

WBMyth. 138f. s. v. Zū [Edzard]; Lambert o. c. 69f.)!!

So reich die Akkad-Zeit an Götterkampfdarstellungen ist, so selten findet man solche in der auf sie folgenden Periode. Während das in die Gudea-Periode zu datierende Siegel Boehmer, EGA 41 Abb. 274, auf dem sich u. a. die kriegerische Ištar an der Bezwingung eines Löwen beteiligt, noch unter akkadzeitlichem Einfluß angefertigt worden ist, ist ein Zylinder in der Pierpont Morgan Library (CANES I Abb. 271) — Gott → Löwe ← Held mit konischer Kappe — die Arbeit eines schlechten Steinschneiders der Ur III-Zeit. Den kappadokischen Siegelherstellern ist das Thema fremd (vgl. N. Özgüç, The Anatolian Group of Cylinder Seal Impressions from Kültepe [1965] 48). Die Kunst der altbabylonischen Epoche, in der z. T. eine Renaissance akkad-zeitlicher Bildgedanken sichtbar wird, nimmt die einst so beliebten Götterkämpfe nicht in ihr gängiges Repertoire auf. Bei dem Kampfpaar Frankfort, CS Taf. 29g ist man im Zweifel, ob es sich um Götter handelt, da die Gegner keine Hörnerkrone tragen und auch hinsichtlich des göttlichen Charakters der auf Bergen kämpfenden Widersacher mit polosartiger, senkrecht gerippter, auf altbabylonischen Terrakottareliefs von einem Tänzerpaar (Opificius, ATR Tf. 17 Abb. 576) getragenen Kopfbedeckung der einen Matrize der Gußform BM. 95 820 ist man unsicher (D. Opitz, Festschrift M. Frhr. v. Oppenheim, AfO Beih. 1 [1933] Taf. 6, 2). Szenen, in denen ein Gott einen Dämonen bezwingt, scheinen etwas häufiger zu sein (z. B. Opificius ATR Tf. 13, 488). Gleiches gilt für die syrische Glyptik. Auf dem Beispiel Frankfort, CS Taf. 44e wird ein sog. sechslockiger Held (Huwawa?, vgl. E. Porada, Seal Impressions of Nuzi, AASOR 24 [1947] 60) von zwei Göttern bekämpft, ein Motiv, das auch Eingang gefunden hat in die mitannische (Frankfort, CS 184 Abb. 52, 53; Porada AASOR 24 Nr. 728f.), nordiranische (E. Porada, Expedition 1 H., 3 [1959] 18ff.; dies., Alt-Iran [1962] 86 Abb. 61), nordsyrische (A. Moortgat, Tell Halaf 3 [1955] Tf. 102a; C. L. Woolley/

T. E. Lawrence/D. G. Hogarth, Carchemish 1 [1914] Tf. B 15) und neuassyrische Kunst (VR Abb. 608; CANES I Abb. 686). Die Sieger sind hier fast stets ohne Hörnerkrone dargestellt, doch werden sie entsprechend dem zuerst zitierten syrischen Beispiel sowie einer Abrollung aus Nuzi (AASOR 24 Nr. 728) von niedrigem göttlichem Rang sein. Obwohl auf dem zuletzt genannten neuassyrischen Rollsiegel (CANES I Abb. 686) neben den Kämpfenden eine Frau mit erhobenen Armen erscheint, dürfte diese Szene nichts zu tun haben mit dem oben erwähnten akkad-zeitlichen Bildmotiv, das zwei Götter(?) ohne Hörnerkrone im Kampf um eine Frau wiedergibt. Während sich Götterkämpfe in der mittelassyrischen Glyptik des 13. und 12. Jahrhunderts wie auch in der kassitischen bislang nicht belegen lassen und nur als Ausnahmen von der Regel zu erwarten sind, sind spärliche Beispiele in der mitannischen (s. o., ferner Th. Beran, ZA 52 [1957] 202 Abb. 205; Šaušatar-Siegel, u. a. Götter mit gehörntem Spitzhelm bezwingen Löwen; E. Porada, AASOR 24 Nr. 518: Götterkampf?) sowie evtl. in der mittelassyrischen Siegelkunst des 14. Jahrhunderts (Beran a. a. O. 143 Abb. 1: Götter (?) mit Spitzhelm ohne Hörner bekämpfen Wiederkäuer) nachweisbar; Dämonen oder andere Götter niederwerfende Gottheiten sind — abgesehen von dem oben zitierten fraglichen Stück aus Nuzi (AASOR 24 Nr. 518) — nicht mehr dargestellt worden. Diese Feststellung besitzt auch für die Kunst des hethitischen Großreichs Geltung, während aus der Periode davor wenige Reliefbruchstücke aus Boğazköy einander bekämpfende Götter — ein Unterliegender trägt die charakteristische Spitzmütze — zeigen (K. Bittel, MDOG 86 [1953] 26f. Abb. 9; J. Vorys-Canby, MDOG 93 [1962] 69ff. Abb. 57). Im nachgroßreichszeitlichen Malatya findet sich die Darstellung eines Gottes, der in Begleitung eines anderen eine gewaltige Schlange erlegt. Diese ist hier möglicherweise als Wiedergabe des Schlangendämons Illujanka* zu deuten (L. Delaporte, Malatya [1940] Taf. 22, 2; H. Th. Bossert, Altanatolien [1942] Abb.

769; E. Akurgal, Die Kunst der Hethiter [1961] Taf. 104 u.; WBMyth. 176f. s. v. Illujanka [E. von Schuler]). Das Motiv als solches ist im 3. Jahrtausend in Mesopotamien nicht unbekannt: in frühdynastischer und frühakkadischer Zeit bildete man zuweilen Götter ab, die einem siebenköpfigen Schlangendrachen die Häupter abschlugen (H. Frankfort, Stratified Cylinder Seals from the Diyala Region, OIP 72 [1955] Abb. 478 [Götter]. 497 [Held]; Vgl. dazu S. Levy, JHSt 54 [1934] 40–53; Frankfort, CS 122; Boehmer EGA 52). Auch die neuassyrische Glyptik zeigt Schlangengeheuer (Tiāmat?) bekämpfende Götter (z. B. VR Abb. 680 [Adad]. 681 [Adad]; CANES I Abb. 688). Zu dieser Zeit sind auch Darstellungen von Dämonen, besonders löwen- oder adlerköpfigen Ungeheuern beliebt, die von verschiedenen Göttern befehlet werden (z. B.: Löwendrachen VR Abb. 615f. — Adlerdämon VR Abb. 626), eine Funktion, die im Achämenidenreich dann eine als König oder königlicher Held zu deutende Gestalt übernimmt (z. B. VR Abb. 757f.; CANES I Abb. 820ff.) und zwar zuweilen in einer Weise, die sich hinsichtlich ihrer formalen Ausführung ohne weiteres von der Komposition der Darstellung auf dem neuassyrischen Königssiegel herleiten läßt (vgl. E. F. Schmidt, Persepolis 1, OIP 68 [1953] Tf. 114, 116, 145 mit A. J. Sachs Iraq 15 [1953] Tf. 18f. und A. R. Millard Iraq 27 [1965] Tf. 1: König bekämpft aufrechtstehenden Löwen). Götterkämpfe in dem Sinne, daß Götter gegen andere Gottheiten streiten, werden in der Kunst des ersten Jahrtausends nicht mehr ausgeführt.

R. M. Boehmer

Götterlisten.

- § 1 Fara
- § 2 The Weidner List
- § 3 The Nippur List
- § 4 Proto-Diri (?)
- § 5 Genouillac List
- § 6 AN = Anum
- § 7 AN = Anu = Sa amēli
- § 8 Sultantepe
- § 9 A Late List
- § 10 Emesal
- § 11 Other Lists
- § 12 Expository Texts

- § 13 Offering Lists
- § 14 Exorcistic Texts
- § 15 The Value of God Lists

§ 1 Fara. God lists are one type of the many sign- and word-lists compiled and handed down by the Sumerian, and later Babylonian and Assyrian scribes. Names of deities occur scattered in a whole variety of these lists, but quite early in the history of this genre lists of divine names alone were compiled. The earliest known lists of any kind, from the Uruk IV and III/II levels, number only four and are not god lists (ATU p. 43), but early dynastic Fara has yielded three large tablets entirely of god names (WVDOG 43, nos. 1, 5, 6), a few small tablets and fragments of the same kind, and other lists containing sections of divine names inter alia. Duplicates of the Fara lists generally have been found at Uruk (ATU pp. 43–47), Ur (UET 2 p. 2), and Tell Šalābīh (being prepared for publication by R. D. Biggs), the first being earlier than the Fara lists, the latter two roughly contemporary. Thus these early lists were not simply ad hoc creations of individual scribes, but were traditional texts, with variants of course, handed down in several (and probably most) cities. There is no reason to suppose that the god lists differ in this respect, and the suggestion of Weidner (AfO 2 [1924–25] 3) that the Fara god lists are based on local cults in particular lacks any foundation. In form these lists are just strings of names, but not lacking some order. There are two kinds of arrangement, and this applies to all the god lists from ancient Mesopotamia: (i) theological and (ii) lexical. Theological ordering rests on the conception of a pantheon organized like a tribe. The older members normally have precedence, coming first in the lists, while their offspring make up the lesser members and follow. Thus the Fara lists begin with An and Enlil (no. 1), or with just Enlil (nos. 5–6), and other major deities follow in the first few lines. Lexical ordering follows the principles of arrangement (or lack of them) found in lists generally. In the Fara lists cols. IV–VI of no. 1 consist of deities with names beginning Nin-. The

Lambert 1957 - 1971 RIA 3

form of the name alone determined this grouping. In general the Fara god lists contain so many obscure and otherwise unknown deities that little more can be said on their order (or lack of order).

§ 2 The Weidner List. The next period from which god lists have survived is the Third Dynasty of Ur, but only a few fragments. One, VAT 6563 (AfO 2, 6) is important as proving the existence at this period of a list which, expanded to over 200 names, remained in use until Late Babylonian times. A substantial fragment from the Isin-Larsa period is also known (VAT 7759: AfO 2, 4—5), and another Old Babylonian fragment (W-B 9: OECT 1 pl. 22). A larger body of material for the reconstruction of this list is Late Assyrian in date and from Assur (KAV 46, 47, 62, 63, 65), and from Late Babylonian Kiš a considerable part of this list has been recovered (OECT 4 nos. 135—149). Also among the Late Babylonian tablets from Babylon in the British Museum a considerable number of fragments contain this list, though they are so far unpublished. The Assur texts were edited by Schroeder in ZA 33 (1921) 123—147; those from Kiš by Van der Meer in OECT 4 p. 57—58; and the whole, so far as available to him, by Weidner in AfO 2, 1 ff. and 71 ff.

The early fragments and Late Babylonian copies present a simple string of names, as do two Assur fragments (KAV 62, 65), but a third Assur piece (KAV 63) has double columns: the names of the traditional list appear on the left, and on the right another name is equated with each one by way of explanation, or an explanatory phrase is used, e. g. „wife of Sin“. The two other Assur pieces (KAV 46, 47) offer a format with five sub-columns. The traditional list is the second. This is flanked on the left by a sub-column giving the pronunciation of each name; and on the right by a sub-column giving the sign-names of the signs used in each name in sub-column 2. The fourth sub-column gives the explanatory equivalent found in the double-column edition. Only a minute scrap of the fifth sub-column is preserved, too

little to ascertain its content. The addition of the pronunciation and sign-names follows the practice of certain lexical series, for example some editions of ea-A-nâqu and diri-DIRI-watru.

Weidner viewed this list as pedagogic, since in two cases, W-B 9 and KAV 65, it appears on the same tablet as Syllabary A. This judgment is confirmed by unpublished exercise tablets in the British Museum of Late Babylonian date which use it, and by the apparent complete lack of this list from Nineveh. In general no exercise tablets have come from the Aššūr-bānapli libraries. At least at the beginning the arrangement of the list is apparently theological. In many places, however, it is difficult to discern the principles of arrangement, if there are any, and it is uncertain if there is even one case of lexical arrangement. Either our knowledge of the deities is inadequate to grasp the basis of the arrangement, or, more probably, various short lists have been compiled without any attempt at integrating them.

§ 3 The Nippur List. Nippur has yielded one Old Babylonian god list which, unlike the Weidner list, is so far unattested from any other place or period. Three major pieces and two fragments have been published (SLT 122—124; 117 and 125), and these allow an almost complete restoration of the list. Generally the copies differ only slightly, but at the end no. 124 finishes with the 210th entry, but nos. 122 and 125 continue with about 60 more names. In style this is a simple string of names, arranged largely on theological principles, though toward the end some lexical grouping seems to occur. An inadequate edition was given by Jean in RA 28 (1931) 179 ff.

§ 4 Proto-Diri (?). Another Old Babylonian list survives which may be Proto-Diri. In OECT 4 no. 153 col. V it occurs as a simple string of names, but unpublished tablets from Nippur offer an expanded form of this with a second sub-column added giving the pronunciations. In the longest recension it has some 100 names, arranged occasionally on theolog-

ical principles, but most commonly its lexical character is clear. It is possible that the Late Babylonian list CT 29, 44—47 is a late version of this list, much expanded and recast, with the pronunciations put on the left-hand side in the more usual fashion, and with a third sub-column explaining the deities by the usual equations of names.

§ 5 Genouillac List. A fourth Old Babylonian list, which formed the basis of the Classical Babylonian god list AN = *Anum*, is only known from a single copy, TCL 15 no. 10, an almost perfectly preserved tablet of 473 names. It is a simple string of names, arranged theologically. It appears that an old, short list has been expanded by the addition of various other lists or excerpts from lists. It begins with a theogony of Enlil (s. Göttergenealogie*) (lines 1—30), then comes An and his theogony (31—37), followed by Enlil and his circle (38 ff.). The older source here took Enlil as son of An, and so gave the theogony of An alone. The compiler of the present list wished to incorporate Enlil's theogony, and in his dilemma as to where it should be placed, he simply put it at the head of the list, before An. Much later (lines 305—341) there is a long section of minor members of Enlil's court, easily identifiable by the inclusion of his vizier Nusku and doorkeeper Kalkal (s. Hofstaat*). The length of this list compared with the Enlil section following An at the beginning suggests that it is a later component added to the earlier kernel. Edited by H. de Genouillac in RA 20 (1923) 89 ff.

§ 6 AN = *Anum*. This Old Babylonian list, much expanded and reworked, forms the largest and most systematic of the Babylonian god lists, AN = *Anum*. It is best preserved on two Middle Assyrian tablets: K 4349 (with lettered fragments) in the British Museum (published in CT 24); and YBC 2401 in the Yale Babylonian Collection (edited by R. Litke, A Reconstruction of the Assyro-Babylonian God-Lists, AN: *āA-nu-um* and AN: *Anu šā amēli*, unpublished Yale thesis, 1958). Both are the work of the well known Kidinsin*, a scribe from the time of Tukulti-

apalešarra I, but they are not identical. K 4349 was based on „an old monster tablet“ according to its colophon (CT 24, 46, 8), but YBC 2401 on „old tablets“. They differ not only in the amount of material they hold (K 4349 had more), but even when presenting the same material there are at times important recensional differences. The earliest Babylonian fragment, and only a small one, is SLT 121, on the date of which S. N. Kramer and M. Civil offer the following opinion: „certainly no earlier than Cassite, and in all probability Cassite.“ Late Babylonian fragments are very few, LKU 7 and an unpublished scrap from Nippur being the only two known to the writer. Late Assyrian pieces are much more common, both from Nineve (chiefly in CT 24 and 25) and from Assur (in KAV). The differences between the Middle and Late Assyrian copies are not serious, and in at least one case the latter follow the Yale rather than the British Museum copy. Probably it is a late Cassite Period compilation, and it comes from circles favourable to Marduk, since Ea has 40 names, and Marduk 50. Only in these two cases does the number of names of a particular deity correspond with his mystical number (Götterzahlen*).

This list consistently has a double-column format. The most common name of the deity being listed is put in the right-hand sub-column in most cases and the less common names are equated with it by being listed in the left-hand sub-column. When only one name was known, as for many obscure deities, it was put in the left-hand sub-column and opposite it in the right-hand sub-column *šu* (i. e. „the same“) was written. This list purports not merely to compile, but also to explain. The overall arrangement provides part of the explanations. It is: (i) the deity being dealt with has his names listed; (ii) next come those of his spouse; (iii) then the children of this pair, with family and courtiers, if any, follow; and finally (iv) the section is rounded off by the household servants of the mother and father. For example, Enlil and Ninlil are separated from their entourage by Ninurta and his

divine court. Similarly Enki and his spouse are separated from their entourage by the big Marduk section. However, to have applied this *de rigueur* would have involved infinite complication, with Anu at the beginning and his court at the end. In fact its application is restricted to certain cases. Sin, to take an example of the neglect of this principle, was commonly conceived as son of Enlil, and the compilers of AN = *Anum* can hardly have had any other opinion. However, unlike Ninurta his section is quite separate from Enlil's (s. dazu auch Hofstaat*). The explanatory character of the list also comes out in the equivalences, and in phrases in late Sumerian either instead of a name in the second sub-column, or in addition to it. In Late Assyrian copies Akkadian renderings of these phrases also appear in some cases.

AN = *Anum* consists of about 1970 names explained in these various ways. Although the two Middle Assyrian copies get all these (and other materials!) on a single tablet, they indicate that normally the list was spread over a series of tablets. The Yale copy at eight points has colophons (s. Kolophon*) giving the tablet number within the series and the number of lines it contained. Only the first seven really belong to the series. The last, of „122 lines“, gives additional names of Marduk and Mandānu, and is an appendix like the 12th tablet of Gilgameš in the Late Assyrian and Babylonian editions. The London Middle Assyrian copy indicates the end of the originally separate tablets by writing „complete“ (til) at certain points, and also giving the number of lines, but it does not give the tablet numbers from the series. The points of division occur at the same places in both Middle Assyrian copies so far as they are preserved, but the London copy has a big gap between its columns V and IX. Column V covers part of what is indicated as „Tablet V“ in the Yale copy, but when the text resumes after the break, what remains of column IX and the upper part of column X contains material which the Yale copy completely lacks. The lower part of column X contains what the Yale copy calls „Tablet VIII“. This

material on the London copy, but lacking from that of Yale, contains one indication of the end of a tablet in the usual style. H. Zimmern, working in ignorance of the Yale copy, thought he had found a shorter god list running more or less parallel to AN = *Anum* in this extra material (BSGW 63 [1911] 125), and as confirmation cited the incomplete colophon of the London copy. However, the colophon does not have to be restored to indicate that three series were copied on the one tablet, and the evidence that this extra material on the London tablet runs parallel to AN = *Anum* is by no means convincing. The obvious explanation is that to the completed AN = *Anum* various other apocryphal shorter lists and groups of names were added, and the London copy has more of this kind than the Yale copy. The Aššurbānapli tablets and fragments offer colophons of what are called „Tablets I“, „II“, and „III“. However, the Late Assyrian „I“ embraces both I and II of the Middle Assyrian copies, so that II of the former corresponds to III of the latter. The only other Aššurbānapli colophon naming AN = *Anum* occurs on a synonym list, which professes to be the 9th tablet of the series (CT 24, 18, 80-7-19, 297). Evidently the god list was the first section of a larger grouping in this library, or this edition. The one surviving Assur colophon (KAV 51) has „Tablet V“ where the Yale copy has „Tablet IV“, still another method of dividing up the work. While fragments of all the eight tablets in the Yale numbering have been recovered from the Aššurbānapli libraries, no duplicates of the extra material on the London copy have yet been found.

§ 7 AN = *Anu* = *ša amēli*. A second series written on both Middle Assyrian copies of AN = *Anum* has a triple-column format, and is known from its first line as AN = *Anu* = *ša amēli*, which may be freely rendered as: An is the name of Anu as god of a man. The first two sub-columns are in exactly the same style as AN = *Anum*. The third explains the special reference of the name in the first sub-column. In this series the explanation is never more

than a short phrase, normally „of...“. This series is almost completely preserved, consists of 157 names and deals with 24 deities in theological order. Apart from the Middle Assyrian copies, there is one Aššurbānapli fragment, K 11966, CT 26; 50. Its date of composition is no doubt Cassite. The placing of Marduk before Ea is inconsistent with an earlier dating. The text has been reconstructed by R. Litke, op. cit.

§ 8 Sultantepe. While Sultantepe has yielded no single fragment of the lists described so far, it has given substantial parts of a single column list: STT 376—382. A fragment from Assur, KAV 68, also belongs to this list. It is not completely preserved, but must have contained some 200 names. This is a distinctively Assyrian compilation, beginning with Aššur, and another Assyrian feature is the writing of Tammuz with a plural sign in the middle (^ddumu^{mes}. zi: STT 376 IV 8), which is only found elsewhere in the Assyrian Tākultu texts. The arrangement is theological, and there is a title at the head, „The Names of the Gods.“ All the copies are Late Assyrian.

§ 9 A Late List. The following fragments from the Aššurbānapli libraries appear to be parts of one list: K 29 (CT 25, 36) + Ki 1902-5-10, 28; Rm 610 (CT 25, 35); K 4209 (CT 25, 33—34); K 4559 (CT 25, 42). The first two are duplicates; the last three appear to be the remains of one tablet. It is a double-column list in the style of AN = *Anum*, arranged theologically. It was written in four columns on one tablet, but its extent cannot be more closely defined. In view of the inclusion of Šihu (or Šipak), a Cassite deity, it cannot be earlier than the Cassite Period, and it may well be a first millennium product. While it has some very common names, it seems to concentrate on the rare and unusual. Not yet edited.

§ 10 Emesal. The Emesal list forms the first tablet of the Emesal Vocabulary, and consisted of about 115 lines dealing with one divine name each, of which all but some 15 are preserved. It has a triple-

column format, of which the last two sub-columns are in the style of AN = *Anum*. The first sub-column gives the Emesal dialectal form of the names, which are of necessity Sumerian. This list has thus a linguistic purpose, and for this purpose has made a selection of names from AN = *Anum* or a related list. As a consequence, the ordering is theological, though the author was theologically naive. At the beginning he wrongly explains Enki and Ninki, the ancestors of Enlil, as Ea and Damkina, and at the end, where he combines two sources (known to us from AN = *Anum* and the Old Babylonian Nippur list, § 3) he included both Lugalabba and Lugalaba, though they are only phonetic variants of the same name. It happens that all the surviving fragments come from the Aššurbānapli libraries, but parts of other sections of the Emesal Vocabulary have been found in Assur and Babylon. The date of composition is probably to be put between 1400 and 900. It has been edited by B. Landsberger in MSL 4, 1—10.

§ 11 Other Lists. Many other lists than those given above undoubtedly existed. Fragments survive, but so far it has proved impossible to reconstruct them in toto, or in sufficiently comprehensive form for them to have value. For example, MDP 27 contains exercise tablets with extracts from lists which do not agree with any known to us, and similar fragments are scattered throughout Assyriological literature. Some of these were certainly specialised, being limited to one god or special groups of deities. As an example, and to illustrate the most elaborate type of god list, mention may be made of the list of 50 Marduk names incorporated in Enūma Eliš. It was a triple-column type, like AN = *Anu* = *ša amēli*, but instead of a simple phrase in the third sub-column it had a whole string of epithets. In Enūma Eliš the middle sub-column was suppressed and extra lines of epithets were added, but the list survived, with further names added at its end, in the Aššurbānapli libraries (CT 25, 46—47, K 7658 + 8222; STC I 165—166, K 8519, K 13337; and other fragments).

§ 12 Expository Texts. In the expository texts of theological character that were compiled by first millennium scholars short god lists are often found, either by themselves or combined with other materials. While in form they are indistinguishable from the lists so far described, their purpose is quite different. Instead of collecting information, the primary purpose of the earlier lists, these set out to demonstrate a theological doctrine. For example, the much disputed Pinches list (CT 24, 50, BM 47406 obv.), which, in the format of AN = *Anu* = *ša amēli* explains the major gods of the pantheon as names of Marduk, is beyond question pushing a monotheistic conception of Marduk, as Pinches first claimed (JTVI 1896, 8). Another example, STT 400 obv., is more typical of this type in that the purpose of listing the particular equivalences of divine names is not clear.

§ 13 Offering Lists. Divine names are listed in certain other types of texts, which should be included here though they are not properly god lists. Offering lists are important since in some cases they give the offerings prescribed for all the state gods. Many survive from the Third Dynasty of Ur, of which the best specimen is undoubtedly TCL 5 : 6053. Others are: TCL 2 : 550r; TCL 5 : 5672; BIN 5, 5; HSS 4, 52, 54; Nik. 2, 529, 530; RTC 247; YOS 4, 260, 272 (list provided by E. Sollberger). From later periods mention may be made of the Mari offering list (StMar. 41—50), and one from the reign of Nabû-kudurriuşur II of Babylon (TMH 2/3 no. 240). In the one Ur III specimen and the Nabûkudurriuşur document, the gods are in theological ordering. The others need further study. With offering lists the Late Assyrian Tākultu texts should be grouped, since they list the gods invited to a sacrificial meal by the king. The deities listed are much more numerous than in any offering list, and there is some kind of ordering, though so far not much understood. These have been edited by R. Frankena, Tākultu.

§ 14 Exorcistic Texts. While offering lists may have provided prototypes for

god lists, it is nowhere possible to prove that they have directly influenced god lists. But this can be demonstrated with certain exorcistic texts. E. Ebeling edited three texts in ArOr. 21 (1953) 357 ff. distinguished as „Gattung I“, „Gattung II“, and „Gattung III“. What he called „Gattung IV“ is unrelated. These three are variant forms of the same genre. All the members of the pantheon are listed in theological order so as to drive away demons with their help. The framework in each case is „Be exorcised by ...“ (zi ... ḫé.pà/nīš ... lū tamāta). If this framework is stripped away a simple god list results. However, there is always some description of each deity so invoked. In „Gattung III“, known from a single copy of Middle or Late Babylonian date, the text is purely Sumerian and the descriptions are quite brief, so that for its size it deals with a relatively large number of deities. „Gattung II“ is in the same style, but is known from Late Assyrian and Late Babylonian bilingual copies. „Gattung I“, known only from Late Assyrian copies, is also bilingual, but it deals with fewer members of the pantheon and describes them at much greater length. The Old Babylonian text from which this has been developed survives in one copy, which is briefer, and shows other important differences, see W. G. Lambert JSS 10 (1965) 123—124. Even a brief comparison of this genre with the god lists shows that they did not develop separately, though it is often difficult to say which influenced the other.

Simple incantations in some cases contain many divine names, Šurpu VIII 14—40 for example, but their relations to the lists need to be studied. Sumerian litanies are relevant on two counts. In the first place, divine names are often listed, and in VS 2 no. 11 rev. V 1 ff. the family of Enlil is listed. Secondly, in some cases the epithets applied to one deity in these litanies appear in god lists as the subsidiary names of that deity.

§ 15 The Value of God Lists. God lists should be considered primary documents of ancient Mesopotamian religion,

but their full value cannot be obtained until their organization is understood, and studies along these lines have hardly begun. While some lists, like AN = *Anum*, have explanatory phrases, these are only explaining parts of the list. Where the list is seen to be theologically arranged, this not only shows the relative positions of the gods within the pantheon, but it allows comparison with lists of different periods. The position of Marduk, for example, is not the same in all lists. The multiplicity of names for single deities is very revealing. If one leaves out of consideration cases where different writings (e. g. ḏn.a.zi, ḏAB × ḫA: SLT 122 III 13—14) and variant forms of the same name (e. g. Gili, Gilima, Agilima: Enūma Eliš VII 78—83) occur, two very important sets of facts can be learnt. The first is the process of syncretism. Throughout the centuries big gods were being identified with smaller gods of the same general type, and this is shown in that the big god takes over the names of the lesser. The second is the attributes of the deities. The epithets more commonly addressed to a deity were often in the course of time transformed into names, and these show the attributes ascribed to the god. God lists also had a formative influence on the composition of the pantheon quite apart from their use in expository texts. The list was a traditional, written document in all periods, and for many centuries there were no explanatory phrases. No doubt oral tradition passed on the necessary understanding of the written lists, but such tradition is not infallible, so that when better organized lists by their grouping and explanatory phrases made explicit what had before been known only by word of mouth, different schools of scribes, either through ignorance or deliberately, chose contradictory alternatives. For example, Erua is a common title of Šarpanitum in late lists and late copies of literary texts. But in AN = *Anum* she is one of two counsellors of Damgalnunna. Quite commonly a minor name became either another name of a major deity or a minor deity in his circle. In such cases changes of sex may easily take place.

Ninimma is most often female, but once she has become „Ea of the scribe“ (CT 41, 27, 1).

W. G. Lambert

Götterprozession in der Bildkunst.

Wenn auch die von Menschen an bestimmten Festtagen durchgeführten feierlichen Umzüge mit Götterbildern „gewöhnlich als eigenes Wandeln der Gottheiten aufgefaßt“ wurden (B. Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien, 2 [1925] 126; vgl. ferner ebda. 1 [1920] 293; 2, 63, 92, 97, 101, 169 ff.; A. Salonen, Prozessionswagen der babylonischen Götter, StOr. 13/2 [1946] 3; N. Schneider, Götterschiffe im Ur III-Reich, StOr. 13/5 [1946] 7, 10 ff.), so unterscheiden sie sich doch von den Prozessionen, die die Götter selbst — ohne irdische Hilfe — bildeten. Darstellungen solcher sind in Mesopotamien unbekannt. Anders verhält es sich im kleinasiatischen Bereich. Hier zeigt das hethitische Felsheiligtum Yazılıkaya* (K. Bittel, Die Felsbilder von Yazılıkaya, IstForsch. 5 [1934] — K. Bittel/R. Naumann/H. Otto, Yazılıkaya, WDOG 61 [1941] 2) zwei einander begegnende Züge aus männlichen und weiblichen Gottheiten, deren Hauptgötter durch Beischriften als dem churritischen Pantheon zugehörig erkennbar werden (E. Laroche, JCS 6 [1952] 115 ff. — H. G. Güterbock, MDOG 86 [1953] 65 ff.). Das äußere Erscheinungsbild der Darstellung spricht dafür, daß hier eine echte Prozession von Göttern wiedergegeben worden ist, auch wenn wir für diese keinen Beleg in zeitgenössischen Texten besitzen. Daran anschließen lassen sich die wie Yazılıkaya aus der Zeit des hethitischen Großreichs stammenden Götterzugfigurchen aus Karkemiš* (Sir L. Woolley — R. D. Barnett, Carchemish 3 [1952] 252 ff. Tf. 64 b. Bessere Abbildungen bei M. Riemschneider, Die Welt der Hethiter [1954] Tf. 106 [Auswahl] und E. Akurgal, Die Kunst der Hethiter [1961] Tf. 53 oben [Auswahl]. Vgl. auch K. Bittel in Historia 7 [1964] 127 f.). Von hier ausgehend wird es möglich, ältere Beispiele churritischen und kappadokischen Ursprungs als Götterprozessionen zu deuten (kappadokische Beispiele für die