

taneity. Albright stands thus on the side of empirical and positivistic philosophers. As few others, he has gauged the impact of new typological methods on the practical and theoretical task of the historian.

My time is up and I have touched on only a few aspects of my subject. The extent of our failure may be judged by the omission of even a bare mention of Albright's most familiar works: *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, *The Archaeology of Palestine*, and the favorite of many, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*.

UGARITIC GLOSSES

JOSHUA BLAU AND JONAS C. GREENFIELD

These glosses are the result of a joint reading of the alphabetic texts and the quadrilingual word list in the recently published *Ugaritica V* (Paris 1968).

I. *Phonological deviations*: In the alphabetic texts there are some deviations from the normal orthographic practices of the Ugaritic scribes:

1. *htr*

il . hlk . lbth .
yštql . lhtrh .

El went to his house,
He betook himself to his court.
Text 1 (RS 24.258) ll. 17-18

mgy . hrn . lbth .
wyštql . lhtrh .

Horon came to his house
And betook himself to his court.
Text 7 (RS 24.244), ll. 67-68

There can be no doubt that *htr* stands for the usual *h_zr*, since it is in parallelism with *bt*.¹ For a possible explanation see J. Blau, (*Journal of the American Oriental Society* 88 [1968] 523-6) who is of the opinion that in one of the dialects of Ugaritic *z* had shifted to *t*.

2. *sb'*:

In text 1 (RS 24.258), l. 3 we find '*d šb'*' "to satiety," but in l. 16 this is written '*d sb'*'.² If this deviation is not due to a scribal error, it may reflect a dialect in which *š* had fallen together with *s* rather than with *š*. The spelling in l. 3 would then represent the classical orthography.

3. *dmr*:

The root *dmr* occurs three times in Text 2 (RS 24.252). Once, obverse l. 3, together with *šr* "to sing": *dyšr wydmr* "who sings and chants":

¹ So already Gordon, *UT* Glossary 852a; Virolleaud sees in our word a dialectical variant for *h_zr* and refers to *qtš* for *qdš* but in that case as in *štqšlm* for *šdqšlm* we are dealing with the assimilation of emphatics. This is not relevant here.

² Virolleaud's transliteration *šb'* (p. 547) is mistaken. There are mistakes elsewhere in his transliteration.

and twice, reverse ll. 6-7: *b'z // bdmrh*, and l. 9: *'zk dmrk*. When parallel to *šr*, one is reminded of Hebrew *'āšīrā wa'azammērā* "I shall sing and chant" (Ps 27:6); and when parallel to *'z*, one thinks of *'ozzi wēzimrat* "my strength and power" (Exod 15:2, etc.). In the later case, the use of *d* can be justified etymologically by recourse to the root *dmr* in Arabic and perhaps in Epigraphic South Arabic. However, *zmr* "to chant," according to the testimony of the other Semitic languages, reflects Proto-Semitic *z* rather than *d*. Is Ugaritic *d* in this root due to a blend of two roots (as is the case, presumably, with Ugaritic *dr'*) or is it simply a scribal error?³

II. Textual Notes

1. *Text 2 (RS 24.252)*: Although it may be tempting to connect this text with the so-called Rephaim texts (*UT* 212, 122, 123, 124) since eating and drinking are characteristic of them, this is by no means necessary. Indeed, *rpu* in our text seems to be the epithet of El, as Virolleaud (p. 553) has seen, and in light of which he restored the first word of the second line. It stands to reason that *rpu* means here "the healer." El's role as healer is apparent in the Keret Epic (*Ugaritic Textbook [UT]* 126, Col. V), where he alone is able to bring about Keret's cure, as has been noted by S. E. Loewenstamm. Loewenstamm rightly emphasizes that the only case where El is used without any additional epithet in Biblical *prose* is in connection with healing: *'el nā rēfā-nā lāh* (Num 12:13).⁴

As to the epithet *mlk 'lm* (l. 1) Virolleaud noted its use in *UT* 2008:9 as a title of Pharaoh. In the Psalms (10:16) the epithet is applied to YHWH as 'eternal ruler.' It should be noted that *melek 'olām* becomes a divine appellative in Judaism and occurs in every statutory benediction. In that context it has the meaning "King of the world" partaking of the semantic change that *'olām* underwent in post-Biblical Hebrew.⁵

The epithet *gtr* was already known from *UT* 5 (passim), and 18, 16-20. In our context it occurs in ll. 2 and 6.⁶ Virolleaud has connected it with Akkadian *gašru* (*Akkadisches Handwörterbuch [AHw]* 283 "überlegen, stark," *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary [CAD]* "G" 56-58 "strong, powerful"). This connection seems valid because both terms are used as epithets of gods (perhaps also *UT* 18, 20). *AHw* connects Akkadian *gašru* with Arabic *gšr* "to be bold, courageous."⁷ Since Arabic exhibits *s* rather than *t*, one is *prima facie* inclined not to relate the two roots. There are, however, other cases of such 'weak phonetic shifts' in

³ It is worth noting that in *UT* 103, in all likelihood Akkadian in the Ugaritic alphabet, *azammar* is written *admr*. For a different view of this problem cf. S. E. Loewenstamm, *Vetus Testamentum* 19 (1969) 464-470.

⁴ *Kirjath Sepher* 37 (1961-62), p. 193. Note too the personal name *Rēfā'el*.

⁵ For the later development of *melek 'olām* cf. J. G. Weiss, *Journal of Jewish Studies* 10 (1959), 169-171.

⁶ In l. 6, where it is an epithet of Anat, one would have expected *gtrt*. Virolleaud assumes a scribal error.

⁷ Cf. Lane, *Dictionary*, 424b; Landberg, *Glossaire Daïnois* (Leiden 1923-42), p. 283.

Ugaritic,⁸ cf. *htbn* = Hebrew *ḥešbōn*, Aram. *ḥušbānā*, Arabic *ḥisāb*. On the other hand, both *htbn* and our *gtr* may very well be loan words, if in fact Ugaritic *t* was pronounced /š/.⁹

In l. 2 *gtr* is followed by *yqr*. As Virolleaud has noted, this word does not occur elsewhere as a noun or adjective in Ugaritic. For its usage here cf. *yqr* as an epithet of kings in Ezra 4: 10 *asnappar rabbā wēyaqīrā*, and cf. too Elephantine Aḥiqar l. 108: *špyr mlk lmhzh kšmš wyqyr hdrh*.

l. 4 For the use of *knr*, *tp*, *mšltm* during a feast cf. Is 5: 12.

l. 8. *kpt*. Virolleaud has connected it with Hebrew *kbš* and a putative Akkadian *kapāšu* (read *kabāšū*, and cf. *AHW* s. v. *kabāsu* p. 415; cf. too, Gesenius-Buhl s. v., p. 334b). This is difficult, since *kbš/kpš* would have been expected in Ugaritic. The meaning of *kpt* remains unclear and it would be best to forego seeking its etymology.

Reverse l. 10-12, p. 553: Gordon (*UT*, p. 555) was surely right in translating *btk ugrt . lymt . špš . wyrḥ . wn'mt . šnt . il* "in the midst of Ugarit for the days of the Sun and Moon and the goodness of the years of El." This may be nuanced as "for the (duration of) the days of the Sun and Moon and the good years of El." Gordon noted the parallelism of *ymt/šnt* in Ps 90: 15. One may add that this parallelism occurs in the early Byblian inscriptions (cf. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften* [KAI] 4; 5; 6; 7). The idea of the sun and the moon as eternal witnesses is found in Ps 72: 5 and 89: 37-38, and also in Karatepe IV 2-3 (KAI 26) *šm 'ztud ykn l'm km šm šmš wyrḥ*. Of great interest is Ps 102: 25 ff., where God is specifically called 'ēl ('ēlī "my God") and his enduring years are noted. In the Ugaritic text El's years are enduring, like those of *špš* and *yḥ*, but in this Psalm, due to its monotheistic conception, it is El's years only that endure, whereas his creations, including heaven and earth, may disappear. One again sees that on the one hand, Hebrew poetry has taken over Canaanite concepts, but on the other hand changes them according to the needs of its monotheistic religion. As to *n'mt šnt il* cf. Job 36: 11 *yēkallū yēmēhem baṭṭōb ušnēhem bannē'imim*. As to the concept of El's years being good, cf. Ps 65: 12 *'ittartā šēnat ṭōbathā*, referring to the bounteous harvest given by God. One wonders whether *šēbā ṭōbā* "good old age" but literally "good hoary head" may be related to *n'mt šnt il*, taking into consideration that *šbt* = Hebrew *šēbā* is a characteristic of El.¹⁰

2. *Text 3*, (RS 24.245). l. 2 *km db . btk . ḡrh*, Perhaps "as a bear in its cave." If this interpretation proves true, *ḡrh* "in its cave" is a homograph of *ḡr* "mountain" ll. 1, 3, rather than a homonym. For its etymology, cf. the material adduced in Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.*², p. 454a.

l. 9 *kyn . ddm*; one doubts that Virolleaud's "vin des pots" is correct. *dd* in the sense of "love" occurs also in l. 7, and one is reminded of Cant 1: 2 *ki-ṭōbim dōdēkā miyyayin*; 1: 4 *nazkīrā dōdēkā miyyayin*; 4: 10 *ma-ṭṭōbū dōdayik miyyayin*; and perhaps 5: 1 *šētū wēšikrū dōdim*.

⁸ For the concept of "weak phonetic change" see Y. Malkiel, *Essays on Linguistic Themes* (Berkeley, 1968), pp. 23-24, 33-45.

⁹ Cf. J. Cantineau, *Semitica III* (1950), 28; M. Dietrich-O. Loretz, *Die Welt des Orients* 3 (1964-6), p. 211.

¹⁰ Cf. *UT* 51, V, 66; *Anat V*, 10.33.

3. *Text 6 (RS 24.272)*: 1. *kymgy adn 2. ilm .rbm 'm dtn* the phrase 'm dtn, occurring twice, is taken by Virolleaud as "the people of DTN." One would rather interpret it as "toward/at/to DTN." The preposition 'm (Hebrew 'im) expressing the goal occurs not only after *lk*, as admitted by Virolleaud, but also with other verbs of motion: *ntn pnm*, and also *hlk (Krt I, 124)*. Virolleaud was correct that *mgy*, as a rule, governs *l* or a direct object, but there is no reason why 'm should not be governed by *mgy*, since this is an adverbial phrase, rather than an indirect object. The *mgy* clause is continued in both passages by a phrase containing *mtpt*. l. 3: *wysal .mtpt .yld*. On first blush, *wys' l mtpt* reminds one of Akk. *dina bu'u* "to institute legal action."¹¹ Accordingly, *adn ilm rbm* wants to sue the child, or preferably, to sue in behalf of the child. In 11: 10-12 *wymy mlakk 'm dtn lqh mtpt* the phrase is *lqh mtpt*, the subject of which is the emissary *mlk*; cf. Akk. *dina lequ* "to accept the decision."¹² One has the impression that *adn ilm rbm* wants to sue (ll. 1-2), and his emissary came to accept (or learn?) the decision. In any case this text is poorly preserved, and nothing definite can be stated.

4. *Text 7 (RS 24.244)*: It would be best to take *bl* in the phrase *ql .bl* (e. g. l. 2) as an imperative of *ybl*. It would then govern the direct object *ql* and the prepositional phrase beginning with 'm, with the appropriate sense "bring the word to," i. e. "inform." Cf. in Ugaritic *ybl b'srt (UT 51, V, 88)* and in Hebrew *he'ebir / hōlik qōl*. The sense would be that *um . phl* is asking *šps* to inform the various gods of the following message.

5. *Text 8 (RS 24.241)*: We would like to propose an alternative interpretation of ll. 19-20: [] *isp .[šp]š l hrm .grpl .l arš / [la]n hmt .lp [.n]tk .abd .lp .akl tm dl*: "Remove, O Shapash, from the mountains fog, from on the earth the strength of venom, from the mouth of the destructive biter (*ntk abd*), from the mouth of the . . . eater." In this interpretation, *lan* is an abstract noun from *tertiaie infirmae l'y* with suffix *-n* (cf. *gan* "pride"). The first two hemistichs complement each other: just as the sun removes the fog from the mountains, so shall it remove from on earth the strength of venom (for the curative role of the sun, cf. Malachi 3:20 and for the use of the *p* and *akl* denoting a destructive reptile or animal, cf. Sefire I, 30-31). If the interpretation of *ql bl* offered above is correct, the restoration of this phrase here is not probable.¹³

6. *Text 9 (RS 24.263)*: l. 22 *dnt* was compared by Virolleaud with Biblical *zanim*. This is impossible, since the latter is a Persian loan word, its *z* corresponding to Semitic *z*.¹⁴

7. *Text 10 (RS 24.271) l. 7*: In the light of *yrh kty* of Text 14, A14,

¹¹ CAD "B" p. 365.

¹² CAD "D" p. 151. Neither of the verses adduced by Virolleaud are in any way pertinent to legal matters.

¹³ For this proposed restoration cf. Virolleaud and M. C. Astour, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 27 (1968), p. 29.

¹⁴ Cf. W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon* (Leiden, 1967), p. 263.

adduced by Virolleaud himself, we are inclined to divide *yrhm kty*, i. e. *yrh* with enclitic *m*.

l. 13: In the light of the other pairs connected by *w*, one is inclined to divide 'd *wšr*.

l. 14: This is undoubtedly to be divided *šdq mšr*, the *Suduk* and *Misör* of Philo of Byblos; note too the Biblical verses containing *šedeq* and *mšör*.¹⁵

8. *Text 11 (RS 24.260)*: l. 6: *š hll ydm*; for *hll* compare Aramaic *hallel* "to wash"¹⁶ and Akkadian *elēlu*.¹⁷ If this is correct, the *hll ydm* may be related to the Akkadian *mš qati* ceremony,¹⁸ *hll* being then perhaps the infinitive of the *D* stem.

l. 8: *w tlhm att* is interpreted by Virolleaud as referring to the queen. A priestess could just as well have been meant by *att*.

ll. 9-10: As to *šlmm kll ylhm bh*, Virolleaud separates *šlmm* from *kll*, interpreting *šlmm* as a kind of sacrifice, whereas *kll* is considered by him as the subject of *ylhm*, as if meaning "all shall eat from it." Yet in the light of Phoenician *šlm kll* (*KAI* 69, ll. 3 ff.), there can be little doubt that *šlmm kll* (*šlm* with enclitic *-m*) is a class of sacrifice. Accordingly, *ylhm bh* may be an impersonal passive form "it may be eaten."

l. 11: *šqym* denotes perhaps an oblation, cf. *UT* 1092, 8.

l. 14: Virolleaud's translation of *ym ahd* "(en) un seul jour" is not convincing. One wonders whether *ahd* is not used in a distributive sense, meaning "each day," cf. the biblical usage of repeated 'eḥād in a distributive sense, e. g. 'iš 'eḥād 'iš 'eḥād lēmattē 'abōtāw, Num 13:2, usually shortened to 'iš 'eḥād laššābet, Deut 1:23, "one man from each tribe."

9. *Text 12 (RS 24.249)*: One should not attach too much importance to l. 3 *barb't šrt* and l. 5 *btmnt šrt*, as if the fem. form of the numeral proved that "a nocturnal sacrifice was meant, since the word for night (Heb. *laylā*) is implied." First, in Ugaritic the usage of gender in numerals is rather indifferent.¹⁹ Moreover, in most Semitic languages, both *ym* "day" and *lyl*, etc. "night" are masculine. Virolleaud, when speaking of *laylā* being feminine, was perhaps influenced by Arabic, where *layla* (*t*) is in fact feminine and is often implied after numbers in the feminine. Hebrew *lāylā* with unstressed *ā*-ending (presumably a remnant of terminative *ā*-ending), is, at any rate, masculine.

10. *Text 13 (RS 24.253)*: Recto l. 3 *bym mlat*, the form *mlat* reminds one of the Hebrew pseudo infinitive *mēlō(')t*. It is interesting to note that the formation of a construct infinitive from *tertiaie aleph* verbs with the ending *-ōt* (written with quiescent *aleph*) is attested also with

¹⁵ Cf. most recently S. E. Loewenstamm in *Studies in the Bible presented to M. H. Segal* (Jerusalem, 1964), pp. 180-182.

¹⁶ J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch s. v.* p. 260; C. Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.*², s. v. 231b.

¹⁷ *CAD* "E" 80-83; *AHw elēlu* II, pp. 197 f.

¹⁸ *AHw s. v.*, p. 659a.

¹⁹ Gordon, *UT*, par. 7.20; S. E. Loewenstamm, "The Numerals in Ugaritic" in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies Held in Jerusalem, 1965* (Jerusalem, 1969), pp. 174-176.

qr' (Jud 8:1), *śn'* (Prov 8:13).²⁰ It is usually explained as an analogical formation in accordance with forms *tertiaef infirmaef*; yet one wonders whether they don't exhibit a genuine *tertiaef aleph* infinitive -*t* (rather than -*at*). In this case, *mVlāt* shifted to *mēlōt* (written *ml't*, just as *ra's* > *rōš*, written *r's*). In light of this, there is the possibility that *ym mlāt* means "the day of fulfilling," i. e. the day of the full moon. There remains the possibility of *ym* = *yam* "sea" and *mlāt* "pool."²¹ Nevertheless, the first interpretation is more likely. May we assume that *yrh* at the beginning of l. 5 is out of place and the full phrase is *ym ml't yrh* "on the day that the moon is full." This fits with the date *arb't 'šrt* at the beginning of the tablet, and perhaps with l. 24 *šnpt*, beginning a new section, and in all likelihood designating two thirds of the month.²²

III. *Quadrilingual Word List* ('Voculaires Polyglottes' pp. 230-51).

1. *Text 130 (RS 2.149)*: no. 24 *a-da-nu*: it had been generally accepted from the context that Ugaritic *adn* also meant "father."²³ This is born out by the identification of Ugaritic *a-da-nu* with Akkadian *a-bu*.

no. 32 *le-e*: It is peculiar that Akkadian *a-na* is rendered by *le-e* [?], that is presumably a long *ē* (in spite of the following *bi-i*). One is tempted to surmise that in "Proto-Ugaritic" *'ilā*, which no longer exists in Ugaritic, left a mark on its partial synonym *la* by influencing its ending: *la* + *'ilē* (< *'ilay*) = *lē*. Similar phenomena are attested in the Arabic dialects.²⁴

no. 35/6 *a-na-ku* displays the assumed original *ku* ending, in contrast to general Canaanite *kī*, represented by Hebrew *'anōkī*, Amarna *a-nu-ki*, Phoenician *'nk(y)*.

no. 37 *ma-al-ku*: Hebrew *melek*, with pronominal suffixes *malkī*, etc., is generally interpreted as originating in *milk* (cf. pausal *melek*, rather than *malek*, which would have been expected if *malk* were original). Hebrew *malk-* is, accordingly, explained as due to Philippi's law. (Note too the personal names *Milkōm*, *Milkā*, Phoenician *Milkīyatōn*, *Milkiyasop*²⁵). It is therefore interesting to note that in Ugaritic *malku* the vowel is *a*. Cf., however, Akkadian *malku*.

no. 37 *ba-a-lu-ma* (cf. also Text 137, no. 187) is presumably a plural, equivalent to Hebrew **bē'ālīm* with singular meaning.

no. 40 *tu-u-r[u]* exhibits vowel harmony, as may be deduced from Hebrew *ṭāhōr*.

2. *Text 137*: no. 157 *tu-un-na-nu* 'serpent' is in the *quṭṭal* pattern, different from Hebrew *tannīn*.

²⁰ Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, *Hebr. Gram²*, p. 206, para. 74h.

²¹ Cf. for *mēlōt* "pool" E. Y. Kutscher, *Leshonenu* 21 (1956-57), p. 254.

²² Gordon, *UT*, p. 555 argues that the use of *šnpt* here proves that *šnpt* cannot mean 2/3 in *UT* 1:10. We believe that *šnpt* here proves the opposite. (See Additional Note below, ED.)

²³ Cf. *adn/um/ih* (*UT* 77, 33-35) and *ab//adn* in Gen 45:8.

²⁴ Cf. C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss* I 495, 252bB; J. Blau, *A Grammar of Medieval Judaeo-Arabic* (Jerusalem, 1961), p. 119, para. 1.5.

²⁵ Z. S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language* (New Haven, 1936), p. 119.

no. 159 *ni-ih-rum*, derived from *nġr*.²⁶ The form of this infinitive is more like the Arabic *maṣdar* than the Hebrew infinitive. This "isogloss" connecting Ugaritic and Arabic is quite interesting. Remnants of this formation in Hebrew are perhaps forms like *bēbigdō* Exod 21:8; *lēšitnō* Zach 3:1.²⁷

no. 173 (cf. also Text no. 131, l. 6') *he-ya-ma* presumably exhibits an adverbial *-ma* ending; translate, accordingly, "being alive."

no. 183 *hu-wa-ú*, *pu-la-tu* represent, no doubt, the infinitive of the D stem. We are inclined to interpret them as *huwwā'u*, *pullātu*. It stands to reason that the *a* of the second syllable is long; cf. the rare Biblical Hebrew *qattōl* < *qattāl*,²⁸ Aramaic *qattālā*,²⁹ and rare Arabic *qittāl*.³⁰ Although the *u* in the first syllable is normally a sign of the passive in West Semitic, one may compare the Akkadian D stem infinitive *purrusu*.

no. 183 *m[a]-al-sà-mu* is, it seems, an abstract noun "running," rather than a participle.

no. 185 *m[a]-ah-hu-rum*, read *b[a]-ah-hu-rum*, in the light of Hebrew *bāhūr*. Note the Hebrew plural *bahūrīm*, whose short *a* is surely a sign of the doubling of the following *h*. The double *h* in Ugaritic indicates the same phenomenon.

no. 186 *hu-zi-ru (m)*: cf. the Babylonian vocalization *hūzīr* (as against Tiberian *hāzīr*).³¹ The *u* is also exhibited by IQIsa in 65:4 (Pl. LII, l. 1), 66:3 (Pl. LIII, l. 13),³² Christian Palestinian Aramaic,³³ and Akkadian *huzīru*.³⁴ In the light of our Ugaritic word without *n*, denoting "swine," it is highly doubtful that *huzr* // *glm* (UT 67 V 9) is "swine."³⁵

no. 186a *he-en-nā-šu*: cf. Arabic *hinnaṣ*, Syriac *hannašā*.

no. 189 *a-du-rum* does not exhibit vowel harmony, as expected. *ma-a-du-ma* (*ibid.*) does not display the expected shift *a' > i'* (as against the usual alphabetic *mid*); *-ma* is, it seems, adverbial.

no. 187 *du-u* 196 *da-ka-rum*, 197 *da-ab-hu*, all corresponding to Proto-Semitic *d*, strengthen the view that this Proto-Semitic sound had indeed shifted to *d* in Ugaritic.

no. 198 *ša-mu-ma*, cf. the Amarna gloss *šamuma/šamema*, EA 211/17, 264/16.

²⁶ In UT 1189 *ġ = HA*; *ġ* is often used in alphabetic Hurrian for syllabic Hurrian *h*. Cf. too Dietrich-Loretz, *Welt des Orients*, 4 (1968), pp. 300-315.

²⁷ Bergstraesser, *Heb. Gram.* II, p. 82, para. 14n.

²⁸ E. g. *qannō* I Kings 19:10; cf. Bergstraesser, *op. cit.*, II, p. 96, para. 17 f.

²⁹ E. g. *baṭṭālā*, *Ezra* 4:21; 6:8. Cf. Bauer-Leander p. 112, para. 35 o.

³⁰ E. g. *kiḏḏāb*, Wright I, p. 115, para. 202.5.

³¹ P. Kahle, *Massoret. Text d. AT*, p. 72.

³² Cf. E. Y. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll* (Hebrew; Jerusalem, 1959), p. 284.

³³ F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (Berlin, 1903), s. v., p. 62a.

³⁴ CAD "H" 266; *AHW* 362.

³⁵ So Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch* p. 114; Gordon, *UT Glossary*, p. 403. Yet forms with and without *n* may interchange, cf. Loewenstamm, *op. cit.* (in note 19), p. 174, note 3. In the context of UT 67 the translation "swine" does not fit.