

Prof. Scott B. Noegel
Chair, Dept. of Near Eastern Languages and Civilization
University of Washington

“Yasim-El's Sophisticated Rhetoric: A Janus Cluster in ARMT XXVI, 419, l. 10.”

First Published in:

Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires 73 (1995), 81-82.

la moindre indication que le *gn* soit situé dans une autre ville qu'Ugarit ; au contraire : tous les emplacements cultuels ici nommés (*hmn, qdš, 'ly, etc.*) se trouvent dans le palais royal ou dans ses environs. Une confirmation ultérieure nous vient du texte administratif KTU 4.219 (enregistrement de sommes d'argent payées pour des jarres de vin remises à deux temples, ceux d'Astarté et de Rasap-*gn*, à des particuliers, à la reine, etc.), duquel il ressort que le temple de Rasap-*gn* (l. 3) est bien une réalité locale (le texte a été trouvé dans la pièce 73 du Palais Royal).

Il faut encore ajouter au dossier un fragment de rituel provenant de Ras Ibn Hani (RIH 77/11, cf. TRU-I, p. 354) qui documente l'existence de *plusieurs* Rasap-*gn* : (...) *w ršp. gn. yšan...* « et les Rasap-*gn* sortiront ... », fait qui s'accorde très bien avec KTU 1.106 (où il est question de deux épithètes de Rasap, *hgb* et *mhb*) et est confirmé indirectement par KTU 1.91 : 11 (*k. t'rbn. ršpm. bt. mlk*).

En ce qui concerne la nature de ce *gn* et son étymologie, l'analyse des textes et la comparaison dans le domaine sémitique (cf. déjà WUS n. 671, p. 67 ; voir ensuite DRS 3, p. 147, s.v. GN'/W/Y/N ; Jongeling-Hoftijzer, DNWSI, I, ss. vv. *gn* et *gnh*, p. 227 ss.) nous oriente sans aucun doute vers la signification de « jardin » ou, si l'on veut, « champ », « potager », sens qui ressort aussi clairement de la documentation ugaritique elle-même (cf. KTU 1.5 VI 21 et 1.6 I 4, où le mot se trouve en parallèle avec *'mq* « vallée », tous les deux employés avec les verbes *lḥ // hrḥ* « fendre », « labourer » : cf. L.L. Grabbe, UF 14, 1982, 89-92).

Ce « jardin » d'Ugarit est à mettre en relation avec des installations analogues documentées peut-être à Mari (*rapiqātum*, Ph. Talon, AIPHOS 22, 1978, 63, mais cf. A. Tsukimoto, AOAT 216, 1985, 61-62 ; voir aussi (?) ARM XII 267, 5) et à Ebla-même (*giš-kiri*₆ dans les textes publiés par G. Pettinato, OA 18, 1976 ; *giš-nu-kiri*₆ dans ARET I, 13, 22 et MEE 10, 2, r. V 5-11, ici en rapport avec Enki ; peut-être *mā-ra-sum* dans P. Fronzaroli, ARET XI, *passim* : les rapports entre ces mots sont à étudier davantage), où elles étaient le siège d'importantes cérémonies centrées sur le culte des rois défunts et d'autres divinités chthoniennes (cf. P. Xella, ds HSAO 2, 1988, p. 356). D'autre part, la nuance sémantique qui fait de ces « jardins » en même temps des « cimetières » a une longue histoire (G. del Olmo Lete, SEL 3, 1986, 62 ss.) qui arrive jusqu'au monde grec (cf. A. Motte, Prairies et jardins de la Grèce antique, Bruxelles 1973, 241 et *passim*), comme cela est confirmé aussi par les autres langues sémitiques (voir surtout éth. [amh.], s.ar. et arabe).

Tout bien pesé, il semble raisonnable d'abandonner l'idée que Gunu(m) était une ville syrienne et d'enregistrer une nouvelle attestation du sémitique **gann-* « jardin » à Ebla, un endroit particulièrement lié – comme d'ailleurs à Ugarit – au culte du dieu Rasap et à l'au-delà.

Paolo XELLA (28-09-95)
Via Valle Scivina 37
I-00141 ROMA, ITALIE

90) Yasim-El's Sophisticated Rhetoric : A Janus Cluster in ARMT XXVI, 419, l. 10' – Jean-Georges Heintz recently drew attention to the presence of a « Janus parallelism » in letter A.2203 from Mari¹. Janus parallelism describes a literary device in which a lexeme parallels in a polysemous manner both that which precedes it and that which follows. Though this type of word play has been known for some time in the Hebrew Bible, it is a recent discovery in Akkadian literature². Nevertheless, the number of cuneiform exemplars continues to rise³.

Heintz's observation was that Yasim-El, the author of the Mari missive, employed the term *nārum* (l. 15') ambiguously, both as « stele » and as « water course⁴ ». As the former, *nārum* faces back to the mention of the clearing of a well in lines 11'-12', and as the latter, it looks ahead to the erection of a commemorative stele in line 19'.

The sophisticated language of this extraordinary letter suggests that we look at it again for its cleverness. In so doing, two additional word plays, also of the Janus type, appear in lines 7'-13'. Here we read : *a-na ša-bi-im ša be-lí-ia ša a-sa-ri-iš wa-aš-bu a-du-ur-ma i-na la mu-du-ut A-tam-ri-im u ir-meš-šu al-li-ik-ma i-na ša-bi-im ša be-lí-ia ší-ri-im-tam aš-ku-un-ma 8 gi-ḥá bu-ur-í[a]-am ep-[r]e-[e-ma] me-e ú-še-li-ma a-na a-tam-ri-im me-e ú-ṣe-ḥi-ma a-tam-rum ma-di-iš iḥ-du* which Fr. Joannès translates :

« Pour l'armée de mon Seigneur qui est installée là-bas, j'ai eu des craintes et, (sans prendre le temps) d'en informer Atamrum et ses serviteurs, j'y suis allé ; dans l'armée de mon Seigneur, j'ai introduit l'émulation et [j'ai ouvert] un pu[is] de 8 cannes de profondeur ; j'ai fait montrer l'eau et j'ai approvisionné Atamrum en eau, de sorte qu'Atamrum s'est beaucoup réjoui⁵. »

Of note here is *ší-ri-im-tam* in l. 10'. While on the one hand we can read it with Joannès as a « cutting tool » used for clearing debris from wells⁶, its appearance with *šabim* « army » in a military context in the Mari letter A.4627 suggests that we interpret *širimtam* as « (military) endeavor, effort⁷ ». That letter reads as follows : *Ha-am-mu-ra-bi ú A-tam-rum bi-ri-šu-nu iš-ia-lu-ma i-na ša-bi-šu-nu ṭa-ra-di-im ma-di-iš ší-ri-im-tam ir-šu-ú* « Hammurapi and Atamrum have consulted amongst themselves and they have made a rushed effort to send their armies ». Also bolstering this reading is the frequent use of *šarāmu* « endeavor, desire » with *kašādu* « conquer⁸ ».

Moreover, the term *šabim* (l.10), though clearly meaning « army » in this context, also can mean « waterwork, irrigation » (from *šabū*), especially when used with *šakānu* (as it is here), and is known to mean

this elsewhere in the Mari corpus⁹. Thus, the phrase *i-na ſa-bi-im ſa be-li-ia ſi-ri-im-tam aš-ku-un-ma* permits several interpretations:

- « I have set my (military) endeavor for the army of my Lord. »
- « I have set my endeavor to the waterworks of my Lord. »
- « I have set (to work) the cutting tool for the army of my Lord. »
- « I have set (to work) the cutting tool to the waterworks of my Lord. »

Here both polysemes also function as Janus parallelisms. As « army », the term *ſabim* reminds us of Atamrum's servants, i.e., his military personnel, and the verb *alāku* « go (on a campaign) » in l. 9'. As « waterwork », it directs our attention ahead to the clearing of the well in l. 11'. Likewise, as « (military) endeavor, effort », *ſarimtum* faces back to *ſabim* (as « army »), and as « cutting tool », it anticipates the *burtum* « well » in l. 11'. Moreover, the Janus use of *ſabim* and *ſarimtum* in tandem (and also that of *nārum!*) is representative of what I have called a « Janus Parallel Cluster » in a previous issue of this journal¹⁰.

Such devices illustrate the rhetorical sophistication of Yašim-El. Doubtless, a literary examination of other Mari letters will yield similar insights into the literary craftiness of their authors.

1. Jean-Georges Heintz, « Myth(olog)èmes d'époque amorrite et amphibologie en ARMT XXVI, 419, ll. 3'-21' ? », *NABU* 1994/68.

2. Scott B. Noegel, « A Janus Parallelism in the Gilgamesh Flood Story », *ASJ* 13 (1991), 419-421; « An Asymmetrical Janus Parallelism in the Gilgamesh Flood Story », *ASJ* 16 (1994), 306-308.

3. For a comprehensive catalogue and examination of Janus Parallelism in biblical and Akkadian literature see Scott B. Noegel, *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job and Its Literary Significance, with Excurses on the Device in Extra-Jobian and Other Ancient Near Eastern Literature* (Ph.D. Dissertation; Cornell University; Ithaca, NY, 1995; Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1995) (= *JSOT Supplement Series* (in press)).

4. Francis Joannès, *Archives Épistolaires de Mari I/2*, Archives Royales de Mari XXVI (Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1988), p. 308, n. e.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 307.

6. CAD S, 315, s.v. *sirimtu*; AHw 1028, s.v. *sarāmu*.

7. CAD S 208, s.v. *širmu*; AHw 1092, s.v. *šermum*.

8. CAD S 101-102, s.v. *šarāmu*; AHw 1083, s.v. *šarāmu*

9. CAD S 45, s.v. *šabū*; AHw 1073, s.v. *šabū* 1082, s.v. *šabū*

10. Scott B. Noegel, « Janus Parallelism Clusters in Akkadian Literature », *NABU* 1995/71.

Scott B. NOEGEL (29-09-95)
Jackson School of International Studies
Box 35360, University of Washington,
SEATTLE, WA 98195-3650, USA

91) The Location of Kuwara – In *ASJ* 17, pp. 275-81, I examined the question of a temple of Ninhursag, which, according to an original inscription¹, was built by Manishtushu « in H.A.A^{ki} ». As I argued, this toponym is none other than the city of Kuwara. I also speculated that the temple in question is possibly the same as Nutur, the temple of Ninhursag at the site of Tell 'Ubaid. In conclusion, I wrote: « If Nutur was located in the city of Kuwara, then Kuwara is Tell 'Ubaid. Alternatively, if Nutur was a separate sacred district, located outside of Kuwara, then Tell 'Ubaid is Nutur and Kuwara is one of the neighbouring sites ».

Since the publication of that article, I have become aware of the existence of a datum that has important bearing on the location of Kuwara. The datum in question is UET 1 33 (= U.6336), an inscription of Ur-Namma commemorating the building of a temple of Ninsun². This inscription is found on a diorite door-socket, which, as stated by C. J. Gadd, came from « the site called Radhibah, near Ur³ ».

The information that there existed an Ur III temple of Ninsun in « Radhibah » is of obvious significance for the question of Kuwara. The reason is that, first, Ninsun is known to have had a temple in Kuwara during that period⁴. Second, it appears that, at least in Ur III times, the main deity of Kuwara was actually Ninsun, and not Asaluhi, who is usually associated with Kuwara in later (primarily magical) sources. This is demonstrated by the Drehem records of offerings to the gods of Kuwara, in which Ninsun is always listed before Asaluhi⁵.

Since it is theoretically possible that Ninsun was worshipped not only in Kuwara but also in a number of other satellites of Ur, the case for « Radhibah » being the site of Kuwara would not have been overwhelming if not for the location of the former place. It is quite certain that Gadd's « Radhibah⁶ » is identical with either Rejibah Jinub or Rejibah Shamal, the twin tells situated almost exactly halfway between Ur and Eridu⁷, that is precisely where Kuwara ought to be sought according to the testimony on ancient sources⁸.

In his description of Rejibah Jinub and Rejibah Shamal, H. T. Wright notes the presence of remains dating to the 'Ubaid?, Uruk?, Jemdet Nasr, Early Dynastic, and Late Larsa periods⁹. Although he makes no mention of Ur III evidence at either site, such evidence undoubtedly had been there, as is shown by the following statement of C. L. Woolley's: « ... Reijibeh, a site which I had visited several times, some six miles