

N.A.B.U.

Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires

2024

N° 1 (mars)

NOTES BRÈVES

1) Proto-Euphratic (PE) grammar without spelling of grammatical elements?* — This note may be understood essentially as a supplement to note *NABU* 2018/93 (“Notes on BA, GI and GU₇ in the Archaic Text Corpus”), illustrated by the example of ‘BA’ (“to bring in front of the eyes [of]”). Since in PE administrative texts, as far as we can judge, apart from numerals, only nouns (including determinatives), adjectives and verbs are written without further marking (e.g. inflectional endings or postpositions, depending on the language type), but not pronouns, adverbs (?), prepositions and conjunctions, one should more or less expect a “positional grammar” (comparable to that of isolating languages, such as Vietnamese), in which the order of the words/signs in a sentence is decisive for correct understanding (cf. Englund, OBO 160/1, 71). This can be observed – apart from the unambiguous case of the position of the adjective: *NABU* 2017/29, note 18 – to some extent in subscripts that are construed in the form of a sentence¹⁾: In the subscript of a7/20274,139 (n DUG BA GI.GI GU₇ z648) BA and GI.GI are in two lines above each other, so they have been placed “deliberately” (*NABU* 2018/93; similarly: “1N₂₂ [?!] KAŠ GÚG BAR” rotated by 90° in c1/149). If a commodity is specified, a subscript containing a verb normally has the commodity (including animals and persons; complex examples: W 20274,80+; a7/21671) at the beginning of the sentence; the numerical value of the commodity, n, which can also denote the commodity itself (m1/27), can be placed before the commodity (m4/3, rev. i1: n ŠE) or (more rarely) behind it (m4/3, rev. ii: ŠE n). The same holds true for LAGAB (“sum”; m1/104 and m1/1 respectively). A determination of location (time, ...) can be positioned at the beginning or end of the subsequent sign string (at the beginning: NI+RU 2N₅₇ SU GIBIL GU₇ [m1/93], z648 BA GI.GI GU₇ [a7/20274,123], NI+RU BA AB.APIN [m1/98]; at the end: a7/20274,139 [see above], BA GI.GI z648 [IM 134289])²⁾. If there is no such determination, the verb usually takes this position as well in those cases in which it was not already at the beginning or end³⁾. The determination of location may also stand in front of the commodity (W 20274,89: z648 n DUG). The sign BAR (“extra”) can be placed at the end of a sentence (m1/164). Compound expressions are never separated: BA AB.APIN, never BA APIN AB (m1/97–99); in texts of the Uruk IV writing phase, however, the reverse order of the components is still sometimes encountered: APIN.NÁM instead of NÁM.APIN (a5/9579,co; Lú A, no. 8). Texts such as a5/9656,ac and a5/9656,ga also show that the order of the signs played a role (in both cases “n TÙR EN ÁB BA”). 3N₅₇ (MS 3035) and 3N₅₇.MÍ (m1/44) are male personal names, *MÍ 3N₅₇, on the other hand, is presumably a woman named “3N₅₇” (cf. MÍ BA.PIRIG in W 20274,33; BA.PIRIG is attested as a male personal name [c1/136]; if the context is clear, the determinative need not be written: m4/67).

5) Une autre attestation de l'image de culte de la déesse ^dTU dans le temple du dieu ^dKU-ra à Ébla —
Récemment (PASQUALI 2023), j'ai attiré l'attention sur certains extraits des textes administratifs éblaïtes qui apportent des preuves de la présence de la statue cultuelle de la déesse mère ^dTU dans le temple du dieu dynastique ^dKU-ra, où elle reçoit, notamment de la part de la reine, des offrandes de tissus et objets précieux à l'occasion de la cérémonie de son habillage (mu^{4mu}).

Grâce à la publication des sorties des métaux de la période du mandat du ministre *Ib-rí-um* (ARET XXI), un nouveau passage s'ajoute maintenant à ceux déjà recueillis :

[1] ARET XXI 16 (5) : 20 ma-na kù:babbar / níg-sa₁₀ / ^r1¹ li-im 2 mi-at ma-na a-gar₅-gar₅ / 2 gín DILMUN kù:babbar / 1 tiš-MUŠEN / 1 gín DILMUN kù:babbar / šu-bala-aka / 5 NI kù-sig₁₇ / sag-sù / níg-ba / ama-gal / en / ^dTU / é / ^dKU-ra.

Ce contexte, en plus de confirmer l'existence de l'image de ^dTU à l'intérieur du temple de ^dKU-ra, nous apporte d'autres informations intéressantes. Tout d'abord, il faut remarquer que [1] est en partie parallèle au passage suivant :

[2] MEE 12 37 r. IV:39 – V:11 : 2 gín DILMUN kù:babbar / 1 tiš-MUŠEN / x x [...] / [...] / [...] [D]U₈² / [níg*]-^rba*¹ / ^rma¹-^rlik¹-tum / ^dTU / [I]ú ^ré¹ / ^dKU-ra / šè / mu^{4mu}-mu^{4mu}.

Selon la chronologie proposée par les éditeurs (ARCHI – SPADA 2023 : 170-171), le compte-rendu annuel de métaux, d'où [1] provient, remonte à la XIII^e année du mandat du ministre *Ib-rí-um*, c'est-à-dire l'année qui précède le mariage du dernier roi d'Ébla. En revanche, l'extrait [2], quant à lui, est plus tardif et appartient à un compte-rendu annuel de métaux de la période du mandat d'*Ib-bí-zi-kir*, le fils *Ib-rí-um*. Cette datation est confirmée par le fait que dans [1] l'offrande est réalisée par la mère du roi (ama-gal en), tandis qu'en [2] c'est désormais la reine (*ma-lik-tum*) qui, après son mariage et son entrée définitive dans la lignée royale éblaïte, est chargée de célébrer cet acte cultuel.

Or, l'extrait [2] est malheureusement lacuneux, et, à cause de ce mauvais état de la tablette, on ne pouvait pas connaître avec certitude l'identité du destinataire de l'objet en argent en forme d'aigle (tiš-MUŠEN), mentionné au début du passage. Étant donné que le temple de ^dKU-ra, en réalité n'y est cité qu'en fonction de la cérémonie d'habillage (mu^{4mu}) de la déesse ^dTU, j'avais déjà exclu la possibilité que ce bien fût du ressort du dieu ^dKU-ra (PASQUALI 2023), contrairement aux dires de Sallaberger (2018 : 131 et n. 70), qui y voyait un lien avec le symbole de commande exhibé en Mésopotamie par le dieu guerrier Zababa, ce qui l'amenait à identifier ^dKU-ra avec un jeune dieu martial, équivalent d'un des fils vaillants d'Enlil, en dépit du fait que ce dernier n'a aucune place dans le panthéon éblaïte. Comme Archi (2013 : 215) l'a bien vu grâce à une analyse attentive des passages où ^dKU-ra est cité, nous pouvons à bon droit affirmer que ce dieu « was a local deity of prosperity, not a warrior god ». En effet, maintenant grâce à [1] nous savons que le tiš-MUŠEN est offert par l'ama-gal en directement à la déesse ^dTU. Ce passage nous informe aussi que l'objet en argent avait une tête (sag) décorée en or. D'après les éditeurs (ARCHI – SPADA 2023 : 160) il s'agirait d'un « casque », mais vu que la destinataire était la déesse mère, il apparaît peu probable qu'elle reçoive ce type d'offrande. On peut penser plutôt à un bijou en forme d'aigle. Des études ultérieures expliqueront le lien qui devait exister entre cet animal et la déesse ^dTU.

Bibliographie

ARCHI, A., 2013, Ritualization at Ebla, *JANER* 13 : 212-237.

ARCHI, A., et G. SPADA, 2023, *Annual Documents of the Metal Expenditures (è) from Minister Ibrium's Period*, ARET XXI. Wiesbaden.

PASQUALI, J., 2023, L'image de culte de la déesse ^dTU dans le temple du dieu ^dKU-ra à Ébla, *NABU* 2023/5.

SALLABERGER, W., 2018, Kura, Youthful Ruler and Martial City-God of Ebla, dans P. Matthiae et al. (éd), *Ebla and Beyond. Ancient Near Eastern Studies after Fifty Years of Discoveries at Tell Mardikh. Proceedings of the International Congress Held in Rome...*, 107-139. Wiesbaden.

Jacopo PASQUALI < pasquali.jacopo@laposte.net >
19, Rue de la Masse, 84000 Avignon (FRANCE)

6) On Sargonic wooden (musical) instruments and felled trees — CL 250 = Lippmann Coll. 273 (= CDLI P472573; hereafter CL 250) is a Sargonic tablet from Adab, which records an expenditure of wood. Its line obv. 1 refers to eight items, whose name is spelled with the signs ĜĚŠ and TAG. Molina (2014: 53, 203, and 284; with previous literature) reads the two signs as ĜĚŠ²TAG, and understands that the word would

denote a wooden implement for building a house (e₂-du₃-še₃ in CL 250: obv. 2). This also appears to be the understanding of the lemmatized edition of this text available on ePSD2.

Nevertheless, this interpretation presents two problems. First, the ġeš-tag tool (spelled as ĠEŠ×TAK₄ in ARES 4 TM.75.G.10011: xi 2; OIP 99, 33: obv. viii 25 and 54+: obv. v 21) appears to be exclusively a musical instrument, since it is always mentioned together with other instruments, namely the balaġ, ge-di, GI×TAK₄, and bur₂-balaġ (ARES 4 TM.75.G.10011: x 20-xi 2; OIP 99, 33: obv. viii 22-25 and 54+: obv. v 18-21; see KRISPIJN 2010: 146 for comments). Second, CL 250: obv. 2 reads ġeš e₂-du₃-še₃ “wood to build a house,” suggesting that the line obv. 1 describes the type of wood to build the house, not the tools used in that process. As a result, a new reading for TAG in CL 250: obv. 1 is needed.

An alternative reading of TAG in this context could be šuš₄ “to cut, to fell; to trim, to peel off.” The line obv. i 7 of MSL SS 1 97-98 (= CDLI P492330) reads [ġeš] šuš₄ = *hu-up-pu-um*. DCCLT parses šuš₄ as an alternative spelling of šuš₄, and its restoration ġeš is assured because earlier and later preserved lines in the tablet refer to wooden objects as well. Thus, ġeš šuš₄ would denote a felled tree (or a broken tree, according to the Akkadian *hu-up-pu-um*, spelling of *huppûm* “broken”) in this manuscript of the Old Babylonian version of the Ur₅-ra lexical list.

If the proposed connection with MSL SS 1 97-98: obv. i 7 is accepted, CL 250: obv. 1-2 could be describing eight previously felled trees (8 ġeš šuš₄) used as lumber to build a house (ġeš e₂-du₃-še₃). The allusion to felled trees may explain the later mention of a “wood joiner” (ġeš šu'-RI.RI) in CL 250: obv. 4 (see MOLINA 2014: 37 for comments). This worker could have joined the trees together to build the house.

Thanks to Jerome Colburn and Uri Gabbay for their comments on an earlier draft of this note.

Bibliography

- MOLINA, M., 2014, *Sargonic Cuneiform Tablets in the Real Academia de la Historia. The Carl L. Lippmann Collection*. Catálogo del Gabinete de Antigüedades. I. Antigüedades. I.1. Epigrafía, Madrid.
- KRISPIJN, Th. J. H., 2010, « Musical Ensembles in Ancient Mesopotamia », in R. J. Dumbrell, R. J. and I. L. Finkel (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference of Near Eastern Archaeomusicology (ICONEA 2008), The British Museum, London, December 4–6, 2008*, London, p. 125-150.

Daniel SÁNCHEZ MUÑOZ <danielsanmu1992@gmail.com>
Granada (SPAIN)

7) On the meaning of Elamite anthroponym Itatu — Itatu is the name of two Šimaškian kings, Itatu I the seventh Šimaškian king, son of Kintatu grandson of Eparti I (STEINKELLER 2007, 221-222), and father of Tan-Rûhûrater the eighth king; and Itatu II the tenth Šimaškian king as stated in the so called ‘Susa King List’, an Old Babylonian tablet found at Susa containing two lists of “12 kings of Awan” and “12 Šimaškian kings” (SCHEIL 1931, 2; STEINKELLER 2007, 216 n. 5 and 221; SALLABERGER & SCHRAKAMP 2015, 24). For the depiction of Itatu I on a silver *kun(-)anki* vessel bearing two Linear Elamite (LE) inscriptions, see MAHBOUBIAN (2004, 52-53) and DESSET (2018, 113 Figure 8 and 119-123).

The anthroponym Itatu may be spelled *i-ta₂-tu₃* (Cuneiform 2: 1, see DESSET *et al.* 2024) in cuneiform, or with a geminated consonant spelling, *i-ta~ta₂-at-tu~tu₃* (in the ‘Susa King List’: SCHEIL 1931, 2; EKI no. 48a § 3 and 48b § 3; SALLABERGER & SCHRAKAMP 2015, 24) in cuneiform and *i-ta-t-tu* (inscriptions Y1; and Z: 1, DESSET *et al.* 2024) in LE script. According to DESSET *et al.* (2022, 40-41) “geminated consonants are usually recorded at the beginning of the second syllable of a word or word component, this may point to a segmentation /i-tatu/, with the element /tatu/ (/taTU/), possibly encountered in the anthroponyms *ta₂-at-tu-ri* (ZADOK 1984, 43 no. 243), *ta-at-tu-a*, *ta-at-tu-u₃*, and *ta-at-tu-u₃-a* (EIW 257f.)”.

In Hinz’s opinion Itatu = helper or the like (RLA 5, 30) however, ZADOK (1984, 18 no. 82) considered that suggestion “unfounded”, and instead proposed “perhaps it could be Akkadian”. In the foregoing we put forward an Elamite interpretation of this royal name.

It is well-known that in Elamite *ta/tiya* = to put/place/deposit/set/establish (GRILLOT-SUSINI 2008, 16; ZADOK 1984, 42), and *tû* = to take/receive (GRILLOT-SUSINI 2008, 16), cf. *tu₃-h* = I received (EIW 346) and *tu₃-uš* = he/she received/took away (EIW 387: “wer es bekommt und es als Eigentum in seine Gewalt bringt” = who gets it and takes possession of it as property). We propose *tatu* to be a composite verb (see