

Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie

Begründet von
E. Ebeling und B. Meissner

fortgeführt von
E. Weidner, W. von Soden und D. O. Edzard

herausgegeben von M. P. Streck

unter Mitwirkung von
G. Frantz-Szabó · M. Krebernik · D. Morandi Bonacossi
J. N. Postgate · U. Seidl · M. Stol · G. Wilhelm

Redaktion
T. Blaschke · J. Fechner · S. Heigl

Band 14 · 1./2. Lieferung
Tiergefäß – Tukultī-Ninurta I.

2014

Sonderdruck

De Gruyter

Zur Datierung s. Persepolis* §§ 7.4–5, 7.10.

Ungefähr zwanzig reale Ortbänder dieses Typs sind bekannt; von ihnen wurden zwei im Friedhof von Devehüyük bei Kar-kamiš (Bernard 1976, Nr. 9f.) und eines, das in einem Stück mit der ebenfalls reliefierten Elfenbeinscheide gearbeitet ist, in einem Tempel in Taht-e Sangin am Oxus (Litvinskii/Pichikian 1982; vgl. Oxusschatz* § 3) ausgegraben. Bei den übrigen handelt es sich um Zufallsfunde, wohl hauptsächlich aus Syrien und Ägypten. Sie bestehen aus Bronze, Elfenbein oder Knochen.

Bernard P. 1976: A propos des bourettes de fourreaux achéménides, *RevArch.* 1976/2, 227–246. – Goldman B. 1957: Achaemenian chapes, *Ars Orientalis* 2, 43–54. – Litvinskii B. A./Pichikian I. R. 1982: An *akinak* scabbard from Bactria, *Soviet Anthropology and Archaeology* 21/1–2, 139–182. – Lunsingh Scheurleer R. A. 1999: Une bourette de fourreau, *IrAnt.* 34, 261–267. – Moorey P. R. S. 1980: Cemeteries of the first millennium B. C. at Deve Hüyük, near Carchemish, salvaged by T. E. Lawrence and C. L. Woolley in 1913 (= *BAR IntSer.* 87). – Stucky R. A. 1976: Achämenidische Ortbänder, *ArchAnz.* 1976, 13–23; id. 1985: Achämenidische Hölzer und Elfenbeine aus Ägypten und Vorderasien im Louvre, *Antike Kunst* 28/1–2, 7–32.

§ 4. Begrenzter Kulturaustausch. Bewusste gegenseitige Wahrnehmung der Träger beider Kulturkreise ist durch Übernahmen von künstlerischen Motiven evident geworden. Ebenso wie die Grabherren von Kelermes und Litoi im frühen 7. Jh. ihre eurasischen Schwerter und deren Scheiden mit urart. Motiven in urart. Stil schmücken ließen, benutzten ungefähr 200 Jahre später achäm. Große an ihren Schwertern eurasischer Form Ortbänder, die sich ikonographisch und stilistisch an den „skythischen“ T. anlehnen.

Der Integration einzelner eurasischer Tierformen innerhalb der vorderasiatischen Bildwelt im Ziwiye des 7. Jhs. entspricht im 5./4. Jh. in Pazyryk die Übernahme eines achäm. Motivs zum Schmuck einer einheimischen Filzdecke.

Soweit ersichtlich beschränken sich die künstlerischen Entlehnungen auf wertvolle Prestige-Objekte und üben keinen nachhal-

tigen Einfluss auf die jeweils fremde Kunst aus.

U. Seidl

Tierwelt (fauna).

§ 1. General words for classes of animals. – § 2. Taxonomy. – § 3. The relationship between humans and animals. – § 4. The fauna in the RIA.

§ 1. General words for classes of animals. Neither Sumerian nor Akkadian has a genuine word for “animal” in general, nor does cuneiform writing have a corresponding determinative.

Akk. *nammaššû/nammaštu* normally designates wild (*ša šēri* “of the open country”) quadrupeds, as becomes clear from the Sum. equivalent *níg.úr.límmu.ba* “thing with four legs” (CAD N/1, 233). The very rare extension to domestic animals (*nammaššê bit amēli* “n. in the man’s house” BAM 315 ii 28) or to aquatic animals (*nammaštu mē* “n. of the water” Freedman, *Šumma ālu* 2, 278f.: 80’) seems to be secondary. Etymologically, *nammaššû/nammaštu* is derived from *namāšu* “to depart, to move”.

Cf. Standard Chinese *dongwu* “moving” for “animal”, M. Siebert, *ZDMG* 162 (2012) 172.

Akk. *būlu* refers to quadrupeds, either domestic or wild; the Sum. equation *máš.-anše* lit. means “goats (and) donkeys”. *umāmu* has a similar range of meaning, etymologically connected with Arab. *hawwām* “lion” and Tigre *həmmām* “leopard” (SED 2 no. 93).

Rare Akk. words, whose exact meaning is unclear, are *ašû*, equated in Hh. XIV 398 with *níg.-zi.ğál* “living being” and in Malku V 21 with *būlu*, and *zermandu*, equated in Hh. XIV 402 with *níg.ki* “thing of the earth”.

For birds there is the general word *mušen/iššūru* (Vogel*), for fishes *ku₆/nūnu* (Fisch*), the signs for the Sum. words also serving as the corresponding determinatives in cuneiform writing.

Hitt. distinguishes *gimraš huitar* “animals of the field”, which corresponds to Akk. *nammaššû*, *daganzipaš huitar* “ani-

mals of the earth” (mainly insects) and *arunaš ħuitar* “animals of the sea” (Collins 2002b, 238).

§ 2. Taxonomy. Mesopot. animal taxonomy doesn’t follow systematic zoological principles but criteria such as habitat, morphological similarity, and function.

§ 2.1. *Habitat*. The general words for classes of animals (§ 1) show that the Sum. and Akk. languages distinguished between animals living on land, in the air, and in water. Therefore, in cuneiform writing bats are classified as birds (determinative ^{mušen}, Maus* § 6), turtles and toads (court. W. Heimpel) sometimes as fish (determinative^{ku6}, Schildkröte* § 1; kíġ-tur^{ku6} Lugalbanda and the Anzu bird [C. Wilcke, *Das Lugalbandaepos* (1969); ETCSL 1.8.2.2] 393). The lexical list Hh. lists fish and birds in tablet XVIII (MSL 8/2) separately from mammals, snakes and insects (Hh. XIII–XIV = MSL 8/1–2; *Lexikalische* Listen*. § 18.1. p. 627).

The three-fold division corresponds well with the taxonomy of Ancient Hebrew, e.g., P. Riede, *NBLex.* 3 (2001) 850.

Hitt. *arunaš ħuitar* “animals of the sea” “includes fish, frogs and snakes” (Collins 2002b, 238).

§ 2.2. *Morphological similarity*. The lexical list Hh. XIV (MSL 8/2) lists wild animals mainly according to morphological similarity. It starts with snakes and other elongated animals (ll. 2–46), among them an eel-like fish named *muš.gú.bi* “gú.bi-snake”/*kuppû* (l. 14). Lines 48–206 contain mammals, ordered according to size from large to small. After *am/rīmu* “aurochs” in l. 48 follows *am.si/pīlu* “elephant” (Sum. lit. “horn-aurochs”) in l. 53. Lines 61–103 list dog-like animals, i.e., large predators, starting with *ur/kalbu* “dog” in l. 61, followed by *ur.maḥ/nēšu* “lion” (Sum. lit. “big dog”). Thus big cats are dogs in Sum. taxonomy (Löwe* A. I. § 1) and not cats (Katze*), which follow in ll. 108–114 of the tablet. Lines 209–396 contain all kinds of small animals, among them lizards (l. 210),

crustaceans (l. 226), locusts (l. 227), worms (l. 271), flies (l. 304) and scorpions (l. 360).

§ 2.3. *Function*. The lexical list Hh. XIII lists important domestic animals (sheep, goats, cattle, and equids), an “example of a special purpose classification motivated by functional concerns” (Wapnish 1984, 183). Similarly, the Hitt. lex. texts distinguish between wild and domestic animals, and in one text within the latter between livestock and pets (Collins 2002b, 238).

Another example is the Sum. category *aṣe* “ass” (Wapnish 1984, 179–183): The ass was the oldest transport and riding animal in Mesopotamia, and the word was also transferred to the *aṣe.a.ab.ba* “dromedary” (lit. “sealand ass”).

Wapnish P. C. 1984: Animal names and animal classifications in Mesopotamia: an interdisciplinary approach based on folk taxonomy (Diss. Ann Arbor).

§ 3. The relationship between humans and animals.

§ 3.1. *Animal husbandry*. Together with agriculture, animal husbandry (Haustiere*; Hirt*; Nomaden* § 2.2; Stall*; Transhumanz*; Viehhütungsverträge*; Weide*) was the foundation of the Mesopot. economy. Most important were sheep (Schaf*), goats (Ziege*), cattle (Rind*), pigs (Schwein*) and poultry (Ente*; Gans*; Geflügel*; Hahn*; Huhn*; Taube*). These animals provided wool (Wolle*), hair, leather (Leder(industrie)* and food (Fett*; Fleisch*; Küche*; Milch-(produkte)*). Donkeys (Esel*), onager-donkey half-breeds (Onager*), horses (Pferd*), mules (Maultier*) and camels (Kamel*; Trampeltier*) served as means of transport (Reisen* § 1; Reiten*; Sattel*; Transport*; Zaumzeug*). Dogs (Hund*) were used as companions and protectors.

§ 3.2. *Fishing, hunting, and other forms of entertainment*. Fishing (Fisch*; Fischen*; Fischer(ei)*) and hunting (Jagd*) supplemented the diet. The royal hunt and the display of wild animals in animal parks (Paradies* § 1; Wildpark*) served both as entertainment and royal propaganda. For

horse races and bull jumping s. Sport* und Spiel. §§ 2.4, 2.6.

§ 3.3. *Threats.* Incantations show that snakes (Schlange*), scorpions (Skorpion*) and biting dogs (Hund*) were especially feared. Locusts (Heuschrecke*) threatened the harvest. For other pests s. Insekten* § 3. The Sum. myth *Enki and Ninnmah* ll. 136–140 knows of a paradisaical primordial time in which dangerous animals did not yet exist (Streck, Or. 71 [2002] 242 § 3.2.2.3).

§ 3.4. *Law.* For the rent of animals (ox, donkey, billy goat for threshing or plowing) s. Gesetze* A. § 3.6c. p. 266f. and Miete* A. I. § 3c; B. I. § 2c; D. § 4. For oxen in law s. Rind* A. § 10 and B. § 9. Intercourse between humans and sheep, pigs, horses or mules were dealt with in the Hitt. laws (Sexualität* B. § 4.2.2).

§ 3.5. *Divination.* Animals were frequently observed in divination. Thus tablets XXII–XLIX of the omen series *Šumma ālu* contain observations of, inter alia, snakes, scorpions, lizards, mongooses, ants, spiders, oxen, donkeys, horses, monkeys, lions, wolves, gazelles, foxes, cats, dogs and pigs; s. Omina* und Orakel. A. § 4.1. For *iqqur iṣuṣ* s. ibid. § 3 (snakes). Observations of malformed newborn sheep, goats, oxen, horses, pigs, dogs and gazelles were collected in the series *Šumma izbu* (Geburtsomina*; Omina* und Orakel. A. § 4.2). Sheep and birds were slaughtered for extispicy or inspection of the body (ibid. §§ 7f.; Orakel* B. §§ 2.1.1, 2.1.3). Augury and snake oracle were also practiced (Omina* und Orakel. A. § 12; Orakel* B. §§ 2.2.2, 2.3).

S. a. Pferd* A. I. § 9.6; A. II. § 7; Ra-be(nvögel)* § 6; Rind* B. § 8.4; Schaf* A. § 7; Schlange* A. § 3; B. § 2; Schwein* A. § 12.1; Skorpion* § 5.

§ 3.6. *Association with gods.* Mesopot. gods were normally anthropomorphic (Gott* A. § 1e; B. p. 544a; D. § 3a [II.3] p. 557b). Gods rarely represent animals: Nin-kilim: mongoose (Mungo* § 2). Nirah*: snake (Schlange* A. § 5.1.f). Nin-

sun* (§ 1): wild cow (Rind* A. § 9.1). However, animals were frequently associated with gods as part of their area of activity, which sometimes resulted in a theriomorphic concept and/or animals as divine attributes (Göttersymbole* und -attribute. A. I. § 7; A. II. § 6; B. § 5d; Gott* A. § 3; D. § 3f [I.b] p. 563f.): Dumuzi/Tammuz*: divine shepherd. Gula*: dog. Inanna*/Ištar: lion. Išhara*: scorpion. Martu* (A. § 6): gazelle. Nanna/Sîn (Mondgott* A. I. § 4): bull (Rind* A. § 9.2; Stier* C. § 3.1). Nanše* (A. §§ 3f.; cf. B. § 2): birds and fish. Nusku* (§ 5): cock. Sumuqan*/Šakkan: wild grass-eating animals. Sungod (Sonnen-gott* B. I. § 4): bull (Rind* B. § 13; Stier* C. § 3.2), horse (Pferd* C. § 2.2. with Abb. 1). Weathergod (Wettergott(heiten)*), esp. in Anatolia: bull (Gott* D. § 3a [II.3.b] p. 557; Stier* C. § 3.3; Stiergott*).

§ 3.7. *Literature.* Animals occur as opponents in several Sum. and Akk. debates (Streitgespräch*): Grain and sheep (Schaf* A. § 7), bird and fish, heron and turtle (Schildkröte* § 6), goose and raven (Raben(vögel)* § 4), ox (Rind* B. § 8.2) and horse (Pferd* A. I. § 9.3). Several Akk. fables are known (Fabel*; Literatur* § 4.7.6 p. 60f.; Streitgespräch* § 8). For the Etana* myth, which features eagle and snake, s. Literatur* § 4.1.1e and Schlange* A. § 6.4. The aurochs occurs in the Lugalbanda* (§ 4.1.1.3) epic. Animals are also found in many proverbs (Sprichwort*).

S. a. Hund* A. § 4; Insekten* § 7; Maus* § 4.1; Mungo* § 3.1; Pferd* A. I. § 9; A. II. § 8; Rind* A. § 9; B. § 8; Spinne*; Schlange* A. § 6; B. § 4; Skorpion* § 7; Zaunkönig*.

§ 3.8. *Namegiving.* Animals sometimes serve as personal names: s. Name*, Namengebung. B. § 2.1 (IA); D. § 4.4; E. § 4.6.3; Floh*; Hase*; Katze*; Insekten* § 9; Rind* A. § 8; Schwein* A. § 11.1. (§§ 11.2f.: toponyms). Domestic animals can be given names: s. Name*, Namengebung. A. § 9; B. § 9; C. § 5.

§ 3.9. *Imagery.* Animals provide the most prominent vehicle of Sum., Akk. and Hitt. imagery.

S. Hirsch* § 7; Hund* A. § 9; Insekten* § 8; Leopard* A. § 7; Löwe* A. I. § 6; B. § 6; Maus* § 4.1; Rind* A. § 9.1; B. § 8.1; Spinne*; Schaf* B. § 7; Schwein* A. § 10.

§ 4. The fauna in the RIA.

Mammals: Affe*, Antilope*, Bär*, Biber*, Elefant*, Esel*, Fischotter*, Fledermaus*, Fuchs*, Gazelle*, Gepard*, Hase*, Hirsch*, Hund*, Kamel*, Katze*, Leopard*, Löwe*, Maultier*, Maus*, Mungo*, Nashorn*, Nilpferd*, Onager*, Pferd*, Rind*, Schaf*, Schwein*, Trampeltier*, Wasserbüffel*, Wolf*, Ziege*.

Birds: Adler*, Ente*, Eule*, Falke*, Gans*, Geflügel*, Geier*, Hahn*, Huhn*, Pfau*, Rabe(nvögel)*, Schwalbe*, Stelzvogel*, Strauß*, Taube*, Trappe*, Vogel(fang)*, Zaunkönig*.

Reptiles: Chamäleon*, Eidechse*, Krokodil*, Schlange*, Schildkröte*.

Arthropods: Biene*, Fischmotte*, Fliege*, Floh*, Heuschrecke*, Krebs*, Insekten*, Skarabäus*, Skorpion*, Spinne*, Tausendfüßler*, Wurm*.

Other animals: Amphibien*, Fisch*, Fischen*, Fischer(ei)*, Flußmensch*, Frosch*, Mollusken*, Muschel*, Purpur(schnecke)*, Tridacnamuschel*.

Fabulous animals (in mythology and cult): Dämonenbilder*, Doppeladler*, Drachen* und Drachenkampf, Fischkentauro*, Greif*, Hedammu*, Himmelsstier*, Hurri*(, Šeri und), Hydra*, Kullu*, Labbu*, Lamaštu*, Löwenadler*, Löwendrache*, Löwenmensch*, Menschenstier*, Mischwesen*, Mušhušu*, Pazuzu*, Šerišu*, Sukkulu*.

Miscellaneous (selection): Elfenbein*, Fabel*, Fett*, Fleisch*, Haustiere*, Herr* der Tiere, Hirt*, Hörnerkronen*, Jagd*, Koralle*, Lebermodelle*, Leder(industrie)*, Medizin* A. § 4 (veterinary medicine), Milch(produkte)*, Muschelförmige* Gefäße, Reiten*, Reliefgefäß*, Rhyton*, Sattel*, Stall*, Streitgespräch*, Tiergefäß*, Tierkampf(szene)*, Tierkapelle*, Tiermedizin*, Tierstil*, Transhumanz*, Weide*, Wildpark*, Wolle*, Zaumzeug*.

Collins B. J. 2002a (ed.): A history of the animal world in the Ancient Near East (= HdOr. 1/64) (pp. 48–75 list of mammals and birds in the Near East); ead. 2002b: Animals in Hittite literature, in: ead. 2002a, 237–250. – Gilbert A. S. 1995: The flora and fauna of the Ancient Near East, CANE 1, 153–174 (pp. 164–169: a survey of “indigenous mammalian fauna of the postglacial Near East”). – Keel O./Staubli T. (ed.) 2001: “Im Schatten deiner Flügel”: Tiere in der Bibel und im Alten Orient. – Landsberger B. 1934: Fauna. – Salonen A. 1976: Jagd und Jagdtiere im alten Mesopotamien (= AASF B 196) (pp. 107–120: a survey of mammals in Iraq).

M. P. Streck

^dTi-gíg-ga s. ^dTI.MI.GA.

Tiglatpileser I. (Tukulti-apil-Ešarra). King of Assyria 1114–1076.

§ 1. Kinglists and chronicles. – § 2. Inscriptions. – § 3. Political history. – § 4. Building activities.

§ 1. Kinglists and chronicles. According to the AKL, T. succeeded his father Aššur-rēšī-iši* (I) and, having ruled for 39 years, was succeeded briefly by his son Ašarēd-apil-Ekur and then by another son, Aššur-bēl-kala* (Königslisten* und Chroniken. B. p. 112 § 55). The Synchronistic King List mentions both T. and Ašarēd-apil-Ekur as contemporaries of the Bab. ruler Marduk-nādin-aḫḫē (Königslisten* und Chroniken. B. p. 119: 17f.). However, it is clear from a chronicle fragment that T. was still king of Assyria when Marduk-šāpik-zēri* succeeded Marduk-nādin-aḫḫē* (ABC 189). A broken eponym list covers T.’s reign (ARI 2, 44).

§ 2. Inscriptions. The inscriptions of T. represent the first appearance of accounts styled as annals (though not yet with year-dated sections), using epic-style language to emphasise the king’s heroism, with certain subsequently popular themes (e. g. the royal hunt) appearing for the first time (Tadmor 1997, 326–328). Other new themes include a concern for the prosperity of the land and its people, the expansion of cultivated land, and the importation of exotic flora and fauna. The inscriptions also feature increased numbers of chariots and horses. A poorly-preserved stele from the “Stelenreihe” at Assur may be attributed to T. (RIMA 2, 79; Aššur* § 60 p. 190). Also an image of T. and an inscription are preserved on a rock face near the source of the Tigris (RIMA 2, 61; Schachner 2009, 173–178; Tigris* B. § 5). Some of the tablets reportedly belonging to a NA temple library found at Assur were written during T.’s reign; they include collections of the MAPD (M. Roth, SBL WAW 6 [1995] 195). It has been suggested therefore that T. was the original compiler of this library (Weidner 1952–1953). However, this has been questioned (Lambert 1976, 85f.), and according to Freydank (1991, 96) the MA