Linguistici 2, 1975. S. 64 Anm. 13 : lies Meier statt Maier. S. 68 lykischer Text Lignes 16-18 : lies *sê-ñte ... seyêti* statt *se-ñte ... seyeti*. S. 71 Z. 4 und 5 der französischen Übersetzung von TL 83 : lies leurs femmes statt leur femme. S. 74 Anm. 43 Z. 2 : lies 75 statt 76. Z. 4 : lies [*ti*]*be* statt *Iti*]*be*. S. 78 Anm. 5 lykischer Text Z. 2 : lies *Upêneh* statt *Upeneh*. S. 82 § 11 Abschnitt 3 Z. 4 : lies *êi* statt *ei*. S. 85 Zif. 2 Z. 3 : lies *massanassis* statt *massanassia*. S. 89 Abschnitt 3 Z. 5 : lies *qlahibiyehi* statt *qlabihiyehi*. S. 114 Zif. 2 Abschnitt 2 am Ende : lies : p. 63. S. 115 Anm. 10 : lies 62 statt 67. S. 140 : Z. 3 von oben : lies XXIV statt XVI. Ligne 4 Z. 2 : lies *Katamlah* statt *Katamla*.

Winterthur, CH. Oktober 1980   P. FREI

ALGEMEEN SEMITISCH

A. M. R. ARISTAR, *The IIwy Verbs and the Vowel System of Proto-West Semitic*. Malibu, Undena, 1979 (28 cm., 18 pp.) = Monographic Journal of the Near East. Afroasiatic Linguistics, Volume 6, issue 6. ISBN 0 89003 001 4.

In this challenging article Mr. Aristar puts his finger on methodological errors and other weaknesses in the proto-west semitic reconstructions of the G perfect of the IIwy class of roots, both in the reconstruction of w/y (*qawama* etc.) and in the so-called biliteral reconstruction (*qa:ma* etc.).

Using arabic data concerning *imāla* and *tafkhim*, the author argues that, while a IIIwy class can be reconstructed for Proto-West Semitic, there can have been no semivowels in the IIwy class at the same time. He concludes that the only conceivable solution for Arabic is the adoption of two early midvowels **/e:/* and **/o:/* (later merging with /a:/), the short grades of which merged with /i/ and /u/ respectively. Ethiopic and Hebrew data are found to be in general agreement with the Arabic conclusions and a system of five vowel-qualities is proposed for the proto-language.

Irrespective of the question whether Mr. Aristar will convince his readers on all the points he makes, his criticism on present theories has to be taken into account by all those interested in the reconstruction of Proto-West Semitic.

Utrecht, sept. 1980   ROEL OTTEN

UGARITISCH

M. DIETRICH, O. LORETZ and J. SANMARTÍN, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, einschliesslich der keilalphabetischen Texte ausserhalb Ugarits*. Teil 1, Transkription. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag, Kevelaer, Verlag Butzon & Bercker 1976 (30 × 22, xx + 507 pp.) = Alter Orient und Altes Testament,

Band 24. DM 115.–. ISBN 3-7887-0485-3 (Neukirchener Verlag), 3-7666-8911-8 (Butzon & Bercker).

We regret that due to circumstances beyond our control this review could not be completed in time. However, since up to this date the number of published reviews of KTU is relatively small for a work of such prestige, we decided that in spite of the unfortunate delay it might be worth while to print our comments.

First of all it should be acknowledged that the scholarly world owes the editors of KTU a great debt because they have made available almost all known Ugaritic tablets in one manageable volume. 376 of these, mostly small fragments, had not been published before. They form a welcome addition to the corpus of alphabetical texts. Moreover, Dietrich and Loretz collated most of the tablets in Aleppo, Damascus and Paris themselves. This resulted in a large number of important new readings in the texts that had already been published (e.g. 1.5:I.22; 1.6:V.4; 1.161:1). For these reasons alone KTU will become a standard work no Ugaritologist can afford to dispense with. It forms an adequate foundation for the Ugaritic dictionary the German team is preparing.

However, it is regrettable that such a fine work suffers from a number of serious flaws. It is pardonable of course that the editors could not include recent finds like those from Ras Ibn Hani, but in view of their explicit claim to have included *all* tablets kept in the musea it is strange to discover that apparently they were not allowed to see the tablets AO 21.086, AO 21.088 and AO 21.090, kept in the Louvre since 1961 (see Semitica 27 (1977) 5-19; UF 10 (1978) 419). Pardonable too is the fact that some fragments were edited twice as a result of wrong RS-numbering in the original publications (e.g. KTU 4.546 = 4.660 and 4.622 = 4.663).

A more serious point of criticism concerns the numbering of the tablets. Apparently the editors were unable to resist the temptation to introduce their own numbering-system, the fifth major system next to those of Virolleaud, Gordon, Eissfeldt and Herdner (for these and other systems we already needed M. Dietrich-O. Loretz, *Konkordanz der ugaritischen Textzählungen*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1972). They divided the texts into 8 categories :
1. Literary and religious texts.
2. Letters.
3. Contracts.
4. Lists and economic texts.
5. Alphabets and school texts.
6. Legends and inscriptions.
7. Unclassified material.
8. Undecipherable fragments.

Within every rubric the tablets have been numbered in accordance with the sequence of the RS-numbers. This system is bound to encounter difficulties when wrong RS-numbers have been adopted or when texts have been included that do not bear a RS-number. For KTU 1.1-25, however, the editors had the wisdom to follow the numbering of Herdner, CTA, no. 1-25.

The new system has two clear advantages : 1) Within each category an infinite number of new texts can be accommodated. 2) The number gives a general idea about the content of the text. Sadly enough it also has a number of disadvantages. Even if one defines the categories as wide as has been done here (which limits their informative

value!) classifying these texts is no easy task. Is KTU 1.91 a religious document or an administrative text (rubric 4)? Is KTU 2.19 a letter or rather a contract (rubric 3)? Many fragments are so small that any attempt at classification is extremely hazardous. A duplicate, a successful join or even an improved understanding of the text might easily necessitate a change of number. All this means that the system of KTU will be subject to constant change and will therefore become a major source of confusion.

A further objection to the new system is the regrettable fact that it is often impossible to omit the letters "KTU" from a quotation. Otherwise the numbers will resemble the RS-numbers too much (e.g. RS 1.17 = KTU 1.47). Especially when it is desirable to cite both RS- and KTU-numbers this results in a very cumbersome procedure.

Next to the new numbering of the tablets themselves, the editors also changed the numbering of the lines in some cases. This was necessary and unavoidable, but it also creates an extra problem for those who want to check a passage referred to in the secondary literature (e.g. CTA 3:C.1 = KTU 1.3:III.4; CTA 3:D.29 = KTU 1.3:III.32; CTA 4:I.7 = KTU 1.4:I.6; CTA 17:I.2 = KTU 1.17:I.1).

The editors have rendered Ugaritologists an eminent service by personally collating the tablets. However, it should be remembered that the condition of many of the tablets has detoriated ever since their discovery. In Assyriology this is a well-known phenomenon. Therefore it is possible that in some cases the early copies and photographs, as well as the early readings by Virolleaud, are superior to what was found by the German team (e.g. KTU 1.4:VII.13,30-32; 1.6:V.6; 4.279:1). For these reasons it is desirable that the second volume of KTU, containing the copies and photographs (see p. xi), is published as soon as possible. Only this will enable the user to check and, if necessary, challenge the readings of KTU. P. Xella who collated himself a number of tablets in the Louvre found a number of different readings for KTU 1.27, 1.41, 1.43, 1.48, 1.53, 1.61, 1.75, 1.76, 1.77 (see OrAnt 17 (1978) 227-230). The outstanding photographs published in *Ugaritica V* and *VII* sometimes seem to contradict the proposals of the editors of KTU (see below on 1.161 and 2.39). Such findings give rise to unnecessary doubts and uncertainty which can only be alleviated by the prompt publication of KTU 2.

The edition itself leaves much to be desired. The printing was executed with the help of an adapted chain-printer. The quality of the printing is often so poor that *b*, *ḥ* and *h*, or *g* and *y* may easily be confused. Moreover, an edition like this one should be absolutely free from misprints, but unfortunately it is not (e.g. 1.4:I.41; 1.16:II.33; VI.10,30; 1.39:6; 1.41:50; 1.82:43; 1.100:68; 2.10:2; 4.728:1). We also regard it as a serious shortcoming that the number of letters missing in damaged passages is not estimated, even where this was perfectly possible. The blank spaces often create a totally false impression or are even entirely superfluous (e.g. 1.4:IV.62; VI.13; VII.43; 1.5:I.22; 1.6:I.52,65; V.3; 1.24:28f., 31; 2.17:15; 2.70:22, 27; 2.71:14).

Whereas Herdner set a good example by discussing various proposals to restore broken passages in the notes of her CTA, the editors of KTU have adopted an attitude of greater reserve in this respect. They were, of course,

entitled to do so. However, it does not explain why they themselves sometimes adopt extremely doubtful restorations (e.g. 1.4:V.51; 1.6:V.5f.; 1.16:II.25; 1.19:III.40; 2.4:7; 2.39) whereas in other cases they seem to have overlooked that the text can be restored with absolute certainty (e.g. 1.4:III.34; V.27,51; 1.4:VII.13,30-32,50; 1.6:VI.33; 1.24:15; 2.13:16f.; 2.32:10).

In order to give an impression of the relative value of KTU we give a detailed discussion of the text of the important tablet KTU 1.161, comparing it with the readings of Caquot in *Annuaire du Collège de France* 75 (1974-75) 427-429, as well as with the excellent photographs published in *Ugaritica VII*, Pl. VII-IX. Normal type indicates uncertainty.

KTU 1.161, revised version

(1) *spr . dbḥ . ẓlm*
(2) *qri'tm . rp'i . 'a[rṣ]*
(3) *qbi'tm . qbṣ . d[dn]*
(4) *qr'a . b'lkn . rp['a]*
(5) *qr'a . trmn . rp['a]*
(6) *qr'a . sdn . wrd[n]*
(7) *qr'a . ṭr . 'llmn*
(8) *qr'a . rp'im . qdmy*m
(9) *qri'tm . rp'i . 'arṣ*
(10) *qbi'tm . qbṣ . dd[n]*
(11) *qr'a . 'mṭtmr [.] m[l]k*
(12) *qr'a . 'u nqm [d .] mlk*
(13) *ksi' . nqmd . td [.] nḥ*
(14) *wydm' . ⟨l⟩ tdm . 'nh*
(15) *lpnh . ybky . ṭlḥn . ml['a]*
(16) *w . ybl' . 'udm'th*
(17) *'dmt . w . 'dmt . ṭdmt*
(18) *'išḥn . špš . w . 'išḥn*
(19) *nyr . ṭbt . 'ln . špš . tṣḥ*
(20) *'aṭr . b'lk . l . ksi' ! . 'aṭr*
(21) *b'lk . 'arṣ . rd . 'arṣ*
(22) *rd . w . špl . 'pr . tḥt*
(23) *sdn . w . rdn . tḥt . ṭr*
(24) *'l⟨ ⟩lmn . tḥt . rp'im . qd⟨mym⟩*
(25) *tḥt . 'mṭtmr . mlk*
(26) *tḥt ! . 'u . nq[md] . mlk*
(27) *'šty . w . ṭ['y . ṭn . w .] ṭ'[y]*
(28) *ṭlṭ . w . ṭ'y [. rb'] . w . ṭ['y]*
(29) *ḥmš . w . ṭ'y . tdṭ [.] w [.] ṭ'y*
(30) *šb' . w . ṭ'y . tqdm 'ṣr*
(31) *šlm . šlm . 'mr[p'i]*
(32) *w . šlm . bnh . šlm . ['a]ryh*
(33) *šlm . bth . šlm . 'u[g]rt*
(34) *šlm . ṭġrh*

Translation, stichometrically arranged :

Report on the sacrificial banquet of the shades.

You (priests) *invoked the Saviours of the country,*
    you summoned the Assembly of Didanu.

He (the king Ammurapi) *invoked Baalkenu, the Saviour,*
    he invoked Tarmennu, the Saviour,
he invoked Sidannu and Radanu,
    he invoked Tharru, the usurpator,
    he invoked the Saviours of old.

You (priests) invoked the Saviours of the country,
  you summoned the Assembly of Didanu.

He (the king) invoked Ammithtamru, the king,
  he invoked — woe ! — Niqmaddu, the king.

You (priests) placed the throne of Niqmaddu.

He (the king) waited and began to shed tears,
  his eyes did ⟨not⟩ cease,
    before him (the shade of Niqmaddu) he wept.
But the table was full and he swallowed.
  His tears disappeared
    and his grief disappeared.

(Incantation :)
Be hot, Shapshu !
  Yea, be hot you good Illuminator !
May Shapshu cry from above :
After your owner, o throne,
  after your owner descend into the earth,
descend into the earth
  and lower yourself in the dust
under Sidannu and Radanu,
  under Tharru, the usurpator,
    under the Saviours of old,
under Ammithtamru, the king,
  under — woe ! — Niqmaddu, the king.

The first (spirit) and he (the king) sacrificed,
  the second and he sacrificed,
the third and he sacrificed,
  the fourth and he sacrificed,
the fifth and he sacrificed,
  the sixth and he sacrificed,
the seventh and he sacrificed,
  you (priests) offered a bird.

(Benediction :)
Hail, hail to Ammurapi !
  And hail to his son !
Hail to his relatives !
  Hail to his house !
Hail to Ugarit !
  Hail to its gates !

Commentary

Line 1 :
ẓlm — KTU's reading is more likely then Caquot's *qlm*. The scribe tends to neglect the lower horizontal wedges (see, *e.g.*, *spr* in the same line). *ẓlm* is a plural of the attested word *ẓl* "shade" (cf. KTU 1.4:II.26f., with Qoh. 7:12).

Line 4 :
b'lkn — With KTU, but Caquot's *b{.}lkn* is also possible.
rp['a] — Because lines 1-3 and 6ff. are much shorter, KTU's proposal to restore *rp['i . 'arṣ]* in lines 4-5 has to be rejected.

Line 5 :
trmn — With Caquot. The photograph is relatively clear at this point. KTU : *tk/rmn*.

Line 6 :
sdn — The reading of KTU s/l/dₐn . w . rd[n] is clearly preferable to that of Caquot, although we do not discern a word-divider between *w* and *rd[n]*. It is unlikely that the name of *ddn*, presumably the founder of the dynasty, would occur here, cf. lines 3 and 10. Since the reading *sdn* is reasonably clear in line 23 and the PN *śdn* is attested we opted for *sdn*. Compare the Assyrian PN *Sidannaja*.

Line 7 :
'llmn — KTU assumes a lacuna at the end of this line. This is unlikely in view of lines 23-24.

Line 13 :
td [.] nḫ — The photograph makes it absolutely certain that my proposal of 1976 to read *'d[b . 'a]ty* cannot be sustained. However, neither Caquot's *'/p/[ ]ty* nor KTU's *'(?)d(?)ty* is convincing. Caquot rightly noted the visible lacuna between the second and the fourth sign, whereas KTU's reading of the second sign as *d* is definitely more likely than Caquot's *l*. The first sign is rather *t* because the other '-signs have the upper point of the "Winkelhaken" in the middle of the sign.
   This results in the reading *td* (2 sg m impf., cf. line 30 *tqdm*) which reminds us of Akkadian *kussâ nadû*, used in an almost identical context (ZAW 88 (1976) 343). Because in Ugaritic the verb corresponding with Akkadian *nadû* is *ydy*, the form *td* should be derived from that root.
   The fourth sign is rather too long to be a *t* and the photograph suggests at least one more notch, so that either *'a* or *n* is possible. The fifth sign is either *y* or *ḫ*. Of the resulting possibilities *'ay*, *ty*, *'aḫ*, *tḫ* or *ny* would seem to make no sense. The reading *nḫ*, however, is acceptable : it could very well be a perfect of *nwḫ* in the meaning of "to wait quietly, to abide" (cf. 1 Sam. 25:9; Hab. 3:16). Everywhere in the text perfects alternate with imperfect , see ZAW 88 (1976) 335.

Line 14 :
⟨l⟩ — See ZAW 88 (1976) 343.
tdm — KTU : *p'nh*, but no sign is visible on the photograph between the word-divider and *'nh*. Probably the editors misinterpreted the slight crack which is running through the tablet at this point.

Line 15 :
ml['a] — With Caquot; see KTU 1.4:I.38 as well as Isa. 28:8. KTU : *ml/k*, but the very clear photograph of the edge of the tablet (Pl. IX) only shows a damaged spot.

Line 17 :
ṭdmt — Although the first sign is slightly damaged, Caquot's reading *ṭdmt* is clearly superior to KTU's *'dmt*. Cf. ZAW 88 (1976) 344.

Line 19 :
ṭbt — Unfortunately the tablet had to be repaired at this point. However, the traces are in favour of Caquot's *ṭbt*. It would seem impossible to accept KTU's *w . bt*.

Line 20 :
ksi' ! — Caquot : *ksh*; KTU : *kp(?)/s(?)h*; De Moor : *ksi'*, because of line 13 and the impressive parallels from elsewhere (ZAW 88 (1976) 335, 344f.). Although it is possible that the clearly visible crack below the three horizontal wedges destroyed the small wedge below *'i*, it is also possible to assume that it was omitted accidentally by the scribe himself (cf. Gordon, UT, par. 4.13).

Line 23 :
sdn — See the note on line 6.

Line 24 :
'l{.}lmn — We doubt the existence of this redundant word-divider which was read by Caquot and KTU. The small wedge might be part of a crack.

Line 24 :
qd⟨mym⟩ — So with Caquot, see lines 7-8! The photograph Pl. IX makes it abundantly clear that *qdš* (KTU) is impossible.

Line 26 :
tht ! — Caquot and KTU are doubtlessly right in reading *thm*, but in view of the context this reading can only have been caused by a *lapsus calami* (confusion with the frequent word *thm* "message").
mlk — Contrary to the impression created by KTU only traces of the upper half of the signs have been preserved.

Line 27 :
t'[y] — The second sign is faintly discernable, as seen by Caquot.

Line 28 :
At this point the quality of the photographs is so poor that we have simply taken over the reading of this line as presented in KTU, although we had obviously to replace *'arb'* by the ordinal *rb'* (see the comment on line 29). Caquot's reading of the line deviates at six points from that of KTU : *tlt [. w .] t'y [. 'arb' . w .] t['y]*.

Line 29 :
tdt — Between the traces of the two *t*'s the left lower corner of *d* is faintly visible, as had to be expected on the basis of *'šty* in line 27. KTU : *tt*. The word-divider after *tdt* is invisible on the photograph and omitted by Caquot, but printed as if certain by KTU.
w [.] — The *w* with KTU, the lacuna with Caquot.

Line 30 :
tqdm — Caquot : *tq[ ] . 'sr*; De Moor 1976 : *tq[ry] . 'sr*; KTU : *tqdš (?)*. KTU rightly assumed a *d*, the lower left corner is visible. The last sign, however, is definitely *m*. The verb *qdm* D in the meaning of "to bring forward (an offering or present)" occurs in KTU 2.36:8 (cf. A. Caquot, *Ugaritica VII*, 124) and in Micah 6:6. The speaker of the latter passage is a man whose language betrays that he is more acquainted with the religion of Canaan than with Yahwism — a subtle use of irony ! Moreover, a Punic offering called *qdmt* is attested (*DISO*, 252).

Line 32 :
w — Damaged sign, not indicated as such in KTU.
['a]ryh — Caquot : *['a]ry[h]*; KTU : *[q]ryt[h]* which requires too much space.

Line 33 :
'u[g]rt — With Caquot; KTU's *'ugrt* ignores the small lacuna.

Line 34 :
šlm — The first sign is damaged which was not indicated in KTU.

It appears that even if we leave line 28 out of consideration (see the comment *ad loc.*) more than twenty readings of KTU 1.161 could be improved. In many instances we found it advisable to follow the readings of the provisional edition by Caquot. It would seem abundantly clear that

a fresh collation of the tablet itself is desirable. The editors were kind enough to inform us by letter dated March 27, 1981 that unfortunately they had experienced some difficulties in collating this particular tablet : "Uns standen leider keine Foto's zur Verfügung, und der Text wurde uns nur für einige Minuten in Aleppo zur Verfügung gestellt". Certainly an honourable excuse, but not quite in agreement with the impression created in the introductory part of KTU 1 (see pp. V, VII, XI). It might have been expedient to indicate the provisional nature of the edition of texts which were not examined as thoroughly as is the custom of the editors who have earned a well-deserved reputation as meticulous epigraphists.

Further details :
1.4:I.41 — *s'* read *ṣ'* (same error in CTA !).
1.4:III.34 — X*m* read *km* "we want to give you presents".
1.4:IV.62 — *l bnt* read *lbnt*.
1.4:V.27 — *ytn* is impossible because of IV.62; read *y[b]n*.
1.4:VI.13 — *w ptm* read *wptm* (cf. 1.4:III.13 !) "he has mocked me, has spitten on [my daughters ?]".
1.4:VII.13 — *bXXXb* : Virolleaud was able to read more, see his copy; therefore : *[b](13)bt . [']rb*, cf. AOAT 16,156.
1.4:VII.30-32 — On the basis of Virolleaud's copy :
   (30) *ytny . b'l . ṣ['at . š]pth*
   (31) *qlh . q[dš . t]rr . 'arṣ*
   (32) *[ṣ'at . špt]h [.] ġrm*.
1.4:VII.43 — *bl mlk* read *blmlk*.
1.4:VII.50 — *l ymr'u* read *d!ymr'u*, cf. AOAT 16,165.
1.5:I.22 — *kl* : a very important new reading; read, however, *k l*, cf. UF 11 (1979) 640.
1.6:I.52 — *k tmsm* read *ktmsm*.
1.6:I.65 — *'il . k lh* read *klh*.
1.6:III.1 — *zb[l b'l . 'arṣ]* is unlikely, see AOAT 16,216.
1.6:V. 3 — *dk ym* read *dkym*.
1.6:V.4 — *ṣġrm* is an important new reading.
1.6:V.5 — *y['l]* ? AOAT 16,226 as well as CTA.
1.6:V.6 — Virolleaud still discerned an *l* at the beginning of this line, cf. AOAT 16,226.
1.6:V.22-24 — Improbable readings which should be compared with Virolleaud's early copy.
1.6:VI.33 — The restoration *[lks'i]* should have been mentioned.
1.16:II.25 — *q[br]* is unwarranted.
1.16:II.33 — *ilhu* read *ilḥu*.
1.16:II.34 (2) — Neither *[w] qt* nor *[t]qt* is acceptable; read *[n]qt*.
1.16:VI.10 — *trḥs* read *trḫṣ* (same error in CTA !).
1.16:VI.30 — *[. udm . k]* read *[. udnk]*.
1.16:VI.31 — *[g]rm* read *[ġ]rm*.
1.17:II.41-44 — Deviating remarkably from CTA, cf. UF 7 (1975) 180.
1.19:III.40 — For *yb* the editors would read *ybky* even though no parallel text supports this emendation. For a more conservative view see UF 7 (1975) 208.
1.24:3 — *b srr* is not in accordance with the early copy of Virolleaud. Read *bsġsġ*.
1.23:5 — *bk* read *bn*, cf. W. Herrmann, *Yariḫ und Nikkal*, Berlin 1968, 5 and JAOS 90 (1970) 534.
1.24:15 — *[snn]wt* rather *[sn]nt*, see line 41.
1.24:17f. — *tn nkl yrḫ* possibly *tn nkl ⟨l⟩y ⟨y⟩rḫ* (double haplography).
1.24:14 — Read *dgn tt[l]*, cf. *Syria* 47 (1970) 171.

1.24:28 f. — *'ttr t* read *yġtr 'ttr* (29) ⟨t⟩*rḫ lk* (haplography) which restores the parallelism: "He (Baal) will ask Astarte (his wife) for her permission (root *ġtr*). Pay the betrothal gift for yourself".

1.24:31 — *w n'n* read *wn 'n*.

1.39:6 — *tkmn* read *ṯkmn*, cf. *OrAnt* 17 (1978) 229.

1.41:50 — *ṣarn* read *ṣqrn*.

1.82:43 — *tiggn* read *l tiggn*.

1.100:68 — *ytšql* read *yštql*.

1.103:4 — *ḥwtn* read *ḥwṯn*, cf. *OrAnt* 17 (1978) 125, n. 15.

1.103:46 — *yddll* (*ydll*) read simply *yd dll* || *yd ḥrdh*, cf. *Ugaritica* VII, 56, and for *dll*, AOAT 16,168.

1.111 — According to the list on p. 458 KTU 1.111 = RS 24.255, but according to Milik, *Ugaritica* VII, 135 ff. RS 24.255 is a different tablet which we did not encounter in KTU.

1.130 — According to p. 459 = RS 24.284, but according to Milik, art. cit., 140 ff. RS 24.284 = the text published as KTU 1.111.

2.2 — A letter?

2.3 (note) — The join of lines 1-7 would seem to be confirmed by 2.8:4.

2.4:6 — Read perhaps *t'zz[k b'd ']lm*, cf. 5.9:4-6.

2.4:7 — *w tt[ṯb . ly .š]lmk* — Correct? See Herdner, CTA, 146, nn. 1-2.

2.5 — A letter?

2.10:2 — *d . plsy* read *l . plsy*.

2.13:15 — *mlkt* perhaps *mlkn*, compare 2.13:18 *bn*.

2.13:16 f. — *llqt* read *lḥlqt*, cf. CTA, 140, n. 3; De Moor, JNES 24 (1965) 358; Hoffner, VTS 16, 132, n. 2, against UF 6 (1974) 461.

2.17:8 — *b'lyskn* read *b'ly skn* and see for this unusual sequence 1 Sam. 24:9; 26:19, etc., also KAI 200:1.

2.17:15 — *tšt 'il* read *tšt'il* and compare *yšta'l* in 2.70:12 and 2.71:10 f.

2.19 — Rather a contract.

2.22 — A letter?

2.24:12 f. — Read perhaps *rgm [. ṯṯb]* (13) [*l'bdk*], compare 2.12 and 2.64.

2.27-29 — Letters ??

2.31 — Letter?

2.32:10 — Restore [*d'iš*]*t'ir*, cf. UF 7 (1975) 195, n. 208.

2.38:13 — There is insufficient reason to emend *mtt* into *tmtt*, cf. Frankena, TLB 4, 35:25,27, etc.

2.39 — Apparently the photographs *Ugaritica* V, 723 ff. were not consulted. See Dijkstra, UF 8 (1976) 438 and De Moor, UF 11 (1979) 650 f.

2.49 — Is the join certain?

2.52 — According to ESS a "Wirtschaftstext".

2.59-60 — These texts should have been included in rubric 7. It is possible that 2.60 is an epical fragment, cf. 1.3:IV. 31 ff. and 17:VI.39 ff.!

2.70:22 — *klt tn* read *k l ttn*.

2.70:27 — *yšb'l* read *yšb' l*.

2.71:14 f. — Read *dbr . hmhkm* (15) *bl⟨b⟩k 'al tšt*, compare 2.30:22 and 2.38:26 f.

3.1:6 — [*nḥš*] read [*nġṯ*] = *nuḫašše*, cf. 2.36:17 and gent. *ngṯy*; furthermore Coote, UF 6 (1974) 2 f.

4.279:1 — The entire word *yn* is omitted, cf. PRU 2, 86.

4.728:1 — *'rb . b'l* read *'rk . b'l*, cf. *Ugaritica* VII,144.

5.10 — According to p. 493 = RS 17.434, but according to Caquot, in: Caquot, Cohen (eds.), *Actes du Premier Congres International de Linguistique Sémitique*, The

Hague/Paris 1974, 203, this is an unpublished letter. The editors corrected their error in UF 10 (1978) 420 without noting, however, that the edition of Caquot in *Ugaritica* VII,392 ff. deviates from theirs in many respects. Both Caquot and the German scholars failed to identify an obvious scribal omission in line 4: *ḥytn lp⟨n⟩ špš*.

All taken together we believe that this edition of the main body of known alphabetic Ugaritic texts is a very useful and welcome tool for all those who are interested in the written heritage of the Canaanites. The German team deserves our gratitude for the impressive work they have produced. Nevertheless we regard this volume as a provisional edition. First of all the second volume containing the copies and photographs should be published without further delay. When this has been studied for some years and when the team has completed the Ugaritic dictionary in which the flaws of KTU 1 will probably have been suppressed, it is to be hoped that a revised edition of the latter will be possible.

Kampen,   M. DIJKSTRA-J. C. DE MOOR-K. SPRONK
August 1980

* *
*

UGARITICA VII, avec la collaboration de Abou-l-Faradj Al-Ouche, A. Caquot, J.-C. et L. Courtois e.a. Paris, Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1978 (28 cm, pp. VI + 564 with 68 plates) = Mission de Ras Shamra XVIII.

Recently an Italian colleague commented to me that in his opinion the Ebla discoveries would so eclipse the Ugaritic finds as to render them peripheral and would cause them to lose much of the attention they have enjoyed these past fifty years. I replied that I read the situation quite differently. With their syllabic writing the Ebla tablets would render the unvocalized Ugaritic documents more intelligible and consequently more important for Semitic philology and Near Eastern studies in general. For instance, on pp. 147-148 of this volume, M. Dietrich and O. Loretz in their short study "Die keilalphabetische Krugaufschrift RS 25.318", maintain that *ršp gn* signifies "Reschef des Schutzes" from the root *gnn*, "to protect", but the frequent occurrence of *dra-sa-ap gu-nu*[ki], "Rashap of Gunu", in the Ebla tablets reveals that Ugar. *gn* should be read *gunu* from a middle weak root such as *gwn* witnessed in the biblical personal name *gûnî* (Gen 46:24), which some have related to the root found in Aram. *gawwēn*, "to tinge, dye". Given that the textile industry was the largest in volume at Ebla and that the economic texts often mention multi-colored garments, a toponym reflecting the dyeing industry makes sense in the cultural framework of Canaan as represented by Ugarit and Ebla. See M. Dahood and G. Pettinato, "Ugaritic *ršp gn* and Eblaite *rasap gunu*(m)[ki]" in *Orientalia* NS 46 (1977) 230-232. I am aware that though *Ugaritica VII* bears the date 1978, the articles were written years before, so that the authors in question could not have known of our proposal.