

generation of your generation' = 'You shall take your eternal kingship, your sovereignty that will continue from generation to generation') and when generated by context (e.g., in the administrative text RIH 78/02, where the genitive use of *d* is generated by the omission of *ksp* in the second phrase: *'šrm ksp ktnt w ḥmšt d pwt* / 'ašrāma kaspu kutunāti wa ḥamišatu dū puwwati / 'Twenty silver of garments and five of madder' = 'Twenty shekels' worth of *kutunu*-type garments and five shekels' worth of madder').

An example of disagreement: the identification of *mn* in RS 34.124:22 as a preposition can only be termed nonsensical, particularly in the author's own syntactic analysis of the clause. The clause *p mn likt ank lht* is parsed as follows: conjunction + preposition meaning "from" + noun meaning "letter" + pronoun + verb meaning "send"; the translation is ". . . I will send a short letter" (49). Note that the author does not propose that the preposition was compounded with the conjunction *p* and that the compound functioned as an expression of subordination ('after I send/because I sent . . .')—which would be superficially plausible because there is no lexical marker of transition to the next clause/sentence. To the contrary and as is expected, the clause in question is taken as the apodosis to the preceding clause, which is introduced by the conditional conjunction *im*. In any case, it appears safe to say that no serious Ugaritologist would today accept that *lik*t be taken as a noun and *lht* as a verb: the latter is simply the Ugaritic word corresponding to Hebrew *lāḥ*, 'tablet', and the former the 1c.s. suffix-conjugation form of the standard Ugaritic verb L'K, 'to send', hence 'I, yes I, have sent a tablet (= letter)'. Strangely enough, the author cites only this passage for the existence of the preposition *mn* in Ugaritic, making no allusion to the other cases that have been claimed over the years as containing this elusive preposition, but she has already asserted above that this preposition must be "common West Semitic" because "All West Semitic languages use the same preposition [i.e., *mn*] to express temporal/causal subordination" (p. 33). The supporting assertion is, in the light of present evidence, surely false, for the

preposition is entirely absent from Ugaritic (*mn* in the text just discussed must be an indefinite pronoun) and it is clearly marginal in Phoenician, where, with few exceptions, it functions as a compounding element with other prepositions (e.g., *l + mn*, 'from') and never independently as a subordinator at the clausal level. The presence of *min(u)* in third-millennium Eblaite, of which the exact linguistic classification is debated, leaves little doubt as to the antiquity of the preposition; its absence from Ugarit is all the more striking. It appears necessary to include a geographical component in outlining its history: it is first attested in central Syria, then, much later, in Aramaic and Hebrew, later still in the Arabian and Ethiopian languages. It is debatable whether it existed in Proto-Phoenician. In any case, the vectors of transmission are, for the most part, missing.

And an example of a strange rendering: Ugaritic *spr* is translated "book," both in the line devoted to linguistic analysis and in the final translation (p. 92). Because there were no books in the Late Bronze Age and the word refers to a relatively brief 'text' inscribed on a tablet, the use of the term is difficult to understand. Although the author clearly wishes to orient her discussion for linguists, some of whom might know little about the Semitic languages, all readers should at least have an historical outline of these languages in mind as well as an outline of the history of writing and of document production.

As is well known to all who have had the temerity to attempt synthetic work on grammar, whether of a single language, of a group of related languages, or of a grammatical theme that takes into account one or more languages, the moves from phonology to morphology to morpho-syntax to syntax, whether at the clause and sentence level or at the discourse level, involve increasing complexity simply because of the increasing number of variables. The author of the present work is to be congratulated, therefore, for the courage to take on three distinct syntactic themes within the Aramaic dialects as informed by Comparative Semitics and to have isolated the peculiar Aramaic contribution to the linguistic analysis of these themes.

The Ugaritic Texts and the Origins of West Semitic Literary Composition. By Dennis Pardee. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Pp. x + 149 + 5 plates. \$60 (cloth).

REVIEWED BY JUAN-PABLO VITA, CSIC-ILC, Madrid

This book is the outcome of the three Schweich Lectures on Biblical Archaeology given by the author at

the British Academy in 2007. The first chapter, "Alphabetic Origins," is subdivided into two main sec-

tions: “The Ugaritic Language and its Place among the Semitic Languages” and “Ugaritic Literature and its Place among the West Semitic Literatures.” In the first section, after a short history of the decipherment of Ugaritic, there is a general overview of the phonological inventory of that language and of the graphic inventory of its alphabet. There follows a discussion of the cuneiform shape and the origin of the signs of this alphabet (an adaptation of the linear script), and of its chronology (the author favors some time during the first half of the thirteenth century). Then the three types of cuneiform alphabet used (the ‘standard’ inventory of thirty signs, a ‘short’ alphabet, and yet another arranged in the order known from South Semitic) are briefly described. Next, the author focuses on a general description of Ugaritic, in order to show that it is distinct from any of the other principal West Semitic languages. The main characteristics of phonology, morphology and the lexicon as well as the classification of Ugaritic are discussed, with particular attention to its relationships with Akkadian, Canaanite and Amorite. This section also briefly introduces the scribe Ilimilku, who is discussed in more detail in chapter 2.

The second section explores the Amorite (Mari) roots of the Ugaritic literary texts, as well as the Eblaite connections of the Baal Myth. At various points, it also reconsiders the problem of the chronology of the Ugaritic script, emphasizing that the writing system must have been invented in the thirteenth century and that, as a result, Ugaritic must be a language documented over at least about six decades and at most about a century and a half. Information is provided on the number of texts found at Ugarit (approximately 2,000 in Ugaritic, 2,500 in Akkadian), on the many different areas of the use of Ugaritic and Akkadian in Ugarit, and on the training of the Ugaritian scribes (“It is clear that to become a scribe at Ugarit one had to go through a Mesopotamian curriculum,” p. 29). Alongside Ilimilku, who is more well-known (he put into writing the tablets of the Danel/Aqhat Legend, of the Kirta Epic and of the Baal Myth), Ṭab’īlu gradually emerges as one of the most important Ugaritian scribes.¹

¹ In addition to the bibliography on this scribe cited by Pardee, see now also P. Bordreuil, R. Hawley and D. Pardee, “Données nouvelles sur le déchiffrement de l’alphabet et sur les scribes d’Ougarit,” in P. Bordreuil et al., eds., *Les écritures mises au jour sur le site antique d’Ougarit (Syrie) et leur déchiffrement* (Paris, 2013), 319–32, esp. 322–30; D. Pardee, “Un chant nuptial ougaritique (RS 5.194 [CTA 24]). Nouvelle étude épigraphique suivie de remarques philologiques et littéraires,” *Semitica et Classica* 3 (2010): 13–46, and “RS 5.229: Restitution d’une nouvelle signature du

The chapter closes with general descriptions of the characteristics of literary Ugaritic, of the various cycles of literary texts (the Cycle of Baal, the Epic of Kirta, the Legend of Aqhat, as well as lesser literary texts) and with an introductory comparison of the broad literary categories attested in the Hebrew Bible with those known in Ugaritic (an aspect that will be the object of more detailed analysis in chapter 3). Throughout this chapter, several Ugaritic texts are set out and discussed: RS 15.039 (an administrative document), RS 94.2168 (a legal text), RS 29.093 (a letter), RS [Varia 14] (a legal text), as well as the letters from Mari A. 1968 and A. 1858.

In chapter 2, “Ugaritic Literary Composition,” the author has decided to focus on the scribe Ilimilku and the Baal Cycle. As it has reached us, this composition comprises six tablets edited by this scribe (CTA 1–6). The five colophons composed by Ilimilku are analyzed in detail, as are the prosopography of his name, the possible date of the scribe (Pardee prefers a date towards the end of the thirteenth century), the fact that no duplicates of these poems have been preserved, Ilimilku’s dual character as both scribe and oral poet, etc.

The chapter then focuses on “The Baal Cycle as a Work of Art.” After presenting the Ugaritic letter RS 34.124 as an example of epistolary rhetoric, it analyzes CTA 2:i:11’–41’ to show how the exchange of messages provided the structure of that literary work. Next, it considers the rhetorical function of parallelism in old Northwest Semitic poetry and the close relationship between letters and the descriptions of sending a message as given in narrative.

In the section “The Stories about *Ba’lu* as a ‘Cycle,’” the author discusses the important question of the possible sequence of the tablets narrating this story (CTA 1–6). His conclusions can be summarized as follows. In all likelihood, CTA 3 and 4 were sequential, based on data of a literary nature provided by the join connecting CTA 3 with 8 (identified by Pardee in 2006), and here the author transcribes and translates the relevant passages from CTA 3, 4 and 8. CTA 4 and 5 are sequential for literary reasons. CTA 5 and 6 are certainly sequential (the text is manifestly continuous from one tablet to the other). In this way, in respect

Scribe Ṭab’īlu,” in C. Roche-Hawley and R. Hawley, eds., *Scribes et érudits dans l’orbite de Babylone* (Paris, 2012), 31–49; R. Hawley, D. Pardee and C. Roche-Hawley, “À propos des textes akkadiens alphabétiques conservés au Musée d’Alep: notes épigraphiques,” in V. Matoian and M. Al-Maqdissi, eds., *Études ougaritiques III*, Ras Shamra – Ougarit XXI (Leuven, 2013), 395–401.

to tablets CTA 3–6, he concludes that “we are on very solid ground in claiming that these four tablets were intended by their author/scribe to represent a narrative sequence, (part of) a continuous story about Ba’lu, a ‘cycle’ in the traditional terminology” (p. 66). On the other hand, the status of CTA 1 and 2 is unclear because of the poor state of preservation of the two texts. Based on detailed comments on epigraphy and material, the author concludes that the traditional obverse–reverse orientation of both tablets (CTA 1 and 2) is to be inverted, “a shifting around of the data that cannot but have repercussions on interpretation.”

The chapter closes with a question concerning “The Meaning and Function of the Baal Cycle,” based on the fact that “there can be no doubt that these texts are ‘religious’ but it is equally certain that religion is politics. The importance of kingship and royal prerogatives in the myth can only, one might think, indicate that the myth had special meaning for human kings”² (p. 72). Quite correctly, he also includes in the discussion the stele known as *Baal au foudre* (“Ba’lu with a Thunderbolt”). Even so, the question of the possible function of these mythological texts in the daily life of ancient Ugarit must remain open: “the texts from Ugarit have provided no direct evidence on the cultic use of the poems recorded by ‘Ilmilku . . . Any firm decision on the precise use of these stories . . . must, therefore, await further evidence from Ras Shamra or from a yet undiscovered similar site” (p. 75). The section closes with comments concerning the importance of correctly tracing the family ties present in these stories.

The aim of chapter 3, “Literary Composition in the Hebrew Bible: The View from Ugarit,” is to “illustrate the similarities that exist between the data from Ugarit and the next principal literary corpus, that to be found in the Hebrew Bible”; the emphasis is “on their literary qualities” (p. 79). The chapter is divided

² On this important question see also, more recently, G. del Olmo Lete, “Littérature et pouvoir royal à Ougarit. Sens politique de la littérature d’Ougarit,” in *Études ougaritiques* II, ed. Valérie Matoïan, Michel Al-Maqdissi and Yves Calvet. Ras Shamra-Ougarit vol. XX (Paris, 2012), 241–50.

into two main parts, “Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry” and “Hebrew Poetry Contrasted with Ugaritic Poetry,” each in turn with several subsections. For the interested reader it may be useful to give here the list of texts in Ugaritic and from the Hebrew Bible that the author compares and comments on:

“Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetry”—*Poetic Structure*: CTA 2:iv:8–9, CTA 4:vi:16–35, CTA 14:i:7–25, CTA 23:1, CTA 24:1, RS 24.252, RIH 98/02 // Ps. 82, Ps. 92:10, Ps. 101:1, Ps. 104:33, Exod. 15:1, Judg. 5:3, Prov. 30:18–19. *Poetic Imagery*: CTA 2:iv:23’–27’, CTA 4:vii:31–44, 25–32, CTA 16:vi:32–34, CTA 17:v:4’–8’, RS 24.252:1–5; // Prov. 8:1–2, Amos 1:2, 2 Sam. 22:14–15, Ps. 29, Ps. 82.

“Hebrew Poetry Contrasted with Ugaritic Poetry”—*Prayer*: RS 24.266 // Ps. 142. *Wisdom Poetry*: CTA 17:i:25’–33’ // Proverbs 31:10–31. *Love Poetry*: CTA 14:iii:142–153 // Song 4:1–7, 5:1. *Lament Poetry*: CTA 5:vi:9’–25’, CTA 5:vi:30’–6:i:10, RS 25.460 // 2 Sam. 1:25–27, Lamentations 1:1, 1:4, 4:11, Ezek. 32:2–3, 16, Jeremiah 12:1, Ps. 28:3, Job 3:20–23. *Poetry in the Prophetic Books*: Isa. 5:1–7.

This work has been written by a renowned specialist in the various areas comprising Ugaritic studies. Furthermore, he is the editor (together with Pierre Bordreuil) of most of the Ugaritic texts found in recent decades. As a result, this book not only provides an up-to-date account of the topics discussed, but is also a valuable summary of Pardee’s own research in the field of Ugaritic literature. Undoubtedly, the result will be of great interest and usefulness to Ugaritologists and biblical scholars, but equally so to specialists in neighboring areas. The book also works perfectly at another level: as a general introduction to Ugarit, so that its potential readership is even wider.³ It only remains for us to congratulate the author for producing a work that is both erudite and accessible.

³ In this respect, in our opinion, this work by Pardee is a worthy complement to books such as those by Marguerite Yon, *The City of Ugarit at Tell Ras Shamra* (Winona Lake, IN, 2006), and by Izak Cornelius and Herbert Niehr, *Götter und Kulte in Ugarit. Kultur und Religion einer nordsyrischen Königsstadt in der Spätbronzezeit* (Mainz am Rhein, 2004).

Foreigners and Egyptians in the Late Egyptian Stories: Linguistic, Literary and Historical Perspectives. By Camilla Di Biase-Dyson. Probleme der Ägyptologie 32. Band. Leiden: Brill, 2013. Pp. xx + 488. \$233 (cloth). REVIEWED BY NIKOLAOS LAZARIDIS, *California State University, Sacramento*

Camilla Di Biase-Dyson, Junior Professor of Egyptology at the Georg-August Universität in Göttingen, has produced a thorough linguistic and literary

examination of the portrayal of Egyptian and foreign characters in a corpus of Late Egyptian narratives, consisting of the works *The Doomed Prince*, *The Quarrel*

Copyright 2001 by Mark Smith Published by Oxford University Press 198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016 Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of Oxford University Press. My thinking benefited from my reading of some of the Ugaritic texts treated in this book. Jack Miles has offered God: A Biography, an engaging "œliterary study" of God as a character over the course of the biblical books.6 Despite its purported purpose as a literary study, the book makes many historical assumptions. Preview " The Ugaritic Texts and the Origins of West-Semitic Literary Composition by Dennis Pardee. The Ugaritic Texts and the Origins of West-Semitic Literary Composition. by. Dennis Pardee. really liked it 4.00 Rating details. 4 ratings 1 review. The discovery and decryption of Ugaritic cuneiform tablets in the 1920s has given scholars an insight into the development of alphabetic writing and the origins of biblical poetry. In this book, based on his Schweich Lectures given in 2007, Professor Dennis Pardee describes the origins of the cuneiform alphabetic writing system developed in Ugarit some time before 1250 BC, the use of alphabetic writing at Ugarit, and gives a comparison of Ugaritic and Hebrew literatures ...more. Download Citation | The Ugaritic Texts and the Origins of West-Semitic Literary Composition | The discovery and decryption of Ugaritic cuneiform tablets in the 1920s has given scholars an insight into the development of alphabetic writing | Find, read and cite all the research you need on ResearchGate. This book, based on the author's Schweich Lectures given in 2007, describes the origins of the cuneiform alphabetic writing system developed in Ugarit some time before 1250 bc, and the use of alphabetic writing at Ugarit, and gives a comparison of Ugaritic and Hebrew literatures. Discover the world's research.