

Sumerian Miscellanea*

P. Steinkeller - Cambridge, Mass.

[1. lá-NI, an accounting term in Ur III documents, is to be read lá-u_x /la'u / and has a morphological alternant lá-a /la'a / in Pre-Sargonic Lagaš.

2. The reading of the ED sign ŠE+NAM is šuš_x and it is used not only to designate a plant but also in the name of the city of Susa and possibly represents an early form of su-si-(ig) "to flay (skins)" in the Uruk archaic texts.

3. The ED reading bu_x of NI is related to the OB value mu_x; both represent /mbu /.]

1. The Reading of lá-NI.

The reading of the 3rd millennium accounting term lá-NI¹, "balance (positive or negative), arrears", corresponding to the Akkadian *ribbātu*, *muftū*, and *tamfītu*, remains disputed, in spite of ample lexical information pertaining to this word. The relevant lexical passages, in which lá-NI appears under its Old Babylonian and later forms LÁL.NI, LÁL.KAK, LÁL.U, LÁL.A, and LÁL², are:

- (1) la-u₄ (var.: la-ú, la-ù, la-u, [lu₃?] (or malformed la?)-ù) = LÁL.KAK (Proto-Ea 79 = *MSL* 14, p. 34).
- (2) la-u₄ (var.: la-u) LÁL.KAK = *ri-ib-ba-tum*, *mu-ut-tù-u₄* (Proto-Aa 79:1-2 = *MSL* 14, p. 92).
- (3) la-'-ú (var.: la-u) LÁL, LÁL.A, LÁL.NI, LÁL.KAK, LÁL.U = *rib-ba-a-tú* (Ea I 250-254 - Sources A and E = *MSL* 14, p. 189).

* I wish to express my cordial thanks to Miguel Civil for his criticism and advice.

Abbreviations used in this article are those of the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* with the following additions:

AbS	Abu Salabikh.
ARE	<i>Archivi Reali di Ebla</i>
Bibl. Mes.	<i>Bibliotheca Mesopotamica</i> (Malibu, Cal., 1975-).
E	Ebla.
EV	Ebla Vocabulary, line numbers as in <i>MEE</i> 4.
MEE	G. Pettinato, <i>Materiali Epigrafici di Ebla</i> (Napoli, 1979-).
NTSS	R. Jestin, <i>Nouvelles tablettes sumériennes de Šuruppak au Musée d'Istanbul</i> (Paris, 1957).
OSP	A. Westenholz, <i>Old Sumerian and Old Akkadian Texts in Philadelphia Chiefly from Nippur</i> (Malibu, Cal., 1975-).
SACT	<i>Sumerian and Akkadian Cuneiform Texts in the Collection of the World Heritage Museum of the University of Illinois</i> (Urbana, Ill., 1972-).
SEb	<i>Studi Eblaiti</i> (Roma, 1979-).

1. The alleged example of the spelling lá-KAK in the Sargonic text *OIP* 14 144:12 (A 795), cited by F. R. Kraus, *Ein Edikt des Königs Ammi-saduqa von Babylon* (Leyden, 1958), pp. 89, 91, reads, in fact, lá-NI (collated by M. W. Stolper).

2. For these various writings, see Kraus, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-91.

- (4) la-a LÁL = *rib-ba-tu* (Ea I 250 - Source B = *MSL* 14, p. 189).
- (5) la-al-ú LÁLA, LÁLNI, LÁLKAK, LÁLU = MIN (= *rib-ba-tu*) (Ea I 251-254 - Source B = *MSL* 14, p. 189).
- (6) la-al-la (var.: la-la) LÁL = *tam-ta-a-tu* (Ea I 249 - Sources A and B = *MSL* 14, p. 189).
- (7) la-al-la-al LÁL = *tam-ti-tu* (Ea I 249 - Source E = *MSL* 14, p. 189).
- (8) lá-ú LÁLA = *lib-ba-a-tum* (S^b B 147 = *MSL* 3, p. 141).

The resulting readings and their distribution can be summarized as follows:

- (1) /la'u/: Proto-Ea, Proto-Aa, Ea I (Sources A and E), and S^b.
- (2) /la'a/: Ea I (Source B).
- (3) /lal'u/: Ea I (Source B).
- (4) /lalla/: Ea I (Sources A and B).
- (5) /lallal/: Ea I (Source E).

These data demonstrate quite clearly that the canonical lexical tradition, represented above all by Proto-Ea and Proto-Aa, interpreted lá-NI primarily as /la'u/, the readings /la'a/, /lal'u/, /lalla/, and /lallal/ being secondary and thus open to doubt. However, the correctness of this tradition has been questioned by M. A. Powell³ and M. Civil⁴, on the grounds that: (1) in the Pre-Sargonic sources from Lagaš the term in question appears as lá-a⁵; and (2) the reading u_x of NI is not otherwise attested. For these reasons, Powell interpreted lá-NI as la_x, while Civil favoured the reading lá-i or lá-ia.

MVN 3 58, an Early Sargonic economic tablet of unknown origin, contains an important datum for the elucidation of this problem. This tablet belongs to a small group of documents dealing with the consignment of cattle to shepherds; the other documents from this group are *MVN* 3 22, 39, 51, 70, 72, 86, and 99⁶. In *MVN* 3 22 and 72, the phrase describing the animals (and butter) that are to be made good by the shepherd to the owner of the flock is, as expected, lá-NI PN-kam, "arrears of PN (i.e., the shepherd)"⁷; in *MVN* 3 58, however, the same statement reads lá-u₅ PN-kam⁸. Since in the latter text lá-u₅ must, because of the context, be analyzed as a syllabic spelling of lá-NI, we can establish that lá-NI does indeed have a reading lá-u_x /la'u/.

As far as the reading u_x (or 'u_x) of NI is concerned, we may note that this value has recently been posited by M. Krebernik for the syllabary of the Ebla lexical sources, on the basis of the variant spellings

3. "Sumerian Numeration and Metrology" (PhD Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1971), pp. 139-149; *JCS* 27(1975)182; *Iraq* 39 (1977)26.

4. Apud D. C. Snell, *Ledgers and Prices: Early Mesopotamian Merchant Accounts* (New Haven, 1982), p. 228. I might add here that Civil advocated this interpretation of lá-NI for many years in his classes of Sumerian.

5. For the examples, see J. Bauer, *Altsumerische Wirtschaftstexte aus Lagasch* (Studia Pohl 9) (Rome 1972), p. 620.

6. A similar group of documents comes from the Sargonic Umma; they have been collected and discussed by B. R. Foster, *Umma in the Sargonic Period* (Hamden, Conn., 1982), pp. 62-69 Groups B. 6 I and II. The technical terminology used in these two groups of texts is quite similar to that found in the Old Babylonian and later "herding contracts", for which see F. R. Kraus, *Viehhaltung im altbabylonischen Lande Larsa* (Amsterdam, 1966), pp. 9-16; J. J. Finkelstein, *JAOS* 88(1968)30-36; J. N. Postgate (with a contribution by S. Payne), *JSS* 20(1975)1-21.

7. For the meaning of lá-NI = LÁL.KAK in "herding contracts", see Kraus, *Edikt*, pp. 89-95.

8. In order to provide the contexts, I offer here full transliterations and translations of these three tablets:

(1) 1) 86 úz-sag 2) 40 u₈-sag 3) 20 udu-nita 4) 5 máš-nita 5) Níg-PA-da 6) KA- kug-ga-ni 7) an-ne-šid (space) 8) 10 máš-[nita(?)] 9) 6 úz(?) -sag(?) 10) 1 u₈-[sag] 11) 1 udu-ni[ta] 12) lá-NI 13) Níg-PA-da-kam 14) mu-a-kam, "151 sheep and goats were consigned to (lit.: counted for) Níg-PA-da and KA-kug-ga-ni (i.e., the shepherds); 18 sheep and goats are the arrears of Níg-PA-da of the (current) year" (*MVN* 3 22).

(2) 1) 2 udu-nita 2) Úr-ni 3) 1 Ur-gu 4) 1 Úr-ni 5) 3 udu ba-uš 6) 1 É-šu 7) udu zi-ga-a 8) 3 u₈ 9) 13 udu-nita 10) 14 úz 11) 11 máš-šag₄-dùg 12) 7 sila₄-šag₄-dùg 13) lá-u₅ 14) Lugal-an-dùl-kam, "2 rams (for) Urni; 1 (sheep for) Urgan; 1 (sheep for) Urni; 3 sheep have died; 1 (sheep for) Éšu; (these) are the sheep which have been handed back (to their owners); 45 sheep and goats are the arrears of Lugal-andul (i.e., the shepherd)" (*MVN* 3 58).

NI-gu-um and ù-gu-um (EV 941a, b = *MEE* 4, p. 304) and the entry *na-si-NI a-na-a /naš'i'ū(?) aynay/* = IGI.ĪL (EV 723 = *MEE* 4, p. 281)⁹. Additional evidence for this value is possibly found in *Bibl. Mes.* 3 29, a Pre-Sargonic school exercise from Lagaš,¹⁰ assuming that the spelling u₅-DU in iii 3 represents the reading of NI-DU, occurring in the preceding line. Further, notice the spelling ⁸¹⁵NI-šub of /ušub/, "brick-mold" (e.g., *Nikolski* 2 342 rev. 12; *YOS* 4 91:6, 196:2, 205:2; et passim in Ur III Umma texts), replacing the usual ⁸¹⁵u₅-šub (Sargonic) (e.g., *TMH* 5 90 iii 1; *OSP* 1 15:3, 16 iv 1, 53 iv 3, 54 iv 1'; *MCS* 9 240: 5; *RTC* 109 rev. 1) or ⁸¹⁵ū-šub (Ur III) (e.g., Gudea Statue B iii 13; Cylinder A v 6, 7, xviii 10; *SACT* 2 243:8; *Nikolski* 2 357:26).

However, the assumption that lá-NI is to be read lá-u_x leaves unanswered the question of the Pre-Sargonic Lagaš form lá-a. Given that lá-a cannot be analyzed as a mere graphic variant of lá-u_x (or vice versa), it seems safe to conclude that lá-u_x and lá-a are morphological alternants¹¹. Of these two alternants, lá-a should probably be considered the original form of the word, on the assumption that it represents a verbal noun of lá, "to diminish" (Akk. *mašū*)¹². Consequently, lá-u_x must be a variant, either dialectal or historical, of lá-a.

Proceeding one step further, we may speculate that lá-u_x is the Emesal equivalent of lá-a, based on the fact that the variant spellings lá-NI / lá-u₅ (and similarly the writings NI-DU / u₅-DU and ⁸¹⁵NI-šub / ⁸¹⁵u₅-šub / ⁸¹⁵ū-šub cited earlier) find an obvious analogy in the interchange ia, i / 'a, 'i/ (Main Dialect) = u₅ / 'u/ (Emesal)¹³. If this is true, we would find here an indication that in the main dialect lá-NI was pronounced lá-ia / la'a /.

These findings suggest the following (though admittedly only tentative) picture: (1) the main dialect form of the Sumerian word for "balance, arrears" was /la'a /; it was written either lá-ia or lá-a; 2) in Emesal, the same word was pronounced /la'u /; its writings were lá-u_x (NI) and lá-u₅; 3) as indicated by the text *MVN* 3 58, the pronunciation /la'u / found its way into the main dialect already in the Sargonic period; since the Old Babylonian lexical texts list /la'u / as the primary pronunciation, it would appear that by Old Babylonian times /la'u / gained precedence over /la'a /, perhaps even replacing it completely.

2. The Reading of ŠE + NÁM.

The entry ŠE + NÁM = *su-šum* in the Ebla Syllabary line 5 (*MEE* 3, p. 196) demonstrates that the sign ŠE + NÁM, so far attested only in Archaic Uruk, Fara, Abu Salabikh, and Ebla texts, is to be read šu š_x¹⁴. That ŠE + NÁM has a value šuš_x can also independently be deduced from the following set of data¹⁵:

- (1) ⁸¹⁵ŠE + NÁM = *su-šum, si-aš-su* (EV 478 = *MEE* 4, p. 253).
- (2) ŠE + NÁM (*MEE* 3 50 ii 9) = MÜŠ.EREN(!) (written LAK-668) (*WVDOG* 43 59 ii 8)¹⁶.

(3) 1) 16(sila) i-nun 2) 8 máš-šag₄-dùg 3) Úr-ni-kam 4) lá-NI Níg-PA-da-kam 5) an-da-lá 6) 3(sila) i-nun 7) 8 máš-šag₄-dùg 8) Amar-ZU.AB-kam 9) lá-NI 10) Níg-PA-da <-kam > 11) an-da-lá, "16 quarts of butter (and) 8 kids, (the property) of Urni, are the arrears of Níg-PA-da (i.e., the shepherd); they have been debited to him; 3 quarts of butter (and) 8 kids, (the property) of Amar-Abzu, are the arrears of Níg-PA-da; they have been debited to him" (*MVN* 3 72).

9. Cf. M. Krebernik, *ZA* 72(1982)198, 221.

10. See Civil, *BiOr* 40(1983) (in press), for a critical edition of this text.

11. This conclusion may actually find support in Source B of Ea I, which records, apart from /la'u /, the pronunciation /la'a / (see above).

12. This is basically the position of Powell, *Iraq* 39(1977)26, who derives the term in question from lá-a, "that which creates a state of equilibrium". It needs to be noted, though, that this interpretation is complicated by the fact that, according to the lexical texts, the verb was pronounced la1 / la1 / and not lá / la' /; see la-a1 LAL = *ma-tu-u* (S^bB 140 = *MSL* 3, p. 140), and la-a1 LAL *ná-tu-u*] (S^a Fragm. Q 16' = *MSL* 3, p. 70). Are we to assume, therefore, that la(1) ended in a glide, whose properties approximated those of a liquid?

13. See u₅^u = ia / i = [šam-nu] (Emesal Vocabulary II 175, also 176-177 = *MSL* 4, p. 23).

14. Cf. Pettinato, *MEE* 3, p. 201.

15. Cf. Pettinato, *ibid.*, p. 184 note to line 25.

16. See Pettinato, *ibid.*, pp. 179-183, for a composite edition of these two texts.

(3) šu-ú-šu (var.: [š]u-šum) GIŠ.MUŠ.ŠEŠ (var.: GIŠ.ŠEŠ) = šu-ú-šu (Diri III 254, courtesy Civil).

Assuming that the logogram MUŠ.ŠEŠ (3) is a descendant of MUŠ.EREN (2), one can establish, based on the alternation ŠE + NÁM = MUŠ.EREN (2), that the Eblaite *su-šum*, *si-aš-su* (1) is the same as the Akkadian tree or plant name *šūšu* (3)¹⁷. On the other hand, the reading /šūšu(m)/ of MUŠ.ŠEŠ (3) points to the pronunciation šūš(u)_x of both ŠE + NÁM and MUŠ.EREN; this assumption is corroborated by the fact that MUŠ.EREN has a value šušin_x,¹⁸ from which šūš_x can easily be derived.

It should be noted, however, that the above alternation ŠE + NÁM = MUŠ.EREN merely proves that ŠE + NÁM and MUŠ.EREN are homonymous, thus admitting the possibility of ŠE + NÁM also having the reading šušin_x. This possibility finds substantiation in the Fara lexical text *WVDOG* 43 29 ii 21-23, which records the following sequence of three personal names: A m ar-ÚR.ĤA.A, A m ar-IN and A m ar-ŠE + NÁM¹⁹. Given that the first two names contain the toponyms Isin_x(IN)²⁰ and U r u m_x (ÚR.ĤA.A)²¹, respectively, we will be justified in assuming that in the third name ŠE + NÁM stands for a toponym, too. And, in view of the alternation ŠE + NÁM = MUŠ.EREN cited earlier, that toponym cannot be anything else but Šušin = the city of Susa. This allows us to determine tentatively that, besides šūš_x, another reading of ŠE + NÁM is šušin_x.

These observations may have a bearing on the interpretation of ŠE + NÁM in the economic texts from Archaic Uruk, where ŠE + NÁM is used both as a description of some technical operation involving animals and as an occupation or title²². The latter usage of ŠE + NÁM is also documented in various ED lists of occupations²³.

In her discussion of the occurrences of ŠE + NÁM in the Uruk animal texts, M. W. Green observed that this term describes the animals which "are in some way exceptional, not tallied in the main account, presumably eliminated from the herd", and, among the possible interpretations, she considered "lost or dead animals, animals kept by the herder or overseer, animals returned on demand to the owner, or animals paid as tax"²⁴. However, at the same time she warned that in these texts ŠE + NÁM could equally well refer to the official who authorized a transaction or took such animals in charge²⁵.

Now, if the reading of ŠE + NÁM in the Uruk animal texts is, in fact, either šūš_x or šušin_x, the only

17. See *AHW.*, p. 1290a under *šūšu(m)*.

18. The reading šušin or šušina of MUŠ.EREN is based primarily on the syllabic spellings su-sín(-na) (see E. Sollberger, *JCS* 10 [1965] 24). Further evidence in support of this reading is provided by the entry šu-ši-nag = *MUŠ.EREN(C)T 29 46 iii 4), where *MUŠ.EREN stands for (In)Šušinak (written also *Nin-MUŠ.EREN or *MUŠ/SUH, see A. Deimel, *Pantheon Babylonicum* (Roma 1914), p. 147 no. 1581, p. 232 no. 2872, p. 257 no. 3179). But note that in Hh. XXI Section 9 24' (*MSL* 11, p. 18) MUŠ.EREN (written ZA.MUŠ.EREN) is interpreted as /šūšu(n)/, apparently under the influence of the Elamite/Akkadian pronunciation *Šušun*: ZA.MUŠ.EREN^{šū-šū}, KI = šū-[šū-m]. For the early occurrences of šušin, see *Rép. géogr.* 1, pp. 154-155, and, further, note *Nin-šušin in a god list from Abu Salabikh (*OIP* 99 82 iv 5, 86 iii 4).

19. These names belong to the well-known Fara and Pre-Sargonic pattern A m ar-GN(-ak), "Calf-of-GN". See, e.g., (1) Amar-G írid^(k) (e.g., *VAS* 14 9 iii 3, 48 v 4, Pre-Sargonic, Lagaš); (2) A m ar-U n u g (*WVDOG* 45 76 xii, 77 ii, Fara); (3) A m ar-K u₆-a^{ki} (= -K u w a r a) (e.g., *HSS* 3 9 vi 9, Pre-Sargonic, Lagaš), written also A m ar-K u₆-a (e.g., *BIN* 8 86:2, 100:13, Pre-Sargonic, Umma) and A m ar-K u₆-a-rá (e.g., *BIN* 8 26:15, 27:6, 37:36, Pre-Sargonic?, Isin). For the interpretation of the last name, see Steinkeller, *JCS* 32(1980)30 and notes 33-34, where, however, the references to the spellings -K u₆-a and -K u₆-a-rá were transposed due to the author's oversight; that -K u₆-a-rá is an explicit writing of K u w a r a, as suggested *ibid.*, p. 30, is conclusively demonstrated by the passage sag PN-šè A m ar-ku₆-a-rá-ke₄ i-su-su, "Amar-Kuwara will restore/repay (it) in place of PN" (*BIN* 8 37:35-37), in which A m ar-K u₆-a-rá-ke₄ must be analyzed as a genitival construction / a m ar-ku w a r a-ak / followed by the agentive postposition -e.

20. Cf. the spelling A m ar-Isin_x(IN)^{si} in the Fara text *NTSS* 229 i' 6'. For the reading isin_x of IN, see, most recently, Steinkeller, *JCS* 30(1978)168-169.

21. For ÚR.ĤA.A as an ED spelling of U r u m_x, see G. J. McEwan, *JCS* 33(1981)56.

22. See M. W. Green, *JNES* 39(1980)8-9.

23. For the examples, see *ibid.*, p. 9.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

similarly sounding Sumerian word that would meet the requirement of being both a technical animal term and an occupation is *su-si(-ig)*, "to flay (skins, hides)" and "flayer"²⁶. Yet the suggestion that *ŠE + NĀM* may stand for *su-si(-ig)* should be taken with considerable caution, since, firstly, the activities of a *su-si(-ig)* are infrequently mentioned in 3rd millennium texts, and, secondly, it is possible that in this particular context *ŠE + NĀM* has another, still unknown, reading²⁷.

3. The Value *m u₄/b u_x* of NI.

Lexical sources from Abu Salabikh and Ebla yield numerous instances of the interchange between the signs NI and *bù*. To cite just a few examples:

- (1) *Ga-NI^{ki}* (AbS), *Ga-bù^{ki}* (E) (*MEE* 3, p. 232 line 76).
- (2) *Ak-ka-NI^{ki}* (AbS), *Ag-ga-bù^{ki}* (E) (*MEE* 3, p. 237 line 219).
- (3) *Az-a-NI^{ki}*, *Az-NI^{ki}* (AbS), *A-za-bù^{ki}* (E) (*MEE* 3, p. 238 line 266).
- (4) *ĥu-NI-lum*, *ĥu-bù-lum/lu-um /ĥubullum/* = *ŠE(ŠU).ĤA.MUL*, "loan" (*MEE* 4, p. 275 EV 673a, b)²⁸.
- (5) *gi-zi-rí NI-tim*, *gi-zi-rí bù-tim /kiš(i)r(i) būdim/* = *ZAG.PAD*, "joint of the shoulder" (*MEE* 4, p. 328 EV 1210)²⁹.
- (6) *na-ù-NI(-um)*, *na-ù-bù-um* = *IGI.LUĤ* (*MEE* 4, p. 279 EV 704a, b)³⁰.

This alternation is also attested in the Ebla economic texts, as shown, for example, by the variant spellings [*G*]ú-šè-NI^{ki} (*ARE* 2 27 ii 2) and *G ú-šè-bù^{ki}* (*ARE* 2 8 ix 5).

Based on this evidence, as well as on such examples as *wa-zu-NI /waššubu/* = *DAĤ*, "to add" (*MEE* 4, p. 323 EV 1148)³¹, where the reading *b u_x* of NI is dictated by the Sumerian equivalent, several scholars assigned to NI the value *b u_x*³². While the existence of this value is beyond question as far as the Old Akkadian and Eblaite syllabaries are concerned, the fact that *b u_x* does not appear in the Sumerian syllabary presents a problem, and thus calls for an explanation. As a possible solution, I propose that *b u_x* is the same as the value *m u₄*, well-documented in Sumerian lexical sources³³. The contrast between the Old Akkadian and Eblaite *b u_x* and the Sumerian *m u₄* could be explained by assuming that the Sumerian value contained the phoneme [*m b*]³⁴, which, as I have argued elsewhere³⁵, in the initial position sounded as /*p*/ to the Akkadians. The

26. See Finkelstein, *RA* 63(1969)61-64. As far as I know, the earliest occurrences of *su-si(-ig)* come from the Fara text *CT* 50 23 iv 2 (*su-si*) and the Early Dynastic Lu List E line 23 (*MSL* 12, p. 17; *MEE* 3, p. 36: *lú-su-si*, with a variant *lú-su*).

27. Given the fact that the Fara texts use both *ŠE + NĀM* and *KU₄* (= *LAK-141*), *ŠE + NĀM* can hardly be the ancestral form of *KU₄*, as suggested by Foster, *RA* 75(1981)189-190.

28. Cf. Civil, *BiOr* 40(1983) (in press).

29. Cf. Krebernik, *ZA* 72(1982)200 under *RI*, 235 (*Nachtrag*).

30. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 198 under *NI*, 233.

31. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 207 under *ZU*.

32. Krebernik, *ibid.*, p. 198; Civil, *BiOr* 40 (in press); D. O. Edzard, *ARE* 2, p. 66 no. 27 ii 2.

33. See *m u-ú NI* (Proto-Ea 94 = *MSL* 14, p. 35); *m u-ú NI = kab-ru*, *ba-nu-ú* (Ea II 19-20 = *MSL* 14, p. 247); *m u-ú NI = [ba-nu-ú]* (*MSL* 14, p. 136 ii' 13'). The syllabic usage of *m u₄* is attested in *Si-m u₄-ru-um^{ki}* (*MVN* 1 182:7).

34. To the best of my knowledge, the existence of this consonant was first proposed by Sollberger, *Or* 28(1959)336-337 note 3, with a suggestion that it represents *mb*, "une phonème labial nasal correspondant au phonème guttural nasal 'g'". [*m b*] was subsequently postulated by Civil, *JNES* 31(1972)22 (also *AS* 20, p. 149), who phonemicized it as /*mb*/. Considering that in the Akkadian loanwords from Sumerian [*m b*] seems to have been replaced by a homorganic sequence of /*m*/ and /*p*/ (see below), it is likely that we are dealing here with a pre-nasalized stop, to be phonemicized as /*mp*/ (thus essentially agreeing with Sollberger's and Civil's reconstructions). For discussions of pre-nasalized stops, which are common in African and Malayo-Polynesian languages, see, for example, J. C. Catford, *Fundamental Problems in Phonetics* (Bloomington, Ind., 1977), p. 212; C. M. Doke, *The Phonetics of the Zulu Language* (Johannesburg, 1926), pp. 64-65; *idem*, *A Comparative Study in Shona Phonetics* (Johannesburg, 1931), pp. 62-64; Ch. F. Hockett, *A Manual of Phonology* (International Journal of American Linguistics Vol. 21, N.º 4, Part 1) (Baltimore, 1955), p. 95; P. Ladefoged, *A Phonetic Study of West African Languages* (2nd. ed.: Cambridge, 1968), p. 24; J. D. O'Connor, *Phonetics* (Harmondsworth, 1973), pp. 224-225.

If the Akkadian word *paršum* is a loanword from /*m arza*/, the Emesal equivalent of /*ngarza*/ (contrast G. Farber-

III Coloquio de estudios Fenicios*

M.E. Aubet - Barcelona

Durante los días 9 y 10 de diciembre de 1983 se celebró en la Universidad Libre de Bruselas el tercer Coloquio de Estudios Fenicios organizado por el Grupo Interuniversitario de Estudios Fenicios y Púnicos. Dicho grupo, fundado en 1980 por el Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones belga y presidido por E. Lipinski, ha promovido durante estos últimos años un ambicioso programa de reuniones científicas orientadas al estudio y discusión de temas concretos del mundo fenicio-púnico. Un primer Coloquio se celebró en abril de 1981 para discutir la cuestión de la conservación y salvaguarda de Tiro y una segunda reunión, organizada en diciembre de 1982, trató sobre aspectos de la historia de Fenicia. Ambos coloquios acaban de ser publicados en los volúmenes I y II de los recién inaugurados "Studia Phoenicia".

El objetivo de este tercer coloquio ha sido el de analizar la influencia del mundo fenicio sobre sus más próximos vecinos: Siria, Anatolia, Mesopotamia, Persia, Palestina, Egipto, Chipre y el Egeo. El contenido es, en consecuencia, muy amplio, máxime si se tiene en cuenta que el Grupo de contacto interuniversitario belga se ha propuesto abarcar todas las disciplinas —arqueología, historia del arte, epigrafía, numismática, filología y religión— que guarden relación con el estudio del mundo fenicio.

Precedida de un texto de introducción al Coloquio por parte de E. Lipiński, la primera comunicación corre a cargo de D. Homès-Fredericq, quien analiza y valora el conocido texto de Ezequiel sobre Tiro para el estudio del comercio fenicio con los antiguos reinos de Edom, Ammón y Moab, comercio del que únicamente se conservan escasas evidencias filológicas y arqueológicas de la Edad del Hierro. Seguidamente, J.B. Hennessey destaca los resultados de sus propias excavaciones en la zona del aeropuerto de Ammán, en Jordania, donde en 1966 identificó una gran estructura de piedra, con altar central, en la que apareció cerámica micénica y chipriota, así como vasos de piedra egipcios. La presencia, en las proximidades, de una zona de incineraciones, traduce la práctica de sacrificios humanos realizados en el recinto sacro durante el siglo XIII a.C.

La comunicación de G. Bunnens se centra en el estudio de las listas de tributos que el rey de Assur impuso a Fenicia y a sus vecinos. De ellas se infiere que la materia primera exigida como tributo a Fenicia la constituyeron los metales, en tanto que la púrpura, la madera de cedro y el marfil lo fueron de Karkemish o Patina.

Por su parte, E. Gubel propone un carácter simbólico-religioso en sustitución de la imagen de Astarté para las pequeñas cabezas de leona de marfil, de fabricación fenicia y procedentes de Nimrud, y P. Bordreuil

* *La Phénicie et ses voisins*, III^o Colloque du Groupe de Contact Interuniversitaire d'Etudes Phéniciennes et Puniqes, F.N.R.S., Centrum voor Myceense en Archaisch-Griekse Cultuur, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1983, Résumés des Comptes Rendus, 24 pp.