

## E-SANGIL AND E-TEMEN-ANKI, THE ARCHETYPAL CULT-CENTRE

A. R. George, London<sup>1</sup>

This paper discusses the sanctuary of the god Marduk in Babylon as the archetype of the Babylonian cult-centre and examines the repercussions of its unique status on first-millennium temple builders. As is well known, the sanctuary of Marduk comprised two principal edifices, a temple in the grand north-Babylonian style known by the Sumerian ceremonial name of E-sangil ‘House whose Top is High’, and the ziqqurrat or stepped tower that lay just to the north, by name E-temen-anki ‘House, Foundation Platform of Heaven and Underworld’. Some twelve other temples, all still to be excavated, crowded around E-sangil as part of what was a great religious precinct in the centre of the city. The most important of these were the river-side sanctuary of Marduk’s father, the god Ea, called E-kar-zaginna ‘House (of) the Quay of Lapis Lazuli’, and E-tur-kalamma ‘House, Cattle-Pen of the Land’, the cult-centre of Marduk’s paramour, a local manifestation of the great goddess Ishtar usually referred to as *Bēlet-Bābili* ‘the Lady of Babylon’.

As a point of introduction I take a passage from the inscriptions of Esarhaddon (680–669 BC), the Assyrian king who refounded Babylon a decade after its sack by his father, Sennacherib, in 689 BC. ‘E-sangil’, we read, is ‘the palace of the gods, mirror image of the Apsû, counterpart of E-sharra, replica of the abode of the god Ea, counterpart of the constellation Field.’<sup>2</sup>

The point about the temple of Marduk is that it was no ordinary sanctuary. In the religious ideology of the day it was the cosmic abode of the king of the gods, the place from where he ruled the universe and where he received the homage of the pantheon. In first-millennium tradition cited by Esarhaddon it was the archetypal cosmic abode, modelled exactly on the cosmic abodes of older gods, namely the Apsû of Ea and the E-sharra of Enlil.<sup>3</sup>

The classic statement of Babylon’s religious centre as a cosmic abode is given in the standard list of the temples of Babylon, where the most important sanctuaries are elucidated in cosmological terms (*Tintir* IV 1–3):

E-sangil	=	Replica of the Apsû
E-temen-anki	=	Replica of E-sharra

<sup>1</sup> School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London, Thornhaugh Street, Russell Square, London WC1H 0XG.

<sup>2</sup> R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Assarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien* (AfO Beiheft 9; Graz, 1956), p. 21, 47–51: é.sag.gíl ekal(é.gal) ilī(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> ma-aṭ-lat apsi(abzu) tam-šil é.šár.ra mi-iḫ-rit šu-bat <sup>d</sup>é-a tam-šil <sup>mul</sup>iki(Aš.iku). The Field is the Great Square of Pegasus.

<sup>3</sup> The following is based on A. R. George, *Babylonian Topographical Texts* (OLA 40; Leuven, 1992), pp. 296 ff. Another discussion of the Babylonians’ conception of archetypal cosmic abodes was presented to the 1996 colloquium by S. M. Maul, ‘Die altorientalische Hauptstadt — Abbild und Nabel der Welt’, published in G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Die orientalische Stadt: Kontinuität, Wandel, Bruch* (CDOG 1; Saarbrück, 1997), pp. 109–24.

E-kar-zaginna = Gate of the Apsû<sup>4</sup>

The cosmic geography that underlies this terminology is mapped out by the poet of the Creation Epic, when Marduk declares his intention of building himself a home to match those of his seniors. It will lie somewhere between them:

Above the Apsû, the emerald(?) domain,  
 as a replica of E-sharra that I built for you,  
 below the firmament whose base I made strong,  
 I will build a house to be the dwelling of my pleasure!<sup>5</sup>

That house turns out to be the city of Babylon. We know from the same poem that Marduk was following the precedent set by Ea in even earlier mythical time:

He established his home on (the dead body of) Apsû . . .  
 In his chamber he took easeful rest,  
 he called it Apsû, whose sanctuaries he allocated.<sup>6</sup>

The allocation of the sanctuaries implies that Ea's cosmic abode was not his home only, it served also, early in mythical time, as the the home of the gods. The provision of a home for the pantheon is also a function of the archetypal cult-centre. For an ideological expression of E-sangil as the home of all the gods one need look no further than the first few lines of the E-sangil Commentary, a text which uses traditional Babylonian exegetical scholarship to reveal, hidden in the ceremonial name of Marduk's temple, statements of its essential characteristics, purpose and function (E-sangil Commentary ll. 1–4):

E-sangil = House with top raised (aloft)  
 E-sangil = House whose top is high  
 E-sangil = House, beloved of Marduk  
 E-sangil = Pleasure-palace of the gods of heaven [and underworld]<sup>7</sup>

In pious and religious literature of the first millennium E-sangil is repeatedly given epithets that confirm this doctrine, most notably *ekal ilī* 'palace of the gods',<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> George, *Topog. Texts*, pp. 58–9.

<sup>5</sup> *Enūma eliš* V 119–22: *e-le-na apsī(abzu) šu-bat haš-ma-ni / mi-iḫ-rit é.šár.ra šá ab-nu-ú a-na-ku el-ku-un / šap-liš áš-ra-ta ú-dan-ni-na qaq-qar-šá / lu-pu-uš-ma bi-ta lu-ú šu-bat la-le-e-a*. On the universe as conceived by the poet of the Creation Epic see now Wayne Horowitz, *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography* (Winona Lake, 1998), pp. 107–29.

<sup>6</sup> *Enūma eliš* I 71 / 75–6: *ú-kin-ma eli(ugu) apsī(abzu) šu-bat-su / . . . qer-biš ku-um-mi-šú šup-šu-ḫi-iš i-nu-úḫ-ma / im-bi-šum-ma apsū(abzu) ú-ad-du-ú eš-re-e-ti*.

<sup>7</sup> George, *Topog. Texts*, pp. 80–1.

<sup>8</sup> For example in the Syncretistic Ishtar Hymn, in prayers and in inscriptions of Esarhaddon, Ashurbanipal and Nabonidus; for selected references see George, *Topog. Texts*, p. 386.

and a variation on it, *é.gal an.ki.a // ekal šamê u eršeti* ‘palace of heaven and underworld’.<sup>9</sup> In recounting the building of Babylon the Creation Epic provides this ideology with a mythological background:

The Anunna gods wielded the mattock,  
 for one whole year they moulded its bricks.  
 When the second year came around,  
 they raised high the top of E-sangil, the replica of the Apsû.  
 They built the upper ziqurrat of the Apsû,  
 they established a seat for Anu, Enlil and Ea, his . . .  
 After they had finished work on E-sangil,  
 all the Anunna gods fashioned their throne-daises.<sup>10</sup>

Since the narrative of the Creation Epic reports the building of no cult-centres other than Marduk’s, the last line must be taken to mean that, having provided Marduk with his home, the gods then took up residence in the same cult-centre. This follows the precedent set by Ea with the Apsû in Tablet I. According to the same text E-sangil was built expressly to serve as the home of the gods. For more information we return to the passage in which Marduk plans his cult-centre:

Therein (i.e. in Babylon) I will found its cult-centre,  
 I will allocate the chambers, I will establish my kingship.  
 When from the Apsû you come up for the assembly,  
 let your night be spent in this place before your assembly.  
 When from the heavens you come down for [the assembly,]  
 let your night be spent in this place before your assembly.  
 I will call it [Babylon], the ‘houses of the great gods’,  
 within it on the eve we will celebrate a festival(?).<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> In the bilingual inscription of Shamash-shuma-ukīn, last edited by G. Frame, *Rulers of Babylonia* (RIMB 2; Toronto, 1995), p. 250, 17.

<sup>10</sup> *Enūma eliš* VI 59–64, 67–8: <sup>a</sup>a-nun-na-ki it-ru-ku al-la / šat-tu <sup>iš</sup>’-ta-at li-bit-ta-šú il-tab-nu / šá-ni-tu šattu(mu.a[n.n]a) ina ka-šá-di / šá é.sag.íl mi-iḫ-rit apsī(abzu) ul-lu-u re-ši-šú / ib-nu-ú-ma ziq-qur-rat apsī(abzu) e-li-te / a-na <sup>a</sup>a-nim <sup>en</sup>-líl <sup>é</sup>-a u.É-šú ú-kin-nu šub-tú / . . . ul-tu é.sag.íl i-pu-šu šī-pir-šú / <sup>a</sup>a-nun-na-ki ka-l[i-šu]-nu pa-rak-ki-šú-nu ib-taš-mu.

<sup>11</sup> *Enūma eliš* V 123–30: qer-bu-uš-šú ma-ḥa-za-šu lu-šar-šid-ma / ku-um-mi lu-ud-da-a lu-kīn šar-ru-ti / e-nu-ma ul-tu apsī(abzu) tel-la-a ana pu-<sup>uḫ</sup>-ri / áš-ru-uš-šu lu-u nu-bat-ta-ku-un ana ma-ḥar pu-ḥur-[k]u-un / e-nu-ma ul-tu šá-ma-mi tur-r[a-da] ana [pu-uḫ-ri] / áš-r[u-uš-šu] lu nu-bat-ta-ku-un ana ma-ḥar pu-ḥur-ku-un / lu-ub-bi-ma šum-[šú bābilu]<sup>ki</sup> bītāt(é)<sup>mes</sup> ilī(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> rabūti(gal)<sup>mes</sup> / <sup>i</sup>’-[sin]-ni qer-b[u-uš-šú] ni-ip-pu-[u]š i-[na? nu-ba]t-tum. The reading of the last line is provisional. W. G. Lambert’s translation, ‘darin wollen wir ein Fest veranstalten: Dies wird das Abenfest sein,’ in K. Hecker *et al.*, *Mythen und Epen* (TUAT III/4; Gütersloh, 1994), p. 591, shows that the standard cuneiform text (W. G. Lambert and Simon B. Parker, *Enūma Eliš. The Babylonian Epic of Creation*. Oxford, 1966) has been superseded at this point.

Babylon, then, is the home of the pantheon because it is where all the gods of the universe gather for the divine assembly. The gathering of the gods in E-sangil at Babylon on regular festival occasions was indeed so, in theory if not in practice, as we know from a cultic explanatory text that reports on divine attendance at Babylon's New Year festival:

All the gods, the gods of [Babylon(?)] Borsippa, Kutha, Kish, and the gods of all the cult-centres come to Babylon to grasp the hands of the great lord Marduk, and go with him to the *akītu*. In front of them the king strews aromatics. Because he (Marduk) arises(?) and Anu and Enlil come to Babylon from Uruk and Nippur to grasp the hands of Bēl (= Marduk) and they proceed with him to E-siskur (the *akītu* temple), with them all the great gods come to Babylon.<sup>12</sup>

We know that the procession to the *akītu* temple and back began and ended with divine assemblies in E-sangil. Divine participants in the procession were thus also present at the two assemblies. The presence of the local deities in Marduk's *akītu* processions is confirmed by several sources. The ritual series itself, extant only for the first few days of the New Year festival, describes the preparations that take place in E-sangil immediately preceding the arrival from Borsippa of Marduk's son, Nabû.<sup>13</sup> From this and other sources we gather that Nabû was in Babylon from the sixth day of the month Nisannu to the eleventh,<sup>14</sup> allowing the obvious conclusion that the god of Borsippa arrived in Babylon in order to accompany his father on his procession to the *akītu* temple on 8 Nisannu and back again on 11 Nisannu. Recently published fragments from Babylon yield the damaged remains of a list of the many deities attendant on Marduk at the *akītu* temple and part of the ritual that they witnessed there.<sup>15</sup> Among the divine participants are Nabû and his entourage as well as the weapons of Marduk and the residents of several temples of Babylon and localities

<sup>12</sup> T. G. Pinches, *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* 30 (1908), p. 82, 1–14: *ilī(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> ka-la-šu-nu ilī(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> šá [E<sup>ki</sup>?] bár-sipa<sup>ki</sup> kutē(gú.du<sub>8</sub>.a)<sup>ki</sup> ki<sup>š</sup>ki u ilī(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> ma-ḥa-za-a-nu gab-bi ana ša-bat qātī(šu)<sup>min</sup> ša<sup>abēl(en)</sup> rabū(en)<sup>u</sup> marduk(amar.utu) ana bābili(E)<sup>ki</sup> il-la-ku-nim-ma itti(ki)-šu ana á-ki-tum illakū(du)<sup>u</sup> šarru(lugal) ina ma-ḥar-šu-nu sír-qa i-sár-raq áš-šú-ut ina-ši-ma<sup>a</sup> a-num u<sup>a</sup> en-lil ana ša-bat qātī(šu)<sup>min</sup> ša<sup>abēl(en)</sup> ana bābili(E)<sup>ki</sup> il-la-ku-nim-ma itti(ki)-šu i-šad-di-ḥu-ú ana é.siskur itti(ki)-{mu}-šu-nu ilī(dingir)<sup>mes</sup> rabūti(gal)<sup>mes</sup> gab-bi ana bābili(E)<sup>ki</sup> il-la-ku-ú-ni. A full treatment of this tablet is awaited from W. G. Lambert, whom I thank for showing me his edition in advance of publication. His interpretation of the passage quoted differs slightly from mine.*

<sup>13</sup> F. Thureau-Dangin, *Rituels accadiens* (Paris, 1921), pp. 127–54. For modern translations see W. Farber, 'Das Neujahrfest in Babylon', in *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments* II/2 (Gütersloh, 1987), pp. 212–23; Mark E. Cohen, *The Cultic Calendars of the Ancient Near East* (Bethesda, 1993), pp. 441–7.

<sup>14</sup> For details of Nabû's movements on 5–6 Nisannu see George, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 53, 381–2. His presence in Borsippa on 11 Nisannu is assured by passages of inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar II and Neriglissar which report that Nabû occupied the Dais of Destinies in E-zida on the fifth and the eleventh, the days of his departure for Babylon and his return home (*CT* 37 10, 9; H.-G. Güterbock, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 40 [1931], p. 290, 37).

<sup>15</sup> *VAS* 24 108–10, edited by B. Pongratz-Leisten, *Ina Šulmi Īrub* (BaF 16; Mainz, 1994), pp. 236–9; BM 47902+48320, ed. *ibid.*, pp. 233–5.

nearby. A long-known tablet that gives us the text of invocations addressed to Marduk at various strategic points on the procession to the temple preserves part of the litany recited before Marduk when he ascended his throne in the *akītu* temple.<sup>16</sup> The invocation is addressed at first to Marduk and then to the deities of Borsippa, Kish and Kutha. These gods, Nabû, Zababa and Nergal, along with their respective womenfolk, would seem in practice to be the principal members of Marduk's divine escort to and from the *akītu*.

Whether or not statues or other representations of Anu and Enlil were actually hauled from Uruk and Nippur all the way to Babylon to pay homage to the ruler of the universe is less certain. In any case, Anu, Enlil and other gods of the old order were already represented in E-sangil by symbol or statue, each in his own shrine or shrines. The shrines of the gods in E-sangil were recorded in full in a list devoted to that purpose (*Tintir* II).<sup>17</sup> The text is still not fully recovered, but so far we have entries for more than 103 of them. The most important deities, Anu, Enlil and Ea, were also among those resident in the cult-chamber of Marduk (and perhaps also the chapel of his wife, Zarpanītum),<sup>18</sup> where their presence symbolized their status as courtiers of the ruler of the universe. It was no doubt these representations of Anu and Enlil in Marduk's cult-chamber that were symbolically veiled during the recitation of *Enūma eliš* by Marduk's manservant (the *šešgallu* of E-umusha) on 4 Nisannu.<sup>19</sup>

In the revised mythology developed for the cult of Marduk in the late second millennium, as expressed in Tablet VI of the Creation Epic, the event that followed the occupation of the newly built temple was the convening of an assembly, at which the gods proclaim Marduk's royal destiny:

In Ubshu-ukkinna the gods exchanged counsel with one another . . .  
they sat in their assembly to pronounce destinies.<sup>20</sup>

The meaning of the Sumerian Ubshu-ukkinna is not completely clear; u b is 'corner, niche' and u k k i n is 'assembly', but š u is difficult in the context. The

<sup>16</sup> K 9876+19534, rev. 2'-33', re-edited by Pongratz-Leisten, *Ina Šulmi Īrub*, pp. 228-32, 286, pls. 2-3.

<sup>17</sup> Edited in George, *Topog. Texts*, pp. 43-55, with commentary on pp. 268-94. A newly published duplicate from Nimrud is D. J. Wiseman and J. A. Black, *Literary Texts from the Temple of Nabû* (CTN 4; London, 1996), no. 237. The obverse has parts of ll. 26-37 (for the right-hand sub-column see *Topog. Texts*, p. 46): 26 é.níg.[érim.ḥul.e.dè = *šu-bat* . . . ], 27 é.gúr.ḥ[ur.sag = *šu-bat* . . . ], 28 ki.šà.du<sub>10</sub>.g[a = *šu-bat* . . . ], 29 ki.zalag.ḡga' = *šu-bat* . . . ], 30 <du<sub>6</sub>>.ki.[sik]il = *šu-bat* . . . ], ruled line, 31 ki.ùr.kù.ga = *šu-bat* . . . ], 32 é.gar.kù = *šu-bat* [ . . . ], 33 [é].idim.sag.gá = *šu-bat* [ . . . ], 34 [é].du<sub>6</sub>.kù = *šu-ba*[t . . . ], 35 [é.ḥu]š.ki.a = *šu-bat* [<sup>4</sup>*nergal* . . . ], 36 [é.ad.g]i<sub>4</sub>.gi<sub>4</sub> = *šu-bat* [ . . . ], 37 [é.a.sikil.l]a = 'šu'-b[at . . . ]. The reverse is not yet placed; transliteration must await collation of the original tablet in Baghdad. For another, unpublished duplicate see further below, fn. 23.

<sup>18</sup> *Tintir* II 2-5 and 9-11, on which see George, *Topog. Texts*, p. 268.

<sup>19</sup> As recorded in the New Year's ritual, where these two gods are represented by a crown (Anu) and a *šubtu* (Enlil): Thureau-Dangin, *Rituels accadiens*, p. 136, 282-4.

<sup>20</sup> *Enūma eliš* VI 162 and 165: *ina ub-šu-ukkin-na-ki uš-ta-di-nu šu-nu mil-kât-su-un / . . . ú-ši-bu-ma ina puḥri(ukkin)-šú-nu i-nam-bu-u ši-ma-a-te*.

whole name is twice glossed in Akkadian as *kisal puḥur ilī* ‘court of the assembly of the gods’, an explanation which is probably a paraphrase.<sup>21</sup> Since this description tallies exactly with the known function of the Ubshu-ukkinna in mythology and ritual, Sumerian *u b . š u u k k i n - a ( k )* can provisionally be rendered ‘court of assembly’. There was an Ubshu-ukkinna in the real E-sangil, as we know best from a well-known passage of an inscription of Nebuchadnezzar II, king of Babylon (604–562), that reports his refurbishment of the seat there of the king of the gods:

The Throne-Dais of Destinies, Du-ku Ki-namtartarede (‘Pure Mound where Destinies are Determined’) in Ubshu-ukkinna, in which during the New Year festival at the beginning of the year, on the eighth and eleventh days, Lugaldimmerankia, the ruler of the gods, resides, and in which the gods of heaven and underworld kneel to pay reverent heed to him, and stand before him to decree as the destiny of my life a destiny of everlasting days — that throne-dais, the throne-dais of kingship, the throne-dais of the ‘Enlil-ship’ (i.e., supreme rulership) of the prince Marduk, wisest of the gods, . . . I coated with shining gold, an embellishment of radiant sheen.<sup>22</sup>

The two assemblies of 8 and 11 Nisannu, the one before the procession to the *akītu* and the other after, were of course the ritual counterparts of the divine assemblies of *Enūma eliš*, which are convened to make Marduk the gods’ champion before his battle with Ti’āmat and to confirm his sovereignty on his victorious return. The Ubshu-ukkinna of E-sangil housed more than the Dais of Destinies (Du-ku). It was also equipped with seats for the seven destiny-decreeing gods, as entered in the list of the shrines of E-sangil (*Tintir* II 16’–24’):

Ubshu-ukkinna Me-zu-ḥalḥalla	=	the seat of the great gods [ . . . ]
Du-ku Ki-namtartarede	=	the seat of the god Lugaldimmerankia [in Ubshu-ukkinna . . . ]
Gishḥur-ankia	=	the seat of Anu in Ubshu-ukkinna facing [which] the god Madānu [ . . . ]
E-dur-mah	=	the seat of Enlil in Ubshu-ukkinna [which] Zarpanītum [ . . . ]
Dur-ankia	=	the seat of Ea in Ubshu-ukkinna where Ea [ . . . ]

<sup>21</sup> In an inscription of Esarhaddon and a ritual: see George, *Topog. Texts*, p. 288. The ritual (K 3446+) has since been published by K. Watanabe, *Acta Sumerologica* 13 (1991), pp. 378–80, Pongratz-Leisten, *Ina Šulmi Īrub*, pp. 288–9, and W. G. Lambert, *Revue d’assyriologie* 91 (1997), p. 59.

<sup>22</sup> I R 54, ii 54–iii 3: *du<sub>6</sub>.kù ki.nam.tar.tar.e.dè ša ub.šu.ukkin.na parak(bára) ši-ma-a-ti ša i-na zag-mu-ku re-eš ša-at-ti u<sub>4</sub> 8.kam u<sub>4</sub> 11.kam <sup>a</sup>lugal-dim-me-er-an-ki-a bēl(en) ilī(dingir) i-ra-am-mu-ú qé-re-eb-šu ilī(dingir.dingir) šu-ut šamē(an) eršeti(ki) pa-al-ḥi-iš ú-ta-aq-qú-šu ka-am-su iz-za-zu maḥ-ru-uš-šu ši-ma-at u<sub>4</sub>-um da-rí-ú-tim ši-ma-at ba-la-ti-ia i-ši-im-mu i-na qé-er-bi parakku(bára) šu-ú parak(bára) šar-ru-ti parak(bára) <sup>a</sup>en-lil-ú-ti ša igi-gál ilī(dingir.dingir) rubē(nun) <sup>a</sup>marduk(amar.utu) . . . ḥurāša(kù.gi) nam-ri ti-iq-ni, me-lam-mi ú-ša-al-bi-ís-su; cf. S. Langdon, *Die neubabylonischen Königsinschriften* (VAB 4; Leipzig, 1912), Neb. no. 15.*

Kashbar-kalamma	=	the seat of Shamash in Ubshu-ukkinna: the seat(?) [of . . . ]
E-sangal	=	the seat of Ninurta in Ubshu-ukkinna which [ . . . ]
Eshbar-me-sisa	=	the seat of Nabû [in Ubshu-ukkinna . . . ]
Tul-idim-anki	=	the seat of [Adad(?) in Ubshu-ukkinna . . . ] <sup>23</sup>

It is, above all, the presence of the Dais of Destinies and the Ubshu-ukkinna that marks out the temple of Marduk as the archetypal cult-centre, the cosmic abode of the ruler of the universe, for here was done the real business of governing the cosmos. Here the gods came together to ratify their sovereign's word.

The question of the location in E-sangil of Ubshu-ukkinna and the Dais of Destinies now arises. E-sangil was built in what I referred to above as the 'grand north-Babylonian' style (Fig. 1a). Other temples that were laid out after much the same model are E-zida of Nabû at Borsippa (Fig. 1b), E-babbarra of Shamash at Sippar (Fig. 1c) and perhaps also the Neo-Babylonian 'double' temple at Ingharra (Fig. 1d). This type of temple comprises a very large, almost square building, usually furnished with four main gates, one in the centre of each of the four exterior façades. The main cult-chamber is a *Breitraum* cella lying beyond a *Breitraum* antechamber (sometimes two) of similar dimensions behind the westerly façade of a central courtyard. Other important cult-chambers typically lie to the left and right of the principal one and on much the same axis; they are served by smaller courtyards of their own and form more-or-less independent suites of chambers on either side of the main unit.<sup>24</sup> At Babylon topographical and metrological lists show that Marduk's consort, the goddess Zarpanîtum or Bêltîya (Madonna), resided in a cult-chamber to his left, and his son, the god Nabû, in a cult-chamber to his right.<sup>25</sup> In E-zida Nabû was sandwiched between, probably, his wife Tashmêtum and his courtesan, Nanāy (or otherwise his son, Mār-bîti). In E-babbarra Shamash can be supposed to have been accompanied by his consort Aya to his left and perhaps his vizier, Bunene, to his right.<sup>26</sup> At Ingharra the layout is slightly different, with only one subsidiary cult-suite.<sup>27</sup> What these temples also share is their orientation. They exhibit the same

<sup>23</sup> Cf. George, *Topog. Texts*, pp. 52–5. This part of *Tintir* II is now better known than it was at the time of my edition, thanks to a school tablet discovered by Petra Gesche. Her kindness in providing me with her copy of the cuneiform in advance of publication is acknowledged here.

<sup>24</sup> In Heinrich's typology the 'grand north-Babylonian' temple would be essentially a sub-set of C3c2, 'Hürdenhaus-Großanlagen': see E. Heinrich, *Die Tempel und Heiligtümer im alten Mesopotamien. Typologie, Morphologie und Geschichte* (Denkmäler antiker Architektur 14; Berlin, 1982), p. 20.

<sup>25</sup> For an attempt at the reconstruction of the courtyards and cult-rooms of Bêltîya and Nabû in the unexplored west wing of E-sangil see George, *Iraq* 57 (1995), pp. 186–93.

<sup>26</sup> This part of the temple is still very little known.

<sup>27</sup> The building at Ingharra is probably to be identified as the E-kur-nizu of Ninlil/Mulliltu (Ishtar) at øursang-kalamma, for the latter was the principal sacred building of this place according to the Neo-Babylonian list published by George, *House Most High. The Temples of Ancient Mesopotamia* (Winona Lake, 1993), pp. 51, 12; 53 f. E-kur-ni-zu was the first-millennium successor of a much more ancient cult-centre, the venerable E-ħursang-kalamma of Inanna. As the residence of an important (and

principal axis, which runs roughly south-west to north-east (more nearly WSW–ENE in E-sangil’s case). The direction faced in each by the chief divine resident, sitting enthroned on his dais in his cult-chamber, is approximately the place of the sunrise at the summer solstice.

While the temples of Nabû and Shamash were certainly provided with extensions abutting their north-eastern façades,<sup>28</sup> the very size of the eastern annexe at E-sangil marks Marduk’s sanctuary out as different. Indeed, the extension at Babylon is so much greater in size than the comparable parts of the other Babylonian temples of this kind, that it must represent some special functional characteristic of E-sangil which does not apply to other temples on the same model. We know from the texts that the eastern extension of E-sangil housed a Lower Court (the equivalent of the Vorhof in the reconstructed ground-plan) and probably there were other courtyards there too. All the documentary evidence points also to the location of the Ubshu-ukkinna, the court of the gods’ assembly, somewhere in this part of the temple.<sup>29</sup> I believe that the ground-plan confirms what the texts suggest, and that the large size of E-sangil’s great eastern annexe can be put down to the presence there of the Ubshu-ukkinna and its associated cult-rooms.<sup>30</sup> Put simply, the architecture of Marduk’s temple reflects its special status as the place of assembly of the gods.

The ideology developed for the cult of Marduk as king of the gods was borrowed to a greater or lesser degree by those ancient theologians who sought to claim similar supremacy for other deities, most particularly for Ashur during the reign of Sennacherib (704–681 BC),<sup>31</sup> but also for Anu in late Achaemenid times.<sup>32</sup> Since one expects changes in ideology to have repercussions in practice as well as in theory, it is legitimate to ask whether the theological reforms carried out by the priests of Ashur and Anu had any effect on the buildings which comprised their earthly abodes. What architectural innovations attended these reforms to proclaim the new order?

I have previously ventured the hypothesis that both sets of reforms prompted substantial alterations to the cult-buildings of Ashur and An<sup>33</sup> As is well known, Sennacherib reports that he realigned Ashur’s cult-chamber in E-sharra, his temple at Ashur, by breaking through its east side-wall and building there a magnificent

unattached) goddess its layout naturally does not match the blueprint provided by the temples of Marduk, Nabû and Shamash, who were family men, as it were.

<sup>28</sup> At Ingharra the NB temple has no comparable annexe on its façade, but a smaller temple is attached to its eastern corner. According to the list of the sacred buildings of ðursang-kalamma, either this temple or the subsidiary cult-suite in the main building must be the temple of the great goddess’s vizier, the goddess Bizilla (see George, *House Most High*, pp. 51, 15; 54).

<sup>29</sup> See George, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 53 (1996), 372–4.

<sup>30</sup> It is true that Nabû sat on his own Dais of Destinies in E-zida (see fn. 14), but there is no textual evidence for an Ubshu-ukkinna there.

<sup>31</sup> On Sennacherib’s religious reforms see now E. Frahm, ‘Die Inschriften als Quellen für Sanheribs Religionspolitik’ in idem, *Einleitung in die Sanherib-Inschriften* (AfO Beiheft 26; Horn, 1997), pp. 282–8, and the bibliography there cited.

<sup>32</sup> See P. Beaulieu, *Acta Sumerologica* 14 (1992), pp. 53 ff.; George, *Iraq* 57 (1995), pp. 194–5.

<sup>33</sup> See George, *Bulletin of SOAS* 52 (1989), p. 119; *Topog. Texts*, p. 466; *Iraq* 57 (1995), pp. 194–



gateway, the Gate of Kingship, to face the sunrise.<sup>34</sup> This, in itself, made E-sharra more like E-sangil, though because of the long-standing orientation of Ashur's cult-chamber, at Ashur 'east', the notional direction of the sunrise, had to be more south-east than north-east. It is worth quoting Sennacherib's report *in extenso*:

I cut through the wall and opened a new gate facing my lord Ashur towards the east and named it the Gate of Kingship. I constructed the porch-building anew and widened its gate . . . I called it the Gate of the Path of the Enlil Stars. I built its (the porch's) courtyard anew and named it the Court of the Row of Stations of the Igigi-Gods. Its gate which faces the sunrise, (giving) on to the river, I called the Gate of the Firmament; its entrance gate to the courtyard I called the Entrance of the Igigi. The gate which is to the south I named the Gate where the Igigi Kneel; its entrance gate to the courtyard I called the Gate of the Yield of the Lands. Its gate which is to the north I named the Gate of the Wagon Star; its entrance gate to the courtyard I called the Gate of the Dais of Destinies. The gate of the cella, the porch-house, its walls, as well as its courtyard, rooms and gates, I completed from its foundations to its parapets with the skill of the brick god.<sup>35</sup>

The extent, location and form of Sennacherib's remodelling of Ashur's temple has been much discussed. From Walter Andrae on, most commentators interpret Sennacherib's words to mean that abutting the new gate he built an annexe, which took the form of a central courtyard entered by four sets of double gates, one set in the middle of each façade, and which thus comprised the superstructure of the excavators' square 'Ostanbau'.<sup>36</sup> The problem here is that only the foundations and a single gate of this annexe, the south-west, were found. The rest of the structure had been eroded away and its ground-plan could not be recovered. The poverty of archaeological remains thus allows room for dissent.<sup>37</sup> It is not possible absolutely to refute the

<sup>34</sup> *KAH* II 124 17–29 and *KAV* 74. On these inscriptions see now Frahm, *Einleitung in die Sanherib-Inschriften*, pp. 163–5.

<sup>35</sup> *KAH* II 124, 15–17, 22–9: *igāru(é.gar<sub>8</sub>) an-da-ak-kis-ma a-na irat(gaba) an-šár bēli(en)-ia mi-iḫ-rit<sup>im</sup>šadi(kur.ra) bābu(ká) eš-šet ap-te-e-ma bāb(ká) šarru-ī[i] šum-šú am-bi<sup>é</sup>šá-ḫu-ru eš-šiš e-pu-uš-ma bāb(ká)-šú ú-rap-piš . . . bāb(ká) ḫarrān(kaskal) šu-ut<sup>en</sup>lil az-za-kar šum-šú kisalla(kisal)-šú eš-šiš ab-ni-ma kisalli(kisal) si-dir man-za-az<sup>i</sup>gi-gi šum-šú am-bi bāb(ká)-šú šá a-na ši-it<sup>šamši(utu)<sup>si</sup></sup> a-na muḫḫi(ugu) nāri(id) bāb(ká) bu-ru-mu az-za-kar ni-bit-su bāb(ká) né-re-bi-šú a-na kisalli(kisal) né-reb<sup>i</sup>gi-gi šum-šú az-kur bābu(ká) šá a-na<sup>im</sup>šūti(u<sub>18</sub>.lu) bāb(ká) kám-su<sup>i</sup>gi-gi šum-šú am-bi bāb(ká) né-re-bi-šú a-na kisalli(kisa[1]) bāb(ká) ḫi-[šib] māti(kur) šum-šú az-kur bāb(ká)-šú šá a-na<sup>im</sup>iltāni(si.sá) bāb(ká)<sup>mul</sup>ereqqi(mar.gíd.da) šum-šú am-bi bāb(ká) né-re-bi-šú a-na kisalli(kisal) bāb(ká) parak(bára) šīmāti(nam)<sup>mes</sup> šum-šú az-kur bāb(ká) pa-pa-ḫi<sup>é</sup>šá-ḫu-ru igārāti(é.gar<sub>8</sub>)<sup>mes</sup>-šú a-di kisalli(kisal)-šú bītāti(é)<sup>mes</sup> bābāti(ká)<sup>mes</sup> ul-tu ušši(uš<sub>8</sub>)-šú a-di gab-dib-bi-šú ina ši-pir<sup>a</sup>kulla ú-šak-lil-šu-ma.*

<sup>36</sup> The most recent upholders of Andrae's position have been G. van Driel, *The Cult of Aššur* (Assen, 1969), pp. 24–8, and J. Börker-Klähn, 'Der bīt ḫilāni im bīt šaḫūri des Assur-Tempels', *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 70 (1980), pp. 258–73. For further bibliography see Pongratz-Leisten, *Ina Šulmi Īrub*, pp. 60–4.

<sup>37</sup> Most recently H. D. Galter, 'Die Bautätigkeit Sanheribs am Aššurtempel', *Orientalia* NS 53 (1984), pp. 433–41.

dissenting position, but in my view Sennacherib's inscriptions — and the topographical lists that also record as a distinct group the names of the gates and their courtyard<sup>38</sup> — make best sense if understood to refer to a single, newly built edifice rather than to existing cultic locations that were given new names.

Taken so, the names of the courtyard and its gates alluded to the new building's cosmological and ritual function, which was very special indeed. The Gate of Kingship celebrated Ashur's royal status as the new Marduk. The courtyard was called the Court of the Row of Stations of the Igigi, that is, where the gods of the pantheon assembled to stand in attendance on their royal master. The inner north-east gate was the Gate of the Dais of Destinies, which speaks for itself and is appropriate given the location of the cosmic Dais of Destinies (du<sub>6</sub>.kù) at the place where the sun rises. The inner south-east gate was the Entrance Gate of the Igigi, where the gods filed into assembly. The outer south-west gate was the Gate where the Igigi Kneel, i.e., paid homage to their king, perhaps as they left the assembly.

The function of the Babylonian Ubshu-ukkinna in myth and ritual was to provide the venue for the divine assembly that ratified the status quo, the 'determining of the destinies' of Marduk and his earthly counterpart, the king. It is very clear from the ceremonial names of Sennacherib's inscriptions that this is the ideology which informed his work on Ashur's temple, and certainly the ideology and whatever ritual that accompanied it (besides the *akītu* procession) were imported from Babylon. Thus I side with Andrae and those who follow him in reconstructing the Ostanbau in the light of the texts cited above (Fig. 2). This building was the Assyrian counterpart of the Babylonian Ubshu-ukkinna. As such it was an eastern extension of the temple modelled on the eastern annexe of E-sangil at Babylon, certainly not exactly — for what has been retrieved of the plan of E-sangil's annexe is not a match for Sennacherib's building — but at least in general terms.

At Uruk the change was more drastic. It evidently became necessary for Anu and his consort, the goddess Antu, to leave his old cult-centre, E-anna, no doubt because there his cult was subordinate to Ishtar, the city's patron deity. A new temple, the Rēsh Temple,<sup>39</sup> was provided for him nearby and rebuilt at least twice in the Seleucid period.<sup>40</sup> The date of the first foundation of this building is uncertain. Well-known references to it in scribal colophons predate the major building activities reported in the older foundation document, the cylinder of Nicarchos (244 BC) and show that it

---

<sup>38</sup> BM 121206: B. Menzel, *Assyrische Tempel 2* (Studia Pohl sm 10; Rome, 1981), p. T 64 (no translation). The same list was also included, with a few minor variants, in some recensions of the Divine Directory (Götteradreßbuch) of Assur, edited without translation by Menzel, op. cit., p. T 166, and again, more fully, by George, *Topog. Texts*, pp. 182–3.

<sup>39</sup> The name *bīt rēš* is a translation of Sumerian é . s a g 'Foremost House', once the ceremonial name of a temple of Lugalbanda at Uruk; see further George, *House Most High*, p. 137.

<sup>40</sup> For its history see A. Falkenstein, *Topographie von Uruk I. Uruk zur Seleukidenzeit* (ADFU 3; Leipzig, 1941), pp. 4–10; Heinrich, *Tempel und Heiligtümer*, pp. 327–331; Susan B. Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture. Alexander through the Parthians* (Princeton, 1988), pp. 20–8; cf. L. Timothy Doty, 'Nikarchos and Kephalon' in Erle Leichty *et al.* (eds.), *A Scientific Humanist. Studies in Memory of Abraham Sachs* (Philadelphia, 1988), pp. 95–118.

was already standing in 251. Cephalon's claim in the second foundation inscription (202 BC) that the temple was founded by the sage Oannes (Adapa) is transparently an attempt to give the building a bogus antiquity,<sup>41</sup> but might suggest that the first structure was built at a time beyond the recall of the living memory of his contemporaries. The oldest tablet excavated at the Rēsh temple does indeed date to about one hundred years before,<sup>42</sup> though of course it cannot be used as secure evidence that the temple was standing then. Practical interest in the religious topography of E-sangil had already been taken up at Uruk by this time, as exhibited in a tablet which was probably copied during the reign of Philip Arrhidaeus (323–316); it later spawned the famous copy of the E-sangil Tablet written out in 229 BC.<sup>43</sup> By the end of the fourth century Anu's elevation by theologians to supreme power was well under way, and it cannot be ruled out that the Rēsh Temple was first built to express the new order in the last quarter of that century.

However that may be, 'the plans of the *bīt rēš* and E-sagil', as I have written elsewhere, 'are, in essence, remarkably similar: both exhibit a main building comprising, along its W–E (or SW–NE) axis, the cult rooms of the principal divine resident, a central courtyard, a large lobby, and beyond that an annexe with its own courtyard [Court VI].'<sup>44</sup> Thus, a temple modelled somewhat in 'grand north-Babylonian' style came to be built in Uruk, though the goddess Antu took her ease in a chamber to the right of her consort, not the left (Fig. 3).

The ritual tablets that lay down the cultic procedures in the new temple inform us that here, as in E-sangil, there was an Ubshu-ukkinna and a Dais of Destinies. Again, there is no consensus on exactly where these cultic locations are to be sited on the plan. Falkenstein's view that the Dais of Destinies was the great platform found in Court I and the Ubshu-ukkinna was Court VI<sup>45</sup> is hardly tenable in the light of what becomes ever clearer, that the Dais of Destinies was the seat of the king of the gods in Ubshu-ukkinna. Recognizing this, Pongratz-Leisten placed both in Court I.<sup>46</sup> Court VI seems to me a better fit.<sup>47</sup> Not only is it immediately adjacent to the north-east façade of the main building ('Anu-Antum Tempel') of the Rēsh temple, as a true reflection

<sup>41</sup> See J. van Dijk, *Vorläufiger Bericht . . . Uruk-Warka* 18 (Berlin, 1962), p. 47.

<sup>42</sup> J. van Dijk and W. Mayer, *Texte aus dem Rēš-Heiligtum in Uruk Warka* (BaM Beiheft 2; Berlin, 1980), no. 119 (slave sale, SE 15 = 297 BC). Note also no. 17 (cult-lament), which possibly dates to Philip Arrhidaeus 2 = 322 BC.

<sup>43</sup> On texts relating to Babylon's cult-centre at Uruk see George, 'The bricks of E-sagil', *Iraq* 57 (1995), pp. 173–97, esp. 193 ff.

<sup>44</sup> George, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 53 (1996), 373. From excavation we know, of course, that other courtyards surrounded the main building and Court VI of the Rēsh temple. At Babylon it was impossible for the excavators to do more than tunnel around the main building and its extension, but the texts speak of at least two further courtyards (the Grand Court and the Court of Ishtar and Zababa) and a great gateway (Ka-sikilla). The fact that the list of temples of Babylon lists so many temples in this part of town (*Tintir* IV 1–14) implies that the precinct of E-sangil must have been crammed full of buildings and courtyards. The modern city plans and architectural drawings that show E-sangil as it were in splendid isolation mislead the uninformed user.

<sup>45</sup> Falkenstein, *Topographie*, pp. 22–4.

<sup>46</sup> Pongratz-Leisten, *Ina Šulmi Īrub*, pp. 59–60.

<sup>47</sup> See already George, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 53 (1996), 373.

of its cosmic counterpart (and of the situation at Babylon), but it was furnished with a row of pedestals that calls to mind the name of the court of the divine assembly at Ashur, the Court of the Row of Stations of the Igigi.<sup>48</sup> The presence of this row of pedestals no doubt influenced Falkenstein in identifying Court VI as Ubshu-ukkinna, though he does not cite it explicitly as a reason.<sup>49</sup> The row was not fully excavated: thirteen or fourteen pedestals were found in a line of probably many more. These were not, therefore, the seats of the destiny-decreeing gods, who were seven in number, but the stations of minor members of the assembly. From the evidence of Babylon, Ashur and Uruk, a picture begins to emerge of the protocol of a divine assembly in Ubshu-ukkinna. The presiding deity, the king of the gods, sat on his throne of power, the Dais of Destinies. Before him sat the seven major deities, the committee of destiny-decreeing gods. Along the sides of the courtyard stood the other members of the pantheon, each on his own station.

In conclusion, one must consider whether Marduk's temple was itself modelled on an existing pattern, for Marduk, of course, was not always the king of the gods. We do not know when his temple was rebuilt in the 'grand north-Babylonian' style, and we do not know when the eastern extension was added to house the divine assembly. We can only guess that E-sangil acquired the layout that we know from Esarhaddon's rebuilding long after the Old Babylonian period. It is well known that in ideology and ritual the cult of Marduk owes much to the great gods of Nippur, namely Enlil and his son Ninurta. This debt is also reflected in the names of gates and shrines of E-sangil, some of which were taken over from the ceremonial nomenclature of Nippur. In its time Enlil's temple, the E-kur, had been the centre of the Babylonian universe, where Enlil convened the assembly to determine destinies.<sup>50</sup> The terminology of the divine assembly itself came from Enlil's great cult-centre at Nippur, where there were also terrestrial counterparts of the Ubshu-ukkinna and its Dais of Destinies.

A sanctuary commonly referred to as the 'temple of Enlil' was excavated at Nippur beside the north-east face of the ziqqurrat (Fig. 4a). It had been rebuilt on the same plan in the Ur III period and the Kassite period, and probably also the seventh century. In seeking comparisons with the religious topography of Babylon we should bear in mind that this very old cult-building is only part of E-kur. At its widest this name, which means 'House, Mountain', referred to the whole temple complex, an area that according to the Middle Babylonian metrological tablet in Jena measured

---

<sup>48</sup> J. Jordan, *Uruk-Warka* (WVDOG 51; Leipzig, 1928), pp. 39 f., pls. 74b, 75b; see also Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture*, p. 25.

<sup>49</sup> Falkenstein, *Topographie*, p. 13.

<sup>50</sup> A discussion of the political expression of Nippur's special status as it developed in early Mesopotamian ideology was presented to the 1996 colloquium: W. Sallaberger, 'Nippur als religiöses Zentrum Mesopotamien' in Wilhelm, *Die orientalische Stadt*, pp. 147–68. See also W. G. Lambert, 'Nippur in ancient ideology', in Maria deJ. Ellis, *Nippur at the Centennial* (CRRA 35; Philadelphia, 1992), pp. 119–26.

some 4.5 ha.<sup>51</sup> The figure given in the same text for ‘the house of Enlil, structure proper’, which is equivalent to about 0.5 ha, is still much too large to match the excavated building.<sup>52</sup> This discrepancy is a good reason to doubt that the building in question is Enlil’s cult-building proper and adds to other doubts already expressed by McCown and Haines, who noted the lack of suitable emplacement for Enlil’s statue and proposed an identification as a ‘kitchen temple’.<sup>53</sup> A much larger building, comparable in size with the great temple of Inanna built nearby by Shulgi and a better fit with the ancient metrological data, would match our expectations better. Unsurprisingly, the ground-plan of the excavated ‘temple of Enlil’ does not look like the precursor of any known part of E-sangil.

The outline of the E-kur complex appears on the famous clay sketch-map of Nippur, abutted on the one side by the slightly smaller E-kiur, the sanctuary of Enlil’s consort, Ninlil (Fig. 4b). Now that the orientation of this map suggested on the grounds of metrology by E. I. Gordon, S. N. Kramer and M. Civil has finally been fixed by archaeology,<sup>54</sup> it is absolutely certain that the old identification of Ninlil’s sanctuary as the forecourt found in the fourth season of early excavations on the south-east side of the ziqqurrat was wrong. The only building excavated in the area of this forecourt, called the ‘small shrine’, is to be identified as a chapel built by Amar-Suen for the presentation of luxury comestibles to Enlil.<sup>55</sup> The E-kiur is to be sought instead in the unexcavated area adjacent to E-kur on the north-east.<sup>56</sup> Further details of the religious topography of Nippur’s religious centre — the true location of Enlil’s cult-building proper, even the general location of E-shumesha, the important temple of Ninurta, Enlil’s son — are hampered by lack of evidence on the ground.

<sup>51</sup> A rough modern equivalent of the figure 12 iku 55 $\frac{5}{6}$  sar given in HS 194, 8: Inez Bernhardt and S. N. Kramer, ‘Die Tempel und Götterschreine von Nippur’, *Orientalia* NS 44 (1975), pp. 96–102 and pls. 7–8.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, HS 194, 2: *qá-du* 1 iku 36 $\frac{1}{2}$  sar 6 gín *bīl(é) en-lil ši-ki-it-tum*. The structure recovered by excavation measures about 45 × 21 m, occupying an area less than a quarter of the ancient figure.

<sup>53</sup> Donald E. McCown and Richard C. Haines, *Nippur I. Temple of Enlil, Scribal Quarter and Soundings* (OIP 78; Chicago, 1967), pp. 32–3; see also Heinrich, *Tempel und Heiligtümer*, p. 160.

<sup>54</sup> See McGuire Gibson, *Sumer* 34 (1978), pp. 118–19; Richard L. Zettler, *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 14 (1987), p. 13. Any lingering doubts were dispelled by the excavation of the city wall at its south-western corner, reported by McGuire Gibson, James A. Armstrong and Augusta McMahon, ‘The city wall of Nippur and an Islamic site beyond: Oriental Institute excavations, 17th season, 1987’, *Iraq* 60 (1998), pp. 11–44, esp. 21 ff.

<sup>55</sup> On the archaeological topography of the area south-east of the ziqqurrat see Richard L. Zettler, ‘The “small shrine” of Enlil at Nippur’, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 43 (1984), pp. 231–8. The shrine is entered in abbreviated form as *é.lál.i.nun-ù-geštin* in my gazetteer (*House Most High*, no. 701), but the full phrase, *é lál i.nun ù geštin ki siskur.ra.ka.na nu.šilig.ge* ‘House where syrup, ghee and wine never cease in his (Enlil’s) place of offerings’, is perhaps not so much a ceremonial name as a formal, functional description.

<sup>56</sup> There must have been a second monumental gate in the perimeter wall that enclosed the ziqqurrat and the ‘kitchen temple’, matching the one found in the south-east and giving access towards Ninlil’s sanctuary. The north-east stretch of this wall was hardly touched by the excavators. A gate linking E-kur and E-kiur is marked on the ancient sketch-map, but it is by no means certain that the perimeter wall of the ziqqurrat found by the excavators coincides with the perimeter of E-kur marked on the plan.

Pinpointing the exact position of Nippur's Ubshu-ukkinna is therefore beyond us for the moment. But we know that Ubshu-ukkinna was considered in antiquity to be located in the E-kur complex,<sup>57</sup> and if it occupied an easterly position in conformity with its cosmic prototype, probably we should seek it in a courtyard situated somewhere between the cult-building proper of Enlil, hitherto undiscovered, on the west and Ninlil's sanctuary on the east.

What seems sure from even this hazy picture of Nippur's religious topography is that the plan of E-kur was not a model for E-sangil, even to the limited extent that its ceremonial nomenclature was. The layout of its buildings did not have repercussions on the great cult-centre of Babylon in the same way as the religious topography of E-sangil served as a guide for the architects who gave monumental expression to the theological reforms of Ashur and Uruk. Perhaps we should see in this a conscious repudiation by Babylon of the old third-millennium archetypal cult-centre in favour of a new model, developed locally. Without more detailed information on Nippur's religious topography and further knowledge concerning the origins of the 'grand north-Babylonian' temple-complexes, it is difficult to say more.

### *Captions*

Fig. 1. Temples in the 'grand north-Babylonian' style, approximately to scale: *a*, plan of E-sangil, after Friedrich Wetzel; *b*, plan of E-zida by Robert Koldewey; *c*, composite plan of E-babbarra, combining those of Hormuzd Rassam and Walid al-Jadir (*CRRA* 36, p. 195); *d*, plan of the Neo-Babylonian temple at Ingharra by L. C. Watelin.

Fig. 2. Plan of the core of Ashur's temple with reconstructed Ostanbau. Key: C = E-ḫursang-kurkurra, the cella of Ashur, P = E-ḫursang-gula, the porch-house (*šahūru*), Y = the Court of the Row of Stations of the Igigi, a = the Gate of Kingship, b = the Gate of the Path of the Enlil Stars, c = the Gate of the Firmament; d = the Entrance of the Igigi, e = the Gate where the Igigi Kneel, f = the Gate of the Yield of the Lands, g = the Gate of the Wagon Star, h = the Gate of the Dais of Destinies.

Fig. 3. Plan of the the Rēsh Temple by C. Preußner.

Fig. 4. The religious topography of central Nippur: *a*, excavated structures of E-kur, detail of *OIP* 78, pl. 5, with the addition, south-east of the ziqqurrat precinct, of Amar-Suen's 'small shrine' and, to the west, of Shulgi's temple of Inanna; *b*, a detail from the ancient sketch-plan of Nippur, adapted from the copy by I. Bernhardt and aligned roughly to match *a* in scale and orientation: E-kur, the temple of Enlil (*middle left*), E-kiur, the temple of Ninlil (*middle right*) and the city gate Abul-igibi-Urimshe 'Gate-towards-Ur' (*bottom*).

---

<sup>57</sup> See S. J. Lieberman, *CRRA* 35, p. 133; George, *Topog. Texts*, p. 290. The ten deities resident in Nippur's Ubshu-ukkinna, as listed in the Nippur Compendium, do not coincide with the committee of destiny-decreeing gods and are to be viewed instead as the permanent occupants of this cultic location.