

dġ ānš, KTU 6.105 [RS 96.2042]:2: a discussion

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

[KTU 6.105 is a “label” or “tag” recently published that bears a brief Ugaritic text whose meaning is here analysed according to the technical vocabulary of this type of administrative record.]

Keywords: label, beer, pulp, draff.

The etymological elucidation of the *hapaxlegomena*, when a clear lexical correspondence is not at hand, implies the most hazardous exercise of comparative lexicography, unless you can rely on an enough clear context (or a native speaker) that guarantees the correlations. The semantic axiom –“a word means what it means in its own language, not what it means in another”– must never be ignored.¹ There are all the same certain limits required by historical linguistics that should never be overrun, especially in the case of loanwords. To such a risk the editors of the newly discovered Ugaritic texts (1994-2002 seasons)² have found themselves exposed, driven by the urgency of offering them to the scholarly world, for which they must be warmly thanked and praised. Such urgency, however, has driven them to give an all too quick answer to the identification of the mentioned *hapax* that come out in those texts (the same holds true for that matter concerning the many new PNN and TNN). The editors have given priority in those cases to the textual edition, over the interpretative discussion. In this article the discussion focuses on a concrete syntagm, *dġ ānš* (KTU³ 6.105 [RS 96.2042]:2), whose proposed semantics is, in our opinion, not correct.

dġ, “pulp, cake” (of crushed vegetable fruits or seeds)

On one of the sides of the “étiquette” / “label” lor “tag” and thanks to the photo offered in the attached CD the reading *dġ ānš* is quite clear. The editors translate (and understand) it as: “(et une mesure-*kd*²) de babeurre³ tourné”. This suggested meaning is evidently, and admittedly, based on the Arabic

1. Cf. G. Del Olmo Lete, *Questions de Linguistique Sémitique. ‘Racine’ et lexème. Histoire de la recherche* (Antiquités Sémitiques 5), Paris 2003, p. 144 (J. Barr).

2. Cf. P. Bordreuil, D. Pardee, *Une Bibliothèque au Sud de la Ville ***. Textes 1994-2002 en cunéforme alphabétique de la Maison d’Ourtenou* (RSOu XVIII), Lyon/Paris 2012.

3. According to Larousse’s dictionary: “babeurre n. m. (de *bas* et *beurre*). Liquide sereux qui reste après le barattage de la crème, dans la fabrication de la beurre”; in Spanish “suero”, vulg. “churre”.

lexicon⁴: the lexeme *dūg*- means indeed “babeure” according to the usual “cumulative” dictionaries (f.i. Freitag, LAL/2, p. 71: “*Lac serosum*”; Kazimirski, DAF/1, p. 750: “babeure”; Hava AED, p. 222: “whey, watery part of milk”). The term does not appear, however, neither in the *Lisān* nor in the dictionaries that collect the ancient sources of the Arabic lexicography (Lane), nor still in the dictionaries of modern standard Arabic (Wehr, Corriente), despite the fact that most of them attest to a base **dūg*. The reason is obvious: *the term is of Persian origin*, as all these lexica make clear: Freitag (*Pers.*), Kazimirski (*pers.*), Hava (P) and even Cohen (“petit lait”. Empr. Pers.).⁵ In this regard the *Muḡam-l-²alfāz al-fārisiyyat al-muḡarrabat*⁶ of Al-Sayyid ²Addi Shir points out: (*al-dūg wa-l-dūq*) *al-mahīd fārisiyyatuhu dūg wa-minhu al-arāmī dūgā² wa-l kurdī dū*. It is rather clear that we have here a relatively late loan in the Eastern Dialects of Arabic⁷. This means that the term did not enter the Arabic lexicon before the conquest of the Persian Empire in the 7th century CE and the foundation of the Abbaside Caliphate with Baghdad as capital in the 8th century. In no case can the word with this semantic value be related to Ug. *dġ*.⁸ To gloss the criticism stated by the editors of the text itself, one could say: “on ne voit pas pourquoi les Ougaritains auraient emprunté un mot *perse* (the word is mine) alors qu’ils devaient avoir leur propre mot depuis des millénaires, c’est-à-dire depuis l’époque où la production de jus par pression fut inventé”; an era for which no doubt the ancient Mesopotamians, rather than the Persians, may be held responsible for the introduction of techniques also concerning dairy production. On the other hand, the reliance of the Levant on Mesopotamia for the lexicon of technical terminology is not infrequent.

As a result, the explanation through Sum.-Akk. *duḥ* / *tuhhu*, “Abfall, Rückstände” (AHw 1366), “bran draff” (CAD T 452: “Sum. lw.: wr. syll. and DUḥ”), attested in the Akk.-Ug. DUḥ = *tu-uḥ-hu* = *šu-hu-li* = *šu-hu-ut-t*], Ug 5 137 III 3⁹ continues to be preferable.¹⁰ It would be possible to understand Ug. *dġ*

4. Already suggested by K. Aartun, *Studien zur ugaritischen Lexikographie*, I, Wiesbaden 1991, p. 43: “Molke”, Arab. *dūg*, *dawg*; this suggestion was already recorded (and set aside) in the *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica* (AuOrS 7), Sabadell (Barcelona) 1996, p. 131, and consigned also in the English 2nd edition (2004, p. 268).

5. Cf. D. Cohen, *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques* I/4, Paris/Louvain, 1993, p. 237.

6. Al-Sayyid ²Addi Shir, *Muḡam-l-²alfāz al-fārisiyyat al-muḡarrabat*, Bayrut 1980, p. 28; see also F. Steingass, *Persian-English Dictionary*, Beirut 1998 (repr. of 1892 ed.), p. 545: “دوغ *dogh* (S. *dugdha*), Churned sour milk, whey, buttermilk”. See following n.

7. Writing on the lexicon of the Eastern Arabic Dialect of Iraq, F. Abu-Haidar says: “Los dialectos árabes de Irak han incorporado numerosos préstamos a lo largo del tiempo, tanto del árabe clásico como de otros dialectos. En época medieval entraron en los dialectos iraquíes numerosas voces persas y más adelante turcas, muchas de las cuales han caído en desuso en la actualidad”, in F. Corriente, Á. Vicente, eds, *Manual de dialectología neoárabe* (Estudios árabes e islámicos / Estudios de dialectología árabe, 1), Zaragoza 2008, p. 206. As my pupil the native Iraqi linguist Pius Hermez Elias informs me: “nowadays the word *dūg* is no more in use in the Iraqi dialects. On the contrary is used normally in the Neo-Aramean community”. Nor even the following dictionaries of eastern dialectal Arabic incorporate this word: A. Barhélemy, *Dictionnaire Arabe – Français. Dialectes de Syrie: Alep, Damas, Liban, Jérusalem*, Paris 1935-; P. Behnstedt, *Die nordjemenitischen Dialekte. Teil 2: Glossar Alif – Dāl*, Wiesbaden 1992; Y. Avishur, *A Dictionary of the New Judeo-Arabic Written and Spoken in Iraq (1600-2000)* (in Hebrew), Tel-Aviv – Jaffa 2008; J. Blau, *A Dictionary of Mediaeval Judaeo-Arabic Texts*, Jerusalem 2006; nothing to say of course of the Western Arabic dialects. See following n.

8. In standard Arabic the usual words for it are: *maṣl*, “whey”, *maṣala*, “to curdle”, and *maḥīd*, “buttermilk”, *maḥaḍa*, “to churn” (cf. Wehr DMWA, p. 896, 912). For the East Aramaic (Syriac) that loans from Arabic the term see Brockelmann-Sokoloff, SL, p. 277: *daugā²*, “sour milk”; Cl.A. Ciancaglini, *Iranian Loanwords in Syriac* (Beiträge zu Iranistik, 28), Wiesbaden 2008, p. 148: “*dwg²* *dawgā* sour milk, MP **dūg* (/dūγ/),” with sources. See particularly pp. 14ff.: “Syriac and Middle Persian”. On the contrary the word does not exist either in Old Aramaic or even in Judeo-Aramaic (Babylonian and Palestinian).

9. Regretfully the lexical text/vocabulary RS 20.123+ III 3 does not give us the corresponding Ugaritic alphabetic word, did it actually exist. The Ug. scribe, instead of giving the cons. form extant behind the supposed but otherwise unattested Ug. syllabic term *šu-hu-ut-t*] has figured out a “neologism” on the basis of the Sum. *du.ga₁₀*, but taking into account the specific velar fricative phoneme implicit in the Akkadian transcription /-ḫḫ-/. The way also in the realization of the first consonant /d, t, š/ points also to a specific phonem in this position.

as the product resulting from the “crushing and pressing” in the case of olives (the oil mill is well known from archaeological remains) and “trampling and pressing” in the case of grapes, following the traditional system of wine-press practiced until recent times in the whole Mediterranean area. The last outcome of this operation, the pulp or cake, is submitted to a second mechanical pressing, what in the case of grapes gives way to the elaboration of acquavita (eau-de-vie, orujo, aguardiente, grappa, marc, etc.) and in the case of olives allows (besides a second pressing in cold) a new oil extraction by “floating”, pouring “hot water” on it, following a well-known process in the Mediterranean area.¹¹ The outcome of these two pressing processes is an oil of two different qualities and value. The process was known also in Ancient Mesopotamia and of course at Ugarit.¹² We have to bear in mind this traditional oil extraction system because of its relevance for the analysis of the semantics of *ʾnš* that follows.

The term *dġ* can be taken then as the singular of (pl.) *dġm* (alt. *-m* enc.) in KTU 4.284:7; here very likely the *dġ* of olives is meant, being its mention fully integrated in the context (see the reference to *šmn* and *ztm* in lin. 6, 8 and possibly in the fragmentary text KTU 7.99:3; while the reference to “wine” (*yn*) is made in the previous register, divided by a ruled line). In the case of KTU 6.105:2 we have no context to help us.¹³ The administrative message was so clear for the addressee that there was no need for any further precision. Nevertheless, the editors of the text, for their part, have offered a precise interpretation: what is meant is neither oil nor wine, but milk; a precision, however, that lexicography does not support.¹⁴

10. Cf. DUL/1, p. 268; W.G.E. Watson, *Lexical Studies in Ugaritic* (AuOrS 19), Sabadell (Barcelona) 2007, p. 82); see KTU 4.284:7, *kdm dġm* “two “jars” of marc (sesame, olives ...), namely: “of pulp or cake of vegetable seeds and other grain fruits after grinding / pounding / pressing”. Maybe the best discussion of the different kinds of DUH is that by Stol, *BO* 28, 1987, 169ff. (rev. art of W. Röllig, *Das Bier in alten Mesopotamien*, Berlin 1970). See also CAD T 452-454.

11. An excellent and synthetic lay out of the “basic methods of oil extraction” is offered by M.P. Charles, “An introduction to the legumes and oil plants of Mesopotamia”, *BSA* 2 (1985) 39-61: “The seeds are first broken up by pounding, milling or grinding to produce an unextracted *meal*. This is then pressed, the expressed oil being filtered off leaving the *cake* of crushed huks and seed kernels. Filtering is through a cloth of fine mesh sieve. The residual cake is still oil-rich (3-15%) and may be further processed by another cold pressing or instead a hot pressing treatment is applied. Alternatively it can be fed to livestock ...” (p. 51). The same process is applied in the beer production; see Stol, *BO* 28, 1987, 169. See among many other witnesses also: D. Eitam, “Olive-oil production during the Biblical period”, in M. Heltzer, D. Eitam, eds, *Olive Oil in Antiquity. Israel and neighbouring countries. Conference 1987, Haifa*, n.d., p. 21s.: “At the site of Beith-El ... a deep rock-cut vat was found ... It seems that oil was produced in the vat by mixing olive-pulp with hot water”; and in p. 30, n. 17 he adds: “this domestic oil extraction was in use during the sabbatical year in Ro. period ... and was still in use at the beginning of the 20th Cent.”. Collected in “basquets” the olive pulp resulting from the pounding or crushing was submitted to a new pressing in cold, as said above; cf. also R. Frankel, “Oil Presses in Western Galilee and the Judaea – A comparison”, *ibdm.* p. 64.

12. On the elaboration of olive oil in Mesopotamia and particularly at Ugarit see the collective work quoted in the previous n. and in the monographic issue of *BSA* 2 (1985): M. Malul, “ze/irtu (se/irdu). The olive tree and its products in Ancient Mesopotamia”, *ibdm.* pp. 146-158; M. Heltzer, “Olive growing and olive oil in Ugarit”, *ibdm.* pp. 106-120.

13. By KTU 3.33:2 (see 2.64:1, 9; 2.72:25; 4.91: 1; 4.158:2; 4.277:3; 4.384:9, and the frag. 4.57:1; 4.260:5; 4.680:3) we know that *ybnm* (**Yabninu*), the here reference subject, was a rich landholder, owner of vineyards and surely also of olive tree groves which he cultivated in the sunny slopes of the country (*gr pth*). But it is above all KTU 2.72 that makes clear the significance of this citizen. Curiously enough in this document he has to do with unction “oil” (*w lqh hw šmn b qrnw w ysq hw l riš l bt mlk amr*); also in KTU 4.91 and 4.158 appears *Yabninu* dealing with different kinds of “oil” (*šmn nh, rqh, mr, tišr*); cf. D. Pardee, “A New Ugaritic Letter”, *BiOr* 34, 1977, 3-20 (11-12); J.-Cl. Courtois, “Yabninu et le palais d’Ugarit”, *Syria* 67, 1990, 104-142. For the presence of Yabninu in the Akk. letters see W.H. van Soldt, *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit* (AOAT 40), Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1991, p. 156.: “an important figure”; for a more precise definition of the role played by this individual at Ugarit see the following paper by Ig. Márquez Rowe.

14. Cf. P. Bordreuil, D. Pardee, *Une Bibliothèque au Sud de la Ville **** (RSOu XVIII), Lyon 2012, p. 210, n. 318.

In the Mesopotamian area the meaning of *tuhhu* was in general that of “pulp of any vegetable fruit / seed”,¹⁵ as an outcome of its crushing and pressing to have its juice or oil.¹⁶ In this connection one aspect must be borne in mind: the document in question is a “label” or “tag” that, as its shape and the holes to be seen at the edge imply, was attached to a container.¹⁷ Now, it is unlikely that “two” heterogeneous commodities such as a seed, “cumin” (*kmn*), and a milky “liquid” (“babeure tourné”), or even the “pulp” of the same or another product, would be mixed up in the same “jar” (*kd*).¹⁸ Consequently the text editors suggest understanding another */(kd)/* before *dġ ʾnš*: “(et une mesure-*kd*¹⁹) de babeure tourné”.¹⁹ The problem is then how a single “label” could be attached to two different containers at the same time.

This last syntagm may be taken, nevertheless, as a determinative of the previous *kmn* (as an adverbial appositional determinative for which an encl. *–m* is sometimes employed) and the whole expression may be translated: “a *kd* of cumin (in/as) pulp ...”, namely: “a *kd* of pulp of cumin”, with a kind of topicalization of the commodity, reduced to pulp after the extraction of its juice/oil; the extraction could be carried out, as pointed out above, by the system of floating (the system used in the extraction of the olive oil), as it was done with sesame seeds. But it could also be taken as pulp ready for such extraction, namely, as pulp or cake (even flour) of crushed and compacted cumin, depending on the precise meaning of *ʾnš*. According to this interpretation, there is no need to restore or understand another container / measure and, what is more important, only one commodity is meant, contained in the one jar. Very likely the cumin oil was used in Mesopotamia, like that of sesame,²⁰ in perfumery or in the preparation of sauces, beside its use as fodder for animals.

1. *ʾnš*, “not fully cooked” / “scalded; alt. “squeezed, moist”

This lexeme has on the contrary a clear Semitic ancestry, already pointed out by the text editors: *ʔnd, unfortunately only attested in Arabic: *ʔanīd*-. According to traditional lexicography, it means: “semi-crude, incompletely cooked ...”,²¹ mainly said of “meat”, as the first produce from the cooking process

15. See AHw 1366, “Abfall, Mehle”, and CAD T 452-454. For the range of the pulses implied cf. also the quoted art. by Stol n. 10. On the different oleaginous plant see M.P. Charles, “An Introduction to the Legumes and Oil Plants of Mesopotamia”, *BSA* 2, 1985, 39-61; H. Waetzoldt, “Ölpflanzen und Pflanzenöle in 3. Jahrtausend”, *BSA* 2, 1985, 77-93.

16. On the different kinds of oil see the articles by Charles and Waetzoldt quoted in previous n.

17. See in this regard W.H. van Soldt, “Labels from Ugarit”, *UF* 21, 1989, 375; the presence of “string holes” in the cone labels are constantly pointed out. In the Biblical period *bullae* were attached to the *papyri* (in the former periods to the tablets also) while information on the vessel contents was imprinted on the storage jar handles; see from among the abundant literature on the subject N. Avigad, *Hebrew Bullae from the Time of Jeremiah. Remnants of a Burnt Archive*, Jerusalem 1986; for *bullae* at Ugarit see P. Borderuil, “Les découvertes archéologiques et épigraphiques de Ras Ibn Hani (Syrie) en 1983: un lot d’archives administratives”, *CRAIBL* 1984, p. 418, n. 30. For the rest, the cuneiform administrative texts certified a rich commerce of DUḪ of different kinds in Mesopotamia, above all of barley, essential in the elaboration of beer; cf. Stol *BO* 28, 1971 170f.; CAD T 453f. (“as commodity”).

18. It is generally accepted that *kd* corresponds to a container / measure for liquids (“jar”: wine, oil ...), while *dd* corresponds to a container / measure for pulses and similar; cf. M. Heltzer, “Olive growing and olive oil in Ugarit”, in M. Heltzer, D. Eitam, eds, *Olive Oil in Antiquity. Israel and neighbouring countries. Conference 1987, Haifa*, n.d., p. 109. For the rest see the Sum. notation DUG GA.MU[N] (BIN 8 132, quoted in CAD K 131) as the exact equivalent of Ug. *kd kmn*. On Sum. DUG see the *Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary* on line: wr. dug; dug₂(BI) “(clay) pot; a unit of liquid capacity”, Akk. *karpatu*.

19. Notice also the absence of /w/. The case of the text tablets is quite different: they record “quantities”, not “containers”; and in this way so different a produce like *hms* and *nbt* can be recorded together (*kt hms w nbt*, KTU³ 2.99 [RS 94.2580]:24), suitably translated by the editors: “un contenant-*kt* de vinaigre et (un autre ²) de miel”; see RSOu XVIII, p. 168.

20. See M. Stol, “Remarks on the Cultivation of Sesame and the Extraction of its Oil”, *BSA* 2, 1985, 119-126.

21. See F. Corriente, Ig. Ferrando, *Diccionario avanzado Árabe t. I. Árabe – Español*, Barcelona 2005: “*ʔnd, “estar mal cocido” (u), “corromperse” (i); *ʔanīd*, “mal cocido”, p. 35. B. Kazimirski, *Dictionnaire Arabe Français*, I, Paris 1860 (repr.), p.

(above all among nomadic people, what could point to an idiosyncratic Arabic semantics). It describes, however, a generic and usual process so that the term can be applied to any other product bound to undergo such a process. In cooking there are lots of such products that consequently may appear in either “raw” or “cooked” (“boiled”, “fried”) state, as well as in a set of intermediate cooking degrees (semi-raw, done, medium, boiled, scalded. ...; in Spanish: semicrudo, hecho, poco hecho, ... cocido, escaldado, pasado por agua ...). On the contrary it is not clear at all how the semantic shift from “incompletely cooked” to “tourné” can be achieved, a shift apparently enforced by the discussed meaning given to *dġ* (“babeure”). Now, taking into account what has been said above on the foreign origin of this lexeme in Semitic lexicography, we can assume with high probability that this “semantic shift” lacks any plausibility. It is more advisable to grant *ʾnš* in Ugaritic the attested Arabic meaning “semi-raw, incompletely cooked / boiled” (Eng. “scalded” // Sp. “escaldado”).

This qualification as applied to *dġ* or “pulp” resulting from the crashing of vegetable seeds (olives and others)²² fits rather well and agrees with the traditional way of processing such produces, as pointed out above, in order to extract their “oil”. It is then presumed that the cumin oil has been already extracted a second time by a floating process. This interpretation seems to the point, so much in case the “olive” pulp is meant in the text (and so two items are involved: *kmn* and *dġ*) as well in case “cumin-seed” pulp is referred to (only one item: *dġ* of *kmn*), in any case the ambiguity (what product is here ment, either olive oil or wine) disappears that so much apparently worries the editors of this text,²³ since such a process is impossible in case of pulp coming out of the trampling of grapes for the extraction of wine: alcohol does not “float”.²⁴

In this context special attention must be paid to the way *tuhhu* of the different pulses and seed was produced. The basic predicate in this regard is *ḥalāšu*, “to squeeze out”, from which the adjective *ḥalšu*, “squeezed”,²⁵ derives, said e.g. of sesame seeds and almonds, as used in perfumery²⁶. Note the following attested Akkadian sentences: KAR sūn (= *nartabu*) *la ḥalša ša šà giš šud-qi*, “1 ½ silas of unsqueezed mash made from almonds”;²⁷ (n) *šá-maš-šam-ni ḥal-šu-ti*,²⁸ “(n of) pressed out sesame seeds (after MIN *nuppušūti* crushed sesame)”; both sentences are very similar in structure and meaning to our label text. DUḥ/*tuhhu* *ḥalšu* would be the “semantic”²⁹ equivalent of Ug. *dġ ʾnš*. The qualifications “unsqueezed” and “squeezed” would thus correspond to the two stages of the oil extraction mentioned above (first and second extraction: by “crushing and pressing”, the latter in cold or by means of hot water) and also to the

62: ²*anaḏa* (i) “être gâté”, “n’être pas assez cuit”; G.W. Freytag, *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum*, Beirut 1975 (repr.), p. 65: ²*anaḏa*, “caro corrupta fuit”, “cruda et non satis cocta fuit (caro)”, ²*anīḏ*, caro cruda, non satis cocta”; the term is not to be found in the lexica of Lane, Dozy, Barthelemy, Wehr ... It is a rather extremely rare word in Arabic.

22. In any case the water involved in this process should not be too hot to avoid affecting the chemical stability of the oil molecules.

23. See *Une Bibliothèque au Sud de la Ville **** (RSOu XVIII), p. 210, n. 318.

24. On wine and its elaboration at Ugarit see J.-Á. Zamora, *La vid y el vino en Ugarit* (Banco de Datos Filológicos Semíticos Noroccidentales. Monografías, 6), Madrid 2000, (“De la uva al mosto: vendimia, pisado y prensa”, pp. 229-239)

25. See AHW 313: “ausgekämmt, ausgepresst”; CAD H 40, 50-51, 187: “to press, squeeze out”, “obtained by *ḥalāšu*, pressed out (said of sesame seeds)”, “a cleaning process performed on sesame seeds”. In general all the authors who deal with the process here meant usually dwell upon the semantics of this predicate.

26. See BSA 2 1985 84, Stol BO 28 1971 167.

27. See Stol, BO 28 167.

28. See CAD H 50.

29. But the temptation must be rejected of relating etymologically Akk. *ḥalāšu* and Ug. *ʾnš*, although the realization of etymological /d/ many times induces a regressive /l/; nor is Akk. *enšu*, “sour” (certainly not unfitting in this context) to be called either in cause, since it has a clear Sem. ascendance: < *emšu* < *emēšu* < c.Sem. **ḥmš*. To claim a loan of a technical Akkadian term we would need to have witnessed in this language the syntagm *tuhhu enšu*, what it is not the case to my knowledge.

two kinds of sesame oil studied by Waetzoldt: *ì-giš-bára-aka* // *ì-giš-du₁₀-ga*.³⁰ We can therefore propose also for Ug. *ânš* the meaning “squeezed scalded”, as a specific reference to the squeezing by means of hot water.³¹ Actually both meanings come very close to each other, as references to the second / first extraction stage of the oil, hot and cold respectively. In both cases the produce could be meant for other uses. Moreover, according to the cuneiform sources DU₁, the result of “squeezing” (*halāšu*) is “wet by nature”,³² that is, it would be a “liquid” rather than a “dry” (“solid”) produce. That would explain why the *dġ* (of *kmn* in this case) is contained in a *kd*, in contrast to *kmn*-grain that would be delivered in *dd(m)*.³³ Consequently I would favor the Akkadian lexico-semantic solution (“squeezed”) considering the well-attested semantic field, the cultural proximity, and the technical character of the lexeme that would speak for a loan, and recognizing at the same time that the “Arabic” lexeme and general meaning (“not fully cooked” / “scalded”) perfectly agrees with the Semitic phonetics and semantics of the base (*ʔnd > Ug. *ânš*), although the specific reference to “meat” may imply a idiosyncratic nomadic-Arabic shift.

Summing up, I propose as the most likely translation of the text *kd d kmn dġ ānd bd ybnn*: “a *k*.-jar of cumin in (squeezed) scalded pulp / draff consigned to NP”; or alternatively: “a *k*.-jar of (squeezed) scalded pulp/draff of cumin consigned to PN”. Normally this kind of pulp was used as fodder for animals, as was pointed out above.

2. The seal impression

As for the seal impression present on two of the sides of the “label”, the scene depicted has parallels in the published seal collections from Ugarit;³⁴ it is not infrequent to find a similar representation of a sequence of human male figures, possibly led by the first, apparently the one in charge (chief of personnel).³⁵ But actually the most interesting aspect of the impression, not very frequent in the Ugaritic

30. See Waetzoldt, “Ölflanze und Pflanzenöle im 3. Jahrtausend”, *BSA* 2 (1985) 84.

31. In this connection is very significant that the only attestation of this base in Ugaritic (KTU 1.169:7: *bhlš bl šml*, appear most probably in connection with “beer” and in reference to a “poor” extraction of juice in a context of scarcity and punishment (// “bread of fasting”). A suitable translation could be: “drinking from a squeezing of dried up beer draff” (DUL 785f.); see also other versions by M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, “Mustertext einer Beschwörung gegen Zauberer (KTU 1.169 = RIH 78/80)”, in O. Loretz et al., eds, *Ritual, Religion and Reason. Studies in the Ancient World in Honour of Paolo Xella* (AOAT 404), Münster 2013, pp. 205-227 (“du sollst trinken aus Sud”); and W.G.E. Watson NABU 2011/67: “you will drink (by pressing or squeezing out) from a water-skin without a cup”, Syr. *hlyš*, “skin bottle”, Akk. *halīšu*, “flayed animal skin”). A suitable alternative could be: “from a dry (*šml*) (pulp) squeezing of beer”, namely, a squeezing that produce scant liquid. In this way *hlš (dġ/bl) šml* would be the opposite of (*hlš*) *dġ ānš*, “squeezing of dried up // wet / scalded beer / pulp (/ draff)”, of our text, parallel to the quoted Sumerian pair on which cf. the following n.

32. See Stol, *BO* 28, 1971, 171: “*tuhhu* sind von Natur nass”, a state quality due to the “pressing” and “floating” processes in its elaboration and that phrases like “to wash the hands in it” presuppose (see CAD T 453: *šumma awilum šu¹¹-šú ina tuh-ḫi imsi*). A distinction must be made in this regard between the usual DU₁.DURU₅, “moist *tuhhu*”, and DU₁.UD.DU, “dried *tuhhu*”, both used as fodder (bran and draff) for animals and for other uses as well.

33. See above n. 18.

34. See Cl.F.-A. Schaeffer-Forrer, *Corpus I des cylindres-sceaux de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et d'Enkomi-Alasia*, Paris 1983; and P. Amiet, *Corpus II des cylindres de Ras Shamra-Ougarit. Sceaux-cylindres en hématite et pierres diverses* (RSOu 9), Paris 1992; cf. also Cl.F.-A. Schaeffer, “Recueil des sceaux et cylindres hittites imprimés sur les tablettes des archives sud du palais de Ras Shamra”, in *Ugaritica III* (MRS VIII), Paris 1956, pp. 1-86 (“Retour à la question du grand sceau des rois d'Ugarit”, pp. 66-77; “Sceaux personnels des rois et reines d'Ugarit”, pp. 77-86).

35. See Amiet, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-120 (“Chapitre X. Les défilés des personnages”). Similar motifs can be seen in coetaneous seal collections: D. Beyer, *Emar IV. Les sceaux* (OBO Series Archaeologica 20), Fribourg/Göttingen 2001; J.-W. Meyer, *Die eisenzeitlichen Stempelsiegel aus dem Amuq-Gebiet. Ein Beitrag zur Ikonographie altorientalischer Siegelbilder* (OBO Series Archaeologica 28), Fribourg/Göttingen 2008.

glyptic, is the inscription it bears. It is a pity that the syllabic text could not be easily read from the available photos in a clear and definite way (even a second photo recently made in Damascus does not allow an improvement in this regard), more so by a non-expert in this kind of writing and texts. In fact the editors of the document have renounced to make any attempt at the reading of the syllabic text and so have I. Therefore I turned to one of our specialists, Dr. Ignacio Márquez Rowe, whose piece of work in this issue is offered in the following paper. He has done a splendid job.



KTU 6.105, faces 1-4 and base [RS 96.2042] 27 x 40 x 20. Photo: Damascus Museum