

Second Order Lexicography

M J Geller

It is always useful to bear in mind that Mesopotamian scholars and scribes did not have the benefit of easily accessible dictionaries and lexicons organised into neat alphabetic categories. The enormous epistemic burden posed by organising individual words within a writing system consisting of several hundred characters presents huge challenges, and what is impressive is that ancient scribes did not simply abandon the entire project from day one. The difficulties can easily be seen in an unusual lexical text known from one complete exemplar from Uruk from the 4th century BCE, also attested in a late fragment from Babylon as well. According to the colophon, the tablet was copied by the prolific late Uruk savant Iqiša from a Babylon original. The text has not yet received the attention it deserves.¹ Niek Veldhuis, in his important general study of lexical texts, *History of the Cuneiform Lexical Tradition* (Münster Verlag, 2013), briefly cites this tablet (p. 421) as having a character which is 'difficult to establish'. He gives a sample 12 lines and confines his description of the overall thematic content as unusual elaborations on two cuneiform signs, TU and KÉŠ (EZEN), with various readings. While Veldhuis is partly correct in his terse evaluation, there is much more to this tablet than two primary signs.

Although it is possible to invoke modern theories of semiotics and semantics, these do not explain the actual mechanics of the sequences of entries in a text such as this one,

¹The tablet (MNAO 11677), located in Rome's Museo Nazionale d'Arte Orientale, was published in photograph only and edited by W. Mayer, 'Lexikalische Listen aus Ebla und Uruk', *Or NS* 74 (2005), 159-164, with brief but useful notes on the text. Although Mayer's edition is exemplary in many ways, it hardly reflects the layout of the tablet, nor is every entry translated, and the primary character of the text remains unresolved. Work on this text was completed during a 3-month stay at the LMU in Munich sponsored by the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung.

which is based upon rare or unusual values of Sumerian signs with Akkadian translations. In almost all cases, the expected correspondence between a Sumerian word and its Akkadian equivalent term do *not* appear in this text.² Instead, the Sumerian entries cited tend to be extracted from lexical lists as alternative or even rare values within the complex system of polyvalent readings for Sumerian signs.

There are other interesting features of this tablet, apart from the fact that it does not represent a simple bilingual glossary. The correspondences between exotic Sumerian entries in the left-hand column corresponding to Akkadian entries in the right-hand column are not always attested in other lexical lists and bilingual texts. Second, the Sumerian values tend to represent 'real' Sumerian words rather than logograms used in Akkadian contexts. The list is not intended for elementary pedagogy, since there is no single discernible pattern for how and why this list was to be used, or why these particular extracts were drawn from standard lexical lists in a rather eclectic fashion. It is clear, however, that the scribe using this list would need to have an advanced knowledge of Sumerian and Akkadian lexicography.

One might consider the possibility that the Sumerian sign forms could function semiotically as pictographic images which were then translated into Akkadian, and that the sign itself (whether representing IGI, ŠI, BAD₅, etc.) serving as a symbol was sufficient. That this is not the case can be demonstrated from the many glosses in the text, which identify the actual phonetic value of the sign as a Sumerian lexeme.

Moreover, this tablet contains a colophon from the noted Uruk scholar Iqīša, claiming to be based upon a tablet-copy (*kī pī ṭuppi gabarī*) from Babylon for which no written sequel followed it (*šá DUB EGIR-šú NU SAR-u DU-ma*), indicating that this text is not part of a larger composition. Although a fragment of the Babylon Vorlage fragment may

² For instance, the common Sumerian logogram SI corresponding to Akkadian *qarnu* 'horn' is absent, in favour of more complex equations.

survive,³ the actual formulation of the text has no known duplicate among the large corpus of lexical texts known so far. From the evidence available to us, there is no way of knowing whether Iqīša was faithfully transmitting a text copied from a Babylonian original, or whether his attribution to an earlier text (*kī pī ṭuppi gabaṛī*) still left room for Iqīša to emend and add to the original composition. The spaced layout of the Rome tablet is characteristic of some other lexical texts⁴ and the transliteration below will attempt to reflect the original spacing as much as possible.

A (unmarked) = MNAO 11667 (see plate)

B = BM 38186 (CT 12 26)

1.	SI	še-el šá ^{gīš} TUKUL	sharpening of a tool ⁵
	SI	MIN šá qa-an-ṭup-pi	sharpening of a stylus
	SÌ	la-ta-ku šá MIN	checking of ditto (stylus) ⁶
	SÌ	la-mu-ú šá li-me-tú	to surround, of an area ⁷
5.	SÌ	za-a-na šá mar-tú.	to spatter (or adorn), of gall ⁸
	SÌ	ha-sa-su šá MU	to be aware, of a name

³ BM 38186 (CT 12 26), noted already by Mayer, *Listen*, 159, and mentioned by Veldhuis, *Lexical Tradition*, 421. The Babylon fragment is small, duplicating only a few lines, and hence it cannot be used as evidence for the complete Vorlage of the Uruk tablet.

⁴ See, for instance, K 49 (CT 18 49, Idu), which duplicates only one line of this text.

⁵ The expression *šēlu ša kakku* appears in one other lexical text (ALAN A 251, Sum. broken, CAD Š/2 275), as well as in a Šumma ālu commentary (CT 41 30: 8, edited Jiménez, E., 2016, “Commentary on Ālu 49 (CCP 3.5.49),” <https://ccp.yale.edu>).

⁶ This value for an equivalent to Akk. *latāku* is unknown, although SI = *latāku* is attested in MSL 9 131: 387, read as *la-ša-[šu]*, but corrected to *la-ta¹-ku¹* in DCCLT (Digital Corpus of Cuneiform Lexical Texts) (dcclt/corpus#P333149.193).

⁷ The 'area' or enclosure might refer to some aspect of writing, such as space on a tablet. This is a citation from Antagal III 207-208 (MSL 17 158) but may also reflect another entry, x SÌ.GA = *ni-tu₄ la-wu-u* 'surrounding an enclosure' (Nabn. O 272 = MSL 16, 294). The reading might also be relevant to another peculiar entry in a commentary to Šumma ālu omens, ŠI = *il-mi* 'to go in a circle': CT 41 28 rev. 31 = S. Freedman, *If a City is Set on a Height*, vol. 3 (Winona Lake, 2017), 33. See also Idu II 88, SÌ = *la-mu-u šá* [...], with a phonetic gloss *su-un-nu*, suggesting a reading of /SUM/ for SÌ; cf. dcclt/corpus#P365233.39.

⁸ The expression 'to spatter gall' is best known from incantations, cf. Udug.hul 13-15: 193-194, translating Sum. *uš₁₁ sù-sù* with Akk. *im-tu₄ iz-za-an*, 'spittle has spattered' (the victim). For other lexical evidence, see Antagal V iv 9' (MSL 17, 164), KI.NE^{zē-i}sì.ga = *za-a-n[u šá mar-ti]*, 'to spatter, of gall'. However, within the present juxtaposition of terms within this Rome tablet, one wonders if *martu* 'gall' might refer to a type of ink, which was applied to either leather or clay.

		Sì	<i>la-mu-ú šá li¹-me-tú</i>	to surround, of an enclosure ⁹	
	SIR ₅ (NU)	SIR ₅ (NU)	<i>ṭa-mu-ú</i>	to weave ¹⁰	
	SIR ₅	SIR ₅	<i>ṭi-mi-tu₄</i>	thread ¹¹	
10.	A.	IGI	<i>bi-ki-tú</i>	mourning, weeping ¹²	
	A.	IGI	<i>di-im-tú</i>	tears	
	A.	IGI	<i>ta-ni-hi</i>	lament	
	A.	IGI	<i>bi-ki-tú</i>	musical instrument ¹³	
	A.	IGI	<i>ba-ku-ú</i>	weep ¹⁴	
15.	BAD ₅ (IGI).	BAD ₅ (IGI)	<i>dáb-du-ú</i>	defeat ¹⁵	
	LIB ₄ (IGI).	LIB ₄ (IGI)	<i>hu-ub-bu-tú</i>	plunder ¹⁶	
	BAD ₅ .	BAD ₅	<i>ša-ba-tú</i>	seize	
	BAD ₅ .	BAD ₅	<i>nak-rù</i>	foreign (i.e. enemy) ¹⁷	
	BAD ₅ .	BAD ₅	<i>bal-ša</i> IGI	staring-eyed ¹⁸	
20.	BAD ₅ .	BAD ₅	<i>na-mir i-ni</i>	bright-eyed ¹⁹	
		LIM(IGI)	<i>na-mir-tú</i>	brightness ²⁰	B:]-[tú]
		ŠI(IGI)	<i>na-piš-tú</i>	breath ²¹	B:]-tú

⁹ This is the same entry as in I. 4 but should theoretically refer to a different context.

¹⁰ Other lexical texts do not record this reading.

¹¹ This reading of NU.NU for this noun is not attested.

¹² Cf. the phonetic gloss A.^{ir}IGI = *bi-ki-tú* in a Commentary to Šumma Izbu I. 147, see E. Leichty, *The Omen Series Šumma Izbu* (Locust Valley, N.Y. 1970), 216.

¹³ See CAD B 225, GI.ÍR.RA // *qan bikīti*, probably referring to a flute, in bilingual passages but not in lexical texts.

¹⁴ The reading of A.IGI in this entry is EŠ₉ (see Diri III 154, e-eš A.IGI = *bakû*, cf. MSL 15, 144). A similar list of Akkadian correspondences to the signs A.IGI appear in Diri texts (cf. M. Civil, *The Lexical Texts in the Schoyen Collection* (CUSAS 12, 2010, 33: 1-4), but with different nouns not usually associated with these Sumerian signs: *šihum* ('weeping'), *nissatum* ('mourning'), *tazzimtum* ('complaint'), and *tašmandum* (< *šamādu*, to 'bind'?); see also OB Diri Nippur (II. 287-292, MSL 15, 22). See also the lexical list Igituh 69-71, A.IGI = *bakû*, *dīmtu*, *tānīhu* (B. Landsberger and O. R. Gurney, 'igi-du-a = *tāmartu*, short version,' AfO 18, 82).

¹⁵ Sum. BAD₅.BAD₅ for *dabdû* appears to be only attested lexically (CAD D 14).

¹⁶ OB Diri Nippur 114 has [li]-[li-ib¹] = *ha-ab-ba-tum*; cf. MSL 15, 16, also noted in Mayer *Listen* 163.

¹⁷ BAD₅ is a near homonym for BAR or BAL (both corresponding to Akk. *nakru*).

¹⁸ Cf. OB Diri (Nippur) 119, bad₅.bad₅ IGI.IGI = *wa-al-ša i-ni*.

¹⁹ The symptoms *baša īni* and *namra īni* appear in eye-disease incantations, cf. BAM 10, 169-170.

²⁰ The reading could be a homonym for I.LIM = *ša-lum-ma-tu* 'radiance', cf. IZI V 63-64 (MSL 13, 162), usually appearing as SU.LIM.

²¹ The ŠI is the normal Emesal value corresponding to ZI, the usual Sum. word for 'breath'; see CAD N/1 296-297.

		i-gi GI	<i>bu-ul-lu-ṭi</i> ²²	to cure	B: -]u-ṭu
		GI ₈ (IGI)	<i>e-ke-ṣu</i>	to sting ²³	B:]-ke-ṣu
25		LIB	<i>da-la-pu</i>	be awake ²⁴	B:]-la-pu
	GÙ.DÉ.	A	<i>ha-ba-bu</i>	to murmur, chirp	B:]-ba-bu
	GÙ.DÉ.	A	<i>ha-mu-ú</i>	to howl, whine ²⁵	B:]-mu-ú
	GÙ.DÉ.	A	<i>hum-mu-ú</i>	to growl	B:]-mu-ú
	GÙ.DÉ.	A	<i>da-ka-ka</i>	to gambol ²⁶	
30	GÙ.DÉ.	A	<i>šá-su-ú</i>	to shout, call	
	GÙ.DÉ.	A	<i>ši-si-tu₄</i>	a shout ²⁷	
	GÙ.DÉ.	A	<i>ṭa-ra-di</i>	to name, call ²⁸	
	[KA].DÉ. A		<i>ša-mu-[ú]</i>	be thirsty ²⁹	
	[GÙ].DÉ.	A	<i>šá-su-[ú]</i>	to crow ³⁰	

col. ii

35	GÙ.DÉ.	GÚ.DÉ	<i>ši- hé-pi</i>	... (Akk. Vorlage damaged) ³¹
		IM	<i>hé-pi</i>	(Akk. Vorlage damaged)

²² The gloss shows a reading /igi/, which could be for Sum. i-gi, 'he makes firm', as a synonym for 'to heal'.

²³ A single duplicate to this line occurs in K 49 (CT 18 49 ii 30), and for the Akk. synonym, see CT 12 29 iv 28 [RA[?]] = *zaqātu* 'to sting'. The reading GI₈ is based on a synonym for GI₄ 'to strike, kill' (*dāku*), while the meaning attributed to *ekēṣu*, 'to sting', is based on W. Sem. ^c*qṣ*.

²⁴ The usual correspondent to Akk. *dalāpu* 'stay awake' is IGI.LIB, which is a compound verb, probably meaning that the eye 'lingers' open, since the Akk. verb can generally mean 'to linger' when referring to the course of a disease.

²⁵ Akk. *hawû* indicates an animal sound and appears in lexical lists together with *habābu* and *šasû* (A V/1 145-147 = MSL 14, 411, see Mayer *Listen* 163, all indicating animal sounds). One is tempted to draw a connection here with HUM = *hamû*, 'paralyse', which appears in l. 64.

²⁶ See Mayer *Listen* 163, in which he notes that the correspondence here is only attested in lexical texts, and he points out contexts in which *dakāku* can indicate noise, such as beams creaking.

²⁷ This same sequence of GÙ.DÉ.A = *šasû*, *šišītu* appears in Sag. Bil B 313-314 (MSL SS1 34).

²⁸ Although *ṭarādu* with the meaning 'to name, call' is only attested in LB contexts in the IV-stem (see CAD Ṭ 60), this is the only term which can correspond to the Sum. (lit. 'voice being poured out').

²⁹ Obviously, the idea of 'thirst' cannot correspond with words for speech, while the normal Sum. equivalent term for thirst is /imma/, not used here; the supposition is that Sum. KA DÉ A is an anagram for A.DÉ.KA, 'mouth craving water', in which DÉ is phonetic for DI // *erēšu* (see Nabn. IV 218-219, MSL 16, 85).

³⁰ To differentiate this entry from l. 30 (which looks identical), cf. Nabn. M 266, buru₅^{mušen}gù.dé = *šá-ṣu-ú*, a sound made by the crow / raven (see MSL 16, 237 and CAD Š/2 168).

³¹ The Akkadian column was broken away on the Vorlage of this tablet (*hepi* 'broken'). This makes it difficult to establish any common connection between the signs GÙ.DÉ and IM in the sequence of entries.

		IM	<i>hé-pi</i>	(Akk. Vorlage damaged)
		IM	<i>hé-pi</i>	(Akk. Vorlage damaged)
		IM	<i>hé-pi</i>	(Akk. Vorlage damaged)
40		IM	<i>hé-pi</i>	(Akk. Vorlage damaged)
	NÍ(IM).	GAL ³²	<i>hé-pi</i>	(Akk. Vorlage damaged)
	NÍ.	GAL	<i>hé-pi</i>	(Akk. Vorlage damaged)
		za-alZAL(NI)	<i>na-har-mu-ṭu</i>	to dissolve ³³
		ZAL	<i>qa-tu-u šá u₄-mu</i>	completion of the day ³⁴
45		ZAL	<i>a-la-ku šá u₄-mu</i>	course of the day
		di-igDIG(NI)	<i>ia-a</i>	woe! ³⁵
		DIG	<i>na-ar-bu</i>	soft ³⁶
	ZAL.	ZAL	<i>šu-tab-ru-ú</i>	be continuous, time passing ³⁷
	<i>šu-tab-ru</i>	-ú	<i>ka-a-a-an</i>	constant ³⁸
50	TUKU.	DA	<i>ra-šu-ú</i>	to have
		ZA	<i>ša-ba-rù</i>	prattle
		ZA	<i>a-mi-lu₄</i>	man ³⁹
	ZAG.	GA	<i>ša-ba-rù</i>	squint? ⁴⁰

³² NÍ.GAL can mean luminosity or radiance. The IM sign is the basis for juxtaposition with previous entries.

³³ Cf. Ea II 15 (MSL 14, 247), duplicating this line and one other entry (l. 47 below).

³⁴ Sum. ZAL refers to the passage of time or concluding of the day, as in the two expressions here. Cf. A II/1 ii 16¹- iii 3¹ (MS 14, 266), giving entries for ZAL(NI) as *naharmuṭu*, *šutabrû*, and *qatû*, as in the Rome tablet, while an earlier OB version of the same lexical text (MSL 14, 136) cites *naharmuṭu*, *šubebrû*, and *alāk ūmi* as correspondences for ZAL (see also *ibid.* ii 12¹, *qatû*). A lexical commentary equates *šutabrû* with *qatû* (A II/1 Comm. B 18¹, MSL 14, 269).

³⁵ Although the meaning is uncertain, it is likely that the expression of 'woe' is based on Sum. /di-ig/ as a variant of *dug₄*, a general term for speech; see CAD U 1, lexical and bilingual entries.

³⁶ Cf. Ea II 14 (MSL 14, 247), duplicating this line.

³⁷ This line is duplicated in Nabn. I 326 (MSL 16, 58), but in a single ruled-off entry.

³⁸ Note the unusual spacing of the Akk. word, mimicking the layout of Sum. entries. A commentary to Enūma Anu Enlil (LBAT 1577 i 17, unedited) gives *bi-it-ru-ú* = *ka-a-a-nu*, similar to our line.

³⁹ Cf. Ea I 19-20 (MSL 14 176), where ZA (phonetically /za-a/) for *amīlu* follows directly after ZA (phonetically /zag-ga/) for *šabāru*. The phonetic values are not differentiated in these lines but in l. 53 which follows.

⁴⁰ See EA I 19, *zag-ga* ZA = *ša-ba-rù* (MSL 14, 176) which is essentially what we also have in l. 51 above, but with a fuller phonetic reading of the Sum. sign as ZAG rather than simply ZA. It is reasonable to assume that this entry is a homonym for *šabāru* of l. 51, for which the medical symptom referring to eyes is a good candidate; see now the full discussion in G. Buisson, 'Une nouvelle version d'UGU 1', JMC 38 (2021), 27-43.

		ZAG	<i>pat-tu₄</i>	district
55		SAG	<i>pu-ú-tu₄</i>	forehead
		SAG	<i>bu-ú-du</i>	shoulder
		SAG	<i>pu-ú-hi</i>	substitute B: S[AG
		SAG	<i>qar-ni</i>	horn ⁴¹ B; S[AG
		SAG	<i>di-na-nu</i>	substitute ⁴² B: S[AG ...
60	GÚM ^{gu-gu-mu}	GÚM	<i>úr-tan-[qab]-bu</i>	be decayed. B: GÚM ^{gu-gu-mu} GÚM [.....]
		^{hu-mu} HUM	<i>hum-mu-šú</i>	deformed ⁴³ B: ^u HUM [.....
		HUM	<i>h[i-i]m-šú</i>	lame B: ^{hu-mu} HUM [...
		HUM	<i>[húb-bu-š]ú</i>	swollen ⁴⁴
		H[UM	<i>ha-mu-u]</i>	paralyse
65		[.....]		
		[.....]		hot B: KUM (=KÚM) [...
		[.....] x		B: KUM [...
		[.....] x		B: KU[M
col. iii				
		SUKUD	<i>šá mu-ú</i>	(high), of water ⁴⁵
70		TI	<i>da-pa-nu</i>	chariot part ⁴⁶
		TI	<i>qab-lu</i>	middle ⁴⁷
		TI	<i>ú-šu</i>	arrow

⁴¹ Cf. Group vocabulary (5 R 16 ii 11) SAG = *qar-nu, pu-hu* (dcclt/corpus#P394142.54).

⁴² Idu I 131, sa-ag SAG = *di-na-[nu]*, cited see CAD D 148, which also lists *dinānu* together with *qarnu* and *pūhu* in the Group vocabulary (see previous note), although this reading is not accepted by DCCLT (dcclt/corpus#P394142.54).

⁴³ There is some discrepancy in lexical lists, whether the phonetic value of the Sum. term is /hum/ (/humu) or /lum/. Our text differs from Ea 5, 1 (MSL 14, 397, restored from A V/1, ibid. 407), which gives: hu-um LUM *lu-um-mu ha-ma-šu*, leaving no doubt as to the reading /lum/ for HUM.

⁴⁴ Restored thus by Mayer *Listen*, 160, presumably based on Lú Excerpt II 171, [HUM.H]UM = *hu-ub-bu-šu* (MSL 12, 109).

⁴⁵ Normally Sum. SUKUD corresponds to Akk. *mēlû*, 'upper part'.

⁴⁶ CT 18 32 i 19': TI = *da-pa-nu šá* ^{gi5}GIGIR (dcclt/corpus#P346058.24).

⁴⁷ See Mayer *Listen*, 163, in which he cites Sum. TI.SAH₄ as equivalent to Akk. *anantu* and *tuquntu*, as synonyms for Akk. *qablu* 'battle'. On the other hand, TI in this line could be a variant of TUM(ÍB), corresponding to *qablu* 'middle'.

		TI	<i>še-e-lu</i>	rib
		TI	<i>ba-la-tu</i>	to live
75		TI	<i>da-pa-nu</i>	<i>be aggressive</i> ⁴⁸
		TI	<i>ha-ba-tú</i>	rob
		TI	<i>šá-mu-ú</i>	<i>to roast</i>
		TI	<i>šub-tu₄</i>	dwelling
		TI	<i>a-šá-ba</i>	dwel ⁴⁹
80		TI	<i>mu-šá-[ab]</i>	dwelling
		TI	<i>nu-ú-[ru]</i>	light
		TI	<i>ti-tur-[ru]</i>	bridge
	UG ₅ .	GA	<i>mu-ú-tu</i>	death
	UG ₅ .	GA	<i>mi-i-tu₄</i>	dead
85		TU	<i>šu-ma</i>	thirst
		TU(TUR ₅) ⁵⁰	<i>mur-šu</i>	illness
		TU(TUR ₅)	<i>mar-ša</i>	sick
		TU ⁵¹	<i>šip-tú</i>	incantation
		KU ₄ (TU)	<i>e-re-bi</i>	enter
90		TU	<i>sum-ma-at</i>	dove
	KÉŠ ^{kiš-kiš} . KÉŠ		<i>ru-uk-ku-su</i>	bind up
	ki-ši KÉŠ		<i>ra-ka-su</i>	bind
	KÉŠ		<i>ka-su-ú</i>	bind
	KÉŠ		<i>ka-ša-rù</i>	tie up
95	KÉŠ		<i>ri-ik-su</i>	bond
	i-zi-in EZEN(KÉŠ)		<i>i-sin-nu</i>	festival
	EZEN ^{iti} BÁRA.ZAG.GAR		<i>šá ni-sa-an-nu</i>	(festival) of Nisannu
	EZEN ^{iti} GU ₄ .SI.SÁ		<i>a-a-rù</i>	(festival) of Ayyaru

⁴⁸ Although no lexical evidence can be cited for this correspondence, bilingual texts show Sum. TI corresponding to the adverb *dapniš* 'aggressively' (cf. CAD D 105).

⁴⁹ see Mayer *Listen*, 163, noting the correspondences.

⁵⁰ for TU.RA

⁵¹ for TU₆

	EZEN ^{iti} SIG ₄ .GA		<i>si-ma-nu šá^dbe-let-ì-lí</i>	(festival of Simanu of Belet-ili)
100	EZEN ^{iti} ŠU.NUMUN.NA		<i>du-‘u-ú-zu</i>	(festival of) Tammuz
	EZEN ^{iti} NE.NE.GAR		<i>a-bi</i>	(festival of) Abu
	EZEN ^{iti} KIN. ^d INNIN.NA		<i>ú-lu-lu</i>	(festival of) Ulūlu
	NINDABA(PAD. ^d INNIN)		<i>nin-da-bu-ú</i>	food offering
col. iv				
	[P]AD.	^d MÙŠ(NIDBA)	<i>ni-qa^l-[a]</i>	offering
105	[P]AD.	^d MÙŠ	<i>nap-ta-[nu]</i>	banquet meal
		BUR	<i>nap-ta-[nu]</i>	banquet meal
	KIN.	SIG	MIN	ditto
	TE.UNUG.	KI	MIN	ditto ⁵²
	<i>ú-nu-un-tu⁴</i> 'utensils'	SAG	MIN	ditto
110	<na->ap-ta-nu		MIN	ditto ⁵³
		SAR	<i>eš-ši</i>	<i>new</i> ⁵⁴
		SAR	<i>mu-sa-ru</i>	garden
		SAR	<i>mu-sa-ru-ú</i>	inscription
		SAR	<i>ha-ma-ṭu</i>	burn
115		ŠAR	<i>ṭa-ra-du</i>	drive away ⁵⁵
		SAR	<i>la-sa-mu</i>	run
		SAR	<i>šur-ru-ú</i>	begin
		SAR	<i>ha-mu-ú</i>	paralyse ⁵⁶
		SAR	<i>gu-ul-lu-bu</i>	shave

⁵² This may be a difficult pun to grasp, combined with corrupted readings. Sum. ÚNU(TE.UNUG) can be a writing for *mākālu* 'food' as well as *naptānu* 'banquet' (Diri VI A 13-14, MSL 15, 185); the latter correspondence is suggested by Mayer *Listen*, 163. However, the gloss *ununtu* is likely represent Akk. *unūtu* 'utensils', perhaps useful for a banquet.

⁵³ The reading TE.ÚNU // *naptanu* 'banquet' is attested, but there appears to be interference with UNUG^{ki} for Uruk.

⁵⁴ Cf. Mayer, *Listen* 163, explaining this from SAR = *ud-du-šu* (cf. CAD E 30 citing CT 18 29 ii 33), but no value of SAR is attested for the adj. *eššu*.

⁵⁵ See the Izbu Commentary in Leichty, *Šumma Izbu*, 220, ll. 293-294: *šá-ar ŠAR = ṭa-[ra-du]*, ^{min}ŠAR = *[ku-uš-šu-du]*, based on a cited text (l. 292), *ṭar-du kuš-šu-du ana URU-šú GUR-[ra]*, 'driven away, driven off, returned to his (own) city'. This term may have been of interest because of the demon or illness name ^d*Terid* (see CAD T 102).

⁵⁶ There is no attested lexical evidence for this equation.

120	MÚ(SAR)	<i>na-pa-hi</i>	flare up
	NISIG(SAR)	<i>ar-qa</i>	greenery
	SAR	<i>ka-šir šá kep-pe-e</i>	tied, of skipping rope ⁵⁷
	SAR	<i>ha-da-da šá ti-nu-ru</i>	roar, of an oven ⁵⁸
	SAR	<i>e-bu-ú</i>	thick ⁵⁹
125	SAR	<i>e-lu-ú</i>	upper
	SAR	<i>ma-ra-’u</i>	fat
	SAR	<i>ma-a-dum</i>	much ⁶⁰
	SAR	<i>ha-la-šú</i>	scrape off
<hr/>			
ME.	ME	A šá DINGIR-šú	Exorcist, son of his god ⁶¹

130 *ki-i* KA DUB GABA.RI E^{ki} šá DUB EGIR-šú
 NU SAR-*u* DU-*ma* IGI.KÁR IM ^mBA-šá-*a* bu-*kúr*
^mdINANNA.MU.KAM ŠÀ.BAL.BAL ^mé-*kur-za-kir*
 LÚ.MAŠ.MAŠ TIR.AN.NA^{ki-ú}

According to the ‘mouth of a tablet’, copy from Babylon of a tablet, which has no written sequel coming after it, checked and copied by Mr. Iqīša, son of Mr. Ištar-šūma-ēriš, descendant of Mr. Ekurzakir, Incantation-Priest of Uruk.

NOTES on the logical transitions

- 3) The first transition in topics is between SI and SÌ, on purely phonetic grounds.
- 8) The sign SIR₅ is a phonetic sequel to the SI and SÌ signs.

⁵⁷ See Antagal F 244, ÉŠ.HÚL^{e-še-min}.SAR.RA = MIN (= *mēlulu*) šá *kip-pe-[e]*. The Sum. for ‘skipping rope’ is *ešemen*, and one might expect SAR in this context to be read as KÉŠ, which is not the case.

⁵⁸ Mayer, *Listen*, 162 also cites no lexical evidence for this expression.

⁵⁹ Possible *epû* ‘to bake’, but neither term has an equivalent in SAR, which also applies to the following entries in ll. 125-128.

⁶⁰ see Mayer, *Listen*, 163, suggests SAR as a reading for ŠÁR = *mādu*, *mādu*, ‘much’.

⁶¹ Mayer, *Listen*, 164, reads this word as *a-šá-an-šú<-tú>*, suggesting that it might be a form of *ašamšūtu*, ‘storm’, corresponding to ME as a form of MIR. Since the many manipulations required make this clever explanation unlikely, we suggest instead reading ME.ME as a known alternative for MAŠ.MAŠ, and that the frequent expression in incantations LÚ.U₁₈.LU DUMU DINGIR.RA.NA // *amīlu mār ilišu* ‘man, son of his personal god’, was the basis for the allusion in this line, referring either to Iqīša or his source.

- 10) A.IGI normalised as ÍR provides the phonetic link with the previous entry, SIR₅, in a sequence of phonetic values /SI/, /SIR/, /IR/.
- 15) The associative logic is between 'weeping' and 'defeat', both under the IGI-rubric.
- 24) The suggestion of reading LIM for IGI // *eqēṣu* is based on an attempt to harmonise the transition between IGI and LIB.
- 25) The LIB entry serves a link with the value /LIB₄/ for IGI of the preceding entries.
- 26-34) The entries for Sum. GÙ.DÉ.A (lit. 'voice cast out') have various possibilities for a transition. The sign LIB(LUL) also has the value /KA₅/, which could be a simple homonym for KA 'mouth', or alternatively the sign has the value NAR for 'to sing', thematically related to using the voice.
- 36) The transition between shouting and IM, usually indicating 'rain / wind' or 'clay' is not clear. Since the Akk. is damaged in the original Vorlage, the connections escape us.
- 43) The assumed connection here is between NÍ in l. 42 and NI in this line, although having the phonetic value of /zal/, hence a graphic association rather than a phonetic one.
- 49) The scribe has inserted a Malku-šarru type of synonym into his text at this point, because he required a Sum. equivalent to Akk. *kānu* -- namely GÁL -- in order to associate this with what follows: GÁL and TUKU are synonyms, both corresponding to Akk. *išû*, 'to exist' and *rašû* 'to have'.
- 51) Since there appears to be no easily identifiable association between TUKU.DA and ZA, we are forced to conclude that ZA reverts back to the ZAL(NI) sequence of line 48, indicating a phonetic transition between ZAL and ZA, interrupted by two lines noting extra associations with *šutabrû*. It appears, therefore, that ll. 49-50 constitute an interpolation but do not belong to the original sequence.
- 53) The phonetic shift from ZA to ZAG to SAG is easily recognisable as transitions (see Veldhuis p. 421).

54-56) There is clearly word play in the harmony between Sum ZAG and SAG with Akk. counterparts *pāṭu*, *pūtu*, and *būdu*.

60) The association between entries is also not easily explainable, except that LUM (GÚM) is also MÚRGU, for shoulder (following SAG for 'head'). The association would therefore have to be considered semantic rather than phonetic, from 'head' to 'shoulder'.

66) These lines are damaged, but one could suggest that KUM is a phonetic rendering of KÚM(NE) for being 'hot' (another medical symptom), following GUM and HUM, both having symptom-related meanings. The reason for choosing KUM rather than the usual KÚM(NE) sign is because of the polyvalence of NE which is not shared by KUM.

70) There is no attested meaning of SUKUD, lit. 'high', for *šamû* 'heaven', but the idea of high water is commonplace in an alluvial plain. Nevertheless, this reading is speculative.

71) There is no easy explanation for the transition between SUKUD and TI.

83) The connection between TI and UG₅ is based upon TI being an equivalent of Sum. TIL, a synonym for dying (or coming to an end).

91) The association between TU, KÉŠ, and SAR is not transparent, although one idea may be that these signs are quite similar in shape and especially TU and SAR are easily confused in LB script.

97-103) It is not at all clear why this text enumerates festivals from the first half of the year only.

104-108) The ritual banquets mentioned in these lines probably follow on from the festivals enumerated in the previous section.

111) The transition to the sign SAR is difficult to explain on either phonetic or semantic grounds.

CONCLUSION

Various possible logical associations were made in this tablet to link one set of phrases to another, such as words referring to anatomy (SI, IGI, etc.) or simple phonetic connections (SI, SÍ, SIR₅, IR, etc.), but two things seem clear. Many of the lines represent multiple entries cited from various lexical lists, such as Antagal, Nabnītu, Erimhuš, Idu, Ea and Aa, etc., rather than simple one-line entries on their own. This means that the connected logic of the text is based upon citations from lexical lists combined to create new logical associations or meanings. Moreover, while many of the themes of individual entries reflect the predominant intellectual interests of the copyist Iqīša, he probably did not compose the tablet but found it useful for his own work. Nevertheless, this should not suggest a purely utilitarian or practical function for this list, since the thematic associations between items may represent the *raison d'être* of the list. In other words, this is a work attempting to define rare values of Sumerian signs which appear in lexical lists but not necessarily as logograms in recipes or magical rituals. This is because the commonest value of the Sumerian signs, such as TI for 'take' or SAR for 'fumigate' or Ì for 'oil' never appear in this list, and hence it would serve no useful purpose for writing medical prescriptions or incantation-rituals.

This is a work of lexicography and word-crafting, attempting to select and combine words from bilingual lexical lists which correspond to the type of vocabulary which can be found in commentaries or high-level hermeneutics. It is for commentary texts that this kind of data could be useful, as somewhat arcane meanings related ordinary concepts, and for which Iqīša was an acknowledged expert. But this particular work is not a commentary, since it does not attempt to base itself upon any known Vorlage or existing text, but only on vocabulary associated with medical, magical, and ritual texts in general, and perhaps other genres as well.