

W.G. LAMBERT
RYAN D. WINTERS

An = Anum and Related Lists

God Lists of Ancient Mesopotamia, Volume I

Edited by
ANDREW GEORGE and
MANFRED KREBERNIK

*Orientalische Religionen
in der Antike*
54

Mohr Siebeck

Orientalische Religionen in der Antike
Ägypten, Israel, Alter Orient

Oriental Religions in Antiquity
Egypt, Israel, Ancient Near East

(ORA)

Herausgegeben von / Edited by

Angelika Berlejung (Leipzig)
Nils P. Heeßel (Marburg)
Joachim Friedrich Quack (Heidelberg)

Beirat / Advisory Board

Uri Gabbay (Jerusalem)
Michael Blömer (Aarhus)
Christopher Rollston (Washington, D. C.)
Rita Lucarelli (Berkeley)



W. G. Lambert †
Ryan D. Winters

An = Anum and Related Lists

God Lists of Ancient Mesopotamia

Volume I

Edited by
Andrew George and
Manfred Krebernik

Mohr Siebeck

W. G. Lambert (1926–2011): 1955–59 Lecturer, University of Toronto; 1959–64 Associate Professor and Chair of Oriental Seminary, Johns Hopkins University; 1964 Lecturer, then 1970–93 Professor of Assyriology, University of Birmingham; 1971 Fellow of the British Academy. He devoted his life to the decipherment and study of cuneiform tablets, chiefly in the British Museum, and is noted for his masterly reconstruction of a large number of Babylonian literary texts, beginning with *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (1960) and concluding with *Babylonian Creation Myths* (2013).

Ryan D. Winters born 1987; 2011–18 BA from the University of Chicago and PhD from Harvard University in Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations; from 2018 to 2021 employed as a postdoctoral researcher at the Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena.

Andrew George born 1955; 1973–79 studied at the University of Birmingham; 1976 BA; 1985 PhD; 1983–2020 taught Akkadian and Sumerian at SOAS University of London; 2000 Professor of Babylonian; 2000–01 Visiting Professor, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg; 2004–05 Member, Institute for Advanced Study Princeton; 2006 Fellow of the British Academy; 2011 Honorary Member of the American Oriental Society; since 2020 retired as Professor Emeritus.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8231-190X>

Manfred Krebernik born 1953; studied classics, Semitic languages and Assyriology in Munich; academic assistant at the Institute of Assyriology in Munich; 1991–94 Heisenberg fellow; 1995–97 Professor of Assyriology in Munich; 1998–2021 Chair of Ancient Near Eastern Studies and curator of the “Frau Professor Hilprecht Collection of Babylonian Antiquities” at the Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena; since 2003 corresponding member of the Bavarian Academy; 2021 retired.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7233-4996>

ISBN 978-3-16-161382-1 / eISBN 978-3-16-161383-8
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-161383-8

ISSN 1869-0513 / eISSN 2568-7492 (Orientalische Religionen in der Antike)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2023 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by epline in Bodelshausen, printed on non-aging paper by Gulde Druck in Tübingen, and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Preface and Acknowledgements

The prehistory and genesis of the present volume are complex. One of the giants on whose shoulders stand modern scholars of Babylonian religion is W. G. Lambert (1926–2011) of the University of Birmingham. In his middle decades Lambert worked intensively on the Mesopotamian god lists and became the acknowledged expert on them. His intention was to produce a definitive edition of the “Great God List”, known to the ancients as An = *Anum*; to present alongside it several related lists; and to elucidate it with a comprehensive commentary. In the event, his publications on god lists and the gods who populated them were limited to articles in the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie (RLA)*, other studies of individual divine names, and two first editions of lists. The encyclopedia articles in *RLA* stretched across a period of twenty-two years, from Gidrišudu (vol. III/5 356, 1968) to MaTUru (vol. VII/7–8 590, 1990). They included not only entries on individual deities, but also important statements on “Göttergenealogie”, “Götterlisten” and “Gott. B. Nach akkadischen Texten”, all in vol. III (1969). Longer articles, published outside *RLA*, focused on the gods gods Ilaba (1981a), Šakkan (1981b, 1986), Aššur (1983a), NidaKUL (1984a, 1989), Kulla (1987h), Nergal (1990), Nuska (2002a), Nissaba (2003b), Ištar of Nineveh (2004a); others brought a critical eye to god lists already known (1984b, 1985b, 2007) and presented additions to the corpus (1985a).

After Lambert’s death, his scholarly *Nachlass* passed into the hands of his former student Andrew George. He and Junko Taniguchi numbered the individual pages of Lambert’s notebooks and loose paper sheets (“Folios”), indexed the notebooks and hand copies of cuneiform texts, prepared the copies for publication, and sorted the many other paper documents, photographs, files and folders. Unsurprisingly, the *Nachlass* was found to contain much evidence of Lambert’s work on the god lists. The relevant material, in all 1,638 folios, was stored in two envelopes and ten foolscap document folders, as follows:

Folios 1653–1812. Two large envelopes containing unpublished hand copies of god list tablets and fragments. These copies have now been published by George and Taniguchi in *Cuneiform Texts from the Folios of W. G. Lambert, Part Two* (CTL 2, 2021) as texts Nos. 454–60 and 465–620.

Folios 6393–7133. These sheets, divided among four folders, comprise the typewritten draft of an edition of An = *Anum* Tablets I, II, III and V 1–104, with extensive philological and theological commentary on Tablets I–III and V 1–104, and a typewritten transliteration of the whole of Tablet V. Lambert wrote these drafts in the 1970s but over the subsequent decades marked them up with anno-

tations in ink and pencil. A second copy of the draft edition of Tablets I–III was stored in the Yale Babylonian Collection until 2018 but lacks Lambert’s annotations. This is the material referred to in 1998 by the collection’s erstwhile curator, William W. Hallo (1928–2015), in his foreword to the long-delayed publication of An = *Anum* and related lists by Richard L. Litke (1921–2018). Recalling an initiative to obtain Lambert’s help in updating and publishing Litke’s dissertation in 1971, Hallo wrote in 1998 that, “for the next ten years, Lambert prepared detailed commentaries on each of the first three tablets (chapters) of the series and sent them to me for review. The last of these submissions was in 1981” (*apud* Litke 1998: vi). Hallo himself made a few annotations on the Yale copy of Lambert’s typescript. Stored alongside it at the Yale Babylonian Collection was a large dossier of detailed notes on Litke’s work, written by Ferris J. Stephens (1893–1969) when Litke was writing up his edition as a doctoral dissertation; these are what Hallo referred to in his foreword as “comments ... from Stephens, his advisor”. Thanks to the kindness of the curatorial staff both sets of material, by Lambert and Stephens, were transferred to Jena in 2018, where they weigh heavily on the shelves of the God Lists of Ancient Mesopotamia (GLAM) project at the Friedrich Schiller University.

Folios 7134–7190. A folder described as “Working Sheets to An = *Anum*”. Lambert recommended that his students collect data on loose sheets of paper rather than the traditional postcard-size filing cards that most people used before the advent of digital technology (which he considered too small). This folder bears witness to his preference: it comprises mainly sheets of accumulated notes on various deities, organized alphabetically, on which he stored facts and references for working into his commentary on An = *Anum*. More such sheets are scattered in the other folders.

Folios 7191–7284. This folder is mostly occupied by a handwritten transliteration of An = *Anum* Tablets I–VII. This draft predates the typescript of the 1970s, and is the only outcome of Lambert’s work on Tablets IV, VI and VII.

Folios 7285–7310. A folder containing handwritten transliterations of the god lists most closely related to An = *Anum*: Anšar = *Anum*, X = An and Shorter An = *Anum*.

Folios 7311–7466 fill a folder in which are collected drafts, mostly handwritten, of the Weidner god list, several second-millennium god lists (including CBS 331, here No. 3 = Fr₁), and the list Enki = *Ea ša kullati*, along with related correspondence, offprints, colleagues’ copies and transliterations, and photographs.

Folios 7467–7546 occupy a folder which Lambert named “Lexical God Lists”: these are lists from the second

and first millennia in which the organizing principle is not theological. They include texts identified as *Diri* VII and its forerunners.

Folios 8226–8377 sit in a folder marked “Litany, Gattungen, Offering Lists”, texts and genres which Lambert mastered in order to mine them for divine names and epithets and other information pertinent to his commentary on An = *Anum*.

Folios 8735–8896 include sundry other materials related to the god lists: notes, collations, photographs and correspondence.

Scans of all these parts of Lambert’s *Nachlass* were made by Junko Taniguchi in 2018 and are now lodged as a resource in the digital files of the GLAM project. Folios 8226–8896 have since been indexed by Dr Netanel Anor as a GLAM research resource.

In 1985–86 Manfred Krebernik wrote his *Habilitationschrift* on early god lists in Munich, part of which was subsequently published in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* (Krebernik 1986). After Lambert withdrew from contributing articles on deities to the *Reallexikon* in 1990, Dietz O. Edzard, the editor-in-chief, engaged Krebernik to take over this duty. He continued in this capacity, in part together with Antoine Cavigneaux, until the *RIA* was completed, beginning with ME-Abzu (*RIA* VII/7–8: 613, 1990), ending the alphabetic list with *Zwillingsgottheiten* (*RIA* XV/5–6: 351–54, 2017), and, in the appendix, signing off with *llaba* (*RIA* XV/7–8: 392–97, 2018). In doing so he built up extensive files on the names of ancient Mesopotamian gods and goddesses.

In 2015 Mark Geller brought Krebernik and George together in Buckhurst Hill to discuss how to go about bringing Lambert’s work on An = *Anum* to fruition. The idea of a joint project emerged, with the aim of making a complete edition of all the Mesopotamian god lists, based on Lambert’s *Nachlass* and the materials collected by Krebernik. In due course a proposal was submitted to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. The proposal was successful, and in November 2018 the GLAM project was launched at the University of Jena, with Krebernik as principal investigator, George as academic consultant and two post-doctoral researchers. Work began immediately, and when the coronavirus pandemic closed university buildings and put an end to face-to-face meetings, the collaboration continued through home-working and video-conferencing. During this time several unsuspected new sources emerged. Consequently, some delay to the project’s first outcome was inevitable.

In line with the proposal accepted by the funding body, the project’s first academic goal was to produce a definitive edition of An = *Anum* and related lists, based on Lambert’s work of forty years ago. With the publication of this first GLAM volume, brought to press by Dr Ryan Winters in close collaboration with George and Krebernik, that goal is now realized. Lambert’s composite variorum edition has been revised from the ground up, and corrected and improved by the inclusion of many additional sources, both published and unpublished. This composite edition is ac-

companied by a completely new presentation of each individual textual witness and exhaustive indexes. The whole takes account of the most recent developments in knowledge, scholarship and method.

Very many of the additional sources that inform the editions were Lambert’s personal discoveries, made during his long-time study in the British Museum. Other pieces were communicated to him by colleagues during his lifetime, and still other fragments of god lists came to light after his death. A history of this increase in sources is provided in Ryan Winters’s introduction.

Magnificent though it is, Lambert’s commentary on An = *Anum* I–III and V 1–104 could not, after the lapse of more than forty years, be brought up to date in a manner that would have pleased him. Nevertheless, its vast learning, sound judgement and meticulous scholarship have made it a resource of immense value to the project. In the philological notes that accompany the present editions, references to Lambert’s Folios by number indicate many places, but by no means all, where his commentary has been essential to the discussion.

While this first volume of the GLAM project coincides with the end of full funding, and simultaneously with the retirement from their universities of both the principal investigator and the academic consultant, we intend to continue the project and accomplish Lambert’s vision. Future volumes now in planning will treat the Weidner god list, Old Babylonian lists, the “lexical” lists and miscellaneous other god lists.

In the meantime, we have the pleasant duty of acknowledging the generosity of those institutions and individuals who have assisted us in the preparation of this volume. Our heartfelt thanks go to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for undertaking to fund the first three years of the GLAM project. We are grateful to Professor Annette Zgoll for recommending the acceptance of the project’s publications in the series *Orientalische Religionen in der Antike* at Mohr Siebeck, and to the production team at Mohr Siebeck for their expert conversion of the manuscript of this first volume. To Ulla Kasten and Dr Agnete Wisti Lassen, former and present Associate Curators of the Yale Babylonian Collection, the project is grateful for the gift of the Yale copy of Lambert’s typescript and Stephens’s notes on Litke’s draft dissertation. Professor Barbara Helwing, Director of the Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin, gave the project very welcome access to unpublished photographs of tablets excavated by Robert Koldewey at Babylon in 1908. They are published here by courtesy of the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft. Dr Anmar Fadhil of the University of Baghdad responded generously to our enquiries about god list tablets in the Sippar library, now in the Iraq Museum, Baghdad. They are quoted by gracious permission of the State Board for Antiquities and Heritage, Iraq. Professor Enrique Jiménez, Dr Zsombor Földi and Tonio Mitto of the University of Munich, and Dr Jeremiah Peterson kindly shared with us unpublished fragments of god lists which they had identified among the collections of the British Museum.

We also acknowledge the generosity of those many colleagues who sent unpublished material to W.G. Lambert during his lifetime. The present volume benefits especially from the goodwill of the late Miguel Civil, who in 1996 and 1997 sent Lambert first his personal transliteration and then photographs of an important unpublished fragment of An = *Anum* V in a private collection in Chicago.

Finally, the project team wishes to record with deep gratitude the constant and unfailing assistance of Frau Bir-

git Tauch. Her long and dedicated service as secretary to the chair of Ancient Near Eastern Studies at the Friedrich Schiller University of Jena, concluding on 1 July 2021, was instrumental to the GLAM project's successful genesis, birth and infancy.

Andrew George, Buckhurst Hill
Manfred Krebernik, Jena

18 November 2021

Table of Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements	V
Abbreviations	XI
Symbols	XIII

Part I

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Lexical Lists	3
1.2. God Lists	3
1.3. Proto-An = <i>Anum</i> (“de Genouillac List”)	5
1.3.1. Summary of Proto-An = <i>Anum</i>	5
1.3.2. Structure and Purpose of Proto-An = <i>Anum</i>	7
1.4. Tablet I Forerunner CBS 331	8
1.5. An = <i>Anum</i>	9
1.5.1. The Reconstruction of An = <i>Anum</i>	10
1.5.2. The Middle Assyrian “Elephant” Tablets	10
1.5.3. Other Middle Assyrian Sources	13
1.5.4. Middle Babylonian Sources	13
1.5.5. Neo-Assyrian Sources	14
1.5.6. Neo-/Late Babylonian Sources	15
1.5.7. Summary of An = <i>Anum</i>	16
1.5.8. The “An = <i>Anum</i> Synonym List”	27
1.6. An = <i>Anum ša amēli</i>	27
1.7. Enki = <i>Ea ša kullati</i>	29
1.8. Shorter An = <i>Anum</i>	30
1.9. Anšar = <i>Anum</i>	34
1.10. X = An	37
1.11. Appendix to An = <i>Anum</i>	37
1.12. How to Use This Edition	40
1.12.1. Ancient Conventions	40
1.12.2. Modern Conventions	43
1.12.3. Scope and Purpose of the Textual Notes	46
2. Text Editions	47
2.1. An = <i>Anum</i>	47
2.1.1. Forerunners	47
Proto-An = <i>Anum</i> (Texts 1–2, “de Genouillac List”)	47
Tablet I Forerunner CBS 331 (Text 3)	63
2.1.2. Canonical An = <i>Anum</i>	67
Tablet I	67
Tablet II	103
Tablet III	135
Tablet IV	160
Tablet V	179
Tablet VI	209
Tablet VII	233
2.2. An = <i>Anum ša amēli</i>	241
2.3. Enki = <i>Ea ša kullati</i>	265

2.4. Shorter An = <i>Anum</i>	272
2.5. Anšar = <i>Anum</i>	299
2.6. X = An	323
2.7. “Appendix” to An = <i>Anum</i>	329

Part II

3. Individual Witnesses	343
3.1. Summary List of Manuscripts	343
3.2. Editions	348
3.2.1. Middle Assyrian Manuscripts (Texts 4–13)	348
3.2.2. Neo-Assyrian Manuscripts (Texts 14–66)	430
3.2.3. Middle Babylonian Manuscripts (Texts 67–76)	527
3.2.4. Neo-/Late Babylonian Manuscripts (Texts 77–106)	541

Part III

4. Concordances	597
4.1. Concordance with Litke 1998, line numbers of An = <i>Anum</i>	597
4.2. Witnesses According to Museum Number	612
4.3. Witnesses According to Previous Publication	615
5. Indexes	619
5.1. Divine Names	619
5.2. Star Names	670
5.3. Place Names	671
5.4. Personal Names (in Colophons)	673
5.5. Sumerian Vocabulary	674
5.6. Akkadian and Other Vocabulary	677
5.7. Glosses	685
5.7.1. Glossed Divine Names	685
5.7.2. Glossed Toponyms	699
5.7.3. MIN Glosses	699
5.7.4. Glossed Signs/Sign Combinations	705
5.7.5. Akkadian Translation Glosses	721
5.7.6. Sign Names	723
6. Bibliography	725
Plates	733
Addendum: Additional Fragments of An = <i>Anum</i>	753

Abbreviations

AA	An = <i>Anum</i>	CUSAS	Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology
1–7	Tablets I–VII		
ABAW	Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Neue Folge	DCCLT	Digital Corpus of Cuneiform Lexical Texts oracc.museum.upenn.edu/dcclt
AbB	Altbabylonische Briefe	DDD	Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible van der Toorn/Becking/van der Horst 1999
6	Frankena 1974	DP	Documents présargoniques
9	Stol 1981		
ADFU	Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka	EŠK	Enki = <i>Ea ša kullati</i>
AfO	Archiv für Orientforschung	Fr ₁	An = <i>Anum</i> Tablet I Forerunner, CBS 331
AHw	Akkadisches Handwörterbuch von Soden 1965–1981	GAG	Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik von Soden 1995
Akk.	Akkadian	GEN	Proto-An = <i>Anum</i> , AO 5376 (“de Genouillac List”) // Np ₁
AnšA	Anšar = <i>Anum</i> , Assyrian Recension	JANER	Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions
AnšB	Anšar = <i>Anum</i> , Babylonian Recension	JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament	JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
275	Gesche 2001	JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
362	Peterson 2009a	ITT	Inventaire des tablettes de Tello
Ap	Appendix to An = <i>Anum</i>	3	de Genouillac 1912
ARET	Archivi reali di Ebla, Testi	KADP	Keilschrifttexte zur assyrisch-babylonischen Drogen- und Pflanzenkunde
16	Lahlouh/Catagnoti 2006		Köcher 1955
AšA	An = <i>Anum ša amēli</i>	KAR	Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts Ebeling 1919
ASJ	Acta Sumerologica	KAV	Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts Schroeder 1920
AUWE	Ausgrabungen in Uruk-Warka Endberichte	KBo	Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi
BBR	Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion Zimmern 1901	26	Güterbock/Carter 1978
BIN	Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies	KUB	Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi
3	Keiser 1971	3	Weidner 1922
CAD	Chicago Assyrian Dictionary Oppenheim/Reiner et al. (eds) 1956–2010	LAK	Liste der archaischen Keilschriftzeichen Deimel 1922
CT	Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets	LKU	Literarische Keilschrifttexte aus Uruk Falkenstein 1931
14	Thompson 1902	MARI	MARI Annales de recherches interdisciplinaires
18	Thompson 1904a	MIO	Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung
19	Thompson 1904b	MSL	Materialien zum sumerischen Lexikon/ Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon
24	King 1908	3	Hallock et al. 1955
25	King 1909a	4	Landsberger et al. 1956
26	King 1909b	5	Landsberger 1957
29	King 1910	8/2	Landsberger 1962
42	Figulla 1959	11	Reiner 1974
51	Walker 1972	12	Civil 1969
CTL	Cuneiform Texts from the Folios of WG Lambert	13	Civil 1971
1	Lambert 2019	14	Civil 1979
2	Lambert 2021	15	Civil 2004
CTMMA	Corpus of Cuneiform Texts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art		
1	Spar 1988		

16	Finkel 1982	3/2	Frayne 1997
17	Cavigneaux/Güterbock/Roth 1985	4	Frayne 1990
MVN	Materiali per il vocabulario neosumerico	RINAP	The Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period
1	Pettinato/Waetzoldt 1974		
11	Owen 1982	RTC	Recueil de tablettes chaldéennes = Thureau-Dangin 1903
18	Molina 1993		
MZL	Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon	SAACT	State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts
	Borger 2010	SF	Schultexte aus Fara = Deimel 1923
NABU	Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires	Sh	Shorter An = <i>Anum</i>
Nik 2	Nikol'skij 1915	SLT	Sumerian Lexical Texts from the Temple School of Nippur
NSGU	Neusumerische Gerichtsurkunden		Chiera 1929
	Falkenstein 1956–1957		
NTSŠ	Nouvelles Tablettes Sumériennes de Šuruppak	SpTU	Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk
	Jestin 1957	1	Hunger 1976
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis	2	von Weiher 1983
OIP	Oriental Institute Publications	3	von Weiher 1988
11	Chiera 1929	4	von Weiher 1993
14	Luckenbill 1930	Syria	Syria Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie
99	Biggs 1974	STT	The Sultantepe Tablets
104	Gelb/Steinkeller/Whiting 1989	2	Gurney/Hulin 1964
111	Zettler 1993	TCL	Textes Cunéiformes Musée du Louvre, Département des Antiquités Orientales
OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung		de Genouillac 1930
ORA	Orientalische Religionen in der Antike	15	
18	Oshima 2014	UET	Ur Excavations Texts
OrNS	Orientalia (Nova Series)	3	Legrain 1937
PIHANS	Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul = Publications de l'Institut Historique-Archéologique Néerlandais de Stamboul	UF	Ugarit-Forschungen
		VS	Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der (Königlichen) Museen zu Berlin
		2	Zimmern 1912
PRAK	Premières recherches archéologiques à Kich de Genouillac 1925	16	Schroeder 1917
2		24	van Dijk 1987
R	Rawlinson 1861–1909 (vols. 1–5)	WF	Wirtschaftstexte aus Fara
RA	Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale		Deimel 1924
RIA	Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie	WVDOG	Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft
RIME	The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Early Periods	XAn	X = An
		YOS	Yale Oriental Series
		2	Lutz 1917
1	Frayne 2008	ZA	Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie
2	Frayne 1993		
3/1	Edzard 1997	ZOrA	Zeitschrift für Orient-Archäologie

Symbols

- ⌈ ⌋ enclose damaged signs
 - [] enclose a restoration
 - ⟨ ⟩ enclose signs to be added through emendation
 - { } enclose signs to be deleted through emendation
 - + indicates signs written together, as a ligature
 - × indicates a sign with another sign written within
 - \ indicates one sign written above another
 - * indicates a new reading that is the result of a collation
 - † indicates currently broken signs, with the reading based on an old photo or copy
 - :: indicates the *Trennungszeichen* (aka “*Glossenkeil*”)
 - | indicates the column divider on a double-column tablet
 - / indicates the start of a new line on a tablet, or, within restorations, alternate possibilities
 - ~ indicates approximate correspondence or belonging
 - A obverse
 - B lower edge
 - C reverse
- e.g. N₁.C.02.10 = ms. N₁, reverse, column ii, line 10

Part I

1. Introduction

This volume has the goal of publishing a complete and up-to-date edition of the ancient Mesopotamian god list *An = Anum*, and some closely related ones. Since god lists are a subgenre of lexical lists, we present some introductory remarks on these.

1.1. Lexical Lists

The lexical list is the characteristic vehicle of the Mesopotamian intellectual tradition.¹ Present from the very beginning, when additional genres outside of administrative texts were yet unknown, lexical lists are quite simply standardized, sequential lists of words (or simply of signs), arranged in a fixed order. They were emblematic of the literate class, whose members occupied positions of power as administrators and managers.² Often dedicated to a specific theme – there are lists of plants, lists of types of pots and pans, lists of animals, and eventually, lists of gods – lexical lists could be compared to dictionaries or encyclopedias. Unlike these modern analogues however, the words are, in the early and prototypical instances, simply listed. Later, explanations of various kinds were provided, giving, for example, the pronunciation of the word, or an explanation of an exotic term using more familiar vocabulary. Still, these explanations are generally very brief compared to what one would expect from a modern lexicon.

Throughout their history, most lexical lists were in the Sumerian language, which ceased to be widely spoken sometime after the fall of the Neo-Sumerian (or “Ur III”) empire, around the transition from the third millennium to the second millennium B. C. Cuneiform writing was invented in the Sumerian south, but already very early on Mesopotamia was a bilingual environment, with speakers of Eastern Semitic Akkadian (from which later the Assyrian and Babylonian dialects would emerge) concentrated in the north. Sumerian lived on as a learned and liturgical language, comparable to the use of Latin in medieval Europe. Sumerian also remained the foundation of the cuneiform writing system itself, which had been adapted to write Akkadian. The decreasing native familiarity with Sumerian was likely the main motivation behind the development from the earlier, single-column, monolingual Sumerian lists to the later multi-column, Sumero-Akkadian lists, which, by the first millennium B. C., had become the norm.

No small part of lexical lists’ enduring presence was the role they played in learning and teaching the cuneiform writing system (for which reason they are also a boon to its modern decipherment). But they also served as a vehicle for the transmission of knowledge. School tablets provide evidence that young pupils, as part of their training, wrote out extracts from lexical lists consisting of a half a dozen or so lines, whereby the sometimes rough execution of these tablets reveals the scribe’s status as a beginner. It seems that, once they were ready to graduate, pupils could write out an entire list in a perfected, exemplary copy, which might then be stored long term in a tablet collection. The point is, the scribes were not expected to produce any original research, by updating, innovating, or adding to these lists. They were to reproduce them faithfully, as they had been received.

The full history of the lexical tradition is too complex to outline in full detail here. In the course of the second millennium, certain lists, which had forerunners going back to the third millennium, ceased to be transmitted, while new types of lists were created, and others were adapted for use in peripheral locations. By around the mid-second millennium – the Middle Babylonian or Kassite period – the most important lexical lists became canonized or standardized. The subject of the present study, the god list *An = Anum*, is a product of this canonization process.

Lexical lists preserve knowledge not just in their individual entries, but in their structural organization. While there was surely a substantial oral or cultural-contextual component that went along with their transmission that will remain mostly lost to us (at least some of which was committed to writing in the form of explanatory columns and, later, commentaries), modern researchers can recover from lexical lists a great deal of information about how Mesopotamians conceptualized their world.

1.2. God Lists

God lists are therefore an invaluable source for the study of ancient Mesopotamian religion as it was conceived of in the scribal milieu. In addition to providing us with a “divine lexicon” or inventory of names (their spelling in cuneiform, and sometimes also their pronunciation) – many of which are known also from other types of sources – god lists attest the reflective process by which their composers sought to commit the polytheistic world around them into written form, in a (more or less) organized manner. In composing the lists the scribes would have drawn upon the traditions around them as they existed, in all their various

¹ For lexical lists in general, see Veldhuis 2014; Civil 1995; Cavigneaux 1983; Civil 1974a.

² Steinkeller 2017: 50–57.

expressions – the physical religious landscape of temples and cities throughout the alluvium, each consecrated to a certain deity; myths and songs that expressed and elaborated on these deities, their characteristics and spheres of responsibility, and their relationships to one another; iconographic elements by which deities were made recognizable – to name a few. Much of the theological information expressed in the god lists may have been simply “known,” part of the broad culture, of which all else that we have preserved today is merely an expression. In addition, information was certainly drawn directly from pre-existing lists that had been handed down from previous generations. One could also consider the extent to which scribes may have, in composing their lists, consciously constructed tradition.

Deities within a polytheistic religion do not exist in isolation, but are defined by their relationships with one another.³ A polytheistic system thus inherently provides various relational criteria by which its members might theoretically be organized, whether by an ancient or a modern scholar. The gods could be ordered, for example, according to their age – their emergence according a generational or cosmological scheme – or grouped according to their familial relationships and descent. They might be ordered according to rank – their position according to a scheme of divine political supremacy. Their arrangement might be according to geography, the local centers where their principal cults are found. One might sort them by role – their patronage over a specific sphere of nature or of human society – or, according to their characteristics, grouping together deities that show similar traits. This inevitably leads compilers to consider the issue of syncretism – whether two or more similar deities should be considered manifestations of but one deity, or kept separate. These criteria all overlap in many ways and are by no means mutually exclusive. As shall be seen, An = *Anum* is organized firstly according to rank, and secondly according to divine familial household, with other criteria detectable within subsections as well.

Among the early god lists, however, the theological principle of organization seems not to have been particularly well developed. The principle of organization (or lack thereof) seems instead to have been the same as the one found in lexical lists generally. In all likelihood, the main purpose of these lists was not a systematic portrayal of the pantheon, but instead collecting and compiling the spellings of these names for the purpose of preserving and transmitting the cuneiform writing system.

About 600 years after the emergence of writing and the earliest lexical lists, lists dedicated to the theme of gods appear among the tablets from Fara⁴ (ancient Šuruppak, ca. 2600–2500 B. C.) and Tell Abu Salabikh⁵ – a gap which matches the fact that, among the administrative texts of

the Uruk period (ca. 3200–3000 B. C.), names of gods are largely lacking altogether. Although the majority of names on these early lists are obscure figures, when a rationale for the grouping together of entries is apparent, it is usually according to graphemic principles, such as a shared initial sign (e. g., ^dnin-). Pockets of theological organization can be found (such as the most important deities occurring at the beginning of a list in rank order, or groups of deities known to be associated with each other appearing adjacently), but one in general gets the impression of a “laundry list” style inventory, aimed more at collecting and compiling rather than organizing and portraying relationships.

Similar in this respect is the so-called Weidner list (named after its first modern editor),⁶ probably first composed in Ur III period, sporadically attested in the Old Babylonian period, and continuing to be attested, in expanded form with added explanations, through the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-/Late Babylonian periods, when it is commonly found on school exercise tablets. Some sections of theologically-based ordering can be found, but in general it, though standardized, seems “random,” and not even any sections arranged by clear lexical or graphemic principles can be readily observed.

Likewise well attested on exercise tablets, but during an older period, is the Old Babylonian Nippur God List.⁷ It has a stronger theological basis for some of its organization, particularly in the early part of the list. But as the list progresses from greater to lesser deities, the theological principle breaks down, and the ordering is either acrographic or follows no clear rationale. Other local Old Babylonian god lists, such as the ones from Isin⁸ and Mari⁹, seem to follow much the same pattern of beginning with the highest members of the pantheon (sometimes including also primordial deities), proceeding through certain thematically grouped sections – the sections themselves not appearing in any particular order – and ultimately returning to a simple inventory with a lexically-based arrangement for their latter part.

While a full treatment of the god lists of the third and early second millennium cannot be undertaken here,¹⁰ it seems to be the case that these earlier lists served primarily a scribal and above all pedagogical purpose – particularly clearly so in the case of the Weidner and Nippur lists – and only secondarily a religious or theological one. An incipient tendency towards a theological organization

⁶ Weidner 1924–1925. See further Shibata 2009; Peterson 2009: 81–82; Gesche 2001: 75–76; Cavigneaux 1981: 79–101; Lambert 1971: 474. While the alleged Ur III manuscript of the Weidner list VAT 6563 probably dates rather to the early Old Babylonian period (Veldhuis 2014: 201), internal considerations make it very likely that the Weidner list itself was originally composed in the Ur III period.

⁷ Peterson 2009: 5–77.

⁸ Wilcke 1987: 94–97; 2018: nos. 146–148.

⁹ Lambert 1985a.

¹⁰ An overview of Mesopotamian god lists in general, including the ones edited in this volume, can be found in Lambert 1971. See also Edzard 2004: 582–584 for Old Babylonian god lists in relation to those of the third millennium.

³ For a recent discussion of the structuralist approach to polytheistic religious systems and its application to early Mesopotamia, see Steinkeller 2021: 255–256.

⁴ SF 1 (the great Fara god list); 1*, 3–4; 5–6; see Krebernik 1986.

⁵ OIP 99: nos. 82–84; 86–90; see Alberti 1985 and Mander 1986.

does however seem to have been present in the Nippur and other local god lists. The major breakthrough in this regard, as far as the present evidence can demonstrate, is represented by the list attested on the tablet AO 5376, of unknown provenience. Often referred to as the Old Babylonian “de Genouillac List” after its first publisher, an appropriate name is also “Proto-An = Anum.” A minuscule duplicate fragment excavated from Nippur, while adding little in terms of text, now confirms what one would have already suspected: namely, that Proto-An was not a list unique to a single tablet, but was a traditional composition that enjoyed some level of circulation among the scribes of the Old Babylonian period.

1.3. Proto-An = Anum (“de Genouillac List”)

The principal source for Proto-An is the tablet AO 5376, kept today in the Louvre. It contains, in ten narrow columns without any explanations or line divisions, a theologically organized list that, in content and arrangement, is very clearly a direct predecessor of the first six Tablets of An = Anum. It was first published in handcopy and transliteration in the 1923 volume of *Revue d'Assyriologie* by Henri de Genouillac.¹¹ A second, more idealizing and simplifying handcopy subsequently appeared in 1930 as TCL 15: 10, a volume of cuneiform copies dedicated to Sumerian religious texts.¹² De Genouillac opened his article by affirming an earlier assessment of Heinrich Zimmern,¹³ regarding what had then been known about the composition An = Anum: that it consisted of a systematic portrayal of the relationships between the great gods, primarily according to kinship, in a manner that reiterates theological ideas. He referred to Zimmern's contention that the An = Anum fragments, at that time known only from tablets discovered at Neo-Assyrian Nineveh, were, based on their contents, certainly later copies of more ancient exemplars that, in Zimmern's view, dated back to at least the time of Hammurabi, and perhaps as far back as the Ur III or the first Isin dynasty (de Genouillac 1923: 89; Zimmern 1911: 83–84). The tablet AO 5376, de Genouillac declared, was the definitive proof of Zimmern's hypothesis. Thus, the fact that Proto-An showed a coherent theologically based structure, and was a precursor of An = Anum, was recognized by scholarship from the beginning.

Proto-An has since been cited here and there in the Assyriological literature, usually in the context of studies on the pantheon or on specific theonyms, but there has not been any modern edition, nor a systematic portrayal of the correspondences with canonical An = Anum. Richard Litke drew upon it in his 1958 dissertation (the edition of An = Anum eventually published in 1998), but not systematically. He cited it occasionally to point out a different spelling than in canonical An = Anum, or to restore a

broken name, but he did not treat it as a text of its own. An edition of AO 5376 available on the *Digital Corpus of Cuneiform Lexical Texts* (DCCLT) by an anonymous author is a bare transliteration only.

For a long time AO 5376 was the only evidence for the text of Proto-An. That changed in 2009 with the publication, by Jeremiah Peterson, of a minuscule fragment excavated from Nippur (here reedited as Np₁). It preserves, in two columns, portions of thirteen lines of what was apparently once the same list as that on AO 5376. Thus while it offers little new in terms of the reconstruction of the text, it confirms that Proto-An was not unique to AO 5376, but was a composition with some level of canonicity, and that it was known in the scribal center of Nippur.

While a specific archaeological context is not available for either of the two pieces attesting Proto-An = Anum, the small fragment from Nippur provides an important criterion for dating, in that it is unlikely to postdate the end of the reign of Samsu-iluna of Babylon. The end of that king's reign seems to mark a hiatus in the attestation of scholarly texts at Nippur that would last until the Kassite period.

The classical script of AO 5376 likewise suggests the middle or latter part of the Old Babylonian period. The paleography and layout demonstrate it not to be a mere rough exercise or the work of a pupil, but a finished product, executed by a skilled and educated hand. To judge from the distribution of preserved entries, the Nippur fragment could have come from a tablet with about 75 lines per column (compared to AO 5376 which has an average of 50 per column).¹⁴ This would imply that the fragment too came from a tablet of exemplary quality, not a draft or practice piece. Too few signs are preserved on the Nippur fragment to adequately judge its script, other than to identify it as Old Babylonian. One notable difference with AO 5376 is that the fragment writes the classical DINGIR sign, shaped like a star and composed of four wedges, while AO 5376 has the younger, cursive, three-wedged form. This however is not a good criterion for dating, and it is just as likely to be a feature of style.

Whether they were writing a literary or lexical text, when scribes of the Old Babylonian period chose to execute their work using classical orthography rather than contemporary cursive signs, it likely implies that they sought to represent the content of their tablets as “old” and traditional. In the case of Proto-An, this could well say something about their reasons for writing it.

1.3.1. Summary of Proto-An = Anum

The list begins, like several other OB lists, with the primordial ancestors of Enlil (GEN 1–30), consisting of pairs of males and females in ^den- and ^dnin-, each of which was conceived as begetting the next pair. There follows a small section on Anu (GEN 31–37), the lofty and remote god of heaven, his wife Uraš or Bēlet-ilī (also a name of the mother goddess), and the primordial oceanic figure Namma,

¹¹ de Genouillac 1923.

¹² de Genouillac 1930.

¹³ Zimmern 1911: 83–88.

¹⁴ Peterson 2009: 79.

“the mother who gave birth to heaven and earth.” Then comes the section on Enlil (GEN 38–75), the chief holder of political power in the pantheon, whose decree was thought to provide legitimacy to earthly kings. It includes his wife and his son Ninurta, as well as Dagan (equated with Enlil) and his wife, followed by Išhara, who could also sometimes have counted as Dagan’s wife (although only bynames of Išhara appear, the later canonical version confirms that they refer to her). The bulk of the figures belonging to Enlil’s extended divine household, the temple Ekur, are however placed separately, towards the end of the composition, between the material corresponding to canonical Tablets V and VI; a smaller Ekur subsection, placed earlier, between the material corresponding to canonical Tablets II and III, contains Nuska and his family. This was probably a conscious choice that reflected the relative rank of the deities, and avoided having the material concerning the other great gods placed too close to the end of composition. The feature of an Ekur section disembodied from the Enlil section is also shared by the Mari god list (see Lambert 1985a: 186 on lines 40–45 and 57–62).

The next two sections, corresponding to the later Tablet II, are those of Enki (GEN 76–111), god of wisdom and male fertility, and of Ninḥursag, the mother goddess (GEN 112–130). The Enki section covers his own names and those of his wife, children, vizier, and servants, including Marduk and Nabû. Notably, Asarluḫi and Marduk are listed separately, with the names of several children and servants of Enki intervening between them.

The mother goddess section lists several of her names, with Ninḥursag as the first and primary one; her Akkadian name Bēlet-ili is not given in this context. Then her husband Šulpa’e is listed with several names, followed by two of her children, Lil and Baragulegara. But Lisin, who appears in this context in the canonical version, is listed elsewhere, in a later section of netherworld or terrestrial deities. Another son of hers, Ašgi, is also missing, but somewhat puzzlingly, the figure who in An = *Anum* is called his wife, Gišḫuranki, is present.

Then follows the aforementioned subsection of Ekur deities centered around the fire deity Nuska (GEN 131–147). His position here, apart from the other Ekur deities, could be a reflection of his importance as conceived by the compiler of the list. On the other hand, the section could be explained as relevant not only to Enlil, but also to Enki, since in canonical Tablet II, after Enki’s section, there is a section on a different fire god, Girra, prompted by Enki’s connection, as patron over crafts, to the smith god.

The next three sections deal with the moon (GEN 148–168), sun (GEN 171–189), and storm (GEN 190–196) gods, and correspond precisely to An = *Anum* Tablet III. The moon god section begins with Sin as the first name, followed by Nanna and then Dilim-babbar. At the end of the list of the members of his family and court comes his herdsman Gayu. Likewise, the sun god section, after enumerating the names of Utu/Šamaš, his wife, children, and court, concludes with Šakkan, the deity over herd animals. The storm god section is not very long, and

it seems to lack the name Adad, since the first ^dIM presumably stands for Iškur and the second one is glossed as Mur. The names of his wife, in a small lacuna, are restored from the canonical version.

Between the moon and sun god sections there are two names (GEN 169–170) which seem to refer to the fire deity Girra and his wife; one thinks that perhaps this material should have belonged in the aforementioned fire deity section.

Next comes a quite long section for Inanna/Ištar (GEN 197–278), goddess of love and war, corresponding to canonical Tablet IV. She is given more names than any other deity, and the long list seems to follow a rough thematic organization: her most important titles are given first, followed by names that relate her to a specific cultic location, or that allude to a specific characteristic of hers; after a subsection giving the names of some of her servants, there is a list of names specifically relating to her astral identities. Following the astral section is a section listing several names or identities of Dumuzi. This is followed by a section on Nanaya, along with her husband Muati, whom later tradition identified with Nabû.

The next section is on local, terrestrial deities, who shared some characteristics with one another and later came to be identified with Ninurta. The first three, Lugalbanda, Lugalmarada, and Ninkilim (GEN 279–291), are listed along with their wives (and children in the case of Lugalmarada); they correspond to the first part of canonical Tablet V. The phonetic similarity between the name of the wife of Ninkilim, Ninmuru^(ki), and the Lagashite goddess Nin-MAR(KI), seems to provide the justification for a subsection on Lagashite deities (GEN 292–295), including Nanše and her husband Nindara. Nanše’s being listed first reflects her original importance over her husband. Although Ningirsu, as a form of Ninurta, would have been germane to the subject matter of this section, he does not appear. Next there appear two names containing the initial element Šulpa’e- (GEN 296–297), later identified as attendants of the Emah, the temple of the mother goddess; they are of unclear contextual relevance, since Šulpa’e himself already occurred in the mother goddess section as her husband. Closing the section are Damu (GEN 298–304), a form of (or a deity similar to) Dumuzi, his sister Geštinana, and her sister Belili; they are followed by the chthonic god Ningišzida and his wife Azimua. These figures all seem to fit with the section’s overall theme – they had netherworld associations but were not death deities, they could sometimes be on the surface of the earth, and they might be associated with the steppe or wilderness.

The aforementioned section on Ekur deities (GEN 305–341) comes next. It includes various deities, for whom information about their identities can be gleaned from the later canonical version of An = *Anum*: divine functionaries and their spouses including Enlil’s goat-herds (GEN 305–307), the chief doorkeeper of the Ekur (GEN 308–310), the purifier Kusu (GEN 328–329), Enlil’s chamberlain (GEN 324–325), and a butcher goddess (GEN 330–331). We encounter the scribal expert and wet-

nurse of Sin, Ninimma (GEN 313–315); Ninurta's sister (GEN 318), and a boatman (GEN 317). There is a subsection on grain deities, including Ašnan and Haya (GEN 320–321), the scribal goddess Nisaba (GEN 322–323), the related figure Nanibgal (GEN 326–327), and deities of alcoholic beverages (GEN 332–334). The order in which the Ekur deities are listed differs substantially from the canonical version, and in some cases leaves some uncertainty about their identities (particularly for the names listed around Ninimma).

Next is a section (GEN 342–357) that more or less fits the same theme as the section GEN 279–291, of terrestrial deities with netherworld associations. This material came to be distributed into different places in canonical An = Anum, and some of it (e.g. a small section on Šara of Umma) seems not to have been incorporated at all. This seems to suggest that the compilers found this material somewhat difficult to classify thematically.

GEN 358–399 deals with the healing goddess, and corresponds to the middle part of Tablet V. A single name of her husband, Aba-u, heads the list, followed by several of her names, including Gula, Nintinuga, Ninisina, and Ninkarak; the name Bau, however, is lacking. A list of three more names of her husband, including Pabilsag, interrupts the list of the healing goddess' names. Chief among the healing goddess' servants in this list is the goddess of prisons, (Ma)nungal.

Next, the list comes to the netherworld proper, with GEN 400–457 corresponding to the latter part of canonical Tablet V and the first part of Tablet VI. The section is headed by Ninazu and his wife Ningirida, followed by Ereškigal, the Sumerian queen of the Netherworld, who in some traditions was Ninazu's mother, and is here given the Akkadian name Allatum. Next comes Tišpak, a figure who is likewise connected with Ninazu, in that he seems to have replaced him as the patron deity of the city of Ešnunna in the Old Babylonian period. There follows a subsection on Namtar, the vizier of Ereškigal, which also includes his mother and his wife. The netherworld section continues with a subsection on the twin deities Lugal-irra and Meslamta-e'a, including also the wife of the former, Kuanesi. Next comes Ninšubur, a vizier deity, whose name sometimes referred to a female, the vizier of Inanna. In An = Anum he appears in his male form as the vizier of An, but perhaps a heavenly vizier is out of place here in the netherworld section. Following a deity Lugal-aba and his wife – to judge from his name, apparently conceived of as the patron over the ocean – begins the section on Nergal, the king of the netherworld. After Nergal's wife, children, and his own additional names, comes a section of names in ^dlugal-, that all seem to be old local deities similar to Nergal. The second aspect of the names "king (of) ..." generally refers to some feature of cultic topography with a netherworld connotation. Some apparent exceptions to this pattern still seem close enough to the general theme of chthonic warrior deities – for example, ^dlugal-kur-dub₂, "king who makes the foreign lands tremble," should refer to an aspect or official of Ninurta or Ningirsu.

Finally, there is a section of deities that later tradition identified as forms of Enki, each one embodying some specific profession or craft (GEN 458–471). These deities were probably placed here because of their low rank compared to the rest of the pantheon. The tradition of placing the Enki-related craft deities at the end of the composition seems to have been maintained in An = Anu ša amēli, while in canonical An = Anum they were placed at the end of Tablet II, after Enki's section. The last two entries on the tablet seem to be an appendix that should have belonged to the healing goddess section, listing a byname of Gula, and an apparently abbreviated form of her husband's name, Pabilsag (GEN 472–473).

1.3.2. Structure and Purpose of Proto-An = Anum

It seems likely that Proto-An = Anum was created specifically in order to satisfy the intellectual need to define and delimit the classical Babylonian pantheon, rather than for general lexical purposes. It is certainly the earliest list we have that was able to successfully do so in a structured manner. The assessment of Lambert (Lambert 1985a: 182), that it is "basically a very simple list expanded at some points" is perhaps too negative. Proto-An displays a clear, coherent, and consistent organization that is already built on essentially the same principles as An = Anum.

The heads of the pantheon are listed first of all by all their various names or manifestations, followed then by their extended circle – a divine familial household, conceived of like a royal court. This family is also presented hierarchically, beginning with the deity's spouse and children, proceeding through high officials (such as viziers), and concluding with lesser servants. Beyond that, deities sharing certain characteristics are grouped together. There may be a few entries that seem out of place, but these exceptions in turn prove the general rule. There are no sections that are built purely on lexical or graphemic principles with no regard to thematic criteria. While there is indeed a section of names in ^dnin- (GEN 211–236), these turn out to be thematically related, being names of Inanna (in contrast to a ^dnin- section in the OB Mari god list, where male deities as well as female appear, see Lambert 1985a: 187 on lines 63–106). Similarly, the gods in the ^dlugal- section (GEN 425–455) all seem, to the extent it can be determined, deities in some way similar to Nergal.

The main difference compared to canonical An = Anum is that in Proto-An there are no explanatory notations given, and the relationships between the deities are only implicit. It had to be taken for granted that, following the main name of a deity, there came a list of his alternate names, and at some point this list ended and his wife's name was given, followed by those of his children, servants, etc. This information was simply already known, and/or transmitted orally. There are also no markers indicating the end of one thematic section and the beginning of another. As we shall see, canonical An = Anum did the ancient and modern "audiences" the favor of making these

relationships explicit by means of an explanatory subcolumn. Indeed, An = *Anum* has greatly aided our identification of the individual figures and overall structure of Proto-An.

For simplicity's sake, one can conceptualize the later An = *Anum* as having been composed on the basis of the text we are calling Proto-An = *Anum*, as an expansion or elaboration. This matches the evidence as we presently have it. It is theoretically possible that the scribe who wrote An = *Anum* sat down with a duplicate of AO 5376 (or a very similar text) and added the additional material and explanations; the relationship is that close. However, it is also possible that the background was more complicated, and that there were other intermediary developmental stages (theoretically, expanded versions of Proto-An).¹⁵ Or, An = *Anum* could have been based on some lost "cousin" of Proto-An. Other earlier lists, not yet attested, may have also been drawn upon in compiling An = *Anum*, being incorporated as subsections. Bearing these caveats in mind, it still makes sense to speak of An = *Anum* as having directly developed from Proto-An. Regarding the recensional history of An = *Anum*, we now have one text available, CBS 331 (see below), which represents an early form of Tablet I.

The present edition of Proto-An is preceded by a structural outline with references to the corresponding passages in canonical An = *Anum*. The transliteration also contains cross references to the specific canonical Tablet and line number containing the corresponding entry. Finally, in the edition of An = *Anum* itself the corresponding lines in Proto-An are listed on the left. This should serve to make the relationships between the two texts as clear as possible and provide a basis for further study.

1.4. Tablet I Forerunner CBS 331

Some light on the recensional history of An = *Anum* Tablet I can be shed thanks to the existence of the substantial fragment CBS 331 (Fr₁), now published in handcopy as CTL 2: 485. In terms of its content, it seems to be the oldest extant witness of canonical An = *Anum*, bearing significant recensional differences that underscore the incipient nature of the composition. Its actual physical age compared to other MB witnesses (e.g., Np₂ or Ht), however, cannot be determined. The text was identified and copied by Lambert. A partial transliteration by Jeremiah Peterson has appeared online, on the *DCCLT*, and the text was briefly discussed by Niek Veldhuis.¹⁶ The script of CBS 331 looks Middle Babylonian; some signs are clearly on the younger/

simpler side (e.g. the forms of MA, LUGAL, and RA). The overall form and shape of the tablet, as far as preserved, seems somewhat reminiscent of AO 5376. Like the other MB copies and unlike AO 5376, every line is ruled, but unlike the other MB copies, the ruling does not extend into the explanatory subcolumn.

Another striking characteristic that sets it apart from other An = *Anum* witnesses is the underdeveloped state of the explanatory column. In the reverse column ii, it is about two-thirds as wide as the names column, and on reverse column i, at the right edge of the tablet, it is less than half as wide. In contrast, later copies have explanatory subcolumns that are either about the same width as the names column, (e.g. the MA ms. *α*), or significantly larger, as much as twice as wide (e.g. the NA ms. N₁). Visibly, the explanatory column is also sparsely populated. The explanations are brief and in a somewhat smaller script, and the column is left blank where later repeating ŠU notations would occur. Instead of repeating MINs, a numerical sequence is used, a tradition maintained by a minority of later copies. The explanatory phrases are briefer and of a more archaic character than later: one observes dam-a-ni instead of dam-bi munus or nita; the omission of the genitival ending -ke₄; the label AN-gub-ba "attendant" but with the owner of the personnel left implied. This all makes the explanatory column seem more like something "extra" than an inherent part of the text. It probably demonstrates that it was at this point still a somewhat recent addition.

The sequence of entries also shows a composition still in development, on its way from Proto-An to the canonical version. While the beginning of the tablet is broken, it clearly already had the new material on Anu and his vizier Ninšubur (see below), although to estimate from the available space, this section seems to have been a bit shorter. One observes that the four lines rev. i 7–10 correspond precisely to Proto-An lines 262–267 and canonical Tablet I lines 262–263 and 266–267; however, canonical lines 264–265, which are new names¹⁷ not paralleled in Proto-An, are not yet present. Another example concerns names of Ninurta: in obv. iii 9'–12', four names of Ninurta are given, corresponding precisely to his four names as given in Proto-An 62–65, with the exception that Ninurta's main name has been moved to the end of the list. The sequence of preceding and following entries in the immediate environment also exactly correspond to Proto-An. In a separate section (within the material concerning the Ekur), rev. 19–30, a second sequence of twelve Ninurta names is given, all of which are novel in canonical An = *Anum*. They correspond to canonical lines 196–211; however, lines 198, 201, 210, 212–214 and 216–217 are not yet present.¹⁸ These new names of Ninurta were later moved and joined

¹⁵ A recently published Old Babylonian list (Ceccarelli 2020) has been alleged by its editor to constitute an extract of an An = *Anum* forerunner, supposedly attesting a stage of development in between Proto-An and the canonical text, yet closer to the canonical one (ibid.: 30). However, the text in question, despite sharing a number of names with each list, does not bear a close structural relationship either to Proto-An or to An = *Anum*. It is certainly not more similar to either Proto-An or to canonical An = *Anum* than those two lists are to each other. Thus, it is not considered here.

¹⁶ Veldhuis 2014: 257–258.

¹⁷ The new entries (^dalad-sa₆-ga and ^dlamma-sa₆-ga) are present on MA, MB, NA, and NB tablets, showing that they entered the stream of tradition.

¹⁸ Note that of these, lines 198, 212, 214, and 216 are represented only by the two large MA copies, but the rest of them occur on these two as well as one NA copy (with a lacuna from 200–203, probably without omissions) and one NB copy (from 210 onwards).

together with his old names earlier in the list, with Ninurta's main name placed second to last. This all suggests that the transition from Proto-An to canonical An = Anum was a process of accretion, with new material and more elaborate explanations gradually added, followed also at some point by a reorganization.

Significantly, a catchline giving the first line of Tablet II is preserved, showing that at least the first two members of the series were already in place, and that the mother goddess section had already been moved to its canonical position, before that of Enki.

The exact chronological relationship of the Tablet I forerunner CBS 331 (Fr₁) to manuscripts Np₂ and Ht (see below § 1.5.4) is uncertain. Np₂, while not displaying, in its preserved portion, any of the recensional archaisms of Fr₁, actually looks somewhat older in terms of its script (although such impressions can be misleading). If Fr₁ were in fact older than Np₂, the fact that Np₂ is from Nippur (while Fr₁ is from an unknown site in Babylonia) could explain the older-looking (archaizing) script of Np₂, despite its actual age. On the other hand, if Np₂ were in fact older than Fr₁, as the script seems to suggest, then it could have been the case that older recensions of An = Anum persisted for longer at sites other than Nippur. As for the Hattuša witness Ht, it remains, due to its peripheral nature, difficult to judge its age relative to the other manuscripts, but the recensional evidence suggests, at any rate, a closer relationship to the Middle Assyrian material than the Babylonian.

1.5. An = Anum

The existence of An = Anum was first revealed to the modern world already in 1866 and 1870 with the publication of Henry Rawlinson's *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, volumes II and III, containing cuneiform copies prepared by Edwin Norris and George Smith, respectively. Fragments belonging to An = Anum were in vol. II, nos. 54–58 and III, nos. 67–69. While it was recognized that these tablets contained lists of the names and titles of gods, they were at this point yet poorly understood and the copies contained many errors. Further reference to these early copies is not made in this book.

A great improvement was made with the publication of *Cuneiform Texts in the British Museum*, volume XXIV, in 1908, followed in 1909 by volume XXV. These volumes contain handcopies by Leonard W. King of all the then-known tablets in the British Museum belonging to the series An = Anum, whose name and numbering could be identified by preserved colophons. CT 25 also published other god lists, some of which could be identified as related to An = Anum. King was an excellent copyist, and his work is still quite reliable today over a century later, with the few errors and shortcomings being mostly limited to damaged portions of the tablets.

These tablets all came from early British excavations at Nineveh, the capital of the Neo-Assyrian empire. In his in-

troduction to CT 24, King recognized the importance of these lists as a source for religious history, and understood their basic organizing principle, of treating the gods along with their divine households. He remarked that this conception revealed that the Babylonian not only endowed his god with human form, but viewed him as living a life precisely similar to his own, the divine temple being imagined as an earthly royal court. Since each god needed his own entourage, he proposed this led to a ballooning of the number of gods in the pantheon, which, for King, necessitated a consultation manual for priests, should any doubt about the identity of a specific deity arise. An = Anum represented therefore in this early view a reference index to help clerics deal with this abundance of names. King recognized and pointed out the existence of duplicates among his material, especially the "great god list," K 4349 (ms. β in the present edition, see further below), a massive but fragmentary tablet containing the entire series. But with the presentation limited to handcopies, the interpretation and reconstruction of the series beyond what each individual witness contained remained the purview only of specialists.

The publication of CT 24 and CT 25 attracted the interest of scholarship, above all in Germany. In 1909 and 1910, there appeared reviews by Bruno Meissner of each of the two volumes, in which he offered many philological notes and suggestions for improved readings, as well as pointing out the existence of duplicates among the corpus that had not been noted by King. Meissner's reviews were made in collaboration with Heinrich Zimmern, who, building upon that initial work, produced the first comprehensive reconstruction of An = Anum in 1911, greatly increasing the accessibility of the material. Zimmern transliterated the whole series as it was then known and presented it in a tabular format, while providing partial translations and philological commentary. For the first time he was able to place the various fragmentary tablets of the series in their correct order, drawing upon the ordering of the names as presented in the Emesal god list (since published in MSL 4: 3–10) as a parallel (although the arrangement in the Emesal list is by no means completely identical to the one in An = Anum).

The next breakthrough in the study of An = Anum came with the 1958 doctoral dissertation of Richard Litke. It was eventually published as a book in 1998, with its core text unchanged, but with the addition of an introduction by William W. Hallo and an index by Maria deJong Ellis. Litke's work made available the "sister" tablet to King's K 4349 – YBC 2401, held in the Yale Babylonian Collection and of unknown provenience – another massive compilation tablet containing the entire series, this one much more well-preserved. With the whole series laid out in such a manner, it allowed the certain arrangement of the individual Tablets in the series and their individual entries in proper order, and small fragments could now be integrated into their proper place. The Yale tablet also supplied much material that had been previously missing. Aside from this, Litke was able to add some new non-Nineveh sources

that had become available since the edition of Zimmern, including above all the fragments excavated by the Germans from Aššur and published in 1920 by Otto Schroeder in *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts*, about a dozen in number. Litke's corpus still suffered, however, from a near total dearth of Babylonian exemplars of the series; while internal considerations made it clear already to the scholars of the early 20th century that An = *Anum* had to be a Babylonian product, Litke could only include two small Middle Babylonian witnesses from Nippur (Np₃ and Np₄). With the publication of the present volume, that picture changes dramatically. Over 30 witnesses to An = *Anum* of Babylonian origin are included.

The large part of these were identified and copied in the British Museum by the late W. G. Lambert, and are now published in the volume *Cuneiform Texts from the Folios of W. G. Lambert, Part 2*. Lambert had already begun his own edition of An = *Anum* around the time that Litke was working on his, and he continued to work on it throughout the 1960s and 70s. As one of the foremost experts on Mesopotamian mythology and religion, his edition had been eagerly anticipated by the scholarly community, especially since Litke's edition, while adequate for consultation, offered little in the way of commentary on either philological or religious matters. However, despite having produced handwritten draft editions of the whole series, Lambert was only ever able to complete a typewritten edition, with commentary, of Tablets I, II, III, and the first half of V. He was never able to bring into publication his intended book on the god lists. With the passage of time, Lambert's original transliterations have grown antiquated. Some new material has also since appeared. Lambert's commentary consisted of an eclectic mix of philology and religious history, containing many precious insights, but being now some 45 years old, it is no longer suitable for publication. For these reasons, the present edition, while relying on Lambert's work as its core, has been constructed anew from the ground up.

In the meantime, an online edition of some of the individual witnesses of An = *Anum* has appeared on the *Digital Corpus of Cuneiform Lexical Texts* (DCCLT), prepared by Jeremiah Peterson and Lluís Feliu. Also on the same website are composite editions of Tablets I-VII and of An = *Anum ša amēli*, by an anonymous author and largely based on the work of Litke.

1.5.1. The Reconstruction of An = *Anum*

The text of An = *Anum* is here presented in a reconstructed form, whereby fragmentary tablets written in diverse times and places are pieced together to produce a readable edition of what the complete composition may have looked like. The result might be somewhat artificial, in that it is unlikely that any single tablet had the exact text we reconstruct. We are forced by the chances of preservation to adopt an eclectic array of readings, sometimes choosing based on our own considerations which reading to adopt from among duplicate manuscripts. Still, a composite

text is of great benefit to modern study. A continuous text above all facilitates the study of the overall structure of the list. Further towards this end, before the edition of each Tablet, an outline of its contents has been provided. Lastly, a summary of the content of each tablet with particular regard to its descent from Proto-An is given below (§ 1.5.7).

The effects of the inevitable "flattening" of a composite edition are mitigated by the notation of any textual variants in the critical apparatus at the bottom of the page, so that the reader can have a complete view of the diversity among the preserved witnesses. No attempt has been made to make the edition reflect any one particular "tradition." Rather, for each entry for which a variant exists, a judgement has been made as to which form seems to be the best. Only exceptionally does the reconstructed line contain a hybrid form from different witnesses, and the variants apparatus will make it clear when this is the case.

In fact, on the basis of the present evidence, one cannot speak of the existence of different versions or recensions of An = *Anum* in the strict sense. The variants are on the level of individual details. Names can be spelled differently; one name might be substituted for another, or perhaps an extra name might be added or subtracted here and there – but there are in general no great structural differences, whereby an entire passage might be moved or inserted elsewhere, or material of a completely different nature be introduced. In its overall form, the composition is remarkably stable considering a range of attestation spanning close to a millennium.

On facing pages, the sources that have been used in the reconstruction for a given line are also presented in tabular form, with indications as to their state of preservation, so that the reader can have a clear view of the material utilized in the reconstruction. The individual manuscripts are given in separate transliteration in Part II of this volume, since they are each, in their own respect, a witness to a tradition belonging to a specific time and place. A brief description of each witness provides contextual information as well as a physical description of its format and state of preservation.

1.5.2. The Middle Assyrian "Elephant" Tablets

The very large Middle Assyrian tablets YBC 2401 (α) and K 4349 (β) remain the backbone of the reconstruction of An = *Anum*. Each preserves portions of all seven canonical Tablets, and they are still the only witnesses to certain passages. Likely to emphasize their extraordinary size, Lambert referred to huge tablets like these (*tupgallu* in the ancient terminology) not merely as large, but as "monster tablets."¹⁹ Perhaps to evoke a friendlier image we can call them "elephants" – modern libraries often refer to very large volumes (over 58 cm tall) as "elephant folios."

Both of their colophons inform that they were the work of one and the same scribe, named Kidin-Sin, son of Sutú. Manuscript α was purchased from an antiquities

¹⁹ E. g. Lambert 1960: 337; Lambert 2013: 421.

dealer and so has no known archaeological provenience, while K 4349 was excavated at Neo-Assyrian Nineveh, where it was kept as a relict, already over four centuries old. Most likely it was part of the library of Aššurbanipal, but it is anyone's guess as to when it first came to Nineveh – whether it had been collected by Aššurbanipal or if it had already been kept at Nineveh for some time. Since one other Middle Assyrian source in our corpus from Nineveh made its way into a private collection (the piece X₁ likely joining to N₁₇), it is possible that the Yale tablet too was illicitly excavated from Nineveh. On the other hand, it could have come from Aššur, since tablets from that site came onto the antiquities market before World War I, and since another tablet written by Kidin-Sin was excavated there (see below).

Kidin-Sin is thought to have worked during the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I (1114–1076 B.C.).²⁰ Since he identifies his father Sutû as a “royal scribe,” Kidin-Sin too, if not already a royal employee, was likely being trained to follow in his father's footsteps. A third tablet bearing his colophon (the “KAR 4” myth and syllable alphabet) has been excavated at Aššur, suggesting that this was his seat of activity, at that time the capital of Assyria. Ms. α and KAR 4 give his title as *dub-sar tur* “junior scribe” while on β he, remarkably, identifies himself and his father as an A.BA, “alphabetic scribe”²¹ – one of the earliest references (if not the earliest) to the use of an alphabet in Mesopotamia. Rarely attested in the Middle Assyrian period,²² the title A.BA would become increasingly common in the first millennium.²³

Whether or not Kidin-Sin was also occupied part-time with writing in alphabetic script, he was clearly a master of cuneiform. Sources α and β are among the most impressive surviving examples of Mesopotamian calligraphy, both for their sheer size and for their exceedingly minute, densely

packed, and neatly arranged script (see the description in Part II before each individual transliteration for details). It is unlikely that an average scribe could have produced work of this quality. Indeed, we are probably right to suspect that Kidin-Sin was showing off. The subject matter – also of his other preserved tablet KAR 4, a creation myth with a mystical and esoteric character²⁴ – seems to be one that would demonstrate that this man of foreign descent had received an education befitting a royal scribe in prestigious Babylonian scribal art, both in its technical sense and in cultural and religious aspects as well. While α and KAR 4 give his title as “junior scribe,” implying status as a pupil, it could well have been the case that the completion of works like these were precisely what qualified him to “graduate” to the status of a full-fledged scribe.

Both α and β compile in a single manuscript all seven canonical Tablets of An = Anum, as well as an additional list, related but of a rather different nature: An = Anum *ša amēli* (on which see § 1.6 below). Manuscript β also squeezes in an array of additional list material, not attested elsewhere and unfortunately only fragmentarily preserved, here edited as the Appendix to An = Anum (see § 1.11). A subcolophon at the end of each member of the series gives a subtotal for the number of entries, and ms. α also provides the Tablets' numeration. The tradition followed by Kidin-Sin apparently divided our Tablet I into two separate Tablets. According to ms. β (obv. i 128; the position is not preserved in ms. α) the division was drawn at line 192, and for this reason the numerations given in ms. α are each one higher than expected (this tradition may also have been followed by A₁ and Ht). Mss. α and β seem, however, to have drawn the division between their Tablet I and Tablet II at different positions, since the colophon preserved at the end of “Tablet II” (i. e., Tablet I) in α . A.02.146 gives a subtotal of 209 entries, whereas that of β . A.02.73 gives a subtotal of only 148 entries.

According to its final colophon, ms. α was copied according to “(several) old tablets (of standard size).” That of ms. β instead states its copying was according to “an old huge tablet” (i. e., one of the same magnitude as α and β itself), whereby it seems improbable that this “old huge tablet” simply refers to Kidin-Sin's own tablet, ms. α . A tablet written by the very same scribe is unlikely to have counted as “old,” and moreover, the texts of mss. α and β are by no means identical but contain recensional differences and varying spellings.²⁵ The statement on ms. β of having been copied according to a single “huge tablet” seems

²⁰ W. Hallo in Litke 1998: viii; Hunger 1968: 31–32, nos. 50–51; Weidner 1952–1953: 203–204. Cf. however the discussions in Freydanck 1991: 94–97 and Pedersén 1985: 31–42.

²¹ For the interpretation of A.BA as “alphabetic scribe” see Schniedewind 2013: 86–87 and Hallo 1996: 39–40 (a skeptical view is presented in Bloch 2018: 12–13, fn. 29). Aside from the *prima facie* obvious reference to the first two letters of an alphabet, that the title is attested for the first time at 13th century Ugarit, where an alphabetic cuneiform script was in use, seems to render such an interpretation unavoidable. That the equivalent of A.BA could be expressed simply by the generic term DUB.SAR/*tupšarru* “scribe” need not contradict the primary meaning of the logogram, without which a specific term for “alphabetic scribe” would be lacking in Neo-Assyrian times. From the Neo-Babylonian period onward such alphabetic scribes were called *šepīru* (or *šepīru*), written with the rather similar logogram A.BAL (see Pearce 1999 and Bloch 2018). The suggestions in Wagensonner 2018: 269, fn. 243, that A.BA “might indicate a certain stage in the career of a scribe” or be merely an “orthographical variant” of DUB.SAR/*tupšarru* are unlikely.

²² See Jakob 2003: 237 for occurrences in the Middle Assyrian corpus and Deller 1982 for the occurrence of A.BA on an impressive seal of a royal scribe Aššur-šumī-ašbat, who may have been a contemporary of Kidin-Sin.

²³ A connection between the title “alphabetic scribe” and Kidin-Sin's apparent foreign, western origin suggests itself – his origin being indicated by his father's name “the Sutean” (usually a rather negatively-loaded term, here probably a kind of ethnic nickname rather than the name he was given at birth). Cf. the remarks in Pearce 1999: 363.

²⁴ See Lambert 2013: 350f.

²⁵ One could question, in this instance and generally, to what degree a scribe was “free” to innovate or adjust spellings according to preference when copying from an exemplar. To take just one example, for Tablet I, line 81, α writes (along with N₁ and B₂) ⁴en-du₆-ku₃-ta-e₃-de₃, while β gives [⁴en-d]u₆-ku₃-ga-e₃-de₃. This seems more likely to be attributable to a difference in Kidin-Sin's exemplar (the alternation TA/GA might suggest Babylonian script) than a conscious choice or a mistake at copying his own tablet. Other peculiarities in Kidin-Sin's copies suggest a Babylonian *Vorlage*, for example in Tablet I, line 299, both tablets write *pirig₃-BI*, where BI likely represents a misinterpreted Babylonian GA.

somewhat contradictory in light of Kidin-Sîn's additional remark that he included the extra material because, having written all that he set out to, there was still enough room left for more. If the extra material really was a kind of afterthought, it would imply that his primary exemplar did not contain the extra material to begin with, but that he drew upon additional, smaller sources for them. Rather than an unexpected coincidence, Kidin-Sîn clearly tried from the start in β to make his material occupy as little space as possible, exploiting the double-column format to write two entries in a single line of text, and omitting redundant notations – a practice he did not follow in α . The matter is speculative, but it seems more likely that α was the text he wrote first, followed later by β .

While neither colophon makes a statement about the geographical origin of Kidin-Sîn's exemplars, it is noteworthy that among the later first millennium corpus, when such a statement of provenience is preserved, the origin of the exemplar in six out of eight instances is Babylon (two of them are on Assyrian tablets from Nineveh, the other four on Babylonian tablets), with one referring to Borsippa (a Babylonian tablet) and one to "Assyria" (a Nineveh tablet). Ultimately An = *Anum* had to have entered Assyria from Babylonia, but we do not know if Kidin-Sîn copied from Babylonian tablets or from Assyrian ones that were already in circulation there.

It has been commonly assumed that the transmission of An = *Anum* into Assyria, along with bilingual Sumero-Akkadian literary compositions and other such texts, could have been connected with the forays into Babylonia on the part of Assyrian kings Tukulti-Ninurta I and Tiglath-Pileser I.²⁶ However, the traditional view has been called into question, of whether the tablets from Middle Assyrian Aššur were really part of a royal, institutional library²⁷ (a category which by implication could have once included α and β since Kidin-Sîn's third tablet, KAR 4, was found there). While this matter is too complicated to deal with here, at least in this particular case, Kidin-Sîn's paternal affiliation to a "royal scribe" should probably be taken at face value. Regardless of how exactly the tablets were stored – in individual scribe's houses or in a central archive – and whether or not they were written at the personal behest of the king, the title implies that Kidin-Sîn was a royal dependent and that he was trained and worked under royal auspices.²⁸ Without getting into a discussion of the highly problematic contrast between "public" and "private" in the ancient world, it is questionable to what degree the label "private" could be meaningful for a royal scribe working at the royal capital, even if we do not know the details of his

affiliation. The extraordinary character of Kidin-Sîn's tablets is itself suggestive, as well as the fact that β was found (still?) as part of a royal collection over four hundred years after it was written.

One modern theory regarding source β must be discussed, namely, the contention that it is not an authentic product of the Middle Assyrian period, but was produced by Neo-Assyrian scribes working for Aššurbanipal.²⁹ Further, the theory alleges that ms. α served as the basis for this later copy, being supposedly the very "old huge tablet" referred to in the colophon. However, this is almost certainly not the case. The Middle Assyrian idiosyncrasies of β , shared also with α , against the later Nineveh witnesses are many. In the spelling of names, sign forms and other redactional elements, not a single indication that could betray the hand of a later scribe can be found (the spelling *qaqquru* in the colophon of β as an alleged Neo-Assyrianism can hardly suffice as proof of a late date, for then one would have to suppose the scribe produced a perfect "forgery" but then lapsed in this one detail, which at any rate cannot be proven to be diagnostic). Furthermore, β contains extra material not included in α , nor attested anywhere else. Neither can ms. α have been the source of the identification in ms. β of the scribe as an "alphabetic scribe" (A.BA), since in α he is simply a "junior scribe" (as also in KAR 4).³⁰ If a tablet so monumental as β had been produced by an Aššurbanipal scribe, one expects he would have appended an Aššurbanipal colophon to the original one. The redactional differences between α and β are better explained by the differing source material than as updates or mistakes made by a later copyist. The shared elements – the extremely minute script and masterful execution over such a large surface – are unlikely to be anything else but the product of the same scribal hand. And lastly, Middle Assyrian tablets originally from Aššur but found at Neo-Assyrian Nineveh are by no means an unknown phenomenon.³¹ Quite simply, the plain facts show that α and β are both the exceptional work of one and the same Middle Assyrian scribe, and there is no reason at all to suppose otherwise.

The indirectly joining fragments that make up α all share a single museum number, while β consists of several separately numbered pieces, most here edited and placed in their proper position for the first time.³²

²⁹ Lassen/Frahm/Wagensonner 2019: 233, apud Beaulieu 1992: 72, n. 19; Wagensonner 2018: 237, fn. 81.

³⁰ The statement in Wagensonner op. cit. that the colophon of KAR 4 also has A.BA, when it in fact has ¹⁰²dub-sar (tur) – as the author's own copy and the photo available on CDLI P282595 indicate – is wrong.

³¹ For a list of such tablets, see Pedersén 1985: 41–42.

³² See the individual witness editions in the Part II of this volume. Lambert 1992: 50 confidently identified the fragment K 20549 (now CTL 2: 518) as part of ms. β , but this cannot be confirmed at present. Because no divine names can be readily identified on that fragment, it is not included in the present edition.

²⁶ E.g. Rubio 2011: 97, fn. 23; see Weidner 1952–1953.

²⁷ Fincke 2003–2004: 138; Freydank 1991: 94–97; Lambert 1976: 85–86, fn. 2.

²⁸ Jakob 2002: 256 states that, while details about Middle Assyrian scribal education are scant, it is relatively improbable that the Assyrian administration did not direct the education of scribes and determine the "lesson plan" from the very beginning, considering that such scribes formed the very backbone of the administrative apparatus.

1.5.3. Other Middle Assyrian Sources

Aside from the two enormous tablets, only a handful of Middle Assyrian sources of An = Anum are known. None of them are close to fully preserved tablets; they are all small to medium-small sized fragments. They can be identified as Middle Assyrian by their script and format. They are eight in total: six from Aššur (one of them, A₈, consisting of two joining pieces), one from Nineveh, and one from a private collection that almost certainly belongs to the same original tablet as the Nineveh piece. They attest portions of Tablets I, III, IV, V, and VII.

The six MA Aššur fragments were excavated by Walter Andrae sometime between 1903 and 1914. For four of them (A₁, A₆, A₈, A₁₁) there is no findspot recorded; the other two (like other MA tablets from Aššur) were found in later Neo-Assyrian contexts (A₇ from the Aššur temple, A₁₀ from a private household belonging to a family of exorcists).³³ Both of those two pieces, moreover, are said to be of baked clay. This probably underscores the fact that they were created as exemplary pieces meant for long-term storage, and indeed were stored at Aššur for several centuries. The piece A₈ bears a fragmentarily preserved *limmu* year.

The Nineveh MA fragment (N₂₀) was excavated from an unknown findspot in Nineveh by L. W. King in 1904 and published in handcopy by Theophile J. Meek in 1920. It cannot be said for certain if it was kept as a relict in the library of Aššurbanipal (like β), but this is the most likely option. The history of the acquisition of its indirectly joining piece X₁ is unknown, only that it was located in Chicago at some point in time (see the description in Part II). It is published here for the first time.

The MA fragments differ from one another in external appearance. A₁ has a layout by which small groups of entries are separated by dividing lines into “cases,” giving it an archaic, grid-like appearance (a feature shared by the Hattuša ms. Ht). A₇ has every line ruled, much like a Middle Babylonian tablet (see below). X₁+N₁₇ has every line ruled on the obverse, but on the reverse switches to drawing ruling lines between small groups of related deities. The rest of them seem to follow much the same formatting conventions as the first millennium tablets. They either have no preserved ruling lines (A₁₁), or only draw them between large groups of deities (A₆, A₉, A₁₀). A₁ seems only to have contained enough room for the first half of Tablet I (up to line 192), and therefore probably followed the same convention as α and β (and possibly Ht), of dividing that Tablet into two separate ones.

1.5.4. Middle Babylonian Sources

While canonical An = Anum had its origin in Middle Babylonian times, this remains the most poorly documented period in its transmission history. So far, only Tablets I and

V are represented by Middle Babylonian evidence. There are a total of nine fragments (two of which very likely belong to the same original tablet).³⁴ Five of them were excavated at Nippur (Np₂, Np₃, Np₄, Np₅, Np₆) and three (including the two joining pieces) were excavated at Babylon (B₁, B₁₃₊₁₄). One outlier, included here for lack of any other appropriate categorization and consisting of two joining fragments, was excavated at Hattuša-Boğazköy in central Anatolia (Ht). None of them come close to preserving the full composition, due either to their state of preservation, or their status as excerpt tablets. They range in size from minuscule (Np₃, Np₄, Np₆) to the smaller side of medium (Np₂, Np₅, B₁, B₁₃₊₁₄, Ht). Of all of these, only Np₃ and Np₅ were known to Litke.

The Babylon fragments were excavated by Robert Koldevey in 1908: B₁ from the so-called diviner’s library and B₁₃₊₁₄ from a large house containing a “large collection of school tablets” (which, despite this appellation, clearly contained many reference-quality tablets, our pieces among them). B₁, kept in the Vorderasiatisches Museum in Berlin, was published in handcopy by Jan van Dijk in 1987 in *Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*, Heft XXIV, no. 17; a second copy by Lambert has been published in 2021 as CTL 2: 487. B₁₃₊₁₄ are kept in Istanbul, and are published here for the first time, transliterated according to excavation photographs, kept in the Berlin museum, of the still uncleaned tablets.

Np₂ is part of the Hilprecht Collection in Jena, and so was excavated at Nippur during the early campaigns conducted between 1898 and 1900. Np₄, Np₅ and Np₆ are kept in the University of Pennsylvania Museum in Philadelphia, and likewise seem to stem from these early campaigns. Np₃, also in Philadelphia, was excavated by Richard Haines during the 1949–50 season. Np₅ was published already in handcopy by Edward Chiera in 1927, as *Sumerian Lexical Texts from the Temple School of Nippur*, no. 121. Np₃, though then unpublished, was used by Litke in his edition, and Lambert’s handcopy is finally published as CTL 2: 492. Np₆ was published by Niek Veldhuis in 2000 and Np₄ by Jeremiah Peterson in 2007. Np₂ is published here for the first time.

Three of the fragments represent excerpts or extracts (Np₃, Np₆, and B₁), produced by scribes who had yet to complete their education, as part of their training. Np₄ is

³⁴ Veldhuis 2000: 73 identified the Nippur fragments 14-N 259 (a, b, c) as a MB source of An = Anum (photographs in Zettler 1993: plate 103), further stating that 14-N 259b preserved glosses for the Marduk section of Tablet II: 184–194 (in the present edition’s numbering). While the fragment indeed preserves glosses of Marduk names, the sequence is not the same as in An = Anum (the glosses correspond to lines 184, 174, 185, 192, and 194). See Veldhuis 2014: 256, fn. 570 for the identification of those fragments as belonging to Diri VII. An MB exercise tablet from Nippur containing an extract of An = Anum, 12-N 595 (also referred to in Veldhuis op. cit.), first reported in Civil 1978: 120, unfortunately cannot be located at the present time. The Nippur fragment HS 1764 (see Veldhuis/Hilprecht 2003–2004: no. 33 and Oelsner 2006), referred to in Veldhuis 2014: 256, fn. 570 as a version of An = Anum VI, does not, in fact, correspond with any other known fragment of that list, and so cannot be integrated into the present reconstruction.

³³ See the descriptions to the individual witnesses in Part II for more information and references.

too small a fragment to tell whether or not it was an extract. Np₃ and Np₆ match the typical profile of a Middle Babylonian exercise tablet.³⁵ In complete form they were rectangular or pillow-shaped, and contained a few lines from a literary composition on the obverse and a few lines from a lexical text on the reverse (Np₆ contains a few lines of *Inanna's Descent*, while the composition on the other side of Np₃ is too fragmentary to identify). B₁ however, is unusual. Though also rectangular and pillow-shaped, it seems to have been larger in size than a typical exercise tablet, and it contains its text in a single, continuous column from obverse to reverse. Still, the preserved lines show it cannot have contained the whole text of Tablet I, and its somewhat sloppy execution suggests its scribe was still on his way towards mastery of the cuneiform script.

Np₂, Np₅, B₁₃₊₁₄, and Ht, on the other hand, represent the remains of complete tablets meant to serve as permanent records, as can be deduced from their proportions and from the line numbers of the composition they contain. Np₅, though only representing the upper left corner of the complete tablet, preserves the better part of a colophon, confirming its status as an exemplary copy. From what is left of Np₅ and B₁₃₊₁₄, they seem to have been similar in script and external appearance to Np₂.

All of the currently extant MB witnesses of An = *Anum*, including the extract tablets (but with the exception of the Hattuša witness), share the distinguishing feature of having every line ruled on the tablet. Np₂, as the most complete MB exemplar, reveals, on the one hand, a number physical features that appear archaic as compared to first millennium copies, but on the other hand, shows developments compared to the redactionally earliest witness, the forerunner to Tablet I, CBS 331 (see above §1.4; note that while the text preserved on CBS 331 tablet is more archaic, whether the tablet itself is actually older than Np₂ is uncertain). Whereas CBS 331 showed a narrow and underdeveloped explanatory subcolumn, Np₂ (and probably also Np₅, B₁₃₊₁₄) has an explanatory subcolumn about as wide as the names subcolumn, even though it remains somewhat sparsely populated. On the obverse (while listing Enlil's ancestors), Np₂ omitted the notation ŠU (a feature seen generally on CBS 331), and as a result the entire preserved explanatory subcolumn is left blank. On the reverse, however, the notations ŠU and MIN have been included. In addition, two vertical guidelines have been drawn down the explanatory subcolumn, in order to help align the notations (they were also drawn on the obverse, even though the subcolumn was left blank); this feature is not generally seen in first millennium or Assyrian copies. Very faint traces suggest Np₅ and B₁₃₊₁₄ might have had these vertical guidelines as well. In terms of its script, Np₂ looks like it could be the oldest preserved Middle Babylonian witness, perhaps even being identifiable as "Late Old Babylonian," although the appearance of the script cannot be a certain criterion for dating.

The chronological relationship of the Hattuša manuscript to the MB and MA witnesses is unclear. Paleographically it displays the so-called "New Script IIIC" phase of Hittite cuneiform, traditionally thought to have been introduced during the reign of Tudhaliya IV (late 1200s B.C.), but which, according to a recent argument may go back as far as Muwatalli II (early 1200s B.C.).³⁶ The Hittite empire collapsed ca. 1180 B.C., so it can be no younger than this. Thus it should predate the large Middle Assyrian witnesses α and β by at least a century (if they date to Tiglath-Pileser I, see above). There do not seem to be, at present, any criteria for precisely fixing the MB witnesses within the Kassite period or dating them to the reign of any specific king. In appearance the Hattuša witness is rather different from the other MB texts. Instead of every line being ruled, on the Hattuša tablet individual entries, which can occupy more than one line including glosses and explanations, are separated by horizontal lines, giving the text the appearance of being divided into cases. The only other witness in our corpus which follows a similar practice is the MA text A₁, although this text can include more than one entry within a case. Notably, the Hattuša text only seems to have contained enough room for the first half of Tablet I, and seems therefore to have divided it into two Tablets, like the MA mss. α , β , and A₁. This practice is not so far attested for a Babylonian witness; Fr₁ and Np₂ seem to have contained all of Tablet I. The history of the transmission of Mesopotamian lexical material to Hattuša is a topic of its own and cannot be explored further here.³⁷ But the present evidence suggests, as one would also expect geographically, a closer relationship between the Hattuša fragment and the Middle Assyrian witnesses, than with the Babylonian ones.

1.5.5. Neo-Assyrian Sources

Almost all of the Neo-Assyrian sources for An = *Anum* come from Nineveh. Only five small fragments are known from Aššur (A₂, A₃, A₄, A₅, and A₈), which, (along with the six MA fragments) were excavated by Walter Andrae between 1903 and 1914. The Aššur pieces have been identified as Neo-Assyrian on the basis of their script, but their exact chronological relationship to the Nineveh material, almost all of which dates to the reign of Aššurbanipal, is uncertain. The NA Aššur pieces cover only Tablets II and III.

The Nineveh material represents the remains of twenty-six distinct tablets. If one counts all of the individually numbered fragments (which have been joined with other pieces to form, or are thought to have once belonged to, a single tablet), the total number is sixty. One additional fragment, a small surface flake, preserves part of what was most likely an An = *Anum* colophon, along with part of an Aššurbanipal colophon in lapidary script.³⁸ All seven

³⁶ See Weeden 2011: 42–56.

³⁷ See Scheucher 2012.

³⁸ K 7730 (CT 24: pl. 4): [dub X-kam an ::] ^da-nu-um. The colophon further states that the tablet was copied "according to a wooden writing board" (^lu^lle-u^l5-um gaba-ri), and contains part of a label

³⁵ See Veldhuis 2000.

canonical Tablets of An = Anum are represented – Tablet IV, however, only by a small fragment (N₁₆), and Tablet VII by a single, moderately well preserved witness (N₂₇). Of the twenty-six individual witnesses, only two or three (N₁, N₅, and perhaps N₁₈) could be considered to be almost complete; a further three (N₈, N₂₄, and N₂₇) are medium-sized, substantial fragments; the remaining twenty-one are small to minuscule sized fragments. Seven pieces (N₁, N₅, N₉, N₁₈, N₂₅, N₂₇) preserve all or part of a colophon, and all of these (except one, N₂₅) record the tablets as having belonged to the palace library of Aššurbanipal (r. 669–631 BC), a king well known for his scribal interest and his active efforts at collecting tablets.³⁹ The colophon of N₂₅ is not fully preserved, but its appearance suggests that it could be older than the Aššurbanipal era. Otherwise, the script and appearance of the fragments without colophons, to the extent their state of preservation allows one to determine, in general suggests they too were written by Aššurbanipal's scribes and formed part of his collections. They all seem to have been exemplary copies, intended for long-term storage; scribal exercises or school tablets are generally not known from Nineveh. Both of the two Aššurbanipal tablets, whose colophons preserve a statement about the provenience of the exemplar from which it was copied (N₅ and N₂₇), state that the origin of this exemplar was Babylon (N₁ and N₁₈ make no such statement; N₉ did, but it is broken). The aforementioned odd-looking piece N₂₅, which, according to its content and its colophon is an “extract,” instead states that its exemplar was a tablet of “Assyria” (kur ^{da}as-šur^{k[il]}). An = Anum was ultimately a Babylonian composition, and Aššurbanipal and his scribes would have probably considered a copy from Babylonia to be superior; on the other hand, as the Middle Assyrian copies attest, copies of An = Anum (perhaps themselves written from Babylonian copies) were already present in Assyria long before Aššurbanipal's time. Further study on the interrelations between the Nineveh tablets and the other Assyrian and Babylonian witnesses might allow the formation of additional hypotheses about their ultimate textual origin. The Nineveh copies, when they preserve the same passage, are among themselves by no means always homogeneous, though they often are.

The majority of the Nineveh material comes from the excavations undertaken by Austin Henry Layard in 1850 and continued by Hormuzd Rassam in 1853; these are the tablets with the prefix “K” (for Kuyunjik, the modern name of the citadel of Nineveh at Mosul).⁴⁰ Fragments with numbers other than “K” came from subsequent ex-

peditions in the late 19th and early 20th centuries led by Rassam, George Smith, R. Campbell Thompson, and Leonard W. King (see the descriptions to the individual witnesses in Part II). Most of this corpus was already published in handcopy by King in CT 24 and CT 25 (see §1.5 above), but some new witnesses (N₂, N₄, N₆, N₁₅, N₁₆, and N₂₁) and joins (parts of N₈, N₁₈, N₂₂, N₂₃, N₂₄, N₂₆, N₂₇) have been subsequently identified, mostly by Lambert.

1.5.6. Neo-/Late Babylonian Sources

Absent an archaeological context, a tablet is dated to the Neo- or Late Babylonian period on the basis of its script. The distinction between Neo- and Late is not always well defined, both in terms of identifying a source as belonging to one or the other and as a matter of definition.⁴¹ In the present corpus, the identification of a source as belonging to the Neo- or Late Babylonian period mostly follows the editors of CTL, where, absent an archaeological context or a colophon containing a date, the determination has been made on the appearance of the tablet and its script.

Litke was not able to use any Neo- or Late Babylonian sources at all for his edition.⁴² Presently, we are able to draw upon twenty-three such witnesses. Only four sources (B₂, S₁, S₂, W₃) have been identified as Neo-Babylonian; the Late Babylonian period is much better represented, with sixteen witnesses. Three extract tablets (B₅, B₁₀, B₁₂) and one small fragment (W₃) are of ambiguous date. Together these sources cover parts of canonical Tablets I through VI; no Babylonian copy of Tablet VII has yet been identified.

The majority – fifteen of them – are kept in the British Museum.⁴³ These tablets come either from the 19th-century excavations conducted by Rassam in Babylonia, or were purchased on the antiquities market. Information about their provenience can only be surmised based on records kept in the museum, which have proven to not al-

⁴¹ A Neo-Babylonian text in general could date to the final period of native Babylonian political supremacy, the Neo-Babylonian empire (626–539 B. C.), but this category could also theoretically include a Babylonian text written in the earlier part of the first millennium B. C., including the period of Assyrian ascendancy. It might also include the first part of the subsequent Achaemenid Persian rule (539–484 B. C.). The conquest of Cyrus did not bring about the end of archives maintained by elite Neo-Babylonian families; these archives came to an end and were deposited after the revolts against Xerxes in 484 B. C., after which there is a decline in the quantity of available written sources (Waerzeggers 2018: 89; 92). A text from the latter part of the Achaemenid period could therefore be defined as Late Babylonian (483–331); this category includes above all the period after the conquest of Babylonia by Alexander, the Hellenistic Seleucid period (331–141), and it even extends into the Arsacid Parthian period (from 141 B. C.) until the very latest cuneiform texts from the first century A. D.

⁴² Litke's manuscript N for Tablet III (Litke 1998: 115; cf. 138, fn. 206), the Late Babylonian text BM 45639, is not a manuscript of An = Anum, but of a different but related god list. The text is now published in handcopy as CTL 2: 543.

⁴³ In Leichty/Finkel/Walker 2019: 380, the descriptions for BM 38080 and BM 38088 have been accidentally switched. BM 38088 is in fact a ms. of Tablet VI (here, B₁₆) while BM 38080 is a fragment of an unidentified composition.

indicating its belonging to the palace of Aššurbanipal, incised into the dry clay in lapidary script. A physical analysis of the fragment might allow it to be linked to one of the Nineveh fragments of An = Anum, but for now the matter is left unresolved.

³⁹ On Aššurbanipal's tablet collecting activities see Frame/George 2005.

⁴⁰ On the discoveries of tablets on Kuyunjik excavations see George 2020 and on the excavations generally, Reade 1998. On the archaeological provenience of the K collection see Reade 1986a. Cf. also George 2003: 381–391 (on Kuyunjik manuscripts of the Gilgamesh epic).

ways be reliable.⁴⁴ A provenience of Babylon or Borsippa is supposed for eleven pieces (B₃, B₄, B₅, B₈, B₉, B₁₀, B₁₁, B₁₆, B₁₇, B₁₈, B₁₉); one is said to come from the place Jimjima (or Jumjuma) within Babylon (B₇); four are possibly from Sippar (B₂, B₆, B₁₂, B₁₅). As far as their state of preservation, only one (B₉) is nearly complete; two are substantial fragments (B₂, B₈); four are small fragments (B₃, B₄, B₇, B₁₅), and the remaining nine are small school extract tablets (B₅, B₆, B₁₀, B₁₁, B₁₂, B₁₆, B₁₇, B₁₈, B₁₉). B₂ and B₈ have preserved colophons, but no date; the colophon of B₉ is damaged, but could plausibly be interpreted as having contained a date referring to a regnal year of Artaxerxes, though there is no indication which of the several Achaemenid kings by this name it could be.

The British Museum Babylonian tablets were identified and copied by Lambert during the course of his work there and incorporated into his draft edition of *An = Anum*, with the exception of B₁₀, B₁₂, and B₁₉. B₁₀ and B₁₉ were identified by J. Peterson, and B₁₂ was identified by E. Jiménez.

One witness (K₁), in several fragments forming a substantial portion of a tablet, was excavated at Kish by Ernest Mackay in 1924 and is kept in the Ashmolean Museum. It was also copied by Lambert, and has been identified as Late Babylonian.

Two witnesses to Tablet III were excavated from a Neo-Babylonian library at Sippar in 1986 by Walid al-Jadir and Zuhair Rajab. They remain unpublished, but are here preliminarily transliterated according to excavation photos of the still uncleaned tablets, thanks to the kindness of Dr. Anmar Fadhil. S₁ represents about one-third of a once complete copy, and its colophon contains a date referring to the 23rd regnal year of Nebuchadnezzar II (ca. 583 B.C.). S₂ is an unusual extract of the sun god section of Tablet III, which writes its text in a continuous double column across both sides and squeezes two entries into a single line where possible.

Five witnesses have been excavated at Warka (Uruk) and are kept in either Berlin or Baghdad. Four of them are small fragments, but W₁ is an almost perfectly preserved copy of Tablet III. The first to have been excavated was W₂, by Julius Jordan in 1928/29, and published in handcopy by Adam Falkenstein in *Literarische Keilschrifttexte aus Uruk*; its current whereabouts are unknown, and its dating is unclear. W₃, now in Berlin, was probably excavated in 1938/39 by Arnold Nöldeke and has been copied by Lambert; it has been classified as Neo-Babylonian. W₁, W₄, and W₅ were excavated from Seleucid levels between 1969 and 1971 by Jürgen Schmidt. They were recovered in what has been interpreted to be a "library" containing a diverse array of genres belonging to a family of incantation priests that was used over multiple generations.⁴⁵ The smaller part of W₁ was published in handcopy by Hermann Hunger in *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk*, Band 1, and the larger

piece in 1988 by Egbert von Weier in SpTU 3; W₄ and W₅ followed in 1993's SpTU 4, also by von Weier.

In general and unlike the Neo-Assyrian texts, which mostly stem from a palatial context, Neo- and Late Babylonian scholarly texts seem, to the extent one can determine, to have been produced and stored in private, familial contexts. Knowledge of cuneiform was a family affair. The texts themselves and the skills needed to read and write them were passed down through the generations, from father to son. The eight preserved NB school tablets in our corpus demonstrate that *An = Anum* played a certain role in scribal education. But pedagogical extracts of *An = Anum* are found in far lesser quantities than those of e.g. the Weidner list,⁴⁶ showing that it was much less commonly used for this purpose. It may have been the case that *An = Anum* was considered too advanced a text for beginners, whereas the Weidner list on the other hand seems to have belonged to the beginner's curriculum from the Middle Babylonian period onwards.

Colophons of complete copies often name both the author and the owner of the text, and give their familial affiliation. Often, the author of the text is the son of the owner, implying that the son completed the text for his father as part of his education, perhaps as a final assignment. Such is also implied by texts which mention that the tablet was deposited in the temple of Nabû (though none among our corpus make such a statement). The completion of this education would permit a young scribe to participate in his family's elite profession, for example as an exorcist or a diviner. That these texts were intended to be stored long term, perhaps even across generations, is implied by curse formulae recorded in the colophons, promising a divine punishment for anyone who would mishandle or illicitly withdraw the text. In this way texts like *An = Anum* continued to be passed down through the centuries. Witnesses from the Hellenistic period (such as W₁) demonstrate that the text was then, about a millennium after its original composition and in a far different religious and cultural milieu, still remarkably intact, constituting for those scribes a source of ancient, received knowledge.

1.5.7. Summary of *An = Anum*

Remarkable above all for its breadth and its organization, the seven-Tablet composition known in ancient and modern times after its first line as *An = Anum* is the most important god list that has come down to us. More so than any other list, *An = Anum* preserves the ancients' effort at expressing a comprehensive, systematic theology in written form. It clearly intends to encompass the entire classical Babylonian pantheon with its roughly 2000 entries. It is hierarchically organized, beginning with heaven and ending with the netherworld. Within this scope, the major figures of the pantheon – far fewer in number than

⁴⁴ For an overview of the problems involved with identifying the origin of tablets among the British Museum's purchased collection, see Reade 1986b.

⁴⁵ See Hunger 1976: 11–13.

⁴⁶ For the role of the Weidner list in scribal education see Gesche 2001: 44–48; 55; 62–64; 69; 75–76; 186; 203; for *An = Anum*, *ibid.*: 180; 186.

the total amount of entries – are listed according to their traditional political and cosmic rank. Around each major deity, one finds a portrayal of their extended divine familial household, itself listed according to rank.

The breakthrough innovation of An = Anum over Proto-An was its conception as an explanatory list, with the double-column format that came to be the standard for lexical lists in general. The left-hand column contains the main list, while the right-hand column contains explanatory information. These can be simple notations that classify a name in relation to the preceding one (either MIN, “the same,” or ŠU, “different, distinct”). They can be the name of another, more well-known deity, or they can be brief explanations, clarifying the role or nature of a deity. In the case of minor deities, this is often in relation to their “parent” deity (i. e., spouse, child, servant, etc.). For a detailed explanation of these conventions, see below § 1.12.1.

As with Proto-An, the structure of An = Anum is built around the portrayal of the familial households of the principal deities of the Babylonian pantheon. Defining a principal deity according to the internal structure of An = Anum, the total number treated is about a dozen. Tablet I concerns the chief deities An/Anum and Enlil; Tablet II, the mother goddess, Dingirmah/Bēlet-ilī, and god of wisdom Enki/Ea; Tablet III: the moon, Nanna/Sīn, the sun Utu/Šamaš, and the storm god Iškur/Adad; Tablet IV is devoted to Inanna/Ištar, the goddess of love and war and the planet Venus (there may have been a section devoted to her spouse Dumuzi, unfortunately not preserved). The organization around a main deity becomes much looser for Tablets V and VI. Tablet V deals with, in essence, local deities similar to, and elsewhere equated with, the terrestrial warrior Ninurta, and his wife the healing goddess Gula/Bau; the queen of the netherworld Ereškigal/Allatum, and finally in Tablet VI, Nergal, the god of death (who elsewhere counts as Ereškigal’s husband but is not here so defined). Tablet VII is different in nature from the rest of An = Anum, and centers around Marduk, listing esoteric names of his. It has been supposed that additional Tablets were at some point tacked on to the end of the series, which however did not consist at all of god lists but were synonym lists; the evidence for this, however, is thin (see below § 1.5.8).

In its portrayal of divine households, An = Anum employs a consistent nested structure as follows: first a principal deity is listed; second, his spouse; third, his children, including their family and court (if they have any); fourth, the deity’s extended household and servants. The nested structure comes into play in that, if a child of a deity is elaborated upon, then their entire subsection must be exhausted according to the same structure (spouse, children, servants) before the text can return to the parent deity, finally listing the parent’s own servants. Thus, for example, in Tablet II, Enki is separated from his servants by a subsection on Marduk, which itself includes a subsection on Nabū. This system is not, however, exploited to fullest extent possible, which would have resulted in too much complication, with e. g. Enlil’s court being list-

ed somewhere at the end of Tablet VII, after all his various children and grandchildren were elaborated upon. As a result, one shortcoming of the An = Anum system is that certain familial relations, of which the compilers cannot have been ignorant, are left unexpressed. Thus, while Nanna/Sīn traditionally counted as the son of Enlil and Utu/Šamaš as his grandson, An = Anum is silent about these relationships. As far as the structure of An = Anum is concerned, Nanna and Utu are principal deities. They occupy the same level as An, Enlil, or Enki, heading their own respective sections, and so no information is given as to their parentage.

Tablet I

Whereas Proto-An began with the ancestors of Enlil, Tablet I opens with An and his wife Antum, who head a list of eleven pairs, defined by a rubric as the “twenty-one ‘ancestors’ of An” (1–23).⁴⁷ Since each pair in the sequence is defined as identical (MIN) with the previous one, this must be conceived of as an evolutionary sequence rather than a chain of procreation. It is apparently given in reverse chronological order, with the most remote pair appearing last, probably since it was desired that the current and most familiar forms, An and Antum, head the list. Up until recently, this sequence of primordial deities was not attested in any earlier list or myth and so appeared to be a novel development. However, early forms of it now appear in a recently published Old Babylonian incantation prayer,⁴⁸ and in two Old Assyrian incantations from Kültepe-Kaneš.⁴⁹ These figures thus appear to have been known quite early and over a wide area, and can no longer be considered an innovation on the part of the An = Anum compiler. Of the deities making up the sequence given here, only Uraš, Anšargal, and the most remote figure Enuru’ula

⁴⁷ The second pair is presented as a unified figure, ^dan-ki “heaven and earth,” explained as both Anum and Antum. Furthermore, lines 20–21 seem to be presented as logographic spellings (^dALAM) of lines 18–19 (Alala and Belili), and therefore could count as a single pair. However, lines 16–17 (^de₂-kur and ^dga₂-r[a]) are attested only in the MA witnesses α and β , and do not occur in the NA or the NB manuscripts, which apparently therefore included lines 20–21 in its count. Either way, one seems forced to include Anu within the count of his own “ancestors,” a term which seems to have been somewhat mechanically imported from the list of Enlil’s ancestors. See also the commentary to these lines below.

⁴⁸ MS 3419 obv. ii: 6’–10’ = George 2016: text no. 59, pl. CXXXI (with treatment and transliteration pp. 152–155): *du-ur₂ u₃ da-ar / lu-uh₂-mu u₃ lu-ḫu-mu / an-ša-ar u₃ DUMU-ša-ar / a-la-la u₃ be-li-li / an u₃ an-tum*. These pairs correspond to Tablet I, lines: 12–13; 14–15; 8–9; 18–19; 1–2 (that is, pairs number 7, 8, 5, 10 and 1). The form DUMU-ša-ar appearing in place of later ^kki-sar₂ is difficult to explain.

⁴⁹ Kt 94/k 520, 20–23 = Barjamovic/Larsen 2008: 145f: *A-nam / u₃ A-na-tam₂ : La₂-aḫ-ma-am / u₃ Du-ra-am : er-sa-tam₂ / u₃ na-i-le-ša*. This sequence seems to be either adapted or garbled from the traditionally known one, in that, following Anum and Antum, Duri and Laḫmu (pairs 7 and 8 in An = Anum) have been made into a pair, followed by “the earth/netherworld, and its water-courses.” Cf. Kt 91/k 502, obv. 8–10 = Kouwenberg 2018–2019: 59: *AN u₂ AN-tam₂ / La-aḫ-ma-am u₃ Du-ra-am / er-sa-tam₂ u₂ na-i-le-ša*.

appear in Proto-An. But Uraš (“earth”), in the older context a name for Anu’s wife, is here instead a male,⁵⁰ and has been provided with a female counterpart Nin-Uraš, a name which is formally equivalent to that of the male warrior Ninurta.

There then follows a second section, which consists of material taken over and expanded from Proto-An. It is concerned with Anu’s wives and Namma (24–30). Anu’s wife is identified, as in Proto-An, as Bēlet-ilī (24), and he has a new junior wife (25). Namma, the ocean who gave birth to heaven and earth (26–27), is however not identified in relation to Anu, but instead as the mother of Enki. She is apparently further identified with Ninimma, a scribal mother figure at Enlil’s Ekur, who appears later (291) among the other Ekur deities. A new figure Ninšar (28) is introduced and defined as Antum and Ištar, and the name Bēlet-ilī is repeated in the next line (29) in order to say that she is the same as Ninšar; this figure is given one more name, Šembizi (30).

Next is a substantial section devoted to Ninšubur, Anu’s vizier, and his other servants. This material was not present in Proto-An, where Ninšubur instead appeared in the netherworld section. It includes fourteen names for Ninšubur (31–44) and two names of his wife (45–46), and a vizier (47), who was already in Proto-An in the netherworld section alongside Ninšubur. Ninšubur’s names are provided furthermore with elaborate Sumerian explanatory phrases, with optional Akkadian translations, which could be an indication that this section had its origin in another source. A list of Ninšubur’s five daughters (48–52) and fourteen sons (53–66) seems not to be attested elsewhere. Ninšubur also has two counselors (67–68). This brings us back to Anu’s section, which closes with a list of his sundry servants (69–87), including some roles not occurring elsewhere in An = *Anum*. He has a chamberlain (69), a constable (70), seven counselors (71–77), a *zabard-ab*-official with his wife (78–79), three cooks (80–82), two chief cowherds (83–84), a chief gardener (85), and two intelligence officers (86–87).

Enlil’s section begins with his ancestors in twenty-one male and female pairs (88–129), each one defined as distinct (ŠU) from the previous generation. This material has been taken over from Proto-An (and is also attested in other lists), but five new pairs have been introduced. The order has also been modified substantially, but the first and last pairs, Enki/Ninki and Enmešara/Ninmešara, are the same. Further novel introductions are the list of Enmešara’s seven sons (130–136), and a figure Lugal-dukuga (137), defined as the father of Enlil but whose relationship to Enmešara and the preceding generations is left undefined. The list of Enlil’s (138–165) and Ninlil’s names are likewise expanded versions of the sequence in Proto-An, with modified order. The names of two of Enlil’s junior wives (173–174) are listed after those of his main wife, whereas

in Proto-An they were relegated to the separate Ekur section. A sequence of entries directly paralleling Proto-An then occurs, listing additional identities of Ninlil and Enlil (175–176), identified respectively with Bēlet-ilī and her husband Šulpa’e, certain high officials of the Ekur bearing human names (178–179), and leading, as in Proto-An, to an excursus on Dagan and Išhara. Dagan still has only one name (181), but his wife, previously only listed as ^dnin-ku₃-GI, now has Šalaš as her primary name, plus three others appended, for a total of five (182–186). Išhara is implied, but not stated to be the same as (or another tradition for) Dagan’s wife. She has five names (187–191): the first name is new, followed by the two already in Proto-An, followed by two new ones. As in Proto-An, the actual name Išhara is not listed, but here it appears in the explanatory column. The name of the final figure in this section is spelled either Anbu or Enbul; he is defined as the “son of the Ešaba (temple),” but his relation to Išhara is not specified (192).

Following the order in Proto-An, we come next to the section on Enlil’s firstborn son Ninurta (193–217); his list of names has expanded from four to twenty-five (see above § 1.4 on the Tablet I Forerunner CBS 331 for the intermediate history of this section). The names of Ninurta’s wife Ninnibru have expanded from three to six (218–223). Following Proto-An, the next figure is Ninurta’s daughter, who has been given an additional name in the MA recensions (224–225); next come Ninurta’s brother-in-law (explained as a son of Anu) and sister (226–227, with the order reversed from Proto-An), a vizier of Ninurta with his wife (228–229), and a beautilian with his wife (230–232). A list of two “socles” for Ninurta (233–334) and three for Ninnibru (235–237) represents a new addition.

The final major section of Tablet I concerns deities associated with Enlil’s temple the Ekur, who in Proto-An were listed in two groups separately from Enlil himself. First come Nuska the lamp god, Enlil’s vizier (238–244), and his wife Sadaranuna (245–251). Then comes some new material concerning counselors of Enlil, Ninlil, Ninurta, Nuska, and Sadaranuna (252–261), and a list of six constables (262–267), expanded by two names from Proto-An. This marks the end of the material corresponding to the first Ekur group in Proto-An. The list of sundry Ekur deities occupying the rest of the Tablet very closely follows the order of the second group in Proto-An, with expansions, at some points, consisting mostly of synonyms. It includes: a doorkeeper Kalkal and wife (268–271), grain deities including Ezinu/Ašnan (272–275), Ħaya (276–280) and Nisaba (281–288) and her newly listed counselors (289–290), the motherly scribal figure Ninimma (291–300) and her husband Kusigbanda (301), a boatman Erda (302), the chamberlain Ennugi and his wife, and a newly listed daughter (303–307), a purifier Kusu, her husband, and a new daughter (308–311), a female butcher Ninšar and her husband (312–317), the wine deity Patindu and a new wife (318–319), the beer deity Ninkasi (320–323), a snake charmer Ninmada (329–330), a messenger Ninmara (331), goatherds (332–334), and incantation deities including Ningirim (335–337). The final section concerning

⁵⁰ There also exists a male warrior deity Uraš of Dilbat, but he is treated in An = *Anum* as a separate figure in Tablet V (line 40, see § 4.7.5 below).

sundry lesser servants of the Ekur (338–350) consists of new material. There is a gate attendant (338), followed by five constables (or *utukku*-demons), each with a name in $d_{1}u_{2}$ - and each associated with a specific temple or shrine within Nippur (339–343). The list concludes with a musician (344–345), two attendants (346–347), and three door-bolt attendants (348–350).

Tablet II

Whereas in Proto-An, Enki's sequence was listed before that of the mother goddess, here the order has been reversed, giving the mother goddess the more prominent position, third in rank below An and Enlil. This position likely reflects the tradition according to which the mother goddess was the older sister of Enlil. That Enki and the mother goddess are listed on the same Tablet, on the other hand, reminds one of certain myths in which these two figures were closely associated with one another, such as Enki and Ninmaḥ or Enki and Ninḥursag. Why the switch in the order of the two figures was made between Proto-An and An = Anum is however not immediately clear.

The previous list of ten names of the mother goddess in Proto-An has been expanded to forty-four names (1–44); the order of the previously paralleled names has also been modified without any clear rationale. Whereas previously Ninḥursag was given as her first name, now Dingirmaḥ, formerly the second, is the first. The tradition is however maintained whereby her Akkadian name Bēlet-ilī is not in the main list; here it appears instead in the explanatory column. A few names have also been provided with etymological explanations or translations in Akkadian. Her husband Šulpa'e's names have been expanded from four to ten (45–54), with the names inherited from Proto-An remaining at the beginning of the list in the same order. Two attendants of the Emaḥ have been moved here from a separate position in Proto-An, and a third one added (55–57). Next comes a substantial section on her children, mostly parallel to Proto-An but greatly expanded. Baragulegara now has three names (58–60) and a wife (61); Lil has another name (62–63), a wife (64), and a constable (65); Ašgi of Adab is a new addition (66), while only his wife (67) appeared before; Lisin and his wife were moved here from a different section (68–69), and his eight children (70–77) are a new addition. Of a long list of various heralds and viziers (78–87), only one (83) was already listed in Proto-An. From here on it is almost all new material: counselors (88–95), additional names of the mother goddess and Šulpa'e² (96–98), another list of sixteen children (99–114), and finally doorkeepers (115–118), one of whom was listed previously. The list of sixteen children is notable for having rather elaborate Sumerian explanatory phrases (with optional Akkadian translations), possibly suggesting it was taken from another source.

The number of Enki's names (119–162) has likewise been greatly expanded, although the exact number, and which names are included, differ somewhat among two extant recensions, represented by α and β (40 names) and

N_4 (36 names), with forty-four in total in our reconstructed edition. Where she once had three, Enki's wife Damgalnuna (also known as Damkina) now has eleven names (163–173). As in Proto-An, immediately following Enki's wife is his most prominent son Asarluḥi, but here Asarluḥi is explained as Marduk. Whereas these two figures were still listed separately in Proto-An, here they are combined into a greatly expanded list of fifty names (174–224; the total is actually fifty-one if one counts his primary name). Although not fully preserved, this sequence seems to have closely paralleled lists given at the end of *Enūma Eliš* and in other compositions.⁵¹ Notably, Enki and Marduk seem to be the only deities in An = Anum for whom their number of names corresponds to their sacred number⁵² – forty for Enki and fifty for Marduk. Fifty had originally been Enlil's sacred number and is thought to have been usurped by Marduk as part of his ascendancy to the head of the Babylonian pantheon, as promoted in *Enūma Eliš*. While we cannot fully explore this topic here, this is a crucial piece of information as far as locating the time and place of the composition of An = Anum. It points to the influence of the scribes of Babylon.

So too the names of Asarluḥi's wife Panunanki and Marduk's Zarpanitum (who respectively had one and two names in Proto-An) have been combined into a single list consisting of seven names (225–231, mostly restored). The sequence that follows has been rearranged from Proto-An, with Nabū now following Marduk's wife as his most prominent associate. Nabū is identified as Marduk's vizier, and given five names (232–236) where he previously only had one. His wife Tašmētum (237–238) has also been given a Sumerian name. The figure of Enkimdu (239–240) has been moved here from a section of Enki-related professional deities at the end of Proto-An. Here he is identified as a "furrow" (apparently intending an agricultural official) of Nabū. With Nabū finished, the composition returns to Marduk and lists the sundry members of his court, all new material, including his sister Mamiā (242), his chamberlain the judicial figure Madānu (243–245), counselors of Marduk (246–247) and Zarpanitum (248), her hairdressers (249–250), and finally, even the dogs of Marduk (257–260).

Having completed the section on Marduk, the composition returns to Enki, to deal with his lesser children and court. The first figure is Id, the divine (ordeal) river (261–264); possibly this figure was listed in Proto-An at the end of Enki's names as $d_{1}id_{2}$ -idigna (GEN 83), but it is not clear if they are the same. Id has a wife (265), son (266), and vizier (267). Next is a list of six of Enki's sons (268–273), the first two of which were already in Proto-An, and daughter (274). Then there is a group of figures, not directly stated but implied to be Enki's children (some with multiple names and spouses), each of which is identified with another prominent deity: Niššubur (275), Amurru (276–280), Sin (279–280), and Ningirsu (281); the first two of these were in Proto-An but the rest are new. As in

⁵¹ See Lambert 2013: 151–168.

⁵² See Röllig 1971.

Proto-An, Enki's vizier Isimud is listed next (281–283); the viziers of Damgalnuna are novel (284–285). A section of musician deities (287–292) was taken from the end of Proto-An. They are followed by counselors of Enki (293–296), which represents new material, but the counselors of Damgalnuna (297–298) were already present in the early version. Of a list of eight doorkeepers of Enki, (299–306), the first two were in Proto-An, and of two gatekeepers (307–308), the first. Further new material includes a door-bolt attendant (309), herald (310), and Ninsirsir the boatman (311).

The rest of the Tablet deals with deities representing professional crafts, who were all associated or identified with Enki. The first group, taken from the end of Proto-An and expanded, consists of the fire deity Girra (313–323) and the smith god Ninagal (324–325). The fire deity is probably included because of the connection with smithery and metallurgy. The second group does not have a precedent in Proto-An and represents a new addition. Displaying a lexically-based organization, it seems to have been adopted from another type of source, a so-called lexical god list, as is also the case for the end of Tablet III. Here, the passage comprises the figure Gukim/Gakim (327–331, a deity of uncertain function), the weaver goddess Uttu (332–340), gods of stone cutters (341–342), leatherworkers (348–351), reed workers (341–342), a fragmentary section (353–360), fuel gatherers (361–362), purification priests (363–366), fruit (367–374), fishermen (375–384), and bird catchers (385–392).

Tablet III

Tablet III deals with the celestial gods in order of rank: the moon Nanna/Sin, the sun Utu/Šamaš, and the storm god Iškur/Adad – the same order as in Proto-An and in tradition generally.

The moon god's names (1–25) have been expanded from seven in Proto-An to twenty-five in the canonical version. Proto-An listed Sin first followed by Nanna (perhaps because the scribe felt this was his more important name), whereas here Nanna comes first, then Sin (probably because the pattern of An = Anum required that the traditional "Sumerian" name be listed first). Also the name Dilim-babbar, previously the third name, was moved to the end of the list and given the Akkadian explanation which is standard in lexical texts. The rest of his names follow the same order as earlier, with insertions in between, as does the rest of Nanna's court. His wife Ningal's single name in Proto-An has been expanded to two (26–27), and a third is explained as "the mother of Ningubalag" (28), but it is unclear if this should be another wife of Nanna or the same one. Nanna's paternity of Ningubalag, known from other sources, is also left unstated in the following line (29). Ningubalag's former list of three names has been expanded to six (29–34), with one of the new names inserted before the old ones. As earlier, his wife follows him (35), and then Sin's vizier Alamuš and his wife Ninurim (36–37); Sin's wife's vizier and his vizier's vizier (38–39)

are new additions. Of two daughters (40–41), the second one was already on the older list. The first of a list of four of Sin's attendants (42–45) was already in Proto-An, but the whole rest of his court is novel material, including eight counselors (46–53), a seal-bearer (54), two counselors of his wife (55–56), and two counselors of his son (57–58).

A change of topic occurs, with an excursus on Lagashite deities, imported from a different context in Proto-An; it is justified by the equation of Nindara (59), now heading the subsection, with Sin. He is followed by a new figure Nimmeten (60), explained as the maidservant of Sin, and presumably also equivalent to Nindara's wife Nanše (61–62), who is accompanied by a "great steward" (63) called Enšalulu. Nindara and Nanše's daughter Nin-MARKI is next, followed by her own strikingly long list of children (65–76), ten in number, and a single counselor (77). Her large number of children could reflect the historically large size of her domain within Lagaš, the Gu'abba district, but most of these seem to be otherwise unknown figures. In Proto-An, the criterion for the placement of this Lagaš material was somewhat shaky, being only justified by the apparent similarity between ^dnin-MARKI and ^dnin-mur₃ki, the wife of Ninkilim (who appears in canonical Tablet V), which there led to the daughter being placed before the mother. Apparently the compiler of the canonical version felt this was a better placement for this material, and it allowed him to follow the standard rank order of husband, wife, and child – even though earlier at Lagaš, the husband Nindara was certainly the less important figure than the wife Nanše (the wife is listed before the husband in Proto-An). The origin of the link between Nindara and Sin, however, is unknown.

The topic returns to Sin with Gayyu (78–79), defined as Sin's shepherd, and who had been the next figure, after Sin's court, listed in Proto-An. His seven children (79–87; including two synonyms) are a new addition, apparently not attested elsewhere.

The sun god Utu/Šamaš (88–113) comes next; the original six names given in Proto-An are listed first, in the same order as before. The new ones are appended for a total of twenty-six. His wife's former four names are expanded to nine (114–122), with a slightly rearranged order. The deity Ilaba is newly introduced, equated with Šamaš (123), followed by three names in ^dPA₄ (124–126) that possibly have something to do with Ilaba. The portrayal of the court of Šamaš is rather elaborate. Unlike with most other deities, his viziers (127–132), of which he had an abundance, and an executive officer (133), are listed before his children; this material was taken over from Proto-An and rearranged with insertions. The subsection of viziers and the first daughter, taken from Proto-An, rearranged, and expanded, seems to have a framed structure. It begins with a pair of viziers (127–128), "righteousness and justice," (the first one "righteousness" is new) and ends with the daughter "truth/righteousness," (134–135), whose name is a synonym of the new first vizier. The group is a traditional lexical pairing or hendiadys, and the second vizier and the daughter had been listed adjacently in Proto-An. In be-

tween are three officials who had already been in Proto-An, and two that have been introduced. The daughter of Šamaš also has her own vizier (136).

From here on, the court of Šamaš is populated with material not paralleled in Proto-An: another daughter and a son, who represent dream deities (137–138), are listed. There then begins a subsection concerning the chariot personnel of Šamaš. It is again framed by the first two (139–140) and the last two (152–153) members. Both pairs are not labeled with specific roles, but with Sumerian descriptive phrases that allude to a role in chariot driving. In between are six counselors (141–146), a messenger (147), a groom (148), a driver (149), and two runners (150–151); the implication is that these all had something to do with his chariot team. Then come five attendants (154–158), six judges (159–164), two doorkeepers (165–166), two merchants (167–168) and two possibly related mercantile figures (169–170), and another pair of dream gods (171–172).

The end of Šamaš section is, as in Proto-An, devoted to his son Šakkan, a god representing herd animals (173–180). Where he had a single name in Proto-An, he now has eight. After Šakkan's wife (181), another figure Laḥar is introduced. Despite the apparent meaning of this Semitic name ("ewe"), other sources suggest Laḥar was Šakkan's son, though such an explicit definition is lacking here. He is listed with four names (182–185).

Just as in Proto-An, the list moves now to the storm god, Iškur/Adad (186–216). From only three names (which appear in the same order as before, but with insertions in between) his list has expanded to thirty-one (186–216, some mss. contained one or two more). His wife likewise has gone from two (restored) names in the early version to seven (217–223) in the canonical. A new son and his wife (224–225) have been introduced, whose names, evoking concepts of justice, seem more appropriate among the circle of Šamaš. A second son (226) and daughter (227) reappear in reverse order from Proto-An, with the list of daughters expanded to three (227–229). The rest of his court consists of new material: a vizier "lightning" (230), two calves (231–232), two bulls (233–234), and six counselors (235–240).

As also with Tablet II, the final passage in Tablet III (241–256) is incorporated, not from Proto-An, but from a different type of source, a so-called lexical god list (see the comments to those lines). It primarily concerns various ways of spelling the names of the pair of deities Šullat and Ḫaniš (241–251), included because of their respective identification with Šamaš and Adad. However, other irrelevant material has also been incorporated. The Šullat and Ḫaniš passage lists one name of Ea (242), ^dnagbu (IDIM), only included because Šullat and Haniš can be written with the same logogram. There are also some additional names, which look like epithets, that refer to Šamaš and Adad (247–251). This is followed by spellings for the pair of names Išhuru and Išḫara (252–256), who are identified respectively with Nisaba and Ištar. They were probably included in the original source on lexical grounds, since one of those names (253) was written with the same logogram

as names of Šamaš (249 and 251). One could have perhaps justified the inclusion of the goddess material as a segue to the topic of the next Tablet, but this does not otherwise seem to have been a practice. The final entry (257) is a name referring to both Šullat and Ḫaniš.

Tablet IV

Unfortunately, this is still the worst preserved Tablet in the series, with significant lacunae remaining. The entirety of Tablet IV is devoted to Inanna/Ištar. This echoes that fact that in Proto-An, Inanna had more names listed for herself than any other figure. Entire sequences have been lifted from Proto-An, and their progression throughout the Tablet generally parallels the earlier order. However, the material has also been substantially rearranged, with new material inserted. Some of the older material also seems to have been discarded. Overall, Tablet IV contained roughly three to four times as much material as the equivalent Inanna section in Proto-An.

The names are organized based on rough thematic criteria. The first eleven names (1–11) seem to be her main or most important names, but unfortunately only half of them are preserved. Most of the names are explained as MIN, marking them as identical to each other, but beginning in line 10 many are marked in ŠU (or have an explanatory phrase without a notation, which probably should imply ŠU); perhaps the compiler wanted to indicate that these were somehow distinct identities or manifestations. From line 12 onwards, the names mostly begin with ^dnin- "lady of" The second element in lines 12–32 is most of the time some cultic location – a city, temple, or a generic physical place (e. g. in 14, "the street"). Lines 20–23 instead relate to battle or combat, and lines 27–29 describe Inanna's physical appearance. Many of the names are explained, with nin- translated either as *šarratum* "queen" or *bēltum* "lady," and the second element of the name either translated in Akkadian or written with a Sumerian logogram. The pattern of ^dnin- names of various kinds continues in much the same fashion from line 32 on, continuing to follow the order of Proto-An but with some rearrangement. These names seem to be less specific, mentioning either generic locations or alluding to some action performed by Inanna (32; 34–35). Unfortunately, from line 46 the text becomes fragmentary. By lines 73–74 (partially restored), the text, still listing names beginning with ^dnin-, seems to be describing Inanna's court, since those two figures are known to have been her counselors. After some more fragmentary ^dnin- names, 96–97 end the pattern, giving the names of two of Inanna's attendants. Lines 98–99 begin a subsection on Ninegal, a manifestation of Inanna related to the palace, and she is given two names incorporated from Proto-An. In 101–102 she is given two counselors, and in 103–107 five (fragmentary) figures, possibly attendants; lines 108–111 are a fragmentary list of her doorkeepers.

Lines 112–132 are somewhat similar to the earlier ^dnin-section, only the names all instead begin with ^dinanna-,

“Inanna of” The names consist mostly of specific, local geographic manifestations of Inanna. Sometimes, the second element is a descriptive phrase or an obscure element. The names are explained mostly by means of Akkadian epithets ending in *-itu*, though in a few cases instead with either a genitival phrase “lady of” or a short description. These names generally do not have precedents in Proto-An.

Now the text returns to Inanna’s court, and begins again to closely follow Proto-An. Lines 133–137 give the five interpreters of Inanna (a sixth name, originally in Proto-An, may have been deleted). The next list is of Inanna’s messengers (138–155); it follows the same order as the former list of twelve but has been expanded to eighteen, with most of the new names inserted in a single block. Then there are eight “outdoor shrines” (156–163), of which two were precedented in the early list.

The next section concerns astral manifestations of Inanna (164–184); the first part of the list (165–172) was taken over from Proto-An, while the latter part (173–180) consists of new material. This section has been restored with the help of ms. N₃₇, which belongs to the composition “Shorter An = *Anum*,” but parallels our text at this point. The text becomes fragmentary as it begins to parallel Proto-An again, dealing with the astral figure Kabta (181–186), who counted as the husband of Ninsianna, Inanna in her aspect as the planet Venus (listed at the start of the astral section in 165). Dumuzi, who could also count as Inanna’s husband or lover, should most likely have been listed somewhere in the following gap (187–223), since in Proto-An he was listed immediately after Kabta.

One fragment should probably be placed somewhere in this gap (1–13’). It seems to have dealt with Nanaya (though her name is not preserved) and her husband Muati, who were listed together at around this position in Proto-An.

When the text resumes, it seems to be listing miscellaneous names, without parallels in the early text, and whose arrangement does not seem to follow any particular thematic pattern as far as one can tell (the explanatory column is unfortunately not preserved for this section). Lines 251–264 are all related to the steppe or wilderness, and 264–265 deal with the figure Gazba. Išhara is treated again (even though she was already listed in Tablet I in connection with Dagan and Enlil), here apparently, but not explicitly, as a form of Ištar. She is given four names (267–270, some of which were present in Proto-An, but not in this context), and a vizier. Her husband, this time identified as Sagger (272–274), is given three names, and they have a son (275). Two additional names (276–277) seem related to Išhara but their exact nature is uncertain. Finally, a small subsection is devoted to the divine rainbow (278–283), associated with Inanna due to being a heavenly manifestation. She has a vizier (283) and a son (284). There is one final figure whose affiliation is left undefined (285), but whose name ^dgiš-su₁₃-ga is suggestive of Nergal (cf. ^dlu₂-giš-su₃-ga in Tablet I: 339).

Tablet V

The placing of the material in Tablet V, after the Inanna/Ištar section, follows the order of Proto-An. The first part of this Tablet deals with terrestrial warrior deities, each associated with some specific local center: Lugalbanda of Uruk, Lugalmarada of Marad, Ninkilim of Muru, Uraš of Dilbat, Nitaḥ of (...?), and Zababa of Kish; the first three of these appeared in the same order in Proto-An, but Uraš, Nitaḥ and Zababa are new. The only one of these deities who does not immediately and obviously seem to fit the model of a Ninurta-like warrior is Ninkilim, a deity originally representing a mongoose (Akkadian *šikkû*), and who could be, in the third millennium, either male or female. Nevertheless, the later tradition grouped Ninkilim among the Ninurta deities: in “Shorter An = *Anum*,” section F, all five of these deities appear in a syncretistic list explaining them as forms of Ninurta. The treatment of these deities is more extensive than in Proto-An. The first one, Lugalbanda (1), is the most elaborate: in Proto-An he was only accompanied by his wife Ninsun, who has now been given a second name (2–3); she is followed by a new list of ten children (4–13), a vizier and a counselor each for him (14–15) and his wife (16–17), two heralds (18–20), and a wife of one of the heralds (21).

Lugalmarada has two names (22–23), given apparently in reverse order from Proto-An; his wife (24) and two children (25–26) also already occurred in the older composition; his vizier (27), his wife’s vizier (28), and two counselors (29–30) are new. Ninkilim is listed with four names (31–34), the last one an innovation over Proto-An; the sequence is one of great antiquity, being already attested at Fara (see the comments to these lines). Canonical An = *Anum* and the Fara texts actually agree in the order in which these names are given, while it is Proto-An that gives them in reverse. Another figure (35), apparently having something to do with textiles, was instead listed in Proto-An before the names of Ninkilim. Ninkilim’s wife has two names (36–37), the second one new; also newly introduced are viziers for each spouse (38–39). Uraš has two names (40–41), a wife (42), a son (43) and a vizier (44). Nitaḥ has just one name (45) and a wife (46). Zababa also has one name (47); his wife is Bau (48), whose mention begins the segue into the next topic concerning the healing goddess. Zababa’s vizier is given as Papsukkal (49). Next, Ugur is listed (50) and explained as the vizier of Nergal; this seems like a non-sequitur, unless the implication is that Zababa and Nergal are the same. Ugur’s wife Ši-šarrat (51) follows; as a pair, these two were imported from a different context in Proto-An.

Next follow Aba-u (52) and his wife Gula (53), who began the healing goddess section in Proto-An. The implication here is that this Aba-u is a similar warrior deity to Zababa and the other preceding ones. They are followed by Ningirsu (54–55) of Lagash, another warrior deity identified with Ninurta, and his wife Bau (56), who already appeared above in relation to Zababa, but for whom the

link with Ningirsu was stronger traditionally. Evidently, the start of the section on the healing goddess, with whom Bau was equated, has led to an excursus on the pantheon of Lagash, different from the earlier one in Tablet III, and consisting of material not in Proto-An. Following Bau is a deity of uncertain nature (57), either a synonym for Bau herself or a related figure. Next is the mother of Bau (58), who is called *Aba-u*; she has the same name as the apparent male warrior who began this section and was defined as the husband of Gula. Then comes Bau's daughter-in-law (59), and *Gatumdug* (60) – here equated with Bau, although at third millennium Lagash she would have rather counted as Bau's mother – and a son (61). There is a steward (62) and constable (63) of the Eninnu (Ningirsu's temple), and a constable of Ningirsu (64). Next is a partially preserved list of Ningirsu's five children (65–69), of whom only the last two, *Šulšagana* and *Igalim*, can be identified from other sources. A list of Ningirsu's four donkeys (70–73) is unfortunately not fully preserved. The earlier constable of the Eninnu is given two viziers (74–75), followed by three constables (76–78) of a generic "household" and a constable of the "city" (79). Bau is given three constables (80–82), and three stewardesses (83–85). Next are five attendants of the Eninnu (86–90), seven counselors of Ningirsu (91–97), four of Bau (98–101), and two chamberlains of hers (102–103). The section concludes with one more figure (104), partially preserved and of uncertain relevance.

Having completed the excursus on Ningirsu and the Lagash deities, the topic returns to the healing goddess. The first group of names (105–110) is explained as *Nintinuga*, and they correspond to the group which occurred in Proto-An just after *Aba-u* and *Gula*, who, in the present text, were listed just before the excursus on Ningirsu. The order of those names, mostly in ⁴nin-ti- or ⁴nin-tin-, follows the same order as in Proto-An, and two new ones have been inserted (one of them not preserved). Next, the husband of *Nintinuga* is listed (111) as *Endaga*, followed by a figure *Enanun*, explained as the mother of *Gula* (112). *Enanun* had occurred in the healing goddess "appendix" at the very end of Proto-An, where she was followed by (an abbreviated form of) *Pabilsag*, himself having already been listed earlier, in the healing goddess section proper. As there, *Pabilsag* is here listed in the following line, this time with three names (113–115), one of which had followed the first occurrence of *Pabilsag* in Proto-An. The occurrence of *Pabilsag* in the present text thus corresponds contextually to both occurrences in Proto-An. *Pabilsag* is thus implied, but not directly stated, to be the same as *Endaga*.

In the next line is another name for the healing goddess, *Ninisina* (116), who, in Proto-An, had immediately followed *Endaga*. She is explained as *Ninkarak*. This begins the long main list of the names of the healing goddess (116–152), thirty-seven in total, expanded from twenty-two in Proto-An. The reoccurring names follow the exact same order as before, but the new ones have been inserted between them throughout the list. *Gula* is again listed

in this sequence, even though she already occurred all the way back in line 53, in the sequence leading into the excursus on Lagash. After this long list, *Damu* is listed as her son (153), possibly with a second name (154), not preserved. *Damu* appeared in Proto-An, but in a different context. Another broken name is listed in relation to *Damu*, possibly his vizier (154); this name might also have occurred at the end of the healing goddess section in Proto-An, but there it is broken too. *Damu* also has a counselor (155), followed by three viziers of *Gula* (157–159), the first of which occurred in Proto-An just after the aforementioned broken entry. The text thus now uses *Gula* as the main name of the healing goddess, even though it occurred somewhere in the middle of the long list. Then come five constables (160–164) of the *Egalmah* – *Gula's* temple – three of which were known in Proto-An, their order now having been changed; the temple also has a doorkeeper (165), also known from Proto-An, but who there occurred within the group of constables. Then her five attendants (166–170) are listed – the first one was in the earlier text and the rest are new – followed by two counselors (171–172). Then the name of one of the attendants is repeated (173) for unclear reasons, and given an unusual description, "(she is) among (š₃) the attendants of *Gula*."

Next begins the section on *Manungal*, the goddess in charge of prisons (also known as *Nungal*, whereby *Manungal* likely derives from *Ama-nungal*). In Proto-An, *Manungal* was listed right after the names of the healing goddess, but before all of the healing goddess' servants (corresponding to the preceding section in the present text). This implies that, in Proto-An, *Manungal* was the chief servant of *Gula*. However, An = *Anum* mentions no connection between the healing goddess and *Manungal* at all. On the other hand, *Manungal* could traditionally count as the daughter of *Anu* and *Ereškigal*, the latter of whom appears in the next section. *Manungal* thus serves as an appropriate transition between the healing goddess section and the section on the netherworld proper. *Manungal's* section begins with newly introduced figures: first a certain *NIN-zu* (174) whose role is left undefined, then *Manungal's* husband, *Birtum* (175). *Manungal* herself has three names (176–178); the first one, *Manungal*, is the newly introduced one. She has a vizier (179) and a chief bailiff (180), both of which names occurred adjacently, but in a different context, in Proto-An – they were instead names or servants of *Inanna*. The rest of *Manungal's* court is populated with new material: a constable (181) and her child (182), two counselors (183–184), a vizier of her husband (185), eight messengers (186–193) – whose names refer to instruments of restraint (manacles, fetters, neck stocks, etc.) – and a herald of the prison (194).

Having dealt with the prison deities, the text arrives at the heart of the netherworld, beginning with its queen, *Ereškigal*. In Proto-An, this section, which followed the end of *Gula's* list of servants, began instead with *Ninazu*, but in the canonical text he is relegated to a more subordinate position. *Ereškigal* is equated with *Allatum*, and she is given four names (195–198). *Ereškigal* and *Alla-*

tum, here listed first and last, were the two names already present in Proto-An; the new entries were added in between. Her husband *Guḡalana* (199) is likewise new. The text moves onto *Ereškigal*'s court, listing three figures in the same order as they appeared in Proto-An: first *Marḡulanki* (200), explained as an advisor or the mother of *Namtar*, then *Namtar* (201), explained as *Ereškigal*'s vizier, and (202) *Dingirḡuṡbisa*, *Namtar*'s wife. The material that follows is all new: *Namtar*'s daughter (203) and a cook of *Ningirida* (204), who seems somewhat out of place, because *Ningirida* (*Ninazu*'s wife) will not be introduced for several more lines; *Ereškigal*'s two doorkeepers (205–206); a list of synonyms for the netherworld or for *Ereškigal*/*Al-latum* herself (207–215); *Ereškigal*'s daughter (216) and messenger (217–218), and the messenger's daughter (219). Finally comes *Ninazu* (220–221), with one newly introduced name. *Ninazu* counted as *Ereškigal*'s son in some traditions, yet here his relationship to her is left undefined. He is followed by his wife *Ningirida*, also known as *Girida* (222), and a list of seven children (223–229), of whom only the first was known in Proto-An.

The list now comes to *Ningiṡzida*, who in turn could have been identified as *Ninazu*'s son, yet no relationship is here specified. *Ningiṡzida* and his wife appeared in a different context in Proto-An, namely at the end of the section of "terrestrial deities" (including *Lugalbanda*, etc. and corresponding to the beginning of Tablet V), and after a subsection on *Damu* and *Geṡtinana*. Here he has been given a second name (230–231). In Proto-An only his first wife was listed, but here he has two (232–233), in addition to a cohort of other figures: three sisters (234–236); three undefined figures (237–239); his vizier (240) and two more viziers (241–242), whose affiliations are broken, and three more figures (243–245) with broken descriptions.

After two more broken figures of unclear affiliation (246–247) comes *Tiṡpak* (248), who, in the second millennium, replaced *Ninazu* as the tutelary deity of *Eṡnunna*, and so could be seen as another form of him. In Proto-An, he was listed immediately after *Ereškigal*. He has two wives (249–250), the first of whom might have been listed in Proto-An. Everything else related to him is new material, including a son (251), vizier (252), counselor (253–254), a son spelled four different ways (255–258), and another son (259).

In the next line the text introduces *ṡuṡinak* (or *Inṡuṡinak*), a *Ninurta*-like warrior deity and the patron of the city of *Susa*. He seems somewhat isolated here, and one could suppose that this placement is due to the fact that his name is spelled similarly to that of *Tiṡpak* (including the *MUṡ_{2/3}* sign). Next comes a subsection on *Iṡtaran*, a judicial deity associated with borders, at home in the city of *Der*. Perhaps there could have been a geographical association between *ṡuṡinak* and *Iṡtaran*, since *Der* was on the way to *Susa* from central Babylonia and the *Diyala* region. *Iṡtaran* has three names (261–263), a vizier (264), counselor (265), son (266), and two attendants (267–268).

The final section of Tablet V is devoted to the twin netherworld gods *Lugalirra* and *Meslamta-e'a*. These two

figures also appeared adjacently in Proto-An, right after the subsection devoted to *Ereškigal*. *Lugalirra* (269) is listed as in Proto-An with his wife *Kuanesi* (270); *Meslamta-e'a* has now been provided with *Mamitum* as a wife, who in Proto-An however was listed next to *Nergal* as his wife; she subsequently reappears in this role in Tablet VI; the deity listed immediately after *Meslamta-e'a* in Proto-An was instead *Ninṡubur*. *Lugal-irra* has a vizier (273) as does *Meslamta-e'a* (274); they share a messenger under their combined name (275). Three logographically spelled deities (276–278) seem as chthonic beings related both thematically and lexically, since the last one refers to "the two gods"; a further three lines (279–281) refer to both *Lugal-irra* and *Meslamta-e'a* as a single unit ("the twin gods"). The final two entries, left unexplained, occurred in Proto-An after the twin deities (if one removes the material on *Ninṡubur*, which was moved to Tablet I). The husband (416), presented with his wife (417), seems from his name *Lugal-a'aba* to be a patron over the ocean. In Proto-An, the section on *Nergal* immediately followed him, which here marks the start of Tablet VI.

Tablet VI

As stated, the transition from the last entry of Tablet V to the first entry of Tablet VI corresponds exactly to the sequence in Proto-An. Tablet VI begins with *Nergal*, whose name (1) is left unexplained. The tradition of Proto-An whereby *Nergal*'s other names followed the name of his wife is also maintained; first a new name for the wife – *Laṡ* – is introduced, followed by the name which was listed already in Proto-An, *Mamitum* (2–3). Then, the rest of *Nergal*'s names follow (4–12): the first four were in Proto-An, and the remaining five are newly introduced, for a total of ten including his main name. Then, another name of his wife is given (13), so that she has a total of three. *Nergal*'s son (14) *ṡubula* was already in Proto-An, while his daughter (15) and vizier are new. The vizier *Iṡum* is defined as a son of *Utu* and given five names (16–20); his wife is *Ninmug* (21), and they have four daughters (22–25).

As in Proto-An, the section devoted to *Nergal* proper is followed by a long section of names beginning with ⁴*lugal* (26–95), which all seem to refer to old local deities similar in nature to *Nergal* himself. They are not however defined as forms of *Nergal*, but instead are all marked as distinct (*ṡU*) from one another. Most of them are left otherwise unexplained, but for some, an Akkadian explanation or translation as *bēl* ... "Lord of ..." has been added. The original sequence from Proto-An is roughly adhered to in places, but overall, the names have been rearranged and expanded via insertions, from originally thirty-one names to seventy. Some names from Proto-An have been discarded. That this group of names has something to do with *Nergal* is implied by its position, and also by their content. The second element of the names often refers to some feature of cultic topography with a netherworld connotation, or constitute what seems to be an epithet appropriate to the god of death and destruction. For some names, the

connection to Nergal seems less immediately obvious, but this might be better explained as due to our own ignorance than the names having been mechanically included from an unrelated source. The group also shows, in places, a clear lexically based arrangement, with names beginning with the same element grouped together.

The end of the ^dlugal- group is marked by the name ^dNIN-uru-bar-ra (96), like in Proto-An. This figure heads the list of a more mixed group that still seems thematically related to the previous one (96–108), and which also includes some ^dlugal- names. It includes the figure Irra or Erra (102–103), similar or identical to Nergal. The final three members (106–108) of this group have names in ^dlugal-giš-... and are explained in Akkadian using words for kinds of demons; the penultimate one (107), ^dlugal-giš-du₃-a, occurred already within the preceding ^dlugal- section (46), with an earlier parallel in Proto-An, and will be repeated yet again in the following section (135); in Tablet I, it was also a name of Ninurta (214).

From this point onward Tablet VI no longer bears any relationship to Proto-An. Nor does it display any real coherent structural organization. The redactors seem to have simply tacked on whatever material they had available that related to the netherworld in order to provide a complete picture of this aspect of the divine realm. The nature of the material concerning demons and other netherworld figures may have not lent itself so well to structural organization based on family and household relationships.

The text proceeds to list various types of demons. In some instances groups of Sumerian designations for demons are explained by a single Akkadian term, while in others the Sumerian term is repeated and explained with different Akkadian words. It begins with a storm demon U_g (109–113), whose name is expanded with suffixes: “of the city” (110) and names which seem to refer to a ferocious state of his “mouth” (111–113); line 113 is a repetition of line 111, but this time explained as a “mad dog demon.” This leads into another subsection of names explained as the mad dog demon (114–117) which seem to convey similar images of ferocity. The next subsection has names explained as “evil god” (118–121). The first name (118), “the bailiff (or: lurker) of the highway,” has already appeared twice in An = Anum, both times explained as Šulpa’ē: in Tablet I: 176 (where the context implied his identity with Enlil) and in IV: 261 (where he was associated with the *hallulāya* “centipede” demon). The next demon (122) is explained in relation to “Erra-baba,” where Erra seems to refer to the death deity but -baba is a suffix of uncertain meaning. The next two lines (123–124) are explained in Akkadian as “the scorcher”; line 123 seems to evoke the storm demon again, while 124 repeats the “lurker of the highway” from 118. Lines 125–126 concern the pair Almu/Allamu; 127–128 concern the Galla. In the next subsection (129–131), the Sumerian logogram ^du_{du}g is repeated, and explained variously as *utukku*, *šēdu*, and *rābišu*. Finally, there is a list of netherworld deities or demons (132–147) without any explanation. Some lexically based internal organization can be detected: 133–136 are names in ^dlugal-

137–138 in ^dUD-; 140–141 end with -at; 143–144 begin in ^dilti-/^delti-; 145–146 are alternate spellings of the same name. The final entry ^dimin-SIG₇, of uncertain meaning, seems, through its first element ^dimin- “seven,” to provide the transition into the next section, which concerns the Sebettu, an infernal or demonic heptad.

At the head of the section concerning the Sebettu “the seven” are two terms standing for them as a collective: “the seven heroes” (148) followed in 149 by “the seven.” Then each member of the group of seven is listed four times by their names as they are known in four different regions: Sumer (149–156); Akkad (157–163); Gutium (164–170); and Elam (171–177). Unfortunately, the actual names of the seven are not preserved for all of these regions except for Elam (and the final entry for Gutium). In the case of Sumer, each member of “the seven” is explained as one of the major Mesopotamian male deities, in rank order: Anu, Enlil, Ea, Šin, Šamaš, Adad, and Ninurta. The names of the seven for the other regions are left unexplained. The names of the Elamite seven seem to authentically belong to the Elamite language, and some are known from other sources.

The subsection concerning “the seven” of Elam has been expanded somewhat: they are provided with a “sister” (178) and a “jester” (179). This leads to an excursus on the Elamite pantheon (180–187), with eight major figures listed, each one defined in relation to its Mesopotamian equivalent. The Mesopotamian deities are the same ones in the same order as seen above for the “seven of Sumer,” only the mother goddess Bēlet-ili has been tacked on to the end. Some of these names seem to be variant spellings of names from among the “seven of Elam” while others are different. This group is also provided with a “jester” (188) whose name seems to be a variant of the jester given above in 179. A figure of uncertain nature is then listed (189) and defined as Ningišzida. Then there is a group of three deities (190–194), with two synonyms, who are defined as the three (...) of Sumer, where the word that states what they actually are is unfortunately broken away.

The next long section, listing sundry demons and netherworld deities (195–222), shows a clear lexically based organization, with figures written with the same logogram grouped together and provided with glosses. For some of them, similar entries are known from lexical sources (see the comments to the individual entries). Some of these groups may have shared a thematic connection as well, but this is difficult to identify due to their obscurity. None of them are provided with any explanation. The sequence starts with a figure ^dnin-ḥa-lam-ma (195), whose name looks like it could mean “Lord/lady of destruction.” Then there is a group of deities written ^dGUD (196–202) and ^dKU₇ (203–207). A figure called Atti (208) is of unclear affiliation. The next group (209–216) share on the one hand a lexical connection (in that many of them are spelled ^dNAGAR), but also a thematic one, in that they all refer to one or more “slain gods,” who, according to certain myths, were killed in order that mankind could be created (see further the comments to these lines). Then there is a

group spelled ^dMUG (217–218) and a group spelled ^dKUD (219–220). Finally, the sequence ends with Martu/Amurru (221) and a possibly identical “man of the mountains,” ^dtu₂-hur-sag (222).

These last two entries provide the link into the next section, dealing with Amurru. It somewhat resembles the material from earlier parts of An = Anum in that Amurru and his wife are listed together by their multiple names, but there are no children or courtiers listed. There is no parallel material from Proto-An and the section reads more like a simple compilation. It seems also somewhat haphazardly organized. Amurru’s first name is given as Samanur (223), the deified lead rope connected with animals, whom we have already encountered in Tablet I: 226, among Ninurta’s entourage and defined as a son of Anu, and in III:87, as a son of Gayyu, Sin’s herdsman. The text lists here a total of five names of Amurru (223–227), two of which are lost. Then, Amurru’s wife is given as Urkitum (228). Then the text goes back to listing names of Amurru. The first one this time is Anubu, with a syllabic and a logographic spelling (229–230); the next is Šaḥan, with a variety of spellings (231–234), and then Gudu-anki (235). The text lists Amurru’s wife yet again, this time with the apparent variant spelling Ikitum (236). Next, the text launches into an excursus of logographic spellings including the elements KUR (237–242) and KASKAL.KUR (243–249), provided with glosses. This was apparently prompted by Amurru’s names Anubu and Šaḥan, which were listed, spelled as ^dKUR, in 230 and 232, and which are given again as the first two names in this sequence. It is unclear if the rest of these figures have any relevance to Amurru himself; at any rate, no explanations are given. With this aside complete, the text returns yet again to Amurru, this time giving his name as ^ddingir-mar-tu (250), which probably represents either a logogram for, or a Sumerianization of, *Il Amurrim* “the god of the Amorite(s).” With only one name given, the text then moves focus to his wife (251–265), listed with fifteen names. The first one is apparently Sumerian, ^dgu₂-bar-ra, and among the list are also some names of clear western origin, such as Anatum, Ašratum, and Ašera.

After the names of Amurru’s wife have been listed, one of them, Ašratum, is repeated again (266) for unclear reasons, but this time defined as distinct (ŠU) instead of equivalent (MIN) to Amurru’s wife. This leads to a section of sundry, unexplained names (266–277), which, since they start to become fragmentary from line 269, are difficult to classify. When the text picks up again, it lists two names for the *bibru*-demon (278–279), apparently a type of bird associated with the wilderness. The next entry is fragmentary (280), and the following two give Sumerian and Akkadian spellings for *Lā-šanān* “the one without rival” (281–282). Then comes, somewhat unexpectedly, the famous hero Gilgamesh. He seems to be included in An = Anum as somewhat of an afterthought, but is at home here, since he was thought to be lord over the human community within the netherworld. His name is given in three spellings (283–285), and he is possibly accompanied by his brother-in-arms Enkidu (286), though this is un-

certain because the name and explanation are fragmentary. There is then a gap of approximately 12 lines (287–298), and two partially preserved entries (299–300). When the text becomes legible again, it is listing sundry names in ^dnin- (301–304) of uncertain nature. The final section (305–310) seems like a kind of appendix, perhaps imported from a different source. It has a lexical format, listing, in Sumerian and Akkadian, what seem to be generic terms for deities or types of deities rather than specific names.

The partially preserved catchline in N₂₅ (^da-ri-a | [...]) seems to indicate that something different from what we reconstruct as Tablet VII followed in the tradition of that manuscript. Significantly, the colophon of N₂₅ identifies it as based on a copy of “Assyrian” origin, whereas all other manuscripts, where such a statement is preserved, give instead Babylon or Borsippa. A comparable catchline appears at the end of ms. B₂₃, (a copy of the Babylonian recension of Anšar = Anum): ^dl^ra⁷-ri-[a] | ^dlugal-gu₂-du₈-a^{ki}. This could imply that there existed a tradition where, instead of or in addition to Tablet VII, containing “esoteric” names of Marduk, another tablet containing additional netherworld deities, essentially an extension of Tablets V and VI, was inserted. Possibly, the “extra” material in β, inserted between Tablets VI and VII and edited below as the Appendix to An = Anum, could be related to this.

Tablet VII

Tablet VII is different from Tablets I–VI and must be considered as an essentially separate composition which was added on to the main series. Instead of providing a systematic, structured depiction of the pantheon, Tablet VII focuses on Marduk. It lists names or epithets of his that generally do not occur elsewhere, and that seem to be novel creations, generated by combining various basic elements in an iterative manner, and listed in an order which makes this iteration evident. They are often difficult to understand, and seem to have an esoteric quality, encoding meaning on multiple levels, and rich in intertextual reference. Tablet VII is only about half as long as the other Tablets in the series. It is divided into two main sections: names listed as equivalent to Marduk (1–65) and names listed as equivalent to ^ddi-ku₅ “judge” (66–122). This logogram, in Tablet II: 244, referred to a deity Madānu, defined as the “chamberlain” of Marduk. Given the context and the nature of Tablet VII, it seems likely that here Madānu, as a lesser deity belonging to Marduk’s circle, should at the same time refer to an aspect of Marduk himself, in his quality as a “judge.” This is further suggested by the re-occurrence of elements from the Marduk section in the ^ddi-ku₅ section, such as ušum-gal or ušum-maḥ, elements which allude to Marduk’s symbolic animal, the dragon.

The only name which seems to have been in real use outside of this list is the last one given in the Marduk section (65), Asarluḫi. The way different building blocks were combined and recombined to form novel titles seems to attest a kind of scribal experimentation with possibilities, one that, once having been established, was then trans-

mitted as a kind of sacred knowledge. This Marduk-focused mysticism is redolent of the intellectual enterprise which produced *Enūma Eliš*. Ironically, however, Tablet VII is so far only attested in Assyrian copies: on Kidin-Sin's large tablets (α and β), on a Middle Assyrian fragment excavated from Aššur (A₁₁), and on a Neo-Assyrian copy from Aššurbanipal's library (N₂₇). This distribution nevertheless demonstrates that it was integrated into the canonical series already from an early date.

1.5.8. The "An = Anum Synonym List"

Following a reconstruction that goes back to Zimmern, it has been supposed in modern scholarship that several Tablets belonging to a synonym list, similar in nature to the list *Malku = šarru*, were at some point appended on to the end of An = *Anum*.⁵³ The Chicago Assyrian dictionary followed suit, citing these synonym lists as "An VII," "An VIII," and "An IX." That an "An X" once existed is surmised through the catchline of "An IX." The assignment of these synonym lists to An = *Anum* is, however, based on a single, partially preserved colophon on a badly vitrified tablet fragment. The colophon on the reverse of that fragment allegedly reads "Tablet IX of An = *Anum*."⁵⁴ The traces on the obverse were recognized by Zimmern as duplicating the better preserved exemplars of the synonym list which, as a result, Zimmern now labeled "An IX." Notably however, the best preserved manuscript of "An IX," which includes a colophon and catchline, does not identify itself as belonging to any series at all.⁵⁵ "An VIII"⁵⁶ has in turn been identified as such only by its catchline, which matches the first line of "An IX." Even more problematic is the so-called "An VII,"⁵⁷ which has been so labeled due to the fact that a single manuscript contains its text followed immediately by the list identified as "An VIII."⁵⁸ Needless to say, it seems unlikely that the synonym list "An VII" really occupied that position within the series An = *Anum*, since, as shown above, this position was already occupied, both in Kidin-Sin's time (mss. α and β) and in Aššurbanipal's (ms. N₂₇). In fact, the newly available colophon of the Nineveh manuscript of the authentic An = *Anum* Tablet VII (ms. N₂₇, fragment K 8720 = CTL 2: 517), while not preserving

its numeration, clearly marks the series as "complete,"⁵⁹ seemingly ruling out the possibility that any synonym lists were really tacked on. Theoretically, since Tablet VII is itself something of an appendix, it is possible that a tradition which tacked on a series of synonym lists assumed a count of only six god list Tablets. But there is no direct evidence for this, and Kidin-Sin's MA recensions demonstrate that Tablet VII was already in place quite early.

Without any further evidence that our god list series was really extended, unexpectedly, to include synonym lists of a completely different nature, it is probably best to disregard the badly damaged "Tablet IX" colophon. The reading itself seems dubious, and the scribe of another manuscript of that synonym list did not bother to include such a designation, suggesting that even if the synonym lists really were ever added onto the end of An = *Anum*, this was a secondary development. The damaged colophon alone is insufficient evidence to make conclusions about a scribal curriculum of god lists supposedly leading into a synonym list. Moreover, a different designation than the extremely generic and misleading "An" should be used in scholarship, both when citing the synonym lists (one could use instead the equations in the first line) and the god list An = *Anum*. Many (if not nearly all) god lists begin with "An," including also the Weidner list (which, itself, is also sometimes confusingly referred to as "*Anum*"); the synonym lists "An VII-IX" contain no equation involving An, yet this designation also allows for easy confusion with the synonym list An = *šamū*.

1.6. An = Anum ša amēli

The list An = *Anum ša amēli* was included by Kidin-Sin in both of his two large compilation tablets (mss. α and β), demonstrating that he considered it to be, to some degree, related or similar to An = *Anum* itself. Yet despite this juxtaposition, and the similarity of their titles, based in each case on their first lines, An = *Anum ša amēli* is a composition of a rather different nature. The first edition of this composition appeared in Litke's 1958 dissertation. There is also a transliteration available online, on the *DCCLT*, by an anonymous author.

Kidin-Sin's Middle Assyrian tablets (mss. α and β) remain our principal source for the composition; beyond these, only two small fragments from Nineveh (N₂₈ and N₂₉) are known. They provide little in the way of text, but confirm, at least, that the composition was still copied in the first millennium. The smaller of these two Nineveh fragments (N₂₈) was recently identified by Jeremiah Peterson and Enrique Jiménez. Some lines in the Enki section near the end of the list can be restored by witnesses belonging to what can now, thanks to a newly available Babylonian manuscript, be identified as a distinct (but closely related) composition: Enki = *Ea ša kullati* (see § 1.7). Overall, the list is almost completely preserved; of a re-

⁵³ Zimmern 1911: 124; see Hruša 2010: 1 with fn. 3.

⁵⁴ 1880-7-19, 297 (CT 24, pl. 18) rev. 1: 'dub' 9-kam an ^dq² a²-nu³-[um]; cf. the photo CDLI P429431, where the signs ^dq² a²-nu³ seem today much more poorly recognizable than portrayed on King's copy. Note that the alleged second AN sign (in ^dq² a²-nu³), if it really is an AN, seems to be written much smaller than the first AN sign.

⁵⁵ "An IX": K 2032 + 8490//K 14789 + 14490 (ed. Meissner 1921: 70-75; see CT 18: pl. 6 for a composite copy and RA 17: 172 for K 14490).

⁵⁶ "An VIII": K 3906 + K 14354//K 5422B//K 12021 (see CT 18: pl. 5 for a composite copy); additional fragments are K 11205 (CT 18: pl. 17), K 12022 (CT 18: pl. 41), and K 169 + K 13658 (CT 18: pl. 11-14, containing also "An VII").

⁵⁷ "An VII": K 4377 (CT 18: pl. 19) + K 4380 (2R 29, 5) + K 8827 (CT 14, 27); K 9983 (CT 18: pl. 19); K 169+ (see the above note).

⁵⁸ Cf. the discussion in Hruša 2010: 4-5 with fn. 26; 20. The synonym list "An VII" in fact runs directly parallel to the last 50 lines of *Malku = šarru V* and all of VI.

⁵⁹ N₂₇ rev. i 1': [dub 7-kam an ^dq² a²-nu³-u]m 'zag' t[il-la-bi-še₃].

constructed total of 164 entries (152 of which belong to the composition proper), approximately eleven names are still missing, and only two explanations. Like An = *Anum*, the ultimate origin of An = *Anum ša amēli* was probably in Kassite Babylonia.

An = *Anum ša amēli* does not share the focus of An = *Anum* on portraying divine households and depicting the pantheon in a structured manner. Instead, the focus is on listing and, above all, explaining, the various names or titles of the principal deities of the pantheon. The list has a triple subcolumn format. The first subcolumn lists a deity's various appellations, some of which can be unusual ones, seldom encountered in everyday texts. The second column repeats, for each entry, the deity's typical or most well-known name, usually their Akkadian one. The third column continues the second one with *ša* "of," and then provides the explanation or analysis of the name in the first column.⁶⁰ Thus, each entry has the following format: "(Atypical name) is (familiar name) of (explanation)," whereby "of" could be interpreted with a broad meaning: "as he/she is related to, in his/her aspect as," or similar. The explanation consists of some word or phrase that describes a particular characteristic, sphere of responsibility, or area of operation of that deity. The relationship between explanation and explained name is, moreover, not arbitrary (in most cases and as far as we can tell). Sometimes, the explanation simply describes a traditional aspect of the deity, aspects which were probably common knowledge in ancient times, and are today known from myths, iconography, and the like. These types of explanations are most often paired with a deity's more common or traditional names. In some cases, the explanation is simply a one-to-one rendering or translation into Akkadian of the plain meaning of the name, which is usually Sumerian. In yet others, the derivation of the explanation from the name seems to rely on some level of hermeneutic analysis beyond that which is directly denoted by the name; it might, for example, derive meaning from another reading of one of the cuneiform signs used to spell the name, or, from a different, but homophonous, cuneiform sign. In at least one case, this method of hermeneutic derivation seems to have resulted in an explanation which was at odds with a deity's traditional characteristics.⁶¹ Sometimes the explanation can be recognized as being based on an equivalence made in a lexical text. Other explanations seem to have been based on a kind of loose semantic association. In those cases, where no clear link between name and explanation can be detected, it cannot always be decided

⁶⁰ The same construction was used in lexical texts generally in order to specify the semantic field to which an Akkadian rendering of a Sumerian term belonged (Lambert 2016 [1975]: 44), e.g. Aa VIII/1: 42 (MSL 14: 493), *du₈ = kamāru ša šurīpi* "Du₈ (Sumerian) means 'to pile up' (as said) of frost."

⁶¹ The case in point being line 100, where the deity ⁴šakkan(GIR₃) is explained as "of lightning" (*ša birqi*). This seems to have been based on the homophony between GIR₃ and GIR₂ as in *nim-gir₂* "lightning." Šakkan however was a pastoral god of wild animals, and is not otherwise known to be responsible for or associated with weather.

whether the apparent arbitrariness is a feature of the text or a result of our own failure to understand. For further examples, see the comments to the individual lines.

If An = *Anum* made any contribution to An = *Anum ša amēli*, then it could have been as a source of names for it to explain; however, these names could have just as easily been derived from some common textual source, or have been drawn from a common pool, being names that were known in general. At any rate, there are many names which do not occur in An = *Anum*, and those names which do, only rarely reoccur in the same sequence. A connection with Proto-An seems even weaker; in many cases (e.g., for Enlil) the names which are listed in *ša amēli* are specifically not those which are listed in Proto-An.

On the other hand, each deity appearing in this text does also appear in Proto-An and An = *Anum*; there are no completely novel figures (with one incidental exception, see below). The overall order, however, is not the same. Only the first few highest ranking deities appear in a comparable traditional order – with the exception of Enki, who here comes near the end of the text. One also notices the lack of the mother goddess in this text. The nineteen deities listed are: Anu (1–12), Enlil (13–21) and Ninlil (22–23), Nanna/Sin (24–38) and Ningal (39), Utu/Šamaš (40–44) and Aya/Šerrida (45–47), Iškur/Adad (48–58) and Šala (59–60), Ninšubur (61–69), Ninurta (70–75), Nergal (76–85), Ištar (86–96) – for whom the name Inanna is notably lacking – Nisaba (97–99), Šakkan (100–106), Marduk (106–112), Nabû (113–118), Enki (119–148) and Manungal (149–152).

After the section of Manungal, the list abandons the previous pattern of explaining names, and instead adopts a triple column, lexical format. The leftmost column is unfortunately not preserved, but it may have contained phonetic spellings. The middle column has logographic spellings, and the rightmost, Akkadian equivalents. There is one section concerning the names of female demons related to Lamaštu (153–157) – who did not appear in An = *Anum* – and another concerning words for "storm" (158–164). The storm section is only contained on ms. β; ms. α ends the text after the Lamaštu section. For this reason one may have thought instead to separate the "storm" material from An = *Anum ša amēli* (as in Litke's original edition) and include it instead with the rest of the "extra" material contained in β. However, one of the manuscripts of the closely related text Enki = *Ea ša kullati* also contained material similar or identical to the storm section in a corresponding position – after names of Enki, Manungal, and Lamaštu – demonstrating that the juxtaposition of these sections was not unique to ms. β alone. Nor does ms. β contain any formatting indication that a new composition has started after the Lamaštu section. For these reasons the "storm" material is included here as part of An = *Anum ša amēli*.

In general, one would not classify An = *Anum ša amēli* as a syncretic list of the same kind as Shorter An = *Anum* (for which, see below § 1.8). Most of the names listed seem either to have been ones traditional for the deity in ques-

tion, or to be epithets appropriate to their character. Some syncretisms were established enough that they already appeared in An = *Anum* – for example, the ones involving Marduk. On the other hand, An = *Anum ša amēli* does take things a step further, and asserts some syncretisms which were not made in An = *Anum*. Šala, Adad's wife, is identified or conflated (59) with the similarly named Šalaš, the wife of Dagan. Under Ninurta's section one finds the similar warrior deities Tišpak and Šušinak (74–75), who were not equated with him yet in An = *Anum*, but who do appear in his long list of names in Shorter An = *Anum*, section F. Under Nergal, one finds the deities Lā-qīpu (83–84), Hēdursag (85), and, surprisingly, the musician deity Dunga (81). Nisaba has been equated with her own husband, Haya (98).⁶² Šakkan has been given the epithet ^dkur-gal “great mountain” (100), which usually belongs instead to Enlil; he is further equated with Amurru (102–103) – for whom the ^dkur-gal epithet was more traditional – and also with Saman(ur) (106). Nabū is equated with Muati (117), while those figures were kept separate in An = *Anum* (Muati is listed in Tablet IV: 7, but lacking in Nabū's section, Tablet II: 232f).

By far the most syncretistic section, however, is the one belonging to Enki. Aside from Enki's traditional names, most of the ones listed for him seem to have been minor deities associated with specific professions. While they may have shared an ancient connection with Enki on some level, since Enki counted as a deity of professions and crafts generally, here the text seems to make the specific assertion that each one of them is merely a particular form or manifestation of Enki, expressing a particular characteristic of his. The explanations are not related to an exegesis of the name, but instead refer to the responsibility of the deity over a profession. Among the deities appearing here, who were not specifically identified as Enki in An = *Anum*, are: Ninagal (126), Kuskibanda (129), Lumḥa (131), Dunga (132), Uttu (138), Ninsirsir (141), and (Nin)-Tudra (142). Uttu and Tudra are telling examples for syncretism, because they otherwise counted as females; (Nin)-Tudra in particular was a name or title of the mother goddess. Also the names ^dUL.ZA.[MU]Š₃ and ^dPAD.AN.M[UŠ₃] (146–147) seem suggestive of Inanna (since MUŠ₃ is usually the sign for Inanna). The Enki section, in addition to being the longest, is different in nature from the rest of the composition. Its somewhat odd placement, in light of Enki's rank, towards the end of the composition, as well as the fact that a different recension of it apparently existed as separate composition (see § 1.7), lead one to question what might have been the original relationship of the Enki material to the list An = *Anum ša amēli* as a whole.

The explanatory *ša*-format, borrowed from lexical texts and employed in An = *Anum ša amēli*, was particularly suited to the expression of syncretism, as exemplified by the Late Babylonian tablet BM 47406.⁶³ In this list, various important deities are explained as aspects of Marduk. The explanations refer to the traditional characteristics of the deity with whom Marduk was syncretized, now asserted to be an area of Marduk's responsibility.

1.7. Enki = Ea ša kullati

The short list Enki = *Ea ša kullati* is known from two fragments from Nineveh (N₃₀ and N₃₁), both of which belonged to tablets of uncertain original dimensions, and a Late Babylonian tablet (B₁₇), which, despite some surface lacunae, is preserved over its entirety. Thus, B₁₇ contained it as a stand-alone composition, whereas the Nineveh copies may have also included other material, perhaps similar to the earlier part of An = *Anum ša amēli*. B₁₇ also preserves part of a colophon, but the title of the composition is broken away.

Enki = *Ea ša kullati* is essentially an alternate recension of the Enki section of An = *Anum ša amēli*. The biggest difference is that an additional, left-hand subcolumn has been added, in which a syllabic spelling of each name is given. In this respect it resembles a typical Sumeru-Akkadian lexical list. The syllabic spellings themselves seem somewhat inconsistent. Sometimes ^dnin- is spelled out ni-in, but other times it is left simply as nin. Certain signs which one might have expected to be phonetically rendered, such as dim₂-mud (4–5), or sir₂-sir₂ (12) are simply repeated in each column; in one case a “syllabic rendering” is actually the traditional spelling of a logographically spelled name (line 8: nin-a₂-gal = ^dSIMUG). Unfortunately, the syllabic column is not preserved from line 20 onwards.

In our edition of this text, the corresponding line numbers from the Enki section of An = *Anum ša amēli* are listed in the left hand margin. One notices that the first nine lines – seemingly those listing Enki's most well-known identities – are in the same order in both texts. From this point on, however, the arrangement is quite different. Most of the entries have a correspondence in each version; the *ša amēli* version has two lines without a correspondence in *ša kullati* (lines 134 and 135: the patrons of the diviner and the scribe), while *ša kullati* has five (lines 24, 25, 26, 28, and 30: the patrons of the stone-cutter, carpenter, sculptor, canal-worker, and fisherman) without a match *ša amēli*. For the lines that do have a correspondence, in almost all cases the explanation is the same across corresponding names; exceptions are the first line⁶⁴ and line 144/14.⁶⁵ In some

⁶² Lambert 2016 (1975): 45 mentioned an instance in An = *Anum ša amēli* of what he considered to be a similar example of a syncretism of a husband and wife, “The last name of Anu given [in line 12] is Urash ‘earth.’ Elsewhere Urash is very properly Anu's spouse: heaven and earth form a natural pair. So even a wife can be absorbed into her husband!” As we have seen above, the originally female Urash (Proto-An line 34) was redefined as a male already in An = *Anum* (Tablet I, line 4) and declared equivalent to Anu.

⁶³ CT 24: 50. See Lambert 2013: 264–265; Lambert 2016 (1975): 46–47; Parpola 1995: 398–401.

⁶⁴ In An = *Anum ša amēli*, line 119, the explanation of the name ^den-ki is preserved only as [ša ...]-a-ti. This is difficult to reconcile with *kullati* (otherwise spelled *kul-la-ti* or *kul₂-la-ti*).

⁶⁵ In An = *Anum ša amēli ša amēli*, ^dza-[zi]-in is the god of the *assinu*, the bowmaker, while in *ša kullati* ^dnin-za-dim₂ is the god of

cases, the same name is spelled differently: e. g. *ša amēli* 128 has [dⁿi]n²-gi-rim-ma for dⁿnin-A.ĤA.KUD.DA in *ša kallati* 29; 132 has [d^u]m-ga for du-un-ga = dⁿNAR in 132; 142 has d^t[u²-ud]-ru for dⁿnin-tu-ud-ra in 13. In other cases, the same explanation is attached to what appear to be completely different names: e. g. *ša amēli* 140 has d^t[suḫu]r²-la₂ for d^we-er⁶⁶ in *ša kallati* 32; 145 has d^en-[t]ur for dⁿnin-ab-ĤI in 17; 146 has d^uL.ZA.[MU]š₃[?] for [d^en²]-apin in 33; 147 has d^pAD.AN.M[Uš₃][?] for as-ki = d^šSIR.SIG₇ (Ašgi) in 18; 148 has dⁿnin-maḫ-[di²] for dⁿnin-ME.BU.BU in 27. Although most of these differences are preserved only in the Babylonian manuscript, the Nineveh ones seem to have had the same differences, to the extent one can determine.

Finally, the manuscript N₃₁ alone contains material corresponding to the end of An = *Anum ša amēli*, only partially preserved: a section on Manungal (34–36), Lamaštu and other female demons (37–41), and words for storm (42–45). This seems to suggest that this recension of the Enki section could have been integrated into a list similar to An = *Anum ša amēli* as preserved principally by the large Middle Assyrian tablets. Yet B₂₀ also demonstrates that it existed as a stand-alone composition. It appears to be the case therefore that sections of larger lists could sometimes occur on their own, or that small lists could be integrated into larger ones.

1.8. Shorter An = *Anum*

The list “Shorter An = *Anum*” has been so called⁶⁷ because of its first few lines. They appear to give a shortened version of the same sequence as in the familiar An = *Anum*, beginning with the same equation: An = *Anum*. The first eleven lines correspond to lines 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 22 of the canonical text, revealing that the compiler was here only interested in the male, Anu, while the female equivalents of Anu’s wife Antum have been removed, along with the compound figure An-Ki. The deities equivalent to Antum were perhaps moved to a different section of the composition, not preserved.

The similarities that would allow us to consider Shorter An = *Anum* merely an abbreviated version of canonical An = *Anum*, however, end here. From what one can tell based on its state of preservation, Shorter An = *Anum* served a completely different function. Rather than portraying the relationships between deities through their families and

the *purkullu*, the stonecutter; see the comment to line 144 of An = *Anum ša amēli*.

⁶⁶ The occurrence of d^we-er as name for Ea, associated in lines 30 and 32 with fishermen and barbers, is difficult to explain. W^er is an ancient name for the storm god (see Schwemer 2001: 200–210); an otherwise unknown deity d^wpi-ir seems even less likely.

⁶⁷ Lambert referred to the composition by this name in his notes and in Lambert 1997: 1, fn. 1. Litke 1998: 5 referred to a composition called “Smaller An = d^wA-nu-um,” including some of the sources we now consider to be part of Shorter An = *Anum*, but also some unrelated ones. Litke believed that the extra material in ms. β (here “the Appendix,” see below § 1.11) belonged to “Smaller An = *Anum*,” but in light of the different nature of the material and the lack of any textual overlaps, they should be kept separate.

households, including lesser deities of all sorts, Shorter An = *Anum* simply collected names of the important deities, with a clear interest in syncretism. Descriptions of affiliation, familiar from canonical An = *Anum*, such as “his son,” “his vizier,” etc., are not present. Instead, some names are provided with explanations that seem to describe the meaning or relevance of a deity’s particular name or title, much like in An = *Anum ša amēli* (see above, § 1.6). Some of these explanations, like in *ša amēli*, take the form borrowed from Sumero-Akkadian lexical texts, of a genitive phrase in *ša*. Others seem more to resemble poetic epithets, like one might see in a literary text. The notation ŠU, used in An = *Anum* to assert that a deity is distinct from the preceding one, never occurs; the explanatory notation is always MIN “the same.” Notably, sometimes a name is declared to be equivalent to not just one, but two or more deities. For example in section B, line 3, a broken name is explained as “Damu and Anum,” while the following name is “Ningišzida and Anum.” In section D line 2, Šin is declared to exercise the “powers of Anu, Enlil, and Ea,” while in sections H and I, a whole sequence of names are declared to be both the mother goddess and Ištar. The deities treated fall into two distinct categories: male and female. While no single statement is preserved declaring this to be the case, it seems that the underlying principle (or perhaps, agenda) of this text is the assertion that there is, despite a surfeit of names, but one god and one goddess, and each name refers to some specific manifestation of that god or goddess. A better name for this list would therefore perhaps be “Syncretic” An = *Anum*. While the list has never before been edited as an integrated composition, some of the individual witnesses have been edited online in the *DCCLT* by Jeremiah Peterson.

The text is presently represented by six Neo-Assyrian fragments from Nineveh, one Middle Babylonian fragment from Babylon, and one Late Babylonian fragment possibly from Sippar.⁶⁸ It is reconstructed in nine non-directly joining sections, assigned the alphabetic sequence A through I. Sections A through G can be connected to one another through a chain of witnesses, each one containing parts of two or more sections. Manuscript N₃₂, from the upper edge of a tablet, and N₃₃, from somewhere in the middle, contain sections A and C, and B and D, respectively; they are, moreover, probably part of the same original tablet, so that section A in column i of N₃₂ is continued, after a gap, by section B in column i of N₃₃; the same applies to sections C and D in column ii. N₃₄, also a fragment from the upper edge of a tablet, contains a bit of the ends of some lines of section A, and provides some more lines to the end section C, unfortunately very fragmentary. The Middle Babylonian fragment B₂₁, again the upper portion of a tablet, contains, in column i, the fragmenta-

⁶⁸ Lambert wrote the heading “The Shorter An = *Anum*” on his unpublished, handwritten transliteration (folio 7285) of an extensive three-column explanatory list of names of Nergal (BM 41255B+ and duplicates, now published as CTL 2: 532–536). On formal grounds, this identification seems far from certain, and so that list will be held back for a future volume.

ry ends of lines apparently belonging to the beginning of the composition (section A); in its second column, it contains lines belonging to section E. This allows the link to the substantial fragment N₃₅, which this time consists of the lower portion of a tablet, containing lines belonging to section E at the end of its obv. column i. N₃₅ could thus have had longer columns than N₃₂+N₃₃, and N₃₄, which may instead have had a short and wide format; they should have had their section E somewhere in their lower column ii, while B₂₁ instead had it at the beginning of its column ii. N₃₅, following a gap at the beginning of obv. column ii, continues with section F, which continues across the preserved lower edge to rev. column i; after a gap, section G is represented by reverse column ii. N₃₆, the lower right portion of a tablet, contains lines belonging to section F. The Late Babylonian fragment B₂₁ contains parts of section G. The Neo-Assyrian fragment N₃₇, containing Sections H and I, represents the very end of a tablet, the lower reverse. It cannot be directly linked to the rest of the composition, but seems very likely to belong at the end of the text, based on its content and rubric. Possibly, it represents the remains of a “Tablet II” of Shorter An = Anum; if it turns out to represent a separate composition, then it is probably still best to include it here because of its closely related nature.

Based on internal considerations and on the existence of the fragment B₂₁, it seems most likely that Shorter An = Anum, like canonical An = Anum, was composed in the Middle Babylonian period. While it should not necessarily be assumed that the composition was exactly the same in the MB period as it is presently reconstructed, based mostly on Neo-Assyrian manuscripts, the fact that B₂₁ included parts of sections A and E suggests that the basic shape of the composition was indeed then already established.

As stated, the first part of section A (1–10) gives the male equivalents of Anu; lines 2, 3, and 4 (Uraš, Anšargal, and Anšar) were provided with explanations, but apparently the explanation for line 4 was already broken in the Nineveh scribe’s exemplar (see the comments to these lines). As a name of Anu, Uraš “earth” seems to be explained in relation to agriculture (“storage bins”) and prayers. Anšargal is explained according to the meaning of his name, but extended to refer not just to the “entirety” of heaven, but of earth as well (AN.KI). Thus, the compiler seems to have been alluding to a cosmology where heaven and earth were united in the figure of Anu. The MB fragment B₂₁ does not preserve any explanations for these lines; they were perhaps written on the lost left hand subcolumn (since the explanations are written to the left of ^dMIN in column ii). From line 12, the subject has apparently turned to Enlil, based on the partially restored name [^dlugal-kur-ku]r-ra, which is a well-known epithet of his going back to the third millennium, emphasizing Enlil’s kingship over all the lands or countries. This epithet did not appear in An = Anum. The next name (13) also seems to have ended in [^d...-kur]-kur-ra. Although the names through the end of the section (14–17) are fragmentary, none of them seem

to match the names given for Enlil in An = Anum. The explanatory column is not preserved either. But the adjacent placement of An and Enlil, who were separated by much other material in An = Anum Tablet I, could hint at the compiler’s intentions. It is possible that the explanatory column could have contained a statement relating Anu and Enlil, perhaps even asserting that they were equivalent to one another. As a matter of speculation, one might suppose that the names (12–13) in kur-kur-ra were interpreted as referring to the “earth,” and the initial element as referring to “heaven,” thus continuing the theme from the Anu section, in lines 3–4. The name in line 12, [^dlugal-kur-ku]r-ra, as a reference to kingship, would further emphasize the god’s supremacy.

The Anu theme seems to have continued into the fragmentary section B, where unfortunately all the names are broken away. In line 3, a name was explained, as “Damu and Anum,” and in 4, as “Ningsizda and Anum.” Damu (a figure similar to or identical with Dumuzi)⁶⁹ and Ningsizda were both chthonic, netherworld-associated deities, who however also had a connection with heaven; one is reminded of Dumuzi and Ningsizda’s appearance at the gates of heaven in the Adapa story,⁷⁰ and their inclusion among the group of seven deities presented with offerings by the deceased king Ur-Namma on his arrival to the netherworld.⁷¹ It thus could be the case that the theme of uniting heaven and earth in a single deity, as seen above in line 4, was continued in this section.

Section C likely also continues this theme; it provides names of Dumuzi, possibly those which were listed in the lacuna of An = Anum Tablet IV; the parallels to Proto-An (268–274) are clear, but several of the names have become corrupted. A half-broken divine determinative in the description to line 2 suggests it should be restored like B.3 above, explaining thus ^dama-ušumgal-an-na as Dumuzi and Anu (^d[a-*nu-um*]). The ancient compiler could have easily seen a reference to the deity Anu and/or the cosmic realm of heaven in the element -an-na of this ancient name of Dumuzi; the syncretic explanation again seems to unite heavenly and chthonic elements. Dumuzi is further identified in lines 7–9 with antediluvian kings of Bad-tibira and possibly also of Larak. These again emphasize a theme of kingship.

Section D begins with the faint traces of a rubric, which contained a label and a subtotal of entries. It could have referred to the entirety of the material covered so far; alternatively, it could have referred only to the Dumuzi-themed material, with the material on Anu and Enlil having already received a separate rubric. The rubrics preserved in section E (R0–11; R12–31) provide good comparative material for restoring this one. Both of those summarize a list of female names, and refer to a “lady of the lands” (*bēlet mātāti* (KUR.KUR), with the added remark that the names designated a particular aspect of hers

⁶⁹ See Fritz 2003: 249 f.

⁷⁰ Izre’el 2001: 18–19, lines 20’, 25’, 39’, 45’.

⁷¹ Flückiger-Hawker 1999: 119, line 104; 122, line 118.

(with *ša* used as in An = Anu *ša amēli*). The aspects are “rulership” (literally: Enlilship) and “as Aya (the wife of the sun god)” respectively. It seems quite likely, therefore, that the lost rubric here referred to a “lord of the lands” (*bēl māṭāti*), a title which would recall the ancient title of Enlil, partially restored in A.12, [^dlugal-kur-ku]r-ra. The rubric could possibly have referred to his aspect of “Anu-ship.”⁷² If there were two rubrics, one might speculate that the second one referred to his “Dumuzi-ship,” i.e., his aspect as Dumuzi.

Section D then continues with what are, in all likelihood, further names of the “lord of the lands,” this time in his aspect as the moon god, Nanna/Sin. The names preserved (1–6) are some of his standard ones, also present in An = Anum, with the exception of a new numerical name, ^d200 (4), likely based on a misunderstanding (see the comment to that line). The explanations are unfortunately mostly broken away, but can be restored from the closely parallel list fragment.⁷³ The explanation of the first name of the moon god, ^dnanna(ŠEŠ.KI), turns out to be the same explanation as in An = Anum *ša amēli*, “Sin of heaven and earth,” based on the cuneiform signs AN and KI as present in ^dnanna. This explanation again demonstrates the all-encompassing cosmic significance which the text wishes to bestow upon the names being treated. The explanation for the second name (Sin, written ^d30) similarly makes a clear syncretic reference appropriate for an identification between Sin and the “lord of the lands.” It states that Sin’s “powers are An, Enlil, and Ea” (^da-nu ^dBE ^u [^de₂-a par-šu-šú]), a phrase known from the parallel god list fragment and an astrological compendium.⁷⁴ In both of those sources, the logic is explained: as the moon progresses through his various phases (“crescent,” “kidney,” and “crown”) he assumes the powers or functions of An, Ea, and Enlil (in that order).⁷⁵ By this logic, the moon god could have been explained as merely an aspect or manifestation of a single great god.

After a gap, we come to section E, which now deals with names of a great goddess. The first part (1–11) lists names and explanations that, based on their content, seem like they should refer principally to Ištar; each explanation is prefaced by the notation ^dMIN, but the referent of MIN is not preserved. The names seem rather exotic, and are not

⁷² The fragment K 2074 (3R 55, 3), containing a section of a god list closely related to this one, preserves a partial rubric at its beginning (not copied in 3R): [šu-nigin ...x +] 4 MUM.EŠ ^d[... ša₂] ^da-nu-u₂-ti-[šú₂].

⁷³ K 2074 (see the previous note, and the comments to Section D, lines 1–2 for a transliteration of the fragment).

⁷⁴ K 250+ vi 16 ff (CT 26, 41; see Koch-Westenholz 1995: 202, line 287). In the god list fragment K 2074, after the fragmentary rubric quoted in fn. 72, comes a list of names of the moon god that closely parallels the present one, although the order is different. According to Lambert 2013: 186, the fragmentary explanatory subcolumn on the left side of K 2074 referred to more names of the moon god (^d30), showing that the fragment comes from the reverse of a tablet. This would further suggest that, despite the parallel (also involving the rubric), it comes from a different composition than Shorter An = Anum, since we are here only in obverse column ii.

⁷⁵ See Lambert 2013: 186–187 and Stol 1992: 250; 267, n. 52.

those listed in An = Anum Tablet IV. Each one is provided with an exegesis, without *ša*, that resembles a literary epithet, but the relationship between explanation and explained name is in most cases obscure. The first name preserved, ^dki-š[ar₂'] might have identified this goddess with Antum, and thus the appropriate cosmological counterpart to Anum/Anšar as listed in the beginning of the text, section A. The rubric reveals that there were twelve names in this section – thus only one is missing – and that they referred to the “lady of the lands in her aspect of rulership (literally: Enlil-ship).”

The next passage (12–20) contains twenty names of the “lady of the lands in her aspect as Aya.” The names listed are the familiar names of the wife of Šamaš as given in An = Anum, but the order has been rearranged and their number expanded; the novel names seem mostly like derivations of the preexisting ones. The first four names are provided with explanations in *ša*, and are, in fact, the same explanations as given for Aya in An = Anum *ša amēli*. One explanation, Aya “of the people,” did not occur there in Aya’s section, but was used for other deities. In an interesting case of syncretism, the Sumerian name of her husband, Utu (with the reading confirmed by gloss), is given as one of her own names. Most significant, however is the additional explanation that is given under the first name: Aya is identified as the “wife of Marduk” (*ḫirat* ^dša₃-zu). This provides a strong clue as to the ultimate identity of the syncretic “great god” who was dealt with in the first part of the text, and hints at the true agenda of the compiler. It is also what one would expect given the nature of the text and its presumed composition in the Middle Babylonian period. A level of syncretism beyond the ordinary is clearly at play here. Despite the element UTU in ^damar-utu, Marduk did not usually count as a solar deity, nor was an equation with the sun god typical.

The following passage (32–38), incompletely preserved, is dedicated to the names of Šala, the wife of Adad. She has been, as also in An = Anum *ša amēli*, conflated or syncretized with the wife of Dagan, Šalaš, due to the similarity of their names. As in the previous passage, here too she is immediately identified as the wife, not of her traditional husband, but of Marduk. The names preserved are the ones listed in An = Anum Tablets I and III for Šalaš and Šala. The names are provided with explanations, which are the same as those she was given in *ša amēli*, and some additional generic explanations that were applied to other deities in that text. While the rubric is not preserved, by analogy with the preceding section it should have referred to the “lady of the lands in her aspect as Šala.”

The identification of both Aya and Šala as Marduk’s wife has far-reaching implications for this text; it implies that likewise Marduk himself was identified with Šamaš and with Adad, and that there were passages concerning Šamaš and Adad in the gap between sections D and E. It likewise implies that purpose of the listing of names of Anu, Enlil, Dumuzi, and Nanna/Sin in sections A–D was ultimately an identification of these deities, not only with one another, but with Marduk, even if a statement to that

effect is not preserved. One can compare certain syncretistic hymns or prayers. In one example, Marduk is identified with Sin, Anu, Dagan, Enlil, Adad, Ea, Ninurta, Nergal, and Šamaš,⁷⁶ a set of names closely matching those treated in the present list (some, such as Ea or Nergal, could have been treated in the lacunae). Similarly, the female deities, including Istar, Aya, and Šala, were, in this list, being syncretized with Marduk's wife Zarpanitum, even if a direct mention of her is nowhere preserved.⁷⁷

In section F, after a gap, the end of the section dedicated to identities of the "great goddess" is apparently marked by a literary passage (1–11) which praises her using language that traditionally refers to Istar. She is declared "the seed of the great gods, who is seated upon a throne, queen of the Abzu who gathered from all the great gods unto herself all the ordinances" (3–5). One line seems to strongly invoke syncretic themes in suggesting that the great god and the great goddess could even be equal to one another: "she is a composite (lit: knotted together), she is (both) Enlil and Ninlil." The inclusion of a literary passage within a god list is a unique feature within our corpus. Since this is attested by two Nineveh manuscripts (N₃₅ and N₃₆), it seems really to have been integrated into the list, though one might speculate that this was result of a later redaction. In this context, the literary passage seems to emphasize not merely the lexical or scholarly interest of this list, but the religious one as well.

With that, the text switches topic and returns to a male deity. This passage, not preserved until its end, contained over fifty-seven names of Ninurta, a quite substantial number. While no statement is preserved to this effect, it seems possible that here too, Ninurta should have counted as but a particular aspect of a single male deity. Or, since an equation between Ninurta and Nabū is asserted (13), the theme could concern the firstborn son of the "great god" – Ninurta as the son of Enlil corresponding to Nabū as the son of Marduk. Given the nature of the composition, this need not be an either-or question.

The influence of both An = Anum and An = Anum ša amēli on this passage is apparent; from the former, names of Ninurta from Tablet I, as well as names of other, similar deities from Tablet V have been imported; from the latter, names along with their explanations in ša. In the first line (12) Ninurta's primary name is explained, as in ša amēli, as Ninurta ša pirišti, "Ninurta of the secret." This apparently justifies the equation between Ninurta, repeated in the next line (13), and Nabū. There then follows a passage of somewhat exotic names (12–20), not listed in An = Anum or in An = Anum ša amēli. Each of these names is paired with an explanation that resembles a literary epithet; it is highly reminiscent of the Istar passage above in

section E. The name Uraš (21) is given an explanation ("of the intercalary month") that was in An = Anum ša amēli instead applied to a name of Nanna/Sin; the following name ^duru₄ (22), which was listed in An = Anum but not An = Anum ša amēli, is then given the explanation ("of the mattock"), which, in An = Anum ša amēli was given to ^duraš. Šaršare (23) is given the same explanation as in An = Anum ša amēli ("of devastation"), while the following name Nunir (24) is both spelled differently (now in nun- instead of nu-) and explained as "of battle" instead of as "of the weir." Tišpak (25) is given the same explanation as in An = Anum ša amēli: "of the bathed (priesthood)." The name Šu-šanabi (26) is new, and explained as "of the hero." Then, the text begins to identify Ninurta with a variety of local and foreign deities (27–38), some of whom occurred in An = Anum Tablet V. Some names are identified as "Ninurta in Subartu" (27, 31), and others as "Ninurta in Elam" (33–38). Some names are further explained by more familiar ones in addition to Ninurta: Aštupinu (27) is identified as "Zababa, Ninurta in Subartu"; Lulu (28) is "Lugalmarḫa, Ninurta" and ^dTUG₂.TUG₂ (29) is "Ninkilim, Ninurta." Ninurta is identified with Sagkud (30), Anu's *zabardab* in An = Anum Tablet I. Some of Ninurta's own names as given in Tablet I are listed (39–43; 46–47). He is identified with sons of the mother goddess from Tablet II (45; 54–56), with some more warriors from Tablet V (52; 57–58; 60; 62–63; 66–67) and Tablet VI (48–50); some names are apparently new (44; 51; 59; 61; 64–65). A name which should have been proper to the storm god, ^dmermer₄(IM×IM), is further specified as "Uta'ulum, Ninurta." Ninurta is even identified with a name of his own wife, Ninuru (53), which, in Tablet I: 220 was given as a name of Ninnibrū.

After a gap, section G is still on the subject of Ninurta, now treating his astral identities. The first group of stars is identified with Mercury (1–6) – a theological rather than an astronomical identification – while the second group (7–12) is identified simply as Ninurta. Syncretic elements can be recognized among the names of some of the stars: they include Marduk (2), Ninazu (8), Zababa (10), and Ningirsu and Ištaran (11). The following passage is then concerned with "divine mayors" (13–37). A variety of names is each identified as the mayor of a specific town or city, some of them rather obscure. The place names, so far as they can be identified, point to a date of composition some time in the Kassite era. Many of the "mayors" are recognizable as the divine weapons of Ninurta/Ningirsu (e. g. lines 17–19; 23–27), while others are Ninurta-like figures with whom he has already been equated (such as Lisin, and Lisin's children in 13–15). Some parallels to this passage are also known from first millennium explanatory texts (see the comments to these lines).

Sections H and I deal with the mother goddess and Istar as a combined figure. Many lines or entire passages have direct parallels in An = Anum tablets II and IV, while others are unusual names not attested elsewhere within our corpus. Although Istar was already treated above in section E, none of those names were taken from Tablet

⁷⁶ KAR 25, ii 3–26, for which see Oshima 2011: 386–391; see further *ibid.*: 392–395.

⁷⁷ Compare the explanatory Zarpanitum lists DT 195+ and BM 32596 (Lambert 2013: plate 41), which, in their complete form, were texts similar to the syncretic Marduk list BM 47406; for that list, and its formal similarity to An = Anu ša amēli, see above § 1.6, final paragraph.

IV. Some names are here provided with additional explanations, either of the literary type (some of which appeared already in An = *Anum*) or in the An = *Anum ša amēli* style. The first group of names in section H (1–33) seem, based on their content, to refer primarily to the mother goddess, with names drawn from Tablet II. Some within this passage however (e. g. 24, [ḏm]e-šu-du₇) seem suggestive of Ištar. Also a name of Ninlil (^dsig₄-za-gin₃-na) occurs (9), which in Tablet I was identified with the mother goddess. Here, the explanatory column, where preserved, provides the notation MIN.MIN, where the first MIN refers, as far as can be determined, to the mother goddess (spelled either dingir-maḥ or *be-let-DINGIR.MEŠ*), while the second refers to Ištar (^dištar₃ or ^diš-tar). In the latter part of section H (34–43), the list begins to closely parallel the first part of An = *Anum* Tablet IV. The primary name ^dinanna is listed first (34), and explained as “Ištar of cleansing,” where “cleansing” in An = *Anum ša amēli* was instead the explanation of the name of Šamaš. The rest of the names in that passage may also have been provided with explanations, but they are lost. Some of these names (38; 41–43) were not in An = *Anum*, but they did appear, with variant spellings, in An = *Anum ša amēli*.

In section I, when the text resumes after a gap, (7–13) it lists names of Išḫara, which are paralleled in the latter part of An = *Anum* Tablet IV. After another gap, the remainder of the section deals with astral identities of Inanna (18–54). It represents essentially an expanded form of the astral passage in Tablet IV. Also the material on the divine rainbow (25–29), which had been listed separately in An = *Anum*, is moved to the front. One notice, furthermore, that the names of Kabta are included (50–52), who counted as the husband of Inanna’s astral identity as Ninsiana. This represents thus an instance of a deity being identified with their spouse.

In addition to the content, the rubric which summarizes the preceding material provides a strong reason for including sections H and I with the rest of the composition. It is virtually identical to the rubric listed after the Ištar names in section E, identifying the preceding as “names of the lady-of-the-lands in her aspect of rulership” – here, there is a divine determinative before ^d*be-let-KUR.KUR* and “rulership” is spelled ^den-lil₂-ti-ša₂ instead of ^dBE-ti-ša₂. Although the rubrics match, as far as preserved, there is no overlap in material covered. It is thus possible that Shorter An = *Anum*, having already covered some aspects of the great goddess, and then switching topics to Ninurta, eventually returned again to the goddess, now employing material taken from An = *Anum* Tablets II and IV. Alternatively, sections H and I could have come from a closely related composition, or even a different recension of the same list. At any rate, it is clear that all the material included in our edition of Shorter An = *Anum* shares a similar background, having clearly been derived from An = *Anum* with influence from other related lists, and having a similar thematic interest in syncretism.

1.9. Anšar = Anum

Named after its first entry, the list Anšar = *Anum* is currently attested in two recensions: a Babylonian, and an Assyrian. The two recensions are different enough that they cannot be edited together as a single composition with variants, yet they are also similar enough that comparing them together is helpful, both for understanding their similarities and differences, and for helping to identify and place fragments belonging to the composition in either version. For this reason, the Assyrian and Babylonian recensions are presented side by side. Where appropriate, blank space is introduced between lines so that the points of comparison line up with one another. Some of the individual witnesses of the Assyrian recension have been previously edited by Jeremiah Peterson, on the online *DCCLT*.

Anšar = *Anum* is written in the same double-column format as An = *Anum*, and seems to follow a similar theological organization according to rank. However, it does not share the interest of An = *Anum* in portraying divine households. Familial affiliation is generally not indicated, even when a wife might follow a husband. Lesser servant deities, with their defined roles, appear only exceptionally. Nor does Anšar = *Anum* seem to display any particularly strong syncretizing tendencies, as observed for Shorter An = *Anum*. Learned explanations of individual names, as present in An = *Anum ša amēli* and occasionally in Shorter An, are not found either. The main interest of Anšar = *Anum* seems, instead, to be in collecting a large number of names, including the most common ones, but with a focus on the rare and unusual.⁷⁸ Characteristically, whenever an additional comment is provided beyond simple equivalence with the preceding entry (MIN), it is to specify the foreign origin of a name.

The Assyrian recension is currently attested by nine fragments, all of them from Neo-Assyrian Nineveh. The material they preserve has been divided into thirteen sections, A through M. The Babylonian recension is attested by four Late Babylonian fragments and is divided into seven sections: A, B, D, F, K, and M, so labeled to match their corresponding sections in the Assyrian recension. The most important of these is B₂₃, because it is a substantial portion of a tablet that preserves both the beginning and the end of the composition. The presence of section M at the end of the Babylonian recension in turn allows us to include, in the Assyrian recension, ms. N₄₄, containing sections J, K, L, and M, as well as N₄₅ and N₄₆, adding further portions of section K. Because N₄₄ preserves its beginning and end, these may have represented “Tablet II” in the Assyrian recension. The other Babylonian manuscripts, B₂₄ (sections D and F), B₂₅ (D), and B₂₆ (B and K) can confidently be included due to the overlapping material with B₂₃ (A, D, K, M). As for the Assyrian recension, the beginning of the composition is attested by N₃₈ (A and E) and continued by N₃₉ (B, D, I), N₄₀ (C, E, F, H, I), N₄₁ (E,

⁷⁸ As also observed by Lambert 1971: 477 (where Anšar = *Anum* is referred to as “a late list”).

F), and N₄₃ (F), all confirmed to belong via overlap; N₄₂ (G) can be placed based on its content. N₃₉, N₄₁, and N₄₂, moreover, could all be parts of the same tablet.⁷⁹

Both recensions began with the equation Anšar = Anum, which can be restored both from the subsequent equation Kišar = Antum (12^A, 10^B), and from the colophon of B₂₃. The beginning of the Assyrian recension is broken, and the text picks up at what is the eighth name of Anum in the Babylonian version; the exact number of names missing is uncertain, but the amount of names preserved for the female counterparts suggest that both versions had the same number up to this point. On the Babylonian side, we see some of the familiar primordial forms of Anu as known from An = Anum (1–5^B, 9^B), but some figures have been omitted – Enšar, Uraš, and Ekur – and Anšargal has been moved to the end of the group, as also in the Assyrian version (11^A). The Babylonian preserves also Ḫawurni (6^B), the Hurrian word for “heaven” and the strange name ^dKU.KU (7^B). Both versions have the high ranking Elamite deity Napiriša “great god,” the Assyrian version in two variant spellings (8–9^A; 8^B). For some reason, the Assyrian version has included one of Enlil’s ancestors here (10^A). None of the foreign names are provided with an indication of their origin, as others later in the text are. Nevertheless, one observes already what will be the general pattern for this text. Names are imported from An = Anum, and further rare or unusual names are added.

For the names of Antum we see a similar pattern, with the familiar female counterparts to each name listed in corresponding sequence (A.12–16^A; A.10–14^B). The female counterpart to Ḫawurni is Bēlet-ilī, in the same unusual spelling as in An = Anum and Proto-An, ^dNIN-i₃-li (17^A; 15^B). The partner of ^dKU.KU is ^dda-da (18^A; 16^B). The Assyrian text breaks off, and the Babylonian moves onto Enlil (17–26^B). The basic name Enlil itself only appears in the explanatory column, conforming to a general pattern throughout this list. The names taken from An = Anum are noticeably low on the list there (the 9th name, the 14th–16th, and the 28th/last name). There is one novel name, ^ddilmun. Enlil’s names start to break off, but what remains of them does not seem familiar (24–26^B). There is a broken designation in the explanatory column, that could have referred to another deity, or, perhaps was some additional remark about Enlil (27–32^B). The following names are all broken away, but they were names of Ninlil (33–37^B) and Ninurta (38–39^B).

The text of the Assyrian version resumes first (section B). It had apparently listed equivalent names for Enlil’s father (3–4^A) and mother (5^A). Then, a list of Enki/Ea’s names begins (6–26^A), which continued into section C (1–2^A), preserved as the top of a column in N₄₀. The Babylonian version only fragmentarily preserves the end of the list of Enki’s names (1–8^B), and the beginning of the list of his wife’s names (9–10^B); to judge from what remains, it had fewer names of Enki than the Assyrian version. Once again, several of the names have been imported from An =

Anum, while others are strange or even otherwise unattested (e.g. ^da-lim-u₈-gal, ^dšu-UL-la-la).

When the text resumes in section D, the Assyrian version has apparently already begun a list of Marduk names (1–26^A), while the Babylonian version has two names of uncertain affiliation (1–2^B) before the Marduk list starts (1–31^B). The Assyrian version resumes in section E after a gap (1–8^A), where it still runs parallel to the Marduk names preserved in section D of the Babylonian version. There are some common names, also listed in An = Anum, but there are also, in the words of Lambert, “some very rare and exotic specimens.”⁸⁰ These include the Kassite Šiḫu (or Šipak; his ethnic affiliation is not here given), Laguda (labeled as “Marduk of Dilmun”), and other strange names like Irgigu, Sa’ila, Milma and Gigma. Both versions feature a group of spellings of Marduk in ^dma₂-ru₁₀(URU₅)–..., which were not present in An = Anum.

Both versions then move on to Marduk’s wife Zarpanitum (E.9–20^B; D.24–31^A). Alongside the “normal” names, partially restored in An = Anum, we again see some unusual ones: Laḫamun is identified as Zarpanitum of Dilmun, and Elagu as Zarpanitum of Elam. One name, ^dišib-abzu, resembles rather a name of Enki’s wife (^dhin-išib-abzu) given in An = Anum (Tablet II: 166). The Babylonian version included fewer names here than the Assyrian.

Next comes, as one might expect, Nabū (E.21–33^A; D.32–37^B). The Assyrian version has more names and a different arrangement than the Babylonian version, listing his “Dilmunite” name Enzag first, and the Sumerian name Mudugasa’a last, while the Babylonian has Mudugasa’a first and Enzag as the third name. Aside from these, Nabū’s names here look mostly like either logograms or learned late Sumerian; the name ^di-zu-zu seems inexplicable. The Assyrian version breaks off just as it was listing the first name of Nabū’s wife (E.34^A), while the Babylonian contains three names of hers (D.38–40), including one that looks possibly Elamite, ^dše-ra-’a³-da-ak. The Babylonian version then goes on to list, unusually for this text, members of Marduk’s court (D.41–48^B) along with an identification of their roles, all of whom were also listed in An = Anum. After a gap, in section F it is still listing members of Marduk’s court in parallel with An = Anum, including his doorkeepers and his dogs (F.1–6^B). Then it transitions to a passage on names of Nergal or deities closely related to him (F.7–21^B). When the Assyrian text resumes, it too is dealing with Nergal or related deities (F.1–35^A). The Babylonian version opens with the possibly Hurrian name ^de-eb-ri (F.7^B), equated with a deity whose name is broken (possibly Nergal), then come two names of Erra (F.8–9^B). A deity Ninsikila is listed (F.10^B), who in An = Anum was the wife of Lisin, but her equivalent is broken; then comes Mamitum, equated with Laš as in An = Anum – Nergal’s wife (F.11^B). The Assyrian version instead has a long section of names in ^dlugal- (F.1; 3–18; 24^A), not present in the Babylonian version, at the head of which is also the unusual name ^dna-i-pu (F.2^A).

79 Lambert 2013: 150.

80 Ibid.

Impressively, only two of these ^dlugal- names also occurred in the long ^dlugal- passage in An = *Anum*; also, they are all equivalent (MIN) to each other, instead of distinct (ŠU) as in An = *Anum*. A deity Emu is said to be [Nergal] of the land of Šūhī (F.19^A). Then follow some of Nergal's standard names as in An = *Anum*, including those of Erra, such that the Assyrian and Babylonian versions now parallel each other once again. The Assyrian version includes an isolated line, ^dgud-gud = *qarrādu* (F.25^A), followed by an equation involving the "lord of the poplar" (F.26^A). It then transitions into a subsection where unusual names are equated with various Nergal byforms such as Lugal-gudua, Lugal-irra and Meslamta-e'a, sometimes with a geographic specification (F.27–35^A) such as Amurru or Suti. This material is paralleled in the Babylonian version, but it seems to have had fewer names and a different organization (F.12–21^B). Both texts break off at this point. How much of the Babylonian version is missing is unclear, but the Assyrian version seems to have contained much more material. The two recensions will only begin to directly parallel each other again at the end of the text.

A small fragment containing names of the moon god can be inserted in the Assyrian version at this point (G.1–20^A). None of the names preserved are ones that also occur in An = *Anum*. Some are simply Akkadian epithets like "he who sets the month" and "he who confirms the month" (G.1–2^A), while others look like Sumerian epithets, e.g. ^dzalag₂-ga "the shining one" (G.4^A). A large group of names, fragmentarily preserved, all ended in -an-na (G.6–16^A), including, oddly, a name ^dusumgal-anna, which usually instead refers to Dumuzi. Section H preserves only MINs (H.1–13^A), probably still referring to the moon god; possibly, the preserved lines actually overlapped with the previous section. Section I contains what was probably the end of the moon god section (I.1–2^A) followed by names of his wife Ningal (I.3–7^A). Then begins, as theologically expected, a list of names of the sun god. They are not fully preserved, but again the list does not seem to contain any importations from An = *Anum*; one recognizes an Elamite name Naḥundi (I.16^A) and the Kassite Saḥḥi (I.17^A). The sun god section is paralleled near the end of the Babylonian version (section K).

A new tablet in the Assyrian version seems to continue with what one would expect, following the moon and sun gods: the storm god (J.1–41^A). There are quite many names, and only a few that were listed in the equivalent section in An = *Anum*. There are many foreign names, labeled according to their origin, as well as strange or unusual ones. Addu is labeled as Amorite (J.16^A); the Hurrian Teššub (J.18^A) as from Suti'um; a name Adgi as from Šūhī (J.19^A); Kunzibami (J.20^A) and Šiḥḥaš (J.40^A) as Elamite, and Buriaš (J.21^A) as Kassite. There are also some odd instances of what looks like syncretism: the name Nintud, usually for the mother goddess (J.12^A); Dumugir (J.13^A), in An = *Anum* a name of the moon god, and a spelling of the name Ašgi, son of the mother goddess (J.23^A). After a dividing line, there is a broken entry (J.42^A) that does not allow one to determine what kind of material was treated next.

After a gap, the Assyrian text continues with what is clearly a list of names of Ištar (K.1–46^A), which again matches the theological progression one would expect according to the order in An = *Anum*. Most of the names preserved are not known from An = *Anum*, but are unusual – e.g. ^dIGI.DARA₃.RU.RU and ^dIGI.NU.DARA₃.RU.RU (K.13–14) – and foreign names. One notices the Hurrian Šauška (K.4) and the Elamite Pinengir (K.6), but no explanatory column is preserved to show if they had geographic labels. The text begins to become fragmentary after line 28, but a group of names in ^dnin- could possibly have been some of the more familiar names seen in An = *Anum* Tablet IV. The Babylonian text, as it begins to resume, is listing names of Dumuzi (K.6–18^B), defined (K.7^B) as the husband of Ištar. It seems likely that names of Ištar should have occurred in the lost portion of the text directly before the names of Dumuzi, so the sections K in the Assyrian and Babylonian versions can be considered almost parallel to one another. Among the names of Dumuzi are also listed some antediluvian kings (K.6; K.12–15^B), as was also the case in Shorter An = *Anum*. There are also some interesting syncretisms, including with the Lagašite Igalim (K.16^B), son of Ningirsu, and Ilabrat (K.17^B), a form of Nišubur. A group of deities marked in ŠU (K.19–22^B) seems to refer to minor figures associated with Dumuzi, but their exact identity is unclear. Then comes a group of names of the sun god (K.23–34^B), beginning with his Amorite name Samsu. The placement of this material makes for an interesting theological progression following Dumuzi. Many of these names are paralleled by the earlier sun god names (section I) in the Assyrian version, including Saḥi (K.25^B) and the names ^dutu-mir-gal₂-anna ^dutu-ḥuš-gal₂-an-na (K.27–28^B), although those names were spelled with gal₁ in the Assyrian version. The placement of those names in the Assyrian version was also different; there, they came just after names of the moon god's wife. A group of names in ^danše- (K.31–34^B) seems to refer to the sun god's chariot team.

In the Assyrian version, there comes, after a gap, a section (L.1–19^A) that is too fragmentary to determine to whom the names referred. Many of them (L.6–14^A) began with ^den-. One wonders if they could have referred to Dumuzi, if a section dedicated to him followed that of Ištar, as was apparently the case in the Babylonian version.

The final sections in both versions directly parallel one another, although the Assyrian (M.1–23^A) is better preserved than the Babylonian (M.1–9^B). The text has shifted here from god list to a lexical format, but the material nevertheless remains thematically germane. Rather than listing strange names of specific deities, here the text takes the form of a vocabulary, listing words that generically mean "deity" in various languages, and providing Akkadian translations. The first part seems to focus around terms for a plurality or a classification of deities (M.3–8^A), including "the great gods" (Sumerian), the Igigu-deities, and the Anunaki-deities. The second part lists singular words for god or goddess (M.9–23^A). It includes the standard Sumerian word Dingir (M.10^A) as well as words specif-

ed to mean “god” in Subarean (M.12^A), Elamite (M.13^A; 21–22^A; M.7^B), Amorite (M.14^A; M.1^B), Lulubean (M.15^A; M.2^B), and Kassite (M.16^A). The list closes with a phrase that means “all of the gods,” given in Sumerian and Akkadian (M.23^A; M.10^B). This passage loosely parallels the end of An = Anum Tablet VI, which also contained generic terms for classes of deities.

The composition, however, seems not to have ended here. The colophon of the main Babylonian witness B₂₃ identifies itself as “[Tablet] ‘1’ of Anšar = Anum, incomplete,” clearly indicating that the series was continued by one or more additional Tablets. Both B₂₃ and N₄₄ – thought to represent “Tablet II” in the Assyrian recension, but whose colophon does not give the name of the composition – give catchlines, but they do not match one another. In the Assyrian version, the catchline is *bu-ru = ša-mu-u₂*, which looks more like an equation from a lexical list than a god list, although it suggests a cosmological theme. In the Babylonian version, the catchline is ^d*lugal-gu₂-du₈-a^{ki}*, an equation which was already attested in the Nergal section of both versions (F.27^A; F.12^B). One will have to await the discovery of additional manuscripts to see how the series may have continued.

1.10. X = An

The composition “X = An” is so called due to the fact that the name in the first line, equated with An, is damaged, and only readable as “X.” Due to a paucity of evidence, little can be said about X = An, other than that it was a relatively compact list bearing a close relationship to the parts of An = Anum concerning main deities. X = An is known only from three fragments (one of them consisting of two joined pieces), all of them from Neo-Assyrian Nineveh. Despite their having been excavated at different times, and the presently different color of each piece, they may have all originally belonged to the same tablet. This was the opinion of Lambert, who physically inspected the fragments. It is also suggested by the lines supplied by each fragment to the composition (see below), and the similar appearance of the script.

Based on what is preserved, X = An seems to have been a simple list of the names of the main deities of the pantheon. Most of the material has been taken from An = Anum, in the same sequence, and supplemented with additional, mostly exotic names, similar to the ones we find in Anšar = Anum. While X = An has a two column format, no description or explanation of any sort is preserved, other than the basic name of the deity and the notation MIN “the same.”

The tablet the three fragments come from may have originally had three double-columns on each side,⁸¹ rather than the two usual for manuscripts of An = Anum; portions of obv. i and ii and reverse ii and iii are what remain.

The preserved text has been divided into four sections, A through D.

Section A, representing the top of obverse i, preserves names of Anu (A.1–10) and Enlil (A.11–24). It begins with N₄₇, an upper edge fragment preserving, on its left, only parts of the first two names, plus, on the right, the remains of the explanatory column. N₄₈ is a left edge fragment, supplying fragmentary names of Anu and Enlil. It is not clear if N₄₇ and N₄₈ can physically join, but N₄₇ seems to provide the explanatory notations for N₄₈ in lines A.5–7 and 11. Section B, preserved on N₄₇ and representing the top of obverse ii, consists only of divine determinatives. After a large gap, Section C begins on the reverse of N₄₇, which represents the bottom of reverse ii; it contains names of Šamaš (C.1–11), which are continued directly by N₄₉ (C.12–C.27), a surface fragment which represents the top of rev. iii. The name “Šamaš” was repeated in the explanatory subcolumn due to it being the top of a new column. N₄₉ contains one more broken entry belonging to an unknown deity (28). Following a gap, we return to the reverse of N₄₈, somewhere towards the bottom of rev. iii. It has names of Adad (D.1–18). After another gap, probably not very large, N₄₇ contains the lower edge of rev. iii, preserving a portion of an Aššurbanipal colophon in lapidary script.

It seems difficult to estimate how much of the text is missing. The preserved sections seem to follow the theological order expected from An = Anum. Thus, after the names of An and Enlil one would have expected at least the names of Enki and Šin. There is no indication that the text also listed the spouses of deities; if Antum has been present, one would have expected her to occur between Anu and Enlil, like in Anšar = Anum. Nor is there any indication that the text listed deities belonging, according to the organization of An = Anum, to the second generation, such as Ninurta, Marduk, or Sakkan. Since the reverse of N₄₈, containing names of Adad, should have come from near the end of the final column, it does not seem likely that there would have been enough room for a section on the next expected deity according to rank, Ištar. While it is possible that the missing portion could have contained e. g. names of the mother goddess, there is no indication that the text listed female deities at all. Further information on the structure and content of this list will have to await additional discoveries.

1.11. Appendix to An = Anum

Kidin-Šin, in the colophon of ms. β, the larger of his two enormous compilation tablets, noted that he “wrote it all together since there was much surface space.”⁸² In addition to An = Anum tablets I through VII and An = Anu *ša amēli*, he included further list material, of a diverse nature, in two separate groups. The first group he included in between Tablets VI and VII, and the second he wrote after An = Anum *ša amēli*, until the end of the tablet. If the res-

⁸¹ According to Lambert (his unpublished notes, folios 7295–7296).

⁸² See pp. 416–417.

toration of the damaged first part of the colophon is correct, he may have referred to some or all of this extra material as “[...] An = Anum.” That is, he referred to it by the same name as the main series, plus some qualifier which is broken away – perhaps “extra” or “extraneous” (BAR. MEŠ⁷). Indeed, some of the preserved material bears a relationship to the canonical text. However, other passages are of a clearly different nature. They seem like they could have represented other individual lists which Kidin-Sin had in his repertoire, and used the occasion of having plenty of space on his tablet to include. Lambert referred to these as “apocryphal shorter lists,”⁸³ a designation which, although employing too loaded of a term, conveys the impression this material gives, even if we cannot draw any firm conclusion on its status based on lack of comparable evidence. No duplicate of this material has so far been discovered, though at least one section has a later Neo-Assyrian parallel (see below). In the present, first-ever edition, we have termed the extra material the “Appendix” to An = Anum, a term which conveys both its placement within the large tablet as a kind of “afterthought,” and its apparent extra-curricular, extra-canonical status in comparison to An = Anum and even An = Anum ša amēli. One could also say that there are actually two separate appendixes, corresponding to what we are calling part one and part two.

Unfortunately, the Appendix is quite poorly preserved. Less than a quarter of the original text survives, due to heavy damage to the reverse of ms. β, especially on the left and right hand sides. This hampers the study of the overall structure and theme. The surviving text has been divided into eight alphabetically labeled sections, A through H. Sections A through E represent part one of the Appendix, listed between Tablets VI and VII, Sections F through H are part two, placed after An = Anum ša amēli. The placement of the two parts of the Appendix matches their thematic nature. Part one mostly follows the same format as An = Anum and seems to deal mostly with chthonic and netherworld deities. At the same time, there is a particular focus on Ninurta and Gula/Bau; one might not otherwise associate these two deities with the netherworld, but the compiler of this list apparently did. Portions of the first part of the Appendix bear a direct relationship to Tablet V, but also to Tablet I, and to a lesser degree, Tablet VI. It could therefore be considered a thematic extension, or a kind of rearrangement, of Tablets V and VI. Part two, on the other hand, consists of material of a completely different nature from An = Anum itself.

Part one of the Appendix began somewhere in the missing columns of the reverse. Section A is attested by β₇, the reverse of which is certainly the upper edge of reverse column iv. Here we begin to see the thematic relevance of the previous juxtaposition of figures from Ninurta's and Ereškigal's circles. The first subsection (A.1–7) lists names, explained as Gula, which occurred in Tablet V, alternating with names, explained as Ninurta, which occurred in Tablet VI. Then there comes a subsection of

names of Ereškigal/Allatum, and of the netherworld generally (A.8–12), taken from Tablet V. Then the topic switches back to Ninurta and Gula (A.13–21), giving them names which occurred in Tablet V. The names applied to Ninurta seem to have a particular netherworld connotation: ^dlugal- names which occurred in Tablet VI in the context of Nergal, and the deities Ninazu and Tišpak. Gula as well is given a netherworld association, through the application to her of the name of Ningirida, Ninazu's wife. Should the juxtaposition with Ereškigal further imply a syncretism between Gula and the queen of the netherworld? The next fragment which belongs here is probably β₁₃ (section B), but it cannot be directly joined. It mentions Ninegal, and the name of four divine winds. The thematic relation to the rest of this part of the Appendix is unclear.

Section C is represented by β₁₅, whose placement is now secured through having been joined to the main fragment. As far as can be determined from its poor state of preservation, it listed miscellaneous netherworld deities, including some that were listed in Tablets V and VI, but also other deities of a perhaps different nature. There is what seems to be the beginning of a group of names beginning with ^dlugal- (C.11–14), recalling the ^dlugal- group in Tablet VI. Two entries (C.9–10) might be restored as Ereškigal and a name of the netherworld (Udba), respectively. Not necessarily evoking a netherworld context, one recognizes the vizier deity Papsukkal (C.5) and Igalim, a son of Ningirsu (C.6). The latter could foreshadow the subsequent theme of the list dealing with Ninurta/Ningirsu.

Section D is contained on the next preserved section of the main fragment, the bottom part of reverse column iv. It opens with Samanur (D.1), the deified lead rope, associated with Šakkan (AA-3: 87) and Amuru (AA-6: 223), but here called the son of Anu, as in Tablet I (AA-1: 226), where he appeared in the context of officials belonging to Enlil's temple Ekur. Then follows a figure of uncertain nature, ^dkur-kur-ra – such a name was listed by one manuscript as a variant to ^derin₂-kur-kur-ra in AA-3: 67, one of the ten children of Nin-MARKI of Lagash. Then we find ourselves in the court of Ereškigal (D.4–6), with her vizier Namtar and his wife and daughter, all listed in the same order as in Tablet V. Then after a broken entry (D.7) we see the three attendants of Ninurta (D.8–10), listed in the same order as in Tablet I. As above with Samanur, we seem to see deities who had been associated with the Ekur now appearing in what clearly seems to be a netherworld context. The rest of section D seems to have listed further netherworld deities including some figures of an uncertain nature (D.30, ^dnam-[ti]-'la'-šu-du; D.31 ^dmen-ku₃-ta).

After a gap, the same topic seems to continue in Section E, juxtaposing netherworld elements with ones having to do with Ninurta and Gula. After some broken entries, we see the two “sacles” of Ninurta (E.6–7) and his wife Ninnibru (E.8–10), as listed in Tablet I. Ninnibru in this context could presumably be equivalent to Gula. Then there is a group four names (E.15–18) headed by Ušumgalana – perhaps related to Dumuzi – and another headed by Lugal-bagara, which was a title of Ningirsu. Then come

⁸³ Lambert 1971: 476.

four weapons of Ningirsu and/or Ninurta (E.19–22), well known from other sources. Then the topic shifts to the netherworld-associated Manungal, goddess of prisons, and lists her messengers as in Tablet V, whose names represent personified instruments of restraint (E.23–29). After a messenger (E.30) and daughter (E.31) of deities whose names are broken, we see listed the heralds of Kulaba, including Mesanga-unug, who were listed early in Tablet V; then comes the herald of the prison (E.32), listed in Tablet V among Manungal's group. Finally the text lists various *utukku* – demons and/or “constables”: of various temples (E.37–39); of Ninurta or Ningirsu (E.40–43); of Bau (E.44–46); of Gula (47–51), and of Manungal (52). The text then has a double line, with the notation TIL “complete,” and gives a subtotal of entries, 264. Adding up all of the numbered lines in our reconstructed sections A through E, including completely broken entries, we have only 145. It seems thus that this subtotal applied to all of the extra material so far, consisting of slightly less material than a full tablet of An = Anum. If Kidin-Sin's colophon referred to an “extraneous” An = Anum, it seems most likely that the label applied to this material.

There is one more block of additional material inserted before Tablet VII starts (E.53–66). Here, the double-column, explanatory format of An = Anum is abandoned, and no subcolumn divider has been drawn. Each line lists a set of “infernal triplets,” with the third member of the group marked off by the Akkadian conjunction *u* “and.” The deities are all essentially forms of Nergal, or similar. Some of them are otherwise known to have formed pairs, e.g. Lugal-irra and Meslamta-e'a (E.54), but here a third member was added to their group, in this case Išar-kidissu. The scribe drew another double line at the end of this section to separate it from Tablet VII, but there is no notation “complete,” nor a subtotal of entries.

The second part of the Appendix begins after An = Anum *ša amēli*, in reverse column vii. The fragment β₁₆ is most likely to be placed somewhere near the top of this column, and so contains what is here designated as Section F. It is not entirely clear exactly how much material may have been missing between the end of *ša amēli* and the start of this fragment. The text once again shows the familiar double column format. It begins, first of all, with two glossed entries spelled with the same sign, ^dhar₂ and ^dgud; these each were explained as another deity, but the names are unfortunately broken. This pair of entries seems lexical in nature, but it is not clear what should have been conveyed theologically. Then comes a group of four lines (E.3–6) in which deified precious metals are equated with a deity: silver with Anu, gold with Enlil, bronze with Ea, and tin with an unusual name that probably refers to the mother goddess. In the next group of three lines (F.7–9), names are explained as either Enlil or Enki, with some unusual theological implications. First we see the primordial deity Anšar, who is provided with a gloss identifying him as ^da-nu. But, in the right hand column, he is explained as ^den-lil₂. It has been suggested that because of the simultaneous equation with both Anu and Enlil, AN.ŠAR₂ should

here actually stand for the Assyrian state god Aššur,⁸⁴ but this is far from certain. In the next line (F.8) ^den-lil₂-ban₃-da, “the junior Enlil,” is explained as Enlil – which comes as a surprise, since “the junior Enlil” is elsewhere a title of Enki (e.g. AA-2: 124). Lastly, it gives an uncontroversial equation between Ea and Enki (F.9), one which, however, reverses the usual order as given in An = Anum, since usually it is the Akkadian name that appears in the right hand column. The final group of names in this section (F.10–17) is of opaque contextual relevance. It is not clear if the subcolumn divider had any purpose here; some lines have three names in a line, and are written across the divider, so the ones on the right might not necessarily be the explanation of the ones on the left. One recognizes Inimani (F.10) and Kalkal (F.11), a vizier of Ninurta and a doorkeeper of the Ekur in Tablet I; ^dnig₂-er[im₂] could perhaps refer to ^dnin-nig₂-erim₂, the daughter of Ninurta. There are some names beginning with ^dlugal- (F.12; F.14–15) that look like they could refer to forms of Nergal (or similar); possibly mentioned also were Amurru (F.12), Išhara (F.15) and Ištar (F.16); one line contains what look, not like divine names, but instead indecipherable fragments of Akkadian words (F.13). In any case, the overall theme of this passage remains unclear.

After a gap, we return to the main fragment, somewhere in the middle of reverse column vii. Unfortunately, section G is almost entirely fragmentary, and no meaningful context can be gleaned from what remains. After another gap, the beginning of section H is still rather fragmentary; one line was explained as Enlil or Bēl (H.1) and the next as Ištar (H.2), then “well-being” and “health” (H.3–4). We observe fragmentary lines explained as “right” (H.5), “left” (H.6), “intercalary day of the year” (H.7) and “intercalary day of the month” (H.8). While the context cannot be grasped, these explanations suggest we were still dealing with a kind of learned or esoteric list involving divine names, as was likely already the case in section F. The text then draws a horizontal line and writes TIL, “complete,” indicating that a subsection has ended and a new one is beginning.

The final preserved part of the Appendix (H.11–29) lists, in the left hand subcolumn, parts of the human body – the head and face, sometimes in pairs “right” and “left.” These body parts are each equated with a god or goddess, listed in the right hand subcolumn. Two Neo-Assyrian fragments constitute a later parallel for this material.⁸⁵ Interestingly, the passage begins with what is clearly a heading (H.9–10) describing its content, a rarity in cuneiform literature, where the usual practice was to place labels at the end of the passages they describe, as rubrics or summaries. The relation between body part and deity is apparently referred to by the phrase [...alan]-dim₂-ma *maṭṭalat* “physical form, mirror image,” but the second line of the heading is damaged and cannot presently be

⁸⁴ So Beaulieu 1997: 64–65, who, however, incorrectly identified the fragment in question (β₁₆ = K 4349E) as Neo-Assyrian (see above §4.2); see further the comment to Ap: F.7.

⁸⁵ 81-2-4, 216 and K13799, copied in George 1992: pl. 55, no. 60.

deciphered. Rather than the body parts all relating to an ordinary human individual or humanity in general, it is perhaps more likely that they should describe the body of a supreme deity, such that the other gods and goddesses – including most of the major members of the pantheon – are all merely parts of him. In this case, we would have here evidence for a kind of syncretism. Like the preceding sections in part two of the Appendix, and unlike An = *Anum* (with the exception of Tablet VII), this material appears to be esoteric or mystical in nature.

1.12. How to Use This Edition

Here we will describe some ancient and modern conventions in order to help the reader best understand the edited lists. Inherent to the ancient texts themselves are the double-column format, the notations MIN and ŠU, and glosses. Related to our modern presentation are the witnesses matrix, the apparatus giving textual variants, the textual commentary, the individual witnesses, and the indexes.

1.12.1. Ancient Conventions

The Double-Column Format

The purpose of the double-column format is essentially to clarify less familiar terms by means of more familiar ones. In lexical lists, a typical arrangement is to have a Sumerian term on the left, explained by an Akkadian one on the right. This is the model for what we observe in An = *Anum*. For a deity with multiple names, typically first of all the deity's "Sumerian" name is listed on the left and his "Akkadian" one on the right, e. g. An = *Anum* (AA-1: 1), or Enki = *Ea* (AA-2:119). Sometimes the assignment of a name to one or the other category has more to do with tradition than etymology, e. g. Nanna = *Sîn* (AA-3: 1). There are also cases where, at least to a modern reader, the Akkadian name might seem like it is the less common or familiar one – e. g. Ereškigal = *Allatum* (AA-5:195). Some deities have the same name in both languages, e. g. Nergal (AA-6: 1), though sometimes a difference in pronunciation might be implied, e. g. Enlil = *Illil* (AA-1: 138). In the case of the healing goddess, who was known by many names, none of them Akkadian or Semitic in origin, a Sumerian name was listed in both the left and the right hand subcolumn (AA-5: 116: Ninisina = Ninkarak).

After the initial pair, any additional names or epithets are listed subsequently on the left (names subcolumn), with each one explained via equivalence to the common (usually Akkadian) name on the right (explanatory subcolumn). Sometimes, in order to conserve space, the *Trennungszeichen* (::) is used to simulate the column divider, and both name and explanation are written in the same subcolumn.

Aside from explaining the identity of one name by means of another, the explanatory column can contain a descriptive phrase, for example stating the familial or pro-

fessional relationship of one deity to another, e. g. "his son," "wife of Ninurta," or "vizier of Enlil." In An = *Anum* such descriptions are usually in written in Sumerian – that is, a kind of Sumerian in conventional use by scribes and scholars from roughly the latter half of the second millennium onwards. Akkadian translations can be optionally provided. Descriptive phrases of a more complex nature can also appear, describing the role of a deity, or the relevance of a particular name or epithet: e. g. ^dig-gal-la = "Ninšubur of the double doors" (AA-1: 33). These descriptions can take the form of a kind of exegesis on the name itself, which, in the case of a Sumerian name explained in Akkadian, might amount to a translation: e. g. ^dnin-me₃-a = *bēlet tāhāzi* "lady of combat" (AA-4: 22).

Rubrics are descriptions which apply to more than one line, occurring as explanations applied to groups of e. g. children or servants. They usually occur along with a numerical notation, allowing one to count backwards to see exactly which entries the rubric applies to.

The Notations MIN and ŠU

Two shorthand notations that ubiquitously appear in the right-hand, explanatory column, and which serve a complementary function to each other, are MIN and ŠU. To previous scholars the function of MIN has been the more obvious one. In both appearance and function MIN – written with two adjacent vertical strokes – is analogous to the modern "ditto." MIN is simply an abbreviation which states "second instance of what was written (in the line above)" or "the same." MIN is thus encountered in sequences of names or epithets belonging to a single deity, indicating that the name employed as the explanation in each line should be repeated. Thus, for example, the first line in the moon god's list of names reads Nanna = *Sîn*, and then for each additional name in the sequence, the explanation reads MIN, indicating that the reader should supply *Sîn* as the explanation. Instead of repeating MIN, some manuscripts use an increasing numerical sequence, whereby the numeral "2" is graphically identical with MIN. Other than in the explanatory column, MIN can also appear in glosses (see below), a usage which appears already in Proto-An (GEN-202), where it is written in its fuller, archaic form KL.MIN, "the second instance."

The function of ŠU has proven to be more difficult to grasp. Litke, in his 1958 dissertation, provided an extensive discussion in which he dismissed previous theories on its function, while providing some important observations, but ultimately admitting that he was at a loss to explain it and that further study was necessary.⁸⁶ In his draft edition, Lambert routinely translated ŠU as "the same," a rendering which, while perhaps literally accurate, fails to provide a meaningful distinction from MIN, which Lambert translated as "ditto." It has been suggested that, whereas MIN indicates a repetition along the vertical axis, ŠU

⁸⁶ Litke 1998: 10–14.

should indicate a repetition along a horizontal axis; thus, according to this interpretation, the function of ŠU would be to state that a name in the left hand column should be repeated in the right columns, and thus presented as equivalent to itself.⁸⁷ While it is unlikely that, in An = *Anum*, ŠU is a shorthand indicating a literal repetition in the same way as MIN (since, unlike MIN, it does not occur as a textual variant for a repetition), the solution to the puzzle of ŠU lies in the realization that it serves the exact opposite function as MIN. Namely, in the context of an explanatory god list, ŠU marks an entry as referring to an entity *distinct* from the one in the preceding line. ŠU indeed marks an entry as equivalent to itself, but a rendering as “the same” can be misleading, because the functional effect of this usage is an assertion that the entry is different from the preceding one. Thus, ŠU is encountered most typically in a list of a deity’s children or servants,⁸⁸ after that deity’s long list of his or her own names, each marked MIN. Lest a reader think that this too was a list of names for a single deity, each member is marked ŠU, “distinct.” One can then ascertain the total number of children (or servants, etc.) in such a sequence by counting the ŠUs. Illustrative examples are sequences which mix ŠU and MIN. For example, at the end of Tablet II (AA-2: 385–392), there occurs a sequence of eight lines giving the names of the “gods of bird catchers,” five of which are marked ŠU and three of which marked MIN.⁸⁹ The rubric gives a total of five, demonstrating that only the ŠUs were counted; the entries marked MIN were seen as alternate spellings of the name in the line which preceded them, and so were not counted. In addition to this function of marking distinctiveness, it seems that ŠU could sometimes be used essentially as a placeholder, occupying a line to which no additional explanation was to be added. Lambert rendered this function of ŠU as “no comment.”⁹⁰ This seems to be reflected by the fact that, in some early manuscripts, entries which would later be marked ŠU are left blank instead. As for the reading of ŠU, one notes that an archaic manuscript of An

= *Anum*⁹¹ writes ŠU-*ma*, whereby *-ma* is almost certainly the Akkadian enclitic marking the predicate (or in the emphatic usage). This speaks in favor of understanding ŠU as, in origin, an Akkadian word. It could perhaps have originally been the anaphoric pronoun *šū* meaning “itself.” Another possibility is that it could stand for the Akkadian word *qātamma* “the same, similarly, in like manner.”⁹² At any rate, the usage of ŠU seems essentially frozen and logographic.

Glosses

Some entries are provided with glosses, which are annotations to assist the reading of rare cuneiform signs or sequences of signs, or of common ones with unusual or potentially ambiguous readings. Glosses are usually inscribed with smaller wedges and physically offset from the rest of the line, like a superscript. Some manuscripts write glosses in a separate line, or in the explanatory column. Some glosses apply to the reading of an entire name (composed of one or more signs), while others apply to only part of a name or to a single sign, in which case the gloss can be written adjacent to the sign(s) they are meant to clarify. Both kinds of glosses were used already in Proto-An. For two examples of the first kind, the sign KAL, referring to a kind of protective deity, was glossed as *Aladu* (GEN 262) and the sign IM, referring to a name of the storm god, was glossed as *Mur* (GEN 187). For the second kind, e.g. the sign nam₂ was glossed with nam₁ in the name ^dnam₂-maḥ (GEN 396). The former two names are provided by later An = *Anum* manuscripts with glosses as well,⁹³ while in the latter case, the gloss has replaced the glossed sign, ^dnam-maḥ.⁹⁴ One observes that the same names are consistently glossed in diverse manuscripts, suggesting that the choice of which names to provide with glosses was a matter of tradition, and glosses were not simply added according to individual scribal whim. Still, the exact phonetic rendering of glossed names varies across manuscripts. There is a functional overlap between glosses and the practice of providing, in lexical lists, an entire subcolumn where each entry is given in a phonetic spelling – seen, in

⁸⁷ E.g. Schwemer 2020: 12, “Ein zweites Wiederholungszeichen [scil. ŠU, after MIN] – hier mit ‘ebenso’ übersetzt – bezeichnet die horizontale Wiederholung: Ein Göttername in der linken Spalte ist in eben derselben Form auch in der rechten Spalte einzusetzen; das (meist sumerische) Theonym wird nicht mit einem anderen, oft akkadischen Götternamen gleichgesetzt.” According to CAD Q: 163 (s.v. *qātamma*), “In lexical texts, when there is no translation for the item in the Sumerian subcolumn, ŠU or ŠU-*ma* indicates that the item is the same in Akkadian,” but “whether ŠU and ŠU-*ma* are both graphic symbols indicating equivalence horizontally, as ditto signs do vertically, is not known.” See further below on the possible readings of ŠU.

⁸⁸ As observed already by Litke 1998: 14, no. 1.

⁸⁹ This is the convention employed by mss. N₅ and B₈, whereas ms. α instead repeats ŠU in the explanatory column, while marking entries which are equivalent to the preceding ones with MIN glosses (on this practice, see below). This phenomenon of an interchange between MIN and ŠU in the explanatory column for entries that have MIN glosses, marking them as logograms for the preceding entry, was pointed out in Litke 1998: 14, no. 2.

⁹⁰ Lambert 1985a: 187. Cf. Litke 1998: 14, no. 5.

⁹¹ See ms. A₇ (Middle Assyrian, Tablet III). For additional attestations within the lexical corpus, see the following note.

⁹² So CAD Q: 163, s.v. *qātamma*. While the meaning matches, there does not seem to be any independent evidence that ŠU was a logogram with the reading *qātam(ma)*. Moreover, it seems inherently more likely that a noun like *šū* would occur in this usage, in a list as a placeholder, than an adverb. As pointed out in the CAD (op. cit.), one also occasionally encounters the spelling ŠU-*u_{1/2}*; this, however, represents a different phenomenon from ŠU-*ma*. In lexical texts, ŠU can appear with a phonetic complement, whereby ŠU seems to stand for an Akkadianization of the Sumerian word in the left hand column, and the phonetic complement represents an Akkadian nominal ending. Quite commonly this phonetic complement is *-u*, but other times it matches the final consonant of the Sumerian word: e.g. ḤAR-ra IV: 266–267 (MSL 5: 173), giš-ma₂-lal₂, giš ma₂-sal-la = ŠU-*u* (for *malallū* and *mašallū*); 291 (Ibid.: 175), giš-ma₂-gur-gur = ŠU-*ru_{1/3}* (for *magurgurru*); Lu IV: 169–170 (MSL 12: 134), gala-maḥ = ŠU-*lu* for *galamaḥḥu*, gala-us-sa₂ = ŠU-*u₂* for *gala₂ussū*.

⁹³ AA-1: 262 and AA-3: AA-3: 187.

⁹⁴ AA-5: 160.

the present corpus, in the text Enki = *Ea ša kullati*. While the express purpose of glosses was to clarify the reading of one or more signs, they could also serve the purpose of rendering a name as pronounced. One must also recognize the existence of glosses that do not relate to the pronunciation of a name, but rather to its identity. One telling example is an instance where the name an-šar₂ is glossed as ^da-nu.⁹⁵ In context, and in light of the use of the divine determinative within the gloss, this is clearly a theological assertion, rather than a philological one. The scribe wished to indicate that the name ^dan-šar₂ referred to the being otherwise known as Anu, rather than that an-šar₂ were somehow a logogram that should be read as anu_x.

MIN Glosses

The use of the repetition sign MIN as a gloss can embrace both categories, of literal pronunciation and theological identification. Sometimes a MIN gloss is used where it clearly refers to pronunciation alone. This can function on a horizontal level, for example in the gloss of BU.BU as si-ir-MIN, in the name of the deity Nin-sirsir,⁹⁶ where MIN clearly refers to the first part of the same gloss. It can also function on a vertical level, indicating that a gloss given to the preceding name be repeated. For example, in a pair of lines, the sign MUG is glossed as gukim, and in the following line the sign ĤAR is glossed with MIN.⁹⁷ This clearly indicates that ĤAR was another logogram with the same reading as the preceding one. On the other hand, there are cases where MIN seems to refer to the identity of a deity, but not necessarily to pronunciation. As an example, in Tablet II, Marduk is first listed by his primary, Sumerian name Asarluḫi, which is then followed by two epithets or titles, ^dnam-ti-la and ^dnam-RU, both of which are marked with the gloss MIN.⁹⁸ These names, which occur also in other sources, seem to have been genuine epithets of Marduk, that were pronounced as written.⁹⁹ There is no reason to suppose that ^dNAM.TILLA was a logogram for which a reading ^dasarluḫi_x should be introduced.¹⁰⁰ This use of a MIN gloss to mark identity rather than pronunciation has a functional overlap with standard MIN in the explanatory column; MIN as a gloss seems to assert a particularly close identification.¹⁰¹ Other instances are somewhat ambiguous as far as expressing either identity or pronunciation. For example, there occurs in Tablet I a name of Enlil, ^dSANGA, marked with a MIN gloss.¹⁰² In origin this appears to have been an epithet, meaning “foremost

one” (rather than referring to a temple or administrative official). Yet, as written and in the context where it occurs (following ^d50, also marked with a MIN gloss), one must admit it also has a logographic character. Still, ^dSANGA was not in widespread use outside of god lists as a logogram for Enlil, nor does it seem justified to introduce a reading enli_x(SANGA). MIN glosses seem thus to occur on epithets that have a logographic character, or, on logograms that have the form of an epithet.

Translations

The smaller script and offset sign placement found with glosses can also sometimes be used to provide an Akkadian translation of a Sumerian term. For example, the phrase dam-bi nita might be translated as *mussa*, with the word *mu-us-sa* written like a gloss in between the signs “dam” and “bi.”¹⁰³ Such translations can also be provided interlinearly and/or within the explanatory column, using normal script. The translations should be seen as optional explanatory notations, and not as an indication that Sumerian phrases were read in Akkadian, or that the Sumerian phrases were logograms. Indeed, the presence, in an archaic and peripheral witness, of syllabically spelled Sumerian, alongside Akkadian translations, seems to prove that the Sumerian phrases were indeed pronounced as written.¹⁰⁴

Sign Names

Also to be distinguished from pronunciation glosses are the sign names – the practice whereby scribes occasionally provided the ancient names of the individual cuneiform signs that spell out a given divine name. These sign names are sometimes written with the same kind of script as glosses, but they can be differentiated from glosses by the lack of a correspondence between the sign names and the divine name – the signs are spelled out according to their ancient conventional name, which does not necessarily correspond with their correct contextual reading. Often, unpronounced determinatives are included. Usually the sign names are given, as a single unit, for an entire complex of signs – e.g. in AA-5: 118, mss. N₁₈ and W₁ give, for the name ^dnin-in-dub-ba, the sign names a-na e-re-eš in-dub-ba-ku, including thus the DINGIR determinative, represented as a-na. But sometimes the name of just a single sign can be given as well – e.g. in AA-6: 125, mss. N₂₂ and N₂₄ give for ^dalmu(ŠID×A) the sign name um-bi-saga-ku (alongside the gloss of the name as almu). A further clue that one is dealing with sign names is the presence of Akkadian nominal endings on the sign names, which are not present on genuine glosses. The sign names can contain the Akkadianized Sumerian genitive ending (?) -ak(u), and sometimes also terms related to the modification of signs such as *tenū* or *gunū*. As with glosses, which entries were provided with sign names seems to have been

⁹⁵ In the Appendix to An = *Anum*, section F, line 9.

⁹⁶ AA-2: 311, ms. K1.

⁹⁷ AA-2: 330–331.

⁹⁸ AA-2: 174–176.

⁹⁹ In the case of ^dnam-RU, there may have been a development from an original title ^dnam-šub that came later to be understood as ^dnam-ru; see the comment to AA-2: 175.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. the discussion in Lambert 2013: 155–156 and Litke 1998: 8–10.

¹⁰¹ As observed already by Litke 1998: 10, no. 3.

¹⁰² AA-1: 141. The MIN gloss is preserved only in a manuscript that has instead the corrupt variant ^dSI (see the comment to this line).

¹⁰³ AA-5: 199, ms. W₃C.01: 4.

¹⁰⁴ *Passim* in ms. Ht.

a matter of tradition rather than free scribal choice. But exactly what purpose the sign names served in the context of a god list is not entirely clear. One can suppose that they had more to do with practical, didactic or scribal concerns than theological ones.

1.12.2. Modern Conventions

Part I of this book contains the composite edition, reconstructed from the various textual witnesses. In Part II, each manuscript is edited individually. In Part III are the concordances and indexes.

Witness Sigla

Each witness has been assigned a siglum based on its ancient provenience, plus a number, in sequence according to the order in which it appears in the edition. The designations are: A for Aššur; B for Babylonia (including tablets excavated at Babylon itself, as well as tablets without a certain provenience but which must come from a site in Babylonia generally, including Babylon, Borsippa, and Sippar); Ht for Hattuša; Ki for Kish; N for Nineveh; Np for Nippur; S for Sippar, and W for Warka. The two very large Middle Assyrian tablets have been assigned the sigla α (the Yale tablet, Litke's "A") and β (the British Museum tablet, Litke's "B"). In addition, each witness is assigned an "overall" number in order to facilitate locating it within the volume. The overall number is based on the order in which the individual transliterations appear in Part II. There, the witnesses are organized first by period, in the order MA, NA, MB, NB, and secondly by composition, following the order of the main editions in Part I (AA-1-7, AšA, EŠK, Sh, AnšA/B, XAn). However, the first three witnesses – the main Proto-An ms. GEN, the fragment Np₁, and the Tablet I forerunner Fr₁ – appear only in Part I. At the beginning of Part II, a list of all witnesses serves as a table of contents to the individual transliterations.

Witnesses Matrix

In the main edition, on right-facing pages, a chart is presented where, for each line, the siglum for each manuscript utilized for the reconstruction of that line are listed – the witnesses matrix. Due to the greatly varying state of preservation of the individual manuscripts, it would be rather misleading to simply list which manuscripts preserved part of a given line; it is often the case that, for a given line, several manuscripts might preserve the explanatory column, but not the actual name at all (and vice versa). For this reason, a system of notation is used to indicate a manuscript's state of preservation in each line. If no notation is present, then the manuscript preserves both the name and the explanation. Otherwise, the letters "N" and "E" are written next to the sigla in superscript to represent the names and the explanatory column, respectively. A capital "N" or "E" indicates a preserved name or explanation (names that have a damaged sign, or that are missing the divine deter-

minative, are counted as fully preserved); a lowercase "n" or "e" indicates that the name or explanation is only partially preserved. An "x" in the first position (where the "N" would be) indicates that the name is completely broken away, while an "x" in the second position indicates a broken explanation. If the physical position on a tablet where an entry should have been contained is preserved, but nothing or only the divine determinative is legible, then two "x" are written. Thus, for example, the notation N₁ would indicate a completely preserved line in manuscript N₁; N₁^{Nx} would indicate a fully preserved name but a missing explanation; N₁^{NE} indicates that both name and explanation are damaged; N₁^{NE} indicates a damaged name but preserved explanation; N₁^{xE} indicates a broken name but preserved explanation, and so on. If a witness omits a given line, the notation "om." is written in that position within the matrix; if there is, due to damage, uncertainty as to whether a line was omitted or broken away, question marks are added. Assyrian witnesses are listed on the left and Babylonian on the right part of the matrix, and, within those groups, older witnesses to the left and younger to the right.

Critical Apparatus: Variants, Glosses

As explained above (§1.5.1), the edition of each list is a modern composite produced from the individual witnesses, which often differ in their details. Any time a witness preserves a name or explanation which differs from what is given in the composite edition, the variant is noted at the bottom of the page in the critical apparatus, on a line-by-line basis. If a manuscript partially preserves a variant in agreement with another witness, then the manuscript siglum is listed in parentheses. If a line is reconstructed as a hybrid between witnesses, then the form as preserved in each witness is given. There is no strict formula adhered to as far as the order in which variant manuscripts are presented, or exactly in which manner the variants are noted. They are given according to pragmatic concerns and to ease readability. The critical apparatus can serve as an overview and a guide, while the individual transliterations in Part II provide the definitive portrayal of each of the witnesses in their diversity.

Because glosses, translations, and sign names are often not contained or preserved in every manuscript, they are usually presented, like variants, within the critical apparatus, rather than the main text. Some translations are presented instead as sub-lines with an alphabetic designation (e.g. line 31b in AA-1), in which case the presence or absence of the translation in each witness is given in the chart on the right-facing page. The transliteration of a divine name in general follows the ancient gloss, unless there is a reason to suspect its accuracy (in which case, see the comment to that line). Glosses are represented, in the apparatus and the individual witness transliteration, in superscript, using a distinct font, e.g. B₂: gloss ^{a-1a-1a}ALAM (AA-1: 20), with the DINGIR and other signs irrelevant to the gloss omitted for readability. If a witness has both a gloss and a variant, the form can be given in full. The

glosses are represented in a different font to keep them distinct from other types of signs conventionally represented in superscript: on the one hand, determinatives (such as KI for places or GIŠ for wooden objects), and on the other, phonetic complements. Phonetic complements originally served a function similar to glosses, but they belong to an older layer of the writing tradition, and have often become integrated as part of logographic spellings. As such, they are not transliterated in gloss script. Examples of spellings with phonetic complements include: ^{i-si}isin₂, nanibgal₂^{gal}, and ulu₄^{lu}.

Transliteration, Line Numbering

The transliterations in this volume employ the sign values established in Borger, MZL. The specific Sumerian phoneme /g/ is not represented in transliteration. Akkadian and other identifiably Semitic words or names are transliterated in italics. Non-italic script is used both for the transliteration of Sumerian and other foreign or non-identifiable words or names. When transliterating individual witnesses, each line on a physical tablet is numbered on the left according to the following scheme: Siglum.Face.Column. Line. The faces are designated A, B, and C, respectively for obverse, lower edge, and reverse (lower edge occurring only very rarely; none of the edited pieces have inscribed upper, left, or right edges). The numbering sequence for columns is started anew on the reverse. The prime symbol (') is used for columns and lines when the tablet is broken and the exact position in the sequence starting from the beginning is not known. Thus for example: N₁₂.C.02.15' designates ms. N₁₂, reverse, column ii, 15th preserved line. On the right side of the witness transliterations, the line number in the reconstructed composition to which the line in the manuscript belongs is given. In the given example, it is AA-3: 224, that is Tablet III, line 224.

Only lines which contain a divine name are assigned a number in our edition, a practice which follows how the ancient scribes calculated the number of entries on their tablets when giving the total in colophons. Practically speaking, this means that rubrics (descriptions which apply to more than one entry) and translations do not get their own line number, even though some manuscripts might write them as a physically distinct line. This accounts for the main source of divergence between our line numbering and that of Litke's edition. Rubrics are labeled with the designation "R" and the span of entries to which the rubric applies. For example, in Tablet I, R346–347 (which had been Litke's line 366) occurs immediately after line 347, and describes the two attendants of the Ekur in lines 346–347. In the indexes, the rubrics are cited according to the last line in their range, so in this example, it would be cited as R347.

Concordances

A concordance between the line numbers in Litke 1998 and those of the present edition is provided in Part III. With

this the reader can easily find, from old references (in, e.g. MZL), the new line number in the current volume. The old Litke numbers are listed on the left: with the An = *Anum* Tablet in Roman numerals; the new numbers are on the right, with the Tablet cited according to the present convention, in Arabic numerals. E.g. "I 25 | 1:24" means Litke's Tablet I, line 25 corresponds to AA-1: 24 in this volume.

A concordance of tablet museum numbers and sigla/text numbers has also been provided. This list is organized alphabetically according to the museum in which the tablets are presently kept.

Lastly there is a concordance of previous publications of tablets (handcopies) and sigla/text numbers, with museum numbers also provided. The previous publications are listed according to their abbreviation, e.g.: CT 24: 12–17 | K 4332 | 18 | N₅.

Indexes

The indexes are tailored to the nature of our texts both as sources of theological information and as lexical lists. First of all is the index of divine names. In addition, indexes of Sumerian and of Akkadian terms and of place names are provided. There is also an index of personal names, occurring in colophons of individual witnesses. Finally, there are indexes cataloguing the different types of glosses present in the individual witnesses.

The index of divine names is arranged and alphabetized not simply according to the transliterations, but according to the identity of the deities, with transcriptions (normalizations) used, as far as possible, as lemmata. Various spellings referring to the same deity are united under a single entry. For example, under the lemma An, *Anu(m)*, are gathered the spellings: an, ^da-ni, ^da-nu, ^da-num, etc. Under *Suen*, *Sin* one finds both the spellings ^dEN.ZU and ^d30; cross references to *Suen* are provided at the alphabetic positions of ^dEN.ZU and ^d30. Names with unclear readings or that are fragmentary are not lemmatized, and are given instead in transliteration.

Furthermore, homophonous or homonymous deities with distinct identities are kept separate: e.g. the goddess Anna (an-na) is distinguished from the deified metal "tin" Anna (an-na). In most cases, the occurrences within the lists themselves suffice to make such distinctions, without the need to turn to other sources. On the other hand, when completely distinct names occur in the same position in different manuscripts of the same list, cross references can be given: e.g. AA-3: 126 lists the name Pa(p)–Unuga (^dpa₄-unug^{ki}-ga), but one witness has for this line the variant ^dDI-nu-KA-mu-un-DI, and so a cross reference is given under each entry. Another example is AA-1:223, Nin–uru–šaga, with a cross reference given to the variant, under a separate lemma, Ama–uru–ešaga. Sometimes however, variants of this nature are grouped under a single lemma (e.g., if the variant is at the end of the name). In either case, cross references are provided.

Lemmata are also provided for logographic spellings that can refer to multiple deities, with the logographic

spellings also included under each respective deity: e. g. under ^dBAĪAR₂ are booked the occurrences referring to Enlil, Nunura, and Lil, and under each of these deities' respective entry are also those occurrences of ^dBAĪAR₂ which refer to them.

The ordering is strictly alphabetic, with index values of transliterated signs ignored. Numerical signs follow characters; the symbol representing broken signs ('x') is in the alphabetic position of "X," and gaps (represented by [...]) come last. References are always made to line numbers within the composite editions rather than to individual witnesses; if a form is given in our edition as a variant, then "var" is written in superscript next to the reference; the reader can consult the main edition to see in exactly which manuscript(s) the forms are attested. As in the witnesses matrix, superscript "E" after a line number indicates that the name falls in the explanatory subcolumn. Superscript "f" indicates the first of two or more successive occurrences.

As far as the normalization of names is concerned, popular or common forms, if they exist, are preferred, e. g. **Marduk, Gilgameš, Nergal**. Recognizable elements of names can be separated with a long dash: e. g. **Lugal-baĥar, Nin-arazu, Igi-šuba, Ētabir-šamē**. A specific element within a name, of unclear reading, might be given in capitals, or in transliteration. For Sumerian names, consonant doubling as an orthographic feature (i. e. when a vocalic suffix is attached to a stem ending in a consonant) is generally not reflected: thus, dug₄-ga is rendered as duga.

After the index of divine names, a small index of star names (most of them with the determinative MUL) has been provided; in our corpus these occur mostly limited to a single context within Shorter An = *Anum*.

The indexes of Sumerian and Akkadian vocabulary are organized in a straightforward manner. For the Akkadian index, transcriptions/normalizations of each word, in the conventional citation form (nominative case) are used as lemmata. Variant spellings and different morphological forms of the same word are grouped together. Logographic spellings, identified by the context as standing for Akkadian words (rather than to be read in Sumerian), are also included. Thus under the entry *bēltu* are included the spellings *be-let*, *be-lat*, and NIN. For lack of any other suitable place, non-Sumerian, non-Akkadian foreign words are included in the Akkadian index (such words usually appear with Akkadianized nominal endings). The Sumerian index, for practical reasons, is not similarly lemmatized. The alphabetization is according to transliteration. Thus forms such as *dumu* "son," *dumu-a-ni*, "his/her son," *dumu-meš* "children," "dumu-munus," daughter," etc., are all indexed separately. At any rate, such derived forms in Sumerian are inevitably alphabetically adjacent to the basic form.

The index of place names is, like that of divine names, lemmatized according to transcriptions of each place name, with common renderings used if they exist. Thus *ki-en-gi* is indexed under "Sumer," KA.DINGIR.RA^{ki} is under "Babylon," AN.ŠAR₂^{ki} under "Aššur," etc. For each

lemma, it is parenthetically indicated whether each toponym refers to a town, temple or region.

The index of personal names is also lemmatized according to the transcription of each name. If the name is fragmentary or of unclear reading, then it is indexed according to its transliteration. Personal names do not occur in the god lists as such, but are encountered in colophons, often designating the owner and/or writers of the tablets. They are sometimes found as part of regnal year-names. As such, the references are to lines on specific witnesses. Again, popular forms such as "Aššurbanipal," "Artaxerxes," "Nebuchadnezzar," are used, if they exist.

Gloss Indexes

The glosses (see above § 1.12.1) contained within our lists constitute an important source of information for Mesopotamian lexicography. Since they are scattered throughout our texts, the glosses have been given their own set of six indexes in order to render them more directly accessible, and so that the reader may have a clear overview of them. Certain sign values are, so far, only attested by glosses from within our corpus. Some of these readings have already been adopted and made canonical for modern research by Rykle Borger in MZL (mostly citing the old edition of Litke). Some values were (perhaps intentionally) not included by him; others are found now in new manuscripts, that were not available to either Borger or Litke. Since the glosses usually do not occur in every witness preserving a certain line of a composition, in the gloss indexes references are made to lines on individual witnesses, in addition to the line number in the composite edition.

The six gloss indexes are: the index of glossed divine names; of glossed place names; of MIN glosses; of glossed signs and sign combination; of Akkadian translation glosses on divine names and on Sumerian nouns, and lastly, the index of sign names.

The first gloss index collects and alphabetically arranges all of the glossed divine names, where the gloss syllabically spells out all or part of the name. The divine names are listed alphabetically on the left according to transliteration, the line numbers in the witness and the composition are given in the middle, and the complete form as glossed is given on the right. The second gloss index does the same for glossed place names.

The third gloss index is the index of MIN glosses, where MIN refers to either a preceding divine name and/or its syllabic gloss (see above § 1.12.1). On the left are listed, alphabetically according to transliteration, the names on which the MIN glosses occur; in the middle is the reference to a tablet line number and to the composition line number, and on the right, the preceding theonym (plus syllabic gloss if included) to which the MIN presumably refers. The MIN-glossed names on the left are transliterated with capital letters (even if they are not necessarily so transliterated in the main editions). While many of these exhibit a logographic character, as explained above, it should not always be assumed that the names with

MIN glosses are to be literally read as logograms having the same pronunciation as the preceding name to which the MIN refers (although this is certainly sometimes the case).

The fourth gloss index is the index of glossed signs and sign combinations, sorted according to the basic value of the glossed sign. In the second column, the basic sign value is given in capital letters, while the gloss itself is given on the left; on the right, is the official sign value corresponding to that gloss, as canonized in MZL; e. g. the sign A is given the gloss *du-r[u]*, yielding the sign value *duru*₅. Some sign values, not found in MZL, are given the index value *x*. Items with a gloss MIN referring to a preceding entry are also included. In case of partial glosses, the non-glossed part of the sign is given in parentheses – e. g. the sign BAD with the gloss *dim*₂, referring to the value *idim*, is given as (i)dim.

The fifth gloss index collects Akkadian translation glosses. The first and larger part concerns logographically written divine names which are provided with syllabic Akkadian renderings in the form of glosses. The logograms are listed alphabetically in the leftmost column; the Akkadian gloss, as transliterated, is given in the next column, and to the right of that a transcription (normalization) of the Akkadian gloss is provided. On the far right are the references to the witness and composition line numbers. The second part, smaller in size, collects the Akkadian translation glosses that a few manuscripts provide for Sumerian nouns. Only glosses of individual Sumerian nouns are included, and not renderings of entire Sumerian phrases in Akkadian. Although some manuscripts can write, as glosses, phrase translations that are written interlinearly in other manuscripts, in the editions these are represented as part of the main text, and so they are accordingly indexed with the rest of the Akkadian vocabulary.

The sixth gloss index is the index of sign names (see above § 1.10.1). It is arranged alphabetically according to the sign or group of signs that are provided with a name. The spelling of the sign name is listed in the second col-

umn, and on the right are the references to the witness and composition line numbers.

1.12.3. Scope and Purpose of the Textual Notes

Lambert's unpublished commentary to his draft edition of *An = Anum* had aimed at achieving an encyclopedic scope. But if this had been attempted here, it would have taken decades, and the result would have been a work five or ten times as long. In particular, Lambert sought to provide definitive studies on the principal members of the pantheon, drawing upon all kinds of sources across the full span of Mesopotamian history. But such a detailed study goes far beyond the scope of an edition of god lists.

The notes in this edition are intended to deal primarily with philological matters, concerning the correct reading of the signs that make up a name, or the comparison of forms varying across witnesses. They also deal with matters related to the structure of the lists, or a deity's occurrence in a given context. For obscure names, they give information on the identity of a deity. The notes are not intended to comprise a synchronic or diachronic study in Mesopotamian religion, but to help the reader understand the lists. Inevitably, philological concerns will intersect with theological matters. For example, the question of how to read a name is connected with its meaning, and this meaning might in turn be related to the role of a deity, as revealed in other sources. Be that as it may, the present work cannot fulfil the role of an encyclopedia of divine names, nor can it provide a complete bibliography on the deities occurring in our lists.

Because of the philological focus, well-known divine names with uncontroversial readings receive little or no commentary, whereas more attention is given to rare or obscure names, especially those for which the present lists provide their principal attestation. In these cases, the reader will understand if, for such names, the comments sometimes exceed the bounds of what is strictly necessary for philological clarification.

2. Text Editions

2.1. An = *Anum*

2.1.1. Forerunners

Proto-An = *Anum* ("de Genouillac List")

1–37	Primordial Deities		
	1–30	Enlil's ancestors	~AA-1: 88–129
	31–37	Anu and related primordial deities	~AA-1: 24–30
		31–33	Anu
		34–35	his wife
		36–37	cosmic ocean
38–75	Enlil Section		
	38–47	Enlil's names	~AA-1: 138–165
	48–50	Ninlil, his wife	~AA-1: 166–172
	51–52	additional identity of Enlil and Enlil	~AA-1: 175–176
	53–56	officials of the Ekur (= deified rulers?)	~AA-1: 177–178
	57–58	Dagan (equated with Enlil)	~AA-1: 181–186
		58	his wife
	59–60	(Išḫara)	~AA-1: 187–191
	61	Anbu	~AA-1: 192
	62–75	Ninurta (Enlil's son)	
		61–65	Ninurta's names
		66–70	Ninibru, his wife
		71–75	his officials
76–111	Enki Section		
	76–85	Enki's names	~AA-2: 119–162
	86–88	Damgalnuna, his wife	~AA-2: 163–173
	89–92	Asarluḫi, his son	
		89–91	Asarluḫi's names
		92	Panunanki, his wife
	93–94	Damgalnuna's counselors	~AA-2: 297–298
	95–97	children of Enki	~AA-2: 274–281
	98–99	Isimud, chief vizier of Enki	~AA-2: 282–283
	100	(Nin-)Sirsir, boatman of Enki	~AA-2: 311–312
	101–103	doorkeepers, gatekeeper	~AA-2: 299–307
	104–107	Marduk (= Asarluḫi)	
		104–105	names of Marduk
		106–107	Zarpanitum, his wife
	108–109	daughters of Enki	~AA-2: 268–269
	110–111	Nabium	~AA-2: 232–236
		111	Tašmētum, his wife
112–130	Mother Goddess Section		
	112–121	names of the mother goddess	~AA-2: 1–44
	122–125	Šulpa'e, her husband	~AA-2: 45–54
	126–127	her children	~AA-2: 58–64
	128	herald	~AA-2: 83–87
	129	wife of Ašgi (?)	~AA-2: 67
	130	doorkeeper	~AA-2: 115–118

131–147	Deities Associated with the Ekur		
	131–140	the fire god	
	131–136	names of Nuska	~AA-1: 238–244
	135–140	Sadaranuna, his wife	~AA-1: 245–249
	141–144	constables of the Ekur	~AA-1: 262–267
	145	[...]	
	146–147	additional names of Sadaranuna	~AA-1: 244; 250
148–168	Moon God Section		
	148–154	names of Nanna/Sin	~AA-3: 1–25
	155	Ningal, his wife	~AA-3: 26–28
	156–159	Ningublaga, his son	
	156–158	names of Ningublaga	~AA-3: 29–34
	159	his wife	~AA-3: 35
	160–163 [?]	Numuša, his son	(...)
	164–165	Alamuš, his vizier	~AA-3: 36
	165	his wife	~AA-3: 37
	166	daughter	~AA-3: 40–41
	167	attendant	~AA-3: 42–45
	168	Gayu, herdsman of Sin	~AA-3: 78–87
169–170	Nunbarana		
	169	wife of Nunbarana [?]	~AA-2: 320 [?]
	170	Nunbarana (= Girra?)	~AA-2: 316
171–189	Sun God Section		
	171–176	names of Utu/Šamaš	~AA-3: 88–113
	177–180	names of Šerda, his wife	~AA-3: 114–122
	181–182	“justice,” vizier	~AA-3: 128
	183	“truth,” daughter	~AA-3: 134
	184	soldier (?)	(...)
	185–187	viziers, executive	~AA-3: 129–133
	188–189	god of herds	
	188	Šakkan	~AA-3: 173–180
	189	Elamesi, his wife	~AA-3: 181
190–196	Storm God Section		
	190–192	names of Iškur/Adad	~AA-3: 186–216
	193–194	[Šala/Medimša, his wife]	~AA-3: 217–233
	195	daughter	~AA-3: 227–229
	196	son	~AA-3: 224–229
197–278	Inanna/Ištar Section		
	197–236	names/identities of Inanna/Ištar	~AA-4: 1–132
	234–246	servants of Inanna [?]	
	237–254	interpreters of Inanna	~AA-4: 133–137
	255–256	“outdoor shrines”	~AA-4: 156–163
	257–266	astral identities of Inanna	~AA-4: 164–184
	267–274	names/identities of Dumuzi	~AA-4: [...]
	275–278	Nanaya	~AA-4: [...]
	275–277	names of Nanaya	
	278	Muati, her spouse	~AA-4: 7 [?]
279–304	Terrestrial Deities		
	279–280	Lugalbanda of Uruk	
	279	Lugalbanda	~AA-5: 1
	280	Ninsumun, his wife	~AA-5: 2–3
	281–285	Lugalmarada of Marad	
	281–282	names of Lugalmarada	~AA-5: 22–23
	283	NIN-zuanna, his wife	~AA-5: 24
	284–285	his children	~AA-5: 25–26

286–291	Ninkilim of Muru	
286–289	names of Ninkilim	~AA-5: 29–35
290 ² –291	Ninmuru, his wife	~AA-5: 36–37
292–295	Lagashite Deities	
292	Nin-MAR.KI	~AA-3: 64–76
293–295	Nanše	
293–294	spellings of Nanše	~AA-3: 61–62
295	Nindara, her husband	~AA-3: 59
296–297	attendants of the Emaḥ	~AA-2: 55–56
296	Šulpa'e-dara	
297	Šulpa'e-amaša	
298–302	Damu (= Dumuzi)	
298	Damu	~AA-5: 153
299–300	Geštinanna (Dumuzi's sister)	~AA-4 ² : [...]
301–302	Ninurub and Belili	
303–304	Ningišzida	
303	Ningišzida	~AA-5: 230–231
304	Azidamua, his wife	~AA-5: 232–233
305–341	Deities related to Enlil and the Ekur	
305–307	Ninamaškuga, goatherd of Enlil	~AA-1: 332–334
305	Ninamaškuga	
306	his wife	
307	his mother	
309–310	Kalkal, doorkeeper	~AA-1: 268–269
310	his wife	~AA-1: 270
311–312	Lugalkisa'a (= Haya?), doorkeeper (?)	~AA-1: 276
312	Igkug (= Lugalkisa'a)	~AA-1: 279
313–319	Ninimma	
314–316	names of Ninimma	~AA-1: 291–300
317	Erda, boatman (/woman?) (= Ninimma?)	~AA-1: 302
318	Ninimma	~AA-1: 297
319	Kusigbanda, her husband	~AA-1: 301
320–323	grain deities	~AA-1: 272–290
320	Ašnan	
321	Haya	
322–323	Nisaba, Nunbaršegunu	
324–327	chamberlains	~AA-1: 303–307
324–325	Ennugi	
326–327	Nanibgal, his wife	
328–329	Kusu, purifier of Enlil	~AA-1: 308–311
329	Indagara, her husband (= Iškur)	
330–331	Ninšar, butcher of Ekur	~AA-1: 312–317
331	Irragal, her husband (= Nergal)	
332–334	beer and wine deities	~AA-1: 318–328
332–333	Ninkasi, Siriš	
334	Patindu	
335–336	Šuziana, junior wife of Enlil	~AA-1: 173–174
336	Enzikalama, her husband (= Enlil)	
337–339	fragmentary/unclear	
340–341	incantation goddesses	~AA-1: 335–337
340	Ningirim, sister of Enlil	
341	Eta'ede	
342–357	Terrestrial and Netherworld Deities	
342–344	Lord of the steppe, the "standard"	~AA-6: 73
345–347	Lugalzag'e, Lulal	~AA-1: 205
348	Lady of the steppe	
349–350	Šara (of Umma)	(...)

	350	Usaḥara, his wife	
	351	Kumulmul	(...)
	352	Irḥan, snake deity	~AA-1: 263 [?]
	354–355	Ugur (related to Nergal)	~AA-5: 50–51
	355	Ši-sarrat, his wife	
	356–357	Lisin	~AA-2: 68–69
	357	Ninsikila, his ¹ wife	
358–399	Healing Goddess Section		
	358	Abba, her husband	~AA-5: 52
	359–364	names of the healing goddess	~AA-5: 104–156
	359–360	Gula	
	361–365	Nintinuga, etc.	
	365–367	Pabilsag, etc. (= her husband)	
	368–389	Ninisina, Ninkarak, etc.	
	390–391	(Ma-)Nungal	~AA-5: 177–178
	392–393 [?]	Gunura, her daughter	
	394–399	vizier, constables, doorkeeper, attendant	~AA-5: 157–173
400–457	Netherworld Deities		
	400–402	Ninazu	~AA-5: 220–222
	401–402	Ningirida, his wife	
	403–404	Ereškigal, Allatum	~AA-5: 195–218
	405–406	Tišpak	~AA-5: 248–259
	406	his wife (?)	
	407–409	Namtar	~AA-5: 201–203
	407	Mardulanki, his mother	
	408	Namtar	
	409	Dingir-ḥušbisa, his wife	
	410–412	Lugal-irra and Meslamta-e'a	~AA-5: 269–284
	410	Lugal-irra	
	411	Kuanesi, his wife	
	412	Meslamta-e'a	
	413–415	Ninšubur	~AA-1: 31–69
	413–414	Ninšubur's names	
	415	Egubiduga	
	416–417	Lugal-aba	~AA-5: 283–284
	417	Nin-ga'uga, his wife	
	418–457	Nergal section	~AA-6: 1–25
	418	Nergal	
	419	Mamitum, his wife	
	420–423	names of Nergal	
	424	Šubula, his son	
	425–456	Lugal-names, gods related to Nergal	~AA-6: 26–95
	457	NIN-urubara	~AA-6: 96
458–462	Profession-deities related to Enki		
	458–462	musicians	~AA-2: 288–292
	463–464	Enkimdu: agriculture	~AA-2: 239–241
	465–467	fire deities	~AA-2: 313–323
	468–469	potters	~AA-2: 149–150
	470–471	smiths	~AA-2: 324–326
471–472	Addition to Healing Goddess Section		
	471	Enanun (= Gula, or mother of Gula)	~AA-5: 112
	472	Pa(bilsag), her husband.	~AA-5: 113

Text 1. GEN: AO 5376

Dimensions: 13.5W × 20.4H × 3.5D

Period: Old Babylonian

Handcopy: de Genouillac, RA 20: 98–99; TCL 15: 10

Photograph: Boulanger/Renisio 1982: 219 (Louvre Exhibition Catalog)

CDLI: P345354

Content: Proto-An = Anum (“de Genouillac List”)

Large tablet containing five narrow columns each on the obverse and reverse. Well-preserved over its complete original length and width, it is marred only by some surface fissures and damage to the right part of the upper edge. Over

most of its lines it is densely inscribed; about one-fifth of the final column has been left blank, but there is no colophon or summary remark. The thin vertical dividing lines that separate the columns are barely visible, being mostly obscured by the subsequently inscribed signs. The tablet’s original provenience is unknown; it was purchased by the Louvre from Isaac Élias Gėjou, a Paris-based antiquities dealer of Armenian origin, who was one of the major suppliers of cuneiform tablets to European museums in the early 20th century. While early studies of the text identified it, on paleographic grounds, as belonging to either the Ur III period or the first dynasty of Isin, the script seems to be archaic rather than genuinely archaic. In all likelihood it dates to the middle or latter part of the Old Babylonian period.

<i>Composition</i>	<i>Tablet</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>Canonical</i>
GEN-01	A.01.01	^d en-ki	AA-1.88
GEN-02	A.01.02	^d nin-ki	AA-1.89
GEN-03	A.01.03	^d en-mul	AA-1.92
GEN-04	A.01.04	^d nin-mul	AA-1.93
GEN-05	A.01.05	^d en-ul	AA-1.90
GEN-06	A.01.06	^d nin-ul	AA-1.91
GEN-07	A.01.07	^d en-NUN	AA-1.110
GEN-08	A.01.08	^d nin-NUN	AA-1.111
GEN-09	A.01.09	^d en-kur	AA-1.112
GEN-10	A.01.10	^d nin-kur	AA-1.113
GEN-11	A.01.11	^d en-kin-gal	AA-1.116
GEN-12	A.01.12	^d nin-kin-gal	AA-1.117
GEN-13	A.01.13	^d en-šar ₂	AA-1.108
GEN-14	A.01.14	^d nin-šar ₂	AA-1.109
GEN-15	A.01.15	^d en-buluḫ(HJAL)	AA-1.102
GEN-16	A.01.16	^d nin-buluḫ	AA-1.103
GEN-17	A.01.17	^d en-bulug ₃	AA-1.100
GEN-18	A.01.18	^d nin-bulug ₃	AA-1.101
GEN-19	A.01.19	^d en-giriš(HI×ŠE)	AA-1.106
GEN-20	A.01.20	^d nin-giriš	AA-1.107
GEN-21a	A.01.21a	^d en-da-šurim-ma	AA-1.123
GEN-21b	A.01.21b	(^d nin-da-šurim-ma)	AA-1.124
GEN-22a	A.01.22a	(^d en-amaš)	AA-1.114
GEN-22b	A.01.22b	^d nin-amaš	AA-1.115
GEN-23	A.01.23	^d en-du ₆ -ku ₃ -ga	AA-1.126
GEN-24	A.01.24	^d nin-du ₆ -ku ₃ -ga	AA-1.127
GEN-25	A.01.25	^d en-an-na	AA-1.120
GEN-26	A.01.26	^d nin-an-na	AA-1.121
GEN-27	A.01.27	^d en-u ₄ -ti-la	AA-1.122
GEN-28	A.01.28	^d nin-u ₄ -ti-la	AA-1.123
GEN-29	A.01.29	^d en-me-šar ₂ -ra	AA-1.128
GEN-30	A.01.30	^d nin-me-šar ₂ -ra	AA-1.129
GEN-31	A.01.31	an	AA-1.01
GEN-32	A.01.32	an-šar ₂ -gal	AA-1.06
GEN-33	A.01.33	^d en-uru-ul-la	AA-1.22
GEN-34	A.01.34	^d uraš(IB)	AA-1.04
GEN-35	A.01.35	^d bēlet(NIN)-i ₃ -li	AA-1.24/29
GEN-36	A.01.36	^d namma	AA-1.26
GEN-37	A.01.37	^d ama-tu-an-ki	AA-1.27
GEN-38	A.01.38	^d en-lil ₂	AA-1.138
GEN-39	A.01.39	^d nu-nam-nir	AA-1.143

<i>Composition</i>	<i>Tablet</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>Canonical</i>
GEN-40	A.01.40	^d kur-gal	AA-1.144
GEN-41	A.01.41	^d eš ₃	AA-1.149
GEN-42	A.01.42	^d šir ₃ -sag	AA-1.151
GEN-43	A.01.43	^d balag-di	AA-1.152
GEN-44	A.01.44	^d dara ₃ -gal	AA-1.153
GEN-45	A.01.45	^d {erasure}BAHAR ₂	AA-1.142/157
GEN-46	A.01.46	^d {erasure}SANGA	AA-1.141
GEN-47	A.01.47	^d {erasure}aš-te	AA-1.--
GEN-48	A.01.48	^d nin-lil ₂	AA-1.166
GEN-49	A.01.49	^r egi ₂ -tum-ma-al	AA-1.168
GEN-50	A.01.50	^d sud ₃ (SU.KUR.RU)	AA-1.169
GEN-51	A.02.01	^d sig ₄ -za-gin	AA-1.175
GEN-52	A.02.02	^d maškim-gi ₆ -lu ₂ -ḫar-ra-an-na	AA-1.176
GEN-53	A.02.03	^d LUM-ma	AA-1.177
GEN-54	A.02.04	^d ḫa-da-ni-iš	AA-1.178
GEN-55	A.02.05	^d en-lil ₂ -la ₂ -zi	AA-1.179
GEN-56	A.02.06	^d ur- ^d EN.ZU	AA-1.180
GEN-57	A.02.07	^d da-gan	AA-1.181
GEN-58	A.02.08	^d nin-ku ₃ -GI	AA-1.183
GEN-59	A.02.09	^d kak-ka ₃	AA-1.188/4.267
GEN-60	A.02.10	^d be-la-at-bi-ri	AA-1.189/4.268
GEN-61	A.02.11	an-bu	AA-1.192
GEN-62	A.02.12	^d nin-urta	AA-1.215
GEN-63	A.02.13	^d ud-ta-ulu ₃ ^{lu}	AA-1.193
GEN-64	A.02.14	^d nimin-DU	AA-1.194
GEN-65	A.02.15	^d ša ₃ -dubur-nun	AA-1.195
GEN-66	A.02.16	^d nin-nibru ^{ki}	AA-1.218
GEN-67	A.02.17	^d nin-tul ₂ -la ₂	AA-1.219
GEN-68	A.02.18	^d nin-uru-sag-ga ₂	AA-1.221
GEN-69	A.02.19	^d nin-nig ₂ -gi-na	AA-1.225
GEN-70	A.02.20	^d nin-ud-zal-le	AA-1.227
GEN-71	A.02.21	^d saman ₂ (ŠE ₃ .BU.NUN.ŠE ₃ ^{erasure?} .TU)	AA-1.226
GEN-72	A.02.22	^d nim-ma-ni-zi	AA-1.228
GEN-73	A.02.23	^d lamma	AA-1.229
GEN-74	A.02.24	^d nin-kar ^l (TE)-nun-na	AA-1.230
GEN-75	A.02.25	^d kinda ₂ -zi	AA-1.231
GEN-76	A.02.26	^d en-ki	AA-2.119
GEN-77	A.02.27	^d dara ₃ - ^r abzu ¹	AA-2.133
GEN-78	A.02.28	^d dara ₃ -dim ₂	AA-2.134
GEN-79	A.02.29	^d dara ₃ -ban ₃ -da	AA-2.139
GEN-80	A.02.30	^d dara ₃ -nun-na	AA-2.136
GEN-81	A.02.31	^d nu-dim ₂ -mud	AA-2.123
GEN-82	A.02.32	^d lugal-abzu	AA-2.130
GEN-83	A.02.33	^d i ₂ -idigna	AA-2.261?
GEN-84	A.02.34	^d nin-ildu ₂ (IGI.NAGAR.BU)	AA-2.--
GEN-85	A.02.35	^d abgal-KA×ŠE	AA-2.--
GEN-86	A.02.36	^d dam-gal-nun-na	AA-2.163
GEN-87	A.02.37	^d nin-gi-ku ₃ -ga	AA-2.167
GEN-88	A.02.38	^d nin-dim ₂ -an-na	AA-2.169
GEN-89	A.02.39	^d asar-lu ₂ -ḫi	AA-2.174
GEN-90	A.02.40	^d asar	AA-2.177
GEN-91	A.02.41	^d asar- ^r alim ¹ -nun-na	AA-2.179
GEN-92	A.02.42	^d pa ₄ -nun-an-ki	AA-2.225
GEN-93	A.02.43	^d e ₄ -ru ₆ (A.EDIN)	AA-2.297
GEN-94	A.02.44	^d ur- ^r e ₄ -ru ₆ ¹	AA-2.298
GEN-95	A.02.45	^d r-x-x ¹ -[o-(o)]- ^r ku ₃ ^{2,1}	AA-2.274?

<i>Composition</i>	<i>Tablet</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>Canonical</i>
GEN-96	A.02.46	^d e[n]si ₂ -maḥ	AA-2.277
GEN-97	A.02.47	^d ga[da-]a ₂ -abzu	AA-2.275
GEN-98	A.03.01	[^d ri]simu ₄ ([PAP.SIG ₇].NUN.ME)	AA-2.283
GEN-99	A.03.02	^d [PAP].SIG ₇ .NIMGIR	AA-2.--
GEN-100	A.03.03	^d sirsir(BU\BU×AB)	AA-2.[203]
GEN-101	A.03.04	^d igi-ḥe ₂ - ^r gal ₂ '	AA-2.300
GEN-102	A.03.05	^d ka-ḥe ₂ -gal ₂	AA-2.299
GEN-103	A.03.06	^d la-ḥa-ma-abzu	AA-2.307
GEN-104	A.03.07	^d amar-utu	AA-2.180
GEN-105	A.03.08	^d tu-tu	AA-2.185
GEN-106	A.03.09	^d zar-pa-ni-tum	AA-2.231
GEN-107	A.03.10	^d nin-barag-ge ₄ -si	AA-2.226
GEN-108	A.03.11	^d dumu-zi-abzu	AA-2.268
GEN-109	A.03.12	^d du ₆ ¹² .ki-gu-la	AA-2.269
GEN-110	A.03.13	^d na-bi-um	AA-2.236
GEN-111	A.03.14	^d taš-me-tum	AA-2.238
GEN-112	A.03.15	^d nin- ^r hur ¹ -sag-ga ₂	AA-2.03
GEN-113	A.03.16	dingir-maḥ	AA-2.01
GEN-114	A.03.17	^d nin-maḥ	AA-2.02
GEN-115	A.03.18	^d a-ru-ru	AA-2.24
GEN-116	A.03.19	^d nin-tu	AA-2.15/18
GEN-117	A.03.20	^d nin-du ₆ -ud-ra	AA-2.14
GEN-118	A.03.21	^d nin- ^r EZEN×KAS ² .EZEN×KAS ²	AA-2.22
GEN-119	A.03.22	^d nin- ^r men ¹ -[n]a	AA-2.20
GEN-120	A.03.23	^d nin- ^r šeš ₂ '	AA-2.23
GEN-121	A.03.24	^d lu ₂ '-gu-la	AA-2.32
GEN-122	A.03.25	^d šul ¹ -pa-e ₃	AA-2.45
GEN-123	A.03.26	^d ud-al-tar	AA-2.46
GEN-124	A.03.27	^d lugal-ur ₃ - ^r ra'	AA-2.47
GEN-125	A.03.28	^d lugal-ud- ^r da'	AA-2.48
GEN-126	A.03.29	^d barag-ul-e-ga[r-r]a	AA-2.58
GEN-127	A.03.30	^d [il]	AA-2.62
GEN-128	A.03.31	^d uru ₃ -maš	AA-2.83
GEN-129	A.03.32	^d giš-ḥur-an-ki	AA-2.67
GEN-130	A.03.33	^d AŠ-an- ^{ta} ?DU	AA-2.116
GEN-131	A.03.34	^d nuska(PA.TUG ₂)	AA-1.238
GEN-132	A.03.35	^d e ₂ -kur-re-si	AA-1.239
GEN-133	A.03.36	^d en-zag-ga	AA-1.240
GEN-134	A.03.37	^d sag-bi-še ₃ -e ₃ -a	AA-1.241
GEN-135	A.03.38	^d enšada(PA.TUG ₂)	AA-1.242
GEN-136	A.03.39	^d sa-dara ₃ -nun-na	AA-1.245
GEN-137	A.03.40	^d nin-ki-ag ₂ -nun-na	AA-1.246
GEN-138	A.03.41	^d dumu-abzu	AA-1.247
GEN-139	A.03.42	^d um- ^r ma ¹ -[GIŠ]. ^r TUG ₂ .PI.SILA ₃ ²	AA-1.248
GEN-140	A.03.43	^d nin-ka-aš-bar-an-ki	AA-1.249
GEN-141	A.03.44	^d a- ^{la} - ^{du} alad ₂ (KAL)	AA-1.262
GEN-142	A.03.45	^d nirah(MUŠ)	AA-1.263
GEN-143	A.03.46	^d udug-ka-ka	AA-1.266
GEN-144	A.04.01	^d lamma-ka-ka	AA-1.267
GEN-145	A.04.02	^d nin-ur[u ¹]	AA-1.--
GEN-146	A.04.03	^d nin-gidru(PA)	AA-1.244
GEN-147	A.04.04	^d NIN-me-šu-du ₇	AA-1.250
GEN-148	A.04.05	^d suen(EN.ZU)	AA-3.02
GEN-149	A.04.06	^d nanna(ŠEŠ.KI)	AA-3.01

<i>Composition</i>	<i>Tablet</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>Canonical</i>
GEN-150	A.04.07	^d dil-im ₂ -babbar	AA-3.25
GEN-151	A.04.08	^d gīš-nu ₁₁ -gal	AA-3.04
GEN-152	A.04.09	^d ab ₂ -kar ₂	AA-3.06
GEN-153	A.04.10	^d men-e-du ₇	AA-3.08
GEN-154	A.04.11	^d dumu-nun-na	AA-3.14
GEN-155	A.04.12	^d nin-gal	AA-3.26
GEN-156	A.04.13	^d nin-gubalag(EZEN×LA)	AA-3.29
GEN-157	A.04.14	^d sumun ₂ -zi	AA-3.31
GEN-158	A.04.15	^d lugal-baḥar(GUD)	AA-3.32
GEN-159	A.04.16	^d nin-e ₂ -i ₃ -gara ₂ (GA _{gunū})	AA-3.35
GEN-160	A.04.17	^d nu-muš-da	AA-3.--
GEN-161	A.04.18	^d nam-ra-a[^l ʔ]	AA-3.--
GEN-162	A.04.19	^d r ⁿ in-x'-a	AA-3.--
GEN-163	A.04.20	^r e-ta-mu ^ʔ	AA-3.--
GEN-164	A.04.21	^d alamuš(LAL ₃)	AA-3.36
GEN-165	A.04.22	^d nin-urim ₅ ^{ki} -ma	AA-3.37
GEN-166	A.04.23	^d ama-ra-ḥe ₂ -ag ₂ -e	AA-3.41
GEN-167	A.04.24	^d nin-ku ₃ -nun-na	AA-3.42
GEN-168	A.04.25	^d ga-a-u ₂	AA-3.78
GEN-169	A.04.26	^d nin-irigal _x (UNUG)	AA-2.320
GEN-170	A.04.27	^d nun-bar-an-na	AA-2.316
GEN-171	A.04.28	^d utu	AA-3.88
GEN-172	A.04.29	^d šamaš(UTU)	AA-3.90
GEN-173	A.04.30	^d gīš-nu ₁₁	AA-3.92
GEN-174	A.04.31	^d sag-kara ₂	AA-3.93
GEN-175	A.04.32	^d gidru-š ^u ₁ (ŠE ₃)-du ₇	AA-3.94
GEN-176	A.04.33	^d nin-SA.ZA	AA-3.95
GEN-177	A.04.34	^d šerrida _x (ŠE ₃ .NIR)	AA-3.115
GEN-178	A.04.35	^d sud-ag ₂	AA-3.118
GEN-179	A.04.36	^d sud-gan.KAM	AA-3.119
GEN-180	A.04.37	^d šerrida(UD.AN.UD)	AA-3.117
GEN-181	A.04.38	^d si-sa ₂	AA-3.--
GEN-182	A.04.39	^d n[ig ₂]-si-sa ₂	AA-3.128
GEN-183	A.04.40	^d nin-gi-na	AA-3.134
GEN-184	A.04.41	^d rezen ^ʔ -maḥ ^ʔ	AA-3.--
GEN-185	A.04.42	^d pa ₄ -nun-na	AA-3.130
GEN-186	A.04.43	^d nin-barag	AA-3.129
GEN-187	A.04.44	^d en-ga-nu ₂	AA-3.133
GEN-188	A.04.45	^d šakkan ₂ (GIR ₃)	AA-3.173
GEN-189	A.04.46	^d el-la-me-si	AA-3.181
GEN-190	A.04.47	^d IM	AA-3.186
GEN-191	A.04.48	^d .mu-u _r mur ₃ (IM)	AA-3.187
GEN-192	A.04.49	^d lugal-dalḥamun _x (IM.EN×EN)	AA-3.195
GEN-193	A.05.01	[^d ša-la ^ʔ]	AA-3.217?
GEN-194	A.05.02	[^d me-dim ₂ -ša ₄ ^ʔ]	AA-3.219?
GEN-195	A.05.03	^d r ^ʔ šuba ^ʔ -nun ^ʔ -[na ^ʔ]	AA-3.227
GEN-196	A.05.04	^d u ₂ -šur-a-wa-su ₂	AA-3.226
GEN-197	A.05.05	^d inanna(MUŠ ₃)	AA-4.01
GEN-198	A.05.06	^d ištar(MUŠ ₃)	AA-4.01
GEN-199	A.05.07	an-zib ₂ -ba	AA-4.168
GEN-200	A.05.08	^d nin-šar ₆	AA-4.246
GEN-201	A.05.09	^d nin-e ₂ -gal	AA-4.98
GEN-202	A.05.10	^d .KI.MIN ^N BU.SU ₆ ^ʔ (KA×X)	AA-4.99
GEN-203	A.05.11	^d in-nin ₉	AA-4.11

Composition	Tablet	Text	Canonical
GEN-204	A.05.12	<i>an-nu-ni-tum</i>	AA-4.--
GEN-205	A.05.13	^d a ₂ -nu-na	AA-4.244/245
GEN-206	A.05.14	^d inanna-kiš ^{ki} -a	AA-4.17/114
GEN-207	A.05.15	^d inanna-ugnim(KI.SU.LU.'UB ₂ 'GAR)	AA-4.20
GEN-208	A.05.16	^d inanna-ni-nu-a	AA-4.19
GEN-209	A.05.17	^d nin-e ₂ -an-na	AA-4.12
GEN-210	A.05.18	^d inanna-[ZA.MU]Š [?] .rUNUG [?] .KI [?]	AA-4.113 [?]
GEN-211	A.05.19	^d nin-šen-šen-na	AA-4.21
GEN-212	A.05.20	^d nin-in-ti-na	AA-4.23
GEN-213	A.05.21	^d nin-e ₂ -muš ₃ -a	AA-4.24
GEN-214	A.05.22	^d nin-gir-gi ₄ -lu	AA-4.26
GEN-215	A.05.23	^d nin-GABA	AA-4.--
GEN-216	A.05.24	^d UN-u ₆	AA-4.--
GEN-217	A.05.25	^d NIN ^e -gun ₃ -nu	AA-4.27
GEN-218	A.05.26	^d nin-KA-imin(7)	AA-4.28
GEN-219	A.05.27	^d nin-KA-limmu ₂ (4)	AA-4.29
GEN-220	A.05.28	^d nin-ḫur-sag-kalam-ma	AA-4.30
GEN-221	A.05.29	^d nin-aratta ^{ki} (LAM.KUR.RU)	AA-4.31
GEN-222	A.05.30	^d nin-uru-ki-gar-ra	AA-4.32
GEN-223	A.05.31	^d nin-gu ₂ -bar-ra	AA-4.33
GEN-224	A.05.32	^d nin-uru-a-mu-un-DU	AA-4.34
GEN-225	A.05.33	^d nin-a-nim-ma	AA-4.36
GEN-226	A.05.34	^d nin-BAD ₃ -ra! ¹ (“KU.BAR”)	AA-4.38
GEN-227	A.05.35	^d nin-ib-gal	AA-4.40
GEN-228	A.05.36	^d nin-gu-la	AA-4.41
GEN-229	A.05.37	^d nin-e ₂ -ḫa-'ma'	AA-4.42
GEN-230	A.05.38	^d nin-'ra'-gaba	AA-4.45
GEN-231	A.05.39	^d nin-a-ra-zu	AA-4.43
GEN-232	A.05.40	^d nin-barag-ge ₄	AA-4.44
GEN-233	A.05.41	^d nin-e ₂ -gab ₂ -ba ^{ki}	AA-4.--
GEN-234	A.05.42	^d NIN- ^g dimgul(MA ₂ .GAG)	AA-5.179
GEN-235	A.05.43	^d nin-ḫar-ra-an-na	AA-5.180
GEN-236	A.05.44	^d nin-gu ₂ -edin-na	AA-?.--
GEN-237	A.05.45	^d ši-la-ba-at	AA-4.133
GEN-238	A.05.46	^d igi-bar-lu ₂ -ti	AA-4.134
GEN-239	A.05.47	^d KA-ba-lu ₂ -sa ₆ '	AA-4.135
GEN-240	A.05.48	^d nig ₂ -u ₆ -r'di-du ₁₀ [?]	AA-4.--
GEN-241	A.05.49	AN-'da [?]	AA-4.136
GEN-242	C.01.01	^d e ₂ -sa-par ₄	AA-4.137
GEN-243	C.01.02	^d ab-ba-šu ₂ -šu ₂	AA-4.[138]
GEN-244	C.01.03	^d ab-ta-gi ₄ -gi ₄	AA-4.[140]
GEN-245	C.01.04	^d inim-kur ₂ -du ₁₁ -du ₁₁	AA-4.[141]
GEN-246	C.01.05	^d ub-da-a-DU.DU	AA-4.142
GEN-247	C.01.06	^d da-a-DU.DU	AA-4.143
GEN-248	C.01.07	^d giš ^{ig} -e-nu-gi ₄ -e	AA-4.144
GEN-249	C.01.08	^d za-ra-e-nu-gi ₄ -e	AA-4.145
GEN-250	C.01.09	^d ama-dag-si	AA-4.146
GEN-251	C.01.10	^d ama-šudu ₃ -de ₃ -imin-bi	AA-4.147
GEN-252	C.01.11	^d da-da	AA-4.153
GEN-253	C.01.12	^d du-du	AA-4.154
GEN-254	C.01.13	^d nin-ḫe-nun-na	AA-4.155
GEN-255	C.01.14	^d ub-saḫar-ra	AA-4.158
GEN-256	C.01.15	^d be-la-at-ur-ri	AA-4.163
GEN-257	C.01.16	^d usan	AA-4.166
GEN-258	C.01.17	[^d USA]N.P[A.SIKIL]	AA-4.167
GEN-259	C.01.18	[^d ti-mu ₂]-'a'	AA-4.169

<i>Composition</i>	<i>Tablet</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>Canonical</i>
GEN-260	C.01.19	^d [ALA]M	AA-4.170
GEN-261	C.01.20	^d gug-kal-la	AA-4.172
GEN-262	C.01.21	^d nin-si ₄ -an-na	AA-4.165
GEN-263	C.01.22	^d kabta(TA×GAG)	AA-4.[183]
GEN-264	C.01.23	^d si-mu ₂	AA-4.171
GEN-265	C.01.24	^d maḥ-di-an-na	AA-4.181
GEN-266	C.01.25	^d kab-ta	AA-4.181
GEN-267	C.01.26	^d dumu-zi	AA-4.--
GEN-268	C.01.27	^d en-nimgir-si	AA-4.--
GEN-269	C.01.28	^d ama-ušum	AA-4.--
GEN-270	C.01.29	^d ušumgal-an-na	AA-4.--
GEN-271	C.01.30	^d me-nun-an-na	AA-4.--
GEN-272	C.01.31	^d ama-ušumgal-an-na	AA-4.--
GEN-273	C.01.31	^d am-a-ra-li	AA-4.--
GEN-274	C.01.32	^d ALAM	AA-4.--
GEN-275	C.01.33	[^d]n]a-[n]a-a	AA-4.--
GEN-276	C.01.34	^d zil ₂ -zil ₂ ¹	AA-3.72
GEN-277	C.01.35	^d in-nin ₉ -sa ₆ -ga	AA-4.108
GEN-278	C.01.36	^d mu ₆ (PA)-a-ti	AA-4.B.7
GEN-279	C.01.37	^d lugal-ban ₃ -da	AA-5.01
GEN-280	C.01.38	^d nin-sumun ₂	AA-5.02
GEN-281	C.01.39	^d lu-lu	AA-5.23
GEN-282	C.01.40	^d lugal-mar ₂ -da	AA-5.22
GEN-283	C.01.41	^d NIN-zu-an-na	AA-5.24
GEN-284	C.01.42	^d TUG ₂ .NAM.EN.AN.MU ₄	AA-5.25
GEN-285	C.01.43	^d NAM ₂ .NUN.NA	AA-5.26
GEN-286	C.01.44	^d rTUG ₂ ² .TUG ₂ ^{2?}	AA-5.35
GEN-287	C.01.45	^d r nin-GADA ¹ .[ki-da ₃]	AA-5.33
GEN-288	C.01.46	^d nin-KI[LIM].[ki-da ₃]	AA-5.31
GEN-289	C.02.01	^d nin-KILIM.gi ₄ -li ₂	AA-5.32
GEN-290	C.02.02	^d mul-ki-gal	AA-5.--
GEN-291	C.02.03	^d nin-mur ₃ (IM) ^{ki}	AA-5.36
GEN-292	C.02.04	^d nin-MAR.KI	AA-3.64
GEN-293	C.02.05	^d na-zi	AA-3.62
GEN-294	C.02.06	^d nanše(AB×ĤA)	AA-3.61
GEN-295	C.02.07	^d nin-dar-a	AA-3.59
GEN-296	C.02.08	^d šul-pa-e ₃ -dar-a	AA-2.55
GEN-297	C.02.09	^d šul-pa-e ₃ -amaš-a	AA-2.56
GEN-298	C.02.10	^d da-mu	AA-5.153
GEN-299	C.02.11	^d geštin-an-na	AA-4.--
GEN-300	C.02.12	^d nin-e ₂ -DAR-a	AA-?.--
GEN-301	C.02.13	^d nin-URU×KAR ₂	AA-?.--
GEN-302	C.02.14	^d bil ₂ -li ₂ -e	AA-?.--
GEN-303	C.02.15	^d nin-giš-zi-da	AA-5.230
GEN-304	C.02.16	^d a-zi-mu ₂ -a	AA-5.232
GEN-305	C.02.17	^d nin-amaš-ku ₃ ¹ -ga	AA-1.333
GEN-306	C.02.18	[^d ni]n ² -[kir]i ₃ ² .amaš ² -a ^{2?}	AA-1.334
GEN-307	C.02.19	^d r ama-a-ra-zu ¹	AA-1.334
GEN-308	C.02.20	^d kal-kal	AA-1.268
GEN-309	C.02.21	^d e ₂ -IG-dib-ba	AA-1.269
GEN-310	C.02.22	^d nin-min-tab-ba	AA-1.270
GEN-311	C.02.23	^d lugal-ki-sa ₂ -a	AA-1.276
GEN-312	C.02.24	^d ig-ku ₃	AA-1.279
GEN-313	C.02.25	^d nin-imma ₃	AA-1.291
GEN-314	C.02.26	^d muš ₃ -me-kul-kul	AA-1.294

<i>Composition</i>	<i>Tablet</i>	<i>Text</i>	<i>Canonical</i>
GEN-315	C.02.27	^d a-ba ₄ -ba ₄	AA-1.296
GEN-316	C.02.28	^d nin-pirig	AA-1.299
GEN-317	C.02.29	^d er-da	AA-1.302
GEN-318	C.02.30	^d a-ba ₄ -ba ₄ -sig ₅	AA-1.297
GEN-319	C.02.31	^d ku ₃ -GI-ban ₃ -da	AA-1.301
GEN-320	C.02.32	^d ašnan(ŠE.TIR)	AA-1.273
GEN-321	C.02.33	^d ḥa-ia ₃	AA-1.280
GEN-322	C.02.34	^d nisaba ₂ (NAGA)	AA-1.281
GEN-323	C.02.35	^d r ⁿ un ^l -bar-š[e-g]u-[n]u	AA-1.284
GEN-324	C.02.36	^d en-nu-gi ₄	AA-1.303
GEN-325	C.02.37	^d uru ₃ -gal	AA-1.304; 3.105
GEN-326	C.02.38	^d nanibgal(AN.NISABA ₂)	AA-1.305
GEN-327	C.02.39	^d nanibgal ^{gal}	AA-1.306
GEN-328	C.02.40	^d ku ₃ -su ₃	AA-1.308
GEN-329	C.02.41	^d indagara(NINDA ₂ ×GU ₄)	AA-1.310
GEN-330	C.02.42	^d n[i]n-SAR	AA-1.312
GEN-331	C.02.43	^d er ₃ ^l -ra-gal	AA-1.316
GEN-332	C.02.44	^d nin-ka-si	AA-1.320
GEN-333	C.02.45	^d siris ₃ (ŠIM×NINDA)	AA-1.321
GEN-334	C.02.46	^d pa ₅ -tin-du ₁₀	AA-1.318
GEN-335	C.02.47	^d š ^u -z[i] ^l -an ^l -na	AA-1.173
GEN-336	C.02.48	^d [en-zi-kala]m ^l -ma	AA-1.174
GEN-337	C.02.49	^d [nin-x-unug ^{ki}] ^l	AA-1.--
GEN-338	C.02.50	[^d o-o-o-o]	AA-1.--
GEN-339	C.03.01	^d nin-DUR.BU.KA	AA-2.309 ² /368 ²
GEN-340	C.03.02	^d nin-girim _x (A.HA.BU.KUD.DU)	AA-1.335
GEN-341	C.03.03	^d e ₂ -ta-e ₁₁ -de ₃	AA-1.337
GEN-342	C.03.04	^d edin-na-ni ₂ -šum ₂ -ma	AA-?.--
GEN-343	C.03.05	^d lugal-edin-na	AA-6.73
GEN-344	C.03.06	^d lugal-š ^u -nir-ra	AA-?.--
GEN-345	C.03.07	^d lugal-zag-e ₃	AA-1.205
GEN-346	C.03.08	^d u ₂ -lal ₃	AA-?.--
GEN-347	C.03.09	^d sa-e ₃	AA-?.--
GEN-348	C.03.10	[^d] ^r nin ^l -edin-na	AA-?.--
GEN-349	C.03.11	[^d] ^r šara ₂ ^l	AA-?.--
GEN-350	C.03.12	rd u ₄ ^l -saḥar-ra	AA-?.--
GEN-351	C.03.13	rd ku ₃ ^l -mul-mul	AA-?.--
GEN-352	C.03.14	^d MUŠ.i[r ² -h]a ^l .TIN.BALAG	AA-1.263?
GEN-353	C.03.15	^d galam-ḥur	AA-2.387
GEN-354	C.03.16	^d [u-gu]r ^l	AA-5.50
GEN-355	C.03.17	^d š ⁱ -šar-ra- ^r at ^l	AA-5.51
GEN-356	C.03.18	^d lisin(NE.SI ₄)	AA-2.68
GEN-357	C.03.19	^d nin-sikil-la	AA-2.69
GEN-358	C.03.20	^d aba-u ₂	AA-5.52
GEN-359	C.03.21	^d kulla(SIG ₄)	AA-5.--
GEN-360	C.03.22	^d gu ₂ -la ₂	AA-5.53/125
GEN-361	C.03.23	^d nin-ti-mud	AA-5.105
GEN-362	C.03.24	[^d nin-t]i-la-ug ₅ -ga	AA-5.107
GEN-363	C.03.25	[^d sag-bi]-š ^e ₃ -e ₃ -a	AA-5.108
GEN-364	C.03.26	^d [nin-ti]n-ug ₅ -ga	AA-5.110
GEN-365	C.03.27	^d [pa-b]il ₂ -sag	AA-5.113
GEN-366	C.03.28	^d u[gal]- ^r am ^l -ur ₂ -ra	AA-5.115
GEN-367	C.03.29	^d en-dag-ga	AA-5.111
GEN-368	C.03.30	^d nin-isin ₂ (IN) ^{sl} -na	AA-5.116
GEN-369	C.03.31	^d nin-kar-ra-ak	AA-5.117

Composition	Tablet	Text	Canonical
GEN-370	C.03.32	^d kur-ra-ib ₂ -ba	AA-5.119
GEN-371	C.03.33	^d maš ₂ -ri-ku ₂	AA-5.120
GEN-372	C.03.34	^d NIN-nig ₂ -gu ₃ -na-ra	AA-5.121
GEN-373	C.03.35	^d NIN-a ₂ -dam-ku ₃ -ga	AA-5.124
GEN-374	C.03.37	^d me-me-sa ₆ -ga	AA-5.128
GEN-375	C.03.38	^d NIN-uru	AA-5.129
GEN-376	C.03.38	^d NIN-kir ₁₁ -sig	AA-5.130
GEN-377	C.03.39	^d NIN-uru-gibil	AA-5.131
GEN-378	C.03.40	^d ama-guruš-e-ne	AA-5.133
GEN-379	C.03.41	^d ka ₃ -ka ₃	AA-5.134
GEN-380	C.03.42	^d e ₂ -e ₄ (A)-dirig-ga	AA-5.135
GEN-381	C.03.43	^d NIN-ma ₂ -gur ₈ -ra	AA-5.137
GEN-382	C.03.44	^d ama-muru _x (GL.KID.MAḪ)	AA-5.138
GEN-383	C.03.45	^d ma ₂ -mu-un-du ₃	AA-5.139
GEN-384	C.03.46	^d NIN-ga ₂ -bur-ra	AA-5.140
GEN-385	C.03.47	[^d r]ab ₂ [?] -ku ₃ -g[a]	AA-5.144
GEN-386	C.04.01	[^d r]ba [?] -ba [?] -du ₆ -da	AA-5.--
GEN-387	C.04.02	^d r _{nin} [?] -arali _x (A.GA ₂ .KUR ^{!(rasur)} .UŠ ₂)	AA-5.147
GEN-388	C.04.03	^d n[in]-URU×KI	AA-5.--
GEN-389	C.04.04	^d nin-[a-r]a [?] -li	AA-5.150?
GEN-390	C.04.05	^d nu[ⁿ -ga]	AA-5.177
GEN-391	C.04.06	^d NIN- ^r e ₂ [?] -[kur-ra]	AA-5.178?
GEN-392	C.04.07	^d gu- ^{nu} [?] -[ra]	AA-5.155?
GEN-393	C.04.08	^d KA-[(o)]- ^r x [?]	AA-5.155?
GEN-394	C.04.09	^d ur-[ma]š	AA-5.157
GEN-395	C.04.10	^d šu- ^{maḫ} [?]	AA-5.161
GEN-396	C.04.11	^d nam ₂ ^{nam} -maḫ	AA-5.160
GEN-397	C.04.12	^d igi-si ₄ -si ₄	AA-5.165
GEN-398	C.04.13	^d tu ₆ -bi ₂ -in-dug ₄ -ba-sa ₆	AA-5.163
GEN-399	C.04.14	^d en-zi-ni-še ₃	AA-5.166
GEN-400	C.04.15	^d nin-a-zu	AA-5.220
GEN-401	C.04.16	^d nin-giri ₁₆ -da	AA-5.222
GEN-402	C.04.17	^d giri ₁₆ -kalam-ma	AA-5.223
GEN-403	C.04.18	^d ereš [?] -ki-gal	AA-5.195
GEN-404	C.04.19	^d r ^{al} [?] -la ₂ -tum ₃	AA-5.198
GEN-405	C.04.20	^d [tišpak [?]]	AA-5.248
GEN-406	C.04.21	^d kul-[ab ₂ [?]]	AA-5.249
GEN-407	C.04.22	^d mar-du ₁₀ [?] -[la ₂ -an-ki [?]]	AA-5.200
GEN-408	C.04.23	^d nam-[tar]	AA-5.201
GEN-409	C.04.24	DINGIR-ḫuš- ^{bi} [?] -[sa ₆]	AA-5.202
GEN-410	C.04.25	^d lugal-ir ₉ -[ra]	AA-5.269
GEN-411	C.04.26	^d ku ₃ -an-ne ₂ ^{KA-a-nu-^rsi[?]}	AA-5.270
GEN-412	C.04.27	^d mes-lam-ta-e ₃ -a	AA-5.271
GEN-413	C.04.28	^d nin-šubur	AA-1.40
GEN-414	C.04.29	^d ḫa-mun-ŠUBUR	AA-1.42
GEN-415	C.04.30	^d e ₂ -gu ₃ -bi-du ₁₀ -ga	AA-1.47
GEN-416	C.04.31	^d lugal-a:ab	AA-5.283/6.26
GEN-417	C.04.32	^d nin-ga ₂ -ug ₅ -ga	AA-5.284/5.142 [?]
GEN-418	C.04.33	^d nergal(KIŠ.UNUG.GAL)	AA-6.01
GEN-419	C.04.34	^d ma-mi-tum	AA-6.03/5.272
GEN-420	C.04.35	^d u ₃ -bu-bu	AA-6.04
GEN-421	C.04.36	DINGIR-ḫuš-ki-a	AA-6.05
GEN-422	C.04.37	^d i-šar-ki-di-iš ₂ -su	AA-6.06
GEN-423	C.04.38	^d gud-a ₂ -nun-gi ₄ -a	AA-6.07
GEN-424	C.04.39	^d šu-bu-la	AA-6.14

Composition	Tablet	Text	Canonical
GEN-425	C.04.40	^d lugal-gud-si-su	AA-6.--
GEN-426	C.04.41	^d lugal-tilla ₂ (AN.AŠ.AN)	AA-6.28
GEN-427	C.04.42	^d lugal-tibir ₃ (TAG×UD)-ra	AA-6.68
GEN-428	C.04.43	^d lugal-uru-bar-ra	AA-6.53
GEN-429	C.04.44	^d lugal-uru-ša ₃ -ga	AA-6.54
GEN-430	C.04.45	^d lugal-inim-gi-na	AA-6.30
GEN-431	C.04.46	^d lugal-TUG ₂ .NAM.EN.AN.MU ₄	AA-6.--
GEN-432	C.04.47	^d lugal-sag-gi ₄ -a	AA-6.69
GEN-433	C.04.48	^d [lugal-o-(o)]-x ¹ -nu	AA-6.--
GEN-434	C.04.49	^d [lugal-o-o-o]-x ¹	AA-6.--
GEN-435	C.04.50	^d [lugal-o-o-o]	AA-6.--
GEN-436	C.05.01	^d lugal-ki-sun ₅ -na [?]	AA-6.89
GEN-437	C.05.02	^d lugal-gu ₂ -du ₈ -a ^{ki}	AA-6.74
GEN-438	C.05.03	^d lugal-a-pi-ak	AA-6.60
GEN-439	C.05.04	^d lugal- ^{is} isin ₂ (IN) ^{ki}	AA-6.59
GEN-440	C.05.05	^d lugal-mes-lam	AA-6.85
GEN-441	C.05.06	^d lugal-an-za-gar ₃	AA-6.63
GEN-442	C.05.07	^d lugal-me-šu-du ₇	AA-6.83
GEN-443	C.05.08	^d lugal-giš-du ₃ -a	AA-6.107/135/1.214
GEN-444	C.05.09	^d lugal- ^{siš} sinig	AA-6.71
GEN-445	C.05.10	^d lugal- ^{siš} asal ₂ (A.TU.GAB.LIŠ)	AA-6.72
GEN-446	C.05.11	^d lugal-sukud-ra ₂	AA-6.--
GEN-447	C.05.12	^d lugal-kur-dub ₂	AA-6.--
GEN-448	C.05.13	^d lugal-ku ₃ -nun-na	AA-6.79
GEN-449	C.05.14	^d lugal-sa-ba-NI	AA-6.78?
GEN-450	C.05.15	^d [lugal]- ^{agr} run-na [?]	AA-6.76
GEN-451	C.05.16	^d lugal-ki-gu- ^{la} ¹	AA-6.80
GEN-452	C.05.17	^d lugal- ^{he} ₂ - ^{gal} ₂ [?]	AA-3.212/5.14
GEN-453	C.05.18	^d lugal-[o-o-o]	AA-6.--
GEN-454	C.05.19	^d lugal-x ¹ -URU×KI	AA-6.--
GEN-455	C.05.20	^d lugal-NIG ₂ .LAGAR	AA-6.94 [?]
GEN-456	C.05.21	^d imin-ku ₂	AA-6.95
GEN-457	C.05.22	^d NIN-uru-bar-ra	AA-6.96
GEN-458	C.05.23	^d dunga ₂ (NAR)	AA-2.287
GEN-459	C.05.24	^d ka-ka-lal ₃ -bi	AA-2.289
GEN-460	C.05.25	^d lumḥa ₂ (EGIR)	AA-2.291
GEN-461	C.05.26	^d nin-gu ₃ -du ₁₀ -ga	AA-2.292
GEN-462	C.05.27	^d il-šu-ah [?]	AA-2.--
GEN-463	C.05.28	^d en-ki-im-du	AA-2.239
GEN-464	C.05.29	DINGIR- ^{he} ₂ -gal ₂	AA-2.241
GEN-465	C.05.30	^d GIŠ.BAR	AA-2.314
GEN-466	C.05.31	^d GIBIL ₆ (NE.GI)	AA-2.313
GEN-467	C.05.32	^d nun-bar-ḥuš	AA-2.319
GEN-468	C.05.33	^d nun-ur ₄ -ra	AA-2.149
GEN-469	C.05.34	^d BAḤAR ₂	AA-2.150
GEN-470	C.05.35	^d nin-a ₂ -{erasure}-gal	AA-2.324
GEN-471	C.05.36	^d {erasure}SIMUG	AA-2.325
GEN-472	C.05.37	^d en-a ₂ -nun	AA-5.112
GEN-473	C.05.38	^d pa-(bil-sag)	AA-5.113

Text 2. Np₁: N 7764 + N 7783*Dimensions:* 2.9W × 4.1H × 1.0D*Period:* Old Babylonian*Photograph:* AOAT 362: pl. 19*Content:* Proto-An = Anum*Provenience:* Nippur

Two minuscule pieces, joining top to bottom, forming a surface fragment of a tablet of uncertain original dimensions. The paleography and layout suggest an Old Babylonian date, and the preserved content matches that of GEN, an otherwise unique composition. If the rest of the content was more or less the same, then the original tablet to which this fragment belonged should have had columns containing about 75 entries each (compared to GEN which has an average of less than 50 per column). Previous treatment by Peterson in AOAT 362: 79–80.

beginning of column broken

Np ₁ .A.01'01'	[^d zil ₂ ² -zil ₂ ²]	GEN-276
Np ₁ .A.01'02'	[^d in-nin ² -sa ₆ -ga]	GEN-277
Np ₁ .A.01'03'	[^d mu ₆ -a-ti]	GEN-278
Np ₁ .A.01'04'	[^d lugal]-ban ₃ -da]	GEN-279
Np ₁ .A.01'05'	[^d nin]-sumun ₂]	GEN-280

*rest of column broken**beginning of column broken*

Np ₁ .A.02'01'	^d [šara ₂ ²]	GEN-349 ²
Np ₁ .A.02'02'	^d u ₄ -s[ahar-ra]	GEN-350
Np ₁ .A.02'03'	^d ku ₃ ² -[mul-mul]	GEN-351
Np ₁ .A.02'04'	^d MU[Š.ir-ḫa.TIN.BALAG]	GEN-352
Np ₁ .A.02'05'	^d galam-[ḫur]	GEN-353
Np ₁ .A.02'06'	^d u ² -[gur]	GEN-354
Np ₁ .A.02'07'	^d ši-š[ar-ra-at]	GEN-355
Np ₁ .A.02'08'	^d N[E ² .SL ₄]	GEN-356

rest broken

Textual Notes to Proto-An = Anum

- 7-8) For the reading of this pair of names as Enkum and Ninkum, see the note to AA-1: 110-111.
- 21-22) The scribe apparently accidentally omitted the female counterpart to ^den-da-šurim-ma and the male counterpart to ^dnin-amaš.
- 35) For the reading of this name as *Bēlet-ilī* see the comment to AA-1: 24.
- 49) Marchesi 2006: 35, fn. 150, suggested reading ^dnintum-ma-al. However, collation from photo suggests the reading ^deg₂ (MUNUS+ŠE₃). This reading is now also supported by the early Middle Babylonian witness – Fr₁.B.02.02: ^deg₂(MUNUS+KU)-tum-ma-al – which clearly writes NIN differently throughout the rest of the text. Marchesi dismissed the Neo-Assyrian witness to the canonical text AA-1.168, N₁.A.02.8': eg₂(MUNUS+KU)^{e-gi} (KU < ŠE₃) as a “a late by-form originating from a misreading,” but this can no longer be maintained. How this development from the apparent Ur III spellings in ^dnin(MUNUS+TUG₂) occurred remains to be explained. See also the note to AA-1: 168.
- 58) See the comment to AA-1: 183 for the possibility that ^dNIN.KU₃.GI is a logogram for Šalaš.
- 59-61) In these three lines, names of the goddess Išhara are listed, but the actual name Išhara is lacking. This tradition was maintained in the equivalent passage in canonical An = Anum (AA-1: 187-192), where Išhara only appears in the right-hand explanatory column, but not in the left-hand main column. For the name Kakka (59), see the comment to AA-1: 188. That these names immediately follow the name of Dagan's wife (GEN: 58, ^dnin-ku-GI = Šalaš) implies that Išhara could likewise count as Dagan's wife, but the canonical text separates these two figures, leaving Išhara's relationship to Dagan undefined. According to Lambert 1985: 176 in RIA 5, “Perhaps she was considered Dagan's spouse in one tradition.”
- 61) The reading of the initial sign AN- as part of the name is based on the spelling in the canonical version AA-1: 192 as ^dA.AN-bu-bu and ^den-bu-ul. The meaning and interpretation remain unclear.
- 118) Based on the context, ‘EZEN×KAS².EZEN×KAS²’ should represent an early variant of later šeg₅-šeg₅ (URU×TU or KA×TU) from AA-2: 22, but this is not certain.
- 130) The minute script makes it difficult to determine whether the gloss on the DU sign is ŠA or TA. While ša₄ is a known value of DU, a /ta/ value is otherwise unknown; however, the later canonical version AA-2: 116 has ^dAŠ-an-ta. The meaning and interpretation of this name remain in any case unclear.
- 179) In the spelling sud.gan.KAM, KAM could have originated as a phonetic complement, indicating a pronunciation like /sugam/.
- 183) ^dNin-gi-na seems to be a phonetic rendering of expected ^dnig₂-gi-na (AA-3: 134).
- 199) An-zib₂-ba is an epithet of Inanna/Ištar equated with Akkadian *telītu* “expert, highly capable” (CAD T: 327 s.v. *tel'ū*), here assigned a rather prominent position among her titles, being listed immediately after her two main names. Note furthermore that the name is located far from those names which describe Inanna's astral identity (257-266), whereas in the later version (AA-4: 168) it occurs among those names, perhaps therefore later having been reinterpreted to describe an astral aspect.
- 200) This line is a later insertion, added after the lines above and below had already been written, and squeezed in with a minute script.
- 202) The reading and meaning of this name of Ninegal remain uncertain. The last sign, not preserved in AA-4: 99, could instead be read BU₃ to produce a name composed of homophonous repeating syllables /bubu/, but this provides little help as to the name's interpretation. If one were dealing here with a masculine/martial aspect of this goddess, then the reading SU₆ “beard” could suggest itself.
- 216) The occurrence of a single name in ^dUN- in the middle of a long section of ^dnin- names is somewhat striking. ^dUN-u₆ could possibly mean “the one whom the people (or: the land) admire.” For other female divine names in ^dUN- see the comment to AA-1: 167.
- 226) The sign -ra¹¹ (“KUBAR”) is perhaps simply malformed due to having been written on the edge of the tablet.
- 241) Although one expects to read ^d[e]-'da' from the parallel in AA-4: 136, the tablet appears smooth and undamaged between AN and 'da'. Read perhaps therefore an-da as a phonetic variant of ^de-da.
- 244-251) For these names of Inanna's messengers, see the comments to the corresponding lines in AA-4: 140-147.
- 250) On ^dama-dag-si and the later variant ^dama-NUN-si, see the comment to AA-4: 146.
- 284) In ^dTUG₂.NAM.EN.AN.MU₄, the first two signs could have originally been a glossed spelling TUG₂^{nam}, in which the gloss was reinterpreted as part of the name. Below in GEN: 396 there occurs precisely such a gloss TUG₂^{nam}, but the gloss is clearly written in a smaller script below the glossed sign. On the other hand, the final element of the name AN.MU₄(TUG₂) looks like it could have constituted a verbal form with a Sumerian prefix, suggesting perhaps that TUG₂.NAM.EN should be read ¹⁸⁸pala₂, allowing a translation as “He/she has put on the (royal) *pala*-garment.” Cf. also the comment to 285 below and to AA-5: 25.
- 285) The name ^dNAM₂.NUN occurs already in early texts where NAM₂ and TUG₂ are still differentiated, e.g. the Fara offering list WF 153: obv. iii 7, and roughly contemporary ED personal names (e.g. TMH 5, 8: ii 4, ur-^dnam₂-nun). NAM₂ could be a variant for NAM, which in Sumerian can be combined with a substantive to form an abstract noun. This would result in a name meaning something like “princeship, princeliness.” An alternation between NAM₂ and NAM can be observed for the similar divine name ^dNAM₂.NIR (SF 1: obv.

- vii 17) and ^dnam-nir (OIP 99: 50, line 146). The ending -NA in the present form is however somewhat suspect, since such abstract compounds (e.g. nam-lugal “kingship”) are not genitival compounds and do not usually feature such an ending. Cf. Krebernik 1998: 140–141 in RIA 9.
- 286)** Damage to the tablet makes it difficult to determine whether the signs are KUKU or TUG₂TUG₂. However, since many of the surrounding names in lines 284–289 seem to have something to do with garments (including the elements TUG₂ and GADA), the reading TUG₂TUG₂ seems more likely.
- 287–289)** For these names cf. the comments to AA-5: 31–33.
- 291–292)** The transition from the subsection on the monogoose-deity Ninkilim to the subsection on Lagashite deities seems to be based on nothing else but the phonetic similarity between the wife of Ninkilim, ^dnin-mur₃^{ki} and the goddess ^dnin-MAR.KI, patron of Gu’abba.
- 301)** Since ^dlugal-urub₂(URU×KAR₂) was a local Lagashite form of Dumuzi (Lambert 1987: 154 in RIA 7), ^dnin-URU×KAR₂ could by logical extension be a form of Dumuzi’s sister Geštinanna, who occurs only two lines previously.
- 302)** The reading ^dbil₂-lil₂-le is motivated by the probability that it is an unusual spelling of Belili, who is also Dumuzi’s sister. See further the Sumerian composition “Dumuzi’s Dream,” lines 205–206, 216–217 (Alster 1972: 76–78; see also *ibid.*: 119).
- 309)** For the uncertainty as to whether the second sign in ^de₂-IG-dib-ba should be read gal₂ or ig, see the comment to AA-1: 269.
- 312)** The *DCCLT* (last access July 2021) claimed to be able to read ^dig₂-ku₃-‘ga’ from a photo, with the alleged -‘ga’ not indicated in the copies, but the photo published in Boulanger/Renisio 1982: 219 reveals no such sign to be present.
- 318)** The *DCCLT* (last access July 2021) claimed to be able to read ^da-ba₄-ba₄-sig₅-ga’ from a photo, with the alleged -ga’ not indicated in the copies, but the photo published in Boulanger/Renisio 1982: 219 reveals no such sign to be present.
- 319)** Like line 200, this line represents a later insertion, added after the lines above and below had already been written, squeezed in with a minute script.
- 325)** See the comment to AA-1: 304.
- 327)** In the spelling ^dnanibgal^{gal} (^dAN.NISABA₂.GAL), the final gal is a phonetic indicator.
- 339)** The reading and interpretation of the name ^dnin-DUR.BU.KA are uncertain. For a possible connection with one of two deities spelled ^dnin-dur-ba (AA-2:309 and 368) see Cavigneaux/Krebernik 1998: 341 in RIA 9. As far as paleography is concerned, note that the sign DUR displays a somewhat younger form, written like GU₂+GAG rather than GU₂×GAG. Compare e.g. a divination tablet from the First Sealand dynasty (George 2013: plate LXXXV, no. 31, line 26’: LI.DUR), where DUR is written like GU₂+TAB. Regarding Old Babylonian Sumerian literary texts, Mittermayer 2006: 36 (no. 88) only shows forms of DUR written GU₂×GAG.
- 354–355)** In Peterson 2009a: 80 (also partially in the *DCCLT*, last access July 2021), these names were instead read as ^diš₈-tar₂ and ^digi-sar-ra-ab. Although the state of preservation of the manuscript, which has here become worse since the handcopies were made, no longer allows for an unambiguous identification of the signs in question, the fragment Np₁ (Text 2) and canonical An = *Anum* unambiguously have, in what is certainly the equivalent context, ^du-gur (a netherworld deity closely associated, and later identified, with Nergal), followed by his wife ^dši-i-sar-rat “she is queen.” Moreover, Ištar’s section already occurred earlier (lines 197–278), and a putative name igi-sar-ra-ab (“scratch the eye!”) is unlikely.
- 379)** For the name Kakkā, see the comment to AA-1: 188.
- 387)** A.GA₂.KUR.UŠ₂ is quite likely an unusual spelling for arali (a designation of the netherworld), usually written E₂.KUR.UŠ₂. The sign A could be a phonetic indicator while GA₂ is simply a variant of E₂.
- 388)** URU×KI is certainly a designation of the netherworld, perhaps also to be read /arali/, as in the line above.
- 414)** The fact that GEN has ^dḥa-mun-ŠUBUR while the canonical An = *Anum* has the inverted [^dŠUBU]R-ḥa-mun leads one to suspect that the name was pronounced simply /ḥamun/, and that the element ŠUBUR was logographic or functioned as a classifier to indicate the nature of the deity in question. For an identically named Ḥamun, the chariot driver of Šamaš, see the comment to AA-3: 149.
- 416)** The spelling A.B.A is interpreted as a:ab, an archaic spelling of a-ab-ba “sea.” In the canonical version, AA-5: 283, the form ^dlugal-a:ab is preserved in manuscript Np₅ as a variant of ^dlugal-a-ab-ba.
- 421)** On the reading of DINGIR-ḥus-ki-a, see the comment to AA-6: 5.
- 431)** See the comment above to GEN: 284.
- 462)** *Il-šu-aḥ* is a human personal name. Since he occurs in the section of divine musicians, perhaps he could have been a deified singer or musician.
- 464)** In DINGIR-ḥe₂-gal₂, it is not clear whether the DINGIR should be read as part of the name (as an apposition, “god-abundance”), or simply as the divine determinative (“abundance”).
- 466)** The reading ^dgibil₆(NE.GI) is long established in the Assyriological literature, but direct proof for it seems to be lacking. Cf. the comment to AA-2: 313.