

SOME PENCILED NOTES ON UGARITIC LEXICOGRAPHY¹⁾

Holger GZELLA,
Leiden University

Ugaritic lexicography is a fascinating, yet thorny and highly controversial field: imperfect knowledge of many aspects of the social and cultural background to these texts, together with numerous epigraphical problems, does not only obscure the finer nuances of many words, but often even their basic meaning. The same condition gives rise to occasionally quite unrestrained speculation in order to gain, if not a more realistic, then at least a more colourful picture of Ugarit and its society. This applies to many items of daily life, not to mention all those technical terms from areas like economy, administration, architecture, or ritual practice, into which the surviving material still gives an insight. Hence, it is understandable that it took several decennia before a comprehensive synthesis of scholarly progress achieved after the once serviceable but simple and now outdated glossaries of Cyrus Gordon and Joseph Aistleitner could see the light of day. Countless discussions in books or specialized journals, among them many passing remarks in footnotes and learned reviews, had to be scouted and filtered, verified and summarized, evaluated and arranged. Anyone wishing to embark on such a formidable task will no doubt be familiar with hesitations like those of August von Platen, who, when approaching St. Mark's Square in Venice, asked himself with fear and disquiet: "Soll ich ihn wirklich zu betreten wagen?"

The two-volume dictionary by Gregorio del Olmo Lete and Joaquín Sanmartín, first published in Spanish between 1996 and 2000, is the only one of those projects announced in an overview article from 1999²⁾ which has finally appeared. After winning the race, it has been translated by Wilfred Watson and attracted such a broad public that a second edition became necessary in 2004, just one year after the first English version had been published.³⁾ This success is fully deserved. However, since content-wise the work has but little changed during the almost ten years between its first and its latest manifestation,⁴⁾ it might be useful to devote a bit more space to the general framework as well as to the individual lemmata than has been done in previous reviews. Consequently, there will be the opportunity to discuss a few things afresh and also to incorporate some recent work on Ugaritic grammar and lexicon: most notably, Dennis Pardee's on-line review of Josef Tropper's *Ugaritische*

Grammatik (Münster 2000)⁵⁾ at <http://www.univie.ac.at/orientalistik/Afo.html#pardee> and his co-authored work, together with Pierre Bordreuil, *Manuel d'Ougaritique*, Paris 2004; in addition to that, some recent translations of the texts will be considered.

The authors record all words and morphemes, including proper names (whether Ugaritic or not), found in the alphabetic texts according to the standard edition KTU². Lexical units attested in syllabic transcriptions, by contrast, are only included if they also feature in the alphabetic texts. This means that several items only known from syllabic texts have been left out, although closely related words were indeed included. Hence, the work is a dictionary of a specific corpus rather than of the Ugaritic language as such; it envisions facilitating access to that corpus in the first place and does not pretend to provide a comprehensive description of the Ugaritic lexicon as a linguistic reality. Since it is often chance which conditions the survival of a particular word in one of the two writing traditions, this decision seems somewhat arbitrary to the present reviewer, although it will no doubt prove adequate for most users, especially since the syllabic data from lexical lists have been treated by John Huehnergard in an exemplary fashion.⁶⁾ Evidence from personal and geographical names is in any case systematically adduced in the sections on etymology and meaning. It should be noted, however, that the meanings of the elements contained in them can rarely be determined due to the lack of a semantic context; moreover, it frequently turns out to be impossible to assign them to any particular dialect; lastly, names, especially place names, tend to preserve archaic features and therefore do not match the respective language or dialect actively used in the same time. The authors exhibit due caution concerning this material and do not generally gloss the corresponding entries.

All lemmata are arranged according to the Latin alphabet, as is customary in Assyriology, instead of a local sequence of letters (for an extensive comment on this practice cf. D. Pardee's review in *JNES* 65 [2006], 232–234, here 233f). The authors stick to the conventional, "Arabicizing" transliteration (on which cf. *BiOr* 62 [2005], 310f). Verbal roots appear between slashes, but for the sake of clarity and consistency, this notation should be reserved for phonemic reconstruction alone. Sometimes the authors' decision to assign different lemmata to what may well be a single lexeme, such as *bnt* (I) "construction" and (II) "creation", is not at all easy to understand, but in general the way in which nouns and verbs are related to roots betrays sound judgment. Furthermore, the heading of each lemma gives the grammatical category to which the word in question belongs and, with nouns, its gender and its basic meaning. The latter two are omitted with personal names, despite the fact that in a number of cases they can be determined by the context or comparative onomastics respectively. Every now and then the linguistic terminology applied strikes the reader as somewhat vague: the terms "allograph", "allophone" and "allomorph", for example, often seem to be used indiscriminately.

A fairly extensive section on etymology assembles much cognate evidence and, if available, syllabic spellings. While this information as a whole in many cases allows for well-

¹⁾ Review article of: Olmo Lete, G. del and J. Sanmartín — *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Second Revised Edition. Part One and Two. (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 1, Volume 67). Brill Academic Publishers, Leiden, 2004. (24,5 cm, XLIV, 474; 24,5 cm, 475–1006). ISBN 90-04-13694-0 (set). ISSN 0169-9423. I am much indebted to Amnon Bruck, Agustinus Gianto, Mervyn Richardson and Wouter Wakker for thoroughly reading an earlier draft of this paper and sharing their ideas with me.

²⁾ W.G.E. Watson, "Ugaritic Lexicography", in: id. and N. Wyatt (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Leiden 1999, 122–133.

³⁾ The reference to "S. Agustín" instead of "St. Augustine" in the preface still witnesses to the Spanish original!

⁴⁾ Very few bibliographical additions have been made, except for those such as the reference to Gordon's different interpretation of *ahdm* in the economic texts not as dual "two" but as a plural "several", proposed in his review of the first volume in the original Spanish (*Or* 67 [1998], 284f, here 284).

⁵⁾ A close study of this review is essential for all users of Tropper's often rather problematic book.

⁶⁾ J. Huehnergard, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*, Atlanta 1987.

founded conclusions regarding the vocalization of a certain word, the authors, contrary to Bordreuil and Pardee in their *Manuel*, and many individual publications by Pardee, Sivan, and others, make no attempt along these lines. Neither are nouns assigned to a particular pattern nor verbs to a given class. This appears to be a matter of principle: del Olmo Lete states elsewhere that he considers vocalizing Ugaritic texts redundant (see his remark in *UF* 36 [2004], 541 with n. 9). Even though the present reviewer considers the same technique an indispensable analytical tool, because it forces a commentator to make his choices explicit,⁷⁾ the authors' decision to give the reader much of the available evidence without applying reconstruction themselves proves to be a sensible one in a dictionary focusing on facts. But Tiberian Hebrew and Syriac, where normative traditions exist, should have been cited in a vocalized form, for this would have added some extra information. The book as such thus appears more geared towards translating and understanding the texts than to linguistic analysis.

Rich though it is, the etymological material has not been processed according to a clear methodology: the authors seem to distinguish "Aramaic" on the one hand and, among others, "Nabataean", "Palmyrene", "Syriac" and "Hatra" on the other, as if the latter were not variants of the same Aramaic subgroup. Hence, for the purposes of a dictionary of Ugaritic there is little point in adducing purely consonantal evidence from various Aramaic languages even for common Aramaic words, such as the numbers. Referring to a comparative and diachronic lexicon like the latter part of Klaus Beyer's *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, 2 vols. with supplement, Göttingen 1984–2004, would have been more straightforward. Now and again less might have been more: to be sure, hardly any of Kjell Aartun's vagaries deserves mention,⁸⁾ and the consistent use of the Ebla texts is perhaps still somewhat premature. One also wishes that semantic relevance had been checked more frequently. Since the study of etymology clearly lags behind in Semitics, one cannot criticize the authors too harshly on this point, but a more nuanced and sophisticated use of cognate evidence ranks high on the wish-list for the next generation of Ugaritic lexicography.

Where applicable, the etymology part is followed by an inventory of grammatical forms, including by-forms. The sigla "cpref" and "prefc" for the term "imperfect" or "prefix conjugation" in its various manifestations oscillate occasionally. A few more comments on unexpected forms and spellings or at least relevant bibliographic references would have been helpful. Obviously, the grammatical analysis depends to a great extent on the translation of individual passages which the authors adopt, although many forms are ambiguous in the consonantal script. Singular nouns with an enclitic *-m* are a case in point, since it is often difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish them from masculine plurals. Quite regularly the context does not provide any indication either: with *lbim* and *y'lm* in KTU 1.169:4 (treated as singular nouns by the authors), the first noun of the bicolon exhibits an *-m*,

while it is precisely the other way round in the preceding bicolon in l. 3, but one cannot determine whether animal similes generally prefer the singular or the plural (the latter being clearly attested in KTU 1.6:VI:21). Hence, the problem remains unsolved. Elsewhere, the use of synonymous or antithetic words in poetic parallelism helps to narrow down the meaning; fortunately, this often vital information is consistently given.

Even though the authors emphasize that their work is not intended to be a thesaurus, they provide generous, and often all, attested examples, albeit not in the most transparent way. Since the words are given in their context, the reader gets a clearer idea of the actual uses of each lexical item in different literary genres or registers and does therefore not wholly depend on the way a given lemma is organized. Sometimes a different reading than the one in KTU² has been adopted, but not in all cases is this clearly stated. Perhaps a few more of Pardee's proposals on epigraphic and palaeographic matters could have been considered. Translating Ugaritic texts leaves very much room to alternative renderings, so the authors had to decide on one particular interpretation and allude to others through bibliographical references. A choice had to be made which suggested translation to cite;⁹⁾ in the present format, however, it is very difficult to figure out the majority opinion, as this might be represented only by one reference among many others, including very far-fetched ones. Strikingly, the same passage is at times rendered differently in different lemmata, or at least inconsistently: *tb'* (KTU 1.14:I:14), for example, has been translated literally as "she left (him)" under *trh* (p. 878), but more exactly as "she died" under *tb'*.¹⁰⁾ Likewise, the authors translate *iqra* in KTU 1.23:2 s.v. with "let invoke", which adequately mirrors the subjunctive, but with "I am going to sing" under *ysm* (I). KTU 2.47:17f, too, is not treated the same way on p. 473 and p. 752 (l. 2 from above). Lastly, more attention might have been given to particular syntactic construction, as in Ernst Vogt's excellent *Lexicon linguae Aramaicae Veteris Testamenti*, Rome 1971. Again, this ties in with the main purpose of the book as such, that is, making the alphabetic Ugaritic texts better accessible to a broader public of readers.

Despite all the copious references to scholarly literature, the present status of research still allows for many further comments or suggestions. The following remarks should be regarded as occasional *Lesefrüchte* adding one or more voices to those already heard and do not claim to be exhaustive in any sense; every instance of disagreement is meant as a respectful attempt to avoid stagnation (the undesirable side-effect of every standard work), in particular on matters which seem obvious at a first glance:

ab (I) "father": On the translation of *m ab* (KTU 2.16:11) as "How is father doing?" cf. *BiOr* 62 (2005), 314, and, possibly, KTU 1.14:I:38 (*m at* "What is the matter with you?"), an interpretation accepted by the authors [cf. s.v. *at*, (c)], although there have been various proposals to emend

⁷⁾ See also M.S. Smith, *Untold Stories. The Bible and Ugaritic Studies in the Twentieth Century*, Peabody 2001, 157.

⁸⁾ The second part of his *Studien zur ugaritischen Lexikographie*, 2 vols., Wiesbaden 2006, is even less helpful than the first one (on which cf., for example, M. Dietrich/O. Loretz *UF* 23 [1991], 439–443, or A. Gianto, *Or* 62 [1993], 453f) and makes no positive contribution at all to Ugaritic scholarship. Consequently, it will not be considered here.

⁹⁾ D. Pardee, *Les textes rituels*, 2 vols., Paris 2000, for example, has not been included; for del Olmo Lete's opinion on this work see now his review article "The Ugaritic Ritual Texts", *UF* 36 (2004), 539–648.

¹⁰⁾ Presumably, the wife did not leave her husband, as the text is often understood, but died: cf. M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* III/6 (1997), 1217 with n. 22.

this passage). It should also be noted that Pardee and Bordreuil suggest that *mab* is a personal name (*Manuel II*, 84).

ab (II) “ghost, spirit”: The translation of *ab* in KTU 1.16:I:5 as “ghost” (of a dead person) and hence the existence of a homonym *ab* (II) in Ugaritic is not certain; indeed, many scholars consider it to be an instance of *ab* (I) “father”.

abn “stone”: Presumably, *abn* in KTU 1.3:III:26 is actually a first person singular “imperfect” from the root *byn* (“I understand the lightning which the heavens do not know”) rather than a substantive, because this would tie in better with the other verbal forms chiasmatically arranged in the same tricolon (*abn* — *l td'* — *l td'* — *l tbn*).

ˁd “to exact”: Pardee in his on-line review of Tropper, p. 226, proposes a different analysis for *ad* in KTU 2.26:20, taking the verb as a D-stem imperative (*l'addi*) instead of an infinitive (the latter was first suggested by del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín themselves in *AuOr* 6 [1988], 261). The translation remains the same, though.

adn (I) “lord, master”: RS 96.2039:13 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 33) now furnishes another instance for *adn* denoting someone who has actual authority over slaves; in this particular case, it is the former owner, to whose estate the slave has fled from his new master. — The purpose of an individual paragraph on the meaning “noble father” remains obscure to the present reviewer, since the preceding section covers all the usages mentioned there as well.

udn (I) “ear”: On KTU 1.16:VI:42 see the note below on the lemma *yqg*. This passage features the singular instead of the dual, as would be expected with paired body parts, because the word refers to the power of hearing rather than the physical organ (cf. Prov 2:2; KTU 1.18:IV:34 is different, because there just one ear, no matter which one, is meant).

udr (I) “express messenger”: Note that the tentative translation “vœu(?)” in Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel II*, 85 (*ad* KTU 2.30:15), follows a similar direction to de Moor’s proposal “promised tribute”, although these two editors also have doubts concerning the reading of the first letter.

ˁh-d “to grasp”: The “inchoative” use of this verb proposed under no. 6, attractive though it sounds, still seems to be badly documented, as *ihd d iṯ b kbdk* (KTU 1.18:I:17f) can be translated literally (“grasp what is in your liver”, i.e., “what is within you”), and the meaning of KTU 1.4:IV:16 remains quite unclear. One should therefore be sceptical about it. Some usages of the verb *qm*, by contrast, would be more suitable for an interpretation along these lines, especially since this verb at times merely further characterizes the *Aktionsart* of an event in other Semitic languages, too (see the corresponding note below). — Furthermore, the reading *ihd hn[d]* (KTU 2.33:21) conceals some epigraphic difficulties: according to KTU², the first two letters of *hnd* are also (partially) broken, while Pardee (*AfO* 31 [1984], 215–219) reads *ihd hn/w't'*. — The authors do not state what they think of unusual spellings like *yuhd* (cf. *BiOr* 62 [2005], 311; in the eyes of the present reviewer, this is still an unresolved problem).

ˁh-r “to go behind”: A new attestation in RS 94.2284:33, may now confirm the meaning “to delay” of the causative stem (see Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 34, with the note *ad loc.*), if indeed the noteworthy spelling *tšhr* “(why) do you delay (your messenger)” for an expected {*tšhr*} /*tašaḥiru*/ can be related to this verb.

ˁ-k-l “to eat”: The authors interpret the complement in *tikl išt b bhtm* (KTU 1.4:VI:24) as an expression of place and translate: “the fire continued to consume in the palace”. However, when governing a prepositional phrase with *b* /*bi-*/ instead of a direct object, the verb may rather highlight partial affectedness, i.e., the fire was burning without completely destroying the palace (with his characteristic intuition, J. Hoftijzer seems to have felt precisely this nuance, as appears from a passing remark in *UF* 12 [1980], 459: “das Feuer fraß am Palast”). Such a usage is hard to prove, given the scarcity of examples and the polyvalence of the preposition /*bi-*/, but it is well-attested for the Hebrew cognate of the same verb, cf. M. Malessa, *Untersuchungen zur verbalen Valenz im biblischen Hebräisch*, Assen 2006, 96f, and my review in *JTS* 2007, 607–610. See also the note on the lemma *lhm* (I) below.

al (I) “no, not”: It has been doubted for stylistic reasons whether *al* in the exercise text KTU 5.9:14 is really the negation, as the scribe seems to record various ways of expressing a positive wish presumably differing in register and degree of politeness or urgency. Cf. D. Pardee, review of Tropper, p. 361, who considers this word an instance of the affirmative particle *al* (II) “surely” (related to the negation in terms of *Gegensinn?*).

il “god”: Like Pardee (review of Tropper, p. 389), the authors do not accept a superlative use of this word, i.e., the view that “an X of *il*” (or, presumably, also “*il* X”) can mean “an enormously great (strong, marvellous etc.) X”, an assumption based on the widespread idea that this is a feature of Biblical Hebrew as well (cf. Gesenius¹⁸, s.v. אלהים, C3 [p. 62], but clearly not all relevant examples are translated consistently there). This scepticism seems sound, although *il* in such cases, both in Hebrew and in Ugaritic, may indeed seem to express something extraordinary, even if it does not act as a superlative in the technical sense.

ilh “the ‘Divine One’”: On **/ilāh-/* as an expanded form of **/il-/* cf. *BiOr* 63 (2006), 400 (with further bibliography).

almg “a type of wood”: Add now another attestation: RS 94.2965:10 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 39).

iln “deity, god”: The relationship between this word and the more usual common Semitic **/il-/* (without the /*n*/) is tricky; cf. now the discussion in R.M. Kerr, *Latino-Punic and its Linguistic Environment*, Ph.D. diss. Leiden 2007, 45f. It might simply be a by-form of **/il-/* once, for whatever reason (to give some special meaning?), expanded by the affix /*-ān-/* which has survived in the lexicon, just like *ilh* (q.v.), without there necessarily being any referential difference. Note that biconsonantal nouns in various Semitic languages are at times affected by similar processes.

um “mother”: The spelling *umy* in several letters for what must be the nominative case of the suffixed form is striking. Elsewhere, the authors seem to believe in *matres lectionis* in Ugaritic alphabetic cuneiform, as their comments on *ky* (s.v. *k* (II)) indicate. However, the *y* may simply point to an enclitic element /*-ya/* whose function (caritative?) still has to be defined.

amd “always”(?): A rendering like “always be a guest of the sanctuary” for *amd gr bt il* (KTU 1.19:III:47), the only attestation of this word up to now, does not do sufficient justice to the fact that this expression is part of a series of curses. Hence, M. Dietrich and O. Loretz translate: “Für immer sei ein Fremder im Haus des El!” (*TUAT* III/6 [1997], 1299); others think of a curse involving leprosy (cf. Renfroe’s proposal, cited in the bibliography, and S.B. Parker, in: id.,

Ugaritic Narrative Poetry, Atlanta 1997, 74: “May El clothe you in leprosy(?)”, reading *grbt* as one single word). The latter would be closer to the traditional phraseology and imagery of Babylonian curse formulae as they frequently appear in, e.g., boundary stones.

amr (I) 1) “order”: *amrk* in KTU 2.33:13 might constitute an attestation of this word in epistolary prose, but the passage is complicated due to a broken context (cf. J.-L. Cunchillos, in: *Textes Ougaritiques* II, 330 with n. 17).

amr (III) TN: The translation “in the TN style” for *k amr* (KTU 1.4:I:41) is unsubstantiated, for a *nisbe*, i.e., an adjective instead of the place name itself, would normally be used to convey that idea. In Ugaritic, as in Hebrew, *k* is generally not augmented by a second preposition and could therefore be understood here as describing an artifact (or: something thin/subtle) “like one from Amurru”; see also the note below on the lemma *k* (I) for a brief discussion and on *nhl* (I) for another possible example of the same phenomenon.

amt (I) “female slave”: For *tdmmt amht* in KTU 1.4:III:21f, M. Dietrich and O. Loretz had proposed “Tadeleien der Mägde” (*UF* 18 [1986], 448), but now they have modified this to “Unzucht mit Mägden” (*TUAT* III/6 [1997], 1156), corresponding to DUL’s “lasciviousness with (female) slaves”.

in “there is not”: It is important for syntactical analysis no less than for historical morphology to note that, according to comparative evidence from the Akkadian of Ugarit (J. Huehnergard, *The Akkadian of Ugarit*, Atlanta 1989, 240; W.H. van Soldt, *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1991, 413) and Amarna Canaanite, the noun associated with this “particle of (non-)existence”, of which the precise grammatical category still defies genuine explanation, is inflected as accusative.

unk: D. Pardee, review of Tropper, p. 99, questions the view that {unk} in KTU 5.11:3 is an uncorrected error for the following *bnk*; instead, he thinks of an aberrant writing of the first person singular personal pronoun and translates: “As for me, your son, I...”. This is clearly an appealing interpretation.

innm “behold”: According to D. Pardee, review of Tropper, p. 211, n. 811, the first letter of the only attestation, read *innm bdk hwt yrš* by the authors (KTU 2.41:14), is damaged. Pardee reconstructs *h'nm*, the deictic particle together with an enclitic *m*, because Akkadian loanwords are rare in the Ugaritic letters we have.

annh “mint”: The reference to Hittite *annanuhha-*, usually translated “trained” and adduced as evidence for translating Ugaritic *annh* as “cub”, might turn out to be a dead end. The connection between this Hittite noun and *annanu-zi* “to train” is not quite clear (one would then have to postulate an unusual causative element *-hha-*).

inš “people”: De Tarragon is cited for the interpretation “cult personnel”, but later on he seems to have abandoned his previous view in favour of understanding the word as a divine epithet (cf. id., in: *Textes Ougaritiques* II, 104f).

any(t) “ship”: Presumably, the unmarked form is a collective meaning “fleet” or “group of boats”, whereas the form with a /-t-/ ending designates either the *nomen unitatis*, that is, the individual boat, or, as sometimes in Hebrew (e.g., Ezk 27:9.29, cf. KTU 2.46:13f), a special type of ship.

ap (I) “also”: The purpose of the section “coordinating adverbial conjunction” (no. 2) is not entirely clear.

ap “viper”: The bibliography section on this difficult word seems somewhat meagre; for some different proposals cf. M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* III/6 (1997), 1285 with n. 208.

-p-q D-stem “to escape”: Instead of the authors’ “do not make yourself scarce”, Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, 67, parse the sole attestation in *al tapq apq* (KTU 1.169:12) as an N-stem “imperfect” form of a verb meaning “to withhold”, hence: “Que (ton) canal ne soit plus bloqué!” The matter no doubt deserves further investigation, so any decision seems hard to make at the moment.

irn: According to the present reviewer, it would be wiser just to say: “unknown animal”. The authors in fact suggest a meaning “puppy”, but none of the alleged cognates adduced in favour of this interpretation is really convincing.

irš “demand, scarcity”(?): The reading and interpretation of this word seem highly uncertain, especially since the context of the only alleged attestation (KTU 1.163:10) is badly damaged. — The affix /-ān-/ should not be called a “determinative suffix”, by the way (see the note below on the lemma *n*).

-t-w “to come”: For a possible directional construction see the note on *ngt*.

-t-r D-stem “to transmit”: The reading *qmm atr amr*, interpreted as “standing they transmitted their demand” (KTU 1.2:I:31), is less certain than the authors’ presentation supposes. Many other commentators read *qmm amr amr* “standing they made a speech” (M.S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* I, Leiden 1994, 267; M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* III/6 [1997], 1122). A second possible example of the same verbal root occurs only in a broken context, and so it cannot be taken for granted that this root is attested at all in the D-stem.

atr (III) “remains”: This meaning is based on a specific interpretation of one formulaic verse. A more recent rendering of *atr* as “way” is given by Dietrich and Loretz, instead of the older one “holy places” referred to in the bibliography (see below, s.v. *dmr*).

d (III): Given the lack of background information concerning the use of *d* in KTU 1.119:9 and indeed the exact meaning of the verbal form *tnrr*, it might be safer not to provide a rendering as specific as “the ‘testimony’, a cultic installation”, but just leave the word untranslated.

-d-b “to put, prepare”: See now the comprehensive survey by M. Dietrich and O. Loretz in *UF* 34 (2002), 75–108, where all the available evidence is neatly assembled. The meaning of this word adapts easily to the situation in which it is used.

dbt “layout, arrangement”: Again, the present reviewer would prefer a more generic description. The paronomastic expression *db dbt* could just mean “to take preparatory measures” or something like that.

-d-d “to declare, respond”: Concerning the tD-stem in Ugaritic, of which *ytdd* “he declared” (KTU 1.4:III:11) is usually thought to be a classic example, one should also refer to J. Huehnergard, *UF* 17 (1986), 402, who considers a tD form more likely than a tL.

dmt “desolation”: The three-fold repetition of *dmt* in KTU 1.161:17 could be a *double entendre* which combines the meaning of “desolation” and an exclamation of lament “how long?”, a meaning occurring frequently in the Hebrew Bible. This would seem fitting for such an elaborate funerary ritual as the one in question.

ʾl (II) “above”: A new letter (RS 94.2406:7 = Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel*, no. 31) now seems to support the view that the long form *ʾlm* means “on the following day” (so, too, Bordreuil and Pardee *ad loc.*) instead of “next, in addition”, since it precedes the expressions “on the third day” and “on the fourth day” respectively in a sequence of events. Amnon Bruck (personal communication) suggests that *ʾlm* “on the following day” may be related to the common Semitic noun /ʾalam-/ rather than the preposition /ʾal/, since the former has a more obvious temporal connotation.

ʾl-m “to be hidden, go unnoticed” or perhaps better: “to know”: The present reviewer prefers to relate this verb to Arabic *ʾalima* “to know” and understand the only attestation (KTU 2.14:14) differently (provided the underlying reading of KTU¹ is correct). The meaning “to be hidden”, attested in various Semitic languages, might be explained as an instance of *Gegensinn* (so, too, Gesenius¹⁸, s.v. עלם) within a broad semantic spectrum including the polar extremes. For further remarks concerning this passage see below s.v. *w*. In any case the epigraphic difficulty involved should have been mentioned.

ʾl-y “to ascend”: Note the difference between the third person masculine singular “perfect” *ʾly* /ʾalaya/ (uncontracted) and the feminine *ʾlt* /ʾalat/ (contracted) instead of the expected, but unattested, **ʾlyt* **ʾalayāt*.

ʾmq (II) “tough, strong”: Instead of Akkadian *emūqu* “power, force”, one might also refer to Akkadian *emēqu* “to be wise”, related to the Semitic root *ʾmq* “to be deep, profound, wise”, and hence render Ugaritic *ʾmq* with “clever” (so, too, S.B. Parker, in: id., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 62). This etymology, though not mentioned in the lemma under discussion, seems to be more suitable for the only attestation given (KTU 1.17:VI:45). In his preceding speech, Aqhat replies to Anat’s promise of eternal life with a word of wisdom stressing the frailty of human existence, so Anat in her reaction is more likely to address Aqhat’s cleverness than his strength. In any case, there appears to be no need to postulate a homonymous root *ʾmq* (II).

ʾm-s 1) “to load”: Strangely, the authors only cite the G-stem “to load X (with Y)”. What they understand as the G-passive participle *mʾms* (see below) is treated in a lemma on its own. However, the /m-/ prefix indicates that it must be a D-participle, with the D-stem presumably meaning “to make X loaded”.

ʾn (I) “eye”: Del Olmo Lete’s earlier interpretation (see “Un conjuro ugarítico contra el ‘mal ojo’”, *Anuari de Filologia* 15 [1992], 7–16) of *ʾnn hlkt* “the evil eye roves about” (KTU 1.96:1; the verb has been left out in the translation *ad loc.*) also features in this lemma. Such an understanding, however, runs into all kinds of problems. First, the alleged “-n of determination” (cf. under “Forms:” in the same entry, which must refer to the passage in question), following an erroneous idea adduced first by Goetze in 1946, has been revived in order to explain the peculiar form *ʾnn*. But it is now quite clear that an “-n of determination” along the lines suggested by Goetze and others does not exist in Semitic languages (see M.P. Streck, “Simply a Seller, Nothing but Gods: The Nominal Suffix *-ān* in Old Babylonian”, in: L. Kogan et al. [eds.], *Memoriae Igor Diakonoff*, Winona Lake 2005, 233–243); its sense, whatever that might be, should not be confused with singular/plural categories. Furthermore, even if *ʾnn* were a form of /ʾēn-/ “eye” augmented by a nominal affix /-ān-, it would in any case behave like a masculine

noun, despite the feminine gender of the base word (cf., besides Streck, *loc. cit.*, the examples in H. Bauer/P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*, Halle 1922, pp. 498–500). In that case it could thus hardly be the subject of all the surrounding verbs in the third person feminine singular (*hlkt*, *šnwt*, *tspi*, *tšt*), yet the context without any doubt strongly indicates that *ʾnn* is indeed the subject of these verbs. Hence, the two strokes of the second {n} should be regarded as an error and consequently the reading corrected to *ʾnt* “Anat” (cf., among others, A. Gianto, *Bib* 80 [1999], 296f), which conforms to the grammatical context and gives perfect sense. Otherwise, the last letter could be explained as an enclitic /-n-/ (so D. Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, Atlanta 2002, 161f, who does not believe in the correction of the text to *ʾnt* but also thinks this incantation is about the “evil eye”), even though this would sound very much like an *ad hoc* explanation.

ʾnn (I) “servant”: While most commentators would agree with the authors in considering *tn bʾl w ʾnnh* “hand over Baal and his servants!” (KTU 1.2:I:35) as another attestation of the noun *ʾnn*, M.S. Smith (*The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* I, Leiden 1994, 267 with n. 88; id., in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 100 with n. 19) points out that the parallelism with *artm* “I may possess” in the following stichos could be an argument for parsing *ʾnnh* as a first person singular D-stem “imperfect” from *ʾny* “to humiliate” (cited as *nw* in *DUL*) with a third person singular suffix. He therefore translates: “that I may humble him”. The glottal stop of the preformative /ʾa-/ would have been elided after /wa-/ due to sandhi writing.

ʾnt “now”: *ʾtn* in KTU 2.16:13, even if one agrees that it is a scribal error for *ʾnt*, does not necessarily mean “now” (“I am already a *hrd*”), but could also function as a discourse marker, even though there might be a logical connection with the preceding *al tdhln* (see below, s.v. *dhl*). Note that Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, 84, assume it to be a participle of an alleged verb *ʾtn* “to protect”, otherwise unattested in Ugaritic (“je suis le protecteur de l’armée”).

ʾn-w “to be depressed”: This verb is categorized as a IIIw root on the basis of Sabaic, where the etymological /w/ consistently appears in the consonantal writing. But its classification in Ugaritic cannot be determined with certainty at the moment. — Not everyone will agree that *tʾny* in *ahd ilm tʾny* (KTU 1.2:I:26), cited as a D-stem and translated “I see, gods, that they humiliate”, rightly belongs here. It seems equally possible to relate the verb to *ʾny* (I) and translate *ilm tʾny* as: “the gods will answer” (see M.S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* I, Leiden 1994, 266, and M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* III/6 [1997], 1122, who all interpret *ahd* as an adverb).

ʾp “to fly”: The authors’ interpretation of the L-stem form *tʾpp* “she flew around” as “she attempted to bewitch” for KTU 1.4:II:10 receives no support from the context or from cognate evidence.

ʾpr (I) “dust”: It is not entirely clear whether *ʾprm* in KTU 1.3:III:15 should be assigned a special meaning “steppe” (no. 3) as distinct from the usual one “dust, ground”. However, analyzing the morpheme *m* as a plural ending semantically modifying the collective singular might render such an interpretation possible. In that case, *ʾprm* would mean “steppe” and not, as the authors suggest, “steppes”.

ʾr (I) “city”: Note that in Ugaritic *ʾr* /ʾir-/ is essentially a poetic word, as opposed to its standard use in more southern

manifestations of West Semitic (on this latter point cf. C. Kühne, *Die Chronologie der internationalen Korrespondenz von El-Amarna*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1973, 7 with n. 34). The normal word for “city” in Ugaritic prose is *qrt* /*qarīt-*/ (see below). Consequently, the alleged prose attestation *ʾrm* in KTU 2.71:17 (in an uncertain context) should be treated with caution.

ʾrm “cloak”(?): The meaning of this word depends on the interpretation of *ʾrm il yštk* (KTU 1.169:13). Because of the parallelism with the preceding stichos (*lbš il yštk*), the authors assume that *ʾrm* must somehow be synonymous to *lbš* “dress” or, if a verb, “to clothe”. Others, however, relate *ʾrm* to Hebrew עָרוֹם “naked” or Arabic *ʾarama* “to bare, expose” and hence translate, “the god can make you naked” (cf. D. Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, Atlanta 2002, 160; likewise, Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, 67), in contrast to the first stichos “the god can make you clothed”.

ʾš “tree”: The precise nuance of *ʾš mt* (KTU 1.100:65 [correct “*ibid.*” to “1.100” in the reference *ad loc.*]) is difficult to pinpoint. Does “tree of death” mean a “deadly tree/plant” or simply a “dead branch”? The meaning “staff” (subsection 3) for this word, while generally plausible, is badly attested and depends to a great extent on the interpretation of *hšk* in KTU 1.3:III:18 as “to seize” (but see below, s.v. *hšk*).

-t-q “to pass”: A translation like “to become old” for the N-stem seems somewhat forced, albeit quite possible in the light of the semantic spectrum of this root in Semitic. The only, and difficult, attestation *k klb b btk nʾtq* (KTU 1.16:I:16 and parallel passages), which according to the authors means “like a dog [that] has become old in your house”, constitutes insufficient evidence for this meaning. Moreover, it is syntactically problematic, since the verb would normally come first in an asyndetical relative clause (cf. KTU 1.3:II:41; perhaps also 1.5:VI:8f, if not a main clause; 1.10:II:9, all featuring a “perfect” as the main verb; for “imperfect” verbs see 1.3:I:13–15; 1.4:IV:60–62; 1.3:II:40; 1.23:64f). But if the form is parsed as a first person plural “imperfect” of the G-stem, it can be translated “like a dog we roam through your house” (cf. M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* [1997], 1241), which is possibly a less precarious solution.

ʾz (III) “strong”: This lexeme is not necessarily an adjective in KTU 2.10:13 (see below s.v. *yd* (I)).

b “in” etc.: The preposition *b* /*bi-*/ on its own is unlikely to express existence, as subsection (1b) suggests: in all examples mentioned, *b* has a strictly locative function. Likewise, a “situation of proximity” does not really cover the usages quoted in subsection (1c), even though such a usage is, albeit rarely, attested in Biblical Hebrew (cf. F. Brown, S.R. Driver, C.A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford 1962, s.v. ב, II). — Although a meaning “from” is well attested for *b*, not all references given in subsection (1e) are convincing: in KTU 1.3:II:34f (translated by the authors “she washes her hands of the blood of the warriors”; similarly M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* [1997], 1139), *b* probably does not mean “from”, for the preposition is not attached to *ydh* but to *dm* (it is not that the hand is washed from blood, but blood is washed from the hand). A better meaning seems to be “she washes her hands in warrior-blood” (cf. M.S. Smith, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 167, n. 50), even though the context describes Anat washing herself after a fierce battle.

Similarly for *b ʾrpt* (KTU 1.4:V:8), it would be more natural to translate “in the clouds” rather than following the authors’ suggestion, “from the clouds”. Note that many usages which require a translation “from” are nonetheless essentially locative (cf. P. Swiggers, *AO 5* [1987], 152–154, esp. p. 154 with n. 14). — There should have been a separate subsection for *b* followed by an infinitive for temporal or causal expressions.

bʾd “behind”: *bʾd kslk* “behind your back” (KTU 1.16:VI:49) appears to be an instance of the preposition *bʾd* rather than the adverb.

b-ʾ-r (II) “to leave, abandon”: *ybʾr l ʾtn aṯth* (KTU 1.14:II:48) apparently means “he left his wife to another (man)”, following the authors’ translation s.v. *ʾtn*. The rendering “for another” s.v. *bʾr* is misleading, since it implies that the wife has been abandoned “for another woman”, but this would require a feminine form of *ʾtn*.

bd (II) “separation”: Even though the authors do not cite any secondary literature, the analysis and translation of the only alleged attestation of this word in KTU 1.2:III:20 is still quite controversial, cf. M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* (1997), 1128, n. 77.

b-h-l (D-stem?) “to dismiss”(?): This verbal root is now attested for the first time in Ugaritic in RS 94.2168 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 38) as a “perfect” (*lb ʾbdmlk bhl bnh*: ll. 19f, cf. 22.26) and an “imperfect” form (*w km lbh ybhl hm*: ll. 20f, cf. 25.29). Cognate evidence yields quite divergent meanings: both in Hebrew and in Aramaic, the root normally means “to move quickly, hasten” (G-stem) or “to frighten” (mostly in the D-stem), while the Hiphil can also be used for “to hurry someone out” (cf. ויבהלוהו in 2 Chr 26,20); Arabic *bahala*, by contrast, means “to leave” (Lane, s.v. [vol. I, p. 267]) or “to curse” and *bāhil* “unbound, free” (for the latter two cf. H. Wehr, *Arabisches Wörterbuch*, Wiesbaden 1985, s.v.). Hence, Bordreuil’s and Pardee’s suggestion “libérer” (*Manuel II*, 106), although given without any discussion, can indeed be defended, especially since the text in question seems to be about a bequest. Nonetheless, their very specific interpretation as “renvoyer de la maison avec un cadeau les fils qui ne reçoivent pas l’héritage principal” presumably needs some further support. So the present reviewer would rather opt for a more generic rendering “to dismiss” and leave the specific legal implications (“to disinherit”?) for the time being open.

b-k-y “to weep”: Is *bky* in *ytn gh bky* “he raised his voice weeping” (KTU 1.16:I:14) really a participle, as the authors suggest in their analysis? This would imply that the Ugaritic verbal system incorporated a kind of *participium coniunctum*, but there is no genuine parallel; moreover, such a construction in any case presupposes a participle much more “verbalized” than the Ugaritic one seems to be. Hence, one might prefer to view *bky* as an infinitive expressing an event subordinate to the main action (cf. Hebrew השכב אותם ארצה “throwing them to the ground”, 2 Sam 8,9), as another kind of verbal noun (cf. Hebrew בכי, or simply as a third person masculine singular “perfect” /*bakaya*). All these, and especially the latter option, would have to be verified in the light of a more comprehensive analysis of the “(short) imperfect” juxtaposed with the “perfect” in poetry, since the opposite sequence is what one would have expected, with the “perfect” at the beginning of a sense-unit.

bnt (I) “construction”: It should be noted that the context of *bnt* DN “construction of DN” in KTU 1.17:VI:13 is actually broken and the divine name has been supplied on

the basis of an inspired guess by some editors. Referring to a bow as *bnt* DN “construction of DN” cannot be regarded as certain and seems to be an odd expression. And why not derive this word from *bnt* (II) “creation” anyway, although the division of the lexeme into two lemmata is not strictly necessary.

b-š-r “to watch”: The only justification for the meaning “to watch” (corresponding to M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* III/6 [1997], 1282: “beobachtete ihn”) is as a semantic extension of the parallel verb *rhp* “to circle” in KTU 1.18:IV:30f, which together could mean “to hover while watching the prey” (Agustinus Gianto, personal communication).

b-t “to lodge”: Thanks to RS 94.2406:6 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, no. 31), there is now also an attestation of a first person singular “perfect” *btt* “I lodged”. This spelling points to a linking vowel before the affirmative, as sometimes occurs with “hollow roots” (cf. *Manuel* I, p. 70).

bt “house”: Another possible instance is *hbt* “the house”, s.v. *hwy* (I). Note that *bt* can be frequently directional without a preposition or the ending *-h*, a usage to be found also in many other Semitic languages including later idioms like Syriac.

b-t “to be ashamed”(?): M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, whose earlier work is quoted in the bibliography, have more recently suggested that the relative verbs in KTU 1.2:IV:28.31 are to be derived from *bt* “to scatter”, parallel to Arabic *batta* “to spread” (*TUAT* III/6 [1997], 1133, n. 115, with further bibliography). The same, quite plausible, solution has now also been accepted by Bordreuil and Pardee (*Manuel* II, pp. 10f).

btñ “serpent”: The alleged Hebrew cognate פתן “viper” is actually an Aramaism (M.L. Wagner, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch*, Berlin 1966, no. 242a [p. 97]) and thus not suitable for comparison; בשן (see Ps 68:23 and A. Gianto, *Bib* 70 [1989], 416) might be the more appropriate pendant, as it conforms to the expected sound change */t/ > /š/ in Hebrew.

d “of”: The reasons for using a “genitival” *d* instead of a bound (“construct”) form still need further clarification. Several of them, especially in poetry, might be stylistically motivated. For example, a chiasmic expression such as *gpm dt ksp dt yrq [nqbnm]* “the harness of silver, of gold the ropes” (KTU 1.4:IV:10f) would be impossible with bound forms; they may also lend variety to a chain of genitives (1.4:I:40: *dbbm d msdt arš* “creatures of the earth’s foundations”; 1.169:1: *ydy dbbm d ġzr* “exorcism of the demons of the young man”, if indeed the first word is to be parsed as a verbal noun and not as an “imperfect”); even so such chains of constructs do occur. Sometimes the differences between the cited examples of the relative particle *d* “as subject” (subsection 2a) and the “circumstantial” one (subsection 2d) are hard to discern.

d-h-l “to fear”: For KTU’s *al tidhln */al tidħalinna/ (> /al tidħalinna/?)* “do not be afraid” (2.16:12; energetic short “imperfect” second person feminine singular), Pardee in *Manuel* II, 24 still sticks to his old proposal made in *AfO* 31 (1984), 220, and reads *al twhln* “qu’elle ne se décourage pas” (third person feminine singular short “imperfect” N-stem with an enclitic /-n-), even though he has to postulate an otherwise unattested verb *yhl* < **whl* “to despair”. In fact, Pardee, whose palaeographic expertise is impressive, also questions the second passage quoted (KTU 2.30:21) and sup-

poses that the verbal root *dhl* does not exist at all in Ugaritic (review of Tropper, pp. 67f).

dlt (III) “weakness”: As *msprt* in *šps msprt dlthm* (KTU 1.23:25) clearly functions as a noun, a translation like “the Sun, guardian of their weakness” deserves preference over the authors’ unlikely suggestion “may DN take care of their weakness”, and similarly s.v. *msprt*. Even if *msprt* is indeed a participle rather than another type of deverbal noun (the corresponding verbal root has a Semitic etymology, but remains unattested in the Ugaritic corpus so far), there are no traces whatsoever of a verbalized participle in Ugaritic, and certainly not of any modal functions.

dnil PN: On this name see now M. O’Connor, “The Human Characters’ Names in the Ugaritic Poems”, in: S.E. Fassberg/A. Hurvitz (eds.), *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting*, Jerusalem 2006, 269–283.

drkt “rule, power”: The reference in the etymology section to Hebrew דרך with allegedly the same meaning is a dead end: it results from a naively “Ugariticizing” reading of a few Biblical passages and has long been disproved, cf. Gesenius¹⁸ s.v., subsection (g), with further bibliography; this dictionary is much more cautious than the various manifestations of Koehler-Baumgartner.

d-t “to soften”(?): Note that the conventional interpretation “to thresh” (used metaphorically in the only attestation KTU 1.18:I:19) has been maintained by M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* III/6 (1997), 1278 and n. 157. It seems to have stronger etymological support and perhaps deserves preference over the authors’ suggestion.

d-m-r (I) “to protect”: Dietrich and Loretz are quoted as representatives of an alternative interpretation “to sing” for this verb, but their publication dates from 1978. More recently (*TUAT* III/6 [1997], 1262), they have accepted the meaning given by the authors and translate *l ’pr dmr atrh* (KTU 1.17:I:28) with “der [...] zum Staub hin beschützt seinen Gang”, which is close to “the one who from the ‘dust’ protects his remains” in the book under review.

g-’-r (I) “to reproach”: *ttrt* in *b šm tg’rm ttrt* (KTU 1.2:IV:28) must be the subject of the verb, not the object, hence “By his name Astarte rebuked (him)” (cf. M.S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* I, Leiden 1994, 356) is better than the authors’ “he reproached DN”.

gd section (2) “fully grown/large type of grain”(?): For a new attestation see now RS 94.2479:14 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, no. 32).

ghrt (?): J.N. Ford, *UF* 34 (2002), 139–144, now suggests the meaning “(destructive) rumble”, based on an interpretation of the context.

g-h-t “to cast out”: This verbal root is based on the reading and interpretation *tghṭk r[gm] b’l* “may the word of Baal cast you out” for KTU 1.169:1, also accepted by Dietrich and Loretz (*TUAT* II/3 [1988], 335). It has a possible cognate גחט/גחט “to erase” in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic (cf. M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*, Ramat-Gan 2002, s.v.). Other scholars, by contrast, break up the first word into two and propose a different emendation of the subsequent lacuna, such as *tg ḥṭk r[hq]* “He has removed the pain (*tg*, < **ygy* “to suffer”) of your rod”, and take *b’l* with the following clause (cf. D. Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, Atlanta 2002, 160 with n. 4). The latter solution presupposes a noun otherwise unattested in Ugaritic and derived

from a likewise unattested verbal root. Therefore, the authors' interpretation seems preferable.

gl̄t "snow" (?): The proposed connection with the common Semitic word **tlg* "snow" does not ring true, especially since the authors recur to a metathesis of non-adjacent letters. Moreover, the given translation for KTU 1.4:V:7 ("the abundance of the *t*-boat in the snow") is incomprehensible. This word must be a verbal noun related to the root *gl̄t* "to pour down", that is, "downpour", "heavy rain" or something like that.

gp 1 "shore": For the etymology, one might compare Hebrew גפה with the same meaning (Sir 40:16, cf. Gesenius¹⁸, s.v.). Prov 9:3 (על-גפי מרמי קרת) "above on the high places of the city") might furnish suitable comparative evidence for the second meaning "slope".

g-r "to take refuge": Pardee suggests another instance of this verb with the meaning "to attack" for *k gr 'z* "when a strong (foe) attacks" (KTU 1.119:26): *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, Atlanta 2002, 149. The glossary in Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, 155, subsumes this under a homonymous root *gr* (II). A broader definition of *gr*, such as "to come as a stranger", might render a proposal along these lines superfluous, even though it can be supported on the basis of Hebrew (see Gesenius¹⁸, s.v. גר, which could equally well be a case of polarity in the meaning [*Gegensinn*] of גר). The existence of an alleged R-stem "to settle" is deduced from *tgrgr* in KTU 1.23:66 (so, too, A. Caquot/M. Szyner, in: TOu I, 378 with note; Th.J. Lewis, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 214), but *tgr* has been interpreted as a G-"imperfect" by others (Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, 31), which would make the following combination of letters, *gr*, either a cognate infinitive (which would perhaps be easier from the colometric point of view) or an imperative going together with the next stichos (so Bordreuil/Pardee, *ibid.*, and Pardee, review of Tropper, p. 338).

grgr (I) "throat" and (II) "javelin" are actually not two homonyms, but two different interpretations of the same *hapax legomenon*.

g-r-š "to drive out": The authors subsume all attestations of this verb under the G-stem. Interestingly, RS 94.2284:22 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 34), now reveals an example where, according to the translation by Bordreuil and Pardee, *grš* means "to send": *w grš bn̄il w yqh t'nk* "Et (quand) Bana'ilu est renvoyé, il prendra ta réponse (= ma réponse à ta lettre)", or more simply: "and send Bana'ilu, so that he can pick up my response to you". If this is correct, it could be that the G-stem means "to send" and the D-stem "to drive out, expel", similar to Hebrew גרש, where the meaning "to expel" normally occurs in the D-stem (cf. Gesenius¹⁸, s.v.). But then there is a problem with *grš d šy lnh* "driving his troublers away" (KTU 1.17:I:29), for here *grš* seems to be a participle, and if so it must be a G-stem (the D-participle would have been written **mgrš*). However, it might be regarded as an exception, since the expected D-stem, especially in poetry, could have been assimilated to all the surrounding G-stem forms (see the note below on the lemma *yr̄t* for another possible instance of the same phenomenon).

gt 1 "wine/olive press": The *pars pro toto* meaning "estate" is now also attested in RS 96.2039:9 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 33): *b gty* "on my estate".

g-d-y tD-stem "to shoot": The only alleged example of this root in the tD-stem *k tgd̄* "when (the cedar [stave])

shoots" (KTU 1.4:VII:41) is dubious: M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, for example, take the four letters as one single word *ktgd̄* "mace" (*An Analytic Ugaritic Bibliography* 1972–1988, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1996, 714; TUAT III/6 [1997], 1170 with n. 130) and translate "Baal looked to the east, the mace in his hand, the cedar in his right hand", which seems to do more justice to the colometric arrangement of the context. Moreover, Arabic *ḡadā* means "to feed" and is thus not really suitable for comparison. On the tD-stem as such see above, s.v. 'dd. M.S. Smith, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 137, isolates the expression: "His hand indeed shakes", taking *ydh* to be the subject of the verb and *k* as an asseverative particle.

glm "boy": Many scholars, perhaps rightly, derive *glm* in *mgyh w glm* (KTU 1.16:I:50) from another root *glm* (II) "to be dark" (cf. *glmt* (II)), although the existence of this word is not entirely certain and thus translate: "after his arrival it became dark" (e.g., M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, TUAT III/6 [1997], 1243; E.L. Greenstein, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 33). The authors' proposal "he reached did the lad" (the somewhat "stretched" English seems to accommodate the emphasis in the Spanish original: "llegó a ella, sí, el mancebo") is somewhat opaque; did they have a proleptic suffix, as often in Aramaic, with a following /wa-/ *explicativum* in mind?

glmt (II) "darkness": The context, that is, an address to Gappu wa-Ugar, suggests that *b<n> glmt* (KTU 1.4:VII:55; the {n} is not in the text) means "sons of darkness", not "in darkness" (the parallel passage should read correctly: *bn zlmt*). There is no evidence whatsoever for the specific meaning "thick fog" proposed by the authors.

g-r "to fall": *w ttn gh ygr* (KTU 1.2:IV:6) can only mean: "And she cried: 'May he fall [...]!'", instead of the authors' "and (Baal) shouting aloud, fell".

g-z-y: For no apparent reason, the authors distinguish between the two meanings "to give presents" and "to win over", although the second on its own covers all usages cited.

-h (II): See the notes on *ngt* and *ns* for remarks on directional constructions.

hbt: Although a change /w/ > /b/ would in theory be possible on purely phonetic grounds (cf. H. Bauer, "Wechsel von p, m, b mit u im Aramäischen und Arabischen", *Zeitschrift für Semitistik* 10 [1935], 11–13), this alleged by-form of *hwt* presumably does not exist (see below, s.v. *hwy* (I)).

h-b-t/ z "to remove": The first meaning, "to knock down", looks like an *ad hoc* proposal for *hbt hw hrd* (KTU 2.61:5) supported by Sabaeen *hbt* "to beat" according to Biella's dictionary cited ad loc. (s.v., p. 104). However, the *Sabaic Dictionary* by A.F.L. Beeston, M.A. Ghul, W.W. Müller and J. Ryckmans, Louvain 1982, only has a root *hbt*. Arabic *hbt* "to sink, decrease" (H. Wehr, *Arabisches Wörterbuch*, Wiesbaden 1985, s.v.) in any case corroborates what is given as a second meaning, i.e., "to remove". Comparative evidence being thus rather weak, it would seem at least equally possible to translate the Ugaritic passage in question "he himself removed the guard".

hl 2 conjunction: While the attempt to describe the functions of the deictic marker *hl* in more precise terms is commendable, the examples cited in this subsection do not necessarily point to a usage as a consecutive or temporal conjunction, since they all can be understood as somehow presentative or implying sensual perception.

h-l-k “to go”: A masculine participle might now be attested in RS 96.2039:18 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 33), though there the meaning of *hkk* is by no means sure (J. Tropper, *UF* 36 [2004], 515 with n. 8, seems to think of an Akkadian calque “messenger”, that is, /hāliku/ for *āliku*); alternatively, it might be an instance of the noun *hkk* (I) “course, movement”.

-hm “their”: The authors translate *klt tn akl lhm* (KTU 2.70:22) with “give them a *k*. in grain”, but this rendering seems problematic for two reasons: first, a verbal form is most unlikely to break up a genitive construction (given the fact that *klt* must be a bound form); second, a word *klt* (II) “measure” lacks good support anyway (see below, s.v.). So it might appear more plausible to interpret *klt* as a substantivized feminine adjective “fullness, totality” and take it with the preceding nominal clause: “concerning your two servants, you have everything (lit.: fullness) there; (so) give them food!” (following Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, 89).

hn: There appears to be growing evidence confirming Liverani’s early observation (*Rendiconti dell’Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei VIII/XIX* [1964], 181f) that this deictic particle can assume demonstrative usages (cf. Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel I*, 44f.73). Markers of definiteness generally evolve out of demonstratives by means of grammaticalization, and some passages might reflect an embryonic stage of this development. Amnon Bruck (personal communication) points out to me that several of possible examples are comparatively late and have been found in one single spot. Presumably, then, only its extinction interrupted the spread of the definite article over the language as a whole. This is, however, no linear process, eventually leading to the regular definite article /ha-/ in some later branches of Central Semitic such as Phoenician, Hebrew, and Old North Arabian (examples of the same phonetically reduced form might even be attested in Ugaritic), but just one aspect of a highly heterogeneous situation which in the course of several centuries acquired a certain equilibrium (cf. my “Die Entstehung des bestimmten Artikels im Semitischen”, *JSS* 51 [2006], 1–18; *Bruggen in een donkere tijd*, Leiden 2006, 7–15). See also below s.v. *hwy* (I).

hnhmt “these”: RS 94.2965:12.20 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 39) contains what seems to be a shorter by-form of this third masculine plural demonstrative *hnhmt*. Supposedly, this is the result of a phonetic development which also appears to be at work with suffixed “energetic” forms (*-/an/+hV/ > /-annu/, cf. D. Pardee, *JNES* 43 [1984], 244f with n. 14).

hnhmt: See *hnhmt*.

ht: According to the present reviewer, a sharper distinction between the temporal or local adverb “now” or “here” on the one hand and its pragmatic use as a discourse marker in combination with /wa-/ on the other (as often in the letters, where it serves to highlight a new topic or argument) would have been useful.

hw 2) “this”: The demonstrative use of the independent personal pronoun is still poorly attested and thus not accepted by all grammarians. Presumably, *hw* in KTU 1.40:32f and parallel passages, the only passage quoted where the context has not suffered serious damage, can also be understood as marking a topic in extraposition (“The sacrifice, it is sacrificed”, according to the translation D. Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, Atlanta 2002, 83). The peculiar expression *hn bnš hw* “this very servant” in RS

96.2039:8.10.15 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 33, who consistently translate it simply as “ce serviteur”; see also the note above on *hn*) might now furnish a somewhat more convincing example. At most two instances, however, might in theory also be interpreted as extraposition, especially since they follow the discourse marker *w ht* (“and concerning the servant, he...”). However, as the oblique form of the pronoun clearly has a demonstrative function (cf. *dr’ hwt hyt* “the seed of that land”, KTU 1.103:55) and such a usage can be found in cognate languages, assuming that also the nominative variant could act as a demonstrative seems reasonable.

hwt: See below, s.v. *hwy* (I).

hbs 2) “waist”: Postulating a second meaning “waist” is not strictly necessary, since the passages cited could also be subsumed to the first meaning “belt”. It would, however, be natural to use the same word for a kind of enclosure and for the thing enclosed (Dutch *tuin* [“garden”] and English “town” are both cognates of German *Zaun* [“fence”], although, admittedly, they belong to different languages).

hms “vinegar”: Add now another attestation in a list which is part of a letter: RS 94.2479:18 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 32).

hpn “greed”: A better translation would be “handful”. The authors derive the meaning “greed” somewhat obscurely from a secondary meaning of Arabic *ḥafana* “to give a little bit” and hence interpret *hpnk* (KTU 1.16:VI:58) as “for your greed”. But the primary meaning of *ḥafana* is “to take with both hands” (H. Wehr, *Arabisches Wörterbuch*, Wiesbaden 1985, s.v.; cf. also *ḥafna* “handful”). It seems therefore better to refer to Hebrew *פיה*, as others have done, and rather think of “hand” or “handful” (M.S. Smith, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 42: “while you still make a fist”). A new attestation of *hpn* in an economic text (RS 94.2600:12 = Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 48) now seems to confirm this latter meaning “handful”, especially since also the whole expression *mā hpnm* has a close Hebrew parallel (Ex 9,8; Lev 16,12; Qoh 4,6).

hrb “sword”: *dry bhrb* (KTU 1.6:V:13) is explained by means of del Olmo Lete’s proposal of a corruption due to haplography. This explanation receives strong support from the similar wording in KTU 1.6:II:31. However, a reader less willing to emend the text might refer to John Healey’s appealing idea that *hrb* here means a “threshing-sledge” with sharp metal wheel-blades (*Or* 34 [1984], 248).

h-r-k “to roast”: Cognate evidence from Hebrew is somewhat problematic, because the only possible case (Prov 12,27; cf. Gesenius¹⁸, s.v.) results from conjecture. The same root is better attested in various forms of Aramaic (see K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer I*, Göttingen 1984, s.v., p. 585); these, however, would rather point to a D-stem and Dt for the passive.

hš-k “to seize”(?): It is worth mentioning that those who interpret *hšk* in *hšk šk bšk* (KTU 1.3:III:18) as a suffixed imperative from *hš* (I) “to hurry” usually also take the following two similarly difficult words as verbal forms with a similar meaning: “Hasten! Hurry up! Rush!” (cf. M.S. Smith, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 110; M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* [1997], 1141).

hšr “mansion”: Translating this word as “courtyard, court” seems closer to the basic meaning “enclosure”, which is well attested, e.g., in Hebrew. A proper subsection for

those cases where the same word means a measure of length (“quarter”) may be misleading, albeit not unreasonable for a lexicographer, since this latter usage is only attested in a poetic formula and may thus be metaphorical.

h-w-y (I) D-stem “to revive”: The second meaning “to carry out, complete” is based exclusively on interpreting the difficult expression *w hwt hbt* (KTU 2.70:15) as “I have completed the task”. In that case *hbt* has to be an otherwise inexplicable by-form of *hwt* “matter”. A rendering “to repair”, by contrast, is closer to the well-attested meaning “to revive” of the D-stem. Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel II*, 89, go so far as to interpret *hbt* as a sandhi writing for **/han bêt-/ > /habbêt-/* “the house” (cf. also their tentative analysis of *hyn* in RS 94.2284:29 as */hayyên-/* “the wine”, *ibid.*, p. 98). This would come very close to the form and function of the definite article in first-millennium Canaanite. The matter definitely merits further investigation, especially in the light of the new material arguing that *hn* can mark definiteness (see above, s.v. *hn*). For a similar phonetic phenomenon in Old Byblian see *בן יחמלך* instead of **בן יחמלך* “the son of Yehimilk” (KAI 6:1; 7:3).

hy (I) “alive” or (II) “life”: Interestingly, the new text RS 94.2284:12 *bis* (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 34) has what seems to be a shortened form *h* (*/hē/ < */hay/ < */hayy/ < */hayy-/?*) of either the adjective or the substantive: *h npšk w h n[pšy]* “by your living power and by my living power!” (for the similar construction of such exclamatory formulae in Hebrew cf. P. Joüon/T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, new ed. Rome 2006, §165e).

hbl (I) “rubbish”: It is not entirely clear how the authors arrive at this meaning. The Hebrew and Aramaic cognates of this *hapax legomenon* (Gesenius¹⁸, s.v. *בבל*₂ with further bibliography) strongly support the alternative proposal “destruction”, and so does Akkadian *habālu* “lawlessness, oppression” (CAD and AHw, s.v.).

hbt “emancipated” and **hpt** “fugitive”: The discussion on the meaning of these related words (with the partial assimilation **/b/ > /p/* before a voiceless consonant), in generic terms perhaps associated with members of a lower social class, still continues. For some further bibliographical references see J. Hoftijzer, “Some Remarks on KTU 2.72:10–16”, in: M.F.J. Baasten/W.Th. van Peursen (eds.), *Hamlet on a Hill*, Louvain 2003, 265–280, in particular pp. 269–271.

hms̄t “five-shekel weight”(?): Nothing indicates that this word specifically means “five shekels”, for it could equally well imply some other measure of weight. Since the only attestation (KTU 1.14:I:30) is a comparison referring to tears pouring down, a lighter measure of weight (five shekels amounts to more than 40g) might conform better to common-sense expectations. Even though one must allow for poetic exaggeration, a lighter unit of weight would hardly spoil the drama of that moment.

hrn “caravan”: The rendering “gang” for this word in KTU 1.4:V:36 (although note that it is “squad” s.v. *šh*) may carry inappropriate connotations: Baal is indeed the father of gods (see KTU 1.24:27), but not a Godfather as depicted by Francis Ford Coppola!

h-s-r “to be missing”: If *npš hsr̄t hn nšm* (KTU 1.6:II:17) were supposed to mean “vigour is/was lacking to men”, one would expect the preposition *l* before *hn nšm* (cf. KTU 1.163:13: *n'mn yhsr lh* “well-being will be lacking to him”).

For the same reason, *bn* is in all likelihood a bound plural of the substantive *bn* “son” rather than a long form of the preposition *b* (cf. D. Pardee, *UF* 7 [1975], 347, and *UF* 8 [1976], 232, for a discussion). Hence, *hsr* seems to be transitive here: “my appetite was lacking human beings” (M.S. Smith, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 155; M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* [1997], 1189). The same might be true for KTU 2.41:17.20, although the interpretation of this latter passage remains controversial (see Pardee, review of Tropper, p. 35 with n. 111, for some further discussion).

hst “mausoleum”: The reading *hst* in 1.123:30 actually follows KTU¹, while KTU² has *hsm*, although Dietrich and Loretz themselves have now returned to their previous reading (*TUAT III/6* [1997], 1240 with n. 173).

h-t “to awake”: When translating KTU 1.14:III:50, where “he woke up” would be normal, the rendering “to come to” (presumably meaning “to come to one’s sense”, representing the Spanish original “volver en sí”) is unfortunately ambiguous in English, and would have been better avoided.

k (I) “like”: Supposedly, the tendency, well-known from Hebrew, to omit another preposition after *k* (P. Joüon/T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, new ed. Rome 2006, §133h) also applies to Ugaritic. This becomes clear from similar cases when *k* appears in its long form *km*, counting as a prosodic unit on its own, and could thus in theory precede a noun prefixed by another proclitic preposition, but in fact it never does. A good example is *in bt l b'l km ilm* “there is no house for Baal as for the other gods” (KTU 1.4:IV:50f; cf. 1.17:I:19). Consequently, some of the prepositional phrases cited here may actually be locative and would thus have to be translated differently, cf. the notes on the lemmata *amr* (III) and *nhl* (I) for specific cases. Note that *k* is not obligatory for comparisons, but can be replaced by what seems to be an adverbial accusative (cf. KTU 1.6:III:7/13 “flowed like honey”; 1.6:II:22 and parallel passages “put him like a lamb in my mouth”).

k (II): While the authors here assume that spellings like *ky* point to *matres lectionis* in Ugaritic, they have a more nuanced comment on the analogous *ky* s.v. *b* (I).

k-b-d D-stem “to honour”: As a matter of detail, note that the prostration formula *tšthwy w tkbdh* (e.g., KTU 1.4:IV:26) must be a circumstantial clause, otherwise the use of the “long imperfect” in narrative, which the first verb clearly exhibits, would be hard to explain; moreover, the same event is expressed by two main verbs (*Identitätsfall*, cf. my *Tempus, Aspekt und Modalität im Reichsaramäischen*, Wiesbaden 2004, 132 with n. 46). Rather than translate “she prostrated herself and paid him homage”, “prostrating herself, thereby honouring him” would then be more accurate.

kblm “leggings”: The letter RS 94.2284:18 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 34), now yields this new word. Bordreuil and Pardee translate it with “jambière”, taking *kblm* naturally as a dual (*ibid.*, p. 98), presumably on the basis of (peripheral) Akkadian *kaballu* “leg of a boot, stockings” and because *kblm* is mentioned together with other pieces of clothing. The Hebrew and Aramaic cognates, however, mean “fetters (attached to feet)” (Gesenius¹⁸, s.v. *כבל*), which is less appropriate in the context of that letter.

kd “jar”: The reading *kdh* in KTU 1.16:I:54 is not quite certain. E.L. Greenstein, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 33 with n. 125, for example, has [*ksl*]/*h*

l arš tbr “her tendons go lax, she collapses” (literally: “her tendons broke to the ground”; Greenstein translates with a present tense, because he believes that all Ugaritic “imperfects” are essentially but variants expressing a kind of *praesens historicum*: see most recently id., “Forms and Functions of the Finite Verb in Ugaritic Narrative Verse”, in: S.E. Fassberg/A. Hurvitz [eds.], *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting*, Jerusalem 2006, 75–102; this idea will presumably not find many followers, since a more sophisticated discourse-based approach can explain several of the allegedly interchangeable usages).

kl (I) “all”: Note that the context of KTU 1.17:VI:38 is broken, hence []*mt kl amt* does not necessarily mean “the death of all I shall die” (so, too, S.B. Parker, in: id., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 61; M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* [1997], 1275, who supply [*ap*] *mt* in KTU²). An alternative reading and rendering “Like everybody dies ([*k y*] *mt*), I shall die” would in any case avoid the otherwise unparalleled expression “to die the death of someone”. A substantivized feminine form *kl* “fullness, totality” might also be attested, although it is not recognized by the authors (see above s.v. *-hm* and below s.v. *kl* (II)).

kl (II) “equipment”: [*kl*] in KTU 1.17:VI:40 is of course not an attestation in a broken context; it is no attestation at all, since no traces of any letter can be determined.

kl (II) a measure: It might be superfluous to postulate a noun *kl* (II), since its alleged occurrence in KTU 1.14:III:58 and parallel passages can also be explained as a substantivized feminine form of *kl* (I) “all” (cf. M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* [1997], 1221 with n. 53). Curiously enough, the authors do not cite *kl* in KTU 2.70:22 here, even though they understand it in the same way s.v. *-hm* “their” (p. 340, last example cited). However, this interpretation does not seem to be correct, see above, s.v. *-hm*.

k-n “to be”: In the morphological inventory the authors list a “perfect” *kn*, but this form does not feature among the passages cited and is, in all likelihood, not attested at all.

kn ny “Canaanite”: The same toponym is presumably also lying at the heart of the personal name /Kina'nānu/ which occurs in a few syllabic texts (see W.H. van Soldt, *BiOr* 46 [1989], 648).

knkt “sealed (coffin)”(?): The text of the only possible attestation in KTU² (1.19:III:41) reads *knrt*, so this might be a ghost-word. For a brief discussion of various interpretations see M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* (1997), 1298 with n. 316, who leave the meaning open.

k-r-k-r “to twist”: For another possible instance see below, s.v. *nkr*.

ksl 2 “sinew, bowstring”: Presumably, *brq* in KTU 1.17:VI:11 does not refer to the preceding *ksl* “bowstring”, but to the following word which unfortunately is now lost. In accordance with traditional West Semitic imagery, one would expect a word for “arrows” (see the useful comment in M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* [1997], 1272, n. 109).

l (I) “to” etc.: There does not seem to be sufficient evidence for the alleged compound prepositions whose second element is not a noun, treated in subsection (11b). Hence, the *l* in *l k dbḥ* (KTU 1.127:12) and *l b bt* (KTU 4.163:16; 4.137:14) should be explained otherwise, in the first case preferably as the asseverative particle /lū/ “it is exactly like a sacrifice” (A. Gianto, *Or.* 60 [1991], 130; D. Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, Atlanta 2002, 130, translates: “like

the (preceding) sacrifice”), but the text, the so-called “lung model”, remains enigmatic. For *lb* see below, s.v. On the pronunciation as [le] (with a short vowel) cf. *BiOr* 62 (2005), 310.

l-ʿy/w “to conquer”: The alleged second meaning “to dry up” is based on the authors’ interpretation of KTU 1.100:68; for a different proposal, see below, s.v. *nḥl* (I).

lb “heart”: As to *lb* in KTU 2.72:20, the authors assume that the word divider results from a scribal mistake. A compound preposition, according to the vocalization by Bordreuil and Pardee (*Manuel II*, 90), is in fact implausible (see above, s.v. *l* (I)). Yet the word *lb* “heart” would be difficult to fit in syntactically, since the verb *yṯ'bt'* (if the reading is correct) points to a locative expression normally requiring a preposition, and the feminine form suggests that *qrt* in l. 22 acts as the subject. Consequently, the present reviewer, albeit with some hesitation, prefers to interpret *l* as the asseverative particle /lū/ (mentioned as an alternative solution by Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, 91) and would translate: “If the city is really in trouble...”.

lh (II) “message, tablet”: This word is attested only in the form *lḥt*, which the authors, together with various other scholars, parse as a *plurale tantum*. While this fits in with cognate evidence from, e.g., Hebrew, where the singular */lūḥ-/ takes the feminine plural ending, it would also seem possible to posit a feminine singular marking the *nomen unitatis* in order to denote one very specific tablet, hence /lūḥatu/ (in Hebrew, too, the unmarked singular לוח is generic except in the metaphor לוח לב: Cant 8,9 [meaning “boards”, the ancient versions have a plural here]; Isa 30,8; a form with the “feminine ending” is unfortunately not attested¹¹). Since tablets do not naturally constitute a collective entity, this interpretation deserves to be given preference. RS 96.2039:4 now appears to furnish yet another attestation of the objective genitive *lḥt X* “message concerning X”, i.e., *lḥt hn bnšḥ* “a message concerning that servant of yours” (according to the present reviewer, a nominal sentence); for a different, perhaps somewhat less convincing, interpretation see Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, 96: “(Quant à) mon message sur tablette: « Voici, ton serviteur [...] »”.

l-ḥ-m (I) “to eat”: This verb may be taken as affecting only partially an object with the preposition *b* /bi-/ , as in KTU 1.23:6, i.e., “to eat something together with others”; the verbal form *šty* in the parallel verse, if the reading is correct, points to a plural subject and thus supports this idea. True, the evidence for such a usage in Ugaritic seems extremely scanty, as the preposition could just as well have partitive (KTU 1.23:6: “eat food of any kind”) or ablative force (1.4:IV:35: “eat food from the tables”). It is, however, well-attested in Biblical Hebrew, for which cf. M. Malessa, *Untersuchungen zur verbalen Valenz im biblischen Hebräisch*, Assen 2006, 98, with my review in *JTS* 2007, 607-610. See also above s.v. *ʿkl*.

l-ḥ-m (II) “to fight”: When referring to cognate evidence from Moabite, one should note that the same verb there takes neither the G- nor the N-stem, as in Ugaritic and Hebrew, but the Gt-stem (KAI 181:11.15.19.32), which died out in Hebrew at a relatively early stage and has only left faint traces in that language. The personal name ¹DINGIR-*taḥ-mu*,

¹¹) As the distribution of generic and specific noun may differ from language to language, evidence from Hebrew is of course not decisive, but it adds something to the general picture.

read as *il-tah-mu*, may well furnish additional evidence for the Gt-stem of this verb from a second-millennium West Semitic dialect (cf. J. Huehnergard, *JAOS* 107 [1987], 722, but see also below s.v. *thm*), although *il* is not the most likely value of the sign DINGIR in this context. There might be a subtle difference in meaning between G- and N-forms, like transitive “to fight” (German: “bekämpfen”) versus reciprocal “to fight with” (German: “kämpfen mit”).

ll “night”: A sceptic might add that the alleged plural *llm* needs further substantiation, as the only possible attestation (KTU 1.111:2) has also given rise to different explanations. The etymological status of Hebrew לילות remains thus unclear (H. Bauer/P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*, Halle 1922, §63m, consider the feminine plural ending with masculine nouns an analogical formation, but do not assign it to any particular stage within the history of Semitic).

l-q-h “to take”: The tentative translation of *ank hrš lqht w hwt hbt* (KTU 2.70:15) “I, the artisan [sic!], have accepted and completed the assignment(?)” is rather unlikely. First, it presupposes the otherwise unattested meaning “to complete” for the verb *hwy*, which normally means “to repair” (see the note below s.v.); second, it supposes that the likewise unattested *hbt* is a by-form of the expected *hwt* “matter”; third (as Amnon Bruck, personal communication, calls to mind), at least in prose the expected construction for two syndetic transitive verbs taking the same direct object would presumably be either to place the object after the first verb and a suffix after the second, i.e., **lqht hbt w hwth*, or to omit the object after the second verb (cf. KTU 2.72:29–32: *w lqh hw šmn [...] w ysq hw* “he took oil [...] and poured”; *ysq* is a transitive verb, as the examples s.v. demonstrate). Hebrew is very similar in this respect, see P. Joüon/T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, new ed. Rome 2006, §146i. Asyndetic sequences of two transitive verbs like *tsad tkbd hmt* (KTU 1.17:VI:30) or *šlhm ššqy ilm* (1.17:V:19f) which are frequent in poetry, by contrast, do not constitute counter-evidence, since they might be interpreted differently: they are either *Identitätsfälle* affecting essentially the same event (“wine and dine”, that is, food and drink go together; cf. my *Tempus, Aspekt und Modalität im Reichsaramäischen*, Wiesbaden 2004, 132 with n. 46), or the event expressed by the second verb is subordinate to the main action (“she served them, honouring them”, i.e., “she served them with honour”) and would presumably have to be parsed as a “long imperfect” (*ibid.*, pp. 147ff). Hence, the most plausible rendering of KTU 2.70:15 is: “I took the craftsman and rebuilt the house” (cf. Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, 88f).

lth (I) a dry measure: On the uncertain etymology see also the discussion in P.V. Mankowski, *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew*, Winona Lake 2000, 82f. He agrees with Kaufman’s attractive suggestion that this is a non-Semitic culture or substrate word, whose original pronunciation was rendered differently in various Semitic languages. The irregular sound correspondence in any case militates against a “genetic” connection with Akkadian *litiktu* “measuring vessel” and Hebrew לִתֵּךְ; obviously, this cannot be explained away by assuming early spirantization, as some older scholars suggested.

lyt “retinue”(?): The reference to “Hb. *nlwh*” is not quite clear; presumably, the authors mean the root ליה, cf. Gesenius¹⁸ (s.v.), ליה (I).

lzt “scorn”: This noun is only attested in *lztm al tmk* (KTU 1.169:11). The rendering “do not let yourself be cast down by scorn” and its variant “do not flag through difficulty” (s.v. *mkk*) are both syntactically awkward, since they presuppose that *mkk* either acts as a transitive verb (which is not the case, either in the only other Ugaritic occurrence in 1.2:IV:17 or for the Hebrew cognate מוֹד/מִכָּךְ) or that it can be used as a passive form, the agent or cause being expressed without any preposition; *lztm* would then have to be taken as an adverbial accusative. Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, 67, by contrast, translate “à la chaleur ne t’abaisse pas”, referring to a likewise unattested noun *lzt* “heat” from the root *lzy*.¹² But because the root exists in Arabic (*lazaya* “to burn”), their solution in the end seems to need slightly less special pleading.

-m (II): One would appreciate a more systematic functional treatment of the various circumstances under which the so-called “enclitic *m*” occurs, such as causing variation, and thus asymmetry, in poetic parallelism (cf. “Parallelismus und Asymmetrie in ugaritischen Texten”, in: A. Wagner [ed.], *Parallelismus membrorum*, Göttingen 2007, 133–146, here p. 140). In such contexts, the *m* generally seems to be attached to the second element, and it may also have other discourse-based functions. From the new texts it is now clear that the same *-m* can also be attached to independent and suffixed personal pronouns in prose (cf. RS 94.2284:26 and 96.2039:21 = Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, nos. 34 and 33).

miyt “pool”: M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 33 (2001), 193–199, now argue for a meaning “bewässertes Feld” in accordance with Emar-Akkadian /maʔtu/. They view *mhyt* in KTU 1.5:VI:5 as a scribal mistake for *miyt*. This is in fact quite plausible, given the similar shape of {h} and {i}.

m^c (I): Referring to Hebrew מִן- when assuming that this particle means “please” begs the question, since the exact function of the Hebrew word is a matter of some controversy (see Gesenius¹⁸, s.v. מִן-, for further bibliographical information). Thomas Lambdin’s interesting, yet by no means definite, proposal that מִן- really marks a logical connection works out for some of the Ugaritic examples as well.

m^cms “laden with”: Instead of a G-passive participle, as suggested by the authors, this has to be a D-stem participle, but not necessarily a passive one. See also s.v. *ms*.

mdnt “city”(?): Despite its obviousness, this translation is rather unlikely, since in the only attested instance (KTU 1.3:II:16) the word acts as the direct object of the verb *grš* “to drive away” and forms a parallelism with a noun designating persons (*šhm*, meaning unclear). A rendering like “enemies” or that like would thus seem preferable (cf. M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* [1997], 1138 with n. 39 for a balanced and informed discussion of the problem). Moreover, not all scholars agree that the third letter has to be read {n} (Pardee, for example, suggests *mdat*).

m(h) “what”: On another possible instance see above, s.v. *ab* (I).

m-ḡ-y “to arrive”: Some scholars take this root as an allo-graph of *mz*¹² (cf. M.S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle I*, Leiden 1994, 122 with n. 2), which, although less well attested, would actually be the expected realization of this Common Semitic verb in Ugaritic.

¹² Presumably, this would be /luzātu/ rather than /luzatu/, as suggested by Bordreuil and Pardee, since the contraction of the triphthong in **luzayatu/* would lead to a long vowel, cf. the present reviewer’s note in *BiOr* 62 [2005], 311.1.

m-ḥ(-w/y) “to clean”: *ymḥ* in KTU 1.3:II:30 could also be parsed as a third person singular masculine “imperfect” of the N-stem /yimmah/: “(blood) was wiped away”.

mḥ “brain”: The alleged adverbial use “with exuberance” is most uncertain; both passages cited in support of it (KTU 1.17:I:38; 1.19:IV:39) have in fact hitherto resisted explanation.

mḥlpt “plait, ringlet”(?): It should have been indicated that not just the context of KTU 1.107:20 is broken, but also that of 1.19:II:33.

mḥs (II): The translation “machete” is too specific; all we really know is that it is some type of weapon or instrument used for striking.

mlk (I) “king”: On syllabic evidence for this word see now W.H. van Soldt, “The Vocalization of the Word *MLK*, “King”, in Late Bronze Age Syllabic Texts from Syria and Palestine”, in: M.F.J. Baasten/W.Th. van Peursen (eds.), *Hamlet on a Hill*, Louvain 2003, 449–471.

mm (I) “winter”(?): This word is used only to specify a certain type of olive; to the attestations add now also RS 94.2479:19 = Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 32 (who tentatively translate “huile d’olive raffinée”, but there is no indication that *zt* ever means “olive oil”, as opposed to the olive tree or its fruit, in Semitic languages). In two of the three examples, no word divider precedes *mm*, although it is otherwise used consistently both in RS 94.2479 and in KTU 4.786. According to an interesting alternative solution, one might thus rather take *mm* as the masculine plural ending with an “enclitic *m*” (an idea suggested to me by Amnon Bruck in a personal communication). Such a solution could indeed be defended: the plural would be natural, since olives are countable, and the “enclitic” *m* might emphasize the plural marker *-m*, so that the *kd* is shown as full of individual olives (as opposed to the collective use attested, e.g., in Hebrew: Mi 6:15).

mn (I) 1) “what?”: There is no need to assume, on the basis of *mn yrḥ* alone (KTU 1.16:II:19f), a meaning “how many”, since the same expression would lend itself more naturally to a rendering like “which month is it [that KRT became ill]?”, especially since the noun is in the singular (cf., in a different context, A. Gianto, *Or* 67 [1998], 542).

mnk “anything”: RS 94.2406:22 (=Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 31) has a formerly unknown indefinite pronoun, presumably an augmented form of *mn* (I).

mr (IV): The only possible attestation (KTU 1.19:I:12) occurs in a passage that has not yet been sufficiently elucidated. Hence, the whole existence of this word is questionable.

m-t “to die”: *mtt* in KTU 2.38:13 would more naturally appear to mean that the group of boats was completely lost than “has run aground”.

mt (II) “death”: On KTU 1.17.VI:38, see above, s.v. *kl* (I); on 1.100:65 cf. s.v. *ṣ*.

mṭkt “she who takes”: The two attestations of *mṭkt* in KTU 1.15:I:1f do not have to be parsed as feminine singular participles of *mtk*, but could equally well be third person feminine singular “perfects” (note the translation of the same passage s.v. *mzmu*: “she who took”, which is really a conflation of both possibilities) with a “gnomic” function, that is, expressing a statement of fact (cf. my *Tempus, Aspekt und Modalität im Reichsaramäischen*, Wiesbaden 2004, 275f).

mtyn a garment: A reference to Hittite *maššiya* might be misleading, since the Indo-European etymology of this word

is far from clear. Perhaps one should rather consider it a *Kulturwanderwort* (so C. Rabin, *Or* 32 [1963], 129; note that Hebrew and Egyptian also have it).

-n: The comparative references indiscriminately mix up various categories which are historically and functionally quite different: on Hebrew **נ**- see above, s.v. *m*’; a so-called “determinative *-n*” in Akkadian is a misnomer (see above, s.v. *n*), a fact which obviously affects the translations given in subsection (1); the suffixed *-n* in Sabaeen marking definiteness presumably reflects a secondary development and results from a post-positive deictic particle /han/ (see E.A. Knauf, *JSS* 51 [2006], 219) also attested in Ugaritic (cf. above, s.v. *hn*); affixing an /-n/ to pronouns and particles parallels a later, and presumably independent, development in Aramaic (K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer I*, Göttingen 1984, 149). Consequently, the authors’ interpretation of this morpheme is highly confusing. Some by-forms, not all of them necessarily being productive, may simply result from euphonic reasons, like the German “Füll-‘e’”.

n’r (II) a type of flour: RS 94.2479:15 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 32), now yields a new attestation.

n-ḡ-r “to protect, guard”: There seems no need to postulate a special meaning “to pay attention” (subsection 1) based on *w nḡr nm ilm* (KTU 1.4:VIII:14). A translation like “take care/watch out, divine servants” gives better sense, as the passage contains a warning not to approach Mot (cf. M.S. Smith, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 139; M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* [1997], 1172). Moreover, it is easier to connect with the otherwise well-attested usage “to protect (someone)” as well as the connotations of the same root in cognate languages. Since this verb is otherwise transitive and roots *In* omit the /n/ in the attested G-imperatives in Ugaritic (see the valuable observations by D. Sivan, *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*, corrected ed. Leiden 2001, 142; *ng* in KTU 1.14:III:27 and 1.14:VI:15 is an exceptional form, since it derives from the verbal root *ngy* and is thus doubly irregular), parsing *nḡr* as an imperative of the N-stem with reflexive meaning perhaps seems more plausible (C.H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook. Grammar*, revised reprint Rome 1998, §9.34, mentions some possible examples, even though in this case one would normally expect a Gt-form).

nḡt TN: Since a locative nominal clause would require a preposition, *at nḡt* (KTU 2.45:21) is unlikely to mean “you are in *nḡt*”, as the authors suggest. Pardee, review of Tropper, pp. 122f, therefore assumes that *at* is a verbal form from *atw* “to go” and translates “go to *nḡt*”, without the directional *-h* (see also the note on the lemma *ns*).

n-ḥ “to rest”: The translation “and I shall be rested” for *w ap ank nḥt* (KTU 2.11:13f) is unintelligible, especially since future and modal usages of the Ugaritic “perfect” are not yet well established. A resultative meaning is an equally good assumption to make: “and I, too, have come to rest”.

nḥl (I) “torrent”: Presumably, *tlu [...] km nḥl* (KTU 1.100:68) does not mean “dried up [...] like a torrent”, but “dispersed as in a river”. Such an interpretation accounts better for the paronomastic figure *tplḡ km plḡ* in the following line, because the image must refer to the venom losing its power due to being diluted rather than drying up (poison cannot simply “dry up”). For similar constructions without an expected second preposition after *k* see above, s.vv. *amr* and *k* (I).

n-k-r (?): The authors' translation of *ykr ʿr* (KTU 1.100:62) as "into foreign hands fell the city" presupposes that a feminine subject can take an "imperfect" with a /y-/ preformative. This is not the most obvious solution. One might rather think of a masculine form from another root, e.g., *krr* ("he returned to": Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, 40, hitherto unattested in Ugaritic) or *krkr* ("he wriggled to": M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* II/3 [1988], 349), both presumably to be construed with a direct object.

n-k-t "to immolate": Referring to Arabic *nakata* is not entirely convincing, since that word means actually "to scratch the ground" (cf. A. Gianto, *Or* 60 [1991], 129).

n-r "to shine": It is unclear why *nr* in KTU 2.16:9 should be modal ("may [...] shine") instead of past ("shone"), as the authors themselves suggest s.v. *pnm*.

nr 2) "lamp": Another attestation for *šmn nr* "lamp oil" is now to be found in RS 94.2479:17 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, no. 32).

n-s "to flee" and **ns** TN: The passage *mlk syr ns* (KTU 2.40:13–15) is translated in these two completely different ways: "the king of SYR has fled" under the verb, but and "the king has travelled to NS" under the place name (thus also s.v. *syr*). Bordreuil and Pardee suggest that the subject is the Hittite king (*Manuel* II, 88) and thus prefer the second rendering. However, this would presuppose that a place name as such (i.e., without a preposition or the ending *-h*) can act as a directional, a usage well attested only for *bt*. Hence, the translation "the king of SYR has fled" might appear more plausible. But note now, albeit in a broken context and palaeographically not completely certain, *w ugrt ilak* [... "and I will send to Ugarit" (RS 94.2406:23 = Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, no. 31). For another possible case see the note on the lemma *nḡt*. The absence of *-h* is likewise striking in RS 94.2406:9f (*bis*), especially since the preceding place name in l. 8 does have it, and might be due to telegram style.

n-š-h "to be victorious" (?): Since the context of the only possible attestation (KTU 1.19:II:36) is broken, reading and interpretation remain uncertain. Consequently this may well be a ghost-word.

n-š-q "to kiss": The asyndesis *yhbr špḥm yšq* (KTU 1.23:49.55) presumably points to a final clause or, more precisely, a circumstantial clause with final meaning: "he bowed down in order to kiss their lips". Bordreuil and Pardee (*Manuel* II, 33) vocalize *yšq* as a "long imperfect" /yaššuqu/, which suggests that they also adhere to this analysis.

ntb "path": As in Hebrew, the unmarked form *ntb* might be restricted to poetic diction (Job 18:10; 28:7; 41:24; Ps 78:50; 119:35, all of them in metaphors or similes), while *ntbt* seems to act as the more normal word.

n-t-r 1) "to jump": Taking *w tr* (KTU 1.4:V:21; 1.10:II.11.28f) as an infinitive construct (according to the inventory of forms) and translating "and jumped/escaped" leads to insoluble syntactical difficulties. It would be preferable to analyse *tr* as a narrative infinitive absolute from another root (e.g., *twr*). An alternative translation for KTU 1.4:V:21 has been suggested by M.S. Smith, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 130: "and the earth shakes", but Ugaritic poetic diction, it seems, would normally use the root *nṯf* for this meaning (cf. 1.4:VII:35).

pgu: For a survey of various possibilities to explain this still unknown word see now W.G.E. Watson, *SEL* 22 (2005),

9–11, who does not propose a definite answer either.

plg "stream, canal": See above, s.v. *nḥl* (I).

pslt (I) "plait" (?): For other interpretations cf. M. Dietrich/O. Loretz *An Analytic Ugaritic Bibliography* 1972–1988, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1996, 833.

p-t-h "to open": *bḥtm* in KTU 1.4:VII:25, being a kind of "plural of amplification", should be translated "palace", just as that expression is rendered in the parallel citation s.v. *bt* (p. 248, penultimate line).

pwt "madder": The reference to Hittite *puwattiš* is somewhat tricky, since this word only occurs in a vocabulary text (KBo 1.42:IV:46), where it glosses Sumerian ŠE.BE.DA and Akkadian *ši-in-du*. The Akkadian could refer to *šindu* "mark"; the Sumerian word, however, is unknown. J. Tischler, *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*, Innsbruck 1983ff, s.v., 679, connects *puwattiš* with *pūwae-zi* "to crush", which, in turn, has a good Indo-European etymology (cf. Greek *παίω*, Latin *pavire*). So the similarity between the Hittite and the Semitic noun might be due to coincidence. Since the Semitic languages in which the word is attested all belong to the "Central Semitic" group (no matter whether this group constitutes an own branch within the genealogical model or a *Sprachbund*) and first appears in Ugaritic, it seems also possible to think of an Indo-European loan which reached Ugaritic via Hittite and then spread further.

qbr "tomb": The context of KTU 1.16:II:25 is broken, so one cannot know if *qbr* is indeed the direct object of *tsr*.

q-l (II) "to run" (?): *tqln* in KTU 1.16:VI:57 cannot be adduced as a witness for the existence of a root *ql* (II) "to run" as opposed to *ql* (I) "to fall"; translating the passage with "may you fall (at the end of your years)", as most commentators do, seems indeed more natural.

q-m "to stand": Supposedly, some instances of this verb might not reflect the literal meaning, but merely characterize the *Aktionsart* of another full verb in an inchoative sense, i.e., "to begin to do something". The same phenomenon is attested in other Semitic languages (cf. my "Zu den Verlaufsformen für die Gegenwart im Aramäischen", *Or* 75 [2006], 184–188). Agustinus Gianto (personal communication) suggests that *qm* simply marks the potential but not actuated ingressive action included in the semantic range of the verb that follows, rather than acting as a proper modifier.

q-n-n "to ascend": J.N. Ford, to whose article in *UF* 33 (2001) the authors refer, actually proposes a meaning "to twist, coil [sc. one's tail]", information which is not given s.v.

q-r "to hiss": It should have been noted that also the context of KTU 1.17:VI:14 is broken, not just that of the other citation. Hence, the rendering of that passage cannot be more than a guess. Note the different translation of the same expression s.v. *qrn*: "coiled up" (referring to a bow?).

q-r-š D-stem "to model": There is no need to translate this verb in KTU 1.16:V:29 with "to model". The usual meaning "to pinch off" (i.e., clay) gives sufficiently good sense (so, too, E.L. Greenstein, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 38, and M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* III/6 [1997], 1249).

qrt (I) "city": See the note above on the lemma *ʿr* (I). One wonders whether this is a by-form of *qryt* /*qaryat*/ and results from contraction of **/qariyt/*.

qrt (II) "glory, honour" (?): This meaning is unlikely, since words related to the root *wqr* / *yqr* generally show a

reflex of the initial glide. Hence, it seems preferable to translate *qrt l ʿly* (KTU 1.23:3, the only possible instance) with “a city on high” (cf. M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* II/3 [1988], 352; Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, 27).

qš (I) “tankard”: The meaning of this *hapax legomenon* (KTU 1.3:V:33) is primarily derived from the parallel with *ksh* “his cup” in the same couplet. This seems indeed strong evidence. Alternatively, one may think of “gift” (cf. Akkadian *qiāšum*), as preferred by M.S. Smith, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 117 and M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* III/6 (1997), 1149 with n. 120.

qš (II) “harsh”: The expression in KTU 1.16:VI:47 (a *hapax legomenon*) may rather be passive, i.e., “you do not take up the case of the oppressed/wretched one” (cf. E.L. Greenstein, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 41, and M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* III/6 [1997], 1252).

rb (I) “great”: *il rbm* (KTU 1.3:III:39), translated “the great god” by the authors, could also mean “the god of the great ones” (i.e., “the great waters”, see M.S. Smith, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 168, n. 67; differently M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* III/6 [1997], 1142 with n. 69).

rbt (II) “seine, trawl”: There seems to be no decisive evidence for the existence of this word, since in KTU 1.4:II:33 it could simply be a feminine form of the adjective *rb* (I) “great”, hence: “grasp a net (*rtt*) with your hand, a big one with both hands”.

rgm “to say”: For KTU 2.14:12, Pardee provides a different reading: *p rgmt* “so that she might mention” (review of Tropper, p. 262), but it is hard to see traces of the final {t} on the photograph. This problem would in any case have to be addressed in a comprehensive study on the still elusive modal use of the “perfect” in Ugaritic. (See E. Verreet, *Bib* 72 [1991], 296, for yet another interpretation.)

r-h-q D-/C-stem “to remove”: The variation between both derived stems could be explained by a different focus, that is, on the action or on the result respectively. Alternatively, the proper function of either the D- or the C-stem might be a matter of deixis: using this verb in the D-stem would then imply that something is distant both from the speaker’s point of view and that of the real agent, while the C-stem would be associated with the agent’s point of view. At least for the Hebrew cognate *רקח*, which is of course better attested, a distinction along these lines seems to work very well (cf. E. Jenni, *Das hebräische Pi’el*, Zürich 1968, pp. 74f, who works with the categories “absolute” and “relative” distance or proximity).

sin “hem”: For the Akkadian cognate *sūnu* (II), the authors refer to von Soden (“Tuch, Binde”) and CAD (“a piece of clothing or part thereof”). Both authorities consider it to be a Sumerian loan; the Semitic etymology, however, has been defended by W.L. Moran, *RA* 77 (1983), 93f; the meaning “trimming, hem”, though not given in the Akkadian dictionaries, may also be appropriate for some or even all the occurrences of *sūnu* (II) cited there.

s-b-b “to turn”: The variation between G-stem and N-stem in KTU 1.4:VI:34f, both apparently meaning “to turn into”, might be due to asymmetry in poetic parallelism (cf. “Parallelismus und Asymmetrie in ugaritischen Texten”, in: A. Wagner [ed.], *Parallelismus membrorum*, Göttingen 2007, 133–146).

skn (I) “prefect”: On this title see now W.H. van Soldt, *UF* 33 (2001), 579–599 (spelling and prosopography); id., *UF* 34 (2002), 805–828 (functions).

s-y-r “to travel”: See the note above on the lemma *ns*.

šbu (I) “army”: The translation “like soldiers” for *l šbim* (KTU 1.3:II:22) instead of the expected “for the soldiers” sounds odd.

šgr (I) “small”: Sabaeen *šgr* confirms that Ugaritic preserves the original shape of this root, as opposed to the Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic by-form *zʿr*.

š-h 2) “to invite”: It is not exactly clear why the authors translate *šir l šir yšh* (KTU 1.6:II:37) as “flesh to flesh was invited”, using the second meaning of the verb. Something like “cried out” (cf. Gen 4:10), using the first meaning, might seem more apt. Generally, this verb seems to imply that the subject expects a reaction from the call.

šp (III): Del Olmo Lete has now abandoned his interpretation of this word as “white ewe” and returned to the earlier explanation “metal vessel” (*UF* 36 [2004], 604).

šb: The meaning “old man” seems unlikely, since the passage in question (KTU 1.3:II:16) is about driving away enemies in a battle. See M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* III/6 (1997), 1138 with n. 39, for further suggestions. They themselves opt for “Beleidiger”, cognate with Arabic *sabba* “to insult”.

š-b-ʿ (II) “to be satiated”: *šbʿ* in *ʿd šbʿ* (KTU 1.114:3) should be an infinitive (*ʿad šabāʿi/* “to satiety”), but such a form is not listed in the grammatical inventory.

š-k-n Gt-stem “to establish”: Since a locative expression would normally require a preposition, “will he establish himself in the land of (my) rule?” is not the most obvious rendering of *arš drkt yštkn* (KTU 1.4:VII:44), unless *arš* is taken as a kind of adverbial accusative. Rather, the present reviewer would prefer a translation like “will he establish for himself a land to rule?” (see M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* III/6 [1997], 1170).

š-k-r (I) “to hire out”: If *škr* in *škr tškr* (KTU 1.14:II:44f) is not an infinitive, but a participle (as it seems to be in RSOu 14:38), the whole expression would not mean “hires out her services”, but “hires a hireling”. In the light of Biblical Hebrew *שכר*, this would appear to be a more natural way of understanding the passage in question.

š-l-m “to be well”: Some instances of the alleged “perfect” *šlm* may actually be the noun “well-being”, especially in expressions like *mid šlm* or *mm šlm*.

šlm (I) “well-being”: Note that *šlm* in greeting formulae is taken to be a verbal form by Pardee in various publications. In KTU 1.161:31–35 the division of the sentence is not entirely clear. It would seem possible to take the first *šlm* with the preceding sentence, i.e., “a bird of peace (= *šlm* (II) ‘peace offering’). Peace to ‘Ammurapi...’

šlyt “powerful”: The etymology section lacks a reference to Aramaic.

šm (I) “name”: On the supposedly original form of this word in Semitic, which would explain the variation of the vowel in the individual languages, cf. *BiOr* 63 (2006), 400.

š-m-h D-stem “to make happy”: On KTU 2.16:11 see above s.v. *ab*. There is no point in citing Cunchillos’ proposal, since it is based on the erroneous idea that Ugaritic had a preposition *mn*.

šnt (I) “year”: Note that the plural form *šnm* only seems to occur in the divine title *ab šnm* (KTU 1.4:IV:24 and parallel passages). This is the reason why some scholars preferred to associate that word with another root. Theoretically, however, there might have been a similar semantic or register-based distinction as with the two plural forms of *ym* (I) “day”, even though it is now opaque; see the corresponding note below s.v.

š-n-w 1) “to transform”: *šnwt* in KTU 1.96:1 seems unlikely to be a feminine singular participle, since it is part of a series of fientic verbs. More plausibly, then, it has to be parsed as a third person feminine singular “perfect”, i.e., /šanawat/ “it transforms” (cf. E. Verreet, *Bib* 72 [1991], 293; see also above, s.v. *n*).

šr (IV): According to Bordreuil and Pardee (*Manuel* II, 46), this *hapax legomenon* (KTU 1.114:30) means “stalk, stem (of a plant)” instead of “navel”.

š-r-p “to burn”: As in Hebrew, this verb generally seems to go together with *b išt* “with fire”, although such a complement might seem redundant.

ta/unt “whispering, conversation, groaning”: On the variation between *tant* in KTU 1.3:III:24 and *tunt* in 1.1:III:14 (a true by-form or just a different spelling?) see also M.S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* I, Leiden 1994, 160 with n. 80, and Pardee’s review of Tropper, 68 (*ad* §51.45u, where he convincingly disproves Tropper’s bizarre idea, even though the underlying hypothesis of an anaptyctic vowel such as /ta’anatu/ is not free from difficulties either). Are these possibly *ad hoc* instances of {a} and {u} for a syllable-closing glottal stop? As to the meaning, one might rather prefer a rendering like “bond”, “union” etc. (cf. Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, 15: “des rapports”, even though the vocalization, *ibid.*, p. 16, is singular in form).

tar “glory, splendour”(?): The reading of the only possible attestation, viz. *šr tar* “song of glory(?)” (KTU 1.106:16), also adopted by KTU², is controversial; moreover, the translation “glory” results from a comparison with Canaanite *tʾr*, even though that word, too, has given rise to a number of highly divergent interpretations, such as “plan”, “form”, “renown”, “outline”, “dignity”, “design”. For a different proposal see D. Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, Atlanta 2002, 54f with n. 55: *šr pamt* “(a singer shall sing) the song several times”, while others emend the text to <š>*šr pamt* “ten times” (as is normal for *pamt* in directions for ritual performance) by adding a letter at the beginning of the line. Since the {p} has just one horizontal wedge more than the {t} and the alleged {r} in KTU² is not clearly legible, the reading *pamt* seems palaeographically defensible. In addition, it avoids the hypothesis of an otherwise unattested word, whose meaning in cognate languages is likewise difficult to pinpoint, in favour of a perfectly usual one in the given context. So this solution might actually be preferred.

tlt “superior power, magic”: When quoting KTU’s proposal to read {t} *lt* or *qlt* at 1.4:II:4 (*ad loc.*, n. 2), it might help to remember that M. Dietrich and O. Loretz understand this word indeed as a verbal form rather than a noun (see their tentative translation in *TUAT* III/6 [1997], 1153: “die Spindel quirlte”, and cf. *lt b* “she launched herself upon” in KTU 1.82:9f).

tdmm “degrading treatment”: The use of *tdmm* in KTU 1.4:III:20 and *tdmmt* two lines further down can be attributed to variation in parallel expressions (others might prefer

to change *tdmm* into *tdmm<t>*, but this is wholly unnecessary, since similar cases recur elsewhere: cf. *tmn* in KTU 1.2:IV:18 with *tmnt* in 1.169:6, both meaning “form, body”). Perhaps the /-t-/ ending marks a kind of *nomen unitatis*, i.e., “an instance of degrading treatment” vs. “degrading behaviour”.

tg (?): See above, s.v. *ghf*.

thm “message, decree”: This lemma contains various obsolete proposals in the etymology section. Several of them go back to a publication by Virolleaud in 1931 and are now evidently untenable, even though the origin of Ugaritic *thm* still remains obscure. First of all, the reference to an alleged attestation *taḥūmu* in Amarna Akkadian, but without any details, is misleading, since no such equivalent of Ugaritic *thm* seems to be attested in that corpus. Akkadian *taḥūmu* normally means “border, boundary”, and exactly the same goes for *thwm* in Palmyrene Aramaic (as, e.g., ll. 111, 119 and 145 in the tax tariff [D.R. Hillers/E. Cussini, *Palmyrene Aramaic Texts*, Baltimore 1996, no. 0259 II] and its Greek parallel passages clearly demonstrate) and indeed other varieties of Aramaic (see DNWSI, s.v., 1208f). The technical use “precept, regulation” for its Syriac cognate (cf. C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*, Halle²1928, s.v.) can easily derive from the more basic meaning “border” than from a homonym related to Ugaritic *thm* “message”. A modern dictionary should not include such suggestions anymore. The element /taḥmu/ in personal names written in syllabic script is cited in the introductory paragraph to this lemma. Also D. Sivan, *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th–13th C. B.C. from Canaan and Syria*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984, 278 (but cf. *ibid.*, p. 241, for a different interpretation and the note above on *lhm* (II)) and Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, *passim*, seem to base themselves on this evidence. However, /taḥmu/ in personal names might be an entirely different word. According to many scholars, it renders the Egyptian divine name Ptah, cf. R.S. Harris, *Amarna Personal Names*, Winona Lake 1993, nos. 165f (pp. 155f). It does not therefore prove that the vocalization of *thm* “message” must be /taḥm-/.

tm “complete, full”: *tmt* in *šb’ šnt tmt* (KTU 1.23:66f) might be a 3fs “perfect” from *tmm* rather than a feminine plural adjective, i.e., “seven years (lit.: a heptad of years) have been completed” (so, too, Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, 34). This corresponds to the normal construction of the cardinal numbers from “three” to “ten”, i.e., the number is followed by the entity to which it refers in chiasmic gender concord. In terms of verbal agreement, the feminine singular meets the grammatical expectations as well (as in Arabic *maḍat ’arba’un* “four [nights] passed”).

t-r (?): See above, s.v. *ntr*.

tr (I) “pole, log”: Some scholars take *trm* in KTU 4.158:7 to be a form of *tr* (II) “turtledove”, cf. Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, 111: “trois cents tourterelles pour dix (sicles la pièce)”.

trbš “yard” > “reserve”: In the light of Akkadian and the syllabic attestation in PRU 3 91f.:17, the meaning is more likely to be “stable” or “sheepfold”.

Many entries for words beginning with /t/ have “Aram.” in the etymology section where “Arab.” would be expected (*tmt*, l. 1; *trd*, l. 1; *tbh*, l. 3; *thr*, l. 2; *thl*, l. 2; *thn*, l. 2; *t-h*, l. 1; *tmt*, l. 1; *trd*, l. 1; *try*, l. 1; *tt*, l. 1). It seems that an original abbreviation “Ar.” has been expanded incorrectly.

t̄ TN: Another attestation of *th* occurs in RS 94.2406:14 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 31). However, Bordreuil and Pardee in their preliminary edition do not parse it as a toponym with an adverbial ending *-h*, but consider the word a biconsonantal noun with the meaning “disaster”. This meaning goes back to Gordon’s glossary (no. 2660) and is derived exclusively from the context. Unfortunately, RS 94.2406 has suffered some damage and the other two instances, both in 2.33, are ambivalent.

t̄ (I) “offering”: Perhaps this is a particular type of offering, to be distinguished from *dbh* /dabḥu/, even though del Olmo Lete explicitly treats both words as synonyms elsewhere (*UF* 36 [2004], 548–551, esp. 550). The same would then apply to the verb *t̄y*. However, nothing certain can be said about this matter.

t̄y (I) “minister, officiant”: The various attestations of *w t̄y* in KTU 1.161:27ff might be better understood as verbal forms, for example masculine plural imperatives (“and offer!”). This would surely give better sense than the enigmatic translation suggested by the authors (“and one / another / another the offerer”).

t̄br “opening”: It should be noted that the context of the only possible attestation *t̄br aphn* (KTU 1.2:I:13) is damaged. So the proposed translation “their nasal fossae” cannot be more than an inspired guess. If one decides to interpret the word in question as a verbal form (e.g., “their nose breaks”, cf. M.S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle I*, Leiden 1994, 265.284; similarly M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* [1997], 1119: “gebrochen(?) ihre Nasen”), the alleged noun *t̄br* does not even exist, while the by-form *t̄brn* certainly does.

th “disaster”(?): See above, s.v. *t̄*.

t̄-k-l “to lose, be deprived of children”: In the only attestation of this verb (KTU 1.100:61), the authors take *bnwth* as the subject of *tkl* (“his offspring was deprived of sons”). Given the larger context, however, the subject is more likely to be the female protagonist, i.e., the Mare mentioned in the beginning of the text (l. 1). She is the one who appeals to each god one by one for help until she reaches Horan, and it seems thus likely that the section beginning with l. 61 corresponds to the preceding “refrains” (cf. A. Gianto, *Or* 60 [1991], 128; D. Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, Atlanta 2002, 178). In that case *w tkl bnwth* would mean: “for she was about to be bereaved of her offspring” (with a rare causal /*wa-*/, see below), the verbal form being a “long imperfect” for the immediate future and *bnwth* indicating a direct object.

t̄lhn “table”: Can this noun really be used as the subject of a supposedly transitive verb? The authors translate *lphn ybky t̄lhn mlk* as “may the royal table weep in front of him!” (KTU 1.161:15). It would be easier to make the king’s table the object of the lament, and to interpret *ybky* either as an internal passive (the subjunctive in a main clause indicating a volitive meaning) or as an active form with an impersonal subject. In the latter case a subjunctive singular /*yabkiya*/ might be more likely than the jussive plural /*yabkiyū*/ due to the third person singular suffix in l. 16 “his tears”. It does not seem syntactically impossible for this to be the impersonal subject of *ybky*, even though del Olmo Lete elsewhere thinks it unlikely (*UF* 36 [2004], 633). A more reasonable rendering of the passage would then be: “before him, may one weep for the king’s table, so that one can swallow one’s tears”.

t̄lt (V) “copper, bronze”: Assuming another meaning “bolt” for the usage at KTU 1.100:71 appears less attractive;

surely this is a kind of *abstractum pro concreto*, i.e., “bronze latches”, cf. B.A. Levine/J.-M. de Tarragon, *RB* 95 (1988), 488.499, and D. Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques*, Paris 1988, 221.

tn (II) 3) “vizier”: One might add KTU 1.23:7 as another example of this meaning.

tp̄t (II) “judge”: Especially as a divine title, the noun seems rather to be related to the other common meaning of the verbal root **tp̄t* and its reflexes in Canaanite, that is, “to rule” (cf. H. Niehr, *Herrschen und Richten*, Würzburg 1986, *passim*); Pardee’s reading [*b tp̄t*]*t nhr* “the ruler Nah(a)ru” of KTU 1.2:IV:4 instead of KTU’s *jm* (cf. now Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, 9) could yield another attestation, but the context is too broken to include it with certainty. The same interpretation would then also apply to the by-form (*il*) *tp̄z* in KTU 1.108:3 (“the god who rules in...” rather than “who judges”).

t̄-r-m “to cut” > “to eat”: For further information on the etymology and semantic development of this word see M.S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle I*, Leiden 1994, 266, n. 85 (a passage cited in DUL, s.v. *trmn* (I)).

trrt “powerful”: Astour preferred to translate this epithet of cities as “well-watered” (so, too, Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, 40: “la bien arrosée”), based on Arabic *tarrun* (H. Wehr, *Arabisches Wörterbuch*, Wiesbaden 1985, s.v.: “wasserreich”), which elicits parallels in Early and Hellenistic Greek poetry if he is to be followed. Note that the Ugaritic attestations are also confined to poetic texts so far.

tyndr TN: On this much-disputed sequence of letters, see also the summary in D.M. Clemens, *Sources for Ugaritic Ritual and Sacrifice*, Münster 2001, 187–196, who agrees that a geographical name is the most likely option.

w (conjunction): The attempt to break down the manifold usages of this conjunction according to syntactic functions deserves praise, but needs some fine-tuning. Without doubt, *r̄gm l mlk šmy w lh y’lm* (KTU 2.14:14, following the reading of KTU¹; the second edition has *w l iytlm*) is not a perfect example of a “causal” /*wa-*/ in subsection (c5), since, aside from the difficulties of epigraphy, the conjunction here rather seems to introduce a final clause. So the present reviewer would translate: “mention my name to the king, so that it will be known to him”, analysing the passage in question as /*wa-li-hu yu’lam*/; the authors’ rendering “because (if not) it will go unnoticed by him” is based on a different understanding of the verb *lm* (see above). Consequently, this passage should be cited in subsection (c3), together with other instances of the “final” /*wa-*/ . A more suitable example of the quite infrequent causal /*wa-*/, by contrast, might be *w tkl bnwth* “for she was to be bereaved of her offspring” (KTU 1.100:61; see above, s.v. *tkl*). Further, /*wa-*/ can follow a nominal phrase fronted for topicalization purposes (as in KTU 1.17:V:9 and other examples, subsumed under the “explanatory” use in subsection (b) by the authors). The “adversative” or “disjunctive” use of the same conjunction (see the Hebrew parallels mentioned in P. Joüon/T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, new ed. Rome 2006, §172) should really have received an entry of its own, of which a good example is *w mkm likt* “but to you I have sent (as opposed to my sending to the king)” from RS 96.2039:21 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel*, no. 33, with a slightly different interpretation of the context). This case also conforms to the principle well-attested in Hebrew (on which see A. Gianto,

Bib 72 [1991], 575) that in clauses introduced by an adverbative *waw* the verb takes a non-initial position. Instances of /*wa-*/ linking two instances of the same word, presumably meaning “the one X and the other”, also need a separate section. An example could be the prostration formula *šb'd w šb'id mrḥqtm qlt* “seven and seven times from afar I fell” = “I fell seven times to the one side and seven times to the other” (KTU 2.12:10 and parallel passages, cf. the occasional addition of *ù kabattumma ù šerumma* “on the belly as well as on the back” or similar expressions in the Amarna letters: A.F. Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets III*, Leiden 1996, 5). The same idea may perhaps be expressed asyndetically, as in *bdh... bdh* “in the one hand... in the other” (KTU 1.23:8f). The two instances in KTU 1.23:56 can perhaps better be subsumed under the “emphatic” /*wa-*/ than under the “temporal” one: “upon kissing: yes, pregnancy!” etc.

w-ḥ-y “to hasten”: Instead of a Gt-stem “imperfect” from an alleged root *why*, others might parse *twḥ* “let hasten” (KTU 1.3:III:20 and parallel passages) as a D-stem “imperfect” from a root *yth* < **wth* “to press” (so, e.g., Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, 18). However, *yth* is not attested elsewhere in Ugaritic.

w-p-t “to spit”: This conventional translation derives from Arabic *naḥāṭa*. Apart from this there is the possibility of some albeit very weak support from Akkadian *wapāšu*, which according to AHw is attested only once in the G-stem (and even then the verb is written incorrectly), and otherwise in the D-stem, but only as a lexical item. Even then, von Soden’s translation of the verb, “beschimpfen”, is much more neutral than “to spit”, and his reference to Ugaritic *wpt* is marked as hesitant.

y-b-l “to carry, bring, take”: Interestingly, the pronominal suffix with this verb consistently expresses the indirect object, just like the suffix attached to its direct object (e.g., *bšrtk* “your news”, that is, “the news [that I hereby bring] to you”: KTU 1.4:V:27; the first person singular “perfect” presumably is a performative). There is one attestation where the suffix is used for the direct object (*yblnh* “he made it disappear”, KTU 1.100:67), but then the verb is in the “energetic” conjugation (*yabilanna-hu*).

y-b-m “to proclaim oneself a nubile widow”: Given the broken context, the interpretation of *tštbm* in KTU 1.6:I:30 as a reflexive to the causative stem derived from a hypothetical root *ybm* (itself being a denominative verb based on *ybmt* “widow”; so, too, M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* [1997], 1186) seems rather speculative. For a different analysis see M.S. Smith, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 152 (*tšt bm* “she drinks [...]”).

yd (I) “hand” etc.: The hypothesis that *yd* meaning “power” can be masculine (contrary to the common principle that paired body parts are feminine in Semitic languages throughout) rests on two uncertain interpretations: first, the view that *z* in KTU 2.10:13 is an adjective “strong” and refers to *yd* in l. 11 of the same text. This, however, is not the only possible analysis of the expression in question: besides Pardee, see also J.–L. Cunchillos’ somewhat imprecise rendering in: *Textes Ougaritiques II*, 279 with n. 15: “Le pouvoir des dieux (sera/est) plus grand que la force des guerriers” (quoted s.v. *k* (I) “like”, but omitted here); E. Verreet, *Bib* 72 (1991), 295f, likewise thinks of a nominal phrase: “Und die Hand der Götter (ist) hier, da Môt sehr stark ist”.

Second, the opinion that *yd* in KTU 1.103:46 is the subject of the masculine verb *ydl* (i.e., “the power of the *ḥurādu*-troops will humiliate him [sc. the king]”), but the context is broken and it could be the object just as well (that is, “the king will lay low the power of the *ḥurādu*-troops”, cf. D. Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, Atlanta 2002, 140). Presumably, the use of this word for male private parts (subsection 3, the only example being KTU 1.23:33f) has been influenced by *yd* (II) “love” (< **wdd*), if the latter indeed constitutes a word of its own rather than pointing to a coalescence of two different sememes and, consequently, a lexical merger. See on this problem M.S. Smith, *Untold Stories*, Peabody 2001, 217.

y-d- “to know”: Strangely enough, the verbal form *td'* in *d l td'* (KTU 1.3:III:26f, *bis*) lacks the /*n*/ of the third person masculine plural ending, even though it can hardly be narrative past or jussive. One could therefore suggest that it is a “subjunctive” within a relative clause. Alternatively (Agustino Gianto, personal communication), it may be one of the rather infrequent and still little-known usages of the “short imperfect” for expressing epistemic modality (see A. Gianto, *IOS* 18 [1998], 194, for some Hebrew examples). This form is morphologically not to be distinguished from the “subjunctive” in the plural, but the negation /*lā*/ instead of /*al*/ makes clear that it is not a command, i.e., not deontic modality, which would be the more normal function of the non-past “short imperfect”. What can be said is that the use of one of the “imperfect” conjugations seems to be related to the modal nuance “cannot understand”, whereas a non-modal “do not understand” would normally take the “perfect” (cf. Job 38,4–5, which exhibits a similar contrast).

y-d-n “to spur on”: This alleged verbal root is entirely based on conjecture and may turn out to be a ghost-word.

ydt (II) “commodity”: The same usage as in KTU 4.158:9, the only passage cited, now also seems to recur in the new text RS 94.2600:8 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 48): *ḥmš ydt ušqm*. Unfortunately, it does not add anything to the still unknown meaning. Bordreuil and Pardee (p. 165) suggest to parse *ydt* as a plural form and subsume it to *yd* /*yad-*/ “hand”, proposing a meaning “handful”, but this would leave it having an opaque relationship with *ḥpn* in the same text (l. 12), also translated “handful” by the editors (see also above, s.v. *ḥpn*).

y-d-y “to throw, eject, expel”: The spelling *ydy* in KTU 1.100:64 points to a “long imperfect” /*yadiyu-*/ (so, too, A. Gianto, *Or* 60 [1991], 129) and thus, possibly, to a purpose clause (“[he headed to Araššihu] in order to cast off a tamarisk”) instead of a main clause with past time reference according to the authors’ translation (“he pulled up”). Alternatively, one could of course think of a kind of historial present, for which the “long imperfect” is particularly suited in Semitic languages that do not use the participle as a normal present tense form (cf. my “Erscheinungsformen des historischen Präsens im Aramäischen”, *Or* 74 [2005], 399–408). Further, there is no need to postulate a second meaning “to pull up” as opposed to the more widespread “to cast off” on the basis of this passage.

y-g-y (?): See above, s.v. *gḥt*.

yhl (?): For a discussion on this alleged root, see above, s.v. *dhl*. A cross-reference might be added in order to help those who use Pardee’s reading of KTU 2.16.

yḥmr “roe-buck”: This word is attested only on the basis of Ginsberg’s reconstruction of 1.6:I:18. Even though it fits

the context and the *realienkundlicher Befund* very well, others read *hmrm* “asses”. Cf. M.S. Smith, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 174, n. 179.

yhr “(poisonous) lizard”: This word is omitted, although many scholars assume that *yhr* in KTU 1.100:73 is a noun referring to some kind of snake (cf. M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT* II/3 [1988], 350; Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, 40). It should be added as a new item.

ym (I) “day”: The difference between the two plural forms *ymm* and *ynt* is remarkable. Could *ynt* possibly refer to an unlimited period of time, as KTU 1.108:26 suggests: “for the days of Sun and Moon”, i.e., forever, an idea reinforced by the expression “the years of El” in the parallel verse (counting one’s years with a god is a metaphor for eternal life: see KTU 1.17:VI:27–29, where the same image serves as an amplification of *bl mt* “immortality”). Unfortunately, the context is sufficiently clear only here. The other plural form, *ymm*, would then indicate a specific or measurable period of time, a little similar to German “Worte” (that is, statements) and “Wörter” (individual words). In Phoenician the plural form in /-t/ seems to be an archaic by-form, since it is characteristic of the Old Byblian dialect, as opposed to Standard Phoenician (see J. Friedrich/W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik*, Rome³ 1999, §240.14). In Hebrew it occurs in the archaic style (Deut 32,7) or in archaizing poetry (Ps 90,15). The original semantic difference has been lost in these languages.

ym (II) “sea”: Even though the root and form of the verb in *tmt mdh b ym* (KTU 1.4:II:6) remains controversial, a translation “next to the sea” for *b ym* does not ring true. The meaning “next to” for the preposition *b* is badly attested (see above, s.v.), since the two possible examples cited s.v. (1c: “situation of proximity”, p. 200) can both be explained otherwise, and more satisfactorily so.

yn “wine”: The etymology section of this lemma suggests, like several other Semitic dictionaries, a direct connection of **yayn-*/ (> */yên-* in Ugaritic) with the Indo-European word for “wine”, as several scholars of Indo-European have assumed in the past. However, it might be more plausible to view it as a *Kulturwanderwort* which has neither a Semitic nor an Indo-European origin, cf. P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, new ed. Paris 1999, s.v. οἶνος, p. 785. But cf. Beekes, *MSS* 48 (1987), 21–26, for an IE etymology of “wine”. Another possible instance may be *hyn* in RS 94.2284:29, see above, s.v. *hwy* (I).

y-p-q “to obtain”: Both instances of *ypq* are apparently parsed as third person masculine singular “perfect” forms, as the morphological inventory demonstrates. While possible in theory, this seems counter-intuitive when taking the actual context of these passages into consideration. For the future statement in KTU 1.103:13.29 a “long imperfect” would be the normal case, while in narrative poetry as in 1.14:I:12 a “short imperfect” meets the grammatical expectations. So both forms should be interpreted as third person masculine singular “imperfects”.

y-q-ğ “to be alert”: If *tağ* in *tağ udn* (KTU 1.16:VI:42) really is a G-stem verb, as the authors suggest, *udn* presumably has to be an adverbial complement, since the Hebrew and Arabic cognates are both intransitive, that is, “be alert as to hearing”. The meaning “your ear” would normally, though in Ugaritic by no means exclusively, presuppose a personal suffix and supposedly also a dual form. Moreover, the possibility of a Gt-stem at least deserves consideration (as Agustinus Gianto points out to me). See also above s.v. *udn* (I).

yqš (II) “game”: As the context of the only possible attestation is broken, one cannot be sure that this word really exists.

yrdt “step, stair”: D. Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, Atlanta 2002, 69 seems to parse *yrdt* in the only possible attestation (KTU 1.39:20) as a verbal form “Then you will descend”. Since this would leave the spelling unexplained (the /d/ in **yarádta/* would assimilate to the /t/ of the afformative > */yarátta/*, written {yrt}, cf. *ylt* /yalattā/ < **yaladtā/* “the two of them have given birth” in KTU 1.23:52.60), DUL may indeed be correct in assuming a substantive. However, unassimilated spellings do occur from time to time, see below, s.v. *ytn*.

yrgt “back part” etc.: The subject of *yrg t’l b ġr* (KTU 1.10:III:27) is presumably Anat, hence “she went up the mountain’s flank” instead of the authors’ “the slope went up the mountain”, since *yrg* elsewhere is construed as a masculine noun (KTU 1.143:3, where the “imperfect” duly has a /y/-preformative).

y-r-t “to possess, inherit”: The use of the Gt-stem of this verb in KTU 1.3:III:47 may result simply from an assimilation to the stem of the preceding form (*imthš*); for another possible example see above s.v. *grš*. Unfortunately, such assimilatory phenomena in syntactical constructions are not yet well known with respect to Semitic languages (but see W.L. Moran, “New Evidence on Canaanite *taqtulū(na)*”, *JCS* 5 [1951], 33–35, on “the rule of modal congruence” between main clause and purpose clause in Amarna Canaanite). It seems therefore hardly necessary to assume a difference in meaning as opposed to the G-stem (“to take possession of” as opposed to “to possess”), especially since the latter is attested in very similar contexts (cf. KTU 1.2:I:19.35).

ysm (II) “elegance”: There is no need to postulate a proper substantive on the basis of KTU 1.10:II:30, since *ysmm* there could just be an adjective plural “the handsome ones”.

y-s-q “to pour”: The authors do not list a “perfect” form, but *ysq* in KTU 2.72:31 can hardly be anything other due to the preceding *lqh*. Hence, the translation would have to be: “(he took oil...) and poured (it)” instead of “will pour”.

y-t-n “to give”: In the inventory of forms, *tn* in KTU 1.4:V:8 is tentatively classified as an infinitive, while the translation of the same passage further down (“and may he emit”: p. 992) points to a modal use of that infinitive. The context would suggest a verbal substantive. A question mark after forms normally understood as C-stem verbs from this root (“to dispatch”) indicates that the authors, like other previous scholars (cf. E. Verreet, *Bib* 72 [1991], 297), are still a little reluctant about this analysis. Since, however, the first person singular *šmt* “I dispatched” (now clearly attested in the new letter RS 94.2479:21 = Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel* II, no. 32) exhibits the same irregular, i.e., unassimilated, spelling as the corresponding G-stem “perfect” *ynt* (on which cf. Pardee, review of Tropper, p. 232), such a connection seems indeed likely. Note that unassimilated spellings of /n/ also occur in syllabic texts, cf. *ša-an-tu₄* (W.H. van Soldt, *BiOr* 46 [1989], 650). Up to now, it cannot be determined whether this is a purely orthographic phenomenon (that is, historical spelling) or evidence for an actual pronunciation. Note that the way KTU 2.36:6 is quoted obscures the palaeographic difficulties (likewise s.v. *špš*, subsection 2b); a more cautious transliteration would be: hl’n’ [...] [h]ryš argmny[‘m] špš štn[t...] (cf. the edition of the text by D. Pardee, *AfO* 29–30 [1983–1984], 121–129).

z-b-r “to prune”: The verbal form *yzbrnn* in KTU 1.23:9 presumably conveys modality rather than past tense, thus: “may the pruners prune him”.

zrm “motionless”: The reference to Hebrew זרם would suggest a meaning like “flow” (an imperative masculine singular, parallel to *rd* “descend!” [text: *wd*] in the preceding stichos, if this conjecture is correct?) for the *hapax legomenon* *zrm* in KTU 1.169:14.

znt “sustenance”: The new letters RS 94.2479:20 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 32), and RS 94.2284:29 (= Bordreuil/Pardee, *Manuel II*, no. 34) now furnish two clear attestations in an undamaged context. Both have *d znt* “belonging to the sustenance”, following a reference to, as it seems, one or more goods.

zt “olive”: The expression *k hrr zt* (KTU 1.5:II:5) proves less straightforward than the accompanying translation (“when the olive tree shrivels”, taking *hrr* to be a verb) implies. Alternatively, one might think of “like a dried olive” (M.S. Smith, in: S.B. Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, Atlanta 1997, 143; M. Dietrich/O. Loretz, *TUAT III/6* [1997], 1176: “wie eine feuergetrocknete Olive”, although *hrr* is not attested as an adjective) or perhaps of “because he was scorching the olive” (J.C. de Moor, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit*, Leiden 1987, 72). On the alleged “types” of olives (subsection 1c) see above, s.v. *mm*.

złmt “darkness”: For *bn złmt* (KTU 1.4:VII:54–56), the authors give the non-mainstream translation “in darkness”, even though many other commentators parse *bn* as “sons”. The enigmatic context renders a clear-cut decision impossible.

In addition to these matters of reading and interpretation, there are many minor slips. The fact that they still remain in the work may be due to the rapid production of a second edition. However, the manuscript definitely needs careful proof-reading. Since especially those errors affecting the citations are not always obvious, a list of those noted by the reviewer will be given here, so that they can be easily eliminated in any future work:

- p. x, l. 4: insert a space between “is” and “as”.
- p. xxxviii: add the abbreviation “RANL — Rendiconti dell’Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rome”.
- p. 15, l. 3: instead of “A0rab.” read “Arab.”.
- p. 80, l. 7 from below: the last “a” of the line should be in italics, if one indeed wants to keep that reference.
- p. 140, penultimate par., l. 8: instead of “superior” read “inferior”.
- p. 167, penultimate line, instead of “zl” read “zł”.
- p. 180, l. 21: after “during” insert a space.
- p. 186, l. 9 from below: instead of “*ibid.* ln. 65” read: “1.100:65”.
- p. 201, l. 10: instead of “ou” presumably read: “nor”.
- p. 201, l. 16: instead of “amon gthem” read: “among them”.
- p. 215, l. 3 from below: instead of “ofthe” read “of the”.
- p. 226, l. 19: instead of “*bny*” presumably read “*bn*”, since *bny* is the oblique form.
- p. 226, l. 16 from below: instead “fmily” read “family”.
- p. 238, l. 4: instead of “*shu*” read “*shu*”.
- p. 238, l. 21: instead of “relis+h” read “relish”.
- p. 242, l. 5: add a second slash before “(II)”.
- p. 247, l. 2: delete the space before the closing bracket before “the”.
- p. 255, l. 1: instead of “*gnpm*” read “*gnm*”.
- p. 263, l. 1: instead of “myrrh” read “myrrh”.
- p. 275, l. 7: instead of “NT” read “TN”.

- p. 286, l. 3: instead of “(which yearns for)” presumably read “(for which yearns)”.
- p. 319, l. 1: (at least) the first line of the lemma *ğll* dropped out.
- p. 319, l. 10 from below: delete “*gm l ğlmh k [tšhw]*”.
- p. 321, ll. 5f: instead of “*bn ğłmt [...]* (*// b ğłmt*)” read: “*b<n> ğłmt [...]* (*// bn złmt*)”.
- p. 349, penultimate line: instead of “*hwt*” read “*hwt*”.
- p. 350, l. 22: instead of “*tr*” presumably read “*dr*”, at least according to the text in KTU².
- p. 360, l. 12 from below: instead of “(I)” read “(II)”.
- p. 397, l. 21: instead of “elliptical” read “elliptical”.
- p. 397, last line: insert a space after “55”.
- p. 404, l. 16: instead of “*nt*” (as would indeed be expected) read “*tn*”.
- p. 412, l. 8 from below: instead of “Loretz” read: “Loretz”.
- p. 420, l. 15: instead of “he” read “the”.
- p. 469, l. 6 from below: “*nšb*” should be “*nšb*”.
- p. 502, l. 9 from below: instead of “artesan” read “artisan”.
- p. 519, l. 16: instead of “*št*” read “*tšt*”.
- p. 541, l. 3: delete the space before “19”.
- p. 550, l. 8 from below: instead of “Soldt” read “Soldt”.
- p. 586, l. 8 from below: insert a space before “and”.
- p. 603, l. 23: insert a space between “may” and “the”.
- p. 612, l. 11: instead of “14 III 14” read “1.14 III 14”.
- p. 628, l. 11 from below: insert a space between “DN” and “reached”.
- p. 638, l. 12: insert a space after “sifter”.
- p. 641, l. 7: instead of “el dios” read “the god”.
- p. 650, l. 7: delete the space after “1.”.
- p. 652, l. 14 from below: delete the space after “1.”.
- p. 654, l. 11: instead of “thousnd” read “thousand”.
- p. 659, l. 6: instead of “1.223:20” read “1.23:20”.
- p. 660, l. 15 from below: instead of “courtesu” read “courtesy”.
- p. 668, l. 6 from below: insert a space after “embers,”.
- p. 679, l. 3: insert a space after “the”.
- p. 699, l. 15: instead of “ql (II)” read presumably “ql (I)”.
- p. 700, l. 13 from below: the quotation is garbled and obscures various palaeographic difficulties; according to KTU², the text reads: *arb’ qšt w ‘ar[b’] [u]lpt ql’ w tt mr[h]m*.
- p. 717, l. 14 from below: instead of “*qašwat*” read “*qaswat*”.
- p. 717, l. 11 from below: instead of “*klnyy nbln*” read “*klnyy qšh nbln*”.
- p. 726, l. 6 from below: instead of “Waetzold” read “Waetzoldt”.
- p. 732: at least one line between the bottom of p. 732 and the top of p. 733 seems to be missing.
- p. 764, l. 7 from below: insert a space after “and”.
- p. 798, l. 5 from below: instead of “1.19 II 1” read “1.19 II 2”.
- p. 819, l. 9 from below: insert “*šlmm*” after “*šin*”.
- p. 844, l. 7: insert a space after “(is)”.
- p. 855, s.v. *talunt*: delete the quotation mark before “groaning”.
- p. 857: last line repeated on the next page.
- p. 882, s.v. *tšlm*, l. 1: instead of “Ahw” read: “AHw”, likewise p. 85, l. 13; p. 305, l. 25; p. 885, s.v. *tznt*, l. 1; p. 888, s.v. *thn*, l. 1; p. 949, last line.
- p. 887, ll. 9 and 10 from below: read both times “*tbq*” instead of “*tbq*”.
- p. 894, s.v. *t’y*, l. 2: delete the box after “538.”; *ibid.*, Nr. 1., l. 3: instead of “*t’y*” read “*t’y*”.
- p. 921, s.v. *tn* (II): instead of “vizir” read “vizir” (*ter*)
- p. 930, s.v. *tr*, subsection (1), l. 3: instead of “fel” read “fell”.
- p. 930, penultimate line: instead of “Tou” read “TOu”.
- p. 931, header: read “/” instead of “)”.
- p. 940, l. 4 from below: the quotation and translation of KTU 2.13:16f are slightly inaccurate; read according to KTU²: *w rgmy l lq<h>t* “and indeed (*//l*) she accepted my words” (DUL has “he”).
- p. 947, l. 6 from below: instead of “1.5 II 18” read “1.5 VI 18”
- p. 949, par. 2, l. 8: instead of “new” read “news”.
- p. 957, l. 15 from below: instead of “PRU 3 203 [...] IV 49” read: “PRU 3 203 [...] IV 9”.

- p. 984, s.v. *ysm* (II), l. 1: the second slash should be roman rather than italics.
 p. 990, penultimate par., l. 6 from below: instead of “prefc.” read “suffc.”.
 p. 992, l. 8 from below: delete one of the two “has been”.
 p. 995, l. 22: instead of “*y**t**b*” read “*y**t**b*”.
 p. 996, l. 7: correct the reference to “4.149:12” (instead of “1.149:12”).

A few names of modern scholars are consistently misspelled: Except at the beginning of a sentence, it must in any case be “von Soden” (instead of “Von”), and “Grøndahl” should be “Gröndahl”.

Diverging opinions on individual points are of course unavoidable and only demonstrate how thought-provoking daily use and attentive reading of this reference work proves to be. The authors have done an enormous service to the field by providing an indispensable tool which takes the study of Ugaritic several steps ahead and at the same time makes the current state of the art better accessible to a non-specialist public. Besides further work on the interpretation of the texts themselves, a dictionary of the next generation would profit from a sharper focus on etymology and comparative matters, as well as a more rigorous use of linguistic insights. For the time being, however, del Olmo Lete’s and Sanmartín’s *opus magnum* will do a splendid job. Some pruning could still greatly improve its value.

Appendix: Grammatical topics treated

In the notes a number of grammatical topics are discussed, which are listed here to facilitate easier reference:

- adversative conjunction: s.v. *w*
- affectedness: s.vv. *kl*; *lhm*
- *Aktionsart*: s.vv. *hd*; *qm*
- asymmetry: s.vv. *-m* (II); *sbh*
- asyndesis: s.vv. *tq*; *lqh*; *nšq*;
- causal conjunction: s.v. *w*
- circumstantial clause: s.v. *kbd*;
- compound prepositions: s.vv. *k* (I); *l* (I); *lh*
- congruence, syntactic: s.vv. *grš*; *yrṭ*
- deixis: s.v. *rhq*
- demonstratives: s.vv. *hn*; *hnmt*; *hnhmt*; *hw*
- determination: s.vv. *n*; *bt*; *hn*; *hw*; *hwy* (I); *-n*; *yn*
- directional: see locative expressions
- extraposition: s.vv. *hw*; *w*
- final clause: s.v. *nšq*
- historical spelling: s.vv. *yrdt*; *ytn*
- *Identitätsfall*: s.vv. *kbd*; *lqh*
- inchoative: s.vv. *hd*; *qm*
- individual/collective: s.vv. *anyt*; *pr*; *lh* (II); *mm*; *tdmm*
- locative expressions: s.vv. *amr* (III); *b*; *bt*; *k* (I); *nṡt*; *nhl*; *škn*
- modality: s.vv. *dlt* (III); *nh*; *rgm*; *yd*’; *zbr*
- numbers: s.v. *tm*
- object marking: s.vv. *lqh*; *ybl*; see also: affectedness
- plural, different meaning of: s.vv. *šnt* (I); *ym* (I)
- reflexive: s.vv. *nṡr*; *ybm*
- relative clause: s.vv. *tq*; *yd*’
- singular, different meaning of: s.v. *udn* (I); cf. also *n* (I)
- stems, semantics of: s.v. *sbh*; see also congruence; deixis; reflexive
- topic: see extraposition
- word order: s.vv. *tq*; *lqh*; *w*