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

**Udug.**

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


§ 1. Meaning and writing of the word. There is no accepted meaning for the term udug, although one might try to define the term through orthographic variants. The homonym reading udug for ṣeššaGI (GÁ.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 udug are known from An = Anum VI 131–133 (ṻ-dug) and lex. texts (MSL 3, 134: 51 [Erim]), although the rare Ur III phonetic writings prefer ū-dug₂ (in Šulgi D 221, 253, 337, s. Klein 1981, 80, 82, 84) and in an interesting administrative tablet referring to one ox for the Dukus, 4 oxen for the Akitu-festival, and 2 oxen for the “spirit” (ṻ-dug₂) of Nintinug(g)a* (Dhorne 1912, 45 SA 47, pl. 2). Schramm (2008) consistently reads /šešú/ for udug when described as “beneficent” (šig₂), corresponding to Akk. šedu, which has some lexical support (Ea I 364), but this reading obscures the valuable observation that many demons (Ḍámonen*) are neutral in character unless specified as either ḫul “evil” or šig₃/ša₆ “good”, similar to Gr. daimon. The signs for udug and gedim “ghost” (cf. § 3) are remarkably similar in all periods, although in 1st mill. orthography the sign for udug is interpreted as “2/3 SAHAR×SILA”, while gedim is “1/3 SAHAR×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 udug can also be read gedim₄, although the gedim-sign has no corresponding reading as udug₃; the justification for the reading gedim₄ may be open to question, usually based on a preconceived notion of a meaning of “ghost” for the udug-sign. There seems to be no obvious distinction in meaning between udug ḫul and udug ḫul-ḡal, although a different nuance not detectable through Akk. translations cannot be ruled out.

Sum. udug was loaned into Akk. as utukku.

§ 2. Distribution. The earliest reference to u. can be found in Gudea Cyl. B ii 9: ū-dug₄ sa₆-<ga>-ni, “his good Udug!”; 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: udug ḫul a-lā ḫul gedim ḫul gaš-lā ḫul ñingir ḫul maškim ḫul, etc. This listing becomes a standard feature of OB Sum. and later bil. incantations, also frequently quoted in 1st mill. Akk. incantations – in the same fixed order of demons – probably indicating intertextuality. The fact that the u.-demon does not feature in 3rd mill. incantations as a central demonic figure is mirrored by his disappearance from most magical contexts in 1st 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 (gedim₄) 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 1st 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 maḫ šu. 2 gir. 2 An-zi[muse]), Livingstone, SAA 3, 72: 6, and W. von Soden, ZA 43, 16: 46 (cf. Dämonen* 2a; Mischwesen* A. § 1. p. 224).

§ 3. Udug-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 alî etîmmu gallî ilu râbiṣu demons; nevertheless the ghost (etîmmu) 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.-group (ibid. 68ff.) and the DIM.-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 as well. 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, šedu, and râbiṣu, 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/saḫ “benevolent”. As for udug as râbiṣu, cf. udug an-na-ke₂ // râbiṣu Anîm (UH XIII–XV 249), or udug dingir-re-e-ne-ke₂ // râbiṣu iltî (UH XIII–XV 197), clearly a benevolent office. The Akk. term râbiṣu* is found already in Old Ass. texts as the chief court bailiff, thus corresponding to Sum. maškim; the râbiṣu-demon’s name probably does not mean “lurker” but is to be derived from the name of this office (the meaning of the verb rabâṣu “to lie in wait” is probably influenced by the demon name).

§ 4. Udug-ḫul series. The u.-demon has its own series (udug-ḫul-a-ka˘m or udug-ḫul-a-меš), which distinguishes it from most other demons (except the aza˘g-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.
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UD.UG. Umu(m).


T. Blaschke

Udumu/e, Udummaja s. Edom.

Udurau s. Hutan.

Überschwemmung s. Flut; Sintflut.

Übersetzungs­literatur s. Sprachе.

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