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Abstract
One purpose of this study has been to investigate the various, sometimes conflicting, theories about Ugaritic grammar. This refers to theories about both the general nature (e.g., classification within the Semitic languages) of the language and specific phenomena in the grammar itself.

Another purpose here has been to penetrate some of the unexplored or enigmatic areas; some areas of Ugaritic grammar have never been systematically investigated. Some features of the grammar have been only superficially treated and I have made a systematic analysis of some such areas, utilizing what information we now possess.
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PART I  INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

THE POSITION OF UGARITIC WITHIN THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES

In 1955 C.H. Gordon wrote "I hesitate to subsume Ugaritic and Hebrew under the category of Canaanite... we will be reasonably safe if we classify Ugaritic as an independent West Semitic language."¹ This statement is highly significant in view of the fact that he assumed a much different position earlier. In 1940 he wrote:

Though differences of opinion have been voiced, we nevertheless safe in attributing Ugaritic to the Canaanite branch of Northwest Semitic. With Albright we may call Ugaritic North Canaanite. The recent publication of Harris' excellent Development of the Canaanite Dialects makes it unnecessary to describe the Canaanite dialects or to show why Ugaritic is one of them. If anything, Harris does not state the case as strongly as he might... The Canaanite character of Ugaritic is even greater than Harris indicates.²

Gordon does not explain exactly what caused this radical shift in his attitude, but it may have been the article published by A. Goetze in 1941 which denied the Canaanite classification of Ugaritic.³ This discussion

¹UM, p. 123, #14:8,9.
²UG, p. 88, #13:1.
of the subject by Goetze is significant and will be dealt with later, but Goetze has not stood alone in the position which denies the Canaanite character of Ugaritic. Other scholars such as Bauer and Friedrich were inclined to regard Ugaritic as an intermediate between Hebrew and Aramaic. The American scholars, on the other hand, were not so hesitant about classifying Ugaritic with Canaanite. H.L. Ginsberg and W.F. Albright as well as lesser known scholars eventually accepted Ugaritic as only dialectically different from ancestral Hebrew.

1 In 1959 Goetze still strongly denied the Canaanite classification of Ugaritic. (JJS, 4[1959], p. 145).

2 By "Canaanite" I mean the Northwest Semitic dialect represented by the early Phoenician inscriptions, the Ugaritic texts, Hebrew, and the Canaanite words and glosses in the Amarna tablets.

3 Das Alphabet von Ras Schamra, (Halle/Salle, 1932), pp. 64–70.


5 H. L. Ginsberg argued cogently for the Canaanite character of Ugaritic, pointing out the many isoglosses between Ugaritic and Canaanite. He concluded that "these and other isoglosses make Ugaritic Canaanite; still others locate it specifically in the Phoenician, as opposed to the Hebraic subdivision of Canaanite." ("Classification of the North-west Semitic Languages," Akten des 24th Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses, [Wiesbaden, 1959], p. 256).

6 W. F. Albright described Ugaritic as definitely being closer to Canaanite than to Amorite. (JBL, 69[1950], p. 389).

7 G. D. Young, Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische For schung, 3(1953), p. 227.
The article\(^1\) published by Goetze in 1941 was a systematic attempt to disprove the Canaanite character of Ugaritic, but his erroneous a priori approach and method\(^2\) to the subject misled him. Goetze's treatment provides a good illustration of the failure to recognize the archaic character of Ugaritic and the evolution of the Canaanite dialects.\(^3\) This error is clearly expressed in his statement that "Ugaritic cannot represent an earlier stage of the language from which Hebrew and Phoenician sprang."\(^4\) This assumption provides the faulty foundation upon which he constructed his theory that Ugaritic is non-Canaanite. Notice that this assumption is the opposite of the position reached by other scholars.\(^5\)

\(^1\) *Language*, 17(1941), p. 126ff.

\(^2\) Albright very clearly pointed out the error of Goetze's "Neogrammarian" method, a method which imposed rigorous linguistic laws on the study of comparative grammar in contrast to the "Neolinguist" approach which allowed for the radiation of linguistic influences and the nonconformity of given phenomena. (*CBQ*, 7[1945], pp. 15-17).

\(^3\) Goetze considered all linguistic phenomena common to both biblical Hebrew and Phoenician as going back to Canaanite. Since Hebrew and Phoenician both have the article, so did Canaanite. Since Ugaritic did not have it, Ugaritic was not Canaanite.

\(^4\) *Language*, 17(1941), p. 128.

\(^5\) Other scholars recognized the archaic character of Ugaritic. J. Friedrich suggested that Ugaritic reflects the early Semitic from which Aramaic and Canaanite both evolved. ("Kanaanäisch und Westsemitisch," *Scientia*, 84 [1949], p. 220). Likewise, W.F. Albright also recognized this when he wrote that "Ugaritic reflects many grammatical and phonetic elements which must have been present in Proto-Hebrew about 1500 B.C.E." (*NASOR*, 70[1938], p. 22).
At this point, Goetze's interpretation of early Canaanite history must be noted: it may help us to follow his reasoning. He believed the Amorites settled in and inhabited Canaan before the Canaanites. He considered the discoveries from Byblos, dated in the first part of the second millennium and usually termed "Phoenician," as incorrectly named. He would call them Amorite.¹ For evidence he cites the Exorcism Texts which came from the Middle Bronze Age as containing exclusively Amorite names. He believed these reflect the end of the preceding Amorite period. This view of his is important to remember when observing his use of the terms "Canaanite" and "Amorite."

After one understands some of these basic assumptions of Goetze it is not necessary to treat seriatim all of the individual points made in his argument. As an illustration of his basic methodology, a few examples will suffice. He stated that in Canaanite the two phonemes b/h > h and since Ugaritic possesses both these phonemes, it cannot be Canaanite.² He should have made it clear that in the

¹ He wrote "In my opinion it is illegitimate procedure to define Canaanite as the North-west Semitic people and culture of western Syria and Palestine before the twelfth century B.C." (JSS, 4[1959], p. 145).

² J. Friedrich made this same mistake when he wrote that c and s have fallen together in Canaanite but remain distinguished in Arabic, Old South Arabic, and Ugaritic. He also failed to reckon with the antiquity of Ugaritic as compared to the other later Canaanite texts, and the fact that all Arabic dialects possess a natural inherent phonemic conservatism. (Phänizisch-punische Grammatik, [Rome, 1951], p. 8, #9:2.)
later texts of Canaanite (Phoenician and Hebrew) $h/\dot{a} > h$
but we do not possess other Canaanite alphabetic texts of
a date contemporary with the Ugaritic texts. Goetze also
emphasized the fact that Ugaritic does not contain the well-
known Canaanite shift *$\ddot{a} > \dot{a}$ and therefore concluded that
since this phenomenon is not attested in Ugaritic, this
language should not be classified as Canaanite. Here again
he made no allowance for dialectal or archaic features.
Perhaps if we had Ugaritic texts from a later period this
shift could then be found in the language.

Apparently, in contrast to Z. Harris\textsuperscript{1} Goetze
ignores or at least neglects the study of the historical
development of the Canaanite dialects. Goetze wrote that
"wherever changes from Proto-Semitic are involved, they have
taken place in prehistoric times and their chronological
order cannot be determined."\textsuperscript{2} Certainly the two linguistic
shifts mentioned above did not take place in prehistoric
times.

Admittedly, there are differences between Ugaritic
and other Canaanite dialects; there are also differences
between Hebrew and the other Canaanite dialects and between
Phoenician and the other Canaanite dialects. Each dialect
of Canaanite has its own peculiarities. For example,

\textsuperscript{1}Cf. his Development of the Canaanite Dialects,
(New Haven, 1939).

\textsuperscript{2}Language, 17(1941), p. 131.
observe the dialect of Moabite: sometimes it agrees with Hebrew against Phoenician and Ugaritic;¹ sometimes it agrees with Phoenician against Ugaritic and Hebrew;² and sometimes it agrees with Ugaritic and Phoenician against Hebrew.³

In Goetze's article he does appear to have pointed out a clear isogloss between Ugaritic and Amorite, but a closer look at that feature reveals that it is not sufficiently established. He asserted that the possessive suffix of the first person plural ("our") should be vocalized -na. This would be a strong isogloss between Ugaritic and "Amorite," since the same suffix is -nu in Canaanite. C.H. Gordon adopted this view and incorporated it into his Ugaritic Manual.⁴

As evidence for this vocalization, Gordon cites the two personal names đUTU-KU-na and đIN-la-na. The first name has been read Ṣapâš-ṣuma-na and rendered "the sun-god is our name." But, as Professor Held has pointed out,⁵

¹The relative pronoun is ʾšr in Hebrew and Moabite (1. 29) but ʾš in Phoenician and đ in Ugaritic.
²The word for "year" is đt in Moabite (1. 2) and Phoenician but đnt in Ugaritic and đn(h) in Hebrew.
³The infixed -t- verbal forms are found in Ugaritic, Moabite, and early Phoenician but are rare in Hebrew.
⁴UM, p. 31, #6:11.
the correct rendering should be Ṣapši-ya₅-na as attested by the personal name Ṣapši-ya₁-na found in the Akkadian texts from Ugarit.¹ In fact, the name is also attested in the alphabetic texts where it is spelled Ṣ-p-ṣ-y-n.²

The second name transcribed Baal-la-na³ probably ends with the hypocoristic suffix -ana and would, therefore, have no connection with the pronominal suffix -na "our." Actually there are many examples of hypocoristic endings in both -ana and -anu. It would be just as appropriate, therefore, to suggest the vocalization -nu for "our" in Ugaritic on such grounds.

As the study of Ugaritic grammar and lexicography continues, the affinities with Canaanite are becoming more and more obvious and certain, despite some differences. It is hardly necessary, in view of the statements mentioned above, to state a preliminary case for the Northwest Semitic character of Ugaritic. Despite frequent resort to the Arabic lexicon by many scholars, most of them do confess that Ugaritic is definitely within the classification of Northwest Semitic.⁴

²PRU, II, 72:5, and Corpus, 85:11.
³PRU, IV, p. 227, 1. 23.
⁴S. Segert described Northwest Semitic as consisting of the two main branches of Canaanite and Aramaic but wrote that "Ugaritic can be bracketed with neither of these groups but must be regarded as an undifferentiated Northwest Semitic language." (ArΘ, 20, p. 474).
Although there are isoglosses between Ugaritic and various individual Semitic dialects, most isoglosses are between Ugaritic and Canaanite. Lexical isoglosses are numerous; according to the unpublished research of Professor M. Held, at least eighteen per cent of the Ugaritic vocabulary (excluding personal names and grammatical elements) is common only to Ugaritic and Canaanite.¹ This is in contrast to one per cent of the Ugaritic vocabulary which is common to Akkadian and another non-Canaanite Semitic language; three per cent which is attested only in Akkadian; one per cent not attested in Canaanite, but found in Arabic, Aramaic, or Ethiopian; and nine tenths of one per cent attested only in Arabic.²

For example, note that the verb "to give" is *ytn in Phoenician and Ugaritic but different in all the other Semitic dialects.³ The verb "to go," *haš, is treated

¹ Notice such household terms as "room": Heb. ḫeder and Ug. hár but Akk. nandhu, and Arb. šuriatu; "roof": Ug. gg and Heb. sag, but Akk. ṣara, Aram. 'ibara, Arb. šathun; "window": Ug. šin and Heb. melān, but Akk. aštu, Aram. kāwalla, Arb. șubbaḵum; "bed": Ug. məṯ and Heb. mittah, but Akk. erkum, Aram. ḫaraḵ, Arb. šarirum; "table": Ug. tilni, and Heb. šulhen, but Akk. puṣṭrum, Aram. paṭūz, Arb. mašidatun.

² M. Held, op. cit.

³ Note the qal form ytn "you have given," (IAB, 6:14). For examples in Phoenician, cf. Z. Harris, A Grammar of the Phoenician Language, (New Haven, 1936) p. 108. The root is ntn in Hebrew and Aramaic, and nadānu in Akkadian.
like a prima yodh verb in both Hebrew and Ugaritic but not in any other dialect. Likewise, the qtl form of the verb "to strike" is found in Ugaritic as hlm but the yql form is spelled ylm. Also note that only Ugaritic, Phoenician, and Hebrew possess the two forms of the first person singular pronoun.

The grammatical isoglosses are also quite striking. Only Ugaritic and Canaanite (Hebrew) are characterized by the so-called pālēl form for medial w/y verbs. For example, Hebrew rāmēm and Ugaritic ryn; Hebrew kāmēn and Ugaritic knn; and Hebrew ērēr and Ugaritic ērē.

Another isogloss with Canaanite is the third

---

1 The word hlk is found in such passages as IK, 94, 180, 182, and IIAB, 2:13, 14. The yql form is found as tk in IVAB, 3:18 and IAB, 3:4:7. Hebrew hšlāk is found in Genesis 26:26, but the yql form yāšlāk is found in Exodus 10:24.

2 The yql form ylm is found in IIIAB, A, 16, 24.

3 Hebrew ān or 'mānk and Ugaritic ān or 'ank.

4 Cf. the section on pālēl forms in Ugaritic.

5 It is true that biblical Aramaic also has this pālēl formation as found in 3rōmēm (Daniel 4:34) and hitt rõmē (Daniel 6:8), but it also has the other form, 1gəḏvəm(h) in Daniel 6:8. The evidence for old Aramaic is not clear but later Aramaic agrees with this latter form. (G. Dalman, Grammatik des Jüdisch Palästinaische Aramaisch, [Darmstadt, 1960], #70:5 and #71:5).

6 IIAB, 4-5:113-116.

7 Ibid., 4-5:47-48.

8 Ibid., 4-5:38-39.
masculine plural form with the preformative т—, a Canaanite feature revealed in the Amarna tablets\(^1\) and preserved in biblical Hebrew in such passages as Job 19:15 and Ezekiel 37:7. Also the same form of the participle of medial weak verbs is found in both Ugaritic and Hebrew. For example, note the participle qm in both Hebrew and Ugaritic but q\(\text{m}^\prime\)im in Aramaic and Arabic.

Such isoglosses in the lexicon and grammar of Ugaritic reflect the Canaanite character of Ugaritic. Since it is generally granted that Ugaritic is Northwest Semitic, it only remains to be decided whether it should be classed with Canaanite, Aramaic, Amorite, or as an independent dialect. Although Ugaritic contains some peculiarities all its own, these hardly warrant its own special classification. Indeed, the same approach could be made to Phoenician for it also has some unique features of its own. Since we know very little about Amorite, and since Ugaritic cannot be considered Aramaic, it is best to classify it with the Canaanite branch of Northwest Semitic.

\(^1\)W. L. Moran, "New Evidence on Canaanite taq\(\text{m}^\prime\)ul\(\text{m}^\prime\)(na)" JCS, 5(1951), p. 33ff.
CHAPTER II

AN ANALYSIS OF THE UGARITIC LANGUAGE

Particular Elements in Ugaritic

Grammar

The following observations indicate a few of the unique features of Ugaritic in comparison to the other Semitic languages, especially the Northwest Semitic branch. The primary purpose of this section is to discuss just a few of the more significant similarities or dissimilarities of Ugaritic with the other Semitic languages.

One unique element in the grammar which may be considered as foreign, or an apparent accommodation to a foreign language is the use in Ugaritic of the unique phoneme ū.¹ Since this ū is discussed at length in the section on phonemes, there is no need to elaborate here.

A distinctive feature found in Ugaritic grammar is the employment of ẖ corresponding to *ḏ.² This is unique in old Northwest Semitic; the Canaanite dialects and Old Aramaic

¹This letter is often used in the spelling of Hurrian names. It is also found in loan words like šl(pl) ("iron"). Cf. Akkadian parzillus and Hebrew barzel.

²The word for "ear" is Ugaritic ʾudn and Arabic ʿudmun.
use 2 corresponding to *ã during this early period.\(^1\) About the middle of the first millennium, Aramaic did change to the use of ã corresponding to *ã.\(^2\)

Another unique feature of Ugaritic grammar is the use of three different aleph signs, each including the following vowel except when the aleph closes a syllable and the aleph is then vowelless. No other alphabetic writing of the ancient Near East exhibits this peculiarity. These aleph signs are discussed at length in the section on the aleph signs in Ugaritic.

The sibilant 3 is also unique to Ugaritic. Of course, it is always possible that this sibilant existed in very early forms of the other Northwest Semitic dialects, but at the present time there is no evidence. Perhaps like the other "archaic" letters 1, 4, and 3, it, at a later period in Canaanite, failed to be individually distinguished and assimilated to another letter. This 3 is discussed in the section on phonemes.

The use of 4 to represent both *e and *g is unique in Ugaritic.\(^3\) The original e and g letters are kept distinguished in Canaanite where *e > 0 and *g > g from Aramaic

\(^1\)SVG, I, p. 134.


\(^3\)For examples, see my discussion of this phoneme in the section on the individual letters of the Ugaritic alphabet.
where $*^{*}$ > 0 but $^*$ > 1. The use of Ugaritic $\square$ to represent both $*^{*}$ and $^*$ remains enigmatic. This phenomenon is discussed later when these letters are studied individually.

Another unique feature of Ugaritic is the regular use of the 3-stem causative. Each of the Northwest Semitic dialects uses its own special causative form: Hebrew uses the H-stem causative, Aramaic the 'A-stem causative, and Phoenician the Y-stem causative. If we had texts in a very early form of each of these dialects, perhaps we could better understand the evolution and interrelationships of the causative stem. At any rate, Ugaritic is unique in West Semitic in regularly using the 3-stem causative.

Many apparently distinctive features of Ugaritic are not peculiar to the Ugaritic language but are actually preserved archaic features which were undoubtedly found also in the older forms of the other Canaanite dialects. Besides the additional letters which Ugaritic preserves, some of the other archaic Canaanite features preserved are enclitic $\mathrm{m}$, proclitic $\mathrm{l}$, adverbial suffixes, and G-stem passive forms.

Lexicon

Like any language, Ugaritic includes various foreign or loan words. This is not surprising in view of the location of ancient Ugarit. This city was located at a crossroads of the ancient Near East. Various cultures and empires ran over, or converged on her boundaries. At the present time, texts
in five different scripts and eight different languages have been recovered from this one site.¹ I do not know of any parallel case of such a phenomenon. The five scripts found are syllabic cuneiform, alphabetic cuneiform, Egyptian, hieroglyphic Hittite, and Cypriote; the eight languages recovered are Akkadian, Sumerian, Hurrian, Hittite, hieroglyphic Hittite, Ugaritic, Egyptian, and Cypriote. Generally, the languages have retained their own individual character, but occasionally borrowings from one language to another may be found. There seems to be practically no significant mutual influence on grammar, and the lexical influence is very limited. Usually the cultural terms are the most susceptible to borrowing.² A few cultural terms are scattered throughout not only the Semitic languages but other ancient languages as well.³

As the following paragraphs will reveal, much has been written on foreign influences on the vocabulary of Ugaritic. Some of these articles have proven very enlightening while others were profitless. As our knowledge of such languages as Hurrian, Amorite, Hittite and Cypriote increases, more lexical borrowings or influences will undoubtedly be

³"Throne": Sumerian, GU-ZA; Akkadian, kussa; Ugaritic, ka'ya; Hebrew, kissef. "Iron": Akkadian, parazlu; Ugaritic, bržl; Hebrew, barzel. The variations of spelling "iron" seem to indicate it is not of Semitic origin.
detected.

The articles referred to in the following paragraphs may contain inaccuracies, but this is not the place to write a critique of these articles or to even engage in an inductive study of the Ugaritic lexicon.

At a very early date in the study of Ugaritic, the Hurrian elements aroused attention. In 1937 C. G. Brandenstein wrote a significant article entitled "Zum Churrischen aus den Ras-Shamra-Texten". At that date very little was known of either Hurrian or Ugaritic but Hurrian elements were recognized. But even earlier than this, H.L. Ginsberg and B. Maisler wrote an article entitled "Semitised Hurrians in Syria and Palestine" which, although primarily an ethnic study, treated the Hurrian language elements in Ugaritic and Amarna. Already in 1934 they had recognized that the phoneme \( \overline{x} \) was especially common in Hurrian texts.

The Hurrian element in Ugarit was described in connection with professions in the article "Zu einigen Bezeichnungen von Berufen in Ugaritischen" by A. Alt. He particularly noted the common Hurrian suffix -\( \overline{uhlu} \) which appears on nouns from Ugarit. In alphabetic writing this suffix appears as -\( \overline{gal} \). Martin Noth, well-known for his

\[\text{1.} ZDMG, 91(1937), \text{p. 555.}\]
\[\text{2.} IOS, 14(1934), \text{p. 243ff.}\]
\[\text{3.} ZAW, 58(1940-41), \text{p. 277-279.}\]
\[\text{4.} \text{Hurrian -\( \overline{uhlu} \) is the nomen agentis suffix. A class of soldiers are known as the m\( \overline{kam} \) (U, p. 287, #1071b).}\]
study of Old Testament names, studied in detail the proper names of Syria-Palestine in an article which discussed at length the various elements, including Hurrian, found in these names.

Some writers have sought to point out various Indo-European elements or words in the lexicon of Ugarit. In 1953 S. Segert and L. Zgusta collaborated in writing an article which claimed to study such elements in Ugaritic. There are few scholars who could be considered competent in both Semitic and Indo-European languages, and this may be why more of such studies have not been written. More recently Harry Hoffner, Jr. believed he had detected an Anatolian cult term in Ugaritic. He suggested that the word ḫšt, found only in Daniel, in supposedly a foreign cult term which Ugaritic borrowed from Anatolia, but the evidence he gave was inconclusive. E. Ullendorf believed he detected an Homeric idiom

---

1"Die israelitischen Personennamen in der Namengebung (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1928)."


in Ugaritic but again the evidence, it seems to me, is very questionable. I do not know of any inductive studies that have been made of the Ugaritic and Aegean cultural relationships. Some of the materials important for such a study are now conveniently collected in Ugaritica III.¹

Egyptian elements have also been found in Ugaritic. In an article discussing names of boats in Ugaritic, A. Alt deals with two Egyptian names of boats.² Ugaritic br³ is equivalent to Egyptian b3r³ (or b3yr³) and Ugaritic hkt⁴ is the Egyptian ḫktṣ. This last word is also found in Isaiah 2:16 where it is incorrectly spelled ḫktṣyyth. As we now know from Ugaritic, the first letter in Hebrew should be ℵ.⁵ A. Alt⁶ also pointed out several Egyptian professional titles found in Ugaritic and the Amarna letters.

R. T. O'Callaghan⁷ believed the word ktp ("weapon")

¹Chapter three (p. 227) contains "Materiaux pour L'étude des relations entre Ugarit et Chypre." Also on page thirty-three begins the section "Documents Chypro-Minoens de Ras Shamra."


³Corpus, 84:2,3,5; PRU, V, 57:2.

⁴Corpus, 84:4,5,6; PRU, V, 85:4-14.

⁵For other examples of scribal confusion between 𐤀 and 𐤁, cf. the section discussing the phoneme 𐤀.


to be used in Egyptian in the same way as in Ugaritic. This
in turn illuminates some verses in the Bible. Anton Jirku1
found an idiom which was common to both Egyptian and
Canaanite.

A number of Egyptian and Ugaritic terms were compared
and discussed by W. Ward;2 in fact, he listed thirty-three
items and discussed the relationships. Some of these are
very doubtful, but others appear to be illuminating. Again,
it must be emphasized that in studies of this type, it requires
proficiency not only in Semitics but also a good knowledge of
the other language that is being compared. A superficial
comparison of roots is profitless.

There have been few inductive studies of the Meso-
potamian elements in Ugaritic; this is surprising in view
of our vast knowledge of the Akkadian dialects. We have
more texts in the Akkadian language than in any other single
language of the ancient world. M. Dahood3 did detect, he
believed, one well-known Akkadian idiom in Ugaritic.

---

1"Das Haupt auf die Knie legen" (Eine Ägyptisch-
2"Comparative Studies in Egyptian and Ugaritic,"
3"Hebrew and Ugaritic Equivalents of Akkadian pitṭ
puridē," Biblica, 39(1958), pp. 67-69. This article con-
tains several errors, the most outstanding being a mis-
reading of the text. tptṭh 'iḏk is not the correct reading
of VIAB, 3:11 (Cf. Corpus, p. 3, n. 7. Also note the
parallel tptṭh 'iḏk in VAB, C, 17).
Otto Missfeldt\(^1\) wrote an article on Mesopotamian elements in Ugaritic and pointed out such expressions as 
\[ l \text{ ym hnd} = iŠtu ūmi annn, \] "from this day on."

These preceding articles have been mentioned here to reflect how scholars have attempted to find foreign influences in Ugaritic. Certainly not all that has been written in this area is correct, indeed, some of it is very incorrect. However, some Hittite, Egyptian, and Mesopotamian words are attested in Ugaritic and continued research along these lines may reveal more.

Personal Names

Although there have been sporadic treatments of the personal names from Ugarit, we still lack a good, comprehensive, systematic analysis of these important names. In 1961, a doctoral dissertation was written on the alphabetic personal names from Ugarit.\(^2\) This study resulted in a convenient collection and collation of the names but is weak because of its purely deductive method. Solid results can be obtained only by a careful, painstaking inductive investigation of these names.

Aistleitner made an exhaustive study of T. Bauer's

---


Die Ostkanaanäer in connection with his analysis of Ugaritic grammar, but he did not include in this study the Ugaritic personal names themselves.¹

The Hurrian element in the proper names from Ugarit has been indirectly treated in various articles. As early as 1939, W. Feiler² utilized the Ugaritic and Amarna personal names in his study of Hurrian names in the Bible. M. Noth³ made many references to the Ugaritic personal names in his study of the onomasticon of Syria-Palestine. A more recent study of the names from Syria was made by Anton Jirku,⁴ and he included many specific references to the Ugarit onomasticon. A.M. Honeymoon made a study of the geographical names of which contained much helpful comparative material.⁵

Poetic and Non-Poetic Language

The inductive study of Ugaritic literature has revealed the clear distinction between poetic and non-poetic language. The difference is in both grammar and vocabulary. This same phenomenon has long been recognized in other

languages. W. von Soden\(^1\) made an important study of Akkadian poetic texts and called this language the "hymnal–epic dialect." The same feature has been found in Homeric Greek, and in our Hebrew Bible the distinction between poetic and non-poetic language is obvious.

The poetic literature tends, in any language, to be archaic. Albright wrote: "Poetic compositions are notoriously unsatisfactory as specimens of a living language, since they archaize and do not represent normal syntax adequately."\(^2\)

The syntax of Ugaritic poetry is very rigid in form. The primary element of syntax in Ugaritic poetry is parallelism; although there are varieties of parallelism employed in Ugaritic, there is strict conformity to whichever variety of parallelism is being used by the poet. Remnants of these poetical devices are found in Biblical Hebrew and a proper knowledge of these forms helps us in better understanding of both the Biblical and Ugaritic texts.\(^3\) The yqtl-atl (atl-\(\text{yqtl}\)) sequence of identical verbs, the active–passive sequence

\(^{1}\textit{ZA}, 40(1932), \text{pp. 163–227}; \textit{ZA}, 41(1933), \text{pp. 90–185}.\)

\(^{2}\textit{BASOR}, 150(1958), \text{p. 37}.\)

of identical verbs, the regular use of the yqtl tense in narrative, are all characteristics of Ugaritic poetry as distinguished from Ugaritic prose.

Also, in the Ugaritic lexicon, a clear distinction is often made between poetic and non-poetic words. M. Held\(^1\) has collected some examples which clearly illustrate this distinction maintained in the lexicon of Ugaritic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epic</th>
<th>Ritual/Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sheep</td>
<td>'imr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth, lad</td>
<td>ʾlm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tongs</td>
<td>mqbtm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large cattle</td>
<td>'alp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small cattle</td>
<td>ṣ'in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another example would be the word bnš ("man") which is common in the non-poetic texts but does not occur in the poetic literature. In a recently discovered polyglott tablet from Ugarit,\(^2\) the four languages of Sumerian, Akkadian, Hurrian, and Ugaritic are found in parallel columns. For the words meaning "man" it had Sumerian nu, Akkadian awilum, Hurrian taršuwanni, and Ugaritic bu-nu-ṣu.

**Chronological Layers**

When a comparison of the three great epics of

\(^1^"\text{mḥš}/*\text{mḥš} \text{ in Ugaritic and Other Semitic Languages}\"

JAOS, 79(1959), pp. 174-175.

\(^2^\text{Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres} \text{ (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1961).}\)
Ugaritic is made, certain differences become obvious. Although all of our present copies date mainly from the fourteenth century, the differences in vocabulary and style reveal that the date of original composition varied with each of the three epics. W. F. Albright\(^1\) concluded that our copies of these epics were written shortly before 1400 B.C.E.

To judge from many indications of mistakes brought about by dictation from oral sources in these epics, especially in Keret and Aqhat, the date of original reduction to writing did not much precede the early fourteenth century B.C., to which our copies belong.

In the following paragraphs I shall discuss, in the following order, the distinctive features of Keret, Danel, and Baal.

To begin with, Keret is the latest of the three epics. As early as 1946, H.L. Ginsberg had already observed the "greater simplicity, directness, and moderation in the use of clichés that distinguish Keret from Ba'al and 'Aqhat."\(^2\)

In this same article Ginsberg\(^3\) goes on to point out that the less ornate and less stereotyped style of Keret also appears in the fact that most of the characters are not even furnished with alternative designations for use in otiose second clauses, and that even the available alternative designations are not used wherever there is an excuse.

---


3. Ibid.
W. F. Albright concluded that Keret was composed "between the seventeenth and the fifteenth centuries B.C." This would be shortly before the date of our extant copies. Besides the style and language of Keret pointing to a later date composition that the other two epics, there are also other internal references to consider. For example, Keret makes references to chariots and horses, a reference which would be anachronistic if we assign an early date to this epic.

Keret is also characterized by a distinctive vocabulary. The following comparison reveals the differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keret</th>
<th>Other Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bed</td>
<td>mït</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tent</td>
<td>ḫmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perish</td>
<td>'abd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrow</td>
<td>ḫz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sword</td>
<td>ṣḥḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cup</td>
<td>ġl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ass</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>ḫg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>mḏd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silver</td>
<td>ḫṭḥ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we turn to the story of Danel, we find a style intermediate between Keret and Baal; it is not as archaic as

---

1BASOR, 150(1958), p. 36.

2These examples were collected by Professor Held.
Baal nor as modern as Keret. Albright\(^1\) believed the references to typical Middle-Bronze names suggest a date of composition after 1800 B.C. In his study of the use of stylistic tricolon in Ugaritic and the Bible, Albright\(^2\) pointed out that the tricolon of the climactic or repetitive type are most common in Danel. In the Keret epic there are several occurrences of this tricolon scheme and in the Baal epic the least examples of this poetic device.\(^3\) A complete investigation of the distribution of these various poetical devices would yield even more evidence for the differences in these epics. This one example mentioned above is just an illustration of what can be done in this area.

The most archaic of the three epics is the Baal story which Albright\(^4\) said "may easily contain elements little changed for many centuries before the date of our copies. It would not be at all surprising if it goes back in substantially its extent form to the third millennium B.C."

It should be noted here that Baal, the most archaic, is the least understood of the Ugaritic texts while Keret, the most

---


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 4.

\(^4\)The Old Testament and Modern Study, p. 31.
recent, is the best understood. Baal contains many words which remain completely unknown and many passages which remain completely enigmatic.

Besides the ancient vocabulary of Baal, the grammar is clearly more archaic. Professor Held pointed out "that the ḫattr-ḫatt (ḫatt-ḫattr) sequence is primarily attested in the Baal epic, rarely in Aqht, and never in evidence in Keret." Professor Held also pointed out "It is not surprising that the t-forms of mab/hab are attested in the Baal Epic only, since [it] represents the oldest layer of Ugaritic and must be considered highly archaic, in contradistinction to the later and less archaic Tale of Aqht and the latest and least archaic Legend of King Keret." Undoubtedly, further inductive study would reveal other archaic peculiarities found only, or most often, in Baal.

In a preceding paragraph, mention was made of Albright's study of patterns of tricolon. From this study he observed that the Baal Epic offered a considerable number

---


3Unfortunately, we do not have uniformity of terminology in such studies. Albright wrote "Since there is hopeless disagreement in the use of the terms 'stich(os)' and 'distich', which interchange respectively with 'hemistich' and 'stich' for the same units, I have given them up entirely and use 'colon' and 'bicolon' respectively." (Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, p. 3, n. 13).
of cases where the first word or two words were repeated in each of a series of cola. Albright goes on to point out that the closest approach to this type of repetitive parallelism found in cuneiform literature appeared in the hymnal-epic texts from the First Dynasty of Babylon, which continued linguistic and literary traditions of the Third Dynasty of Ur. Albright believed there was a "virtual linguistic continuum" at this particular point in history "in spite of the diverse origin and traditional culture which separated the Canaanites in some respects so widely from the Accadians."2

Besides the differences, noted above, between these three great literary survivals, there are differences among the other, smaller literary pieces which have survived. For example, the text noted as B. H. or Hadad, contains a peculiar way of spelling certain words. The Ugaritic words ṣā' (“to go out”) and ṣhā (“to laugh”) are spelled ṣā’ and ṣhā in this text. Also ṣā (“to reach, find”) appears in this text as ṣā.5

---

1 IAB, 1:18ff; V:llff; IIAB, 1:13ff; 6:47ff.
3 B. H., 1:14,19.
4 B. H., 1:12.
5 B. H., 1:37; 2:51,52.
CHAPTER III

THE UGARITIC ALPHABET

The Ugaritic Alphabetic Tablets

We now possess five alphabetic tablets which have been published in *FRU*, II, as numbers 184, 185, 186, 188, 189. All these tablets reveal the same order of phonemes. *FRU*, II, 184 is the only complete alphabet found and it contains thirty different symbols, in the traditional order of the Northwest Semitic alphabet, but including eight additional signs. The two aleph signs, *ב* and *ע* were undoubtedly added later to the original alphabet which is a possible explanation of their position at the end. Gordon believed these letters were appended after the original composition of the alphabet.¹

The very rare sign א, which is used in foreign or loan words and a few proper names, is placed at the end of the traditional order. The remaining five extra letters probably represent earlier Semitic letters which later dropped from use as the language became simplified. Certainly this is the case with Ugaritic ל, י, and פ which

were then later represented in Hebrew and Phoenician by מ, ר, and ש.

The letter מ presents some peculiarities of its own as vividly revealed in the variety of transcriptions the scholars have given it. This מ apparently represents an early phoneme not hitherto represented in the Northwest Semitic alphabet. If it were a later development, we would expect it to be located at the end of the alphabet. Gordon¹ claimed this מ > ש in Hebrew and Phoenician but did not cite examples.²

It should be noted in Ugaritic, in contrast to Hebrew, מ is the thirteenth letter of the alphabet, being found between מ and ל. Ugaritic מ occupies the place of Hebrew מ.

The other four alphabetic tablets exemplify the same order of signs but contain numerous omissions. PRU, II, 185 is the same as PRU, II, 184 but minus seven signs which are broken off its left side. PRU, II, 186 contains only the first seven signs. PRU, II, 188, discovered in 1955, preserves an interesting example of what appears to be a student's practice tablet for learning the alphabet.

PRU, II, 189 is a list of the first ten and last ten signs of the alphabet. In a parallel column the scribe has

²I will discuss this letter more in the section which treats the various letters according to Semitic distribution.
listed an Akkadian syllabic counterpart for each individual
sign. The Akkadian consonantal parallels are what we would
have expected. Only the following need comment.

The ha sign is used to represent both h and k on
this tablet. This is noteworthy because Akkadian writing
does not have a consonantal counterpart for h. However,
Canaanite scribes did use cuneiform h to represent Canaanite
w as in the word for "dust, dirt," Ugaritic תער but found in
Amarna as ha-ru-ru.2

The comparison, on this same tablet, of Ugaritic h
with Akkadian ku is unusual. Etymologically, the Ugaritic
h would not appear in Akkadian, although its influence on
the vowel change a > o is usually observed. An example of
this is found in the word meaning "to plow, cultivate"
which is Ugaritic hrt and Akkadian ɜɜ. However, in West
Semitic loan words in Akkadian, cuneiform h may correspond to
etymological h as in the word meaning "to perceive, under-
stand" Ugaritic ɜɜ but Akkadian hakû.3 In fact, the h of
West Semitic words almost regularly appears as h in the cunei-
form writing from the Palestine-Syria region. Another example

1Ungnad - Matouš, Grammatik des Akkadischen, (München:

2BA, 143:11. The regular Akkadian word for "dust,
dirt" is ɜɜ (CAD, E, p. 184).

3hakû is a West Semitic loan word found in the
Akkadian from Mari (CAD, H, p. 32).
is "wall" written in Ugaritic hmt, Hebrew hāmāh but found in Amarna as hu-mi-tu. In Ugaritic and Hebrew we find the verb hmn ("to favor") which is, as we would expect, ṣēnu in Akkadian. However, in Amarna writing we find Šumma Šarru būlī yihannāni ("if the king, my lord, shows favor to me.").

The scribal indication of h = ku remains without clarification except for one comparison which has been pointed out by several scholars: Ugaritic ḻṭek signifies a type of dry measure and is compared to Hebrew ḻṭek and Akkadian ḻṭiktu.

Our next observation of PRU, II, 189 concerns itself with the comparison of h = su. This h sign is extremely rare in our present Ugaritic texts. The word for "horse"

---

1 The CAD listing (H, p. 234) of Ugaritic hmt ("wall") is incorrect.

2 EA, 141:44.

3 CAD, E, p. 164.

4 EA, 137:81.

5 PRU, II, 189.

6 Speiser has cited, with reference to this problem, examples of the interchange of h and k in Akkadian (BASOR, 175[1964], pp. 42-47).


8 Corpus, 142:3,4,10.

9 Hosea 3:2.

10 AHw, p. 556.
(Hebrew שן) is written in Ugaritic either שנ or סֶנ. Ugaritic שנ is found in the poetic texts \(^1\) but סֶנ in the non-poetic texts.\(^2\)

The word פֶּנ\(^3\) is also written פֶּ֗נ.\(^4\) The precise meaning of this word remains uncertain although Eissfeldt has suggested that the word may indicate one-half measure of whatever is under consideration in its context.\(^5\) This פ is also found in personal and geographical names. Albright suspected that Hebrew פ may actually represent two different original sibilants.\(^6\)

It is unfortunate that this very important alphabetic tablet\(^7\) has the ten central signs missing. It would be most interesting to observe what syllabic equivalents the scribe would assign to the Ugaritic signs of פ and פ.\(^8\)

The remaining Akkadian consonantal equivalents to the Ugaritic phonemes are what one would expect, e.g.,

\(^{1}\)IRP, B,3; IK, 128, 140, 272, 285.

\(^{2}\)PRU, II, 12: 24, 32, 38; 123: 5; PRU, V, 49: 47; 64R: 16, 18. סֶנ is the regular spelling used in the hippiatric texts (Corpus, 160: 2, 4, 6, 10; 161: 21, 32).

\(^{3}\)PRU, II, 59B: 3; PRU, V, 105: 1; 113: 32.

\(^{4}\)PRU, II, 99: 29; 146: 5; 152R: 2, 4; PRU, V, 12: 5; 36: 1, 2; 152: 4.

\(^{5}\)JSJ, 5(1960), p. 43.

\(^{6}\)Cf. his review of Gordon's UH. (JBL, 69[1950], p. 385).

\(^{7}\)PRU, II, 189.

\(^{8}\)These letters will be discussed in detail in our section on sibilants.
b = be, g = ga, r = ra, etc.; however, their choice of vowel is unexplained. Why the scribe wrote that b = be but g = ga, or g = sa but q = qu remains enigmatic despite some ingenious theories. F. M. Cross and T. O. Lambdin\(^1\) suggested that the vowel represented the first vowel of the traditional name of the letter, e.g., 'a/a = alpu, b/be = bētu, g/ga = gamlu, etc. This theory will fit some of these correspondences, but others still remain unexplained.\(^2\)

### The Labials

As the chart below demonstrates, the labials are generally unchanged in their etymological distribution throughout the Semitic languages.\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>b̪</td>
<td>b̪</td>
<td>b̪</td>
<td>b̪</td>
<td>b̪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lord</td>
<td>b̪l</td>
<td>b̪l</td>
<td>b̪l</td>
<td>b̪l</td>
<td>b̪lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son</td>
<td>bn</td>
<td>'bn</td>
<td>bn</td>
<td>bn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td>lb(b)</td>
<td>lb(b)</td>
<td>lb(b)</td>
<td>lb(b)</td>
<td>libbu(^4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^3\)Since we are studying phonemic distribution, these charts give etymological correspondence, not semantic equivalents! The vowels are omitted for the sake of clarity.

\(^4\)Etymological equivalent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[p]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>pm¹</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>pm</td>
<td>pû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breath</td>
<td>npš</td>
<td>nps</td>
<td>npš</td>
<td>npš</td>
<td>napištum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nose</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>appu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>mn</td>
<td>mû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die</td>
<td>nt</td>
<td>nt</td>
<td>nt</td>
<td>nt</td>
<td>mätu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td>'m(m)</td>
<td>'mm</td>
<td>'m(m)</td>
<td>'mm</td>
<td>ummu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ugaritic š sometimes corresponds to p in other Semitic dialects. Ugaritic npš "life" appears as nbš in the Pnwm I inscription.² Within Akkadian itself we find mutation of b/p in the vicinity of certain sibilants.³ Dehöod⁴ listed another example of b/p mutation found in the word for "honey" which is Ugaritic nbt⁵ but Hebrew nūqet.

Aistleitner compared Ugaritic bīn "serpent" with what he called Hebrew ptn as an illustration of this labial mutation.⁶ Although there is a mutation involved here, his

---

¹For etymological clarity, Arabic l will always be written p.


³GAO, p. 28, #27d.


⁵IK, 72,165.

⁶UGU, p. 11.
example needs further explanation. Actually \textit{ptn} is the Aramaic word for serpent which W. F. Albright compared to Arabic \textit{bnn} and Akkadian \textit{bašmu}.\textsuperscript{1} The Canaanite word (\textit{bnn}) is probably preserved in the Old Testament in Deut. 33:22.\textsuperscript{2} Albright suggested that the place-name "Bashan" had something to do with vipers originally but does not cite any evidence.\textsuperscript{3} Cross and Freedman suggested Hebrew \textit{bāšān} in Psam. 68:23 refers to the "sea-dragon."\textsuperscript{4} Aistleitner also compared "\textit{brd} = eilig bringen, aber Akkadian \textit{parādu} (hasten)."\textsuperscript{5} Akkadian \textit{parādu} never means "hasten." The Akkadian word meaning "hasten" is \textit{bâšu}.\textsuperscript{6} The word \textit{brd}, which occurs in our texts only once,\textsuperscript{7} seems to mean "divide, slice," in reference to fat meat.\textsuperscript{8} A similar context is found in Hosea 4:14 which may be translated "they divided (meat) with harlots, they made a party with whores." The word \textit{brd} in this passage may then be considered as equivalent to Ugaritic \textit{brd}. Aistleitner\textsuperscript{9} also compared \textit{hpĕ} ("to collect, gather") with Akkadian \textit{habāšu},\textsuperscript{10} which means "to break to pieces," or "to chop up." Moreover, if the Ugaritic word \textit{hpĕ} appeared

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}\textit{HUCA}, 23(1950), p. 27.
  \item \textsuperscript{2}"Dan is a young lion/Which attacks a viper"(Suggested by Albright, \textit{HUCA}, 23(1950), p. 27.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 27.
  \item \textsuperscript{4}\textit{JBL}, 47(1948), p. 208.
  \item \textsuperscript{5}\textit{UGU}, p. 11. Cf. \textit{WUS}, #954.
  \item \textsuperscript{6}\textit{CAD}, H, p. 146.
  \item \textsuperscript{7}\textit{VAB}, A, 6.
  \item \textsuperscript{8}\textit{JBL}, 84(1965), p. 163.
  \item \textsuperscript{9}\textit{UGU}, p. 11. Cf. \textit{WUS}, #954.
  \item \textsuperscript{10}\textit{CAD}, H, p. 9.
\end{itemize}
in Akkadian we would expect ḫubu/epēsu. Thus his comparison is neither semantically nor etymologically correct.

As another example of this labial mutation between Ugaritic and other Semitic dialects, Aistleitner compared "Ug. ḫlṭ (D): retten... aber akk. balātu - leben."¹ I seriously doubt if these words are etymologically equivalent. Certainly they are not semantically equivalent since Ugaritic ḫwy² means in the G-stem "to live" and in the D-stem (hwy)³ "to give life" the precisely same meanings of Akkadian balātu⁴ in the G and D-stems.

Ugaritic ḫlṭ is not used in parallel with hwy but rather is used in parallel⁵ with ẓyw and signifies "to deliver."

The Dentals

The letters ẖ and š are classed with the sibilants because of their distribution in the Semitic languages. Ugaritic ẖ becomes a sibilant (š) in Hebrew and Akkadian, but appears as a dental (t) in Aramaic. Ugaritic š, although not completely understood, is discussed in the section on

¹UGU, p. 12.

²IID, 6:26, hwy means "life". Cf. Hebrew ḥavvîm.

³IID, 6:30,32.

⁴AHN, p. 99.

⁵These words are found in parallel in IID, 1:13.

Hebrew ẓzw and ḫlṭ are found in parallel in Psalms 37:40 and Psalms 40:18.
sibilants.

These three dentals do not cause any serious problems and their distribution is quite regular although the d of Ugaritic which normally corresponds to d of Hebrew may also correspond to Hebrew t as in the words "to set," Ugaritic ṯd but Hebrew šrt, and "to serve" Ugaritic šrd but Hebrew šrt.

The Ugaritic letter d may also correspond to Akkadian t as in the word "to vanish" which is Ugaritic ḫd but Akkadian abātu.

In Ugaritic *d>d and *d>s. The simple chart below shows the distribution of *d and *d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d</th>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>blood</td>
<td>dm</td>
<td>dm</td>
<td>dm</td>
<td>dm</td>
<td>damu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand</td>
<td>yd</td>
<td>yd</td>
<td>yd</td>
<td>yd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>ḫd</td>
<td>ḫd</td>
<td>ḫd</td>
<td>ḫd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacrifice</td>
<td>dbh</td>
<td>dbh</td>
<td>zbh</td>
<td>dbh</td>
<td>zebu³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car</td>
<td>'udn</td>
<td>'dn</td>
<td>'zn</td>
<td>'dn</td>
<td>uznu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grasp</td>
<td>ḫd</td>
<td>ḫd</td>
<td>ḫz</td>
<td>ḫd</td>
<td>aḥāzu⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹IAB, 3-4:15; IIAB, 4-5:29; IID, 2:11.
²IK, 77, 169.
³CAD, Z, p. 84.
⁴Etymological equivalent. Semantic equivalent is sabātu (CAD, 2*, p. 5).
The Ugaritic letter $\check{z}$ (Gordon's $\check{a}$) usually corresponds to a sibilant ($z$, $\check{z}$) in the other Semitic languages (see pages 48, 49 for examples) and is, therefore, treated in the section on sibilants. It is especially found in Hurrian words where it often corresponds to cuneiforms $\check{a}$. However, $\check{z}$ does sometimes correspond to the Arabic letter $\check{a}$ as in "arm" which is Ugaritic $\check{z}r^c$ but Arabic $\check{d}r^c$; or "to deliver" which is Ugaritic $\check{c}zr$ and Arabic $\check{c}dr$.

The chart below presents the Semitic distribution of Ugaritic $\check{t}$ and $t$ which appear regularly as $\check{t}$ and $t$ in the other Semitic languages.\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sacrifice</td>
<td>$\check{t}b\check{h}$</td>
<td>$\check{t}b\check{h}$</td>
<td>$\check{t}b\check{h}$</td>
<td>$\check{t}b\check{h}$</td>
<td>$\check{t}b\check{h}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rain</td>
<td>$m\check{t}r$</td>
<td>$m\check{t}r$</td>
<td>$m\check{t}r$</td>
<td>$m\check{t}r$</td>
<td>$m\check{t}r$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin</td>
<td>$h\check{t}'$</td>
<td>$h\check{t}'$</td>
<td>$h\check{t}'$</td>
<td>$h\check{t}'$</td>
<td>$h\check{t}'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>$b(y)t$</td>
<td>$b(t)$</td>
<td>$b(t)$</td>
<td>$b(t)$</td>
<td>$b(t)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine</td>
<td>$t\check{c}$</td>
<td>$t\check{c}$</td>
<td>$t\check{c}$</td>
<td>$t\check{c}$</td>
<td>$t\check{c}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to open</td>
<td>$p\check{t}$</td>
<td>$p\check{t}$</td>
<td>$p\check{t}$</td>
<td>$p\check{t}$</td>
<td>$p\check{t}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Gutturals

The Ugaritic letter $\check{g}$ not only represents the $\check{g}$ of Arabic but also the $\check{z}$ of Arabic. There has been a consider-

\(^1\)The $t$ of Ugaritic corresponds to the $d$ of Akkadian in the word "to give": Ugaritic $ytn$ but Akkadian $nad\check{a}nu$. 
able amount of material written about this phoneme.\(^1\)

Ružička\(^2\) concluded that the confusion surrounding this letter was largely due to the variant pronunciations given it. But whereas his study was based primarily on "sounds" my investigation is strictly limited to the orthographical correspondences of this letter as preserved in the epigraphical materials. For our purpose here, we are more concerned about the actual Semitic distribution of this phoneme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Akkad.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be hungry</td>
<td>rgb</td>
<td>r(\acute{c})b</td>
<td></td>
<td>ber(\dot{c})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hero</td>
<td>ġzr</td>
<td>ġzr(^3)</td>
<td>c(\acute{z})r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grape</td>
<td>ġnb</td>
<td>c(\acute{n})b</td>
<td>c(\acute{n})b</td>
<td>inbu(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>šg(\acute{r})</td>
<td>šg(\acute{r})</td>
<td>š(\acute{s})r</td>
<td>š(\acute{b})ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gate, door</td>
<td>šg(\acute{r}(t))</td>
<td>š(\acute{s})r</td>
<td></td>
<td>tr(\dot{c})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^3\) Cf. the passage in I Chronicles 12: c\(\ddot{z}\)\(\ddot{e}\)rah\(\ddot{m}\)ham\(\ddot{m}\)ah\(\ddot{m}\)ah ("heroes of the war") along with gibb\(\ddot{b}\)rim ("warriors") (v. 1) and \(\ddot{a}\)\(\ddot{n}\)\(\ddot{s}\)\(\dot{e}\) g\(\ddot{a}\)\(\ddot{b}\)\(\dot{a}\) ("men of war") (v. 9).

\(^4\) Akkad. inbu ("fruit") may perhaps be etymologically related to these words for "grape" (*CAD*, I, p. 144).
In Hebrew and Aramaic *ח appears as כ. Normally, ח is reflected in Akkadian only by its influence on vowels.¹ Sporadic examples of ח corresponding to כ in Akkadian are rare and not normal. Of course, in Amarna cuneiform writing the situation is quite different because the scribe is attempting to express Canaanite in the cuneiform script. He will use כ to represent ח in words as סטרכו,² ("gate") for Ugaritic כד and bullu,³ ("yoke") for כיל.⁴ It may be noted that Amarna cuneiform also used כ to represent כ as in הבארו,⁵ ("dirt") for Hebrew כ_FRAMEBUFFER.

That Ugaritic, which possesses its own ח, should sometimes use ח to represent כ has posed a problem. Von O. Rössler⁶ attempted to demonstrate that Ugaritic ח does not represent כ. His study is based upon Gordon's glossary and contains numerous errors.⁷ For example, in his mention

---


²EA, 244:16. This is a gloss for abullu.

³EA, 296:38. This is a gloss for nɪru.

⁴Such a root signifying "penetrate, dip" may be found in Ugaritic כובו כול bdm (VAB, B, 27) "she dips both knees in blood" and in Hebrew כמלכי כמר כאר יאר (Job 16:15) "I dipped my horn in the dust."

⁵EA, 143:11, a gloss for eperu.


⁷Cf. the response to this article by Anton Jirku, "Der Buchstabe Chain in Ugaritischen" ZDMG, 113(1964), p. 481.
of Ugaritic *nfr, ("to guard") he does not mention Akkadian 
*nfru, with the same meaning, which confirms *₂.¹ Also his
attempts, in some cases, to compare ₃ with Akkadian ₄ are
incorrect; for example, he compared ₃ ("mountain") with
Akkadian ḫurru(m), a word not even listed in CAD. Also he
compared ḫab ("fruit") with Akkadian ḫanšbu² which is
incorrect; the Akkadian word for "fruit" is inbu.³

The correspondence of Ugaritic ₃ to *₂ seems
most unusual and the simple table below presents, on the
basis of logic, an unknown, original phoneme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>₂</td>
<td>ḫ</td>
<td>₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>₄</td>
<td>ḫ</td>
<td>₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>ḫ</td>
<td>₃</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps Ugaritic ₄ has subsumed two different
original letters which we could call ₄ and ₅. This would
be comparable to Ugaritic ₃ which also includes both ₃ and
₅. Such a phoneme would be distributed as follows:

---

¹*₂ regularly appears as ₂ in Akkadian; *₃ never
appears as ₂ in Akkadian.

²This verb means (1) "to grow abundantly" and (2)
"to be radiant" (CAD, II, p. 75). There is a rare Old
Babylonian word ḫaŋššbu (CAD, p. 76) which may signify
some kind of fruit but the regular Akkadian word for "fruit"
is inbu.

³CAD, I, p. 144.
Ugaritic is not frequently found and this paucity of evidence cautions us. The very important evidence for Ugaritic corresponding to *$\xi$ is listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\xi$</td>
<td>$\acute{\imath}$</td>
<td>(a &gt; e)</td>
<td>$\acute{\imath}$</td>
<td>$\acute{\imath}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\xi(\text{h}^\text{a})$</td>
<td>$\hat{\imath}$</td>
<td>$\hat{\imath}$</td>
<td>$\hat{\imath}$</td>
<td>$\hat{\imath}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining gutterals are $\hat{\imath}$, $\hat{\imath}$, $\hat{\imath}$ and $\hat{\imath}$. Aleph is discussed at length under our section concerning vowels in Ugaritic. The correspondence of Ugaritic gutterals to gutterals in the other Semitic languages is given on the following chart.

1 This form is actually attested in Ugaritic itself (BH, 1:37; 2:51, 52).
2 This form is actually attested in Ugaritic itself (III K, 1:2).
3 For a discussion of the Egyptian evidence, which preserves $\acute{\imath}$, $\hat{\imath}$, $\xi$, $\hat{\imath}$, $\hat{\imath}$, cf. W. F. Albright, "Northwest-Semitic Names in a List of Egyptian Slaves from the Eighteenth Century B.C.,” JAOS, 74 (1954), p. 222f.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[c]</th>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hock, tendon</td>
<td>ḏqɓ</td>
<td>ḏqɓ</td>
<td>ḏqɓ</td>
<td>ḏqɓ</td>
<td>ḏqɓ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be alert</td>
<td>ḏ(w)r</td>
<td>ḏwr</td>
<td>ḏwr</td>
<td>ḏwr</td>
<td>ḏr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ibex</td>
<td>y’l</td>
<td>w’l</td>
<td>y’l</td>
<td>y’l</td>
<td>y’l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[h]</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wine</td>
<td>ḫḥ</td>
<td>ḫḥ</td>
<td>ḫḥ</td>
<td>ḫḥ</td>
<td>ḫḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grasp, take</td>
<td>ḫḥzd</td>
<td>ḫḥzd</td>
<td>ḫḥzd</td>
<td>ḫḥzd</td>
<td>ḫḥzd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>ḫḥmek</td>
<td>ḫḥmek</td>
<td>ḫḥmek</td>
<td>ḫḥmek</td>
<td>ḫḥmek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[p]</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ass</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
<td>ḫmr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultivate</td>
<td>ḫḥr</td>
<td>ḫḥr</td>
<td>ḫḥr</td>
<td>ḫḥr</td>
<td>ḫḥr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[h]</td>
<td>ḫḥk</td>
<td>ḫḥk</td>
<td>ḫḥk</td>
<td>ḫḥk</td>
<td>ḫḥk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>ḫḥk</td>
<td>ḫḥk</td>
<td>ḫḥk</td>
<td>ḫḥk</td>
<td>ḫḥk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palace</td>
<td>ḫḥkl</td>
<td>ḫḥkl</td>
<td>ḫḥkl</td>
<td>ḫḥkl</td>
<td>ḫḥkl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This distribution of Ugaritic gutterals is normal; any deviations should be subject to suspicion. Aistleitner suggested that Ugaritic ḏ corresponded to Akkadian ḫ and compared Ugaritic ḫmek "herauserissen" to Akkadian nasētu. Then later, in his lexicon, he suggested Akkadian "niṣū [sic], entfernen." But Akkadian nasū means "to carry, bear" and corresponds to Hebrew nēṣū and is not used in the sense of extirpation. Akkadian nesū, "be removed," is used in this sense and can be compared to Hebrew nēṣū or nēṣah and

---

1 This is the etymological equivalent; sabētu is the semantic equivalent.

2 Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume, (Budapest, 1948) I, p. 213.

3 WUS, #1803.
Ugaritic \( \text{nsc} \).

The view that Ugaritic \( \text{c} \) corresponded etymologically to Akkadian \( h \) must be rejected. If, in fact, a correspondence of this kind is found, we are probably confronted with a loan word.

Likewise, Ugaritic \( h \) does not appear as \( h \) in Akkadian.\(^1\) It only reflects, usually, the vowel change \( a > e \).\(^2\) However, the correspondence of \( h \) to Ugaritic \( h \) would reflect a loan word. An example of this is the word "to cultivate" which is Ugaritic \( \text{krt} \), Hebrew \( \text{haraš} \), and Akkadian \( \text{erēsu} \).\(^3\) But notice the West Semitic loan word \( \text{harašu} \)\(^4\) found in Amarna.

In his attempt to equate Ugaritic \( h \) with Akkadian \( h \), Aistleitner\(^5\) compared Ugaritic \( \text{rbs} \) "to wash" with Akkadian \( \text{rahēsu} \). But \( \text{rahēsu} \) is neither the etymological nor the semantic equivalent of Ugaritic \( \text{rbs} \). The words in Akkadian meaning "to wash" are \( \text{mešā} \) ("to wash part of the body") or \( \text{ramēku} \) meaning "to bathe". Akkadian \( \text{rahēsu} \) (\( \text{irhīs} / \text{irahhīs} \)) means "to flood".\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) One exception to this pattern is found in the word meaning "to hasten" which is Ugaritic \( \text{hs} \) and Hebrew \( \text{hās} \), but Akkadian \( \text{hāšu} \).

\(^2\) \text{CAD}, p. 11, #9a.

\(^3\) \text{CAD}, E, p. 285.

\(^4\) \text{CAD}, H, p. 96.

\(^5\) \text{Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume, I, p. 211.}

\(^6\) There is another \( \text{rahēsu} \) (\( \text{irhīs} / \text{irahhīs} \)) in Akkadian with the meaning "to trust in". Cf. Aramaic \( \text{reḥag} \).
Continuing in his endeavor to compare Ugaritic \( \text{h} \) with Akkadian \( \text{h} \), Aistleitner\(^1\) compared Ugaritic \( \text{hln} \) ("window") with Akkadian \( \text{hilMi} \) but Akkadian \( \text{bIl} \text{hilMi} \)\(^2\) refers to an entire section of a palace and may be Hittite\(^3\) in origin.

Aistleitner also has a section in this same article\(^4\) where he gives examples of Ugaritic \( \text{c} \) corresponding to Arabic \( \text{t} \), but these examples reflect mere speculation. Many of these examples are based upon Ugaritic words which are yet uncertain. It is profitless to conjecture a general meaning for an Ugaritic word and then scout for an Arabic root which has some remote meaning which could be generally related to the general meaning assigned the Ugaritic word. A better use of Arabic for Ugaritic studies is that utilized by M. Bravmann where he, with caution and criticism, studies the Arabic words in context, in early poetry.\(^5\)

The table that follows presents the distribution of these letters which remain unchanged in the various Semitic languages.

\(^{1}\)Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume, I, p. 211.

\(^{2}\)CAD, II, p. 184.

\(^{3}\)Ibid., p. 184.

\(^{4}\)Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume, I, p. 215.

\(^{5}\)"An Arabic Cognate of Ugaritic \( \text{harm} \)," JCS, 7(1953), p. 27.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ugaritic</strong></th>
<th><strong>Arabic</strong></th>
<th><strong>Hebrew</strong></th>
<th><strong>Aramaic</strong></th>
<th><strong>Akkadian</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>king</td>
<td>mlk</td>
<td>mlk</td>
<td>mlk</td>
<td>malku¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talent</td>
<td>kkr</td>
<td>kkr</td>
<td>kkr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest</td>
<td>khn</td>
<td>khn</td>
<td>khn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleave</td>
<td>bq c</td>
<td>(pq')</td>
<td>bq c</td>
<td>bq c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take</td>
<td>lqḥ</td>
<td>lqḥ</td>
<td>lqḥ</td>
<td>leqū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grave</td>
<td>qbr</td>
<td>qbr</td>
<td>qbr</td>
<td>qabru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entreat</td>
<td>mgn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mgn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garden</td>
<td>gn</td>
<td>gn</td>
<td>gn</td>
<td>gn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncover</td>
<td>gly</td>
<td>gly</td>
<td>gly</td>
<td>gly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Sibilants

Ugaritic $\overline{q}$ may represent either *$\overline{s}$* or *$\overline{s}$* as illustrated in the chart below, but Ugaritic has preserved its own sign for *$\overline{q}$*. This $\overline{q}$ corresponds to either *$\overline{s}$* or *$\overline{s}$*.²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>$q\overline{r}$</td>
<td>$q\overline{r}$</td>
<td>$q\overline{r}$</td>
<td>$\overline{q}r$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hunt</td>
<td>$\overline{q}(w)d$</td>
<td>$\overline{q}(w)d$</td>
<td>$\overline{q}wd$</td>
<td>$\overline{q}wd$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rival</td>
<td>$q\overline{r}(r)$</td>
<td>$q\overline{r}$</td>
<td>$q\overline{r}(r)$</td>
<td>$\overline{c}rr$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land</td>
<td>'arq</td>
<td>'r$q$</td>
<td>'r$q$</td>
<td>'r$q/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>livestock</td>
<td>$q'n$</td>
<td>$q'n$</td>
<td>$q'n$</td>
<td>$\overline{c}n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harness</td>
<td>$\overline{q}md$</td>
<td>$\overline{q}md$</td>
<td>$\overline{q}md$</td>
<td>$\overline{q}md$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The semantic equivalent is $\overline{zarru}$.

² Cf. the discussion of $\overline{k}$.

³ Akkadian $\overline{q}$ corresponding to Ugaritic $\overline{g}$ is not expected. Normally, $\overline{g}$ does not appear in Akkadian. Cf. the section on $\overline{g}$.
The rare letter א is not well understood because of the paucity of evidence for study. Very few words use this letter, and most of these words are not clearly understood.

The etymological correspondence of this letter throughout the Semitic languages is unclear and does not seem to follow any perceptible pattern. Since it is found in Hurrian names, it may be related some way to this language. Many personal names have the Hurrian termination -ןיטן ("brother"), which is written -ן in Ugaritic. One such name, 'iwrן, also contains the Hurrian title 'iwr ("Lord").

Sometimes א corresponds to Hebrew and Akkadian א as in the words for "iron" and "he seized." The word א is only found in one passage and its meaning is disputed.

---

1 The Ugaritic personal name פֵּאֶנֶּן is probably equivalent to the well known Hurrian name פ-ה-ש-ט-ה-נ-נ.  
2 For example: תֹּזֵן, פֵּזֵן, פַּזֵּן, פָּזֵן, פִּזֵּן, פִּזָּן, פִּזָּנ, פִּזָּן, פִּזָּן, פִּזָּן, פִּזָּן.  
4 Hebrew barzel, Akkadian parzillu.  
5 Akkadian abēzu (etymological equivalent, semantic equivalent is gabatu), Hebrew 'abaz, Ugaritic 'abd. However, Ugaritic 'ābāz is used in B.H. (=Corpus, 12) II,35,34.  
6 IIIAB, B, 19,35.  
7 H.L. Ginsberg translated פֵּא as "his spoil" (ANET, p. 130), Driver translated it as "his portion" (CML, p. 79).
If it means "gold"\(^1\) and is related to Hebrew \(paz\),\(^2\) it provides another example of Ugaritic \(\mathfrak{x}\) corresponding to Hebrew \(z\). Ugaritic \(\mathfrak{x}\)\(^3\) apparently means "arm"\(^4\) and therefore corresponds to Hebrew zer\(\mathfrak{c}\). If \(\mathfrak{x}\)\(^5\) means 'lettuce'\(^6\) and corresponds to Hebrew hazeret,\(^7\) we have another example of this same correspondence.

On the other hand \(\mathfrak{x}\) may sometimes correspond to Hebrew \(\mathfrak{z}\). Ugaritic \(\mathfrak{x}\), according to contexts, must mean something like "vision, dream" and may be compared to Hebrew \(\mathfrak{z}\). In Job 7:8, \(\mathfrak{z}\) is parallel to \(\mathfrak{r}\)\(^8\)\(\mathfrak{m}\) and in Isaiah 30:11, \(\mathfrak{r}\)\(\mathfrak{m}\) is parallel to \(\mathfrak{h}\)\(\mathfrak{s}\); therefore, \(\mathfrak{z}\) could be considered parallel in meaning to \(\mathfrak{h}\)\(\mathfrak{s}\) ("To envision").

The \(-\mathfrak{m}\) ending on personal names corresponds to Hurrian \(-\mathfrak{m}\)\(\mathfrak{n}\)i ("brother") and would be an example of Ugaritic \(\mathfrak{x}\) corresponding to cuneiform \(\mathfrak{x}\).

The synonymous parallelism\(^7\) of \(\mathfrak{t}\)\(\mathfrak{k}\) and \(\mathfrak{k}\)\(\mathfrak{d}\) ("to long for") in I*AB, 1:16,17 is a clear example of the interchange of \(\mathfrak{x}\) and \(\mathfrak{z}\) within Ugaritic.

---

2Aramaic \(\mathfrak{pizz}\).
3I*AB, 6:20.
4Translation of H.L. Ginsberg, ANET\(^2\), p. 139.
5Corpus, 160:11; 161:15 (Hippiatric texts).
6WUS, #984; Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, p. 395.
Ugaritic 𒅉 includes two different Semitic sibilants. Also Hebrew, Aramaic, and Phoenician use one sign to represent these two different sibilants of 𒅉 and 𒅏. The polyphonic nature of this sign is reflected in the pointing given it by the Tiberian Masoretes; by the use of a diacritical mark, they distinguished the 𒅉 from the 𒅏. In another school of Masoretes, the scholars used a supra-linear system of pointing the biblical manuscripts, and the distinction was simply indicated by placing a small  sesame or  over the original 𒅉/𒅏 sign; the  signifying the sign was to be considered as a 𒅉, and the  indicating the sign should be interpreted as 𒅏. 1 Other evidence, 2 which is pre-Masoretic, also reveals the two different sibilants subsumed in Hebrew 𒅉/𒅏 and Ugaritic 𒅉.

Old South Arabic and Classical Arabic reveal the original sibilants 3 of Ugaritic 𒅉 in any given root or

3 A systematic study of these sibilants was made by Sanford LaSor ("Sibilants in Old South Arabic," JQR, [1957-58], p. 166ff.). Another important discussion of this subject was made by Dorothy Stehle ("Sibilants and Emphatics in South Arabic," JAOS, 60[1940], p. 507ff.").
word, as the table below illustrates.\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSA</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>$\breve{s}$</td>
<td>$\breve{s}$</td>
<td>$\breve{s}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>$\breve{s}$</td>
<td>$\breve{s}$</td>
<td>$\breve{s}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ(^2)</td>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>ñ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples in the table below illustrate the distribution of these three sibilants.

1This transliteration of Old South Arabic (\(\breve{s} = ñ\), \(\check{s} = ñ\), \(\breve{x} = \breve{z}\)) is the same as that used by A.F.L. Beeston, *A Descriptive Grammar of Epigraphic South Arabian*, (London: Luzac and Co., 1962), p. 4.

\(^2\)Old South Arabic.

\(^3\)This word appears in Ugaritic normally as $\breve{\breve{s}}$mm, but an occurrence of $\breve{\breve{s}}$mm is found in ID, 186,192.

\(^4\)Since Arabic $\breve{z}$ is the etymological equivalent of Semitic $\breve{z}$, we use $\breve{z}$ in our transliteration of Arabic. Also in our transliteration of Hebrew we see no point in distinguishing $\breve{y}/\breve{b}$, $\breve{z}/\breve{g}$, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSA</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>drink</td>
<td>sqy</td>
<td>sqy</td>
<td>sqy</td>
<td>ṣaqû1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sun</td>
<td>šmb</td>
<td>šms</td>
<td>šmâ2</td>
<td>šamšu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>left, north</td>
<td>šml</td>
<td>šml</td>
<td>šm'al</td>
<td>šumšlu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>ilit</td>
<td>šlâš</td>
<td>ilit</td>
<td>šalâšu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lift</td>
<td>nê'</td>
<td>nê'</td>
<td>nê'</td>
<td>našû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>root</td>
<td>šrê</td>
<td>šrê</td>
<td>šrê5</td>
<td>šurêu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appoint</td>
<td>šym</td>
<td>šym</td>
<td>šym</td>
<td>šâmû</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these two charts we observe that the Arabic dialects provide the clue as to whether the West Semitic š/ʕ sign or Ugaritic ṣ represents š or ʕ in any given word.

Besides Arabic, Ethiopic will also provide the clue as to whether this polyphonic symbol is to be considered š or ʕ. Ethiopic agrees, as we would expect, with the

---

1 Akkadian ṣaqû means "to give to drink". Hebrew ṣqy is used in the causative stem and also means "to give to drink". Hebrew, Ugaritic, and Akkadian šty all mean "to drink".

2 Instead of the expected Hebrew šmâ, we find šmâ which is the result of the influence of another sibilant in the word. Thus in Hebrew we find šlâš ("three") instead of šlê, šmâ ("sun") instead of šmâ, and šrê ("root") instead of šrê.

3 Mutation of labials is often the result of sibilants in the word. Cf. the section on labials for examples.

4 In this example, it appears that Old South Arabic rather than Ugaritic has preserved the original phonemes. The process of assimilation then took place in Hebrew, Ugaritic, and Classical Arabic. This approach also seems best in view of the phenomenon mentioned in footnote two above.

5 See footnote two.
Arabic representation of these sibilants. But there may
be cases where lexical correspondences which are not avail-
able, or unsure, in Arabic, may be sought in the lexicon of
Ethiopic. Notice the following distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Ethiopic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bed</td>
<td>cᵣš</td>
<td>cᵣš</td>
<td>eršu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten</td>
<td>c₃r</td>
<td>c₃r</td>
<td>ešru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lift</td>
<td>nš</td>
<td>nš'</td>
<td>naša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tooth</td>
<td>šmn</td>
<td>šms</td>
<td>šinnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven</td>
<td>šbᶜ</td>
<td>šbᶜ</td>
<td>sebu²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the reflexes of the South Semitic
languages, we also are able to use the North Semitic
languages of Aramaic and Syriac to guide us in our analysis
of Ugaritic 𒏃, or Hebrew 𐤌/𐤋. Early Aramaic inscriptions do
don't orthographically distinguish the 𐤌 from the 𐤋. However,
in later Aramaic–Syriac, *𐤌 > ḫ but *𐤋 > ḫ/𐤋. The following
table illustrates this phenomenon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Old Aram.</th>
<th>Aram.–Syriac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flesh</td>
<td>bār</td>
<td>bär</td>
<td>bsr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley</td>
<td>š’r</td>
<td>šᶜṛ(t)</td>
<td>šᶜṛ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Ethiopic 𐤌 corresponds to Arabic ُ and Hebrew 𐤋; 艨
Ethiopic 𐤋 corresponds to Arabic 𐤋 and Hebrew 𐤌 (S. Moscati, ed., An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the
²šab in Old Assyrian (SAG, p. 91, #69b).
³S. Moscati, op. cit., p. 44.
Therefore, a study of the reflex in Young Aramaic or Syriac will enable one to determine the original sibilant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Young Aramaic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hate</td>
<td>ūnʾ</td>
<td>ānʾ</td>
<td>snʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten</td>
<td>ʾsr</td>
<td>ĕr</td>
<td>ʾsr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoary</td>
<td>ʾb</td>
<td>ʾb</td>
<td>ʾb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>ʾb</td>
<td>ʾb</td>
<td>ʾb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The polyphonic nature of this sibilant is also related to the problem of dialect. Among the Canaanites there were various dialects as illustrated in chapter twelve, verse six of the book of Judges. This story relates how the Ephraimites could only speak sibbuleṯ, when they were requested to speak sibbuleṯ. This narrative illustrates the dialectal nature of this sibilant ס/ש.

Another illustration of the dialectal nature of this phoneme is found in a source which pre-dates the Masoretic tradition by two millennia. In the Amarna letters emanating from Jerusalem, we are able to witness a distinction between ס and ש. These letters used ג for Hebrew ס: ycrṭnḥlāyim ("Jerusalem") was written u-ru-se-lim; bêt šēn

---


2 Zellig Harris, Development of the Canaanite Dialects (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1939), p. 34.

3 PA, 289:14; 287:25.
("Beth-shan") was written bit-se-e-ni;¹ *lukīš* ("Lachish") was written la-ki-si.² However, these same Amarna letters use 𒈨 for "š; *ēšeh* ("field") was written še-te-e;³ *ēšir* ("Seir") was written še-e-ri.⁴ In Jerusalem, during the Amarna period, apparently a phonetic distinction was observed between š and š, although they were always written with the same sign in the Northwest Semitic script.

Later, the phonetic similarity between š and š caused them to be confused. In languages, any given phoneme will undergo variations in pronunciation depending where and by whom it is used. The abundance of sibilants in Canaanite caused confusion between the š and š. Hence, the Masorah listed eighteen instances of words with š in place of š; the reverse, substitution of š for š is rare.⁵

Besides this cuneiform evidence from Amarna, we also find the distinction between š and š in East Semitic. The abundance of sibilants in East Semitic has also presented difficulty and frustration to a complete, systematic analysis. Also the cuneiform system of writing sibilants has presented an obstacle to clear and accurate

²⁴EA, 288:45.
³⁴EA, 287:56.
⁴⁴EA, 288:26.
classification. Jussi Aro and Albrecht Goetze have both written articles dealing with this specific problem.\(^1\)

The Akkadians, who used a Semitic language, borrowed the Sumerian script, which represented a non-Semitic language, for the writing of their Akkadian. The Sumerian system of writing was an inadequate vehicle for expressing the Akkadian phonemic system. But on the basis of a systematic study of the Old Akkadian dialect,\(^2\) we have long known that a $\ddot{s}$ phoneme existed in East Semitic.\(^3\) In his Akkadian syllabary,\(^4\) W. von Soden listed twelve syllables beginning with the $\ddot{s}$ phoneme. Since Sumerian did not possess such a Semitic phoneme, syllables beginning with Sumerian $s$ are used to represent Semitic $\ddot{s}$. There is one example where Sumerian $\ddot{u}d$ is used to represent Akkadian $\ddot{s}u$.\(^5\) In fact, Goetze believed that southern Old Babylonian represents or reflects

\(^1\)Jussi Aro, "Die Semitischen Zischlaute ($\ddot{a}$), $\ddot{e}$, $\ddot{i}$, $\ddot{u}$ und ihre Vertretung im Akkadischen," Orientalia, 28(1959), p. 321; Albrecht Goetze, "The Sibilants of Old Babylonian," RA, 52(1958), p. 137.

\(^2\)GAG, p. 29, #30. Also see the discussion of I. J. Gelb, Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 36.

\(^3\) $\ddot{s}$ was written in Old Babylonian with $\ddot{u}$ but in Old Akkadian with $s$; "lips" Hebrew $\ddot{s}\ddot{a}\ddot{p}\ddot{u}$, Old Babylonian $\ddot{u}\ddot{a}\ddot{p}\ddot{u}$, but Old Akkadian $\ddot{u}\ddot{a}\ddot{p}\ddot{u}$. For more examples see Orientalia, NS 28(1959), p. 330.


\(^5\)Ibid., p. 67.
not only ָא, ָי, ַע, ָע, ַע, but also what he calls ָס. ¹

The sibilant ָס is consistently distributed throughout the Semitic languages as ָס, as demonstrated on the chart at the beginning of the section on sibilants. In contrast to Hebrew, I know of no case in Ugaritic where Ugaritic ָס is confused with ֶס (represented in Ugaritic by ֶל). In the later stages of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Phoenician languages, ָס and ָס are sometimes confused. Ugaritic ָס does sometimes appear written with the ֶל sign as indicated in the following discussion.

The very rare ֶל sign in Ugaritic is used in only a few words and represents etymological ָס. Logically, one would expect the transliteration ָל, representing Hebrew שֶׁסֶק-תָּו, for this phoneme. But to distinguish this sign from ָל (Hebrew ש), and to agree with the transliteration used in Herdner's new corpus of texts, ֶל is used in this dissertation. Two easily recognized words using this sign are בָּשֵׁי ("horse") and בָּשֵׁי ("throne"), both acknowledged loan words. The word בָּשֵׁי is an Indo-European loan word and בָּשֵׁי is a loan word from Sumerian.²

The word for "throne" is predominantly spelled בָּשֵׁי, and the spelling בָּשֵׁי appears only in Corpus, 33:7, in a

---


²Sumerian GU.ZA > Old Akkadian kussâu > kussû. Hebrew kÎšâ'.
broken context.\(^1\) Also the word for "horse" is found spelled either ššw or š-sw. When a word has such variant spellings, the spelling with the \(\hat{s}\) sign normally appears in non-poetic texts.\(^2\)

The word prš (or prš) is found only in the economic texts.\(^3\) The spelling prš denotes a quantity of measure, probably one-half,\(^4\) and is used with qmr\(^5\) ("flour"),\(^6\)

\(h\text{m} \) ("wheat"),\(^8\) and qlbm.\(^9\)

Ugaritic spšg ("glaze")\(^10\) is also spelled š]pšg.\(^11\)

A number of personal names from Ugarit contain this š: \(\hat{s}\rn\) \(^12\)

---

\(^1\) Our references to Ugaritic texts will be directly based upon the corpus of texts by A. Neher. In this dissertation, references to texts not found in this Corpus will be clearly designated by either their number in FRU or their place of original publication.

\(^2\) Thus, ššw appears in FRU, II, 12:24, 32, 38; 123:5; V, 49:4, 7; 64R:16, 18; Corpus, 160:2, 4, 6, 10; 161:21, 32.

\(^3\) WUS, #2273.


\(^5\) FRU, V, 36:1.

\(^6\) Hebrew qemah.

\(^7\) FRU, II, 146:5.

\(^8\) Hebrew hittah.


\(^10\) IID, 6:36. In Proverbs 26:23 read kšpsag(m), "like glaze."

\(^11\) FRU, II, 106:8.

\(^12\) FRU, II, 146:7; Corpus, 102:III:2.
is found as well as \( \text{srn} \), along with the cuneiform spelling \( \text{sú-ra-nu} \). The personal name \( \text{hpsry} \) is also spelled \( \text{hpsry} \). The name \( \text{arsw} \) is also spelled \( \text{arsw} \) and \( \text{arswn} \) is found also as \( \text{arswn} \). In one text, we find the following personal names using \( \text{b} \): \( \text{ab1, alyyn, arsaw,} \) and \( \text{brsm} \); furthermore, many other names spelled with \( \text{b} \) are attested in other texts.

The letter \( \text{b} \) is well known from Arabic \( \text{b} \), with which it corresponds, as the following table demonstrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>place</td>
<td>( \text{'str} )</td>
<td>( \text{'tr} )</td>
<td>( \text{'šr} )</td>
<td>( \text{'tr} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultivate</td>
<td>( \text{hrt} )</td>
<td>( \text{hrt} )</td>
<td>( \text{hrš} )</td>
<td>( \text{hrt} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snake</td>
<td>( \text{btn} )</td>
<td>( \text{bšn} )</td>
<td>( \text{ptn} )</td>
<td>( \text{bašmu} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. \( \text{Corpus, 83:3; 119:1:42.} \)
2. \( \text{PRU, III, 16.257:IV:19; 15.42:II:26; 15.09:A:9.} \)
3. \( \text{PRU, II, 41:2.} \)
4. \( \text{PRU, II, 140:2.} \)
5. \( \text{Corpus, 87:6; 113:II:14.} \)
6. \( \text{PRU, II, 62:5; Corpus, 86:2.} \)
7. \( \text{PRU, II, 77:9.} \)
9. \( \text{Corpus, 113.} \)
10. \( \text{This name also appears in Corpus, 99R:1, 87:6; PRU, II, 62:5.} \)
11. \( \text{Possibly preserved in Deut. 33:22 and Ps. 68:23.} \)
12. \( \text{Cf. p. 35.} \)
13. \( \text{ptn in Hebrew is an Aramaic loan word.} \)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eight</td>
<td>īmn</td>
<td>īmn</td>
<td>ʾāmn</td>
<td>tmny</td>
<td>(samānd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife, female</td>
<td>ʾtt</td>
<td>ʾnt</td>
<td>ʾnṯ</td>
<td>ʾntt</td>
<td>aššatu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this table we observe that Ugaritic ʿ appears as ʿ in Aramaic, but as ʾ in Hebrew and Akkadian.

A variety of transcriptions³ had been used for the sign which I write as ʿ; however, at the present time ʿ is commonly used.⁴ This sibilant corresponds to Arabic ʿ(ṣ).

In the text, B.H.,⁵ we find two cases of Ugaritic ʿ corresponding to *ḏ. The word ʾḥq ("laugh") corresponds to Arabic ʾḥk, and Akkadian ʾḥḥu.⁶ Also in the text B.H. we find Ugaritic ʾḥʿa ("go out") which represents *ḏʿ. Old South Arabic reveals ḫʿ but Ethiopic ḫʿ apparently represents the original as confirmed by the Aramaic reflex of ʾḥʿ; *ḏ normally appears as ḫ in Aramaic while *ḏ appears as ʾ or ʿ. Normally, *ḏ appears in Ugaritic as ʿ.

---

²Vololleaud ʿ, Bauer ʾ, Contineau ʿ, etc.
³Virolesaud ʾ, Bauer ʾ, Contineau ʿ, etc.
⁴Aistleitner, Gordon, Ginsberg, Held.
⁵Corpus, 12.
⁶GAD, ʾ, p. 64.

¹GAD, p. 91, #69b.
The following table shows the distribution of Ugaritic glyphs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>enclosure</td>
<td>ḫsr</td>
<td>ḫṣr²</td>
<td>ḫṣr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>summer</td>
<td>q(y)ʃ</td>
<td>qṣ</td>
<td>qṣ</td>
<td>qṣ†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bone</td>
<td>ʃm</td>
<td>ʃm</td>
<td>ʃm</td>
<td>cṯm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thirst</td>
<td>ʃm'</td>
<td>ʃm'</td>
<td>ʃm'</td>
<td>ʃm'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrow</td>
<td>ḫš</td>
<td>ḫšt</td>
<td>ḫš</td>
<td>ḫš</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next to the glyph,  is the most rare sign employed in Ugaritic writing; possibly this is because * is also represented in Ugaritic by the  glyph.²

Some Ugaritic words which are normally spelled with a  are spelled with a  in the B.H. (Corpus, 12) text.³

Canaanite and Akkadian words containing  may reflect *, *, or * ⁴. In most cases the Aramaic reveals the original phoneme. In Aramaic, * > ʃ; * > ʃ/ʃ; and * remained  ⁴. Harris believed this development in Hebrew and Phoenician of * >  took place at about the same time as in Ugaritic.⁴ Since Ugaritic has a separate sign for ²

---


² Cf. the section on ².

³ ḫš', ʃm', ʃh', ʃm². These words are consistently spelled with a  in all other texts.

but not for \textit{d}, the Canaanite shift of \textit{d} > \textit{s} took place before the existing Ugaritic alphabet.

Before concluding our discussion of \textit{z}, a few remarks should be made on the interchange of \textit{ms'a}, \textit{ms'a}, \textit{ms'y} - "to find, to reach." In Hebrew, \textit{ms'} often means "to find" in the sense of "to arrive at a place or to reach a place." Thus the Israelites in Exodus 15:22 did not "find" water, meaning they did not "arrive" at any water sources. Very often this word is used in the sense of "finding" favor or "arriving" at a position or state of favor before another.

Ugaritic \textit{ms'} is found only in the text called B.B. (\textit{Corpus}, 12); \textit{ms'y} is the regular Ugaritic spelling of this word, and \textit{ms'} appears only once.\footnote{\textit{IAB}, 5:4, according to \textit{WUS}, #1634 and \textit{UM}, #1145.} But it is questionable if \textit{ms'} is actually attested since the tablet is slightly broken. In fact, in her new edition of this text, Herdner restored \textit{msh}\footnote{\textit{Corpus}, p. 41, n. 9.} and compared this line with that found in VAB, E, 9 where \textit{msh} is used with \textit{'arg}. These lines in VAB, E, 9 are also adjacent to a broken section of the tablet, and this \textit{'imsh} is a restoration of Cassuto and Gordon.\footnote{\textit{Corpus}, p. 18, n. 6.} The verb \textit{msh} ("to kick") occurs only one other
time, in IAB, 6:20.¹ This leaves mg’a as the only variant of mg in these two words is not normal in Ugaritic.

The Liquids

The liquids l, n, s in Ugaritic are consistently distributed throughout the Semitic languages as the chart below shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td>lb(b)</td>
<td>lb(b)</td>
<td>lb</td>
<td>libbu²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bricks</td>
<td>lbnt</td>
<td>lbnt</td>
<td>lbnt</td>
<td>libnitu³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to dress</td>
<td>lbš</td>
<td>lbš</td>
<td>lbš</td>
<td>labššu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wing</td>
<td>knp</td>
<td>knp</td>
<td>knp</td>
<td>kanpu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>mny</td>
<td>mny</td>
<td>mny</td>
<td>mana₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garment</td>
<td>ktn</td>
<td>ktn</td>
<td>ktn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myrrh</td>
<td>mr(r)</td>
<td>mr</td>
<td>mr(r)</td>
<td>murru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head</td>
<td>r'iš</td>
<td>r's</td>
<td>r'iš</td>
<td>rašu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ride</td>
<td>rkb</td>
<td>rkb</td>
<td>rkb</td>
<td>rakšbu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metathesis of r is observed on the word "be hungry"
Ugaritic rkb but Akkadian berā.

Gordon mentioned the dropping of final r in certain

¹See the translation of H. L. Ginsberg in ANET², p. 141.
²Etymological equivalent.
³For variants see AHw, p. 551.
instances. However, an examination of these passages reveals nothing of significance; they are probably due to scribal errors.

As in Hebrew, the l of lqā assimilates in the yqāl form. For example, lqā ("I will take") and yqā ("he will take"). Note also the imperative form qā. 4

As in Hebrew, Ugaritic prima-n verbs assimilate the n in their yqāl forms. 5

In the imperative forms, as in Hebrew, the prima-n is omitted, e.g. ś'ā ("lift your hands"). 6 Verbs, final-n do not present assimilation, in the qaI form when it has a sufformative beginning with a consonant. Thus we find forms like mgntm 7 ("you entreat"). This is the same as in Hebrew, except for the verb ntn; in this word, the final nun does not assimilate to consonantal sufformatives. For evidence of this, Gordon 8 cited the example ytnūt ("you gave")

---

1 UM, #5:24.
2 IK, 204.
3 VAB, A, 15; ID, 145.
4 IIAB, 2:32; IIK, 1-2:41.

A characteristic of Amorite is that the n in this position is not assimilated (BASOR, 168(1962), p. 26; 73 (1939), p. 10; 86(1942), p. 30; 89(1943), p. 31). In contrast to Amorite, Ugaritic follows the Canaanite pattern.

6 IK, 75.
7 IIAB, 3:30.
8 UM, p. 69, n. 2.
found in IAB, 6:14.

The Three Aleph Signs

A peculiarity of Ugaritic is the employment of three different signs to indicate the single consonant aleph. Each sign represents aleph plus one of the three early Semitic vowels, a, i, or u. In a few cases, as discussed below, the aleph sign may not include the representation of a vowel. Bauer wrote, in 1936, that any one of the three aleph signs could be used to indicate vowelless aleph, but that usually 'a was used. Writing even earlier, in 1934, H. L. Ginsberg and B. Maisler had expressed the view that the aleph sign indicates the following vowel, except when there is no vowel, in which case the 'a sign is used. Previous to this, Friedrich had suggested that the aleph sign could indicate the preceding vowel as well as the following vowel. He believed the choice of aleph sign was based upon the neighboring vowel. But when we observe forms like Ugaritic g'īn⁴ (ša'nu)⁵ we should expect it to be written in

---

²JPOS, 14(1934), p. 250.
³ZA, MP 7(1933), p. 307.
⁴Hebrew šā'ın ("small livestock").
⁵Arabic ḥa'nu.
Ugaritic as *g'an*, according to Friedrich, if the aleph sign designates the neighboring vowel. To circumvent this difficulty, Z. Harris propounded the theory that in such words, the shift $a \to i$ had already taken place.¹ Harris gave several examples but they do not confirm his theory. Furthermore, this shift (attenuation), is a late phenomenon and we would not expect it at such an early date as that of Ugaritic.

It is safe to state that the aleph sign indicates the following vowel, and in cases where aleph closes the syllable, the aleph *i* sign is used. The few possible exceptions to this pattern can best be explained on the basis of vowel harmony.

In the following list of nouns, the initial aleph sign indicates vocalization in agreement with the ancient vocalization preserved in the Akkadian words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'abn</td>
<td>abnu</td>
<td>&quot;stone&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ugr</td>
<td>ugšru</td>
<td>&quot;field&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'lp</td>
<td>alpu</td>
<td>&quot;ox&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'irt</td>
<td>ištu</td>
<td>&quot;breast&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'išt</td>
<td>iššatu</td>
<td>&quot;fire&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'išd</td>
<td>iššu</td>
<td>&quot;foundation&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'atnt</td>
<td>atšnu</td>
<td>&quot;she-ass&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'arb</td>
<td>arbašu</td>
<td>&quot;four&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ab</td>
<td>abu</td>
<td>&quot;father&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹JAOS, 57(1937), p. 151.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'amt</td>
<td>antu</td>
<td>&quot;handmaiden&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'amt</td>
<td>annatu</td>
<td>(a measurement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'um</td>
<td>ummu</td>
<td>&quot;mother&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'imr</td>
<td>immeru</td>
<td>&quot;lamb&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'any</td>
<td>anayl</td>
<td>&quot;boat&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ap</td>
<td>appu</td>
<td>&quot;nose&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'att</td>
<td>aššatu</td>
<td>&quot;wife&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ugaritic and Akkadian vocalization of the initial syllable do not concur in the following three nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'ušk</td>
<td>išku</td>
<td>&quot;testicle&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'uṣpt</td>
<td>išpatu</td>
<td>&quot;quiver&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'iqn'u</td>
<td>uqnu</td>
<td>&quot;precious stone&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first two words 'ušk and 'uṣpt both appear in Akkadian with an "i" vowel but Hebrew seems to reflect an *a vowel. The statement that Hebrew reflects *a is based on the comparison of 'esēk < *ašku just as Hebrew melek < *malku, therefore 'espān < *ašpatu.

In the following nouns, the aleph-vocalization of the original medial open syllables agrees with the vocalization preserved or reconstructed in the corresponding Semitic words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
<th>Assyrian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g'eqn</td>
<td>hem'āh</td>
<td>himatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;pride&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;butter&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;butter&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2[CAD](, H, p. 189).
"vulture" Ugaritic participle $d^h'i^u < d'ay$ ("to fly").

"messenger" Ugaritic "maqtalu" form of $l'ak$ ("to send").

The following words represent examples of aleph used as the closing consonant of closed syllables where it is, of course, vowelless.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$d'i^u$</td>
<td>*$\bar{s}a'n\u$</td>
<td>$\bar{d}a'nu$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l'ak$</td>
<td>*$\bar{r}a'\u$</td>
<td>$\bar{r}a'su$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{s}'ir$</td>
<td>*$\bar{s}a'\u$</td>
<td>Akkadian $\tilde{s}'iru$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In such words as the above, Harris and some others would consider the aleph as perhaps indicating the preceding vowel. But, as I shall demonstrate in verbal forms also, the 'ı sign regularly is used for the vowelless aleph. In such considerations we can only judge on the basis of comparative studies. It is possible that Ugaritic may have been vocalized quite independently from the same word in other Semitic languages but this seems unlikely and we must operate on the basis of the information we do possess.

The following words illustrate examples of nouns, in the nominative case, ending in aleph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ugaritic</th>
<th>Akkadian</th>
<th>Old Akkadian</th>
<th>Akkadian $lal'u$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$k\tilde{s}'u$</td>
<td>&quot;dais&quot;</td>
<td>*$kussa'\u$</td>
<td>$kuss\bar{u}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s\bar{b}'u$</td>
<td>&quot;warrior&quot;</td>
<td>*$\bar{z}bi'\u$</td>
<td>(participle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l'l'u$</td>
<td>&quot;kid,lamb&quot;</td>
<td>*$lal'\u$</td>
<td>$lal'u$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Akkadian $lal\u$ is hyper-poetic for "kid". The semantic equivalent is $\bar{p}uh\bar{d}u$. 
Nouns ending in aleph reflect the three Semitic case endings: nominative ם, genitive י, and accusative א.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ksb'</td>
<td>tødö</td>
<td>(IAB, 4-5:103)</td>
<td>&quot;a throne is placed&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lks'</td>
<td></td>
<td>(IAB, 6:12)</td>
<td>&quot;from the throne&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyhpk</td>
<td>ks'a</td>
<td>(IAB, 6:28)</td>
<td>&quot;he will surely overturn the throne&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wq'</td>
<td>sb'u, sh'i</td>
<td>(IK 86)</td>
<td>&quot;and let the host of the army go out&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original vocalization of the following two words is uncertain: Ugaritic p'at² ("border, edge") appears in Akkadian as patu/pattu. The Ugaritic word p'it³ ("forehead") is found in Akkadian as p'tu. In the Hebrew Bible these words were confused and both appear as Hebrew p't'Ah which must mean "forehead" in Leviticus 13:41, 19:27 but "border, edge" in Leviticus 19:9 and Joshua 13:14.

Ugaritic r'um ("bison") is found in Hebrew as re'om/r'm,⁴ in Arabic as ri'um, and Aramaic as raymah, and Akkadian r'umu.

The two aleph signs ם and י are also used to designate the nature of initial *diphthongs, 'ם = ə < *aw and 'י = ə < *ay.

¹Notice the final י on the verb indicating the jussive.

²IK, 105,193; E.H. 1:35; S.S. 68.
³IID, 2:9, and in a mutilated context in Corpus #13:15.
⁴Cf. the Hebrew personal name re'āmāh in Genesis 22:24.
"either, or"

"sorrow, trouble"

"gift"

"why"

"no, not"

"where"

These examples of the gtl verbal forms containing alephs are as we would expect.

*nš'a (naš'a) 7

kl'at (kala'at)

*nš'u (naš'û)

'aḥd (‘aḥad

"he lifted"

"she closed"

"they lifted"

"he took"

1Arabic tends to preserve diphthongs but in Akkadian *aw > u and *ay > i (GAC, #11a). Also to the list of occurrences of this word Aistleitner collected (WUS, #3) should be added IIAB, 7:43.

2This root may be found in the Hebrew name yēhôš’āš (Cf. M. Noth, Die israelitischen Personennamen, p. 171).

3Diphthongs followed two patterns in Hebrew: they could monophthongize, e.g. *mawtu > mōt ("death"), or an anaptyctic vowel could be used, e.g. *mawtu > mawet ("death").

4By metathesis (GAG, #11b, 118a).

5Notice again that y is preserved in Ugaritic when it is followed by a second y, as in 'ayyalu ("deer").

6AHW, p. 23.

These forms are reconstructed on the basis of comparative Semitic linguistics. Such early Canaanite forms have been attested in the Amarna letters.
Aistleitner\(^1\) considered s'id as a D-stem. This seems unlikely since the qatal form of this word is ta'ad;\(^2\) the qatal of the D-stem should be ta'id for *tasa':idu.* It seems best, therefore, to interpret sa'ida as the qatal and tis'adu as the qatal of the G-stem.\(^3\)

The following few examples illustrate the use of the aleph in the qatal forms.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{y'iḥd} (ya'ḥidu)\(^4\) "he seizes" IAB, 5:1
  \item \textit{t'iḳl} (ti'kalu)\(^5\) "(fire) consumes" IIAB, 6:24
  \item \textit{yš'u} (yišša'u)\(^6\) "he lifted" IIK, 6:15,40
  \item \textit{y'itbd} (yi'ṭabidu) "(family) is destroyed" IK, 24,8
  \item \textit{tṛḥš} (tirtaḥšu) "you wash yourself" IK, 62
  \item \textit{y'adム} (ya'addimu)\(^7\) "he rouged himself" IK, 156
  \item \textit{tl'u'an} (tal'u'anna) "(sleep) prevails" IK, 33
\end{itemize}

\(^1\)\textit{WUS}, #1879.

\(^2\)\textit{ID}, 5:30.

\(^3\)Cf. Hebrew *ša'ila* and *yiš'alu* for *ša'ila* "I asked" (I Samuel 1:20) and *yiš'al* (Exodus 22:13).

\(^4\)Vocalization based on the Hebrew *yaqtilu* pattern of this word.

\(^5\)Vocalization based on the Hebrew *yaqtilu* pattern of this word.

\(^6\)\textit{Ibid}.

\(^7\)D-stem.
Examples of aleph in the imperative forms are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Imp. form</th>
<th>Bib. Ref.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʾšʾu</td>
<td>'ilm</td>
<td>IIIAB, B,27</td>
<td>(ʾšʾu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾšʾa</td>
<td>ydk</td>
<td>IK, 75</td>
<td>(ʾšʾa)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 'irš | ʾyhm | IID, 6:26,27 | ('errišu) 

In the qatl verbal forms of final aleph verbs, the third masculine singular always terminates in aleph-ā, but in the third masculine singular forms of the qatl, any one of the three aleph signs may be used. This has led to the conclusion that the Ugaritic qatl may represent three different moods, known as indicative (ʾyaṣṭula), subjunctive (ʾyaṣṭul), and volitive-jussive (ʾyaṣṭul). There may be some truth in this supposition but the details have never been worked out. It is true that final aleph verbs of the qatl usually terminate in aleph-ā, although forms ending in aleph-ā, and least often, aleph-ā are also attested. An analysis has not revealed any definite semantic patterns from these forms but this may be explained by the fact that we are working primarily with poetic texts. Perhaps as more non-literary texts are studied, a semantic pattern will appear.

---

1 This is a D-stem imperative whose first vowel is influenced by the second vowel which is i. When there is another a vowel in the word, we do not find this: ṣḥ t'arš (ta'arrīšu) "What do you request" (VAB, E, 36; IAB,2:14).

2 This subject is discussed in detail in our section on the qatl forms of the Ugaritic verb.
Since, except for the aleph signs, the nature of the Ugaritic vowel is not revealed in the script, we must vocalize the texts on the basis of vocalization derived from comparative Semitic studies. Akkadian writing preserves the vowels and helps us in many cases. Arabic is very conservative and also reveals the three original Semitic vowels, but Hebrew is of primary significance for the vocalization of Canaanite. Unfortunately, the vocalization of our Hebrew Bible was written in quite late and reflects a complicated, elaborate system of approximating the traditional vocalization used by the scribes of that particular time. This Masoretic vocalization was based on tradition and not on a scientific endeavor to ascertain the original vocalic structure of the language; therefore, we must go back beyond this tradition, while at the same time deriving our primary clues from it.

Besides our information provided by the aleph signs, the presence of a vowel can also be indicated by the $w$ or $y$ which is preserved only when it is found in an inter-vocalic position, or when it is doubled.\(^1\)

Whether a vowel is to be considered long or short must be based upon the analysis of the form of the word, e.g., if a word is analyzed as a participle, it would be vocalized as qetilu, a form based upon comparative Semitic

\(^1\)For examples, see the section on dipthongs.
linguistics.

The nature or class of the vowel is also determined by comparison with the other Semitic languages. Whether Ugaritic contained the "colored" vowel ą is unknown for certain but it is very likely in view of the vocalization preserved in the syllabic writing of personal names. However, in this study ą is used only to indicate diphthongal *ay > ą. Ugaritic also used diphthongal ą < *aw in addition to the vowels ą, ą, ą.

The infixed ą in certain words has been a problem which remains without a satisfactory explanation. Thus, the word for "city" is normally spelled ąr but is also possibly found as ąrāt. Ugaritic ąrā is in IX, 32,34 means "sleep" and is probably related to Hebrew ąm. Also the word for "dream, vision" ąhāt, seems to be related to Hebrew ądr. It is interesting to note, in connection with this, that medial ą in such Hebrew words sometimes corresponds to Aramaic ą. For example, note Hebrew ąnā ("run") and ąnā ("be ashamed"), but these same words in Aramaic are spelled ąn and ąnt.

In noun forms in Soqotri, a similar use of ą seems

---

1WUS, #2462. For additional examples, see the list in PRU, V, p. 153.
2PRU, II, 147:1 and perhaps also in PRU, II, 173:2-3.
3IK, 36.
4Numbers 23:9, 24:17.
to be found; Leslau explains this phenomenon on the basis of hiatus.\textsuperscript{1} This same kind of $h$ had been pointed out earlier in South Arabic by Rhodokanakis.\textsuperscript{2}

The infixed $v$ in the variants for "assembly", \textit{phyr}$^3$ or \textit{phyr}$^4$ and "city", \textit{grt}$^5$ or \textit{qryt}$^6$ remains enigmatic. The word \textit{grt} is in the construct state\textsuperscript{7} whereas \textit{qryt} is in the absolute state. The infixed $h$ or $v$ may be a ballast device but we need more examples in order to make a thorough study.

**Ugaritic Diphthongs**

Diphthongs consist of a vowel and $v$ or $w$. They are classified as either descending (vowel followed by consonant) or ascending (consonant followed by vowel). Descending diphthongs have been preserved in Arabic but were monophthongised in the Canaanite dialects. Since Ugaritic script does not show vowels or diphthongs, our evaluation must be based upon comparison with Arabic and

---

\textsuperscript{1} W. Leslau, \textit{Lexique Sogotri (sudarabique moderne)}, Paris, 1938, p. 22.


\textsuperscript{3} \textit{WUS}, #2215. Akkadian \textit{pubru}.

\textsuperscript{4} \textit{PRU}, II, 144:3; \textit{IK}, 25.

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{WUS}, #2462.


\textsuperscript{7} \textit{ID}, 163, 164, 165.
Hebrew.

In descending diphthongs with homogeneous vowels, the vowel was merely lengthened (i.e., it became a monophthong) e.g., iy > i, uw > u. In descending diphthongs with heterogeneous vowels, usually the vowel was lengthened, e.g., uy > u, iw > u. In a word like ḫwːrōt ("blind") in Isaiah 42:7, we must remember that the y in this word is actually doubled although the Hebrew text does not always show it. Originally, "blind" was ḫwɔwɔru and monophthongization did not occur when w or y was doubled. The remaining descending diphthongs are *ay > e, and *aw > ą.

In transcribing Hebrew it is customary to use the circumflex to indicate *diphthongs > monophthongs, and also pure or original long vowels and reserve the macron for tone long vowels. Unfortunately there is no absolutely uniform system for transcribing the vocalization of the Semitic languages. Since tone lengthening is not an important issue at this juncture of Ugaritic studies, we will use the macron for indicating both *diphthongs > monophthongs, and pure long vowels.

The following passages will demonstrate where

---

1. C. Bergsträsser, Hebraische Grammatik, I, p. 97, #17 e,f.

2. Ugaritic ūy "deer" and Hebrew āyyūl and Akkadian āyyalu.
monophthongs have developed in the verbal forms.

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{gatl} & \text{bnt} & \text{bn} \\
\text{you (pl.) entreated} & \text{I built} & \text{build!} \\
\text{VIIA, 3:31} & \text{IIAB, 6:36} & \text{IIAB, 4-5:80} \\
\text{klt} & \text{gaztm} & \text{(gaz&stem)} \\
\text{I destroyed} & \text{you (pl.) entreated} & \text{IIAB, 3:31} \\
\text{VAB, D, 36}
\end{array}
\]

The following passages will illustrate some
*diphthongs > monophthongs in nominal forms.

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text{bt} & \text{qaz} & \text{tld} \\
\text{house, dynasty} & \text{summer} & \text{she gives birth} \\
\text{ID, 18}
\end{array}
\]

1 Cf. ban\text{ti} in EA, 292:25.
2 This is considered a D-stem in analogy to Hebrew usage.
3 We know from Akkadian and Arabic that this word was originally a \text{prima\-\text{w}} verb, but in analogy to Hebrew, we vocalize it on the basis of the \text{prima\-\text{y}} verb. Hebrew reveals a yaqtilu (y\text{\text{\&}led}) vocalization form for this word.
4 Since the diphthong \text{\text{\&}} is medial between the a vowel and the i vowel, it is sometimes indicated in Ugaritic by 'a and sometimes by 'i.
5 I take this final 'i as indicating the shortened form of the \text{yatl} with the vowelless ending.
6 Hebrew b\text{ayit}. Akkadian b\text{\text{\&}tu}.
7 Hebrew g\text{ayig}, Amarna q\text{\text{\&}e\text{-}zi} (EA, 131:15).
Ugaritic spelling reveals consonantal 𐤇 or 𐤈. Here are some cases of consonantal 𐤇 or 𐤈 in verbal forms:

'iq 'atut ('atiwat) qnyt 'ilm, "Why has the progenitress of the gods come?"; hyn 𐤇ly (𐤈laya), "Hyn ascended."

In the participles we find such forms as: bny (bāniyu) bhwšt, "Creator of creatures"; qnyt (gāniyatu) 'ilm, "Progenitress of the gods."

Consonantal 𐤇 or 𐤈 is attested in the following nouns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'ayl</td>
<td>(ayyalu) &quot;deer&quot;</td>
<td>IAB, 1:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hwt</td>
<td>(hawštū) &quot;word&quot;</td>
<td>I*AB, 1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫy</td>
<td>(ẖayyu) &quot;alive, living&quot;</td>
<td>IAB, 3-4:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'abyñ</td>
<td>(aḇyānu) &quot;poor, wretched&quot;</td>
<td>Corpus, 94:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mryn</td>
<td>(maryanu) &quot;charioteer&quot;</td>
<td>Corpus, 82:7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Hebrew 𐤇ayin, Akkadian Ónu.
2 IIAB, 4-5:32.
3 IIAB, 1:24.
4 IAB, 3:5.
5 IIAB, 3:30.
6 IAB, 1:24.
7 I*AB, 1:13.
8 IAB, 3-4:2.
tūnîy( tūnîyyatu) "victory" VAB, B, 27
'al'îy(n) ('al'îyânu) "Prevailing One" IAB, 1:12, 14, 19,

'al'îy(n) is the epithet of Baal which is found frequently in the Baal epic. This word is derived from the Ugaritic verb l'y ("to be able, to prevail"). The aleph is a prefix found also in other Semitic languages and may be compared in this case, to the Arabic elative. The -nu suffix is sometimes found on substantives derived from verbs, e.g. Hebrew re'âmôn ("hunger"), and zikkārôn ("memorial"). The adjective form, 'al'îy, is found without the substantive ending.

---

1 Cf. Hebrew tūnîyyâ(ḥ). The meaning of something like victory is evidenced in such passages as Job 12:16 and Proverbs 2:7. Driver and Ginsberg try to make this word a verb but the l would not show in the verbal form.

2 For examples in Hebrew, see BL, p. 437.
PART III  MORPHOLOGY

CHAPTER IV

THE NOUNS

Gender

Like the other Semitic languages, Ugaritic has only the two genders of masculine and feminine. The masculine singular does not have a morphological indicator of gender but is ascertained on the basis of its usage; however, the masculine plural ending is clearly indicated with terminative -m. Masculine nouns in Hebrew are sometimes found with the -3t feminine plural ending. Notice such Hebrew masculine nouns as 'ab ("father") which regularly has the feminine plural ending, *'abbot; dôr ("generation") which appears in the plural as dôrôt (although the masculine plural -im ending is also attested);¹ levil or levîmah ("night") which has levîlot for the plural form. All these masculine nouns are found in Ugaritic in their singular forms, but I do not know of any clear examples of their plural forms.

The word r'M ("head") is masculine and is found with the masculine plural -îm ending in both Hebrew and Ugaritic. This word is not found in Hebrew with the plural

¹Dôrîm in Isaiah 51:6; Psalms 72:5; 102:5.
-st ending, but Gordon\textsuperscript{1} and Aistleitner\textsuperscript{2} considered r's\textsuperscript{5} attested in both plural forms: r'sm and r'st. Ugaritic r'st is plural in some passages\textsuperscript{3} but there may be cases where it is adverbial as Hebrew r'st (r'shit). The lack of a clear understanding of adverbial suffixes in Ugaritic cautions us against hastily classifying such forms.

Another indicator of the feminine gender is -y which is preserved in the Hebrew name šāray.\textsuperscript{4} This feminine ending is perhaps found on such Ugaritic personal names as 'arsy, ḫly, ḫdy, ḫry, ḫmy.

**Number**

Ugaritic nouns are found in the singular, dual, and plural. The dual is found in Arabic, Akkadian, and Hebrew and was used most extensively in the early periods of these languages. Syriac and Ethiopic preserve only a few cases of the dual.\textsuperscript{5} For the vocalization of the dual, comparative evidence yields nominative -šm and genitive/accusative -šm. The final -m drops in the construct

\textsuperscript{1} UN, #1734.
\textsuperscript{2} MUS, #2472.
\textsuperscript{3} IIIAB, B, 23, 27, 29. For a discussion of this idiom by Anton Jirku, see ZDMG, 105(1953), p. 372.
\textsuperscript{4} Genesis 11:29.
\textsuperscript{5} B. Moscati, ed. An Introduction to the Semitic Languages (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1964), p. 94.
state. Incidentally, this dual -m is in agreement with Canaanite (Hebrew, Phoenician) and against Akkadian, Arabic, and Aramaic -n.

One example of the dual is found on the word for "horn" which is ʄר1 in the singular, ʄר2 in the dual, and ʄר3 in the plural.

Ugaritic uses the dual with all nouns, even if they are unnatural pairs. However, caution must be exercised to distinguish dual -m from the plural -m, or even adverbial -m.

The masculine plural -m is of course easily distinguished from the masculine singular which has no gender indicator but the feminine -t which is used on both singular and plural feminine nouns must be analyzed on the basis of context and syntax.

Some scholars believe that Ugaritic also has the internal or broken plural. Gordon considered bht as the plural of bt ("house") but he did not provide evidence for this conjecture. In fact, he listed bht6 as the

1Hebrew qeren (Joshua 6:5; Daniel 8:5).
2Hebrew qarmayim (Daniel 8:6).
3Hebrew qarnat (Ex. 29:12; Lev. 4:7; Eze. 43:20).
4For examples, see UM, p. 43, #8.5.
5UM, p. 44, #8.7.
6UM, p. 246, #321.
plural of bt, in such passages as IIAB, 5:75,80,81,92, 98,113,115,123. Gordon therefore considered bt as having the two different plural forms of bht and bhtm. Aistleitner\(^1\) gave two entries to this word in his lexicon: bht\(^2\) ("Fracht-
haus") and bt\(^3\) ("Haus"). He did not list any plural form of bt, but he considered bhtm as the plural of bht. Aist-
leitner also listed bhtm as singular with mimation in such passages as IIAB, 5:113,115,123.

The preceding reflects, to some extent, the confusion that has arisen because of enclitic -m and internal -h-. My view of internal -h- is discussed in the section on vowels. I do not believe that Ugaritic employs the broken or internal plural forms of nouns. Forms such as 'ilhm\(^4\) ("gods"), 'ilht\(^5\) ("goddesses"), 'amht\(^6\) ("handmaidens"), l'umhthm\(^7\) ("to their mothers"), are not internal plurals but lengthened forms of biradical words.\(^8\)

\(^1\)WUS, #504.
\(^2\)WUS, #504.
\(^3\)WUS, #600.
\(^4\)Corpus, 34:3,5; 35:12,18.
\(^5\)IIAB, 5:48,50,52,54.
\(^6\)IIAB, 3:21.
\(^7\)IIIK, 1:6.
\(^8\)These forms in Hebrew are treated by Gesenius as artificial expansions into triliteral stems (GR, p. 285).
Nevertheless, Aistleitner is quite convinced that Ugaritic has numerous broken plurals and he listed them very systematically — in accordance with Arabic grammar.\footnote{\textit{Ugu}, pp. 38-46.} Because of his presupposition that Ugaritic is very similar to Arabic, his analysis of broken plurals in Ugaritic has led him far astray. Most of his examples have no basis whatsoever and the remaining examples are based on erroneous notions in regard to the Ugaritic lexicon. Most of his examples do not deserve any serious comment but in order to examine his methodology, I shall discuss a few of his examples.

Aistleitner\footnote{\textit{Ugu}, p. 38.} compared singular \textit{p’at} with the plural form \textit{p’at} ("Grenyen"). However, in his lexicon\footnote{\textit{Wug}, §2161.} he listed \textit{p’at} for both singular and plural forms, and then he listed \textit{p’it} without any comment about it.\footnote{In the section of this dissertation dealing with the aleph, it was pointed out that there are two different words involved here.}

Aistleitner also compared singular \textit{bn’t} with the plural \textit{bnwt} ("erzeugnisse, Gesch"äfte").\footnote{\textit{Ugu}, p. 38.} Here he has two different words confused. The words \textit{bn’t} \footnote{\textit{B.H.}, 2:44.} mean

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{p’at} ("Grenyen")
  \item \textit{p’it} (without any comment)
  \item \textit{bn’t} ("erzeugnisse, Geschäfte")
  \item \textit{bnwt} ("erzeugnisse, Geschäfte")
\end{itemize}
literally "daughters of the fields" or wadies.\(^1\) The phrase\(^2\) byn bmyt means "Creator of creatures."

Next he\(^3\) compared singular hmt ("wall") to plural bmyt. In this case, unfortunately, the context of bmyt\(^4\) does not indicate whether the word should be considered singular or plural. But his example does not provide evidence for internal plurals. In fact, medial -\(\text{r}\) is found, without explanation, in several Ugaritic words.

Aistleitner also compared singular rbt ("ten thousand, myriad") with plural rbbt;\(^5\) but we must remember that the \(b\) in rbt may be doubled but not indicated in the writing. Variants of this same word are found in Hebrew which has both r\(\text{b}^\text{h}^\text{b}\text{h}\) (Lev. 26:8) and rabb\(\text{b}\) (Judges 8:30).

Aistleitner also presented a section on broken plurals which appeared in Ugaritic only in their singular or plural (according to him) forms. With this kind of approach, he has already taken a step in the wrong direction.

Under the \(\text{qat1}\) class of plurals, which he compared to Arabic \(\text{aq}\text{tul}\) or \(\text{aq}\text{ta}\), he placed \(\text{agz}\text{r}\)\(^6\) from the

\(^{1}\)Thus Driver (CML, p. 73, n. 4) and Gordon (UL, p. 55).

\(^{2}\)IAB, 3-4:5,11.

\(^{3}\)UGU, p. 38.

\(^{4}\)Corpus, 32:28

\(^{5}\)IIAB, 1:29,44.

\(^{6}\)S.S. 58. Note that the text actually has \(\text{azzrym}\) (Corpus, p. 100).
hypothetical singular *gazir* which he compared to Hebrew gizarb ("Leibesgestalt"). This rare word is found only in S.E. 23,58,61 and is translated by Driver "twin figures." Driver agreed with Aistleitner that this is an inner plural and compared it to Syriac *gazar* ("cut, to shape"); Gordon merely quoted Aistleitner. Gray translated *agzrym bnym* as "my two greedy sons." Despite these variant translations and the unclear meaning of the word, there is no clear evidence of an internal plural here.

Next, Aistleitner mentioned plural *iam* from the singular *gazir*. This word also is limited to S.E. where it is found in lines 15, 36, 31. Gordon and Aistleitner compared this word to Arabic *agza* ("to burn") and Pope noted the parallel of this word with *kat* and therefore translated "fire." At any rate, there is no evidence of an internal plural in this word.

---

1 WUS, #643.
2 OML, pp. 121, 123.
3 Ibid., p. 134, n. 7.
4 UU, p. 251, #399.
6 WUS, #678.
7 UK, #37. In WUS, #678, Aistleitner translated "Kohle."
Again, Aistleitner listed plural *anhr* from singular *nhr*. He, along with Gordon, Driver, and Gray compared this word to the Akkadian naheru and translated it "dolphin or sea-creature,"² and T. Gaster translated it "whale."³ Again, we find no evidence of an internal plural. Aistleitner believed this word to be parallel to the plural ṛumm.⁴

The word *anah⁵* was construed by Aistleitner as a broken plural from the singular *mun⁶* ("mint"). This is also found in S.S. 14, which Driver⁷ translated "mint." But Gordon⁸ translated "kid" on the basis of its parallel to [g]d.

Aistleitner believed that *inr⁹* is a broken plural from the Arabic root nyr and translated it "dogs." Ginsberg (ANET²) translated it "cur." This word is found

---

¹IA=AB, 1:15.
²Driver, naheru ("sea-monster"), CML, p. 135, n. 25; Gordon, naheru ("dolphin"), UL, p. 39, UM, p. 239, #173; Gray, naheru, op. cit. p. 47.
³Thespis, p. 204.
⁴IA=AB, 1:15.
⁵S.S. 14.
⁶WUS, #1794.
⁷CML, p. 121. In his lexicon (CML, p. 135), he compared Akkadian nānābu.
⁸UM, p. 240, #180.
⁹WUS, #316.
in IIK, 1:2,16, where its meaning is derived from parallelism with klb ("dog"); however, there is no evidence for a broken plural in this word.

Aistleitner\(^1\) considered 'iql as a broken plural\(^2\) from Arabic taul.\(^3\) He thought this referred to a "bee-swarm." But Gordon\(^4\) and Driver\(^5\) translated it as "breath, gust (of air)" on the basis of its parallelism with rb and qfr. Again, there is no proof in this word of a broken plural.

Aistleitner listed many, many more examples of what he considered broken plurals in Ugaritic, but the few examples cited above are sufficient to reveal his superficial approach to lexicography. It should be noted that especially his over-reliance on Arabic led him to many of these errors.

Ugaritic grammar should not include classes of broken plurals.\(^6\) The regular plurals in Ugaritic are those listed at the beginning of this section. Ugaritic

\(^1\) All of the preceding examples of broken plurals are taken from UGU, pp. 36-47.

\(^2\) The form 'iql is found in VIAD, 2:9; ID, 88,93; IID, 1:125.

\(^3\) UGU, p. 42.

\(^4\) UL, p. 244.

\(^5\) GML, p. 134.

\(^6\) Aistleitner listed such classes as 'aql, 'iql, 'ugtl, 'astt, 'ugtlt, atbl, qtl, and qttl.
is not a dialect of Arabic!

Case

Comparative Semitic evidence yields the following case endings for Ugaritic: in the singular, nominative -u, genitive -i, and accusative -a; in the plural, nominative -ii, and genitive/accusative i. This is confirmed by nouns ending in aleph as indicated in our discussion of the aleph.

It is interesting to notice that despite the many variations, both phonological and morphological, among the Semitic languages, this is a point of uniform agreement: they all use the three primitive vowels in the same case-ending classification and variations caused by evolution does not alter this basic fact. Since Ugaritic, apart from final aleph nouns, does not reveal the nature of the final vowel, the use of the cases in Ugaritic can only be determined by comparative evidence.

State

Ugaritic has the two nominal states of "absolute" and "construct". Akkadian usually loses final vowels in the construct state and may lose also a consonant preceding that final vowel; for example, notice the use of ūṣšu

\footnote{While only aleph indicates the nature of the vowel, final .githubusercontent(a, b) or 也因此 numerical value can indicate the presence of a final vowel. Final 也因此 numerical value is not preserved in the script unless followed by a vowel.}
("king") and bītu ("house") in these examples: Šar Škalli ("king of the palace"), Šarri Škalli ("king of the palace"), bīt Šarri ("house of the king"). But Ugaritic nouns have retained their final vowels even in the construct state. This difference between Akkadian and Ugaritic on this point is not merely chronological; the oldest Akkadian had dropped final vowels on nouns in the construct state. This difference must be a distinct dialectal difference between the two languages. Z. Harris¹ said that the Amarna evidence is inconclusive on the case endings of Canaanite nouns in the construct, but he believed these final vowels on construct nouns must have dropped shortly after our latest Ugaritic texts were written. That Ugaritic preserved these vowels is revealed by final ṭ and ṭ words which would have dropped their final ṭ or ṭ in the construct forms if they were not followed by a vowel; bny (="bēniyu") bavt, "Creator of creatures". The nature of this final vowel is revealed by final aleph nouns in the construct state, and this aleph sign is in agreement with the case of the word in construct, as the following examples show.

The nominative case of a final-aleph noun in construct is found in mr'u skn, (a public title found often in the non-literary texts).² The genitive case is attested in sbl'u

¹Canaanite Dialects, pp. 41–42.
²UM, p. 291, #1161; WU2, #1664.
qu'lu ("the host of the troops of ngb") and bns' nh (literally, "in the lifting of his eyes"). The accusative is attested in lyhpk ks'a mlk ("May he overturn the throne of thy kingship").

The little Ugaritic evidence that we have on final vowels on words in construct does not reveal any confusion of vowels; the final vowel agrees with the case of the word in construct. Z. Harris believed that the Egyptian transcriptions gave no evidence for final vowels on construct nouns although they did provide such evidence for nouns in the absolute state. Apart from this, there is no clear evidence that vowel endings were dropped from construct nouns before they were dropped from nouns in the absolute state. G. Bergsträsser believed such final vowels were lost on construct nouns before they were lost on the absolute nouns, but he wrote in the pre-Ugaritic period and was not aware of this newer evidence from Ugaritic.

Patterns

Ugaritic noun patterns generally agree with those found in other Semitic languages, particularly the Canaanite

1IK, 86, 176-177.
2IIAB, 2:12; IID, 6:10.
3IAB, 6:28.
4Canaanite Dialects, p. 42.
5Hebräische Grammatik, I, p. 115, #21d,e.
dialects. These various patterns are usually presented and discussed in the larger grammar books and there is no particular profit in repeating that material here. The primary profit in comparing Ugaritic noun patterns with the same patterns in other Semitic languages is that information is provided which helps to reconstruct the vocalization of the nouns.

Ugaritic contains the usual uniliteral, biliteral, triliteral, and quadriliteral types of nouns found in Semitic. Quadriliteral nouns include ḫuṣn² ("cup"), ḫm'āl³ ("left"), ḫwdrত ("arid, dried up"), ⁶ḥzn⁷ ("swine, boar").³

The unusual form yamm(t)⁹ is considered a form of the root ysm and translated "beautiful, decorative, ornamental."

---

3. #1390.
4. S.S. 64; IIIAB, E:40.
5. ID, 70.
6. Ginsberg (ANET², p. 153) translated this as "unwatered land" and Driver (GML, p. 61, n. 5) as "blasted land". Cf. Akkadian hamādiru or hamādiritu (GAD, H, pp. 57,58) "withered or shrivelling," but the correspondence of Akkadian h with Ugaritic h is not normal, although such correspondence is attested (e.g., "hasten": Ugaritic ḫm, but Akkadian ḫn). ⁷

8. Thus Aistleitner (MUS, #1048), Gordon (UM, p. 267, #717) and Driver (GML, p. 107), but Gaster translated it as "serving maids" (Theopis, p. 211). The word is only attested in I*AB, 5:9.

9. IIIAB, 4:15; IID, 2:42; ID, 60.
CHAPTER V

THE PRONOUNS

Independent Pronouns

The independent pronouns attested in Ugaritic are the first person singular (‘an and ‘ank),\(^1\) the second person singular (‘at),\(^2\) the third person singular feminine (hw),\(^3\) third person singular masculine (hw),\(^4\) and the third person masculine plural (hm).

It has been informative for Bible scholars to find the two forms of the first person singular independent pronoun used interchangeably in the early literature of Ugarit. The variants do not reflect "late" or "early" linguistic layers in biblical Hebrew.\(^5\)

The third person singular pronouns hw (masculine) and hv (feminine) also have the variants hvu\(^6\) and

\(^1\)Both forms are found in poetry but ‘ank is the regular form used in the prose texts (PRU, II, 10:7; 12:11, 15; 15:15; 21:6; PRU, V, 9:10; 10:11; 59:18,23).

\(^2\)For examples, see UM, p. 240, #189.

\(^3\)ID, 201; PRU, II, 2:41,42.

\(^4\)ID, 1:39; PRU, V, 114:5,6.

\(^5\)Note the statement "‘an is used in P (incl. H) always ... exc. Genesis 23:4...; in JB 'nv is preferred, though not exclusively..." (RDB, p. 59).

\(^6\)ID, 4:13; ID, 129,133.
which are used in the oblique cases. This is the same pattern followed by the Akkadian third person singular pronouns which used the forms $\text{šu}$ or $\text{ši}$ for the nominative case but $\text{šu'eti}$ or $\text{ši'eti}$ for the genitive and accusative cases. These Akkadian forms may reflect the aleph that is found in the Hebrew forms $\text{hu}$ and $\text{yu}$. Phoenician also has this aleph and used the form $\text{hu}$ to represent both masculine and feminine. The writing of both genders as $\text{hu}$ caused some confusion in the pointing of the Hebrew Bible. Sabaean spelled the masculine as $\text{hu}$ and the feminine as $\text{yu}$, for the third person singular. Both Sabaean and Qatabanian also have the forms with the final $\text{t}$, in both genders.

The history and development of these variants is obscure and impossible to accurately reconstruct on the basis

---

1ID, 138,143.

2Akkadian, of course, has variants due to time and place. Akkadian also possesses a special form ($\text{šu'shin}$ and $\text{ši'shin}$) for the dative. For the many variations see von Boden, GAG, p. 41, #41.

3J. Friedrich, Phönizisch-Finische Grammatik, (Rome: Pontificio Institutum Biblicum, 1951), p. 45, #111. The Greek and Latin transcriptions for the third masculine singular are $\text{ou}$ and $\text{hu}$.

4El, p. 248.


7Beeston, op. cit., p. 47.
of our present information.

Gordon\(^1\) denied the existence of an independent first person plural pronoun in Ugaritic, but Aistleitner\(^2\) mentioned the possibility of the word "any.\(^3\) But this word is found only in this broken and obscure passage where the meaning is not clear.\(^4\) Besides, on the basis of comparative Semitic linguistics, we should expect the letter \(h\) to appear in the word since it is found in Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic and perhaps reflected in Akkadian \(n\(\text{nu}\).\(^5\)

Gordon denied the existence of the second person masculine plural independent pronoun in one place,\(^6\) but he then, in another place, listed such a form (\(atm\)).\(^7\) Aistleitner did not find any evidence of such a pronoun.\(^8\) In his lexicon,\(^9\) Gordon listed \(atm\) as the second person plural form but did not indicate where it is attested.\(^10\)

\(^2\)\textit{UGU}, \#60; \textit{WUS}, \#459.
\(^3\)\textit{IIAB}, 4:47.
\(^4\) The existence of such a word here is conjectural (\textit{Corpus}, p. 26).
\(^5\)\textit{Moscati}, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 102, \#13:1.
\(^7\) See the pronoun chart, \textit{UM}, p. 221.
\(^8\)\textit{UGU}, p. 30. He listed \(atm\) (\textit{WUS}, \#464) as dual.
\(^9\)\textit{UM}, p. 240, \#189.
\(^10\) It is attested in \textit{VAB}, 4:77.
The third person plural pronoun is attested in the masculine form *hm* which is found in S.S. 68-71. Aistleitner mentioned this, but later he considered *hm* as representing only the dual as in S.S. 39, and not the plural. Because of the paucity of evidence, it cannot be demonstrated whether *hm* is plural or dual. The fact that only two persons are mentioned in the same context with this word does not prove that it is dual. It seems safer to consider it plural. The confusion about such a situation is well reflected in the new handbook on comparative Semitic linguistics edited by Moscati, which listed *hm* as both plural and dual but indicated the dual in parentheses. The third plural feminine is not attested in Ugaritic, as correctly noted by Gordon and Aistleitner; it should be noted, however, that it is not attested in Phoenician either.

The dual has been partly discussed above in connection with the third person plural. Although Gordon did not list

---

1 UM, p. 30, #6:3.
2 UGU, #60.
3 WUS, #838.
5 There is a possibility that it is found in the badly broken text PRU, II, 2:49. The words *ram hm* (l. 49) should be compared to *ram ṭank* (l. 39) and *ram hv* (l. 41).
6 UM, p. 221.
7 WUS, p. 91.
8 Friedrich, op. cit., p. 44, #110.
any examples of dual independent pronouns in his discussion of pronouns, he did indicate on his pronoun chart,\(^1\) — with an asterisk — dual pronouns in both the second and third person. Aistleitner listed examples of the second person dual in both masculine and feminine genders.\(^2\) But Aistleitner is also inconsistent; he listed ‘at as dual under entry WUS, #459 but ‘atm is listed as dual second person under WUS, #464.

Since the dual forms would be identical in Ugaritic orthography with the plural forms, only the context can reveal the difference.

**Pronominal Suffixes**

In Ugaritic, the pronominal suffixes are the same on nouns as on verbs — except for the first person singular.

In the first person singular on nouns, ‘\(\text{ḥ} \)’ is used to indicate genitive, but the nominative has no orthographical indication, and may be vocalized, as in Akkadian, ‘\(\text{ḥ} \)’.\(^3\) The first person singular suffix on verbs is, as in other Semitic languages, ‘\(\text{ḥ} \)’.

The second person singular suffix is ‘\(\text{k} \)’ representing

---

\(^1\)UM, p. 221.

\(^2\)WUS, #459.

\(^3\)The same is true of Phoenician, e.g., ‘\(\text{ḥ} \)’ ("my father") but ‘\(\text{ḥ}\)’ ("of my father"), Z. Harris, Grammar of the Phoenician Language, p. 48.
both genders and used on both nouns and verbs. The distinction in vocalization indicated the difference in
gender, probably -ka for masculine and -ki for feminine.

The third person singular suffix on nouns is -n,
but on verbs it seems to appear as -n under certain condi-
tions. Gordon¹ claimed this suffix can assume the forms,
-nh, -nh, -nn, or -n, and Aistleitner² also listed the forms
-nh, -nn, and -n. But the situation is not really this
complicated; the suffixes -nh and -nn are merely the simple
suffixes attached to verbal verbs terminating in a num
energieus. Such forms are found in biblical Hebrew where
they may assimilate (-*enhu > -ennu),³ or they may remain
simply -enu.⁴ Gordon⁵ suggested this possibility in Ugaritic
but failed to point out that a doubled letter is not ortho-
graphically indicated in the Ugaritic script. The doubled
-mn reveals two letters separated by a vowel; thus, if
assimilation cannot be the basis for forms ending -mn,
perhaps some form of leveling is the explanation. Gordon⁶

¹UM, p. 221.
²UGU, p. 142.
³E.g., I Samuel 17:25 he'ìë 'aë'ær yakkennō ya's̄'e rennō
hammelek, "as for the man who slays him, the king will
reward him."
⁴GK, p. 157, #561.
⁵UM, p. 28, #5:22.
⁶He suggested -nō ("his") and nē ("her"). UM, p. 31,
#6:8; UM, p. 28, n. 2.
made no attempt to explain the variants but turned to what he considered another possible third person singular suffix, namely, "n. For evidence he cited yb! āšt l[n] ("he will make a bow for her"). But this reading is uncertain as Andrée Herdner pointed out in her new edition of the texts. Albright suggested l[k] ("to thee") which seemed to fit the context best; Driver merely accepted ln and translated "for us."  

These variants of the third person singular suffix on verbs do not seem to be based on the dating of the text since they are scattered throughout all three major epics from Ugarit. Neither do the variants appear to be caused by the styles of the various scribes since variants are found in the same text. It is always easy to say the variants are due to the style in the language itself but this is not really a satisfactory answer. We must admit that the variants of the third person singular suffix on verbs cannot be explained on the basis of the information

---

1 IID, 6:24.
2 Corpus, p. 83, n. 12.
3 Ibid.
4 CHL, p. 55.
5 E.g., tdkyn h waqbrnh (IAB, 1:16,17) "she weeps for him and she buries him," but hamlkn (IAB, 1:46) "I'll make him king." Also waqbrnh (ID, 140) "and I shall bury him" but hāštn (ID, 141) "I shall please him." A few lines later, in ID, 151, we find tš̱ht'am, "they arouse him."
we now possess. A much better understanding of the energetic
num on verbs in Ugaritic is needed first.\footnote{It is interesting to note that Aistleitner did not
list any -n, -m, -nh pronominal suffixes in his lexicon
(WUS), although he did list the -h suffix. In his grammar
(UGU), he had listed all four forms.}

The first person plural suffix on nouns is \(-n\), but
Aistleitner believed the suffix may also appear as \(-ny, -nuy,\nand \(-nym\).\footnote{UGU, p. 29. He also called this the first person
dual suffix.} For evidence he\footnote{Ibid., p. 27.} cited \(k\l\)\(n\)\(yy \)\(q\)\(\_h \)\(n\)\(bln \)\(k\l\)\(n\)\(y\)\(y\)\(n\)\(bl \)\(k\)\(h\).\footnote{VAB, E, 41-42.} Ginsberg did not translate this passage in \(\text{ANET}\),
but Driver interpreted this as a dual and translated "both
of us will carry his chalice, both of us will carry his cup."\footnote{CMJ, p. 90.} Gordon also translated this as a dual "both of us."\footnote{UL, p. 23.} However,
Ginsberg translated the parallel passage, \(k\l\)\(n\)\(y\)\(n \)\(q\)\(\_h \)\(n\)\(bln \)\(k\l\)\(n\)\(y\)\(n \)\(n\)\(bl \)\(k\)\(h\),\footnote{IIAB, 4–5:45.} as the plural suffix, "all of us must
bear his gift, all of us must bear his purse." Ginsberg
had long ago considered \(-ny\) as the first person dual prono-
nominal suffix.\footnote{RASOR, 72(1938), p. 19, n. 9.} One Ugaritic letter\footnote{Corpus, 51:1.} reads \(l\)\(\_us\)\(y \)\(l\)\(\_ad\)\(n\)\(y \)"to my mother, our lady," and is sent by two persons, \(tl\)\(m\)\(yn\)
and 'ahtmak. In line seven of this same text, glny means "we (two) fall." Another letter\(^1\) is very similar to the letter mentioned above except that the singular pronominal suffix is used instead of the dual: \(1\ mlct 'adty\(^2\) ("to the queen, my lady") and glt\(^3\) ("I fell"). This evidence cited above demonstrates the use of \(-\text{ny}\) for the first person dual and \(-\text{m}\) for the first person plural suffix but the additional \(-\text{m}\) and \(-\text{y}\) on the forms klny\(^4\) and klnyn\(^5\) is difficult. Aistleitner in his discussion of this mentioned the adverbial use of \(-\text{ny}\) as found on such words as klny\(^6\), hmy\(^7\), and tmy\(^8\), but I doubt if this sheds much light on these pronominal suffixes. Neither Gordon nor Aistleitner gave examples of the first person plural accusative suffix. On his chart of pronominal suffixes, Gordon\(^9\) left empty the space allotted for this verbal suffix. It should be noted here, that in orthography, a verb with this \(-\text{m}\) suffix would appear the

1. Corpus, 52.
2. Corpus, 52:1.
3. Corpus, 52:11.
4. VAB, E:41-42.
5. TIA, 4-5:45,46.
9. UM, p. 221.
same as a verb with the energetic nun. Also, as discussed above in connection with the third person singular suffix on verbs, a verb terminating in -n could signify this third person suffix. In such cases, the interpretation must be based on context.

The second person plural suffixes are -igm (masculine) and -igm (feminine). These forms are not attested in Phoenician, neither on nouns nor verbs, but they are preserved in Hebrew.

The third person plural suffixes are -hm and -hm, for both nouns and verbs. In Phoenician, the masculine suffix -m is attested on both nouns and verbs but the expected feminine suffix -n has not been found. Phoenician also has a masculine plural suffix -nm, and Harris concluded that, in the verb, -nm occurs after vocalic terminations and -m after the consonantal. In Hebrew, the -h- of -hm is usually dropped, although it is preserved in a few cases.

1 J. Friedrich, Phönikisch Punische Grammatik, p. 46, #112.
2 Z. Harris, Phoenician Grammar, p. 47; J. Friedrich, op. cit., p. 46, #112.
4 Hebrew -hem is frequently found after qal verbs or nouns ending in a vowel; otherwise, simple -m is used. The suffix -hm is regularly used on prepositions.
Relative Pronouns

Gordon\(^1\) considered \(\dot{a}\) as representing the personal pronoun and \(\dot{d}t\) as representing the impersonal pronoun. He is wrong because the pronoun \(\dot{a}\) is also used to refer to such impersonal nouns as \(\text{\'ahun},\)\(^2\) ("table") and \(\text{\'ahn br\(\text{\'o\)}}\) ("thunderstones"). On the other hand, \(\dot{d}t\) is used in reference to personal antecedents as the three different professional groups \(\text{\'hr\(\text{\'u\)}}\),\(^4\) \(\text{\'hr\(\text{\'u\)}}\),\(^5\) \(\text{\'bd\(\text{\'l\)}}\).\(^6\) Thus we observe that Gordon's theory does not stand in the light of the evidence.

On the other hand, Aistleitner interpreted \(\dot{a}\) as the relative pronoun for masculine or feminine, and singular or dual,\(^7\) and earlier he considered \(\dot{a}\) as the general relative pronoun in Ugaritic whereas \(\dot{d}t\) was identified as a "nota genetivi".\(^8\) Moscati\(^9\) merely repeated Gordon's view but pointed out that Old South Arabic used \(\dot{a}\) for the masculine

\(^{1}\text{\'UM, p. 33, }\text{\#6:22-24.}\)
\(^{2}\text{\'ITAB, 1:39.}\)
\(^{3}\text{\'VAB, 0,23.}\)
\(^{4}\text{\'PRU, II, 24:5-6.}\)
\(^{5}\text{\'PRU, II, 24:10.}\)
\(^{6}\text{\'PRU, II, 35:5.}\)
\(^{7}\text{\'WUS, }\text{\#714.}\)
\(^{8}\text{\'UGU, }\text{\#65,66.}\)
\(^{9}\text{\'Op,cit., pp. 113,114.}\)
and dt for the feminine singular forms and 'lw for the plural of both genders. De Langhe concluded that d represented the masculine singular while dt was used for both the feminine singular and the plural of both genders.¹

De Langhe's theory that d represents masculine singular and dt the feminine singular and plural of both genders does not stand in the light of the evidence cited above which reveals that d can also represent the feminine singular.² He is correct, however, in stating that dt can refer to the masculine plural.³

Neither can we conclude that d is masculine whereas dt refers to the feminine antecedent. In the following examples, d refers to a feminine antecedent: dkn'm qnt n'mh ⁴ ("whose fairness is like the fairness of Anat");⁵ d'qh 'ib 'ign'⁶ ("whose [Lady Hry] eyeballs are the pureness of lapis");⁷ km ṣpē ḏbrt⁸ ("like the sun which is pure").⁹ But


²IK, 145,147,291,294; PRU, II, 5:2,3.

³IIIRP., 13; IIAB, 6:42.

⁴IK, 145,291.

⁵The relative pronoun d refers back to Lady Hry.

⁶IK, 147,294.

⁷Translation of H.L. Ginsberg (ANET², p. 144).

⁸PRU, II, 5:2,3.

⁹Notice the feminine ending on the verb br.
dt may refer to a masculine antecedent as in these examples:

\[ \begin{align*} 
& \text{cglm dt šnt}^1 \text{ ("calves of a year")}; \\
& \text{št gpmn dt ksp dt yrq nbqnm}^3 \text{ ("He attaches trappings of silver, a housing of gold").}^4 
\end{align*} \]

The complex origins and uses of the relative pronouns are not completely understood. Harris\(^5\) believed that the Phoenician relative pronoun \(\text{itn}^5\) came to be used after \(\text{q}\) declined in use in Phoenician, a change which took place in Byblos between the tenth and fifth centuries. In Biblical Hebrew, \(\text{tašer}\) or simply \(\text{š}\) is used as the relative pronoun but the demonstrative pronoun \(\text{z}\) is also used sometimes as a relative pronoun.\(^6\) Harris\(^7\) suggested that the form \(\text{dt}\) may merely be the relative pronoun with the "deictic \(\text{t}\)" suffix, as found on some prepositions. Aistleitner suggested that Ugaritic also possesses the relative pronouns \(\text{š}\) and \(\text{š}\), but the evidence does not confirm this statement.\(^8\)

The regular relative pronoun in Ugaritic is \(\text{d}\) or \(\text{dt}\) but the distinction between these two forms remains unexplained.

\[ \begin{align*} 
^1\text{IIIRp, 13; IIAB, 6:42}. & \\
^2\text{Ugaritic also has the word cglt. "heifer" (I*AB, 5:18)}. & \\
^3\text{IIAB, 4:10,11}. & \\
^4\text{Translation of H. L. Ginsberg, ANET}^2, \text{ p. 133}. & \\
^5\text{Phoenician Grammar, p. 55; Dialects, pp. 69–70}. & \\
^6\text{GK, p. 446, #138g}. & \\
^7\text{Dialects, p. 70}. & \\
^8\text{US, #2562; #2709}. & 
\end{align*} \]
Demonstrative Pronouns

In this section are included also those words which may be used as demonstrative adjectives or other particles of definiteness. At this present state of Ugaritic studies, we are not able to neatly classify the various diverse particles into precise categories. This has been attempted in biblical Hebrew, but the result has yielded overlapping of categories and general confusion. This has been the result in Hebrew largely because of the neglect to take into proper consideration the evolution of the language and the various dialects assimilated. There is a difference between a descriptive grammar and a historical grammar. W. Von Soden's\(^1\) grammar of Akkadian makes an attempt to combine both approaches, but he nevertheless wrote largely from the perspective of Old Babylonian. Although the Ugaritic corpus of literature is extremely smaller than Akkadian, yet this literature also contains the diverse elements of poetic, prose, earlier and later language, as well as various foreign influences.

The most common demonstrative particle in Ugaritic is \(\text{hn}\) which is often found as \(\text{hnd}\). Aistleitner\(^2\) attempted to classify this word into about seven different categories. Although he has made an outline too elaborate for the

---

\(^1\) GAG.

\(^2\) "Das ugaritische hinweisende Fürwort \(\text{hn}\)," BO, 17 (1960), pp. 11-12.
evidence to support, Aistleitner has clearly indicated the demonstrative character of this particle.

The following examples, prepared separately from Aistleitner’s article, show this particle’s use as a demonstrative adjective: **hn ym**₁ (“this day”) — but more often **hn** is used; **ktb spr hnd**₂ (“wrote this letter”); **spr mlk hnd**³ (“this royal document”); **lym hnd**⁴ (“from this day”); 1 yah bt hnd⁵ (“he did not take this house”). Albright wrote that he interpreted **hnd** as an adverb since it “does not change with gender or number.”⁶ He wrote this statement concerning the passage **hn ‘alpm eswm hnd**⁷ which he translated “behold, the two thousand horses are here.” Actually, there is sometimes a semantic overlapping in pronouns and adverbs as a word may signify “these here” or “those there.”⁸ This pronominal–adverbial usage of **hn** may be found in biblical Hebrew in passages as Joshua 8:20 where the inhabitants from

---

¹**IllRp**, B,17; **Corpus**, 32:9,17.


⁴**PRU**, II, 6:1.


⁷**PRU**, II, 12:11,12.

⁸This is especially true in the Semitic languages. In fact, Brockelmann in his great study of these languages devotes one section to what he calls the 'Demonstrativadverbia', I, p. 323.
Ai were not able to flee הַנֶּן הַנֶּן הַנֶּן ("this way or that way"), and in II Kings 4:35, where הַנֶּן הַנֶּן הַנֶּן must signify that Elisha walked once "this side and that side."\footnote{Also cf. Ezekiel 1:23, Daniel 12:5.}

This word may also be used as a substantive, or a demonstrative pronoun according to Aistleitner\footnote{BO, 17(1960), pp. 11-12.} but the examples are few: הָנָה הָנָה הָנָה ("this is from my mouth"), הָנָה הָנָה ("these are they").\footnote{H.K., 45.}

The form הָנָה appears in a private letter, הָנָה הָנָה ("over here with us")\footnote{PRU, II, 161:8.} In this case the word is used as an adverb; in fact, Aistleitner\footnote{Corpus, 51:10. Note also הָנָה הָנָה in PRU, V, 59:6; 61:6.} interpreted terminative הָנָה as adverbial.

The word הָנָה seems to be used as a demonstrative pronoun in the clause הָנָה הָנָה הָנָה הָנָה ("why has he imposed this on his servant?").\footnote{Translation of H.L. Ginsberg, BASOR, 72(1938), p. 18. Gordon translated "Lo with us." (UL, p. 117).}

\footnote{WUS, #849.} \footnote{PRU, II, 12:23.} \footnote{Cf. BASOR, 150(1958), p. 36.}
Indefinite Pronouns

Ugaritic mrm\(^1\) may be compared with Phoenician mrm\(^2\) and perhaps with the Akkadian indefinite pronoun m\(\text{m}^{-}\)num (<m\(\text{m}^{-}\)nma).\(^3\) In a private letter, mrm r\(\text{m}^{-}\)m\(^4\) signifies "whatever word".\(^5\) It is also used in the stock phrase mrm\(\text{m}^{-}\)lm ("whatever thy welfare may be") in several private letters.\(^6\) The same word occurs in the poetic text dml\(\text{m}^{-}\)a mrm d\(\text{m}^{-}\)mm\(^7\) ("which is filled with all kind of game").\(^8\)

Albright\(^9\) believed he had found a new indefinite pronoun (\(\text{m}^{-}\)m\(\text{m}^{-}\))\(^10\) which is peculiar to the late prose letters. Albright considered the final -m as mimation against Virolleaud who considered it plural. The form without the final -m (\(\text{m}^{-}\)m\(\text{m}^{-}\)) occurs in PRU, II, 9:12.

---

\(^1\)To WUS, #1593, add mrm (in the phrase mrm \(\text{m}^{-}\)lm) PRU, V, 9:8; 59:8; 61:8; 115:89. Also note Phoenician mrm (J. Friedrich, op. cit., p. 52, #124a).

\(^2\)J. Friedrich, op. cit., p. 52, #124a.

\(^3\)GAG, #48c.

\(^4\)Corpus, 53:16,17.

\(^5\)Cf. BASOR, 82(1941), p. 47. Also UM, pp. 33-34, #6:25.

\(^6\)Corpus, 52:13; 51:16; 50:12; PRU, II, 15:16; PRU, V, 9:8; 59:8; 61:8; 115:89.

\(^7\)IIAB, 1:40.

\(^8\)Cf. the translation of Ginsberg in ANET\(^2\), p. 132.


Gordon\(^1\) listed ‘ay as an indefinite pronoun found in \(lhm\) blhm ‘ay \(wšty\) bhur \(yn\) ‘ay\(^2\) ("eat of any food and drink of any wine"). Earlier\(^3\) he had translated this same passage as "Eat of the bread, ho! And drink of the liquor of wine, ho!" Aistleitner\(^4\) considered this word as a divine name. Driver\(^5\) also translated the word as "ho!" Perhaps this word is related in some way to Akkadian ayyu and ayyumma.\(^6\)

**Interrogative Pronouns**

The pronoun \(my\) is used to express "who?" as in \(my\) b’ilm\(^7\) ("who among the gods?"). This same pronoun is spelled the same and used the same way in Old Phoenician\(^8\) and Hebrew. In the Amarna tablets it is written \(mi\)-ya.\(^9\)

The pronoun \(mh\) is used to express "what?" as in \(mh\) yah\(^10\) ("what will he take?"). This is spelled \(m\)h in

---

\(^1\)UM, p. 34, #6:26. He compared Hebrew ‘ay \(škr\) ("any liquor"), Proverbs 31:4.

\(^2\)S.S., 6.

\(^3\)UL, p. 58.

\(^4\)WUS, #159.

\(^5\)CML, p. 121.

\(^6\)GAG, p. 49, #47d, p. 50, #48h; AHw, p. 26.

\(^7\)IIK, 5:14,20.

\(^8\)J. Friedrich, op. cit., p. 50, #120.


\(^10\)IID, 6:35.
Hebrew but appears simply as m in Phoenician. 1

The pronoun iy is used to express "where?" as in iy al'iyyn b'h1 iy zhl b'1 'arg2 ("Where is victor Baal? Where is the prince lord of earth?"). The same spelling and use of this pronoun is found in Hebrew.

The pronoun lik is used to express "why?" as in lik m'y al'iyyn b'3 ("Why has victor Baal come?"); lik tnrsh 0m al'iyyn b'4 ("Why striv'at thou with Puissant Baal?"); lik tnuyn rbt 'atrst m6 ("Why do ye homage to Lady Asherah of the Sea?").

The word mn seems to indicate something like "how many?" as in mn yrh kars mn kdw kr7 ("How many months has he been sick? How many has Keret been ill?").

The word hm seems to introduce the second half of a question in mnaha tr'il dp'id hm xtna bny bnv7 ("Have you besought Bull El kindly? Have you paid homage to the Creator of Creatures?"). The grammatical counterpart of this

---

1Friedrich, op.cit., p. 50, #120.
2IIAB, 3–4:28, 29.
3IIAB, 2:21.
4IIAB, 1:24, 25.
5Translation of H.L. Ginsberg (ANET2, p. 141).
6IIAB, 3:28, 29.
7IIK, 1-2:81, 82.
hm would be 'im in Hebrew,¹ a word which does not appear in Ugaritic.

In contrast to Hebrew, Ugaritic does not use an interrogative indicator at the beginning of a sentence. The case cited above is the only known case of such an interrogative indicator, and it is only for the second clause of the sentence.

¹Broekelmann, *Hebräische Syntax*, p. 55, #54f; p. 161, #169c.
CHAPTER VI

THE VERBS

Strong Verbs

Perfect (qtl)

On the basis of comparative evidence, we know the $G$-stem of the qtl consisted of three open syllables. The first and last vowels were $a$ vowels, but we cannot always be certain of the nature of the middle vowel. The grammar of Arabic exhibits three series of vowels in the qtl: $a-a-a$ (active), $a-i-a$ (transient condition), and $a-y-a$ (permanent condition).\(^1\) Moscati,\(^2\) in his outline of the Semitic languages, expressed his view that the same series of vowels was in use in Northwest Semitic, but he did not give evidence in support of this view. In Ugaritic, prima-aleph and final-aleph verbs reveal the first and last vowels are $a$, but the paucity of medial-aleph verbs leaves us uncertain about the nature and usage of the middle vowel in Ugaritic qtl verb forms.

The sufformatives of the qtl agree with those of Hebrew. However, because of the lack of vowel indication in

\(^1\) W. Wright, A Grammar of the Arabic Language, I, p. 30.

\(^2\) Moscati, op. cit., p. 122, #16:2. He believed this series of vowels was used in Amorite, Ugaritic, and Amarna.
Ugaritic, such a grapheme as qtil could represent four possibilities: third feminine singular, second masculine singular, or second feminine singular, and first common singular.

The third feminine dual was apparently used in Ugaritic as Gordon¹ and Aistleitner² have indicated. The one passage for such evidence is S.S. 53 (= Corpus, 23:53) where the verb ylt ( yalatat < "valadta")³ is used to express the fact that the two⁴ wives of 'il have borne 3hr and 31[m].

Gordon⁵ also gave an example of the third masculine dual, but in Ugaritic the spelling of the third masculine dual would be identical with the spelling of the third masculine plural. Consequently, we lack definite evidence of the third masculine dual, although it is probable, in view of the attested third feminine dual.

Aistleitner⁶ gave fifteen examples of the third masculine dual, but I find most of these examples are

¹ UM, p. 56, #9:4.
² UGU, p. 84; WUS, #324.
³ Cf. the Arabic feminine dual gataltā.
⁴ Cf. the dual 'attām ("two wives") in lines 39, 46, and 48. The plural of this word is spelled 'att (e.g., 3lt 'att [Corpus, 60:16]), a homograph with the singular form, 'att. Note Akkadian singular aṣṣatu but plural aṣṣatū (AHw, pp. 83, 84).
⁵ UM, p. 56, #9:4.
⁶ UGU, pp. 83, 84.
completely irrelevant. Some of these examples are not even plural but singular! Moreover, he also described a second masculine dual in Ugaritic which he claimed is found in LIAB, 3:30,31, but I reject this; this example is simply second masculine plural.

However, there is evidence for a first common dual in Ugaritic. In the study of pronominal suffixes, a first common dual suffix -ny was attested and it is also found as a sufformative on the qal stem of the verb. In an Ugaritic personal letter,\(^1\) two men address themselves to 'adtny "our lady" and then, speaking of their obeisance, say glny\(^2\) "we (two) fell." The first plural verbal sufformative could be -ny, but there is no conclusive evidence to indicate it should be interpreted thus. Since the first person plural pronominal suffix is -n\(^3\) (in contrast to the dual suffix -ny), we expect -n for the first person plural sufformative and -ny for the first person dual sufformative of the qal form.

Imperfect (yatl)

The Ugaritic yatl forms agree with that of Hebrew, except, in the third masculine plural Ugaritic often uses

---
\(^1\)Corpus, 51.
\(^2\)qal means "to fall" (WJS, 2408).
\(^3\)WAB,E,40, mlkn ("our king") and tpmn ("our judge").
a t- preformative instead of the expected y- preformative commonly found in Hebrew.\(^1\) Also, in the third feminine singular, the preformative t- may be omitted entirely in a few cases; 𐤀𐤁𐤉 btlh 𐤂𐤃𐤃 tnt,\(^2\) ("the virgin Anat rejoices"); 𐤀𐤁𐤉 btlh 𐤂𐤃𐤃 tnt\(^3\) ("the virgin Anat laughs"). This same feature is attested in Phoenician: 𐤀𐤃𐤁 gbl, w5 w5 w5 ly n5,\(^4\) ("...the lady of Byblos, and she heard my voice and she treated me kindly"). This same feature has also been found in Hebrew: Isaiah 7:14 has הָרֶּם ("she will conceive").

The vocalization of the ygtl form may be one of three possibilities: yaqtulu, yastilu, or yiqtalulu. This was discovered in Hebrew by Barth\(^5\) and later demonstrated by Ginsberg\(^6\) to be operative in Ugaritic also. On the basis of prima-, or medial-aleph verbs in Ugaritic, we know this to be true. Yaqtulu forms attested in Ugaritic are 'amlk ("I shall rule"), 'amr ("I shall die"); yastilu forms include 'ard ("I shall descend"), 'exr ("I shall sing"); yiqtalulu forms include 'il'ak ("I will send"), 'ilbm ("I will eat"),

---

\(^1\) E.g., IIAB, 5:77, tblk 𐤀𐤉 m'5 l5 ksp ("the mountains shall bring thee much silver") whereas IIAB, 5:100 has yblmn 𐤀𐤉 m'5 l5 ksp.

\(^2\) IIAB, 4-5:82.

\(^3\) IIAB, 4-5:87.


\(^5\) ZDMG, 4(1894), pp. 36ff.

\(^6\) Orientalia, 8(1939), pp. 319-322.
ishb (“I will smite”). The Barth–Ginsberg law tends to be obscure in some instances because of the fact that gutturals attract class vowels.

The qatil tense consistently terminates with an a vowel, but the yiqtol may terminate with any one of the three vowels indicated by the aleph signs. Since there is no special sign for vowelless aleph, we assume that the aleph–1 sign is used to indicate vowelless endings. The fact that in the third masculine singular, any one of the three aleph signs may be used in the yiqtol of final aleph verbs has led to the conclusion that the Ugaritic yiqtol form may represent three different moods: indicative (yaqtula), subjunctive (yaqtula), and volitive–jussive (yaqtul). There is certainly no question among scholars concerning the existence of these three forms of the yiqtol; there is a difference of opinion about the significance of these forms. After a thorough study of the usage of these forms, I have concluded that we cannot neatly classify these forms on the basis of their meanings. More will be said on this later, after a survey of other research has been given.


2 Final aleph verbs attested in Ugaritic include nā'ā (“to lift”), ml’a ([D-stem] "to fill"), mr’a (“to feed”), sn’a (“to eat”), gr’a (“to call”), sn’a (“to despise”), kl’a (“to shut”), zg’a (“to go out”), h’t’a ([D-stem] "to sin"), ms’a/mb’a (“to reach”).
R. Meyer\(^1\) found an indicative-\text{yaq\texttt{u}}\text{tul} and a subjunctive-\text{yaq\texttt{u}}\text{tul} in Ugaritic but is silent about the \text{yaq\texttt{u}}\text{tul}-jussive form. Albright used a different terminology when he classed the \text{yaq\texttt{u}}\text{tul} form not as subjunctive but as volitive.\(^2\) Goetze merely referred to the three forms as indicative, subjunctive, and apocopate.\(^3\) Moran preferred the terms durative (\text{yaq\texttt{u}}\text{tul}), jussive (\text{yaq\texttt{u}}\text{tul}), and "emphatic" jussive (\text{yaq\texttt{u}}\text{tul}).\(^4\) Hammershaimb, in his intensive study of the verb, preferred the terms apocopated and subjunctive.\(^5\) Z. Harris\(^6\) believed that the proto-Semitic modal system consisted of what he termed indicative, jussive, and subjunctive. Moscati believed these three different moods were existent in the various dialects of Northwest Semitic and briefly described some of the supposed evidence for their presence in Amorite, Aramaic, and Phoenician.\(^7\)

---


\(^6\)Dialects, p. 83. Also cf. pp. 7, 8.

The preceding paragraph clearly reveals the general recognition by various scholars of the three moods of the yată, but this conclusion is reached on the basis of forms alone and not meaning. These three forms cannot be classified into three categories of meaning or usage. The lack of vowels in our inscriptions of Northwest Semitic cautions us in the assignment of moods to these yată forms. However, there are also other clues to help in finding moods. In Phoenician, the distinction between indicative and subjunctive is expressed in the third person plural by the presence of -a in the indicative and its absence in the subjunctive. The same is true of Biblical Aramaic.

In each of the following paragraphs I shall discuss the possibilities of these three moods in Ugaritic.

The most common mood, the indicative is found in the stock phrase yë'u ʾāh ʾyṣḥ, ("he lifts his voice and cries"). There are many examples of yāt forms terminating in ʾu and used in the sense of the indicative mood. I have not found any examples of yāt forms terminating in ʾi or ʾa which must, without any question whatsoever, be interpreted as the indicative mood. There are some such forms in broken passages, and some in unclear passages, but none which must

---


be considered as indicative.

The \text{yiq\text{al}} forms ending in 'i normally reflect a non-indicative mood. As noted in the beginning of this section, most scholars refer to this form in Ugaritic as the jussive, but I prefer to avoid a clear semantic classification. Comparison with biblical syntax and grammar can be misleading; in Hebrew, the jussive is applied to the second and third persons while cohortative is used of the first person. However, in Ugaritic the situation is quite different since we find \text{yiq\text{al}} forms other than the first person ending in 'a, and we find first person forms ending in 'i.\footnote{\text{yiq\text{al}}}^1

Goetze, in his study of the tenses of Ugaritic, concluded that the shortened, or as he called it, apocopated form, is used under five conditions in Ugaritic: (1) jussive, (2) after .roomnas that emphasizes jussive, (3) after 'al, the prohibitive negation, (4) after 'ero, "verily," (5) after  
"and, so and then." But some of these semantic categories overlap with the other \text{yiq\text{al}} forms. The subject is even further frustrated by the fact that in Ugaritic we are working primarily with poetic texts. The Amarna texts, on the other hand, are strictly non-poetic. However, it may be noted that the \text{yiq\text{al}} form in Amarna is often used of a wish, request, or command.\footnote{N.L. Moran, \textit{Orientalia}, 29(1960), pp. 1-19.} Also, in Hebrew, the jussive form is

\footnote{\text{yiq\text{al}}}^1$\text{yiq\text{al}}$ (B.H. 1:37), $\text{yqr\text{a}}$ (IIAB, 7:47), $\text{t\text{e}a\text{shm}}$ (I*AB, 2:16), and $\text{ank} \text{i\text{esp\text{a}}}$ (I*AB, 1:5).
used in a special way in poetry, and is explained by Gesenius\textsuperscript{1} on rhythmical grounds. Gordon\textsuperscript{2} spoke of the three yqtl forms as three different moods and then added that "the moods are not necessarily used with rigidity."

Albright\textsuperscript{3} believed that a yqtl form ending 'a may indicate a jussive since the aleph sign could indicate a preceding vowel in such a case, and that forms like ygr'a and tō'ī are to be read ygrā' and tō'ī'. Albright\textsuperscript{4} also found a "jussive passive" in yl'ak (yul'ak), "let them be sent."

The yaqtula form, called by most scholars subjunctive, is called volitive by Albright and Moran.\textsuperscript{5} W.L. Moran\textsuperscript{6} wrote an article entitled "Early Canaanite yaqtula". His study was based on sixty-six Amarna letters from Byblos and is very instructive inasmuch as he followed an inductive method. Of course, in this kind of study it is very difficult to distinguish the Akkadian ventive –a from the Canaanite subjunctive –a. He concluded that this yaqtula found in Amarna reflects Canaanite yaqtula which was the basis for the Hebrew

\textsuperscript{1}GK, p. 323, #109k.
\textsuperscript{2}UM, p. 58, #9:9.
\textsuperscript{3}JBL, 69(1950), p. 390.
\textsuperscript{4}BASOR, 150(1958), p. 15.
\textsuperscript{5}JBL, 69(1950), p. 389.
\textsuperscript{6}Orientalia, 29(1960), pp. 1-19.
cohortative. There may be some truth in this, but certainly much needs to be worked out yet. Why does this cohortative only appear on the first person forms in Hebrew?¹ What is the origin of the Hebrew jussive which is used only in the second and third person yet corresponds semantically to the cohortative of the first person?²

After a careful listing and study of these three different forms of the yqtl tense, I am convinced that we do not have sufficient evidence to arrange distinct semantic categories for these forms. First, we must possess more final aleph yqtl forms, and second, we must have more non-poetic texts for evaluation. The difference in the use of moods in Semitic is considerable. A survey of the moods in Akkadian, Arabic, and Hebrew reveals distinctions not only in use but in forms themselves. Moreover, the moods of Hebrew are based on a later and artificial approach to the language. If we possessed vocalized Northwest Semitic prose texts, our interpretation of Canaanite moods might be quite different.

In addition to the yaatulu tense, Goetze believed there was a yeqattal tense in Ugaritic. Others have followed him in this view; on the basis of the evidence from

¹It is found on other forms in Ugaritic, e.g., ymz'a (B.B. 1:37).

²First person yqtl forms are found ending in 'i in Ugaritic, e.g., 'isp'i (I*AB, 1:5).
Amarna, R. Meyer and O. Rössler considered the yaqattal form existent in old Canaanite.

Some of these scholars just mentioned believe there is evidence in Qumran to support this view. Goetze calls this tense the "present-future" in contrast to the "imperfect" which he claims is used primarily as past tense in narration. At one time, Albright wrote that he agreed with Goetze, as opposed to the Ginsberg and Gordon interpretation of the Ugaritic verbal system just then published in Ugaritic Grammar by Gordon. I am not certain whether Albright still retains this view but Gordon, Ginsberg, Held, Rosenthal, Friedrich, and many others do not discuss any such form as a Ugaritic yaqattal.

As a piece of evidence for his theory, Goetze cited mh t'aršān ("What do you want?"). But I would interpret this verb, not as taʾarrāšan(m)u, but as the D-stem taʾarrīšan(m)u.

In addition to these G-stem active forms, a G-stem passive was also used in Ugaritic and Hebrew. Many outlines

---

1VT, Suppl. 7(1959), p. 311.
2ZDMG, 100(1951), pp. 461-514.
5IAB, 2:14.
6Feminine singular.
of Hebrew grammar list the N-stem as the passive of the G-stem, but the G-stem had its own passive form. Confusion had arisen because the consonantal orthography was the same for both G-stem and D-stem passives. For some unknown reason, the Massoretes vocalized many G-stem passives as if they were D-stem passives. Consequently, a suspect form is a vocalized D-passive form which does not have a corresponding D-active form; such forms are probably G-stem passive forms.

On the basis of comparative study, the qtl passive was vocalized quttal, the yqtl as yuqatalu, and the participle qattal. Notice the vocalization in these Amarna letters: tu-ul-qu mātuka ("your country is being taken"); ana ámēnā klä tu-da-nu-na, ("I sent] for horses but they were not given"). Also note Ugaritic yl'ak (yul'ak) "Let him be sent."

Participles

Orthographically, participles in Ugaritic are not

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1}}qtl could represent either the D-stem passive quttal or the G-stem passive qatal, and yqtl could be either N-stem yiqqatāl or G-stem passive yuqatal (\textit{OX}, pp. 140-141, #52e).

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{2}}G. Bergsträsser, \textit{Hebräische Grammatik}, II, #15e.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{3}}\textit{EA}, 83:15,16.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{4}}Also cf. yulqu in \textit{EA}, 86:11.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{5}}\textit{EA}, 83:23.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{6}}\textit{PBU}, II, 12:36.
distinguishable from the infinitives or third masculine singular or plural forms. Roots containing the aleph sign could provide a valuable clue, but primarily the analysis must be based on context and cognate usage.

Probably many of the professional or guild titles are simple active participles.\(^1\) This may be the case with šr ("singer"), mk\(^2\) ("merchant"), ml\(^3\) ("cymbalist?"), ġzą\(^4\) ("shearer"), hr\(^5\) ("artisan"), sb′u ("soldier"), ps\(^6\) ("sculptor"), ḫp\(^7\) ("baker"), and ḫh\(^8\) ("weaver"). Rarely is a Š-stem participle, such as ml\(^9\) ("wet-nurse"), used in this way.

This G-stem active participle may also be used in the literary texts as denoting a temporary action as in Hebrew: ḥd ("the one holding"), sp′u ("the one eating"),

---

\(^1\)This statement is based upon the existence of such Canaanite forms as Hebrew špēh ("baker") and ūrēg ("weaver").

\(^2\)Corpus, 71:75; 75:3; 76:4.

\(^3\)PRU, II, 26:R13.


\(^5\)WUS, #976.

\(^6\)Corpus, 82:B,4; PRU, II, 24:R18,19.

\(^7\)PRU, II, 133:5; 40:10; V, 94:4,5.


\(^9\)From the root yna ("to suck"), Akkadian enēqu, Hebrew ūnēq. The word is found in IIIK, 2:28.
1 ("the one plastering"), rhes ("the one washing") and hth2
("the one gathering").

Gordon3 suggested that Ugaritic may contain two
forms of the D-stem passive: the expected *gatulu and also,
as in Arabic, a *maqatulu form. Ugaritic has the Canaanite
*gatulu form, but I do not find evidence for a *maqatulu
form in Canaanite. Gordon4 gave as examples of this passive
participle, the three words: strht ("bride"), mad ("beloved"),
and mas ("loaded one"). Aistleitner5 analyzed strht as a
D-stem passive participle; however, without vocalization,
there are other possibilities of such forms with prefixed
m-. Gordon6 connected mad ("beloved") with a root *wdd,
but I do not know of such a root;7 Akkadian dđd8 ("darling
favorite") suggests a medial-weak root. His last example,
mas ("loaded one") is correctly related to the root ma9
("to carry"), but there is no evidence for comparing its

---

1 Hebrew tαh.
2 Hebrew hēteb (Deuteronomy 29:10).
3 UM, p. 63, #9:20.
4 Ibid.
5 WUS, #2803.
6 UM, p. 63, #9:20.
7 Aistleitner compared the word to Arabic wadda, and
Akkadian madđdū but Akkadian madđdū means "to measure."
8 CAD, D, p. 20.
9 Hebrew ma. 

---
form to that of Arabic *maqtalu. I do not know of any forms of this kind in Canaanite, and without vocalization, we should be cautious in such a comparison.

Other examples of the various participles in the derived stems are treated in those sections discussing such stems.

Infinitives

Again, as with the G-stem participles, the orthography of the infinitive is not different from several other forms. The presence of infinitives in Ugaritic must be decided on the basis of context and usage, with particular reference to the uses of the infinitive in Hebrew. I do not consider Ugaritic as possessing two infinitives; there is only the *qatalu form which is used in various ways corresponding to the uses of the infinitive absolute and the infinitive construct in Hebrew.

As in Hebrew, the infinitive can be used to emphasize an action:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mtm 'amt} & \quad \text{"I shall surely die"} \quad \text{(IID, 6:38)} \\
\text{brkm ybrk} & \quad \text{"He indeed blesses"} \quad \text{(IIIK, 2:18)}
\end{align*}
\]

As these examples reveal, enclitic -m may be found on the infinitive. There may be a proclitic 1- on the finite verb in \( \text{yd}^c \text{ lyd}^c 1 \) which is found in a broken context.

\[1 \text{VIAB, 5:21.} \]
Another uncertain example is נקֵר תָּקֵר¹ ("[she] locks herself in"). This is Ginsberg's² translation, and he indicates in a footnote that this translation is implied by the parallelism, but the etymology is difficult. Also, Ginsberg³ translated (in italics!) מַזל יָמָל⁴ ("He gropes his way").

This same use of the infinitive may be found with the qṭl form of the finite verb in such examples as רָבָּה רַבְּת⁵ ("Have you been hungry?") and לָמְעַו לְמִית⁶ ("Have you been thirsty?"). I have translated these as the past tense but of course in poetry, the tense distinction is often not maintained, as far as translation or meaning is concerned. In Hebrew the infinitive absolute used as emphasis is regularly used with the yqṭl form. Its use here with the qṭl is unusual.

In Hebrew, this infinitive is sometimes placed after the finite verb to stress continual action.⁷ This may be the case with יָסְדִי יָסְדָע.⁸ However, the infinitive following

---

¹IK, 98,99.
²ANET², p. 143.
³Ibid.
⁴IK, 100,101,188.
⁵IIAB, 4:33.
⁶IIAB, 4:34.
⁷OK, p. 343, #113r.
⁸IRp., B:10.
a finite verb can also be used to simply emphasize the action.\(^1\)

The infinitive in Ugaritic can also be used as the infinitive construct of Hebrew is used. But again the orthography often leaves us in doubt about whether we are dealing with infinitives, nouns, or participles. In §3.51,52, we find the two phrases \(ba\ n\bar{e}g\) ("in kissing"), and \(bb\bar{e}q\) ("in embracing"). Since these phrases are used adverbially in their context, this can be compared to the same form in Hebrew where the preposition is prefixed to the infinitive construct form. A clear case of such an infinitive construct form used adverbially would be \(bn\bar{e}i\ b\bar{h}\) ("when he looked"). Notice the genitive case ending here, "in the lifting of his eyes." It is less likely that this aleph-i sign indicates a vowelless ending on the infinitive. Elsewhere\(^3\) I have indicated why I believe that words in construct still retained their final vowel. But I would not be dogmatic about the infinitive construct form in particular; it is possible that this is one construct form that was without a final vowel. I say this because of such forms as \(bbk\ Krt\) ("while Keret wept").\(^5\)

---

\(^1\)IK, p. 343, #113r.
\(^2\)IIAB, 2:12.
\(^3\)See the section on the construct forms of nouns.
\(^4\)IK, 60.
\(^5\)If the final vowel were preserved on this infinitive, we would expect \(bb\bar{k}\).
CHAPTER VII

DERIVED STEMS

The D-Stem

Various designations have been used for the derived conjugations of the Semitic languages, but I believe there may be a trend now towards uniform terminology. The system which works conveniently for Ugaritic, Hebrew, Akkadian, and other Semitic languages is the one which labels the gal or simple stem as G, the intensive or piel stem as D, and the causative as Š, H, or 'A. Infixed features can then be identified as Ct, Št, etc.

Noteworthy in Ugaritic is the D-stem yatil form vocalized with an a class vowel in its preformative; a feature corresponding to the Hebrew D-stem yatal form,¹ but in contrast to the u preformative vowel found in Arabic and Akkadian.

'abq₃ "I shall seek"  

tn t'elm 'am'id "Grant that I may multiply kin"  

'sgrbk⁴ "I shall bring you near"  

IAB, 4:44²  

IK, 58³  

NK, 27

¹Cf. BL, p. 281, #38h; p. 323, #45b.  
²Used only in the D-stem in Hebrew, e.g., 'abaq₃.  
³For Ginsberg's restoration, see Corpus, p. 62, n. 14.  
⁴Note the use of this verb in the D-stem in Hebrew.
In these examples, the aleph-plus-vowel sign indicates the nature of the preformative vowel. Such forms as these are easily recognized as D-stem qatl forms on the basis of their vocalization. For examples of the aleph-sign indicating closed syllables or yaqtilu type forms, see the section on the aleph signs.

In contrast to G-stem participles, D-stem participles are easily recognized in Ugaritic by their form, or orthography, since they are characterized by a prefixed m-. An example of the D-stem feminine participle is found in mmml'at.²

However, D-stem qatl forms cannot be recognized on the basis of orthography, but must be recognized by context and comparison to Hebrew usage. For example, the word lmd in Hebrew means "to learn"³ in the G-stem but "to teach."⁴

---

¹Used only in the D-stem in Hebrew.

²IK, 114.217. Hebrew used the D-stem of this verb in reference to filling with water (Genesis 21:19; I Kings 18:35).

³The form lmd is found in the colophon of IAB, 6:54 where it must signify "taught, dictated" as in Psalm 60:1.

⁴almdk ("I will teach you") is found in IIID, 1:29. Aistleitner (WUS, #1469) incorrectly listed this occurrence as IIID, 6:29.
in the D-stem; kly means "to end" in the G-stem but "to make end" in the D-stem; hwy means "to live" in the G-stem but "to make live" in the D-stem. Thus, some Ugaritic D-stems can be recognized by their usage, meaning, and context, if the orthography does not provide the clue.

Another D-stem form that can be detected on the basis of orthography is the yql form of prima-verbs. Since this n does not assimilate because of the intervening vowel, it will serve as a clue to a D-stem form. Such forms are tngth₁ (tanazzitiyhu) and tngznh₂ from the root ngt ("to wander")³ and ynh⁴ from the root nht ("to descend").⁵

The N-Stem

N-stem forms are difficult to find in Ugaritic since our texts are largely poetic where the yql form prevails (the orthography is usually⁶ the same for the yql forms of G and N-stems). Again, our judgment must be based upon context and comparison to the other Canaanite dialects.

---

¹IAB, 2:27.
²VIAB, 5:17.
³Cf. Akkadian naggū ("to wander aimlessly"). Not to be confused with Ugaritic ngū ("to approach, meet").
⁴IIIAB, A,11,16.
⁵Hebrew nahšt.
⁶One exception would be the prima-verbs where the n would not assimilate in the yql N-stem form.
One example of an N-stem ygl form may be \textit{\textit{tntkn}}\textsuperscript{1} ("His tears are shed"). Compare this to \textit{\textit{ytk}}\textsuperscript{3} ("His tears are shed"). Gordon listed, as an example of a N-stem ygl form, \textit{\textit{yt'adm}}\textsuperscript{5} ("You redden/rouge yourself"). Orthographically this is possible, but it should be noted that Hebrew uses a D-stem\textsuperscript{7} of this verb but never a N-stem form. Therefore, in such a case, I prefer to consider this form as a D-stem as it is used in Hebrew. Gordon believed the same about \textit{\textit{mh t'arén}}\textsuperscript{8} ("What do you ask?"), but again, I prefer to consider this as a D-stem.

The paucity of evidence for the N-stem in Ugaritic has raised some serious questions in my mind. In the gtl forms, the prefixed \textit{n-} of the N-stem provides clear evidence in the orthography, but these forms are very rare in Ugaritic. Most of the N-stem gtl forms listed by Aistleitner,

\textsuperscript{1}From the root \textit{ntk} ("to flow, trickle"). Hebrew \textit{n\textsuperscript{2}t\textsuperscript{k}}.
\textsuperscript{2}\textit{IK}, 23.
\textsuperscript{3}G-stem passive.
\textsuperscript{4}\textit{ID}, 82. In all other places (IAB, I, 10; IIK, 1:28; IK, 28, Corpus, 27:11) this word is written with the prothetic aleph; therefore, we probably face a scribal error in this passage.
\textsuperscript{5}\textit{IK}, 62.
\textsuperscript{6}\textit{UM}, p. 66, \#9:30. He emphasized this is not a G-stem form; but nobody is debating that. Is it \textit{n} or D-stem?
\textsuperscript{7}The D-stem participle (\textit{\textit{m\textsuperscript{2}t\textsuperscript{dd\textsuperscript{m}m\textsuperscript{m}}}) is found in Exodus 25:5; 26:14; 35:7 where it is used of reddened skins.
\textsuperscript{8}\textit{IAB}, 2:13.
Hammershaimb, Gordon and others are very dubious. Gordon suggested nkbd$^1$ as a N–participle but this entire line is questionable since there are no word dividers and the words could be divided differently.$^2$ Hammershaimb considered the forms nht'u and ntkp$^3$ as examples of the N–stem gtl form.$^4$ Again the orthography itself is ambiguous; a ngtl form could be the third person singular or plural masculine of the gtl form N–stem or the first person plural of the yglf form G–stem. In such cases the context must decide. Albright$^5$ apparently interpreted ntkp$^6$ as the first person plural yglf form because he translated it "we press" but nht'u was translated by him "We have been shattered."$^7$

In summary, the following considerations should be kept in mind when evaluating the N–stem of Ugaritic: (1) the G–stem passive was evidently used more extensively in Ugaritic than in biblical Hebrew, (2) the reflexive and reciprocal action was often indicated by the infix –t– in the verb, (3) we have few, if any, gtl verbal forms, with which we can confirm

$^1$Corpus, 34:2.


$^3$Corpus, 53:8,14.


$^5$BASOR, 82(1941), p. 46.

$^6$Corpus, 53:8,14.

$^7$BASOR, 82(1941), p. 46.
the N-stem on the basis of orthography. The only conclusive evidence for the N-stem is the y吉利 form of the prima -n verb ntk which is found as tntkn.

The Š-Stem

An interesting phenomenon in Canaanite is the diverse designations used for the causative: Ugaritic used the Š-stem, Hebrew the H-stem, and Phoenician the Y-stem. Aramaic, on the other hand, used the 'A-stem. Sometimes there can be identified a loan from one dialect to another; Hebrew regularly uses the Š-stem of the root hwy1 with the meaning of "to bow down", and the Š-stem is sometimes also found in Aramaic2 where it sometimes reflects Akkadian influence. Z. Harris tried to explain these various causative formations on the basis of linguistic evolution. He believed that both the H-stem and Š-stem causative forms existed in proto-Semitic, and that the Canaanite languages came from the section which had used the H-stem, except that in Ugaritic (or its parent dialect) the Š-stem form became accepted later on.3 However, he does not produce the evidence to support this view. The evidence from the conflate forms found in the Amarna letters is difficult since the Š-stem is the regular causative in Akkadian. However, we have an example of an H-stem causative

1UM, p. 262, #619.
2BR, p. 92, #261.
3Z. Harris, op.cit., p. 6.
from Amarna in EA, 256:7, hi-hh-be-e, which is an H-stem causative form of the Hebrew word הִסָּפַר ("to hide").

Since the š-stem represents the normal causative in Ugaritic, I shall discuss these forms first and then later discuss the theories about other possible causative stems in Ugaritic.

An example of a qatl form in the š-stem (ṣaqtila) is found in dšly ẓn ldgm¹ ("which ẓn erected to Dam."). In another text² the same form, only in the feminine (dšlyt) is found.³

Examples of the qatl forms in the š-stem include the following: ʾašhk⁴ ("I will cause to flow"); ʾašsprk⁵ ("I will make thee count").

The imperative is, as in other stems, the qatl form minus the preformative, for example, ʾılm ("feed!").⁶

Participles in the š-stem include ʾešntr⁷ ("wet-

¹UM, p. 150, text #70.
²UM, p. 150, text #69.
³Apparently these two small texts were not included by Herdner in her Corpus. They are listed on the table in her index (p. xxxii), but I have been unable to locate them in her book.
⁴VAB, E, 32.
⁵IID, 6:28,92. Notice the š-stem - G-stem sequence (ʾašsprk-ṭapr) of identical verbs here. Also note the factitive-passive sequence of identical verbs pointed out by M. Held (JBL, 84[1965], p. 273).
⁶IID, 5:19.
⁷IIIK, 2:28.
nurses"; մեսպատ, 1 ("mourner"); մես'ւ, 2 ("one who releases").

As we turn to investigate other possible causative stems in Ugaritic, we are confronted with an array of theories and conjecture but no solid evidence. Such scholars as Albright, Goetze, Harris and Hammershaimb have found Ի-stem and 'A-stem causatives in Ugaritic. Some of these theories were set forth at a very early period of Ugaritic studies; however, as late as 1957, Dahood 4 wrote an article entitled, "Some Aphel Causatives in Ugaritic".

The two men (Goetze, Hammershaimb) who have written the most complete and systematic studies of the Ugaritic verbal system concluded that there are non-Զ-stem causatives in Ugaritic. Goetze, 5 in his lengthy study of tenses admitted the Զ-stem is the normal indication of the causative, yet he listed such a stem as the Itt'el for ԵԵԵԵ, 6 ("she is calmed down") and ԵԵԵԵ 7 ("he lies sunken"). Hammershaimb 8 went much

---

1 ID, 172.
2 ID, 1:28.
6 VAB, 2:27.
7 B.H. 2:55.
further, and listed the following categories: סָפָּגֵל, חִיפָּגֵל ('אֱל), חָוֶּגֵל, חֵיתָגֵל, חֵיתָגֵל (הֵיתָגֵל), Reflexive (Arabic V form), and 'יַסְתָּגֵל! In the following paragraphs I shall briefly discuss the methodology and results of Hammershaimb's study.

First of all, it is important to note that Hammershaimb indicated that he had no examples of יָגְּתָל forms in the N-stem (חָטִל) or 'A-stem ('גְּתֵל). This is extremely important for it is in such forms that the prefix would be evident in the orthography of Ugaritic. All of his examples are from יָגְּתִל or other such forms which are ambiguous as far as the spelling is concerned. In some of his examples with the infix -י-, he was misled by other considerations such as incorrect root analysis or confusion of the preformative י- with that of the infix -ו-. His discussion of these forms covers thirty-two pages of his book so I can only be selective in presenting and criticizing his approach.

Some of his examples are of יָגְּתִל forms which could be interpreted on the basis of orthography as G, D, or 'A/H stems. For example, he gave this form as representing the N-stem: מָלֵק ("we will make king") and then stated that this could be also taken as a יָגְּתִל 'A-stem form. He pointed out that in Hebrew this verb (מָלֵק) is not used in the D-stem.

1The יָגְּתִל form could represent G-stem (יָגְּתָל), D-stem (יָגָגָטֵל), N-stem (יָגְּתִל), or H-stem (יָגָטֵל).
2IAB, 1:26.
but is frequently used in the H-stem.

Although Hammershaimb, in his study of Ugaritic, made constant comparison with Hebrew, he failed to recognize the archaic character of Ugaritic orthography as compared to Hebrew orthography. In the following paragraph I will give one example of what I have in mind.

The original form of the H-stem qtl must have been haqtil; which in turn became yahasqtil after the preformative ya- of the qtl form was prefixed to it. After the syncopation of the -h-, in the qtl form, the *yahasqtil > yasqtil. If there is any doubt about this evolution, further evidence can be found from the imperative form, which is found in all stems by omitting the preformative element from the qtl form. When the preformative is removed from the *yasqtil form yahasqtil, the resultant imperative form is haqtil which is the form found in the Hebrew Bible. In our Hebrew texts, as they now stand, syncopation of -h- has taken place in several areas. However, in Ugaritic I do not know of any cases of such syncopation, or consonantal elision. In fact, I do not know of any cases in Ugaritic of the syncopation, aphaeresis, or

---

1 For the morphology and evolution of such forms see the following discussions: BL, p. 329, #46a; Bergsträsser, op. cit., II, p. 107, #1910.

2 For the syncopation of *-h- in Hebrew, see BL, p. 329, #46a; Bergsträsser, I, pp. 94-95, #16a-e.

3 Note the syncopation of -h- in the pronominal suffixes (Bergsträsser, op. cit., #16d,e) and in proper names (BL, p. 223, #25c -d; Bergsträsser, I, p. 94, #16c).
apocopeation of any consonant. The omission of \( y \) and \( y' \) in some cases is not due to aphaeresis, syncopation, or apocopeation but rather to monophthongisation.\(^1\) Nor are there any cases in Ugaritic where the \( y' \) is dropped. Such facts again emphasize the archaic character of Ugaritic orthography in contrast to the later, sometimes defective orthography of Hebrew. In summary, I see no reason why the \( H \) or \( 'A \) or \( Y \) indicators of these causative stems should be omitted from the archaic orthography of the Ugaritic yqtl forms.

For examples of the 'ifta\(^6\)el in Ugaritic, Hammer-shainb\(^2\) gave yrth\(^3\) ("He washed himself") and tmth\(^4\) ("she fights"). I prefer to consider these examples in the G-stem with the reflexive or reciprocal action reflected in the infixed \(-t\) of the form. The simple orthography of such forms would permit analysis as other forms. However, the D-stem is ruled out because I do not know of any unquestionable D-stem forms that contain an infixed \(-t\). It is probably safe to state that the infixed \(-t\) does not occur in the D-stem in Ugaritic.

Hammershainb\(^5\) found 'aphel imperatives in such forms

---

\(^1\)See the sections on diphthongs and also the sections on prima and medial \( w \) and \( y \) verbs.

\(^2\)Op. cit., p. 44.

\(^3\)IK, 156.

\(^4\)IAB, 6:24.

as \( \text{\texttt{kn}}^1 \) ("prepare!")\(^2\) and \( \text{\texttt{bn}}^3 \) ("take notice!").\(^4\) He\(^5\) found an hophal form in \( \text{\texttt{umlk}}.\(^6\)

Z. Harris\(^7\) pointed out that Akkadian and Minaen which have third person pronouns \( \text{\texttt{3}} \) and \( \text{\texttt{6}} \) respectively, have \( \text{\texttt{5}} \)-stem and \( \text{\texttt{6}} \)-stem causative forms, and Arabic, Sabaeen, Ethiopic, Aramaic, Hebrew and Phoenician which have third person pronouns in \( \text{\texttt{h}} \) have \( \text{\texttt{H}} \)-stem or \( \text{\texttt{A(Y)}} \)-stem causative forms. Thus, in view of the Ugaritic personal pronoun \( \text{\texttt{h}} \), it would not be surprising to find an \( \text{\texttt{H}} \)-stem causative. However, the only non-\( \text{\texttt{5}} \) causatives which Harris can find are those in the \( \text{\texttt{yqtl}} \) forms where the orthography is ambiguous.\(^8\)

Albright\(^9\) also — at least years ago — found non-\( \text{\texttt{5}} \) causatives in Ugaritic. He considered \( \text{\texttt{abn}}^{10} \) ("look at!") as

\(^1\text{IK, 15.}\

\(^2\)His translation was based on \( \text{\texttt{akh}} \) which should be now read with Cassuto and Ginsberg, \( \text{\texttt{thn}} \) (Corpus, p. 62, n. 2).

\(^3\text{IK, 117.}\

\(^4\)The word \( \text{\texttt{abn}} \) represents a noun (Hebrew \( \text{\texttt{chbn, "stone"}} \) not a verb. The phrase \( \text{\texttt{abn yak}} \) refers to \"your handstones\" in parallel to \( \text{\texttt{thk}} \) \"your arrows\".

\(^5\)Op. cit., p. 41. This is from the phrase \( \text{\texttt{umlk ubmlk}} \) ("whether king or not"). Many of Hammershaimb's examples are like this, where he divided the words incorrectly.

\(^6\)IIAB, 7:43.

\(^7\)"The Expression of the Causative in Ugaritic," JAOS, 58(1938), p. 103.

\(^8\)This was the same problem with Hammershaimb's examples which have already been discussed.

\(^9\)BASOR, 63(1936), p. 27.

\(^{10}\text{IK, 117.}\)
the causative imperative of the root *byn,1 and found another
causative imperative in *agzryn2 ("feed ye!")3 from the root
gzr,4 ("to eat voraciously").5 Also he took *nyn,6 *usn'al7
("right and left") as infinitive passives of the 'aphel stem.8

M. Dahood9 took the word 'adr10 ("cut!") as an 'aphel
imperative of the root dry. This word 'adr has been rendered
a variety of translations: J. Gray translated it as "Goodli-
ness"11 and connected it with the word 'adr in Hebrew meaning
"noble"12; Albright and Mendenhall translated the form "I

1BASOR, 63(1936), p. 30, n. 53. He compared Ugarit-
ic *abn to Hebrew hābin.
2S.S., 58.
5Ibid.
6Albright compared this to Hebrew hēmim ("to turn
right") which is used intrinsively, and interpreted this
Ugaritic form as an infinitive absolute passive ("He turned
right") of the 'afel. (BASOR, 71[1938], p. 37).
7S.S., 64,65.
8BASOR, 71(1938), p. 37, n. 19.
9"Some Aphel Causatives in Ugaritic", Biblica, 38
(1957), p. 65.
10IAB, 2:31.
11PEQ, 1953, p. 119.
12J. Gray, Legacy of Canaan (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1957),
p. 38, n. 5.
vowed"; Gaster understood it to signify "strength"; Ginsberg took it to mean "plenty". The same form appears in some other uncertain passages. However, 'adr does not provide evidence for a 'A-stem in Ugaritic.

Dahood also found an *aphel causative in the form 'arb ("rain down") in the following passage: sk šlm lkb'd
'arg 'arb dd lkb'd šdm ("pour peace into the earth's bowels, rain down love into the heart of the fields"). There has been a question about the division of this last line: Cassuto and Aistleitner gave the same division of words as above, but Goetze disagreed.

As a summary to this section on the causative stem, it must be admitted first of all - in fact, all scholars do - that the Š-stem is the regular causative stem in Ugaritic. Secondly, it must be noted that no H-stem, 'A-stem, or Y-stem causatives in the qtl tense have been produced and clearly confirmed. Many examples have been given for the qgtl form, but since this spelling is always ambiguous, nothing is proved. Finally, no one has given any reason why the H or 'A or Y indicator of such a

---

1 JNES, 1(1942), p. 228.
2 Thespis, p. 284.
4 PRU, II, 151:5, Corpus, 140:2.
6 VAB, C, 13,14.
causative stem should be missing from the normal qatal form. The Ș of the causative is found in both the qal and qatal forms. Since the letters H, 'A, and Y are not "weak" in Ugaritic as they sometimes are in Hebrew, we should also expect their presence in both the qal and qatal forms of derived stems.

**Infixed -t-**

This infixed -t- form is also found in the other early Canaanite dialects, but in a later period it dropped out of the Canaanite languages; however, it is found in other Semitic languages. It is attested only in the early period of Phoenician,\(^1\) and is also found in the Moabite inscription. That it was a feature of early Canaanite may be reflected in some Canaanite geographical names which retain this infixed -t-.\(^2\)

Only qatal forms have this infixed -t- and it is not found in the D-stem, although it is attested in both the G-stem and Ș-stem.

Since the infixed -t- basically denotes reflexive or reciprocal action, and it does not take a direct object. Here are some examples of its use:

\(^1\) E. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, p. 43.

\(^2\) 'eštā'šl (Judges 13:25) or 'aštā'šl (Joshua 15:33), 'elēqāʾ (Joshua 19:44) or 'elēqāʾ (Joshua 21:23), and 'ēstāmāc (Joshua 21:14).
'imthq
yrthq
trtqš
y'itsp
ytš'u

"I shall fight"
"He washes himself"
"It swoops"
"It gathers to itself"
"He lifts himself"

VAB, 3:43
IK, 156
IIIAB, A:15
IK, 18
IID, 5:6

Of course in prima nun or prima y or ū verbs, it is easy to confuse the infixed -t- with a radical of the root. This could be the case with wtqš which occurs in the difficult passage 'ištmc wtqš 'udn1 which is translated by Gordon, Ginsberg, and Driver in the general sense of "listen! and incline (thine) ear!"2 Apart from context such a form as wtqš could easily represent a prima -n or prima -t verb as well as a prima -ū verb. Ginsberg3 suggested that wtqš is from the Arabic root yacīzī ("to [be] awake") and that 'ištmc is from the root ēm4 ("to hear") with a prothetic 'i. But I see two problems to this interpretation: 1) I do not know of any prothetic aleph used in Ugaritic in this manner, 2) forms with infixed -t- do not take direct objects.

For some clear examples of prima -n and prima -ū or ū verbs with infixed -t-, see the sections discussing these two classes of verbs.

The infixed -t- is used consistently in the ū-stem

1IIK, 6:42.
2Ginsberg, "List and incline thine ear" (ANET2, p. 149); Gordon, "Listen and be alert of ear" (UL, p. 82); Driver, "Hearken and do thou lend(?) an ear" (CML, p. 47).
of the root הָּוָּי ("to bow").\(^1\) This word has been carried over into our Hebrew Bible in this same form. Other סַת forms are rare and difficult. The word ṭָּוַּהַּּהַּ ("to bow") is not translated by Ginsberg,\(^3\) but Gordon\(^4\) translated it "puts whiteness". Driver\(^5\) divided the form into ṭָּוַּהַּּהַּ סַת. Although the context is difficult, this is not a סַת form.\(^6\) Other such examples of סַת forms are difficult also. Aistleitner\(^7\) considered סַת לַּמּ ("kin") as a סַת participle feminine dual of the root סַל.\(^9\)

Suffixed -n

This form is found only in the wqtl forms of Ugaritic

---

\(^1\) This word has incorrectly been considered a hjqtl form from the root אָה (BDB, p. 1005; L. Koehler-W. Baumgarten, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, [1953], p. 959).

\(^2\) ID, 10.

\(^3\) ANET, p. 153.

\(^4\) UL, p. 94.

\(^5\) Although there is no word divider, this same division is presented in Corpus, p. 87.

\(^6\) Notice סַת was used just two lines before, in this same passage.

\(^7\) NUS, #2028.

\(^8\) S.S., 31, 35, 36.

\(^9\) This is hardly possible. The context demands something more like Gaster's translation of "in both of his hands." (Thespius, p. 427). Cf. Hebrew סַלּ ("handful"). Thus, סַת לַּמּ is not an example of a סַת form.
and Hebrew. In Phoenician there is a n retained after long vowels, as in Aramaic and Arabic. But this must be different from the suffixed -n in Ugaritic which is also found on singular forms. Without the preservation of the original vocalization we can only vocalize on the basis of comparison to Hebrew. Moreover, the Ugaritic orthography does not reveal whether the n was doubled or not. It is usually compared to the Hebrew energetic -n and thus Gordon vocalized it "yagulanna.¹ Since the doubled nun is not orthographically indicated, when we find -nn terminating a form we must conclude that such letters are separated by a vowel. As I described in the section on pronominal suffixes, I take such forms as indicative of energetic nun plus the pronominal suffixes, e.g., trhem² ("she washes him") and tḥt'ann³ ("they rouse him")⁴.

The exact significance of this suffixed -n is elusive. We do know that it was used often in the Amarna tablets, but in the poetry of Ugaritic it could be used for merely stylistic or ballast reasons. This sounds like an easy dismissal of such a phenomenon but compare these two

¹UM, p. 58, 9:8.
²IIK, 6:10.
³ID, 151.
⁴ḥṭ'ā in the ū-stem is attested only in this one passage. See the translation of Ginsberg (ANET², p. 154).
passages which are apparently identical in meaning although one has this suffixed -n:

\[ \text{'igr'a 'ilm n}_1^{\text{cm}1} \]  
\[ \text{'igr'an 'ilm n}_2^{\text{cm}2} \]  
- "I will invoke the pleasing gods."

It is strange to find the -n on a first person verbal form; it is normally found on the third person forms. However, in Hebrew a suffixed -n is also found on the second person qatal forms. 3

Gesenius believed that in some cases a suffixed nun was used merely for euphonnic reasons, or to avoid hiatus before י or ע. 4 Hammershaimb, after his study of forms with suffixed -n, failed to find any semantic significance. 5
Neither have I been able to discern any semantic significance to this Canaanite feature of the suffixed -n.

Other Stems
The D-stem of the medial י or י verbs is commonly termed the pûel or, with Gordon, 6 the L-stem. Here are some examples of this stem:

1s.s., 1.
2s.s., 23.
3\text{Bergsträsser, op. cit.}, II, p. 19, 5a,b.
4\text{SK}, p. 128.
5\text{op. cit.}, pp. 110-117.
6\text{UM}, p. 67, #9:32.
dyknmh

"who established him"

IIAB, 4-5:48

hš rm

"hurry, erect!"

IIAB, 5:114

tōrk

"it arouses you"

IIAB, 4:39

In cases where the third radical is also y or y, the second radical is then doubled instead of the third radical: kyhw

"when he gives life”.

Aistleitner listed mārm ("singers") as an example of the L-stem participle from the verb ūmr ("to sing") but in Hebrew the G-stem participle mārim is used to designate "singers". Moreover, the passage in Ugaritic actually has mārmr.

There are several four-radical roots in Ugaritic.

Two of these are actually reduplicated forms. In a passage in IIAB, 4-5:29, we read wykrkr 'ugbōθh ("and he twiddles his fingers"). Another reduplicated form is found in mārm.

1 The root is kn, Hebrew kūn, Akkadian kānu.
2 The root is rm, Hebrew rım.
3 The root is cōr, Hebrew qōr, Akkadian ṣru (CAD, E, p. 326).
4 IID, 6:30.
5 WUS, #2682.
6 Corpus, 32:18,27.
7 Amarna (EA, 107:42) has ṣa-ri-ma.
8 Corpus, 32:18,27.
9 Note the use of nūkarkṣr ("dancing") in II Samuel 6:14,16.
("to mix")\(^1\) which is only found in the hippiatric texts Corpus, 160:4; 161:27.

It is common to find liquids used, especially in second position, in four-radical roots, such as in these nouns: prə\(^2\)a\(^2\), grə\(^3\)3, and qalə\(^4\)4. Notice the liquids in the following Hebrew four-radical forms\(^5\): kram\(^6\), krbl\(^7\), prəz\(^8\), trgm\(^9\). This same feature is often true in the four-radical forms in Akkadian.\(^10\) One example of such a verb in Ugaritic is prəb\(^11\) ("to collapse"). The word səhr\(^12\) is difficult. Aistleitner\(^13\) and Gordon\(^14\) compared it to Arabic səhr\(^1\), which Gordon said means "shadeless desert."

\(^1\)Meaning derived from context.

\(^2\)IIAB, 1:36.

\(^3\)IK, 11.

\(^4\)Corpus, 161:8.

\(^5\)Bergstrasser, II, op. cit., p. 110, #20e.

\(^6\)Psalms 80:14.

\(^7\)I Chronicles 15:27.

\(^8\)Job 26:9.

\(^9\)Ezra 4:7.

\(^10\)GAG; p. 157, #108.

\(^11\)IIIAB, A, 22, 25. Aistleitner, WUS, #2274 compared this to Akkadian purastu/purasuku but the correspondence of Ugaritic k to Akkadian k is not normal.

\(^12\)IAB, 2:24; S.S., 41; B.H., 2:44.

\(^13\)WUS, #2316.

\(^14\)UM, #1624.
CHAPTER VIII

THE WEAK VERBS

Introduction

The term "weak" is used because it is common terminology in describing certain kinds of verbs in all languages. Sometimes the word "irregular" is used but this term is not accurate since these verbs are quite regular in their own way.

Also, in Hebrew, certain letters such as the ' , h, w and y became weak due to the evolution of the language, and, in our Hebrew Bibles, due to the peculiar system of vocalization indicated on the traditional consonantal text. This vocalization was merely an approximation of the pronunciation of that time.

However, in the archaic language of Ugaritic there is nothing "weak" about such letters as the ' or h. The letters w and y were weak only inasmuch as they formed diphthongs which became monophthongized. But I believe we should be cautious in our attempts to postulate hypothetical, original three radical roots for all of the so-called "weak" verbs. I have come to believe — and I am not alone — that some verbs were originally biradical just as some primitive nouns were biradical. I have in mind especially the medial w or y verbs and the geminate verbs. It is possible that
geminate verbs were artificially formed from original biradical roots. This would explain the fact that on the one hand some verbs have the same letter for the last two radicals but on the other hand we never find verbs with the first two letters the same. Moreover, it appears that in genuine Semitic roots, each radical is usually from a different phonetic class: we do not expect to find roots beginning with two labials (\(bm-, mp-,\) etc.) nor ending with two different sibilants (\(-\text{ss}, -\text{ph},\) etc.), nor two different dentals, nor two different liquids.

**Prima n**

As in Hebrew, this \(n\) assimilates to the next consonant when there is no intervening vowel. The yat\(l\) form of the root \(npl\) ("to fall") appears as yat\(l^1\) and tat\(l^2\). Notice also that the root \(lqh\) is handled in the yat\(l\) form in Ugaritic just as it is in Hebrew.\(^3\)

In cases where we have an infixed \(-t-\), the \(n\) assimilates to this \(-t-\): tat\(l^4\) \(<\text{*tantapilu}\); yat\(s^i^5\) \(<\text{*yantaši'i}\); yat\(š^u^6\) \(<\text{*yantaši'u}\).

---

1\(^{\text{IIIAB, A,5.}}\)
2\(^{\text{IIIAB, B,15.}}\)
3\(^{\text{The yat\(l\) form is yoh (VAB, A,16; S.S., 35; ID, 145).}}\)
4\(^{\text{IK, 21.}}\)
5\(^{\text{Corpus, 32:16,17,33.}}\)
6\(^{\text{IID, 5:6; ID, 21.}}\)
However, in the D-stem, where the n is separated from the next consonant by a vowel, the n is preserved in the orthography. Note the following examples which are all found in the D-stem:

\[\text{wnnng}^1 \quad \text{yqtl form of nsg}^2 \quad \text{"to kiss"} \]
\[\text{ynghn}^3 \quad \text{yqtl form of nsh}^4 \quad \text{"to butt, gore"} \]
\[\text{ynht}^5 \quad \text{yqtl form of nht}^6 \quad \text{"to bring down"} \]

In addition, in verbs which are both prima -n and medial -w, the n is preserved in the yqtl form: 'atbn 'ank w'anhn wtnh b'irty nps\(^7\) ("I will sit and rest, and my soul will be at rest in my breast").

In the imperative form, the n is not written: n'a\(^8\) ("Lift!"); sk\(^9\) ("Pour!").

In summary, the prima -n verbs in Ugaritic are written the same as in Hebrew; when there is no intervening

---

1ID, 54,71. tnšq is found in IIIRp, B, 4.
2Hebrew wayenāšeq (Genesis 32:1), Akkadian nuššugu.
3IAAB, 6:17.
4Hebrew yēnaggah (Deuteronomy 33:17).
5IIIAB, A,11,18.
6Hebrew nhta\(^t\) is apparently attested only in the gtl form of the D-stem (BDB, p. 639).
7IAAB, 3:18,19. Hebrew nūh.
8IK, 75.
9VAB, C,13; D,53.
vowel, the \( n \) assimilates to the following letter.

**Prima \( \nu \) and \( y \)**

As in the other Northwest Semitic dialects, in contrast to Arabic, original \( \nu > y \) in Ugaritic. One exception appears to be \( \nu \! pt \)\(^1\) ("to spit") an exception which may be due to onomatopoeia. Aistleitner\(^2\) and others have found other prima \(-\nu\) verbs but their examples do not stand under careful examination.

Aistleitner\(^3\) listed the root \( \nu \! th \) ("to hasten") and he noted that U. Cassuto took that form as a \( Gt \) form from the Arabic root \( \nu \! h \! b \). There is only one form \( (\nu \! th) \)\(^4\) of this verb found in Ugaritic, in three different passages. Dahood\(^5\) took the passage,\(^6\) with the obscure script on the original copy, and suggested the change of \( \nu \! th > \nu t \! th \), which means he divided the \( \nu \) sign into a \( p \)-sign and a \( t \)-sign. Of course this division leaves us with an extra wedge! His purpose in this was to find an Ugaritic equivalent for the Akkadian idiom \( \text{pet} \! t \nu \! \text{pur} \! \text{td} \) which signifies "in a moment". This is a very

---

1. IIAB, 6:13; IIAB, 3:13.
2. WUS, pp. 95-96.
3. WUS, 7:877.
4. VAB, C, 17; VAB, D, 56; VIAB, 3:11.
ingenious approach but utterly impossible here. To put it briefly, M. Dahood's theory is obviated by the simple fact that the root \( wth \) appears in two other passages where the orthography or original script is clear and unquestioned. Incidentally, Dahood thought he found this idiom in Isaiah 45:1 which he translated "I will make the kings run" instead of "I will loosen the loins of the kings". But he apparently missed the point of the Akkadian idiom which means "quick as a flash" and not merely "to run".

A prima -\( w \) verb has its initial \( w \) preserved in \( wywrnm gnh \),\(^2\) ("And his inward parts instruct him").\(^3\) I take this as a D-stem form since this same root\(^4\) is used in Hebrew, with this meaning, in the D-stem.

Prima \( w \) or \( j \) verbs are especially confusing since the form, for example, \( ybl \) could be \( qtl \) or \( yqlt \); in fact, such a form as \( ybl \) could also be an infinitive or participle. The following two examples are easily recognized as \( qtl \) forms: \( yblt \)\(^5\) ("I brought"), \( yq\text{a}'t \)\(^6\) ("It went forth"). But a form as

\(^{1}\) VAB, C, 17; VAB, D, 56.

\(^{2}\) IIK, 6:26.

\(^{3}\) For a discussion of this passage, see H.L. Ginsberg, BASOR, SS 2-3 (1946), p. 48.

\(^{4}\) Hebrew \( y\text{a}'sor \).

\(^{5}\) IIAB, 5:89.

\(^{6}\) IAB, 1:35.
yrđ could be "he descended" (yarada), or "he descends" (yəridu). The suffixed -n provides a clue to the yət form in this example: ybln ("he brings").

The root may be difficult to recognize in forms which contain an infixed -t-; for example, 'itr ("I acquire") from the root yrd. Such a form would be vocalized 'Itaritu (*'iytaritu).

The following examples are prima -w or y verbs found in the Š-stem:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'aš̄ld</td>
<td>&quot;I caused to be born&quot;</td>
<td>S.S., 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yšš'ı</td>
<td>&quot;He brings forth&quot;</td>
<td>IIK, 5:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'aš̄š'ı</td>
<td>&quot;I shall bring out&quot;</td>
<td>IIIAB, A, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, the following examples represent the imperative form of prima -w or y verbs in the G-stem:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tn</td>
<td>&quot;Give!&quot;</td>
<td>IID, 6:24; IAB, 2:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd</td>
<td>&quot;Descend!&quot;</td>
<td>IIK, 6:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z'i</td>
<td>&quot;Go forth!&quot;</td>
<td>B.H., 1:14,19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1IAB, 1:35.

2For the explanation of *diphthongs becoming monop-thongized in prima -w or y verbs, cf. the section on diph-thongs where examples are given.

3IID, 5:12.

4VAB, D, 44.

5Hebrew yəraž.

6aš̄lidu < *ašawlidu.
Medial *w* or *y*

The fact that the *w* or *y* of these verbs never appears leads me to the view that these roots were originally biconsonantal. It is much later, in Mishnaic Hebrew, that these medial *w* or *y* roots are treated as regular, strong verbs, with the doubling of the middle radical in D-stem forms. In biblical Hebrew, both the archaic, and the later forms are found, but Ugaritic used the pūlāl form.

The qātāl forms are spelled št ("He set"), gm ("He rose"), mt ("He died"). The qātāl forms are spelled ydm (y[

The imperative forms are simply the same as the qātāl minus the preformative: št\(^6\) (šmt), "set!"; tb\(^7\) (tub), "heed!"

The qātāl forms of the D-stem are easily recognized because the orthography indicates the reduplicated final radical of the root:

---

1. This medial *w* does appear in the D-stem of the root hwy (IID, 6:32). Since the final radical in this case is *y*, the medial *w* is doubled. The qātāl form would be vocalized yahawwiyū.

2. *GK*, p. 194, n. 1; p. 197, §72m.

3. IID, 5:7; ID, 23.

4. The vocalization is based on comparison to Hebrew and the nature of the *medial consonant.*

5. IIAB, 3:15; IVAB, 2:17.

6. VAB, C, 12; D, 53.

7. IID, 6:42.
trmm hklh "You erect his palace" IIAB, 6:17
'tahbt tr tcrkk "The love of the Bull arouses you" IIAB, 4:39
mlk dyknh "The king who established him" VAB, E, 44

An example of the qatil form in the š-stem would be hn 'ibm šsg ly¹ ("Behold, the foes pressed me"). An example of the yiqtol form of the š-stem is tšsg[nh² ("She seizes him").

A form of distant assimilation takes place in the yiqtol form of the root šḥ³ ("to return"). In these forms, the š of the causative stem becomes š: rm tṭḥ⁴ ("May she return the report"). Gordon⁵ called this assimilation, but it should be noted that these are not contiguous consonants according to his reconstruction (*tāṣatīb > tāṣatīb). This is the only prima-verbs which appears in the š-stem so we must be cautious in any conclusions reached on the basis of this one word. This type of assimilation seems to be found consistently in the other forms of the š-stem of this word. Notice the imperative form is wṭṭḥ ml'alm lh⁶ ("Return the messengers to him!"); and rm ḫṭṭ⁷ ("Return the report!"). Also note the

¹PRU, II, 12:27.
²IAB, 2:10.
³Hebrew šḥ.
⁴Corpus, 57:14.
⁵UM, p. 28, #5:28.
⁶IK, 136.
⁷Corpus, 57:17; 50:13.
**Final w or y**

Since w or y is preserved in intervocalic position,\(^3\) in **yqtl** forms where the final w or y is not preserved, we conclude that there was a jussive or shortened **yqtl** form and the final vowel had dropped.

Roots that terminate with -w are extremely rare in Ugaritic as in Hebrew. The Ugaritic roots 'atw\(^4\) ("to come") and šlaw\(^5\) ("to repose") are found also in Hebrew, but only šlaw is preserved in Hebrew with its original final -w. Hebrew treats 'atw as a final -y verb.

Examples of the **qtl** form of the final -w/y verbs are: bnt\(^6\) ("I built"); \(1\) 'atwt\(^7\) ("She came").\(^9\) An example of the **yqtl** form is 'ašlaw\(^10\) ("I will repose"). Examples of the

---

\(^{1}\) PRU, II, 6:17; 15:19.

\(^{2}\) Corpus, 35:45.

\(^{3}\) Examples of this may be found in the section discussing the w and y in Ugaritic.

\(^{4}\) WUS, #460.

\(^{5}\) IK, 149.

\(^{6}\) banēti (<*banayti>.

\(^{7}\) IIAB, 6:36.

\(^{8}\) 'atawat (Note the preservation of w in this intervocalic position).

\(^{9}\) IIAB, 4-5:32.

\(^{10}\) IK, 149.
imperative are **bn**¹ ("Build!") and **tny**² ("Repeat!").

The participle is **bny**³ (**bāniyu**), "Creator". The D-stem of the final $\text{-w}/y$ verb is illustrated in the **qtl** form $\text{l kl}_{4}$ ("Have I not destroyed?")⁵ and in the **yqtl** form $\text{ygly}_{6}$ ("He prays").

The following examples are of the **yqtl** form of final $\text{-w}$ verbs in the $\mathcal{S}$-stem:

| **yšcly** | "He offers up" | ID, 185 |
| **yššq** | "He gives to drink" | IID, 2:31 |
| **tššqy** | "She causes to drink" | IID, 5:29⁷ |

An example of the **qtl** form in the $\mathcal{S}$-stem is $\text{dšcly}_{8}$ ("which she set up").

**Geminate Verbs**

Gordon⁹ had very little to say about the geminate

---

¹ **IIAB**, 4-5:80.
² **II*AB**, 2:9; **IIAB**, 8:31.
³ **IAB**, 3-4:5,11.
⁴ **kalliti** (<<kalliyyti).
⁵ **VAB**, D, 36.
⁶ **yashallyu** (ID, 39).
⁷ Hebrew also uses the causative stem of this verb with the meaning "to give to drink" in contrast to the G-stem which means "to drink". Akkadian uses two different words for these concepts: $\text{šatū}$ ("to drink"); but $\text{šagū}$ ("to give to drink").
⁸ This is found in **UM**, p. 150, #70:1. The same phrase is found with the masculine $\text{dšcly}$ (**UM**, p. 150, #70:1).
⁹ **UM**, #9:49.
verbs in Ugaritic, but he does list the following possibilities: ])** 1, hrr, 2, 3, hnn. 4 Hammershaimb 5 was not so cautious and listed many more in addition; he found such examples as rkk, 6, dmm, 7, sbb, 8, arr, 9, mrr, 10, kss, 11, mkk, 12, ršš. 13 Also, Hammershaimb 14 listed such D-stem yqtl forms as yḥšk, 15, ykltnh, 16, thr, 17, ymm, 18, ttp, 19, tămān, 20, tšš. 21 But many of these examples will not withstand critical analysis.

In Hebrew we find two forms of the yqtl in these verbs, the yḥšb and the yissb; therefore, the orthography of Ugaritic (e.g., ysb) could be interpreted either as yḥšb or yissb. But in the qtl form there would be a difference between sbb and sbb in the orthography of Ugaritic, the former being spelled sb and the latter sbb.

---

1 ID, 41.
2 S.S., 44 (= Corpus, 23:44).
3 ID, 156,158; VAB, 2:57.
4 IVAB, 1:12.
6 IVAB, 3:28.
7 IIK, 1:25-26.
8 IIAB, 6:35.
9 IK, 133.
10 ID, 195.
11 I*AB, 6:16.
12 IIIAB, A,17.
13 IK, 10.
15 IIAB, 4:38.
16 IIAB, 4-5:72.
17 S.S., 41.
18 S.S., 37.
19 VAB, B,42.
20 I*AB, 4:25.
21 ID, 156; VAB, A,1 and B,15.
The qtl forms of verbs in Ugaritic are rare; the qatl form is the regular narrative form employed in Ugaritic. The following evidence is slight but does help us understand qtl forms of geminate verbs. In one passage we find ab ksr lbrk nab llbn ("The silver turns into..., the gold is turned into bricks"). The verb ab ("to turn") in this passage is spelled ab for the qatl form, but as indicated above, this same word has two qtl forms in Hebrew: sab and sgbab.

In ID, 195, the word mrrt is parallel to brkt:
lbrk 'alk brkt, tarn 'alk mrrt ("Do thou bless me, so I'll go blessed; Beatify me so I'll go beatified"). This enigmatic word is also found in IID, 1:24,25: lbrkm lmr 'il 'aby, tarn lbny bnw ("Wilt thou not surely favor him, O Bull El, my father, Beatify him, O Creator of Creatures?"). In these passages we find a root mrrt ("to beatify") but its cognates, if it has any, remain unknown; however, its meaning can be deduced from its parallel to brkt.

---

1TIAB, 634.

2For the verbal sequence here, see M. Held, JBL, 84 (1965), pp. 273; 277, notes 22-25.

3For what is sometimes an evident distinction (transitive and intransitive) between such forms, see GK, p. 176, #67a.

4The text is broken here, and the reading is not certain (Corpus, p. 91, n. 4).

5Translation of H.L. Ginsberg, (ANET, p. 155).
When we turn to the qatal forms we have more examples. One root which is both geminate and prima -n is nadd\(^1\) ("to stand") which is the A-word\(^2\) in parallel to the B-word gm\(^3\). It is undoubtedly related with the Hebrew word nō̄d used of something standing.\(^4\) Aistleitner\(^5\) listed the root nadd as meaning "eilig gehen, hommen," and Hammershaimb\(^6\) gave it the meaning "flüchten"; Gordon\(^7\) gave it the meaning "to wander, stride, go". All of these scholars apparently neglected to study its use in context and parallelism.

A geminate verb *pqg* ("to cut, slice") is perhaps attested in wpq n̄'tam \(^8\) ṣ̄d bhrb mlh as [mr'i],\(^9\) ("and he

---

\(^1\)The qatal form nadd (VAB, A,8) is instructive inasmuch as it confirms a "səbab" form for Ugaritic in addition to the "səb" qatal form of geminate roots. The "sb" qatal form is confirmed in IIAB, 6:34, sb ksr lrgn ("silver turned to [blocks?]).


\(^3\)IIAB, 3:12,15; IVAB, 2:17,18.

\(^4\)See Exodus 15:8 where it is said of the Red Sea that niqṣāh kūmā nō̄d nṣālim ("The torrents stood up like a nō̄d"). Similarly, the waters of the Jordan also stood up as a nō̄d (Joshua 3:13).

\(^5\)WUS, #1755.

\(^6\)ibid., p. 232.

\(^7\)UN, #1212.

\(^8\)The meaning of this word is based on context and its parallelism with bhrb ("knife").

\(^9\)IIAB, 6:56-59. For the restoration see IIAB, 3:42-44; IABB, 4:13-14; IID, 6:4.
cuts with a knife breasts, with a sharp knife, slices of fatling". If such a word does indeed exist, it must be kept distinct from the root *pqw ("to find") which is attested in *'att qdch lypq ("The wife of his right he surely finds"). This same word is also found in Phoenician: *pq 'yt h'ren 2 ("you find this coffin").

Another geminate verb attested in Ugaritic is *hse ("to remember") which can be compared to Akkadian *hase. In IIIK, 3:25, we read *whse *'atrt ndrh, ("and *'atrt remembers her vows"). In another passage we find *yd *'il m[lk] yhsk, *'ahbt fr 3crrk, ("The *yd of King El arouses you, the affection of the Bull stirs you"). The root *wr means "to arouse, excite" and is used here in the pEwe or D-stem, and I suspect that *hse may be used in the D-stem here also, since its meaning in the D-stem in Akkadian (*hussu = "to remind") best approximates the meaning of *wr, the parallel verb in this passage.

Hebrew nmrk ("he bowed") is also found in Ugaritic. In IIIAB, A,17, we read *ymk ("He is not bowed"). This

---

1 Whether the root is medial w or medial y is uncertain.
2 IX, 12.
3 Tabnith Inscription from Sidon, line 3. (Donner-Rüdlig, op. cit., #13:3.
4 CAD, E, p. 122.
5 IIAB, 4:39.
6 CAD, H, p. 122.
could also mean "humiliated" but hardly, with Gordon, 1
"vanquished".

Another geminate verb, which can be recognized from
its use in parallelism is dem ("to wail, groan, sob") 2. In
Ugaritic this word is the B-word parallel to the A-word, bky
("to cry"). 3

The geminate verb fdd is attested in one passage: 4
fadd kbdh bnhq, yml'u lbh bshmhit ("Her liver swells with
laughter, her heart is filled with joy").

The geminate verb yll is found in the phrase yl
yll 5 ("the dew distills").

Hebrew srr ("to vex, harass") is attested in Ugaritic
'al tar 7 ("vex not"). The Hebrew word nsgas ("to suck") is
also found in Ugaritic in IIIK, 2:27 where it apparently is
a participle: yng lbh 'a[rt]rt msq td btl [cαt], ([Who]
draws the milk of Asherah, sucks the breasts of the maiden
Anath").

---

1 UN, p. 268, #1099.
2 Akkadian demEmu (CAD, D, p. 59).
3 See IIK, 1:26,30.
4 VAB, B,25,26.
5 The meaning of this word is based on context and
synonymous parallelism with yml'u.
6 ID, 41. The geminate character of this word is
revealed in Aramaic fallāh and Arabic fallun.
7 IIK, 133.
Hebrew םָזָנָן ("to shear") is attested in the form גָּזֶנֶן. The yiqtol form is יָגֶנֶן, which may be compared to Hebrew יָגֵז.  

---

1 Akkadian ɡaẕzu.  
2 PRU, II, 84:30; 99:4,26.  
3 PRU, II, 153,5.  
4 Deuteronomy 15:19.
CHAPTER IX

THE PARTICLES

Prepositions

Prepositions are used to express relationships between things. Any given preposition does not always express the exact same relationship, and this polarity is well demonstrated by the use of the preposition 1 in the following passage: 1 yr'd lks'i ytb lhd m lw l hdm ytb l'arg, ("He goes down from the throne, sits on a footstool, and from the footstool sits on the ground"). Normally, we would expect to read b as meaning "into, by," and l as meaning "to, for," but in Ugaritic, b also signifies "from" and also this same meaning is found for l; moreover, this same usage is also attested in Hebrew. 2 This Canaanite feature is also found in the Amarna writing which used ana in many cases where normal Akkadian would have used ina, and used ina where we would have expected ana. 3 Normally, Akkadian used ana with the word mitti, but instead, ina is used in EA, 23:15; 17:35. Likewise, ana is used in the following phrases where

---

1 I*AB, 6:12-14.

2 For examples, cf. UM, p. 75, #10:1.

3 Franz Böhl, Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe, p. 69, #33, e.g.
normally ina would have been used: ana qati', ana libbi'. This same phenomenon has also been observed in the Akkadian from Alalakh.

The preposition b is sometimes omitted before a word beginning with b, e.g., bry bty ' Ish arb qmt bry ("I will take bry into my house, I will bring the maiden into my court"). This last phrase seems to indicate that b is sometimes omitted before b. The omission of b before a word beginning with this same letter is also found in Hebrew in such passages as Genesis 24:23, Isaiah 44:13 and Jeremiah 27:21.

M. Dahood wrote an article to point out how Ugaritic derives verbs from prepositions. As one example, he listed wtarb ('and she shall conceive') from the preposition arb ("midst"). Another similar example is the verb btr ("to conceive") from the same root for "womb". However, in his

1NA, 5:19; 112:21.
2NA, 137:49,61. Further examples are listed in E. Ebling's glossary to the Amarna tablets.
4IK, 203.
5"Denominative ribham 'to conceive, enwomb'"., Biblica, 44(1963), p. 204.
6TIK, 3:5.
7Already pointed out in Aramaic by Ginsberg, BASOR, s.s.(1946), p. 41.
example of the preposition רְקָמ, he does not find the verbal form in Ugaritic but only in Hebrew.

The preposition שָׁאֵר is commonly interpreted as meaning "after", but there is also the meaning "with" in this word. The phrase שָׁאֵר וְנַפְשָׁה ² signifies "with the sun"; Ginsberg translated it "then, at the sun". Also this same meaning is attested in Hebrew; in Jeremiah 25:26, "the king of Sheshach shall drink with them" (not after them!); in Ruth 1:15, 16, Ruth is bidden to return after (שָׁאֵר) her sister-in-law, but we should read "go back with"; and she replies "Intreat me not...to return from following after thee", where the natural sense is "to turn back from accompanying thee." Also Exodus 11:5 speaks of "maidservant that is behind (שָׁאֵר) the mill", but "at the mill" is more appropriate. Again, in Ecclesiastes 12:2, we should translate "the rain clouds return with the rain", not "after" the rain! There are also other examples where this preposition should be translated "with" when used with such Hebrew verbs as הָעָלָה, אוֹלָה, yěRad, and הָעָלָה. Like Hebrew, Ugaritic also has the preposition בּוֹד ("behind"); בּוֹד קָלָה כְּלַאֲמִית ⁴ ("the widow behind your back");

¹This meaning for the word has been discussed by R.B. Y. Scott (JTS, 50[1949], p. 178).
²IK, 195, 209; IRP, B, 5.
³ANET², p. 145.
⁴IK, 6:49.
bÇdn ksl ttbr,¹ ("behind, her loins do break").

The common Hebrew preposition min, although not listed in Gordon's Ugaritic Textbook, has been found in Ugaritic prose by M. Dahood² in w'am tśmie m'ah³ ("and may my mother draw her happiness from my father"). However, Ugaritic regularly used b in places where Hebrew would have used min.⁴

In addition to these regular prepositions, Ugaritic also has such "extended" prepositions as ln⁵ and cmn.⁶ Perhaps this suffixed -n is the same as that found on the Hebrew preposition takht'on (Joshua 18:13). Albright preferred to call these extended prepositions "ballast variants".⁷ This may be possible in a poetic passage,⁸ but I fail to see

¹VAB, D, 30.
³PFU, II, p. 31. Cf. Prov. 5:18; Ecc. 2:10.
⁴tb of bth (IID, 2:39), "They departed from his house"; Hebrew would have used min in such a case. Also Ugaritic regularly used b in the sense of drinking or eating from a container (IIAB, 4:36-38; IIAK, 3:13-15); Hebrew would have used min in such cases (II Samuel 12:3; Proverbs 5:15), although a remnant of this archaic use of b, meaning (drink) from is attested in Amos 6:6.
⁵IIIAB, B, 25: wln kbt zblm, "and on the thrones of their princeliness."
⁶VAB, C, 22: "...swn cm args, that cmn kbnm; ("...of the heaven with the earth, of the deeps with the stars."). Notice that cm is parallel with cmn.
⁸Cf. in VAB, C,21,22 where cm is parallel with cmn.
how this applies to such a form in a prose letter. This preposition can also have the meaning "like" as in IID, 6:28–29; moreover, the verb itself, "to be like", is attested in Hebrew in such passages as Ezekiel 31:6, and II Chronicles 14:10.

Aistleitner listed ht as meaning "with" and compared it with Akkadian itti and Hebrew ʾēt. This is incorrect etymology; I know of no case where Ugaritic h corresponds to Hebrew ʾēt.

There is no need here to list the other common prepositions found in both Hebrew and Ugaritic. Only one more unusual example should be noted: dm which has a meaning of "because" in IID, 6:34–35 and VAB, C,17–18.

Cf. cmm in PRU, II, 12:34.

2 ʾassprk cmm bʿl šnt, cmm bn ʾil tspr yrhm ("I’ll make thee count like Baʿal years, like the son of El thou shalt count months").

3 ʾarazim lū cmmēmuḥā ("The cedars were not like him").

4 ʾan cimmēkē laʿazur ("No one is like you to help").

Aistleitner (WUS, #862) listed this as found in IAB, 1:11, but this is incorrect; it is found in IAB, 1:19. Furthermore, there is some question about its existence there (Corpus, p. 39, n. 5).

WUS, #862.

Aistleitner (WUS, #862) listed this as found in IAB, 1:11, but this is incorrect; it is found in IAB, 1:19. Furthermore, there is some question about its existence there (Corpus, p. 39, n. 5).

7 WUS, #862.

8 ʾal tā[r]gm ybltlm dm lgzr šrgk bhm ("Do not fib to me, O you maiden, because to a youth thy bluffing is despicable"). The translation of bhm is based on its parallel to ml ("low") in IIAB, 8:12–13, and also there may be some connection with Akkadian habhu, "spittle" (CAD, H, p. 28), but it is admittedly questionable.

9 dm rgm ʾit ly wʾargmk ("because I have a message I would tell thee").
Adverbs

In addition to separate words used as adverbs, the Semitic languages also employ several different suffixed elements for adverbs. Also the accusative case is used for adverbial meaning or emphasis. First, some of the individual words used as adverbs will be considered.

Ugaritic ṭam can be compared to Hebrew ṭam ("also") or ṭam ("then") and Phoenician ṭam. The adverb ṭamk ("immediately, straightway") is found several times in the poetic texts. The form ṭamk (same meaning as ṭam) is found only in IIRp, 2:5. The adverb ṭam is the same as ṭamk minus the deictic -K and is found in VAB, A,24 and IIK, l19. I believe the adverb ṭam can be compared to Akkadian appuna "in addition, moreover, besides."

The two adverbs ṭamk and ṭam are used — in that order — in parallel in the Danil Epic, and only in that epic are they used in that pattern. The form ḫk is difficult; I compare it to Aramaic ṭayin ("then, thereupon"), but

1I*AB, 6:11; ID, 38; IID, 5:26; IIK, 1:46; IIIK, 2:8. For the possibility of this word in IID, 1:1, see Corpus, p. 79, n. 1.

2For lack of a better descriptive term, I refer to this -K which is suffixed to several particles, as "deictic".

3AHw, p. 60; GAG, p. 175, #120d.

4ID, 19,20; IID, 1:1,2; II:27,28; 5:3,4,12,13,32,33.

5I*AB, 1:9 and often in the poetic texts.
Gordon\(^1\) and Aistleitner\(^2\) compared it only to Arabic \textit{idāka}.
Goetze\(^3\) had a completely different approach when he suggested that \textit{idk} is \textit{i}, a negative adverb, plus a demonstrative \textit{d}, plus a deictic \textit{k}. I cannot accept this view with the little evidence he gave.

The adverb \textit{bl}, like Hebrew \textit{‘abel},\(^4\) has asseverative or adversative force. The asseverative force is attested in \textit{bl nalk}\(^5\) ("We shall surely make king"). The adversative use is well illustrated in the following passage: \textit{d ‘in bn l} \ \textit{km ‘abh w šrē km ‘aryh} \ \textit{bl ‘it bn lh km ‘abh wērē km ‘aryh};\(^7\) ("who has no son like his brothers, nor an offspring like his kinsmen’s, on the contrary, let there be a son for him like his brothers’, and an offspring like his kinsmen’s"). The passage \textit{bl ‘ešt ‘urtb bb|tm}\(^6\) was translated by Ginsberg\(^9\).

--

\(^1\)UM, p. 233, #20:47.
\(^2\)WUS, #61.
\(^3\)Studia Orientalia Joanni Pedersen septuagenario... dicsta. (Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard, 1953), p. 115.
\(^4\)Note the asseverative force in Genesis 42:21 and II Samuel 14:5. The adversative use of this particle is found in Daniel 10:7 and II Chronicles 19:3.
\(^5\)IAB, 1:48.
\(^6\)‘ary is always a \textit{B}-word; its meaning is based on its use in parallel to \textit{šrē}.
\(^7\)IID, 1:19–22.
\(^8\)IIAB, 4–5:123.
\(^9\)ANET, p. 134.
as "A window I'll make in the house" but this omits translating the adverb, so I would translate it, "Surely, I will put a window in the house." J. Friedrich, in his grammar of Phoenician, interpreted "bl" as being only a negative, resulting from ' plus bl, two other negatives found in Phoenician.  

The adverb ht ("now") was apparently used in the same way as ^nt ("now"): ^nt br# ^nt p ^ _nt pdr dr ^2 ("Now, tomorrow, and forevermore, From now unto all generations") ^3, but, on the other hand, lht w ^ _nt pdr dr ^4 ("From now and forever, From now unto all generations"). Aistleitner^5 listed ht as meaning "jener, dieser, jenes, was." He apparently was led to this error on the basis of pure etymology since he compared Ugaritic ht with what he called Old Assyrian $Ut and $It.

The word m'id used as an adjective is also used as an adverb in the phrase m'id tmtham^6 ("she fights much").

Another adverb is knâ^7 ("this here"). Since it does

---

^1Phönielisch-Fulische Grammatik, p. 114, #249.
^2ID, 161,162. See also ID, 154.
^3Translation of H.I. Ginsberg, (ANE2, p. 154).
^4ID, 167.
^5WUS, #861.
^6VAB, B,23.
^7PRU, II, 5:9,11,13; 12:32,35; PRU, V, 8:R12.
not change with gender or number, Albright concluded it was truly an adverb.

The adverb "thь" ("there") is easily recognized on the basis of its cognates in other Semitic languages as well as by its use in Ugaritic. However, I suspect that this word may also be an interjection "behold" in some passages. W.L. Moran has found a ḫumma in the Amarna tablets which means "behold". Although it is possible this is Akkadian, he gives some good reasons for assuming there is a Canaanite word reflected here; for example, nine out of ten occurrences of such a use of this word are found in Canaanite letters.

The adverbial subordinate conjunction ḫм ("if") is found in the following passages: ḫм ṯм yрмм mlк ("behold, if the king...commands"); ḫм ḫит ṯм ṯм ḫм ḫм ḫм ḫм ḫм ḫм ḫм ḫм ("if there be fat, if there be bone"). This same particle may also be used to indicate the latter part of a question, as in biblical Hebrew. The following examples reveal its use in Ugaritic:

... ḫм ḫм ḫм ḫм ḫм ḫм ("[or] obeisance to the Creator of

2 Hebrew ḫмм, Arabic ḫяммм, Aramaic ḫмммм.
3 "Amarna Summa in Main Clauses," JCS, 7(1953), p. 78.
5 PRU, II, 12:30.
6 ID, 110.111.
7 Judges 5:8,13; Genesis 37:8; Numbers 11:11,12.
8 TIAB, 3:31.
creatures?"); \ldots hm ḫrt k'ab 'adm\(^1\) ("...[or] authority like the father of men?"); \ldots hm 'ant ṭatrt\(^2\) ("...[or] is Asherah a handmaid?").

In addition to these words used as adverbs, Ugaritic used certain endings on words to indicate adverbial usage. We now know from Ugaritic that the adverbial suffix -ḥ in Hebrew is consonantal. Usually, an adverb of place results from this suffix, as in ḥmḥ\(^3\) ("heavenward, in heaven"); argh\(^4\) ("to the ground"); yrḥp ydp ṭṣḥ\(^5\) ("he washed from hand to elbow"). An adverb of time with this terminative -ḥ, indicating adverb of place may be an alternate way of writing the word without the prefixed preposition. For example, in S.S. 38, ḥmḥ is parallel to bḥmm.

The adverb ṭmt in Corpus, 53:18 may be the word ṭm ("there") plus the adverbial suffix -ṭ. In Hebrew, we also find ḥmmḥḥ alongside of ḥm. This adverbial -ṭ suffix probably is found on such Hebrew words as ṭḥḍrannit\(^7\) ("back-\[\ldots\]

\(^1\)Iκ, 42.
\(^2\)IIAB, 4-5:61.
\(^3\)S.S. 38; Iκ, 168.
\(^4\)Iκ, 29.
\(^5\)Iκ, 157.
\(^6\)Iκ, 154.
\(^7\)Genesis 9:23; I Samuel 4:18; II Kings 20:10.
wards") and rabbat\textsuperscript{1} ("often"). In Akkadian, there are also suffixed -\textit{atta(m)} adverbial endings.\textsuperscript{2} Gesenius also referred to this adverbial -t suffix.\textsuperscript{3}

I believe the word mknt contains this adverbial -t and so I translate krt \textit{ard} m\textsuperscript{6} mknt.\textsuperscript{4} ("Keret has been cut off in regard to establishment"). Since m\textsuperscript{6}k\textsuperscript{5}ñh is used for the base or stand of a cult object, I assume the word in this passage from Keret is not feminine but rather has the adverbial -t.

It is very probable that adverbial -t has been confused with feminine -t in some Ugaritic words. For example, the word \textit{grn}\textsuperscript{5} ("threshing floor")\textsuperscript{6} is found alongside \textit{grn}\textsuperscript{7} and \textit{grnt}\textsuperscript{8}. Since these latter two forms are in the same context in both passages, either we have two different plural forms, or one is adverbial, or they are both singular with an adverbial suffix attached (there is also an

\textsuperscript{1}Psalm 129:2; 65:10.
\textsuperscript{2}GAG, p. 163, \#113L.
\textsuperscript{3}He also gave the example qed\textit{Ṭrrnnit} (Malachi 3:14) and translated it "darkly attired," but I would translate "mournfully" (\textit{OK}, p. 295, \#100g).
\textsuperscript{4}\textit{IK}, 11.
\textsuperscript{5}\textit{ID}, 30.
\textsuperscript{6}Hebrew \textit{gōren}.
\textsuperscript{7}\textit{IK}, 215.
\textsuperscript{8}\textit{IK}, 112.
adverbial -m in Ugaritic). Ginsberg translated both forms as plural\(^1\) and suggested the change of \(\text{gmn}^2\) to \(\text{gmr}\).\(^3\) Since Hebrew has the plural -\(\text{mt}\) on this word \(\text{gmr}\), the form \(\text{gmn}\) is either an error as Ginsberg suggested or it is singular with enclitic adverbial -m.

This same phenomenon is found with the word \(\text{c}_{\text{pr}}^4\) ("dust, earth"). The form \(\text{b}_{\text{prm}}^5\) is found as well as the form \(\text{b}_{\text{prt}}^6\). The context is again the same for both forms. Hebrew uses the feminine plural on this word; however, a singular form appears more appropriate for the passage in VAB, C,12 where \(\text{b}_{\text{prt}}^6\) is parallel to \(\text{b}'\text{ars}\). I believe that the enclitic -\(\text{t}\) and -m on this word may indicate adverb of place. Admittedly, there are problems involved, and I cannot prove that these enclitic elements are adverbial but examples like those given above may deserve some better explanation than emendation of the text.

Adverbial -m suffixed to words is easily confused

\(^1\)ANET, pp. 144,145.
\(^2\)IK, 215.
\(^3\)BASOR, SS 2-3(1946), p. 40.
\(^4\)Hebrew \(\text{c}_{\text{pr}}\).
\(^5\)VAB, D,53,67,73.
\(^6\)VAB, C,12.

\(^7\)In Corpus, p. 16, n. 10, this form \(\text{b}_{\text{pr}}^6\) is changed to \(\text{b}_{\text{prm}}\) to agree with the other passages which have \(\text{b}_{\text{prm}}\).
with the masculine plural -m. In the passage tkwm ht\(1\) ("shoulder of the wall") the -m is not the m of the plural form here because the word is in construct; therefore, I interpret this enclitic -m as adverbial. Other examples of the enclitic adverbial -m include the following: \(\text{sw}^2\) ("loudly"), \(\text{mwm}^3\) ("with a stick"), \(\text{mm}^4\) ("with gore").

Enclitic adverbial -m is attested in Hebrew in such words as \(\text{mmn}^5\) ("truly"), \(\text{hinmm}^6\) ("graciously"), and \(\text{yhm}^6\) ("daily"). Akkadian also indicates the adverbial sense with a final -um, thus gerbhm bēbili is equivalent to ina gerb bēbili ("in Babylon"). This adverbial -m is also found in Amarna in such forms as \(\text{raqm}^5\) which is equivalent to Hebrew \(\text{raqm}^6\) ("empty-handed") in Genesis 31:42 and Exodus 3:21.\(^6\) Also Ugaritic tun means "two, second," but tun\(^7\) means "twice". Sometimes a preposition used with one word is balanced with an adverbial -m on the parallel word: lqh \(\text{'imr dbb bydh ll'a kl'atm}^8\) ("He took a sacrificial lamb

\(^1\)IK, 75.
\(^2\)IID, 4:15.
\(^3\)VAB, B,15.
\(^4\)VAB, B,35.
\(^5\)EA, 137:20.
\(^6\)Albright suggested that enclitic -mi is Canaanite in contrast to Akkadian -ma which is restricted to the Mesopotamian letters (JBL, 69[1950], p. 385).
\(^7\)IIXD, 4:22; ID, 1:78.
\(^8\)IK, 159-161.
in his hands, a lamb in both hands).

The word for "table" in Ugaritic is $\text{tlbn}^1$ and the plural is found in $\text{cr\, tlhn}^2$ ("She arranges tables").$^3$ But also the form $\text{tlhm}^4$ is found, a form which probably has the adverbial $-m$ of place. Ginsberg$^5$ interpreted this as dual and translated "between the two tables," but then why should this hectic battle be limited to a small area "between two tables?" Furthermore, we know from VAB, B,21, that she set up more than two tables.

An example of the dual $-m$ is found in $\text{grm}^6$ where the meaning, in that context, could be "two horns" or a "pair of horns". The plural form, $\text{grnt}^7$, is found in a context which definitely implies many horns, not just one or two. The singular form $\text{grm}$ is found in IID, 4:10. From this data it is observed that adverbial $-m$ cannot only be confused with plural $-m$ but also with dual $-m$.

Adverbial terminative $-u$ is listed by Gordon$^8$ as

$^1$IIIrp, B,16.
$^2$VAB, B,21.
$^3$Ginsberg translated this "table," but the singular form seems improbable in this context; she is pretending that the tables and chairs are her enemies. (ANET$^2$, p. 136).
$^4$VAB, B,30.
$^5$ANET$^2$, p. 136.
$^6$B,H., 1:30.
$^7$IID, 6:22.
$^8$UN, p. 84, n.2.
"common Semitic" but I am cautious in finding such a form in the unvocalized texts from Ugarit. E.J. Young\(^1\) compared this to the \(-\text{u(m)}\) of Akkadian gerdum babili but I believe that in this example, the adverb is denoted by the final \(-m\) and not by the preceding \(-u\) vowel. Albright also compared Akkadian \(-\text{um}\) with Hebrew \(-\text{m}\) and Arabic \(-\text{uma}\).\(^2\)

Adverbial terminative \(-n\) is possibly found in \(\text{htkn}\)\(^3\) ("in regard to progeny"). The suffix \(-\text{ny}\) seems to be used in forming such adverbs as \(\text{hnny}\) and \(\text{hlny}\) ("here") and \(\text{tmny}\) ("there"). Gordon\(^4\) suggested the adverb \(\text{gzmny}\)\(^5\) ("violently"), but this reading is not certain; Virolleaud and Ginsberg read \(\text{gzm t\text{ey}}\).\(^6\) The phrase \(\text{hnny gmmny}\)\(^7\) ("here with us") is also written \(\text{hnny gmmny}\) in two other passages with similar contexts.\(^8\) Note Hebrew hennath sometimes means "here".\(^9\)

---

3IK, 10. Cf. \(\text{htk dsm}\), "offspring of Dagan", (IVAB, 3:35).
4UM, p. 84, #11:3.
5IIIAB, A,5.
6Corpus, p. 11, n. 7.
7Corpus, 51:10.
8Corpus, 50:9; PRU, II, 13:12. In addition, hlny is found in broken contexts — in Corpus, 57:3; #64:18.
The adverb ṭmy 1 ("there") is used in the following passages:

dealloc 3 ṭmy 2 ("there with our lady") and ṭmy 3 ṭmy 3 ("there with my mother"). Notice that ṭmy 4 ṭmy 5 and ṭmy 6 are attested in only non-poetic texts.

Conjunctions

The regular co-ordinate conjunction in Ugaritic is umbnail which agrees with Canaanite (Hebrew, Moabite, Phoenician). The use of this conjunction as an indicator of sequence of tenses has never been completely evaluated in Ugaritic, but again it must be remembered that the great majority of our texts represents poetry, a poor place to study tense.7 We do not possess long sections of prose narrative where we could compare the use of Ugaritic umbnail with the consecutive use of umbnail with the prose narrative of Hebrew.

In addition to umbnail, Ugaritic also has the co-ordinate

---

1 See also PRU, V, 9:7; 59:7; 61:7.
2 Corpus, 51:14,15.
3 Corpus, 50:11.
5 Corpus, 50:9; 57:3; 64:18; PRU, II, 13:8(?),12.
6 Corpus, 51:14,15; 50:11.
conjunction $p$ $pyn$ $\text{1} \text{("and he spends the night")}$, $\text{nt brh}$ $p \text{lmh} \text{2} \text{("now, tomorrow, and forever")}$, $p \text{ank tn} \text{3} \text{("and I will give")}$. This conjunction is also found in Arabic, Old Aramaic, \text{4} and sometimes in biblical Hebrew. \text{5} I suspect, therefore, that its origin lies in a non-Canaanite layer of West Semitic.

Ugaritic $p$ ("and") must not be confused with the Ugaritic adverb, $p$ ("here"). \text{6}

Ugaritic also has the disjunctive $u$ $u \text{ ilm tn} \text{7}$ ("or do gods die"); $u \text{ ym} \text{ u sm'al}$ \text{8} ("or right or left"); $u \text{ mlk} \text{ u bll} \text{9}$ ("either king or commoner").

Subordinate conjunctions customarily consist of adverbs or prepositions when introducing adverbial clauses.\text{10}

\text{1\text{IID}, 1:16.}
\text{2\text{ID}, 154,161.}
\text{3\text{PRU}, III, 10:7.}
\text{4\text{Panamwa I inscription, lines 3,13,14,30,31, (Donner-Rüllig, op. cit., I, p. 38, #214).}
\text{5The verb yahitp (Job 9:12) should be interpreted as the verb ht(h) (as in Psalms 52:7) plus the conjunction p, (Biblica, 38[1957], p. 306). Also note Garbini's "La Con-
\text{6guinzione Semitica *p*", "Biblica, 38(1957), pp. 419-427.}
\text{7\text{IIK, 1:22,105.}
\text{8s.s., 63.}
\text{9\text{IIAB, 7:43.}
\text{10d ttbh tn} \text{tmsh}, "She smites until she is satisfied" (VAB, 2:29).}
These adverbs have been discussed elsewhere in this dissertation. Noun clauses are introduced with the subordinate conjunction הָדוּ�,¹ just as in biblical Hebrew. However, in the later layers of biblical Hebrew, הָדוּ� is sometimes used to introduce noun clauses,² but in Ugaritic, הָדוּ is never used in this way. This is what we would expect in view of the archaic character of Ugaritic.

Other subordinate conjunctions used to introduce adverbial clauses include הָדוֹ ("when"), כּ ("until"), and הָדוּ ("if"). Biblical Hebrew also uses הָדוּ ("if") to introduce conditional clauses, but this is non-Canaanite in origin and consequently not found in Ugaritic.⁶

**Negatives**

As in Hebrew, הָדוּ denotes non-existence as these two examples illustrate: הָדוּ בַּלֶּ ("Baal does not have a

---

¹IAB, 3:8: מִדְו בַּלֶּ הָדוּ הָדוּ ("and I know that 'Al'în Baal lives").

²C. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax*, p. 152, #159b,160b.

³IIB, 42: הָדוּ מָהְב כּ מָהְב ("when she sees her brother... ").

⁴VAB, 2: כּ מָה כּ מָה ("until she is satisfied, she smites").

⁵IAB, II, 12:30: הָדוּ מָה כּ מָה ("Behold if the king commands"). Also cf. 1B, 110,111.

⁶הָדוּ is Aramaic and found mostly in later books of the Bible. (Gesenius, op. cit., pp. 494, #159L: 497, #159w. Also see C. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax*, p. 157, #164d).

⁷VAB, 5:46.
house"; d ʿin bn ʾlh¹ ("who has no son"). In addition, this particle itself may be the subject of a sentence: ʿin bʾilm ʾnyh² ("none among the gods answers him").

The simple, declarative negative is 1.³ Normally, this negative particle is prefixed to the verb it negates; however, in cases where a ʾ precedes the verb, the l is then appended to this ʾ.⁴

This negative ʾl is easily confused with the emphatic ʾl. Since the orthography is the same, the context must determine the interpretation.⁵ For example, the passage ʾātt ʾsdʿh lypq⁶ could be translated "his lawful wife he did not find" or "his lawful wife he surely found". Other passages containing this prefixed ʾl have caused variations in translation.

When the negative particle is used in the first stichos of two parallel stichoi, it is not necessary to repeat it again in the second stichos: ʾlʾb yʾc ʾlʾc, gtr

---

¹IIK, 1:19.
²IIK, 5:12-13, 16, 19, 22.
³For examples, see UM, pp. 88-89, #12:4.
⁴ʾlʾb yʾbʾlm (I*AB, 1:9); ʾlʾbʾlm Gt (VAB, B, 19); ʾyʾcʾa ʾlʾbʾlm (ID, 73); ʾlʾbʾlm pbl mlʾk (IK, 222).
⁵Note bʾh ʾrm yʾcʾa (ID, 75) which Ginsberg (ANET, p. 153) translated "Scarcely hath the word left his mouth," but which Driver translated "Verily the word came forth from his mouth."
⁶IIK, 12.
lrkb crpt¹ ("No enemy appeared before Baal, nor adversary before the rider of the clouds"). This same phenomenon is also found in biblical Hebrew.²

The negative particle 'al is used as in biblical Hebrew. It may be used in a curse: ᵀ_rb b'arg 'al ykp³ ("May thy root not grow in the ground"). The use of 'al as a negative of the jussive is regular in Ugaritic as in Hebrew: 'al tqrb lbn 'ilm mt 'al ydbkm⁴ ("Do not draw near to the son of El, Moet, lest he slaughter you").

The negative particle bl is found only a few times in Ugaritic, Hebrew, and Phoenician.⁷ Little can be said about it although it is probably safe, in view of its occurrences, to consider it pure Canaanite.⁸ J. Obersmann

¹VAB, D, 34, 35.
²Proverbs 30:2; Psalms 9:19; 44:18.
³ID, 159.
⁴IIAB, 8:15–17.
⁵Notice that Hebrew pen- is often used in this position (Gesenius, op. cit., p. 482, #152w).
⁶Ugaritic ᵀ_db corresponds semantically with Akkadian epššu and Hebrew ᵀ_dbh; all three words may be used in the sense of "sacrifice" or "slaughter". Akkadian epššu niše means to sacrifice (CAD, B, p. 214). For examples of Hebrew ᵀ_dbh see BDB, p. 794b. Ugaritic ᵀ_db ("slaughter") is also found in ᵀ_db 'imr bphd, "slaughter a sheep with a lamb" (IID, 5:16, 17).
⁷It is also written 'bl and 'ylb sometimes in Phoenician (Harris, Phoenician Grammar, p. 87).
⁸It seems to be limited to poetic texts. The non-poetic texts regularly use the negative 1.
described $bl$ as being the "absolute negative."\(^1\)

The negative $bl$ is used with the jussive in $bl$ $tl$ $bl$ $rnh$\(^2\) ("May there be no dew, no rain"). This particle is also found in compound words such as $blmklk$ ("commoner") and $blmt$ ("immortality"). With this last expression ($blmt$) one should compare Hebrew 'al $mawet$\(^3\) ("immortality").

A. Goetze claimed that Ugaritic 'li was a negative used with wishes;\(^4\) however, in many of the cases he gives, the 'li is found compounded as 'lik\(^5\) and 'lak.\(^6\) He suggested that Ugaritic 'li coincides with Akkadian $sy$ or $ē$ in both form and function.\(^7\) Also it should be pointed out that Phoenician used the negative 'li.\(^8\) In Amarna we also find $ē$ $lā$ teḵemnē šina\(^9\) ("No! Do not listen to them"). L. Matous has proposed


\(^2\) ID, 44.

\(^3\) Prov. 12:26.

\(^4\) "Ugaritic Negations," Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen (Copenhagen, 1953), p. 123. He considered 'li the negative used for statements and 'al the negative used with commands.


\(^6\) IIAB, 8:10; I$\#$AB; 5:11.


\(^8\) J. Friedrich, Phönizisch-punische Grammatik, p. 148, #318. Phoenician also used the negatives 'bl and 'lybl.

\(^9\) NA, 1:05.
that š 1 in Akkadian may in some cases express a positive wish.¹

Because of the paucity of examples using the 'i in Ugaritic, it is premature to be dogmatic. Most scholars have not interpreted Ugaritic 'i as a negative particle.²

Interjections

Ugaritic hn corresponds to Hebrew hên or hinah and means "behold!": hn šbēm³ ("behold! at sunrise"); hn ym wîn⁴ ("behold! one day and a second"). In one letter⁵ we found hn hn ym ʷmlk ("behold, if the king ... commands"). In an Amarna letter⁶ we find annû used in similar fashion: annî annî ištu šapārika ("furthermore, behold after you wrote").

Ugaritic hi also signifies "behold". In Aramaic both 'aru and 'alu⁷ denote "behold".⁸ Examples of Ugaritic


²Note Aistleitner, WUS, #2; Gordon, UM, #1; and the translation of Ginsberg in ANET.

³IX, 118.

⁴IIAB, 6:34.

⁵PRU, II, 12:30.

⁶EA, 256:29, 30.

⁷Note the interchange of liquids l, n, r in these interjections; Akkadian annû, Aramaic 'aru and 'alu.

⁸For Aramaic hlw ("behold"), see Donner–Rollig, op. cit., #233:9,11,13; #270:A,1; B,4.
hl include the following: hl yārāb\(_T\)\(^{1}\) ("Behold he brings arrows"); hl šlm[t tld b[nn]\(^2\) ("Behold the maiden shall bear a son"). Sometimes this particle is appended to the conjunctive w: wlm\(^3\) c`
`two\(^4\) ("And behold Anat fights"); wlm c`
`two lbbt\(^5\) tɑ́mgym\(^5\) ("And behold Anat reaches her house").

Ugaritic hm means something like "behold" in these passages: wm hy 'al'iŷn b[nn] msg 'it sb il b[nn] 'aro\(^6\) ("And behold alive Prevailing Baal, and behold existent Prince Lord of earth"); hm šm'u sm'it\(^7\) ("Behold, have you indeed been hungry?"); hm yd 'il mlk yhsk\(^8\) ("Behold, the love of King El prompts you"); hm 'in mm\(^9\) ("Behold, there is nothing"); hm ntkp m nk\(^{10}\) ("Behold, we press for your answer"). An interjection may include the suffixed deictic ḫ\(^{11}\) as in hlk ɑ́st

---

\(^{1}\)IID, 5:12,13.

\(^{2}\)N.K., 7.

\(^{3}\)The form hlm is found only in this passage, VAB, 2:5,17.

\(^{4}\)VAB, 2:5.

\(^{5}\)VAB, 2:17.

\(^{6}\)IAB, 3-4:2,3.

\(^{7}\)IIAB, 4-5:34.

\(^{8}\)IIAB, 4-5:38.

\(^{9}\)Corpus, 53:9.

\(^{10}\)Corpus, 53:14.

\(^{11}\)This deictic ḫ is also found on other particles. The form r'apn, "thereupon", (VAB, A:24; IIK, l:119) is found as well as the form r'apn (I*AB, 6:11; ID, 19) with the same meaning.
The interjection mk\(^2\) also means "behold" as in mk špēm bēb\(^0\)3 ("Behold, at sunrise on the seventh [day]"). In this same poem, the semantic equivalent is expressed by ybn špēm bēb\(^0\)4. The similar phrase, mk bēb\(^0\) vwm\(^5\) ("Behold, on the seventh day"), is found in other Ugaritic texts.

The Vocative

The vocative in Ugaritic has been studied in detail by A.D. Singer.\(^6\) Several grammatical forms were employed in Ugaritic to denote the vocative. The proclitic \(\_\) was the most common sign for the vocative. It is found in such passages as šm\(^c\) l'al'iyen b\(^c\)1 bn lrkb\(^c\) rpt\(^7\) ("Hearken, O Prevailing Ba\(^c\)al, understand O Rider of the Clouds"); šm\(^c\) m\(^c\) 1'aqht azr\(^9\) ("Hearken, O Aqhat the youth"). Note also

1IID, 5:12,13.
3IK, 3:107; IK, 5:221.
4IK, 3:118,119.
6JCS, 2(1948), pp. 1-10.
7IIAB, 5:121,122. Cf. also IIAB, 6:4.
8\(\_\) an enclitic particle following the imperative, is also found in IAB, 6:25; IID, 1:23; IK, 229.
9IID, 6:16.
Less often, the proclitic $x$— is used to indicate the vocative: $\text{?}\text{a\[tt\] t}\text{g\[t\]h ykr\[t\] l}\text{a\[tt\] t}\text{g\[t\] h\[t\]k}$ ("The woman you take O Keret, the woman you take into your house"). Note also $\text{y\[b\]n}$ ("O Shapash"); $\text{ynt}$ ("O husband"); $\text{y\[l\]t\[t\]t}$ ("O wives"); $\text{ybn}$ ("O sons").

In some cases, the vocative is indicated by the use of both the proclitic $x$— or $l$— and the enclitic $m$, as the following examples reveal: $\text{?al t}\text{\[a\]r\[m\] ybt\text{\[l\]m}}$ ("Do not lie, O Maiden"); $\text{y\[l\]l\[m\]}$ ("O El"); $\text{lht\[\[n\]m b}$ ("O son-in-law of Ba\[\[l\]n").

Sometimes the context indicates a vocative where the appellation is written without any proclitic or enclitic element: $\text{lm A\[\[m\] t}\text{\[l\]m y\[l\]l\[m\]} t\text{\[k\]m l\[\[r\] brk\[t\]m}$ ("Why, O Gods, have you dropped your heads upon your knees?").

---

1) TAB, 2:14. Cf. also IID, 4:12.
2) IIIK, 2:21.
3) TAB, 4:25,36,46.
4) S.S., 40,46.
5) S.S., 64.
6) S.S., 65; IIIK, 6:55.
7) IID, 6:34.
10) IIIAB, E, 24.
11) This expression for mourning is also found outside of Ugaritic. ZDMG, 103(1953), p. 372.
Proclitic Particles

Proclitic \( \mathbf{\text{\textbf{l}}^-} \) is sometimes used for emphasis in Ugaritic\(^1\): \( l'\text{aqryk bnth pS' c [arym] bnth g'an} \)\(^2\) ("I will surely meet thee in the path of arrogance, [encounter (thee)] in the path of presumption"); \( lyhkp ksa'mlkk lybrh bt mtrb\)\(^3\) ("He will surely overturn the throne of thy kingship, he will surely break the scepter of thy dominion").

This emphatic \( l^- \) is also found in the Hebrew Bible:
\( \text{wayy\_m} \, \text{lb\_n} \, h\_n \, luf \, y\_h\_h \, kib\_r\)\(^4\) ("And Laban said, Behold, may it surely be according to thy word"); \( k\_l\_ke\_l\_h \, k\_n\_h\_u\_t \, m\_h\_m\_n\_m\_h\_n\)\(^5\) ("For even a live dog is better than a dead lion").

The emphatic \( l^- \) can easily be confused with the negative \( l^- \) in some cases. In such instances, the context must determine the meaning of the proclitic \( l^- \). In the Legend of Keret we find \( '\text{akt gdq} \, \text{lvpq} \)\(^6\) which could be translated "The wife of his right he does not find" or "The wife of his right he surely finds." In this example, the context seems to indicate that Keret did find her. Another

---

\(^1\)See F. Nötscher's study, "Zur Emphatischen Lamed," \( VT, 3(1953)\), p. 372ff.

\(^2\)IID, 6:43, 44.

\(^3\)IAB, 6:28, 29.

\(^4\)Genesis 30:34.

\(^5\)Ecclesiastes 9:4b.

\(^6\)IK, 12.
example of possible confusion of this kind\textsuperscript{1} is found in \textit{\textsc{lp} \textsc{lp}n \textsc{lp}h} \textsuperscript{2} which Driver\textsuperscript{3} translated "The progeny of Lutpan shall surely live" but which H.L. Ginsberg\textsuperscript{4} translated "An offspring of the Kindly One not live?"\textsuperscript{5}

Proclitic \textit{k-} is also used as an emphasizing particle in Ugaritic.\textsuperscript{6} It is prefixed to the verb which is placed at the end of the sentence: \textit{\textsc{m} l'\textsc{a}th ky\textsc{h}}\textsuperscript{7} ("Aloud he surely cries to his wife"); \textit{\textsc{m} l\textsc{m}lk k[t\textsc{h}]\textsuperscript{8} ("She really called aloud to her lad"); \textit{lktp c\textsc{nt k\textsc{tâ}th} ("She surely sets him on Anat's shoulder")}.

\textbf{Enclitic Particles}

The enclitic -\textit{m} in Ugaritic remains enigmatic in some instances. The adverbal -\textit{m} and the dual or plural -\textit{m} have

---

\textsuperscript{1}For more examples, cf. \textit{UM}, 9:12.

\textsuperscript{2}IIK, 23.

\textsuperscript{3}ANET, p. 41.

\textsuperscript{4}ANET, p. 147.

\textsuperscript{5}Notice that a negative is sometimes used for positive emphasis. "Am I not king" could mean "I surely am king." Also note the figure of speech, litotes, in which something is expressed by a negation of the contrary, e.g., "not a few" meaning "many".

\textsuperscript{6}See the study of R. Gordis, "The Assessorative Kaph in Ugaritic and Hebrew" \textit{JAOS}, 63(1943), pp. 176–178.

\textsuperscript{7}IID, 5:15.

\textsuperscript{8}IIAB, 2:29. Cf. IIAB, 7:53.

\textsuperscript{9}IAB, 1:14,15.
already been discussed. Prepositions sometimes have an enclitic -ם, such as בִּמ, הַמ, and לֵמ. A. D. Singer was very cautious about an explanation for this -ם found on these prepositions. The forms with enclitic -ם seem to be only stylistic variants of the forms without -ם.

The enclitic -ם is used adverbially in some passages and in these cases it can be attached to a noun in construct as in בִּקַּנְבָּמ ("on the shoulders of the wall"); בַּקְרַפָּמ יִנ. ("from goblets of wine"). If a noun has both a prefixed preposition as well as an enclitic -ם, it is questionable whether this enclitic -ם should be considered as adverbial. But in some contexts the enclitic -ם is clearly adverbial as in בִּשְּכָלְמ ("by sickness") and בַּקְרַמ ("by health"). Sometimes the parallel word indicates the enclitic -ם is adverbial as in the parallel of בְּדַח ... בְּלַדְתָּמ ("in his hand ... in

---

both hands").

The enclitic -t used adverbially has already been studied in the section on adverbs.

In Ugaritic, an enclitic -n is sometimes found on prepositions such as ln\(^1\) and cn\(^2\) and on the particle hln\(^3\).

Albright suggested that in Ugaritic, the preposition with enclitic -n may be a "ballast" variant.\(^4\) The enclitic -n may have been used adverbially as I have already pointed out in the section on adverbs.

The suffix -ny is sometimes found on adverbs as in hnn\(^5\) ("here with us") and tnn\(^6\) ("there with our lady").

---

\(^1\) IIIAB, B, 25: lgr brktkm wln kht zblkm ("on their knees and on the thrones of their princeship"). Cf. also the same phrase in lines 27, 29.

\(^2\) VAB, C, 22: qmm cm 'arg, thrm cm kbkm ("heaven with earth, the deep with stars").

\(^3\) VAB, B, 5, 6: whln cm tntm ("and behold Anat makes battle").


\(^5\) Corpus, 51:10. Also cf. hlny (Corpus, 57:3; 50:9; 64:18; PRU, II, 13:12).

\(^6\) Corpus, 51:14, 15. Cf. also tnn\(^6\) (Corpus, 50:11), "there with my mother".
CHAPTER X

SUMMARY

The decipherment of the Ugaritic language was the fastest of any ancient language. As soon as the grammatical correspondence between Ugaritic and West Semitic (particularly Hebrew) was recognized, the decipherment and translation of the texts swiftly followed.

Although scholars, in their efforts to unravel the perplexities of Ugaritic, have sought help from such diverse dialects as Aramaic, Arabic, and Akkadian; the primary source of illumination has been Hebrew. Despite this fact, some scholars are still reluctant to categorize it as Canaanite and would prefer to either place it along-side Aramaic or Arabic, or to keep it strictly in a class of its own.

In the past, and even now, primary interest in Ugaritic has been lexical and cultural in nature. Studies concerned with the Ugaritic literature in general have often contained fresh and valuable grammatical insights but few scholars have made inductive studies1 concerned

---

solely with the features of Ugaritic grammar. Moreover, some of these early studies, because of more recent information, are now recognized as inaccurate or spurious.¹

One purpose of this study has been to investigate the various, sometimes conflicting, theories about Ugaritic grammar. This refers to theories about both the general nature (e.g., classification within the Semitic languages) of the language and specific phenomena in the grammar itself.

Another purpose here has been to penetrate some of the unexplored or enigmatic areas; some areas of Ugaritic grammar have never been systematically investigated. Some features of the grammar have been only superficially treated and I have made a systematic analysis of some such areas, utilizing what information we now possess.

The method used in this study has been to make a brief survey of what has been done in the field of Ugaritic grammar and to glean and utilize what has been proven accurate and illuminating. In cases of conflicting theories, they have been checked against the present available evidence and a solution has been sought.

The inductive method employed in this study means

that all the available data on any particular feature of
the language has been collected, collated, and appraised.
The results of this observation were carefully and
systematically recorded and the essentials set forth in
the proper category of the grammatical outline. In a few
cases where the availability of such collected data may
later be useful, it has been recorded in the text.³

The method used here, while not ignoring what has
been written about Ugaritic, has primarily concerned it-
self with the study of the texts themselves. The original
texts are now conveniently accessible in the Corpus and
FRU series. This method, while working primarily with
the Ugaritic literature itself, has also made constant
reference to and use of the other Canaanite dialects of
Hebrew, Phoenician, and the Amarna tablets.

I have given reasons for classifying Ugaritic
as Canaanite; the numerous lexical and impressive
grammatical isoglosses between Ugaritic and the other
Canaanite dialects clearly reveal the Canaanite features
of the language. Furthermore, the Canaanite character of
Ugaritic literature has always been recognized. If
Ugaritic is not Canaanite, what is it? No serious attempt
can be made to classify it as Arabic; nor is there a good

³Note the list of final aleph verbs (p. 116, n.2). The list of geminate verbs (p. 160), on the other hand, are
not those actually proven but rather proposed by various scholars.
basis for considering it as Aramaic. The same reasons adduced for assigning Ugaritic an independent classification could also be used in assigning Moabite or Phoenician an independent classification; each Canaanite dialect has its own characteristics.

Extensive evidence was set forth to demonstrate that the aleph sign indicates the following vowel; the vowelless aleph is normally indicated with the aleph-i sign.

We now have enough evidence to recognize a clear distinction between poetic and non-poetic language. Furthermore, it is now possible to recognize earlier language from later language. These distinctions are especially evident in the lexicon but they can be also observed in the style of the language.

Most scholars recognize that the causative stem in Ugaritic is a 3-stem; however, some have proposed other possible causative stems. I have examined such proposals and given reasons for rejecting such theories.

My examination of Ugaritic nouns has not revealed any evidence for a broken or internal plural in Ugaritic. Some scholars have suggested such a possibility but my study of their examples has revealed them to be unacceptable. Such grammatical comparisons with Arabic are misleading.
I have pointed out some theories which must now be rejected and discussed other theories which have been confirmed with the accumulated evidence. The study of Ugaritic grammar has now reached the point where further progress will be achieved only through intensive, inductive study of particular aspects of the language. The general outlines of Ugaritic grammar have been clear for many years; in the future, scholars must assume the task of clarifying and elaborating various facets of the language.

Some areas of the grammar remain enigmatic; for example, the existence of the N-stem, especially as compared to the G-stem passive. My investigation has revealed practically no clear evidence for the N-stem. In such an inquiry, the ambiguous orthography of Ugaritic presents a great obstacle: the N-stem yqtl form would be written the same as the G-stem and D-stem yqtl forms, and the yqtl tense is the regular narrative tense in Ugaritic poetry.

In the analysis of the Ugaritic alphabet, several letters remain unclear as to their origin, distribution, and use. Ugaritic 𒈪 probably has some connection with Hurrian since it is often found in Hurrian personal and geographical names.

It remains unknown why Ugaritic 𒈪 sometimes is used where it corresponds to š; Ugaritic has its own š.
Perhaps as more examples are made available in future texts some clarification on this will ensue.

Undoubtedly a dialectal feature is involved in the text E.H. (= Corpus, 12), where ȝ is used in words which are normally spelled with a ꜱ elsewhere.

The sibilant ꜱ also requires more illumination. In our present texts, this letter is too rare to provide much material for comparative study. It appears to be simply a variant of ꜱ.

Early Ugaritic studies were based primarily on the investigation of poetic texts. It is only in recent years that non-poetic texts have received special interest. This has largely been due to the recent publications of non-poetic texts published in ĀtUra, II, and ĀtUra, III. There are clear distinctions between poetic and non-poetic Ugaritic and as poetic Ugaritic has illuminated the poetry of the Hebrew Bible, it is safe to assume that these non-poetic Ugaritic texts will shed light on the prose of the Hebrew Bible.

The study of Ugaritic grammar is important because through it we obtain a better understanding of Hebrew which in turn helps us have a better understanding of the Bible itself.
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