Artículo-Recensión

A Ugaritic Reference Grammar for the 21st Century

Wilfred G. E. Watson - Newcastle upon Tyne

A little more than seventy years after the discoveries at Ras Shamra we now have a comprehensive reference grammar of Ugaritic and it merits consideration in some detail[1]. The author, P. D. Dr Josef Tropper, who continues to make an immense contribution to Semitic studies with several books[2] and what seems to be a never-ending stream of papers, is to be congratulated on completing a work of this scale and importance. The following remarks are set out under a number of headings and largely follow the pagination of UG within each section.[3]

1. *Previous grammars*

Aside from C. H. Gordon's series of grammars, which culminated in his *Ugaritic Textbook*[4], there are two other main grammars, one by Segert[5], which is also to some extent a teaching grammar, and the other by Sivan[6]. Some summary grammars, by H. Cazelles, by J.-L. Cunchillos with J.-A. Zamora, and by D. Pardee are also available[7] and a lengthy summary grammar of Ugaritic was also provided by Tropper himself in the recent *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*[8]. Aware that "[a]s yet there is no complete, modern

1. A review article of Josef Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 273), Münster 2000, Ugarit-Verlag, 17 × 24,5, pp. xxii + 1056. Following the author's wish, here it is abbreviated to "UG". The author was kind enough to read and comment on an earlier draft of this review article.

2. Note in particular *Der ugaritische Kausativstamm und die Kausativbildungen des Semitischen* (ALASP 2; Münster 1990).

3. Other reviews so far: L. Kogan, "Remarks on J. Tropper's *Ugaritische Grammatik*. A Review Article", *UF* 32 (2000) 717-732; S. Scorch, *OLZ* 96 (2001) 223-228; M. P. Streck, *ZDMG* 152 (2002) 185-192.

4. C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome 1965; revised reprint 1998).

5. S. Segert, *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1984).

6. D. Sivan, *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* (Leiden, New York, Köln 1997), based on his grammar, written in Hebrew, published in 1993.

7. For details see UG, 6.

8. W. G. E. Watson - N. Wyatt, eds, *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies* (HdO I 39; Leiden, Boston, Köln 1999) 91-121 (translated by Watson).

reference grammar of Ugaritic"[9], T. wrote his *Habilitation* with the title "Untersuchungen zur ugaritischen Grammatik. Schrift- Laut- und Formenlehre" (Freie Universität Berlin, 1997) and this has been the foundation for his monumental *Ugaritische Grammatik*. A condensed form of this grammar has now been published as *Ugaritisch: Kurzgefasste Grammatik mit Übungstexten und Glossar*[10], an English translation of which is in preparation.

2. *Outline of contents*

Some idea of the rich material set out in this grammar can be gained from an outline of its contents. The *Introduction* (pp. 1-12) discusses such problems as the classification of Ugaritic, current research on Ugaritic grammar, the aims, objectives, methodology and structure of UG as well as the alphabetic sequence used (a modified form of the Hebrew alphabet)[11]. Next comes *The Script* ("Schriftlehre", pp. 13-86), which deals in great detail with the long and short cuneiform alphabets, syllabic cuneiform and the logograms for numerals. *Phonology* ("Lautlehre", pp. 85-204) describes the phonological system, the phonemes and sound changes[12]. Chapter 4 deals with *Pronouns* (pp. 205-246), i.e. the personal pronoun and pronominal suffixes, and the demonstrative, determinative (or relative), interrogative and indefinite pronouns. It is followed by a section on the *Noun* (pp. 247-342), including noun formation, gender, number, case, state and determination (and indetermination). A table of nominal inflections is given on p. 341. A complete section is devoted to *Numerals* (pp. 343-422): cardinal and ordinal numbers, fractions, iteratives and mutiplicatives, distributives, collectives and unspecified numbers, including a paragraph on the syntax of numbers (§69). Nearly a third of the whole grammar is on the *Verb* (pp. 423-726)[13], a section which has the following headings: Categories of the basic stem (imperative, prefix conjugation, suffix conjugation, verbal adjectives, verbal nouns, verbal forms with the energic ending and with object suffixes), verbal stems (the G-stem, the N-stem, the D-stem, the L-stem and the Š-stem), morphological peculiarities of certain root classes, aspect and tense, mood. The penultimate chapter is on the *Particles* (pp. 737-836): adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections, asseverative particles, optative particles, negatives, existential particles and enclitic particles. Finally comes *Syntax* (pp. 837-914), which deals with the noun and its attribute, nominal and verbal main clauses, the extrapositional construction ("Pendens-konstruktion"), problems of agreement at the level of the sentence, parataxis between sentences and subordinate clauses. After the abbreviations (pp. 915-923) come twenty-one pages of bibliography and no fewer than nine indexes.

3. *Phonology*

To his examples of the assimilation of *n*K > /KK/ (p. 143) can be added Ug. *ṯṯ* (KTU 4.205:3), which denotes a piece of cloth or a garment or a type of wool(?), Akk. *šim/nṭu*, (AHw, 1239); "plucked wool" (CAD Š/2, 20). The assimilation is inner-Ugaritic, so the word could have been borrowed as *šinṭu* which then became *šiṭṭu* or the like, Ugaritic *ṯṯ*. In his discussion of the etymology of *kknt* (i.e. from *knknt*, p. 146) there should be a cross-reference to §51.5b (p. 276) where Ug. Akk. *ku-ku-na-tu* is mentioned (see already W. van Soldt, SAU, 304). On the interchange of *ḫ/ḥ* between Ugaritic and other

9. J. Tropper, "Ugaritic Grammar", *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, 92; similarly, UG, 6.

10. Volume 1 in the new series Elementa Linguarum Orientis, Münster 2002.

11. Note that the sequence used in the indexes is largely "Roman" (see p. 950).

12. J. Cantineau, "La langue de Ras Shamra (*Deuxième article*)", *Syria* 21 (1940) 38-61 is perhaps too antiquated to be cited on p. 89.

13. Equivalent in scale to E. Verreet, *Modi ugaritici* (Leuven 1988).

Semitic languages (pp. 121-124) note the following. The verb *ḫnn* in KTU 2.15:9 is considered a form of *ḥnn*, "to be gracious" (p. 123), but *ḥnn* does actually occur both here (in line 3, as T. himself notes) and elsewhere (see DLU, 178-179). J. C. de Moor[14] explained the verb from *ḫnn* in Arab. and Syriac, where the meaning is "to make (oil) rancid", and this seems preferable[15]. Also, there may be no need to resort to this interchange for Ug. *rḫ* (p. 123, where it is considered a variant of *rḥ*, "Wind, Duft" with the meaning "Sinn, Geist") since it may be a loan-word from Eg. *rḫ*, "knowledge"[16]. On *n^crn* (p. 155) see now W. Mayer - R. Mayer-Opificius, "Die Schlacht bei Qadeš", *UF* 26 (1994) 321-368. The spelling *mlbr* (KTU 1.12 i 21.35) is not a scribal mistake but (as T. notes p. 156 §33.137.3) a genuine instance of the consonantal change (*d > /l/). In fact, as M. Sznycer had previously noted, it is also attested (in reverse) in Phoenician both in the PN *Ṣdmb^cl* for *Ṣlmb^cl* and in the variants "Gaulos" and "Gaudos" (for the place-name Gozzo)[17]. Tropper is probably correct that the insertion of a secondary /h/ is not attested in verbs (p.163) since Ug. *khp* may perhaps be explained by Eg. *khb*, "stoßen (mit Horn), gewalttätig sein, stürmen, etc"[18]. As an example of /y/ instead of /w/ the verb *syr* is given (p. 164, also p. 649), but the root of Ug. *syr* may be *syr*, not *swr*; cf. Arab. *sayara*, "to move (on)" (cf. DLU, 411). To the examples of prothetic *alef* cited (p. 202) add *(i)blbl*, "message-bearer", Akk. *babbilu*[19] and *anḫr*, "dolphin(?)" (KTU 1.5 i 15; 1.133:5), Akk. *naḫīru*, "Schnauber" (AHw, 714-715). The same topic is also discussed in §33.211 (p. 170).

4. *Metathesis*

The metathesis of consonants is discussed in §33.16 (pp. 164-166). T.'s explanation of *rb^c* as a metathetic form of *br^c* (in KTU 1.17 v 2-3), as in Arab. *bara^ca,* "to give" (p. 165 and also pp. 347, 592), may find further support in Chadic **b(a)r* "to give" and Egyptian *^cb3* (< **br*) "darbringen, präsentieren, ausstatten (*m* mit)"[20]. However, the explanation of Ug. *gml* as a metathetic form of Heb. *maggāl*, "sickle"[21] is unlikely as the form is a *nomen instrumenti* with preformative *m-* from the root *ngl, as in Arab. *nġl* "to cultivate, till the soil, reap the harvest, crop" according to Aro[22]. Similarly, the appeal to metathesis to explain Ug. *mzl* seems unnecessary, as the verb probably means "to run"[23]. The same applies to *^crp* (KTU 4.721:2.13) which is not a form of *^cpr*, "dust" (p. 166), but means "to cover".[24] On the other hand, Tropper's explanation (p.165) of *ṯrp*, "to swish (the tail)" (in KTU 1.83:4.6), Arab. *ṯfr*, is preferable

---

14. J. C. de Moor, "Frustula ugaritica", *JNES* 24 (1965) 335-364 (360), an article not included in T.'s bibliography.

15. See DLU, 194. Some support may be supplied by Eg. *ḫnn*, "stören, s. zersetzen, etc." (R. Hannig, *Die Sprache der Pharaonen. Großes Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch (2800-950 v.Chr.)* (Mainz 1995) 637.

16. See my "El's Erudition (KTU 1.4 v 3-5)", *AuOr* 19 (2001) 138-142.

17. M. Sznycer, "Notes de lexicographie ougaritique", *GLECS* 73 (1973) 73-79, esp. 73-79. He notes (p. 78) "On a ainsi, selon toute vraisemblance, l'attestation d'une mutation d̲ > l̲ dans un dialecte ougaritique du XIVème siècle av. J.C. et, d'un autre côté, une mutation l̲ > d̲ dans un dialecte phénicien de l'archipel maltais, au IIème siècle av. J.C. Y a-t-il un lien entre ces deux phénomènes parallèles, malgré leur éloignement dans l'espace et dans le temps?".

18. Hannig, *Handwörterbuch*, 887.

19. J. Sanmartín, "Glossen zum ugaritischen Lexikon (V)", *SEL* 5 (1988) 171-180 (175).

20. Cf. Hannig, *Handwörterbuch*, 135; G. Takács, *Egyptian Etymological Dictionary* I (Leiden 1999) 78.

21. See already Watson, *NUS* 1981, 9.

22. J. Aro, "Gemeinsemitische Ackerbauterminologie", *ZDMG* 113 (1964) 471-480 (476) and other references cited by Takács, *Egyptian Etymological Dictionary* I , 112.

23. As first proposed by me in "An Unrecognized Hyperbole in Krt", *Or* 48 (1979) 112-117.

24. W. G. E. Watson, "Light from Mari on a Ugaritic word", *NABU* 1998/83; similarly, G. del Olmo Lete, "Le phén. *^crpt*, l'acc. *urpatu(m)* et le groupe lexical *^c/ġ -r-b/p*", *Transeuphratène* 14 (1998) 167-174.

to Loewenstamm's suggestion[25] that it is a metathesis of *prṭ*, "to split". Additional examples of metathesis (not mentioned by T.) may be Ug. *šiy*, "bird of prey", in view of Emar Akk. *ša-a-i* "falcon, hawk",[26] and possibly Ug. *šir*, "furrow", Akk. *še/ir'u*, "Saatfurche" (AHw, 1219-1220); "furrow" (CDA, 368)[27].

5. *Alternative meanings and etymologies*

As T. is only too well aware, occasionally another etymology and/or another meaning can be provided for certain words. The word *ḫśwn* does not mean "lettuce" (p. 44) but "onion, garlic", Akk. *ḫazuannu*, etc.[28] The verb *dwṯ* may mean not "to trample" (p. 109, also pp. 512, 644, 649, 650) but "to knock down", Arab. *dṯṯ* (cf. HALOT, 218) or even "to soften" (cf. DLU, 138). The sequence *ulp*, translated "chief" (p. 174) has also been differently explained, based on an analysis as *u + l + p*, meaning "in the manner of" or the like (cf. DLU, 30). The term *mswn*, rendered "Nachtquartier" (p. 191) may mean "delegate", as proposed by G. del Olmo Lete[29]. It remains difficult. The word *mddt* in KTU 1.17 ii 41 is translated "Geliebte" (p. 268) but it may mean "distributor", Akk. *mādidu*[30]. The verb *ġtr*, "to attack" (p. 523, see p. 126) may mean something like "to betray" in view of Jibbāli *ġrr*, "to cheat, deceive" and *ġtr*, "to deceive someone"[31]. Hence perhaps *bᶜln yġtr ḫrd* means "The lord, (him) the troops will betray" (KTU 1.103+:39), unless the verb is passive. For Ug. *mtrḫt*, "bride" (KTU 1.14 i 13; cf. 1.24:10), T. cites Akk. *marḫītu*, "wife" (p. 477). However, Ug. *mtrḫt* is from *trḫ*, whereas Akk. *marḫītu* is from √ *reḫû*, "to sire, etc." (cf. CAD R, 252). Cf. instead Phoen. *mtrḫ* (cited in DLU, 307). The root of the verb forms *ymnn* and *mmnnm* in KTU 1.23 may be *mnn* or *mw/yn* (pp. 578 and 581), or it may even be *ymnn*, "to seize with the right hand" (cf. DLU, 529). The difficult term *ššlmt* (p. 602) has now been explained by J. Sanmartín[32], following (to some extent) Gordon (UT §19.2424). It does not refer to a textile but means "supplementary delivery or ration" (see now DLU, 455-456). Yet another explanation of *šlyṭ* (discussed on p. 602) has been provided by P. Fronzaroli[33] who suggests "celui qui pique", based on Arab. *slṭ*, Geez *sal(l)ata*. The form *ytr* in KTU 1.6 vi 53 is derived from *trr*, "to drive away" (p. 674) but other analyses are possible[34]. For *hlm* (p. 746) see perhaps Punic *alem* (*hlm*), "here" (DNWSI, 283). T. is no doubt correct that there was no preposition *mn* in Ugaritic (pp. 762-763) but instead of explaining *mab* as a mistake for *mad*, it is possible to consider the initial *m-* as an enclitic on the preceding verb (omitting the word divider): *um tšmḫ{.}m ab*, "(my) mother pleased (my) father" (KTU 2.16:11)[35]. In KTU 1.14 ii 34 and iv 15, *mᶜ* may mean "powerful, etc." (p. 813) but the meaning "together"[36] cannot be excluded. The word *spr* in *sprn ṯhrm*, "our / the documents /scribes are pure (?)" (KTU 2.39:33) (p. 853), may mean "bronze" (cf. DLU, 408).

25. S. E. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1980) 357.

26. See my "Emar and Ugaritic", *NABU* 2002/9.

27. As proposed in "An Akkadian cognate for Ugaritic *šir*?", *NABU* 2001/71.

28. Watson, *SEL* 12 (1995) 227-228, following W. Farber, "Altassyrisch *addaḫšu* und *ḫazuannu* oder von Safran, Fenchel, Zwiebeln und Salat", *ZA* 81 (1991) 234-242.

29. G. del Olmo Lete, *Interpretación de la Mitología cananea. Estudios de semántica Ugarítica* (Valencia 1984) 169-171.

30. J. C de Moor, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit* (Nisaba; Leiden 1987) 32. Cf. DLU, 261.

31. T. Johnstone, *Jibbāli Lexicon* (Oxford 1981) 87.

32. J. Sanmartín, "Notas de lexicografia ugarítica", *UF* 20 (1988) 265-275.

33. P. Fronzaroli, *MARI* 8, 289 and n. 56.

34. Cf. Wyatt RTU, 145, n. 126.

35. As in DLU, 1-2. See previously G. del Olmo Lete - J. Sanmartín, "A New Ugaritic Dictionary. Its Lexicographical and Semantic Structure", *AuOr* 6 (1988) 255-274 (259).

36. Watson, *Or* 48 (1979) 113, n. 8; F. C. Fensham, "Notes on Keret 79(b)-89 (*CTA* 14.2.79(b)-89)", *JNSL* 7 (1979) 17-25 (24).

6. *Comparative material from Akkadian*

Further comparative material for Ug. *ḥsp* (pp. 103 and 475) is available from Emar Akk. *ḥaspu* and *ḥissipu*, which are terms for a kind of wine and a clay vessel respectively[37]; in addition, it is possible to refer to Akk. *esēpu*, which in the N stem can mean "to be decanted" (CAD E, 331)[38]. To the cognates for *npẓl* (pp. 114, 540) add perhaps Akk. *pasālu*, "to turn (away)" (CDA, 268). Besides the meaning "to protect" for *yqy* (p. 459, also pp. 505, 634) based on Arab. *waqā*, the meaning "to obey" is also possible, Akk. *waqû*, "to wait for, attend to". For *ḥrṣ* (KTU 4.145:8, etc.) T. (p. 383) proposes the meaning "reserve", based on Arab. *ḥrs/z*, "to guard, watch, control", *iḥtirās*, "caution, prevention, reserve". Alternatively, the meaning may be "precise(ly)", corresponding to Akk. *ḥariṣ*, "exactly"; *ḥarīṣu*, "exact", as proposed by Del Olmo Lete[39], although this would entail Ug. *ḥ* = Akk. *ḥ*. Rather than "Dreigespanne" (p. 384), Ug. *tlt* means "third (charioteer)", Akk. *tašlī šu*, (AHw, 1339)[40], although as the form in Ug. is *tlt* (cf. also Heb. *šālîš*) it is probably not borrowed from Akkadian.[41] For *bt ikl* T. suggests "dining room" (p. 485, cf. p. 254) with reference to Akk. *iklu*, although it means "victim" (CDA, 126; CAD I/J, 61), not "Verzehr" (as in AHw, 369). The form *nšlm* is considered to be a verb (p. 535) but it could mean "pledge" (DLU, 335), Akk. *našlamtu*. Similarly, *tšlm*, also analysed as a verb (p. 555) could be a noun and mean "redemption, ransom"[42], Akk. *tašlimtu*, "final payment". On the other hand, it would seem that Mari Akk. *zubultu* (cited for Ug. *zbl* on p. 260 §51.42j) does not exist (and in any case would be a West Semitic loan-word) and is to be read *šubultum*[43].

7. *Non-Semitic loan-words and cognates*

A Semitic etymology is suggested for *tlḥn*, "table" (p. 109[44]) with the rider that it is more probably a loan-word. In fact, G. Takács[45] compares it with Egyptian *s3ḥ* [*slú] which means "stand, trestle". On the correspondence of *ḥtt*, silver" (KTU 1.14 ii 17; 1.14 iv 1) to Hitt. *ḥattu(š)-*, Fensham noted[46]: "It is noteworthy that *ḥattuš* as "silver" occurs nowhere in the extant Hittite texts. It is, thus, not at all certain that *ḥtt* is to be derived from a Hittite (or possibly a Protohattic) word", a view shared by T. (p. 111). However, the word is in fact documented in Hattic (see DLU, 184 for references). The connection of *ltḥ* with Akk. *letû* suggested by A. Caquot - E. Masson[47] and also by T. (p. 123) is rejected by Sanmartín[48] in his discussion of *ltḥ* as "[m]uy improbable". The topic has been re-examined by P. V. Mankowski, who concludes that it is "a culture or substrate word"[49]. Tropper (p. 139) accepts that *tlb* may be an Akk. loan-

37. See E. Pentiuc, *West Semitic Vocabulary in the Akkadian Texts from Emar* (Winona Lake 2001) 58 and 68-69.

38. See also Kogan, *UF* 32 (2000) 729.

39. G. del Olmo Lete, "Quantity Precision in Ugaritic Administrative Texts (*ṣmd*, *ḥrṣ*, *aḥd*)", *UF* 11 (1979) 179-186; cf. DLU, 180.

40. Hitt. LÚ *šališḫa*; cf. Watson, *UF* 28 (1996) 705 for references.

41. Similarly, HALOT, 1526.

42. J. Sanmartín, "Glossen zum ugaritischen Lexikon (II)", *UF* 10 (1978) 349-356 (356, n. 59).

43. M. Stol, review of CDA, *BO* 57 (2000) cols. 625-629 (626).

44. However, cf. Kogan, *UF* 32 (2000) 721.

45. Takács, *Egyptian Etymological Dictionary* I, 197.

46. F. C. Fensham, "Remarks on Keret 58-72", *JNSL* 4 (1974)11-21 (19).

47. A. Caquot - E. Masson, "Tablettes ougaritiques du Louvre", *Semitica* 27 (1977) 5-19 (14, n. 3).

48. J. Sanmartín, "El *ordo* litúrgico KTU 4.14", *AuOr* 8 (1990) 89-99 (94, n. 32).

49. P. V. Mankowski, *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew* (Winona Lake 2000) 82-83.

word, but he does not exclude another etymology, and cites Eg. *sb3*, "to play the flute" and Cushitic *sabārā*, "flute". However, according to Takács[50], Eg. *zb3* (from **zbr*) is cognate with Sem. *zmr*. Interestingly, the translation of *nbt* as "plated (with silver)" (p. 517) may find support in the Eg. verb *nbj*, "vergolden, überziehen mit Gold; gießen (aus Gold), (aus Silber) herstellen"[51], which may be cognate, in which case the Ug. verb would not be *n(w)b*.

8. *Uncertainties*

As T. agrees (p. 166), it is still uncertain whether *qsᶜt* means "bow" or "arrows", though he opts for the former. The question has been discussed in considerable detail by D. P. Wright[52]. KTU 5.11:6-7 *att l tt lḥmy wl tt yny* is translated, "the (house-)wife is not (or: indeed) furnishing my food and is not (or: indeed) furnishing my wine" (p. 595)[53]. However, this is uncertain, especially as the reading in KTU² is *att l tlḥmy wl ttyny* where *tlḥmy* and *ttyny* may be personal names (cf. DLU, 490, 511)[54]. In view of the obscure nature of so many words in Ugaritic, T. correctly opted not to discuss them in a reference grammar, although he frequently provides alternative explanations when there is some degree of uncertainty. Among the words not analysed are *nyr* (KTU 1.16 i 37-38; 1.161:19)[55] // *špš*) and *nzl* (cf. pp. 246 and 848)[56]. Incidentally, T. is rarely dogmatic, unlike grammarians of earlier generations, and is prepared for ambiguity and uncertainty in view of the nature of the corpus.

9. *Inconsistencies*

There are occasional inconsistencies, which is not surprising in a book of this length and complexity. For example, the verb *ylšn* is rendered "höhnte" (p. 712) but also "geiferte" (p. 553), perhaps reflecting the uncertainty of interpretation. Also, the translation of *l ištbm tnn ištm pʾh* (KTU 1.3 iii 40) on p. 811 is "I have certainly (?) muzzled the Dragon, I have shut his mouth" but a different reading (and therefore a different rendering) is provided elsewhere (p. 525 and 572): *l ištbm tnn ištmdʾh* "Have I not gagged(?) the *Tnn*-dragon, (have I not completely) destroyed him?". However, he does add (p. 572): "Lesung des letzten Wortes, Etym. der Verbalformen und Interpretation des ganzen Kolons unsicher". Again, whereas *rks* (KTU 1.5 i 4) is considered a scribal mistake due to metathesis (p. 59), elsewhere (p. 103) it is analysed (uncorrected) as *k + rs*. In a note (p. 193) the root *bdy* is rejected as underlying *bd* (KTU 1.16 i 5.19; 1.16 ii 42) in favour of *bdd*, yet *bdy* is the root proposed on p. 486. Either root is accepted on p. 677 (§75.66). Different meanings are proposed in each case. In fact, the root is probably *bd(d)*, " to sing" (see

---

50. Takács, *Egyptian Etymological Dictionary* I, 34.

51. Hannig, *Handwörterbuch*, 404, who notes that it is difficult to differentiate from the homograph *nbj*, "schmelzen (Gold, Silber), gießen (metallene Geräte)".

52. D. P. Wright, *Ritual in Narrative. The Dynamics of Feasting, Mourning, and Retaliation Rites in the Ugaritic Tale of Aqhat* (Winona Lake 2001) 88 n. 4.

53. D. Pardee, "New Readings in the Letters of ᶜzn bn byy", *AfO* Beiheft 19 (1982) 39-53 (45), on the verb form (*tt*) (*ibid*., 47 and n. 14, following Caquot).

54. Also uncertain is *hm l tt l pkdy*, "if she does not furnish ...", as read and translated by Pardee (see previous note). However, the reading in KTU² is *hm l tl pkdy*, "if to the wife (?) of PN (???)", cf. DLU, 348 and 490.

55. On which cf. Wyatt RTU, 225 n. 220.

56. For a survey and a new explanation cf. W. G. E. Watson, "An Enigmatic Expression in Ugaritic", *Abr-Nahrain* 30 (1992) 172-175.

p. 673)[57]. The meaning "Wohnstatt" for *ahl* (p. 251) rather than "tent" (as on p. 157) was proposed by Sanmartín[58].

10. *Typographical errors and omissions*

The following printing mistakes have been noted, most of them insignificant, particularly in a work of this size: p. 4: quote from E. LipiØski, for "form Hebrew" read "from Hebrew"; p. 5 "forth printing" for "fourth printing"; p. 15: for "2.71:12" read "2.75:12"; p. 33: for "/'ūt-/" read "/'ūṭ-/"; p. 191: for "Refroe" read "Renfroe"; p. 375, 2nd line from bottom of page, for "*ksmk*" read "*kmsk*" in KTU 4.707:23; p. 487: for "1.16:V:16" read "1.6:V:16"; p. 497: for "Engergikus I" read "Energikus I"; p. 605 (KTU 1.4 i 31): for "einem goldenen Sockel" read "ein göttliches/wunderbares Podest" (as on p. 517); p. 734 §77.51a: for "*armgn*" read "*argmn*"; p. 825 §89.2: for "Emmerton" read "Emerton"; p. 937: for "una" read "uno"; p. 939: for "Terminologie" read "Terminologia"; p. 920, under BGUL: for "Forth" read "Fourth"; p. 939, under both Shehadeh and Sivan: for "millenium" read "millennium"; p. 965 right hand column: for "ḫl /ḥallta/ 675" read "ḫlt /ḥallta/ 675". The gloss "sich wenden zu, weggehen" (p. 626 also p. 656) should have been added after *ny* as on p. 661. One occurrence of the form of the conjunction *p* with enclitic *-m* is mentioned, i.e. KTU 2.71:11 (p. 788) but there is another in KTU 2.23:30, mentioned p. 832. The reference (p. 797) for *hln* should be §81.4d (not §81.22g) and for *hlm* it should be §81.22h (not §88.22i).

11. *New explanations*

Often, difficult or obscure passages are resolved by better analysis or reference to different etymologies. A case in point is KTU 1.4 ii 5-7, where *tmt^c*, normally considered as deriving from *mt^c* ("to carry, remove, etc."), is analysed as a Gt from *mw/y^c*, "to soak in water" (with cognates in Arabic and Ethiopic), and the resultant translation, "Her clothing, the covering of her flesh, she (repeatedly) soaked in water, etc." (pp. 521-522) avoids positing backward ellipsis of the verb, which does not occur in Ugaritic[59]. More significantly, new constructions have been identified on the basis of comparative Semitics. Noteworthy is the "Uneigentliche Genitivverbindung" (§91.314.2, pp. 845-846), roughly translated as "improper genitive association", that T. has recognised in Ugaritic from its occurrence in Akkadian, Arabic, Hebrew and even Egyptian. An example is *dq anm* (KTU 1.6 i 60), literally "feeble of strengths", i.e. "one with little strength".

12. *Additional bibliography*

Some additional references could be inserted in the body of the book. The form *pḫyr* (p. 53) has been discussed by A. van Selms, "Pa^cyal formations in Ugaritic and Hebrew Nouns", *JNES* 26 (1967) 289-295; R. Allan[60] has proposed a new reading for KTU 1.24:15, usually corrected (as here, p. 62). A full listing of words split over two lines at line-end (see p. 70) is provided by J.-L. Cunchillos[61]. On the personal

---

57. Cf. now DLU, 104.

58. J. Sanmartín, "Götter, die in Zelten wohnten?", *WZKM* 86 (1996) 391-397.

59. See C. Miller, "Patterns of Verbal Ellipsis in Ugaritic Poetry", *UF* 31 (1999) 333-372; this passage is discussed on pp. 370-372. Incidentally, Tropper does not discuss verbal ellipsis in his grammar, but does deal with ellipsis in connection with measurements (pp. 413-414 §§ 69.24, 69.25) and of the object (p. 894 §96.25).

60. R. Allan, "KTU 1.24 (= RS 5.194):15. A Revised Reading", *SEL* 18 (2001) 45-50.

61. J-L. Cunchillos Illarri, "Cadenas quebradas", in M. Dietrich, - I. Kottsieper, eds, *"Und Mose schrieb dieses Lied auf". Studien zum Alten Testament und zum Alten Orient. Festschrift für Oswald Loretz zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres mit Beiträgen von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen* (Münster 1998) 151-174.

pronoun (pp. 204-228) see G. del Olmo Lete, "The Semitic Personal Pronouns. A Preliminary Etymological Approach"[62]. Monoradicals (p. 248) are further discussed by Del Olmo Lete[63]. On nouns with two plural forms (p. 299 §53.331.3) see also. M. Baldacci, "A Lexical Question Concerning the Ugaritic Anath's Text (sic!)", *UF* 10 (1978) 417-418. Further discussion of the cohortative particle *i* (p. 808 §85.3) is provided by Arnaud in connection with letters from Tyre found at Ras Shamra, although he makes no reference to Ugaritic *i*.[64] The author himself has also made significant contributions elsewhere, on pleonastic *w*[65], on the definite article[66] and on verbs in poetry[67].

13. *Main bibliography*

The following items are not in the otherwise very extensive bibliography[68]: S. Lieberman, "The Afro-Asiatic Background of the Semitic N-Stem : Towards the Origins of the Stem-Afformatives of the Semitic and Afro-Asiatic Verb", *BO* 43 (1986) 577-628; L. Milano, "Osservazioni sul bilinguismo ugaritico-accadico", *Vicino Oriente* 3 (1980) 179-197; D. Pardee, "New Readings in the Letters of ᶜzn bn byy", *AfO* Beiheft 19 (1982) 39-53. Also missing from the bibliography (cf. p. 97) are M. Heltzer, "The *úrš qᵓn* in Ugarit. The Meaning of the Term and the Functions of these People", *UF* 29 (1997) 211-240 and J. Sanmartín, "Herramientas agrícolas y burocracia en Ugarit", *AuOr* 5 (1987) 149-152.

14. *Indexes*

The indexes are comprehensive but could not be exhaustive, of course, otherwise the book would have been too bulky. Only words specifically discussed have been included. The following comments are merely for the convenience of users. Homonymous roots are not differentiated in the root index, e.g. *mrr* "to leave, etc." and *mrr* "to be strong". Similarly, there are two different roots *bṣr* (listed p. 951): "to see" (p. 105) and "to cut" (pp. 447, 458, with syllabic spelling). To the indexes add the following: *ḫlpnt* (p. 148); *kdr* (p. 264); *ltú* (p. 123); *klat* (p. 383); *mgṯ* (p. 269); *msrr* (p. 582); *nmrt* (p. 265); *tinṯt* (p. 270); *tbṣr* (p. 270); *tbtḫ* (p. 270) and *tgmr* (p. 270 §51.45 y). Note that after *itnn* the page numbers should be in the sequence 161, 162, and for *bl*, 771f. and 817f. Perhaps in a second edition the more important page numbers could be printed in bold.

15. *Overall evaluation*

Much of this review concerns lexis rather than grammar, yet as T. demonstrates, the two aspects cannot be separated. For example, T. argues (p. 557)[69] that in KTU 1.17 i 10 (and parallels), *yšqy* is a D-

62. In Y. Avishur - R. Deutsch, eds., *Michael. Historical, Epigraphical and Biblical Studies In Honor of Prof. Michael Heltzer* (Tel Aviv - Jaffa 1999) 99-120.

63. G. del Olmo Lete, "The monoconsonantal Semitic Series", *AuOr* 16 (1998) 37-76.

64. D. Arnaud, "Une bêche-de-mer antique. La langue des marchands à Tyr à la fin du XIIIᵉ siècle", *AuOr* 17-18 (1999-2000) 143-166 (150-151).

65. "'Pleonastisches' *und* in posttopikaler Stellung im Ugaritischen und in anderen semitischen Sprachen", *OLP* 29 (1998) 21-31.

66. "Die Herausbildung des bestimmten Artikels im Semitischen", *JSS* 46 (2001) 1-31, esp. 24-26.

67. "Sprachliche Archaismen im Parallelismus membrorum in der akkadischen und ugaritischen Epik", *AuOr* 16 (1998) 103-110, esp. 104-109.

68. Note that only HAL was used, but HALOT (the ET of HAL) contains additional material on Ugaritic, especially in the later volumes.

69. See previously J. Tropper, "Ugaritisch *šqy*: 'trinken' oder 'tränken'?", *Or* 58 (1989) 233-242.

stem meaning "to give (someone) drink". If the difficult word *uzr* means "table-cloth", corresponding to Akk. *uzāru* with the same meaning[70], then the translation of *uzr yšqy bn qdš* is "on a cloth(?), he gave the holy ones drink", which corroborates T.'s own analysis of *šqy*[71].

In spite of the comments made above, many of which in any case concern minor matters or unresolved difficulties, there can be absolutely no doubt that this grammar of Ugaritic is an improvement on all previous grammars. In terms of scope, detail, approach, clarity and documentation there is nothing comparable. In fact, it is probably one of the best grammars of a Semitic language to be written in recent years, particularly as it deals so thoroughly with comparative Semitics. Furthermore, the chapter on syntax, which though it runs to nearly ninety pages, is considered "eine relative knappe Darstellung" (p. 837), since points of syntax are also considered in the body of the grammar[72], comprises not merely an afterthought or an appendix but is an integral part of the grammar. In conclusion it need only be said UG will be the standard reference grammar for Ugaritic for some time to come.

70. See "Two difficult words", *NABU* 2002/37.
71. For recent discussion see Wright, *Ritual in Narrative*, 24-26.
72. The use of cases on nouns (§54), the syntax of numerals (§69), the verb (§76) and the use of various particles (§8), as T. points out (p. 837).