

UGARITIC LEXICAL STUDIES IN PERSPECTIVE

Wilfred G. E. Watson

I Previous Work

Since there are adequate surveys of previous studies in the field of Ugaritic lexicography there is no need to repeat all the material here¹, but some brief reminders may be helpful. To begin with, the only complete dictionary of Ugaritic, which also includes personal names and lemmata from the letters and administrative documents, still remains Aistleitner's *Wörterbuch*². Although revised several times since its first publication, it must be remembered that the original manuscript of this work dates back to 1958. The only other comparable «dictionary» is the glossary to Gordon's series of handbooks to Ugaritic. With each new edition, the glossary was revised as new texts were discovered and different solutions were proposed³. Like Aistleitner's *Wörterbuch*, Gordon's glossary included all the words found in the Ugaritic texts, as well as personal and place names.

Partial glossaries are to be found in Segert's grammar⁴ and in the various translations of the Ugaritic texts⁵. Works with specialised glossaries are studies on the personal names⁶, the hippiatric texts⁷, the ritual texts⁸ and the particles⁹. Of particular interest is the study of terms connected with textiles used in the Ugaritic texts pre-

¹ J.C. de Moor, *Ugaritic Lexicography*, in P. Fronzaroli (ed.), *Studies on Semitic Lexicography*, Florence 1973, 61-102, esp. 61-77; G. del Olmo Lete - J. Sanmartín, *A New Ugaritic Dictionary. Its Lexicographical and Semantic Structure*, AuOr 6, 1988, 255-74, esp. 255-56.

² WUS. There are 2963 entries.

³ UT (with *Supplement to the Ugaritic Textbook*, 1967). Also his *Ugaritic Grammar*, Rome 1940; *Ugaritic Handbook*, Rome 1947 and *Ugaritic Manual*, Rome 1955.

⁴ S. Segert, *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language with Selected Texts and Glossary*, Berkeley 1984.

⁵ In addition to those mentioned by del Olmo Lete - Sanmartín, AuOr 6, 1988, 255, see now TOu II, 427-31 and 463-64.

⁶ F. Gröndahl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*, Rome 1967.

⁷ D. Cohen - D. Sivan, *The Ugaritic Hippiatric Texts: A Critical Edition*, New Haven 1983; D. Pardee, *Les textes hippiatiques*, Paris 1985.

⁸ TRU (I); cf. also G. del Olmo Lete, *La religión cananea según la liturgia de Ugarit. Estudio textual*, Sabadell 1992.

⁹ K. Aartun, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen 1. Teil*, AOAT 21/1, 1974 and *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen 2. Teil*, AOAT 21/2, 1978.

pared by Ribichini and Xella¹⁰. Useful, too, are the listing by Pardee of lexical items¹¹ and the study of syllabic spellings by Huehnergard¹². The personal names of Ugarit are also a source of lexical items even though their meaning may not have been noticed overtly either by those who gave them or by those who bore them. The classic collection by Gröndahl is a useful if somewhat dated reference work in this respect¹³. Some recent studies have provided additional material¹⁴.

Several scholars have started out to write a series of articles on Ugaritic lexical problems. The most well-known of such series is, of course that begun by M. Dietrich and O. Loretz (later joined by J. Sanmartín) in the annual *Ugarit-Forschungen*. There were other additional series, begun by Aartun¹⁵, Berger¹⁶, Sanmartín¹⁷, etc., as well as sets of studies on Ugaritic semantics¹⁸.

A high number of notes and articles are on individual words or groups of words. It is, of course, impossible to list them all here. However, because they are so scattered in various journals, books¹⁹, conference proceedings and so on, it is difficult for scholars to keep track of them²⁰. It is also a fact that some words receive more attention than others for a variety of reasons.

II Two Dictionary Projects

Two significant projects for the preparation of a Ugaritic dictionary have been under way for some time. The first was initiated in Münster at Ugarit-Forschung several years ago and at present exists in unpublished form in the files of that establishment²¹. The second was started more recently in Barcelona. The Spanish

¹⁰ S. Ribichini - P. Xella, *La terminologia dei tessili nei testi di Ugarit*, Rome 1985.

¹¹ D. Pardee, *Ugaritic Bibliography*, AfO 34, 1987, 355-471.

¹² J. Huehnergard, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*, Atlanta 1987. See also D. Sivan, *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th-13th C. B.C. from Canaan and Syria*, AOAT 214, 1984.

¹³ Gröndahl, *Personennamen*.

¹⁴ W.G.E. Watson, *Ugaritic Onomastics (1)*, AuOr 8, 1990, 113-27; *Ugaritic Onomastics (2)*, AuOr 8, 1990, 243-50; *Ugaritic Onomastics (3)*, AuOr 11, 1993, 213-22.

¹⁵ K. Aartun, *Beiträge zum ugaritischen Lexikon I*, UF 16, 1984, 1-52.

¹⁶ P. Berger, *Zum ugaritischen Wörterbuch I*, UF 2, 1970, 339-40.

¹⁷ J. Sanmartín, *Glossen zum ugaritischen Lexikon (I)*, UF 9, 1977, 263-68.

¹⁸ See now G. del Olmo Lete, *Interpretación de la mitología cananca. Estudios de semántica Ugarítica*, Valencia 1984; J. Sanmartín, *Semantisches über 'MR/'schen' und 'MR/'sagen' im Ugaritischen*, UF 5, 1973, 263-70, etc.

¹⁹ For example, O. Loretz, *Die Psalmen II. Beitrag der Ugarit-Texte zum Verständnis von Kolometrie und Textologie der Psalmen. Psalm 90-150*, AOAT 207/2, 1979, 415-501, where Ug. *ḥlp*, *ḥšt*, *dkym*, *ḫh*, *d* (relative pronoun), *šrš*, *drkt*, *srt*, *ḥdy*, etc. are discussed.

²⁰ Of great use are the indices to UF, AfO, AuOr, etc., and the listings in the *Keilschriftbibliographie* of Or, the *Elenchus of Biblica* and elsewhere. To these can now be added NABU. Until 1989 the *Newsletter for Ugaritic Studies* was also very informative.

²¹ For a brief report see now W.G.E. Watson, *The Research Team «Ugarit-Forschung», Newsletter*

project for a dictionary of Ugaritic, under the heading «Canaanite Lexicography of the II Millennium. Materials for the edition of an Ugaritic Dictionary», was approved and funded by the Spanish «Advisory Commission for Scientific and Technical Research» ten years ago, in 1984. It was intended to be a glossary of the alphabetic texts from Ras Shamra, Ras Ibn Hani, etc., which would take into account comparative lexical material from around the same period as the Ugaritic texts and from neighbouring geographical areas. In other words, use would be made of texts from El Amarna, Mari and, if possible, Ebla²² as well as Akkadian and Hurrian material from the documents found at Ras Shamra. Full but not exhaustive bibliographical information was to be supplied, and alternative meanings for the more difficult words were to be included²³. It is good news indeed that the first of the two volumes of the dictionary is now in the press²⁴ and that the second is at an advanced stage of preparation.

III Methodology

In view of the vast literature on Ugaritic lexicography and the often conflicting or at least divergent conclusions reached by scholars, there have been several attempts to set out solid methodological principles. These are discussed here.

In his survey, de Moor discussed method in general terms, under a number of headings. Some of these are (a) the correct text must be established, (b) context is of «primary importance», (c) syllabic spellings must be taken into account, and (d) comparative philology is important. For (d) de Moor provides a set of rules which can be summarised as follows: context is more significant than etymology; without context, etymology (which must be based on the language closest to Ugaritic, whatever that might be²⁵) can only uphold a hypothetical proposal; phonological rules should only be flouted with supporting evidence; homographs and homonyms should only be assumed as a last resort; finally «we should not only compare words, but also idioms». Illustrative material is then given for all these²⁶.

The use of cognate languages has been the subject of several studies. Healey has surveyed the contributions which can be provided by Hebrew, Phoenician, Arabic, Akkadian, South Arabian and Ethiopic, with particular emphasis on Aramaic (and

for *Ugaritic Studies* 13, May 1977, 10 = P.C. Craigie (ed.), *Ugaritic Studies (II): 1976-1979*, Calgary, Alberta 1980, 33.

22 See now J. Sanmartín, *Isoglosas morfológicas eblaitico-ugaríticas: la trampa lexicográfica*, AuOr 9, 1991, 165-217.

23 For a more detailed description of the project see del Olmo Lete - Sanmartín, AuOr 6, 1988, 255-74, with the sample pages provided there (259-74).

24 G. del Olmo Lete - J. Sanmartín, *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica I (A-L)*, AuOrS 7, Sabadell.

25 According to J. Tropper, *Is Ugaritic a Canaanite Language ?*, in G.J. Brooke - A.H.W. Curtis - J.F. Healey (eds.), *Ugarit and the Bible. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Ugarit and the Bible. Manchester, September 1992* (UBL 11), Münster 1994, 351: «the lexical relationship between Ugaritic and Canaanite is beyond doubt».

26 De Moor, *Ugaritic Lexicography*, 78-101 (98).

Syriac)²⁷. His conclusion, though, is that context is «the ultimate arbiter»²⁸. The use of Arabic as a resource for determining the meaning of Ugaritic words has been examined at great length by Renfroe²⁹. He has shown that while there is a relatively high number of genuine Arabic-Ugaritic isoglosses there is an equal if not greater number of spurious isoglosses. In many cases we may simply have to say that there is insufficient evidence for any firm conclusions³⁰.

The first task necessary before resolving the meaning of a Ugaritic word is to survey all previous attempts, which is often very time-consuming, with no guarantee of complete coverage. With these preliminaries over, the scholar must then establish the correct reading on tablet, determine the context, use etymology based on established language laws, refer to a wide range of Semitic languages, if necessary, use other languages (including Egyptian, Hurrian, Hittite and even Sumerian) and avoid the multiplication of homonymns and homographs. These rules, however, are an over-simplification. In practice, several other factors need to be taken into account, as the following examples show.

IV Some Illustrative Examples

A selection of examples is presented in alphabetical sequence.

(1) *adr*

This word occurs in the passage listing materials for making the famous composite bow: *adr tqbm blbnn* etc., (KTU 1.17 vi 20-24) and has been discussed recently. G. Garbini argues that *adr* must be a verb here and suggests that it means «to cut», corresponding to Phoen. *ʔzr* with the same meaning³¹. Renfroe, instead, posits a root *dry*, «to carry, fetch, bring», as in Aramaic³². The important point here is that both scholars agree in rejecting a nominal meaning for *adr* (such as «most splendid») on syntactical grounds.

(2) *anšt*

Caquot has suggested that in KTU 1.18 iv 9-11 - as in 1.16 vi 36 - *anšt* derives from the verb *ʔnš*, «to be weak». Here it refers to the feeble light of the new moon which would provide cover for Yatpan's nefarious deed³³. The point is that this removes the

²⁷ J.F. Healey, *Ugaritic Lexicography and other Semitic Languages*, UF 20, 1988, 61-68.

²⁸ Healey, *Ugaritic Lexicography*, 68.

²⁹ F. Renfroe, *Methodological Considerations Regarding the Use of Arabic in Ugaritic Philology*, UF, 18 (1986), 33-74; AULS; *Arabic and Ugaritic Lexicography*, Unp. diss., Yale University 1989; *Arabic Evidence for Ugaritic* p̄h1 «Stallion», UF 17, 1985, 410-11, etc.

³⁰ AULS, *passim*.

³¹ G. Garbini, *Il verbo adr in ugaritico*, OA 29, 1990, 57-62.

³² AULS, 35 and n. 21.

³³ A. Caquot, *Notes philologiques sur la légende ougaritique de Danel et d'Aqhat. II (Sur KTU. 1 18 IV 9-11)*, *Semitica* 38, 1990, 73-79. For the suggestion that darkness was required see already ARTU, 244, n. 139.

need for a homonym with a different meaning, as some scholars have posited.

(3) *ḡd*, occurs in the following texts:

KTU 1.4 iv 23-24³⁴

tgly. ḡd il. wtbu.

qrš. mlk. ab. šnm.

KTU 1.1 iii 23

ygly ḡd i[...]

KTU 1.2 iii 5

[] *ḡd i[l]. wybu[.*

q[r]š. mlk[. ab. šnm

KTU 1.3 v 9

[*t]bu. ḡdm. qny[]*

KTU 1.19 iv 49-52

mgy[t] pgt. lahlm.

rgm. lyf[pn. y]bl

agrtn. bat. bḡdk.

[...] *bat. bhlm*

«Pughatu reached the tent(s).

Word was brought to Yapanu:

- Our employee³⁵ has entered your *ḡd*,

[...] has entered the <tent(s)>³⁶.

In all these passages the word *ḡd* is clearly in a context involving a «camp» (*qrš*)³⁷ with «tent» or «tents» (*ahlm*)³⁸ and use of the verb «to enter» (*ba + b* «into»)³⁹. F. Renfroe has studied this word in some detail. He rejects derivatives from Arabic *ḡwd* as irrelevant since the Arabic root means «to expel», etc. He proposes, instead, comparison with (Mari) Akkadian *š/šadādu*, «to camp»⁴⁰. Many years previously,

³⁴ Parallel or near-parallel texts: KTU 1.3 v 7-8 (// 1.5 vi 1-2); 1.6 34-36; 1.17 vi 48.

³⁵ Or «she who hired us» – cf. B. Margalit, *The Ugaritic Poem of AQHT* (BZAW 182), Berlin 1989, 457 and 461-62.

³⁶ Emending to *ahlm*; cf. Margalit, *AQHT*, 242 and AULS, 98 for discussion. The meaning of *hlm* is discussed by Renfroe, AULS, 98, n. 7 (probably «when») and by myself in *Final -m in Ugaritic*, *AuOr* 10, 1992, 223-52 (246).

³⁷ As suggested by Renfroe, AULS, 99, the cognate here is Akk. *karaš/šu*, «encampment».

³⁸ The *-m* may be a plural ending or a final *-m*.

³⁹ J.C. Greenfield, *Keret's Dream: ḡhrt and ḡhrt*, BSOAS 57, 1994, 87-92 comments: «Since *ḡd* is found in parallelism with *qrš* 'pavilion' and *ahl* 'tent' ... the translation 'territory' or 'premises' fits» (89, n. 17).

⁴⁰ R. Kutscher, *Akkadian šadādum/šadādum= «To Camp»*, ZA 76, 1986, 1-3. As Renfroe notes, AULS, 99, this meaning is not included in CAD Š/1.

Cassuto had commented «Another possible meaning is 'tent-curtains', on the basis of Akkadian»⁴¹, though he did not cite an actual cognate. In fact, the Akkadian word in question is probably *šiddu*, «cloth, curtain» (CAD Š/2, 407b-408), «Vorhang, Decke» (AHw, 1230b). It would seem that in the above passages «curtains» is metonymic for «tents»⁴².

This difficult word illustrates some of the principles set out above. As expected, *context* is of great importance. Also, reference to another Semitic language cannot be arbitrary; Arabic proves to be of little help but Renfroe's suggestion, based on Akkadian is very attractive. However, he overlooked Cassuto's earlier proposal, also based on Akkadian (though Cassuto did not cite an Akkadian word). The result is two different etymologies for the same word, both based on Akkadian, and both supporting the meaning already established by context.

In at least two other passages the meaning is not so clear because of lack of context (note that in both the word appears to be plural). One is KTU 1.19 iv 57-58 *il dyqny. ḡdm.*, perhaps «The god who created tent-camps»⁴³ or «Ilu, the owner of the encampment»⁴⁴. The other is KTU 1.18 iv 15 *ištir. bḡdm wn'rs[]*, «He/I (will) stay in the tents(?) and []»⁴⁵.

There appear, then, to be two homographs: *ḡd* I, «(tent-)curtain» and *ḡd* II, «breast» (variant or dialectal spelling of *šd*) in KTU 1.23⁴⁶.

(4) *ḡrq*

KTU 1.5 i 5-6

ank. ispi. uṭm

ḡrqm. amtm

There is clearly a reference to eating here (*ispi* is from *sp*², «to consume»), but the exact meaning of these two lines escapes us, in spite of several attempts by scholars⁴⁷. Renfroe shows that Arab. *'aṭṭa* means basically «to enclose» and with

41 U. Cassuto, *The Goddess Anath*, Jerusalem 1971, 145. Note that the original Hebrew edition was published in 1951.

42 Similarly in Hebrew; cf. M.V. Fox, *The Song of Songs and the Ancient Egyptian Love Songs*, Madison-Wisconsin-London 1985, 101-102 on Song 1:5, and cf. 2 Sam. 7:2 // 1 Chron. 17:1; for «tents» // «curtains» see Jer. 4:20, 10:20, 49:29; Is. 54:2. Note de Moor's comment (ARTU 16, n. 82): «In the texts of Ugarit 'encampment' is a metaphor for territory and 'tent' a metaphor for dwelling».

43 So Margalit, *AQHT*, 166 and 458.

44 ARTU, 265.

45 The meaning of the passage was established by J. Hoftijzer, *A Note on G 1083³ and Related Matters*, UF 3, 1971, 361-64. See also MLC, 384.

46 Renfroe, AULS, 100-102; see Pardee, *Ugaritic Bibliography*, 424. There is no third homograph since *kḡd* is a single word and not *k + ḡd*.

47 Surveys: Renfroe, AULS, 84-85; del Olmo Lete, *Interpretación*, 158-62.

reference to meat may denote cooking in a sealed pot. If Ug. *uṭ* can be explained along these lines, then *ḏrq* may have a cognate in Akk. *šarāqu* C, «to cook meat» (CAD Š/2, 57b; not in AHW)⁴⁸. Unfortunately, no clear translation results. The final *amtm* is particularly difficult.

Although etymologies can be suggested for the two most difficult words, since the precise context cannot be determined a convincing solution cannot be reached.

(5) *ḥt*

In a list of offerings related to the palace comes the entry *wtn ḥtm* (KTU 1.41:22). This was translated «unseasoned bread» by de Moor with reference to Arab. *ḥutt*⁴⁹ and later «two unseasoned loaves»⁵⁰. Other scholars followed suit, e.g. «due forme di pane»⁵¹, «deux pains secs»⁵² and «dos panes ácimos»⁵³. Egyptian *ḥt3* «a kind of bread»⁵⁴ can be cited in support of de Moor's rendering. However, M. Tsevat has questioned the validity of this proposal. First, he argues, the reading may be *ḥ^c* and not *ḥt*⁵⁵. Second, he calls into question the Arabic etymology⁵⁶; however, he makes no suggestion as to the meaning of the Ugaritic word.

A completely different translation is offered by Levine-de Tarragon on the basis of Akk. *ḥišu*, «basket, cage», i.e., «2 cages». According to their interpretation, the «two pigeons» (*ynt q[rt]*) mentioned in the previous line (line 21) were brought to the temple in these cages⁵⁷, presumably one in each⁵⁸. This suggestion is plausible and it is interesting to see an alternative proposal. However, one would expect a preposition, e.g. *b*, before *tn ḥtm*, it is uncertain whether *ynt qrt* is singular or plural (let alone dual), and the passage seems to be a list of separate items. There is no definitive solution as yet.

Here, then, is a case where the reading is uncertain, the etymology disputed (two entirely different meanings have been proposed) and yet the context is reasonably

48 W.F. Albright, BASOR 83, 1941, 41, n. 12: «red (arterial) blood», Akk. *šarqu*. However, Akk. *šarqu* means «stolen» (CAD Š/2, 66).

49 J.C. de Moor, *New Year with Canaanites and Israelites*, Kampen 1972, II, 15, n. 49.

50 ARTU, 162.

51 TRU (I), 62; however, see Xella's comment: «senso qui accettato in via ipotetica» (67).

52 TOu II, 155, with no comment.

53 Del Olmo Lcte, *Religión*, 75 and 80, n. 82, following de Moor and also citing Arab. *ḥutt*.

54 R.O. Faulkner, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, Oxford 1962, 181.

55 See M. Tsevat, *Was Samuel a Nazirite?*, in M. Fishbane - E. Tov (eds.), «*Shaa'rci Talmon*». *Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, Winona Lake 1992, 199-204 (203).

56 Tsevat, *Samuel*, 203.

57 B. Levine - J.-M. de Tarragon, *The King Proclaims the Day: Ugaritic Rites for the Vintage* (KTU 1.41 // 1.87), RB 100, 1993, 76-115.

58 Note that del Olmo Lcte, *Religión*, 75 translates *ynt q[rt]* as «una paloma 'domestica'».

clear. Unusually, we do have a parallel text to KTU 1.41 (KTU 1.87, probably copied from 1.41) but the corresponding passage is missing from this tablet. The word *ḥt* only occurs here. Part of the problem lies in our not knowing to what extent bread formed part of ritual offerings.

(6) *mṣrrt*

It occurs in a list of clothing (KTU 4.270:9) and so may mean «benda, fascia» or «veste a fasce» as suggested by Ribichini and Xella⁵⁹. It could also mean «libation garment» (i.e. ritual clothing worn during libation ceremony) in view of Akk. *muṣarrirtu*, «ein Tropfgefäß» (AHw, 678b-79a) from the root *ṣarāru*. However, the restoration at the end of line 9 (*ṭṭm. ṭṭ. kbd. mṣrrt. p[ṭṭ]*), i.e. «li[nen]», though very plausible, is uncertain. It is possible that Ug. *mṣrrt* may simply denote a saucer or plate, corresponding to Akk. *muṣarrirtu*, «(a flat dish)» (CAD M/2, 241-42).

Once again context indicates the meaning here, but as elsewhere the exact translation of the word in question remains uncertain.

(7) *palt*

KTU 1.19 ii 12-16

ydnil. ysb. palth

bṣql. yph. bpalt.

bṣq[l] yph. bḡlm.

bṣql. yḥbq. wynšq.

aḥl. an. bṣ[ql] ynp^c. bpalt.

bṣql. yp^c byḡlm

«Danil went round his *palt*,

he saw an ear of corn in the *palt*,

an ear of corn he saw in the weeds(?)⁶⁰,

He hugged and kissed the ear of corn.

- If only the ear of corn would grow in the *palt*,

the ear of corn grow in the weeds(?)»⁶¹.

The following meanings and cognates for *palt* have been proposed⁶²:

1. «fissured land, parched ground», a by-form of *pwl/pll*⁶³;

⁵⁹ Tessili, 49-50, and 85, on the basis of Heb. *šrr*.

⁶⁰ The actual meaning of *yḡl* is uncertain: cf. Renfroe, AULS, 158-60 for discussion.

⁶¹ Largely following ARTU, 253; see also Margalit, AQHT, 159; MLC, 390. In the initial line there may be haplography (*ydn<h. dn>il*), on which see the remarks of M. Dijkstra - J.C. de Moor, *Problematical Passages in the Legend of Aqhātu*, UF 7, 1975, 203; MLC, 390, etc.

⁶² For a similar survey cf. B. Margalit, *Lexicographical Notes on the Aqht Epic (Part II: KTU 1.19)*, UF 16, 1984, 119-79 (137-38).

⁶³ Dijkstra - de Moor, *Problematical*, 203; Renfroe, AULS, 159, comments: «That Ugaritic knew a form *p'l*, ultimately to be derived from his biconsonantal etymon [i.e. *pl*], signifying 'split, broken, cracked' and that the term was applied to damaged soil can be postulated on the basis of the comparative and contextual evidence, despite the absence of any cognate *p'l* having semantics

2. «'parched ground' or the like», Arab. *fa'ala*, dried up – «parched ground⁶⁴», though according to Greenfield this root does not exist⁶⁵;
3. «cracked-field», a hybrid of the (unattested) Ugaritic roots *p'(w/y)* (Arab. *fa'ay/wa*), «to cleave, split» and *lt(w/y?)* with the same meaning⁶⁶;
4. «vegetable patch», from context alone⁶⁷;
5. «field with meagre growth», Arab. *ba'il* «thin, lean»⁶⁸;
6. «fallow land, waste land», perhaps connected with *p'ʿl*, «worked»⁶⁹.

However, in view of Arab. *fa'ʿla*, «to give a good omen»⁷⁰; Qatabanian *fʿl*, «one who wishes ill, ill-wisher»; Sabaeen *fʿl*, «to wish ill to someone», yet another explanation is possible. Ug. *palt* may mean «ill-omened (land)». Some support for this meaning can be provided from Akkadian *ba'ālu*, «to pray to, to beseech» (CAD B, 2), also attested in the texts from Ebla⁷¹. Whether there is any connection with Ug. *pil* in *lth pil* (KTU 4.751: 7) and []x.dd.pil[] (KTU 4.747: 4') is uncertain⁷².

(8) *šlw*

Only found in KTU 1.14 iii 45 *ašlw bšp 'nh*. The accepted translations are «I would repose in the glance of her eyes»⁷³ and «(Give me the girl Hry...) so that I may find rest in the clarity of her eyes»⁷⁴. The verb is *šlw*, «to rest». An alternative is «(whom) I circle because of the clarity of her eyes», proposed by de Moor and Spronk, where the verb would be a Š-stem of *lwy*⁷⁵. This proposal is rejected by

compatible with the present context».

64 CML¹, 162, n. 19, following Cassuto.

65 J.C. Greenfield, *Ugaritic Lexicographical Notes*, JCS 21, 1967, 89-94 (90, n. 13); he posits a connection with Akk. and Heb. *'bl*, «to dry up». Cf. CML², 155.

66 Margalit, *AQHT*, 159 and 388-89; *Notes*, 137-39, esp. 138. See Renfroe, *Considerations*, 67-69 for discussion.

67 TOu I, 466 and note p: «la traduction 'potager' a été proposée par Ginsberg, sans autre appui que le sens général du passage».

68 WUS, #2184 (p. 252): «kümmerlich bewachsenes Feld (?)».

69 MLC, 608 («barbecho, páramo»).

70 CML¹, 162, n. 19 cites Arab. *fa'lu*, «good luck».

71 As *ba-a-lum*. G. Conti, *Il sillabario della quarta fonte della lista lessicale bilingue eblaita*, Florence 1973, 95 prefers comparison with Akk. *bālu*, «to beseech» (Semitic **bhl*), although he mentions the root *pll* with a similar meaning. See also M. Bonechi, *Un atto di culto a Ebla*, in P. Fronzaroli (ed.), *MisEb*, 2, Florence 1989, 135-37.

72 M. Heltzer, *Vineyards and Wine in Ugarit (Property and Distribution)*, UF 22, 1990, 119-36 (131, n. 81), rejects his previous suggestion (in UF 12, 1980, 414, n. 6) that *pil* = «wine from uncultivated (wild) grapes». According to M. Dietrich - O. Loretz - J. Sanmartín, *Zur ugaritischen Lexikographie (XI)*, *Lexikographische Einzelbemerkungen*, UF 6, 1974, 19-38 (34, entry 89) it means «Pflanzung».

73 TOu I, 526; MLC, 296; CML², 86.

74 E. Verreet, *Modi ugaritici. Eine morpho-syntaktische Abhandlung über das Modalsystem im Ugaritischen*, Leuven 1988, 157-58.

75 J.C. de Moor - K. Spronk, *Problematical Passages in the Legend of Kirtu (I)*, UF 14, 1982, 153-71

Verreet⁷⁶. Yet another possibility is that Ug. *šlw* is cognate with Akk. *šalû*, «to submerge oneself (in water)» (CAD Š/1, 273-74). In that case, *šp* would mean «bowl» here⁷⁷, indicating the translation «that I may immerse myself in the bowl of her eyes». Assuming the stichometry is correct, the problem then becomes a matter of imagery.

(9) *tn*

Although Ug. *tn* (KTU 4.123:16; 4.146:8, and perhaps 4.402:5 and 4.185:5.7⁷⁸) is commonly accepted as meaning «dyed scarlet» (Heb. *šani*, «scarlet»), the Akk. cognate *šinītum*, «dyed textile»⁷⁹, suggests the meaning may simply be «dyed», i.e., «dyed textile». In Akkadian the nominalized feminine adjective *šinītu*, «Abspülung, Färbung» (AHw, 1242b) derives from *šanû*, «to flood with water, etc.» (CAD Š/1, 408-409), «abspülen» (AHw, 1167). And, in fact, part of the dyeing process comprised washing and drying the raw wool⁸⁰.

It is also important to compare not just individual words but *syntagmata* in Ugaritic with those in another (Semitic) language. Del Olmo Lete has provided a list of syntagmata common to Ugaritic and Phoenician⁸¹. An example (cited by Del Olmo Lete) is Ug. *šlh yd* (KTU 1.15 iv 24) and Phoenician *šlh yd* (KAI 24: 6)⁸², both meaning «to stretch out (one's) hand».

IV Non-Semitic words in Ugaritic

It is known that many words in the Ugaritic lexicon are in fact borrowed from Hurrian, occasionally from Hittite and more rarely from Egyptian. Over the years more and more such words have been identified⁸³. Here one particular word (*nḥt*) is examined to determine whether in fact it is purely Semitic.

(169) with discussion of the reading and stichometry.

76 Verreet, *Modi*, 141-42, 157-58 and 173. A Š-stem of *lwy* is not included in J. Tropper, *Der ugaritische Kausativstamm und die Kausativbildungen des Semitischen*, ALASP 2, Münster 1990, nor is this passage discussed.

77 See TRU (1), 41, with references. This would remove the homograph *šp*, «glance», from the Ug. lexicon.

78 For references cf. Ribichini - Xella, *Tessili*, 68-69; KTU 4.146 is translated *ibid.*, 76.

79 So K.R. Veenhof, *Aspects of Old Assyrian Trade and its Terminology*, Leiden 1972, 188 – with text references. Ug. *tn* with this meaning is not discussed by W.H. van Soldt, *Fabrics and Dyes at Ugarit*, UF 22, 1990, 321-57.

80 See van Soldt, *Fabrics*, 332-33.

81 Listed by G. del Olmo Lete, *Fenicio y Ugarítico: correlación lingüística*, AuOr 4, 1986, 31-49 (46-47).

82 See now J. Tropper, *Die Inschriften von Zincirli*, ALASP 6, Münster 1994, 35 for further references.

83 See the list provided by de Moor, *Ugaritic Lexicography*, 98. Not all are correct, of course. For additional material the indices of UF and other periodicals may be consulted.

nḥt, «seat»

KTU 1.3 iv 3⁸⁴

lnḥt. lkḥt drkth

«from the seat of the throne of his dominion»⁸⁵.

As de Moor remarked many years ago, the collocation of *yṯb*, «to sit» and *nḥt* (in KTU 1.16 vi 23-24) «lends support to Aistleitner's view... that *nḥt* means something like 'upholstery, seat' rather than 'dais'»⁸⁶. The etymology of *nḥt* is considered to be Ug. *nḥ*, «to rest»⁸⁷; cf. Akk. *nāḥu* (*nuāḥu*), «to be slow, etc., to take a rest» (CAD N/1, 143; cf. AHW,) from which is derived *nēḥtu*, «peace, security» (CAD N/2, 150b-51a), «Ruhe» (AHW, 775a). From etymology alone, however, *nḥt* is a place where one can rest, with no specific reference to being seated.

In Ugaritic, *nḥt* is followed by *kḥt*, which scholars consider to be a Hurrian word⁸⁸. It has also been suggested that in Hurrian, *naḥḥa-* may mean «to sit»⁸⁹. Remarkably, both these words also co-occur (as in the Ugaritic texts) in Hurrian texts. The first text runs as follows:

^DIM-ub ... *ge-eš-ḥi-ni na-aḥ-ḥa-ab*

«and the Weathergod sat down on the stool...»⁹⁰.

Similar are *na-aḥ-ḥa* ^{GIŠ}*ki-iš-ḥi-ni*⁹¹ and *ki-iš-ḥi-ni na-aḥ-ḥu-u-du-wa*⁹². These collocations indicate that Ug. *nḥt*, «seat», is another loanword from Hurrian. Alternatively, there may be an ancient stem *NḤ* denoting «to rest» which appears in Hurrian (and Urartian) and in the Semitic languages (Akkadian, Ugaritic, Phoenician, Hebrew, etc.) with different but related meanings.

Two other loanwords can be mentioned. One is *ḥswn/ḥšwn* (KTU 4.4:9; 4.14:3.11; 4.44:26; 4.232:32) for which different meanings have been suggested such as

⁸⁴ Also KTU 1.4 i 33; 1.16 vi 23-24. W.T. Pitard, *A New Edition of the «Rapi'uma» Texts: KTU 1.20-22*, BASOR 285, 1992, 33-77 (72) accepts the emendation of *nzt* to *nḥt* in KTU 1.22 i 18.

⁸⁵ Translation, ARTU, 12. Similarly, MLC, 589: «del diván, del solio de su poder».

⁸⁶ J.C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu According to the Version of Ilmilku*, AOAT 16, 1971, 120, with further references.

⁸⁷ For a survey cf. Pardee, *Ugaritic Bibliography*, 426.

⁸⁸ M. Dietrich - O. Loretz, *Die sieben Kunstwerke des Schmiedegottes in KTU 1.4 I 23-43*, UF 10, 1978, 57-64 (61); MLC, 564.

⁸⁹ E. Neu, *Varia Hurritica. Sprachliche Beobachtungen an der hurritisch-hethitischen Bilingue aus Ḥattuša*, in E. Neu - C. Rüster (eds.), *Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden 1988, 235-54 (247 and n. 47; 250 n. 57). See especially M. Salvini, *Betrachtungen zum hurritisch-urartäischen Verbum*, ZA 81, 1991, 81ff. Further references in G. Wilhelm, *Hurritische Lexicographie und Grammatik: Die hurritisch-hethitische Bilingue aus Bogazköy*, Or 61, 1992, 122-41 (132).

⁹⁰ KBo XXXII 13 I 4; Hitüte parallel in KBo XXXII 13 I 5-6, cited by Neu, *Varia Hurritica*, 251.

⁹¹ KBo 12, 80 + KUB 45.62 obv. i 14 cited by Salvini, *Betrachtungen*, 127-28.

⁹² ChS I/1, Nr. 41, rev. iii 39, cited by Salvini, *Betrachtungen*, 127-28.

«thyme»⁹³ and «lettuce»⁹⁴. It may even be a plant from the onion family⁹⁵. The other is *mgn*. To the data collected by O'Connor on this word⁹⁶ can be added Salvini's comment: «L'attestation de ce mot à Mari montre qu'il n'est pas nécessairement un emprunt indo-arien»⁹⁷.

V Conclusions

The set of principles set out by de Moor over twenty years ago (see above) has stood the test of time. Three additions can be suggested: the significance of correct stichometry, implicitly or explicitly recognised by all scholars, the contribution of correct syntactical analysis and the importance of comparing syntagmata across different languages. Other aspects, such as imagery, may also play a part. However, our main obstacle to understanding correctly many a difficult passage is principally that there is no similar passage in Ugaritic or that the context is uncertain. In other words, the Ugaritic corpus is simply too small owing to lack of texts. It is to be hoped that continuing excavation will bring more tablets to light (as has happened so remarkably in 1994) and thus reduce the number of questionable entries in the Ugaritic lexicon.

⁹³ M. Dietrich - O. Loretz, *Ug. HS/ŠWN «Thymian» ?*, UF 10, 1978, 431.

⁹⁴ See H.A. Hoffner, *Hittite and Ugaritic Words for 'Lettuce'*, JCS 25, 1973, 234.

⁹⁵ Garlic or a type of onion, aA *ḥazuannum*, Hitt. *ḥazzuwaniš*, aWab *ḥazanum*, Ebla *ḥa-za-núm*, Akk. *azannu*, Bog. *azzannu*, according to W. Farber, *Altassyrisch addaḥšu oder von Safran, Fenchel, Zwiebeln und Salat*, ZA 81, 1991, 234-42 (238). See M. Stol, *Garlic, onion, leek*, in J. Postgate - M.A. Powell (eds.), *Bulletin on Sumerian Agriculture*, III, Cambridge 1987, 57-80 (58-59).

⁹⁶ M. O'Connor, *Yahweh the Donor*, AuOr 6, 1988, 47-60, esp. 47-51.

⁹⁷ M. Salvini, *Un texte hourrite nommant Zimrilim*, RA 82, 1988, 59-68 (65).