

The Nominal Postpositional Morpheme /-y/ in Ugaritic Gender, inflection, and vocalization

Gregorio del Olmo Lete – Universitat de Barcelona-IPOA
Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 585 - Barcelona

[The Ugaritic suffixed morpheme /-y/ intervenes in the formation of several nominal patterns. There are a number of uncertainties regarding the determination of their gender, inflection and vocalization. In this paper we will address these items, by using the extant syllabic notation of the respective Ugaritic consonantal lexemes. The information gathered from this and other sources may provide a firm grounding for resolving these uncertainties.]

Key words: -y nisba derivatives, nouns and names in -y.

The Ugaritic suffixed morpheme /-y/ intervenes in the formation of several nominal patterns, namely: 1) derivative gentilic adjectives; 2) feminine PNN and DNN (personal and divine names) and denominatives in /-y/ from Myth and Legend; 3) common feminine nouns ending in /-y/; 4) PNN ending in /-y/ from the administrative texts; and 5) TNN (place names). There are a number of uncertainties regarding the determination of their gender, inflection and vocalization. In this paper we will address these items, using the extant syllabic notation of the respective Ugaritic consonantal lexemes. The information gathered from this and other sources may provide a firm grounding for resolving these uncertainties.

1. *Gentilic adjectives*

The gentilic semantic derivative function of this suffixed morpheme (/y/) is generally recognized as a common Semitic grammatical morph¹ and creates no problems as regards gender and inflection. It is easily extended to cover other related semantic categories². The vocalization pattern is universally triptotic in Ugaritic (/i-yu:i:a/)³. The derivation is commonly based on a toponym (TN), as its semantic or

1. There is a complementary distribution of /-āy-/ and /-īy-/ patterns in the different Semitic languages. See Brockelmann GVG I 397; Moscati ICGSL 83; Lipiński SLOCG 223f.; Von Soden GAG § 56: H 37.

2. Special cases: only for *uḥry* (syll. É:ḥi-ri-ti ù A.ŠA.MEŠ ša uḥ-ra-a-yi; PRU 3:52f. [RS 15.85]) the syll. notation (see below and n. 39) provides a hint as to their vocalization; see DUL 40, 161. Needless to say, the present participle of bases of III-y are not considered here, since the ending phoneme /-y/ belongs to the base and the vocalization follows a regular nominal pattern (/qātil/). See in this connection syll. A.Š[A.ḤI.A] ^da(?)*-li-yi* (PRU 6 29:5, according to Huehnergard's reading, UVST 160), ; Ug. n.m. ^cly. The same may be said of animal nouns like *gdy*, *zvy*... (< /qatl/; for *irby* later n. 35).

3. See Gordon UT 61f.; Tropper UG 273f.; Sivan GUL 74. The doubling of the consonant /y/ is developed in NWS (Hebrew, Arabic and maybe Aramaic). But the long vowel (/i/) is also normal.

etymological reference, with the value: “native of ...”; the suffix may also be added to a patronymic (PN) name with the value: “belonging to the stock of ...”. Territory and *ethnos* define the gentilic relation. The functional and nominal patterns are easily verified when we have both the TN/PN and its gentilic denominative.

The pattern is fully supported by the syll. transcription. We will simply record the *few* direct testimonies (taking into account the total number of attested consonantal GNN) which have a syll. counterpart, referring to DUL for the text data in this and in the following categories. In the syll. notation the gender and the case inflection can normally be ascertained.

<i>'ugrt</i>	= /ugartī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>u-ga-ar-ti</i> ⁴ , <i>u-ga-ar-ti-yu</i> (PI))
<i>'alty(y)</i>	= /aliṭī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>a-li</i> (SI)- <i>ši</i> -PI, <i>a-li-ši</i> -PI ⁵)
<i>apsny</i>	= /apsanī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>ap-su-ni-yi-ma</i> , ^{al} <i>ap-sú-na</i> -PI ⁶)
<i>birty</i>	= /birutī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>bi-ru-ut-ti</i> ⁷)
<i>gb^cly</i>	= /giba ^c lī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>gi</i> ₅ (KI)- <i>ba-'a-li</i> -PI, <i>ašar-ba-'a-li</i> -PI ⁸)
<i>gbly</i>	= /gublī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>gu-ub-li</i> -PI)
<i>ḥry</i>	= /ḥurrī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>ḥur-ri</i> ⁹)
<i>knp y</i>	= /kanapī(:iy)yu/ (< A.ŠA <i>ka-na-BI</i> -PI ¹⁰)
<i>ma/iḥdy</i>	= /ma/iḥadī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>ma-ḥa-di</i> -PI)
<i>mšry</i>	= /mušrī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>mu-uš-ri</i> -PI)
<i>pṭrty</i>	= /paṭaratī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>pa-ša-ra-ti</i>)
<i>qrty</i>	= /qartī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>qar-ti</i> - ^l PI/ <i>qa-ra-ti</i> -PI/ <i>qa-ra-ti</i> -PI- <i>ma/ú</i>)
<i>qrṭy</i>	= /qurtī(:iy)yu/ (< ^{al} <i>qu-ur-tu</i> ¹¹)
<i>rišy</i>	= /rišī(:iy)yu/ (< SAG-PI)
<i>šlm</i>	= /šalmī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>šal-mi</i> -PI ¹²)
<i>štgy</i>	= /šatigī(:iy)yu/ (< ^l <i>ša-te-ga</i> ¹³)
<i>ṭlrby</i>	= /ṭalurbī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>ša-lur-x-bi</i> -PI)
<i>ṭnqy</i>	= /ṭanaqī(:iy)yu/ (< <i>ša-na-qi</i> ¹⁴)

4. A contraction /ugārī/ for *u-ga-ar-ti-yi*, as is normally the case with /-a-ya/ < /-ā/ in TNN, normal also in the Arabic nisba and transferred into the Romance languages (see n. 3). For this sort of /-iy(y)/- contraction in nisba adjectives see particularly Heb. ^l*ibriy(y)i(m)* / < ^c*ibri(m)*; *mō'ābiyyāh/mō'ābīt*; Kautzsch GHG 240; Bauer-Leander HGHSAT 501f.; Joüon-Muraoka GBH I 267, 271, 317. The same TN *ugrt* could itself be analysed as a contracted nisba fem. derivation from *ugr*, “field”: /ugārīyu // /ugārīyatu/ > /ugārītu/, with external gender marker; see Van Soldt, *UF* 28 1996, 657; id., TCSU 169.

5. We should bear in mind the polyvalence of the signs *ia*, PI and *a-a* to transcribe /-yu/, /-yi/, /-ya/; see Von Soden GAG § 22:4, 2; also Mayer, *Orientalia* 72, 2003, 293-306; and the very pertinent comments of Kühne, *UF* 7, 1975, 255f. For the reading of the sign /PI/ in the Ugaritic PNN and TNN and the distribution of those signs in the different archives see Van Soldt SAU 280f., 334ff.; Huehnergard UVST 238f.; id., AkkU 41-45.

6. See *infra* n. 118 on this exceptional syll. notation..

7. See n. 4: /birutī/ for *bi-ru-ti-yi*.

8. See later on this TN.

9. See n. 4: /ḥurrī/ for *ḥur-ri-yi*.

10. See PRU 3, p. 79 [16.239]7; Kühne, *UF* 7, 1975, 255f.

11. See n. 4: /qurtū/ (Akk. pattern) for *qu-ur-ti-yu*.

12. In this case GN, TN and PN have the same spelling, probably derived from *šlm*, TN or common noun. A GN *šlmgy* is not extant.

13. See n. 4: /šategā/ for *ša-te-gi-ya*.

14. See n. 4: /šanaqī/ for *ša-na-qi-yi*. The masculine DN *ṭrty* (syll. *šar-ra-ši*-IA > /ṭarraṭīyu/), of Hurrian origin, may also belong here; see Arnaud, SMEA 34, 1994, 107; Pardee TR 2, p. 800f.).

In this first group of adjectives, the morph /-y/ functions as a grammatical derivative *suffix*. We cannot go further in determining its origin, but certainly this postposition does not correspond either to a hypocoristicon (“Verkürzung”), or to a diminutive (“Zärtlichkeits- suffix”), categories we will find later on in keeping with other similar nominal patterns.

As we said above, besides these gentilic adjectives, Ugaritic also has a few masculine non-gentilic denominative adjectives which follow the same pattern and for which obviously we lack a syll. counterpart. Their vocalization must be guessed by analogy and comparison, mostly according to the derivative patterns /-īyu/ (/āyu?).

<i>'agzry</i>	= /agzarīyu/
<i>'lly</i>	= /ilānīyu/
<i>°llmy</i>	= /°alalmīyu/ ¹⁵
<i>try</i>	= /tararīyu/ ¹⁶

2. Feminine PNN and denominatives in /-y/ from Myth and Legend

Besides this clear-cut category of gentilic and assimilate derivatives we have a few lexemes apparently of the same pattern, but which function in this case as *feminine* PNN or qualifiers (personal names are singular by definition and its gender is determined by the referent), beginning with the famous three/four daughters of Baal: *pdry*, *arsy*, *ily*, *ybrdmy*. The first three are clearly derivatives so the hypocoristicon or “Zärtlichkeitswort” character of the /-y/ must be also ruled out in this case: *arsy* < “that of the earth/Hell”, *ily* < “that of the dew”, *pdry* < “that of the town”¹⁷. We can also include in this group the DN *mlghy* and the denominative: *hby* (< *hbl*, “destruction”) and *rmy* (< *rhm*, “womb, damsel”).

A first but unequivocal hint of the vocalization of those PNN is provided by the two syllabic counterparts of the PNN that we have: *ù it-ta-[din-]un-šu-n[u a-na [t/T]a-la-PI ... iš-tu qâtī^{ti} ta/TA-la-PI*, “ils les ont cédés à Dame Talaya ... des mains de Dame Talaya”¹⁸; and *]ʔ bani^d bi-it-ra-i (< pi-id-ra-i)*¹⁹. The sign PI is read /-ya/ by Nougayrol²⁰; here, as is always the case at the end of a word, while Van Soldt reads /-yu:i/ according to the case inflection²¹, prepositional genitive in this case, the gender being indicated by the determinative. The other example is more debatable: *ilānu [ša^{mat al}]ú-ga-rit iladad [ša^{al}.....]-ba-ni^{il} bi-it-ra-i ... liššuru^u-ka*, “Que les dieux (d’Ougarit), Adad, (de)-bani B/Pitra’i ... te gardent”²². As pointed out by Nougayrol “nous devrions trouver aux l. 2’ et suiv. des dieux d’Amurru”. Actually the quoted god, parallel to Adad of Ugarit and probably also a masc. deity, may indeed be a patron god of Amurru, although unknown to us at present, and would therefore have nothing to do with Baal’s daughter *pdry*. Morphologically it is in nom. so the syll. notation /-a-i/ (< /-’i/) is difficult to explain²³ from the point of view of Ugaritic grammar (see later). But being a denominative one would

15. See Del Olmo Lete IMC 42; for other opinions see DUL 158.

16. See Del Olmo Lete, *Aula Orientalis* 16, 1998, 187-192.

17. See Gröndahl PTU 171f.; this etymology is questioned by Pope-Röllig GMVO, p. 303. For a discussion of the possible etymology of *ybrdmy* see Del Olmo MLRSO 93, 165. .

18. See PRU 3, p. 61 [RS 16.156]:8, 17.

19. See PRU 4 132 (RS 17.116):3’ n. 14;) and later on nn. 35 and 84 for the reading and vocalization.

20. See also Gröndahl PTU 202 /talaya/; De Moor SP 83; Gordon, NUS 31, 1984, 11; Aartun StUL 61ff; Cross CMHE 56 n. 47; Sivan GAGI. 289f; Huehnergard UVST 214.

21. Van Soldt insists on “case ending”, *passim* in his books and articles on the subject. I myself have used the ending /-ayu/ as the normalization of those PNN (MLC; but changed to /-ay/ in MLRSO as a spoken form).

22. See PRU 4 132 (17.116): 14’, n. (1).

23. It may be that the scribe copied only the first part /’i/ of the compound sign /ia/? In this case we should have *Pidraya/Pidrayu* (?). But, as we pointed out, this deity is not known as the main god(dess) of the contemporary State of Amurru.

expect the corresponding gender marker for feminine DNN. This means that besides being a derivative suffix /-y/ (< /-ayu/) is in this case a morphemic suffix. To distinguish between the two functions I choose in this case the vocalization /-ayu/ instead of /-āyu/ of the derivative nisba suffix:

<i>'aršy</i>	= /Aršayu/
<i>pdry</i>	= /Pidrayu/
<i>tly</i>	= /Ṭallayu/
<i>ybrdmy</i>	= /Yabrudmayu/ (?) ²⁴
<i>ḥbly</i> (Anat)	= /Ḥablayu/
<i>mlghy</i> (<i>ktrt</i>)	= ḡ ²⁵
<i>rḥmy</i> (Anat/Ashtarte)	= /Raḥmayu/

In this case the parsing will be: /-ayu/ derivative/morphemic suffix, feminine, triptotic²⁶, used in PNN.

The difference in semantic function, gender and vocalization distinguishes this suffix from the previous nisba suffix /-ī:āyu/. We could even hypothesize that they form a kind of complementary distribution (/ī:āyu/ vs. /-ayu/) within the field of derivative suffixes: common gentilic vs. PN, masculine vs. feminine. One might even think of a diptotic pattern (/ayu/, /-aya/), which is normal with PNN, vs. the triptotic nisba pattern (/iyu:i:a/). In any case, as will be seen later on, the categorical grouping of those clear derivative PNN with the general class of non-derivative feminine PNN ending in /-y/, will allow a wider perspective for our discussion of the morphological origin of the postposition.

Furthermore, in the Ugaritic literary texts we also have a wider set of *feminine* denominatives ending in /-y/, sometimes functioning as PNN, applied this time to humans. Some of them are clearly derivative in origin, others less so. They may be treated according to the same vocalization pattern:

<i>dmgy</i> (Ashera's slave)	= /Dam(v)gayu/
<i>dnty</i> (Danil's wife)	= /Dan(v)tayu/ ²⁷

and possibly some others.

One cannot in any case consider the ending /-y/ as a mere graphemic convention at the consonantal level in Ugaritic, like the Ar. fem. pattern /fa^cla^y/, /fu^cla^y/ for /fa^clā/, /fu^clā/ // (/fa^cla:/, /fu^cla:/)²⁸. It must preserve its full consonantal value. Nor is a normalization of the sort *pdry* < /pidray/²⁹ acceptable in

24 See n. 17.

25. Maybe a compound DN: *mlg-hy* ("She is ..."); see DUL 548.

26. But the diptotic declension of PNN is common in Semitic: Brockelmann GVG I 461; Lipiński SLOCG 258f. Even Izre'el AALS 193 asserts. "Personal names do not regularly inflect for case", with regard to El-Amarna PNN (see also p. 195).

27. The DN *i/ušhry* (< /Išḥarayu/; syll. *iš-ḥa-ra* [Ug V 18(RS 20.24):23], and p. 56), apparently of Hurrian (?) origin. Furthermore, PNN of non literary texts like *btšy* (*agdn*'s daughter) > /Batšayu/, *kbby* (f?) > /Kubabayu/ ("this of Kubaba"; see Hur. *kbb(d)*), *nkly* (f?) > /Nikkalayu/ ("this of Nikkal; see RSO 14 50:15, p. 376-377), *prdny* (*wrt*'s wife) > /Pardānyu/ (?), *trhy* (*ḡlm[n]*'s wife) > /Tar(-)hayu/ (?), *lḡdy* (*lqht*) > /lḡd-ayu/ (Hurrian name) may follow the same vocalic pattern.

28. See Tropper UG 282 ("plus Kasusendung") and Van Sold, *passim* ("(plus) the case ending").

29. See Gordon UT 62; Bordreuil-Pardee MOu II 194 (also /'aršay/, /ṭallay/, /ḥablay/, *a. l.*). Pardee's review of Tropper UG, (*AfO* 50, 2003-2004, on-line, p. 176f.) completely misses the point, among other things because "the Arabic feminine morpheme /ay/" is absent; the /-y/ (*alif maqṣura*) is merely graphic. The same elementary error is made by S.C. Layton, AFPCPN 241ff., 245 (see in this regard Streck AOAT 352f.) and Van Soldt TCSU 166; id., *Fs. Groneberg*, 322 n. 140. The references quoted in this connection, namely W. Wright GAL I:184, and Fischer GKA § 64b n. 5 (this note has nothing to do with the diphthong /-ay/), speak of "Feminines in ʿ'- // -ā (ʿ)" (namely, of graph ʿ without diacritic points), not of diphthong -ay (*fa^clā^y*), nor *fa^clay*; neither ending -ā nor -ā'-u are written with [consonantal] -y). These grammarians speak of standard or literary Arabic; on a possible ancient dialectal diphthong -ay see below n. 46, but this is impossible in the Ugaritic phonological system. Resorting to Heb. *šāray* (see later) is not justified either, since in Heb. the quoted monophthongation does not take place (except in the

Ugaritic phonology, where the ascending diphthong /-ay/ becomes without exception /-ê/ (alternatively /-î/) the contraction absorbing the closing semiconsonant /-y/ (see jus. III-y /-ay/ = /-ê/). As we have seen, the syllabic transcription ¹*Tá-la-PI* confirms the syllabic pronunciation of this final /-y/ in these names.

3. Common feminine nouns ending in /-y/

Besides these derivative nominal groups, the last and most striking category of Ugaritic lexemes ending in /-y/ is that of common nouns. In a pioneer article O. Loretz³⁰ gathers and analyses a few lexemes, three common names and one mythical place name (TN): *n^cmy*, “delight, beauty”, *brky*, “pool”, *šrry*, “heights” // *hmry*, TN, “the muddy”. The first group, thanks to parallel forms (*n^cmt*, *brkt*, *šrrt*), appear to be *feminine*, a characterization that can also be extended to the TN *hmry* (//*hmrt*)³¹. On the other hand, in this case there is no hint of the inflectional (case and number) pattern and vocalization, a question Loretz does not consider, since no syll. counterpart is available. To them we should add *uhry* for which this time we have the syll. witness *uh-ra-a-PI* (gen., “extremity”, “posterity”)³² However, the semantic coincidence between the forms in /-t/ and /-y/ obliges us to take the pattern as a *morphemic alternative*, not as a suffixed derivative form. Consequently the /-y/ element must be of different origin in this case. But once again, hypocoristic or diminutive/“Zärtlichkeitswort” patterns are clearly excluded.

Those examples are taken from the great literary texts from Ugarit. The ritual, administrative and other minor literary texts present some more cases of this morphology which should be placed in the same group: *'abdy*, “ruin, destruction” (KTU 1.107:7³³), *'ubdy*, “land, plot, farming” (KTU 4.103:1 and

construct state), nor is the case ending extant; see the difficulties experienced by Kautzsch, GHG 224, 242, in attempting to explain this form. A hypothetical preservation of the diphthong /-ay/ in roots III-y, after the case-vowel was lost (but actually this did not happen in Ugaritic) is also ruled out by the syllabic evidence of the preservation of the case-vowel in the bound forms, according to Tuttle's conclusions; cf. G.A. Tuttle, *Fs. LaSor* 253-268; J. Huehnergard, *JCS* 33, 1981, 199-205 (204). A possible alternative (accepting that “anything is possible”) would be to put forward the vocalization /-āy/, with the long vowel hindering the contraction (see Van Soldt TCSU 165, who accepts this vocalic pattern, even though this vocalism would hinder the contraction, as is manifest in the case of toponyms) or an ‘historical spelling’ (*pidrā*), as Van Soldt TCSU 166 suggests; for a possible occurrence of this sort of vocalization in Emariote see Arnaud *SEL* 8, 1991, 27. In this regard consider the TN ^{um}*pa-ni-iš-t-a-i/pa-ni-iš-t-a-a* that certifies the case ending (-*ayi*, -*aya*); the same phenomenon can be observed in Mari (see below). But the mere final consonantal /-y/ is an epigraphical value that is unknown and impossible in the Akk. syll. system. See Van Soldt TCSU 163; also Richardson *JSS* 23, 1978, 311, 312; in the Akk. syllabary the consonantic value /-y/ for the sign /-i/ is unknown. In this respect, Streck's normalizations of /Ka-a/ and /Ka-i/ as /-ayy/ (AOAbZ 183) are supposed to mean rather /-ayy-/. For the situation at Emar see Pentieu WSVATE 236 (*ḥa-pá-i* = /ḥapāyi/; *ḥa-pá-ú* = /ḥapāyu/). Then /-a-i/ stays for /-a-yi/ against Izre'el's opinion AALS 42 (“Consonantal *y* in non-Akkadian names is attested in word-final position in the following names: ^d*pi-id-ra-i* [RS 17.116:3'], a Ugaritic DN; ^h*ḥa-a-i* [EA 166:1, 14], for the Egyptian PN /ḥa'ay/” (see also p. 195). Here two different transcription systems are mixed up: the syll. Ugaritic for Semitic *pdry* and the Amarna system for an Egyptian PN whose vocalization is unknown. According to this line of thinking, other PNN, not only this one, should be read as ending in consonantal /-y/: PN *ú-ši-i*; EA *ka-si-i* (Hess APN 97, 207, Ug. *ksy*; on the other hand, /ḥa-a-i/ is here normalized /ḥaya/, p. 75, 217). The grammarians of the Ugaritic Akkadian (Huehnergard, Van Soldt; also Tropper; see also Von Soden GAG § 22:4, 2: “e (seltener i) auch für ji”) argue for the inflectional type of this kind of syll. notation. In Ugaritic phonetics such normalization is impossible (see above Huehnergard and Tuttle's advice). For the reading ^d*pi-id-ra-i* see PTU 171.

30. See O. Loretz, “Ugaritisch ^cq I-II, ^cq und hebräisch ^cq in Ps 6,8. Zur Nominalform qtlly (šrry) in KTU 1.16 I 2-9a”, *UF* 33, 2001, 303-324. Already Tropper UG 274, 283 (/ -āy//: /nu^cmay/, maybe an error[?] for /nu^cmāy/, p. 282: “plus Kasusendung”), who refers to Ar. /fu^clā/ fem. pattern of masc. pattern /'af^calu/. In this regard see Pardee AfO 50, 2003-2004, on line, p. 171. But one has to bear in mind that the morpheme /-ayu/ in TNN is feminine in gender, so it cannot be considered simply a nisba ending.

31. See also Tropper UG 282f. (on Pardee's review, see above n 29); Sc.C. Layton AFCPN 243-244. There are some other mythical TNN of this kind such as *knkny*, *hdy* (Heb. 'Edre^cī, Ar. Der^cā), for which we do not have a syll. counterpart.

32. See KTU 1.19 III 56 and par.; 1.103+:39-40. For reading and interpretation, see DUL 40 and Tropper UG 274. Nougayrol's interpretation (PRU 3 52 [RS 15.85]18) is quite divergent.

33. See DUL 6. Otherwise D. Pardee TP 241 (“la destructrice”, /'abday/(!).

passim); *mnhy*, “offering” (/ *mnh*³⁴; KTU 1.2 I 38); *mšpy*, “?” (KTU 1.16 IV 14); *nkšy*, “accounting” (KTU 6.66:3-4).³⁵ Those nouns mostly have an abstract feminine semantic value (“destruction”, “farming”, “offering”, “accounting”)³⁶.

No clear or indirect gender mark or syll. transcription is available for these nouns either. In this situation, only analogy and comparatism are of some utility. The alternation in Heb. between *šāray* (/šarrayu/) and *šārāh* (/šarratu/), “queen” (Gen. 17:15) has been frequently quoted³⁷. The example is particularly pertinent since it turns out to be at the same time a PN and a common noun. According to the biblical text *šāray* (see Gen. 11:29-31; 12:5, 11, 17; 16:1-8) was the old exceptional (Amorite/Aramaic³), name, while *šārāh* would turn out to be the innovation, the normal (Canaanite, actually Akkadian from the point of view of the Bible exilic redaction) pattern (*šarrum/šarratum::šār/šārāh*)³⁸.

In view of these data, we propose the following normalization³⁹ for this category of common nouns, considered to be of *feminine* gender and their inflection pattern supposed to be triptotic, like that of their parallel forms in /-atu/.

<i>'abdy</i>	= /abdayu/
<i>'ubdy</i>	= /ubdayu/
<i>'uḥry</i>	= /uḥrayu/ ⁴⁰
<i>brky</i>	= /birkayu/
<i>hmry</i>	= /himrayu/
<i>mnhy</i>	= /minḥayu/
<i>mšpy</i>	= /mišpayu/
<i>n^cmy</i>	= /nu ^c mayu/
<i>nkšy</i>	= /nikšayu/
<i>šrry</i>	= /šar(i)rayu/ (?) ⁴¹

Interestingly, this morphemic ending (/ -ay-/) can also be found in Syriac, as well as in derivative adjectives (/ -ay(a)/)⁴², in seven *feminine* nouns; an ending that Nöldeke defines as “eine alte

34. See Heb. f. *minḥāh*,

35. The parsing proposed in DUL 631 (“Akk. obl. pl. /nikkassī/, with *mater lect.* -y”) seems less probable. We leave aside the *hapax qnuy*, “craftsman”, a derivative of nisba type /qanu'iyu/, /qani'uyu/ (< *iqnu*; KTU 2.73:17; see DUL 705). The animal names *ary:w*, *gdy/gd*, *zby*, are simple triptotic nouns, as already pointed out, *supra* n. 2. More dubious *irby*, “locust” = *'irbayu* > Hb. *'arbeh**; slightly different in Tropper UG 174.

36. On the special case of *šjy*, as MN (AkkUg. *ša'iy-*) see Del Olmo Lete, *AuOr* 28, 2010, 133 (pattern /qātil/?).

37. See Bauer-Leander HGHSAT 512 (also p. 502, and other examples without morphological counterpart and probable radical nature of the ending /-y/); Kautzsch GHG 224, 242; Koehler-Baumgartner HALOT 1355; Meyer HG II, p. 40; Richardson UPNY 314-315. For Heb. *Mordechay* = Akk. *Marduکی(ja)* (“The one of Marduk”) see Zadok *UF* 17, 1955, 392. The pair /bty/ # /bt/ of KTU 1.96: 6, 12-13 could be considered as alternative feminine forms /-ayu/ # /-atu/ (see in this regard Tarazi, *UF* 36, 2004, 465ff.: infinitive/nominal pattern); but the complementary distribution of mas./(contracted) fem. nouns of profession, treated as indissoluble in the chiasitic organization, seems more likely (see Tropper UG 283; G. del Olmo Lete, *AuOr* 28, 2010 49f.).

38. Some other *hapax* of apparently the same (?) nominal pattern (in this case masculine in gender) seem to have survived in Heb.: *ḥōray*, *gōbay*, *šāday*, etc., as well some masculine PNN: *Zakkay*, *Ḥaggay*, *Barzillay*, *Yanay* ... (see the above note: *Mordechay*). Maybe this is a nisba derivative morpheme (“this of ...”) following the alternative Akk.-Aram. pattern (see above n. 1) or a conditioned environmental assimilation/dissimilation of the nisba /-iy(y)-/: /-aX-iy/ < /-aX-ay/; /-iX-iy/ < /-iX-ay/.

39. The vocalization /-ayu/ is here assumed as against the nisba /-āyu/; see n. 1; Tropper UG 282ff

40. The syll. notation *uḥ-rā-a-yi* would suggest rather a nisba vocalization /uḥrāy-//; see Tropper UG 274. But see *ibdm.* /na^cmay/; see above n. 30.

41. See Sanmartin, *UF* 10, 1978, 454 n. 9.

42. See Costaz GS 55; Nöldeke KSG73-81; Muraoka *Csyr.* 32.

Femininendung ... nicht mehr flektierbar⁴³: *gôgay*, “spider”, *hi'fay*, “gnat”, *kûkbay*, “owl”, *salway*, “quail”, *tanway*, “contract”, *tû^cay*, “error”, *tûšay*, ‘to be occulted’, Lat. *clam* (“nur in *bṭûš^cay*, ‘heimlich’⁴⁴). Originally this ending, applied mainly to animal nouns, was also a suffixed morphemic element in Syriac.

But it is above all in Arabic where the nominal *feminine* gender morpheme /-ya/ is witnessed in different categories, along with the common /-t/ ending of triptotic inflection (/atu:i:a/). We must leave aside the case of the masculine *plural fractus* patterns /qatlā/ and /qatālā/, as well as that of the feminine of adjectives of the patterns /qatlān-/ , /'aqtal-/ and even /qatal-/ > /qútlā/⁴⁵, whose final /-y/ turns out to be purely graphic (*'ālif maqšūrat*)⁴⁶. But in Arabic there are also original feminine nouns of the same pattern /qatlā/⁴⁷, but which have a *dualis* and *pluralis sanus*, in which the soundless graphic ending /-y/ becomes fully incorporated into the triliteral scheme, even though it does not belong to the ‘root’: *dikrā^(y)* > *dikrayāt-*, “memory/ies”⁴⁸. As for the inflection, both the broken plural and the original feminine pattern /qatlā/, according to Wright⁴⁹, are diptotic. He also equates the PNN ending in /'ālif maqšūrat-/ and those in /'ālif mamdūdat-/. Nevertheless, the script clearly distinguishes them: *yahyā^(y)* and *zakariyyā'u*. The same is ascertained in common names: *dikrā*, *dunyā*, but *šahrā'-u*, *ḥuyalā'-u*. In this regard Fischer is explicit: “Das Suff. -ā hat eine flektierbare Variante -ā'u”; but “Nomina mit stammauslautenden -ā sind Sg. indeclinabel”⁵⁰. Corriente also comments in this connection: “Los morfemas de caso no se usan con bases acabadas en /a:/ (o »à«)”⁵¹; that is, they are indeclinable, not diptotic.

Interestingly, the patterns /qatlā^(y)/ and /qatlā^(y)-/ are normal patterns for forming *feminine* adjectives of /qatlān-/ , /'aqtal-/ and even of /qatal-/ patterns, as pointed out above, along with other non-derivative feminine adjectives that follow this pattern (by analogy?)⁵². This suggests that the those graphic patterns /qatlā^(y)/ are felt to be equivalent to /-at-/ as regular morph of feminine gender. Maybe this morphemic use comes from the morphology of the primary feminine nouns (in Ugaritic, Syriac) with this pattern, quoted above. What does this parallelism imply from the point of view of phonology and morphology? Why did the Arabic grammarians and lexicographers set up this notation system: feminine with soundless /-y/? Are we right to see here an etymological trace of the ancient west-Semitic morph /-ayu/ of the PNN, with its consonantal value recovered in the plural?⁵³. In that case, is it justified to trace the development: Amor./Ug. /-ayu/ > Heb./Syr. /-ay/ > Ar. /-ā^(y)/, but pl. /-ay(āt)/?

43. See Nöldeke KSG 54; Costaz GS 38 (“invariables” < “ancien absolu”); K. Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*, Hildesheim 1966, a.l.

44. See Nöldeke, *loc. cit.*; Costaz, *loc. cit.* mixes up the last two items; Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, p.282, 292.

45. See Wright GAL I 184, 199; Fleisch TPhA I 315-319; Fischer GKA § 64b.

46. See above n. 35. Fleisch TPhA I 316 quotes Sībawayhi’s testimony of the dialectal pronunciation of three toponyms, of which he says: “la toponymie, domaine des survivances, des conservatismes, ne peut ici permettre d’inférer un emploi étendu d’un suffixe -ay dans la langue vivante. Elle est plutôt un témoin de ce qui a été, à rapprocher de la correspondance: syriacque *salway*, arabe *salwā*”. A possible final *diphtong* /-ay/ may be found in the late North Arabian Dedanitic, but given its unvocalized notation the question remains highly speculative; see M.C.A. Macdonald, CEWAL 501.

47. See Wright GAL I 179,

48. See Wright GAL I 94, 197; see p. 94 (verbs III-y).

49. See Wright GAL I, pp. 239-242; see the forms of /-y/ in p. 441

50. See Fischer GKA § 64a, 154a.

51. See F. Corriente, *Gramática árabe*, Barcelona 2006², p. 91.

52. See Wright GAL I 184.

53. See in this connection Fleisch’s suggestion: “-ay serait peut-être une diphtongaison de -ā ... Cette hypothèse de -ay anciennement una variante affective de -ā, usée, et ramenée a -ā par l’arabe, serait peut-être un moyen d’accorder un certain état ancien avec le sentiment linguistique des grammairiens arabes qui ont vu un *'alif* dans ce suffixe -ā > -ā, un *'alif maqšura*, qu’ils ont opposé à l’*'alif mamdūda*, selon leur synthétisation” (TPhA 318 n. 1). For his part, Van Soldt (TCSU 166) suggests. “-āyu is most likely to be a feminine ending which also seems to occur in Ugaritic words and personal names. Forms like *Gulbatā* and

In any case, these Arabic data refer to a late linguistic level that cannot apply unrestrictedly to the situation implied by the Ugaritic morphology and orthography. It must be stressed that at the linguistic consonantal level of the latter we cannot consider the ending /-y/ as a merely historical graphemic convention, as it is in Arabic. It must preserve its full consonantal value, as we pointed out above.

We conclude, then, that the morpheme /-ayu/ is used in Ugaritic in common nouns as a feminine pattern, along with the more normal /-atu/. Maybe it was considered more archaic and literary, or maybe it was reserved, as a “marker of class”, for more or less abstract nouns (“prettiness”, “acuosity”, “height”, “muddiness”, etc.) whose gender *neutral* character is normally worded by the feminine gender in Semitic (while in Syriac it survived as morph for animal names). The preexistence of this archaic feminine morphemic pattern probably determined its application in case of the derivative personal and denominative names we have dealt with above. In this way, the two linguistic processes came together.

Morphologically, this pattern, besides the peculiar ending, also shows a clear base alternance in Arabic⁵⁴. This is the phonetically significant element, while the /-y/ turns out to be merely graphic. So this is a sort of internal inflection characteristic of flective languages and in this regard more primitive in Semitics, a family fundamentally of this kind, than the agglutinative ending /-at-/⁵⁵.

4. PNN ending in /-y/ from the administrative texts

Of the more than 6,000 syll. Ugaritic PNN, some 200 end in /-y-/. The consonantal Ugaritic PNN with this ending show a similar proportion. Here only the PNN with a syll. counterpart (some 50) will be taken into account. The rest are assumed to follow the same pattern. Let us now verify the gender, inflection and possible vocalization of the general class of PNN as witnessed by the syll. transcription according to the *editio princeps* of the texts (PRU 3, 4, 6; Ugaritica 5; RSOu 7, 14; TMOM 47; see also DUL for other sources).

As regards the *inflection*, Van Soldt, after a thorough inquiry sums up the situation as follows: “There are about fifty syllabically written personal names with this suffix, which can be spelled with IA or PI. The first is normally used when the name has the accusative ending /-a/, the second when it has either the nominative /-u/ or the genitive /-i/.⁵⁶ Some names occur with different case endings and they can serve as an illustration of these spellings. In particular the names ending in -yāyu show this difference quite clearly⁵⁷. Nevertheless, Van Soldt quotes some cases in which this equation fails, and in which the ending sign PI is used for accusative case inflection and the sign IA for other cases. So the scribes were aware that both signs could represent the three values /-yu, -yi, -ya/; that is, they were general case ending signs.⁵⁸ Consequently Van Soldt concludes that this distribution implies a triptotic inflection of those PNN.⁵⁹

Ḥub/patāyu suggest that this ending was compatible with the feminine ending -at⁶⁰. The most frequent correspondence however is between endings /-ā/ and /-a-a/ < /-aya/ in PNN and TNN.

54. I must thank Professor F. Corriente for this suggestion; in a private communication, he commented on this kind of feminine ending (/a^y/), asserting: “Algo en que no han reparado los lingüistas, al citarlo como morfema de fem. en ár., limitado a ciertos tipos de sg., es que, a diferencia de -at/h, que se añade simplemente al masc., este morfema y su pareja -ā requiere alternancia de tema, como el fem. fracto del etiópico (*tabīb*, fem. *tabbāb*), que parece ser lo mismo, pero con transfijación”.

55. But it is almost impossible to find/ this alternance in non-vocalized texts, above all in the PNN. As this is a secondary and culturally borne linguistic field, the application of the old fem. nominal pattern was an archaizing and mechanical procedure which worked in a merely agglutinative way, unless we take the distribution /-iy-/# /-ay-/ as a form of base alternance.

56. See Van Soldt SAU 332f.; id., Fs. Groneberg 309.

57. See Van Soldt, *op. cit.*, p. 309.

58. See Van Soldt, *op. cit.*, n. 29, 51, 53.

59. The scribal alternative would suggest rather a diptotic declension (normal for PNN, but in this case the sign /-ia/ should stand for genitive/accusative cases). One even could suppose that the alternative sign aims to represent the different grammatical

As for the *gender*, in the overwhelming majority of cases, the complementary distribution recorded by Huffman⁶⁰ for the interpretation of this ending in the Amorite PNN is correct and could be extended to the Akkadian of Ugarit: /-īyu/ for masculine and /-ayu/ for feminine PNN, their gender being clear either from the use of the determinatives attached to the names (^l# ^f# ^{lf}) or from the prefixed inflection of the verbal predicate (*ušab*, ...). These morphs, distributed in this way, could also be supposed to be present in the consonantal notation from Ugarit (/y/). So, in the case of /-ayu/, we are dealing with an ancient Amorite or West Semitic morph which is also extant, although never in so clear a use, in other WS languages, as we have seen earlier. Here is their distribution, distinguishing the groups of PNN ending either in /-īyu/⁶¹ or /-ayu/; the notations PI and IA have been verified in Nougayrol's copies of the cuneiform texts.

1-PNN m. > /-īyu/:

'a/iby	= /Ab(b)īyu/ (^l a-bi:e-PI, ^l ab-bi-PI, ^{lf} a-bi-IA) (gen./nom)
'ady	= (see below ^c dy)
'a/iḥ	= /Aḥīyu/ (^l a-ḥi-IA) (gen./nom.) ⁶²
'ully	= /Ululīyu/ (^l bin-ú-lu-li-PI) ⁶³ (no gender marker?) (gen., nom.)
'ily	= /Ilīyu/ (^l ili-PI, [^f]e-li-IA) (nom.)
'alpy	= /Alipīyu/ (^l il-pi-PI, ^l i-li-pi-PI) ⁶⁴ (gen.)
'army	= /Urūmiyu/ (^l u-ru-mi-PI) (gen.)
'ayy	= /Ayīyu/ (^l a-i-ú) (nom.) (see ^c yy)
^c bdy	= ^c Abdīyu/ (^l abdi-PI ... ^l it-ta-si, IR-TE-PI) (nom.)
^c dy	= ^c Addīyu/ (^l ad-di-PI, also ^l a-da-a-a) ⁶⁵ (nom., gen)
^c lpy	= ^c Alpīyu/ (^l il-pi-PI) (nom.)
^c rmy	= ^c Armīyu/ (^l ar-me- ^l PI) (nom.)
^c yy	= ^c Ayīyu/ (^l a-i-ú) (nom.) (see ^c ayy)
ddy	= /Didīyu/ (^l ti/te-še-IA) ⁶⁶ (gen.)
dkry	= /Dukurīyu/ (^l zu-ku-r[a]-PI, ^l zu-uk-ri-PI) (acc., gen., nom.)
gpn(y)	= /Gupanu/, /Gupanīyu/ (^l gu-pa-na) ⁶⁷ (gen.)

function [nominal: absol., const./prep. gen. // verbal: ac.] rather than the corresponding vowel, allowing us to presume a possible indeclinable form in /-ya/ as Nougayrol apparently did. Furthermore the loss of inflection of PNN is generally recognized from Middle-Babylonian onwards (cf. Pruzsyznszky PNTE 72; Arnaud, *SEL* 8. 1991, 24 et n. 4). Were this the case, the sign PI would obtain a general value /ya/, in final and non-final position in Ugaritic, except for gentilic and foreign words, giving rise furthermore to a contracted non-inflected type in /-ā/. But these are mere hypotheses that are not easy to test. For the time being the more reasonable position is to accept Van Soldt's proposal.

60. See Huffman APNMT 134f. ["At Mari the hypocoristic ending *-iya* ... is found only with masculine names. Corresponding to *-iya* is the hypocoristic ending *-a(y)a*, found mostly with feminine names"], n. 22 [in "Akkadian... *-(i)ya* is found with both mas. and fem. names"]; Layton AFCPN 242. PNN in /-i(y)a/ are common in Alalakh; see Wiseman AT 125ff.; Stamm ANG 113, 242f.; Lipiński SLOCG 223. At Ebla the ending /-y/ in onomastics is apparently non-extant; see the comprehensive works by A. Archi, ed., EPNSN and M. Krebernik PNTE. For the discussion of the value of the sign NI as ending element in PNN see *ibdm* pp. 99-101.

61. Van Soldt's basic article (2010) does not take this ending into account – only /-āyu/.

62. Or /^lAḥīyā/, taking into account the notation *-ya-a: i[-n]a* U.MEŠ-*te* ^la-ḥi-ya-a (PRU 6 72 [RS 19.65]:5'), nom. Possibly two different persons. This would be a clear example of a non-inflected form; see also nom. *ši-DI/di-IA*.

63. It may be Hittite, according to Gröndahl PTU 274, with derivative suff. > TN *ul* (p. 26). Possible harmonization.

64. See also below ^clpy.

65. Other cases of gen. in /-a-a/: *ša* ^la-da-a-a, *i-na pa-ni* ^la-da-a-a; nom. ^fla-e-ia-a;

66. See Gröndahl PTU 263 (Hurrian); Wiseman AT 149; Laroche GLH 266f.; Watson, *AuOr* 13, 1995, 222. Gen. in /IA/: *iš-tu qāti*^{ti} ^lti-še-IA.; see also ^lki-li-IA, *kur-ni-IA*.

67. Gen. also in this case: *ina qāti* ^lgu-pa-na. According to Van Soldt Fs. Groneberg 318, following Liverani and in accordance with the Semitic grammar, the PNN endings in /-ānu/ are diptotic.

<i>gzry</i>	= /Gazarīyu/ (¹ <i>ga-za-ri</i> -PI) (gen)
<i>klby</i>	= /Kalbīyu/ (¹ <i>kál-bi/be</i> -PI) (gen., nom.)
<i>kly</i>	= /Kilīyu/ (¹ <i>ki-li</i> -IA) (gen.)
<i>kny</i>	= /Kunīyu/ (<i>ku-ni</i> -PI) (gen.)
<i>krny</i>	= /Kurnīyu/ (<i>kur-ni</i> -IA) (gen.) (no gender marker)
<i>kt̄y</i>	= /Kaṭīyu/ (¹ <i>ka-ši</i> -PI) (gen.)
<i>liy</i>	= /Laṭīyu/ (¹ <i>la-i</i> -PI, ^f <i>la-e-ia-a</i>) ⁶⁸ (gen.)
<i>lbiy</i>	= /Labṭīyu/ (¹ <i>la-ab-’i</i> -PI) (gen.)
<i>mmy</i>	= /Mamīyu/ (¹ <i>ma-mi</i> -PI) (gen.)
<i>mny</i>	= /Munīyu/ (¹ <i>m[u]-ni</i> -PI) (nom.)
<i>mšry</i>	= /Mišrīyu/ (<i>mi-iš-ri</i> -PI) (gen.) (no gender marker)
<i>pity</i>	= /Piṭīyu/ (<i>pi-’-da</i> -PI) (gen.) (no gender marker)
<i>pdy</i>	= /Pa:ḏīyu/ (¹ <i>pa/pi-di</i> -PI/IA) (gen.)
<i>płsy</i>	= /Pilsīyu/ (¹ <i>pil-si</i> -PI) (gen., nom)
<i>sny</i>	= /Sinīyu/ (¹ <i>SI/si-ni</i> -PI(?)) (gen)
<i>šdy</i>	= /Šidīyu/ (<i>ši-DI/di</i> -IA ... <i>ú-šab</i>) (nom.); cf. <i>tdy</i> .
<i>šlmy</i>	= /Šalmīyu/ (¹ <i>ša-al-mi</i> -PI) (gen.)
<i>ṭ^cy</i>	= /Ṭaṭīyu/ (¹ <i>ša-i</i> -PI) ⁶⁹ (gen.)
<i>tdy</i>	= /Ṭidīyu/ cf. <i>šdy</i> .
<i>ṭpty</i>	= /Ṭiptīyu/ (¹ <i>ši-ip-TI/ṭi</i> -PI) (nom.)

2-PNN f. > /ayu/

<i>a/ib</i>	= /Abayu/ (^f <i>a-ba</i> -PI) (gen.)
<i>abyy</i>	= /Abbuyayu/ (^f <i>ab-bu</i> -IA-PI) ⁷⁰ (gen.)
<i>adty</i>	= /Adatayu/ (<i>a-da-ta</i> -PI) (gen.) (no gender marker)
<i>agy</i>	= /Agayu/ (<i>a-ga</i> -IA) (gen.) (see ^c <i>qy</i>) (no gender marker)
<i>’ilyy</i>	= /Iliyayu/ (^f <i>e-li</i> -IA-PI) (ac.) ⁷¹
<i>usyy</i>	= /Usiyayu/ (<i>ú-zi</i> -IA-PI) ⁷² (gen.) (no gender marker)
<i>ušy</i>	= /Ušayu/ (^f <i>ú-ša</i> -PI) (gen.)
^c <i>qy</i>	= / ^c Aqayu/ (<i>a-qa</i> -PI) (gen.) (see <i>agy</i>) (no gender marker)
^c <i>ṭty</i>	= / ^c Uṭtayyu/ (¹ <i>uš-ta</i> -PI) (nom.) ⁷³
<i>ddy</i>	= /Dudayu/ (<i>du-da-a</i> -PI, <i>da-de₄</i> -PI, <i>da-dá-a</i>) (gen.) (no gender marker) ⁷⁴
<i>ḏkry</i>	= /ḏukurayu/ (¹ <i>zu-ku-r[a]</i> -PI) (ac.)

68. Gröndahl’s suggestion seems unlikely; see Gröndahl PTU 50 (‘Nominalsatz’) 61, 66, 154 (part. of /l’y/?); also Sivan GAGI 241; Huehnergard UVST 238 (¹*la-i-yi*), but 249 (¹*la-i-yv*). In this category of PNN the final /-y/ is a morphemic element; a contraction could be presumed /la-i-y(v)-ya/. On Mari *Lā’iyu* see Millet PRMERZL 311.

69. See Dietrich, Loretz, Sanmartín, *UF* 5, 1973, 117.

70. See Van Soldt Fs. Groneberg 309, 314 (RS 23.79 ii:15’).

71. In this and other cases the syll. transcription prohibits taking the last /-y/ as a notation of the gen. case ending in consonantic Ugaritic; see Bordreuil, *SEL* 5, 1988, 25-30 (27-29). In some cases we can at most presume the use of two forms of the same PN: with and without the morph /-y-/. Notice in this case the ‘anomalous’ use of PI for ac. ending.

72. For the reading see Van Soldt Fs. Groneberg 310 (^m*ú-zi*-IA-PI = Uziyāyi(?)); Huehnergard AkkUg 44. Nougayrol reads: *bin-ú-zi-ya-wa*; Gröndahl PTU 229: /uziaya/ and maintains this PN to be Hurrian. It may be related to *asyy* (KTU 4.611.4); vd. Stamm ANG 216.

73. This PN appears in the new text 94:2383: see Van Soldt Fs Groneberg 2010 213, n. 57; but the reference 19.09[PRU 6, n99]:21) is mistaken (lin. 22).

74. See Gröndahl PTU 122, 424; Huffmon APNMT 181; Van Soldt SAU 10, n. 116; Huehnergard UVST 213. They may be different persons.

<i>úmny</i>	= /Ḥaminnayū/ (^f ḥa-mé-en-na-PI) ⁷⁵ (gen.)
<i>mlky(y)</i>	= /Milkā/Milkayū/Milkiyayū (^f mi-il-ka-a ... tū-šab; za-ka-at ... ^f mi-il-ka-IA) ⁷⁶ (nom.)
<i>nqly</i>	= /Niḡalayū/ (<i>ni-qa-la-a</i>) (gen.) ⁷⁷
<i>pīṭ</i>	= /Pi'tayū/ (<i>pi-'-dā/TA-PI</i>) (gen.) (no gender marker)
<i>pdy</i>	= /Pid(d)ayū/ (^f pi-da-PI, ^f pi-id-da-PI, also ^f pi-id-dā) ⁷⁸ (gen., ac.)
<i>ply</i>	= /Pilayū/ (^f pi-la-PI) (gen.)
<i>pṭry</i>	= /Paṭarrayū/ (^f pa-ṭar-ra-PI) (gen.)
<i>rqdy</i>	= /Raḡdayū/ (<i>raq_x(ZUM)-da-PI</i>) (gen.)
<i>ršpy</i>	= /Rišpayū/ (^l ri-iš-pa-IA) (nom., gen)
<i>sly</i>	= /Salayū/ (<i>ZA/sà-al-la-a</i>) (gen.) (no gender marker)
<i>šdy</i>	= /Šadayū/ (^f ša-da/TA-PI, ^l ša-TE/de ₄ -PI) (gen.)
<i>šrn</i>	= /Šurunayū/ (^f šu-ru-na-PI) (gen.)
<i>šyy</i>	= /Šayayū/ (^f ša-ya-a ... ù-za-ak-ki ... ù za-kà-at ... tamât...,) (nom., ac.)
<i>ṭly</i>	= /Ṭal(l)ayū/ (^f ta/TA-la-PI) (gen.)
<i>ṭdy</i>	= /Ṭudiyayū/ (^f šu-zi-IA-PI) (gen.) (no gender marker).
<i>yy</i>	= /Yayū/ (?) (<i>ya(?)</i> -PI) (gen.) (no gender marker) ⁷⁹

3- In some cases both forms appear (even in the same text) in a clearly complementary distribution, unless we presume some kind of phonetic mistake:

- PN m. ^fab-bi-y- # PN f. ^fa-ba-y-
- PN m. ^fka-ši-y- # PN m. ^fku-ša-y- (?)⁸⁰
- PN m. ^fla-i-y- # PN f. ^fla-e-y-
- PN m. ^fpi-di-y- # PN f. ^fpi-da-y-
- PN m. ^fša-ti-y-(?) # PN f. ^fša-da/TA-y-

4- In other cases, already pointed out, since the quoted markers are absent, the analogy rule must be applied.

5- Nevertheless, there are a few exceptions to Huffmon's distribution that could be interpreted either as scribal or transcriptional errors or as phonologically conditioned forms, due maybe to the foreign character of the name or to phonetic harmonization: fem. PNN in /-iyū/: ^fa-da-ti-y-, ^fla-i-y-/^fla-e-ya-a⁸¹, [^fp]i-iz-zi-y-⁸², ^fzi-di-y-; masc. PNN in /-ayū/: SUM-ta-PI ('arty); ^fku-ša-y-⁸³, ^ftu-la-y-⁸⁴.

75. See Gröndahl PTU 51, 135 ("Kurzform eines Namens wie 'bdhmn"), but the vocalization *ab-di-ḥa-ma-ni*/Ḥa-ma-nu rules it out.

76. Notice the vocalization *mi-il-ka-a*. See Van Soldt SAU 8 n. 70, 156 n. 185 (hypocoristic [-a-a]); see in Emar *Milkia*, *Abdia*/*Abdaia*, Pruzsinszky PNTE 149, 174. As for the double suffixation /-yy/ see below 8-). For the meaning of the double determinative /^h/ see Brinkman Fs. Brigg. 2-10; Van Soldt Fs. Muraoka 458, 460.

77. The syllabic spelling has only the short form. Van Soldt Fs Groneberg 315, n. 82.

78. See Dietrich-Loretz, *UF* 1, 1969, 21ff.; De Moor, *BiOr* 24, 1969, 106; Lipiński, *OLA* 1, 1973, 129ff. (his interpretation seems improbable); Maraqtan SOARI 203 (Aram., Phoen., Heb., Saf.); Siva, GAGI, p. 256f. < /pdy/ p.p.(?), but fem. *Pidaya* rules this out.

79. See Gröndahl PTU 143 (Sem.? or 'Lallwort'). The reading is doubtful.

80. Both in /-ayu, -iyū/ masculine.

81. This last form in nom. contradicts any inflexion pattern.

82. See. Dietrich, Loretz, Sanmartín, *UF* 6, 1974, 35; Watson, *AuOr* 8, 1990, 123 (Hurrian).

83. In other instances [*ky*, *ly*, *py*, *šdy*; see below] the double vocalization may correspond to two different persons. In this case the PN is of Hurrian origin; see Watson, *AuOr* 14, 1996, 101 (*ku-ša-ya*: Wiseman AT 37:11). Notice the odd case inflection

On the other hand some PNN offer a reading /-u-y-/, with and without gender marker:

'agy	= /Aguyu/ (<i>a-gu-y-</i>) ⁸⁵
'ady	= /Adduyu/ (<i>a-du-ú</i> < <i>a-du-yu</i> < <i>a-dû</i> ;
'ily	= /Iluyu/ (¹ DINGIR/ <i>ilu-y-</i>)
'ky	= / ^c Akkuyu/ (¹ <i>ak-ku-y-</i>) ⁸⁶
bly	= /Buluyu/ (<i>bu-lu-y-</i>) ⁸⁷
šdy	= /Šaduyu/ (¹ <i>ša-du-y-</i>) ⁸⁸
s/šw(y)	= /S:Šuwayu/ < S:Šûwâ [?] > (¹ <i>zu-ú-y-/ZU-(ú-wa)</i>) ⁸⁹
šy	= /Šuyu/ (¹ <i>šu-y-</i>)

Also without illative vowel (-y-):

gd	= /Gad(a)yu/ (<i>ga-ad-y-</i>) ⁹⁰
hny	= /Ḥan(i)yu/ (¹ <i>Ḥa-an-y-</i>) ⁹¹

6- There are also a couple of exceptional notations in ending isolated vowels /-u:i/ (-'u:i// -yu:i). They probably represent scribal oversights or hypercorrections which try to render precisely the inflection ending⁹²:

'ady	= /Aduyu/ < /Adû/ < <i>a-du-ú</i> (?) (nom.)
'ady	= /Adayu/ < /Adâ/ < <i>a-da-a-a</i> (gen.)
ušy	= /Ušiyu/ < /Ušî/ < <i>ú-ši-i</i> ⁹³ (gen.)
ayy/yy	= /Ayiyu/ < /Ayû/ < ¹ <i>a-(y)i-ú</i> (nom.)
kry(y)	= /Karāyu/ < /Kurāyayu/ < (¹ <i>ku-ra-a-ia-ú</i>) ⁹⁴
pdry	= /Pidrayu/ < /Pidrayi/ [?] i/ < (^d <i>pi-id-ra-i</i>) ⁹⁵ (nom.)

in PRU 3 195 22: *ina qâti^{li} qarradu(!) mâr¹ka-ši-ya^{amili} muru(!)*, “des mains de NP fils de NP *murû*”. Neither the first PN nor the qualifier are declined.

84. See Gröndahl PTU 296 (Hittite[?]); Goetze, *JCS* 16, 1962, 53 (Hurrian *T/Du-li-ia*). In those cases the apparently anomalous masc. vocalization /-ay-/ may depend on the foreign origin of the PN or reflect the alternative nisba suffix /-āyu/.

85. In the case of *aguya* (Ug 5 5 [RS 17.22+]:28) we are dealing with a Hurrian PN; cf. Gröndahl PTU 215 (“Kurzform eines Namens wie *agu-šenni*” [Gelb et al. NPN 198]).

86. In consonantal notation TN (syll. URU *a-ki-yu*) and PN (syll. *ak-ku-ya*) coincide; those syll. transcriptions are exceptional. See Belmonte *AuOr* 17-18, 1999-2000, 15; possibly a Hurrian name.

87. For the vocalization /-uya/ for /buli:aya/ (?) see Gröndahl PTU 117 (< *b^cly*), 288 (< *ply* [cf /puluya, pilaya/].

88. See Watson *AuOr* 13, 1995, 228; for the orthography Van Soldt SAU, p. 309 n. 115 (*ša-de₄TE-ya*). The vocalization ... ¹*ša-du-ya* ... could be taken as a variant of ¹*ša-di-ya*

89. See Gröndahl PTU 293; Segert, *UF* 15, 1983, 212; Tropper, *UF* 27, 1995, 523; See also ZU-*wa*-ZU-*wa* (PRU 4, p. 232 [RS 17.252]13[?]; Ug 5 81 [RS 21.230]:36). Anomalous /-aya/ for masc., maybe due to the Hittite origin of the PN. - See Izre'el AALS 42: “Note that final PI is interpreted above as designating *ia₈* rather than *wa*. The latter is attested for non Semitic PN's, as in *ar-sà-wa* (EA 60:27); cf. alphabetic *arsw*”.

90. See Gröndahl UVST 217.

91. See Gröndahl PTU 231 (Wiseman AT 135 *passim*: *ḥanaia*; Hur. *ḥaniia*); Sivan GAGI 204 (< ^c*anu/ [?]*); Hess APN 71ff. (EA *ḥa-an-ia*).

92. In this regard see Van Soldt Fs Groneberg 313-314: “There are several names in which the vowel *-a* is not separated from the case ending by *-y-*, but by an aleph: *Abišta'u*, *Aga'u*, *Aḫala'u*, *Anana'u*, *Ara'u*, *Kila'u*, *Mama'u*, *Mutra'u*, *Taba'u*, *Talma'u*””. “As observed by Gröndahl, 71 abbreviated names can take different suffixes. *Aga'u* can be compared to *Agaya*, *Mama'u* to *Mamiyu*, *Taba'u* to *tby* and *Talma'u* to *Talmiyu* and *Talmiya*. However, it cannot be shown that the ending *-a'u* is a variant spelling for the ending *-āyu*”.

93. See Watson, *AuOr* 25, 2007, 130; id., LS 159.

94. See Van Soldt Fs Groneberg 311 n. 39; id., Fs Veenhof 438f.

7- But the contracted forms /-a-a/ must also be taken into account, sometimes alternating with the expansion /-y-/⁹⁶. This is an acc. contracted form or an indeclinable pattern as in Arabic in case of a nom. or gen. case form in /-a/ (see above). The PN may also be treated as a simple noun without /-y/ expansion:

<i>liy</i>	= /La'iyā/ (^l la-e-ia-a) (nom., gen.)
<i>mlky</i>	= /Milkā/ (^l mi-il-ka-a) (nom.)
<i>nqly</i>	= /Niqaalā/ (^l ni-qa-la-a) (gen.) (no gender marker)
<i>pty</i>	= /Piddā/ (^l pi-id-da) (gen.)
<i>pzny</i>	= /Piza:unā/ (^l pi-za-na, ^l pi-sú/zu-ni) (gen. both) ⁹⁷
<i>pzry</i>	= /Pazirā/ (^l pa-zi(?) -ra) (gen.)

8- Finally, let us consider the alternative double suffixation as a case of reduplicated morpheme⁹⁸. Note, nevertheless, that this reduplication, when the syll. notation allows confirmation, corresponds to the syll. vocalic pattern /-ayu/ (/Abayayu/, /Iliyayu/, /Usiyayu/, /Milkiyayu/); in other cases the first /-y/ probably (?) belongs to the base (/Maniyayu/, /Ramiyayu/; but /^oAyiyu/, /Bayiyu/, /Šayiyu/). Might this mean that the morph represents in the first two cases a feminine gender alternative affixed to the masculine form?

'abyy and 'aby⁹⁹
 byy and by
 ilyy and ily¹⁰⁰
 mlkyy and mlky
 mnyy and mny
 rmyy and rmy
 šy and šyy

The result of these records may be summarized as follows:

In the overwhelming majority of cases, the complementary distribution recorded by Huffmon¹⁰¹ for the interpretation of this ending in the Amorite PNN seems to be correct and can be maintained for the syll. PNN of Ugarit: /-iya/ for mas. and /-aya/ for fem., even if there are some cases of contrary use. As we said above, the gender is made clear either by the use of the determinatives attached to the names (^l#^f) or by the prefixed inflection of the verbal predicate (*ušab*, ...). This morph, distributed in this way, could also be supposed to be present in the consonantal notation from Ugarit (/y/). So we may be dealing with an ancient Amorite or West Semitic morph, occasionally added to the hypocoristic or derivative form of the PN, and thus conforming a reduplicative pattern.

Nevertheless, a closer analysis of the Amorite (Mari) prosopography obliges us to revise Huffmon's complementary distribution, and in fact to reject it altogether. It was founded on the texts from Mari published up to 1964. Working on a much larger register of PNN (Amorite names from all areas, from Ur III through Old Babylonian and North-Mesopotamian areas up to Syria [Alalakh]; from Mari only the names from the texts published in ARM I-XV) Gelb offers the records of nominal suffixes /-aja/ and /-ija/.

95. See n. 29.

96. See Van Soldt 2010: 314-315. But we cannot speak of "abbreviations" in this case, but a kind of hypocoristic of an hypocoristic ...

97. See Gröndahl PTU 245 (Hurrian fem.), cf. Gelb/Purves/MacRae NPN 246.

98. See Van Soldt Fs. Groneberg 110, 115-316.

99. See Van Soldt 2010:314, n. 78-79

100. See Van Soldt 2010:310

101. See n. 60.

Of 64 PNN ending in /-aja/ only 28 are fem., half of them from Mari, while the masc. PNN of this origin are almost the same in number; and of the 126 PNN ending in /-ija/ the majority are masc. in gender; only 17 are fem., 10 from Mari¹⁰². *This means that the morph /-iyu/ # /-ayu/ is not by itself a gender marker*¹⁰³.

Moreover those studies have been superseded by Millet's¹⁰⁴ analysis of some 5,000 Mari PNN, coming from previous or recently published texts¹⁰⁵ and also from a notable quantity of unpublished ones, although limited to Zimrî-Lîm's reign.

In the first place, Millet's record confirms the conclusion to be drawn from the studies quoted previously: the *small relative quantity* of PNN exhibiting the ending /-ay-/ , /-iy-/ . Of the approximately five thousand recorded names, only some 160 present these endings. Of these, 49 end in /-aja/, 15 masc.¹⁰⁶; while of the 90 ending in /-iya/, 34 are fem. PNN¹⁰⁷. The calculation is approximate and does not take account of repetitions. This type of PNN is more frequent in the list and documents from the Mari district than in those from Terqa and Saggaratum. In fact the PNN recorded in these two last districts are certified in the Mari district as well: they can be considered as loans from Mari. In any case, the distribution points to a clear Amorite origin of this nominal formation.

The conclusion we can draw is that the two endings are interchangeable with regard to the gender of the individuals in question, to a much greater extent than in the previous Akkadian records or in Ugarit. We can then conclude that the difference between syll./Ac. /-ayu/ and /-iyu/ does not provide enough lexicographical support for the complementary distribution suggested by Huffmon. The names of males and females could end in either form.

What becomes clear is the persistent Amorite tradition (from Ur III to Ugarit) of the existence in this Semitic branch of a specific syll. morpheme /-(a:i)yu/ for the formation of PNN. The cuneiform sign in this final position is universally IA in Mari PNN, while PI is not used in this position. But this sing IA (/-

102. See Gelb CAAA 436f., 464-466. A *retractatio* of Gelb's materials has been carried out by M.P. Streeck AOAbZ, but his treatment of the PNN ending in /-iy-a/ and /-ay-a/ is rather cursory (pp. 340-355) and develops along the customary lines. On the other hand, the pioneering work of Th. Bauer, *Die Ostkanaanäer* (Leipzig 1926) was already considered by Gelb. Other treatments (by Buccellati, Von Soden, Knudsen, Zadok, Gordon) are only partial; see Streeck, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-134.

103. See in this regard Van Soldt Fs Groneberg 316

104. See Millet PRMERZL

105. Millet's dissertation includes all the PNN to be found in ARM (including Birot-Kupper-Rouault's onomastic index in ARM 16) and J.-M. Durand's *Documents épistolaires du palais de Mari*, T. I-III (Littératures Anciennes du Proche-Orient 15-18), Paris 1997-1998-2000, and some 700 unpublished onomastic tablets, up to 2001.

106. The number after the name sends to Millet's Dissertation page. The readings have been collated personally by the authoress whose transcription is maintained. **Fem. PNN in /-aya/:** ^fAbubaya (90), ^fAbu-laya (25), ^fAgapaya (300), ^fBašaya (416), ^fEštar-lilaya (305), ^fHalum-abuya (371), ^fHardaya (287), ^fHuraya (536), ^fKalaltulaya (178), ^fKanzaya (178), ^fLamassaya (311), ^fLabaruya (515), ^fLanisaya (311, 480), ^fNanâya (89), ^fManaya (180), ^fMar[saya] (420), ^fMenulaya (181), ^fNarbaya (142), ^fMashaya (364), ^fNenišnaya (182), ^fNubennaya (24), ^fRubaya (37, 71, 96, 184, 364), ^fSalimaya (184), ^fSamas-înâya (185), ^fŠehlum-naya (186), ^fSerum-nâya (90), ^fŠulnaya (242), ^fTulup-naya (242), ^fTunip-šaya (24), ^fTuzaya (242, 539), ^fYataraya (82, 189). **Mas. PNN in /-aya/:** ^mDagan-ašraya (215, 444), ^mIddaya (115), ^mIlî-ašraya (154, 338, 537), ^mIlî-binaya (354), ^mIlî-har naya (215), ^mIlî-kima-abiya (221), ^mIlî-gumlaya (221), ^mIlî-mešimhaya (405), ^mIlî-turaya (32, 537), ^mIrsaya (419), ^mKazataya (310), ^mIlî-nušraya (253), ^mQuṭṭulaya (493), ^mIlî-šimhaya (36, 68, 217, 247, 446), ^mUbaya (200), ^mUllaya (143).

107. **Mas. PNN in /-iya/:** ^mAbiya (160, 337), ^mAhiya (106), ^mAkatiya (152), ^mAkiya (25, 50, 1153, 160), ^mAliya (394), ^mAyaturiya (47), ^m[Az]ziya (115), ^mBinniya (509), ^mDâdiya (179), ^mDagan-asiya (450), ^mDagan-ašriya (66), ^mEniya (107), ^mErra-asiya (240, 305), ^mHammiya (143, 519), ^mHaniya (186), ^mHubuš-baniya (418), ^mIlî-gumliya (236), ^mIlî-kima-abiya (221), ^mImniya (111), ^mIšhiya (147 [cf. Išhi-Samaš]), ^mIthiya (147, 223), ^mKatiya (338), ^mLâ'iyu (311), ^mLâ'um (491)], ^mLipit-Iliya (217), ^mMannum-kima-beliya (124), ^mPusiya (116), ^mQêriya (105), ^mŠamaš-kima-iliya (72, 270), ^mSamsiya (118, 131), ^mSin-kima-iliya (200), ^mSitriya (116), ^mTukkiya (108), ^mZimriya (105). **Fem. PNN in /-iya/:** ^fAbabuya (94, 102), ^fAlmu-haliya (166), ^fAmur-nišya (168), ^fAmur-nišuya (168), ^fAnnū-asiya (168, 461), ^fAttuya (170), ^fBudiya (173), ^fEštar-asiya (174), ^fHaburiya [// Puratiya] (534), ^fHikniya (281), ^fHinniya (82), ^fIlî-asiya (177, 309, 441), ^fIna-pî-lidiya (88, 177), ^fIna-pîm-lidiya (177), ^fIšhara-asiya (177, 355), ^fKakka-asiya (178), ^fKînim-liya (32), ^fKudiya (23), ^fLa'iyu (164, 233, 355), ^fMakiya (180), ^fMaliya (420), ^fMamnu-asiya (180), ^fMupattiyu (181, 269, 312 [: Mupattiyatum: 312]; 483, 516), ^fNanniya (183), ^fNuna-bîniya (313), ^fPuliya (24), ^fPuratiya (364), ^fRahiya (520), ^fRameya (314, 454), ^fRamiya (183), ^fRapiya (37, 421), ^fŠagiya (185), ^fTabubu-hâliya (187), ^fTaram-gagiyu (539).

ia/) is also ambivalent regarding its actual syllabic value. What in any case becomes clear from this record is the syllabic character of the alph. ending /-y/.

This tradition is reinforced by the presence of the same PNN in Mari and Ugarit as well (f.i., syll. *Abiy-*, *Aḥiy-*, *Aliy-*², *Idday-*², *Akiy-*, *Ḥaniy-*, *Lâ'iy-*, *Salimay-*). One question remains open: why did the Ugaritic scribes introduce the alternative notation PI/IA in the PNN ending in /-y-/ given the constant presence of IA in Mari notation. As we saw above, PI is used for nom. and gen. (/yu/, /yi/) and IA for ac. (/ya/), as pointed out by Van Soldt, leaving aside the exceptions to this rule. This implies that the Ugaritic PNN in /-y/ were triptotic. A distribution PI (nom.) # IA (gen./ac.) would have favoured this pattern¹⁰⁸. However a generalization of the notations /-u-²u/, /-i-²i/, /-a-²a/, at least in case of homorganic vowels would have removed the ambiguity (see the TNN ^{al}*am-mi-za* // ^{al}*am-mi-za-ú*, both nom.)

This ending has commonly been interpreted as a hypocoristicon or “Zärtlichkeits-suffix”/diminutive,¹⁰⁹. But I feel that such abbreviated connotative and normally familiar names would be most unlikely to have been used in formal (and often legal) documents as is the case in the Ugaritic texts. It seems that we are projecting back modern uses into old societies¹¹⁰. Moreover many of those names do not easily lend themselves as the first or second element of theophoric or compound/phrase-names¹¹¹; nor is the normal, entire form of the name extant. Dealing with *Ḥaminḥayyu* (see above n. 75) Gröndahl comments: “Kurzform eines Namens wie ^c*bdḥmn*” (Phoen., Ug. ^c*bdḥmn*). It could seem a good case, but the syll. vocalization rules it out: *ab-di-ḥa-ma-n*¹¹². In most cases we have no parallel theophoric names

108. See above. Even nominative forms like ^f*la-e-ia-a* and ^f*mi-il-ka-a* play for a monoptotic or indeclinable pattern. (-ā/-á:iya).

109. See Huffmon APNMT 135; Hess APN 202, 214, 217, 228; Gröndahl PTU 50; Stamm ANG 242f.; Lipiński SLOCG 223f. Tropper UG 283, leaves the question open. The morph is common in the onomastics of the epigraphic Aramaic: M. Maraqten, *Die semitischen Personennamen in den alt- und reich-aramäischen Inschriften aus Vorderasien* (Texte und Studien zur Orientalistik, 1), Hildesheim/Zürich/New York, 1988, p. 109 (“Hypokoristika auf -y”); for Hatra see S. Abbadi, *Die Personennamen der Inschriften aus Hatra* (Texte und Studien zur Orientalistik, 1), Hildesheim/Zürich/New York, 1983, p. 180 and *passim* (“Die Endung -Y steht entweder für die Hypocoristiconendung, die 1.p.sg., z.B. ^cYNY, oder für die arb. Nisba”). In Epigraphic South-Arabian the situation is ambiguous: while in Sabaic the peculiar use of the ending /-y/ is almost non-existent (ending element /-^cly/ and /-ḥy/ are nominal not morphemic), in Qatabanian they are not rare, either for masc. or fem. names. See S.A. Tairan, *Die Personennamen in den altsabäischen Inschriften* (Texte und Studien zur Orientalistik, 8), Hildesheim/Zürich/New York 1992. From the ca. ten thousand names (of Epigraphic North and South Arabian, both personal and toponymic) gathered in Harding ICPIAN only some two hundred exhibit the ending /-y/, in many as a radical consonant or nisba morpheme. In any case it is difficult to assess this evidence due to the lack of vocalization; the book has to be used with great caution as far as the etymological proposals go. See in this regard the updated on-line database of the University of Pisa (<http://www.csai.humnet.unipi.it>) which presents a range of some four thousand names (personal and toponymic) for the ESA only (mostly Qatabanian). The fact that Tigray, on the other hand, forms the diminutive with this morph (/ay/) does not seem enough to warrant the origin of the morph under discussion, except as a mere coincidence in the use of an original hypocoristicon; nor even the diminutive function of the ending /-iya/ is demonstrable (see Streck AOAbZ 349, 352). For the difference between hypocoristicon/shortening and “Zärtlichkeitswort”/diminutive see Van Soldt Fs Groneberg 309 n. 21, quoting Stamm and Streck. But the distinction may be not so clear-cut: a hypocoristicon can be also “affectionate” (see the English /-(i)y/), leaving aside nicknames.

110. What is taken as a hypocoristicon/abbreviation may be just a one-word name of the kind labelled “Arabic type” by opposition to the very common NWS “phrase-name”; see in this regard Del Olmo Lete’s communication to the 3rd Meeting of the IACS Zaragoza 2010. In the many supposed hypocoristicons/abbreviations (see Van Soldt Fs. Groneberg 315 and his communication to the RAI55 Paris, in the press) we should see just alternative morphemic variations bearing in mind the multifunctionality of some morphemes that appear as homographs (above all in consonantal writing) and even as homophones, leaving aside their own etymology. See in this regard the Spanish morph /-ez/, used to form abstracts (‘escas-ez’) and patronymics (Fernánd-ez).

111. See Gröndahl’s constant uncertainty about etymology.

112. See DUL 395; Gröndahl PTU 135, 230.; Sivan GAGI 223. See also Van Soldt Fs. Groneberg 312 n. 42: *Milkā* /*Milkinadal/ari*. See the many examples in Van Soldt’s communication in the RAI55 Paris, in press. This kind of abbreviation of PNN in /ay/ seems to be very common in Aramaic; see Dalman GJPA 178-180: “Bei Verkürzungen längerer Namen, besonders solcher auf iy-yā, wird die Endung ai, aus welcher ā werden kann, gern angewandt”.

for the lexical element of the PNN, and it seems difficult to figure them out. However in many cases the /-y/ ending emerges as a derivative element or suffix. Masculine PNN (< /-iyu/) in particular present this pattern *prima facie*, with the PN, the TN and the GN sometimes coinciding in the consonantal skeleton.

Consequently the parsing of these postpositions /-īyū/ and /-ayu/ in the formation of Ugaritic PNN should be: nisba suffix /-ī:āyū/ in case masc. PNN and the archaic alternative fem /-ayu/ morph in case fem. PNN.

5. Place names

Finally we also have TNN ending in /-y/ in Ugaritic. In principle we might expect to find the same situation with those Ugaritic toponyms as with the PNN. But the comparison with the syll. transcription, when we are fortunate enough to have it, offers a very different result. To begin with, the determination of the gender of these names cannot be solved by these means; grammatically they are all presumed to be feminine and normally diptotic¹¹³. The gender determination is in this case categorial and could be explained by reference to a feminine noun like *qar(i)tu* or the like¹¹⁴. But such a reference or dependence, apparently of a nisba sort (we also have some TNN ending in syll. *-iy-*), does not explain the form of the normal fem. ending /-ayu/, as a suffix /-atu/ would do, nor does it account for the TNN ending in /-iyu/. In the case of PNN we have seen other kinds of suffix being added to masculine names. We could say that the Ug. TNN ending in /-y/ are feminine according to noun category not according to noun morphology, which must be explained differently in each case.

The normalization /-ayu/ of the alphabetic script starts from the conclusions reached in keeping with the fem. PNN and its Amorite ascendancy which will be summarized and discussed later on (see n. 153). Here also we refer the reader to DUL for the sources quoted.

- 'ubr^c(y) = /Ubur^cā/ < /Ubur^cayu/ (^{al}*u-bur-a*) (nom., gen.)
 'agm(y) = /Agimu/ < /Agima^yyu/ (^{al}*a-gi-mi*, ^{al}*a-gi-mu*) (nom., gen.)
 'agny = /Aganayu/ > /Aganā/ (^{al}*a-ga-na*, ^{al}*a-ga-na-a*)¹¹⁵ (gen.)
 'alty = /Alatīyū/ (^{mat}*a-la-ši-IA*, *a-la-ši-PI*)¹¹⁶ (gen.)
 'amd^y = /Ammidāyū/ > /Ammidā/ (^{al}*am-mi-za*, ^{al}*am-mi-ša*, ^{al}*am-mi-za-ū*)¹¹⁷ (nom.)
 'aps^{ny} = /Apśunayū/ > /Apśunā/ (^{al}*ap-su-na-PI*, ^{al}*ap-sú-ū-na*, ^{al}*ap-su-na-a*, ^m*ap-su-na*)¹¹⁸ (nom., gen.)
 'arny = /Aranīyū/ (^{al}*a-ra-ni-PI*) (nom. gen.)¹¹⁹
 'ary = /Arayū/ (^{al}*a-ra-PI*)¹²⁰ (nom.)

113. See Joüon-Muraoka, GBH II 495; Costaz GS 33; Wright GAL 178;. But the Ugaritic PNN in /-ayu/ are triptotic, in accordance with function of this morph parallel to /atu/. See Van Soldt TCSU 10ff.

114. See Van Soldt Fs. Groneberg 316; id. TCSU 166.

115. See Van Soldt TCSU 7, 162; Bordreuil, *UF* 20, 1988, 15; Belmonte RGTC 4; id., *AuOr* 17-18, 1990-2000, p. 21.

116. See Belmonte RGTC !2/2 11f.; Richardson UPNY 308; apparently not dealt with by Van Soldt. In this case TN, PN and GN coincide in the conson. notation. This case is atypical and consequently does not warrant the extension of this vocalization type (/iy-a/) to the whole category of TNN ending in /-y/. See PRU 6 79 (RS 19.42) *passim* for TNN in /-iya/. Cf. in this regard Van Soldt TCSU 166.

117. See Van Soldt TCSU 9162 SAU 337, n. 177; Belmonte RGTC 12/2 19f. For the interpretation of the *hapax* ending /-u/ in *am-mi-za-ū* see Huehnergard UVST, p. 236 n. 106; Richardson UPNY 308.

118. PN /^ʔApsunay-a/ as against GN /^ʔapsuna:iy-u/; see above. See Van Soldt TCSU 10, 162, 170; Belmonte RGTC !12/2 27; Astour NuzHur 1 14 n. 9.

119. See Van Soldt TCSU 12, 170f; SAU 337; Belmonte RGTC 12/2 29f; Richardson UPNY 308. The vocalization /-iya/ is firm like in some other following TNN; see later.

- 'ayly = /Ayalu/ (*a-ia-la*, *a-ia-li*)¹²¹ (gen.)
 'ky = /'Akīyu/ (^{al}*a-ki-PI*) (gen.)¹²²
 'nmk(y) = /'Ēn(u)makā/ > /'Ēn(u)makayu/ (^{al}IGI/*īnu-ma-ka*, [^{al}IGI/*īnu-ma-ka-PI*]¹²³ (nom.)
 gb^cl(y) = /Giba^clā/ > /Giba^cliyu/ (^{al}gi₅(KI)-^dU(-la) / ^{al}ašar^{il}₂*ba^cala^{la}*, *ašar^{il}₂ba^cali*, ^{al}gi₅^{il}₂*ba^cla^{la}*, *gi₅^{il}₂ba^cala*, ^{al}ašar^{il}₂*ba^cala*, URU *gi₅(KI)-bá-la*, ^{al}gi₅(KI)-*ba-'a-li-PI*/^{al}*ašar-ba-'a-li-PI*)¹²⁴
 (nom., gen.)
 glbt(y) = /Gulbatā/ > /Gulbatayu/ (^{al}*gul-ba-ta*) (nom.)
 gltky = /Galilitukīyu/ (^{al}*ga-li-li-tu-ki-IA*)¹²⁵ (gen.)
 gn^c(y) = /Ganā/ > /Ganīyu/ (^{al}*ga-an-a*, ^{al}*gán-na-a*, ^{al}*ga-ni-'a*) (nom.)
 ḥb/pt(y) = /Ḥu:ab:patā/ <>/Ḥu:ab:patayu/ (^{al}*ḥu-pá-ta*, ^{al}*ḥu-pa-ta*, ^{al}*ḥu-pa-ta-ú*, ^{al}*ḥa-pa-ta-PI*, ^{al}*ḥu-pa-ti*, ^{al}*ḥu-up-pa-ti*)¹²⁶ (nom., gen.)
 ḥlb(y) = /Ḥalbā/ > /Ḥalbayu/ (^{al}*hal-ba*, ^{al}*hal-ba-PI*)¹²⁷ (gen.)
 ḥldy = /Ḥuldā/ > /Ḥuldayu/ (^{al}*ḥu-ul-dā*)¹²⁸ (gen.)
 kbry = /Kubarīyu/ (^{al}*ku-ba-ri-IA-a*)¹²⁹ (nom.)
 kmkty = /Kamkatīyu/ (^{al}*kam-ka₃-t[i-?]*)¹³⁰ (nom.)
 knpy = /Kanaḫīyu/ (*ka-(an)-na-pí-PI*, *ka-na-bí-PI*, *ka-an-na-bi-PI*)¹³¹ (nom.)
 m^crb(y) = /Ma^crabā/ > /Ma^crabayu/ (^{al}*ma-ra-ba*, ^{al}*ma-ra-ba*, ^{al}*ma-ra-pa*, ^{al}*ma-ra-bá*, ^{al}*ma-ra-bá-a*, ^{al}*ma-ʔ/aḥ-ra-bá*, ^{al}*ma-a'-ra-pa*, ^{al}*ma-a-ra-bu*)¹³² (nom., gen.)
 mgdly = /Magdalayu/ (^{al}*ma-ag-da-la-a*, ^{al}*ma-ag-da-la*) (nom.)
 nḥry = /Naḥrayu/ (^{nar}*na-ḥa-ra*, *na-aḥ-ra*, ^{nar}*na-aḥ-ra-PI*)¹³³ (gen.)
 nny = /Nanayu/ (^{HUR.SAG}*na-na-a*)¹³⁴ (gen.?)

120. See Van Soldt TCSU 11, 162, 170; SAU.337 (rdg. *a-ra-ya*); Belmonte RGTC 12/2, p. 30; Dietrich - Loretz - Sanmartín, *UF*, 5 1973 83; Astour. *UF* 13 1981 4; Richardson UPNY 304-305 ("there is considerable doubt that *ar* and *ary* are the same place"), 312.

121. See Van Soldt TCSU 8, 162, 170; Belmonte RGTC 12/2, p. 48; Richardson UPNY 308, 312. In /ayala/, /ayali/ are there two different types of contraction or is it just a (mistaken) scribal normalization of nominal inflection? If the latter, then this would certify the triptotic pattern of TNN.

122. It is missing in Van Soldt TCSU.

123. See Dietrich - Loretz - Sanmartín, *UF* 5, 1973, 113ff.; Astour RSP 2 353; Van Soldt UBL 11 376f. (°Ēn Makā); id., SAU 338f. n. 177; Watson LSU 198; Richardson UPNY 306.

124. See Belmonte RGTC 12/2 80; Astour, *UF* 11, 1979, 15f.; Van Soldt, *UF* 28, 1996, 11, 664f.; id., *UF* 29, 1997, 699; id., *UF* 30, 1998, 718; Huehnergard AkkUg 401f.: ^{al}*ašar-bašala/i*; Watson LSU 199; Belmonte, *AuOr* 17/18, 1999/2000, 17 with n. 13; Richardson UPNY 308.

125. See Astour RSP 2 347; id., *UF* 11 1979 20; Van Soldt, *UF* 28 1996 665; id., SAU, p. 337 n. 177; Richardson UPNY 308-309, 312.

126. See Virolleaud, *Syria* 21 1940 144; id., *GLECS* 3, 1940, 98; Astour, *UF* 13, 1981, 6; id., NuzHur 1 16 no. 23; Van Soldt, *UF* 28, 1996, 670; id., *UF* 30, 1998, 727; Richardson UPNY 309. On the endings /-u/, /-i/ see above.

127. See Belmonte RGTC 12/2, p. 108f.; diff. Van Soldt, *UF* 28, 1996, 667 [Ḥalbā(yu)]; Dietrich, Loretz, Sanmartín, *UF* 5, 1973, 108; Astour RSP 2 285f. no. 41; id., NuzHur 1, p. 15 no. 21; Richardson UPNY 306.

128. See Richardson UPNY 309.

129. For the reading see Van Soldt, *UF* 28, 1996, 674 (Kubariyā); Arnaud, *SMEA* 32, 1993, 128 (*šu-ma-ri-a*).

130. See Astour, *UF* 13, 1981, 8 n. 51; Van Soldt, *UF* 28, 1996, 674 (Kamkatiya); id., *UF* 29, 1997, 691.

131. See Belmonte RGTC 12/2, p. 87f., 402; Kühne, *UF* 7, 1975, 255f.; Huehnergard UVST, p.138; SAU, p. 304; Richardson UPNY 309-310. But see Van Soldt Toponimie 155 (adj. / NP?)

132. See Belmonte RGTC 12/2 180ff.; Astour, *UF* 11, 1979, 23 n. 71; Van Soldt SAU 338; id., *UF* 28, 1996, 677; Sivan GAGI, 242. The transcription /ma^crabu/ is questionable; see Van Soldt, *l.c.*; Richardson UPNY 306.

133. See Belmonte RGTC 12/2 392; Astour, RSP 2 305f., 359; Sivan GAGI, p. 251; Van Soldt SAU 331 n. 160, 338 n. 177; id., *UF* 28, 1996, 679. This represents a special category of TNN, river name, reflected maybe in its nisba triptotic inflection. See ^{nar}*na-aḥ-ra-ya*: (RS 25.516:7', unpubl.; cf. Van Soldt, *UF* 28, 1996, 679, n. 214; id., TCSU 166).

134. See Del Monte, Tischler RGTC 6 106f., 280; Bordreuil, *Syria* 66, 1989, 275ff.; Astour, *RSOu* 11, p. 65 n. 72; Van Soldt, *UF* 28, 1996, 679, n. 215 [Nanu'u].

<i>rkby</i>	= /Rakbayu/ (^{al} <i>ra-ak-ba</i> , ^{al} <i>ra-ak-ba[-?]a</i>) ¹³⁵ (nom., gen.)
<i>šlmy</i>	= /Šalmīyu/ (^{al} <i>ša-al-ma</i> , ^{al} <i>šal-ma</i> , [^{al}] <i>šal-ma-a</i> , ^{al} <i>šal-mi-PI</i> , ^{al} <i>šal/ša-(al)-mi-IA</i> ¹³⁶ , ^{al} <i>s/ša₁₀-li-ma-a</i> , ^{al} <i>šal-ma</i>) ¹³⁷ (nom., gen.)
<i>šm(n)g(y)</i>	= /Šammegā/ > /Šamm(:n)e:igayu/ (^{al} <i>šam-me-q:ga</i> , ^{al} <i>šam-ni-q:ga</i>) (nom., gen.)
<i>š/ṭmny</i>	= /Š:Ṭamnayu/ (^{al} <i>ša-am-na</i>) ¹³⁸ (nom., gen.)
<i>ṭlhny</i>	= /Ṭulḥanayu/ (^{al} <i>šul-ḥa-na/nu</i> , ^{al} [<i>s</i>] <i>i(?) -il-ḥa-na</i>) ¹³⁹ (nom., gen.)
<i>ṭlrby</i>	= /Ṭallurbayu/ (^{al} <i>šal-lu-ur-ba-a</i> ¹⁴⁰ , [^{al}] <i>šá-lir_x-ba-a</i> , ^{al} <i>šal-lur_x(NIR)-bu</i> ¹⁴¹ ; ^{al} <i>šal-lur_x(NIR)-bi-PI</i> (nom., gen.)
<i>ṭmry</i>	= /Ṭam(u)rayu/ (^{al} <i>šam(Ú)/ú(?) -ra-a</i> , ^{al} <i>šá-am-ra-a</i>) ¹⁴² (nom., gen., ac.)
<i>y^cny</i>	= /Ya ^c (a)nīyu/ (^{al} <i>ya-'a-ni-PI</i>) (gen./nom.)
<i>yny</i>	= /Yēnayu/ (^{al} <i>ye-na-a</i> , ^{al} <i>ye-na</i> , ^{al} GESTIN- <i>na</i>) ¹⁴³ (nom., gen., ac.)

The picture that emerges from this record of TNN is that of a completely random distribution of the syll. endings /-iy-/ and /-ay-/, as was the case with the PNN at Mari. Moreover, unlike GNN and PNN, one cannot speak of a gender-dependent complementary distribution of TNN. The simple, non-extended or derivative ones with /Ø/ gender marker are pointed out clearly as feminine (see Ug. *udm rbt/trrt*), which conforms to the general grammatical Semitic categorization, as noted above¹⁴⁴. This would be the case when we find syll. notation of ending /-u:i:a/ in non-derivative TNN: *agimu/agimi*, *a-ia-li*, *ma-a-ra-bu* ...; even in hypercorrections like the ones we saw in the case of PNN: *am-mi-za-ú* (< *ammizayu), *ḥu-pa-ta-ú* (< *ḥupatayu), but *ḥu-up-pa-ti*. All these forms suggest a triptotic pattern¹⁴⁵ or a scribal hypercorrection to reconstruct the regular nominal inflexional pattern¹⁴⁶.

135. See Astour RSP 2 330, 361; Van Soldt SAU 338; id., *UF* 28 1996 685 [Rakbāyu]; Richardson UPNY 310.

136. See Van Soldt, *UF* 28 1996 687 n. 279: "The two references ... stem from a letter written at Alalakh, which probably explains their aberrant spelling".

137. See Belmonte RGTC 12/2, p. 260f.; on the existence of two places with this name cf. also Van Soldt SAU 337 n. 177; also id., UBL 11, 365 ("more than one town"); id., *UF* 28, 1996, 687 n. 279; Bordreuil, *Syria* 61, 1984, 9; Astour RSP 2 330f., 364f; Richardson UPNY 310.

138. See Belmonte RGTC 12/2 262f.; id., *AuOr* 17/18 1999/2000 22, on the existence of two villages with this name cf. also Van Soldt SAU 338 n. 177; id., *UF* 28, 1996, 687; Astour RSP 2 331, 365; Sivan GAGI 272; Richardson UPNY 307.

139. See Belmonte RGTC 12/2 302; Huehnergard AkkUg 365; Van Soldt, *UF* 28 1996 690; Richardson UPNY 310.

140. See Arnaud *SMEA* 32, 1993, 128; Van Soldt, *UF* 28, 1966, 690.

141. Asi Van Soldt TCSU 47 n. 416, colación desde un moulage; la copia de Nougayrol (PRU 6, XXXIX) un PI borroso.

142. See Belmonte RGTC 12/2 300; Rainey, *JOS* 3, 1973, 40f.; Astour RSP 2 337f., 365; id., *UF* 11, 1979, 20 n. 60; id., *UF* 13, 1981, 9, 11; id., RSOu 11 68; Van Soldt UBL 11 365 n. 9 (6); id., *UF* 30, 1998, 734; Sivan GAGI 281; Van Soldt UBL 11 365 n. 9 (6); id., SAU 337f. n. 177; id., *UF* 28, 1996, 690; Richardson UPNY 311; for URU *Ú-ra-a*, PRU 6 78:10, cf. Huehnergard UVST 252 n. 164; Van Soldt, *Fs. Loretz* 1998, p. 780.

143. See Van Soldt TCSU 25, 163, 176; id. UBL 11 377, 381; Belmonte RGTC 12/2 345f.; Astour, *UF* 13, 1981, 7; id., RSOu 11 65; Dietrich, Loretz, *UF* 10, 1978, 63; Richardson UPNY 309.

144. See above n. 117. The gender of the TNN can be seen determined by the implicit appellative (town, city: Ug. *qrt*, *mdnt*, as was pointed out. Many modern Arabic TNN are shaped according to this *nisba* ending /-iyya(h)/ or /-iyyi:e/ (by palatalization, conditioned by the consonantal environment, according to F. Corriente, private communication). See Al-Macani NJON 172.178. But in Ar. TNN we also have an ending in /-ayyā/ ("Die Aramäische Nisbe"), indeclinable; see id., *op. cit.*, pp. 178-180., also 170-172.

145. See Van Soldt TCSU 160.

146. On those readings in /-Ca-ú/ Huehnergard (AkkUg 45) comments: "final -Ca-ú might be taken to represent /-Cayul... It is preferable, however, to regard these spellings as attempts by the scribe to create nominative forms out of GN's that are normally monophthotic in /-a/".

But since most TNN are clearly derivative (“this of ...”), many times in coincidence with GNN¹⁴⁷, the hypothesis can be advanced of an origin of this kind for some if not all the TNN which bear the vocalized nisba marker /-iy-/¹⁴⁸. They may be presumed to be masculine in gender and of triptotic inflection, referring back to a masculine substantive: *mqm*, *atr*, *g* ...¹⁴⁹, whereas those TNN taking the ending /-ay-/ would follow the archaic triptotic feminine pattern (/ayu/), discussed earlier (see Fleisch’s opinion on toponyms)¹⁵⁰, also with derivative value (“that of...”), with both endings being contracted to monoptotic /-ā/ in the AkkUg¹⁵¹ and in consonantic Ug. as well, the alternative writing with /-y/ representing an archaic notation, as pointed out above. If we do not have syll. notation of the /-y/ ending, the pattern is unpredictable. But in this category the hypocoristicon or “Zärtlichkeit” origin of the postposition must also be questioned: we are dealing apparently with well known suffixes and morphemes. In this lexical category we do not seem to have a TNN ending in double /-yy/.

Conclusions

Summing up: in the case of the nisba adjectives the ending /-y/ functions as a grammatical derivative suffix. This is a primary grammatical morph whose origin cannot be discussed further. The morphological pattern can be parsed in this way: /-īy(y)-/ derivative suffix, masculine¹⁵², triptotic, with gentilic value. From this grammatical group we must separate the group of feminine PNN and qualifiers ending also in /-y/ by reason of semantic function, gender and vocalization. In this case the parsing of the morph will be: /-ay-/ suffix, feminine, triptotic¹⁵³, functioning as PN. Its origin is in keeping with the existence in Semitic of a nominal feminine suffix /-ay-/ witnessed in common nouns in Syriac, Arabic and sporadically in Hebrew. In this case we lack any clues regarding its inflectional and vocalization pattern, since there are not syll. counterparts. Nevertheless, comparative Semitics and the semantic coincidence in Ugaritic of forms ending in /-y/ with others ending in /-t/, obliges us to postulate the existence of a feminine suffix /-ayu/¹⁵⁴ as a morphemic alternative of the normative /-atu/. In this case the morph turns out to be: /-ayu/

147. The same lexeme GN-PN-TN: *alty*, *army*, *ary*, *gb^cly*, *m^crb(y)*. The same lexeme GN-TN: *^cky*, *hb/pt(y)/hbty*, *hlby*, *magdl*, *šlmy*, *šmny*, *tlhny*, *tlrby*.; PN-GN: *gpny* (?). In Alalakh the TNN bear the ending /-iya/, also /-uya/, to the exclusion of /-aya/; see Wiseman AT 154ff.; in Amarna we have /-ū.t.āya/; see Hess Am PN 202f.

148. But the presupposed fem. gender of these TNN would present a problem: the expected form would be *-iyat-*; see in this regard the alternance *nihrija/nihraju/nihrijatum* (Mari).

149. See above ^{al}*ašar* ^{il}*ba^cala^{ba}*. This type of TNN is not infrequent in ancient and modern languages, a sort of locative nisba.

150. See n. 46 A reflection of the influence of the Akk./Aram. nisba, could not be ruled out [see n. 1]. *-āyu* es nisba frecuente en mB.

151. See Richardson UPNY 314-315 (“whatever its meaning, because it is so often reflected in Akkadian spellings as /a/, it may have been as original /-aya/ (which would naturally have been written in Ugaritic as *-y*) which has contracted to /-ā/”).

152.. The feminine derivation is carried out, as is well known, by the ulterior marker /-at-, sometimes contracted to /-it- (< /-iy(y)-at-); see n. 4.

153. But the diptotic declension of PNN is common in Semitic: Brockelmann GVG I 461; Lipiński SLOCG 258f. Even Izre’el AALS 193 asserts. “Personal names do not regularly inflect for case”, in regard to El-Amarna PNN (see also p. 195).

154. The length of the vowel in fem. /-āyu/ (vs. /-ayu/) is not clear to me (pace Van Soldt Fs Groneberg 321). There is no cogent reason to presume a long vowel in this case. I maintain for the time being the brief notation of the fem. morph /-ayu/ (see Tropper UG 282ff.), based on the testimony of the NWS grammar and on the correspondence with its functional counterpart /-atu/. Furthermore, the existence in Ug. of contracted triphthongs /-ayu:i:a/ (Tropper UG 198-200; Van Sols Fs Groneberg 308) against the permanence of nisba /-āyu/ suffix, presupposes the brief notation; with a long vowel the contraction is impossible, as Van Soldt recognizes (see n. 29); the parallelism with the ending /-ānu/ is not a valid argument. In this case the comparative lexicography provides it. In this connection Van Soldt Fs Groneberg 322 n. 141 quotes Barth, Brockelmann and Kienast. The first two speak of the nisba suffix /-āy-/ and Kienast does not mention the fem. ending /-ay/ at all.

primary (archaic?) morph (not a derivative suffix), feminine in gender, most probably triptotic, and used with common nouns.

Finally the presence of the suffix /-y/ in Ug. onomastics (anthroponymy and toponymy) presents particular problems, although in this case we may use the syll. notation to address them. The vocalization /-iy-/ and /-ay-/ is found in PNN, either masculine or feminine. In case of the former, both suffixes should be linked to the nisba counterparts, the normative (-īyu) and the alternative (-āyu), in keeping with the pivotal and undifferentiated character of the north-west Semitic Syrian language of that moment¹⁵⁵. In turn, the feminine PNN ending in /-ayu/ bears witness to the alternative feminine nominal ending we found in Ugaritic and other Semitic languages. So do the TNN, which end for the most part in /-ay-/ and considered feminine in gender by categorical distribution. In consequence their inflection will be triptotic against the grammatical norm for this nominal category. In this case the suffix will conform to the feminine nominal morph just mentioned to which toponymy, as a universally recognized archaizing nominal category, will also bear witness¹⁵⁶. The few masculine TNN vocalized in /-īyu/ will also be parsed as derivative nisba forms, extensively certified in the Semitic languages in those nominal categories¹⁵⁷.

* * * * *

Some determinative adjectives, (*ayy-*), interrogative (*my*) and personal suffixed pronouns (*-ny*), which are well known in various Semitic languages, also bear a similar sort of ending /-y/. They belong to the primitive stock of the linguistic family and should be considered from a comparative perspective.

There are also some functors/particles whose ending /-y/ must be considered as an agglutinative enclitic particle with its independent semantic value rather than a suffix morph: *idy*, *iky*, *iy* (?), *uy*?, *ky*. But all these lexes and ‘particles’ lie outside the nominal morphology to which our inquiry is restricted. A study of the possible function of the ubiquitous emphatic particle /-y/ in the formation of all those morphs, including the nominal and functorial ones, would be most welcome.

GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS

ac.	accusative
c.	case
CN(N)	common noun
cs.	construct
f(em).	feminine
g.	gender
gen.	genitive
GN(N)	gentilic name(s)
m(asc.).	masculine
nom.	nominative

155. See in this regard Del Olmo Lete Fs. Militarev 44ff. ; id. LEA 169ff.

156. This kind of derivative morpheme should be clearly separated from the nisba ending. So Kühne: “Aus morphologischen Gründen empfiehlt es sich nicht, (etwa ausgehend von der Gleichförmigkeit der alphabet-schriftlichen Gestalt) das im ugaritischen Toponomastikon häufig belegte Afformativ *-j = -āja*, das, ohne praktisch eine Bedeutungsveränderung zu bewirken, an ONN angefügt sein kann, mit dem Nisbeafformativ *-j = *īju* gleichzusetzen” (UF 7, 1975, 258).

157. The few exceptions to this distribution (namely, masc. PNN in /-ay-/ (possible Akk.-Aram nisba /-ay-/ reflex) and fem. PNN in /-iy-/ (for which no explanation is extant; see Van Soldt TCSU 166; above 3) § 5)) can be assigned to phenomena of contamination, contraction, phonetic environment and foreign language conditioning, scribal oversights. The free distribution of those morphs supposes a problem in Mari. Maybe a similar solution can be applied.

PN(N)	personal name(s)
prep.	prepositional
sing.	singular
syll.	syllabic
TN(N)	toponym(s)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reference works

- AALS Sh. Izre'el, *Amurru Akkadian. A Linguistic Study*. Volume I (HSS 40), Atlanta GA 1991.
- AFCPN Sc.C. Layton, *Archaic Features of Canaanite Personal Names in the Hebrew Bible* (HSM 47), Atlanta GE 1990.
- AkkUg J. Huehnergard, *The Akkadian of Ugarit*, Atlanta, GA 1989.
- AOAbZ M.P. Streck, *Das amurritische Onomastikon der altbabylonischen Zeit*. Band 1. *Die Amurriter. Die onomastische Forschung. Orthographie und Phonologie. Nominalmorphologie* (AOAT 271/1). Münster 2000.
- AmPN R.H. Hess, *Amarna Personal Names (Dissertation Series, 9)*, Winona Lake IN 1993
- ANG J.J. Stamm, *Die Akkadische Namegebung* (MVÄG 44), Leipzig 1939.
- ANN E. Cassin, J.J. Glassner, *Anthroponymie et Anthropologie de Nuzi*, Malibu CA 1977.
- ÄP H. Ranke, *Die ägyptischen Personennamen*, I-III, Glückstadt 1935-1977.
- APN R. Hess, *Amarna Personal Names (ASOR Dissertation Series, 9)*, Winona Lake IN 1993.
- APNMT H.B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts: A Structural and Lexical Study*, Baltimore, MD 1965.
- AT D.J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* (Occasional Publications of the BIAA, 2); London 1953.
- BC 2 M.S. Smith, W.T. Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle. Volume II. Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU/CAT 1.3-1.4* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 114), Leiden/Boston 2009.
- BHAN J.J. Stamm, *Beiträge zur hebräischen und aramäischen Namenkunde. Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag eds. E. Jenni and M. A. Klopfenstein*, Freiburg-Schweiz/Göttingen 1980.
- CAAA I. Gelb, *Computer-aided Analysis of Amorite*, Chicago 1980.
- CAT A.F. Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets*, I-IV, Leiden New York-Köln 1996
- CEWAL R.D. Woodard, ed., *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of the World's Languages*, Cambridge 2004.
- CSyr T. Muraoka, *Classical Syriac* (Porta Linguarum Orientalium, 19), Wiesbaden 1997.
- CMHE Fr.M. Cross, *Canaanite Mythology and Hebrew Epic. Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*, Cambridge Mass. 1973.
- DEPM J.-M. Durand's *Documents épistolaires du palais de Mari*, T. I-III (Littératures Anciennes du Proche-Orient 15-18), Paris 1997-1998-2000.
- DNWSI J. Hoftijzer - K. Jongeling, *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*. Parts One/Two, Leiden 1995.
- DUL G. del Olmo Lete, J. Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Part 1-2 8(HOI/67), Leiden/Boston 2004².
- EPNSNG A. Archi, ed., *Eblaite personal names and Semitic Name-giving* (ARE-Studi 1), Roma 1988

- ICPIAN G. L. Harding, [*An Index and concordance of pre-Islamic Arabian names and inscriptions*](#), Toronto 1971.
- Fs. Groneberg
 Sehata, Fr. Weiershäuser, K.V. Zand, eds, *Von Götter und Menschen. Beiträge zur Literatur und Geschichte des Alten Orients. Festschrift für Brigitte Groneberg* (Cuneiform Monographs, 41), Leiden/boston 2010.
- Fs. LaSor G.A. Tuttle, ed., *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor*, Grand Rapids, MI 1978.
- Fs. Loretz 1998
 M Dietrich In. Kottsiepper, eds, “Und Mose schrieb diese Lied auf”. *Studien zum Alten Testament und zum Alten Orient. Festschrift für Oswald Loretz ...* (AOAT 250), Münster 1998.
- Fs. Militarev L. Kogan, ed., *Studia Semitica. Fs. Alex. Militarev* (Orientlaia III), Moscow 203.
- Fs. Muraoka M. Baasten, W. van Peursen, eds, *The Hamlet on the Hill, Studies for T. Muraoka*, Brussels 2003.
- GAG W. von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*, Rome³1995.
- GAGI 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*, Kevelaer/ Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984.
- GAL W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, Cambridge 1967³.
- GBH P. Joüon, T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Subsidia Biblica, 14/I-II), Roma 1993.
- GHG E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius Hebrew Grammar*, Oxford 1966 (repr. Oxford 1910²).
- GJPA G. Dalman, *Grammar des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*, Darmstadt 1960 (repr. 1905).
- GLH Em. Laroche, *Glossaire de la langue hourrite (Études et Commentaires, 93)*, Paris 1980.
- GMVO H.W. Haussig, ed., *Götter und Mythen im vorderen Orient* (Wörterbuch der Mythologie I/1), Stuttgart 1965.
- GS L. Costaz, *Grammaire Syriaque*, Beyrouth 2003⁵.
- GUL D. Sivan, *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*, Leiden 1997.
- GVG C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen in zwei Bänden*, vols. I/II, Hildesheim 1961.
- HALOT L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, I-V, Leiden 1994-2000.
- HG R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik* I-IV, Berlin 1966-1972.
- HGHSAT H. Bauer, P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*, Hildesheim 1962 (repr. Halle 1922).
- ICGSL S. Moscati, ed., *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, Wiesbaden 1964.
- IMC G. del Olmo Lete, *Interpretación de la mitología cananea* (Fuentes de la Ciencia Bíblica, 2), Valencia 1984.
- IPN M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namegebung*, Stuttgart 1966 (repr. Stuttgart 1928).
- KSG Th. Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik*, Darmstadt 1966 (repr. Leipzig 1998).
- LEA J.P. Monferrer Sala, M. Marcos Aldón, eds, *Lenguas y escritura en la Antigüedad*, Córdoba 2010.
- LSU W.G.E. Watson, *Linguistic Studies in Ugaritic* (AuOrSuppl. 19), Sabadell (Barcelona) 2007.

- MLC G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaán según la tradición de Ugarit* (Fuentes de la Ciencia Bíblica, 1), Madrid 1981.
- MLRSO G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos, leyendas y rituales de los semitas occidentales* (Pliegos de Oriente, 1), Madrid/Barcelona 1998.
- MOu P. Bordreuil, D. Pardee, *Manuel d'Ougaritique*, vols. I-II, Paris 2004
- NBSS J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, Hildesheim 1967 (repr. Leipzig 1894²).
- NJOH S. Al-Macani, *Nordjordanische Ortsnamen* (Texte und Studien zur Orientistik, 7), Hildesheim/Zürich/New York 1992.
- NPN I.J. Gelb - P.M. Purves - A.A. MacRae, *Nuzi Personal Names*, Chicago 1943.
- NuzHur M.A. Morrison, D.I. Owen, eds, *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of the Nuzi and the Hurrians*, Winona Lake 1981.
- NUS *Newsletter of Ugaritic Studies*, Calgary.
- PNET M. Krebernik, *Die Personennamen der Ebla-Texte. Eine Zwischenbilanz* (Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient, 7), Berlin 1988.
- PNPPI F.L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions*, Rome 1972.
- PNTE R. Pruzsinszky, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar* (Studies on Civilisation and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians, 13), Bethesda MD 2005.
- PRMERZL A. Millet Albà, *La population du Royaume de Mari à l'époque du Roi Zimri-Lîm*, Diss. EPHE Sciences Historiques et Philologiques, Paris 2001.
- PRU 3 Cl.F.-A. Schaeffer, ed., *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit III. Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives Est, Ouest et centrales*, par J. Nougayrol, Paris 1955.
- PRU 4 Cl.F.-A. Schaeffer, ed., *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit IV. Textes accadiens des Archives Sud (Archives internationales)*, par J. Nougayrol, Paris 1956.
- PRU 6 Cl.F.-A. Schaeffer, ed., *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit VI. Textes en cunéiformes babyloniens des archives du Grand Palais et du Palais Sud d'Ugarit*, par J. Nougayrol, Paris 1970.
- PTU F. Gröndahl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*, Rome 1967.
- RANP M. Birot, J.-R. Kupper, O. Rouault, *Répertoire analytique* (2e volume) ... *Noms propres* (ARM XVI/1), Paris 1979.
- RGTC 3 B. Groneberg, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der altbabylonischen Zeit* (Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes, Band 3), Wiesbaden 1980.
- RGTC 6 G.F. Del Monte, J. Tischler, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte* (Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes, Band 6), Wiesbaden 1978.
- RGTC 12/2 J.A. Belmonte Marín, *Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes, Band 12/2. Die Orts- und Gewässernamen aus Syrien im 2. Jt. v. Chr.* (BTAVO B/7/12/2), Wiesbaden 2001.
- RSOu 7 P. Bordreuil, ed., *Une bibliothèque au sud de la Ville* (Ras Shamra-Ougarit VII), Paris 1991.
- RSOu 11 Cl.F.-A. Schaeffer, ed., *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit VI. Textes et cunéiformes babyloniens des Archives du Grand Palais et du Palais Sud d'Ugarit*, par J. Nougayrol, Paris 1970
- RSOu 14 M. Yon, D. Arnaud, eds, *Études ougaritiques I: Travaux 1988-1995* (Ras Shamra-Ougarit, 14), Paris 2001.
- RSP 2 L.R. Fisher, ed., *Ras Shamra Parallels. The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*. Vol. II (AnBi 50), Roma 1975 (Chapt. VIII, "Place Names", by M.C. Astour, pp. 249-369)
- SLOCG Ed. Lipiński, *Semitic Languages. Outline of a Comparative Grammar* (OLA 80), Leuven 1997
- SOARI M. Maraqtan, *Die semitischen Personennamen in den alt- und reich-aramäischen*

- Inschriften aus Vorderasien* (Texte und Studien zur Orientalistik, 1), Hildesheim /Zürich/New York, 1988
- SP J.C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern* (AOAT 16), Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1971.
- StUL K. Aartun, *Studien zur Ugaritischen Lexikographie*. Teil I-II,A-B, Wiesbaden 1991-2006.
- TCSU W.H. van Soldt, *The Topography of the City-State of Ugarit* (AOAT 324), Münster 2005.
- TMOM 47 Y. Calvet, M. Yon, eds, *OUGARIT au Bronze moyen et au Bronze récent* (Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée, 47), Lyon 2008.
- TP D. Pardee, *Textes paramythologiques de la 24e campagne (1961)* (RSO IV), Paris 1988.
- TR D. Pardee, *Les textes rituels*. Fascicule 1-2 (RSOu XII), Paris 2000.
- UBL 11 G.J. Brooke, A.I.W. Curtis, J.F. Healey, eds., *Ugarit and the Bible. Proceedings of the Intenational Symposium on Ugarit and the Bible. Manchester, September 1992* (Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur, 11), Münster 1994.
- Ug. 5 J. Nougayrol et al., *Ugaritica V. Nouvelles texts accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques ...* (Mission de Ras Shamra, 16), Paris 1968.
- UPNY M.E.J. Richardson, "Ugaritic Place Names with Final -Y", *JSS* 23, 1978, 298-315.
- UT C.H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, Rome 1965.
- UVST J. Huehnergard, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*, Atlanta, GA 1987.
- WSVATE E.J. Penttuc, *West Semitic Vocabulary in the Akkadian Texts from Emar* (HSS 49), Winona Lake IN 2001.
- WSVES D. Sivan - Z. Cochavi-Rainey, *West Semitic Vocabulary in Egyptian Script of the 14th to the 10th Centuries BCE*, Beer-Sheva 1992.

Studies

- D. Arnaud, "Contribution de l'onomastique du moyen-Euphrate à la connaissance de l'Émariote", *SEL* 8, 1991, 23-46.
- D. Arnaud, "Relecture de la liste sacrificielle RS 26.142", *SMEA* 34, 1994, 107-109.
- M.C. Astour, "Toponymic Parallels Between the Nuzi and Northern Syria. Appendix: Nuzi Place Names in Egyptian Topographic Lists", in M.A. Morrison, D.I. Owen, eds, *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of the Nuzi and the Hurrians*, Winona Lake 1981.
- P. Bordreuil, "Variations vocaliques et notations sporadiques du génitif dans les textes alphabétiques de l'Ougarit", *SEL* 5, 1988, 25-30.
- P. Bordreuil, "Nouvelles restitutions de toponymes de l'Ougarit", *UF* 20, 1988, 9-18.
- P. Bordreuil, "La citadelle sainte du Mont Nanou", *Syria* 66, 1989, 275-279.
- P. Bordreuil, A. Caquot, *Syria* 56, 1979, 311, n. 12; 57, 1980, 384f.
- J.A. Brinkman, "Masculine or Feminine? The case of conflicting gender determinatives for middle Babylonian personal names", in M. Roth et al., *Studies Presented to Robert D. Biggs, June 4, 2004* (From the Workshop of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary, 2), Chicago 2007, pp. 2-10.
- D. Charpin, "La 'toponymie en miroir' à l'époque amorite", *RA* 97, 2003, 3-34.
- G. del Olmo Lete, "Notes on Semitic Lexicography (I). The Proto-Semitic Cluster /tr(r:w:y)/ and Ug. *trry/t'*", *Aula Orientalis* 16, 1998, 187-192.
- G. del Olmo Lete, "Ugarítico", in *LEA*, pp. 169-177.
- M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, "Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit (I). Ein Forschungsbericht", *UF* 13, 1981, 63-100.
- M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, J. Sanmartín, "Zur ugaritischen Lexikographie (VIII). Lexikographische Einzelbemerkungen", *UF* 5, 1973, 105-117.

- M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, J. Sanmartín, “Zur ugaritischen Lexikographie (XI). Lexikographische Einzelbemerkungen”, *UF* 6, 1974, 19-35
- Ig. Gelb, “La lingua degli amoriti”, *ANLR* VIII/XIII/1-2, 1958,
- Al. Goetze, “Cilicians”, *JCS* 16, 1962, 48-58.
- Fr. Gröndahl, Rev. of Huffmon APNMT, *Or NS* 35, 1966, 449-456.
- C.H. Gordon, “The Three Graces”, *NUS* 31, 1984, 11.
- J. Huehnergard, “Akkadian evidence for ase-vowels on Ugaritic bound forms”, *JCS* 33, 1081, 199-205.
- J. Huehnergard, “Northwest Semitic Vocabulary in Akkadian Texts” (rev. of D.Sivan, *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary ...*), *JAOS* 107, 1987, 713-725.
- C. Kühne, “Mit Glossenkeilen markierte fremde Wörter im akkadischen Ugaritischen”, *UF* 7, 1975, 253-260.
- Ed. Lipiński, “Allusions historiques dans la correspondance ougaritique de Ras Shamra: lettre de Ewri-Šarriv’s Pilsiya”, *UF* 13, 1981, 123-126.
- Ed. Lipiński, “The Legal documents from Tell Ḥalaf”, in id., *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics* (OLA 1), Leuven 1973, pp. 114-142.
- W.E. Mayer, “Besonderheiten in der Verwendung des Grapheme A.A. im Akkadischen”, *Orientalia* 72, 2003, 293-306.
- D. Pardee, *Review of Ugaritic Grammatik*, *AfO* 50, 2003-2004, 1-404 (on-line).
- M. Pope, W. Röllig, “Syrien. Die Mythologie der Ugariter und Phönizier”, in *GMVO*, pp. 217-312.
- An. Rainey, “Observations on Ugaritic Grammar”, *UF* 3, 1971, 151-172
- An. Rainey, “Gleanings from Ugarit”, *IOS* 3, 1973, 34-62.
- S. Ribichini, P. Xella, “Problemi di onomastica ugaritica. Il caso dei teofori”, *SEL* 8, 1991, 1149-170.
- J. Sanmartín, “Lexicographisches zu Ug. ^cTQ (KTU 1.16 I 2-5, 15-19; II 38-42)”, *UF* 10, 1978, 453-454.
- St. Segert, “The last sign of the ugaritic Alphabet”, *UF* 15, 1983, 201-213
- J. Tropper, “Das letzte Zeichen des ugaritischen Alphabets”, *UF* 27, 1995, 505-528;
- G.A. Tuttel, “Case Vowels on Masculine Singular Nouns in Construct in Ugaritic”, in G.A. Tuttel, ed., *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor*, Gran Rapids MI 1978, pp. 253-268.
- W.H. van Soldt, “Studies in the Topography of Ugarit (I)”, *UF* 28, 1996, 653-692.
- W.H. van Soldt, “The Ugaritic suffixes -āyu and -ānu”, in D. Shehata, Fr. Weiershäuser, K.V. Zand, eds, *Von Göttern und Menschen Beiträge zu Literatur und Geschichte des Alten Orients. Festschrift für Brigitte Groneberg*, Leiden/Boston 2010, pp. 307-327.
- W.H. Van Soldt, “The Vocalization of the Word *mlk* - “king” in Syllabic Texts from Syria and Palestine during the Late Bronze Age”, in M. Baasten, W. van Peursen, eds, *The Hamlet on the Hill, Studies for T. Muraoka*, Brussels 2003, pp. 449-471.
- W.H. van Soldt, “On Abbreviated Personal Names in texts from Ugarit”, communication to the RAI55 Paris, in press.
- J. Violelaud, “Questions de phonétique ougaritique”, *GLECS* 3, 1940, 97-99.
- W.G.E. Watson, “Ugaritic Onomastics (1)”, *AuOr* 8, 1990, 113-127.
- W.G.E. Watson, “Ugaritic Onomastics (5)”, *AuOr* 14, 1996, 93-106.
- D.R. West, *Some Cults of Greek Goddesses and Female Daemons of Oriental Origin specially in relation to the mythology of goddesses and daemons in the Semitic world* (AOAT 233), Münster 1995.