

## THE AKKADIAN OF UGARIT: LEXICOGRAPHICAL ASPECTS

*Wilfred H. van Soldt*

### 1. INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

The Akkadian attested in records found at Ugarit of the Late Bronze Age (LB III/3)<sup>2</sup> has to be regarded as a written rather than a spoken language. The scribes themselves spoke Ugaritic and had at least a passive knowledge of Hurrian. Akkadian served as the *lingua franca* and was used in the international correspondence. However, it also penetrated into the local administration and was used there in competition with Ugaritic.

Since the scribes had to learn both the language and the script, and since both were foreign to Ugarit, teachers had to be imported from abroad to instruct scribes-to-be. Who these teachers were remains unknown to us, all the names available to date are indigenous to Syria and are not Assyrian or Babylonian. We can, however, say a bit more about the origin of the study material that the teachers taught at Ugarit. The lexical texts follow the Mesopotamian tradition as we know it from centers outside Nippur, the date of the influx of the texts must be set after the Old Babylonian period. Since a number of vocabularies have a Hurrian column, some of the teachers must have come from a Hurrian speaking area. Only very few texts can be shown to have been brought in from outside the city, one probably derives from Ḫattuša, another from Mesopotamia<sup>3</sup>.

The scribes learned Akkadian in a school. These schools were not located in the palace but in private houses. The student had to study a curriculum which was similar to that followed in Mesopotamia. The texts followed a didactic order, so that the student began with simple syllabaries and ended with complicated lists of compound ideograms. In the last stage of his study he would use the Akkadian words in context by copying literary and religious texts. The many mistakes in the schooltexts clearly show the difficulties that the students encountered in mastering their study material. Most scribes also learned to write the alphabetic script and could write documents in Akkadian as well as in Ugaritic, the two main languages used in written documents at Ugarit.

Akkadian was first and foremost put to use in documents which concerned the relations with states and cities outside Ugarit. Thus, the treaties and legal documents concerning international affairs are all in Akkadian (except for a number of

---

<sup>1</sup> The introduction is more or less a summary of van Soldt 1995.

<sup>2</sup> For the dating of the archives discovered at Ugarit, see van Soldt 1991a, chapters 1 and 2.

<sup>3</sup> Van Soldt 1995, note 30.

translations in Ugaritic), as are most of the letters. However, Akkadian was also used in the local administration, almost all the legal texts are written in this language, and a sizable amount of the administrative texts as well. Why a scribe decided to write an administrative text in Akkadian, and not in Ugaritic or vice versa, remains unknown. The only genre which had no competition from Akkadian was that of the indigenous literary texts. All our available copies are in Ugaritic.

## 2. AKKADIAN WORDS WRITTEN BY UGARITIC SCRIBES

As I have said above, Akkadian was not a spoken language at Ugarit. Therefore, we cannot really speak of the Akkadian «dialect» of Ugarit, as the term dialect generally refers to the opposite, at least in modern times: a spoken substandard variety of a standard language, usually without a writing tradition of its own<sup>4</sup>. The population of Ugarit spoke Ugaritic, a West Semitic language akin to Hebrew and Aramaic, and possibly understood at least a bit of Hurrian<sup>5</sup>. Therefore, we can expect all sorts of mistakes in the Akkadian written by the Ugaritic scribes, ranging from simple misunderstandings to interference of the local language. Naturally, the teachers are partly to be blamed for mistakes which occur consistently and which they probably brought in from outside, from such centers as Ḫattuša<sup>6</sup>, Mittanni<sup>7</sup> or possibly from somewhere in Syria<sup>8</sup>. In this paragraph I will discuss some of the scribal mistakes which can be encountered.

The first category which I want to discuss is that of the isolated mistakes, that is, mistakes that do not show a clear pattern. Quite a few words that were written in lexical texts can be identified only with difficulty and sometimes not at all, partly because the scribe apparently did not understand what the teacher told him, partly because the teacher did not remember the word in its correct form. Some examples from a few hundred cases will suffice:

ú.KI.KAL.ḫi.li.a = *la-a-a-ri-tu* (*larđu*), Hh 16-17, MSL X, 108:24.

ú.nab.na.đu = *mu-ri-da-di-lu* (*murdudû*), *ibid.*, line 35.

ú.<sup>d</sup>DIM.ME = *na-ma-li-te* (*lamaštu*), *ibid.*, 111:112<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Of course, «standard language» is a recent phenomenon and should not be applied to the Ancient Near East, at least not before the standardization of Qor'anic Arabic and of Biblical Hebrew. Even in northern Europe, standard languages came into being only after the Middle Ages and before that, texts were usually written down in the local dialect of the scribe.

<sup>5</sup> Van Soldt 1991a, 229, 340 and 519.

<sup>6</sup> Van Soldt 1995, note 30.

<sup>7</sup> Because of the Hurrian columns in the lexical texts.

<sup>8</sup> As I have tried to show elsewhere (van Soldt 1991a, 519f.), the Akkadian of Ugarit shows a strong Hurrian-Mittannian influence which diminishes in time. There is, however, a growing influence from the local language, as well as from Assyrian. Note that one archive (Lam.) has produced documents in good Babylonian written in a Babylonian hand.

<sup>9</sup> Van Soldt 1991a, 389.

giš.sag.kul.lá.lá = *sú-ku-ru za-gi-ri (sikkūr šāqili)*, Hh 5b-6, MSL 6, 28:273<sup>10</sup>.  
 giš.suḥur = *ma-gi-qu (mekkū)*, *ibid.*, 96:148.

The number of examples can easily be multiplied. In literary texts, too, we find this kind of mistake:

*dal-ḥat-e-re-tum = dalḥā tērētu*, U 5, 162:5'.  
*ul iq-bu-ú a-da-mur-ši-ia = ul iqbū adān muršiya*, *ibid.*, line 8'.

In many cases the mistakes of the apprentice scribe make it hard for us to understand what he meant and, due to lack of parallels, some texts still remain partly unintelligible<sup>11</sup>.

Naturally, the documents which the scribes composed after the completion of their study do not suffer from these mistakes to the same degree. The scribe was well aware of the meanings of the words which he wrote down. However, unexpected peculiarities may point to a lack of proficiency, and possibly of education, on the part of the scribe. Compare, for example:

(<sup>14</sup>)*a-ši-mi ú-ra še-ra* (<sup>15</sup>)*e-te-e-ru a-na šà-bi-šu-nu* (<sup>16</sup>)*ù te-ša-bi-tu<sub>4</sub> Ptu-tu* (<sup>17</sup>)50  
 kù.babbar *ú-ma-ia-e* (<sup>18</sup>)*i-na šu Ptu-tu = šumma urra šēra iturrū ana libbišunu u*  
*tišabbitū*<sup>12</sup> *Tutu 50 (šiqil) kaspera umallū ina qāt Tutu*, «If in the future they go back on  
 their decision and seize Tutu, they will compensate Tutu with fifty shekels of silver»  
 (PRU 6, 50)<sup>13</sup>.

And, finally, an idiosyncrasy (two cases of crasis<sup>14</sup>) from an administrative text:

(4)...<sup>uru</sup>*ap-su-na il-ka la-lak = Apsunā ilka lā allak*, «I will not perform the *ilku*-service  
 of Apsunā» (PRU 6, 77), and:  
 (8)*šu.niḡin 6 erim<sup>l</sup>.meš* (<sup>9</sup>)*la-li-ku ša il-ki* (<sup>10</sup>)<sup>uru</sup>*ap-su-ni-yu-ma = napharu 6 šābu lā*  
*ālikū (?) ša ilki apsuniyūma*, «In total six workers from Apsunā who do not perform  
 the *ilku*-service» (*ibid.*)<sup>15</sup>.

The second category is that of consistent mistakes, that is, mistakes which are not the result of some *ad hoc* mechanism, but are determined by other factors. Here we enter the area of interference, the most common cause of conditioned changes on every imaginable level: orthography, phonology, morphology, syntax, as well as lexicon. In my opinion, it is the task of the modern researcher to isolate and discuss these interference phenomena rather than treat the so-called Akkadian dialect of Ugarit as if it were a spoken language<sup>16</sup>. Since we are concerned here with lexicography, and not with grammar, I will leave out examples from phonology and syntax.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, the wisdom text U 5, 163. For a recent treatment, see Dietrich 1992.

<sup>12</sup> Ugaritic form, see Huehnergard 1989, 160 & 280; van Soldt 1991a, 432.

<sup>13</sup> Huehnergard 1989, 11 note 13; van Soldt 1991a, 439 (p).

<sup>14</sup> Huehnergard 1989, 108; van Soldt 1991a, 438.

<sup>15</sup> Or: «Who do not perform the *ilku*-service of Apsunā (*ap-su-ni-yi-ma*)».

<sup>16</sup> Van Soldt 1991a, xxii.

### Orthography

The documents from Ugarit cannot be dated with the accuracy of Mesopotamian standards. If the scribe bothered at all to write the name of the ruling king he always did so without mentioning the regnal year. Therefore, we can only assign a text to the reign of a certain king, not to a specific year. This should be kept in mind when we discuss spelling changes that can be observed over a period of time.

The most remarkable orthographical phenomenon at Ugarit is probably the interference from the Mittannian syllabary in the earlier documents. The spelling of words in documents from the reigns of the first three kings (Niqmaddu II, Arḫalba and Niqmepa<sup>c</sup>), shows characteristics which are at home in peripheral areas and not in Mesopotamia proper. They all but disappear during the reign of ‘Ammitamru II and his successors Ibirānu, Niqmaddu III and ‘Ammurapi’. These characteristics can be summed up as what is commonly referred to as the «confusion of the stops». It means that stops are not always written with the signs that one expects on the basis of the Mesopotamian syllabary. Thus, one can find TA instead of DA and vice versa. However, this «confusion» does not occur at random but follows a certain pattern. This pattern is based on the so-called Mittanni syllabary as we know it from the Hurrian letter EA 24, a long message from Tušratta to Amenophis III<sup>17</sup>. The scribes who wrote this letter did not use all the signs available from the Akkadian syllabary but chose certain signs only, usually just one sign out of a group of two or three like, for example, TA from DA-TA, DU from DU-TU-ṬU<sup>18</sup>. The syllabary for the stops looks as follows<sup>19</sup>:

	-a	-e	-i	-o	-u
Dental	TA	TE	TI	DU	DU
Guttural	KA	GI	KI	KU	GU
Labial	PA	BE	BI	BU	BU

Consequently, words in Akkadian texts can be written in early texts in a form which differs from that in later texts. For example:

(22) *ša-ni-tam um-ma* Pèr-TI (23) *kù.babbar ú-nu-DU gáb-bu mim-mu* (24) *ša ama* Pkál-bi (25) *ugu-ia ia-nu* (26) *gáb-PA tal-te-qé* (27) *ù tap-ta-ṭar* = *šanītam umma ‘Abdi kaspu unūtu gabbu mimmū ša ummi Kalbi eliya yānu gabba talteqe u taptatar*, «Furthermore, this (is what) ‘Abdu (said): “I do not owe silver or any other property to Kalbu’s mother, she has now taken everything and she has left”» (RS 16.143; PRU 3, 81; time of Niqmepa<sup>c</sup>).

In this example, those signs have been capitalized which do not follow standard Mesopotamian practice. As one can see, the deviations conform with the Mittanni syllabary.

The relevance of the «Mittannian rule» for lexicography can be shown in cases where the confusion of the stops has led to faulty interpretations of certain Akkadian words. One example may suffice. In the legal terminology of Ugarit a phrase occurs

<sup>17</sup> The most recent translation is by Wilhelm in Moran 1992.

<sup>18</sup> I will not go into the phonological background of this choice.

<sup>19</sup> See also van Soldt 1989, 110 and 1991a, 380.

which stipulates that the owner of a property has to perform a certain service<sup>20</sup>. The verb which is used in this phrase is *abālu*, which is almost always spelled with the sign BAL<sup>21</sup>. In only six cases do we find a different spelling:

*ub-PA-lu* (15.89:21; PRU 3, 53; time of Niqmaddu II)

*ú-PA-lu* (16.156:15; PRU 3, 61; time of Niqmaddu II)

*ub-BA-lu* (16.138:36; PRU 3, 143; time of 'Ammitamru II)

*ub-BA-lu-nim* (16.204 r. 12'; PRU 3, 119; time of 'Ammitamru II)

*ú-BA-al* (16.343:19; PRU 3, 129; time of 'Ammitamru II)

*ú-BA-al* (16.386 r. 15'; PRU 3, 165; time of 'Ammitamru II).

It is clear that the occurrences from the time of Niqmaddu II have PA, whereas those of the time of 'Ammitamru II have BA. In view of the «Mittannian rule» of the earlier texts (Niqmaddu II) one has to assume that the consonant was /b/ and not /p/. Thus AHW's interpretation (*abālu*)<sup>22</sup> is to be preferred over that of the CAD (*apālu*)<sup>23</sup>.

Similar cases of morphemic confusion are the verbs *šamādu* (interpreted by some as *šamātu*<sup>24</sup>) and *kabātu* (probably partly to be read as *kabādu*<sup>25</sup>). Here, too, lexicography has to take notice of orthographic practices (as well as phonological interference).

### Morphology

During the period that texts were written at Ugarit interference from the local language was constant. However, there was also interference from other sides which could differ per archive. Thus, the archive of the «Maison-aux-tablettes»<sup>26</sup> showed a substantial level of interference from the Assyrian dialect of Akkadian, whereas the archive of the Lamaštu-tablets<sup>27</sup> produced texts in good Babylonian script and language. All these various influences added to the confusion which sometimes seems to exist on the morphological level. Two phenomena will be discussed here: the apparent confusion in forms of the third person pronoun, and the use of MEŠ and 𐎗.1.A as ideogram markers.

20 This service (*ilku, pilku, unuššu*) will be discussed in detail by I. Márquez-Rowe in his forthcoming dissertation.

21 In the form *ubbal*.

22 AHW *s.v. w/babālu(m)* G II, 10c, *pilku* II 2.

23 CAD *s.v. apālu* A, 6b.

24 For the reading with /d/, see van Soldt 1991a, 244; for /t/, see most recently Huehnergard 1987, 171f. The argument mainly revolves around the interpretation of the gloss sign, for which see below, lexicon.

25 *Kabātu* is, of course, the standard Akkadian form, *kabādu* is West Semitic; see most recently Durand & Joannès 1990.

26 See in general van Soldt 1991a, 182f., 474.

27 *Ibid.*, 204f., 474.

In the documents of everyday life (legal and administrative texts) we find two forms for both genders of the anaphoric pronoun: *šū* and *šūt* (masc.), (*šī*) and *šīt* (fem.). Compare the following examples:

*šū*: (20) *ù šu-ú ú-ra še-ra* (21) *lú mu-du lugal 10 kù.babbar ú-bal*, «But he, as “friend of the king”, will continue to deliver ten (shekels of) silver (annually)<sup>28</sup>» (16.250; PRU 3, 85; time of Niqmepa<sup>c</sup>).

*šūt*: (11)[... a].šà.meš *šu-ut* (12) *š[a-mi-id ...]*<sup>29</sup>, «These fields are “bound” to (Thar’elli queen of Ugarit ... )» (U 5, 161; time of Ibirānu?)<sup>30</sup>.

*šī*: (only in the Lamaštu incantation U 6, 402:16’).

*šīt*: (23) *šī-it be-el-tu<sub>4</sub> é* (24) *ugu dumu-ši*, «She will be head of the family over her son» (16.250; PRU 3, 85; time of Niqmepa<sup>c</sup>).

Note that the forms *šū* and *šīt* are attested in the same text (16.250). The short forms (*šū*, *šī*) are Babylonian, the forms in *-t* Assyrian. It seems obvious that the scribe’s training, in which apparently both the Assyrian and Babylonian forms had been taught, is to be blamed for the apparent confusion<sup>31</sup>.

A similar case, be it with a different background, is the apparent confusion of the pronominal suffixes of the third person fem. sing. *-ša* and *-ši*. Akkadian grammar prescribes the use of *-ša* with nouns and the use of *-ši* with verbs. In Ugarit one also finds the opposite:

*-ša* used with a verb: (18) *šum-ma* *Ṕdingir-[ku-yu] [i]-ze-’er-ša* ..., «If Ilkuyu rejects her ...» (15.92; PRU 3, 54; time of Niqmaddu II).

*-ši* used with a noun: (r.8) *ma-am-ma-an ú-ul i-[laq-qè-šu]* (9) *iš-tu šu-ti ša-na-an-ti* (10) *ù šu-ti dumu.meš-ši*, «No one will take (it) from Šanantu and from her children» (16.245; PRU 3, 94; time of Niqmepa<sup>c</sup>).

Since both Assyrian and Babylonian of this period have *-ša* for nouns and *-ši* for verbs, one has to find the cause of the confusion in Ugaritic this time. Unlike Akkadian, Ugaritic had only one form for the suffix in all positions at its disposal: *-ha*. This lack of differentiation in the scribe’s native tongue may very well have induced his sloppiness in the use of the Akkadian forms<sup>32</sup>. In my opinion, a dictionary should point out the background of this sort of phenomenon.

Another pitfall for lexicographers which I would like to discuss briefly is the use of the plural markers MEŠ and 𐎡.A.

The two markers of the plural MEŠ and 𐎡.A frequently occur with ideograms. However, in a number of cases an ideogram followed by such a marker does not stand for a word in the plural but for a singular, compare, for example:

28 Cf. 16.254D:11’ (PRU 3, 79). For the ‘Abdu archive, see Vargyas 1981, 171f.

29 For the restoration of the following lines, see U 5, 159:11f. and Nougayrol’s transliteration of n<sup>o</sup> 161.

30 That despite the plural subject *šūt* must be singular is shown by the verbal form in U 5, 159:11.

31 Huehnergard 1989, 134f.; van Soldt 1991a, 399.

32 Huehnergard 1989, 128f.; van Soldt 1991a, 403f. The phenomenon occurs at other peripheral sites as well.

(9)a.šà.ḫi.a *an-nu-ú* (10)*ša-mi-id a-na p̄kur-wa-na ...* (13)*lú-lum ma-am-ma-an* (14)*la-a i-laq-qè* a.šà.ḫi.a *an-na-a* (15)*jš-tu qa-ti p̄kur-wa-na ...* (18)*ù p̄l-ku ia-nu* (19)*i-na* a.šà.ḫi.a *an-ni-i*, «This field is “bound” to Kurwānu ..., no one will take this field from Kurwānu ..., and there is no *p̄lku*-service on this field» (15.136; PRU 3, 121; time of ‘Ammit-tamruII).

Another example:

(14)*p̄er-d*maš.maš *dumu èr-mi-ir ù [p̄mu-n]a-ḫi-mu* (15)*ḫi-it-tá gal.meš i-te-ep-šu*l, «‘Abdi-Rašap son of ‘Abdi-meher(?), and Munahḫimu have committed a serious crime» (16.249; PRU 3, 96; time of Niqmepa’).

Since 𐎲.A only occurs after ideograms one has to conclude that in these cases it does not mark a plural but only indicates that the sign has to be understood as an ideogram. The same conclusion must be inferred for MEŠ, although this marker occurs with ideograms as well as with syllabically written words<sup>33</sup>. The phenomenon is not restricted to Ugarit but is also attested in other peripheral text groups (Mittanni, Nuzi, Elam) and even in Neo-Assyrian<sup>34</sup>.

Finally, it should be noted that MEŠ can also be used to mark the preceding ideogram as an abstract noun. For example:

(4)*p̄dingir-d*maš.maš *dumu sú-dú-mi* (5)*ir-ku-us p̄sum-d*u (6)*i-na šeš.meš-šu*, «Ili-Rašap son of Sudumu adopted Ari-Teššub as his brother» (16.344; PRU 3, 75; time of Arḫalba).

Apparently, *šeš.meš* stands here for *aḫḫūtu*<sup>35</sup>.

### Lexicon

The words and expressions which are attested in the Akkadian of Ugarit are generally those that we find in native Akkadian. Sometimes there are certain peculiarities that link Ugarit Akkadian only with other peripheral sites. Such a link is the strong influence of the local language that we find at all these sites, and at Ugarit this is, of course, Ugaritic. In documents composed by the scribes (legal and administrative texts, letters), many words show up that they are to be identified as belonging to the scribe’s native language. Sometimes these words are indicated by a gloss sign, at other times they are simply used in the text together with Akkadian words. The question whether such words should be listed in a dictionary of Akkadian cannot be answered categorically. On the one hand it can be argued that an Akkadian dictionary should contain only Akkadian words, on the other hand, words that are written in an Akkadian text but are not Akkadian will have to be listed somewhere and, for all practical purposes, they might as well appear in a dictionary where one tends to look for them first: the Akkadian dictionary. This dictionary then in fact serves as a thesaurus of all words occurring in Akkadian texts, including those words which are not Akkadian but behave as if they were.

I will conclude this section with a few examples of the use of foreign words in the Akkadian texts from Ugarit. In the legal and administrative texts words occur that do

33 Huchnergard 1989, 89f.

34 Van Soldt 1991a, 428f.

35 Huchnergard 1989, 89; van Soldt 1991a, 426 note 52.

not belong to the Akkadian lexicon but must be regarded as either Hurrian or Ugaritic. The first are relatively rare<sup>36</sup>, the second occur frequently. The Ugaritic vocables occur with and without the gloss sign. The large majority of words with a gloss sign can be found in the legal texts, the administrative texts use it quite rarely<sup>37</sup>. The reason for this probably is that the economic texts usually contain words listed as items, whereas the legal texts give them as part of a sentence. The words preceded by a gloss sign usually refer to topographical entities. They also occur without the gloss signs. The following may serve as an example:

(10)še.meš-šu kaš.meš-šu (11)ša : ma-ʾ-ša-ri-ša (12)ù udu.meš : ma-aq-qa-du (14)a-na Pia-zi-ra-ma, «Its grain and its beer which (serve as) tithe, and the sheep (which serve as) grazing tax belong to Yaʿdirānu as well» (16.153; PRU 3, 146; time of ʿAmmit-tamru II)<sup>38</sup>.

However, there are some cases where the gloss sign is written before words which appear to be Akkadian rather than Ugaritic like, for example, *šamādu*<sup>39</sup> and *abātu* N<sup>40</sup>. Ambivalent cases are *qubūru* and *tarbašu*<sup>41</sup>. Note that the verb *kabād/tu* (with Ugaritic /d/) is not attested with a gloss sign<sup>42</sup>.

The economic texts provide us with a wealth of syllabically written Ugaritic words. These words have recently been collected and studied by Huehnergard (1987). However, a few words which we find written syllabically in some texts are sometimes written ideographically in others. This is especially true for professions. Compare, for example, the <sup>lú</sup>simug urudu.meš and the <sup>lú</sup>uš.bar (17.131:23; PRU 6, 93), which are paralleled by the (<sup>lú</sup>)na-sí-ku urudu (17.240:15; PRU 6, 136 and 15.09 B:1; PRU 3, 195) and the <sup>lú?</sup>ma-ḥi-šu (19.99 vert. 4; PRU 6, 166). Compare also <sup>lú</sup>.mešDUG.QA.BUR (15.172:9; PRU 3, 204) with *ia-sí-ru-ma* (15.09 B:12; PRU 3, 195). Of quite a few ideograms no syllabic Akkadian equivalent is attested like, for example, <sup>lú</sup>sanga (*khn*), <sup>lú</sup>i.du<sub>8</sub> (*tgr*) and <sup>lú</sup>nagar (*hrs*)<sup>43</sup>. It seems likely that most of these ideograms stood for Ugaritic words rather than Akkadian. Therefore, unless an Akkadian equivalent is attested, they should be listed in the dictionary with the Ugaritic word<sup>44</sup>. In this context it should be remembered that student scribes sometimes wrote a Ugaritic column on their copy of Sa. The direct equation of an ideogram with a Ugaritic word was therefore not something invented by scribes of administrative texts.

The last example I would like to give of a lexicographical peculiarity is formed by the so-called «learned spellings». There are a few examples of words in which scribes either used rare sign values or invented new values in order to create a

36 Huehnergard 1987, 206; 1989, 93.

37 For the gloss sign, see Huehnergard 1987, 204f. and 1989, 91f.

38 Huehnergard 1987, 154 and 164.

39 See my discussion in 1991a, 244 note 9.

40 Hoflijzer & van Soldt 1991, 193.

41 Huehnergard 1987, 206.

42 Huehnergard 1987, 135, and see above, orthography.

43 See also van Soldt 1995, for <sup>lú</sup>sukkal (*tʿy*).

44 Note that some professions, like *yāqīšu*, are only attested in their Ugaritic form.

connection between the ideogram and the local word or name. Such «puns» are not always readily recognizable. A few examples are:

kur dugud-ri = *māt Kapturi* (16.238+:10; PRU 3, 107; time of ‘Ammitamru II).

𐎠𐎢𐎣𐎠.gâr-îd = *Ugarit* (16.162:23; PRU 3, 126).

na<sub>4</sub> ka-bi = *aban gabê = abnu şurru*, «alum» (KA = *şurru*; see van Soldt 1990a, 324f.).

### 3. MODERN LEXICOGRAPHY

After the lengthy discussion of lexicographical peculiarities I will discuss briefly the results of modern research with regard to the Ugarit Akkadian lexicon.

The syllabic Akkadian texts started to appear at the same time as their alphabetic Ugaritic counterparts: during the very first campaign at Tell Ras Shamra in 1929<sup>45</sup>. The epigraphist was then Virolleaud, who subsequently published all the tablets found before the second world war. After the war, when tablets were found in ever increasing numbers, it was decided that Virolleaud would limit himself to the study and publication of the alphabetic material, while Nougayrol would do the same with the syllabic texts. Both Virolleaud and Nougayrol carried out their tasks admirably. Nougayrol published the Akkadian texts in four impressive volumes, PRU 3, 4, 6 and *Ugaritica* 5, in which most of the legal, administrative texts and letters were published. Unfortunately, many of the schooltexts, especially those found in the house of Rap’ānu, were not included. One can only hope that this lacuna will soon be filled.

Nougayrol’s interest in the background of the texts and their lexicon is clearly shown by the glossaries which he added to each text volume. He not only provided indispensable lists of names, but he also arranged lists of words systematically, the most detailed lists can be found in PRU 3 and 4. In this way the Ugarit material was made available to a large circle of scholars and did not remain confined to a small group of Assyriologists who specialized in Ugarit Akkadian. The standard set by Nougayrol was followed in later text publications, the most important of which is RSOu 7, published in 1991. Here, too, we find a glossary made up of various lists of names, words, ideograms, etc.

The Akkadian texts from Ugarit have given rise to a stream of publications. The total number of pages is, of course, far less than that devoted to the study of the alphabetic Ugaritic texts, but that was to be expected. After all, the latter are a relatively isolated phenomenon, whereas the former are part of a larger corpus of peripheral Akkadian texts from Anatolia, Syria, Palestina and Egypt. Still, since the Akkadian texts from Ugarit come from a well defined and well described environment, and since their number is sufficiently large, they certainly deserve a separate study. For this reason, several grammars have recently been published, one by Huehnergard (1989) and one by this author (1991a). Many of the phenomena discussed above have been dealt with in these two grammars and many words and expressions have been treated in detail. Lists of words were added as appendices to

45 Schaeffer 1929, 295.

each of them. As has become clear from the examples given above, many words and expressions cannot be properly understood unless they are studied in their grammatical context.

However, the grammatical description of a term or expression is not always enough to clarify the juridical, socio-economic or political context in which the terms or expressions are used. Therefore, special studies have been dedicated to all of these aspects. The juridical terminology has been the subject of various dissertations, of which I mention Miller 1980 and Libolt 1985. The status of women has been treated by Amico (1989). The socio-economic situation at Ugarit was the subject of Rainey's 1962 dissertation and has been discussed in detail by M. Heltzer in numerous publications (for example 1976, 1978 and 1982). M. Liverani wrote an important contribution on this subject for the *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* (1979). The political history of Ugarit was treated by Liverani in a special book in 1962 and summarized and updated in his contribution to the *Dictionnaire* in 1979. Many articles have been devoted to these subjects as well, but I limit myself here to the principal publications.

A real dictionary of the Akkadian of Ugarit still has to be written, but this work should include lemmata from other peripheral texts in the area as well, especially those from sites in Syria. This would give us a better insight in the Akkadian *koinè*<sup>46</sup> that was used throughout Syria in the Late Bronze Age. So far, a special glossary has only been devoted to those syllabic words from Ugarit Akkadian texts which belong to Ugaritic rather than Akkadian (Huehnergard 1987). However, since many words listed in this glossary also find their way into the main dictionaries of Akkadian, its importance is beyond any doubt. Moreover, it gives students of West Semitic a better insight in the vocalization of the Ugaritic words.

The last, but certainly most important, source for our knowledge of the semantics of Akkadian words written at Ugarit is, of course, formed by the two main dictionaries of Akkadian, the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* (CAD) and the *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* (AHw). Both dictionaries have organized their lexical material in a way that the source of an attestation is readily apparent. Most explicit in this matter is the CAD. Here, special paragraphs are dedicated to the peripheral material, sometimes to the Ugarit material alone. Ugaritic words used in Akkadian texts are in principle admitted to the dictionaries, a rule which does not apply, however, to words that appear in special Ugaritic columns in the quadrilingual lexical texts. For these, Huehnergard's glossary has to be consulted (1987)<sup>47</sup>. The dictionaries do not always agree on the derivation of a word, or on its meaning. The example of *abālu/apālu* has been discussed above (see orthography). Another example is the verbal form *l/yikkim*, which occurs in a number of Amarna letters. According to the CAD the form has to be derived from the West Semitic verb *naqāmu*, «to avenge, save, succor», whereas AHw takes it as a form of Akkadian *ekēmu* (a possibility left open by the CAD) and in this it is followed by most scholars (for example, Pitard 1982). Finally, there are the

<sup>46</sup> Kühne 1973, 5f.

<sup>47</sup> Additions in van Soldt 1990b. For a collection and discussion of all West Semitic words from Akkadian texts, see Sivan 1984.

two forms *sākinu* and *sōkinu* (spelled *sūkinu*) which are treated separately by both dictionaries but are, at least in my opinion, better listed under the same lemma and treated as dialectical variants of the same word<sup>48</sup>.

It is to be hoped that a special glossary of words in western peripheral Akkadian texts will one day become available. Then it will be even better possible to detect lexicographical links between the various sites and then we would, hopefully, gain more insight in the spread of Akkadian over the periphery of Mesopotamia.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amico E.A., 1989, *The Status of Women at Ugarit*, Ann Arbor.
- Dietrich M., 1992, «Ein Leben ohne Freude ...», *Studie über eine Weisheitskomposition aus den Gelehrtenbibliotheken von Emar und Ugarit*, UF 24, 9f.
- Durand J.-M., & Joannès Fr., 1990, *Kubuddā'u à Mari et à Emar*, NABU 1990/70.
- Heltzer M., 1976, *The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit*, Wiesbaden.
- Heltzer M., 1978, *Goods, Prices and the Organization of Trade in Ugarit*, Wiesbaden.
- Heltzer M., 1982, *The Internal Organization of the Kingdom of Ugarit*, Wiesbaden.
- Hofstijzer J. & van Soldt W.H., 1991, *Texts from Ugarit Concerning Security*, UF 23, 189f.
- Huehnergard J., 1987, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*, HSS 32, Atlanta.
- Huehnergard J., 1989, *The Akkadian of Ugarit*, HSS 34, Atlanta.
- Kühne K., 1973, *Die Chronologie der internationalen Korrespondenz von El-Amarna*, AOAT 17, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Libolt C.G., 1985, *Royal Land Grants from Ugarit*, Ann Arbor.
- Liverani M., 1962, *Storia di Ugarit nell'età degli archivi politici*, SS 6, Roma.
- Liverani M., 1979, DBS, 1295f., Paris.
- Müller P.D., 1980, *Studies in the Juridical Texts from Ugarit*, Ann Arbor.
- Moran W.L., 1992, *The Amarna Letters*, Baltimore.
- Pitard W.G., 1982, *Amarna ekēmu and Hebrew nāqam*, *Maarav* 3, 5f.
- Rainey A.F., 1962, *The Social Stratification of Ugarit*, Ann Arbor.
- Schaeffer Cl.F.A., 1929, *Les fouilles de Minet-el-Beida et de Ras Shamra (campagne du printemps 1929)*, *Syria* 10, 285f.
- Sivan D., 1984, *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th-13th C. B.C. from Canaan and Syria*, AOAT 214.
- Van Soldt W.H., 1989, *An Orthographic Peculiarity in the Akkadian Letters of Tušratta*, in *To the Euphrates and Beyond, Archaeological Studies in Honour of Maurits N. van Loon*, 103f.
- Van Soldt W.H., 1990a, *Fabrics and Dyes at Ugarit*, UF 22, 321f.
- Van Soldt W.H., 1990b, Review of Huehnergard 1987, *BiOr* 47, 728f.
- Van Soldt W.H., 1991a, *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit: Dating and Grammar*, AOAT 40, Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Van Soldt, W.H., 1991b, *Akkadische Lexicographie: CAD S* (together with W. Mayer), *OrNS* 60, 116f.
- Van Soldt, W.H., 1995, *Babylonian Lexical, Religious and Literary Texts and Scribal Education at Ugarit*, in *UGARIT – Ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient. Ergebnisse und Perspektiven der Forschung*, ALASP, Münster 1995.
- Vargyas, P., 1981, *Le MUDU à Ugarit. Ami du roi?*, UF 13, 165f.

---

<sup>48</sup> Van Soldt 1991b, 117.