

Zagros = P.E. Pecorella – M. Salvini, *Tra lo Zagros e l'Urmia. Ricerche storiche e archeologiche nell'Azerbaijaniano*, Roma 1984.

Mirjo SALVINI <mirjo.salvini38@gmail.com>
8, rue de Mézières, 75006 Paris (FRANCE)

88) On The Logic of Name Substitution in the Assyrian Version of *Enuma Elish* —The “Assyrian version” of *Enuma Elish* is so called because it makes five naming substitutions: It replaces the name of Marduk with that of Aššur (spelled AN.ŠÁR); those of Marduk’s parents, Ea and Damkina, consequently, though less consistently, with those of Anšar’s parents Laḫmu and Laḫamu respectively; that of Anu, Ea’s father and Marduk’s grandfather, once with Laḫmu’s; and Babylon’s with Assur’s (Baltil) throughout (LAMBERT 1997: 77–78). It should be remarked that, because the three manuscripts of the version—two from Assur and one from Nineveh—are all incomplete, it is impossible to know how consistent each name replacement actually was (for a manuscript list, LAMBERT 1997: 177).

As Lambert surmises (1997: 77–78), in what we have, Marduk seems always to be replaced with Aššur/Anšar, as is Babylon with Baltil, yet Ea/Damkina are replaced with Laḫmu/Laḫamu in certain lines (I 78, 83, 84 [KAR 117 obv. 27, rev. 5, rev. 6, respectively]) but not in another (I 60 [KAR 117 obv. 9]). Lambert construes the seeming inconsistency in parental switching as a fault of “this very amateurish revision,” one rendering it, where Tablet I is concerned, “incompletely done” (1997: 78). Yet, when the lines in question are taken in context, it seems not like a sign of amateurish incompleteness but rather of discernment. Whereas I 73, 83, and 84 are all part of the description of Marduk’s birth, and would therefore have caused a lapse in logic should Marduk’s name have been replaced with Anšar’s without also switching those of their respective parents, I 60 describes an action of Ea’s that is unrelated to Marduk, namely Ea’s “seeking out” the murderous designs of Apsû and Mummu (*ea ḫāsis mimmāma iše”â šibqīšun*, “Ea, who knows all, was seeking out their plans.” For an up-to-date edition of *Enuma Elish*, HEINRICH 2021). Replacing Ea’s name with Laḫmu’s in I 60—with the implication that it was Laḫmu, not Ea, who killed Apsû with his incantation in the following passage (I 61–69)—is not actually necessitated by the replacement of Marduk by Anšar. And indeed, the resulting sequence of events, while diverging from the original, is not in itself inconsistent: Ea creates the Apsû out of Apsû’s corpse, as in the original, and then Ea’s grandparents Laḫmu and Laḫamu bear Aššur there. Replacing Ea with Laḫmu in I 60, and thus as the magic-wielding slayer of Apsû and creator of the Apsû itself, may, moreover, have been not only unnecessary but problematic. For it may have implied an additional, and perhaps unintended, theological takeover: the transfer of the domains of magic, wisdom, and water from Ea to Laḫmu.

One may construe as similarly logical a change, in the same passage, from Anu’s name to Laḫmu’s in I 89, a line in whose original version Anu sees his newborn grandson Marduk (*īmuršūma ānu bānû abīšu*, “Anu, the creator of his father, saw him”). Lambert writes, “The replacement of Anu by Laḫmu can be justified in that Anu and Anšar are identified in some traditions, though emphatically not in *Enūma Eliš*” (1997: 78). Yet this change may be accounted for based on different reasoning, having to do not with equations between gods found in “some traditions” but the logic of the story itself. Anu is Anšar’s own son, and would therefore have needed replacing as Anšar/Aššur’s delighting grandfather. That he was replaced with Laḫmu specifically appears at first glance inconsistent, for Laḫmu is the father of Anšar and not, like Anu vis-à-vis Marduk, his grandfather. Yet this can likewise be accounted for in view of the fact that Anšar’s grandfather, and therefore Anu’s technical equivalent in this scenario, would be Apsû—who, on account of being dead and rendered a geographical location at this point, could hardly have served. One may speculate further. In “standard” manuscripts, the phrase *bānû abīšu* in I 89 is sometimes written out phonetically (e.g., *ba-nu-ú a-bi-[šú]* in HEINRICH 2021 Man. AššNA6 rev. 5 and *[b]a-n-ú a-bi-šu* in SipNB2 rev. 1) and sometimes partially logographically (*ba¹-nu-ú AD-š[u]* in KišNB1 obv. 89). In the one manuscript of the Assyrian version testifying to I 90, the line runs *i-mur-šu-ma ḏlāḫ-mu ba-nu-u AD-šú* (KAR 117 [AššNA5] rev. 11). One suspects that perhaps, underlying that spelling, lies a reanalysis of the line’s grammar: from “Anu, the creator of his father (*bānû abīšu*), saw him” into “Laḫmu, the creator (*bānû*), his father (*abīšu* [AD-šú]), saw him.” The original’s use of the literary bound form *bānû*, rather

than *bān*, would have made such a change almost seamless, involving only a switch in case from *abīšu* to *abūšu*.

These assessments, less critical than Lambert's, of the changes made in the Assyrianized version, comport with Eckart Frahm's judgment that "Given the political importance of their endeavor, it seems preferable to assume that the authors of the new text knew quite well what they were doing" (2011: 350–351). They likewise dovetail with Frahm's argument whereby Aššur's identification with his own ancestor Anšar, may, when taking into account Aššur's characterization in other sources as *bānû ramānīšu*, "The creator of himself," be seen as a sign not of amateurishness but of theological sophistication (2011: 351). Interpreted thus, the Assyrianized version of *Enuma Elish* deserves more credit than it has sometimes been given.

Bibliography

- FRAHM, E., 2011, *Babylonian and Assyrian Text Commentaries: Origins of Interpretation*, Münster.
 HEINRICH, A. C., 2021, "Poem of Creation (Enūma eliš) Chapter I. With contributions by Z. J. Földi and E. Jiménez. Translated by Anmar A. Fadhil and Benjamin R. Foster," electronic Babylonian Library. <https://doi.org/10.5282/ebli/1/2>
 LAMBERT, W. G., 1997, "The Assyrian Recension of Enūma Eliš," in H. Waetzoldt and H. Hauptmann (eds.), *Assyrien im Wandel der Zeiten: XXXIXe Rencontre assyriologique internationale, Heidelberg, 6.–10. Juli 1992*, Heidelberger Studien zum alten Orient 6, 77–79.

Eli TADMOR <eli@tadmor.us>

89) Winnowing Down the Syntactical Possibilities of a Key Assertion in the *Marduk Ordeal* —The so-called *Marduk Ordeal* (LIVINGSTONE 1989 no. 34 [*Assur Version*] and no. 35 [*Nineveh Version*]) contains a remarkable statement: *enūma eliš ša dabibūni ina pān bēl ina nisanni izammurūšūni ina muḫḫi ša šabītūni [šū]* (*Assur Version*: 34, *Nineveh Version*: 29). While its general sense seems clear, its syntax is difficult to parse and has been variously construed. Frymer-Kensky translates "Enuma Elish, which is said before Bel in Nisan: he³ sings it because he (Bel) is captive (*or*: before Bel who is captive)" (1983: 135); Livingstone, "Enūma eliš, which is recited and chanted in front of Bēl in Nisan, concerns his imprisonment" (1989: 84); Kämmerer and Metzler, "*Enūma eliš*, das im Angesicht von Bēl vorgetragen ist (i.e.: wird), singen sie darüber³, daß sie ihn ergriffen halten" (2012: 36); and Worthington, "*Enūma eliš*, which is spoken, (and which) in front of Bēl they sing to him in the month of Nisan, is about the fact that he is (*or*: the one who was) captured" (2020: 120).

One issue with the translations of Frymer-Kensky and Kämmerer and Metzler has to do with *izammurūšūni*. That verb can be understood either as ending with a plural ventive or an Assyrian subjunctive. In light of the omnipresence of Assyrian subjunctive forms in the *Marduk Ordeal*—looking at the Assur version, such forms are found in every line from obv. 1 to 68—as well as the presence of such a form (*dabibūni*) earlier in the line, the latter option seems more likely. Yet if *izammurūšūni* is indeed in the subjunctive, the verb should belong with the subordinative clause beginning with *enūma eliš ša*, "*Enuma Elish*, which," rather than begin a new clause one as it would in Frymer-Kensky's "he³ sings it" and Kämmerer and Metzler's "singens sie darüber³."

A second issue—one which, to my knowledge, has not been invoked in discussions of the line—is that translations such as "which is said before Bel in Nisan" and "das im Angesicht von Bēl vorgetragen ist" involve a verb-initial construction beginning with *dabibūni*. In most Akkadian texts, especially literary ones, this would not be a problem. Yet it would be strange for the *Marduk Ordeal*, for every other clause preserved in it is verb final. Such a problem is also found in Livingstone's "recited and chanted in front of Bēl in Nisan." And his translation is likewise contraindicated by the location of *ina nisanni* between *dabibūni* and *izammurūšūni*, which points to *ina nisanni* qualifying one verb and not the other. That being said, one could analyze *enūma eliš ša dabibūni ina pān bēl ina nisanni izammurūšūni* as "Enuma Elish, which is recited before Bēl in Nisan, (and) which they sing (before Bēl in Nisan)," ending up with the same sense as Livingstone's idiomatic "recited and chanted" though still having the problem of the unique clause-initial *dabibūni*. A further, though more minor, problem with Livingstone's translation is that one