Additions and Corrections

This volume has been out of print for some time, and a revised edition was promised several years ago. It has, however, proved impossible to carry out a thorough revision of the text, and so I have settled on reissuing the book in its original form with an addendum listing major corrections and additions. Many of these were first noted in some of the longer reviews of the book, and I am very grateful to those reviewers for their insightful comments: D. Pardee (1991), S. Parker (1989), D. Sivan (1989), M. Smith (1989), and especially W.H. van Soldt (1990). A number of changes are based on texts written at Ugarit that have been published in the last twenty years.

I cannot claim that the following set of additions is complete; it consists simply of the notes and marginalia that I have collected since the book first appeared in 1987. But I hope that these will nevertheless be of use to readers.

This addendum will also be published online at eisenbrauns.com (thanks to the good offices of Jim Eisenbraun), so that users of the original form of the book may likewise have access to it.

The list follows, and is keyed to, the pagination of the first printing of the book.

I wish, finally, to thank Michael Coogan and Jo Ann Hackett for their good advice and their careful reading of these notes, and for saving me from many errors.

Carlisle, Mass. July 2008

- **p. 12.** A number of reviewers, especially van Soldt (1990: 733), have added more question marks to the interpretation of text Ug. 5 153 as Ugaritic. Thus the forms in that text should probably be treated even more circumspectly. It is worth repeating, however, that at least some of the text cannot be read as Akkadian.
- **p. 17.** In the list of publications, at Syria 16 194, read Dhorme (not Virolleaud).
- **pp. 22–23.** Major improvements in the arrangement and interpretation of the Polyglot S^a Vocabulary texts were presented by van Soldt in his reviews of Sivan 1984 and of the present book (van Soldt 1989; 1990). In van Soldt's careful reconstruction there are six manuscripts, including two represented by unpublished texts. These are, together with the S^a Vocabulary sign numbers covered by each:

```
Text A<sub>1</sub>: Ug. 5 130(+)134(+)131+138: nos. 20–25, 32–44, 46–48, 61–(64?) Text A<sub>2</sub>: Ug. 5 136: nos. 66–(69?) Text A<sub>3</sub>: Ug. 5 137: nos. 150–154, 157–160, 173–211 Text B: Ug. 5 135: nos. 50–65, 142–161 Text C: Ug. 5 133: nos. 39–46, 170–174a Text D: RS 20.429 (unpublished): nos. 18–38 Text E: Ug. 5 132; UF 11 479: nos. 24–48 Text F: RIH 77/5 (unpublished): nos. 11–27
```

Texts A_1 , A_2 , and A_3 comprise three tablets of a single manuscript A, each with two columns on each side. Texts B and C "are probably one-column tablets which contain the whole text. Texts D, E, and F are excerpts" (van Soldt 1990: 729). Van Soldt's improvements naturally result in a number of new readings.

A new trilingual S^a Vocabulary text was discovered at Ras Shamra in 1994 and published by B. André-Salvini and M. Salvini (1998, with new and additional readings in André-Salvini and Salvini 1999). This large tablet, RS 94.2939, shows the Akkadian and Hurrian readings current in the Ugarit scribal curriculum for a large number of the S^a signs that are broken in the quadrilingual manuscripts.

Copies of the S^a Vocabulary also appear among Akkadian texts from the city of Emar (Arnaud 1985–88, vol. 4, plates 139–142; see also Cohen 2003); these have also allowed some improved readings of the Ugarit versions.

- **pp. 24–25, S^a Voc. No. 22.1.** In the Hurrian column, read δi -ni-am rather than δi -ni-bi⁷ (van Soldt 1990: 732).
- **S^a Voc. No. 23.** In the Ugaritic column, van Soldt's collation suggests that the first sign is partially visible, and possibly \acute{u} , thus $\lceil \acute{u}^{? \gamma} ru$.
- S^a Voc. Nos. 26–28. In the Akkadian column of these lines, unpublished Ugarit S^a Vocabulary texts have the following forms (van Soldt 1990: 731); unfortunately the Ugaritic column of the lines is broken.

- No. 26 BA = *suppinnu* '(a tool used in brick-making and spinning)'
- No. 27 ZI = nupultu 'person'
- No. 28 GI = $qan\hat{u}$ 'reed'
- S^a Voc. No. 30.1. In the Hurrian column, read with van Soldt (1990: 731) i-t[i]n-ni.
- **S^a Voc. No. 32.1.** The Ugaritic form is $\delta a^{-1}an^{-1}[t]u_4$, not $\delta a^{-1}an^{-1}[t]u_4$, not
- **pp. 26–27, S**^a **Voc. No. 34.** This line also appears in UF 11 479: 13 (van Soldt 1989: 651), which preserves only the Ugaritic form: i- $s\acute{u}$ 'wood'; see below, ad p. 54.
- S^a Voc. No. 35/36.1. In the Akkadian column an Emar S^a Voc. exemplar here has *pisannu* 'container, box'.
- **S^a Voc. No. 37.3.** In the Akkadian column, van Soldt (1990: 733) suggests $n\hat{a}]k^2-ru$ 'enemy' rather than our proposed $z]\hat{e}^2-ru$.
- **pp. 28–29,** S^a **Voc. No. 41.4.** The Ugaritic form is [x]-iZ-hu rather than [la-q]a-hu, according to van Soldt's collation (1989: 650). See below, ad p. 59.
- S^a Voc. No. 44.2. Van Soldt (1989: 651) notes that collation confirms our proposed reading of the Ugaritic form: $i-[r]i-i\check{s}-[t]u_4$. The new trilingual S^a Voc. RS 94.2939 supplies the Hurrian $ta-ri-i\check{s}-\check{s}e^!$ for 'request'.
- **pp. 28–31,** S^a Voc. Nos. 45–51. In light of the collations and studies of van Soldt (1989, 1990), these lines may now be read as follows; lines attested in the new trilingual S^a Voc. RS 94.2939 are also given here.

S^a #	Sign	Akkadian	Hurrian	Ugaritic	Meaning	Reference
45.1	[A]N [AN	ša-ти- ^г ú [¬] [ša-ти-ú	ḥa]-bur-ni ḥa-ur-ni] 「ša-mu [¬] -ma	sky	Ug. 5 133 i 12' UF 11 479 29 RS 94.2939 ii 6
45.2	AN [AN	e-nu [a-nu] ^r e [¬] -ni a-ni] 「i-lu-ma [¬]		Ug. 5 133 i 13' UF 11 479 30 RS 94.2939 ii 7
45.3	AN [AN	i-lu [i-lu	e-ni e-ni] i-lu	god, El	Ug. 5 133 i 14' UF 11 479 31 RS 94.2939 ii 8

45.4	AN	šar-ru []	king	Ug. 5 133 i 15'
45.5	[A]N	šar-ra-nu []	kings	Ug. 5 133 i 16'
46.1	[ĤA]L HAL	ḫal-l[u] ḫal-lu	zi-ia-ni zi-ia-an-ni	$[h]u^{?}$ -sa] -[nu [?]]	lap?	Ug. 5 133 1 17' UF 11 479 32 RS 94.2939 ii 9
46.2	[ĤAL	$b[a-ru-\acute{u}$ $ba-ru]^{-\Gamma}\acute{u}^{\dagger}$ $ba-a-ru$	pu-ru-li-ni p]u-ru-l[i-ni wu-ru-ul-li-ni	pu-r[u-l	_		Ug. 5 133 1 18' UF 11 479 33 Ug. 5 131 1' RS 94.2939 ii 10
47.1	[UR [UR	-	ir-bi ir-wi [ir-wi	ka-a[l-b	u]]	C	UF 11 479 34 Ug. 5 131 2' RS 94.2939 ii 11
47.2	UR [UR	「ba [¬] -a[š-tu ₄ bá-aš-tu	in-n]i]in-ni in-ni	ђе- ^г bи¹ ђе́-bи			UF 11 479 35 Ug. 5 131 3' RS 94.2939 ii 12
47.3	[UR] [UR UR	mi-it-[ḫ]a-ri-i[s mitḫāriš] mi-it-ḫa-ri-iš	pí-ir-ri	pí-ru ir-ku		elephant?	UF 11 479 36 Ug. 5 131 4' RS 94.2939 ii 13
48.1	NE NE	i-ša-tu₄ [i- ^r ša [¬] -tu	ta-a-ri	$]i$ - $\check{s}i$ - $t[u_4]$.]	fire	UF 11 479 37 RS 94.2939 ii 14
48.2?	P[NE?	per³u	<i>h</i>] <i>í-iš-ši</i>	šap-ḫu		scion	Ug. 5 131 5'
48.3?	P[NE?	napištu [?]	š]u-ḫu-ur-ni	þé-уи-т	a	life	Ug. 5 131 6'
48.4	NE	pè-em-tu	šul-li			charcoal	RS 94.2939 ii 15
48.5	NE	ṭì-ik-me-nu	šal-mi			ashes	RS 94.2939 ii 16
48.6	NE	nu-ru	ta-gi			light	RS 94.2939 ii 17
49	GIBIL missing	<i>eš-šu</i> in the quadrilin	「 <i>šu-ḫé</i> ┐ gual Sª Voc. tex	ats		new	RS 94.2939 ii 18

50 [KA]
$$\delta i^{-1}in^{-1}-nu$$
 [] tooth Ug. 5 135 2'
51.1 [SA]G $qa-qa-du$ $pa-[a-hi]$] head Ug. 5 135 3'
51.2 [SAG $am\bar{\imath}lu$ $tar-\delta]u-wa-an-ni$: $bu-nu-\delta u$ man Ug. 5 131 7'
(52–63.3 as on pp. 30–33)

pp. 32–33, S^a **Voc. No. 63.4.** The question marks after sign UD and Akk. *anumma* are unnecessary in view of the equation of those terms in the Ras Shamra grammatical text *MSL SS1*, as noted in our Addendum to the original book.

S^a **Voc. No. 63.6.** A more likely reading of this line is as follows; see below, ad p. 69.

63.6 [UD?
$$\check{s}ah\bar{a}tu$$
?] hu ?- ut - ta - ru to attack Ug. 5 138 7'

pp. 34–35, S^a Voc. Nos. 156–160. The new trilingual text RS 94.2939 allows us to restore these lines with more confidence. See further below, ad pp. 72–74.

156	AR AR	na-ma-ru 「ki [¬] -i-nu	hi- $[x$ - x - x - $[hi$ - i s- na - a [r ?- a]]]	to shine true	Ug. 5 135 r. 14' RS 94.2939 iv 5'
157	「MUЬ MUŠ [•	ap - $\check{s}i^?[$ $\lceil ap$ - $\check{s}e^{\rceil}$]tu-un-r] na-nu	serpent	Ug. 5 135 r. 15' RS 94.2939 iv 6' Ug. 5 137 i 8'
158.1	[Ú]R 「ÚR¹ [[s]u²-nu sú-ú-nu	「ḫu¬-ri¹[ḫu-ri]	ђе́-qи]	lap	Ug. 5 135 r. 16' RS 94.2939 iv 7' Ug. 5 137 i 9'
158.2	「ÚR [¬] ÚR	「na [?] -[s]a ^{!?} ru na-ṣa-ru	$\lceil x \rceil - ru - [$ $ut - ru - um - mi$]	to guard	Ug. 5 135 r. 17' RS 94.2939 iv 8'
158.3	「ÚR [™] ÚR [pè-nu pè-e-ni	ur¹-n[i² ur-ni		ri-i[g]-l] u	foot	Ug. 5 135 r. 18' RS 94.2939 iv 9' Ug. 5 137 i 10'
159.1	ŠEŠ ŠEŠ	а- <u>ђ</u> и а- <u>ђ</u> и	še-e-n[i [?] še-in-ni]	brother	Ug. 5 135 r. 19' RS 94.2939 iv 10'
159.2	ŠEŠ ŠEŠ [na-ṣa-r[u na-ṣa-ru	ut-ru-um-mi]	ni-iḫ-rù]	to guard	Ug. 5 135 r. 20' RS 94.2939 iv 11' Ug. 5 137 i 11'

159.3 ŠEŠ ma-r[a-ru]] to be Ug. 5 135 r. 21' ŠEŠ ma-ra-ru ma-la-še bitter RS 94.2939 iv 12' 160.1 IB \dot{u} - $r[a^?$ - $\dot{s}u^?$ Ug. 5 135 r. 22'] unclean IΒ ú-ra-šu i-še-na garment? RS 94.2939 iv 13'

pp. 36–37, S^a **Voc. No. 173.1.** Cf. BAD = BI-TUM in the Emar S^a Voc.

 S^a Voc. No. 173.3. Cf. BAD = ba-la- tu_4 in the Emar S^a Voc.

 S^a Voc. No. 173.4. In the Ugaritic column, read perhaps [u]z-zu; see below, ad pp. 74–75.

 S^a Voc. No. 173.6. Cf. BAD = la-BI-TUM in the Emar S^a Voc.

- **pp. 38–39, S^a Voc. No. 176.y.** In the Akkadian column, rather than our proposed *šerru*, the Emar S^a Voc. here equates TUR with $la^{3}\hat{u}$ 'small child', sehru 'young, small', and $m\bar{a}ru$ 'son'.
- **S^a Voc. No. 180.1.** In the Akkadian column, the Emar S^a Voc. here has *qatnu* 'thin, fine'; see below, ad p. 79.
- **S^a Voc. No. 180.3/181.** This line is to be read as follows (Wilhelm 1992); see below, ad p. 80.

180.3 [SIG $\delta \bar{a}q\hat{u}tu$ $t]ap-\delta a-hal-\delta e$ $ma-a\delta-q[u-u^2]$ office of Ug. 5 137 ii 15' cupbearer

- **S^a Voc. No. 182.** The Emar S^a Voc. has TE = me-nu, apparently for $m\bar{\imath}nu$ 'what?' (see CAD M/2 89b).
 - **S**^a **Voc. No. 183.1.** Cf. KAR = e- te_4 - $r\grave{u}$ in the Emar S^a Voc.
- **pp. 40–43, S^a Voc. Nos. 186–198.** In these lines too the new trilingual text RS 94.2939 allows more certain restorations and interpretations. See further below, ad pp. 84–100.

	[ŠA]Ḥ ŠÁḤ	•		ú-ḥe ú-ḥé [¬]	ḫu-zi-rù	pig	Ug. 5 137 ii 25' RS 94.2939 v 3'
186a?	[ŠAḤ.7	ΓU]R? <i>k</i>	ur-ku-	za-nu —	he-en-ni-șu	piglet	Ug. 5 137 ii 26'
	[ŠAḪ ſŠÁḪ⅂	-		šu-ra-at-ḫe zu- ^r ra-at ^{?¬} -ḫé	qi-i-lu	anus?	Ug. 5 137 ii 27' RS 94.2939 v 4'
187.1	[LÚ LÚ	šu-ú šú-ú]	ma-an-ni ma-an-ni	ú-wa	he	Ug. 5 137 ii 28' RS 94.2939 v 6'
187.2	[LÚ	ša?]	a-PI	du-ú	(relative pronoun)	Ug. 5 137 ii 29'

18′	7.3	[LÚ	bēlu] $^{\lceil}e^{?\neg}$ -we-ri	ba-a-lu-ma	lord	Ug. 5 137 ii 30'
18′		[LÚ LÚ	amīlu a-mi-lu	tar-š]u-wa-ni ta-a-e	bu-nu-šu	man	Ug. 5 137 ii 31' RS 94.2939 v 5'
188	8.1	[LUGAL LUGAL		e-we-e]r-ni e-we-er-ni	ma-al-ku	king	Ug. 5 137 ii 32' RS 94.2939 v 7'
188	8.2	[LUGAL	bēlu	eweri	$b]a$ - $\lceil a$ - lu - ma \rceil	lord	Ug. 5 137 ii 33'
189	9.1	MAĤ	sīru se-e-ru] ^r x [¬] ^r a-mu-mi-ia-aš	a-du-rù a-še [¬]	noble	Ug. 5 137 ii 34' RS 94.2939 v 9'
189	9.2	[MAḤ	ṣēru	a-wa-a]r-re	: ša-du-ú	plain, field	Ug. 5 137 ii 35'
189	9.3	[MAĤ	mādu/ma³du]-ši	ma-a-du-ma	much,	Ug. 5 137 ii 36'
189	9.4	MAḤ	ra-「bu-ú¬	ta-la-am-e		large	RS 94.2939 v 8'
		(MAḤ/	rubû [?] / sarru [?] /ṣabru [?]]-ri	š/sar-rù	prince?/ false?	Ug. 5 137 ii 37'
190	0.2	ĤNT ĤNT	masku ma-às-ku	ni-ru]-ba-de 「ni-ru [¬] -pa-te	ba-ṭá-lu	bad	Ug. 5 137 ii 38' RS 94.2939 v 11'
190	0.3	[ĤUL	zāmânu?]-「x¬	ḫa-ri-mu	foe?	Ug. 5 137 ii 39'
190	0.4	- 0	lemnu lem-nu	šu]-bi šu-be	ḫa-ri-ти	evil	Ug. 5 137 ii 40' RS 94.2939 v 10'
190	0.5?	[ĤUL	zīru?	$TA]R^{?}$ -du-bar-i	ri ma-aš-nu-ú [?]	enemy?	Ug. 5 137 ii 41'
190	0.6	ĤUL	a - $\lceil \check{s}a^{?} \rceil$ - x	^Γ šú ^{?¬} -ni-te		?	RS 94.2939 v 12'
190	0.7	ĤUL	lum- ^r nu [¬]	$[x]$ - ha - $^{\circ}u$ - u - ni		harm	RS 94.2939 v 13'
19	1.1	[GUL	lemnu [?]]	šu-bi	ḫa-ri-mu	evil	Ug. 5 137 ii 42'

pp. 42–43, S^a Voc. No. 198.5. Following collation, van Soldt (1989) notes that the signs of the Ugaritic column look like [r]a-m[u] rather than our proposed [r]a- $[g]a^2$ - $[zu^2]$ or Nougayrol's [r]a- $n[u^2]$; thus read probably:

198.5 [IDIM kabtu

r]a-m[u]

exalted Ug. 5 137 iii 13'

- S^a Voc. No. 198.8. The equation of IDIM with Akkadian *ekletu* 'darkness' now appears in the Emar S^a Voc.
- S^a Voc. No. 198.10. See the Addendum above, p. 374, for reading this line as follows; the equation IDIM = $\S arru$ also appears in the Emar S^a Voc.

1

198.10 [IDIM *šarru*

ewirni

ma-al-ku

king

Ug. 5 137 iii 17'

- **p. 49, no. 25.2.** Van Soldt (1990: 732) prefers to understand the line as 'waterskin' rather than 'stela' because the form $n\bar{a}du$ for the latter is "a late variant of the only lexically attested $nad\hat{u}$ "; but as noted on p. 49, another Ugarit lexical text does give the form na-du for 'stela', so the word in that form was known to the Ugarit scribes.
- **p. 50, no. 30.x/30a.x.** Van Soldt (1989: 651; 1991: 307) proposes to read the Ugaritic form *ri-gi-mu* as an unusual writing for /rigmu/ (with an epenthetic vowel), a *qitl* infinitive meaning 'to speak'? (see also Tropper 2000: 169). But given the irregular writing that must be assumed and the fact that neither no. 30 GIM nor no. 30a BAN denotes 'to speak', the suggestion is difficult to accept.

- **p. 51, no. 31.** Van Soldt (1990) reads the Ugarit form as ti-[i]t- tu_4 , which would presumably reflect a form /tittu/ as in Akkadian, with loss of f/ and assimilation of /n/. Since loss of f/ is relatively rare in Ugaritic, however (Tropper 2000: 157–59), the reading ti-[n]a- tu_4 remains more likely.
- **p. 51, no. 32.1.** As noted by van Soldt (1990), the Ugaritic word for 'year' is written $\S a \lceil a n \rceil [t] u_4$, not $\S a na tu_4$ as expected. The writing reflects a pronunciation [\Santu], the result of syncope of the medial unaccented a of the underlying form /\Santu/, a form that also accounts for the non-assimilation of n. Other instances of post-tonic syncope are cited above, pp. 282–83. Were the original or underlying form of the word *\Santu\$ in Ugaritic, of course, we would expect the n to have assimilated, yielding a form *\Santu\$ as in northern Hebrew, Moabite, Phoenician, and some dialects of Aramaic.
- **p. 54, no 34.** The Ugaritic form i- $s\acute{u}$ in UF 11 479: 13 represents the singular / c isu/, alongside the plural / c issūma/ reflected in the writing is- $s\acute{u}$ -[ma] of Ug. 5 130 iii 8'.
- **p. 59, no. 41.4.** Since collation reveals the signs of the Ugaritic column to be [x]-iZ-hu rather than [la-q]a-hu, the proposed infinitive /laqāhu/ is obviously to be deleted above, pp. 143, 320. The writing [x]-iZ-hu is probably another qitl infinitive (see p. 320), perhaps [ni]-is-hu for /niṣhu/ 'to be(come) pure', thus another instance of S^a Voc. No. 40 (40.4), $EL = el(\bar{e})lu$ '(to be) pure'. The root n-s-h meaning 'be pure' is attested in Arabic and $G\mathfrak{D}^c\mathfrak{D}$ although in Northwest Semitic, including alphabetic Ugaritic (nsh, DUL 647), the root has instead the meaning 'succeed, endure, shine'. If our identification is correct, it would mean that text UF 11 479 lacked sign no. 41 IGI (as well as no. 42 IGI- $gun\hat{u} = SIG_7$).
- **p. 61, no. 45.1.** Van's Soldt's collation shows that the reading of the Ugaritic word as *ša-mu-ma* is fairly certain.
- **p. 61, no. 45.2.** Nougayrol's suggestion that Akkadian *e-nu* was written for expected *a-nu* 'An' is confirmed by RS 94.2939 ii 7. Van Soldt's collation (1990: 731) of UF 11 479 shows that line 30 is to be placed here rather than at no. 45.3, and that the Ugaritic column has the plural form $\lceil i-lu-ma \rceil = \lceil i \rceil \text{ ilūma} \rceil$; compare the plural (of majesty) /ba^c alūma/ in the Ugaritic column of no. 37.2.
- **p. 61, no. 45.3.** Van Soldt's collation (1990: 731) of UF 11 479 shows that in line 31 the Hurrian form is *e-ni* 'god' rather than *ta-ni* as suggested by Laroche's copy, and that the Ugaritic form is *i-lu* for /'ilu/'god'. This line thus goes here rather than at no. 45.4.

- **p. 61–62, no. 45.4.** With the adjustments just noted to nos. 45.2 and 45.3, this line now appears only in Ug. 5 133 i 15'.
- **pp. 61–62, nos. 45.5, 46.1.** I read UF 11 479: 32 as $[b]a^2-a-[lu^2-ma^2]$ 'lords', i.e., sign no. 45.5 corresponding to Akkadian $\delta arr\bar{a}n\bar{u}$ 'kings' in Ug. 5 133 i 16'. With van Soldt 1990: 732, however, we should equate UF 11 479: 32 with sign no. 46.1 HAL = Akkadian $\hbar allu$ = Hurrian zianni 'crotch' (thus no. 45.5 now only appears in Ug. 5 133 i 16'). Further, van Soldt's collation shows that the medial sign of the Ugaritic word is ZA. With reservation, I propose to read $[\hbar]u$ - δa -[nu] for $\hbar a$ - δa -
- **p. 62, no. 46.2.** See van Soldt 1989a for the correct reading of this line as $HAL = Akkadian b\bar{a}r\hat{u}$ 'diviner', corresponding to Hurrian *purulini*, which in turn is the source of the Ugaritic form pu-r[u-li-nu], attested in alphabetic texts as prln (see DUL 680).
- **p. 62, no. 47.1.** It is now well established that Hurrian *irvi* means 'dog' (corresponding thus to sign UR and Akkadian kalbu), so that the Ugaritic word is to be read ka-a[l-bu] as tentatively suggested on p. 62.
- In UF 11 479: 36, I would suggest, the Ugaritic form BI-ru denotes not, as I originally proposed, the preposition /bi-/ plus the beginning of a noun, but rather the word /pīru/ 'elephant', the scribe having misconstrued Hurrian pirri 'equally' as the noun piri, equivalent to Akkadian $p\bar{\imath}ru$ 'elephant', as in no. 191.3, for which see below, ad pp. 91–92.
- **p. 64, no. 48.2.** Our original 48.2 NE? = Hurrian [p]i-ir-ri = Ugaritic ir-KU is now to be read as another instance of no. 47.3; see the preceding entry.
- **p. 64, no. 49.1.** The line we originally placed at sign no. 49 GIBIL must now be placed at no. 48.2, for it seems that no. 49 GIBIL was missing from the quadrilingual vocabularies. Thus read NE = BIL for BÌL (giš + gibil) = Akkadian $per^{3}u$ 'shoot, scion' and the Hurrian $he\check{s}\check{s}i$ and Ugaritic /šaphu/ as before. (Van Soldt [1989a, 1990:

- 732] reads this line and the next two lines of Ug. 5 131, viz. lines 5'-7', as additional instances of sign no. 47 UR; but that seems unlikely since none of the Hurrian or Ugaritic words in those lines fit well as glosses of UR.)
- **p. 64, no. 50.2??.** Since it is still difficult to connect any of the values of no. 50 KA or no. 51 SAG with the meaning 'life' of the Hurrian and Ugaritic columns, perhaps we may suggest instead, with all due reservation, that Ug. 5 131 6' is another instance of no. 48 NE, the scribe having misconstrued the value NE = IZI as ZI = *napištu*. In this case signs 50 and 51 would be missing from Ug. 5 131 (as well as no. 52 and perhaps no. 53; see the following paragraph).
- **p. 68, no. 63.4.** As noted in the Addendum to the original publication of this book (p. 374), the proposed reading of the line as no. 63 UD = Akkadian *anumma* 'now (then), here' is confirmed by the Ugarit version of the MB grammatical text.
- **p. 69, no. 63.6.** It was noted on p. 69 that an intransitive D verb (/zuttaru/ 'to go out') was problematic (see also Tropper 2000: 564). Further, alphabetic *ztr* in KTU 1.17 i 28, ii 17 is most likely a noun (see *DUL* 1001–2). If the first, broken sign of the Ugaritic form may be read as hu rather than zu, the form may represent a D verb /guttaru/ 'to attack', corresponding to alphabetic gtr in KTU 1.103+:39 (see DUL 327f.), and to sign UD, for UD.DU = E = Akkadian sahatu.
- **p. 72, no. 156.** RS 94.2939 offers Akkadian $k\bar{\imath}nu$ 'true', an otherwise unattested equation, rather than $nam\bar{a}ru$ 'to shine' as in Ug. 5 135.
- **p. 72, no. 158.1.** The reading of the Akkadian as $s\bar{u}nu$ 'lap' is now confirmed by RS 94.2939 iv 7'.

- **p. 72, no. 158.2.** The reading of the Akkadian as $nas\bar{a}ru$ is now confirmed by RS 94.2939 iv 8', which also offers the Hurrian infinitive utr=ummi, which also glosses $\check{S}E\check{S}=nas\bar{a}ru$ three lines later in the same text (RS 94.2939 iv 11'); the Hurrian root utr- is otherwise unattested (André-Salvini and Salvini 1998: 22).
- **p. 72, no. 158.3.** RS 94.2939 iv 9' gives the Hurrian for 'foot' as urni, so that we are undoubtedly to read $ur^!$ - $n[i^2]$ in Ug. 5 135 r. 18' as well. As noted by André-Salvini and Salvini (1998: 21), this word is undoubtedly the same as uri 'foot' attested in a bilingual S^a Voc. from Boğazköy, with the individualizing suffix -ni. The distinction between the two Hurrian words for 'foot', ugri and ur(n)i, is unclear.
- **p. 73, no. 160.1.** RS 94.2939 iv 13' confirms Nougayrol's original reading of the Akkadian as *urāšu*, meaning perhaps 'something dirty, unclean garment' (see André-Salvini and Salvini 1998: 13).
- **pp. 74–75, no. 173.4.** Van Soldt 1991: 304 follows Nougayrol in reading the Ugaritic, tentatively, as $[ku-u]s-s\acute{u}$ for the D verb /kussû/ < *kussawu. But our objections to this reading remain valid. Perhaps the scribe considered Akkadian $kat\bar{a}mu$ in its meaning 'to overwhelm' (see CAD K 300b), in which case the Ugaritic may simply be [u]z-zu for /cuzzu/ 'strength, power', alphabetic cz (I) (DUL 195–96).
- **p. 77, no. 176.y.** See above on the Emar S^a Voc. Akkadian equivalents of sign 176 TUR here, any of which could correspond to Ugaritic /wal(a)du/ 'child'.
- **p. 77, nos. 177.1, 177.2.** The readings proposed here had already been suggested by J. W. Wesselius in 1979, in a study unfortunately overlooked by me.
- **pp. 78–79, no. 178.** See Pardee 1984: 219 with n. 27 for a possible Ugaritic root hdr meaning 'to stay inside' (KTU 2.33:15), which might also be the root of Ugaritic $hu^{-1}-du-ru$ here, rather than hdr.
- **p. 79, no. 180.1.** Akkadian *qatnu*, as in the Emar S^a Voc. here, corresponds well with our proposed Ugaritic /daqqu/.
- **p. 80, no. 180.3?/181?.** Wilhelm (1992) has shown that the Hurrian column offers an abstract noun $tap\check{s}a\dot{g}al\check{z}e$ meaning 'office of cupbearer', from $tap\check{s}a\dot{g}i$ 'cupbearer', and corresponding to Akkadian $\check{s}\bar{a}q\hat{u}tu$; as Wilhelm notes, the sign SIG has apparently been either interpreted as SAGI (= $\check{s}\bar{a}q\hat{u}$ 'cupbearer') or related to the lexical (Diri) equation DUG.A.SIG = $ma\check{s}q\hat{u}$ 'watering place, drinking vessel'. Thus the Ugaritic form is undoubtedly /mašqû/ (< *mašqayu), i.e., a maqtal form of the root \check{s} -q-y 'to give to drink', with which Wilhelm rightly compares Hebrew $ma\check{s}qe$, which

- on at least one occasion (Genesis 40: 21) denotes 'office of cupbearer'. Note alphabetic *mšq* in *mšq* mlkt 'the queen's cup' (KTU 4.265: 1; see DUL 593), which may be the same word and thus, like Hebrew *mašqe*, denote both 'drink' and 'office of cupbearer'.
 - Sign no. 181 SIG₅ is thus missing in Ug. 5 137 (as also in the Emar S^a Voc.).
- **p. 82, no. 183.2.** The Akkadian writing *la-sà-mu* probably represents the adjective *lasmu*, here substantivized in the meaning 'runner'; see Huehnergard 1989: 117 with n. 66 for the (probably) epenthetic second vowel of the writing.
- **p. 82, no. 183.3.** Hurrian *puḥḥi* 'nose' is also attested as *punḥi*; see Wegner 1995: 123.
- **p. 82, n. 37.** Correct the cross-reference at the end of this note to n. 107 (p. 290).
- **p. 83, no. 183.5.** Van Soldt (1989: 649) points out that the scribe of Ug. 5 137 did not use the $^{\circ}$ sign, and so the writing ma-AH-ha-du for the Ugaritic word might indeed denote ma-a-ha-du for /ma $^{\circ}$ hadu/, rather than our proposed [mahhadu] with assimilation of $^{\circ}$ to the following h.
- **pp. 83–84, no. 184.2.** For the Hurrian infinitive *tapš=oġ=umme* corresponding to Akkadian *nabalkutu* 'to cross, exceed, turn upside down', see Wilhelm 1992: 252f. The reading of the Ugaritic form as /tuhappiku/ was also suggested by van Soldt (1989: 651; 1991: 303) and by Lambert (1988).
- **p. 84, no. 185.** Alphabetic *bhr* (KTU 1.15 v 22) is also glossed 'lad' in DUL 219.
- **pp. 84–85, no. 186.1.** On alphabetic hzr 'assistant, auxiliary', which is not related to the syllabic form hu-zi-ru here, see further DUL 417–18.
- **p. 86, no. 187.1.** The restoration of the sign and the Akkadian as $L\dot{U} = \check{s}u \acute{u}$ is now confirmed by the Ugarit grammatical text (as noted in our original Addendum, p. 373) and by RS 94.2939 v 6'.

- **p. 86, no. 187.4.** The trilingual S^a Voc. RS 94.2939 v 5' offers a different Hurrian word for 'man', *ta-a-e* (which is usually written *taḥe*), than *taršuwanni* found elsewhere in these texts; see André-Salvini and Salvini 1998: 17–18.
- **p. 87, no. 189.1.** For Hurrian $\lceil a-mu-mi-ia-a\check{s}-\check{s}e\rceil$ in RS 94.2939 v 9', see André-Salvini and Salvini 1998: 9, who identify it as an adjective based on the noun *amummini* 'administrator' < 'high-placed'. This adds weight to the identification of the Ugaritic form $a-du-r\grave{u}$ as 'noble' or the like.
- **p. 87, no. 189.3.** Syllabic /ma³ adūma/ 'many' corresponds to alphabetic *mad* in KTU 1.14 ii 35; DUL 511. Alphabetic *mid* (also once *mud*) instead reflects the noun /mu³du/ 'abundance' (also used adverbially, 'much, greatly', like Hebrew $m \partial^3 \bar{o} d$; see DUL 512). See also the next paragraph.
- **p. 87, new S^a Voc. no. 189.4.** It is possible that Akkadian $rab\hat{u}$ and Hurrian talme 'large' in RS 94.2939 v 8' correspond to Ugaritic ma-a-du-ma 'much, many' in Ug. 5 137 ii 36' (thus, no. 189.3; see the preceding paragraph), but it is more likely that these are distinct entries for sign no. 189.
- p. 88, new S^a Voc. no. 189.5?. See the following paragraph.
- **p. 88, no. 190.1.** This line is unfortunately not in the newly published trilingual S^a Voc. RS 94.2939. Nougayrol's original proposal to read Ug. 5 137 ii 37' as $\text{HUL} = \text{Akkadian } sarru = \text{Ugaritic } sar-ru = /\text{sarru}/ \text{ 'false}; \text{ liar'}, \text{ which I also adopted, remains possible. (The Akkadian column may have had <math>sabru$, as in the corresponding S^a Voc. from Emar, rather than sarru.) But it is equally possible to interpret Ug. 5 137 ii 37' as another instance of sign no. 189 MAH, which is equated in one lexical text (a commentary on Enūma Eliš vii 96; see CAD R 396a) with Akkadian rubu 'prince', in which case the Ugaritic may be read sar-ru = /sarru/ 'prince', alphabetic sr (cf. Hebrew sar; cognate with Akkadian sarru 'king'), and the Hurrian, perhaps, as another instance of sarru 'king'.
- **p. 88, no. 190.2.** RS 94.2939 v 11' shows that in Ug. 5 137 ii 38' we are to read sign no. 190 HUL = Akkadian *masku* = Hurrian *nirubade*, all meaning 'bad' (for the Hurrian form, see André-Salvini and Salvini 1998: 14). Our interpretation of Ugaritic *ba-TA-lu* as /baṭalu/, a *qatal* adjective cognate with Arabic *baṭala* 'to be false, vain, worthless' (still unattested alphabetically) thus remains likely.
- **pp. 89–90, nos. 190.3, 190.4, 191.1.** RS 94.2939, unfortunately, has no line corresponding to Ug. 5 137 ii 39'; I still consider my proposal to read the Ugaritic of no. 190.3 as /garmu/ 'foe' to be plausible.

RS 94.2939 v 10' shows that Hurrian *šu-be* in nos. 190.4 and 191.1 corresponds to Akkadian *lemnu* 'evil' rather than *šulputu* as I had suggested; *lemnu* in turn provides the meaning of Ugaritic *ha-ri-mu* in Ug. 5 137 ii 40' and 42'. It still seems likely to me that the Ugaritic word is /harimu/ originally meaning 'desecrated, unholy', as proposed on pp. 89–90, but having shifted semantically to the broader sense 'evil'.

- **p. 90, no. 190.5.** Evidence for a passive *maqtūl* participle in Ugaritic remains sparse at best (Tropper 2000: 476–76). Thus our alternative suggestion to take the syllabic form *ma-aš-nu-û*² as a *maqtal* noun with vowel assimilation around the ³, i.e., [mašnu³u] for /mašna³u/, is to be preferred. Other Ugaritic *maqtal* nouns denoting persons are /mal³aku/ 'messenger' and /malsamu/ 'runner'.
- **p. 91, no. 191.2.** In the Akkadian column, the S^a Voc. from Emar at sign no. 191 GUL has, inter alia, the D form *ubbutu* 'destroyed; to destroy', which lends support to our proposal that the Ugaritic i-pu-u reflects a qitl verbal noun f obliteration'.
- **pp. 91–92, no. 191.3.** The new trilingual text RS 94.2939 v 14' has sign no. 191 GUL/SÚN, which is equated with Akkadian BI-ru, which the editors André-Salvini and Salvini (1998: 15) reasonably identify as $p\bar{\imath}ru$ 'elephant', an identification accepted in CAD (P 418b), although the equation seems to be unattested otherwise (see CAD ibid.). The Ugaritic word for 'elephant' is not yet attested in alphabetic texts; we might expect it to be /pīlu/ as elsewhere in West Semitic (and occasionally in Akkadian); if the identification of the Akkadian pi-ru as 'elephant' is correct, the Ugaritic /pīru/ (like the Hurrian piri) may be a loan from Akkadian, or simply a north Syrian Wanderwort.

As an alternative, we may note that GUL = SÚN corresponds to Akkadian $r\bar{\imath}mtu$ 'wild cow', and suggest that the scribe wrote a semantically similar word, $b\bar{\imath}ru$ 'bull; young cattle (regardless of sex)'. The Ugaritic bi-ru might then reflect /bi^cru/, unattested alphabetically, but cognate with $G \Rightarrow^c \Rightarrow b \Rightarrow^c r$ 'ox' and Aramaic/Hebrew $b \Rightarrow^c \hat{\imath}r$ 'cattle' (and, probably, Akkadian $b\bar{\imath}ru$ itself).

- **p. 93, no. 193.1.** The Akkadian of RS 94.2939 v 18' is δe^{-qu} , which confirms our emendation to δe^{-qu} in Ug. 5 137 ii 49'.
- **pp. 94–95, no. 194.1.** RS 94.2939 v 21' confirms the Akkadian column as *irtu* 'chest'; the Hurrian word is *neherni* (see Wegner 1995: 121 for other instances).

Note, in an S^a Voc. text from Emar, the West Semitic form ri-i-u for ri-u/ 'lung' (glossing HAR), a masculine form corresponding to feminine ri-u in Arabic and $r\bar{e}$ -u in post-biblical Hebrew; see Cohen 2002.

- **p. 95, no. 194.3.** An alphabetic form ptr occurs in KTU 1.16 vi 8, and is glossed 'aperture' in DUL 687, probably related to the root meaning 'to loosen, separate'. Note also the form pzr 'to loosen' in KTU 1.107: 34, with $\langle z \rangle$ as a hypercorrect spelling for $\langle t \rangle$ (see DUL 690).
- **p. 96, no. 194.4.** For other Ugaritic forms with \S -prefix, see now Tropper 2000: 600–2.
- **p. 97, no. 198.1.** Note that the new trilingual RS 94.2939 has the expected form *nagbu* in the Akkadian column.
- **p. 98, no. 198.5.** Ugaritic [r]a-m[u], if that is indeed the reading as van Soldt suggests, probably represents the adjective /ramu/ = alphabetic rm, 'high, exalted' (DUL 741), corresponding to Akk. kabtu, which is equated with sign 198 IDIM in the Emar S^a Voc. and which may likewise mean 'honored, important'. The length of the base vowel of /ramu/ is uncertain; note Hebrew ram < *ram vs. Aramaic ram < *ram vs. Aramaic ram < *ram vs.
- **p. 100, no. 198.10.** The reading of the Ugaritic as ma-al-ku is confirmed by the equation of IDIM = $\check{s}arru$ in the Ugarit grammatical text. For IDIM = kabtu, as I had proposed originally, see instead the preceding paragraph.

p. 104, new root ³B^cLT.

/°ib°alatu/ n. month name.

econ.: (gen.) *ib-a-la-ti* RS 25.455A+ iii 4' (van Soldt 1991: 303).

Alphabetic: *ib*^c*lt* KTU 1.119: 1, 11 (DUL 5).

- **p. 107, root** L. Add the plural form / ilūma/. See above, ad p. 61, no. 45.2.
- **p. 108, root** ³**N0.** The Hurrian word *unuššum* is now attested in Old Assyrian; see Günbattı 2004: 252 line 79; further, Márquez-Rowe 2006: 292–93.
- **p. 109, root** ${}^{\circ}$ **R.H.** Delete this root. Van Soldt's collation of a cast of Ug. 5 3 indicates that after the gloss sign in r. 10' we have either ti-tar- ${}^{\circ}$ hu-Za or ti-tar- ${}^{\circ}$ ri-Za. The former is difficult to parse as any meaningful form. The latter, however suggests a D yaqtula form of a root trZ, /titarriZa/; could this be denominative from the noun trzz, 'light march, speed' (DUL 880), itself a derivative of the verb rwz 'to run'? This would certainly fit the context, viz., a Ugaritic gloss of the Akkadian tirhus 'she will run quickly'.
- **p. 112, root BDL.** A more accurate translation of Ugaritic *bdl* is 'substitute, proxy'; see DUL 217; Schloen 2001: 226–30. (The Hurrian etymology discussed in the latter, following a suggestion of I. Márquez Rowe, seems unlikely; a Hurrian form with

an initial labial stop should be imported into Semitic with /p/, not /b/.) See also below, ad p. 167, root PTR.

- **p. 113, root BLM.** Van Soldt's collation of the line reads qa-du É IM X DI/KI : $\S aB$ - $\lceil li$ -mi \rceil , in which X "is a horizontal at the bottom of the line" (1990: 733). My proposal to read a $\S aqtil$ form of a root blm should probably be discarded, although I have no other explanation of the form after the gloss mark, except to return to Boyd's suggestion that it represents a form of the root $\S pl$, either a noun / $\S aplu$ / 'low place' or an adjective / $\S apalu$ / 'low' (with post-tonic syncope; see pp. 282–83) plus enclitic -mi (which does occur sporadically in Ugarit Akkadian in contexts where it is not expected; see Huehnergard 1989: 210).
- **p. 114, root B^cL.** See also above, ad p. 104, for the new root ³B^cLT.
- **p. 114, new root B**^c**R**². See above, ad p. 91–92, no. 191.3, for the following possible reading:

/bi^cru/? n. '(a bovine)'?.

- p. 122, root ZTR. Delete this root; see above, ad p. 69, no. 63.6.
- p. 122, new root HBT?.

/habatū/² v. G suffix-conj. 'they were lost'?.

legal: (garments) ŠU PN ki ha-ba-tu '(garments) in the custody of PN, though they have been lost' PRU 6 128.

Alphabetic: thbt (DUL 354).

The alphabetic form *thbt* in KTU 1.82: 25, a list of incantations, is glossed 'to be beaten' by Caquot (1988: 40; 1989: 68) and others, including DUL 354. The meaning 'to beat' is based on comparison with the root *hbt* 'to beat' in Hebrew and Aramaic, and a verb *habata* in Arabic, which, Caquot noted, can mean 'périr'. But the Arabic verb that is cognate with the Hebrew and Aramaic root is actually *habata* 'to beat', and so a Ugaritic cognate to those roots should also have *h* as its first root consonant (note also *hbt* 'to beat, strike' in Sabaean). Thus *thbt* in KTU 1.82 is indeed probably cognate to Arabic *habata*, and means 'may you/they be lost/perish'. That in turn suggests the meaning of *ha-ba-tu* in PRU 6 128: 7, viz., 'to be(come) lost, go missing', as originally suggested by Nougayrol in the editio princeps ("quand (?) ils ont disparu (??)").

p. 125, root HLL. In the first text, read probably genitive *hal-la-t*[*e*] with van Soldt (1989: 651), who also notes that the month name occurs as well in RS 25.455A+B iii 6'.

p. 126, new root ḤṢN². See above, ad pp. 61–62, nos. 45.5, 46.1 for the following possible reading.

/huṣānu/² 'crotch, lap'.

```
lex.: (Sum.) [\muAL] = (Akk.) [\muallu] = (Hur.) zi-ia-ni = (Ugar.) [\mu]u<sup>2</sup>-ṣa-[nu^2] UF 11 479: 32 ((polyglot vocab.)
Sa Voc. no. 46.1.
```

Alphabetic: unattested.

- **p. 126, root ḤRḤR.** Perhaps to be deleted; as noted by van Soldt (1990:733), both of the forms cited here may be Akkadian rather than Ugaritic.
- **p. 127, new root HDR**?. See above on pp. 78–79, no. 178.
- **pp. 128–29, root ḤYR.** The month name /hiyyāru/ occurs in a number of other Ugarit Akkadian texts; see van Soldt 1991: 340.
- p. 129, new root HLR?.

```
/hullūru/? n. 'chickpea(s)'.
```

letter: GÚ.GAL hu-ul-lu-ru 'chickpea(s)' PRU 6 18: 14.

Alphabetic: unattested.

The Akkadian word for 'chickpea' is *ḥallūru*. The form in PRU 6 18, with the pattern *quttūl* rather than *qattūl*, may thus be Ugaritic; see pp. 269–70. Note, however, that the provenance of PRU 6 18 is not certain and, further, that the form *ḥullūru* also occurs once in an Akkadian text from Nuzi.

- **p. 131, root ZRW.** On Sabaean *drw* and other Semitic cognates, see Sima 2000: 269–70.
- **p. 133, root Yṣ̄'.** Note the similar form *i-ṣa-ma* (with enclitic *-ma*) in RS 25.423, cited by van Soldt (1989: 650); in the latter instance, however, the form, as translated by van Soldt ('he will go out') is not perfective.
- **p. 135, root KBD.** Delete entry (a) /kabidu/. The S^a Voc. line 47.1 denotes 'dog', and the Ugaritic form is to be read ka-a[l-bu] = /kalbu/; see above, ad p. 62, sign 47.1.

Entry (b) /kubuddatu/ is probably also to be deleted; the form [k]u-bu-ut-ta-tu₄ mes has now appeared in a text written in Egypt (Lackenbacher 1995: 81 and n. 28), where a Ugaritic word is unlikely, and so the form in PRU 3 98f. is probably also simply a (peripheral) Akkadian term. But see also Márquez-Rowe 2006: 220–21.

- **p. 136, root KLB.** This root, and the Ugaritic word /kalbu/ 'dog', are now confirmed in S^a Voc. 47.1; see above on p. 62, sign 47.1.
- **pp. 140–141, root KRK.** Note Egyptian Arabic *kurēk* 'shovel', which is said to derive from Turkish *kürek* (Littmann 1954: 124; Badawi and Hinds 1986: 744); it is possible, however, that the Turkish, Arabic, and Ugaritic words all descend from an early Anatolian word.
- p. 143, root LQH. Delete entry (a) /laqāhu/. See above, ad p. 59, no. 41.4.
- **pp. 145–46, root MW/YR.** This root should probably be deleted. Márquez-Rowe (2006: 233 n. 41), on the basis of his collation, suggests that PRU 3 51f.: 9 should be read simply *a-na* PN_2 -*ma* a-di $\lceil da \rceil$ - $\lceil ri$ - $ti \rceil$. This seems preferable to my proposal based on my own collation of the line (see Huehnergard 1986: 170). If Márquez-Rowe's reading is correct, lines 8–9 are to be translated 'The burial-ground of PN_1 belongs only to PN_2 forever'. For similar examples of enclitic -*ma* in a verbless clause, see Huehnergard 1989: 205.
- p. 146, root MḤṢ. Entry (a) /māḥiṣu/ probably means 'weaver; beater'; see DUL 541–42.
- **pp. 147–48, root MSW.** Vita 1995 proposes an alternative interpretation of the forms ${}^{gi\bar{s}(me\bar{s})}ma-\acute{a}s/sa-wa-tu$ as 'oars', corresponding to alphabetic $m\theta t$ and Hebrew $m\bar{a}\check{s}\hat{o}t/mi\check{s}\check{s}\hat{o}t$. There are several difficulties with this suggestion, however, that make it highly unlikely: (a) PRU 114 is a list of trees or types of wood, in which a manufactured item such as 'oars' is out of place; (b) the value $\check{s}a_{10}$ for SA is very rare in Ugarit Akkadian; and (c) the consonantal w of the syllabic forms should also appear in an alphabetic writing of this word and in a Hebrew cognate.

p. 150, new root -N.

```
/-nā/ pron. suff. 1cp 'our'.
```

legal: LUGAL EN-na-a 'the king our lord' PRU 3 41ff.: 19.

Alphabetic: -n.

The Ugarit Akkadian text PRU 3 41ff. (RS 16.270) was not included in our corpus because it seemed possible that it was written at Amurru. Several scholars have, however, convincingly argued that it was indeed written at Ugarit (Kühne 1973: 183; Izre'el 1991: 22–23; 1992: 169; Márquez-Rowe 2000). Thus the writing -na-a, which in context is obviously the 1cp suffix 'our', provides the vocalization of that suffix in Ugaritic (with the same vowel as in Arabic, Aramaic, and Ethiopic, vs. Hebrew $-n\hat{u}$, Akkadian -ni).

- **p. 150, root N³.** Additional cognates of Ugaritic /ni³tu/ have come to light: note Mari Akkadian ^{giš}*ne-e-tum* 'ax' (see DUL 612) and Eblaite *ne-a-tum/ni-a-ti* 'ax' (Archi 2005).
- p. 153, root NSK. Note the following additional example, construct plural /nāsikū/:

```
econ: 「na-sí-ku<sup>T</sup> URUDU 'bronze-smiths' PRU 3 195b B 1 (van Soldt 1991: 306).
```

Syllabic $\lceil na\text{-}si\text{-}ku \rceil$ URUDU corresponds to the frequent alphabetic $nsk \theta l\theta$, i.e., $\lceil n\bar{a}sik\bar{u} \theta al\theta i \rceil$ (see DUL 911).

p. 153, new root NSH. See above, ad p. 59, no. 41.4, for the following:

```
/nishu/ G v.n./infin. 'to be(come) pure?
```

```
lex.: (Sum.) [EL] = (Akk.) [elēlu²] = (Hur.) [ ] = (Ugar.) [ni]-IZ-ḫu UF 11 479: 24 (polyglot vocab.)

Sa Voc. no. 40.4.
```

Alphabetic: Cf. nsh 'to be victorious' (DUL 647).

p. 155, new root NTK[?].

*/nutku/², pl. (Akkadianized) /nutkū/ n. '(a glass paste)'.

letter: ù lu-ú-me-e šu-bu-lu-um-ma la-a tu-še-ba-la ù NA₄ ka-am-ma : nu-ut-ki la-a ta-na-aš-ši-ma la-a tu-še-ba-la 'do not under any circumstances do this kind of sending; do not collect and send such stone : nutku' PRU 4 221ff. (RS 17.383): 23–25.

Alphabetic: ntk (DUL 653).

PRU 4 221ff. is a letter sent to the king of Ugarit by his ambassador Taguḥlu, and so it was almost certainly not written at Ugarit, and was not included in our original corpus. But Taguḥlu's use of the form *nutku*, rather than the form *nitku* attested once in a core MB text (see CAD N/2 299b), may reflect his native Ugaritic pronunciation. See Sanmartín 1992 for the meaning 'glass paste/beads' (used as a substitute for lapis lazuli), for the likely connection of *nutku* with alphabetic *ntk* with the same meaning (DUL 651–52), and for the derivation of the noun from the Akkadian and Northwest Semitic root *ntk* 'to spill, pour (out)'.

p. 155, new root $N\theta K^2$.

```
/naθku/<sup>?</sup> n. 'bite'.
```

lit.: ina ÚŠ.MEŠ na-aš-ki-ša 'with the blood of her bite' Ug. 5 17 r. 7'.

Alphabetic: $n\theta k$ (DUL 653).

Since Akkadian for 'bite' is $ni\check{s}ku$, the writing in this literary text probably represents the Ugaritic form. The same line contains the Akkadianized Ugaritic verb li-ip-hu- $d\acute{u}$, for which see p. 166.

- **pp. 156–57, roots SKK, SKN.** It is now quite clear from examples at Emar and Mari that the word $si-ka/ka_4-ni-ma$ in Ug. 5 96 represents the oblique pl. of /sikkānu/, with double -kk-, and thus a $qitl\bar{a}n$ form of the root skk rather than a form of the root skn. Further, the meaning of the word is 'stela, standing stone'. For surveys of bibliography see Pentiuc 2001: 156–59; DUL 759; Durand 2005.
- **p. 158, root SRR.** See above, ad p. 88, no. 190.1, for the possibility that this line denotes 'prince' rather than 'false', thus Ugaritic $\check{s}ar-ru=/\check{s}arru/$ rather than sar-ru=/sarru/.
- **p. 159, new root ZZ.** See above, ad pp. 74–75, no. 173.4 for the following possible reading.

/^cuzzu/[?] n. 'strength, power'[?].

lex.: (Sum.) BAD = (Akk.) $kat\bar{a}mu$ = (Hur.) hu-x[] = (Ugar.) $[u]z^2-zu$ Ug. 5 137 i 21" (polyglot vocab.)

Sa Voc. no. 173.4.

Alphabetic: ^cz (DUL 195–96).

- **p. 160, root** ${}^{c}MQ$. In the second entry we are perhaps to read ${}^{unu}ku$ -um-ba: ${}^{r}at^{?q}$ - $q\grave{a}$; see below, ad p. 164, new root ${}^{c}TQ$.
- **p. 161, root** ^cS. Note the singular form, also found in an S^a Voc. text (van Soldt 1989: 651).

/cisu/, pl. /cissūma/? n. 'tree(s), wood'.

lex.: (Sum.) [GIŠ] = (Akk.) [i s u] = (Hur.) t a - l i = (Ugar.) i - s u UF 11 479: 13 (polyglot vocab.)

(Sum.) [GIŠ] = (Akk.) $[iss\bar{u}^2]$ = (Hur.) [tali] = (Ugar.) $iss\bar{u}$ -[ma] Ug. 5 130 iii 8' (polyglot vocab.)

Sa Voc. no. 173.4.

Alphabetic: ^cs, pl. ^csm (DUL 186–87).

- **p. 162, root** c **SR.** Note also the form us-su-ur in an Emar lexical text; see Cohen 2003: 184.
- **p. 162, root** c **RB.** On the form ${}^{[1\acute{u}],me\acute{s}}\acute{u}-ru-ba-nu$, see Hoftijzer and van Soldt 1991.
- p. 162, new root ^cRB².

/yi^crabu/ v. G *yaqtulu* 3ms 'he will enter'.

legal: *i-ṣa-ma iḥ-ra-bu* 'he will exit and enter' RS 25.423: 13 (van Soldt 1989: 650).

Alphabetic: $y^c rb$ (DUL 179–80).

(This form is not, despite our normalization, evidence for the Barth–Ginsberg rule, since the first sign could also be transliterated *ah*.)

p. 162, new root cRK ?. See above, ad p. 63, no. 47.3, for the following possible reading.

/cirku/n. as adverb 'equally'.

lex.: (Sum.) [UR] = (Akk.)
$$[mitharis]$$
 = (Hur.) $pi-ir-ri$ = (Ugar.) $ir-ku$ Ug. 5 131 4' (polyglot vocab.)

S^a Voc. no. 47.3.

Alphabetic: ^crk (DUL 182).

- **p. 163, root** ^cŠR¹. On the etymology of this term for an official, see now the bibliography cited in DUL 189, and add Dietrich and Loretz 1991.
- **p. 164, new root** ^c**TQ**[?]. See Márquez-Rowe 2006: 214–15 with n. 10 for this root and the interpretation of the following.

/cat(v)qu/2 adj. 'ruined, abandoned'?.

legal: it-ta-ši ... URU at-qà ša-ak-na 'took ... the ruined city Šakna' PRU 3 112f.: 4-6.

it-ta- $\check{s}i$ $u^{ru}ku$ -um-ba: $\lceil at^{?} \rceil$ - $q\grave{a}$ 'took the ruined city of Kumba' PRU 3 152f. 3.

Alphabetic: Cf. the verb ^{c}tq 'to pass', N 'to become old, age' (DUL 191–92).

The form [catqu] would be the result of post-tonic syncope (see above, pp. 282–83), for an underlying *qatvl* adjective.

p. 165, new root GTR?. See above, ad p. 69, no. 63.6, for the following possible reading.

/guttaru/ D v.n./infin. 'to attack'?.

lex.: (Sum.) [UD²] = (Akk.) [
$$\check{s}ah\bar{a}tu^2$$
] = (Hur.) [] = (Ugar.)] hu^2 -ut-ta-ru Ug. 5 138 7 (polyglot vocab.)

Sa Voc. no. 63.6.

Alphabetic: *ftr* (DUL 327–28).

p. 165-66, new root PGR.

/pagrūma/ n. month name.

```
econ.: (gen.) pag-ri-ma RS 25.455A+ iii 1 (van Soldt 1991: 306).
```

Alphabetic: pgrm (DUL 665–66).

- **p. 167, root PTR.** For entry (b), Tropper (2000: 532–33) remarks that the meaning given here, viz., 'to exchange' (lit. 'to release to one another'?) is unlikely for the root ptr in West Semitic. He thus proposes instead to read the form as $na-ab-da-lu' = /nabdal\bar{u}/$, again N suffix-conj. 3mp, but from bdl, the root of the noun /bidalūma/ 'substitutes'. While semantically attractive, the proposal is difficult to accept, since a verbal root bdl is otherwise unattested, and since an emendation is required for the new reading. Thus Nougayrol's original reading and our interpretation of the form as /naptarū/ seem preferable.
- **p. 169, new root PR.** For the following readings, see above, ad p. 63 no. 47.3 and pp. 91–92, no. 191.3.

```
/pīru/<sup>f</sup> n. 'elephant'<sup>?</sup>.

lex.: (Sum.) [GUL] = (Akk.) [pīru<sup>?</sup>] = (Hur.) pí-i-ri = (Ugar.) pí-rù Ug. 5
137 ii 44' (polyglot vocab.)

(Sum.) [UR] = (Akk.) mit[h]āri[š] = (Hur.) [piri<sup>?</sup>] = (Ugar.) pí-ru UF 11
479: 36.

Sa Voc. nos. 47.3, 191.3<sup>?</sup>.
```

Alphabetic: Unattested.

p. 169, new root PRLN. See van Soldt 1989a for the following.

```
/purulin(n)u/ n. 'diviner'.
```

```
lex.: (Sum.) [\text{ḤAL}] = (Akk.) [ba-ru]-u<sup>?</sup> = (Hur.) pu-ru-li-ni = (Ugar.) pu-r[u-li-nu] UF 11 479: 33 (polyglot vocab.) S<sup>a</sup> Voc. no. 46.2.
```

Alphabetic: prln (DUL 680).

- **p. 169, root PRS.** Delete this root; for the reading of the Ugaritic, see under the new root PRLN just above.
- **p. 169, root ?PRR.** Delete this root; for the reading, see above, new root PR.
- **p. 171–72, root** SMT. In Huehnergard 1989: 68 (and n. 142) I suggested that this verb was better understood to mean 'to devolve (of property)'. It should be noted that my interpretation of the forms listed under SMT as Ugaritic remains a minority view (see, e.g., Márquez-Rowe 2006: 227–28), most scholars preferring to see them as examples of the verbal adjective of Akkadian $sam\bar{a}du$ 'to join'. But the latter view, in my opinion, presents insurmountable difficulties: (a) it is unusual in these texts for Akkadian verbal forms to take on Ugaritic morphology, as in the form sa-ma-ta (unlike Canaanizing forms in Amarna texts; but see below, ad p. 320, on ti-tu-ru-na, and ad p. 321, on $te-sa-bi-tu_4$); (b) the gloss mark preceding two instances of these

forms would remain unexplained; (c) as noted on p. 171, Akkadian *ṣamādu* is not used of the transfer of property.

- **p. 174, root QṬN.** This root should perhaps be deleted, and the form read instead *kadi-nu*, i.e., *katinnu*, the Hurro-Akkadian word for a work implement or weapon, as proposed by Heltzer 1989 and Vita 1996. The writing with medial *DI* may reflect Hurrian intervocalic voicing. The equation of the form with Ugaritic *qtn* is accepted, however, by Pentiuc 2001: 145–46.
- **p. 175, root Q^cL.** The root of Ugaritic qi-i-lu 'anus, buttocks' is uncertain; see above, ad p. 85, no. 186.2.
- **p. 176, root RGZ.** Delete this root; see instead below, ad pp. 177–78, new root RWM.
- **p. 177, root RGM.** See above, ad p. 50, no. 30.x/30a.x. for *ri-gi-mu* as a possible (but unlikely) writing of /rigmu/ 'word'.
- p. 177–78, new root RWM². See above, ad p. 98, no. 198.5, for the following. /rămu/² adj. 'high, exalted'².

lex.: (Sum.) [IDIM] = (Akk.) [kabtu[?]] = (Hur.) [] = (Ugar.) [r]a-m[u] Ug. 5 137 iii 13' (polyglot vocab.)

Sa Voc. no. 198.5.

Alphabetic: rm (DUL 741).

- pp. 177–78, new root RWZ. See below, ad p. 186, new root TRZ.
- **p. 179.** Between ?RKM and ?R^cB, add a cross reference: ?RM: see RWM (above, ad pp. 177–78).
- p. 180, root Š²L. Correct the text reference: PRU 3 56f.: 5 (Clemens 2002: 221).
- **p. 182, root ŠN.** As noted above, ad p. 51, no. 32.1, the Ugaritic form here is written $\delta a^{-1}an^{-1}[t]u_4$, not $\delta a^{-1}an^{-1}[t]u_4$.
- p. 183, new root ŠPL?. See above, ad p. 113, root BLM, for the following:

/šaplu/² n. 'low place'? or /šapalu/² adj. 'low'?.

legal: qa-du É IM X DI/KI : šaB- $^{\Gamma}li$ -mi $^{\Gamma}$ 'with the low? ... house' PRU 6 56: 4'.

Alphabetic: Cf. verb *špl* (DUL 836).

p. 184, new root ŠQY. See above, ad p. 80 for the following. /mašqû/ n. 'office of cupbearer'. lex.: (Sum.) [SIG] = (Akk.) [$\bar{s}\bar{a}q\hat{u}tu$] = (Hur.) [t] $ap-\bar{s}a-\bar{h}al-\bar{s}e$ = (Ugar.) $ma-a\bar{s}-q[u-\hat{u}^2]$ Ug. 5 137 ii 15' (polyglot vocab.) S^a Voc. no. 180.3.

A1 1 1 2 CC × /DIH 500

Alphabetic: Cf. mšq (DUL 593).

- **p. 184, new root ŠRR.** See above, ad p. 88, no. 190.1, for the possibility that that entry may denote 'prince' rather than 'false', thus Ugaritic $\delta ar ru = /\delta arru/$ rather than $\delta ar ru = /\delta arru/$.
- **p. 185, root TMR.** For the alphabetic form *tmry* in RIH 83/2 see Bordreuil apud Pardee 1991: 306.
- **p. 186, new root TRZ**?. See above, ad p. 109, for the suggestion that *ti-tar-ri*?-*ZA* in Ug. 5 3 r 10' may denote Ugaritic /titarriza/ 'she must hasten', a D *yaqtula* form of a root TRZ, denominative of *trzz* 'light march, speed'.
- p. 186, new root TRN².

/tarnu/ n. 'mast (of a ship)'.

letter: aš-šum gišta-ar-ni GAL 'concerning the large mast' PRU 6 19: 4'.

Alphabetic: trn (DUL 879).

- Cf. Hebrew *tóren* 'mast'. The word *tarnu* is not otherwise attested in Akkadian texts (AHw 1331a; CAD T 239b). Note, however, that the provenance of PRU 6 19 is uncertain; Nougayrol (ad loc. p. 21 n. 1) pointed out that certain features of the writing resemble those of Ug. 5 no. 22, a letter from Cyprus.
- **p. 186, root 0HT.** The alphabetic form $m\theta tm$ in KTU 4.689: 3 probably means 'oars' (see above, ad pp. 147–48), and so should not be compared with the syllabic form ma-AS-ha-tu-ma. Thus the root of the latter is uncertain: $\partial/s/s\dot{s}/\partial/z/z-\dot{g}/h/h-t$.
- **p. 189:** *am-ma-ti*. Márquez-Rowe (2006: 247–48) wonders "whether the (presumably Ugaritic) word could be connected with Hurrian *ammade* ... meaning 'grandfather, ancestor', and denoting then in the Ugarit deeds something like 'inherited sonship'."
- **p. 190:** ha-AB-BI/BU. Compare perhaps alphabetic \(\geq b \) '(sacrificial) pit'? (DUL 316).
- **p. 190:** *ha-ba-tu*. See above, ad p. 125, new root HBT.
- **p. 191:** $ir^{?}$ -KU. See above, ad p. 63, no. 47.3, and ad p. 162, new root ${}^{c}RK$.
- **p. 191:** $[l]i^2/[U]Z^2-ZU$. See above, ad pp. 74–75, no. 173.4, and ad p. 159.

- **p. 192:** ma- $a\check{s}$ - $\lceil x \rceil$ [. See above, ad pp. 80, 184 (root $\check{S}QY$).
- **p. 193:** $ra^{-1}PA^{-1}$ -ni. See van Soldt 2005: 40–41 with n. 349, who agrees with Nougayrol that this form is another instance of /rahbānu/ (see above, pp. 178–79).
- **p. 193:** *ri/tal-GI-mu*. See above, ad p. 50.
- **p. 193:** ZI-ZA-hal-li-ma. A number of scholars have proposed that this word is derived from sisû 'horse', thus perhaps 'couriers'. See Márquez-Rowe 2006: 239 n. 95.
- **pp. 195–265, Part III, Chapter 1. Orthography.** A number of minor corrections could be made to this chapter on the basis of the new and corrected readings offered in the preceding pages, but the basic presentation would not be affected, so a detailed list seems unnecessary.
- **pp. 195–202.** As shown by van Soldt, the "confusion" in the writing of stops pertains only "to the older layer of texts written at Ugarit. The younger texts tend to write the stops much more in accordance with Mesopotamian practice" (van Soldt 1990: 734; see also van Soldt 1991: passim).
- **pp. 196–99.** Van Soldt (1990: 734–35), perhaps rightly, challenges our proposal that certain syllabic writings reflect a surface intervocalic voicing rule in Ugaritic.
- **pp. 211–65.** Note the 1978 study of Segert on the syllabic representation of Ugaritic phonemes, which I unfortunately overlooked.
- **p. 230, n. 86.** On the various syllabic writings of the royal name ${}^{c}m\theta tmr$, see now Hutton 2003.
- **p. 238.** On the use of the PI sign for $/y\bar{e}/$, note also, in a trilingal lexical fragment from Aphek, [GEŠTI]N.MEŠ = (Akk.) ka-ra-nu = PI-nu, i.e., $/y\bar{e}$ nu/ 'wine' (Rainey 1983: 137 line 3).
- **p. 239.** For gentilics in $-\bar{u}yu$, compare the alphabetic writing $qnuym = (pl.)/qan^3\bar{u}y\bar{u}-ma/in RS 17.434+: 39'$, noted by Pardee (1991: 306).
- **p. 244.** Another instance of a H-sign for $/^c$ / is the writing ih-ra-bu for /yi^crabu/; see above, ad p. 162, new root ${}^cRB^2$.
- **p. 250, n. 159.** Syllabic mi-ir in the PN iR-mi-ir undoubtedly represents /mihir/ < *mahir (with assimilation around the guttural; see pp. 271–73); cf. Hebrew $m\bar{a}h\hat{i}r$ 'skilled', Syriac $mhir\bar{a}$ 'practiced scribe'.

- **p. 258, n. 191.** In the second paragraph of the note, delete the reference to alphabetic $n\theta t$, which is to be read $\lceil a \rceil \theta t$ (Pardee).
- **pp. 271–73.** As noted above, ad p. 90, no. 190.5, the normalization [mašnu 5 u] for /mašna 5 u/, with short [u] in the second syllable due to assimilation, now seems more likely. See also above, ad p. 250, n. 159, on the form /mih \bar{i} r/ < *mah \bar{i} r. Note, finally, that a similar assimilation is attested in a number of Amarna Canaanite passive suffixconj. forms with the shape *qitil* for expected *qatil*, all with a guttural as the medial consonant; see Rainey 1996: 2.306.

Sivan (1989: 361–62) and Tropper (2000: 171) prefer to see *mrzḥ* as a *maqtil* noun, despite the paucity of evidence for vowel lowering before gutturals in Ugaritic (see my n. 25 on p. 272). But my explanation of Hebrew *marzēaḥ* as a frozen loan (ibid. n. 26) should probably be abandoned.

- **pp. 273–75.** Additional alphabetic examples of the assimilation of an unstressed vowel in an open syllable after initial /°/ are listed by Tropper 2000: 174–75, who generalizes the rule to affect any short vowel, thus $v_1 > v_2$ / °___C v_2 (see also my n. 26 on p. 274).
- **p. 276.** The beginning of the formula for the sound rule given about one-third of the way down the page contains an unfortunate typo, \bar{a} for intended \bar{a} ; i.e., it should read $\bar{a} > [+hi] / \#C = \{w,y\}$.
- **p. 278, n. 53.** Pardee (1991: 306) notes that a verb $k \partial d$ probably does not exist (read instead $k \partial d$ 'like a herd of ...').
- **p. 279.** As noted above, ad p. 83, the writing ma-AH-ha-du may not in fact indicate the assimilation of \dot{b} to the following h, i.e., it may denote ma- \dot{a} -ha-du for /ma \dot{b} hadu/. Thus, much of the discussion on this page may be moot.
- **pp. 282–83.** Other instances of post-tonic syncope have been noted in the preceding pages: [šantu] < /šánatu/ (see ad p. 51, no. 32.1); [^catqu] < /^cátvqu/ (see ad p. 164); perhaps also [šaplu] < /šápalu/ (see ad p. 113).
- **p. 286, n. 86.** On alphabetic *qrt* and syllabic /qarītu/ and their Semitic cognates, see also Nöldeke 1910: 130 and van Soldt 2005: 182–83.
- **pp. 289–90.** Monophthongization of -ayu has also occurred in the form /ma $\sin(x)$ <

- *mašqayu; see above, ad p. 80. Much more detail on the reflexes of original triphthongs is given by Tropper (2000: 194–200).
- **p. 290, n. 108.** Note the archaic/archaizing writing $\S{mym} = \S{mym} = \S{mym}$ (KTU 1.19 iv 24, 30), in which the original triphthong is preserved.
- **p. 293, A.1.b.** Add 1cp suffix $-na-a = /-n\bar{a}/$ 'our'; see above, ad p. 150, new root -N.
- **p. 295, near end.** Note that the syllabic writing of 'year' is $\delta a^{-1}an^{-1}[t]u_4$, for [\delta antu] < /\delta anatu/; see above, ad p. 51, no. 32.1.
- **p. 296, d** (1) (a). Add [i-lu-ma] = [i] i lu ma/ 'god(s)'; see above, ad p. 61, no. 45.2.
- **p. 297, d** (1) (b). Add $\lceil na\text{-}si\text{-}ku \rceil$ URUDU = $/n\bar{a}sik\bar{u}$ $\theta al\theta i/$ 'bronze-smiths'; see above, ad p. 153, root NSK.
- **p. 298 (3) Dual forms.** The allomorph of the dual ending with -a, in $-\bar{a}ma$, is probably original, the i of $-\bar{a}mi$ and of Arabic $-\bar{a}ni$ undoubtedly the result of dissimilation (the i then spreading to the oblique $-\bar{e}mi$ and Arabic -ayni); see Brockelmann 1908–13 1.253 §94b. (Note also the masc. dual yaqtulu verb ti- $e\bar{s}$ -ma-na, presumably for /tišma c āna/ 'they listen', in EA 103:22.)
- **pp. 302–3.** The length of the base vowel in the form [r]a- $m[u] = /r\bar{a}mu$ / 'exalted' is uncertain, so it is unclear whether it belongs under qal or $q\bar{a}l$.
- **p. 304.** Add to the list of *qatl* forms $na-a\check{s}-ki-\check{s}a=/na\theta ki/\ell$ 'bite'; see above, ad p. 155.
- **p. 305.** Add to the list of *qitl* forms [ni]-is- $hu = /nishu/^2$ 'to be(come) pure'; see above, ad pp. 152–53.
- **p. 306.** Add to the list of *qutl* forms nu-ut- $ku = /nutku/^{l}$ '(a glass paste)'; see above, ad p. 155, new root NTK².
- **p. 307.** Under *qatal* add perhaps *šap-li-mi* for [šapli]? < /šapali/ 'low'?; see above, ad p. 113.
- **p. 308, top.** Delete from the list of $qat\bar{a}l$ forms $[la?-q]a?-\hbar u?$ (see above, ad p. 59, no. 41.4) and [r]a-[g]a?-[zu?] (see above, ad pp. 177–78, new root RWM).
- **p. 312.** Add under $qutt\bar{u}l$ perhaps $hu-ul-lu-ru = /hull\bar{u}ru/^{l}$ 'chickpea(s)'; see above, ad p. 129.

- **p. 317.** Add to the Hurrian loanwords pu-r[u-li-nu] = /purulin(n)u/ 'diviner'; see above, ad p. 169, new root PRLN.
- **p. 319.** In the summary of verbal forms:

Add G yaqtulu 3ms yiqtalu.

Delete probably G Vbl. Adj. *maqtūlu*.

Delete Gt yaqtulu 3fs tiqtatlu.

Add D yaqtula 3fs tiqattila?.

p. 320. Under G Prefix-conj.:

Add *yaqtulu* 3ms ih-ra-bu = /yi^crabu/ 'he will enter' (RS 25.423: 13); see above, ad p. 162 (^cRB²).

Note the 3mp form *ti-tu-ru-na* '(if) they return' (RS 22 .399+: 17), in which the Akkadian verb *târu* is supplied with the Ugaritic 3mp prefix *t*- and with the *yaqtulu* 3mp ending -*ūna*; the form is cited by van Soldt 1991: 432 and Tropper 2000: 459.

Under G Verbal nouns:

Delete geminate $pi-r\dot{u} = /pirru/$; see above, ad p. 169, new root PR.

Add perhaps [ni]-IZ-hu = /niṣhu/² 'to be(come) pure'?; see above, ad pp. 152–53.

Delete [la?-q]a?-hu? = /laqahu/; see above, ad p. 59, no. 41.4.

Delete $[r]a-[g]a?-[zu?] = /rag\bar{a}zu/$; see above, ad pp. 177–78, new root RWM.

Under G Verbal Adjective/Passive Participle:

Delete probably the form *ma-aš-nu-ú*, which is more likely a *maqtal* noun; see above, ad p. 90, no. 190.5.

- **pp. 320–21.** Delete the Prefix-Conj. 3fs *yaqtulu* form :ti-tar-h[u]; see above, ad p. 109, and below, ad p. 321, D Prefix-Conj.
- **p. 321.** Under D Prefix-Conj., add perhaps 3fs *yaqtula* form *ti-tar-ri*²-ZA = /titarriza/ 'she must hasten'; see above, ad pp. 109 and 186. This interpretation is offered with much reservation. If it is correct, however, it indicates that the prefix vowel of the D stem in *yaqtul* forms was *i* rather than *u* or *a*, i.e., *yiqattil*-. The *a* vowel in the prefix of 1cs forms, i.e., 'aqattil-, which is well documented in a number of alphabetic examples written <aqtl>, would thus be the result of vowel harmony after initial ³, for which see above, ad pp. 273–75. Supporting evidence for *i* as the prefix vowel of the D is the 3mp form te-sa-bi-tu₄ '(if) they seize' in PRU 6 50: 16, for expected $isabbat\bar{u}$ or $isbat\bar{u}$ (see Huehnergard 1989: 160); although the root of the latter form is Akkadian, the morphology can be considered purely Ugaritic, especially the prefix *t* for 3mp, i.e., D yaqtul 3mp $tiqattil\bar{u}$. Whether the prefix vowel in the D participle

might also have changed from the original *u* to *i* (i.e., *muqattil* to *miqattil*) is difficult to ascertain; certain PN's show the form *muqattil* (see Tropper 2000: 562), but we cannot be sure, of course, that these reflect Ugaritic morphology.

Under D Verbal Noun, instead of [z]u-ut-ta-ru = /zuttaru/, read perhaps hu^2 -ut-ta- $ru = /guttaru/^2$ 'to attack'; see above, ad p. 69, no. 63.6, and p. 165, new root GTR.

p. 322. The form of the tD verbal noun /tuhappiku/ may be compared with the form of the Eblaite Dt infinitive, *tuptarris*, as noted by Lambert (1988); on the form see further Tropper 2000: 574.

In the synoptic table of attested forms:

In G Suff.-Conj., for *ha-ba-tu*, read perhaps 3mp *habatū*.

Add G Pref.-Conj. *yaqtulu* 3ms form *yi^crabu*; also in G Pref.-Conj., note (Akk.) *ti-ta-ru-na*, with 3mp *yaqtulu* ending -ūna.

Delete G Vbl. Noun forms *pirru*, *laqāḥu*, *ragāzu*; add *niṣḥu*².

Delete G Vbl. Adj. *mašnū* ³*u*.

Delete Gt Pref.-Conj. *yaqtulu* 3fs *ti³tarḥu/tittarḥu*.

Add perhaps D Pref.-Conj. yaqtula 3fs titarriza.

Change D Vbl. Noun *zuttaru*? to *guttaru*?.

pp. 358–64. Delete the following roots from the index of Ugaritic forms:

°RḤ p. 390	?KBD /kubuddatu/ p. 392	PRR /pirru/ p. 397
BLM p. 391	LQḤ /laqāḥu/ p. 393	?QTN /qatinnu/ p. 398
ZTR /zuttaru/ p. 391	MW/YR /mār(a)/ p. 393	RGZ /ragāzu/ p. 398
?НЯНЯ р. 392	SKN /sikānu/ p. 395	?θΗΤ /maθḫaṭu/ p. 399
KBD /kabidu/ p. 392	PRS /pur(r)ŭs(s)atu/ p. 397	

Add the following roots to the index of Ugaritic forms:

^o B ^c LT / ^o ib ^c alatu/ p. 390	NTK /nutkū/ p. 394	PGR /pagrūma/ p. 396
^o L / ^o ilūma/ (pl.) p. 390	NθK /naθku/ p. 394	PR /pīru/ p. 397
B ^c R /bi ^c ru/ p. 391	SKK /sikkānu/ p. 395	PRLN /purulin(n)u/ p.397
ḤBṬ /ḥabaṭū/ p. 391	^c ZZ / ^c uzzu/ p. 395	RWM /rāmu/ p. 398
ḤṢN /ḥuṣẵnu/ p. 392	^c S / ^c iṣu/ (sg.) p. 395	ŠPL /šap(a)lu/ p. 398
HLR /hullūru/ p. 392	^c RB ² /yi ^c rabu/ pp. 395–96	ŠQY /mašqû/ p. 398
KLB/kalbu/ p. 393	^c RK / ^c irku/ p. 396	ŠRR /šarru/ p. 399
-N /-nā/ p. 393	$^{c}TQ/^{c}at(v)qu/p.396$	TRZ /titarriza/ p. 399
NSH /nishu/ p. 394	GTR /guttaru/ p. 396	TRN /tarnu/ p. 399

Bibliography Cited in the Additions and Corrections

- André-Salvini, Béatrice and Mirjo Salvini. 1998. Un nouveau vocabulaire trilingue sumérien-akkadien-hourrite de Ras Shamra. Pp. 3–40 in D. Owen and G. Wilhelm, eds., *Studies on the Civilizaton and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians*, vol. 9 (Bethesda, MD: CDL).
- André-Salvini, Béatrice and Mirjo Salvini. 1999. Note brevi. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 41: 145–48.
- Archi, Alfonso. 2005. Minima Eblaitica 22: The Symbolism of the Axe (*ni*³tum) in the Oath. *NABU* 2005/69.
- Arnaud, Daniel. 1985–88. *Emar VI/1–4*. 4 volumes. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Badawi, El-Said and Martin Hinds. 1986. *A Dictionary of Egyptian Arabic: Arabic–English*. Beirut: Librairie du Liban.
- Caquot, André. 1988. Un recueil ougaritique de formules magiques: KTU 1.82. *SEL* 5: 31–43.
- Caquot, André and Jean-Michel de Tarragon. 1989. *Textes ougaritiques*, vol. 2: *Textes religieux et rituels*. LAPO 14. Paris: Cerf.
- Clemens, D.M. 2002. Review of *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. JNES 61: 221–23.
- Cohen, Yoram. 2002. The West Semitic/Peripheral Akkadian Term for "Lung." *JAOS* 122: 824–27.
- Cohen, Yoram. 2003. Studies in the Literary Texts from Emar. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
- Dietrich, M. and O. Loretz. 1991. Ugaritisch ^cšr, āširūma und äthiopisch ^caššara. Pp. 309–27 in Alan S. Kaye, ed., Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of His Eighty-fifth Birthday. 2 volumes. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- DUL = G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín. 2004. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Translated by W.G.E. Watson. 2d ed. 2 volumes. Leiden: Brill.
- Durand, Jean-Marie. 2005. Le Culte des pierres et les monuments commémoratifs en Syrie amorrite. Florilegium Marianum 8. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Günbattı, Cahit. 2004. Two Treaty Texts Found at Kültepe. Pp. 249–68 in J.G. Dercksen, ed., Assyria and Beyond: Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen. Leiden: NINO.
- Heltzer, Michael. 1989. Akkadian *katinnu* and Hebrew *kīdōn*, "Sword." *JCS* 41: 65–68
- Hoftijzer, J. and W.H. van Soldt. 1991. Texts from Ugarit concerning Security and Related Akkadian and West Semitic Material. *UF* 23: 189–216.
- Huehnergard, John. 1986. RS 15.86 (PRU 3, 51f.). UF 18: 169-71.
- Huehnergard, John. 1989. The Akkadian of Ugarit. HSS 34. Atlanta: Scholars.
- Hutton, Jeremy M. 2003. An Areal Trend in Ugaritic and Phoenician and a New Translation of KTU 1.15 I 3. *UF* 35: 243–58.
- Izre'el, Shlomo. 1991. *Amurru Akkadian: A Linguistic Study*. 2 volumes. HSS 40–41. Atlanta: Scholars.
- Izre'el, Shlomo. 1992. Review of Huehnergard 1989. BiOr 49: 168-80.
- Kühne, Cord. 1973. Ammistamru und die Tochter der 'Grossen Dame'. UF 5: 175-84.
- Lackenbacher, Sylvie. 1995. Une correspondance entre l'administration du pharaon Merneptah et le roi d'Ougarit. Pp. 77–83 in M. Yon et al., eds., *Le pays d'Ougarit autour de 1200 av. J.-C.* Ras Shamra–Ougarit XI. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

Lackenbacher, Sylvie. 2002. Textes akkadiens d'Ugarit: Textes provenant des vingtcinq premières campagnes. LAPO 20. Paris: Cerf.

Lambert, Wilfred G. 1988. A Further Note on tōhû wābōhû. UF 20: 135.

Littmann, Enno. 1954. Türkisches Sprachgut im Ägyptisch-Arabischen. Pp. 107–27 in Fritz Meier, ed., Westöstliche Abhandlungen: Rudolf Tschud zum siebzigsten Geburtstag überreicht von Freunden und Schülern. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Márquez Rowe, Ignacio. 2000. The King of Ugarit, His Wife, Her Brother, and Her Lover: The Mystery of a Tragedy in Two Acts Revisited. *UF* 32: 365–72.

Márquez Rowe, Ignacio. 2006. The Royal Deeds of Ugarit: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Diplomatics. AOAT 335. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Militarev, Alexander and Leonid Kogan. 2000. *Semitic Etymological Dictionary*, vol. 1: *Anatomy of Man and Animals*. AOAT 278/1. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Nöldeke, Theodor. 1910. Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft. Strassburg: Trubner.

Pardee, Dennis. 1991. Review of UVST. JNES 50: 304-6.

Parker, Simon B. 1989. Review of UVST. JBL 108: 320-22.

Pentiuc, Eugen. 2001. West Semitic Vocabulary in the Akkadian Texts from Emar. HSS 49. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Rainey, Anson F. 1976. A Tri-lingual Cuneiform Fragment from Tel Aphek. TA 3: 137–40.

Rainey, Anson F. 1996. Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets. 4 volumes. Leiden: Brill.

Sanmartín, Joaquín. 1992. RS-akk. *nutku* und ug. alph. *ntk* «Glaspaste, -perle(n)». *NABU* 1992/111.

Schloen, J. David. 2001. The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Segert, S. 1978. Rendering of Ugaritic Phonemes by Cuneiform Syllabic Signs in the Quadrilingual Vocabularies from Ras Shamra. Pp. 257–68 in vol. 2 of B. Hruška and G. Komoróczy, eds., *Festschrift Lubor Matouš*. Budapest.

Sima, Alexander. 2000. Tiere, Pflanzen, Steine und Metalle in den altsüdarabischen Inschriften. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Sivan, Daniel. 1984. Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th-13th C.B.C. from Canaan and Syria. AOAT 214. Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker/Neukirchener.

Sivan, Daniel. 1989. A New Study of Ugaritic Words in Syllabic Transcription. *UF* 21: 357–64.

Smith, Mark S. 1989. Review of UVST. CBQ 51: 718-20.

Soldt, W.H. van. 1989. Review of Sivan 1984. BiOr 46: 645-51.

Soldt, W.H. van. 1989a. Atn prln, "Attanu the Diviner." UF 21: 365–68.

Soldt, W.H. van. 1990. Review of *UVST*. *BiOr* 47: 728–36.

Soldt, W.H. van. 2005. *The Topography of the City-State of Ugarit*. AOAT 324. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Tropper, Josef. 2000. *Ugaritische Grammatik*. AOAT 273. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Vita, Juan-Pablo. 1995. Acadio *maswatu*, ugarítico *mtt* "remo". Préstamo ugarítico al acadio de Ugarit. *AuOr* 13: 139–41.

Vita, Juan-Pablo. 1996. La herramienta *katinnu* en el texto de Ugarit RS 19.23. *Sefarad* 46: 439–43.

Wegner, Ilse. 1995. Die hurritische Körperteilbezeichnungen. ZA 85: 116–26.

Wesselius, J.W. 1979. New and Old Ugaritic Words. AIUON 39: 105-6.

Wilhelm, Gernot. 1992. Zum viersprachigen Vokabular aus Ugarit. Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici 29: 249–53.