STUDIES IN THE EBLA LEXICAL LISTS, II.

*MEE* 4 82, 84, 85, 86*

Marco Bonechi

**TM.75.G.2300 = MEE 4 85 = eEBL-j**

The bilingual lexical list 75.2300 (*MEE* 4 85, *EV* m1; photograph of the obverse in *MEE* 4, Tav. XXXd, and in Fronzaroli 1995a:354) is inscribed on the obverse of a rounded small tablet.

eEBL-j deals with two Sumerian terms, both with their Semitic translation. Both these entries occur in the Ebla bilingual list. Since eEBL-j has entries attested after the end of the main source EBL1, it does not belong to the same family of manuscripts as EBL1. It is not immediately clear if eEBL-j is related to some of the other main sources. In fact, it bears rare Sumerian terms, its first translation differs from that attested in the main sources, and its second Sumerian term is without translation in the main sources. However, all this is true if the main sources EBL2 and EBL4 are considered, but it cannot be proven for the main source EBL3, where both these entries are missing. Therefore, it cannot be ruled out that eEBL-j belongs to the same family of manuscripts as EBL3.

The marker \ of the Semitic translation, which is found in other texts of the same type, does not occur in eEBL-j.

The text of eEBL-j runs as follows:

**obverse**

(1) (= *VE* 970, *EV* 0467)

I:1-2 munsu(LAK-672) / sa-rí-a-du “hair, mane”

(2) (= *VE* 1004, *EV* 0177)

II:1-2 kad₄mişen / ba-git-lu-um “(a kind of bird)”

**reverse** (blank)

Commentary:


1 Pettinato 1982:105.

2 This has been noted in Fronzaroli 1995a and 1995b:58.
(1) In the main bilingual lists the sources EBL₁ and EBL₄ translate the Sumerian term LAK-672 as *da-mu, clearly *dāmum, “blood”⁵. In these two sources LAK-672 is therefore to be read uš₄, a reading already attested at Šuruppak and at Abu Salabikh. At Ebla this reading is confirmed by ESL 61, LAK-672 = *ū-sum⁴, and by the syllabic writing ab-uš-ga of áb-uš₄-ga, “(a kind of cow)”, found in LLi a19⁵.

Therefore, II millennium uš₄ = *dāmum was uš₄ = *dāmum in the second half of the III millennium, at least for the Ebla scribes of the bilingual sources EBL₁ and EBL₄. It is noteworthy that at Ebla “blood” does not occur among the parts of the body collected in the sources of ELPB available to us⁶.

It has been suggested that the Semitic translation found in eEBL-j 1, *sa-rí-a-du, has the same etymology *šaاةr(-at) of the II millennium Akkadian term for “hair”, šārītu (commonly = Sumerian siki, Nippur Ugumu 10, but also = Sumerian munsūb, Nippur Ugumu 25)⁷, but also that the equivalence is to be interpreted as uš₄ (LAK-672) = šaاةrīyatum, “net (of blood vessels)”⁸, “capillary”⁹.

At Ebla (where siki, passim in the administrative texts and untranslated in VE 971, only means “wool”) “human hair (on the head)” is siki-sag, at least for ELPB a63-64, siki-sag / iji-um, “human hair (on the head)” / “face”¹⁰. This term for “hair”, siki-sag, does not occur in the bilingual list, but it is found in the unilingual Sumerian list MEE 15 7 r.III.²¹¹ and in the bilingual list eEBL-a, 102 (see ad loc.), where unfortunately it is not translated, but significantly it occurs at the end of a section of Sumerian terms with sāg, which mainly deals with parts of the head.

As for *šaاةr(-at) at Ebla, it also occurs in two entries of the bilingual list:

VE 260, SAGxKIΔ = sa-ra-du-um (source EBL₁b), also = ma-alē-a-tum (sources eEBL-a₁, eEBL-b₁ and eEBL-d) and = bār-a-tum (source eEBL-b₂), and

VE 972, SIKI.UZUD, SIKI.LAK-175 = sa-ra-du-um (source EBL₂), sa-ra-tum (source EBL₄).

In VE 972 the Sumerian term (= akⱽ, later akⱽ?), also attested in AH B 247, should refer to animal’s hair and mean “coat, hair, fleece”, cf. the deliveries of fleeces, šu-mu-takaⱽ, SIKI.UZUD, in Ebla administrative texts such as ARET I 14, 15 and 75.1418 (and

---

6 Even if “blood” could have been attested in the second and lost main tablet of the list, see the reconstruction of the sources in Catagnotti - Bonechi n.d.
7 Gelb et alii 1991:225.
10 Catagnotti - Bonechi n.d., with literature.
11 To be read siki-sag, notwithstanding Picchioni 1997:49 and 164 n. 167, palaeography 275 n. 1.
also en-na-il lú SIKL.UZUD in ARET III 627 v.IV:1f.). Its Semitic translation in the
sources EBL₂ (sa-ra-du-um) and EBL₄ (sa-ra-tum) should be interpreted as ša'ratum,
Akk. ša'rtum), with the contextual meaning “coat, hair, fleece” suggested by the meaning of
its Sumerian counterpart.¹²

In VE 260¹³, the source EBL₁b has the writing sa-ra-du-um, once again from *ša'r(-
at)-, as the translation of a different Sumerian term, namely SAGxKĪD. This is translated by
the source eEBL₂-b₂ as bar-a-tum, which, on the basis of par<σtum = šārtu of Izbu Comm.
137, should be derived from *par<-σ, “(loose) hair (of the head)”¹⁴. The third and more frequent (sources eEBL-a, eEBL-b₁ and eEBL-d) translation, ma-al<σ-a-tum, on the basis of pērtu = malû in An IX 78 and LTBA 2 1 vi 26 and 2:362 should be compared with
Akk. malû(m) II, “unkempt, matted, dirty (body) hair”, often used in the plural. Since all
the Ebla transcriptions end with /-t-/t/, probably they may all be interpreted as plural forms.
The equivalence in VE 260 may be read (sag)munzer,<σ(SAGxKĪD) (forerunner of the later
SAG.IM.SĪR, SAG.MU.SĪR) = ša'rātum, par<σ-tum and malp<σ-tum, with specific reference to “unkempt, matted, dirty hair” (in opposition to ḥamanzer = mus<σtu(m),
“combed-out hair”).

To sum up, it is possible that at Ebla “human hair (on the head)” is siki-sag = ?, “coat,
hair, fleece” is SIKL.UZUD, SIKILAK-175 = ša'rātum, and “unkempt, matted, dirty hair” is (sag)munzer,(SAGxKĪD) = ša'rātum, par<σ-tum and malp<σ-tum.

It is interesting to observe how - just after a section mainly dealing with boats, má - the
very disturbed sequence of seven entries in EBL-A 896-903 // VE 966-973 (missing
from the source EBL₃) is arranged:

[a] (= EBL-A 896 // VE 966, EV 092)
EBK-A ’hāb
EBL₂, EBL₄ 〈om.〉
eEBL-u 〈om.〉
[om.] 〈om.〉
[b] (= EBL-A 897 // VE 967)
EBK-A, EBL₂, EBL₄ geštin
[c] (= EBL-A 898 // VE 634, VE 968, EV 024)
EBK-A AD₆<σ-A NA
EBL₁ AD₆<σ-NA
EBL₂, EBL₄ A.AD₆<σ NA / si-gū<σ-um
eEBL-d A.AD₆<σ NA / si-gū<σ(GU)-um
[d] (= EBL-A 899 // VE 636, VE 969, EV 023)
EBK-A AD₆<σ-A geštin
EBL₁ 〈om.〉
EBL₂, EBL₄ A.AD₆<σ geštin
eEBL-d AD₆<σ geštin / [...]-LUM
[e] (= EBL-A 900 // VE 970, EV 0467)
EBK-A LAK-672
EBL₂, EBL₄ uṣ₅(LAK-672) / da-mu

¹³ Sjöberg 2003a:543f., with discussion and literature.
¹⁴ Fronzaroli 1965:30, 43; Militarev - Kogan 2000:192.
eEBL-j munsub(LAK-672) / sa-rí-a-du
[f] (= EBK-A 901 // VE 971)
EBK-A siki
EBL₂, EBL₄ siki
[g] (= EBK-A 902 // VE 972)
EBK-A SIKI.UZUD
EBL₂, EBL₄ SIKI.LAK-175 / sa-ra-du-um, sa-ra-tum.

This sequence includes a short complete section of five entries in [a-e] and the beginning of the next section (siki) in [f-g].

[a] The sequence begins with the Sumerian term for “stinking fish-oil or glue, ill-smelling oil”, ḫāb. Its Semitic translation is biṣṭum < *bṣî6. Rather than “stink, stench” (Akk. biṣṭu) or “bad, malodorous” (Akk. biṣṭu), for this equivalence a meaning “menstrua” is probable, since the Sumerian term is also found in ELPB b27, at the very end of the extant list dealing with parts or features of the lower body.

[b] Then there is the untranslated but well known Sumerian term for “wine”, geštin.
[c-d] The sequence continues with two Sumerian terms including the sign LÚxÚŠ, that is AD₆ (LAK-339).

The only known reading of this sign is ad₆, adda, but additional unknown values may be supposed. The meaning “human cadaver, corpse” of adda occurs at Ebla in the unilingual Sumerian list MEE 15 27 v.VI’:16’, but elsewhere AD₆ means “fermented, sour, putrid”, see

VE 128, ninda-AD₆ = hamışum, “sour bread”18, and
VE 684, še-AD₆ = ḏaru hadārtim, where the translation literally means something like “seed of (alcoholic) fermentation”19.

Furthermore, see

gig:AD₆ in the unilingual Sumerian list MEE 15 27 v.IV’:9’ (perhaps “fermented wheat”; or an anatomical term?), and, perhaps,

bid-AD₆ in the unilingual Sumerian list MEE 15 41 v.I’:11’ (perhaps “putrid anus (a disease?)” or “putrid excrement”).

The alternation between AD₆.A and A.AD₆, however, could suggest an unknown value of this cluster of signs, perhaps ending in -n/ because of the -NA, and thus it remains unclear whether A is simply a, “water”. The Semitic translation in [c] has not been interpreted. The Semitic writing in eEBL-d, si-gu-um, has the sign -gu- used specifically for /qu/. Therefore, it may be a form derived from *ṣqy, “to give to drink, irrigate”: A.AD₆-NA = ṣiqûm < *ṣiqyum, perhaps something like “putrid water used for irrigation” or the like. However, eEBL-d is full of mistakes and, as yet, there is no published photograph of it. If -gu- in eEBL-d is a further ancient scribal mistake, or a

---

16 Sjöberg 2003a:262 (therefore Bonechi 1999:98 is to be corrected).
17 Catagnoti - Bonechi n.d. Cf. ḫāb, “gall-nut or madder (Rubia tintorum)”, well known from Uruk to Ebla, also as the name of a red-brown colour.
18 Conti 1990:83 and n. 93, with literature.
19 Conti 1990:179 and n. 521, “(un momento della preparazione della birra)”, with literature.
20 Bonechi 2007a.
modern misprint for "gú" (used twice in the main sources), then a more convincing interpretation (suggested to me by Leonid Kogan) is then širkum (or šerkum), to be compared to Akk. šarku(m), "— pus, suppuration".22

[d] With a fragmentary translation, the Sumerian term includes geštin, here perhaps not "wine" but "reddish like wine".

[e] In the bilingual sources EBL₂ and EBL₄ the entry means "blood".

[f] Then a new section, clearly based on acrography, begins. It is the section siki: after the Ebla Sumerian term for "wool" in [f] (untranslated, so we do not know if at Ebla its Semitic equivalent was šipāttu(m) as in Akkadian) there is in

[g] the Sumerian term for "coat, hair, fleece", as seen above.

While the previous acrographic section with má and the following one with siki are easy to justify, the rationale of the section between má and siki found in EBK-A remains to be clarified. It seems to me that the scribe of EBK-A wrote a section of Sumerian terms which refer to malodorous and/or red liquids. This results from reading in sequence the meanings suggested for the entries in this section of EBK-A:

"menstrua (?)",
"wine",
"— pus, suppuration",
"putrid reddish liquid (?)" and
"blood".24

However, it is important to note that the synoptical reconstruction of the Ebla section in EBK-A 896-902 shown above is artificial.

22 In Hh XV a₃₄ šarku corresponds to lu-ğu-uršug(ŪŠ.BABBAR), and cf. Hg Hh XV 34, adama(ŪŠ.GL)₃-da₄-nu = adamatu = šarku. See PSD A/3, p. 32 and CAD Ś/2, pp. 63f. ("šarku" (Sumerian ‘white blood’), as opposed to adamatu (Sumerian ‘black blood’), appears to refer to light-colored discharges from the body, e.g., the purulent discharge from the urethra (associated with chronic gonorrhoea), the ears, and the anus (as in dysentery), as well as to the suppuration issuing from a wound or ulcer).23

Notice, however, that in the Ebla main bilingual list normally the term which is also the key-word of each acrographic section occurs at the end of the section itself. This applies to ú, sa, ê, giš, šu, ša, a, še, muš, UD, an, gi₄, ib, kur, ugula, kaskal, maḥ, SU, zi, ḫ, tur, bīr, sī, mu, dub, zīd and zag, see VE 307, 312, 341, 497, 533, 595, 642, 700, 742, 779, 815, 819, 867, 869, 960, 981, 994, 1019, 1050, 1071, 1087, 1098, 1122, 1150, 1167, 1175 and 1182. However, also cases in which the key-word occurs at the beginning of its section may be found, as in the cases of gir₃, gu₃, ga, ir, giš, fl, dul and dam, see VE 995, 1030, 1039, 1041, 1106, 1168, 1193 and 1255. Clearly the former arrangement is more common in the first part of the VE (i.e. in its first 950 entries) and in the case of sections with many terms, while the latter is more common in the second part, and in shorter sections.

23 I wonder if the entries in EBK-A 896 and 898-900 may be a forerunner of the much later sequence found in the part of HAR-ra = ḫubullu dealing with the human body, Hh XV Gap A a₃₄ - a₃₄₄ (MSL IX, pp. 10f.):

u₃₁ a₃₄₄Uršu = ḫemu, "womb",
u₃₁ uršu-₄ṣa₄ɡ₁-ga = [...], "(liquid related to the womb)",
u₃₁ uršu-₄ṣa₄ɡ₁-ga = [...], "(liquid related to the womb)",
u₃₁ ɡ₁ = ḫamu, "blood",
lu-₃₁ ṣu₄Uršu(ŪŠ.BABBAR) = šarku, "— pus, suppuration",
adama(ŪŠ.GL) = adamatu, "red blood (a dark-coloured bodily discharge)"
In fact, we have to distinguish between, on the one hand, this section as conceived by the scribe of the monolingual source EBK-A (and probably also by the scribe of the bilingual excerpt eEBL-u) and, on the other side, its rearrangement made by other scribes working in a different bilingual perspective.

The scribes of the bilingual sources EBL₂ and EBL₄ anticipated the entries EBK-A 898 and 899 probably because they took seriously the presence of the sign A in the Sumerian version. Thus they put these two entries (VE 634 and VE 636) into the acrographic section a, mainly dealing with “water” (but perhaps not by chance before VE 637, a-kum₄ = māyny ḥammūtum, lit. “hot water”, actually perhaps “thermal water”²⁶, therefore near another normally malodorous liquid). Therefore these scribes undid the suggested semantic structure of the thematic section conceived by the scribe of EBK-A, where the focus was on other kinds of liquid substances. Yet another option was adopted by the scribe of eEBL-d, who put together in obv. II:3-8 Sumerian terms with AD₆ (ninda-AD₆, A.AD₆-NA and A.AD₆-geštin) and their translations. This confirms how pliable and amorphous the material available to the scribes was, once they deviated from the thematic lists.

The section EBK-A 896-900 was furtherly reduced by the scribes of the bilingual sources EBL₂ and EBL₄ because of the omission of the entry in EBK-A 896. At the end of the process, in the bilingual sources EBL₂ and EBL₄ this section had changed its thematic rationale, only including two entries, “wine” and “blood”, clearly related only because of the red colour of both the referents.

In the single sources, the relevant material just discussed occurs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EBK-A v.X:28-34:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>896</td>
<td>ḫāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>897</td>
<td>ḡeštin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>AD₆.A-NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>AD₆&lt;A-geštin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>uš₄ (LAK-672)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>siki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>902</td>
<td>SIKI.UZUD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| EBL₂ and EBL₄: |
|------------------|--|
| VE 634 | A.AD₆-NA / širkum | “- pus, suppuration” |
| VE 636 | A.AD₆-geštin | “putrid reddish liquid” (?) |
| VE 637 | a-kum₄ / māyny ḥammūtum | “thermal water” (?) |
| VE 966 | <om.> |  |
| VE 967 | ḡeštin | “wine” |

²⁵ Disregarding the issue of the chronological order of production of the tablets, a major problem which makes the suggestion proposed here very preliminary.

²⁶ To complicate the situation, the source EBL₄ interpolates di-dī = ḥ₂-la-gūm (< *hlk) in VE 635!

In attitude, the scribe of eEBL-

(a) There are, in fact, cases in which LAK-672 has an homophonous reading uš₃, with reference to later uš = sekērum(m) , “to shut off, block up”. See:

EBK-A 574 // VE 612, a-uš₃-ki = zi-gi-lum (source EBL₁), = za-gi-rí a (sources EBL₂ and EBL₄), sikrum and sakāri māyi, “dam, barrage” ²⁸. The term a-uš₃-ki also occurs in the unilingual Sumerian lists MEE 15 21 r.II:3’ and MEE 15 25 v.V:9’, while, in the unilingual Sumerian lists, cf. the following terms, probably related to this entry:

a-uš₃ (MEE 15 25 v.IV:13’ and MEE 15 32 v.III’:14’) and

ki-uš₃ (MEE 15 21 r.VI:14’ and MEE 15 32 v.III’:15’).

EBK-A 544 // VE 579 also refers to hydraulic works, šag₄-a-uš₃ = sa-a-tum (source EBL₁), = si-a-tum (sources EBL₂ and EBL₄), šayṭum and šiyāṭum, “rainwater cistern, place where water collects” ²⁹.

Therefore, in the second half of the III millennium at Ebla, the sign BAD with the value uš was not used for “blood” or for “to shut off, block up”. Only later were uš₃ = dānum and uš₃ = sakārum reduced to uš = dāmu(m) and uš = sekēru(m).

However, besides uš₁ I, “blood” and uš₂ II, “to shut off, block up”, other readings of LAK-672 were also known in the second half of the III millennium.

(b) At Šuruppak sumur is probably attested in AH C b248, má-sūmur ³⁰.

(c) Then there is subs₃, related to the value munsu₃ of LAK-672 ³¹. At Ebla it occurs in EBK-A 493 // VE 525, šu-subs₃ = ib-zú (source EBL₁), = ʼa₃-gi-da-tum (sources EBL₂ and EBL₄), probably ḫibšum and ḫagidatum or ʼaqidatum, “(a kind of bandage for the hands)”, later in Mesopotamia šu-su-ub = šuṣippu(m), “towel” ³².

³⁰ Veldhuis 2004:147, “sumur = MUNSUB ... a kind of reed structure on a boat”, with literature; Alster 2005:15, “a cover of reeds or similar protecting the center of a boat against the sun”; Attinger 2007, “cabine”.
(d) But munsub was also known to the Ebla scribes, as shown by an entry of the section dealing with ropes and parts of the harness of AH A, attested in the Abu Salabikh source IAS 33 r.X:12-17 and in the Ebla source MEE 3 45+46 v.I:2-9.33:

ad-tab, “headstall of a harness”,
KA-SU, “tethering rope”,
níg-anš-e-aka, “part of the harness”,
níg-dul₅, “cover(ing) of the head” or “yoke for equids”,
(ēš-)dam-ga, “(binding of) the draft pole”,
(ēš-)sa-ḪAR, “carrying net”,
(ēš-)munsub, “goat hair (rope)”,
ēš-bāra, “sack”.

These materials could suggest that the basic differences between siki vs. munsub are
(a) untied and short hair vs. tied and long hair (or a hair-style) and (b) hair vs. the mane
(which is also gū-bar = gupārū).

(e) However, I am uncertain about the reading and meaning of LAK-672 in:
ₚ₇-ti-LAK-672 (at Šuruppak in SF 69 r. VI:2, perhaps a(n anatomical?) term referring
to the eye),
ₚ₉al₅ (LAK-636)-LAK-672-ṬAR (at Šuruppak in AH C b217),
ₚš-LAK-672 (at Ebla in EBK-A 457, in the unilingual Sumerian lists MEE 15 23
v.IV:12’ and MEE 15 41 edge III’:1’, and in VE 489, = uš-du-bu, uninterpreted,
in the sources EBL₂ and EBL₄, untranslated in the sources EBL₁ and probably also in
ELP₁).

The same problem applies to the two names of stones in one of the Šuruppak sources
of AH B (SF 20 r.II:13f.):
ₚš-LAK-672³,₉,
murgu-LAK-672³,₉,
as well as for the following terms found in unilingual Sumerian lists from Ebla, probably
with reference to parts of the intestine (considering that at Ebla šag₄ means not only
“interior of a building, (secluded) chambers”, as in VE 595, = ḫadrum³⁴, but also “inner
body, internal organs”, as in ELPB b6)³⁵:
šag₄-gig-LAK-672 (MEE 15 18 r.V’:4’ and MEE 15 25 v.II:2’, wr. šag₄-LAK-672-
gig),
šag₄-si-LAK-672 (MEE 15 25 v.III’:3’),

Here perhaps LAK-672 is a verb, to be read either šub₃ (as in šu-sub₃) or uš₅ =
sakārum, “to shut off, block up”, discussed above (therefore šag₄-gig-uš₅, šag₄-si-uš₅ and
šag₄-uš₅ are names of parts of the intestine or of diseases of the intestine?).

However, the entries now discussed show the existence of a series of terms formed by
names of parts of the body + LAK-672:
gū-LAK-672,
murgu-LAK-672,
šag₄-LAK-672.

---

Conti 2001:197; cf. in Mesopotamia šag₄ = qerbu(m) and also the use of Italian “budello”.
35 Catagnoti - Bonechi n.d., with literature.
ṣu-LAK-672.

As we saw above, for ṣu-LAK-672 there is evidence for the reading ṣu-sub₅. Furthermore, a word in some way related to these terms (unless it is a Semitic loanword?) is ne-sub₅ (EBK-A 783), which in VE 849 is translated as ne-sa-gu (source EBL₁), ne-sa-gu-um (sources EBL₂ and EBL₄), i.e. nišgum, “kiss”⁳⁶.

Another member of this series, then, is igi-LAK-672, attested in EBK-A 672. In VE 730 the bilingual sources EBL₁ and EBL₄ (missing from EBL₂ and EBL₃) translate it as si-rí-a-du. This translation has been considered the same as sa-rí-a-du = LAK-672 of eEBL-j, and has been interpreted as “net of blood-vessels” or (with the reading igi-munsub) as “hair of the face”⁴⁷. If EV 0467 is to be read uš₅ = sa-rí-a-du and to be interpreted as “net of blood-vessels”, then igi-uš₅ = si-rí-a-du could mean “capillaries of the eyes”, šīrīyātum.

However, these interpretations of the two Semitic translations si-rí-a-du and sa-rí-a-du look unlikely to me⁴⁸. I suggest that the scribe of eEBL-j opted for the value munsub of LAK-672, and that at Ebla sa-rí-a-du = munsub is šašīyatum, “hair, mane” or the like⁴⁹. If so, this scribe shows he is aware that LAK-672, when used as a substantive, refers to “blood” and to “hair, mane”. This was probably clear also to the scribe of EBK-A as well as to the scribes of the bilingual sources EBL₂ and EBL₄. In fact, the only rationale I see for the sequence LAK-672 - siki in EBK-A 900-901 // VE 970-971 is that LAK-672 had both the meanings “blood” and “hair, mane”. In its first meaning, it closed the non acrographic but strongly thematic section dealing with evil smelling and / or red liquids, but at the same time in its second and rarer meaning it introduced the acrographic section siki dealing with “hair” and “wool”. If this conjecture is correct, the scribes of the bilingual sources EBL₂ and EBL₄ translated LAK-672 as “blood”, while the scribe of eEBL-j translated it as “hair, mane”. A merely palaeographic reason for the proximity of LAK-672 and siki in these texts seems less probable to me, because in the second half of the III millennium LAK-672 had not yet become SIKI+SUḪUR (like MUNSUB some centuries later), but ERIN+LAK-347.

Therefore I suggest for VE 730 an equivalence šīrīyātum = igi-uš₅ or = igi-sub₅ or = igi-munsub, but anyway with reference to an anatomical part of the eye, probably the “eyelash(es)”, not attested in ELPB, where the Sumerian terms which refer to the “eye” in (a17 - a24) and in (a32 - a34) are⁴⁰

igi, “eye”,
SAGxIGI(LAK-309a) (probably to be read gakkul₅), “eyeball(s)”,
sig-ṣi-zi, “pupil(s)”,

³⁸ In Militarev - Kogan 2005:344 both si-rí-a-du and sa-rí-a-du are compared to the difficult Semitic root *šIr(y)-(ā)n- and var., “(Achilles’) tendon; sinew, muscle (of leg)”, discussed in Militarev - Kogan 2000:239f., where the occurrences of ‘‘artery’’ in Syr. šeryānā, Mnd. širiana and Arb. šarīyān-, and of ‘blood vessels’ in Amh. šarassē (to be reconstructed as another meaning ‘artery, blood vessel’ for common Semitic?)’ are mentioned.
³⁹ As for the formation cf. e.g. VE 1151, uru-bar = i-rí-a-tum, šīrīyatum, “suburbs” (Fronzaroli 1979b:9 and 1984b:131, 143; Sjöberg 2004:273).
⁴⁰ Catagnoti - Bonechi n.d., with literature.
sig₇-ka-kešda, probably “eyelid(s)”,
sig₇-igi, “eyebrow(s)”,
igi-ub, perhaps “lachrymal gland, tear-sac”,
igi-LAGAB, “(a part of the eye)”,
igi-kun, “(a part of the eye)”,
igi-su₄, “(a part of the eye)”,
igi-su₄-su₄, probably “iris”,
igi-dar, “ocular cavity”,

while other relevant Sumerian anatomical terms dealing with the “eye” in other Ebla lexical sources are

e-igi-2, perhaps “optic nerve” (in the unilingual Sumerian list *MEE* 15 18 r.III’:8’), and

sig₇-gi₄-zi-na, “(a part of the eye)” (in the unilingual Sumerian list *MEE* 15 26 v.IV:18).

(2) The Sumerian term⁴¹ also occurs in the “Tribute” List 26 and 54 (Ebla source, ga-kad₄-muten in the Šuruppak sources; the context refers to its eggs) and in LFA 79 (Šuruppak source, kak-tum muten in the Ebla source). At Ebla it is found in EBK-A 934 and in unilingual Sumerian lists *MEE* 15 32 v.VI’:13’ and *MEE* 3 41 I’:5’.

In *VE* 1004 it is left untranslated by the main sources EBL₂ and EBL₄ (missing from EBL₃). Its translation in eEBL-j may derive from *bqr, “to perforate, split”⁴². Probably it is an O/1 participle, ṣuṣiru, perhaps with reference to a typical behaviour of the bird, such as its ability to split objects or the like (the “woodpecker”?).

⁴³ Pettinato 1982:104.
⁴⁴ Fronzaroli 1984a:185.
The text has the marker \ of the Semitic translation, but only in the first equivalence. The text of eEBL-k runs as follows:

obverse
(1) (= EV 0221)
I:1-2 nam-munus / ù-nu-sum \ “femininity”
(2) (= VE 581, EV 0371)
II:1-2 §ag₃-₃u / wa-a-tum “midwife”
reverse (blank)

Commentary:
(1) eEBL-k provides the only Ebla attestation of this Sumerian abstract term (as for the nouns with nam- see below, eEBL-n). Its Semitic translation is $unu$©um\textsuperscript{45}.

(2) The Sumerian term also occurs (a) in ED Lù C 44 and ED Lù E 159, (b) in the literary text Hymn to Nisaba found at Ebla (ARET V 7 v.VI:2), and (c) in the Šuruppak and Ebla administrative records\textsuperscript{46}. In the Ebla unilingual acrographic (ē§-bar-kin\textsubscript{3}) lists it is attested in EBK-A 546 and in MEE 15 32 v.III':16’ and MEE 15 53 r.III':6’. As for the bilingual list, in VE 581 the main sources EBL\textsubscript{1}, EBL\textsubscript{2} and EBL\textsubscript{4} translate it as mullittum, a 0/2 participle\textsuperscript{47}. eEBL-k has a different translation but with the same etymology, wallādum or more probably wallāttum < *wld\textsuperscript{48}.

TM.75.G.2199 = MEE 4 82 = eEBL-l
The III millennium Ebla bilingual lexical list 75.2199 (MEE 4 82, EV\textsuperscript{49}; photograph in MEE 4, Tav. XXXa) is inscribed on the obverse of a regularly rounded, very small tablet.

eEBL-l deals with one Sumerian term, followed by its Semitic translation. This equivalence does not occur in the main sources of the Ebla bilingual list, and therefore eEBL-l cannot be related to any of them.

The text has of the marker \ of the Semitic translation.

The text of eEBL-l runs as follows:


\textsuperscript{49} Pettinato 1982:103.
obverse

(1) (= EV 0419)
I:1-2 ḫaš-ḫaš / ga-da-tum
I:3, II:1 (blank)
reverse (blank).

Commentary:

(1) Because of the later lexical equivalence ḫaš = gadādu⁵⁰ (where the WSemitic loanword in Akkadian means “abtrennen” in AHw, p. 273, “to chop” in CAD G, p. 8, and “− to separate off” in CDA², p. 87), the translation in eEBL-I has been mostly derived from Semitic *gdd, “to cut (off), separate off, engrave” (“couper, inciser” in DRS I, pp. 99ff.), while, as for its morphology, sometimes it has been interpreted as an infinitive 0/1, gadādu⁵¹.

However, in the main Ebla bilingual list, a reduplicated Sumerian form such as ḫaš-ḫaš (a) is not used to indicate the plural of a noun (as, instead, happens e.g. in the Ebla administrative records for writings such as lugal-lugal or dumu-mí-dumu-mí) and (b) normally does not correspond to a Semitic 0/1 infinitive la2a3-, which commonly corresponds to non-reduplicated Sumerian elements (e.g. VE 717, ĕr = ba-ga-um, bakayum, “to cry”)⁵² or to Sumerian compound verbs (e.g. VE 145, igi-gar = ba-la-um, barāyum, “to inspect”)⁵³.

Bearing in mind that in the Ebla bilingual list the Semitic 0/1 infinitive is written using sequences such as Ca-Ca-Cum / Ca-Ĉa-Cu(-um), we can distinguish three groups of equivalences in which a reduplicated Sumerian element occurs.

[A] In 37 equivalences reduplicated Sumerian elements are found in second position of compounds, while the Semitic translations are not sequences such as Ca-Ca-Cum / Ca-Ĉa-Cu(-um)⁵⁴:

| VE 44   | ninda-du₈-du₄ | a-ba-tum                      |
| VE 55   | nīg-sa₇-sa₇   | a-ga-ša-tum (?) , a-gú-šu    |
| VE 62   | nīg-du₄-du₄   | da-bu                        |
| VE 64   | nīg-lu-lu     | ti-ʔa-ma-tum                 |
| VE 68   | nīg-ē-sun-sun | en-nu, ʔa-na-núm             |
| VE 71   | nīg-si₉-si₉   | ša-nu, ūnu-nu-ga-tum         |

⁵⁰ Aa III/5:103ff. (M. Civil et alii, MSL XIV, p. 346), ṣub-šaš = šeβēru, ḫaššu, ḫaššu, ḫaššu, ḫaššu, ẖumuštu, ḫakāru, gadādu, ḫaššu, ĕpaššu, ĕpāššu, ĕpaššu, ĕpāššu. Diri I 64ff. (M. Civil et alii, MSL XV, p. 108).


⁵⁴ As for the pairs of Sumerian terms where one of them has a reduplicated element see Krecher 1984:154 and Conti 1990:69ff. n. 33, with further literature, «Krecher ... nota che ad una coppia di sumerogrammi, dove il secondo ha il secondo elemento raddoppiato (X.A : X.A.A) corrisponde frequentemente una coppia di glosse, con rapporto 1v2v3- : tv1(tv)2v3-». 
Studies in the Ebla Lexical Lists, II

| VE 74          | nig-kar-kar       | dal-da-i-bù          |
| VE 77          | ninda-sal-sal     | is-bi-lu             |
| VE 132, 1401   | nig-mes-mes       | uš-ti-du            |
| VE 175         | gu-dim-dim        | ḫu-ba-ra, ḫu-ba-lum |
| VE 176         | gu-ē-dim-dim      | ḫa-ḫa-na-tum        |
| VE 258         | sag-KAK-bad-bad   | NE-ti-ū sag, ga-la-tum |
| VE 282         | še-ū-ri-ri-ga     | li-gi-tum           |
| VE 467         | giš-pa-mul-mul    | ḫu-si-bù, ḫu-sa-bù, ḫu-sa-šù₁₆ |
| VE 476         | giš-su-dab-dab    | a-du-um, mu-a{-[...]|
| VE 529         | šu-gíd-gíd        | mu-da-bīl-du        |
| VE 555         | á-du₇-du₇         | da-da-ga-bù-um      |
| VE 574         | sā-dab-dab        | du-uš-da-na-um, du-uš-da-ne-um, du-sa-ne-um |
| VE 578         | sā-gíd-gíd        | bi-na-tum           |
| VE 603         | a-NE-NE           | ti-iš-da-i-mu       |
| VE 656         | še-ār-ār          | da₂-ān-um, da₂-ān-um |
| VE 662         | še-zū-zū          | ma-ba-ga-da         |
| VE 665         | ŠE-SIG₂₃-NE-NE    | ga-za-um, gi-za-um  |
| VE 892         | i-rá-rá           | ra-gi-um            |
| VE 939         | dug-gur₄-gur₄     | gu-ra-ru₁₂ ŞE+TIN, gu-ra-lu ŞE+TIN |
| VE 990         | al₆-dab-dab       | du-ub-da-lu-um, dub-da-lu-um |
| VE 1049        | zi-du₈-du₈        | da-da-me-zu-um      |
| VE 1132        | ū-sā-sā           | da-da-i-lum, si-ga-bù-um |
| VE 1139        | ū-gal-gal         | du-da-gi-LUM, da-da-mu-um |
| VE 1145        | mu-giri-giri      | da-la-LUM           |
| VE 1165        | dub-zu-zu         | ā-me-a-nùm          |
| VE 1216        | sag-si-bad-bad    | ma-ba-a-su sag      |
| VE 1250        | mes-lu-lu         | [...]-ri-tum        |
| VE 1264        | ab-lā-lā          | ur⁻xd⁻[...]         |
| VE 1406        | še-gud-gud         | gi-za-lu a-ti wa-ba-um. |

Clearly the Semitic translations in VE 55, 62, 64, 68, 71, 74, 77, 126, 132, 175, 176, 258, 282, 467, 476, 529, 555, 574, 578, 603, 662, 665, 801, 892, 939, 990, 1049, 1132, 1139, 1165, 1216, 1250, 1264 and 1406 are not of the Ca-Ca-Cum / Ca-Ca-Cu(-um) kind. Actually, these equivalences refer to elative or intensive nominal forms. While the meaning of the equivalence in VE 1145 is still unknown, based on the occurrence of ninda-du₈-du₈ as the name of a profession in the Ebla source of Names and Professions List 47, VE 44 should refer to the name of a profession of the lA22ā3- type (‘appa-lum, “baker”)⁵⁵, and the equivalence in VE 665 certainly refers to a noun (an anatomical term)⁵⁶.

---

⁵⁵ Bonechi 2006:89, with literature.
⁵⁶ Catagnioti - Bonechi n.d.
[B] In four equivalences, reduplicated Sumerian terms occur in the first position in compounds, before a verbal base, and once again their Semitic translations are not 0/1 infinitives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sumerian</th>
<th>Semitic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VE 164</td>
<td>tēš-tēš-kú du-uš-da-gi-lum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE 531</td>
<td>šu-šu-ra da-ba-um, ma-ḥa-zi i-da-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE 793</td>
<td>MUL-MUL-za na-me-su(-um)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE 1126</td>
<td>DIM-DIM-za da-da-me-šum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the three translations which are not 0/1 infinitives, VE 793 and VE 1126 refer to kind(s) of noise. As for the meaning of VE 164, notice that VE 163 probably means “famine, hunger, starvation” the possibility that this pair (if it is a pair) of equivalences refers to the opposition between a lack and an abundance of food cannot be ruled out.

Semitic 0/1 infinitives could occur only in VE 531, but I prefer nominal forms such as ṭapāhum and maḥši yidayn.

[C] In 8 equivalences reduplicated Sumerian elements do not occur in compounds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sumerian</th>
<th>Semitic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VE 716</td>
<td>ʾér-ʾer i-it-ma-a-tum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE 792</td>
<td>mul-mul ga-ma-du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE 826, 635</td>
<td>di-di a-lu-um; ʾa-la-gúm, ʾa-gúm, ʾa-a-gúm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE 829</td>
<td>ᵃš-sag₇-sag₇ du-da-du-um; da-da-zi-gúm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE 980</td>
<td>kas₄-kas₄ du-da-zi-lu-um, du-da-zi-lum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE 1234</td>
<td>dal-dal nu-bu-ru₄₉-um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE 1304</td>
<td>me-me ʾu-me-tum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV 0419</td>
<td>ḫa-ḫa ga-da-tum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since they are not of the Ca-Ca-Cum / Ca-Ca-Cu(-um) kind, the Semitic translations are not 0/1 infinitives in VE 716, 829, 980, 1234 and 1304.

In VE 792 the equivalence refers to the “Pleiades”, kaymatum. In VE 826 and 635 both the Semitic translations, with reference to a kind of motion, show forms from *hlk and *w-ra². They may be interpreted, I think, as two (almost synonym) nouns of the 1a23- pattern, waʾrum and halkum.

To sum up, it seems unlikely that in EV 0419 ga-da-tum is the 0/1 infinitive gada-dum.

The equivalence could refer to another nominal form of *gdd. If so, it may be (a) a 1a23- m. s. noun, namely gaddum, cf. VE 826, di-di = halkum and waʾrum (see above), (b) or, more likely, a 1a23-āt- f. pl. noun, namely gaddātum, cf. VE 716, ʾér-ʾer =

---

57 VE 793, 1126, see Civil 1984:88, 83 and Black 2003:49f.; both the Semitic translations from *nms.
58 VE 164, tuṣṭaʾkilum, Conti 1990:90 and n. 126, tuṣṭaʾkilum < *ʾklu, “verosimilmente ‘moltiplicazione’” because of Akk. ṣutākulu, with literature and discussion, and Fronzaroli 2006:37, “multiplier”.
60 Conti 1990:151 and nn. 412f., with literature and discussion, ṭapāhum and maḥši yidayn, “battere le mani”.
"idmaʾätum, “tears”\(^{63}\). A generic translation “pieces” fits well with the many occurrences of ḫaš (-ḫaš) in the Ebla administrative texts, which will be discussed elsewhere\(^{64}\).

**TM.75.G.2202 = MEE 4 84 = eEBL-n**

The III millennium Ebla bilingual lexical list 75.2202 (MEE 4 84, EV \(^{65}\); photograph in MEE 4, Tav. XXXc) is inscribed on the obverse of a very small and olive-shaped rounded tablet (the writing runs along the longer axis). It is well written.

eEBL-n deals with one Sumerian term, followed by its Semitic translation. This equivalence does not occur in the main sources of EBL, while the Sumerian term could occur in eEBL-d, where, however, it should have a different translation (obv. V:6f., see *ad loc.*).

eEBL-n bears the marker \ of the Semitic translation.

The text of eEBL-n runs as follows:

obverse
(1) (EV 0219)
I:1-2 nam-bárag/ da-za-ʔaš-núm\ “the act of spreading, smearing (or the like)"

reverse (blank).

Commentary:
(1) The reading of the two terms is uncertain, and the entry is still unexplained.

At Ebla NAM has the values bir\(_5\) (and bir\(_6\)), buru\(_5\), nam and sim. In the Ebla acrographic list, a section NAM with eleven entries is found in EBK-A 1012-1022 // VE 1088-1098. These entries are:

(a) terms with nam-, in reference to abstract notions or to nomina actionis:
   (a1) nam-en = ma-li-ğú-um, maššukum, “kingship”, in EBK-A 1012 // VE 1088 (sources EBL\(_2\) and EBL\(_4\))\(^{66}\);  
   (a2) nam-nam-en = du-da-li-ğú-um, tumallikum, “exertion of kingship”, in EBK-A 1013 // VE 1089 (sources EBL\(_2\) and EBL\(_4\))\(^{67}\);  
   (a3) nam-kuš = giš-tum, kitišum, “sworn pact, oath”, in EBK-A 1014 // VE 1090 (Sumerian term in the sources EBL\(_2\) and EBL\(_4\), translation in the source EBL\(_3\))\(^{68}\);  
   (a4) nam-ra-aka = ša-la-tum, šallatum, “booty”, in EBK-A [1017] // VE 1093 (sources EBL\(_3\) and EBL\(_4\))\(^{69}\);

---

\(^{63}\) As for VE 716, Conti 1990:183 and n. 555, with literature.

\(^{64}\) Bonechi n.d.

\(^{65}\) Pettinato 1982:104.


(a5) nam-munus = ṣunuṯum, “femininity”, in EV 0221 (source eEBL-k, see above)\(^{69}\);
(a6) nam-nir = [...], perhaps “authority, supremacy”\(^{70}\) (source eEBL-c₄, see ad loc.);
(b) terms with sim, “swallow”:
(b1) sim-ma = dag-ga-tum, daggatum, “chicken”, in EBL-A \(\langle 1020 \rangle \) // VE 1096
(sources EBL₃ and EBL₄)\(^{72}\);
(b2) sim-gün\(\text{muten} \) (?) = sa-su-ga-lum (?), perhaps šaša’garum, perhaps “(a kind of
swallow)” or less probably “(a kind of sparrow, perhaps the) golden oriole”, in EBL-A
\(\langle 1021 \rangle \) // VE 1097 (source EBL₄)\(^{73}\);
(c) terms with bir₃\(^{74}\), “flying insect” rather than “locust”, and at Ebla probably “fly”,
perhaps also generic for “insect”:
(c1) bir₃ = šē-bū, dibbum, “fly”, in EBL-A 1022 // VE 1098 source EBL₄, Akk.
zumbu, zubbû(m), zumbu\(^{75}\).
(c2) bir₅-ur = ga-bí-a-nûm, kalbiyûnum, “tick”, in EBL-A 1015 // VE 1091 (Sumerian
in the sources EBL₃ and EBL₄, Semitic translation in the source EBL₄)\(^{76}\);
(c3) bir₅-na-DU.DU = nu-bí-a-nûm, nupplûnum, “(a kind of insect)”
(probably “caterpillar” or less likely “(a kind of butterfly)”)\(^{77}\), in EBL-A \(\langle 1016 \rangle \) // VE 1092
(sources EBL₃ and EBL₄), cf. Akk. nappillû, “caterpillar”, in Hh XIV 246 and 273d-275b

1983:38; Conti 2003:129; cf. PSD A/3 p. 126. The Sumerian term is also attested in AH D 40’.
(?)” and 1984b:153, «la grafia permetterebbe anche una forma lu23-»; Krebernik 1983:45f.; Sjöberg
2004:278; e-PSD, “femininity”.
71 Krebernik 1992:130.
72 Sjöberg 2003a:264.
Rendsburg 1992, šaša’garum; Müller 1995:137 and n. 11; Sjöberg 2003a:264 and 2004a:271; Veldhuis
2004:270; Militarev - Kogan 2005:46f. Furthermore, is sa-su-ga-lum another case of
“synthetic” writing (most recently discussed in Bonechi 2008b), to be interpreted as “sa-ga-LUM
and su-ga-LUM”?
75 This same interpretation was independently suggested to me by Leonid Kogan in a letter dated
76 Cf. Salonen 1973:150; Sjöberg 2003b:553, “dog fly”, Sumerian term compared with later nim-ur-
gi = zumbi kalbi, Semitic translation with Akk. ḡību, “(a kind of fly)” and related Semitic terms;
In the Ebla administrative text 75.1669 v.III:4 ga-bí-a-nûm is a PN. Moreover, because of the rather
improbable writing of the translation I wonder if VE 1395’, read “BU-ur = ī-wa-a-NE-LUM” (source
EBL₃ₖ) in Pettinato 1982:339, is in fact another attestation (to be collated) of this entry.
77 Incidentally, the as yet unidentified Sumerian and the Semitic terms for “butterfly” very probably
occur in the Ebla lexical lists. The former is girû₃(UH)\(^{\text{stern}}\) (for this term see recently Veldhuis
2004:246 and n. 87, with literature, and Civil 2007:25), which is attested in LA B 117 (source E₄,
MEE 3 18 r.VI.’18’). The latter is to be found in ESLA 44 (MEE 4 116, r.IV:12, read gul-zi’-NE-
tum in Pettinato 1982:386, and unexplained in Sjöberg 1996:19) and in EBLA 68 (MEE 4 96
v.VI.1’, read [...]-x’-NE-tum in Pettinato 1982:108), where almost certainly gul-zi-bi-tum occurs.
This writing, if confirmed, is to be interpreted as kūršiptum or kūršibtum, which is the same term
known in Akkadian (Militarev - Kogan 2005:164 and XLVI).
corresponding to \textsuperscript{zi-bi-in} zibin and to za-na-bal, za-na-maḥ, za-na-mul and uṣu\textsuperscript{78}; or to be read ziba(na),(BIR3)\textsuperscript{na-DU,DU};?

(c4) bir\textsubscript{5}-KUR = \textit{ir-bi-nūm}, \textit{erbēnum} < \textit{ṣarbay-ān-um}, “locust”, in EBL-A \textsuperscript{[1018]} // VE \textsuperscript{1094} (sources EBL\textsubscript{3} and EBL\textsubscript{4}), Akk. \textit{erbâ(m)}\textsuperscript{79}.

(c5) bir\textsubscript{5}-KUR\textsuperscript{mûšen} = \textit{ir-gi-lum}, hergilum, “(a kind of locust)”, in EBL-A ‘\textsuperscript{1019}’ // VE \textsuperscript{1095} (sources EBL\textsubscript{3} and EBL\textsubscript{4}), Akk. \textit{ergiltu}\textsuperscript{80}.

Therefore buru\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{mûšen}, “sparrow”, does not occur in the section NAM of EBL-A and EBL.

In eEBL-n a possible reading of the Sumerian term is nam-tág\textsuperscript{81}, “sin”, but the Semitic translation is different from the various Akk. terms for “sin” (i.e., \textit{emettu(m)}, \textit{gillatu(m)}, \textit{gullutu(m)}, \textit{ḥitu(m)} I, \textit{namtaggû, pipilû, settu}), and I am unable to explain “\textit{da-za-NI-LUM}” as an Ebla form with such a meaning.

My reading nam-bárag = \textit{da-za-\textsuperscript{a}s-nūm} is a reference to VE \textsuperscript{129}, níg-bábrág = WAZA-té (source EBL\textsubscript{3}), = \textit{da-ti-ba-\textsuperscript{[um]} (source EBL\textsubscript{3a}). Elsewhere I have discussed these two translations, suggesting that they are the Semitic nouns \textit{waṣ‘um} or \textit{wiṣ‘um} (from Semitic *\textit{wd}k) and \textit{ṭaphûm, ṭiphûm} (from Semitic *\textit{ṭph}), and that the equivalence may refer to “poultice”\textsuperscript{82}. On these grounds, in eEBL-n the translation may be a \textit{tālā2a3-ān-\textit{um}} from *\textit{wd}k (\textit{ta} for \textit{s} at Ebla is rare but not impossible)\textsuperscript{83}.


\textsuperscript{81} The entry is read “nam-dag = \textit{tā-za-ni-lum}” in Pettinato 1982:104.

\textsuperscript{82} Bonechi 2008b, with literature.

\textsuperscript{83} It remains unclear to me whether and how relevant two further Ebla equivalences are here. They are VE 201, KA-AN-DAG (also attested in the unilingual Sumerian list EBL-A 191, KA-an KA-AN-DAG (É)) = \textit{ba-zi-lu-\textsuperscript{um}} (sources EBL\textsubscript{3} and EBL\textsubscript{4}), = \textit{ba-zi-lum} (source EBL\textsubscript{3a}), and VE 1198, baran-DAG = WA-sa-NI-\textit{um} (source EBL\textsubscript{4}), = WA-sa-NI (source EBL\textsubscript{3b}). The two Sumerian terms show the same formation, and a verb (bárag = Akk. \textit{ṣuparruru II}, “to spread out”, \textit{ṣêtûm} II, “to spread out”; dag = Akk. \textit{nagâru(m)}, “to demolish, scratch”, dag-dag = Akk. \textit{nagâšu(m), “to go to(wards)”, iangasu, “to wander, travel about”}) looks more likely to me than a noun (dag = Akk. \textit{ṣubtu(m)}). But both the Ebla Semitic translations are of uncertain interpretation. The former has been compared to Akk. \textit{bussurat(m)}, \textit{bussurat(m)} (D’Agostino 1990:64, “KA-an-dag, ‘messaggio, ambasciata’ ... si può avanzare l’ipotesi che dag sia stato considerato un verbo ausiliare”), but a more convincing comparison is with Aram. \textit{bṣr}, “to scatter” (Sjöberg 2004:259, “if DAG is to be read as bāra ‘to spread (out)’”). The morphology of the Semitic translation remains unclear (\textit{lab3}-?). The latter (read \textit{wa-sa-NI-\textsuperscript{um}} in Pettinato 1982:327), on the basis of the meaning “to roam freely; to pursue, search after” of the verb bar-dag, has been read “\textit{wa-sa-li-\textsuperscript{um}}” (Civil 1984:83, “\textit{waṣārūl}, ‘to release’ ... ‘to roam freely’”, followed by PSD B, pp. 117f., and see also Sjöberg 2004:275), with the problematic use of N\textit{I} with the value \textit{lī}. The more probable readings are WA-sa-as\textsubscript{-\textit{um}} or WA-sa-I\textsubscript{-\textit{am}}, and WA-sa-bu\textsubscript{-\textit{am}}. The former, as “\textit{wa-sa-I\textsuperscript{-\textit{um}}}”, is adopted in Butz 1984:115 and n. 85, “‘ausbreiten’ (von) ‘Garben’ ... Zu akkad. \textit{waṣṣûm} ‘ausbreiten, weit öffnen’”; the latter in D’Agostino 1990:169 n. 76, “\textit{waṣābu}, attestato nelle liste mesopotamiche per il valore bāra del segno DAG’). Cases of Semitic \textit{li}’ written by means of signs of the series A (a, i and u) are known at Ebla (Bonechi 1989:138f.), but, to my knowledge, cases of N\textit{I} = a or i for \textit{ḥâl, īril}, are unattested. If the translation is to be read WA\textsubscript{-\textit{ba-\textsuperscript{a}s}(\textsuperscript{-\textit{um}})}, among other possibilities cf. perhaps Ar. \textit{ašaba}, “mèlar; blâmer”, \textit{aṣābat}, “gens d’origines diverses”, \textit{awšāb}, “ramassis de gens de toute sorte” (DRS, p. 640, *\textit{wsb} / *\textit{šb}), or Syr. \textit{awšēb}, “étendre” (DRS, p. 645, *\textit{wsb}).
Sigla of the lexical lists quoted:

| AH A | IAS 31+33, IAS 30 + 37 + 226, IAS 35 + 225, MEE 3 45 + 46, TM.75.G.10011, MEE 3 61 (excerpt) |
| AH B | SF 20, SF 21+22, IAS 34 |
| AH C | SF 43 +74 |
| AH D | MEE 3 44 |
| EBL-A | MEE 4 115 = MEE 15 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 |
| EBL-1a-e | MEE 4 12; MEE 4 24; MEE 4 32; MEE 4 40; MEE 4 47 + 48 + 53 + 60 (source D in Archi 1986:83) |
| EBL-2 | MEE 4 1+2+3+4+5+6+7+16+17+18 (source A in Archi 1986:83) |
| EBL-3a | MEE 4 13 + 14 + 15 + 19 + 20 + 21 + 25 + 26 + 31 + 33 + 34 + 35 + 36 + 37 + 38 + 39 + 41 + 42 + 43 + 44 + 49 + 50 + 51 + 52 + 54 + 55 + 56 + 57 + 58 + 59 + 61 + 62 + 72 + 106 + 107 (source C in Archi 1986:83) |
| EBL-3b | MEE 4 63 + 64 + 71 + ARET III 683 (source A 2 in Archi 1986:83) |
| EBL-4 | MEE 4 8 + 9 +10 + 11 + 22 + 23 + 27 + 28 + 29 + 30 + 45 + 46 + 65 + 66 + 67 + 68 + 69 +70 + MEE 3 42 (source B in Archi 1986:83) |
| EBLA | MEE 3 96 + 101 + 110 + 112 |
| ED Lü C | SF 47 |
| ED Lü E | IAS 54 + 56 + 58, IAS 55 + 59, IAS 60, IAS 57, MEE 3 7 + 8 + 9 + 10 + 11 +, MEE 3 6, HSS X 222, MAD 5 35, Buccellati 2003 |
| eEBL-a1 | MEE 4 81, EV i |
| eEBL-a2 | MEE 4 75, EV c |
| eEBL-b1 | MEE 4 74 |
| eEBL-b2 | MEE 4 73 |
| eEBL-c1 | [lost tablet] |
| eEBL-c2 | MEE 4 76, EV d |
| eEBL-c3 | [lost tablet] |
| eEBL-c4 | MEE 4 79 + 110, EV g+ai |
| eEBL-d | MEE 4 89 + 90, EV q |
| eEBL-k | MEE 4 86, EV n |
| eEBL-u | MEE 4 108, EV ag |
| ELFA | MEE 3 40 |
| ELPB | MEE 3 68, 71, 70 |
| ESL | MEE 3 51, 52 = Archi 1987:91-113 |
| ESLA | MEE 4 116 |
| LA B | IAS 28, IAS 27, MEE 3 20, MEE 3 22 + 23, MEE 3 19 + 24 + 25 + 75 + MEE 15 57, MEE 3 18, MEE 3 21 |
| LFA | ATU 3 “Birds”, SF 58 obv. VI:11ff., MEE 3 39 |
| LLi | ATU 3 “Cattle A”, SF 81, IAS 25 + 26, MEE 3 12 + 13 + 14 + 15 + 16 + 17, MEE 3 62 (excerpt). |

Sumerian writings:

- ḫaṣ-ḥaṣ “pieces”, = gaddātum, eEBL-l 1
- kad₄mušen “(a kind of bird)”, = bāqirum, eEBL-j 2
- munsu(LAK-672) “hair, mane”, = ša’riyatum, eEBL-j 1
- nam-bárag “the act of spreading out”, = tawṣa’ānum, eEBL-n 1
- nam-munus “femininity”, = ṭunūtum, eEBL-k 1
- šag₄zu “midwife”, = wallātum, eEBL-k 2
Further Sumerian elements:

bárag 
see nam-bárag
munus 
see nam-munus
muṣen 
see kad₄muṣen
zu 
see šag₄-uzu

Semitic writings:

ba-gi-lu-um 
bāqirum, “(a kind of bird)”, = kad₄muṣen, eEBL-j 2
da-za-ṣa₅-núm 
tawṣaʿānūm, “the act of spreading out”, = nam-bárag, eEBL-n 1
ga-da-tum 
gaddātum, “pieces”, = ḫaš-ḥaš, eEBL-l 1
sa-rí-a-du 
ṣaʿrīyatum, “hair, mane”, = munsub(LAK-672), eEBL-j 1
ù-nu-sum 
ʔunūtum, “femininity”, = nam-munus, eEBL-k 1
wa-a-tum 
wallātum, “midwife”, = šag₄-uzu, eEBL-k 2

Semitic terms:

ʔunūtum 
ù-nu-sum, “femininity”, = nam-munus, eEBL-k 1
bāqirum 
ba-gi-lu-um, “(a kind of bird)”, = kad₄muṣen, eEBL-j 2
gaddātum 
ga-da-tum, “pieces”, = ḫaš-ḥaš, eEBL-l 1
ṣaʿrīyatum 
ṣa-rí-a-du, “hair, mane”, = munsub(LAK-672), eEBL-j 1
tawṣaʿānūm 
da-za-ṣa₅-núm, “the act of spreading out”, = nam-bárag, eEBL-n 1
wallātum 
wa-a-tum, “midwife”, = šag₄-uzu, eEBL-k 2

Semitic roots:

*ʔanut- 
“to be feminine, female”: see ʔunūtum
*bqr 
“to perforate, split”: see bāqirum
*gdd 
“to cut (off), separate off, engrave”, see gaddātum
*ṣaʿr(-at)- 
“hair”: see ṣaʿrīyatum
*waʃ̄ 
“to stretch (out), spread (out), strew, release”: see tawṣaʿānūm
*wld 
“to bear, give birth to (a child)”: see wallātum
Bibliography

Alster 2005

Archi 1985

Archi 1986

Archi 1987a

Archi 1987b

Archi 1988
A. Archi, “Minima Eblaitica I”, NABU 1988/44.

Archi 1996

Attinger 2007

Baldacci 1994

Biga 1996
M.G. Biga, “Prosopographie et datation relative des textes d’Ébla”, Amurry 1, pp. 29-72.

Biga 1998

Biga 2000

Biga- Milano 1984

Biggs 1966

Biggs 1974
R.D. Biggs, Inscriptions from Tell Abū Salahīkh, OIP XCIX, Chicago.

Black 2003

Bonechi 1989
Bonechi 1997

Bonechi 1999

Bonechi 2000

Bonechi 2001

Bonechi 2006

Bonechi 2007a

Bonechi 2007b

Bonechi 2008a
M. Bonechi, “Bleeding and Leeches at ED III Shuruppak?”, forthcoming in NABU.

Bonechi 2008b

Bonechin.d.
M. Bonechi, Remarks on the Archaic Hymn to Shamash of Sippir, in preparation.

Buccellati 2003

Butz 1987

Castellino 1984

Catagnoti 1997a

Catagnoti 1997b

Catagnoti - Bonechi n.d.

Cavigneaux - al-Rawi 2002
Civil 1960
M. Civil, “Prescriptions médicales sumériennes”, RA 54, pp. 57-72.

Civil 1984

Civil 2007

Civil 2008

Conti 1990

Conti 1993

Conti 1997

Conti 1998

Conti 2001

Conti 2003

D’Agostino 1990
F. D’Agostino, Il sistema verbale numerico nei testi lessicali di Ebla, SS NS 7, Rome.

D’Agostino 1996

D’Agostino 2003

Edzard 1981

Edzard 1984
Studies in the Ebla Lexical Lists, II

Fronzaroli 1965

Fronzaroli 1979a
P. Fronzaroli, “Problemi di fonetica eblaia, 1”, SEb 1, pp. 65-89.

Fronzaroli 1979b
P. Fronzaroli, “Un atto reale di donazione dagli Archivi di Ebla (TM.75.G.1766)”, SEb 1, pp. 3-16.

Fronzaroli 1979c

Fronzaroli 1980a

Fronzaroli 1980b
P. Fronzaroli, “Gli equivalenti di eme-bal nelle liste lessicali eblaite”, SEb 2, pp. 91-95.

Fronzaroli 1982a

Fronzaroli 1982b
P. Fronzaroli, “Per una valutazione della morfologia eblaia”, SEb 5, pp. 93-120.

Fronzaroli 1984a
P. Fronzaroli, “Materiali per il lessico eblaia 1”, SEb 7, pp. 145-190.

Fronzaroli 1984b

Fronzaroli 1984c

Fronzaroli 1988

Fronzaroli 1989

Fronzaroli 1991

Fronzaroli 1993
P. Fronzaroli, Testi rituali della regalità (Archivio L.2769), ARET XI, Rome.

Fronzaroli 1995a

Fronzaroli 1995b

Fronzaroli 1995c
P. Fronzaroli, “Textes de chancellerie et textes littéraires à Ebla”, in F. Ismail (ed.), Proceedings of the International Symposium on Syria and the

Fronzaroli 2003

Fronzaroli 2005a

Fronzaroli 2005b

Fronzaroli 2006

Fronzaroli - Catagnoti 2006

Gelb et alii 1991

Huehnergard 1987
J. Huehnergard, Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription, HSS 32, Atlanta.

Krebernik 1983
M. Krebernik, “Zu Syllabar und Orthographie der lexicalischen Texte aus Ebla. Teil 2 (Glossar)”, ZA 73, pp. 1-47.

Krebernik 1984a
M. Krebernik, Die Beschwörungen aus Fara und Ebla. Untersuchungen zur ältesten keilschriftlichen Beschworungsliteratur, TSO 2, Hildesheim.

Krebernik 1984b

Krebernik 1988

Krebernik 1992

Krecher 1984

Lahlouh - Catagnoti 2006

Mander 1982

Militarev - Kogan 2000


The paper deals with four small bilingual lexical lists, TM.75.G.2199, 2202, 2300 and 2318 = MEE 4 82, 84, 85 and 86, found at Tell Mardikh (Syria), ancient Ebla, in Archive L.2769 of the III millennium BC royal palace. A new edition of each text is provided, followed by a philological and lexical commentary and by indexes of the writings and of their interpretations.