

attested twice in Biblical Hebrew, the /YQTL/ form in both cases shows the full root HLM whereas Ugaritic shows only the *ylm* pattern. The imperfective type is also different from that of *yēšēb*, viz., /yaqtul/ rather than /yaqtil/. T. assumes that the Ugaritic form is /yalum-/ and that it is derived directly from /yahlum/, but the differences just mentioned plus the fact that the imperative of HLM in Ugaritic is *hlm* (the imperative of this root is not attested in Biblical Hebrew) lead to the conclusion that the pattern of this root in Ugaritic more plausibly resembled those I-y roots in Hebrew which show doubling of the second root consonant in the /YQTL/, e.g., *yīṣṣōr*, ‘he will form’. This the Ugaritic /YQTL/ form may well have been /yallum-/, rather than /yalum-/. Only by ignoring the important differences just discussed is it possible to assume that *ylk* and *ylm* showed identical patterns in Ugaritic simply because the second root consonant of both is /l/ (p. 624 [§75.31]; above, p. 160 [§33.142.3b], T. observed that other I-h roots with /l/ as the second radical do not so behave).

— p. 625 (§75.331a). T. classifies here three tokens of the writing {hlkt} as 3 f.s. /QTLa/. The first two occur in contexts too damaged to allow a distinction between /QTLa/ and participle (RS 1.008:5 [KTU 1.45] and RS 2.[021]:4 [KTU 1.62]). The third appears in a well-preserved passage (RS 22.225:1 [KTU 1.96]) and the analysis as a participle is just as likely, if not more so (see above, remark to pp. 596, 597 [§74.624] on the parallel verb *šnwt*).

— p. 625 (§75.332a). Because of the broken state of RIH 77/8A, there is no way of being certain either that {ylk[...] } in line 33' (CAT 1.166:25) is complete or that it is to be parsed as 3 m.s.

— p. 625 (§75.332b). *lk* in RS 2.[022]⁺ iii 13, 14, 20, 27, 28 (KTU 1.5) is confidently parsed as a m.s. imperative with no statement regarding the relationship of this word to the word *ilm* that follows immediately in lines 14 and 20. Others have seen the imperative as addressed to these ‘gods’ (the form could be either dual or plural).¹¹⁰⁸ Unfortunately, the tablet is here too damaged to permit any certainty—all the more reason for the grammarian not to classify such forms precisely and with no sign of doubt. Even more dubious is the case of RS 3.340 i 27 (KTU 1.18), where *lk* immediately precedes *tlk* in a broken passage: the parallelism of an imperative and a jussive/imperfective is always possible, but far from certain, and *lk* may here, therefore, be the preposition *l* + pronominal suffix. In RIH 78/20:10 (CAT 1.169), the latter analysis may even be judged preferable to T.’s analysis as an imperative of HLK¹¹⁰⁹—he should in any case have indicated that his interpretation is not universally accepted.

— p. 626 (§75.42). {ydb} does not appear in just the name *ydbil* in RS 24.246 (KTU 1.102) as T. asserts here, but also in *ydbb*^l and in *ydbhd* in the same text. Because √DBB, ‘to speak’, appears in Ugaritic only *in malam parte*, T.’s first etymology of the form, viz., NDB, ‘to offer voluntarily’, is more plausible than this one.¹¹¹⁰ T. does not enter into the discussion

¹¹⁰⁸E.g., Smith *apud* Parker, ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 145.

¹¹⁰⁹Pardee, in *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (1993) 212; idem, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 877, 887-88; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 160; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 67, 68; Ford, *UF* 34 (2002) 155, 187.

¹¹¹⁰Bibliography in Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 528 n. 41; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 21.

regarding whether this and the other verbal forms in the proper names of this list are /YQTLu/ or /YQTLØ/:¹¹¹¹ he simply parses this form as /YQTL/, without any specific identification among the sub-forms.

— p. 627 (§75.42). T. qualifies the reading of {tgr} in RS 16.402:13 (*KTU* 2.33) as “sehr unsicher.” My collation shows the reading not only to be uncertain but to be unacceptable. The first two signs may in fact be {lb .l}.¹¹¹²

— p. 627 (§75.42). The /YQTLØ/ form of the hollow root NH, 3 f.s., cannot be “*tanûh*” (cited here are RS 2.009+ iii 19 [*KTU* 1.6] and RS 2.[004] ii 13' [*KTU* 1.17]), for the second syllable is closed.¹¹¹³ Vocalize /tanuh/.¹¹¹⁴ Curiously, in the continuation of the same section on the next page, T. vocalizes another hollow root form, *yns*, ‘may he (not) flee’ (RS 02.[008]+ iii 5' [*KTU* 1.4]), as “*yanus*,” said to be derived from “*yanûs*” (the macron may be a simple typographical error since the very same form is said on p. 644 [§75.522] to be derived from “*yanûs*”—on the problem of the circumflex vs. the macron, see also above, seventh general remark).

— p. 629 (§75.46). T. parses *nqh* in RIH 78/20:5 (*CAT* 1.169) as G-imperative f.s. without mentioning that the form has also been taken as G-stem /QTLa/ 3 m.s.¹¹¹⁵

— pp. 630-32 (§75.511d-g), p. 641 (§75.519). One cannot accept T.’s identification of /YQTL/ I-y forms in Biblical Hebrew of the *yēšēb* type as based on a true I-y root, i.e., as developed directly from /yayšib/, for the simple reason that these forms are virtually never spelled *plene*, as would be expected if the historical syllable were a diphthong (contrast *yēšēb* with *yīṽšan* or *bēṽt*). As regards his reconstruction of the corresponding Ugaritic forms, T. chooses to go against comparative Semitic evidence by vocalizing them with /î/ (/yîda^c-/ ‘he knows’) or /â/ (e.g., /yâtîb-/ ‘he sits’), that is, to note in his reconstruction of the form that a contraction has taken place of the vowel of the preformative and the first root consonant resulting in a long vowel (/yiwda^c-/ → /yîda^c-/ or /yawtîb-/ → /yâtîb-/)—neither Hebrew nor Arabic shows any trace of such a development.¹¹¹⁶ The vowel quality of each

¹¹¹¹Pardee, *AuOr* 16 (1998) 255-60; cf. here above on *yrgbb*^cl in this text, remark to p. 32 (§21.31), and on *yarš*-, remark to p. 547 (§74.412.21).

¹¹¹²*Les documents épistolaires* (in preparation).

¹¹¹³See above, seventh general remark, and below, remark to pp. 641-53 (§75.52).

¹¹¹⁴The form is vocalized “*tanûh*” on p. 644 (§75.522), i.e., with the hyphen by which T. preserves the virgin length of the contracted vowel (here it is only parsed as 3 f.s., without an explicit statement as to whether the form is /YQTLØ/ or /YQTLu/).

¹¹¹⁵Pardee in *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (1993) 212; idem, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 876, 877, 883; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 160 with note 5 (p. 163); Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 67, 68; Ford, *UF* 34 (2002) 155.

¹¹¹⁶One is thus at a loss to explain what he means by: “Aus sprachvergleichenden Gründen darf postuliert werden, daß Formen der G-PK I-y immer einen Reflex des ersten Radikals aufweisen, der sich in der Regel in einer Kontraktionslängung des Präfixvokals manifestiert” (pp. 630-31) when he himself cites Arabic and Ethiopic as showing /yaqil-/yiqal-/ forms. Below, p. 632, he cites Amorite and Akkadian, but both sets of data are a dubious basis for reconstructing Ugaritic because of absence of texts in the first case (Amorite is known principally from personal names) and because of the ambiguities of the writing system in both cases (Amorite is attested only in Sumero-Akkadian syllabic script; the length of the first vowel in the

type is established by the Ugaritic consonantal writing of the 1 c.s. form: e.g., {îd^c}, ‘I know’, and {âtḇ}, ‘I sit’. The pertinent questions are, however, what the quantity of the vowel represented by {â} was and what both the quantity and the quality represented by {î} were. The problems with T.’s reconstructions are: (1) that already alluded to, viz., that other Semitic languages do not prefer these forms (the Hebrew evidence speaks directly against the reconstruction of {îd^c} as /’îda^c-/ in that /î/ is attested for certain roots, e.g., /yîšan/ ← /yiyšan/, but not for the root YD^c, which is /yēda^c/); (2) the assumed diphthong contractions are irregular: one could argue about /iw/ → /î/, but I know of no reason to believe that the passage of /aw/ to /â/ was regular (a rule-ordering explanation would be required, of course, wherein /aw/ → /â/ would be differentiated from the standard /aw/ → /ô/). The hypothesis according to which the Ugaritic /YQTL/ forms follow the Arabic pattern by showing no trace of the original weak consonant, viz. that they are /yida^c-/ and /yaṭib-/ must, therefore, be preferred. In its own way, Hebrew attests to the same pattern. The corresponding forms are /yēda^c/ and /yēšēb/; the first may represent a simple passage from proto-Hebrew /yida^c/ with secondary assimilation to the /yēšēb/ pattern as concerns irreducibility of the /ē/,¹¹¹⁷ while the second apparently shows vowel harmony, perhaps by dissimilation from the Hiphil (proto-Hebrew /yašib/ should have become /*yāšēb/ and it would, of course, have been identical to the proto-Hebrew form that became the Hiphil jussive and ‘wāw-consecutive’, viz., /yahašib/ → /yašib/ → /yāšēb/ and /wayyāšēb/).¹¹¹⁸

— p. 632 (§75.511h). T. does not explain why he prefers to vocalize *šq*, ‘pour’ (RS 2.[003]⁺ ii 18 [*KTU* 1.14]), as /šaḳ/ on the basis of the corresponding anomalous form in Biblical Hebrew (2 K 4:41) rather than as /šuḳ/ in conformity with the /YQTL/ /yaṣ(š)uḳ-/ (cf. Hebrew *yīṣṣōq*), which is the normal correspondence in the Semitic languages (viz., the theme vowel of the imperative will correspond to that of the /YQTL/). The existence in Hebrew alongside *šaq* of a ‘strong’ imperative form *y³šōq* (Ezek. 24:3) hardly appears to be sufficient evidence to posit that all the Northwest-Semitic languages showed only /a/-imperatives following aphaeresis of the first root consonant.

— p. 633 (§75.512). The form *td*, claimed here to be a 2 m.s. form of WDY₁, “niederlegen, ablegen,” and listed as attested in RS 2.[008]⁺ ii 34’ (*KTU* 1.4) appears to be a ghost form. It is, in any case, not present in the text cited. Moreover, in the text index (p. 989), only this page and p. 660 are cited as containing references to *KTU/CAT* 1.4 ii 34, but when one turns to p. 660 one finds no reference there either to this text or to a *td* 2 m.s. It would appear that a mistaken reference to this text was eradicated from p. 660, but not from p. 633, only after

corresponding forms in Akkadian is disputed and is in any case different from Ugaritic, cf. /isim/ and /ubil/). For the cases of Hebrew and Arabic, see below.

¹¹¹⁷This irreducibility counts against the /ē/ representing the simple lengthening of /i/ to /ē/ in Hebrew, which should occur only in tonic and pretonic open syllables.

¹¹¹⁸On the distinction by accent between the proto-Semitic jussive and ‘preterit’ forms, see R. Hetzron, “The Evidence for Perfect **yáqtul* and Jussive **yaqtúl* in Proto-Semitic,” *JSS* 14 (1969) 1-21. Though the data from the living languages do not support Hetzron’s hypothesis as well as he would have wished (cf. E. J. Revell, “Stress and the WAW ‘Consecutive’ in Biblical Hebrew,” *JAOS* 104 [1984] 437-44), it retains value as a construct.

the index had been completed. (Below, p. 660 [§75.532], at the entry for this root as III-y, only one token of *td* from this root is cited, one which appears in RS 19.054:1 [KTU 1.93] and which is parsed on both pages as 3 f.s.)¹¹¹⁹

— p. 633 (§75.512), p. 660 (§75.532), p. 735 (§77.51b), cf. p. 367 (§63.171). T. cites no etymological basis, and I am not aware of any, for a root YDY ← WDY that would mean “‘Sünde/Schuld bekennen’ (alt.: Lobpreis verrichten),” or, as he translates on p. 367, “führen den Lobritus/Bannritus.” He classifies this root as WDY₃, but the only text in which it would appear is RS 24.266:22' (KTU 1.119) where the form is *tdn*. Others have seen there the root DNY to which I referred above in a remark to p. 514 (§74.222.3), etc.¹¹²⁰ This appears to be a case of preferring to cite a root for the existence of which there is no comparative evidence over the analysis of the verb as 2 m.s. (see remark above to p. 211 [§41.12], etc.).¹¹²¹

— p. 633 (§75.512). T. claims the existence of a root WDN that would mean “(ein Tier) antreiben” but cites no etymological data for the existence of the root. The two attestations that he claims (*ydn* in RS 3.322+ ii 12, 19 [KTU 1.19]) may more plausibly be derived from DNY, ‘to approach’¹¹²² (cf. remark above to p. 514 [§74.222.3], etc.).

— p. 633 (§75.512). T. indicates that the /YQTL/ theme vowel for YD^c, ‘to know’, is /i/, though he vocalizes forms below with /a/. It is uncertain whether the classification is a simple error or whether he is saying that the root belongs to the /yaṭib-/ type (see above, remark to pp. 630-32 [§75.511d-g]) with secondary shift of /i/ to /a/ because of the guttural in final position. If the latter is the case, this is no place to indicate the theory, for the shift, if /yadi^c-/ ever existed, had occurred already in proto-Semitic.

— p. 633 (§75.512). Because of the {-y} on *ūmy* in the phrase *ūmy td^c ky* (RS 15.008:6-7 [KTU 2.16]) the noun may be in the vocative (/ʾummiya/) and hence the verb 2 f.s. jussive (/tida^cī/), rather than 3 f.s., as T. parses it here. The {-y} may, of course, be enclitic,¹¹²³ like the one on {ky}, in which case T.’s analysis would be correct (/ʾummīya tida^c kīya/).

¹¹¹⁹There appears to be no case of {td} listed in J.-L. Cunchillos and J.-P. Vita, *Banco de Datos Filológicos Semíticos Noroccidentales. Primera Parte: Datos Ugaríticos*. Vol. II/1-3. *Concordancia de Palabras Ugaríticas en Morfología Desplegada* (Madrid: Instituto de Filología, 1995), vol. 2, p. 1974, that would fit the parsing in question.

¹¹²⁰Cf. Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 678 with bibliographical references in note 94.

¹¹²¹In UF 33 (2001) 687-88, T. identifies the root in question as one cognate with Hebrew *hōdāh*, ‘to give praise’—a semantic leap that requires a great leap of faith to accept. T. claims that the verb can mean “Sünden bekennen” in Hebrew, but the dictionaries cite only one verse where such a meaning would be found, Ps. 32:5b, which reads *ḥaṭṭā(ʾ)tī^y ʾōw dī^y ʾakā wa ʾawōw nī^y lō(ʾ)-kissī^y tī^y ʾāmartī^y ʾōw de^h ʾalē^y p³šā ʾay layhwh w³ ʾattā^h nāsā(ʾ)tā ʾawōw n ḥaṭṭā(ʾ)tī^y*. In line with many other usages of the verb and with the sense of the entire verse, the principal complement of ʾōw de^h must in the second line be *layhwh*: ‘(On account of) my sins (which you have forgiven) I will praise you, for my iniquity I (have not attempted to) hide; I have said: I will give praise, (on account of) my transgressions (which you have forgiven), to the Lord; you have forgiven my iniquitous sins’.

¹¹²²Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 352.

¹¹²³Not a *mater lectionis*, as T. analyses it on p. 51 (§21.341.21)! See remark above to pp. 37-38 (§21.322.5), etc.

(On the analysis of the {-y} of *ky* as the enclitic particle rather than a *mater lectionis*, see above, remark to p. 52 [§21.341.21c], etc., and below, remark to p. 800 [§83.24]).

— p. 634 (§75.512). Ugaritic and Hebrew clearly show different forms of one I-y root: {ʾrt}, ‘I will take possession of’ (RS 3.367 i 19’, 35’ [KTU 1.2]), shows the Ugaritic form to have been /yarit-/ whereas the Hebrew form is /yīraš/. This is apparently what T.’s notation “TV /i/!” (i.e., the theme vowel is really /i/) is meant to express, for, as we shall see, Hebrew is the odd one out among the other West-Semitic languages. The existence in Hebrew of two imperative forms, /rēš/ and /*raš/ (only attested in pause as /rāš/), shows that the /YQTL/ in proto-Hebrew may well also have been /yariš-/. If so, it may have re-formed by dissimilation to the /QTLa/ which was /yariša/, as is shown by forms with suffixes, e.g., *wīyrēšū^wkā*, ‘and they will take possession of you’ (Ezek. 36:12), in agreement with Aramaic (/yʾrēt/, /ʾīret/ in Syriac) and Arabic (/wariṭa/). The attestation of {ʾrt} in Ugaritic appear to require the hypothesis that the /YQTL/ form had not there undergone this dissimilation and that the theme vowel was, therefore, identical in the two conjugations (/yariṭa/yarit-/). This is the case in Arabic where the two forms are, however, much more clearly distinguishable because the root is I-w (/wariṭa/ vs. /yarit-/), and in Aramaic, where the situation is more like the Ugaritic one would have been (/yʾrēt/ vs. /yērēt/).

— p. 634 (§75.512). If the /YQTL/ form of the verb YŠN (← WŠN), ‘to sleep’, was indeed /yīšan-/, as T. proposes, it is hard to believe that it developed directly from /yiwšan-/, as he also proposes, i.e., that the form is not built off the secondary root YŠN (/yīšan-/ ← /yiyšan-/). There is no internal evidence from Ugaritic on the vocalization of the form, and there is no way of knowing whether it followed the pattern that gave /yīyšan/ in Hebrew or another. Arabic shows the /yawqal-/ pattern expected there. To account for the Hebrew patterns, one must posit that, when the I-w to I-y shift took place, the /YQTL/ forms re-formed on three patterns: all /yaqtil-/ forms plus YD^c (all of these were I-w) formed on a /yatil/yital/ pattern, the other I-w roots re-formed their /YQTL/ on the new I-y root, while some if not all of the original I-y roots patterned on I-n roots (e.g., /yaššur-/, ‘he forms’, and /yaššuq-/, ‘he pours’—nowhere does T. discuss the reconstruction in Ugaritic of I-y/w forms that in Hebrew show /u/ as the stem vowel of the /YQTL/ and, frequently, a doubled second radical). As a corollary of this hypothesis, one must infer that the Barth-Ginsberg law took effect after this I-w to I-y shift and that monophthongization took place subsequently to both of these developments: /wašina/yawšan-/ → /yašina/yayšan-/ → /yašina/yiyšan-/ (Barth-Ginsberg law) → /yāšēn/yīšan-/.¹¹²⁴

— p. 634 (§75.512). In a long list of forms written {yṭb} that are classified as 3 m.s. /YQTL/, for some the indication that the form may alternatively be taken as /QTLa/ is added while in other cases no doubt is expressed. The classification of RS 1.003:7 (KTU 1.41) as one of the first group may not be considered a likely one, for in these prescriptive ritual texts virtually all finite forms are imperfective and the chances that yṭb in this text is perfective must be judged to be very small indeed.

— p. 635 (§75.512), p. 746 (§81.22h), p. 797 (§83.213). Out of the blue and without a question mark or any other indication of the novelty of his proposal or of the irregularity of

¹¹²⁴On the case of YRT, see preceding remark.

the phonetic equivalence, T. etymologizes {ytq} in RS 24.244:6 *et passim* (KTU 1.100) by Akkadian “*wasāqu*” and translates “*stärken, aufrichten.*” In the other two paragraphs cited, he translates by “*fesseln,*” in accordance with the line of interpretation and etymological identification, viz., Arabic *waṭaqa*, ‘to bind’, that have been broadly accepted since the publication of the text in 1968.¹¹²⁵

— p. 635 (§75.512). In an “Anm[erkung]” to the entry devoted to /YQTL/ forms of the verb YP^c, ‘to arise,’ T. cites the personal name {ya-a-pa-³-u} attested at Ugarit (RS 19.042:9 [PRU VI 79]) as well as {ia-ap-pa-a[ḫ-dIM]} attested in the Amarna text 97:2, with the remark that neither shows adherence to the Barth-Ginsberg law (i.e., /yaqta/-/ → /yiqta/-/) but without an explanation for the anomaly. Two come immediately to mind: (1) the names are neither Ugaritic nor Canaanite—this is one of the principal isoglosses separating certain Amorite names (hence, apparently, dialects) from Ugaritic and Canaanite; (2) the forms are not /YQTL/ but /QTLa/ (the {a} in the syllabic writing could be a phonetic indicator for the correct reading of the {PI}-sign rather than an indicator of vowel length; as for the Amarna example, orthographic gemination does not necessarily correspond to grammatical gemination).

— p. 635 (§75.512). As is shown by three other /QTLa/ forms in RS 13.006 (KTU 1.79), viz., *lqh* in lines 4 and 6 and *dbḫ* in line 7, *ytn* in line 2 is in all probability also /QTLa/,¹¹²⁶ not /YQTL/ as T. parses it here. Curiously, he parses the same form in RS 15.072:2 (KTU 1.80), a text which shares many features with RS 13.006,¹¹²⁷ as /QTLa/.

— p. 635 (§75.512). If one does not admit the necessity to emend {‘ly} to {‘ly} in RS 16.402:26 (KTU 2.33) (see remark above to p. 61 [§21.354.1c]), then the verb *ytn* at the beginning of the line is not /YQTL/ but /QTLa/ (/lêma la yatanahumu malku ‘alayya/, ‘Why has the king surely imposed them upon me?’).¹¹²⁸

— p. 635 (§75.512). RS 1.032 (KTU 2.9) is too damaged to allow certitude that *ttn* in line 5’ is 2 m.s., as T. parses the form here, with no indication of doubt. Somewhat ironically, but more properly, he places {yd^c} in the following line among examples of uncertain parsing of the root YD^c (p. 640 [§75.518]).

— p. 635 (§75.512). The same is true of the same form in RS 2.[026]:2’ (KTU 2.9), where all that is preserved of the line is {[...][p]š . ttn[...]}. Though the restoration ‘to the Sun you must give’ is certainly plausible, it is anything but certain.

¹¹²⁵Cf. Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 210, with bibliography; more recently, Parker, *apud* Parker, ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 220; Wyatt, *Religious Texts* (1998) 380-84. At one point, Dietrich and Loretz explained the Ugaritic form by Akkadian *šaqû*, ‘to be high’ (UF 12 [1980] 160), an explanation ruled out by the fact that the Arabic equivalent of the Akkadian verb is ŠQY rather than TQY; more recently (*Studien* [2000] 328), they have returned to the explanation by Arabic WTQ, choosing the nuance “*stärken*” of that root (in the course of the remark, they credit T. in this paragraph of the grammar with the comparison with Akkadian *wasāqu*, in spite of the phonetic difficulty that the comparison presents).

¹¹²⁶Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 430, 431.

¹¹²⁷Ibid., pp. 428-38.

¹¹²⁸Cf. idem, *AfO* 31 (1984) 216, 229; idem, *Context III* (2002) 106.

— p. 635 (§75.512), p. 722 (§77.322b). The reading {ttn} in RS 18.113A+B:32' (*KTU* 2.42:20) must be accepted as the only plausible one, for it clearly corresponds to the scribe's final wish.¹¹²⁹ In the first paragraph cited, T. indicates {ttn}, but one finds “*t[?]tn*” in the second and a reference to *KTU/CAT*'s reading, following the editor,¹¹³⁰ of {ātn}.

— p. 635 (§75.512). T. parses *ttnn* in RS 17.117:20' (*KTU* 5.11) as 3 m.pl. with no indication of doubt, choosing to ignore that others have taken the form as 2 m.s.¹¹³¹

— p. 635 (§75.513). T. parses *d^c*, ‘know’ (RS 17.139:28 [*KTU* 2.34:30]), as G-imperative 2 m.s. The letter is, however, addressed to a woman, as he recognizes elsewhere (e.g., p. 489 [§73.525]), to the point of having her give birth (see remark above to p. 257 [§51.41h], etc.).

— p. 635 (§75.513), p. 902 (§97.21). On p. 635, T. does well to reject the new reading of RS 16.402:21 (*KTU* 2.33) in *CAT* ({yd^c}), but on p. 660 allows for the restoration of the {y} (he there gives the reading as {[x]d^c}). In both cases, he fails to mention my epigraphic remarks on the reading of the first of these signs, to the effect that the most plausible reading is {l}, viz., that of *KTU*.¹¹³² T. first parses the signs {d^c} as a G-imperative, 2 f.s., then on p. 902 considers both that analysis and the restoration/analysis as 3 m.s. to be possible. If the first sign ends with a vertical wedge, as I have claimed, this latter interpretation is impossible and the first may only be said to exist in a vacuum until the first sign is explained.

— p. 636 (§75.513). T. parses four tokens of the sign sequence {tn} in RS 17.117 (*KTU* 5.11) as certain examples of the G-imperative 2 m.s. of YTN, ‘to give’ (ll. 9, 15, 17, 20), but fails to mention that others who have studied the text do not agree on this analysis of all four examples.¹¹³³

— p. 636 (§75.513). Few will accept T.'s analysis of the two tokens of *tn*, ‘give’, in RS 24.244:73 (*KTU* 1.100) as 2 f.s., for the speaker is usually taken as female and the addressee as male.¹¹³⁴

— p. 636 (§75.514). T. presents the only options of analyzing {yd^ct} in RS 2.[026]:3' (*KTU* 2.9) as 1 c.s. or 2 m.s., but the text is too damaged to rule out the analyses as 2 f.s. or 3 f.s.

— p. 636 (§75.514). In spite of having stated above (p. 465 [§73.331.3]) that the vocalization of the 2 m.s. pronominal element of the /QTLa/ could be /-ta/ (in agreement with all the West-Semitic comparative data), and there leaving the question open, T. here

¹¹²⁹Pardee, *UF* 19 (1987) 208 (line 21').

¹¹³⁰Virolleaud, *PRU* V (1965) 14, 15, copied and transcribed {ātn}. This reading was followed by Dietrich and Loretz in *Die Elfenbeininschriften* (1976) 21 and by Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín in both *KTU* and *CAT*. In *CAT*, however, a note has been added to the effect that one might read {ttn}, but without citing my comments in *UF* 19 nor the manuscript which I sent to them in August of 1994, in which this reading was indicated. Nor does T. cite either of these sources for the reading {ttn}.

¹¹³¹Caquot, *Ugaritica* VII (1979) 398; Pardee, *AfO Beiheft* 19 (1982) 45; idem, *Context* III (2002) 109.

¹¹³²*AfO* 31 (1984) 217, 218-19.

¹¹³³Cf. Pardee, *AfO Beiheft* 19 (1982) 43-45, where the author's analyses are compared with the editor's (Caquot, *Ugaritica* VII [1979] 389-98).

¹¹³⁴E.g., Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 202, 204; Parker *apud* Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 222-23; Wyatt *Religious Texts* (1998) 387.

vocalizes this form of the root YRD as “*yaradtā*” (see remarks above to p. 143 [§33.115.11] and to p. 207 [§41.1]).

— p. 636 (§75.514). I see no certain way of determining whether *yṭb*, 3 m.s. of the verb YṬB, ‘to sit’, in RS 2.002:8 (*KTU* 1.23) is /YQTL/ or /QTLa/—T. parses as the latter, with no indication of the motivation of his choice. Having admitted the uncertainty, however, I would observe that all three verbs in the following verse (*yzbrnn*, *yšmdnn*, and *yšql*) are /YQTL/ and this fact certainly favors the same analysis of *yṭb*.

— p. 636 (§75.514). T. parses *yṭb* in RS 24.245 (*KTU* 1.101) as 3 m.s. /QTLa/ of the verb YṬB, ‘to sit’, with no mention of the fact that the form has been taken as /YQTL/.¹¹³⁵

— p. 636 (§75.514). I see no way of determining with certitude that *yṭb* in RS 24.258:14, 15 (*KTU* 1.114) is each time /QTLa/. No reference is made to the fact that the forms have previously been analyzed as /YQTLu/¹¹³⁶ (T. parses the form first as /QTLa/, mentioning the other analysis as an option).

— p. 636 (§75.514). T. parses *yṭbt* in RS 34.124:21 (*KTU* 2.72) as 3 f.s. /QTLa/, with no indication of uncertainty. The analysis as a G-participle, f.s., is at least as likely, if not more so.¹¹³⁷

— p. 637 (§75.514). T. remarks that the reading of {ytn} is not clear in RS 18.[507]:5' (*KTU* 4.573), but nevertheless includes this as a certain example of /QTLa/, 3 m.s., of YTN, ‘to give’. In point of fact, the fragment is so small that no such precise analysis can be considered certain. The same must be said of RS 19.100A:6 (*KTU* 4.637), also listed as a certain example of the same form.

— p. 637 (§75.514). *ytn* in RS 24.292:2 (*KTU* 4.728) is here listed as a certain example of /QTLa/, 3 m.s., in spite of the facts (a) that it was translated as a plural on p. 235 (§43.12) and (b) that its subject was specifically analyzed as a plural there and on p. 262 (§51.43k). On the interpretation of this passage, see above, remark to p. 235 (§43.12), etc.

— p. 637 (§75.514). Because RIH 78/04 (*CAT* 1.173) belongs to the category of prescriptive rituals, it is far more likely that *ytn* in line 17' belongs to the /YQTL/ than to the /QTLa/, T.'s preferred analysis here.¹¹³⁸

— p. 637 (§75.514). After offering grammatical classifications with no sign of doubt for several tokens of {ytn} found in very fragmentary contexts (see several of the preceding remarks), T. classifies *ytn* in RS 18.140:17' and 20' (*KTU* 2.45:18, 21), a relatively long and well-preserved passage, as /QTLa/, unless the form be /YQTL/ in one case or the other (“sofern nicht G-PK 3.m.sg.”). Here the context allows for the parsing of the first as /QTLa/, the second as /YQTLu/: (16') {w . ml^lk^l . ššwm . n^cmm (17') ytn . l^l . l^l 'b^ldyr^lḥ (18') w . mlk . zm^l . š^ltn . ššwm (19') n^cmm . lk . l^ltm^l [.] l^lw^l . āt (20') ng^t . w . ytn . hm . lk}, ‘Now

¹¹³⁵Pardee, *ibid.*, p. 124, 130.

¹¹³⁶Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 21; see here remarks here to p. 648 (§75.524), p. 711 (§76.524.5a), and p. 713 (§76.525).

¹¹³⁷Bordreuil and Pardee, *Une bibliothèque* (1991) 147.

¹¹³⁸Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 852 (the editors' translation was ambiguous: Bordreuil and Caquot, *Syria* 57 [1980] 354: “il place”; the same is true of the other treatments that I cited under “principales études” on p. 850 of *Les textes rituels*).

the king has given good horses to ‘*Abdiyariḥu* and the king (of?) ZM has had good horses sent for you (in the number of) sixty. Just go to (the land of) Nuḥašše and he will give them to you.’

— p. 637 (§75.516), p. 667 (§75.536b). On p. 637, T. parses *ydy* in RIH 78/20:1 (*CAT* 1.169) as a G-infinitive of the /qatāl/ type, functioning as a “Verbalsubst[antiv]”; on p. 667, the same form is classified among “Verbalsubstantive” of types other than /qatāl/. Though an analysis as a verbal noun is certainly possible, T. might have mentioned the equally plausible analysis as a /YQTL/, 3 m.s., with the incantation itself as the subject: ‘(This) will drive out ...’.¹¹³⁹

— p. 638 (§75.517a). T. vocalizes the G-passive /YQTL/ of YŠQ as /yûšaq-/, assuming that /yuyšaq-/ would have contracted in this fashion.¹¹⁴⁰ If, however, the G-active was /yaššuq/, as is the case in Hebrew (cf. above, remark to p. 634 [§75.512 YŠN]), the G-passive would have been /yuššaq-/. Moreover, a large portion of the forms cited here are from the hippiatric texts, where *yšq* is more plausibly active than passive (see above, remark to p. 511 [§74.222.2], etc.).

— p. 640 (§75.517e), p. 865 (§93.342). On p. 640, T. parses {štn} in RS 17.063:9 (*KTU* 5.10) as 3 m.s. without mentioning the fact that the form has been analyzed as f.s. impv.¹¹⁴¹ The editor¹¹⁴² had read the third word of the line {‘zn}, ‘*Uzzīnu* (personal name), and made this ‘*Uzzīnu* the subject of the verb *štn*; he was followed by *KTU* in this reading. I read the word {tzn} and was followed in this reading by *CAT*; I made it the object of the verb, taking *tzn* as designating a commodity of some sort (it would be the masculine variant of *tznt*, attested twice in economic texts). On p. 865, T. leaves the question of the reading open (“/tzn”) and maintains Caquot’s analysis of the word as a personal name. He does not, however, discuss the reading, of which I judge the {t} to be almost certain.

— p. 640 (§75.518). This paragraph is devoted to “Nicht sicher deutbare Formen.” As should be clear from remarks here above, many forms should be removed from certain classifications and placed here.

— p. 640 (§75.518), p. 679 (§75.676). In an “Anm[erkung]” to each of these sections, T. claims that the root WDD, to love’ (which would, of course, have become YDD in Ugaritic), is only attested by the nominal derivatives *mdd(t)* and *tdd*, each time qualifying the assertion by “offenbar.” Above, however, he listed *yd* in RS 2.[008]⁺ iv 38’ (*KTU* 1.4) and RS 2.[014]⁺ iii 6’ (*KTU* 1.3) as a /qatl/ form of that root (p. 253 [§51.41a]). This analysis is,

¹¹³⁹Cf. Pardee, *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (1993) 211, 213; idem, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 876-79; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 160; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 67, 68.

¹¹⁴⁰No vocalization is provided for the G-active (p. 635 [§75.512]), and no discussion is provided in the introduction (pp. 630-33 [§75.511]) of the problems involved in the reconstruction of I-y/w roots with stem vowel /u/ in the /YQTL/. On T.’s (dubious) vocalization of the G-imperative or YŠQ as /šaq/, see above, remark to p. 632 [§75.511h]).

¹¹⁴¹Pardee, *AfO* Beiheft 19 (1982) 40, 43; cf. idem, *Context* III (2002) 109.

¹¹⁴²Caquot, *Ugaritica* VII (1979) 392.

indeed, more plausible than taking it as the word meaning ‘hand’,¹¹⁴³ because it is in both cases paralleled by *āhbt*, ‘love’.¹¹⁴⁴

— pp. 641-53 (§75.52). For a general statement on T.’s presentation of hollow roots, see above, seventh general remark. Pedagogical questions aside, the principal problems are (1) the inconsistency of presentation of the stem vowel in closed syllables as long or short and (2) the absence of a theory differentiating vowel “contraction” that resulted in a vowel identical to an original pure long vowel (e.g., “/û/” ≈ /ū/) from monophthongization of diphthongs that produced a new and invariable vowel (e.g., /aw/ → /ô/). An additional frustration that the reader may feel while working through the section on the /YQTL/ (pp. 643-46 [§75.522]) is T.’s reticence to parse forms as ‘short’ (/yaqul/) or ‘long’ (/yaqûlu/, or, as T. notes it, /yaqûlu/). Sometimes he does, sometimes he does not, and no explanation is offered for why one form is completely vocalized, another not. Just one example: in the first line of the entry on PWQ, ‘to acquire’ (p. 645), a passage is cited from the *Kirta* epic in which there seems to be no particular reason to doubt that *ypq* would have been perfective, viz., /yapuq/, ‘he acquired’ (RS 2.[003]⁺ i 12 [KTU 1.14]), then three lines are cited from omen texts where there seems to be no reason to doubt, judging from third-person plural forms written with {-n} in the principal text (RS 24.247⁺ [KTU 1.103⁺]) and the general semantics of the genre, that *ypq* would have been imperfective indicative, viz., /yapûqu/, ‘he will acquire’. T. indicates only “*yapûq-*” as the vocalization for all the passages cited.

— p. 642 (§75.521c). In his discussion of whether hollow roots had a “Bindevokal” between the verbal stem and the pronominal element in the /QTLa/, T. presents the vowel in question as /ā/. Such a stance appears to show more reticence than is habitual with T., for Akkadian shows /ā/ in this slot (resulting from paradigm alignment on the 1 c.s. form¹¹⁴⁵) and Hebrew shows /ô/, which can only have come from /ā/ (e.g., /h^aqīmōtā/, ‘you caused to rise’ ← /haqīmāta/). See also remarks below, to pp. 647-48 (§75.524) and to p. 664 (§75.534), on the matter of T. actually representing this “Bindvokal” in Ugaritic as /a/—i.e., without even indicating the possibility of /ā/—, a reconstruction that must, on the basis of the comparative data, be rejected out of hand for Ugaritic.¹¹⁴⁶

¹¹⁴³Cf. Wyatt, *Religious Texts* (1998) 76 with note 38 (p. 77) on RS 2.[014]⁺ iii 6’; on p. 100, n. 30, the author queries whether *yd* in RS 2.[008]⁺ iv 38’ is “love” or “penis”; del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *Diccionario II* (2000) 521, list both passages under *yd*, “amor.”

¹¹⁴⁴Cf. del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *ibid.* They also include under this heading RS 5.194:8 (KTU 1.24).

¹¹⁴⁵See the chart in Gelb, *Sequential Reconstruction* (1969) 176.

¹¹⁴⁶In T.’s theoretical study of the phenomenon (“Die Endungen der semitischen Suffixkonjugation und der Absolutivkasus,” *JSS* 44 [1999] 175-93), he concludes that both proto-Akkadian (p. 183) and proto-Arabic (p. 184) had a short vowel between the verbal and the pronominal element, e.g., “*šalim-a-tā*,” and that the /ā/ in this slot in proto-Hebrew and in non-paradigmatic Arabic forms was secondary (pp. 185-86). This is on the one hand a very precarious reconstruction—since all the explicit data from the Semitic languages are for the vowel being or having been /ā/—and on the other ignores Gelb’s hypothesis developed in *Sequential Reconstruction* (not cited in the bibliography though two others of Gelb’s works are) that plurality was associated in proto-Akkadian with vowel length (i.e., according to Gelb’s hypothesis, by lengthening of the singular morpheme). In Gelb’s view, the proto-form of the singular pronominal elements would have contained a short vowel following the consonant (i.e. /ta/ instead of /tā/), which happens to agree with the data from the three principal branches of the Semitic languages (e.g., 2 m.s. /-ta/ in both East and West

— p. 642 (§75.521c), pp. 647-48 (§75.524). On p. 642, T. vocalizes /QTLa/ forms of the root M(W)T, ‘to die’, as showing either /â/ or /û/ as the stem vowel (e.g., “*mâ/ûtâtû*”); on pp. 647-48, he proposes only /â/. No explanation is offered for why Ugaritic would differ in this lexical item from Hebrew and Aramaic, which both show the proto-base /mît-/.¹¹⁴⁷ One may assume that he expects the form to show anything but /î/ because the /YQTL/ is /yamût-/ and the original root would have been MWT (cf. the Arabic pattern /qāla/qumta/ for II-w roots), but theory cannot displace data. An additional remark on forms of this type from this root: on p. 642, T. reconstructs the forms that show two tokens of {t} with the linking vowel /ā/ but on pp. 647-48 he indicates “*mât(a)tu*” for the 1 c.s., “*mât(a)tā*” for the 2 m.s., reconstructions that can only be described as wanting in all respects: (1) it is unlikely, judging from Hebrew and Aramaic, that the first vowel was /â/; (2) the linking vowel must have been /ā/, not /a/; (3) the form written with two tokens of {t} cannot not have had a linking vowel because /matta/ would be written with only one {t} (T.’s appeal to historical writing as an explanation [p. 642] finds no parallels in Ugaritic orthography); (4) all comparative evidence for the vowel of the 2 m.s. pronominal element shows that it must have been short (see above, remarks to p. 207 [§41.1] and p. 465 [§73.331.3]).

— p. 642 (§75.521c), p. 647 (§75.524). On p. 642 without a question mark but on p. 647 with a question mark, T. parses {mtt[...] } in RS 3.367 iv 1' (KTU 1.2) as 1 c.s. G-stem /QTLa/ of the root M(W)T, ‘to die’, without noting that there is a break after these three signs. The break means, however, that any analysis is purely hypothetical. 1 c.s. /YQTL/ forms characterize the following passage, but there is no way of ascertaining whether this and {[...]htt} (on which see below remark to p. 675 [§75.64]) in this line are /QTLa/ forms in the same grammatical person.

— p. 642 (§75.521c), p. 648 (§75.524). I fail to see on what grounds T. classifies {štt} in RS 17.434+47' (KTU 2.37:5) as a 1 c.s. form, when the entire context is too badly damaged to allow for analysis of any kind, let alone as a specific verbal form.¹¹⁴⁸ The question mark attached to the analysis is insufficient to convey to the reader how totally arbitrary the classification is.

— p. 642 (§75.521d), pp. 648-49 (§75.525). T. remarks that the participle of hollow roots shows a ‘weak’ form, i.e., without the hypothetical middle radical, compares Hebrew, and reconstructs the Ugaritic form as “qām-” ← “*qāw(i)m.” Since he chose to compare Hebrew, he might have attempted an explanation for why, if proto-Hebrew also had /qām-/, the /ā/ did not go to /ō/, or, if proto-Hebrew was /qam-/, the *qameš* of the form in Biblical Hebrew is

Semitic, /-ka/ in Ethiopic). All the available data—certainly for West Semitic!—indicate therefore that the proto-form would have been /QTL-āta/ and there is at present no basis on which to propose any other reconstruction for Ugaritic.

¹¹⁴⁷As is normal in Hebrew, the /QTLa/ forms have all assimilated to the pattern with no vowel between the verbal stem and the pronominal element, viz., /mīta/mītāta/ → /mit/mitta/ → /mēt/mattā/ (the second of this last set by Philippi’s law). Compare /qāma/qāmāta/ → /qam/qamta/ → /qām/qamtā/ and contrast Aramaic, where the entire paradigm assimilated to the /mīt-qām-/ stems after the rule disallowing long vowels in closed syllables was no longer operative.

¹¹⁴⁸Pardee, *Afo* 30 (1983-84) 323, 326.

irreducible (as in *qāmê YHWH*, ‘those who rise up against the Lord’). That the vowel is secondary is shown by the corresponding /i/-type participle (e.g., *mētē milḥamā^h*, ‘those who have died in battle’). I know of no process that produces irreducible /ā/ in an environment similar to that which produces irreducible /ē/. In his treatment of G-participle forms on pp. 648-49, T. proposes only one possible form as having an /e/-type vowel, viz., B(Y)N, ‘to understand’, might show the participial form /bên-/ ← /bāyin-/. One must remark, however, that, at least in Hebrew, the active vs. stative participles of hollow roots show no correlation with presumed /w/ or /y/ as the original middle radical (as is illustrated by the verb ‘to die’ just discussed, a prime candidate for an original II-w root). T. recognizes this implicitly by vocalizing the participle of Š(Y)R, ‘to sing’, as “šār-,” not /šēr-/ (“bân-” was also his first vocalization of the participle of the root meaning ‘to understand’). Nor is there any reason to expect these two participial forms to be linked with original /w/ or /y/, as stativity is expressed by internal vowel pattern, not by root consonants. There is, therefore, no reason to expect that the /ē/-participles in Hebrew should have come from an original form /qāyil-/; and, in terms of the discussion above in this remark, if the /ā/-participles had come from /qāwil-/ that should have occurred at so early a period that the resultant /â/ should have become /ō/ in Canaanite, which did not happen. The problem of the development of hollow-root participles remains not only unsolved here but essentially unaddressed.

— p. 643 (§75.522), p. 801 (§83.24a). In the first reference cited, *ybt* in RS 16.402 (*KTU* 2.33) is parsed as /YQTLu/ from the root BYT, “übernachten,” and vocalized accordingly as “*yabîtu*,” but there is no translation of the form in context. In the second, one finds the translation “die Nacht verbracht hat.” Since /YQTLu/ forms normally do not have preterital value in T.’s view of things (and certainly not in mine), this apparent discrepancy should have been explained.

— p. 644 (§75.522). {tb̄n} in RS 16.266:11 (*KTU* 1.83) is indeed a “n[eue] L[esung]” as compared with CAT’s reading of {tb̄n}. The reading was proposed by T. in 1996¹¹⁴⁹ and was corroborated by Pitard.¹¹⁵⁰ (My collation, done in 1981, and again in 1996 in collaboration with Bordreuil, but never published, agrees with the reading of {t̄} in this word.¹¹⁵¹)

— p. 644 (§75.522). {ykn} in RS 34.148:7 (*CAT* 2.75) is here analyzed as a 3 m.s. /YQTL/ form of the root K(W)N, ‘to be’, but the passage is nowhere translated. When viewed in context, that analysis appears impossible. The text reads {wl̄nykn̄pât (8) ‘m . mlt . gr̄gm̄š}. In the *editio princeps*, Bordreuil and I divided line 7 as *w ln̄ ykn pāt*, “Et pour nous que les marches soient solides ... ,”¹¹⁵² but that analysis now appears unlikely to me, for a 3 f.pl. /YQTL/ form (assuming that *pāt* is plural) should not have a {y}-preformative. It appears, therefore, necessary to adopt the division that we considered as an alternative, viz., *w lny kn*

¹¹⁴⁹In one of T.’s reviews of *CAT*: *AfO* 42-43 (1995-96) 271.

¹¹⁵⁰“The Binding of Yamm: A New Edition of the Ugaritic Text *KTU* 1.83,” *JNES* 57 (1998) 261-80; cf. Parker *apud* Parker, ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 192 (where Pitard is credited).

¹¹⁵¹Cf. my textual remarks on this text, *AuOr* 16 (1998) 89-90 (p. 89, remark to RS 16.266:4, on this particular correction to *CAT*).

¹¹⁵²*Une bibliothèque* (1991) 163, 164.

pāt, ‘and for the two of us (i.e., the writer and the addressee), the border areas are firm (towards the kin<gd>om of Carchemish)’.¹¹⁵³

— p. 645 (§75.522), p. 692 (§76.343c). In the first section cited, T. parses *t‘n* in RS 2.[014]⁺ ii 23 (*KTU* 1.3) as /YQTLØ/, whereas in the second he reasons from the form with which it is in parallel, *thdy*, that it should be /YQTLu/. As regards the etymological analysis of the form, the two sections agree in identifying the root as ‘(Y)N, ‘to eye’, a solution that is much superior to T.’s subsequent proposal to find here a cognate with Hebrew ‘NH, ‘to sing’.¹¹⁵⁴

— p. 645 (§75.522), p. 699 (§76.423). On p. 645, T. cites a form *tšhn* that is said to appear in RS 3.322⁺ ii 40 (*KTU* 1.19), parses it as “PK^L 3.m./f.du.,” and vocalizes it “*tašî/ûhânî*”; on p. 699 the same reference is given for a form that is said to be *tšh* and is parsed as “PK^{Ki} [YQTLØ/ functioning as a narrative perfective] 3 m.du.” In neither section does he indicate that the form in question is entirely restored. It is unclear why T. would wish to restore the long form, since on p. 699 he makes a point of the short form being in sequence with another short form (*tnšā*); moreover, the short form is restored in *CAT*, though the long form was restored in *KTU*.

— pp. 645-46 (§75.522). T.’s assumption that the /YQTL/ of QL, ‘to fall’, would have had /ī/ as its stem vowel is apparently based on the assumption that the proto-Semitic root was QYL, a conclusion that is consonant with the Akkadian form *qiālu*. It is thus superior to my first vocalization with /ū/,¹¹⁵⁵ to my second with /ā/,¹¹⁵⁶ and infinitely superior to my maintenance of /ū/ along with /ā/ in a single publication!¹¹⁵⁷

— pp. 645-46 (§75.522). On the basis of the noun *mrym*, ‘high place’, the proto-Ugaritic root of the verb RM, ‘to be high’, should be RYM and the stem vowel of the /YQTL/ should be /ī/ (T. indicates the root as RY/WM and the stem vowel as /ī//ū/—though below, on /QTLa/ forms [p. 648, §75.524], he indicates that the root is RYM). Of course, one finds in the other Semitic languages nominal forms from a single hollow root with both /y/ and /w/, or /ī/ and /ū/, and such may be the case in Ugaritic as well; but *mrym* does at least provide one datum internal to the language. This means that personal names with the element /yarim/ may be good Ugaritic names, while those with /yarum/ should represent another linguistic tradition

¹¹⁵³Cf. Pardee, *Context* III (2002) 105.

¹¹⁵⁴“Anats Kriegsgeschrei (*KTU* 1.2 II 23),” *UF* 33 (2001) 567-71 (where the fact that Arabic shows ḠNY for this meaning is glossed over far too glibly—phonological inconsistencies certainly exist but one should not adopt such a solution in a given passage unless standard phonological rules provide no good interpretation).

¹¹⁵⁵*AfO* 33 (1986) 145.

¹¹⁵⁶*Les textes rituels* (2000) 271, 604.

¹¹⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. 549, where I simply repeated the vocalization proposed in *AfO* 33 without aligning it on the other two tokens of the verb in that collection of texts. I obviously had not given adequate thought to the problem. Three such forms are properly vocalized with the appropriate /ī/i/ vowel in Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 12, 16.

(either a name form from an older parallel tradition that was maintained in usage at Ugarit or a name borne by a person of non-Ugaritic origin, Canaanite for example).¹¹⁵⁸

— p. 646 (§75.522). It is not clear why {y^lql^ln} (RS 1.009:11 [*KTU* 1.46])¹¹⁵⁹ and {tqln} (RS 24.253:4 [*KTU* 1.109]), 3 m.du. forms that appear in the same formula in two texts prescribing a virtually identical ritual, are presented together in the same entry with 3 m.pl. forms with {t}-preformative. The plural forms are explicitly parsed but the dual forms are not and the unwary reader could believe that all forms are being presented as plurals. This pair of dual forms provides one of the clearest illustrations of T.'s observation that /YQTL/ dual forms may have either *t*- or *y*- as preformative—in contrast with the plural, which has only *t*-preformative—,¹¹⁶⁰ and it would have been useful to have the dual forms set apart from the plural forms. Above, p. 438 (§73.223.41.5), T. suggested, as an alternative interpretation, that *tqln* might be a plural form, but nowhere does he prefer that analysis, and the virtual identity of the two texts makes it, in my estimation, highly unlikely.

— p. 646 (§75.522). T. lists RS 2.002:36 (*KTU* 1.23) among texts attesting *yšt*, 3 m.s. /YQTL/ of ŠT, 'to put', without noting that the final consonant was omitted by the scribe (the tablet bears {yš}).

— p. 646 (§75.522). It is not clear why T. parses only *yšt* in RS 24.252:13 (*KTU* 1.108) as from the verb ŠT, 'to put', taking the other three tokens of this form (ll. 1, 10) and *tšt* (l. 6) as all from ŠTY, 'to drink' (p. 662 [§75.532]). This is all the more difficult to understand when one considers that line 13 is badly broken and there is thus no contextual basis for a differentiation in meaning between line 13 and the preceding sections.¹¹⁶¹

— p. 646 (§75.522), p. 662 (§75.532). T. gives as his first analysis of {yšt} in RIH 77/18:15' (*CAT* 1.175:13) and of {[y]št} in line 19' of the same text a derivation from ŠT, 'to put', only considering ŠTY, 'to drink', as an alternative. Two considerations lead me to believe that the priority should be reversed: (1) {šty} appears in line 11' of this text and, though the context is broken, the explicit {y} must be considered as an indicator in favor of the interpretation of *yšt* below by ŠTY; (2) *yšt b gbh*, 'he shall drink (it) from his cup' is a far more transparent than 'he will put it in his body' (= 'on his body?') or 'he will put it in his cup' (at the end of the text!). RIH 77/18 appears fairly clearly to be medical in nature and, just as medication was poured through the nostrils of the sick horse according to the hippiatric texts, and just as the person recovering from alcoholic intoxication is to drink the remedy (*KTU* 24.258:31' [*KTU* 1.114]—see remark above to p. 310 [§54.133.1b], etc.) so the sick person may be expected to have been required to drink the medicine. Finally, when on p. 662 T. considers the possibility of deriving *yšt* in RIH 77/18 from ŠTY, he parses it as a /YQTLØ/. Because of the formal parallels between medical texts and omen texts, it is, however, more likely that the application of the remedy was expressed indicatively (viz., the verb in the

¹¹⁵⁸Cf. del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *Diccionario* II (2000) 390.

¹¹⁵⁹On the various transcriptions and analyses that T. offers for {y^lql^ln}, see remark above to p. 438 (§73.223.41.5), etc.

¹¹⁶⁰See above, introduction and note 5.

¹¹⁶¹Some scholars have taken the other tokens of *yšt/tšt* as from ŠT, 'to put' (cf. Pardee, *Les textes par-mythologiques* [1988] 83-84; idem, *Ritual and Cult* [2002] 194).

omen apodosis is /YQTLu/ rather than /YQTLØ/); {yšt} here appears, therefore, to be best parsed as a contracted /YQTLu/ form from a III-y root (/yištû/ ← /yištayu/). On other cases of {yšt} = /YQTLu/, see remark below to p. 662 (§75.532), etc.; on the vocalization of forms of this type, see remark below to p. 656 (§75.531e).

— p. 646 (§75.522). T. cites RS 16.402:12 (*KTU* 2.33) as having two certain examples of *âšt*, ‘I shall put’, but the {â} of the first example is restored, and the restoration may not be considered particularly likely.

— p. 646 (§75.522). *ytb* in RIH 78/16:6' (*CAT* 1.171) cannot be classified with certainty as from the root T(W)B, ‘to return’, as T. does here.¹¹⁶²

— p. 646-47 (§75.523). T. here correctly vocalizes all of the m.s. G-imperatives from hollow roots with a short vowel, e.g. /bin/, ‘understand’.¹¹⁶³ It would have been worth observing that there is no way of determining from the consonantal script which of these may have been in the extended form, in which case the stem vowel would have remained long, e.g., /bīna/.

— p. 647-48 (§75.524). In his listing of /QTLa/ forms of hollow roots, T. indicates the hypothetical proto-West-Semitic form only for the very first: {bât} is vocalized “*bâ’at*” and said to come from “**bawa’at*.” In all vocalizations but one of 2^d and 1st person forms, he leaves open the possibility that there may have been a vowel between the verbal stem and the pronominal element: this vowel is always indicated as “(a),” and the reconstruction here differs, therefore, from that indicated in the introduction to the hollow roots, viz. “*ā*,” and for the worse since /ā/ is far more likely than /a/ in this slot (see remark above to p. 642 [§75.521c]). Finally, in the one case where he does not indicate the possibility of this vowel, he has forgotten to shorten the vowel in the verbal stem: “*bâštumā*” (‘you two tarry’) would have to have short /a/ in the first syllable (/baštumā/) for the reason discussed above in the seventh general remark (for the likelihood that the form was in fact /bāšātumā/, see above, remark to p. 469 [§73.333.3], etc.).

— p. 648 (§75.524). Only in the case of NH, ‘to rest’, does T. consider seriously the possibility that the stem of the hollow-root /QTLa/ in the first- and second-person forms may have had /u/, viz., /nuḥtu/, ‘I have rested’, citing as evidence the Amarna form {nu-uḥ-ti} (EA 147:56). No attempt is made, however, to work the form into his overarching theory of hollow roots, in particular his preference, based on all available Ugaritic data, for the hypothesis that there would have been a vowel between the verbal stem and the pronominal element (see preceding note).

— p. 648 (§75.524), p. 707 (§76.524.2). The comparatively high incidence of participles in the “para-mythological” texts indicates that *ql* in RS 24.258:21 (*KTU* 1.114) may be so parsed¹¹⁶⁴ rather than as /QTLa/.

¹¹⁶²Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 873, 874.

¹¹⁶³I had not thought through the problem when vocalizing such forms in *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988), e.g., p. 183, where “*šit*” is indicated in lines 6, 7, and 9.

¹¹⁶⁴Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 26, 205-6.

— p. 648 (§75.524). Because the context of *qlt* in RS 1.032:3' (*KTU* 2.8) has disappeared, one may not limit the number of possible analyses to 2 m.s. or 1 c.s. of QL, 'to fall', as T. does here. This would be the only occurrence of this verb in letters outside the epistolary formula 'at the feet of X does [the writer] fall', and the absence of context simply makes the analysis, even the identification of the root, uncertain.

— p. 648 (§75.524). With a question mark, T. parses *štt* in RS 17.434⁺:7 (*KTU* 2.36) as 2 m.s. from ŠT, 'to put'. If, however, the verb is indeed ŠT and not ŠTY, 'to drink', as others have thought, then the restoration of {m[š]l[mt]}, 'treaty', at the end of the line,¹¹⁶⁵ rather than {m[š]l[rm]}, 'Egypt',¹¹⁶⁶ becomes plausible (T. does not indicate anywhere his reading and interpretation of the whole line). If that be the case, then it is hardly likely that the queen of Hatti would be saying that 'you (Niqmaddu) set [X] in the treaty'; far more likely that Puduḥepa is quoting from a previous message from Niqmaddu in which he said that 'you (Puduḥepa) set [X] in the treaty'. Hence the form is more plausibly 2 f.s. (On the difficulty of any parsing of {štt} in line 47' of the same text [*KTU* 2.37:5], see remark above to p. 642 [§75.521c].)

— p. 648 (§75.524). T. parses *št* in RS 2.002:61 (*KTU* 1.23) as verbal, 3 m.du. /QTLa/ of ŠT, 'to put', without mentioning that others have taken the form as nominal, meaning 'lady'.¹¹⁶⁷ On the form of this noun, see remark below to p. 649 (§75.525a).

— p. 648 (§75.524). No question mark is attached to the analysis of *tb* in RS 16.402:39 (*KTU* 2.33) as G-/QTLa/ 3 m.s. of TB, 'to return', but here the beginning of the line is almost entirely lost, and the identification of the subject is impossible.¹¹⁶⁸

— p. 649 (§75.525a). If Ugaritic had productive stative verbal adjectives like those of the other Northwest-Semitic languages, it is highly unlikely, for simple paradigmatic reasons, that *knm* in RS 2.002:54 (*KTU* 1.23) is a G-active participle, for KN means 'to be' and is, therefore, as stative as can be. The corresponding form in Hebrew is /kēn/, listed in the dictionaries as a simple adjective because the G-stem of this root has otherwise fallen out of usage, but corresponding in form to other stative adjectives of hollow roots such as /mēt/ (cf. above, remark to p. 642 [§75.521d], etc.).

— p. 649 (§75.525a). Whether or not the Ugaritic word for 'woman' written {št} was originally a G-stem participle from a root ŠWD, it cannot possibly have been vocalized "šâ/êtt-" as T. proposes here, for the vowel in the first syllable cannot have been long (contrast Arabic *sitt*-, which T. actually cites).

— p. 649 (§75.525a). T. apparently recognizes that *w tb* in RS 1.002:35' (*KTU* 1.40) cannot be a simple perfective, but, in line with his usual refusal to recognize 2^d person forms in the prescriptive ritual texts (see above, remark to p. 211 [§41.12], etc.), he parses the form as an infinitive. On the other hand, he parsed *šqrb* in line 26' of this text as a m.pl. impv. (p. 595

¹¹⁶⁵Verreet, *OLP* 17 (1986) 75; Dijkstra, *UF* 19 (1987) 47 n. 51; idem, *UF* 21 (1989) 143; Cunchillos, *Textes ougaritiques* II (Paris, 1989) 395.

¹¹⁶⁶Cf. Pardee, *AfO* 29-30 (1983-84) 327-28.

¹¹⁶⁷E.g., Pardee, *Context* I (1997) 282; Parker *apud* Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 213; Wyatt, *Religious Texts* (1998) 334.

¹¹⁶⁸Pardee, *AfO* 31 (1984) 216.

[§74.623]—see my remark above on this parsing), and it is unclear why he did not continue that line of analysis here. Because of the tight construction of the mirroring masculine-feminine sections of this text, it appears very likely that whatever verb form was used in line 26' was imitated in line 35'.¹¹⁶⁹

— p. 649 (§75.526a). The analysis of {ʿ-ʾšt} in RS 24.247+:42' (*KTU* 1.103) as the G-infinitive of ŠT, 'to put', as T. indicates here to be a certainty, is far from certain because the partially preserved sign before {št} appears not to be a word-divider.¹¹⁷⁰

— p. 649 (§75.527a). T. reconstructs {...}ʾdʾk} in RIH 77/18:14' (*CAT* 1.175:12) as {[y]dk} and interprets it as a G-passive in spite of the fact that {dk} is attested in line 4' of this text, where it was interpreted by the editors, correctly in my opinion, as an imperative; the editors extrapolated, again correctly, that reading to line 14'.¹¹⁷¹ T. has not noticed that the person to whom the medical instructions are communicated in this text is always addressed directly, i.e., in the second person (see above, remark to p. 605 [§74.632], etc.).

— p. 650 (§75.527c). In my vocalization of RS 24.258:28 (*KTU* 1.114), I rendered *nʿr* as /QTLa/ (/naʿāra/),¹¹⁷² an analysis adopted here by T. Because the verb is in a clause introduced by *hn*, because it expresses the result of the medical care devoted to ʾIlū by the goddesses ʿAnatu and ʿAṯtartu, and because of the frequent use of participles in these para-mythological texts, I wonder now if the analysis as a participle (/naʿāru/) is not preferable.

— pp. 650-51 (§75.527d-f). In these sections devoted to the L-stem of hollow roots, T. vocalizes all forms but one with /ā/ rather than /â/, e.g., “*yukānin*,” ‘he established’ (√KWN); the exception is “*mutâr(r)ât-*” (L-passive participle √TWR). Why did the disappearance of the weak middle radical not produce a contracted vowel in these forms as it did, according to T., everywhere else?¹¹⁷³ (See above, seventh general remark.)

— pp. 651-52 (§75.527g-i). Up to this point in his presentation of hollow roots, T. has been fairly careful in marking what is for him the contracted vowel as short when the vowel appears in a closed syllable. In the presentation of the Š-stem of hollow roots, however, the indicator of contraction/length has been retained in all syllables, closed or open.¹¹⁷⁴ There are even two cases of so marking the stem vowel in /QTLa/ (“*šakînta*” and “*šaḳîlta*”),

¹¹⁶⁹I have analyzed both forms as m.s. imperatives: *Leslau* (1991) 1185, 1187; *Les textes rituels* (2000) 97, 98 (correct /tūb/ here to /tub/ or to tūba/—see above, seventh general remark); *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 82, 83; cf. Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 54.

¹¹⁷⁰Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 544; see the new copy and photograph in Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004), text 20 in the *Choix de textes*.

¹¹⁷¹Bordreuil and Caquot, *Syria* 56 (1979) 296, 297.

¹¹⁷²*Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 22.

¹¹⁷³Indeed, on p. 577 (§74.511) it is said that the L-stem pattern for hollow roots is “*yu1â3i3*.”

¹¹⁷⁴There is, however, one example of a mistake in the opposite direction: “*yVštakinu*” (p. 652 [§75.527i]). Judging from the long discussion on pp. 607-8 (§74.642—to which there is no cross-reference on p. 652), where the derivation of this form as Š-stem from √K(W)N or as G-stem from √ŠKN is debated, the vocalization with /i/ may be a remnant of the latter analysis, even though the former is preferred.

something that not even the invasion of /i/ into the Hiphil in proto-Hebrew was able to accomplish (the corresponding form is /hiqtáltā/ in strong roots, /hēqámtā/ in hollow roots).

— p. 652 (§75.528). One may contrast T.’s willingness to parse forms in the most obscure and broken contexts with his unwillingness to prefer a parsing of *ykr* in the well-preserved context of RS 24.244:62 (*KTU* 1.100), here said to come from √K(W)R, √KRR, or √NKR.¹¹⁷⁵ It is inconsistent to devote an entire section to this and four other forms when any number of forms that are above parsed more or less precisely are of equally dubious analysis for one reason or another—I have remarked above on the ones that struck me as most dubious.

— p. 652 (§75.529). There are two anomalies in the paradigm entry for the G-stem “Inf[initiv] abs[olut]” of hollow roots: (1) there is no such thing as an “infinitive absolute” in Ugaritic in the same sense as in Hebrew, only an infinitive that appears in the paronomastic figure of speech in which the Hebrew infinitive absolute appears regularly (e.g., /qātōl qātálti/); (2) the form is vocalized “*qûm-*” whereas above (p. 649 [§75.526a]) the standard infinitive is vocalized with “*â*” and is derived from the /qatāl/ base, i.e., the standard base of the G-infinitive in Ugaritic—this reconstruction corresponds to Hebrew, where the infinitive construct is /qûm/, the infinitive absolute /qôm/ ← /qām/ ≈ /qātōl/ ← /qatāl/ and it is the latter that appears, of course, in the paronomastic figure of speech (/qôm qámti/). That a verbal noun /qûm-/ may have existed in Ugaritic is one thing, identifying it is the ‘infinitive absolute’ is quite another.

— pp. 652-53 (§75.529). There is another anomaly in the presentation of L-stem forms in this paradigm: the vowel of the first root syllable is given as “ô/â,” e.g., “*yuqô/âmimu*.” As remarked above, /â/ is expected from T. though he indicates /ā/ in §75.527d-f (pp. 650-51). Where the /ô/ comes from here is anybody’s guess since he does not discuss it (he apparently thought at some time that the form should have derived from /qawmama/ *yuqawmim-*, i.e., a simple reduplicating pattern /qatlala/, rather than being related to the /qātala/ stem).

— pp. 653-71 (§75.53). In addition to the general problem of the distribution of III-y and III-w forms mentioned above in the seventh general remark, another problematic aspect of T.’s treatment of III-weak roots may be mentioned here (cf. above, remark to p. 190 [§33.311.5], etc.): he vocalizes /YQTLØ/ in the G-stem and imperative forms in the derived stems with a contracted vowel at the end (e.g., /yabkî/ ← /yabkiy/ and /hawwî/ ← /hawwiy/) whereas proto-Hebrew and Arabic had a short vowel in the /YQTLØ/ and Arabic does in the imperative as well. (One may surmise that the /ē/ in the principal verbal stems in Hebrew represents paradigm pressure from the Qal, where the accent was certainly on the final syllable: /biníy/ → *b^onē^h*.) Certainly in the /YQTLØ/ and plausibly in the imperative of the derived stems, where the accent would not have been on the final syllable because one of the preceding syllables was long (e.g., /hawwî/), I see no reason to doubt that the Ugaritic pattern was similar to that of Arabic. The explanation provided for his decision found on p. 656 (“Da jedoch sichere Anhaltspunkte fehlen, wird die Möglichkeit der Voklakürzung in der folgenden Vokalisierung der Verbalformen III-w/y nicht berücksichtigt”) is, as nearly as

¹¹⁷⁵Cf. Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 202, 215; Wyatt, *Religious Texts* (1998) 384 n. 32.

I can determine, valueless: given that it is difficult to come up with potential sources of internal data which might elucidate the question (certainly not Ugaritic orthography!) and that the West-Semitic comparative data go against the hypothesis, T.'s choice can only be described as showing a preference for theory over data (one would expect /iy/ to give /î/ and the fact that this was manifestly not the case in two of the principal branches of West Semitic is considered inconsequential). In particular, the difference between Hebrew /y^hîy/, 'may he live', and /yēbk/, 'may he weep', seems not to have impressed T., for he vocalizes both forms in Ugaritic with an identical final vowel, /î/ (/yaḥî/ and /yabkî/). Hebrew /y^hîy/ must, however, have developed along similar lines as nouns of the type /p^hrîy/, 'fruit', viz., through loss of a final short vowel and homorganic shift from /y/ to /î/: /píryu/ → /píry/ → /pírî/ (this stage gave the pausal form /pérîy/) → /p^hrîy/—in other words, in the verbal form it is the second root consonant that has created the /î/, not the third (/yaḥiy/ → /yaḥyi/ → /yaḥy/ → /yaḥî/ → /y^hî/). There is no reason to doubt that proto-Hebrew also had /yibka/ (from /yabki/ by paradigm collapse on the /yiqta/ form). An important element of T.'s reconstruction is that he considers that Arabic and Hebrew went through the stage /yaqtî/ on the way to /yaqti/. That explanation does not, however, account for the forms just discussed and it must be judged more likely that the attested forms represent a simple dropping of the final weak consonant (i.e., /yaqtiy/ → /yaqti/) or perhaps a paradigm based on an historically biconsonantal root (i.e. /yaqti/ ← /yaqti/, not /yaqti/ ← /yaqtiy/). Another indication that proto-West-Semitic never went through the contraction stage comes from what for T. is a conundrum, viz., whether proto-Ugaritic /yištay/ went to /yištê/ or to /yištâ/ (the latter would be "in Analogie zum Starken Verb" [p. 656]—which, however, does not make a lot of sense because there is no strong-root form with /â/; presumably the analogy is to /yiqta/, but if so the analogy is poor).¹¹⁷⁶ Arabic /yaqta/ and Hebrew /yēqt/ demonstrate that the stage of proto-West-Semitic from which these two languages descended had /yaqta/ (the *šere* in Biblical Hebrew shows proto-Hebrew /yiqta/ by the Barth-Ginsberg law; the writing of the 1 c.s. form of this verb as {îšt-} shows explicitly that Ugaritic had the same historical stem).¹¹⁷⁷ Neither could have undergone a shortening from /yaqtê/ (← /yaqtay/) because neither Arabic nor proto-Hebrew had a phoneme /e/. In an e-mail discussion of this point, T. has remarked: "Kurzformen (Präteritum) von Verben III-inf. haben im älteren Akkad. wahrscheinlich einen langen Auslautvokal besessen. Diese wurden erst später gekürzt"

¹¹⁷⁶T. does not, however, present the conundrum consistently, for the options are only presented for the root ŠTY; other /yiqtay/ forms are vocalized /yiqtâ/ with or without a question mark (p. 659, BGY; p. 660, HDY) or /yiqtê/ with a question mark (p. 662, PHY— the imperative of this root is given as /p^Vhê/ without a question mark on p. 663).

¹¹⁷⁷It is well known that the singular jussive and preterit forms disappeared from Aramaic. In Old Aramaic, however, the jussive form was still alive, as Degen demonstrated by the use of different *matres lectionis* in the two forms, *he* for the indicative, *yod* for the jussive (GGA 231 [1979] 36-39; on the consistency of this pattern in the Tell Fakhariya inscription, see Pardee, *Semitica* 48 [1998] 146-47). One must surmise either that this was a rare case of using a *mater* with a final short vowel, that the historical short vowel had secondarily lengthened, or that proto-Aramaic had developed along the lines proposed by T. for Ugaritic. In any case, the form is no longer attested in the many texts known from the late sixth century on because the jussive had fused with the indicative.

(March 13, 2004). Whatever the case may have been for proto-West Semitic, the agreement between Hebrew and Arabic for the final vowel of such forms having been or being short and the exclusion of an intermediate form /yaqte/ from both languages (the same problem should exist theoretically for /yaqtaw/ → /yaqtô/) constitute impediments to the explanation of the West-Semitic forms by contraction and subsequent shortening of the final syllable. If, however, T.'s view of the early Akkadian data is correct and if a plausible solution can be found for the /yaqtê/yaqtô/ problem, one could posit that a form such as /yaqtî/ could develop to /yaqti/ if accented on the first syllable—this theory would require in turn that the jussive and perfective forms distinguished by accent according to Hetzron's theory (see note 1118) had fallen together or that the form with final long vowel simply disappeared. Whatever the ultimate solution may be for the problem in proto-West Semitic, I see no reason to posit that the Ugaritic language of the 13th century would have had a long vowel in the final syllable of III-weak /YQTLØ/ forms.

— pp. 653-71 (§75.53). At various points in this section on III-y/w roots, T. mentions “Pleneschreibung” as a possible explanation of forms written with {-y}. There are virtual doublets written with and without {-y} (see remark below to p. 658 [§75.531f]) and an explanation along these lines is certainly to be envisaged; ‘historical writing’, however, might be a more appropriate term, i.e., one would assume that a phonetic shift had occurred in the spoken language but that forms were occasionally still written in an archaic manner. (On the general problem, see remark below to pp. 682-718 [§76].)

— pp. 653-54 (§75.531b). T. here cites evidence for III-w roots in Ugaritic, but the quality of the data varies considerably: only two forms written with {w} are cited, while the rest represent T.'s views of diphthong and triphthong contractions, in particular {tdù}, ‘she flies’, is said to come from /tad'uw(u)/ and {t'l}, ‘they ascended’, from /tal'uwû/, i.e., it is assumed that /yaqtul/ forms are built off a III-w root or a III-w variant of a root that is only attested in Ugaritic consonantal writing as III-y—which is the case of both D'Y and 'LY. This reconstruction appears to be related more closely to Arabic *orthographic* conventions (where the presence of {w} or {y} may be determined by the preceding vowel, e.g., /yabnuwna/ 3 m.pl. vs. /yabniyna/ 3 f.pl.) than to a full-scale reconstruction of proto-Ugaritic. What is clear from the orthography is that in Ugaritic, as in the other Northwest-Semitic languages, virtually all III-w roots have become III-y, so the system is certainly not identical to the Arabic one, where roots may be classed as III-w or III-y on the basis of the retention of /w/ or /y/ throughout much of the verbal paradigm. What is unclear for Ugaritic is whether there was a systematic use of the imperfective modes in poetry—this description is required because the relationship between writing and phonology is uncertain, i.e., no one has yet come up with a description of the system of usage of {y'n} vs. {y'ny}. That being the case, a systematic reconstruction of the proto-Ugaritic forms that resulted in the forms we encounter in the texts at our disposal is at present out of reach. I see no solid basis on which to determine whether the /yaqtul/ base was still in use with III-weak roots or whether it had already fallen together with /yiqtal/ and /yaqtîl/ as in proto-Hebrew. T.'s principal argument, viz., that the attested forms must come from /yaqtul/ base forms because /yaqtîl/ would give irreducible triphthongs, assumes more about the monophthongization of triphthongs than can in fact be demonstrated. As for the coexistence of III-w and III-y verbal forms of the same

root, viz., that the proto-Ugaritic form of the root was III-w when preceded by /u/ but III-y when preceded by /a/ or /i/, T. should demonstrate the plausibility of the existence of such a system in a Northwest-Semitic language before simply assuming its existence in Ugaritic or in proto-Ugaritic. His only positive consonantal data from Ugaritic (i.e., data provided by the presence of {w}) are provided by nominal forms with /w/, viz., *bnwn* and *bnwt*. These exhibit the fluidity of III-weak roots in proto-Ugaritic, something that is clear from all the West-Semitic languages. The principal orthographic argument is the following: though the relatively frequent verbs BNY, ‘to build’, and ‘LY, ‘to ascend’, show various forms with final {-y}, not a single case exists of an imperfective form showing final {-y} (nine and seventeen tokens, respectively, of /YQTL/ forms of the two roots are cited on pp. 659 and 661). It is apparently this fact that has led T. to conclude that these and a few other roots had /yaqtuw-/ as their /YQTL/ (on the particular cases of BNY and ‘LY, see remarks above to p. 427 [§73.131], etc.). What would have been needed is a statement regarding the stage of evolution of the Semitic languages at which T. believes a full-blown system of yaqtuw/y-/ forms to have existed and the place occupied by Ugaritic in that evolution. T. refers to a III-w system as “productiver” (p. 654) in Ugaritic, but the data are extremely sparse for so encompassing an hypothesis. To my knowledge, there is only one certain case in Ugaritic of verbal forms from one and the same root showing {w} and {y}, {ātwt}, attested once as the 3 f.s. /QTLa/ of ʾTW/Y (RS 2.[008]⁺ iv 32' [KTU 1.4]), and {tity}, attested twice as the 3 m. pl. /YQTL/ of the same root (RS 3.343⁺ iii 17', 18' [KTU 1.15]).¹¹⁷⁸ The other roots cited by T. would have shown the opposite distribution in the two conjugations, e.g. {‘ly}, ‘he ascended’, is attested whereas {y‘l}, ‘he ascends’, is said to come from /*yal‘uw-/. As regards the orthographic data, it is important to note that the number of imperfective forms where one would expect the third consonant to be written according to T.’s norms of monophthongization if the root were III-y is much lower than the total of twenty-six tokens that are cited, indeed only three forms in six tokens ({t‘ln}, ‘they ascend’, attested four times, {n‘l}, ‘we will ascend’, in RS 24.266:33 (KTU 1.119), and {tbnn}, ‘they build’, in RS 2.[008]⁺ vi 16).¹¹⁷⁹ It is not impossible that such a small number of forms is owing to the vagaries of monophthongization or of orthographic practice among the scribes. That possibility is proven by the existence of {tštn}, ‘they drink’ (twice in RS 24.258 [KTU 1.114], identified by T. as contracted from /tištayūna/ [p. 663]) and of {tbkn}, ‘they/you weep’ (in RS 3.343⁺ v 12, 14 [KTU 1.15], identified on p. 459 [§73.273.5] as contracted from /tabkiyūna/ but in this section [p. 659, §75.532] as a 2 m.s. form, with no suggestion for identifying who

¹¹⁷⁸The case of {‘rwt} in RS 2.[003]⁺ i 7 (KTU 1.14) and {‘ryt} in RS 18.031:25 (KTU 2.38) is resolvable by epigraphic means. The latter form is quite plausibly a /qatīl/ or /qatīl/, rather than a finite verbal form (see above, remark to p. 195 [§33.322.2b], etc.) and from the root ‘RY, ‘to be naked’ (said of a ship stripped of its sails). On the other hand, {‘rwt} is almost certainly not the correct reading in RS 2.[003]⁺ i 7 (against KTU/CAT) because the editor was correct in seeing the right tip of the first sign as having the form of a horizontal wedge, not that of a {‘} (the tablet was collated in June of 2003).

¹¹⁷⁹Another form cited by T. on p. 654 is irrelevant: {t‘l} in RS 16.402:37 is probably 3 f.s. (with *mlāky* as subject) rather than 3 m.pl.

that singular subject would be).¹¹⁸⁰ At the end of the day, it appears legitimate to query whether the data are sufficient to posit the existence in Ugaritic of a productive */*yaqtuw-/* paradigm. One possibility is that the forms adduced in favor of that hypothesis are frozen forms dating back to an earlier period, when full paradigms existed for both */yaqtuw-/* and *yaqtuy-/*. In this respect, it must be observed that T.'s reconstructions taken to their logical extreme would mean that there was no such thing in proto-West Semitic as roots distinguished by whether they were III-w or III-y, but only III-weak roots with variable */w/* or */y/* that was determined by the preceding vowel. Such an hypothesis goes against the data from Arabic, where III-w roots often exist alongside III-y roots and each has a distinct meaning. Would T. argue that all such cases are inner-Arabic developments and that the Arabic system was absent from proto-West Semitic? An hypothesis just as plausible as T.'s would say that */yaqtuw/y-/* had fallen together with */yaqtiy-/* under the influence of the shift from III-w to III-y in all other forms, i.e., that representative forms of the paradigm were */yabni/* (3 m.s. jussive ← */yabniy/*), */yabnû/* (3 m.s. indicative ← */yabniyu/*), */y/tabnû/* (3 m.pl. jussive, a remnant of earlier */y/tabnuw/yû/* or a contracted form of the more recent */y/tabniyû/*), and */y/tabnûna/* (3 m.pl. indicative, also either a remnant of earlier */y/tabnuw/yûna/* or a contracted form of the more recent */y/tabniyûna/*). Finally, as in so many other details of this grammar, consistency has not been achieved, e.g., *yḥ* in RS 2.[012] i 35' (*KTU* 1.12) is on p. 144 vocalized *yahḥi* but on p. 661 *yahḥû*."

— pp. 653-54 (§75.531b), p. 659 (§75.532). It is highly unlikely that {tbnn} reflects *"/tabnû-nna/*," for the orthography represents the perception by the scribe of the form as a single word. It must, therefore, represent either */tabnunna/* i.e., with loss of length in */u/* and hence of the information which that vowel length carried regarding plurality, */tabnun/*, also with loss of vowel length, or else */tabnûna/*. T. has apparently chosen the *-nna/* ending because he prefers it over */-n/* for unstated reasons (see above, second remark to pp. 497-506 [§73.6]) and because of the homonymy produced by attaching a simple */-na/* to verbal forms that end in a long vowel, for that ending would be identical with the indicative marker (*/YQTLûna/* indicative, */YQTLû/* jussive—see above, seventh remark to pp. 497-506 [§73.6]). As observed above, eighth general remark, the use of the dash in such forms constitutes essentially a refusal to come to terms with the necessity to posit the loss of the marker of plurality in forms of this type—we all know that the dash represents segmentation of the morphemes, but, when vocalizing Ugaritic forms, the Ugaritic vocalization should be given, not a non-existent hybrid located somewhere between the proto-form and the actual reconstructed form. Curiously, T. admits this necessity on p. 654, but only in a non-existent form: "Auf der Basis des Paradigmas III-y wäre eine Schreibung **tbny* (= *tabniyunna/* ← **tabniyû-nna*) zu erwarten." Below, in the list of III-w/y */YQTL/* forms (pp. 658-664 [§75.532], {tbnn} is again vocalized *"/tabnû-nna/* but {iṣtn} (RS 16.265:16 [*KTU* 5.9 i 16]) is vocalized correctly *"iṣtanna"* as a derivation from */iṣtaya + nna/* (cf. also p. 656 [§75.531e]). Consistent representation of the presumed Ugaritic vocalization would be far more intellectually satisfying and far less confusing to the users of the grammar.

¹¹⁸⁰T. refers to the "konventionelle Deutung" of the form as 2 m.pl., but offers no explanation for his breaking from convention.

— p. 654 (§75.531b), p. 661 (§75.532). Though my analysis of *tʿl* in RS 16.402:37 (*KTU* 2.33) as 3 f.s. jussive with the following word *th* as subject may have to be abandoned, for there is as yet no proof that *th* was a feminine noun,¹¹⁸¹ T.’s analysis as 3 m.pl. is even less likely, for there is no basis on which to analyze *tʿl* as 3 m.pl. jussive (“let them arrive in *th*”). If, therefore, *th* is not the subject, the only other plausible candidate is *mlākty*, ‘my messenger party’ (l. 35). The phrase would mean ‘it (my messenger party) will arrive in a dangerous situation (or whatever meaning be established for *th*)’.

— p. 655 (§75.531d), pp. 664-65 (§75.534). There can be no certainty that the contracted form of the 3 m.s. /QTLa/ of III-w/y roots showed a long vowel (“/ʿalâ/ < *ʿalay/wa ”): though this vowel in Aramaic and Arabic is long, Hebrew shows *qameš*, which normally corresponds to /a/ in proto-Hebrew. (The Hebrew 3 f.s. tells us nothing because it reflects a mutation: ʿāl^htā^h consists of the secondary feminine morpheme /ā/ ← /-at/ which has been attached to a proto-Hebrew form which would have been similar to the Ugaritic form, viz., /ʿalat/ or /ʿalât/ ← /ʿalayāt/.) In this matter of contracted and uncontracted forms (e.g., {ʿl} vs. {ʿly}), the possibility must be mentioned that the latter may represent historical writings or consciously archaic forms, viz., that only /ʿala/ or /ʿalâ/ existed in the spoken language of Ugarit. It is certain that the uncontracted third-person forms do not belong only to the archaic language of poetry, for some are attested in prose; the data do, on the other hand, conform to the theory that they should represent a later stage of the language, for no contracted forms are yet attested in poetry.

— p. 656 (§75.531e), p. 661 (§75.532). As is shown by the jussive form {tūdn} in RS 92.2014:8 (RSO XIV 52), {tʿl} in lines 4 and 6 of the same text may be parsed as jussive as well (rather than as indicative with contraction), in spite of the preceding negative particle *l* (see above, remarks to p. 514 [§74.222.3], etc., and to p. 612 [§75.212.12]).

— p. 656 (§75.531e). When it comes to reconstructing the /YQTLu/ forms of the III-y /yiqtal/-type in which the root letter /y/ is not present in the writing, T. plugs in his rule for vowel contraction, according to which /ayu/ should go to /û/ (p. 199 [§33.232.2b]). Thus the 2 m.s. form would be identical with the 2 m.pl. jussive/perfective, viz. /tiphû/ ← /tiphayu/ and /tiphayû/ (expressed in terms of the 2^d person because of the near absence of y-preformative 3 m.pl. forms). It is clear that Arabic did not follow this pattern, for the corresponding forms, here expressible for 3^d person, are /yaqta(y)/ (3 m.s.) and /yaqtaw(ʾ)/ (3 m.pl. juss. ← /yaqtayû/), and the later Northwest-Semitic languages also eliminated such 3 m.s. forms through paradigm leveling (e.g., Hebrew *yīšte^h*). That Ugaritic followed neither of these patterns appears, however, to be indicated by {tlû} in RS 24.244:68 (*KTU* 1.100), which should be /tilʾû/¹¹⁸² ← /tilʾayu/ (3 f.s. indicative of LʾY—unless the final vowel here reflect the fact that this root was III-w in proto-Ugaritic, viz., /tilʾawu/). By analogy, my vocalization of the G-passive form *tp* in RS 24.103+:19 (*KTU* 1.103+) as

¹¹⁸¹The phrase *p mgy th* is now attested in RS 94.2406:14 (see Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* [2004], text 31 in the *Choix de textes*), but the context is broken; perhaps *th* is adverbial there, as it may also be in RS 16.402.

¹¹⁸²Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 202.

/tuppâ/¹¹⁸³ from /*tunpayu/ is perhaps to be abandoned in favor of /tuppû/ (so T. p. 513 [§74.222.2], p. 656 [§75.531e], p. 668 [§75.537a]), my vocalization of *ykl* in RS 19.015:1 as /yiklâ/¹¹⁸⁴ should certainly be changed to /yiklû/ (see remark above to p. 512 [§74.222.2], etc.), and my vocalization of *yʿl* in RS 24.277:23' (*KTU* 1.127:30) should be corrected from /yaʿlî/¹¹⁸⁵ to /yaʿlû/ (see remark above to p. 126 [§32.146.33a], etc.). If {tlû} does reflect a general pattern, one should perhaps consider that there was, in addition to the rule of contraction to which there are too many exceptions for it to be entirely convincing, a psycholinguistic basis: expression of the verbal mode (in this case the /u/ of the indicative) was important enough to outweigh the disadvantage of homophonous forms.

— p. 656 (§75.531e), p. 663 (§75.532). In the first section cited, T. proposes two analyses and vocalizations of the 3 m.pl. /YQTL/ form *tštn* in RS 24.258:3 (*KTU* 1.114), either as /YQTLu/ (/tištûna/ ← /tištayûna/) or as /YQTLØ/ plus energetic ending (“*tištûnna*” ← “*tištayû-nna*”); in the second, only the first of these options is indicated. The latter vocalization is, of course, impossible, since the vowel would have to shorten in the closed syllable. This shortening would produce a form identical with 3 f.s. and 2 m.s. indicative + energetic (according to T.’s system), viz., /tištayunna/, and, moreover, T. would expect the /ayu/ triphthong to contract (pp. 198-99 [§33.323.2], here and on p. 657 a series of exceptions are cited), which would further reduce the form to /tištunna/. If, however, one posits here an energetic ending /-(a)na/, that and the indicative forms would have been identical—hence apparently T.’s avoidance of that possibility (see above, seventh remark to pp. 497-506 [§73.6] and remarks to p. 500 [§73.611.2d] and to pp. 653-54 [§75.531b], etc.). Whatever the upshot of the discussion regarding energetic forms may be, RS 24.258 seems to show a rather consistent use of /YQTLu/ forms, and that appears to be the better solution for *tštn* here (the vocalization is thus plausibly /tištûna/ ← /tištayuna/).¹¹⁸⁶ See also below, remark to p. 662 (§75.532) on *yšt* in lines 16 and 31' of this same text.

— p. 657 (§75.531e). The list of verbal roots that do not show monophthongization of /-iyû/ is incomplete, as a perusal of the relevant forms on pp. 658-63 will show.

— p. 657 (§75.531e), p. 663 (§75.533). In his second interpretation of {šdyn} in RS 2.[009]⁺ iv 18 (*KTU* 1.6) as consisting of a verbal form + energetic ending (instead of *šd yn*, ‘pour out wine’), T. does not take vowel shortening into consideration for the question of monophthongization, viz., he vocalizes, as is so often the case, by segmentation rather than indicating the final form: “*šidiyî-nna*.” The penultimate syllable would, of course, have become /in/, and the presence of so many /i/ vowels, one of which according to T.’s hypothesis would have been ultra-short, casts doubt on the plausibility of the reconstruction.

— p. 658 (§75.531f), p. 659 (§75.532), p. 692 (§76.344). As a possible explanation of {tgly} in RS 2.[008]⁺ iv' 23 (*KTU* 1.4) and RS 2.[009]⁺ i 34 (*KTU* 1.6) over against {tgl} in

¹¹⁸³AfO 33 (1986) 146; *Les textes rituels* (2000) 550; T. p. 660 (§75.532).

¹¹⁸⁴*Les textes rituels* (2000) 491.

¹¹⁸⁵Ibid., p. 715.

¹¹⁸⁶Idem, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 21; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel II* (2004) 46 (the first token is mistakenly indicated as “tištûna” but the second is correctly “tištûna”).

the identical formula in RS 2.[014]⁺ v 7 (*KTU* 1.3), all three in Baal-Cycle texts,¹¹⁸⁷ on p. 658 T. uses the term “Pleneschreibung.” His other explanations are: the {-y} would be the enclitic particle or, preferred over the other two, the poet would have purposely chosen the perfective aspect in the one case, the imperfective in the other. On p. 692, he cites first the two cases of {tgly}, then remarks that the imperfective aspect is not obligatory in this expression because {tgl} is also attested. Nowhere does he confront the fact that the parallel verb is in all cases {tbû}, i.e., /tubû’u/, a marked imperfective form, which requires the grammarian to ask whether the sequence perfective-imperfective is plausible for sequential acts in narrative poetry. Is ‘She uncovered the threshold, then she begins entering’ a plausible aspectual interpretation?¹¹⁸⁸ Note that if the explanation of the form {tgly} as a *plene* writing were adopted, this form would everywhere be perfective. More plausible, it appears to me because contracted /YQTLu/ forms are reasonably well attested, is the analysis of {tgl} as such a contracted form (/taglû/ ← /tagliyu/). But that conclusion in turn raises the question: did the uncontracted and contracted forms exist side-by-side in the language or does {tgly} represent historical writing? That question has already been raised with respect to demonstrably different writings of grammatically identical nominal forms (see remark above to p. 51 [§21.341.21a], etc., on {âhy} vs. {ûhy}/{îhy}). On the parallelism of *tgl(y)* and *tbû* in the context of the use of III-’ roots in reconstructing the Ugaritic verbal system, see remark above to pp. 620-21 (§75.232); on T.’s attempt to solve the code of the poetic verbal system by aspect theory, see below, remark to pp. 682-718 (§76).

— p. 658 (§75.532), p. 674 (§75.62a). I first noted on p. 658 the use of the abbreviation “PK^Kp” which is not indicated in the list of abbreviations on p. 917. It apparently stands for ‘short prefix conjugation, preterit function’, i.e. /YQTLØ/. This form and function are normally noted by PK^Ki, where “i” stands for “indicativische Funktion,” a term which, by the way, goes against traditional usage where ‘indicative’ is used, correctly in my opinion, for the /YQTLu/ form which expresses the imperfective with no modal variation. On p. 674, I remarked for the first time “PK^KPp,” which appears to be related to the former (it is placed in contrast with “PK^L,” that is, /YQTLu/) but which I am at a loss to explain.

— p. 659 (§75.532). I do not see how T. can be sure that {ybky} in RS 24.282:2’ (*KTU* 1.129) is 3 m.s. /YQTLu/ in so small a fragment where very little context is preserved. Any possible analysis of this sign sequence must be left open.

— p. 659 (§75.532). T.’s alternative analysis of {îbgyh}, ‘I will reveal it’ (four attestations in mythological texts), as N-stem can hardly be considered likely because of the pronominal suffix: transitive N-stem forms, though known, are not commonplace in any of the Northwest-Semitic languages, certainly not in Ugaritic.

¹¹⁸⁷{tgly} is attested twice more in the same idiom in texts from the ³*Aqhatu* cycle.

¹¹⁸⁸See above, remark to pp. 620-21 (§75.232), where this possibility is broached. T. accepts the existence of a category of imperfective usage for marking inception of action, in particular for the verb NŠ’ when it expresses ‘lifting the voice’ (p. 695 [§76.348]).

— p. 659 (§75.532). Another unregistered abbreviation is found here in describing the /YQTL/ forms of HDY, ‘to incise (one’s flesh in mourning)’: the forms are vocalized as /YQTLu/, which would normally be “PK^L,” but are here described as: “PLKF.”

— pp. 660-61 (§75.532). T. interprets the verbal form {[y]mǵk} in RS 24.252:19' (*KTU* 1.108) as G-stem /YQTLØ/, but with no attempt to explain the pronominal suffix (-k, ‘you’). I have attempted to explain the form as D-stem, factitive, and indicative (hence as a contracted form of /YQTLu/) ‘he will enable you to attain (what you have requested)’.¹¹⁸⁹ If that analysis be rejected, then a different set of restorations for the passage should be proposed. A similar problem is encountered in RS 3.334:8 (*KTU* 2.2), where an uncontracted form of the same verb is encountered ({ymǵyk}); T. parses it also as 3 m.s. G-stem, but again the context is damaged and there is no sure way of ascertaining either the verbal stem or the subject of the verb. Above, p. 437 (§73.223.34.14), T. explained the pronominal suffix here as having a dative function; he also recognized implicitly there that the subject, lost at the end of the preceding line, is unknown—that being the case, it cannot even be judged certain that the function of the pronominal suffix here is dative. I once judged that to be the case of the final {y} of *tmǵyy* in RS 16.402:31,¹¹⁹⁰ but I now believe that T.’s analysis here of that sign as representing the enclitic particle is more likely as is his analysis of the verb as G-stem rather than D-stem.¹¹⁹¹

— p. 660 (§75.532), p. 698 (§76.421a), p. 700 (§76.427). T. accepts my vocalization of {ymǵ[-]} in RS 24.272:10 (*KTU* 1.124) as /yamǵi/,¹¹⁹² interpreting it as a /YQTLØ/ form. Because, however, this text is basically in prose, where the /YQTLØ/ perfective was no longer regularly in use, and because {ymǵy} appears in line 1 of this text, it may be preferable to read {ymǵ[y]} (or to see *ymǵ* as a contracted /YQTLu/ form, not the better solution because all other such forms in this text are written with {-y}). There are two problems here, the actual reading on the tablet (the surface to the right of the signs {ymǵ} is damaged) and the aspect of the verb. This verb is preceded by direct speech which may contain an example of /waQTLa/ with imperfective function (*w št b bt w pr‘[t] hy hlh*, ‘... and put it in the house and it will bring his illness to an end’)—though *pr‘t* in this “para-mythological” text is perhaps better parsed as a participle. But, at least as I have interpreted the text, it then refers to the arrival of the messenger (*w ymǵ[]*) and to his reception of the message, expressed as a /QTLa/ form (*lqh*). If this were Biblical Hebrew, *w ymǵ* would be a paradigmatic example of “wāw-consecutive” + /YQTLØ/: ‘Your messenger has arrived ...

¹¹⁸⁹*Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 81, 82, 113. In fact, in my vocalization of line 19' on p. 81, I erroneously indicated the uncontracted form “*ya]maǵǵiyuka*,” though I did better on the contracted form in line 20' (“*yamaǵǵi]ka*”—by the considerations offered above in the remark to p. 656 [§75.531e], however, the contracted /YQTLu/ form should have been vocalized /yamaǵǵu/).

¹¹⁹⁰*AfO* 31 (1984) 216: “Get those 2000 horses to me.”

¹¹⁹¹*Context* III (2002) 106: “Those 2000 horses must arrive here” (the form is probably plural, however, rather than dual, as T. parses it, i.e., it agrees with the real plurality of the number rather than with the dual of the numeral-noun that means ‘1000’).

¹¹⁹²*Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 183 (“*yamǵi*,” of course, for T.).

he has received ...’. But that morpho-syntax is not yet well attested in Ugaritic and one must ask oneself whether that is the best interpretation here.

— p. 660 (§75.532). T. parses {ymgy} in RS 24.257:7 (*KTU* 1.113) as 3 m.s. /YQTLu/ form. Because, however, this is the only word preserved in the line and because the literary genre of this part of the text is undetermined, the analysis of the signs may not be limited to this one possibility.

— p. 660 (§75.532), p. 694 (§76.347). Here {ym[gy] in RS 2.[003]⁺ iv 34 (*KTU* 1.14) is parsed either as a 3 m.s. /YQTLu/ form or as /YQTLØ/ with *plene* writing and {ymgy} in line 47 of the same text is parsed as 3 m.s. /YQTLu/ (without the *plene* option). I see no reason to believe that in the first case the expression would be perfective, in the second imperfective. On p. 694, both forms are cited as imperfectives following *āhr*. Though the *Kirta* cycle presents several problems in the area of verbal morpho-syntax for which no ready solution is available, the possibility may nonetheless be worth considering that the forms in question are in fact the 3 m.pl. short form (/yamgiyū/), which would have as subject *Kirta* and his army—this would also be the case, then, of *ylk* in line 44. The principal indicator that the forms are indeed singular is that immediately preceding plural forms were written with {t}-preformative ({tškn} in line 29 and {tlkn} in line 31). At least the second of these forms indicates, however, that—unless the {-n} be the enclitic particle—the poet is here using ‘long’ forms not ‘short’ forms. So, unless one be willing to admit that the army’s movements were first expressed by imperfectives with {t}-preformative, then by perfectives with {y}-preformative, it appears necessary to parse all these forms as imperfective, first plural then singular (viz., in agreement with T.’s stance that there are no 3 m.pl. /YQTL/ forms in the *Kirta* cycle that show /t-/ as the prefix). I must confess that I see no convincing explanation from aspect theory for the presence of the imperfective *ymgy* in these two passages, since the verb is fientive and expresses what I would expect the narrator to have viewed as complete: at the end of a part of (l. 34) or the entirety of (l. 47) his voyage, *Kirta* ‘arrives at’ a specific place. Is it the fact that the arrival is viewed as only a prelude, in each case, to the important events narrated immediately thereafter? In the first case only the adverb *tm* is inserted between this clause and the next, in the second this clause is followed by an asyndetic verbal clause. (On T.’s attempt to explain the usage by the preceding particle, see remark below to p. 694.)

— p. 660 (§75.532). Though the passage is damaged, it does not appear particularly likely that *ymgy* in RS 2.[004] ii 46' (*KTU* 1.17) has been correctly parsed here as 3 m.s. What has just been recounted is *Dānī'ilu*’s wife having safely traversed the months of pregnancy and there is no clear masculine singular subject for the verb—indeed the verb is immediately preceded by *yrhm*, ‘months’, though that noun may not have been the subject of the verb.

— p. 660 (§75.532). The option of taking {ymgy} in RS 24.252:9 (*KTU* 1.114) as a perfective with *plene* writing appears remote at best: all /YQTL/ forms in this text appear to be /YQTLu/, not /YQTLØ/. (On the apparent exception of *trpā* in line 28', see above, remark to p. 438 [§73.223.41.4], etc.)

— p. 661 (§75.532). Though T. prudently places a question mark after his analysis of {tmgyn} in RS 3.427:5' (*KTU* 2.1) as 3 m.pl. /YQTLu/, it must be observed that the context

is so broken that any one formally possible analysis of these signs is just about as plausible as any other.

— p. 661 (§75.532). In the analysis of {tmǵyn} in RS 3.322⁺ ii 40 (*KTU* 1.19), one encounters another abbreviation not included in the list on p. 917, viz., “PK^Lp”; this appears after the preferred analysis, “PK^L 3.m.du.” Because the form should be dual and because it appears in sequence with a /YQTLØ/ dual form ({tšá}, ‘they lifted up’), one might expect the alternative analysis to be as /YQTLØ/ with energetic ending or enclitic-{n}. Both analyses would run up against the problem discussed above (seventh remark to pp. 497-506 [§73.6] and remarks to p. 500 [§73.611.2d], to pp. 653-54 [§75.531b], etc., and to p. 656 [§75.531e]) of creating homophonic forms: (1) if the energetic morpheme /-(a)nna/ was present, the expression of duality by vowel length would have been lost (/tamǵiyā + nna/ → /tamǵiyanna/) as it would have been if the energetic ending /-(a)n/ was present (/tamǵiyā + n/ → /tamǵiyan/); (2) the energetic morpheme /-na/ (if there was such a thing), the enclitic morpheme /-na/, and the marker of the long form /-na/ are, of course, formally indistinguishable.

— p. 661 (§75.532). The reading {y[‘n]y} in RS 2.[014]⁺ v 10 (*KTU* 1.3) is presented here as a “n[eue] L[esung].” T. first proposed the reading in 1995,¹¹⁹³ I confirmed the proposal in my review of the article in question,¹¹⁹⁴ and it was—as is to be expected—present in the transcription of Ugaritic texts collated by Bordreuil and myself that was put at T.’s disposal when this grammar was in its last stages of preparation.

— p. 661 (§75.532). T. proposes two analyses of {y‘ny . nn} in RS 24.272:4 and 13 (*KTU* 1.124): /YQTLu/ or /YQTLØ/. The second analysis would entail the conclusion that the {y} is historical writing—all the more so since the vowel would have been short: /ya‘ninnannu/).¹¹⁹⁵ Since ‘long’ forms are attested in this context and there is no reason to doubt that the function of these forms was imperfective, the former analysis is certainly more plausible. But a third formal possibility is omitted, viz. that the ending corresponds to the Arabic/proto-Hebrew Energetic I with the resultant vocalization /ya‘niyannannu/ (/ya‘niyanna + nnu [← an + hu]/).¹¹⁹⁶ (On the question of whether the energetic forms are independent modes or consist of morphemes attached to the other principal modes, see above, remarks to pp. 497-506 [§73.6].)

— p. 662 (§75.532), p. 691 (§76.343a). On p. 662, *yšqynh*, ‘he causes him to drink’, in RS 2.[014]⁺ i 9 (*KTU* 1.3) is analyzed as either /YQTLØ/ or /YQTLu/ whereas, on p. 691, the parsing as /YQTLu/ is given as certain. (For the similar case of *yšlḥmnh* in line 5, see above, remark to p. 591 [§74.622.3].)

¹¹⁹³*AuOr* 13 (1995) 232.

¹¹⁹⁴*AuOr* 16 (1998) 87.

¹¹⁹⁵T. does not vocalize the form but, by his theories, it would presumably be /ya‘nînVnnu/, i.e., /ya‘nî + nVn [his Energetic III] + hu/.

¹¹⁹⁶Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 183.

— p. 662 (§75.532). “yšr[ʃ” in RS 18.147:14 (*KTU* 2.46) should have been qualified as a new reading for *KTU/CAT* indicate {yšrʿn[...]} and my collation confirms this reading (against {yšrʿrʿ} in the *editio princeps*).¹¹⁹⁷

— p. 662 (§75.532), p. 698 (§76.421a). *yšt* in RS 24.258:16 (*KTU* 1.114) is parsed as a /YQTLØ/ form and vocalized /yištâ/ê/. On this hesitation, see above, remark to p. 656 (§75.531e) on diphthong/triphthong contraction in III-weak roots. On the likelihood that the form in question should be /yišta/ rather than either of T.’s options, see general remark to this section (pp. 653-71 [§75.53]). I also vocalized the form as /YQTLØ/ in *Les textes para-mythologiques* (p. 21), but the many examples of triphthong contraction cited by T. and the facts that there is not a single provable /YQTLØ/ form in this text and that this very root shows a /YQTLu/ plural form with contraction (*tštn*, twice in line 3—see above, remark to p. 656 [§75.531e]) lead me to believe now that the form should be vocalized as a /YQTLu/, viz., /yištû/. The same is probably also true of the same form in line 31' and of *yšt* from the hollow root ŠT (line 29'), both of which I vocalized as jussives in *Les textes para-mythologiques*—this new analysis is based on the formal similarity between medical texts and omen texts (see above, remark to p. 646 [§75.522], etc.). Yet another case is *tšt* in RIH 78/20:7 (*CAT* 1.169): in *Les textes rituels* (p. 877) I vocalized both this form and the parallel verb *tlhm* as jussives, as does T. here, but the writing without {y}, one must conclude from T.’s many examples of contracted long forms, says nothing at all about whether the form is jussive or indicative and, since the context does not dictate the analysis as a jussive, the indicative is to be preferred. This applies equally to *yšt* in RIH 77/18:15', 19' (*CAT* 1.175:13, 17)—see remark above to p. 646 (§75.522), etc.

— p. 663 (§75.533), p. 685 (§76.322), p. 790 (§83.123b), p. 830 (§89.25a). T.’s treatment of *pn* in RS 24.258:12 (*KTU* 1.114) has two major failings: (1) the analysis as a m.s. imperative that has been strengthened into a particle fails to convince; (2) he ignores *pn* in translating the verse. On p. 663, he parses *pn* as a m.s. imperative of PNY, “sich wenden, sich abkehren,” then comments “(zu Partikel erstarrt [= “nicht doch!”])”; on p. 790, he cites Garr and Watson as proponents of the analysis of *pn* as consisting of the conjunction *p* expanded with *-n* then refutes them by asserting that “*pn* in 1.114:12 ist als (erstarrter) Imp. der Wz. √*pny* zu deuten (vgl. he. *pæn* ‘damit nicht’).” In context, *pn* could not be functioning as a m.s. imperative, because two goddesses are addressed;¹¹⁹⁸ T. appears, therefore, in spite of his explicit parsing on p. 663, to believe that *pn* is indeed functioning as a particle in this Ugaritic text—he is not simply providing an etymology for the Hebrew particle. Choosing a verbal etymology that makes appeal to an irregular imperative form (Hebrew *pen* shows no formal similarity with a m.s. impv. from a III-weak root) as the basis for a

¹¹⁹⁷Virolleaud, *PRU* V, text 61.

¹¹⁹⁸This consideration is the basis Wyatt’s interpretation of *pn* as meaning “Look!” (addressed to the goddesses): *Religious Texts* (1998) 409; this interpretation goes back to the editor, who translated « Prenez garde » (Virolleaud, *Ugaritica* V [1968] 547). Wyatt observes that this interpretation requires that the verb be explained as denominative to *pnm* ‘face’ because the normal Ugaritic verb for ‘to see’ is PHY. In my estimation, Wyatt is correct in this qualification, for Hebrew PNY, to which Virolleaud appealed and which he translated “être attentif,” means ‘to turn’ and the various passages often cited as supporting a translation ‘to look’ clearly reflect a basic meaning ‘to turn (toward)’.

conjunction when a conjunction exists of which *pn* would be an expanded form does not appear to me to be a plausible solution to the problem posed by the lexical specificity of *pn*, viz., the fact that it expresses a negative purpose clause when the simple conjunction *p* expresses only a strong linkage between two clauses. T. translates the passage twice (pp. 685, 830), treating it both times as though the clause began with the word following *pn*, e.g., p. 685: the text is cited without *pn* and translated “Einem Hund gebt ihr ein Lendenstück ... ?” If, however, the syntactic unit begins with the conjunction *pn*, the verbs can only be in the third person, not the second:¹¹⁹⁹ ‘... that they should not prepare for a dog a *nšb*-cut ...’.¹²⁰⁰ — pp. 664-65 (§75.534). T. shows a great deal of hesitation in vocalizing /QTLa/ forms as /qatala/ or /qatila/, and this reflects his summary statement (p. 469 [§73.352]) to the effect that fientive verbs may be /qatala/ or /qatila/; the stem /qatula/, said in the section just cited to be reserved entirely for stative verbs, is proposed only as a second option to explain ‘*rwt* in RS 2.[003]⁺ i 7 (*KTU* 1.14)— a form that probably does not exist (see above, note 1178). As for the hesitation concerning /qatala/ vs. /qatila/, T. was apparently driven to it by the fact that *all* III-³ roots show the /qatila/ form and all are transitive (*šil*, ‘he asked’, *lik*, ‘he sent’, and *sīd*, ‘he served (food)’). One may, however, doubt that the inverse is true, viz., that verbs that belong semantically in the stative camp would have been /qatala/ in form, e.g., ḤYY and DWY: the proto-form of /ḥayya/, ‘he lives’, is here reconstructed as /ḥayi/aya/. I can see no more reason for hesitation regarding the vocalization of the proto-form of this stative verb as /qatila/qatula/ than in the case of DWY, ‘to be ill’ (see above, remark to p. 195 [§33.322.2d], etc.). On the other hand, for the next form listed from ḤYY, viz., the 2 m.s., he presents only the stem /ḥaiy-/ , which is as it should be. (On this form, see also following remark.) — p. 664 (§75.534). T. vocalizes *hyt*, ‘you (m.s.) live’, as /ḥayîta/ (from /*ḥaiyiya/) or as /ḥayyata/, with no explanation. If the vocalization reflects the idea that geminate roots may have had a vowel between the verbal stem and the pronominal element, that vowel must have been long (cf. Hebrew /qallôtā/, Akkadian /parsāta/—see remark above to p. 642 [§75.521c]). Given, however, that in the other Northwest-Semitic languages, the root ḤYY behaves not like a geminate root but like a III-weak root (Hebrew /ḥayītā/ ← /ḥaiyiya/, not /ḥayyōta/ ← /ḥaiyāta/), the first option for reconstruction must be judged the more likely.

¹¹⁹⁹Nowhere in the grammar does T. parse these verbal forms.

¹²⁰⁰Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 21, 22, 52-53; idem, *Context I* (1997) 304; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 169; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 45, 46. For Wyatt and Vroilleaud, who take *pn* as a fully functioning imperative (see note 1198), the following verbs are also in the 2^d person (*Religious Texts* [1998] 409). B. Margalit, on the other hand, takes *pn* as a fully functioning imperative, but the verbs as 3^d person (“The Ugaritic Feast of the Drunken Gods: Another Look at RS 24.258 (*KTU* 1.114),” *Maarav* 2 [1979-80] 65-120, esp. p. 72). Note that, even if one prefers the analysis of *pn* in this passage as a verb (which I do not) and the particle *pn* disappears from the Ugaritic lexicon (for it is only attested here), two observations may still be made with regard to the particle: (a) the origin of Hebrew *pen* remains to be explained and (b) the very existence of the particle in Hebrew may be taken as a sign that the particle may also have existed in Ugaritic.

— p. 664 (§75.534). Given the apparently rather high incidence of participles in the verbal system(s) of several of the “para-mythological” texts, *mgy* in RS 24.244:67 (*KTU* 1.100) may be a participle, rather than /QTLa/ as T. classifies it.¹²⁰¹

— p. 664 (§75.534). Though his question mark is certainly apropos, T.’s classification of {mgy [...] } in RIH 78/21:10’ (*CAT* 2.80) as 3 m.s. is in fact nothing more than a guess, for the tablet is too fragmentary to allow any inference from the context. The same analysis of the following form cited, {mgy[]} in RS 11.772⁺:3 (*KTU* 3.1), has more going for it, viz., the plausible comparison with Akkadian edicts, but here also the text is so fragmentary that a question mark would have been in order.¹²⁰²

— p. 664 (§75.534). It is not certain that the two tokens of *mgt* in RS 17.434⁺:8, 10 (*KTU* 2.36) are both to be parsed as 2 m.s.: the first may be self reference on the part of the author of the letter.¹²⁰³

— p. 664 (§75.534). T. parses ‘ly in RS 16.402:25 (*KTU* 2.33) as verbal, either /QTLa/ 3 m.s. or an infinitive; he precedes the entry with a question mark but provides no indication that others have seen in those signs the preposition ‘l + 1 c.s. pronoun.¹²⁰⁴

— p. 664 (§75.534). It is altogether unclear why T. proposes that the 3 m.s. /QTLa/ of PHY would be /pahiya/ when appearing alone, but /pahiya/ or /pahaya/ when followed by a pronominal suffix.

— p. 665 (§75.534). Whatever the precise meaning of *mrt* in RS 17.139:30 (*KTU* 2.34:32) may be, it is far from certain that *štt* in the same line is a form of ŠTY, ‘to drink’; ŠT, ‘to put, place, settle’, appears a more plausible candidate (see remark above to p. 266 [§51.45e]).

— pp. 666-67 (§75.536a-b). For a general statement regarding the morphology and morpho-syntax of III-y infinitives, see remark above to pp. 486-87 (§73.523ba-β), etc. Here one is at a loss to explain why examples of both {bk} and {bky}, verbal nouns from BKY, ‘to weep’, are listed in the two sub-sections cited, which are devoted to /qatāl-/ infinitives and to other forms of verbal nouns. As stated above, since at least one datum showing that the infinitive in the syntagmeme *b* + infinitive was of the /qatāl-/ type, it borders on the perverse to place some examples of {bk} and {bky} under /qatāl-/ but other examples of {bky} preceded by the preposition under the heading “Verbalsubstantive (außer MphT {qatāl}),” especially when one token of *b* + *bky* is located just a few lines from the datum just mentioned. I refer to RS 2.003 i 31-32 (*KTU* 1.14) *bm bkyh w yšn // b dm ‘h nhmmt*, ‘As he wept he slept, as he shed tears he slumbered’ (lit., ‘in his weeping he went to sleep, in his shedding tears (there was) slumber’ /bima bakāyihu wa yîšan bi damā ‘ihu nahamāmatu/), which is followed in lines 37-39 by *w yqrb b šāl krt mn^l krt k ybky*, ‘He (‘*Ilu*) came near, asking *Kirta*: Who is *Kirta* that he should weep?’ (lit. ‘he approached in asking *Kirta*...’ /wa yiqrab bi ša’ āli kirta mīna kirta kī yabkiyu/). Another example of the same syntagmeme is

¹²⁰¹Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 202, 217.

¹²⁰²On the reading, restoration, and historical interpretation of this text, see my article in *Semitica* 51 (2001) 5-31.

¹²⁰³In my preliminary study of this text (*AfO* 30 [1983-84] 325), I parsed both forms as does T., but additional reflection has led to the analysis indicated above (*Les textes épistolaires*, in preparation).

¹²⁰⁴E.g., Pardee, *AfO* 31 (1984) 216, 229.

found near the beginning of the next column that shows a contracted form (*b bk krt // b dm^c n^cmn ġlm il*), but, as was observed above (remark to pp. 486-87 [§73.523b α - β], etc.), it would have been necessary to prove that the contraction of /qatl/qitl/qutl/ was more likely than that of /qatāl/ to make of the former the preferable reconstruction.

— p. 669 (§75.537d), p. 693 (§76.345). T. parses *ykly* in RS 3.367 iv 27' (*KTU* 1.2) as a simple long form (/YQTLu/. If that analysis is correct, the form may express iteration, inception and continuation of action, or simply reflect the non-systematic use of /YQTLØ/ and /YQTLu/ forms in poetry. One may also consider the possibility, however, that behind this writing is a /YQTLa/ form expressing an indirect volitive, i.e., ‘with the intention of ...’. The problem is reflective of the general difficulty in determining the precise morphology of a given form or sequence of forms: here there is no way of knowing whether the first two verbs in the sequence are /YQTLØ/ or /YQTLu/ (and, one might add, there is not even certainty that {ykly} does not represent historical writing of a {YQTLØ} form). The possibility being aired in this remark is that the sequence was /yaquṭ ... yašit ... yakalliya/, ‘he grabbed ... he dismembered ... he intended to finish off’.¹²⁰⁵

— p. 669 (§75.537d), p. 686 (§76.323). T. translates *k ġz ġzm tdbṛ w ġrm tṭwy* in RS 3.325+ vi 31-32 and 43-44 (*KTU* 1.16) as “Wenn Angreifer angreifen, weichst du zurück; und Räuber veranlaßt du zum Bleiben/nimmst du gastlich auf” (p. 686), allowing two possible meanings for the D-stem of *TWY*. Since the accusation is of improper conduct, the stronger of the two interpretations is surely preferable.¹²⁰⁶ This fits the semantics of *TWY* which in the G-stem means ‘to be a guest’ or, transitively, ‘to provide a guest with something’ (see remarks above to p. 110 [§32.144.12b], etc., to p. 211 [§41.12], etc., and to p. 595 [§74.623]), and which should be factitive in the D-stem, ‘to take in a person as a guest’.

— p. 669 (§75.537d). On the analysis of {nṭ^cy} in RS 1.002:24', 32', 41' (*KTU* 1.40) as 3 m.s. N-stem /QTLa/,¹²⁰⁷ rather than as 1 c.pl. D-stem /YQTL/ as T. parses here, see above, remark to pp. 211-13 (§41.13), etc. T. does not consider worthy of mention the alternative interpretation, which has been preferred by various scholars at least since 1949.¹²⁰⁸

¹²⁰⁵On p. 693, T. classifies this verse as an example of “Inzidensschema,” defined as “eine Gleichzeitkeitsrelation von SVen [Sachverhalten]” (see remark below to this section). My translation reflected an emphasis on inception of action: “Ba‘lu grabs Yanmu and sets about dismembering (him), sets about finishing Ruler Naharu off” (*Context I* [1997] 249); cf. Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 10-12: “Ba‘lu se met à traîner *Yammu*, commence à le dépecer, à achever Chef *Naharu*” (in agreement with T., all three verbs are vocalized as /YQTLu/ forms). In context, the point of the imperfectives would be that this verse does not describe the complete demise of *Yammu* but the inception of the process, though the nuance of *ykly* may be iteration.

¹²⁰⁶My gloss “detain,” which was based directly on the Arabic lexicon, and my analysis of the verbal forms as plural (*Context I* [1997] 342) both now appear unfortunate to me (the long form plural of the first verb would have been written with {-n}).

¹²⁰⁷Pardee, *Leslau* (1991) 1185, 1187; idem *Les textes rituels* (2000) 125-27; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 82-83.

¹²⁰⁸Bibliography in idem, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 125 nn. 141, 142.

— p. 670 (§75.537d). Why should *ykly* in RS 24.277:8' (*KTU* 1.127) be D-passive and mean “vollendet werden” rather than D-active, with the meaning ‘to consume’?¹²⁰⁹

— p. 670 (§75.537f), p. 694 (§76.347), p. 710 (§76.524.42). On p. 670 *tššqy* in RS 2.[004] v 29' (*KTU* 1.17) is explicitly parsed as /YQTLu/, on p. 694 it is included among examples of /YQTLu/ following the adverb *āpnk*, whereas on p. 710 it is included among examples of /YQTLØ/ as response to a preceding imperative.

— p. 671 (§75.538). T. follows *KTU* in reading *tkl* in RS 3.427:7' (*KTU* 2.1), which he takes as a possible form of KLY, ‘to deplete’. The first sign is, however, probably {ā}, as the first editor proposed¹²¹⁰ and as has been accepted by the authors of *CAT*. (The reading {ʾākl} was indicated in the transcription that I made available to both the editors of *CAT* before that work appeared and to T. before this grammar appeared.) Only the first few signs at the beginnings of eight lines of this text are preserved, however, and no interpretation is possible.

— p. 671 (§75.539). The representation of the proto-form of the m.s. impv. of the root PHY, ‘to see’, as “*phiy*” can only be an error for ‘*phay*’, for here and above the verb is regularly treated as /(yi)qta/.

— p. 672 (§75.61b). Regarding geminate roots, T. states a bit more positively than the data allow that “Im Grundstamm herrscht bei formen mit vokalischer Endung (nach dem dritten Radikal) immer die schwache Bildungsweise vor, z.B. PK^L 3.m.sg. *ysb* = /yasubbu/, SK 3m.sg. *sb* = /sabba/, SK 3.f.sg. *sbt* = /sabbat/.” The first two forms are attested as cited, though the analysis and hence the vocalization of the second are not certain (see below), while the third is not attested for the root SBB. As is well known, Hebrew tends to show bi- and trisyllabic third-person forms for active roots where the base was /qalala/, as in *sābab*, ‘he surrounded’, *sāb^abū*, ‘they surrounded’, but mono- and dissyllabic forms for stative roots where the base was /qalila/qalula/, as in *tam*, ‘he is/was mature’ (i.e., /tamima/tamuma/ → /tamma/ → /tamm/ → /tam/ by the standard rules of development from proto-Hebrew to Biblical Hebrew), *tāmmū*, ‘they were/are mature.’ Only the latter stem-form is used in the second and third persons, where for both types there is a linking vowel between the verbal stem and the pronominal element, as in *sabbōtā* and *tammōtā*. When one checks T.’s list of /QTLa/ forms, one discovers that the certain third-person forms are either stative or may be passive forms of transitive roots.¹²¹¹ The latter is very likely the case of *rš* in RS 2.[003]⁺ i 12 (*KTU* 1.14), as most commentators have seen, and may well be the case of *sb* in RS 2.[008]⁺ vi 34 (*KTU* 1.4) as well (on these two forms, see remark below to p. 676 [§75.64]). According to T.’s reconstruction of the G-passive /QTLa/, viz., /qutila/, as in Arabic, the geminate forms might be expected to have behaved as /qalila/ statives did in proto-Hebrew, hence to have become /qulla/ in the G-passive and to be written {ql}. For

¹²⁰⁹Bibliographical discussion in *ibid.*, pp. 719-20.

¹²¹⁰Virolleaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 343-44.

¹²¹¹*nd* in RS 3.362⁺ iii 16' (*KTU* 1.10) and *ndt* in RS 3.340 i 26 (*KTU* 1.18) would make T.’s point nicely if his interpretation and, in the second case, the reading were certain. T. takes them, respectively, as 3 m.s. and 3 f.s. /QTLa/ from the root NDD, ‘to flee’, but the texts are too damaged to bear the burden of establishing the morphology of an entire category of verbs.

reasons that are unclear, what might be considered a clear case of a transitive verb which cannot be taken as a passive and which is written with only one token of the second consonant is omitted from T.'s list of /QTLa/ forms. I refer to *šl* in RS 19.011:6 (*KTU* 2.61), which T. parses below as /QTLa/ but for which he never proposes an etymology (see remark to p. 702 [§76.521.1], etc).

— p. 673 (§75.62). T. confidently analyses both tokens of *ybd*, 'he chants' (RS 2.[014]⁺ i 18 [*KTU* 1.3] and RS 2.[004] vi 31' [*KTU* 1.17]), as /YQTLu/ forms. The latter parsing is apparently extrapolated from the III-y form *yšqynh* that appears asyndetically just before *ybd*, but no such indicator is present in the context of the first example. It is likely that the long forms in RS 2.[004] reflect the fact that they appear in a series of clauses introduced by *k*, 'when', that express the recurring events associated with the annual resurrection of *Ba'lu* and the promise that 'Aqhatu may enjoy an immortality like *Ba'lu*'s. *yšqynh* also appears in RS 2.[014]⁺ i, but several lines away and separated from *ybd* by III-weak verbal forms that do not show the third radical (*tphnh* in line 14 and *t'n* in line 15). The case for *ybd* here being /YQTLØ/ is thus weaker here.¹²¹²

— p. 673 (§75.62). Above, p. 659 (§75.532), T. parsed *tbk* in RS 3.325⁺ i 30 (*KTU* 1.16) as a /YQTLØ/ form. Here he analyzes the immediately following form *tdm* as either /YQTLØ/ or /YQTLa/. Because the verbs express sequentially two future acts of a feminine protagonist that are desired by the speaker (as all recent interpreters have seen), the two are plausibly identical, probably jussives. T.'s openness in admitting the possibility that *tdm* may be a /YQTLa/ volitive is commendable, but this analysis would imply that *tbk* is probably the same, something that T. would not wish to admit but that cannot be ruled out, given the irregularity of triphthong contraction as represented in writing.

— p. 673 (§75.62a). With no sign of doubt, T. analyzes {yhr} in RS 24.647:4' (*KTU* 1.151) as 3 m.s. /YQTL/ from HRR. I can find nothing, however, in the very damaged context to allow for so definite an identification of these signs.

— p. 673 (§75.62a), pp. 672-73 (§75.61c), p. 675 (§§75.63-64), cf. p. 680 (§75.72a). These are the sections in which T. assumes the existence of a root MRR which in the G-stem would mean 'drive out' (see remarks above to p. 333 [§54.423d], etc., p. 500 [§73.611.2d], etc., and to p. 601 [§74.626.3b], etc.) and another root MRR which in the G-stem would mean 'strengthen, bless' (see above, to p. 540 [§74.35], etc.). I once myself accepted this etymology of the forms *āmr* and *mr*, the latter form associated with the name *āymr*, in the mythological text RS 3.367 iv 2', 19' (*KTU* 1.2).¹²¹³ But further study has convinced me that this interpretation does not square with the Arabic verb usually cited as etymological support, for Arabic *marra* is an intransitive verb of movement. If that root is represented in Ugaritic,

¹²¹²I once vocalized all /YQTL/ forms in this passage as /YQTLØ/ (*Trial Cut* [1988] 2), but that was more out of desperation than based on a comprehensive theory of the verbal system in Ugaritic poetry. I also vocalized *yšqynh* as /yašqiyannahu/, viz., as Energetic I; given the uncertainties surrounding the forms and functions of the energetic forms in Ugaritic (see above, remarks to pp. 497-506 [§73.6]), one must consider the possibility that the {y} in that form is present owing to the linking of energetic form and pronominal suffix rather than being a /YQTLu/ indicative.

¹²¹³*Context I* (1997) 249 n. 61.

it is in the reduplicated form MRMR attested in RS 92.2014:2 (RSO XIV 52), which was discussed above in a remark to p. 333 (§54.423d), etc.. On the other hand, Arabic does show a III-y root that functions transitively, and the forms in RS 3.367 could just as well be derived from such a root as from a geminate root:

(19') <i>šmk . ʾt . ʾymr</i>	You, your name is 'Ayamiri;	<i>šumuka ʾatta ʾāyamiri</i>
<i>ʾymr . mr . ym .</i>	O 'Ayamiri, expel Yammu,	<i>ʾāyamiri miri yamma</i>
<i>mr . ym</i> (20') <i>l kših .</i>	expel Yammu from his throne,	<i>miri yamma lê kussa ʾihu</i>
<i>nhr l kḥt . drkth .</i>	Naharu from his sovereign seat.	<i>nahara lê kaḥti darkatihu</i>

The forms containing MR(R) that have caused so much controversy are thus plausibly explained as follows:

MRY 'to drive out' (in the passages just mentioned);¹²¹⁴

MR (← *MYR) 'to bless (concretely)' (see above, remark to p. 540 [§74.35], etc.);

MRR 'to be bitter'; ŠMRR 'bitterness, venom', the latter derived from the unattested finite verbal form ŠMRR 'to cause bitterness' (see remark above to p. 601 [§74.626.3b], etc.).

MRR 'to pass (intransitively)', attested in the factitive form MRMR 'to make move back and forth' (see remark above to p. 333 [§54.423d], etc.).

— p. 674 (§75.62a). T. derives *tšr* in RS 2.[003]⁺ iii 29 and vi 10 (*KTU* 1.14) from the root ŠRR, which he translates "einschließen, belagern." Comparing the Ugaritic datum with other West-Semitic languages, most commentators would say that the geminate root would have had the less military connotations of 'harass, vex', that it was the hollow root that would have had the specific connotation of 'besieging'.¹²¹⁵

— p. 675 (§75.63). Though the case of ḤTT, 'to be desolate, in a shattered state', is more ambiguous than that of ḤNN (see remark above to p. 220 [§41.221.2], etc.), one must nevertheless reject T.'s vocalization of the imperative form *ḥt* as /ḥutt-/. The structural reason here is the opposite of the case of ḤNN: the latter verb is transitive, but ḤTT is stative. The imperfect paradigm in Biblical Hebrew reflects this fact with no exceptions, for the base is always /*yihatt-/. Here it is the imperative that creates the ambiguity, for it is only attested in one verse of the Hebrew Bible (Isa. 8:9), but there it is repeated three times, each time vocalized by the Massoretes as /ḥōttūw/ (i.e., with *holem* as the first vowel). Given the semantics of the root and the unambiguous testimony of the imperfect forms, this is in all likelihood to be understood as an error for /ḥāttūw/ (i.e., the first vowel should have been *qameš* according to Massoretic norms—historical /a/ in a closed accented syllable can become /ā/). Whatever the proper explanation of the Hebrew form may be, unless T. wishes to propound a theory explaining why some geminate roots would have had different stem vowels in the G-imperative and /YQTL/, thereby going against the standard pattern in Semitic, he must reconstruct the stative form in Ugaritic with /a/ rather than /u/.

— p. 675 (§75.64). With no sign of doubt, T. parses {...}ḥtt in RS 3.367 iv 1' (*KTU* 1.2) as 3 f.s. or 1 c.s. G-stem /QTLa/ of the root ḤTT, 'to be desolate, in a shattered state'. As we have seen to be the case, however, with the following signs ({mtt[...]}—see remark above

¹²¹⁴Obermann, *JAOS* 67 (1947) 203, n. 31; Smith, *Baal Cycle* (1994) 343.

¹²¹⁵E.g., Wyatt, *Religious Texts* (1998) 195 note 92.

to p. 642 [§75.521c], etc.) the break means that any specific analysis is nothing but a guess. No indication is provided for why the preferred analysis of this form is 3 f.s. whereas the only analysis offered for the other was as 1 c.s.

— p. 676 (§75.64), p. 713 (§76.525). In my general remark above on the reconstruction of the /QTLa/ of geminate roots, two forms were mentioned as constituting possible examples of 3 m.s. active forms of geminate roots that show the /qalla/ pattern rather than /qalala/, *sb* in RS 2.[008]⁺ vi 34 (*KTU* 1.4) and *rš* in RS 2.[003]⁺ i 12 (*KTU* 1.14). T.'s interpretation of the latter is highly novel in the context of Ugaritic scholarship and may not be considered literarily acceptable. The text reads *krt ḥtkn rš // krt grdš mknt*. T. translates “Keret hatte die Herrschaft zerschlagen; Keret hatte die Machtstellung zerbrochen” (p. 676) and “Keret hatte (selbst) der Herrschaft zerschlagen, Keret hatte (selbst) die Stellung zerbrochen” (p. 713), taking *ḥtkn* and *mknt* as direct objects of the two verbs. On p. 676, he comments “d.h. Keret hat selbst sein Königtum verspielt” and this view of things is worked into the translation on p. 713. Analyzing the verbs as passive, the two nouns as adverbial accusatives, and *Kirta* as subject, however, is just as plausible and avoids the idea that *Kirta* had gone about destroying his own household, a notion that is nowhere else expressed in the text, indeed that is belied by the following account of how his attempts to gain offspring were thwarted by other agencies. The literal translation would be: ‘*Kirta*, as regards the family, he was crushed // *Kirta* was destroyed, as regards the home’.¹²¹⁶ As for *sb*, T. claims on p. 534 (§74.32) that it is stative in the passage cited (*sb ksp l rqm // ḥrš nsb l lbnt*, “Das Silber war zu Platten geworden; das Gold hatte sich zu Ziegeln verwandelt”—identical translation p. 713). If such be the case, one must assume either that Ugaritic, like Arabic, could express a single verbal root as active /qatala/ and as stative /qatila/ or that the root SBB showed a semantic makeup in Ugaritic that was different from that of the same root in Hebrew, where the verb belongs to the class of active verbs that express both a form of movement and transitivity with regard to where the movement is exercised. Thus SBB means both ‘to perform a circuit’ and transitively ‘to go around (an entity)’,¹²¹⁷ and ‘BR means both ‘to perform a passage’ and transitively ‘to pass through (an entity)’; of these two examples, both take complements marked by the definite direct object marker *’et* in the G-stem and the N-stem is attested for both, the function of the latter being either middle or passive. In the Ugaritic passage in question, the G-stem form could be active (‘the silver turned to plaques’) or it could be passive (‘the silver was turned into plaques’) while the N-stem *nsb* could be either middle (‘the silver became bricks’) or also passive. This single form *sb* is not, therefore, sufficient to demonstrate that proto-Ugaritic /qalala/ forms had become /qalla/ in Ugaritic. That conclusion or its refutation must await the discovery of unambiguous data (on

¹²¹⁶Most translators have avoided so literal a translation, including myself: “*Kirta*—(his) family was crushed, *Kirta*—(his) home was destroyed” (*Context* I [1997] 333; cf. Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* [2004] II 19). But T.’s way of dealing with the absence of gender concord of *grdš* with *mknt* is not the only one available.

¹²¹⁷One may conclude that the semantic range of the verb was similar in Ugaritic on the basis of sentences like *ysb pālth bšql yph b pālth*, ‘he went around his cracked fields, he saw something green in the cracked fields’ (RS 3.322⁺ ii 12-13 [*KTU* 1.19]), where SBB + *pālth* is zero marked whereas PHY + *pālth* requires the preposition *b*.

the problem posed by *šl* in RS 19.011:6 [*KTU* 2.61], see remark below to p. 702 [§76.521.1], etc.).

— p. 676 (§75.64). T. parses ‘*z* in RS 3.367 iv 17’ (*KTU* 1.2) as a certain example of the G-stem /QTLa/. Because all the other narrative verb forms in this passage are /YQTLØ/ perfectives, with no example of the /QTLa/-perfective,¹²¹⁸ it appears just as likely that ‘*z* was the stative verbal adjective, in this context /‘*azzu*’¹²¹⁹ rather than /‘*azza*/. The form is followed immediately by one of the /YQTLØ/ forms (‘*z ym l ymk*, ‘*Yammu* is strong, he does not collapse’), and the use of the verbal adjective, which bears no aspect marking, in such a sequence might have been considered more appropriate to express *Yammu*’s power than a form marked for perfectivity. Judging from T.’s grouping this passage together with a similar sequence from *Ba‘lu*’s battle with *Môtu* (RS 2.[009]+ vi 17-20 [*KTU* 1.6]), his parsing of the form in RS 3.367 appears to have been based in part on the fact that the culmination of the other battle is expressed by the phrase *mt ql b l ql*, ‘*Môtu* falls, *Ba‘lu* falls’, structurally parallel to ‘*z mt z b l*, ‘*Môtu* is strong, *Ba‘lu* is strong’, repeated three times in the preceding lines. That parallelism does not appear, however, to be a sufficient criterion, for *ql* is a verb of movement, hence fientive rather than stative.

— p. 676 (§75.65). No stative verbal adjective is listed under “Formen des G-Partizips” of geminate roots. This is in keeping with T.’s standard practice of not classifying this adjective with the other verbal adjectives (see above, remark to pp. 471-77 [§§73.4-73.427]). In the case of the geminate roots, however, it would have been essential to separate the stative verbal adjectives from the active and passive ones, because they were written differently: /*gāzizu*/, ‘shearer’, /*barūru*/, ‘purified’, but /*rabbu*/, ‘great’, ← /**rabibu*/ or /**rabubu*/).¹²²⁰ Above, at /*qall*/ base substantive from geminate roots (p. 253 [§51.41a]), T. lists only nouns, no adjectives; at /*qatil*/ and /*qatul*/ base substantives (pp. 258-59 [§51.42c,d]), he lists both nouns and adjectives but no forms derived from geminate roots. Thus what was almost certainly an important grammatical category (/*qall*/ stative adjectives are common across the board in the Semitic languages and, as stated in the remark to pp. 471-77, /*qatil*/ *qatul*/ stative adjectives were apparently productive in proto-Northwest Semitic) has slipped entirely through T.’s fingers. This blind spot appears also to have been instrumental in leading T. to categorize certain /*qall*-/ forms as /QTLa/ when they may in fact have been verbal adjectives (see preceding remarks to various forms that T. has identified as /QTLa/).

— p. 679 (§75.7). T.’s argument that the transformation of bi- or triconsonantal roots into quadriconsonantal stems by reduplication of one of the radicals was no longer productive is

¹²¹⁸The last certain /QTLa/ form in the narrative was in line 6, in the formulaic phrase [*b*] *ph rgm l yšà*, ‘the word had hardly left his mouth’.

¹²¹⁹Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 12.

¹²²⁰The analysis of *zb*, ‘it foams’, in RS 92.2014:1 (RSO XIV 52) as a stative verbal adjective (/*zabbu*/) might be preferable to the analysis as a /QTLa/ form that I proposed in my preliminary edition of this text (*Les textes rituels* [2000] 830-31); the adjectival interpretation is preferred in Bordreuil and Pardee, *ibid.*, p. 69. This analysis avoids seeing the particle *û* that precedes this verb as having the ‘consecutive’ function that I proposed in my preliminary study (on the unlikelihood that this particle has the meaning ‘Woe!’, see above, note 741).

based solely on the rarity of the patterns in Ugaritic. Because such forms are attested in all the West-Semitic languages and because the etymological underpinnings of many forms are relatively clear, it appears improper to argue directly from rarity to non-productivity and from there to lexicalization of such forms as quadriconsonantals (“Verben mit vier Radikalen”). His two other arguments are of no more value, viz., that the reduplication patterns “keinem einheitlichen Muster folgen” and that the underlying roots are not attested in Ugaritic. Taking the second argument to its logical conclusion would mean that any Ugaritic verbal form for which the G-stem and derived nouns are not attested must be classified as having lexicalized in Ugaritic in whatever form is attested. Cross-Semitically, the various reduplication patterns do not follow simple or unified patterns; in Biblical Hebrew alone, where the corpus is small but larger than that of Ugaritic, one finds a similar spread of forms derived from both strong and weak roots. And T.’s claim that none of the cited forms is attested as a “Grundwurzel” in Ugaritic is directly related to his perception of what constitutes a root: he admits that *qtqt* and *mrmr* are related to what are probably geminate roots in Ugaritic, but what he wants is the ‘original’ biconsonantal ‘root’—too much to ask for judging from the corresponding Arabic forms (/QLQL/ forms are often derived from geminate roots in Arabic lexicography). He sees one case of a form /QLQL/ that would be related to a hollow root (see second following remark). One could perhaps argue for Hebrew as well that the corresponding forms were no longer productive, but moving them on that basis from the category of derived verbal stems to that of quadriconsonantal roots borders on the nonsensical. Does the relative rarity of occurrence of these verbal forms make them so different from, say, nouns produced by prefixing of /m-/ (most of which go back to some proto-stage of the language in question, many clearly to proto-Semitic), that we must classify the former as quadriconsonantal but the latter as bi- or triconsonantal with a prefixed morpheme?

— p. 680 (§75.72a). T. proposes that the vowel of the prefixed syllable in the /YQTL/ of the reduplicated stems would be /u/ “analog D/Š-PK.” If, however, the vowel was not /u/ in this syllable in either the D-stem or the Š-stem, and such was certainly not the case of the 1 c.s. (see above, general remark on vocalization and remarks to pp. 544-46 [§74.412.1-16] and to pp. 587-88 [§74.622.1]), then there is no analogy.

— p. 680 (§75.72a). T. takes the signs {tgrgr} in RS 2.002:66 (*KTU* 1.23) as a single word, viz., the verbal ‘root’ GRGR which would be comparable (“vgl.”) to the common Semitic root G(W)R, ‘to dwell (somewhere as an alien)’. Neither this derivation nor T.’s interpretation thereof (“als Fremde(r) wohnen,” viz. as an intensive of the G-stem) is implausible, but he might have mentioned the possibility of dividing the signs into two forms of the G-stem, the jussive followed by the imperative:¹²²¹

<i>tm . tgr</i>	There you must dwell as resident aliens,	<i>ṭamma tagūrū</i>
<i>gr . l ābnm .</i>	dwell among the rocks,	<i>gūrū lê ’abanīma</i>
<i>w l . ’šm .</i>	and among the trees.	<i>wa lê ’iṣīma</i>

¹²²¹It is fair to say that the use of the word-divider in this text does not show sufficient consistency to give any weight to its absence here (i.e., after {tgr} according to the lexical/grammatical division that I am proposing) for the correct division of the signs.

This is opposed to two other possible poetic divisions, viz., as a bicolon

tm . tgrgr . l ābnm . // w l . šm

or as a tricolon

tm . tgrgr . // l ābnm . // w l . šm.

— p. 680 (§75.73). T. takes *šhrrt* in RS 2.002:41, 45, 48 (*KTU* 1.23) as intransitive, which now appears to me to be correct (see remark above to p. 584 [§74.522b], etc., in particular note 1056).

— p. 681 (§75.74b). On the necessity of taking *grdš* in RS 2.[003]⁺ i 11, 23 (*KTU* 1.14) as passive, rather than active as T. parses it here, see remark above to p. 676 (§75.64) on *rš* // *grdš* in this passage.

— p. 681 (§75.75). It is unclear to me why T. classifies *pršā* in RS 2.[008]⁺ i 35' (*KTU* 1.4) with “Vierradikalige Verben anderer Struktur” for he only presents two options of interpretation: (1) the root is PRŠ', in which case the form belongs to §75.74, quadriconsonantals with /r/l/ as second consonant; (2) the root is PRŠ and the {ā} is a *mater lectionis* for the final /-a/ of the 3 m.s. /QTLa/ form (on this analysis, see T., p. 51 [§21.341.12]).

— pp. 682-718 (§76). T. has done more in this section to come to terms with the Ugaritic verbal system(s) than has anyone before and any criticisms voiced here and below must be taken in that context. Most basically, I agree fully with T.'s basic position that the Ugaritic verbal system was aspectual in nature and believe that this approach to explaining the variety of forms that one encounters is the only one that has any chance of succeeding. First, one relatively minor qualification: I believe strongly that it is necessary to see the marking of aspect as limited to the finite forms. On p. 718 (§76.6), T. observes that “Bei nominalen Kategorien ... läßt sich keine einheitliche aspektuell-temporale Funktion feststellen,” but then he goes on to claim that the G-stem active participle “ist imperfektiv ausgerichtet,” while the G-stem /qatāl-/ infinitive “ist demgegenüber offenbar perfektiv ausgerichtet.” Such formulations are, to the extent that they correspond at all to linguistic reality, open to misunderstanding and it is preferable to say simply that all verbal adjectives and nouns of all the verbal stems were unmarked for aspect and any aspectual or temporal translation value is derived from context.¹²²² One major criticism of the introductory sections (pp. 682-84

¹²²²Pardee, *Semitic Languages* (1997) 138; idem, *Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (2004) 303-4, 307-8. I also believe that there is a basis for disagreeing with T.'s derivation, in his study of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system, of the perfective-aspect form /QTLa/ from a proto-Semitic /qatil/qatul/qatal/ perfective form (best known in Akkadian, where the predominate form was /qatil/— see Tropper, *ZAH* 11 [1998] 153-90). It appears to me that a case could be made for the Akkadian, and hence the proto-Semitic, form being unmarked for both aspect and tense, that is, as an adjectival form, it did not express aspect. Thus, in Akkadian, the attachment of pronominal elements to adjectives and nouns (*maršāku*, ‘I am sick’ ≈ *šarrāku*, ‘I am king’) was only the first step towards what became in West Semitic one of only two forms expressive of aspect. The fundamental difference between the two systems is revealed by the fact that the pronominal elements could no longer be attached to nouns in West Semitic. If this perspective be admitted, one could argue that, as the Hebrew /wayyiqṭōl/ form retains an old perfective function from proto-West-Semitic /YQTLØ/, so /w^oqātal/ retains an old proto-West-Semitic non-aspectual function of /QTLa/ that has secondarily taken on an imperfective function by grammaticalization in Hebrew. T. D. Anderson's approach along similar lines (“The Evolution of the Hebrew Verbal System,” *ZAH* 13 [2000] 1-66) is far more sophisticated than either T.'s or mine, for he proposes tense/aspectual marking for all forms at all periods. I

[§§76.1-2]),¹²²³ and of the following presentation of the imperfective and the perfective aspects is that T. makes no explicit statement here in his introduction to the effect that the verbal systems of prose and poetry differed in one major respect: there is not a single certain instance of the use of the /YQTLØ/ form to express perfective aspect in prose (though there may be some rare cases of that pattern when preceded by *w*, viz., what became the systematic ‘*wāw*-consecutive’ form of Biblical Hebrew). Thus the language of every-day expression at Ugarit in the thirteenth century had already evolved from an early West-Semitic one in which /YQTLØ/ was regularly used to express acts viewed as complete and to express the jussive and in which /QTL_a/ functioned, as in Akkadian, as an adjective marked for person, to one where imperfectivity was marked by /YQTL_u/, perfectivity by /QTL_a/ whereas /YQTLØ/ was reserved primarily for the expression of volitivity. This being the case, T.’s valiant effort at providing a linguistically valid explanation for the distribution of the /YQTLØ/ and /YQTL_u/ forms (see following remark) is in fact an attempt to deal with the apparent inconsistent use of these forms in poetry—there are virtually no such problems in prose. Anyone who knows the texts will pick this fact up from the texts that are cited; but a grammar such as this will be consulted by people who do not know the texts and who may not know that “[*KTU/CAT*] 1.23” and “[*KTU/CAT*] 1.114,” for example, are poetic, while “[*KTU/CAT*] 1.41” and “[*KTU/CAT*] 1.116,” for example, are in prose. T. does not make clear his views on the absence of /YQTLØ/ perfectives in prose until the introduction to §76.4 and nowhere does he outline his views on the verbal system in use in prose.¹²²⁴ Surely it is not enough in a grammar with the pretensions to theoretical and empirical exhaustiveness of this one just to say that one of the major forms visible in poetry is not present in prose. Another major criticism: in §76.13 (pp. 682-83), T. points out correctly that verbal systems are not usually marked only for tense or only for aspect, but express both in varying ways. He never addresses, however, the issue of the simplicity of the archaic West-Semitic verbal systems, viz., the fact that they have only two finite forms. That being the case, they do not have the luxury visible in the Slavic languages, in Greek, or even in Akkadian or in Syriac (in its secondary development of a verbal system expressive

wonder, however, if considering that the proto-West-Semitic nominal forms were not specifically marked for either tense or aspect is not a better solution.

¹²²³Another criticism would apply to the following section (§77), which treats the “Modalsystem.” Because, as T. himself recognizes (p. 719 [§77.21]), the expression of mode is limited in the West-Semitic languages to the /YQTL/ system, the modes should be presented as a sub-set of the aspectual system, rather than as a separate category (cf. Pardee, *Semitic Languages*, §2.6.5; idem, *Encyclopedia of the World’s Ancient Languages* (2004) 304-5).

¹²²⁴On p. 696, T. does claim that if narrative prose were attested in Ugaritic, we might find that the /YQTLØ/ form was used more extensively in prose than we now know to be the case. He cites as a basis for this hypothesis, the prevalence of /wayYQTLØ/ in Hebrew narrative prose. One must object that the form is also common in Hebrew direct speech, as attested both in the Bible and in the extra-biblical inscriptions in the Judaeen dialect, whereas such forms are extremely rare in Ugaritic prose, if attested at all. /wayYQTLØ/ clearly belongs to the verbal system used in Hebrew prose and is not genre-dependent (or, more precisely, it was used in both strata of the language but its use was systematized in prose in a way that is more easily identifiable than is the poetic usage) and one might expect the non-use of /YQTLØ/ in Ugaritic prose also to have been systematic.

of tense), where a more complicated verbal system permits certain forms to specialize in the expression of aspect, others in the expression of tense. From the perspective of grammatical marking, it appears necessary to hold that the two finite forms of the archaic West-Semitic verbal systems express aspect *not* tense; the latter is not in the purview of the verbal system and is only expressed to the extent that real-world temporal relationships fit the aspectual system. As we shall see in the next remark, T. organizes his presentation in terms of how the system expresses tense, when he might have done better to organize it in terms of what the aspectual system was expressing, i.e., the various categories of ‘completion’ and ‘incompletion’.

— pp. 684-701 (§§76.3-4). The following types of explanations for the apparently inconsistent uses of /YQTLu/ vs. /YQTLØ/ may be evoked: (1) aspectual variation that appears non-intuitive to the modern reader; (2) ‘historical writing’ (III-y roots, viz. {y‘ny} = either /ya‘niyu/, ‘he answers’, or /ya‘ni/, ‘he answered’); (3) enclitic-{y} (III-y roots, viz., {y‘ny} = either /ya‘niyu/, ‘he answers, or /ya‘ni + ya/, ‘he answered’); (4) enclitic-{n} (2 f.s., duals, and plurals, viz. {tqtlñ}, for example, = either /taqtulūna/, ‘they answer’, or /taqtulū + na/, ‘they answered’), or, most radically; (5) there was no true ‘system’ in narrative poetry, that is, the proto-Ugaritic verbal system in which /YQTLØ/ and /YQTLu/ expressed opposite aspects was no longer understood and the forms were used ‘stylistically’ rather than according to a grammatical ‘system’ in poetry. Attenuated forms of this last hypothesis would say (a) that the Ugaritic poets knew the archaic dialect and played on the forms ‘stylistically’ (T. sometimes resorts to this mode of explanation—see remark below to p. 689 [§76.342]) or (b) they knew the dialect but made an occasional error or (c) they no longer knew the archaic dialect but had passed the poems down orally from generation to generation and an occasional ‘incorrect’ form had slipped into the tradition.¹²²⁵ (It should be noted that, unless one be willing to admit the existence of quiescence and accompanying use of /’/ as a *mater lectionis*, the explanation by historical writings will not solve the problems of III-’ roots, viz., {yšū} in RS 2.[003]⁺ ii 46 [KTU 1.14] vs. {yši} in the following line.) As regards T.’s general approach, it should be noted that he attempts in these sections to classify the verbal forms in poetry, whether part of the narrative or in direct speech embedded in the narrative, according to whether a given form in fact occurs in a real-world time frame of ‘present/future’ (“Gegenwart”/“Zukunft”) or ‘past’ (“Vergangenheit”). Four comments/questions are in order: (1) one encounters many fewer problems in direct speech than in the surrounding narrative; (2) Why were temporal categories chosen as the organizing principle for a language

¹²²⁵Cf. Pardee, *Encyclopedia of the World’s Ancient Languages* (2004) 303. Such permutations in poetry are, of course, linked to the question of oral poetry in antiquity: did the ancient poet reinvent the poem every time it was told (in which case he had to ‘know’ the dialect) or did he only repeat a poem learned by heart (in which case he would not need to ‘know’ the dialect and his own language might interfere with that of the poem learned by heart)? An analogy for the first situation may be found in modern American religious circles: in conservative denominations where the King James version is venerated, some members are capable of extemporaneously producing long prayers in which the conventions of seventeenth-century English are reproduced reasonably well. Most such persons will have had no formal training in that dialect of English and will have learned to pray in it by imitating their predecessors and from long exposure to the King James version itself.

admitted to be primarily aspectual?; (3) Are temporal categories appropriate for reflecting the linguistic structure of poetic narrative?;¹²²⁶ (4) It is clear from several of the examples cited below that by “Gegenwart” T. is referring to the German present tense as a translational representation of Ugaritic forms, not as a true tense opposed to ‘past’ and ‘future’: this becomes obvious from his classification of some such forms as ‘gnomic’ or from his inclusion of the prose example *il mšrm dt tgrn npš špš mlk*, ‘the gods of Egypt who guard the life of the Sun, the king’ (RS 16.078:22-23 [KTU 2.23])—they do not do this presently but permanently. Some of these questions/problems could have been answered/solved by rigorously separating prose from poetry and, in poetry, direct speech from narrative. The basic presentation might have better served the Ugaritic language by being organized according to aspectual expression rather than to temporal categories, which function here as much as a translational device as one for grammatical categorization. (I noticed more categorization by translational categories in these sections than anywhere to this point in the grammar, e.g., §77.5 “Die modalen Nuancen ‘müssen’, ‘dürfen’ and ‘können’”—it is well known from Hebrew, for example, that the ‘indicative imperfect’ can be used to express a weaker form of volition than the imperative or the jussive and this usage should have been separated out from others that may have similar translation values.¹²²⁷)

— p. 685 (§76.321). T. cites *ārḥ tzg l ‘glh bn ḥpt l ūmhthm k tnḥn ūdmm* (RS 3.343+ i 5'-7' [KTU 1.15]) as his very first example of the “PK^L für Sachverhalt der Gegenwart,” which in this case is said to be “PK^L in sprichwörterhafter [gnomischer] Funktion,” but he does not say to which of the two verbs in the passage the analysis applies. He translates “(Wie) eine Kuh nach ihrem Kalb ruft, (wie) Jungtiere, die sich verlaufen haben, nach ihren Müttern (rufen), (genau) so klagen die Udumäer (um die Prinzessin *Hry*).” *tzg* is the only verb in the proverbial section and its marking as a ‘long’ or as a ‘short’ form is, at best, ambiguous; elsewhere T. analyzes it as one of his /YQTLu/ forms from a III-*w* root,¹²²⁸ but only the

¹²²⁶That T. is not unaware of this issue is revealed by his comment on the use of the imperfective in introductions to direct speech: “Erzähltechnisch werden durch den Gebrauch der PK^L wörtliche Reden aus dem Erzählfluß hervorgehoben, wodurch die Erzählung als Ganze lebendiger gestaltet wird” (p. 695 [§76.348]). On the other hand, on p. 696 (§76.412), he explicitly rejects the hypothesis that Ugaritic poetry would be present-oriented rather than past-oriented. He might have taken an entirely different tack, however: the issue is to a certain extent moot if the verbal system expresses aspect, not tense. We know from Hebrew, to name only the most closely related corpus, how an aspectual verbal system functions to narrate what is presented as ‘history’. But the question deserves asking and being answered of whether the Ugaritians viewed their myths as ‘history’. Though one might on some philosophical basis argue that the Baal Cycle was not viewed as ‘history’, it appears more difficult to do so for the *Kirta* and *ʿAqhatu* cycles, in particular the former, which may in some sense have functioned as the founding narrative for the dynasty in power at Ugarit in the late 13th-early 12th centuries (the presence of the *qbš dtn*, ‘the assembly of *Ditānu*’, in both this text and the royal funerary ritual [RS 34.126, KTU 1.161] leaves little doubt that the *Kirta* story was seen as ‘history’). If this be admitted, then what we have is ‘history’ being recounted in an archaic poetic dialect, viz., T.’s “Vergangenheit” described in an aspectual system of which the two primary forms are /YQTLØ/ and /YQTLu/ (see below, remark to p. 696 [§76.411]).

¹²²⁷For one example, see remark above to p. 223 (§41.221.52c), etc., on *ylmdnn* in RS 92.2106:42' (RSO XIV 53).

¹²²⁸P. 200 (§33.323.5), p. 654 (§75.531b), p. 656 (§75.531e), p. 659 (§75.532).

most assiduous reader could be expected to go to the index to ascertain this (neither explanation nor cross-reference is supplied here) and, as has been pointed out above (remark to pp. 653-54 [§75.531b]), it is one of T.'s more dubious grammatical categories. If correctly derived from a hollow root, *tnḥn* is marked in the writing as a long form by the {-n}, whether it be 3 f.du. (parsing *ūdmm* as dual, referring to the two sections of the city indicated in the text as *rbt*, 'great', and *trrt*, 'well-watered') or 3 m.pl. (referring to the inhabitants of the city, which should, however, be written {ūdmym});¹²²⁹ but this part of the sentence expresses the application of the gnomic phrase and the long form refers to the hypothetical situation that the speaker is depicting as arising if *Hurray* leaves her native city.¹²³⁰ It would appear, then, that the passage can only have been cited with reference to *tzġ* and one must conclude that, to the extent that this section is intended to correlate morphology and syntax,¹²³¹ the example is not particularly illuminating, even dubious (since, even by T.'s standards, {*tzġ*} could be historically either /YQTLØ/ or /YQTLu/).

— p. 685 (§76.321). The basis for translating *bn ḥpt* (line 6 of this same text) as "Jungtiere, die sich verlaufen haben" might have been provided here, or at least a cross-reference provided to the explanation proposed elsewhere (p. 487 [§73.523c]: "Jungtiere, die sich verlaufen haben (w.: Jungtiere der Verirrung ?)"). The question mark is revelatory of the problem.¹²³²

— p. 685 (§76.322). The example of /YQTLu/ in an interrogative sentence cited from RS 24.258:12-13 (*KTU* 1.114) is probably not valid since the utterance is more plausibly a prohibition expressed as a negative purpose clause (see remark above to p. 663 [§75.533], etc.).

— p. 686 (§76.324), p. 715 (§76.533). In both these paragraphs, the first of which is devoted to /YQTL/ in temporal and conditional clauses, the second to /QTLa/ in conditional clauses, T. comments in an introductory remark to the problems inherent in using temporal categories to describe the use of the two basic forms in identical constructions. Strangely enough, however, he does not exploit these examples to illustrate how aspect functions nor, from a broader perspective, has he allowed these usages to influence his thinking on presenting the aspectual categories in temporal terms. Even the most basic presentation, viz., the titles of the sections, are revelatory of T.'s unease and of the seriousness of the problem: §76.324 is a sub-section of §76.32, which is entitled "PK^L für Sachverhalte der Gegenwart," whereas §76.533 is a sub-section of §76.53, which is entitled "SKf [T.'s abbreviation for /QTLa/ of fientive verbs] für perfektive Sachverhalte der Gegenwart," that is, with a temporal definition of the first, an aspectual definition of the second. The use of both /QTLa/ and /YQTL/ in both the protasis and the apodosis of conditional sentences is one of the hallmarks of both Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew. What appears to speakers of

¹²²⁹On these problems, see remark above to p. 442 (§73.223.5), etc.

¹²³⁰Cf. Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 337.

¹²³¹"Die Sammlung erhebt keinen Anspruch auf Vollständigkeit. Sie enthält überwiegend morphologisch eindeutige Belege" (p. 684 [§76.24]).

¹²³²Cf. Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 337.

temporal languages to be a free interchange of forms must be understood linguistically in aspectual terms, viz., both the protasis and the apodosis may be expressed as either complete or incomplete by the speaker according to his/her view of the situation. This usage is probably one case where aspect reflects *realis/irrealis*, with the perfective expression used to categorize a condition or an outcome as more real/certain than one expressed by an imperfective. In any case, the expression of conditions and outcomes has nothing to do with time *per se*, but with the aspect which the speaker accords to each. This is clear from Biblical Hebrew, where many more examples are attested, but is demonstrated empirically for Ugaritic by the hippiatric texts, where /YQTL/ and /QTLa/ forms appear in identical slots in different versions of an otherwise identical sentence.¹²³³

— p. 686 (§76.324), p. 687 (§76.332). In the first section, T. cites *yšû* in RS 24.247+: 45' and 51' (*KTU* 1.103) to illustrate the use of the /YQTLu/ form in conditional clauses, in the second *yspû* to illustrate the same form in the apodosis. The first is under the heading “Gegenwart,” the other under the heading “Zukunft,” a good example of T.’s categorization of forms and usages in temporal terms. The text in question is one line of a collection of omens, each of which is expressed as an (unmarked)¹²³⁴ conditional sentence. Line 51' reads: [...] *bh b ph yšû ibn yspû hwt*, which may be rendered “[And if] its [--]B protrudes from its mouth, the enemy will devour the land.”¹²³⁵ The apodosis event is logically posterior (= future) to the protasis event, but the protasis event is not ‘present’ to the utterance of the sentence but posterior to it since it is expressed in the utterance as a hypothetical event. In aspectual terms, both events are viewed as incomplete.

— p. 686 (§76.324), p. 799 (§83.231), p. 806 (§85.1). On p. 686, T. indicates *hm* in RS 24.266:28 (*KTU* 1.119) as entirely reconstructed, whereas on p. 799 he transliterates “*h[?]m[?]*” and qualifies this as a “n[eue] L[esung].” On p. 805, he simply says that “*hm*” is to be read in place of “[*a*]” in *CAT*. Both signs of this word are in fact partially preserved but only the upper left corner of the first sign is extant and it is, therefore, uncertain whether the conditional particle here was *hm* or *im*.¹²³⁶

— p. 686 (§76.324), p. 688 (§76.332). It is not clear to me why T. includes *hm ymt*, “Falls er stirbt” (RIH 78/12:19-20 [*CAT* 2.82:18-29]) in this list of /YQTLu/ forms in conditional

¹²³³Pardee, *Les textes hippatriques* (1985) 17-18. In §76.533, T. comments on this ‘interchangeability’ but does not explicitly exploit the usage to illustrate how aspect functions in Ugaritic prose, contenting himself with the remark that both the /YQTL/ and /QTLa/ forms may be rendered as presents: “Die SKf findet auch als ‘Tempus’ von Konditionalsätzen Verwendung und ist dabei im Dt. in der Regel präsentisch wiederzugeben.” Such a remark might be considered appropriate in a teaching grammar intended for German (or English) speakers, but one expects more of a reference grammar which in so many respects is based on sound linguistic principles and so often gives no quarter in combating more traditional approaches.

¹²³⁴The sections of this omen text where the beginning of the line is preserved show that no conditional particle was expressed except, plausibly, in the first line of the text, where it must be restored (Pardee, *AfO* 33 [1986] 124, 126; idem, *Les textes rituels* [2000] 546, 549; idem, *Ritual and Cult* [2002] 139 with note 4, p. 147).

¹²³⁵Pardee, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 140.

¹²³⁶Pardee, in *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (1993) 216, n. 29; idem, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 664; see the new photograph and copy in Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004), text 11 in the *Choix de textes*.

clauses, for it does not bear an orthographic marker of its form and he himself appends a question mark to the parsing as /YQTLu/. He remarks that the form is “möglw. potentialer Sinn,” which is not quite clear either, since conditionals normally have a ‘potential’ component to them. Surely he does not mean thereby to say that the form might be a jussive occurring in a marked conditional phrase (the context precludes any volitional nuance).¹²³⁷ Nor can it be a /YQTLØ/ perfective, for the text is a letter and the /YQTLØ/ perfective is not used in prose. On p. 688, *ilhmn*, ‘I will fight’, in line 21 is cited as an example of /YQTLu/ in the protasis of a conditional sentence, again with a question mark attached to the parsing as a long form. Here the question of an alternative analysis is more open because the form in theory could be /YQTLa/, viz., an indirect volitive expressing resolve on the part of the speaker, and all the options for parsing the appended {-n} must be considered (Energic I, Energic II [both in terms of Arabic grammar], /YQTLu + -na/, and /YQTLa + na/).

— p. 686 (§76.324). *ytn* in RS 15.082:6 (*KTU* 4.168) is not only unmarked for mood but also for aspect (the root is YTN) and its inclusion in this paragraph on /YQTLu/ forms in temporal/conditional clauses is therefore dubious (see above, remark to p. 512 [§74.222.2], etc.).

— p. 689 (§76.342). After citing passages where actions extended over two days or more are expressed with /YQTLu/-forms, T. comes to RS 2.[024] i 21-24 (*KTU* 1.22) where a /YQTLØ/ form is followed by two /YQTLu/ forms. He explains the latter as expressing the plurality (viz., iteration) inherent in actions extending over time, whereas the former “könnte stilistische Gründe haben.” This sort of explanation is the weak link in the hypothesis that the scribes knew the poetic dialect well, for ‘stylistic’ is not a linguistic explanation but an admission that we do not know why the scribe would have chosen knowingly to use different forms to describe a sequence of actions that are otherwise situationally identical.

— p. 689 (§76.342), p. 693 (§76.345). In the first section cited, T. explains the /YQTLu/ forms *ttlkn* // *tšdn* in RS 2.002:67-68 (*KTU* 1.23) as expressing iteration (the ‘plural’ nature of the act), in the second as providing the “Inzidenzbasis” for the following act. In this second section, he refers back to the former, saying that “Sie bezeichnen zugleich pluralische S[ach]v[erhalt]e,” but the former explanation must be preferred over the latter because the existence of the second category is inadequately substantiated (see remark below to p. 693).

— p. 690 (§76.342). T. here cites two passages from RS 24.258 (*KTU* 1.114) in both of which /YQTLu/ forms are used and he contrasts one of these (*tlhmn ilm w tštn*, ‘the gods eat and drink’) with a passage in the Baal Cycle (RS 2.[008]⁺ iii 40'-41' [*KTU* 1.4]) where the same verbs with the same subject appear in /YQTLØ/-forms. This may serve as an example of the necessity to come to terms not only with the different verbal systems of prose and poetry but with the fact that not all poems show the same distributions of verbal forms. Neither here nor anywhere else does T. attempt to view the verbal system of RS 24.258 as a whole. As I have remarked above (remarks to p. 513 [§74.222.2], etc., with note 961, to p. 656 [§75.531e], etc., and to p. 662 [§75.532]), there are no certain cases of /YQTLØ/ forms

¹²³⁷See Pardee, *AfO* 31 (1984) 222; idem, *Context* III (2002) 93.

in this text and it appears, therefore, to reflect a poetic dialect—if one may infer a system from so brief a text¹²³⁸—different from that of the major mythological cycles.

— pp. 690-91 (§76.342). An important problem of aspectual sequencing is encountered in the parallel passages describing self-mutilation as a sign of mourning: in RS 2.[022]⁺ vi 18-19 (*KTU* 1.5) one encounters *ydy* // *yhdy*, ‘he scratches incisions // he cuts’, when *ʾIlu* is the actor; the corresponding forms when *ʿAnatu* is the actress are *td* // *thdy* (RS 2.[009]⁺ i 2-3 [*KTU* 1.6]). T. describes *td* as “offenbar eine PK^K,” *thdy* as “erwartungsgemäß eine PK^L,” but offers no explanation for the sequence perfective-imperfective in a single verse.

— p. 691 (§76.342). Apparently inspired by cases of this type, T. remarks that in the sequence *tḡdd* // *ymlû* (RS 2.[014]⁺ ii 25 [*KTU* 1.3]) the first verb may either be /YQTLu/ like the second or /YQTLØ/, “morphologisch variiert.” He offers no aspectual explanation for the morphological variation.

— pp. 691-92 (§76.343b). In this paragraph, which is simply entitled “PK^L asyndetisch nach PK^K,” it would have been useful to remark explicitly on the different function of the perfectives in the latter category, the first five examples, as compared with that of the one example of a jussive.

— p. 692 (§76.344). For another example of explaining variant texts by stylistic considerations, see remarks above to pp. 620-21 (§75.232) and to p. 658 (§75.531f), etc., on the parallel to {tbû} appearing as both {tgly} and {tgl}: T.’s solution here is that the use of the imperfective to express “Ausschilderung bereits genannter Themen” was “nicht obligatorisch,” but he offers no explanation for the sequence *tgl* ... *tbû* (perfective ... imperfective) in a single verse.

— p. 693 (§76.345). This section is entitled “PK^L im Inzidenzschema” and attempts to show that /YQTLu/ forms may provide the “Inzidenzbasis” for following perfective forms, which constitute the “Inzidenzakt.” Only two passages are cited, however, and one of these two does not meet the structural criteria as T. defines them. In RS 2.002: 67-68 (RS 2.002) the /YQTLu/ forms are followed by what is plausibly a narrative infinitive (*ngš hm*) rather than a /QTLa/ perfective;¹²³⁹ T. himself recognizes that explaining *ttlkn* // *tšdn* in this passage as expressive of iteration is valid (see remark above to p. 689 [§76.342]). The latter explanation is also sufficient to explain *ykly* in RS 3.367 iv 27' (*KTU* 1.2) (as well, perhaps, as the two preceding forms of which the aspect is not orthographically marked): the verbs in question describe the acts by which *Baʿlu* defeats *Yammu* and the imperfective apparently

¹²³⁸In my study of the texts from this archive that manifest mythological motifs (*Les textes para-mythologiques* [1988] 26, 205-6), I pointed out the higher incidence of participles and of /YQTLu/ forms in at least two of these texts, this one and RS 24.244 (*KTU* 1.100).

¹²³⁹T. recognizes the validity of this analysis explicitly on p. 483 (§73.513.5b) and on p. 484 (§73.513.6); on p. 468 (§73.333.1) he presented the parsing as a /QTLa/ perfective as a valid alternative, but the structure QTL + independent pronoun visible here is characteristic of the use of the narrative infinitive (absolute) in later Northwest Semitic, in particular in the Phoenician inscription from Karatepe where it functions as the main narrative verbal structure, and may be considered the better parsing in this context. The parsing of *ngš* as an infinitive is also indicated in the vocalized text in Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 34. On the inadmissibility of assigning aspectual function to the verbal nouns and adjectives, see above, remark to pp. 682-718 (§76).

visible in *ykly* (as well as that of the previous two verbs if they are correctly identified as /YQTLu/ forms) may be explained as expressive of inception of action or of iteration. Indeed, the first two forms may have been /YQTLØ/ perfectives (/yaquṭ ba‘lu wa yašit yamma/) and only the third one of the ‘long’ forms (either /yakalliyu/ or /yakalliya tāpiṭa nahara/), here expressing purpose.¹²⁴⁰

— p. 693 (§76.346a). One worries whenever one encounters the word ‘obviously’ in an explanation, all the more so when the word appears in the title to an entire section: “PK^L in Temporalsätzen, offenbar mit Vorzeitigkeitsnuance.” In this case, though the category may be linguistically viable, none of the examples is convincing. T. begins with three cases of what he takes as unmarked temporal clauses (*w yšû*, *yšû*, ‘he raises’, and OBJECT + *ymġy*, ‘he arrives at’). As regards the first two, he does not remark that /YQTL/ forms of NŠ’, however they be explained, are very frequently /YQTLu/; since these two examples occur in clauses unmarked for temporality, the specific categorization of these two, and these two only, as owing their form to the expression of a temporal clause must be doubted.¹²⁴¹ On the other hand, it may be necessary to admit that NŠ’ commonly expresses “Vorzeitigkeit” because of its common appearance in idioms where one lifts X before doing Y—one would have wished to see a general statement from T. on the morpho-semantics of NŠ’ in addition to its treatment in various of the categories of this chapter. The third example of a /YQTLu/ form in what T. takes as an unmarked temporal clause comes from RS 24.258 (*KTU* 1.114),¹²⁴² at text which, as I have remarked above (e.g., on p. 662 [§75.532]), shows no certain examples of the /YQTLØ/ perfective; the example is for that reason doubly irrelevant, viz., *ymġy* is not in a temporal clause and there would be no reason to expect a /YQTLØ/ form in this text.¹²⁴³ Three examples of marked temporal clauses are cited in a second section of this paragraph, one from another ‘para-mythological’ text which, though its form of expression is prosaic, resembles others of the ‘para-mythological’ texts in its extensive use of the /YQTLu/ form (RS 24.272 [*KTU* 1.124]);¹²⁴⁴ a /YQTLØ/ form is, therefore, no more expected here than in RS 24.258. The other two examples come from inscriptions on liver models, where the temporal clause in each case modifies a nominal main clause, e.g., RS 24.312 (*KTU* 1.141) ‘(This consultation of a liver is) for ³*Agiptarru* when he is to obtain a servant-boy from an Alashian’ (*l āgṽpṭṛr k yqny ġzr ṽd āṽlṭyy*). T. translates, “als er daran war, einen Knaben ... zu kaufen,” but there is no “als er daran war” in the text, and *yqny* expresses, in aspectual terms, simply the incompleteness of the purpose

¹²⁴⁰On the problems of parsing the three verbs in this verse, see above, remark to p. 669 (§75.537d).

¹²⁴¹The two examples cited are *yšû ‘nh ... w y‘n*, ‘He lifts his eyes and sees’, in RS 3.362⁺ ii 13’-16’ (*KTU* 1.10) and *yšû yr šmmh*, ‘He raises (the staff), casts it into the sky’, in RS 2.002:37-38 (*KTU* 1.23).

¹²⁴²*ṭṭrt w ‘nt ymġy ‘ṭṭrt t‘db nšb lh w ‘nt ktp*, ‘He goes up to ³*Aṭtartu* and ³*Anatu*; ³*Anatu* prepares him a *nšb*-cut of meat, ³*Aṭtartu* a shoulder-cut’ (ll. 9-11).

¹²⁴³In RS 2.002:38 (*KTU* 1.23), *yšû* is followed by a III-y form written without {-y} and it is not certain that *y‘n* in RS 3.362⁺ ii 14’, 15’ (*KTU* 1.10) is not a /YQTLu/ form that shows monophthongization of the historical final triphthong. In the case of RS 24.258, however, one would not expect *ymġy* to be anything but a /YQTLu/ form.

¹²⁴⁴Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 183-84.

of the oracular consultation at the time of the consultation.¹²⁴⁵ The clause does not, therefore, represent “Vorzeitigkeit” to an event expressed in the sentence itself (‘when X has done Y, then he does Z’), as is purported to be the case in the preceding examples, but expresses imperfectly the reason for the consultation: if there is any “Vorzeitigkeit,” it is in the nominal clause that refers to the consultation since it preceded in real time the procuring of the servant.

— p. 694 (§76.347). I am far more dubious about the linguistic viability of this section than about the preceding one. It is entitled “PK^L in komplexen, durch *apnk* oder *âhr* eingeführten Syntagmen.” The only linguistic argument offered for these adverbs being followed by imperfective forms is that the imperfective “scheint vom vorausgehenden Syntagma logisch abhängig zu sein (vgl. §76.343),” but here, instead of the imperfective form expressing a sequence to another verbal expression, the imperfective would depend entirely on the simple adverb. T. himself cites at the end of the paragraph a set of exceptions (viz., *âhr* followed by what may be perfective forms—though none is certain) and a set of possible exceptions (viz., *âpnk* followed by orthographically ambiguous forms). All of the examples of sentences introduced by *âpnk* may be explained either by the morpho-semantic nature of the verb (two examples of NŠ’—see preceding remark) or by seeing iteration in the verbal expression {ŠLY, ‘to pray’, and ŠŠQY, ‘to cause to drink’). Only one example of *âhr* is provided, against four possible exceptions in the following “Anm[erkung],” hardly a statistically convincing presentation. The one example is furnished by the twofold occurrence of *ymgy* in RS 2.[003]⁺ iv 34 and 47 (*KTU* 1.14) for which I have tentatively proposed a narratological explanation above (remark to p. 660 [§75.532], etc.). With the possible exception of this last example (where the adverbial expression is in fact complex, consisting of *âhr*, *špšm*, ‘at sundown’, and *b* + ordinal number, ‘on the *n*th day’), the entire section appears *ad hoc* in nature and fails to convince.

— p. 694 (§76.347), p. 796 (§83.211), p. 771 (§82.310). On p. 694, T. says that *âhr*, ‘after’ (in its function as a conjunction), can “offenbar” be followed by /QTLa/ forms and offers as proof *âhr mgy ktr w ḥss*, ‘after MGY Kôtaru-wa-Ḥasīsu’, in RS 2.[008]⁺ v 44 [*KTU* 1.4]), where the orthography does not allow a certain parsing of *mgy* as a finite form or as a verbal noun. In the other two sections cited he admits freely that *âhr* could be functioning prepositionally (in which case the verbal form is that of the verbal noun); indeed, on p. 771, he cites a passage where gender incongruence shows clearly that *âhr* is there functioning as a preposition followed by a verbal noun ([*âh*]r mgy ‘dt ilm, ‘after the arrival of the assembly of the gods’ [RS 3.343⁺ ii 11’, *KTU* 1.15]). No cases are cited where gender congruence between subject and verb following *âhr* proves that particle to be functioning as a conjunction with a /QTLa/ form.

— p. 694 (§76.347). What does “Offen ist der Tempusgebrauch ...” mean in a presentation of the verbal system as aspectual? What T. appears in general to be trying to do in this chapter is to determine why a given aspect is used to express a given temporal situation. From that perspective, there is no such thing as “Tempusgebrauch,” only aspectual usage representing real-world temporal situations.

¹²⁴⁵Cf. Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 766-68, with previous bibliography.

— p. 695 (§76.348b). Though *w y‘ny* does indeed appear “am Textanfang” in RS 24.293:1 (*KTU* 1.133), I do not see the relevance of the observation since this text is, in one sense or another, only an extract from a longer text.¹²⁴⁶

— p. 695 (§76.411). T. is correct in asserting that there is no difference in “aspektuell-temporale Funktion” between /YQTLØ/ and /waYQTLØ/ forms in Ugaritic, but who would expect there to be any? Though he never says so, the statement appears to have been made with reference to the Hebrew ‘*wāw*-consecutive’ forms and it is almost as if he were denying the existence in Ugaritic of what is known in traditional Hebrew grammar as “*wāw*-conversive,” i.e., the view that the *wāw* “converted” the imperfect /*yiqtol*/ into a past-tense form. If this is the point of reference, the implied comparison is meaningless, for in the Hebrew syntagmeme *wāw* + /YQTL/, the verbal form is the old /YQTLØ/ which, with very few exceptions, occurs in Hebrew prose only when preceded by *wāw* and which has nothing to do with proto-Hebrew /YQTLu/. If one includes both prose and poetry in the purview, and if one admits that some /YQTL/ forms in Hebrew poetry descend from /YQTLØ/,¹²⁴⁷ there is no difference between /YQTLØ/ and /waYQTLØ/ forms in Hebrew any more than in Ugaritic (viz., the verbal system of Hebrew poetry is no easier to describe than is that of Ugaritic poetry and /YQTLØ/ was not used in prose in either language). The principal differences between the two languages as regards verbal forms preceded by *w* are: (1) /waYQTLØ/ did not become a common expression of perfectivity in Ugaritic prose as it did in Hebrew prose, indeed it is extremely rare in Ugaritic prose (for the possible example of {*w ymǵ*[-]} in RS 24.272:10 [*KTU* 1.124], see remark above to p. 660 [§75.532], etc.) and (2) /waYQTLu/ appears to have been used commonly in Ugaritic prose to express simple imperfectivity whereas in Hebrew prose it is used almost exclusively to express purpose and result clauses.

— p. 696 (§76.411). As nearly as I can determine without re-reading the entire section on verbs up to this point, T. first introduces the concept of narrative ‘foregrounding’ here, where he claims that /YQTLØ/ is used in poetry for “Erzählvordergrund” whereas /QTLa/ functioned as a preterit (above, p. 682, he defined ‘preterit’ as expressing past tense). Below, in §76.524 (pp. 705-12), the foregrounding function of /YQTLØ/ is argued in detail but the description of /QTLa/ as a preterit is dropped (the operative phrase on p. 706 is “dient ... zur Darstellung isolierter Sachverhalte der Vergangenheit”). The many cases of /YQTLØ/ and /QTLa/ forms used in parallel in a single verse or in adjacent verses must, however, make one dubious about the two forms having opposite narratival functions. T. refers to this use of /QTLa/ as an “erzähltechnische Variante” to /YQTLØ/, which hardly seems a satisfactory solution: if forms are marked for foregrounding and backgrounding, the poet would be creating narratological chaos by mixing them in a single utterance. T. also exaggerates when he says that a narrative section introduced by /YQTLØ/ “in der Regel” is followed by a series of /YQTLØ/ forms (p. 698 [§76.421b])—I have no quarrel with the examples that he cites, but there are many exceptions, e.g., col. I of the *Kirta* text (RS

¹²⁴⁶For a discussion, with bibliography, see Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988), ch. 4.

¹²⁴⁷As T. does on p. 697 (§76.412).

2.003+ [*KTU* 1.14]). T.'s stance appears to take a measure of validation from the fact that many narrative junctures (e.g., change of speaker) are expressed by /YQTL/ forms. That observation, however, raises the further problem of the mixing of /YQTLØ/ and /YQTLu/ forms at narrative junctures (striking examples may be found in what T. referred to in §76.348 [p. 695] as “PK^L in der Redeeinleitung”—balanced out by §76.423 [p. 699] entitled “PK^K in der Redeeinleitung”). It is nonetheless a fact that, in the major mythological texts, only rarely does one find /QTL/ forms at narrative junctures and, when one does encounter such forms, there are often reasons to believe that the form in question is the ‘narrative infinitive’ rather than the /QTLa/ perfective. What do /YQTLØ/ and /YQTLu/, diametrically opposed in aspectual expression, have in common that make them proper for expressing narrative juncture, a feature that /QTLa/ does not share? The obvious answer is: aspect. If the /QTLa/ form was not marked for aspect in proto-West Semitic, as I have suggested (see above note 1222), it may be expected to have been less strongly marked for aspect in the archaic dialect of poetry than /YQTLØ/ and /YQTLu/ and hence less appropriate for the expression of foregrounding.¹²⁴⁸ This explanation also fits the Hebrew data remarkably well, for /qātal/ is not used in Biblical Hebrew prose for expressing the backbone of a narrative¹²⁴⁹ (that function being reserved for /wayYQTL/), though /w^oQTL/ is used commonly for expressing the main line of an imperfective discourse—surely an inner-Hebrew development explained by grammaticalization of the proto-West Semitic non-aspectual /QTLa/).¹²⁵⁰ It thus appears that, at least for major narrative junctures, T.'s description is in part valid (he does not incorporate into the foregrounding hypothesis the frequent /YQTLu/ forms at narrative junctures and one would not want to follow him down the path of tensedness to explain the /QTLa/ forms). Given the variety of usage of /QTLa/ in poetry, it appears dubious that it was “marked” for backgrounding (see remark below to p. 708 [§76.524.3c])¹²⁵¹. At the very least, it must be said that the interplay of /YQTL/ and

¹²⁴⁸In his introduction to §76 (p. 682), T. asserts that in many languages, including Ugaritic, the perfective is less strongly marked than the imperfective. Whether one can spot a difference in markedness between the /YQTLu/ (imperfective) and /YQTLØ/ (perfective) in poetry is debatable, but, as we have just seen, there are good historical and descriptive reasons for holding that, in poetry, /QTLa/ was less strongly marked for perfectivity than was either of the other forms for their respective aspect. Another perspective: in the case of Biblical Hebrew the ‘perfect’ (← /QTLa/) is marked for perfectivity and the /YQTL/ forms for non-perfectivity + whatever modal nuance they carry (see B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990] 347-48; cf. ch. 31, pp. 496-518, entitled “Prefix (Non-Perfective) Conjugation”).

¹²⁴⁹Cf. my review (*JNES* 52 [1993] 313-14) of A. Niccacci, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose* (tr. by W. G. E. Watson: *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 86; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).

¹²⁵⁰The definitions just given avoid the word “foregrounding” because J.-M. Heimerdinger has shown that, if ‘foregrounded’ material is defined as that which is essential for understanding the discourse, then such material is commonly expressed by w-X *qātal* forms in perfective discourse (*Topic, Focus and Foreground in Ancient Hebrew Narratives* [JSOTSS 295; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999]); the same is demonstrably true of w-X *yiqṭōl* forms in imperfective discourse.

¹²⁵¹He does not use the technical term “marked” frequently; indeed in the introductory paragraph to the use of /QTLa/ to express the “Darstellung vergangener Sachverhalte in der Poesie” (pp. 705-6), he includes backgrounding as only one of three principal functions and does not assert that the form is “marked” for

/QTLa/ forms within narrative units in Ugaritic poetry is not easily explained by a simple foregrounding/backgrounding dichotomy. Grammars perforce present data piecemeal; it would have been nice to find as an appendix to §76 a detailed analysis of a long narrative passage in which T.'s views on all forms would have been clearly expounded. In sum, it appears that /YQTLØ/ and /YQTLu/ were the primary forms used at narrative junctures, that the infinitive could also so be used but much more rarely, and that /QTLa/ could be used in almost free variation with /YQTLØ/ within narrative units as expressions of perfectivity. Adequate explanations for the interplay between forms expressing perfectivity and imperfectivity at narrative junctures (viz., /YQTLØ/ and /YQTLu/) and within narrative units (viz., these two plus /QTLa/) are more difficult to attain (see above, remarks to pp. 682-718 [§76] and to pp. 684-701 [§76.3-4]).

— p. 697 (§76.421a), p. 712 (§76.524.6b), p. 747 (§81.24b). RS 3.343⁺ vi 2 (*KTU* 1.15) is cited with the emendation {<t>lḥm} in spite of the facts that (a) the emendation is not noted above in the section on textual errors consisting of omitted signs (pp. 60-61 [§21.354.1]) and (b) T. himself once proposed that the {t} is actually visible on the tablet.¹²⁵² On the problem that the assumed emendation poses, see remark below to p. 712 (§76.524.6b).

— pp. 700-1 (§76.427), p. 702 (§76.521). None of T.'s "Mögliche Belege der PK^Ki in Prosatexten" (§76.427) is convincing. He argues from the single writing {tqṭṭ} in RS 1.002:31' (*KTU* 1.40) that all similar forms are /YQTLØ/ but (a) drawing such a conclusion on the basis of a single writing is methodologically dubious and (b) the text is not in straightforward prose and may be imitating poetic style (see above, remark to pp. 444-45 [§73.233.41-42], etc.). He takes *ymḡ* in RS 24.272:10 (*KTU* 1.124) as /YQTLØ/ but the analysis is uncertain, perhaps epigraphically unnecessary, perhaps even orthographically unnecessary (the questions being whether the form was {ymḡ} or {ymḡ[y]} and whether the former could be contracted /YQTLu/); moreover, it is possible that the morpho-syntactic unit to be considered here is {w ymḡ[...] } (see remark above to p. 660 [§75.532], etc.). Two cases of /YQTL/ forms of L'K, 'to send', in letters are cited (RS 16.264:4 *tlīk* [*KTU* 2.26] and RS 34.124:10 *tlīkn* [*KTU* 2.72]) but with no conviction for, as T. himself recognizes, the expression may each time be imperfective (the -n on the second form marks it as imperfective, for it is 2 f.s.; the first form is 2 m.s. and hence not open to marking by a morpheme including a consonant, but there is to my mind no reason to doubt that that form is

backgrounding. §76.524.3d (p. 708) is devoted to "Skf zur Darstellung des Erzählg Hintergrund," but it contains only five examples (not all of which are convincing—see remark below) with a sixth indicated as possible. Note that Heimerdinger's research cited in the previous note was devoted primarily to foregrounding and that he does not deal to any serious extent with backgrounding structures (as his observations seriously weaken the facile definition of backgrounding as always being expressed by non-'wāw-consecutive' forms, his reticence on the definition of backgrounding is frustrating). I have devised the following description, which surely needs further refining: "If one accepts Heimerdinger's view that not all *wayyiqṭōl* forms express foregrounding, then foregrounding is occurring all around these forms while backgrounding may be expressed by *w²-X qātal* forms, by non-verbal phrases, and by entire clauses that have this function, particularly circumstantial clauses" ("The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System in a Nutshell," manuscript in preparation).

¹²⁵² *AfO* 42-43 (1995-96) 269: read { 'd l t lḥ m } for { d m . <t> lḥ m } in *CAT*.

also /YQTLu/). His last case is *ylmdnn* in RS 92.2016:42' (RSO XIV 53) but T. has already analyzed it as imperfective (see remark above to p. 223 [§41.221.52c], etc.) and finds that solution preferable here also. His formulation that the /YQTLØ/ perfective “begegnet hier ... fast nie” (p. 702) though meritorious for its reserve nevertheless overstates the case. Once again, in §76.427 T. has devoted more space to a (highly dubious) grammatical category than it merits—the only form in this list that requires attention as /YQYLØ/ is the one cited from RS 24.272:10 and it may have been better discussed in terms of the morpho-syntactic unit /w YQYLØ/.

— pp. 700-1 (§76.427a). In an “Anm[erkung]” to this section of the presentation of possible cases of /YQTLØ/ in prose, T. opines that all the /YQTL/ verbal forms in RS 24.244:61-69 (*KTU* 1.100) are /YQTLØ/ (“PK^Ki”). There is one form in this list that appears rather clearly to be /YQTLu/: *tlú* in l. 68 (see above, remark to p. 656 [§75.531e]), though T. shows his characteristic ambiguity toward it, parsing it once as /YQTLØ/ (p. 617 [§75.222]) once, with a question mark, as /YQTLu/ (p. 660 [§75.532]). *ydy* in line 64 is formally ambiguous since it is a I-y root. But, observing that there is not a single certain case anywhere in this text of a /YQTLØ/ form and taking this text in the context of the others from this archive, in particular RS 24.258 (see remark above to p. 690 [§76.342]), it may not be judged likely that the ambiguous forms were /YQTLØ/. (T.’s argument that the forms in ll. 65-66 that show the ending {-nh} were /YQTLØ/ may not be accorded any particular weight, for it is tied in directly with his view of the form and function of energics—see remarks above to pp. 497-506 [§73.6].)

— p. 702 (§76.51). In his introduction to the /QTLa/ form, T. correctly observes that it is “von Hause aus nominaler Natur und deshalb tempusneutral,” but he then goes on to opine that “Ihre Funktionen sind als perfektiv zu betrachten.” As observed above (remark to p. 696 [§76.411]), I believe that a good case can be made for the perfective function of /QTLa/ being secondary, one that it took on when /YQTLØ/ fell from usage as a perfective form in the spoken language. Thus its marking as a perfective may be expected to be weaker in poetry, where the /YQTLØ/ perfective is still alive, than in prose, where the entire burden of expressing perfectivity has fallen on /QTLa/.

— p. 702 (§76.521.1). An example from RS 15.125 is T.’s first of the “Belege [of /QTLa/ forms] aus Briefen,” but, in spite of its inclusion in section 2 of *KTU* (text 19), that text does not belong to the epistolary corpus (it is a legal text).

— p. 702 (§76.521.1). T. translates *ḥbṭm* in RS 15.098:8 (*KTU* 2.17:1) as “Ḥubṭu-Söldner.” Though this text does not state what type of service these *ḥbṭm* were expected to provide, there is no reason to infer from the writing with {b} that a special category is designated, for the writing could represent either the plural of *ḥubṭu* (/ḥubaṭīma/ with the original root preserved because of the vowel between the /b/ and the /t/) or the category of worker designated by what may be the G-active participle (cf. *ḥbṭ aḥd* in opposition to *b‘lm*, ‘[textile] workers’, in RS 18.050:7-8 [*KTU* 4.360]).¹²⁵³

— p. 702 (§76.521.1), pp. 870-71 (§93.421). In these two sections, T. explicitly parses *šl* in RS 19.011:6 (*KTU* 2.61) as a /QTLa/ form, translates by “plünderte,” but neither vocalizes

¹²⁵³See remarks above to p. 110 (§32.144.12b), etc., to p. 137 (§33.112.31), and to p. 226 (§41.222.4a).

nor proposes an etymology. Because the cognates are clearly geminate (Hebrew and Aramaic ŠLL, Akkadian *šalālu*), one is surprised at the absence of an entry for a root ŠLL in the appropriate section on geminate roots (p. 676 [§75.64]). Others have analyzed *šl* as a narrative infinitive¹²⁵⁴ because of the fact that it is followed immediately by the 3 m.s. independent pronoun (*w šl hw qrt*, ‘and he plundered the town’). If, however, *sb* in RS 2.[008]⁺ vi 34 (*KTU* 1.4) is taken as proof that fientive geminate verbs in Ugaritic did not show the /qalala/ pattern of proto-Hebrew, then the only indicator that *šl* is infinitival would be the fact that it is followed immediately by the independent pronoun. T. does not accept that this fact is sufficient basis for the analysis as an infinitive¹²⁵⁵ and I tend to share his dubiety on this point. On the other hand, the postulate that fientive geminate /QTLa/ forms were of the form /qalla/ is based on very ambiguous data (see remarks above to p. 672 [§75.61b] and p. 676 [§75.64], etc.), and it cannot be absolutely ruled out that the Ugaritic system was similar to the Hebrew one. In that case the analysis of *šl* as an infinitive of a geminate root would fit the pattern of *qn* in RS 92.2014:7 (RSO XIV 52) (see remark above to pp. 577-79 [§74.511a, b], etc.).

— p. 703 (§76.521.1). In an “Anm[erkung],” T. suggests that the verb *lhmt*, ‘I have fought’, in RIH 78/12:9 (*CAT* 2.82) may designate an act begun in the past but that extends to the present. Because the document is a letter, this interpretation would have to be nuanced to reflect the fact that the writer of a Ugaritic letter expresses tense by aspect from the recipient’s perspective not his/her own.¹²⁵⁶ Once that is recognized, however, it does indeed appear more than likely that the author was referring to an immediate situation, not to an historical one.¹²⁵⁷

— p. 703 (§76.521.2). RS 16.401:3'-4' (*KTU* 2.32) is a strange choice for an example of /QTLa/ in an interrogative sentence, not because it is not that but because T. places the interrogative particle and the verb in a restored context that is far from sure. The text reads {lm . likt | [...]l-ly}, which T. restores as *lm likt* [‘m]ny and translates “Warum hast du (einen Boten) [zu m]ir geschickt?” in spite of the fact that the {n} is uncertain and that there is no reason to believe that the lacuna was only wide enough for two signs. This latter fact is clear both from the presentation in *CAT* and in my transcription of the text made available to T. It is thus possible that *likt*, rather than being used in a so-called ‘pregnant’ construction with no expressed object, here had a noun as its direct object. RS 19.029:13 (*KTU* 2.63),

¹²⁵⁴Dijkstra, *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies* (1999) 154; Ford, *UF* 33 (2001) 209 (see above, note 1037).

¹²⁵⁵He does not explicitly reject that analysis, but he parses the two tokens of /QTL + hw/ in RS 19.011:5-7 (*KTU* 2.61) and the three tokens of the same sequence in RS 34.124:27-32 (*KTU* 2.72), the clearest examples of this structure in prose, as containing /QTLa/ forms (on the explicit parsing of *ybl* and *yšq* in RS 34.124:27 and 31 as /QTLa/ forms, see pp. 636-37 [§75.514]; on the sequence /QTL hw/ in these two passages, which we must understand as being taken as /QTLa hw/ because of the parsings just cited, see pp. 870-71 [§93.421]).

¹²⁵⁶Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 1-31; T. pp. 704-5 (§76.522).

¹²⁵⁷Pardee, *AfO* 31 (1984) 221: “I have done ... the fighting”; cf. *Context* III (2002) 93: “I have been fighting”

which is cited as a point of comparison, does not, according to my collation, even belong here, for the reading {[l]m} of *KTU/CAT* is not to be retained (I read {l-ly}).

— pp. 704-5 (§§76.522-3). Though a good case can be made for including a category known as “Briefperfekt” in a grammar of this sort, because it involves a perspective on the epistolary exchange that is different from ours (viz., the writer expresses himself from the reader’s perspective rather than from his own as he writes¹²⁵⁸), the case for the “Urkundenperfekt” is more difficult. The contracts cited reflect situations where the parties are in a single place at a single time and the document at hand represents the writing down of the legal act. The use of the /QTLa/ reflects, therefore, the simple perfective or, perhaps, the performative nuance thereof (‘has given’ or ‘hereby gives’, in English parlance). Is it the formula *l yn hnd*, ‘on this day’, which corresponds to *ištu ūmi annī*, ‘from this day’, in Akkadian, that has created for T. a problem of temporality?

— p. 704 (§76.522). Since *yblt*, ‘I bring’, in RS 2.[008]⁺ v 27 (*KTU* 1.4) is part of a speech addressed by a personage who is in the presence of her interlocutor, it cannot by definition be an example of the “Briefperfekt.” Nor is it at all likely that it is a performative, T.’s alternative analysis. It is a simple perfective expressing a complete act, literally ‘I have brought (the proof being that I am standing before you)’. The translation “I bring”¹²⁵⁹ is nothing but an accommodation to English usage.

— p. 706 (§76.524.1). In a “S[prach]v[ergleichung],” T. contrasts the use of /YQTL/ and /QTLa/ in Ugaritic poetry with /wayyiqtol/ and /qātal/ in Biblical-Hebrew narrative prose. Though his remarks are certainly correct, of more interest would have been a comparison with verbal usage in Biblical-Hebrew poetry, where problems similar to those of Ugaritic poetry are encountered. Such a comparison would have stressed the virtual absence of narrative poetry in Biblical Hebrew and could have brought to the fore the problems of comparing narrative poetry with narrative prose (see above, remark to pp. 684-701 [§§76.3-4], in particular note 1226).

— p. 708 (§76.524.3c). T. cites ‘*rb ... tb*’ in 2.[004] ii 26’ and 39’ (*KTU* 1.17) as his sole example of /QTLa/ forms beginning and ending a poetic unit. The unit does not begin with line 26, however, but with the preceding bicolon (ll. 24-25),¹²⁶⁰ which fits the rule that major poetic units usually begin with a /YQTL/ form (see remark above to p. 696 [§76.411]). T. explains these forms as “marking” a backgrounding unit embedded within the larger foregrounding unit, which does appear plausible, though the variety of usage of /QTLa/ in poetry would seem to require that the notion of “marking” for backgrounding be dropped, viz., the forms would, properly speaking, be unmarked for foregrounding rather than marked for backgrounding (to the extent that these terms correspond to the usage of the principal verb forms—see remark above to p. 696 [§76.411], in particular note 1250).

¹²⁵⁸Pardee, “The ‘Epistolary Perfect’ in Hebrew Letters,” *Biblische Notizen* 22 (1983) 34-40; Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 1-31.

¹²⁵⁹Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 260.

¹²⁶⁰Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 345; Parker *apud* Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 56.

— p. 708 (§76.524.3d). T. claims that there is a long backgrounding unit in RS 2.[014]⁺ i (*KTU* 1.3) beginning with *šid* in l. 3 and extending through *qm* in line 18. It would stand in contrast with *Ba‘lu*’s acts, which would be expressed in the foreground by /YQTL/ verbs. He may well be right, but he explains neither why in the three three-verb units that set off sub-sections within this unit each contains two /YQTL/ forms nor why the bicolon that follows this long unit also contains a single /YQTL/ form in spite of the fact that *Ba‘lu* is the object, rather than the subject, of the verb.

— p. 708 (§76.524.3d). Here T. parses ‘ny- in RS 03.325⁺ v 13, [16, 19], 22 (*KTU* 1.16) as certain examples of /QTLa/ expressing backgrounding in spite of the fact that above, p. 666 (§75.535a), the parsing as participles was indicated as equally certain.

— p. 708 (§76.524.3d). One wonders what T.’s definition of backgrounding is when he categorizes the /QTLa/ forms in RS 3.322⁺ iv 46-51 (*KTU* 1.19) as fitting this category when the subject is identical here and in the preceding section and when this section describes a trip taken by the principal protagonist that brings her into contact with her adversary (first she dresses [/YQTL/], then she travels [/QTL/]). It should further be remarked that there are significant restorations in the text presented by T. (that of *KTU/CAT*) and the overall structure of the unit is thus not totally clear. Finally, if the last verb of the sequence is correctly restored as {[y]bl}, which appears very likely, the root is I-y and there is thus no way of being certain whether it is /QTLa/ or /YQTL/.

— pp. 708-9 (§76.524.3d). Chair-gods and throne-goddesses and jar-gods and barrel-goddesses (RS 2.[008]⁺ vi 40-54 [*KTU* 1.4]) are otherwise unknown in Ugaritic and reading the text in that manner is not required,¹²⁶¹ though T. indicates no alternative.

— pp. 709-10 (§76.524.41-42). Though he devotes an entire section (§76.524.41) to the “SKf in der Ausführung von imperativisch formulierten Anweisungen”¹²⁶² in which he provides quasi-phonetic reasons for the sequence (viz., like the imperative, /QTLa/ has no performative whereas the jussive and the /YQTLØ/ perfective are identical in form), he effectively disposes of the sequence as revealing any kind of a rule governing the use of the /QTLa/ form by citing many examples of /YQTLØ/ that express the response to a command expressed as an imperative (§76.524.42). Indeed, there are so many examples of the latter that one wonders if the grammarian should take seriously the idea of an imperative –/QTLa/ command-response sequence as representative of anything but the free variation of /QTLa/ and /YQTL/ within poetic units. There is only one fairly long passage where the sequence operates cleanly, RS 2.[003]⁺ ii 12 - 26 and iii 55 – iv 8 (*KTU* 1.14), a total of thirteen lines with nine verbal forms that all correspond to imperatives in ii 12-26. This section is followed by a longer one which shows more mixing of volitive forms that tend to mirror each other in the command and response sections (e.g., *yīp* in ii 30 and iv 11 or *hlk* in ii 40 and iv 19). There is a set of four such mirroring forms in RS 2.[008]⁺ iv 4'-12' (*KTU* 1.4). In other texts, imperatives may be followed by either /QTLa/ or /YQTLØ/ forms with no clear structure

¹²⁶¹See my discussion in *Context I* (1997) 262 n. 178.

¹²⁶²What has been known in English as the use of the imperative taken up by the perfect in a “command-response” sequence: T. L. Fenton, “Command and Fulfillment in Ugaritic—‘TQTL : YQTL’ and ‘QTL : QTL’,” *JSS* 14 (1969) 34-38

visible.¹²⁶³ It appears legitimate to say that the poet(s) who created RS 2.[003]⁺ purposely devised a structure based on a series of mirroring forms that would express morpho-
semantically the precise carrying out of the commands but that this was an organizing feature characteristic of virtually this text alone (it is debatable whether the four-verb sequence of RS 2.[008]⁺ is long enough to qualify).

— p. 711 (§76.524.5a). Because of the general absence of /YQTLØ/ forms in RS 24.258 (*KTU* 1.114)—see above, remark to p. 656 (§75.531e), etc.—and the prevalence of participial forms in the ‘para-mythological’ texts (see above, remark to p. 636 [§75.514]), the distant parallelism of *yg*‘*r* and *g*‘*r* in lines 11 and 14 may represent morphological parallelism of /YQTLu/ and the participle,¹²⁶⁴ rather than of /YQTLØ/ and /QTLa/, as T. holds here, with no reference to the other analysis.

— p. 712 (§76.524.5b). If *ymnn* in RS 2.002:37 (*KTU* 1.23) is denominative from *ymn*, ‘right hand’, a notion that T. refuses even to entertain (see above, remark to p. 578 [§74.511b], etc.), then the parallelism there may be /QTLa/ // /QTLa/,¹²⁶⁵ rather than /QTLa/ // /YQTLØ/, as T. holds here.

— p. 712 (§76.524.5b). By the same considerations evoked in the second previous remark, *mgy* // *yštql* in RS 24.244:67-68 (*KTU* 1.100) may be participle // /YQTLu/,¹²⁶⁶ rather than /QTLa/ // /YQTLØ/, as T. holds here, with no reference to the other analysis. The same remark holds for *hlk* // *yštql* in and for *ngšnn* // *yštql* in RS 24.258:17, 19-20 (*KTU* 1.114).¹²⁶⁷ If the four examples of /QTLa/ // /YQTLØ/ concerning which doubt has been expressed in this and the preceding note are removed from consideration, there remain only two in the entire poetic corpus (RS 2.[022]⁺ v 19-21 *škb* // *tš*‘*ly* [*KTU* 1.5] and RS 3.348 ii 3 *āsr* // *tšmd* [*KTU* 1.20]), which requires one to ask whether the first of these two forms may not also be a participle or, perhaps more likely in these texts, both may be infinitives—more likely, because, in an “Anm[erkung]” to this section, T. cites some examples of what must, because of the absence of gender marking, be infinitives in parallel with /YQTL/ forms (e.g., *t*‘*r* // *t*‘*r*, where the goddess ‘*Anatu* is the subject, in RS 2.[014]⁺ ii 20-21 [*KTU* 1.3]).

— p. 712 (§76.524.6b). In his treatment of the “Austauschbarkeit” of /QTLa/ and /YQTLØ/ in the “Mahlformel,” T. assumes that the verb meaning ‘to eat’ shows the same variation as the verb meaning ‘to drink’ (*šty* and *tšty*) in two texts. In one of these (RS 3.343⁺ vi 02 [*KTU* 1.15]), however, the presence of the preformative {-t} is at best dubious (see remark above to p. 697 [§76.421a], etc.) while in the other (RS 02.[008]⁺ iii 40' [*KTU* 1.4]) the entire first part of the line is destroyed and with it the beginning of whatever form of LHM may have been present. Coupled with this problem is the fact that the preceding particle is

¹²⁶³Fenton’s claim to a second series in the *Kirta* text (RS 2.[003]⁺ iii 4-10 and iv 47-v 3 [*KTU* 1.14]) is not compelling for some of the forms do not stand up to the analysis as sequences consisting of imperatives taken up by /QTLa/-forms.

¹²⁶⁴Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 21.

¹²⁶⁵Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 33, 35.

¹²⁶⁶Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 202.

¹²⁶⁷*Ibid.*, 21. On *ngšnn*, see above, third remark to p. 223 (§41.221.52c), etc.

‘*d(m)*’ in those cases where the beginning of the formula is extant (twice clearly ‘*d lhm*’: RS 02.[008]⁺ vi 55 [*KTU* 1.4] and RS 2.[022]⁺ iv 12 [*KTU* 1.5]), and T.’s interpretation as an adverb meaning “lange” may not be considered certain (see above, remark to p. 252 [§51.41a], etc.).

— pp. 712-13 (§76.525). This paragraph is devoted to examples of /QTLa/ “zum Ausdruck der Vorzeitigkeit in der Vergangenheit” and the term “Plusquamperfekt” is used in the introductory paragraph, placed in quotation marks, as part of the explanation for the usage. Whatever the value of such translational categories may be in a reference grammar of an language with an aspectual verbal system, some of the examples are highly dubious even as such, e.g. RS 22.225:1-3 (*KTU* 1.96), RS 24.244:70-71 (*KTU* 1.100), and RS 24.258:1 (*KTU* 1.114). In these three cases, not only is the translational category dubious,¹²⁶⁸ but the morphological one as well, since all the forms identified as /QTLa/ may in fact be participles (see remark above to p. 636 [§75.514] and cross-references there).

— p. 714 (§76.531). The analyses of *rgmt* in RS 16.402:25 (*KTU* 2.33) as a 1 c.s. /QTLa/ functioning as a performative or as an ‘epistolary perfect’ are not the only ones possible: it may be 2 f.s. and addressed by the writer of the letter directly to the person who transmitted to him the bad news to which reference is made, that is, the writer of the letter to which he is responding. In this analysis, the function would be simple perfective and correspond to the use of the present perfect in English: ‘you have declared’.¹²⁶⁹

— p. 715 (§76.532). “Gnomisch” appears a strange term by which to describe habitual actions expressed as perfects, viz., « X has (always) done Y », as opposed to acts having some connection with *gnosis*. Even more remarkably, /QTLa/ forms of the verb YD^c, ‘to know’, are classified under “SKf zum Ausdruck anderer perfektiver Sachverhalte der Gegenwart” below on the same page (§76.534).

— pp. 716-17 (§76.541a-c). Of the six examples of the /QTLa/ said to express a future perfect (“SKf für perfektive Sachverhalte der Zukunft”) in main clauses, only one is completely convincing: *l yrt*, ‘you must descend’, in RS 2.[022]⁺ i 6 [*KTU* 1.5].¹²⁷⁰ The one example said to follow the particle *k* is *yld*, from the root YLD, but the writing of that form reveals nothing about whether the form is /QTLa/ or /YQTL/ and the context leaves open the question of real-time tense (on this form in RS 2.[004] ii 14' [*KTU* 1.17] see above, remark to p. 512 [§74.222.2], etc.). Three of the other four examples¹²⁷¹ contain the syntagmeme *w* + /QTLa/, where the historical form is, I believe, unmarked for aspect and secondarily imperfective, not perfective. T. maintains that the proto-Semitic /QTL(a)/ form is

¹²⁶⁸See my recent English translations in *Ritual and Cult* (2002).

¹²⁶⁹Pardee, *AfO* 31 (1984) 219 (three possibilities considered); *Context* III (2002) 106 (analysis as 2 f.s. preferred).

¹²⁷⁰Idem, *Context* I (1997) 265 with note 214; Smith *apud* Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 141; Wyatt, *Religious Texts* (1998) 116.

¹²⁷¹T. includes in this listing the phrase *w ikm kn* from RS 1.026⁺:10' (*KTU* 2.7), where the verb is probably in fact perfective. The phrase may not mean “und irgendwie wird/möge es geschehen” (cf. p. 905 [§97.42b] “Und wie auch immer es sein wird ...”); it may be a complete interrogative sentence, ‘And how is he?’ (the referent would be the king, who was named in the previous phrase).

perfective,¹²⁷² but one may argue from its basic stativity that it was unmarked for aspect and only developed secondarily into the West-Semitic perfective (see above note 1222). These forms in Ugaritic prose may reflect the syntagmeme *w* + archaic stative (\approx Ø-aspect) that came to express imperfectivity in Biblical Hebrew—rather than a simple perfective with future application.

— p. 718 (§76.55). T. cites *ytn* in RS 15.082:6 (*KTU* 4.168) as an example of stative /QTLa/; this is followed by “ähnl. 4.182:61f.63f.” The passages are indeed similar, but RS 15.106:61-64 (*KTU* 4.182) contains neither the root YTN nor any /QTLa/ forms. (On T.’s extreme view of the similarity of these passages, see above, remark to p. 512 [§74.222.2], etc.)

— p. 718 (§76.6). On T.’s classification of the active participle as “imperfektiv ausgerichtet” and the infinitive as “demgegenüber offenbar perfektiv ausgerichtet,” see above, remarks to pp. 471-77 (§73.4-73.427) and to pp. 682-718 (§76).

— pp. 719-36 (§77). In this chapter on the “Modalsystem,” T. all too frequently confuses marking/function and translation value. This is perhaps best illustrated by the contrast between his view of nominal sentences, including infinitives and stative /QTLa/ forms (but not participles), which are “von Hause aus modusindifferent” and hence “In den überwiegenden Fällen sind sie indikativisch gemeint” (p. 719 [§77.22]) and finite verbal forms, any of which may be either volitive or indicative. This contrast is visible also in §77.3 (p. 720), where the fientive /QTLa/ is listed among forms that “können volitivische Funktionen besitzen,” whereas nominal clauses are “modusindifferent” but “können ... zuweilen volitivische Nuancen zum Ausdruck bringen.” Would it not be more correct to say that /QTLa/, for example, like the nominal sentence to which it is historically related, is unmarked for mood and that its appearance in sequences expressing volitivity (there is no case of a /QTLa/ form used alone to express volition) constitutes a particular use of the perfective aspect? A similar situation, as is clear from languages better attested than Ugaritic, e.g., Biblical Hebrew, certainly obtained in the case of the indicative imperfective: /YQTLu/ forms were used to express a wish on the part of the speaker that was somehow different from expression of a wish by an imperative, a jussive, or a cohortative. (On this basis, one must doubt T.’s explicit exclusion of the /YQTLu/ form from his group of forms that “können volitivische Funktionen besitzen” [p. 720, §77.3]—though /YQTLu/ is not marked for volitivity, wishes could in all probability be expressed in that form in Ugaritic just as in Hebrew.) The moods should be presented as marked categories and similar uses of forms unmarked for mood should be presented as adjuncts to these marked categories; furthermore, an attempt should be made to determine why unmarked or indicative forms were used in volitive contexts. Several of T.’s examples of /QTLa/ forms and of nominal sentences that are presented here as volitional in mood come from the “command” section of the *Kirta* story, where there are also some /YQTLu/ forms. More interesting than simply listing such forms under the heading “mit volitivischer Nuance” would have been an attempt to explain with why such forms, either unmarked for mood or marked for indicativity, were mixed in with marked volitive forms. Strictly speaking, it is not the unmarked or indicative

¹²⁷²Cf. Tropper, *ZAH* 11 (1998) 152-90, esp. 181-86.

form that has a volitive “nuance,” but the context that requires us to translate along such lines.

— p. 720 (§77.311), p. 721 (§77.32). It would have been nice to have some proof of the assertions that the imperative is less polite (“höflich”) than the jussive and that it is for that reason used particularly when addressing equals or subordinates. To my knowledge, this distribution is not visible in Biblical Hebrew, with its more extensive corpus, nor in the much smaller corpus of ancient Hebrew inscriptions, and for that reason more than simple assertions would have been welcome here.

— pp. 721-25 (§77.32). Though T. admits the existence of the first-person jussive (see above remark to p. 429 [§73.143], etc.), he here presents the jussive (/YQTLØ/) as practically limited to the second and third persons, assuming apparently that the first-person volitive was expressed primarily by the /YQTLa/ form. This seems to be a case of assuming that the Ugaritic volitive system was essentially that of the first-millennium Canaanite languages, where the first person jussive had disappeared (as in Hebrew and Aramaic) and the /YQTLa/ form was practically limited to the first person (as in Hebrew; it had entirely disappeared in Aramaic). He himself admits the existence of one first-person jussive ({āḥd} /ʾaḥdi/, ‘I would see’, in RS 3.322+ iii 4, 19, 33 [KTU 1.19])¹²⁷³ and there is one other virtually certain form of which he does not admit the classification as a jussive ({āšši} /ʾaššiʾ/, ‘I would cause to go forth’, in RS 3.367 iv 2' (KTU 1.2): on pp. 589 (§74.622.3) and 623 (§75.237d) he does not translate this form, the stated reason being “Kontext unklar.” The form is located, however, within a sequence of first-person forms, all of which may plausibly be analyzed as 1 c.s. jussives.¹²⁷⁴ Given the very small number of criteria for vocalizing Ugaritic texts, the existence of these two clear forms must be taken as indications that the first-person jussive form was still a living form in poetic diction.

— p. 721 (§77.322a). T. usually makes a point of establishing morphological categories by orthographically distinct forms, but such is not the case here. He cites six examples of 3^d-person jussive forms (/YQTLØ/) from poetic texts only one of which is clearly determined by the orthography: {tši} represents /tašiʾ/. In the other five cases, therefore, there is no objective way of determining whether the event in question was expressed as a wish or as a vision of the future. For example, in RS 2.[008]+ iv 62' (KTU 1.4) *ybn*, ‘BE BUILT’, may be /YQTLØ/, /YQTLa/, or /YQTLu/; there can be no doubt that *ʾilu* is decreeing the construction of a palace for *Baʿlu*, but precisely how he expressed the decree is uncertain; though the writing with {-y} makes the analysis as /YQTLØ/ the preferred one, triphthong contraction does not correspond to orthography as regularly as one would wish and that analysis of {ybn} cannot, therefore, be considered certain. Judging from Biblical Hebrew morpho-syntax, at least one, perhaps two, of these examples could be /YQTLu/ or perhaps /YQTLa/. *ykn* in RS 2.[004] i 25' and 42' (KTU 1.17) follows the conjunction *w* and may function as a purpose/result clause. The verb after the conjunction in such cases is

¹²⁷³P. 443 (§73.233.1), p. 451 (§73.243.22c), p. 456 (§73.265), p. 726 (§77.33), p. 660 (§75.532).

¹²⁷⁴Cf. Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 248; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 9, 11, 12.

marked in Biblical Hebrew as /YQTLu/ or, if 1st person, it may be /YQTLa/.¹²⁷⁵ Another such case may occur in col. ii, line 13, of this same text, where *w tnh* follows 1 c.s. energetic forms.

— p. 722 (§77.322b). In this paragraph, six passages are cited from poetry which are said to contain 2^d-person jussive forms; only one of these forms is orthographically distinctive ({tšt} 2 f.s.; the indicative form would be {tštn}) while another depends on a “n[eue] L[esung]” (what has previously been read as {w dū} in RS 3.322+ iii 14 and 28 [KTU 1.19] is here read as {w tdū})¹²⁷⁶. T.’s first example in the list is particularly unconvincing, for it depicts *Kôtharu-wa-Hasīsu* as predicting *Ba‘lu*’s victory over *Yammu* (RS 3.367 iv 9’ [KTU 1.2]), and one might expect the certainty of victory to be expressed by the indicative¹²⁷⁷ rather than allowing whatever element of doubt is contained in a volitive. Another pair of examples depends entirely on T.’s view of the energetic: {tbrknn ... tmrnn} in RS 2.[004] i 23’, 24’ (KTU 1.17) are energetics to which the /h/ of the pronominal suffix has assimilated (‘may you bless him’), and the appropriateness of including these forms among the jussives depends entirely on whether the energetic forms are independent moods or consist of /YQTLØ/, /YQTLu/, or /YQTLa/ + energetic ending (see remarks above to pp. 497-506 [§73.6]). This same stricture applies to {tšknn}, cited among the examples from prose (RS 18.148:3, 5 [KTU 2.47]). At this juncture, it appears more plausible to say that the basic verbal form here was /YQTL-a-/, whether the form be analyzed as consisting of the productive volitive + energetic ending or as one of two independent energetic moods. Finally, it is entirely inappropriate to cite among prose passages RS 1.018:6-7 (KTU 2.4) as providing an example of the jussive because the verbal form is half restored ({tt[tb]}) and because the set of restorations to which that one belongs is without parallel (see remark above to p. 594 [§74.622.3], etc.). It is even less proper to cite this form as, by implication, certain—certain by implication because four explicitly “unsichere” examples are cited at the end of this paragraph. Three of these “unsichere” forms, by the way, go beyond simple uncertainty to the point of not belonging in a serious grammar: on RS 1.021:12-13 (KTU 2.6:13-14), see the remark just cited; the context of {tšt} in RS 1.026+:7 (KTU 2.7) is, as T. acknowledges, broken and there is simply no way of knowing what the mood of the verb may have been; {tttb ly} probably does not occur in RS 17.327:7 (KTU 2.35—T. cites the reading from CAT while remarking that Bordreuil/Pardee disallow it).

— pp. 723-24 (§77.324a-c). None of the examples claimed to be of jussives following imperatives is orthographically marked. Some of the cited forms are energetics (on which problem see preceding remark). Especially when the two forms are addressed to the same person, it is not at all certain that the second form is marked as a jussive, rather than as an

¹²⁷⁵T. cites this passage below, p. 728 (§77.38) and p. 913 (§97.10.2b), where he holds that the purpose/result clause is expressed by /YQTLØ/, but the only orthographically marked form is /YQTLa/ (see below, my remark to §77.38).

¹²⁷⁶See also p. 427 (§73.131), p. 428 (§73.133), p. 448 (§73.243.1), p. 616 (§75.222), p. 617 (§75.223), pp. 653-54 (§75.531b), p. 659 (§75.532), p. 663 (§75.533).

¹²⁷⁷Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 9, 11.

indicative expressing the certainty of the outcome, e.g., *tb^c ... tbn*, ‘go ... BUILD’: the second form could be either /*tabni*/, ‘you must build’, or /*tabnû*/, ‘you will certainly build’.

— p. 724 (§77.325). T. lists *âl* in RS 16.265:14 (*KTU* 5.9) among examples of the particle {*âl*} that is used as a negative volitive particle, rather than in the section dealing with {*âl*} used as an emphatic particle (cf. pp. 805-7 [§85.1]), probably because this would be the only attestation of the latter usage in prose. In this analysis, he follows a long line of tradition.¹²⁷⁸ It appears far more likely, however, that the scribe of this practice letter is showing off his erudition by producing as many forms of the verb YTN as possible, and all are positively polarized because the final clause says ‘give me a cup of wine that I might drink it!’¹²⁷⁹ It appears highly unlikely that he would have inserted the negative command, ‘don’t give’, in this list of injunctions. Another example of this scribe’s imitation of poetic speech is cited in the remark to p. 777 (§82.414).

— pp. 726-27 (§77.34). A general remark on T.’s examples of what is known traditionally as a ‘precativ perfect’ (viz. /QTLa/ used as a volitive): in addition to the possibility that some of these may be participles functioning as attributive or predicate adjectives rather than volitives (see following remarks), T. makes no effort to prove that the few provable examples of /QTL/ volitives are not infinitives used in place of a marked volitive.¹²⁸⁰ When these two possibilities are considered, one must conclude there may not be a single case of /QTLa/ used as a volitive in Ugaritic.

— p. 726 (§77.34a). T. cites only one example of /QTLa/ as a volitive “in absoluter Verwendung” (viz., without an accompanying marked volitive form) and that example is far from certain: *âḥd* in RS 2.[008]⁺ v 56 (*KTU* 1.4) may be a participle: /^ʾalpa šiddi ʾāḥida bêta/, ‘(... build) a house covering a thousand šiddu-measures (of land)’.

— p. 726 (§77.34b). Though the possibility certainly exists that *ngb* in RS 2.[003]⁺ ii 32, 33 (*KTU* 1.14) is /QTLa/ or infinitive with volitive value from context, for the simple reason that *hlk* certainly has that value in lines 39 and 41, the analysis as a G-stem passive participle is equally plausible: ‘let the army, having been provisioned, go forth’. Also to be considered is the analysis of *ḡly* in RS 3.322⁺ iii 54 (*KTU* 1.19) as a G-participle: ‘May your root not send up sprouts from the earth, (your) head having come down into the hand of him who would pull you up’. The poet may purposely have used two participles in the same verse in order to amplify the contrast between the actors. According to this analysis, *šršk b ʾarš ʾâl yp^c // riš ḡly bd ns^ck* would be vocalized /šuršuka bi ʾarši ʾal yipa^c // raʾšuka ḡāliyu bîdê nāsi^cika/.

¹²⁷⁸Virolleaud, *PRU* II (1957) 40: “Et que tu (le) donnes ou que tu ne (le) donnes pas ...”; Gordon, *UT* (1965) §13.79 (p. 127): “if thou wouldst give, then give; and if thou wouldst not give, then don’t give”; Del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín list this text among their examples of the “fonctor neg.” and translate “no des” (*Diccionario I* [1996] 22).

¹²⁷⁹Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 11; Pardee, *Context* III (2002) 115.

¹²⁸⁰He actually includes here a paragraph entitled “Verbalsubstantive mit volativischer Nuance” (§77.36), but it is only four lines long, states that all possible examples are disputed, and refers the reader back to §73.532 (pp. 492-93), which is entitled “Imperativischer Gebrauch” and deals only with possible examples of verbal nouns used to replace marked imperative forms, viz., there is no discussion of verbal nouns replacing jussives.

— p. 726 (§77.34c). T.'s preferred analysis of *yblk*, 'they will bear (it to) you', in RS 2.[008]⁺ v 17 (*KTU* 1.4) is as a /QTLa/ form because if it were /YQTLu/ it would be in parallel with *tblk*, with *t*-preformative. The alternative that he considers, viz., that the poet purposely used a 3 m.pl. form with *y*-preformative in parallel with a 3 m.pl. form with *t*-preformative, is a nonetheless plausible one in this text from the *Ba'lu* cycle, the one group of texts where the appearance of 3 m.pl. forms with *y*-preformative is relatively clear.

— p. 727 (§77.35). It is not necessary to take *rm* in RS 3.343⁺ iii [2'], 13' (*KTU* 1.15) as volitive in nature.¹²⁸¹ The reference need not be to some future uplifting of *Kirta* in the council of *Ditānu*. The latter may, from the viewpoint of this mythological text, be chairing the council in which *Kirta* holds an important place. His presence among the 'shades' of the dead may not be forecasting his death; one may see him as belonging to the epoch from which these revered shades hailed.

— p. 727 (§77.35). T. correctly rejects the attempt by Cunchillos to interpret *šlm* in the epistolary formula '*m X mnm šlm* as a volitive, as is proven, if need be, by the fact that the Akkadian equivalent is a nominal phrase, e.g., {it-ti LUGAL KUR-u-ga-ri-it (8) ù it-ti-ki mi-nu-me-e (9) šul-ma-nu té-ma te-er-ri}, 'With the king of Ugarit and with yourself, whatever well-being (there may be), send (me) a message (on that topic)' (RS 16.111:7-9 [*PRU* III, p. 13-14]). Since the Akkadian formula is only attested in the west, however, it must be judged unlikely that the Ugaritic "auf einer akk. Vorlage beruht." Because the formula is clearly not of Mesopotamian origin, is somewhat awkward in Ugaritic, and is only attested within the Hittite sphere of influence, its origin may even have been Hittite.¹²⁸²

— p. 727 (§77.37). Because "Nominalsätze sind von Hause aus tempus- und modusneutral," one may doubt that they "können aber auch volitivistischen Charakter bestitzen," which is not to deny that nominal phrases are used in volitive contexts, just as /YQTLu/ indicative forms are used in such contexts— it is just that one is required to deduce from the context that the act so expressed is included in the list of desired events. In T.'s first example, the phrase '*mk šb't ḡl mk* is translated "Bei dir seien deine sieben Burschen" because the nominal phrase is preceded by the imperative *qh*, 'take' (RS 2.[022]⁺ v 6, 8-11 [*KTU* 1.5]) and there can be no exception taken to the translation. But seeing this as a category of volitivity is an entirely different question, as the prepositional phrases may be interpreted as depending directly on *qh*¹²⁸³ or be translated literally into English, i.e., with no explicit marking of volitivity, and yet retain their comprehensibility.¹²⁸⁴

— p. 728 (§77.37), p. 858 (§92.42c and §92.43b). The context permits taking *šlm* in RS 2.002:7 and 26 (*KTU* 1.23) as the D-stem imperative, addressed to the gracious gods who are the subject of this text,¹²⁸⁵ rather than as a noun used volitively. Though *šlm* in RS 34.126:31 (*KTU* 1.161) is, on the other hand, nominal, neither does it occur in a direct

¹²⁸¹Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 338.

¹²⁸²See remark above to p. 244 (§45.122b), etc., and Pardee, *Fronzaroli* (2003) 466 n. 66.

¹²⁸³Wyatt, *Religious Texts* (1998) 124: "(take) with you seven divine assistants."

¹²⁸⁴Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 267; Smith *apud* Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 147.

¹²⁸⁵Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 276 and note 11.

volitive. T. follows some authors in taking the two occurrences of that word in line 31 as having an identical function (“Heil! Heil (sei dem König) ‘Ammura[pi] ...!’), but, as the editors of this text have held from the beginning, the first *šlm* is to be construed with the preceding phrase: ‘You are to present (a) bird(s) as an offering of well-being: well-being for ‘Ammurāpi’ ...’.¹²⁸⁶ Finally, it is not clear why T. cites only lines 28'-30' and 33' of RS 24.271 (*KTU* 1.123) as further examples of *šlm* meaning “Heil!” when *šlm* appears also in lines 1-3 of the same text. In all these occurrences also, however, the word may be parsed as verbal rather than as nominal.¹²⁸⁷

— p. 728 (§77.37), p. 859 (§92.52). Even if the reading of the last word be accepted,¹²⁸⁸ *āt āḥ w ān ā[hk]* in RS 3.340 i 24 (*KTU* 1.18) need not be taken as a volitive nominal sentence.¹²⁸⁹

— p. 728 (§77.37). There is no reason to believe that the Ugaritians translated their epistolary formulae from Akkadian (“vgl. die akk. Wendung *lū šulmu ana ...*, die als Briefgrußformel im Ug. sonst verbal ... wiedergegeben wird”). When each of the formulae is examined in detail, it becomes clear that the formulae are not for the most part Mesopotamian in origin; if the Ugaritic form is in any given case calqued on a formula known from Akkadian it is because the ultimate origin of the formula was neither Ugaritic nor Akkadian (cf. the possible example of the formula *mnm šlm 'm X rgm TTB 'my*, discussed in the remarks to p. 244 [§45.122b], etc.; p. 246 [§45.23a], etc.; p. 727 [§77.35]; p. 856 [§92.238b]; p. 904 [§97.42]).

— p. 728 (§77.37). A particularly striking case of a nominal sentence gaining force from translation as an expression of indicativity (i.e. certainty) rather than as a wish is provided by RS 24.252:23'-27' (*KTU* 1.108): not ‘may your strength be X’, but ‘your strength *will* be X’.¹²⁹⁰

— pp. 728-29 (§77.38), p. 913 (§97.10.2b). Biblical Hebrew cannot, of course, dictate the analysis of Ugaritic forms, but it does seem reasonable to expect that the basis should be indicated for the assertion that /YQTL/ forms in purpose clauses are /YQTLØ/ volitives (see above, remark to p. 721 [§77.322a]). In Biblical Hebrew, a jussive form (i.e., /YQTLØ/) in a sequence of verbal forms has the force of a simple jussive, whereas an indicative form

¹²⁸⁶Bordreuil and Pardee, *Syria* 59 (1982) 123; Pardee, *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (1993) 209-10; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Une bibliothèque* (1991) 155, 162; Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 818, 819, 824; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 88, 115 (notes 130, 132); Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 64, 65.

¹²⁸⁷Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 696-97; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 151-52.

¹²⁸⁸Cf. Wyatt, *Religious Texts* (1998) 279 n. 132, who claims that the last visible sign begins with a vertical wedge, not a horizontal, but does not propose a reading/restoration. My collation of the tablet in July of 2004 led me to believe that the traditional reading here is plausible. I observe that the editor's copy might lead one to think of a vertical wedge here (Virolleaud, *Danel* [1936], pl. X; reproduced in Herdner, *CTA* [1963], fig. 57), but what one finds on the tablet better fits the reading as a horizontal wedge.

¹²⁸⁹Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 348; Parker *apud* Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 79 n. 19.

¹²⁹⁰Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 82; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 195. For this fundamental view of the force of the nominal sentence it is immaterial whether the last sentence of the text begin in line 23', as I believe, or in the following line, as T. translates it (“Deine Kraft ... seien inmitten von Ugarit”).

after the conjunction (i.e., $w^o + /YQTLu/$) in such a sequence functions as a purpose or result clause, whether the previous verb be volitive or indicative. Though he does not indicate his reason for the parsing of $w ykn$ in RS 2.[004] i 25' and 42' (*KTU* 1.17) as $/YQTL\emptyset/$, one may deduce that it is because $/YQTLa/$ is attested as the second verb in such a sequence when the verb is in the 1st person ($w \dot{u}b\dot{a}$ in RS 24.244:72 [*KTU* 1.100]) for $/YQTLa/$ is, of course, for T. only an expanded form of the $/YQTL\emptyset/$. But, if the latter theory not be tenable (see remark above to p. 429 [§73.143], etc.), and if the semantics of the $/YQTLa/$ form not be so closely tied to those of $/YQTL\emptyset/$ as T. believes, then there may be room for positing that purpose/result clauses were expressed in Ugaritic, as they were in Hebrew, by $/YQTLu/$ and $/YQTLa/$ verbal forms.

— p. 732 (§77.412.2a). Above, p. 500 (§73.611.2d), T. identified *tmtn* in RS 3.325+ i 18, ii 40 (*KTU* 1.16) as $/YQTLu/$ + Energic I, here that analysis is indicated first but T. then suggests in parentheses that the basic verbal form may be $/YQTL\emptyset/$. On p. 500, he translated “mußt du sterben”; here the alternative translation is “Sollst auch du ... sterben?” I can think of no case in Biblical Hebrew, a language in which the distinction between jussive and indicative forms is more extensively visible, of a jussive used to express constraint from without in an interrogative sentence, either marked as interrogative or interpreted as such from context. T.’s alternative analysis would appear, then, perhaps to be too closely tied in with the equation in his mind between the West-Semitic jussive and German *sollen*.¹²⁹¹ As regards T.’s view of the energic system, see remarks above to pp. 497-506 (§73.6), etc.; it may be noted here that, in a structure such as this one, the question of whether the form be indicative + energic or an energic form as constituting an independent mood is of no real importance for interpretation, for the function of the form appears to be only to express a degree of emphasis (‘will/must you *indeed* die?’). If, however, the energic forms did represent independent moods, the question regarding the indicativity or the volitivity of the basic verbal form would become moot: the mood would be neither emphatic indicative nor emphatic volitive, but energic.

— pp. 734-35 (§77.5). It must be judged doubtful that two pages of a reference work such as this should be devoted to “Die modalen Nuancen ‘müssen’, ‘dürfen’ und ‘können’” when, as T. makes clear in the introductory paragraph, there is no marking in Ugaritic for such “nuances.” One can see a place for such a translational category in a teaching grammar intended for German speakers, but not in a reference grammar that is addressed to the international community of scholars. Moreover, some of the examples are open to question on a purely translational level. One wonders why, for example, T. included RS 11.772+:25' (*KTU* 3.1) here, when he himself translates by “er ... zu bringen hat” rather than by one of the verbs included in the title of the paragraph and when the simple future works perfectly well in French, for example.¹²⁹² Certainly in French and in English, the future indicative gets the idea of obligation across in various contexts, such as contracts or when deities are

¹²⁹¹This becomes even clearer below, pp. 734-35, in the section devoted to “Die modalen Nuancen ‘müssen’, ‘dürfen’ und ‘können’” (§77.51) where it is stated that $/YQTLu/$ “für die modale Nuance ‘müssen’ steht” (p. 735); one notes the absence of *sollen* anywhere in this section.

¹²⁹²Pardee, *Semitica* 51 (2001) 13.

speaking, with a different force but one that may not be considered of less force than would have been present in a marked volitive (on the strength of indicativity, cf. above, e.g., remark to p. 722 [§77.322b]). This is illustrated here by contrasting T.’s rendering of *š* in RS [Varia 14]:10 (KTU 3.9) as “so verpflichte ich mich ... zu zahlen” with the simple English “I shall pay,”¹²⁹³ which, in the contractual context, expresses the legal obligation with no ambiguity.

— p. 735 (§77.51b). The problem of whether *t*-preformative forms in the ritual texts are 2 m.s. (as I have taken many of them) or 3 m.pl. (as T. holds for many examples) is not solved by citing forms that may be parsed as passives and forms of which the subject is explicitly indicated in the sentence itself. The problem arises when neither of these solutions is possible, and some passages of the latter type preclude the analysis as 3 m.pl. (see remarks above to p. 211 [§41.12], etc., and to pp. 505-6 [§73.634a]).

— p. 735 (§77.53). Restricting *l tš* in RS 19.066:14 (KTU 3.8) to the meaning “nicht zahlen können” is legally incorrect: the persons in question must undergo the stated penalty if for any reason they do not pay the stipulated amount of money. ‘Not being able’ to do so is only one possible situation. Translate: ‘If they do not pay the 1000 (shekels of silver), they will be sold into Egypt.’

— pp. 737-38 (§81.11a-d), p. 751 (§81.4e). In the first sections cited here, T. presents the case for *hn*, as well as the expanded forms *hn*, *hnn*, and *hndt*, functioning as local adverbs meaning ‘here’ or ‘hither’. The entire category may, however, be reduced to a single example and, in that example, the local adverb is in all probability to be distinguished from the presentative particle by its vocalism. In RS 16.402:31, *hn* may indeed be a local adverb (see above, remark to p. 229 [§42.0], etc.), but it is to be identified with Arabic *huna*, not with Hebrew *hinne*^h.¹²⁹⁴ Thus the Ugaritic local adverb would have been /huna/ and only a cousin of the presentative particle, whereas the latter would have been /han(na)/. Other than in this passage, *hn* functions uniquely as a presentative particle in Ugaritic, and the same is true of the expanded forms *hnn* and *hnn*; *hndt* is only attested to date as a demonstrative pronoun (see above, remark to p. 230 [§42.3], etc.). Epistolary usage shows that, if one of the presentative particles has taken on a local nuance, it is *hl*, not *hnn*. This is demonstrated by the fact that the two are interchangeable in the double formula of well-being¹²⁹⁵ but not at the beginning of the body of the letter, where only *hl* is found (see above, remark to p. 197 [§33.322.42a], etc.), apparently with the purpose of stressing that the events to be recounted occurred where the writer is located¹²⁹⁶. I would hold, therefore,

¹²⁹³Pardee, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 218; cf. Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 108 (“je payerai”).

¹²⁹⁴The origins of the Hebrew particles based on H + N remain to be worked out in detail: judging from the comparative evidence, there should have been in proto-Hebrew a deictic particle /han-/, a local particle /hun-/, and a conditional particle /hin-/. The first two coalesced as /hinn-/, except in the definite article where the /a/ is retained, while the third shows up as *ʾim*, already known from Ugaritic as a by-form of /himma/ (← *hin* + *ma*/), hence *ʾimma*/.

¹²⁹⁵Pardee, Fronzaroli (2003) 451 n. 13.

¹²⁹⁶There is not a single case of reference by *hl* to a situation occurring in the sphere of the addressee, not even {*hl* *hl* . *ah* *y* [...] } (RS 19.181A [KTU 2.67]), where the word, ‘my brother’, in all likelihood refers to

that T. has reversed the proper interpretation of the particles when he translates *hln hn* ‘*mn šlm*’ as “Siehe, hier bei mir ist Wohlbefinden.” It should rather be ‘Here, behold¹²⁹⁷ with me it is well¹²⁹⁸’.

— p. 738 (§81.11c), p. 743 (§81.21a). T. is correct, as we have just seen, in observing that *hnny* and *hlny* are interchangeable in the double formula of well-being, but he gives the wrong impression when he says that *ht* fills that slot in RS 17.139:6 (*KTU* 2.34), for there *ht* introduces the main clause of the formula by which one refers to a previous letter by a *casus pendens* then responds to something, usually a request or a reproach, that was stated in that letter.¹²⁹⁹ That main clause happens in RS 17.139 to be the double formula of well-being because the preceding letter had asked him how he was: the reference to the previous correspondence is {lht . šlm . k . lik[ʔ]} (6) ūmy . ‘my’, ‘Concerning the fact that my mother sent me a letter asking how I was’, lit. ‘The tablet of well-being, (concerning the fact) that my mother sent (it) to me ...’, and the response is {ht . ‘mny (7) kll . šlm}, ‘here with me everything is fine’. Given that the formula of well-being does not need to be introduced by a presentative particle,¹³⁰⁰ *ht* is not, formulaically speaking, playing that role here; rather it is a presentative particle introducing the apodosis. That particle is not, therefore, yet attested as one of those by which the double formula of well-being is introduced.

— pp. 741-42 (§81.13h). It is a strange grammatical procedure to create a section for an unattested grammatical entity because it might have existed. This section proposes that *yd*, which is attested only as a preposition meaning ‘with, along with’, “könnte aber auch als Adverb ... gebraucht worden sein.” No texts are cited, of course, because the usage is unattested.

— pp. 742-43 (§81.21a). T. classifies the particle *ht* as a temporal adverb in poetry, as a presentative particle in prose. This distribution must be judged dubious. Only one text can be cited in which the temporal function is clear and there *ht* is preceded by the preposition *I* (*I ht w* ‘*Imh*, ‘for now and evermore’, RS 2.322 iv 5-6 [*KTU* 1.19]). One could argue that the preposition was needed to give the particle a specifically adverbial notion (in spite of the parallel construction *I* ‘*nt*, where ‘*nt* is certainly a temporal adverb). In one other case, *ht* appears after a sentence-initial verb but before the subject (*tšmh ht aṭrt*, ‘let ‘*Aṭiratu* herself rejoice’ [RS 2.[009]⁺ i 39, *KTU* 1.6]), but T. does not here make a case for post-positioning

the addressee but the text is broken thereafter and we have no way of determining the topic that the writer was about to address.

¹²⁹⁷The translation with “behold” is purely conventional as modern American English no longer has a broadly utilized presentative particle; it corresponds to the still living *voici* in French. For the interpretation of *hl-* and *hn-* just outlined, see Bordreuil and Pardee, *RSO* XIV (2001) 373-74; Pardee, *Context* III (2002) 112 n. 193; idem, Fronzaroli (2003) 451; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) I 73, II 160.

¹²⁹⁸There are good reasons for believing that *šlm* in this formula is verbal, rather than nominal: see remarks to p. 246 (§45.23a), p. 856 (§92.238b), and Pardee, *Fronzaroli* (2003) 453-54.

¹²⁹⁹For the analysis of the epistolary formula and of the particular manifestation of the formula in RS 17.139, see idem, *BiOr* 34 (1977) 8.

¹³⁰⁰Idem, Fronzaroli (2003) 451.

as a criterion for disqualifying particles as presentative in function ¹³⁰¹. If this particle is derived from *hn*, as T. holds and as does indeed appear likely, and if *hanna* is not a local adverb but functions only as a presentative (see above, remarks to p. 230 [§42.3], etc., p. 231 [§42.5], etc., and to pp. 737-38 [§81.11a-d]), then the basic function of *ht* is probably presentative as well. Since the function is clearly presentative in prose, T.'s view of the function in poetry would mean that the function of the particle had evolved from temporal in the archaic form of the language preserved in poetry to one more or less identical to that of *hn* in prose, hardly a likely scenario. T. translates by “jetzt” and by “nun” (sometimes more freely); “nun” is certainly the better of the two for, like ‘now’ in English, that word can function either temporally or as an interjection focusing attention on the following word or phrase.¹³⁰² In any case, it is just as inaccurate to build a grammatical category on these translations as it is to classify Hebrew *wʿattāh* as functioning temporally on the basis of the common English translation ‘now’ (as is commonly done, though not by T.). In all examples but the one cited here above, *ht* is better translated by something corresponding to the conventional ‘behold’ than by an adverb which primarily expresses temporality. A typical example is the tricolon in RS 3.367 iv 8'-9' (*KTU* 2 iv) *ht ibk b'lm // ht ibk tmḥš // ht tšmt šrtk*. T. translates *ht* each time by “jetzt,” whereas one finds ‘behold’ in some English translations,¹³⁰³ ‘now’ in most.¹³⁰⁴ Finally, it is not clear why the putative function as a temporal adverb and that as a “Präsentationspartikel” are both presented in the same section when there is a section below on “Demonstrative Adverbien” in which *hn* as a presentative particle is treated; thus the treatment of *hn* is divided into two sections according to its two putative functions whereas that of *ht* is in a single section.

— p. 743 (§81.21c). It is highly unlikely that there was no vowel between the second and third consonants of the particle ‘*nt*, ‘now’, a possibility that T. leaves open in his vocalization “‘*an(V)ta*.” If there had been no vowel there in proto-Ugaritic, the /n/ would have assimilated to the following /t/; if that vowel had reduced by syncope in Ugaritic, a murmured vowel would have remained.

¹³⁰¹That such a criterion would be invalid is proven by RS 96.2039, where the sequence *w ht hn* appears three times and *hn* cannot mean ‘here’ because in one case the position of the referent is explicitly said to be with the writer, i.e., ‘there’. Hence both *ht* and *hn* are functioning as presentative particles and one of the two is perforce not phrase-initial.

¹³⁰²My dictionary identifies *jetzt* only as an adverb, *nun* as either an adverb or a particle, the latter translated by the English rhetorical ‘now’ or left untranslated.

¹³⁰³E.g., J. A. Montgomery, “Ras Shamra Notes IV: The Conflict of Baal and the Waters,” *JAOS* 55 (1935) 268-77, esp. p. 272; W. F. Albright, “The Psalm of Habakkuk,” in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (ed. H. H. Rowley; Edinburgh: Clark, 1950) 1-18, esp. p. 3; John Gray, “Canaanite Mythology and Hebrew Tradition,” *TGUOS* 14 (1950-52) 47-57, esp. p. 49. H. L. Ginsberg translated by “Lo!” (“The Victory of the Land-God over the Sea-God,” *JPOS* 15 [1935] 327-33, esp. p. 331) before switching to “now” (see next note). G. R. Driver translated by “Ha!” (*Canaanite Myths and Legends* [Old Testament Studies 3; Edinburgh: Clark, 1956] 81).

¹³⁰⁴From Ginsberg in *ANET* (1950) 131, to Wyatt, *Religious Texts* (1998) 65. I translated as a cleft sentence in order to avoid the archaic ‘behold’ and the ambiguous ‘now’ (“As for your enemy ...,” *Context I* [1997] 248). In French, ‘voici’ is preferable to ‘maintenant’ (Caquot, Herdner, and Sznycer, *Textes ougaritiques I* (1974) 136; Bordreuil and Pardee, *MARI* 7 [1993] 63; idem, *Manuel* [2004] II 9).

— p. 744 (§81.22b). T. is correct in reading {ḥpn} in RS 2.[004] i 1' (*KTU* 1.17), rather than {ḥph}, which was indicated as a certain reading in *KTU* and retained in *CAT*. (The reading of {n} rather than {h} may be judged certain.) On the other hand, he does not justify his decision to emend {ḥpn} to {ḥp<h>n} other than by the assertion that *ḥphn* is used in a « stereotyped » way in this text. If the particle does indeed consist of an expanded form of *ḥp*, I see no reason to deny the existence of an adverb consisting of *ḥp* + *-n* (T. admits only the existence of a conjunction so spelled). T.'s proposals to vocalize this and the following particle also lack coherence: this one is vocalized “*appV-hinnā*” while *ḥpnk* is vocalized “*ḥappūnaka*.” The first element of *ḥphn* is identified specifically with what T. takes to be a conjunction *ḥp* (on this question, see below, remark to p. 791 [§83.131], etc.), whereas this explicit identification is not stated in the case of *ḥpnk*, which is compared with Akkadian *appūna(ma)*. I would remark that the doubling of the /p/ is dubious in West Semitic (see remark just cited), there is no obvious basis for the final /ā/ (above, *hn* is vocalized as “*ha/innV*”), and the vowels of *ḥpnk* may not have been identical in West Semitic and in Akkadian. The origin of the /ū/ particularly obscure: /ḥapunaka/ I could understand because the linking vowel between /ḥap-/ and /-na/ is unknown¹³⁰⁵, but what would be the origin of the length in /ū/? If one takes the Akkadian form as evidence for the vocalization of the Ugaritic forms and reconstructs the latter on West-Semitic principles, the three forms just discussed may have been /ḥapuhanna/¹³⁰⁶, /ḥapuna/, and /ḥapunaka/.

— p. 744 (§81.22e). T.'s confident derivation of *ḥdk*, ‘thereupon’, from a noun /ḥid-/, “Zeitpunkt, Mal,” plus the relative/determinative pronoun (which he here vocalizes as /dā/ with a question mark) plus the affirmative particle “-k” is certainly plausible but not the only possibility. Hebrew *ḥāz* shows that the corresponding Ugaritic particle *ḥd* may consist of the relative/determinative with prosthetic *ḥalif* and the Ugaritic particle *ḥdk* may be simply this particle expanded with -k. The Hebrew form also shows, by the absence of a final vowel, that this particle stems from a more basic particle with a final short vowel, rather than from the relative/determinative particle itself of which the vowel was long. The Ugaritic form may thus have been /ḥidaka/ rather than /ḥiddāka/.

— p. 745 (§81.22e). There is no basis whatever for the restoration of *ḥdk* in RS 18.[528]:5' (*KTU* 2.60), where the reading is {iḥd[...]} . It would be illegitimate to criticize too harshly T.'s observation that the literary genre of the text is uncertain, for the fragment is very small, but the editors' classification, with question mark, as a letter¹³⁰⁷ must be judged the most

¹³⁰⁵I have in the past indicated /a/ as the linking vowel (e.g., *Les textes rituels* [2000] 877, vocalization of *ḥphm* in RIH 78/20:8), on the assumption that adverbs appear more frequently with a marking like that of accusatives than with nominative marking, but the Akkadian form may be considered a basis for vocalizing with /u/.

¹³⁰⁶One may posit the existence of a demonstrative particle /ha/ in proto-Ugaritic that was expanded in various ways (see above, remark to p. 229 [§42.0], etc., where the possibility is considered that the proto-definite article in Ugaritic that is written {h-} may have been this most basic particle). One would expect the simplest expansion with /-na/ to have given /hana/, but the corresponding particle in Hebrew, /hinnēh/, is often taken as a basis for vocalizing with doubled /n/, viz. /ha + n(a) + na/. The vocalization of this particle with all qualifying parentheses in place would thus be /ḥapuhan(n)(a)/.

¹³⁰⁷Dietrich and Loretz, *Die Elfenbeinschriften* (1976) 34.

likely for all of the words attested are found elsewhere in letters and the *ductus* belongs to the general type attested in many other administrative/epistolary texts from this large lot of tablets and fragments. One form, ‘*my*, ‘with/to me’, shows without doubt that the text is recording direct discourse and a second either does the same or else is in a form only attested in epistolary texts (*by* may either be the preposition + 1 c.s. pronominal suffix or else the expanded form of the preposition — on which see above, remark to pp. 37-38 [§21.322.5], etc.). Because *idk* is found only in the mythological texts and apparently once in a divinatory text (RS 18.041:21 [KTU 1.86]), because the divinatory text is not expressed in direct discourse, because RS 18.[528] does contain direct discourse, and because most of the Ugaritic texts from this lot of texts are administrative in nature, the only reasonable conclusion is that this text belongs to the latter broad genre and is more specifically epistolary. Hence several readings/restorations and analyses are possible: read simply the adverb *id* (attested in the letter RIH 78/12:3 [CAT 2.82]), conceivably an expansion thereof (though no such form is yet attested in prose), or consider such restorations as *id*‘, ‘I will know’ (presently not attested in letters), or the multiplicative morpheme *id* (that the latter could be separated from the number noun is proven by {tlt . id} in RIH 78/14:12’ [CAT 1.163:5]).

— p. 750-51 (§81.4b-e). T. does not discuss the second element of the particles {hln} and {hlny}, in spite of the fact that the vocalization of the longer form appears to be provided by a polyglot vocabulary entry: {al-li-ni-ya}.¹³⁰⁸ It would have been of interest to have T.’s views on the origin of the /i/ of the affirmative element /li/. If one accepts the syllabic writing as evidence that the /l/ of *hlny* was indeed geminated, it appears likely that, instead of witnessing to an independent deictic particle /hall-/ or /hal- + -l-/, the first two syllables represent the accretion of /han-/ and /-l-/, as T. proposes for the basic particle *hl*.¹³⁰⁹ On the other hand, there are no data from Ugarit for the vocalization of this basic form *hl* and its expanded form *hlk*, and the possibility must be kept open that *hl* was simply /hal(i)/ (viz., a variant of the particle that in Arabic became the definite article /ʾal/) and that *hlk* was a direct expansion of it, vocalized /halika/. On the semantics of *hlny*, see above, remarks to p. 197 (§33.322.42a), etc., and to pp. 737-38 (§81.11a-d).

— p. 750-51 (§81.4b-e). In spite of having above described *hlm* as a “Nebenform” of *hl*, “nun, siehe” (p. 332 [§54.423c]), there is no reference to a form *hlm* in these sections on the deictic adverb *hl* and its expanded forms.

— pp. 750-51 (§81.4b-e). One may doubt that *hlh* in RS 2.002:32, 33 (KTU 1.23) consists of the deictic adverb *hl* and the suffixal form of the 3 f.s. pronoun, for the contextual meaning of *hlh* is, as T. translates, “die eine ... die andere.” It appears more likely that the reference to the two distinct entities is by the repetition of the deictic particle alone (as in Hebrew *kōh wā kōh*, lit., ‘thus and thus’, contextually ‘in one manner, then in another’, ‘this way and that’).

¹³⁰⁸RS 20.426B:5’ (Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* V [1968], text 138). On the interpretation of this entry, which the editor did not translate, see Huehnergard, *Ugaritic Vocabulary* (1987) 32-33, 121. Because only the Ugaritic column is preserved of this small fragment, Huehnergard’s analysis may not be considered certain, though its plausibility is indubitable.

¹³⁰⁹On the nature and vocalization of the element /ni/, see below, remark to pp. 823-25 (§89.1).

If such be the case here, *hlh* would be another expanded form of *hl*. This is, however, one of those cases where different analyses would probably give the same vocalized form, viz., /halliha/ (on T.'s unlikely vocalization of the 3 f.s. pronominal suffix as /-hā/, see above, remark to p. 214 [§41.21], etc.).

— p. 751 (§81.4d). *hln hn* in RS 92.005:9 (probably to be restored in line 29 as well) (RSO XIV 49) does not mean “Siehe, hier,” but ‘Hier, siehe’.¹³¹⁰ See remarks above to p. 197 (§33.322.42a), etc., and pp. 737-38 (§81.11a-d), etc.

— pp. 752-53 (§81.61c). In terms of historical phonology, it makes no more sense to say that Ugaritic *ʾān*, ‘where?’, derives from “ʾayyānV” than to say that Hebrew *ʾān* derives from Hebrew *ʾayin*. These are simply variant forms that arose either by mutation or by particle accretion (i.e., the most basic particle may have been /ʾa/ rather than /ʾay/). If T. wishes by citing Hebrew *ʾān* as an etymological element to imply that the Hebrew development was identical to the one that produced the Ugaritic form, which he vocalizes as /ʾân-/ , the comparison must be rejected, for the process that produced Ugaritic /ʾân-/ would have produced /ʾōn/ in Hebrew.

— p. 753 (§81.63). For a criticism of T.'s derivation of the interrogative adverb *i/iy*, ‘where?’, from a base form /ʾayy-/ , see above, remark to p. 171 (§33.213.1b), etc. The same basic proposal is made here for *ik/iky*, ‘how (is it that)?’, though it is tempered somewhat, that is, the form is derived directly from “ʾay(yV)-kā,” which is said to be etymologically derived from a basic particle /ʾayy-/ . The Ugaritic form, as well as Hebrew *ʾēk*, must, of course, be derived, from the form without parentheses, viz., /ʾayk-/ . The Hebrew and Syriac forms (Hebrew *ʾēk* and *ʾēkā^h*, Syriac *ʾaykan* and *ʾaykannā*) show, by the way, that the Ugaritic particle probably consisted of /ʾay/ + the expanding particle /-ka/, that is, the second element was not the adverb *kā*, as T. holds.

— p. 754 (§81.64a). With no hesitation, T. indicates the final vowel of *lm*, ‘why?’, as /ā/, then cites three forms from other Semitic languages which illustrate that the vowel must have been short, viz., Hebrew *lam(m)ā^h*, Syriac *l³mā³*, and Arabic *lima* (the /ā/ in Hebrew is certainly secondary, i.e., represent the lengthening of /a/, while the length of the vowel in Syriac may also be secondary, as is often the case in word-final position in Aramaic). As for the first vowel, T. indicates that it may have been /i/ or /a/, but does not indicate the possibility of /ê/ (see above, remark to p. 52 [§21.341.21c], etc.).

— p. 754 (§82.11), p. 758 (§82.12). In line with observations made above (remark to p. 52 [§21.341.21c], etc.), {by} and {ly} may not be described simply as “orthogr. Variante” of {b} and {l}. It is just as plausible, if not more so, that the longer forms consist of the basic prepositions + the enclitic particle {-y}. It is also highly unlikely, because it goes against the evidence of the other West-Semitic languages, that *b* was realized with a long vowel (“[bī]”). The case of *l*, however, is very different because it appears to have developed a secondary form /lē/ (← /lay/), more akin to Hebrew *ʾēlēy* (← /il/ + /ay/) than to Arabic *li/la*.

— pp. 755-81 (§82). T.'s presentation of the Ugaritic prepositions is certainly well-founded theoretically—how could I say otherwise when he accepts the basic thesis of my dissertation, namely that the prepositions in Ugaritic are principally marked for position

¹³¹⁰Bordreuil and Pardee, RSO XIV (2001) 371, 373; Pardee, BASOR 320 (2000) 73.

rather than for directionality?¹³¹¹ On the other hand, T. has not always distinguished as well as he might have done between prepositions in verbal clauses, where any possible directionality may have been a function of the verb/preposition combination, and nominal clauses, where the function of the preposition may be expected to have hewed more closely to its ‘original’ meaning. The principal criticism that I would make of this section, however, concerns the organization of each paragraph: the data for any given prepositional lexeme may be organized into both grammatical and lexical categories without proper distinction between the two. For example, *l* is presented in fifteen sections set off by bullets, seven of which are grammatical in nature (from “possessivisch” to “ablativisch”) while the other eight are defined by glosses (from “bei” to “gegen”); the two forms of categorization are interspersed according to no clear principle (i.e., “in (großer Zahl),” “wegen,” and “während” all follow “distributiv” but do not appear to be subsets thereof). Such a presentation must be judged faulty because it is confusing. Moreover the use of many detailed German glosses as an organizing principle in so serious a grammar must be judged unwise—the place for such categorizations is the dictionary, of which the intention is to offer glosses of words from one language in another, not a reference grammar. (I do not mean to imply that grammatical categories do not have broad lexical values in any given language that are more or less easily extrapolated to another language; it is the mixing of the two categories and the micro-organization of a grammar by translation value to which I am objecting.)

— p. 756 (§82.11). T. does not mention the possibility that *trtqš + b + yd* in RS 3.367 iv 13' and 20' (*KTU* 1.2) and *yrtqš* in lines 15' and 23' of the same text may express ‘whirling in the hand’ rather than “Springe aus der Hand.”¹³¹²

— p. 757 (§82.11), p. 792 (§83.141.1a). T. takes RS 24.266:12-13 (*KTU* 1.119) as expressing a sacrificial act in which a bull would be offered either as a *ûrm*-sacrifice or as a *šnpt*-sacrifice. An alternative division of the text is possible, however, which does away with this optional functional categorization of a single specific sacrifice, something for which I know no precise parallel in these texts. If the phrase *û ûrm û šnpt* is attached to the following series of sacrifices and if *û* is identified as the coordinating conjunction (on which see below, remark to pp. 782-91 [§83.1-132]), then a double functional categorization is applied to a series of sacrifices¹³¹³—something for which good parallels also do not exist but which is easier to understand because of the multiple sacrifices in the following list.

— p. 758 (§82.12). One may doubt that the semantics of *l* in the epistolary formula *NĠR + l šlm*, attested now in RS 92.2005:7-8 (RSO XIV 49) but common in the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra as *NŠR + ana šulmāni*, is correctly described as an “Angabe eines Ortes” and that it is to be translated “bei, neben, in,” here “euch beide in Wohlergehen bewahren.” The agreement in the two languages on using a preposition that commonly expresses a

¹³¹¹*UF* 8 (1976) 286-91.

¹³¹²Pardee, *UF* 8 (1976) 267-68; idem, *BiOr* 37 (1980) 274; cf. Bordreuil and Pardee, *MARI* 7 (1993) 63-64, 66-67; idem, *Manuel* (2004) II 9-10.

¹³¹³Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 666, 667, 669, 676; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 52.

notion of ‘to’ or ‘toward’ led the editors of the text to see the *l* here as marking a result of the divine protection: “Que les dieux en vue de (votre) bien-être vous protègent.”¹³¹⁴

— p. 760 (§82.12). One encounters here another striking use of “n[eue] L[esung].” The reading in question is {l [ʿ]nt} in RS 1.009:2 (in place of {l [dg]n} in *CAT* 1.46), first proposed in print in 1995.¹³¹⁵ The authors of *CAT* have muddled the waters here by proposing in a note that the correct reading might be either {[šp]n} or {[ʿ]nt},¹³¹⁶ then asserting in a *corrigendum* that they really meant the latter proposal to be {[ʿ]n<t>}.¹³¹⁷

— p. 760 (§82.12). T. does not explain what would be the point of gathering dew ‘from’ barley rather than ‘for’ it (HSP *l* in RS 3.322+ ii 2, 6 [*KTU* 1.19]).¹³¹⁸

— p. 760 (§82.12). Though he attaches a question mark to his own interpretation of ŠPK *l* in RS 92.2014:14-15 (RSO XIV 52) as ‘pour out away from’, T. neither informs the reader that that was not the interpretation of the editors of the text¹³¹⁹ nor does he even mention the possibility of another interpretation.

— p. 760 (§82.12). Because T. so often situates Ugaritic phenomena in the broader context of the Semitic languages, one would have expected that to the assertion “*l* zur Einführung des Handlungssubjekts in Passivkonstruktionen ist ug. nicht nachweisbar” would have been added another to the effect that none of the ancient Semitic languages expresses the agent of a passive verb explicitly.

— p. 762 (§82.13). Does German not have terms for distinguishing an equational metaphor from an explicit simile? T. remarks with regard to RS 2.[022]+ i 14-16 (*KTU* 1.5) and RS 24.293:24 (*KTU* 1.133) that “Vergleichsgrößen können auch ohne *k(m)* genannt werden” with no comment on the rhetorical form. In these parallel texts, the phrase *npš npš lbim thwt* takes on the form of the equational metaphor: ‘My throat (is) the throat of the lion in the wasteland’.¹³²⁰

— p. 762 (§82.13), p. 802 (§83.24c), p. 904 (§97.41). In a remark attached to the end of the section on the preposition *k*, T. asserts that the particle *k* in RS 2.[009]+ ii 6, 7, 28, 29 (*KTU* 1.6) is to be analyzed as a conjunction, not as a preposition. §83.24c is devoted entirely to this passage which is said to contain the only case of the conjunction *k* “mit modaler Funktion,” but that example is said to be uncertain and the section concludes with the assertion that “die *k*-Lexeme sind hier jedoch eher als Präpp. zu deuten” (similar bipolar presentation on p. 904). This same conclusion was already assumed on p. 748 (§81.3c), where the particle was translated as a preposition. The distinction is only made in German

¹³¹⁴Bordreuil and Pardee, RSO XIV (2001) 371, 373; Pardee, *Context* III (2002) 112 n. 192.

¹³¹⁵Pardee, *BSOAS* 58, p. 229. The reading was indicated in the transcriptions of texts collated by P. Bordreuil and myself that was made available both to the authors of *CAT* prior to its publication and to T. prior to the publication of this grammar.

¹³¹⁶*CAT*, p. 83, n. 1.

¹³¹⁷Dietrich and Loretz, *Word-List* (1996) 225.

¹³¹⁸Contrast Pardee, *UF* 7 (1975) 346; idem, *UF* 8 (1976) 230; idem, *Context* I (1997) 352.

¹³¹⁹Bordreuil and Pardee, RSO XIV (2001) 388: “Au bénéfice de ʾUrtēnu, de son corps, de ses membres.”

¹³²⁰Pardee, *Context* I (1997) 265; Smith *apud* Parker, ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 142.

by adding “(ist)” at the end of the clause according to the analysis as a conjunction. In English the different analyses would be expressed more explicitly: ‘As (is) the heart of a cow for her calf ...’ vs. ‘Like the heart of a cow for her calf ...’. The absence of other cases of such a use of the conjunction in Ugaritic and perhaps elsewhere (T. cites no comparative evidence and I can think of none) makes the prepositional analysis preferable. That being the case, the category should have been eliminated with, perhaps, a note in the section on the preposition mentioning the other analysis as an outside possibility—not the contrary, as T. has chosen in fact to do.

— p. 764 (§82.31). T. rightly observes that the verb *ṭṭb* is normally followed by the preposition *l* in the epistolary return-of-news formula and cites two cases of *ṭṭb* ‘*m* (RS 15.008:19 [*KTU* 2.16] and RS 92.2005:13 [RSO XIV 49]) To these may be added RS 94.2479:7-10 {*tmny* (8) ‘*m . ādy . mnm <šlm>* (9) *w . rgm . ṭṭb* (10) ‘*m . ‘bdh*}, ‘There with my lady, whatever <is fine>, may she return word (of that) to her servant’.¹³²¹ Since in the other two examples the phrase was *ṭṭb* ‘my, ‘return (word) to me’, without an explicit nominal object, this third example is valuable in that it shows that ‘*m* was used with nouns as well in the absolute formulation, just as is the case with *l*.

— p. 764 (§82.31). It is a dangerous procedure to reason from the clear case of *MḤṢ* ‘*m* meaning ‘to fight against’ in RS 2.[009]⁺ vi 24-25 (*KTU* 1.6) that the preposition ‘*m* means “gegen” elsewhere, in particular in col. I, lines 51 and 52, of this same text, where the difficulties are legion and T.’s argument that the passage must refer to combat is not altogether convincing.¹³²² The presentation here appears to be based a bit too much on the German translational equivalent (contrast English ‘to fight with’, which is normally the equivalent of ‘to fight against’ but can mean ‘to fight alongside’, as in ‘X fought with Y against Z’).

— p. 767 (§82.34). The preposition ‘*l* does not function ablatively in RS 3.325⁺ vi 47 (*KTU* 1.16): the prepositional phrase complements *šm*, ‘those who prey’,¹³²³ not *tdy*, ‘you drive out’. Thus the only example of ‘*l* fitting such a category disappears.

— p. 770 (§82.38). Again in the interest of banning 2^d person forms from the ritual texts,¹³²⁴ T. prefers emendation or aberration: *tnrr* in RS 24.266:9 (*KTU* 1.119) should mean ‘oven’ (i.e., /tan(n)ūru/) rather than a verb meaning ‘to produce light’.¹³²⁵

— p. 772 (§82.311), cf. p. 333 (§54.423d). T. classifies *bl* in RIH 78/20:7 (*CAT* 1.169) as a certain example of the preposition meaning ‘without’ and remarks that the terms *hlš* and *šml*

¹³²¹See, provisionally, Pardee, *Context* III (2002) 107 with note 146; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* II (2004), text 32 in the *Choix de textes*.

¹³²²Contrast Pardee, *Context* I (1997) 269; Smith *apud* Parker, ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 154; Wyatt, *Religious Texts* (1998) 132.

¹³²³Pardee, *UF* 7 (1975) 375; idem, *UF* 8 (1976) 275; idem, *Context* I (1997) 342; Parker *apud* Parker, ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 41; cf. Wyatt, *Religious Texts* (1998) 241, who takes ‘*l* in the sense of ‘child’.

¹³²⁴See, explicitly, T. in *UF* 33 (2001) 692.

¹³²⁵Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 666, 667, 673; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 52; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 57, 58, 186.

in the same phrase are unclear, but leaves unmentioned that not everyone accepts that *bl* is a preposition in this text.¹³²⁶ In the other mythological text cited (RS 3.322+ i 44-45 [*KTU* 1.19]), the thrice repeated *bl* is better identified as a noun or as the adverbial negative particle derived therefrom,¹³²⁷ each time the subject of a nominal clause, ‘(there is) absence of dew ...’.¹³²⁸ T. cites one other case of what he takes to be the preposition *bl* (RS 16.395:11 [*KTU* 4.243]), then remarks that all other occurrences of *bl* are to be classified as the negative particle; he singles out RS 2.[003]+ ii 37, 38 (*KTU* 1.14) but does not give his reasons here for that interpretation and translates the passage below with a preposition, “ohne Zahl,” but gives the literal meaning of *bl spr* as “der Nicht-Aufzählung” (p. 817 [§87.31b]). The interpretation of *bl* in RS 22.225:4-5 (*KTU* 1.96) as a noun appears likely (so T. p. 780 [§84.424]) because it is there preceded by the preposition *l* and compound prepositions are relatively rare in Ugaritic.¹³²⁹ Similarly, *bl* in the phrase *d bl spr*, ‘without number’, in RS 2.[003]+ ii 37 might be more plausibly taken as the noun (‘of absence of number’) or the preposition (‘who were without number’) because it is introduced by the particle *d* and not followed by a preposition which would have explicitly marked the phrase as genitival (‘of which there was no number to them’ = ‘they had no number’). T. treats the phrase *bl spr* as the negative particle negativizing a noun (cf. phrases of the type *lō’ dābār* in Biblical Hebrew), but the presence of the relative particle makes that interpretation dubious (in Biblical Hebrew, simple adverbial phrases with *lō’* are not introduced by the relative pronoun).

— p. 772 (§82.312). T.’s dubiety about the reading of {db} in RS 2.002:65 (*KTU* 1.23) is misplaced: though both the {d} and the {b} are badly damaged, enough remains of each sign to make the reading sure. In particular, one sees the forms of the first and third verticals of the {d}, with space in between for the second and the sign cannot, therefore, be {b}, as T. opines.

— p. 774 (§82.411). T. considers that it “läßt sich nicht sicher eruieren” whether *bd* and *l* functioned differently in nominal sentences of the type *šd PN₁ bd/l PN₂* in administrative texts. It appears impossible that they did not because in some administrative texts one finds various combinations of these two prepositional phrases, including the double categorization

¹³²⁶E.g., Pardee, *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (1993) 212; idem, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 877, 886 (with previous bibliography in notes 72, 73); idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 160; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 67, 68, 151; del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *Diccionario I* (1996) 108.

¹³²⁷T.’s alternate interpretation is as a negative particle (pp. 817-18 [§87.32a]).

¹³²⁸Cf. Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 351 (interpreted as a description of the drought described in the earlier narrative); Parker *apud* Parker, ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 69 (the translation appears to reflect this same interpretation); Wyatt, *Religious Texts* (1998) 296 (interpreted as a curse formula). The interpretation of this passage hinges on the interpretation of *yšly* in line 39: Pardee and Parker seek to avoid a negative polarity, translating respectively by ‘to utter a spell’ and ‘to abjure’, while Wyatt believes it means ‘to curse’ (cf. Pardee, note 95; Wyatt, p. 295, note 201); T. appears to accept the former view since he translates *yšly* by “anriefen” (p. 554 [§74.412.27]) and by “beschwören” (p. 669 [§75.537d], p. 694 [§76.347]).

¹³²⁹Del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *Diccionario I* (1996) 180, classify *bl* in this text as a preposition but cite the text without !

lX bd Y in the same entry, e.g., RS 18.024:2-5, 6-7 (*KTU* 4.337).¹³³⁰ The fact that this text is dealing with movable goods while *T.* was referring to fields is insufficient basis for holding that *bd* and *l* were interchangeable when the entity in question was real estate. On the other hand, until the Ugaritic economy becomes known in more detail, it is difficult to say exactly what the difference was. In theory, when the entity in question is fields, *bd* should denote some kind of superintendence, *l* some form of proprietorship, but the precise form that each of these legal statuses took is presently unknown.¹³³¹

— p. 774 (§82.411). *T.* does not point out that his interpretation of RS 18.031:19 (*KTU* 2.38) as “sein (sc. des Schiffes) ganzes Getreide” reflects a n[eue] L[esung]: he transcribes *kl dr‘h* whereas *KTU/CAT* show *dr‘hm*. It is the latter reading that is correct.¹³³²

— p. 775 (§82.411). The preposition in the phrase *ykl bd* in RS 19.015:1 (*KTU* 1.91) does not mark the agent of a passive verb, for the agent of the passive verb is not marked in the ancient Semitic languages and because it is preposterous to believe that a thousand liters of wine¹³³³ would have been used up *by* the person in question (perhaps {r[b khnm]}, ‘the chief priest’). Whether the verb be passive or simply stative,¹³³⁴ the preposition marks the oversight by the official in question, responsible for storing the wine and distributing it for actual consumption at the various feasts named in the first part of this text.¹³³⁵

— p. 777 (§82.414), cf. p. 766 (§82.33). *T.* takes ‘*d* in the phrase *b ‘d ‘lm* in the practice letter RS 16.265:6 (*KTU* 5.9) as a noun that is to be vocalized /‘ād-/ and translated as “Dauer”; it is said to be cognate with Hebrew ‘*ōd*, ‘yet’, which also occurs following the preposition *b*². The problem with this analysis, which goes back to the editor of the text and has been adopted by a few scholars,¹³³⁶ is that, in Hebrew at least—the point of comparison generally cited!—*b*²‘*ōd* means ‘while yet’, as in, e.g., Prov. 31:15 *wattaqom b*²‘*ōw d laylāh*, ‘she arises while it is yet night’. The epistolary formula cannot, however, mean ‘while it is yet eternity’, as is shown by simple logic and by the use of *adi darīti*, ‘to eternity’, in corresponding Akkadian formulae.¹³³⁷ The Ugaritic phrase must consist, therefore, either of a compound preposition (*b* + ‘*d*, ‘in + until/during’) or, as I consider more likely, of the preposition *b* + the common noun cognate with Hebrew ‘*ad*, ‘perpetuity’.¹³³⁸ This noun is

¹³³⁰Cf. Pardee, *Syria* 77 (2000) 46-48.

¹³³¹On ownership of fields by members of the royal personnel, see Pardee, *Semitica* 49 (1999) 19-64.

¹³³²See the new photograph and copy in Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004), text 26 in the *Choix de textes*.

¹³³³On the amount, see Pardee, *Topoi* 11 (2001) 673, correcting Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 518.

¹³³⁴My preference in *Les textes rituels* (2000) 491, 494-96; see remark here above to p. 512 (§74.222.2), etc..

¹³³⁵*Ibid.*, p. 497.

¹³³⁶Virolleaud, *PRU* II (1957) 40; Dahood, *Psalms* III (1970) 282 (who proposes that several Hebrew texts be revocalized in favor of ‘*ōd*); Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 427; for Gordon, *UT* (1965), §10.8 (p. 96), §19.1813 (p. 453), ‘*d* here could be either the adverb/noun ‘*ōd* or the noun ‘*ad*, ‘perpetuity’.

¹³³⁷Ahl, *ibid.*, p. 139.

¹³³⁸J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache* (ed. O. Eissfeldt; Berichte über die Verhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig; Philologisch-historische Klasse, Band 106, Heft

attested in poetry, but only here in prose, and its use in this artificial letter appears to constitute another element of the high-flown style that the scribe is imitating (see remark above to p. 724 [§77.325]).

— pp. 777-78 (§82.421), p. 792 (§83.141.1b), pp. 792-93 (§83.141.2a). T. glosses the compound preposition *lp* as “gemäß dem Wortlaut von; auf Geheiß; gemäß; nach Art von,” then uses the latter in his translation of RS 1.002:19'-21' (*KTU* 1.40) where the idiom is *ḥṭ*, ‘to sin’, + *û lp* and of lines 28'-32' of the same text, where the idiom is *šn ypkm*, ‘your “beauty” changes’, + *ûlp*. He comments that the prepositional phrase may also be interpreted as “gegenüber” but provides no indication of what he believes the socio-religious function of the text would be if the Ugaritians are in it described as sinning or of seeing their well-being disintegrate ‘in the manner of’ various ethnic groups with whom they had regular contact; nor does he explain how ‘against’ would work with the second idiom. For a global interpretation based on the an interpretation of *lp* as meaning ‘according to the declaration of’, which T. only includes among his glosses, not as a real interpretational possibility, see my studies of the text.¹³³⁹

— p. 778 (§82.422). By the principle of ‘a single swallow does not a summer make’, the single occurrence of the noun *pnm* spelled with {w} in the pronominal state (*pnwh* in RS 2.[014]⁺ i 6 [*KTU* 1.3]) is insufficient to prove that this noun (and the related verb meaning ‘to turn’) were derived from a III-w root, as T. assumes here and above, p. 204 (§33.443). As for the suffixal form of the noun written with two {n}s ({l pnnh} in RS 2.[014]⁺ iv 40 [*KTU* 1.3] and in RS 3.362⁺ ii 17' [*KTU* 1.10]), T. offers no explanation for his vocalization “*panî-nnVhu*.” The first and perhaps most obvious remark: as has been observed many times above, the vowel /î/ would not have retained its length in a closed syllable and the actual Ugaritic form would perforce have been /paninnVhu/. But even more important: what is the reason for the gemination of the /n/? This looks for all the world like a suffix on a verb (i.e., /-hu/-ha/ attached to the energetic form ending in a vowel, e.g., /-annahu/), not the suffix appropriate for nouns (where the suffix follows immediately on the case vowel). More likely than the hypothesis according to which suffixes appropriate for verbs were occasionally extrapolated to nouns is the idea that compound prepositions, just like simple prepositions, showed forms expanded with {-n}.¹³⁴⁰ Above, pp. 221 and 223 (§41.221.51, §41.221.61), T. refers to {nh} on *pnnh* as the “sogennante *n*-Variante des P[ronominal]s[uffix]” whereas here he refers to “*-n* erweiterte Formen” of the prepositions; he provides here a cross-reference to §41.221.51, .61, but the examples cited on p. 781 are only of primary prepositions (*b*, *l*, and ‘*m*’). It appears necessary to adopt the view that the {n} is an expanding element on the preposition, not a part of an expanded pronominal suffix;

3; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963) §1999 (p. 227); Parker, *Studies* (1967) 62, n. 7; Pardee, *UF* 7 (1975) 362; Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 11; Barré, *Maarav* 3 (1982) 186.

¹³³⁹ *Leslau* (1991) 1181-96; *Les textes rituels* (2000) 92-142; *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 77-83 and n. 113 (pp. 111-12); cf. Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 52-55, 193.

¹³⁴⁰ The signs {bdnhm} in RS 18.031:18 (*KTU* 2.38) were first explained by Hoftijzer as representing the compound preposition *bd* (← /bi + yadi/) plus the expanding element *-n* plus the 3 m.pl. pronominal suffix (*UF* 11 [1979] 387 with note 37).

l pnnh shows that compound prepositions had forms with expanding *-n* just like primary prepositions. The phrase *l pnnh* is, therefore, to be vocalized with the *-n* expanding particle, and there is no reason to expect that *-n* to have been geminated. The expected vocalization is, therefore, something like /lê panînahu/.

— pp. 782-91 (§83.1-132). T. makes no place in this section on coordinating conjunctions for *û*, to be vocalized /ʾû/ and distinguished from the disjunctive conjunction, also written {û}, but vocalized /ʾô/ ← /*ʾaw/.¹³⁴¹ For specific comments on instances of /ʾû/, see remark above to p. 757 (§81.11), etc., and below to p. 792 (§83.141.1a). The origin of the conjunction is obscure because one cannot cite for it rules of the relatively simple type that account for Akkadian *u* or Hebrew/Aramaic {w} pronounced as /û/. Nevertheless, I am not convinced by the proposal of del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín to see it as a semantic variant of disjunctive /ʾô/ which would have had a conjunctive function.¹³⁴²

— p. 782 (§83.1). One should perhaps not lodge too vigorous a complaint against T.'s formulation when he says that the coordinating conjunctions “dienen zum Ausdruck” of various “Beziehungen” (he names copulative, adversative, disjunctive, and causal)—though “Ausdruck” is not the best term since the conjunction does not ‘express’ the ‘relationship’, it only links two phrases that happen to have this or that relationship. In a remark to p. 786 (§83.113d), however, the terminology is even less felicitous: “Zu einer vergleichbaren Funktion [the reference is to the adversative relationship] der Konj. *û* in den Amarnabriefen” The particle itself has neither different vocalizations according to its different translation values nor different functions defined syntactically (as, for example, with certain particles that introduce morphologically distinct phrases, such as particles that function both as prepositions, introducing a noun, and as conjunctions, introducing a finite verb); its single function is explicitly to mark a link between various morpho-syntactic units (words, phrases, clauses, and on up the ladder to long literary units). These units will have different logical relationships that require different translations of the conjunction in languages where such relationships are expressed explicitly at the lexical level. At the most basic level, first-year students of Biblical Hebrew, for example, have to learn that the conjunction *w* may be translated either as ‘and’ or as ‘but’ (among others) but that these are not different manifestations of *w*, only a reflection of the fact that Biblical Hebrew does not have a commonly used adversative particle; the various translations reflect, not different meanings or even different functions of a single *w*, but the logical relationships between clauses as expressed in a given modern language. It does not appear to be too much to ask to find this basic fact of grammar/lexicography reflected in a reference grammar such as this.

— p. 782 (§83.11). T. cites the Hebrew forms of the conjunction cognate to Ugaritic *w* as “*w^e*” and “*wa*”; to these should be added *wā* (as in *tōhū^w wā bōhū^w*), not an unimportant

¹³⁴¹For the instances of coordinating /ʾû/ in the ritual texts, see Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 1103 and commentaries to the texts cited there.

¹³⁴²*Diccionario I* (1996) 1.

alloform since it provides a datum for the proto-form being /wa/. As earlier evidence, it would have been appropriate also to cite Eblaite *wa*.¹³⁴³

— p. 784 (§83.112a). Whether the *w* of the phrase *w hl*, ‘and (X-category) is pure, i.e., cultically unrestricted’, common in the ritual texts, belongs properly to the category of ‘pleonastic’ *wāw* depends on whether *hl* is verbal or not. If both this phrase and the preceding are nominal phrases, ‘(there is) setting of the sun and the king (is) pure (/wa ḥallu/) or ‘and (there is) purity of the king’ (/wa ḥullu/),¹³⁴⁴ then the two clauses are on the same syntactic level and the use of the *w* is not peculiar.¹³⁴⁵ If, on the other hand, *hl* is verbal (/wa ḥalla/), as is certainly plausible,¹³⁴⁶ then the ‘*wāw*-consecutive’ structure following a nominal clause fits the category under discussion in this section, i.e., the translation is ‘(At) the setting of the sun, the king becomes pure’.

— p. 784 (§83.112c). T. classification of *km ḡlmm w ‘rbn* (RS 2.[014]⁺ iii 8'-9' [KTU 1.3]) as containing an example of ‘pleonastic *wāw*’ is certainly valid, but doubts arise regarding his interpretation, “Wie (zwei) Pagen * * tretet fürwahr ein!” (the two asterisks stand for the untranslated *w*). The persons addressed are two pages; what would be the force of the command to enter ‘like two pages’? It appears better to take *km* as an adverb meaning ‘so, at that moment, then’ or the like.¹³⁴⁷ It is perhaps distinct from *kāma*, ‘thus’, consisting simply of the preposition plus enclitic *-m* (/kama/).

— p. 785 (§83.112e). T.’s doubts at taking the *w* of ‘*bdk ān w d ‘lmk* as ‘pleonastic’ appear well founded, for the second clause appears to be simply an expansion of the predicate of the first, lit. ‘I am your servant, (I am) the one of your eternity’. His first classification, as ‘explicative *wāw*’ (p. 783 [§83.111d]) is, therefore, preferable.

— p. 787 (§83.114a). T. suggests no alternative to the translation of {*w b‘lyskn . yd‘ . rgmh*} in RS 15.098:15 (KTU 2.17:8) by “Und mein Herr, der Gouverneur, soll seine Worte

¹³⁴³Cf., e.g., I. J. Gelb, “The Language of Ebla in the Light of the Sources from Ebla, Mari, and Babylonia,” in *Ebla 1975-1985. Dieci anni di studi linguistici e filologici. Atti del Convegno Internazionale (Napoli, 9-11 ottobre 1985)* (ed. L. Cagni; Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor, vol. XXVII; Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1987) 49-74, esp. p. 70.

¹³⁴⁴See discussion in Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 202-5.

¹³⁴⁵In his definition of the category, T. refers to only one specific syntactic incongruity, the so-called ‘hanging clause’ (“pendierendes Satzglied”); his two over-arching categories are “ein topikalisiertes ... Satzglied” and “ein nachgestelltes Satzglied”; in none of these is the *w* to be translated in German or “in anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen.” What characterizes all of these examples of “*w* zur Verbindung von Satzteilen,” however, is that the morpho-syntax of the clause or phrase introduced by *w* is different from that of the preceding clause or phrase. Most examples consist of the well-known structure consisting of a prepositional phrase + *w* + verb, e.g., ‘in his lifting his eyes and he sees’ = ‘when he lifts his eyes, he sees’. But other categories are represented, e.g., a direct object followed by *w* plus a prepositional phrase: *št ālp qdmh // mriā w tk pnh*, ‘he puts a bovid before him, a fatling in his presence’, lit., ‘he puts a bovid before him, (he puts) a fatling and (it is) in the midst of his face’ (RS 2.[014]⁺ iv 41-42 [KTU 1.3]).

¹³⁴⁶On p. 675 (§75.64), T. parses the form as /QTLa/, but he also indicates in parentheses the alternative analysis as an adjective.

¹³⁴⁷Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 251. Wyatt (*Religious Texts* [1998] 77 with n. 41) translates like T., but considers the text to be defective; Smith (*apud* Parker, *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* [1997] 109) translates like T. without commentary.

zur Kenntnis nehmen.” The absence of a word-divider after {b¹ly} and the presence of {y} on a noun that would be in the nominative case (both attested but nevertheless minority usages) indicate that *b¹lyskn* may be a personal name.¹³⁴⁸

— pp. 787-88 (§83.115a). In this section entitled “Kopulative Konstruktionen ohne w,” one encounters only one putative example of two *nomina recta* following a *nomen rectum*: T. interprets *um phl phlt* in RS 24.244:1 (*KTU* 1.100) as meaning “die Mutter des Hengstes (und) der Stute.” He does not mention the fact that the standard interpretation is to take *phlt* as modifying *um* appositionally, rather than genitively: ‘The mother of the stallion, the mare ...’ (/’ummu pahli pahlatu/ rather than /’ummu pahli pahlati/).¹³⁴⁹

— p. 788 (§83.12), p. 790 (§83.123b), p. 832 (§89.29). In the first paragraph cited, T. says that the analysis of {pm} in 29.095:11 (*KTU* 2.71) as the conjunction *p* + enclitic *-m* is “wahrscheinlich”; in the second, the presence of the conjunction *p* is said to be “sicher”; in the third, the combination of *p* + *-m* is described as “möglich”—in the latter case, the interpretation of the passage is described as “unsicher.” If the presence of the conjunction *p* is certain, then that of the expanded form *pm* must be equally certain, for by no stretch of the imagination can the {m} be attached to the following signs, which are {yqh}. On the meaning of this passage, see above, remark to p. 270 (§51.45w), etc.

— p. 791 (§83.131), pp. 807-8 (§85.2). Not a single example cited on p. 791 requires the analysis of *ap* as a coordinating conjunction, in spite of T.’s claim that he is citing only examples in which *ap* “eindeutig kopulativ gebraucht wird.” Once one is willing to admit that the particle can function as an adverb (which is what T. essentially does in §85.2, where usages of *ap* as an “Affirmationspartikel” are proposed),¹³⁵⁰ all examples may be identified as an adverb which, because of its etymology (the conjunction *pa* + prosthetic *’alif*), marks a logical relationship between what precedes and what follows. For example, in RS 15.098:8-10 (*KTU* 2.17:1-3) {l yblt . hb¹tm (9) ap ksphm (10) l yblt}, which T. translates “Du hast keine *Hubtu*-Truppen gebracht. Und auch ihren Sold hast du nicht gebracht,” may just as well be translated ‘You haven’t brought the *hubtu*-men; what’s more, as regards their money, you haven’t brought that either.’ T., following most commentators, takes *ap* in RS 2.[024] i 12 (*KTU* 1.22) {tbh . alp¹m . ap šin} as coordinating the two elements of a compound object phrase: “Er schlachtete sowohl Rinder als auch Kleinvieh.” The following division of the

¹³⁴⁸So, most recently, van Soldt, *UF* 33 (2001) 581 n. 22.

¹³⁴⁹So the editor, Virolleaud, *Ugaritica* V (1968) 566; cf. Astour, *JNES* 27 (1968) 15; Pardee, *JANES* 10 (1978) 74-75; idem, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 201, 202; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 174; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 36. Of recent translators, Parker (*apud* Parker, ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* [1997] 219) analyses the line as does T., with a note on the other interpretation (p. 223, n. 1), while Wyatt retains the older interpretation (*Religious Texts* [1998] 378).

¹³⁵⁰Like T., Gordon ascribes both functions to the particle (*UT* [1965] 104 [§11.10] 106 [§12.1]), as do del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín (*Diccionario* I [1996] 42-43). Both Segert, *Basic Grammar* (1984) 80 (§57.22), 134 (§83.3), and Rainey, *Or* 56 (1987) 401, parse *ap* as a conjunction in RS 18.075:21’ (*KTU* 2.41:20), which is certainly incorrect (the phrase is *w ap ank*, ‘and I, for my part ...’).

passage, however, provides good semantic and quantitative parallelism (only the syllable count is indicated).¹³⁵¹

<i>tbḥ ḏlp̄m</i>	/ṭabaḥa ʾalapīma/ (7)	verb + A	He slaughters bovids,
<i>ḏp šin šql</i>	/ʾapa šaʾna šaqīla/ (7)	B + verb'	Yea he fells caprovids:
<i>ṭrm w mri ḏlm</i>	/ṭōrīma wa marīʾī ʾēlīma/ (10)	A' + B'	bulls and fattened rams,
<i>ʿglm dt šnt</i>	/ʿagalīma dāta šanati/ (9)	A''	yearling calves,
<i>imr qmš llim</i>	/ʾimmirī qumši laliʾīma/ (9)	B'' + B'''	innumerable lambs, kids. ¹³⁵²

If this analysis be accepted, it eliminates the only example of the use of *wa* as a copula linking noun phrases that is cited by any of the authorities that I have consulted. The frequency with which *ḏp* follows the coordinating conjunction *w* and with which it precedes an independent pronoun (e.g., *w ḏp ḏnk*, ‘and I for my part’) in both Ugaritic¹³⁵³ and Hebrew makes the identification as a coordinating conjunction dubious.¹³⁵⁴ Finally, in both paragraphs cited, T. indicates the vocalization /ʾappV/,¹³⁵⁵ for which I can see no basis. T. does not propose a specific derivation, but I see no reason to doubt the etymology indicated here above, i.e., prosthetic /ʾ/ attached to the conjunction *p*, analogical to *id*, ‘then’ (/ʾ/ + the relative/determinative pronoun /d/), or to *āl*, ‘not’ (/ʾ/ + the negative particle /l/). That derivation indicates the vocalization /ʾapa/—at least until explicit data confirm or disprove it. — pp. 792-93 (§83.141). T. classifies the two examples of *ūy* (RS 1.013⁺:13 [*KTU* 2.3] and RS 88.2159:21 [RSO XIV 51]) under the only word he recognizes behind the writing {ū}, viz., the disjunctive conjunction. In both passages where the particle occurs, however, the context is too damaged to permit distinguishing between coordinating /ʾū/ (on which see above, remark to pp. 782-91) and disjunctive /ʾô/.

— p. 792 (§83.141.1a). T. includes the phrase *ʿmtmr mlk ... ū nqmd mlk* (RS 34.126:11-12, 25-26) under disjunctive *ū* but translates it “auch(?),” i.e., conjunctively.¹³⁵⁶ Since the function of the particle in these passages is clearly not disjunctive (the reference is to ‘*Amittamru* and *Niqmaddu*,’ not to ‘*Amittamru* or *Niqmaddu*’), it is better to admit the existence of a coordinating conjunction of which the vocalization may be /ʾū/.¹³⁵⁷

¹³⁵¹On the place of the various parallelistic devices in Ugaritic and Hebrew poetry as I understand them, see Pardee, *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism. A Trial Cut* (‘nt *I* and Proverbs 2) (SVT 39; 1988).

¹³⁵²This formulaic list is found also in RS 2.[008]⁺ vi 40-43 (*KTU* 1.4) and, largely restored, in RS 3.361 iv 30-32 (*KTU* 1.1).

¹³⁵³T. includes *w ḏp* in RS 88.2159:9 (RSO XIV 51) among his “eindeutig” examples of *ḏp* functioning as a conjunction, but no others; the context of *w ḏp* in this text is badly damaged, but the adverb is certainly not followed by an independent pronoun (the signs are {ūt[...]}).

¹³⁵⁴In Hebrew, the status of the particle is clouded by its association with *kī* to form a compound conjunction *ʿap kī*, which may or may not represent an original conjunctival function for *ḏp*.

¹³⁵⁵Rainey, *Or* 56 (1987) 401, gives /ʾappa/, with no explanation.

¹³⁵⁶His alternative analysis, as the interjection *ū*, will not stand up for two reasons: (1) such a particle is as yet not certainly attested in Ugaritic (see remark below to p. 805 [§84.22]) and (2) such a translation of RS 34.126 (p. 805: “Gerufen ist — ach! — der König *Niqmaddu*”) does not fit the rhetoric of RS 34.126, in particular ll. 25-26, where *ū nqmd* appears at the end of a long list.

¹³⁵⁷Bordreuil and Pardee, *Une bibliothèque* (1991) 154, 155; Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 818, 819, 1103; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 63-64, 141.

— p. 796 (§83.211). It is debatable whether half a page should have been devoted to the possibility that *āhr* functioned in Ugaritic as a conjunction when no certain example exists whereas certain examples of the functions as an adverb and as a preposition do exist. Cross-references to the sections dealing with the latter categories would have been sufficient. (The ambiguity exists, of course, only because our texts are unvocalized: the Ugaritians would have distinguished clearly between, say, an adverb followed by 3 m.s. /QTLa/, ‘thereafter he arrived’, and a preposition followed by the infinitive of the verb, ‘after the arrival of ...’.)

— p. 796 (§83.211). T.’s argument that *īd* must be a subordinating conjunction because it may appear at the beginning of a text is insufficient to prove the point because the particle is attested to date primarily in ritual texts. In this genre, the text borne by a given tablet is not always independent of other ritual events, i.e., the text on a given tablet may begin *in medias res*. The fact that *k* is the common conjunction for introducing subordinate temporal clauses may be adduced as a (relatively weak) argument for classifying *īd* as an adverb. But, until a text is discovered in which one or the other of these analyses is clear, the question must remain open.¹³⁵⁸

— p. 797 (§83.213). T. devotes half a page to the proposition that *hlm* is a subordinating conjunction, then a long remark showing that such is not necessarily the case. In fact there is no reason, etymological or contextual, for believing that this particle ever functioned as a subordinating conjunction. *hlm* is simply an expansion of *hl* and, unless clear evidence of conjunctival usage exists, there is no reason to see it as anything but an adverbial particle of presentation, perhaps with a temporal connotation along the lines of ‘then, next’. One may note here that *hlm* is followed directly by the verb in only one text (RS 24.244:6 *et passim* [KTU 1.100]), the only one of his list to which he attaches the question mark. This word order is not, of course, required of conjunctival usage, but it does occur frequently. Presentative particles, on the other hand, often precede a topicalized noun in the phrase, often the subject.

— p. 798 (§83.221). I see no reason to set up a separate grammatical category for *ātr* in the phrase {ʾāldm (34) ātr . īt . bqt (35) w . štn . ly}, ‘A man, wherever he might be, seek out and dispatch to me’ (RS 18.038:33-35 [KTU 2.39]). T. does so and entitles it “Lokale Konjunktionen” but the section contains this example only and, furthermore, it contains the correct analysis of the form as a common noun (“Subst. *atr* ‘Ort, Stelle’ in einem adverbialen Kasus”). The correct grammatical analysis was argued in detail by Rainey as early as 1966.¹³⁵⁹ One cannot posit the passage from one grammatical category to another on the basis of a single example.

— p. 800 (§83.232d). T. follows KTU/CAT in reading {īm} as the last signs of the line in RS 1.024 B 3 (KTU 4.17:3). Traces of another sign appear after these two, however, and then the tablet is broken off. Though the traces are not clear, the sign in question is certainly

¹³⁵⁸See my more detailed discussion, with bibliography on the two analyses, in *Les textes rituels* (2000) 482-83.

¹³⁵⁹In Hebrew in the journal *Lešonenu* 30, pp. 250-72; see the English version in *UF* 3 (1971) 151-72, esp. 160-62.

not the word-divider, and this text does not, therefore, contain the conjunction *im*. Read perhaps {im^rl}, viz., the same word as appears in line 1.

— p. 800 (§83.24). As remarked above (remark to p. 52 [§21.341.21c], etc.), {ky} may not be just an “orthogr. Variante” of the conjunction *k*, but a phonetic one, i.e., the regular form expanded by enclitic -y, hence /kīya/.

— p. 802 (§83.24d), p. 822 (§88.22b). The first paragraph is unnecessarily devoted to a single example of the conjunction *k(y)*, said to introduce a “Kausalsatz (‘da, weil’),” in RS 18.038:19 (*KTU* 2.39). In the passage in question, the second *ky* does not mark the reason for the previous assertion but the content of the message: *w lḥt ākl ky lḥt ‘m špš b’lk ky ākl b ḥwtk inn špšn tūbd [...]* ‘Now regarding the fact that you sent a message to the Sun to the effect that there is no food in your land, the Sun is perishing...’.¹³⁶⁰ As the -n of apodosis on *špš* shows, the protasis of this reference to a preceding letter extends through *ākl b ḥwtk inn* and, as recent commentators have seen,¹³⁶¹ the passage does not refer to a request for food from the king of Ugarit to the Hittite emperor¹³⁶² but to a refusal on the part of the Ugaritic king to furnish food to his sovereign, refusal based on the claim that he has no food to send to Hatti.

— pp. 802-3 (§83.24e). T. accepts my views¹³⁶³ on the meaning and function of *k(y)* in the epistolary formula of the type *lḥt X k(y) lḥt*, ‘As concerns the fact that you sent a message regarding X’, lit. ‘the tablet of X, concerning the fact that you sent (it)’. (It was previously thought by many that the particle *k(y)* in this structure was to be analyzed as a relative pronoun rather than as a subordinating conjunction.) But nowhere does he outline how the *k(y)* subordinate clause is linked to the following main clause (that is done by *p*, *ht*, and Ø); nor does he deal specifically with the topic of a second subordinate clause inserted between the first *k(y)* clause and the main clause (on his misunderstanding of one of these, see preceding note).¹³⁶⁴

— p. 804 (§84.12). *I* in lines 1, 4, and 19 of the first of the Arslan Tash incantations is not vocative (the reading of line 1 indicated by T. is incorrect).¹³⁶⁵ There is, therefore, no attestation of a vocative *I* elsewhere in Northwest Semitic (on the similar use of Arabic /la/li/, see above, remark to p. 315 [§54.214b], etc.).

— p. 805 (§84.22). There is something wrong with a particle that is supposed to be phonetically indistinguishable from the conjunction meaning ‘or’ (both, according to T., were pronounced /ô/ ← /’aw/), that is supposed to mean both “ach!” and “wehe!,” and regarding which, in usage, it is possible to say “Es ist schwierig, eine genaue Grenzlinie zwischen der Ausrufpart. *u* und der Konj. *u* ‘oder’ ... zu ziehen.” There is in fact no convincing example of

¹³⁶⁰Pardee, *BiOr* 34 (1977) 7-8; idem, *UF* 13 (1981) 152; idem, *Context* III (2002) 95.

¹³⁶¹Freu, *Semita* 48 (1999) 27; Singer, *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies* (1999) 707-8, 717.

¹³⁶²J. Hoftijzer, “Une lettre du roi hittite,” pp. 379-87 in *Von Kanaan bis Kerala. Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. Dr. J. P. M. van der Ploeg O.P.* (AOAT 211; 1982).

¹³⁶³*BiOr* 34 (1977) 7-8.

¹³⁶⁴On these matters, see the chart in *BiOr* 34 (1977) 8.

¹³⁶⁵Pardee, *Syria* 75 (1998) 18, 20, 34-35.

the emphatic particle (see remark above to p. 196 [§33.322.3c] and the remark in note 741 on *ûzb* in RS 92.2014:1), and it should be removed from future editions of this grammar. T.'s own ambivalence is revealed by the fact that he translates *û* in RS 3.343+ iii 29' (*KTU* 1.15) and in RS 3.325+ i 4 (*KTU* 1.16) by “oder” on p. 793 but here by “Wehe!” As we saw above, remark to p. 792 (§83.141.1a), T. accepts implicitly that the particle /ʾô/ can also function conjunctively (on this view, proposed by del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, see remark to pp. 782-91 [§83.1-132]).

— p. 809 (§85.5). As was noted above (remarks to p. 88 [§31.3], etc.), *âdn* in RS 18.038:6, 8 (*KTU* 2.39) means ‘father’ not ‘lord’.¹³⁶⁶

— p. 809 (§85.5). T. suggests that {ûky} in RS 16.078+:5 (*KTU* 2.23) may consist of the emphatic particle *ûk* + enclitic -y. It may also consist of the conjunction *û* (see above, remark to pp. 782-91 [§83.1-132]) plus *ky*; the latter element may consist either of the well-attested conjunction plus enclitic -y (/kīya/) or of the adverb plus the enclitic particle (/kāya/).

— p. 809 (§85.7). T. remarks concerning the so-called ‘emphatic *k*’ that “Die Abgrenzung von *k* mit affirmativer (‘emphatischer’) Bedeutung von der kausal-koordinierenden Konj. *k* ist—insbesondere in satzeinleitender Position—schwierig.” If one accepts, as does T., that this particle is in fact phonetically identical to the conjunction and if one remarks the many examples of *kī* in Biblical Hebrew serving to link only very loosely one utterance to another, it appears necessary to accept that the ‘emphatic’ particle was extremely frequent in Biblical Hebrew, both in prose and in poetry but especially in the latter. An alternative view would be that there was no distinct emphatic particle in either language, that the coordinating conjunction could be used to link utterances with a looser form of causality than our modern languages would lead us to expect. This would mean that the clear cases of ‘emphatic’ *k* in Ugaritic, viz., where it appears before a verb that is dislocated to the right in its clause (i.e., the particle and the verb are not in first position in the clause), do not contain a distinct particle but the coordinating conjunction placed in an abnormal, i.e., emphatic or highly marked, position. It would, if there is anything to this view, be the syntax/word order that creates the emphasis, not the use of a lexically distinct particle. In any case, none of T.’s three examples of ‘emphatic’ *k* in first position in an utterance is particularly convincing, especially not the one example from prose: *k* in RS 18.038:7 (*KTU* 2.39) clearly introduces an explication of the previous statement and is translatable in standard American English by ‘for’.¹³⁶⁷ As regards the examples from poetry, little confidence is inspired when he describes them here as “relativ sichere Belege” after he has already provided a first classification of one of them as causal (p. 785 [§83.113b] on RS 3.362+ iii 35').

— p. 810 (§85.7b), p. 812 (§85.8b), p. 884 (§94.23). T. proposes somewhat hesitantly that RS 29.093 (*CAT* 2.70) would contain two examples of ‘emphatic’ *k*, but neither should have been cited here. I have already dealt with his treatment of line 23 above (remark to p. 448 [§73.243.1], etc.). A different division of the signs in line 22 from T.’s (*k l ttn âkl lhm*),

¹³⁶⁶Pardee, *Context* III (2002) 95.

¹³⁶⁷*Ibid.*

“sollst du ihnen fürwahr(?) zu essen geben”) permits a very different interpretation: one may divide *tmt* ‘*mnk klt tn ákl lhm* and translate along the lines of ‘there with you is all (one could need): give food to them!’ (or: *kl ttn*, ‘is all: you must give’).¹³⁶⁸ There are, therefore, no clear examples of ‘emphatic’ *k* in prose, whether that entity be described lexically or syntactically.

— p. 810 (§85.7c). With the reading of the particle in RS 22.225:2 (*KTU* 1.96) as *k* rather than *w* (see remark above to p. 597 [§74.624], etc.) and with the analysis of *tp* in the same line as verbal, meaning ‘she/it sees’ (see remark above to p. 199 [§33.323.2b], etc.), this example of ‘emphatic’ *k* disappears. The function of the *k* here is to introduce the object clause expressing what is seen.¹³⁶⁹

— p. 811 (§85.8aα). Understanding that *ádn* means ‘father’ not ‘lord’ (see remarks above to p. 88 [§31.3], etc., p. 250 [§51.3h], etc., and p. 809 [§85.5]) would have enabled T. to see that the *l* in line 9 could not be emphatic: the line must mean ‘my father never lacked grain’.¹³⁷⁰ It could not mean ‘my father always lacks grain’ because the father of the reigning Hittite monarch is dead.

— p. 816 (§87.2). In his discussion of the etymology of negative *’al*, T. does not mention the possibility that the form may have arisen historically by prefixation of */’/* to negative *l*. Similar forms can be cited (for some examples, see remark above to p. 791 [§83.131], etc.) but this one appears particularly appealing because of the basically identical semantics of the two forms, i.e., they are both negative particles of which the distribution reflects mood.

— p. 816 (§87.21), p. 883 (§94.21). In the first section cited, T. translates *w b’ly bt ‘bdh ál yb’r b ydh* in RS 92.2010:21-22 (RSO XIV 50) as a simple sentence (“Und mein Herr soll das Haus seines Dieners nicht mit seiner (eigenen) Hand zerstören”) but in the second as cleft (“Und was meinen Herrn betrifft - Das Haus seines Dieners soll er nicht mit seiner (eigenen) Hand zerstören”). I can only hope that in the latter case he was not influenced by the editors’ translation (“Et, mon maître, quant à la maison de (22) son serviteur, qu’il ne (23) la détruise pas (24) de sa main”¹³⁷¹) which was only an accommodation to the physical order of the sentence components on the tablet, not a statement regarding morpho-syntax. However that may be, neither the fronting of the object phrase nor the writing {*b’ly*} qualify as indicators of a true cleft sentence.

— p. 820 (§88.1c). T.’s argument that *’t* in RS 29.093:29 (*CAT* 2.70) may be verbal¹³⁷² because of similarities with the construction *mn m ḥsrt* in RS 18.075:20'-21' (*KTU* 2.41:19-

¹³⁶⁸Ibid., p. 111. T.’s complete translation of lines 20-22 is “Und was deine beiden Diener betrifft, die dort bei dir sind, (so) sollst du ihnen fürwahr(?) zu essen geben,” but there is no relative pronoun before *tmt* and “die” should, therefore, have been in parentheses in the translation. The absence of the relative pronoun makes possible the epigraphic and syntactic divisions that I am proposing, for the entire ‘hanging nominal clause’ may consist of *w tm ‘bdk* in line 20.

¹³⁶⁹Pardee, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 162.

¹³⁷⁰Idem, *Context III* (2002) 111.

¹³⁷¹Bordreuil and Pardee, RSO XIV (2001) 376.

¹³⁷²On the ambiguity of the textual data cited by T. in favor of *’t* having become a true verb in Ugaritic, see remark above to p. 463 (§73.313), etc.

20) founders on the fact that *hsrt* in the second text is probably nominal rather than verbal (see remark above to p. 52 [§21.341.21a], etc.). T.'s position on *hsrt* is ambivalent in that he never parses it and treats the syntactic construction in which it is found alongside others where the corresponding element is indubitably nominal (p. 902 [§97.23a]); the most striking example is *mnm irštk* in line 17' of this very text. But his unambiguous statement here on p. 820 can at least be taken at face value as indicating that he takes *hsrt* as a verb. The analysis as a noun ('whatever my lack [may be]') is based on the nominal structure in line 17' of this text and on a clear parallel in an Akkadian text from Ras Shamra: RS 17.116:24'-25' (*PRU* IV, p. 133) reads {ma-an-nu-me-e (25') ší-bu-te-ka a-na muḥ-ḫi-ia (26')} [ša t]a-šap-pár-ra a-na-dì-na-ak-ku}, translated by Nougayrol as "Tout désir [que tu] m'exprimeras, je le satisferai pour toi."¹³⁷³

— pp. 823-36 (§89). T. goes far beyond any of his predecessors in his treatment of enclitic particles, both in quality and in quantity (numbers of citations and variety of distributions of the particles). Comparing his work with some of the muddled presentations of earlier decades, especially by those whose only real interest was in Biblical Hebrew, is like comparing day with night.¹³⁷⁴ My negative reactions here are few. One of the most important is to the fact that T. provides very little space here for the interpretation of various tokens of {-y} attached to particles as the enclitic particle, having preferred almost exclusively the interpretation as a *mater lectionis* (see above, remark to pp. 37-38 [§21.322.5], etc.).

— pp. 823-36 (§89). It is difficult to see on what basis *-h-* and *-d-* are excluded from this presentation of the enclitic particles.¹³⁷⁵ It would appear to be on semantic/functional grounds: one of the functions of *-h-* is much more clearly definable than are any of the particles listed here, viz. when attached to a substantive as adverbial marking place, direction, or manner, while *d* also exists as an independent particle, viz., the determinative/relative pronoun. But are these grounds for excluding them when they are formally enclitic, i.e., attached to other nouns or particles and never separated therefrom by the word-dividing small vertical wedge when the particle in question is affixed? (The latter feature is regular among monoconsonantal particles: while such particles that precede the word they modify are often separated therefrom by the word-divider, such is never the case of the particles that follow the word to which they are attached.) In his treatment, T. proceeds from the productive particles, those that could in theory be attached to any other word (*-n-*, *-m-*, and *-y-*), to those which are known only as formative elements of other particles (*-k-* and *-t-*). *-d-*, in its capacity as a particle expander, clearly belongs to the latter category, while the distribution of *-h-* is more complex, for it appears as the adverbializing affix *-h-*, as the root particle of other more complex particles (*h-*, *hn*, *hl*, etc.), and as a particle expander itself (*mh*, *mhk*, *mhkm*, etc.).

¹³⁷³Cf. Parker, *Studies* (1967) 13, 28.

¹³⁷⁴The major exception is K. Aartun's *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen* (AOAT 21; 1974, 1978) to whose views on this matter I have come increasingly closer over the years since they first appeared in print.

¹³⁷⁵Contrast Pardee in *The Semitic Languages* (1997) 141; Bordreuil and Pardee in *Manuel* (2004) I 77.

— pp. 823-25 (§89.1). In his treatment of the “enklitische Partikel *-n*” T. considers only cases where {-n} is actually attached to the end of a word; he vocalizes it “/-(*Vn*)*na*/?” and considers it to be etymologically identical to the energetic verbal morpheme. Nowhere does he deal with the problem of the relationship between this particle and the expanding particle /n/ which shows up as an element in several compound particles. One of these particles, *hlny*, is attested in a polyglot vocabulary spelled {al-li-ni-ya} which T., following Huehnergard,¹³⁷⁶ vocalizes /hallinīya/, without discussing the element /nī/. Is the /ī/ correct here and does this form mean that the {-n-} always has /ī/ as its vowel? It appears necessary to respond negatively to both questions. Whether or not {-n} is the same element as the energetic particle, a hypothesis that does not appear implausible and which T. accepts provisionally (p. 823), there is every reason to believe that it is cognate with the /n/ of nominal nunation, which in Arabic is /-na/ and which was certainly not /-nī/ in proto-Aramaic since the vowel has disappeared in the attested Aramaic dialects. If one be willing to admit that the expanding particle {-n-} and the enclitic particle {-n} are etymologically identical—and I can see no reason not to do so—it appears necessary to conclude that the /i/ of {al-li-ni-ya} is secondary, having arisen under the influence of the following /y/ or of the preceding /li/, or of both. It is, therefore, probably short, though the /y/ may have been geminated: /halliniya/ or /halliniyya/. It is probably best, however, to represent the proto-form of the particle as /-n(a)-/, since the vowel of the deictic and expanding particles does not appear always to have been stable.

— p. 823 (§89.1). Given the many uncertainties of the ‘energetic’ elements of the verbal system (see remarks above to pp. 222-23 [§41.221.52c], etc., and to pp. 497-506 [§73.6], etc.), it appears a bit rash to define enclitic *-n* as serving “zur Hervorhebung von nicht-verbalen Wortarten.” Not only may the principal energetic morpheme itself be historically identical to ‘enclitic’ *-n* (as T. himself observes here), but saying that no final *-n* on any verb form may be enclitic rather than energetic appears to go beyond that which is firmly supported by the data at hand.

— p. 823 (§89.11a,b). In this listing of the enclitic particle *-n* “nach topikalisiertem (betont vorangestelltem) Satzglied,” T. includes three prepositional forms ending in *-n*: *bn*, *ln*, and ‘*mn*. This raises the question as to whether these alloforms of the prepositions should be simply listed alongside nouns to which the enclitic morpheme has been added *ad hoc*. This is particularly true of ‘*mn*, which is a very frequently attested alloform, especially in prose and especially before the 1 c.s. pronominal suffix. An attempt should be made to distinguish between the productive use of the enclitic particle and frozen forms of other particles which arose at some time in the past by affixation of the etymologically identical particle. What is interesting is that, in the case of prepositions, one encounters what appear to be very rarely attested forms with {-n-} inserted between the lexical stem and a pronominal suffix (on the case of {b dʾnhlm} in RS 18.031:18 [KTU 2.38], see remark above to p. 214 [§41.21], etc.)—were these frozen forms that happen to be attested rarely or do they attest to the productivity of the {-n} even between lexical and pronominal morphemes?

¹³⁷⁶Ugaritic Vocabulary (1987) 121.

— p. 826 (§89.21). There is a particularly egregious bit of circular reasoning here: it is concluded that a Ugaritic noun with enclitic *-m* probably showed geminated /m/, e.g., /ʾarṣumma/, ‘to the earth’, because that is the common form in Akkadian; the conclusion is then drawn that nouns in the singular must once (“ursprünglich”) have had mimation in the singular, as in Akkadian. (According to the systems as attested, Akkadian shows *-m* in the singular but not in the plural, while the West-Semitic system is the opposite, e.g., Akk. *šarrum/šarrū* vs. West-Semitic *šarru/šarrūma*.)

— p. 828 (§89.232a). On p. 841 (§91.24) T. states that the placement of an attributive adjective before the noun it modifies occurs only in poetry, but here he cites the prose text RS 17.031:11 (*KTU* 4.296), where one finds the phrase *āḥd ālp*, ‘one bovid’. This is probably, however, not a simple case of an attributive adjective preceding the noun it modifies but a bit of book-keeping shorthand: the previous paragraph began *tlṭ ālp*, ‘three bovids’, and, though the beginnings of the rest of the entries in this list are missing, it appears likely that the scribe was simply placing the number word in first position, irrespective of whether it was a noun or an adjective, viz., that the number word was being put conceptually in a separate column in spite of the fact that the text is not arranged in columns. Above, p. 388 (§69.112), two other texts are cited where this placement of *āḥd* occurs and each time the entry with *āḥd* is immediately preceded by another entry headed by a cardinal number noun.

— p. 828 (§89.232b), p. 842 (§91.242b). On p. 828, the {-m} of *ṭhrm* in the phrase *bht ṭhrm iqnīm*, ‘a mansion of purest lapis-lazuli’ (RS 2.[008]⁺ v 19, 34-35 [*KTU* 1.4]) is said to be enclitic whereas, on p. 842, the reader is urged to note the gender and number agreement between the adjective *ṭhrm* and the noun *iqnīm*. Whether *ṭhrm* be in construct or appositional to *iqnīm*, I see no reason to doubt that it is, morpho-syntactically, a substantivized adjective rather than a simple attributive adjective. (On p. 841 [§91.24], T. avers that not all examples to be cited in the following paragraphs belong to this latter category, but he does not say why that should be the case; on my principal reason for disagreeing, viz., that the placement of an attributive adjective before the noun it modifies is a late phenomenon in West Semitic, see remark above to p. 419 [§69.43], etc.; the other important reason is that one sometimes finds gender disagreement between the two elements, which is a clear indication that the ‘adjective’ is not modifying the following noun in a simple attributive way.)

— p. 831 (§89.27a). T. presents the phrase *w nḥlhm* that appears in administrative texts after *w nḥlh*, ‘and his heir’, as bearing the 3 m.s. pronominal suffix and enclitic *-m* (‘and his heir’, viz., that of the preceding heir). He makes no mention of the possibility that *-hm* might be the 3 m.du. (or pl. in the cases where there are two tokens of *w nḥlhm* one after the other) pronominal suffix, stating that the third-generation heir is not simply the descendent of his father but of his grandfather as well (and, in the case of four generations, of his great-grandfather). In that interpretation, *nḥlhm* would be vocalized either /naḥaluhumā/ and mean ‘and their heir (they = dual)’ (i.e., the heir of his father and his grandfather) or /naḥaluhumu/ ‘and their heir (they = plural)’ (that is of his father, his grandfather, and his great-grandfather).

— p. 833 (§89.3). T. refers only to Aartun's¹³⁷⁷ and his own¹³⁷⁸ treatments of the Ugaritic particles as having given space to enclitic -y. Though certainly not to be classed with these extensive studies, my mention of the phenomenon in a *précis* of Ugaritic grammar, prepared independently of T.'s study, may, by the nature of the work in which it appeared, have brought the existence of the category to the awareness of a larger audience.¹³⁷⁹

— p. 834 (§89.32). T. asserts here that RS 11.772+ (*KTU* 3.1) “gehört offenbar zur Gattung der Briefe und beruht auf einem akk. Originaltext (RS 17.227+).” In an epigraphic and philological study of the Ugaritic text, I have evaluated the first proposition with an emphatic negative (though RS 11.772+, RS 17.227, and the other Akkadian texts all appear to belong to the same genre, none is epistolary in nature) and the second with a guarded negative (there are too many differences between RS 11.772+ and any of the known Akkadian texts to allow for the former to be a direct translation of one of the latter).¹³⁸⁰

— p. 840 (§91.21a). T. does not state why he rejects the editors' analysis of *qdš* in the phrase ‘š *qdš* (RS 92.2014:3 [RSO XIV 52]) as nominal (/‘iši qudši/, lit. ‘wood of holiness’)¹³⁸¹ in favor of identifying *qdš* as an adjective—all the more surprising when he makes a point in the introductory paragraph to this section of the fact that the Semitic languages make greater use of the nominal attributive genitive than do the Indo-European languages, where the attributive adjective is more common. Another important consideration is that, with the root QDŠ, the nominal attributive genitive construction is common in Biblical Hebrew, as in the type-expression *har qodšī*, ‘my holy mountain’. Nevertheless, it goes without saying that, in the absence of a vocalized text, it is impossible to know which construction was actually used in any given case. (It is also impossible to know whether ‘š might in fact be a plural construct, reflecting the use of more than one piece of wood in this rite; if such were the case, the construction would certainly be nominal.) But, when in doubt, might it not be best to choose the more commonly attested construction?

— p. 840 (§91.21b). It is strange to find *ālp mri* listed as one of only two examples of participles used as attributive adjectives when it is not at all certain that *mri* is a participle. The doubt is not just mine, for in various sections above, T. considers that this form may be a simple adjective, a substantive, or a passive participle (p. 261 [§51.43c], p. 294 [§53.312b], p. 303 [§54.111], p. 476 [§73.426]). Because the comparative evidence speaks for the adjective *mrū* having the form /qatīl/ (as T. classifies it on p. 261), while what little internal evidence there is speaks for the G-passive participle being /qatūl/ in Ugaritic (see remark above to p. 473 [§73.422], etc.), one must conclude that it is unlikely that the phrase *ālp mri* contains a token of the passive participle that was productive in Ugaritic.

¹³⁷⁷*Partikeln* I (1974) 44-47.

¹³⁷⁸ *UF* 26 (1994) 473-82.

¹³⁷⁹ In *The Semitic Languages* (1997) 141; cf., more recently, *Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (2004) 310; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) I 77-78.

¹³⁸⁰ *Semitica* 51 (2001) 5-31.

¹³⁸¹ The formal *editio princeps* of this text was in RSO XIV (2002), but the manuscript was made available to T. in advance.

— p. 841 (§91.23), p. 885 (§95.14), p. 901 (§97.122). T. does not state why he rejects the editors' analysis of *ghrt* in RS 92.2014:11 (RSO XIV 52) as verbal and as syntactically independent of the previous unit—except to the extent that the subject of *ghrt* was stated in the previous unit.¹³⁸² T. takes *ghrt* as an adjective immediately dependent on the preceding phrase (*hwt bn nšm*, 'the word of anyone'). The preceding phrase, however, is the last unit of a longer poetic verse, while *ghrt* begins a new verse; for that reason, the editors saw a syntactic break between the two verses. On pp. 885 and 901, T. takes *ghrt* as agreeing with *hwt*, which is described as the "Leitwort im (vorausgehenden) Hauptsatz," but on both pages takes the following nouns (*phm w šptm*) as the real subject of the nominal sentence, translating "deren Münder und deren Lippen laut/leer(?) sind." He does not explain why he chooses to reject the editors' overall interpretation of the passage according to which *ghrt* begins a new sentence and the following nouns are in the adverbial accusative: 'it (the word) resounds in their mouth and on their lips'.¹³⁸³

— pp. 844-45 (§91.314.1). In an "Anm[erkung]" to the use of the construct chain to express a notion of superlativity, T. cites a series of texts where *X + il* is supposed to mean "göttlich, majestätisch, überaus schön." One may observe, however, that all of the examples that even approach being qualifiable as clear¹³⁸⁴ are from a single passage, RS 2.[008]⁺ col. 1 (*KTU* 1.4), e.g., *kt il*, in line 30, is translated "ein herrlicher Sockel." An argument can be made, however, that the various items in this list are in the long run intended for 'Ilu himself and that the construct formulation expresses attribution, just as in the preceding formulations of the type *mgn rbt ātrt ym*, 'a gift of (= for) Lady 'Aṭiratu of the Sea' (line 21).¹³⁸⁵ Maximalist lists of the so-called superlative use of various divine names and titles in the Hebrew Bible have also been proposed and contain many examples that are equally dubious. The parade example, *rūwāḥ 'ēlōhīym* in Gen. 1:2, sometimes translated 'a mighty wind', is among the most dubious: how can one believe that a Hebrew speaker on hearing that formula just after hearing that 'ēlōhīym was creator of heavens and earth would not have understood that the same 'ēlōhīym was the one who had sent the wind? This does not mean that the wind was not 'mighty' but that by, restricting the English translation to that word, the notion of divine origin in the Hebrew expression is left out entirely. Perhaps the modern reader, just like the ancient audience, may be expected to understand that a wind from the creator would by the nature of its origin be a mighty one.

— p. 845 (§91.314.1). T. cites the phrase *mlk mlkm* as occurring in lines 9 and 10 of RS 34.356 (*CAT* 2.76) and in lines 1 and 9 of *CAT* 9.530. The latter "text" is, however, in fact identical to the former (see above, remark to p. 10 [§18.6]). Whatever may be the reason for the creation of the new text *CAT* 9.530, the reading of the phrase *mlk mlkm* is equally

¹³⁸²Bordreuil and Pardee, RSO XIV (2002) 387; cf. Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 830, 832-33; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 159; Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 69.

¹³⁸³Ibid.

¹³⁸⁴For several examples representing two basic phrases that do not require the interpretation as superlatives, see above, remark to p. 245 (§45.21d), etc.

¹³⁸⁵Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 256, esp. n. 125.

plausible in lines 1, 9, and 10 of RS 34.356. According to my collation, the exact readings are, respectively: {mlk . m^ll^l[km]}, {mlk . mlk[m]}, and {mlk [.] ^lmlk^l[m]}.

— p. 846 (§91.314.2). The reading {ǧzrm . ^lg^l . ṭb} in RS 2.002:14 (*KTU* 1.23) is much clearer than the transcription {ǧzrm [[ṭb]]g . ṭb} in *CAT* has led T. to believe (he here qualifies the reading *ǧzrm g ṭb*, ‘lads with nice voices’, as uncertain). The {m} of *ǧzrm* is not in fact written over “an anticipated *ṭb*”¹³⁸⁶ and there is a word-divider between this word and the following *g*. The reading may be judged certain from context though the bottom of the wedge is damaged with the result that, epigraphically speaking, it could theoretically be {g} or {z}. The syntactic construction is certainly different, therefore, from *ǧzr ṭb ql*, lit. ‘the lad (who is) nice of voice’, in RS 2.[014]⁺ i 20 (*KTU* 1.3).

— p. 846 (§91.315.2). T. opines that the substantives *šmāl* and *ymn*, ‘left/right (hand)’, may function as adjectives in Ugaritic because their syntax is not that of a *nomen rectum*. Proof for the latter grammatical observation appears clearly in RS 24.247+:11 (*KTU* 1.103) one finds [b] *pīth šmāl*[l] (the pronominal suffix would appear on the final word of the phrase if it consisted of a construct chain). His alternative solution, however, viz., that these nouns function as adverbial accusatives, conforms better to known Northwest-Semitic usage (‘in its temple on the right’) and indeed is required in RS 24.247⁺ since neither *šmāl* nor *ymn* ever shows gender agreement with the noun it is modifying.¹³⁸⁷

— p. 848 (§91.321c). T. accepts the reading in *KTU/CAT* of {ṭā^lt l^l}, ‘ewes for’, in RS 24.255:17' (*KTU* 1.111:18). Neither of the last two signs are to be found on the tablet, however, and the writing of the first two is not unproblematic.¹³⁸⁸

— p. 848 (§91.321c). Bordreuil, in his preliminary publication of RIH 83/22 (*CAT* 4.779),¹³⁸⁹ took *l ḥṭb* in l. 12 as the negative particle (“n’a pas été compté”); T. here translates it as a purpose clause (“zur (Begleichung der) Rechnung”), with no mention of the editor’s views. Moreover, T. does not translate the purpose clause in context, and I do not see how his analysis could be made to fit in with what precedes.

— p. 849 (§91.321f). T. offers here a reading of RS 17.434⁺:4 that does not correspond to the transcription in *CAT* 2.36: in *CAT* one finds {d . ḥwtk . [w] . dt [.] ^lmk} whereas T.’s version is (he includes no word-dividers and indicates signs of which the reading is uncertain as restored) {d ḥwtk [w d] b[t ml]k[k]}, “deines Landes und [deines](?) Kö[nigshau]ses.” Since T.’s readings correspond to those that my collation of the tablet showed to be most likely,¹³⁹⁰ I can only prefer his. I have not in the past restored a pronominal suffix after *mlk*, but such a restoration is certainly plausible. T.’s remark that his readings are “aus dem Akk. übersetzter Text,” might, however, be misunderstood by some, for he is referring to a

¹³⁸⁶*CAT*, p. 67, n. 2.

¹³⁸⁷Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 550, 1153, 1167.

¹³⁸⁸*Ibid.*, p. 619 with note 14, p. 621 with notes 17 and 18, and p. 1282.

¹³⁸⁹*CRAI* 1984, p. 431; see now Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004), text 52 in the *Choix de textes*.

¹³⁹⁰*AfO* 29-30 (1983-84) 321 (with n. 7), 323, 324. The precise transliteration resulting from several collations is {d . ḥw[t]k . ^lw^l [. d] ^l. bt^l [.] ^lml^lk [...]}.

hypothetical original from which the Ugaritic would have been translated, not to any text that has actually been discovered.

— p. 849 (§91.322). Not everyone agrees with T.’s analysis of *yd il*, ‘hand/love of [’]*Ilū*’ (RS 2.[008]⁺ iv 38’ [KTU 1.4]), as an objective genitive (‘love directed towards [’]*Ilū*’).¹³⁹¹

— p. 851 (§91.338). The pronominal suffix on *mlāktu*, ‘my messenger party’, in RS 16.402:35 (KTU 2.33) is more likely expressing a subjective genitive (‘my messenger party, viz., the one that has brought this tablet to you’) rather than an objective notion (“die an mich gerichtete Gesandtschaft”). At this point in the letter, the author is requesting a response to his complaints, not referring to the message to which he is responding.¹³⁹²

— p. 855 (§92.237b). Whatever the exigencies of translation into modern European languages may be, the poetic verse in RS 2.[008]⁺ iv 16’-18’ (KTU 1.4) does not contain two nominal sentences, as T. proposes here, at best only one. The verse appears to consist of a tricolon with a verb in the first colon which is gapped in the second, perhaps in the third as well:

<i>qdš yūḥdm šb’r</i>	<i>Qudšu</i> begins to illumine (the way),
<i>āmrr k kbkb l pnm</i>	(as does) [’] <i>Amruru</i> , like a star, in front,
<i>āttr btl’t nt</i>	(while) behind (is) Girl [’] <i>Anatu</i>
	or: behind Girl [’] <i>Anatu</i> (also gives light).

— p. 856 (§92.238b). T. analyzes *šlm* in both parts of the ‘double formula of well-being’ (see above, remarks to p. 197 [§33.322.42a], etc., to p. 246 [§45.23a], and to pp. 737-38 [§81.11a-d], etc.) as nominal. He cites as his example of the first *hlly* [’]*mny kll šlm*, “Siehe, bei mir (herrscht) in vollkommener Weise Wohlbefindung,” but the fact that the adverb *mid(m)*, ‘very’, can be inserted between *kll* and *šlm* (RS 8.315:11-12 [KTU 2.11], RS 18.038:3-4 [KTU 2.39], RS 20.199:12-13 [KTU 2.68]) and the fact that *kll* can follow *šlm* rule out the analysis of *šlm* as a noun: (1) *kll šlm* cannot be a construct chain (‘there is entirety of well-being’) when an adverb intervenes or when *kll* follows *šlm*; (2) *kll* is not, at least when an adverb appears between *kll* and *šlm*, used adverbially with the noun *šlm* (the use of a double adverbial expression, ‘there is entirely very much well-being’, is unlikely); (3) it is implausible that *kll* is a noun when it precedes *šlm* but an adjective when it follows that word. These variations of the formula show that *šlm* is best taken as a verb, e.g., ‘all is very well’ (/kalīlu ma’da šalima/) and ‘all is well’ (/kalīlu šalima/ and /šalima kalīlu/). On the other hand, the Akkadian formula corresponding to the second element of this double formula regularly contains a noun (*šulmānu*) and one does not find similar syntactic features in the corresponding Ugaritic formula as those we have just discussed. These differences lead to the conclusion that *šlm* in the second part of the double formula of well-being, e.g., *tmny* [’]*m ūmy mnm šlm w rgm ttb ly*, ‘There with my mother, whatever well-being (there may

¹³⁹¹E.g., Wyatt, *UF* 27 (1995) 562 n. 6; idem, *Religious Texts* (1998) 100; Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 259; Smith *apud* Parker, ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 128 with n. 120 (p. 171).

¹³⁹²Pardee, *Afo* 31 (1984) 216; idem, *Context III* (2002) 106.

be), send word (of that) back to me' (RS 11.872:11-13 [*KTU* 2.13]), was nominal in Ugaritic.¹³⁹³

— pp. 861-69 (§93.3). Readers unacquainted with modern German scholarship on verbal valence, viz., whether a verb takes zero, one, or two complements, must be aware that T. uses the concept to describe only surface phenomena: a G-stem intransitive verb, a G-stem transitive verb with unexpressed direct object, and a D-stem factitive verb with unexpressed direct object are all univalent; a Š-stem causative verb with only one expressed direct object is bivalent. This approach has its uses but the concentration on surface phenomena sometimes leads to passing over important underlying phenomena (see following remark and remark to p. 864 [§93.33c]).

— p. 863 (§93.33a). Though at one level one cannot fault T. for considering suffixal complements to transitive verbs that function as direct or indirect objects as examples of 'trivalent' verbs (identified as transitive verbs that take two nominal or pronominal complements neither of which is introduced by a preposition), for he is describing a single surface phenomenon, there are reasons why it might nevertheless have been worth his time to separate out the two grammatically distinct entities. First, the oldest attested Semitic language, Akkadian, had a set of dative pronominal suffixes distinct from the accusative set; for someone who bases so much of his analysis of Ugaritic on comparative phenomena, T. might have taken the examples of the indirect object expressed by a pronominal suffix (e.g., *ātṅk*, 'I will give to you') as a relic of an earlier stage of the language, especially since the certain attestations of this syntagm are found only in poetry. Second, on a purely statistical level, such structures are extremely rare, for indirect objects are normally expressed by prepositional phrases; the rarity of the phenomenon is basis enough for treating it separately. Finally, since in his introduction to this section he speaks of these two categories, he certainly should have presented separately all examples of nominal accusative complements that express an adverbial notion rather than a direct object complement.¹³⁹⁴ Once again, one cannot quarrel with the listing in one place of all accusative complements, but that is not how he introduces the paragraph and, in any case, it is not reprehensible on the part of a

¹³⁹³On these various questions regarding the analysis of the elements of this epistolary formula, see Pardee, *Fronzaroli* (2003) 446-75; specifically on the *šlm*-formulae, see pp. 452-54. T. holds that the corresponding Akkadian formula, with nouns in both parts, shows that *šlm* in both parts of the corresponding Ugaritic formula was nominal, but he does not attempt to explain why different nouns were used in Akkadian, *šulmu* in the first part, *šulmānu* in the second. This distinction may be explained by taking the use of two nominal formations as an attempt to reflect different Ugaritic forms, verbal then nominal. That is, the scribes would have remarked the use of *šalima* in the first part of the formula, *šalāmu* or *šulmu* in the second, and reflected that difference by using different nouns, the first most commonly accompanied by the particle *lū* which emphasizes the predication. The use of a verb in formulae which resemble the Ugaritic phrases in question is clearly visible in the Amarna letters and hence may reflect Canaanite usage (see Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 [1987] 7) and is attested in epistolary usage in Old Babylonian as well (*ibid.*, p. 20-22).

¹³⁹⁴In his remarks to various examples, he sometimes refers to "freie Adverbiale Angabe," with which I agree fully, but also to the locative case, for which he has made a greater place than is to be found in any previous grammar (on my hesitancy regarding such broad acceptance of this grammatical category, see above, remark to pp. 326-35 [§54.4]).

grammarian to describe sub-categories of a single overtly marked grammatical category—T. does it frequently in this grammar (and I have sometimes criticized him for ascribing different “functions” to these sub-categories). Because there are usually clear grounds for distinguishing the two (see further below, remark to p. 864 [§93.33c]), it would have made the structure of the language in this respect much clearer to his readers to have presented the data separately.

— p. 861 (§93.33a). I find it remarkable that a grammarian as alive to enclitic *-m* as T. would base his analysis of HLM, ‘to strike’, as taking a double accusative in RS 3.367 iv 14'-15', 16'-17' (*KTU* 1.2) on the form *ydm* (parallel to ‘*nm* in lines 22' and 25'). It appears equally plausible to see in each colon a single accusative phrase, i.e., *ydm* and ‘*nm* would be in the construct state with enclitic *-m* (quoted is the first verse of each poetic section) :

<i>hlm ktp zbl ym</i>	/hulum katipa zabūli yammi/	Strike the shoulder of Prince Sea,
<i>bn ydm [tp]t nhr</i>	/bêna yadêma tãpiṭi nahari/	twixt the hands of Ruler River.

...

<i>hlm qdqđ zbl ym</i>	/hulum qudqda zabūli yammi/	Strike the pate of Prince Sea,
<i>bn 'nm tpt nhr</i>	/bêna 'ênêma tãpiṭi nahari/	twixt the eyes of Ruler River. ¹³⁹⁵

One could further argue that, even if the construction was a double accusative, the body part was an ‘accusative of respect’, not a direct object (T. is in this paragraph treating the latter topic): ‘Strike Prince Sea on the shoulder, Ruler River between the hands’.¹³⁹⁶ The analysis of the structure as containing two accusatives—of either type—would be more plausible if the word designating a body part did not each time precede the name of the deity being struck.

— p. 863 (§93.33b). There is nothing at all “offenbar” about T.’s analysis of *yqr dbḥ ilm* (RS 3.322+ iv 22-23 [*KTU* 1.19]) as a double-accusative construction, ‘he causes the sacrifice to reach the gods’. Attributions may be expressed genitively in all the old Northwest-Semitic languages, and such may be the form of this phrase: ‘He brings the sacrifice(s) of the gods’.¹³⁹⁷

— p. 864 (§93.33c). Though causative-stem verbal forms certainly provide the primary examples of true double accusatives (i.e., X causes Y to perform Z-act on M-entity), one of the accusatives in some of T.’s examples consists of an adverbial rather than a direct object. The primary criterion by which to determine the distinction is the morpho-semantic type of the G-stem, viz., whether it takes a direct-object complement or adverbial complements (adverb, prepositional phrase, or adverbial accusative): in the former case, both complements of the Š-stem may be expected to be direct objects whereas, in the second, one will be an adverbial accusative. Examples: LBŠ is probably stative (cf. /lābēš/ in Biblical Hebrew) and *šlbš* does not, therefore, mean ‘to cause someone to wear a garment’, but ‘to clothe someone in/with a garment’; ‘RB, ‘to enter’, is a verb of movement and a complement

¹³⁹⁵Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004) II 10-12.

¹³⁹⁶This analysis appears required for RS 3.340 iv 22' (*KTU* 1.18) *hlmn tnm qdqđ*, ‘Strike him twice on the pate’, where the parallel to *qdqđ* is *'l ūdn*, a prepositional phrase (‘above the ear’).

¹³⁹⁷Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 354.

stating where the entering takes place is doubtlessly adverbial rather than expressing a second direct object. (For the case of HLK, see remark above to p. 589 [§74.622.3], etc.; for that of QRB in the D-stem, see remark above to p. 551 [§74.412.26], etc.) Though the marking of these two categories may be identical, viz., the accusative case, the morpho-semantics of the basic form and the fact that the adverbial accusative is interchangeable with another form of expressing the adverbial notion require distinct grammatical descriptions of complementation of the derived form as well. The upshot of this discussion and those to which cross-references are provided above is that, of T.’s seven examples of the double-accusative construction, three may be explicitly classified as expressing one direct object and one adverbial accusative (ŠHLK, ‘to cause X to go to Y’, ŠLBŠ, ‘to cause X to be clothed in/with Y’, and Š‘RB, ‘to cause X enter into Y’), two are clear examples of the double accusative in the traditional sense of the term and both direct objects are in each case expressed in the text (ŠSPR, ‘to cause X to count Y’,¹³⁹⁸ and ŠPQ, ‘to cause X to obtain Y’¹³⁹⁹), and one is theoretically likely, but uncertain because of the state of the text (ŠŠ‘, ‘to cause X to pay Y’—see remark above to p. 598 [§74.624]). I would have to judge that the final example belongs to the first category on the basis of the comparative evidence, but these data are not all that clear and the Ugaritic data are insufficient (I refer to ŠSKN, which may mean ‘to care for X with Y’—see remark above to p. 595 [§74.623], etc.).

— p. 864 (§93.342). In citing the verb-preposition idiom YTN ‘*m*, ‘to give to’, as appearing in RS 2.[004] vi 18' (*KTU* 1.17) and only there, T. notes neither that the reading of the preposition is indicated as uncertain in *KTU/CAT* nor that Herdner tentatively read a word-divider where the authors of *KTU/CAT* read {‘} and reconstructed a {l} thereafter. Herdner’s eye and instincts were correct, for the reading does indeed appear to be {l. l}: though both signs are damaged, the preserved traces of writing correspond much better to these signs than to {‘m}. Thus the only case of YTN ‘*m* in the sense of ‘to give to’¹⁴⁰⁰ disappears.

— p. 865 (§93.343b). Though the problem is less acute in Ugaritic than in Biblical Hebrew, T. might have addressed explicitly the cases of verbs that take both an accusative complement and a prepositional complement, with little apparent difference in meaning, e.g., BĤR + ‘et or b’ in Biblical Hebrew, both translatable as ‘X chooses Y’. The Ugaritic example that incites this remark is ‘ĤD b, ‘to seize’, concerning which T. notes “‘ĥd wird sonst transitiv konstruiert.” This case is fairly easily explained because one also finds the construction ‘ĤD + acc. + b, which means ‘X seizes Y by his/her Z’. The idiom with ‘ĤD + b is attested only with b preceding a word that denotes a part of the body, and one may

¹³⁹⁸ššprk ‘m b‘l šnt (RS 2.[004] vi 28'-29' [*KTU* 1.17]), ‘I will cause you to count years with Ba‘lu’.

¹³⁹⁹špq ilm krm yn (RS 2.[008]⁺ vi 47, with more examples in the following passage [*KTU* 1.4]), ‘he provides the gods with rams, with wine’, lit. ‘he causes the gods to obtain rams, wine’ (on the interpretation of the passage as a whole, see remark above to p. 298 [§53.331.2], etc.).

¹⁴⁰⁰For that verb-preposition combination with the direct object *pnm*, ‘face’, in the idiom meaning ‘to head off in the direction of X’, see Pardee, *UF* 7 (1975) 352.

conclude that the expression is elliptical for ‘X seizes (Y by his/her) Z’.¹⁴⁰¹ If T. accepts this explanation, he might have made that clear; if not, he should have given his reasons.

— pp. 866-68 (§93.351). In this section are listed verbs that are used with Ø complement, an accusative complement, and/or a prepositional complement. I cannot say why so much space was devoted to this topic, for just about any transitive verb in any language that I know can be used ‘absolutely’, i.e., without a stated object, or with a direct-object complement, or with a prepositional phrase expressing an indirect or a quasi-indirect object. E.g., BRK, ‘to pronounce a blessing’, ‘to bless someone’, ‘to bless someone to a deity’; DBḤ, ‘to sacrifice’, ‘to sacrifice a beast’, ‘to sacrifice a beast to a divinity’, etc. What this section does, then, is provide many details on such distributions of complementation to transitive verbs in Ugaritic.

— p. 867 (§93.352). Because it is a standard rule for understanding prose as well as poetry in Biblical Hebrew that a pronominal direct object may be omitted if the meaning of the phrase is clear from context, one may doubt that such omissions in Ugaritic were a feature primarily of poetry and owing to ellipsis in parallel verse-segments. T. himself cites a case from prose (RS 34.124:31 [CAT 2.72]), and one might expect more prose attestations if there existed a corpus of narrative prose similar in size to that of narrative poetry. The relatively high number of cases in RS 2.002 (KTU 1.23) lead one to speculate, moreover, that this omission was a stylistic feature that would vary in frequency from one poet/narrator to another.

— pp. 874-76 (§§93.423-.424). In these two sections, T. identifies with more or less hesitation some epistolary formulae as translations from Akkadian because they show verb-final word order (e.g., *ilm l šlm tgrkm*, ‘may the gods guard you for well-being’ [RS 92.2005:7-8 [RSO XIV 49])¹⁴⁰² or *l p‘n X qlt*, ‘at the feet of X I fall’). Because there is very little evidence for direct Akkadian influence on the formation of the Ugaritic epistolary formulae, however, and because variations on the prostration formula are well attested in Ugaritic poetry, one must doubt any direct influence from Akkadian in these cases. Inner-Ugaritic topicalization of the word judged to be most important in the sentence is a sufficient basis to explain these highly stilted formulae. Interestingly enough, T. does not identify the much commoner simple formula *ilm tgrk*, ‘may the gods guard you’, as a translation from Akkadian (p. 872 [§93.422.1]), a lack of identification with which I fully agree. But one must ask whether it is legitimate to identify the addition of *l šlm* as calqued on the Akkadian (‘calque’ must, in any case, be considered a better term than ‘translation’) simply because it is frequent in Akkadian but attested only this once in Ugaritic.¹⁴⁰³ Is the letter of a son writing home to his mother and father the most likely place to find an erudite imitation of Akkadian usage? Finally and most importantly, because the epistolary formulae in Levantine Akkadian tend to differ from Mesopotamian usage, a case could be made for the claim that the Akkadian used in these areas imitated local usage rather than *vice versa* — though the

¹⁴⁰¹Pardee, *ibid.*, pp. 376-77.

¹⁴⁰²On this interpretation, see remark above to p. 758 (§82.12).

¹⁴⁰³Cf. Bordreuil and Pardee, RSO XIV (2002) 373.

exact origin of each formula is debatable (cf., for example, remark above to p. 727 [§77.35]).

— p. 885 (§95.12). Discussing the personal name *il'nt*, ‘my god is ‘*Anatu*’, under the category of “Genusinkongruenz” must be considered a misunderstanding of the name, which does not mean ‘my goddess is ‘*Anatu*’, but ‘my god is ‘*Anatu*’, i.e., since the masculine form is the less marked of the genders, it is the one used to express divinity in general. Naming one’s child *ilt'nt*, ‘my goddess is ‘*Anatu*’, would leave open the question ‘who, then, is your god?’ whereas *il'nt* precludes such a question.

— p. 887 (§95.231). Neither of T.’s two examples of a singular verb with a dual subject proves the point: *y'n* in the phrase *y'n gpn w ūgr* (RS 2.[022]⁺ i 11 [*KTU* 1.5]) may in fact be dual (see remark above to p. 438 [§73.223.41.2], etc.) and the reading of the word *y'n* in RS 2.[014]⁺ iv 5 (*KTU* 1.3) is probably incorrect (see other remark above to p. 438 [§73.223.41.2], etc.). With regard to the first text, it may furthermore be remarked that double divine names sometimes take singular modifiers, sometimes plural modifiers.¹⁴⁰⁴ Is sufficient complementation of *gpn w ūgr* attested to allow certainty that this name is always treated as a dual? In §95.233 (p. 888), T. considers singular agreement to be normal with double divine names. But one must ask why, if *Kôtharu-wa-Hasīsu* take(s) both forms of agreement, would *Gapnu-wa-ʾUgāru* not qualify for the same status?

— p. 887 (§95.232). All of T.’s examples of a singular verb with multiple subjects, some of which may be morphologically plural, are taken from the hippiatric texts, where he analyzes all the verbs as passive in voice. As we have seen above (remark to p. 511 [§74.222.2], etc.), all these forms may be active, 3^d person, singular or plural, with as objects the nouns that T. takes as subjects. Though T. cites an example of absence of number agreement in an Amarna text, it is difficult to admit the existence of the feature in Ugaritic on the basis of such weak evidence.

— p. 889 (§95.44). T. claims that the use of the singular in speaking of several persons each of whom has a single body part (the example is ‘head’) is only sporadically attested and constitutes logical number disagreement (lit. ‘the plowmen lift their head’). Neither here nor above, p. 289 (§53.14), a similar though less theoretically oriented section, is the similar behavior of the dual mentioned. One must object to both facets of the formulation. Though the examples are too few to be certain of the distribution in Ugaritic, it is the rule, rather than the exception, for the singular, and even more so the dual, to be so used in Biblical Hebrew: the plural of ‘hands’ is not used when the reference is to the hands of a group of living individuals. Including the dual in the formulation also shows quite clearly that this form of agreement is in no way illogical. To the contrary, it is just as logical as T.’s preferred logic: since each person of the group has only one head and two hands, it would be illogical to add them all up as though they were discrete entities and express them higgledy-piggledy as plurals. (Note that in Hebrew body parts are expressed as plurals when they are separated from the body and become discrete entities: II Kings 2:6-7). It is a common feature of the old Northwest-Semitic languages, as well as of many modern languages, to use singular/dual formulation of distributives, though the reality of the plurality can also be

¹⁴⁰⁴Pardee, *Context I* (1997) 244 n. 19.

expressed. In English we regularly express the plurality ('they put their hats on their heads') whereas in French the singular distributive form is common ('ils mirent leur chapeau sur la tête', 'mettez vos mains dans la poche') though the real plurality may also be expressed, but usually not in the case of a single body part ('ils mirent leurs chapeaux sur la tête').

— p. 895 (§96.28). It is highly unlikely that the two entries beginning with *k* in RS 19.015:10-11 (*KTU* 1.91) are to be associated under a single cultic heading as T.'s classification as an example of "Asyndese von Nebensätzen" assumes, for the first (*k t'rb ttrt šd bt mlk*) is attested as a discrete entity in RS 24.643:18-22 (*KTU* 1.148). It is moreover possible, though less clear, that the second entry (*k t'rbn ršpm bt mlk*) corresponds more or less directly to another rite which would be only partially preserved on the second of two tablets (RS 24.250+ [*KTU* 1.106]).¹⁴⁰⁵

— p. 896 (§96.311). Quite remarkably T. compares the "Koppelung" of two finite verbal forms, where the first has the translation value of an adverb, e.g., *ḤWŠ*, 'to do something quickly', with Akkadian but not with Biblical Hebrew, for Hebrew has a whole series of these verbs. They were classified by Lambdin as "hendiadys," were appropriately grouped, and their different morpho-syntactic structures clearly laid out.¹⁴⁰⁶ T. might have given heed especially to this latter facet of their usage because he describes the phenomenon uniquely in terms of parataxis, e.g., *ḥš bhtm tbnn*, 'quickly build a palace'. One finds this structure in Hebrew, but others as well, with no apparent fundamental difference in meaning, viz., (1) parataxis of precisely identical forms (e.g., *hōw'ēl qah*, 'please take', II Kings 5:23, two imperatives); (2) identical forms joined by *w* (e.g., *hōw'ēl ūbārēk*, 'please bless', II Sam. 7:29, two imperatives joined by *w*); (3) the verb in question followed by a 'wāw-consecutive' structure (e.g., *w'ālūw hōw'alnūw wannēšeb*, 'if only we had been content to stay', Josh. 7:7); (4) the verb in question followed by *l* and an infinitive construct (e.g., *hōw'altīy l'dabbēr*, 'I have dared speak', Gen. 18:28). It is the similarity of meaning across these different syntactic structures that is of interest in terms of T.'s classification of the Ugaritic forms, for it makes clear that the function of this class of verbs is not to be linked with any single syntax. This may be taken as at least an indication that a heading broader than 'parataxis' might have been found for the Ugaritic phenomenon. At the very least, an explicit comparison with the Hebrew usage would have been in order.

— p. 896 (§96.312). This paragraph provides an example of T.'s maximalist approach: the correlation of the D-stem of ŠLM and NGR, 'to keep well' and 'to guard', in the epistolary blessing formulae is hesitantly placed under the following classification: "Zwei Verben bilden bedeutungsmäßig eine Einheit ('Hendiadyoin')." T. himself brings forward one argument against that classification, viz., that the two-verb sequence may be expanded to three (he cites the case of 'ZZ D-stem, 'to strengthen'; in addition to expansion by this verb, Bordreuil and I have proposed that √TMM D-stem, 'to keep in perfect condition' was so used in RS 92.2005:28 [RSO XIV 49])¹⁴⁰⁷. Two other arguments go unmentioned here, though

¹⁴⁰⁵On these matters, see idem, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 491, 505-7; idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 215.

¹⁴⁰⁶*Introduction to Biblical Hebrew* (1972) 238-40 (§173).

¹⁴⁰⁷RSO XIV (2001) 374.

T. is in each case well aware of the phenomena: the order of the two verbs is not fixed (ŠLM – NGR and NGR – ŠLM are both well attested) and an element may be inserted between them, namely *l šlm*, ‘for well-being’.¹⁴⁰⁸ It is hardly plausible that an epistolary formula that shows so much variety is properly described as expressing a semantic “Einheit.” —pp. 904-5 (§97.4). None of T.’s examples of subordinate clauses with a modal function is convincing and the section should be eliminated. §97.41 deals with “Komparativsätze,” for which, in spite of the plural in the title, a single example in two tokens is proposed (RS 2.[009]⁺ ii 6-9, 28-30 [KTU 1.6]); but T. himself considers the analysis as a subordinate nominal clause unlikely (see remark above to p. 762 [§82.13], etc.). §97.42 is devoted to “Andere Modalsätze,” but neither of the analyses proposed here proves the existence of the grammatical category: §a deals with a formula that appears frequently in letters of which the protasis is not a modal expression (T.’s interpretation is criticized in detail in the following remark); §b deals with a single phrase in a broken context of a letter (RS 1.026⁺ [KTU 2.7]) that may be an independent interrogative sentence rather than a modal subordinate clause (see above, remark to pp. 716-17 [§76.535a-c], esp. note 1271).

— p. 904 (§97.42). I agree fully with T. that *mnm šlm* in the epistolary formula that runs *mnm šlm* ‘*m* X *rgm* TT̄B ‘my, ‘whatever well-being there may be with X, (may X) send back word (of that) to me’, does not constitute an independent sentence, as some have held, but a subordinate clause (see remark above to p. 244 [§45.122b], etc.). I cannot see, however, that it has any modal value. T.’s expanded translation is “Hinsichtlich (der Art und Weise bzw. des Ausmaßes) des Wohlbefindens schicke eine Nachricht zurück.” I would not wish to deny that the writer wishes to know ‘how’ the addressee is, but, at the surface level, he is simply asking that the addressee return word of his/her well-being. This is indicated by two important variations on the formula: (1) when the writer asks for return of news regarding a specific situation, in the sentence *mnm rgm d tšm* ‘*tmt w št b spr* ‘my, ‘Whatever word you hear there, put (it) in a letter to me’ (RS 4.475:16-19 [KTU 2.10]), *rgm* in the *casus pendens* is the implied direct object of *št* in the main clause; (2) in the expanded form of the the return-of news-formula found in RS 92.2010:12-20 (RSO XIV 50), the noun *rgm* is omitted from the main clause and it is the quadruple *šlm* that is the direct object of the verb: *b’ly šlm^l h^l w šlm nkly w šlm bth w šlm šm* ‘*rgmk n* ‘*m* *āt tt̄b* ‘*m* ‘*bdk*, ‘As for my lord, his well-being and that of *Nikkalaya* and the well-being of his household and the well-being of those who listen to your good word may you return to your servant (i.e., please return word of that well-being)’¹⁴⁰⁹. These variants show that T.’s analysis of the *casus pendens* in the standard formula as having an adverbial function (‘as regards your well-being’) is correct because the verb of the main clause has another explicit direct object, *rgm*; but they also make it dubious that the use of *mnm* in the *casus pendens* constitutes an expression of modality. In Ugaritic, one did not ask ‘how’ someone was, one asked for his ‘well-being’ or

¹⁴⁰⁸On this element, see above, remark to p. 758 (§82.12).

¹⁴⁰⁹See the French rendition in the *editio princeps* (RSO XIV 50) and my English translation of the full text in *Context III* (2002) 112-13; see also Bordreuil and Pardee, *Manuel* (2004), text 30 in the *Choix de textes*. On the *casus pendens* structure of this passage and the shift from 3^d to 2^d person (the latter a common feature of letters), see T., p. 883 (§94.21), p. 890 (§95.43).

for a report thereon. All that *mnm* adds to the request is an expression of completeness: ‘report to me whatever forms of well-being characterize your life.’¹⁴¹⁰ I am dubious that this constitutes a grammatical expression of modality. To have categorized the Ugaritic return-of-news formula as explicitly modal, T. appears to have permitted himself to be influenced by the psychology reflected in our modern expressions, which consist of a neutral statement that allows explicitly for a positive or a negative response (‘Wie gehts?’, ‘Comment ça va?’, ‘How are you?’), and to have infused *mnm* with the same degree of neutrality rather than taking the positively marked *šlm* at face value.

— p. 906 (§97.71a). With a question mark, T. interprets *āthlm tūtk tīzr pnm* in RS 24.261:9 (*KTU* 1.116) as consisting of a main clause and an asyndetic circumstantial clause: “ein āthlm-Opfer für Šauška, wobei das Gesicht zu verhüllen(?) ist.” But he has failed to notice that, in this bilingual text, the attribution of sacrifices to a divinity is expressed explicitly by the Hurrian dative morpheme attached to the divine name. Above, in line 3, the attribution of the *āthlm*-sacrifice to *Ta’uška*, is so expressed, *āthlm tūtkd*. Below, in lines 10-11, there is a mixed Ugaritic-Hurrian sentence similar to the one in lines 8-9 and there the divine name bears the dative morpheme.¹⁴¹¹ The absence of *-d* on *tūtk* in line 9 means that the *āthlm*-sacrifice is not explicitly ascribed to her there¹⁴¹² and that the divine name functions as the subject of the following verb.¹⁴¹³

Typographical errors:

— p. 60, §21.354.1a, “sonstige Fälle,” line 6: “1.17:V:20” should be ‘1.17:V:19’.

— p. 69, §21.412g, line 5: “‘*bd.pdr* 4.269:7” appears twice.

— p. 125, §32.146.313 *gr*: “4.17” should be ‘4.27’.¹⁴¹⁴

— p. 139, §33.112.36Anm., line 4: the last sign of the PN “*agttb*” according to *CAT* 4.320:3 is *p*.

¹⁴¹⁰The limitation of the question to well-being is also characteristic of the later West-Semitic languages: though Š’L (+ *l*) + *šlm*-X is the equivalent of our ‘asking how someone is’, on the surface level it consists of ‘asking (regarding) the well-being of someone’. The first explicit expression of uncertainty regarding the quality of the addressee’s well-being of which I am aware in inscriptions is in the Phoenician letter KAI 50 where, in line 2, *w šlm ’t* must in context be taken as a question and mean ‘Are you in a state of well-being?’ (cf. Pardee, *et al.*, *Handbook* [1982] 167). In the Hebrew Bible, the inquiry after someone’s health may also be expressed interrogatively: *hāšālōm ’at*, ‘Are you in a state of well-being?’

¹⁴¹¹Ll. 8-9: *w l b btm āthlm tūtk tīzr pnm*, ‘And in the house/temple, sacrifice; as for *Ta’uška*, you are to veil her face’; ll. 10-11: *w b bt āthlm intt tlnṯm*, ‘And in the house/temple, sacrifice for the gods *Talanni*’.

¹⁴¹²See Laroche, *Ugaritica* V (1968) 500, 502, for the hurritological viewpoint.

¹⁴¹³Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 658 (with previous bibliography); idem, *Ritual and Cult* (2002) 95; I did not deal with these lines in my brief study of the bilingual ritual texts in *Bilingualism* (1996) 63-80.

¹⁴¹⁴“Should be” in this and following entries represents the correct notation according to T.’s conventions which are not necessarily mine; what is found in his text is enclosed in double quotation marks, the correction in single quotation marks.

— The line numbers indicated for the ‘polyglot vocabulary’ RS 20.123⁺ often differ from those of the *editio princeps* (Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* V, text 137. pp. 240ff.);¹⁴¹⁵ the first example I noted was on p. 144, §33.115.42, last line: “II:6’ ” is found in col. II, line 12’, in the *editio princeps*.¹⁴¹⁶

- p. 171, §33.213.1a, line 4: the entry said to appear in “II:4’ ” is found in line 10’.
- p. 171, §33.213.1a, line 7; p. 301, §53.34, line 10: the entry said to appear in “I:3’ ” is found in line 20”.
- p. 188, §33.311.1a, line 3: the entry said to appear in “III:7’ ” is found in line 32”.
- p. 188, §33.311.2a, line 2: the entry said to appear in “I:3’ ” is found in line 9’.
- p. 251, §51.41a, lines 10-11; p. 278, §52.11, line 4: the entry said to appear in “IVb:18” is found in line 17; because the lemma for each entry is “*ba-a-lu(-ma)*”, examples should have been cited for the writing with { -ma }, e.g., col. II, lines 30’ and 33’ of this text.
- p. 251, §51.41a, line 18: the entry said to appear in “II:30’ ” is found in line 26’.
- p. 252, §51.41a, line 2: the entry said to appear in “IVb:15” is found in line 14.
- p. 252, §51.41a, line 9; p. 303, §54.111, line 2: the entry said to appear in “II:13’ ” is found in line 19’.
- p. 252, §51.41a, line 31: the entry said to appear in “I:3’ ” is found in line 9’.
- p. 254, §51.41c, line 8: the entry said to appear in “I:5’ ” is found in line 11’.
- p. 254, §51.41c, line 14; p. 303, §54.111, line 4: the entry said to appear in “III:4’ ” is found in line 29”.
- p. 254, §51.41c, line 17: the entry said to appear in “I:4’ ” is found in line 10’.
- p. 257, §51.41g, line 2: the entry said to appear in “II:4’ ” is found in line 10’.
- p. 266, §51.45e, line 5: the entry said to appear in “II:15’ ” is found in line 21’.
- p. 266, §51.45e, last line: the entry said to appear in “III:7’ ” is found in line 32’.
- p. 303, §54.111, line 7: the entry said to appear in “II:6’ ” is found in line 12’.
- p. 149, §33.115.9Anm., last line: the cross-reference to “§74.232.2a” should be ‘§74.232.21’ (see p. 521).
- p. 158, §33.141.42, line 5: ditto.
- p. 171, §33.212c, last line: in CAT 2.31, *ib’r* is found in line 55, not “54.”
- p. 172, §33.212.2, line 5: “1.23:2” should be ‘1.23:6’.
- p. 175, §33.215.21b *utb*, line 2: “4.337:1” should be ‘4.337:11’.
- p. 188, §33.311.2aAnm., line 1: “RS 20.196” should be ‘RS 20.196A’.
- p. 195, §33.322.1b, line 6: “1.16:I” should be ‘1.16:VI’.
- p. 197, §33.322.42c, line 11: insert double quotation marks after *Birt*.

¹⁴¹⁵The differences cannot reflect another edition of the text, for T.’s numbers sometimes coincide with those of the *editio princeps* and he sometimes cites the same reference for different entries (see below “I:3’ ” on pp. 171 and 252).

¹⁴¹⁶The great number of discrepancies would lead one to believe that T. is using an edition other than the *editio princeps*, but I know neither of such an edition nor why the numbering of the lines would vary so significantly and in an unpredictable way from the editor’s.

- p. 198, §33.323.1b, line 2; p. 258, §51.42a, line 10: the word *pn* is not attested in *CAT* 1.1:II:14.
- p. 200, §33.323.4b, line 6: the syllabic entry *ta-bu* should be moved up to §a.
- p. 202, §33.421, line 5: “§33.151.1” should be ‘§33.151’ (see p. 162).
- p. 210, §41.112.7, line 5: “2.31:65” should be ‘2.31:63’.
- p. 215, §41.221.11a, last line: “2.71:12” should be ‘2.75:12’.
- p. 216, §41.221.12b, line 1: “§54.133c” should be ‘§54.133.2c’.
- p. 225, §41.222.2b, last line: “3.9:8-7” should be ‘3.9:6-7’.
- p. 255, §51.41c, line 6: “4.15” should be ‘4.14’.
- p. 255, §51.41e, line 8: it is strange to cite *hmr* as appearing in “4.14:18&” when the word is also found in lines 6 and 12 of the same text.
- p. 256, §51.41e, line 6: no gloss is provided for *šb*’.
- p. 257, §51.42a, line 10: “4.272:1” should be ‘4.272:2’.
- p. 265, line 11: the second “51.44m” should be ‘51.42n’.
- p. 268, §51.45k, line 1: “/mappuh/” should be ‘/mappuh/’.
- p. 271, §51.46a, line 9: “9.432:17” should be ‘RS 92.2016:18’ (elsewhere, this text is always cited by its RS-number rather than by the meaningless *CAT* number—meaningless because §9 was added in *CAT* to provide a place to list tablets of which the existence was known to the editors but not the text itself).
- p. 275, §51.5a, line 20: “Pflanzenspezies” should be ‘Pflanzenspezies’.
- pp. 301-2, §53.36: this section has paragraphs “b” through “f,” but no section ‘a’.
- p. 347, §62.152a, line 4: “1.14:I:29” should be ‘1.14:I:30’.
- p. 349, §62.182bAnm, line 9: the tablet RS 3.343+ (*KTU* 1.15) is referred to as a “Stein.”.
- p. 349, §62.192, line 3: “§63.18” should be ‘§63.19’.
- p. 379, §65.147c, line 8: “2.40:5-9” should be ‘2.40:5-8’.
- p. 410, §69.223.12b, line 7; p. 417, §69.313.11, line 5: it is strange to cite *tt dd š’rm* as appearing in “4.14:7” when the phrase is already found in line 1 of the same text.
- p. 413, §69.241, line 6: “4.132:2” should be ‘4.132:3’.
- p. 420, §69.53, line 3: “*ksmk*” should be ‘*kmsk*’.
- p. 420, §69.53, line 3: “4.707:29” should be ‘4.707:23’.
- p. 446, §73.233.9, line 7: insert ‘nicht’ after “auf daß ihr.”
- p. 464, §73.331.1, line 20: it is strange to cite “*qra*” as appearing in “1.161:5.6.7.11.12” when the first appearance of the form is in line 4.
- p. 467, §73.332.4, line 13: insert ‘5.11:5’ as the text reference for the cited form.
- p. 468, §73.333.1Anm., line 5: contains a cross-reference to this very section.
- p. 475, §73.426, line 9: “1.124.15f” should be ‘1.124:14f’.
- p. 478, §73.431c, line 10: “Pfüger” should be ‘Pflüger’.
- p. 516, §74.223.2 *√mhš*, line 2: “1.19:IV:52f” should be ‘1.19:III:52f’.
- p. 524, §74.232.21 *√rqs*, line 3: “1.3:IV:23f” should be ‘1.2:IV:23f’.
- p. 526, §74.232.21 *√tmn*, line 6 contains a cross-reference to this very section (it should apparently have been to §74.432).

- pp. 537-38, §74.333 √*mšh*, line 1, √*ngh*, line 1, and √*ntk*, line 1: the 3 m.du. ending is each time indicated as /-ūna/.
- p. 547, §74.412.21, four lines from bottom of page: “4.442:2” should be ‘4.422:2’.
- p. 547, §74.412.21Anm., lines 1-2: several words are in *Italic* script that should be in *Roman*.
- p. 553, §74.412.27 √*kbd*, line 7: “1.17:VI:30” should be ‘1.17:V:30’.
- p. 554, §74.412.27 √*šly*, line 3: “1.19:I:38f” should be ‘1.19:I:38-40’.
- p. 561, §74.414.3 √*gzy*, line 1: “**gāziytumā*” should be ‘**gāzziytumā*’.
- p. 580, §74.512 √*rym*, line 1: according to T. reconstruction of the form in line 2 of this paragraph, the vocalization should be ‘*rāmim*’, not “*rāmim*.”
- p. 582, §74.515.1, line 5: “1.12:II:8” should be ‘1.12:II:9’.
- p. 596, §74.624, line 9: “D-PK” should be ‘D-SK’.
- p. 600, §74.626.1, line 3: “Ptz.” should be ‘Inf.’.
- p. 600, §74.626.1, line 5: the Hiphil infinitive absolute in Hebrew is /haqtēl/, not “*haqtīl*.”
- p. 606, §74.642 √*hwy*, line 5: “/yVštaḥwiyu/” should be ‘/tVštaḥwiyu/’.
- p. 611, §75.212.11 √*py*: “3.f.s.” should be ‘3.m.s’ and “1.14:II:3” should be ‘1.14:II:30’.
- p. 613, §75.212.14 √*wd*: “2.16:19” should be ‘2.26:19’.
- p. 616, §75.222, line 22: “Z. 4” should be ‘Z. 3’.
- p. 617, §75.223 √*d’w*, line 4: “*du*” is said to appear in 1.19:III:14 though it was just stated in lines 2-3 of this paragraph that the proper reading there is “*tdu*.”
- p. 617, §75.224, lines 6, 7, and 13: the repetition of “2.36+” (twice) and “2.4” should be removed.
- p. 621, §75.232, line 3: “[*’*]l tšr” should be ‘[a]l tšr’.
- p. 621, §75.232 √*mz’*, line 2: “1.12:II:37” should be ‘1.12:I:37’.
- p. 621, §75.232 √*ml’*, line 2: “3.f.sg.” should be ‘3.m.sg.’
- p. 622, §75.235b √*ht’*: the cross-reference to “§73.422.3” should be ‘§73.426’.
- p. 624, §75.32 √*hdy*, line 2: “/yuhaddiyu/” should be ‘/tuhaddiyu/’.
- p. 633, §75.512 √*wd’*, line 1: “TV /i/” should be ‘TV /a/’.
- p. 635, §75.512 √*ytn*, line 2: the form *ytn* does not occur in “1.1:II:14.”
- p. 635, §75.512 √*ytn*, line 7: the form *ttn* is entirely reconstructed in 1.18:IV:5.
- p. 635, §75.513 √*wd’*, line 3: “/da’/” should be ‘/da’r’.
- p. 639, §75.517 √*wld*, lines 1-3: the entire paragraph is repeated.
- p. 640, §75.518Anm., line 2: “§51.45j” should be ‘§51.45w’.
- p. 643, §75.522 √*bw’*, line 3: “**tabû*” should be ‘**yabû*’.
- p. 643, §75.522 √*bw’*, lines 7-8: “1.15:IV:21” is repeated.
- p. 643, §75.522 √*bw’*, line 9: “/taba’â/” should be ‘/tabû’â/’.
- p. 646, §75.522 √*šyt*, line 8: the form *tšt* is entirely reconstructed in 1.101:16.
- p. 648, §75.524 √*nwr*, line 2: “3.m.sg.” should be ‘3.m.pl.’.
- p. 649, §75.527a √*dwk*, line 2: “1.85:2” should be ‘1.85:3’.
- p. 652, §75.527g √*twb*, line 2: “/taṭīb/” should be ‘/taṭīb’/’.
- p. 652, §75.527g √*twb*, line 3: “/taṭībī/” should be ‘/taṭībī’/’.
- p. 652, §75.527h √*qyl*, line 2: “1.23:11” should be ‘1.23:10’.

- p. 652, §75.527i √kwn, line 2: “/yVštakinu/ /yVštakînu/— p. 659, §75.532 √hdy, line 3: “/yuhaddiyu/” should be ‘/tuhaddiyu/’.
- p. 663, §75.533 √mhy, line 2: “1.124:15” should be ‘1.124:14’.
- p. 663, §75.533 √‘ly, line 2: “/‘liy/” should be ‘/‘lî/’.
- p. 668, §75.537d √hy/wy, line 6: “aḥw” should be ‘aḥwy’.
- p. 670, §75.537g √hy/wy, line 2: “/yuštaḥwiyu/” should be ‘/yVštaḥwiyu/’.
- p. 670, §75.537g √hy/wy, line 3: “/yVštaḥwiyu/” should be ‘/tVštaḥwiyu/’.
- p. 676, §75.64 √‘zz, line 2: correct the ordering of “1.6:VI:17(2x).20(2x).18.19.”
- p. 676, §75.65b √brr, line 3: “§73.422.3” should be ‘§73.426’.
- p. 686, §76.323, line 3: insert quotation marks at end of translation.
- p. 687, §76.331, line 19: “1.17:VI:33” should be ‘1.17:VI:38’
- p. 688, §76.332, line 6: “4.168:6” should be ‘4.168:6-8’.
- p. 691, §76.343a, last line: “§97.11.2” should be ‘§97.11b’.
- p. 692, §76.343b, line 3: ditto.
- p. 692, §76.343c, last line: “§97.11.2-3” should be ‘§97.11b-c’.
- p. 692, §76.344, line 18: “1.2:II:4f” should be ‘1.2:III:4f’.
- p. 699, §76.423, line 4: judging from the structure of this paragraph as compared with the previous paragraph, “y‘n” should be ‘t‘n’.
- p. 703, §76.521.2, line 6: “11 likt” should be ‘lm l likt’.
- p. 709, §76.524.41, line 22: square brackets should be inserted at various points to indicate the damaged nature of the quoted text.
- p. 711, §76.524.44, line 7: “§73.223.33” should be “§73.223.33.2.”
- p. 712, §76.524.6a, line 8: insert ‘[n.L.]’ after “1.18:I:19f.*” ([tḫb‘] is not in CAT).
- p. 716, §76.541, line 6: “aber” is repeated.
- p. 716, §76.541a, line 8: “Verpflichtung” should be ‘Verpflichtung’.
- p. 723, §77.323, last line; p. 724, §77.324bAnm., line 2: “§97.102b” should be ‘§97.10.2b’.
- p. 725, §77.33, line 18: “/’šîtā/” should be ‘/’ašîtā/’.
- p. 726, §77.34cAnm., line 1: “1.23:38” should be ‘1.24:38’.
- p. 727, §77.34cAnm., line 3: “1.23:37-39” should be ‘1.24:37-39’.
- p. 740, §81.12e, line 3: “als” is repeated.
- p. 742, §81.21a, line 2: insert ‘und’ after “Poesie.”
- p. 759, §82.12, last line: “b‘d” should be ‘atṛ’.
- p. 764, §82.31, line 13: “mlykm” should be ‘mlakm’.
- p. 765, §82.33: “§82.214” should be ‘83.214’.
- p. 772, §82.312, line 26: “1.3:IV:41-43” should be ‘1.3:IV:41-42’.
- p. 785, §83.113a, line 5: “die die” (twice) should be ‘(die) die’ (the relative pronoun is not present in the text being translated).
- p. 790, §83.122g, line 5: “2.72:22f” should be ‘2.72:20-23’.
- p. 791, §83.131, line 10: “mk b b’” should be ‘mk b šb’.
- p. 791, §83.131, line 10: insert “\” for each line division
- p. 791, §83.131, line 15: “1.17:VI:30-32” should be ‘1.17:VI:30-33’.
- p. 807, line 2; p. 816, §87.23, line 2: “1.6:VI:25f” should be ‘1.6:VI:26f’.
- p. 847, §91.321b, line 3: insert “\” between ḥmšt and pwt.

- p. 848, line 18: “4.363:1” should be ‘4.363:1f’.
- p. 848, last line: “*mšḥt*” should be ‘*mšḥf*’; “4.167:15” should be ‘4.167:15f’.
- p. 861, §93.31a, line 3: “1.14:I:16f” should be ‘1.14:I:6f’.
- p. 952: under the heading *√gw/yl*, the references to pp. 126 and 645 should be moved down to a new entry ‘*√gwI*’.
- p. 965: add an entry for *ḥmr* denoting a dry measure with references to pp. 255, 411.
- p. 969: add an entry for *nʿr*, “Rostmehl,” with reference to p. 411.
- p. 969: add p. 278 to the references for “npš.”
- pp. 983-1054 index of “Belegstellen.” Though I have not checked every entry, in general, the errors in text references mentioned previously in this section are mirrored in the index.

In sum, while recognizing that T.’s organization of Ugaritic grammar is far and away the best, the most complete, and the most linguistically sophisticated treatment currently available, the number of debatable points as well as a significant number of epigraphic faults and a not insignificant number of grammatical decisions that I would consider faulty or at the very least unwise keep me from being more enthusiastic about it than I am. One important question regarding this very serious work of scholarship is whether its weight will confound the detractors of presenting Ugaritic texts and grammar in vocalized form or whether the many debatable points included herein will create even more dubiety towards the procedure than has been voiced hitherto. The fact that this work is firmly founded in comparative Semitics cannot in and of itself override such doubts, for any given case that is decided entirely or even principally by comparative considerations must by its very nature remain within the domain of speculation until internal data are attested to confirm or deny the hypothesis. From the above remarks, it should be clear that T. often prefers a reconstruction favoring archaic Semitic whereas it appears to me that one based on a triangulation with Hebrew and Arabic (and Phoenician and Aramaic where possible and relevant) is often preferable. As was remarked in the introduction, perhaps what was needed before this study, which is in many respects an historical grammar of Ugaritic, would have been a less speculative descriptive grammar that treated the data as completely as this one. T. could then have devoted his considerable erudition as a comparative Semitist to a historical/comparative grammar addressed primarily to specialists in Ugaritic and in comparative Semitics, one that would have been less likely to be considered canonical and thereby to have an effect upon even the more casual students of Ugaritic. As it is, one can foresee generations of students becoming confused by the many inconsistencies encountered in this grammar and believing, to choose three egregious examples, that Ugaritic was the only West-Semitic language to have three energetic morphemes, that the {-h} adverbial morpheme was a true case marker, or that the D-stem was really /yuqattal-/ in spite of attested /ʾaqattal-/.

DENNIS PARDEE

University of Chicago