

Colloque international "Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes"

E. V. H. Pirart – Universitat de Barcelona

L'Institut Interuniversitaire d'Études du Proche Orient Ancien, avec l'aide du Ministère espagnol de l'Éducation et de la Science, de la Généralité de Catalogne et de l'Université de Barcelone, a réuni au *Palau Maricel* de Sitges, les 4 et 5 mai 1993, treize spécialistes de différents pays autour des difficultés que présente la syntaxe des dialectes indo-iraniens les plus anciens.

La Collection du Savoir des Strophes (*Rgvedasamhitā*), monument le plus archaïque de la littérature indienne, et l'Avesta, livre sacré de l'Iran ancien, ont été le terrain de recherches que la plupart des communications ont reflétées. Ces contributions à l'avancement des connaissances de la syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes paraîtront dans les actes de ce *Colloque international* et formeront un volume de la série *Aula Orientalis-Supplementa*. Ce sont, par ordre alphabétique des auteurs, les suivantes:

George DUNKEL (Universität Zürich), *Mono- and Disyllabic ā in the R̥gveda*.

José Luis GARCÍA RAMÓN (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid), *Infinitivos y abstractos verbales en indoiranio: las formaciones en -(C)ani en R̥g-Veda*.

Almut HINTZE (Universität Berlin), *Parataxis and Hypotaxis in the Avesta*.

Stephanie W. JAMISON (Harvard University), *Syntactic Constraints on Morphological Change: The Vedic Imperatives bodhī, dehī, and dhehī*.

Jean KELLENS (Université de Liège), *Les fonctions du génitif en vieil-avestique*.

Antonio PANAINO (Università di Bologna), *Considerations on the 'mixed fractions' in Avestan*.

Georges-Jean PINAULT (Université de Lille), *Le substantif épithète dans la langue de la R̥k-Samhitā*.

Eric PIRART (Universitat de Barcelona), *Avestique hīm*.

Prods Oktor SKJÆRVØ (Harvard University), *On the Middle Persian Imperfect*.

Jean-Marie VERPOORTEN (Université de Liège), *The double negation in the earliest Upaniṣads and in the ancient philosophical Bhāṣya*.

Brent VINE (Princeton University), *On the Expression of Reflexive Possession in the Rig-Veda: RV svā-*.

Calvert WATKINS (Harvard University), *'Throng-lord of throngs': an Indo-Iranian stylistic figure*.

Les discussions ont révélé des divergences d'opinions fort intéressantes, principalement concernant le recours à la métrique. À n'en pas douter, elles seront le moteur de futurs travaux.

The divine panoply (KTU 1.65: 12-14)

G. del Olmo Lete – Universidad de Barcelona

In the recently published Mari text A.1968: 2'-4' *Addu of Halab* says to the King Zimri-Lim through his "answerer" (*āpilum*): "the weapons with which I fought *Têmtum* I have given them to you" (giš-tukul-[meš] *ša it-ti te-em-tim am-ta-aḥ-sū ad-di-na-ak-kum*)¹. This immediately recalls *Ba'lu's* fight against *Yammu*, described in Ugaritic text KTU 1.2 IV 11ss, as pointed out by the editor of the Mari Text. There, *Ba'lu* is provided twice by *Kôtaru* with a magical weapon (*smd*) that eventually enables him to overcome his enemy. Moreover, another Mari text, A.1858:5-10, informs the same king that: "the weapons of *Addu of Halab* arrived here and are kept by me in Dagan's temple" (giš-tukul-ḥá *ša* ⁴IM *ša ḥa-la-ab*^[ki] *ik-šu-du-nim-m[a] i-na é* ⁴*da-gan i-na ter-qa*^[ki] *ka-le-ek-šu-nu-ti*). It is then plain that the mythical representation has become a ritual action related to the royal liturgy, in connexion perhaps with the king's enthronement, taking into account the mention of "anointing" that follows in the first text, A.1968:4'-5': "with the oil of my victory I have anointed you" (*i ša nam-ri-ri-ti-ta ap-šu-úš-ka-ma*)². But we know nothing of this liturgy. Nevertheless, it is clear that the divine panoply was kept in the sanctuary, and the king could also make use of it in special ceremonies (perhaps in times of trouble?).

Divine weapons are well known in the liturgy of the Ancient Near East³ and they have also been found in Ugarit⁴. Of special interest in this regard are the repeated references to the "divine weapon" (giš.tukul dingir.meš) and more precisely to the "divine axe" (*ḥa-si-in-nu* dingir.meš) that closes the procession in several Emar liturgies⁵.

An attempt has been made to identify such weapons in the Ugaritic myth⁶. The quoted text speaks only of *smd(m)*, usually translated by "club". This is paralleled by the literary *hapax ktp* in KTU 1.6 V 1ss that could mean a kind of "sword" (Fr. *harpè*). Etymology is in both cases rather doubtful.

But we know of other mythical accounts that speak of *Ba'lu's* weapon *par excellence*, lightning/-

1. Cf. J.-M. Durand, "Le mythologème du combat entre le dieu de l'orage et la mer en Mésopotamie", *M.A.R.I.* 7 (1993) 45.

2. The mention of Ps. 110:2 is perhaps pertinent in this connexion: "your strong mace (sceptre) will the Lord send (extend)-from Zion to overcome your enemies in battle"; cf. A. González, *El libro de los Salmos. Introducción, versión y comentario*, Barcelona 1966, 499 ("El centro del poder te lo envía el Señor desde Sión"); L.C. Allen, *Psalms 101-150* (Word Biblical Commentary), Waco, TE 1983, pp. 79ss, 86s ("with the royal mace of v 2 he (God) shatters their (king's enemies) power"); H.-J. Kraus, *Psalmen II* (BKAT XV), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1966³, pp. 752ss ("zu den Insignien des Inthronisierten gehört das Zcepter, das ursprünglich wohl magische Bedeutung hatte"); M. Dahood, *Psalms III 101-150* (The Anchor Bible 17A), Garden City, NY 1970, pp. 112ss ("He has forged your victorious mace"; this new meaning of Hb. *šlh* is unnecessary). – Was there in ancient Juda a handing over of the divine weapon/sceptre, kept in the Temple, to the new king on his accession to the throne (*pace* González)? Yahweh's normal weapon, however, seems to be the 'sword' (cf. *HAL* 336). The theme is overlooked by P. D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*, Cambridge, Mass 1975.

3. Cf. E. Salonen, *Die Waffen der alten Mesopotamier. Eine lexikalische und kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Helsinki 1965, pp. 63-66 ("Götterwaffen"). It seems that a specific cult to the "divine spear" (Akk. ⁴*sappum*) of Ishtar from Tubā also existed in Mari; cf. A. Catagnoti, "Le royaume de Tubā et ses cultes", in J. M. Durand, ed., *Florilegium marianum. Recueil d'études en l'honneur de Michel Fleury*, Paris 1992, pp. 25-27; id., "Du nouveau sur la 'lance sacrée'", *N.A.B.U.* 1992/2, n.° 61.

4. Cf. C.F.A. Schaeffer, *Ugaritica III*, Paris 1956, pp. 251ff.; *Da Ebla a Damasco. Diecimila anni di archeologia in Siria*, Milano 1985, p. 245, 'ascia ceremoniale', along with a model of 'harpè' (247) and of 'ascia fenestrata' and its casting mould from Ebla (pp. 233ff).

5. Cf. D. Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d'Aštata. Emar VI/3*, Paris 1986, pp. 326ff. (e. g., text 369:7, 29, 45, 65-66); D. E. Fleming, *The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar. A Window on Ancient Syrian Religion*, Atlanta, GE 1992, p. 50, n. 7.

6. Cf. P. Bordreuil – D. Pardee, "Le combat de *Ba'lu* avec *Yammu* d'après les textes ougaritiques", *M.A.R.I.* 7, 1993, 67s.

thunderbolt, literarily and iconographically represented as a “spear” (*mrh*)⁷, as it is expressly named in KTU 1.6 I 51 the weapon with which he faces any main enemy. It may also have been fashioned by *Kôtaru* too (KTU 1.1 III 25-30)⁸ and was kept by *Ba^clu* in his holy abode as his most precious and mysterious possession (KTU 1.3 III 20-31); its shape is that of a “spear”: ‘head’ and ‘shaft’, ‘stone’ and ‘tree’ (‘cedar’; cf. KTU 1.4 VII 41). In the ‘stèle du Baal au foudre’, it appears consequently as a flourishing spear, symbolizing the two aspects: power and fertility. *Ba^clu* brandishes it against all his enemies who are afraid of it (KTU 1.4 VII 38-41). The iconography places it in his hand (stele, ‘smiting god’ statuettes and seals). The symbolic shape of lightning is unmistakably that of a “spear, lance” (*mrh*).

The second Mari text quoted clearly supposes the fashioning of the divine weapons as cultic objects, as archaeology also certifies in connexion with ceremonial “axes”, for instance⁹. Now, a mention of this divine panoply (“spear”, “axe” and “club”) appears to be found in the Ugaritic cultic text KTU 1.65: 12-14:

<i>bmrh il</i>	In/by the divine spear!
<i>bnit il</i>	In/by the divine axe!
<i>bšmd il</i>	In/by the divine club! ¹⁰

In this connexion I have commented: “In these cases *il* may be a generic determinative related to the immediately previous god whose weapons are celebrated in mythology”¹¹. This god is *Ba^clu*, under the triple invocation:

<i>il hš il add</i>	The god of divine (Mount) <i>Hš</i> , <i>Adadu</i> ¹² !
<i>b^cl špn</i>	<i>Ba^clu</i> of <i>Šapānu</i> !
[b] ^c l ugrt	<i>Ba^clu</i> of Ugarit!

If the text is understood in this way, it is testimony to the cultic invocation of the divine (*Ba^clu*’s) panoply and to its apparent presence in the sanctuary. The liturgy gives an objective and complete enumeration of the panoply’s elements, gathering together the scattered data that mythology mentions in a poetic form. We can then draw up this partial lexical field, leaving aside its etymological justification, looking only at the literary texts from Ugarit:

- *mrh*, “spear, lance, javelin”; tree-like symbol of lightning/thunderbolt, according to mythology, created (by *Kôtaru*?) and kept in *Šapānu*; after (and perhaps before) his victory over *Yammu*, *Ba^clu*’s definitive weapon.
- *šmd*, “club, mace”; weapon given by *Kôtaru* to *Ba^clu* to overcome *Yammu*; in the ‘stèle du Baal au foudre’, representation of *Ba^clu*’s victory over Chaos/*Yammu*, it appears in his hands along with the former.

7. Cf. C. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, Roma 1965, n. 1475.

8. Cf. G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaán según la liturgia de Ugarit*, Madrid 1981, p. 104.

9. Interesting in this connexion would be the unfortunately damaged text 673 from Emar: BE giš.tukul... BE giš.tukul... BE giš.tukul...; cf. D. Arnaud, *Recherches au pays d’Aštata. Emar VI/4*, Paris 1987, p. 298.

10. Cf. G. del Olmo Lete, *La religión cananea según la liturgia de Ugarit*, Barcelona 1992, pp. 229-231, n. 41 (bibliografía). For a similar panoply assigned to Anat cf. KTU 1.3 III 18 (c^s, c^{bs}); b. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas...*, p. 184.

11. Cf. Del Olmo Lete, *La religión cananea...*; p. 229, n. 25. The most obvious use of the adjectival value of *il* is to be found in KTU 1.4 I 30ff.: *kt il, kh^t il, hdm il, n^cl il, llm il, š^c il*.

12. We should emend in this way the slightly different version proposed *ibid.*, p. 229, n. 23. The rhythm of the text is based on enumerations of three members: *il/trmn wšnm/il watrt // bn il/dr bn il/mpht bn il // hn iln/nšbt il/šlm il // il hš il add/b^cl špn/b^cl ugrt // mrh il/nit il/šmd il // dpn il/šrp il/knt il*. The last element (*gdyn il*) may go with the lost final line as the last utterance of confidence: “In/by the divine (*Ilu*’s) good will we trust/let us be saved!”, or the like.

- *nit*, "axe"¹³; archaeologically well attested and an alternative weapon to the previous one in the statuettes of the smiting god¹⁴.
 - *ktp*, "sword, 'harpè'"; a literary word of seemingly foreign origin¹⁵, not used apparently in large-scale confrontations by the smiting gods/chieftains as a main weapon, according to myth¹⁶, although present also in carvings¹⁷.
 - *hpb*, "sword, knife, sickle"¹⁸; a general cutting instrument of many uses, culinary and agricultural as well as warlike, used by gods and men. May be considered, like the previous one, a 'common' weapon, and is therefore not included in the divine panoply.
 - *qšt*, "bow"; empirical and divine-magic weapon, but never assigned to *Ba^hlu*; frequent in glyptic (hunting scenes).
- Of course, the field of war implements, including war chariots, is wider at Ugarit¹⁸.

13. Cf. Akkadian of Ugarit: *ni-it* (RS 20.235:13), *ni-i-tu qâtê^mês* (RS 19.23:1, 5; 19.135:2); J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica V*, Paris 1968, p. 178, n. 8; id., *Le palais royal d'Ugarit VI*, Paris 1970, pp. 110ff., taken by *AHw* 798 ("eine Waffe?"); and *CAD N/II* 300 ("a bronze tool"). It may be etymologically related either to Akk. *nātu*, "handle" or more likely to Eg. *nit*. "wrong-doing"; *ni*, "throw down (an enemy)"; cf. R. O. Falkner, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, Oxford 1981, p. 125; cf. W. G. E. Watson, *SEL* 6 (1989) 49-50. On the other hand, I cannot follow either J. Sanmartín, *AuOr* 5 (1987) 150, who distinguishes two *nit*: "azada" and "tiara", on the basis of Eg. *nwt* and *nt* respectively, or the Arabic etymology put forward by J. Greenfield, *JCS* 21 (1967) 93, which is vague and in my opinion farfetched. For other proposals see Healey, *UF* 15 (1983) 49; Dietrich-Loretz, *BO* 33 (1966) 1331 (ploughshare); Gray, *SVT* 15 (1966) 183, n. 5 ("transcendence"); K. Aartun, *WO* 4 (1967-1968) 292 ("Granscheit"). On the other hand, the Ugaritic hapax *nat* (KTU 1.127:4, 10) could be understood as a pl. of *nit* ("the sacrifice of the spears" [?]), on the pattern *riš/raš(m/t)*, *mit/mat*. For the reconstruction of an hypothetical *qrđm*, "axe", see N. Wyatt, *UF* 22 (1990) 459-65.

14. Cf. O. Negbi, *Canaanite Gods in Metal*, Tel Aviv 1976 (fig. 179, 1317, among others); and more in general for *Adad/Ba^hlu*'s armory in the Ancient Near East, A. Vane, *L'iconographie du dieu de l'orage dans le Proche-Orient ancien jusqu'au VII^e siècle avant J.-C.* Paris 1965.

15. Either Egyptian or Akkadian: the Arabic isogloss is probably culturally and semantically secondary. For a discussion of its etymology see P. Bordreuil-D. Pardee, *M.A.R.I.* 7, 1993, 70.

16. This appears clear from KTU 1.6 V 1ff., where *Ba^hlu* employs a *ktp* to deal swiftly with the great (*rbm*) gods, a *smd* to account for those as strong as *Yammu*, in keeping with the mythological account; the other small ones (*sgrm*) he just kicks away, without the use of any weapon; cf. G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaán*, p. 141, 231. We do not accept in this connexion the reading *šhr mt* that yields no sense in the context (*msh*); cf. P. D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior*, pp. 37f.; M. Yon, "Šhr mt, la chaleur de Mot", *UF* 21 (1989) 464; P. Bordreuil - D. Pardee, *M.A.R.I.* 7, 1993, 65. The combat with *Môtu* is described in the following column, when this god "falls down" under *Ba^hlu*'s pressure (KTU 1.6 VI 21).

17. Cf. O. Negbi, *Canaanite Gods in Metal*, figs. 1311, 1317 (fastened to the belt); it appears frequently in glyptic.

18. For the manufacture of weapons in Ugarit cf. C.F.A. Schaeffer, *Ugaritica III*, Paris 1956, pp. 251ff.; M.-J. Chavane, *RSOu III* (1987), pp. 357-367; O. Loretz, *Ugarit und die Bibel*, Darmstadt 1990, pp. 227-28. Other instruments, like *hṭ* and *mṭ*, are not exactly weapons.

The Reading of Uru-KA-gi-na Again

W. G. Lambert - University of Birmingham

In honour of Miguel Civil
Más vale tarde que nunca

In *AuOr* 9 (1991) 77-79 D.O. Edzard argued for Irikagina as the correct reading of the Sumerian name for which the present writer in *Or* 39 (1970) 419 had proposed Uru'inimgina. There are four quite separate issues: (i) the history of the discussion, (ii) uru or iri/eri/ere (we shall use iri henceforth without allusion to eri/ere), (iii) questions of name-type, and (iv) inim or ka. They will be dealt with in turn.

- *nit*, "axe"¹³; archaeologically well attested and an alternative weapon to the previous one in the statuettes of the smiting god¹⁴.
 - *ktp*, "sword, 'harpè'"; a literary word of seemingly foreign origin¹⁵, not used apparently in large-scale confrontations by the the smiting gods/chieftains as a main weapon, according to myth¹⁶; although present also in carvings¹⁷.
 - *hrb*, "sword, knife, sickle"¹⁸; a general cutting instrument of many uses, culinary and agricultural as well as warlike, used by gods and men. May be considered, like the previous one, a 'common' weapon, and is therefore not included in the divine panoply.
 - *qšt*, "bow"; empirical and divine-magic weapon, but never assigned to *Ba'lu*; frequent in glyptic (hunting scenes).
- Of course, the field of war implements, including war chariots, is wider at Ugarit¹⁸.

13. Cf. Akkadian of Ugarit: *ni-it* (RS 20.235:13), *ni-i-tu qātē*^{mēs} (RS 19.23:1, 5; 19.135:2); J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica V*, Paris 1968, p. 178, n. 8; id., *Le palais royal d'Ugarit VI*, Paris 1970, pp. 110ff., taken by *AHw* 798 ("eine Waffe?"); and *CAD N/II* 300 ("a bronze tool"). It may be etymologically related either to Akk. *nātu*, "handle" or more likely to Eg. *nit*. "wrong-doing"; *ni*, "throw down (an enemy)"; cf. R. O. Falkner, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, Oxford 1981, p. 125; cf. W. G. E. Watson, *SEL* 6 (1989) 49-50. On the other hand, I cannot follow either J. Sanmartín, *AuOr* 5 (1987) 150, who distinguishes two *nit*: "azada" and "tiara", on the basis of Eg. *nwt* and *nt* respectively, or the Arabic etymology put forward by J. Greenfield, *JCS* 21 (1967) 93, which is vague and in my opinion farfetched. For other proposals see Healey, *UF* 15 (1983) 49; Dietrich-Loretz, *BO* 33 (1966) 1331 (plough-share); Gray, *SVT* 15 (1966) 183, n. 5 ("transcendence"); K. Aartun, *WO* 4 (1967-1968) 292 ("Granscheit"). On the other hand, the Ugaritic *hapax nat* (KTU 1.127:4, 10) could be understood as a pl. of *nit* ("the sacrifice of the spears" [?]), on the pattern *riš/raš(m/t)*, *mit/mat*. For the reconstruction of an hypothetical *qrđm*, "axe", see N. Wyatt, *UF* 22 (1990) 459-65.

14. Cf. O. Negbi, *Canaanite Gods in Metal*, Tel Aviv 1976 (fig. 179, 1317, among others); and more in general for *Adad/Ba'lu*'s armory in the Ancient Near East, A. Vane, *L'iconographie du dieu de l'orage dans le Proche-Orient ancien jusqu'au VII^e siècle avant J.-C.* Paris 1965.

15. Either Egyptian or Akkadian: the Arabic isogloss is probably culturally and semantically secondary. For a discussion of its etymology see P. Bordreuil-D. Pardee, *M.A.R.I.* 7, 1993, 70.

16. This appears clear from KTU 1.6 V 1ff., where *Ba'lu* employs a *ktp* to deal swiftly with the great (*rđm*) gods, a *šmd* to account for those as strong as *Yammu*, in keeping with the mythological account; the other small ones (*šgrm*) he just kicks away, without the use of any weapon; cf. G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaán*, p. 141, 231. We do not accept in this connexion the reading *šhr mt* that yields no sense in the context (*msh*); cf. P. D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior*, pp. 37f.; M. Yon, "*Šhr mt*, la chaleur de Mot", *UF* 21 (1989) 464; P. Bordreuil - D. Pardee, *M.A.R.I.* 7, 1993, 65. The combat with *Môtu* is described in the following column, when this god "falls down" under *Ba'lu*'s pressure (KTU 1.6 VI 21).

17. Cf. O. Negbi, *Canaanite Gods in Metal*, figs. 1311, 1317 (fastened to the belt); it appears frequently in glyptic.

18. For the manufacture of weapons in Ugarit cf. C.F.A. Schaeffer, *Ugaritica III*, Paris 1956, pp. 251ff.; M.-J. Chavane, *RSOu III* (1987), pp. 357-367; O. Loretz, *Ugarit und die Bibel*, Darmstadt 1990, pp. 227-28. Other instruments, like *hr* and *mt*, are not exactly weapons.

The Reading of Uru-KA-gi-na Again

W. G. Lambert - University of Birmingham

In honour of Miguel Civil
Más vale tarde que nunca

In *AuOr* 9 (1991) 77-79 D.O. Edzard argued for Irikagina as the correct reading of the Sumerian name for which the present writer in *Or* 39 (1970) 419 had proposed Uru'inimgina. There are four quite separate issues: (i) the history of the discussion, (ii) uru or iri/eri/ere (we shall use iri henceforth without allusion to eri/ere), (iii) questions of name-type, and (iv) inim or ka. They will be dealt with in turn.

(i)

Edzard's statement "las man bis 1970 Uru-ka-gi-na", and that afterwards some following me read Uru'inimgina or Uru-KA-gi-na, is incorrect. A. Falkenstein in his *Die neusumerischen Gerichtsurkunden*. Munich, 1956-57, wrote "Urukagina" in German contexts, but uru-KA-gi-na in transliteration, see *Dritter Teil* p. 80. Edzard himself in *Sumerische Rechtsurkunden des III. Jahrtausends*. Munich, 1968, no. 32a B+C ii 4 similarly wrote [ur]u-KA-gi-na. Thus I can claim no merit for having first raised doubts about the correct reading of KA in this name.

(ii)

Edzard argues that "in older Sumerian" "city" was iri not uru, so for the ruler of Lagaš Iri- is correct. In support of this proposition he notes that Proto-Ea gives i-ri alone as the gloss for URU, Syllabary A 71 gives e-ri, while Syllabary B gives ú-ru. Then the Ebla and Old Akkadian phonetic value of URU, *ri*, is obviously derived from iri, not uru. Hence he concludes, for an ED ruler of Lagaš only Iri- is acceptable.

There is an unstated and questionable assumption in this reasoning, that there was only one pronunciation of Sumerian words at any given time. He assumes that the sign URU was everywhere pronounced iri from ED to OB times, and in post-OB times it became uru. The present writer assumes that there were dialectal differences between different Sumerian-speaking cities, though evidence is unlikely to be found often because logograms were used for most nominal and verbal roots and so the actual pronunciation is concealed. For "city" it is well known that the Emesal dialect writes URU × UD from OB times, and lists gloss this uru. Edzard declines to investigate the use of this úru in non-Emesal contexts. It is well known and generally accepted that the scribal tradition of main dialect and Emesal is not the whole truth. In any case the fact is that the oldest gloss for URU is Old Babylonian and from Nippur, so its validity for ED Lagaš is open to question. Thus Edzard's case rests in fact on the syllabic value *ri* of the third-millennium Semitic world.

I.J. Gelb in *MAD II*² (1961) p. 53 cited from Uru'inimgina's own inscription ^dza-za-URU (A. Steible, *FAS V/1 Ukg 1 ii 11*) as ^dza-za-ru₉. Edzard dismisses this by arguing that ^dza-za-*ri* is equally possible, but this is wrong. Gelb himself refers to this god as Zazaru, and the evidence consists of: ^dza-za-ru in Ur-Ningirsu 1.6 i 7 (H. Steible, *FAS IX/1 p. 128*), Gudea (Cylinder B xi 4), and "The Rulers of Lagaš" (E. Sollberger, *JCS 21* (1967) 282-184). The same god is written ^dza-az-rù/rum in an OB fragment of a Sumerian litany from Kish (De Genouillac, *PRAK II C 56 5*). Though Ur-Ningirsu is later than Uru'inimgina, most scholars will consider this evidence from Lagaš itself as stronger evidence than the value *ri* from the contemporary Semitic world. So for the Lagaš ruler Uru- is more likely than Iri-.

(iii)

In 1970 the present writer did not argue that Uru'inimgina and Lugalningina belonged to the same name-type since the matter seemed beyond question. Edzard now argues that though "Lord of the reliable word" is a complete, meaningful name, "City of the reliable word" is not. This denial derives from a modern European understanding, not on study of ancient thought. The present writer's opinion, from before 1970 in fact, is that in such Sumerian (and Babylonian) names "city" is a kind of hypostasis for the patron deity of the city:

"Hymns to temples and cities were a genre of Sumerian and Babylonian literature, and there is clear proof that the divinity of the deity was seen to have spread to temple, city and accoutrements" (W.G. Lambert, *RHR 207* [1990] 128).

For personal names Akkadian offers more evidence than Sumerian, and the meanings in Akkadian are more sure. So B. Landsberger in J.J. Stamm's *Die akkadische Namengebung* (MVAG 44 [1939]) 86 tried to take some Akkadian personal names containing a city name or *āhu* in a modern sense, but he had to admit

that there was no difference in meaning between *Pān-Kēš-lūmur* "Let me see the face of Kēš" and *Pān-Marduk-lūmur* "Let me see the face of Marduk". The former certainly alludes to the Mother Goddess, patron of the city of Kēš, not simply to the fabric of the city. On pp. 84-85 many examples are given, from which we shall quote one type alone: *Mannu-kī(ma)-Arba'il/Ḫarrān/Ninua/Uruk*, "Who is like Arba'il/Ḫarrān/Nineveh/Uruk?" The use of the personal "Who?" proves that the cities named were not expressions in this context of the buildings and streets, but of the patron god, and this type of name with a divine name is common in both Akkadian and Sumerian, e.g. *Mannu-kī-Ištar*, or a-ba-^den-lil-gim. In this light the Ur III names *lugal-ma-dùg* "the lord has done good things for me" and *uru-mu-ma-dùg* "my city has done good things for me" (examples in H. Limet, *L'Anthroponymie sumérienne*) are identical in reference. The lord in the first is a divine lord, the city in the second alludes to the patron deity of the city. Similarly the ED personal name from Lagaš (examples in V. V. Struve, *op. cit.*) *uru-mu-a-na-ak* "What have I done to my city?" parallels the stock phrase in Sumerian prayers, e.g. *gá-e dingir-mu a-na i-na-ak* "What have I done to my god?" (*JNES* 33 (1974) 291 1). Thus *Uru-KA-gi-na* and *Lugal-KA-gi-na* are identical in reference, and so, contrary to Edzard's arguments, a gloss on the one is relevant to the other.

(iv)

Edzard's choice of *ka* in preference to *inim* is based on the Akkadian personal name *pū-su-GI* (*pūšu-kīn*). This is hardly compelling, especially when the Sumerian *zi(d)* "reliable" is synonymous in this combination with *gin*, and there is a common Sumerian personal name from ED to Ur III: *inim-ma-ni-zi* "His word is reliable", later used for a minor god. Thus Falkenstein's wisdom in writing *uru-KA-gi-na* is fully vindicated. The arguments erected by Edzard for reading *Īri-ka-gi-na* cannot be sustained, and the glosses on *Lugal-KA-gi-na* are still valid evidence for the other name. The case for *Uru'inimgina* stands.

Los antropónimos íberos en (-)beles(-)*

A. Lillo – Universidad de Murcia

El componente (-)beles(-) se encuentra en antropónimos íberos: a) en las inscripciones, bajo la forma indicada, tanto como primer elemento del nombre como segundo, además de *-beles* y *-bels*; b) en textos latinos, transmitido como *-bilis* (*Indibilis*), *-beles* (*Laurbeles*, *Umarbeles*, etc.), *-bels* (*Bennabels*), *-peles* (*Estopeles*), *-meles* (*Ordumeles*), *-melis* (*Turtumelis*), *-mels* (*Adimels*); c) en las fuentes griegas, como *-βάλης* (Ἰνδοβάλης), *-βέλης* (Ἰνδιβέλης), *-βιλίς* (Ἰνδιβιλίς) y *-βολίς* (Ἰνδιβολίς)¹. Una lista exhaustiva de éstos se puede encontrar en los excelentes *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum III*, 1² editados y comentados por Untermann, por lo que no procede enumerar aquí tales formas.

Este componente nominal ha sido puesto en relación con el aquitano *belex* y explicado también en relación con el vasco *beltz*, "negro"; también se lo ha relacionado con el vasco *belatz*, "gavilán", forma del

* El presente trabajo se enmarca dentro de un proyecto financiado por la DGICYT.

1. Para más detalles sobre la aparición de las variantes griegas cf. M.^a L. Albertos, *La onomástica personal primitiva de Hispania Tarraconense y Bética*, Salamanca 1966, s. v. *Indibilis*, p. 124-5.

2. Citado como *MLH*, Wiesbaden 1990, p. 216-7, 7.31-7.33. Cf. también M.^a L. Albertos, *op. cit.*, p. 262-3.

that there was no difference in meaning between *Pān-Kēš-lūmur* "Let me see the face of Kēš" and *Pān-Marduk-lūmur* "Let me see the face of Marduk". The former certainly alludes to the Mother Goddess, patron of the city of Kēš, not simply to the fabric of the city. On pp. 84-85 many examples are given, from which we shall quote one type alone: *Mannu-kī(ma)-Arba'il/Ḫarrān/Ninua/Uruk*, "Who is like Arba'il/Ḫarrān/Nineveh/Uruk?" The use of the personal "Who?" proves that the cities named were not expressions in this context of the buildings and streets, but of the patron god, and this type of name with a divine name is common in both Akkadian and Sumerian, e.g. *Mannu-kī-Ištar*, or a-ba-^den-lil-gim. In this light the Ur III names *lugal-ma-dùg* "the lord has done good things for me" and *uru-mu-ma-dùg* "my city has done good things for me" (examples in H. Limet, *L'Anthroponymie sumérienne*) are identical in reference. The lord in the first is a divine lord, the city in the second alludes to the patron deity of the city. Similarly the ED personal name from Lagaš (examples in V. V. Struve, *op. cit.*) *uru-mu-a-na-ak* "What have I done to my city?" parallels the stock phrase in Sumerian prayers, e.g. *gá-e dingir-mu a-na i-na-ak* "What have I done to my god?" (*JNES* 33 (1974) 291 1). Thus *Uru-KA-gi-na* and *Lugal-KA-gi-na* are identical in reference, and so, contrary to Edzard's arguments, a gloss on the one is relevant to the other.

(iv)

Edzard's choice of *ka* in preference to *inim* is based on the Akkadian personal name *pū-su-GI* (*pūšu-kīn*). This is hardly compelling, especially when the Sumerian *zi(d)* "reliable" is synonymous in this combination with *gin*, and there is a common Sumerian personal name from ED to Ur III: *inim-ma-ni-zi* "His word is reliable", later used for a minor god. Thus Falkenstein's wisdom in writing *uru-KA-gi-na* is fully vindicated. The arguments erected by Edzard for reading *Īri-ka-gi-na* cannot be sustained, and the glosses on *Lugal-KA-gi-na* are still valid evidence for the other name. The case for *Uru'inimgina* stands.

Los antropónimos íberos en (-)beles(-)*

A. Lillo - Universidad de Murcia

El componente (-)beles(-) se encuentra en antropónimos íberos: a) en las inscripciones, bajo la forma indicada, tanto como primer elemento del nombre como segundo, además de *-beles* y *-bels*; b) en textos latinos, transmitido como *-bilis* (*Indibilis*), *-beles* (*Laurbeles*, *Umarbeles*, etc.), *-bels* (*Bennabels*), *-peles* (*Estopeles*), *-meles* (*Ordumeles*), *-melis* (*Turtumelis*), *-mels* (*Adimels*); c) en las fuentes griegas, como *-βάλης* (Ἰνδοβάλης), *-βέλης* (Ἰνδιβέλης), *-βιλίς* (Ἰνδιβιλίς) y *-βολίς* (Ἰνδιβολίς)¹. Una lista exhaustiva de éstos se puede encontrar en los excelentes *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum III*, 1² editados y comentados por Untermann, por lo que no procede enumerar aquí tales formas.

Este componente nominal ha sido puesto en relación con el aquitano *belex* y explicado también en relación con el vasco *beltz*, "negro"; también se lo ha relacionado con el vasco *belatz*, "gavilán", forma del

* El presente trabajo se enmarca dentro de un proyecto financiado por la DGICYT.

1. Para más detalles sobre la aparición de las variantes griegas cf. M.^a L. Albertos, *La onomástica personal primitiva de Hispania Tarraconense y Bética*, Salamanca 1966, s. v. *Indibilis*, p. 124-5.

2. Citado como *MLH*, Wiesbaden 1990, p. 216-7, 7.31-7.33. Cf. también M.^a L. Albertos, *op. cit.*, p. 262-3.

mismo radical³. Muy recientemente, en un excelente estudio sobre la relación entre la onomástica aquitana y su relación con la ibérica⁴, tras un exhaustivo estudio comparatístico de los usos, entre otros segmentos, del íbero *beles / -bels* y del aquitano *Belex / bels* se vuelve otra vez a destacar que la relación de estos formantes nominales con el vasco "*beltz* 'negro' constituye una de las mejores correspondencias no sólo íbero-aquitanas, sino también vasco-ibéricas". Pero seguidamente se señala que "el único punto de discrepancia reside en que en los compuestos aquitanos ocupa siempre la segunda posición, como corresponde en vasco a un adjetivo, mientras que en los compuestos ibéricos se documenta también, aunque menos frecuentemente, en primera posición", para acabar con la constatación de que si "*beles / -bels* significara 'negro', comprobación esencial que queda fuera de nuestras posibilidades por ahora", habría que admitir una estrecha y antigua relación entre ambas lenguas, aunque no excluye la posibilidad de que "tanto el ibérico como el vasco antiguo lo tomaran prestado de una tercera lengua desconocida".

Pese a que es comúnmente admitida la interpretación de tal componente de antropónimos a partir de la forma del vasco⁵, la explicación que se nos da de la etimología del nombre del régulo *Indibilis*, versión latina de la forma adaptada al griego como Ἰνδοβάλης por Polibio, en nuestra opinión es bastante discutible: "Se trata probablemente de una forma híbrida, indoeuropea-íbera, cf. ide. **ndhi-* prefijo con valor superlativo, y vasco *beltz* 'negro', lo que da un significado de 'muy negro'"⁶. Pero esta explicación del nombre propio en su conjunto, además de la del componente (-)*beles*(-), no nos parece aceptable por los siguientes motivos:

a) El recurso a una forma como híbrida en una lengua tan mal conocida como la íbera tiene toda la apariencia de ser una explicación *ad hoc*, sin mayor fundamento que el del mero parecido casual.

b) No consideramos aceptable *per se* su vinculación necesaria y directa con el vasco *beltz*, *belatz*, ya que la puesta en relación de una forma con otra de una lengua diferente, dos mil años posterior, con el único fundamento de su apariencia similar, nos parece un procedimiento poco probatorio; la única apoyatura de este aserto está en la semejanza del componente nominal del íbero con la forma del vasco, pero la validez de este procedimiento estaría en función de la utilidad del vasco para explicar y entender los hechos, o una gran parte de los hechos de lengua del íbero, lo que no ocurre. Queda claro que, en todo caso, la distribución dentro de las formas presenta alguna diferencia con el aquitano, ya que en íbero puede aparecer como primer elemento de un compuesto y como segundo, mientras que en el aquitano sólo aparece como segundo.

c) Un componente nominal que signifique "negro" no parece muy adecuado para convertirse en un elemento de uso relativamente frecuente en la composición de antropónimos. Aunque se pueden encontrar formas de "negro" en usos antropónimos en diferentes lenguas⁷, no es un procedimiento frecuente, ni tan frecuente proporcionalmente como nos lo sugieren los testimonios del íbero. Además, en estadios antiguos de cultura es habitual encontrar nombres propios parlantes, máxime en el caso de reyes o jefes locales, nombres en los que se ensalza el valor o el poder de los mismos⁸. No parece, por tanto, verosímil que el rey de una tribu lleve por nombre "Muy negro", o que, por ejemplo, *iko'beles*, otra forma considerada nombre propio, tenga que interpretarse, en consecuencia, como el "*iko'* negro".

Como señala Albertos⁹, "la mayor parte de los nombres personales que consideramos ibéricos constan de dos elementos y a veces podemos aislar alguno más. Esto guarda cierta relación con la onomástica indoeuropea. Recuérdesse que en los pueblos de lenguas indoeuropeas, la capa social directora posee

3. Cf. M.^a L. Albertos, *op. cit.*, p. 271; J. Siles, *Léxico de inscripciones ibéricas*, Madrid 1985, s.v. *be.l.e.s*, p. 116-7.

4. J. Gorrochategui, "La onomástica aquitana y su relación con la ibérica", en J. Untermann y F. Villar (eds.), *Lengua y Cultura en la Hispania Prerromana. Actas del V Coloquio sobre Lenguas y Culturas Prerromanas de la Península Ibérica (Colonia, 25-28 de Noviembre de 1989)*, Salamanca 1993, p. 627.

5. Cf. M.^a L. Albertos, *op. cit.*, p. 271: "Completamente admitida está la identidad del íbero *beles*, *bels* y del aquitano *belex* con el vasco *beltz*, 'negro'".

6. Cf. M.^a L. Albertos, *op. cit.*, p. 124-5.

7. Sin ir más lejos, *Schwarz* en alemán o *Negre* en catalán.

8. Para esta cuestión, por lo que atañe a la antroponimia griega, y, concretamente, la homérica, se puede mencionar la obra de H. von Kamptz, *Homerische Personennamen. Sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation*, Göttingen 1982.

9. M.^a L. Albertos, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

con frecuencia antropónimos compuestos, formados de dos elementos radicales diferentes". Esto se ve, por ejemplo, en los nombres celtas en *-rix*. Pero éste es un hecho que también se da en las lenguas semíticas. Sin ir más lejos, el nombre del general cartaginés *Hasdrubal*, ערובעל, es un nombre parlante, como se desprende de su análisis, compuesto de un primer elemento עזר, que significa "socorro", "ayuda", y de בעל, "señor", "dueño"¹⁰. Y lo mismo se puede decir de *Hannibal*, חנבעל, compuesto de חן, "gracia", y del mismo segundo elemento de la forma anterior¹¹. Se trata, pues, en ambos casos de antropónimos contruidos con la forma que significa "señor", y que aparece en acadio como *bēlu(m)*, hebreo *ba'al* y arameo *ba'lā*¹².

Como hemos señalado anteriormente, la relación de (-)beles(-) con el vasco *beltz*, *belatz* se establece únicamente en función del mero parecido formal. Pero, si el único criterio que procede aquí es el de ese parecido formal, pensamos que resulta mucho más interesante poner en relación este morfema del íbero con el formante anteriormente indicado de las lenguas semíticas, בעל, "señor", "dueño", ya que en lenguas semíticas podemos encontrar la forma בעל, "señor", tanto en primero como en segundo elemento de compuesto, lo que se ajusta perfectamente a la evidencia del íbero. Además de los antropónimos mencionados, aparecen formas como Βαλσλληχ, en *CIL VIII 16*¹³; *Baliahon*, en *CIL VIII 18677*; *Baliaton*, en *CIL VIII 16011*¹⁴; *Balsamo*, en *CIL I 2407*; ¹*Ba-* 'al-ma-lu-ku'¹⁵, ⁴*Ba-* 'al-sa-me-me'¹⁶ o *Ba-* 'li-sa-pu-na'¹⁷ en asirio.

Todo ello permite pensar que la base nominal (-)beles(-), adaptación íbera de la forma בעל, "señor", tomada del semítico a través del fenicio, pudo haber sido incorporada por lo íberos a su sistema de lengua, lo que es, en nuestra opinión, verosímil, precisamente porque es larga la presencia y profunda la influencia fenicias en toda esta amplia zona, como lo atestiguan los restos arqueológicos¹⁸. Nuestra propuesta tiene también la ventaja sobre la explicación previa, de corte vasco-iberista, de que:

a) Además de la semejanza formal y de funcionamiento de este componente nominal del íbero con el del semítico, en ambos casos se trata de formas próximas en el espacio y en el tiempo.

b) El vocalismo *e* de (-)beles(-), coincidente con la forma del acadio, y representa la apofonía *a/e* inducida por el fonema faringal⁶, típicamente semítico, que también cae en púnico (< *bal*).

c) El doblete (-)beles(-)/-bels sugiere que la segunda *e* pudiera ser una especie de vocal de relleno y, por tanto, sin relevancia morfológica especial.

d) La terminación *-s(-)* puede considerarse un morfema gramatical del íbero, que se habría añadido a la forma de préstamo, como lo sugiere su aparición en otras formas en final de palabra, o, en ocasiones, de "segmento"¹⁹.

e) El significado que se le podría atribuir a (-)beles(-) según esta propuesta estaría más en consonancia con lo que es un sistema de nombres propios y se adecuaría en mayor medida a lo que es el nombre de un rey o un régulo, en paralelo a lo que encontramos en otras lenguas que nos son más conocidas. Piénsese, sin ir más lejos, que las fuentes latinas nos obsequian con un antropónimo íbero *Aenibeli*²⁰, que sugiere el nombre del famoso general cartaginés. Cabe, por tanto, la posibilidad de explicar antropónimos íberos en (-)beles(-) a partir del semítico. En el caso de *Indibilis*, gr. Ἰνδοβάλης no resultaría especialmente forzado poner en relación el primer elemento *Indi-*, gr. Ἰνδο- con hebreo y arameo *ntn*, ugarítico *jtn*, acadio *nadānu*, "don", "regalo"²¹.

10. Cf. Z. S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, New Haven 1936, p. 88 y 132, s.v.; J. Friedrich, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik*, Roma 1951, p. 86.

11. Cf. Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 103, s.v.; Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

12. W. v. Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch I*, Wiesbaden 1985, p. 118, s.v.

13. Cf. J. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

14. Cf. J. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 30 para las dos últimas formas.

15. Cf. J. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 57 para las dos últimas formas.

16. Cf. J. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

17. Cf. J. Friedrich, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

18. Cf. en este mismo sentido, J. Sanmartín, *AuOr* 6 (1988) 92ss.

19. Cf. J. Untermann, *op. cit.*, p. 314, correspondiente al índice inverso de formas íberas del noreste.

20. Cf. J. Untermann, *MLH* III 1, p. 216.

21. Cf. W. v. Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch II*, Wiesbaden 1972, p. 701, s.v.