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The present contribution continues the diachronic analysis of the Ugaritic vocabulary undertaken in the previous issue of *Sefarad*, now focusing on possible exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and non-Canaanite Semitic languages: Arabic, Aramaic and Akkadian. Presentation of the evidence will be followed by a general discussion and some preliminary conclusions.

2. **EXCLUSIVE ISOGLOSSES BETWEEN UGARITIC AND OTHER SEMITIC LANGUAGES**

It goes without saying that a correct evaluation of the exclusive isoglosses between Ugaritic and Canaanite can only be achieved by comparison with exclusive isoglosses shared by Ugaritic and other Semitic languages. Three groups of such isoglosses have been detected in the course of the present investigation — Ugaritic-Arabic, Ugaritic-Aramaic and Ugaritic-Akkadian.

2.1. **Ugaritic-Arabic**

Exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic occupy a special place in the history of Ugaritic lexicography because of the extraordinary richness of the Arabic vocabulary. Incidentally, these lexical features have often been adduced as a proof of a special genealogical proximity between Ugaritic and Arabic. Much of the relevant material is dealt with in a special monograph (Renfroe 1992) — something which exclusive lexical isoglosses uniting Ugaritic with either Hebrew or Akkadian have never received.

Renfroe’s study provides a solid background for this segment of our investigation, but numerous points of disagreement in both methodology and concrete etymological decisions have compelled me to undertake an independent scrutiny of the pertinent lexical evidence. On the wake of Renfroe, the results are presented in two separate subsections. Isoglosses which are both truly exclusive and philologically reliable are listed in the first subsection. The second subsection presents a selection of isoglosses which, for various reasons, have been considered unreliable or not compelling. I will thus attempt to demonstrate — once again! — how many of the allegedly exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic do not withstand critical scrutiny.

---

1 Bibliographic references and abbreviations can be found at the end of this article.

2 To be sure, at this very point Renfroe’s results are already quite persuasive.
2.1.1. Probable

In Renfroe 1992:11-74, twenty-four exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic are acknowledged as probable. Many entries from this selection are indeed reliable, so that much of what I included in the present subsection has already been recognized by Renfroe. At the same time, quite a number of isoglosses considered reliable by Renfroe have been omitted presently in view of serious philological and/or etymological difficulties. As a result, the number of exclusive isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic has decreased from 24 to 18.

1. ٰušn ‘present, gift’ (DUL 118).

- *Hapax Legomenon* in 1.14 III 31-32: ‘uddn ymnt’ ʼil w ʼušn ʼab ʼadm ‘ ʼuddm is a gift of ʼil and a present of the father of mankind’.
- Arb. ʼws ‘to offer a present’, ʼaws- ‘gift’ (LA 6 20).
- Ugr.-Arb. *wš ‘to grant, to offer a gift’ has no cognates elsewhere in Semitic and may be considered an exclusive isogloss (cf. Renfroe 1992:16).

2. ƙƙ ‘a destructive one’ (DUL 177).

- Attested twice as a divine epithet, the meaning ‘ripper’ is probable because of the parallelism with ʼaklm ‘devourers’: ḫl ld ʼaklm tbrkk w ld Ḿkkm ‘writhe and bear the devourers, kneel and bear the rippers’ (1.12 II 25-27), wn ʾmγγ́y ʼaklm w ʾmγγ́ʼa ṿkkm ‘that he might reach the devourers and meet the rippers’ (1.12 I 36-37).

---

3 Additions are seven: ʼpʾid ‘heart’, ḧsʳ ‘to watch’, Ṿṣ ‘to tear’, Ṿḵš ‘to jump’, Ṧzm ‘benevolent’, Ṣgn ʼggn ‘interior’ and Ṣbm ‘to muzzle’. The former four isoglosses are just missing from Renfroe’s book. The latter three are rejected by Renfroe as non-exclusive, which is fully or partly unjustified.

4 Thus, the well-known crux of 1.16 VI 43-44 (k ɣzc ɣzm tdb ʼr w γrn ttwy) is so ambiguous (cf. Pardee’s recent evaluation in 1997:342) that I prefer to leave out of consideration three otherwise plausible exclusive isoglosses accepted by Renfroe: Ugr. ɣzc — Arb. ɣzw ‘to invade’ (1992:39-41), Ugr. ɣrm — Arb. ɣwr ‘to plunder’ (1992:37) and Ugr. ttwy — Arb. ttw ‘to be idle’ (1992:68-69). The same applies to such highly problematic passages as k ʾyd ʼarz b ʾymnh in 1.4 VII 41 (Ugr. ʾyd — Arb. ʾy ḥ ‘to hasten, to speed’, Renfroe 1992:31-34, cf. Pardee 1997:263, DUL 317-318), tkln b qbl ʾn ṣnt b Ṣpnk w t’n in 1.16 VI 57-58 (Ugr. ṣpn — Arb. ṣff ‘to surround, to encompass’, Renfroe 1992:49-52, cf. Pardee 1997:343, DUL 366), ṿdr b ṣl ʾil ṡknm in 1.7 VI 23 (Ugr. ʾṣ — Arb. ʾṣ ‘thicket’, Renfroe 1992:34-36, cf. Pardee 1997:347, DUL 318). Sabaic and other ESA languages are often tacitly assumed to be the same as “Arabic” in Renfroe’s study, which is by no means warranted (cf. Renfroe 1992:2). Ugaritic-Arabic isoglosses shared by ESA are, therefore, not to be considered exclusive. This objection applies to the multiplicative enclitic -id as well as to Ṭdb ‘to put in order, to prepare’, ʿmn ‘assistant’ and Ṣfr ‘fate, lot’.

5 For the presence of *wš in Hebrew onomastics and its methodological significance v. Kogan 2006b (especially p. 243).
Arb. ‘qq ‘to split, to rip, to cut’ (Lane 2095).

The exclusive nature of the Ugr.-Arb. isogloss (acknowledged in Renfroe 1992:24-26) is to some extent undermined by Tgr. ‘akkā ‘to cut, to wound, to furrow’ (WTS 467), which, however, may be an Arabic loanword in view of the lack of cognates elsewhere in Ethiopian Semitic.

3. ‘tk ‘to tie, to fasten, to bind’ (DUL 191).
   • Attested in stereotype descriptions of heads fastened to the belt: ‘tkt r’išt l bmnḫt šnst kpt b ḫbšh ‘she attached heads to her back, bound hands to her gird’ (1.3 II 11-13). 6
   ▶ Arb. ‘tk ‘to stick (intrans.)’ (Lane 1948).
   ▼ Ugr.-Arb. *‘tk ‘to stick, to attach’ is an exclusive isogloss (Renfroe 1992:26-29).

4. bšṛ ‘to watch’ (DUL 241).
   • The most reliable attestation of this verb is 1.18 IV 30-31: ‘lh nšrm trḥpn ybšṛ ḫbl d’i[y][m] ‘vultures soar above him, a band of hawks is watching’. 7 As persuasively argued by Pardee (2000:669), mlkm ṭbšṛn in 1.163:4 is to be understood as ‘kings will watch one another’. 8 Conversely, ṭbšṛ in 6.24:1 remains highly problematic (v. Singer 1999:703-704; DUL’s translation ‘examination’ is hardly more than a conjecture).
   ▶ Arb. bšṛ ‘to see’ (Lane 210).
   ▼ Ugr.-Arb. *bšṛ ‘to see’ is an exclusive isogloss. 9

5. gngn, ggn ‘insides’ (DUL 296, 300).
   • Attested in 1.16 VI 26 (w ywsrnn ggnh ‘and his inner self instruct him’) and 1.4 VII 47-49 (yḵr’a mt b npšḥ ystrn ydd b gngnh). 10

---

6 The adjective ‘tk ‘anchored, moored’ postulated in DUL 191 for 4.421:4-5 is unreliable because of the damaged context.

7 Or: ‘is being seen’?

8 Pardee’s Akkadian parallels involving naṯālu can probably be supplemented by those with amāru  N (e. g. šarrānu ina pulṣrim innammarā in YOS 10 33 II 30), cf. CAD A, 27.

9 Mhr. ḫ₇bš-war ‘to see well’ (ML 55), Jib. ḫbš’r id. (JL 29) are likely borrowed from Arabic. An etymological relationship between Arb. bšṛ ‘to see’ and Hbr. bāṣār ‘gold ore’ (HALOT 149) advocated in RUNDGREN 1963 is at best conjectural.

Arab. ętr wäh‘interior, heart’ (Lane 403).

Possible cognates to Ugr.-Arb. *gVnVn ‘heart, interior’ dealt with in SED I No. 83 are rather unreliable, so it is preferable to treat this isogloss as exclusive. There is hardly any justification for its rejection by Renfroe (1992:10), whose comparison between Ugr. g(n)gn and Hbr. gargərōt ‘throat’ (let alone Akk. gaggurītu, most probably non-existent) is patently wrong (cf. SED I No. 102).

6. γδδ ‘to swell’ (DUL 317).

- Hapax Legomenon in 1.3 II 25-27: tyδδ kbdh b šḥk yml ‘u lbh b šmnḥt kbd ‘nt tṣyt ‘her liver swells with laughter, her heart fills with joy, ‘nt’s liver with triumph’.

Arab. γδδ IV ‘to be swollen because of anger’, γuddat- ‘ganglion, bubo’ (Lane 2231).

Ugr.-Arb. *γδδ ‘to swell’ is an exclusive isogloss (Renfroe 1992:30-31), provided that MSA parallels like Mhr. γātt ‘to be seized by the throat’, γaddēt ‘influenza’ (ML 132), Jib. γedd ‘to throttle’, γaddēt ‘chooking feeling’ (JL 83) are Arabisms.

7. ḫydy ‘to lacerate oneself’ (DUL 336).

- Hapax Legomenon in 1.5 VI 19-20: yḥdy ḫn m ḫn ylt ḫn dr’h ‘he lacerated his cheeks and beard, he harrowed his upper arms’.

Arab. ḫdw ‘to cut with a sword’ (LA 15 420).

Ugr.-Arb. *ḥdw ‘to cut’ as an exclusive isogloss is correctly recognized in Renfroe 1992:45-48. 11

8. ḫpnn ‘benevolent’ (DUL 507).

- Attested as an epithet of ‘il, notably in the combination ḫpnn ‘il d p’id. The meaning of ḫpnn can only be ascertained through etymological comparison with Arab. ḫf (v. extensively Tropper–Hayajneh 2003).

Arab. ḫf ‘to be firendly, kind, considerate, indulgent, merciful’ (WKAS L 698). 12

---

11 Comparison between Ugr. ḫdy and Gez. tahadya ‘to be burned through heat, to be dissolved by being cooked too much’ mentioned in CDG 215 is semantically unattractive.

The origin of Ugr.-Arb. *ltp is obscure as no further Semitic parallels seem to be attested.\textsuperscript{13}

9. \textit{myd} ‘food, provisions’ (DUL 532).

- \textit{Hapax Legomenon} in 1.14 II 27-31, meaning reliably established from context (‘\textit{idb} ’\textit{akl l \textit{kryt \textit{hatt l bt \textit{hbr y'im l\textit{hm d \textit{hm\textit{s myd \textit{lt yr\textit{hm ‘he prepared food from the barns, wheat from the storehouse, he baked bread for five months, provisions for three months’).

- Arb. \textit{gdw}, \textit{gdy} ‘to feed, to nourish’ (Lane 2236).

- There is no cognate for Ugr.-Arb. \textit{gdw} ‘to feed’. The exclusive nature of this isogloss is correctly recognized in Renfroe 1992:60-61.

10. \textit{n\textgamma} ‘to contract, shake; to buckle’ (DUL 625).

- Attested in the descriptions of buckling bodies of gods (v. No. 51 in section 1).

- Arb. \textit{n\textgamma} ‘to be in motion, convulsion; to totter’ (Lane 2818).

- Ugr.-Arb. *\textit{n\textgamma} ‘to shake’, with no cognates elsewhere in Semitic, is correctly recognized as an exclusive isogloss in Renfroe 1992:62-64.

11. \textit{p'\textit{id}} ‘heart’ (DUL 658).

- Attested exclusively in the combination ‘\textit{id} d \textit{p'\textit{id}} (Tropper–Hayajneh 2003), the meaning ‘heart’ is established on etymological grounds only.

- Arb. \textit{fu'\textit{\textad}} ‘heart’ (Lane 2323).\textsuperscript{14}

- Ugr.-Arb. *\textit{pV'd} ‘heart’ has no reliable Semitic cognates (cf. SED I No. 205).

12. \textit{m\textgamma t} ‘suckling’ (DUL 574).

- \textit{Hapax Legomenon} in 1.4 VI 55-56: ‘\textit{d l\textit{hm \textit{shy 'ilm pk m\textgamma t td ‘while gods are eating, drinking, consuming sucklings’.

- Arb. \textit{r\textgamma t} ‘to suck’ (Lane 1112).

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Contra} Renfroe 1992:127. Tgr. \textit{l\textgamma f\textu} ‘to be mild, gentle’ (WTS 50) has no bearing on the exclusive nature of the Arabic-Ugaritic isogloss since the Tigre verb is obviously borrowed from Arabic. The same is true of similar Arabisms in a variety of other Semitic languages, such as Harari, MSA and modern Hebrew (rightly acknowledged in Tropper–Hayajneh 2003:171).

\textsuperscript{14} A detailed semantic analysis of Arb. \textit{fu'\textit{\textad}} can be found in Tropper–Hayajneh 2003:173-175.
*ṛ₂̣ to suck(le)’ is an exclusive isogloss, as recognized in Renfroe 1992:65-66.

13. *mz ‘to tear, be torn’ (DUL 607).
- *mz ‘to tear’ is an exclusive isogloss.
- Arb. *mz ‘to tear’ (LA 8 399).
- Ugr.-Arb. *mz ‘to tear’ is an exclusive isogloss.

14. *ṛḳs ‘to jump, to leap’ (DUL 746).
- *ṛḳs ‘to jump, to dance’ (Lane 1136).
- Comparable forms are also attested in MSA, but the possibility of an Arabic loanword is high: Mhr. *raḳws ‘to jog up and down’ (ML 325), Jib. *erḳs ‘(animals) to trample fodder’ (JL 213), Soq. *rēkoš ‘danser’ (LS 407). Semantically related but phonetically somewhat different variant roots elsewhere in Semitic are discussed in CDG 464 and EDG 523-524.

15. *šbm ‘to muzzle’ (DUL 805).
- The principal attestation of Ugr. *šbm is the much-discussed passage 1.3 III 40, read and translated as l ʾišbm tnn ʾišmîlḥ ‘je me suis permis de museler le dragon, voulant le détruire’ in Bordreuil–Pardee 2004:15. Notwithstanding numerous objections summarized in Barr 1973 and Renfroe 1992:144-145, this interpretation remains the most plausible one (Pardee 1994). Much less certain is tṇhydration n l šbm tšt in 1.83:8-9 (‘you shall put a muzzle on the Dragon’ according to DUL 805).
- Arb. šbm ‘to put a piece of wood crosswise in the mouth of a kid’ (Lane 1499).
- Ugr.-Arb. *šbm ‘to muzzle’ is an exclusive isogloss with no parallel elsewhere in Semitic.

15 As pointed out to me by Dennis Pardee, a new attestation of this root can now be found in RIH 98.02:5: nmr ḫg̣t ṛḳs ‘(as) a mighty panther does she pounce’ according to PARDEE 2007:35.
16 Sab. ṣ̌bm ‘strangling’ (BIELLA 510) is not recognized in SD.
16. **t’it** ‘mud, clay’ (DUL 892).
   - *Hapax Legomenon* in 1.17 II 6-8: ṭḥ ḡgk b ḷm t’it ṭḥṣ ṃpṣk b ḷm rṯ ‘who plasters his roof in a dirty day, who washes his garment in the day of mud’.
     - Arb. *ṭa’ṭ* - ‘black mud’ (LA 7 301).

17. **ydy** ‘to rip, to scratch’ (DUL 958).
   - *Hapax Legomenon* in 1.5 VI 17-18: γṛ b ’abn ydy psLt m b γ’r ‘with a stone he scratches incisions on (his) skin, with a razor he cuts cheeks and chin’ (Pardee 1997:268).
     - Arb. *wadyat* - ‘notch, incision, cut; wounds’ (LA 15 451).
     - Ugr.-Arb. *w̱dy* ‘to cut, to scratch’ has no cognates elsewhere in Semitic (Renfroe 1992:70-71).  

18. **yly** ‘comrade, companion’ (DUL 963).
   - *Hapax Legomenon* in 1.12 II 50-51: šr ’ahḥ mt’ah w mt’ah šr ylyh ‘the prince of his brothers met him, the prince of his comrades met him’.
     - Arb. *waliyy* - ‘friend’, *wly* ‘to be close’ (LA 14 480).
     - Ugr.-Arb. *w̱v̱ḻv̱y* - ‘companion’ (and the obviously cognate verbal root *w̱ḻv̱y* in Arabic) can be metathetically related to the verbal root *ḻw̱y* ‘to accompany, to join oneself to’, attested in Hebrew and Aramaic (HALOT 522). The formal and semantic proximity between Ugr. *y̱ḻy* and Arb. *waliyy*- is, nevertheless, so conspicuous that Renfroe (1992:71-74) may be right to consider it an exclusive Ugaritic-Arabic isogloss.

---

17 Mhr. aw̱ḏi ‘to torment, to pester’ (ML 422), Jib. ʾōdi ‘to pester’ (JL 287) are probably Arabisms.

18 Phonologically identical verbal lexemes with the meaning ‘to turn, twist, to surround’ are usually thought to be related as well (cf. CDG 322): Akk. lāwū ‘to move in a circle’ (CAD L 69, AHw. 540), Arb. ḥwy ‘to twist’ (LANE 3015), Gez. talawya ‘to be twisted, wrapped’ (CDG 322), Tgr. lāwā ‘to walk on roundabou ways’ (WTS 45), Tna. lāwāyā ‘to flex’ (TED 120), Mhr. ḻw̱ū ‘to bend’ (ML 258), Jib. lē ‘to turn’ (JL 167). Soq. ḥwy ‘saisir’ compared in LS 230 is semantically quite remote. Also problematic is Syr. ṭālē ‘deceit’ (LSyr. 185) with unexpectedly preserved ṭ- (an early Arabian infiltration?).

19 But note Sab. w̱ḻy ‘protected persons, clients of a clan’ (SD 160), Min. nwly ‘se mèler, s’occuper de’ (LM 104). Jib. ʾōli ‘to turn towards’ (JL 292) is probably an Arabism.
2.1.2. Dubious or Unreliable

In this subsection, 21 allegedly exclusive Ugaritic-Arabic lexical features are presented. This selection, quantitatively by far inferior to ca. 100 examples dealt with in Renfroe 1992:75-161, is restricted to well-known isoglosses widely recognized in modern Ugaritological scholarship (notably, in DUL). Not unlike the preceding subsection, my evaluation does not always coincide with Renfroe’s: some of my examples (‘mt, bdl, dpr, ḥmr, ktt, ng, ṭbt, ṭ’ar) are missing from his book, whereas a few others (‘nn, hbr, ḫt) are listed by Renfroe as reliable instead of spurious and uncertain, which would be more appropriate from my point of view.


2. ‘mt ‘to hit’ (DUL 166) — Arb. ‘mt ‘to beat with a stick’ (TA 5 11).
   - Hapax Legomenon in the difficult passage 1.16 VI 8-9 (ḥṯm t’mt pṭr km ṣbln ‘l ṭʾšḥ). Del Olmo Lete’s interpretation ‘con una vara golpeó abriendo brecha, y exterminando/desapareció la enfermedad de su cabeza’ (1981:320) is attractive, but hardly compelling (left untranslated in Pardee 1997:342).

3. ‘nn ‘manservant, assistant’ (DUL 170) — Arb. ‘wn IV ‘to help’ (Lane 2203).
   - The meaning ‘servant’ is suitable in some of the relevant contexts (e. g. 1.4 IV 59-62: p ‘bd ‘an ‘nn ‘aṭrt p ‘bd ‘an ḫl ṣl ḥm ‘amt ‘aṭrt ṣbln ṣbn ‘m ‘mnt ṣm ‘a servant, an attendant on ’aṭrt? am I a servant who holds a trowel? is ‘aṭrt a maidservant who makes bricks?’), but derivation from *‘wn as envisaged in Renfroe 1992:22-24 is faced with serious morphological difficulties. At any rate (as Renfroe correctly recognizes), this isogloss is not exclusive since *‘wn ‘to help’ is well attested also in Sabaic: ḥ-‘n ‘to aid, to help, to protect’ (SD 23).

- The meaning and the origin of the Ugaritic term are extensively discussed in Schloen 2001:226-230. The Arabic etymology is potentially suitable to explain both the widespread translation ‘substitute’ and the now less popular interpretation ‘merchant’.\(^{20}\) If accepted, Ugr.-Arb. *bdl* ‘to exchange’ would represent an exclusive isogloss.\(^{21}\) However, morphological peculiarities made apparent by the syllabic spellings of Ugr. *bdl* — namely, the pattern *C₁C₂āC₃*, highly atypical for a professional designation (cf. Tropper 2000:181), and nunciation instead of mimation in the alternative plural form *bi-da-lu-na* (ibid. 294) — cast serious doubts on the validity of this comparison and make one think of a non-Semitic (possibly Hurrian) origin of Ugr. *bdll/bidalu* (Schloen 2001:227, notwithstanding Huehnergard’s objections in 2008:391-392).

5. **bdn** ‘land’ (DUL 222) — Arb. *balad-* ‘country, land’ (Lane 247).

- Attested in 1.91:6 and 1.162:1 in the combination ‘il bdn. The translation ‘gods of (our) country’ is widely accepted (Pardee 2000:503, del Olmo Lete 2004:260), but remains conjectural in spite of the hypothetic parallelism with DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR u-ga-ri-it in PRU 3 18:6-7. As for *bd* in 1.22 I 18, “that *bd* γll might have meant ‘the district of γll’ is possible, but undemonstrable” (Renfroe 1992:90)\(^{22}\).

6. **dpr** ‘to exhude a strong smell’ (DUL 277) — Arb. *dafr-* ‘to stink’, *dafir-* ‘stinking’ (Lane 890).

- *Hapax Legomenon* in 1.22 I 16 (*dpr tlhm b kl’*). The passage is very obscure and DUL’s translation ‘the table exuded a strong smell’ is merely conjectural. Arb. *dfr* has no reliable cognates elsewhere in Semitic.\(^{23}\)

---

\(^{20}\) Contrast Huehnergard 1987:112 and Huehnergard 2008:390

\(^{21}\) Comparable terms in Ethiopian Semitic and MSA — Tna. *biddäla* ‘to exchange, barter’ (TED 1196), Mhr. *abōdal* ‘to change’ (ML 43), Jib. *ōdal* ‘to change’ (JL 22), Soq. *bdl* ‘être changé’ (LS 82) — are likely borrowed from Arabic. The traditional equation between Arb. *bd* ‘to (ex)change’ and Hbr. *bd* ‘to withdraw, to separate’ (HALOT 110) is hard to justify semantically. In view of the high degree of graphic ambiguity, the widespread identification between BA-DA-LUM in Ebla with either Arb. *bd* or Ugr. *bd(m)* (e. g. Fronzaroli 1984:156-157) is at best conjectural.

\(^{22}\) Interpreted as *b ld γll* ‘wine into the goblet? of intoxication ’ in DUL 494.

\(^{23}\) Tgr. *dāfrät* ‘breath, smell, scent’ (WtS 544) is clearly an Arabism. Since Arb. *dfr* also means ‘to be base, abject, vile’ (Lane 890), Jib. *dēf*r ‘bad’ (JL 35) can be borrowed from Arabic as well. Note, moreover, that according to a personal communication by Dennis Pardee a recent collation has shown the first sign of the relevant Ugaritic word is *upr* rather than *dpr*.
7. **gbl** ‘summit, mount’ (DUL 293) — Arb. ūabal- ‘mountain’ (Lane 376).
- *Hapax legomenon* in 1.3 VI 7-8 (‘[ caravan gbl ’br k’l]’). The translation ‘mountain’ is possible (‘cross the mountain, cross the height’ in Pardee 1997:255), but hardly compelling (v. Renfroe 1992:103-104 and 139-140 for the alternative translation ‘Byblos’, tentatively accepted in Parker 1997:118, 169).  

8. **yll** ‘thirsty one’ (DUL 319) — Arb. yll ‘to be thirsty’ (Lane 2277).
- *Hapax Legomenon* in 1.12 II 34 (context partly broken), supposed to be paralleled by ‘aklm ‘the devourers’, present throughout this text. Identification with Arb. yll is possible, but by no means compelling (cf. Renfroe 1992:107).

9. **ynt** ‘to gulp down’ (DUL 323) — Arb. ynt ‘to drink’ (LA 2 196).
- *Hapax Legomenon* in 1.108:11 in a partly broken context. As pointed out in Renfroe 1992:108, “the proximity of this word to w yšt ‘il ‘God drinks’ in line 10 of this text has prompted some to compare the word with Arb. yanaṭa ‘to drink a draught, then take a breath’. The structure of the text suggests much more that the word be understood as a name or epithet of a deity.”

10. **hbr** ‘to bow’ (DUL 333) — Arb. habr-, habīr- ‘depressed area surrounded by higher ground’ (LA 5 290).
- **Passim** in the prostration formula (e. g. 1.3 III 9-10: l p’n ‘nt hbr w kl ‘to ‘nt’s feet they bowed down and fell’) as well as in 1.23:49 (yhb r špthm yšk ‘he bowed down and kissed their lips’). The semantic relationship between the Ugaritic verbal root and the topographic terms in Arabic is far from certain (cf. Renfroe 1992:42-45).

11. **hbt** ‘to knock down, to hit; to remove, to wipe out’ (DUL 334) — Arb. hbt ‘to go down, to be lowered, degraded’, ‘to beat, to strike’, ‘to remove’ (Lane 2876).

   Reliably attested in letters only (Dijkstra 1975). The best preserved example is 2.61:3-7 (bn ḫr nv mgy hbt hw ḥrd w šl hw krt), where both meanings

---

24 The same reasoning applies to the parallel k’l (RENFTERE 1992:139-140), which can be identified with the Canaanite geographic term (Hbr. ḥāʾilā, HALOT 1116) instead of the Arabic appellative qāʾilāt- ‘a tall mountain’ (LA 11 666).

suggested by the Arabic etymology (‘to strike’ and ‘to abase’) can fit. More difficult is špḥ ‘al tbṭ in 2.47:16, translated as ‘tu ne permettras que le clan soit abaissé’ in Bordreuil–Pardee 2001:382, where this passage is extensively discussed in connection with the double attestation of hbṭ (in damaged contexts) in the letter RSOu 14 51. Very obscure is 2.4:18-20 (ḥt yšm ‘ūḥy l gy ḵ yhbṭ bn”š w ytn ‘ilm bdhm). For the problematic ḥtbn in 1.163:3 see, finally, Pardee 2000:866. Summing up, “le sens précis de HBṬ nous échappe encore” (Pardee 2000:866), which makes this verb unsuitable for a diachronically meaningful lexical isogloss (Renfroe 1992:114-115).

12. ḥdg ‘birth-chair’ (DUL 354) — Arb. ḥidż- ‘a certain thing upon which the women of the Arabs of the desert ride’ (Lane 530).

- Hapax Legomenon in 1.12 I 17-19, where it is listed among objects necessary for the birth process (ḥṣ ks’ānk ḥdgk ḥtlk ‘take your chair, your “saddle”, your swaddling cloth’). This identification is widely accepted, but, as Renfroe rightly points out (1992:117-118), the realia behind it are obscure and it is preferable to refrain from treating it as a reliable exclusive isogloss. There is no suitable verbal root elsewhere in Semitic from which either the Arabic or the Ugaritic terms could be reasonably derived.

13. ḥmr ‘red, reddish’ (DUL 364) — Arb. ḥmr IX ‘to be red’ (Lane 640).

- Attested in hippiatric texts (e. g., 1.85:17) as an attribute of ʿaryni/iryn, which denotes a materia medica. The translation ‘red’ (Cohen–Sivan 1983:31-32) is arbitrary. The same is true of the alternative interpretation ‘donkey’.

14. ḫtt ‘happy, lucky’ (DUL 383) — Arb. ḥaḍiya ‘to be happy’, ḥadda- ‘fortune’ (Lane 595-596).

- Hapax Legomenon in 1.3 V 30-31: tḥmk ‘iḥ ḥkm ḥkmk ḥm ʾlm ḥyt ḫṭ tḥmk ‘your decisions, ḫ, are wise, your wisdom is forever, your decision(s) provide a life of good fortune’ (Pardee 1997:254). Even if this widely accepted in-

---


27 In DUL 334, Sab. hbṭ is adduced, which would make this isogloss not exclusive. However, as pointed out in Renfroe 1992:115 and Gzella 2007:542, the very existence of the Sabaic verb is doubtful.

28 Stol 2000:121.
terpretation is correct, the Ugaritic-Arabic isogloss is (contra Renfroe 1992:52-56) by no means exclusive, cf. Sab. ḫty ‘favor’, ḡṯṯyw ‘to be successful’ (SD 75), Min. ḫty ‘obtenir des auspices favorables’, ḫty ‘faveur’ (ML 51), Mhr. ḥad ‘luck, share’ (ML 167), probably also Gez. ḥaše ‘title of the emperors of Ethiopia’ (CDG 226, with discussion).

15. **ktt** ‘to drag’ (DUL 721) — Arb. qtt ‘to draw, to drag, to collect’ (Lane 2487).
   - *Hapax Legomenon* in 1.2 IV 27: ykt b’l w yšt ym. The commonly accepted interpretation of this passage — ‘B’il grabs Ym and sets about dismembering him’ (Pardee 1997:249, cf. Parker 1997:104, del Olmo Lete 1981:177) — is by no means certain and, at any rate, the translation ‘he grabs’ for ykt is derived from etymology rather than from context. The meaning of the reduplicated stem kkti in 1.114:5-6 (km k[l]b yktkt th[ t]l[nt]) is even more obscure, v. extensively Pardee 1988:42-43.

16. **m** ‘as one, together’ (DUL 519) — Arb. ma’ar ‘together’ (LA 8 405).
   - *Hapax Legomenon* in 1.14 II 32-35: ‘dn ngb w ṣy’i ṣb’u ṣb’i ngb w ṣy’i ‘dn m’ ṣb’uk ‘ul m’ad. Although there is no unanimously accepted understanding of the syntax of this passage, comparison with Arb. ma’ar ‘together’ is certainly not the only way of interpreting m‘ in this context (‘a throng will indeed go forth’ in Pardee 1997:334 and cf. Tropper 2000:813, Renfroe 1992:128).

17. **ng** ‘to go away, depart’ (DUL 624) — Arb. nĝw ‘to go out, to escape’ (Lane 3028)
   - *Hapax Legomenon* in 1.14 III 27-29, meaning clear from context (ng mlk l bty ‘depart, king, from my residence’, paralleled by rḫk krt l ḫtyy ‘keep far off, Krt, from my abode’).
     - The only cognate for the Ugaritic form adduced in DUL 624 is Arb. nĝw, but PCS *ngw is also attested in ESA: Sab. ngw ‘to give out’, mngw ‘event, incident, outcome’ (SD 94), Min. ngw ‘promulger, notifier, proclaimer’ (LM 66), Qat. mngw ‘result, outcome’ (LIQ 102).^31

---

^29 As is well known, the whole scope of meanings connected with favor, luck etc. eventually goes back to PS *ḥvṭ ‘arrow’ (RENFROE 1992:54-55) with a meaning shift also present in Arb. sahm- ‘arrow; lot, portion’ (LANE 1454).

^30 Italics added.

^31 Tgr. näga ‘to be clean’ (WTS 342), Mhr. nīgi ‘to be free’ (ML 288), Jib. nīgi ‘to survive’ (JL 184), Soq. ngy ‘délivrer’ (LS 256) are Arabisms.
18. *nkt* ‘to immolate’ (DUL 631), *mkt* ‘immolation, offering’ (ibid. 545) — Arb. *nkt* ‘to strike with a stick; to throw upon the ground; to thrust, to pierce’ (Lane 2846).

- The most reliable attestation is 1.40:32-33: *dbh hndb hw t’ nl’y hw nkt nkt* ‘le sacrifice, il est sacrifié, l’offrande, elle est offerte, l’abattage est fait’ (Pardee 2000:97-98). Less transparent are 1.86:4 (*w prt tkt* ‘you’ immolate a cow’, context broken) and 1.48:16 (*’aht l mkt* ‘one for the offering of...’, context broken). Notwithstanding Renfroe’s objections (1992:134-135), one has to agree with Aartun (1968:278) and Pardee (2000:127-128) that comparison with *arb.* *nkt* is the best (probably, the only) way of explaining *nkt nkt* in 1.40:33. The Ugaritic-Arabic isogloss is, nevertheless, not exclusive, since clearly related terms are well attested in Ethiopian Semitic: Tna. *näkkätä* ‘to drive in (a dart); to hit a branch or hedge with a stick’, *mankat* ‘beating’ (TED 1342-1343), Amh. *näkkätä* ‘to break, to smash’ (AED 1046).

19. *nzl* ‘offering’ (DUL 655) — Arb. *nuz(u)l* ‘food prepared for the guest’ (Lane 3031).

- *Hapax Legomenon* in 1.14 III 55-59: *lkh ‘imr dbh b ydh ll’a kl’atnm klt lhmh d nzl lkh msrr ‘sr db[h]* ‘he took a sacrificial lamb into his hands, a kid — with both (of his hands), a measure of his bread of offering he took, the entrails of a sacrificial bird’. As rightly observed in Renfroe 1992:136-137, the meaning of the Arabic noun can only be secondary with respect to the basic meaning of the root *nzl* in Arabic, viz. ‘to descend’ (> ‘to stop, to sojourn, to abode, to lodge in a place’, Lane 3001), note in particular *nazil* ‘guest’ (ibid.). Arb. *nuzul*- is therefore unsuitable for direct comparison with phonologically similar terms in other Semitic languages. Since no alternative cognate term is at hand, the expression *lhmh d nzl* still awaits a meaningful contextual and etymological interpretation.

20. *rgbt* ‘respect, fear’ (DUL 732) — Arb. *ržb* ‘to be frightened, afraid’ (Lane 1033).

- Attested in 1.112:4 (list of sacrifices) in the expression *š’rgbt*, interpreted as ‘platter of respect’ in DUL. No such meaning can be deduced from the context (cf. Pardee 2000:637-638 for a different, albeit no less arbitrary, interpretation ‘mottes de terre’). Even less certain is 1.133:19 (*rgbt zbl* ‘the fear of the Prince’ in DUL vs. ‘la motte du Prince’ in Pardee 1988:162). No coherent interpretation has been proposed so far for *šm[h] rgbt y‘u[h]b* in 1.92:31-32.

---

21. \textit{t’ar} ‘avenger (of blood)’, \textit{t’r} ‘to avenge blood’ (DUL 891-892) — Arb. \textit{t’r} ‘to revenge one’s blood’ (Lane 327).

- The Arabic root has been widely used to interpret the difficult passage \textit{qa’r} ‘\textit{am tkn lh} (1.14 I 15), but no satisfactory result has been obtained so far.\textsuperscript{33} The verbal form in 1.2 III 21 (\textit{yt’ir t’r ‘il ‘abh}) is also usually interpreted on the basis of the Arabic cognate, but here too the details remain obscure.\textsuperscript{34} The translation ‘your seven “avengers”’ for \textit{šb’ t’irk} in 1.18 I 25 (DUL 892) is of necessity conjectural because of the heavily damaged context. Finally, \textit{t’t’ar} in 1.3 II 37 is probably a mistake for \textit{t’t’r} (with DUL 891). At any rate, the Ugr.-Arb. isogloss is not exclusive, since \textit{t’t’r} ‘blood revenge’ is also attested in Sabaic (SD 149).

2.2. Ugaritic-Aramaic

Since potentially exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Aramaic are extremely few, reliable examples will be listed below side by side with more problematic ones.

1. \textit{dḥl} ‘to fear’ (DUL 269).

- Supposed to be attested in 2.16:10-12: \textit{w ‘um ... ‘al tdḥln} ‘and let my mother ... be not afraid’. The reading with -\textit{d-} is suspect,\textsuperscript{35} whereas \textit{tdḥṣ} seems to be written in a similar context in 2.30:21 (Bordreuil–Pardee 2004:85).
  - Common Aramaic *\textit{dḥl} id. (HALOT 1850, LSyr. 148).
  - Possible cognates of Ugr.-Arm. *\textit{dḥl} are discussed in Kogan 2005:526.

2. \textit{grdš} ‘to be undermined, ruined’ (DUL 307).

- \textit{Hapax Legomenon} in 1.14 I 10-11: \textit{krt ḫtn rš krt grdš mknt ‘Krt — his family was crushed, Krt — his home was destroyed’ (Pardee 1997:337).}

\textsuperscript{33} Cf. TROPPER 1995a where KTU’s reading is abandoned in favor of \textit{ṭmt ‘un}. The traditional reading is re-affirmed (even without restoration marks) in BORDREUIL–PARDEE 2004:20. Comparison with Lev 18:6 in PARDEE 1997:333 is, however, hardly attractive, as it implies that Ugr. \textit{ṭ’ar} (‘kin’ in Pardee’s interpretation) is related to Hbr. \textit{šēr ‘flesh}, whose regular formal and semantic cognate is Ugr. \textit{š’ir ‘flesh}’ (DUL 797, also PARDEE 2000:1165), see further SED 1 No. 238 and TROPPER 1995a:530. The same is true of PARDEE’s analysis of \textit{šb’ t’irk} in 1.18 I 25 (1997:394). Note that according to Pardee (personal communication) the Hebrew word for ‘kin’ in passages like Lev 18:6 (= Ugr. \textit{ṭ’ar}) is not to be immediately associated with \textit{šēr ‘flesh}’ attested elsewhere (= Ugr. \textit{š’ir}). In my opinion, this proposal is hard to reconcile with the fact that also Hbr. \textit{bāṣar ‘meat, flesh}’ is widely attested with the meaning ‘kin’ (DBB 142), note especially the combination \textit{šēr bāṣarō}.

\textsuperscript{34} Contrast ‘the Bull, his father ‘Ilu may take blood vengeance’ (PARDEE 1997:248), ‘may Bull El his Father take vengeance” (Parker 1997:97) and ‘bull DN stood surety’ (DUL 890).

\textsuperscript{35} Cf. twḥln in BORDREUIL–PARDEE 2004:84.
Syr. gardeš ‘erosit’ (LSyr. 132). The semantic overlap between Ugaritic and Syriac is far from complete. Besides, attestations of the Syriac verb are rare and late, and the root does not seem to be present anywhere else in Aramaic.

3. nḥt ‘to take down’ (DUL 628).
- Attested in 1.23:37 (‘il ḫḥ nḥt ‘il ymn mṯ ydh ‘il lowers his staff, ‘il grasps his rod in his right hand’) and elsewhere in this text.
- Common Aramaic *nḥt ‘to go down, to descend’ (DNWSI 726, HALOT 1929, LSyr. 424).
- Possible cognates of Ugr.–Arm. *nḥt ‘to go down’ are discussed in Kogan 2005:523–524.

4. šdy ‘to pour’ (DUL 811).
- Hapax Legomenon in 1.6 IV 18: šd yn ‘n bḵb’t ‘pour sparkling wine into a goblet’ (translation from DUL 692).
- Common Aramaic *šdy ‘to throw, to pour’ (LSyr. 757, DJBA 1109, DJPA 538).
- Ugr.–Arm. *šdy ‘to pour’ has no direct cognate elsewhere in Semitic.

5. škḥ ‘to meet’, N ‘to be met, welcomed’ (DUL 814).
- Thought to be attested in 2.38:13–15: by gšm ’adr nškḥ ‘they found themselves in a heavy rain’. Potentially relevant forms in 2.73:14 (tškḥ) and 2.73:19 (nšk[h]) are hard to evaluate because of the broken context.
- Common Aramaic *škḥ ‘to meet, find’ (DNWSI 1132, LSyr. 775).

36 There is, conversely, a remarkable semantic proximity between Ugr. grdš and Mhr. əngərdōš, Jib. əngərdēs ‘to fall down’ (ML 124, JL 78). MSA š is compatible with Ugr. š but not with Syr. š. Cf. also Amh. gārāddāśa ‘to break a stick, to fell a large tree’ (AED 1943).

37 Translation from PARDEE 1997:280–281 (with commentary). Note that in BORDREUIL–PARDEE 2004:29 the translation ‘Ilu prépare sa verge’ has been preferred (personal communication Dennis Pardee).

38 As TROPPER reasonably suggests (1995b:60), ynḥt in 1.2 IV 11 (ktr šndm ynhṭ) may belong to a different Ugaritic and Common Semitic root *nḥt ‘to cut, to trim’.

39 Arb. sdw ‘to stretch one’s legs’ tentatively compared in LSyr. 757 is semantically quite remote. More attractive is Brockelmann’s alternative comparison, namely sudar ‘left, let alone, neglected’ (LANE 1336). Cf. also sdw ‘to play with walnuts throwing them into a hole’ (LANE 1336).
2.3. Ugaritic-Akkadian

1. ʿugr ‘field, soil’ (DUL 27).
   - Hapax Legomenon in 1.12 I 23-25 (krʾ ṣm ḫ ṳḥ ṣn-yd ʿugrm ‘dig your elbow into the dust, the bone of your hand, into the soil’). Although the precise meaning of this difficult text is uncertain (cf. Stol 2000:121), parallelism with ṣm ‘dust’ makes the translation ‘into the soil’ for ʿugr-m highly probable.
   - Akk. ʾuğaru ‘Feldflur, Ackerland’ (AHw. 1402).
   - The etymological background of Ugr.-Arm. *škḥ ‘to find’ is discussed in Kogan 2005:561.

2. ʿmr ‘to look at’ (DUL 71).
   - The most reliable attestation is 1.3 I 22-24, where the meaning ‘to look at’ seems to be assured by the parallelism with ʾn ‘to see’ (ymr bʾl bnth yʾn ṣdry bt ʾar ʾqpn fły bt ṣb ‘Bʾl looks at his daughters, he sees ṣdry, daughter of ʾar, also ṣṭl, daughter of ṣb’). Considerably less certain is ṣšl ṣʾšm yʾṭmr ‘they look like’ one fire, two fires’ (1.2 I 32), whereas the meaning of yʾṭmr in 1.172:22 cannot be ascertained because of the broken context. In spite of its somewhat sparse attestation, the existence of Ugr. ʿmr ‘to look at’ is widely accepted in Ugaritological literature (v., in particular, Tropper 2000:519-520 for the grammatical problems involved).
   - Akk. amāru ‘to see’ (AHw. 40, CAD A₂ 5).
   - The extraordinary complex semantic history of the root *ʾmr cannot be reassessed here, but if one follows Moscati (1946:125) and Albright (1954:229) in regarding the meaning ‘to see’ as the original one, ʿmr Ugaritic must be the only Semitic language where this archaic meaning is attested virtually side by side with the innovative ‘to say, to command’, normal for the rest of CS. ⁴²

⁴¹ In 1.2 I 31: ʾamr ‘order, demand’ (DUL 72).
⁴² The specificity of the Ugaritic picture is duly recognized in HALDAR 1964:275 and SANMARTÍN 1973:267-270. Remnants of the original meaning ‘to see’ have been surmised for ʾmr in other CS languages as well (for Hbr. ʾmr ‘to see’ v. DAHOO 1963:295-296, for Arb. ʾamarat-, ʾmu-r- ‘sign, mark’, LANE 97-98, v. MOSCATI 1946:124, RUNDGREN 1963:182), but they are much less certain. It would be tempting to regard the meaning shift ‘to see’ > ‘to say’ as a shared semantic innovation of CS, but cf. common MSA *ʾmr ‘to say’ (Mhr. ṣmʾr, Jib. ṣr, Soq. ṣʾmr, ML 25, JL 13, LS 315), which is hard to separate from this root in spite of the irregular *-ʾ-.
3. *išd* ‘leg’ (DUL 116).

- Reliably attested in 1.3119-20 (‘my p’n tsmn ‘my twtḥ ‘išd ‘let your feet run to me, let your legs hasten to me’), where the meaning ‘leg’ is clear from the parallelism with *p’n*, the basic term for foot in Ugaritic. See also 1.101:5-6 (r’išḥ tply ṭly bn nh [...] ‘uṣ’rt tmll ‘išdḥ kṛn [...] bt ‘ḥ ‘Ṭly lui épouille la tête, [...] “entre les yeux”, ‘uṣ’r’ ṭ lui frotte les pieds, Bt ‘ḥḥ, les cor-nes’, Pardee 1988:125).

  ▶ Akk. *išdu* ‘base, foundation, bottom, lower extremities’ (AHw. 393, CAD I 235).

  ▼ Akk.-Ugr. *’išd-* ‘leg’ may be ultimately related to a variety of anatomic and non-anatomic terms elsewhere in Semitic (v. SED I No. 255), but only Akk. *išdu* and Ugr. *’išd* match exactly from the phonological point of view. 43

4. *ušr* ‘penis’ (DUL 118).

- Hapax Legomenon in a divinatory compendium (1.103+:47). The present interpretation, although fully dependent on the Akkadian etymology, is widely accepted (e. g. Pardee 1997:289).


  ▼ Akk.-Ugr. *’VšVr-* ‘penis’ has no parallel elsewhere in Semitic. If the Akkadian and Ugaritic terms are related as cognates, the traditional derivation of Akk. *išaru* from ešēru ‘to be straight’ (< *yšr*) 44 becomes impossible.

5. *mḳ* ‘tough, strong’ (DUL 165).

- Hapax Legomenon in 1.17 VI 45: n’mmn ‘mḳ nšm ‘good and strong among men’. This almost universally accepted interpretation entirely depends on the Akkadian etymology. 45 It is uncertain whether the syllabic *am-*ḳa reflects the same basic meaning (‘stronghold’, Huehnergard 1987:160) or rather belongs to *mḳ* ‘to be deep’ (‘plain’, van Soldt 1991:306).

43 Needless to say, the semantic difference between Akk. *išdu* and Ugr. *’išd* cannot be disregarded. Although there are good reasons to suspect that Akk. *išd-*ān was originally an anatomic term, in most of its extant attestations this meaning is by no means apparent. Curiously enough, purely anatomic meaning ‘foot, leg’ is only attested in historical and literary texts of the 1st millennium (listed under ‘lower extremities, stance’ in CAD I 240, meaning f).

44 AHw. 392: *išaru* B = *išaru* A, i. e. ‘penis’ = ‘straight’. Less explicit also CAD I 226. For the same conclusion reached on the basis of the Ebla gloss šē-ne-bu₃₆ wa i-sa-lum (= Sum. KUN) in VE 1372’ v. KREBERNIK 2006:85.

45 The same is true of Gzell’a’s feasible alternative ‘clever’ = Akk. *emḳu* (2007:536).
The origin of Akk.-Ugr. *’\text{mk}’ to be strong’ is uncertain. Hypothetic WS cognates with the meaning ‘strength’ (notably, Hbr. ‘\text{\textbar{em}\textbar{ak}}’) are quite doubtful (with HALOT 849 and \textit{contra} Greenfield 1967:89). There is no transparent semantic link between Akk.-Ugr. *’\text{mk}’ to be strong’ and *’\text{mk}’ to be deep’ widely attested throughout WS. According to CAD E 161, Akk. \textit{em\textbar{}ku} ‘strength’ is, in its origin, an anatomic term (‘arm’), but there is no etymological support for this conjecture.

6. ‘\text{rb}’ ‘to enter’ (DUL 179).
\begin{itemize}
\item Passim in the Ugaritic corpus.
\item Akk. \textit{er\textbar{}ebu} ‘to enter’ (AHw. 234, CAD E 259).
\item Ugaritic is the only WS language where *’\text{rb}’ fully preserves its (presumably, original) status of the main exponent of the meaning ‘to enter’. Elsewhere in WS, only derived meanings such as ‘to set (sun)’ or ‘to stand surety’ are attested (for which v. HALOT 876, CDG 69).
\end{itemize}

7. ‘\text{hw}t’ ‘word, statement’ (DUL 349).
\begin{itemize}
\item Passim in the Ugaritic corpus.
\item Akk. \textit{awatu} ‘word, utterance; matter, affair, thing’ (AHw. 89, CAD A2 29).
\item The origin of Akk.-Ugr. *’h\text{awat}’- ‘word; matter’ (Halder 1964:275), ultimately related to the verbal root *’h\text{wy}’ ‘to speak’ underlying Akk. \textit{atw\textbar{}u} ‘to discuss, to talk over’ (AHw. 89, CAD A2 29, Goetze 1947:244-245, Kouwenberg 2008), is uncertain (cf. DRS 386).
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{46} Somewhat more promising are Tgr. ‘\text{\textbar{am}m\textbar{k\textbar{a}}}’ ‘to rob, to defraud’ (WTS 456), Amh. \textit{amm\textbar{}k\textbar{\textbar{k\textbar{a}}} ‘to oppress, to rule by force’ (AED 1126).

\textsuperscript{47} Well attested in Ugaritic (in the derived noun with the meaning ‘valley’, DUL 165), but missing from Akkadian, unless one accepts its traditional identification with \textit{em\textbar{}ku} ‘to be wise’ (AHw. 213, CDG 63) — semantically far from evident (application of modern concepts like ‘deep knowledge’ seems anachronistic). Curiously enough, Akkadian has no special verb for ‘to be deep’, this meaning being expressed by \textit{\textbar{}nap\textbar{}u ‘to be low’ (CAD \textbar{} 422}).

\textsuperscript{48} Of some interest may be Tna. ‘\text{\textbar{amm\textbar{}ok\textbar{}a}’ ‘to hit hard (with an elbow)’, \textit{m\textbar{}\textbar{}\textbar{}mak\textbar{}w ‘thrashing, striking with a bent elbow’ (TED 1835).

\textsuperscript{49} Cf. \textit{von Soden’s remark “ug. ‘\text{rb}’ wie akk.” in AHw. 234.

\textsuperscript{50} Both of these derived meanings are attested in Ugaritic as well as in Akkadian: ‘\text{rb}’ ‘sunset’, ‘\text{rb\textbar{}n’ guarantor, surety’ (DUL 183), \textit{er\textbar{}ebu ‘setting of the sun’, erub\textbar{}\textbar{}tu ‘pledge’ (CAD E 258, 327).

\textsuperscript{51} It is still uncertain whether Hbr. \textit{haw\textbar{}w\textbar{}a and h\textbar{}w\textbar{}a are indeed to be translated as “words”}}
8. ḥpr ‘ration, supply’ (DUL 366).

- Passim in economic documents.

- Akk. ipru ‘barley ration, food allowance’ (AHw. 385, CAD E 166), epēru ‘to provide with food rations’ (AHw. 223, CAD E 190).

- The origin of Akk.-Ugr. *ḥpr ‘to provide with food’ is uncertain.

9. ḫrn ‘gang, caravan’ (DUL 405).

- The most reliable attestation is 1.4 V 29-31: šḥ ḫrn b bhtk ḏbt b ḫrb hklk ‘call a gang to your house, a squad to your palace’. The meaning ‘messenger’ (lit. “son of the road”) is usually postulated for bn ḫrnk in 2.61:3, but the exact significance of the relevant lines (bn ḫrnk mγy ḥb ḥw ṭrd w ṣl ḥw ṭrt) remains uncertain (cf. Singer 1999:726).

- Akk. ḫarrānu ‘road; caravan; business venture; service unit’ (AHw. 326, CAD H 106).

- The etymology of Akk.-Ugr. *ḫarrān- ‘road, caravan, gang’ is unknown. Huehnergard’s comparison with Arb. ḫrr II ‘to set free; to point, to adjust’ (2003:105, 116) is hardly appealing from the semantic point of view, the more so since the meaning ‘to set free’ is obviously derived from ḫrr I ‘to be free’, ḫurr- ‘freeborn’ (Lane 538, with transparent cognates elsewhere in CS (HALOT 348). Semantically more suitable could be Gez. ḫrā ‘army, troops’ (CDG 240), usually derived from the same root. 52

10. ḫt ‘sceptre, rod, wand, stake’ (DUL 414).

- Widely attested, the most reliable examples include 1.6 VI 28-29 (l yhpk ks’a mlkk l yṯbr ḫt mṭlk ‘he will surely overturn the throne of your kingship, will break the sceptre of your rulership’), 1.23:8-9 (bdh ḫt ṭkl bdh ḫt ’ulmn ‘the rod of bereavement is in his hand, the rod of widowhood is in his hand’), 1.23:37

(DCH 2 502-503, cf. HALOT 242) instead of the traditional “desire” and “destruction” in passages like Ps 38:13 (dōrašē rā ‘āti dibbārū hawwōt), Ps 52:4 (hawwōt tahlšōb lašōnākā), Mc 7:3 (haggadōl dōbēr hawwōt napšō), Jb 6:30 (’im ḫkkīlō (’ yāḇīn hawwōt), Ez 7:26 (hōwā ‘āl hōwā tābō (’ wū-šēmū ’ā ‘āl-šēmū ’ā tīhyā). In any case, these marginal examples do not undermine the fundamental agreement between Akkadian and Ugaritic in what concerns the basic status of awatu/hwt. Arb. ḫwt I ‘to call’ compared in DUL 349 is hardly related, being rather a by-form of ḫyt II ‘to call someone saying hayta hayta’ (LANE 2910). More promising could be Arb. haw ‘mind, purpose, desire’ (LANE 2904).

52 Huehnergard does not mention Ugr. ḫrn, but on p. 111 of his study he admits that the apparently unmotivated fluctuation between ḫ and ḫ is attested not only between WS and Akkadian, but also within West Semitic (with several instructive examples).
(‘il šṭ nḥt ‘il ymn mṯ ydh ‘‘il lowers his rod, he takes the staff into his right hand’’), 1.114:7-8 (w d ṭd’nm ylmn šṭ mṯ tḥl ṭlḥn ‘and one who does not know him strikes him with a stick under the table’), 1.169:5 (ḥṭ nḵh ‘u krb ḥṭ ‘the rod is ready’, or the rod is near”).

▶ Akk. ḫṭṭu ‘scepter, staff, stick, branch, twig’ (AHw. 337, CAD ḫ 153).

▼ Akk.-Ugr. *ḥṭṭ- ‘rod’ has no reliable cognates. 53

11. kms ‘to buckle, to bend’ (DUL 446).

- **Hapax Legomenon** in 1.12 II 53-54: npl b’l km tr w tkms ḥd km ‘ibr ‘B’il fell like a bull, ḥd kneeled down like a steer’.

▶ Akk. kamāsu ‘to squat, to kneel’ (AHw. 431, CAD K 117).

▼ Akk.-Ugr. *kms is vaguely reminiscent of Akkadian and WS anatomic terms denoting articulation, joint (Akk. ḫmšu, Hbr. ḫmšm, SED I No. 172), but no phonologically exact cognate has been detected so far.

12. kšd ‘to search for, to reach’ (DUL 467).

- **Hapax Legomenon** in a rather problematic context: hm brky tkšd r’umm ‘n k ḥd ‘aylt ‘does not it crave the pool like wild bulls, the spring — like a herd of deer’ (1.5 I 16-17). 54

▶ Akk. kašādu ‘to reach, to arrive’ (AHw. 459, CAD K 271).

▼ Akk.-Ugr. *kšd (or *kšl) ‘to reach’. 55 has no clear cognates elsewhere in Semitic. Of some interest may be Arb. kāšīd- ‘one who earns, obtains much’ (LA 3 466), semantically remarkably similar to some of the prominent meanings of Akk. kašādu (‘to obtain’, ‘to get hold’, ‘to conquer’).

13. ḫb ‘to summon, to invoke’ (DUL 690).

- Reliably attested in 1.161:9-10: kr’itm rp’i ‘arš ḫb’itm ḫbš ḥd ‘you have summoned the Rp’um of the Earth, you have invoked the congregation

---

53 Arb. ḫṭṭ- ‘line, streak, stripe’ adduced in DUL 414 with reference to Lane 759 is semantically remote, being probably derived from the verbal root ḫṭ ‘to make a mark upon the ground’, which is further related to Akk. ḫṭṭu ‘to make a ditch, to excavate’ (CAD ḫ 152), Syr. ḫṭ ‘effodit’ (LSyr. 226), Jba ḫṭ ‘to dig out’ (dJba 449), possibly Tna. ḫṭṭ bāḥlā ‘to scratch’ (TED 299).


55 The semantic overlap between Akkadian and Ugaritic is, of course, far from complete.
Another possible attestation adduced in DUL is ḳbʿat in 1.6 VI 40 (heavily broken context).

- Akk. ḳabû ‘to say, to tell, to speak, to decree’ (AHw. 889, CAD Q 22).
- The origin of Akk.-Ugr. *ḳb/*ḳby is uncertain. Any connection with Hbr. ḳbb ‘to curse, enchant’ (HALOT 1060), Tgr. ḳābbā ‘to contemn, to revile, to ignore’ (WTS 249), Tna. ḳābābā ‘to mock, to deride, to scorn’ (TED 980)?

14. krd ‘hero, powerful one’ (DUL 709).
   - Attested as an element of B’l’s title ‘alʿiy krdm ‘the most powerful of the heroes’, as well as in 1.119:26-29 (k |r| |r| |r| ṭyrm krd ṭmytkm ... ṭy |l| ṭrny krd [l] ṭmytny ‘when a mighty one attacks your gates, a valiant one your walls, (you will say) “if you throw away the mighty one from our gates, the valiant one from our walls...” ’).
   - Akk. kardu ‘heroic, valiant’, karrādu ‘hero, warrior’, ħurādu id. (AHw. 903, 905, 928, CAD Q 129, 140, 312).
   - There is no reliable cognate for Akk.-Ugr. *krd ‘to be heroic’. Could one tentatively compare Arb. qdr ‘to have power or ability to do smth.’ (Lane 2495) with metathesis? Also of interest is Tna. kārrādā ‘to refuse to agree or listen; to be stubborn, argue, to persist in wanting to overcome so.; to be rival, to quarrel with each other’ (TED 949).

   - The verb lsm and its nominal derivates are known from several reliable attestations: ‘my pʾnk lsmn ‘my twṭh ṣālk ‘let your feet run to me, let your legs hasten to me’ (1.3 III 19-20), ymsḥn k lsmm ‘they trample’ each other like the swift ones 58 (1.6 IV 20-21), kymʾ il b lsmt ‘those who assist ‘il with alacrity’ (1.22 1 5-6), mlsm mrkbt (1.162:22). 59 Akk. la-sà-mu is equated with Ugr. ʾmaʾ- al-sà-mu in the lexical list (Huehnergard 1987:143).

---

57 The underlying root *ḳby for Akk. ḳabû has been advocated in recent studies on Sargonic Akkadian because of the orthographic alternation ʾk-Bî [yikbî] ‘he said’ vs. ʾkā-BI [yekabbe] ‘he says’, which makes better sense if these forms are reconstructed as *yikbiy vs. *yikabbay (SOMMERFELD 1999:20, as well as HASSELBACH 2005:41-42, who deals specifically with the implications of this phenomenon for the etymological comparison under review).
59 ‘Coureurs de chars’ according to PARDEE 2000:895.
Akk. *lasāmu ‘to run fast’ (AHw. 538, CAD L 104).

Akk.-Ugr. *Ism ‘to be swift’ lacks etymological parallels.

16. mnd‘ ‘perhaps’ (DUL 561).
- Attested in 1.16 II 24 (mnd‘ krt mγ[y] ‘perhaps Krt has already departed’, Pardee 1997:340) and 2.34:10-13 (w mnd‘ k ‘ank ‘aḥš mγy mnd‘ k ‘igr w ‘u ‘igr[r] ‘m Špš ‘perhaps I will hurry to come, perhaps I shall lodge here or I shall lodge with the Sun’).

- While formally or semantically similar lexemes are attested more or less throughout WS — Hbr. maddīā‘ ‘why?’ (HALOT 548), Off. Arm. md‘m ‘something’ (DNWSI 598), Gez. ‘ndā‘i ‘perhaps’ (CDG 28), Soq. ‘ādah ‘perhaps’ (LS 53) — it is only Ugr. mnd‘ that matches Akk. minde exactly in both form and meaning.

- The most reliable reconstruction of the original shape of this particle is *mīna ‘ida‘ ‘what I know?’ (AHw. 655, Tropper 2000:146).

17. n-dd ‘to stand’ (DUL 620).
- Most of the relevant examples are listed under the meaning (3) ‘to prepare, hurry, launch oneself’ (lagerly based on Pope 1947 and Tropper–Verreet 1988:346-347). By far the most transparent are the passages where n-dd is paralleled by (or occurs side by side with) km, such as 1.3 I 4-8 (km γt r w yšlhmnh ... ndd yšr w yškynh ‘he arises, prepares, and gives him food ... he arises, serves and gives him drink’, Pardee 1997:250) and 1.4 III 12-13 (ydd w yklṣn ykm w ywpṭn ‘he stood up and scorned me, he arouse and spat on me’). Also significant is 3.9:12-14: ‘al ydd mt mrzd h w yrgm ‘let no man of the association stand up and say’.

- Akk. izuzzu ‘stehen’ (AHw. 408).

- Parallels to Akk. izuzzu elsewhere in WS are restricted to a few hypothetic remnants in Hebrew. Post-biblical ḏwz ‘to move, to go away, to depart’ (Ja. 385) is well compatible semantically and has indeed been compared with both izuzzu and n-dd ever since Poebel 1939:182-185 (v. most recently Huehnergard 2002:177-178), but one can only wonder how such a (presumably, very archaic) root could survive and even be commonly used in post-Biblical lan-

---

60 The semantic difference between Akkadian and Aramaic has been aptly observed by Kaufman (1974:72).

61 The semantic ambiguity of the concept ‘to stand’ — from the most stative ‘to be still, motionless’ to the most dynamic ‘to arise for action’ — is well illustrated by the usage of the Hebrew verbs ḏwm and ṣmd (BDB 877, 763). Cf. also Poebel’s penetrating remarks in 1939:184.
guage without leaving a minor trace in its more ancient strata. Biblical mazûzâ ‘door-post’ is more feasible as a cognate (Poebel 1939:186-189), but the possibility of an Akkadian loanword (rejected by Poebel and, recently, Mankowski 2000:85) cannot be entirely discarded. Even if real, these sparse remnants would contrast sharply with the basic status of n-dd in Ugaritic.

18. ngr, ngrt ‘herald’ (DUL 623).

- Attested as a divine epithet: šm‘l ngr ‘il ‘il[š] ‘ilš ngr bt b‘l w ‘aṭṭk ngrt ‘ilḥt ‘listen, o herald of ‘il, ‘il[š], ‘il[š], herald of the house of B‘l, and your wife, the herald of the goddesses’ (1.16 IV 8-11). This widely accepted interpretation of ngr and ngrt (e.g., Pardee 1997:623) seems superior to *naggār- ‘carpenter’ (Huehnergard 1987:94).

  ▶ Akk. nāgiru ‘herald’, nāgirtu id. (AHw. 711, CAD N 115).

  ▼ The origin of Akk.-Ugr. nāgir- ‘herald’ is uncertain. The Akkadian lexeme is hard to separate from Sum. nimgir with the same meaning, and a borrowing from Akkadian to Sumerian appears more likely than vice versa (Edzard 1981:284-285, Steiner 2003:634, Sassmannshausen 1995:91-92, contra Sommerfeld 2006:64). The Akkadian term must then go back to a non-attested *nagāru ‘to announce’, in its turn likely related to Gez. nagara ‘to say’ and its Ethiopian cognates (so AHw. 710, CDG 392, Sanmartín 1991:197). Huehnergard’s assertion “the word nāgiru “herald” is not attested in any Semitic language other than Akkadian” (1987:94) is nevertheless correct (contra Sanmartín).

19. nmrt ‘splendour’ (DUL 632).

- Hapax Legomenon in 1.108:24-25, in a series of divine attributes (‘zk ḏmrk l‘ank ḫtkt nmrtk ‘your strength, your protection, your power, your sovereignty? your splendour’).

---

62 Poebel’s comparison is emphatically rejected (unfortunately, with no argument whatsoever) in von Soden 1952:169.

63 As one can judge from the examples collected in DUL 702, in the extant Ugaritic corpus ḏmr is probably no more frequent than n-dd. Moreover, n-dd is once attested in a non-literary text, whereas ḏmr seems to be restricted to the literary corpus. All this means that my decision to treat ḏmr as the basic term with the meaning ‘to stand’ in Ugaritic (Kogan 2006a:442) was probably erroneous. The exclusive Ugaritic-Akkadian isoglosses in Swadesh wordlist (such as ‘bird’, ‘breast’, ‘cloud’) can thus be supplemented by one more reliable example.

64 Huehnergard’s reference to “the context of building a house” is unclear to me.

65 Possibly preserved in nugguru ‘to denounce’ (CAD N, 313) as well as in its nominal derivates munaggiru ‘informer’ (CAD M, 198) and taggirtu ‘denunciation’ (CAD T 38).
20. *niš-m* ‘people, men’ (DUL 649).

- Reliably attested in epics and an incantation: 1.3 III 27-28 (*rgm l td* 'nšm w l tbh hmlt 'ars ‘a matter which people do not know, the multitudes of the land do not understand’), 1.4 VII 49-52 (*aḥdy d ymlk l 'ilm d ymr'u 'ilm w nšm d yšb[ ] hmlt 'ars ‘I am the only one who rules over the gods, who fattens gods and men, who satiates the multitudes of the earth’), 1.6 II 17-19 (*npš ḫsr bn nšm npš hmlt 'ars ‘my appetite lacked men, my appetite — the multitudes of the earth’), 1.17 VI 45 (*nʾnn ṭḥ nšm ‘good and strong among men’), 9.435:9-10 (*hwts rš’ hwt bn nšm ‘the word of a wicked one, the word of (any) man’). The basic status of *nš-m* is confirmed by the equation of its syllabic equivalent ’*na*₅-[*š*]u-*ma* with U[Na] in the lexical list (Huehnergard 1987:155).

- Akk. *niš-u* ‘mankind, human beings, people’ (AHw. 796, CAD N₂ 283).

- Throughout WS, Ugaritic *nš-m* is the closest approximation to Akk. *niš-u* both formally (external masculine plural) and semantically (‘men’, ‘people’). The complex etymological background of these terms cannot be discussed here in its entirety, but if structurally identical CS terms for ‘women’ (Hbr. *nāš-im*, Syr. *nešš-e*, Arb. *nis-ūna*, HALOT 729, LSyr. 450, LA 15 374) indeed represent a semantic narrowing of an original meaning ‘people’, the fact that this isogloss is not shared by Ugaritic becomes all the more significant.

---

66 Bulakh emphasizes correctly that the Akk. *namurratu* and related lexemes with *-m* cannot be immediately derived from *nawāru* ‘to shine’ (cf. Edzard 1994).

67 Notably, their relationship to PCS *ʿinš- ‘man’ and related CS terms.

68 As is widely acknowledged (Bauer–Leander 1927:617, DUL 650, Huehnergard 1987:77, Krebernik 1985:54). The archaic nature of the *a*-vocalism in Hebrew is, contra Bauer–Leander 1927:617, reaffirmed not only by Ugr. *ʾna*-[*š*]u-*ma*, but also by the Akkadogram *NA-SE₅₁* in Ebla (Krebernik 1985:54). The vocalic difference between Akkadian, Arabic and, probably, Syriac on the one hand and Hebrew, Ugaritic and Eblaite on the other remains enigmatic. Arb. *nāš*- and Arm. *nāšā* ‘people’ are not to be directly associated with any of the aforementioned forms as they almost certainly go back to prototypes with *V*-(ʾunāš-, ānāšā). Also the long *ā* in Arabic and Aramaic is not compatible with the short *a* in Hebrew (st. constr. nāšēn).

69 Cf. the regular (non-suppletive) plural of *ʾatt* ‘woman’ in 4.349:2 (*arb* *ʾatt* ‘four women’, DUL 130). The same is true of ESA, where *(n)*ṯ has a variety of plural forms (Sab. *(n)*ṯ, *(n)*š, *(n)*š, SD 7; Min. *(n)*ḥṯ, LM 6) and *nVš*- is not attested at all.
21. **phd** ‘a yearling lamb’ (DUL 669)

- **Hapax Legomenon** in 1.17 V 16-19: ‘db ḫmr b phd l ḥṣs l brlt ḥyn d ḫrš ‘she prepared a lamb from the flock, for the throat of Kṭr ḥṣs, for the gullet of Ḥyn d ḫrš’ (Pardee 1997:346). This interpretation of *phd* remains the most likely one notwithstanding a few obvious difficulties (notably, the absence of collective meaning for Akk. *puḫādu*).
  - Akk. *puḫādu* ‘lamb, young male sheep’ (AHw. 875, CAD P 476).
  - Akk.-Ugr. *puḫād-* ‘lamb; flock’ has no cognates elsewhere in Semitic.

22. **sin** ‘edge, hem’ (DUL 751).

- **Hapax Legomenon** in 1.6 II 9-11, meaning reliably established from context: t’ḥd mt b s’ in ḫšk[n] b ʾḳš ‘all ḥy took Mt by the edge of his garment, she seized him by the hem of his mantle’.
  - Akk. *sūnu* ‘a cloth trimming’ (CDA 328). More traditional interpretations found in CAD S 388 (‘a piece of clothing or part thereof’) and AHw. 1059 (‘ein Tuch oder Binde’) are likely to be rejected (Moran 1983).
  - There is no cognate for Akk.-Ugr. *su’n-* ‘hem’. According to AHw. 1059, the Akkadian term is borrowed from Sum. ṭūn, but this is difficult to reconcile with the Ugaritic evidence (let alone the internal Akkadian difficulties outlined in Moran 1983).

23. **tb** ‘to go, leave, depart’ (DUL 857).

- **Passim** in the Ugaritic corpus.
  - Akk. *tebū* ‘to get up, to rise; to set out, to depart, to leave’ (AHw. 1342, CAD T 306).
  - Akk.-Ugr. *ṭb* ‘to set out, to depart’ are probably related to Arb. *ṭb* ‘to follow’ (Lane 293), but the semantic gap underlying this comparison contrasts sharply with the virtual semantic identity between Akkadian and Ugaritic.

---

70 The most exact semantic match for the Ugaritic lexeme is DURAND’s ‘ourlet’ (2000:586, with more details in 2009:93-95).

71 Mhr. *ṭāba*, Jib. *ṭē* ‘to follow’ (ML 399, JL 269) are probably Arabisms. In CDG 569, Gez. *ṭaba* ‘to be brave, to be manly’ and its ES cognates are tentatively compared to Akk. *tebū* ‘to rise to make war’, *ṭēbū* ‘insurgent’, but this is unlikely since Akk. *tebū* (as well as Ugr. *ṭb*) is primarily a verb of movement whose military connotations are at best secondary. Contra DUL 857 and LSyr. 814, Syr. *ṭba* ‘urṣit, institit, pressit’ and its Aramaic cognates are not related to Akk. *tebū*, being rather secondarily derived from *ḥṭy* ‘to seek, to request’ (so HURWITZ 1913:98, ZABORSKI 1971:58).

- *Hapax Legomenon* in 1.2 IV 17-18: *l ṭnγšn pnth̄ l ydlp tmnh* ‘his knuckles did not buckle, his frame did not break up’. It seems preferable to identify *tmn* in this passage with Akk. *temmennu* ‘foundation’ (CAD T 337) separating it from Hbr. *tamūnā* ‘form, manifestation’ (HALOT 1746) and its presumable Ugaritic cognate *tmnt*.


25. *trbš* ‘yard, reserve’ (DUL 620).


  - Akk. *tārbāšu* ‘pen (for cattle, rarely for sheep and goats, horses), enclosure, courtyard’ (AHw. 1327, CAD T 217).

  - Akk.-Ugr. *tārbāš*– ‘enclosure, yard’ goes back to PS *rbš* ‘to lie down, to rest (mostly of animals)’ (HALOT 1181).

26. *tr̄h* ‘to get married’ (DUL 878).

- Both the verbal root and its nominal derivates are widely attested: 1.14 I 12-14 (*’aṭṭ ṣdkt̄ l ṣyk nmt̄ḥ yvr̄h *’aṭṭ tr̄h w tbt* ‘he did not obtain his lawful wife, no legitimate spouse, he married a wife but she went away’), 1.23:64-65 (y *’aṭṭ ʾirh̄ y bn *ʾašld *’o wives whom I married, o sons whom I begot’), 1.11 IV 47-50 (*yšʾi tr̄ḥ ḫdty ybrʾ l tnʾ *’aṭṭh lm nkr mddth* ‘let the newly married leave his wife to someone else, his beloved one to a stranger’), 1.111:20 (*trḥt tʾarš* ‘the bride-price that you will request’), and *passim* in 1.24.

  - Akk. *terḥatu* ‘bridewealth’ (AHw. 1348, CAD T 350).

  - The origin of Akk.-Ugr. *ṭrḥ* ‘to pay a bride-price, to get married is uncertain’. Possible WS attestations of *ṭrḥ* outside Ugaritic are problematic: the meaning of the Phoenicial priestly title *mtrḥ ʾstrny* is disputed (cf. DNWSI 710, Krahmalkov 2000:390), whereas Sab. *ṭrḥ*, sometimes understood as ‘redemption-price’ (cf. SD 148, Biella 536) is phonologically unsuitable (Sab. ḥ vs. Akk. and Ugr. ḥ).

---


73 As persuasively argued by Goetze (1947:242), Akk. *terḥatu* cannot be derived from *reb̄u* ‘to copulate, to inseminate’, as it used to be supposed in earlier studies quoted ibid.
3. CONCLUSIONS

3.1. Ugaritic as a Canaanite language — the lexical evidence

The lexical evidence dealt with in this article is substantially different from the Swadesh wordlist analyzed in Kogan 2006a. Since the impact of this difference is mainly negative, it seems appropriate to outline the deficiencies of the new evidence in greater detail before proceeding to its more positive outcome.

1. Swadesh wordlist is restricted to the most fundamental lexical features whose relevance for genealogical classification is potentially high because of their clear-cut semantic shape and slight probability of borrowing. Lexical features discussed in the present article have no such restrictions: some of them belong to less basic, more culture-bound semantic fields, such as social hierarchy and professions (**Vby-ān- ‘poor’, No. 2; **adān- ‘lord’, No. 5; **ḥa(raš)- ‘artisan’, No. 36; **kbs- ‘to wash clothes’, No. 38; **yḵš- ‘to hunt with a snare’, No. 73), materials, tools and artifacts (**Vm-‘ship’, No. 12; **Vpn- ‘wheel’, No. 13; **bardīl- ‘iron’, No. 22; **nVṭk- ‘weapon’, No. 48; **rVt- ‘net’, No. 55; **ta-‘sheath’, No. 64; **tūḥān- ‘table’, No. 68; **yār- /**ta-‘knife, razor’, No. 71), construction and architecture (**arubb-‘sky-light’, No. 15; **ṭr- ‘city’, No. 18; **gagg- ‘roof’, No. 25; **ḥāmiy-(a)- ‘wall’, No. 35), agriculture (**dagan- ‘grain’, No. 24; **gin- ‘wine or olive press’, No. 28; **kussam- ‘spelt’, No. 39; **pVṭ- ‘flax’, No. 53; **sVm-‘raisin’, No. 58), abstract concepts and intellectual activities (**ān- ‘vigor, wealth’, No. 10; **awn- ‘misfortune’, No. 11; **aps- ‘extremity’, No. 14; **hamull- ‘crowd’, No. 31; **paš- ‘crime’, No. 52; **tamūn- ‘shape, form’, No. 66; **tūšiy- ‘success’, No. 67; **wsr/*ysr ‘to teach, to instruct’, No. 70; **yapīḥ- ‘witness’, No. 74).

2. In the framework of Swadesh wordlist, functional equivalence between the terms under comparison is of paramount importance: presence of this or that root in a given pair of Semitic languages is not relevant unless both lexemes in question can be shown to function as the basic exponents of the respective concept. The present investigation, on the contrary, accumulates all exclusive isoglosses between Ugaritic and Canaanite independently of their functional status. Thus, a given Ugaritic lexeme can be attested as a margi-
nal, non-basic word, whereas its Canaanite cognates clearly enjoyed the basic status, like *dbr ‘to say’ (No. 23) or *harr- ‘mountain’ (No. 32). The reverse is also possible, as shown by *yapīḥ- ‘witness’ (No. 72).

Significantly, the traditional, “narrow” Canaanite is sometimes divided along the same lines. Thus, a few specific lexical features prominent in Hebrew are marginal in both Ugaritic and Phoenician: *īr- ‘city’ (No. 18), *ṣy/*ṣy ‘to make’ (No. 19), *ḥudt- ‘new moon, month’ (No. 33). The reverse situation (a root marginal in Hebrew, but basic in both Ugaritic and Phoenician) can be illustrated by *bād- ‘by, at, from’ (No. 20) and *ṣyt ‘to put’ (No. 63), perhaps also *nub-t- ‘honey’ (No. 45). The only isogloss separating Hebrew and Ugaritic from Phoenician is the broad use of the negative particle *’ayn- (Ginsberg 1970:109).

3. Lexemes accepted for comparison in Swadesh wordlist have to be well attested in semantically unambiguous contexts, which assure their basic status independently of etymological considerations. Hapax Legomena and other rare words whose exact meaning (let alone functional status) cannot be established contextually are preferably to be left out of consideration. In the present article, on the contrary, a few Hapax Legomena have been admitted: *’an ‘strength’ (No. 10), *’aps- ‘extremity, end’ (No. 14), *dagan- ‘grain’ (No. 24), *gyl ‘to rejoice’ (No. 26), *gVšm- ‘rain’ (No. 28), *lyn ‘to sleep, to stay the night’ (No. 40), *maṭṭ- ‘down’/*mVṭt-at- ‘bed’ (No. 42), *paš- ‘crime, transgression’ (No. 52), *rVṭ-t- ‘net’ (No. 55), *šns ‘to gird’ (No. 61), *ta’r- ‘sheath’ (No. 64), *tūšiy-yy-at- ‘success’ (No. 67).

4. Quite often, the diachronic background of this or that CC lexeme cannot be elicited, which makes impossible to consider it a shared innovation. And conversely, some of the typically Canaanite words do have cognates with more or less the same meaning somewhere else in CS or WS: *’dm ‘to be

---

75 Presumably also *gVšm- ‘rain’ (No. 28) and *naḥaš- ‘snake’ (No. 47). Since no Phoenician exponents are available for these concepts, one cannot exclude that the functional status of these lexemes in Hebrew and Phoenician was not identical (in which case they would rather belong with the isoglosses discussed in the next paragraph).

76 Ginsberg (1970:111) considers this lexeme to be “the simplest mark” by which his “Hebraic group” can be distinguished from other Canaanite languages as well as from the rest of Semitic. The latter is not the case in view of the broad presence of *ṣy in ESA.

77 Phoenician evidence for *nub-t- is scarce, but *dibš- is not attested at all.

78 Needless to say, for a dead language with a restricted textual corpus even such contexts have no absolute value.

79 Some of them even the same basic status.
red’ (No. 3), *’adam- ‘man; mankind’ (No. 4), *‘ṭr- ‘city’ (No. 18), *šy/*šy ‘to make’ (No. 19), *sbb ‘to turn’ (No. 56), *spr ‘to count’ (No. 57), *yayn- ‘wine’ (No. 72). Evidently enough, these lexemes, too, cannot be regarded as Canaanite innovations, but only as specific, less trivial retentions from PCS or PWS.

These deficiencies are weighty enough to be taken seriously by everybody willing to assess the lexical proximity between Ugaritic and Canaanite. Nevertheless, they are not sufficient to overshadow the positive aspects of the present lexical inquiry.

1. Perhaps the most striking result of our investigation is the extraordinary high number of exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Canaanite. There is virtually nothing to compare with 78 exclusive (or, rarely, quasi-exclusive) lexical features shared by Ugaritic with Hebrew and/or Phoenician — contrast 18 exclusive isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic or 26 between Ugaritic and Akkadian, let alone the meager five exclusive lexical features shared by Ugaritic with Aramaic, its potentially closest NWS relative. With all possible limitations in mind, this huge amount of exclusive lexical features cannot be dismissed as diachronically meaningless.

2. Many of the relevant lexemes do belong to the most basic semantic strata: *’dm ‘to become red’ (No. 3), *’adam- ‘man; mankind’ (No. 4), *’hb ‘to love’ (No. 7), *’ayn- ‘there is not’ (No. 9), *šy/*šy ‘to make’ (No. 19), *bād- ‘by, at, from’ (No. 20), *dbr ‘to say’ (No. 23), *gašm- ‘rain’ (No. 28), *hlm ‘to strike’ (No. 30), *harr- ‘mountain’ (No. 32), *lyn ‘to sleep, to stay the night’ (No. 40), *na’r- ‘boy, lad’ (No. 43), *nub-r ‘honey’ (No. 45), *naḥaš- ‘snake’ (No. 47), *ṣyr ‘to put’ (No. 63), *tawk- ‘midst’ (No. 65), *yr ‘to be afraid’ (No. 76), *yšk ‘to pour’ (No. 77), *ytn ‘to become old’ (No. 78). It is thus fair to claim that CC isoglosses are not restricted to the superficial layers of the cultural vocabulary.

3. The proportion of *Hapax Legomena* among the relevant Ugaritic lexemes is by no means high (12 out of 78). Our conclusions are thus based on well attested lexemes and not on a few exotic occasionalisms. Comparison with Ugaritic-Arabic isoglosses is instructive in this respect: among 18 exclusive lexical features shared by Ugaritic with Arabic, *Hapax Legomena* are no less than 13.

---

80 In other words, as far as genealogical affiliation of Ugaritic is concerned, it is not possible to find any remotely comparable number of “roots and words in subsets of languages that would indicate other subgroupings” as predicted by HUEHNERGARD (2005:190, cf. HASSELBACH–HUEHNERGARD 2007:420).
4. For more than 20 CC lexemes, the path of semantic or formal innovation can be plausibly reconstructed: *

*ab(h)īr- ‘bull; horse’ (No. 1), *Vby-

ān- ‘poor’ (No. 2), *‘āyn- ‘there is not’ (No. 9), *Vny(-at)- ‘ship’ (No. 12),

*Vphn- ‘wheel’ (No. 13), *bād- ‘by, at, from’ (No. 20), *bkt ‘to look for’ (No. 21), *gyl ‘to rejoice’ (No. 26), *ḥudt- ‘new moon, month’ (No. 33), *ḥāmiy-(a) t- ‘wall’ (No. 35), *ḥa(raš- ‘artisan’ (No. 36), *kbs ‘to wash clothes’ (No. 38),

*kussam-t- ‘spelt’ (No. 39), *lyn ‘to sleep, to stay the night’ (No. 40), *nub-t- ‘honey’ (No. 45), *nāḥaš- ‘snake’ (No. 47), *pam- ‘time’ (No. 49), *ṣVmVk- ‘raisin’ (No. 58), *ṣadāy- ‘cultivated field’ (No. 59), *ṣyt ‘to put’ (No. 63),

*ya’r-t*ta’r- ‘knife, razor’ (No. 71). Given the fact that — at least in Semitic — the origin of “new lexemes” 81 can rarely be established even hypothetically, the significance of this proportion can hardly be overestimated.

In view of the evidence collected and analyzed in the present article, a close association between Ugaritic and Canaanite (not fully apparent as long as the inquiry was restricted to the concepts of Swadesh wordlist) becomes a feasible probability. To put it differently, if there is any subdivision of Semitic with which Ugaritic has ever been specially connected, this subdivision is of necessity the Canaanite group. This conclusion itself is not new. What is innovative is rather the vast body of supporting evidence, which will probably make the Canaanite hypothesis more credible than the somewhat impressionistic statements of my predecessors. 82

The Canaanite affiliation of the Ugaritic vocabulary quickly prompts a few fundamental questions of genealogical, geographic and historical order.

81 To be sure, the situation with “new morphemes” (i. e., morphological innovations used in the subgrouping procedure) is exactly the same if not worse.

82 Such as GREENFIELD 1969:98 (“but the bulk, the great bulk of the vocabulary of Ugaritic, when not gemeinsemitisch ... has its strongest links with Canaanite”) or TROPPER 1994:351 (“it is an undisputable fact that the great majority of the Ugaritic lexicon (about 70%) and especially the basic vocabulary of Ugaritic is attested in the Canaanite dialects with the same or at least similar meaning”. Tropper gives no single example of a common Ugaritic-Canaanite lexical feature, nor does he specify the source of his statistics. Greenfield refers to “the common words for table, roof, window, fish” without mentioning any concrete lexical form, whereas at least the first three — overtly cultural — concepts are by no means the best available illustrations of what the common words and the bulk of the vocabulary of Ugaritic actually are. One can easily understand why these and similar statements, in spite of being even if essentially correct, did not produce much confidence, especially among scholars a priori skeptical about the classificatory value of the basic vocabulary. The same applies to GINSBERG 1970:103 where ‘roof’, ‘window’ and ‘table’ are supplemented by *

*ytn ‘to be old (of things)’, *grš ‘to drive out’ and *ḍkn ‘to be old (of people)’. That the latter feature is “confined to the Canaanite languages” is, moreover, incorrect (KOGAN 2006a:432).
By far the most important problem is how the very designation “Canaanite” should be understood. As we have just seen above, some of the most conspicuous lexical isoglosses labeled “Common Canaanite” in this article fully affect Ugaritic and Phoenician only, their presence in Hebrew being quite marginal. And conversely, some of the typically Hebrew lexemes are only sporadically attested in Ugaritic and Phoenician. As long as both Phoenician and Hebrew are thought to be legitimate representatives of the Canaanite Sprachtypus (which is the common opinion), one is forced to conclude that even within this “classical” or “narrow” Canaanite there are two different, only partly overlapping, bundles of specific lexical features — a Southern one and a Northern one. The fact that both types of lexical features are to some extent present over the whole Canaanite area can be explained in two different ways. The relevant isoglosses could have emerged in an incipient form already in Proto-Canaanite, but their subsequent development — from marginal to highly prominent — was different in the North and in the South. Alternatively, two independent focuses of lexical innovations can be postulated, influencing each other via geographic diffusion.

Evidently enough, it is the Northern bundle with which Ugaritic is particularly closely associated. The easiest way to explain this association is, of course, the geographic proximity between Ugarit and Phoenicia as opposed to more southern and more inward areas of Canaan. It is this geographic solution that is usually accepted by those Semitists who do not consider lexical evidence as a reliable tool of genealogical sub-grouping, but are nevertheless reluctant to disregard completely some of the most striking lexical coincidences.

However, also a genealogical hypothesis envisaging a diachronic unity of Phoenician and Ugaritic within the Canaanite group is worth considering. The vocabulary of such a “Phoenic group,” postulated without hesitation in Ginsberg’s brilliant summary description of NWS (1970), can be characterized — both positively and negatively — by several important isoglosses. From among the features collected in the present article, note ++$bād$- ‘by, at, from’ (No. 20), ++$šyt$ ‘to put’ (No. 63), ++$nub$-‘honey’ (No. 45) and --$tīr$- ‘city’ (No. 18), --$šy$ ‘to make’ (No. 19), --$hudt$- ‘new moon, month’ (No. 33).

A closer inquiry into Swadesh wordlist will supplement this list with ++$pa’m$-/+$pa’n$- (+$rVgl$-) ‘foot’ (Ginsberg 1970:105, Kogan 2006a:458), ++$n$‘$m$ (+$tyb$) ‘(to be) good’ (Kogan 2006a:454), ++$ytn$ (+$ntn$) ‘to give’ (Ginsberg 1970:105).

84 + means “extensive use, basic status”, -- means “marginal use, non-basic status”.
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A comprehensive diachronic assessment of the “Phoenic”/“Hebraic” lexical dichotomy — to one’s utmost regret, fatally hampered by the severe shortage of Phoenician lexical material — is still to be carried out. One possible model of explanation has been briefly outlined above in connection with *šyt ‘to put’. The readiest interpretation of this peculiar case is that a highly innovative CC feature once affected (proto-)Hebrew, but then gradually receded, perhaps under a foreign influence. The same approach can be applied to several other examples adduced in the preceding paragraph: for 8 out of 13 basic concepts, the Hebrew equivalents are the same as in Aramaic (to some extent, also Arabic) in opposition to Ugaritic/Phoenician. Within such a paradigm, Ugaritic is to be regarded not just as Canaanite, but as Canaanite par excellence, whereas for Hebrew a kind of lexical “de-Canaanization” has to be posited.

This is of course a formal (but still lexically determined) peculiarity.

That ‘dr functioned as the basic term for ‘(to be) big’ in Phoenician is likely. In Kogan 2006a:444, I tentatively accepted rb as the main exponent of this meaning in Ugaritic, but the supporting evidence for this assumption was scarce. Now it seems that ‘adr is at least no less likely to fill this semantic slot, especially in view of its wide presence in non-literary texts, notably in opposition to dk (which, then, could be considered as the main exponent of the meaning ‘small’, with Huehnergard 1987:39, Tropper 1997:664-665 and contra Kogan 2006a:449-450): ṭ in kndmw ‘adrwm ṭ knpwdk ‘two large kndw-garments and one small knpwdk-garment’ (4.4:2-3), bryt ḏk[t] ṭ ḫm ḫ lr[t] ‘arb’ ḏbd w bryt ‘adr ‘ttn ṭmn ḏbd[t] ‘134 large bryt-objects and 68 small bryt-objects’ (4.411:3-8), ‘aṭt ‘adr ‘grown-up’ woman’ passim in 4.102 (cf. Hbr. gdl, gādēl about age in DBD 152-153). The literary attestations do not provide any positive evidence for this hypothesis, but do not contradict it either. The precise meaning of the lexical entry a-du-rū (Huehnergard 1987:104) can hardly be established (according to Huehnergard 2008:388, the newly discovered Hurrian a-μου-μι-να-ας-ς suggests, admittedly, the translation ‘noble’).

In Ugaritic, ‘alp (pl. ‘alpm) was the basic designation of large cattle widely attested in a variety of contexts. The usage of ṭr is, conversely, restricted to the poetic corpus, whereas ḏkr is attested only once. The Phoenician picture is almost exactly the same ( ‘lp common, ḏkr rare, *šr unattested), the Hebrew one is exactly the opposite (šr and bāḵar common, ṭlēḵ deeply marginal).

With del Olmo Lete 1986 and, it seems, contra Liverani 1964:191, who believes that only late, non-literary varieties of Ugaritic documentation start to display Canaanite features. As far as I can see, the evidence collected in Liverani’s study hardly ever corroborates this conclusion. Surprisingly enough, lexical evidence is not even mentioned in Liverani 1964.

I am well aware that this model is not easily compatible with some crucial assumptions about the basic lexicon on which the present investigation is largely based (such as diachronic stability and resistance to borrowing). However, an instructive example pointing exactly in the same
To what degree the lexical evidence for the “Phoenic” hypothesis is compatible with a variety of positive and negative morphological isoglosses between Ugaritic, Amarna Canaanite, Phoenician and Hebrew is (and will probably remain for quite a while) a debatable issue in Semitic diachronic linguistics. ⁹⁰

Another interesting problem is the chronological stratification of the lexicon within the linguistic history of Ugaritic. It has often been observed (Albright 1958:38, Held 1959:174-175, Haldar 1964:276-277, Liverani 1964) that both the grammar and the vocabulary of Ugaritic prose can be substantially different from the language of myths and epics. Can such differences be detected within the body of the evidence discussed in the present contribution? A positive answer would be of great importance for both genealogical and geographic dimensions as described above. On the one hand, some of the “incipient Canaanisms” could be not ripe enough to appear in the archaic poetry, but nevertheless flourish in the everyday prosaic speech. On the other hand, the poetic corpus could be too archaic to be affected by the hypothetic diffusion of the Southern Canaanite, “Hebraic” lexical features. Some evidence in favor of this hypothesis is indeed available: *dbr ‘to say’ (No. 23), *gVšm- ‘rain’ (No. 28), *harr- ‘mountain’ (No. 32), *nāḥaš- ‘snake’ (No. 47), *hudt- ‘new moon’ (No. 33) are attested in letters, incantations, omens, rituals and other cultic texts, but not in myths and epics. ⁹¹ But, in general, one has rather to agree with Greenfield direction can be detected also in the realm of verbal morphology. As is well known, t-prefixation in the 3 m. pl. of the prefix conjugation is one of the most salient peculiarities of both Ugaritic and Amarna Canaanite. This feature — no doubt a highly specific innovation with respect to PS *y- — left virtually no trace in either Phoenician or Hebrew, which, for all practical purposes, are usually considered as linear descendants of the Canaanite linguistic varieties attested in the EA corpus. A non-motivated abandonment of such a marked innovation with a concomitant re-establishment of its diachronic forerunner (which, as common sense plainly suggests, must have been simply forgotten many generations ago!) looks an unexplainable mystery unless one suspects some sort of “de-Canaanizing” external influence.

⁹⁰ Thus, Tropper (1994:352), after a penetrating acknowledgement of the lexical proximity between Ugaritic and Phoenician, emphatically denies the possibility “to subsume Ugaritic and Phoenician in one single subgroup of Canaanite” since “morphological differences between Ugaritic ... and all South Canaanite dialects ... still remain and should not be ignored”. Not a single morphological difference of this kind can, however, be located on the pages of Tropper’s contribution. Moreover, Tropper rejects as irrelevant virtually all such differences suggested in previous studies on the topic (e. g. Blau 1978:38-39, Huehnergard 1991b:286), such as the Canaanite shift *ā > ə, the ə-causative and the shift *a > i in the first syllable of the suffix conjugation of the intensive and the causative stems.

⁹¹ Perhaps ri-[g]-lu (rather than p ‘n) in the lexical list (Huehnergard 1987:176, 72) belongs
(1969:98) that the Canaanite nature of the Ugaritic vocabulary is manifest in all of its chronological and stylistic strata.

3.2. Exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Arabic: an evaluation

18 exclusive lexical features shared by Ugaritic with Arabic give a fair account of the lexical proximity between these two languages. But the paucity of examples is not the only argument in this case. The immense majority of the relevant Ugaritic lexemes are *Hapax Legomena* —non-basic, functionally marginal lexemes preserved as rare poetic occasionalisms. That such words have no reliable cognates outside Arabic can be easily explained by the extraordinary richness of the Classical Arabic vocabulary accumulated in traditional lexicographic tools. Moreover, in the whole corpus of exclusive Ugaritic-Arabic lexical features there is not a single reliable semantic innovation. This is a telling witness of the archaic, conservative nature of the Ugaritic-Arabic lexical coincidences. To sum up: as long as basic vocabulary is considered to be of some relevance for linguistic subgrouping, the probability of a special genealogical relationship between Ugaritic and Arabic, still advocated in some recent studies on the topic, is close to zero.

3.3. Ugaritic and Akkadian: shared lexical archaisms or early loanwords?

By their nature, exclusive lexical isoglosses between Ugaritic and Akkadian are fundamentally different from similarly exclusive matches between Ugaritic and West Semitic languages. Lexical features which Ugaritic shares with Hebrew, Aramaic or Arabic are potentially indicative of a closer genealogical proximity. For obvious reasons, no special genealogical relationship between Ugaritic and Akkadian is at all conceivable, which means that the lexical features under scrutiny cannot be shared innovations. But where do they come from? Theoretically, two explanations suggest themselves:

---

92 *Contra* Healey (1995:82-84), a lexical investigation aiming at a meaningful pattern of genealogical subgrouping can by no means ignore such fundamental notions as exclusiveness of lexical isoglosses, functional equivalence between the lexemes under scrutiny, their innovative vs. conservative nature, let alone the frequency of their attestation and their philological reliability. Without a systematic application of these concepts, any *crude statistics* of lexical coincidences between Ugaritic and this or that Semitic language is deemed to be useless.

93 Such as Kaye 1991.

94 The same is obviously true of the Ugaritic-Aramaic genealogical proximity advocated in Segert 1965.
1. non-trivial lexical retentions from Proto-Semitic, lost elsewhere in WS but preserved in Ugaritic because of its archaic character and/or early written attestation

or

2. lexical borrowings from Akkadian into Ugaritic which did not penetrate into other WS languages, less affected by the influence of the cuneiform civilization.

In fact, there need not be one solution for the whole corpus of examples. While some cases are best explainable as shared archaisms, others can be more convincingly interpreted within the borrowing paradigm. 95

The former solution is to be preferred when we are faced with lexemes belonging to more basic semantic strata and, therefore, unlikely to be borrowed: ‘mr ‘to look at’ (No. 2), ‘išd ‘leg’ (No. 3), ‘rb ‘to enter’ (No. 6), n-dd ‘to stand’ (No. 17), nš-m ‘people, men’ (No. 20), tb ‘to go, to leave’ (No. 23), possibly also ‘mk ‘tough, strong’ (No. 5), kms ‘to buckle’ (No. 11), kšd ‘to search for, to reach’ (No. 12), kb ‘to summon, to invoke’ (No. 13), lsm ‘to hurry’ (No. 15), mnd ‘perhaps’ (No. 16). Together with a few Akkadian-Ugaritic isoglosses from Swadesh wordlist ( ‘sr ‘bird’, ‘irt ‘breast’, ‘rpt ‘cloud’, Kogan 2006a:456-457), such lexemes may belong to a very ancient stock of Proto-Semitic vocabulary still preserved in Ugaritic, but lost or marginalized in WS languages with more recent textual documentation. 96 Direct borrowing from Akkadian — at least in historical times 97 — seems highly improbable in such cases.

95 This dichotomy was clear already to Haldar (1962:275): “there are a number of pure Akkadian loanwords in Ugaritic, and in other cases common Semitic words have the same meaning in Ugaritic and Akkadian in contradistinction to the other Semitic languages”. This reasonable statement is followed by a very short list of randomly selected examples, none of which is explicitly attributed to any of the two aforementioned categories.

96 One may be tempted to suppose (with Held 1959:174-175, Albright 1958:38, Liverani 1964) that, because of the archaic nature of Ugaritic myths and epics, many of the pertinent lexemes can be even more ancient than the tablets on which they are inscribed, thus reducing the chronological gap between Ugaritic and Akkadian and emphasizing the difference between Ugaritic and WS languages of the 1st millennium (such as Hebrew). This hypothesis is plausible, although it fails to account for several common lexemes not restricted to the literary corpus ( ‘rb ‘to enter’, n-dd ‘to stand’, tb ‘to go, to leave’, ‘sr ‘bird’). Besides, the extant non-literary texts in Ugaritic are by no means representative from the lexical point of view.

97 The pre-historic situation might have been different, however, as will be surmised in the end of this subsection. An early presence of East Semitic linguistic varieties in Syria might be
The second alternative brings us to the thorny problem of Akkadian lexical influences on Ugaritic, a problem which received surprisingly little attention from Ugaritological scholarship notwithstanding its obvious relevance.\(^{98}\) Even W. Watson’s meticulous inquiry into foreign vocabulary of Ugaritic\(^{99}\) deals only with non-Semitic loanwords and excludes Akkadianisms. It becomes less surprising, in such a context, that not a single lexeme from our list has been even tentatively qualified as an Akkadianism by the authors of DUL.

As a systematic perusal of Watson’s lists of non-Semitic loanwords in Ugaritic demonstrates, most of them are concentrated in political, administrative, economic and, to some extent, cultic contexts, where they usually designate more or less specific realia.\(^{100}\) A few Akkadian loanwords are certainly expected to appear in the same groups of texts and can indeed be detected on the pages of DUL, although more or less promising examples are surprisingly few in number: md ‘an official’ < mūdū (DUL 524, CAD M₂ 167),\(^{101}\) mḥr ‘price’ < maḥāru (DUL 539, CAD M₁ 92), mnt ‘recitation of spell, incantation’ < minūtu (DUL 565, CAD M₂ 98), nkš ‘accounting, accounts’ < nikkassu (DUL 631),\(^{102}\) npš ‘red wool’ < nabāsu (DUL 637, CAD N₁ 21), rbš ‘inspector’ < rābiṣu (DUL 731, CAD R 20), ršy ‘to receive, to have’ < raṣū (DUL 748, CAD R 193),\(^{103}\) sbyny ‘black cumin’ < zibibiānu (DUL 752, CAD Z 102), sγr, sγr ‘servant’ < sūhāru (DUL 755, CAD § 231),\(^{104}\) šmt ‘reddish shade’ < sāmtu (DUL 831, CAD

\(^{98}\) Penetrating remarks on individual lexemes by such leading figures of Ugaritological, Semitological and Assyriological scholarship as A. Goetze, W. Moran, J. Huetnergard and D. Pardee (v. references below) are not sufficient to replace a systematic treatment of this fascinating subject.

\(^{99}\) The references to Watson’s studies are conveniently summarized in Watson 2006:727-728.

\(^{100}\) This is clear from the distribution chart in Watson 1999:793.

\(^{101}\) Persuasive arguments in favor of this etymology can be found in Huetnergard 1987:144-145.


\(^{103}\) For the relevant passage (2.41:14-15) and the expression hwt yrš v. Márquez Rowe 1992:152-153.

\(^{104}\) Akkadian origin advocated in Tropper 2000:46 seems likely in view of the fact that PS

*šγr ’(to be) small’ is well attested in Ugaritic in its original form (DUL 780), although it remains unclear why Akk. š and š should have shifted to γ and s (š) in Ugaritic. The former correspondence could probably be explained by the speaker’s awareness of the etymological relationship between suhāru and sγr (an etymologically motivated contamination, as in Biblical Aramaic hālāk < Akkadian ilku). The latter can only be accounted for by some sort of phonetic difference between Akkadian š and Ugaritic s (affricate vs. non-affricate or glottalized vs. backed?).
S 121), šūmn ‘sesam’ < šamaššammû (DUL 847, CAD Š₁ 301), št ‘measure of capacity’ < sūtu (DUL 831, CAD S 420).

Is it possible to subsume under this group some of the terms from our list of exclusive Ugaritic-Akkadian lexical isoglosses? Hardly so. On the one hand, the relevant words are almost never connected with realia: most of the concepts involved, even if not very fundamental, are universally known and could have been easily expressed by native words. On the other hand, the majority of their attestations come from myths and epics, where all types of loanwords (and especially Akkadianisms) are empirically known to be rare.

As common sense nevertheless suggests, the probability of an Akkadian origin for some of the lexemes from our list is rather high. Here belong ’uṣr ‘field’ (No. 1), ’ušr ‘penis’ (No. 4), ḫwrt ‘word’ (No. 7), ḫpr ‘ration’ (No. 8), ḫhr ‘gang, caravan’ (No. 9), ḫṣ ‘sceptre, rod’ (No. 10), ḫkr ‘hero’ (No. 14), ḫnr ‘herald’ (No. 18), ḫmmrt ‘splendour’ (No. 19), phd ‘a yearling lamb’ (No. 21), s ’in ‘edge, hem’ (No. 22), tmn ‘foundation’ (No. 24), trbš ‘yard’ (No. 25), trṛ ṭ ‘to get married’ (No. 26). In some cases this attribution may look subjective, but more often the reasons behind it are quite transparent: a highly specific non-basic meaning (‘ration’, ‘caravan’, ‘sceptre’, ‘hero’, ‘herald’, ‘splendour’,

---

105 It may be not superfluous to list here a few other lexemes qualified as Akkadisms in DUL, but in fact more or less uncertain both philologically and etymologically: mm ‘winter’ < mammû (DUL 559), msg ‘skin, leather’ < mašku (DUL 581), rpš ‘open country’ — rapšu (DUL 744), škm ‘one who brays, donkey’ < šāgimu (DUL 815), šml ‘commercial agent’ < šamallû (DUL 825).

106 I am convinced that the allegedly broad presence of Hurrian, Hittite and Egyptian loanwords in epics and myths as reflected in the chart in Watson 1999:793 is largely due to uncritical selection. This is not to pretend that Akkadisms are altogether missing from epics and myths, but fully reliable examples (like šd < šiddu ‘a measure of length’, DUL 809, CAD Š₁ 403) are indeed extremely few.

107 Explicitly qualified as a cognate in Pardee 1997:289.

108 Apparently treated as a cognate in Goetz 1947:245.


110 An Akkadism according to Pardee 1988:115.

111 According to Moran 1983, “perhaps an old loanword from Akk. before the loss in the latter of the aleph, or perhaps both going back to a common source and the textile vocabulary of the third millennium B.C.?” The possibility of an Akkadian loanword in Ugaritic is emphatically rejected in Durand 2009:95.

112 According to Huehnergard (1987:176), “whether Ugar. ṭarbašul is native to the language, or a loan from Akk., cannot be determined” (cf. Kühne 1974:159). Huehnergard is right to observe that later ṭarbašu was indeed borrowed into Aramaic (Kaufman 1974:107).

113 Probably an Akkadism according to Goetz 1947:241-242.
‘foundation’, even ‘word’); a peculiar phonological (‘ušr, nmrt) or morphological (trbs) shape; a more or less feasible possibility of an eventual Sumerian origin (‘ugr ‘field’, ngr ‘herald’, tnn ‘foundation’).

Summing up: some Ugaritic lexemes look like Akkadianisms but, by their semantic and/or distributional properties, differ greatly from generally acknowledged,114 “normal” Akkadian loanwords. In my opinion, a plausible solution of this paradox is to be sought in the chronological dimension of the borrowing process. Within such an approach, those Akkadian loanwords which denote specific realia in economic and administrative contexts are to be treated as recent borrowings roughly contemporary with the documents in which they are attested. This chronological stratum is opposed to another, considerably more ancient layer of Akkadianisms to which most of the terms treated in the preceding paragraph can be attributed. An early date of borrowing can convincingly account for the broad attestation of the terms in question (notably, their presence in the most archaic monuments of Ugaritic literature) and, importantly, for their archaic phonological shape: evidently enough, such lexemes as hwt ‘word’, hpr ‘ration’ or s’in ‘hem’ could only be borrowed from very ancient, pre-OB varieties of Akkadian. That such early loanwords are indeed conceivable is clearly shown by hkl ‘palace’ (and its WS cognates), evidently borrowed from a third millennium proto-form *haykal rather than from the standard Akkadian ekallu.

No less interesting is the geographic dimension of the problem. In order to account for such deeply rooted lexical Akkadianisms, a notoriously close interaction between (proto-)Akkadian and (proto-)Ugaritic is to be assumed. Now, it may be doubted that “classical”, core Mesopotamian Akkadian — with all its cultural prestige — could be responsible for such a marked lexical influence. Could we rather attribute this influence wider East Semitic linguistic (notably, lexical) presence in Syria in early periods?
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