are used to touch the *comel*.

70a Restored after 31f. Cf. also 81 where the *81SINIG* qud-du₃-ši reappears.

71a Restored after 32.
Text BAL-ma, collated.

Cf. W. Mayer UFBG 420, Šamaš 83, and 433, bēlu; contrary to Gurney and Mayer we do not break up 79–85 into two “incantations”, one to Šamaš and the other to the tamarisk. Once it is observed that, contrary to general usage, 79 (ending with pâqid) is not a unit, but continues with kūšat … in the next line, no objection can be raised against ʾumma in 81 as the last word of the nominal sentence ʾŠamaš bēlu … (79–80) ʾumma (81). Only in this way does the incantation 79–85 become a grammatical and semantical unit, comparable to the incantation to Šamaš 159–161.

Cf. S. Langdon apud O.R. Gurney AAR 22 44¹, and CAD E 343a, where the translation of this line is to be modified in accordance with 79a.

Cf. W. Mayer, ORNS 58 274.


So A and C; text II Obv. 22 omits ʾEN.ŠINIG.


91b 91–95: Text II replaces ZABAR with URUDU throughout.

Restored after 24; a-[lā] (collated).

Restored after 320. b Restored after 321; cf. MVAG 41/3 16:371f., and Müller’s commentary p. 45.

Reading uncertain, and partly inspired by UD.SAKAR in 112.

Cf. above note 100a.


110b 110–112: text II replaces ZABAR with URUDU throughout.

Certain emendation with 93, 117, 130 and text II Obv. 23, 30 and 93.

Text II Obv. 30 omits.

Text II Obv. 31 omits.

Text II Obv. 33–37. Text II replaces ZABAR with URUDU throughout.

Text II Obv. 34 omits. Cf. text II 39 where <rukīt> is also omitted.

Restorations in this section are based on the following considerations:

a) Although the slight trace visible to the right of approximately 120 is physically different from what is certainly the remainder of a ruling visible to the right of the column between approximately 123 and 124, and cannot therefore serve to divide section 115–123 into two sections, one may yet wish to divide this section into more sections, supposing that the ruling dividing these sections did not cut the demarcation line dividing the columns. The resulting two sections would have to be 115–121 (description of šā I KUS la-an-šu restored after text II), and an extremely short section 122–123. For the text of 122–123 one might refer to the objects of tamarisk present in text II, but not in text I: NU.MES “BAR.US” (Rev. 9–10), NU.MES [kam-su]-šu (Rev. 11–12), and MĀ.GUR.ŠES (Rev. 23). As will be seen below (II.A.5.A), however, the regular relationship between the order of statues in text I and text II does not allow these figures to appear here in text I; comparison with the incantations of II (II.B.2) shows that no further figures of tamarisk are to be expected.

b) On the other hand, if we choose not to insert a dividing line and suppose a second section, we are left with approximately two lines not accounted for after filling in the text of the nisītu. The nisītu omits three phrases regularly appearing in the descriptions of the figures of tamarisk and serving exactly to fill the gap of about two lines. These phrases have been restored here accordingly. They are: e-ni ZABAR ina SAG.DU-tā sa, S1.MES ZABAR GAR-in, and IM.X ana til-šu las-bāš.

Text II Obv. 34: GUB-az, “he stands”.

Approximately below this restored line, the trace of a ruling is visible (collated; not copied by Gurney).

The restoration [Meslamtaea] here is based on the comparison of the figures in the tamarisk section (67–143) and their incantations at the end of the text (cf. II. B. 2). The number of statues of Meslamtaea must be even, since the are placed at both sides of the gate (395). If 6 is excluded, the choice
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between 2 and 4 is clinched by referring to the 4 statues of his companion Lugalgirra (97, 134, 319), to the somewhat uncertain appearance of the number 4 in 135, and to the incantation to the statues of Meslamtaea (291ff.) where the reduplication of Meslamtaea (two instead of one at each side of the gate) is explained by his epithet “Maštabba, twin gods”.

124a–137: section not present in text II. Restorations follow the stereotyped formulas for the description of gods in this part of the text.

125a The the traces in B may belong to this line.

127a The traces in B may belong to this line.

b Collated. See Fig. 2.

c Restored after 193.

128a Resoration guessed (also in 131, 132 and 133), but cf. Afo 18 306 iv 11 (MA inventory) with a similar phrase.

130a Collated, see Fig. 2.

b Only two weapons can have been in the hands of each statue; the daggers may have been in the belt, cf. STT 251 Obv. 12’ and Kleinplastik 1.2.

132a Cf. below II.A.4 for this weapon. Collated.

b CL-SI-nu restored after 180 and 182.

133a Collated, see Fig. 2.

The stereotyped descriptive formulas end here; the following lines cannot be restored.

135a In 134 and 135 [ša] instead of [IV] is possible. The available space in 135 does not permit the restoration [NU.MES ša]. This section describes some as yet unspecified features connecting or contrasting the statues of Lugalgirra and Meslamtaea.

137a No trace of a division line is visible in A or B (Collated).

138a Text II Obv. 26: *Na-ru-du; Bit mésert I/iv 32. 2Na-ru-di. In view of the form Na-ru-un-di (An-Anum VI 184/193) (dissimilation) and the anticipated elision of -u- when not followed by a double consonant, we normalize this name as Naruddaluli.


c 139a Text II Obv. 26 omits ina til-ii-e-ša.

142a So A; B: d XV. Cf. text II Obv. 38–40 for the description of this statue.

b Division line not in B.

143a Gurney reads here SI.TI-nu-á, understood as “change” for SI.DU-ú-á; von Soden AHw 441a (followed by CAD K 541b) proposed on the basis of Gurney’s copy: tuk-[in]-1-mu-á The questionable signs were collated for me by dr. M.J. Geller, who states: “tuk-ti-nu-[ša] is perfectly clear”.

145a 145–156: for similar rituals at the clay pit cf. CAD K 506b, Q 46b, Borger BiOr 30 182, Farber BID 208, 214, LKA 86 and duplicates 10ff., OrNS 42 508:7’ff. In BBR 52:4 we read: IM K.I.GAR1 ŠÁM DUG3 GA IM (tu-kary-ri-[ša]), “clay of the clay-pit, you are bought! you will say, and pinch off the clay”, CAD K and Q restore 145 as tu-qad-[d4š], Ebeling MDOG X:2 29, CAD G 113b, Ahw 502a and Gurney STT 12 12 ad 251 read 145 as tu-qad-[dš]. Our choice is based on similar texts with quuddušu (BBR 52:2, OrNS 39 143:19, OnNS 42 508:7’, and, slightly different, BiOr 30 178:33), and on the fact that quattušu is never used in this context. Quuddušu and hippu go together in this text also in 67f. (preparation of the tamarisk, cf. note 70a and 78).

146a Restored after the parallel section 67ff., the preparation of the tamarisk. A restoration tu-[qad-dš] is improbable, since this text apparently construes quaddušu with ina, not with two accusatives (31f.). This strengthens the observations made above 145a.

150a MIN stands for K1.GAR.

151a MIN stands for K1.GAR.

b One sign is needed to fill the small gap behind LīL. The incantation 151–157 was briefly treated by Ebeling in MDOG X:2 28f. ad ThL 25.

153a [e] is on the tablet (collated).

b Correct reading i-ana instead of -at first noted by Borger BiOr 18 153a.

154a Cf. 153b.

156a Collated, see Fig. 2.

158a Traces of one sign; EN?

160a Room for one short sign, restored after 166 and context.

161a For the restoration of ina, see the texts quoted by CAD K 210a. The reading IM (instead of Gurney’s NI = ramāna) was already proposed by Ebeling in MDOG X:2 29. The content of the incantation is comparable with the content of the incantation to Šamaš 79ff.

b Restored after 156f. and the texts quoted by CAD K 210a.

162a The entity spoken to here must be present on the scene and be in some way connected with clay, water, or the creation of statues.

163a K1.GAR is possible as well (collated).
Only one line is missing (collated).

In contrast with 159, the function of the statues as watchmen may be referred to here.

Restored after 160.

The missing part of this line may have described a next stage in the preparation of the statues.

Restored, mutatis mutandis, after the parallel sections 41–43 (ŠMA.NU) and 86–87 (ŠINIG); cf. also LKA 86/87/88:16, BBR 52:4, BiOr 30 178:33.

b Restore ana KI?

Uncertain reading. IV NU TU.RA, “four statues of the sick man” is out of place here before tuḫ-kin, and x-na is not a suitable verb; this text uses DŪ-uš. The preparation of such statues on the other hand, is expected from 156 (IM NENNI A NENNI akumu). Gurney reads GAR- nu i-nu-kiš (?)-ma, and restores the preceding line: [...] KESDA ša? “[a cult-installation (?) which with ...] is furnished thou shalt install (and kneel down).

unidentified sign, see collation Fig. 2.

Restored after 44, cf. also 88. The clay pit is probably not inside the city.

Text II Obv. 12 has only ša IM, “of clay”. For [DUH.LAL] see collation Fig. 2.

Text II Obv. 12 has: ... ša IM GI MUŠEN PA.MES GAR-nu, “(statues of sages) of clay, furnished with the face of a bird and wings”. Text I formulates differently, but u in the next line gives away the presence of a noun at the end of 170.

Text II Obv. 12 omits.

Text II Obv. 12 has MU-ili-la.

Text II Obv. 13 has giš.BA-AN.DU₃.DU₉-ša.

Text II Obv. 13 omits.

Text II Obv. 13 has PA.MES MUŠEN; kap-pi MUŠEN.MES/PA.MES MUŠEN does not necessarily refer to wings, but may refer to feathers as well. Since the wings are mentioned already in 170/Text II Obv. 12, and since one would expect KAPPA·šunu in 173 if “wings” were the translation of kappi, the translation “feathers” is to be preferred.

In text II Obv. 13 the reading te-qi-e-ti was established through collation by F. Köcher (AFO 18 310, against Meissner BAW 2 56, cf. also AHw s.v. teqitu 2b). The meaning of this phrase has remained in the dark. Köcher proposes to translate teqitu as “Muster, Borde, Schmuckband”, von Soden leaves the translation open, and Durand ARMIT 21 220 translates the phrase ina teqiti esēalu as “pourvoir par semblant!” (cf. also Barrelet RA 71 57). Rittig Kleinplastik 164 translates “Vogelflügel an die Schuiberblätter (using the older reading pu-qi-e-ti) umgebunden”, and Hilbert apud Kolbe Reliefprogramme 200: “Die Flügel sind mit einer Buntenzierung (um)görert”. Once it is realized that kappu here means “feather” rather than “wing”, the meaning of the sentence becomes clear: the feathers are represented by lines drawn in the still wet overlay (ina teqiti). Other secondary features are similarly drawn on the overlay of other statues in a contrasting colour (the jets of water on the laḫmu and on the apkallu from Eridu, the sash on Narudda, the fish scales on the apkallu of 175). Indeed, actual figures of the bird-apkallu (Ritting Kleinplastik 70ff.) do show hatchings, clearly meant to represent feathers (apparently the feathers can also be brought on by black paint, cf. Kleinplastik 5.2.34–40).

That the meaning “to endow with something by hatching” belongs to esēalu (more suitable than esēalu read here by Rittig, Hilbert, CAD, and AHw) appears from 179 and 181, where groups of fish- apkallu “BAR KU₆ es-ēalu” are differentiated from a group of fish-apkallu (175) having their scales drawn on with black paste (actual fish-apkallu show hatching, painting, or both, cf. Kleinplastik 80ff.), and especially from the description of the suhurmāšu 190f. “BAR KU₆ es-ēalu”, when compared with the actual figure of a suhurmāšu (cf. Ritting Kleinplastik 97, Green Iraq 45 Pl. XV). If “by hatching” depends on esēalu, then ina teqiti adds only adverbial precision; the natural meaning of teqiti, “liquid paste” makes good sense in the present context, and adds adverbial precision so obvious, that ina teqiti could be omitted after its first and only appearance.

Text II Obv. 15 omits.

Text II Obv. 15 omits.

Text II Obv. 15: KI.MIN (=mu-li-la in 12).

Text II Obv. 15: KI.LA, for KI.MIN or ki-(l) ma-(aḫ-ri-ma), cf. Obv. 29. For ši′BA-AN.DU₃.DU₉-ša in 13.

Text II Obv. 17: ina XV-šu-nu.

Text II Obv. 17: giš-SA GISIMMAR. As explained below (II.A.4.B) we read liḥbi gišimmari.

Text II Obv. 17: ina GĀB-šu-nu.

Text II Obv. 18: GABA.MES-šu-nu.

The traces in C are probably to be read: [GIM NU.MEŠ NUN.ME.MEŠ an'-nu-] [ti ...]

For the signs in A see Wiggermann _JEOL_ 27 94 and below Fig. 6 (collation). The sign is definitely not lāh-; NUN and KID are possible. The spelling is either a simple mistake (cf. KID for SUKKAL, _NUN_ 33 195 ad 160), a mistake going back to the use of Babylonian MSS by Assyrian scribes (Babylonian lāh is similar to Assyrian KID), or a mistake inspired by the preceding groups of NUN.ME. C: lāh-‐mu.MEŠ, text II Obv. 34: lāh-‐me, collated.

Both A and C have the deviant spelling with TUR instead of TUR, ŠA in A is confirmed by collation.

Apprently MS A has lines of different lengths in its third column; the longer lines do not show signs of crowding, and may have extended over the right edge. Compare the following lines, the exclamation mark indicating the point in each line to the right of which the same amount of space is available:

180: .......... [l-‐hu-
181: .......... [l-‐ša-‐nu (9)UR.GAL].

In 184 and 186 the column is too small to accommodate the certain restorations. Therefore, in A the number of signs missing at the right cannot be guessed at. The same is not true of MS C, which, having the section in its second column, cannot have extended its lines over the demarcation line and into the third column. On the basis of MS C we can calculate the number of signs missing in 185 and 187. MS C ii reads:

2' 184 II NU lāh-‐mu.MEŠ IM.BABBAR! [lab-‐ša & A.MEŠ ina IM.GI₂ &-‐puru 183DU-‐sa] 3' II NU MUŠ.SA.TUR II NU ! MUŠ.HU₂ II NU ....... 186II NU UR.IDIM.MEŠ ]
4' II NU ku-‐sa-‐rik-‐ku II ! NU [GIR.TAB.LÜ.ULU-lu 187NīTAH u MUNUS]
5' šu IM ša IM. I KA [L-‐LI lab-‐ša, .....]
6' 188II NU lāsh-‐ša-‐mu-‐ša-‐ša & 189IM ] & [M. ...]

After the exclamation mark, the number of signs in each line is:

2': 12 signs. Text complete.
3': 9 signs. The missing portion of the text is the end of 185.
4': 9 signs. Text complete.
5': 4 signs. The missing portion is the end of 187.
6': 2 signs. Text incomplete. It appears that in 3' between 0 and 3 signs are missing, and in 5' between 5 and 8 signs. The UR.MAḪ.LÜ.ULU-‐lu of text II rev. 15 exactly serves to fill the calculated gap at the end of 187: [II NU UR.MAḪ.LÜ.ULU-‐lu] (7 signs). In text II no further statue of clay is available to fill the gap after II N[U... in 185 (0 to 3 signs). Why the U₄.GAL of text II Obv. 41 (there made of tamarisk) must be used to fill this gap will be explained below (II.A.3.16).
193 IM.SIG₇.SIG₇ refers to the overlay of the fourth pair of dogs; 193f. refers to the multicolored dogs (GUN.GUN) of text II Rev. 21. Both texts show the same sequences of colours. Slightly different sequences of colours (exchange of SIG₇.SIG₇ and GUN.GUN) are attested in ḫḫ XIV 89ff. (MSL 8/2 13f., with translations into Babylonian) and Nougayrol RA 41 34:10ff.

b For similar phrases cf. CAD L 206 and text II Rev. 17, where the first pair of dogs is described as ša IM.BABBAR lab-šu, corresponding to II 1M. BABBAR............. nu-la-[ba-š]a] of text I.

194 For parallels cf. CAD B 103b and Lamaštu II/ii 9 (Rm 2.212 = ZA 16 197: 9, 10 // 4 R² 58 ii 10 // LKU 33 Rev. 32) parallel to Lamaštu III 15 (79-7-8, 81 +143 = 4 R² addenda p. 11 21: UR.GI₇.MEŠ ina IM.BABBAR[gaš-qa īl-biši-e tu-bar-rum], “you shall colour the dogs with gypsum and charcoal” (cf. CAD K 946b with a different reading). Again text II gives only the result of this action (Rev. 21): kaṭbu b_arramu, “a multicolored dog”.

195 Restored after Lamaštu II/ii 12 parallel to Lamaštu III 18 (same sources as above note 194b: NU.ME₇.MEŠ ina MU.MES-nu SAR-dr. Text II Rev. 17ff. omits this phrase.

196 Cf. text II Rev. 17. The restoration UR.GI₇ BABBAR instead of UR. BABBAR is also possible (cf. 200). Here and in 198 the restoration UR has been preferred above UR.GI₇ for reasons of space; UR and UR.GI₇ alternate in text II Rev. 17ff. as well. The exact breadth, however, of the gap between the main tablet of MS A and the not joining piece K 11812 cannot be determined.

197 Cf. text II Rev. 17; the last word (atta) of text I is not present in text II.

198 Cf. text II Rev. 18.

199 Since the exact breadth of the gap remains uncertain.

b Cf. text II Rev. 18; ri-giš-šu instead of ri-gim-šu is a scribal mistake. The sign is definitely not GIM (collated). Cf. ZA 61 219f.:220 for the same mistake.

199a The black dogs have already been treated in 198-199. The appearance of a second pair of black dogs with the names of the red dogs must be a mistake, therefore: SA₃ is to be understood here for GI₆.

b Cf. text II Rev. 19.

201a Cf. text II Rev. 19.

202a Cf. text II Rev. 20.

203a Cf. text II Rev. 20.

204a Cf. text II Rev. 21.

205a Cf. text II Rev. 21. Note that in this text the names of the dogs (196-205) follow the description (191-195), while in text II Rev. 17ff. each described dog is followed immediately by its name. For a similar difference between the two texts cf. note 35b.

206a Restored after 66.

207a 205-217: bit mēṣerī līy 1-2 (practically all of the preceding text of tablet I is missing) is the end of the section describing the statues of clay (cf. iv 1: ĖN ina IM 4È.A DŪ-ta-nu-su [SID-nu], the incantation to the statues of clay, not to be identified with III.B.13), following on sections describing the statues of various kinds of wood (cornel and tamarisk; cf. iv 6f.: NU.MEŠ ša GIŠ.MEŠ NU.MEŠ ša [IM] / ma-la te-pu-uš (sic)). Bit mēṣerī līy 3-9 describes the purification of these statues (tūl-lāš-su-nu-[fi]) comparable to text I 207-216; analogous to bit mēṣerī līy 10-11, 217-22? may have referred briefly to the performance of a pīt pl-ritual. The ritual actions performed to the statues apparently continue through the whole gap, ending in 234.

207b In te gap further ritual actions with the statues are described, among them probably a pīt pl-ritual (see note 207a).

208 Collated, see Fig. 3.

b The statues (NU.MEŠ) must have been mentioned here, since they are referred to in the next line with a pronoun. A restoration NU.MEŠ an-nu-ti is possible as well.

c A verb or a verbal phrase is to be restored here.

232a Cf. Borger BiOr 30 178:21f. for the same phrase in a similar context.

233a Zimmern BBR 146 note to 41-42:5 and Gurney AAA 22 56f consider the restoration [tu-हab]. The phrase E tu-हab, however, appears in 264 and is not to be expected at this point in the text, which describes some further manipulation with the statues.

234b Restored after 274.

240a Uncertain restoration; Zimmern BBR 146:11 reads DINGIR [Ē], who, however, appears in 244.

242a The purification of the house (242-263) is roughly comparable to the purification of the sick man in bit mēṣerī līy 12-23.

244a Collated, see Fig. 3, and cf. text V ii:3'.

246a A: KESDA, B [KESDA].MEŠ.

b Collated, see Fig. 3; this reading was already proposed by von Soden AHw 441a (followed by CAD K 541b). For older proposals see Gurney AAA 22 58b. 29

250a So A; B: -u.
251a So A; B: L.A.
252a Cf. Gurney AAA 22 583 for ŠAḪ rather than GIŠIMMAR as copied by Zimmern.
252b So B; A: -e (collated); in A Zimmern's copy (BBR 41:23) and Gurney's transcription (AAA 22 58) have -e, but Gurney's copy mistakenly has MES!
253a Read with Ḡhw 1349α (telīru) and CAD L 187α.
256a Text: .UM.UM.
257a Collated.
258a Restored after BBR 26 II 3: takpinatī . . . ana KÂ tu-še-šu, cf. CAD Z 108α. Gurney AAA 22 58 reads [K]U4-ub-sā, a form of erēbu that cannot have the transitive meaning required by the context.
258b Borger HKL II 91 ad Gurney AAA 22 refers to the incantation incipit AB.TA NAM.MU UN.DA.
258b KU4.KU4.DE AOAT 110 XXI (with literature; add HKL II 21, R.I. Caplice OrNS 40 169:8', T. Abusch IVNES 33 253f.), which, although properly at home at this point in the text, cannot be restored here without questionable modifications: extra signs after AB.TA, and a (corrupt) verbal form [NAM.D]A.AN.
258b NU.KU4.KU4.DE.
260a Collated, see Fig. 3.
261a Restored after an unpublished manuscript at Yale, discovered by B. Foster.
262a So A; B: [. . . .].MES.
263a Text: .UM.UM.
263a So A and B, collated.
265a A: [. . . .]-di-ma; B: SUB-ma.
265a This incantation is attested elsewhere in similar context, cf. von Weiher SbTU 2 83 ad Vs. ii 9, Parpola LAS 1 172 Rev. 9 (cf. LAS 2 163, the incipit refers to the later part of the incantation CT 16 27ff., beginning with 92), MSL 4 116:9', where the edition is to be corrected (read ḫ-baš-r[a]), and MSL 17 185:108.
270a The unidentifed remains of signs in K 13980 right column (Fig. 5) should belong to 270ff., if this MS has the same column divisions as MS A.
274a Restorations in 271–274 after 236–239.
275a So A; B: -lu.
275b In A a gap follows estimated at about ten lines. The lines of B are slightly longer, so that the same amount of text is accommodated in only 9 lines. Since the reconstruction follows the only available MS, B, it is apparently one line too short. For this reason the last line before 286 (from where A takes over) has been numbered "284/285".
276a The restoration is a guess based on the context.
277a Collated. The incantation 277–288 can be restored after its duplicates K 2496 Obv. 12ff. (text V, here quoted as D; identified as duplicate of this incantation by R. Borger HKL II 91), BM 64517 Obv. ii 10ff. ff. (text V, here quoted as E), and STT 126 (perhaps a MS of text I or text V, here quoted as F).
278a Cf. text II Obv. 37: ĹN at-ta šal-mu sa-kip lem-ni u a-a-bī ana IGI-šá (i.e. NU 𒌵ŠINIG ša 1 KUŠ la-an-šá) ŠID-nu.
278b D: [ . . . ] [X-a] {for -e??}; E: mi-qît[. . . ]; F: mi-qît AN-[e].
278c B: -e; D: -e-nu.
278d Text: B; D: [. . . .]; E: <šá> ina DI[NGER.MEŠ].
278e Text: B; D: -u.
280a B: [ul-la-nu] may not have been present in this MS; it has been restored here on the assumption that [ana IGI] alone does not fill the space to the left of lE.A; D: [ . . . ]ul-la-nu; E: ana IGI 𒌵.A ul-la-nu; F: see 280c.
280b Text: B; E: omits; D: [. . . .].
281a Sign as copied by Zimmern, collated. Definitely not k[u]. Text: E, and partly D; both MSS have a clear -ka.
282a D: -u; E: -u.
282b B: lu; D: lu-u.
282c B: HUL; D: lem-nu.
283a Text: E.
283b B: -la-ha-; D: -lāwy.
The phrase *ina qa-bit* is not present in any of the MSS, but has been restored after similar phrases in *namburi* texts (cf. OrNS 34 127:7ff., 36 15:25ff., 19:4, RA 48 84:6).

The word *a-a-TE-a* is not present in any of the MSS, but has been restored after similar sections in *namburi* texts, cf. W. Mayer *UBFG* 267f.

The generally accepted (Zimmern *BBR* 150, Gurney AAA 22 62, Mayer *UBFG* 394, Borger *HKL* III 78, *CAD* K 354b, M/I 402a) restoration: *ana IGI NU.MEŠ DUGAL.GIR.RA u MES.LAM.TA.È.A* (290), matched by *EN NU.MEŠ DUGAL.GIR.RA u MES.LAM.TA.È.A* (291) is wrong for several reasons:

1. The statues of Lugalgirra have their own incantation (319ff.).
2. The available space does not permit the restoration *DUGAL.GIR.RA u* in 290 and 291. The space available in MS B can be deduced from complete lines or lines restored with certainty: B iv ( *BBR* 42 "andere Seite") 5 [DINGIR.MEŠ ša EN.NUN.I], 6 [mu-par-ri-du DINGIR.İ, 8 [ša ina È NENNII A], 9 [up-ta-na-r]a-], 10 [i-duk-ku i-hab-], that is space for four or five signs.
3. The disturbed analogy with 319ff., the incantation to the four statues of Lugalgirra unknown to previous commentators.

Freely restored after *bit mēsērī* II 63.

Possible restorations (contrasting this line with the next) are *KI.DUR.MEŠ ša nu MAH.MEŠ* or perhaps better *KI.GUB.MEŠ ša nu MAH.MEŠ*.


Restoration guessed. Since *attunu-ma* appears here, it has not been restored in 291.

Restoration guessed. Since *attunu-ma* appears here, it has not been restored in 291.

After *Na-nu-di*, A leaves out the brief ritual described in B, and continues immediately with 310'.

Uncertain restoration. The unexpected *EN* in A 318 may represent the remains of a similar but shorter ritual in MS A.

So A; B: ZAG.UDU.

"Left" and "right" imply an even number of statues of Meslamtaea.

A Omits; restored in B after 158, (162), 319, (329), (340), and 346.

In A there is probably no room for NU.MEŠ after VII; B: VII NU.MEŠ šu-ut GIR.MEŠ.

Cf. *UBFG* 267ff., the description of Sebetta.

After *Na-nu-di*, A leaves out the brief ritual described in B, and continues immediately with 310'.

A Omits; restored in B after 158, (162), 319, (329), (340), and 346.

In A there is probably no room for NU.MEŠ after VII; B: VII NU.MEŠ šu-ut GIR.MEŠ.

Cf. *UBFG* 267ff., the description of Sebetta.

After *Na-nu-di*, A leaves out the brief ritual described in B, and continues immediately with 310'.

Uncertain restoration. The unexpected *EN* in A 318 may represent the remains of a similar but shorter ritual in MS A.

So A, for SĪD, not DUG₄.GA cf. 319; B: ki-a-am DUG₄.GA šu-ut. For this difference between A and B cf. also 330a.

*Restored after text II Obv. 25 and 28, where this incipit is quoted for Sebetta and Naruddu. Restorations in this incantation are after an unpublished text discovered by B. Foster at Yale.*
18ff.) are as follows: ....]a-ti/ ....]GA/ ......]RA/ ......]i-ti/ ....]a/ ......]MÉ/ ......]NENN I A NENN I/ ....]ez-zi-ti/ ....]-ú KÅ.

312a Collated, see Fig. 3.
316a Cf. B iv 25 (quoted above note 311b) and 300.
318a Perhaps the remains of a ritual, cf. 310b.
320a So A; B:[dLUGAL]GI R.RA.
322a DINGIR.MES is a guess based on the context.
324a So B; D: -šu-.
325a So B, and perhaps also D.
326a So B, D: [X-MU-ma, probably not the same word; the MSS do not always agree on their lines.
329a D has 329-330 on two lines, B on one.
330a So D; B: DUG_S, GA, cf. 310b for the same difference between A and B.
331a Incipit restored after text II Obv. 32; since B and D divide their lines differently (D having shorter lines), the exact place of the words in the incantation cannot be determined.
332a Restoration guessed, cf. 292, 311, and 322.
333a Uncertain emendation; the sign is rather GAB, as copied by Zimmern (collated); note, however, that the epithets used here recur in other incantations (cf. "431"("Maqla V 139, AMT 86/1 iii 5, etc.).
336a Uncertain restoration.
339a Last line of D, the incantation may have continued.
340a The presence of this section has been assumed on the basis of 142 and text II Obv. 38-40; if it were not present, the statue of the god of the house would be the only statue of tamarisk without incantation. A very slight confirmation is found in 344, where SUHUS may refer to the foundation of the house for which something is wished in the next line; this would fit well in an incantation to the god of the house.
341a Incipit from text II Obv. 40.
344a The alternative readings [a[m-], ni[m-], or N[Á] (without ½t) do not seem to give any sense. ; for a possible sense of SUHUS in this context, cf. 340a. The exact position of MS C col. v, from which 344-351 is taken, cannot be determined. The incantation to the monsters of clay is expected after those to the gods of tamarisk at the end of the text (parallel to the sequence tamarisk — clay in the description of the statues). The deduced figure for the text of MS C col. v (between 356 and 379, see introduction to text I MS C) makes its position at the very end of A col. vi probable. After the last line of C v, three lines have been reserved for the end of the incantation.
348a The names of the monsters have been restored after 184ff. For the sequence cf. II.A.5.A.
350a Uncertain restoration, based on comparison with bit mésēR l iv 1, apparently an incantation to all the statues of clay (quoted above 207a).
353/355a The lines of 344–351 are divided after MS C; since MS C has longer lines than MS A, MS A would fill some two lines more with the same amount of text; for this reason two lines have been subtracted from the gap after 351.
356a The 38 lines reserved here for A col. vi are the maximum number of lines. The remainder of col. vi is all colophon, and starts at about the same point in the column as A col. v 30 and col. iv 32. If 6 lines less were reserved for col. vi, the section pertaining to the god of the house could be deleted.

COLOPHON

1a The two last lines were copied by Bezold Catalogue 760. For lines 8'-11'cf. Zimmern BBR 156, Hunger BAK nr. 563, and Borger WdO 5 170. Line "1" may in fact be a trace of ruling, separating the body of the text from the colophon. The restorations in the colophon follow the colophons from Sultantepe (BAK 351-408), to which it resembles most.
5a Cf. BAK 176b (šātîr).
7a Restore perhaps: ū-šam-šu-ü, and cf. BAK 168a (maššā).
8a Restored with Zimmern BBR 156 and Borger WdO 5 170.

32
Di’a šibṭa mātāni šātuqu, “to make di’u-disease, stroke and plague pass by”

After the end of text I as represented by MS A, MS C continues in col. v with material probably to be identified with the title KAR 44 20b, di’a šibṭa mātāni šātuqu, following directly on 20a, the title of ritual I (see below II.B.1.A). The meagre remains of this second ritual show clear affinities with the continuation of text I in the nisḫu from Assur, KAR 298 (text II), and with other texts, referred to in the notes, mixing 20a and 20b material.

If MS C v 1 = text I 344, then vi 1 would be ca line 430 of the continuation of text I in MS C, and some 75 lines would have been lost after the end of text I in C v.

C

"430" [ ]
[kám] DUG₄ GA
[ÉN ez-ze-t₅ šam-ra-t₅ na-ad-ra-t₅ gas₄-sa-a-t₅]
[da₅-na-t₅ pa-a₅-q₅-ra-t₅ lem-né-t₅ a-a₅-ba-₅]
[ta₅ šá la ḫ₅-E₅.A.]
[ma₅-nu ú-na-ah-ku-nu-ši₅]
[É₄.E₅.A li₅-ni₅-ih₅-ku-nu-ši₅]
[DU₄.DU₅.BI⁶] PAD DAL₄₆ GI₅SIMMAR₂A TI-qí

"435" [te-te-mi₄r] N₄₄.KUR-nu DIB₄ ina A.MES SÚD
[KI₄.ESIR HI ḫ₅-E₅N III₃₄-š₅₄ ana S₅₄] S₁₄ID-nu II N₄₄.MES
[ki₄-ḫ₅-su-ru-t₄₅] ina K₅₄.TILL₄₅ ZAG b Gáb₅ ḥ₅ú₄R₅₅-ma
[GABA₅ H₄₅.L u a-a₅-bi₄ tur-r₄₅ at₅ S₅₄] b₄₅ tu₅ D₅₅.LAD₄₅
[₄₅.Ü₄.S₄₅.MES ana] [É₄].L₄₅.NU TE₄₅.MESb₄₅

"440" [ ] [x₄].DIB.BA. [ ]
[ ] [x₄][ ]

Rest of column broken away

"430" [ ] you shall speak [as follows:]
[Incantation: you are fierce, violent, raging,] ferocious,
[strong, depresssing, evil, hostile;] but for Ea,
[who can soothe you (plural)?] May Ea soothe you (plural).
[Its ritual: and] you shall take a ... and a “thorn” of the date-palm

"435" [and bury it] you shall crush šadd₄nu šābitu-stone in water,
[mix it with bitumen, and thrice] recite [the incantation over it,] two statues
[of (big weather-beasts) linked together you] shall draw in the outer gate
[right and left, and

[the breast of the evil one and the enemy will be turned away; str]oke, the šēdu-demon, [and the plague] will not approach someone’s house.

Too fragmentary for translation.

33
The incipit of this incantation is quoted in text II Rev. 42, cf. below text II ad 41 with further literature. The text here has been restored after AMT 97/1 8ff., but for reasons of space ("433") and the expected DU.DU.BI ("434"), the phrase referring to Marduk has been deleted.

The unexpected plural suffix is probably due to contamination by the plural form of this incantation, ez-ze-tu-nu sam-ra-tu-nu gar-sa-tu-nu, cf. Meier Maqtî V 139ff., von Weiher SBTV 2 12 iii 38, BBR 26 v 75, PBS I/1 13 Rev. 48.

PAD DĀLA GISIMMAR is also attested in text II Rev. 23 and 27, where it is to be buried respectively "in the foundation of the courtyard on the left" and "under the threshold of the outer gate on the left and right". A ritual "to put to flight an enemy", SST 218-219 // K 6013 (below Fig. 20, duplicate K 8106 identified by Reiner JNES 26 185, later joined to K 6013 and K 16001; cf. also Eliat BiOr 39 12), which shows clear similarities to "434"ff. and the later part of text II (for the incantation SGAMES, see below ad text II Rev. 37), has Obv. ii' 11'[...P]AD DĀLA GISIMMAR TI[...PL][A]-M[ER].

Restored after the source quoted in the preceding note.

For the restorations in this section cf. SST 218-219 Obv. ii' 16'ff. // K 6013+ Obv. ii' 5'ff.; DU.DU.BI NAK.KAGILNA DIB[n]A ina a-ta-sâk ki esîr īlīnī en III-fu ana SA SîD.-nu II NUMEŠ ki-is-su-ru.[i][i][i] ina KĀ TIL.MEL SUU-d[u] LU-RA.MEŠ šû-ra-ter SîB-TU (ALAD) ù UŠ-MEŠ ana E LÚ NÚ TEMEŠ; as a ruling the text continues with the incantation EN KAGILNA DIB.ŠA SI VI.UL.SA, for which see also text IV i' 4'. The phrase stating the purpose of this ritual ("438"f.) is not identical to, but comparable with text II Obv. 44 (cf. II.B.1.G).

Restored after the source quoted above "434"b.

Clearly thus in K 6013+ Obv. i' 7', after which SST 218-219 Obv. i' 17' is to be corrected. The comparable rituals with šadânu šâbi-šu-stone prescribe figures of U4.GAL (text I/4 1ff., restored, cf. text II Rev. 35) or of U4.GALMEŠ ki-is-su-ri-i (beside U4.GALMEŠ-GEŠPU.MEŠ, text IV Obv. 1' 7'ff.). Just like ša umâši is short for usâl lu ša umâši, so kâšûtu is short for usâl lu kâšûtu (cf. text IV, note to i' 7'f.) That the U4.GAL is meant here appears also from the fact that the inscription on the U4.GAL, mutšur irat lemmi u ajjābi (text II Obv. 42) perfectly fits the purpose of the ritual: ira lemmi u ajjābi tuuru.

The parallels do not give the obvious specification "right and left".

Restored after the parallels quoted above "435"b.

For ALAD as an evil demon cf. Oppenheim, The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East 281ff., von Soden BM 3 152ff., AHw s.v. šēdum, BAM 407:7,212 Obv. 1. ALAD does not occur elsewhere in a similar context between names of impersonal diseases, which underscores the comparability of SST 218-219 // K 6013+ and this section of MS C. A further point of contact is the appearance in SST 218-219 and its duplicate of šēp lemuttu, for which see II.B.1.

These lines ("438"="439"), somewhere in the midst of the continuation of text I in C, indicate that the material treated in this continuation is not a unity (as would be expected if the continuation was an integral part of text I), but consists of separate sections.

The possibility that text I/4 continued the present text cannot be excluded.

D Fragments of similar rituals

I/2 SST 126; Neo-Assyrian

The few signs on this very fragmentary piece duplicate ritual I 277ff. (incantation atta salmu sākip lemmi u ajjābi). The tablet may belong to text I, or to any other text in which this incantation occurs (see note 277b).

I/3 SST 350; Neo-Assyrian

This small fragment was identified by E. Reiner as "part of a ritual dealing with figurines () similar to the instructions in KAR 298" (JNES 26 195).

1' [ ] [x][ ] [ ]
   [ ] SAG.JDU-su AGA [x][ ]
The text may describe the statue of a god crowned with a tiara (AGA), with a belt around its waist, and holding an axe (hasinnu) in one of its hands. STT 350 does not, however, belong to text I/II, since this ritual formulates the description of the statues differently: x NU.MEŠ (name/material) AGA/a-gi-e Niššu-na a-pir(ap-rat/ap-ru); SAG.DU, “head”, does not appear in this context. The name of the statue described in STT 350 may be ša 1 Kūš la-an-šu, which holds an axe in its right hand in text I/II (I 115ff.). Since other gods can hold axes as well (Ninurta CT 38 21:11, Nergal TMHNF 4 45, cf. Cl. Wilcke ASAW 65/4 74 and Heimerdinger SLFN 3 N-T 916, 339, Istar L. Rost MIO 8 175), and since STT 350 is not a duplicate of ritual I/II, the identity of the described god must remain uncertain.

I/4 STT 253; Neo-Assyrian

This fragment, provisionally treated by E. Reiner JNES 26 192, describes the preparation of a paste with šadānu šābitu-stone to be used for drawing a figure of “the lord” and two figures of “big weather-beasts” (cf. notes to 4' and 7'), each with its own incantation.

The stone šadānu šābitu, the “big weather-beasts”, and the phrase šēp lemutter pu-ruṣ, prove this text to be thematically connected with ritual I/II. Ritual I/II first part (above I.B) does not seem to have room for the text of STT 253, but the possibility that STT 253 continues text I “440” (after description of the EN) cannot be excluded. Since other texts treat similar material, we cannot be positive.

1' [NA₄ .K]A.GI.NA.DI.BA [x] [ ... II NU.MEŠ U₄.GAL.MEŠ a ina KÁ ... b ]
[x x] tu-us-šar-šu-nu-[i₈]

[i-na ZA]G EN te-es-ši-[ir]

[na-a]d-ru₄ gab-šu sa-ak-pa₄[(x x) kip-pu tar-šu īa-rid pa-ni]
5'[lem-]ni la a-di-ru šag-g[(i-šu x x x ) u₄-mu da-'] (i-ku₈ x x x)

[i]na GĀB EN te-es-ši-[ir]

mu-UM-MEŠ₄ ki-šād₄ HUL- t[u₄ ur-ru-hu la-pit₅ ÜŠ.MEŠ₄]
mu-un-ner-bu₄ la-ala-mu₄ la mu-kil-x₅ šā İLLAT.MEŠ-šu₄]
GIR₄ HUL-tim [KUD-us]

Traces of signs
1' [you shall ... 3]adānu šābiṭu-stone, [two figures of big weather-beasts
[in the ... gate] 2' you shall draw [ ............]

3' [On the ri]ght of the lord you shall dra[w ... and inscribe as follows:]

[Agg]ressive, bold, thrown down by (the god) [x], ready snare, expeller
5' of the ev[il one], fearless murderer, kill[ing weather-beast ...]

[on the le]ft of the lord you shall dra[w ... and inscribe as follows:]

 crusher of the neck of the evil ones, exceedingly quick one, who is smeared with
 blood, 8' runner, swift one, who does not keep to his troop:
 block the entry of the enemy.

NOTES TO TEXT I/4

1ra The name of the beings to be drawn on the wall is apparent from the fact that the incantation 7' — 9' is actually attested on a lion demon, Babylonian U4 GAL "big weather-beast."

These figures appear in similar contexts elsewhere, sometimes called kišburatu or ša umāšī (cf. I "435"ff. with notes, IV 1' 3'yf. with notes; for their identity see note to 7'). In view of the plural suffix in 2', unnecessary when the object has been mentioned in the preceding line, the "N M.BES U4 GAL.MES" may have been introduced in the lines preceding 1'.

1rb Uncertain restoration after similar passages in similar texts (text II Obv, 34ff., I "437" and duplicates, partly 7' 8'), where figures of U4 GAL are to be drawn in the gate.

2ra Note the use of šarru (D) to refer to a plurality of figures, whereas ešeru (G) is used when the exact position of a single statue and its accompanying incantation is described.

4ra The incantation 4'-5' is found also on R.C. Thompson Archaeologia 79 (1927) Pl. XL1/3 (from Niniveh), an upper left hand corner of a limestone slab of which Thompson remarks: "doubtless the inscription related to some larger pieces of sculpture of the protecting demon raising his club, which were found in the debris, doubtless originally from Ashurnasirpal's palace (Readre, CRRAT 30 217 denies the existence of this palace). Cf. PL. LXIX fig. 2, and probably the demon on the frontispiece of my Devils vol. II". Thompson's opinion is confirmed by the fact that the inscription on the demon "on the frontispiece of my Devils" is combined with the incantation 4'-5' on STT 253. In the transcription the text between square brackets stems from Thompson's text; the text between brackets has been restored. The fragmentary slab, LXIX fig. 2, to which Thompson refers, actually shows the hand of Lulal (Kolbe Reliefprogramme Type XVI), a god that appears only together with an uggalla.

5ra Restored after CT 16 46;1621.: u 4 n i g-d u 4 g-g a u d a g i š-b a r-r a /u 4-mu da-\i-\i-kul ra-bi-\i la kak-ku, "the death dealing țimū-demon, the rābīṣu-demon who has 'no weapon'" (cf. CAD D 26b; the Akkadian translation of g i š - b a r - r a may be a mistake for gāpparu, a trap, comparable to kippu tarsu of STT 253 4'). Thompson's text apparently continues with another incantation* of which only the first sign (KID) remains.

7ra The incantation 7'-9' is found also on BM 93078 (collations below Fig. 18), a bronze lion demon, first published by R.C. Thompson, The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia II (1904), Frontispiece (photo and transcription). Figure and inscription have been discussed by K. Frank LSS III/3 26ff., B. Meissner Bu4 205, U. Seidl BuM 4 173, D. Rittig Kleinplastik 107ff. (good photo Pl. 45), and D. Kolbe Reliefprogramme 111ff. (with collations by C.B.F. Walker). The identity of the figure as U4 GAL has now been established by the correct reading of the inscription on the lion demons from Nimrud communicated by A. Green Iraq 45 913. The text on the figure corresponding to STT 235 7' most commentators read as: mu-ḥāp-pi gu ḫul-tim (Thompson's reading mu-ḳil pi īk is vitiated by ki-ṣad in STT 253), "crusher of the neck of evil", but cannot be harmonized with the clear mu-um-me of the tablet.

7rb Figure: gu.

7rc See collation Fig. 16.

7rd Only Rittig reads la-.pi BAD NUMUN(?), epigraphically possible (cf. collation), but not giving any sense.

7re Figure mu-nar-bu (Rittig), confirmed by collation. Rittig quotes the similar phrase KAR 92:5: mu-nar-bu la mu-ḳil-ḳi llaṭ就是在, "runaway, who does not keep to his troop" (CAD 42a, Meissner MAOG XI 1-27).
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Figure: 'la-si-mu, “scout”.

The relevant parallel adduced by Rittig and quoted above ad 8’a strengthens the reading mu·kil obtained by collation. The next sign remains undeciphered, but in view of the parallel indicating that no further item is to be expected between mu·kil and šē, one is tempted to read [-lum].

Thus, as demonstrated by the parallel, correctly read by Walker apud Kolbe Reliefprogramme 112. See collation Fig. 18. -šā was omitted by Thompson (Frank 27 transcribes -šu, Delitzsch-system, incorrectly followed by Rittig).

Figure: cm

I/5 CT 51 102; Neo-Babylonian

This very fragmentary and poorly understood text apparently involves a contrastive description of statues of Lulal and Latarak to be used in a unidentified ritual.

```
1’ [ ] | x x | UR SAL
[ ] I-en ina XVIII II-ū AN.TA KUR.KUR
[ ] dLa-]ta-rak SIG dLā-lāl KUR.KUR GAR-nu
[ ] lu-]šu-ūs-tū ṝiššu ša-biš
5’ [ ] ĝl-x] i SAG.DU-šā TŪG? KĀD
[ ] ĝšū? GAR-nu u IB.TAG4-šā ša LŪ-ut-im
```

Pinches’ copy suggests a reading [dLa-ta-rak in 1’; our collation did not confirm this reading. Lulal and Latarak, however, do appear in 3’. The continuation of the text reminds us of the descriptions of the figures of tamarisk in text 1: 4’ “clad in his proper garment”, 5’ description of head cover, and 6’ “furnished with [something on] his [ ]”. Especially useful is the second half of 6’: “and the rest of him is human”. This proves that at least one of the two gods Lulal and Latarak is not completely anthropomorphic.

For KUR.KUR in 2’ and 3’ I propose the reading nipḫu (cf. CAD N/2 245f.), “disks”, “rosettes”; KUR is attested with the value nipḫu elsewhere (CAD splits nipḫu into two lemmata and places KUR = nipḫu under nipḫu A, while the meaning disk is reserved for nipḫu B; AHw has only one lemma nipḫu. If correctly read, the present text confirms the position of AHw).

I/6 F. Lenormant, Choix des Textes 25 = King apud J.D. Beazley, The Lewis House Collection of Ancient Gems (1920) 316. Amulet; Neo-Assyrian

The text of this well preserved amulet was first published by Lenormant (1875) and later by Beazley (1920), with a copy() and a description by L.W. King, revised by S. Langdon (cf. Beazley, Preface). A transcription was offered by Frank LSS III/3 52f. (cf. already Boscawen BOR IX (1901) 67f.) on the basis of Lenormant’s copy; Frank corrected his reading of 7–8 in MAOG XIV/2 72. The images on the other side have been briefly described by Lenormant (cf. Frank LSS III/3 52) and published in photograph by Beazley. The amulet is peirced at the top, and “evidently worn on a string” (Beazley Lewis House 3).
The “reverse” shows two identical figures wearing the head-dress with horns and a shawl; in their raised right hand they hold a double axe, and in their left a mace. They stand in a walking pose.

The text addresses a god dMAŠ.MAŠ, “twin”, a name of Nergal or more properly of Lugalgirra or Meslamtaea (cf. Frankena Tākultu 103, von Weiher Nergal 5, 908, 93, 942; also for Ninurta, cf. van Driel The Cult of Aššur 107). The god is called MAŠ.TAB.BA, “pair” (ki/al/iin). The address shows that the incantation concerns the reduplicated god on the other side. Text I 124ff. prescribes four statues of Meslamtaea for the defense of the outer gate (cf. II.A.4); “four” is surprising since for other single figures except Lugalgirra one or two statues are prescribed. The incantation to the figures of Meslamtaea stresses the fact that he is Maštabba (“pair”), “the twin god”. The amulet and the text imply that one god, Meslamtaea, is imagined as having two identical bodies (as indicated by the four statues in text I, the same goes for his companion Lugalgirra; it will be seen below that the amulet rather represents Meslamtaea); he is a doubled god. The amulet also indicates the reduplication of Mašmaš by using DU.DU instead of DU in line 2. The epithet “that goes in front” also calls to mind text I where Meslamtaea is stationed in the outer gate (II.A.4.A). In the epithet GABA HUL.GAL MU.NU.GI.GI in 3f. we recognize the Akkadian irat lemini tunu, known to be one of the purposes of text I (cf. note to “437”a), and recurring in the epithet of the ugallu (text II Obv. 42); GI.GI here stands for GI4.GI4 = tunu (GI4 = tāru). The description of Meslamtaea in text I 124ff. prescribes a huḫpalu-mace (cf. below II.A.4.A) for their right hands (restored), and a zahatâ-axe for their left (restored). The figures of Lugalgirra (I 101) hold bows and arrows. The text thus indicates that it is Meslamtaea rather than Lugalgirra who is depicted on the amulet (Nergal and Ninurta are not twin gods, and cannot be meant by Mašmaš here), but the Meslamtaea of the amulet holds the double axe in his right hand and the mace in his left. In the new bit mēseri manuscript ShTU 3 69:2 it is Lugalgirra who is armed with mace and axe (also Nergal and a figure whose name is broken), which stresses the identity of the two gods, and the futility of choosing.

I/7  Rm 40 Rev. = Leeper CT 35 Pl. 18

The obverse of Rm 40 bears captions for narrative sculptures of Ashurbanipal (cf. Weidner AfO 8 191ff., Bauer IWA 92); the reverse has an incantation which is to be [inscribed] in front of the statues of the sages. Weidner AfO 8 1753 did not consider this incantation a suitable epigraph for sculpture (cf. 19265), and doubted that obverse and reverse belong to the same type of text. When it is realized that incantations occasionally appear accompanying apotropaic figures on reliefs (cf. text 1/4 note to 4’a), and
that at least the fish-āpkišu are unquestionably represented in sculpture, Weidner’s objection loses its force. With Reade *BaM* 10 38² we take both obverse and revers as captions for sculpture; against Reade, the incantation does not necessarily belong to the anthropomorphic apkallu.

A transcription and translation of the text can be found in Bauer *IWA* 92. The text addresses a plurality of beings — āpkišu according to the subscript; their word together with those of Ea and Marduk is to chase away a plurality of evils. Especially interesting is 8, where we read (with Bauer): [niš d É A DINGIR b]a-ni-ku-nu .........., “[by Ea the god] your creator ..........” (followed by Marduk, Ninurta and Nergal). Even if the restoration is uncertain, the text at least shows that one group of āpkišu is conceived of as created by a god, since after niš (restoration certain) only the name of a god can be restored.
Extracts from šep lemutti ina bit amēli parāsu and di'a šibta mútāni šūtuqu.

A Manuscripts and comparison with text I

1 VAT 8228 = KAR 298; collations Fig. 10. Neo-Assyrian, from Aššur

The text has been transliterated and translated several times: S. Smith apud C.L. Woolley, Babylonian Prophylactic Figures, JRAS 1926 695ff., transliteration only; O.R. Gurney, Babylonian Prophylactic Figures and their Rituals, AAA 22 (1935) 64ff.; D. Rittig, Assyrisch-babylonische Kleinplastik Magischer Bedeutung vom 13.-6. Jh. v. Chr. (1977) 151ff.; Ph. Hibbert apud D. Kolbe, Die Reliefsprogramme Religiöse-mythologischen Charakter in Neuassyrischen Palästen (1981) 193ff. For further literature I refer to R. Borger HKL I 102 and HKL II 57. All transliterations are based on Ebeling's copy of the text.

The importance of the text for the identification of the prophylactic figures is reflected in a number of studies, cf. the articles and monographs quoted above, M.E.L. Mallowan, The Excavations at Nimrud (Kalhu), 1953, Iraq 16 (1954) 85ff., E. Klengel-Brandt, Apotropäische Tonfiguren aus Assur, FuB 10 (1968) 19ff., and A. Green, Neo-Assyrian Apotropaic Figures, Iraq 45 (1983) 87ff. Further relevant literature will be mentioned in connection with the treatment of gods and monsters.

No duplicates of the nīšu are known. K 11812, referred to by R. Borger HKL II 57 as comparable ("vgl.") to text II, proved to be part of text I MS A.

Parts of text II are duplicated in other texts (beside text I):

- W 22730/3 (von Weifer SbTU 2 no 18), probably a namburbi text, contains a recipe (17) also occurring in text II Rev. 36.
- K 2468 (unp., cf. Anbar UFo 7 5186) contains recipes and incantations against mursu, d'i, diliptu and mútānu. Rev. (?) 6'ff. is similar to II Rev. 38ff.
- K 2481 (unpublished, identified also by Abush RA 78 93) contains the end of a section apparently duplicating text II Rev. 36–37 (K 2481:2': KUD-[jar]), a slightly variant version of text II Rev. 38–40 (K 2481 3'–9'), and a section (10'-13') duplicating text II 43–44 up to ana NA u E-šu NU TE.MEŠ-u; this section is also duplicated by BAM 434 iii 17–20 and UET 7 125 Rev. 1–5 (Abush RA 78 93).
- K 9873 (identified by G. Meier AfO 13 72b and treated below as text IV) Rev. iv' 5'-10' duplicates text II Rev. 41–42.

The text was written by Kissir-Aššur, the well known exorcist of the temple of Aššur, who lived at the time of Ashurbanipal (cf. Meier AfO 12 246, van Driel, The Cult of Aššur 134, Hunger BAK 19, Menzel Assyrische Tempel I 247). The text was excerpted from a longer text (za-mar [zi-ḫa], cf. BAK no 201:4) for the purpose of a specific ritual performance ([ana ša-bat e-pe-ši], BAK 201:1).

Notwithstanding the attention that the text has received from philologists and archaeologists, a number of points have remained unclear. Some of these obscurities have
been clarified by collation and comparison with other texts, especially text I. From the collation of the text in Berlin it appeared that Ebeling had made good sense of quite a few difficult abraded passages not indicated as such in his copy; a sign of which only little remains is regularly completely and correctly restored.

2 Collations

Obverse

1 \[\text{ana} \, \text{dA[kadi] NU} \, \text{TE-} \, \text{hi} \, \text{u} \, \text{Gi} \, \text{Rx. HUL} \, \text{ina} \, \text{E} \, \text{NA} \, \text{KUD-si}\]

The first sign is certainly not EN (so Ebeling, with question mark); the second sign is probably DINGIR, which limits the range of choice for the third sign (cf. below II.B.1.G). The restoration TE-hi is a guess, based on the assumption that the following conjunction, \(\text{u}\), connects two verbal phrases rather than two nouns both dependent on KUD-si, which would represent a unique extension of this well attested expression. The sign before HUL is neither NIG nor SAL; the emendation "SAL, proposed by Ebeling in his copy and adopted by Rittig in the transcription, is supported by the correct reading of the last two signs. For the resulting phrase šēp lemuṭtu ina bit ameli parāsu cf. below II.B.1.

Translation: “to prevent the šēd\[u-demon from approach\]ing and \[to block\] the \[entry of the enemy\] in someone’s house”.

2–11 Cf. text I 44–65.

3 Contrary to the copy, the text has: \(\ldots \text{ša KA} \) (not: ina KA) \(\text{u SUHUŠ} \text{IZI} \text{ka} \text{bu}\).

4 As suspected by von Soden AHw 1127b and confirmed by text I 64, the text has \(\text{u₄-mu ša ana šag-si} \ldots\)


13 For ina te-qi-e-ti (reading and translation) see note to text I 173c.


15 BAR KU₆ instead of PA\(^7\) KU₆ is confirmed; for KI.MA see text I note to 177b.


20 ina IGI-[ar]\(^{33}\) GU.ZA.


22 For the plural qul-<ma>-[tum] cf. text I 309; -[tum] is clearly on the tablet. Rittig and Hibbert both follow AHw 927a and emend qul-ma\(^1\) singular in accordance with text I 91.

24 End: [al-lā], cf. text I 96 and Landsberger JCS 21 150\(^{62}\).


27 End: ina \(\text{A CL-} \) [ša tāl-lal], cf. text I 141 (tal-lal) and Landsberger JCS 21 150\(^{62}\).

29–32 Cf. text I 106–114, 331.

33–37 Cf. text I 115–119, 277.

38–40 Cf. text I 140, 340.

38 \([\text{NU}] \, \text{DINGIR} \, \text{E}\); no more sign after na-ši.

41–42 Cf. text I 185.
41 End: [na-šu-u].
42 [ina Á-šu-nu mu-ti UR GABA ẖul] [u] [a]-bi SAR-ār. The reading of the light traces before a-a-bi is assured by the inscription on a lion demon (Green Iraq 45 913), the only inscription on a statue that fits the traces preserved here; cf. also text I note to “437”a.
43-44 Cf. text I 184.
43 NU.MEŠ làh-me IM ša ṣMIA[R] na-šu-u, cf. JEOL 27 91, 9212. MAR and E fit the traces, but ṣME is of no use here.
44 Instead of ú-sur read ú-sur, plural stative, with subject AMEŠ.
45-46 Cf. text I 186: ku-sa-rik-ku.
45 [NU.MEŠ .UR.IDIM ṣM]EREN IM. KALLA lab-[šú ša] [X.Y.] na-šu-u ina Á-šu-nu.
46 After the break: ...]; LA [SAR ina KÁ KAR²].
47-48 Cf. text I 186, UR.IDIM.MEŠ.
47 [NU.MEŠ UR.IDIM ṣM]EREN IM. KALLA lab-[šú ša] [X.Y.] na-šu-u ina Á-šu-nu.
48 [DINGIR É lu ka-a-a-ar] ina GÁB-šu-nu d’LAMMA É lu [dá-a-ri][SAR-ār...]
For the restoration UR.IDIM see II.A.3.17; the object carried by the UR.IDIM is possibly [UD.SAKAR], after text IV col. B 10. The first half of the inscription on the UR.IDIM (48) has been restored after the inscription on ND 7901, a clay figure, see A. Green Iraq 45 9351 and Pl. XIIIc. The space available for the restoration does not allow the addition of a reference to “on their right side” implied by ina GÁB-šu-nu “on their left side”. Apparently the formula ina (šú) XV-šu-nu inscription......., ina GÁB-šu-nu inscription.... SAR-ār has been contaminated by the formula for one-sided inscriptions: ina Á-šu-nu inscription SAR-ār.... A restoration [ina MAŠ.SI]GÁB-šu-nu (cf. text VI 110 col. B 10) is epigraphically impossible.

Reverse

1-2 Cf. text I 185 (MUŠ.ŠA.TUR).
1 [NU.MEŠ .UR.IDIM] aš-me IM. [lab-šú ša] [šÈ.TAB.BA URUDU ina pi]-[šu- nu na-šu-u ina Á-šu-nu].
The šú copied by Ebeling as the last visible sign of the line is no longer (?) present and has been ignored in the transcription. The “na” before “šú” is probably to be read ina p[i-i-, cf. text VI 110 Col. B:17: II ba-aš-me ša bi-nî ša pa-al-ta ša bi-nî ina pi-i-šu-nu na-šu-u.
3 Cf. text I 185.
4-5 Cf. text I 190.
4 [NU.MEŠ S]UR.MAŠ IM [ša ṣMA.R] na-šu-u
The name of the object that the figures carry in their hands has been restored after text VI 111 Col. B:21, cf. below II.A.4.B. e’ru.
5 The reading taš-nu u ma-ga-ru rather than taš-nu-u ma-ga-ru is confirmed by BM 74119 (Fig. 17, text IV/1) I’1’f., breaking up this inscription: 1’[...taš-nu] 2’ u ma-ga-ru[i].
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The sign x in ri-x remains unidentified. The reading ri-da is clear on BM 74119 (Fig. 17, text IV/1 ii'4'), a similar description of the kulullā, and on the actual figure of this being, Rittig Kleinplastik 9.1.2 (cf. also IM 3337, Trésors du Musée de Bagdad, 1977, no 141).

8 Cf. text I 186.

9–10 Cf. text I note to 1186 and below II.A.5.A. We consider this figure to be an intruder from beyond text I.

9 NU.MEŠ [X.Y]š̌i-bi-ni ša š̌PA š̌I GIŠIMMAR na-šū-u ina Á-šū-nu ú-suḫ
l[um-na]

10 er-ba maš-ru-u [SAR-ār].
Unfortunately the signs spelling the name of this being could not be deciphered. It must be male (imperative usuḫ). Hibbert does not propose a reading, and neither does Rittig on p. 158; on p. 191, however, she adopts Gurney's reading (AAAA 22 70) and reads UŠUMGAL. The reading UŠUMGAL is epigraphically impossible. In BM 74119 ii 6'f. (Fig. 17, text IV/1) an unidentified being is described (after the suḫrubātā and the kulullā), that may be identical to the being described here: NU [DŪ]-uš (??) x[x]-x[x]šá š̌PA š̌I GIŠI/MMAR na-šū-u/[ku-bu-us lum-nu er-ba meš]-ru-u [ina Á-šū-nu ? SAR-ār].

Harmonization of X.Y in text II with [DŪ]-uš in text IV/1 leads to unsurmountable difficulties, cf. also text IV/1 note to i' 6a.

The reading [um-na] instead of m[ur-ša] (Gurney, Hibbert, Rittig, CAD N/2 8a) was prompted by comparison with BM 74119.

11–12 Cf. note to text I 1186; like 9–10 an intruder from beyond text I.

11 NU.MEŠ [kam-su-ti š̌I] bi-ni.

Gurney AAA 22 70, CAD A/2 155a and B. Hruska, Der Mythenadler Anzu in Literatur und Vorstellung des Alten Mesopotamien (1975) 104, read [(AN). IM.DUGUD.MUŠEN], Hibbert and Rittig abstain from an interpretation. The reading kamsūtī, indicated already by comparison with text VI 111 col. B 25, is confirmed by collation. For further references to this group see text III.B.10, and Borger BiOr 30 178:18.

11 ……tı-NIG.TUK(mašrā) lu [ša-dīr]

12 TILA [(HÉ).ZAL.ZAL1 (balatu līšebēr)] SAR-ār.

Rittig and Hibbert do not offer interpretations of 12, reading TILA x NI² IR'. S. Smith JRAS 1926 700 (translation only) apparently reads HÉ.NI.IR or HÉ.IR¹.IR, "may he bring" (IR = abālu); Gurney reads "balā-ṭum ir-ba (?)". The reading adopted here is based on the fact that only the reading HÉ both fits the traces and satisfies the expected parallelism with lu sadīr; on the fact that no root XNR exists in Akkadian; and on the fact that when a logogrammatic spelling is accepted, NI cannot express an infix, IR - šalālu does not make sense (IR = abālu does not occur in Akkadian texts), and ZAL = šute-brā must be expected to occur reduplicated (cf. CAD B 280f.).

Translation: "may life be permanent".

13–14 Cf. text I 188f.

15–16 Cf. text I 187.
17-22 Cf. text I 191-206.

17 [NU UR.GI]. In 18-22 only [NU] is to be restored at the beginning of the line.

18 a-ru-uh is certain.

23ff From here on the text is not paralleled by text I

23 . . . BURU₅ KUR.RA UR.GU.[LA IM²PAD ešDALA] GIŠIMMAR [X]. Cf. text V i'4'...MĀ.GUR₅.MEŠ ešSINGU u BURU₅ KUR.RA ( . . . tetemmer); for PAD ešDALA GIŠIMMAR cf. text I "434"a

24 ZID.EŠA x [SIG₅].

x is as copied by Ebeling; [SIG₅] remains uncertain.


26 [II NU me-li-]e GIŠ KEŠDA GİR.MEŠ es-hi GIN.MEŠ na-šu-u,

"you shall construct (rakāsu) two statues of mēlā of wood, endowed with daggers and holding axes . . . ."

A (d)mēlā is attested in comparable contexts (Müller MVAG 41/3 10:9, Frankena Tākultu 30, cf CAD M/L 14b) and has been understood etymologically as the deified staircase (Frankena). This text – if read correctly – does not favour the etymological explanation, since the being apparently has hands to hold an axe with.


Cf. K 2496 ii 7' (text V, Fig. 11) for an UR.GUL.A of the same material.

30 DIŠ NA copied by Ebeling at the beginning of the line is no longer on the tablet.

[DİŞ NA] GİR II SAL.HUL [KI/EGIR-]-ša² [ir]- ta-kās

Gurney AAA 22 72 reads: šēpē lemunt-im [ina bītī is-di-ḫa ip-]-ta-ras,

"(If – as to any man – ) the foot of evil [cut]s off [prosperity in his house],"

and refers to KAR 44:20; Rittig and Hibbert correctly do not adopt is-di-ḫu, a mistake of KAR 44 (read KUD-ṣi with the " duplicates” BRM 4 20:24 and STT 300 Rev. 13, followed by a new title starting with di-ḫu), but retain ip-]-ta-ras (-ras against the copy, which has BI; not collated) and the translation with "foot of evil" as subject of the sentence. However, when šēp lemunti is combined with parāsu, it is the logical object in all cases (see II.B.I), cf. especially 37, where the result of the ritual 30ff. is expressed as: šēp lemunti parsat, "the entry of evil is blocked". The introduction (30) which describes the nature of the evil must have a meaning opposite to 37 quoted above, such as "when the foot of evil is present". This is aptly expressed by rakāsu itti/arki, especially common in the context of sorcery where the incantation ŠEG.A.Me.EN (37) is also at home.

Translation: "[When someone] – the foot of evil is permanently bou[nd to him]".


37 For the incantation ŠEG.A.Me.EN cf. Köcher BAM 434 vi 17ff., and XIII with further references. The last word appears as KUD-ṣat on K 2481, the last word of an otherwise broken section followed by a ruling.

38 . . . NUMUN ḡ[nUMUN], cf. K 2481 5': NUMUN ḡNUMUN.

40 Cf. K 2481 7'f. . . . . te-te-em-mi-ir / [di-ḫu-]-um EN MU I.KĀM ana LÚ NU
41-42  Cf. below text IV Rev. iv' 5'-10'.

41  After ë.NA the sign ßl is partly erased, followed by traces of an other erased sign, then: NU TE-e

42  For the incantation ë.N ez-ze-ta šam-ra-ta cf. BAM 471 iii 25'-27', AMT 86/1 iii 5-9, AMT 97/1 8ff., text I "431"ff., UET 7 125 Obv. 3ff. (See Borger HKL II ad AMT 97/1, G. Meier AfO 21 77, and especially Köcher BAM 5 XXI ad 471 iii with further references). One of the duplicates (AMT 97/1 8ff.) was transliterated and translated by Ebeling TuL 143.

43-44 Duplicates to this section: BAM 434 ii 17-20, K 2481 10'ff., UET 7 125 Rev. 1-5 (cf. Abusch RA 78 93).

3  Additional material to text I. Inventory of figures

Although text II is an extract, and as such less informative on the ritual than text I, it nevertheless supplies information not supplied by text I. The extra information of text II is given below figure by figure in the order of text I. For each figure the details relevant to the discussions below are added: number of order in text II, name, number of statues, material, nature, character of incantation and inscription, attributes.

1.1  umū-apkallū, I 44ff.; 7; e'ru; anthropomorphic/human.

attributes: in the right hand: a cornel(-stick) charred at both ends; left hand on breast.

buried: ina SAG šiNÀ, "at the head of the bed" (II Obv. 11).

incantation: ÉN VII NUN.ME.MEŠ aša-rē-dù-tū, "seven leading sages" (II Obv. 11). Text I omits this incantation; its function is apparently fulfilled by the incantation ÉN UDUG HUL EDIN.NA DAGALLA I 40 (cf. below III.C.).

These figures are not supplied with horns of bronze/copper, which would positively identify them as gods, nor do the inscriptions and incantations characterize them as divine: they are sages of human descent, giving life by their incantations, and putting to flight evil. The lack of added precision in the description (in contrast to the specifications of the bird- and fish-apkallū), and the head dress, garments, and hands, make them anthropomorphic.

2.6  Sebettu, I 88ff.; 7; bēnu; anthropomorphic/god.

attributes: in the right hand a hatchet of bronze/copper, in the left a dagger of bronze/copper. They are furnished with the horns of divinity; bows and quivers hang at their sides.

buried: ina 1GI-at NU šiBi-ni, "in front of the statue of tamarisk" (II Obv. 25). The incantation to these figures in text I (311ff., cf. note 311b) makes it clear that they were posted in the gate.

The designation NU šiBi-ni, "statue of tamarisk" (2, 4, 7), refers to statue 5. It is clear that in the descriptions of burial places "statue of tamarisk" cannot refer to the statue 2, 4, or 7, since their positions in the gate are defined in relation to the "statue of tamarisk", and not to the statues 3 or 6, since these statues are omitted in text II. The choice between the remaining statues of tamarisk (5 and 8) is decided in favour of 5 by the designation "statue of
tamarisk” (I 276) before the incantation atta śalmu sākip lemni u ajjābi known to belong to statue 5 (subscript I 289, II Obv. 37). The same designation recurs in other texts (IV K 9873 ii 8’, V ii 7’, 11’).

The incantation I 311ff. characterizes them as fearful warriors.

3.- Lugalgirra, I 97ff.; 4; binu; anthropomorphic/god.

attributes: in the right hand a bow, in the left an arrow; on their heads a sundisk (?); furnished with the horns of divinity.

buried: since text II omits this figure, we have no exact information on the place of inhumation. Fortunately the incantation to these figures in text I (328) informs us that they are posted in the gate.

The incantation I 322ff. characterizes these figures as fearful warriors.

4.8 šāt kakki, I 106ff.; 7; binu, anthropomorphic/god.

attributes: in the right hand a mace, in the left hand a cornel(-stick); on their heads (?) a crescent; furnished with the horns of divinity.

buried: ina KÁ TILLA₃(AŠ.A.AN) ina EGIR na-dāš GĪR ina IGI NU šid bi-ni, “in the outer gate, behind the (statues) holding a dagger, and in front of the statue of tamarisk” (II Obv. 32). The designation na-dāš GĪR, “holding a dagger”, must refer to one of the (groups of) statues holding a dagger, that is 2, 5, 6, or 16. Statue 6 is not treated in text II, statue 5 appears (as “statue of tamarisk”) next to one “holding a dagger” in the description of the burial of statue 4, and the two specimens statue 16 are stationed not in the outer gate but in the passages, and their positions at the right and the left make them ill-suited to fix the position of another group. Accordingly, nāš patri refers to statue 2 (Sebettu) and must be translated as a plural: “(statues) holding a dagger”.

The incantation I 331ff. characterizes these figures as fearful warriors.

5.9 ša isšet ammatu lān-šu, I 115ff.; 1; binu; anthropomorphic/god.

attributes: a dagger of [bronze]/copper seven fingers long in his right hand, and an axe of [bronze]/copper in his left. Judging by the space available for restorations in text I, he was furnished with the horns of divinity; text II, however, omits the phrase in question. The incantation I 277ff. confirms his divinity and characterizes him as a strong warrior keeping watch in the middle of the gate (I 281); the inscription underscores his character as a door keeper by opposing sakāpu, “to repel (evil)”, to šārubu, “to cause to enter (good)”.

buried: ina KÁ TILLA₃(AŠ.A.AN), “in the outer gate” (II Obv. 36).

6.- Meslamaetae, I 124ff.; 4; binu; anthropomorphic/god.

attributes: in the right hand a mace with a head of stone, in the left a battle axe; a dagger of bronze is probably fastened to the bronze belt. They are furnished with the horns of divinity.

buried: since text II omits this figure, we have no exact information on the place of inhumation. Fortunately the incantation to these figures in text I (305) informs us about their positions at the right and left of the gate.

The incantation I 291ff. characterizes them as [gods of] the watch, who kill the evil ones (I 296).

7.7 Narudder I 138ff.; 1; binu; anthropomorphic/goddess.

attributes: a harp² (timbūtu) hangs at her left side; instead of being bound with a girdle of bronze like the other gods, she has a sash drawn upon her with
yellow paste, and instead of being crowned with a tiara and furnished with horns like the other gods, she is crowned with a red head gear.

*buried: ina KÁ TILLaₜ(AŠ.AAN) KI NU.MEŠ dነ.VI.BI ina IGI-at NU šiḥ bi-ni, “in the outer gate, together with the statues of Sebettu, and in front of the statue of tamarisk” (II Obv. 28).*

The incantation to the Sebettu is also used for their sister Narudda. (I 308ff., II Obv. 28).

**8.10 Il biti**, I 142; 1; bitunu; anthropomorphic/god.

Text I 142 only mentions this statue; text II Obv. 38-40 gives a probably incomplete description.

*attributes: he greets with his right hand (i-kar-rab), and holds a magical weapon (šiḥ gam-lum) in his right.*

*buried: ina KÁ TILLaₜ(Aš.AAN), “in the outer gate” (II Obv. 39).*

Text II quotes the incipit of an incantation: ÉN DINGIR ė-u-ṣur ē-ka, “incantation: god of the house, guard your house” (tentatively restored in I 341ff.). Incantation, weapon, and position characterize the god of the house as a door keeper.

**9.2 Bird-apkallu**, I 170ff.; 7; clay and wax; human/bird.

*attributes: in the right hand a cleaner (mullilu), in the left a bucket.*

*buried: ina SUHUŠ ē-II-i ina SAG šiḥ-nā, “at the base of the (wall of the) second room”, at the head of the bed” (II Obv. 14). The translation of II-i is uncertain: Smith JRAS 1926 696: “second pavement” (70914: “not clear”); Gurney, Hibbert and Rittig suppose that II-i introduces an alternative position, which seems improbable in the present context. In MAss/NAss the ša biti šanî (CAD B 296b) is a servant in the dining room, and bitu šanî is accordingly perhaps “dining room”, cf. CAD B 297f., Kinnier Wilson CTN I 85, Postgate FNALD 5:5, Dalley CTN 3 165 ad 12. An incantation to these figures is attested only in text II (Obv. 14, incipit): ÉN at-tū-nu NU NUN.ME ma-ṣa-ri, “incantation: you are the statues of the sages, the guardians”: the incipit reveals only a part of their character: they are guardians.

**10.3 Fish-apkallu**, I 174ff.; 7; clay; human/fish.

*attributes: in the right hand a cleaner, in the left a bucket.*

*buried: ina I.DIB. ē.NUN, “at the threshold of the bedroom” (II Obv. 16).*

The incantation to these figures is the same as the one to the bird-apkallu (only in text II Obv. 16).

**11.4 Fish-apkallu**, I 178ff.; 7; clay; human/fish.

*attributes: in the right hand on offshoot of the datepalm, the left on the breast.*

*burried: ina tar-ṣī KÁ ina EGI.R šiḥ GU.ZA, “opposite the gate, behind the chair” (II Obv. 18)*

The incantation to these figures is the same as the one to the bird-apkallu (only in text II Obv. 18).

**12.5 Fish-apkallu**, I 181ff.; 7; clay; human/fish.

*attributes: in the right hand a standard, the left on the breast.*

*burried: ina MÛRU ē ina IGI-[at] šiḥ GU.ZA, “in the middle of the room, in front of the chair” (II Obv. 20).*

The incantation to these figures is the same as the one to the bird-apkallu (only
13.12 *lahmu*, I 184; 2; clay; anthropomorphic/lesser god.
*attributes*: a *gš* [MAR] (II Obv. 43), “spade”.
*buried*: *ina* UB.MEŠ [Ĕ.x.x] *ina* TUR, “in the corners of the . . . room at the side of? the courtyard” (II Obv. 44). Reading and translation remain uncertain: for Ĕ.x.x read perhaps Ĕ.NUN (kummu). Since only two statues are available, and a room or courtyard has four corners, two corners must have been specified here in one way or another. The corners of the courtyard are specified in II Rev. 13 and 14 (Lulal an Latarak) as back and front corners; “back” (ĔGIR-ti) and “front” (ĬGĬ-ti) as well as the conceivable specifications “right” and “left” are excluded here epigraphically. It must be assumed then, that “in the courtyard” serves to define the corners of a room, and that the signs in the break define the room.

*Inscription*: er-[ba MAŠ]KIM SILIM-me ši-ši MAŠKIM ŠUL (restored after the inscription on actual figures of *lahmu*, cf. JEOL 27 91ff.), “ent[er guardian of peace, go out guardian of evil]” (II Obv. 43; to be written on the arms, *ina* Â-šū-nu). These orders laid in the mouth of the *lahmu* characterize him as a door keeper; the general incantation to the monsters I 349ff. is badly preserved, and does not inform us about the character of these figures.

14.15 *basmu*, I 185; 2; clay; monsters.
*attributes*: an axe (paštû) of copper in the mouth (II Rev. 1). The information that the *basmu* are clad in [ ] paste (II Rev. 1) is lacking in text I.
*buried*: broken (II Rev. 2).

An *inscription* for [their sides] is prescribed in text II Rev. 2:
[*ši]-i lum-nu er-ba [SILIM-mu] (restored after the inscriptions on actual *basmu*, cf. Rittig Kleinskiplastik 122ff.), “[g]o out evil, enter [peace]”. These orders laid in the mouth of the *basmu* characterize him as a door keeper; the general incantation I 349ff. does not give information on the nature of the *basmu*.

15.16 *mušḫuššu*, I 185; 2; clay; monster.
*attributes*: none. The information that the *mušḫuššu* is clad in [ ] paste (II Rev. 3) is lacking in text I.

No *inscription* is prescribed for its sides. The general incantation to the monsters I 349ff. does not inform us about its nature.
*buried*: *ina* ÎDI[B], “at the treshold [ of the room]” (II Rev. 3).

16.11 *ugallu*, I 185; 2; clay; monster.
*attributes*: in the right hand a dagger (GIR), in the left a mace (*gšTUKUL*) (II Obv. 41). The information that the *ugallu* is clad in yellow paste (IM.KALLA, II Obv. 41) is lacking in text I.
*buried*: *ina* né-re-ba-ni XV u GÁB, “in the passages of the right and of the left” (II Obv. 42).

Text II Obv. 43 prescribes an *inscription* for their sides (II Obv. 42): [*mu-ṭīr GABA HUL*] [u] [a]-a-ši, “who turns away the breast of the evil one and the enemy”. The inscription characterizes the *ugallu* as a door keeper.

In text I 185, only U₄.GAL can be restored in the gap of 0–3 signs at the end of the line: it is the last item of a limited set of monsters (cf. below VII.B), after using the *urmahšullu* to fill the longer gap in I 187. In text I, the *ugallu* is
made of clay, but in text II of tamarisk; the difference in material is matched by the difference in position. In text II, the ugallu appears after the il bitu, the last statue of tamarisk in text I; in text II it appears (restored) among the monsters of clay. Text II reflects a form of the ritual in which the ugallu was made of tamarisk, and is described directly after the il bitu (for the otherwise basically identical sequence of statues in I and II see below, II.A.5.A). Text I does not have room for the ugallu after the il bitu and before the statues of clay, and clearly states that the tamarisk is reserved for the statues of gods (esemti il bitu I 81; binut sam M I 143) while the clay is for the binut aps, the "creatures of aps" (I 144) among whom the ugallu resorts. Actual clay figures of the lion demon (Green Iraq 45 90) further attest to the existence of the ritual as represented by text I. The appearance of an ugallu of tamarisk in text II is probably to be explained by the tension between the nature of the ugallu as a creature of aps and his function as an armed warrior in the first line of defense among the gods of tamarisk (see below II.A.4.A).

17.14
uridimmu, I 186; 2; clay (I), erênu (II); monster.

attributes: broken, perhaps a crescent (II Obv. 47). Text II Obv. 47 informs us that they are clad in yellow paste (im.KALLA).

An inscription for their sides is prescribed in text II Obv. 48: [DINGIR = lu ka-a-a-an], “[may the god of the house always be present]”, and on the left: {LAMMA = lu [də-a-ri]}, “may the lamassu of the house be enduring”. The inscription characterizes the uridimmu as serving the forces symbolizing the well-being and prosperity of the house.

buried: broken (II Obv.48).

The important restoration UR.IDIM in II 47 is based on the following considerations:

1 Two figures from text I do not have unquestionable counterparts in text II: UR.IDIM (17) and ku-sa-rik-ku (18); the fact that text I and II are virtually duplicates (text I has only Lugalgiirra and Meslamtaea extra), and the fact that both figures belong to the core of Ti`mat's army (cf. VII.B), make their presence in text II highly probable.

2 Beside the unidentified intruder of tamarisk (II Rev. 9f., certainly not to be read UR.IDIM or kusarikku in one of its known spellings), text II has two figures not unquestionably identified: II Obv. 45f. (13) and II Obv. 47f. (14).

3 The fragmentary signs in II Obv. 45 suffice to identify the figure named there as the kusarikku (see below, next figure).

4 Only II Obv. 47f. remains for UR.IDIM.

5 The inscription prescribed in II for this figure is attested on a clay figure of a monster (Green Iraq 45 92f. and Pl. XIIIc, XIVb), which contradicts text II where the figure is to be made of cedar. The change from clay to cedar in text II is difficult to understand, since as a member of Ti`mat's army the uridimmu should be of clay like its peers. The use of a third kind of wood implies an extra day of ritual purifications and preparations for which text I certainly does not have room (since figures in text II can only break the sequence in order to be moved forward, the prepa-
ration of cedar should occur after the preparation of the clay; after the preparation of the clay and the description of the clay figures, however, text I continues with different subjects). The alternative solution, that II Obv. 47f. is an intruder from beyond text I, would leave us without uridimmu in text I, and gainsay justified expectations. Is the cedar of text II a mistake influenced by other texts? (cf. text VB, VII.C.5)

Green Iraq 45 92f. describes the monster with the inscription II Obv. 48 as furnished with bird talons and a twisting scorpion-tail. We would rather compare the monster with the one from the North Palace of Ashurbanipal (Barnett Sculptures from the North Palace of Ashurbanipal Pl. XXVI and LIV) and describe it as having lion’s claws and a lion’s tail (dr. Green informs me that this is possible for the figure from Nimrud). In this way the name of the monster with the element ur “dog”, “lion” fits its appearance.

Indeed, since the uridimmu is one of the last unidentified members of the “creatures of apsu” and must have leonine or dog-like features as indicated by its name, the leonine monster from Ashurbanipal’s palace would have to be considered a good candidate for identification even without text II Obv. 47f. [Cf. now A.R. Green Iraq 47 76f.](Green now accepts our identification of ND 7901 as uridimmu, cf. also Green, Visible Religion 3 88 note 23).

18.13 kusarikku, I 186; 2; clay; monster.

attributes: holds a bucket (II Obv. 45). Text II Obv. 45 informs us that they are clad in yellow paste (IM.KALLA).

buried: [ina KÁ KAR⁵] XV u GÁB, “in the gate of the store room right and left” (II Obv. 46).

An Inscription for their sides is prescribed in text II Obv. 46: si-i ṣer-ša[ba] TL.A, “go out [death, enter] life”. These orders laid in the mouth of the kusarikku characterize him as a door keeper. The inscription has been restored after the inscriptions on actual figures of the bull-man (cf. Rittig Kleinplastik 98ff.).

The reading kusarikku in II Obv. 45 is based on the following considerations:

1 For considerations 1 and 2, see above 17. uridimmu.

3 The choice is limited to UR.IDIM or kusarikku in one of its spellings. The signs are fragmentary, but sufficiently preserved to exclude the reading UR.IDIM; therefore we must recognize kusarikku in one of its spellings in II Obv. 45 (text I 186 has ku-sa-rík-ku).

4 In the sequences of monsters from other texts (below VII.A), kusarikku is spelled: ku-sa-rík-ku(m), (d)GUD ALIM and GUD.DUMU.AN.NA; if in similar sequences of monsters in ritual texts GUD.DUMU.UTU (text IV ii 16', after lahmu, ii 23', V i 12', after lahmu, restored after ii 9', VI Col. B 14) were not a spelling of kusarikku, two mutually exclusive monsters would exist, one of them having no Akkadian reading (GUD.DUMU.UTU), cf. similarly already Frankena Tākultu 90. The equation GUD.DUMU.UTU = kusarikku is not known from the lexical texts, but the forerunner of ḫḫ XIII (MSL 8/1 45) implies this equation:
5 The reading GUD.DUMU.d UTU in II Obv. 45 is indicated not only by the traces, but also by the parallel text V i 12; it is beyond doubt.

6 Considerations 3 and 5 lead to ku-sa-rik-ku = GUD.DUMU.d UTU; the equation is backed up by consideration 4.

19.19 girtablulla, I 186; 2; clay; monster.
attributes: none. Text II Rev. 8 informs us that the girtablulla was clad in yellow paste (IM.KAL.LA).
buried: ina KÁ ÚR AN.TA, “in the gate to the roof, upstairs” (II Rev. 8).
No inscription is prescribed for its sides. The fact that the girtablulla is the only figure appearing together with a female of the same species, and their position far from the gate, perhaps indicate a peaceful character.

20.24 urmalullull, I 187; 2; clay; monster.
attributes: none.
buried: ina KÁ mu-sa-a-te XV u CL, “in the gate to the lavatory, right and left” (II Rev. 16).
An inscription for their sides is prescribed in text II Rev. 15: ta-par-ri-ik SAG.-HUL.HA.ZA, “you shall bar (the entry of) Supporter-of-Evil”. The inscription characterizes the urmalullull as a door keeper.

21.22 Lulal, I 188; 2; clay; anthropomorphic/god.
attributes: none, unless the broken second part of I 188 contained a description of its attributes.
buried: ina UB.MEŠ TÜR EGIR-ti, “in the back corners of the courtyard” (II Rev. 13).
No inscription is prescribed for his sides.
At least one of the two gods Lulal and Latarak is not completely human (see above text I/5). There is good reason to believe that Lulal is an anthropomorphic god (cf. below 116ff.) and that therefore Latarak is the monster.

22.23 Latarak, I 189; 2; clay; monster.
attributes: none, unless the broken second part of I 189 contained a description of its attributes.
buried: ina UB.MEŠ TÜR IGI-ti, “in the front corners of the courtyard” (II Rev. 14).
No inscription is prescribed for his sides. For the monstrous appearance of this god see above 21.

23.18 kulullull, I 190; 2; clay; monster.
attributes: none. Text II Rev. 6 informs us that the kulullull is smeared with bitumen and clad in white paste.
buried: ina MŪRU É [x] [ina] KÁ ÚR KI.TA, “in the middle of the . . . room, in the gate to the roof, downstairs” (II Rev. 7).
An inscription for their sides is prescribed in II Rev. 6f.: *ri-*da hi-šib KUR-[i] er-ba taš-mu u ma-ga-ru, “come down abundance of the mountain, enter intercession and compliance”. The orders put into the mouth of the *kululu characterize him as one concerned with attracting prosperity and divine benevolence to the house.

24.17 *suhrumāšu*, I 190; 2; clay; monster.
*attributes*: a [(stick of) *cornel* (II Rev. 4).
*buried*: *ina MŪRU MUD ina MŪRU TŪR, “in the drain (uppu) in the middle of the courtyard” (II Rev. 5).

An inscription for their sides is prescribed in II Rev. 5: *er-ba taš-mu u ma-ga-ru, “enter intercession and compliance”*. The order put into the mouth of the monster characterizes it as one concerned with attracting divine benevolence to the house.

25.25 *dogs*, I 191ff.; 10; clay; animal.
*buried*: *ina KA TILLAx (AŠ.A.N), “in the outer gate” (II Rev. 22).
*incantation*: ENUR.M~ BABBAR.MES, “incantation: white dogs” (II Rev. 22). The inscriptions characterize the dogs as watch dogs.

In the description of the figures certain phrases recur; we will treat these here:

1 IM.X an al/ina ti-l(e)-šū-(nu)/šá la-biš/lab-šū/lab-sat, “he/they/she is/are/is clad in colored paste for/ on his/lheir/her tillu”. The phrase is used to describe the *imut-apkallu* from Eridu of *cornel*, the Sebettu, probably Lugalgirra (restored), the šūt kakki, probably ša ḫēšt ammatu lān-šu (restored), probably Meslamtaea (partly restored), Narudda, all of tamarisk, and the fish-apkallu (10) of clay. Thrice text I replaces *ana tillē* with *ina tillē*, in which cases text II omits *ana/ina tillē* altogether (Sebettu, Narudda, fish-apkallu); this forces us to take the variation *anajina* seriously. The whole phrase is omitted in the description of the *il biti*, and *anajina tillē* is omitted in the description of all figures of clay except the fish-apkallu (10). That the beings and not *NU.(MES)* are the subject of the stative forms of lab-šat is proved by the feminine form lab-sat (II 26; I 139 mistakenly has lab-sā-tu) in the case of Narudda. About the meaning of *anajina tillē* opinions diverge: Zimmern translates “als ... Kleid”, Smith “for ... outer garment”, Gurney “for ... garment”, Hibbert “(auch) über/für ... Waffe?”, Rittig “bis zu ... tillu/Gürtel (als tillu?)”, and CAD L 18a “as a belt”. Von Soden AHw 1358b and ZA 67 240 understands tillu “an Figürchen” as a type of garment, but does not give a translation. We follow von Soden in separating tillu from BE-lu (AHw belu II, ZA 67 240; reading remains uncertain, perhaps also gam-lu); revealing is especially Anzū II 107f. (LKA 1 Rs iii 10f. // STT 21 Rev. iii 107f.): *li-qīql-e-ma BE-lu₄ (gam-lu₄?) ana ār-kāṭar₄ kāt šu-ka-di-ka / nu-[uk-kiš] ab-ri-(e)-šu... (*the execution of this advice is described in the badly broken third tablet CT 46 42 Obv. 5f.*) “take the BE-lu after (having shot) your arrows, cut off his wings ...”; the BE-lu weapon apparently has a cutting edge, it is a sword or an axe; the determinative GIS points to an axe. *Tillū* in ritual I/II is not BE-lu (Hibbert) “(a type of axe)” or any kind of weapon; weapons are described differently, and the apkallū are unarmed (cf. II.A.4.B); “for” (=by way of) should be *kīma* (cf. I 140, GIM ḫu-sa-an-ni) and
the personal pronoun after tillû indicates that it denotes a more general feature of the outfit of the figures. For tillû I propose “uniform”, “proper equipment” (completing the outfit of men and animals), cf. Müller MVAG 41/3 39f. Lackenbacher RA 71 475, von Soden ZA 67 240, McEwan FAOS 4 47157, 143334; it may resemble a belt since it is sometimes “bound” (rakâsu, cf. RA 71 46:254, Ebeling Glossar zu den Neubabylonischen Briefen 246; for an interpretation see below 2.). For proper understanding tillû must be defined by an adjectival or genitival complement. That not all tillû look alike is shown by the fact that the tillû of Narudda is worn by certain priests (RA 71 46:254), and the tillû of the king by a ša-rešû (BiOr 39 21-22:13). Tillû is not simply “belt”; the belts of the figures in text I/II are called miserru (made of bronze or copper) and have actually been found (Rittig Kleiplastik 1.2.1.3. Abb. 6, 1.2.2.1-4 Abb. 9); it is probably not a part of the armour at all, since the ugalû, armed exactly like the gods, does not have tillû, while the unarmed apkallû have. Tillû describes the function of a garment rather than the garment itself in ABL 461 (NAss. ritual): TûG SA5 TûG til-li-e-šû MU4.MU4-su, “(a statue of the dead man of clay) you shall clad him in a red garment, the garment of his tillû”; comparable is TûG til-li-e-šû in SbTU 2 8 iii 14. Comparable also is ritual I/II where ana tillê- is used to describe a function of the layer of colored paste (ana cannot be “by way of”). When tillû describes the function of a garment (or of a layer of paste) it must be translated as a verbal noun; since the derivation remains uncertain (pirs of talâlu, a verbal noun also used concretely? cf. STT 366:12 where tillû is used with tullulu. In that case we should rather read tillû, but the regular spelling with -e- remains unclear), an exact translation cannot be given. The distribution of tillû in ritual I/II seems to indicate that it is a mark of honour; it is used by most gods, some sages, but not by the lower beings who have (mostly) human bodies and are therefore physically suited to wear a tillû (ugalû, laḫnu, Lulal).

The colours for the figures are:

- **IM.SA5** = šaršerru, “red paste”, is used for the ūmu-apkallû from Ur, Sebettu, Narudda, and the third pair of dogs.
- **IM.BABBAR** = gaššu, “white paste”, “gypsum”, is used for the ūmu-apkallû from Nippur and Eridu (distinguished by water drawn in black on the gypsum), the šû kakkî, perhaps Lugalpirra (cf. text IV i’184), four groups of clay apkallû, the laḫmu, the mušḫuššu (?), the kullû, the suḫurmaštu and the first pair or dogs. Only figures clad in white can have details painted on with black paste or bitumen: the ūmu-apkallû from Eridu and the laḫmu have jets of water painted on with black paste; the members of the first group of fish-apkallû have their scales painted on with black paste; the kulûlû is smeared with bitumen, but to what purpose is not stated.
- **IM.G16** = ?, “black paste”, is used for the ūmu-apkallû from Kullab, two of the four statues of Meslamtaea, Latarak, and the second pair of dogs.
- **IM.KALLA/LI** = kalâti, “yellow paste”, is used for the ūmu-apkallû from Keš, the ugalû, the uridimmu, the kusařikku, and the girtabûlû.
- **IM.SIG7.SIG7** = da’mâtu, “dark/dull paste” (cf. Landsberger JSC 21 148), is
used for the ūmu-apkallu from Lagaš, two of the four statues of Meslamtaea, Lulal, and the fourth pair of dogs; here we must observe that the result of colouring a dog with IM.SIG7.SIG7 = da'mātu (I 193) is a UR SIG7.SIG7 (II Rev. 20), a “green” (arqu, after MSL 8/2 14 93) dog, the actual colour of the “green” dog, to be recognized by its inscription, is a “slightly greenish blue” (Gadd RA 19 159). Since the dogs from the palace of Ashurbanipal (=Rittig Kleinplastik 16.1.1-5) conform in all respects to the prescriptions of ritual I/II, such evidence cannot be dismissed as being due to the independence of the ritual texts. That we must expect a term for “(a slightly greenish) blue” is confirmed by blue paint on other figures (Rittig Kleinplastik 225f.). The literal meaning of da'mu may be “matt”, and da'mātu may often have to be translated as “grau” (Landsberger JCS 21 148); here at any rate it denotes a shade of blue (cf. below 000).

IM.KAL.GUG = kalgukku, “orange paste”, is used for the ūmu-apkallu from Šuruppak.

GÜN.GÜN = burrummu, “multicoloured” is used for the fifth pair of dogs. Text I 194 shows that black (G16) was one of the colours; the second paste may have been white (cf. Gadd RA 19 159 where the dog with the prescribed inscription is white with reddish-brown spots. Reddish-brown is a third colour, a mixture, or a deviation from the text).

The colours of some figures are unknown or in doubt: Lugalgirra (perhaps a different colour for each pair of statues of Lugalgirra), ša īštēt ammatu lān-šu, bašmu, mušhuššu; for the urmahltulā and the il biti no colour is prescribed at all.

It is clear that the layer of coloured paste does not always represent a garment; the bašmu, the mušhuššu, and the dogs are certainly naked. Where IM.X is said to be applied ana tilla-, “for …uniforming” the layer of paste does represent a garment. In some cases then (defined by ana tilla-), IM.X, “x coloured paste” is a layer representing a garment and a colour distinguishing the figure in question from other figures; in other cases it is only a colour.

Colours are used to distinguish the members of quite different groups from each other (the ūmu-apkallu of different cities, the figures of Lugalgirra⁴ and Meslamtaea, Lulal and Latarak, the dogs) and to distinguish certain groups from other groups. It therefore seems improbable that all difference of coloration can be reduced to a single value for each colour. Apart from the colours used to distinguish the ūmu-apkallu and the dogs, a certain grouping of colours may be detected: the darker colours (red, black and blue) are used only for gods (Sebettu, Narudda, Mesiamtaea, Lulal, Latarak), the brighter colours (white, yellow) for sages, monsters, the šū tukkī and, if text IV may be adduced, for Lugalgirra (the colour prescriptions of text IV seem to agree with those of I/II).

\[2\] AGA/a-gi-e Nīra-ma-ni-šā-(nu) a-pir/ap-ru lu-bu-uš Nīra-ma-ni-šū-(nu) la-biš/lab-shā, “crowned with his/their own tiara, clad in his/their own garment”. The phrase is used to describe the ūmu-apkallu, the Sebettu, Lugalgirra, the šū tukkī, ša
ištēt ammatu lān-šu, and probably Meslamtaea (restored). In the description of Narudda these phrases are replaced by: ū-šur-ta ša IM.KALLA GIM ḫu-ša-an-ni MŪR-U-ša te-šir 108.BAR.SIG ŠaŠ ap-rat, “you shall draw a design with yellow paste representing a sash around her waist; she is crowned with a red head gear”.

Aglā here does not denote the horned crown; the horns are described separately: ȘLEŠ ZABAR (text I)/URUDU (text II) GAR-nu, “furnished with horns of bronze/copper” (Sebettu, Lugalgirra, šūt kakkā, ša ištēt ammatu lān-šu (restored), Meslamtaea; note that Narudda is not furnished with horns). Since, if the tiaras were of metal they would have been described as such, and since no remains of metal tiaras have been found (cf. Rittig Kleioplastik 130ff.), the tiaras were probably cut in the wood. Although figurines of gods are sometimes clad in real garments (cf. SbTU 2 8 iii 14; the remains of fabric found together with a figure of Niヌsubura, Rittig Kleioplastik 1.1.3 and 226, may not be part of his outfit, cf. Borger BiOr 30 178:25ff.), they may also be clad in garments cut out in the material they are made of (so regularly the garments of the figures of clay); in view of the analogy with the tiaras the latter possibility is the more probable one in the present context.

If we compare the phrases used to describe the garments of the gods with those used to describe the outfit of Narudda, we could get the impression that the gods are clad in their proper garments (ramānī-), but that Narudda for some reason is unusually dressed (her garments are not ramānī-ša, “her own”, but described explicitly); there is, however, a different and less unlikely solution for the omission of *ramānī-ša in the case of Narudda: the gods (and the ūmu-apkallū) wear garments cut “out of themselves” (out of their own wood), while Narudda is crowned with a real cloth gear, and has a sash painted on. This use of ramānī+Suffix is confirmed by an inscription of Sennacherib (OIP 2 108 vi 67, cf. CAD K 349a) where “aladlamme” of marble are described as towering high ina kīgallī ramnī-šunu, “on their own pedestals” about which CAD K 349a remarks: “i.e. made likewise of marble”; it is indeed difficult to imagine why the pedestals should be described as “their own” or “fitting them”.

We are now in a better position to judge the use of the tillū-uniform: the ūmu-apkallū from Eridu, probably Lugalgirra (restored), the šūt kakkā, probably ša ištēt ammatu lān-šu (restored), and probably Meslamtaea (partly restored) wear a colored tillū-uniform over their lubūšu “underwear” (the paint is applied on the wooden figure with cut-in garment “ana tillē+Suffix”); Narudda and the fish-apkallū (10) do not have a lubūšu garment; instead they have tillū, probably cut out in the wood and not separately described (the coloured paste is applied ina tillē+Suffix). The Sebettu have a lubūšu garment which apparently functions as their tillū since the colours are applied ina tillē-šunu.

This interpretation of the text and the proposed generic meaning of tillū are confirmed by the palace reliefs. Gods and sages here generally wear some form of the shawl (cf. Hrouda Kulturgeschichte 25f., 29t., 36f., 40, Madhloom Chronology 70f., Reade Iraq 34 92, BaM 10 36) over a short tunic (lubūšu). Although, excepting the Sebettu, the gods of wood are not represented on the reliefs, we may safely assume that they were similarly dressed. A representation of Meslamtaea identified with certainty on an amulet (text I/6) wears a shawl and a short tunic. The only female genius of the reliefs (Kolbe Reliefprogramme Type XX, Reade BaM
1037) and the fish-apkallu (Kolbe Type II C, Reade 38f.) wear a distinct form of the shawl (Hrouda Kulturgeschichte 25, Madhloon Chronology 71), the deity over a long dress reaching to the ankles, the fish-apkallu over a short tunic. The distinct shawl of the female genius was presumably the same as the one on Narudda, who is not attested on the reliefs but is known to be dressed in a distinct type of tillū (RA 71 46:25') fit for goddesses and transvestites (the kurgarrā and assinnu priests, cf. CAD K 559a). That the lubūšu of Narudda is not described in the text may perhaps be explained from the fact that her legs did not show, which made special treatment of the roughly hewn figure unnecessary; why the lubūšu of the fish-apkallu was not described remains unexplained. The Sebettu are the only gods identified with certainty on the reliefs (Kolbe Reliefprogramme Type XX, Reade BaM 10 37); in conformity with the text in which only they wear a lubūšu garment for tillū, they are dressed distinctly on the relief in question. They wear a long dress reaching to the ankles, but no shawl. Generally speaking, the distinctions made in the text are matched by the distinctions made on stone.

Tilla is not a word for a specific garment, but in fact it often denotes one of the several types of shawl; this explains why rakāšu, "to bind", can be used with tillū. The specific word for "shawl" is not known. It was certainly not aguḫḫu (so Meissner Beiträge I 7f., Leemans Íštar of lagaba 11f., contra: Köcher MIO I 84. In the Göttertypentext, one figure (2) is dressed both in an aguḫḫu and a gadamaḫḫu; the gadamaḫḫu covers the whole body, cf. Wiseman Iraq 22 167, and cannot be combined with a shawl).

One god of the reliefs and other apotropaic art has not been mentioned here (cf. Kolbe Reliefprogramme Type XVI, Reade BaM 10 36). If Green Iraq 45 92 is right (cf. already the negative comments of Kolbe Reliefprogramme 223f.), this god should be identified as the "god of the house" (il bitī) and his wear should be treated here in connection with the description of the il bitī. There is good reason (see 63f.) to believe, however, that this figure is not the il bitī, but Lulal. That he is dressed just like the ugalī and therefore does not wear, a tillū as do the gods of wood, should not be brought to bear on the omissions in the description of the il bitī. The description of the il bitī is certainly defective; text I 142 only mentions him, and text II Obv. 38ff. describes only the gesture of his right hand, the attribute in his left hand and the headband. Although they are not described, there is no reason to believe that he was not furnished with a horned tiara and a belt like the other gods of wood (the distinct outfit of Narudda is also described); most probably he was painted (the only other figure whose paint is not described is the urmahlišu); he was certainly not naked, and once the above mentioned god is excluded from identification, there is no reason to believe that he did not wear a tillū uniform (probably a shawl) just like the other gods of wood.

3 ina KLGAL (štšINIG I 89) pu-ri-da GUB-su-(nu-ti)(I) GUB-az/zu(II) “on a pedestal (of tamarisk) in a walking pose you shall place him/them (I)/he/they shall stand (II)”. The phrase is used in the description of the Sebettu, Lugalgirra, the šut kakkti, ša isētē ammatu lān-šu (restored in I; II has the variant pu-ri-du), Meslamtæa (restored). The reading bu-ri *GUB(DA)/GUB.GUB advocated by some (Gurney AAA 22 6612, CAD K 349a, B 340a, Hibbert apud Kolbe Reliefprogramme
194f.), goes back to a proposal of Smith (JRAS 1926 711 27), who understood pu-
ri-da as a variant of ši-SINIG in I 89 and hesitantly viewed piburidu as a feminine
formation of burat, “read-mat”. The new join K. 8620 (Fig.2) now clearly shows
that in I 89 ši-SINIG is followed by [pu]ri-da (I 90) which makes discussion of the
reading bu-ri superfluous (correct reading already in AHw 880b, followed by Rittig
Kleinplastik 154f.). The “walking pose” referred to by puridu is nicely illustrated
by the pose of the Sebettu on a relief of Ashurbanipal (Kolbe Reliefprogramme
Type XX Pl. XV/1) and that of a representation of Meslamtaea on an amulet
(Text I/6).
The kigallu, “pedestal”, must have looked like the pedestals of the figures of clay
(Rittig Kleinplastik Figs. 3, 11, 42 e.a.); Sumerian ki-gal can have the same mean-
ing (cf. Cooper AnOr 52 132, S. Dunham Foundations 451ff.).

4 mi-sir ZABAR(I)/URUDU(II) ina MŪRU,MEŠ -šú-nu rak-sa(I) rak-su(II), sg.: . . . ina
MŪRU -šú rak-sa(I)<ra-kis>(II), “they are bound around their waist(s) with a
girdle of bronze/copper”, sg.: “he is bound around his waist with a girdle of
bronze/copper”. The phrase is used in the description of Sebettu, Lugalirra, the
šut kakkā, ša ʾistiʾi ammatu lān-šu, Meslamtaea. The exact denotation of miserru
here is difficult to establish. It may denote a simple belt around the waist or a belt
around the waist with a second belt crossing the chest attached to it. Examples of
the latter type belonging to figures of wood have been found (Rittig Kleinplastik
1.2.1.2, 1.2.1.3, 1.2.2.1–4, on reliefs: Kolbe Reliefprogramme Pl. VI/3, VIII/1), but
the former type is known to interchange with it (cf. the ugalJu Kolbe Pl. XIII/3
with the ugalJu Pl. XIII/4, and Lulal Pl. XIII/4 with Lulal Rittig Kleinplastik Fig.
59).

5 e-ri ZABAR(I) URUDU(II) ina SAG.DU,MEŠ -šú-(nu) rak-sa(I)rak-su(II), “he/they
are bound with a headband of bronze/copper around his/her head(s)”. The
phrase is used in the description of Sebettu, Lugalirra, the šut kakkā, ša ʾistiʾi am-
matu lān-šu, Meslamtaea, il bīti (only in text I, where <ra-kis> is omitted). The
e(r)ru headband was correctly identified by K. Deller apud H. Waetzoldt RlA 6
199f. Although the figure in question (R. Barnett SNPN Pl. IV/1 = Kolbe Re-
liefprogramme Pl. XIII/4 and passim) is Lulal and not one of the gods of wood,
we may assume that the gods of wood had a similar headband; only in the case
of Lulal is the headband visible as distinct from the helmet (Lulal has an unusual
and old-fashioned hairdo).

4 Regularities

When the statues, their properties, and their positions are studied more closely, inter-
esting patterns appear. It is possible to isolate groups of statues, each with its proper
purpose, and to understand the purpose of each group in relation to the purpose of
the ritual as a whole (cf. II.B.1.I).

A Statues in the outer gate; the armed gods, the ugalJu, and the dogs

We can visualize the positions of the statues in the outer gate on the basis of informa-

58
tion supplied by text II (above II.A.3).

The exact position of the *il biti* in the outer gate is not indicated in the text. His position here is prompted by text IV i 12 ff., where the Sebettu with Narudda before them are drawn at the right of the gate, and the *šat kakkī* with the *il biti* behind them are drawn at the left of the gate.

The statues of Lugalgirra are placed together with those of Meslamtaea at the right and left of the gate. From the text only their presence in the gate is known; *Maqlâ* VI 141 (cf. VI 15) stations Lugalgirra and Meslamtaea at the right and left in the gate.

For the statues of the dogs the text only gives a position in the outer gate. The dogs are clearly described as two groups of five, and have been placed accordingly at the right and left of the gate. Whether they stand in front of or behind the statues of Lugalgirra and Meslamtaea cannot be decided. Note that the ritual as reflected in the *nisḫu* text II omits the statues of Lugalgirra and Meslamtaea, leaving only the dogs for the defense of the flanks.

Material, nature, attributes, inscriptions and incantations underscore the main function of these figures as guardians of the gate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Left</th>
<th>Additional</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Incantation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebettu</td>
<td><em>qulmā</em></td>
<td><em>patru</em></td>
<td><em>qaṭṭu ḫatlu</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>warriors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugalgirra</td>
<td><em>qaṭṭu</em></td>
<td><em>šillaḫu</em></td>
<td><em>niḫu?</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>warrior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>šat kakkī</em></td>
<td><em>kakkī</em></td>
<td><em>eṭu</em></td>
<td><em>uskaru</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>warriors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One cubit</td>
<td><em>patru</em></td>
<td><em>ḫaṣinnu</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>door keeper</td>
<td>warrior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meslamtaea</td>
<td><em>ḫuṭpalā</em></td>
<td><em>zaḥaṭṭā</em></td>
<td><em>patru</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>god of the watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narudda</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>tīmīṭu</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>same as Sebettu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>il biti</em></td>
<td><em>geets</em></td>
<td><em>gamlum</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ugallu</td>
<td><em>patru</em></td>
<td><em>kakkī</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>door keeper</td>
<td>cf. 1349f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dogs</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>door keeper</td>
<td>only incipit known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material: all figures in the outer gate, except the dogs and in text I the *ugallu*, are made
of tamarisk (cf. above 3.16); figures of tamarisk occur only here in the outer gate (the two figures II Obv. 9f. and 11f. are intruders, cf. II.A.). The wood of the tamarisk used for the statues is called in the incantation to Šamaš (I 81): ēṣemti ilūti, "the bone of divinity". Indeed, all figures of tamarisk are anthropomorphic gods (with the exception of the ugallu in text II; ša išēt ammatu lân-šu, "One cubit", and šūt kakki are designations for nameless lesser deities, whose descriptions indicate an anthropomorphic representation): in I 143 they are called the bīnūt šamē, "creatures of heaven", and are distinguished from the bīnūt apsē, "creatures of Apsû", a designation for the figures of clay. Latarak may be anthropomorphic but is covered by a lion's skin. Lulal is an anthropomorphic god, the only exception to the rule that the gods are made of tamarisk.

**Attributes:** all figures in the outer gate (except the dogs and Narudda) are armed. The other figures are not armed (the pāštē in the mouth of the bašmu is probably not meant as a weapon; he has no hands to use it). We must comment briefly on these attributes:

- *qulmā*, "hatchet", is to be identified with the hatchet held by the Sebettu on a relief of Ashurbanipal (Kolbe Reliefsprogramme Type XX and Pl. XV/1, Read BaM 10 37). In their left hands they hold a dagger (*pātra*). The bow (*qaštu*) they once held was erased to be replaced by the dagger.

- *e'ru*, "cornel(-stick)", is held by the šūt kakki; it is a magical weapon (*kakku*) and identifies its bearer as deputy of the central divine authority (in this context: the gods of white magic), cf. below B. No figure holding two maces or a mace and a stick is known to me from art; below B we will identify the *e'ru* with the mace of the winged gods of the palace reliefs (kolbe Reliefsprogramme Type V, VI); they hold the mace in their left hand, while the other hand greets or holds a sprig.

- *kakku*, "mace" is held by the ugallu and the šūt kakki. In the case of ugallu it is certainly a mace since practically all lion-demons are armed with a mace and a dagger (*pātra*); in the case of the šūt kakki it must denote a specific weapon as well, and cannot mean, "weapon (unspecified)". Since specific *kakku* cannot denote two different weapons in the same text, it also denotes a mace in the case of the šūt kakki. The name *kakku* for the mace of the ugallu (and ḫupalāl for the mace of Meslamtaea, cf. text 1/6) neatly refutes the opinion that a mace held below the lump is not a weapon but a ceremonial mace or sceptre (so e.g. Landsberger Sam'al 89f.226, Douglas van Buren RA 50 101ff., Hrouda Kulturgeschichte 82, 104, Lambert OrNS 45 13f.).

- *hasinnu*, "axe", is held by ša išēt ammatu lân-šu; the figure is not identified on reliefs, and a dagger and an axe belonging to a disintegrated figure of wood have not been found; a single bladed OB axe is identified by its inscription as a hasinnu (Dossin IrAnt 2 pl. XXIII, 12), and perhaps the axe (Rittig Kleinplastik Fig.5) of a clay figure (Kleinplastik 1.2.1.2), also armed with a dagger (in the belt) and a sword, belongs here. Axes and swords belonging in pairs to disintegrated figures of wood (Kleinplastik 24.2.1–9, 22.1.10–8, Fig. 67, 69) might also be adduced. It must be noted, however, that neither type of figure can be unquestionable identified with ša išēt ammatu lân-šu; the former is of clay instead of of wood, the latter is found in a temple (not in a private house) and belongs
to a group of seven (?). Cf. text I/3 for another figure holding a *hasinnu.

Cf. text 1/3 for another figure holding a *h~innu.

*Jutpalu,* “mace with a head of stone”, is held by Meslamtaea (for the identification of this weapon cf. Unger ZA 31 236, Borger BiOr 30 182, Eilat BiOr 39 18). Meslamtaea with his mace appears on an amulet (text I/6); on the amulet Meslamtaea holds the mace in his left hand and the axe in his right. According to *ARM* 21 223:7ff., the *hu-ur-pa-ru-um* has a “top” (*muhhu*) and a “handle” (*napdu*), cf. Durand *ARM* 21 344, 365f.

*zabatù,* “battle-axe”, is held by Meslamtaea. Kassite models of axes inscribed with *ZA.HA.DA* (cf. Hallo BiOr 20 14188, Brinkman *MSKH* 263) indicate that the *zabatù*-axe had a single blade. The figure of Meslamtaea on an amulet (text I/6) on the other hand, holds an axe with two blades. Perhaps the unpublished and cursorily described (Oates *Iraq* 21 112 = Rittig *Kleinplastik* 3.3.1) clay figure with in his right hand a double-bladed axe and in his left a mace, should be adduced here. It cannot be decided whether the axe of the amulet is a deviation from the text, or whether *zabatù* at this time denoted the double-bladed axe. Older attestations do not give information on the nature of this weapon (cf. *OrNS* 55 234, *JCS* 21 114:93, ZA 65 217). At least it can be said that *qulmu* (used also to fell trees I 42, 87), *hasinnu,* *pāstu* (see below), *zabatù* and *pāstu* (I 30, 69, restored) all denote different types of axes. The double-headed axe is certainly expected among them.

*gamnum,* “curved staff”, is held by the *il biti*. The curved staff is one of the tools of the exorcist (cf. *CAD* G 35a, M/2 281a; also of divine exorcists) and as such is in a certain sense a weapon (cf. Durand *ARMT* 21 340ff., Farber *RIA* 6 251f., Kupper *Amuru* 155, 161) against supernatural enemies. In *Šurpu* VIII 41 the *gamlu* which cleanses and the *banduddû* which exorcises are held by certain gods. Other texts show that the *gamlu* cleanses (*ullulu*) and releases (*pa,taru*) (see now also *IEOL* 29 56). Although the curved staff in the hands of a god or sage is not attested either on the palace reliefs or in the *Kleinplastik*, we can be certain that it is the curved staff, the tool of the exorciser, which is meant here by *gamlu*: in the first place, the curved staff in the hands of a fish-*apkallu*, the exorcist par excellence, is attested on a Kassite seal (Porada *CANES* 581, cf. Rittig *Kleinplastik* 88), and secondly, the nameless gods of wood share properties with the sages as is proved by the *e'ru* in the hands of the štū *kakkā*, and amply substantiated by the palace reliefs. The *il biti* uses the *gamlu* to guard his house (cf. I 341).

*karābu:* a greeting gesture is made by the *il biti,* “the god of the house” with his right hand. As a proper host, he greets his visitors at the gate. On the reliefs the greeting gesture (cf. Kolbe *Reliefsprogramme* 47) is made by gods (Kolbe *Type* IV C, V), a goddess (Kolbe *Type* VIII), and sages (Kolbe *Type* VI, IV A, B; cf. Reade *BaM* 10 36f.). The slightly damaged hand of a *girtlabullû* from the Ninurta temple in Nimrud (Kolbe *Type* XI, Reade *BaM* 10 39 and Meuszynski *EtTrav* 6 61ff. Fig. 15, *Iraq* 38 38 Pl. XIV) was probably empty and made the same greeting gesture. In his left hand he holds a sprig, and a sprig in the left hand can only be combined with an animal in the right, or a greeting gesture; enough remains of the relief to exclude the animal. All figures make the greeting gesture only with their right hand.
nipḥu, “sun disk” (if read correctly), uskara, “crescent”, are carried by Lugalgirra and the šut kakki on their heads; sun disks or crescents are not attested on the heads of the apotropaic gods of the place reliefs. Statues of servant gods with sun disks or crescents on their heads appear at the entrances of Neo-Assyrian temples, if J. Börker-Klähn ZA 63 272ff. is right. Crescent-tipped standards belonging to disintegrated figures of wood have been found in Kalhu: Rittig Kleinplastik 22.6.3 (add Oates Iraq 21 112, Mallowan N and R 423, from fort Shalmaneser), and Dūr-Sarrukin: Kleinplastik 22.6.1–2. The identity of the “crescent” found in the mouth of a bašmu (Kleinplastik 22.6.4–5) remains dubious (see below). The fact that these crescents stood on poles (probably to be restored for the ones from Dūr-Sarrukin), and the fact that they were found along with spears, speak against identification of the disintegrated wooden figures with Lugalgirra or the šut kakki. Their presence, however, confirms the prescriptions of the text in a general manner. Perhaps the dNi-ip-ḫu-i-ALAM are to be adduced here (Frankena Tākultu 107); they are possibly sun disk on poles or statues of servant gods with sun disks on their heads. Certainly comparable are the Aš.ME, “sun disk”, U₄.SAR, “crescent” and MUL, “venus” prescribed in the Lamaštu texts (LΚU 33 Rev. 18 // Rm 2,212 11’ = ZA 16 197 cf. Falkenstein LΚU 10¹⁴, Farber RIA 6 442b; the correct reading, based on unpublished duplicates, was communicated to me by dr. Farber) for an amulet against Lamaštu and actually attested on these amulets. The fourth symbolic object prescribed in the Lamaštu text, the gamlu, “curved staff”, is prescribed in our ritual for the hands of the ʾi biti; unless gamlu unexpectedly denotes one of the other symbols commonly attested in the top register of the Lamaštu amulets, it does not occur there. The presence of the symbols of Šamaš (sun disk) and Sin (crescent) probably gives additional protection to the inhabitants of the house and the wearer of the amulet.

timbātu, “harp ?”, is held by Narudda. The presence here of Narudda with her harp is difficult to understand. Perhaps she serves only as a companion to her brothers the Sebettu and is not directly concerned with the purposes of the text; This position seems to be confirmed by the fact that her function is not made explicit by an inscription or an incantation; the incantation to the Sebettu serves Narudda as well. The object held by Narudda remains unidentified.

Inscriptions and incantations: the inscriptions and incantations stress the warlike character and other qualities befitting guardians of the gate.

The incantation to Šamaš I 79ff. contains a statement concerning the purpose of the statues of cornel: they are installed ana sakāp lemātu, “to repel the evil ones”. The meaning of sakāpu here is cleared up by the opposition to šurubu, “to make enter” in I 122; the verb recurs in the inscription of ša istēṭ ammatu lān-šu (I 122) and in the incantation to this figure (I 277). The function of Meslamtaea in text I/6 is described as “to turn away the breast of evil”, a phrase that is used also to describe the function of the ugalu (cf. text I “437” note a). The incantations to the gods of cornel show that they function not only as guardians against the entry of future evil, but also play a part in the expulsion of present evil (I 282ff., 300ff., 316ff., 326ff.). This dual purpose of the installation of the figures of cornel tallies well with the dual purpose of the ritual
(below II.B.1): the expulsion of present evil, and the prevention of the entry of future evil foretold by it. The expulsion of present evil is probably also exemplified in the appearance of the e'ru and gamlu, tools of the exorciser, in the hands of the šūt kakkā and the il bīṭi.

Besides expulsion and prevention, the attributes identify the following additional themes:

- welcoming friendly visitors (il bīṭi),
- protection of the house by Šamaš (sun disk) and Sin (crescent).

**Identifications:** On the apotropaic palace reliefs only the Sebettu can be recognized (Kolbe *Relieftérommune* Type XX). Meslamtaea is represented on an apotropaic amulet (text 1/6). Below (000f.) we will propose to recognize the “nameless” gods or groups of gods (šūt kakkā, ša iššēt ammatu lān-šu, il bīṭi) in the (winged) gods of the palace reliefs. It remains here to rebut the proposed identification of the god with the raised fist of the palace reliefs (Kolbe Type XVI, Reade *BaM* 10 36), the Klein plastik, and the amulets, with the il bīṭi. Kolbe *Relieftérommune* 223f. discusses the same equation, but rejects the identification. We collect the counterarguments here:

1. The sequence *il bīṭi*-ugallu-laḥmu in text II is purely coincidental. The *il bīṭi* is the last god of tamarisk; text II changed the material of the ugallu from clay to tamarisk, and shifted the ugallu accordingly (cf. above 3.16). After relocation of the apkalālā of clay (in text II described after the āmu-apkalālā), the first figure of clay is the laḥmu. For further discussion of the different sequences in I and II see below II.A.5.A.

2. The sequence god with raised fist-ugallu-laḥmu on reliefs is purely coincidental. On reliefs and amulets (but perhaps not in the Klein plastik), the god with the raised fist is completely dependent on the ugallu. He never occurs alone. The ugallu, with or without this god, is the most generally attested apotropaic figure. In the North Palace he appears together with dogs of clay (Rittig *Kleinplastik* 15.1.1-5, Room S entrance b), with the urmahšlilū (Room T entrance b, Room F), and with the laḥmu.

3. The description of the *il bīṭi* does not match the “god with the raised fist” (cf. Kolbe *Relieftérommune* 223f.). The following arguments lead to a more positive result:

1. The god with the raised fist does not appear only on reliefs; he is attested also in the Klein plastik (cf. Green *Iraq* 45 92f.): Rittig *Kleinplastik* 44ff. 1.2.1.1 (arms broken, unarmed; different garment, different hairdo), 1.2.1.1 (right hand broken, unarmed; different garment, but with naked upper body, like the god of the reliefs; found together with a clay figure in lion’s pelt *Kleinplastik* 13.1.2), 1.2.1.4 (different garment), 1.2.1.6-7 (*Iraq* 45 95 XIc (different garment)); Rittig *Kleinplastik* 211ff. restores weapons in all cases, and adduces the gods of tamarisk of ritual I/II for comparison. Whether the figures were armed or not, the gods of
Tammarisk should not be adduced for comparison as long as two gods of clay are still unidentified: Lulal and Latarak (II.A.3. 21 and 22).

Two of the figures of the god with the raised fist (1.2.1.1, 1.2.1.4) show traces of blue paint; besides dogs differentiated from their peers by colour, and fish-\textit{apkallu} from Urartu (\textit{Kleinplastik} 225f), the colour blue is used only for these figures. This corresponds to the colour prescriptions for the figures of clay in the ritual: blue is used for a dog and for Lulal (cf. above 54f.). The text does not prescribe an attribute for Lulal.

Since there is no necessity to restore weapons in the hands of the adduced clay figures, we may just as well restore them after the well attested "god with the raised fist" of the reliefs, and identify the two. The unarmed clay god must be identified with one of the unarmed gods of clay in the ritual, Lulal or Latarak. The colour decides in favour of Lulal. Minor differences between the god of the palace reliefs and the amulets and the god of the Kleinplastik can be left out of consideration.

On the palace reliefs and the amulets Lulal appears only together with the \textit{ugallu}. Ritual I/II prescribes a burial place “in the back corners of the courtyard”, which may have been near the \textit{ugallu}, buried in the passages (of the gate). The figures of the Kleinplastik come from unclear or unspecified contexts and may or may not have been buried together with, or near an \textit{ugallu}.

The god Latarak is the last remaining unidentified figure of clay of ritual I/II (for the other figures cf. below VII.C.11). All that we know of his appearance is that it was not completely human (II.A.3.22). Latarak must be identified with one of the remaining unidentified clay monsters of the Kleinplastik. They are:

1. Löwenmensch (\textit{Kleinplastik} 13).

We base our choice for 1) on the following argument:

a. Figure 2) is unique, figure 1) is well attested (cf. Green \textit{Iraq} 45 91 with previous literature).

b. In accordance with the prescription of the ritual, the lion man Kleinplastik 13.1.2 is painted black.

c. In lexical lists \textit{urgulû}, denoting the regular lion (cf. below II.A.5.c), is equated with Latarak (cf. \textit{AHw} 1429a, Cavigneaux \textit{Texts from Babylon} I 105:10). This points to leonine features for Latarak.

The mention of a figurine of the “daughter of Anu” (Lamaštû) next to a figurine of Latarak in a \textit{NÂ}s letter (Parpola \textit{LAS} 218 Rev. 3ff., cf. \textit{LAS} 2 212) possibly indicates a ritual in which Lamaštû is chased away by Latarak; the same ritual is exemplified on Lamaštû amulet 2 (cf. Ellis \textit{Finkelstein Memorial Volume} 76 Figs. 3, 4) where a lion-man holding a whip, Latarak, chases away Lamaštû.
B Statues in the private rooms; the apkallû, "sages"

In the bedroom (kummu, cf. III.B.6), the "place of life" (AAA 22 88:146f.), at the head of the bed of the threatened man, the seven anthropomorphiC ümu-apkallû, the "leading sages" (cf. II.A.3.1), are stationed. The seven bird-apkallû are buried against the wall at the head of the bed, but in an adjoining room (uncertain, cf. II.A.3.9). At the threshold of the bedroom seven fish-apkallû guard the entrance; two further groups of seven fish-apkallû are buried in front of, and behind the chair. The chair may have been in the bedroom or perhaps rather in an adjoining living-room or dining-room (the furniture of a dining room in the Neo-Assyrian period has been studied by K. Deller and I. Finkel in ZA 74 86f.; it includes a kussiu, "chair", but no bed).

Material: the ümu-apkallû are made of e'ru, a kind of wood well known for its magical properties, but as yet not identified with certainty; Thompson DAB 298f.: "Laurel", CAD E 318ff.: a variety of cornel (followed by AHw 247a), Salonen Wasserfahrzeuge 99, 152: "Lorbeer" (cf., Oppenheim Eames 5471), Civil apud Landsberger Datepalm 2677: "(dwarf)ash" (followed by CAD M/1 221a, M/2 220b, S 202a, AHw 676a), see further Sollberger Genava 26 61 and Snell Ledgers and Prices 211. In the incantation UDUG-HUL EDIN NA DAGALLA (cf. text III.C), that accompanies the fabrication of the statues of the ümu-apkallû, the e'ru of which they are to be made is called: giTUKUL MA.NU: VII u4-mu giTUKUL dAMAR.UTU, "the mace of e'ru: the seven ümu-demons, the mace of Marduk". Here "the mace of cornel" may refer to the seven ümu-apkallû holding an e'ru stick or mace in their right hands. In straight-forward ritual contexts (notes 2, 13c, d, e) "mace of cornel" is rather an alternative designation of the e'ru (stick/mace) itself. The ümu-apkallû certainly did not belong to the binat apse, "creatures of apsû" (I 144); they probably did not belong to the binût šamê, "creatures of heaven", either, since the preceding designation Šalmi annûtû, "these statues", refers to the statues of tamarisk made the same day, and not to the statues of cornel made the day before (I 143). The line closing the description of the statues of cornel does not contain a general term analogous to I 143 closing the tamarisk section; perhaps I 28 did contain such a term, or perhaps no such term was used.

The bird- and fish-apkallû are made of clay, and are included among the binût apsê, "the creatures of apsû" (I 144). They and the other statues of clay are the Šalmi sákîp lemmûti ša Ea u Marduk, "the statues repelling the evil ones, of Ea and Marduk", stationed in the house "to expel the foot of evil" (I 160f. 165f.). The bird- and fish-apkallû are separated, however, from the other figures of clay by a line indicating the end of a section (I 183). In text I the clay of the bird-apkallû is mixed with wax.

---

1 For the notes see p. 79ff.
**Attributes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ūmu-apkallū</td>
<td>cornel(e &amp; wax)</td>
<td>e'ru</td>
<td>breast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bird-apkallū</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>multilu</td>
<td>banduddu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish-apkallū</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>multilu</td>
<td>banduddu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish-apkallū</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>libbi gišimmari</td>
<td>breast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fish-apkallū</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>urigallu</td>
<td>breast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**banuddu**, “bucket”. *Banuddu* unquestionably denotes the bucket held by many figures of the reliefs, cf. Frank *LSS* III/3 671, Zimmern ZA 35 151, Smith *JRAS* 1926 70913, Hrouda *Kulturgeschichte* 77, Madhloom *Chronology* 109ff., Kolbe *Reliefsprogramme* Type IIA, VI, IIB, IIC. The object is attested also in the hands of clay figures: Rittig *Kleinplastik* 70ff. (bird-apkallu), 80ff. (fish-apkallu), 98f. (*kusarikku*). Two buckets from Babylon belonged to unknown figures of wood. The actual figures always carry the bucket with their left hand; the texts prescribe the *banuddu* for the left hand when another object is held in the right hand. When a figure does not hold a second object, the hand with which to hold the *banuddu* is not specified (*kusarikku*, cf. also text V i 12'; *urmaḫlullu*, text VI Col. B:31). Only *Ensimaḫ* in the divergent “Göttertypentext” (*MIO* 1 76 v 21) holds the *banuddu* in his right hand. The *banuddu* bucket is not to be confused with the “flowing vase”, called *hegallu*, “abundance”, in Akkadian (*MIO* 1 106 vi 8). In rituals the *banuddu* was filled with water (cf. *CAD* B 97f.): the exorcist imitates Marduk, who, on the advice of Ea, takes water from the “mouth of the twin rivers”, casts his spell over it, and sprinkles it over the sick man: *VAS* 17 1 i 21ff. (OB) reads: escaped text. What follows is barely readable, but the section ends with: (26') a ā - m - e - sū. In the translation the broken lines have been restored after the late parallels *KAR* 91 Rev. 1ff. and *CT* 17 26 64ff. (bilingual): “take the bucket, the hoisting device with the wooden bail, bring water from the mouth of the twin rivers (cf. Falkenstein ZA 45 32 ad *CT* 17 26 65), over that water cast your holy spell, purify it with your holy incantation, and sprinkle that water over the man, the son of his god”. The effect of sprinkling the holy water is the “release” (*ptr*) of the threatened man (cf. *Šurpu* VIII 41; K 8005+ 33, quoted by Zimmern *BBR* 157 and *CAD* B 79b). The connection between “*banuddu*” and “release” (*ptr*) may have been reinforced by etymological speculation (*d ug₂ = paṭaru*). The escaped text was originally a reed (determinative GI) container (*b a - a n*, cf. Oppenheim *Eames* 108, Steinkeller *OrNS* 51 359) used to carry liquids (*VAS* 17 1 i 21', cf. *Civil Studies Oppenheim* 87; as such it was coated with bitumen: *d ug₈*, “to caulk” (*Oppenheim Eames* 85, Falkenstein *NSGU* 3 110). A *b a - a n - d ug₈ - d ug₈ could be made of metal as well (cf. *CAD* B 79b). The Neo-Assyrian bucket was occasionally still decorated with an imitation of basket-work design, but in fact apparently made of metal (cf. Madhloom *Chronology* 110ff., Stearns *AfOB* 15 25⁴).
mullilu, "purification instrument" (literally: "cleaner"). When it is agreed upon that a word denoting the cone, the most common object in the hands of the bird-apkallu and the fish-apkallu, must appear among the terms denoting objects held by the apkallu in ritual I/II, this word can only be mullilu. The identification of mullilu as denoting the cone is based on the observation that the cone on reliefs, seals and in the Kleinplastik never occurs as the only object held by an apkallu; thus e'ru, libbi gišimmari, and urigallu, the other objects held by an apkallu, are excluded. Klengel-Brandt (FuB 10 3487, cf. Rittig Kleinplastik 215) thinks mullilu denotes "eine Art kurzen Wedel ... der hauptsächlich zum besprengen mit Wasser benutzt worden ist", and indentifies it with the cone. Correctly, but without justification, Parker (Essays Wilkinson 33) states that mullilu, "purifier", "may be the cone-shaped object carried by the genii". Unclear is BBR 26 v 39ff. (restored from 28:9, quoted by CAD M/2 189a), where the king carries a mullilu in his right and in his left hand. Never, on seals, reliefs or as a statue, does a figure carry a cone in both his left and his right hand.

The identity of the cone is still being debated: male inflorescence of the date-palm, or cone of a coniferous tree (cf., with previous literature, Stearns AfrOB 15 2443). In a recent study, the second option is hesitantly favoured (Bleibtreu, Flora 61f., 93f., 123f.). The Akkadian term mullilu does not give a clue. From a philological point of view the fir-cone (terinnu) is preferable to the male inflorescence of the date-palm (rikbu, cf. Landsberger Date Palm 19): terinnu is attested as an instrument bringing about the release of sin (Maqlû 1 24, cf. Landsberger Date Palm 1437) and thus resembles the other objects carried by the apkallu. For rikbu no such use is known.

Regarding cone and bucket, we conclude with the following:

a The bucket is always carried in the left hand. The other hand may be empty, or may carry a variety of objects, such as the sprig (Kolbe Reliefsprogramme Type VI), which occur also in the hands of figures not carrying buckets. The value of the bucket in the ritual cannot be dependent on the objects held in the other hand. The bucket, or rather its content, is effective simply by being present.

b One object, the cone, appears only when the figure in question carries a bucket in its left hand. The value of the cone must in some way be dependent on the value of the bucket.

c The texts indicate that the bucket contained holy water effectuating "release". As was proposed before, the dependent cone "purifier" (mullilu) held in the right hand activated the holy water: it was a sprinkler (Klengel-Brandt, Rittig, CAD M/1 189a).

d The figures carrying buckets (and cones) are engaged in a purification ritual. As will be seen below, this accords well with their function of apkallu.

e Figures carrying cones point their cone at the sacred tree, the king, or courtiers (Stearns AfrOB 15 64f.). Figures standing in doorways and apparently pointing their cones at nothing, are perhaps best thought of as pointing their cones at passing visitors, just as the weapons and the gestures of greeting are directed at the visitors, and not at the building.

f The sacred tree benefits from the activities of the genii, the genii do not need the tree, cf. Stearns AfrOB 15 10ff. It is not necessary to understand the meaning of the tree in order to understand the meaning of the figures with bucket and cone. For the tree we refer to Porada AASOR 24 108ff., Madhloon Sumer 26 137ff., Stearns AfrOB 15 70ff., Genge AcOr 33 321ff., Hrouda BaM 3 41ff., Kolbe Reliefsprogramme 83ff., Bleibtreu Flora 37ff., and passim, Parker Essays Wilkinson 38. For a doubtful connection with the texts, cf. van Dijk Syncretism 175ff., and Lugal 1 10ff. (see below 000).

— e'ru, "cornel (-stick)", ša appa u išdē išātu kabbu, "charred at both ends" (1 46), is held by the ūmu-apkallu. The e'ru stick, often defined as "charred at both
ends” (notes 1, 3, 5a, 7b, 8), is held by the exorcist, imitating Marduk, in his left hand (note 4), by the šāt kappi (note 12a), by the šāt kakki (note 12c), and by the suhurmašu (note 12b). It may also be erected (note 13a), or placed near to or on the head of the threatened person (notes 2, 3, 5a, 5b, 5c, 6, 13d?). It protects the exorcist against the forces of evil (notes 8, 9), purifies the body on behalf of the gods (note 6), puts to flight evil (UET 6 56:64; ends of incantation 1, 2, 5, 7c, 8, 9); when addressed as a tree it gives protection, “sweet shade” (note 7a). The nature of the e’ru stick was determined by Ea (note 5a) or the great gods (note 7a, cf. 6); it is the “august mace of An” (notes 1, 5b, 8, 9), the “strong mace of the gods” (note 7a), and the “mace that hits evil of the u d u g/rābišu-gods” (notes 5a, 6) or of the “u d u g/rābišu-god of An” (note 4). It was apparently An or his deputy (rābišu) who guaranteed the effect of the e’ru stick. The e’ru stick is attested in magical use already in the OB period (cf. 7c, Geller UHF index s.v. m a-n u).

Oppenheim, Eames 5471, on the basis of Akkadian translations (he quotes hattu, hutāru, šabbītu, marrū) and Ur III usage, defined e’ru as “(wooden) stick, staff”; CAD E 320a as: “a native hardwood used primarily for making sticks”. The only attempt at identifying the magical e’ru sticks is Kilmer’s in JAOS 89 374; she identifies the e’ru object with the stick (?) in the hands of Marduk (?) on Weidner Gestirndarstellungen Pl. 2. Even if this identification, based on conjectures and assumptions, proves to be correct, it would not bring us much further than the philological determination “stick, staff”, since the drawing is small and unclear. The use of the e’ru object in magical contexts was discussed briefly by Frank LSS III/3 69f. The texts quoted below in the notes give additional information on the nature of the e’ru object, be it with pain.

The denotation “stick of cornel” is confirmed by the subscript of an incantation (note 8) concerning šu4MA.NU, referring to the object also as šu4PA šu4MA.NU, “stick/stick of cornel” (cf. note 12b). This stick is a weapon (kakku, note 12c), more specifically a mace (kakku, when used as the description of a specific object: cf. note 2, 13c, d, e; probably also when defined by a complement: 1, 2, 5b, 7a, 8, 9), that is: a stick for hitting. Accordingly the e’ru is called a šu4l-d u b-ba, “a wooden mace for hitting the evil one(s)’, cf. Grayson Iraq 37 69 for a NAšn4haltappu, a “mace to hit the evil one(s)’, with a stone head (inscription on a mace head; see Reiner AfO 24 102:8 for the translation lemnāti nuppusu in a late commentary). The texts quoted below (note 4, 5a, 6) indicate that not only the exorcist held the haltuppā mace (cf. CAD Ḥ 53a: ša’4 haltappē = šāpu), but also the u d u g/rābišu, “deputy (god)”. Our suspicion that the mace is the sign of office of the divine deputy, and that the divine deputy appears as the “god with the mace” on OB (and later peripheral) seals, must be substantiated elsewhere.

libbi gišimmari (šu4ŠA GIŠIMMAR, šA šu4GIŠIMMAR, šu4PEŠ GIŠIMMAR, PEŠ šu4GIŠIMMAR cf. below note 14), “offshoot of the date palm” (cf. Landsberger Date Palm 14, 26f., 42), is held by the second group of fish-apkallū; it is held also by the šāt kappi (note 12a) or (a figurine of) the threatened man (notes 11, 12e); together with the e’ru stick it can be placed near to or at his head (notes 3, 5c). The mystical identification of the “offshoot of the date palm” with Du-
muzi (note 10) does not help in determining its ritual function. Although the offshoot of the date palm is held together with the e'ru stick by the exorcist (apkallu, šut kappā), it does not benefit him, but rather the threatened person at whose head it is laid. Leaving aside ritual I/II where the apkallu act in unison, the exorcist never carries only an offshoot of the date palm, and it does not occur in the incantation in which he legitimizes himself as “man” of the gods of white magic; when the exorcist holds it, it is only to bring it to the threatened person. The threatened person on the other hand may hold only an offshoot of the date palm, and its effect is expected to be the removal of his sins (note 10). The present evidence thus indicates that the e'ru stick/mace identifies its bearer, the exorcist or the god or sage he imitates, and the threatened person, as protected by the gods of white magic, especially Ea, while the date palm offshoot is a magical device to remove sin. Only one text (note 6) where the e'ru is called mubbib zumri, “that purifies the body”, does not seem to fit; it must be noted, however, that when, as here, a weapon (kakkū) purifies the body, it does so by force. Purification here probably refers to the result of putting to flight evil, which fears the e'ru mace and its bearer. The mace, identifying its bearer as deputy of the authorities empowered to bring order by force (udug/ rābiṣu), neatly contrasts with the staff (ḥaṭṭu) identifying its bearer as sukkallu, deputy of the central authorities in more peaceful matters.

— ara gišimmari, “frond of the date palm” (cf. Landsberger Date Palm 25f.) does not occur in ritual I/II (or in other rituals) in the hands of the apkallu. It does occur, however, in the hands of the intruders of texts II Rev. 9–10, and in those of the possibly comparable figures of text IV/1 ii 6’f. (cf II.A.2 Rev. 9f.). In view of the similarities with e’ru and libbi gišimmari it is best discussed here. The date palm frond is torn out by dígī-sīgī-sīgī, the gardener of Anu (note 5b, cf. CAD N/2 327a, and PBS 10/4 12 // BBR 27 ii 14, where the same god “gardener of Enlil” is linked with the mulūlu). The verb nasāḥu, “to tear out” (cf. for libbi gišimmari nasāḥu Landsberger Date Palm 26b), used here unexpectedly with ara, and the subscript (Iraq 42 29:88 cf. 40 ad 88 for variant) mentioning gīšeps gīšimmari instead of gīšpa gīšimmari as expected, leave room for doubt as to the correctness of the textual transmission. A plausible reconstruction would replace gīšpa gīšimmari in 65 with gīšeps gīšimmari, omit 73f. (properly at home in the next incantation 115ff. after gīšpa), and correct the subscript 88 to: ka-in-im-ma-gīšeps gīšimmari sāg-lū-ta-ra-gā-gā-da-a-ki 4 (cf. the subscripts 1, 50, and the description of this action in 71). This reconstruction also gives meaning to the sequence of incantations in this tablet: first 5a treating the e’ru stick, then 5b treating libbi gišimmari and repeating the e’ru stick, and finally 5c treating ara gišimmari and repeating the e’ru stick and libbi gišimmari. For these reasons, we take 5c to be the proper incantation for the date palm frond: subscript: ka-in-im-ma... pā gīšimmari lū-ta-ra-a-šu-gīr-bī-kēs-kām, “incantation: ... for binding the limbs of the sick man with date palm frond” (Iraq 42 30:127). Marduk (/the exorcist) is advised by Ea to split (salātu) a date palm frond and bind it on the limbs of the sick man; it will keep nam-ūš-ḥul/mātū lemnu, “evil death”, and sāg-gig-ga/di’u, “di’u disease”, away. In (4), a similar incantation, Marduk (/the exorcist) is
urged to hit the bed of the sick man with the date palm frond which he holds in his right hand. The object is attested in the hands of the exorcist (and perhaps in the hands of the eššēbu, below notes 9, 12d); in this context it is called ša parsī rabāti (note 9), "with important (divine) assignment". It is also held by the figurine of a sick man (note 12d), and used among other things in a ritual reported in a Nāṣr letter (note 13b).

— urigallu, "great protector", is held by the members of the third group of fish-apkallū. Urigallu is a loan from Sumerian, and literally means "great (gāl) protector (ūrī)". The determinative ḡ indicates that an urigallu was at least partly made of reed. In our ritual clay models may have been used. Sumerian ārī, "protector" (Landsberger WZKM 57 16f., Edzard CRRAI 20 160f., Alkhalesi Mesopotamia 12 64f.), sometimes made partly of copper (cf. Cooper RA 76 191 ad Biggs AOAT 25 39), denotes a type of standard "mit darauf gesetzten deutlich und weithin sichtbaren Aufsatz" (Edzard), perhaps originally or especially the gate-post ("Bügelschaft"), the object depicted by the sign ūri (cf. Falkenstein ATU 59, Heinrich Bauwerke 32, 37, Thureau-Dangin ZA 18 130). Since the gate-post disappears from Babylonian art after the OB period (During Caspers IEOL 22 211ff.), while the word urinnu remains in use, urī must have denoted other standards beside the gate-post. Like later urigallu, the Sumerian ārī was "set up", du (zaqāpu), cf. Gudea Cyl. A XX:1, SGL 1 13:45, BL 43:3, 44:3 and duplicates, Iraq 13 28:34, AWL 175 ad vi 1, 389 ad ii 1 (on a field), ASKT 12 Obv. 13. There seems to be no reason to suppose that ārī-gal was anything else than a bigger or more important ārī. If ḫ-dūrī-maš, ḫ-di-UD.NUN and ḫ-di-NUN all denote the same canal Iturungal (see RGTC 2 271), the signs UD.NUN and NUN, originally denoting standards differing from the gate-post, spell the word /urugal/, showing that /urugal/ (also spelled ārī-gal) is not limited to one type of protective standards.

The protection (a n-dūl, cf. below on the incantations of bit mēseri) and shadow (gissu) of an ārī-gal are referred to in a Sumerian myth (EWO 166, cf. Benito "Enki and Ninmah" and "Enki and the World Order" 94); four ḫ-dūrī-gal in an OB Sumerian incantation (OECT 5 19:19) appear in a context similar to that of ritual I/II and other late rituals: after the bed of the sick man, and before a god "lord of the door". The OB God List TCL 15 10:325 (cf. also AS 16 22) includes a god ḫ-dūrī-gal replaced in the canonical successor (An-Anum, CT 24 10:8) by ḫ-dūrī-mašāšū-ma-dī, "twin protective standard", "throne-bearer of Enlil". A ḫ-dūrī-maš is also attested in the OB list (TCL 15 10:128), and ḫ-dūrī-bar, "outside protective standard", is found in an OB temple (UET 6 195 Rev. 22, inventory of objects in a temple). Other deified standards, no doubt originally real standards in the temples of their respective gods, appear in the god lists as sukcallu, "messenger" (CT 25 19:8), and nāgiru rabū, "chief herald" (CT 24 26:124); these functions indicate that on certain occasions deified standards could represent the god outside of the temple. The identification with Śamaš in CT 25 25:21 is probably evidence for the existence of a standard tipped with a sun disk, the symbol of Śamaš (cf. Thureau-Dangin RAcc 1162, Borger ABZ 427). The two moveable ḫurigallu of RAcc 114:8 are certainly deified standards of some sort, part of the temple equipment (cf. RA 41 33:3). The phrase DNī/
DN₂ ... (gi) uri-gal-bi-hé-a, “may DN₁/DN₂ ... be its (of the stable) protective standard” (KAR 91 Obv. 28, Rev. 8), at the end of two incantations, shows that the effect of a protective standard was enhanced by identification with a god. *Urīgalla* of gods (Adad, Nergal or Šamaš cf. Borger ABZ 427, Menzel AT I 276) on chariots accompany the Assyrian army (cf. AHw 1430a); they are probably to be identified with the symbol tipped poles attested in Neo-Assyrian art (Hrouda Kulturgeschichte 106f., Pl. 30/3, 4; cf. Reade Iraq 34 96, Meissner BuA I 92f., Weidner AfO 17 278 ad 53). The spelling *ūrīgal* for Nergal (ABZ 138, 419, 427) may have been prompted by the identification of the god with the standard of his chariot (cf. von Weiher Nergal 100⁴, Menzel AT I 276 with note 3709).

In rituals (cf. already OECT 5 19:19 quoted above) the *urīgalla* are set up to form a magical enclosure; this is clear in *bit mēseri* where fourteen *urīgalla* surround the sick man on all sides (text III.B.4f.). When used to build a magical enclosure in an open field (cf. Caplice OrNS 36 30), the *urīgalla* were apparently rather voluminous bundles of reed (cf. the unpublished text quoted by Reiner Šurpu 61a); they have been plausibly identified (Meissner MAOG 8 19, Parpola LAS 2 198f.) with covers of reed bundles appearing on certain seals (Muscarella Ladders to Heaven no 86, Meissner MAOG 8 18 Abb. 13, AfO 10 161). Such bundles are far too big for the hands of the *apkallū*, and unnecessarily large for use inside the roofed house.

Unlike the magical weapons and purifiers treated above, the *urīgalla* in rituals represent gods or nameless beings. This clearly stems from the “names” given to each of the *urīgalla* in *bit mēseri* (III.B.4f.). Seven of the *urīgalla* in the bedroom represent gods: Ea, Marduk, Ninurta, Nergal, Nuska, Usmû, and Madānu. Since, with the possible exception of CT 16 7:245, the *urīgalla* are unaccounted for in the incantations legitimizing the exorcist and his tools, it is tempting to connect the *urīgalla* representing gods with the gods accompanying and protecting the exorcist in an incantation like 8 below. The other seven *urīgalla* in the bedroom are named by their function; they are life-giving and protective “forces”. Only one of them has a name: Enkum.

Enkum and his wife Ninkum (but cf. JCS 21 11:26+a: *Ninkum ebdu*) are servants at the court of Enki; their function there is not very clear, but the few times that they appear it’s mostly together with an *apkallu*: EWO 103, VAS 17 13:6, CT 17 47 106f. (with Adapa, cf. Geller UHF 56f.), JCS 21 11:25+ af, BiOr 30 170:18f., or in a magical context: UET 6 63 Rev. 8, JCS 33 90:133, CT 17 23:164. Besides being the name of a specific god, *e n k u m / n i n k u m* can also be a functionary in the human (cf. CAD E 168, N2 239, TCS 3 174:112) or divine (Faber-Flügel Studia Pohl 10 p 11) world. An uncertain explanation of the presence of Enkum in the bedroom (kummu) would refer to the unproved analysis of the word *e n k u m* as /e n - k u m/, “Lord bedroom” (van Dijk OrNS 44 60²⁹, already Jensen Kosmologie 491).

The seven *urīgalla* in the gate (III.B.12) are also named by their functions, but unlike those in the bedroom they are all defensive. Three of them are doorkeepers: *lú-sigarrat a/ša šigarī*, “he of the bolt”, *lú-ka-n a/ša bābi*, “he of the gate”, *lú-a-bū-l a/ša abullī*, “he of the entrance gate”. Besides by their names, the function of the standards in the bedroom is also revealed by a general statement: their protection (a n - d úl/sulālu) is life (III.B.4 = AfO 14 148:164f.). We may safely assume that the function of the *urīgalla* in the hands
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of the *apkallu* of ritual I/II was the same as that of the *urigallû* of *bit mēseri*, where they accompany *apkallû* in the bedroom and at the gate: to protect life against intruding evil. The mystical identification with *IV.III.B.1*, the great gods, the sons of *Išhara* (text III.D cf. the comments of Ebeling *TuL* 80, Laessøe, *Bit Rimki* 86 and Parpola *LAS* 2 189f.), does not add to this definition.

No group of seven objects or figures on the palace reliefs comes into consideration for identification with the erected *urigallû* of *bit mēseri* (cf. III.B.4; the *urigallû* are represented by drawings). On another type of monuments with scenes narrowly related to ritual I/II and *bit mēseri*, a group of seven figures that might conceivably be the seven personified *urigallû* does occur. On *Lamaštu* amulets a group of seven (amulets 1, 2, 4, 36, 50, 63) or six (amulet 2, Saggs *AfO* 19 123ff. Fig. 3) human-bodied, animal-headed demons appears. Their right fists are raised in a gesture which, by analogy with the raised fist of Lulal, we would like to view as defensive. They are supernatural powers supporting the sick man and the *apkallu*, both present on the amulets as well, against evil. The alternative view, that the right hand is raised in attack and the seven figures mean to harm the sick man, cannot be totally excluded. Indeed, the identification with the seven evil *utukkû* proposed by Frank should be considered an open possibility in that case. Frank's (*LSS* III/3 11ff.) reasons for identifying this group with the *utukkû*, however, were insufficient (discussed by Seidl *BaM* 4 173ff., Rittig *Kleinplastik* 91, 105, 110, Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* 111ff.). In a quite atypical passage Frank (32), discovered an *utukku* attacking the neck. He concluded — illogically — that the lion-demon called “crusher of the neck of evil” (cf. above text I/4 note to 7a; uncertain reading) is an *utukku*. The lion-demon, however, is now safely identified with the *ugallu* (cf. II.A.3.16). Even those who, in spite of the illogical inference, in spite of the different owners of the neck (evil in the case of the lion-demon and the sick man in the case of the *utukkû*), and in spite of a doubtful reading and the generally atypical character of the quoted texts, still choose to follow Frank (Seidl, Rittig, Kolbe), did not follow him in his next conclusion: the lion-demon/*utukku* is to be identified with the lion-headed figure without bird's claws on the amulets (both figures regularly appear together on the amulets). Later (*MAOG* 14/2 33) Frank thought his conclusion to be confirmed by the “Unterweltsvision”, in which the *utukku* has the head of a lion and the hands and feet of Anzû, and can therefore be indentified neither with the lion-demon/*ugallu*, nor with the lion-headed figure in the row of “demons” on the *Lamaštu* amulets. Once the lion-headed figure was identified, Frank identified the other figures of the row with the other members of the seven evil *utukkû*.

If the seven figures of the amulets are considered to be beneficial, they are to be expected in rituals prescribing the use of their representations, ritual I/II, *bit mēseri*, and similar texts treated below. One fact, unknown to Frank, throws a different light on these figures: on two amulets (19 mostly broken, 61) the human-bodied animal-headed figures are replaced by a row of seven staffs with animal heads (on amulet 25 perhaps by a row of seven triangles). Within the present reach of knowledge, the only group of seven which comes into consideration for representation by animal-headed staffs or “humanized
animal-headed staffs" — if we may thus interpret the evidence — is the group of seven personified urigallū. This identification must remain tentative; new texts or fragments of already known texts may supply a better candidate.

Only ritual I/II prescribes that the urigallū be held in the hand, thus implying a limited distribution and a staff-like appearance for this type of urigallū. Even if the sprig, the frond, and the mace have been incorrectly identified, they certainly do not come into consideration for identification with the urigallū; the only object that does is the staff held by apkallū of the Kleinplastik (bird-apkallu: Rittig Kleinplastik 70, Waetzoldt AfO 28 134; fish-apkallu: Kleinplastik 85:8.4, 90). What is known of the urigallū in earlier ages does not definitively weigh against identification with a reed (determinative gi in text I/II, there executed in clay) pole or long staff; though with ring, “Aufsatz” or animal head, the gate posts of older art, the army standards and the staffs of the Lamaštu amulets could be adduced for comparison. The fact that the staffs of the apkallū in the Kleinplastik do not have separate personalities, however, remains a source of doubt as to the correctness of their identification as urigallū. Klengel-Brandt FuB 10 37 hesitantly identified a “bundle” in the hands of a fish-apkallū (further attestations Kawami FuB 16 12) with the urigallū of ritual I/II; Kawami FuB 16 12 calls this “bundle” “stalks of vegetation”, and identifies - hesitantly - the frond? incised next to the hand with the urigallū. She compares this object with a reed postulated to have fitted into the holes in the hands of certain fish-apkallū (FuB 16 9b = Rittig Kleinplastik 8.2). If, with Kawami, we view the “bundle” as “stalks of vegetation”, it should probably not be dissociated from the various sprigs (libbi gišimmari) held by apkallū and functionally related gods on the palace reliefs. The incised object is perhaps a palm frond, but whatever it is, the history of ûrī ( - ga l) as a longish, staff-like object makes it sufficiently clear that it cannot be an urigallū. As for the object to be postulated for the hole, we may perhaps refer to the short stick held by a fish-apkallū (AAA 18 Pl. LVIII, bucket in the other hand; also adduced above in connection with mullūlu).

Identification of e’ru, libbi gišimmari and ara gišimmari. Before we try and identify these words, we present a survey here of the objects in the hands of apkallū on reliefs, seals, and in the Kleinplastik. The survey is not meant to be complete. It is based on the recent treatments of Rittig (Kleinplastik), Kolbe (Reliefprogramme), and Reade (BaM 10 17ff.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kolbe</th>
<th>Reade</th>
<th>Rittig</th>
<th>Various</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>CS Pl. XXXVj, Ward 684</td>
<td>goat/deer</td>
<td>frond/sprig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IVA, B</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ward 688, Iraq 17 Pl XI/4</td>
<td>greets</td>
<td>sprig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ward 693, 696</td>
<td>greets/sprig</td>
<td>bucket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Hrouda Kultur., 20/11</td>
<td>cone</td>
<td>bucket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>VAR 676, Iraq 24 38:8</td>
<td>greets</td>
<td>mace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Identifcation of ūmu-apkallū on reliefs. The description and incantation of the ūmu-apkallū make it clear that they are anthropomorphic figures of human descent; the material they are made of also distinguishes them from the gods and the monsters and apkallū of non-human lineage. That the horns of divinity are lacking in the description then is not a coincidence (as it is in the case of the il biti). On amulets, in a context clearly defined by the bed of the sick man and the presence of fish-apkallū, only one figure is available for identification with the ūmu-apkallū (see above); this figure serves as a check on any identification of the ūmu-apkallū in the less clear context of the palace reliefs. There is no reason why the ūmu-apkallū must appear on reliefs; the text quoted by Reade BaM 10 38127 may have belonged to fish- or bird-apkallū (text I7). However, the apparent bearing of our rituals on the apotropaic subject-matter of the reliefs, and more specifically the presence of the bird- and fish-apkallū, leads us to expect them. Although ritual III prescribes specific attributes for each type of apkallū, the actual fish- and bird-apkallū of the Kleinplastik show that this specificity is a forced choice between a number of more or less equivalent attributes; we must not expect the ūmu-apkallū to have held only the object denoted by ē'ru, whatever it is; the ūmu-apkallū of the Lamaštu amulets confirm this point. The banduddālī, identified with certainty with the bucket, thus isolates two groups with anthropomorphic members: the (winged) figures with headband and the (winged) figures with horned tiara (we will return to them below). The other attributes of the members of both groups can be matched to the attributes of the apkallū known from the texts; the horned figures, however, must be gods, and since the apkallū are no gods, the figures with the headband should be the apkallū (so Reade BaM 10 37; differently Kolbe Reliefsprogramme 14ff., cf. 41f. 47, 50). The ūmu-apkallū of the Lamaštu-amulets confirms this identification: decisive is the headband defining this type of supernatural beings (this band with daisy-like flowers differs from the diadem with two strips of cloth pendant behind, worn by the king or the crown-prince, cf. Reade Iraq 29 46, Iraq 34 92f.). Unfortunately the headgear of the ūmu-apkallū is described only as āqē ramâni-šunu, "crowns (cut out) of their own (wood)"; āqē denotes a variety of functionally similar divine or royal headgear (CAD A/1 157a). The different dress of the apkallū of the Lamaštu amulets cannot be adduced against identification with the apkallū of the reliefs; differences in dress are attested for the bird-apkallū as well, cf. Kolbe Reliefsprogramme Pl. IV/1 and 2, Iraq 33 Pl. XIVe, Wittig Kleinplastik Fig. 20f; ūmu-apkallū with a shawl covering the legs appear on seals (VAR 675, probably CANES 705).

History. The name-like designations of the ūmu-apkallū are artificial and systematic; they do not even pretend to be historical realities. The names all start with ūmu / ud and may have been grafted on the u₄- and pîrîg-names of other apkallū (Güterbock ZA 42 10³, Hallo JAOS 83 175, Reiner OrNS 30 6). Pîrîg in these names is explained in a commentary to the diagnostic omens as nûru (Pîrîg-gâl-a₄₅–u = nûru rabû ša aṣpi, RA 73 153:2, OrNS 30 3:18') and also Berossos' account of the activities of the first sage, Oannes (S. Mayer Burstlein SANE 1/5 13f.), indicates that the common denominator of ūmu and pîrîg is "light" rather than a monstrous appearance; that personified ūmu denotes the personified day or weather, sometimes visualized as a lion (or leonine monster), in other contexts as well will be explained below (VII.C.4a). For this reason we have translated ūmu in the names of the ūmu-apkallū as "day". The ūmu-apkallū were either antediluvian or postdiluvian sages; without definite proof, we prefer the former
The cities of the ūmu-apkallā (Ur, Nippur, Eridu, Kullab, Keš, Lagāš Šuruppak) can be considered to complement the cities of the fish-apkallā (Eridu, Bad-tibira, Larak, Sippur) as antediluvian centres.

The reason for the invention of a second group of antediluvian apkallā, attested only in ritual III and its close relatives (III.B. and III.C.), may have lain in the necessity of mythologically underpinning the existence of a traditional Assyrian apotropaic figure without appropriate credentials. Support for this view can be found in the combative derpinning of the bird-apkallā, but not with the fish-apkallā; the bird-apkallā are a similar group of Assyrian apotropaic figures, similarly underpinned, the fish-apkallā are genuinely Babylonian. The iconographic history of the ūmu-apkallā is in view of his human appearance difficult to trace; forerunners perhaps are the figures briefly discussed by Rittig Kleinplastik 28, and specimens from Mass times may possibly be found on the seals Iraq 17 Pl. X3, Iraq 39 Pl. XXVII/2A, XXIX/27, ZA 47 55:5, 56:9.

Speculation. The name of the last apkallu before the flood, ūmu ša anā šagši balātu inamdinu, “day that gives life to the slain”, could conceivably be a learned interpretation of the name of the last king of Šuruppak before the flood zi-ud-dī-su-ra; using Babylonian methods (cf. J. Bottéro Finkelstein Memorial Volume 5ff.), u d gives ūmu, š is ES of zi (for š e29) or ra (for šag-gis-ra) gives šagšu, r a gives anā, z i gives balātu, and sū (for š u m) gives nadānu. That this possible derivation actually applies, however, cannot be proved.

II Bird-apkallā: griffin demonstration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kolbe</th>
<th>Reade</th>
<th>Rittig</th>
<th>Various</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>cone</td>
<td>bucket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>cf. BMQ 36 Pl. LVI, AfO 28 134</td>
<td>staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>cf. Iraq 45 88 8</td>
<td>breast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Mass seal: Iraq 39 261 14A here?</td>
<td>frond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kneeling: Layard Mon. 1 Pl. 50/4 = Ravn AfO 16 243 (with cone and bucket). Other activities: attacking animals and monsters, cf. Frankfort CS 202; when attacking, the ūmu- and bird-apkallā do not hold the exercising tools, but weapons, e. g. a sword (CANES 606, 607), a bow (CANES 610), an axe (Delaporte Louvre II 87/14b), a hook (CANES 765, 766, VAR 731), a scimitar (Iraq 33 Pl. X1Ve, CANES 733), and a dagger (CANES 608). Holding heaven (?): AASOR 24 793, AOAT 27 222, AfO 28 38, ZA 52 189, 192f., Orthmann Untersuchungen 320ff. Tearing branch off "sacred tree" (CANES 609). On a garment: Iraq 33 Pl. X1Ve. Identification as apkallu on the basis of ritual III: Smith IRAS 1926 70911, Mallowan Iraq 16 87f., Rittig Kleinplastik 771, 215, Green Iraq 45 88, Reade BaM 10 39, Kolbe Reliefsprogramme 23, Parker Essays Wilkinson 33; sceptical, on insufficient grounds (cf. Rittig, Green, Parker): Stearns AfO 15 264, Porada AfO 28 182 (cf. also AASOR 24 120f., Akkadica 13 5f.).

History: the griffin-demon does not stem from Babylonia; there he is attested first on the assyrianizing robe of Nabû-mukin-apli (cf. Brinkman PIPK 171 1034, beginning of the 1st millennium) holding cone and bucket (King BBS Pl. LXXIV); in Assyria, Syria, and the north he is attested much earlier (Parker Essays Wilkinson 33, Collon AOAT 27 222, on Mass seals: Klenge Brandt FuB 10 24 38, 39), cf. Madhloom Sumer 20 57ff. Thus we are led to believe that a traditional northern hybrid with apotropaic functions was matched in Assyria with a traditional Babylonian literary figure with similar functions. In Babylonia, from MB onwards, the apotropaic apkallā were viewed as partly man and partly carp; in the early first millennium Babylonia takes over the bird-apkallā (BBS Pl. LXXIV), and Assyria the fish-apkallā (Rittig Kleinpastik 27). The first
millennium magical texts of Babylonian origin had to accommodate these foreign apotropaic beings. The bird-apkallû are accommodated in bit mêserî by a slight change of form and sequence of the names of the fish-apkallû (text III.B.10). In ritual I/II they are simply provided with the same incantation as the fish-apkallû.

III Fish-apkallû.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kolbe</th>
<th>Reade</th>
<th>Various</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IIC</td>
<td>Seal CS Pl XXXIIIj.</td>
<td>cone</td>
<td>bucket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38f.</td>
<td>L.-am. 37*</td>
<td>angular obj.</td>
<td>bucket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3609,39</td>
<td>AAA 18 Pl. LVIII, cf. FuB 16 9</td>
<td>stick</td>
<td>bucket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VAR 638, 750, CANES 772f., L.-am.5</td>
<td>greets</td>
<td>bucket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>cf. FuB 16 9 (+stick?), Iraq 45 8916</td>
<td>breast+[stick]</td>
<td>bucket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MBab seal: AFO 28 57I. 30</td>
<td>frond</td>
<td>bucket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>L.-am. 1; R4 16 109 V (seal)</td>
<td>sprig</td>
<td>bucket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MAOG 8/1 20:14 (seal)</td>
<td>dish</td>
<td>bucket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Iraq 17 99 Pl. XI/4 (seal)</td>
<td>greets</td>
<td>bucket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AAS 2 169ff. Pl. II (stele)</td>
<td>stick</td>
<td>sprig2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CANES 581 (Kassite seal)</td>
<td>curved staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Karmir Blur, cf. Kleinplastik 90</td>
<td>[staff]</td>
<td>breast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>cf. Iraq 45 8913</td>
<td>breast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* L.-am. = Lamaštu amulet

Kneeling: not attested.

Other activities: not attested.

Lamaštu amulets: The fish-apkallû on Lamaštu amulet 2 (and 47), exactly like the ūmu-apkallû on Lamaštu amulets 3 and 61, has his left hand on the bed of the sick man. The right hand is slightly damaged, but probably greeting.

Wrong hand: occasionally apkallû are attested holding the bucket in their right hand: AFO 28 57I. 30 (above III/6), Lamaštu amulet 5 (?), Calmeir Reliefbronzen 66 H:8 (bird-apkallû).

Unidentified object: one of the apkallû on CANES 773 holds in his right hand an unidentified feather-like object.

Identification: the identification of the fish-apkallû of ritual I/II with the "fish-garbed" man goes back to Smith JRAS 1926 70913 (based on comparison with the Kleinplastik from Ur); identification of one of them with Oannes has been proposed since the early days of Assyriology (Kolbe Reliefprogramme 26, Zimmern KAT3 535ff., ZA 35 151ff.), but was proved only after the names of the sages in Berossos' Babylianiaka were recognized in cuneiform (van Dijk UXB 18 46ff.). Occasionally the apkallû is mistakenly identified with the fish-man/kulallû (see below, VII.C.9), a completely different figure. U4 - a n (Oannes) and Adapa, a human sage living approximately at the same time, are probably two different figures (Borger INES 33 186, Picchioni Adapa 97ff.). The texts clearly indicate that the fish-apkallû are not fish-garbed priests, but mythological figures, man and fish; they are bûnît apsû, "creatures of apsû", in ritual I/II, purâd tãîmî ... șa inâ nãrî ïbbânâ, "carp of the sea ... who were grown in the river" in text III.B.8 (cf. also Cagni Erra 1 162), and Berossos clearly describes them as a mixture of fish and man (cf. S. Mayer Burstein SANE/JS 13, 19). Their names lack the determinative DINIR, they are no gods, and the horns on the head of the fish (on palace reliefs, not on seals, cf. Kleinplastik 90, FuB 10 35) probably developed from its gills. Berossos calls them "hemidaimones" (Jacoby FGrH 400).

History. In the third millennium a bg a l is the name of a profession: see MSL 12 10:15, ZA 72 174 11 v 3, Bauer AWL 125 4 i 4 (NUM.MEKA×GANAG2), cf. also Barton MBI 2 4 2, Ukg.6 ii 30', III 4 (NUM.MEKA×MEGANA2) UET 8 33:15 and for the same profession in the divine world: TCL 15 10:98 (A bg a l) cf. 85. In OB sum. incantations a bg a l apparently refers to a mythological sage at the court of Enki: IAS 17 13:5 (together with Enkum, Ninkum, and the seven children of Apsû), 16:11, 32:21, HSAO 262:56, PBS 1/2 123:9 //ISET 1 217 Ni 4176:12, OnNS 44 6842, cf. ASKT 12 Obv. 11ff. The "seven apkallû of Eridu", at least in AnSt 30 78 (SB) identified
with the seven antediluvian sages (Anenlilda is among them), are rooted in the third millennium (TCS 3 25:139, cf. Benito "Enki and Ninmah" and "Enki and the World Order" 91:105, and for later attestations JCS 21 11 25+a, Maqlû II 124, V 110 = AFO 21 77, VII 49, VIII 38). The names of the seven antediluvian sages are certainly not as old as the names of the antediluvian kings: they seem to be derived partly from the titles of literary works (Hallo JAOS 83 175f.), and partly from the names of the antediluvian kings. The element en· me· (e 4 n) (and a m· me, a m - i etc.) = en· me· (er$- en) (cf. Finkelstein JCS 17 42 12, Wilcke Lugalbanda 41 96), "lord", in the names of the kings has been reinterpreted as "the lord (en) who makes good (ulO·ga)/ perfects (bl u g.g iI) the regulations (m e)". Although the resulting names are good Sumerian (Lambert ICS 16 74), the consistent difference is telling. The Sumerian of the linguistically rather simple bilingual incantation to the fish-apkallû in bâ m e s e r i (III.B.8) could well be of MB date, and the Kassite seals with representations of the fish-apkallû prove that at this time the later views existed at least partially. These undatable later views connect the named carp apkallû with canonized literature (Hallo JAOS 16 59ff., Hallo ICS 83 175f., van Dijk-Mayer BaMB 2 no 90) and have possibly been developed concurrently.

Literature on the apkallû types: below text III.B.8, 9, 10, 11; Borger JNES 33 183ff., Foster OsN 43 344ff., Komoróczy ActAntHung 21 135ff., 142ff., S. Mayer Burstein SANE 1/5 13ff., Kawami Iran 10 146ff., van Dijk UVB 18 43ff., all with many references to previous literature.

We list here the objects available for identification with e'ru, libbi gišimmari, and ara gišimmari:

goat

**apkallû:** I/1.

Winged gods: Layard Mon. I Pl. 47/4 (on garment).

laḫmu: Layard Mon. 50/7 = Ravn AFO 16 244 (on garment). Barnett Assyrian Palace Reliefs in the British Museum 12 25, followed by Kolbe Reliefpro- gramme 38ff. and Parker Essays Wilkinson 37 identifies with mašcultuppû, "goat hitting evil" of the apotropaic rituals (cf. CAD M/1 365b, also 364b, mašcultappû and cf. cultuppû: cultappû CAD H 231a, Iraq 37 69). The identification is plausible, but deserves further elaboration. Reade BaM 11 84 remarks that the genies carrying goats are the only figures who seem to occupy almost directly equivalent positions in different palaces: they are placed at service entrances.

deer

**apkallû:** I/1.

Winged gods: —

Hybrid: Kolbe Reliefprogramme 12b.

No identification is proposed. Cf. Parker Essays Wilkinson 37, Kolbe Reliefprogramme 31ff., 40, Ellis Foundation Deposits 42f.

frond

**apkallû:** I/1, II/4, III/6.

Winged gods: —

The object is not in all cases incontestably a palm frond (according to Kolbe Reliefprogramme 31 and Bleibtreu Flora 60 the apkallû I/1 holds an ear of corn, according to Parker Essays Wilkinson 38 a palm frond). Incontestably a palm frond: **apkallû** II/4 (PaB 10 Pl. 8/6-7). Identification with ara gišimmari was proposed by Parker Essays Wilkinson 38.

sprig

**apkallû:** I/1, I/2, I/3, III/7, III/9, III/10.

(Winged) gods: Kolbe Reliefprogramme IVC, V, Layard Mon. I Pl. 47/7 (on garment), Iraq 44 94/4 (no wings; on vase).

laḫmu: Layard Mon. I Pl. 50/7 = Ravn AFO 16 244 (on garment), Kolbe Reliefprogramme 12b (hybrid); girtañullû: Kolbe Reliefpro-
A number of quite differently formed "sprigs" have been collected here under "sprig" (for forms cf. Bleibtreu _Flora_ 60ff. and passim). The branch with palmettes and its deformations might well be _libbi gितिमारì_ (Parker _Essays_ Wilkinson 38). The _illuru_, "flower" (Landsberger _Date Palm_ 1752), in the hands of a _lamassu_ (OIP 2 107 vi 33) should be mentioned here.

**greeting apkallu:** I/2, I/3, I/5, III/4, III/9.


_גירתבלולו_: greeting gesture restored (cf. above II.A.4. under _karābu_). The gesture involved has been identified as _karābu_ on the basis of ritual I/II (cf. above II.A.4.A), where _karābu_ is done by the _il biti_ with his right hand. The gesture implied by _karābu_ is sometimes understood differently (Landsberger _MAOG_ IV 296, opened hand to the face; cf. also below III.B.18 + x).

**cone apkallu:** I/4, II/1, III/1.


_גירתבלולו_: Iraq 33 Pl. XVIb (on garment), on seals: Delaporte _Bibl. Nat._ 356, Louvre II 88/12. Identified with _mulilu_.

**bucket apkallu:** I/3, I/4, II/1, II/3, II/4, III/1-8.


_גירתבלולו_: same as above, cone.

Identified with _banduddò_.

**mace apkallu:** I/5.

winged gods: Kolbe _Reliefprogramme_ V.

The mace is always held in the left hand, while the right hand greets or holds a sprig.

**short stick apkallu:** III/3, III/5?, III/10.

Since the short stick held in the right hand is combined not only with the bucket in the left hand, but also with a "sprig" (_apkallu_ III/10), it cannot be simply a variant cone/angular object (combined only with bucket). The short stick and the mace are both candidates for identification with the _e'ru_. The long staff is excluded since it cannot be used as a club.

**staff apkallu:** II/2, III/11, III/13.

Identified with _urigallu_.

**angular object apkallu:** III/2.

Probably a variant of the cone/_mulilu_ (Reade _BaM_ 10 36, 39).

**dish apkallu:** III/8.

No identification is proposed.

**curved staff apkallu:** III/12.

Identified with _gamlu_ (above II.A.4.A); cf. differently Reade _BaM_ 10 38.

**bracelet**

winged goddess: Kolbe _Reliefprogramme_ VIII, cf. Reade _BaM_ 10 36. It is probably the same goddess (no wings) that occurs on an amulet _Budge Amulets and Superstitions_ 98 = Saggs _The Greatness that was_
The limited number of candidates available for identification with e'ru, libbi gišimmari and urigallu enables us to choose a denotation, even when the results of philology are not unequivocal in each case. The sages and the lesser gods of NAss art share attributes and therefore functions: goat, sprig, greeting gesture, cone, bucket and mace. Both can occur with or without wings. The apkallu of the rituals share properties with some of the gods of the rituals: the šuš kappp (II.A.3.4) hold the e'ru-stick/mace, the il biti (II.A.3.8) greets and holds the gamlu-curved staff (attributes also of apkallu in art), the undeciphered intruders of text II Rev. 9f., probably gods since they are made of tamarisk, hold an ara gišimmari (cf. also text IV/1 ii 6'f.; held by apkallu of art), and the šuš kappi, “the winged ones”, of biti mēseri (III.B.6) hold the e'ru and the libbi gišimmari. Like the (winged) gods and sages of art (Kolbe Reliefprogramme IIA, VII; above apkallu I and II) the gods of the rituals sometimes kneel (šuš kappi, III.B.6); kamsštu, “kneeling figures”, probably gods since they are made of tamarisk in ritual II Rev. 11f., occur as well (Ritual II Rev. 11f., Text VI Col. B:25, BiOr 30 178:18).

The designations of these purifying and exorcising gods of the rituals are not names, but descriptions of function or appearance: šuš kakkí, “weapon-men”, il biti, “god of the house”, šuš kappi, “winged ones”, kamsštu, “kneeling ones”. Likewise the purifying and exorcising gods of art are not represented as individuals but as indistinguishable members of a group of lesser gods of similar function, holding more or less interchangeable attributes. Although not an exorcist but an armed door keeper, the nameless god ša iššet ammatu lān-šu, “One Cubit” (II.A.3.5), might belong here; the winged goddess holding a bracelet (Kolbe VIII) may be a female member of the same group.

Without definite proof we propose to indentify the nameless exorcising gods of the rituals with the indistinct winged gods of the reliefs. The “names” distinguish the members of this group according to form or function, but we ought to expect a term identifying these gods as similar lesser gods. The only term available is lamassu (also proposed by Reade BaM 10 36). In view of the many difficulties surrounding this term (provisionally Foxvog/Heimpel/Kilmer/Spycket RlA 6 446ff.) definite proof would require a separate study.

NOTES TO II.A.4.B

1 CT 17 18:8ff.

[šišm]a-nu šiš tu kul-maḥ-an-na-ke šu u-me-ti
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e-[ri] kak-ku si-i-ri šá d4A-nim le-qé-ma
úr-pa-bi izi û-bi-tag
ap-pi u ši-di i-šá-a-tu4 lu-[pu3-ut]-ma
Followed by: “cast the spell of Eridu, and place it at the head of the sick man”.

2 CT 16 21:202ff.:

The gišmanu gištukul kala-ga/ e-ra kak-ka dan-na is to be placed at the head of the threatened king; the spell of Eridu is cast upon it. Cf. the title: gišTUKUL gišMANU ša rēš erši šarri (CT 22 1:15), “the mace of corne1 at the head of the bed”. 

3 Lamaštu III Rev. 16 (4 R² 55 // 79–7–8, 81+143 = 4 R² add. p. 11): gišMANU še KIR4 u SUHUŠ IZI TAG gišŠA.GISIMMAR ina SAG.DU-šá tu-kal-ma, followed by the incantation ĖN UDUG HUL.GĀL SAG GAZ.ZI.DA. Both are to be placed at the head of the threatened child: ina SAG-šá GAR-an. The prophylactic measures in this section of the text are part of the standard apotropaic repertory and not specifically against Lamaštu (cf. Abusch JNES 33 253f.). The incantation is not written out in the incantation tablets of the Lamaštu series.

4 CT 42 Pl. 10:5ff. (cf. Borger AOAT 1 13, Landsberger Date Palm 26, Falkenstein OLZ 1961 371):

The sign read u <dug> above is in fact KINGUSILU; on the basis of the parallel passages (5a, 6) we may assume that the sign stands for UDUG, perhaps = ŠL 578: “KINGUSILU.ŠXTAR”.

5a CT 16 45:139ff. // SbTU 2 1 iii 17ff. (for K 5120 cf. Geller Iraq 42 45 Fig. 3; subscript: ibid. 28:1’): ka-inim-ma gišmanu sag-lú-tu-ra gá-gá-dê-ke4:

The sign read u <dug> above is in fact KINGUSILU; on the basis of the parallel passages (5a, 6) we may assume that the sign stands for UDUG, perhaps = ŠL 578: “KINGUSILU.ŠXTAR”.
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The e'ru is to be present on the head of the sick man constantly.

b  Geller Iraq 42 29:63ff.:

\[\text{d}^1\text{gi-sig}_7\text{-sig}_7\text{ nu-kir}_4\text{-gal-an-na-ke}_4\]
\[\text{d}^\text{MIN} nu-ka-ri-[bu] \text{[GAL ša]}^7\text{d}^\text{A-nim}\]
\[\text{šu-kú-ga-a-ní-ta pa} \text{g}^\text{š1} \text{gišimmar im-ma-an-bu}\]
\[\text{ina qa-ti-šá KÚ.MEŠ a-ra is-suḥ-ma}\]
\[\text{ka-tú}_6\text{-gál-} \text{Eridu}^\text{kí-} \text{ga-ke}_4 \text{lú-kin-gi}^4\text{a-} \text{d}^\text{En-ki-ga-ke}_4 \text{šu im-}\]
\[\text{a-ši-pu Eri}^4\text{-du}_{10} \text{mar šip-ri šá} \text{d}^\text{MIN il-}qé\text{-e-ma}\]

Then the incantation priest of Eridu recites an incantation, and places the date palm frond at the head of the patient.

ibid. 75ff.:

\[\text{g}^\text{iš} \text{ma-nu} \text{g}^\text{iš} \text{tukul-ma}^h\text{-an-na-ke}_4 \text{sag-gá-na} \text{ba-ni-in-gar}\]
\[\text{g}^\text{iš} \text{MANU} \text{kak-ka ši-ra šá} \text{d}^\text{A-nim} \text{ina re-ši-šú} \text{iš-kun-ma}\]

c  Geller Iraq 42 30:113ff.:

\[\text{g}^\text{iš} \text{ma-nu} \text{g}^\text{iš} \text{peš-gišimmar s}ag-gá-na \text{u-m}e-ni-gar\]
\[\text{e-ra lib-bi g}i\text{šim-ma-ri ina re-ši-šú šu-[}u]\text{n}]-\text{ma}\]
\[\text{pa} \text{g}^\text{iš} \text{gišimmar u-meni-sil}\]
\[\text{a-ra su-}lu-\text{ut-ma}\]

Var.: peš-gišimmar.

6  AOAT 113 XXIV (cf. Borger WdO 5 174):

\[\text{g}^\text{iš} \text{ma]_nu} \text{g}^\text{iš} \text{hul-[d}ú\text{b-b}]a\text{-udug-e-ne-ke}_4\]
\[\text{g}^\text{iš} \text{tukul-su-dadag-dingir-e-ne-ke}_4\ldots\]
\[\text{sag-gá-na} \text{a-ba}^\text{n}i\text{-in-gub: e-ra} \text{[g}^\text{iš}\text{8}] \text{MIN?}] \text{[šá?] ra-b}i\text{-ši kak-ka mu-[u}\text{b}\text{-b}i]-ib [zu-u]\text{m-rí šá DINGER.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ \ldots\ldots[ina re-]ši-šú li-iz-zuz}\]

7a  KAR 252 Obv. II,cf Oppenheim Dreams 304222:

32: \text{d}^\text{Utu} \text{g}i\text{š} \text{ma-nu} \text{g}i\text{š} \text{tukul-kala-ga-dingir-e-ne-ke}_4
\[\text{[igi]-zu-šè [da]dag-ga-ám}\]
37: \text{dingir nam-tar-giš ma-nu hé-en-tar-e-ne \text{tu}_{6} \text{-én}\]

In the next incantation the great gods are addressed one by one and invited to determine the nature (nam-tar) of the e'ru. The e'ru is addressed in the incantation II 51ff.:

\[\text{én giš ma-nu giš [tukul-kala-ga-dingir-e-ne-ke}_4\]
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gissu-ga-dûg-ga [x²]-zu-šè gá-gá

"Incantation: e’ru, strong mace/weapon of the gods, created for the sake of your sweet shade" (cf. CAD E 313b). The reading gissu is doubtful, since other text indicate that gissu ends with -n (cf. Krecher Fs. Matouš II 67²³).

7b Castellino OrNS 24 243:6:
[ÉN gi⁺MANU ša KA-šu u] SUHUš-šu IZI kab-bu tu-šam-na-šu-ma
Uncertain restoration based on the observation that the apposition ša appa-šu išdê-šu išātu kabbu does not occur with other ritual instruments.

7c VAS 17 18, cf. van Dijk Syncretism 175, and for the incipit Wilcke Afo 24 1ff. 5:6. A syllabic duplicate is VAS 10 192. No exact canonical duplicate is known but the text shows affinities with the incantation Iraq 42 28ff., STT 230 and the “Kultmittel” incantations of Šurpu IX (1ff. gi⁺ši ni gi, 9ff. di-n-u-uš).

Notes: 1: var. ma-nu di-ma-na. Reading 6-an-na with van Dijk Syncretism 175. 3: var. gu-kû-la; for the covered (šu) vessel gakkul cf. Civil Studies Oppenheim 83, CAD K 59. The syllabic spelling here has not been noted before (cf Lieberman Loanwords no 203).
4: var. ki e-si-ra gi⁺³-i-r. For gir-si.g cf. Sjoberg Afo 20 174, van Dijk Hsao 251, Hallo-van Dijk Yner 3 75. 5: var. kaskal 1-هاš izi ba-an-lá. To my knowledge, the reading hûš for KUD (هاش) is not attested elsewhere; the expression kaskal-هاش, “to break a path” is not known to me; in combination with izi-lá (var.: i-zi ba-an-[]), “to set afame,” “to purify with fire” (cf. Falkenstein AnOr 28 1275), it would perhaps refer to the breaking of a path using sickes of corneU and fire. 6: var. si-la-si-īg. For si-la-si-(ig)/igs-ga, “the silent street” cf. Falkenstein LssnF 189³, ZA 57 110, van Dijk Sgl 248, Hallo Ps Kraus 106; di-bé, var.: di-bé. 8: var. [4Dumu - zi] [...ni-]iš-ta-na [...]/he-[ma-d]i-i-di-bé; the variant implies the reading ġiss₂₃-dam/na for MUNUS₂₃DAM (ها’ inu, حتر). For MUNUS₂₃TAH = ġiss, cf. Alster Mesopotamia 2 118, Jcs 28 125. The ES forms mudna (NFT 209 iv 5, MNS 84, SP 389, Msl 4 17²³) and mudanna (MNS 85) are regularly derived from ġiss₂₃/na rather than from forms based on ni-ta-dam (gi₃t₃am, cf. Krecher Ps Matouš 2 48). If DAM PI in CUN 9 (Yildiz Orns 50 92, but cf. Finkelstein Jcs 22 73) is accepted as a spelling of ġiss₂₃/na, reference should be made to the value ġeštan of PI (Krecher Ps Matouš 2 43). 10: var. sag-ta-ab/[mu ḫe]-a; sag-ta-b = ṭešu, sulalu, “helper, protection” (cf. Falkenstein ZA 49 133, Sjoberg Finkelstein Memorial Volume 191:62). 11: var. sag-ka-al[6]Nin-urta / hu-m[u-u]n-ta-a[b-r-j-i-ri. 12: This line recurs in MS k of the incantation quoted above as 5b (cf Geller Iraq 42 40 ad
The cornel tree, the link with heaven, the cornel tree, the link with the house of An,
its roots are in darkness, its crown is the table of heaven.
Above, it is like a gakkul-vessel, the top is covered with wood,
below, it is like a shoe, the soles are lined with wood,
it breaks a path, clears it with fire.
With Geštinanna of the silent streets it goes about,
and with Dumuzi entering the lap of the loved one it goes everywhere,
so may it be my helper, may it lead me,
and may strong Ninurta lead me.
Evil one, go away from before me!

Incantation for the e'ru(-stick)

The e'ru(-stick) is urged to accompany the exorcist in the silent streets (like Geštinanna) and in the bedroom of the sick man (like Dumuzi). Ninurta is asked to protect him (cf. Falkenstein LSSNF 1 30 and for Ninurta in this function see Ebeling ArOr 21 403ff. passim).

8 STT 230 Rev. 13f. //STT 176 (+) 185: 8'ff.
The exorcist goes protected at all sides by gods (Šamaš, Enki, Marduk, Ninurta Nergal, Ištar and the Ilu Sebettu), and:

\[g1\ as\] \textit{ma-nu g1 tukul ma-h an-na-ke4 sum-un-da-an-[gál]} (var.: sum)
\textit{e-ra kak-ku ši-i-ri ša dA-nim ina qa-ti-ia na-šá-[ku]} (var.: a-ša-bat)
\textit{úr-pa-bi iži ü-tag [nam-šub] ba-an-sum}
\textit{ap-pa šu-di i-šá-ti al-pu-ui šip-ti [a²]-di}
\textit{si-sá al-du si-sá al-ná}
\textit{i-šá-riš a-lak i-šá-riš [a²]-šal-lal}
\textit{eme hul-gál bar-še hé-em-ta-gub}
\textit{li-šá-an li-mut-ti ina a-ha-ti li-iž-ziz}
Subscript: DU.DÜ.BI ÉN an-ni-ti ana UGU gis MANU III-sá šID-ma...

9 CT 16 6:211ff., cf. Falkenstein LSSNF 1 26\textsuperscript{1} (OB forerunner Ni 2320), CT 16 3:86ff.(115: sîl\textsubscript{7} lá i gi-mu-ta, cf. above 7) //SbTU 1 25: 1'ff.

\[g1\ as\] \textit{ma-nu g1 tukul ma-h-[an-na-k]} e4 \textit{sum-mu-un-da-an-gál}
e-ri kak-ku ši-i-ri ša \textit{A-nim i-na šu²-[na-šá-ki]} (CT 16 3:87)
gis pa-gisimmarr garza gal-l[a² šu-m]u² mu-un-da-an-gál
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Then the exorcist, the man of Enki, wishes that the evil forces will not approach his body. Gods who are to protect the exorcist are enumerated.

10 Mayer UFBG 270f. In prayers, together or in isolation, the following phrases are attested:

- **bīnu lillilanni**, "may the tamarisk purify me";
- **maštakal lipšuranni**, "may the maštakal-plant absolve me";
- **giiš.A.GISIMMAR anīqa liptūr lēerti lītīl iluqaddišanni or lipṭṭiršu / lipšuršu / aranšu liptur**, "may giiš.A. GISIMMAR absolve my sins/take away my misdeed/purify me", or "release him/absolve him/absolve his sin". Cf. also Reiner JNES 17 206 and Šurpu 54 with a similar text and the important variant ŠA-bi gi-[šim-ma-ri]. In this context (Mayer UFBG 270, Landsberger Date Palm 1437) and in magical texts between bīnu, maštakal, suhuššu and qān šalāli, giiš.A. GISIMMAR and GISIMMAR are mutually exclusive. The mystical commentary PBS 10/4 i 4–7 (// BBR 27 i, cf. text III.D) explains bīnu as Anu, giiš.A. GISIMMAR as Dumuzi, maštakal as Ea, and qān šalāli as Ninurta. The **terinnu** "cone" adduced above in the discussion of mulilu comes from a similar context.


12a In the hands of šut kappī (cf. below text III.B.6): giiš.MANU giiš.PEŠ.GISIMMAR lē-ra ŠA-bi gišim-ma-ri (AfO 14 149:188f.). Although these figures are not calledapkallā, they too replace the exorcist (cf. below ad III.B.6).

b Held by the suḫurnāšu; Text II Rev.4; both in view of the available space and the fact that giiš.MANU and giiš.PA giiš.MANU do not contrast (above 8), we have preferred the restoration [ša giiš.MANU] na-šu-u in text II Rev. 4 (giiš.MANU in ritual I/II is also attested in the hands of the ūmu-apkallū and the šut kakkū). In text VI Col. B:21 these figures hold a giiš.PA giiš.MANU; giiš.MANU is not attested in this text. Note that the suḫurnāšu does not have hands to hold something with, and that accordingly actual figures of this being never hold anything.

c Held by the šut kakkī in ritual I/II (cf. above II.A.4.A). Since these figures holding a mace (kakkū) and an e’ru are called the šut kakkī, "those of the weapons" and not šut kakkī, "those of the weapon (sg.)", we may conclude that e’ru here is a kakku, a weapon or specifically a mace.

d Held by an eššēbā? Borger BiOr 30 179:41: giiš.MANU giiš.TU.KUL.SAG.NA₄ u giiš.PA GISIMMAR il’ ... "you (the exorcist ) shall hold a mace and a date palm frond, like the eššēbā"; Borger translates: "während er beschwört" (with question marks) and apparently derives iš-ši-bu from wašāpu (expected form: tuššapu, the exorcist here is addressed as you).

e Held by a figurine of the sick man: AMT 59/3, cf. Landsberger Date Palm 14b, 26b: [giiš.PA] GISIMMAR and giišSA.GISIMMAR (for these together cf. also Borger OrNS 54 23:24)
Varia:


b ABL 977:12; VII PA 𒈩G̷I̷Ş̷I̷M̷M̷M̷ AR are used in a ritual.


d 𒈩T̷U̷K̷U̷L 𒈩M̷A.NU ša ina SAG LÚ.GIG GAR-na īl-ma . . ., "the weapon of cornei thas was placed at the head of the sick man, you will take up and . . .", followed by the incantation: 𒈩I̷N̷I̷M̷I.BI.AN.[NA . . .] indentified by Köcher with AfO 16 295:1ff. (against the seven ītuuki), but perhaps an incantation to the seven weapons of cornei (AfO 21 18:43).

e K 8852 (+ K 2547+, cf HKL 2 18 ad AfO 17 358ff): NU VII 𒈩T̷U̷K̷U̷L 𒈩M̷A.NU, "figures of the seven weapons of cornei " (Borger Fs Reiner 31).

Inscriptions and incantations: the names of the ūmu-apkallā (II.A.3.1) show them to be concerned with the procurement of life, plenty, splendor, beauty, and justice; of the incantation to the bird- and fish-apkallā (II.A.3.9ff.) only the incipit remains; here the apkallā are "guardians", maššārā, but of what has not been preserved. The apkallā of incantation I/7 chase away evil by their word; they are the offspring of Ea. In text III.C (AAA 22 90:8ff.) the ūmu-apkallā are the "seven wise ones (esōtēta) who cannot be withstood" and stand at the head of the sick man; by their holy incantation they give life to the sick and put to flight evil.

Position, material, attributes and incantations define the apkallā of text I/II as purifiers and exorcists. They chase away evil and procure life. In ritual I/II the gods (šāt kakki, īl biti, perhaps Narudda) may fulfil similar functions but always in the outer gate. On reliefs and in other art the overlap of functions is more marked.
Also the laḫmu (above “goat”, “sprig”), the girtablullu (above, “sprig”, “greeting”, “cone”, “bucket”) and other hybrids (above “deer”, “sprig”) can be furnished with exorcising tools; in ritual I/II the suḫurmaššu (also in VI) holds the e’ru-stick/mace and the kusarikkku a banduddā-bucket. In text VI a banduddā is held by the urmaḫlullu.

C The rest of the house; monsters, laḫmu, Lulal, and Latarak.

Our information on the positions of these figures is incomplete (II.B.3.13ff.). Clear are only the positions of the girtablullu, the urmaḫlullu, Lulal and Latarak, the kulullu and the suḫurmaššu. The positions of the girtablullu (roof), the kulullu and the suḫurmaššu (not along walls) perhaps help to explain their scarcity in the Kleinplastik (buildings excavated along walls), if the directives of the text were at least sometimes followed. The only figure that is perhaps associated with a specific room is the urmaḫlullu (cf p. 98). He bars, according to the inscription on his sides, the (entry of the) Supporter-of-Evil and perhaps also (?) of Šulak, a demon active in the bathrooms that he guards. A special place among the monsters of clay is taken by the ugallu; together with the gods he guards the outer gate (and is accordingly made of tamarisk in text II), cf. above II.A.4.A. If his companion, the god with the raised fist, has been correctly indentified with Lulal, he was probably not far off.

The inscriptions with the opposition ši...erba, “go out...,” enter...” characterize the figures with this text as doorkeepers (laḫmu, bašmu, kusarikkku, cf. text VI.B where also other figures are supplied with this kind of inscription). Nevertheless, these figures are not always prescribed for doors (laḫmu; the laḫmu of the palace reliefs guard entrances, cf. JEOL 27 102). The inscriptions on the uridimmu, the kulullu and the suḫurmaššu stress divine benevolence and prosperity; similarly the task of the doorkeepers is not only to prevent the entry of evil, but also to let good pass: rābiš šulme, “the deputy of peace” (laḫmu), šulmu, “peace” (bašmu), balātu, “life” (kusarikkku). “Peace” and “life” are the reverse of “enemy” and “cases of death” against which the ritual is directed (II.B.1).

None of the attributes held by these figures are arms:

- marru, “spade”, held by the laḫmu. The spade is held by the laḫmu on palace reliefs (Kolbe Reliefprogramme Type XIV, 102ff., 105) and in the Kleinplastik (Rittig Kleinplastik 51ff., 60ff., Green Iraq 45 91f.). The spade is a well known symbol of Marduk (Seidl BaM 4 117ff., Deller OrNS 53 124), and its presence here is probably to be judged in the same way as the presence of the nipu and the uskaru in the outer gate, and the uskaru in the hands of the uridimmu: it puts the house under the protection of Marduk and thus deters evil.

- paštu is a type of axe; it is held by the bašmu in its mouth (cf. also text VI). Although the paštu can be used as a weapon, this is hardly the reason of its appearance here, since a bašmu without hands cannot use it as such. It may have some symbolic value. The crescent found in the mouth of a bašmu from Ur (Kleinplastik 17.1–2) should be a paštu; at least the two “horns” of the “crescent” satisfy the element TAB.BA “double” of the logogram (ŠEN.TAB.BA).

- uskaru (uncertain reading), “crescent”, is held by the uridimmu. Indeed, actually attested uridimmu do hold crescents (below VII.D.5). The crescent is present also in the outer gate (cf. above II.A.4.A).

- bandudda, “bucket”, is held by the kusarikkku. A clay kusarikkku from Ur (Kleinplastik 11.3.1) holds a bucket. In text VI where paštu, uskaru and (haṭṭi ša) e’ru/
are held by the same monsters as in ritual I/II, the *banduddū* is held by the *urmatullā*. The bucket apparently held the water that was used in a purification ritual (cf. II.A.4.B).

*e'ru*, "cornel(-stick)", is held by the *suḫurrāšu* (also in text VI). Curiously, the *suḫurrāšu* does not have hands to hold it. The *e'ru* is a weapon of exorcists "for hitting the evil ones" (cf. II.A.4.B).

The attributes held by the monsters are of a heterogeneous character. Unlike those of the gods of tamarisk and of the *apkallū*, they do not point to one specific function. Interesting, however, is that the monsters fulfil their protective task unarmed. Although the attributes held by the figures of the Kleinplastik and the palace reliefs are not always in accordance with the attributes prescribed by the text, they are also never arms (excepting the *uγallu* and Lulal who belong to the outer gate).

All beings of clay (including the dogs and the *apkallū*) are called *binat apsē*, "creatures of Apsû" (I 144); thus they are distinguished from the *binat šamē*, "the creatures of heaven", being the gods of tamarisk (I 143). The figures of clay are the *šalmū sākip lemnūti ša Ea u Marduk*, "the statues repelling the evil ones, of Ea and Marduk", stationed in the house "to expel the foot of evil" (I 160f., 165f.). The term *binūt apsē*, referring to apotropaic figures, recurs twice in NAss royal inscriptions (cf. Lackenbacher *Le Roi Bâtisseur* 123 ad Rost *Tigl. III* 76:31 and Borger *Asarhaddon* 87:25).

In a text of Tiglath-pileser III they are made of stone and called "guardians of the great gods"; what beings are meant is not made explicit. The interpretation of the Esarhaddon passage is disputed (Lackenbacher 1234), but if *binūt apsē* is in apposition to *šalmū* and not to *hurāšu* the beings denoted by it do not apparently include *laḫmu* and *kusarikku*, both mentioned separately in the same passage.

5 Differences between text I and II.

A Different sequences of statues

In text I the three groups of figures, those of *cornel*, those of tamarisk and those of clay, are each treated subsequently to the consecration of their respective materials. The sequence of statues in text II is based on the sequence of text I, but text II breaks the sequence to describe related figures together. Both texts start with the description of the *ūmu-apkallū* of cornel, but while text I continues with the figures of tamarisk, text II first describes the bird- and fish-*apkallū* of clay in the same order as I, and only then continues with the figures of tamarisk. After the first figures of tamarisk, the Sebettu, text II continues with their sister Narudda. The other figures of tamarisk follow in the same order as in II. The *uγallu*, in text II properly treated between the other soldiers of Tiāmat's army, is treated in text I directly after the figures of tamarisk; concomitantly its material is changed from clay to tamarisk (cf. II.A.3.16, II.A.4.A; the change is probably explained by the fact that figures in the outer gate are of tamarisk). Thus the basic order, cornel — tamarisk — clay, is retained. Both texts start the description of the monsters of clay with the *laḫmu* and share a basic order.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 laḫmu</td>
<td>laḫmu (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 kusarikku (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 uridimmu (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 bašmu</td>
<td>bašmu (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 mušḫuššu (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 suḫurmaššu (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 kulullā (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 girtablullā (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- intruder (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- intruder (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Lulal (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Latarak (23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 urmahālullā (24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sequence, laḫmu - bašmu - mušḫuššu - girtablullā - urmahālullā is shared by both texts; text II advances kusarikku - uridimmu and suḫurmaššu - kulullā, both in the reverse order, and Lulal and Latarak. The reasons for advancing these pairs are unclear; the analogy with the apkallū and the gods indicates that the advanced pairs are in some way related to their predecessors.

The sequence of monsters in I 346ff. deviates from that in I 184ff. At least it is clear that after kulullā in 348 not merely [u SUḪUR.MĀŠ kām šīd-nu] can be restored; the resulting line would be too short and the preceding lines too full. The proposed restoration advances the pair suḫurmaššu and kulullā (in the sequence of II) to a position after girtablullā (in II after mušḫuššu), and then continues with the sequence of II: Lulal, Latarak, urmahālullā. These restorations, however, remain speculative, and no conclusions will be drawn from them. Both texts end their descriptions with the dogs. The same method of advancing related elements from later in the text determines the relation between Proto-Ea and Ea (Landsberger MSL 2 6) and between S¹ and S² (Thureau-Dangin ZA 15 162ff.).

Two intruders (II Rev. 9f. and 11f.) break the sequence of figures corresponding to text I. They must come from the second part of text I/II, but the reason for their relocation in text I remains unclear. They have been inserted as 20 and 21 after the girtablullā and before Lulal, Latarak, the urmahālullā, and the dogs. These intruders are apparently not monstrous; they share properties with the apkallū (II.A.4.B) and, if anywhere, they might have been expected to be inserted after the apkallū.

Curiously, a figure strongly resembling II Rev. 9f. appears in text IV/1 after the suḫurmaššu and the kulullā, that is, skipping the girtablullā, at the same place as in text II. Since the two intruders of text II are of tamarisk and are totally misplaced among the figures of clay, it seems inexplicable that a second text should repeat the same sequence. It is also highly improbable that a nishu from Aššur (text II) with an uncommon relation to its main text (text I) is related to a (not completely identical) text (text IV/1) from Babylonia. Coincidence?

**B Other differences**
Text I fully informs us on the rituals pertaining to the preparation of materials, on the figures made thereof, on the accompanying incantations and the reasons for their
installation; the purification of the house is described only cursorily (I 242ff.), the ritual with the statue of the sick man (implied by I 156) not at all. Text I has eight statues of two gods (Lugalgiirra and Meslamtaea) more than text II for the defense of the outer gate, but since the outer gate seems well defended in text I too (cf. II.A.4.A), this difference may be unimportant. At least the first part of text II is a nīšu, an extract, and as such less informative. The long introduction of text I is reduced to a single sentence, rituals are not described at all, and of the incantations only the incipit is quoted. Nevertheless on certain points the nīšu is more complete than the main text:

---

Text II specifies the place of interment of each statue; the statues of text I were certainly placed in the house but we are informed of this fact only by coincidence in the incantations (cf. above II.A.3.2, 3, 5, 6; if text III.C is identified correctly with the incantation UDUG ḪUL EDIṈ.NA DAGAL.LA, we are also informed on the place of the ūmu-apkallū, cf. II.A.4.B inscriptions and incantations). The information on the positions of the figures is given by all related texts, and also by text I MS C “430” ff., the continuation of text I after the end of text I tablet I. This does not prove that, after the end of tablet I, text I continued with specifications of the positions of the figures (and perhaps the incantation to the dogs) before it treated further subjects. If text I did not specify the positions of the figures at all, we must suppose that the exorcist followed a general rule (dogs, gods and ugallū in the outer gate, apkallū in the private quarters, the other figures in the rest of the house) of which the specifications in text II are only an instance.

---

Besides minor unsystematic differences in the descriptions of the figures (referred to in the notes; cf. especially the longer description of figure 5 in text I and of figure 8 in text II), text II is systematically more complete in its description of figures 13–20 and 23–24. Text II specifies their attributes and prescribes inscriptions. Here again it must be supposed that the exorcist of text I supplied attributes and incantations on the basis of general rules and common knowledge. It seems highly improbable (and is refuted by the related texts) that text I enumerated all figures again to specify their position and to prescribe attributes and inscriptions for some of them (the attributes of gods and apkallū are specified in both texts). The lack of correspondence with the positions of actual figures (for the palaces cf. Reade BaM 1184; for the Kleinplastik cf. below 183ff.), the interchanging attributes (for the apkallū cf. above II.A.4.B, for the other figures Rittig Kleinplastik passim), and the fact that figures with inscriptions prescribed are sometimes found without them (Rittig Kleinplastik e.g. 2.1 laḫmu, Ismail AFOB 19199 bašmu with “wrong” inscription, Kleinplastik 12.1.1 ugallu, Oates Iraq 21 112 Type V uridimmu cf. Green Iraq 45 92f. for examples with inscr., Kleinplastik 11.3.1 kusarikku, Kleinplastik 9.1.3 kulullū) show that the exorcist did indeed have a certain freedom.

---

Text II quotes the incipits of incantations not present or impossible to restore in text I: the incantations to the ūmu-apkallū, to the bird- and fish-apkallū, and to the dogs. If we have correctly identified the text of the incantation UDUG ḪUL EDIṈ.NA DAGAL.LA recited in connection with the preparation of e're for the ūmu-apkallū, this incantation (below III.C) may replace in text I the incantation to the ūmu-apkallū in text II. The room available in tablet I does not
seem sufficient to accommodate an incantation to the *apkallā* of clay (somewhere between 342 and 346) after the incantations to the figures of tamarisk, or an incantation to the dogs (352-356) after that to the monsters. The dogs of ritual I may have been satisfied with their inscriptions (as are those of the ritual against Lamaštu), the *apkallā* of text I are left without any verbal support. Similarly text II leaves the *muššuššu*, the *girtablullā*, Lulal and Latarak without verbal support, since these figures are uninscribed and the general incantation to the monsters of clay is lacking in this text.

Text II prescribes different materials for two figures. If in the case of the *ugallu* the change from clay to tamarisk is understandable (cf. above A), the change from clay to cedar implies the presence of a ritual describing the consecration of this wood (analogous to the consecration of *cornel*, tamarisk and clay) for which text I certainly does not have room.

C  The second part of text II
The continuation of text II after the text shared with text I, and the continuation of text I in MS C, consist of short thematically related rituals probably collected in KAR 44 under the title *di'ā šipta mātānī šātuqu*, “to make *di'u*-disease, stroke, and plague pass by” (20b, cf. II.B.1.B).

The two intruders of tamarisk (II Rev. 9f., 11f.) probably stem from the second part of the text, but the reason for their being advanced is unclear.

The ships of tamarisk (cf. the uncertain restoration of text V i' 4') laden with provisions and presents (II Rev. 23ff.) probably played a part in the dismissal of evil to the underworld. The dismissal of evil by boat is well attested, cf. Bottéro ZA 73 191ff (etemnu), 191126 (Lamaštu), Zimmern ZA 23 372ff. (Kulla), Landsberger ZDMG 74 442 (māmitu in KAR 74, also a šep lemuttī text, cf. below II.B.1.Ff), KUB 37 61+(?), Maqlû III 128ff., VIII 33ff., IX 52ff. (sorcerers), cf. also text III.B.13+d, Text VI col. B 1ff.

An ārib šadi (II Rev. 23) recurs in text V i' 4', cf. V.C.

The ūr.GU.LA (II Rev. 23, of clay7, 28, of fir), attested also in text III.B.14+× (“with his dogs”) and V ii' 7' (cf. Oppenheim JNES 8 177, 188, AHw urgulā 1b, OrNS 40 148:49), is a regular lion (cf. Heimpel Tierbilder 337; in later texts cf. CAD N/2 193a and 197a ad BaM 248 iv 41) and sometimes the name of a disease (AHw urgulā 1c, Durand RA 73 162) or a musical instrument (Šulgi B 167, SLT 139 ii 8' = MSL 6 157:223, 124:86). Lions are not attested in the Kleinplastik but abundantly in other art forms, cf. Madhloom Chronology 100ff., Reade BaM 10 42, Weidner AfO 18 351ff., referred to with a variety of names (cf. the dictionaries under pirikku, nēšu, urmahāḫu, Iraq 38 90, MARI, 3 45f., ZA 68 115:42ff.). Against Rittig Kleinplastik 218 ūr.GU.LA is certainly not a human being (*Ur.(d)G u·lu·tu*) and ūr.GU.LA with his dogs of bit mēseri is not to be identified with the “Gruppenbild: Man und Hund”.

The identity of the mellā of wood remains completely dark (cf. above II.A.2. Rev. 26).

The drawn *ugallā ša umāši* (in all corners of the house) of II Rev. 35 (cf. IV i' 7b, III.B.13+) are paralleled by (*ugallā*) kīšsurūtu drawn in the gate in I “436”f., cf. IV i' 7b, III.B.13+h.
B Title and purpose; inventory of figures

1 Title and purpose of the ritual

A The "vademecum of the exorcist" (Kar 44) refers to one of the activities of this craftsman as (20a) šēp lemutti ina bū amēli parāsu, "to block the entry of the enemy in someone’s house" (cf. the similar entries in BRM 4 20:24 and STT 300 Rev. 13). This title is followed by (20b): dī’a: šibša mūtāni šātuqū, "to make dī’u-disease, stroke, and plague pass by" (not in BRM 4 20 or STT 300). Bottéro in his recent treatment of Kar 44 (Annuaire EPHE IVe section 1974/75 95ff.) was still unaware of rituals or incantations for this purpose, but recently 20a has been identified as referring to ritual I/II by myself (apud Stol Zwangerschap en Geboorte 1126) and independently by S. Parpola in LAS 2 207 ad 211:11.

B This identification can be justified on the following grounds:

a The introduction of text II, separated by a ruling from the ritual, states the purpose of the ritual as "..... and to block the entry of the enemy in someone’s house". The phrase is repeated in the introductory lines of the additional alternative Rituals II Rev. 30ff. (not present in text I). The corresponding introduction of the extract text (II) is broken at this point.

b One of the phrases by which text I refers to the purpose of the installation of the statues is ana nasah šēp lemutti, "to expel the ‘foot of evil’" (160, restored in 166).

Although the phrase recurs in other texts (cf. below F; duplicates to text II second part cf. II.A.1 K 2481, K 9873), only ritual I/II is a complete and well balanced ritual, and as such the best candidate for identification with the title 20a. Part of the other texts, especially the continuation of text II (Rev. 23ff.) and the related but different continuation of text I in MS C ("430"ff.), are probably to be identified with the text denoted by the title 20b directly following on 20a. These texts treat similar material and may be characterized as collections of short alternative or additional rituals.

C A certain reference to these rituals outside of the magical texts is found in LAS 211 Rev. 11 (Kud-aš [gir hul]-ti). LAS 218:11ff. (d[i-‘u] šib-tu mu-a-nu ana ḫ[u nu te-e]) may refer to 20b rituals but perhaps not to 20a rituals, since the month of performance mentioned in the letter (Kislimu) differs from the month prescribed for 20a in the exorcist’s almanac (BRM 4 20:24, STT 300 Rev. 13; Addar 28). The namburbi OrNS 39 118:1ff., adduced by Parpola LAS 2 212, is in view of its "explicitely royal character" (Caplice OrNS 39 123), also excluded. On the second title of the same letter (13f.), GIG dī’u ana ḫu nu te-e, Parpola LAS 2 212 comments: "certainly referring to the ritual Kar 298 1ff. (ritual II)". He quotes Rev. 40 which shares GIG di-hu with LAS 218:13ff, and has dilipu and mūtānu in excess. As will be seen below (G), it is mūtānu rather than GIG di-hu that is implied by šēp lemutti and should accordingly be expected in any title referring to the texts denoted by 20a or its continuation 20b.
The long introduction to text I can be divided in two parts: a general introduction closing with the all-inclusive "[whatsoever there be, or anything not good that has no name]" (9f.); then, after the general introduction, a much shorter section enumerating evils far less commonly attested and apparently related to the specific purpose of the ritual. The expansion of the purpose of the ritual in the prefixed general introduction is echoed in the text by occasional references to the evil forces enumerated there: gallâ lemmnu (II Obv. 35), râbîṣ lunni (II Obv. 43), Namtar (I 297), Sâghûlhaâza (II Rev. 15), Mātu (II Obv. 46). They are to be repelled, chased away, barred, or urged to get out. In excess to the introduction the text has šegiddimakkâ (I 282) and asâkkâ (I 200). Although the ritual is directed against šēp lemmûtì, the function of the installed gods and monsters has apparently been broadened to prevent the entry of other evils as well. Indeed, the incantation to the statues of Meslamtaea ends (I 306f.): "may anything evil and anything not good recede 3600 'miles' for fear of you". Separate rituals existed against most of the evils of the general introduction, referred to in the "vademecum of the exorcist" (KAR 44) by separate titles: utukkû lemmûtu (7b), Lâmaštu (15c), A.LÁ HUL, lîlâ (cf. 10a), ŠU.DINGIR.RA ŠU.ŠINANNA, AN.TAŠUB.BA, dLUGAL.ḪR.ŠA, SAG.HUL.ḪA.ZA (33f). Many quite characteristic rituals exist against eṭemmnu (provisionally Bottéro ZA 73 153ff.).

After the all-inclusive phrase I 9f., that clearly marks the end of a unit, the text continues with less commonly attested evils. These evils appear together with šēp lemmûtì in other rituals as well and are narrowly related to the specific purpose of the ritual, the expulsion of šēp lemmûtì (below H): [mû]lânû "[plague]", šaggâšu "the murderer",  šibtu "stroke", [di’]u “[di’]u-disease”, ḫibîlu “damage”, sîtu “loss” and finally “[whatever evil]” that [stands] in someone’s house as a sign of evil”, described further by heavily restored phrases for which we refer to the edition. The verb stating what is to happen with these evils, the purpose of the ritual, is lost in the break and our restoration of I 18 is defended below. The last line of the introduction (I 19) must be restored so as to link the ritual to its title and to the introductory line of the nisḫu text II.

Comparable rituals and other texts with šēp lemmûtì.

Text II Rev. 30 ff. and duplicates in other texts (cf. introduction to text II). Of interest for the present subject is the fact that the effect of a magical substance described in II Rev. 38ff and introduced as “to block the entry of the enemy (šēp lemmûtì) in someone’s house” is restated in II Rev. 40 as “murṣu di’u (di’u-disease) dîlîptu (sleeplessness) and mûtânû (plague) will not approach the man or his house for one year”. Šēp lemmûtì is a present evil viewed as (Fig. 6) a sign of evil to come; the evils enumerated in II Rev. 40 are apparently among the expected disorders. This observation, reinforced by the texts quoted below, also serves to connect the two titles of KAR 44 20 a (šēp lemmûtì) and 20b (di’u, šibtu, mûtânû), identified with ritual I/II and its continuation. Yet the existence of these two titles implies a difference between the rituals denoted by these titles. The relative simplicity of the second ritual (the continuation of I/II) perhaps indicates that it was applied in less serious situations; the fact that it was affixed to ritual I/II perhaps indicates that it could be used to strengthen the effect of that ritual in very serious cases.
b Text I MS C "430"ff. and its duplicates (cf. I "434a", "435b") is a ritual
concerned with putting to flight an enemy, and also with šēp lemmuti (STT 218–219
Obv. ii' 25', K 6013+ i' 3', iv' 7). The effect of the ritual is described as (I "438"ff.):
"the evil one and the enemy will be put to flight (irat lemni u aįjābī
turrat, literally: "the breast of . . . will be turned away"); stroke (sibtu), the
šedu-demon and plague (mūtānū) will not approach someone's house".

c Text I/4 7"ff., is an incantation to be inscribed on an uggallu, a monster defen­
sing the house also in text I/II and according to its inscription (mutir irat
lemni u aįjābī) especially fit to put to flight the evil one and the enemy (cf.
II.A.3.16). The incantation urges the monster to block (purus) the entry of
evil (šēp lemmuti).

d An unpublished namburbi, K 10333 (quoted by CAD L 128b, M2 297a), has
(5): šēp lemmuti [parsat (cf. text II Rev. 37) ... ] Uš.MEŠ (mūtānū) ana biī amēli
la iṭehhā, "the entry of evil is blocked, . . . plague will not approach someone's
house".

e The namburbi OrNS 39 118ff. ("ritual for the royal army") to prevent di'udisease, stroke (sibtu), and plague (mūtānū) from approaching the king's horses and
and troops, has a subscript (120:64f.): "the 'foot' (GIR) of evil", di'udisease,
plague (mūtānū), dirge (serhu) and anger (uggatu) (of a god) will not approach
the king's horses and camp". Here šēp lemmuti appears among expected evils
and must itself describe an evil, rather than foretell one.

f KAR 74; cf. Ebeling ZDMG 74 183, Landsberger ibid. 442, CAD S 220a, Seux
Hymnes et Prières 4131, Farber BID 76 and BAM 316 v 4 for the restoration of
the first line: "When a man is constantly gloomy (adīr), worries day and night
(inazziq), death (mutū) and loss (ḥulqu) are 'bound' to him (itti-šu raksū) and
his children great or small die one after the other (iδanuttī), and he has to
bear continuing losses among slaves and servant girls (sū ardi u amti iṛtanaššī),
and death comes constantly into his house (mutū ana biī-šu sadir), evil ap­
pearances and signs are present in his house, . . . . and his god and goddess
are angry with him: [to . . . ] dissolve curse and oath, [to . . . ] and to block the
entry of the enemy in his house". Most of the following ritual is broken away;
apparently a figure of māmītu, personified oath, is provided with food and sent
away. The last word of the introduction is namburbi.

That šēp lemmuti in this text refers to the described evils is evident from the
fact that "to block the entry of the enemy (šeįp lemmuti)" is given as the purpose
of the ritual; the other phrase stating the purpose of the ritual (we ignore the
breaks), "to dissolve curse and oath", refers not to the evils themselves but to
their cause in curse and oath and determines the character of the ritual with
the statue of māmītu, "oath". That šēp lemmuti constitutes a portent is clear not
only from the last word, namburbi, which characterizes the ritual as directed
against anticipated evil, but also from a comparison with the introduction of
ritual I:

1 I 11–12 lists disorders that are not present but are to be prevented from
approaching (cf. Fa above); 13–17 must list disorders that are not present
either, since the verb expressing the purpose of the ritual appears after
13–17 and must cover both the evils of 11–12 and those of 13–17. Clearly,
however, the evils 13–17 are actually present in the house. What is not present is the evil they portend (ana GISKIM ʾUL, I 13), and it is against this approaching evil that the ritual is directed. For this reason we have restored ʾUL-šū, “its evil”, that is, the evil they portend (cf. I 284/5) in I 18.

2 The purpose of the installation of certain figures is described as: ana nasāḥ šēp lemutti, “to expel the ‘foot of evil’” (I 160, restored in I 166). The verb nasāḥu is typically used for the expulsion of evil and in namburbi’s for the expulsion of the evil portending phenomenon that is conceived of as an evil itself.

3 In the incantation to the figures of Meslamtaea (I 300ff.) the purpose of their installation is described as “to expel” (ana nasāḥi) an ill-portending presence in the house, one that constantly screams and causes constant terror and fright, illness, death, damage, theft and losses.

4 The evils enumerated in KAR 74, gloom, worry, loss and repeated cases of death, are comparable to those of text I (14ff., 300ff.); they are described as šēp lemutti in KAR 74 and as ill-portending in text I (13, 301).

These observations allow the following conclusions:

5 From 2) ana nasāḥ x = 3) ana nasāḥ y, the purpose of ritual I/II, that x=y, or, that šēp lemutti is a way of referring to terror, fright, illness, death, damage, theft and losses (cf. Fe where šēp lemutti describes an evil, and FF with a similar list of disorders covered by šēp lemutti).

6 From 1) where we substitute šēp lemutti for the evils of 13–17 after 5), from 3) with the same substitution, and from 4), that the evils described by šēp lemutti portend the approach of further evil.

7 From Fa (and 6) and G (below), that it is in fact mūtānū, “plague”, literally “cases of death” (Kraus RA 65 97ff.), that is foretold by the evils described as šēp lemutti. This conclusion is supported by the specific introduction of text I (above E), and in general by the other šēp lemutti rituals directed at the prevention of mūtānū. It stands to reason that mere occasional deaths, together with ominous happenings, can be described as “foot of evil”, “entry of the enemy”, and can be understood as portending further cases of death, an epidemic, threatening the man and his family with total destruction.

8 From 5), 6) and 7), that, if mūtānū is not to approach, the deaths and ominous occurences (šēp lemutti) portending mūtānū have to be stopped. This concern has given the ritual its title: “to block the entry of the enemy (šēp lemutti) in someone’s house”.

šēp lemutti is attested in OB omen apodoses as a diagnosis of disease: YOS X 20:17: “it is a šēp lemutti; calamities, the sick man will die” (cf. CAD A/1 127a, Bottéro Annuaire EPHE 1974/75 I Ve section 95ff. ad 20a). This omen ties in with the nature of šēp lemutti as discussed above: the diagnosis šēp lemutti implies the approach of calamities and death. Less explicit is YOS X 26 iii 55. The corresponding Sumerian term gîr ḫul occurs once in an incantation concerning diseases among herd animals (VAS 17 32 Rev. 53, OB).
We tabulate here the disorders portended by šēp lemutti besides mútanū. In the table, “I” refers to text I (cf. above E), “20b” refers to KAR 44 20b, and the letters to texts discussed above under F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>20b</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mútanū</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>šibtu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>di’u</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>šaggāšu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>šedu</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>hibiltu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>sītu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>diliptu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>uggatu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>šerḥu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a Perhaps also in the shortened introduction of II and also after šēp lemutti in text IV iv’13’.

**Group A:** In all cases where a text concerned with šēp lemutti lists disorders, mútanū is among them; šibtu and di’u occur regularly but not always. This leads us to believe that it is especially mútanū that is predicted by šēp lemutti. Mūtanū, “cases of death”, may be a general word for plague (cf. differently Adamson WdO 13 9: “bubonic plague”), not connected with a specific set of symptoms. Di’u and šibtu are perhaps specific forms of plague. On the meaning of šibtu opinions diverge (cf. Edzard RIA 5 169b, Cagni SANE 1/3 15f.) but here, between di’u and mútanū, and below B next to šaggāšu (which in its turn occurs together with di’u and mútanū), it can hardly denote anything else than a form of epidemic disease. This denotation is also implied by YOS 7 96:5 (Achaemenid. Reference courtesy M. Stol) where šibtu occurs among animals.

**Group B:** Personified disease: šaggāšu, “killer-(demon)”, šedu, “šedu-demon”. Note that šaggāšu, “murder”, a name implying a demonic agent (murderer), occurs among epidemic diseases elsewhere: di’u šaggāšu mútanū (Antagal 8:3), di’u šibtu šaggāšu (YOS I 43:19, both from CAD D 165a), šaggāšu mútanū (Wiseman Treaties 456, from CAD M/2 297a), bēl šibtu u šaggāšti (Nergal; AHw 1127a, von Weiher Nergal 861). If šedu is correctly identified with the human-headed bull (Kolbe Reliefprogramme Type I, Reade BaM 10 41, Vorys Canby Iraq 33 39f.), we may recognize the evil šedu in the human-headed bull chased by akpallū, gods, and monsters on NAsh seals (Frankfort CS 201, Unger RLV 8 “Mischwesen” § 16).

**Group C:** “Damage”, “loss” and “sleeplessness” (all from text I/II) refer to the evils that constitute a šēp lemutti, cf. Fг, I 16f., I 303f. Their continued presence would prove the ritual unsuccessful.

**Group D:** “Anger” probably refers to divine anger as a possible source of disorder.

**Group E:** “dirge” refers to the song of the kalā, “chanter”, who officiates in apotropaic rituals especially when they concern the king and divine anger (cf. Fe above, LAS
In a way these songs prove the presence of evil and may therefore have been considered unpleasant and undesired.

**H** Deaths and ominous happenings in the house can be diagnosed as šēp lemuttī, “foot of evil”, “entry of the enemy”, a diagnosis that implies the expectation of further entries of the enemy, increasing deaths, mūtanā, “cases of death”, “plague”. The connection between the diagnosis and the prognosis points to a metaphoric understanding of plague as an inimical army entering the country in ever growing numbers, taking possession of it house by house, killing owners, slaves and cattle. The following observations point in the same direction:

- Analogous to the personification of disease and death in general (Mūtu, “Death”, Namtar, “Fate”) we can expect personified forces representing “cases of death” (mūtanā). The word mūtanā does not have this derived meaning (cf. CAD M/2 296f). The personifications appear under other names and are kept separate from their deadly effect.

- One of the evils foretold by šēp lemuttī is šaggāšu, “killer” (-demon).

- “Putting to flight the evildoer and the enemy” is one of the goals of šēp lemuttī texts (cf. Fb, Fc, text I/6:3f.) and the special assignment of the ugallu (Fc, I/4 5’, 7’) is one of the most generally attested figure both in apotropaic art and in the rituals. The same ugallu is urged in I/4 9’ to block the entry of the enemy, which indicates the identity of the entering enemy and of the enemy put to flight. The “evildoer” and the “enemy” (lemnu and aijābu) recur in the address to the “statue of tamarisk” (1277) that repels the evildoer and the enemy (sākip lemnī u aijābu) and in the incantations to, or inscriptions on other figures (201, 205, 296f., 314, 316). A general designation for figures of door men is sākip lemnūti, “that repel the evildoers”; indeed, we expect the evils opposed by armed gods and monsters to be susceptible to the application of force, and to be of the same kind as the defenders. On an amulet (Thompson Iraq 17 111, 128 no 41, cf. Reiner JNES 19 151) šibbu, di’u and šibu, are called [HUN]-nu-ti dār-ra, “the evildoers of Erra”. Other occurrences of lemnu and aijābu are discussed by Elat in BiOr 39 11f. (cf. also ABRT I 81:13).

- The representation of diseases as soldiers in the army of Nergal is also attested in the MB Myth Nergal and Ereškigal (Knudtzon EA 357). Ea gives Nergal fourteen diseases to accompany him to the Netherworld (EA p.972:46ff.). They hold the gates of the palace of Ereškigal, while Nergal penetrates into its innermost parts (972:67ff.). The seven warriors (dSebettu) which Anu gives to Erra to be his fierce weapons and to kill men and beast, are also to be adduced here (Cagni Erra 62:39ff.).

**I** We can now summarize the purpose of the ritual as the expulsion of present evil and the prevention of the entry of similar evil portended by it. The measures prescribed by the ritual are in line with its purpose. The expulsion of evil by the exorcist (cursorily treated I 234ff.), centering on the purification of the house and culminating in the exit of evil (1265), reappears as a secondary theme of the installation of gods and monsters, and as the main theme of the installation of the apkallū, purifiers and exorcists whose presence continuously protects the inhabitants against evil influences. The defence
against demonic intruders is the main task of gods and monsters stationed in the outer gate and at strategic points inside the house (cf. II.A.4.A–C).

Finally, it must be noted that the directives of ritual I/II, in which the house has already been erected and the installation of figures is prompted by the observation and interpretation of certain occurrences, do not cover the installation of apotropaic orthostats in the palaces, erected simultaneously with the building. Nevertheless, there is good reason to judge these apotropaic orthostats after the directives of ritual I/II:

- The inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian kings, the builders of the palaces, occasionally refer to the figures and the reasons for their installation; *irta lemmi turrur*, “to put the enemy to flight” (Borger *AfOB* 9 62 B:43), is one of the reasons. Other royal inscriptions stress their function as guardians of the gate (e.g. *CAD* M/1 343b; cf. B. Engel, Darstellungen von Dämonen und Tieren in assyrischen Palästen und Tempeln nach den schriftlichen Quellen [1987], 104ff.).

- More specifically, the inscription on a fragmentary slab accompanying an *ugallu* (text I/4 4′f. with notes) and the context in which the same incantation appears on a tablet, show that the *ugallu* of the orthostats had the same function as the *ugallu* of text I/II. A second inscription (text I/7) belonging to *apkallu* on orthostats is not duplicated in the rituals, but like the *apkallu* of text I/II those of the inscription are exorcists.

- The fragmentary building rituals (text IV, IV/1, V) prescribing figures of apotropaic beings and thus suitable candidates (note the doubtful *bāb ekallim* in IV/1 i′ 8′), or at least analogies to suitable candidates, for covering the apotropaic subjects of the palaces, differ in only minor details from text I/II in as far as the use of figures is concerned (same set of figures, same attributes and inscriptions). The dogs (Rittig *Kleinplastik* 16.1.1–5) and the *urnahlullu* (Barnett *SNPAN* 40) from Ashurbanipal’s palace in Nineveh bearing inscriptions identical to those prescribed in ritual I/II (I 191ff., II Rev. 15ff.) witness to the comparability of ritual I/II and the building ritual covering the apotropaic figures of the palaces.

The widespread use of apotropaic figures in Neo-Assyrian palaces indicates that their installation did not depend on the interpretation of specific ominous occurrences before or during the building. Their installation is part of any building program and was perhaps prompted by doubts about divine approval and protection, which, if withheld, would make the house liable to attacks of evil. Divine disapproval is probably the source of the impurity of the gate, at least one of the reasons for the application of ritual IV (cf. iv′ 5′) and the subsidiary ritual II Rev. 38–40 (cf. 41).

However, the differences between ritual I/II and the perhaps unwritten ritual covering the installation of apotropaic figures in palaces cannot be overlooked. Firstly, the relief programs evolve (cf. Kolbe *Relieffiguren* 150ff.); the stress shifts from exorcist *apkallu* and gods (cf. II.A.4.B) to apotropaic guardians. No palace uses exactly the figures that are prescribed by text I/II. To a certain degree metal and clay figures may have complemented the “relief programs” of the palaces; metal figures are known from royal inscriptions (cf. provisionally *CAD* s.v. *lamassu*, *aladamnū*, *apsatū*, *laḫmu*, *kusarikku*, *kulullu*, *suhrmaišu*, *anzā*, *nāʾīru*, *kurbiu*), clay figures from excavations (cf. Rittig *Kleinplastik* 232ff.). Secondly the positions of the figures generally do not correspond to those prescribed in ritual I/II. Since the positions of the figures in different
palaces (Reade BaM 11 83) and in other rituals do not agree among each other, this point should not be stressed. Here again we may suspect that the exorcist applied general rules rather than the exact prescriptions of a text (cf. II.A.5.B).

Only in Ashurbanipal's north palace (Barnett SNPAN) do we find a set of figures comparable to ritual I/II: apkallā (known only from text I/7; in the building no apkallā have been found), lāhmu, māšuššu, ugallu, uridimmu, urmahšullū, a set of clay dogs, and a partly preserved group of Sebettu. In some cases the positions of these figures seem to be related to the prescriptions of text I/II:

— the clay dogs (/Rittig Kleinplastik 16.1.1-5, Barnett SNPAN 50), clearly meant to supplement the figures of the orthostat that housed them, stand like the dogs of ritual I/II (cf. already Gadd SA 190) in the, or rather in an outer gate (gate-chamber S, cf. Reade BaM 11 82ff., back-door to park). The orthostat in question shows two ugallā facing each other (“linked together”, that is kisurattu) and an ugallu accompanied by Lulal (Room Sd 1). The orthostat at the opposite side has not been preserved but we may assume that it showed the same scene and housed the second set of five dogs (cf. II.A.4.A). The presence of drawn ugallu linked together is prescribed for the outer gate by the second part of text I (“435”ff.) and by other rituals of the same kind (cf. note “435”b, II Rev. 35f., III 13+, here “sa umāši”, IV i’ 7ff.).

— Ritual I/II prescribes an urmahšullū for the gate to the lavatory (cf. II.A.3.20). The urmahšullū of the north palace are in rooms that may very well be lavatories: T, connected to V with the niche characteristic for bathrooms and called an ablation suite by Turner (apud Barnett SNPAN 31), and F (slabs 11 and 13) with niche and drain. The spot where the only clay urmahšullū was found in situ is unfortunately not known, but it may have been at the niche excavated in the same house (Ismail AfOB 19 199). Certainly not all bathrooms of Assyrian palaces (and houses) were protected by urmahšullū (cf. Turner Iraq 32 190ff., Reade BaM 11 84). If correct, the connection of the urmahšullū to bathrooms is striking; other figures do not seem to guard specific rooms. The unique position of the urmahšullū is matched at the side of evil by an equally striking phenomenon: a demon housing especially in lavatories, Šulak (cf. CT 51 142:14, AMT77/1:8ff., CAD M/2 234). According to the description of Šulak in the “Unterweltsvision” (cf. Frank MAOG XIV/2 25 X, 33) this demon has the appearance of a regular lion. Is the Lion-man (urmašullū) installed in the bathroom to guard it against attacks of the lion demon Šulak? In fact, on one of the very few seals showing an urmahšullū, we see him attacking a lion (MAss, ZA 47 67 Abb. 30).

Other figures are installed in positions certainly not conforming to the prescriptions of ritual I/II:

— The uridimmu of Sa and Ia certainly do not occupy comparable positions. The directives of the ritual are not preserved (II.A.3.17).

— The Sebettu (Mb, exit to court) are not in the same gate as the dogs. The text prescribes the outer gate for both of them. The lāhmu in the same exit are prescribed for corners in the text (II.A.3.2, 25, 13).
Thus even a palace with a comparable set of figures (it was only partly excavated and may have housed more types) does not conform to the directives of the ritual as to their positions.

In private houses a similar situation prevails. In a house in Assur (Preusser WVDOG 64 32f. and Pl. 13:20, MDOG 31 23, Klengel-Brandt FuB 10 29f.) seven bird-apkallū guard the entrance to the private quarters (Rittig Kleinplastik 5.4.1-7). Two other figures (Kleinplastik 3.1.1-2) with inscriptions stressing life and wealth guard the entrance to a reception (?) suite; they do not correspond to any figure of the rituals. The position of the bird-apkallū corresponds roughly to ritual 1/1. Another house in Assur (Plq k E 11 I, FuB 10 30f.) is protected by three figures in one box: a kusarikku with the inscription prescribed in ritual I/II (Kleinplastik 11.1.3.), a “man” (lahmu, Kleinplastik 3.1.3, JEOL 27 92) and a dog (?) not expected single; muššuššu? Kleinplastik 16.1.12). The text at least does not bury the lahmu and the kusarikku together. In two houses a more complete set of figures came to light:

A House of the exorcist in Assur: Preusser WVDOG 64 58, Andrae WeA 2 31ff., Klengel-Brandt FuB 10 22, Ismail AfOB 19 199f., Rittig Kleinplastik 234:8, Kassim FuB 16 9ff. (fish-apkallū). Due to incomplete publication, the positions of the figures are only partly known. Judging from Preusser’s plan of the building (Pl. 27a) it seems improbable that the two boxes with each a lahmu and a bird-apkallū in Plq h C 8 I Ost (FuB 10 22) belonged to this building. Even when we subtract these boxes, the number of boxes known to Klengel-Brandt is greater than the number of boxes in Preusser’s plan. Of the positions of the figures found during recent Iraqi excavations (Ismail) nothing is known. In this house we find the following figures:

— bird-apkallū Kleinplastik 5.3.1.1-15. Number, interment in two different rooms, and the fact that each is paired with a lahmu do not conform to ritual I/II; bucket and cone do.
— fish-apkallū Kleinplastik 8.2.1-21. For their positions in the house cf. the photograph WVDOG 65 Pl. 28 a/b. Attributes and positions are not exactly as prescribed.
— lahmu Kleinplastik 2.2.1-14, each holding a marru “spade” as prescribed. Their number and consequently their positions do not conform to the text. A further lahmu was excavated recently (AfOB 19 199).

The shape of the rooms and the accumulation of apkallū indicate that we are dealing here with the private quarters (cf. II.A.4.B.). The following figures apparently stem from the rest of the house (Ismail AfOB 19 199):

— bāšmu : attribute (Resten von bronzenen Zungen) and inscription do not conform to ritual I/II.
— muššuššu: Neither attribute nor inscription conforms to ritual I/II.
— urmahullulā : For the urmahullulā of the ritual no attribute is prescribed (this one holds a vessel in its folded hands). The inscription is illegible.

From the fact that only one buried vessel with remains of copper objects has been found we may conclude that the outer gate with its wooden figures has not yet been completely excavated. This explains why no ugallu and no dogs have yet
been found. The girtabullā “buried” on the first floor must have disintegrated. Still missing are the uridimmu, Lulal, Latarak, the kulullā, and the suḫurmaššu. If this house indeed contained the complete set of figures of text I/II (and no more), a further argument for the identity of Latarak can be derived. The last figure of the Iraqi excavations is the “Löwenmensch” (Rittig Kleinplastik 110f.) that must be identical with one of the still missing figures enumerated above. Since uridimmu, kulullā, and suḫurmaššu have been identified with certainty, and in all likelihood Lulal, only Latarak (and perhaps Lulal) remains for identification. Thus the preserved figures in the house of the exorcist show differences with the figures of the ritual, but only in details. Their positions do not conform strictly to the prescriptions of the ritual but rather to the general ideas underlying these prescriptions: gods and ugallā in the outer gate, apkallā in the private quarters (the German excavation), and the monsters and Lulal and Latarak in the rest of the house (the Iraqi excavation). It would be interesting to know whether the ummahullā is indeed the figure found near the niche (bathroom). Unfortunately, it cannot be decided archaeologically whether the figures were placed during or immediately after the erection of the building, or later. Therefore we do not know whether it was a building ritual (like text IV) or a šēp lemutti text (like I/II) that covered their installation.

B Building of Sin-balāssu-iqbi in Ur: Woolley AJ 5 375, JRAS 1926 689ff., U E 8 93f., Gadd History and Monuments of Ur 220ff., Rittig Kleinplastik 250f. The building is completely ruined, with walls perished down to or even below floor level. Due to incomplete reports not all figures excavated can be matched with a box in the plan.

- bird-apkallā Kleinplastik 5.2.34-40; hold only a bucket in their left hand, not the prescribed mullītu in their right.
- fish-apkallā Kleinplastik 8.3.22-35. Each group of seven in a separate box. No further details are reported.
- bašmu Kleinplastik 17.3-6. Without the prescribed inscription and attribute.
- mušḫuššu Kleinplastik 15.2-3.
- ugallu Kleinplastik 12.1.7-9. The raised right arm originally held a clay club. Without the prescribed inscription.
- uridimmu Kleinplastik 6.1, “Genius mit Vogelbeinen”. The singularity of this figure with the “claws of an eagle” (JRAS 1926 695) raises doubts as to the correctness of its description. If we change “claws of an eagle” to “claws of a lion” the figure fits the description of an uridimmu. The stretched out right hand held a staff (with symbol) rather than a weapon.
- kusarikku Kleinplastik 11.3.1. The left hands holds a banduddā bucket as prescribed.
- girtabullā Kleinplastik 7.1.1–2, “Genius met Skorpionstachel”.
Against the prescription this figure holds a vessel with both its hands.
- Lulal Kleinplastik 1.2.1.3
Missing are one group of fish-apkallū, laḫmu, ʾurmaḫlullā, Latarak, kulullā, suḫur-māšu, and the dogs. Two additional types are represented by gods holding vessels (Kleinplastik 1.4.1–6) and a god (Kleinplastik 1.3.1) holding a spear or a spade. Neither type is attested in clay elsewhere. The positions of the figures are not in complete accordance with the prescriptions of the text: four times a bašmu is paired with a girtablullā (prescribed for the first floor); the number of boxes indicates that they stood at two entrances (not indicated on the plan). At three points in the building an ugallu is paired with a god with vessel. Two pairs occupy positions at each side of a wall and therefore hardly comparable positions; two other ugallu are not paired with a god with vessel, and between them there may have been an entrance (they are prescribed for the passages of the gate). The position of the fish-apkallū is not known, but the bird-apkallū occupy a separate room (of which only one corner remains), conceivably private. Specimens of all types except the bird-apkallū are found in one square space that can only have been a courtyard (with the two ugallū defining the outer gate?); here perhaps the figures (except the girtablullā) occupy positions comparable to those prescribed in the ritual. Unfortunately our information as to the prescribed positions of the bašmu, mušhuššu, uridimmu and kusarikku is incomplete; exactly here the text shows a number of irreparable breaks. The god with the vessel and the god with the spear or spade are not covered by the ritual at all. Again it cannot be decided archaeologically whether the figures were installed during or immediately after the erection of the building, or later. Therefore we do not know whether it was a building ritual (like text IV) or a šep lemutti text (like text I/II) that covered their installation. Figures have been found in other houses and palaces of NAṣṣ time (cf.Rittig Kleinplastik 232ff., Green Iraq 45 87ff.) but due to lack of plans, incomplete excavation or the incomparability of lay-outs (especially the ekal māšartī in Calḫū where a large number of types has been found, certainly not all of the same date) they do not allow judgement about the application of the ritual texts.
### 2. Inventory of Figures in text I/II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Colours</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 apkallu (ūmu)</td>
<td>cornel</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 Sebēttu⁴</td>
<td>tamarisk</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lugalgirra</td>
<td>tamarisk</td>
<td>[white⁵/?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7 šūt kakkī</td>
<td>tamarisk</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 One Cubit⁶</td>
<td>tamarisk</td>
<td>[?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Meslamtaea</td>
<td>tamarisk</td>
<td>black/blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 Narudda</td>
<td>tamarisk</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 il biti</td>
<td>tamarisk</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7 apkallu (bird)</td>
<td>clay (+ wax)</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 apkallu (fish)</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7 apkallu (fish)</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 apkallu (fish)</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 laḥmu</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 bašmu</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>[?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 mušhuššu</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>[white ?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 ugallu</td>
<td>clay (I)</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 uridīmmu</td>
<td>clay (I)</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 kusrīkku</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 girabullā</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 urmaṭullā</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2 Lulal</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2 Latarak</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 kalullā</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 suḫumāštu</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10 dogs</td>
<td>clay</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Incantation</th>
<th>Buried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 apkallu (ūmu)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 Sebetti</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Obv. 11 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 Lugaligirra</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>outer gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7 šūt kakāši</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>outer gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 One Cubūt</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>outer gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Meslamtaea</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>outer gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 Narudda</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>outer gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 il bitī</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>outer gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7 apkallu (bird)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Obv. 14 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 apkallu (fish)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Obv. 14 bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7 apkallu (fish)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Obv. 14 living-room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 apkallu (fish)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Obv. 14 living-room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.laḫmu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>346ff. — ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 bašmu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>346ff. — ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 mushuššu</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>346ff. — ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 ugallu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>346ff. — outer gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 uridimmu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>346ff. — ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 kusarikku</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>346ff. — store room?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 girtuballā</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>346ff. — gate on the roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 urmāḫtullā</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>346ff. — lavatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2 Lulu</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>346ff. — courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2 Latarak</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>346ff. — courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 kulullā</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>346ff. — gate to the roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 sūḫurmaššu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>346ff. — courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10 dogs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Rev. 22 outer gate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
- **a**: II: tamarisk.  
- **b**: II: cedar.  
- **c**: After text IV i'18'.  
- **d**: Replaced by I 40 (incipit)? Cf. text III.C.  
- **e**: Also: nāš patri.  
- **f**: Also šalam bīni.
General Observations

Rituals I/II and III are to a certain extent comparable (Gurney *AAA* 22:37, Meier *AfO* 14:140, Ellis *RA* 61:58\(^1\)); both texts use figures of gods, sages and monsters. There are, however, also differences (cf. below B ad tablet I). As long as R. Borger's new edition (*JNES* 33:188), based partly on unpublished sources, is not available, a complete study of ritual III cannot be undertaken. Our observations here are based on the published sources and restricted to the goals of the present study.

Published and unpublished sources were collected and discussed by R. Borger, *Die Beschworungsserie Bit mēseri und die Himmelfahrt Henochs, JNES* 33 (1974) 183ff., and *HKL* 2:195 ad G. Meier, *Die Zweite Tafel der Serie Bit mēseri, AfO* 14 (1941/45) 139ff. The Uruk tablet *W* 22762/2, Borger's Uruk ex. a, has now been published by E. von Weiher as *SbTU* 2 no 8. In the same book we find duplicates to *KAR* 58 (no 9, 10) and a reference to Haupt *ASKT* 105ff., which according to Borger belongs to *bit mēseri* as well (p. 68). Incantation 1 is duplicated by *SbTU* 2 no 11.

Sm 1277 (*BBR* 40) which according to Borger "könnte nach den äusserlichen Kriterien hierher gehören" is rather a namburi of the "Field and Garden" type (cf. Caplice *OrNS* 40:155ff.); Sm 711 does not belong here, cf. text I MS B, to which it is now joined.

K 6855 (*HKL* 2:195), quoted by Abusch *JNES* 33:254\(^{10}\), 258, probably does not belong here either; the incantation *tummu bitu* appears in a quite different context in *bit mēseri* (cf. below incantation 16+x). K 16367 (*HKL* 2:195, with question mark) is now joined to K 2987B+ (text I MS A).

To the ritual tablet (I) Borger remarks: "Leider ist es nicht sicher ob K 6310+ und K 6390+, die beide zu derselben Seite der Tafel gehören müssen, zur Vorderseite oder zur Rückseite der Tafel gehören; ich rechne sie mit Vorbehalt zur Vorderseite". It can be proved that both pieces belong to the reverse:

a Analogous to other series we may expect that the incantations of tablets II–IV follow the sequence of incipits of the ritual tablet (I).

b The right column of tablet I K 6390+ (+) K 6310+ contains (6'ff.) the incipits of the incantations of tablet II and the beginning of tablet III (cf. Borger ad ex. a) in the same sequence; any other incantation must belong to the incantations of III–IV. If one of these other incantations can be shown to have been quoted by its incipit in the left column of K 6390+ (+) K 6310+, it will be proved that the left column contains the right column, and as a consequence, that the right column is column iv, and the left column is column v.

c It is indeed a fact that incipits of other incantations are quoted in the left column (see below ad tablet III–IV 14+xff.).

The series appears as *bit mēseri* in an unpublished catalogue from Aššur (Meier *AfO* 14:139) and in the "vademecum of the exorcist" *KAR* 44:11b; in the comparable "almanac of the exorcist" this title is not attested, and the series apparently goes under the name "marša ana ēsērī" (cf. Ungnad *AfO* 14:259 ad *BRM* 4:19:30, 20:36; the new text *STT* 105
300:22, 23, 26 has LÚ.GIG, proving the reading maršu instead of mursu for GIG in BRM 4. The almanac prescribes the same days for profitable performance (STT 300:23, Tašritu 7, 26, Araḫšamma 12, or rather [22]) as the ritual tablet of bit mešeri 1/vi 7 (correct here Araḫšamma 12 to 22?). To the references in the lexica we can add AFO 17 313:7, a commentary to “An Address of Marduk to the Demons”.

[The important new text SbTU 3 69 describes the statues, their outfit and place. Incorporation of this text into the present book would have required a thorough revision.]

B The text

Tablet I

Published sources (mainly after Borger JNES 33 188, with modified sequence of columns):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>1–9</td>
<td>Sm 1939 (Frank ZA 36 215ff.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>1–26</td>
<td>Sm 2004 (BBR 48) + K 8980 (AMT 94/9), 25–39; + K 8189 (AMT 2/5); second part of iv: K 6310 (BBR 53), 19'–25'; + Sm 263 (AMT 71/4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>1–19</td>
<td>K 6390 (AMT 34/2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>1'–19'</td>
<td>Sm 1939 (ZA 36 215ff.), SbTU 2 11 1’–7’ (in 7’ read: ina 1/1)DU₆.KU UD VI ...).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv 1–2 is the end of a section describing statues of clay: 1 ĖN ina IM dÉ.A Dû-ku-nu-štī [šīd-nu], “incantation: from the clay of Ea I have made you [you shall recite]” (a second incantation with this incipit is III.B. 13); then follow offerings to Ea, Šamaš and Marduk, and the purification (iv 9: tull-lal-šu-nu-[ni]; text I 216: [tu-hap]) of “all the statues of wood and [clay] that you have made” (iv 6f.: NUMESS šā GISS.MES NUMESS šā [IM] /ma-la te-pu-uš, cf. text I 207). Analogous to text I/II, in which the first part of the text describes the preparation of materials and the construction of figures, we expect a full treatment of materials (tamarisk, cori, and clay) and figures (not described in the preserved parts of text III) in columns i–iii. The descriptions of the figures in the rest of the text are shortened, and serve only to identify the figure when its incantation or position is given.

The circumstances leading to the choice of this ritual are described in tablet II 78ff.: repeated deaths, confusion and unhappiness have befallen the house. The exact evildoers are unknown (II 89), which explains the general nature of the diagnosis reflected in the introduction I/i 1ff. So far ritual I/II (cf. above II.B.1) and III are comparable. The difference seems to lie in the absence of namburbi features in ritual III; the circumstances are not interpreted as a sign of evil to come. This tallies with the end of ritual III (Uruk ex. a col. iv), where the statues are thrown into the river and the drawn figures are wiped off. In ritual I/II the statues are to remain in position against the anticipated “entry of the enemy”.
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Sequence of figures and incantations:

1 Incipit: **EN ga-aš-ru šu-pá-ū e-te Eri-[du₄]**
   Quoted: I/iv 6’.
   To: Marduk (not a statue or drawn figure).

2 Incipit: **EN dLUGAL.GIR.RA ALAM SUH.KÉŠE.KÉŠE.RE**
   To: NU dLUGAL.GIR.RA šá KEŠDA-su šuk-šu-lu, “the figure of Lugalgirra whose outfit is perfect”.
   Position: *ina ri-kás* É, I/iv 34, II 206, “in the joint of the house” and apparently near the head of the sick man (II 56).

3 Incipit: **EN dLUGAL.GIR.RA Ju-l Ju-du [DINGIR ga-aš-ru]**
   Quoted: I/iv 12’f.
   To: NU dLUGAL.GIR.RA ina (SAG) É.GAR₄ eš-ru, “the statue of Lugalgirra that is drawn on (the head of the) wall”.
   What drawn figures of gods looked like is known from STT 73 Obv. ii 57ff. (drawings of Ea and Marduk, cf. Reiner JNES 19 26f.).

4 Incipit: **EN dENKUM MAH DU₆.KU.GA BA AL.GUB.BA**
   Quoted: I/iv 14’f.
   To: XIV UR.GAL IM.BABBAR ša ina É.GAR₄ eš-ru, “fourteen urigallû of gypsum that are drawn on the wall”. For their position cf. also II 166/7: *idāt erši marṣi uzāqqip,* “I have erected them at the sides of the bed of the sick man”, and AAA 22 92:194 (text III.C): *urigallû ina reš-eši uzāqqip,* “I have erected the urigallu at his head”. The incantations speak of the urigallû as “set up”, but the ritual makes it clear that such urigallû can be represented by drawn figures.

5 same as 4. The incantation is a variant of the preceding one and not quoted in the ritual tablet. The last lines of this incantation give the exact positions of the urigallû in the bedroom, but due to gaps we cannot give a reconstruction. The incantations make it clear that there are two kinds of urigallû: four of each kind are “erected” in the bedroom, and three of each kinds in the gate (of the bedroom). The four of the first kind are between them at the sides.

6 Incipit: **EN Á.I.LA.ZU.NE NE ṙg₄.SA₅ IN.I.L.E.DÈ**
   Quoted: I/iv 16’f.
   To: VI.NU.MES šu-ur kap-pi šá ina SAG É.NUN eš-ru šá NU dU.GUR (var. I/iv 17’ adds: *u dšum NIMGIR GAL* ina IGIGI-šá-ru GUB-zu (var. I/iv 17’: GUB.MES), “seven figures of winged ones that are drawn on the head of the bedroom with a statue of Nergal (var.: and Isum the great herald) standing before them”. The red garment, the multicolored cord, the e’ru stick and the libb; gimmari (cf. above II.A.4.B, Frank LSS III/3 44) show that these figures are exorcists (cf. II 231ff. where they cast an incantation). They are “born from apsû ... sons of Ea” (II 234), but they are not called apkallû, which excludes identification with the bird-apkallu of ritual I/II (so Gurney AAA 22 37,39). The obvious candidate for identification is the winged god with exorcist functions of the palace reliefs (cf. II.A.4.B, end). That É.NUN = kummu denotes the bedroom in these texts is clear from the following considerations:
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a *kummu* in this text must be a specific room, not “private quarters” consisting of several rooms, because the description of the positions of the figures must be unequivocal.

b The šut kappi occupy the *kummu*, a specific room, together with Išum and Nuska (II 199f.); the bed of the sick man is in the same room (cf. below 13+g, especially 17+x). This makes it highly probable that the gate of incantation 9 is not defined according to a hypothetical adjoining room, but according to the room where the bed stood (KÁ ENUN).

c The sick man of text III.C lies in his bed in the *kummu* (AAA 22 88:146).

d Sumerian *ENUN* also has the meaning “bedroom” (cf. Caplice OrNS 42 299; Alster OrNS 41 354, but with reservations RA 67 1021; Waedock Iraq 37 117; and for further references and discussion: Charpin Iraq 45 62, von Soden CRRAI 20 140, Komorócsy ActAntHung 22 172105, M. Lambert Sumer 6 153, Pettinato OAColl XVI 30, OrAnt 18 114f., Mander OrAnt 19 19120, Sjöberg TCS 3 85, above I.A.4.B uriggallu ad van Dijk OrNS 44 6020, van Dijk AOAT 25 131f.).

Tablet III–IV (the quoted sources are not meant to be complete)

7 Incipit: EN A.R.U.UB MAŠKIM HUL.
To: VII NU.NEŠ 4 VII.BI ša șTMA.NU ša șTUKUL.MEŠ na-šu-ū, “seven figures of Sibettu of cornel that hold weapons”.
Position: at the head of the bed (I/iv 29).
Text: 4 R2 21 B Rev. 10ff.

8 Incipit: EN U4.AN.NA GIŠ HU.R AN.KLA ŠU.DU7.
Quoted: omitted in tablet I.
To: VII NU NUN.ME SUHUR18 (var.: SUHUR.MAŠK18) ša ina IM.BABBAR u IM.GI6 UQ-QU-ū ša ina le-ēt EN UN ina E.GAR8 ēŠ-NU, “seven figures of carp sages, painted with gypsum and black paste, that are drawn at the side of the bedroom on the wall”.
Text: Uruk ex. a i ff., Reiner OrNS 30 2f. 1’–33’, Cavigneaux BaM 10 120 4 (W 23830c), cf. Borger JNES 33 192.
The first seven sages of this incantation are the fish-apkallû (puradu namrātu, puradu tātimi . . . . sha ina nāri ibbanū, “shining carp, carp of the sea . . . that were created in a stream”). The following group of four apkallû, of human descent (ilitti amēlāti), endowed with understanding by Ea, are improperly added; the resulting incantation is, contrary to the directives of the ritual, addressed to eleven apkallû of mixed descent.
The improper addition of four apkallû proves that the list of apkallû does not originate from bit mēseri but from another text — a chronicle? —, from where it was adopted by bit mēseri. The fish-apkallû are discussed above II.A.4.B.

9 Incipit: EN U4 [NAM].TILLA [Û.TU.UD.DA URIT1].MA. Incantation to the ūmu-apkallû (cf. II.A.3.1); the first of them in text I/II is called: ūmu balāṭi ilitti Uri, “day of life, offspring of Ur” (cf. I 55b). The second part of the line is restored after unpublished texts (information courtesy prof. Borger).
Quoted: I/iv 21ff. (restores Uruk ex. a).
To: VII NU MEŠ NUN MEŠ šā گی MaNU quD-du-ši ina KĀ É NUN ana [e-h]i LÚ GIG ana IGI [SAG گی]NÁ GUB-zu, “seven figures of sages of consecrated cornel; they stand in the gate of the bedroom nearest to the sick man at the head of the bed”. Note that also in text I/II (cf. note to I 31ª) and text III.C (AAA 22:88:152ª) the umu-apkallu are made of consecrated cornel. In text I/II they are the only figures made of this material, in bit mēseri the Sebettu are also made of cornel. In text I/II (cf. II.A.3.1.), in text III.C (AAA 22:90:9), and in bit mēseri they stand at the head of the sick man.

Text: Uruk ex. a i 32ff., OrNS 30 3 34ª f., cf. JNES 33 192.

Quoted: I/iv 23ª f., cf. I/iv 28 (Borger BiOr 30 182 ad 18).

To: [VII NU MEŠ N]UN MEŠ šā گی šING kām-su-ti šā ina GRIT-šī گی NÁ GUB-zu, “[seven figures of] sages of tamarisk (var.: OrNS 30 4 1ª: šā 1[M], “of clay”), kneeling, that stand at the foot of the bed”.

On the basis of text I/II (cf. II.A.4.B) we should expect umu-apkallu, fish-apkallu and bird-apkallu in the bedroom. The apkallu of inc. 8 are clearly the fish-apkallu, the apkallu of inc. 9 are clearly the umu-apkallu, the apkallu of inc. 11 do not stand in the bedroom; only the apkallu of inc. 10 remain for identification with the bird-apkallu. The alternative solution, that the bird-apkallu are omitted here and that the apkallu of inc. 10 are a second group of fish-apkallu, is excluded by the fact that fish-apkallu are not attested kneeling (cf. p.144).

Text: OrNS 30 4 Rev. 1ª–10ª, cf. JNES 33 192, VAS 24 121.

Quoted: expected at the unpublished end of I/iv.

To: XIV URGAL IM BABBAR šā ina šā KĀ ZAG [u GĀB es-ru], “fourteen urigallu of gypsum that [are drawn] in the gate right [and left]”. For the restoration cf. I/iv 14ª.

Text: Uruk ex. a ii 7–13.

Quoted: expected at the unpublished end of I/iv.

To: XIV URGAL IM BABBAR šā ina šā KĀ ZAG [u GĀB es-ru], “fourteen urigallu of gypsum that [are drawn] in the gate right [and left]”. For the restoration cf. I/iv 14ª.

Text: Uruk ex. a ii 14–29 (end broken).
After incantation 13 the sequence of incantations is broken. Tablet I/iv 7’ff., before the enumeration of incipits corresponding to incantations 2–13, has: “the figures as many as you have made... you shall speak to them as follows”. This implies that we may expect the remaining figures, in as far as they are provided with an incantation, quoted at the unpublished end of I/iv (I/iv continues with different subjects). The candidates are:

13+a [II NU MEŠ šā T]UG UD.1.KÁM lab-šā i-di ana i-di šā KÁ LŪ.GIG GUB-[zu], I/iv 27, “[two figures] clad in daily wear, standing on each side of the gate of the sick man”. The restoration [II] is based on i-di ana i-di, “on each side”, implying an even number of figures. Perhaps identical to 13+1 below (from an incantation).

13+b [II NU MEŠ šā TIM-bu-ut-ta na-[šā-tú] / [ina gi]}R-it gišaša GUB-az, I/iv 32f., “[two figures] of tamarisk clad in the garment of an eššebu-priest [ ... ] / [that] stand [at] the head of the bed and at the foot of the bed”. The restoration [II] is based on “at the head and at the foot of the bed” implying an even number of figures. The figures of 13, 13+a and 13+b are probably all anthropomorphic, characterized by different garments.

13+c [NU] dNa-ra-di šā gišINIG šā tim-bu-ut-ta na-[šā-tú] / [ina gi]}R-it gišaša GUB-az, I/iv 32f., “[a figure of] Naruddi of tamarisk, who holds a harp (?)”; she stands [at the foot] of the bed”. Naruddi is referred to in I/II 76 and 210 as the sister of the Sebettu / great gods; in II 210 she is placed under the bed. A separate incantation for Naruddi is not to be expected; in I/II the incantation to her brothers is used for her as well. In text I/II the harp hangs at her side.

13+d NU ūš (māti) A.BAR, I/iv 33, “a figure of death of lead”. This figure is not apotropaic; it probably plays a part in the ritual of dismissal of death and other evil to the netherworld (II 122ff., Uruk ex. a iv 15ff.).

13+e [NU] dMES.ŁAM.TA.EL.A gišINIG ina SAG gišaša mi-th-rū I [Ū.GIG ... ], I/iv 36, “[figure of Meslamtaea of tamarisk; he [stands] at the head of the bed opposite the sick man ... ]”. Uncertain restoration. Meslamtaea is expected in this text (cf. Lugalgirra 2, 3) and mentioned in II 207 without indication of his position.

13+f Figure of Nergal (d’U.GUR), cf. above 6, II 195ff. Together with the šūt kappī in the position.

13+g Figure of [‘I-šum NIM.GIR GAL, “[Iš]um the great herald”, cf. above 6; together with the šūt kappī in the bedroom; in AAA 22 86:127 at the head of the sick man. Cf. [H]E[NUR].SAG.GAL[NIM.GIR.GIL GIŠ STT 213:4’(similar context).

13+h Figures of ugalu (cf. text IV i’ 7th for their identity): 2 šalam māši ēkṣurūti ša bunnannē šuklulū sākip gallē lemmi ina rēš marṣi imna u šumēla ulziz, II 203f., “two figures of twins linked together, whose appearance is perfect, repelling the evil constable, I have placed at the head of the sick man right and left”.

13+i Figures of ugalu (? although these figures are described neither as ēkṣurūtu nor as ša umāši, the parallelism with the descriptions of 13+h and 13+j indicates that also the māša of 13+i are ugalū): māši mundahši ša gasṣi ina lībbi bābbi ēṣir, II 216, “twins, fighters, of gypsum I have drawn inside the gate”.

13+j Figures of ugalu (cf. text IV i’ 7th for their identity): māši mundahši ša umāši ša ītē ina sippī bābbi imna u šumēla ulziz, II 219f., “twins, fighters, wrestlers, of bitumen I have placed on the posts of the gate, right and left”. Cf. AAA 22
90:172f. where figures of bitumen of wrestlers (and) linked together guard the door posts (quoted III.C.e).

13+k Figures of Lulal and Latarak: *ana mimma lemmi la tēhē Lulal u Latarak ina bābi ulriz, II 212*, “to prevent the approach of whatever evil, I have placed Lulal and Latarak in the gate”.

13+l Figures of watchmen: *2 salam maššarī ša Ea u Marduk ina libbi bābi ulriz, II 223f.*, “two figures of watchmen of Ea and Marduk I have placed inside the gate, right and left”. Possibly identical with 13+a above (cf. CAD M/I 343; text I 159 where the monsters of clay are “the statues repelling the evil ones, of Ea and Marduk”).

13+m Figure of Ensimalē: *kisalli biti īssabat Ensimalē*, II 111, “the courtyard of the house Ensimalē has occupied”. A description of Ensimalē is given in the Göttertypentext MIO I 76 v 13ff. Since Ensimalē has bull’s ears, the bull-eared god of art is sometimes adduced for identification, cf. (negatively) Opificius UAVA 2 215, van Buren *Iraq* 1 74f. (who identifies the same god with Ningišzida), Porada CRRAI 26 265 (god of the underworld).

13+n Figure of Istar: *ina apit biti īttasab tešitu Ištār*, II 112, “in the window of the house shrewd Ištār has taken seat”. This “Ištār in the window” is perhaps identical with Kūtīti, cf. Zimmern OLZ 1928 2, Frankena Tākultū 97 and Farber BID 79 who all quote this line, and further Lambert Fs Kraus 209, Parpola LAS 2 184, Menzel Assyrische Tempel II T 7 ad 5’, Fauth Fs Günther Neumann 5411 (Aphroditē parakjptousa, with previous literature).

13+0 Figure of Gula: *ina muḫḫi asukkanat ašībat Gula azugallatum rabītum, II 114*, “on the threshold sits Gula, the great chief physician”.

After the gap (*Iv* end) the text continues with the following figures and incantations:

14+x Figures of Urgula and his dogs: *ina bābi kamāni ur-gu-la a-šīb a-di kal-bišū, II 113*, “in the outer gate Urgula sits with his dogs”. We read kalbi-šu (pl.) here, rather than kalbi-šu (sg.; so Meier AfO 14 147, Heimpel RIA 4 497a, Rittig Klei̇nplastik 218f.) and identify these dogs with the watch dogs of clay of ritual II/II. This interpretation is confirmed by ex. n, where line 3’ of the incantation preceding 15+x has u r - b i - e - n e, “his dogs”. Accordingly a quotation of the incantation to the dogs is expected at the end of *Iv*, preceding the quotation of 15+x in *Iv* 1ff.

15+x Incipit: *ĒN ZIL.ZIL.GAR.RA KA BA.AB.DUḪ / šā pi-it pi-i-šu ana duₘ₃-ql šak-nu ex. u ₃š/ ex. n 9’, restored after Gurney AAA 22 92 186f., Meek BA 10/1 37 10;

Introduction ex. i 1f., ex. n 7f.:

............... *ana šā GEŠTU MĀŠ šā ina SAG LŪ.GIG KEŠDA-su ki-a-am tu-lāḥ-haš ÈN tum(ex. n; ex. u: tūm)-mu È EGR-IŠŠ ŠID-nu*

The ritual is described in *Iv* 1ff.:

[........ MĀŠ] *ina SAG LŪ.GIG KEŠDA*

[........ ana šĀ] *GEŠTUḪ šā tu-lāḥ-haš*

cf. AAA 22 92:193 ... ū-ri-sa ina re-eš mar-su ir-ku-us

16+x Incipit: *ĒN tu-mu* È quoted *Iv* 5, cf. above 15+x. The circle of flour associated with this incantation is mentioned in *Iv* 7. The plural suffix in *Iv* 6 refers perhaps to the drawn figures (cf. *Iv* 3) of the winged ones, since the red garment (*Iv* 4) and the circle of flour reappear in the incantation 6 recited to these fig-
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ures. The text of the incantation *tummu bitu* is known partly from a commentary, Meier *AfO* 12 241 (cf. 240 and note 27 with literature), and cf. Borger *HKL* II 195 with further literature (add now Borger *WdO* 5 172, Abush *JNES* 33 254 with note 10) and the remark: “auch belegt in der Serie *bit mēsēri*, wo an­scheinend die zweispr. Beschworung *zi.Li.zi.Gar ra ka ba.ab.dušt* (15+x) so bezei­chnet wird”. I can see no grounds to affirm Borger’s opinion. In the introduction to 15+x, *kišam*, “thus”, refers to the following recitation or rather whispering of the incantation 15+x; it is clearly stated, and confirmed by the quotation I/v 5, that the incantation *tummu bitu* is to be recited thereafter (EGIR-šu). The situation assumed by Borger would be very unusual. Both incantations are (partly) known, and completely different.

17+x Incipit: [*EN dziegar a-na d*] Marduk ku-ru-ub
Quoted: I/v 14; incipit restored after KAR 58 1ff. and I/v 14, 15.
To: [*EN dziegar I/v 14, 15 = *dzALAG KAR 58 1, 23 (var. n][u-úr from SbTU 2 9:6]* = *dzALAG // nu-ú-ru*;]
Another reading of *AN.zALAG* is discussed by Deller *Fs Lacheman* 62ff., cf. also Durand *RA* 73 15510, von Soden *BiOr* 40 107, Craig *ABRT* 81:7. That the lamp, *nuRu*, refers to Nuska (= *n u - s i g a, “the good lamp”*) is clear from variants to KAR 58 23ff. (Mayer *UBFG* 483) and 39 (ibid. 485), cf. Oppenheim *Dreams* 298, Borger *ABZ* 105 (quoting the unpub. *bit mēsēri* sources ex. v // ex. a), and for the lamp as a symbol of Nuska Seidl *BaM* 4 128f., *KAR* 58 39ff. (edited by Mayer *UBFG* 485f.), cf. Borger *JNES* 33 191 ad “Stück V”.

The two prayers 17+x and 18+x, the latter said by the sick man, explain the presence of the lamp at the head of the sick man on Lamastu amulets (Lamastu amulets 1, 2; on 61 at his feet). The sick man of the amulets makes a gesture of supplication (opened hand directed to the face: amulets 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 29?, 37, 58?, not on 61, 64 = Wiggerman apud Stol Zwangerschap en Geboorte 97 no 62) probably accompanied by a prayer like 18+x.

From Borger’s remarks on ex. a (*JNES* 33 188ff.) we can deduce the approximate number of lines missing in Uruk ex. a i. The last line of Uruk ex. a i = ex. a iii 101 = Reiner “36”’. Seven broken lines follow to the end of the column. In col. iii 25 lines follow after the last line of K 5119 (Gurney *JRA*S 1935 459ff.), Accordingly, the first line of K 5119 (ex. a) rev. is approximately iv 26 (Reiner Rev. 1’ = iv 26); the first line of Uruk ex. a is K 5119 14’ = iv 39. The number of missing lines at the end of Uruk ex. a i is: 7 + 38 = 45. The total number of lines of Uruk ex. a would be 34 + 45 = 79; the complete text of *bit mēsēri* III–IV on Uruk ex. a counts 4x79 = 316 lines. This tallies
well with ex. a: 66 lines in iii, ca 105 in iv and v (based on the known number of lines of the columns on the obverse) = 276 lines, leaving room for 40 lines and a colophon (Uruk ex. a has a very short colophon) in vi.

Between Uruk ex. a iii end and iv 1'ff. (end of the ritual) approximately 79 – 32 = 47 lines are missing. The 32 lines of ASKT 12 rev. (Borger apud von Weiher SbTU 2 68) have to be accomodated here. Given the fact that we may expect further Kutmittel incantations we may be confident that not much information on the statues is lost from this part of the text.

The end of incantation 13, the hypothetical incantations 13+…., and the attested incantations 14+, 15+, 16+ and 17+ all fall in the gap between Uruk ex. a ii and iii, measuring about 113 lines. The incantation 16+ is probably not written out. The incipit appears in other series where the text is not written out either (Lamaštu, Maqlû, cf. Abush JNES 33 254). The text is found in a collection of unspecific incantations (Borger AOAT 1 2 ad ex J). The incantations 15+ and 17+ are known, and, with their introductions, take up some 50 lines. 63 lines remain available for the end of 13 the 15 (or 14 when 13+a and 13+1 are identical) hypothetical incantations 13+, and 14; this clearly indicates that we should not expect all 15 (or 14) figures enumerated at 13+ to have been provided with separate incantations and that an unknown number of hypothetical incantations 13+ will eventually have to be deleted.

C The utukkû lemnûtu incantation Gurney AAA 22 76ff.

In his article on prophylactic figures and their rituals Gurney treated as text III “the ritual for healing a sick man” (AAA 22 76ff.), CT 16 35–36, 38 (utukkû lemnûtu tablets D and F) and its then known duplicates (BIN 2 22, K 4625, K 3241, cf. also Falkenstein LSSNF 1 742^3). Further duplicates and literature can be found in HKL 2 91 to which now must be added the unpublished MB duplicate from Nippur (12N–228, cf. Civil OIC 23 114) and SbTU 1 137 from Uruk (identified by Schramm WoD 10 123 and Lambert AO 16 26 111); a new edition by M.J. Geller is in preparation. In his discussion Gurney (37) adduced the comparable texts 4 R2 21a, BBR 48 and BBR 53 (cf. also Zimmern ZA 35 153^1), now known to be parts of bit mûšeri. I will try here to define the relation to bit mûšeri sharper. Again, a complete discussion is out of the question and must await the new edition incorporating much unpublished material:

a The incantation EN UDUG HUL EDIN.NA DAGALLA, “Evil spirit (who) in the broad steppe”, is quoted in bit mûšeri I/iv 15 and text I 40. The text of this incantation is not given in the preserved parts of bit mûšeri and the few missing lines at the end of text I certainly could not accomodate this incantation together with an introductory line. Accordingly we must expect this incantation to have been written out elsewhere, that is in the collection of utukkû lemnûtu incantations, since the incipit indicates that the incantation belonged to this type.

b The incipit in question is not preserved in the extant text of utukkû lemnûtu. If the continuation of this incantation is preserved at all, it must be found among incantations without incipit and with a text starting with statements concerning the activities of a single utukku (the incipit) and continuing in a manner fitting bit mûšeri and ritual I. The identification of this incantation without incipit with the incantation UDUG.HUL EDIN.NA DAGALLA necessarily will be based on circum-
The incipit of AAA 22 76ff. is not preserved. Its incipit is probably the first incipit of the tablet, utukkū lemnuțu XIII (?). At the least, a tablet existed in a series of incantations starting with the incipit in question, BM 37866 (known to me from the incipit catalogue of M.J. Geller). The tablet gives the last line of an incantation: [...]U.GÁL [BAR.ŠE HÉ.EM.TA.GUB] followed by a ruling and a colophon with the catchline: [ÉN ŪDUG.Ḫ]UL EDIN.NA DAGALLA [...]. Although it cannot be proved that BM 37866 belongs to utukkū lemnuțu, the presence of our incipit in a series confirms our expectation that the incantation was written out elsewhere.

d AAA 22 76ff. could have begun with a statement concerning the activities of a single utukku. Although, contrary to regular practice, Marduk's report to Ea is not phrased exactly as the introductory description of the demon's activities (cf. Falkenstein LSSNF 1 74), we probably hear an echo of the incipit in the first line of Marduk's report (27/8): UDUG ḪUL / utukku lemnu ša [...].

e The ritual implied by Ea's instructions to Marduk in AAA 22 76ff. is similar to the ritual of bit mēseri and text I/II. Especially important is the fact that only in these three texts the ūmu-apkallū of e'ru wood appear, and quite prominently (AAA 22 88:148ff., text I 44ff., text III.B.9). In text I the incantation UDUG ḪUL EDIN.NA DAGALLA accompanies the preparation of e'ru wood for the ūmu-apkallū; AAA 22 88:150ff. similarly prescribes the use of e'ru wood for figures of ūmu-apkallū and underscores their healing activities at the head of the bed of the sick man. The mašhultuppū of the prescriptions of AAA 22 (86:115ff.) is mentioned in passing in ritual I/II (I 250) and is conspicuously present in bit mēseri (I/v 13, 21, II 193f., 213). Since ritual I/II describes the exorcistic ritual only cursorily — its main concern is prophylactic, even the ritual with the statue of the owner of the house implied by I 156 is not described —, bit mēseri shows most correspondances with AAA 22 76ff. Both texts prescribe a canopy (TÚ.GAN.ḌUL) to cover the sick man (bit mēseri I/v 12f., AAA 22 84:20ff.), the use of a kid bound to his head (bit mēseri incantation 15+x, AAA 22 84:105ff. // SbTU 1 137, 88:140ff., 92:177ff.), the presence of Išum, the great herald, at the head of the bed (bit mēseri 13+g, AAA 22 86:126ff.) and figures of wrestling and linked together (ugallū) in the doorway (bit mēseri 13+j, AAA 22 90:172ff., cf. text I "435"ff., II Rev. 35). The KÌ.dUTU.KÁM of bit mēseri I/v 10 is perhaps to be linked to the offerings and prayer (for intercession with the personal god) to Šamas of AAA 22 82:96ff. (cf. 90:10ff.).

f The incantation to the kid prescribed by Ea in AAA 22 76ff. (above e.) is written out after AAA 22 76ff. on the same tablet (92:186ff.). The same incantation appears in bit mēseri (15+x). This too links AAA 22 76ff. to bit mēseri.

g On the basis of the circumstantial evidence collected above we conclude that the text of the incantation UDUG ḪUL EDIN.NA DAGALLA has been preserved in AAA 22 76ff. The fact that the incantation is bilingual and the greater number of "isoglosses" with bit mēseri point to this text as its original home. The existence of a MBab duplicate attests to the antiquity of (at least part of) these rituals.

[The correctness of the preceding considerations is now ascertained and will be proved in a forthcoming article]
**D Commentaries on related texts**

Sp I 131 (Strassmaier *ZA* 6 241ff.) 15ff. is part of a commentary on a ritual for curing a sick man.

*BBR 27 // PBS 10/4 12* is a compendium of “mystical” identifications.

For both texts cf. Lambert *JSS* 13 110ff. Here we quote only those identifications that are of interest for the present study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i 4</th>
<th>gšššINIG</th>
<th>dA-nim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>gšššÀ.GIŠIMMAR</td>
<td>dDumu-zi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. II.A.4.B. note 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ii 13</th>
<th>mul-lil-lum</th>
<th>dIglSIG7.SIG7 NU. gššKIRÌ6 dEN.LÌL.LÀ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. II.A.4.B. <em>mullilu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>gššTUkUL.MÀNU</td>
<td>VII u₄-mu gššTUkUL dAMAR.UTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. II.A.4.B. <em>material</em> and e'rù, ara gišimmari</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table: Inventory of figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L II</th>
<th>Figures</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>apkallu (šumu)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>cornel</td>
<td>gate of the bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sebettu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>cornel</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lugalgirra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lugalgirra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>drawn</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Meslamatae?</td>
<td>13+e</td>
<td>tamarisk</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Naruddu</td>
<td>13+c</td>
<td>tamarisk</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nergal</td>
<td>13+f</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Išum</td>
<td>13+g</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ensimmah</td>
<td>13+m</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ištar</td>
<td>13+n</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gula</td>
<td>13+o</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>šüt kappā</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>drawn</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>apkallu (bird)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>tamarisk</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>apkallu (fish)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>drawn</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>urigallu</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>drawn</td>
<td>(gate of the) bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>apkallu (fish)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>drawn</td>
<td>outer&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>urigallu</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>drawn</td>
<td>outer&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ugallu</td>
<td>13+h</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ugallu</td>
<td>13+i</td>
<td>drawn</td>
<td>outer&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ugallu</td>
<td>13+j</td>
<td>drawn&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>outer&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lulal</td>
<td>13+k</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>outer&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Latarak</td>
<td>13+k</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>outer&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Urgula</td>
<td>14+&lt;i&gt;x&lt;/i&gt;</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>outer gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>dogs</td>
<td>14+&lt;i&gt;x&lt;/i&gt;</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>outer gate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Analogous to inc. 4, the wall has been taken to be the wall of the bedroom. <sup>b</sup> The gate of the inscription has been taken to be the outer gate; the gate of the bedroom is already occupied by the urigallu 4, 5. <sup>c</sup> For the urigallu in the outer gate cf. text I/4 I'; Lulal (and Latarak) is expected to accompany the ugallu (II.A.4.A. end). <sup>d</sup> Cf. Text IV i' 77f.

Other figures: anthropomorphic<sup>7</sup> (13 clay, 13+a, 13+b tamarisk), death (13+d), guardians (13+1) in the (outer ?) gate.

Although both texts I/II and III have the defence of the house (cf. III/II 79, 86f., 110f.) rather than the sick man as their main subject, they apply different strategies. While text I/II entrusts the defence of the outer gate to the gods of tamarisk, text III stations them as guardians in the bedroom and leaves the outer gate and the defence of the rest of the house to less important gods, apkallu, monsters, and dogs.

Due to the use of shortened descriptions in the preserved parts of <i>būt mēseri</i> we are informed only defectively on the attributes of the figures. The weapons of the Sebettu are probably the dagger and the hatchet of text I/II (II.A.3.2.); the <i>timbuttu</i> ("harp"?) is not held by Naruddu in text I/II but hung at her side (II.A.3.7). The šüt kappā are not present in text I, their attributes the <i>e'ru</i> stick/mace and the offshoot of the date palm are held by other figures in that text (II.A.4.B). In text I/II urigallu are held by
the fish-apkallu; for that reason we have associated the two groups of urigallu of text III with the two groups of fish-apkallu of the same text (II.A.4.B). Kneeling figures not called apkallu are attested in the second part of text II (II Rev. 11, discussed II.A.4.B end). Wrestling and linked together ugallu are common figures in the better preserved texts (I, II, III, IV).

The choice of materials used for the execution of the figures is similar to, but not identical with, that of text I/II; there only the ūmu-apkallu are made of cornel and is none of the apkallu groups made of tamarisk. The drawn Lugalgirra (3) should have been of tamarisk, and so should the šut kappi, if they have been correctly identified as lower gods. Drawn figures do not occur at all in text I/II (the ugallu of the second part of I and II excepted), but drawing is not a substitute for clay, since none of the drawn figures (except again the ubiquitous ugallu) belongs to the group of monsters. Drawing is apparently used selectively.

Indeed, the total absence of clay monsters in text III is striking. Analogous to text I/II we would expect them to have guarded the now insufficiently defended remainder of the house. When it is remembered that our information on the figures of text III is based on a mostly broken ritual text and casual references in the incantations to other figures, we realize that this group may have disappeared in the gaps of the ritual tablet. This seems to be confirmed by the existence of other figures of clay (13) and by the references to figures of clay in the first preserved part of the description of tablet I (cf. above B introduction). The absent figures of clay are: laḫmu, bašmu, muššušu (ugallu), uridimmu kusarikki, ĝīrtablullu, urmahlullu, kulułlu, and suḫurmathšu.

F A fragment of a related incantation

A fragmentary incantation, K 4656 + K 9741 (Fig. 8, join Wiggerman) duplicates K 9417 + and other texts, all part of An Address of Marduk to the Demons (W.G. Lambert AfO 19 118). This text can now be shown (see Wiggermann, forthcoming) to be a tablet of Utukku Lemnūtu, the one that precedes BIN 2.22 (see above III.C). These tablets of Utukku Lemnūtu show clear affinities with the texts treated in this book.

In the courtyard (2'f.) are stationed the enzātu arqātu, the “yellow goats”. These figures also occur on a tablet of extracts (?) from Aššur, followed by an incantation to the fish-apkallu (III.B.8): “who are you? . . . We are the sons of Nippur, . . ., the yellow goats of Enlil, the Lord of the lands” (LKA 76:9/10). For further attestations of these goats see CT 24 11:37, CT 16 23:314f (see BiOr 28 65b), W. Farber BID 60:55ff. In a door way are stationed Tišpak, the Sebettu, Maṣṭabba (= Lugalgirra), Lulal and Latarak, and the shrewd Istar. Išum is mentioned in 24' (hal-su šá 4šešum na-г[i-ru GAL-ú]).

The ritual to which this incantation belongs is concerned with the dismissal of evil (27'f.) and the prevention of its return (installation of figures in courtyard and door way). To this end the house is purified (13': ul-lul É) and put under the spell of the great gods (17'ff.). Special attention is given to the entrance: 20'f. ūm-mé É ūm-mé LDB tūm-m[u-ú . . . .] ZAG.DU₈ u SLGAR tūm-mu-ú [ . . . .], “the house is put under a spell, the threshold is put under a spell, [ . . . .] the door-posts and the bolt are put under a spell, the [ . . . .] are put under a spell”.
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IV TEXT IV

Purification of a new house

A The Text

Rev. ii' 5'–10', copied also by Bezold (Catalogue 1054), was identified as duplicating KAR 298 Rev. 41–42 (text II) by G. Meier in his review (AfO 13 72b) of R.C. Thompson, A Dictionary of Assyrian Chemistry and Geology. R. Borger joined 79–7–8, 240 to K 9873.

After three partly preserved signs and a ruling⁷, the text reads as follows (see next page):
Transliteration

i' 1'  [x x x] [x x]
 [x x N] A pu-u[h-
 [x x (x)] [x x NA4.KA.GI.NA.DIB.BA][ina A.MES SUDa]
 [EN N] A4.KA.GI.NADIB.BA SI VII S[1.SA4 x x x]
5' [III-xu-ší] D-NU ZAG.DU8.MES E.MES [x x x4]
 [x x] [x] rug-be-e-ti ina IM.BABBAR šú tam-hu-hu

[za-xu]-hA4 [U4], GAL.MES GEŠPU.MES šú ina ESIR šú tu-šaš-su-lu4

[ina x] [x u] ina KÁ TILLA4 U4, GAL.MES GEŠPU.MES
[ina U] b4.MES HUR-ir U4, [GAL], MES ki-šš-ru-ti

10' [ina] E[SIR ina ZAG.DU8 KÁ XV u CL HUR-ir
[GEŠPU.MES ina] UGU b4 IG.MES ki-[lÁ]-la-an HUR-ir

[VII N] U.MES [d VI] BIS ša IM.SA5 lab-su
[šú] NU dNa-ru-di ina 1IG-šú-nu ina XV KÁ HUR-ir

[VII N] U.MES šú-ut b4 TUKUL.MES šú IM.BABBAR lab-su


[II4 N] U.MES d.LU JGAL.GIR.RA šú-ut GIR.MES u b4 BAN.MES
[ina šU.MES-šú-nu na-šú-][u]4 u NU dLUGAL.GIR.RA
[šú] IM.BABBAR lab-su
[x x4] ina šip-šatb KÁ HUR-ir

ii' 1'  [x] [x x x x]
 [KÁ].MES UBI.MES x]
 ZID1.SUR1.RA-a KÁ.MES[
 ŠÍN É.A IGILBI [É4]1]
5' KÁ [GUR-MA4 x] lu-[nam-x-]

ina nu-bat-ti-šú-nu [x][
ina UGU b4 NÁ.MES šú-[š-
NU b4 bi-nit]
NU dLUGAL.GIR.RA
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Translation

i' 1' [.....] ... [ 
[..... a man a substitute? 
[.....]...... šadānu šābinu-stone [you shall pulverize in water,] 
[Incantation: šadānu šābinu-stone, having seven horns r[eady,] 
5' [thrice you shall recite; the door-posts of the rooms, the [... ] 
[the ... ] (and) the attic rooms with gypsum that you have soaked (in that water) 
[you shall wash; big weather-beasts, wrestlers, with butimen that you have melted 
[in the ..]. and in the outer gate, and big weather-beasts, wrestlers, 
in the corners (of the rooms) you shall draw, big weather-beasts linked together, 
10' [with bitumen (on the door-post of the gate, right and left, you shall draw,] 
[wrestlers on both doors you shall draw. 

[Seven figures of [Sebetti], clad in red paste, 
(with) a figure of Narudda in front of them, on the right of the gate you shall draw. 

[Seven figures of weapon-men, clad in gypsum, 
15' [with a (figure of the god) of the [house] posted behind them, on the left of the gate you shall draw, 
[two? figures of Lugalgirra who [hold] daggers and bows 
in their hands] and a figure of Lugalgirra 
clad in gypsum 
[...] on the architrave of the gate you shall draw.

ii' 1' [.....] ... [ 
gates], corners [ a circle of flour [you shall draw] at the gates [ Incantation: "of the house, its front ... [ 
5' The gate you shall [close] and [ 

When they go to rest [ 
on the beds ... [ The figure of tamarisk! [ 
the figure of Lugalgirra
10' VII.NU.MES dVII.[BI
VII.NU.MES šu-u[Ša]TUKUL.MEŠa
VII.NU.MES NU[N]².ME.MEŠa
[x][
an-nu-ši
15' EGIR-šu-nu [d]Laš]-me GU[d.DUMU].dUTUa
KU[6].[LÚ.LUL]-lu [
EGIR-šu-nu ta- [
VIII.NU.MES NUN.ME.MEŠ
VII.NU.MES [x x][
[x x x x x][d]Laš-me ]
[GUD.DUMU].dUTU][
[d]LÚ.LUL][d]La-ta-rak
25' NU.MEŠ [EGIR-[x][
a-[x][

iii' 1' [x x x]
GI DUG.G[A
XV U [CL]
UDU [NA₂ x x][
5' US.MEŠ-šu-nu ina DU[G³
ù GARI-šu-nu [
in UGU [ab]-r[i
BAL-tú BAL-qú [
VII.TA.ÁM [x][
10' NIG. U? LA? U ZA [UM/DUB][
LÚ.MAŠ.MAŠ [x][
ÉN UR.SAG³][
ÉN LUGAL [x
uš-kin [x][
15' an-nam [x][
ina US MÁŠ [x][
[x x]
the seven figures of Sebet[tu
the seven figures of the [weapon-m]en [the seven figures of the s[ages']
... [these [

Thereafter [ figures of[
[the hairy one], of B[ison
of Fish-Man [Thereafter ... [The seven figures of the sages

The seven figures of the sages

the seven figures of the [weapon-m]en [the seven ... [
[............][Bison][[Lulal][

Thereafter [figures of[

iv' 1' [x x x x x x x] [x] [x x x x x] [x x x] [én x x] [x x x] VII-[]šú SID]-nu


5' [DIŠ N]A KÁ-šú ħu-ub-bu-ub a <KLA. dÍD IM.BABBAR IM.SAŠ I-níš SÚD b>

[ina bil-la-tu a] HÍ.HÍ-ma ÉN ez-ze-ta šam i (text: KID)-ra-ta b

[III-šú ana SA Ś]ID-nu ZAG.DUŠ KÁ É NA IM.GÚ a
[x x x EG]IR-šú a bil-la-tu b ša HÍ.HÍ

[x x x i]na UGU IM.GÚ ta-šá-hat a

10' [kiš-p]i a ana É NA NU TE-ḫi

[x x x x] [x] ana UGU maš-qi-tá a šá GİR HUL-tim
[ina É NA KU]D-si a ÉN EN [TEMEN] É.KUR.RA b
[X-šú ŚID-nu [x x x]-aš-šu šá ana [dÁLAD k]ina É NA KUD-si

[x x x x] a-na É.NUN SUM-in

15' [NA ana] É-šú GIBIL. ana KU A-šú ina U 4 ŠE.GA a
[x x x x A K]U SUD ĝšUTUG ŠUB-di a
[x x x a] ana dÉ.A dUTU u d[ASAL].LÚ.HÍ LÁ-[aš]
[x x x x] [x] ina UGU-[ẖī]GÍD.DA-[ad] ŠE.NUMUN DUB-[ak]
[x x x x x x] [x] ÉN DIN.GIR [nam-nu a] III-šú ŚID-nu

20' [x x x x x] [x] [EN dUTU x x x] [x x x x x] [x] [DA] [ ] É[ ]
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[Incantation: ........] seven [times you shall recite].

[That the one may be at peace with the other: sprinkle [the threshold with vinegar.]

[When someone's gate is purified, < sulphur, gypsum, and red paste]
you shall mix it [into the billatu-liquid] and Incantation: “you are fierce you

[together you shall crush,> you shall mix it [into the billatu-liquid] and Incantation: “you are fierce you

[thrice] [you shall recite][over it], the door-post of the gate of the house of the man with the sediment

[you shall smear7, there] after the billatu-liquid into which you have mixed (the ingredients)

[you shall ..., and] wash over the sediment.

[Sorcery will not approach the house of the man.

[over the potion of “to [block the progress of evil

[in someone's house”] Incantation: “lord of the [foundation] of Ekur”

[x times you shall recite] ... of “to keep the šedu demon away from someone's house”,

[... to the bedroom you shall give

[That someone] may enter his new house: on a favourable day

[... holy [water] you shall sprinkle, a reed-hut you shall erect

[... for Ea Samaš and Marduk you shall get ready,

[... a curtain7] you shall draw over it, you shall heap seed

[... ] Incantation: “[radiant] god” thrice you shall recite

[... ] Incantation: “Šamas... [ [ ] ... [ [ ] ] house [ ] ]
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NOTES TO TEXT IV

i' 3rd Restored after I "435" and the similar text quoted in the note to I "435".
4th Restored after the note to I "435".
5th Cf. Text I 248f., II Rev. 34f.
7th Restored after text II Rev. 35.

b Cf. Text II Rev. 35: ina ša UB MEŠE [DO.A.B] ta-ta-hat-ma U₄.GAL,GESPU ina UGU te-es-si-ir. W. von Soden AHW 1412b reads here: ugališa' u., "mit u.1". For the following reasons we consider GESPU in this context to be a logogram for ša umāši (pl. šāt umāši), "wrestler":
1 In bilingual texts GESPU is translated as ša umāši (AFO 14 150:217f. = text III.B.13+j; AAA 22 90:172f. = text III.C).
2 If GESPU denoted an object, the relation between the object GESPU and U₄.GAL would have to be expressed by a genitive; GESPU by itself could not denote the figures. Although in i' 11'[G][S][M][E][S] could denote the objects GESPU, it is far more probable that it denotes the same type of figures mentioned before in this text and elsewhere (III.B.13+j, III.C, quoted above). Similarly kisṣuratu is the shortened form of ugalīša kisṣuratu (cf. note to text I "437"a).
The two terms defining ugalīša, GESPU and kisṣuratu, are used to define different māšu, "twins" in bit mēseri (text III.B.13+h, 13+j; also AAA 22 90:172f.); since only the ugalīša are described in this manner, and since māšu is not a description of a type of figure but a way of referring to a figure occurring in pairs (the references stem from the incantations and not from the descriptive parts of the text), we conclude that the two types of māšu of bit mēseri (and AAA 22 90:172f.) are in fact two types of ugalīša.

9th Cf. text II Rev. 35 quoted in the preceding note.

b The fact that the spelling with š recurs as a variant of kisṣuratu in CT 16 36:26 (cf. AAA 22 914 = text III.C) excludes emendation (* ki-š <šu>-nu-š). Perhaps kisṣu is a phonetic variant of kisṣurātu, which would make it comparable to the problematical pair sehrū/sehrītu (cf. Stol Studies in Old Babylonian History 77).
10th ina restored after above 7'. Cf. text III.B.13+j: twins ... ša umāši ša šīt ina sippi bābi imma u šumela udik.

13th Here and in 15', ša has been restored after the context and the parallel in III.B.6.
16th The plural forms šāt, GIR.MES and BAN.MES prove that we are dealing with a plurality of figures of Lugalgirra (cf. II.A.3.3).

17th Restored after similar descriptions in text I 308f., 320f.
19th Cf. AHW 1246b, šisipšisatu, "Holzgitter?". The word is attested here for the first time in a SB text; it must be something in the middle of the gate. Deller OLZ 60 249 proposes "Türsims, Architrave".

ii' 4th The incantation is unknown to me. Similar incipits in a related text are SB.TU 2 16 ii 16, 21, 22.
5th Cf. AFJ 21 18:41 in a similar context and text V ii'11'.
11th Restored after i' 14' and text I where the only group of seven beside the apkallū and the Sebetti is the group of šāt kakki. The unique šāt kappe of text III.B.6 are unlikely candidates in this text generally comparable to ritual I/II.
12th The only plausible group of seven here are the apkallī (cf. 11'1a), but the reading is epigraphically uncertain.

16th In 16'f. the monsters of clay (and the anthropomorphic laḫmu) are apparently enumerated; kusariškū follows laḫmu in similar enumerations in other texts (cf. VII.A).

iii' 12th Perhaps the incantation EN U.R.A.S.O. šTU.U.DA of text IV/1 i'4' and CT 16 39 Rev. 35. However, other incantations beginning with U.R.A.S.O. do exist (e.g. BAM 3 XV ad 216 28'–32', BAM 322 Rev. 80, KAR 253 Rev. 8).

iv' 4th Cf. K 2331:3': LÜ.KI.LU.SILIME in a ritual also involving AGESŠIN.NA (text mentioned by Borger ZA 61 73 and BCh 30 182. Building ritual, unpublished); BAM 315 iv 5, Semitica 3 17f. ii 16'.
5th 5'–10' is parallel to, but not identical with, text II Rev. 41–42.
[Δ8-N]A is restored after text II 41. The gap could have accommodated more signs but the text is complete as restored. Instead of šu-ub-ub-ub, text II 41 correctly has šu-ub-ub.
b Corrected after text II 41; the omission of the ingredients to be mixed with the billatu-liquid (6' and II 41') must be incorrect.
6th Restored after text II 41f. and 8' where billatu refers back to an earlier description of its preparation.

b For this incantation cf. above ad text II Rev. 42.
7th IM.GU, a verb and EGR are to be restored in the small gap of text II Rev. 42.
8 a Not preserved in text II.

b Note the syllabic spelling of billatu. In text II we must read KANUSALKALU.HI-MA as billatutuballilu-MA, “the billatu-liquid into which you have mixed (the ingredients of Rev. 41)”.  

9 a Text II Rev. 42 has a slightly different text: ina KUŠNI tET-sat-MA sat-lim (end of section), “you shall wash it over his body and he will be well”.

text II has a slightly different text: ina KUŠNI tET-sat-MA sat-lim (end of section), “you shall wash it over his body and he will be well”.

10 a This phrase follows in II Rev. 41 on the introductory phrase, here first half of 5’.

11 a The potion (masqu) cf. Parpola LAS 2 353 is not described in the preserved parts of the text. It is not to be connected with the substances of the preceding section.

12 a For references to this phrase cf. above II.B.

b The incantation is unknown to me.

13 a The sign is UN rather than KAL. For 4LAAD in this context cf. II.B.1.G.


16 a For 8SUTUG cf. Mayer UFBG 174 65, AHw 1294a, ShTU 2 16 Obv. i 9, 17 Obv. iii 2.

17 a For 8SUTUG cf. Mayer UFBG 174 65, AHw 1294a, ShTU 2 16 Obv. i 9, 17 Obv. iii 2.

19 a The incantation prescribed here is possibly to be identified with UFBG 420 Šamaš 90.

**B General observations**

At least part of the purpose of the present text is the purification of the gate (iv’ 5’), probably of a new house (iv’ 15’), and the magical defence of the house against anticipated evil (ii’ 3ff., figures of armed gods in the gate). Although no reference is made to a sick man in the preserved parts of the text, and “his” (of the sick man) body” of II Rev. 42 is replaced in iv’ 9’ by “the sediment”, the owner of the new house is considered threatened: the “substitute” (i’ 2’) can only be his. The eventualities of an unfriendly visitor, sorcery and “entry of the enemy” (šēp lemuttim) are treated separately in iv’ 4’–14’. A final (?) ritual before the purified and magically defended house was entered is described in iv’ 15’ff.

**C Similar rituals**

The text shows similarities with other building rituals but does not seem to be part of one of them:

1 Series *Kulla* (cf. Zimmern ZA 30 212, Falkestein LSSNF 1 3, Bottéro *Annaire EPHE* 1974/75 IVe section 95ff. ad KAR 44:2a).

   a H. Zimmern, Ein Babylonisches Ritual für eine Hausweihe, ZA 23 369–376 (cf. Borger ZA 61 73); similar texts: Borger ZA 61 73 (references to unpublished texts; for K 8026 see below text V MS D), von Weiher ShTU 2 16ff. K 11735, ShTU 2 17, RA 65 158ff. no. 2, KAR 253a, K 3354 (Zimmern ZA 30 212) followed by K 4147 (Meek RA 47 17 132, cf. Borger HKL 2 193).


2 Another series consisting of several tablets (Borger ZA 61 73):

   a K 3472, K 7247.

   b R. Borger, Tonmännchen und Puppen, *BiOr* 30 176–183 (cf. CRRAI 20 107). This text identifies the god with the staff as Ninšubura (cf. Rittig *Kleinplastik* 36ff., 209ff.). The presence of Ninšubura under the dais of a temple ensures the proper contact between god and man; it is not apotropaic. We will return to this subject in a separate study. Sixteen other figures are described but not
named (cf. Rittig *Kleinplastik* 180ff.). The kneeling (*kamsūtu*) statues holding a mace (*hutpalā*) are possibly to be compared with the winged figures of the palace reliefs (above II.A.4.B).

c) K 3810 (+) 7 K 2331 (*BiOr* 30 182, *ZA* 61 73 and note 2; quoted above note iv' 4"a").


For "Building Rites" in general cf. Ellis *Foundation Deposites* 5ff.

### D Inventory of figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text I/II (cf. II.A.3)</th>
<th>Text IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> <strong>apkallu (āmu)</strong></td>
<td>cf. below 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Sebettu</td>
<td>i'12', ii'10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Lugalgirra</td>
<td>i'16'?, ii'9'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> šāit kakkā</td>
<td>i'14', ii'11', 20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> ša ittāt ammatu lān-šu</td>
<td>i'8' (cf. II.A.3.2 for the designation NU <em>ēšbi-ni</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Meslamteca</td>
<td>[to be restored at the broken end of i']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Naruddu</td>
<td>i'13'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> îl bāti</td>
<td>i'15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> <strong>apkallu (bird)</strong></td>
<td><strong>apkallu</strong> appear in i&quot; 12' (?) and 19' but it is uncertain to which group they belong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> <strong>apkallu (fish)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong> <strong>apkallu (fish)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong> <strong>apkallu (fish)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong> laḫmu</td>
<td>ii' 16', [ii' 22' ?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong> bašmu</td>
<td>[ii' 16'?], [ii' 23'?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong> mušhuššu</td>
<td>[ii' 16'?], [ii' 23'?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong> ušgalu</td>
<td>i' 7', 8', 9', 11'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong> uridimmu</td>
<td>[ii' 16'?], [ii' 23'?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong> kasarikku</td>
<td>ii' 16', 23'; spelled GUD.DUMU. 4UTU (cf. II.A.3.18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong> giraballā</td>
<td>[ii' 16'?], [ii' 23'?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong> urmaḫullā</td>
<td>[ii' 16'?], [ii' 23'?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong> Lulal</td>
<td>[ii' 17'?], ii' 24'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong> Latarak</td>
<td>[ii' 17'?], [ii' 24']</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong> kalullā</td>
<td>ii' 17', [ii' 23'?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong> suḫurāššu</td>
<td>[ii' 17'?], [ii' 23'?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong> dogs</td>
<td>[ii' 17'?], [ii' 25'?]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only NU *ēšbi-ni* is certainly not a drawn figure; all other figures are either drawn (col. i') or of unknown execution (col. ii').

The colours of the Sebettu and of the weapon-men are the same as those prescribed for these figures in text I/II: red and white. The colour prescription for Lugalgirra is not preserved in text I/II; in view of differences between the Lugalgirra of text
IV and the Lugalgirra of text I/II (who is armed with bow and arrows) we hesitate to restore the colours of text I/II after text IV.

The positions of the gods and the ugallu in the outer gate (col. i') strongly resemble those of text I/II (cf. II.A.4.A). We may assume that they fulfil the same function. We may also assume that the apkal-ulû, the laḫmu, the monsters, Lulal and Latarak, and the dogs were present in text IV, and fulfilled similar functions. The presence of some of them is ascertained by the text; all information on their functions is broken away.

E  Text IV/1

BM 74119. Fig. 17. Neo-Babylonian.

This text was identified by W.G. Lambert as belonging to the present subject.

\[
\text{I'} \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{II SUHUR.MAŠ DÛ-uš}^a \\
\text{er-ba taš-mu}^a \\
\text{u ma-ga-r[i ina Á-sú-nu SAR-ár}^a
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{II KU₆.U₄.UL[U-u DÛ-uš ...]} \\
\text{ri-da hi-sib KUR-i er-ba taš-mu u ma-ga-r}^a \text{ ina Á-sú-nu}^b
\]

\[
\text{II NU [DÔ-uš}^a \text{x-[x]-[x]} \text{šá gîs\,PA [gîs]\,GÎŠI|MMAR na-sú-u} \\
\text{[ku-bu-us lum-nu er-ba meš]-nu-ú [ ina Á-sú-nu SAR-ár} \\
\text{[a]-na KÂ É.|GAL-lim}^2 |LUGAL^7|LA BAL AN
\]

\[
\text{[} \\
\text{]} \\
\text{[} \text{x x x x x}[ \\
\text{]}
\]

\[
\text{ii'} \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{1'} \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{[} \text{x x x x} [ \\
\text{]} \text{[x]} \text{ul-tu KÂ Ė.|pa-pa-hi} \\
\text{[} \text{x]} \text{iš-ba-tu-ma}^a \\
\text{[} \\
\text{É|N UR.SAG Ú.TU.UD.DA}^a \\
\text{5'} \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{[} \\
\text{]} \text{NU.MEŠ šú-nu-tî} \\
\text{[} \text{TI-qî} \\
\text{]}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

NOTES TO TEXT IV/1

\text{i'} \quad \text{0\,\textsuperscript{a}} \quad \text{Restoration based on the inscription (in text II only the sukurû and the kulullû have inscriptions with u ma-ga-r[i]) prescribed for this being. DÔ-uš is restored after the uncertain reading of \textit{6'}}. In text I DÔ-uš is the last word of the descriptions (196, 105, 114, 142, 191).

\text{1\,\textsuperscript{a}} \quad \text{Restored after text II Rev. 5.}

\text{2\,\textsuperscript{a}} \quad \text{Restored after text II Rev. 4 (ina Á-sú-nu) and below 5' (SAR-ár).}

\text{4\,\textsuperscript{a}} \quad \text{Restored after text II Rev. 6f.}

\text{b} \quad \text{Cf. note 2\,\textsuperscript{a}.}

\text{5\,\textsuperscript{a}} \quad \text{To the left of SAR a smaller written PAP is visible in the margin. It is a scribal mark indicating "incorrect entry", cf. Bezold \textit{Catalogue} 408 ad K 2111, Caplice 129}
Reading ĐU-us epigraphically uncertain. The contrast with 3', where before the name of the being in question NU does not appear, leads to the assumption that in 6' after NU no name will appear. On the other hand text II with the same sequence suhurmāšu — kulullā and the same inscription for these figures leads us to expect here one of the beings following on the kulullā. The girtablullā is certainly not meant here, but the next figure (text II Rev. 9–8) has a similar inscription and holds ĐU-PA šu-dišimmār. I could not decipher the sign(s) giving the name of this being (NUMES xx); here [ĐU-us] seems impossible. The inscription prescribed for these beings is slightly different from the inscription of text II i'6': "trample evil, enter wealth" (text II: “tear out evil, enter wealth”).

The nature of this text remains unclear. It is concerned perhaps with the palace (i' 8'; uncertain reading) and certainly with a shrine (ii' 2'); a building ritual? The correspondence of text IV/1 with ritual II Rev. 3ff. is probably coincidental; there are also differences: after the kulullā the girtablullā is omitted, and i' 6'ff. is not exactly the same as II Rev. 9f. Furthermore, it seems unlikely that a text from Babylonia could be based on a nisḫu from Aššur with a quite unusual relation to the main text (ritual I, cf. II.A.5.A).

For translations, we refer to text II.A.1, where books and articles containing translations of the corresponding parts of text II are enumerated. Col. ii' is too broken for translation. Col. i' 6'f. has been translated in the note.

Since ii' 5' NUMES šu-nu-tū implies a preceding description of “those statues”, and since col. i' apparently contains this description, the text must belong to the reverse of the tablet. Thus, although text IV/1 and text V describe the statues in a similar way, text IV/1 is probably not part of text V, where the statues are described on the obverse.

Inventory of figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I/II</th>
<th>Text IV/1</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2 kułullā</td>
<td>i' 3' ff.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 suhurmāšu</td>
<td>i' 0' ff.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 figures</td>
<td>i' 6' ff.</td>
<td>ara gišimmār</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inscriptions on the suhurmāšu and kułullā conform to ritual I/II. The inscription on the third figure is slightly different.
A building Ritual

A The text

Presently four MSS are known:

a  BM 64517  Figs. 15, 16.  Neo-Babylonian.
B  K 2496   Figs. 11, 12.  Neo-Assyrian.
C  K 10232  Figs. 16.  Neo-Assyrian.
D  K 8026  Fig. 17.  Neo-Assyrian

R. Borger HKL 2 90 ad Gurney AAA 22 recognized K 2496 Rev. 12'ff. as a duplicate to text I 277f.; I. Finkel lead me to BM 64517 that turned out to be a duplicate of K 2496. His provisional transcription of this MS was of great help in deciphering its contents. K 8026 was mentioned by Borger (ZA 61 73) as related to K 3397+, Zimmern's Babylonisches Ritual für eine Hausweihe (ZA 23 369ff.); he quoted line 4' in Symbolae Böhl 52 ad Si 36:22.
\[\text{II} \text{ ba-aš-mu šá gšišinig}^{a}, [\text{KUR.RA ina KÁ TILLA}^{4}]\]
\[\text{te-te-em-mer}\]

\[\text{II lāh-mu x x x ina}^{a} \text{[Á]-šú-nu er-[ba MAŠKIM SILIM-me]}\]
\[\text{si-i MAŠKIM HUL}^{a} \text{SA}R-ádr ina KÁ TILLA_{4}\]
\[\text{x x x É}^{?}-\text{a-nu te-te-em-mer}\]

\[\text{II GUD.DUMU.4UTU šá gša BAAN.DU}^{8} \text{.DU8 ĪL-ú ina Á-[šú-nu]}\]
\[\text{si-i ÛS er-ba T}^{a} \text{.LA SAR-ádr}\]
\[\text{É}^{?}-\text{a-ni te-te-mmer}\]

\[\text{15'} \] 
\[\text{šá} \]
\[\text{ĪL-ú ina Á-šú-nu}\]
\[\text{SAR-ádr ina k}^{i}-\text{[sal-li]}\]
\[\text{É}^{a} ?\] 

Gap
Translation

| 1' | ... [ ] (an inscription) ... you shall write [ ]
| 5' | deep-going boats of] cornel and a [“mountain crow”]

[... in the room of the courtyard? you shall bury.

| 10' | [Two Vipers of juniper in the outer gate]
|     | [ ] you shall bury.

| 10' | [Two Hairies ...... on] their [sides “enter guardian of peace]
|     | [go out guardian of evil” you shall write, in the outer gate
|     | [and insi]de you shall bury.

| 15' | [Two Bisons who] carry [a buck]let, on their sides
|     | [“go out death, enter li]fe” you shall write,
|     | [ insi]de you shall bury.

| 15' | [Two ...... who] [carry][a ... ], on their sides
|     | [“...............” you shall write, in the courtyard
|     | [of the house (......) you shall bury.]
B

/ii 1' [ ] [x ] [ ] [x ] MAR

| DINGIR | [É] dXV Éa
| [u dLAMMA É |
| a | .MEŠ tu-ḥap-pa
| a | ana ]ID ŠUB-dîb
| | ]|ana dÉ.A dTU u dASALL]Ú.HI tara-kásb

NU.MES [ma-la te-pu]\nUR.GUG.LA šá gššINIG [II]b UR.GUG.LA šá gšš.INIG.[II]b
II UR.IDIM.MEŠ šá gššEREN II ba-aš-mu šá gššINIG.KUR.ERAa
II láš-mu II GUD.DUMU.dUTU ina šÀ-bi\nPú tuš-za-az-ma

10' LÁL.INUN.NA GEŠTIN L.ÈISH BÁRA.GA BAL-qaš-nu-ti-ša
[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ }
1' the god of the house, the goddess of the house...

5' the lamassu-spirit of the house... into the river you shall throw,

[for Ea, Šamaš and Marduk] you shall prepare [the setting].

The statues that you have made, the statue of tamarisk, [two] Lions of pine, two Mad-Lions of cedar, two Vipers of juniper, two Hairies, two Bisons you shall place in a hole and

10' syrup, butter, wine, oil obtained by pressing, you shall pour out for them and the gates you shall close. In front of the statue of tamarisk you shall speak as follows:

(Incantation translated above text I 277ff.)

22' Seven and seven times you shall say (it) and bury that statue.

[When] you have buried [the statues], what is needed for purification, [...... and] the half-sila containers you shall place in a row at every gate.

25' You shall make seven torches into one, and
infixed it with cedar, cypress, and sweet reed,
you shall pour out? oil obtained by pressing, arrange one row at the right of the house:

first [...], behind that the censer and the goat-that-hits-evil,
behind that the man who is clad in a red garment and holds the whip,
30' behind that the goat-for-the-torch, the living-sheep, a goose,
the hide-of-the-great-bull, the strong-copper, seed, [the man] who recites the incantation,

[and ...], behind that mashatu-flour, [...]. this

35' [... you shall purify,

[... two censers]

[... you shall place

[... you shall purify

[... you shall draw

[...]

40' [...]

[...]

[...]

[...]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{D} & \quad \text{[an-nu-u] lu } \text{[} \text{[x] } \text{[shu-} \text{[x]} \text{]} \\
\text{[ana } \text{[e an-} \text{n}\text{-i-} \text{[a} } \text{[x]} \text{[i-pu-} \text{[s}\text{]} \\
\text{[\text{[a} } \text{[ana } \text{[e an-ni-} \text{i-kur-} \text{[b} \text{-} \text{[s}\text{]} \\
\text{5'} & \text{[lu} \quad \text{[SIG5-im} \text{[a} \text{ina } \text{[s}\text{[a-bi-b} \text{-} \text{[s}\text{]} \\
\text{[GIM an-nam taq-ta-b]u-u ana } \text{[iG} \text{[d} \text{[e-A} \\
\text{[dUTU u] dASALLU hi ki-a-am tu } \text{[s}\text{[a-ba-b} \text{-} \text{[s}\text{][b} \text{-} \text{[c} \\
\text{[ÉN} & \text{[x] SIG5-im } \text{[s}\text{uk-na-nim-ma} \text{[a} \\
\text{[x x H]UL a-na a-dar-a-ti} \\
\text{10'} & \text{[lu-ab-lu? t] } \text{[x] } \text{[x] } \text{[kur-ba-nim-ma} \\
\text{[l-a]} \text{[i-e } \text{ÉD}[\text{-} \text{[s}] \text{[u-u} \text{-} \text{[b} \\
\text{[ina } \text{[h]} \text{[i-da-a-t]} \text{[u ri-} \text{[s}] \text{[a-a-ta}] \text{[u} \text{[4-mi-} \text{[s} \text{am} \\
\text{[lu]} \text{[t-tal-lak } \text{[ina } \text{[s[\text{-} [\text{-}[e-} \text{[m]} \text{[a } \text{[[s-} \text{[a-am-ma]} \text{[r} \text{[a lu-uk-} \text{[s} \text{u-ud} \\
\text{[ } & \text{[ru-} \text{[u} \text{[t]} \text{[ina } \text{[s]} \text{[i-ri-} \text{[s} \text{[a} \\
\text{15'} & \text{[x x } \text{[l-} \text{[i-nu-} \text{[b} \text{[u } \text{[a } \text{[s[\text{-} [\text{-}[b} \text{-} \text{[s} \\
\text{[ ] [mu-} \text{[u } \text{[ina } \text{[s[\text{-} [\text{-}[b} \text{-} \text{[s} \text{a} \\
\text{[ ] [s} \text{[a} \\
\text{[ ] [ma} \\
\text{20'} & \text{d[a-lt-[l-[ku-nu } \text{[l[du} \text{[l}\text{[l} \\
\text{Gap}
\end{align*}
\]
[When you have said this], in front of Ea, Šamaš and Marduk you shall make him speak as follows:

[Incantation: ......] provide me with good [ ] and joy, forever

may I live,] ... benedict me,
that I may enjoy the house that I have built,
that [in happiness]s [and jubilation] daily
[I] may walk in it, that I may obtain [whatever] I [strive after],

that ... may][... to it,

that ... [may enter] into it,

that ... may]. in it,

that .........] in it,

] it,

] and

I will praise [you.]
POINTS TO TEXT

ii' 2a Uncertain reading. The traces of the last sign of the inscription for the figure described here (if sar-dr is the correct reading) do not fit r bj, the sign expected when the figure described here were the uridimmu; the sequence in col ii' leads us to expect the uridimmu before the bašmu, but the BURUŠ KUR.RA in 4' shows that other figures may have been mentioned or described in col. ii' between the uridimmu and the bašmu.

4a Restored after text II Rev. 23, where MÀ.GURɓ.MEŠ ˒bi ni precedes BURUŠ KUR.RA.

b Cf. Text II Rev. 23.

7a Restored after ii'8'. The uncommon logogram ˒biíng.KUR.RA = burāšu (cf. CAD B 326b) confirms the restoration expected from the sequence of figures in ii'. For an OB attestation see AFO 29:38.

9a Restored after ii'9'. The inscription, identical with the one prescribed for the laḫmu in text II Obv. 43 (cf. II.A.3.13), confirms the restoration.

10a Restored after text II Obv. 43 (cf. II.A.3.13).

12a Restored after ii'9' , the [ju b of ˒baAN.DU₅₂DU₅₂ and the ]LA of the prescribed inscription confirm the restoration, cf. II.A.3.18.

15a Of the monsters of text I/II (cf. II.A.3.13ff.) only the laḫmu (marru), the bašmu (paštu), the ugallu (partru and kakku), the uridimmu (uskaru ?), the kusrâkku (bandudda) and the suhuruljoiningrku (e ru) hold something; all these figures have inscriptions (here indicated by ina A-Su-nu). Laḫmu, bašmu, and kusrâkkû have been treated in the previous lines; ugallu, uridimmu and suhuruljoiningrku remain candidates.

16a Restoration implied by ina A-Su-nu in the previous line.

17a For kisallu biti as the location of a figure cf. text III.B.13+m (Ensimah).

ii' 3a Cf. text I 244. Since between DINIUR and ˒xy the copula is lacking, the text must continue with ur ˓q̱amma bit in the next line. The traces in MS a are uncertain and have been generally ignored here (1'-7'). The attestations of il biti / iltar biti known to me do not help in restoring this passage: CAD 1 101a, CT 16 29 83 (cf. Falkenstein LSSNF 1 182, Borger BîOr 28 66a), J. Prosecký ArOr 43 255 ad x + 145, Hunger SbTU 2 88 ad Vs iii 2 (with references to RAC), Farber ZA 71 62 Obv. 17', Sweet EASW 61, STT 232 Obv. 9, LKA 141 passim, ABRT 57:31, (K 2331 and K 2553, both unpublished).

5a In MS a li 3rd read perhaps here ana še-šim, "in the morning".

b Cf. text I 263.

6a In MS a read perhaps here ana še šim, "to the temple of ... ."

b Division line only in a.

7a Uncertain traces. Restored after text III (bit mēseri ) ii'v 7.

b So B; a omits.

c Cf. text II Rev. 28 where the same figure appears.

8a Cf. above note ii' ˒qa'ila.

9a So a; B omits -bi.

11a Cf. text IV ii' ˒qa'ila.

b Division line only in a.

23a Restoration guessed; tuttammiru needs a plural object (for single statues temēnu G is used) and a subjunctive. In these lines MSS a and B distribute the text over the lines in different ways.

24a Division line only in a.

25a Between 24' and 25' as transcribed here, probably nothing is missing.

b So a, B omits -dr.

c So B, a omits -mu.

26a Restored after KAR 26 20f.

27a So a, B omits še.

29a So a, B: [˒di]-ja-za.

30a Restored after text I 125, cf. also BBR 26 i 21, ii 5, AHw 1402 s.v. udutula for further references.

ii'iv' 3a Restoration after analogy with Symbolae BöhI 52 Si 36:25, 53 Si 12:17.

3a ˒du-su refers to the house built by the inhabitant to be (parallel: Symbolae BöhI 52 Si 36:22, ZA 23 370:22, 371:28, 32); the main verb kurba-šu in the next line has this house and probably the [owner] of this house as objects (parallel: ZA 23 371:28).

4a If in the preceding line ana biti anu is correct, this biti anu cannot also be dependent on kurba-šu but must be dependent on an anun.

5a For similar wishes cf. Symbolae BöhI 53 Si 12:18ff.

7a So a and D; C: -ba-ab.

b So a; C omits; D: -šu.
6' and 7' on two lines in a and C; on one in D.


9a So a; D: ana.

10 So a, after EASW 7:15; C: šlä-a-ti.

11a Cf. the parallels quoted by Mayer UFBG 251 +47; the reading ma-ḻa is also possible (cf. RA 65 160).

12a The copy of a does not favour šlä-bi-tū.

Text V is a building ritual (cf. iii’ 3’, 11’) and perhaps part of one of the fragmentary rituals enumerated above (IV.C). The exorcist buries figures of apotropaic beings on several points in the house to prevent it from being invaded by evil; he purifies the house (ii’ 23’ff.) and both he and the future inhabitant implore blessings from the gods (iii’).

B Inventory of figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I/II</th>
<th>Text V</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Inscr.</th>
<th>buried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>One Cubīt</td>
<td>i’i’ 7’, 11’ (22’)</td>
<td>tamarisk</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 laḥmu</td>
<td>i’ 9’ff., i’i’ 9’</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 bāšmu</td>
<td>i’ 7’ff., i’i’ 8’</td>
<td>juniper</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 uridimmu</td>
<td>i’i’ 8’</td>
<td>cedar</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 kusarikku</td>
<td>i’i’ 12’ff., i’i’ 9’</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>banduddā</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 urgulū</td>
<td>i’i’ 7’</td>
<td>fir</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ārib šadī</td>
<td>i’ 4’</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>makurra</td>
<td>i’i’ 4’</td>
<td>tamarisk</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Uncertain position, cf. II A.3.5. In the incantation shared by both texts this figure is urged to guard its right and left (I 281).

b Spelled GUD.DUMU.dUTU

The complete text described more figures (cf. i’ 15’f.). The enumeration in ii’ 7’f. is apparently incomplete, since at least BURUs KUR.RA is left out; the figures enumerated here, however, form some kind of unit, perhaps because they are buried together.

The hole in which the figures were buried is here referred to by Akkadian būrtu (Pú), “pit”, “hole” (ii’ 9’). In ii’ 9’ they are “placed” in it, but later the text (ii’ 23’) speaks of them as buried.

The wording of the inscriptions, if such are present, conforms to ritual I/II (bašmu, laḥmu, kusarikku). The laḥmu and the kusarikku may, like those of text I/II, have been of clay; their material is not mentioned in this text. Unlike text I/II ritual V prescribes a bašmu of wood without inscription; the uridimmu of cedar is paralleled by text II but not by text I where he is of clay (cf. II A.3.17). The change from clay to cedar in text II is difficult to comprehend and has perhaps been brought about under the influence of prescriptions in other texts (text V). The burial places of text V differ from those in text I/II (cf. especially laḥmu II A.3.13).
C  The Bird.

The bird BURUs KUR.RA (read ārib šadi with CAD A/2 266b) is attested only twice, in text V i' 4' and in text II Rev. 23. We are tempted to identify this bird with the clay birds of the Kleinplastik (Rittig Kleinplastik 123ff.), but since the texts do not name the material the bird is to be made of, and the inscriptions accompanying these clay birds have not (yet) been found prescribed in the texts, this identification must remain tentative.

As to the difficult inscriptions on the clay birds from Babylon (Koldewey WVDOG 15 7 // 19 cf. HKL 1 243f., Meissner OLZ 1915 419f.) we can only add one reading to the previous treatments (Ungnad OLZ 1911 289f., Peiser OLZ 1911 291): 1 UMBIN ḤU.R.L.INmulen1.NA, “claw of an eagle”.
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The ritual for the Substitute King

A The Text

The text has been published by W. G. Lambert in *AFO* 18 109ff. and *AFO* 19 119; related is *LKA* 83 (Borger *HKL* 2 266; *AFO* 18 110 Col. B 3 is restored after *LKA* 83 12: [GIZ.KIM.MEŠ]-ti-ka; 111 Col. C 5f. is analogous to *LKA* 83 7 concerned with mentioning the name of an etemmu, not with an oath). Perhaps also related is K 6336 (identified by Lambert; Rev. i' 11' mentions a ALAM pu-u-ḫi ša ana pu-ḫi LUGAL SUM-nu, "statue of a substitute given as a substitute for the king") recently joined by me to K 5641 (*BBR* 49). Of interest for the subject of the present study is BM 121052 (Fig. 19), a duplicate to *AFO* 18 110ff. Col. B 10–16 (identified by Lambert and Millard *Catalogue* SS 6) and used below. Meaning and background of the ritual are discussed by Parpola *LAS* 2 XXIIff. (with previous literature). BM 121052 // *AFO* 18 110ff. Col. B 10ff.:

The new MS restores

13: i-na ba-ab ú-ri te-ši-mer
14: u.GUD.DUMU.ŠTU šaša šiššiGIN te-pu-ūš
    [ina B.A.R./Š]I GÁB-šú-nu
15: ki-a-am SAR-ār
    [ši]-i lum-nu er-ba mi-ša-ru ta-ša-šar
    (end of column)

Translation

13: you shall bury them in the gate of the roof.
14: Two Bisons of tamarisk you shall make,
    [on] their left [hilp]
15: you shall write as follows:
    ["go out] evil, enter justice".
    You shall write this and

B Inventory of figures

The numbers in the first column refer to the inventory of figures in II.A.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I/II</th>
<th>Col. B</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Inscr.</th>
<th>buried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>II ba-šš-me</td>
<td>17ff (3)</td>
<td>Tamarisk</td>
<td>pašu of tamar.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>II ur-dim-me</td>
<td>10ff (1)</td>
<td>Tamarisk</td>
<td>uskāru of cedar</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>II GUD.DUMU.ŠTU</td>
<td>14ff (2)</td>
<td>Tamarisk</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>II UR.MAḪ.LU.ŠLI-LU</td>
<td>30ff (6)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>banduddā</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>II SUMUR.MĂŠšku</td>
<td>21ff (4)</td>
<td>Tamarisk</td>
<td>hašši ša e'ri</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>II kamsštu</td>
<td>25ff (5)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prescribed inscriptions diverge in all cases from those prescribed in ritual I/II, text IV/1 (suḫurnāšu), and text V; in as far as preserved they are all based on the opposition
of *ši*-i, “go out (evil)” and *er*-ba, “enter (good)”. Since all figures are made of wood, none of these inscriptions has been preserved on an actual figure.

The attributes held by the figures are the same as those of text I/II; there, however, it is the *kusarikku* and not the *urmahullû* that holds the *banduddû*, cf. II.A.4.C. The metal buckets from the Ninurta temple in Babylon (Rittig *Kleinplastik* 22.8.1–2) may have belonged to figures of wood but are not necessarily to be connected with the present ritual. The *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).
### A Inventory of monsters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Rituals</th>
<th>Other texts (below B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>la&lt;em&gt;mu&lt;/em&gt;&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>I 2 1' [ ] [ ] - 2 [ ] 3 2 [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ba&lt;em&gt;šmu&lt;/em&gt;</td>
<td>2 5 [ ] [ ] + 3 1' [ ] 1' [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>mu&lt;em&gt;šuššu&lt;/em&gt;&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3 6 [ ] [ ] [ ] - 8 [ ] 2 3 [ ] 2' [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ugal&lt;em&gt;lu&lt;/em&gt;&lt;sup&gt;det&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>[4] 1 [ ] [ ] [ ] - 4 [ ] 4 - 1 3' [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>uridimmu&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5 [4] [ ] [ ] + 1 5 [ ] 5 4 2 4' 5 [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>kusarikku&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6 [3] 2' [ ] [ ] + 2 3 + 8 5 6 5' 6 1'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>girtablullu&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>[7] 9 [ ] [ ] [ ] - [ ] 6 - 3 6' [ ] 2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>urmahullu&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>[8] 10 [ ] [ ] [ ] 6 [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>kulullu&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9 8 3' 2' [ ] [ ] 6 [ ] 7&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt; 6 7&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt; [ ] 7 [ ] [ ] +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>suhur&lt;em&gt;māšu&lt;/em&gt;</td>
<td>10 7 [ ] 1' [ ] [ ] [ ] 4 7 [ ] - 7 8 [ ] [ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Spelled mu<em>ššu-tu</em>r in both MSS of II 185 (mu<em>ššu-tu</em>r in 8:7; cf. Cooper <em>AnOr</em> 52 141<sup>b</sup>) and syllabically in all other texts.

<sup>b</sup> Spelled u<em>Š.GAL</em> in all rituals and 11, u<em>Š.GAL-la</em> in 7 and 9, u<em>Š.GAL-lum</em> in 9 III 32, u<em>Š.GAL-šu</em> in 12.

<sup>c</sup> Spelled ur<em>-dim-me</em> in VI, ur<em>-dim-me</em> (me) in 9, ur<em>-dim-me</em> in 10 and ur<em>-dim</em> in all other texts.

<sup>d</sup> Spelled syllabically in I, 7, 9 (III 91: ku<em>-ša-rak-ki</em>), 10, GUD.DUMU<sup>d</sup> (cf. II.A.3.18) in II, IV, V, VI, GUD.DUMU<sup>d</sup> in 8 (ku<em>-ša-rak-ki</em>, bilingual), 11, 12, 13, and GUD.DUMU<sup>d</sup> (cf. II.A.3.18) in 14.

<sup>e</sup> In rituals only <em>laḥmu</em> is sometimes furnished with the determinative DINIR (I 184 MS C, IV); in Ee (9) <em>laḥmu</em> (here in the form <em>laḥama</em>) is always furnished with the determinative, and so is <em>muḥuššu</em> occasionally as well; 7, 8, 10 and 11 do not use determinatives at all (but the unpub. duplicate of 10, 79, 8, 193, preserving only <em>laḥmu</em> and <em>muḥuššu</em>, uses the determinative for both); 12 has only <em>kusarikku</em> (GUD.DUMU<sup>d</sup>), 14 apparently only <em>urahullu</em> (before GUD.DUMU<sup>d</sup> the text is broken), and 13 gives all preserved figures the determinatives.

<sup>f</sup> For further ugallu cf. I IV 3 and notes "<sup>435</sup>b", "<sup>437</sup>a", text I/4; II Rev. 35, III 13+h, 13+j.

<sup>g</sup> In text 7 the <em>muḥuššu</em> appears in another context (III 13) as Marduš's mount (ku<em>-ša-rak-ki</em> / i-<em>lu-ši</em>-šui); in text 14 the <em>muḥuššu</em> appears a few lines before the other monsters, but as Nabû's ally rather than as one of the slain heroes (82:7, cf. also 86:15: rakib <em>muḥuššu</em>, "who rides the m.").

<sup>h</sup> Spelled ku<em>-ši</em>-šu in 11 and ku-<em>ši</em>-šu in one MS of Ee (9, <em>KAR</em> 162 Rev. 4).

The comparison of ritual I/II with the other texts shows that we are dealing with a limited set of figures. The inscriptions prescribed for these figures in ritual I, in this respect more explicit than ritual II, 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 II could not be read (numbers 3 and 4); above (II.A.3.18 and 17) we identified their names as <em>kusarikku</em> and <em>uridimmu</em> 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: <em>laḥmu</em>, baš<em>šmu</em>, ugal<em>lu</em>, uridimmu, kusarikku, urmahullu, kulullu, and suhur<em>māšu</em>. For two monsters the text does not prescribe inscriptions: <em>muššuššu</em> and suhur<em>māšu</em>. 

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

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

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

If combinatory logic alone is not enough to establish the identity of the figures beyond doubt, the etymology of their names affords a check on the proposed identification (below C). It will be seen that the names of the monsters (including the *lahmus*) 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 II.A.5.A.
Ignoring text VI, all texts start with "Iahmu-bašmu-mušḫuššu" and continue with ugallu-uridimmu; only in 9 and 11 is kusarikku separated from ugallu-uridimmu, which forced us to make it a separate group. All texts end with girtablullû-urnamhullû, followed by kulullû-suḫurmasû (reverse order of groups in VI); exceptions again are 9 and 11 where the displaced kusarikku is accommodated after (9) or in between these groups (11).

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

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

B The army of Tiâmat and its history

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

7 Pinches 5 R 33 iv 50ff. (collations by W. van Soldt). Late copy of an inscription of Agum-kakrime, an early Kassite king, relating the return of Marduk to Babylon and the building of his temple by the king. Here Marduk is not yet the sole ruler of the universe (cf. i 5ff., vii 34ff.); the text does not reflect the theology of Enûma elîš. The mušḫuššu (cf. above note g) is already Marduk's symbolic animal and perhaps for that reason does not appear among the monsters laid in with gems in the wood of the doors of his cella. The text cannot be dated exactly and its authenticity remains a subject of discussion, cf. Brinkman MSKH I 95f. (and index), Sommerfeld Der Aufstieg Marduks 172 (with previous literature), Schott OLZ 45 165ff. [A new text, P 24 97, mentions Babylon and Esagil, and enumerates the monsters: bašmu, mušḫuššu, ugallu, uridimmu, kusarikku and suḫurmasû. The text is probably MB and comes from Babylon].

8 W. G. Lambert, The Chariot of Marduk, Symbalae Böhl 275ff. 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 Enûma elîš. Analogous to the monsters of Ninurta's chariot in Angim 51ff., they can be understood as Marduk's thropies. A further theriomorphic monster was probably mentioned in 11; it sticks out its tongue (cf. mušḫuššu, aš e-m-e 6-d-e, Gudea CY 6 XXV1 24ff.).

9 W. G. Lambert, Enûma elîš. The Babylonian Epic of Creation. The Cuneiform Text. I 133ff. // II 19ff. // III 23ff. // III 81ff. The monsters are created by mother Ḫubur / Tiâmat to fight against the younger gods. The number is enlarged with mušmahhû, ušumgalû and umû dabrûtu, so that together with their general Kingu they total twelve. They bear unsparring weapons, are unafraid of battle (144 and parallels, cf. V 74) and terrifying (VI 115). In IV 116 they are galû, "soldiers". After their defeat by Marduk they are bound and trampled underfoot (IV 115ff.); Marduk breaks their weapons and installs their images (salmu) in the gate of Apsû (saying): "let this be a token; may it never be forgotten" (V 73ff., cf. Landsberger and Kinnier Wilson JNES 20 176, Frankena Fs Brongers 33f. ad STC II 67:5f., Lambert Atra-hasis 58:216f., 229f.). Berossos' account of creation
contains a reference to Tiamat's monsters set up (after defeat) in the temple of Bel (S. Mayer Bursttein SANE 1/5 14 2.1f.; the monsters of Berossos were added already by Delitzsch AW 99f.). Assyrians advancing to battle against Tiamat and the offspring of her womb (nabûn qerrûšû), "the beasts (umûdânûmû)", are engraved on the copper gate of Sennacherib's akûtu house (OIP 2 139ff., cf. Fallis akûtu 260ff.). These decorations are not preserved but they may be compared with the decorations on the bronze bands of the doors of Nabû's temple in Khorsabad (Loud-Altman Khorsabad 11 Pl. 49); they show a kusarekkû (or perhaps an urûdinnû, Koîbe Reliefprogramme 135), a kulullû and a mudûšûšû (remainder not preserved). This temple may also have contained an akûtu-complex (Postgate Sumer 30 51ff.), but the representations and the akûtu festival are not necessarily related. The fanciful collection of monsters (4 kusarekkû, 4 kulullû, 4 subûrmâšû 2 urûdinnû, 2 giratullû) at the entrance of Sennacherib's "Ost-änbau" of the Assyrian temple (Börker-Klähn ZA 70 258ff., esp. 260ff.2 with previous literature; the four kusarekkû of Sennacherib were replaced by Esarhaddon by two: Borger Asarhaddon 87 Rs. 4ff., Börker-Klähn ZA 70 266ff.) have been promoted by architecture and apotropaic magic rather than by Ec.

The exact date of Ec within the MB period remains a subject of dispute, cf. Komoróczay Act Ant Hung 21 30ff. and most recently Lambert BSOAS 47 1ff.

Fastening slain adversaries to buildings is a practice attested elsewhere:

- In the provincial version of the Anûzû myth (cf. Wiggermann Fs Kraus 423ff.) STT 23 // 25 Sûf (Hruška Anzu 173), Ninurta fastens the slain Anûzû to the front of the Ekur. The text explains the actual presence of apotropaic Anûzû's at the gates of Mesopotamian temples (cf. Hruška Anzu 77ff.).

- After cutting the cedar and killing Ḫumbaba, Gilgamesh and Endiku return to Nippur with a door made out of the felled cedar and the head of Ḫumbaba (von Weher Banût 11 100ff. // EG Pl. 19 K 3252). The door is a present for Enil: li-stû-du [î-tu-um-ga]6En-ii /// li-stû-ii-îm /// En-ii (TIM 9 46:27ff., OB), "may Enil the ruler be pleased . . . , may Enil be jubilant about it (the door)"; indeed it arrives in Nippur where it is later bitterly addressed by Enkidû (tablet VII). What happens to the head of Ḫumbaba? In tablet VII Lansberger RA 62 1032 reads a broken line (STT 14 Obv. 8a) of Enkidû's speech to the door as: [inda] ka-sû lu [i]-zi-za an-zû-a-a, "In seinem (=des Enil) Tore hätte ich den Vogeldämon aufgestellt". Anûzû, however, is completely out of place here, he has nothing to do with the adventures of Gilgamesh and Enkidû. A reading ʰuûm-bal-bal is equally possible and solves the riddle of Ḫumbaba's destiny. The Sumerian forerunner of this part of the epic (van Dijk GSI 71 99ff.) relates how Gilgamesh and Enkidû enter Ekur and place the head of Ḫumbaba before Enil. Another OB Sumerian text containing references to the Gilgamesh cycle speaks of Ḫumbaba as an ur-su ag da-dû-da-ba, a "captured hero" (cf. Cooper AnOr 52 110); he is brought to Enil in Nippur and probably underwent the same fate as the captured heroes of Ninurta/Ningirûtu (Cooper AnOr 52 141ff.), that end up as trophies on his chariot or temple (Klein AOAT 25 280:95ff.). Indeed, Ḫumbaba-heads are actually attested at the doors of Mesopotamian temples (cf. Th. Howard-Carter Iraq 45 69ff.) and elsewhere as an apotropaion against evil (cf. Moorey Iraq 37 88, Opificius UAVA 2 221ff., and generally Wilcke RIA 4 530ff.).

- Marduk Ordeal Text (T. Frymer-Kensky, JAOS 103 133, 135:) 20: "[the head which they hang] on the gateposts of the 'Mistress of Babylon': that is the head of the criminal who stood with him".

- An especially clear case comes from Nebuchadnezzar King of Justice (W.G. Lambert, Iraq 27 5, 8) 6ff.: "... (a criminal) .. they cut off his head and sent it through the land. They (also) cut off a stone head, made it into the likeness of that man's head, had the following inscribed on that man's head, and fixed it on the outer gate of that law court for all mankind to see: A man whose case has been judged, the tablet of whose verdict has been written, and whose tablet has been sealed, but afterwards he returns for judgement — in like manner shall his head be cut off".

10 Šarpû 8 6ff. // 79–7–8, 193 (unpublished; quoted by CAD B 141b), cf. Lambert AF 19 122. The enumerated monsters are introduced as šat mē nân u nîballû, "those of the water of the river and of the dry land"; together they are the "umûu-demons (u₄₄-mu), which, in the presence of Bel (šā 丹麦n) [are filled with] terror, dread, and spîllenco[r]" (Lambert's translation AF 19 122).

11 Craig ABRT 1 56 Obv. 4ff., lîpšûr litany. The figures are enumerated in the suit of Ea and Marduk (~ASAL.Î₄.U.Î₄). After giratûllû two (?) monsters are missing (4[, 5]). Between 5 and 6 the text has one extra figure:

[AN.I.M][MU][U][GU][M][H] (Anûzû). After subûrmâšû there is room for two more figures.

12 Ebeling KAR 312 7, cf. Lambert AF 19 122. Probably a hymn. The figures enumerated belong in the suit of Marduk, as proved by the presence of his u₄₄ u₄₄ gân Nûdîn-mé-qâîl (5) and Muîkîl-mê-balûhî (6) (CT 24 16:15ff., 28:70ff.).
13 Craig ABRT I 29 Obv. 15ff. Prayer of Ashurbanipal to Marduk, with allusions to Ee; cf. Borger HKL I 68, Hruska Anzu 88 with note 231, Seux Hymnes et Prières 115ff. The enumeration of slain monsters starts with Anzu (15) and a monster whose name is broken. After a break, with room for approximately four monsters, the text names the uridimmu, the kusarikku and the kalullū. At the end of the line there is room for one more monster. The next line (17) starts with LUGAL, apparently introducing a different subject, since none of the names of the monsters starts with LUGAL. The defeat of Tiamat and Kingu is referred to in 20. In 37 Lah-me appears after Ea and [Damkin]; perhaps lahmu is therefore not to be restored as one of the slain monsters in 16.

14 Lambert Fs Matou II 82:12. Hymn to Nabû. Text of first millennium origin. Nabû shares with Marduk the rulership of the cosmos, the mushkūšu as a symbolic animal, and the defeat of the monsters of chaos. Before the first preserved monster (kusarikku) there is room for a substantial restoration; the exact number of missing signs, however, cannot be determined.

15 BM 45619, unpublished, cf. Berger AOAT 4/1 68 and 322. NB text enumerating the monsters set up in Esagila. At least the kalullū is among them (Lambert RLA 6 324a). [Now published by A.R. George in RA 82 39ff.].

1 Unstructured origins and subsequent organization

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

Analysis of Names. Concrete beginnings.

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

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

The names that do not reveal any part of their composite denotation are clearly not in origin those of composite beings, but of the phenomena they denote. The imaginary monsters only serve to make these awe-inspiring natural phenomena visible.
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Heavy-Cloud (6) and the fearsome Days (7, 8) are convincingly realized as lion/eagle composites.

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

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

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

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

Whereas the need to be precise about the abstract character of Exemplary Member could arise only from the demands of visual expression, it is regular artistic activity that is responsible for the creation of a commonly known and accepted art as the channel through which the novelty of monster form could spread and take 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 cannot be very far removed from invention.

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

Since monsters did not exist in nature but were visible only in man-made reality, and since this reality must have been widely distributed and long lasting in order to create generally accepted monster images, the only alternative to art is religious practice, the cult. Although conceivably animal-human hybrids could be dressed up priests, the actual composition of the Bison beings (animal body and human face and hands) does not favour this theory. The fourth millennium Iranian hybrid Man-with-Mufflon-Head (Barnett Syria 43 259ff., Amiet Syria 56 333ff., GS 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. PoradaJAOS 103 477, and the drawing in D. Schmandt-Besserat ed., The Legacy of Sumer, Fig. 9a–b, p. 187). Indeed, nakedness is a prerequisite for officiating early third millennium priests, and priests with long hair are a well known phenomenon in the cult of Enki (Sjöberg JCS 21 278, Charpin Le Clergé d'Ur 349, add VAS 2 66 r. 11). If then in origin the naked hero was a priest, two curious facts would be explained: his completely human appearance and his secondary name.
After the priestly function was abolished, the figure would have lived on in art as a supernatural servant of Enki (with hair now symbolizing water), one that did not exist earlier and was named after his appearance “Hairy-One.”

The theory of Exemplary Member presented above does not require that there was only one Exemplary Member. All through Mesopotamian history pluralities of monsters occur, and it is often unclear whether MONSTER NAME should be translated “a...” or “the...”. In art human-faced bisons and bison-men regularly appear in pairs, and sometimes even Roaring-Day (PKG 14 137c), Furious-Snake (VAR 147), and Heavy-Cloud (GMA2 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>Element</th>
<th>Symbolic Value</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 māš-carp. The carp itself enters into other compositions (OB kulullā, Fish-Man; MB fish-apkallū also called “carps”, cf II.A.4.B). The scorpion(-man) is in origin a simple mythological scorpion fulfilling, like the Egyptian ḫpr, “beetle,” a cosmic task (watching over the rising and setting of the sun, VII.C.7d) with its pincers. It is not part of other composed beings, but the simple scorpion occurs as a symbol of marriage (Cooper RIA 4 267) and of the goddess Iššara (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 (kulullā, fish-apkallu, urdimmu, urmahlullā).

Besides the tenacious monsters treated here the third millennium saw a number of others, short-lived and generally known either from art or from literature. Of ED III and Akkadian art the boat-god, (human-faced) lion, and bird-man remain nameless, but apparently played a part in the lost mythology of the period (cf. e.
The Ninurta mythology gave birth to a fair amount of new monsters (see below II), and the most important of them, Ḫḫ-a-g, has the abstract character required by the theory (see below III).

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

**Summary (concrete to abstract)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>concrete</th>
<th>abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>awe-inspiring phenomena</td>
<td>Exemplary Members, agents, “causes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal</td>
<td>only religious entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snake</td>
<td>imagined in its own from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bison</td>
<td>different from gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scorpion</td>
<td>opposed to anthropomorphic gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earlier</td>
<td>become half imaginary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>later</td>
<td>become completely imaginary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy cloud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haity one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awe-inspiring phenomena of nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of first stage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII.C</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Name a</th>
<th>associated</th>
<th>adversary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Violent Death</td>
<td>snake + lion</td>
<td>Furious-Snake</td>
<td>Ninazu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peace (Passive)</td>
<td>bison + human face</td>
<td>Bison</td>
<td>Utu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peace (Active)</td>
<td>bison + human hands</td>
<td>Bison-Bull</td>
<td>Utu</td>
<td>Utu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cosmic Instrument</td>
<td>scorpion (+ man) b</td>
<td>Scorpion-Man</td>
<td>Utu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>carp (+ goat) c</td>
<td>Carp-Goat</td>
<td>Enki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ruling Power</td>
<td>eagle + lion</td>
<td>Heavy-Cloud</td>
<td>Enlil</td>
<td>Ninurta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Destructive Power</td>
<td>lion + eagle</td>
<td>Roaring-Day</td>
<td>Iškur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>lion + human hands</td>
<td>Big-Day</td>
<td>Iškur</td>
<td>Utu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Keeper of Life</td>
<td>curls + human body</td>
<td>Haity-One d</td>
<td>Enki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2 Association with gods. Monstrous servants and anthropomorphic masters

Anthropomorphism did not affect the whole pantheon at once, but was, like monster formation, an ongoing process. At least part of the pantheon is not anthropomorphic in origin. Utu, the Sun, and Nanna, the Moon, must once have had only their cosmic identities. The first deity for whom a human form can be assumed is Inanna, whether in origin Venus or not. The ideology of rulership in her city Uruk is based on the marriage of the ruler (e n) with the goddess, inconceivable without anthropomorphism. The Uruk Vase (PKG 14 Fig. 33) shows the e n bringing his gifts to the goddess (or her human representative) and receiving e n -ship (the sign EN) in return. It is the oldest attestation of the ideology of e n -ship, and dates to the Uruk IV period. From ED II onwards horned crowns distinguish gods from men, and one by one they become recognizable by their attributes. By the end of the Akkad period all important gods (Nanna, Utu, Inanna, Enki, Ninhursag, 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 Ešnunna (Frankfort OIP 60 no. 331), probably Ninzu, is scaled. His successor, Tišpak, is green (VAS 17 4:2, OB inc.), and must have had a snake’s skin. An earlier anthropomorphic Ninzu on a mušhuššu occurs on an ED IIIb seal (Boehmer UAVA 4 Abb. 283, cf RA mušhuššu 3.2). Later still the SB Göttertypentext (Köcher MIO 1 57ff.) gives the goddess Nintu “scales like a snake” (iii 49’). In art however, the goddess is completely anthropomorphic (cf. Stol, Zwangerschap en Geboorte bij de Babyloniers en in de Bijbel 34ff.). A snake god with human upper body (Boehmer UAVA 4 102ff.) is well known from Akkadian seals, but later disappears, probably because he shed the snake part. There is reason to believe that he is the city-god of Der, Ištarān, and that the snake part became his symbolic animal, Niraḥ.

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

The establishment of formal complementarity reveals an essential characteristic of the monsters and the awe-inspiring phenomena they stand for. Contrary to anthropomorphic gods, monsters stand outside the normal order, they are supernatural freaks, unexpected extras, 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 mušḫuššu 3.2); the fish (monster) Carp(-Goat) and Hairy-One, a spirit of streams, are associated with Enki, the ‘Lord of the Earth’ and master of rivers and streams; the stormy Days of war and destruction belong to the storm god Iškur, who tramples the land; the scorpion(-man), who watches over the mountain of sunset and sunrise, is associated with Utu, the sun god.

Less obvious is the relation between Bison and Utu. The two share an interest in a part of the world that is left alone by others, the distant fairy tale lands where Bison, the forebear of the Ditnu-nomads, was a kind of mythological sheik, and Utu, the only god who dared travel that far, his divine supervisor (see below b.). It is also Utu, who supplies Gilgamesh with seven monstrous ‘warriors’ to guide him to the cedar mountain (Gilgamesh and Huwawa 37ff., cf Kramer JCS 1 36 217, Shaffer JAOS 103 307).

Only Anzū’s ties with Ninurta are not obviously explained from a shared field of action in nature. Anzū 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 Anzū was associated not with Ninurta, but with Enlil. Anzū, Heavy-Cloud (or at least an atmospheric phenomenon), is naturally associated with Enlil, “Lord Ether,” the hard-handed ruler of everything between heaven and the surface of the earth.

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

b  Rebels and defeated enemies.

The art of the Akkad period gives precedence to subjects that were hardly treated before. One of them is the battle scene, depicting fights of gods with gods (Boehmer RIA 3 471ff.) or of gods with monsters. Although it cannot be totally excluded that Akkadian art finally found a way to depict a traditional subject of mythology for some reason avoided by earlier art, it is much more likely that the political innovations of the Akkadian empire gave rise to mythological adaptations, and that the gods became more imperious, and more sensitive to rebellion: “for men create the gods after their own image, not only with regard to form, but also with regard to their way of life”
Aristotle, *Politics* i 2 7). A positive indication is that the Sumerian word me d da, which denotes specifically a weapon of gods, is a Semitic loanword (*maḫḫat-*).

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

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

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

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

Of the whole list of Ninurta/Ningirsu’s enemies only *ušum bašmu* and *gud l kusarikku* have a mythological future (on Anzū see below). Most of
The least transparent additions are \textit{ku-\textit{li-an-\textit{n-a}}} and \textit{ma-\textit{gi-\textit{lum}}} Both seem to be associated with water (cf. VII.9a; \textit{Argim} 34). The latter is not only a monster, but also a kind of ship, real and mythological (\textit{Cooper AnOr} 52 148, \textit{CAD M/1 magilu, magisu}), and has a variant form (HLC 168 PI. 104, see Heimpel \textit{ZA} 77 38\textsuperscript{25}) \textit{ma-a\textit{-r-g-i-\textit{lum}}} The \textit{ma} part of the word suggests the ship it denotes, the \textit{-ilum} ending on the other hand suggests an Akkadian loanword (type \textit{ti-g-i-\textit{lum}}; many of these foreign \textit{-il} words entered Sumerian by way of Akkadian with the ending \textit{-um}). The variant discovered by Heimpel suggests that both are true and that the word is a compositum: \textit{Ship-argilum}. The second part is probably identical with the foreign word (by way of Akkadian) \textit{ir-giliu}, "(a locust)," attested in Hebrew in the form \textit{hargol}. Whatever the exact denotation, boat nor monster can be older than the Akkadian period.

Etiological explanation of apotropaic features is another source of defeated enemies. "Head-of-the-Bison" (\textit{s-a-g-a\textit{-lim-a}}) is a very unlikely enemy, but as "emblem of Utu" quite likely an apotropaion (\textit{Gudea Cyl. A XXVI 4}). "(King) Palm" is difficult to imagine as a fearsome mountaineer (explicitely \textit{Gudea Frg. 1 ii}, cf. van Dijk \textit{Lugal} 11\textsuperscript{23}), but common in temples and at gates (cf. Howard-Carter \textit{Iraq} 45 64ff., Weiss \textit{BD} 481 105f.). There is even one on Ningirsu's chariot (\textit{PKG} 14 Abb. 111 a). The natural lion (\textit{u-r-m-a\textit{b})} is found only in \textit{Gudea}'s list. He is either in origin an apotropaic guardian of gates, or simply Ningirsu's symbolic animal. The \textit{Huwawa} story (cf. above I) seems to be based on etiology as well.

"Strong Copper" and "Gypsum" come from the mountains, but as merchandisc, not as enemies. They loose their monster nature in later mythology, but live on as apotropaia in magic.

Beside \textit{Ship-Locust} and (\textit{King}) Palm and (perhaps \textit{ku-\textit{li-an-\textit{n-a})} all monsters can well be imagined as inhabitants of the mountains. It is nowhere stated that they are the offspring of the mountains, like later the monsters are the offspring of Sea. Only once a different group of monsters is called 'sons of one mother' (\textit{Gilgamesh and Huwawa} 36). Their knowledge of the mountains is to guide Gilgamesh to \textit{Huwawa}, they are at home there, and the unnamed mother could be the mountain land.

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

This fundamental lack of precision has an important bearing on the interpretation of third millennium (and later) art. The collisions that are shown are not illustrations of specific myths, but examples of the general scheme with one or several variable players at both sides. Naturally the god that is chosen to play the part of the warrior is likely to be pitched against those monsters that are nearest to him by nature (above IIa). The scene, however, does not show his struggle on a specific occasion in the past, but visualizes the ongoing battle against the other side, rebellion, the forces of evil. What has been said about the monsters applies just as well to the mountain gods defeated by Utu and other gods (Boehmer \textit{UAVA} 4 Abb. 300ff., \textit{RLA} 3 471ff.). That these scenes do not depict specific battles against specific mountain gods, but visualize in a general manner the struggle against the outside enemy, is shown not only by the lack of distinct-
tion between the several mountain gods and between the scenes in which they appear, but also by the association of defeated mountains and mountain gods with defeated monsters (cf. e. g. UAVA 4 300, mountain god and kusarikku; BaM 17 Taf. 2:4, ugallu, Ninurta, mountain; 5 Utu on mountain throne, ugallu). One mountain is included in the list of Ninurta/Ningirsu’s enemies (s a g - a r). A specific struggle of a deity, Inanna, with a specific mountain, Ebih, is described in a myth. Undoubtedly this myth reflects historical reality (cf. Steinkeller in McGuire Gibson ed., Uch Tepe 1 163ff.); it is not depicted on Akkadian seals.

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

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

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

Babylonian incantations reveal the existence of independent cosmogonic traditions with a genealogy of An that differs completely from the one recorded in the OB forerunner of the canonical god list (TCL 15.
Annum from the debris of previous (Dari - Dari), the importance of Alala - Anu in Hurrian cosmogony (cf. Güterbock RdA 6 327ff.) point to a non-Sumerian (northern) background for this cosmogonic tradition. Enûma Elîš, that rebuilds mythology from the debris of previous ages, finds room for both traditions concerning laḫmu, for the cosmogonic god (formerly laḫmu B, cf. Lambert OrNS 54 189ff.), and for the humber monster, once a servant of Ea, now among the soldiers of Tiamat (laḫmu A, cf. JEOL 27 94ff.). The fact that Ea recognizes both traditions shows that the cosmogonic god Laḫmu did not replace the servant laḫmu, and that the two existed side by side as separate entities.

Since the texts are silent on this point, the cosmic function of the cosmogonic Laḫmu can only be derived from art. It must be found in naked heros appearing in functions that can be interpreted as cosmic, but at the same time distinguish them from their peers, the non-cosmic laḫmu-servants/soldiers. Obviously the naked heros holding gate posts, the basis of Lambert’s solution, do not meet these conditions. According to Lambert (OrNS 54 199) the gate posts or the naked heros keep heaven and earth separated, they are the pillars of the universe. The laḫmu of the deviant Göttertypenlektüre might be added to support the view that laḫmu are atlantes, they certainly do not prove that gate posts or doors had a cosmic function. On the contrary, there is good evidence that they do not. Other beings that did not develop into cosmogonic gods hold gate posts or doors, e.g. the kusarikku (Amiet GMA 2 1300 B; OIP 78 109-11; Boehmer UA A 4 Abb. 110, 113; doors: GMA² 819), the mushushu (PKG 14 119, vase of Gudea), and the two lower gods, door keepers of Utu (UA A 4 Abb. 392ff.). Generally speaking, gate posts are (or once were) parts of doors (cf. PKG 14 Abb. 94a, Heinrich Bauwerke in der Alisum. Bildkunst Abb. 17), and monsters function at doors, which is why all of them, and even the gate posts (cf. II. A. 4.B urgallu), stand watch at the gates of temples and private homes. Thus, although it cannot be excluded, gate posts, doors, and the deviant laḫmu of the Göttertypenlektüre do not lead to a cosmogonic Laḫmu separating heaven and earth.

If then it is not the gate post that distinguishes the cosmogonic Laḫmu from his humbler namesake the door keeper, what is it? The conditions are met by a group of naked heros discussed by Amiet (RA 50 118ff., GMA² 147ff., Pl. 111; cf. also Porada Fr Reiner 279ff., especially those in horizontal position. On two OB seals (GMA² 1478, 1480) the horizontal heros indeed do contrast with the common servant hero. The bodies of the horizontal naked heros on the first seal are the water on which a ship sails, on the second a series of horizontal heros hold each other’s feet, while above them, on a suspended floor, a more common scene with smaller figures is shown. These beings are literally water, perhaps the water of Apsû (properly a cosmic domain and not itself water), and certainly suitable beings to develop into cosmogonic gods. Equally distinctive is the swastika of heros grasping each other and surrounded by streams (cf. JEOL 27 100:2). Like the horizontal heros, they are obviously connected with the watery part of the cosmos. A connection of cosmic laḫmu not only with water, but also with the sky, is implied by a number of OB seals showing the distinctive horizontal laḫmu, or an upright one, with flowing vases and stars on either side of his head (Porada Fr Reiner 279ff., Figs. 1. 10, 12-14; Moortgat Vêr 545). Earlier it was suggested (JEOL 27 100:2, 103:7) that two of the deviant laḫmu of the Göttertypenlektüre, Onslaught and Struggle, who grasp each other and hold heaven and earth, retained something of the real laḫmu, who grasp each other in pairs or fours. That indeed real laḫmu sometimes held heaven, as the Göttertypenlektüre indicates for the deviant ones, appears from a number of second millennium seals, but it is a function they share with many other demonic beings, and thus not the specific task of the cosmogonic laḫmu (cf. D.M. Matthews, Principles of Composition in Near Eastern Glyptic of the Later Second Millennium B.C. no. 450-485; singular is the seal Porada Afo 28 42 no. 23). Unfortunately the only text that tries to inform us on the nature of the cosmogonic Laḫmu (KAV 52 and dups., see JEOL 27 94) is completely ununderstandable. To what use, if any, he was put in the cosmogonic hotchpotch of Enûma Elîš must remain undecided.

Beside the laḫmu, who became a cosmogonic god in a northern mythology, other monsters have cosmic functions as well (cf. Amiet RA 50 113ff. for girtablullû, a li m a, and kusarikku in art), but there is nothing to prove a relation with cosmogony. Anzu (Heavy-Cloud) apparently plays a part in the early cosmos. In the Lugalbanda Epic (Wilcke Lugalb. 100:99ff.) he is the one that makes the decisions about the Tigris. The Eagle-Tree of Enki in which he lives is rooted in Utu’s “seven-mouthed-river” (o.c. 92:23ff.). In the SB Anzu-myth Anzu’s birth provides clouds and the water for Euphrates and Tigris, already dug but still empty (Moran JCS 31 70, 92ff., for mount Šaršar see now Lambert JNES 41 17). Later on he takes care of Enlil’s bath (o.c. 80 iii
6). That Anzā was considered the source of the rivers is unequivocally demonstrated by two Kassite seals, on which streams flow from each of the heads of a two-headed lion-eagle (Porada AfO 28 52 no. 27, 53 Fig. o; the waters, contributed to by a mountain god, are guided by two kulullā). The universe is in a progressed state of development when two other monsters are born, the mušhuššu (designed by Enlil, brought forth by Sea and River, CT 13 33, cf. Wiggermann Tišpak 118f.), and the bašmu (KAR 6:1ff., created in the sea). They do not contribute anything to the cosmos, but are merely pests, devouring man and beast.

Among animals, objects and geometrical figures (MSL XI 107:387ff., OB Hh XXII) also monsters are identified with stars or constellations. The Italumum version of Gilgamesh and Ḫuwawa (Shaffer JAOS 103 307f., Kramer JCS 1 36217) seems to place the monsters that guide Gilgamesh to the cedar mountain as stars in heaven. In the Labbu myth (that cannot be younger than OB) the constellation mušhuššu is etiologically explained as Enlil's design on the basis of which Sea and River created the actual monster (cf. Wiggermann Tišpak 125). Lambert suggests that the eleven defeated enemies of Ninurta together with their victor have 'astrophysical relevance one for each month of the year' (CHRAI 32 58). Much too little is known about third millennium stars and constellations to speculate about the mythological notions that named them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prehistoric connections have not been our concern in this chapter, but van Dijk's theory, true or false, implies separate origins for gods and monsters, and in this respect agrees with the views presented here. A completely different theory is put forward by Th. Jacobsen (*Treasures of Darkness* 9). According to Jacobsen, like sun and moon are the original forms of the later anthropomorphic Utu and Nanna, so the monsters are the earlier non-human forms of later anthropomorphic gods, specifically the *muššušu* of Ninazu (Jacobsen: *Nigišıšida*, see *RIA* muššušu 3.2) and the 'thunderbird' *Anzā* of Ninurta/Ningirsu, the 'power in the thunderstorms' (*Treasures of Darkness* 128f., *The Harps That Once* 235f.). If this theory is applied to the monsters as a group, it cannot be upheld. Bison and Scorpion cannot be earlier forms of the sun. The personified Days are patently not identical with the weather god Iškur. In the Akkadian period Ninazu (or the god associated with the *muššušu*) himself is not yet (always) completely anthropomorphic, and as such cooccurs with the *muššušu* (*OIP* 60 no. 331, cited above); the dragon cannot be the earlier non-human form when the god himself is still partly theriomorphic. The theory can be saved by considering the monsters not so much as earlier forms of the whole god, but as manifestations of the god in specific situations, for instance the scorpion as manifestation of the sun in the morning and in the evening. In this form the theory is similar to the one presented here (IIa), in which god and monster operate in the same field of action, and the god covers more of it than the monster. The difference is that in the weaker version of Jacobsen's theory the relation between god and monster is specified (monster represents part of god's activities), while it was left vague here (monster and god are associated).

Jacobsen explains the mythological battles between gods and monsters as expressions of the tension
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 Labbu-myth Enlil sends the muššuššu to wipe out noisy mankind. The monster is defeated by Tīšpak, who restores the nation to order. The myth translates history, the Old Akkadian overtake in EAnunnû, into mythology, and justifies Tīšpak's kingship and the servitude of the muššuššu, the animal of the former city god Ninazu, by presenting them as a consequence of Tīšpak's liberation of the nation. It is a myth of local importance only (cf. Lambert CRRAI 32 S6f., Wiggermann, Tišpak 124).

The most influential early combat myth is the Anzu myth (cf. Lambert CRRAI 32 S6f.). The history of Anzu's rebellion is complicated, and narrowly related to the rise of Ninurta.

Anzu, although his cry of woe makes the Anunna hide like mice in the earth (Wilcke Lugalbanda 100:82f.), is still a faithful servant of the gods in the Ur III Lugalbanda Epic, and not yet among the defeated enemies of Ninurta in Gudea Cyl. Under orders of his father Enlil he blocks the entry of the mountain lands, "as if he were a big door" (Wilcke Lugalbanda 100:99f.). Thus it is no coincidence that 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 (UAVA 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 Enlil.

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

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 Lagaš is the Anzu above two ducks/geese. (Fuhr-Jaeppeht Materialien zur Ikonographie des Löwenadler Anzu-Indugud 169ff.). The duck/geese is the symbolic animal of an unidentified
goddess, often called Bau (Opificius \textit{UAVA} 2 211f.). An \textit{Anzù} (or eagle, the head is broken, cf. Braun-Holzinger \textit{RIA} 7 95) above gazelles appears on the socle of an ED II statue from Tell Asmar (so-called Abu, \textit{OIP} 44 Pl. 6). It might be the emblem of a local god, since the group is accompanied by a hydra (cf. Frankfort \textit{CS} Text-fig. 27 and Pl. XXIIIj, both from Tell Asmar) on an ED III mace head of unknown origin (Frankfort \textit{AnOr} 12 105ff.). An OB text from Ur (\textit{UET} 6 105:10f., cf. Charpin \textit{Le Clergé d’Ur} 287, 291) describes a gate with two a l i m a (Charpin: l u l i m) and an eagle, in some way combined with a solar disc. The a l i m a (human-headed bisons) and the solar disc belong to Utu. The stags under an\textit{Anza} on a copper relief rom Ninibursag’s ED III temple in Ubaid (\textit{PKG} 14 Pl. 97) are the symbolic animals of that goddess (Gudea \textit{Cyl.} B X 4, Fig. 5 ii, cf. Heimpel \textit{RIA} 4 420). The ibex belongs to Enki, who is called d à r a - k ù - a b z u (Gudea \textit{Cyl.} A XXIV 21) and Dà r a - a b z u (\textit{TCL} XV 10:77, cf. Green \textit{Eridu} 194). Thus the symbolism of Entemena’s silver vase (drawing \textit{RIA} 7 95) becomes transparent. It shows three pairs of animals, each under an\textit{Anzù}. The ibexes belong to Enid, in this time Ningirsu’s father (cf. Falkenstein \textit{AnOr} 3091), the stags to his mother Ninḫursag, and the lions to Ningirsu himself, the god to whom the vase is dedicated. The\textit{Anzù’s} belong to neither, but add something as yet undefined to the symbolism of each.

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

Although objects dedicated to Ningirsu sometimes only have lions (dagger, Parrot \textit{Tello} Fig. 26g; mace head, \textit{ibid} p. 101; lion protomes, Bocse \textit{UAVA} 6 218f.), there is a clear preference for the composite emblem. This is naturally explained from the wish to distinguish the symbolic lion of Ningirsu from that of other gods (\textit{RIA} 7 91), and from the simple apotropaic lion (\textit{RIA} 7 89). The Gudea texts are ambiguous about Ningirsu’s emblem (š u - n i r). The one on his chariot (\textit{Cyl.} A VI 22) corresponds to the lions plus \textit{Anzù} on the stele fragment. The emblem of Ningirsu’s clan, d L u g a l - k u r - d ú b (\textit{Cyl.} A XIV 18, XVIII 13, B VII 22, cf. Lambert \textit{RIA} 7 147), is patently not identical with \textit{Anzù} (differently Landsberger \textit{WZKM} 57 1794), since in Angim the latter is among the defeated enemies, while the former is an active associate of the god (\textit{Angim} 67). Only once \textit{Anzù} alone is the ‘emblem of his (Gudea’s) king (Ningirsu)’ (\textit{Cyl.} A XIII 22, cf \textit{RIA} 7 96).

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

160
In some way connected with the symbolism of Utu is the ED III scene of an Anzu attacking a human-headed bison (RIA 7 94). The more explicit pieces combine the scene with the boat god (Fuhr-Jaepe 1970, Abb. 86), Utu (Boehmer UAVA 4 79f.), or elements of the boat god scene (bird-man, plow, human-headed lion, scorpion, vessel, Abb. 77, 78, 109, 137). On one seal (Abb. 87) the Anzu 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; 46, natural bull). Apparently the Anzu 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 Anzu's occur in the boat god scene with other animals (Abb. 85, 112). In those cases they do not attack. Anzu's attacking other animals than the human-headed bison are extremely rare (GMA 1043).

The Anzu then is not Ningirsu's symbol, nor that of any of the other gods with whose symbolic animal it is combined. It represents another, more general power, under whose supervision they all operate. This higher power can only be Enlil, which is exactly what the Lugalbanda Epic and the Anzu myth (JCS 31 80 i 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, Anzu still operates at the side of law in the early Ur III period (Gudea, Lugalbanda Epic). Shortly afterwards the situation changes. In the Ur III compositions Angim and Lugal Anzu is among the defeated enemies of Ningirsu/Ninurta (Cooper AnOr 52 141ff., van Dijk Lugal 11ff.). In Ur III art Anzu (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 Anzu, 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 dupis., see Alster JCS 24 120ff., Kramer AulOr 2 231ff.). Anzu 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 Apsû, and eternal mastery over Anzu. 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 šar dadme, with previous lit., Saggs Afo 33 1ff., Moran Afo 35 24ff.) relates how Anzu was born, came into the service of Enlil, took the opportunity to steal the tablet of destinies containing the me Iparsû, gained universal power, and finally was defeated by Ningirsu/Ninurta with a trick of Ea. Ninurta is rewarded with what was promised to the victor, sanctuaries everywhere and universal glory. The gods make good their promise by equating Ninurta with a long list of other gods (Afo 33 25:127ff., OB kernel with SB additions).

With its results the myth reveals its purpose, to explain the growth of Ninurta's power and cult, at the expense of Enlil and other gods. The myth justifies Ninurta's rise to power by presenting it as the result of his victory over a rebel threatening divine establishment. By making Anzu into the culprit the myth solves another problem, that of Anzu's position. Notwithstanding its aggresive behaviour against the human-headed bison, Anzu was the only monstrous mountaineer on the side of rightful rule; among the beings on Ningirsu's chariot Anzu was the only one that was not a defeated enemy.
In Lagâs Ningirsu was the warrior of Enlil (AnOr 30 90, JNES 32 28:8) before he became his son and was syncretized with Ninurta, at the latest in the time of Gudea (AnOr 30 90), and therefore prior to the Anzâ myth. Although conceivably the local Ningirsu mythology contributed to the national Ninurta mythology, the Anzâ myth cannot be a local affair, since it affects the nature of a national being. Thus, while the interpretation of local mythology (Ningirsu, Lagâs) in national terms (Ninurta, Nippur), had begun already in the time of Gudea, its justification in a national myth had to wait for the restoration of centralistic power in the Ur III period.

Strongly influenced by local (Lagâs) mythology is the myth Lugal (cf. van Dijk RIA 7 134ff.). Its protagonists are Ninurta/Ningirsu, and a monster, á - z á g/Askku, like the other monsters a warrior who lives in the mountains. Sumerian á - z á g characterizes disease (or the demon that causes it) in a general way; it does not denote a specific disease only, but diseases of a certain type (cf. van Dijk Lugal 19ff., with previous lit., Jacobsen Fs Sachs 225ff., Stol Epilepsy, forthcoming). The nature of the diseases it denotes is revealed by incantations and medical texts: Askku is practically always partnered with n a m - t a r (see provisionally CAD askku A, nantari), which denotes disease (and death) that is 'decided' by the gods, part of the rightful cosmos. From the observation that the pair askku and nantari fill a semantic field, it follows that askku denotes what is not decided, disease that is not part of the rightful cosmos, suitably translated as 'disorder'. Diseases like n a m - t a r and á - z á g are combated by the physician goddess Bau, and those syncretized with her (Gula, Ninisina, Ninkarrak, cf. Römer SKIZ 244ff., AOAT 1 279ff., 285:48, Civil RA 63 180 no. 14, Ali Sumerian Letters 138:20). That the á - z á g combated by her husband Ningirsu/Ninurta (and those syncretized with him, see below) is the same demon Disorder on a cosmic level, is clearly indicated by the myth Lugal. The whole myth is concerned with Ninurta deciding the fates; exactly when he sits down to do so, the message is brought of Disorder in the mountains. 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 cyclops on an OB plaque with Askku, Lugal 20ff., frontispiece = Opificius UAVA 2 no. 488). From Jacobsen's discussion (Fs Sachs 225ff.) it follows that even the myth that founded his existence did not have a clear picture of his appearance.

The OB Nippur god list (SLT 123 r. ii 11ff. /124 ii 2ff.) identifies six gods with Ninurta (and their wives with Bau). Similar lists occur in the MB hymn of Bullussa-rabi (Lambert OrNS 36 105ff.), in the SB Anzâ myth (AfO 33 25:127ff.), and in a SB theological text (KAR 142 i 22ff., cf. CT 26 45 1f.), where they are called in a subscript the 'seven Ninurtas'. The most important Ninurta's are Ningirsu (protagonist of OB Anzâ myth, and probably originally of Lugal, cf. van Dijk RIA 7 134), Zababa (Lambert OrNS 36 114, JNES 48 217, Cavigneaux Texts from Babylon I 137:1), Lagamal/Nergal (Cooper AnOr 52 146', KAR 6), and Nabium (not in the OB list; KAR 142 i 25). The inclusion of m u š - s a g - i m n in the list of defeated enemies of Nabium in the Converse Tablet (Lambert Fs Albright 335ff.) shows that the list is borrowed directly from Ninurta, and not from Marduk, since the dragon in question is not among the enemies of Marduk. The reconstruction of Nabium's mythology along the lines of Ec is attested in a hymn to Nabium (VII.B.14), in which his trophies are those of Marduk in Ec. Once the victory over Anzâ is ascribed to Adad (King BMS 20:18).

Only one text attests to the association of a group of monsters (essentially that of Ec) with Marduk while not yet ruler of the universe, the inscription of Agum-kakrime (VII.B.7). Marduk had taken over the mušhuššu from Tišpak probably after Hammurabi's victory over Ešnunna; laḫmu, kušuili and suḫurmuššu were servants of Ea, and may have served his son Marduk as well. The uridimmu may have been Marduk's servant from the time of its invention onwards. Two monsters, bašmu (u š u m) and kusarišku (g u d - a l i m) were originally among the defeated enemies of Ninurta.
Although the text does not expressly state that the monsters at the door of Marduk’s cella were his defeated enemies, this conclusion can hardly be escaped. The former enemies of Ninurta (bašmu, kusarikkau) probably did not change their character, and the combat mythology of Ninurta that influenced so many city gods and even Marduk’s son Nabium cannot have left Marduk untouched.

Since at this stage Marduk was not yet ruler of the universe, the mythology underlying the collection of enemies was certainly not of the same type as that of Ee, the justification of Marduk’s cosmic rulership. Thus we do not expect Tiāmat as 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 Tiāmat and a cosmic battle. Tiāmat was among the enemies of Ninurta, and both she and Apsu, the later cosmogonic pair, breed and shelter monsters (above IIb).

If Lambert is right (The History of the m u š - ḫu š in Ancient Mesopotamia In L’Animal l’homme, le dieu dans le proche-orient ancien 90) Tiāmat is represented by wavy lines on Marduk’s seal (Wetzel WDOG 62 Pl. 43f.). Berossus (S. Mayer Burstein SANE 1/5 14f., Lambert JThS 16 294f.) presents her both as a body of water and as a woman. In Ee she is water, but also a cow (Landsberger JNES 20 175) or a goat; she has lower extremities (ibdu, IV 129), a belly (karšu, I 23, IV 99, 101), udders (širtu, V 57, cf. Oppenheim Dictionary of Scientific Bibliography XV 640f.; Ans. S 98:34), a neck (šišādu, II 113, 115), insides (šibītu, IV 100, V 63), blood and arteries (šulāt dāmī, IV 131, dāmu, IV 32), spittle (rupuštu, V 47), a tail (zišbatu, V 59), a head (qaqqadu, V 53), a skull (muṣu, IV 100, V 63), a mouth (pū, IV 97, 100), lips (šaptu, IV 98), nostrils (nahrū, V 56), eyes through which Marduk releases the Euphrates and Tigris (V 55, Livingstone Mystical Explanatory Works 82:3), and a horn, cut off by Marduk (Livingstone o. c. 82:1, 13) and undoubtedly to be connected with the body of water called ‘Horn of the Sea’ (s i a - a b - b a), that enters the land from the Persian Gulf and gave its name to Borsippa (Oppenheim o. c. 65531).

4 Marduk and Enūma Eliš

Up to now Marduk’s rulership was apparently felt to be sufficiently covered by the traditional model that made the ruling city-god an appointee of the divine assembly led by Anu and Enlil (so in the introduction of CH, and in other OB royal inscriptions, cf. Sommerfeld, Marduk 66ff., and for the model Jacobsen Before Philosophy 207ff.). At the end of the second millennium the old model, in which the power of the ruling city-god is checked by the divine assembly, was abolished. The justification of Marduk’s rulership was changed: he was made independent of the decisions of a divine assembly, and promoted to sole ruler of the universe. Ee is the myth giving form to this new arrangement. It was composed at the occasion of the return of Marduk’s statue to Babylon in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I (cf. Lambert in McCullough ed., The Seed of Wisdom 3ff.). In many details Ee shows its dependency on the Anzū-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: Tiāmat, formerly only one of the enemies and a breeding place of monsters, is promoted to arch-fiend and cosmic power; the other monsters are made dependent of her as her children and soldiers. Their number is enlarged to eleven, twelve together with their leader Kingu, possibly to suggest a relation to a cosmic phenomenon.

The added monsters are ušumgallu (cf. VII.C.2.a.f.), ūmū dabrātu (cf. VII.C.4.f.),
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and *mušmaḫḫu*, all in the plural. The three of them may be related to the Ninurta mythology. For the *mušmaḫḫu* 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 *Fauna* 53:11ff., *MSL* 8/1 7:3 and forerunner *SLT* 51 iv 11, Frankfort *AnOr* 12 105ff. no 1 Figs. 1–4. The *muḫḫuššu*, 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 *girtabullūtu*. Omitted is the *suḫurmaššu*, perhaps he was not considered a suitable soldier.

In some texts the list is expanded still further and includes Anzu (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. Hruska *Anzu* 87ff., van Dijk *Lugal* I 25ff., Jacobsen *Unity and Diversity* 72 ff., Lambert *JSS* 13 110ff.).

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

The following terms are used for the members of Tiāmat’s army as a group: *ūmu*, “weather-beasts” (VII.B.10, *Šurpu* 8:8), *umāmnūtu*, “beasts” (*OP* 2 141:14), *gallūtu*, “soldiers” (VII.B.9, *Ee* IV 116), *šat mē nāri u nābilī*, “those of the water of the river and the dry land” (VII.B.10, *Šurpu* 8:6), *bīnāt aptū*, “creatures of Apsū” (text I 144), and, in apotropaic context, *sākip lemmātī ša Ea u Marduk*, “those that repel the evil ones, of Ea and Marduk” (text I 160ff., 165ff.). For *Eṣet-eḫ-nānissu* cf. Lambert *CRAI* 32 58.

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

### C Individual histories

1 *lahmu*, “the hairy one”.

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

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

96: For the Nimrud “heroes” without the distinctive six spiral tresses but inscribed as the *lahmu* cf. now Green *Iraq* 45 91ff. An interesting misread NB attestation of the *lahmu* in the service of Ea is Lambert *Atra-hasis* 116:7, recurring, with variations, in 116:10, 118:5, 12, 19, 120:35 (cf. also 116:28). Just as Anu and Adad guard the upper regions, and Sin and Nergal guard the middle earth, so Ea on the command of Enlil guards “the bolt, the bar of the sea” together with his . . . *qā-du X-mi-šu*. In his commentary (166ff.) Lambert identifies the sign X as *U*, and hesitates between reading *ū-mi-šu* or *šam-mi-šu*; the sign may just as well be *lāh* and the resulting reading *lah-mi-šu*, “his hairies” makes perfect sense. It seems that later Ea blames these *māsaṭarū tamti*, “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-hasis*, perhaps not too far removed from OB *Atra-hasis* and certainly reflecting pre-*Ee* mythology, hints
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here at a story of mutinous *lahmu* punished by Ea. Mutinous *lahmu* are not implied by first millennium seals (Amiet *Akkadica* 28 31f.) showing a *lahmu*-like monster defeated by gods. This monster is apparently a successor of Humbaba. New is the reading of King *AKA* 389:11 (cf. Grayson *ARI* 1 43,154): \(\text{läḫū}^1(\text{ḫ})\text{-}\text{ma AN.GU.ŠU \text{raḫuš lu}la\text{ši}b}^{,} \text{“and I gave the *lahmu*, its protective spirit, its eminent place” (MAss private building inscription).}

For a *lahmu* depicted on a potstand (OB) cf. now Durand *ARM* 21 222 48f. (\(\text{kanna ša la-aḫ-mi}\) and 363\(^{32}\).

100\(^{33}\): For the “Viermenschenradmotiv” cf. also Collon *AOAT* 27 59\(^4\), B. Teissier *ANECS* 173.

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

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


10 With goat and sprig in *apkallu*-like function: Layard *Mon* I 50/7 = 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 *laḫəm a*. A more general use of the term is attested in the *Got­tertypertext* (97ff.). An uncertain third millennium attestation is *ARET* V 6 ix 2: \(\text{<Iš-aḫam a>\text{-}zum} [\text{\text{AB(?\)}}]^{2}\text{ztu}^{.} \) [W. G. Lambert convincingly contested the existence of *lahmu* B, “the muddy one”, *OrNS* 54 189ff.]


c. **Attestations**: from Early Dynastic (perhaps even Jemdet Nasr) period in art; from Gudea Cyl. A XXIV 26ff. in the texts (the loanword *laḫa ṣam 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 (99ff.). 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-ḫasis (above ad 96). Though furnished with the determinative more often than the other “monsters” (96ff., 99, above VII.A note e), he never became completely divine and remains iconographically distinct from the gods with their horned tiaras. In Sumerian and later texts of older origin (or with passages reflecting pre-*Ee* mythology) the *lahmu* appear as a group of fifty servants of Enki (95ff.).
Even later (MB, cf. above VII.B), when he enters the suit of Marduk and holds the spade (92, 101:5, above II.A.4), he remains associated with water (101:4).

e **Apotropaic Representations**: representations of *lahmu* stand at the *dub-lá* of Sumerian temples (95; since Gudea Cyl.A XXIV 26f.); the OAkk *lahmu* associated with a *kurasikkku* (96) may also have been apotropaic. A monumental OAkk *lahmu* holding a gate post is the Bassetki statue (cf. Ayish Sumer 32 69). In a SB incantation of older origin (96:7) a *lahmu* is present in a private house (cf. Opificius UAVA 2 221 for OB representations on clay plaques). MAkk and later royal inscriptions describe *lahmu* at gates (91f., 102f.); a MAkk private building inscription records the presence of a *lahmu*, “its protective spirit”, in a house with a well (AKA 389:11, cited above); the *lahmu* of the royal inscriptions and the rituals (VII.A) can be matched with the figures actually attested in palaces and houses (Rittig Kleinplastik 51ff., Reade BaM 10.38, Kolbe Reliefprogramme 96ff.).

2 *bašmu.*

For the two Sumerian terms *ušu*um and *muss-tă-tūr* Akkadian has only one: *bašmu* (spelled logographically *MUŠŠA:TUR/TUR*). It is uncertain whether *ušu*um and *muss-tă-tūr* denote two different iconographic types. If they do, and if the two types have not been confused in the course of history, Akkadian *bašmu* must refer to two different types of mythological snakes as well, and we will call them *ušu*um/*bašmu* and *muss-tă-tūr/*bašmu.*

a *ušu*um/*bašmu*, “Venomous Snake”.

a **Word**: Sumerian *ušu*um is an Akkadian loanword, derived from a postulated dialectical *wašm*; Akkadian *wa*—becoming Sumerian *u*—is not without precedents (cf. Edzard Genava 8 24741), nor is the additional vowel in the proximity of a syllabic consonant (cf. JEOl 27 973). Akkadian *š* < PS *š* is regularly rendered by Sumerian *-š*-.. The Akkadian word goes back on PS *BTN/M* (cf. Landsberger Fauna 584, Humbert AbO 11 235ff.). It is now attested also in Ebla (Fronzaroli SEb 1 76 with further literature, MEE 4 393 iii 9, ARET 5 no 4 i 3).

b **Identification**: horned snake with forelegs (cf. Weidner Gestim­darstellungen Pl. IX-X, where the caption *dMUŠ* is a shortened spelling of *MUŠŠA:TUR = bašmu*, historical *ušu*um/*bašmu*).

c **Attestations**: in texts as the name of a specific monster (not as a general word for dragon) since Gudea Cyl.A XXVI 29 (and Fragment 1 TCL 8 Pl. 53, cf. van Dijk Lugal I 1125); the *ušu*um/*bašmu* of Angim 33 and Lugale 129 stem approximately from the same time. In art only one doubtful attestation is known to me from OAkk (Douglas van Buren OrNS 19 Pl. IX/2 = UAVA 4 Abb. 290). All further attestations stem from the first millennium (seals like Moortgat VAR 680, 681).

d **Mythology**: originally *ušu*um/*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 councillor or defeated enemy of Tišpak, and perhaps replaces the muššuššu who fell into the hands of Marduk. From Ur III onwards it is attested as one of the “warriors” (ur-sag) slain by Ninurta (Cooper AnOr 52 143). The SB myth KAR 6 describes a MUŠ ba-[aš-mu] (re-stored 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 ušu m/bašmu rather than the footless muš-s-a-tūr/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 muššuššu, the ušu m/bašmu became the symbolic animal of gods formerly associated with the muššuššu.

e Apotropaic representations: Gudea Cyl. A XXVI 29; in art: the dragon from the palace of Esarhaddon (Kolbe Reliefsprogramme Type XVIII; Reade BaM 10 40) can hardly be anything else than apotropaic, and therefore, if the list of VII.A is complete, must be a bašmu (it can certainly not be a muššuššu, the only other dragon of the list). The ušu m/bašmu is not attested in the Kleinplastik.

f ušumgal, rendered in Akkadian by ušumgallu and bašmu, is a derivative of ušum and literally means: “Prime Venomous Snake”. Its use is determined by inflation which made the far more generally used ušum gal oust simple ušum. Ušumgallu is like ušum used as a generic term as well, and occasionally replaces muššuššu when the dragon of Nabû is referred to (4 R² 20/3 Obv. 15f., KAR 104:29, ABL 951 Obv. 12-13, cf. Lambert Fs Matouš 2 93, Parpola LAS 2 266 ad 16), or the dragon of Ninurta (Iraq 14 34 72–73). The foremost quality of an ušumgal (and probably of an ušum) is being a determined killer, killing probably with its venom, and frightening even the gods (de Genouillac Thuvaille 1, Ur III incantation). It is this quality that makes ušum (gal) a suitable epithet for certain gods and kings. In Ee (cf. above VII.B.9) the number of monsters is enlarged with mušmaḫḫu, ušumgallu and umū dabrūtu. This indicates that, if we have correctly equated the denotations of ušum/bašmu and ušumgallu, the bašmu of Ee is the muš-s-a-tūr/bašmu. The use of muš-s-a-tūr in the Sumerian version of a bilingual text enumerating apparently (some of) the same set of monsters (VII.B.8), and the correspondance of the bašmu of the rituals with the 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  mušštû /bašmu/, "Birth Goddess Snake."

a  *identification*: horned snake. The snake of the Kleinplastik, proved to be the *bašmu* by its inscription (Klengel-Brandt *FuB* 10, 1968, 36; suggested earlier by Landsberger *Fauna* 56, 58, when the inscribed figures had not yet been published), does not have horns (Rittig *Kleinplastik* 122ff., 216ff.). However, since both types of *bašmu* are probably horned, since the snake without horns is securely identified with *Nirah* and opposes on *kudurrus* with a horned type, and since the Kleinplastik leaves off the horns of the *mušhuššu* and the *su₄₅ur₄₅₃₅* 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 mušḫuššu, Gudea *Cyl. A* XXVI 24f., *TCS* 3 41:416ff., *BiOr* 30 362:49, cf. Frayne *JAOS* 102 512ff.; all apotropaic representations). In art: Frankfort *Iraq* 1 Pl. IIIh (O²kk., uncertain); on NAss seals, represented as a rearing cobra with horns, attacked by a god armed with a bow (*VAR* 689ff. and other seals); on *kudurrus* (Seidl *BaM* 4 155.). In NAss Akkadian *bašmu* is possibly used to denote the Egyptian uraeus (Lambert, *JJS* 33 62).

c  Of the mythology of this dragon little is known. In (OB) *Gìlgamesh* and *Ḫuwawa* 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 *Ḫuwawa*; 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 *mušhuššu* (cf. above *attestations*) or other monsters (Heimpel *Tierbilder* 87.6); in the Kleinplastik: Rittig *Kleinplastik* 122f., Ismail *AfOB* 19 199.

3  *mušhuššu*, "Furious Snake", "Aweful Snake".

a  *Word*: Sumerian mušḫuššu is attested as a loanword in Akkadian since OB (Lieberman *SLOB* 1 no 489).

b  *Identification*: snake-dragon. Identified by Koldewey *MDOG* 19 (1903) 14ff. on the basis of a comparison of the figure on the gates of Babylon with the description of Nebuchadnezzar II (*KB* III/2 23 = *VAB* 4 72:21).

c  *Attestations*: since O²kk. An earlier dragon with a lion’s head and without the talons is certainly a *mušhuššu* in ED IIIb, and probably already in the protoliterate period (cf. *RIA* s. v. muššuššu § 3.1-2). The lion-parts are progressively replaced by snake-parts.

d  *Mythology*: the *mušhuššu* originally serves the underworld god Ninazu, the king of the snakes; he is perhaps an angel of death, killing with his venom. In *Esnunna* during the O²kk period Tišpak, a god of foreign origin, replaces Ninazu as city god, and takes over his symbolic animal. The
myth recording Tišpak's victory over the symbolic monster of his predecessor seems to be preserved in CT 13 33f., cf. Wiggermann, Tišpak, his seal, and the dragon mushuššu in O.M.C. Haex et al. eds., To the Euphrates and beyond (Fs M. N. van Loon) [1989] 117-133. In Lagaš Ningišzida, the son of Ninazu, is associated with the dragon; his proper animal, however, is the snake Širah. From MB onwards, probably as a consequence of Hammurabi's conquest of Ešnunna, the city of Tišpak, the dragon is found associated with Marduk and his son Nabû. After Sennacherib's conquest of Babylon the mushuššu is usurped by Aššur. Ninazu and Tišpak become associated with other snakes and dragons (.uš úm /bašmu, ušumgallu). Though since Tišpak's takeover in Ešnunna no longer the servant of an underworld god, the mushuššu remains a fearless killer.

e **Apotropaic representations:** since Ur III (Gudea Cyl. A XXVI 24f., TCŠ 3 41:416f., BiOr 30 362:49, cf. Frayne JAOS 102 512f.). Apotropaic use of representations of the mushuššu can be understood from his function as a fearless warrior watching over the just rule of his masters and attacking evildoers (cf. Brinkman PHPKB 80:14). Rittig's reservations about the identity of the clay figures, Kleinpastik 114ff. (cf. also Green Iraq 45 93), are unwarranted: the suḫurmašu also lacks its horns in the Kleinpastik, and the lowered tail may be inspired by practical considerations. Apotropaic mushuššu are attested also on plaques (BMQ 36 136 and Pl. LVf, NAṣs) and palace reliefs (Kolbe Reliefprogramme Type XVIII, Reade BaM 10 40). See now Wiggermann RIA s. v. mushuššu, forthcoming.

4 **ugallu**, "Big Weather-Beast", "Big Day".

a **Word:** Akkadian ugallu is a loanword from Sumerian u₄-gal, "big weather-beast"; since Sumerian u₄-gal in bilingual texts is always translated as ūmu rabâ, "big weather-beast", and since the lion-demon called ugallu is attested only after the Ur III period, it seems that ugallu is an artificial, learned loanword, invented to give one standardized weather-beast a definite name. One attestation of u₄-gal = ūmu rabâ (UET 6 391 Obv. 16) was known to Sjöberg OrNS 37 240; the following ones can be added: LKA 77 Rev. iv 37 // LKA 78 Rev. '1, CT 16 9 i 40f., CT 16 22 266f. (for this phrase cf. also the incantation TIM 9 62:8), AnOr 21 384:17 (cf. Tallqvist AGE 175 for the restoration of 18), STT 192 Obv. 7f., van Dijk Lugal I 105:424. The unilingual Sumerian attestations of u₄-gal were recently discussed by Römer SKIZ 100, Fs Kraus 306f., Sjöberg TCŠ 3 100 (add: SEM 86 1, 2, ZA 63 2:6, StOr 49 184 Sk 11:2, 7, CT 17 7 v 5, ArOr 21 396:38 cf. CT 44 32 Rev. "v" 25', StTU 2 16 Rev. iii 1, CT36 22 ii 1, JAOS 103 10036). For ₄u₄-gal-gal, a name of Iskur, and for his temple é-u₄-gal-gal cf. Renger AFO 23 73 (and STT 20:8'); for the ship of his wife Sala, ₄m₄-u₄-gal-gal, cf. MSL 5 178:322. That older Sumerian u₄-gal/ēMU rabâ does not denote a specific being, but a being differentiated from simple u đ only by its stature (gal), follows from the fact that Iskur rides both an u đ and an u₄-gal...
The being denoted here by u d and u d - gal must be the lion-dragon, Iškur’s mount and draught-animal since ED (cf. Abou Assaf BaM 14 43ff., 46f.). Although other sources as well give the impression that u d - (g a l) /šimu (rabû) denotes a specific being (Gudea Cyl. A XXV 9, apotropaic u d at the gate), or at least a being going on all fours (mount or draught-animal, see below d), this cannot be true, since one of the u d , the later u d - gal /šimu, was imagined as an upright lion-demon, and since u d šimu is used to denote the whole group of monsters constituting the army of Tiamat (VII.B.10) as well as the different group of monsters attacking Sin in CT 16 19:1ff. Our neutral translation “weather-beast” rather than “storm-beast” is based on the observation that good u d do exist (below d) beside evil u d ; the u d -beings are apparently neutral. Landsberger’s “Geistertiere” (Fauna 75) stresses the unspecific denotation of šimu, but seems too reserved as to the relation with u d šimu, “day”, “storm”. Heimpel’s translation “Flügellöwe” is too narrowly restricted to one of the possible denotations (Tierbilder 113, cf. Römer Fs Kraus 306f.).

An ud.gal.mulen is attested in SB (Weidner Syria 33 177 Rev. 1:6, cf. Landsberger WZKM 56 12239) as one of the passû naprusšitu, “the winged ‘puppets’” of a board-game. Pirigallu in NAss royal inscriptions has nothing to do with ugallu. It denotes the “lion bases” of columns (cf. BaM 10 Pl. 11, Turner Iraq 32 7661, Landsberger Fauna 75).

b Identification: lion-demon. Proved by Green Iraq 45 (1983) 90f. on the basis of the inscription on a lion-demon from Nimrud, matching the inscription prescribed for the ugallu in ritual II Obv. 41f. (cf. already Deller apud Kolbe Reliefsprogramme 222, Wiggermann apud Stol Zwangerschap en Geboorte 112). The lion-demon is sometimes incorrectly identified with the urmahlullû (Frankfort CS 175, Lambert Iraq 41 10). Once the ugallu is identified as the lion-demon, the restoration d U4.[GAL] in the Göttertypentext MIO I 68 52’ (quoted by Frank MAOG XIV/2 35 incorrectly as K 10064) can no longer be doubted. As usual, the monster described by the Göttertypentext deviates from the regular one. The ugallu has the head and the ears of a lion (UR.MAH), and human hands; in his right hand he holds a [MU]L.UD.DA (? Collated) and in his left a hatchet (qulmû). These attributes are not attested in the hands of a lion-demon in art. His claws are perhaps described in 51’, but the line cannot be restored. Frank MAOG XIV/2 35 apparently reads GIR] MUŞEN ša-kin, “furnished with the claws of a bird”, but instead of MUŞEN the tablet clearly has RI (collated). A dagger (GIR) is in his belt. The door-keeper of the underworld, Pêtu (“Nedu”), is described in the “Unterweltvision” in a similar fashion (lion’s head, human hands, claws of a bird); Frank MAOG XIV/2 35 convincingly associated Pêtu with the unnamed clay figure of “one cubit” with a lion’s head prescribed in the etemmu ritual KAR 227 i 24f. (misquoted by Ellis Finkelstein Memorial Volume 73).
c  **Attestations:** in art the lion-demon is attested since OB; earlier differently formed lion-demons (without talons or donkey's ears) may or may not be ud's — this type of beings is attested already in Fara (SF 1 vii 24f.) — but they are certainly not yet the exclusive denotation of u₄-g₄l. The OAkk. lion-demon is an adversary of the Sun god (Seidl *BaM* 4 XLVI E.1, Boehmer *UAVA* 4 79), or an associate of Adad (ibid. 333). The later lion-demons sometimes attack human evil-doers (Seidl *BaM* 4 LXVI G, cf. also Lambert *Iraq* 41 10, Buchanan *Yale* 781, Frankfort *SCS* 906, Parker *Iraq* 37 28 15), cf. *SBH* 15 no. 7: 15f.: u₄ k₄₄ b₄₄ m u₄ l u š u₄ t i₄ a₄, "Weather-beast, that holds the man in his mouth" (cit. TCS III 125, with duplicates). Once on an OB seal (Frankfort *CS* Pl. XXVI-IIc) a lion-demon appears together with a smaller lion-demon. Without sufficient reason Landsberger *WZK* 57 8 considered them uncommon representations of Anzu and its young.

d  **Mythology:** in origin the ud j₅μu demon is the personified Day and its nature the manifestation of divine will. Since days of health and peace are what the gods need in order to be taken care of by their human servants, days of health and peace are what can be expected from them, the normal days. Thus Good Days (u₄-d u₄ g - g₄ a) are worth mentioning only in contrast to the Evil Days that bring them to an end (*First Ur Lament* AS 12:190). The Days of exceptional splendor and plenty before the flood, a golden age, are personified as anthropomorphic Wise Ones (j₅μu-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 (*AnOr* 52 60:17, cf. Langdon *Epic of Creation* 885) or their weapons (*AnOr* 52 123f. ad 131, 132). The personified Days resemble the evil spirits (*utukku lemnētu*; cf. *AS* 12:400ff., *JCS* 30 132ff. 20). One of them is one's dying day, the (Evil) Day (j₅μu lemnētu; *U*d₄), the messenger of the underworld god Erra (*UET* 6 395 Obv. 12, *SEM* 117 ii 9); another is the day of the flood (*Gilg.* XI 91f., cf. also *ibid.* 118). Generally the bad Days are associated with Iškur/Adad, the storm god; they are "released from the sky" (a n₄ t₄ a₄ š u₄ b₄ r₄ r₄ a₄, cf. e.g. *UET* 6 391 Obv. 16), howl and roar (*TCS* 3 100). These violent weather phenomena, roaring storms, are imagined as (at least partly) leonine monsters (interchangeable with pi r i₄ g₄, "lion"; see also below 11a, lion-dragon u₄-k₄₄ a₄-d u₄ h₄-h₄ a₄), mounts and draught-animals of gods (mount of Iškur: above a; mount of Ištar: *JNES* 33 234 VIII; chariot of Utu: *OrAnt* 8 42 ad 89ff., of Marduk: *Ee* IV 50; of Ninurta: *Gudea Cyl.* B XIII 19; of Gilgamesh: *Gilg.* VI 12). The u₄-g₄l a₄ t first was not a specific being but simply a big ud (above a; translated into Akkadian as j₅μu rabā). After the Ur III period u₄-g₄l 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
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.


f The *ūmuš dabrātu* defeated by Marduk in Ee (above VII.B.9) also belong here ("fierce weather-beasts") and are perhaps related to the *ūmuš šamrātu*, "fierce weather-beasts", lead away by one of the incarnations of Ningirsu/Ninurta in the Gula hymn *OrNS* 35 126:173.

5 *uridimmu*, "Mad Lion".

a *Word: uridimmu* is a loanword from Sumerian *u r - i dim*; the elements of the Sumerian word are *u r*, "dog/lion", and *i dim*, "(howling) mad", "wild", "not domesticated" (Heimpel *Tierbilder* 351ff., von Soden *Symbolae Böhl* 351; glosed *i-d*[i-]*-im* in *MSL* 8/2 14:94). The correct form of the Akkadian loanword is rather *urDimmu*: text VI Col. B 10 *ur-dim-me, MSL* 11 31 Sect. 10:8' // Cavigneaux *Texts from Babylon* I 105:4 mul *u r - i dim =*[u]* *-dim-mu* (which also establishes the name of the constellation), and Weisberg *YOS* 17 345:6 (NB, offerings to) *dUr-dimmu*. Unfortunately the spellings with -*dim* and -*dim* do not allow us to establish the nature of the dental (D) and to date the loanword. The element *i dim* can be used to determine imaginary beings (ZA 57 90: *ušumgal - i dim*); thus the composition of the word does not allow us to determine whether the being denoted was real or imaginary. For *UR.IDIM*, the monster, and for *UR.IDIM*, the constellation (cf. *AHw* 1429b), the reading *ur(i)dimmu* is ascertained by text VI and *MSL* 11 31 (quoted above). It seems probable therefore that *UR.IDIM = ur(i)dimmu* the constellation was also imagined as a monster; if we may hold that the imaginary beings of heaven did not change their appearance after their invention, the heavenly *ur(i)dimmu* is the oldest attestation of this monster (it occurs in typologically older astrological texts and may go back to the third millennium, cf. van der Waerden, *die Anfänge der Astronomie* 54ff., Hunger-Walker *MDOG* 109 30:22). Perhaps Sumerian *u r - i dim* also denoted a variety of *u r*, "dog/lion", in Akkadian explained by, or...
translated with źibu, “jackal” and kalbu šegû, “mad (howling) ‘dog’ ” (AHw 1429b; MSL 8/2 14:95, van Dijk Lugal I 73:171). The relation between this real being and the monster remains unclear.

b **Identification:** human-headed lion-man. Cf. above II.A.3.17 and VII.B.

c **Attestations:** before SB ur·i·dim = ur(i)dimmu is not actually attested (VII.A.5). Occurrences in VII.B.7 and 9 go back to MB originals. Occurrences in lexical lists (MSL 8/2 14:94, MSL 11 31 quoted above) and typologically older astronomical texts may go back to the beginning of the second millennium. The constellation UR.IDIM = ur(i)dimmu may have been named in the third. In art the human-headed lion-man is extremely rare. The oldest example seems to be on a silver vase from Iran (Orthmann Der Alte Orient no 306) where he holds a crescent on a pole and accompanies a bull-man. The authorities date the piece to the last quarter of the second millennium (Amiet Syria 45 256, Orthmann Der Alte Orient 389f., Porada Akkadica 13 4, all with photographs). Of about the same date is the lion-man on a kudurru (Seidl BaM 4 42 Abb. 10, cf. 175; the tail is not visible, but Kolbe Reliefprogramme 134 gives him a scorpion’s sting and dismisses him). Besides the apotropaic representations only a few uncertain NAss examples are known: one on the bronze bands of a door of Sargon II (Kolbe Reliefprogramme 135 with Seidl BaM 4 175; Reade, after the drawing, determines the being as a bull-man, BaM 10 40) one on a NAss seal, holding a sun-disk (?) on a pole (Ravn Catalogue no 142), and one on another NAss seal (Parker Iraq 24 37 Fig.2).

d **Mythology:** about the earlier mythology of the ur(i)dimmu nothing is known. In the MB period he was included among the trophies of Marduk, and later became a member of Tiāmat’s army. The magical text KAR 26 (cf. Ebeling ZDMG 69 96ff.) and its unpublished duplicates (HKL 2 55) give some information on the ur(i)dimmu, but the prayer to Marduk in this text (cf. Seux Hymnes et Prières 449ff.) makes it clear that the text does not predate Ee and the exaltation of Marduk. The ritual prescribes the fabrication of an ur(i)dimmu of cedar to be hung on a loop of gold and flax together with a (seal of, K 3268+) ḫulālūstone and inscribed as follows: ĖN d ASAR.I.ME.ÉN SIL, ÉRIMA NIG.AK.A 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 Šarpanitu, a long prayer is recited (Obv. 11ff.) in which Marduk is implored (46ff.) to give the ur(i)dimmu of cedar a (var. your) consignment of life (ur·ta šá TI.LA, var. K 5937: ur·ta-ka) so that good health will accompany the sick man. A similar request is made to Šarpanitu (57, cf. Seux Hymnes et Prières 4537), she is to make him well disposed (milik damāqi) towards protecting the life of the sufferer. The monster is called (Obv. 50) šābit abbūti ana Marduk u Šarpanītum bēlîšu, “who intercedes with Marduk and Šarpanitum, his masters”, probably because as their gate keeper (Obv. 47) he was in the position to do so. The text on the figure, also recited later in the ritual to Mar-
duk and Šarpānitu, may well contain his interceding words. Finally the ur(i)dimmu himself is addressed and reminded of the consignment of Marduk and the advice of Šarpānitu (Rev. 28ff.). Thus in this text, the ur(i)dimmu is the gate keeper of Marduk and Šarpānitu and intercedes with them on behalf of the sick man. He also is the guardian of their gate (Obv. 46), chases away evil (Obv. 48f.), and, ordered to do so by his masters Marduk and Šarpānitu, helps the sick man to obtain health. The inscription on the ur(i)dimmu of text II (cf. II.A.3.17) characterizes him as serving the forces (DINGIR ē, 4LAMMA ē) symbolizing the well-being and prosperity of the house, and as such resembles the consignment of life of KAR 26.

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

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

6 kusarikku, “Bison”, “Bison(-bull)”.

a Word/attestations/mythology: Sumerian a lim (1) and its free variant g u d - a lim denote, at least in Sumer (3), the bison (4). In art the bison is represented at first naturalistically, but later (from ED I onwards) generally with a human face (5). Perhaps under the influence of foreign images (6), the bull-man or rather bison-man was developed from a bison in upright position (an active variant) (7). Only the free variant g u d - a lim and the Akkadian loanword (8) kusarikku come, probably already in the Akkad period, to be associated with the bison-man (9). The human-faced bison and the bison-man are associated with the sungod (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 moutain himself, may have inspired bedouins to call the forebear of their tribe (“ditu”) “Bison” (Ditan- 14), also the name of the “mountain of the
The variation alim:gud-alim is attested in the equations alim (6).

Amiet in Ebla a lim is equated withHUD−a lim (9).

The derivation of his son-man (bull-man) from (upright) bison and further developments: Hilzheimer gud−alim certainly did not denote only the bison-man corresponding to sag-(gud)-alim-ma in the texts (KieinZA 73 gud−a lim “Wisentstier”. This distribution of the terms could nicely explain the choice of lidnu (10).
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While the recumbent (human-faced) bison is the apogee of unshakeable peace, the relations of the combative bison-man (16) with the sun-god (17) are not always peaceful. His defeat by Ninurta/Ningirsu (later Marduk) is known from NSum and later sources (18). The texts have nothing to tell on the nature of Ninurta/Ningirsu’s quarrel with the kusarikku; the defeat of the kusarikku is perhaps only a by-product of Ninurta/Ningirsu’s dealings with the mountains (19).

1) Syllabic spellings: ZA 58 33, Kutscher AH 115; in lexical lists: MSL 14 54:568, 440:10, cf. CAD K 584a. In gud−a lim perhaps the sign alim has also the value alima (Falkenstein GSGL 1 13). The Akkadian word for “bison” is didnu (CAD A/1 349b, D 165a) or karšanā (K 223b).

2) The variation alim: gud−alim is attested in the equations alim = kusarikku (< gud−alim ), cf. CAD K 584a, and gud−alim = alimā (< alima), cf. CAD A/1 349a. Sumerian gud−alim certainly did not denote only the bison-man (cf. Heimpel Tierbilder 77, OrNS 43 331:10). From lexical lists where Sumerian alim is translated with Akkadian kusarikku (denoting only the bison-man) it could be concluded that Sumerian alim also denotes the bison-man, but no context cases have been found. Landsberger assumed (Fauna 93) that gud in gud−alim is the determinative; at least the “determinative” is not only graphical, since the loanword proves that it was actually spoken (cf. Heimpel Tierbilder 199f.). Without discussion a different solution is proposed by Heimpel Tierbilder 77: alim “Wisent” (both sexes), gud−alim “Wisentstier”. This distribution of the terms could nicely explain the choice of masculine gud−alim to denote the active, ostentatiously ithyphallic bison-man.

3) In Ebla a lim is equated with il-a-um-inum, related to Akkadian lu, “bull”, and with u−gi−um, related to Semitic ‘igl, “calf” (MEE 4 282:73, 327:1192). The feminine form a lim−munus is equated with il-a-um (MEE 4 282:732) related to Akkadian iliu and the Hebrew PN LE′a, “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 saq−(gud)−a lim−ma in the texts (Klein ZA 73 270f).

5) Cf. with previous literature: Amiet GMA 3 112f., 137f., Behm-Blancke BaPo 1 46ff., Boehmer BaM 9 18f. From the Ur III period onwards (Boehmer UAVA 4 44, Amiet GMA 3 1478) the human-faced bison is often furnished with the horns of divinity (for stone representations cf. Huot Sumer 34 104ff.). The only conceivable Semitic name for the divine (human-faced) bison is a theophoric element in Amorite names. Didan− (CAD D 165a, Huffmon APN 184, Butz WZKM 65/66 313, Gelb AS 21 295). If so, the heros eponimos (Edzard ZZB 39 166) of the tidnu Amorites was (perhaps under the influence of Mesopotamian conceptions) conceived as a bison. The name of the late successor of the human-faced bison, the NAsh human-headed bull (Kolbe Reliefprogramme Type 11a/b, Landsberger Fauna 89), is not yet established with certainty (see II.B.1.G. šedu; aladannā ? Cf. CAD A/1 287, Turner Iraq 32 81f.).

6) Amiet GMA 3 84a, Porada BiMes 4 1 115.


8) gud−alim was proposed by Landsberger Fauna 93. For the interchange r: l that troubled Landsberger cf. now Šjöberg OrSu 10 6, AJO 24 41, Civil JCS 25 137f., Falkenstein ZA 45 34, Labat-Edzard MDP 57 26, RGTC 2 80 (Hu′urti/Hulti). The correspondence of Sumerian t (the last consonant of the first element of the word, later changed into d but still present when the word was loaned in the OAkk period) to Akkadian s− is attested elsewhere as well (Liebermann SLOB 1 434, 538, 647). Since Sumerian has a word for the bison-man that is certainly not borrowed from a third language (as proved by the omissible element gud; alim is not necessarily Sumerian, cf. Oppenheim JNES 4 170,180), it is hardly likely that Akkadian kusarikku is borrowed from a third language; in that case we should expect Sumerian (gud)−a lim to be borrowed from the same language (Salonen Jura 207 derives kusarikku and its variants — cf. CAD K 584 — from a substrate word: κχαρικα).
9) In OAkk a number of GUD-sá-ri-ku (PBS 9 30:1) appear together with two lahmus; in view of the regular association of the bison-man and the naked hero, the denotation bison-man is probable in this case but cannot be proved. The gúd-a-lím enemy of Ningirsu/Ninurta is certainly the bison-man (attested first in Gudea CyLA XXV:13); like the gúd-a-lím of the texts (Cooper AnOr 52 148) he appears on the chariot of a god (Ningirsu?) on the stele of Gudea (Orthmann Der Alte Orient Figs. 111a, b, p. 220). In the hymnic introduction of the NAss Anzû myth, the kusarikku defeated by Ninurta can hardly denote anything else than the kusarikku of the contemporary rituals. The kusarikku, trophy of Marduk since MB, is the successor of the earlier gúd-a-lím kusarikku of the Anzû myth, the trophy of Ningirsu/Ningirsu; the kusarikku of Marduk is directly related to the kusarikku of the late rituals and certainly a bison-man.

The constellation kusarikku is attested already in OB (cf. CAD K 584b), and was named probably even earlier; C.B.F. Walker will prove (personal communication) that the later constellation kusarikku (GUD-alîm) is the bison-man, constituting together with Šullat and Hanuš (the hind quarter, cf. ŠL IV/2 no 240) the constellation Centaurus. To the attestations noted by the dictionaries, Landsberger Fauna 92ff., and Heimpel Tiberbilder 75ff., the following can be added: ORNS 43 331:30 (Sum. lit.), ARM 21 222:52f. (together with kamassatu on a kanna, “potstand”); OB, KUB 4 47 Rev. 10 (kiššu prayer:  "Qa-ag-a-ad Kusarikku-<kad>-rù ša ... [.....] û Kusarikku-šú-dînu-nir-mes ša [.....]). MIO 1 70:9 (uncertain. The being described could be a kusarikku and 70:9:7 could be read as [ka]:[za]-[ri-ik-ka], CT 46 51 Obv. 36', GUD-alîm Rev. 20’ “explained” as: ka-bu (=ALIM), “venerable” [kar-ra-du’] (=GUD), “warrior”, LKA 133 Rev. 5 (SB inc.: I put you under the spell of Kusarikku at the gate of the house of Ea, your father”), ZA 71 110:5 (SB omens). The only attestation of kusarikku in a god list is STT 376 iv 17’; GUD-DUMU.UTU among other gods represented by statues.

10) For the human-faced bison cf. Behm-Blancke BaFo 1 51, Frankfurt CS 161. The ság-a-lím, “head of the (human-faced) bison”, is the šu-ni:`UTU, “emblem of Utu”, in an enumeration of defeated enemies of Ningirsu (Gudea CyA. XXVI 4; cf. in 13; gúd-a-lím). Such heads are actually attested and may have had an apotropaic function (Klein ZA 73 270ff., Anmit GHA 137, Behm-Blancke BaFo 1 146)). An Ed IIIa mace head with human-faced bison is dedicated to Utu (UB II pl. 183, cf. Soltsberger Iraq 22 73:71) and suggests a relation between the animal and the god (cf. Frankfurt AnOr 12 115ff., AnOr Sumer 9 233, Behm-Blancke BaFo 1 51). For the bison-man cf. UAVA 2 85f., CS 161, Orthmann Der Alte Orient Pl. 248 (where he carries the throne of Šamaš). His relation to Utu is also recorded by the logogram GUD.DUMU.UTU (since OB, cf. above II.A.3.18 and for attestations in rituals VII.A.6; in Assyria since MAss); the attestations were collected by Frankenke Tahkultu 90 (add: KÁR 137:10, Freydank-Saporet nude Nuveateu notenticii 5, Menzel AT T 137 B.3, and cf. Müller MVAG 41/328). The meaning of the logogram is not completely clear (cf. Borger BAL 129). It must be noted that DUMU.UTU does not necessarily refer to Utu’s physical fatherhood; it can also refer to a natural phenomenon described metaphorically as “son of Utu” (light, flame, wind), cf. van Dijk HSAO 249 ad BASON 94 2ff.5f., Borger WiO 5 173, Geller ZA 73 115. The later canonical replaces GUD.DUMU.UTU with GUD.DUMULANNA (cf. above II.A.3.18); since this spelling is attested only once as the logogram of kusarikku (VII.A.6 text 14), and since these differ only slightly, we consider the latter a graphical development of the former [cf. now A.R. George RA 82 151]. Certainly not related to GUD.DUMU.UTU/GUD.DUMULANNA or the bison (-man) is gúd-a-n-á-naš, the “bull of heaven” (cf. CAD A11 377, Borger RA 4 413f., VAS 17 10:21, 46, Castellino Two Sulgi Hymns 130, JNES 43 119), positively identified with the humped bull (Thureau-Dangin RA 16 156, Weidner Gesildmardstellunghen 81; perhaps on a plaque, killed by Gilgamesh and Enkidu, cf. Opifusici UAVA 2227; for the animal see Douglas van Buren Fauna 29c). In less conservative contexts (late second and first millennium seals) the bull of heaven appears as a winged, human-faced bull (cf. the description of a winged ala in AIO 18 302:17f.), and for the seals with Gilgamesh and Enkidu fighting the bull of heaven W.G. Lambert in A.E. Farkas ed., Monsters and Demons in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds [1987] 48ff. The term alá, however, is not used to refer to the apotropaic human-faced bulls of Assyrian palaces. They must have had another name (see i.B.0.G.šedu). Whether the dying god GUD-gal-an-na (cf. Lambert CRRAI 26 62ff.), or the bull slain in a clearly mythological context on seals (Frankfort CS 126f., Boehner UAVA 4 60f., Vanel l’Iconographie du Dieu de l’Orage 26) has anything to do with the “bull of heaven” cannot be discussed here. The bull, the symbolic animal of Adad, is sometimes a humped bull (Abou Assaf ABA 14 51), but it is known in the texts only under the name of binu ekdu, “fierce young bull” (MDP 2 90:17, LKU 313).
From OB onwards the bison-man generally is furnished with the horns of divinity.

Barrelet RA 48 16ff., Amiet GMA² 138f., Boehmer UAIV 2 85, BM 9 21, Behm-Blancke BoFo 1 47.

Cf. above note 5 and for this complicated problem e.g. Astour UFo 5 36ff., Diakonoff CRRAI 28 24f., Lipinski F. Losenstamm 91ff., Helzer The Suteans 1ff.

For his combative ness on seals cf. Amiet GMA² 147; the texts give only hints: in Angim 35 Ninurta brings the bison out of the "dust of battle"; id i m, "the wild one" is equated with kusarikku in MSL 14 27823 (Aa II G).

Identification: bull-man (the traditional designation of the archaeological type; "bison-man" is historically more correct). Cf. above II.A.3.18 (and Wiggermann apud Green Iraq 45 92f.; apud Stol Zwangerschap en Geboorte 112). the complete equation is:

(1) GUD.ALI = (2) GUD.DUMU.UTU = (3) GUD.DUMU.AN.NA = (4) kusarikku = (5) bull-man. For (2) = (3) cf. also above 10. The following solutions were proposed previously:

Smith Chaldean Genesis (1875) indentified the naked hero and the bull man with Izdubar (now read Gilgamesh) and Heabani (now read Enkidu). This identification is totally unfounded, but has won almost universal acceptance until quite recently, see, with previous literature, W.G. Lambert, Gilgamesh in Literature and Art: The Second and First Millennia, in A.E. Farkas ed., Monsters and Demons in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds [1987], 37–52

Langdon AJSL 31 (1914/15) 284, Epic of Creation (1923) 89f.: (1) = (4) "fish-ram" (Goat-fish). Langdon's identification was based on the spelling kuš-sa-rak-ki in Ee III 91 (cf.CAD K 584a), which he read Kuš.DAR-rak-ki. The misreading was noted and the proposal rejected by Landsberger Fauna (1934) 93.

Landsberger Fauna (1934) 93: (1) = (4) = human-faced bison. The solution is based on al i m = 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 Sumer 8 196, Gadd Iraq 28 120, with modification) but does not seem to have won general acceptance, especially not where the late successor of the human-faced bison, the NAss human-headed bull, is concerned.

Landsberger Sam' al I (1948) 96: (2) = bull-man. The identification is correct but was not yet proved. It was based on a general comparison of occurrences of GUD.DUMU.UTU in apotropaic contexts in NAss royal inscriptions with occurrences of the bull-man on orthostats in Sam'al.
Landsberger did not believe that GUD.DUMU.dUTU was the original name of the bull-man, or even that the bull-man had a name at all. He thought that the naked hero (mistakenly identified with *apkallu*) and the bull-man were traditional apotropaic types of art, brought into the pantheon by equating them with traditional apotropaic figures of the texts (*apkallu* and GUD.DUMU.dUTU; Landsberger, who did not yet know the Nippur forerunner of Ḫḫi, *MSL* 8/1 87:200, thought the latter was a traditional figure in the Assyrian pantheon only). This unfounded but at the time plausible position has had an impeding influence on the study of Babylonian art: it gave a respectable philological base to the thought that the figures and themes of art are related only in the most general manner to the figures and themes of literature. The present identifications show that this relation is less lax; yet complete correspondance is not to be expected.

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

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

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

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

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

Laroche *JCS* 6 120 and *RHA* 84/85 78, followed by Güterbock *Yazilikaya* 2 177, identified two bull-men standing on the hieroglyph for earth and holding up the hieroglyph for heaven, no 28/29 of the Yazilikaya rock relief, with Šeriš and Ḫurriš. There is no caption to prove this identification, nor can it be proved that Šeriš and Ḫurriš must be present at all. Some voiced misgivings about this identification (Otten *Anatolia* 4 34), but two other bulls then available for identification with Šeriš and Ḫurriš (*Yazilikaya* 2 42a, 43a, cf. Haas *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 Teššup’ (Ṣarrūmma, Güterbock *Yazilikaya* 2 171, *Les Héroglyphes 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.

— Ḫurriš and Šeriš draw the chariot of Teššup (*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.
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There is good reason to think that Hurriš and Šeriš were real animals, not monsters: in *An-Anum III* 257ff. Šeriš is one of the two *gud-škur-ke4*, "bulls of Adad"; for GUD = Šeriš, cf. Ebeling *ArOr* 21 401, *OrNS* 23 126 ad 24, *CAD* K 29a; in a text quoted by Laroche *Glossaire de la Langue Hourrite* 115 and 227 Šeriš and Hurriš are GUD.HILA-ri, "bulls".

Conceivably the two bull-men of Yazılıkaya 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 Yazılıkaya, N° 28–29". Amiet (*RA* 50 117) suggests that Hurriš and Šeriš (Jour et Nuit) derive from the lying human faced bulls of third millennium Mesopotamian art, that sometimes replace the mountains through which the sun rises (see also *GMA* 2 139).

**Apotropaic representations:** in texts: cf. above (9); like the trophies of Marduk, the trophies of Ninurta on his chariot or temple front must have discouraged evil. On a vase of Ibbi-Sin: *OrAnt* 23 39:19. In Mari on a potstand: *ARM* 21 222:25. In an OB incantation (Farber *ZA* 71 63 Rev. 5, cf. *AMT* 96/2 i 12 quoted by *CAD* K 584a, and cf. Ebeling *MAOG* V/3 11 for a similar text with *lahmu*) the crying baby wakes up (the god of the house and) the *kusarikku* who reacts: *ma-nu-um id-ki-a-ni ma-nu-um ú-ga-li-ta-ni, "who woke me up, who startled me?", a domestic version of Enlil's anger at the noise of mankind. Certainly this *kusarikku* was present in the house, represented on an apotropaic clay plaque (Opificius *UA* 2 no 402ff., especially 402 found in context against the outer wall of the Hêndursag chapel at OB Ur, Moorey *Iraq* 37 89f.), or as a statuette (in texts: cf. Landsberger *Fauna* 93). In M/NaAss palaces and temples bull-men have not actually been found, but they are known to have been installed from the texts (cf. above note 9, *KUB* 4 47 Rev. 10, *CT* 46 51 Obv. 36', Rev. 20', *LKA* 133 Rev. 5, Menzel *AT* 2 T 134 IX 8, Frankena *Tākultu* 90, also with references to GUD.DUMU₄ in NaAss royal inscriptions, Borger *AfOB* 9 87:4, cf. Börker-Klähn *ZA* 70 260⁴, 266f.). The bison heads on seals and toggle pins recall the later heads of Humbaba and may well have been apotropaic (Amiet *GMA* 2 137). On kudurru’s: Seidl *BaM* 4 XLVII. In the MB temple in Tell Rimah: Howard-Carter *Iraq* 45 64ff. and Pl. IIIa. In Syria: Ortmann *Untersuchungen* 306ff. In Kleinplastik (cf. VII.A.6): Rittig *Kleinplastik* 98ff., Ismail *CRRAl* 28 199, Green *Iraq* 45 92, generally with the prescribed (II.A.3.18) inscription: "go out death, enter life". The figure on the reverse of Lamasṭu 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 Lamasṭu amulets.
girtablullu, “Scorpion-Man”.

a **Word:** the composition of the word out of the elements gîr-ta-b, “scorpion”, and 1ú-ù-lu, “untamed man”, reveals the being denoted as partly man and partly scorpion. Above VII.A we gave reasons to identify this being with the scorpion-man of the palace reliefs and the Kleinplastik, rather than with Seidl *BaM* 4 XLIV or XLV, if the latter is indeed distinct from the scorpion-man of the reliefs (so Kolbe *Reliefprogramme 82*). Comparison with other names of monsters composed with -ullu (urma(lullu), kalullu) shows that the element -ullu 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 girtablullu. The Göttertypentext *MIO* 1 64 6’f. may have given a description of a [gfr.tab.]lu:úlu:lu, but unfortunately only one word is preserved: a-li-ku, “in walking posture” (*CAD* A/1 347a). The Scorpion-man and -woman of the Gilgamesh Epic (IX ii-iv), guarding the gate in the mountain through which the sun rises and sets, are hardly an invention of the editor of the SB redaction of the epic. Their antiquity cannot exactly be established, but the appearance of a scorpion-man on an OAkk seal (Amiet apud Porada *Ancient Art in Seals* Fig. II-20), formally related to the scorpion-man of the reliefs rather than to *BaM* 4 XLIV or XLV, and like the girtablullu 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/girtablullu, adjunct of the sun-god, existed already, see also Green *Iraq* 47 759 (Seal), J. Börker-Klähn *BaFo* 4 Pl 26e (on standard, winged). Still earlier scorpion-men are associated with the sun as well, but are formally different (Amiet *GMA*² 133f., 155, Pl.95, Frankfort *CS* 68); they derive from a mythological scorpion manipulating heavenly bodies with its pincers. The pincers became hands and a head was added, the essentials of the human upper body of the scorpion-man. (Amiet *GMA*² 133f.).

b **Identification:** cf. above, *Word*. Whether the scorpion-man Seidl *BaM* 4 XLV, different from the Scorpion-Man of the reliefs and seals and never associated with the winged disk (Kolbe *Reliefprogramme 82*), is a girtablullu as well must remain undecided (positively so Edzard *WdM* 100).

c **Attestations:** since Ed IIIa (Lyre from Royal Graves in Ur, *UE* II Pl.105; Teissier, *ANECS* 335). The word is therefore genuine Sumerian, but the being cannot have been named before the pincers were understood as human hands.

d **Mythology:** The epic of Gilgamesh informs us on the activities of the girtablullu prior to the theology of Ee. The girtablullu here is accompanied by his wife, a curiosity that reappears in the rituals, where the girtablullu is the only figure of whom a male and a female statue are made. Together they guard the gate of mount Mâšu (“Twin”) and watch over the rising and setting of the sun. They discuss Gilgamesh when he
arches, 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 girtablullu with the sun god goes back to the third millennium.
e

8 urmahullu, “Lion-Man”.

a Word: composed out of ur-ma-hu, “lion” and lu-ulu, “untamed man”. The urmahullu is extremely rare. It is omitted thrice in enumerations of the trophies of Marduk (VII.A.8), and its first appearance in art is on a MAss seal (ZA 47 67 Abb. 30). Possibly, therefore, the loanword is a learned neologism, based on the analogy with kulullu or girtablullu.

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 urmahullu of text II (II.A.3.20): ta-par-ri-ik SAG.HU.L.A.ZA (the editor, Klengel-Brandt, read the inscription slightly differently in FuB 10 26, but the photograph Taf. 5/2 shows that the correction proposed by Ellis is right). The identification was later confirmed by the appearance of the same text on a perfectly preserved monumental specimen from Ashurbanipal’s palace (Gadd apud Barnett SNPAN 40). Whether winged examples are also called urmahullu cannot be decided (on seals: Frankfort CS Pl. XXXIVd, Beran AfO 18 273 abb. 25). The lion-demon (above 4) or the human-headed lion-man (above 5) are sometimes mistakenly identified as urmahullu (Frankfort CS 175, Lambert Iraq 41 10, Reade BM 10 40). There is no connection with priests clad in lion’s skins or wearing lion masks (Oppenheim JAOS 63 32, cf. recently W. Faust WD 11 2419 with further literature). Reade BM 10 41 proposed kuribu for the unwinged lion-centaur.

c Mythology/Attestations: the first attestation of an unwinged lion-centaur on a 13th century Assyrian seal (ZA 47 67 Abb. 30) predates its inclusion among the trophies of Marduk; it is not yet present in Ee (VII.B.9), telling, since this text enlarged the number of monsters with traditional names. Thus the lion-centaur does not seem to have had a function in traditional mythology. It was invented in the late second millennium, probably by analogy with the centaurs (not necessarily in Assyria, since a winged lion-centaur also existed in the South, Beran AfO 18 273 Abb. 25), named by analogy with kulullu or girtablullu, and functioning in mythology only after its inclusion among the trophies of Marduk.
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Apotropaic representations: in texts: VII.A.8, probably also RA.114:10 and YOS 6 3:3. In Kleinplastik: Rittig Kleinplastik 112f.; on reliefs: Kolbe Reliefsprogramme Type XVII, Reade BaM 10 41, Madhloom Chronology 98f. (winged: Kolbe Reliefsprogramme 'type 12b). The position of the unwinged 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).

kullūlā, "Fish-Man".

a Word: that KU₆.LU.ULU-lu is to be read kullūlā appears from the Göttertypentext where the word is spelled ku-lu-ul-lu (MIO 1 80:12). A long -ā is demanded by Sumerian lū-ūlu, from which lullā is borrowed, but none of the lullā 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 kullil(l)u is attested in KAR 162 Rev. 4 (Ee, spelled ku-li-li). This kullil(l)u is to be kept distinct from:

a) "Ku-li-li, variant of dKi-li-li (Landsberger Fauna 136, Frankena Takultu 97, CAD K 357a), a female figure, possibly apotropaic as well (III.B.13+n).

b) kullītu (Sum.: būrūs-īd-dā), "dragonfly".

c) ku-lī-an-na = kullītu. The SB bilingual text of Angim 58 translates ku-lī-an-na, "friend of heaven/An", denoting one of the trophies of Ninurta/Ningirsu, with ku-līl-ta. What ku-lī-an-na denotes in the OB text is not known; it was hardly Dumuzi, who is sometimes called "friend of An". The later MAss MS has ku₆-lī-an-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-lī-lī-an-na, "little bride of An" = Akkadian kullīltu, an insect since it appears among other insects in Ḫḫ (cf. Landsberger Fauna 136, Cooper AnOr 52 149). Although kullīltu, "little bride" (an insect) and kullītu, "fish-woman" are not related linguistically, they may have been fused in the mind of the late translator of Angim. The existence of kullītu, "fish-woman" (proving the by-form of the masculine word to have been kullīlu), became apparent only recently from a NAass administrative document (CTN 3 95 B:28: 1-te ku-lil-te ... 2 ku-lil-ate) describing statues in the Ezida of Nabû in Kalhu. The two "fish-women" are described after a suhurmāšu and a KU₆.LU.ULU-lu. Monumental representations of apotropaic insects are unknown, and kullītu here cannot have denoted such a being. In art the fishman appears first in the OB period (Heuzey RA 5 131 Fig. C, Porada CANES 433, Delaporte Louvre II Pl. 76 A 251); thus, if the being was named in this period, kullūlā is a learned neologism based on the analogy with girtablullā; alternatively, it may have been named earlier, before its first appearance in art, when Sumerian was still spoken. In that case kullūlā is a genuine loanword.

b Identification: fish-centaur. This identification was proposed earlier
but could not be proved until 1968, when Klengel-Brandt published a fish-centaur from Aššur (FuB 10 32 = Rittig Kleinplastik 9.1.2) carrying the inscription prescribed by ritual II (II.A.3. 23). An uninscribed example from Aššur was correctly identified by Lutz in 1930 (UCP 9/7383ff.), but did not strictly constitute proof. The description of a *kulullâ* in MIO 1 80:5ff. is, as usual in this text, divergent. Here the *kulullâ* has a human upper body, hands, and the head of a *kissu*, which, whatever it is, is not the head of a human being. Below the waist it is a *puradu*, "carp". The *kulullâ* is sometimes mistakenly identified with the fish- *apkallu* (Meissner BuA 2 205, Köcher MIO 1 95, Edzard WdM 100, Borger JNES 33 186, Komoróczy ActAntHung 21 143).

c. **Attestations:** in art from OB onwards. For more primitive forms, a human-headed fish with arms and a human-headed fish without arms (the latter attested also in OAss. art, cf Özgüz TTKY 22 72, TTKY 25 43) cf. Collon CS III p.45. The SB texts in which the *kulullâ* appears go back partly to MB (VII.B.7, 9). Kassite appearances have been briefly discussed by van Buren OrNS 23 23 (cf. also Flowing Vase Pl. XX 68, 69, 70) and Porada AfO 28 53. For later examples cf. below (apotropaic representations) and e. g. Parker Iraq 24 37 Fig. 2 (together with *kusarikku* and fish- *apkallu*), Ward SC 657ff., Delaporte Bib. Nat. 392, 543.

d. **Mythology:** already with its first appearance in OB, the fish-centaur is together with the suhurmâšu associated with Ea and streams (RA 5 131 Fig. C, Collon CS III 73, 288). In the *Göttertypentext* MIO 1 80:12 he is "one of Ea" (šut *Ea*) and the flowing vase he carries is called *hengîlu*, "abundance". The inscription prescribed in ritual II (cf. II.A.3.23) for apotropaic representations of this being stresses its relation with bounty and divine benevolence: "come down produce of the mountain, enter intercession and compliance" it speaks. The late translator of Angim may have identified the female form (*kuliltu*) with ku-li-i-a-n-a, one of the trophies of Ninurta/Ningirsu, and so have imbedded her in tradition.

e. **Apotropaic attestations:** in rituals: VII.A.9; in NAss royal inscriptions: OIP 2 145:20, KAV 74:8 (cf. Börker-Klahn ZA 70 258ff.); K. among Isin deities: RA 41 36:14; in an NAss administrative document giving measures of statues in the Nabû temple in Kalḫu in view of their covering in gold leaf: CTN 3 95 B:19 (KU₆.LU.ULU.UL[û]), 28 (ku-lil-te...ku-lil-a-te, cf. above; also mentioned are 2 SUHUR.MâŠ in the same shrine). In Kleinplastik: Rittig Kleinplastik 94ff. (cf. 218 for identification, Green Iraq 45 Pl. XVb, photograph of Kleinplastik 9.1.3, and for another inscribed example, Trésors du Musée de Bagdad no 141 = IM 3337). Monumental examples: Mallowan N & R I 234ff. Fig. 198 (outside the Nabû temple in Kalḫu) conforming to the text CTN 3 95 describing the same shrine. The female variant present here according to the same text has not been found, but for an example cf. Unger RIV 8 "Mischwesen" § 5. For further discussion of the colossi of the Nabû temple cf. Madhloom Chronology 99ff., with further literature. [See now Green Iraq 48 25ff.].
suḫur-mašu, “Carp-Goat”.

a Word: the few examples of suḫur-mašu/mašku in Sumerian texts indicate that the being denoted was a real fish, rather than a monster (EWO 96 with the comments of Falkenstein ZA 56 62, Wilcke Lugalbanda 392ff., Falkenstein SGL 1 81:16). The Akkadian loanword suḫur-mašu may have retained this denotation (in omens: KAR 300:15; in OrNS 30 3:32 where the duplicate SbTU 2 8 i 30 has suḫurku6, cf. CAD S 352a where an emendation is proposed). Thus we cannot be certain that Akkadian suḫur-mašu 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: suḫur, “carp”, and maš/maš, “goat”.

b Identification: Goat-fish. On the basis of etymology this being was identified as the suḫur-mašu by Jensen ZA 5 (1890) 129 and Kosmologie (1890) 73ff., 2773. Zimmern apud Frank LSS II/2 (1906) 11, 34 added the evidence of the Nazimarruttaš kudurru, where the goat-fish of Ea is named su-ḫur-ma-šu (MDP 2 Pl. 17 iv 5). Final confirmation came from the goat-fish published by Lutz in UCP 9/7 (1930) 383f., carrying the inscription prescribed by the ritual for the suḫur-mašu (= Rittig Kleinplastik 10.1, for the inscription cf. IIA.24).

c Attestations: since Ur III, cf. Seidl BaM 4 XLIX, and for the Ur III and Isin-Larsa periods also Collon CS II 412, Buchanan Yale 702.

d Mythology: since its appearance in the Ur III period, the goat-fish is associated with water, flowing vases, and Ea. This association is confirmed by the texts (LKU 45:16, MDP 2 Pl. 17 iv 5). Especially interesting is a LB Sumerian text of MB origin, where he is called sān-ga-ma-buzzu-ke4, “the lofty purification priest (cf. CAD mullilu 2) of the apšu” (Lambert Fs Albright 346:25). Associated with seals is the Carp-Goat of a bit meseri incantation (III.B.8 = OrNS 30 3:18ff. // SbTU 2 8 i 20ff., cf. Borger JNES 33 192) in which Piriggalabzu, the sage of Adab, hangs his seal on it, angers Ea, and gets killed (by a fuller) with the (same ?) seal in consequence. The inscription prescribed for representations of this being in ritual II (IIA.3.24) indicates intercessory activity. The e’ru-stick that the suḫur-mašu carries (although he has no hands to hold it) in the rituals (cf. p. 84.12b) connects him with exorcism (p. 67f.). Generally the suḫur-mašu is one of the trophies of Marduk (VII.A.10), but Ee leaves him out. Perhaps he was too thoroughly peaceful for the army of Tiāmat.

e Apotropaic representations: in rituals: VII.A.10; in Nass royal inscriptions: OIP 2 145:20 (cf. Börker-Klähn ZA 70 258ff.), AfOB 19 95:11; in an NB royal inscription: VAB 4 282:59; in a NAss administrative document enumerating statues in the Nabû temple: CTN 3 95 B:15 (cf. above kulullû). In Kleinplastik: Rittig Kleinplastik 97 (photograph also Green Iraq 45 Pl. XVa. Like the bašmu and the mušhušu of the Kleinplastik this suḫur-mašu misses its horns). A goat-fish in front of a temple is de-
11 Other apotropaic monsters.

a Lion-Dragon. Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* Type X, Reade *BaM* 10 42.

The classical Akkadian lion-dragon (Braun-Holzinger *RLA* 7 97 Type 3a) is preceded in earlier art by a more leonine type (*ibid.* Type 1). Its development (addition of bird parts) is comparable to that of the *muḫuššu*. The lion-dragon is Adad's mount and called *u4* (VII.C.4), "weather-beast", and probably also *u4 - k a - d u h - h a šűmu na'iru, "weather-beast-with-opened-mouth/roaring weather-beast" (*cf. CAD* N/1 150, K 35, *ŚL* IV/2 58ff.). Originally *Anzû* was represented in art by the lion-headed eagle (VII.B.III, Braun-Holzinger *RLA* 7 94ff.). After the Ur III period the lion-headed eagle disappears from art, but representations of *Anzû* continue to be mentioned in the texts (*cf. CAD* A/2 155). Apparently, while Adad's interests shifted from the lion-dragon to the bull, the lion-dragon came to represent *Anzû*. In the Neo-Assyrian period the lion-dragon was split into two beings (a similar split is attested for the *muḫuššu* as well, *cf. RLA* *muḫuššu* 3.5), one (with feathered tail, *RLA* 7 type 3a) the enemy of Ninurta, one (with scorpion's sting, Type 3c) his mount. The monster on which Ninurta had his feet in the MB *Götterypentext* (*MIO* 1 66 i 59', ii 9), that is before the split and therefore Type 3a, is called *Anzû*; the monsters that stand next to his throne in his temple in Kalhu (*Iraq* 14 43 72ff.) are referred to with the general term *ušumgallu* (VII.C.2.a.f.; for the NAss iconography of Ninurta see Moortgat-Correns, *AfO* 35 117ff.).

In the Ur III period *Anzû* was included in the list of defeated enemies of Ninurta/Ningirsu (above III). Later the victory over *Anzû* was ascribed also to other gods (*cf. Cooper* *AnOr* 52 153ff., *Hruska* Anzu 87ff., Nergal, Adad, Nabû), among them Marduk (VII.B.11, 13). A slightly different earlier Assyrian form of the lion-dragon/*Anzû* (Type 2) occurs on three Lamaštu amulets (27, 34, 35; MAss.) *cf. 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 Seidl* *RLA* 3 489 c, Braun-Holzinger *RLA* 7 98 Type 3c) seems a more likely candidate to be covered by the descriptions (Kolbe *Reliefprogramme* 72ff.).

c *Rittig* *Kleinplastik* 21.1 = *Green* *Iraq* 45 95 and Pl. XIIb. Figure with human and leonine faces. For this unique figure no identification can be proposed. The figure may not be covered by the apotropaic rituals discussed in this book.
The visual types 1–11 correspond to the monsters discussed in VII.C. The other types are discussed elsewhere in this book, or added for contrast. A review of all monsters and non-anthropomorphic gods, including some that were not discussed here, will appear in RIA art. Mischwesen (A. Green - F.A.M. Wiggermann). Since for a variety of reasons the monsters in that article are numbered differently, we will refer to their RIA number here with M. + number.

1 (M. 1) Lahmu, "Hairy One".
   a Amiet GMA² 1599, cf Porada JAOS 103 477. Proto-literate forerunner.
   b Boehmer UAV 4 Abb. 232. Akkadian.

2 (M. 26) Bašmu, "Venemous Snake".
   The history of the bašmu is not yet completely clear. Positively bašmu's are the snake of the Kleinplastik (without horns and forepaws, VII. C. 2b), and the snake-monster with forepaws (and wings) from the palace of Esarhaddon (VII. C. 2a; below c), see the discussion in RIA muššušu §6 (also for muššušu).
   a Collon, First Impressions no. 850. Neo-Assyrian.
   b Weidner, Gestirn-Darstellungen auf Babylonischen Tontafeln Pl. 9 (constellation Hydra/μισσα). Neo-Babylonian.

3 (M. 27) Muššušu, "Furious Snake", "Awful Snake".
   a Porada CANES 1. Proto-literate forerunner.
   b Frankfort OIP no. 331. Akkadian forerunner (addition of snake's head).
   c Frankfort OIP 4 no. 570. Akkadian. Classical form.
   d Amiet GMA² 1246.C. Neo-Assyrian.

4 (M. 6) Ugallu, "Big Weather-Beast", "Big Day".
   Kolbe Reliefprogramme Pl. XII/3. Neo-Assyrian. The Akkadian forerunner has human feet.

5 (M. 5) Ur(i)dimmu, "Mad Lion".
   Kolbe Reliefprogramme Pl. XIV/1 (holding crescent).

6 (M. 3) Kusarikkku, "Bison", "Bison(-Bull)".
   Amiet GMA² 820. ED I.
   For the human-faced Bison (a i m) see below no. 11g.

7 (M. 4) Girtablullû, "Scorpion-Man".
   a Teissier ANECS 335. ED II/III (?). Seated at table.
   b Amiet GMA² 1245.C. Neo-Assyrian.
   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) Urmahlullû, "Lion-Man".
   D.M. Matthews, Principles of Composition in Near Eastern Glyptic of the Later
Second Millennium B.C. no. 393. Middle Assyrian.

9 (M. 22) Kulullâ, “Fish-Man”.
Matthews ibid. 141. Kassite.

10 (M. 23). Suḫurmâšu, “Carp-Goat”.
Matthews ibid. 529. Middle Assyrian.

11 Lion-headed Eagle (M. 14; third millennium Anzu d /Anzû), and Lion-Dragon (M. 25; u₄₃ k a - d u ḫ a /kaduhhâ/ āmu na’iru. Second and first millennium Anzu). a Amiet GMA² 1602 (M.A. Brandes FAOS 3/II Pl. 12). Protoliterate forerunner of Lion-headed Eagle (cf. Fuhr-Jaeppeít, Materialien zur Ikonographie des Löwenadlers Anzu-Indugud 6ff., 87ff., RIA Löwenadler §1a)
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 forerunner of Lion-Dragon, RIA Löwendrache §1.
e Amiet GMA² 1278. ED forerunner of Lion-Dragon, RIA Löwendrache §1.
f Boehmer UA 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 (talon, feathered tail) in the development of the mushšûšu (3), the Lion-headed Eagle, the Lion-Dragon, the Scorpionman (7), and the ugallu (4).

12 (M. 15) Scorpion-tailed Bird-Man. Identification uncertain, but possibly identical with 7 above.
Collon, First Impressions no. 356. Neo-Assyrian.

13 (M. 10) Pazuzu, see index.
Drawing from Saggs AfO 19 123ff. Fig. 3, and Lamashtu-amulet 40d.

14 (M. 31) Genie, see p. 79f., and II. A. 4. B umu-apkallu (I)
Collon, First Impressions no. 346. Neo-Assyrian.

15 (M. 9) Griffin-Demon, identified as the bird-apkallu, sec II. A. 4. B (II).
Mathews ibid. 283. Middle Assyrian.

16 (M. 8) Fish-garbed figure, identified as the fish-apkallu, see II. A. 4. B (III)

17 (M. 7) Lion-garbed figure, identified as Latarak, see index.
Ellis, Finkelstein Memorial Volume 76 Fig. 3. Neo-Assyrian.
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Saggs, H.W.F. The Greatness that was Babylon (1968)
SCS 1/3 see Cagni, L.
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Seux, M.-J. Hymnes et Prières aux Dieux de Babylone et d'Assyrie (1976)
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UAVA 4 see Boehmer, R.
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Wilcke, C. Kollationen zu den Sumerischen Literarischen Texten aus Nippur in der Hilprecht-Sammlung Jena, ASAW 65/4 (1976)
PLATES

Fig. 1 Text I MS A, map
2 Text I MS A Obv. (K 2987B+ (+) K 9968+)
3 Text I MS A Rev. (K 2987B+, lower part)
4 Text I MS A Obv. (K 11812)
5 Text I MS A Rev. (K 2987B+, upper part)
   Text I MS D (K 13980)
   Text I MS A i (K 14829)
6 Text I MS A iii 49, collation (K 2987B+)
7 Text I MS C (DT. 186)
8 Text I MS B (Sm 711)
   Text III F (K 4656+)
9 Text I MS B, map
10 Text II, collations (VAT 8228)
11 Text V MS B Obv. (K 2496)
12 Text V MS B Rev. (K 2496)
13 Text IV Obv. (K 9873+)
14 Text IV Rev. (K 9873+)
15 Text V MS a Obv. (BM 64517)
16 Text V MS a Rev. (BM 64517)
   Text V MS C (K 10232)
17 Text IV/1 (BM 74119)
   Text V MS D (K 8026)
18 Text 1/4 7ff., collations to BM 93078
19 Text VI, duplicate (BM 121052)
20 K 6013+
Text I.  Ma[A.  K.9835+ and K.7860+ touch; the fact that both pieces are part of one tablet is proven not only by their contents, but also by the matching dividing lines; K.9835+ and K.9783+ also touch. K.1167+ does not join K.7825+. K.14829+ does not join the back of K.97237.
Col. VI:

From the first line of the colophon to the end of the column: 13.2 cm.
The traces of the colophon on K. 1387 b were not copied by Gurney.

Fig. 3

13 x 15 cm.

Col. IV:

After line 16 and before line 53, 4.3 cm is completely broken away. This amounts to 12 a 13 lines of text in the same column.

47: Gnr. Dingir?

48: SLK

57: BRR

60: Erasure before KK

61: Begins:

65: [ind] T36 Tirm

64: 
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Fig. 10 Collations to text II KAR 298 = VAT 8228

Obv. 1. No signs between "ES" and A. End: (not "ina KA of. UGU in 5:

3. ša n=št , not "ina KA of. UGU in 5:

10. u₄-mu ša ša q₄-q₄-

13. PA.MES ḤUSūN k₄₄-₄-e-ti

15. ḤHK

20. Ḥr₄-GU.ZA

22. Ḥ

24. End: \[\]

27. End: \[\]

38. \[\]; end: "ma₄-ṣi (break)

42. \[\] a₄-a-h₄

43. NUMES ḤTT₄₄-IM ša gi₄-š₄-

45. [NUMES QUD] ḤTT₄₄-IM; .N]A would look like *š₄₄-

46. \[\]

48. ina GAB-š₄-

Rev. 1. After the break:

6. "IM.BABBAR ₄₄₄₄ \[\] [ina] š₄-š₄-nu \[\]

9. Begins:

11. Begins:

12. TI.LA ḤET-N.I.R (read ḤE.ZAL.ZAL)

17. Begins:

23. "BURU₄₄-KUR.RA lu₄₄ \[\]

24. "SIG₄₄":

26. Begins:
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27. Begins: • • •

28. ... UR.GU.LA • • •

35. ... ina ša? UR.MES1 É • • •

36. Second plant: û û û û û û û û û û û û û

38. ... ina ét NA KUD-š1 NUMUN û û û û û û û û û û û û û

39. ... ina LÀL KUR.RA û û û û û û û û û û û û û
Fig. 18. Collations to BM 93078 (I/4)

1. ḫḫ

4. la- ššḫḫ

5. mu- šš-bu

7. la mu- šš-šš

8. IV ḫḫ, MES-hā

Fig. 19. BM 121052 = TH. 1929, 10: 12, 48

Text VI

6.7 x 4.1 cm
Fig. 20

K6013 + K8106 + K16001
10.4 x 8.4 x 2

K6013

K8106

K16001
### Indices

**A Iconographical items and selected words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abgal</strong></td>
<td>Deity: 76 (also a profession; spellings); see <em>apkallu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adapa</strong></td>
<td>Sage: 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>agū</strong></td>
<td>Tiara: 55f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>aguhhu</strong></td>
<td>Shawl: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>alīm</strong></td>
<td>Bison (real and mythological being): 147ff., 150 (earliest history); 152 (associated with Utu); 160 (symbolic); 161 (attacked by Anzu); 175; 186f. (line drawing 11g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>alīm-munu</strong></td>
<td>175^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>alimbū</strong></td>
<td>Lion-headed eagle, later lion-dragon: 44; 146 (fastened to Ekur); 146 (defeated enemy); 147; 147ff.; 150 (Heavy Cloud, earliest history); 152; 159ff. (associated with Enlil); 156 (relation with water and cosmic function); 161 (attacks human-headed bison); 185 (identification); 186f. (line drawing 11a-c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>apkallu</strong></td>
<td>Sage: XI (identification); 39 (incantation on relief); 65 (in bedroom); 71; 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>āmu-apkallu</strong></td>
<td>Anthropomorphic (winged) sage with headband (a figure): 46; 65; 73ff.; 102f.; 114; 116; 128; cf. 186f. (14, Genie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bird-apkallu</strong></td>
<td>Sage/griffin-demon (a figure): 48; 65; 75f.; 99f.; 102f.; 116; 128; 186f. (line drawing 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>fish-apkallu</strong></td>
<td>Sage/fish-garbed figure: 48; 65; 76f.; 99f.; 102f.; 116; 128; 186f. (line drawing 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ara gišimmari</strong></td>
<td>Frond of the date palm (used in purification rituals): 44; 69; 77 (identification); 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>āriš šadī</strong></td>
<td>An apotropaic bird (a figure): 45; 90; 139; 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>arqu</strong></td>
<td>A colour: 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>asakku</strong></td>
<td>An enemy of Ninurta (&quot;Disorder&quot;): 150; 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>banduddū</strong></td>
<td>Bucket (held by figures): 61; 66; 86; 102; 139; 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bašmu</strong></td>
<td>Venemous-Snake (a figure): 28^{185} (spelling-TUR/TÜR); 43; 49; 99f.; 102f.; 128; 139; 141; 143; 153; 166ff.; 186f. (line drawing 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mūš-ša-tùr</strong></td>
<td>Tamarisk, material of certain figures; 25^{20} (incantation); 115; 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>billatu</strong></td>
<td>127^{8} (syllabic spelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>binu</strong></td>
<td>Creatures of Apsu (designation of certain figures): 24^{28}; 60; 65; 76; 87; 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bīnūt apsē</strong></td>
<td>Creatures of Heaven (designation of certain figures): 24^{28}; 60; 65; 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bīnūt šamē</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

213
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bitu šaniu</td>
<td>deity: 153 (vizier of Utu and monster slayer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burāšu (GIŠIN.GUR.KUR.RA)</td>
<td>juniper tree/wood: 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burrumu</td>
<td>multicoloured (cover of figures): 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bāru ekdu</td>
<td>bull of Adad: 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DĀLA GIŠIMMAR</td>
<td>34(^{49}) (PAD-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da’matu</td>
<td>a shade of blue (cover of figures): 54f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diliptu</td>
<td>a (symptom of) disease: 95ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dītān</td>
<td>deified bison, and forebear of Dītu-tribe; 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dītu</td>
<td>a tribe: 152; 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dī’um</td>
<td>a disease: 24(^{12}); 45; 69; 95ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dumu-dUtu</td>
<td>son of Utu (used metaphorically): 176(^{10})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebih</td>
<td>deity (mountain): 153 (defeated enemy of Inanna); 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enki</td>
<td>deity: 152 (associated with Hairy-One and Carp-Goat); 160 (associated with ibex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enkum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlil</td>
<td>deity: 152, 159ff. (original master of Anzū)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en-me(-en)</td>
<td>in names of sages: 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensimaḫ</td>
<td>deity (apotropaic): 66, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>é-nun</td>
<td>see kammu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enzātu arqātu</td>
<td>yellow goats: 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erru</td>
<td>headband (of figures): 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e’ru</td>
<td>a kind of wood (cornel) of which figures are made, and a stick or mace made of that wood: 60; 65; 67ff. (charred at both ends); 78 (short stick); 87; 102; 114; 115; 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esēhu</td>
<td>to endow with something by hatching: 27(^{173})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ešemti ilāti</td>
<td>bone of divinity (designation of tamarisk wood): 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esēbāu</td>
<td>an incantation specialist: 70, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubēš e.</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gadamāḫu</td>
<td>a garment: 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gakkul</td>
<td>82 (syllabic spelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gallū</td>
<td>designation of monsters: 145; 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gamlu</td>
<td>curved staff (tool of the exorcist); 53; 61; 62 (divine symbol); 78 (identification); 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gasṣu</td>
<td>gypsum (cover of figures): 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gir-si.g</td>
<td>82 (syllabic spelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>girtablullū</td>
<td>Scorpion-Man (a figure): 52; 86; 100; 102ff.; 128; 143ff.; 146; 147ff., 150 (earliest history); 149 (cosmic function); 152 (associated with Utu); 180ff.; 186ff. (line drawing 7, 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giš(MUNUS,NITAH)</td>
<td>82 (syllabic spelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giš-dam/nā</td>
<td>82 (syllabic spelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gišimmar</td>
<td>palm (defeated enemy of Ninurta), see lugal-giš-gišimmar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gitlam</td>
<td>82 (syllable spelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dGU₄,UD</td>
<td>deity: 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dGUD</td>
<td>see Šeriš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dGUD.ALM</td>
<td>see kusarikku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gud-an-na</td>
<td>Bull of Heaven (humped bull): 176&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dGUD-gal-an-na</td>
<td>deity: 176&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUD.DUMU.dUTU</td>
<td>see kusarikku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUD.DUMU.AN.NA</td>
<td>see kusarikku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gula</td>
<td>deity: 90; 116; 162 (goddess of healing, combats asakku)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḷaltappû/hultuppû</td>
<td>a type of mace (held by figures): 65; 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥasinnu</td>
<td>a type of axe (held by figures): 35; 60; 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḷatu</td>
<td>staff (held by figures): 68; 69; 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḷengallu</td>
<td>designation of flowing vase: 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḷibiltu</td>
<td>a (symptom of) disease: 95ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḷultuppû</td>
<td>see ḷaltappû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫumbaba</td>
<td>a monster: 146 (head brought to Enlil); 150 (face, apotropaic grin; iconography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫurriš</td>
<td>deity in form of Bull: 178ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫu ḳ(KUD)</td>
<td>82 (syllabic spelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫutpalû</td>
<td>a type of mace (held by figures): 38; 61; 102; 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idim</td>
<td>wild: 172; 176&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt; (equated with kusarikku)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igisigisig</td>
<td>deity (gardener of Anu/Enlil): 69; 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>il bitti</td>
<td>god of the house (a figure): 42; 43; 48; 50; 57; 58ff.; 63ff. 79 (purifier); 102ff.; 128; 138; 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illāru</td>
<td>flower: 78 (held by lamassu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>im-babbar</td>
<td>gypsum (defeated enemy of Ninurta): 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM.GI&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>a colour (cover of figures): 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iškur</td>
<td>deity: 152 (associated with ugallu and ūmu nā'iru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>išpatu</td>
<td>quiver (held by figures): 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ištar</td>
<td>deity: 111 (in the window); 116; 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ištar bitti</td>
<td>goddess of the house: 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Išum</td>
<td>deity (apotropaic): 114; 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dIZI.GAR</td>
<td>see Nāru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kakku</td>
<td>mace, weapon (held by figures): 60; 68; 102; 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dKakkabtu</td>
<td>deity (star symbol): 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kakkabu</td>
<td>star (symbol on amulets): 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalbu</td>
<td>dog (figure): 53; 58ff.; 98 (position); 102ff.; 116; 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalbu Šegû</td>
<td>mad dog (u r i d i m): 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalgukku</td>
<td>a colour (cover of figures): 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalû</td>
<td>a colour (cover of figures): 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kamštûtu</td>
<td>kneeling ones (figures): 79 (purifiers); 117; 128; 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanū D</td>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karābu</td>
<td>to greet, bless (impllying a gesture with the hand): 61; 78 (identification); 102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
kattillu 24th
kigallu pedestal: 57f.
Kiiliti deity: 111 (Istar in the window); 182
ku-llatu clay-pit: 26145 (rituals at); 127
ku-li-an-na 154 (defeated enemy of Ninurta); 182
kulillu see kulillu
kullitlu Fish-Woman (a figure); little-bride-of-An (an insect): 182.
kulullu Fish-Man (a figure): 44; 52; 76 (# fish-garbed figure); 86; 102f.; 128; 129f.; 143; 146; 182f.; 186f. (line drawing 9)
kummu(É.NUN) bedroom: 65; 107f.
KUR see niphu
kuribu name of a figure (griffin): 181
kusarikku (GUD.ALIM, GUD. DUMU. AN.NA, GUD. DUMU. dUTU) Bison(-Bull) (a figure): XIf. (identification), XIII3; 42; 51f.; 100; 102f.; 128; 139; 141; 143; 146; 147ff., 150 (earliest history); 153 (enemy of Utu); 174ff.; 186f. (line drawing 6)
labbu a mythological monster: 154 (myth); 159 (myth); 168 (myth)
lá-a-ma see lahmu
lahmu Hairy-One (a figure): XI (identification); 28184; 42; 49; 99f.; 102f.; 128; 139; 143; 148ff.; 150 (earliest history); 152 (associated with Enki); 155f. (cosmic function); 164ff.; 186f. (line drawing 1)
lamassu protective goddess; designation of a type of deities: 78 (holds flower); 79; 1769; 186f. (Genie)
l. btti 50; 138; 174
Lamaštu amulets baby snatching she-demon:
XIII1 (additions to list); 62 (divine symbols on); 64 (ugallu and Lulal on); 64 (chased by Latarak); 72 (urigallu/animal-headed staffs on); 74 (anthropomorphic apkallu on); 76 (fish-apkallu on); 112 (prayer of sick man to the lamp Nuska); 172 (ugallu on); 179 (kusarikku on); 185 (variant lion-dragon on)
ritual 29194,195; 62; 80
Latarak deity (apotropaic figure): 37; 52; 60; 64 (identification); 86; 102f.; 116; 117; 128; 144; 186f. (line drawing 17)
lemnātu Erra Evildoers of Erra (demons): 96
libbi gišimmari offshoot of the date palm: 68f. (purification instrument); 69; 78 (identification); 84f. (spellings); 102; 115
lubūšu a garment: 55ff.
l. eššebē 110
Lugalgirra deity (apotropaic figure): 2597 (double god); 31280; 38; 47; 58f.; 102f.; 116; 128
lingal-giš-gišimmbar

Lugal kurdub

Lulal

lí-llu lulülí

má-gí-lum

makurrū

Marduk

marru

maššarā ša Ea u Marduk

Mašmaš

Maštabba

mašḫuhluppá

medda

mélû

Meslamtaea

miserru

Mukil mē balāti

mullīlu

MUNUS.NITAḪ

mušḫuššu

mušmahḫu

muš-šag-imin

muš-šā-tūr/tūr

mālānū

mūtu

Nabū

Nādin-mē-qāti

Narudda

nāš patri

Nedu

Nergal

Nīg-babbar

Nīnazzu

Ningirṣu

King Date Palm (defeated enemy of Ninurta): 154
deity: 160 (not identical with Anzû)
deity (apotropaic figure): 37; 52; 57; 60; 63f. (identified
as god with raised fist); 86; 100; 102f.; 116; 117; 128; 144
untamed (?) man: 179 (in compositions girtab-, urmah-,
ku-); 181; 182
a type of (mythological) ship (defeated enemy of Ninurta): 154
model of m. ship used in rituals: 25118, 45, 90; 139
deity, monster slayer: 107; 112; 115
spade (divine symbol, held by figures): 42; 86; 102
designation of apotropaic figures: 111
deity: 38 (twin god)
(epithet of a deity): 26124 (twin god); 38; 117
apotropaic goat: 77; 114
153 (god's weapon; Semitic loanword)
apotropaic figure: 45 (not the deified staircase); 90
deity (apotropaic figure): 2597 (double god); 31290; 38;
47; 58f.; 62; 102f.; 116; 128
girdle: 58
a deity, servant of Marduk: 146
cleaner (a purification instrument): 67; 78 (cone, angular object); 102; 115
see gisx
Furious-Snake, Aweful-Snake (a figure): 49; 99f.; 102f.;
128; 143; 145; 146; 147ff.; 150 (earliest history); 151 (as-
associated with Ninazu); 159 (in Labbu-myth); 168f.; 186f.
(line-drawing 3)
a seven-headed snake: 145; 147; 164 (seven-headed dragon)
Seven-Headed Snake (a dragon): 153; 162
plague: 91ff.; 95ff.
death (a figure): 110; 116
deity: 162 (monster slayer); 163
a deity, servant of Marduk: 146
a goddess (figure): 26138 (reading); 47; 58f.; 102f.; 116;
128
(figures) carrying daggers (designation of Sebettu): 47
see Penû
deity (figure): 38 ("MAŠ.MAŠ"); 71 ("UR.L.GAL"); 95 (god of
plague);
gypsum (defeated enemy of Ninurta): 154
151 (associated with mušḫuššu); 152
deity, monster slayer: 153; 160 (associated with lion);
162 (mythology); 174
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Ninursag  
deity: 160 (associated with stag)

Ninkum  
deity: 71, 76

Ninšubura  
deity (figure): 56 (clothed); 127 (in rituals)

Ninurta  
deity, monster slayer: 153; 162 (mythology): 174

disk (held by figures): 37 (spelled KUR); 62

Nippuṣalmu  
deity: 62

NUN  
see urigallu

Nūru (dIZI.GAR, dZAŁAG)  
deity (deified lamp): 112

Nuska  
deity (apotropaic): 112 (deified lamp?)

giš-pa-gišimmari  
see ara  
34434

PAD DĀLA GIŠIMMAR  
scribal mark: 1295

PAP  
sash: 56

paršigu  
34434

pāštu (šEN.TAB.BA)  
a type of axe (held by figures): 43; 86; 102; 141

patru  
dagger (held by figures): 102

Pazuzu  
a monster: V; 179; 181; 185; 186f. (line drawing 13)

giš-paš-giš-gišimmari  
see libbi  
85

Pētā  
deity: 170 (figure)

Piriggalabzu  
a sage: 74

piriggalu  
170 (lion-base of column)

purādu/suḫur  
carp: 76 (fish-apkallu); 183 (kulullu); 184 (suẖurmaššu); 149 (knowledge)

puriddu  
walking pose: 57f.

qarnu  
horn (on tiara of deities): 56; 163 (of Tiāmat)

qarradu/u r-sag  
warrior (designation of monsters and enemies of gods): 146 (Humbaba); 153; 162 (bašnu); 168; 1769

qaštu  
bow (held by figures): 38, 102

qulmā  
hatchet (held by figures): 60; 102

rābisu/udug  
deputy (divine functionary): 365; 68

ramānu  
self (attributes of figures cut out of themselves/their own material): 55f.

rikbu  
male inflorescence of the date palm: 67

sag-alim  
head of the bison (apotropaic): 154 (emblem of Utu); 1754; 17610

sag-ar  
Jebel Sinjār: 153 (defeated enemy of Ninurta/Ningirsu); 155

sag-gud-alim  
head of the bison (apotropaic): 1754

SAG-HUL-ḪA.ZA  
a demon: 52

sag-kal  
82 (syllabic spelling)

sag-tab  
82 (syllabic spelling)

sānga-maḫ-abzu  
designation of suẖurmaššu: 184
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group of seven gods (apotropaic figures): 46; 58f.; 63 (on reliefs); 72 (sons of Ishtar); 96 (accompanying Erra); 98 (position); 102f.; 115 (different groups); 116; 117; 128

Carp-Goat (figure): 43; 53; 68; 84; 86 (position); 102f.; 128; 129f.; 141; 143; 146; 147ff., 150 (earliest history); 152 (associated with Enki); 184f.; 186f. (line drawing 10)

statue of tamarisk (designation of a figure): 46; 128

loss (among symptoms of disease): 95ff.

see libbi gišimmari; see uqāru; 85

a type of stone used in rituals: 34435; 35; 120
One Cubit (apotropaic figure): 47; 58f.; 79; 102f.; 128; 139
murder: 95
killer (a demon); 95ff.
sun disk (a symbol): 62
a colour (cover of figures): 54
an (evil) demon (represented by the Neo-Assyrian human-headed bull): 34438; 42; 95ff.; 12713; 1756; 17610
Six-Headed Wild Ram (defeated enemy of Ninurta): 153
see pāštu
entry of evil: 91ff.
deity in the form of a bull: 178f.
arrow: 38, 102
architrave: 12619
stroke, blow (epidemical disease): 95ff.
an evil demon in the form of a lion: 86 (in bath rooms); 98 (with urmahullatu)
emblem of Utu: 154 (see sa g al im); 17610
44
apotropaic figures with maces: 47; 58f.; 68; 79 (purifiers); 84; 102f.; 128
apotropaic figures with wings: 68; 79 (purifiers); 84; 116
12716
fir-cone (as purification tool): 67; 84
(liquid) paste: 27173
Sea (deity, enemy of Ninurta and Marduk): 147; 155f.; 163 (representation)
proper equipment: 53f.; 55; 56
harp (denotation uncertain): 62; 79; 102; 116
Tišpak
deuity (figure): 117; 151 (associated with muššuššu; 162; 168

u₄-an
a sage (Oannes): 74, 76 (fish-apkallu)

UD.NUN
see urigallu

udug
see rabisu, see utukku

udutila
138

ugallu (UD.GAL)
Big Weather-Beast, Big-Day (a figure): 35ff., 38; 42; 49; 58f.; 64 (with Lulal); 96 (puts evil to flight); 97; 98 (position); 100; 102f.; 116; 128; 143; 144; 147ff.; 150 (earliest history); 153 (enemy of Utu); 169ff.; 186f. (line drawing 4)

ša umāši
wrestlers: 34³³⁷; 90; 114; 116f.; 126⁷

kiššurātu
linked together: 34³³⁷; 90; 114; 116f.; 126⁷

UD.GAL.MUŠEN
winged ugallu: 170

uggatu
anger: 95ff.

umāmu
designation of monsters: 146; 164

üm /ud
personified day; leonine monster; designation of various monsters: 146; 164; 170

üm-apkallu
see apkallu

ümū dabrātu
145; 163; 172

ümū nāˈiru /ud-k a-
duḥ-a
designation of lion-dragon: 147ff., 150 (Roaring Day; earliest history); 152 (associated with Iškur); 160 (fore-runner); 171; 184f.; 186f. (line drawing 11d-f)

ümū rabā /ud-gal
169

ümā šamrātu
172

uqūru
heart of the date palm: 85

urgulā
lion (figure): 64, 90, 116, 139

uridimmu (urDimmu)
Mad Lion (a figure): 42; 50f. 98; 100; 102; 128; 139; 141; 146; 172ff.; 186f. (line drawing 5)

urigallu
great protective standard (also personified): 70ff. (spelled NUN, UD.NUN); 78; 102; 115; 116

urinnu/ürī
protective standard: 70
dūri-bar
deity: 70
dūri-gal
deity: 70
dūri-maš
deity: 70
ūrī-dū
to erect a protective standard: 70

urmahlullū
denomination of lion-dragon: 147ff., 150 (Roaring Day; earliest history); 152 (associated with Iškur); 160 (fore-runner); 171; 184f.; 186f. (line drawing 11d-f)

ur-sag
see qarradu

ur-sag-imin
see muš-sag-imin

urudu-nig-kalag-ga
Strong Copper (defeated enemy of Ninurta): 154

uskaru
crescent (held by figures): 62; 86; 141

ušum
see bašmu

ušumgallu
44; 145; 153; 163; 167
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>utukku</strong></td>
<td>lesser god, demon: 72 (iconography); 146 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utu</strong></td>
<td>deity: 152; 152 (associated with Bison); 153 (monster slayer); 154; 174 (kusarikku);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zababa</strong></td>
<td>deity: 162 (monster slayer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zaḥaṭa</strong></td>
<td>battle axe (held by figures): 38; 61; 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d′ZALAG</strong></td>
<td>see Nūru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zibu</strong></td>
<td>see (ur-idim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zi-u-d-sū-ra</strong></td>
<td>75 (ancient speculation on name)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B Subject Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>angular object</strong></td>
<td>78 (in hands of apkallu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>anthropomorphism</strong></td>
<td>151ff. (distinguishes gods from monsters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>architrave</strong></td>
<td>see šibšatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>arrow</strong></td>
<td>see šilitahui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>axe</strong></td>
<td>see haššinu, pāštu, zaḥaṭa, qulimu; held by gods: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bedroom</strong></td>
<td>see kummu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bird</strong></td>
<td>see arib šadi, see eagle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bison</strong></td>
<td>see alim, Disšan, kusarikku; 149 (firmness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bison(-man)</strong></td>
<td>see kusarikku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>head of bison(-man)</strong></td>
<td>see sag-(gud)-alim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>blue</strong></td>
<td>see da'matu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bow</strong></td>
<td>see qaštu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bracelet</strong></td>
<td>78 (in hands of goddess)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bucket</strong></td>
<td>see banduddu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bull</strong></td>
<td>see Hurriš, Šeriš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>of Adad</strong></td>
<td>see búru ekdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(humped) bull</strong></td>
<td>see gud-an-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bull-man</strong></td>
<td>see kusarikku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>human-headed bull</strong></td>
<td>see šedu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>carp</strong></td>
<td>see fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>clay-pit</strong></td>
<td>see kullatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>combat myth</strong></td>
<td>154; 159ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cone</strong></td>
<td>see mullitu, terinnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>copper</strong></td>
<td>see urudu-nīg-kalag-ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cornel</strong></td>
<td>see e′ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>crescent</strong></td>
<td>see uskaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>date palm</strong></td>
<td>see (lugal)-giš-gišimmari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>frond of the d.</strong></td>
<td>see ara gišimmari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>heart of the d.</strong></td>
<td>see uqūru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>offshoot of the d.</strong></td>
<td>see libbi gišimmari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>male inflorescence of the d.</strong></td>
<td>see rikbu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dagger see *patru*
deer 77
demon see *asakku, Lamaštu, lemnuitu* *Erra*, SAG.SUL.GA.ZA, Šaggāšu, šēdu, Šulak, utukku
deputy (divine) see *rābišu*
dog see *kalbu*
dragon see *lion-dragon, snake-dragon, ušumgalu*
eagle 149 (agression); 187 (addition of bird parts)
  griffin-demon see *bird-apkallu*
  griffin see *kuribu*
  lion-headed eagle see *Anzû*
fir-cone see *terinnu*
fish see purādu (carp)
  "fish-garbed" sage see *fish-apkallu*
  fish-man see *kulullu*
  fish-woman see *kušitu*
  goat-fish see *suḫururu*
flower see *illiru*
flowing vase see *ṭengallu*
garment see lubûšu, tillû
gesture (greeting) see karabû
  (praying) see Lamaštu (112)
girdle see *miseru*
goat see enzātu arqatu, mašhultuppû
  goat-fish see *suḫururu*
  ibex see *Enki*
god (winged) gods (anthropomorphism; 58ff. 79f.
  god with raised fist see *Lulal*
griffin see *kuribu*
griffin-demon see *bird-apkallu*
gypsum see gassu, im/nig-babbar
hair see *lahmu*
harp? see timbûtu
hatchet see quilmû; axe
hatching see esēhu
headband see āmu-apkallu, erru
horn see qarnu
humped bull see *bull*
ibex 160 (associated with *Enki*)
lamp see *Nâru, Nuska*
lion figure of -
demon in form of -
beings with leonine features
leonine monster
god clad in lion's skin
lion-demon
lion-centaur
human-headed lion-man
seven-headed lion
lion-headed eagle
lion-dragon
lion-base of column

mace monster
monster slayer
general designations
mountain gods

palm
paste
pedestal

quiver

sacred tree
sage
sash
scorpion-man/woman
shawl
ship
snake
monsters partly snake
snake-dragon
seven-headed snake
seven-headed snake-dragon

spade
staff
stag
standard
star
stick
sun disk
symbol

149 (aggression, power); 160 (associated with Ningirsu)
see urgûtu
see Šulak
see ūmu (171)
see labbu
see Latarak
see urmahullû
see uridimmu
see Anzû
see Anzû, Lamaštu, ūmu nā'iru
see piriggallû
see e'ru, haltappû, hultuppû, ḫutpalû, kakku, me d a
defined in Ch. VII; 151ff.
(distinguished from gods); 157 (collective)
see Bunene, Marduk, Nabû, Ningirsu, Ninurta
see gallû, umâmu, ūmu
154f.; see Ebiḫ, s a g- a r

see date palm
see tēqītu
see kīgallû

see ispatu

Adapa, akpallū, ū-a-n, Zi-u-d-sû-r a, Piriggalabzu
see paršigu
see gîrtablullû
see agû-hû
see makuru, m ā-gi-lum
149 (death)
see bašmu, usumgallû
see mušhuššu
see mušmahhû
see muš-sag-imin
see marru
see gamlu, ha-ṭu, Lamaštu, uriggallû
160 (associated with Ninêursag)
see uriggallû, urinnu
see dákkabtu, kakkabu
see e'ru
see niphû, šamšatu
see kakkabtu, kakkabu, Lamaštu, marru, šamšatu, niphû,
Nûru, uskaru, šamšatu; s a g-a l i m
C Unpublished texts

The list includes the previously unpublished texts edited in this book.

BM 37866 114
BM 64517 131f.; Figs. 15, 16
BM 74119 129ff.; Fig. 17
BM 121052 141; Fig. 19

K 2331 126 (iv' 4a); 128; 138 (ii 3'a)
K 2468 41 (duplicates part of Text II)
K 2481 2412; 41 (duplicates part of Text II); 45f.
K 2496 131ff.; Figs. 11, 12
K 2553 138 (ii 3'a)
K 2987B+ 1ff. (Text I MS A)
K 3268 173f.
K 3472 127
K 3727+ joins K 2987B+; Fig. 5
K 3810 128
K 4656 + 9741 117 (duplicates Aj/O 19 118); Fig. 8
K 5641 + 6336 141 (šar pāḫi ritual)
K 5829+ joins K 2987B+; Fig. 3
K 6013+ 3443ff. (//STT 218-219); Fig. 20
K 6855 105
K 7247 127
K 8005 66
K 8026 127; 131ff.; Fig. 17
K 8106+ joins K 6013+
K 8620+ joins K 2987B+; Fig. 2
K 8753+ 2ff. (Text I MS B)
K 8852+ 85 (Pazuzu ritual)
K 9383+ joins K 2987B+; Fig. 3
K 9741+ joins K 4656
K 9873 + 79-7-8, 240 119ff.; Figs. 13, 14; 41 (duplicates part of Text II)
K 9968+ 1ff. (Text I MS A)
K 10232 131ff. Fig. 16
K 10333 93 (Namburbi)
K 11585+ joins K 9968+; Fig. 2
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K 11812</td>
<td>1ff. (Text I MS A); 41; Fig. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 13980</td>
<td>3ff. (Text I MS D); Fig. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 14829</td>
<td>1ff. (Text I MS A); Fig. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 15720+</td>
<td>joins K 2987B+; Fig. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 16001+</td>
<td>joins K 6013+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 16367+</td>
<td>joins K 2987B+; Fig. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 17093+</td>
<td>joins K 2987B+; Fig. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 18835+</td>
<td>joins K 9968+; Fig. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm 711+</td>
<td>joins K 8753+; Fig. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT 186</td>
<td>2ff. (Text I MS C); 33ff.; Fig. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-7-8, 193</td>
<td>146 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-7-8, 240</td>
<td>joins K 9873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12N-228</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>