

New contributions to the Old Syrian vernacular: Additions and corrections to GLOS 1 and 2

Scholium: naming the left-hand columns

Joaquín Sanmartín
IPOA, Universidad de Barcelona

[The purpose of this article is to review and complete some lexical data of my *Glossary of Old Syrian* in light of the publication by A. George and M. Krebernik of the so-called Amorite-Akkadian bilingual tablets (RA 116, 2022). In the body of the article, 60 lexemes are analysed and discussed. At the end, I add a scholium in which I propose to recalibrate the term Amorite, a label common in the Assyriological mainstream but not without controversy.]

Keywords: Bilingual texts, lexicography, Akkadian, Amorite, Old Syrian.

In 2022, Andrew George and Manfred Krebernik published two bilingual texts that have had a significant impact on the somewhat stagnant Assyriological milieu.¹ One of these, designated CUNES 50-11-020 (Jonathan and Jeanette Rosen Ancient Near Eastern Studies Seminar in Cornell University, Ithaca, New York), is the no. 1 in the George / Krebernik's publication. The other tablet, which comes from a private collection in London, is no. 2. The authors of this study have undertaken a thorough examination of the two texts. This examination has involved a meticulous process of transliteration, translation and commentary. The texts are accompanied by excellent photographic reproductions, which were obtained using the Ammonium Chloride technique. Two years later, Manfred Krebernik made a series of further clarifications, additions and suggestions on these bilingual texts available to us in an article intended for the German-speaking public. This was accompanied by a comparative study with the so-called 'Rosen Vocabulary' (CUNES 47-12-32).²

1. Andrew George / Manfred Krebernik, "Two Remarkable Vocabularies: Amorite-Akkadian Bilinguals!", *RA* 116 (2022), pp. 113-166. [Henceforth: George / Krebernik, op.cit.]

2. M. Krebernik, „Die ersten amurritisch-akkadischen Bilinguen: eine Nachlese nebst einem Vergleich mit dem 'Rosen Vocabulary'“, *WO* 54 (2024), pp. 199-214 [Henceforth: Krebernik, op.cit.]. The vocabulary was originally published by C.J. Crisostomo, "Multilingualism and Formulations of Scholarship: The Rosen Vocabulary". *ZA* 106 (2016), pp. 22-32.

The significance of both texts lies in their contribution to the understanding of the vernacular linguistic strata that diverge from the grammatical orthodoxy (both lexical and syntactic) embodied in the various manifestations of written Akkadian, notably from Babylonia, Ešnunna and Mari. In this respect, we are faced with one of the most significant findings of recent decades. This is particularly evident in the lexicographical field, where the texts offer insight into the ‘un-formed’ linguistic strata that were previously only accessible from anthroponymy, and from specific rare items found in lexical lists.

I had been interested in studying the linguistic components that lay beyond the conventional Babylonian corpus for several years, particularly the lexical data. This led me to develop a comprehensive repertory to facilitate access to and management of this ‘marginal’ material. The end result of all this was the publication of *A Glossary of Old Syrian* in two volumes: *vol. 1, ʔ-k* (2019), and *vol. 2, l-z* (2024).³ It is regrettable that the compilation of materials and the elaboration of the glossary took place – due to circumstances that are not relevant here – before the publication of George / Krebernik’s article in RA 116 (2022). Consequently, the texts studied by George / Krebernik and *a fortiori* their updating by Krebernik (2024) could not receive due attention.

For these reasons, we have found it useful to revise the materials offered in GLOS in light of the aforementioned articles by George and Krebernik. This has allowed us to include some omissions and nuance or correct our proposals where deemed necessary. The absences (noted below ‘*vacat*’) have been found to be few in number. This is due to the fact that many of the lexemes attested in CUNES 50-11-020 and in the London text had already been incorporated in GLOS from additional sources. These lexemes were present, at least, at the *etymon* level. In certain instances, however, it has been deemed necessary to incorporate new lexemes, or to correct certain statements in the light of George and Krebernik’s studies.

The authors have also dealt exhaustively with issues related to comparative Semitic syntax and intertextuality, especially the relationship of the bilingual tablets with the so-called “Akkadian-WSem. Bilingual” CBS 8538,⁴ and the Sumerian-Akkadian vocabulary CUNES 47-12-32.⁵ These are all very relevant aspects which, however, go beyond the strictly lexicographical scope of the present work, which we have preferred to keep limited to Old Babylonian texts.

Corrections and additions are performed at the level of normalised lexemes.⁶ Adhering to the GLOS paradigm, the lexical elements are categorised into two distinct groups: free contexts (CTX), and lexical list (LL).⁷ In the transcription (normalization) of both etyma and lexemes (verbal and nominal bases), International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA)-based symbols will be used instead of the more customary ones. Note that the alphabetical order employed here is consistent with that of

3. Joaquín Sanmartín, *A Glossary of Old Syrian. Vol. 1, ʔ-k* (2019), *vol. 2, l-z* (2024). Languages of the Ancient Near East 8/1–2. Eisenbrauns, University Park [Henceforth: GLOS 1, GLOS 2].

4. George / Krebernik, op.cit. pp. 150-154.

5. Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 208f.

6. I.e. verbal and / or nominal roots and their (de)verbal and / or (de)nominal derivations; GLOS 1, loc.cit.

7. GLOS 1, pp. xix f. *Vacat* here the mark ONOM: lexical entry extracted from onomastic material.

GLOS, namely: ʔ, ʕ, b, d, ɖ (d), g, ɣ (g), h, ħ (h), x (ḫ), k, ʕ (q), l, m, n, p, r, s, ʃ, sl (š), s2(š), š, t, ṭ, θ(t), θ (ṭ), w, y, z.⁸

The sigla are self-explanatory and coincide with the common ones in Assyriology and the already used in GLOS. Additionally, non-Babylonian materials from the bilingual tablets are introduced with the abbreviation *OBVern.*: vernacular dialect(s) in Old Babylonian sources.⁹

...

[ʔ-b-y] (2) (GLOS *vacat*).¹⁰

Sem.: ʔbh (Hb.) “to want (something)”; ʔby (Aram.) “to want, to wish”; ʔabā (ʔby, Arab.) “to refuse, reject”; ʔabaya (Eth.) “to refuse”. The nominalisations ʔab(i)yān “poor”, ʔab(i)yātt “poor female / poverty” (both Mari), ʔbyn “poor” (Ugarit), and ʔbywn (ʔebyôn, Hb.) “poor” are generated from a primary etymon [ʔ-b-y] whose relation to [ʔ-b-y] “to want” is highly debatable.

Note that the nominalisations [ʔab(i)yn] “poor” of [ʔ-b-y] [1] always exhibit the affix [=ān]. This leads us to consider them as primitive nouns resulting from strong lexicalisation.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** a-bi-ma [ʔābi=ma], G pref. with emphatic suffix “I truly wanted”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 121f. (1: 26).

As far as I am aware, this etymon is not productive in the Old Syrian vernacular outside of this text. George / Krebernik (loc. cit.) offer as a possible alternative the normalisation [ʔabbiʔ=] from an etymon [n-b-ʔ]. However, the strong lexicalisation of [n-b-ʔ] in the field of calling, proclamation, invocation both in the Old Syrian linguistic tradition (Ebla, Mari, Emar, Tuttul, Ugarit) and according to the general map of Semitic isoglosses makes it advisable to adopt the version “to want”, which is more in keeping with the erotic tone of the “love charm”.

[ʔ-m-r] (1) (GLOS 1, pp. 26f.).

Sem.: ʔmr (Hb. Ph., Aram.) “to say”; ʔamara (Arab.) “to order”; amāru(m) (Akk.) “to see”; ʔammara (Eth.) “to show”, ʔaʔamara “to know”.

The etymon [ʔ-m-r] (1) is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Alalah IV, Emar, Egypt, Amarna, and alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 27: **[ʔ-m-r]** “to see” / “to command, to speak”.

8. GLOS 1, p. xxi.

9. I attach a list of the most frequent ones: = (short equals sign) morphemic boundary; = (equals sign) equalizer; C: Causative stem; CTX: Lexical entry extracted from free contexts, unlike e.g. lexical lists (LL); Cstr.: Construct state; Euphr.-Akk.: Euphratean Akkadian (mainly Mari); G: Ground verbal stem; Gt: -t-infixed verbal stem G; H: Causative verbal stem *Ha=qtal; LL: Lexical entry extracted from the Lexical Lists; OBVern.: Vernacular dialect(s) in Old Babylonian sources; Prefc.: prefix conjugation; Suff.: (With) suffix / suffixed; Suffc.: Suffix conjugation;

10. The etymon [ʔ-b-y] in GLOS 1, pp. 6f., should be changed to [ʔ-b-y] (1) and differentiated from the [ʔ-b-y] (2) proposed here.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** Cf. *ia-a-mu-* [yaʔmur|, [yāmur(?)], G prefc.?, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 121, 130 (1: 25).

With due caution because of the fragmentary context, George / Krebernik's suggestion seems the most appropriate. The preconsonantal radical [ʔ] has apparently been retained. In view of the lack of reliable context, the translation of the verb "to say" (instead of "to see") seems to me to be somewhat hasty.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *ta-mar* [taʔmur| [tāmor], G prefc.? "you will need to have a talk(?)", George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 122, 130 (1: 29).

As George / Krebernik point out, the parallelism with Akk. *atwu* (*atwûm* Gt imperative) "talk!" in the right column suggests placing the spelling *ta-mar* within the scope of the etymon [ʔ-m-r| 'to command, to speak', with a clear volitive nuance. It could be a non-conventional spelling of a taPRuS theme [taʔmur| in accordance with Barth-Ginsberg's law, provided that the [a] of MAR was in fact a mere allophone of [o] [tāmor], motivated by a vowel harmony process. There is strong indication that the prefix vowel is independent of the thematic vowel in Ebla, Mari and Akkadian, as well as in Aramaic, Hebrew and Ethiopic. In general, this is also true of Arabic. Furthermore, it appears that Barth-Ginsberg's law (rigid sequences [i - a], resp. [a - i/u]) was only effective in the late stages of certain Semitic languages (e.g. 'classical' – i.e. Masoretic – Hebrew). Even in Ugaritic, exceptions are recorded, such as in the proper name *ia-an-ḥa-mu*.

In this respect, it should be noted that ḪAR = *mur* may be read as *mar*₆ (or *mar*₅) in NBab, and that ḪAR often admits the reading *hur*. All of this can be traced back to an oscillation between [a] and its allophone [o] — a phenomenon which, in my opinion, has not yet received the necessary attention. Cases have been observed of graphic alternations [a/u] which point to the (expected) functional validity of the sound [o], absent in the syllabary. Some spellings with *u* reflect the evolution of [a] to [o], while some spellings with *a* correspond to the evolution of [u] to [o]: *ta-mar* [taʔmur| > [tāmor]. Alternative solutions do not offer greater plausibility. George / Krebernik point to the reading of *ta-mar* as a possible imperative tG [taʔmar| [tāmar] in semantic and morphological equivalence with the Akk. imperative *atwu*. The authors rightly point out that tG forms do not appear in either the NWSem or the Arabic paradigms.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** G prefc. *ma-a-a-mu-ru-ul-la-ka* [mah=yaʔmurun=la=ka] [mā=yāmurul=la=ka], G prefc. "what did she tell you?"; George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 126, 130 (2: 12).

As the authors note, the segment [yaʔmurun=] undergoes phonological and syntactic change (*sandhi*) due to contextual pressure from the preceding interrogative [mah=] and subsequent complementation [la=ka].

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *mu-[ru?-. . .]* G imperative [murū](?), George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 127 (2: 17).

The Akkadian equivalent *qī-bi-a*, and the Arabic isoglosse *murū*, fully support the authors' proposal.

GLOS 1, p. 27: **ʔamr, ʔamrat** "word, matter".

Add: CTX **OBVern.** Cstr. *a-mar* [ʔamar=], George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 127f., 130 (2: 20).

In my opinion, the spelling *a-mar* corresponds to a PaRS form in the construct state. Akkadian influence results in the absence of case desinence (accusative) and the insertion of an epenthetic vowel.

[ʔ-n-θ] (1) (GLOS 1, pp. 33f.).

Primary noun, Sem.: *aššatu(m)* (Akk.) “wife”, *tenēštu*, *tenīšu*, “people, population”; *ʔšh* (*ʔiššāh*, Hb.) “woman, wife, female”; *ʔšt* (Ph., Pun.) “wife”; *ʔnth* (Aram.) id.; *ʔuntā* (Arab.) “female, woman”; *ʔntt* (OSArab.) “wife”; *ʔanəšt* (Eth.) “woman, wife, female”.

The etymon is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Malku, and alph. Ugaritic.

Add: **taʔnīθ** “woman”.

CTX **OBVern.** *ta-aḥ-ni-šum* [taʔnīθ=um], George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 126 (2: 12, 13); *ta-aḥ-ni-ši-ia* [taʔnīθ=ya], with pronominal suffix; George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 127 (2: 16).

As the authors point out, it is important to emphasise that the form is grammatically masculine and singular, with the concrete meaning “the woman”. In contrast, the Ugaritic hapax *tīnθt* seems to function as an abstract feminine noun ([taʔnīθt]), meaning “the female sex”, or a plural collective ([taʔnīθātu]), meaning “the women”. The synecdoche mechanisms at work in these semantic frameworks must, of course, be taken into account.

[ʔ-t-w/y] (GLOS 1, p. 49).

Sem.: *ʔth* (Hb.) “to come”; *ʔty/h/ʔ* (Aram.) id.; *ʔatā* (*ʔty*, Arab.) id.; *ʔtw/y* (OSArab.) “to pass”; *ʔatawa* (Eth.) “to come (back / home)”.

This etymon is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Emar, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 49: [ʔ-t-w], [ʔ-t-y] “to come, arrive”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *ta-ti* [taʔti] [tāti], G pref. in the jussive modus “come on!”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 123, 130 (2:2).

[ʔ-y-θ] (GLOS 1, p. 50).

Primary noun [ʔ/ya/iθ] “presence, existence of”, Sem.: *yš* (*yēš*, Hb.) “it exists, there is”; *yš*, *s*, *us* (Poenulus Pun.) id.; *ʔyt(y)* (Aram.) id.; *ʔīt* (Syr.) id.; *išū(m)* (Akk.) “to have” (neg. *laššu* “there is not”). Cf. *laysa* (Arab.) “not to be”.

This etymon is productive in Ebla, and alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 50: [y-θ-y] “to be, exist”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *iʔ-[šaʔ]-a*; George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 121 (1: 22a); *la i-ša-a* [lā ʔiθay] “there is no ...”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 127 (2: 15).

It should be noted with due caution that the form [ʔiθay] corresponds to the alphabetic notation iθ ([ʔiθē/ā] < [ʔiθay(a)]) in Ugaritic. Most probably, the variants [y-θ-w] and [ʔ-θ-y], noted in GLOS 1, p. 50, are stative verbalisations of a proto-substantive [ʔ/ya/iθ] “presence, existence of”.

[ʔ-θ-r] (GLOS 1, pp. 51f.).

Primary noun, Sem.: *ʔaṭar* (Arab.) “track”, *ʔi/uṭra* “footprint” > *ʔaṭāra* (Arab.) “to transmit”, II “to make an impression”, *muʔaṭṭir* “he who impresses”; *b ʔṭr* (OSArab.) “after”; *ʔtr(ʔ)* (Aram.) “place, trace”; *ʔašar* “path” > *ʔašara* (Eth.) “to follow, look for tracks” (denom.). Hence (A) *ʔšr*

(*ʔe/ošer*, Hb.) “success, happiness” > *ʔšr* (Hb.) “to walk”, Pi “to lead” / Pi “to call blessed”; (B) *ašru(m)* (Akk) “place, abode”; *ešertu(m)* (Akk.) “chapel, shrine”; *ʔt/šrh*, *ʔšrth* (Aram.) “sanctuary”; *ʔšr* (*ʔašer*, Hb.) “who, which” (relat. pn.).

This etymon is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Amarna, Emar, Alalah IV, and alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 52: **ʔaθira(t)**, **ʔaθrat**, **ʔaθart**, **ʔaθirt** “the Favourite, Lucky One; DN”.

Add: **ʔaθerat** “the Favourite, Lucky One” (DN).

LL **OBVern.** *a-še-ra-tum* [ʔaθeratum] = DINGIR.MAH, George / Krebernik, op.cit. pp. 118, 126 (1: 3).

Indications of Akkadianism are found in the mimation and the vowel |e| (in the context of |r|) instead of the expected |i|.

|ʔ-w/y-r| (GLOS 1, pp. 53f.).

Primary noun, Sem.: *urru(m)* (Akk.) “daytime”; *ʔwr* (*ʔôr*, Hb.) “light”, (*ʔûr*) “light, glow”, *ʔwrh* (*ʔôrāh*) “brightness”, *ʔwr* “to be light, bright”, denom.; *ʔwr(ʔ)* (JAram.) “light”, *ʔuwār* (Arab.) “heat, blaze”.

This etymon is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Alalah VII and IV, Emar, Malku, Egypt, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 54.

Add: **ʔār (??)** “light”.

LL **OBVern.** *a-a-[ru?]-um* = ^d*i-šum*, as suggested by George / Krebernik, op.cit. pp. 118f. (1: 6).

The maintenance of the vowel |ā| instead of |ō| (and its allophones, cf. Akk., Hb., Aram., and Arab.) is very problematic. In alphabetic Ugaritic, a fluctuation is seen between the writings *ār*, *îr* and *ûr*, with possible semantic variations.

|b-k-r| (GLOS 1, pp. 114f.).

Primary noun, Sem.: *bk(w)r* (*b^eko/ôr*, Hb.), *bkyr* (*bākîr*) “first-born”, *bkyrh* (*b^ekîrāh*) “premature female child”, *bkr* (*bēker*) “young male camel”; *bkr(ʔ)* (JAram., Syr.) “first, earlier”, *bkwtȳt?* “earliest ripening”; *bkr* (OSArab.) “first-born”; *bikr* (Arab.) “first-born”; *bak^wr* (Eth.) “first-born”; *bukru(m)* (Akk.) “son, child”. Denominative verbs: *bkr* (Hb. D) „to bear first fruits“; (JAram., Syr., Pa.) “to bear first fruits; to begin”; *bakara*, *bakkar*, *ʔabkar* (Arab.) “to hurry, make haste”; *bakwara*, *tabakwara* (Eth.) “to be a first-born, have a first-born”.

The etymon is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Emar, Egypt, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 115.

Add: **bikrāt** “first fruits offering”.

CTX **OBVern.** *bi-ik-ra-ti-ia* [bikrātī=ya], plural oblique with pronominal suffix, George / Krebernik, op.cit. p. 128 (2: 22).

This is a PiRS theme, which, in certain morphosyntactic contexts such as the construct state, produces PiRaS in Assyrian rather than PiRiS as in Babylonian. PiRS themes can occur in the presence of the suffix $|(a)t|$ together with the expected PiRiSt, as in our case.¹¹

|b-y-n| (1) (GLOS 1, p. 134).

Sem.: *byn* (Hb., JAram.) “to understand, to pay attention”; *bayān* (Arab.) “to be evident”, *bayyana* (Arab.) “to distinguish clearly, to examine”, *tabayyana*, “to seek repeatedly to obtain knowledge, to scrutinize”; *bayyana* (Eth.) “to discern”. The verbal bases generate numerous prepositional lexicalisations: *b(y)n*, *bynwt* (*bēn*, *bēnôt* < $|bayn|$, Hb.) “interval, amidst, among”; *bn* (Ph.) id.; *byn*, *byn(y)*, *bynt* (Aram., Nab., Syr.) id.; *bayna* (Arab., Eth.) id.; *byn* (OSArab.) id.

The etymon $|b-y-n|$ (1) is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Alalāḥ IV, Egypt, and alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 134: **bayn (A)** “middle part; midst”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *bé-[na?]-a-na* $|bēn=ay=nā|$ “among us”(?), George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 121 (1.22b).

The term is clearly an adverbial accusative, meaning “in the middle part, midst”. If the written element *-na* is the pronominal suffix 1.pl., $|nā|$, then the adverbialisation becomes a preposition; see below under $|n|$ (2). However, the presence of the ‘emphatic’ (highlighting / euphonic) morpheme $|na/ni|$ cannot be excluded; see below under $|n|$ (1).

|d-r-r| (GLOS 1, pp. 150f.).

Sem.: *darra* (Arab.) “to flow copiously”; see further *darāru(m)* (Akk) “to move freely”, *nadarruru* “to become free”.

This etymon is productive in Alalāḥ VII and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 151.

Add: **darūr** “showering abundantly (?), DN”.

LL **OBVern.** *da-ru-ru* = MUL ^dEN.KI, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 120 (1: 13).

It is most likely an actant noun of the PaRūS theme, similar to the Arabic *darūr*, meaning “one who gives a lot of milk” and the like. George / Krebernik (loc. cit.) rightly point out the connection between Ea and the Pisces and Aquarius sections of the MUL.APIN (I, ii, 38–40) series.

|d-w/y-d| (GLOS 1, pp. 152f.).

Primary noun, Sem.: *dwd* (*dôd*, Hb.) “beloved, lover”; *dd(?)* (Palm., Nab., JAram., Syr.) “(paternal) uncle, beloved”, *ddh*, *ddt?* (Syr.) “paternal aunt”; *dādu* (Akk.) “love-making, favorite”; *dādat* (Arab.) “governess, dry nurse”; *dud* (Eth.) “uncle”.

11. D.O. Edzard, ‘*Parsat*’, ZA 72 (1982), 68–88.

The etymon |d-w/y-d| is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Tall al-Rimah, Alalah VII and IV, Qatna, Emar, Egypt, alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 152.

Add: **dādūma** (pl. tantum) “love(making)”.

CTX **OBVern.** Pl. *da-du-ú-ma* *d[a-d]u-ú-ma* |dādūma dādūma| “love(-making)”; with suffix pronoun 2.m.sg. *da-di-i-ka* |dādī=ka| “your love(-making)”, George / Krebernik, op.cit. pp. 121f., 131 (1: 23, 26).

It is a lexicalized *plurale tantum*, analogous to the plural forms found in alphabetic Ugaritic and Hebrew. The etyma |d-w/y-d| and its variants are likely to be denominative of a primordial babble word *|da|, denoting a personal love object. This is a frequent phenomenon in the vocabulary of close family relationships (cf. also Hurrian |tad=| “to love” and its derivatives).

The plural ending (cstr.) |ī=| in *da-di-i-* is, in contrast to the expected |ay=|, Akkadian. Note, however, that in syll. Ugaritic, the possessive |ya| (y) alternates with |ī| (no graphemic notation).¹²

|ð-b-ḥ| (GLOS 1, p. 160).

Sem.: *zbḥ* (Hb., Pun.) “to slaughter (for a sacrifice)”; *zbḥ* (*zēbah*, Hb.; Ph., Pun.) “sacrifice”; *mzbḥ* (*mizbēḥ*, Hb.; Ph., Pun.) “altar”; *dbḥ* (Aram., Syr.) “to slaughter (for a sacrifice)”; *dbḥ*(?) “animal sacrifice”, *mdbḥ*(?) “altar”, *ḏabaḥa* (Arab.) “to kill, slaughter; sacrifice”, *ḏa/ibḥ* “cutting an animal prepared for slaughter”, *maḏbah* “the place of the slaughter”; *ḏbḥ* (OSArab.) “to sacrifice, kill”, “(animal for) sacrifice”, *mḏbḥt* “sacrificial place”; *zabḥa* (Eth.) “to slaughter, sacrifice”, *zəbḥ* “sacrifice”, *məzbaḥ* “place where one slaughters”; *zību(m)* (Akk.) “food offering”.

The etymon |ð-b-ḥ| is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Emar, and alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 160.

Add: **ḏabah** “sacrifice”.

CTX **OBVern.** *za-ba-ḥa* |ḏabāḥa| “by way of sacrifice”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 128 (2: 22).

As the authors point out, it is undoubtedly an accusative with the complement function of specification / relation, referring to the verbal nucleus *la-am-ti-in* (see below for |n-t-n| “to give”, under |n/w/y-D-n|).

|y-l-m| (1) (GLOS 1, p. 200).

Primary noun, Sem.: *ʕlm* (*ʕelem*, Hb.) “young man”; *ʕlym*(?), “child, slave” (Aram., Syr.), (JAram.) “youthful, strong, violent”; ALEM (Pun.) “man”; *ḡulām* (Arab.) “young man”, *ḡalim* “lustful, sensual”, *ḡulma* “lust, carnal appetite”. Fem.: *ʕlmh* (*ʕalmāh*, Hb.) “young woman”; *ʕlymh* (Aram., Palm.) id., (Syr. fem.) *ʕlymt*(?) id; *ʕlmt* (Ph.) id.; *ḡulāmat* (Arab.) “young woman”.

This etymon is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Alalah IV, Emar, Malku, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 200.

Add: **yalam** “young man; DN”.

12. J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik, Zweite, stark überarbeitete Auflage*, AOAT 273, Münster 2012, p. 215f.

LL **OBVern.** *ḥa-la-mu* = ^d*šu-bu-la*, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 110, 130 (1: 7).

The disyllabic structure 'PaRaS' could present an obstacle to this reconstruction, given that Semitic isoglosses predominantly employ the monosyllabic forms Pa/i/uRS, as evidenced in the onomastics of Mari and Alalah IV (|ṽalm|, |ṽilm|, |ṽulm|). In Eblaite, one epenthetic form, *ḥa-la-mi-im*, is attested in a free context, alongside several onomastic segments *ḥa-lam*(=) < |ṽalm|.

|h-l-k| (GLOS 1, p. 215).

Sem.: *hlk* (Hb., Ph., Pun., Moab., Aram. Nab., Palm.) “to go, walk”; *hlykh* (*h^alīkāh*, Hb.) “walking, advance”; *hlk(?)* (Aram.) “tribute”, *hlkh*, *hlkt?* (JAram., Syr.) “entrance, going”; *alāku(m)* (Akk.) “to go, to move”, *alaktu(m)* “way, course”, *ilku(m)* “(state) service”; *halaka* (Arab.) “to perish, pass, go away”.

This etymon is productive in Ebla, Malku, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 215: **h-l-k|** “to go, walk”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *ta-li-ku* |taliku|, G prefc., George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 125 (2: 10); *a-li-ku* |ʔaliku|, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 127 (2: 16); in the energetic modus *a-li-ku-na* |ʔalikunna|, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 128, 130 (2: 24); verbal action noun *el-kum* |hilkum| [helkum], George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 127 (2: 16).

|h-m| (GLOS 1, p. 217).

Sem. *|s¹im(-ma)|: *šumma* (Akk.) “if”; *hm* (OSArab.) “if”; *ʔm* (*ʔim*, Hb.; Ph., Pun., Palm, JAram.) “if; either ... or”; *ʔm* (MSArab.) “if”; *ʔamma*, (*ʔam*), *laʔamma* (Eth.) “if”, *ʔammani ... waʔammani* “either ... or”; *ʔimmā* (Arab.) “either ... or”; *ʔn* (Aram., Syr.) “if; either ... or”; *ʔin* (Arab.) “if; either ... or”; *ʔy* (JAram.) “if; either ... or”. Further: *hm* (JAram.) “also”.

The etymon is productive in alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 217.

Add: **ʔimma** “if”.

CTX **OBVern.** *im-ma* |ʔimma|, George / Krebernik, op.cit. pp. 127, 130 (2: 18).

The statement that the initial |h| is not reflected in the script could be qualified by noting that the underlying form is not |himma|, but actually |ʔimma|, as seen in Hebrew, Phoenician, Punic, Arabic and Ethiopic. There is no graphic reflex of the initial |ʔ| (see George / Krebernik, op. cit. # 4.1.4.2, p. 130).

|h-b-S| (GLOS 1, pp. 229f.).

Sem.: (Arab.) *ḥabasa* “to obstruct, shut off, confine”, *ḥabs* “holding, keeping back”; *ḥbs* (MSArab.) “to imprison”; *ḥabbasa* (Eth.) id.; *ḥbš* (Hb.) “to saddle, bind up, imprison”, *taḥbešet* (NHb.) “bandage”; *ḥbš* (JAram., Syr.) “to imprison, shut in”; *abšu* (Akk. LL) “a strap or band”. See further: *taḥab/paštum* (OAkk.) “an object of reed”.

The etymon |h-b-S| is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Alalah VII and IV, Egypt, Amarna, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, pp. 229f.

Add: **hubūS** “cinch, belt” (?).

LL **OBVern.** *hu-bu-[ú?]-su* = KUŠ É.ÍB, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 120, 130 (1: 20).

George / Krebernik are probably right to suggest the reading [*hu-bu-u*]š-šu (= [*mi-sér*-[r]u) in Malku-šarru VIII 71.¹³

|h-w/y-w/y| (1) (GLOS 1, pp. 260f.).

Sem.: *hyh* (Hb.) “to be / stay alive”, *hy(m)* (*hay*. pl. *hayyīm*) “life”, *hyh* (*hayyāh*) “what is living” > “life”; *hwy*, *hw2*, *hyy* (Ph., Pun., Palm.) “to live”, *hy(m)* “living” / “life”; *hyy* (Aram., Syr.) “to live”, *hy* “alive”, *hyw(t?)* “life”, (Syr.) *hyt* “alive”; *hayiya*, *hayya* (Arab.) “to live”, *hayy* “living, live, alive”, *hayāh* “life”; *hwy*, *hyw*, *hyy* (OSArab.) “to live”, *hwy* / *hyw* / *hywt* “life”, *hym* “alive”; *hwy* “to recover” (MSArab.), *heyōt* “life”; *haywa* (Eth.) “to live, be alive”, *hayāw* “alive, living”, *haywat* “life”.

This etymon is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Alalah VII, Emar, Egypt, Amarna, and alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 260.: |h-w-y| (A), |h-y-y| “to live, be alive”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *li-iḫ-wi-i-ka* |a=yahwī=ka| [lihwika], H prefc. in the precative modus, George / Krebernik, op.cit. pp. 123, 134 (1: 30); Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 211ff.

As the authors point out, it is most likely a causative H stem of the NWS type (theme |ya=ha=PRiS| > |yaPRiS|) in the precative mood. The resulting verbal form |liPRiS=| instead of the expected |liPaRRiS| is noteworthy, as is the difficulty of convincingly explaining the transition from |lū=yaPRiS| to the volitional H stem |liPRiS|. In any case, the objections raised at the time against the presence of a proclitic |lū=| in the volitional forms based on the prefix, and the thesis in favour of the proclitic |la=| (and, in certain circumstances, its allomorph |li=|), remain in full force here.¹⁴ The transition |la=yaPRiS| > |la=yiPRiS| > |liPRiS| is consistent with normal phonological development.

The spelling *li-iḫ-wi-i-* is a good example of mixed morphology due to the Akkadian adstratum. The NWS forms of the prefix conjugation already exhibit a potential volitional, commanding or intending character, which explains the absence of precative proclitic particles in these linguistic domains. The proclitic |la| > |li| is explained by contamination from the Akkadian *li-ba-al-li-iṭ* of the right-hand column. It is worth bearing in mind that causative H-forms are problematic in second-millennium Syrian documentation. They are absent from Ugaritic and rare (or uncertain) in Amarna Akkadian. However, they are fully operational in the first millennium, appearing in Hebrew, Samʿalite, Old Aramaic, Official Aramaic, Moabite, Old South Arabic (Sabaean) and Modern South Arabic (Mehri), among others. It is impossible to say whether this is

13. I. Hrůša, *Die akkadische Synonymenliste malku = šarru*, AOAT 50, Münster 2010, pp. 142 and 424: [xxx]x-šu.

14. See J. Huehnergard, “Asseverative *la and hypothetical *lu/law in Semitic”, JAOS 103 (1983), pp. 569–593; see in particular pp. 580, 588.

an innovative feature. Given its survival in South Arabic documentation, its roots and original setting are difficult to determine.

Some authors have raised questions about the presence of H-stem forms in the North and West Syrian vernaculars from the 2nd millennium,¹⁵ while others, including George / Krebernik, have defended their existence (op. cit. # 4.2.4, p.133; # 4.2.4.3.2, p. 134). In my opinion, the existence of the prefix causatives |ha=| and |s¹=| should probably be acknowledged in certain linguistic areas with specific characteristics. In any case, the presence of H-stem forms alone is not a reliable indicator of a text's linguistic affiliation. For example, consider that in the Aramaic linguistic realm, there are causatives with both the prefix |ha=| and |ʔa=|, and that many lexemes can be traced back to radicals with the prefix |s¹=|.

|x-n-p| (GLOS 1, p. 276).

Sem. Cf. *hnp* (Hb.) “to be godless”; *hnp* (JAram., Syr. G/D) “to lie, deceive”; *hanafa* (Arab.) “to incline”, *hunūfa* “to get irritable, be arrogant”, *hānif* “arrogant”, *ʔahnaf* “with a distorted side”; *hnf* (OSArab.) “to incline”. See further: *hanafa* (Arab.) “to turn / bend sideways” (unrelated?). The etymon |x-n-p| seems to basically mean “to behave offensively, boldly, insolently”, and to have been lexicalised in the religious domain (“to misbehave towards God”, Hb.), from where its later uses in other languages probably originate.

This etymon is productive in Euphr.-Akk., Amarna, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, 276: |x-n-p| “to mislead; act untruly, with audacity”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *hu-nu-pa* |xunup=a/ā|, G imperative with reinforcing enclitic “tackle the challenge!”, George / Krebernik, op.cit. p. 125 (2: 9).

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *ha-am-pi-ni* |xanpī=ni| [xampīni] oblique, with Akkadian pronominal suffix “our action, challenge”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 125, 130, 132 (2: 8).

Add: CTX **OBVern.** [*ha*]-*an-pa* |xanpa|, sg. Accusative, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p.125, 130 (2: 9).

It seems that the vocabulary used in the paronomasia *hunupa/ā hanpa* in the left-hand column has been carefully selected to reinforce the rather neutral command expressed in the right-hand column (*epša šipram*) semantically. Appropriate translations would be “tackle the challenge!” or “!take action!”

|x-ṭ-ṭ| (1) (GLOS 1, p. 286).

Sem.: *ḥaṭṭu(m)* (Akk.) “sceptre, rod”. Cf. *ḥt* (Eg.) “wood, tree; sceptre, rod”. This etymon is productive in Ebla, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 286.

Add: **xetṭ** “rod (penis?)”

15. V. Golinets, *Das amurritische Onomastikon der altbabylonischen Zeit*, vol. 2, *Verbalmorphologie des Amurritischen und Glossar der Verbalwurzeln*, AOAT 271/2, Münster 2018, p. 74.

CTX **OBVern**. Cf. *ḥé-eṭ-tu* [ḥé?-eṭ?]-tu, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp.121, 129 (1: 24).

The well-attested presence of the spelling *ḥt* in Ugaritic,¹⁶ meaning “sceptre, rod”, and the probable occurrence of the variant *ḥa-dum* in Ebla, support option no. 4, as suggested by George / Krebernik. Section 1: 23–26 indeed seems to correspond to a love charm; cf. *dādūma*, *dādīka*, 1:23, 26, and above: [d-w/y-d]. Note that the Ugaritic word *xṭ* could occasionally be used amphibolically to mean “virile member”, e.g. in KTU 1.169:5. This is most probably also the sense in 1: 24.

[k] (1) (GLOS 1, pp. 291ff.).

Sem. morpheme of deixis: Cf. *-k* (*-kā*, *-ēk*, Hb.) “your(s), you”, pl. *-km*, *-kn* (*-kem*, *-ken*); *-k* (Ph., Pun.) “your(s), you” (Late Pun. fem. *-ky*), pl. m. Pun. *-HOM* (for *-CHOM*); *k*, *-yk*, *-ky*, *-yky* (Aram.) “your(s), you”, pl. *-km*, *-kwn*, *-ykm*, *-kn*, *-ykn*; *-k*, *-yk*, *-ky*, *-yky* (Syr.), pl. *-kwn*, *-ykw*, *-kyn*, *-yky*; *-ka*, *-kum*, *-ki*, *-kim* (Akk.) “your(s), you”, pl. *-kinūti*, *-kunu*, *-kunūšim*, *-kināti*, *-kina*, *-kināšim*, indep. *kuāšim* “you”, *kū(m)* “belonging to you”, *kuāti* “you”; *-ka*, *-ki* (Arab.) “your(s), you”, pl. *-kum*, *-kunna*; *-k*, *-š* (MSArab.) “your(s), you”, pl. *-kām*, *-kən*; *-ka*, *-ki* (Eth.) “your(s), you”, pl. *-kamu*, *-kən*.

This etymon is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Alalah VII, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 292: **=k(a)** “your(s); you”.

Add: CTX **OBVern**. *ma-a-a-mu-ru-ul-la-ka* [mah=ya?murun=la=ka] [mā=yāmurul=la=ka] “what did she tell you?”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 126 (2: 12); *el-ḥa-ku-un-ka* [yal?akun =ka] [(?)el?akun=ka], George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 126 (2: 13).

[k-w/y-m] (GLOS 1, p. 330).

Sem.: *kimtu(m)*, *kīmu* (Akk.) “family”; ultimately related with *qawm* (Arab.) “fellow, kinsfolk, tribe”. See further *kymh* (*kīmāh*, Hb.) “Pleiades”; *kym?* (JAram., Syr.) id.

The etymon [k-w/y-m] is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Alalah VII and IV, Emar, and Egypt.

GLOS 1, p. 330: **kaymāt** “the Pleiades”.

Add: **kēmāt** “the Pleiades”.

LL **OBVern**. *ke-e-ma-at* = ^d*za-ap-pu*, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 119, 129, 139 (1: 11).

It is related to the theonym *kaym* (and its allomorph *kawm*) “family, clan; DN” of Ur III and Mari, and to the diphthongated *kaymāt* “the Pleiades” from Ebla.

[k-w-m] (GLOS 1, pp. 361f.).

Sem.: *qwm* (Hb.) “to rise, stand up, get up (against)”, *mqwm* (*māqôm*) “place, site”; *qwm* (Ph., Pun., Nab., Palm.) “to rise, stand up”, *mqm* (Ph., Pun.) “place, site”; *qwm* (Aram., Syr.) “to rise,

16. GLOS 1, p. 286: *xṭ*.

stand up”, *qwm(?)* “station, position”, *qyym* (JPAr.) “enduring, in existence”, *qywm(?)* (Syr.) “standing one, protector”; *qāma* (Arab.) “to stand still, to stand up”, *qayyim* “manager, conductor, superintendent”; *qiwām* “base, support”; *qawm* “family, folk(s), clan” (MSArab.), *qīma* “value, worth”, *maqām* “place of the feet”; *qwm* (OSArab.) “to serve as witness”, *mqm* “post, position”; *qwm, qoma* (Eth.) “to stand, stay, rise”, *qawm* “sponsor, defender”, *maqwām* “place where one stands”.

The etymon |k-w-m| is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Alalah VII and IV, Emar, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 1, p. 361: |k-w-m| “to stand (up), to get up, rise”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *qū-ú* |kūm| [ku], G imperative “get up!”, George / Krebernik, op.cit. pp. 123, 130 (2: 2).

George / Krebernik (loc.cit.) are understandably undecided between the bases |k-w-n| and |k-w-m|, both of which are supported by the graphemic and lexical data. However, I am inclined towards the second option |k-w-m| given its more dynamic connotations, as opposed to the static connotations of |k-w-n|. For the final consonant dropping see additionally Krebernik, op. cit. p. 210.

|| (1) (GLOS 2, pp. 1f.).

Sem.: *l* (*l^e*, Hb.) “to(wards), on, at, in, according to, away from”; *l* (Ph., Aram., Syr.), *ly/i* (Pun.) “to, for”; *li* (Arab.) “for, at, by”, *la* (Eth.) “to(wards), for, according to”. See also *lmh* (*lām(m)āh*, *lāmeḥ* (Hb.; Aram., Syr.) “why?”; *limā* (Arab.) id.; *lmn(?)*, *lmwn* (Syr.) id.; *limā(dā)* (Arab.) id.

The etymon || (1) is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Emar (?), and syll. and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 2: **la (A), li (A), lu (A)** “to, for”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *la*, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 121, 127 (2: 16, 19); *ma-a-a-mu-ru-ul-la-ka* |mah=yaʔmurun=la=ka| [mā=yāmurul=la=ka] “what did she tell you?”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 126 (2: 12); *la-a-i-de-ni* |la=yidē-ni| “for our hands”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 124 (2: 3).

George / Krebernik (loc.cit.) point out that the spelling *la-a-i-de-ni* may be the result of a contraction *sandhi*: |la=yidē-ni|. In my opinion, this is the most plausible explanation.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *le-i-a* |lē(la=ī)=īya|; *le-ia* |lē=ya| “to me”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 122, 128 (1: 27; 2: 20); *-la-a-ka* |lay(a)=ka| “to you”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 127, 129 (2: 14).

The spelling *le-i-a* is the result of a compromise between two segments. The first consists of the preposition |la=| followed by the first-person singular case suffix |=ī| (la=ī=| > |lī=| > |lē=|). The second element consists of the emphatic enclitic |=īy(a)|, which is well attested in the Semitic family.¹⁷ In my opinion, it is unnecessary to resort to the “etym. Zusammenhang mit dem sem. prp. ʔilay”.¹⁸ This enclitic semantically reinforces the syntagm |lī=|, in the sense of “strive to come to me (and only me!)”.

17. See among others J. Tropper, op. cit. p. 833ff.

18. J. Tropper, op. cit. p. 758. A solution accepted by George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 122.

As stated in the previous paragraph, for the same reasons, I do not think it is necessary to resort to the preposition **ʔilay* for the cluster *la-a-i-*, which can be explained perfectly well by the *sandhi*-spelling mentioned by the authors. The writing *la-a-ka* reflects a process similar to, but not identical with, the one just described. The prepositional nucleus *|la=|* is expanded by the emphatic segment *|y(a=|*, followed by the pronominal complement *|=ka|*.

GLOS 2, p. 2.

Add: **lamāya** “why”.

CTX **OBVern.** *la-ma-a-a* *|la=mā=ya|*, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 121, 132 (1: 22a).

This is another example of the emphatic enclitic in question, this time in its variant form, *|=ya|*.

|l| (2) (GLOS 2, p. 2).

Sem. negative functor: *lʔ* (*loʔ* Hb.) “no, not”; *l*, *lʔ*, *lʔw*, *lh*, *lw*, *lwʔ* (Aram., *lw* Syr.) id.; *lā* (Akk., Arab.) id.

The etymon **|l| (2)** is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Amarna, and alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 2: **lā** “no, not”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *la*, George / Krebernik, op.cit. pp. 121, 127 (1: 22a; 2: 15).

|l-ʔ-k| (GLOS 2, p. 4).

Sem.: *mlʔk* (*malʔak*, Hb.; Ph., Aram.) “messenger, angel”, *mlʔkh* (*m^llākāh*, Hb.) “trade, mission”, *mlʔk(ʔ)* (Aram., Syr.) “messenger, angel”, *mlʔkh* (Aram.) “mission”, *mlʔkw(tʔ)* (Syr.) “mission”; *ʔalʔak*, *ʔalāk* (Arab.) “to send”, *malʔāk*, “messenger”; *laʔaka* (Eth.) “to send”, *malʔak* “messenger, angel”, *mal(ə)ʔakt* “letter, message”.

The etymon **|l-ʔ-k|** is productive in Old Bab., and in alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 4: **|l-ʔ-k|** “to send”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *el-ḥa-ku-un-ka* *|yalʔakun =ka|* *[(ʔ)elʔakun=ka]*, G pref. in the energetic modus “did she send you?” (2: 13); *el-ḥa-ku-un-na-ni-la-a-ka* *|yalʔakunn=annī=lay=ka|* *[(ʔ)elʔakunn=annī=lay=ka]* “did she send me to you?” (2: 14), Krebernik, op. cit. p. 210f., correcting George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 126f., 129f.

The phonetic realisation *[(ʔ)elʔaku=]* shows a process of substitution of the vowel *|a|* of the prefix (*|ya=|*) by its allophone *|e|*,¹⁹ a phenomenon already noted e.g. in Ugaritic in the neighbourhood of resonant phonemes (liquid *|l|*, nasals *|m|* and *|n|*). More surprising is the suppression of the initial *|y|*, probably weakened in a *|ʔ|* without graphemic notation.

GLOS 2, p. 4.

Add: **malʔak** “messenger”.

19. In personal names, the prefix vowel is also *|a|*, whereby *|ya=|* can become *|(y)e/i=|*, as noted by Krebernik, op. cit. p. 211 (fn. 14).

CTX **OBVern.** *ma-al-ḥa-kum* [malʔakum], George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 127, 130 (2: 19).

There seems to be an alternative form written *ma-la-k*, whose normalisation as [mālak] is problematic (see GLOS 2, p. 4), although its meaning is clearly “messenger”. In view of its context (OBab letter), I consider it to be a contamination with the Akkadian word *mālaku(m)* “way”.

|l-h-m| (1) (GLOS 2, pp. 11f.).

Sem.: *lḥm* (Hb.) “to eat with someone”, (Ph.) “to eat, devour”, *lḥm* (*leḥem*, Hb.; Pun., Palm.) “grain, bread, food”; *lḥm(ʔ)* (Aram., JArām., Syr.) “bread; food, meal”; *lēmu(m)*, *laʔāmum* (Akk.) “to take food or drink”; *laḥama* (Arab.) “to feed on meat”, *laḥm* “meat”.

The etymon |l-h-m| (1) is productive in alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p.12.

Add: **laḥm** “bread”.

LL **OBVern.** *la-[aḥ-m]u* = NINDA, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 120, 130 (1: 16); *la-aḥ-ma-am* [laḥmam], accusative, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 120, 124, 130 (2:4).

These are the first and only attestations of this vernacular lexeme in syllabic spelling to date. Please note the preservation of |a| in the vicinity of the laryngeal, as in Hb., Aram., Arabic, and, exceptionally, in Old Akk. (*laʔāmum*).

|m| (1) (GLOS 2, pp. 22ff.).

Sem. optional prosodic bound morpheme with no lexical value, used to reinforce single words or to connect sentences. Cf. =*m*, =*mw* (= [*V*] *m*, =*mô*, Hb.; optional, prosodic reinforcement of all sort of morphemes; mainly a mere stylistic device); =*m* (Aram.; optional prosodic reinforcement with prepositions and conjunctions and, seldom, adverbs); =*ma* (Akk.; marker of nominal sentences, prosodic reinforcement, sentence connective), *mi* (in citation of direct speech); =*mma* (Arab.), =*mā* (*mā az-zāʔida*, with prepositions:); =*m*, =*mw(y)* (OSArab.; optional morph, no lexical mng); =*mma* (Eth.; emphasis of all sort of morphemes).

The etymon |m| (1) is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Qatna, Alalakh VII and IV, Emar, Amarna, Malku, and alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 23: =**ma** optional prosodic reinforcer.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *a-bi-ma* [ʔābi=ma] “I truly wanted”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 121f. (1: 26).

See above under |ʔ-b-y| (2).

|m| (2) (GLOS 2, pp. 24ff.).

Sem.: |mV=| in two apophonic variants |ma/i=| for animate and inanimate subjects, often expanded with the deictic morphs. The resulting morphemes form the bases of interrogative and indefinite pronouns. Animate set: see (Hb.) *my* (*mī*) “who?”; *mn* (*man*, Aram., Syr.) “who?; whoever”; *mannu(m)* (Akk) “who?”, *mamma*, *mamman* “someone, anyone”, *mannummē*, *mannumma* “who(so)ever”; *man* (Arab.) “who?; whoever”; *mn* (OSArab.) “who?; whoever”; *mōn*

(MSArab.) “who”; *mannu* (Eth.) “who?”. Inanimate set: *mh* (*māh*, Hb.) “what?”, *mdwʿ* (*maddūʿ*) “why?”; *mʔ*, *mh* (*mā*, Aram., Syr) “what?”, *md(ʿ)m*, *mydy* “something”; *mā*, *mah*, *mahmā* (Arab.) “what?”; *mīnum* (Akk.) “what?”, *mimma* “something, anything”, *mīnummē* “whatever, all, each (of)”, *minde/a* “perhaps”; *mi*, *mənt* (Eth.) “what?”.

The etymon is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Malku, Amarna, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 24: **mah** “what, how?”

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *ma-a-a-mu-ru-ul-la-ka* |mah=yaʔmurun=la=ka| [*mā=yāmurul=la=ka*] “what did she tell you?”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 126, 130, 132 (2: 12).

Instead of the long allomorph |mah(a)| (Hebrew *māh*, Arabic *mah*), the text favours the short allomorph |mā|, which is well attested in Ugaritic (*m*), in Aramaic and Syriac (where the spellings *mʔ*, *mh* are due to the use of *matres lectionis*), and in Arabic *mā*. This is undoubtedly due to the phonosyntactic alteration undergone by the morpheme when it comes into contact (*sandhi*) with the following verbal form: |yaʔmurun| [*yāmurun*]; see above |ʔ-m-r| (1). Please note that the vocalised form with |a| contrasts with the vocalisation with |i| of Old Akkadian *min*, Assyro-Babylonian *mīnu(m)*, Tigre *mi*, and Geʿez *mənt* “what?”

Add: **lamāya** “why?”

CTX **OBVern.** *la-ma-a-a* ||la=mah=ya| [*la=mā=ya*], George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 121, 132 (1: 22a).

Note the presence of the emphatic enclitic, this time in its variant form, |=ya|.

Both the element *la-ma-* (*la-ma-la-DINGIR*, *la-ma-a-da-e*, *la-ma-a-te*, *la-ma-i-la*, *la-ma-du-du*, etc.) read in the Mari-onomastics,²⁰ and the enigmatic segment *la-mi-* in Emar (*la-mi-ba-aʔ-la*, *la-mi-^dKUR*) might be unrelated to the interrogative particle, or result from a lexical neogenesis.

|**m-ʔ**| (1) (GLOS 2, p. 27).

Primary noun, Sem.: *mym* (*mayim*, pl. Hb.) “water, liquid, juice”; *mym* (pl. Ph.) id.; *myyn*, *myʔ* (pl. Aram., Syr.) id.; *myʔ* (pl. Nab.) id.; *mn* (pl. Palm.) id.; *mū*, *māʔū*, *māmū*, *māwū* (Akk.) id.; *māʔ* (Arab.) id.; *mw* (OSArab.) id.; *ḥe-mōh*, *ḥe-myōh* (MSArab.) id.; *māy* (Eth.) id.

This etymon is productive in Ebla, Emar, Amarna, Aphek, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 27: **maʔw**, **māw**, **māy** “water, liquid, juice”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *me-e* |mē|, pl. oblique (Akkadianism), George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 124, 129, 131 (2: 3).

This is another example of Akkadian intrusion into vernacular structures. Hence the absence of the expected plural-ending |=ū/īma|, unlike e.g. the Ugaritic *mym*, *mm*, or Amarna A.MEŠ *mé-e-ma*, A.MEŠ : *mé-ma*, A : *mé-ma*.

20. The exact reading is uncertain. According to J.-M. Durand the non-existent DN **Lama should be read *labaʔ*; see “La religion à l’époque amorrite d’après les archives de Mari,” in: *Mythologie et religion des Sémites Occidentaux*, ed. G. del Olmo Lete, vol. 1, *Ebla et Mari*, OLA 162.1, Leuven 2008, pp. 651f.

|**m-l-k**| (GLOS 2, pp. 38-42).

Primary noun, Sem.: *mlk* (*melek*, with suff. *malk*=, Hb.) “king, ruler”, *mlkh* (*malkāh*) “wife of the king, queen”; *mlk* (Ph., Pun., Moab., Ammon., Edom., Nab., Palm., Hatra) “king”, *mlkt* (Ph., Pun., Nab., Palm.) “queen”; *mlk(?)* (Aram., Syr.) “king”, *mlkh*, *mlkt?* “queen”; *malku(m)*, *maliku(m)* (Akk.) “prince, king”, *malkatu(m)* “queen”; *malik* (Arab.) “king, ruler”, *malika* “queen”; *mlk* (OSArab.) “king”, *mlkt* “queen”. Denom. verbs and other derivations: *mlk* (Hb.) “to be the king, rule”, *mlkwt* (*malkūt*), *mmlkh* (*mamlākāh*), *mmlkwt* (*mamlakūt*) “kingship, royal dominion”; *mlk* (Aram., Syr.) “to reign”, *mlwkh*, *mlwkt?* (Aram.) “kingship”; *malikūtu(m)*, *malkūtu* (Akk.) “rule, government”; *malaka* (Arab.) “to exercise authority, possess, own”; *mulk* “kingship, reign; property, domain”, *milk* “property, possessions”, *mālik* “reigning, owning, the possessor of command”, *malakūt* “realm, kingdom”, *mallāk* “owner”, *malīk* “king”, *malīka* “queen”, *mamlaka* “kingdom”; *hmlk* (OSArab. C) “to cause to possess”, *mlk* “kingship; property”, *mlyk* “royal”, *mlkt* “queen”; *amlōk*, *s¹emlōk* (MSArab.) “to give a man legal possession of a wife”; *malaka* (Eth.) “to own property, dominate”, *malāki* “master, ruler”, *mākat* “domination”, *mākot* “ownership”, *ʔamlāk* “Lord, God”.

The etymon is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Alalah IV and VII, Amarna, Emar, Tall Munbaqa, Egypt, Malku, and syll. and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 41: **mal(i)k** “ruler, king; dead king(s); DN”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *ma-li-k[um, ma-li-kum* |malikum|, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 127 (2: 19, 25); *ma-li-ki* |maliki| genitive, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 128 (2: 20).

Note the erroneous *ma-li-kum* in 2: 25 instead of the expected genitive |maliki(m)|, and the absence of mimation in *ma-li-ki* (2: 20). Comparative data show that the lexemes *malik* and *malk* are mere allomorphs, consistent with the frequent alternations of the PaRS / PaRiS pair in Semitic languages. Incidentally, it should be noted that the Hebrew vocalisations (Hexapla, Babylonian and Tiberian) are somewhat inconsistent in their treatment of the PaRS / PiRS themes. In Arabic, it is well known that the themes FaʿaL and FaʿiL are often merely phonetic variants of FaʿL. In any case, certain oscillations may be due to the inadequacy of the graphemic systems or occasionally caused by anaptyxis.

The Akkadian words *malku(m)* and *maliku(m)* are not necessarily, at least regarding their origins, ‘Western’ borrowings in competition with *šarru(m)*, but are instead peculiar political categories that coexist within different geo-social contexts. Note the attribution of the title *šarru* to local kings and chiefs in Amarna-Akkadian, in clear parallelism with *awīlu* and *ḥazannu*, and compare, for example, the Latin pairs *rex* and *princeps*, the German *König* and *Fürst*, and the Eblaite NAM.EN and *ma-li-gú-um*.²¹ Examples of quasi-synonyms that coexist depending on the context, and of the resulting lexical contaminations, could be multiplied.

21. M. Krebernik, “Zu Syllabar und Orthographie der lexikalischen Texte aus Ebla. Teil 2 (Glossar)”, *ZA* 73 (1983), p. 38; diff. among others P. Fronzaroli, “The Eblaic Lexicon: Problems and Appraisal”, *QuSe* 13 (1984), p. 145: “kingship”.

|**m-t**| (GLOS 2, p. 57f.).

Primary noun, Sem: *mt* (pl. *mētīm*, Hb.) “men, people”; *mutu(m)* (Akk.) “husband, man, warrior”, *mutūtu(m)* “status of a husband, manliness, bravery”; *māt* (Eth.) “husband”.

The etymon |**m-t**| is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Alalāḥ IV and VII, Emar, Amarna, Taanakh, Malku, and syll. and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 57f.: **mut** “man, husband, hero; DN”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *mu-tum*, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 127 (2: 15).

|**n**| (1) (GLOS 2, p. 67).

Bound morpheme with highlighting / euphonic function. Cf. Hb. *n?* (*nā?*) emphatic.

This etymon is productive in Euphr.-Akk., and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 67: **=na (A)**, **=ni (A)** highlighting and euphonic enclitic.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *bé-[na?]-a-na* |bēn=ay=na?| “right in the middle of us”(?), George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 121 (1.22b).

This option, not mentioned by George / Krebernik (loc. cit.), cannot be excluded. However, I favour the pronominal reading |**=nā**|; see below under **n (2)**.

|**n**| (2) (GLOS 2, pp. 67f.).

Sem. formative elem. in first person pronouns: sg. c. accus. |**=ni=ya**|, pl. c. |**=nā**|. Suffixed forms: Hb.: *=ny* (*nī*, 1 sg. c. accus.), *=nū* (1 pl. c.); Aram., Syr.: *=n* (1 sg. c. accus.; 1 pl. c.); Akk. *=ni* (1 sg. c. accus.), *=ni(m)* (1 sg. c. dat.), *=niāti* (1 pl. c. accus.), *=niāši(m)* (1 pl. c. dat.); Arab. *=nī* (1 sg. c. accus.), *=nā* (1 pl. c.); Eth. *=nī* (1 sg. c. accus.), *=na* (1 pl. c.). Indep. forms: cf. Akk. *nū(m)* “our”, *=niāti* (1 pl. obl. c.), *niāšim* (1 pl. dat. c.).

The etymon |**n**| (2) is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Alalāḥ VII, Amarna, alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, 67: **=na (B)**, **=nā** “our”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *bé-[na?]-a-na* |bēn=ay=nā?| “right in the middle of us”(?), George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 121 (1.22b).

GLOS 2, 67: **=ni (C)** “our”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *la-a-i-de-ni* |la=yidē=ni| “for our hands”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 124 (2:3).

In this case, as in others (e.g. Euphr.-Akk. *i-lu-ni*, *a-du-ni-a-bi-ia*, *su-mu-la-ni*, *si-ma-aḥ-la-ni*, *su-mu-ni*; Alalāḥ VII: *i-la-a-ni*), the presence of the suffixed pronominal form |**=ni**| indicates a strong Akkadian pressure.

|n-ʕ-l| (2) (GLOS *vacat*).²²

Culture word: *nʕl* (*naʕal*, Hb.) “sandal”; *nʕl* (JAram., Mandaic) “shoe”; *nəʔāl*, *nʕal*, *nāʕl* (MSArab.) “sandals”; *naʕl* (Arab.) “shoe, sandal”.

Add: **naʕl** “sandal”.

LL **OBVern**. *na-aḥ-lu* = KUŠ E.SÍR, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 120, 130 (1: 21).

This lexeme is probably not related to the Ugaritic *nʕl* “platform” or “palanquin”; see GLOS 1, 78 under |ʕ-l-y|.

|n-ʕ-m| (GLOS 2, pp. 69ff.).

Sem.: *nʕm* (Hb.) “to be lovely, pleasant”, *nʕm* (*noʕam*) “kindness”, *nʕym* (*nāʕīm*) “pleasant, lovely, delightful”, *mnʕmym* (pl.t. *manʕammīm*) “delicacies”; *nʕm* (Pun.) “good, fortune; agreeable, favourable”; *nʕm* (JAram. C) “to be lovely, pleasant”, *nʕym* “pleasant”; *naʕama*, *naʕima* (Arab.) “to become plentiful and easy; to be good, pleasant, be happy, pleased”, *naʕam* “gazing livestock”, *naʕma* “life of ease”, *nāʕim* “soft, tender”, *naʕīm* “amenity, comfort”, *niʕma* “blessing, benefaction, grace”, *nuʕmā* “happiness”, *nuʕūma* “softness, tenderness”, *manāʕim* “favours, blessings”; *nʕm* (OSArab.) “to please, be favourable, prosperous”; *nʕmtm* “prosperity, success”; *náʔmēt* (MSArab.) “well-being”, *nəʔāym* “soft, smooth”.

The etymon |n-ʕ-m| is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Alalah VII, Emar, Egypt, and syll. and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, 69f.

Add: **naʕmat**, **niʕmat** “fortune, goodness, grace”.

CTX **OBVern** *na-aḥ-ma-ti* |naʕmat=ī|, with pronominal suffix, George / Krebernik op. cit. pp. 127, 129 (2: 17); *ni-iḥ-ma-tam* |niʕmatam|, accusative, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 127f., 129 (2: 23).

The lexeme |naʕmūt| is attested in the Ebla texts, as is the lexeme *nʕmt* in alph. Ugarit; both probably have the same meaning: “fortune, goodness, grace”. Regarding the doublet *naʕmat* / *niʕmat* mentioned by the authors in 2:17, 23, note the variable coexistence of *naʕm*, *niʕm* and *nuʕm* themes in Ebla, Mari, Alalakh VII, Emar and Ugarit, with a slight prevalence of PaRS and PuRS themes. In my opinion, there is no need to resort to the “facultative shift *i* > *a* in closed syllables before ʕ” (George / Krebernik, op.cit. # 4.1.1).

|n/w/y-D-n| (GLOS 2, pp. 77ff.).

Sem. basis |=D-n| with augments in |n=|, |w/y=|. For |n-D-n| see *ntn* (Hb., Aram., Ammon., Edom., Nab., Palm.) “to give”, *mtn* (*mattān*, Hb) “gift, present”, *mtnh* (*matānāh*) id., *mtt* (*mattat*) id., *ntyn* (pl. *nēʕīnīm*) “temple slaves”, *ndn* (cstr. *nēdānayk*) “present”, *ʔtnh* (*ʔetnāh*), *ʔtnn* (*ʔetnan*) “gift”; *mtnʔ*, *mtnh*, *mtntʔ* (JAram., Syr.) “gift”, *ntl* (*nettel*, Syr. < **ntn* l) “to give”, *mtl(ʔ)* “gift”;

22. Add on p. 69 as GLOS (2) and change the current |nʕl| to |nʕl| (1).

nadānu(m) (Akk.) “to give”, *nidnu(m)* “gift”, *nādinum* “giver, donor”, *mad(d)atu(m)*, *mandattu* “payment, obligation” (> Aram., Syr. *mdh*, *mdt?*; Hb. *mdh*), *nidintu(m)*, *nidittu(m)* “gift, dowry”; *nudunnû(m)* “marriage gift”; *ntn*, *natana* (Eth.) “to give” (< Hb.). For |w/y-t-n| see *ytn* (Ph.) “to give”, *mtt* (Ph.), *mtn*, *mtnt* (Pun.) “gift”.

Variants of this etymon are productive in the following contexts: Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Alalakh (VII and IV), Tall Biṣa, Tall Munbaqa, Emar, Amarna, Taanakh, Egypt, and alphabetic and syllabic. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 78: |n-t-n| “to give”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *ti-nam* |tin=am|, G imperative in the ventive modus “bring here!”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 124 (2: 3).

In my opinion, the absence of the ventive morpheme in the Akkadian column is not sufficient grounds to deny its presence in *ti-nam*, given that the text provides other examples of ventive morphemes (2:4, 20). It is worth noting that the ventive forms in the left-hand column clearly indicate the importation of Akkadian grammatical categories into the vernacular text.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *la-am-ti-in* |la=ʔantin| [lamtin], G pfc. in the volitive mode “I would like to give”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 124, 128 (2: 22).

The spelling *la-am-ti-in* is evidence of the dissimilation [ʔantin] and dropping of the personal prefix [ʔ=] of the expected form [ʔantin], preceded here by the (Akk.) volitional proclitic |la=|. It is worth noting that the process of dissimilation [nt] > [mt] is a frequent occurrence in Babylon (*tanaddina* > [tanamdina] ta-nam-di-na). Furthermore, dissimilation by means of [m] is well attested in the Palestinian, Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, Aramaic, Ammonite, and Nabataean areas.

|n-p-S| (GLOS 2, p. 98f.).

Primary noun, Sem.: *npš* (*nepeš*, Hb.) “throat, fauces”; *npš(?)* (JAram., Syr.) “throat”; *napaštum*, *napaltu*, *napištum*, *naʔištum*, *napuštu(m)*, *napultu*, *napšat(m)*, (Akk.) “throat, neck”; cf. *naḥas* (Arab.) “swallow, gulp, draught”. Denom. and further derivatives: *npš* (Hb. N) “to breathe freely”, *npš* (*nepeš*) “breath, living being, life”; *nbš* (Ph., Aram., Syr.), *npš* (Ph., Pun., Nab., Palm. Hatra) *npš* “life, person”; *npš* (JAram., Syr.) “to breathe out”, (Aram., Syr.) “soul, living person”; *napāšu(m)* (Akk.) “to breathe, be(come) wide”; *tanaffas* (Arab.) “to breathe, get his breath back”, *naḥs* “soul, spirit, life, a person”, *naḥas* “breath”; *ḥfsw* (OSArab.) “to cause to spread out”, *ḥfs* “self, soul, life”; *néfoš* (MSArab.) “to breathe, live”, *nefesét*, *naḥsét*, *naḥsēt* “soul, person, individual”; *ʔanfasa* (Eth.) “to breathe”, *naḥsa* “to blow”, *naḥs* “soul, breath, self, a person”, *naḥās* “wind, air, spirit”. See also: *nšb* (Hb., JAram., Syr.) “to blow”; *našāpu(m)* (Akk.) “to blow, winnow”.

This etymon is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Alalakh VII, Qatna, Emar, alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 98: **nap(a)S**, **nap(i)S** “throat; breath; life”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *na-ap-sa-ka* |napS=a=ka|, George / Krebernik, op.cit. p. 123 (1: 31).

As the authors rightly point out, the affix =a= can be the result of the influence of the Akkadian adstratum, in which case it would be a mere echo of the parallel epenthetic formation |napišt=a=ka|, or it could be the accusative morpheme |=a| of the triprotic declension. The latter would be

preferable given the persistence of case endings in vernacular Old Syrian texts from the 3rd and 2nd millennia BC.

The treatment of the phonetic realisation of the sibilants |s¹(š)| and |s²| (George / Krebernik, loc. cit.: š) suffers from a certain circularity, since the sign SI does not seem to distinguish between |s¹i| and |s²i|, as in the cases of *am-SI-qu* [ʔamSiḵu] and *SI-ḥa* [Siʔa/ā]. The shadow of the Masoretic tradition is long.

|n-s¹-ḵ| (1) (GLOS 2, p. 104).

Sem.: *nšq* (Hb.) “to kiss”, *nšq* (*nešeq*) “pleasant smells”, *nšyqh* (*n^ešīqāh*) “kiss”; *nšq* (Aram., Syr.) “to kiss”, *nšyqh*, *nšyqt?* (JAram.) “kiss”, *nwšqh*, *nwšqt?* (Syr.) “kiss”; *našaqu(m)* (Akk.) “to kiss”. See further: *našīqa* (Arab.) “to smell, sniff”.

The etymon is productive in Ebla and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, 104: |n-S-ḵ| “to kiss”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *am-si-qu* [ʔanSiḵu] [ʔamSiḵu], G pref. “I shall kiss”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 129f. (2: 25).

Notice that the spelling *am-si-qu* shows dissimilation ([ʔamtin]), similar to that already noted in [lamtin] (2:22; see above |n-t-n| “to give” under |n/w/y-D-n|).

|n-s²-ʔ| (GLOS 2, pp. 105f.).

Sem.: *nšʔ* (*nšʔ*, Hb.) “to raise, lift up, carry”, *nšyʔ* (*nāšīʔ*), *nsy*, *nsyʔ* “ruler, chief”, *mšʔh* (*maššāʔāh*) “exaltation”; *nšʔ* (Ph., Pun., Moab.) “to raise, lift up, carry”, *nšʔ* “ruler, chief”; *nšʔ*, *nsy* (Aram.) “to lift up, take away”; *našū(m)* “to lift up, raise”, *nāšū* “bearing, bearer, porter”; *našaʔa* (Arab.) “to rise, become elevated, appear”, *naššaʔa* “to bring up, raise”; *nšʔ* (OSArab.) “to undertake a project”; *nəšū*, *nše* (MSArab.) “to transhume”; *našʔa* (Eth.) “to take (up), raise, lift”.

The etymon |n-s²-ʔ| is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Alalah IV, Tall Biṣa, Emar, Amarna, Egypt, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 106: |n-S-ʔ| “to raise, carry, accept”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *si-ḥa* [Siʔ=a/ā], G imperative with reinforcing enclitic “set the table!”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 124 (2: 5, 7).

The element [=a/ā] is an optional (euphonic / suprasegmental) enclitic that reinforces the volitional character of the imperative; see also below |s¹-w-t|. The different translations “fetch!” (Akk. *išiʔam*, line 5) and “remove!” (Akk. *tabal*, ln. 7) are perfectly subsumable, with nuances, in the fundamental meaning of “to set (the table)”.

|p-ḥ-m| (GLOS 2, p. 121).

Primary noun, Sem.: *pḥm* (*paḥam*, Hb.; Ph., Pun.) “foot, step, pace, time”; *pēmu(m)*, *pēnu* (Akk.) “(upper) thigh”; *fawm*, *fām*, *faym*, *faḥm* (MSArab.) “foot, leg”.

Etymon productive in alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 121.

Add: **pašm** “foot”.

CTX **OBVern.** cf. *pa-aḥ-ma-{x}-a* |pašmay=ya|(?), probably oblique dual, suffixed, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 128f., 129f., 131 (2: 24).

The authors provide an adequate discussion of the rather uncertain textual quality of the passage. In any case, *pa-aḥ-ma-{x}-a* is an oblique pronominal state in |=ay| which would normally resolve to |ê|, but the treatment of diphthongs is inconsistent in these texts (cf. George / Krebernik, op. cit. # 4.1.2, p. 129). Clearly, the nominative *ma-li-kum* is a mistake for |maliki(m)|. Note that the vowel |a| is preserved in the vicinity of the laryngeal |ʕ|, as in Hebrew and Modern South Arabian, but not in Akkadian *pēmu(m)* or *pēnu*.

|**p-r-s-ḥ**| (GLOS 2, p. 136).

Sem.: *napalsuḥu(m)*, *naparsuḥu* (Akk.) “to fall to the ground”; see also *faršaḥ/ḥa* (Arab.) “to straddle”.

Etymon productive in alph. Ug.

GLOS 2, p. 136: |**p-r-s-ḥ**| “to collapse”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *ta-ap-ra-an-si-ḥa* |tapransihā|, Dn pref. “you have dropped by”(?), George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 126, 134 (2: 11).

The authors rightly propose analysing the form in light of the C₁C₂vnC₃vC₄ scheme, as found in Arabic and Ethiopic, for instance (form III of the quadriconsonantal bases, which is rarely encountered; see George / Krebernik, op. cit. # 4.2.4.3.3, p. 134). In this scheme, it should be remembered that the morphological segment |=n=| is not actually an infix, but rather the result of dissimilation of the geminate C₃. The base |p-r-s-ḥ| is present in the alphabetic spelling *yprsh* in Ugaritic. It is most likely that the Ugaritic lexeme is a loan from the Akkadian *napalsuḥu(m)*, *naparsuḥu* “to fall to the ground”, which also survives in Arabic as *faršaḥ/ḥa* “to straddle”; the base was already present in Ebla, in the lexical equation A.BAL = *ma-wu mu-da-bar-si-ù-tum* |māwū muttaparsihūtum|. ²³

In this case, the basic meaning of “to fall to the ground, collapse” takes on the nuance of “to prostrate oneself as a sign of submission/respect”, which intensifies the mere “you have come over there” (*tattabalkatam*) of the right-hand column. However, the possibility of a colloquial sense cannot be excluded, along the lines of “to drop by”.

|**r-ʕ**| (GLOS 2, p. 150).

Primary noun, Sem.: *rʕ* (*rēʕ*, extended by-form: *rʕy*, *rēʕeh*, Hb.) “friend, companion”, fem. *rʕh* (pl. cstr. *rēʕôt*, *raʕyot*) “companion, friend”, denom. *rʕh* (G) “to get involved, mixed up with”, (C) “to join oneself to”; *rʕ* (Aram.) “friend, companion”; *rūʔu(m)*, *rūm*, *rūʔa* (Akk.;

23. See M. Bonechi, “Lexique hydrographique à Ebla”, in: L. Milano / S. de Martino / F. M. Fales / G. B. Lanfranchi (eds.), *Landscapes, Territories, Frontiers and Horizons in the Ancient Near East. Papers Presented to the XLIV Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, vol. 2, Padova 1999, p. 100: “cascade”.

exceptionally: *rāḷum*) “friend, companion”, fem. *rūtum*, *ruttu(m)*, *ruḷtu* “companion, associate”, denom. *rāḷu* “to befriend”. Cf. *raḷawa* (Eth.) “to yoke, join”.

This etymon is productive in Ebla, Ur III, and alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 150: **raḷ** “friend, companion”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *ra-ḥa-a-a* |raḥay=ya|, pl. with possessive suffix 1.sg., George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 127, 129f. (2: 16).

Note that in syll. Ugaritic, the suffixed possessive pronoun 1sg. |ya| alternates with |ī| (no graphemic notation).²⁴

|**r-S-p**| (GLOS 2, pp. 171f.).

Sem.: *ršp* (*rešep*, Hb.) “flame, glow, blaze”; *ršp* (Aram., Palm.) “a demon”(?). Cf. *ršpm* (Ph.) “manes, shades” (?; cf. *ṛṣ ršpm*).

This etymon is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Emar, Amarna, alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 172: **raSap** “flame, blaze; DN”.

Add: LL **OBVern.** *ra-sa-pu-um* = NERGAL, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 118 (1: 5).

The mimation points to an Akkadian adstratum. The consonantal quality of /S/ remains uncertain, though all signs point to |s¹|; see George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 129f. § 4.1.4.1. The PRS theme is present in the Ebla lexical lists and in the onomastics of Ebla, Mari and Emar. The themes *riSp*, *ruSp*, *raSip* and *rSap* are also attested in the Mari, Amarna and Ugaritic onomastics.

|**r-S-y**| (GLOS 2, pp. 172f.).

Sem.: *ršy* (JArām., Syr.) “to obligate, bring suit; to have authority”, (C) “to empower, permit”; *rašū(m)* (Akk.) “to get, acquire”, *rāšū(m)* “rich, well-off”; *rašā* (*rašw*) (Arab.) “to bribe, obtain a favour by gifts”; *rs²w/y* (OSArab.) “to offer, dedicate, make a grant” (?), *rs²y* “gift”; *rešō* (MSArab.) “to bribe”. See also *ršt* (*rešet*, Hb.) “net”.

This etymon with its variants (|**r-S-y**|, |**r-s¹-y**|, |**r-θ-y**|) is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Emar, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, 173: |**r-θ-y**| “to receive, possess”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *la-ar-ši* |la=yarθi| [larθi], H prefc. in the precativus modus “may he (the god) let you keep your life”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 123, 134 (1: 31); Krebernik, op. cit. p. 212.

Add: *li-ir-ši-a-ni-ma* |la=yarθiy=annī=ma| [[lirθiyannīma], H prefc in the energetic modus “may he (the god) provide me with good things”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 128, 134 (2: 23); Krebernik, op. cit. p. 212.

The variant base |**r-θ-y**| is attested in the Ebla and alph. Ugaritic. On the function of the (Akk.) volitional proclitic |la=|, see above |**h-w/y-w/y**| (1). Once again, we are dealing with a morphological invasion, this time from the Akkadian *li-ba-al-li-īt*. However, the enclitic |=ma| in *li-*

24. J. Tropper, op. cit. p. 215f.

ir-ši-a-ni-ma [lirθiyannīma] is not necessarily an Akkadianism given its frequent use in the Syrian linguistic area (e.g. Ugarit).

[s-b-y] (GLOS 2, p. 186).

Culture word, loan: *sabû* (Akk.) “to brew beer”, *sābû(m)*, *sābium*, *sēbû*, *sā/ēbi?u* “brewer, innkeeper”, *sābītu(m)* “female brewer, alehouse keeper”, *sabûtu*, *sibûtu(m)* “innkeeper’s trade”; cf. *sb?* (Hb.) “to tipple”, *sb?* (*sobe?*) “drink, tipple”.

This etymon is productive in Ebla.

GLOS 2, p. 186.

Add: **sa?b**, **sāb** “alcoholic drink”.

LL **OBVern**. *sà-a-bu* = ĠEŠTIN, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 120, 130 (1: 17).

George / Krebernik, loc. cit., quite rightly point out that the word for “wine” ĠEŠTIN (*karānum*) in the right-hand column requires a noun in the left-hand column. Or, at least, a verbal noun. However, I do not fully follow the derivation of the spelling *sà-a-bu* from the base [s-b-?] (*sābu* < **sab?u*), as set out on pages 120 and 130. Clearly, the spelling *sà-a-bu* is closely related to the Akkadian vocabulary associated with beer, such as *sabû* “to brew beer”, and *sābītu(m)* “female brewer or alehouse keeper”, as well as *sabûtu* and *sibûtu(m)* “innkeeper’s trade”. At first glance, the underlying etymology of these Akkadian lexemes should be [s-b-y], which is also active in the Eblaite lexemes [sabayt] “brewing supplies” (= MUNU₄.GUG) and [sābiyt] (“female brewer; alehouse keeper” (= ĠĒME.KAR.AG / ĠĒME.GAR.A). As far as I know, this etymon, [s-b-y], has no obvious Semitic etymology and seems to be a culture word with limited extra-Akkadian diffusion. The only exceptions are the Hebrew noun *sb?* (Masoretic *sōbē?* < **sub?* “drink, tipple”), and its secondary, late verbal denominative [s-b-?] “to tipple”. Other occurrences, such as the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic [s-b-y] “to retail wine in a tavern”, *sbwyh* and *sbwyt?* (n.f.) “wine retailer”, as well as *mswby*, *mswbyt?* “tavern girl”, seem to support the hypothesis of cultural diffusion of the etymon. The extreme forms of this diffusion process can be found in Arabic: *sabà* (*saby*, *sibā?* “to transport (wine)”, and *sabiyya* “transported wine”, which have undergone semantic fusion with the words “to captivate” and “captive”.

It is clear that the etymon [s-b-y] has undergone semantic changes during the process of cultural diffusion. It is also worth considering whether these changes have affected the morphology of the derived lexemes. This is clearly evident in the Hebrew [s-b-?], which reflects the identification of the C₃[y] bases with the C₃[?] bases that is characteristic of Akkadian and Aramaic, for example.

In my opinion, the variants [s-b-y/?] occasionally gave rise to a third variant [s-?-b], which appears in the lexicographical tradition as [si-i] [SI] = *sa-a-bu*, *si-i-bu* (^a*a* = *nāqu* III/4:150ff.; see CAD S p. 231: *šību* “beer”, lexical section). If this is the case, the spelling *sà-a-bu* in the left-hand column should be normalised as [sa?b], or more accurately [sāb], with the preconsonantal [?] being elided and compensatory lengthening of the vowel, according to an original PaRS theme (George / Krebernik, #4.1.4.2, p. 130), with analogies in PiRS (Akkadian *sību*, both from the variant root [s-?-b]) and PuRS (from the variant root [s-b-?]; Hebrew *sobe?*).

|š-n-p| (GLOS 2, p. 220).

Primary noun, Sem.: *šnyp* (*šānīp*, Hb.) “headband”, denom. *šnp* “to wind around”; *šnyp*, *šnph*, *šnpt?* “border, fringe, edge”, denom. *šnp* (JAram.) “to wrap oneself”; *šinf*, *šinfā*, *šanifa* (Arab.) “border, fringe”; *šənf*, *šanf*, *šanaḫī*, *šannāḫe* “border, fringe”, denom. *šanfa* “to be(come) a border”.

The etymon is productive in Ebla.

GLOS 2, p. 220.

Corr. **šanipt** to **šinipt** “headscarf”(?).

Add: LL **OBVern.** *ši-ni-ip-tum* = BAR.SI, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 115.

Note the presence of the lexeme in Ebla: *zi-na-ba-ti*, *zi-ne-ib-ti*.

|s¹-w-ṭ| (GLOS 2, p. 266).

Sem.: *šwṭ* (Hb.) “to rove about, roam, row across water”, *šyṭ* (*šayit*) “oar”, *mšwṭ* (*māšōṭ*) “rudder”; *šwṭ* / *šṭṭ* (Aram.) “to roam”, *šwṭ* (JAram., Syr.) “to swim, float; to sail”, *šyṭ(?)* (Aram.) “swimmer; sailor”, *mšwṭ* (JAram.) “rudder or oar”; *šātu* (Akk.) “to pull, tow”.

The etymon |s¹-w-ṭ| is productive in Egypt and in alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 266.

Add: |s¹-w-ṭ| “to row, sail, exert oneself” or similar.

CTX **OBVern.** *su-ṭa* |s¹ūt=a/ā|, G imperative with euphonic enclitic “strive to come!”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 122f., 134 (1: 27; 2: 1).

As George / Krebernik, loc. cit., rightly point out, the Akkadian *alkam* in the right-hand column suggests a verb of motion or approach. The base |s¹-w-ṭ| is a plausible candidate. However, its exact meaning in this context is more difficult to pin down. In my opinion, it falls within the semantic realm of effort, perhaps meaning “to struggle”, “to labour” or “to manage to come”, as implied by the Semitic isoglosses “to row”, “to sail”, etc., which should perhaps not be taken literally. For the enclitic |a/ā|, see also under |n-s²-ṭ|.

As an alternative to the etymon |s¹-w-ṭ, Krebernik, op. cit. p. 209f., proposes the etymon |s²-w-ṭ|, which is attested in Arabic as *šata* with the sense of “he ran a heat, or a single run, or a run at once, to a goal, or limit”. Very cautiously, the author himself warns us about the fragility of this proposal, given the late date (18th century) of the Arabic testimony and the consequent chronological distance. It should be added that the denotation suggested by the classical Arabic testimonies and those from modern Southern Arabian place the etymon |s²-w-ṭ| in the realm of heat and fire, and not so much in that of approach and motion required by the Akkadian *alkam* of the right column.

|s²-h-r| (GLOS 2, p. 273).

Sem.: *Šhrnym* (*šah^aronīm*, pl. Hb.) “little moons (amulets, jewellery)”; *šhr* (Aram.) “Moon god”, *šhr(?)* (Aram., Syr.) “moon”; *šahr* (Arab.) “new moon, month”; *s²hr* (OSArab.) “new moon”; *šeher* (MSArab.) “moon”; *šāhr* (Eth.) “moon, first day of the month”.

This etymon is productive in syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, 273.

Add: **s²ahr** “new moon, month”.

CTX **OBVern.** *šar-ra-me-ha-da* [s²ahram=], [s²āram=], accusative, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 128f., 130 (2: 21).

This is clearly a compressed graphemic *sandhi*-set ([s²ahram=(?)ehada]), as the authors rightly observed. They offer two possible explanations for the segment. In my opinion, the first solution (loss of [h] with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel [a]) is preferable in view of analogous phenomena in other linguistic contexts. In Ugaritic, for example, cases of loss of [h] in syllable-final position before [r] are documented,²⁵ with very probable lengthening of the preceding vowel (without graphemic notation).

|θ-l-h-n| (GLOS 2, p. 322).

Culture word, Sem.: *šlhn* (*šulhān*, Hb.) “table”.

This etymon is productive in syll. and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 322: **θulhān** “table”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *šu-ul-ḥa-nam*, accusative, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 124, 130 (2: 5, 7).

|θ-h-r| (GLOS 2, pp. 332f.).

Primary noun, Sem.: *šhr* (*šōhar*, Hb.) “roof”; (Akk.) “back, upperside”; *zahr* (Arab.) “back”.

This etymon is productive in Ebla, Amarna, and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, 332f.: **ṭahr** “back”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *ša-ri-i-a* [ṭahrī=ya], with possessive pronominal suffix, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 127 (2: 19).

The vowel /a/ is preserved in the vicinity of the laryngeal [h]. This is not the case in Akkadian *šēru(m)*.

|w| (GLOS 2, p. 337).

Sem.: *w* (West Sem. languages) “and”; see *w* (*w^e*, *wa*, *wā*, Hb.; Aram., Syr.); *U*, *Y*, *UY* (Pun.); *w?* (Samalian); *ú-ma-?* (Warka-Aram.). Other Sem. areas: *u* (Akk.; occasionally OAss. *wa*) “and, but, also, then”; *wa* (Arab.) id.; *w* (OSArab.) id.; *w*, *əw*, *wə* (MSArab.) id.; *wa* (Eth.) id.

The etymon is well attested in Ebla, where it is vocalised as *wa*, and in the alphabet. Ugaritic, written *w*. For syll. Ugaritic PI ([wa|?]), see GLOS 2, *sub. voce*.

GLOS 2, p. 337: **wa** “and (also); namely, or (else)”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *wa*, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 121 (1: 24, 26; 2: 24).

25. J. Tropper, op.cit. p. 160.

|w-b-l| (1) (GLOS 2, pp. 339ff.).

Sem.: *ybl* (Hb., C) “to bring”, *ybwł* (*y^ebûł*) “yield of soil”, *ʔbl* (*ʔubāl*), *ybl* (*yābāl*), *ywbl* (*yūbal*) “water-course, canal”, *mbwł* (*mabbûł*) “the celestial sea; the Deluge”; *ybl* (Aram.) “to bear, bring, to convey”, (Syr., D) “to lead”, *blw* “tribute”, *ybl(ʔ)* (JAram., Syr.) “stream”, *mwbl* (Aram., Syr.) “shipment, load”; *wabālu(m)*, *abālu*, *ubālu*, *babālu(m)*, *tabālu(m)* “to carry, bring”, *biltu(m)*, *bissu*, *bīsu* “load; yield, rent”, *babbilu(m)*, *wābilum* “bearer, carrier”, *biblu(m)* “bringing; (said of) high water”, *bibbulu(m)* “spate, flood”; *wabala* (Arab.) “to shed heavy rain”, *wabl*, *wābil* “(heavy) downpour”, *wābila* “the extremity of the scapula”; *wbl* (OSArab.) “pay tribute, prescribe taxes”, *wblm*, *hwbltm* “tribute”. See further *tanbala* (Eth.) “to be ambassador”, *tanbal* “envoy”.

The etymon **|w-b-l| (1)** is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Babylon, Tall al-Rimah, Tall Biṣa, Emar, Amarna, Egypt, and syll. and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 340: **|y-b-l|** “to carry, bring, take, supply”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *bi-lam* **|bil=am|**, G imperative in the ventive modus “get here!”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 124 (2: 4).

Despite the presence of a biradical imperative *bl* in alph. Ugaritic, it is most probably an Akkadianism, as the authors note, motivated by the ventive *bi-lam* in the right-hand column. It should be noted that ventive forms are foreign to the Old Syrian morphological repertoire.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *li-bi-lam* **|la=yâbil=am|** **[lībilam]**, G prefc. in the precativ modus “may he bring!”, G/K 124 (2: 20). See above **|h-w/y-w/y| (1)**.

Note the retention of the vowel in the second syllable of *li-bi-lam* **[lībilam]**, as opposed to the elision evident in Akkadian *li-ib-lam* **[līblam]**. The authors appropriately highlight this phonotactic constant in section # 4.1.4 (pp. 130f.). The fact that the elision is apparently optional in the vernacular onomastics may be due to either Akkadian intrusions or an inherent irregularity in the spoken language due to suprasegmental pressures.

|w-h-d| (GLOS 2, pp. 346f.).

Primary noun, Sem.: *ʔhd* (*ʔehād*, Hb.) “one”, *yhyd* (*yāhīd*) “only”, *yhd* (*yaḥad*) “together”, *yhd* “to be united”; *ʔhd* (Ph., Pun.) “one”, *ʔhdy* (Pun.) “together”; *(ʔ)hd* (Palm., Hatra) “one”; *hwd* (Nab.) “alone, only”; *hd* (Aram. Syr.) “one”, *ʔhyd* “singled out”, *yhyd* “lone, unique”, *yhd* (D, C) “to unite”, *hwḥd* (Aram. C) “to gather”, *hwd* (Syr. D) “to join, unite”; *(w)ēdu(m)* (Akk.) “single, sole, alone”, *ēdēnu*, *ēdānu*, *ēdennu*, *īdīnu* “alone”, *ēdumānu* “single”, *ēdāniš*, *ēdiš* “alone”; *ʔaḥad* (Arab.) “one”, *ʔaḥāda* “one by one”, *waḥad*, *waḥid*, *waḥīd*, *wāḥid* “only”, *waḥada* “to be alone, unique, singular”, *waḥḥada* “to unite” *tawaḥḥada* “to be one, alone”, *ittahada* “to form a unity”; *ʔhd* (OSArab.) “one”, *kwḥd* “together”; *wəḥāyd*, *aḥdī* (MSArab.) “alone”; *ʔaḥadu* (Eth.) “one”, *ʔaḥād* “unit, unique”, *ʔaḥud* “first”, *ʔawāḥada* “to unite one thing with another”, *wāḥəd* “only, one”.

Etymon productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Tall Biṣa, Alalah VII, Amarna, Babylon, syll. and alph. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 346f.

Add: **(ʔ)ehad** “one”. **|=(ʔ)ehada|**

CTX **OBVern.** *šar-ra-me-ha-da* **|=(ʔ)ehada|**, accusative, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 128f. (2: 21).

Compressed spelling (*sandhi*): |s²ahram=(?)ehada|. As a postposed adjective, it is constructed in agreement with its syntactic nucleus |s²ahram|; see *s²ahr* “new moon, month” under |s²-h-r|. Notice that the mimation is absent from the accusative form |(?)ehada|, despite being present in the core form |s²ahram|. The authors rightly point out the irregularity of mimation in these texts, where no discernible pattern emerges to explain their presence or absence (# 4.2.1.3, p.131). In my opinion, the occasional mimation is a product of the irregular pressure exerted on the vernacular by Akkadian. It is highly unlikely to be a residual phenomenon related to the mimation of the *status indeterminatus*, as seen e.g. in Old South Arabic (probably a residue of the indefinite pronoun |mā|). The intermittent use of mimation in the vernacular onomastics still resists a satisfactory alternative explanation to (occasional) Akkadian pressure. In general, an inconsistency in the deployment of mimation is evident from the earliest Eblaite and East Semitic written testimonies.

|w-r-x| (GLOS 2, p. 353).

Primary noun, Sem.: *yrh* (*yārē^h*, Hb.) “moon”, (*yerēh*) “month”; *yrh* (Ph.) “moon”, (Ph., Pun., Nab., Palm., Hatra) “month”; *yrh*(?) (Aram., Syr.) “month”, (JAram.) “moon”; (*w*)*arhu(m)*, *urhu(m)*, *barhum* (Akk.) “the moon; month”; *wrh* (OSArab.) “month”; *warh*, *ōrh*, *wōrah*, *wārah* (MSArab.) “month”; *warh* (Eth.) “moon, month”.

The etymon |w-r-x| is productive in Ebla, Euphr.-Akk., Babylon, Tall Biṣa, Alalah IV and VII, alph. and syll. Ugaritic, and possibly in Ur III.

GLOS 2, p. 353: **yar(i)x**, **yarax** “(new) moon; DN”.

Add: LL **OBVern.** *ia-ra-[h]u-um* = EN.ZU, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 118, 129f. (1: 4).

The mimation is attributable to the influence of the Akk. adstratum. The PaRaS theme is also evident in personal names from Mari (passim as divine name in the second position |yarah|), as well as from Tuttul (*ia-ra-ah*-dEN.ZU) and, most likely, Alalah VII (*a-bi-ra-ah*) and Ebla (spellings *a-ra-hé-iš* and variants). The normalisation |yarhum| (sic!) in # 4.1.4.2. (p. 130) should be corrected to the PaRaS theme |yarahum|.

|w-s¹-t| (GLOS 2, pp. 360).

Primary noun, Sem.: *išti*, *ište*, *ašte/i*, *išta=*, *ištu* (Akk.) “with; from”, *ištu(m)*, *ultu*, *e/uštu*, *iltu/a/i*, *issu*, *ildu* “from, out of; since, after”, *ištūma* “if indeed”; *wasata* “to be in the middle” (Arab.), *wassata* “to be, place, put in the middle”, *wasṭ*, *wasat*, *ṭausat* “middle, centre”, *wasīt* “middle, medial”; *ws¹t*, *mws¹t*, *ys¹t* (OSArab.) “middle, interior; during”; *wašt* (MSArab.) “in, inside”; *wast* (Eth.) “interior, middle”, *wasta* “in, into, inside, on, to, among”.

This etymon is productive in Ebla.

GLOS 2, p. 360: **waStay** “at, with; from, since”

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *ḥa-aš-ti* |ṭaStī|, with pronominal suffix 1.sg. |=ī|, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 122, 130 (1: 28, 29).

The solution proposed by George / Krebernik, loc. cit., to explain the spelling *ḥa-aš-ti* (1: 28, 29) has certain disadvantages. The authors advocate reconstructing it as |ṣašt=| (base |ṣ-š-t|), a theme which they believe would also be found in the Eblaite *áš-da/ti/du*) and the Old Akkadian *ište*, meaning “together with”. However, this solution presents several problems:

1. The use of signs from the $\mathfrak{H}$ series to transcribe $|\mathfrak{S}|$ is relatively rare, particularly at the beginning of a syllable. The spelling $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\text{-}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\text{-}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{i}$ is not among the examples provided by the authores on p. 130. 2. The ascription of $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\text{-}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\text{-}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{i}$ (and Eblaitic $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\text{-}\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{i}/\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{u}$) to the etymon $|\mathfrak{S}\text{-}\mathfrak{s}\text{-}\mathfrak{t}|$ bypasses the proposals which, in my opinion, rightly link the preposition with the etymon $|\mathfrak{w}\text{-}\mathfrak{s}^1\text{-}\mathfrak{t}/\mathfrak{t}|$.²⁶

George / Krebernik, loc. cit., describe the spelling $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\text{-}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\text{-}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{i}$ as “noteworthy”, and for good reason. In my opinion, the main issue is the use of the sign $\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{A}$ for the initial syllable of $|\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{t}|$. This is a relatively anomalous use, purely orthographic and of no phonetic relevance. It should be noted that the Eblaite $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\text{-}$ (VC) spellings presuppose an original HVC syllabic scheme in which the H position would etymologically have been occupied by a $*|\mathfrak{w}|$.²⁷ The Eblaite notation by $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}$ appears to exclude the supposed segment $|\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{S}|$ (George / Krebernik, op. cit., p. 116: $\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}\text{-}$), as the initial $|\mathfrak{S}|$ would typically be written in Ebla using the signs A ($\mathfrak{a}$) or AG ($\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}$), rather than $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S}$. If the Eblaite etymon is indeed $|\mathfrak{w}\text{-}\mathfrak{s}^1\text{-}\mathfrak{t}/\mathfrak{t}|$, as the *communis opinio* suggests, then the spellings such as $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\text{-}\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\text{-}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{i}$ and $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\text{-}\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{u}$ reflect the expected elision, omission or muting of the initial $|\mathfrak{w}|$.²⁸ This is in contrast to the Oakk praxis (notation by PI). Clearly, a Semitic morpheme cannot have a vowel at the beginning, which suggests the existence of a phonological $|\mathfrak{?}|$ that is not represented in writing: $[\mathfrak{?}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{S}\text{-}]$. This phonological presence, which is difficult to reflect with the resources of the standard syllabary, would have prompted the use of a sign $\mathfrak{H}$, resulting in the anomalous (or “noteworthy”) spelling $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\text{-}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\text{-}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{i}$. Note that in scribal praxis, $\mathfrak{h}$ may occasionally be used to write $|\mathfrak{?}|$, e.g. in OBab. and OAss.

If our deductions are correct, such a spelling is a ‘modernised’ (vulgar) and orthographically risky / unorthodox version of the morpheme $|\mathfrak{?}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{V}|$ (cf. Eblaite $|\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{y}\text{-}|$ [$\mathfrak{w}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{e}\text{-}$]) followed by the pronominal suffix 1.sg. $|\mathfrak{=}\mathfrak{i}|$, as documented, for example, in ARET 18, 9 r. II 1 (Catagnoti, op. cit. p. 94: “da parte mia”); and ARET 18, 14 r. I 2 (Catagnoti, loc. cit.): “presso di me”).²⁹ In our text, the resulting syntagma appears to align with the data obtained from the Eblaite textual registers, which favour a general sense of proximity or companionship. According to this, the line 28 $\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{i}\text{-}\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\ \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\text{-}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\text{-}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{i}$ should be normalised as $|\mathfrak{?}\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{k}\text{-}\mathfrak{a}\ \mathfrak{?}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{i}|$ and translated as “place your trust in me!” (see below: $\mathfrak{w}\text{-}\mathfrak{?}\mathfrak{k}$), and the line 29 $\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{a}\text{-}\mathfrak{m}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{r}\ \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{a}\text{-}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{s}\text{-}\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{i}$ as “you will need to have a talk(?) with me” (see above: $|\mathfrak{?}\text{-}\mathfrak{m}\text{-}\mathfrak{r}|$).

$|\mathfrak{w}\text{-}\mathfrak{?}\mathfrak{k}|$ (GLOS 2, 366).

Sem.: *waṭīqa* (Arab.) “to place one’s confidence, put faith, rely”, *ṭīqa* “trust, confidence”, *waṭīq* “firm, strong”, *wāṭiq* “trusting”; *wtq* (OSArab.) “to entrust, have faith”, *ṭwtq* “hostage”, *tqt* “guarantee”; *wītṭaq* (MSArab.) “to be fixed”, *wēṭṭaq* “firm, secure”.

The etymon $|\mathfrak{w}\text{-}\mathfrak{?}\mathfrak{k}|$ is productive in Ebla.

26. See GLOS 2, p. 360, with further bibliography and, for Oakk *ište*, *ištu*, etc., cf. among others I.J. Gelb, *Glossary of Old Akkadian*, Chicago, Illinois 1973, p. 80f., $\mathfrak{?}\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{T}$, and W. von Soden with W. R. Mayer, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*, Rome 1995, p. 165. Pace L. Kogan / K. Markina, “Review of R. Hasselbach, *Sargonic Akkadian. A Historical and Comparative Study of the Syllabic Texts*”, *Babel und Bibel* 3 (2006), pp. 563f.

27. According to the symbology proposed by M. Krebernik, “Zu Syllabar und Orthographie der lexikalischen Texte aus Ebla. Teil 1”, *ZA* 72 (1982), p. 179; A. Catagnoti, *La grammatica della lingua di Ebla*, QuSe 29 (2012), p. 9.

28. Catagnoti, op. cit., p. 61f.

29. For the use of the 1 sg. possessive enclitic $\text{-}\mathfrak{i}$ in Sargonic Akkadian see R. Hasselbach, *Sargonic Akkadian. A Historical and Comparative Study of the Syllabic Texts*, Wiesbaden 2005, p. 151; Kogan / Markina, op. cit. p. 572.

GLOS 2, p. 366.

Add: |w-θ-k| “to put faith, rely, trust”.

CTX **OBVern.** *ši-qa* [θiḱ=ā], G imperative 2.sg.m. “place your trust!”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 122 (1: 28).

As the authors suggest, this is an extended form of the imperative well known, for example, in Amarna Akkadian, Hebrew and Ugaritic. It is less probable to take the spelling *ši-qa* to stand as a verbal noun of the *til* type³⁰ with the function of an adverbial accusative of manner: [θiḱa] “trusting”, “with confidence”.

|w-y-n| GLOS 2, p. 366).

Culture word, *wiyan*= (Hitt.) “wine”; Sem.: *yyn* (*yayin*, Hb.) “wine”; *yn* (Ph., Amm.) id.; *yyn*(?) (Aram.) id.; *īnu* (Akk.) “wine”; *wayn* (Arab.) “black grapes”; *wyn*, *yyn* (OSArab.) “grapes, vineyard”; *wayn* (Eth.) “vine, wine, grapes”.

This etymon is productive in Amarna, Aphek, and syll. and alph. Ugaritic. The evidence from Ebla is highly dubious.

GLOS 2, p. 366.

Add: **yayn** “wine”.

CTX **OBVern.** *ia-a-na-am* [yaynam], accusative, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp. 124, 129 (2: 6).

Note the (unusual) maintenance of the diphthong, as opposed to the monophthongisation [yēn] in Amarna, Aphek and syll. Ugaritic. This diphthong is also found in Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic and Ethiopic.

|y| (2) (GLOS 2, p. 369).

Sem. enclitic: intensifying the meaning of the affected lexeme or syntagm.

The etymon y (2) is productive in Eblaite, Euphr.-Akk., Alalakh VII and IV, and alphabetic and syllabic Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 369 =āy, =īy, =īya “(is really, indeed!)”

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *le-i-a* [lī(li=ī)=īya], George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 122 (1: 27); *la-ma-a-a* [la=ma=āya], George / Krebernik, op. cit. p. 121 (1: 22a).

See above under || (1) for a discussion of these forms.

|y-d| (GLOS 2, pp. 370f.).

Primary noun, Sem.: *yd* (*yād*, Hb.) “hand, arm, power”; *yd* (Ph.) id., *IADEM* (Pun., du.), id.; *yd* (Nab., Palm.) id.; *yd*(?), *ḡyd*(?) (Aram., Syr.) id.; *idu(m)* (Akk.) “hand, arm, power, wage(s), rental”; *yad* (Arab.) “hand, arm, power”; *yd* (OSArab.) id.; *ḡayd*, *éd*, *ṣḡad*, *ḡēd* (MSArab.) “hand, arm”; *ḡad* (Eth.) “hand, arm, power”.

30. Cf. J. Tropper, op. cit. p. 489f.

The etymon [y-d] is productive in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Babylon, Qatna, Alalakh IV, Taanakh, Amarna, Egypt, and alph. and syll. Ugaritic.

GLOS 2, p. 370: **yid, yidat** “hand, arm, power; rental”.

Add: CTX **OBVern.** *la-a-i-de-ni* [la=yidē-ni], dual with Akkadian pronominal suffix “for our hands”, George / Krebernik, op. cit. pp.124, 129, 131 (2: 3).

If the *sandhi* spelling *la-a-i-de-ni* (see above: || (1)) is accepted, the authors’ statement that the segment *-i-de-* (< *|yaday|) “shows the same phonetic development [...] as Akk. *idum*” should be nuanced. Note the attestation of the by-form [yid] in Ebla, Ur III, Euphr.-Akk., Qatna and, probably, Amarna (*yi-id-ia*, *i-di-ya*). These testimonies reinforce the change [a] > [i/e] pointed out by the authors (# 4.1.1).

...

Despite careful analysis of the texts in question, some data have not been sufficiently clarified.

Thus, in 2: 8, the spelling *ta-al-ti-iḥ*. It corresponds to the Akkadian *ti-bé-a* [tibeʔa/ā] ‘get up!’, a G imperative of *tebû*. According to the authors (op. cit. p. 125), it could be a jussive Gt from a root [L-y-H], or, alternatively, [S-y-H], with [S] > [l] before [t]. In the second case, they propose, some possible candidates for comparison, Akk. *šiʔāḫum* “to grow tall” and its lexicalised form *šatāḫum* “to stretch out”. With all due caution, the spelling *ta-al-ti-iḥ* could be normalised as [taš/Ltiḥ] and rendered “reach out (to do something)! ”

In 2: 10, the spelling *an-ni-ki-an* is, in my opinion, simply an error,³¹ the product of a confusion with an Akkadian lexeme (*annikām*, *annakam*, *annikēm*, *annikā* “here, hither”). Recall, in this connection, that the letter EA 287: 52 from Jerusalem mentions the form *an-ni-ka-nu* “here, hither”, which is also found in Ugarit (RS 17.83: 12; 17.393: 21).³²

...

Scholium: Naming the left-hand columns

The attentive reader of these pages will have noticed that the term Amorite is not mentioned. Its absence is not a lapse but a well-considered choice.

It is well known that several authors have polemicised over the last decades about the use of the term Amorite in Assyriology and about its content. But A. George and M. Krebernik are unreserved in their acceptance of the term Amorite.³³ Accordingly, the word Amorite already

31. The authors point out that the first signs are written over an erasure.

32. Cf. A.F. Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets. A Linguistic Analysis of the Mixed Dialect Used by Scribes from Canaan*, vol. 3, Leiden 1996, p. 6.

33. Certain reservations are already evident in the pioneering publications. Note, for example, the quotation marks in the title page of T. Bauer *Die Ostkanaanäer. Eine philologisch-historische Untersuchung über die Wanderschicht der sogenannten “Amoriter” in Babylonien, Asia Major*: Leipzig 1926.

appears (with exclamation marks) in the title of their brilliant and well-pondered work. And although they neutrally qualify the texts as “unusual” on p. 113, they conclude on p. 150 that the tablets “demonstrate the ancient reality of the Amorites”. Nevertheless, as with designations such as ‘the Celts’, ‘the Germans’, or ‘the barbarians’, which have recently been criticised,³⁴ it seems necessary to review the issue of ‘the Amorites’ in depth.

Dealing with the problem of the Amorite language is, actually (and in their own words), dealing with the problem of “the language that *we* (and the *Babylonians*) *call* Amorite” (op. cit. p. 149 [my emphasis]). Starting with a clarification of the linguistic terminology, since all too often, the terms Amorite(s) (with and without quotation marks), North-West Semitic, Central Semitic, Syrian, and so on, are used interchangeably without providing the reader with an explanation of the reasons for such a varied repertoire. Everything seems to indicate, in my opinion, that the question of the existence and nature of the Amorite(s) moves on a plane of strictly ‘etic’ hermeneutics: a first degree ‘etic’ hermeneutics (product of the own Babylonian imaginary) *and* a second degree ‘etic’ hermeneutics (our exegesis of the Babylonian view). The Amorites are those sections of the population which the Babylonians declared as such, and which we, following in the footsteps of the Babylonians, continue to designate as such.³⁵ To be an Amorite, to behave like an Amorite, to speak in Amorite is something that was decided by those who were not Amorites –the Babylonians– and is still accepted by us. In short: Amorite is an exogenous term. In my opinion it is urgent to study, if it exists and is accessible from the sources, the endogenous Amorite point of view. In any case, as F. Barth observes, identity is not something that is projected onto a group, but rather a form of self-consciousness that is formulated from within the group.³⁶

Obviously, we must designate things in some way, and the ‘Amorite’ label may still be useful, provided the reader is warned that it is not an ethnologically and historically reliable term, but “a catch-all term” fabricated by others.³⁷

34. See A. Rau, “Ein Buch über die, die es nicht gab. Anmerkungen zu Heiko Steuers ‘*Germanen*’ aus Sicht der Archäologie”, *Germania* 100 (2022), pp. 313-348.

35. Cf. J. Sanmartín, “Old Syrian and Amorite: The pitfalls of nominalism”, *forthcoming*.

36. F. Barth, “Introduction”, in: F. Barth (ed.), *Ethnic groups and boundaries. The social organization of culture difference*, Boston 1969, p. 11.

37. R. de Boer, *Amorites in the Early Old Babylonian Period*, Proefschrift ter verkrijging van de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden, 1981, p. 279.