According to Civil, one could interpret the Semitic zamīndu from sawdīdu “to mill flour” with prothetic a, and asammātǔ(m) would then be the word or term for some or all pests which destroy flour. Perhaps preferable would be asparrumītu, -t feminine. As to the type of word cf. Ebla Voca.741 (MEE 4, p.283) muṣ-zur = a-za-ri3-tum, which should be connected with Akk. purritu, a type of lizard, see M.Civil, BeA, p.92. Reading tum (not -ulum) is then certain. So in 3e-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 (ma-ma-an and si-nam) the absence of ending is worth noticing. An Old-Akkadian proper name me-sagī is attested, cf. FAOS 19, p.207. I was not able to find a meaning of meseg; however, it should kept in mind that there are proper names which are names of animals, see, for instance the Aramaic PN bēr-ha-atē, Sarg. perhalum “Flea” (see comm. on iv 9 above), and me-sag 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) kišša = la-ša-na-nūm3, la-ma-nūm3 3a-par-y-un “ant”, “flying ant”. la-ma-nūm3 MEE 4, p.112 no.112 ii 6°. Cf. Akk. lamattu = kulububu in Malka V 61 (: CAD J1, p.67 “ant”; < lāmattu with ref. to B.Landsberger, Fauna p.136, where he refers to Hebr. n'mattâ:b, l'll // nml; Arab. naml, namahm, 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: lamōn, the being diminutive, see our text ill 9 be-la-ma-un with comm. above.

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

9. si-na-mu: might belong to the preceding entry.

The Ugarit Lexical Text RS 13.53

By Nieck 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.1) 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 (AsOr 7 [1981] pp.11-14).

Emar:

Col I'
1' [m³šı̄m]a₃-apin 140°
2' [m³šı̄m]a₃-apin 141°
3' [m³šı̄m]a₃-apin 142°
4' [m³šı̄m]a₃-apin 143°
6' 1-apin
7' 1-apin

Col II'
1' 3³šū₃-r -
2' 3³šū₃-r -
3' 3³šū₃-r -a₃-n-ta 272°
4' 3³šū₃-r -kター 273°
5' Ṽls₃-du₃-du₃ 274°
6' Ṽls₃-du₃-du₃ 276°

Rev. Col. I'
1' 3³š₃ -
2' 3³š₃-tar₃ - 405°

---

1) 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 ur₃-ra 3-7 (GSS), 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.

2) See also Krecher in UP 1 (1969) p.139.
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gual Emir text 𒈣𒇼𒀀𒅗𒉿 is rendered kalbatum. The line can be connected with an entry in Hg: 𒈣𒇼𒀀𒅗𒉿 = kalbatum = summanu la šapīn (MSL 7, p.153: 188). The word probably refers to a leather strap. The word with šī determinative may refer to an alternative wooden construction, or the leather strap may have had some wooden part. Similarly, the word for 'whip' (šašan) appears as šašan and šašan, which apparently because a whip consisted of both wood and a leather part.

Column II was erroneously read šiṭukūl in PRL III. In the Emur version the šiṭukūl follows at some distance from the section šašan. 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 Emur version in closing the šašan section with šašu-an-ta: šašu-kī-ta. In the Emur text these items are rendered kikirra uṣu and kikirra la-pāl. The lines correspond to šašu-ē-gar = uṣu and šašu-bi-ē-gar = la-pāl in late uṣa-rā (where kikirra is implied) and to šašu-bi-ē-gar and šašu-bi-ē-gar in the Old Babylonian Nippur version. In both versions these lines close the section šašan. That in the Akkadian rendering in the late version kikirra is implied is confirmed by Nabûtu: 256 šašu-bi-ē-gar = kikirra šašu (MSL 2, 228). In the Middle Babylonian Western tradition the Sumerian is assimilated to the preceding section (representing kikirra with šašan) and to the general patterns of Sumerian-Akkadian translation (representing uṣu with an-ta and la-pāl with kī-ta).

Column I has the section šašan. The reconstruction šašan for line 1 is supported by the Nuzi tablet SMN 2486 (RA 36, p.87; MSL 6, p.43: V2):

Emar:
1 šašam-en-apin 139'
2 šašam-sa-šu-apin 140'
3 šašan-apin 141'
4 šašar-siš-en-apin 142'
5 šašar-siš-apin 143'
6 šašar-siš-en-apin 158'
7 šašan-siš-en-apin 159'(Emar:šu-din-apin = nišn)'
8 šašan-siš-en-apin 160'
9 šašar-siš-en-apin 161'
10 šašar-siš-en-apin 162'
11 šašar-siš-en-apin 163'
12 šašar-siš-en-apin 164'
13 šašar-siš-en-apin 165'
14 šašar-siš-en-apin 166'

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

The items šašan-apin and šašan-siš-en-apin are not found in the late tradition, but do appear in Old Babylonian versions.\(^3\)


\(^3\) The Emur variant is erroneous. šašan-siš-en is the common Sumerian equivalent of nišn.

\(^4\) In MSL 6, p.147: 44-45 DAM is to be read NIS (collated). Several new duplicates confirm this reading.

\(^5\) For šašan see MSL 7, p.133: 223-224, and p.219f.: 111-114 (O.B. Nippur).

\(^6\) The item šašan does not appear in late uṣa-rā, but is known from Middle Babylonian peripheral sources (see MSL 6, p.11: V1; Emur 6/4, p.67: 37-42), and from O.B. Nippur (unpublished).

\(^7\) šašan = kikirra ("bottom board"). See uṣa-rā 7A: 174-205 (MSL 6, p.98-100 and p.150; O.B. Nippur).

\(^8\) Note that in Armud's edition the distance is much too large, since he erroneously inserted the sections 'doors' and 'room' (191-222); see Civil, Ugarit 7 (1980) p.12.

\(^9\) MSL 6, p.100: 204-205.

\(^10\) MSL 6, p.150: 94-95. The sign after uṣ in line 94 is neither šu nor ūla, but clearly ūla (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 šašu-bi-ē-gar, with DUR erased. A few new duplicates confirm this reading of the Nippur version.

\(^11\) This line is quoted in a commentary (transliterated in MSL 6, p.100).

\(^12\) The reason to include the šašu-bi-ē-gar items in the ūla section of Nabûtu is exactly that the paradigmatic translation ūla = an-ta does not work here.
The Emar version continues with:

274' ṣā-waṭitū[new line]
275' ma-ṣūlī = lītītum
276' ša-ṣūlī = parākšum
276' ã-reṣī = šišī lītīt(ī)

The object written DIŠ (lītītum = ‘true measure’) in Emar appears in late urs-ra VII A: 225–228 (MSL 6, p. 103) written entifier or entifier, both glossed līd-da. This gloss is confirmed by Diri II.1) The line in the Ugarit fragment (ṭdā-dā ṣaṭā) follows the same (erroneous?) tradition as the Emar gloss.

The first column on the reverse lists musical instruments.1) ʿāsā-tar is read tīgīdā, and was borrowed in Akkadian as tīgīdā.2) The reading tīgīdī / tīgīdā (rather than tībūlu / tībūli) is confirmed by glosses in the Emar version. The penultimate item of this column was copied in PRU III as ʿāsā-ta III. Collation is needed to prove or disprove the more probable reading ʿāsā-ta III (MSL 6, p. 124: Gap a line b). The last item of this column parallels the Emar item ʿāsā-ta I, with the variant gū-tā-u-dē. The word is probably identical with ṣa-gū-tā-u-dē or ṣa-gū-tā-dē, found in literary texts and in urs-ra 7 B, 117 (MSL 6, p. 125). ṣa-gū-tā-dē immediately follows the ʿāsā-ta section in the Old Babylonian Nippur version.

The first two lines of the second reverse column are tentatively restored ʿāsā-u-nir (kurimmu = ‘standard’, etc.). The Emar version has two ʿāsā-u-nir1) passages, both repeating the same word three times (compare MSL 5, p. 87: 39–41). This reduplication is probably due to copying from different Babylonian traditions. The first Emar ʿāsā-u-nir passage is followed by ʿāsā-saṣaṭar3) items. For this passage there is a bilingual parallel with Sylilcic Sumerian from Nuzi.1) The second Emar ʿāsā-u-nir passage is almost immediately followed by words for devices for hoisting water, including nām-šu-da-di-a (-[āš]-u-tu). The Sumerian is a garbled version of the O.B. entry nām-šu-tar-ra (MSL 6, p. 149: 75) which is found in the same context. Curiously, in the late recension the word appears as nām-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 ʿāsā-saṣaṭar corresponds to ʿāsā-saṣaṭar in the Emar version (see also MSL 6, p. 89: 81). It is rendered ṣa-nāṭāṭu in Akkadian (‘singe engine’).

If this reconstruction of Rev. Col. II is correct the evidence shows that the Ugarit and Emar versions solved the same problem in different ways. The problem was the diversity of traditions. In different Babylonian traditions the same section (e.g. ʿāsā-u-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 ʿāsā-u-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 /dudū/ as against /lidā/, in the word nām-šu-da-di-a, and in ʿāsā-u-nir /dīrān-tu /dīrāk-tu, 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 reduction.

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

2) The instruments are discussed by Krieger in Akadikia 70, pp. 1–27. See now Kilmer in RIA Band 8 ‘Musik’.
4) The Emar version regularly omits the ša.