

# DIE WELT DES ORIENTS

Herausgegeben von Heinz Halm, Wolfgang Röllig und Wolfram von Soden †

---

## *Anschriften der Herausgeber*

Prof. Dr. Heinz Halm, Orientalisches Seminar, Münzgasse 30, 72070 Tübingen  
Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Röllig, Altorientalisches Seminar, Schloß, 72070 Tübingen  
Manuskripte sind einzusenden an W. Röllig, Tübingen

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft

Herstellung: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

ISSN 0043-2547

# DIE WELT DES ORIENTS

Herausgegeben von  
Heinz Halm, Wolfgang Röllig  
und Wolfram von Soden †

Band XXVII/1996

**V&R**

VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT IN GÖTTINGEN

ording to Civil, one could interpret the Semitic *sammidu* from *samādu* "to mill flour" with prothetic *a-*, and *asammidu(m)* would then be the word or term for some or all pests which destroy flour. Perhaps preferable would be *ašamamītum*, *-t* feminine. As to the type of word cf. Ebla Voc. 741 (MEE 4, p. 283) *muš-zur* = *a-za-ra-ri<sub>2</sub>-tum*, which should be connected with Akk. *šurirītu*, a type of lizard, see M. Civil, BaE, p. 92. Reading *-tum* (not *-dum*) is then certain. *še* in *še-a-sa* (= *a-za-ma-mi-tum*) is certainly "grain". *a-* might be the verbal prefix but the meaning of *sa* is unknown: "(animal) which ... grain".

6. *me-sa-ag*: as in the two following entries (*la-ma-an* and *si-nam*) the absence of ending is worth noticing. An Old-Akkadian proper name *me-sag<sub>2</sub>* is attested, cf. FAOS 19, p. 207. I was not able to find a meaning of *mesag*; however, it should be kept in mind that there are proper names which are names of animals, see, for instance the Presargonic PN *bur-ḥa-aš<sub>2</sub>*, Sarg. *perḥašum* "Flea" (see comm. on iv 9 above), and *mesag* might belong to that group of proper names. In our line, however, *me-sa-ag* denotes an animal.

7. *la-ma-an*: cf. Ebla Voc. 1189 (MEE 4, p. 327) *kiš<sub>i</sub><sub>6</sub>* = *la-ma-num<sub>2</sub>*, *la-ma-num<sub>2</sub> par<sub>2</sub>-su-um* "ant", "flying ant". *la-ma-num<sub>2</sub>* MEE 4, p. 112 no. 112 ii 6'. Cf. Akk. *lamattu* = *kulbabu* in Malku V 61 (: CAD L, p. 67 "ant"; < *lamāntu* with ref. to B. Landsberger, Fauna p. 136, where he refers to Hebr. *n<sup>e</sup>mālā(h)*: *lml* // *nml*; Arab. *naml*; *namalum*, *namlu* in Akk. (CAD N/1, p. 208) is a West-Semitic word.

Note absence of ending as in the preceding entry. *la-ma-an*: *lamān*, *-ān* being diminutive, see our text iii 9 *ba-ša-nu-um* with comm. above.

8. *si-nam*: I was not able to find a plausible explanation.

9. *si-na-mu*[(*x*)]: might belong to the preceding entry.

## The Ugarit Lexical Text RS 13.53

By Niek Veldhuis, Groningen\*

At the time of its publication in PRU III (p. 212 and Planche X) the lexical fragment RS 13.53 could not be placed.<sup>1)</sup> Now that parallel texts from Emar have become available, the piece can be fitted into the Middle Babylonian peripheral tradition and appears to furnish some interesting variants. The following transliteration includes the line numbers of parallel Emar entries in the edition by Arnaud (Emar VI/4, pp. 65-82), with the corrections by Civil (AuOr 7 [1989] pp. 11-14).

Emar:

Col I'

1'	[ <sup>giš</sup> a]ma <sup>7</sup> -apin	140'
2'	[ <sup>giš</sup> ]nig-apin	141'
3'	[ <sup>giš</sup> kak]-nig-apin	
4'	[ <sup>giš</sup> sag]-apin	142'
5'	[ <sup>giš</sup> kak-s]ag-apin	143'
6'	[ ]-apin	
7'	[ ]-api]n	

Col II'

1'	<sup>giš</sup> dúr- [	
2'	<sup>giš</sup> dúr- [	
3'	<sup>giš</sup> dúr- <sup>r</sup> an-ta <sup>1</sup>	272'
4'	<sup>giš</sup> dúr-ki-ta	273'
5'	[ <sup>giš</sup> ]du <sub>8</sub> -du <sub>8</sub>	274'
6'	<sup>giš</sup> á-du <sub>8</sub> -du <sub>8</sub>	276'

Rev. Col. I'

1'	<sup>giš</sup> [	
2'	<sup>giš</sup> ŠA.TAR- [	405'

\* I wish to thank Beate Pongratz-Leisten (Tübingen) and Miguel Civil (Chicago) for sharing with me their insights, and for the use of some unpublished material. The Old Babylonian Nippur version of *ur<sub>5</sub>-ra 3-7* (GIŠ), which is quoted at various places in this paper, was studied from originals and casts in Philadelphia, Jena, and Chicago, and will be edited in my dissertation.

<sup>1)</sup> See also Krecher in UF 1 (1969) p. 139.

3' <sup>giš</sup> SA.TAR- [	406'
4' <sup>giš</sup> SA.TAR- [	407'
5' <sup>giš</sup> sa'-III	(408')
6' <sup>giš</sup> gú-[dé?]	410'? (AuOr 7, p. 13)

## Rev. Col. II'

1' [ <sup>giš</sup> u-n]ir	318'	463'
2' [ <sup>giš</sup> u-n]ir <sup>7</sup>	318a' AuOr 7, p. 13)	464'
3' [ <sup>giš</sup> u <sub>4</sub> -sa]kar-ra	319' (AuOr 7, p. 13)	
4' [ <sup>giš</sup> nam-l]ú?-da-ri-a		469' (and 264'; AuOr 7, p. 14)
5' [ <sup>giš</sup> ]zi-na		475' (AuOr 7, p. 13)

Column I has the section <sup>giš</sup>apin.<sup>2)</sup> The reconstruction <sup>giš</sup>ama-apin for line 1' is supported by the Nuzi tablet SMN 2486 (RA 36 [1939] p. 87; MSL 6, p. 43: V 2):

	Emar:
1 <sup>giš</sup> eme-apin	139'
2 <sup>giš</sup> ama-apin	140'
3 <sup>giš</sup> nig-apin	141'
4 <sup>giš</sup> kak-nig-apin	
5 <sup>giš</sup> sag-apin	142'
6 <sup>giš</sup> kak-sag-apin	143'
7 <sup>giš</sup> su-din-apin	158'
8 <sup>giš</sup> šudun <sub>4</sub> -apin	159'! (Emar: su-din-apin = <i>nīru</i> ) <sup>3)</sup>
9 <sup>giš</sup> kak-šudun <sub>4</sub> -apin	160'!
10 [ <sup>giš</sup> n]íg-PI-apin	144'
11 [ <sup>giš</sup> h]ar-apin	145'
12 [ <sup>giš</sup> nínda-apin	146'
13 <sup>giš</sup> kak-nínda-apin	147'
14 <sup>giš</sup> gúr-nínda-apin	148'

The reverse continues with thirteen (illegible) APIN items. The versions from Nuzi and Emar are basically identical and provide a safe basis for the reconstruction of the Ugarit fragment.

The items <sup>giš</sup>nig-apin and <sup>giš</sup>kak-nig-apin are not found in the late tradition, but do appear in Old Babylonian versions.<sup>4)</sup> In the bilin-

<sup>2)</sup> Late version ur<sub>5</sub>-ra 5, 110-172 (MSL 6, pp. 15-20). Old Babylonian versions: MSL 6, p. 42 and pp. 146-147 (Nippur).

<sup>3)</sup> The Emar variant is erroneous. <sup>giš</sup>šudun<sub>4</sub> is the common Sumerian equivalent of *nīru*.

<sup>4)</sup> In MSL 6, p. 147: 44-45 DAM is to be read NIG (collated). Several new duplicates confirm this reading.

gual Emar text <sup>giš</sup>nig-apin is rendered *kalbatum*. The line can be connected with an entry in Hg: <sup>kuš</sup>nig = *kalbatum* = *kurussu ša* <sup>giš</sup>apin (MSL 7, p. 153: 188). The word probably refers to a leather strap. The word with <sup>giš</sup>determinative may refer to an alternative wooden construction, or the leather strap may have had some wooden part. Similarly, the word for 'whip' (*ùsan*) appears in Old Babylonian and Middle Babylonian lists both as <sup>giš</sup>ùsan and <sup>kuš</sup>ùsan,<sup>5)</sup> apparently because a whip consisted of both a wooden and a leather part.

Column II was erroneously read <sup>giš</sup>tukul in PRU III. In the Emar version the <sup>giš</sup>dúr<sup>6)</sup> items follow at some distance from the section <sup>giš</sup>apin.<sup>7)</sup> This distance corresponds to the positions of the two sections relative to each other in the Ugarit fragment. In this the Middle Babylonian peripheral versions agree with the O. B. Nippur tradition. In the late tradition the sections belong to different tablets (tablets 5 and 7A respectively). The Ugarit fragment agrees with the Emar version in closing the <sup>giš</sup>dúr section with <sup>giš</sup>dúr-an-ta; <sup>giš</sup>dúr-ki-ta. In the Emar text these items are rendered *kiskirru elû* and *kiskirru šaplû*. The lines correspond to <sup>giš</sup>šu-eš-gar = *elû* and <sup>giš</sup>bar-eš-gar = *šaplû* in late ur<sub>5</sub>-ra<sup>8)</sup> (where *kiskirru* is implied) and to <sup>giš</sup>dúr-bi-eš-gar and <sup>giš</sup>bar-bi-eš-gar<sup>9)</sup> in the Old Babylonian Nippur version. In both versions these lines close the section <sup>giš</sup>dúr. That in the Akkadian rendering in the late version *kiskirru* is implied is confirmed by Nabnītu 25: 166 <sup>giš</sup>dúr-bi-éš-gar = *kiskirrum elû* (MSL 16, p. 228).<sup>10)</sup> In the Middle Babylonian Western tradition the Sumerian is assimilated to the preceding section (representing *kiskirru* with <sup>giš</sup>dúr) and to the general patterns of Sumerian-Akkadian translation (representing *elû* with a-n-ta and *šaplû* with ki-ta).<sup>11)</sup>

<sup>5)</sup> For <sup>kuš</sup>ùsan see MSL 7, p. 133: 223-224, and p. 219f.: 111-114 (O. B. Nippur). The item <sup>giš</sup>ùsan does not appear in late ur<sub>5</sub>-ra, but is known from Middle Babylonian peripheral sources (see MSL 6, p. 11: VI; Emar 6/4, p. 67: 37-42), and from O. B. Nippur (unpublished).

<sup>6)</sup> <sup>giš</sup>dúr = *kiskirru* ('bottom board'). See ur<sub>5</sub>-ra 7A: 174-205 (MSL 6, p. 98-100 and p. 150: O. B. Nippur).

<sup>7)</sup> Note that in Arnaud's edition the distance is much too large, since he erroneously inserted the sections 'doors' and 'looms' (191'-252'; see Civil, AuOr 7 [1989] p. 12).

<sup>8)</sup> MSL 6, p. 100: 204-205.

<sup>9)</sup> MSL 6, p. 150: 94-95. The sign after <sup>giš</sup> in line 94 is neither šu nor túo, but clearly dūr (collated; CBS 7152 = SLT 23 was joined by me to CBS 7139 = SLT 166 and N 330). The next line on the same tablet reads <sup>giš</sup>(dúr)-bar-bi-eš-gar, with DÚR erased. A few new duplicates confirm this reading of the Nippur version.

<sup>10)</sup> This line is quoted in a commentary (transliterated in MSL 6, p. 100).

<sup>11)</sup> The reason to include the <sup>giš</sup>dúr-bi-éš-gar item in the *elû* section of Nabnītu is exactly this: the paradigmatic translation *elû* = a-n-ta does not work here.

The Emar version continues with:

274'	du-ut-tu <sub>DIŠ</sub>	= <i>litiktum</i>
275'	min <sub>DIŠ</sub>	= <i>parsiktum</i>
276'	á-DIŠ	= <i>idi litik[ti]</i>

The object written DIŠ (*litiktu* = 'true measure') in Emar appears in late UR<sub>5</sub>-ra VII A: 225-228 (MSL 6, p. 103) written <sup>giš</sup>ŠÀ.DIŠ or <sup>giš</sup>ŠÍTA, both glossed lid-da. This gloss is confirmed by Diri III.<sup>12)</sup> The line in the Ugarit fragment (<sup>giš</sup>du<sub>8</sub>-du<sub>8</sub>) follows the same (erroneous?) tradition as the Emar gloss.

The first column on the reverse lists musical instruments.<sup>13)</sup> <sup>giš</sup>ŠÀ.TAR is read *tigidlu*, and was borrowed in Akkadian as *tigidlû*.<sup>14)</sup> The reading *tigidlu* / *tigidlû* (rather than *tibulu* / *tibulû*) is confirmed by glosses in the Emar version. The penultimate item of this column was copied in PRU III as <sup>giš</sup>ŠÀ<sup>3</sup>-III. Collation is needed to prove or disprove the more probable reading <sup>giš</sup>ša-III (MSL 6, p. 124: Gap a line b). The last item of this column parallels the Emar item KA×IM-[, with the variant gú-uḥ<sup>7</sup>-dé. The word is probably identical with <sup>giš</sup>gù-dé or <sup>giš</sup>gù-di, found in literary texts and in UR<sub>5</sub>-ra 7 B, 117 (MSL 6, p. 125). <sup>giš</sup>gù-di immediately follows the <sup>giš</sup>tigidlu section in the Old Babylonian Nippur version.

The first two lines of the second reverse column are tentatively restored <sup>giš</sup>šú-nir (*šurinnu* = 'standard', etc.). The Emar version has two (<sup>giš</sup>šú-nir<sup>15)</sup> passages, both repeating the same word three times (compare MSL 6, p. 87: 39-41). This reduplication is probably due to copying from different Babylonian traditions. The first Emar (<sup>giš</sup>šú-nir passage is followed by (<sup>giš</sup>u<sub>4</sub>-sakar<sup>16)</sup> items. For this passage there is a bilingual parallel with syllabic Sumerian from Nuzi.<sup>17)</sup> The second Emar (<sup>giš</sup>šú-nir passage is almost immediately followed

<sup>12)</sup> The evidence is cited by Landsberger in MSL 6, p. 102. See M. Civil, JCS 28 (1976) p. 76.

<sup>13)</sup> The instruments are discussed by Krispijn in Akkadica 70, pp. 1-27. See now Kilmer in RIA Band 8 'Musik'.

<sup>14)</sup> On <sup>giš</sup>tigidlu see Civil in NABU 1987/48: 'The Tigidlu Bird and a Musical Instrument'; and most recently Kilmer in RIA 8 'Musik', p. 467 (1995). In O.B. Nippur UR<sub>5</sub>-ra <sup>giš</sup>tigidlu is spelled either <sup>giš</sup>ŠÀ.TIR, or <sup>giš</sup>DI.TAR (unpublished). The DI (graphically close to šl in O.B.) may be a phonetic indicator. The spelling <sup>giš</sup>ŠÀ.TAR is attested in the Isin Craft archive (see Marc Van de Mieroop, Crafts in the Early Isin Period [Leuven 1987] p. 151). The spelling <sup>giš</sup>DI.TAR is found in 'The Slave and the Scoundrel' (Martha Roth: JAOS 103 [1983] p. 276: 24; reference courtesy M. Civil).

<sup>15)</sup> The Emar version regularly omits the GIŠ.

<sup>16)</sup> *Šínu*: object in the form of a crescent. See M. Civil in RA 81 [1987] p. 187.

<sup>17)</sup> SMN 2559 (RA 36 [1939] p. 94). See Civil in RA 70 (1976) p. 94; RA 81 (1987) p. 187; and AuOr 7 (1989) p. 13. A further parallel is found in MSL SS 1, 96 col. IV: 10'-11' (O.B.; unprovenanced).

by words for devices for hoisting water, including nam-lú-da-ri-a (= [d]i-lu-tu). The Sumerian is a garbled version of the O.B. entry <sup>giš</sup>nam-nu-tar-re (MSL 6, p. 149: 75) which is found in the same context. Curiously, in the late recension the word appears as <sup>giš</sup>nam-tar (MSL 6, p. 65: 153-154). In Emar the passage 'devices for hoisting water' is itself duplicated as well (262'-264' and 467'-469'). The last line of the Ugarit fragment [<sup>giš</sup>]zi-na corresponds to (<sup>giš</sup>)z[é-na] in the Emar version (see also MSL 6, p. 89: 81). It is rendered *kalbānātu* in Akkadian ('siege engine').

If this reconstruction of Rev. Col. II' is correct the evidence shows that the Ugarit and Emar scribes solved the same problem in different ways. The problem was the diversity of traditions. In different Babylonian traditions the same section (e.g. <sup>giš</sup>šú-nir) appeared in different contexts. The Emar version chose to duplicate some of these passages. The Ugarit scribe seems to have merged the same passages, so that following the <sup>giš</sup>šú-nir items we find lines from the contexts of both the corresponding passages in the Emar version.

Small as the fragment is, it shows in a number of details that the Middle Babylonian Western lexical texts basically belong to one tradition. In the reading /duddu/ as against /lidda/, in the word <sup>giš</sup>nam-lú-da-ri-a, and in <sup>giš</sup>dúr-an-ta - <sup>giš</sup>dúr-ki-ta, this tradition is opposed to both the late 'canonical' text and to the Old Babylonian Nippur version. At the same time in the order of the sections the Emar/Ugarit tradition often goes with the Nippur text against the late redaction.

These interpretational remarks are necessarily provisional as long as Ugarit duplicates remain unpublished.