

The Passive Participle in Ugaritic: A Formal and Semantic Inquiry

Tania Notarius – Martin-Luther University Halle-Wittenberg / University of the Free State
(Bloemfontein)

[Abstract: The Ugaritic G passive participle reveals innovative *qatū/īl* patterns; it is used in several syntactic positions: as an attribute, patient noun, converb, and verbal predicate; used verbally, it takes over present passive, resultant, and future optative functions.]

Keywords: North-West Semitic, Ugaritic, verb, participle, passive.

1. Introduction*

Participles are widely attested cross-linguistically, and due to their specific morphosyntactic status they are routinely affected by grammaticalization processes in verbal systems. The North-West Semitic (NWS) languages of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages (15th–10th centuries BCE) went through a morphosyntactic revolution of the verbal system, and participles played an important role in this development.

This study of the Ugaritic passive participle (pass ptc) began from an observation regarding non-Ugaritic data. Analysis of the language of the old Biblical Hebrew poems revealed that although there is practically no predicative use of active (act) ptc in texts that consistently demonstrate an archaic language type,¹ there are explicit cases of the pass ptc used as present resultant or optative verbal predicates: see: *הָלֹא-הוּא כָּמֶס עֲמָדִי חֲתוּם בְּאֻצְרוֹתַי* ‘Indeed this **is laid up** in store with me, **sealed up** in my treasures’ (Deut 32:34), and cf. also: *אָרוּר אַפָּם כִּי עָזוּ וְעִבְרָתָם כִּי קָשָׁתָהּ* ‘Cursed be their anger, for it is fierce, and their wrath, for it is cruel!’ (Gen 49:7).² Iron Age early epigraphic data is equally stimulating.³ Old Aramaic reveals several unambiguous examples of the pass ptc in predicative usage: *w-kl mlky? zy shrtly ?w kl zy rhm h? ly w-?šlh ml?ky ?[l]wh l-šlm ?w l-*

*Abbreviations: SC = suffix conjugation, impf = imperfective, pass = passive, ptc = participle, act = active, NWS = Northwest Semitic, BH = Biblical Hebrew. Quotations from Ugaritic are according to KTU3, unless noted.

The preliminary version of this paper was presented at the *Ugaritic Studies and Northwest Semitic Epigraphy* section of the SBL Annual Meeting in Boston 2017 and at the Mainz International Colloquium in November 2018. The author thanks the participants for their useful comments; the reviews of two peer-readers helped a lot to improve the content. Special thanks go to Aaron Hornkohl for copy-editing the paper and suggesting significant comments. All possible mistakes are mine. The research on this work was supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

1. There are examples of ‘hymnic’ participial phrases; see the discussion in Notarius 2010 and Notarius 2013: 285–286.

2. Cf. also Num 24:9 and Deut 33:13.20.21.24. Notice also *קָשִׁים* “(the shield was not) anointed” in 2 Sam 1:21.

3. On the G pass ptc morphological patterns in Iron Age NWS epigraphic material cf. Garr 1985: 130–131.

kl ḥpšy ʔw yšlḥ mlʔkh ʔly pthh ly ʔrḥʔ l-tmšl by b-zʔ w-l-tršh ly ʕly[h] ‘Now (as for) all the kings of my vicinity or anyone who is a friend of mine—when I send my ambassador to him for peace or for any of my business or (when) he sends his ambassador to me, the road **has to be opened** for me. You must not (try to) dominate me in this (respect) or assert your authority over me concerning [it]’ (KAI 224:7–9 = Sfire III 7ff).⁴ The predicative use of the pass ptc is documented in Moabite:

אנך בנתי בת במת כי הרס היא ‘I built Bet-Bamat because it **laid ruined**’ (KAI 181:27 = Mesha Stela).⁵ Evidently, the historical development of the two ptc in ancient NWS was not symmetric, and the pass ptc acquired verbal predicative usage at a different stage and through different processes.

In this paper I seek to determine whether already in ancient NWS material the pass ptc played a role in verbal morphosyntax. The present paper concentrates on the Ugaritic language and aims at collecting comprehensive data about the formal and semantic properties of the pass ptc in corpus.⁶ The main focus will be on the G stem pass ptc, as the most common and emblematic case; pass ptc in derived stems are excluded from the discussion. First, the documented morphological properties will be discussed (see paragraph 2). Thereafter, a syntactic analysis will lend support to the morphological argument: it will be demonstrated that the pass ptc could be used as an adnominal attribute, a patient noun, a converb, and a verbal predicate (paragraph 3).

Participles are verbal adjectives and as such they are participant-oriented: if act ptc are agent-oriented, pass ptc and stative adjectives are patient-oriented.⁷ In Ugaritic pass ptc are derived from dynamic transitive and, apparently, from some intransitive verbs (see some explicit examples and the discussion below). Pass ptc typically function as present resultants (called also resultative, denoting a state that results from a previous event or situation) and modals (denoting a potential resultant state), but can also be properly eventive, denoting passive diathesis in the present progressive or present perfect tenses (paragraph. 4).⁸

4. See also *ʕm klbyʔ šmn yhb hmw ly mrʔy mlkʔ* ‘...they **had been put** with the dogs. My lord, the king, gave them to me...’ (KAI 233:7); *šmy ktb ʕl ydhm* ‘my name **is/was written** on their hands’ (KAI 233:12). The examples are quoted from Loesov and Kalinin (forthcoming), I thank the authors for access to their unpublished manuscript; there are no examples of predicative act ptc in Old Aramaic (Loesov, personal communication). The Aramaic G pass ptc pattern was apparently **qatīl* > *qatīl*. Opinions about its formal correlation with the Gpass SC *qatīl* vary: either the *i* of the **qatīl* pattern lengthened to *ī* (perhaps still under the influence of the ptc, see Brockelmann 1908: 537–539) or secondary verbalization of the pass ptc occurred (see Loesov 2009: 484, cf. also Retsö 1989: 165–166). The latter approach suggests that the predicative pass ptc may have a history dating back into the ancient stages of NWS.

5. See Ahituv 2008: 415, Jackson 1989: 120, Garr 1985: 131. The past resultant usage of the form does not preclude parsing as a Gpass SC. The data from Phoenician is ambiguous and requires further investigation. According to Friedrich and Röllig 1999: § 139 and 140b, the pattern in Phoenician was *qatīl*; cf. also Tropper 2012: 475.

6. El-Amarna Canaanite is beyond the scope of this paper: Moran (2003: 28–29) suggested that the *qatīl* pattern in Old Canaanite had passive usage; see also Sivan 1984: 136, Tropper 2012: 151, Baranowski 2016: 62–73, and cf. ḥa-mu-du ‘desired’ (EA 138:126), see CAD H: 325. For morphosyntactic analysis of the act ptc in Ugaritic poetry cf. Notarius 2019 (forthcoming).

7. On this terminology for act versus pass ptc cf. Haspelmath 1994: 152–156; according to his temporal analysis, act ptc commonly denote present tense, pass ptc past and future. Cf. Gai 2005, Doron and Reintges 2006, Goldenberg 2013: 198.

8. Haspelmath (1994: 157–163) points out three main semantic types for the pass ptc: resultative, simple past, and modal. For nominal versus verbal semantic characteristics of pass ptc in Israeli Hebrew, see Doron 2000, and cf. Rosen 1956 and Mirkin 1967–1968. Doron (2000) demonstrates a distinction between dynamic progressive and stative resultant pass ptc. According to Embick 2004, there are eventive, resultative, and stative pass ptc.

2. The Ugaritic Passive Participle: Morphological Characteristics

Since Ugaritic consonantal alphabetic writing does not differentiate consistently between the G pass ptc and many other homographic verbal forms, while the distinction between passive and non-passive forms is commonly established semantically, on the basis of diathesis, the formal challenges are as follows: (a) What was the vocalic pattern of the G pass ptc? Was it an innovative *qatū/īl*, as suggested by the data in later NWS languages, or more conservative *qati/ul* or even *quti/al*, as suggested by some comparative and ambiguous data? (b) What are the formal criteria distinguishing the G pass ptc and the Gpass SC (apparently, *quti/al* patterns), bearing in mind that both forms have passive diathesis and can be used in similar syntactic functions? (c) Do G stative verbs derive pass ptcs or not, while both pass ptc and stative adjective are patient-oriented and not contrasted by diathesis?

Some forms of pass ptcs are formally debated; fuller syntactic and semantic discussion below substantiate the parsing. The cumulative morphological criteria permit establishment of the following distinctions:⁹

- (1) Syllabic *ḥa-ri-mu* ‘desecrated’ (RS 20:123) is a G pass ptc *qatīl* or *qatīl*,¹⁰ other G pass ptc or Gpass SC patterns are not attested in syllabic writing.
- (2) I-² forms are mostly debated: *uzr* ‘clothed’ (1.17 I 2.7; 1.17 I: 21–22) and sometimes *uḥd* ‘seized’ (4.635:4.5.9) are interpreted as G pass ptc *qatūl* or *qatul*, colored by vowel harmonization; however, *uzr* is probably a noun and *uḥd* is better interpreted as a Gpass SC *quta/il*;¹¹ *aḥd* ‘bloated, grasped’ (1.85:15)¹² and *a[s]rkm* ‘your captive’ (1.2 I 37)¹³ lack vowel harmony and, if indeed G pass ptcs, suggest the *qatīl* (or *qatīl*) pattern.
- (3) II-² forms, *luk* ‘sent’ (2.17:4) is unambiguously a G pass ptc *qatūl* (or *qatul*),¹⁴ contrasted to *lik* ‘sent’ (4.777:2.3.5.6.8.9) – G act SC ‘he sent’,¹⁵ and *lak* ‘was sent’ (2.70:13) – Gpass SC.¹⁶

9. My interpretation of *mḥy* ‘erased’ (1.124:14), *blym* ‘collapsed’ (2.45:22–24), and *šbt(m)* ‘blocked’ (2.36:17) as G pass ptcs will be fully defended basing on the semantic analysis in paragraph 4.

10. See Ugaritica V: 245 (137 III 39', 40', 42'); cf. Sivan 2001: 69, 122, Huehnergard 2008: 309, Tropper 2012: 474; according to DULAT 400 *ḥa-ri-mu* is derived either from *hrm* ‘excommunicate, forbid’ or *hrm* ‘pierce’. Cf. perhaps also ^{LÜ}a-sí-ri /^Uasīri/ or /^Uasiri/ ‘prisoner’ (RS 8.333:8.24); according to Tropper 2012: 474 this might be a proper Akkadian noun, cf. also *a[s]rkm* ‘your captive’ (1.2 I 37).

11. On the vowel harmony see Tropper 2012: 174–175. For the form *uzr* (1.17 I 2. 7; 1.17 I 21–22) see Sivan 2001: 122 and cf. Wyatt 2002: 251 note 6; the form is interpreted as a verbal adjective in DULAT 134 or as a noun ‘(type of) sacrifice’ or ‘(type) of cloth’, cf. Watson 2002 and Tropper 2012: 474. According to Tropper (2012: 473, 514), *uḥd* (4.635:4.5.9) is a Gpass SC; DULAT 35 lists the form as a participle and on p. 37 it is parsed as Gpass SC: “PN (re)captured”, see also Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín 1973: 85.

12. The passive meaning of *aḥd* (1.85:15) is promoted by DULAT (37), but the parsing is obscure: “has been bloated with barley”; cf. Sanmartín 1988: 232–233 (who also mentions the G act ptc as a possible parsing) and Watson 2007: 71. According to Tropper (2012: 614, 686), the form is a G act SC “(horse) seized (food/barley)”, thus also in Bordreuil and Pardee 2009: 223–225, and cf. Pardee 2016: “se le cheval saisit anormalment sa nourriture” (= bulimia). Cohen and Sivan (1983: 25–27) translate as a pass “If a horse is seized with pain”, interpreting the noun *akl* as an Akkadian loan ‘pain’, but tend to parse the verb as active; cf. also Cohen 1996: 125–126, n. 28, and Cohen and Klein 2016: 109, n. 31.

13. See Sivan 2001: 69, Tropper 2012: 261.

14. See Sivan 2001: 69, Tropper 2012: 473, 619. According to DULAT (483), *luk* ‘sent’ (2.17:4) is 3ms Gpass; but how can *luk* be a SC that was presumably in the *qatal* / *qatīl* pattern?

(4) In III-² passive forms the final *-u* vowel of the ptc in the nominative sing, cf. *mru* ‘fatling’ (1.4 V 45),¹⁷ *htu* ‘is to be crushed’ (1.6 II 23)¹⁸ is contrasted to the final *-a* vowel of the SC in 3ms, cf. *prša* ‘was covered’ (1.4 I 35).

(5) III-y passive forms preserve consonantal *y*: ms *kly* ‘spent, liquidated’ (1.16 III 13–16 3x; 4.361:1; 4.362:1; 4.855:4.7) might be a G pass ptc in the *qatū/īl* pattern, a *qatil* verbal adjective, or a Gpass SC *qutil*, but not a *qatul* or *qutal*, due to the rules of triphthong contraction;¹⁹ cf. also *šbyn* ‘our captive’ (x2 1.2 IV 28–30), *mhy* ‘erased’ (1.124:14, 1.41:54, 1.87:8), *šy* ‘elaborated’ (4.282:7.10.14),²⁰ *špy* ‘covered, embroidered’ (2.79:10; 4.167:3); fpl *špyt* ‘ibid.’ (4.167:2.6),²¹ *knyt* ‘honored’ (1.4 I 15 + more cases),²² *nkyt* ‘distressed’ (1.16 II 27);²³ mpl *blym* ‘collapsed’ (2.45:22–24), *špym* (4.167:4).

(6) In geminate roots there is an explicit contrast between the G SC (of a stative verb) *d brt* ... *br* ‘was free’ (3.12:3–4), and the G pass ptc *brr* ‘purified’ (1.41:7+ many times) in the *qatū/ūl* patterns;²⁴ see also *kt* ‘powdered’ (4.203:14, 4.288:7.9, 4.721:4).²⁵

15. The form *lik* (4.777:2.3.5.6.8.9) is parsed as G act SC ‘PN sent’ in DULAT (482–483) and similarly in Tropper 2012: 470, 474, 514; see McGeough and Smith 2011: 593 (they translate in passive, but parse as act SC in impersonal usage).

16 The forms *lāk* ‘was sent’ in *w lāk lh . khdnn* ‘and it (the answer) was sent to him (to say), but he refused’ (2.70:13) is debated, see Tropper 2012: 514–515, cf. 2.42:27 and 1.176:25 (both broken), and cf. also *lakt* 1.2 II 10 (broken); *lak* in 2.70:13 and 2.42:27 are seemingly interpreted as infinitive in DULAT 482; Bordreuil and Pardee 2009: 240 parse *lak* in 2.70:13 as an imperative (followed by another imperative *khdnn* (DUTAL 429: hapax D ‘deny’), but imperatives do not fit the context, namely the modality of the greeting formula and the following forms are of SC.

17. For other forms of this lexeme cf. *mrim* 4.128:2, *mri*; *mrat*. *mrim* 4.247:2.16.17.20; see also 4.128:1.2; 1.3 IV 41; 1.4 VI 41–42, 4.247:20; see the discussion in Sivan 2001: 69.

18. According to Tropper (2012: 476), *htu* (1.6 II 23) is a G pass ptc in predicative use, but he (2012: 518) raises the possibility of a Gpass infinitive (like the infinitives *ngš* and *‘dbnn l arš* in the immediate context); in my view an internal passive infinitive looks implausible; cf. Sivan 2001: 122. Scribal mistake for N form <n>*htu*, on the pattern of *nhtu* ‘crushed’ (N-stem in 2.10:8.10; cf. Tropper 2012: 540, 822), defended in KTU3 and DULAT 408, is an unnecessary emendation; cf. also Marcus 1970: 108 and Verreet 1985: 329 note 27.

19. On the triphthong contraction see Tropper 2012:194–200, although exceptions are possible; cf. Tropper 2012: 655 and see the discussion in Pardee 2003–2004. Sivan (2001: 122) interprets *kly* in 1.16 III 13–16 as a G pass ptc; Tropper (2012: 664) opts for either a G pass ptc or G act SC. According to Tropper (2012: 515–516), *d kly* in 4.361:1, 4.362:1 and 4.855:4.7 is a Gpass SC and, as such, an indication of the *qutil* pattern; cf. Pardee 2003–2004: 257–258, 375 for the criticism of this interpretation. Bordreuil, Pardee, and Hawley (2012: 89–90) translate *d kly* in 4.855:4.7 (RS 94.2560) as passives, but their parsing is obscure. I opt for *kly* in all these cases as G pass ptc in agreement with singular forms of collective ‘stuff’-nouns (*lhm*, *qmḥ*, and *ksmm*), contra Tropper (2012: 515–516), who claims that in 4.855:4.7 the subject is plural.

20. Tropper 2012: 475.

21. Cf. also 2.83:9 (but very broken). For *špyt/m* as pass ptc see Sivan 2001: 122. According to Tropper (2012: 475, 515), *d* [. *š*] *py* (4.167:3) and *d* [. *l*] *špyt* (4.167:6) are Gpass SCs, while the form *špyt* (4.167:2) is a pass ptc, like *špym* (4.167:4) — masculine dual or mpl, see also DULAT 778. However, *d l špyt* in 4.167:6 is clearly marked as a pass ptc by the nominal feminine plural ending *-t* (in agreement with the subject in pl *lḥt mrkbt* ‘three chariots’) and there is no need to interpret *d* [. *š*] *py* (4.167:3) as a SC.

22. See Tropper 2012: 475; according to DULAT (446–447) this is an adjective.

23. See DULAT 623.

24. See Sivan 2001:122, cf. TO II: 154, n. 45, Tropper 2012: 475. Tropper (2012: 467) opines that *šlm* ‘paid’ (4.665:4ff) may be a G pass ptc or D verbal adjective, derived from the stative root *š-l-m* (cf. *tmny šm ādtny mnm šlm* ‘there, with our mistress, may all be well’ (2.11:14 + parallels)), and cf. also *šlm* ‘paid’ (4.226:1ff, 4.667:2ff + many times); according to DULAT (807) the form is in D.

25. See Tropper 2012:476.

(7) As for personal endings, the word-final *-m* routinely denotes the pass ptc in plur masc, cf. *blym* ‘collapsed’ (2.45:22–24), *špym* ‘covered’ (4.167:4), *šbtlm* ‘blocked’ (2.36:17), *ršmm* ‘chequered’ (4.4:4),²⁶ but can be also enclitic or adverbial *-m*, cf. *brktm* (1.19 IV 32) or *uzrm* (1.17 I 21–22);²⁷ *-t* is a fem ending in sing pass ptc, cf., perhaps, *nbt* ‘coated’ (1.4 I 31), or pl, cf. *špyt* (4.167:2.6), *nkyt* (1.16 II 27), *sšt* (1.14 III 7–9 // 1.14 IV 51–V 1),²⁸ but may also be a Gpass SC 3fs (Gpass SC 1st, 2nd pers., and 3fpl seem to be unattested).

Altogether, as far as (a) the vocalic pattern of the G pass ptc is concerned, syllabic *ḥa-ri-mu* ‘desecrated’ (RS 20:123), perhaps I-² *aḥd* ‘seized’ (1.85:15), and II-² *luk* ‘sent’ (2.17:4) exclude verbal adjectives in *quti/al* patterns. The III-y *kly* ‘spent’ (1.16 III 13–16) excludes patterns with a second short *-a-* or *-u-* vowel, namely *qutal* and *qatul*, and geminate *brr* ‘purified’ (1.41:7) excludes any pattern with a second short vowel, namely both the *quti/al* and *qatu/il* verbal adjective patterns, suggesting a pattern with a second long vowel. Therefore, while the patterns *quti/al* and *qatu/il* are excluded by part of the data, there is no indication contra the *qatū/īl* patterns. One cannot absolutely rule out a degree of morphological diversity and the sporadic usage of rarer, conservative forms. However, the adjectival derivational patterns *qatūl* or *qatīl* were most commonly grammaticalized as the G pass ptc in Ugaritic.²⁹

As for (b) the formal distinction between G pass ptc and Gpass SC, there are very few cases that show a straightforward morphological contrast between these two forms when used in predicative position:³⁰ the most diagnostic is II-² *luk* ‘sent’ (2.17:4) contrasted with *lak* ‘was sent’

26. For this form (*tn pldm ršmm* ‘two chequered *pld*-cloths’ (4.4:4)) cf. DULAT 735: probably a mistake for *rmšm* ‘check, chequered (cloth)’; cf. Akk. *ramāšu* ‘einfassen (?)’.

27. For an adverbial or enclitic *-m* in *uzrm* cf. Bordreuil and Pardee 2009: 177, but the case is doubtful, see above: *uzr(m)* (1.17 I several times) is a noun, according to Watson 2002.

28. The case *sšt b šdm ḥtbt* (1.14 III 7–9 // 1.14 IV 51–V 1) is morphologically unclear: if the root is *s-f-y*, judging from Hebrew, Arabic, Akkadian and Syriac, the lack of *-y-* suggests a verbal noun *sʿt* ‘attack’ (see Tropper 2012: 488, 667) or a Gpass SC 3f sing *qutal* pattern (**sufayat* > *sufāt*), but the subject seems plural. According to the former parsing a noun exhibits verbal syntax: *sšt* ... *ḥtbt* ‘raid ... upon wood-cutters’, *sšt* ... *šibt* ‘raid ... upon water-bearers’. The problem with the latter interpretation is that the Gpass SC form is used as a future-optative (1.14 III 7–9). Alternatively, DULAT (740) suggests the hollow root *s-f*, and *sʿt* is parsed as a fpl G pass ptc.

29. According to Fox (2003: 123, 187–202), both *qatūl* and *qatīl* were productive Proto-Semitic nominal patterns: he emphasizes that in Eastern Semitic *qatīl* is mainly a substantive, while in Western Semitic it correlates with the patient adjective *qatīl*; in Akkadian poetry the pattern *qatūl* is rarely used as a pass ptc (see GAG 55i). According to the analysis in Kogan 2008, the *qatīl* adjectival pattern is reliably reconstructed up to Central Semitic level, but its status in Proto-Semitic (particularly due to the ambiguity of the Akkadian data) is not clear; *qatūl*, conversely, is not reconstructed by Kogan (2015: 58–59) in either proto-level. Tropper (2012: 473) emphasizes that although the system of internal passive stems is reconstructed for Central Semitic (see also Weninger 2011: 159 and Huehnergard 2006: 10), there was no dedicated form for the Gpass ptc in Ugaritic and that *qatūl* adjectives took over this function. For other patterns for passive adjective cf. Huehnergard 1987: 308–309; for *qūtal/quttal* and *qittōl* pass ptc in BH see Bauer and Leander 1922: 287o, Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 375 and cf. אֶיִן אֶיִן אֶיִן (Ex 3:2) and הָבֵן הָיִלֹד (Ex. 1:22); see also the discussion in Retsö 1989: 166–170. According to Retsö (1989: 174), the *qutīl* G stem passive pattern is not attested outside Classical Arabic. For possible cases of the *maqūl* pattern in Ugaritic cf. Tropper 2012: 476–477, but very uncertain.

30. The existence of the Gpass stem in Ugaritic is admitted by most scholars; cf. Marcus 1970, Sivan 2001: 126–128, Tropper 2012: 509–517, but see cf. Verreet 1985: 324–330 for a more skeptical approach. The patterns of the Gpass SC are considered to be either *qutīl* or *qutal*; Tropper 2012: 514–515 claims that the pattern was *qutīl*, less plausibly *qutal*,

(2:70:13) as well as *lik* ‘he sent’ (many times) and some clear cases of *-m* and *-t* plural nominal endings, as mentioned above (cf. *špyt* 4.167:2.6, *špym* 4.167:4 ‘embroidered’). Finer syntactic and semantic distinction is required: as will be further demonstrated, certain syntactic conditions disambiguate between the G pass ptc and Gpass SC forms (paragraph 3); semantically, the Gpass SC remained within the realm of past tense reference, while the G pass ptc is more explicitly associated with speech-time reference (paragraph 4).

This morphological discussion suggests that in Ugaritic (c) some stative and intransitive verbs derived G pass ptc in *qatū/īl* patterns in some syntactic positions: the most evident case is the geminate *brr* ‘purified’, cf. also the syllabic *ḥa-ri-mu* ‘desecrated’ (RS 20:123), the plur masculine *šbtm* ‘blocked’, and the III-y root *bly(m)* ‘collapsed’.³¹

3. The Ugaritic passive participle: syntactic functions

The main syntactic function for the pass ptc is attributive, denoting a property of a patient:

Ex. 1

1.2 I 32-33 *išt . išt m . yitmr . ḥrb . lṣt [ls]nhm* ‘(Like) a fire, two flames they appear, their [ton]gue a **sharpened** sword’.³² See also *knyt* ‘purchased’ (1.3 I 37 + more cases), *ššy* ‘processed, cultivated’ (1.17 VI 8, 4.282:7.10.14),³³ *ḥsp* ‘shaped, created; decanted’ (1.91:29.36, 4.213:24–27), *ršmm* ‘chequered’ (4.4:4), *kt* ‘powdered’ (4.203:14, 4.288:7.9, 4.721:4); *mlḥt* ‘salted’ (1.3 I 7, 4.247:20), *bq<t>/bq<t>* ‘split’ (4.247:21.23).³⁴ For less certain cases cf. *brḥ* ‘fleeing, fugitive’ (1.5 I 1, may be an act ptc), *lmd* ‘trained’ (2.91:4),³⁵ *ḥlq* ‘ruined’ (4.213:3; 4.611:2 + multiple times; probably stative adjective).

Commonly the patient’s referentiality is incorporated within the ptc form, generating a patient noun:

Ex. 2

1.2 I 37 *bn . dgn . a[s]rkm* ‘The Son of Dagan, **your captive**’. See also *šbyn* ‘our captive’ (1.2 IV 28–30 2x, used as a predicative), *mru / mrim* ‘fatling’ (1.4 V 45, 4.128:2 + many cases), *bnwt*

but cf. *lak* ‘was sent’ (2:70:13, discussed above). The latter form is diagnostic: (1) it contrasts to the G act SC (written *lik*); (2) it indicates that the pattern of the Gpass SC was not *qatil* as in Amarna Canaanite.

31. This tendency is consistent with Biblical Hebrew that derive G pass ptc in many stative and intransitive verbs: נָפַח, וְחִמְדִּיקָם, שָׁלְמִי אֲמוֹנִי, יִשְׂרָאֵל, אֶהְיֶה, יְדַעִים, חֲשִׁים, גָּלוּי עֵינָיִם, קָלוּט, חָרוֹם, צָרוּעַ, פְּרוּעַ, רְבוּעַ, שְׂדוּפַת קָדִים, שְׁנוּאָה, טָלוּא, בְּרוּרִים, עָלוֹם, נְעוּמָה, אֲמִלָּה.

32. See Sivan 2001: 122, Tropper 2012: 477.

33. According to Tropper (2012: 666) *ššy* in 1.17 VI 8 is an act ptc; see also DULAT 188, but the context is broken. Tropper (2012: 475) claims that the pass ptc in 4.282:7.10.14 are predicative: *šd ššy* ‘the field is cultivated’.

34. See Tropper 2012: 475: read ln. 21 *bq<t>* fpl.

35. *ššrm lmd* ‘twenty trained (oxen)’ (2.91:4), see DULAT 857, but broken.

‘creatures’ (1.6 III 5.11 + other cases),³⁶ *hṭk* ‘offspring’ (1.10 III 34),³⁷ *dbḥt* ‘sacrificed (liver)’ (1.142:1),³⁸ *ḥbtm* ‘emancipated, mercenary’ (2.17:1).³⁹

The pass ptc is very rarely a relative clause expanded by more arguments; certain cases are in prose (ex. 3a). A case with a null antecedent in ex. 3b (*uzr(m)* in 1.17 I) is lexically debated (cf. above):⁴⁰

Ex. 3

a. 4.167: 1–2 *tlṭ . mrkb[t] spyt . b . ḥrṣ [.]* ‘three chariots **plated** with gold’; see more *spy/t/m* (2.79:10, 4.167:3–6).

b. 1.17 I 2.7 *uzr . ilm . ylḥm* ‘**girded** (alternatively: as *uzr*-sacrifice), he gives the gods food’; also *uzrm* (1.17 I 21–22). The forms *nbt* (parallel to *šmrgt*) ‘coated’ (1.4 I 30–32) is uncertain;⁴¹ cf. also *npl* (1.5 VI 8–9) but can be analyzed differently.⁴²

The pass ptc is available for adverbial usage as a converb introducing secondary predication (ex. 4a) or in a comparative phrase (ex. 4b):

Ex. 4

a. 1.19 IV 32–33 *l tbrkn . alk . brktm tmrn . alk . nmrrt* ‘Bless me—I would go **blessed**! Empower me—I’d go empowered!’⁴³ See also *mlk] yṭb brr* ‘sits **purified**’ (1.41:7 + many cases),⁴⁴ *mlk yṭb brr w mḥ[y]* ‘the king shall sit down purified and cleansed of’ (1.87:8), *lbš il yštk* ‘the god puts you

36. Thus Sivan 2001: 122. According to Tropper (2012: 474–475) *bnwt* is a noun, *bunwat*- ‘building’, like Akkadian *binātu*.

37. According to DULAT (371) the noun *hṭk* ‘lineage, offspring’ in *w bšr hṭk dgn* ‘do receive the good news, offspring of DN’ (1.10 III 34) is formally a pass ptc of the root *h-t-k*.

38. Tropper 2012: 475, but cf. DULAT 260: a feminine noun.

39. DULAT 381: *ḥbt* as a masc adj. ‘emancipated; unattached’ > ‘mercenary’ (< ptc. Gpass. /ḥ-b-t/). Cf. also 2.107:8 (broken); in 2.90:9 *ḥbt* is to be parsed as a SC.

40. On the contrary, the act ptc is widely used as an independent participial phrase (“hymnic participle”) in the language of poetry; see Notarius 2019 (forthcoming).

41. The poetic passage *kt . il . dt . rbtm kt . il . nbt . b ksp šmrgt . b dm . ḥrṣ* ‘a (throne-)stand for El of twenty thousand (shekels), a (throne-)stand for El, **coated** with silver, coated with liquid gold’ (1.4 I 30–32) is difficult; cf. Smith and Pitard 2009: 417. According to DULAT (609), *nbt* is derived from the root *n-b* and is a G pass ptc. The following syntactically parallel passage, *s . il . dqt . k amr sknt . k ḥwt . yman* ‘A grand bowl (**pounded**) **thin** like those of Amurru, **crafted** like those of the country of Yaman’ (1.4 I 41–42), suggests adjectives (or nouns) in similar usage; cf. DULAT 276, 748, Smith and Pitard 2009: 423. However, the closest stylistic and functional parallel, *hdm . id(il) d prša . b br ... ṭlḥn . il . d mla mnm . dbbm* ‘a footstool for El which was **covered** in tin ... a table for El, which was **filled** with all sorts of beasts’ (1.4 I 34–35 ... 38–39), demonstrates an explicit (apparently passive) SCs marked by final *-a* spelling in relative clauses.

42. According to Tropper (2012: 713) the form is a SC expressing anteriority, but may be alternatively a G pass ptc; cf. DULAT 626: “(who had) fallen to the ground”.

43. See Tropper 2012: 475, 540, Sivan 2001: 122 (cf. Gordon 1965: 78), parallel to the N-stem form *nmrrt*; the participle is used in an adverbial accusative with an enclitic or adverbial *-m*.

44. There are two main syntagms involving a participle *brr*: *mlk yṭb brr* ‘(the king) will sit purified’ and *yṛṭṣ . mlk . brr* ‘the king will wash himself clean’ (see 1.46:10; 1.87:4.7–8.49.51.55; 1.105:20; 1.106:27; 1.109:2; 1.112:11.17; 1.119:5); Tropper (2012: 475) distinguishes three types of a syntagm.

clothed” (1.169:12; // *šrm* “naked”); cf. also *l[bš]n špm w m[h] [pn]h* “robed in (embroidered) garment(s) and with a clean face” (1.41:54, broken),⁴⁵ *n[tt] 1.82:9* (but very obscure).

b. 1.16 II 26–28 *tšr trm tnqt km nkyt [...]* *km šklit* ‘she sobbed, raised a scream like **distressed** (women)... like emaciated (women)’.⁴⁶

Strikingly, the pass ptc is attested as a main verbal predicate, perhaps in poetry (ex. 5a), and in prose (ex. 5b, c), attaching arguments in the genitive (cf. ex. 5b; however, the argument *akl* may alternatively be analyzed as accusative), and verbally, by means of prepositions (ex. 5c):

Ex. 5

a. 1. 16 III 13–16 *kly lhm . b(?) dnhm . kly yn . b hmthm . k[l]y šmn . b [...]* ‘The food is **spent** from its storage; the wine is all **spent** from its skins; the oil is all **spent** from [...]’. Cf. also *htu* ‘(he) is to be crushed’ (1.6 II 21–23),⁴⁷ *sšt* ‘swept’ (1.14 III 7–9, 1.14 IV 51–V 1, but uncertain),⁴⁸ and *šbyn* ‘our / the captive’ (2x 1.2 IV 28–30, but this is a patient noun used as a predicate).

b. 1.85:15 *k ahd ākl ššw* ‘if the horse is **seized** with barley/pain’.⁴⁹

c. 2.17:4–7 *w ht luk ‘m ml[akt] pgsdb šml šn* ‘PN, commercial agent of ivory is (being) **sent** with the mission’. See also *pth* ‘be opened’ (1.103:5, but very broken), *mhy* ‘erased’ (1.124:14–15), *š[b]t*, *šbtm* ‘blocked’ (2.36:15–17); *blym* ‘collapsed’ (2.45:22–24); *hbt* ‘ill-treated’ (2.87:8; 2.103:12),⁵⁰ *ššy* ‘cultivated’ (4.282:7.10.14, but cf. the discussion above); cf. also the uncertain *šlm* ‘paid’ 4.665:4ff (+ many times).

The present discussion highlights some prominent syntactic characteristics of the pass ptc: (1) a relative clause marked by the particle *d* can introduce either a SC (ex. 6a) or a pass ptc (ex. 6b); (2) the negative particle *l* is used with ptcs (cf. *d . l . špyt*, ex. 6b);⁵¹ (3) word-order in affirmative verbal clauses with the predicative pass ptc is as a rule VS (cf. in ex. 5 above), unless a topicalized subject *btm*, marked by the enclitic *-n*, is fronted ex. 6c):

45. Cf. DULAT 532, but their parsing is not clear; cf. Pardee 2002: 65 “[Someone will X] the ŠPs and someone will wi[pe] his [],” evidently interpreting as imperative or infinitive, but obscure.

46. See DULAT 623, 803, and the discussion of alternative interpretations there.

47. The passive use of the lexeme is attested also in *k lli b tbrn qnh tñtan* ‘like a sucking lamb in the opening of his esophagus you shall remain **ground up**’ (1.4 VIII 20).

48. Cf. the discussion above, but according to Tropper (2012: 488), the form is a verbal noun, ‘outcry’ (root *s-ʿ-y*), in modal and narrative function.

49. Here and in imperfective *k yihd ākl ššw* ‘if the horse is bloated with food/barley’ (1.72:16.21; 1.97:2) both passive (present resultant) and active ‘if the horse seizes food/barley’ (or ‘the pain seizes the horse’, pace Cohen) are possible, but the form cannot be a Gpass SC, otherwise one would expect *uħd* for the *quta/il* pattern (contra DULAT 37).

50. In *ky hbt w l ušal* “because I am ill treated and am not being consulted” (2.87:8; 2.103:12) the form *hbt* is either Gpass SC 1cs “I was ill-treated” with assimilation of the *t* (thus DULAT 380, but the assimilation does not occur in some similar cases as *ynt /yatanātu/* “I gave” (2.90:7), cf. Bordreuil and Pardee 2009: 249), or G pass ptc – “I am ill treated”, coordinated with *l ušal* – Gpass PC imperfective for present iterative / habitual; Bordreuil and Pardee 2009: 250 parse as G act SC 3mpl; Tropper 2012 does not discuss this case.

51. The negative particle *in* ‘(there is) not’ is attested with some N-stem verbal adjectives / participles (cf. *npl̄* ‘saved’ 2.82:10–12 and *nhtu* ‘crushed’ 2.10:8–10, but these forms are outside the scope of this research).

Ex. 6

- a. 1.4 I 34–35 ... 38–39 *hdm . id(il) d prša . b br ... tlhn . il . d mla mnm . dbbm* ‘a footstool for El which was **covered** in tin ... a table for El, which was **filled** with all sorts of beasts’; see perhaps also *d št* ‘who was appointed’ (2.47:14–15).⁵²
- b. 4.167:5–6 *tlṭ mrkbt. mlk d . l . spyt* ‘three chariots that are not **plated**’; see also *d [. š]py* ‘that is plated’ (4.167:3),⁵³ thus also *d kly* ‘that is liquidated’ (4.361:1, 4.362:1, 4.855:4.7).
- c. *btm mhy l dg w l klb* (1.124:14–15) ‘The house shall be **cleansed** of fish and dog’.

4. The Ugaritic passive participle: semantic scope

The formal considerations shed light on some explicit examples of the pass ptc in the Ugaritic corpus and allow discussing its semantic functions.⁵⁴ Of particular interest are verbal properties of pass ptc allowing tense-aspect, and modal interpretation of participial clauses.

Prototypically, the pass ptc, denoting an event, takes the functional slot of a passive present tense, derived from a transitive dynamic verb with patient promoted to subject and instrumental agent marked explicitly or implied. The most explicit case of the pass ptc used as passive present tense is *luk* in 2.17:4 (ex. 7): it suggests an eventive interpretation and the particle *ht* emphasizes the speech-time reference; a progressive aspectual interpretation — ‘is being sent’ — cannot be entirely excluded:

Ex. 7

- 2.17:45 *w ht luk ‘m ml[akt] pgsdb šml šn* ‘Look, PN, commercial agent of ivory, is **sent** with a mission’. Cf. also *hbt* ‘(I am) ill-treated’ (2.87:8, 2.103:13, although uncertain).

On most occasions the pass ptc acquires resultant meaning, denoting a present tense situation that resulted from an event experienced by the patient. Resultant meaning is particularly available in predicative position (e.g., ex. 8abc), but is also detectable in other syntactic functions (attributive or relative phrase, e.g., ex. 8d, converb, e.g., ex. 8e):

Ex. 8

- a. 1.16 III 13–16 *kly lhm . b ‘dnhm . kly yn . b hmthm . k[I]y šmn . b* ‘The food is **spent** from its storage; the wine is all **spent** from its skins; the oil is all **spent** from’.

52. For *št* as a pass ptc in *šbd mlk d št šl ḥrdh* ‘an official of the king **placed** in command of his guard’ (2.47:14–15) see DULAT 152, 254, but DULAT 836 seems to interpret it as G act SC (with ‘the king’ as the subject): ‘which he (the king) placed in front of his guard’; however, the dependent in the construct chain (*šbd mlk*) can only with difficulty be taken as an antecedent of the relative clause. Impersonal use of 3mpl G act SC is possible, but passive interpretation is preferable.

53. For *dy l ydš* (1.178:1) ‘one who does not know’ see DULAT 942; del Olmo Lete (2014: 184–187) translates ‘the one who actually knows’ as an act ptc (or G SC used for the present tense), but according to Tropper (2012: 476) this is a negated pass ptc (‘one who is unknown’).

54. According to Tropper (2012: 477–480) act and pass ptc in Ugaritic are aspectually contrasted: “das aktiv Partizip aspektuell imperfektive (und damit grundsätzlich präsentisch zu übersetzen) ist, das passive aber perfektive ist.”

- b. 2.36:15-17 *š[b]t . ntbt . mšrm u šbtm ntbt mšrm b hwt ugrt h[wt]. qt . w. b . hwt[t .] ngt. tšqn* “(If) Egypt’s way is blocked, or Egypt’s ways in the country of Ugarit (and) the country of Qṭ are blocked, they can pass through the land of Nḡṭ” (quoted with KTU³: 189).
- c. 2.45:22-24 *w lht alpm hrṭm k rgmt ly blym alpm aršt lk* “as for the message concerning work bullocks, as you said to me: **collapsed** are the oxen, I requested for/from you or for/from any man that you sent to...” See also *ahd* 1.85:15, but uncertain, *rgm* “pronounced” 2.42:25-26.⁵⁵
- d. 1.4 I 30–32 *kt . il . dt . rbtm kt . il . nbt . b ksp šmrḡt . b dm . hrš* ‘a (throne-)stand for El of twenty thousand (shekels) a (throne-)stand for El **coated** with silver, coated with liquid gold,’ but debated *uzr(m)* 1.17 I 2, 7, 21–22; *ššy* 1.17 VI 8, 4.282:7.10.14 (alternatively, in predicative position); *dbm* 2.88:27; 4.631:13,19, but very uncertain.⁵⁶
- e. 1.19 IV 32–33 *l tbrkn . alk . brktm tmrn . alk . nmrrt* ‘Bless me — I would go **blessed**! Empower me — I’d go **empowered**!’ See also *nkyt* (1.16 II 26–28).

I suggest interpreting *š[b]t* and *šbtm* (ex. 8b) as G pass ptc-s masc sing and plur / dual correspondingly of the root *š-b-t* ‘cease, stop’, opposite to other interpretations.⁵⁷ Also for the form *blym*, derived from the root *bly* ‘deteriorate’, (ex. 8c) the parsing as G pass ptc, used for present resultant, is preferable semantically.⁵⁸ Both latter roots, together with *kly* ‘finish’ (cf. 8a), and, probably, *ha-ri-mu* “desecrate” (RS 20:123) are examples of intransitive verbs denoting telic process that derive pass ptc in Ugaritic; cf. also *brr* ‘be free’ above.

Resultant meaning can cooperate with future reference, denoting a potential optative situation:⁵⁹

55. Uncertain and broken context: *rgm . ank* [...] *mlkn ybqt ānyt* ‘I was **said** [...] the king himself has to look for a ship’ (2.42:25–26) is parsed in DULAT 721 as pass ptc *rgm* (?).

56. According to DULAT 145, this is a form of an act ptc: *w spm* ... *dbm* ‘the vessels are prepared / placed / ready / left over’ (2.88:27); according to Tropper (2012: 476) it is a G pass ptc.

57. The noun *ntbt* ‘road’ in 2.36:15-17 is masc sing (see DULAT 642) and plur correspondingly, *-m* in *šbtm* is mask plur or dual ending rather than *-m* enclitic, since likely two roads are mentioned (“in the country of Ugarit (and) the country of Qṭ”), while *u* is a contrastive conjunction ‘or’. To the best of my knowledge this interpretation has not yet been suggested: DULAT 795 translates *u šbtm ntbt mšrm b hwt ugrt* “or did I suspend Egypt’s (right of(?)) way through the country of Ugarit?” presumably parsing as infinitive or SC 1cs; Pardee 1983–1984: 325: “and they have stopped”, hinting that *u* is used for the conjunctive *w* (?); Dijkstra 1989: 144 suggested the contraction of /ʔu ʔašabbī-ma/ to /ʔūšabbī-ma/ “am I permitted to stop passages of caravans?”, otherwise the spelling *ʔu-* for 1cs prefix is difficult to explain; Cunchillos in TO II: 405-406. n. 185 “me laissent de côté” parses as Špass 1cs of the root **b-t-t*; Tropper 2012 does not discuss these verbs; the argument that the broken context in *w ank . ušbt* [...] (2.3:10) dictates the interpretation of *ū šbtm ntbt* in 2.36 is not tenable. In this example the speech time reference is emphasized by the imperfective in apodosis (*tšqn*). On the historical background of the route control in ancient Canaan see Smith 2014: 224-225 (he compares the present text to KTU 4.266, 4.336, and Ju 5:6).

58. The form *blym* is commonly interpreted as a compound *blym* ‘no day, never’, after Hoftijzer (1982: 125), who translates *w lht alpm hrṭm k rgmt ly blym alpm aršt lk. w. ly mn. bnš. d. l{ . }ikt. m[k]* “Was nun die Briefe hinsichtlich der Pflugoachsen betrifft, in denen Du zu mir sagst: niemals habe ich Ochsen gefordert. Wieviel Diener habe ich (Dir) dann wohl um Ochsen gesandt?” (2.45:22–25). The problem with this interpretation is that Hoftijzer does not render *lk . w . ly* at the end of line 24; moreover, the phrase *blym* ‘no day’ is not idiomatic. I am forced to resort to Gordon’s (1965: 372, n. 474) interpretation, followed by de Moor (1969: 187, n. 148), according to which the form is a pass ptc of the root *b-l-y*; for this root in Ugaritic see DULAT 221.

59. In Ugaritic the optative usage of the pass ptc is parallel to the optative usage of stative adjectives, as in, e.g., *lmny šm ādtny mnm šlm* ‘there, with our mistress, may all be well’ (2.11:14).

Ex. 9

1.124:14-15 *btm mhy l dg w l klb* “the house shall be cleansed of fish and dog.” Cf. also *htu* “is to be crushed” (1.6 II 21-23), *sšt* (1.14 III 7-9, but uncertain) “are to be swept.”

The form *mhy* (1.124:14-15) is routinely understood as a case of the imperative, but the use of optative pass ptc is preferable semantically.⁶⁰

5. Conclusions

The cumulative formal and semantic considerations permit a better definition of the pass ptc within the Ugaritic verbal paradigm. Together with some signs of formal heterogeneity the pass ptc reveals innovative *qatū/īl* patterns. It is used in a number of syntactic positions — as an attribute, patient noun, in a relative clause, and, prominently, as a converb, denoting secondary predication, and as a verbal predicate. The pass ptc’s functioning lays within the realm of passive voice and present tense: it takes over passive present tense, passive resultant, and passive future optative functions. Pass ptc’s are derived not only from dynamic transitive roots, but also from intransitive verbs of process and even stative roots. Apparently, these properties of the G pass ptc are emblematic and characterize the innovative linguistic development that advanced the pass ptc into the core of the verbal system in NWS languages.

6. Bibliography

Ahituv, S. 2008. *Echoes from the Past: Hebrew and Cognate Inscriptions from the Biblical Period*. Jerusalem: Carta.

AHw = Soden, W. von. 1965-1981. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Baranowski, K. J. 2016. *The Verb in the Amarna Letters from Canaan*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Bauer, H. and Leander, P. 1922. *Historische Grammatik der hebraeischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*. Hildesheim: Olms

Blau, Y. 1954. “Benoni pa⁶ul behora’a ⁷aktivit,” *Lešonenu* 18: 67-81.

Bordreuil, P., Pardee, D. and Hawley, R. 2012. *Une Bibliothèque au Sud de la Ville: Textes 1994-2002 en Cunéiforme Alphabétique de la Maison d’Ourtenou*. Lyon : Maison d’Orient et de la Méditerranée.

Bordreuil, P. and Pardee, D. 2009. *A Manual of Ugaritic*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

Brockelmann, C. 1908. 1913. *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Semitischen Sprachen*. Vols 1-2. Berlin: Reuther und Reichard.

60. The form *mhy* is interpreted as an imperative in Pardee 2012: “cleanse (wipe) the house: no more fish and no more dog,” DULAT 532, 264: “remove the fish and the dog”. Tropper (2012) is not decisive about the interpretation: on p. 663 he parses as ms imperative + enclitic -y (otherwise the diphthong contracts); on p. 475 he claims that the form might also be a SC. The main problem with the interpretation as imperative is the particle *l-*: the preposition *l-* does not introduce a direct object; (however enclitic -y is not uncommon with imperatives, see Huehnergard 2012: 79: “optional particle to mark direct speech”, and see DULAT 931–932). In my view this is a case of a G pass ptc with optative meaning: “the house shall be cleansed of fish and dog;” Tropper (2012: 475) also opines that the form may be a pass ptc. The same form *mhy* pass ptc in 1.41:54, 1.87:8 (used as a converb, cf. above and see DULAT 532 for the discussion) supports this parsing.

- CAD = Gelb, I. J. et al. (eds.). 1956–2010. *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary (The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago)*, 26 vols. Chicago: Oriental Institute.
- Cohen, Ch. 1996. “The Ugaritic Hippiatric Texts: Revised Composite Text, Translation and Commentary,” *Ugarit Forschungen* 28: 105–153.
- Cohen, Ch. and Klein, J. 2016. “Akkadian Hapax Legomena: Scribal Ego and Foreign Words,” *MAARAV* 21.1–2 (2014): 103–125.
- Cohen, Ch. and Sivan, D. 1983. *Ugaritic Hippiatric Texts: A Critical Edition*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Degen, R. 1969. *Altaramäische Grammatik der Inschriften des 10-8 Jh. v. Chr.*, Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Dietrich, M., Loretz, O. and Sanmartín, J. 1973. „Zur ugaritische Lexicographie (VII),“ *Ugarit Forschungen* 5: 79–104.
- Dijkstra, M. 1989. “Marginalia to the Ugarit Letters in KTU (II),” *Ugarit Forschungen* 21: 141–157.
- Doron, E. 2000. “Benoni savil,” *Balšanut šivrit* 47: 39–62.
- Doron, E. and Reintges, C. 2006. “On the syntax of participial modifiers,” Unpublished manuscript. <http://pluto.huji.ac.il/~edit/edit/>.
- DULAT= del Olmo Lete, G. and J. Sanmartín. 2003, 2015². *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Embick, D. 2004. “On the Structure of Resultative Participles in English,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 355–392.
- Fox, J. 2003. *Semitic Noun Patterns*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Friedrich, J. and Röllig, W. 1999. *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*³. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- GAG = Soden, W. Von. 1995. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. 3. Aufl. Roma: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum.
- Gai, A. 2005. “The “Signigifié” [sic] of the Non-Active Participle in Semitic Languages,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 155: 9–23.
- Garr, W.R. 1985. *Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000–586 bce*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goldenberg, G. 2013. *Semitic Languages: Features, Structures, Relations, Processes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gordon, C. H. 1965. *Ugaritic Textbook: Grammar, Texts in Transliteration, Cuneiform Selections, Glossary, Indices*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Haspelmath, M. 1994. “Passive Participles across Languages,” pp. 151–177, in Fox, B. and Hopper, P. J. (eds.) *Voice: Form and Function*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hoftijzer, J. 1982. “Quodlibet Ugariticum,” pp. 121–27 in Driel, G. van et al (eds.), *Zikir šumim: Assyriological Studies Presented to F.R. Kraus on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Leiden 1982.
- Huehnergard, J. 1987. *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Huehnergard, J. 2006. “Proto-Semitic and Proto-Akkadian,” pp. 1–18 in Deutscher, G. and Kouwenberg, M.J.C. (eds.), *The Akkadian Language in its Semitic Context: Studies in the Akkadian of the Third and Second Millennium BC*. Leiden: Brill.
- Huehnergard, J. 2012. *An Introduction to Ugaritic*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.

- Jackson, K. 1989. "Language of the Mesha' Inscription," pp. 96-130 in Dearman, J. A. (ed.), *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- KAI = Donner, H. and Roellig, W. 2002⁵. 1966-68². *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. Vols. 1-5. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Kogan, L. 2008. "On Proto-Semitic Deverbal Derivation". *Aula Orientalis* 23:91-115.
- Kogan, L. 2015. *Genealogical Classification of Semitic. The Lexical Isoglosses*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kouwenberg, N. J. C. 2010. *The Akkadian Verb and its Semitic Background*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- KTU = Dietrich, M., Loretz, O. and Sanmartín, J. 1995², 2013³. *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Loesov, S. 2009. "Arameyskiyi yaziki," pp. 414-496 in Belova, A., Kogan, L., Loesov, S., Romanova, O. (eds.), *Semitskiyi yaziki: Akkadskiy yazik, severozapadnosemitskiyi yaziki*. Moscow: Academia.
- Loesov, S. and Kalinin, M. "A History of the Passive in Old Aramaic," (forthcoming).
- Marcus, D. 1970 "The Qal Passive in Ugaritic," *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Society* 3:102-111.
- McGeough, K.M. and Smith, M.S. 2011. *Ugaritic Economic Tablets. Text, Translation and Notes*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Mirkin, R. 1967-1968. "Mišqal mefu'al," *Lešonenu* 32: 140-152.
- Moor, J.C. de 1969. "Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts," *Ugarit Forschungen* 1: 167-188.
- Moran, W. L. *Amarna Studies: Collected Writings*. Huehnergard, J. and Izre'el, Sh. (eds.). Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Notarius, T. 2010. "The Active Predicative Participle in Archaic and Classical Biblical Poetry: A Typological and Historical Investigation," *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 47: 240-68.
- Notarius, T. 2013. *The Verb in Archaic Biblical Poetry: A Discursive, Typological, and Historical Investigation of the Tense System*. Leiden: Brill.
- Notarius, T. 2019. "Participial Phrase in the Language of Ugaritic poetry," in Arnold, W. und Golinets, V. (eds.), *Sechstes Treffen der Arbeitsgemeinschaft Semitistik in der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft Münster*, (forthcoming)
- Olmo Lete, G. del. 2014. *Incantations and Anti-witchcraft Texts from Ugarit*. Boston: de Gruyter.
- Pardee, D. 2002. *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Pardee, D. 1983-1984. "Ugaritic," *Archiv für Orientforschung* 29-30: 321-329.
- Pardee, D. 2003-2004. "Review of Tropper 2000," *Archiv für Orientforschung* 50 (online version).
- Pardee, D. 2016. "Trente ans de recherches sur les textes et les soins hippatriques en langue ougaritique," *Pallas: Revue d'études antiques* 101: 159-188.
- Rainey, A. 1974. "The Ugaritic Texts in Ugaritica 5," *JAOS* 94: 184-194.
- Retsö, J. 1989. *Diathesis in the Semitic Languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Rosen, H. 1956. "Mefu'al ba-'ivrit ha-yisra'elit," *Lešonenu* 20: 139-148.
- RS = Ras Shamra excavation number.
- Sanmartín, J. 1988. "Textos hipiátricos de Ugarit y el discurso del método," *Aula Orientalis* 6:227-235.

- Sharvit, Sh. 1980. "Ma^ʿarexet hazemanim belašon hamišna," pp. 110-125 in Sarfatti, G., Artzi, P., Greenfield, J., and Kaddari, M. *Mixkarim be'ivrit ubilšonot šemiyot*. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University.
- Sivan, D. 1984. *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian texts of the 15th-13th BCE from Canaan and Syria*. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker.
- Sivan, D. 2001. *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*. Leiden: Brill.
- Smith, M. S. 2014. *Poetic Heroes: Literary Commemorations of Warriors and Warrior Culture in the Early Biblical World*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmann.
- Smith, M. S. and Pitard, W. T. 2009. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, Vol. 2. Leiden: Brill.
- TO I = Caquot, A., Sznycer, M. and Herdner, A. 1974. *Textes ougaritiques, I* (mythes et légendes). Paris.
- TO II = Caquot, A., de Tarragon, J.-M. and Cunchillos, J.-L. 1989. *Textes ougaritiques II* (textes religieux et rituels, correspondance). Paris.
- Tropper, J. 2000; 2012². *Ugaritische Grammatik*. Munster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Ugaritica V = Nougayrol, J., Laroche, E., Virolleaud, C. and Schaeffer, C.F.A. 1968. *Ugaritica 5. Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des Archives et Bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit, commentaires des textes historiques*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Verreet, E. 1985. "Beobachtungen zum ugaritische Verbalsystem II," UF 17: 319-344.
- Waltke, B.K. and O'Connor, M. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Watson, W. 2002. "Unnoticed equivalents to two difficult words," NABU 37/1: 40-41.
- Watson, W. 2007. *Lexical Studies in Ugaritic*. Aula Orientalis Supplementa 19, Sabadell: Editorial AUSA.
- Weninger, S. 2011. "Reconstructive Morphology," pp. 151-178 in *The Semitic Languages. An International Handbook*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.