

The Identity of Martu (^dMAR.TU) in the Ur III Period¹

Andreas JOHANDI²

Abstract. *The main purpose of this article is to study the divine figure(s) who hid behind the writing ^dMAR.TU during the Ur III period. The question is posed whether this writing signified only Martu/Amurru, the Amorite deity, or is there any reason to believe that Martu was not the only divine concept that stood behind this writing. As we know, in some other cases in Mesopotamian religion, the names of several deities were written in the same way (with the same signs). Some earlier studies have assumed that there was a connection between the similarly named gods Martu and Marduk. In the second part of the article, this question is revisited and it is asked whether the "other" ^dMAR.TU could be identical with Marduk, the later king of the gods in Mesopotamia. Finally, the relationship of ^dMAR.TU to the divine figure named AN.AN.MAR.TU is also discussed.*

Rezumat. *Principalul obiectiv al acestui articol este acela de a studia figura sau figurile divine ce se ascundeau în spatele grafiei ^dMAR.TU, în timpul perioadei Ur III. Este urmărită obținerea unui răspuns care să confirme dacă această expresie semnifică strict Martu/Amurru, zeitatea amorită, sau sunt motive să bănuim că Martu nu era singura entitate ce se afla în spatele acestei scrieri. După cum știm, în unele cazuri din religia Mesopotamiei, numele anumitor zeități erau scrise în același mod (cu aceleași simboluri). Unele studii timurii au considerat că există o legătură între zeii cu nume asemănătoare Martu și Marduk. În a doua jumătate a articolului, această chestiune este iarăși abordată, pentru a afla dacă „celălalt” ^dMAR.TU ar putea fi identic cu Marduk, suveranul celest târziu în religia mesopotamiană. În încheiere, este discutată și legătura dintre ^dMAR.TU și zeitatea numită AN.AN.MAR.TU.*

Keywords: *Martu, Amurru, Amorites, Marduk, Mesopotamian religion, Ur III pantheon.*

In literary texts of the Old Babylonian period the god Martu/Amurru (^dMAR.TU) is depicted as a deity with savage characteristics whose father is An and mother either Uraš or Ninḫursaĝ.³ The position and genealogy of ^dMAR.TU in the Ur III administrative documents

¹ This study was supported by the Estonian Research Council grant (PRG938). The current article is an extended and thoroughly revised version of some discussions that first appeared in my doctoral thesis (JOHANDI 2019). I thank the anonymous reviewer for many insightful remarks; all the remaining mistakes are my own. For the abbreviations used in this article, see the online version of *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie*: <https://rla.badw.de/reallexikon/abkuerzungslisten.html>.

² University of Tartu, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, School of Theology and Religious Studies, Research Fellow in Near Eastern Religions, E-mail: andreasj@ut.ee.

³ No monograph exists on the god Martu/Amurru; for briefer overviews with further references, see EDZARD 1987–1990; KLEIN 1997; BEAULIEU 2005; BURKE 2021, 254–256. Note that the interpretation of ^dMAR.TU as Martu is conventional and not proven beyond doubt. For the reading of the name, see, e.g., EDZARD 1987–1990, 433–434;

reflecting the offerings to deities in the town of Ku'ara near Eridu and Ur in South Mesopotamia seems to be different. The following discussion takes this observation as its starting point and asks whether there was one divine figure known by this writing, or were there several?

In the text TCL 2 5482 from Puzriš-Dagān, dating to Ibbi-Su'en 01-07-13 it is reported that Ninsun, Asalluḫi and Nindamana (in this order) are the temple-owning deities in Ku'ara (offerings take place “in the temple of DN”, šà é DN).⁴ In the temple of Nindamana, offerings are made to the deities Ḫaia, Nindamgalnuna and Martu.⁵ The peculiar name Nindamgalnuna (^dnin-dam-gal-nun-na) seems to be the only reference to this deity in the vast Ur III administrative corpus.⁶ However, as the offerings are given in the temple of Nindamana, one would expect to see the temple-owner among the receivers of offerings. Thus, the name Nindamgalnuna here probably refers to the goddess Nindamana by her byname. Already E. Ebeling observed in the first volume of *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* that Nindamana stands here for Damgalnuna, Ea's (= Enki's) wife.⁷

The sequence of the deities in Ku'ara is approximately similar in document TCL 2 5514 that also originates from Puzriš-Dagān and is dated to Ibbi-Su'en 02-10-03, although, differently from the temple of Ninsun (é ^dnin-sún), the temples of Asalluḫi and Nindamana are not explicitly mentioned in this text.⁸ The god Asalluḫi is – as in TCL 5482 – followed by the deified and deceased king Šulgi, but the next three deities listed are interesting to observe: Nindamana, Ensimaḫ and Ḫaia. W. Sallaberger has demonstrated that this trio of deities – in a different order – corresponds to Ḫaia, Nindamgalnuna and Martu who were placed to the temple of Nindamana according to TCL 5482.⁹ Thus, Martu = Ensimaḫ. This equation is confirmed in the first millennium *An=Anum* god-list (tablet II, line 293, see LITKE 1998, 102) in which the same identification is

ATTINGER 2011. For an exceptional case in which Enlil is mentioned as the father of Martu (AN.AN.MAR.TU), see RIME 4, 307–308, inscription no. 2006 (a votive inscription to Rīm-Su'en I of Larsa).

⁴ Cf. the text AUCT 2 308 from Ibbi-Su'en 02-07-07, which for Ku'ara lists only the offerings to Ninsun, Asar and Nindamana. Thus, only the temple-owning deities of Ku'ara are brought offerings in this text. AUCT 1 488 (Amar-Su'en 03-10-14) mentions Ninsun and Asalluḫi among the deities of Ku'ara but does not mention Nindamana.

⁵ Note that the offerings to Martu appear twice in this text. For the first time, he is offered a lamb in Ur (?), this time, he is immediately preceded by Enki who is also given a lamb as an offering.

⁶ Another occurrence of this name appears on an Old Babylonian seal immediately preceded by the god Enki (DELAPORTE 1923, 139, number A.489, cited by CAVIGNEAUX and KREBERNIK 1998–2001, 338), see also the manuscript of the Weidner god list from Tell Taban (Old Babylonian), column 1, line 8 (SHIBATA 2009, 34) that seems to have ^r^dnin-gal-nu-na and CUSAS 35 500 (Old Akkadian), column 2, line 1: ^dnin-dam-gal-nu.

⁷ EBELING 1928, 102.

⁸ Cf. table 77 in SALLABERGER 1993 II, 134. In TCL 2 5514 the sequence of deities of Ku'ara is slightly different as compared to TCL 2 5482.

⁹ See table 77 in SALLABERGER 1993 II, 134. In TCL 2 5482 the sequence of deities seems be “theological” in the sense of Mesopotamian god-lists: the pair of god and goddess is followed by their child(ren). The logic behind TCL 2 5514 is different: the deities are probably listed in the sequence of their local importance as Nindamana, the temple owner, is listed first.

made.¹⁰ In addition to this equation in the previous line (292) of *An=Anum*, a deity named Ensigalabzu is equated with AN.AN.MAR.TU.¹¹ In another manuscript of *An=Anum* (see CT 24 29), Ensigalabzu is seemingly (the second column is fragmentary here) equated with Martu and the deity Ensi-gal-maḥ with AN.AN.MAR.TU.

Sallaberger considered Nindamana in TCL 2 5482 as the only possible candidate among the deities appearing in the sources to be the wife of the god Asalluḫi, “[...] vorausgesetzt, sie werde (vergleichbar Ninlil in Nippur) in einem eigenen Tempel neben dem Asarluḫis verehrt.”¹² It seems to be a more probable option that the wife of Asar/Asalluḫi is not mentioned at all in these lists of deities, and Nindamana’s husband in these two texts is Ḫaia who is equated with both Ea and Enki. M. Civil has commented on the name Ḫaia: “Originally, the name may have been a variant spelling of é-a and therefore identical with Enki [...] Note that while offerings are made to Ḫaia, especially in Ur, in the Ur III period, at that time Ea appears only in personal names.”¹³ The *Grussformel* of an Old Babylonian letter (UET 5 71) has the god Ensimaḥ following Ea (obverse, line 4) that reflects the same familial relationship than exists between Ḫaia and Ensimaḥ in TCL 5482.¹⁴ On the basis of this evidence and the argument made by Civil, it seems safe to conclude that Ḫaia, who in the Ku’ara offering lists was brought offerings in the temple of Nindamana, was identified with Ea.

That both Ḫaia and Ea, however, are identified with Enki in the eyes of the scribe who wrote TCL 2 5482 can be argued on the basis of the peculiar name Nindamgalnuna which thus seems to be a version of the name of Ḫaia’s spouse Nindamana. In this context, it is also conspicuous that, in the offering lists dealing with Ku’ara, the name Enki is not mentioned at all. Considering the similarity of names Damgalnuna and Nindamgalnuna, the latter seems to be the local name for Enki’s wife. Note that the writing ^dnin-dam[...] appears a few lines before Enki in an Ur III administrative text UET 9 320 from Ur. For our purpose, it makes no real difference here whether one restores Nindamana or Nindamgalnuna, as both restorations add weight to the argument that Ḫaia appearing in texts dealing with Ku’ara should be treated as Enki. The hypothesis that the name Ḫaia denotes the god Enki can be further supported by the evidence from several other Ur III documents in which Martu (i.e., Ensimaḥ) is listed

¹⁰ Cf. SALLABERGER 1993 I, 225, n. 1075.

¹¹ For Ensigalabzu, see my forthcoming brief article “Some notes on the god Ensigalabzu”.

¹² SALLABERGER 1993 I, 224, n. 1072. Cf. MICHALOWSKI 1989, 92: “Of these deities [mentioned in the Ur III administrative documents dealing with Ku’ara – A. J.] only Nindamgalnuna and Nindamana are possible candidates for the role of wife of Asaluḫi.”

¹³ CIVIL 1983, 44.

¹⁴ Additional Ur III evidence for Ensimaḥ is that, according to text UET 3 166 from Ur, two fattened grass-eating lambs are offered for the “lustration rites” (a-tu₅-a) of Ensimaḥ. The only personal name known to me constructed with the name of this deity, lú-^dénsi-maḥ, appears in an Old Babylonian Ur document UET 5 191. Perhaps unsurprisingly this person is a priest connected to the abzu (gudu₄-abzu).

immediately after Enki.¹⁵ The fact that ̒aia seems here to be identical with the god Enki/Ea could add weight to the hypothesis that both names – Ea (é-a, *̒ajja) and ̒aia (̒a-ià) – are derived from the Semitic root *̒yy, “to live”.¹⁶

What is then the identity of Martu/Ensimah, the son of Enki/Ea/̒aia in these archival documents? According to the different parentage of An and Uraš appearing for Martu/Amurru, the Amorite deity in the literary texts of the Old Babylonian period, one might consider a wholly different personality for this deity. One should add that there seems to be nothing that would suggest an “Amorite context” in the aforementioned texts in which Martu seems to appear as Enki’s son. Among the Ur III administrative corpus, one document that does suggest a connection between the god Martu and the Amorites is MVN 15 362 (= RA 09 040 SA 03 (pl.1)) which, directly after the god Martu, mentions the Jebel Bishri Mountain (̒ur-saġ-ba-ša-ar) as the recipient of an offering of a lamb. This location is a well-known power base of the Amorites.¹⁷ In another text (PIOL 19 349), offerings to ^dMAR.TU ̒r-ra, (perhaps “Martu on the roof(top)”, or “Martu of the roof(top)”) are attested, following offerings to du₆-̒r (perhaps “rooftop mound”),¹⁸ Ningišzida and Su’en ̒r-ra (or Enki ̒r-ra).¹⁹ This text possibly reflects some nightly rites involving celestial bodies by the cultic structure (artificial hill?) set up on the roof of the temple.²⁰ The notion that this ^dMAR.TU might be a god associated with the Amorites is corroborated a few lines later when an Amorite (mar-tu) named Naplanum and his (nameless) wife are mentioned. This Naplanum is marked as a recipient of different types of cattle in tens of Ur III documents.²¹

The question then arises whether the Ur III documents refer to one or two gods whose name was written as ^dMAR.TU. If there was only one Martu, then one must consider not An but Enki to be his father during the Ur III period, as An as the father of Martu only appears in the Old Babylonian sources. Another and more probable option seems to be that one and the same

¹⁵ Martu appears immediately after Enki in texts TCL 5482 (possibly reflecting offerings in Ur, see above), MVN 13 124 and AUCT 2 97 (all from Puzriš-Dagān). Note that, in text ITT 3 5280 from Ġirsu, he is preceded by ^ddam-gal-nun. The close connection between Martu and Enki in the Ur III period offerings has been stressed before by D. O. Edzard (1987–1990, 436).

¹⁶ Cf. SELZ 2019, 28: “̒ajja as well as ̒ajja are probably Semitic loans (in different periods) from *̒hjj “to live”.” For details, see SELZ 2002, 663–671.

¹⁷ For Jebel Bishri, with references to further literature, see BEAULIEU 2005, 39; see also BURKE 2021, 59–61.

¹⁸ For du₆-̒r, see SALLABERGER 1993 I, 130–131; WAETZOLDT 2005, 334–338 (in *ibid.*, 337, note 32, du₆-̒r is translated as “Dach des Hügels” based on the analogy of forms such as an-ša, an-úr and kur-ša).

¹⁹ According to the copy by H. Sauren in PIOL 19, the second sign of the DN is clearly ZU; in OPPENHEIM 1948, 166 the sign is interpreted as KI. I cannot decide which reading is correct based on the photo in CDLI (<https://cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P122887.jpg>).

²⁰ For some Ur III rites performed on the roof of the temple, see SALLABERGER 1993 I, 125.

²¹ For Naplanum, see, e.g., MICHALOWSKI 2011, 108, with references to previous literature. Michalowski thinks that Naplanum was the head of the foreign royal guard of the Ur III kings.

writing stood for two separate divine figures.²² One of the two deities was in all probability a Semitic god called Amurru, connected to Amorites and in all probability to An and Uraš as parents, although the documentation of this connection is documented only in the Old Babylonian texts.²³ There seems to be a consensus among scholars that the god Amurru is not an Amorite god *per se*, i.e. a god worshipped by the Amorites but a “*theos eponymos*, a construct of Sumerian religious tradition intended, perhaps, to integrate Amorites into Babylonian theology [...]”.²⁴ The second ^dMAR.TU was a son of Enki and Damgalnuna, at home in Ku’ara and probably in a wider region around Eridu and Ur. He presumably had nothing to do with the Amorites at first and was of Sumerian origin.²⁵ The name written with the divine determinative seems to appear first in an Old Akkadian letter (CUSAS 27 74) as a theophoric element in the personal name *i-hu-ur-^dMAR.TU*, probably to be interpreted as Semitic (“Martu chose”) and, thus, probably stands for Amurru.

The Ur III tradition of two Martus – or at least some confusion between the two traditions – probably survived in an Old-Babylonian manuscript of the Weidner god-list (VAT 7759).²⁶ In this list, one ^dMAR.TU appears in column vi, line 8, and is followed by AN.AN.MAR[.TU] and ^daš-ra-tum who are, deciding by other manuscripts of the Weidner list, followed by ^dnisaba (only the determinative has survived in VAT 7759) and ^dḫa[-ia]. The other ^dMAR.TU is listed in the colophon seemingly as the first of the four divine scribes: ^dMAR.T[U], ^dna-bi-um, ^dnisaba, ^dḫa-ià.²⁷ ^dMAR.TU here possibly appears as a divine scribe through his association with his father Enki/Ea, the god of wisdom who is often related to scribal arts. The fact that, in the manuscript of the Weidner god-list, ^dMAR.TU is followed by Nabium, i.e. Nabû, makes it probable that it is not Martu the Amorite who is meant, but Marduk, the boss and later

²² For other occasions when one writing stands for several, clearly distinguishable deities, see e.g., ^den-ki that stood for both Enki, the so-called forefather of Enlil, and Enki(k), the god of Eridu. Note also the writing ^dTU that stood for the mother-goddess Nintu, the male deity ^dTU(-da), the god Dumuzi (KREBERNIK 2014–2016a, 152–154) and probably also for Martu in the Middle-Babylonian period lexical series Ea (CIVIL 2010, 12, line 216), and Uraš (for several deities hiding behind the writing ^duraš, see further below).

²³ An and Uraš as a couple occurs together in only two Ur III administrative documents: PDT 1 527 (from Puzriš-Dagān) and TCL 5 6053 (from Umma, the deity preceding Uraš is missing in a lacuna but should probably be restored as An). In TCL 5 6053, the pair is followed by ^dur-saĝ-an-na, “the hero of An” (is there a chance that this writing represents Martu/Amurru?). In PDT 1 527 *ki ur-saĝ-e-ne* (“the place of heroes”) follows the divine pair.

²⁴ BURKE 2021, 254.

²⁵ Note the reading ĝar₇-du₂ offered by P. Attinger (2011, 61). G. J. Selz has suggested the possible interpretation “the planting and producing one” for ĝar₇-du₂ (personal communication).

²⁶ That ^dMAR.TU appears twice in the Weidner list is mentioned but not discussed in detail in EDZARD 1987–1990, 434. For the copy of VAT 7759, see WEIDNER 1924–1925, 3.

²⁷ The surprise to find Martu/Amurru in this short list of divine scribes was expressed by J.-R. Kupper: “Il est normal que l’auteur de la tablette invoque ses doctes patrons à la fin de son travail, mais il est curieux autant qu’inattendu de voir figurer Amurru en leur compagnie; aucun des traits que nous avons relevés jusqu’ici ne nous préparait à l’accueillir parmi les maîtres du calame” (KUPPER 1961, 71).

father of Nabû.²⁸ For Ħaia appearing here, several traditions could be at play, featuring one associating him with Nisaba at the town of Ereš and the other with Enki/Ea in the Eridu/Ku'ara/Ur region.

Mixed traditions could also appear in the hymn *Martu A* in which An is the father and NinĦursaĝ the “original mother” (ama ugu-ni) of Martu. That NinĦursaĝ was the mother of Martu has been explained before by Edzard on the basis of Martu's/Amurru's relations to the mountains, as he is often characterised as the “man/one of the mountains” (lú-Ħur-saĝ-ĝá).²⁹ The other possible explanation is that, in *Martu A*, the two genealogies and traditions involving ^dMAR.TU were mixed up, and NinĦursaĝ appears as Martu's mother, as according to one tradition – represented most prominently in the myth *Enki and NinĦursaĝ* – she was Enki's wife. This could be interpreted as an implicit hint to the parentage of Martu/Marduk in *Martu A*, as in *Enki and NinĦursaĝ* and the hymn *Damĝalnuna A*, NinĦursaĝ was equated with Damĝalnuna/Damkina who is usually considered Enki's/Ea's wife and Marduk's mother. There are some other things that unite the god Martu as depicted in *Martu A* with Marduk. For example, both deities are dealing with seven winds in the Old Babylonian period. In *Martu A*, line 17, it is said that Martu “donned the seven winds” (tum, imin-na zag mu-ni-in-^rkéš').³⁰ In the Old Babylonian hymn to Marduk originating from Sippar, it is Marduk who is said to “cause the seven winds to unite into storms” (*mu-uš-ta-ar-Ħi me-Ħe-e 7 ša-ri*).³¹ If one adds post-Old Babylonian material for Marduk to the comparison, then the use of maces and bows and arrows (+quiver) can be added.³² Finally, in the Sippar hymn, Marduk is associated with the mountains. In the first line of the hymn, he is most probably called “the lord of the mountains”.³³ Exactly the same epithet (*be-lu šá-di-i*) is known for Martu/Amurru in a first millennium tablet of the canonical lamentation *The Honored One of Heaven*.³⁴

²⁸ T. Sharlach (2002, 98), based on the interpretation of AN.AN.MAR.TU as ^ddingir-mar-du-ak, “(divine name) The God of the Amorites” (cf. RICHTER 1998, 136–137) has suspected the influence of Martu on the divine figure of the god Marduk: “Current theories have been unable to account either for the etymology the name Marduk or the reason for his identification with AsarluĦi. Is it possible that Marduk and dingir-mardu-ak, the god of the Amorites, are different writings for one and the same god? This explanation would provide an etymology for the name Marduk. Moreover, Marduk's presence in Kuara in the circle of Enki could explain Marduk's syncretization with AsarluĦi and his identification as the son of Ea. Did a dynasty of Amorite rulers move “the Amorite god” to a prominent, even preeminent position in the pantheon?”

²⁹ EDZARD 1987–1990, 435; see also KLEIN 1997, 104. Klein (1997, 102) counted 15 occasions when the epithet lú/mu-lu Ħur-saĝ-ĝá was used for Martu.

³⁰ Transliteration: ETCSL 4.12.1.

³¹ Transliteration: AL-RAWI 1992, 79.

³² See *Martu A*, line 11, and *Enūma eliš*, tablet IV, lines 35–38 (LAMBERT 2013, 88–89).

³³ The interpretation of KUR.DU-*i* for *šadi* is not entirely certain, see AL-RAWI 1992, 82. The mountains (*ša-di-i*) are mentioned again in line 11 of the text in an unclear context.

³⁴ COHEN 1988, 212, line b+126

^dMAR.TU's connection to Enki and his circle are also present in other canonical lamentations. A first millennium version of the lamentation *The Bull in his Fold* includes the following listing of deities: Martu (with the epithet mu-lu-ḥur-saḡ-ḡá, "man of the mountains"), Amanki (= Enki), Damgalnuna, I(d)lurugu, Kiša, Asalluḥi, Panunanki, Muzebbasa (= Nabû).³⁵ One notices that this listing looks quite similar to the sequence of deities in the Weidner god-list (Enki, Ea, Damgalnuna, Damkina, I(d)lurugu, Kiša, Asalluḥi, Marduk, Šarpanitum, Nabium), and one can perhaps suspect the widely circulated Weidner god-list to be the basis for this listing. It is interesting to note, however, that according to one manuscript of this lamentation (VAT 246), Asalluḥi does not appear, and Kiša is followed directly by Panunanki. The logic behind the sequence of deities in VAT 246 without Asalluḥi could perhaps be interpreted in the following manner: by the first millennium, Asalluḥi and Marduk (here Martu) were considered to be one god, more important than Enki, and thus placed to the first position in the list. Ea and Damkina (Enki's and Damgalnuna's additional names in the Weidner list) are not mentioned, and the more archaic name of Asalluḥi's wife, Panunanki (perhaps thought to be more suitable for the genre of lamentations), is used for Marduk's wife Šarpanitum. These changes can be explained by the programme of ascendance of Marduk to the top of the pantheon by the first millennium. In this text, we could be dealing with the tradition of two Martus as well, as the line preceding the mention of Martu reads: ur-saḡ-gal umun-^duraš-a-ra, "great hero Uraš" although according to the epithet, here the male version of Uraš is mentioned and not the mother of Martu. The writings for both deities were, however, the same (for this, see further below).

A similar tradition probably also survived in the *An=Anum* god-list in which – similarly to the Weidner list – two Martus appear. The first ^dMAR.TU and AN.AN.MAR.TU – as was discussed above – are listed on the second tablet and are equated with Ensi(gal)maḥ and Ensigalabzu and directly attached to Enki's circle of deities. The second ^dMAR.TU and AN.AN.MAR.TU appear only on the sixth tablet of the composition (lines 228 and 257 respectively) in the context that points to the Amorites and their gods (for example, the god of draught animals Saman (VI 230), "Mardu of the steppe of An/heaven" (^dmar-du₁₀-eden-an-na, VI 231),³⁶ the divine rat ḥumunšir (VI 234), Martu's/Amurru's wives Ašratum (^daš-ra[-tum], VI 262) and Adḡarkidu (^dad-ḡar[-ki-du₁₀], VI 265).

The name AN.AN.MAR.TU itself – as far as I know, not attested earlier than the Old Babylonian period – raises some interesting questions. Firstly, one could ask whether this name is just another name for the god whose name was written as ^dMAR.TU. M. Stol has studied a group of Old Babylonian texts that mention both names and, from the use of these names in similar contexts (temple names, personal names and epithets of deities), has concluded that

³⁵ COHEN 1988, 157, lines 65–71.

³⁶ T. Oshima (2006, 78) interprets this name as "The Pleasant Spade of the Fields of the Heavens". Having the spade for a symbol is another thing that unites Martu and Marduk; for this, see *ibid.*, 77–79.

“gods ^dMAR.TU and AN.AN.MAR.TU are identical”.³⁷ At the same time, the writing AN.AN.MAR.TU looks suspiciously like an artificial creation that was possibly invented by ancient scholars in the course of some “theological” organizing of previously confusing data. This means that the sign AN was added to the earlier common writing ^dMAR.TU with at least the initial purpose of showing that the bearer of this name was considered different compared to ^dMAR.TU.

One should probably first ask whether the cause for this possible invention was to make a distinction between two aspects of one god named Martu or between two separate gods whose name was written in the same way.³⁸ J. J. A. van Dijk interpreted the names in line with the first option and considered ^dMAR.TU the chthonic and ^dAN.MAR.TU the astral aspect of the god.³⁹ Some pieces of evidence speak in favour of following van Dijk and taking ^dAN.MAR.TU to be the astral *Erscheinungsform* of ^dMAR.TU.

For example, one could refer to the aforementioned document PIOL 19 349 that mentions rites on the roof – a place suitable for the worship of astral deities, although, in this text, the writing ^dMAR.TU and not ^dAN.MAR.TU was used (if the scribe had indeed used the latter writing, the issue would have seemed solved!).⁴⁰ Van Dijk also interpreted divine names ending with -an-na as the astral epiphanies of the deities (see, e.g., examples such as ^dama-ušumgal-an-na and ^dgeštin-an-na).⁴¹ Based on this, one wonders – without complete certainty – whether the name ^dmar-du₁₀-eden-an-na was perhaps similarly an astral epiphany of AN.AN.MAR.TU.

Finally, when browsing through the Old Babylonian seal legends, one notices that in lines that reflect the personal devotion of the seal owners, the god AN.AN.MAR.TU is often connected to various astral deities such as the sun god Utu and his consort Aya, the moon god Su'en, goddess of the Venus star Ninsianna, storm-god Iškur (astral deity in the sense of bringing rain and lightning from above) and Nergal (god of death and the planet Mars). In contrast, the association of AN.AN.MAR.TU with Enki or Ea is very rare, and as far as I know, appears only in one document: in text HEO 12 59 from Kutalla, one Su'en-muballiṭ identifies

³⁷ STOL 1979, 178. Stol had the opinion that AN.AN.MAR.TU was written when the scribes unmistakably wanted to refer to the god Martu/Amurru and to differentiate it from the gentilic “Amorite” that was sometimes written as ^dMAR.TU. J.-R. Kupper (1961, 69–70) also thought that the name of Amurru had two forms.

³⁸ Cf. similar questions posed in EDZARD 1987–1990, 437.

³⁹ VAN DIJK 1973, 505, note 14. For AN.AN (or AN-^d) as the marker for astral deities, see also SELZ 2008, 22; 2016, 69. Note also that Edzard mentioned the possibility that AN.AN.MAR.TU could be a diri-writing with an unknown reading in the vein of AN.AN.NISABA = Nanibgal. (EDZARD 1987–1990, 437). Cf. MICHALOWSKI 2011, 105–107, who came to the conclusion that MAR.TU is a (diri-)writing for Amurru.

⁴⁰ H. Waetzoldt (2005, 337, note 32) is of the opinion that either the places for offerings to Su'en (or Enki? – see note 19 above) and Martu or their statues were situated on the roof of one of the buildings in the temple complex of the moon god.

⁴¹ VAN DIJK 1957–1971, 535–536. Note that, in an Old Babylonian seal legend (YOS 8, 009), a person defines himself as the devotee of ^dMAR.TU and Geštinanna. Are we dealing with the cult of two astral epiphanies here?

himself as the devotee of AN.AN.MAR.TU and Enki. In the document OLA 21 15, one Su'en-bāni declares himself to be a devotee of Nabium and Martu. In these two examples, it could be the god Marduk who is meant.

There is no place here for a thorough analysis of the data, but some doubts can be raised about the theory that the writing AN.AN always denoted astral epiphanies of deities. One could, for example, argue that if the additional AN was indeed for indicating astral deities, then why was this “method” not regularly used for Nanna/Su'en and Utu who no doubt had their own chthonic (or rather earthly) epiphanies.⁴² Should not these too have been kept separate from the astral one as was done in the case of AN.MAR.TU and AN.AN.MAR.TU?

The data discussed above points to the possibility that in the Ur III period there were two separate divine figures whose names were both initially written as ^dMAR.TU. If this is true, then the name AN.AN.MAR.TU could alternatively have been an attempt to differentiate between the two namesakes. In line with this theory, I propose that – although I am currently not able to offer a proper reading for the name – the writing AN.AN.MAR.TU – at least in some cases – reflects familial relations and shows that its bearer is related to the sky god An (in the case of Martu/Amurru as a son, although the exact relation is most probably not specified in the writing).⁴³ This name was probably first implemented to make it different from the other ^dmar-tu or ^dġar₇-du₂ (the son of Enki) appearing in the Ur III data.

The argument that the name AN.AN.MAR.TU reflects familial relations can be strengthened based on the parallel data that concerns the goddess Uraš, An's wife and Martu's mother. As Martu's name was at times written as AN.AN.MAR.TU, the writing AN.AN.uraš(ĪB) exists for the goddess Uraš. As this writing comes up in at least three different compositions in the Old Babylonian material and thrice in one of these, one can exclude the possibility that it was a mistake made by a scribe.⁴⁴ The purpose of this writing seems to be the same as for the writing AN.AN.MAR.TU – that is to make a distinction from another deity, in this case ^dUraš, the Ninurta-like city-god from Dilbat, who is well-documented for the Old Babylonian period.⁴⁵ An attempt to make a differentiation between the two Martus by inventing the name-form AN.AN.MAR.TU proved not to be successful in the long run, as in most cases, both writings seemed to be used in the same contexts and, thus, for the same deity (see Stol above). A more successful attempt was (later?) made by the Old Babylonian theologians who, as a result of some

⁴² I know of no occasion when the name of the sun god was written with AN.AN in the beginning; for the moon god Nanna, the practice seemed to have been known only in the Ur III period Ur (see documents UET 3 205, 263, 698, 702, 703, 1384; UET 9 408, 904, 905).

⁴³ In this respect, it also reflects the astral aspect of the god as was opined by van Dijk but from a somewhat different angle.

⁴⁴ The writing AN.AN.uraš comes up in an Old Babylonian incantation (OECT 5 19, line 38), in *The Cult Song of Damu* written in Emesal (TCL 15 8, lines 152, 164, 176) and in the *šir-gida* hymn to Ninisina (SRT 7, line 25 (= Ninisina A)). Note that, in the latter case, the other manuscript of the text (SRT 6, column iii, line 14) has the writing AN.uraš.

⁴⁵ For the female Uraš, see KREBERNIK 2014–2016b, 401–404; for the male Uraš, see KREBERNIK 2014–2016b, 404–406.

yet inexplicable theological reform, “divided” the writing ^dMAR.TU into ^dMAR.TU and ^dAMAR.UTU, Thus, the writing ^dMAR.TU (and also AN.AN.MAR.TU, as it was now used for the same concept)⁴⁶ was reserved for the god Amurru, i.e. the god of the Amorites related to mountains with An and Uraš as parents, while the other ^dMAR.TU, the son of Enki and Damgalnuna later became the patron deity of the Hammurapi dynasty under the name of Marduk.

Based on the similarity of the names and divine parentage, one could see the ^dMAR.TU appearing in the Ur III documents dealing with Ku’ara as an early writing for the god Marduk and the appearance of both Asalluḫi and Martu in Enki’s (= Ḫaia’s/Ea’s) circle an early association between Asalluḫi and Marduk. The name ^dAMAR.UTU is otherwise conspicuously lacking in the vast Ur III documentation, and, considering its popularity in the following Old Babylonian period, one could suspect this divine figure (or its predecessors) to appear somewhere in the data.

A lot of questions, however, remain. For example, one could ask whether Marduk – despite a different position in the Ur III pantheon under the name Martu – was *originally* the god of the Amorites (or *theos eponymos* of the Amorites) who, for some reason, gained a separate identity in the Ur III period, or was he a domestic Sumerian deity by origin? Was the god Martu not chosen as the protégé of the Amorite Old Babylonian dynasty because, as some sources communicate, he was described in terms too pejorative to be a pretender for the divine rule over Babylonia? At this point, I leave these intriguing questions for future studies.

References

- AL-RAWI, F. N. H. 1992. A New Hymn to Marduk from Sippar. *RA* 86, 79–83.
- ATTINGER, P. 2011. La lecture de MAR.TU. *NABU* 2011(58), 61–62.
- BEAULIEU, P.-A. 2005. The God Amurru as Emblem of Ethnic and Cultural Identity. In: W. H. Van Soldt (ed.). *Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia: Papers Read at the 48th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Leiden, 1-4 July 2002*. *PIHANS* 102. 33–46. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor Het Nabije Oosten.
- BURKE, A. A. 2021. *The Amorites and the Bronze Age Near East: The Making of A Regional Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CAVIGNEAUX, A. and Krebernik, M. 1998–2001. Nindamgalnuna. *RIA* 9, 338.
- CIVIL, M. 1983. Enlil and Nihil: The Marriage of Sud. *JAOS* 103, 43–66.
- CIVIL, M. 2010. *The Lexical Texts in the Schøyen Collection*. CUSAS 12. Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press.

⁴⁶ Note that the name AN.AN.MAR.TU could be read as ^dam₆-mar-tu that is rather similar to ^damar-utu (writing am₆(AN) was mainly used as an early writing for the copula that later was written as am₃). This, however, would be a rather peculiar interpretation.

- COHEN, M. E. 1988. *The Canonical Lamentations of Ancient Mesopotamia*. 2 Volumes. Potomac, Maryland: Capital Decisions Limited.
- DELAPORTE, L. 1923. *Catalogue des cylindres, cachets et pierres gravées de style orientale, Musée du Louvre*. Vol. 2. *Acquisitions*. Paris: Librairie Hachette.
- EBELING, E. 1928. Amurru. *RIA* 1, 99–103.
- EDZARD, D. O. 1987–1990. Martu (Mardu). A. *RIA* 7, 433–438.
- JOHANDI, A. 2019. *The God Asar/Asalluḫi in the Early Mesopotamian Pantheon*. PhD Thesis. Tartu: University of Tartu Press.
- KLEIN, J. 1997. The God Martu in Sumerian Literature. In: I. L. Finkel and M. J. Geller (eds.). *Sumerian Gods and Their Representations*. CM 7. 99–116. Groningen: Styx.
- KREBERNIK, M. 2014–2016a. ^dTU(-da). *RIA* 14, 152–154.
- KREBERNIK, M. 2014–2016b, Uraš. *RIA* 14, 401–406.
- KUPPER, J.-R. 1961. *L'iconographie du dieu Amurru dans la glyptique de la I^{re} dynastie babylonienne*. Bruxelles: Académie royale du Belgique.
- LAMBERT, W. G. 2013. *Babylonian Creation Myths*. MesCiv. 16. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- LITKE, R. L. 1998. *A Reconstruction of the Assyro-Babylonian God-lists, An: ^dA-nu-um and An: Anu šá Amēli*. TBC 3. New Haven: Yale Babylonian Collection.
- MICHALOWSKI, P. 1989. *The Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur*. MesCiv. 1. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- MICHALOWSKI, P. 2011. *The Correspondence of the Kings of Ur: An Epistolary History of an Ancient Mesopotamian Kingdom*. MesCiv. 15. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- OPPENHEIM, A. L. 1948. *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets of the Wilberforce Eames Babylonian Collection in the New York Public Library*. AOS 32. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.
- OSHIMA, T. 2006. Marduk, the Canal Digger. *JANES* 30, 77–88.
- RICHTER, T. 1998. Die Lesung des Götternamens AN.AN.MAR.TU. *SCCNH* 9, 135–137.
- RIME 4 = Frayne, D. N. 1990. *Old Babylonian Period (2003–1595)*. The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia. Early Periods 4. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- SALLABERGER, W. 1993. *Der kultische Kalender der Ur III-Zeit*. UAVA 7. 2 Volumes. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- SELZ, G. J. 2002. 'Babilismus' und die Gottheit ^dNindagar. In: O. Loretz, K. Metzler and H. Schaudig (eds.). *Ex Oriente Lux. Festschrift für Manfred Dietrich zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 6.11.2000...* AOAT 281. 647–684. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- SELZ, G. J. 2008. The Divine Prototypes. In N. Brisch (ed.). *Religion and Power: Divine Kingship in the Ancient World and Beyond*. OIS 4. 13–32. Chicago, Illinois: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- SELZ, G. J. 2016. Who is a God? A Note on the Evolution of the Divine Classifiers in a Multilingual Environment. In: P. Corò, E. Devecchi, N. De Zorzi and M. Maiocchi (eds.). *Libiamo ne' lieti calici:*

Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Lucio Milano on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends. AOAT 436. 605–614. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

SELZ, G. J. 2019. Female Sages in the Sumerian Tradition of Mesopotamia. In: S. Anthonioz and S. Fink (eds.). *Representing the Wise: A Gendered Approach: Proceedings of the Melammu Workshop, Lille, 4–5 April 2016.* Melammu Workshops and Monographs 1. 17–42. Münster: Zaphon.

SHARLACH, T. 2002. Foreign Influences on the Religion of the Ur III Court. *SCCNH* 12, 91–114.

SHIBATA, S. 2009. An Old Babylonian Manuscript of the Weidner God-list from Tell Taban. *Iraq* 71, 33–42.

STOL, M. 1979. Review of “*Stephen D. Simmons, Early Old Babylonian Documents, Yale Oriental Series: Babylonian Texts, 14. With the collaboration of Edwin C. Kingsbury.*” *JCS* 31, 177–183.

VAN DIJK, J. J. A. 1957–1971. Gott. A. Nach Sumerischen Texten. *RLA* 3, 532–543.

VAN DIJK, J. J. A. 1973. Une incantation accompagnant la naissance de l’homme. *OrNS* 42, 502–507.

WAETZOLDT, H. 2005. Tempelterrassen und Ziqqurrate nach der sumerischen Überlieferung. In: Y. Sefati et al. (eds.). *An Experienced Scribe Who Neglects Nothing: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein.* 322–342. Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press.

WEIDNER, E. 1924–1925. Altbabylonische Götterlisten. *AfK* 2, 1–18.



© 2021 by the authors; licensee Editura Universității Al. I. Cuza din Iași. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons by Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).