

dUD.UD s. Šer(i)da. § 1; Sonnengott. A. I. Tab. S. 602.

### Uduḡ.

S. a. Lamma/Lamassu\* A und Schutzgott\* A.

- § 1. Meaning and writing of the word. –
- § 2. Distribution. – § 3. Uduḡ-family. –
- § 4. Uduḡ-ḫul series.

§ 1. Meaning and writing of the word. There is no accepted meaning for the term uduḡ, although one might try to define the term through orthographic variants. The homonym reading úduḡ for <sup>g</sup>isšita(GĀ.GIŠ) “weapon” is attested in lex. traditions (s. Diri II 255 and Proto-Ea 428–430), although no connection with the demon can be established, nor is there any convincing iconography for a specific weapon identifying an u.-demon. Phonetic writings of uduḡ are known from An = Anum VI 131–133 (ú-duḡ) and lex. texts (MSL 3, 134: 51 [Erim]), although the rare Ur III phonetic writings prefer ú-duḡ<sub>4</sub> (in Šulgi D 221, 253, 337, s. Klein 1981, 80, 82, 84) and in an interesting administrative tablet referring to one ox for the Duku, 4 oxen for the Akitu-festival, and 2 oxen for the “spirit” (ú-duḡ<sub>4</sub>) of Nintinug(g)a\* (Dhorme 1912, 45 SA 47, pl. 2). Schramm (2008) consistently reads /šédu/ for uduḡ when described as “benevolent” (sig<sub>5</sub>), corresponding to Akk. *šédu*, which has some lexical support (Ea I 364), but this reading obscures the valuable observation that many demons (Dämonen\*) are neutral in character unless specified as either ḫul “evil” or sig<sub>5</sub>/sa<sub>6</sub> “good”, similar to Gr. *daimon*. The signs for uduḡ and gedim “ghost” (cf. § 3) are remarkably similar in all periods, although in 1<sup>st</sup> mill. orthography the sign for uduḡ is interpreted as “2/3 SAḪAR×SILA”, while gedim is “1/3 SAḪAR×SILA” (MSL 14, 195: 359–363; MSL 3, 134: 48–52 [ref. courtesy U. Steinert]; Tod\* A. § 4.1); the orthography could suggest a wraith-like image from “street-dust”. According to sign lists uduḡ can also be read gedim<sub>4</sub>, although the gedim-sign has no corresponding reading as uduḡ<sub>x</sub>; the justification for the reading

gedim<sub>4</sub> may be open to question, usually based on a preconceived notion of a meaning of “ghost” for the uduḡ-sign. There seems to be no obvious distinction in meaning between uduḡ ḫul and uduḡ ḫul-ḡál, although a different nuance not detectable through Akk. translations cannot be ruled out.

Sum. uduḡ was loaned into Akk. as *utukku*.

§ 2. Distribution. The earliest reference to u. can be found in Gudea Cyl. B ii 9: ú-duḡ<sub>4</sub> sa<sub>6</sub>-<ga>-ni, “his good Uduḡ!”, u. representing a kind of benevolent spirit or guardian. Surprisingly, the u.-demon does not occur in Ur III incantations from Nippur (TMH 6, passim), either as an individual demon or in his characteristic role introducing a formulaic listing of various demons: uduḡ ḫul a-lá ḫul gedim ḫul gal<sub>5</sub>-lá ḫul dingir ḫul maškim ḫul, etc. This listing becomes a standard feature of OB Sum. and later bil. incantations, also frequently quoted in 1<sup>st</sup> mill. Akk. incantations – in the same fixed order of demons – probably indicating intertextuality. The fact that the u.-demon does not feature in 3<sup>rd</sup> mill. incantations as a central demonic figure is mirrored by his disappearance from most magical contexts in 1<sup>st</sup> mill. magic as well. Within the Diagnostic Handbook, for instance, the exorcist never refers to the “hand of the u.”, although the hand of the ghost (gedim) is well represented in diagnostic omens and in medical literature as a disease name; magico-medical recipes aimed at preventing the ghost from whispering into a patient’s ear are common. The u. also does not feature in late Egalkurra incantations or hemerologies, suggesting that he has dropped out of fashion by the late 1<sup>st</sup> mill. At the same time, the Göttertypen-texts (cf. Mischwesen\* A. § 1) offer no description of the u.-demon, possibly because he was somewhat replaced in later periods by the foreign Pazuzu\* demon. One meagre description does occur in a unique narrative about an underworld vision of an Ass. prince: among various underworld demons and *Mischwesen* depicted is the evil *utukku*, whose

“head is of a lion, with hands and feet of an Anzu-bird” (sag.du ur.maḥ šu.2 gir.2 *An-zu*<sup>mušen</sup>), Livingstone, SAA 3, 72: 6, and W. von Soden, ZA 43, 16: 46 (cf. Dämonen\* 2a; Mischwesen\* A. § 1. p. 224).

§ 3. Uduḡ-family. An important study (de Jong 1959) argued in favour of various classes of u.-demons, rather than being a demonic *Einzelgänger*. De Jong (1959, 34) argued for an u.-family comprising the standard listing of evil *utukku alû eṭimmu gallû ilu rābišu* demons; nevertheless the ghost (*eṭimmu*) forms a separate category (as well as being part of the u.-group), since the ghost is usually referred to in the singular while *utukku*-demons usually occur in plural (de Jong, l.c.; cf. also Dämonen\* 1a–b; Person\* § 4; Tod\* A. § 4.1). De Jong 1959 identifies three separate groupings of demons, namely the u.-group (ibid. 60ff.), the LIL<sub>2</sub>-group (ibid. 68ff.) and the DIM<sub>3</sub>.ME-group of demons (ibid. 70ff.). De Jong’s analysis allows us to get away from seeing u.-demons as a separate entity, but rather as representing a class or family of demons, showing both good and bad attributes. There are various ways in which the u.-demon can represent other demons in this group, apart from the reference in Gilg. XII 83 in which Enkidu’s ghost is referred to as an *ú-tuk-ku* (George, GE 1, 732). The term *udug* can in fact be translated with Akk. *utukku*, *šēdu*, and *rābišu*, as happens in god lists (An = Anum VI 131–133), and in all cases the Akk. terms can either be positive or negative, depending upon contexts and whether the *udug* is described as *ḫul* “evil” or *sig<sub>5</sub>/sa<sub>6</sub>* “benevolent”. As for *udug* as *rābišu*, cf. *udug ana-ke<sub>4</sub> // rābišu Anim* (UH XIII–XV 249), or *udug dingir-re-e-ne-ke<sub>4</sub> // rābiš ilī* (UH XIII–XV 197), clearly a benevolent office. The Akk. term *rābišu\** is found already in Old Ass. texts as the chief court bailiff, thus corresponding to Sum. *maškim*; the *rābišu*-demon’s name probably does not mean “lurker” but is to be derived from the name of this office (the meaning of the verb *rabāšu* “to lie in wait”

is probably influenced by the demon name).

§ 4. Uduḡ-ḫul series. The u.-demon has its own series (*udug-ḫul-a-kam* or *udug-ḫul-a-meš*), which distinguishes it from most other demons (except the *azag-demon*, which overlaps with a disease caused by a taboo-violation; cf. Tabu\* § 2). Many of the characteristics of the u.-demon are generally described in the series (s. Geller 2007), although many of the characteristics attributed to the u.-demons can be applied to other demons as well.

Dhorme P. 1912: *Tablettes de Dréhem à Jérusalem*, RA 9, 39–63. – Geller M. J. 2007: *Evil demons: canonical Utukkū Lemnūtu incantations (= SAACT 5)*. – de Jong H. W. M. 1959: *Demonische ziekten in Babylon en Bijbel*. – Klein J. 1981: *Three Šulgi hymns: Sumerian royal hymns glorifying king Šulgi of Ur*. – Schramm W. 2008: *Ein Compendium sumerisch-akkadischer Beschwörungen (= GBAO 2)*.

M. J. Geller

ᵈUD.UG s. Ug, *Ūmu(m)*.

**Udul-kalama.** Nach der SKL 7. König der 1. Dyn. von Uruk (s. a. Königslisten\* und Chroniken. A. § 1. S. 84), Sohn des *Urlugal\**, damit Enkel des *Gilgames\**, regierte 15 Jahre (Jacobsen, SKL 90f.). Inschriften oder Ereignisse aus der Zeit von U. sind nicht überliefert.

T. Blaschke

**Udumu/e, Udummaja** s. Edom.

**Uduran** s. Hutran.

**Überschwemmung** s. Flut; Sintflut.

**Übersetzungsliteratur** s. Sprache.

**Üçtepe** (Kurḫ). Fundort ca. 40 km östl. von Diyarbakır, südl. des Tigris gegenüber