HAL open science

Studies in Ugaritic Epistolography

Robert Hawley

To cite this version:

Robert Hawley. Studies in Ugaritic Epistolography. Humanities and Social Sciences. University of Chicago, 2003. English. NNT : . tel-00434324

HAL Id: tel-00434324

https://theses.hal.science/tel-00434324v1

Submitted on 22 Nov 2009

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

STUDIES IN UGARITIC EPISTOLOGRAPHY

VOLUME ONE

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF NEAR EASTERN LANGUAGES AND CIVILIZATIONS

BY

ROBERT HAWLEY

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JUNE 2003

UMI Number: 3088741

UMI®

UMI Microform 3088741

Copyright 2003 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against

unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Copyright © 2003 by Robert Hawley

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE

ABSTRACT ..... **xvi**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **xviii**

INTRODUCTION **1**

0.1 WHY AND HOW? 1

0.1.1 The interest of epistolary texts *1*

0.1.1.1 General 1

0.1.1.2 A new treatment of Ugaritic epistolography 5

0.1.2 Method *7*

0.1.2.1 Appropriate to the task 7

0.1.2.2 Form and Content 8

0.1.2.3 The interest of this study 10

0.2 DEFINITION OF THE CORPUS 13

0.2.1 Elaboration of a definition *14*

0.2.1.1 Ugaritic terminology for written correspondence 14

0.2.1.2 Functional and formal definitions 17

0.2.1.3 Summary 18

0.2.2 Application *19*

0.2.3 Results *24*

0.3 MACROSTRUCTURE 25

0.3.1 The importance of macrostructure *25*

0.3.2 Previous studies *27*

0.3.3 Horizontal scribal lines *29*

0.3.3.1 Diagnostic of macrostructure 29

0.3.3.2 Implications of the use of scribal lines 34

0.3.4 Tripartite macrostructure as contextually normative *36*

0.4 TYPOLOGICAL PRIORITIES 39

0.4.1 The importance of the address and polite formulas *39*
0.4.2 The praescriptio *41*
0.5 FORMAL PATTERNS AND CONTEXTUAL INTERPRETATION 42
0.6 TERMS OF SOCIAL RELATION 49
0.6.1 REL phrases in the address *49*
0.6.2 Two Conceptual Models *51*
0.6.3 Conceptual Status *54*
0.6.3.1 Necessary theoretical categories: ASC, HOR, and DESC 54
0.6.3.2 Practical categories: UNMARKED, UNKNOWN, and MIXED 57
0.6.4 The inventory and distribution of conceptual categories *60*
0.6.5 The interest of classification on the basis of REL terminology *62*
0.7 FORMAT 63

CHAPTER 1: THE DOUBLE FORMULA OF ADDRESS 67

1.1 INTRODUCTION 67
1.2 COMPOSITION 68
1.2.1 Macro-composition *68*
1.2.2 Micro-composition of the « S » component *70*
1.2.3 Micro-composition of the « R » component *75*
1.2.4 Inventory of compositional patterns for the address *82*
1.2.5 Interpretation of the main compositional patterns *86*
1.2.5.1 ASC letters and the pattern « l ID REL rgm tḥm ID REL » 87
1.2.5.2 UNMARKED letters and the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* » 88
1.2.5.3 HOR letters and the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* » 91
1.2.6 Order of mention in the address: « RS » versus « SR » *93*
1.3 DISTRIBUTION OF THE ADDRESS FORMULA 98
1.4 COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE FOR THE ADDRESS FORMULA 100
1.4.1 Comparative evidence from Akkadian and Hittite letters *100*
1.4.1.1 General 100
1.4.1.2 {um-ma} in logo-syllabic texts and Ugaritic *tḥm* 101
1.4.2 By Corpus *103*
1.4.2.1 Ras Shamra Akkadian letters 103

1.4.2.1.1 asc letters 105
1.4.2.1.2 unmarked letters 107
1.4.2.1.3 hor letters 109
1.4.2.1.4 Other conceptual categories and patterns 110
1.4.2.1.5 Summary: the address in RS Akkadian letters 111
1.4.2.2 Akkadian letters from Tell Meskene 112
1.4.2.3 Akkadian and Hittite letters from the Hittite Realm 115
1.4.2.3.1 Hittite letters from Maşat-Höyük 116
1.4.2.3.2 Hittite letters from Boğazköy 120
1.4.2.3.3 Akkadian letters from Boğazköy 122
1.4.2.4 Akkadian letters from Tell el-Amarna 126
1.4.2.4.1 asc letters in the Amarna corpus 128
1.4.2.4.1.1 ASC letters and « ana ID REL qibī-ma umma ID REL » 129
1.4.2.4.1.2 ASC letters and « ana ID REL umma ID REL » 132
1.4.2.4.1.3 Other « RS » address formulas among the ASC letters 133
1.4.2.4.1.4 « SR » address formulas among the ASC letters 134
1.4.2.4.1.5 Summary: the address in ASC letters from Amarna 135
1.4.2.4.2 unmarked letters in the Amarna corpus 137
1.4.2.4.3 Horizontal letters in the Amarna corpus 139
1.4.2.4.4 Other conceptual categories 141
1.4.2.5 Address formulas in other epistolary traditions 142
1.4.2.5.1 Letters from Tell Atchana (Alalaḫ) 143
1.4.2.5.2 Miscellaneous Late Bronze epistolary finds at Levantine sites 145
1.4.2.5.3 Late Bronze Age letters from Mesopotamian sites 147
1.4.2.5.3.1 Yorgan Tepe (Nuzi) 148
1.4.2.5.3.2 Nippur and the Kassite Babylonian Tradition 149
1.4.2.5.3.3 The Middle Assyrian Tradition 151
1.4.2.5.4 Comparative evidence anterior to the Late Bronze Age 153
1.4.3 Comparative evidence from the Ugaritic literary texts 154
1.4.3.1 The order « RS » in the literary texts 157
1.4.3.2 The literary « R » motif 158
1.4.3.3 The literary « S » motif 162
1.5 *SITZ-IM-LEBEN* OF THE ADDRESS FORMULA 165

1.5.1 Geographical and chronological background *166*
1.5.2 Situational context *171*
1.5.2.1 The situational context of the « S » component 171
1.5.2.2 The situational context of the « R » component 178
1.5.2.3 The address formula in its epistolary usage 182
1.6 GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS 183
1.6.1 Preliminaries *183*
1.6.1.1 The syntactic independence of « S » and « R » 183
1.6.1.2 One "double formula" or two independent formulas? 187
1.6.2 The grammatical analysis of the « S » component *188*
1.6.3 The grammatical analysis of the « R » component *197*
1.7 TYPOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION OF THE UGARITIC ADDRESS FORMULAS 204
1.7.1 "Standard" patterns *204*
1.7.1.1 « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL » 205
1.7.1.2 « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* » 207
1.7.1.3 « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* » 209
1.7.1.4 Other "standard" address formulas 210
1.7.2 "Non-standard" patterns *212*
1.7.2.1 "Non-standard" addresses in which « S » = « N_S » 213
1.7.2.2 "Non-standard" addresses in which « S » contains *tḥm* 214
1.7.2.3 "Non-standard" addresses in which « S » is absent 217

VOLUME TWO

CHAPTER 2: THE PROSTRATION FORMULA 219

2.1 INTRODUCTION 219
2.1.1 The "polite formulas" in general *219*
2.1.2 The "prostration formula" as a polite formula *221*
2.2 COMPOSITION 223
2.3 DISTRIBUTION OF THE « PROS » FORMULA 230
2.4 COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE FOR THE UGARITIC « PROS » FORMULA 237
2.4.1 Akkadian and Hittite « pros » formulas of similar composition *237*
2.4.2 Comparative evidence drawn from the Ugaritic literary texts *270*

2.4.3 Miscellaneous comparative evidence *281*
2.4.3.1 The « pros » idiom outside of the epistolary formulary 281
2.4.3.2 Miscellaneous prostration motifs of dissimilar composition 286
2.4.3.2.1 Epistolary « pros » formulas of dissimilar composition 287
2.4.3.2.2 Non-formulaic prostration motifs of dissimilar composition 289
2.4.3.2.3 Extra-Ugaritic literary evidence for the « pros » formula 291
2.4.3.3 Iconographic evidence for the « pros » formula 293
2.5 THE *SITZ-IM-LEBEN* OF THE PROSTRATION FORMULA 294
2.5.1 Geographical, chronological, and literary background *295*
2.5.2 The Situational Context *299*
2.5.2.1 The Prostration Formula and Ascending Social Situations 300
2.5.2.2 The Agent of Prostration 308
2.5.2.3 The Act of Prostration 311
2.5.2.4 The Moment of Prostration 314
2.5.2.5 The Contextual Burden of the Prostration Formula 316
2.6 GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS OF THE COMPONENTS 318
2.6.1 The verbs qlt *and* qlny *319*
2.6.1.1 General 319
2.6.1.2 The usage of the suffix conjugation in the « pros » formula 322
2.6.2 The semantics of the preposition l *in « l pʿn N_R + Q(Y)L »* *331*
2.6.3 The common noun pʿn *332*
2.6.4 The word mrḥqtm *332*
2.6.5 The multiplicative phrases *338*
2.6.5.1 The numerical components šbʿd, ṯnid, šbʿid, and ṯmnid 338
2.6.5.2 "How many times?" 344
2.6.6 The word hllm *352*
2.7 CLASSIFICATION OF THE « PROS » FORMULAS BY CONCEPTUAL CATEGORY 356
2.7.1 In conceptually ASCENDING letters *357*
2.7.1.1 « ASC POW » 357
2.7.1.2 « ASC BIO » 358
2.7.1.3 « ASC MIXED » 359
2.7.2 In « HOR BIO » letters *359*
2.7.3 In letters of unknown conceptual classification *360*

CHAPTER 3: THE SALUTATION FORMULA **361**

3.1 INTRODUCTION 361

3.2 COMPOSITION OF THE « SAL » FORMULA 367

3.3 DISTRIBUTION OF THE SALUTATION 374

3.4 COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE FOR THE SALUTATION 385

3.4.1 Epistolary comparative material *385*

3.4.1.1 The syllabic « sal » formulas from Ras Shamra 388

3.4.1.1.1 Composition 389

3.4.1.1.2 Distribution 396

3.4.1.2 Salutation formulas in the Amarna corpus 403

3.4.1.2.1 Composition 404

3.4.1.2.2 Distribution 412

3.4.1.3 Salutation formulas from Boğazköy and Maşat Höyük 416

3.4.1.3.1 Composition 418

3.4.1.3.1.1 Compositional similarities 420

3.4.1.3.1.2 Compositional differences 424

3.4.1.3.2 Distribution 428

3.4.1.4 Salutation formulas from Tell Meskene 431

3.4.1.5 Tel Aphek 436

3.4.1.6 Tell Atchana 437

3.4.1.7 Salutation formulas in the Middle Assyrian tradition 439

3.4.1.8 The salutation in letters from Kassite Babylonia 441

3.4.1.9 Salutation formulas in the Old Babylonian traditions 442

3.4.2 Extra-epistolary Ugaritic comparative evidence *444*

3.4.2.1 The syntagm « *šlm* + noun phrase(s) » 444

3.4.2.1.1 « *Šlm* + noun phrase(s) » in *KTU*[2] 1.23 and RS 34.126 446

3.4.2.1.2 The *Šlm*-motifs in the god-list RS 24.271 455

3.4.2.2 The salutary motif in the *Baʿlu Cycle* of myths 460

3.5 *SITZ-IM-LEBEN* OF THE SALUTATION 463

3.5.1 Geographical, chronological, and literary background *463*

3.5.2 The situational context of the salutation *466*

3.5.2.1 The salutation in its social setting....466
3.5.2.2 The salutation as a speech act: "speaker" and "agent"....470
3.5.2.2.1 The "speaker" of the salutation....471
3.5.2.2.2 The "agent" of ŠLM in the salutation....471
3.5.2.2.3 The salutation and the *Šulmānu*-gift in Akkadian letters?....474
3.5.2.2.4 The contextual "burden" or purpose of the salutation....477
3.5.2.3 The contextual "moment" of the salutation....477
3.6 GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SALUTATION....479
3.6.1 The semantics of the « sal » formula....479
3.6.2 Syntax: "surface" and "deep" structure of the idiom yšlm +1 N_R....*482*
3.6.3 The phonemic reconstruction of the « sal » formula....484
3.7 TYPOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION OF THE UGARITIC « SAL » FORMULAS....493
3.7.1 "Standard" patterns....494
3.7.1.1 « *yšlm lk* » or « *yšlm lkm* »....494
3.7.1.2 « *ly* REL *yšlm* », « *l* REL *yšlm* », or « *ln* REL *yšlm* »....496
3.7.1.3 Other compositionally "standard" « sal » formulas....498
3.7.2 "Non-standard" « sal » formulas....500
3.7.2.1 Salutations in which the grammatical subject of *yšlm* is expressed....500
3.7.2.2 Forms of ŠLM other than « *yšlm* »....502
3.7.2.2.1 « *p šlm l* N_R »....502
3.7.2.2.2 « (*p*) *šlm* NP *l šlmt* » and « (*p*) *šlm* NP *p šlmt* »....503
3.7.2.3 « *ḫytn* » in a salutation formula?....507

VOLUME THREE

CHAPTER 4: THE DIVINE BENEDICTION....510

4.1 INTRODUCTION....510
4.2 THE COMPOSITION OF THE "STANDARD" BENEDICTION....512
4.2.1 The "necessary" components of the benediction....512
4.2.2 The "optional" components of the benediction....517
4.2.3 Survey of the attested compositional patterns....520
4.2.4 Reference to the recipient in the benediction....521
4.3 DISTRIBUTION OF THE BENEDICTION FORMULA....522

4.3.1 The benediction in conceptually UNMARKED letters *523*
4.3.2 Distribution according to conceptual status *524*
4.3.3 Distribution according to conceptual model *526*
4.3.4 The placement of the benediction among the "polite formulas" *529*
4.4 COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE FOR THE BENEDICTION 531
4.4.1 The « ben » formula in other epistolary traditions *532*
4.4.1.1 Ras Shamra Akkadian letters 533
4.4.1.1.1 Distribution 535
4.4.1.1.2 Composition 540
4.4.1.1.2.1 Necessary components 541
4.4.1.1.2.1.1 The noun phrase referring to "the gods" 542
4.4.1.1.2.1.2 The naṣāru verbal form 545
4.4.1.1.2.2 Optional components 547
4.4.1.1.2.2.1 The prepositional phrase ana šulmāni 548
4.4.1.1.2.2.2 The šullumu verbal form 550
4.4.1.1.2.2.3 Temporal adverbial phrases 552
4.4.1.1.2.2.4 "Optional" components with no Ugaritic equivalents 553
4.4.1.1.2.3 Attested compositional patterns 556
4.4.1.2 Akkadian letters from Tell Meskene 563
4.4.1.3 Benedictions in the Amarna corpus 565
4.4.1.4 The « ben » formula in letters from Anatolian sites 573
4.4.1.4.1 In the Boğazköy Akkadian letters 575
4.4.1.4.2 In the Hittite letters from Boğazköy and Maşat-Höyük 578
4.4.1.4.2.1 Composition: necessary components 578
4.4.1.4.2.1.1 "The Gods" element 579
4.4.1.4.2.1.2 Two verbal idioms 580
4.4.1.4.2.1.2.1 The verbal idiom « paḫšandaru » 580
4.4.1.4.2.1.2.2 The verbal idiom « TI-an ḫarkandu » 582
4.4.1.4.2.1.3 Reference to the recipient 583
4.4.1.4.2.2 Optional compositional elements 585
4.4.1.4.2.3 Two main predications 587
4.4.1.4.2.4 Distribution of Compositional Patterns 588
4.4.1.4.2.5 Distribution of the « ben » formula 589

4.4.1.5 Miscellaneous Syrian Corpora....593
4.4.1.5.1 Comparable to the standard Ugaritic « ben »....593
4.4.1.5.2 Not comparable to the standard Ugaritic « ben »....597
4.4.1.6 Middle Assyrian Epistolary Tradition....598
4.4.1.7 Middle Babylonian (Kassite) Letters....598
4.4.1.8 Old Babylonian Traditions....600
4.4.2 Non-epistolary comparative evidence for the « ben »....601
4.4.2.1 Functional parallels, mostly Ugaritic....601
4.4.2.1.1 Wishing and telling: *KTU*^{2} 1.15 II 19 and RS 24.266:34'-36'....602
4.4.2.1.2 Gods and men: *KTU*^{2} 1.15 II 21-23 and *KTU*^{2} 1.19 II 17-18....604
4.4.2.1.3 Blessing and cursing: *KTU*^{2} 1.19 III 30-32 and IV 5-6....607
4.4.2.1.4 Blessings and prayers: *KTU*^{2} 1.15 II 13 and other passages....610
4.4.2.1.5 Speaker: *KTU*^{2} 1.15 II 21-23 and other passages....615
4.4.2.2 Formal and functional parallels in Ugaritic....616
4.4.2.3 Akkadian and Hittite parallels....620
4.4.2.3.1 The « Bénédictions sur le roi » as known at Emar and Ugarit....621
4.4.2.3.2 A benediction in the *Gilgamesh Epic*....624
4.4.2.3.3 Some benedictions from the Hittite treaty tradition....626
4.5 *SITZ-IM-LEBEN* OF THE BENEDICTION FORMULA....628
4.5.1 Origins....629
4.5.1.1 Literary Background....630
4.5.1.2 Geographical and chronological background....631
4.5.2 The situational context of the « ben » formula....635
4.5.2.1 The « ben » in its social setting....635
4.5.2.2 The « ben » as a speech act: speaker, beneficiary, and agent....638
4.5.2.3 The contextual "burden" or purpose of the benediction....639
4.6 GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS OF THE BENEDICTION....642
4.6.1 Orthography: grammatical implications of the writing ìly ůgrt....*644*
4.6.2 Two morphological issues....650
4.6.2.1 The scope of *taqtulū*(*na*) for the 3rd m pl....650
4.6.2.2 *tšlmk*: D-stem or Š-stem?....652
4.6.3 Three syntactic questions....654
4.6.3.1 "Anticipatory gapping" in *ìlm tǵr tšlmk* and *ìlm tšlm tǵrkm*....654

4.6.3.2 The scope of the adverbial phrase *l šlm* 656
4.6.3.3 The « S V » order of syntactic components 658
4.6.4 The etymology of tǵrk *and related forms*....660
4.7 TYPOLOGY OF THE UGARITIC BENEDICTION FORMULAS 661
4.7.1 Compositionally standard formulas....661
4.7.1.1 Unexpanded benedictions 661
4.7.1.1.1 « *ìlm tǵrk tšlmk* » 662
4.7.1.1.2 Variant of *ìlm* element, otherwise standard....664
4.7.1.1.3 « *ìlm tšlmk tǵrk* » 664
4.7.1.2 Expanded benedictions....664
4.7.1.2.1 Additional adverbial element *l šlm*, otherwise standard....665
4.7.1.2.2 Additional predication, otherwise standard....665
4.7.1.2.3 Additional predications and adverbial phrases 665
4.7.2 Compositionally non-standard « ben » formulas 665
4.7.2.1 The « ben » formula in RS 17.117 665
4.7.2.2 The « ben » formulas in RS 16.078+ and RS 18.113+....667

VOLUME FOUR

CHAPTER 5: FORMULAIC ASPECTS OF THE BODY 669

5.1 MACRO-STRUCTURE 670
5.1.1 The "message" as the primary macro-structural unit....670
5.1.2 The analysis of messages in terms of function and form 672
5.1.3 A typology of messages in terms of pragmatic function....673
5.1.4 Survey of the five speech act categories, with Ugaritic examples....678
5.1.4.1 « Directives »....678
5.1.4.2 « Assertives »....680
5.1.4.3 « Commissives »....683
5.1.4.4 « Expressives »....685
5.1.4.5 « Performatives » 687
5.1.5 One pragmatic function per message?....689
5.2 MICRO-STRUCTURE: INTRODUCTION 692
5.2.1 The pervasiveness of the formal structure « topic : comment » 693

5.2.1.1 « Topic : comment » on the sentence level 694
5.2.1.2 « Topic : comment » on the level of two sentences 695
5.2.1.3 « Topic : comment » on the level of multiple sentence messages 696
5.2.1.4 Stereotyped features within the pattern « topic : comment » 698
5.2.2 Inventory of « topic », « comment », and « conj » motifs 699
5.2.2.1 « Topic » elements 700
5.2.2.1.1 The function of « topic » elements 700
5.2.2.1.2 The form of « topic » elements 701
5.2.2.1.3 The distribution of « topic » elements 701
5.2.2.1.4 Toward a formal typology of « topic » elements 702
5.2.2.1.4.1 Noun phrases 703
5.2.2.1.4.1.1 Function 703
5.2.2.1.4.1.2 Form 703
5.2.2.1.4.2 Prepositional phrases 706
5.2.2.1.4.2.1 Function 707
5.2.2.1.4.2.2 Form 708
5.2.2.1.4.2.2.1 « *ʿm* NOUN PHRASE » 708
5.2.2.1.4.2.2.2 « *l* NOUN PHRASE » 709
5.2.2.1.4.2.2.3 « *b* NOUN PHRASE » 710
5.2.2.1.4.3 Adverbial particles 711
5.2.2.1.4.3.1 Function 711
5.2.2.1.4.3.2 Form 711
5.2.2.1.4.3.2.1 *hln*(*y*) and *hnn*(*y*) in the reciprocal well-being motif 712
5.2.2.1.4.3.2.2 *ṯmn*(*y*) in the reciprocal well-being motif 714
5.2.2.1.4.3.2.3 Proximal adverbs outside the reciprocal well-being motif 714
5.2.2.1.4.3.2.4 Distal adverbs outside the reciprocal well-being motif 715
5.2.2.1.4.4 Verbal clauses 716
5.2.2.1.4.4.1 Function 716
5.2.2.1.4.4.2 Form 717
5.2.2.1.4.4.2.1 Relative pronouns 718
5.2.2.1.4.4.2.2 Conditional clauses marked by *hm* and *ỉm* 718
5.2.2.1.4.4.2.3 The *k*- series of subordinating conjunctions 720
5.2.2.1.4.4.2.4 Unmarked subordinate verbal clauses 725

5.2.2.2 « Comment » elements 725
5.2.2.2.1 The function of « comment » elements 726
5.2.2.2.2 Formal patterns in « comment » elements 727
5.2.2.2.3 The distribution of « comment » elements 727
5.2.2.2.4 A provisional typology of the « comment » elements 731
5.2.2.2.4.1 Imperatives 731
5.2.2.2.4.1.1 Function 731
5.2.2.2.4.1.2 Form 732
5.2.2.2.4.2 Suffix conjugation 732
5.2.2.2.4.2.1 Function 732
5.2.2.2.4.2.2 Form 733
5.2.2.2.4.3 Prefix conjugation 735
5.2.2.2.4.3.1 Function 735
5.2.2.2.4.3.2 Form 736
5.2.2.2.4.4 Predications not containing finite verbal forms 739
5.2.2.2.4.4.1 Function 739
5.2.2.2.4.4.2 Form 740
5.2.2.2.4.4.2.1 Predicators of existence and non-existence 740
5.2.2.2.4.4.2.2 Predicate adjectives 742
5.2.2.2.4.4.2.3 Predicate nouns 742
5.2.2.2.4.4.2.4 Prepositional phrases as predicates 743
5.2.2.3 Conjunctive elements 744
5.2.2.3.1 Function 744
5.2.2.3.2 Form 744
5.2.2.3.3 Distribution of conjunctive and presentational elements 745
5.2.2.3.4 Preliminary typology 746
5.2.2.3.4.1 w 746
5.2.2.3.4.2 p 747
5.2.2.3.4.3 àp 750
5.2.2.3.4.4 ht 751
5.2.2.3.4.5 hn 754
5.2.2.3.4.6 Other particles 756
5.3 THE MOTIF OF RECIPROCAL WELL-BEING 758

5.3.1 Introduction *758*
5.3.2 Composition *762*
5.3.2.1 Composition of the « S.R. » 763
5.3.2.2 Composition of the « I.R. » 767
5.3.3 Distribution *769*
5.3.4 Comparative evidence *773*
5.3.5 Sitz-im-Leben *778*
5.3.5.1 Geographical, chronological and literary background 778
5.3.5.2 Situational context and speech acts 779
5.3.6 Grammatical issues *781*
5.3.7 Catalog of the formulaic well-being motifs *782*
5.3.7.1 « S.R. I.R. », the standard motif of reciprocal well-being 783
5.3.7.2 « S.R. » alone 785
5.3.7.3 « I.R. » alone 785
5.3.7.4 Imperfectly preserved 785
5.3.7.5 Possible "non-standard" situation reports 786

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS 787

6.1 EPISTOLARY FORMULAS 788
6.1.1 Standard and non-standard traditions *788*
6.1.2 The standard Ugaritic epistolary tradition *788*
6.1.3 An appreciation of the Ugaritic tradition *789*
6.1.3.1 The independence of the Ugaritic tradition 789
6.1.3.2 Comparative parallels 791
6.1.3.2.1 Sibling traditions in letters from Ras Shamra and Meskene 791
6.1.3.2.2 Cousin traditions from Hittite Anatolia and the southern Levant 792
6.1.3.2.3 Distant kin in Mesopotamia: a shared Amorite heritage 793
6.2 STEREOTYPED MOTIFS OF THE BODY 794

BIBLIOGRAPHY 796

ABSTRACT

The tell of Ras Shamra on the Mediterranean coast of Syria has yielded thousands of cuneiform tablets which shed light on the scribal traditions of ancient Ugarit, a city-state which flourished during the latter part of the Late Bronze Age. This dissertation treats one aspect of the local scribal practice, the letter-writing tradition in the Ugaritic language. The studies presented here contain a description and analysis of the formal characteristics of all currently known Ugaritic letters, not only stereotyped formulas, but also patterned motifs found in the body. Chapters 1-4 treat the major epistolary formulas, building on previous research by incorporating data from unpublished letters, by approaching the formal analysis from the wider perspective of cuneiform letter-writing in Late Bronze West Asia, and by consistently attempting to understand the patterns of formal variation in terms of social vocabulary drawn from the letters themselves. Chapter 5 is a preliminary study of the structural patterns in the body of Ugaritic letters. A dual emphasis on form and function is attempted; the provisional conclusions are intended to complement a more traditional philological approach in the ongoing interpretation of Ugaritic epistolary prose.

On a broader level, the Ugaritic letter-writing tradition shows striking formal kinship with the Akkadian and Hittite epistolary traditions of the "Western periphery"; formal similarities with contemporary Mesopotamian traditions are much less pronounced. These parallels suggest that the Ugaritic epistolary tradition was a local manifestation of a common "Amorite" heritage which persisted among the scribal cultures of Hittite Syria.

In its contemporary context, however, the Ugaritic tradition should ultimately be considered as independent, since none of the contemporary or anterior traditions is fully parallel. It was a local scribal culture, unique in many respects, and not demonstrably derivative of the traditions of neighboring cultures.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish first of all to thank my advisor, D. Pardee, who suggested the topic of this dissertation and tirelessly followed its progress over the last five years. He has been a model of critical method, scholarly integrity, and generosity throughout my time at Chicago, and it is no doubt his influence that is most evident in my academic work.

I also wish to thank H. A. Hoffner, Jr., and D. Schloen for serving on my dissertation committee. They gave liberally of their time and knowledge; their corrections and comments have proven invaluable.

Many other teachers who have taught me much deserve mention here as well. In particular, my gratitude goes to J. A. Brinkman, J. J. Collins, S. Creason, N. Golb, R. S. Hanson, and M. Wise.

I thank the Dolores Zohrab Leibmann Fund, and the Century and Robert Brandt Cross Scholarships from the University of Chicago, without which my graduate studies would not have been possible.

I gratefully acknowledge the hospitality extended to me over the course of the last three years by the members of the Laboratoire d'études sémitiques anciennes (CNRS, Collège de France, and Université de Paris IV) in Paris, France; and in particular by Professor J. Teixidor, C. Robin, P. Bordreuil, F. Briquel-Chatonnet, C. Fauvaud, and A. Sérandour. I was given liberal access to the library and regularly included in the team's activities.

My thanks also go to the Institut Catholique de Paris, where I made extensive use of the fine BOSEB library and where I took several classes and seminars in the

ELCOA department. For this hospitality, P. Bordreuil, F. Malban-Labat, R. Lebrun, and the library staff have my gratitude.

I am pleased to thank the Franco-Syrian Archeological Mission to Ras Shamra, and especially its directors, M. Yon, Y. Calvet, and B. Jammous, for permitting me to use unpublished texts, and for including me on several epigraphic projects, both in Paris and in Damascus. The members of the Mission have been very hospitable, and I am grateful for their encouragement and support.

C. Chanut, F. Malbran-Labat, E. Masson, and J.-P. Vita read and commented on portions of this dissertation. I greatly appreciate their time and expertise.

Finally, my family and friends in the U.S. and in France, and especially Carole, have constantly supported my rather unusual career choice. To them goes my heartfelt thanks.

INTRODUCTION

0.1 WHY AND HOW?

0.1.1 The interest of epistolary texts

0.1.1.1 General

> "Since the Messenger's mouth was too slow, and he could not repeat [the message], the Lord of Kullab patted some clay and set down the words as on a tablet. Before that day, there was no putting of words on clay; but now, when the Sun rose, it was verily so: the Lord of Kullab had verily put words on clay!"[1]

If a justification for a study dedicated to epistolography were needed, this celebrated passage from Sumerian literature would supply a point of view drawn from an intellectual tradition native to ancient West Asia: according to this text, writing itself was invented for the explicit purpose of permitting communication of an epistolary nature.[2]

---

[1]The passage is from *Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta*; translation of H. Vanstiphout, *CANE* 4 (1995) 2185. The *editio princeps* is S. Kramer, *Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta* (1952); see also S. Cohen, *Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta* (1973). A recent integral translation is provided by T. Jacobsen in *Context* 1 (1997) 547-550; general introductions to the text may be found in B. Alster, *CANE* 4 (1995) 2316, 2320-2321; and W. W. Hallo, *Origins* (1996) 32-33.

[2]Compare Jacobsen, *Context* 1 (1997) 547, "… when his message was too long for his envoy's memory, Emerkar invented the letter for his envoy to take with him to Aratta." See also G. Komoróczy, *AoF* 3 (1975) 19-24; H. Vanstiphout, *Visible Religion* 6 (1988) 159; *idem*, *Studies Sjöberg* (1989) 515-524; and the discussion in P. Michalowski, *Letters from Early Mesopotamia* (1993) 1-3.

Whatever the historical worth of that tradition,[3] the importance of the letter in the history of literature in the cuneiform world is also evident from an external, empirical point of view. In statistical terms, the proportion of epistolary texts with respect to other genres among the various corpora is considerable. Certainly also at Ras Shamra, the site of the ancient city of Ugarit and the field of study in which my own area of expertise lies, tablet finds of an epistolary genre make up, both in terms of sheer number of tablets and in terms of textual volume, one of the most important literary categories.[4]

---

[3]As Michalowski remarked (*ibid.*, 2), "The relatively late appearance of letters is paradoxical. If the purpose of writing is to bridge the communicative distance and supplement human memory, then the letter would seem to be the ideal form of this new technology, and yet this genre comes relatively late in the development of written forms of expression." An interesting survey of the history of speculation into the origins of writing is given in D. Schmandt-Besserat, *Before Writing* 1 (1992) 1-13. For a critique of Schmandt-Besserat's own theory, see P. Zimansky, *Journal of Field Archaeology* 20 (1993) 513-517.

[4]In the Ugaritic corpus, the epistolary genre is now represented by over one hundred examples (see below, section 0.2.3), which makes it one of the better attested literary genres in terms of number of tablets (the corpus of administrative lists, numbering just under a thousand tablets, is perhaps the only genre better attested than the epistolary in purely numerical terms). In terms of amount of preserved text, judged by number of (fully or partially) preserved words or signs, the epistolary corpus (approximately 4,500 words / 16,000 signs) is inferior not only to the administrative genre (approx. 20,000 words / 75,000 signs), but also the corpus of narrative poetic texts (that is, the myths and epics: approx. 14,000 words / 50,000 signs), and the corpus of texts treating ritual matters (approx. 8,500 words / 29,000 signs). The numbers just given are, of course, approximate; they are derived from manipulation of the data found in J.-L. Cunchillos *et al.*, *GSRC-BDFSN* (1996) and in computer files prepared by D. Pardee which he made available to me (mistakes or misrepresentations of either body of data being, of course, my own). There is, however, another reason for caution in using these figures: the criteria for defining some of these genres remain extremely flexible, often combining formal, functional, and/or thematic considerations, making in turn the discrete existence of the genre so-defined a very tenuous matter. It is the ritual genre in particular, among the genres cited above, that is most vulnerable to this problem, as D. Pardee recognized in his recent re-edition, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 7-8.

The Akkadian corpus, prior to the fortuitous 1994 season, contained at least 150 letters, the entire corpus numbering, perhaps, approximately 1,800 tablets and fragments. For the number of letters, see the information assembled in J.-L. Cunchillos, *TEO* 2 (1989) 29-41; for the total number of Akkadian tablets, a quick count of the documents bearing Akkadian text cited in P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, *TEO* 1 (1989) 418-422, yields 1,797 items. The several hundred Akkadian letters recovered from recent excavations in the "House of Urtenu", and especially the 1994 season, have greatly

A study of epistolography also facilitates a more accurate and better informed exploitation of the letters as a historical source. This is of no small importance, for the very nature of epistolary documents lends them a singular significance in historiography. In their portrayal of the events and concerns of daily life, mundane and not-so-mundane, the letters, as A. L. Oppenheim once argued, offer

> "… insights into the Mesopotamian society of such an immediateness as no other cuneiform texts of the same range of subject matter — no ration list or legal document, to mention the most typical representatives — are able to offer."[5]

He insisted that the epistolary texts

> "… illuminate both the writer and the addressee as human beings, shed light on their expectations and fears, and on the setting in which they live. Letters are thus far more revealing than the formalized historical and literary texts with their ideological narrowness and tradition-determined contents."[6]

In light of these views, when he poses the following question with regard to the letters, "Are these the texts that will clearly reveal what those who wrote them, and those for

---

augmented the relative percentage of epistolary texts in the Akkadian corpus; see F. Malbran-Labat, *SMEA* 36 (1995) 103-111; P. Bordreuil and F. Malbran-Labat, *CRAIBL* (1995) 443-456; and F. Malbran-Labat, RAI 42 (1999) 237-244. The current corpus contains over 400 tablets of an epistolary nature, which may make up as much as 20% of the total corpus of Akkadian tablets.

An appraisal of the entire Ras Shamra corpus, both alphabetic and logo-syllabic (which does not, however, incorporate epigraphic finds post-dating 1973) is provided by W. van Soldt, *SAU* (1991) 227. The table he assembled shows epistolary documents as representing approximately 12.5% of the total Ras Shamra corpus in terms of number of tablets; this is roughly on a par with tablets of a juridical nature (12.5%), but inferior to the percentages of tablets of an administrative nature (40%) and those of a lexical or scholarly nature (20%).

[5]A. L. Oppenheim, *Letters from Mesopotamia* (1967) 64. In his foreword (p. v), the author spoke of the " … kaleidoscopic diversity of life as mirrored in these documents," offering a " … more intimate and varied image of [the] civilization than that offered by the … epic texts, royal inscriptions, and law codes."

[6]*Ibid.*, 65.

whom they were written, thought about themselves, their world, their gods?"[7] we might infer for him a cautiously optimistic response.[8]

Furthermore, in containing extensive passages of prose discourse, and in bearing witness to the language of everyday usage,[9] Oppenheim's view of the letters as "more revealing" than other genres applies equally well to their relevance for studies of a linguistic nature. This is of particular significance for Ugaritic studies, where the archaic or archaizing idiom of the poetic texts has for so long dominated linguistic discussions of the language.[10]

Finally, the study of letters is valuable for purely literary reasons. The epistolary corpora of the Ancient Near East, including the Ugaritic corpus, contain examples of carefully crafted texts, full of elaborate rhetorical strategies aimed at persuasion. Such deliberate and thoughtful written composition, even if in vernacular language, leads to the problem of the point at which letters represent literature.

---

[7]Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (1964) 24.

[8]Note also the reflections of M. T. Larsen, with respect to the study of the letters in the Old Assyrian corpus with a view to "grasp the emotions and motivations for some of those myriad acts that constituted social reality as reflected in our texts", in *Studies Veenhof* (2001) 275-277.

[9] M. Liverani, *Les communautés rurales* 2 (1983) 159, characterizes letters as ". . . l'unique documentation de ce qui devait être la pratique du dialogue verbal et en général des rapports interpesonnels."

[10]Compare the statement of D. Pardee, *JNES* 52 (1993) 317, made with reference to analyses of the verbal system: "Instead of setting up categories on the basis of the . . . poetic texts and then fitting in the prose forms willy-nilly, the two bodies of texts must be analyzed separately."

Benjamin Foster recently asked this question,[11] and proposed that

> "carefully written letters . . . provide an excellent testing ground for the creative process that goes into making literature, being cases of careful choice of words, form, and figures of speech, though with the intent of persuading only a specific reader."[12]

0.1.1.2 A new treatment of Ugaritic epistolography

General treatments of the letter-writing tradition in the Ugaritic language have been undertaken in the seventies by O. Kaiser,[13] S. Ahl,[14] A. Kristensen,[15] and A. Caquot;[16] and in the eighties and nineties by J.-L. Cunchillos.[17] Given this history of research, a new treatment requires some justification. Above all, it is the information provided by the unpublished Ugaritic letters which justifies a fresh approach to Ugaritic epistolography: at least twenty of the Ugaritic tablets from the 1994 and 1996 seasons are epistolary in nature, and of these, at least seven are intact or nearly so.[18] Secondly, apart from Ras Shamra, several other sites, such as Ma□at-Höyük in Turkey, Tell Sheikh Ḥamad in the Khabur basin in eastern Syria, and Tell Meskene on the

---

[11]B. Foster, *Studies Hallo* (1993) 98: "Here [in the texts of letters] the reader can see everyday (or, at least, non-literary) language being differentiated, rewritten, and artificed, perhaps by amateurs. This raises an important question of language and literature: at what point do letters become literature?"

[12]*Ibid.*

[13]O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 10-23.

[14]S. W. Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973).

[15]A. L. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 143-158.

[16]A. Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), cols. 1413-1417.

[17]See J.-L. Cunchillos, *Estudios de Epistolografía ugarítica* (1989) 141-234; and *idem*, *TO* 2 (1989) 239-421, but especially the "Introduction", on pp. 241-267. An updated version of the latter was published by the same author recently in English in *HUS* (1999) 359-374.

[18]See below, footnote 23, and section 0.2.3.

Euphrates, to name three examples, have yielded new and important Late Bronze epistolary corpora which can be profitably compared with the Ugaritic. This comparative aspect is weak in previous treatments, where few attempts were made to place the Ugaritic epistolary tradition within its larger context.[19]

A partial rectification of this situation was provided by A. Hagenbuchner[20] and E. Cancik-Kirschbaum,[21] each of whom interacted to some degree with the Ugaritic tradition in treating Hittite and Middle Assyrian epistolography, respectively. But the perspective of these two specialists is necessarily somewhat external with respect to the Ugaritic material, and a view "from the inside looking out" would be helpful. The present study attempts to supply such an internal perspective. The data provided by the new letters and their analysis in the wider context of cuneiform letter-writing in Late Bronze West Asia help to supplement, update, and at times correct past treatments of Ugaritic epistolography.

---

[19]As an additional reason for a new treatment of the subject, if one is needed, one could cite a lack of recent scholarly attention, alluded to by Cunchillos, *HUS* (1999) 360: "The study of letters written in Ugaritic has not progressed much since Cunchillos 1989a. . . ."

[20]A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989).

[21]E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 49-71.

0.1.2 Method

0.1.2.1 Appropriate to the task

In his contribution to a volume honoring William Moran, the British Assyriologist W. G. Lambert offered the following reflection on his own methodology: "As with archaeological digging and housekeeping, sound principles have always to be adapted to the particular job at hand."[22] Despite the levity, and the far-flung nature of the comparisons, the point Lambert made seems both reasonable and germane: a valid methodology is seldom to be determined *a priori*, independent of a detailed study of the available sources. In other words, it is the data that are primary, and it is they which determine, to very large measure, which methodological approaches will be most fruitful, and not the other way around.

My method in treating Ugaritic epistolography was established in working through the philological and interpretive problems of twenty-one newly recovered epistolary documents, the edition of which is currently in preparation.[23] This study led to two methodological priorities: (1) at the present state of the field, a study of the formal features of Ugaritic letters is the most productive means of approaching the genre as a whole, and (2) an effective means of digesting and interpreting the diverse

---

[22]Lambert, *Studies Moran* (1990) 289, n. 1. The surrounding context is well worth reprinting here in full: "The writer has no set method of dealing with newly discovered or previously unedited Babylonian literary texts. As with archaeological digging and housekeeping, sound principles have always to be adapted to the particular job at hand. One major danger to avoid is blind adherence to previous conclusions. Previously available evidence may have led to then justified positions, but new evidence always requires an impartial and ruthless reconsideration of old conclusions. The essential equipment is as exhaustive as possible a knowledge at first hand and an understanding of all related material."

[23]P. Bordreuil, R. Hawley, and D. Pardee, "Lettres (n°s 59-79)", chapter 3 in the volume *Textes ougaritiques des campagnes de 1994, 1996, 1999, 2000, 2002* (in preparation for publication in the series Ras Shamra-Ougarit, Paris, Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations).

body of formal features found in the letters, and of perceiving and evaluating standard and variant patterns among them, is provided by typological classification.

0.1.2.2 Form and Content

Why study structure? This is certainly a valid question, especially in light of my extensive citation of Oppenheim in the paragraphs above. He had pointed out that the formal aspects of ancient literary genres were more often than not an impediment, that rigidity of form can occasionally prevent direct access to the individual humanity of the text.[24] If Oppenheim's capacity as a historian lead him to privilege content, especially that of an individual or distinctive nature, over uniformity of form,[25] in his role as a lexicographer he would certainly not have claimed that the study of structure was unimportant.[26] On the contrary, for historian and lexicographer alike, a sound grasp of form is essential for perceiving and distinguishing both human individuality and literary tradition behind the textual veil.

Such a discussion of the respective roles of form and content in interpretation is reminiscent of the dichotomy of the hermeneutic circle, the paradoxical notion that the whole cannot be understood without reference to the component parts, nor the parts without reference to the whole.[27] A similar dictum has long circulated in the halls of

---

[24]Oppenheim, *Letters from Mesopotamia* (1967) 65: "Again, our search for life communication is forestalled by the medium: letter and scribe."

[25]In describing his choice of texts in the foreword (*ibid.*, p. v) he admitted, "I chose the atypical rather than the typical. . . ."

[26]Compare *ibid.*, 63-64, "The cuneiform tablets exhibit, moreover, the effects of a good number of topical and stylistic restrictions, as is natural for any formal literary expression. To a certain extent the pattern created by such restrictions facilitates the *prima facie* understanding of such texts."

[27]I have benefited from the accessible discussion of this and other philosophical issues involved in J. D. Schloen, *The House of the Father* (2001) 1-28, esp. 10-12.

the Oriental Institute, though in more casual terms: "You can't read a text until you know what it says, and you can't know what a text says until you read it".[28] Beyond Assyriology, however, in a more esoteric domain like Ugaritology, the delicate balance of this dichotomy is upset, and this for the simple reason that the Ugaritic language is still poorly understood, certainly much less well understood than Akkadian.[29] When this lacuna in the modern linguistic knowledge of Ugaritic is coupled with the patterned formalism observable in the tablets themselves, structural considerations assume paramount importance in the ongoing interpretation of Ugaritic texts.

Such an apology for a form-critical approach to Ugaritic texts should not, however, be taken to mean that the study of the whole should entirely supplant the study of the component parts. Rather, by emphasizing the limits of our modern knowledge of the Ugaritic lexicon and syntax, the study of the whole often informs the requisite, if imperfect, study of the parts in a way that is not simply beneficial but necessary.[30] With respect to the topic studied here, a reasonably accurate understanding of the Ugaritic letter-writing tradition, or, less generally, of any given Ugaritic letter, necessarily entails, perhaps more than anything else, an adequate understanding of the structure of a typical Ugaritic letter. The structure of epistolary

---

[28]D. Pardee, *Or* 70 (2001) 235, attributes the saying to "l'un de nos professeurs", a reference to the late I. J. Gelb.

[29]Should such a declaration require argument, it can be said that Akkadian is better understood than Ugaritic for at least three reasons. (1) It has been studied for a longer period of time, and by a wider array of scholars; (2) the sources are much more extensive and go far beyond the examples from Ras Shamra; and (3) it is written in a graphic system which records the vocalic elements of the language much more extensively than does the alphabetic cuneiform system, and thereby communicates more grammatical information.

[30]S. Parker, *Maarav* 2 (1979-1980) 7-41, for example, argues that progress in interpreting dificult sections of the Ugaritic texts results only from genre identification.

texts, like that of legal or administrative texts, provides an interpretative frame, a set of expectations so to speak, which restricts interpretation effectively enough to inspire a fair amount of confidence that the documents in question are understood more or less accurately. It is in this sense that structure guides interpretation. Furthermore, the relative effectiveness of such a structural approach in text interpretation is directly proportional to the amount of formality present. Since the formulaic nature of the introductory sections of Ugaritic letters has long been recognized, a form-critical approach seems, almost *a priori*, very promising. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, structural analysis *works*. In other words, many aspects of the Ugaritic epistolary texts are explained by resorting to an analysis of form.

0.1.2.3 The interest of this study

After several years of research, my work on Ugaritic epistolography may be considered as a contribution toward a formal typology of the Ugaritic epistolary texts; by "typology" I mean a reasoned classification on the basis of criteria taken to be of diagnostic import.

In working through the new Ugaritic letters,[31] it quickly became evident that they could be best appreciated not only through comparison with the rest of the Ugaritic epistolary corpus, but also with the contemporary cuneiform corpora from other sites in Syria, Anatolia, and Mesopotamia. Such an undertaking demands a typology as a prerequisite, not only to ensure the solidity of ensuing cross-linguistic comparisons, but also to appreciate the originality and formal distinctiveness of the Ugaritic tradition.

---

[31]See above, footnote 23.

More than simply a tool which permits comparative research, however, typological classification is also a heuristic aid in the comprehension of the Ugaritic texts themselves, for it provides a framework for organizing and conceiving the corpus. The filling out of this framework brings to the fore both differences in internal structure and similarities. In this way, typological classification is, in and of itself, a way to understand, one way among many others perhaps, but a way that is at once useful and practicable.[32]

It is useful on several levels, but first and foremost because it is empirical, and therefore less vulnerable to the kinds of error typical of more intuitive approaches. This empirical aspect has especial relevance for the establishment of diagnostic criteria. If the criteria by which a typology is organized are valid, the resulting classification will bear this out; if not, the imbalance will be noticeable. The "forced observation" required by typological classification provides an empirical basis for the identification of those formal patterns which may be considered standard or normative in the known Ugaritic epistolary tradition,[33] as well as those motifs which have few or no parallels. It is naturally these standard formulas, and their composition, that are diagnostic in classification.

Such form-critical analyses can also contribute extensively to the broader interpretation of individual epistolary texts, by an increased critical attention not only

---

[32]In proposing that to classify is, in some sense, to understand, one is reminded of J. Goody's contributions to cognitive anthropology, and more specifically, of his discussion of the implications of list-making (which I take to be one form of typological classification, and incidentally, one that was extensively practiced by the ancient Ugaritians) for cognition. See, for example, his classic formulation in *The Domestication of the Savage Mind* (1977), esp. ch. 5.

[33]While brute statistics can be revealing, the identification of various aspects of the "standard" Ugaritic epistolary tradition(s) is more credible when supplemented by distributional and contextual factors. With respect to the address formula, for example, see below, section 1.2.1.

to the generic identification of letters as such,[34] but also to their contextual interpretation, especially with respect to the implications of "non-standard" formal features.

Finally, on a practical level, a rigorous typology permits, of course, the reconstruction of fragmentary texts. Typology provides a frame of formal and structural expectations which guide the eye in epigraphy. Here again one finds the delicate compromise between form and content in interpretation: formal constraints do not replace basic epigraphy, but thanks to these expectations, the epigrapher knows what to look for, and where.[35]

These benefits, described above, apply to all Ugaritic texts bearing recognizable patterns in the structure of their composition. In practical terms, this includes letters, of course, but also lists of all sorts, tables, contracts, school exercises, "scientific texts" characterized by the protasis-apodosis structure, votive inscriptions, rituals, and even the narrative poetic texts. The limitations of the method are indirectly proportional to the amount of formal structure present in the text; the greater the formality the more promising the method.

---

[34]For example, had the typological characteristics of Ugaritic letters been better known, the analysis of the text RS 11.772+ (KTU 3.1) as a letter in G. Knoppers, *BASOR* 289 (1993) 81-94, would not have been proposed, much less accepted in subsequent discussions, as in A.-S. Dalix, *CRAIBL* (1997) 819-824; and *idem*, *Semitica* 48 (1998) 5-15. On the generic interpretation of this text, see now D. Pardee, *Semitica* 51 (forthcoming).

[35]An elementary illustration of this methodological compromise, if such be needed, is provided by RS 5.274 (KTU 7.54), examined by the writer at the Louvre museum in Paris during the winter of 1999: the clear reading of the sequence {ykš[...]} in line 2', followed by {⌈-⌉pṣ⌈-⌉r[...]} in line 3', leads directly to the hypothesis that the text is an abecedary. In turn, the formal expectation of an abecedary thus allows the correct reading of two of the signs in line 3': {ʿ!} (the oblique wedge which constitutes this sign was impressed twice, the earlier impression still being visible, thus giving the impression of one wedge superimposed upon another) and {q}.

0.2 Definition of the corpus

As in virtually any other study of a typological nature, be it textual or material, I have proceeded here in a series of steps: (1) the definition of a corpus, (2) the study and detailed description of the repetitive characteristics there observable, (3) the identification of those criteria by which these repetitive characteristics may be understood, (4) the elaboration of various workable nested classifications of the corpus accordingly, and finally, (5) a comparative analysis which attempts to replace the inner Ugaritic data within a broader external typological context. This process, of course, is not always a neat linear progression, but more often then not recursive, with repeated returns to the basic study of the primary data after failed attempts at classification or the discovery of striking parallels in the comparative corpora.

If the first steps seem relatively easy to accomplish, the final step, comparative analysis, is more troubling to a Ugaritologist. It is thus with a good deal of clumsiness that the Akkadian and especially the Hittite sources are dealt with, these being the two principal languages of the contemporary epistolary corpora essential for the appreciation of the Ugaritic texts. Nevertheless, in order to render a descriptive study such as this one valuable and useful, especially for those who are not Ugaritologists, it seemed worthwhile not to turn a blind eye to all that lay beyond the alphabetic domain, but rather to attempt to confront the results of an internal study with the external data. In spite of the inevitable shortcomings of such a comparative project, in which a specialist pretends to be a generalist, the potential benefits of such an undertaking seem encouraging.

0.2.1 Elaboration of a definition

Typological classification begins by establishing the Ugaritic epistolary corpus. This seemingly simple step requires, first and foremost, a workable definition of a "letter", as distinct from other literary genres in the inventory of Ugaritic scribal compositions.

0.2.1.1 Ugaritic terminology for written correspondence

The terminology employed by the Ugaritian scribes themselves when alluding to written correspondence provides an interesting, and perhaps even essential, point of departure. One finds at least four common nouns, for example, which, given an appropriate context, can refer to a "letter". In terms of their usage in Ugaritic, as well as their etymology, two of these nouns, *rgm* and *tḥm*, can be connected with the semantic field of "speaking", and the other two, *spr* and *lḥt*, with that of "writing".

The least-marked English gloss of *rgm* is 'word',[36] but it occurs in the specific sense of 'message', probably of the written kind, in the formulaic "information request", one of the few formulaic motifs to be found in the body of Ugaritic letters.[37] A typical example of that idiom is *rgm ṯtb ly*,[38] literally 'Send word back to me!', a request for

---

[36]See the data cited in G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 386-387. The verb with which it is cognate (**ragama* / **yargumu*), and indeed probably derivative, is the basic verb for speaking in Ugaritic.

[37]See below, section 5.3.

[38]As in RS 29.095:8 and elsewhere; see below, section 5.3. Compare also the sense of 'message' in the literary text KTU 1.23:52, *rgm l ʾil ybl*, 'They (then) bring word to ʾIlu … ,' although in this case there is no reason to believe that the "message" in question was not an oral one.

subsequent written correspondence, probably which specifically incorporates the epistolary "situation report": *ʿmny šlm*, 'with me, it is well.'[39]

The noun *tḥm* is best glossed by 'message', be it of the written or oral[40] variety. A textbook example of *tḥm* in the sense of 'written message' or 'letter' is, of course, provided by the epistolary address formula itself, as in *tḥm mlkt*,[41] 'Message of the queen'. Here the nominal phrase serves as a heading or title of sorts to the written message it introduces.[42] Another, less formulaic but equally telling instance drawn from the epistolary corpus is provided by the phrase *ky lỉkt bt mlk tḥmk hln*[*y*],[43] a fronted nominal clause which can be translated: '(As for the fact) that you sent *your message* to the royal palace, now then . . . .'

Of the two words in the second category, those connecting with the semantic field of "writing", the most general is *spr*.[44] It is usually best glossed 'document', since it designates virtually all sorts of texts, from lists to rituals.[45] It does occur, however,

---

[39]For a more detailed presentation of these two formulaic motifs, which together compose the "double formula of well-being", see below, section 5.3.

[40]If the sense of 'oral message' or even 'spoken word' for *tḥm* is not immediately apparent in the prose texts, it is familiar from the mythological texts; compare the literary « S » motif discussed below, section 1.4.2.

[41]As in RS 94.2406:1, RS 94.2580:1, and RS 96.2039:1.

[42]See below, section 1.5.2.

[43]RS 17.434+:5, a letter from a certain *pdǵb*, almost certainly Puduḫepa, the celebrated Hittite queen of that name, to a certain *nqmd*, almost certainly the Ugaritic king typically referred to as "Niqmaddu III" (S. Lackenbacher, *RA* 89 [1995] 70, n. 24), but who can now be called "IV" in light of the expanded canonical sequence of divinized kings published by D. Arnaud, *SMEA* 41 (1999) 163.

[44]From an etymological point of view, the attribution of *spr* to the semantic field of "writing" is questionable since a primitive root *SPR might have denoted enumeration and recitation. A more etymologically explicit gloss for the noun *spr* would be 'an enumeration or recitation (committed to writing in the form of a tablet).' A connection between the noun *spr* and the semantic field of "writing" is certainly legitimate, however, from the point of view of inner Ugaritic usage.

[45]See the data collected in del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 407-408.

in the explicit sense of 'written message' in one of the letters from the 1994 season, in the temporal clause *k ytnt spr hnd ʿmk*,[46] '. . . when I dictated (lit., "gave") this letter to you . . . .'

Finally, more marked than *spr* is *lḥt*, which, because of its etymology, is often glossed 'tablet'.[47] Inner Ugaritic usage, however, is fairly uniform in employing the noun *lḥt* specifically to designate a "letter".[48] A clear example of this is provided by a passage from a letter in which the author (the king) replies to a previous request made of him by his correspondent (T̲aryelli, his mother): *lḥt šlm k lỉkt ủmy ʿmy ht ʿmny kll šlm*,[49] 'As for the letter about well-being that[50] my mother sent to me, now then, with me all is well.'

These four substantives serve as complements to several verbs linked to epistolary communication. These include (1) LʾK, 'to send' (G-stem), which is used of *lḥt* and *tḥm*, but also in the pregnant sense of 'to send (a written message)', without an

---

[46]RS 94.2406:4-5.

[47]Compare C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (1965), § 1358.

[48]See now G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 243, though the editors have chosen to follow Gordon, *ibid.*, in interpreting *lḥt* as "pl. *tantum*". One may also interpret *lḥt* as singular (perhaps */lūḥatu/* or */lôḥatu/*), as here. The argument of J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000) 298, § 53.331.2, that *lḥt* is (feminine) plural because it occurs accompanied by a relative pronoun, of which it is the antecedant, having the form *d* (and not *dt*) in RS [Varia 4]:6-7, *lḥt spr d lỉkt*, 'the documentary letter (?) (lit., "the [epistolary] tablet of (the sort characterized as) *spr*") that you sent . . . ,' is not adequate proof, since (1) it is not clear that *lḥt*, and not *spr* is the antecedant of *d* (cf. RS 17.118:1, *mỉt šmn d* ... , 'one hundred [*kd*-jars] of oil, which . . . ,' where the second term in the construct chain appears to be the antecedent); and (2) in any case, other passages are known in which the form *d* has as its antecedent a feminine singular noun, as Tropper himself points out, *ibid.*, § 43.2, p. 237, where he mentions RS 15.125:2-3 (KTU 2.19), *km špš d brt*, '. . . just as the Sun, which is "pure". . . .'

[49]RS 17.139:5-7.

[50]The Ugaritic passage contains no relative pronoun; one is included here to render the syntax less awkward in English. Literally, the passage reads '(As for) the tablet of well-being, (the fact) that my mother sent (it) to me — Now, with me all is well.'

explicit accusative complement;[51] (2) RGM, 'to speak, say' (G-stem), complemented, in some sense at least,[52] by *tḥm* in the epistolary address formula; (3) T̲(W)B, 'to send back (Š-stem)', used with the noun *rgm*;[53] (4) YTN, 'to give' (G-stem), complemented by *spr*, probably in the sense of 'to dictate a letter (*ʿm*, to someone)';[54] and (5) DBR, a less frequent and apparently more highly marked verb of speaking, used with *lḥt*.[55]

Such a survey of the vocabulary of epistolary communication provides an "interpretive" definition of a Ugaritic letter: a document (*spr*), specifically a tablet (*lḥt*), which contains the message (*tḥm*, and *rgm*, 'word') that the sender has dictated (YTN, lit. 'to give') to a scribe. The missive is then sent (LʾK) to its destination, where it is read aloud (RGM and DBR, both verbs of speaking) to the recipient.

0.2.1.2 Functional and formal definitions

Such an "internal" functional approach is compatible with a common "external" functional definition given for a "letter": a written message which permits communication between at least two persons who can not or will not communicate directly.[56] A number of problems become apparent in the application of even this

---

[51]See the citations given in del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 239.

[52]It is unlikely that *tḥm* is the accusative complement of the imperative *rgm* in the address formula; see below, section 1.6.1.1. If not linked in an explicitly grammatical sense on the clause level, it is nevertheless clear that the implied object of the imperative *rgm*, 'Say!' is, in fact, the actual message which follows the address, and to which the address formula itself refers with the noun *tḥm*, 'message'.

[53]Del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 485.

[54]RS 94.2406:4-5.

[55]Del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 128.

[56]Compare the similar functional definition given by N. Ziegler in her article "Correspondance" in the recent *Dictionnaire de la civilisation mésopotamienne* (2001) 202.

definition, however. In the first place, it is founded on function, for which direct information is fragile and in any case difficult to control. Furthermore, according to such a purely functional criterion, virtually any text could qualify as a letter. Even a simple list of personal names, and Ras Shamra has produced a good number of these, could, in certain situations,[57] have fulfilled this function of written communication between two persons.

It would seem that a uniquely functional definition is insufficient; and it is helpful to add a formal element. Furthermore, it is precisely such a formal element which permits typological classification, since the formally stereotyped motifs, or formulas, occurring in the letters can be catalogued, described, and compared. It is also these which first allow the epigrapher to identify the literary genre of a new text as being a letter.

0.2.1.3 Summary

The following composite definition was adopted: a letter is defined as a written message between at least two persons, containing formulas which manifest this same function. These formulas are diagnostic of letters in the sense that they are found typically or even uniquely in texts of this nature.

What then are the formulas in question? There are several, and chapters 1-4 are devoted to the detailed study of each. One is of particular importance in defining the corpus: the epistolary address formula, formed on the model "Message of X: To Y

---

[57]Compare the implications of RS 94.2592, which provides a scenario for the contextual interpretation of some such nominal lists; and also the enigmatic text RS 22.003.

speak:", or "To Y speak: Message of X."[58] This idiom is at once (1) formulaic, and thus amenable to typological analysis, (2) it manifests the epistolary function, and (3) it is found almost exclusively in texts of this genre.

0.2.2 Application

A preliminary triage of the known Ugaritic corpus yields at least forty-three tablets which certainly or almost certainly begin with the standard address formula, described above.[59] In six other tablets, the presence of this formula is very probable, if not certain.[60] Finally, as many as eleven other tablets certainly or probably begin with address formulas which are, in one way or another, non-standard in terms of composition.[61]

---

[58]The address formula is thus a double formula consisting of one component which identifies the sender of the letter, and another which names its intended recipient; see the more detailed discussion in section 1.2. These two components are alluded to throughout the following discussions of form with the abbreviations « S » and « R », respectively.

[59]Forty-three tablets begin with (that is, contain at the top of one of the two facial surfaces which, according to context, must be the beginning of the text) an address formula of standard composition. By "standard composition", I mean an address formula consisting of two components, of variable order, the one being « *tḥm* <noun phrase(s)> », and the other « *l* <noun phrase(s)> *rgm* »; the former is referred to throughout this work with the abbreviation « S » (that component which identifies the sender), and the latter with « R » (the component which identifies the recipient). These tablets are: RS 1.018, RS 1.021 (virtually certain), RS 4.475, RS 8.315, RS 9.479A, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 17.434+ (virtually certain), RS 18.031, RS 18.038, RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 18.286[A], RS 19.102, RS 19.181A (virtually certain), RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 29.095, RS 34.148, RS 34.356 (virtually certain), RS 88.2159, RS 92.2005, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2406, RS 94.2429, RS 94.2479, RS 94.2537 (virtually certain), RS 94.2545+ (virtually certain), RS 94.2580, RS 94.5003+, RS 94.5009, RS 96.2039, RIH 77/21A, RIH 78/03+ (virtually certain), and RS [Varia 4]. By the phrase "virtually certain" I mean that at least one of the components of the address formula is not preserved: *l*, *rgm*, *tḥm*, or some indication of the noun phrase(s). The classification of these documents as epistolary, however, is not in doubt.

[60]A standard address formula may be partly or largely restored at the beginning of RS 15.158, RS 15.174, RS 16.402, RS 17.327, RS 19.029, and RS 94.2946.

[61]In the case of eight tablets, the presence of a non-standard address formula is certain or virtually certain: RS 15.007, RS 16.264, RS 16.265, RS 17.063, RS 18.148, RS 19.011, RS 94.2273, and

In the letters thus isolated, sixty in number, the address formula is very often immediately followed by one or more other formulas which also manifest, though to a lesser extent than the address, the epistolary function of a written message between two parties. These include not only the "polite formulas",[62] such as the prostration formula,[63] the salutation,[64] and the benediction,[65] but also a double formula dealing with the exchange of news about "well-being".[66] When the beginning of a text is destroyed, they may also serve as diagnostic criteria in the definition of the corpus of epistolary texts. At least nine other tablets may be added to the corpus on these grounds.[67]

RIH 78/12. Three other tablets, RS 1.020, RS 3.334, and RS 17.117, probably also begin with non-standard address formulas: the probability of RS 1.020 and RS 3.334 belonging here is established by their comparison with one another; that of RS 17.117 by its resemblance to RS 17.063.

At least five "non-standard" compositional patterns for the address formula are attested in this group, three which mention both sender and recipient (i-iii), and two which mention only the recipient (iv-v): (i) « *tḫm* <noun phrase(s)> *l* <noun phrase(s)> » (RS 16.265, RS 94.2273, and probably RS 16.264); (ii) « <noun phrase(s)> *l* <noun phrase(s)> » (RS 15.007, RS 17.063, and possibly RS 17.117); (iii) « *tḫm* <noun phrase(s)> *ʿm* <noun phrase(s)> » (RS 18.148); (iv) « *l* <noun phrase(s)> » (RIH 78/12, and possibly RS 1.020 and RS 3.334); and (v) « *l* <noun phrase(s)> *rgm* » (RS 19.011). On these patterns, see below, section 1.7.

[62]See below, chapters 2-4.

[63]This formula is abbreviated <pros> throughout this dissertation; for more detailed information on it, see below, chapter 2.

[64]Abbreviated <sal>; see below, chapter 3.

[65]Abbreviated <ben>; see below, chapter 4.

[66]Like the address, this is a double formula. Throughout this study, I often refer to the two components of which it is composed in abbreviated form: <s.r.> (for "situation report) designates the one, and <i.r.> (for "information request") the other. For a more detailed discussion, see below, section 5.3.

[67]Though the address is not preserved, the certain or very probable presence of one of the polite formulas (prostration [abbreviated pros], salutation [sal], benediction [ben]); and/or the double formula of well-being (situation report [s.r.], information request [i.r.]) at the beginning of the preserved text allows the addition of nine tablets to the corpus: RS 3.427 (<⌜sal⌝ ⌜ben⌝>), RS 18.075 (<⌜sal⌝ ⌜ben⌝>), RS 18.287 (<⌜pros⌝ | ⌜i.r.⌝>; prior to the <pros> formula, a portion of the address, <⌜S⌝>, may be

Finally, some tablets contain more than one letter. In other words, secondary or "piggyback" letters were occasionally appended immediately following a primary letter. Since the context of the second letter is different from that of the first, that is, the identity of the correspondents is not the same, nor is the message itself, these "piggyback" letters merit classification as independent and distinct texts. They too are defined by the presence of the diagnostic formulas, the key difference being that it is not necessary to insist on the diagnostic formulas appearing at the beginning of the tablet. At least five texts may be added to the epistolary corpus on this basis.[68]

The above considerations yield a preliminary corpus of seventy-four texts, classified as epistolary on a combination of formal and functional grounds: the presence of certain diagnostic formulas which manifest an epistolary function, that is,

---

restored), RS 18.[312] (<⌜pros⌝ ⌜i.r.⌝>), RS 18.[364] (<⌜sal⌝>, and possibly <⌜pros⌝>), RS 18.[482] (<⌜i.r.⌝>, and perhaps <⌜ben⌝>), RS 19.158B (<s.r. i.r.>), RS 34.124 (<⌜pros⌝ ⌜sal⌝ ⌜ben⌝ | s.r. i.r.>), and RS 94.2428 (<⌜pros⌝ ⌜sal⌝ ⌜ben⌝>).

[68]At least eight tablets contain repetitions of the introductory epistolary formulas in the middle of the text, and not at the beginning (that is, not at the top of the face which must, from context, be the *recto*). These are RS 16.265, RS 18.140, RS 19.102, RS 34.356, RS 92.2005, RS 94.2406, RS 94.2545+, and RS 94.2957. Of these, I consider it reasonably certain that five represent separate "piggyback" letters: RS 16.265.2, RS 18.140.2, RS 19.102.2, RS 92.2005.2, and RS 94.2406.2 (I distinguish the "piggyback" letter from the first letter on the tablet by the addition of ".2" to the tablet number for the former, and ".1" for the latter).

RS 16.265.1 (from "*i̭ṯtl*" to "*mnn*") is probably a scribal practice letter; the "piggyback" letter appended to it would seem to represent an imaginary response to the primary letter (the correspondents are reversed: the sender is "*mn*" and the recipient "*i̭ṯtl*"). The address formula of RS 16.265.2 is, like that of RS 16.265.1, non-standard: « *tḥm ḏ* <noun phrase(s)> *l* <noun phrase(s)> ».

RS 34.356 and RS 94.2545+ are difficult cases. Despite the presence of repeated introductory formulas in the middle of these texts, I do not consider them to contain "piggyback" letters. Rather, they would seem to represent single letters which contain, for whatever reason, repetitions of certain of the introductory formulas. The following considerations support such a view: (1) the correspondents mentioned in the second address formula are the same as those in the first (same sender, same recipient); (2) in the case of RS 34.356 the first letter would have contained almost no content prior to the beginning of the second letter; (3) in the case of RS 94.2545+, the identity of the correspondents is the same as, and the body of the letter closely parallel to, RS 94.2284, which is not a double letter; and (4) comparative parallels exist for the repetition of certain formulaic elements within a single letter (compare EA 100 and 124, and RS 94.2545+, for example).

On RS 94.2957, see the following footnote.

which imply, from their semantics and context, that they belong to the literary genre of written messages between two parties. The epistolary classification of this group can be considered virtually certain. However, in epigraphy as in archaeology, the boundaries of typological categories are often not black and white, but somewhere between various shades of grey. Thus, the corpus can be augmented by the addition of numerous other texts, for the most part fragmentary, which lack the diagnostic formulas cited above, but which may nevertheless be classified as epistolary on various contextual or logical grounds. Often, this classification is possible on the basis of phrases or vocabulary typical of letters. The epistolary classification of these additional texts ranges from virtually certain to merely plausible.

In some cases, the identification on formal grounds of "piggyback" letters permits the definition of the text which precedes it on the tablet as epistolary, the reasoning being that "piggyback" letters are appended to other letters, not to texts of other literary genres. This adds two further texts to the epistolary corpus.[69]

The corpus can be supplemented by the addition of fragmentary tablets which lack the introductory formulas, but which nevertheless contain motifs and *topoi* typically found in the body of letters, making their classification as epistolary virtually certain. At least twelve texts fall into this category.[70]

---

[69]This applies to RS 18.140.2 (a clear "piggyback" letter) and the subsequent definition of RS 18.140.1 (a fragmentary text preceding the former) as epistolary. Similar considerations argue for the inclusion of RS 94.2957.1 (a fragmentary Ugaritic text) in the epistolary corpus. It is a special case, however, since it contains a "piggyback" letter (RS 94.2957.2) written in Akkadian language and in logo-syllabic cuneiform script (and thus not included in the "Ugaritic" epistolary corpus).

[70]These are RS 1.032, RS 15.098, RS 15.191[A], RS 16.078+, RS 16.394, RS 16.401, RS 18.[528], RS 18.[565], RS 94.2457, RS 94.2592, RS 94.5015, and RIH 77/01. They include the following epistolary motifs or *topoi*: (a) "put (it) in a document (to me)" (RS 18.[528], RS 94.2592, RS 94.2457); (b) "know!" at the end of a paragraph (RS 1.032, RS 18.[565], RS 94.5015 [several times, once at end of paragraph], RS 15.098); (c) "sending" [L'K] (RS 16.394 [*ilåkk*, perhaps also "don't worry" motif, perhaps "put it" motif], RS 16.401 [*spr ... likt*]); (d) "the desire of my lady" (RS 15.191[A]

Finally, further additions to this corpus may be made on the basis of those texts which contain vocabulary typical of epistolary texts. Of especial importance in this category is the use of 1st and 2nd person forms, that is, forms implying direct address,[71] very often in the form of pronominal suffixes attached to the various nouns of social relation.[72] At least twenty-three texts may be added to the corpus on the basis of vocabulary,[73] but it should be noted that the epistolary classification of these texts is possible, or at most, probable, and by no means certain.

[*iršt ådty*]); (e) non-standard epistolary polite formulas (RS 16.078+ [a non-standard benediction]); and (f) "look" and / or "now then" at beginning of paragraph (RIH 77/01, [*ḥd hlny*]). For a survey of these motifs, see below, chapter 5.

[71]Direct address, reflected in the use of 1st and 2nd person forms, is not unique to the epistolary genre: it occurs in poetic narrative (mythological texts), in incantations, and would plausibly occur in royal edicts and juridical texts, were these genres better attested in Ugaritic. In practice, however, the majority of prose texts showing direct address are epistolary, making its use as a criterion legitimate, if carefully controlled. Epistolary classification made on these grounds, however, is provisional and probable, and not certain.

[72]On the noun phrases of social relation, or REL terms, see below, section 0.6.

[73]Nine texts contain not only 1st and 2nd person forms, but also other vocabulary items typical of letters. The classification of these texts as epistolary ranges from probable to possible: RS 2.[026], RS 18.285[A], RS 18.286[B], RS 18.[400], RS 18.[566], RS 94.2450, RIH 77/25, RIH 78/21, and RIH 78/25.

At least two, and probably three additional texts may be added on the basis of the presence of noun phrases of social relation (see below, section 0.6), with attached 1st or 2nd person pronominal suffix (a form of reference typical of letters): RS 16.196 (*ådty* and *ʿbdk*) and RS 18.[387] (*bʿly*). The possibility that RS 18.[387] contains a portion of the standard address formula, in the middle of the text, argues for its classification as a double letter: RS 18.[387].1 and RS 18.[387].2. Despite the presence of such a term in RS 22.003:1 (*bʿly*, 'my master'), after some hesitation, this text was not included in the epistolary corpus: the tablet is complete and the text intact, no standard epistolary formulas are present, the content of the text is clearly best understood as an administrative account or invoice of sorts (various commodities are mentioned, some with their "price"), and the first two lines appear to function as a sort of heading for this invoice: *bd bʿly tlḫt*, 'By the agency of Mr. BʿLY I hereby send (the following items):' I would thus classify the text as administrative (note, however, the reedition of the text by P. Bordreuil, *Syria* 58 [1981] 301-311); it seems to reflect the function of an epistolary text, but not the form (see above, section 0.2.1.2).

Five texts are so classified on the basis of other 1st and 2nd person pronouns, suffixes, and or verbal forms: RS 1.013+, RS 1.026+, RS 18.[508], RS 19.181B, and RS 94.2960.

Finally, six texts may be classified as possible letters on the basis of vocabulary items typical, or at least not inappropriate, for letters: these include RS 1.[084]+ (perhaps the verb LʾK, and perhaps

0.2.3 Results

These considerations yield a reasoned catalog of Ugaritic epistolary texts, inclusive of the 2000 excavation season, which contains one hundred eleven texts.[74] Of these, the classification of eighty-four as epistolary is certain or virtually certain,[75]

ànk); RS 15.107 (the phrase *ảdn ḥwt ...*); RS 18.[380] (*lìk*); RS 18.[567] (probably the verb M□Y, and probably *lḥt*); RS 19.022 (the preposition *ʿm*, the word *sprn*, probably the verbal form *lqḥt*); and RS 19.174G (*tḥm*). Needless to say, such classifications are tentative.

[74]The Ugaritic letters are as follows (the terms "probable" and "possible" indicate the likelihood, in my opinion, that the text in question is epistolary in genre; the epistolary classification of texts without parenthetical comment is here considered virtually certain): RS 1.013+ (probable), RS 1.018, RS 1.020 (probable), RS 1.021, RS 1.026+ (possible), RS 1.032, RS 1.[084]+ (possible), RS 2.[026] (probable), RS 3.334 (probable), RS 3.427, RS 4.475, RS 8.315, RS 9.479A, RS 11.872, RS 15.007, RS 15.008, RS 15.098, RS 15.107 (possible), RS 15.158, RS 15.174, RS 15.191[A], RS 16.078+, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.196 (probable), RS 16.264, RS 16.265.1, RS 16.265.2, RS 16.379, RS 16.394, RS 16.401, RS 16.402, RS 17.063, RS 17.117 (probable), RS 17.139, RS 17.327, RS 17.434+, RS 18.031, RS 18.038, RS 18.040, RS 18.075, RS 18.113, RS 18.134, RS 18.140.1, RS 18.140.2, RS 18.147, RS 18.148 (probable), RS 18.285[A] (probable), RS 18.286[A], RS 18.286[B] (probable), RS 18.287, RS 18.[312], RS 18.[364], RS 18.[380] (possible), RS 18.[387].1 (possible), RS 18.[387].2 (probable), RS 18.[400] (probable), RS 18.[482], RS 18.[508] (possible), RS 18.[528], RS 18.[565], RS 18.[566] (probable), RS 18.[567] (possible), RS 19.011, RS 19.022 (possible), RS 19.029, RS 19.102.1, RS 19.102.2, RS 19.158B, RS 19.174G (possible), RS 19.181A, RS 19.181B (possible), RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 29.095, RS 34.124, RS 34.148, RS 34.356, RS 88.2159, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2428, RS 94.2429, RS 94.2450 (probable), RS 94.2457, RS 94.2479, RS 94.2537, RS 94.2545+, RS 94.2580, RS 94.2592, RS 94.2946, RS 94.2957.2, RS 94.2960 (possible), RS 94.5003+, RS 94.5009, RS 94.5015, RS 96.2039, RIH 77/01, RIH 77/21A, RIH 77/25 (probable), RIH 78/03+, RIH 78/12, RIH 78/21 (probable), RIH 78/25 (probable), and RS [Varia 4].

[75]These are RS 1.018, RS 1.021, RS 1.032, RS 3.427, RS 4.475, RS 8.315, RS 9.479A, RS 11.872, RS 15.007, RS 15.008, RS 15.098, RS 15.158, RS 15.174, RS 15.191[A], RS 16.078+, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.264, RS 16.265.1, RS 16.265.2, RS 16.379, RS 16.394, RS 16.401, RS 16.402, RS 17.063, RS 17.139, RS 17.327, RS 17.434+, RS 18.031, RS 18.038, RS 18.040, RS 18.075, RS 18.113, RS 18.134, RS 18.140.1, RS 18.140.2, RS 18.147, RS 18.286[A], RS 18.287, RS 18.[312], RS 18.[364], RS 18.[482], RS 18.[528], RS 18.[565], RS 19.011, RS 19.029, RS 19.102.1, RS 19.102.2, RS 19.158B, RS 19.181A, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 29.095, RS 34.124, RS 34.148, RS 34.356, RS 88.2159, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2428, RS 94.2429, RS 94.2457, RS 94.2479, RS 94.2537, RS 94.2545+, RS 94.2580, RS 94.2592, RS 94.2946, RS 94.2957.1, RS 94.5003+, RS 94.5009, RS 94.5015, RS 96.2039, RIH 77/01, RIH 77/21A, RIH 78/03+, RIH 78/12, and RS [Varia 4].

and that of twenty-seven is probable or possible.[76] Furthermore, at least thirty of these texts represent wholly intact or virtually intact letters.[77]

0.3 MACROSTRUCTURE

0.3.1 The importance of macrostructure

The epistolary corpus having been defined, its various constituent structures may be isolated and interpreted. This introduces a troubling aspect of the typologist's work: the establishment of "standard" structural characteristics within a corpus that shows considerable heterogeneity.

The task is troubling because it is at once necessary and difficult. On the one hand, the identification of such "standard" structures is essential for a typology, since it is this interpretative step which allows not only credible description of the Ugaritic epistolary tradition as a whole, but also meaningful comparison with other epistolary corpora. On the other hand, the structural heterogeneity in the Ugaritic corpus means that any such "standards" proposed must be approximate rather than absolute, describing tendencies rather than universals.

---

[76]These are RS 1.013+ (probable), RS 1.020 (probable), RS 1.026+ (possible), RS 1.[084]+ (possible), RS 2.[026] (probable), RS 3.334 (probable), RS 15.107 (possible), RS 16.196 (probable), RS 17.117 (probable), RS 18.148 (probable), RS 18.285[A] (probable), RS 18.286[B] (probable), RS 18.[380] (possible), RS 18.[387].1 (possible), RS 18.[387].2 (probable), RS 18.[400] (probable), RS 18.[508] (possible), RS 18.[566] (probable), RS 18.[567] (possible), RS 19.022 (possible), RS 19.174G (possible), RS 19.181B (possible), RS 94.2450 (probable), RS 94.2960 (possible), RIH 77/25 (probable), RIH 78/21 (probable), and RIH 78/25 (probable).

[77]Perhaps as many as thirty-three texts may be considered virtually intact: RS 4.475, RS 8.315, RS 9.479A, RS 11.872, RS 15.007, RS 15.008, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.264, RS 16.265.1, RS 16.265.2, RS 16.379, RS 17.063, RS 18.031, RS 18.038, RS 18.040, RS 19.011, RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 29.095, RS 34.124, RS 34.148, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2479, RS 96.2039, RIH 78/12, and RS [Varia 4].

In approaching the structure of Ugaritic letters, it seemed heuristically sound to move from general to specific, from larger units toward progressively smaller ones. The definition of the epistolary corpus[78] represents, in this sense, the most general level of such an analysis, while the detailed treatment of the individual epistolary formulas and motifs,[79] the most specific. Between these two extremes lies the macroscopic structure, or, put another way, the "*mise-en-page*" of Ugaritic letters. This topic is treated here, following the definition of the corpus as a whole, and prior to the detailed treatment of the individual formulas, not only because such a sequence coincides with a progression from general to specific in interpretation, but also because this topic illustrates well the problem of heterogeneity in typological classification, as well as a possible means toward its solution. In this sense, the method elaborated and followed here will prove useful below, in treating the individual formulas.

Even apart from its potential role in typological classification, macrostructure is important. As argued above,[80] any reasonably accurate understanding of a particular Ugaritic letter requires an adequate understanding of the general structure of a typical Ugaritic letter. For this, it is necessary to be able to distinguish the constituent components of the letters, that is, the parts of which the letter is made up.

---

[78]See above, section 0.2.

[79]See below, chapters 1-5.

[80]See above, in section 0.1.2.2, where the notion of the "hermeneutic circle" is discussed. It is there argued that a structural approach, assuming the priority of form in the interpretation of content, is appropriate in the interpretation of Ugaritic texts. This is taken to be a consequence of the extreme deficiency of modern knowledge of the Ugaritic language, a state of affairs which makes intuitive or etymological interpretations which do not take account of form notoriously unreliable.

0.3.2 Previous studies

Past students of macrostructure, however, have not been unanimous in their conclusions as to the number and identity of these component parts. In 1949, Cyrus Gordon isolated six potential components of Ugaritic letters.[81] Nearly twenty-five years later, his student Sally Ahl suggested a three-part structure as standard.[82] In 1989, Jesús-Luis Cunchillos proposed a binary structure,[83] and D. Pardee's work in Ugaritic epistolography reflects a similar view.[84] Finally, in his contribution to the

---

[81]C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature* (1949) 116: "Ugaritic letters contain, in varying degree, the following elements: 1. Addressee . . . , 2. Sender . . . , 3. (a) Salutation(s) and/or (b) divine blessing . . . , 4. Report on senders' welfare . . . , 5. Special message and/or request . . . , [and] 6. Request for report on addressee's welfare." In the terminology used in this dissertation, elements 1 and 2 correspond to the « R » and « S » components of the address formula (see below, chapter 1), respectively; element 3 to any or all of the polite formulas (the prostration, salutation, and/or benediction; see below, chapters 2-4); elements 4 and 6 to the two parts of the "double formula of well-being" (see below, section 5.3), the "situation report" and the "information request", respectively; and, element 5 to the non-formulaic portion of the body of the letter (see below, section 5.3).

[82]Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 131: "Letters in both Ugaritic and Akkadian include three components: the heading, the salutation, and the subject." Ahl grouped Gordon's elements 1 and 2 (see the above footnote) under her term "heading" [that is, the "address" in my terminology]; she retained element 3 as "the salutation" [which corresponds to the three "polite formulas" in my terminology, and should not be confused with my own use of "salutation" for one of these polite formulas]; and she regrouped elements 4, 5, and 6 under her term "subject" [which corresponds to "body" in my terminology].

[83]Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 243: "La *structure* d'une epître ougaritique est simple : à l'*introduction* fait suite *le corps du message*." His category "introduction" represents, in a sense, a reduction of Ahl's first and second categories (see the above footnote), that is, of Gordon's elements 1-3 (see two footnotes above): "Ce que nous venons d'appeler l'*introduction* se compose à (p. 244) son tour de différentes parties qui ne sont pas toujours représentées dans chaque missive. On y distingue aisément l'*adresse*, la *proskynèse*, la *salutation*, et les *voeux*" (Cunchillos's terms "proskynèse" and "voeux" correspond to those formulas I have called "prostration" and "benediction", respectively).

It is clear from this passage, however, that Cunchillos groups the three individual "polite formulas" on the same hierarchical level as the address; in this sense his classification is different from that of Ahl (and of Gordon), who viewed the three polite formulas as a group; moreover, Ahl (though not Gordon) placed this group of "polite formulas" on the same hierarchical level as the address.

[84]D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (manuscript in preparation), ch. 2 (RS 1.018), remarques épistolographiques: "Comme dans nos études précédentes consacrées à l'épistolographie, nous employons ici le terme *praescriptio* pour désigner l'ensemble des formules qui introduisent le corps de la lettre." Regarding the composition of the *praescriptio*, Pardee specifies that "Après les formules

Handbook of Ugaritic Studies, Cunchillos returned to the hypothesis of a three-part structure,[85] though one that is different from that proposed by Ahl.[86]

There are, I believe, at least two reasons for the lack of scholarly accord in separating Ugaritic letters into their component parts: (1) the means by which the component parts are to be distinguished from one another are not obvious, and, (2) whichever criterion is selected, its systematic application produces heterogeneous results, owing to the heterogeneity of the corpus, which means that any "standard" structures which emerge will be, at most, only generally applicable, but not universally so.

0.3.3 Horizontal scribal lines

0.3.3.1 Diagnostic of macrostructure

The criteria employed in distinguishing the standard structure of Ugaritic letters have included, in various degrees, physical, semantic, and contextual factors. Of these, S. Ahl was certainly correct to have paid special attention to the most obvious physical factor, namely the use of horizontal scribal lines during the impression of the

---

d'adresse, le message commence souvent par des formules de politesse" (*ibid.*). This view reflects an extension to the Ugaritic epistolary corpus of his conclusions regarding the basic structure of Hebrew letters: they consist of a *praescriptio* and a body; and the *praescriptio*, in turn, contains an "address" and "(initial) greetings". See D. Pardee, J. D. Whitehead, and P.-E. Dion, *JBL* 97 (1978) 332.

By placing the "polite formulas" as a group on a par with the address, Pardee's scheme represents, more than does that of Cunchillos (see the above footnote), Ahl's scheme, with her first and second elements collapsed into one category.

[85]Cunchillos, *HUS* (1999) 360: "Usually, a letter comprises heading, main message and ending."

[86]For Cunchillos, *HUS* (1999) 361, "The heading, also called the introduction, comprises the address, proskinesis, greetings and wishes" (Cunchillos's terms "proskinesis", "greetings", and "wishes" correspond to those formulas I have called "prostration", "salutation", and "benediction", respectively). Thus, the "heading" is equivalent to that element which he had labelled "introduction" in Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 243 (see three footnotes above). As above, this category groups collectively the elements of Ahl's first and second categories.

letter.[87] D. Arnaud drew attention to the patterned usage of these lines in the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra.[88] Finally, J.-L. Cunchillos, in treating the Ugaritic data, also recognized the importance of such lines for the study of structure in describing them as "un des . . . signes de ponctuation que connaît l'ougaritique."[89] Such a preference for the native scribal indications of epistolary structure, over analyses of an external or functional nature, would seem not only laudable but methodologically sound. Unfortunately, as Ahl recognized, the usage of horizontal scribal lines in the Ugaritic corpus is inconsistent and variable,[90] leaving this criterion insufficient if not strictly controlled.

Even if the attested usage of the horizontal scribal lines is less than absolutely systematic, however, it may still provide a reliable starting point in the search for standard epistolary structure by revealing not universals, but tendencies in usage. Furthermore, the chances of recognizing such tendencies are greater thanks to the increase in the size of the known Ugaritic epistolary corpus since Ahl's 1973 dissertation.

---

[87]Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 61-69 (in the use of scribal lines in the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra) 104-108 (on their use in the Ugaritic letters), and pp. 131-132 (where the employment of scribal lines in the two corpora is compared).

[88]D. Arnaud, *SDB* 9 (1979), cols. 1355-1356, speaks of the usage of ". . . le trait . . . dans les lettres en particulier où l'on reconnaît d'un coup d'oeil l'adresse, la salutation et le corps." Arnaud's allusion to a tripartite epistolary structure is thus consistent with Ahl's view (see above), as well as the view argued here; his term "salutation" corresponds to Ahl' term of the same name, and to the three "polite formulas" in my terminology.

[89]Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 248. The usage of such scribal lines was neither mandatory nor standardized, however, and thus as a kind of "punctuation", it differs from the more codified and highly prescriptive usage of punctuation in various modern orthographic traditions.

[90]Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 107: "There seems to have been no rule governing the use of scribal lines."

With this in mind, I would propose that the usage of these scribal lines is sufficient to indicate the basic macrostructure of Ugaritic letters, provided the following two conditions are met: (1) the statistical predominance of the macrostructural pattern hypothetically considered "standard", and (2) the lack of formal homogeneity among those tablets which do not represent the "standard" pattern. Later on, contextual factors will be adduced to justify an analysis founded on these two conditions.

(1) A survey of the epistolary corpus yields over sixty letters in which the "*mise-en-page*", by means of horizontal scribal lines, is wholly or partially perceptible.[91] Eighteen of these present certain or virtually certain examples of a pattern in which the scribes' use of horizontal lines neatly distinguished three sections: (i) the address, in which the recipient of the message and its sender are named; (ii) the "polite formulas" in which, in which the sender expresses his obeisance toward the recipient, solicits the well-being of the recipient,[92] or both; and (iii) the body of the letter, in which the message itself is to be found.[93] This latter section is generally less

---

[91]The "*mise-en-page*", by means of horizontal scribal lines, is wholly or partially perceptible in the case of at least sixty-four letters, and possibly as many as sixty-six: RS 1.018, RS 1.021, RS 3.427 (in part), RS 4.475, RS 8.315, RS 9.479A, RS 11.872, RS 15.007, RS 15.008, RS 15.098 (possible), RS 15.158, RS 15.174, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.264, RS 16.265.1, RS 16.379, RS 16.402, RS 17.063, RS 17.117, RS 17.139, RS 17.434+, RS 18.031, RS 18.038, RS 18.040, RS 18.075 (in part) , RS 18.113, RS 18.134, RS 18.140.2, RS 18.147, RS 18.148, RS 18.286[A], RS 18.287 (in part), RS 19.011, RS 19.029, RS 19.102.1 (in part), RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 29.095, RS 34.124, RS 34.148, RS 34.356 (in part), RS 88.2159, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2428 (in part), RS 94.2429, RS 94.2479, RS 94.2537 (in part), RS 94.2545+ (in part), RS 94.2580, RS 94.2957.2 (possible), RS 94.5003+, RS 94.5009 (in part), RS 96.2039, RIH 77/21A, RIH 78/03+ (in part), RIH 78/12, and RS [Varia 4].

[92]I consider both the salutation and the benediction to represent solicitations of the well-being of the recipient; the difference between them being one of agent, on which see below, sections 3.5 and 4.5.

[93]These eighteen are RS 4.475 < SR | sal | body | >; RS 11.872 < RS | pros sal ben | s.r. i.r. | body | >; RS 15.174 < SR | sal ben | body | body >; RS 16.137[bis] < RS | pros | s.r. i.[r.] ... >; RS 16.379

stereotyped in composition than the preceding two sections, and may be composed of one or more subsections or "paragraphs".[94] Eight other letters possibly contained this structure, though tablet damage prevents certainty in this determination.[95] It also necessary to mention twelve other letters which contain no polite formulas, but do contain a scribal line separating the address from the body.[96] These letters are included here because it seems evident that the absence of the "polite formulas" is due to factors of social context,[97] and not to a different underlying structural model: in this sense, these letters may be considered as representing the same tripartite structure described above, in which the second element is "zero". Finally, four letters represent cases in which the scribes involved apparently considered the "double formula of well-being" not as a part of the body, as it is here interpreted, but as another "polite

---

< RS | pros sal ben | s.r. i.r. | body | >; RS 16.402 < RS | pros sal | body | body | >; RS 17.139 < SR | sal ben | body | body> ; RS 18.040 < RS | pros | body | >; RS 18.113 < RS | ben* | body ... > ; RS 18.134 < RS | sal ben | body ... > ; RS 18.140.2 < RS | pros | body ... >; RS 18.147 < SR | sal ben | s.r. i.r. | body ... >; RS 19.029 < RS | sal ben | body .... >; RS 34.124 < RS | pros sal ben | s.r. i.r. | body | >; RS 92.2005.2 < SR | sal ben | s.r. i.r. body >; RS 94.2383+ < RS | ben | body | >; RS 94.2479 < RS | pros sal | s.r. i.r. | body >; and RS 94.5003+ < RS | pros sal ben | s.r. i.r. | body | body | ... >.

[94]Already one notices the necessity of supplementary criteria in identifying and consolidating this structural pattern. It is context which permits the grouping together of those letters which contain a single "paragraph" in the body (for example, RS 4.475 < SR | sal | body | >) and those which contain more than one (for example RS 11.872, which has two: < RS | pros sal ben | s.r. i.r. | body | >). What becomes important is the consistency in the use of such scribal lines to delimit the formulaic portions of the letter; the use of these lines within the less formulaic portions of the body is less relevant.

[95]These are RS 3.427 < [...] ⌜sal⌝ ⌜ben⌝ | body | >; RS 18.075 < [...] ⌜sal⌝ ⌜ben⌝ | body | body | >; RS 19.102.1 < RS | pros ... >; RS 20.199 < RS | pros sal ben (?) s.r. i.r. | > (scribal line superfluous around edge?); RS 94.2391 < RS | pros sal ... >; RS 94.2428 < [...] pros sal ben | body ... | >; RS 94.2537 < SR | sal ben ... >; and RS 94.5009 < RS | sal pros ... >.

[96]These are RS 18.038, RS 18.286[A], RS 19.011, RS 88.2159, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2429, RS 94.2580, RS 96.2039, RIH 77/21A, possibly RS 15.098, and possibly RS 94.2957.2.

[97]In general, when a correspondent addresses a social inferior (such as RS 94.2406.1, from *mlkt*, 'the queen' to an individual named *ùrtn*, 'Urtenu'), he or she more often than not omits the polite formulas.

formula".[98] In these letters horizontal scribal lines separate the address from the polite formulas, and the polite formulas (here including the double formula of well-being) from the non-formulaic body. This yields a group of forty-two letters, representing a statistical majority, which certainly or probably reflect, or at least are not inconsistent with, the basic macrostructure < address | polite formulas | body >.

(2) If the forty-two letters discussed above show a more or less homogeneous usage of scribal lines, the twenty-four letters which remain do not. The use of scribal lines in this group is heterogeneous. Two letters make no use whatsoever of scribal

---

[98]These are RS 18.031 < RS | sal ben s.r. i.r. | body | >; RS 18.287 < [R]⌜S⌝ | pros s.r. i.r. | body ... >; RS 29.095 < SR | sal ben s.r. i.r. | body | >; and RS 92.2005.1 < RS | sal ben s.r. i.r. | body | >. As mentioned below in section 0.3.3.2, the absence of the scribal line in these cases does not necessarily indicate that no syntactic break was perceived, but rather that the would-be break, whether or not it was perceived, was not marked in the text.

If speculation be allowed as to the motivation for the absence of a scribal line between the polite formulas and the double formula of well-being, two factors come to mind: (1) in its formulaic composition, the double formula of well-being is more reminiscent of the polite formulas than the body, which is generally much less formulaic; and (2) in treating the topic of *šlm*, 'well-being', the double formula of well-being is reminiscent of the polite formulas, and especially of two of the polite formulas in particular, the salutation and the benediction, both of which incorporate forms of the verb ŠLM, 'to be well (G-stem), to keep (s.o.) well (D-stem).'

lines,[99] and one contains a scribal line after every line of text.[100] Three letters contain scribal lines only at the very beginning of the text, and not elsewhere.[101] Three other letters are alike in containing a scribal line between the two components of the address.[102] Seven letters contain no line between the address and the polite formulas,[103] and four contain no line between the polite formulas and the body,[104] both groups being otherwise standard. Three letters contain no line between the address and the polite formulas, nor between the polite formulas and the body, but do contain scribal lines within the body.[105] Finally, RS 34.356, though it does make use of scribal lines, is unique in containing an otherwise unattested obeisance or submission motifs

---

[99]These are RS 15.007 < S* R* body >, which is unique in several other respects, and RS 94.2273 < S R* pros* be[n] ... >, probably a scribal exercise.

[100]This is RS 18.148, which is formally unique in other respects.

[101]These are RS 92.2010 < | RS ben pros s.r. i.r.* body >; RS 94.2406.2 < | SR sal body > (a "piggyback" letter); and RIH 78/12 < | R pros body >.

[102]These are RS 1.018 < R | S sal ben* | body | body | body | >; RS 16.264 < S* | R* b | ody | body | body | body | >; and RS 34.148 < R | S sal* ben body | body || >. If the scribal line in this location in RS 1.018 was misplaced (inadvertently placed between lines 2-3 instead of lines 3-4), this letter would represent another example of the "standard" tripartite *mise-en-page* consisting of < address | polite formulas | body ... >. See paragraph (1) in the text above.

[103]These are RS 1.021 < SR ⌜sal⌝ ⌜ben⌝ ⌜|⌝ ⌜body⌝ >; RS 15.158 < ⌜S⌝R sal | [b]ody | body... >; RS 16.265.1 < SR ben* | body | body | scribal doodles | >; RS 17.063 < SR polite formulas* | body | body >; RS 17.434+ < SR s.r. ⌜sal*⌝ | body | body... body >; RS 29.093 < RS sal* ben pros | body | body >; and RS [Varia 4] < SR ben | body | body| body >. These examples lend credence to Cunchillos's (1989) view of Ugaritic epistolary structure as essentially binary: l'*introduction + le corps du message*; Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 243. The small number of examples showing this structure, however, is a problem.

[104]These are RS 8.315 < RS | pros ben s.r. body i.r. | >; RS 9.479A < RS | pros i.r. | >; RS 15.008 < SR | sal ben body s.r. i.r. | >; and RS 19.102.2 < RS | pros s.r. i.r. >.

[105]These are RS 17.117, which (along with RS 17.063) is non-standard in several other respects; RS 94.2545+, a very unusual text, < SR body RS body pros ben body | body >, probably best explained as a draft; and RIH 78/03+, which contains a non-standard address formula.

between two address formulas.[106] The fact of heterogeneity in this group reinforces the "standard" status of the tripartite structure described above.

0.3.3.2 Implications of the use of scribal lines

It should be noted that the presence of a scribal line indicates not only that the scribe perceived a syntactic or thematic break, but also that he wished to mark that break in a way visually perceptible for the intended reader. It follows that the absence of a scribal line does not necessarily indicate that the scribe perceived no break, but rather may simply indicate that he felt no need for a visually perceptible break marker. The reason for the absence of a scribal line thus could be (i) that no break was perceived, but also (ii) that a break was perceived but was not considered to be of sufficient interpretive importance to be marked graphically.

The inconsistent usage of scribal lines by certain scribes is significant in this regard. The two best examples of such inconsistency are to be found in double letters where the assumption of a single scribe seems justified. In RS 92.2005.1 scribal lines are used to separate the address from the polite formulas and the double formula of well-being from the body, but not between the polite formulas and the double formula of well-being: < RS | sal ben s.r. i.r. | body | >. In the second letter, RS 92.2005.2, (presumably) the same scribe included a line between the polite formulas and the double formula of well-being, but none between this latter and the non-formulaic body: < SR | sal ben | s.r. i.r. body >. In RS 94.2406.1, a scribal line appears between the address and the body (there are no polite formulas in this letter, from *mlkt*, 'the queen', to *ủrtn*, 'Urtenu'): < SR | body | body (etc.) >. In the attached "piggy-back" letter,

---

[106]That is, < RS | submission motif(s)?* | RS | body ... >.

however, no scribal lines are used, save at the very beginning of the text, marking the transition from the first letter to the second: < | SR sal body >.

The importance of the consistent, not occasional, absence or presence of scribal lines between any two given adjacent components emerges from these considerations. In this respect, it is remarkable that the usage of scribal lines affirms the unity of the "polite formulas" section:[107] I know of no example in which a scribal line separates one of the polite formulas from another.[108]

With these considerations in mind, several of those letters mentioned above in paragraph (2) which show a "non-standard" disposition of scribal lines may be shown to be compatible with, though not strictly indicative of, the "standard" tripartite macrostructure < address | polite formulas | body >. Of particular relevance are the seven letters which contain no scribal line between the address and the polite formulas, but do contain one between the polite formulas and the body;[109] and the four which contain no line between the polite formulas and the body, but do contain one between the address and the polite formulas.[110] In the cases of both of these groups, the lack of a scribal line where it might have been expected does not indicate that no structural break was perceived, but rather merely that such a break was not marked on the tablet, whether or not it was perceived. In this sense, these two groups neither

---

[107]Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature* (1949) 116, had already recognized this.

[108]Such does occur in Hittite scribal practise, however; compare A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 31.

[109]RS 1.021, RS 15.158, RS 16.265.1, RS 17.063, RS 17.434+, RS 29.093, and RS [Varia 4]; see above.

[110]RS 8.315, RS 9.479A, RS 15.008, and RS 19.102.2; see above.

explicitly affirm nor contradict an underlying tripartite macrostructure; they are merely compatible with such a macrostructure, not incompatible with it nor indicative of it.

0.3.4 Tripartite macrostructure as contextually normative

The tripartite macrostructure, here suggested as standard on the basis of the usage patterns of scribal lines, also finds support on the level of contextual interpretation: the letters which explicitly manifest the tripartite macrostructure are for the most part connected with known elites of the Ugaritian kingdom.[111] Foremost among these is the group of letters from the king to the queen mother,[112] but one may also include those letters from prominent administrative officials, whether these are mentioned by administrative title[113] or by name.[114]

---

[111]Of the eighteen letters which explicitly manifest the structure < address | polite formulas | body > (see the list above), the correspondents are more or less identifiable in sixteen cases (the exceptions are RS 18.140.2 and RS 19.029). Of these, the senders of at least eleven, and possibly thirteen, are explicitly linked with the Ugaritian royal administration (see below). Senders who are non-Ugaritians are to be found in as many as three letters: RS 18.134 (from *mkl* [*g*]*bl*, 'the king of Byblos'); RS 18.147 (from *pgn åbk*, 'PGN, your "father",' presumably addressed to *mlk* [*ůgrt*], 'the king of Ugarit'); and probably RS 15.174 (sender unknown, but probably addressed to *mlkt* [*ůgrt å*]*ḫty*, 'the queen of [Ugarit], my [si]ster'). These do not represent a counterargument; they merely indicate that the macrostructural pattern standard in the Ugaritian court was also standard elsewhere, which is not particularly surprising in light of the formal parallels observable in the epistolary corpora from Tell Meskene, Boğazköy, and Ma□at-Höyük, for example.

[112]These are RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 34.124, and RS 94.5003+, in all of which the structure < address | polite formulas | body ... > is clear.

[113]This is the case with RS 94.2479 (from *skn* to *mlkt*), and perhaps also for RS 18.113 if indeed the sender should be reconstructed as *rb mî*[*ḫd*] (compare {LÚ.UGULA URU.KAR} in RS 17.465:4, for example, where this title is carried by the well-known individual {^{d}MAŠ.MAŠ-AD}, Rašap-ʾAbū). This letter (RS 18.113) is unusual, however, in that its polite formulas' section < pros ben* > contains a formally atypical benediction formula.

[114]These are RS 18.040 (from *ṯpṭbʿl*, addressed to *mlk bʿly*); RS 92.2005.2 (from *ʿzîlt*, addressed to *åby åḫty*); RS 94.2383+ (from *ʿṯty*, addressed to *ůrtn åḫy*); probably RS 16.137[bis] (from *îllḏr*, addressed to *mlkt ådty*); probably RS 16.402 (from *îwʾrṯrm*, addressed to [*mlkt*] *ådty*); and perhaps RS 4.475 (from *îwrḏr*, addressed to *plsy*).

Conversely, those letters which are manifestly incompatible with the tripartite macrostructure here taken as "standard" show other formal features which are statistically atypical.[115] In addition, not only is this group more internally diverse than the former,[116] but it is also, for the most part, less obviously connected with senders who represent social-cultural elites of the kingdom. There are a number of important exceptions to this latter observation,[117] but the reduced number of this group and their atypical nature greatly lessen their interpretative importance. With respect to the internal diversity, mentioned above, a few of the letters in this group may derive from formally distinct epistolary sub-genres, hitherto poorly attested in the Ugaritic corpus,

---

[115]Foremost among these is RS 18.148, which contains a scribal line after every line of text, and which presents many other unique formal features; the sender of this letter is *ydn*, addressed to *mlk bʿlh*, 'the king, his lord'.

Another group which is manifestly incompatible with the tripartite macrostructure < address | polite formulas | body > consists of those letters which contain atypical or unique formal elements, or standard elements in an atypical order. They include RS 94.2545+ < SR body RS body pros ben body | body >, which intersperses elements of the body with the polite formulas; RS 34.356 < RS | unknown motifs | RS | ... >, in which two address formulas are present; RS 15.007, which contains no scribal lines whatsoever, and which uses a non-standard address formula, and non-standard orthography; RS 16.264 < S* | R* b | ody | body | body ... >, which contains a non-standard address formula and at least one misplaced scribal line; RS 17.063 and RS 17.117, both of which employ non-standard address formulas and non-standard polite formulas.

The other letters which do not show the superficial structure < address | polite formulas | body > are nevertheless not necessarily manifestly incompatible with this tripartite structure. In many cases, a tripartite structure may be implied, but simply not marked by means of scribal lines.

[116]I do not mean simply on the formal level; this group includes international diplomatic letters (RS 34.356 for example), letters between private individuals (RS 15.007 for example), and even what appear to be unsent drafts of letters (RS 94.2545+).

[117]Compare, for example, RS 16.264 (the address reads {(1) tḫm . rgm (2) mlk | (3) l ḫyʾl ... }; and RS 34.356 (sent by *ʿmrpi* [that is, a Ug. king of that name], to [*ml*]*k rb mlk mlk*[*m*], 'the great [ki]ng, the king of king[s]').

and as such would not be representative of that particular genre which constitutes the majority of the preserved letters.[118]

Another contextual means of control is the following: the tripartite structural division, founded upon the physical aspect of the tablet, finds a sort of confirmation on the interpretive level. It may be said that, in terms of their respective literary "function", the address represents the mutual identification of the correspondents; the address and the polite formulas together reflect the social relationship which exists between them, at least as expressed by the sender; and the body represents the context-bound message itself. This three-step sequence finds a surprising echo in the Ugaritic mythological texts. One finds in the mythological narratives a stereotyped sequence of motifs which treat the sending of a message by one god to another. Three motifs are normally present: (i) the arrival of the messengers *chez* the intended recipient of the

[118]Such sub-genres might include, for example, (a) letters from a Ugaritic king to a "great king", a situation which appears to have generated an epistolary formulary of its own (cf. RS 34.356), not unlike the one followed in similar circumstances in many letters from the Amarna and Boğazköy corpora; or (b) unsent drafts of letters in which the formal arrangement ought not be taken as final or even intentional (cf. RS 94.2545+).

message,[119] (ii) their act of prostration before the recipient,[120] and (iii) the delivery of the message itself.[121] In the narrative discourse, these three steps correspond more or less precisely, it seems to me, to the tripartite structure of the letters: (1) mutual identification of the correspondents, (2) formal gestures which affirm the hierarchical social relationship between them, and (3) the message itself. In this sense, the structure of the Ugaritic letter reflects the way in which the Ugaritians themselves imagined indirect communication, whether it be of an oral or written nature.

0.4 Typological Priorities

0.4.1 The importance of the address and polite formulas

While a comprehensive treatment of the Ugaritic letter-writing tradition, in all of its aspects, would certainly be laudable, such an undertaking is beyond the skill and time available to the present researcher. Selection being therefore necessary, and

---

[119]It would be more accurate to say "the journey of the messengers" in which their destination is explicitly mentioned, and after which mutual recognition is usually stated or implied. A typical example is the narrative of the arrival of Baʿlu's messengers at Ṣapānu, having returned from their mission to Môtu, in KTU 1.5:I.9-11: *ỉdk l ytn pnm ʿm bʿl mrym ṣpn*, 'Then, they (*ỉlm*, "the two gods", in line 9, a reference to Baʿlu's two divine messengers) set (their) faces toward Baʿlu, on the heights of (Mount) Ṣapānu.' Furthermore this motif occurs in two contexts: (1) in commissions, in which the sender of the message is dictating instruction to the messengers, and (2) in narrative accounts of the fulfillment of these commissions. For references on both, see the discussion in G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (1981) 54-55, regarding the motif he labels « orden de marcha ».

In some cases, however, actual arrival (in which the implication of mutual recognition is more obvious, I believe) is explicitly mentioned; cf. KTU 1.2:I.30: *åḫr tmǵyn mlåk ym*, 'Afterwards, the two messengers of Yammu arrive (at Mount Lullu [*ǵr ll*], the site, in this episode, of an assembly [*pḫr mʿd*] of the gods).' Another example of arrival (with implied mutual recognition) is KTU 1.2:III.5: *w ybû* [*q*]*rš mlk*, 'Then he (Kôṯaru) enters the dwelling (*qrš*) of the "King" (=ʾIlu).'

[120]For references to this motif, both in commissions and in narrative accounts, see del Olmo, *ibid.*, under his heading « orden de postración ».

[121]This is marked by a motif in which the messengers announce the message they intend subsequently to recite. As above, this motif can occur in commissions and narratives. For a survey of both situations, with references, see del Olmo, *ibid.*, where he refers to this motif as « mensaje ».

given the interest in typological classification expressed above,[122] it seems reasonable to restrict the present inquiry to those areas of research having direct bearing on this subject.

With this in mind, it is obvious that the three major subsections of a typical Ugaritic letter are not of equal importance in the typological analysis of form. On the one hand, the two sections devoted to the address and the polite formulas are without question of primary import: their composition is stereotyped and their distribution regular, almost predictable. Such patterned regularities are, of course, essential for typological purposes — it is they which permit the identification, classification, and cataloging of attestations, as well as the perception of formal variants. For this reason, the components of the address and polite formulas sections have received a detailed treatment in this work, dealing with composition, distribution, important variants, and comparative parallels.

On the other hand, the third section of a typical Ugaritic letter, the body, is much more flexible: the motifs to be found there are more variable in composition and often unpredictable in distribution; this part is thus less sensitive to typological analysis. Consequently, apart from a brief catalog of several typical stereotyped motifs, I have not developed my study of the body as part of this typological analysis.

If the address and the polite formulas are both of primary importance, however, their respective value is also unequal. In one sense, the address is less essential than the polite formulas in typological classification since (1) virtually every letter contains an address formula, and thus its distribution is generally not of typological interest, but also (2) its composition is relatively simple and uniform, the majority of the epistolary

---

[122]See above, section 0.1.2.

corpora of the cuneiform cultures of ancient West Asia, not simply the Ugaritic, being formed on one and the same basic model, and thus the typological value of its composition is somewhat, though not entirely, restricted.[123] In another sense, however, the address is of greater importance than the polite formulas in the contextual interpretation of the letter. If the polite formulas contain data of higher formal importance, the information in the address formula provides the fundamental criteria upon which a contextual interpretation of the letter must be made. The address provides information essential for an accurate classification of the letter, not only formal but also contextual, and thus it cannot be neglected.

The procedure followed in this dissertation represents a compromise. The chapters devoted to the polite formulas are the most extensive, and, in the final analysis, perhaps the most important from a purely formal point of view. But I have also included a fairly detailed treatment of the address formula. For the motifs of the body, I provide a catalog of the more frequent examples, but none of the details such as those supplied for the polite formulas. In this way, I hope to have exploited to the fullest extent those criteria of highest diagnostic important for a formal typology.

0.4.2 The praescriptio

Because they are entirely formulaic in terms of composition and distribution, the address and the polite formulas are often grouped together under a single cover term to distinguish them from the third and final part of the letter, the body, which is markedly less formulaic. The cover term used here for this purpose is

---

[123]The variable order of mention of the sender and the recipient in the Ugaritic epistolary address formulas (see below, sections 1.2 and 1.5.1) represents one important exception to this statement: this aspect is of considerable importance, along with other criteria, in establishing the position of the Ugaritic tradition in relation to contemporary and anterior corpora of cuneiform letters.

"*praescriptio*".[124] It is to a certain extent questionable whether this term designates a structural unit perceived as meaningful by the ancients.[125] I have nevertheless retained it in certain cases, as it provides a convenient means of alluding to that formulaic part of the letter consisting of the address and the polite formulas.

0.5 FORMAL PATTERNS AND CONTEXTUAL INTERPRETATION

The challenge of typology is not simply the task of identifying formal patterns and variations in a collection of subjects; this requires patience and little else, and the result is little more than antiquarianism. Rather, the challenge, and that aspect which demands certain amounts both of reflection and of luck, is the task of credibly relating formal differences to various contextual factors, whether these be chronological, geographical, or socio-cultural in nature.

The most common application of typological classification in Ancient Near Eastern studies is probably the systematic attempt to link changes in form with the passage of time. Since the novel applications of W. M. Flinders Petrie, associating ceramic sequences (changes in form) with tell stratigraphy (changes in time),[126] the importance of this method in the establishment of relative chronologies, especially for

---

[124]D. Pardee has also employed this term in his studies of Ugaritic letters, following the terminology adopted by J. Fitzmyer in his study of Aramaic epistolography.

[125]A few letters, mentioned above, present a disposition of horizontal scribal lines which could be interpreted as affirming such an underlying two-part macrostructure < formulaic *praescriptio* | body >. These do not represent the statistical majority, however, and furthermore are not necessarily incompatible with the statisitically predominant tripartide macrostructure. See the fuller discussion of this question in section 0.3 above.

[126]A brief biographical entry on Flinders Petrie and a survey of his main contributions to archeological method, with some anterior bibliography, may be found in N. Silberman's article in *OEANE* 4 (1997) 308-309.

material artifacts, can hardly be overestimated. W. F. Albright pioneered the application of typological method to epigraphy, specifically paleography,[127] and his intellectual descendants in general continue to show a strong interest in typology as a tool for not only relative, but sometimes even absolute dating. Despite the enormous progress made in this domain by Albright and his students, the establishment of chronological sequences is not, of course, the only application of typological classification.[128] Indeed, the most trenchant critiques of uniquely chronological typologies applied to the paleographical analysis of the West Semitic alphabetic scripts of the Iron Age have stressed the neglect of other contextual factors, and most especially, of geography.[129] This does not, of course, negate the value of much of the work done in paleography; it merely demands a greater awareness of the limitations inherent in the method, and consequently requires much greater caution in any uniquely chronological interpretation of the established sequences.

A strictly chronological interpretation of any putative typology drawn from the linguistic data in the Ugaritic corpus, whether such be paleographic, orthographic,

---

[127]See the memorial of Albright, written by his student F. M. Cross, in the *Yearbook of the American Philosophical Society* (1972) 114; reproduced in Cross, *Maarav* 3 (1982) 121-122. As one early example of Albright's contributions to paleographic typology applied to the Semitic alphabetic scripts, Cross mentions Albright's seminal essay "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus," published in *JBL* 56 (1937) 145-176.

[128]Cross's famous "Alphabets and Pots" essay, published in *Maarav* 3 (1982) 121-136, and reprinted, with minor changes, in an anthology of essays, *From Epic to Canon* (1998) 233-245, dwells almost exclusively on the chronological application of typological sequences. Needless to say, I doubt that Cross would insist that chronological applications are the *only* application of such sequences.

[129]The argument offered by S. A. Kaufman, *HUCA* 57 (1986) 1-14, has lost none of its force, even after sixteen years. An excellent paraphrase of his position appears on p. 3: "Unlike the typological development of American automobiles . . . , the history of the alphabet involves a spatial dimension as well as a chronological one. Even if it were true, and of course it is not, that we possess a datable Phoenician inscription from every generation of the First Millennium B.C.E., the fact would remain that we do not possess such an inscription from every possible site where that alphabet might have been in use."

morphological, or stylistic in nature, seems, at present, very dubious. Most of the alphabetic tablets are notoriously difficult to date, and the traditional view that the Ugaritic corpus spans about two centuries of scribal activity[130] is no longer accepted without question.[131] The chronological provenance of the texts being for the most part uncertain, the possibility of distinguishing diachronic stages, in the language and in scribal tradition, can only rarely be accomplished on empirical criteria, and hence runs the risk of becoming basically an exercise in speculation. In fact, the suspicion is growing among students of the Ugaritic language that the (alphabetic) corpus at our disposal derives for the most part from the last generation of occupation at the site.[132] If this is the case, then Ugaritic, as it is presently known, may be described as a "one-period" language. While the existence of diachronic development in the Ugaritic language and in its written traditions is theoretically very likely, as long as such fundamental chronological questions remain unanswered it is very difficult in practice to establish any sort of chronological chain of development that is both credible and non-arbitrary. In short, I have not attempted to link the formal differences observed in the chapters below with any sort of chronological sequence. This is not to say that such is not possible; rather, it is at present indemonstrable by any data known to me, and therefore, of limited interest from a critical point of view.

---

[130]Compare, for example, Gordon's statement in *Ugaritic Textbook* (1965), § 1.2.

[131]Compare Pardee's remarks in *Context* 1 (1997) 241, n. 3; for a cautious paraphrase of the problem, see Pardee, *BASOR* 320 (2000) 80.

[132]Compare Pardee's statement in his description of the Ugaritic language in the *Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (forthcoming): "In recent years it has become clearer that the greatest number of texts date from the last few decades of the site and there is, therefore, no basis on which to define a "late" Ugaritic over against the main body of texts (*contra* Tropper [*UF* 25 (1993) 389-394]), for the main body of texts is late Ugaritic. The only clear strata of the language are the poetic dialect in which most mythological texts are written and the prose dialect used for everyday communication and administration."

Neither have I attempted to link the observed formal differences in the letters with geographical factors. Here again, there is no doubt that scribal habits varied geographically.[133] Neither is there any doubt that the cuneiform alphabetic script commonly called "Ugaritic" was in use outside of the city of that name,[134] and indeed, outside of the politically unified "country"[135] named after that city from which it was governed.[136] Rather, as with the chronological factor discussed above, the geographical provenance of most letters in the Ugaritic corpus is simply not knowable. Much of the corpus almost certainly represents domestic correspondence, and this in part justifies a neglect of geography as a factor.[137] Furthermore, even in the case of those letters in which the sender evidently resided outside of the kingdom, it is not clear that the Ugaritic text in question was actually composed on foreign soil: on the contrary, many students of these texts have simply assumed that such Ugaritic texts represent translations, made locally by Ugaritian scribes, of Akkadian originals. Such

---

[133]Such is obvious in the Amarna corpus, for example. For a recent contribution on this subject, see J.-P. Vita, *ZA* 90 (2000) 70-77. H. A. Hoffner, Jr., has informed me (personal communication), however, that the paleographic study of Hittite cuneiform in texts from Ma□at, Ortaköy, and Ku□akli has shown the signforms did not vary significantly within the Hittite heartland.

[134]I allude to the epigraphic finds from Ras Ibn Hani; and to the tablet find at Tell Sukas, near the southern border of the kingdom; see P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, *TEO* 1 (1989) 362-377, 382.

[135]I use the word "country" as a translation of the Sumerogram {KUR}, and of its Ugaritic equivalent, *ḫwt*.

[136]Compare the cuneiform alphabetic inscriptions in "Ugaritic" script from Tell Nebi Mend (ancient Qadeš / Kinza, on the Orontes), from Kāmid el-Lōz (ancient Kumidi, on the Litani), from Sarepta on the Mediterranean coast, from Hala Sultan Tepe on Cyprus, and from Tel Taanach, Mount Tabor, and Beth Shemesh in Palestine/modern Israel; see Bordreuil and Pardee, *TEO* 1 (1989) 378-382.

[137]This is valid unless one assumes that provincial centers of scribal training existed within the kingdom, outside of and formally distinct from those of the capital.

was not necessarily the case,[138] but even so, it seems best to defer geographical considerations entirely. As above with chronology, since geographical provenance is for the most part simply unknowable, its use as a contextual criterion of classification is not only uncontrollable, but introduces an element of arbitrariness which would probably only harm the results.

In the absence of chronological and geographical controls, the interpretation of the formal differences described in the chapters which follow must be made on other grounds: the kinds of data accessible in the letters suggest the possibility of an interpretation based on social or cultural factors. In other words, one could propose that Ugaritic letters have formal structures connected with certain socio-cultural facts. One of the main problems of interpretation is the identification of these latter, which may, in turn, permit a credible explanation of the particular formal structures.

Such a restriction to socio-cultural factors in the interpretation of epistolary form, despite its practical necessity in this case, may not, in fact, be distortive. Diachronic formal development during the relatively brief period documented in the Ugaritic corpus was probably negligible or nearly so, and the fact that epistolary corpora from roughly contemporary Syrian and Anatolian sites, such as Tell Meskene and Ma□at Höyük, share the same basic formal structure, suggests that local differences, in the sphere of Hittite influence at least, were probably also of restricted importance. The only credible contextual factors which remain to explain the observable formal variation are those of a socio-cultural nature. For both pragmatic

---

[138]F. Malbran-Labat, in *CRAIBL* (1995) 445, mentions an Akkadian letter from the 1994 season which indicates that a Ugaritian scribe was a resident at the court of the king of Alašiya (Cyprus). If such a practice was widespread, it is possible that at least some of the Ugaritic letters of foreign provenance recovered at Ras Shamra are not local translations of Akkadian originals, as has long been assumed, but are genuine Ugaritic compositions by similar Ugaritian scribes residing abroad in foreign courts.

and theoretical reasons, I classify the formal differences described below by means of socio-cultural information; very often this information is empirically observable in the address formulas of the letters.

Linking the interpretation of form with considerations of social and cultural context is not new: Hans Güterbock proposed a connection between the form of the address formula and the social status of the correspondents already in 1944 in dealing with a Hittite letter,[139] and Jean Nougayrol recognized the same in the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters in 1955.[140] Since these views touch on the question of social status in Ugaritian society, it is appropriate to state briefly my approach to such a subject. Methodologically speaking, it seems that the lens through which we moderns must view the social status of the various correspondents in Ugaritic letters is the conceptual social terminology used by the Ugaritians themselves to describe their own relationships. The social relationships revealed in the letters, when described by the correspondents themselves, are metaphors drawn from daily life in the household.[141]

---

[139]Cited in P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *Festschrift Römer* (1998) 171: ". . . the formulation of the rule preferred by Güterbock in 1944 in his treatment of the first Ma□at letter, . . . [p.] 400: 'Dass der Briefschreiber sich selbst zuerst nennt, zeigt, dass er von gleichem oder höherem Rang ist als der Empfänger.' "

[140]J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 (1955) 3, "D'après certains de ces exemples particulièrement nets, la formule 1 [= *ana* B *qibī-ma umma* A], qui *met en avant* le nom du destinataire, distingue, à Ras Shamra, les lettres d'un inférieur — de droit ou de fait — à un supérieur, tandis que la formule 2 [= *umma* A *ana* B *qibī-ma*], qui *met en avant* le nom de l'expéditeur, y est employée entre égaux ou à l'égard d'un subalterne. Ce détail nous permet, sans doute, à l'occasion, d'éclairer la position respective des correspondants." The fact that two orders of mention were present in the address formulas of Ras Shamra letters (Ugaritic and Akkadian) had already been observed by J. Friedrich, *AfO* 10 (1935-1936) 80-81, who compared similar variation in letters from Boğazköy and Amarna; compare also J. Nougayrol, *Semitica* 3 (1950) 19-20. To my knowledge, however, with respect to the Ras Shamra corpus, it was only in *PRU* 3 (1955) that the connection between the form of the address and the social hierarchy of the correspondents was made.

[141]It is to Knutson's credit that he recognized and explicitly articulated this observation (*RSP* 2 [1975] 199): "The 'nouns of relation' also show the relative rank of the correspondents." These "nouns of relationship" include the following "household" terms: *bʿl*, 'master', and its feminine equivalent, *ảdt*,

I have attempted in the chapters which follow to establish and document such a connection for the formal aspects of the Ugaritic letters. In particular, I consider the social context behind the letters to be directly accessible through the very extensive use throughout the letter, but especially in the address, of those terms which express the social relationship between the correspondents. These terms of social relation, abbreviated as "REL terms", appear to be the most convenient means of explaining the formal patterns observable in the letters.[142] The presence of these terms in the letters has already been studied,[143] but they have not, to my knowledge, been exploited as the primary contextual criterion in a typological classification.

The advantage of using these REL terms is three-fold: (1) they reveal differences and equivalences in social status, at least as expressed by the sender, a factor which, following Güterbock and Nougayrol, seems formally relevant; (2) they introduce an empirical constraint on the identification of such social status, which does much to avoid attribution of social status based on circular or intuitive arguments; and (3) they reflect social relationships in terms native and important to the society which produced the letters under study.

'mistress' or 'lady'; *ʿbd*, 'servant', and its feminine equivalent, *åmt*, 'handmaid' or 'servant girl'; *rʿ*, 'compagnon' or 'colleague'; *ådn*, which, from an etymological point of view, should mean something like 'lord' (compare its feminine etymological cognate *ådt*, above), but the inner Ugaritic usage of which clearly favors the meaning 'father' (in the biological sense); perhaps *åb*, the standard Northwest Semitic word for 'father'; *ům*, 'mother'; *bn*, 'son'; and finally, *åḫ* and *åḫt*, 'brother' and 'sister', respectively. See also J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 247-248; and Cunchillos, *HUS* (1999) 361-362. In the words of J. D. Schloen, *Patrimonial Household* (1995) 172, ". . . 'household' is preferable to 'kinship' because it encompasses master-servant relationships as well as blood ties, and therefore expresses more accurately the composition of the patriarchal domain."

[142]Examples will be multiplied in the course of the subsequent chapters; see especially the second and seventh sections of chapters 1-3.

[143]See the references cited above in footnote 141.

By giving major attention to these REL terms, I do not wish to neglect other social or cultural factors which may have conditioned certain formal aspects of letter-writing. Other studies have convincingly drawn attention to various other such factors.[144] What I seek to do here, rather, is to develop, as fully as possible, the evidence for connecting the formal patterns in the Ugaritic epistolary *praescriptio* with the distribution of REL formulas used therein.

0.6 TERMS OF SOCIAL RELATION

0.6.1 REL phrases in the address

The address formulas in particular facilitate the interpretation of the patterns which emerge in the form and distribution of the *praescriptio*. In a certain sense, they can be considered as the key to the typological classification offered here, since they provides the contextual information considered diagnostically essential.

The address contains two kinds of information about the correspondents: on the one hand (1) nouns or noun phrases, common or proper, which identify the sender and the recipient as individuals, and on the other (2) noun phrases which characterize the social relationship between the correspondents. For convenience, the former may be called "identifying" phrases, abbreviated ID, and the latter "relational" phrases, abbreviated REL. The latter are of concern here.

---

[144]D. Arnaud, *Syria* 59 (1982) 107, n. 53, for example, has proposed that certain formally elaborate benediction formulas among the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters may be best understood as reflecting a common "formation intellectuelle" among the correspondents; they appear to derive from a particularly cultivated scribal milieu. Working with the Hittite epistolary corpus from Ma□at-Höyük, Houwink ten Cate, *Festschrift Römer* (1998) 163-164, has proposed that certain formal features are to be explained by reference to the theme of the letter: if the letter treated military matters, no polite formulas were included; if it treated administrative matters, this exclusion did not apply.

The noun phrases of social relationship, or REL phrases, are drawn from the basic vocabulary of social life in the household.[145] They may be conceived in terms of kinship, as when the sender qualifies his correspondent as *ủmy* 'my mother', *ảḫy* 'my brother', or the like; or they may be conceived in terms of the power hierarchy within the home, as when the sender addresses his correspondent as *bʿly* 'my master', and alludes to himself as *ʿbdk* 'your servant'.[146] D. Schloen was correct to observe that both series of metaphors find their origin, or "root metaphor", in the patrimonial household.[147]

Certainly, the ID phrases, which identity the correspondents as individuals, are of no small significance for the contextual interpretation of the formal structure of the letter. The REL phrases which frequently accompany them, however, are absolutely central in interpretation. Other contextual factors besides the distribution of REL terms bear on form, of course, but in general, the choice of term employed by the sender to express his social relationship with the recipient appears to have been directly related to the formal composition of the letter, or, at the very least, of the *praescriptio*.

The inventory of REL terms in productive use in the Ugaritic epistolary tradition appears to have been small. Leaving aside the pronominal suffixes attached to them,

---

[145]This use of the term "metaphor" is not intended to distinguish between "literal" and "figurative" usages of given REL phrases. All of the REL phrases are metaphorical in the sense that they allude to a single symbolic setting, that of the patrimonial household, regardless of whether or not the sender is literally the biological "brother" (for example) of the recipient. The REL terminology does not distinguish between metaphorical and literal usages. Judging from this, one may legitimately wonder if such a distinction was perceived as meaningful by the social actors themselves.

[146]See the survey of the attested forms below, in section 1.2.

[147]J. D. Schloen, *Patrimonial Household* (1995) 172; *idem*, *The House of the Father* (2001) 1, 45-46. The only modification to his formulation that I would suggest with respect to the letters is that *nḥl*, 'heir', is not part of the inventory of household terms used productively to evoke the possible types of social relation.

as many as eleven such conceptually explicit common nouns, or REL terms, are attested. The bulk of these may be found in the corpus of address formulas; listed alphabetically these are: *ảb* (probably), *ảḫ* (and its orthographic variant *ỉḫ*), *ảḫt*, *ảdn*, *ảdt*, *bn*, *bʿl*, *ʿbd*, *rʿ* (possibly), and *ủm*. Expanding the survey to the remaining epistolary sections yields at least one other such REL term, not yet attested in the address: *ảmt*.[148]

0.6.2 Two Conceptual Models

In surveying this inventory, the two distinct conceptual models may be distinguished.[149] Some of these terms refer to relationships of biological kinship: *ảb*,[150] if it is indeed to be included here,[151] *ảḫ* (and its orthographic variant *ỉḫ*)

---

[148]In RS 29.095, lines 12 and 19, the phrase *ảmtk*, 'your maidservant' is evidently a reference to one of the (two) senders of the letter.

[149]This applies to the other cuneiform epistolary traditions of West Asia.

[150]I do not know how exactly to gloss *ảb*. In earlier Ugaritic lexicography, comparative Semitic considerations led to the intuitive assumption that this was the Ugaritic word for '(biological) father', as it is in the cognate languages. It is certainly used in this sense in the myths (see G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 1-2); but Ugaritic prose and the native (Mesopotamian-derived) Ugaritian lexicographical tradition itself use another lexeme for this sense: *ảdn* in alphabetic, written {a-da-nu} in the Ugaritic column of the *Syllabary A Vocabulary* (and corresponding to the Akkadian entry {a-bu}, and Hurrian {at-ta-ni}); see (two footnotes below), J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 232-233 (and n. 2), and J. Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 104.

It may have been that *ảb* and *ảdn* had a similar denotation, '(biological) father', but different socio-cultural connotations (cf. Amerian English 'father' and 'dad'; Pardee once suggested to me an analogy from British English which better reflects the etymology of both *ảb* and *ảdn*: 'father' vs. 'gov'). In any case, *ảdn* appears to have been the "least marked" common noun for denoting biological paternity.

[151]I am aware of only one occurrence of this word in a REL phrase: RS 18.147:1 (I think the context of RS 15.098:16 is too broken to allow confident interpretation), where, however, the reading of the word is not clear, and must be partially reconstructed.

'brother', *åḫt* 'sister', *ådn* 'father',[152] *bn* 'son', and *ům* 'mother'. The others have no bearing on kinship, but rather express hierarchical relationships of power: *ådt* 'lady, mistress', *åmt* 'maidservant', *bʿl* 'lord, master', *ʿbd* 'servant', and perhaps *rʿ*, 'companion, colleague'.

To my knowledge, all of the REL terms found in the corpus of Ugaritic letters fit into one or the other of these two conceptual models, that of biological kinship or that of hierarchical power. The use of one model or the other was significant in Ugaritic epistolary composition, and for this reason, it is useful to distinguish the biological kinship model from the hierarchical power model in a convenient way: the abbreviations "BIO" and "POW", respectively, are employed for this purpose. Furthermore, as mentioned above, the inventory of REL terms is unified by the fact that all of these terms refer to social roles found in the prototypical antique household, whether such roles be those of kinship or those of power. To my knowledge, no REL terms appear in the epistolary corpus which do not derive from this metaphorical setting. The exclusiveness of household terminology for expressing all types of social relationship is surely significant, and has been developed elsewhere, and in broader terms, by D. Schloen.[153]

The semantics and usage of these terms permit not only the elaboration of the basic inventory at the disposal of the scribe for each model, but also some abstraction. Both models require, and make use of, three kinds of terms. The three kinds, defined

---

[152]Current data on Ugaritic prose usage seem to indicate that it was generally this term, *ådn*, which was used to denote biological paternity, 'father', or at least was the "least-marked" term for such a denotation, and not *åb*, as had been supposed. This is evident not only from the symmetry in the address formula of RS 92.2005:1-5, where the sender addresses his two recipients as [*å*]*dny*, 'my father', and *ůmy*, 'my mother', respectively, but also from the lexicographical data cited two footnotes above. Compare the remarks of D. Pardee, *Context* 3 (2003) 52, n. 52.

[153]J. D. Schloen, *Patrimonial Household* (1995); *idem*, *The House of the Father* (2000).

by the semantics inherent in the terms, are: (1) those appropriate for use when addressing a social superior, (2) those appropriate for a social peer or equal, and (3) those appropriate for a social inferior.[154] According to this schema, then, one can define the theoretical inventory of both BIO and POW relationships, though a small amount of reconstruction is necessary in both cases.

For the POW model, the inventory is as follows, with the superior, equal, and inferior terms occupying the top, middle, and bottom rows, respectively; and the terms used for masculine or common grammatical gender given in the left column, and those marked for feminine gender on the right. Unattested relational terms are preceded by an asterisk.

bʿl, 'lord'	*ảdt*, 'lady'
rʿ, 'colleague'	**rʿt* (?),[155] '(feminine) colleague'
ʿbd, 'servant'	*ảmt*, 'maid-servant'.

The BIO model, listed according to the same schema, is as follows.

ảdn, 'father'	*ủm*, 'mother'
ảḫ (*iḫ*), 'brother'	*ảḫt*, 'sister'
bn, 'son'	**bt*,[156] 'daughter'

---

[154]The recognition of three such categories of relationship between the correspondents, and their influence on epistolary structure is standard, though not necessarily conceived in the same terms employed here: compare, for example, J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 (1955) 3; Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 71-72; Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 199; Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 144; Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), col. 1414; and Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 245-247.

[155]My proposal for the feminine equivalent of *rʿ*, 'colleague', is speculative.

[156]There can be little doubt about this term. It is explicitly attested in the epistolary corpus; most notably in the well known letter RS 34.124, in which the phrase *bt mlk ảmr*, 'the daughter of the king of ʾAmurru', occurs several times (lines 17, 24, and 32). This particular phrase, however, is not a REL phrase, but an ID phrase, referring to the person being discussed in the letter in an individual and specific way.

0.6.3 Conceptual Status

A further abstraction, founded on the symmetrical nature of these two inventories and on the paired distribution within the letters of the terms which they contain, permits a conceptual classification of letters that will be extremely useful in the explication of epistolary structure.

The distribution of the REL terms allow one to define six possible types of conceptual status for any given letter: (1) "ascending", (2) "horizontal", (3) "descending", (4) "unmarked", (5) "unknown", and (6) "mixed". The first three are the most important from a theoretical point of view, and derive directly from the terminological inventory; the latter three were added by necessity, on the basis of the unsystematic use of REL terms in the letters as well as the fragmentary state of certain tablets.

0.6.3.1 Necessary theoretical categories: ASC, HOR, and DESC

Of the six types of conceptual status mentioned in the paragraph above, only three are strictly required by the theoretical paradigm. These three types, whose existence is invoked by the nature of the REL terms, are conceptually "ascending", "horizontal", and "descending" letters.

By conceptually "ascending" letters, abbreviated "ASC", I mean those letters in which the sender employs REL terminology appropriate for an ascending social relationship between himself and the recipient. In other words, this category denotes (1) those letters in which the sender refers to the recipient with the phrases *bʿly*, 'my lord', or *ådty*, 'my lady', and to himself (or herself) with the phrases *ʿbdk*, 'your servant', or *åmtk*, 'your maidservant'; and also (2) those letters in which the sender

refers to the recipient with the phrases *ůmy*, 'my mother', or *ådny*, 'my father', and to himself (or herself) with the phrases *bnk*, 'your son', or **btk*, 'your daughter' (not yet attested). The former may be described as ASC POW letters since they are not only conceptually ascending, but also employ REL terms of hierarchical power; in like manner letters of the latter type may be described as ASC BIO. In both of these cases, the relationship of sender to recipient may be characterized as conceptually "ascending".

By conceptually "horizontal" letters, abbreviated "HOR", I mean those letters in which the sender employs REL terminology appropriate for a relationship of social peers or equals between himself and the recipient. Thus, as above, this category denotes those letters in which the sender refers to the recipient with the phrases *åḫy*, 'my brother', or *åḫty*, 'my sister', and to himself or herself with the phrases *åḫk*, 'your brother', or *åḫtk*, 'your sister'; such letters may be characterized as HOR BIO, since they are not only conceptually horizontal, but also employ REL terms drawn from the vocabulary of biological kinship. In theory, this category would also denote those letters in which the sender refers to the recipient with the phrases *rʿy*, 'my colleague', or **rʿty*, 'my (female) colleague' (unattested), and to himself or herself with the phrases *rʿk*, 'your colleague', or **rʿtk*, 'your (female) colleague' (unattested); and such letters would be described as HOR POW, conceptually horizontal letters conceived on the hierarchical power model. In practice, however, no "pure" examples of this type are known, a fact not without implications for the precise connotations of the words *åḫ* and *åḫt* in the letters. In all of these cases, the relationship of the sender to the recipient may be characterized as "horizontal".

By conceptually "descending" letters, abbreviated "DESC", I mean those letters in which the sender employs REL terminology appropriate for a descending social

relationship with the recipient. This conceptual category is particularly rare in the Ugaritic corpus: only two possible "pure" examples are known, and neither of these is without epigraphic problems involving the reading of the REL terms. In the case of RS 18.147, the sender refers to the recipient with the phrase *bny*, 'my son', and apparently to himself with the phrase *åbk*,[157] 'your father (?)', though this is not the standard word for 'father' in Ugaritic prose.[158] If properly interpreted, then, this letter could be described as DESC BIO, conceptually descending and conceived on the biological kinship model. In RS 19.181A, the sender apparently refers to the recipient with the phrase *ʿbdy*,[159] 'my servant', which leads one to speculate that a corresponding REL term in which the sender refers to himself as [*bʿlk*], '[your lord]', should be restored in line 1.[160] If understood correctly, this letter can be described as DESC POW, conceptually descending and conceived on the hierarchical power model. In these cases, the relationship of sender to recipient may be characterized as conceptually "descending". The rarity of conceptually descending letters, however, is itself of great interest, and is addressed elsewhere.[161]

---

[157]Judging from Pardee's collation, the reading {⌜åbk⌝} at the end of line 1 is epigraphically possible, but not certain; compare his comments in *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 45 (RS 18.147), remarques textuelles: "Les traces de {⌜åbk⌝} à la fin de la ligne sont claires (nouvelle lecture)."

[158]See above, section 0.6.3.

[159]In the *editio princeps*, Virolleaud read {ʿbdy} at the end of line 2, without hesitation (though his copy shows some damage to the last three signs in this word): *PRU* 5 (1965) 177. The readings of Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín {ʿ⌜bdby⌝} in *KTU*^{2} 2.67, and of Pardee {ʿ⌜bdy⌝} (his textual remarks will be be published in *Les textes épistolaires* [in preparation]), reflect more uncertainty.

[160]The presence of {⌜hl⌝ny . åẖ⌜y⌝} in line 4, however, is a potential problem. This line should represent the first line of the body of the letter, and it is not uncommon in such circumstances to employ a vocative: 'Now then, O my brother. . . .' If such is the case, the reconstruction of the REL terms in lines 1-2 must be reconsidered.

[161]See below, for example, in sections 0.6.4 and 1.7.1.3.

0.6.3.2 Practical categories: UNMARKED, UNKNOWN, and MIXED

Three other types of conceptual status are necessary to deal effectively with the Ugaritic epistolary corpus. Unlike the three terms defined above, these three conceptual categories are not required by the nature of the REL terms, but rather by the practical distribution of the terms within the letters. These are conceptually "unmarked", "unknown", and "mixed" letters.

Letters which do not employ conceptually explicit REL terms in references to the sender and recipient may be described as conceptually "unmarked". In such letters, only ID phrases or simple pronouns, and not conceptually explicit REL phrases, are used for such purposes. Typical examples of this category are provided by the letters from the king or queen to named individuals. In RS 94.2406.1, for example, one such conceptually "unmarked" letter, the sender identifies herself as *mlkt*, 'the queen', and addresses her recipient, by name only, as *ủrtn*, 'Urtenu'. By the definitions employed here, both political titles and personal names are ID terms, not REL terms, since they refer first and foremost to an individual, and not to a relation. In fact, no conceptually explicit REL terms are used for sender-recipient deixis anywhere in the letter. In the absence of conceptual REL terminology, then, such letters are considered as "unmarked".[162]

In practice, however, some aspects of the social relationship between the sender and the recipient are obvious, not from the usage of REL terms, as elsewhere, but from contextual considerations. Such contextual considerations include, most notably, the knowledge of certain facts of Ugaritic social organization, facts directly

---

[162]Conceptually UNMARKED letters are thus unmarked by REL terms.

evoked by the words *mlk*, 'king', and *mlkt*; 'queen', for example; but also from the semantic content of the body: numerous direct imperatives, threats, and the like are more appropriate in the mouth of a social superior addressing a subordinate. Considerations such as these require the creation of a category of letters which are contextually descending, but terminologically unmarked. Furthermore, the relatively large size of the corpus of such letters, combined with the dearth of letters which are explicitly DESC on the basis of REL terminology (see above), is not without implications for the scribal habits regarding the use of REL terms when composing letters of a socially descending nature.[163] Despite the lack of congruity, however, between the minimal use of conceptually descending REL terminology and the number of letters which obviously derive from socially descending situations, the creation of this category of conceptually "unmarked" letters seems empirically necessary. True, it makes the identification of those letters which derive from socially descending situations a complicated process, but it also forces the student of these texts to recognize the distributional differences in the use of REL terms according to context, which is surely worthwhile.

Secondly, a great many letters are so fragmentary that their conceptual status cannot be known with certainty. This requires the creation of another category, that of

---

[163]Compare the comments of M. T. Larsen, regarding a similar distribution of REL terminology in the Old Assyrian corpus (*Studies Veenhof* [2001] 281-282): "The common phrases 'you are my brother/father' stand for the normal bonds binding kin and colleagues together. However, it is characteristic that only equality or a lower standing can be expressed by the writers; one can refer to one's correspondent as "brother" or as "father" or "lord", but it is very unusual for anyone to say that someone else is his "son", or that he is the "father" of his correspondent. This is true even when it was a biological father writing to his son, who would invariably be called his 'brother'. Clearly it was unacceptable to be open about one's superiority, which could anyway be adequately expressed in other ways." In a foonote (*ibid.*, n. 42) Larsen elaborates on the last sentence: "The introductory formula of the letters always indicated the relative standing of the correspondents, as the most senior/important of the two had to be mentioned first."

conceptually "unknown" letters, which should not be confused with that of the "unmarked" letters.

Finally, in some letters, the sender employs simultaneously REL terms appropriate for more than one type of conceptual status or model. This mixed usage requires the existence of a category of conceptually "mixed" letters. At least three theoretical types of such conceptually "mixed" letters may be distinguished: (1) those which are "mixed" in terms of conceptual model, (2) those which are "mixed" in terms of conceptual status, and (3) those which are mixed in terms of both model and status. The Ugaritic corpus contains examples of the first two types, but to my knowledge no clear instances of the third type. These types are of unequal interpretive value.

An example of the first type is provided by RS 16.265.1: in this letter, which was probably composed as a scribal exercise, the sender refers to the "recipient" as both *åḫy*, 'my brother', and *rʿy*, 'my colleague'. Both terms are conceptually horizontal in status, but they are derived from different models, the first being from the BIO model, and the second from the POW model. The letter may thus be classified as HOR in terms of status, but MIXED in terms of model. Furthermore, while it may be taken as representative of letters of HOR status generally, it is not relevant as evidence for the use of one model or the other.

An example of the second type is RS [Varia 4]. In this letter the sender refers to the recipient both as *bny*, 'my son, and as *åḫy*, 'my brother'; and to himself both as *ådnk*, 'your father', and as *åḫk*, 'your brother'. The REL terms of this letter are thus all drawn from the BIO model; it is "mixed", however, in terms of conceptual status, since it simultaneously employs DESC and HOR terminology. Consequently, this letter may be taken as representative of the BIO model, but not of either DESC status or HOR status.

0.6.4 The inventory and distribution of conceptual categories

The inventory of conceptual models and statuses described above yields the theoretical potential for at least fourteen distinct conceptual categories. In practice, however, only eleven may be applied to the Ugaritic epistolary corpus,[164] at least as it is presently known, and only a handful of these are of any statistical importance.[165]

The largest category belongs to those letters which, because of their poor state of preservation, are of unknown conceptual classification. Of the corpus defined above, I count forty-six letters which are conceptually UNKNOWN.[166] Obviously, these are of very limited, if any, use.

The remaining conceptual categories are all of greater use, their conceptual status being either explicitly unmarked or explicitly marked. The former, that category of conceptually UNMARKED letters, contains at least seven, and possibly as many as ten members.[167]

---

[164]These are <UNKNOWN>, <UNMARKED>, <ASC BIO>, <ASC POW>, <ASC MIXED>, <HOR BIO>, <HOR POW>, <HOR MIXED>, <DESC BIO>, <DESC POW>, and <MIXED BIO>. Three theoretical categories are at present unrepresented: <DESC MIXED>, <MIXED POW>, and <MIXED MIXED>.

[165]Only five categories are represented by more than one member: these are <UNKNOWN> (forty-six members), <UNMARKED> (seven members), <ASC BIO> (eight memebers), <ASC POW> (twenty-eight members), and <HOR BIO> (fifteen members). Obviously, it is only with great uncertainty that the structural features of poorly attested conceptual categories may be determined.

[166]These are: RS 1.013+, RS 1.020, RS 1.026+, RS 1.032, RS 1.[084]+, RS 2.[026], RS 3.334, RS 3.427, RS 15.098, RS 15.107, RS 16.265.2, RS 16.394, RS 16.401, RS 17.434+, RS 18.140.1, RS 18.285[A], RS 18.286[A], RS 18.286[B], RS 18.[364], RS 18.[380], RS 18.[387].1, RS 18.[387].2, RS 18.[400], RS 18.[482], RS 18.[508], RS 18.[528], RS 18.[566], RS 18.[567], RS 19.022, RS 19.029, RS 19.158B, RS 19.174G, RS 19.181B, RS 88.2159, RS 94.2429, RS 94.2450, RS 94.2457, RS 94.2592, RS 94.2946, RS 94.2957.ug, RS 94.2960, RIH 77/01, RIH 77/21A, RIH 77/25, RIH 78/21, RIH 78/25.

[167]The seven letters which are clearly unmarked are: RS 4.475, RS 15.158, RS 16.264, RS 18.038, RS 29.095, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2580. In addition, three letters which are technically "unknown" on the basis of their state of preservation (and are included in the list of such conceptually unknown letters given above) were very probably unmarked: RS 17.434+, RS 94.2429, and RIH 77/21A.

There remain twelve potential conceptual categories, all of which are, in one way or another, explicitly marked in terms of conceptual status and model. The category of ASC BIO letters, that is, conceptually ascending letters conceived on the biological kinship model, is represented by eight letters.[168] There are a far greater number of conceptually ascending letters conceived on the hierarchical power model: I count twenty-seven such ASC POW letters.[169] Finally, three letters are conceptually ascending, but incorporate terms drawn from both conceptual models, and thus are ASC MIXED.[170]

The vast majority of conceptually horizontal letters are conceived on the biological kinship model: these letters, HOR BIO, number fifteen.[171] One letter appears to represent the category HOR POW: RS 15.007. Finally, one letter, though clearly conceptually horizontal, incorporates terms from both models, and is thus HOR MIXED: RS 16.165.1.

As mentioned above, relatively few Ugaritic letters are terminologically descending. One letter, RS 18.147, appears to represent the category DESC BIO, and another, RS 19.181A, the category DESC POW.

These latter, however, should be used with caution, so as to avoid circularity in analysis, since the arguments for their definition as "unmarked" are in large part contextual, and not empirical.

[168]These are RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 19.102.1, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, and RS 94.5003+.

[169]These are RS 9.479A, RS 15.191[A], RS 16.078+, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.196, RS 16.402, RS 17.327, RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 18.140.2, RS 18.148, RS 18.287, RS 18.[312], RS 18.[565], RS 19.011, RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 34.148, RS 34.356, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2428, RS 94.2479, RS 94.5009, RS 94.5015, and RIH 78/03+.

[170]These are RS 8.315, RS 17.117, and RIH 78/12.

[171]Thee are RS 1.018, RS 1.021, RS 15.174, RS 17.063, RS 18.031, RS 18.075, RS 18.134, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2537, RS 94.2545+, and RS 96.2039.

Finally RS [Varia 4] represents a category which is mixed in terms of conceptual status, since both descending and horizontal terminology is employed, but consistently employs the biological kinship model. It is thus MIXED BIO.

0.6.5 The interest of classification on the basis of REL terminology

This theoretical framework, generated by the usage of the REL terms in the letters, provides a criterion by means of which one may classify and understand the formal features of the Ugaritic epistolary corpus, in terms meaningful to the civilization that produced these documents. If such notions of conceptual status and model were the only criteria conditioning the formal composition of Ugaritic letters, however, one would expect a congruence between a classification of the corpus based entirely on REL terminology, and a classification based entirely on form. Such is not the case. There are a number of "exceptional" cases: letters whose formal structure is not effectively explained when classified in terms of their REL terminology, and conversely, letters which, when classified on purely formal grounds, present unexpected or atypical REL terminology.

Obviously, the theoretical framework outlined above is not perfect; it does not provide once and for all the interpretive key by means of which the structure of all known Ugaritic letters becomes entirely comprehensible, even predictable. Also obviously, the employment of REL terminology was not the only factor which conditioned structure. This should not be surprising, of course. It is ridiculous, in fact, to suppose the contrary, that the ancient Ugaritian scribes were mindless robots, mechanically generating fixed form letters on the sole basis of a particular terminological "input". If we make the assumption that ancient social life was at least as complicated as modern social life, then it is not the few exceptional letters which

stand out, but the mass of formal uniformity. What is most striking is the pervasiveness of scribal tradition, not the individuality or uniqueness of expression.

Despite its imperfections, this approach seems valuable for a number of reasons. First and foremost among these is the fact that a connection between REL terminology and formal structure is *largely* valid, if not *wholly* so. In other words, such an approach effectively explains a great many of the preserved letters, though not all of them. Furthermore, for my part, I have been unable to find any other theoretical approach that is as effective and convincing as this one. Secondly, attention to REL terminology is, in a sense, empirical: the social relationship of the correspondents is not determined on the basis of the modern student's vague and intuitive assumptions about ancient social structure, but on the basis of the actual meaning-bearing terms of relationship employed by the actors themselves. Finally, this process appears, to me at least, to be valid not only for the Ugaritic epistolary corpus, but also for the more or less contemporary epistolary corpora of adjacent geo-cultural areas: these include the many Akkadian corpora from throughout the ancient Near East, but also the Hittite letters from Anatolian sites. In this way, the broad application of this approach provides another means of observing the similarities and differences between the various letter-writing traditions.

0.7 Format

The five chapters which follow treat successively (1) the double formula of address, (2) the prostration formula, (3) the salutation, (4) the benediction, and (5) the double formula of well-being.

For each chapter, the discussion and analysis of the formula in question is divided into seven sections, consisting of (1) an introduction to the formula, (2) its

composition, (3) its distribution, (4) the comparative evidence relevant to its elucidation, (5) its *Sitz-im-Leben* or socio-cultural life setting, (6) its grammatical analysis, and finally (7) a brief listing of variant patterns.

Several of these sections require explanation, apology, or comment. Sections 2 and 3, devoted to the composition and distribution of the formula, are intended not only to provide an accurate description of the Ugaritic data, but also to attempt to explain them by reference to the subjective contextual criteria of conceptual status and conceptual model described above. In some cases such attempts at explanation are unsuccessful, or at least are not entirely satisfactory to me. I felt nevertheless obligated at least to attempt to move beyond mere description toward a meaningful and (hopefully) legitimate contextual interpretation of the formulas in question.

In section 4, I cite such comparative evidence as exists in the hope of gaining a fuller understanding of the formula. In terms of the comparative evidence which derives from languages other than Ugaritic, I restricted myself essentially to roughly contemporary Akkadian and Hittite epistolary corpora. This was done in part from my own lack of competence in other areas, but I do in any case believe that the Akkadian and Hittite material cited is far more relevant to the interpretation of the Ugaritic data than is any Egyptian material or any Akkadian traditions anterior or posterior to the Late Bronze Age. It was, above all, in the corpora recovered from Ras Shamra, Tell Meskene, Boğazköy, Ma□at-Höyük, and el-Amarna that I found formulas structurally comparable or identical to the Ugaritic formulas under study. Should any specialist in any of these areas wish to correct any mistakes on my part in this regard, the information will be welcomed.

I also included in section 4, where appropriate, information drawn from the Ugaritic narrative poetic texts that appeared directly relevant to the formula under

discussion, which has generally not been exploited to its full potential, in my opinion. The value of the Ugaritic literary evidence was especially clear with respect to the address and prostration formulas.

Section 5 is not intended to be the centerpiece of each chapter; it evolved from my own need to situate each formula in its geographical, chronological, and situational context. The discussion of geographical and chronological context is directly relevant to subsequent evaluations of the status of the Ugaritic formula. The influence of form-criticism as an interpretive approach is, I hope, fairly evident in my work: the inclusion of a discussion of the situational context, or *Sitz-im-Leben*, of each formula is my attempt to follow more faithfully the methods of the pioneers in this area, the biblical scholars Hermann Gunkel and Hugo Gressmann.[172] I am at present unsure of the exact worth of these sections; they were, however, particularly fruitful in the development of my own thought in dealing with the address, the prostration formulas, and the salutation.

Section 6, the grammatical analysis of each formula, is really the only area in which my formal philological training has left me more or less comfortable. The epistolary formulas are by no means philologically difficult. There are, however, more problems and points of strictly philological interest in them than one would think, in surveying the secondary literature. I have attempted to address here every philological point that appeared germane, and especially to do so in the light of the information provided by the preceding sections. The choice to place the grammatical analysis after the comparative evidence and the discussion of the *Sitz-im-Leben* was a

---

[172]On form(ula) criticism generally, see G. del Olmo, *La religión cananea* (1992) 12; the useful survey in T. Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography* (1991) 3-21, with much anterior bibliography; and the remarks of W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 74 (1939) 12, on the early history of form criticism.

conscious attempt to emphasize the circular nature of text interpretation, and to challenge any linear interpretative approach which assumes that micro-philological analysis is somehow logically prior to global interpretation.

Finally, section 7 is a somewhat heterogeneous. It provides a brief tabular survey, in order to emphasize the apparent diversity of literary traditions that existed in the Ugaritic corpus itself.

CHAPTER 1

THE DOUBLE FORMULA OF ADDRESS

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The impersonal nature of epistolary communication would seem to lend itself to an inherent formalism. These formulaic structures insure the explicit clarification of the background knowledge necessary for a reasonably accurate contextual interpretation of the message. Ugaritic epistolography is no different from other epistolary traditions in this respect, and the most obvious of such structures to be found within the corpus of letters, and certainly the most important from a pragmatic point of view, is the epistolary formula commonly called "the address."[1] This formula occupies the beginning of the letter. It contains an identification of the letter's intended recipient, and nearly always an identification of its sender as well. I will refer to this formula in two ways: either simply as "the address," following the traditional

---

[1]This (and its equivalents in French and German, "l'adresse" and "der Adresse") is the standard appellation. Compare O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 11; A. L. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 144; A. Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979) cols. 1413-1414; M. Liverani, *SDB* 9 (1979) col. 1328; J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 244; Cunchillos, *HUS* (1999) 361; and D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), *passim*. It applies to the comparative corpora as well: for the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, compare J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 (1955) 2; F. B. Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 199; and J. Huehnergard, *HUS* (1999) 375. E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 54, employs the term "die Anrede" for this formula in Middle Assyrian letters. Note, however, that in her disseration S. Ahl refers to this formula as "the heading" (*Epistolary Texts* [1973] 49, 69-75 [for the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra], and pp. 99, 108-115 [for the Ugaritic letters]), which should not be confused with Cunchillos' use of the same phrase (*HUS* [1999] 361), which he defines as follows: "The heading, also called the introduction, comprises the address, proskynesis, greetings and wishes"; in other words, that part of the letter containing both the address and the polite formulas, for which the cover term used here is "*praescriptio*".

terminology used by past students of ancient epistolary texts, or as "the double formula of address," a more descriptive title reflecting the formula's bipartite structure.

1.2 COMPOSITION

1.2.1 Macro-composition

The address formula in Ugaritic is a "double" formula in that it normally consists of two distinct components, one which identifies the sender of the letter and another which identifies its intended recipient.[2] I will refer to the former in abbreviated form as « S », and to the latter as « R ».

The « R » component can be considered as a necessary compositional component, since every preserved example of the address, standard and non-standard alike, contains one. The « S » component appears in all but two intact examples of the formula.[3] Whatever the reason for its absence in these two cases,[4] its distribution must be considered technically "optional". The statistical predominance of those examples

---

[2]On the twofold nature of the address, compare S. Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 110, and J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 245. Note that in his early work on these texts, C. H. Gordon did not group these two components together as one formula (that is, as "the address"), but classified them separately as independent formulas in their own right; see his *Ugaritic Literature* (1949) 116 ("the addressee" and "the sender" as two of the formal elements of Ugaritic letters).

[3]These are RS 19.011 and RIH 78/12, which represent in some ways the standard Ugaritic epistolary tradition. Both of these tablets explicitly lack the component in which the sender of the letter is identified. They are mentioned below, in section 1.7, dealing with "non-standard" address formulas.

[4]One could assume in these cases that either (1) the recipient would have already known or anticipated the identity of the sender without reference to an « S » component (in RIH 78/12, for example, the queen would no doubt have been able to guess easily her correspondent's identity, in part due to the « REL » terms he employed [esp. *ủmy* 'my mother' and *bnk* 'your son'], but also from the references to mutual acquaintances [*ʿbdmlk*, for example] or mutually understood context), or that (2) certain contextual circumstances would have conditioned the exclusion of a normally standard formal element (in RS 19.011, for example, the gravity of the calamities reported may have rendered formalities superfluous).

in which the « S » component is present, however, argue in favor of conceiving it as "virtually necessary".

The order of mention of these two components was not fixed in the Ugaritic epistolary tradition(s). Some letters bear the sequence « SR », others « RS ». This compositional flexibility distinguishes the Ugaritic corpus from the contemporary epistolary traditions of the Mesopotamian heartland, but aligns it with other cuneiform traditions in the Western periphery.[5]

Statistical and contextual considerations allow for the definition of one particular "standard form" of the Ugaritic address formula, over against a group of variant formulas which present atypical compositional patterns.[6] In its standard manifestation, the Ugaritic address formula contains both components, « S » and « R ». The « S » component of the standard Ugaritic address displays the compositional structure « *tḥm* N_S », where N_S represents the noun phrase or phrases identifying the sender of the letter; the standard structure of the « R » component is « *l* N_R *rgm* », where N_R represents the noun phrase or phrases identifying the letter's intended

---

[5]J. Friedrich, *AfO* 10 (1935-1936) 80-81, was among the first to observe this feature of Ugaritic epistolography. He cited as parallels similar compositional flexibility in the address formulas of some Akkadian letters found at Boğazköy and el-Amarna. See below, section 1.4.2.

[6]My means of defining the "standard" Ugaritic address formula is statistical and contextual. The form described here as standard is (1) the best attested structural pattern of the address formula (by my calculations, the formula described here as "standard" is attested in well over fifty of the Ugaritic letters whose address formula is sufficiently preserved to merit analysis;); and (2) regularly attested with other epistolary formulas which are themselves statisitically standard. (3) Those address formulas which are unambiguously different from the standard formula occur in less than ten Ugaritic letters, and, furthermore, do not represent an internally coherent group, but rather several distinct formal patterns. Finally, (4) the formula described here as standard is generally found on letters which pertain directly to members of the royal family or to aspects of the administration of the kingdom, and as such represent the known norms as practised by the socio-political elites in the kingdom (that is, those responsible for the bulk of the written documentation available to modern students). On those letters whose address is, in one way or another, nonstandard, see below, in section 1.7.

recipient. As mentioned above, the order in which these two components occur in the standard epistolary tradition was not fixed.

1.2.2 Micro-composition of the « S » component

The « S » component of the Ugaritic address formula contains an identification of the sender of the letter. Four distinct compositional patterns are attested for the « S » component in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus. These include (1) the most frequent pattern « *tḥm* N_S »,[7] and the rare patterns (2) « *tḥm ḏ* N_S »,[8] (3) « N_S »,[9] and (4) « *tḥm rgm* N_S ».[10] In addition, two letters omit the « S » component entirely from the

---

[7]This is the most common form of the « S » component (56 examples), explicitly or very likely attested in RS 1.018 (very probably), 1.021, 4.475, 8.315, 9.479A, 11.872, 15.008, 16.137[bis], 16.265, 16.379 (very probably), 16.402 (very probably), 17.139, 17.327, 17.434+ (very probably), 18.031, 18.038, 18.040, 18.113, 18.134, 18.140.2 (very probably), 18.147, 18.148, 18.286[A], 19.029, 19.102.1, 19.102.2, 19.181A, 20.199, 29.093, 29.095, 34.148, 34.356 (first address), 34.356 (second address), 88.2159 (very probably), 92.2005.1, 92.2005.2, 92.2010, 94.2273 (very probably), 94.2284, 94.2383+, 94.2391, 94.2406.1, 94.2406.2, 94.2429, 94.2479, 94.2537 (very probably), 94.2545+ (first address) (very probably), 94.2545+ (second address), 94.2580, 94.2946 (very probably), 94.5003+ (very probably), 94.5009, 96.2039; RIH 77/21A, RIH 78/03+, and RS [Varia 4].

[8]This pattern is attested only once, in RS 16.265.2; see below, in section 1.7.2.2.

[9]This structure is attested for RS 15.007, RS 17.063, and RS 17.117 (probably). All of these letters possess other features, strutural and otherwise, which may be characterized as statistically non-standard with respect to the Ugaritic epistolary corpus. See below, in section 1.7.2.1.

[10]Only one Ugaritic letter bears this structure: RS 16.264; see below, in section 1.7.2.2. It may be worthwhile to point out a partial parallel between this « S » component and that of several Neo-Assyrian letters, namely the phrase « *amat šarri* » (and variants), 'the word of the king', used as the « S » component in such letters. See R. H. Pfeiffer, *JAOS* 43 (1923) 26; E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 81-82; *CAD* 1:2 (A, part 2) (1968) 37. The parallel is not perfect, however, for while Akkadian *amat šarri* could correspond to Ugaritic *rgm mlk*, both meaning 'word of the king', there is no element in the Neo-Assyrian « S » component corresponding to the Ugaritic introductory element, *tḥm*.

address.[11] The first pattern, « *tḥm* N_S », is not only by far the most common in numerical terms, but is also generally associated with letters which are standard in other formal respects and normative in context. For these reasons, it is taken as the paradigmatic form of the « S » component in "standard" Ugaritic epistolary tradition.

The standard « S » component, « *tḥm* N_S », consists of two elements, in a fixed order: (1) the common noun *tḥm*,[12] and (2) a noun phrase or phrases, designated N_S, identifying the sender of the letter. Among the attested variant patterns of the « S » component, one, « *tḥm ḏ* N_S », is compositionally very similar to the standard pattern, the sole difference being the insertion of the relative pronoun between the nominative (*tḥm*) and genitive (N_S) elements of the noun phrase. Another variant pattern, « N_S », consists of only a single element, the noun phrase or phrases identifying the sender. Finally, a third variant pattern, « *tḥm rgm* N_S », consists of three structural components: (1) the common noun *tḥm*, followed by (2) the morphologically ambiguous word *rgm*, understood here as a common noun,[13] and (3) the N_S element.

In all of these patterns, standard and non-standard alike, the composition of the N_S element of the « S » component is itself complex. In terms of structure, it may be observed that: (1) the N_S may be composed of one, two, or, rarely, more than two

---

[11]I have found it useful to consider this absence (« S » = Ø) as a distinct formal pattern. On the address formulas of RS 19.011 and RIH 78/12 (RS 1.020 and RS 3.334 may belong here as well), see below, in section 1.7.2.3.

[12]See below, in section 1.6.2, for the grammatical analysis of « S ».

[13]The word *rgm* is attested in Ugaritic both as a substantive, **rigm-*, meaning 'word', and as a productive verb, RGM, meaning 'to speak, say' (in fact, RGM seems to be the main, or "least marked" verb of speaking in the Ugaritic language). For a detailed history of the discussion of this word in the « S » component of RS 16.264, see Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 26 (RS 16.264), remarques épistolographiques.

constituent nouns or noun phrases in apposition;[14] (2) these N_S elements may be subdivided into two potential constituents, ID and REL, which, when both are present, always occur in that order;[15] (3) the ID element consists of either a personal name or an administrative or political title,[16] either of which identifies the sender individually and specifically; (4) the REL element contains of a social relationship term drawn from the conceptual sphere of the household,[17] which portrays, in either a literal or metaphorical sense, the broader social relationship between the sender and the

---

[14]In the case of the standard pattern, « *tḥm* N_S », this noun phrase (or these noun phrases in apposition) of which N_S is composed are governed grammatically by the preceding common noun *tḥm* (that is, the noun phrase is in the gentive case). This applies also to the pattern « *tḥm ḏ* N_S », but obviously not to the pattern « N_S », which must be a free-standing nominal phrase, and not necessarily to the pattern « *tḥm rgm* N_S », which is ambiguous in terms of morpho-syntax.

[15]From the present data, there are no exceptions to this with regard to N_S, unlike the case of N_R in RS 8.315 and 16.265.

[16]The attested political titles used as the « ID » element in N_S include: *mlk*, 'the king' (RS 11.872 *et al.*); *mlk* « GN », 'the king of « GN »' (RS 15.158 *et al.*); *mlkt*, 'the queen' (RS 94.2406.1 *et al.*) (rem RS 17.434+, where we have both a personal name and a title; the title begins *mlk*[*t* ...], 'the quee[n ...]'); *špš*, 'the Sun' (RS 18.038 *et al.*); *rb mi*[...], perhaps to be read *rb mi*[*ḫd*], 'the chief of the harbor' (RS 18.113; compare {LÚ.UGULA URU.KAR} in RS 17.465:4, for example); *ủṯryn*, 'the *ʾušriyanu*-official' (RS 19.181A); and *skn*, 'the prefect' (RS 94.2479 *et al.*). On the *ủṯryn*, 'the *ušriyanu*-official', note that in KTU 3.1 (RS 11.772+), lines 28-29, *ủṯryn* is used as the Ugaritic equivalent of the functionary designated in syllabic script in RS 17.227, lines 27-28, as {tar-te-ni}, 'the *tardennu*-official', a title often thought to designate the Hittite heir apparent. For both texts, see J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 4 (1956) 40-46, and pls. 24-25.

[17]As with N_R (see below, section 1.2.3), the attested "household" relationship terms used in the « REL » element of N_S include both terms which describe relationships of biological kinship and those which describe hierarchical power relationships. On the biological model the attested terms in « S » include: *ảb*, apparently 'father' (RS 18.147); *ảḫ* (and the graphic variant *iḫ*), 'brother' (RS 18.031 *et al.*); *ảḫt*, 'sister' (RS 94.2383+); and *bn*, 'son' (RS 11.872 *et al.*); and, on the power model: *ʿbd*, 'slave, servant' (RS 8.315 *et al.*). One notices a marked paucity in the use of the « REL » element in N_S when compared with its usage in N_R. There appears to have been a tendancy for the sender to include the « REL » element in N_S only in ascending letters and in some horizontal letters, namely, those in which, for whatever reason, polite deference is shown to the recipient. In descending letters the « REL » element appears to have been generally omitted from N_S. The single exception being RS 18.147, where the fact that the « REL » element is conceived on the biological model may play a role. No descending letters conceived on the power model contain a « REL » element in N_S.

recipient, as viewed by the sender; and (5) in light of their usage, we may regard ID as a necessary component and REL as optional.[18]

These observations allow further classification of the micro-structure of the various « S » components. The most common micro-compositional patterns are (1) « *tḥm* ID » and (2) « *tḥm* ID REL ».[19] The first pattern, « *tḥm* ID », is represented by twenty unambiguous examples,[20] of which all but three derive from otherwise standard address formulas.[21] In terms of conceptual status and model, two of these are conceptually UNKNOWN,[22] seven explicitly UNMARKED,[23] and eleven explicitly

---

[18]In other words, the « ID » element is present in every intact example of N_S, while the presence of « REL » is only occasional, and appears to be conditioned by social factors. Two means of empirically qualifying these social factors are: (1) the order of mention of the correspondents in the address, and (2) the conceptual status of the letter as ascending, horizontal, or descending.

[19]In addition to the examples which will be cited below, several letters contain « S » components which certainly belong to one or the other of these categories, though tablet damage prevents the determination of which. These are eight in number (RS 18.113, RS 18.140.2, RS 18.286[A], RS 19.029, RS 19.181A, both of the address formulas in RS 34.356, and RS 94.5009); all eight unambiguosly contain the structure « *tḥm* ID [?] », that is, the presence or absence of the « REL » term cannot be determined empirically (though in many cases, contextual considerations allow its probable reconstruction or omission).

In addition, another eight « S » components (RS 1.018, RS 1.021, RS 15.098 [if indeed lines 1-2 are an address formula], RS 88.2159, RS 94.2545+ [first address], RS 94.2946, RS 94.2957 [if indeed lines 1-2 are an address formula], and RS 94.5003+) unambiguosly contain the structure « *tḥm* [?] », that is, the nature of the noun phrase which followed the word *tḥm* cannot be determined empirically, though, as above, in certain cases contextual considerations allows a probable reconstruction.

Finally, in the case of two letters, the micro-structure of the « S » component is simply unknown from an empirical point of view: RS 15.174 and RS 34.124. The latter provides a good example of a formula which is empirically unknowable, but which may be reconstructed with a fair amount of certainty on contextual grounds.

[20]RS 4.475, RS 15.008, RS 15.158, RS 16.265.1, RS 17.139, RS 17.434+, RS 18.038, RS 18.148, RS 29.095, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2429, RS 94.2537, RS 94.2580, RS 96.2039, RIH 77/21A, and RS [Varia 4].

[21]The three exceptions are RS 16.265.1 and RS 94.2273, which omit the imperative *rgm* from the « R » component; and RS 18.148, which also omits the verb, and contains an atypical preposition (*ʿm* instead of *l*) in the « R » component.

[22]These are RS 17.434+ and RIH 77/21A, both of which may probably be interpreted as having been conceptually « UNMARKED », for contextual reasons (the identity of the correspondents indicates

marked for status and model: three conceptually ascending[24] and eight conceptually horizontal.[25]

The second pattern, « *tḥm* ID REL », is unambiguously present in twenty address formulas, all of standard composition.[26] Furthermore, the presence of this pattern in another three formulas seems extremely likely, though the ID component must be restored in all three cases: « *tḥm* [ID] REL ».[27] Of these twenty-three examples, obviously, by virtue of the presence of a REL term, all are explicitly marked in terms of conceptual status and model. The vast majority are conceptually « ASC »,[28] a handful

---

that they derive from socially descending situations, and socially descending situations are most often conceptually « UNMARKED »).

[23]These are RS 4.475, RS 15.158, RS 18.038, RS 29.095, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2429, and RS 94.2580.

[24]RS 15.008 and RS 17.139 are « ASC BIO », and RS 18.148 (non-standard) is « ASC POW ».

[25]All are conceptually « HOR BIO »: RS 16.265.1 (non-standard « R » component), RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2273 (non-standard « R » component), RS 94.2284, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2537, RS 96.2039, and RS [Varia 4].

[26]These are RS 8.315, RS 9.479A, RS 11.872, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.379, RS 16.402, RS 18.031, RS 18.040, RS 18.134, RS 18.147 (apparently), RS 19.102.1, RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2479, and RS 94.2545+ (second address formula).

[27]These are RS 17.327, RS 34.148, and RIH 78/03+.

[28]These number eighteen. Thirteen are « ASC POW » (RS 9.479A, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.402, RS 17.327, RS 18.040, RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 34.148, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2479, and RIH 78/03+), four « ASC BIO » (RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 19.102.1, and RS 92.2005.1), and one « ASC MIXED » (RS 8.315 contains ASC terminology drawn from both models).

are conceptually « HOR »,[29] and one is apparently conceptually « DESC ».[30]

The group of micro-compositional patterns which remains (1) is internally diverse,[31] (2) contains no patterns which are represented by more than two unambiguous examples,[32] and (3) is generally restricted to letters which are otherwise non-standard.[33]

1.2.3 Micro-composition of the « R » component

The « R » component of the Ugaritic address formula contains an identification of the intended recipient of the letter. At least three structural variants of this element are attested.[34]

---

[29]There are four of these, all conceptually « HOR BIO »: RS 18.031, RS 18.134, RS 94.2383+, and RS 94.2545+ (second address).

[30]The reading of the REL term {⌜åbk⌝} in line 1 of RS 18.147 is not certain. The reconstruction of this line may need to be reconsidered.

[31]Four different compositional patterns for the « S » component may be observed within a total of nine letters. These are (1) « [« S » component absent] » (I think such cases, "« S » = Ø", must be considered as a genuine compositional variant), (2) « ID », (3) « *tḥm rgm* « ID » *1* « ID » », and (4) « *tḥm ḏ* ID ».

[32](1) The « S » component is unambiguously absent in two letters, RS 19.011 and RIH 78/12; it is possible that two other letters, RS 1.020 and RS 3.334, also represent this pattern. (2) The pattern « ID » is unambiguously present in two letters, RS 15.007 and RS 17.063, and is possibly present in RS 17.117. (3) One letter, RS 16.264, presents the pattern « *tḥm rgm* ID », and (4) one letter, RS 16.265.2, the pattern « *tḥm ḏ* ID ».

[33]All but one of these nine present formal features of a "non-standard" nature, outside of the address formula; the exception is RS 16.264 (which can only be empirically qualified as non-standard in terms of its address formula).

[34]There is a remote possibility that lines 1-2 of RS 94.2273 should be read and interpreted as a fourth variant of the « R » component: {(1, cont'd) ql (2) [l .] ůrtṯb}, 'Say to Uri-Teššub', thus, « *ql 1* N_R ». This is not the only possible interpretation of these lines, however, nor the most likely. See the eventual publication of RS 94.2273, epistolographic remarks: P. Bordreuil *et al.*, *Textes ougaritiques 1994-2002* (in advanced stages of preparation).

The most common of these patterns is (1) « *l* N_R *rgm* ».[35] Less well attested variants include (2) « *l* N_R »,[36] and (3) « *ʿm* N_R ».[37] The statistical preponderance of the first form, « *l* N_R *rgm* », and its frequent association with Ugaritic letters which are normative in other respects, indicate that it should be considered paradigmatic for the "standard" Ugaritic epistolary tradition.

The standard « R » component is composed of three elements, in a fixed order: (1) the preposition *l*, which governs (2) a noun phrase or phrases, here designated N_R, identifying the recipient, and (3) the verb *rgm*. The two variants of the « R » component, « *l* N_R » and « *ʿm* N_R », consist only of a prepositional phrase corresponding to the first two of these elements;[38] the verb *rgm* is there omitted.

In all « R » components, standard and non-standard alike, the composition of the element N_R, the noun phrase or phrases identifying the recipient, is, like the N_S

---

[35]By my calculations, approximately fifty certain or probable examples of the « *l* N_R *rgm* » structure are attested: RS 1.018, RS 1.021 (very probably), RS 4.475, RS 8.315, RS 9.479A, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 15.158, RS 15.174, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 17.434+, RS 18.031, RS 18.038, RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 18.134, RS 18.140.2 (very probably), RS 18.147, RS 18.286[A], RS 19.011, RS 19.029, RS 19.102.1, RS 19.102.2, RS 19.181A (very probably), RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 29.095, RS 34.148, RS 34.356, and very probably in the second occurrence of an address formula in RS 34.356 (lines 9-11), RS 88.2159, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2429 (very probably), RS 94.2479, RS 94.2537, RS 94.2580, RS 94.2946 (probably), RS 94.5003+, RS 94.5009 (very probably), and RS 96.2039; RIH 77/21A, RIH 78/03+; and RS [Varia 4].

[36]Unambiguous examples include RS 15.007, RS 16.264, RS 16.265.1, RS 16.265.2, RS 17.063, RS 94.2273 (if the string {ql} at the end of line 1 is considered external to the « R » component), and RIH 78/12.

[37]The only epistolary example is RS 18.148, but such a usage is not without parallel elsewhere in Ugaritic; note its occurrence in the literary « R » motif found in the Kirta Epic, as in *KTU*[2] 1.14:III.19-21. See below, section 1.4.2.

[38]Note, of course, that in the case of RS 18.148, the preposition *ʿm* appears in the slot normally occupied by *l*.

element discussed above, complex.[39] The N_R element may be composed of one, two, or, rarely, more than two constituent noun phrases in apposition, all governed by the preceding preposition. The first noun phrase virtually always identifies the recipient individually and specifically, as distinct from other individuals, by means of a personal name or an administrative or political title:[40] in other words, it is a ID phrase. If a second (or subsequent) element is present, it may be a social relationship term drawn from the conceptual sphere of the household, which places the recipient in a broad social category which reflects, often metaphorically,[41] the recipient 's social

---

[39]Since the N_S element of the « S » component and the N_R element here in the « R » component are structurally identical (that is, « ID » phrase + « REL » phrase), the description of N_S given above also applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to N_R. The necessary changes involve the pronoun attached to the « REL » term: in the N_S element, this pronominal suffix is second person; in the N_R element it is first person.

[40]One exception to this is RS 8.315, where N_R contains neither a personal name nor a political title, but rather two successive social relationship terms: *ůmy ảdtny*, 'my mother, our lady'. Another exception is RS 16.265.1, a scribal practice letter where N_R is an indefinite pronoun: *mnn* (*mn* + *n*), 'whomever' (that *mnn* is here an indefinite pronoun, and not a personal name, seems evident from the fictional "response" attached to this letter, RS 16.265.2, in which the correspondents are reversed: *tḥm ḏ mn l ỉṯtl*, 'Message of "whomever" to *ỉṯtl*' — note the absence of the enclitic *-n* in this example). The attested administrative or political titles used as ID elements in the N_R include: *mlkt*, 'the queen' (RS 9.479A *et al.*); *mlk*, 'the king' (RS 16.264 *et al.*); *mlk* « GN », 'the king of « GN »' (RS 18.031); *skn*, 'the prefect' (RS 94.2429); *rb khnm*, 'the chief (of the) priest(s)' (RS 1.018); *rỉš rʿy y*[...], 'the chief of the shepherds of Y[...]' (RS 3.334; on this title see D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* [in preparation], chapter 9 [RS 3.334], remarques épistolographiques and commentaire); *rỉ*[*š* ...], 'the chie[f of ...]'; and the international diplomatic letters addressed to "the Sun", which present a mulititude of such titles: cf. RS 34.356+: [*špš mlk*] *rb mlk mlk*[*km*], '[the Sun], the great [king], the King of Kin[gs]' (another such letter is RIH 78/03+). The current consensus on the word *ṯryl* is that it is a personal name rather than a title; see W. van Soldt, *SAU* (1991) 15-18; I. Singer, *HUS* (1999) 690-91; and Pardee, *ibid.*, chapter 12 (RS 8.315) commentaire, and chapter 17 (RS 15.008) commentaire.

[41]Some authors, such as J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 247-248, and again in *HUS* (1999) 362, insist that the REL terms are always purely metaphorical. In light of recently discovered "family letters" such as RS 92.2005, however, the more cautious position of F. B. Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 199, is preferable: "The use of familial terms . . . does not preclude the possibility that the correspondents are actually related, but this is rare."

relationship to the sender, at least from the sender's own point of view;[42] in other words, it may be a REL phrase.

The ID and REL elements, when both are present, virtually always appear in that order.[43] From the available data, it is justifiable to regard ID as a necessary compositional element of the « R » component,[44] and REL as optional. The presence

---

[42]The attested "household" relationship terms used in the « REL » element include both terms which describe relationships of biological kinship and those which describe hierarchical power relationships. The attested terms for the « REL » element of N_R include, on the biological model: *ủm*, 'mother' (RS 8.315 *et al.*); *ảdn*, 'father' (RS 19.102); *ảḫt*, 'sister' (RS 15.174 *et al.*); *ảḫ* (and the graphic variant *ỉḫ*), 'brother' (RS 18.031 *et al.*); and *bn*, 'son' (RS [Varia 4]); and on the power model: *ảdt*, 'mistress, lady' (RS 8.315 *et al.*); *bʿl*, 'master, lord' (RS 18.040 *et al.*); and *ʿbd*, 'slave,servant' (RS 19.181A). It is conceivable that the term used for "equals" in the power model, namely *rʿ*, 'friend, companion', known from its use in the body of RS 16.265, is also attested as the « REL » element in the « R » component of the address of RS 3.334: {[l] ⌜r⌝iš . rʿy . y⌜-⌝[...]}, '[To] (Mr.) Raʾšu, my friend, Y⌜-⌝[...]'; yet this interpretation is problematic for at least two reasons: (1) there are no examples of the word *rỉš* used by itself as a personal name, and (2) the string {y⌜-⌝[...]}, which, from its placement, ought to belong to the « R » component, remains unexplained. A more preferable interpretation is to take *rʿy* as a common noun, plural construct, followed by a partially preserved noun: '[To] the chief of the shepherds of Y⌜-⌝[...]' (It is conceivable that the last word should be restored as {y⌜p⌝[t]}, on the analogy of RS 1.020:2, and interpreted in both places as a common noun for some category of bovid, thus 'the shepherds of the *yp*[*t*]-bovids'; compare the interpretation of the poetic pair *ypt* // *ảlp* in KTU 1.10 III 2-3 in del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 534).

In some cases both conceptual models are used concurrently; compare RS 8.315 and RIH 78/12, where both *ủm*, 'mother' and *ảdt*, 'mistress' are used. On this topic, see also Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 199; Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 247-248; Cunchillos, *HUS* (1999) 361-362; and on the theoretical background, see Schloen, *Patrimonial Household* (1995) 170-176 and 216-229.

[43]The one unambiguous exception to this tendency occurs in a letter which is non-standard in several other respects: RS 17.063, where the address reads *ʿzn bn byy l ảḫth ʿṯty*, 'ʿUzzinu son of BYY to his sister ʿUštaya'. It is possible that the second address of RS 94.2545+ represents another potential exception: lines 9-10 read *w l ảḫy* [(?)] ⌜*ṯ*⌝*ḥm* ⌜*ảb*⌝*ny* ⌜*ả*⌝[*ḫtk*], 'And, to my brother [?]: Message of ʾABNY, [your] si[ster].' Like RS 17.063, RS 94.2545+ also contains many "non-standard" features. On the non-standard epistolary features of RS 17.063, see Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 32 (RS 17.063), remarques épistolographiques. On RS 94.2545+, see below in that tablet's publication. On the second occurrence of the address formula within a single letter (not to be confused with the address of the second letter of a double letter), compare RS 34.356; and EA 100 and 124.

[44]It would be more accurate to say "virtually necessary". The exceptions are RS 8.315, where the « R » component, *l ủmy ảdtny rgm*, 'to my mother, our mistress, say,' contains no « ID » element, but rather two consecutive « REL » elements (note, however, the possibility that *ủmy* is a hypochroristic personal name; compare, for example, the name {^{f}um-mi-ḫe-bi} in RS 16.343:4); and the scribal exercise in epistolary form, RS 16.265, where N_R consists wholly of the indefinite personal pronoun *mnn*, 'whomever'. The statement of Cunchillos, *HUS* (1999) 361: "The personal names of both the

of a REL element in N_R appears to be linked empirically with two partly overlapping factors: (1) the order of mention of the correspondents, and (2) the conceptual status of the letter.

These distinctions allow for the classification of the micro-structure of the various « R » components. Three micro-compositional patterns are well represented in the corpus: (1) « *l* ID REL *rgm* », (2) « *l* ID *rgm* », and (3) « *l* ID ».[45] The first pattern, « *l* ID REL *rgm* », reflects one of two common micro-compositional realizations of the standard « R » component, « *l* N_R *rgm* ». The pattern « *l* ID REL *rgm* » is the most frequent compositional pattern; it is unambiguously present in twenty-seven address formulas,[46] and can be partially reconstructed, its presence being (epigraphically)

---

sender and the recipient are quite often replaced by terms denoting relationship," is misleading, and applies only to RS 8.315, and possibly RS 94.2545+, in the second occurrence of the address formula, in lines 9-10: *w l åḫy* [*rgm*] ⌜*t*⌝*ḥm* ⌜*åb*⌝*ny* ⌜*å*⌝[*ḫtk*], 'And, to my brother [speak]: Message of ʾABNY, [your] si[ster].' His earlier statement is slightly more accurate, Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 247: "Expéditeur et destinataire ne sont pas toujours désignés par leurs anthroponymes respectifs, mais par des appellatifs de relation qui remplacent les noms des correspondants *ou s'y ajoutent*" (my italics). Only once (RS 8.315) does a « REL » element replace an « ID » element; if personal names in the address are "quite often replaced" by anything, it is by political or administrative titles; see above.

[45]In the case of eight address formulas, it was not empirically possible to distinguish between the patterns « *l* ID *rgm* » and « *l* ID REL *rgm* » for the « R » component: its structure in these letters may be characterized as « *l* ID + [?] *rgm* ». All of these letters are otherwise standard: RS 18.147, RS 18.286[A], RS 34.148, RS 34.356 (both addresses), RS 94.5003+, RIH 77/21A, and RIH 78/03+.

Furthermore, several other address formulas are too damaged to provide complete information on the composition of the « R » component. These are (1) those address formulas for which no unambiguous information regarding the « R » component is available (RS 17.117, RS 17.327, and RS 34.124), (2) those formulas for which the perceivable structure of the « R » component may be characterized as « *l* + [?] » (RS 15.098, if indeed lines 1-2 represent an address), (3) those for which its composition is « *l* ID + [?] » (the first address formula in RS 94.2545+), (4) those for which it is « *l* REL + [?] » (the second address formula in RS 94.2545+), and (5) those for which it is « *l* + [?] + *rgm* » (RS 18.140.1, RS 94.2946, and RS 94.2957.1, if indeed lines 1-2 correspond to an address formula).

[46]RS 1.021, RS 9.479A, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 18.134, RS 19.011, RS 19.102.1, RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2479, RS 94.5009, RS 96.2039, and RS [Varia 4].

virtually certain, in five others.[47] Of these thirty-two examples, all save one are otherwise standard in terms of their epistolary composition.[48] The majority of the « R » components bearing this pattern are distributed among three conceptual categories: (i) six are « ASC BIO »,[49] and (ii) thirteen « ASC POW »,[50] making for a total of nineteen explicitly ascending letters among a group of thirty examples (or 63%) for which the conceptual classification is unambiguous. Finally, (iii) nine are conceptually horizontal, all of these being « HOR BIO ».[51] Of the remaining examples, two of these thirty-two are conceptually UNKNOWN,[52] one is apparently conceptually descending,[53] and one is « MIXED BIO »,[54] containing « DESC » and « HOR » terminology, both drawn from the « BIO » model.

The second well attested pattern mentioned above, « *l* ID *rgm* », reflects the other common micro-compositional realization of the standard « R » component. It is unambiguously attested in at least eight,[55] and possibly as many as ten[56] address

---

[47]RS 15.174, RS 16.402, RS 19.029, RS 19.181A, and RS 94.2537. Contextual considerations allow the full or partial reconstruction of this pattern in several other letters in which the address formula is less well preserved; but these latter are not taken into consideration here.

[48]RS 19.011 must be considered non-standard since it omits the « S » component.

[49]RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 19.102.1, and RS 92.2005.1.

[50]RS 9.479A, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.402, RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 19.011, RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2479, and RS 94.5009.

[51]RS 15.174, RS 18.031, RS 18.134, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2537, and RS 96.2039.

[52]RS 1.021 and RS 19.029.

[53]Line 2 of RS 19.181A would seem to imply such; it might be profitable to reconsider the reading of this line.

[54]RS [Varia 4].

[55]RS 1.018, RS 4.475, RS 18.038, RS 29.095, RS 88.2159, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2429, and RS 94.2580.

formulas. Of these ten, seven are conceptually UNMARKED,[57] two are conceptually UNKNOWN,[58] and one probably HOR BIO.[59]

The third pattern, « *l* ID », owing to the absence of the verbal element *rgm*, does not reflect the standard structure. It is unambiguously present in the address formulas of seven letters.[60] All are non-standard in other aspects of their composition.[61]

A number of other micro-compositional patterns for the « R » component can be mentioned. These are (1) « *ʿm* ID REL » in RS 18.148, (2) « *l* ID REL » in RIH 78/12, (3) « *l* REL ID » in RS 17.063,[62] and (4) « *l* REL REL *rgm* » in RS 8.315. None of these is of any statistical importance, and virtually all are found in letters which are in other respects non-standard.[63]

---

[56]RS 15.158 and RS 17.434+.

[57]RS 4.475, RS 15.158, RS 18.038, RS 29.095, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2429, and RS 94.2580.

[58]RS 17.434+ and RS 88.2159.

[59]RS 1.018.

[60]RS 1.020, RS 3.334, RS 15.007, RS 16.264, RS 16.265.1, RS 16.265.2, and RS 94.2273.

[61]RS 1.020 and RS 3.334 apparently omit the « S » component and contain non-standard ŠLM motifs; RS 15.007 presents a non-standard « S » component and contains orthographic irregularities; RS 16.264 presents a non-standard « S » component; RS 16.265.2 presents a non-standard « S » component and a body limited to scribal exercises (abecedaries and doodles?); and RS 16.265.1 and RS 94.2273, probably also scribal exercises, present atypical polite formulas.

[62]The second address formula of RS 94.2545+ may present another example of this pattern; the observable structure of the « R » component there is « *l* REL + [?] ».

[63]The exception is RS 8.315, which is composed entirely of “standard” epistolary formulas motifs.

1.2.4 Inventory of compositional patterns for the address

A synthesis of the observations presented above allows for an easier interpretation of the data regarding the address formula as a whole. Among the address formulas presenting a standard composition, three main micro-compositional patterns may be distinguished:

(1) « *l* ID REL *rgm* », « *tḥm* ID REL ». As many as twenty-seven examples of the standard address formula in the Ugaritic corpus certainly or very probably present this compositional pattern.[64] These derive from twenty-six different letters.[65] Twenty-three of these are conceptually « ASC », and three conceptually « HOR ». Of the twenty-three « ASC » letters, seventeen are specifically « ASC POW »,[66] and six « ASC BIO ».[67] The three "horizontal" letters are all « HOR BIO ».[68]

---

[64]The following address formulas clearly present this pattern: RS 9.479A, RS 11.872, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.379, RS 18.031, RS 18.040, RS 18.134, RS 19.102.1, RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2391, and RS 94.2479. Two other letters clearly present the equivalent of this pattern, adapted for multiple senders or recipients: RS 29.093, which derives from two senders, and RS 92.2005.1, addressed to two recipients. Finally, eleven other address formulas almost certainly also present this pattern, but must be partially or largely restored; these are RS 16.402, RS 17.327, RS 18.113, RS 18.140.2, RS 34.124 (virtually entirely restored), RS 34.148, RS 34.356 (first address formula), RS 34.356 (second address formula), RS 94.5003+, RS 94.5009, and RIH 78/03+. It is possible that RS 19.029 belongs here, but this is by no means obvious (the reconstruction lines 1-3 is not certain, and must be reconsidered in light of the composition of its polite formulas — I allude specifically to the absence of the « pros » formula, and the composition of the « sal » formula); it is not considered here.

[65]Both of the address formulas in RS 34.356, which probably contains only one letter and not two, show this pattern.

[66]RS 9.479A, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.402, RS 17.327, RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 18.140.2, RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 34.148, RS 34.356, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2479, RS 94.5009, and RIH 78/03+.

[67]RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 19.102.1, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, and RS 94.5003+.

[68]RS 18.031, RS 18.134, and RS 94.2383+.

(2) « *tḥm* ID », « *l* ID REL *rgm* ». Eleven letters contain a standard address formula of this pattern.[69] Seven of these are conceptually « HOR BIO ».[70] Of the remaining four, two are « ASC BIO »,[71] one apparently « DESC POW »,[72] and one « MIXED BIO ».[73]

(3) « *tḥm* ID », « *l* ID *rgm* ». As many as eleven standard address formulas follow this pattern.[74] One expects such addresses, almost by definition, to derive from letters of UNMARKED or UNKNOWN conceptual status.[75] Seven of these eleven are, in

---

[69]This pattern is clear in RS 15.008, RS 17.139, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2406.2, RS 96.2039, and RS [Varia 4]. Four address formulas which almost certainly also show this pattern must be partially restored: RS 1.021, RS 15.174, RS 19.181A, and RS 94.2537. The first address in RS 94.2545+ may also belong under this rubric, owing to its formal parallels with RS 94.2284; no trace of any « REL » term has been preserved, however, and it cannot therefore be distinguished empirically from the category which follows. It has not been included.

[70]RS 15.174, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2537, RS 96.2039. The conceptual classification of RS 1.021 is technically unknown, but may belong here as well, if the restoration of *ả*[*ḫy*] in line 2 is correct.

[71]RS 15.008 and RS 17.139.

[72]This is RS 19.181A, and the classification is made solely on the basis of the uncertain reading {ʿ⌈bdy⌉} in line 2. The incongruency of the « POW » conceptual model in a group otherwise restricted to the « BIO » model, as well as the rarity of explicitly « DESC » terminology in the « POW » model (this is the only example), may suggest a reconsideration of the reading of this line.

[73]RS [Varia 4] is composed on the « BIO » model, but makes concurrent use of both HOR and DESC conceptual terminology.

[74]Six letters clearly belong here: RS 4.475, RS 18.038, RS 29.095, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2429, and RS 94.2580. The address formulas of two letters are partially restored, but nevertheless bear this pattern (the absence of a « REL » term in the « R » component is obvious): RS 15.158 and RS 17.434+. Finally, should contextual considerations be allowed, three other letters almost certainly belong here, despite the fact that these address formulas cannot be distinguished empirically from those listed in section 1.2.4.2 above: the absence of polite formulas in RS 18.286[A] and RS 88.2159 argues for their inclusion here; the probable identity of the sender of RIH 77/21A suggests its inclusion.

[75]I say “almost by definition” and not simply “by defintion” since it is possible for a letter to be explicitly marked in terms of in its conceptual status, and yet contain no « REL » terms in the address formula: RS 16.265.1, RS 94.2273, and possibly RS 1.018 are examples of this.

fact, conceptually « UNMARKED »,[76] and four conceptually « UNKNOWN ».[77] Furthermore, in the case of seven of these eleven letters, the ID terms in the address provide sufficient contextual information to interpret the relation between sender and recipient as contextually, though not terminologically, descending.[78]

These three compositional patterns just described account for forty-nine of the "standard" address formulas for which the composition is perceptible or may be reconstructed more or less accurately.[79] There are at least three other compositionally standard address formulas[80] which do not fit into one of the three patterns outlined above. These are (i) « *tḥm* ID ⌈REL⌉ *l* ID [REL] *rgm* » in RS 18.147,[81] (ii) « *l* ID *rgm*

---

[76]RS 4.475, RS 15.158, RS 18.038, RS 29.095, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2429, and RS 94.2580.

[77]RS 17.434+, RS 18.286[A], RS 88.2159, and RIH 77/21A. Though empirically these letters are terminologically unknown, it is likely that they may also belong to the class of « UNMARKED » letters.

[78]RS 15.158, RS 17.434+, RS 18.038, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2429, RS 94.2580, and RIH 77/21A.

[79]In the case of three letters, the compositional pattern contained in the address is not entirely preserved, and while it is possible to perceive the « SR » order of mention, the precise composition of the N_S and N_R elements is unknown (in other words, a « *tḥm* [?] » element precedes a « *l* [?] *rgm* » element, but little else is clear). These are RS 94.2946, RS 15.089 (if indeed lines 1-2 represent an address formula), and RS 94.2957.1 (if indeed lines 1-2 represent an address formula).

[80]For clarification, by compositionally standard I mean those address formulas containing two components, « S » and « R », in which the macrostructure of « S » is « *tḥm* N_S », where N_S represents the noun phrase or phrases identifying the sender of the letter, and that of « R » is « *l* N_R *rgm* », where N_R represents the noun phrase or phrases identifying the letter's intended recipient (see above, section 1.2.1).

[81]The address of RS 18.147 apparently presents this structure. The order « SR » is clear, but this pattern is distinguished from the other standard address formulas of « SR » order by the fact that the « S » component apparently contains a « REL » term. Given the uncertain nature of the reading of the latter, however, this compositional oddity, in and of itself, might suggest a reconsideration (based on collation, of course) of the reading of line 1.

tḥm [?] » in RS 1.018,[82] and (iii) « *l* REL REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL » in RS 8.315.[83] These variant patterns are of limited statistical importance.

There also remain thirteen non-standard address formulas which present various compositional patterns, all of which are distinct from the three models cited above.[84] At least two of these, and possibly as many as four, omit the « S » component entirely.[85] The nine remaining non-standard address formulas contain both components. Of these nine, eight present an order « SR »,[86] and one « RS ».[87] Of these thirteen "non-standard" address formulas, it is surely significant that at least twelve show compositional features other than the address formula which must be characterized as "non-standard".[88] This is surely significant, and justifies, in my

---

[82]The composition of the « R » component of RS 1.018 is clear, not that of the « S » component. The « RS » order is also apparent, but the « R » does not contain any « REL » term, which distinguishes this example from the other standard address formulas of « RS » order.

[83]The address of RS 8.315 is peculiar in lacking an « ID » element in the « R » component. I have no explanation for this compositional oddity.

[84]For a survey, see below, section 1.7.

[85]These are RS 19.011 « *l* ID REL *rgm* » and RIH 78/12 « *l* ID REL REL ». It would seem that RS 1.020 and RS 3.334, assuming that they have been correctly restored, belong here as well: both of these present the pattern « *l* ID ».

[86]These include what appear to be two scribal practice letters, RS 16.265.1 and RS 94.2273, both of which reflect the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID », as well as the apparently fictive "piggy-back" letter attached to the former, which bears a related pattern: RS 16.265.2, « *tḥm ḏ* ID *l* ID ». The remaining five examples include RS 16.264 « *tḥm rgm* ID *l* ID », RS 18.148 « *tḥm* ID *ʿm* ID REL », RS 15.007 « ID *l* ID », RS 17.063 « ID *l* REL ID », and RS 17.117 « ID [?] », which may have been compositionally identical to RS 17.063.

[87]The second address formula appearing in the letter RS 94.2454+ (for various reasons, this tablet should be interpreted to contain one, not two letters) bears this sequence: « *w l* REL [? *rgm*] [*t*]*ḥm* [I]D ⌜REL⌝ ».

[88]There can be little doubt about the "non-standard" nature of RS 1.020, RS 3.334, RS 15.007, RS 17.063, RS 17.117, and RS 18.148, not merely in regard to their address formulas, but with respect to all or most formulaic aspects (or lack thereof) of their composition, and in the distribution of any such formulas. The thoughout-going "non-standard" status of the composition of RS 19.011 and RIH 78/12 is less obvious, but they belong here as well. RS 94.2545+ is peculiar in a great many respects, and its

opinion, my partial neglect of these "non-standard" letters, at least in attempting to isolate the structural features of the "standard" Ugaritic epistolary tradition.

1.2.5 Interpretation of the main compositional patterns

The three main micro-compositional patterns described above neatly circumscribe virtually all of the "standard" Ugaritic address formulas.[89] Since it is above all the compositional and distributional features of the standard epistolary tradition that I wish to explicate, the study of these three patterns alone provides a convenient means of comprehending the "standard" Ugaritic address formula generally.

In the first place, it seems evident that factors of a socio-cultural nature, namely, the differences in social status between the correspondents as expressed by the sender, best explain the distribution of these three patterns. More specifically, the conceptual categories established by the distribution of REL terminology correspond with remarkable regularity to the three compositional patterns.

---

likely status as a "draft" may explain much of this variation from the "standard" structure. Finally, scribal practice letters represent in some sense a literary genre distinct from that of "real" letters; this generic difference may acount for the formal irregularities in RS 16.265.1, its "piggy-back" letter RS 16.265.2, and RS 94.2273. The only exception is RS 16.264, which, apart from its address formula (and the unsystematic use of scribal lines), shows no other formally "non-standard" features.

[89]These three micro-compositional patterns encompass forty-nine of the "standard" address formulas in the Ugaritic corpus; three formulas remain which fit the "standard" compositional structure (« S » = « *tḥm* N_S », « R » = « *l* N_R *rgm* »), but which do not follow one of these three micro-compositional patterns; see above.

1.2.5.1 ASC letters and the pattern « l ID REL rgm tḥm ID REL »

When a Ugaritic letter bears a compositionally standard address formula and is conceptually ASC POW, it employs the pattern « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL », without exception.[90] Seventeen of the standard address formulas sufficiently preserved to permit unambiguous analysis are conceptually ASC POW; all seventeen show this pattern.[91] No unambiguous example of a standard address formula in a conceptually ASC POW letter exists which does not employ this pattern.

When a standard address formula appears in a conceptually ASC BIO letter, it most often employs the pattern « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL ». Eight such ASC BIO letters provide unambiguous evidence for the composition of their address formula; six of these show this pattern.[92]

I think it safe to conclude that the model « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL » was appropriate, perhaps even expected, in all conceptually ASC letters, whichever model was employed. When a conceptually ascending Ugaritic letter shows an address formula of any other compositional pattern, it ought to be interpreted as a special case.[93]

---

[90]RS 18.148 and RS 19.011 do not present a standard address formula, and so do not represent exceptions to this statement; see below, section 1.7.

[91]RS 9.479A, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.402, RS 17.327, RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 18.140.2, RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 34.148, RS 34.356, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2479, RS 94.5009, and RIH 78/03+.

[92]These six letters are RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 19.102.1, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, and RS 94.5003+. The two exceptions are RS 15.008 and RS 17.139, both of which show (unexpectedly, I would add) the pattern: « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* ».

[93]Sample "special cases" include (1) the "exceptional" letter represents an epistolary tradition different from that of the majority of Ugaritic letters (this applies to the composition of RS 18.148), (2) the "exceptional" letter was composed in special circumstances, in which adherence to the standard pattern was not deemed necessary (this applies, I believe, to RS 19.011), or (3) other socio-cultural factors, beyond the conceptual content of the REL terminology in the letter, conditioned the composition

1.2.5.2 UNMARKED letters and the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* »

When the state of preservation allows the conceptual status to be determined without ambiguity, all address formulas of the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* » are UNMARKED.[94] Conversely, all standard address formulas which are conceptually UNMARKED bear the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* ».[95] It might be thought that address formulas displaying the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* » would be UNMARKED by definition. Such should not necessarily be the case, since a letter may omit REL terminology in the address, and yet contain it in the polite formulas or in the body, thus allowing the overall conceptual classification of the letter as ascending, horizontal, or descending, despite the absence of REL terms in the address.[96] Nevertheless, it is true that in the

---

of the "exceptional" letter (this applies to RS 17.139, I believe, in which high social status inherent in the sender's identity as *mlk*, 'king', allowed for the use of a compositional model not typical of ASC letters, despite the fact that the recipient is explicitly identified using such ASC BIO terminology: *ỉ̈my*, 'my mother'; this may also apply to RS 15.008). Other ASC letters which do not display the expected pattern, and which also, therefore, represent special cases, include RS 8.315 (which apparently contains no ID phrase in the « R » component, but rather two successive REL phrases; it is otherwise standard: « *l* REL REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL »).

[94]Any address formula of the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* » is, by definition, a standard address formula (two components, « *tḥm* N_S » and « *l* N_R *rgm* »). The unambiguous examples are RS 4.475, RS 18.038, RS 29.095, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2429, and RS 94.2580. Despite their technical status as conceptually UNKNOWN, it seems virtually certain that RS 15.158 and RS 17.434+ belonged here as well (the absence of a REL term in the « R » component of each is obvious). Finally, I consider it likely (though not certain) that RS 18.286[A], RS 88.2159, and RIH 77/21A were also conceptually UNMARKED.

[95]This states the obvious: it is true by definition of "standard address formula" (two components, « *tḥm* N_S » and « *l* N_R *rgm* ») and by definition of UNMARKED conceptual status (REL terms absent); I include it here for clarity in describing the data. RS 16.264 is an example of a conceptually UNMARKED letter which bears a non-standard address formula; because it is non-standard, it is not included here.

[96]This situation applies to RS 16.265.1 and RS 94.2273, for example, both of which contain address formulas of the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID » (a "non-standard" compositional pattern which contains no REL terms), and yet contain explicit REL terminology (as it happens, in both cases these terms are conceptually HOR in status) elsewhere in the letter.

majority of cases in which REL terminology is absent from the address, it is absent from the entire letter. This applies, in fact, to all cases which involve an address formula of "standard" composition.

The conceptual category UNMARKED, however, is an empirical necessity, not a social reality. Unlike the categories ASC, HOR, and DESC, it does not reflect a meaningful pattern of social relationship perceived and expressed by the letter writers themselves. It is useful, therefore, to attempt to interpret in a socially meaningful way the connection observed above between the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* » and these terminologically UNMARKED letters. Several lines of evidence allow this to be done quite convincingly, in my opinion. Foremost among these is a consideration of the social status implications of the respective identities (that is, of the ID terms) of the correspondents in these UNMARKED letters. Where such information is present,[97] it consistently suggests a contextually descending social relationship between the sender and recipient.[98] Of the eleven terminologically UNMARKED or UNKNOWN letters which present the compositional pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* » in the address formula,

---

[97]The information to which I allude consists of those ID terms which, owing to their semantics, have implications for the social relationship between the correspondents. Of these, obviously the most explicit are those ID terms which are political titles, like *mlk*, *mlkt*, *špš*, *mlk grgmš*, and the like, which, depending on the ID term of the other correspondent, may very well communicate an inherent social superiority.

[98]The following UNMARKED letters may be considered "contextually descending" on the basis of the social implications of the ID terms which they contain: RS 15.158 (from [*mlk g*]*rgmš* to [« PN » *m*]*lk ůgrt*), RS 18.038 (from *špš* to « PN »), RS 94.2406.1 (from *mlkt* to « PN »), and RS 94.2580 (from *mlkt* to « PN »). The terminological classification of RS 17.434+ (from *pdǵb mlk*[*t* ?] to *nqmd*), RS 94.2429 (from *mlk*[*t*?] to *skn*) and RIH 77/21A (from *š*[*pš mlk*] *rb* to *m*[?]) is technically unknown; they are in all probability UNMARKED letters as well, however, but in any case, should also be considered "contextually descending". RS 16.264 is also conceptually UNMARKED, and contextually descending (from *mlk* to « PN »); it is not included here, however, since it presents a non-standard address formula.

seven may be characterized as contextually descending on this basis.[99] In the four letters which remain, the nature of the social relationship between the correspondents can simply not be determined,[100] but a contextually descending social relationship cannot be excluded.

It seems reasonable to draw two conclusions from the above discussion: (1) the standard Ugaritic epistolary tradition generally used conceptually UNMARKED letters in socially descending situations,[101] and (2) in such socially descending situations, the standard Ugaritic epistolary tradition employed the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* » in the address formula. Two implications follow from these conclusions: (1) when a Ugaritic letter appears to bear explicitly descending REL terminology, its reading ought to be scrutinized,[102] or, if its reading is sound, it ought to be interpreted as a special case.[103] And, (2) when a Ugaritic letter which appears to derive from a contextually

---

[99]These are RS 15.158, RS 17.434+, RS 18.038, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2429, RS 94.2580, and RIH 77/21; see the information in the above footnote.

[100]These are RS 4.475 (from *iwrḏr* to *plsy*), RS 18.286[A] (from *mlk* […] to *mlk* […], perhaps to be reconstructed *tḥm mlk* [*grgmš*] *l mlk* [*ůgrt*] *rg*[*m*], on analogy with RS 15.158?), RS 29.095 (from *tlmyn* to *pzy*), and RS 88.2159 (from [?] to *gr*[…]).

[101]Two arguments support this: (1) the rarity and uncertainty of explicitly descending REL terminology in standard Ugaritic letters (only three letters in the corpus appear to contain explicitly descending REL terms: RS 18.147 is classified as DESC solely on the basis of the uncertain reading {⌜åbk⌝} in line 1; RS 19.181A solely on the basis of the uncertain reading {ʿ⌜bdy⌝} in line 2; and RS [Varia 4], though it does contain unambiguous DESC terminology, is conceptually mixed since it also contains explicitly horizontal REL terms, and so cannot be taken as representative of DESC status), and (2) the fact that in those cases where the ID terms in conceptually UNMARKED letters have implications regarding the nature of the social relationship between the correspondents, all suggest a contextually descending relationship (see the examples cited above).

[102]This applies to the reading and interpretation of RS 18.147:1 and RS 19.181A:2.

[103]This applies to the status of RS [Varia 4] as a special case: it is conceptually MIXED since it simultaneously employs HOR and DESC terminology. The address pattern in that letter, incidentally, is consistent with that employed in the majority of HOR BIO letters (see below).

descending situation shows an address formula of any compositional pattern other than « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* », it ought to be interpreted as a special case.[104]

1.2.5.3 HOR letters and the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* »

A preliminary distributional feature regarding horizontal letters is worth highlighting: all of the conceptually horizontal letters containing a standard address formula are specifically composed on the biological kinship model; in other words, they are all conceptually HOR BIO. No examples of the poorly attested HOR POW model exist in the group of compositionally and contextually "standard" Ugaritic letters.[105] This has obvious implications for the contextual interpretation of HOR BIO terms like *ảḫ* and *ảḫt*: if a scribe trained in the standard Ugaritic epistolary tradition wished to allude to the sender or the recipient in a conceptually explicit way that was neither ascending nor descending, the *only* "horizontal" terms which were in productive use and at his disposal were those drawn from the metaphor of biological kinship. Obviously, and I believe virtually all Ugaritologists will agree, these biological kinship terms cannot always be interpreted literally.[106]

---

[104]This applies to RS 16.264, which employs a non-standard address formula.

[105]RS 15.007 is non-standard in several respects (compositional and orthographic, mainly), and RS 16.265.1 contains non-standard address and benediction formulas, and derives from a non-standard epistolary context (being a scribal practice letter).

[106]This does not, of course, imply that they should never be taken literally. That at least some examples of such BIO terms refer to genuine biological kinship seems evident from the "family" letter RS 92.2005. Indeed, since *ảḫ* (*iḫ*) and *ảḫt* must serve for all social relationships perceived neither as ascending nor as descending, and since (genuine) biological fraternity and broad social parity both fall under the rubric of such non-ascending non-descending relationships, it follows that *ảḫ* (*iḫ*) and *ảḫt* must serve for both.

When a Ugaritic letter bears a compositionally standard address formula and is conceptually horizontal, it most frequently employs the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* ».[107] Conversely, of the eleven standard address formulas which certainly or probably present the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* », the majority are conceptually HOR.[108] Clearly, the connection between the compositional pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* » and the horizontal conceptual status is not as clear-cut as the connections described above, between the pattern « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL » and the ascending conceptual status, and between the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* » and those letters which are terminologically unmarked but contextually descending. Nevertheless, the fact remains that most standard address formulas in conceptually horizontal letters follow this pattern, and most examples of this pattern occur in letters which are conceptually horizontal. Even though they must be considered as tendencies rather than universals, the recognition of these distributional facts is surely worthwhile.

Even if, however, the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* » is considered to be typical of HOR BIO letters, and *vice versa*, the fact remains that three HOR BIO letters contain a standard address formula which follows not this "typical" pattern, but the pattern « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL », that is, the pattern generally associated with conceptually ascending letters. Obviously, in the case of HOR BIO letters, a consideration of the REL

---

[107]Of those standard address formulas which appear in conceptually horizontal letters, when the compositional pattern can be determined with certainty or a high degree of probability (nine cases), the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* » appears in six examples (it is clear in RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2406.2, and RS 96.2039; it is evident, but requires partial reconstruction, in RS 15.174 and RS 94.2537); RS 1.021 may belong here as well. The pattern « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL » occurs in three HOR letters (RS 18.031, RS 18.134, and RS 94.2383+).

[108]This applies with certainty to RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2406.2, and RS 96.2039; and with a high degree of probability to RS 15.174, RS 94.2537, and perhaps RS 1.021.

terminology does not provide, in and of itself, a complete explanation for the composition of the address formula.

As above, the above discussion permits two conclusions: (1) the standard Ugaritic epistolary tradition generally employed conceptually HOR BIO terms in all socially "horizontal" situations, and (2) in such horizontal letters, the standard Ugaritic epistolary tradition employed one of two patterns in the address formula: (i) most often « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* », but also occasionally (ii) « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL ». Also as above, two implications follow from these conclusions: (1) when a Ugaritic letter bears HOR POW conceptual terminology, it ought to be interpreted as a special case,[109] and (2) when a Ugaritic horizontal letter shows in its address formula any compositional pattern other than the two mentioned above, it ought to be interpreted as a special case.[110]

1.2.6 Order of mention in the address: « RS » versus « SR »

I have not found it profitable to frame my discussion of the composition of the standard address formula purely in terms of the order of mention of the « S » and « R » components, as is often done. My reasons are (1) that the standard address formula in Ugaritic comprises three, not two, main micro-compositional patterns; and (2) that these three patterns can be more or less convincingly linked to the three main conceptual categories of ascending, terminologically unmarked (but contextually

---

[109]That is, it should be suspected of being distinct from the standard Ugaritic tradition, which employs uniquely HOR BIO terms for expressing all horizontal relations; this applies to RS 15.007 and RS 16.265.1.

[110]This applies to RS 16.265.1 and RS 94.2273, both of which employ non-standard address formulas, polite formulas of atypical composition, and furthermore, were probably scribal exercices.

descending), and horizontal letters. Nevertheless, previous discussions of this subject, couched entirely in terms of order of mention, are by no means invalid.

In broad terms, virtually all students of Ugaritic epistolography agree that social rank played an important role in the basic structure of the address formula, specifically that the correspondent of higher social status was generally mentioned prior to the correspondent of lower status.[111] A difference of opinion on this matter, however, seems to exist concerning the scope of social status as a factor. Some scholars imply that relative social rank is the only important factor in explaining the order of mention in the address,[112] and others consider it as one factor among several.[113] Aside from such subtle differences, this widely held opinion is *grosso modo* consistent with my own conclusions, described above, regarding the composition of the standard address formula in (i) conceptually ascending letters and (ii) terminologically unmarked but contextually descending letters.

Another view is represented by Güterbock's 1944 proposal, in publishing the Hittite letter ABoT 65, that the « SR » order corresponds not only to descending social

---

[111]Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 11-15; Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 108-110; Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 144-147; Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), cols. 1413-1414; Liverani, *SDB* (1979), col. 1328; Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 244-247; *idem*, *HUS* (1999) 361; Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 2 (RS 1.018), remarques épistolographiques.

[112]Such is the impression given by F. B. Knutson, "Literary Genres in *PRU* IV," *RSP* 2 (1975) 199: "In Ras Shamra letters the relative rank of the correspondents can in most cases be determined by the sequence of their names and/or titles. The name of the correspondent of superior rank is first, the inferior second." Compare also Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 108-109; and Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 144. For the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, compare the strong statement of J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 66: "La régle de l'étiquette qui consiste à disposer l'*addresse* de telle façon que la personne de rang supérieur . . . y soit nommée d'abord . . . , est maintenant confirmée par un nombre considérable d'exemples sûrs. Elle paraît si stricte que, dans les *très rares* occasions où nous ne la jugeons pas appliquée, nous avons d'*autres* raisons de supposer, soit que le scribe n'était pas de bonne classe, soit qu'on a délibérément commis cette infraction."

[113]See Liverani, *SDB* (1979), col. 1328; Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 244-247; *idem*, *HUS* (1999) 361.

situations but also to those situations in which the correspondents were of equal rank,[114] and, by implication, that the « RS » order corresponds to ascending social situations. This view also applies to the composition of the standard Ugaritic address formula, described above, with considerable accuracy, though it is slightly different from the formulation that "the name of the correspondent of superior rank is first, the inferior second."[115] J. Nougayrol proposed the same compositional distribution as Güterbock for the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra in 1955,[116] and S. Ahl did the same for the Ugaritic letters in her 1973 Brandeis dissertation.[117]

Despite the broad accuracy of both of these views, however, and especially the latter, they encounter a problem when applied to conceptually horizontal letters, which show not only the more common compositional pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* », (that is, the « SR » order), but also, less frequently, the pattern « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL » (the « RS » order). Nor can my appeal to the usage of REL terminology explain this compositional distribution, since both patterns are found on conceptually horizontal letters of otherwise standard composition.

Two solutions might be proposed: (1) the distribution of these two patterns in horizontal letters reflects the social rank of the correspondents, despite the fact that

---

[114]Güterbock is cited by P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *Festschrift Römer* (1998) 171, as follows: "Dass der Briefschreiber sich selbst zuerst nennt, zeigt, dass er von gleichem oder höherem Rang ist als der Empfänger". The source of the citation (unavailable to me) is given as H. G. Güterbock, *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* II 3 (1944) 400.

[115]Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 199.

[116]Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 (1955) 2-3.

[117]Ahl tentatively applied this view to the Ugaritic letters in *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 110. O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 11-15, had not proposed « SR » as the *de facto* order of horizontal letters, but had maintained more generally that the « SR » order was appropriate for descending situations, and « RS » for ascending.

conceptually horizontal terms are explicitly employed, and thus such status differences are not accessible in these cases by means of the REL terms;[118] or (2) the distribution reflects politeness or simple courtesy on the part of the sender, but not necessarily any difference of social status.[119] I know of no empirical means of deciding this question, but in favor of the former several comments can be made. (a) Among letters which are not conceptually horizontal, it is above all social status differences, usually as reflected in the REL terminology, and not considerations of politeness which are unrelated to such status differences, that explain the composition of the address formula. As such, one might expect this concern for mapping status differences onto formal patterns to extend to the conceptually horizontal letters as well. In other words, even if relative social status were not the only factor conditioning the order of mention of the correspondents in the address, it is certainly the most pervasive factor.[120] (b) In theory, the conceptual status of "brotherhood" does not, in the broader "root metaphor" of the household, necessarily preclude hierarchical status differences within it. Quite the opposite, in fact, as anyone who has had the experience "big brother" can attest. Finally, (c) in practice, such internal hierarchical gradations within the ranks of

---

[118]Nougayrol's position in *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 66 (with respect to the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters), is consistent with this view.

[119]Compare Liverani, *SDB* (1979), col. 1328; Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 244-247; and *idem*, *HUS* (1999) 361.

[120]Compare A. Caquot: "Le formulaire, salutation et adresse même, varie selon le qualité des destinataires et surtout selon la différence de statut social qui peut exister entre l'expéditeur et le destinataire" (*SDB* 9 [1979], col. 1413); and D. Pardee: "L'ordre de mention des correspondants correspond le plus souvent — bien qu'il y ait des exceptions — au rang social des deux personnes, la personne de rang supérieur étant mentionnée en premier lieu" (*Les textes épistolaires* [in preparation], chapter 2 [RS 1.018], remarques épistolographiques).

"brothers" are explicitly attested in the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, though not yet in the Ugaritic letters found at the same site.[121]

In summary, this attempt to classify the formal patterns of the Ugaritic standard address formula purely in terms of the type and distribution of the REL terminology within these same letters has been only partly successful. The most convincing distributional link is that between conceptually ASC letters and the compositional pattern « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL ». Also valuable, however, is the identification of terminologically UNMARKED letters as contextually descending whenever the data allow a determination to be made. The further recognition that all standard address formulas in letters which derive from contextually descending social situations present the compositional pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* », invites the thoroughgoing equation of UNMARKED conceptual status = contextually descending situation = the composition pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* » for the standard Ugaritic epistolary tradition. The data do not allow a categorical insistence on the latter two elements of this equation, but the distribution appears highly suggestive. Finally, somewhat less satisfactory is distributional connection of the standard address formula in conceptually horizontal letters with two compositional patterns, the first, « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* », being the more common, and the second, « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL », being otherwise associated with ASC letters. Thus, in the case of horizontal letters, a classification based entirely on REL terminology does not coincide with a purely formal classification of the address formulas as neatly as it did above in the cases of (explicitly) ASC and (contextually) DESC letters. It is possible, as has long been assumed, that the

---

[121]Two Ras Shamra Akkadian letters attest to the existence of such terminologically horizontal, but practically ascending situations: RS 34.164, addressed to two individuals whom the sender describes as {ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ia GAL.MEŠ}, 'my big brothers'; and RS [Varia 25], addressed to an individual whom the sender calls {ŠEŠ-ḫi-ia GAL}, 'my big brother'.

distribution of these two patterns in HOR letters reflects hierarchical differences in social status within the larger conceptual category of "brothers". But, since such status differences are not observable in the REL terminology, it is difficult to evaluate this hypothesis in any empirical way. I consider it probable, and more likely than any other contextual explanation, but I do not know how it can be convincingly demonstrated.

It is noteworthy that the composition of the standard address formula in the Ugaritic epistolary tradition seems best explained by a grouping of the corpus according to three types of conceptual status: terminologically ASC, terminologically HOR, and (terminologically UNMARKED but) contextually DESC letters. The notion of conceptual model, that is, whether the REL terminology was drawn from the BIO model or from the POW model, does not seem relevant to the formal composition of the standard address.

1.3 Distribution of the address formula

The corpus of Ugaritic epistolary texts contains sixty-seven certain or probable examples of the address formula.[122] Owing to its presence in all letters preserved well enough to permit analysis,[123] the current data allow one to consider the address formula as a "necessary" component of Ugaritic epistolary structure.

---

[122]Since the presence of an address formula was one of the criteria by means of which the epistolary corpus was defined, the relevant data were surveyed in the introduction; see above, section 1.2.2.

[123]The only possible exception to this statement that I know of is RS 16.078+ (and perhaps also RS 94.5015 if its lines 1-2 are to be restored on the analogy of RS 16.078+), which contains no address formula at the top of the *recto*. Many solutions are possible, but one which allows us to avoid classifying this tablet as a letter which omits the address formula is to imagine that the tablet RS 16.078+ derives from a multiple-tablet letter, of which it does not represent the first tablet, and therefore

Not only is its presence necessary, but also its placement is fixed: it consistently occurs at the beginning of each letter,[124] and is followed by the polite formulas, if such are present, and the body, in that order. Often, a horizontal scribal line separates the address from the following section.[125]

Normally, the address formula occurs only once in each letter. In two cases, however, not only is an address present, as expected, at the beginning of the text, but another address formula may be found farther on in the text, separated from the initial address formula by intervening elements: these are RS 34.356 and RS 94.2545+.[126] Such a usage is extremely rare,[127] however, and its explanation may be found in a consideration of the precise epistolary sub-genres which these texts represent.[128]

---

does not contain the *praescriptio* (which would have been present on the preceding tablet). Pardee's discussion in *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 24 (RS 16.078+), remarques épistolaires, reflects the problem of the absence of the address formula (and of the entire *praescriptio*, in fact): "La première question que soulève ce texte est de savoir pourquoi le message commence *in medias res*." After a detailed discussion (*ibid.*), he also favors the hypothesis that RS 16.078+ represents the second tablet (or in any case, a subsequent tablet) of a multiple tablet letter: "Il nous paraît nécessaire d'en tirer la conclusion que nous ne possédons que la fin d'un message plus long, qui aurait été consigné sur (au moins) deux tablettes. Suite et corollaire de cette conclusion : le fait que la *praescriptio* ne fait défaut dans aucune des lettres internationales connues en langue ougaritique indique que cette absence ici ne constitue pas une omission voulue qui devait se combler lors de la rédaction du texte accadien, mais le résultat du fait que la première partie du texte fut inscrite sur une autre tablette, où l'en-tête aurait été présent."

[124]I consider second or "piggy-back" letters to be independent epistolary texts in their own right; in these letters as well always begin with an address formula.

[125]See above, section 0.3.3, and the references cited there.

[126]As remarked above, section 0.2.2, for various reasons it is not likely that the second address formula in these two tablets represents the beginning of a "piggy-back" letter.

[127]The fact that there are only two examples in of a corpus numbering over one hundred shows that this usage is very rare in the Ugaritic tradition. The Amarna corpus appears to contain two examples of this usage as well: EA 100 and EA 124.

[128]RS 34.356, for example, is addressed to a "great king" (Ug. *mlk rb*), and this context may have conditioned a different epistolary protocol which incorporated a repetition of the address formula. Compare EA 100 and EA 124, also with repeated address formulas and addressed to a "great king".

1.4 Comparative evidence for the Address formula

The pages which follow contain a discussion of two types of comparative evidence: (1) a survey of the address formulas employed in contemporary and anterior epistolary traditions in the Akkadian and Hittite languages, and (2) an overview of those Ugaritic literary motifs which present formal and contextual parallels to the Ugaritic address formula.

1.4.1 Comparative evidence from Akkadian and Hittite letters

1.4.1.1 General

My goal in this section is to isolate those epistolary traditions which make use of an address formula comparable in both distribution and composition to that identified above as "standard" for the Ugaritic corpus. Specifically, I wish to identify in the various comparative corpora evidence for the existence of epistolary traditions which, like the Ugaritic, make productive use of three micro-compositional patterns, one in terminologically ASC letters, another in (terminologically UNMARKED) contextually DESC letters, and a third pattern which appears, along with some examples of the first pattern, in terminologically HOR letters. Furthermore, I hope to establish patterns of compositional similarity between such a set of three micro-compositional patterns, and the Ugaritic patterns to which they correspond.

RS 94.2545+ is, to a very large extent, parallel in terms of structure and content to RS 94.2284. The extent of these parallels, in fact, permits one to classify RS 94.2545+ as a draft (RS 94.2284 is probably also, I believe, a draft), rather than a letter that was actually sent. Perhaps its status as a draft explains to some extent the formal liberties taken in its composition.

1.4.1.2 {um-ma} in logo-syllabic texts and Ugaritic *tḥm*

It is occasionally observed that the Ugaritic address formula is distinguished from contemporaneous Akkadian address formulas by the fact that in the « S » component the Ugaritic version employs a common noun, *tḥm*, 'message', where the Akkadian formula has an adverb, *umma*, 'thus'.[129] This alleged distinction should not be pushed too far, however. I think all will agree that it is an accurate observation on a purely descriptive level, but, if applied to the cross-linguistic comparison of parallel formulas in Ugaritic and Akkadian, the "distinction" borders on irrelevance: it amounts to little more than observing that one formula is in the Akkadian language and the other in Ugaritic. To claim, entirely on the basis of this *tḥm* / *umma* distinction, that the Ugaritic and Akkadian address formulas are not formally parallel, is to suppose that semantically equivalent statements in two languages ought to be equivalent at the morpho-lexical level rather than at the phrase level. That such a supposition is faulty is clear in any attempt at translation, as St. Jerome recognized long ago.[130]

A second problem in the interpretation of the graphic sequence {um-ma} in logo-syllabic texts is the fact that, in texts of western provenance, the word is typically

---

[129]See A. L. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 144 ("Apart from the use of *tḥm* contemporary Akkadian letters from Ugarit and Amarna are strictly parallel"); and J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 248 ("Le substantif *tḥm* « message » différencie les formules ougaritiques des formules accadiennes contemporaines (Ougarit même et El-Amarna) où l'on trouve *umma* « ainsi » à la place de *tḥm*").

[130]Compare the reflection of A. L. Oppenheim, *Letters from Mesopotamia* (1967) 67: "In all my translations, however, the inspiring words of the patron saint of all translators, St. Jerome, have been before my eyes: *Non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu*." In other words, languages are not substitution codes at the lexical level.

followed by a noun phrase declined in the genitive case.[131] In standard Akkadian usage, of course, *umma* is an adverb, and is followed by a noun in the nominative case: 'Thus N_S'.[132] This (standard) version of the « S » component in Akkadian letters, « *umma* N_S » as 'Thus N_S', while analogous to the Ugaritic « S » component on the contextual and phrase level (in introducing the direct speech of N_S), is not analogous on the morpho-lexical level, since in this case *umma* does not denote a common noun in construct with N_S, but rather a sentence level adverb.[133] Western scribes working in Akkadian, however, appear to have used the sign sequence {um-ma} in the epistolary address formula as a logogram of sorts, denoting not the Akkadian adverb expressed by the phonemic value of those signs, but rather a common noun, meaning 'message' or the like.[134]

In short, the fact that Western peripheral Akkadian address formulas, and possibly also those in Hittite letters,[135] employ the graphic sequence {um-ma} in the

---

[131]On the general phenomenon of *umma* followed by a noun in the genitive case, see L. Matouš, *AnOr* 24 (1957) 381; J. Huehnergard, *Akkadian of Ugarit* (1989) 144-145, 209; W. L. Moran, *Amarna Letters* (1992) xxii, n. 52; and A. F. Rainey, *CAT* 2 (1996) 174-180; all with anterior bibliography. A. Goetze suggested a parallel usage in Hittite texts (in R. Marcus, *JCS* 2 [1948] 224), but H. A. Hoffner, Jr., has refuted (personal communication) the suggestion (see below, section 1.6.2).

[132]See, for example, W. von Soden, *GAG* (1995), §121b.

[133]In all fairness, this is probably the point made by Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 144; and Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 248, mentioned above.

[134]Hittitologists have labelled such usages in Hittite texts as "Akkadograms", and denote them in transcription with italicized upper case letters. Such a convention was followed by P.-R. Berger, *UF* 1 (1969) 218; but note the objections to its appropriateness by A. Rainey, *IOS* 5 (1975) 22-23, n. 25. Note also the early observation of W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 87 (1942) 33, n. 7: "Since *umma* is followed in Akkadian by a nominative, the construction [followed by the genitive] is obviously influenced by Canaanite models such as Ugaritic *tḥm* N, 'message of N,' Hebrew *nᵊʾûm* N, 'utterance of N,' which is prefixed to so many prophetic oracles."

[135]The evidence is not clear for the Hittite material; see below, section 1.6.2.

slot where Ugaritic addresses have *tḥm* does not, in and of itself, exclude the possibility of a formally parallel compositional pattern employed in the epistolary traditions of all three languages. On the contrary, the frequent use of the genitive case following {um-ma} in such formulas, especially in the traditions of the Western periphery, seems to support the possibility of a single underlying formal structure in the address formulas, which is not only parallel on the phrase level, but also on the morpho-lexical level: «common noun 'message' + N_S ». Such an underlying pattern is directly observable in the Ugaritic tradition, and may be plausibly inferred for the address formulas in many Western peripheral traditions.

1.4.2 By Corpus

1.4.2.1 Ras Shamra Akkadian letters

The most important body of comparative evidence for the Ugaritic letters is the corpus of Akkadian letters found at the same site.

The recognition that in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus the correspondent of higher social status was generally mentioned prior to the correspondent of lower status seems to be a valid and useful rule of thumb.[136] As above, in my discussion of the compositional patterns attested in the Ugaritic corpus, however, I have found it useful here to chart the distribution, not of two compositional patterns, that is, those of the « RS » order versus those of the « SR » order, but three.[137] It will nevertheless be

---

[136]On this feature in the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra, see J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 (1955) 2-3; *idem*, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 66-67; Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 199; and D. Arnaud, *SMEA* 30 (1992) 184.

[137]See above, section 1.2.6.

evident to the reader that these three compositional patterns discussed here translate easily into « RS » and « SR » classification, one of the three main patterns being « RS », and the other two « SR ». The apparent insights to be gained by such a tripartite division of compositional patterns seem, to me, to justify this departure from the traditional discussion.

Furthermore, to facilitate the presentation of the evidence, I have organized the following survey of the Ras Shamra Akkadian address formulas by conceptual status: terminologically ASC, (terminologically UNMARKED but) contextually DESC, and terminologically HOR letters, in other words, those conceptual categories found to be of diagnostic importance for the classification and comprehension of the Ugaritic address formula. It will be seen that such a presentation coincides more or less convincingly with the distribution of the three major compositional patterns.

The provisional corpus of Ras Shamra Akkadian letters that I have assembled contains 206 texts of an epistolary genre, of which forty-three are conceptually UNKNOWN,[138] forty-eight conceptually UNMARKED,[139] and one hundred fifteen explicitly marked in terms of conceptual status and model. Among this latter group,

---

[138]RS 11.794, RS 11.834, RS 12.005, RS 15.018, RS 15.019, RS 15.124, RS 16.116, RS 17.390, RS 17.394+, RS 17.398, RS 17.429, RS 17.451, RS 17.456, RS 18.054, RS 18.057, RS 18.268, RS 18.281, RS 19.115, RS 20.[438], RS 20.095A, RS 20.130, RS 20.141A, RS 20.141B, RS 20.159, RS 20.189D, RS 20.191, RS 20.196D, RS 20.200A, RS 20.214D, RS 20.225, RS 20.242, RS 20.244, RS 20.246, RS 21.006C, RS 21.007C, RS 21.063F, RS 21.201, RS 26.158, RS 34.165, RS 34.180,13, RS 34.180,5, RS 1980.387, and RS 88.2158.

[139]RS 4.449, RS 8.333, RS 12.033, RS 13.007bis, RS 15.011, RS 15.077, RS 16.003, RS 17.130, RS 17.132, RS 17.133, RS 17.239, RS 17.288, RS 17.289, RS 17.292, RS 17.385, RS 17.397B+, RS 17.423, RS 19.050, RS 20.003, RS 20.013.1, RS 20.015, RS 20.017, RS 20.018, RS 20.021, RS 20.022, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.174A, RS 20.212, RS 20.216, RS 20.237, RS 20.239, RS 20.426,14+, RS 22.006, RS 34.129, RS 34.136, RS 34.137, RS 34.138, RS 34.139, RS 34.143, RS 34.145, RS 34.146, RS 34.158, RS 34.160, RS 86.2216, RS 86.2230, RS 88.2009, RS 88.2013, and RS [Varia 16].

fifty-four letters are conceptually ASC,[140] at least forty-three and probably as many as fifty conceptually HOR,[141] and at least eight and probably as many as ten letters are explicitly DESC in their use of REL terms.[142] One letter which is conceptually mixed, both in terms of status and in terms of model, rounds out the corpus.[143]

1.4.2.1.1 ASC LETTERS

Forty-six of the conceptually ascending letters are composed on the POW model (that is, are ASC POW). The composition of the address formula may be more or less clearly perceived in thirty-four of these cases.[144] At least twenty-five, and probably as many as twenty-eight of these thirty-four ASC POW letters show address formulas

---

[140]RS 1.[056], RS 1.[057], RS 15.014, RS 15.178, RS 16.112, RS 17.083, RS 17.143, RS 17.383, RS 17.391, RS 17.393, RS 17.422, RS 17.425, RS 17.455, RS 19.006, RS 19.070, RS 19.080, RS 20.016, RS 20.019, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.033, RS 20.150, RS 20.151, RS 20.162, RS 20.168, RS 20.178.2, RS 20.182A+, RS 20.182D, RS 20.184, RS 20.200C, RS 20.219, RS 20.227.2, RS 20.238, RS 20.243, RS 21.054B, RS 21.064, RS 25.138, RS 25.461, RS 32.204.1, RS 32.204.2, RS 34.135, RS 34.140, RS 34.142, RS 34.150, RS 34.151, RS 34.152, RS 34.170, RS 34.171.1, RS 34.180,60, RS 88.2011, RS 92.2007, RS 92.2017.1, RS 92.2017.2, RS 92.2021, and CK 107.

[141]RS 6.198, RS 10.046, RS 11.723, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 15.063, RS 17.116, RS 17.142, RS 17.144, RS 17.148.2, RS 17.286, RS 17.315, RS 17.428 (probably HOR), RS 17.452, RS 18.089 (probably HOR), RS 19.053, RS 20.013.2, RS 20.158, RS 20.172, RS 20.178.1, RS 20.182C (probably HOR), RS 20.194 (probably HOR), RS 20.200B, RS 20.227.1 (probably HOR), RS 20.232 (probably HOR), RS 20.248, RS 21.183, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.141, RS 34.149, RS 34.153, RS 34.154 (probably HOR), RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.163, RS 34.164, RS 34.167+, RS 34.173, RS 34.174, RS 34.180,17, RS 86.2212+, RS 86.2221+, RS 86.2232, RS 86.2236, RS 92.2006, RS 92.2017.3, RIH 81/4, RS [Varia 25], and RS [Varia 26].

[142]RS 11.730, RS 16.111, RS 17.078, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.152, RS 17.247, RS 20.255A (probably DESC), RS 25.131, RS 34.133, and RS 34.155 (probably DESC).

[143]This is RS 34.171.2, which uses REL terminology of both HOR and ASC conceptual status, drawn from both the BIO and the POW models.

[144]The composition of the address formula is unknown in the following ASC POW letters: RS 1.[057], RS 15.014, RS 15.178, RS 20.182A+, RS 20.182D, RS 20.227.2, RS 20.243, RS 21.054B, RS 34.140, RS 34.171.1, RS 92.2007, and RS 92.2021.

which follow the compositional pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL »,[145] this being the precise equivalent in Akkadian of the Ugaritic pattern « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL », typical of ASC POW letters. Only six ASC POW letters show address formulas of a pattern other than this one.[146]

Of the five ASC BIO letters in which the composition of the address formula can be perceived,[147] at least two and probably three follow the expected pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL ».[148] The remaining two each show another pattern.[149]

The majority of the conceptually ASC letters in the RS Akkadian corpus present a compositional pattern corresponding to that of the Ugaritic ASC letters.[150]

---

[145]The pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL » is unambiguously present in twenty-five ASC POW letters: RS 16.112, RS 17.383, RS 17.391, RS 17.393, RS 17.422, RS 17.425, RS 17.455, RS 19.006, RS 19.080, RS 20.016, RS 20.019, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.033, RS 20.162, RS 20.184, RS 20.200C, RS 20.219, RS 25.461, RS 32.204.1, RS 32.204.2, RS 34.135, RS 34.150, RS 34.151, RS 92.2017.1, and CK 107. It is very probable in RS 1.[056], and the preserved portions of the address in RS 20.151 and RS 34.180,60 are consistent with this pattern.

[146]Two of these, RS 21.064 and RS 25.138, present address formulas of a very similar pattern, « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID », in which the REL term is absent from the « S » component. In RS 88.2011, the pattern is « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID » (REL terms are absent from both components). These three letters nevertheless preserve the more general pattern familiar from the Ugaritic corpus: the order « RS ». Two other letters, RS 34.142 and RS 34.152, display an address formula familiar from the Mesopotamian heartland, as S. Lackenbacher noted in her publication of the former, RSO 7 (1991) 101, n. 75, and quite unusual for the Western periphery. Compare the similar patterns in the ASC POW letter published by R. D. Biggs, *JCS* 19 (1965) 95-102, and above all among the letters from Kassite Nippur, for which see H. Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings* (1908) 32, pattern (b). The reconstruction of the first line of RS 34.152 proposed by the editor in RSO 7 (1991) 85, n. 4, should be favored. Finally, the address formula of RS 92.2017.2 lacks the « S » component: « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* ».

[147]The composition of the address formula of RS 34.170 is unknown; that of RS 20.150 and RS 20.178.2 reveals little more than the <RS> order of mention.

[148]RS 17.143 and RS 20.238 clearly show this pattern; it is probable in RS 20.168.

[149]RS 17.083 shows the <RS> order of mention: « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID », but the <R> component lacks a REL term. The pattern of RS 19.070, « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* », is directly comparable to the unexpected address formulas in the Ugaritic letters RS 15.008 and RS 17.139, and probably to be explained in the same way.

1.4.2.1.2 UNMARKED LETTERS

Of the forty-eight conceptually UNMARKED letters for which the structure of the address formula is more or less observable, all but two[151] show a compositional pattern which is precisely parallel to that pattern found to be typical of UNMARKED letters in the Ugaritic corpus, namely, « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* ». By far the majority of these show the pattern « *umma* ID *ana* ID *qibī-ma* »,[152] but one, from the Hittite king, shows a different, but formally similar pattern.[153]

---

[150]At least twenty-seven and possibly as many as thirty-one out of thirty-nine letters in which the composition of the address formula is unambiguously or virtually clear show the pattern.

[151]These two are RS 4.449 and RS 20.021, which both present the compositional pattern « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID ». On the former, note the comments of D. Arnaud, *SMEA* 37 (1996) 51; and see the corpus of Alalakh letters, below. It may also be worthwhile to compare the Ugaritic letter RS 1.018 with these two.

[152]Forty-five letters show this pattern: RS 8.333, RS 12.033, RS 13.007bis, RS 15.011, RS 15.077, RS 16.003, RS 17.132, RS 17.133, RS 17.239, RS 17.288, RS 17.289, RS 17.292, RS 17.385, RS 17.397B+, RS 17.423, RS 19.050, RS 20.003, RS 20.013.1, RS 20.015, RS 20.017, RS 20.018, RS 20.022, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.174A, RS 20.212 (very probably), RS 20.216, RS 20.237, RS 20.239, RS 20.426,14+, RS 22.006, RS 34.129, RS 34.136, RS 34.137, RS 34.138, RS 34.139, RS 34.143, RS 34.145, RS 34.146, RS 34.158, RS 34.160, RS 86.2216, RS 86.2230, RS 88.2009, RS 88.2013, and RS [Varia 16].

[153]This is RS 17.130, « *kunukku*? ID *ana* ID *qibī-ma* ». The interpretation of the first three signs of RS 17.130 (and its duplicate RS 18.003, which has not been taken into consideration here) seems difficult to me. The editor had read {^{aban}*kunukku-ma*}, that is, {NA$_4$.KIŠIB-ma}, 'the (stone) seal'. A seal impression is present on the tablet, on the upper left corner of the recto, judging from the editor's copy. On formal grounds, however, the (Akkadian) word *kunukku*, 'seal' is unexpected in the <S> component: one expects a nominal phrase in which the identification of the sender (which is present here), is preceded by a word which clarifies the relationship between the sender and the epistolary text which follows. In Ugaritic, this is more or less the equivalent of a label: *tḥm mlk*, for example, which I would freely intrepret as '(the text which follows constitutes) the message of the king'. In the traditional Akkadian epistolary style, *umma* plays the same role: *umma šarri*, 'Thus the king' - *umma* is an anticipatory "pro-form" which refers to the entire message. In RS 17.130, however, it is diffifcult to identify the message itself as a *kunukku*, '(stone) seal'.

Further complicating the problem is the fact that, on the epigraphic level, {KIŠIB} 'seal', {UM} (as in {um-ma}, 'thus'), and {DUB} 'tablet' are difficult to distinguish from one another; and had the determinative {NA$_4$} not been present, the editor would surely not have hesitated to transcribe {um-ma}.

Also as in the Ugaritic corpus, despite the explicit absence of REL terminology from these letters, the nature of the social relationship between the sender and the recipient can nevertheless occasionally be inferred on the basis of contextual knowledge. This permits the identification of the "contextual" status of at least twenty-two, and possibly as many as thirty-one of these unmarked letters. Where contextual factors allow a plausible identification, all of these seem to be socially descending.[154]

---

[154]Among the corpus of terminologically UNMARKED letters, I believe the following twenty-four letters may be safely assumed to derive from a "contextually descending" social situation: RS 8.333 (from {LUGAL KUR-kar-ga-m[is]} to {^{m}a-[m]is-tam-ri LUGAL KUR-ú-[g]a-ri-it}); RS 12.033 (from {[LUGA]⌜L$^{?}$⌝ - ma} to {^{f}šar-e-li GAŠAN KUR ú-[g]a-r[i-it]}), RS 13.007bis (from {LUGA[L-r]i-ma} to {^{m}am-m[u]-ra-bi LUGAL KUR-ú-ga-ri[-it]}); RS 16.003 (from {LUGAL KUR kar-ga-[mi]s} to {^{m}a-mis-tam-ri LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 17.130 (from {^{m}ta-ba-ar-na ^{m}ḫa-at-tu-ši-li LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR ḫa-at-ti} to {^{m}níq-mu-pa}); RS 17.132 (from {^{d}UTU-ši LUGAL GAL} to {^{m}ni-iq-ma-an-da}); RS 17.133 (from {^{d}UTU-ši-ma} to {^{m}a-mis-tam-ri}); RS 17.289 (from {LUGAL KUR kar-ga-mis} to {^{m}i-bi-ra-ni LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 17.292 (from {LUGAL KUR kar-ga-mis} to {^{m}i-bi-ra-na LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 17.385 (from {LUGAL KUR k[ar-g]a-mis} to {^{m}i-bi-ra-ni LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 17.423 (from {LUGAL-ma} to {^{m}i-bi-ra-ni LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 20.013.1 (from {MÍ.LUGAL-m[a]} to {^{m}ia-an-ḫa-[m]u}); RS 20.022 (from {LUGAL KUR kar-[g]a-mis} to {^{m}a-mis-tam-ri LUGAL KUR ú-[g]a-ri-it}); RS 20.174A. (from {LUGAL-ma} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 20.216 (from {LU[GA]L-ma} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 20.237 (from {LUGAL-m[a$^{?}$]} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 34.129 (from {^{d}UTU-ši-m[a] LUGAL GAL - ú} to {LÚ sà-ki-in-ni}); RS 34.136 (from {LUGAL-ma} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-rít}); RS 34.138 (from {LUGAL KUR kar-g[a-mis]} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-r⌜i-i⌝t}); RS 34.143 (from {LUGAL-ma} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 34.145 (from {LUGAL-ma} to {MÍ.LUGAL KUR u-ga-⌜ri⌝-it}); RS 86.2216 (from {LUGAL-ma} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}; RS 88.2013 (from {LUGAL-ma} to {^{m}am-mu-ra-pí ⌜LUGAL⌝ KUR ú-ga-ri-it}; and RS [Varia 16] (from {LUGAL - ma} to {^{m}am-mu-ra-pi L[UG]AL KUR ú-ga-rít}.

It seems reasonable to include the following six letters here as well: RS 17.288, from {LUGAL KUR URU u[š-na-ti(?)]} to {LÚ ŠÁ.KÍN <KUR?>-ti ša(?) KU[R-u-ga-ri-it(?)]}; RS 17.397B+, from {^{md}IM.DI.KUD (2) [LUGA]L URU am$^{?}$-qí } to {^{md}U-za-DUGUD (4) LÚ.ŠÁ.[KÍ]N ša KUR URU-u-ga-[ri-it] }; RS 20.017, from {LUGAL KUR [u]š$^{?}$[-na-ti$^{?}$] } to {^{m}ia-ab-n[i-]n[i] }; RS 34.137, from {LUGAL KUR PÚ.MEŠ-ti} to {^{m}LÚ.ŠÁ.KÍN KUR u-ga-ri-[i]t}; RS 34.146, from {LUGAL KUR kín-za} to {^{m}u⌜z-z⌝e-e-na LÚ šá-kín KUR u-ga-ri-it}; and RS 34.158, from {LUGAL KUR URU ⌜uš⌝-na-ti} to {^{m}uz-zi-ni}.

Finally, three letters from individuals bearing the title {DUMU LUGAL} to various Ugaritians, including the king, probably belong here as well: RS 15.077, from {^{m}a-li-ḫe-eš-[n]i DUMU LUGAL} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}; RS 20.003, from {^{m}šu-kúr-^{d}IM-ub DUMU LUGAL} to {^{m}am-mis-tam-ri (3) LUGAL URU ú-ga-ri-it}; and RS 22.006, from {^{m}úr-ḫa-e [DUMU$^{?}$] LU[GA]L$^{?}$} to {^{m}ia-ab-ni}. Note that {DUMU LUGAL} is an ID term, not a REL term; it does not describe a relationship between the sender and the recipient, but between the sender and "the king" (this would be, I suppose, the Hittite monarch or the king of Carchemish).

This, too, parallels the Ugaritic corpus. Socially descending situations favor not only the explicit absence of REL terminology, but also a compositional pattern of the order « SR »; that is, « *umma* ID *ana* ID *qibī-ma* ».

1.4.2.1.3 HOR LETTERS

The composition of the address formula of forty-two conceptually HOR letters is perceptible with clarity.[155] Of these, the vast majority shows a single compositional pattern, « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* »,[156] which corresponds precisely to the pattern most typical of HOR letters in the Ugaritic corpus, « *tḫm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* ». A second pattern is represented by no less than six letters: « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL »,[157] which likewise corresponds to the second most frequent pattern in the Ugaritic corpus, « *l* ID REL *rgm tḫm* ID REL ». Four other compositional patterns are represented among the six HOR letters which remain.[158]

---

[155]The address is missing from six HOR letters: RS 17.116, RS 20.182C, RS 20.194, RS 20.227.1, RS 34.174, and RIH 81/4.

[156]This pattern is certain or very probable in thirty-one letters. Twenty-four of these are certain: RS 15.033, RS 15.063, RS 17.142, RS 17.144, RS 17.148.2, RS 17.286, RS 17.428, RS 18.089, RS 20.013.2, RS 20.158, RS 20.172, RS 20.178.1, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.141, RS 34.149, RS 34.153, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.173, RS 86.2212+, RS 92.2006, and RS 92.2017.3. The pattern is almost certain in RS 20.200B, and very probable in RS 11.723, RS 15.024+, RS 17.452, RS 21.183, and RS 86.2232. Finally, RS 19.053 represents a special variant of this pattern: « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL ID *qibī-ma* »; that is, the <R> component is not simply ID REL as expected, but ID REL ID.

[157]RS 10.046, RS 17.315, RS 20.248, RS 34.164, RS 34.167+, and RS [Varia 26].

[158]At least two, and probably three letters contain the pattern « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID »: RS 20.232 and RS 34.163 are certain. RS [Varia 25] also appears to have been structured on this pattern, though its superficial appearance is distorted by an apparent scribal lapse: « *ana* ID *umma* ID *qibī-ma* ». Regarding the pattern « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID », compare RS 1.018 in the Ugaritic corpus.

The pattern « *umma* ID REL *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* » is represented by two letters (RS 6.198 and probably RS 86.2236), and the formally similar pattern « *umma* ID REL *ana* ID *qibī-ma* » by another (RS 34.154). The Ugaritic letter RS 18.147 may be comparable with one or the other of these patterns.

Finally, RS 34.180,17 appears to present yet another pattern, « *ana* ID *umma* [?] », in which the element *qibī-ma* is absent.

1.4.2.1.4 OTHER CONCEPTUAL CATEGORIES AND PATTERNS

The corpus of the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters is distinguished from the Ugaritic corpus by, among others factors, the presence of a fair number of letters which are unambiguously DESC BIO in terms of their conceptual classification.[159] There are at least eight such letters in which the composition of the address formula is clear,[160] and all share one and the same compositional pattern: « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* »,[161] the very pattern found to be most typical of HOR BIO letters in this corpus and the Ugaritic corpus.

The regular distribution of this pattern in DESC BIO letters is not without implications. In the first place, the pattern « *umma* ID *ana* ID *qibī-ma* », discussed above as being typical of terminologically UNMARKED but "contextually" descending letters, may perhaps be better imagined as appropriate not for descending social situations in general, but specifically for those descending social situations in which the distance between the sender and recipient is fairly great, that is, in which the social relationship would be more accurately characterized by the POW model than the BIO model. In other words, the pattern « *umma* ID *ana* ID *qibī-ma* » seems more appropriate when, for example, a "lord", {EN}, addresses his "servant", {ÌR}.[162]

---

[159]The Ugaritic corpus contains only one letter which is DESC BIO, RS 18.147.

[160]The address formula of RS 20.155A is missing.

[161]These are RS 11.730, RS 16.111, RS 17.078, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.152, RS 17.247, RS 25.131, and RS 34.133.

[162]Because in such situations REL terms were omitted altogether, the grounds for the identification of such letters are indirect, based on contextual factors ("contextually descending" letters, discussed above), distributional factors (the complete or virtual absence of explicitly DESC POW letters), and reasons of symmetry (a comparison of those letters in which the correspondents are the

Secondly, given the presence of two main patterns among conceptually HOR letters, and the possibility that the use of one or the other was conditioned by the relative social position of the sender with respect to the recipient, it appears plausible that the pattern « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* » may be conceived as appropriate for expressing social relationships which are contextually "descending", thus the placement of the « S » component prior to the « R » component, but in which the social distance separating the sender and recipient is not so great as to require the complete omission of REL terms.

Finally, two other letters, despite the fact that their conceptual classification or their compositional pattern is atypical, are more or less consistent with the distributional patterns discussed above.[163]

1.4.2.1.5 SUMMARY: THE ADDRESS IN RS AKKADIAN LETTERS

Unlike the Ugaritic corpus, the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra derive not only from domestic correspondence, but also encompass a large amount of

---

same, conceptually ASC POW when party X writes to party Y, but UNMARKED when party Y writes to party X).

[163]RS 34.155 is probably best described as terminologically UNMARKED but contextually descending: the pattern of its address formula is difficult, but apparently « *umma* ID *ana* ID *qibī-ma* ». The editor read the <S> component in line 1 as {⌜um-ma⌝ ^{m}ta-pá-ʾa-e ⌜DUMU LUGAL$^{?}$ EN$^{?}$-ka⌝}. Although {⌜EN$^{?}$-ka⌝}, 'your lord', is indeed a REL phrase, it appears to describe not the relationship between the sender and the recipient, but rather that between a third party, "the King", {LUGAL}, of whom the sender is the son, and the recipient. As such it does not fit the definition of REL phrase used here. Thus, I prefer to interpret {⌜DUMU LUGAL$^{?}$ EN$^{?}$-ka⌝} as one long and complex ID phrase, the elements {LUGAL$^{?}$} and {EN$^{?}$-ka⌝} being in apposition, and functioning to specify further the individual identity of the sender. If this analysis be legitimate, the form presented in the address formula here is typical for the conceptual category represented, that of terminologically UNMARKED letters.

RS 34.171.2 is conceptually MIXED: both the POW and BIO models appear, and terms appropriate for both ASC and HOR conceptual status. The form of the address follows the pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL », the pattern typical of conceptually ASC letters.

international correspondence sent from, and presumably composed in Anatolia, Cyprus, and other sites in coastal and inland Syria.

It is evident from the above survey that for the most part, this group of letters follows the same pattern of composition and distribution for the address formula as did the Ugaritic letters. The necessary conclusion is that, with respect to the address formula, Ugaritic epistolary style resembled that generally in use by the scribes, not merely of Ugarit, but of contemporary Hittite Anatolia, Cyprus, Carchemish, and the cities of the Levantine coast.

Not all address formulas represented in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, however, employ patterns typical of the Ugaritic corpus. Judging from the allusion to {KUR ma-ri}, 'the land of Mari', in the benediction formula of RS 34.142, one of these "variant" patterns, which is also attested in RS 34.152 and is current in Kassite Babylonia, represents a usage practiced along the Euphrates, but to the south and east of Emar.

1.4.2.2 Akkadian letters from Tell Meskene

The corpus of epistolary texts from Tell Meskene is much smaller than the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian corpora, numbering, at most, thirty texts. Seventeen of these are explicitly ASC in terms of their conceptual terminology, and the majority of these display address formulas which present the compositional pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL », that is, the pattern found to be typical of conceptually ascending letters in the Ugaritic and Akkadian corpora from Ras Shamra.

At least nine letters certainly present this pattern,[164] and it is very probable in two others.[165] The composition of three other letters may be represented as « *ana* REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL »,[166] a pattern which I consider to be a variant of the standard pattern: it presents the « RS » order of mention, contains REL terms for both elements, and differs only in lacking the ID element of the « R » component. Three conceptually ascending letters remain which present different compositional patterns.[167] All seventeen of these letters incorporate ASC conceptual terminology drawn on the POW model: sixteen are exclusively ASC POW, and one ASC MIXED.[168]

Of the seven conceptually UNMARKED letters for which the composition of the address formula is observable, the majority unambiguously present the pattern « *umma* ID *ana* ID *qibī-ma* »,[169] that is, the pattern found to be standard for UNMARKED letters in the Ras Shamra corpora. Furthermore, at least two of these four contain contextual clues that the social relationship between the sender and the recipient was of a

---

[164]These are Msk 7441.1, Msk 7442, Msk 7445, Msk 7452.1, Msk 7497.1, and Msk 74102c, recovered in regular excavations; and ME 53.1, ME 54, and ME 127, presumably found at Meskene.

[165]Msk 7454 and Msk 7498d.

[166]This pattern is certainly present in Msk 7451.1 and Msk 7472, and very probably in Msk 74270.

[167]The pattern of the address formula in Msk 7451.2 is « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID » (it differs from the standard pattern in lacking the REL term in the <S> component); and that of Msk 7474+ is « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID [REL?] » (it lacks the REL term in the <R> component). Whether or not Msk 7452.3 represents a genuinely separate letter is a valid question; in any case, its "address formula" is unique: {(25) INIM ^{md}30-a-bu}, that is « *awāt* ID » (?); compare Msk 7441:30.

Despite the compositional distinctiveness of two of these, Msk 7451.2 and Msk 7452.3, note that other letters on these same tablets bear "standard" patterns. Although one hesitates to allow too great of interpretive importance to variants in such a small sampling, it would seem the Emar scribes, at least in some circumstances, enjoyed a certain amount of flexibility in the composition of address formulas.

[168]Msk 74102c incorporates ASC terminology from both models.

[169]These are four in number: Msk 7437, Msk 7461, ME 53.2, and ME 57.

descending nature.[170] The remaining UNMARKED letters show a diversity of compositional patterns.[171] One Hittite letter found at Tell Meskene also must be mentioned here: it is terminologically unmarked, but must be considered "contextually descending", and shows the pattern « *UM-MA* ID *A-NA* ID *QÍ-BÍ-MA* ».[172]

Only one explicitly horizontal letter is to be found among the letters in the Emar corpus; and this, RE 83, is not from regular excavations at Tell Meskene.[173] Nevertheless, the pattern of composition in its address formula is the same as that found to be typical of hor letters in the Ras Shamra corpora: « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* ».

Two Meskene letters are explicitly descending; both are conceived on the BIO model. The address of one, Msk 7451.4, seems to present the equivalent of the pattern

---

[170]Msk 7437 is from {LÚ.UGULA.KALAM.MA} to two named individuals, {^{m}a-gi$_5$-ia} and {^{md}30-GAL}; and ME 57 is from {LUGAL-ma} to {^{m}ma-di-^{d}KUR}. Msk 7461, from {^{m}a-gal$_9$-^{d}UTU LÚ x [(x)]} to {^{m}ZU-ba-la}, may belong here as well, if the sign following {LÚ} may be read {⌜UGULA⌝.⌜x⌝[…]}, which seems at least possible judging from the editor's copy. The contextually descending status of ME 53.2 is not obvious from the ID elements of the address; but the direct imperative in the body and the absence of a <pros> formula are consistent with such a classification.

[171]The pattern of the address formula in Msk 7452.2 is « *umma* ID »; the <R> component is omitted, apparently being understood from context, the sender being one of the two senders of the first letter, and the recipients apparently remaining the same. In this sense, this letter represents a special case, and is not like other "piggy-back" letters, in which either the sender or the recipient are entirely different.

The address formula of Msk 73280 is « *ana* ID *umma* ID »; this letter is not only formally atypical, but also orthographically ({um-ma-a} instead of {um-ma}) and stylistically (new "paragraphs" are preceded by the word *umma*, for example, and not *anumma* or *enūma*, etc.).

Finally, it is unsure if the genre of Msk 7441.2 should even be qualified as epistolary in the normal sense: it appears rather to report (to the recipient of the first letter) the correspondance of a third person by means of the formula {(30) a-wa-at ^{m}ut-ri-it-te a-na pa-ni-<ia?>}. It may not be legitimate to consider this as an address formula in the same sense as the term is used elsewhere.

[172]A transcription of Msk 73.1097 is provided by A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989) 40-41.

[173]RE 83 was not recovered in controlled excavations at the site; its provenence is therefore conjectural.

« *umma* ID *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* », this same pattern being frequent among the RS Akkadian letters of explicitly DESC BIO conceptual status; it is also the pattern typically found in terminologically HOR BIO letters, in the Ugaritic, RS Akkadian, and Meskene corpora. The address of the other, Msk 7497.2, follows the pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID ».[174]

Finally, Msk 7451.3 appears to be a special case. The sender apparently qualifies the multiple recipients of the letter as {DAM.MEŠ-ia}, 'my wives (?).'[175] Such a REL term is, to my knowledge, as yet unattested as such in the RS epistolary corpora. Its conceptual status is difficult to determine; one hesitates between DESC and HOR. In any case, the pattern in the address may probably be schematized as « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID ».[176]

Although the epistolary corpus from Meskene is small, by and large the compositional patterns used in the address formulas are consistent with those found in the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian letters.

1.4.2.3 Akkadian and Hittite letters from the Hittite Realm

Due to the large mass of data involved and to my limited competence in Sumero-Akkadian epigraphy, I have not explored the epistolary corpora of Boğazköy and Ma□at-Höyük with the same thoroughness as those of Ras Shamra. My intention

---

[174]Compare RS 17.083 (ASC BIO).

[175]The editor interpreted {MEŠ} here as "un marquer d'idéogramme, non un véritable pluriel" (D. Arnaud, Emar 6:3 [1986] 263), which may be preferable to the interpretation offered here. As another alternative, is it epigraphically possible to read {NIN.MEŠ-ia} instead of {DAM.MEŠ-ia} in line 30 (see the copy, Emar 6:1 [1985] 191)? In RS corpus at least, {NIN} appears frequently as the feminine equivalent of {ŠEŠ}, that is, *aḫātu* (Ug. *ảḫt*), a HOR term.

[176]See Msk 7497.2 above (also conceptually descending); and compare RS 17.083 (ASC BIO).

here is to provide a broad overview of the address formulas in the letters from Hittite Anatolia, in order to determine whether here, as in the Ras Shamra corpora, there was an observable connection between the three compositional patterns discussed above and the three conceptual categories found to be linked to them.

1.4.2.3.1 HITTITE LETTERS FROM MA□AT-HÖYÜK

Of the thirteen conceptually ascending letters in the Ma□at corpus that I have examined,[177] as many as eleven certainly or probably show the compositional pattern « *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA UM-MA* ID REL »,[178] that is, the same pattern as that found to be typical of conceptually ascending letters in the Ugaritic corpus.[179] The other two

---

[177]These are HKM 17.2, HKM 27.3, HKM 29.2, HKM 36.2, HKM 46, HKM 47, HKM 48, HKM 49, HKM 51, HKM 52.2, HKM 60.2, HKM 62.2, and HKM 81.1.

[178]Note that the letters of the Ma□at corpus regularly use the "Old Babylonian" writing of the Akkadian imperative *qibī-ma*, {*QÍ-BÍ-MA*}. The letters from Boğazköy, Hittite and Akkadian alike, show this spelling as well as the more typical spelling for the Late Bronze western periphery: {qí-bi-ma}.

[179]These are HKM 17.2 (possibly), HKM 27.3, HKM 29.2, HKM 36.2, HKM 46, HKM 47, HKM 48, HKM 49 (possibly), HKM 52.2, HKM 62.2, and HKM 81.1. The compositional pattern of HKM 17.2, if it belongs here, is « *A-NA* ID [REL] *QÍ-BÍ-MA UM-MA* ID REL »; is it possible to restore the REL phrase in the <R> component at the end of line 38 (even on the edge) or at the beginning of line 39? HKM 49, if it belongs here, is « *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA UM-MA* ID [REL] »; is it possible to restore the REL phrase in the <S> component at the end of line 3 (even on the edge)? The structural interpretation of several of these address formulas is slightly deceptive: note that when the title {*BE-LÍ*} or {*BE-LI*} is employed without a following pronoun (as in HKM 27.3, HKM 29.2, HKM 52.2, HKM 62.2, and HKM 81.1), it is an ID phrase, not a REL phrase. All REL phrases must, by definition, contain not only (1) a REL term (such as {*BE-LÍ*}), but also (2) a pronominal suffix referring to the sender or recipient, which clarifies the nature of the relation between the two. If the pronominal suffix is absent, {*BE-LÍ*}, 'the lord' is simply a title, like {LUGAL}, 'the king', and therefore an ID term. Finally, several of these address formulas contain a conceptually explicit REL phrase not encountered in the other corpora: {*MAḪ-RI-IA*} (HKM 27.3, HKM 36.2, and HKM 52.2) or {*MA-AḪ-RI-IA*} (HKM 29.2). It seems evident that this term is an ascending term; but I do not know if it is drawn from the BIO or POW model. Etymologically, one would think the POW model ('my "front" ', that is 'my superior'), but usage may differ from etymology.

ASC letters display atypical patterns.[180] These ascending letters are mostly ASC POW,[181] but also ASC BIO[182] and ASC MIXED[183] in terms of their conceptual classification.

The Ma□at corpus contains at least forty-four conceptually UNMARKED letters.[184] Where the composition of the address formula may be unambiguously determined, all of these show the compositional pattern « *UM-MA* ID *A-NA* ID *QÍ-BÍ-MA* », that is, the same pattern as that found to be typical of conceptually UNMARKED letters in the Ugaritic corpus. A great majority of these are from {^{d}UTU-*ŠI*}, 'the Sun

---

[180]The address formula of HKM 51 lacks the <R> component; its structure is « *UM-MA* ID ». The address of HKM 60.2 lacks the <S> component (presumably the sender of the second letter is the same as in the first); its structure corresponds to « *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA* ».

[181]Six ASC POW letters certainly or probably display the "standard" pattern, « *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA UM-MA* ID REL »: HKM 17.2 (probably), HKM 27.3 (ASC POW terminology + {*MAḪ-RI-IA*}), HKM 46, HKM 47, HKM 48, and HKM 49 (probably). A seventh ASC POW letter, HKM 51, is ASC POW, but displays the pattern « *UM-MA* ID » (the <R> component is omitted).

[182]Three ASC BIO letters show the "standard" pattern, « *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA UM-MA* ID REL »: HKM 29.2 (ASC BIO terminology + {*MA-AḪ-RI-IA*}), HKM 36.2 (ASC BIO terminology + {*MAḪ-RI-IA*}), and HKM 62.2. A fourth ASC BIO letter, HKM 60.2, contains the pattern « *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA* » (the <S> component is omitted).

[183]HKM 52.2 and HKM 81.1 contain ASC terminology drawn from both models (the former also includes the asc term {*MAḪ-RI-IA*}).

[184]HKM 1, HKM 2.1, HKM 3.1, HKM 4, HKM 5, HKM 6, HKM 7, HKM 8, HKM 9, HKM 10.1, HKM 11, HKM 12, HKM 13, HKM 14, HKM 15, HKM 16, HKM 17, HKM 18.1, HKM 19.1, HKM 20, HKM 21, HKM 22, HKM 23, HKM 24.1, HKM 25, HKM 26, HKM 27.1, HKM 30.1, HKM 31.1, HKM 32, HKM 34, HKM 36.1 (probably), HKM 37.1 (probably), HKM 38, HKM 39.2, HKM 53.1, HKM 54, HKM 59, HKM 60.1, HKM 62.1 (very probably unmarked), HKM 68, HKM 71.1, HKM 72.1, and HKM 73.1.

god',[185] that is, the Hittite monarch, to various subordinates,[186] and may thus be qualified as "contextually descending" despite their terminologically UNMARKED status.[187]

I have isolated thirty-two letters in the Ma□at corpus which are certainly or very probably conceptually horizontal.[188] All of these employ the BIO model.[189] This

---

[185]Several factors suggest that the writing {DINGIR UTU ŠI} in western peripheral texts ought to be interpreted as the divinized common noun *šamšu*, 'sun', in the genitive case; and not as this same noun in the nominative case and bearing a 1st person singular pronominal suffix: **šamšî*, *'my divine sun': first of all (1) the pervasiveness of the writing {^{d}UTU-ši} in genitive contexts (after prepositions, for example); but also (2) the tendancy of western peripheral scribes to put the noun phrase which follows *umma* in the genitive (see Marcus, *JCS* 2 (1948) 223-224) and not the nominative; (3) the presence of the writing {^{d}UTU-šu} in a nominative context in some texts; and (4) the presence of a genuine writing corresponding to 'my divine sun' in a genitive context: {^{d}UTU-ši-ia} as in certain letters from Byblos in the Amarna corpus. The "function" of the syllabic sign {ši} would rather appear to be to clarify the identity of the particular "sun-god" in question; that is {^{d}UTU-ši} indicates the word is *šamši*.

[186]The following thirty-four letters certainly or probably have the structure « *UM-MA* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI*(*-MA*) *A-NA* PN(N) *QÍ-BÍ-MA* | (... body ...) ... »: HKM 1, HKM 2.1, HKM 3.1, HKM 4, HKM 5, HKM 6, HKM 7, HKM 8, HKM 9, HKM 10.1, HKM 11, HKM 12, HKM 13, HKM 14, HKM 15, HKM 16, HKM 17, HKM 18.1, HKM 19.1, HKM 20, HKM 21, HKM 22, HKM 23, HKM 24.1, HKM 25, HKM 26, HKM 27.1, HKM 30.1, HKM 31.1, HKM 32, HKM 34, HKM 36.1 (probably), HKM 37.1 (probably), HKM 38.

[187]As many as four other UNMARKED letters, in addition to the thirty-four letters from {^{d}UTU-*ŠI*}, might also have been qualified as contextually descending situations: HKM 68, from {UGULA.NIGIR.ERÍN. MEŠ} to {^{m}pal-la-an-na} and {^{m}za-ar-tum-ma-an-ni }; HKM 71.1, from {GAL LÚ.MEŠ-iš} to {^{m}ka-aš-šu-ú}; HKM 72.1, from {GAL DUB.SAR} to {^{m}ga-aš-šu-ú}; and HKM 73.1, from {GAL DUB.SAR.GIŠ} to {^{m}ga-aš-šu-ú}. Note, however, HKM 70, which contains the same correspondents as HKM 71.1 (above), and in which the conceptual status is not UNMARKED: the sender characterizes the recipient as {ŠEŠ-*IA*}, 'my brother'. The address formula of HKM 70 follows the pattern « *UM-MA* ID*A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA* ».

[188]ABoT 65, HKM 2.2, HKM 3.2, HKM 10.2, HKM 17.3, HKM 19.2, HKM 21.2, HKM 22.2, HKM 27.2, HKM 28.2, HKM 30.2, HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2, HKM 36.3, HKM 37.2, HKM 52.1, HKM 53.2, HKM 56.1, HKM 57, HKM 58.1, HKM 58.2, HKM 63, HKM 64, HKM 65.2, HKM 66, HKM 70, HKM 71.2, HKM 73.2, HKM 81.2, HKM 82.2, HKM 84.2 (probably HOR), and HKM 95.2.

[189]In fact, it is standard usage when writing to one's "brother" to characterize him as {ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA-*IA*}, literally 'my good brother'. Only rarely does the phrase {ŠEŠ-*IA*}, without the attribute for "good", appear (HKM 30.2, HKM 56.1, and HKM 70). In referring to himself, however, the sender regularly omits {DÙG.GA} from the formulation; in other words, in the <S> component, REL phrases like {ŠEŠ-*KA-MA*} are typical.

group of letters presents only two compositional patterns for the address, where the state of preservation allows a determination to be made.[190] The more common pattern is « *UM-MA* ID *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA* »,[191] that is, the equivalent of that compositional pattern found to be most frequent in conceptually horizontal letters in the Ugaritic corpus. Slightly less frequent is « *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA UM-MA* ID REL »,[192] that is, the equivalent of that pattern found to be second in frequency only to the pattern just mentioned for conceptually horizontal letters in the Ugaritic corpus, as well as standard for conceptually ascending letters.

Finally, three Ma□at letters are explicitly descending with respect to conceptual terminology.[193] All show one and the same compositional pattern in the address: « *UM-MA* ID *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA* », that is, the pattern described above as most typical in conceptually horizontal letters.

It seems evident that the scribes responsible for the Ma□at letters shared with the Ugaritic scribes not only the same inventory of compositional patterns for the address formula, but also the same distributions for these patterns. The implications for these parallels are explored below in section 5.

---

[190]The address formula has not been preserved in HKM 36.3 and HKM 37.2.

[191]The pattern « *UM-MA* ID*A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA* » is certainly or probably present in twenty letters: ABoT 65, HKM 19.2, HKM 21.2, HKM 22.2, HKM 27.2, HKM 28.2 (probably), HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2 (possibly), HKM 52.1, HKM 53.2, HKM 57, HKM 58.1, HKM 63, HKM 65.2, HKM 66 (possibly), HKM 70, HKM 71.2, HKM 81.2, HKM 82.2 (probably), and HKM 84.2 (possibly).

[192]The pattern « *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA UM-MA* ID REL » is certainly or probably present in ten letters: HKM 2.2, HKM 3.2, HKM 10.2, HKM 17.3 (probably), HKM 30.2, HKM 56.1, HKM 58.2, HKM 64, HKM 73.2, and HKM 95.2.

[193]These are HKM 18.2, HKM 56.2, and HKM 65.1. In the first two of these, the sender characterizes the recipient as {DUMU.DÙG.GA-*IA*}, 'my good son'; the third omits the attribute: {DUMU-*IA*}.

1.4.2.3.2 HITTITE LETTERS FROM BOĞAZKÖY

A fairly large corpus of Hittite letters from Boğazköy is available for study. The majority of these were published thirty years ago in KBo 18,[194] but several other volumes also contain such texts.[195] A very convenient collection of these letters, in transcription and translation, is provided in the second volume of A. Hagenbuchner's 1989 monograph, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter*, to which the reader is referred for further information and discussion.

Conceptually ASC POW letters may be found for the most part in chapters 15-17 of Hagenbuchner's book,[196] with a few appearing earlier in ch. 13.[197] I have glanced at a total of forty-two such ASC POW letters. The composition of the address formula in twenty-four of these certainly or probably follows the pattern « *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA UM-MA* ID REL »,[198] that is, the pattern found to be typical of ASC POW letters (and ASC letters generally) in the Ugaritic corpus. The address formulas in another sixteen letters are not preserved in their entirety, but are nevertheless entirely

---

[194]H. G. Güterbock, *KBo* 18 (1971).

[195]Hittite letters may also be found in H. H. Figulla and E. F. Weidner, *KBo* 1 (1916); H. Otten, *KBo* 8 (1955); *idem*, *KBo* 9 (1957); *idem*, *KBo* 13 (1967); H. Otten and C. Rüster, *KBo* 31 (2000); H. Berman and H. Klengel, *KUB* 48 (1977); and A. Archi, *KUB* 57 (1977). See also the information assembled in E. Laroche, *Catalogue des textes hittites* (1971) 21-27, and especially the concordance in the frontmatter of A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989) xxxii-xliv; both of these sources list both the letters in Hittite and those in Akkadian, those from Boğazköy and those from other sites.

[196]Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989) 46-162.

[197]*Ibid.*, pp. 1-34: KBo 13.062, KBo 18.045, KBo 18.047, KUB 19.023, and KUB 57.123 are conceptually ASC POW.

[198]KBo 8.018, KBo 9.081, KBo 9.084, KBo 15.028, KBo 18.001.2, KBo 18.011, KBo 18.012.2, KBo 18.014, KBo 18.015, KBo 18.037.2, KBo 18.045, KBo 18.047, KBo 18.050, KBo 18.054, KBo 18.054.2, KBo 18.059, KBo 18.060, KBo 18.065, KBo 18.095, KBo 18.132, KUB 19.023, KUB 57.001, KUB 57.123, and *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1.

consistent, inasmuch as the preserved portions are legible, with this same pattern.[199] Only two ASC POW letters explicitly contain another compositional pattern, and this is not strikingly different from the standard pattern; it differs only in lacking the ID phrase in the <R> component.[200]

I have encountered four ASC BIO letters in the corpus.[201] Two of these certainly or probably present the compositional pattern « *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA UM-MA* ID REL » in the address formula,[202] and the other two the pattern « *UM-MA* ID *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA* ».[203]

All four of the terminologically UNMARKED letters that I have found in the corpus certainly or probably bear the pattern « *UM-MA* ID *A-NA* ID *QÍ-BÍ-MA* » in the address formula.[204] Moreover, the identity of the sender in all four cases indicates that all four should also be considered to reflect socially "descending" situations.[205]

---

[199]The remaining traces of the address formula in the following sixteen letters are entirely consistent with the pattern « *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA UM-MA* ID REL »: KBo 9.083, KBo 13.062, KBo 18.013, KBo 18.016, KBo 18.029, KBo 18.052, KBo 18.055, KBo 18.058, KBo 18.062, KBo 18.077.2, KBo 18.088, KBo 18.108, KBo 18.113, KBo 18.128, KUB 48.88.2, and *Mélanges Laroche* 3.2.

[200]KBo 9.082 and probably VBoT 118 represent the pattern « *A-NA* REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA UM-MA* ID REL ». Compare the Ugaritic letter RS 8.315.

[201]These are KBo 18.004, KBo 18.005, KBo 18.097.2, and KBo 18.098. I was unable to find any unambiguous ASC BIO letters in ch. 13 of Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989), "Die Korrespondenz der Königsfamilie," pp. 1-34. All four examples cited here appear in ch. 18, "Schreiben von Personon, die den Adressaten mit familiären Benennungen ansprechen," pp. 163-186.

[202]KBo 18.097.2 (probably) and KBo 18.098.

[203]KBo 18.004 and KBo 18.005 (probably). The similarity with the Ugaritic letters RS 15.008 and RS 17.139 is obvious.

[204]These are KBo 8.021, KBo 13.063 (probably has this pattern), KBo 18.134 (the remaining traces are consistent with this pattern), and KUB 23.085.2.

[205]The sender of KBo 8.021, KBo 13.063, and KBo 18.134 is {^{d}UTU-*ŠI*}; and the sender of KUB 23.085.2 {MÍ.LUGAL}. All four are addressed to named individuals.

Of the sixteen conceptually horizontal letters encountered in the corpus,[206] all are composed on the BIO model. The majority of these follow the compositional pattern « *UM-MA* ID *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA* » in the address formula.[207] Two HOR BIO letters, however, show another pattern in the address: « *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA UM-MA* ID REL »,[208] that is, the pattern typical of ASC letters.

On the basis of this limited survey of the Hittite letters from Boğazköy, it seems clear that the composition and distribution of the address formula in these letters is parallel to that of the Ugaritic corpus in every significant aspect.

1.4.2.3.3 AKKADIAN LETTERS FROM BOĞAZKÖY

Another large group of letters found at Boğazköy is in Akkadian, published for the most part in KBo 28,[209] KUB 3,[210] and KBo 8,[211] but also in a number of other volumes.[212]

---

[206]KBo 8.017.2, KBo 9.083.2, KBo 18.021, KBo 18.024, KBo 18.035, KBo 18.038, KBo 18.087, KBo 18.096, KBo 18.100, KBo 18.101, KBo 18.107, KBo 31.040, KUB 3.074, KUB 23.099, KUB 23.110, and VS 28.129.

[207]This pattern is certainly or probably present in fourteen letters. It is certain in five: KBo 18.024, KBo 18.087, KBo 18.096, KBo 18.107, and VS 28.129; probable in another three: KBo 31.040, KUB 3.074, KUB 23.099; and should be partially reconstructed in six (in other words, the remaining traces are consistent with this pattern): KBo 18.021, KBo 18.035, KBo 18.038, KBo 18.100, KBo 18.101, and KUB 23.110.

[208]This pattern is clear in KBo 8.017.2 and probable in KBo 9.083.2.

[209]H. M. Kümmel, *KBo* 28 (1985).

[210]E. F. Weidner, *KUB* 3 (1922).

[211]Otten, *KBo* 8 (1955).

[212]See the information assembled in Laroche, *Catalogue des textes hittites* (1971) 21-27; the concordance in the front matter of Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989) xxxii-xliv; and the concordance in E. Edel, *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi* (1994) 236-237; all three of these sources list letters in Hittite as well as those in Akkadian; and letters from Boğazköy as well as from other sites.

The coverage given to these letters by Hagenbuchner[213] is conveniently supplemented by Elmar Edel's 1994 treatment of the large mass of international correspondence between Ḫatti and Egypt.[214]

It is with some hesitancy that many of these international letters are brought into comparison with the Ugaritic letters, which are for the most part domestic in nature. The formal protocol followed in the international diplomatic correspondence between "great kings" was rather elaborate, certainly more complicated on the compositional level than what is found in most Ugaritic letters. In this discussion of the address formula, however, I have nevertheless decided to include these letters between "great kings", grouped in an undifferentiated way along with other letters. My reasoning is that the basic structure of the address formula in all of these is directly comparable to that of the address formulas of the Ugaritic corpus: (1) two components, « S » and « R », of variable order; (2) the basic structure of « S » being « *umma* N_S »; (3) the basic structure of « R » being « *ana* N_R *qibī-ma* »; and (4) the elements N_S and N_R being composed of ID and/or REL phrases. With respect to the address formula, the formal differences between international diplomatic letters and domestic letters are mainly to be found in the compositional nature of the ID phrases in both the « S » and « R » components: in the international correspondence one finds very frequently a multiplication of successive ID phrases, all in apposition. As such, these formal expansions found in these international letters do not affect the overall structural analysis of the address formula, which is of central concern here.

---

[213]Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989), ch. 20, "Internationale Korrespondenz," pp. 240-462.

[214]Edel, *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi* (1994).

I have found only ten conceptually ascending letters in the corpus which provide information on the composition of the address formula. Seven of these are formulated on the POW model,[215] and three on the BIO model.[216] Of the seven explicitly ASC POW letters, four certainly or probably present the compositional pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL »,[217] and another two, though broken, contain traces consistent with this pattern.[218] The address of one ASC POW letter, however, KBo 28.048, appears to present another pattern, « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* », which, in the Ras Shamra corpora, is frequently found on letters conceived on the BIO model, and especially those of HOR status, but is not typical of ASC POW letters.[219] Of the three ASC BIO letters, two certainly or probably show the pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL » in the address formula,[220] and one, KUB 3.070, shows the pattern « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* ».[221]

Only five letters have come to my attention which are certainly or probably UNMARKED in terms of conceptual status. The address formulas of three of these

---

[215]The letters KBo 8.016, KBo 28.048, KBo 28.053, KBo 28.054, KBo 28.055, KBo 28.056, and KBo 28.078 are conceptually ASC POW.

[216]The letters IBoT 1.34, KBo 28.065, and KUB 3.070 are conceptually ASC BIO.

[217]These are KBo 28.054, KBo 28.056, and KBo 28.078. KBo 8.016 very probably presents this pattern.

[218]KBo 28.053 and KBo 28.055.

[219]The Ugaritic letters RS 15.008 and RS 17.139 are ASC BIO, and present the Ugaritic equivalent of this pattern, « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* »; and the (probable) address formula of RS 18.148, which is ASC POW, apparently presents a similar though not identical pattern: « *tḥm* ID *ʿm* ID REL ».

[220]These are IBoT 1.34 and (probably) KBo 28.065.

[221]This pattern is more typical of HOR BIO letters, or, more generally, letters composed on the BIO model (compare RS 15.008 and RS 17.139, two ASC BIO Ugaritic letters bearing the equivalent of this pattern). It is also found on KBo 28.048, an ASC POW letter in this corpus (see two footnotes above).

certainly or probably present the pattern « *umma* ID *ana* ID *qibī-ma* »,[222] and the traces of the address formula in the remaining two letters are consistent with this same pattern.[223]

Of twenty-nine conceptually HOR BIO letters in which at least part of the address has been preserved,[224] the compositional pattern « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* » for the address formula is found in the majority: twelve letters certainly or probably show this pattern,[225] and fourteen letters, in which the address formula is less well preserved, shows traces consistent with this pattern.[226] Three HOR BIO letters, however, show another pattern: « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL ».[227]

I encountered three letters which may be classified as conceptually DESC BIO.[228] All appear to present the pattern « *UM-MA* ID *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BÍ-MA* » in the address formula.[229] Finally, one letter, KBo 28.082, of unknown conceptual status,

---

[222]KBo 1.024+, KBo 28.059, and KUB 3.066+.

[223]KBo 28.040 and KUB 3.068.

[224]KUB 3.035 is conceptually HOR, but its address formula has not been preserved.

[225]The pattern « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* » is certain or probable in ABoT 59+, KBo 1.009+ (probable), KBo 1.010+, KBo 1.029+, KBo 28.023, KBo 28.049 (probable), KBo 28.050 (probable), KBo 28.014 (probable), KUB 3.022 (probable), KUB 3.025+ (probable), KUB 3.041, and KUB 3.063.

[226]These are FHL 98, KBo 28.004, KBo 28.005 (which is probably conceptually HOR), KBo 28.017, KBo 28.021, KBo 28.030, KBo 28.031, KBo 28.047, KUB 3.028, KUB 3.044, KUB 3.062 (probably conceptually HOR), KUB 3.123, KUB 34.002, and Winckler 414.

[227]KBo 8.017.2, KBo 28.066 (probably this pattern), and KUB 3.071.

[228]KBo 28.044+, KBo 28.046, and KUB 4.095+.

[229]The pattern is clear in KBo 28.046, probable in KBo 28.044+, and consistent with the remaining traces of KUB 4.095+.

appears to present in its address the pattern: « *ana* ID *umma* [ID?] ». It is similar to the address formulas of the Middle Assyrian letters.[230]

By and large, the address formulas in the Boğazköy Akkadian letters present a composition and distribution consistent with that observed for the Ugaritic letters. This observation has a certain significance, since a number of these manifestly derived from places other than Ḫattuša: several of these letters, for example, come from Amurru,[231] and from Egypt,[232] and a few derive from senders in Assyria[233] and Mittanni.[234]

1.4.2.4 Akkadian letters from Tell el-Amarna

The contextual interpretation of the Amarna corpus is more difficult to control than that of the other comparative corpora discussed thus far. There are several reasons for this: (1) the corpus is relatively large,[235] (2) the graphic habits of the scribes involved, and the linguistic features denoted by them, are not as well

---

[230]See below, section 1.4. Given the formal patterns observed for the letters found at Ras Shamra, Tell Meskene, and Amarna, I do not understand the grounds upon which Hagenbuchner's claim of a Syrian provenance for this letter (Teil 2, p. 414) can be based. Note now the formal parellels among the letters from Sheikh Ḥamad: E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996), unavailable to Hagenbuchner.

[231]KBo 8.016, KBo 28.053, KBo 28.054, KBo 28.055, KBo 28.056,

[232]See the data assembled in Edel, *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi* (1994).

[233]Compare, for example, KBo 28.059.

[234]For letters from the king of "Ḫanigalbat", compare IBoT 1.34, KBo 28.065, and KBo 28.066.

[235]The corpus contains well over three hundred letters; compare the survey in Moran, *Amarna Letters* (1992) xv-xviii of the introduction.

understood as in other peripheral corpora,[236] and (3) the geographical provenance of the tablets is more varied. The Ugaritic, Meskene, and Ma□at epistolary corpora are largely restricted to domestic correspondence, and the Ras Shamra Akkadian and Boğazköy letters also contain a high percentage of correspondence of a domestic nature. By contrast, the Amarna letters contain virtually no examples of domestic correspondence.[237] As a consequence, while geography was a negligible, or, at most, a manageable factor in explaining formal variation in the other corpora, in the Amarna corpus the geographical provenance of the letters cannot be ignored, and almost assumes a central role in interpretation. Finally, an additional complicating factor is the fact that (4) much of the Amarna corpus represents correspondence addressed to a "great king", and this contextual situation in particular appears to have generated a formulary all its own.

Despite these complications, I have nevertheless decided in favor of continuity of format, and the Amarna data are here presented as in previous sections, organized primarily in terms of the various conceptual classifications of the letters, as elaborated above for the Ugaritic corpus, and the formal compositional patterns associated with them. Those epistolary traditions in the Amarna corpus which clearly follow patterns of composition and distribution different from those in the Ugaritic corpus will thus stand out, and can then be explained, if appropriate, by an appeal to geographical provenance. By contrast, those letters which fit neatly into the patterns formulated on

---

[236]This is not intended to minimize A. Rainey's contribution to the elucidation of these problems in his recent four volume work, A. Rainey, *CAT* (1996). On the contrary, Rainey's encyclopedic discussion of the relevant problems is a valid starting point for entering the discussion, whether or not one disagrees here and there with the author's specific interpretive decisions.

[237]Furthermore, the range is very broad, from Anatolia and Cypus to the Mesopotamian basin. Most of the correspondence, however, derives from minor kingdoms in Palestine. See the overview in Moran, *Amarna Letters* (1992) xxii-xxxiii of the introduction.

the basis of Ugaritic usage, whatever their geographical provenance be, might be taken as representing scribal traditions of broader geographic distribution than the specific city from which the letter was sent. A "minimalist" frame of interpretation, which I have attempted to follow, is given here: (1) those Amarna address formulas in letters of diverse geographical provenance which show a composition and distribution consistent with the main patterns present in the Ugaritic corpus *cannot* be shown on those grounds to be representative of an independent epistolary tradition, defined essentially in geographical terms; and (2) those formulas which show a composition and distribution different from the main patterns present in the Ugarit corpus *can* be assumed to represent an independent epistolary tradition, and this independence is possibly, but not necessarily, to be explained by appealing to factors of a geographical nature.

1.4.2.4.1 ASC LETTERS IN THE AMARNA CORPUS

Due in part to the nature of the archive, the vast majority of the preserved letters are conceptually ascending, and most of these are conceived on the POW model. Most of these are addressed to the Egyptian pharaoh.[238] I count a total of two hundred thirty-eight conceptually ascending letters, of which only three are specifically ASC BIO,[239] and another two ASC MIXED.[240] The remainder are ASC POW letters, thus being the best represented conceptual category in the entire corpus.

---

[238]Exceptions are EA 44, EA 48, EA 59, EA 158, EA 164, EA 178, EA 256, and EA 287.2, which do not involve "great kings".

[239]EA 44, EA 73, and EA 82.

[240]EA 158 and EA 164 incorporate conceptually ascending REL terminology drawn from both models, BIO and POW.

The address formula in one hundred ninety-eight ASC POW letters is well preserved,[241] and that of another thirty-six letters is sufficiently preserved for a more or less reliable restoration.[242] This group presents a bewildering diversity of formal patterns for the address formula.

1.4.2.4.1.1 ASC letters and « ana *ID REL* qibī-ma umma *ID REL »*

The most common formal pattern in this group is « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL », that is, the Akkadian equivalent of the Ugaritic pattern found to be typical of conceptually ascending letters. At least sixty-five ASC POW letters certainly or probably present this pattern,[243] and the preserved traces of the address formulas in another four letters are entirely consistent with it.[244]

It is worthwhile to note here that the composition of the ID and REL elements in these Amarna address formulas also shows remarkable variety. In many letters

---

[241]These are EA 12.2, EA 49-55, EA 59-61, EA 63-64, EA 68, EA 74-79, EA 82-87, EA 90, EA 92, EA 100, EA 103-109, EA 112, EA 117-119, EA 121-126, EA 130, EA 132, EA 136-141, EA 143-144, EA 147-161, EA 164-165, EA 168, EA 170.1, EA 174-175, EA 177-178, EA 182-183, EA 185, EA 187, EA 189, EA 191-195, EA 198, EA 201-207, EA 209, EA 211-213, EA 215-217, EA 220-230, EA 232-235, EA 239, EA 241-244, EA 246, EA 248-250, EA 252, EA 254-256, EA 258-262, EA 264-274, EA 278-284, EA 286, EA 287.2, EA 288-290, EA 292, EA 294, EA 296-299, EA 301-305, EA 309, EA 314-315, EA 316.1, EA 317-326, EA 328-331, EA 334, EA 337-338, EA 362-366, and EA 378.

[242]These are EA 48, EA 58, EA 62, EA 65, EA 81, EA 88-89, EA 91, EA 93-94, EA 110, EA 114, EA 116, EA 129, EA 142, EA 145, EA 184, EA 196, EA 200, EA 219, EA 231, EA 238, EA 253, EA 257, EA 263, EA 275-276, EA 285, EA 287.1, EA 293, EA 295, EA 300, EA 306, EA 332-333, and EA 336.

[243]This pattern is certain in thirty-nine letters: EA 55, EA 63-64, EA 87, EA 90, EA 104, EA 130, EA 132, EA 141, EA 143, EA 185, EA 195, EA 201-206, EA 209, EA 211, EA 216-217, EA 228-229, EA 230 (although the verbal element here is written simply {qí-bi}, without {ma}), EA 239, EA 249-250, EA 252, EA 256, EA 262, EA 281, EA 286, EA 287.2, EA 290, EA 294, EA 330, EA 337, and EA 363; and probable in another twenty-six: EA 187, EA 192, EA 198, EA 213, EA 220, EA 224, EA 242, EA 244, EA 246, EA 248, EA 255, EA 261, EA 266-271, EA 278-280, EA 292, EA 296-297, and EA 365-366.

[244]The traces in EA 157, EA 222, EA 226, and EA 243 are consistent with this pattern.

addressed to the Egyptian pharaoh, for example, the ID element is expanded to comprise multiple distinct ID phrases, all in apposition.[245] Such appositional expansion also occurs in the REL element. In some cases only the REL term in the N_S element is expanded,[246] and in other cases only that of the N_R element.[247] In still other examples, the REL terms in both elements are expanded.[248] It is particularly interested to note the diversity of metaphors used to evoke the social relationship between the correspondents. The inventory of REL terms found in the Amarna letters is not limited to the archetypical human relationships in the "household", but includes also objects found in the household setting.[249] Furthermore, in some cases, the writers did not limit themselves to the "root metaphor" of the household in choosing their terminology, but incorporated also metaphors drawn from the celestial and other spheres.[250] This expansion may be easily interpreted as a polite attempt, on the part of the sender, to express the elevated social status of his correspondent, the Egyptian king. In some

---

[245]A typical example is EA 60:1, in which the ID element consists of two distinct noun phrases: {^{m}LUGAL ^{d}UTU}, 'the king, the divine sun'.

[246]Compare the REL terms in EA 195 and EA 330. The REL phrases in EA 63, EA 64, and EA 262, also deserve mention: in these cases reference to the recipient is not made by means of a 2nd person pronominal form, but rather by an elliptical use of the 3rd person.

[247]Compare EA 104, EA 132, EA 281, EA 294, EA 337, and EA 363.

[248]Compare EA 141, EA 143 (probably), and EA 185.

[249]Compare, for example, the REL terms in the « S » component of EA 195, where the sender refers to himself as (i) {ÌR-ka}, 'your servant', (ii) {IŠ.MEŠ : ip-ri ša GÌR.MEŠ-ka}, 'the dust of the your feet', (iii) {KI.MEŠ ša ka-bá-sí-ka}, 'the grounds (upon) which you tread', and (iv) {GIŠ.GU.ZA-ka ša a-ša-bi-ka}, 'the chair (upon) which you sit', and (v) {GIŠ.GÌR.GUB : gi-iš-tap-pí ša GÌR.MEŠ-ka}, 'the footstool at your feet'.

[250]In EA 104, for example, the recipient is called both {EN-ia}, 'my lord', and {^{d}UTU-ia}, 'my divine sun'. The REL terms in the « R » component of EA 141 are even more elaborate: the recipient is called (i) {EN-ia}, 'my lord', (ii) {^{d}UTU-i[a]}, 'my divine sun', (iii) {DINGIR.MEŠ-ia}, 'my gods (?)', and (iv) {ša-ri TIL.LA-ia}, 'the breath of my life (?)'.

cases, the recipient is of such exalted status that none of the household metaphors are sufficient, in and of themselves, to express the perceived social distance between sender and recipient; in these cases, other metaphors were added.

With these considerations in mind, two other compositional patterns found among the address formulas of ASC POW letters may be mentioned: (1) « *ana* ID REL ID *qibī-ma umma* ID REL »,[251] and (2) « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL ID ».[252] Both patterns may be imagined as compatible with the standard pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL », discussed above, in the sense that the « R » and « S » components contain both ID and REL terms. The fact that in these cases additional ID phrases are present following the REL phrase is not so much evidence of a distinct compositional pattern as it is an example of another means of appositional expansions within the N_R and N_S components. I think it likely that these two patterns represent expansions of the basic pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL », and that such expansions were conditioned by the high social status of the recipient, being the Egyptian pharaoh, with respect to the sender.

Two ASC BIO letters in the corpus, EA 44 and EA 82, also show this pattern.

1.4.2.4.1.2 ASC letters and « ana *ID REL* umma *ID REL »*

The second most common pattern among the ASC POW letters in the Amarna corpus is « *ana* ID REL *umma* ID REL ». The pattern is distinguished by its omission from the formula of the verb *qabûm*. At least thirty-seven letters certainly or probably

---

[251]This pattern is certainly or probably present in EA 84, EA 85, EA 118, EA 138, EA 221, EA 223, EA 232, EA 233, EA 234, EA 235, and EA 241. In some of these the REL component is expanded (several REL phrases, in apposition).

[252]This pattern is probably present in EA 174, EA 175, and EA 183. In some of these the REL component is expanded (several REL phrases, in apposition).

show this pattern.[253] As above, in many of these, the ID phrases[254] or the REL phrases[255] show appositional expansion. Such elaboration in the N_R and N_S elements may also explain the presence of three other formal patterns: (1) « *ana* ID REL ID *umma* ID REL »,[256] (2) « *ana* ID REL *umma* ID REL ID »,[257] and (3) « *ana* ID REL ID *umma* ID REL ID »,[258] which may be interpreted as expansions of the basic pattern under discussion here, « *ana* ID REL *umma* ID REL ».

The two conceptually ASC MIXED letters in the corpus, EA 158 and EA 164, and one of the ASC BIO letters, EA 73, also present the pattern « *ana* ID REL *umma* ID REL ».

1.4.2.4.1.3 Other « RS » address formulas among the ASC letters

Another twenty ASC POW letters in the corpus probably represent one or the other of the two patterns discussed above, but damage to the tablet has prevented the

---

[253]These are EA 49, EA 51, EA 53, EA 59-61, EA 103, EA 136, EA 140, EA 147-149, EA 151, EA 153-154, EA 156, EA 159, EA 161, EA 168, EA 177-178, EA 189, EA 194, EA 212, EA 215, EA 254, EA 258-259, EA 265, EA 273-274, EA 282-284, EA 315, EA 316.1, and EA 364.

[254]Compare the « R » component of EA 49, in which the ID element contains two phrases in apposition: {LUGAL ^{d}UTU-ši}, 'the king, the divine sun'.

[255]Compare the « R » component of EA 151, in which the REL element contains two phrases in apposition: {^{d}UTU-ia DINGIR-ia DINGIR.MEŠ-ia}, 'my divine sun, my god, my gods'.

[256]This pattern appears in at least twenty ASC POW letters: EA 138, EA 298-299, EA 301-305, EA 319-326, EA 328-329, EA 331, and probably EA 378. The REL phrases in many of these also show appositional expansion.

[257]This pattern probably appears in one ASC POW letter: EA 182. The REL phrases there also show appositional expansion

[258]This pattern appears in at least one ASC POW letter: EA 314. The REL phrases here also show appositional expansion.

determination of the presence or absence of the imperative of the verb *qabûm* at the end of the « R » component.[259]

Finally, a relatively small number of ASC POW letters present address formulas of the « RS » order which do not fall under the two compositional rubrics described above. This group consists of ten letters, which contain no less than six different compositional patterns.

Two letters, EA 225 and EA 227, present a composition pattern similar to the first main pattern discussed above: « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID ». The absence of a REL phrase from the « S » component, however, justifies a separate classification.

Likewise, a number of these letters present patterns similar to the second main pattern described above. Four letters show the pattern « *ana* ID REL *umma* ID »,[260] and one letter, EA 52, the pattern « *ana* ID *umma* ID REL ». As above, the absence of a REL phrase in the « S » component of the former, and in the « R » component of the latter, justifies a separate listing.

Finally, three letters are distinct in presenting compositional patterns which incorporate the preterite, *iqbī*, rather the imperative, *qibī*, of the verb of speaking. Three patterns are attested: (1) « *ana* ID REL » « ID *iqbī* » in EA 260, (2) « *ana* ID REL » « ID REL *iqbī* » in EA 317, and (3) « *ana* ID REL ID » « ID REL *iqbī* » in EA 318.

---

[259]The following twenty letters almost certainly contained address formulas in which the order of mention was « RS », but in which the presence or absence of the word *qibī-ma* cannot be determined: EA 50, EA 54, EA 77, EA 86, EA 124-125, EA 139, EA 150, EA 152, EA 155, EA 160, EA 165, EA 207, EA 264, EA 272, EA 288-289, EA 309, EA 334, and EA 338.

[260]EA 144, EA 170.1, EA 191, and EA 193.

1.4.2.4.1.4 « SR » address formulas among the ASC *letters*

In the paragraphs above, over two hundred conceptually ascending letters are discussed which present address formulas of the compositional order « RS ». Some of these represent parallels to the standard Ugaritic address formula not only on the level of macro-composition, that is, in showing the order « RS », but also on the level of micro-composition, that is, in showing the pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL ».

There remain, however, a group of nearly thirty ASC POW letters which do not show the « RS » order of mention, but « SR ». Nearly all of these derive from Rib-Haddi of Byblos.[261] This uniformity of provenance implies that as least some of the scribes of the Byblos court knew and followed an epistolary protocol distinct from that which was standard at Ugarit at the beginning of the 12th century.

This group of thirty letters may be subdivided into at least seven micro-compositional patterns, but none of these is comparable to the patterns known in the Ugaritic corpus.[262]

---

[261]The exceptions are EA 12.2 and EA 100.

[262]A large number of the Byblos letters follow micro-compositional variants of the macro-pattern « N_S *iqbī/ištapar ana* N_R », in which the verbal form (usually *qabû* but occasionally *šapāru*) appears as a preterite. The most common is (i) « ID *iqbī ana* REL ID », attested in EA 68, EA 74, probably EA 75, EA 78, EA 79, probably EA 81, probably EA 83, possibly EA 88, possibly EA 89, possibly EA 91, EA 105, possibly EA 106, and possibly EA 109. Often the ID element in the « R » component shows appositional expansion. Other similar patterns include (ii) « ID *iqbī ana* ID » in EA 76 and EA 107 ({EN-li} in line 2 must be qualified as a ID term, owing to the absence of a pronominal suffix referring to the sender); (iii) « ID *iqbī ana* ID REL ID » in EA 92; and (iv) « ID *ištapar ana* REL ID » in EA 108, probably EA 116, probably EA 119, probably EA 121, EA 122, and EA 123. Owing to tablet damage, the exact pattern of the address in EA 94, EA 112, EA 114, EA 117, and EA 129 is unknown, but all probably belong in one of these four sub-categories.

The pattern « ID » « *qibī ana* ID REL » (the « S » component consists only of « ID ») may be attested in as many as three Byblos letters: EA 126, perhaps EA 137, and EA 362 (where the verb is written *qibī-ma*).

1.4.2.4.1.5 Summary: the address in ASC *letters from Amarna*

In terms of macro-structure, over two hundred conceptually ascending letters in the Amarna corpus show address formulas of the order « RS », while about thirty show the order « SR ». At this level of analysis, the Amarna corpus resembles the Ugaritic, where conceptually ascending letters also typically followed the « RS » order.

A more revealing comparative portrait, however, is provided by micro-structural analysis. Approximately one third of the address formulas in conceptually ascending letters in the Amarna corpus show the pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL », or minor variations thereof.[263] This pattern is the Akkadian equivalent of the Ugaritic pattern found to be typical of conceptually ascending letters, « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL ». Furthermore, in many of these cases, the geographical provenance of the sender of the letter is known. Such information should not be interpreted in too simplistic a manner however: it is not necessarily legitimate, for example, to conclude

---

A particularly elaborate pattern appears in the address of EA 100: « *ṭuppi annū ṭuppi* ID *ana* ID REL *umma* ID ». Note that this address contains two « S » components, one before and one after the « R » component.

Finally, a particularly abbreviated address formula is apparently present in EA 12.2 (I would interpret {i-sa-ak-ni} in line 24 as a one-word prostration formula, as in the Middle Assyrian tradition). It's composition is limited to the « S » component, no « R » component is present: « REL ID ». One must assume that the recipient of the "piggy-back" letter was the same as in the main letter.

[263]Eighty-three conceptually ascending letters, out of two hundred thirty-four unambiguous examples (or 35%), fall under this rubric (see above, section 1.4.4.4.1.1): EA 55, EA 63, EA 64, EA 84, EA 85, EA 87, EA 90, EA 104, EA 118, EA 130, EA 132, EA 138, EA 141, EA 143, EA 157, EA 174, EA 175, EA 183, EA 185, EA 187, EA 192, EA 195, EA 198, EA 201, EA 202, EA 203, EA 204, EA 205, EA 206, EA 209, EA 211, EA 213, EA 216, EA 217, EA 220, EA 221, EA 222, EA 223, EA 224, EA 226, EA 228, EA 229, EA 230, EA 232, EA 233, EA 234, EA 235, EA 239, EA 241EA 242, EA 243, EA 244, EA 246, EA 248, EA 249, EA 250, EA 252, EA 255, EA 256, EA 261, EA 262, EA 266, EA 267, EA 268, EA 269, EA 270, EA 271, EA 278, EA 279, EA 280, EA 281, EA 286, EA 287.2, EA 290, EA 292, EA 294, EA 296, EA 297, EA 330, EA 337, EA 363, EA 365, EA 366.

that the epistolary tradition at Byblos in the 14th century[264] was identical to that practiced latter at Ugarit, merely on the basis of these few address formulas, since letters sent by Rib-Haddi show a bewildering variety of formal patterns. The interpretation of this diversity is a delicate matter: perhaps Byblos had no local scribal school, or perhaps it had several. What is legitimate, in my opinion, is a more cautious conclusion: at least some of the scribes active at Byblos at this time, but certainly not all,[265] had been schooled in an epistolary tradition in which the composition of the address formula in conceptually ascending letters parallels that which is known in the corpus of Ugaritic letters. Why this was the case is difficult to answer. Aside from Byblos, other localities connected with the senders of these ASC letters in which the address presents a formal pattern consistent with that attested among the Ugaritic ASC letters include: Amurru,[266] Gezer,[267] Megiddo,[268] Akko,[269] Beirut,[270] Jerusalem,[271] Qiltu,[272] and a number of less well represented cities.[273]

---

[264]The sender of nine of these letters is Rib-Haddi of Byblos: EA 84-85, EA 87, EA 90, EA 104, EA 118, EA 130, EA 132, and EA 138.

[265]See above, section 1.4.4.4.1.4.

[266]EA 63, EA 64, and EA 157.

[267]EA 266-271, EA 292, EA 294, and EA 297.

[268]EA 242-244, EA 246, and EA 365.

[269]EA 232-235.

[270]EA 141 and EA 143.

[271]EA 286, EA 287.2, and EA 290.

[272]EA 278-281, and EA 366.

[273]These include Qatna (EA 55), Ḫaṣor (EA 228), Damascus? (EA 195), Kumidi (EA 198), Šakmu? (EA 252), Lakiša (EA 330), Akšapa? (EA 223), Ḫašabu (EA 174), Mušiḫuna (EA 183), Ḫasi (EA 175 and EA 185), Enišasi (EA 187 and EA 363), Piḫilu (EA 255-256), Ruḫizza? (EA 192),

The remaining two thirds of the address formulas in conceptually ascending Amarna letters show a variety of micro-compositional patterns, none of which find precise parallels in the Ugaritic corpus.

1.4.2.4.2 UNMARKED LETTERS IN THE AMARNA CORPUS

The Amarna corpus contains at least twelve letters which are certainly or probably conceptually UNMARKED.[274] These are a diverse group, judging from the geographical provenance of the sender: four represent outgoing letters of the Egyptian pharaoh to "vassal" kings in Palestine,[275] another four are from Rib-Haddi of Byblos,[276] and other letters in this group derive from senders in Anatolia,[277] Assyria,[278] and perhaps Babylonia.[279]

Ṣiribašani (EA 201), Šasḫimi (EA 203), Qanu (EA 204), Ṭubu (EA 205), Naziba (EA 206), Šaruna (EA 241).

[274]EA 12.1, EA 15, EA 31, EA 71, EA 93, EA 95, EA 97, EA 98, EA 99, EA 102, EA 170.2, EA 316.2, EA 367, EA 369, and EA 370.

[275]EA 99, EA 367, and EA 369-370.

[276]EA 71, EA 93, EA 95, and EA 102.

[277]EA 31.

[278]EA 15.

[279]EA 12.1. The status of this letter as conceptually UNMARKED is not certain since the interpretation of the « N_R » element in line 1 is ambiguous: {a-na I BI NI IA}. One can interpret the string as a REL term, {a-na ^{m}bé-lí-ia}, 'to my lord' (thus the letter would be conceptually ASC POW), or as an ID term, {a-na ^{m}bi-ni-ia}, 'To (Mr.) Biniya' (I see no reason to interpret the string as a "Canaanism", yielding a DESC BIO REL phrase: {a-na ^{m}bi-ni-ia}, 'to my son'). One may accept the presence of the *Personnenkeil* on the evidence of Knudtzon (J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 1 (1915) 98-99) and Schroeder (O. Schroeder, *Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna* 1 (1915) 11); Abel appears to have missed it (H. Winckler, *Der Thontafelfund von El Amarna* (*WA*) (1889-1890) 150). Knudtzon, *ibid.*, obviously considers the *Personnenkeil* superfluous, in light of his translation of line 1, "Zu meinem Herrn" (he transcribes the signs "$^{I(!)}$bi-lí-ia"). W. L. Moran, *Les lettres d'El-Amarna* (1987) 88, follows Knudtzon (his translation is "à mon seigneur"), but notes on p. 89, n. 1, that Landsberger, *apud* [E. I.] Gordon, had suggested reading line 1 as {a-na ^{m}bi-ni-ia}. This suggestion has, in fact, considerable merit, including, but not limited to, the following: (1) in other address formulas of the Amarna corpus,

Only one of these conceptually UNMARKED letters shows an address formula with a compositional pattern parallel to that found in UNMARKED letters in the Ugaritic corpus: this is EA 31, in Hittite, from the king of Arzawa to the Egyptian king. The address represents the pattern: « *UM-MA* ID *A-NA* ID *QÍ-BÍ-MA* ». Given the formal parallels with the Ugaritic address observed above with respect to other epistolary texts from Anatolian sites, the composition of the address in this Anatolian letter is not surprising.

The others all present compositional patterns of the « RS » order. Two micro-compositional patterns are attested: (1) « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID »,[280] and slightly less frequently, (2) « *ana* ID *umma* ID ».[281] Neither occurs among the conceptually UNMARKED letters in the Ugaritic corpus.

Of particular significance are the four letters from the Egyptian pharaoh to political subordinates,[282] which clearly represent a contextually descending social relationship; the order « RS » is nevertheless employed in the address. These cuneiform scribes transcribing letters for the pharaoh were trained in an epistolary tradition different from that of attested in the epistolary corpora of Ras Shamra

---

the *Personnenkeil* generally precedes proper names, not conceptually explicit <REL> terms like "my lord", (2) when such a <REL> term is present in the address of conceptually ascending letters (such as this one would purportedly be), it would typically follow a <ID>term (for example, {a-na LUGAL EN-ia}, where the <ID> term is {LUGAL}, 'the king'), (3) the inferior status of the sender of conceptually ascending letters is virtually always noted in the address with a conceptually inferior <REL> term of the type {ÌR-ka} or {GEMÉ-ka}, and (4) the syllabic value /li/ is otherwise noted in this letter with the {LI} sign (that is, li: see lines 8, 9, and 19), not with the {NI} sign (that is, lí); this sign is used in this letter for the value /ni/ (see lines 22 and 24).

For these reasons, I have classified EA 12.1 as conceptually UNMARKED. In either case, however, the compositional pattern in the address formula would find no parallels in the Ugaritic corpus: as ASC POW « *ana* REL *qibī-ma umma* ID », and as UNMARKED « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID ».

[280]EA 12.1, EA 15, EA 95, EA 102, EA 99, EA 367, and EA 370.

[281]EA 71, EA 93, EA 97, EA 170.2, EA 316.2, EA 369.

[282]EA 99, EA 367, and EA 369-370.

(including the Ugaritic), Tell Meskene, Boğazköy, and Ma□at-Höyük. Also of interest are the five letters, of which four are from Rib-Haddi of Byblos, which contain the prostration formula following the address, and yet which make use of no conceptually ascending REL terminology whatsoever in the address.[283] This feature, too, is atypical of the Ugaritic and other epistolary corpora just mentioned.

1.4.2.4.3 HORIZONTAL LETTERS IN THE AMARNA CORPUS

At least twenty letters in the Amarna corpus are explicitly horizontal in terms of their conceptual classification.[284] All of these employ the BIO model. All represent international diplomatic correspondence, mostly between "great kings".[285] Finally, very often this group exhibits the kind of appositional expansion in the N_S and N_R elements described in the paragraphs above.

The Ugaritic corpus showed two main compositional patterns in conceptually HOR BIO letters. Both have parallels in the Amarna letters. The more common Ugaritic pattern is « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* ». Only one conceptually HOR Amarna letter unambiguously shows the Akkadian equivalent of this pattern, « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* »: EA 41, sent from the king of Ḫatti to the Egyptian monarch.[286] Another HOR BIO letter, EA 34, from the king of Alašiya to the Egyptian king, apparently presents a similar pattern, « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL », lacking the verbal form. As such,

---

[283]EA 71, EA 93, EA 95, EA 102, and EA 316.2.

[284]These are EA 1-3, EA 6-11, EA 16-17, EA 33-35, EA 37-41, and EA 166.

[285]The exceptions are EA 40 and EA 166, which do not involve "great kings".

[286]This pattern is common in the HOR BIO letters found at Boğazköy and Ma□at Höyük; see above.

this pattern finds no parallel in the Ugaritic corpus.[287] Though admittedly difficult to judge without examination of the tablet, one might nevertheless wonder if this letter presents the same pattern as EA 41, the signs {qí-bí-ma} having been imprinted on the right edge of the tablet but subsequently obscured by damage.[288]

The majority of the HOR BIO letters in the Amarna corpus show another pattern, which also finds a parallel in the Ugaritic corpus: the pattern « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL » is typical of conceptually ascending letters, but also occurs in a minority of HOR BIO letters. At least twelve, and possibly as many as eighteen HOR BIO letters in the Amarna corpus show the pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL »,[289] the Akkadian equivalent of the Ugaritic pattern just mentioned. The senders of these letters derive from a variety of localities: Egypt,[290] Babylonia,[291] Assyria,[292]

---

[287]Note, however, the composition of the address formula in the "non-standard" ASC POW letter RS 18.148: « *tḥm* ID *ʿm* ID REL ».

[288]For the presence of {qí-bí-ma} in other letters from Alašiya, compare EA 35, EA 37-40 (but contrast EA 33-34). For the damage near the right edge on line 1 of EA 34, see the "autotype facsimile" in C. Bezold and E. A. W. Budge, *Tell el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum* (1892) 14.

[289]This pattern is certainly or probably present in EA 1, EA 3 (probably), EA 6 (probably), EA 8, EA 9 (probably), EA 16, EA 17, EA 35, EA 37 (probably), EA 38, EA 39, and EA 166. The traces of the address formula in EA 2, EA 7, EA 10, EA 11, and EA 40 are entirely consistent with this pattern. As above, one wonders about the possible presence of {qí-bí-ma} in EA 33 (were this word present, this letter would belong here as well). The copy of Schroeder, *Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna* 1 (1915) 30 (though not that of Abel, Winckler, *Der Thontafelfund von El Amarna* (*WA*) (1889-1890) 13) does, in fact, show tablet damage at the end of line 1, allowing the hypothesis that {qí-bí-ma} had been impressed on the right edge, at the end of line 1 (see the footnote above).

[290]EA 1.

[291]That is, "Kara(n)duniaš": EA 2-3, EA 6-11.

[292]EA 16.

Mittanni,[293] Alašiya,[294] and Amurru.[295]

The address formulas in HOR BIO letters in the Amarna corpus show strong compositional similarities with their Ugaritic counterparts, but not the kind of striking congruence witnessed in the Akkadian and Hittite letters from Ras Shamra, Tell Meskene, Boğazköy, and Ma□at-Höyük.

1.4.2.4.4 OTHER CONCEPTUAL CATEGORIES

There remain three conceptually descending letters and eight conceptually mixed letters to account for in the Amarna corpus.

The conceptually MIXED letters are a fairly uniform group: they derive from Tušratta of Mittanni and are address to the Egyptian king, whom Tušratta qualifies as both {ŠEŠ-ia}, 'my brother', and {ḫa-ta-ni-ia}, 'my son-in-law'.[296] Thus, this letter contains both horizontal and descending terms, conceived on the BIO model as well as on another model appropriate for kinship through marriage. All of these show address formulas consistent with the pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL ».[297]

One of the three conceptually descending letters, one, EA 96, is DESC BIO. Its address formula shows the pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL », as in the

---

[293]EA 17.

[294]EA 33, EA 35, EA 38-40.

[295]EA 166.

[296]These are EA 19-21, EA 23-24, and EA 27-29.

[297]This pattern is certain or very probable in EA 19-21, EA 23, and EA 28. The traces of the address visible in EA 24, EA 27, and EA 29 are entirely consistent with this pattern. As above, the N_S and N_R elements in these address formulas contain numerous appositional expansions, as well as relative clauses. Compare, for example, EA 19:2 {[ḫ]a-ta-ni-ia ša i-ra-ʾa-am-an-ni}, 'my son-in-law who loves me'.

mixed letters discussed above. The DESC POW letter EA 162, to the "man" of Amurru, and apparently from the Egyptian king, probably shows an address formula of the pattern « [*ana* I]D *qibī-ma* [*umma*] ID REL », a pattern which finds no clear parallels in the Ugaritic corpus.[298] The other apparently DESC POW letter is EA 30, a very peculiar document in which the generalized plurality of recipients is more suggestive of a "passport" than of a typical letter, addressed to a specific recipient.[299] Its address formula follows the pattern « *ana* ID REL *umma* ID », also unknown in the Ugaritic corpus.

1.4.2.5 Address formulas in other epistolary traditions

Finally, it is necessary to treat the address formulas from other epistolary traditions, which bear no striking resemblance to the composition and distribution of the formula in the Ugaritic corpus. I think it necessary to include a fair amount of detail in this section because of the prevalence of statements in the literature to the effect that the Ugaritic epistolary protocol followed, calqued, or was otherwise derived from an Akkadian model. This may well have been the case, but it only distorts the issue to speak of *the* Akkadian epistolary tradition when there were several, and not all of these are attested in the documentation from Mesopotamia proper.

---

[298]On a macro-compositional level, this pattern is reminiscent of other letters sent by the Egyptian pharaoh to subordinates, in which the order of mention was also « RS ». See above, under UNMARKED letters.

[299]Compare Moran, *Amarna Letters* (1992) 100.

1.4.2.5.1 LETTERS FROM TELL ATCHANA (ALALAḪ)

The corpus of texts recovered from Tell Atchana contains about a dozen letters in which the composition of the address formula may be perceived.[300] A few of these are in Hittite,[301] and the remainder in Akkadian. Formally, the address formulas in the two Hittite letters may be treated separately, since only they present the order « SR »; all of the Akkadian letters show addresses of the order « RS », regardless of conceptual status.[302] AT 125 is conceptually unmarked, and presents the micro-compositional pattern « *UM-MA* ID *A-NA* ID *QÍ-BI-MA* ». Given the identity of the sender, {LUGAL}, 'the king', and the fact that it is in Hittite, it seems reasonable to place the provenance of this letter in Hittite Anatolia.[303] Indeed, conceptually UNMARKED letters found at Boğazköy and at Ma□at also show this compositional pattern, as do the conceptually UNMARKED letters in the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian epistolary corpora. The address of AT 124 is damaged; it certainly followed the order « SR », however, and the traces which remain are entirely consistent with the pattern « *UM-MA* ID *A-NA* ID *QÍ-BI-MA* ».

---

[300]These are AT 107-113, AT 115-117, and AT 124-125, published, for the most part, in D. J. Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets* (1953) 58-62; with copies on pls. 24-27, and in D. J. Wiseman, *JCS* 8 (1954) 9-10.

[301]For AT 24-25; see L. Rost, *MIO* 4 (1956) 340-342, and now A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989) 387 and 440. For AT 35, see C. Niedorf, *Festschrift Dietrich* (2002) 517-526.

[302]Compare the comments of D. Arnaud, *SMEA* 37 (1996) 51, who uses this argument (among others) in his proposal for the provenence of RS 4.449.

[303]Compare Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989) 388, with anterior bibliography, where the king of Carchemish is also suggested as a possibility.

The address formulas in the Akkadian letters found at Tell Atchana all present the order « RS ».[304] Given the almost predictable distribution of the various compositional patterns of the address formulas in the Ras Shamra, Boğazköy, and Ma□at corpora, the uniformity of the « RS » order in the address formulas of the Alalakh letters is surprising, especially in the case of contextually descending letters such as AT 108, addressed to an individual named {^{m}ú-ut-ti} from no less a personage than {LUGAL}, 'the king'; but also with respect to conceptually UNMARKED letters in general,[305] all of which show the order « RS ». Among these UNMARKED letters, two micro-compositional patterns are attested, neither of which has a parallel among the Ugaritic letters: (1) « *ana* ID *umma* ID »,[306] and (2) « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID ».[307]

Three of the letters from Alalakh are conceptually ascending.[308] One of these is ASC POW,[309] and the other two ASC MIXED.[310] The address formula in AT 113

---

[304]AT 107-109, apparently AT 110, AT 111-113, and AT 115-117.

[305]AT 109, AT 111-112, AT 117, and possibly AT 116.

[306]AT 108-109. The traces of the address in AT 110, as reconstructed by the editor (Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets* (1953) 59), are consistent with this pattern.

[307]AT 111-112, and AT 117. The traces of the address formula in AT 115-116 are consistent with this pattern.

[308]AT 107, AT 113, and AT 115.

[309]AT 107.

[310]AT 115 incorporates ascending terms from both POW and BIO models; compare {a-bi-ia EN-ia} in line 5. In AT 113, the sender characterizes the recipient as {be-li-ia ^{d}UTU-ia}, 'my lord, my divine sun', a combination frequent in the Amarna corpus (see above), and refers to himself as {ÌR-ka du-šu-mu-ka}, 'your servant, your *dušumu* (??)'. The latter term is apparently conceptually descending, but whether or not its meaning corresponds to 'servant' (Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets* [1953] 160), is difficult to determine. This, at least, does not appear to be the Hurrian equivalent of {ÌR}: compare the *Sa Vocabulary* with a Hurrian column in RS 94.2939, where the sign {ÌR} in the Sumerian column is glossed with {ur-du} in the Akkadian column and {pu-ra-mi} in the Hurrian (see B. André-Salvini, and M. Salvini, *Nuzi and the Hurrians* 9 [1998] 8 and 15, and the legible photo on p. 38; and E. Laroche, *Glossaire de la langue hourrite* [1980] 205).

presents the micro-compositional pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL », which corresponds to the pattern used in conceptually ascending letters in the Ugaritic corpus, as well as in such letters from the other comparative corpora discussed above. It is conceivable that AT 107 and AT 115 had this structure as well.[311]

Setting aside the two Hittite letters, which show a compositional pattern well attested in similar letters found at Anatolian (Boğazköy and Ma□at) and Syrian (Ras Shamra) sites, the address formulas in the Alalakh letters are more reminiscent of Old Babylonian models than of Syro-Anatolian forms current at the end of the Late Bronze Age. It is true that as many as three conceptually ASC letters may show a compositional pattern found also among the ASC letters of the Ugaritic corpus, but this resemblance is mitigated by the fact that all of the Akkadian letters found at Tell Atchana show address formulas of the order « RS », regardless of their conceptual status, a distribution which is incompatible with the Ugaritic corpus.

1.4.2.5.2 MISCELLANEOUS LATE BRONZE EPISTOLARY FINDS AT LEVANTINE SITES

Several sites have yielded scattered tablet finds of an epistolary genre. I have glanced at a group of nine such letters, recovered from various sites in the Levant:

---

[311]Judging from the editor's copies, the preserved traces of the address in AT 107 correspond to « *ana* ID REL […] *qibī-ma* […] *umma* ID […] ». A REL phrase such as {ÌR-ka} may have been present in the « S » component, at the end of line 3, on the right edge of the tablet (now lost). Likewise in AT 115, the preserved structure, « *ana* ID/REL? R[EL …] *qibī*-[*ma* …] *umma* ID […] », allows the possibility of restoring a REL term in the « S » component, at the end of line 3, again on the right edge of the tablet (now lost).

Kāmid el-Lōz,[312] Tell Taanach,[313] Tel Aphek,[314] Beth Shean,[315] and Hazor.[316] Apart from the letter from Tel Aphek, in which the sender is in any case a Ugaritian, none of these present any striking parallels with the Ugaritic corpus with respect to the composition of the address formula.

The letter from Tel Aphek[317] is conceptually ASC MIXED, addressed to a certain Ḫaya whom the sender qualifies as {a-bi-ia EN-ia}, 'my father, my lord'. The sender himself is an individual named Tagḫuli(nu), a fairly important and fairly well-attested official active in the Ugaritian court during the second half of the 13th century BCE.[318] The address of the letter presents the pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL », which is typical in conceptually ascending letters in Ugaritic and Akkadian from Ras Shamra.

All of the remaining letters present address formulas of the order « RS », regardless of conceptual status. That these letters represent a different epistolary tradition than that found in the Ugaritic corpus is especially clear in the case of conceptually UNMARKED letters: the pattern « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID » occurs in

---

[312]Two letters: Kumidi 1 (Kl 69.277) and Kumidi 2 (Kl 69.279), published in D. O. Edzard, *Kamid el-Loz—Kumidi* (1970) 50-56.

[313]Four letters: TT 1 and 2, published in F. Hrozný, *Tell Taʿannek* (1904) 113-117, 121, and Taf. 10; and TT 5-6, published in F. Hrozný, *Nachlese auf dem Tell Taʿannek* (1906) 36-41, Taf. 1-3. On the Taanach letters, see now A. Rainey, *EI* 26 (1999) *153-*162, with anterior bibliography.

[314]One letter, Aphek 52055/1, published by D. Owen, *TA* 8 (1981) 1-17.

[315]One letter, here provisionally labelled "*IEJ* 46.210", inscribed on a clay cylinder. It was published by W. Horowitz, *IEJ* 46 (1996) 208-211; a preliminary edition by the same author appeared in *Qadmoniot* 27 (1994) pp. 84-86 (in Hebrew).

[316]One letter: Hazor 16455, published in W. Horowitz, *IEJ* 50 (2000) 17-18.

[317]Aphek 52055/1.

[318]See I. Singer, *TA* 10 (1983) 3-25; and now C. Roche, *Recherches sur la prosopographie du royaume d'Ougarit* (2001), vol. 2.

such letters from Hazor,[319] Tell Taanach,[320] and Kāmid el-Lōz.[321] The two letters from the latter site are especially striking, since they clearly derive from contextually descending situations,[322] and yet retain the « RS » order.[323] A similar pattern, which lacks the verbal element, « *ana* ID *umma* ID », is known from UNMARKED letters from Tell Taanach.[324] Neither pattern has a parallel in the Ugaritic corpus. Finally, a conceptually ascending letter from Beth Shean presents the pattern « *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma umma* ID », and one conceptually horizontal letter from Taanach has the pattern « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID ». Both are unknown in the Ugaritic corpus.

In short, despite the relative geographical and chronological proximity of these scattered epistolary finds to the Ugaritic letters, they generally do not represent the same scribal habits in the composition of the address formula. The only exception is Aphek 52055/1, which, in any case, was sent from Ugarit.

1.4.2.5.3 LATE BRONZE AGE LETTERS FROM MESOPOTAMIAN SITES

Judging from the sizeable corpus of epistolary finds from Nippur, Yorgan Tepe (Nuzi), and Tall Sheikh Ḥamad (Dūr Katlimmu), the epistolary traditions practiced in Mesopotamia proper during the Late Bronze Age do not exhibit striking parallels with

---

[319]Hazor 16455.

[320]TT 1.

[321]Kumidi 1-2.

[322]They are addressed to named individuals in charge of particular cities, from {LUGAL}, 'the king', probably the Egyptian pharaoh.

[323]Compare EA 99, EA 367, and EA 369-370; and AT 108 (discussed above).

[324]TT 5-6.

the Ugaritic corpus with respect to the composition and distribution of the address formula.

For a survey of other Mesopotamian sites that have yielded Late Bronze archives, see O. Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries* (1998), pp. 80-125. I have concentrated on those sites which produced relatively large epistolary corpora.

1.4.2.5.3.1 Yorgan Tepe (Nuzi)

Dealing with the Nuzi archives is difficult, owing to the size of the corpus, the dispersed nature of the publications, and the fact that many texts are available only in cuneiform copy. My brief and admittedly incomplete survey[325] suggests that the address formulas in Nuzi letters consistently present the « RS » order, regardless of conceptual status. Particularly telling examples in this regard are letters sent to named individuals by {LUGAL}, 'the king',[326] in which the « RS » order is maintained, despite the contextually descending nature of the relationship. Furthermore, it seems that the micro-compositional pattern « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID » is also standard.[327]

---

[325]R. Borger, *HKL* 3 (1975) 56, provides references to some of the Nuzi letters. Convenient orientations to the Nuzi tablets now in the Harvard Semitic Museum and at the Oriental Institute may be found in the articles of J. Fincke and M. P. Maidman in *Nuzi and the Hurrians* 10 (1999) 13-24, and pp. 25-34. A useful list of text publications is given in P. Negri Scafa, *Nuzi and the Hurrians* 10 (1999) 74-80; and a general presentation of the archives from Yorgan Tepe and nearby sites is provided by Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries* (1998) 15-32.

[326]Compare, for example, the letters published by E. Chiera, *JEN* 5 (1934), no. 494; by R. H. Pfeiffer, HSS 9 (1932), nos. 1-3 (compare also nos. 5-6); and by E. R. Lacheman, HSS 14 (1950), nos. 14, 17, 19.

[327]Compare the letters published in E. Chiera, HSS 5 (1929), nos. 102-106; Pfeiffer, HSS 9 (1932), nos. 1-6; Chiera, *JEN* 5 (1934), nos. 494, probably 495, 496, probably 497, 498-499; R. H. Pfeiffer, and E. R. Lacheman, HSS 13 (1942), nos. 38, 51, 108, and 405 (in transcription only); Lacheman, HSS 14 (1950), nos. 12-17, 19-22, 24-25, probably 26, 27, and 31; and Lacheman, HSS 15 (1955), nos. 43B, 187, 189, and 291-292.

Very few REL terms are to be found in these address formulas.[328] In general, the address formulas in the Nuzi letters appear to follow the patterns described by E. Salonen as standard for letters in the Old Babylonian period.[329] They do not present compositional or distributional parallels form the Ugaritic address formula.

1.4.2.5.3.2 Nippur and the Kassite Babylonian Tradition

For Kassite Babylonia, the largest body of evidence comes from excavations at Nippur.[330] Well over one hundred letters have been published thus far,[331] the majority of which in Hugo Radau's 1908 publication *Letters to Cassite Kings from the Temple Archives of Nippur*.[332] This sampling is sufficient to indicate that the address formulas in the epistolary traditions of Kassite Babylonia differ from those in the Ugaritic corpus, both in terms of formal composition and distribution. In his treatment of a fairly large group of conceptually ASC POW letters, Radau distinguished two formal

---

[328]An apparent exception is the letter published by Pfeiffer and Lacheman, HSS 13 (1942) 24, no. 149 (in transcription only), in which the ID element in the « S » component (a personal name) is followed by what appears to be a REL term: {šu-un-ka$_4$}, 'your ŠU-UN (??)'. I have no suggestion for its meaning.

[329]Compare E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 16. Note also that in virtually all of these address formulas the imperative *qibī* is written with the {NE} sign (that is, bí), another aspect typical of the Old Babylonian period, and rare in the western periphery (or at least at Ras Shamra) during the Late Bronze Age.

[330]For other sites yielding epigraphic finds, see Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries* (1998) 103-120; and the catalog of J. A. Brinkman, *Materials* (1976).

[331]Many more remain unpublished; compare the statement in K. Nashef, RAI 35 (1992) 151-152.

[332]Over a hundred letters were published in H. Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings* (1908). Another significant publication of letters (over a dozen) appeared in H. F. Lutz, *Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts* (1919), texts XXIX-XLI, pp. 88-99. For other letters, which have appeared in scattered publications, compare A. Goetze, *JCS* 6 (1952) 142-145; T. G. Pinches, *CT* 44 (1963), no. 44; R. D. Biggs, *JCS* 19 (1965) 95-102; and the references in Borger, *HKL* 3 (1975) 55.

patterns of composition in the address formula,[333] neither of which finds a parallel in the Ugaritic corpus: (1) « *ana* REL *qibī-ma umma* ID REL »,[334] and (2) a pattern which lacks an explicit « R » element, and in which the « S » element takes the form « REL ID ».[335]

A telling example of the address formula in a contextually descending social situation in this tradition is provided by letter no. 75 in Radau's treatment.[336] The letter is conceptually UNMARKED, but given the identity of the sender, {LUGAL}, 'the king', it ought to be understood as contextually descending. Despite the high social status of the sender, the recipient is mentioned first: « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID », a feature which neatly distinguishes this tradition from the Ugaritic.[337] Other conceptually unmarked letters, in which the nature of the relationship between the correspondents is not clear, also show this compositional pattern.[338]

---

[333]Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings* (1908) 32. Letters 1-74 are conceptually ASC POW; *ibid.*, p. 13.

[334]A possible exception is RS 8.315. Otherwise, Ugaritic address formulas in conceptually ascending letters systematically follow the pattern « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL » (that is, both the N_R and N_S components consist of « ID REL »).

[335]No Ugaritic address formula shows this pattern. Note, however, the presence of this pattern in two Akkadian letters found at Ras Shamra (RS 34.142 and probably RS 34.152). The address formula of the "piggy-back" letter EA 12.2 would appear to follow the same pattern.

[336]BE 17/1.75 = CBM 12582, published in Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings* (1908), text no. 75, pl. 54. The address formula reads {(1) a-na ^{m}LÚ-^{d}AMAR.UTU qí-bi-ma (2) um-ma LUGAL - ma (3) um-ma a-na ^{m}LÚ-^{d}AMAR.UT[U-ma?]}, that is, « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID ».

[337]Conceptually unmarked letters in the Ugaritic corpus follow the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* ».

[338]Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings* (1908) 18.

Finally, conceptually horizontal letters show the pattern « *ana* ID *qibī-ma umma* ID REL »,[339] which is not precisely analogous to either of the Ugaritic patterns found among HOR letters.

Not only do the letters representing the epistolary tradition(s) of Kassite Babylonia present different micro-compositional patterns, however, but also on the level of macro-composition, when both correspondents are mentioned in the address formulas, the order of mention is consistently « RS »,[340] which neatly distinguishes this corpus from the Ugaritic corpus in particular, and from the western periphery in general.

1.4.2.5.3.3 The Middle Assyrian Tradition

Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum published an accessible treatment of the Middle Assyrian epistolary tradition in 1996.[341] The corpus she studied numbers well over a hundred texts, the majority deriving from two sites, Qalʿat aš-Širqāt (ancient Aššur) and Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad (ancient Dūr Katlimmu). The epistolary formulas appearing in these letters present a number of features familiar from other Mesopotamian epistolary traditions, but also some striking formal idiosyncrasies, which should play a role in future attempts to affirm a supposed Assyrian provenance for formally similar letters found outside of the Assyrian heartland.[342] In this sense, Cancik-Kirschbaum's

---

[339] *Ibid.*

[340] See the presentation in Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 57-61.

[341] E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 49-71.

[342] I am thinking of KBo 28.082 (H. Güterbock, *AfO* Beiheft 7 [1942], no. 3, pp. 36, 83; republished by Kümmel, *KBo* 28 [1985] 24), which is formally similar, though not identical to the Middle Assyrian models (the prostration formula employs the writing {ul-tu$_4$-ḫé-ḫi-in} instead of Middle Assyrian {ul-ta-ka-in}). Another, equally valuable application of Cancik-Kirschbaum's

discussion is especially useful for the non-specialist interested in epistolary form, and fills a void in the literature.[343]

It is clear from Cancik-Kirschbaum's treatment that the epistolary address formula followed in the Middle Assyrian tradition did not resemble that of the Ugaritic letters, neither in composition nor in distribution. This is especially clear on the macro-compositional level: all address formulas, regardless of conceptual status, present the order « RS ».[344] Letter no. 9 in Cancik-Kirschbaum's publication presents a tangible example: despite the explicitly superior status of the sender, the order « RS » is maintained.

Despite this clear formal difference; the Middle Assyrian corpus also presents a surprising parallel to the Ugaritic address formula on the micro-compositional level. The address formulas of conceptually ASC POW letters present in the « S » component not the expected pattern « *umma* N_S », but rather « *ṭuppi* N_S ».[345] This pattern provides a parallel to the Ugaritic « S » component, « *tḥm* N_S », both on the morphological and semantic levels.

---

discussion is the possibility to exclude, on formal grounds, letters previously ascribed to the Middle Assyrian tradition on the basis of purely linguistic criteria; compare RS 6.198 (F. Thureau-Dangin, *Syria* 16 [1935] 188-193) which presents an address formula entirely out of keeping with the now known Middle Assyrian formulary.

[343]A previous treament is Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 76-77. In light of the peculiarities presented by the Middle Assyrian epistolary formulas with respect to other more or less contemporary cuneiform corpora, I have been unable to understand the comments of a recent reviewer of Cancik-Kirschbaum's work: "most of the information in this section is pertinent to basic Akkadian and not peculiar to Middle Assyrian letters" (*JNES* 60 [2001] 57). On formal grounds, both certain variants of the address formula (the pattern « *ṭup-pí* N_S » in conceptually ASC POW letters) and the prostration formula (« *ultakaʾʾin* », usually written {ul-ta-ka-in}) deserve special treatment, and, at least on present evidence, do indeed appear to be "peculiar to Middle Assyrian letters."

[344]Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 53-56.

[345]"Präscriptio Typ II" in Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 56. Where the second sign of the « S » component is clearly legible ({BI} versus {MA}), the potential ambiguity between the readings {UM} and {DUB} for the first sign is resolved.

1.4.2.5.4 COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE ANTERIOR TO THE LATE BRONZE AGE

I have not explored the epistolary corpora from periods anterior to the Late Bronze Age in the same detail as those discussed in the survey above. Nevertheless, even a cursory study is sufficient to indicate a lack of precise parallels for the composition and distribution of the Ugaritic address formulas in the Eblaite, Sumerian, Old Akkadian, and Old Babylonian epistolary traditions.

This is most obvious on the macro-compositional level: all of these traditions except the Old Assyrian present a fixed order of mention of the correspondents in the address formula, which the Ugaritic formula does not. In some of these traditions, the fixed order is « SR », as in Eblaite,[346] Sumerian,[347] and Old Akkadian.[348] In Old Babylonian, however, the fixed order is « RS ».[349]

---

[346]The epistolary texts found at Ebla from the 3rd Millennium BCE appear consistently to present « SR » as the order in the composition of the address formula. The most frequent micro-compositional pattern is « *en-ma* ID NI-*na* ID » ({NI-na} appears to be a writing of the preposition *ʾana*). Compare the two texts presented in P. Michalowski, *Letters from Early Mesopotamia* (1993), nos. 2-3, pp. 12-18 (I believe these are TM.75.G.2342 and TM.75.G.2367); and at least five other epistolary texts mentioned in M. V. Tonietti, *Miscellanea Eblaitica* 4 (1997) 89-90 (TM.75.G.2561, TM.75.G.11696, TM.75.G.1766, TM.75.G.2345, and TM.75.G.2605). Two other Ebla letters also represent the macro-compositional order « SR », but appear, at least on the graphic level, to present a slightly different micro-composition: the pattern « *en-ma* ID *si-in* ID » in the letter TM.76.G.86 (see P. Fronzaroli, *Miscellanea Eblaitica* 4 [1997] 8); and the pattern « maḫ-maḫ ID NI-*na* ID » in TM.75.G.1626 (see Tonietti, *Miscellanea Eblaitica* 4 [1997] 89).

[347]B. Kienast and K. Volk, *Die sumerischen und akkadischen Briefe* (1995) 4. The pattern cited is « N_S-e na-(b)e-a N_R(-ra) ù-na-du_{11} ». See also the letter CIRPL 46, presented in Michalowski, *Letters from Early Mesopotamia* (1993) 11, no. 1, which also presents « SR »; and the numerous references provided by Borger, *HKL* 3 (1975) 53.

[348]According to E. Salonen, *StOr* 38 (1967) 12-13, and Kienast and Volk, *Die sumerischen und akkadischen Briefe* (1995) 4-20, Old Akkadian letters display two types of addresses, both of which display the « SR » order: (1) « *enma* N_S *ana* N_R », and (2) « *enma* N_S *ana* N_R *qibīma* ». See also the references given in Borger, *HKL* 3 (1975) 53-54.

[349]Compare Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 16-17; and a large collection of references in Borger, *HKL* 3 (1975) 54-55.

The Old Assyrian tradition is less easy to dismiss, since like the Ugaritic tradition, the order of mention of the sender and recipient in the address formula is variable : both orders are employed, « RS » and « SR ».[350] Despite this similarity on the macro-compositional level, however, the micro-compositional patterns of the address formula in the Old Assyrian tradition(s) are not comparable to those of the Ugaritic corpus. In particular, « REL » terms are generally not used in the address formulas of Old Assyrian letters. The result, adopting the terminology employed in this study, is that whatever the contextual relationship of the correspondents might have been, the terminological status of many Old Assyrian letters is UNMARKED. Apart from questions of explicitly marked conceptual status, however, the distribution of one pattern or the other in the Old Assyrian corpus was, like the Ugaritic, conditioned by a concern to place the higher-ranking correspondent in first position.[351]

1.4.3 Comparative evidence from the Ugaritic literary texts

The corpus of Ugaritic literary texts[352] contains a group of stereotyped motifs which treat, in the course of the narrative, the commissioning and delivery of messages by means of a third party, or messenger. These motifs are relevant for the study of the epistolary address formulas since they not only exhibit striking formal parallels with

---

[350]Compare H. Hirsch, *Al-Ḥudḥud* (1981) 79-94; and C. Michel, *Correspondance des marchands de Kaniš* (2001) 34-35.

[351]Michel, *Correspondance des marchands de Kaniš* (2001) 35: " … le personnage le plus important apparaît systématiquement en premier."

[352]I am referring to the corpus of narrative texts which exhibit poetic parallelism, especially the myths and epics. For an overview of the corpus, see D. Pardee and P. Bordreuil, *ABD* 6 (1992) 706-708; an older treatment, though with more detail, is A. Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), cols. 1365-1403.

the latter, but also derive from a similar contextual setting, that of indirect communication.[353]

One can distinguish two distinct contextual settings among these motifs: (1) those in which the sender of the message directly addresses his messenger(s), commanding them to speak to the intended recipient of the message, and (2) those in which the narrative fulfillment of this command is related in the 3rd person. The former can be called message "commissions", and the latter message "deliveries".[354] These two settings have a distinct but unequal importance for the interpretation of the epistolary address formula, and for this reason it seems helpful to give an illustration of each.

The following passage represents an example of a message commission:

KTU[2] 1.3.III (11) w . rgm . l btlt . ʿnt (12) ṯny	*wa rugumā lê-batūlati ʿanati*
. l ymmt . lỉmm (13) tḥm . ảlỉyn . bʿl . hwt	*ṯanniyā lê-yabimti liʾmi-ma*
(14) ảlỉy . qrdm	*taḥmu ʾalʾiyāni*[355] *baʿli*
	huwwatu ʾalʾiyi qarrādīma

'So, say to Girl ʿAnatu,
repeat to Liʾmu's sister-in-law:
"Message of Mightiest Baʿlu,
Word of the Mightiest of Warriors: « MESSAGE » "'

---

[353]J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 241, uses the term "ternaire" (as opposed to "binaire") to describe this aspect. On the relationship between the epistolary address formula and these literary "message" motifs, see S. E. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies* (1980) 256-260 (original publication in Hebrew, 1968).

[354]These two motifs fall under the rubric "orden-ejecución" discussed by G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (1981) 52-55; and "instructions and execution" in Parker, *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition* (1989) 28-31.

[355]The long penultimate vowel may indicate a diptotic inflection for this noun (thus, a "genitive" marked with *-a*), rather than the standard triptotic inflection.

In this commission, Baʿlu address his messengers directly, and charges them to "speak!" (an imperative) the massage which he then relates. The command *rgm l btlt ʿnt*, 'Speak to Girl ʿAnatu!' represents a literary motif formally and functionally parallel to the epistolary « R » component; and the first words that the messengers are commanded to pronounce, namely, *tḥm ảlỉyn bʿl*, 'Message of Mightiest Baʿlu', represent a similar parallel for the epistolary « S » component. Both of the literary motifs, « R » and « S », show the parallelistic expansion typical of Ugaritian prosody.[356]

A slightly different structure occurs in the narrative account which relates the delivery of this same message:

KTU[2] 1.3.IV (5) [w] ʿn[357] . ǵlmm . yʿnyn .	[*wa*]-*ʿanâ ǵalmāmi yaʿniyāni*
l ỉb . ypʿ (6) l bʿl . ṣrt . l rkb . ʿrpt (7) tḥm .	*lā-ʾêbu yapaʿa lê-baʿli*
ảlỉyn . bʿl . hwt . ảlỉy (8) qrdm	*ṣarratu lê-rākibi ʿarapāti*
	taḥmu ʾalʾiyāni baʿli
	huwwatu ʾalʾiyi qarrādīma

---

[356]S. Parker, in *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition* (1989) 28, speaks of the relationship between epistolary formulas and their literary adaptations as follows: "The formulaic monocolon *tḥm* PN 'message of so-and-so' . . . is built into a bicolon by the creation of a second colon composed of a parallel to PN . . . (or) the whole formula: *hwt* PN_2. . . . But we know from correspondence in the various archives that *tḥm* PN is also the opening announcement of the source of a message. This epistolary usage confirms that not only is the formulaic bicolon a poetic extension of a formulaic monocolon, but that the latter was adopted directly from the standard language of messengers." See also Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies* (1980) 256-260.

For a recent overview of Ugaritic poetry, see Watson, *HUS* (1999) 165-192, with anterior bibliography. On the various forms and distributions of poetic parallelism, this being generally accepted as the most significant structural feature of Ugaritic poetry, see also D. Pardee, *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism* (1988) xv-xvi and 168-201; and S. Parker, *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition* (1989) 7-59.

[357]*KTU*[2] reads {⌜y⌝ʿn} here; I am following A. Herdner, *CTA* (1963) 17 and fig. 9, who reads {[-]ʿn}. The restoration of {[w]ʿn} rather than {[y]ʿn} is made solely on the basis of what I consider to

[Then], the two lads answered, saying:
'No enemy has arisen against Baʿlu,
(no) adversary (has arisen) against the cloud-rider.
Message of Mightiest Baʿlu,
Word of the Mightiest of Warriors: « MESSAGE » '.

This passage relates the speech of Baʿlu's two messenger lads, having arrived *chez* ʿAnatu: prior to delivering the message, they respond to an anxious question regarding Baʿlu's welfare posed to them by the goddess. Message delivery motifs such as these contain no precise formal and functional parallel for the epistolary « R » component. They do, however, retain the literary « S » motif, which precedes and announces the recitation of the message proper.

1.4.3.1 The order « RS » in the literary texts

The most significant general observation to be made with respect to the two literary motifs comparable to the two components of the epistolary address formula is that when both motifs are present, they always occur in the sequence: « R » « S ».[358] This presents a contrast with the epistolary corpus, where the order of the components

be parallel grammatical constructions (I have not seen the tablet, and cannot evaluate the readings on epigraphic grounds), such as *KTU*[2] 1.6 I 53, {⌈wl ʿn . rbt . åṯrt ym}, and 1.18 I 22, {w ṣḥq . btlt . [ʿnt]}. For an interesting, though now slightly dated approach to these forms, see D. Marcus, *JANES* 1/2 (1968), and p. 59, n. 19, for anterior bibliography.

[358]This sequence is clear or likely in ten literary passages: *KTU*[2] 1.1 III 4-6 (partially reconstructed); 1.2 I 16-17; 1.2 I 33-34; 1.3. III 11-13; 1.3 VI 21-25; 1.4 VIII 29-34; 1.5 II 8-9; probably 1.7 25-26 (partially reconstructed); perhaps 1.14 III 19-21 (if lines 20-21 contain a non-standard « R » component); and 1.14 V 29-33 (partially reconstructed, with a standard « R » component). All of these derive either from the Baʿlu Cycle (the first eight citations), or from the Kirta text (the last two citations).

is variable, largely as a function of nature of the social relationship between the correspondents, at least as such was expressed by the sender or the sender's scribe.

In a certain sense, however, the fixed sequence « RS » for the literary motifs is a matter of course: the « R » motif represents the sender's command to his messengers to "say" to the recipient the message which follows, and the message which follows begins with the « S » component. If this sequence is a logical one for the literary motifs, why is it not also so for the epistolary formula? The answer, I suspect, is to be found in the conflict between origin and usage: the fixed « RS » order is consistent with the origins of these formulas and motifs: the practicalities which lay behind indirect communication situations, especially those that function on an oral level, as seems to be the case for the most part () in the Ugaritic myths and epics. The variable order, « RS » or « SR », however, would appear to represent the development of a usage divorced from its original setting. (a parallel in lexicography comes to mind: the respective roles of etymology and contextual usage in determining a word's meaning). The kind of communication involved is still indirect, since the two parties are not in one another's presence, but the virtual lack of any and all allusions to the messengers who must have carried the letter, and the virtual predominance of direct discourse, suggest a tendency toward a more binary communication.

1.4.3.2 The literary « R » motif

In his discussion of these literary "message" motifs, G. del Olmo Lete lists the occurrences of the literary equivalent of the epistolary « R » component, all in

message commissions.[359] Eight of these appear in the "Baʿlu Cycle" of myths, and three in the Kirta text. One message delivery scene, KTU 1.2 I 33, also contains a motif superficially similar to these literary « R » motifs.

In order to compare these literary « R » motifs with their epistolary equivalents, I have found it helpful to classify them typologically, by composition. In most cases, this means temporarily neglecting, or at least accounting for, the parallelistic expansion, or « B » line, in the literary version.[360] Only two macro-compositional patterns are attested: (1) « *rgm l* N_R », 'Say to N_R!', certainly or probably present in eleven passages,[361] and the otherwise unique patterns (2) « *l yrgm l* N_R »,[362] an impersonal volitional clause, 'let one (or "let them") say to N_R', and (3) « *rgm l* N_R », a narrative account of the delivery of a message: 'the two (of them) said to N_R'.[363] The first pattern is not only the most frequent, but also the most important for comparative purposes. Despite the graphic similarity of the third pattern with the first, I believe it necessary to distinguish them, since the latter is precisely parallel to the epistolary

---

[359]del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (1981) 54, under the rubric « encargo de mensaje » : *KTU*[2] 1.1 III 4-6; 1.2. I 16-17; 1.3. III 11-13; 1.3 VI 21-25; 1.4 V 12; 1.4. VIII 29-34; 1.5 II 8-9; 1.6 III 24; 1.14 V 32-33; 1.16 I 38; and 1.16 VI 28-29. The status of *KTU*[2] 1.1 III 4-6 and 1.14 V 29-33 as "commissions" is plausible, though not certain, given the presence of the literary « R » component (only one message "delivery" contains the « R » motif: *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 33). S. A. Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 184, proposes another passage: *KTU*[2] 1.7 25-26, a fragmentary section which appears to preserve traces of another literary « R » motif.

[360]It is the « A » line, as in « *rgm l* N_R », 'Say to N_R!', which parallels the epistolary « R » formula in form and function. The typical « B » line, as in « *ṯny l* N_R », 'Repeat to N_R!', represents a semantic parallel.

[361]The pattern is clear in *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 16-17; 1.3 III 11-13; 1.3 VI 21-25; 1.4 VIII 29-34; 1.5 II 8-9; 1.6 III 24; and 1.16 I 38; and probable in *KTU*[2] 1.1 III 4-6 and 1.14 V 29-33. Allowing for the poetic "staircase" pattern, the structure of *KTU*[2] 1.16 VI 28-29 also falls under this rubric. The broken passage *KTU*[2] 1.7 25-26 may belong here as well.

[362]*KTU*[2] 1.4 V 12.

[363]*KTU*[2] 1.2 I 33.

« R » component in morphological terms, and the latter not so. Even in the case of the first pattern, however, the parallel with the epistolary « R » component is not perfect: though the compositional constituents are the same, their order is not.[364]

On the micro-compositional level, the macro-pattern « *rgm l* N_R » presents two variant patterns. The more common is (1) « *rgm l* ID »,[365] occurring in circumstances where the social relationship between the sender of the message and the intended recipient is either contextually descending in nature,[366] or one of contextual parity.[367] The conceptual category which presents the closest parallel with this group in the epistolary corpus is that of UNMARKED letters. Ugaritic UNMARKED letters may or may not be "contextually descending", and present a similar micro-compositional pattern in the « R » component: « *l* ID *rgm* ». The other micro-compositional pattern falling under this category is only attested once: (2) « *rgm l* ID REL », which appears in a rather complicated, conceptually MIXED social context. Inasmuch as this passage

---

[364]In other words, both the epistolary « R » component and the literary « R » motifs described by the first pattern consist of three compositional elements: (1) the imperative *rgm*, (2) the preposition *l*, and (3) a noun phrase or phrases referring to the recipient, N_R. In the epistolary « R » component, the imperative follows the prepositional phrase; in the literary motif, the imperative comes first.

[365]This pattern is clear in *KTU*[2] 1.3 III 11-13; 1.3 VI 21-25; 1.4 VIII 29-34; 1.5 II 8-9; and 1.6 III 24; and plausible in *KTU*[2] 1.1 III 4-6; 1.7 25-26; and 1.14 V 29-33. *KTU*[2] 1.16 I 38 also belongs here, despite the apparent presence of a REL term in *åḫtk*, 'your sister'; this term is in fact an ID term, since it has nothing to do with the relationship between sender and recipient, but rather further defines the relationship between messenger and recipient. On the sequence « *l åḫtk* (personal name) » in an address formula, however, compare the second address formula in RS 94.2545+ (to be edited by P. Bordreuil *et al.*, *Textes ougaritiques 1994-2002* (in preparation).

[366]I have included the following here: (1) messages from Baʿlu to Kôṯaru (*KTU*[2] 1.3 VI 21-25; though perhaps this should be considered a relationship of parity?), (2) from ʾIlu to Šapšu (*KTU*[2] 1.6 III 24), (3) from ʾIlu to Kôṯaru (*KTU*[2] 1.1 III 4-6), and (4) from Kirta to his daughter *ṯtmnt* (*KTU*[2] 1.16 I 38). I am disregarding the identity of the messengers bearing the message.

[367]I include under this notion messages (1) from Baʿlu to ʿAnatu (*KTU*[2] 1.3 III 11-13), (2) from Baʿlu to Môtu (*KTU*[2] 1.4 VIII 29-34 and 1.5 II 8-9), and (3) from king PBL to KRT (*KTU*[2] 1.14 V 29-33). I have disregarded the identity of the messengers who carried the message.

reflects a conceptually ascending relationship between the sender and recipient,[368] this pattern is comparable to the corresponding pattern typical of the epistolary « R » component in conceptually ascending letters, namely, to the extent that in such situations the N_R element consists of « ID REL ». The partially preserved literary « R » motif in KTU 1.16 VI 28-29 also derives from an ASC BIO setting, and may also have displayed the equivalent of the pattern « *rgm l* ID REL ».[369]

The two remaining patterns, « *l yrgm l* N_R »[370] and « *rgm l* N_R »[371] (the verb *rgm* here is not an imperative) offer micro-compositional structures more or less comparable with the contextual distribution just described. The first pattern is found in a situation where the relationship between sender and recipient is terminologically unmarked though either contextually descending or contextually horizontal.[372] As in the similar situations described above, the N_R element here consists only of ID terms. The second pattern, however, is found in a context which may be characterized, at

---

[368]*KTU*[2] 1.2. I 16-17. The situation is complicated because the sender of the message, Yammu, qualifies his (primary) recipient, the god ʾIlu, as *åb*[*y*], 'my father' (for the restoration, compare the delivery scene in line 33) here, in the « R » component (thus an ASC BIO situation). In the « S » component, however, the sender but clearly intends to present himself as socially superior to his recipient by means of the DESC POW REL terms used there: *bʿlkm*, 'your (pl.) master' and *ådnkm* 'your lord'. However, the fact that the pronominal suffix is plural indicates that these REL phrases apply first and foremost, not to ʾIlu alone, but to the group alluded to by the phrase *pḫr mʿd*, 'the (divine) assembly'. Yammu does not specifically use the phrase *bʿlk*, 'your master' when addressing ʾIlu directly; his claim of lordship is intended rather in regard to the larger group of lesser deities. In this sense, the form of the « R » motif *rgm l ṯr åb*[*y*], 'Say to the Bull, [my] father' might be taken as genuinely reflecting the ASC BIO relationship between Yammu and ʾIlu, and, as such, comparable to the Ugaritic address formulas in ASC letters.

[369]I say "equivalent of the pattern" because this passage contains a "staircase" structure, which, when unraveled, may be understood in the terms described above.

[370]*KTU*[2] 1.4 V 12.

[371]*KTU*[2] 1.2 I 33.

[372]In *KTU*[2] 1.4 V 12, ʾAṯiratu commissions a message to be sent to Baʿlu.

least in part, as conceptually ASC BIO.[373] As in similar situations described above, the N_R element here consists of both ID and REL terms.

The data are admittedly too few to be conclusive, but the trend revealed here indicates both compositional similarities and differences between the Ugaritic literary « R » motifs and their epistolary counterparts. The main difference is to be found at the level of word order: in the literary motif the verb comes first, in the epistolary formula it comes last. The compositional similarity is to be found at the level of the micro-composition of the N_R element. In those few cases where the literary « R » motif contains both ID and REL terms, conceptual terminology of an ascending nature is also present. In those cases when the « R » motif contains only ID terms, the contextual relationship between sender and recipient, though terminologically unmarked, is often best understood as contextually descending. These two aspects find parallels in the distribution of compositional patterns of the epistolary « R » component.

1.4.3.3 The literary « S » motif

The corpus of Ugaritic mythological and epic texts contains nearly twenty occurrences of the literary « S » motif.[374] Since these occur not only in message

---

[373] *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 33 recounts the delivery of the message commissioned in *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 16-17: one of the recipients of Yammu's message is ʾIlu, whom the former qualifies with the REL term *ȧb*, 'father'. For the complicated social relationships involved in this scene, see the footnote above.

[374] I count a total of nineteen certain or probable « S » motifs, the majority of which are listed in G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (1981) 54-55, under his rubric « mensaje »: *KTU*[2] 1.1 II 17-18 (partially reconstructed); 1.1 III 5-6 (partially reconstructed); 1.2 I 17; 1.2 I 33-34; 1.3. III 13; 1.3. IV 7-8; 1.3 VI 24-25 (partially reconstructed); 1.4 VIII 32-34; 1.5 I 12-14; 1.5 II 10-11; 1.5 II 17-18; 1.6 IV 10-11; 1.7 26 (virtually entirely reconstructed); 1.14 III 21; probably 1.14 V 16-18 (virtually

commissions, as was the case with the « R » motifs, but also in message deliveries, the greater frequency of this motif is not surprising. Because the form and function of the « S » motif is identical in both message commissions and deliveries, these narrative settings have not been differentiated in the following survey. As above, it is helpful to classify the various attested « S » motifs by their composition, first at a macro-level, and then at a micro-level. Also as above, I have paid more attention to the « A » line than the « B » line in this motif.[375]

Where the composition may be perceived, all examples of the « S » motif exhibit the macro-compositional structure « *tḥm* N_S », 'message of N_S',[376] where N_S represents the noun phrase or phrases referring to the sender of the message. In this respect the composition of the literary « S » motifs is identical to that of its epistolary counterpart.

On the micro-compositional level, two patterns are attested: « *tḥm* ID » and « *tḥm* ID REL ». The presence of the former, « *tḥm* ID » is clear in eight passages,[377] and possible, though restored, in another two.[378] The presence of the latter, « *tḥm* ID

---

entirely reconstructed); 1.14 V 33 (partially reconstructed); 1.14 VI 3 (virtually entirely reconstructed); 1.14 VI 40-41; and probably 1.17 VI 54 (virtually entirely reconstructed).

[375]As above, it is the « A » line, as in « *tḥm* N_S », 'Message of N_S!', which presents a closer parallel to the epistolary « S » component in form and function. The typical « B » line, as in « *hwt* N_S », 'Word of N_S!', represents a semantic parallel.

[376]On biblical literary parallel « *nʾm* DN », 'saying of DN', see S. A. Meier, *Speaking of Speaking* (1992) 298-314.

[377]*KTU*[2] 1.3 III 13-14; 1.3 IV 7-8; 1.4 VIII 32-34; 1.5 I 12-14; 1.5 II 10-11; 1.5 II 17-18; 1.14 III 21; and 1.14 VI 40-41.

[378]The composition of the « S » motif in *KTU*[2] 1.3 VI 24-25 and 1.14 V 33 is unknown, but probably to be restored on the pattern « *tḥm* ID » in both cases. The former is usually reconstructed as recounting the commission of a message of Baʿlu to Kôṯaru, via the messengers typically associated with ʾAṯiratu, but such an arrangement seems odd (why would Baʿlu not have used his own messengers?). One wonders if the reading of col. vi, line 24 ought to be {tʳḥm¹ åʳṯr¹[t …] }, 'Message of ʾAṯira[tu …]'? The photo in Herdner, *CTA* (1963), pl. v, is not decisive.

REL », is clear in three passages,[379] and probable in two.[380] The four remaining « S » motifs are of unknown composition.[381]

For purposes of comparison with the epistolary formulas, the distribution of these two micro-patterns can be charted against the contextual relationships of the correspondents. In the eight passages where the pattern « *tḥm* ID » is certainly present, the contextual relationship between sender and recipient is neither one of explicit or acknowledged superiority or inferiority, but rather it seems to be one of contextual parity, and in some cases, active rivalry.[382] On the other hand, in all five passages where the pattern « *tḥm* ID REL » is certainly or probably present, the contextual relationship between the sender and the recipient contains an explicitly descending aspect, judging from the REL terms appearing in the N_S element.[383]

---

[379]*KTU*[2] 1.2 I 17; 1.2 I 33-34; and 1.6 IV 10-11.

[380]The composition of the « S » motif in *KTU*[2] 1.1 II 17-18 and 1.1 III 5-6 is unknown, but probably to be restored on the pattern « *tḥm* ID REL » in both cases (on the basis of context, and above all, the composition of the B-line: probably *hwt lṭpn ḥtkk*, 'Word of Luṭpānu, your sire', in both cases).

[381]The precise composition of *KTU*[2] 1.7 26; 1.14 V 16-18; 1.14 VI 3; and 1.17 VI 54 is unknown.

[382]Contextual parity is represented by *KTU*[2] 1.3. III 13-14 and 1.3. IV 7-8, which treat the sending of messages by Baʿlu to ʿAnatu. The presence of a rivalry in a relationship which seems to be essentially one of parity seems likely in *KTU*[2] 1.4 VIII 32-34; 1.5 I 12-14; 1.5 II 10-11; and 1.5 II 17-18, all of which treat the exchange of messages between Baʿlu and Môtu; and in *KTU*[2] 1.14 III 21 and 1.14 VI 40-41, which treat the exchange of messages between Kirta and Pabil. Given the narrative context in the latter two passages, it is conceivable that this relationship does not represent "contextual parity", but the social dominance of Kirta; even here, however, Kirta is not seeking hegemony *per se* over king Pabil: he has simply resorted to the use of force in order to acquire the latter's daughter in marriage.

[383]*KTU*[2] 1.6 IV 10-11 treats the sending of a message of ʾIlu to Šapšu, via ʿAnatu as an intermediary. *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 17 and 1.2 I 33-34 treat the commission and delivery of a message of Yammu to ʾIlu and the divine council. As noted above, the conceptual nature of the relationship between Yammu and ʾIlu is particularly complicated (ASC BIO, but DESC POW, judging from the terms used); the use of the plural pronominal suffix in the REL phrase in the N_S element (*bʿlkm*, 'your [pl.] master'), however, seems sufficient to indicate that Yammu is here claiming a superior status not so much with respect to ʾIlu individually, but with respect to the divine assembly, *pḫr mʿd*, as a whole.

Allowing a certain interpretive prudence in light of the small body data exploited here, the trend in usage appears to suggest that the pattern « *tḥm* ID REL » was appropriate in narrative contexts in which the sender sought to affirm or simply acknowledge his own superior social status with respect to the recipient. On the other hand, the distribution of the pattern « *tḥm* ID » suggests that it was appropriate when no such existing social hierarchy was perceived between the correspondents.

As above, with respect to the « R » motif, one may observe both similarities and differences between the Ugaritic literary « S » motifs and their epistolary counterparts. The similarity is to be found on the compositional level: in both corpora, the standard « S » component shows the macro-structure « *tḥm* N_S », attested in two main micro-compositional variants, « *tḥm* ID » and « *tḥm* ID REL ». The difference lies in the distribution of these two patterns. In the epistolary corpus, the former pattern was typical of contextually descending relationships; here, in the literary texts, where relationships of a descending nature are perceptible, the « S » motif follows the pattern « *tḥm* ID REL ».

1.5 *Sitz-im-Leben* of the Address formula

The purpose of this section is to present briefly some inferences regarding the *Sitz-im-Leben*, or contextual setting, of the address formula, based on a consideration of the internal and comparative data presented above. Two main aspects of this contextual setting will be explored: (1) the origins and (2) the usage of the address formula. By origin, I mean a consideration of the geographical and chronological

---

The pattern « *tḥm* ID REL » is probably also present in *KTU*[2] 1.1 II 17-18, in which ʾIlu sends a message to ʿAnatu; and in *KTU*[2] 1.1 III 5-6, in which ʾIlu sends a message to Kôṯaru.

history of the formula; and by usage I mean the situational context to which the formula alludes and in which it is appropriate.

1.5.1 Geographical and chronological background

This section is not so much concerned with the geographical and chronological history of epistolary address formulas in general, as it is with the particular compositional patterns found in the Ugaritic address formulas, in their particular distribution. In other words, the central concern here is the geographical and chronological distribution of the standard Ugaritic address formula, which employs three main micro-compositional patterns,[384] distributed over three main conceptual categories.[385]

Several sites have yielded epistolary corpora in which this pattern of composition and distribution for the address formula is statistically significant: Ras Shamra, Meskene (small sample), Ma□at Höyük, Boğazköy, and a significant portion of the Amarna corpus. Conversely, the epistolary corpora from a number of other sites do not present significant similarity to the Ugaritic corpus with respect to the composition and distribution of the address formula: Tell Atchana, various Levantine sites, Yorgan Tepe, Nippur, and the various sites yielding Middle Assyrian letters, such as Aššur and Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad.

The nature of epistolary texts, however, requires a further consideration, which is not always empirically observable: the provenance of the letters is usually different

---

[384]See above, section 1.2.4, "Inventory of compositional patterns for the address".

[385]See above, section 1.2.5, "Interpretation of the main compositional patterns".

from their find spot. For those archives which represent mainly domestic correspondence, such as Ma□at Höyük, this consideration has less importance than for those which contain a high proportion of incoming letters of international provenance, such as the Amarna corpus. In any case, a brief survey of the provenance of those letters which present address formulas comparable with the Ugaritic formulas in terms of composition and distribution would be helpful.

In the first place, of the corpora mentioned above which contain address formulas comparable to the Ugaritic, the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, the Meskene corpus, and the two Anatolian corpora (Ma□at and Boğazköy), all contain a significant amount of domestic correspondence. In these cases the composition and distribution of the address formula reflects the local epistolary protocol in the kingdom of Ugarit,[386] the land of Aštata,[387] and the kingdom of Ḫatti,[388] respectively.

Secondly, the corpora of Ras Shamra (Akkadian), Boğazköy, and Amarna also contain a significant amount of international correspondence.[389] For the address

---

[386]Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra, presenting an address formula consistent with the standard Ugaritic pattern, which derive from Ugarit itself, or at least from senders who are Ugaritians: RS 6.112, RS 17.239, RS 17.455, RS 19.070, RS 20.013.1, RS 20.013.2, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.178.1, RS 20.184, and RS 20.238. See the arguments given in J. Huehnergard, *Akkadian of Ugarit* (1989) 11-12, and the table on p. 329.

[387]Within the relatively small epistolary corpus from Tell Meskene, most of the letters appear to be domestic in nature; only a few suggest an international provenance, and these are from members of the Hittite political sphere: The sender of ME 57, {LUGAL}, 'the king', is probably the king of Carchemish; and Msk 7474+ is from an individual bearing the title {DUMU LUGAL}, 'king's son'.

[388]Virtually all of the Ma□at letters are domestic in nature, representing administrative and military correspondence between royal officials (including the king) in various Hittite centers in Anatolia. For domestic correspondance in the Boğazköy letters, see A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989), chapters 13-18.

[389]For a recent overview of the internation correspondence from Ras Shamra, see S. Lackenbacher, *RA* 89 (1995) 67-76; for Boğazköy, see Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989), chapters 20-22; and for Amarna, a perusal of the two volume work of M. Liverani, *Le lettere*

formulas of such international letters which show precise formal similarity with the Ugaritic address formulas in terms of composition and distribution, it seems that the scribes who produced these letters were also trained in, or at least familiar with, the same protocol as that found in the Ugaritic letters. This inference allows the geographical horizon for the usage of the address formula protocol standard at Ugarit to be expanded to include epistolary composition at a number of other sites. In the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, those address formulas of international letters which are consistent in terms of composition and distribution with the Ugaritic patterns derive from Carchemish,[390] from high-ranking officials within the Hittite realm,[391] from the Hittite emperor himself,[392] from Tarḫuntašša,[393] from Alašiya,[394] from the Levantine kingdoms of ʿAmqu,[395] Ušnatu,[396] Qadeš,[397] Amurru,[398] Ṣidon,[399] Beirut,[400] and from

---

di el-Amarna (1999), which presents the corpus by provenance, gives a useful illustration of their geographical diversity.

[390]RS 8.333, RS 16.003, RS 17.289, RS 17.292, RS 17.385, RS 20.022, RS 34.138,

[391]I refer here to the letters from individuals bearing the title {DUMU LUGAL}, 'king's son': RS 15.077, RS 17.247, RS 20.003, and probably RS 22.006.

[392]RS 17.130, RS 17.132, RS 17.133, RS 34.129,

[393]RS 34.139.

[394]RS 20.018.

[395]RS 17.397B+.

[396]RS 17.083, RS 17.143, RS 17.425, RS 34.158, probably RS 17.288, and probably RS 20.017.

[397]RS 20.016, RS 20.172, RS 34.146, and probably RS 20.200B.

[398]RS 17.152, RS 17.286, probably RS 16.111.

[399]RS 11.723, RS 34.149.

[400]RS 11.730, RS 34.137.

Emar in inland Syria.[401] In the Boğazköy corpus, comparable address formulas are found in letters from Egypt, from Amurru, and a few from Mittanni.[402] For the Amarna corpus, such letters derive from Arzawa in Anatolia, from Assyria, Babylonia, Mittanni, Alašiya, Amurru, and from a large number of local rulers of Levantine cities, especially Byblos.[403]

In terms of geographical provenance, then, the composition and distribution of the Ugarit address formula is not unique to the kingdom of Ugarit, but seems rather to be a feature of an epistolary protocol which was current throughout the "western periphery", or, put another way, in the Mediterranean centers of cuneiform learning. This pattern is not, however, documented for the Mesopotamian heartland; it is virtually absent from the roughly contemporary domestic correspondence yielded by sites like Nippur, Yorgan Tepe, Aššur, and Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad. If a Mesopotamian origin is to be proposed for the standard Ugaritic address formula, its empirical justification is not to be found in the available textual documentation.

Chronologically, the formula under discussion here is restricted to the Late Bronze Age. To my knowledge, none of the anterior cuneiform epistolary traditions present precise compositional and distributional parallels. Within the Late Bronze Age, one must acknowledge the chronological priority of the Ma□at and Amarna corpora, for example, over the Ugaritic corpus, though this need not, of course, imply that the Ugaritic tradition postdates these. On the contrary, the presence of strikingly similar literary versions of the address formula in Ugaritic mythological texts such as

---

[401]See the letters of Emariote provenance published by D. Arnaud in RSO 7 (1991) 65-78.

[402]See the references given above, section 1.4.2.3.3.

[403]See the references given above, section 1.4.2.4.1.5, section 1.4.2.4.2, and section 1.4.2.4.3.

the Ba‘lu Cycle and in the Kirta Text might be taken to suggest a longer history for the local Ugaritic epistolary form than is implied by the chronology of the letters themselves.

In short, the geographical and chronological origins of the Ugaritic address formula are not obvious. It is clear, however, that the Ugaritic pattern must be compared geographically with the epistolary traditions of the western periphery, and not, or at least not directly, with those of the Mesopotamian heartland. It is chronologically restricted to the Late Bronze Age, without precise demonstrable parallels in the anterior periods. Given this geographical and chronological framework and the political environment in which Ugarit found itself, a historical link between the Ugaritic tradition and the cuneiform traditions of the Hittites seems plausible, but until the origins of Hittite cuneiform culture itself are better understood,[404] it is difficult to characterize the address formula discussed here as an old Syrian pattern adopted by the Hittites, or *vice versa*, as a pattern employed by Hittite scribes and later adopted by the chancelleries of the Syrian kingdoms under their purview. In any case, nothing excludes the possibility of an long-standing indigenous Syrian epistolary tradition, of which the composition and distribution of the Ugaritic address formula would be one manifestation.[405]

---

[404]Compare the discussion of H. A. Hoffner, Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 25 (1992) 98-99, with references.

[405]Note, though, that the Ebla letters present another formal pattern for the address. The very existence of the Ebla archive, however, over a thousand years prior to the Ugaritic texts, amply illustrates the possibility of a long-standing native Syrian cuneiform tradition.

1.5.2 Situational context

1.5.2.1 The situational context of the « S » component

If the most obvious contextual function of the epistolary « S » component is to identify the sender of the letter, we can further nuance and refine our understanding of this function by an examination of the *Sitz-im-Leben*, or real-life contextual setting, in which the « S » component and its literary cousins were used.

Among the sources at our disposal for conceiving such a contextual setting and function of the « S » component, are: (1) the Ugaritic mythological texts, which contain a literary motif analogous to, and in some cases identical with, the epistolary « S » component;[406] and (2) the form and usage of the « S » component of the epistolary traditions of other languages of the ancient Near East, contemporaneous with, and/or linguistically related to, Ugaritic.[407]

In the context of Ugaritic poetic narrative, the « S » motif represents the prefatory words which the messenger speaks as he kneels or stands before the recipient of the message, immediately prior to beginning his recitation of the sender's message proper. In this sense, it is at once an integral part of, and yet exterior to, the message itself. This is illustrated by the fact that the « S » motif is found, in identical form, in narrative accounts of both the commissioning and the delivery of messages.

---

[406]See above, section 1.4.2. I will refer to the literary version of the « S » formula found in the myths as the "« S » motif", as a means of distinguishing it from the "« S » component" of the letters.

[407]See above, section 1.4.1, in which the Akkadian evidence from Ras Shamra, and the Hittite and Akkadian evidence from other roughly contemporary epistolary corpora are explored. The various Northwest Semitic epistolary traditions of the Iron Age are separated from Ugaritic corpus by several centuries, and numerous formal differences. These sources, as well as the Hebrew Bible, of which substantial parts probably derive from the Iron Age and which provides some data on the extra-epistolary usage of the Hebrew formula corresponding to the « S » motif, are nevertheless used on occasion in the paragraphs which follow.

The « S » motif is an integral part of the message in the sense that the exact message which the sender charges the messenger to "say" to the recipient begins not with a specific topic-oriented message, but with the « S » motif.

An illustration is provided by *KTU*[2] 1.3 III 11-14,[408] a passage in which the god Baʿlu commissions his messengers with a message for the goddess ʿAnatu. In this passage, the first thing that Baʿlu charges his messengers to say to ʿAnatu is the literary « S » motif: *tḥm ảlỉyn bʿl hwt ảlỉy qrdm*, 'Message of Mightiest Baʿlu, Word of the mightiest of warriors.' It is only immediately following these words that the specific topic-oriented message of Baʿlu actually begins. In another sense, however, the « S » motif is structurally external to the message. This aspect is illustrated by the account of the delivery of this same message, in *KTU*[2] 1.3 IV 5-8.[409] In this passage, Baʿlu's two messenger lads have made the journey to ʿAnatu, and when they begin speaking, they first respond to an anxious question which ʿAnatu posed to them on their appearance. In this sense it is they, the two lads themselves, who are having a direct conversation with ʿAnatu, rather than merely serving in their usual capacity as tertiary agents, mouthpieces as it were, in an indirect conversation between ʿAnatu and Baʿlu. The « S » motif here, which immediately follows the lads' response to ʿAnatu's question, represents this same narrative voice: it is the lads themselves who speak the « S » motif, not Baʿlu speaking through them. Only with the beginning of the specific topic-oriented message itself in line 8 does Baʿlu himself begin to speak, as it were, through the agency of a third party.

---

[408]The passage is cited in full above, in section 1.4.2.

[409]The passage is cited in full above, in section 1.4.2.

Another aspect of the contextual setting of the « S » component revealed by the usage of the literary « S » motif is the relative placement of the latter: it is always found after the « R » motif, if the « R » is present at all, and immediately before the specific topic-oriented message. This consistent placement after the « R » motif accords well with the apparent contextual function of both motifs in the myths: the « R » motif represents the sender's initial instructions to the messengers, prior to their departure, *chez* the sender, while the « S » motif represents the messenger's initial words to the recipient, upon their arrival *chez* the recipient. The necessary chronological sequence entailed by these contexts, that is, the fact that departure must precede arrival, naturally entails the consistent placement of « R » before « S ».

The fact that the Akkadian documents from Ras Shamra are not only contemporaneous with the Ugaritic literature, but were produced by the very same civilization, and in some cases, by even the same individual "bi-scriptal" scribes,[410] makes this literature the most important body of comparative material.[411] It is also fortuitous, since the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus is some respects richer and more diverse than the Ugaritic corpus. For example, the Akkadian equivalent of the Ugaritic epistolary « S » component, « *umma* N_S », is found not only in letters, but also in various other literary genres. These include such texts as edicts;[412] and also

---

[410]This has been made clear by W. van Soldt, ALASP 7 (1995) 183-186.

[411]See above, section 1.4.2.1.

[412]Edicts, or binding legal proclamations of the king, often begin with the « S » component: « *umma* N ». Compare RS 17.334 as representative of this genre, which begins {um-ma LUGAL-ma}, "Thus the king"; for this text see J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 4 (1956) 54-55, and pl. xliii. The edict itself, which follows the « S » component, is in the king's own words; that is, he himself is speaking, often in the first person. It is a message addressed not to one paticular party as in a letter, but rather to all concerned parties under his jurisdiction. The « *umma* N » formula introduces this direct speech; for those who hear the contents of this text secondhand, this formula signals the identity of the speaker, which, being the king himself, naturally entails a certain binding authority for the words. Whatever authority the

treaties[413] and judicial texts.[414] These extra-epistolary uses of the Akkadian « S » component shed more light on the formula's contextual setting: in all three genres, the motif « *umma* N_S » precedes the direct quotation of a speech made by the personage designated by the phrase « N_S ». For individuals physically separated from the actual pronouncement of this speech, the motif « *umma* N_S » provides an indication of who actually said the speech which followed.

In the cases of edicts and treaties, the « S » component introduces the statement or speech of a particular individual; and since that individual was often the king, the speech itself naturally had a certain amount of authority. However, it was not necessarily the form of the « S » component itself which conveyed any importance to the speech; it was rather the person of the speaker, « N_S », which gave the speech binding authority if such was present. When the king spoke, people listened; but there is no reason to believe that simply attaching the « S » component to the recital of the speech of "the man on the street" would have conveyed inherent importance to those words. This is illustrated not only by the presence of the « S » component in the

---

pronouncement had was not inherent in the *umma* element, but rather in the person of the "N" component.

[413]Treaties also often begin with « *umma* N ». Compare, as an example of this genre, RS 17.338, which begins {um-ma ^{d}UTU-ši ^{m}mu-ur-ši-li [LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR URU ḫa-at-ti . . .]}, "word (?) of the Sun, Muršili, [the Great King, the King of the land of the city of Ḫatti . . . .]"; for this text, see Nougayrol, *PRU* 4 (1956) 85-87, and pl. xlvii. As in the edicts, following the « S » component are the very words of the "Sun", in direct speech. In second-hand readings of the text, it would have been the « S » component which identified the speaker; and such an identification would no doubt have been an important factor in measuring whatever binding authority the speech carried.

[414]Unlike edicts and treaties, juridical texts do not begin with the « S » component, « *umma* N »; rather it is found on three occasions within the body of the text; so Huehnergard, *Akkadian of Ugarit* (1989) 209. Compare, as an example, RS 16.239, line 20, in J. Nougayrol, G. Boyer, and E. Laroche, *PRU* 3 (1955) 79-81, and pl. lxix, {š[a-ni-]tam um-ma ^{m}ÌR^{di}}, "Furthermore, (this is) the statement of ʿAbdu:" after which comes a verbatim statement which continues until line 25. On the implication of the genitive case after *umma*, see below, in the section on the grammatical analysis of the « S » component.

address formulas of explicitly ascending letters,[415] but also by the fact that the syntagm « *umma* N_S » also occurs in Akkadian in the recounting of verbatim statements.[416] In such cases it occurs immediately preceding the direct quotation, a usage consistent with that of edicts, treaties, juridical texts, and the epistolary address formula.

It is often pointed out that the phenomenon of prophecy borrows its vocabulary and conceptual setting from the milieu of messages and messengers,[417] the same conceptual setting to which the Ugaritic epistolary genre also bears witness. As such, it is not surprising that one should find, in the epistolary corpus and in prophetic texts alike, a formalized means of identifying the sender of the missive in question, be it an oral message, a written letter, or an oracle of perceived divine origin, corresponding to the structure here called the « S » component.

In the Hebrew Bible, one of the formulas which identify the "sender" of a prophetic "message" takes the form « *nʾm* N_S »,[418] where *nʾm* is a common noun

---

[415]See above, section 1.4.2.1.1.

[416]On this usage in the juridical texts, see above. I have found no such examples in the Akkadian epistolary corpus from Ras Shamra; the following examples have been drawn from Old Babylonian letters: see R. M. Whiting, *Old Babylonian Letters from Tell Asmar* (1987), no. 34, lines 20-22: {um-ma a-na-ku-ma / at-ta lu be-li-ma / a-na-ku lu wa-ra-ad-kà}, which Whiting translates as, "This is what I said: 'you are indeed my lord and I am indeed your slave' "; and lines 28-30: {um-ma a-na-ku-ma / a-dì ba-al-ṭá-ti / at-ta-ma lu be-el-ni}, "This is what I said: 'As long as you are alive, you are indeed our lord.' " Note that in these cases, the "N" element is represented by a personal pronoun (in the nominative), a usage which may be revealing for the broken Ug. passage RIH 78/03+, lines 16'-17': {(16') [...]⌈-⌉ . tḥm hy . klm . ḏrʿ (17') [...]⌈.⌉ b . ḥwt . ủgrt .}. In light of the parallel Akkadian usage with independent personal pronouns in the nominative case, perhaps this passage means, "This is what she said, 'All of the ḏrʿ-grain [...] in the land of Ugarit.' " Such a usage of the nominative following *tḥm* is inconsistent with an understanding of this syntagm, « *tḥm* N », as a construct chain.

[417]Compare, for example, S. Parpola, SAA 9 (1997) lxii, and n. 282; pp. lxiv-lxv, and nn. 289-290; and esp. no. 2.4, pp. 16-17; nos. 3.4-3.5, p. 25; and no. 5, p. 34.

[418]W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 87 (1942) 33, n. 7, made this observation: "Since *umma* is followed in Akkadian by a nominative, the construction is obviously influenced by Canaanite models such as

meaning 'announcement, utterance',[419] in a construct relation with N_S, a noun phrase or phrases identifying the sender of the message. It is thus structurally and semantically parallel to Ugaritic « *tḥm* N_S », western peripheral Akkadian « *UM-MA* N_S »,[420] or even one of the Middle Assyrian variants of the « S » component, « *ṭuppi* N_S », all of which might be translated 'Message of N_S'. Several passages in the Hebrew Bible point to a parallel in contextual usage as well, instances in which the formula « *nʾm* N_S » occurs immediately preceding the verbatim speech of the sender of a message, where its function is apparently to identify for the audience, who were not present at the actual commissioning of the message, the speaker of the words which follow. Some of the clearest examples include Is 56:8, Ps 110:1, and Zech 12:1; instances where poetically expanded[421] versions of « *nʾm* N_S » identify more explicitly N_S, the speaker whose words immediately follow. Other excellent examples may be found in

---

Ugaritic *tḥm* N, "message of N," Hebrew *nᵊʾûm* N, "utterance of N," which is prefixed to so many prophetic oracles."

[419]See L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *HAL* 2 (1995) 657-658.

[420]In standard Akkadian usage *umma* is an adverb, and is followed by a noun in the nominative case, "Thus N_S". See W. von Soden, *GAG* (1995), §121b. This (standard) version of the « S » component, « *umma* N_S » as "Thus N_S", is contextually analogous to the Western usage (in introducing the direct speech of N_S), but not precisely structurally so, since in this case *umma* does not denote a common noun in construct with N_S, but rather a sentence level adverb. Western scribes working in Akkadian, however, appear to have used the sign sequence {um-ma} as a logogram of sorts, denoting not the Akkadian adverb expressed by the contemporary phonetic value of those signs, but rather a common noun, meaning 'message' or the like. Hittitologists have labelled such usages in Hittite texts as "Akkadograms", and denote them in transcription with italicized upper case letters. Such a convention was followed by P.-R. Berger, *UF* 1 (1969) 218; but note the objections to its appropriateness by A. Rainey, *IOS* 5 (1975) 22-23, n. 25. On the general phenomenon of *umma* followed by a noun in the genitive case, see L. Matouš, *AnOr* 24 (1957) 381; Huehnergard, *Akkadian of Ugarit* (1989) 144-145, 209; W. L. Moran, *Amarna Letters* (1992) xxii, n. 52; and A. F. Rainey, *CAT* 2 (1996) 174-180; all with anterior bibliography. Note especially the parallel Hittite usage, outlined by A. Goetze in R. Marcus, *JCS* 2 (1948) 224.

[421]Such poetic parallelism is the single most significant structural feature of Hebrew poetry as well as Ugaritic. See D. Pardee, *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism* (1988) xv-xvi and 168-201; S. Parker, *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition* (1989) 7; and [Watson, 1999 #282] 169-185.

Num 24 and 2 Sam 23, two passages where it is not difficult to remove the rather transparent editorial framework around several discrete literary units; these literary units constitute "messages"[422] which begin with the formula « *nʾm* N_S ». In these cases, as in the Ugaritic and Akkadian examples of « S » components, the formula « *nʾm* N_S » represents the "voice" of a third party, be he messenger or scribe, giving the identity of the person whose verbatim speech he is about to convey to an audience which was not physically present during the "actual" recital, or commissioning, of the message. Also, as in the case of the Ugaritic and Akkadian « S » components, the formula immediately precedes the verbatim speech. In the remaining occurrences of the Hebrew formula « *nʾm* N_S », its function remains the same: to identify the sender of the message in question for the audience who was not physically present at the commission; but the placement of the formula has changed: it often occurs in the middle or at the end of the message whose sender it would identify. I interpret such usages as a later literary or poetic stylistic feature, quite analogous to the placement of the English phrase « N_S said » in the middle or at the end of a quotation of direct speech in narrative prose or poetry.

With these structural, semantic, and contextual parallels from Ugaritic literary texts; Ras Shamra Akkadian edicts, treaties, and juridical texts; and Hebrew prophesy, I have hoped to illustrate that the Ugaritic « S » component is not purely epistolary in origin or usage, but develops out of the wider context of indirect or tertiary communication, that is, communication via messenger.

---

[422]"Messages" in the broadest sense; in the Balaam story, these units could more accurately be described as "oracles"; in 2 Sam, as a "testament".

1.5.2.2 The situational context of the « R » component

The obvious practical function of the epistolary « R » component is to identify the intended recipient of the letter. Further light on the usage and possible origin of the « R » component comes from an examination of the *Sitz-im-Leben*, or the real life contextual setting, which gave rise to the formula. Form critically, the « R » component does not appear to have been a strictly literary phenomenon.[423] One insight into its contextual setting comes from the Ugaritic mythological texts, where one encounters a literary motif, formally and functionally parallel to the « R » component, which treats the commissioning of messages. The similarity between the epistolary « R » component and its literary counterpart, which, for the sake of clarity, I will refer to as a motif rather than a component, suggests that the contextual function of the « R » motif in the myths can provide an illustration of the contextual usage of the « R » component in actual communication, whether or not of an epistolary nature. In the myths, the « R » motif represents part of the introductory instructions which the sender gives to his messenger(s), prior to reciting the message itself. As in the case of the epistolary « R » component, the purpose of these instructions is to inform the messenger(s) of the identity of the intended recipient of the message.[424] The commissioning of Baʿlu's message to ʿAnatu in *KTU*[2] 1.3:III.11-14 may serve as an

---

[423]See the comments of S. E. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies* (1980) 256, with anterior bibliography (originally published in Hebrew: *Lešonenu* 32 [1968] 27-35).

[424]Another imperative in the mythological texts which the sender typically gives to the messenger(s) prior to reciting the actual message is the command to fall prostrate in obeisance at the feet of the recipient (or explicitly not to do so, as in *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 11-19). The relevance of this literary motif to the *Sitz-im-Leben* of the epistolary prostration formula will be explored in detail below, in the section dealing with the prostration formula.

example.[425] In this passage, Baʿlu is speaking to his messengers, directing them to deliver the message which follows to ʿAnatu. The formal similarity of this literary motif with the epistolary « R » component is obvious: an imperative of the verb RGM, 'to speak', and a prepositional phrase expressing the indirect object of this verb.[426] In its literary version, the imperative of the « R » motif is addressed by the sender to the messenger(s); such would naturally apply to the epistolary « R » component as well.[427] As such, the « R » component is the only element of epistolary composition which alludes overtly to the third party, that is, the messenger,[428] by means of whom the message itself was conveyed from sender to recipient.

---

[425]The passage is cited in full above, in section 1.4.2. That these lines contain a commission, and not a delivery, is clear since the account of the actual delivery of this same message appears later on, in col. IV, lines 7-20. Note, however, that in the delivery of this message, the « R » motif is not present.

[426]The only significant structural differences between the epistolary « R » component and the literary « R » motif are (1) the poetic expansion of the literary « R » motif by the addition of a synonymously parallel phrase, namely « *tny l* N_R », and (2) a different word order in the literary « R » motif, namely the placement of the verb before its prepositional complement; see above, section 1.4.3.2. Poetic expansion is not surprising since such parallelism is the single most distinctive feature of Ugaritic poetry; for a recent overview of Ugaritic poetry, see Watson, *HUS* (1999) 165-192. The difference in word order can be explained in at least two ways: (i) the difference reflects the genre difference between poetry and prose, or (ii) the word order in the epistolary « R » component has been influenced by other traditions which carry a verb-final order, namely the southern Mesopotamian epistolary tradition (in this case, Akkadian).

[427]Thus the early observation of J. M. Munn-Rankin, *Iraq* 18 (1956) 98: "this was a command to the messenger who delivered the tablet." But contrast the alternate proposal of J. Friedrich, *AfO* 10 (1935-1936) 80, who had allowed the possibility that the imperative was addressed to "the personified letter itself": "Die Adresse [ist gerichtet] . . . an den Boten, der den Brief überbringt, oder an den personifizierten Brief selbst. . . ;" a suggestion which is adopted by A. L. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 144. S. A. Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 194, defends a different interpretation, made by J. Marty, *Mélanges Dussaud* (1939) 845-846, understanding the imperative form in the « R » component to be addressed to the scribe, *chez* the recipient, whose task it was to read the letter.

[428]The bibliography on messengers and their role in epistolary and oral communication is large. A fairly recent comprehensive treatment, with extensive text citations and bibliography, is Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988). A recent summary treatment is G. H. Oller, *CANE* 3 (1995) 1465-1473, with a fair amount of anterior bibliography on pp. 1472-1473; and some further

Another literary motif resembling the epistolary « R » component also appears occasionally in Ugaritic narrative; it appears in narrative accounts of the delivery of a message. Unlike the « R » motif in the commission, however, this motif is less relevant to the *Sitz-in-Leben* of the epistolary « R » component. Consider *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 33'-34':

KTU[2] 1.2 I (33', cont'd) rgm . l ṯr . åbh . ỉl .	*ragamā lê-ṯôri ʾabī-hu ʾili*
tḥm . ym . bʿlkm (34') [åd]⌈n⌉km . ṯpṭ . nhr	*taḥmu yammi baʿli-kumu*
	[*ʾadā*]*ni-kumu ṯāpiṭi nahari*

'They said to the Bull, his (i.e., Yammu's) father, ʾIlu:
"Message of Yammu, your master,
(message of) your [lo]rd, Judge Naharu: ' « MESSAGE » ' " '

In this passage, the narrative describes the actions of the messengers, having already arrived at their destination, and as they stand[429] before the intended recipient of the letter. In this example and cases like it, the subject of the verb *rgm* is the two messengers, and the time reference is narrative, describing events as having already occurred: 'they said'. This being the case, the form of the verb must be the suffix conjugation. Thus, the usage of this motif is not parallel to the epistolary « R » component, for the letter was necessarily composed before it was delivered to the recipient, and the literary motif used for the delivery applies only after the messengers

---

bibliographical references, often with particular relevence to the Ugaritic data, may be found in G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (1981) 55, n. 78; and in J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 241-242.

[429]They do not kneel in prostration because, when receiving their commission, they were told not to do so. This situation probably derives from the context of Yammu's political struggle for supremacy. On this issue, see M. S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* 1 (1994) 287-288, with anterior bibliography.

have arrived at their destination. Furthermore, unlike the « R » motif in the commission, the « *rgm l* N_R » motif is not an essential element of the delivery, as illustrated by its absence from the delivery of Baʿlu's message to ʿAnatu in *KTU*[2] 1.3 IV 5. This absence is an indication that the « R » motif is in some sense external to the actual message: in the myths it was addressed first and foremost to the messengers, not to the intended recipient of the message.

Accepting this approach to the *Sitz-im-Leben* of the « R » component as valid, one can view the « R » component not as an integral part of the message, but rather as an introductory element, prefatory to the message itself. In light of the usage of the corresponding motif in the Ugaritic literary texts, one can even pose the question of whether the « R » motif was actually recited aloud when the letter was read before the recipient, for in the myths, the « R » motif is not recited when the message is delivered. However, one key difference between the literary « R » motif and the epistolary « R » component hints nevertheless at a positive answer to this question, despite the evidence from the myths. In the myths the order of mention in the address is fixed, it is always « RS »; in letters one encounters the order « SR » as well as the order « RS ». Since, as I will argue below, the « S » component actually was recited aloud before the recipient, common sense seems to require, at least in addresses of the order « SR », that the « R » component was recited aloud as well. Would the scribe have stopped his recitation after the « S » component, skipped silently over the « R » component, and then resumed reading aloud the portion which followed? Such seems intuitively unlikely. Further, if the « R » component was recited aloud in addresses of the « SR » order, one might venture to suppose it was also recited aloud in addresses of the « RS » order. In this respect, therefore, I propose that the contextual usage of the epistolary « R » component differed from its literary counterpart.

1.5.2.3 The address formula in its epistolary usage

If the contextual setting of the literary « S » and « R » motifs seems more or less evident, the concurrent usage of these two motifs in the epistolary address formula would seem to represent a certain departure from these origins. Unlike the literary corpus, in which the « R » motif necessarily precedes the « S » motif, the epistolary corpus presents a variable order for these components, this order being conditioned by the nature of the social relationship between the correspondents. To a certain extent, this must represent a reanalysis of the contextual setting, especially of the « R » component. No longer does the « R » component represent the sender's initial instructions to the messengers, prior to their departure; such an origin has become secondary to the emphasis on expressing in graphic form the social differences between the correspondents, manifested by the order of mention of the two components: « SR » or « RS ». In fact, the double address formula as a whole would seem, at least in Ugaritic epistolary usage, to have assumed a similar contextual function as that attributable to the literary « S » motif: a sort of formulaic heading which identifies, for those who were not present at the actual commissioning of the message, not only the speaker of the words which follow, but also the party to whom they are to be addressed.

Furthermore, the formal uniformity observable not only in the corpus of Ugaritic epistolary address formulas, but in all of the contemporary cuneiform epistolary corpora, and especially those of the western periphery, implies, I believe, that the address formula was not actually pronounced by the sender in dictating the letter. Rather, it would seem to be the result of a rigorous scribal training: the

composition and distribution of the standard Ugaritic address formula was learned by apprentice scribes in the course of their training,[430] and mechanically inserted by professional scribes in the course of the redaction of actual messages. Had the address formula represented the actual words of the sender, it is difficult to explain why the same formal pattern would be so widespread in time and space.

1.6 Grammatical analysis

The paragraphs which follow deal respectively with the problems surrounding (1) the syntactic relationship between the « S » and « R » components, and the grammatical analyses of (2) the « S » component and (3) the « R » component.

1.6.1 Preliminaries

1.6.1.1 The syntactic independence of « S » and « R »

That the two components of the standard Ugaritic address formula, namely « R » and « S », are syntactically independent from each another, and are thus two components of a "double" formula rather than constituent parts of a single syntactically integrated formula,[431] is suggested by three factors: (1) the occasional presence of a

---

[430]Certain "form letters" such as RS 16.265 and RS 94.2273 may represent such exercises.

[431]This is by far the consensus among students of Ugaritic epistolography: O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 11-13; S. W. Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 69-75 *passim*, but especially p. 72 (on Akkadian letters), and pp. 108-115 *passim*, but especially pp. 110-111 (on Ugaritic letters); A. L. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 144; and A. Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), col. 1414; and J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989), *passim* in his translations. Compare the remarks of D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 2 (RS 1.018), remarques épistolographiques: " La comparaison avec les documents épistolaires en accadien — de Ras Shamra et d'autres sites et d'autres époques — est utile pour déterminer la fonction syntaxique de *tḫm* dans la *praescriptio* ougaritique. La place du nom commun qu'est *tḫm* est rempli en accadien par l'adverbe *umma*, le premier mot du message tel qu'il est prononcé devant le messager. On en conclura

horizontal scribal line placed between the « R » and « S » components,[432] (2) the syntactically independent nature of these two components in formally parallel epistolary traditions, especially in the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra,[433] and (3)

---

que *tḫm* aussi fonctionnait comme le premier mot du message et qu'il était toujours au nominatif, que sa position dans la phrase, avant ou après RGM, est sans importance pour son analyse morphologique. La traduction des deux principales formes d'adresse sera donc : « Message de NP^1 : à NP^2 dis : MESSAGE » et « A NP^1 dis : message de NP^2 : MESSAGE », et on n'admettra pas la traduction/analyse suivante de la seconde formule, celle qui se trouve dans ce texte-ci : « A NP^1 dis le message de NP^2 : MESSAGE ».”

[432]The presence of a scribal line placed between the « R » and « S » components in the address formulas of RS 1.018, RS 16.264, and RS 34.148, suggests an underlying syntax in which these two components are independent from each another. On the use of scribal lines to mark syntactic breaks in the letters, compare S. Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 60-69 (on the use of scribal lines in the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra), and pp. 104-108 (on the same in the Ugaritic letters); J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 248; and *idem*, *HUS* (1999) 362. One must, however, also take note of the occasional “misplaced” scribal lines, one of which occurs, for example, later on in RS 16.264, between lines 5-6; and also in RS 94.2479, between lines 11-12. Such counter-examples, though, are by far the exception rather than the rule, and the statistically preponderance of scribal lines used to mark syntactic breaks allows us a certain optimism in interpreting their function.

Such a means of graphically separating the « S » and « R » components is also known in the Boğazköy epistolary corpus, and especially in the Egypt-Ḫatti correspondence, for which see E. Edel, *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi* (1994); and in at least one letter from Emar, Msk 7441, for which see D. Arnaud, Emar 6:1 (1985) 182, and D. Arnaud, Emar 6:3 (1986), no. 264, p. 261. This usage may also occur in the Ras Shamra Akkadian letter RS 19.006; see Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 61. In the published transcription, the scribal line is not indicated, but in the hand copy, the scribal line seems to be not so much following line 2, {[qí]-bí-ma}, as superimposed upon it; see J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 6 (1970), no. 1, p. 2; and pl. 1.

[433]The weight of precise structural parallels between the Ugaritic epistolary formulas and the Akkadian and Hittite comparative corpora discussed above (section 1.4.2), especially the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, suggests that the syntax of the address formula in Ugaritic matched that of these Akkadian and Hittite letters. Were the Ugaritic address formula a syntactically integrated whole, the entire « S » element ought to be a noun phrase functioning as the direct object of the verb *rgm* in the « R » component. In the Akkadian and Hittite comparative corpora, however, the « R » and « S » components of the address formula are best understood as syntactically separate, since the « S » component begins with the string {um-ma}, which, superficially at least, is the Akkadian clause level adverb *umma*, normally translated ‘thus’ (one may imagine *umma* as a sort of “pro-form”, which alludes to the entire epistolary message following the address formula). Note, however, the many examples of *umma* followed by « N_S » in the genitive case in the « S » component of western peripheral Akkadian letters; on this usage, see below in the syntactic analysis of the « S » component. Note also the occasional peripheral Akkadian letter in which the « S » and « R » components are separated from one another by a scribal line; see the above footnote.

evidence from the Ugaritic literary texts, where one finds two distinct poetic motifs formally related to the two components of the epistolary address formula.[434]

A. Caquot has suggested a different syntactic division for the certain versions of the address, specifically pertaining to the interpretation of the « R » component.[435] He translates addresses of the « SR » order as follows: "message de N à N'. Dis", implying a syntactic break between the elements « *l* N_R » and « *rgm* » in such addresses. In his understanding of the syntax of addresses of the « RS » order, however, Caquot is consistent with the majority of Ugaritic scholarship; he translates such addresses as "à N dis : message de N'." One must raise the at least three objections against Caquot's translation of addresses of the « SR » order: (1) If the sequence « *l* N_R *rgm* » represents a syntactically unified utterance when it occurs before the sequence « *tḥm* N_S », that is, in addresses of the « RS » order, one wonders why such should not be the case when this same sequence, « *l* N_R *rgm* », happens to be placed after « *tḥm* N_S », that is, in addresses of the « SR » order. The components are the same; merely their order has changed. (2) As mentioned above, we have one example of an address of the « SR » order which does mark the syntactic break between « S » and « R » with a scribal line, RS 16.264: { (1) tḥm . rgm (2) mlk . | (3) l ḥyʾl }. Despite the fact that this particular address is non-standard,[436] the placement of

---

[434]See above, section 1.4.3. The different distribution of these motifs, the different contextual settings in which they appear, and the poetic expansion observable in their composition all imply the syntactic independence of the « R » and « S » motifs.

[435]Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), col. 1414.

[436]This address is unique in two ways: (1) instead of the standard « *tḥm* N_S », the internal structure of the « S » component of RS 16.264 is « *tḥm rgm* N_S »; and (2) instead of the standard « *l* N_R *rgm* », the « R » component of this letter lacks the verbal element *rgm*. D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), RS 16.264, remarques épistolographiques, n. 2, comments as follows: "Quoi qu'on pense de la place de *rgm* dans la formule, il ne s'agit certainement pas de l'absence total du mot, comme le laisse croire la présentation par Ahl (*Epistolary Texts* [1973] 115) de ce texte parmi

the scribal line, between « *tḥm rgm* N_S » and « *l* N_R », nevertheless argues against a translation of this address as "Message (containing) the word of the king to Ḥayya-ʾIlu." Rather, the scribal line seems to require a syntactic break: "Message (containing) the word[437] of the king: To Ḥayya-ʾIlu." If this letter is representative of the syntax of standard Ugaritic address formulas, the prepositional phrase « *l* N_R » ought to be syntactically separate from the noun phrase « *tḥm* N_S » there as well. (3) While freely admitting the tenuous value of negative evidence, if there were indeed a syntactic break between « *tḥm* N_S *l* N_R » and « *rgm* » in addresses of the order « SR », in light of the frequent use of horizontal scribal lines to mark such breaks, especially in the *praescriptio*, one wonders why we do not have a single such letter which has a scribal line marking the syntactic break between these elements. Even if the syntactic

---

ceux où fait défaut *rgm*." He appears to have misrepresented Ahl's view. She specifically refers to "the directive element rgm" (*ibid.*), by which she surely means *rgm* as an imperative verbal form, a standard element of the « R » component, and lacking, as she quite correctly observes, in the address of this letter. It is not feasible to understand *rgm* in this letter as an imperative; it must rather represent a novel element of the « S » component.

[437]Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), RS 16.264, remarques épistolographiques, has interpreted *rgm* here as a finite verbal form (in the suffix conjugation), and thus understands the « S » component to contain an unmarked relative clause ("Message (qu')a dicté le roi"). While such unmarked relative clauses do occur in Ugaritic (see Sivan, *GUL* [1997] 220-221), no known example of the « S » component contains a verbal element. In all unambiguous examples, the « S » component is a free-standing nominal phrase. Furthermore, an admittedly incomplete parallel between the « S » component here, « *tḥm rgm mlk* », 'message of the word of the king,' and the « S » components of many Neo-Assyrian royal letters may also be relevant. The « S » component of Neo-Assyrian royal letters frequently carries the forms: « *abat šarri* » and « *amat šarri* », 'word of the king'; and « *ṭuppu šarri* », 'tablet of the king'. On such Neo-Assyrian « S » components, see, for example, R. H. Pfeiffer, *JAOS* 43 (1923) 26; E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 81-82; *CAD* 1:2 (A, part 2) (1968) 37; S. Parpola, SAA 1 (1987) 4-12; and S. W. Cole and P. Machinist, SAA 13 (1998) 4-6. The semantic parellel between Ugaritic *rgm mlk* and Akkadian *amat šarri* (and variants) presents another argument for understanding the *rgm* element in RS 16.264 not as a verb, but as a common noun, **rigm-*, meaning "word." For a history of the interpretation of *rgm* in this letter, see Pardee, *ibid.*

break between (standard) « R » and « S » is marked with a scribal line only very rarely, such occurrences are at least attested.[438]

1.6.1.2 One "double formula" or two independent formulas?

Granted that the « R » and « S » components are syntactically independent utterances, one might ask why they should be treated together at all, as components of a larger formula under the potentially cumbersome rubric of "double formula of address," as opposed to separately, as independent epistolary formulas in their own right.[439] Such a question of classification, however, is not particularly crucial for an understanding of the structure, function, and meaningful variations encountered in the formulas themselves; it is rather a question of organizational convenience and even personal preference, and perhaps a largely arbitrary one at that. My reasons for choosing the former method of presentation, namely, that of treating these two semi-independent formulas together as the "double formula of address" are as follows: (1) the statistical preponderance of instances where these two are found immediately adjacent to one another (that is, not separated by other components) and at the very beginning of a letter; (2) the fact that neither constitutes an integral part of the message itself, properly speaking, but rather both together constitute a sort of preamble or orientation, included for the practical benefit primarily of the party who actually delivered the message, and for the party receiving the message (it always

---

[438]Three times in Ugaritic: RS 1.018, RS 16.264, and RS 34.148 (see above). Note also this same feature in the RS Akkadian letter RS 19.006, and in the Emar (Akkadian) letter Msk 7441. On this topic, see Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 60-69 and 104-108.

[439]This was C. H. Gordon's early solution, in *Ugaritic Literature* (1949) 116.

helps to know who is talking to whom); and (3), though there are a handful of instances in which the scribes placed a horizontal line between the « R » and « S » components (as mentioned above), in the vast majority of cases these two components were grouped together in a section all their own at the beginning of the tablet, and separated from what followed by a horizontal line.[440]

1.6.2 The grammatical analysis of the « S » component

The only significant problem in the morpho-syntactic analysis of the Ugaritic « S » component is the word *tḥm*. All unambiguous inner Ugaritic evidence for *tḥm* suggests that the word is a common noun: (1) in poetic texts it is paralleled by "B-terms" which are best understood as common nouns,[441] (2) in both poetic and non-poetic texts the word often carries pronominal suffixes,[442] and (3) such an understanding as a common noun best fits the overall grammatical and semantic context of the passages. S. Ahl also envisions the possibilities that *tḥm* is a third person masculine singular verb or an adverb.[443] Against the verbal understanding, it

---

[440]See above, and Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 60-69 and 104-108.

[441]The parallel between *tḥm* and its "B-word", *hwt*, 'word', in the literary « S » motif in *KTU*^{2} 1.6:IV.10-11 (and parallels) was recognized very early by D. H. Baneth, *OLZ* 35 (1932), col. 452; he translated *tḥm* as "Spruch" and *hwt* as "Wort". On the Ugaritic common noun *hwt*, apparently written as {ú-[P]I!?-[t]u$_4$} in the Ugaritic column of the polyglot vocabulary RS 20.189, in the row for which the Sumerian and Akkadian entries are reconstructed as [MU] and [*zikru*], respectively, see E. Laroche, *UF* 11 (1979) 477-480; and especially J. Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 120-121. Note also the parallel between the form *tḥmk*, 'your *tḥm*', and *ḥkmk*, 'your wise utterance (?)', in the literary "flattery" motif in *KTU*^{2} 1.3 V 29-30 (and parallels).

[442]The passage most directly relevant is epistolary, RS 17.434+, line 5: { | (5) ky . lik̀t . bt . mlk . tḥmk [.] hl⌜n⌝[...]}, '(As for the fact) that you sent your message to the royal palace, now then [. . .]'. See A. Caquot, *Ugaritica* 7 (1978) 123; and the collation and reconstruction of the text by D. Pardee, *AfO* 29-30 (1983-1984). Note also the form *tḥmk* in the literary motif in *KTU*^{2} 1.3 V 29-30.

[443]Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 112.

must be pointed out that there is no unequivocal evidence for a verbal root TḤM in Ugaritic.[444] As for *tḥm* as an adverb, since any common noun may be used adverbially, this being one of the (many) functions of the accusative case,[445] such is a theoretical possibility, though a nominative inflection of the noun seems more likely.

Accepting the status of *tḥm* as a common noun, the internal syntax of the « S » component must consist of two noun phrases bound together in the construct relation, with the second noun phrase, namely, the N_S element, being in the genitive case. The case inflection of the first noun phrase, namely, the common noun *tḥm*, should be nominative, consistent with the syntax of other such free-standing nominal phrases,[446] such as those used as headings in administrative lists[447] and titles in some ritual

---

[444]Incidently, this was the early interpretation of C. Virolleaud, *Syria* 12 (1931) 355-356, in translating the string *tḥm åliyn bʿl hwt* in *KTU*[2] 1.6:IV.10-11 (and parallels) as "Aleïn Baal a fixé le *hwt*." On the lack of an etymological relationship between Ugaritic *tḥm* and the proto-Semitic root TḪM, however, as in the Syriac common noun *tᵊḥūmā*, 'border', see below.

[445]See J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), §54.133.2, pp. 310-313; and D. Sivan, *GUL* (1997) 178.

[446]C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (1998 [1965]) #345], §13.2, groups phrases of this type under the rubrique of the "simple existential sentence", which he describes as follows: "The simplest sentences are nominal, expressing existence, and consisting of only one member."

[447]Compare, as an example, the heading of RS 10.090 (*KTU*[2] 4.53), lines 1-2: {(1) mḏrǵlm . d ỉnn (2) msgm . lhm | }, '*Mḏrǵl*-personnel who have no *msg*-items:' A list of personal names follows. In its contextual role as a heading, one may reconstruct the vocalization of the word *mḏrǵlm* in the nominative: /**maḏraǵalūma*/. For the (re)publication of this text, see A. Herdner, *CTA* (1963) 209-210, fig. 185, and pl. lxvi. That such free-standing nominal phrases were conceived in the nominative case is clear from (1) examples of headings written in syllabic script, and (2) examples of headings in alphabetic script where the quality of the case vowel is illustrated by a {ủ} sign. For the former group, compare RS 11.602 (*CTA* 71, *KTU*[2] 4.68), a list of towns with numbers, followed by a list of professions with numbers. On the left edge of the tablet is a free-standing nominal phrase, written in logo-syllabic script, which functions as the "heading" of the list: {(76) ṭup-pu ERÍN.MEŠ ša (77) GIŠ.BA[N].MEŠ}, "Tablet (containing a list) of archers". Another example is RS 18.102 (*PRU* 5:34, *KTU*[2] 4.381), where the heading, though broken, begins {(1) ṭup-pu Ì.MEŠ ⌜-l⌝[...]}, "Tablet of oil [...]." The nominative case vowel carried by the first word of these headings, *ṭuppu*, illustrates the syntax of such free-standing nominal phrases in Akkadian, and by extension, in Ugaritic. For the examples in alphabetic script, compare RS 18.080A (*PRU* 5:78, *KTU*[2] 4.371), a list of personal names bearing the

texts.[448] This syntactic similarity between the « S » component and headings and titles in other text genres agrees well with the contextual role of the « S » component itself as a "heading", introducing the speech of the sender.

The single datum that causes some pause in this analysis is the fact that the internal syntax of the « S » component in the corresponding Akkadian and Hittite epistolary corpora is not superficially identical with the syntax of the Ugaritic version proposed here.[449] This is surprising in light of the widespread morpho-syntactic parallels in other components of the epistolary formulary. In the standard Akkadian version of « S », « *umma* N_S », the first element, *umma*, is not a common noun referring to the actual message itself, as is Ugaritic *tḥm*, but rather a deictic particle, adverbial in meaning, and often translated, "thus."[450] In this sense, the standard Akkadian « S » component cannot be understood as precisely parallel to the Ugaritic « S » component on the morpho-syntactic level, as is the case with the Akkadian and Ugaritic versions of the « R » component (see below): the internal structures of Akkadian « *umma* N_S », 'thus N_S' (with N_S in the nominative case), and Ugaritic « *tḥm* N_S », 'the message of N_S' (with N_S in the genitive case) are morphologically distinct.

---

heading {(1) rišym . qnùm}, "People from *Raʾšu* (who are) *qannāʾūma*." On this (standard) usage of the nominative case, compare J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), §54.131, p. 308.

[448]Compare, as an example, the title of the ritual RS 34.126 (*KTU*^{2} 1.161), line 1: {(1) spr . dbḥ . ẓlm}, 'Document of the sacrifice(s) of the shades:' As a title of the entire ritual, one may vocalize the word *spr* in the nominative: /**sipru*/. See P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, RSO 7 (1991), no. 90, pp. 151-163.

[449]See above, section 1.4.1.2. Compare J.-L. Cunchillos, *HUS* (1999) 362: "The noun *tḥm*, 'message', differentiates the Ugaritic formula from contemporary Akkadian formulae (El Amarna and even Ugarit itself) which begin with *umma*, 'thus'."

[450]Compare W. von Soden, *GAG* (1995), §121.b, "folgendermassen".

Akkadian usage at Ugarit and other centers in the West, however, is significantly different from standard Akkadian with respect to the word *umma*.[451] In Western peripheral Akkadian, the particle *umma* in the « S » component is followed by the N_S element in the genitive case rather than the nominative, a usage which aligns perfectly with our understanding of the internal syntax of the Ugaritic « S » component.[452] In the « S » component of Hittite letters as well, some have claimed that the "Akkadogram" *UM-MA* is followed by the N_S element in the appropriate grammatical inflection for expressing the genitive relation.[453] On the basis of the genitive inflection on the N_S element, we can suppose that the scribes of Ugarit and other western centers, when composing a letter in Akkadian, apparently had a common noun, meaning 'word, message', or the like, in mind when using the sign sequence {um-ma} in the « S » component of a letter. The alleged Hittite parallel cited by A. Goetze,[454] in KBo V 2, a text in which an apparent parallel of the « S » component occurs two times, once in the form « *UM-MA* N_S » and a second time in the colophon in the form « *A-WA-AT* N_S », might suggest that this western tradition, in which the *umma* element of the « S » component was understood as denoting a

---

[451]In addition to Ugarit, this observation applies to many of the Amarna letters sent from Levantine cities, as recognized by W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 87 (1942) 33, n. 7, and R. Marcus, *JCS* 2 (1948) 224; many of the Amarna letters sent from Mittanni, on which see A. F. Rainey, *CAT* 2 (1996) 176; and those from Alašiya, on which see P.-R. Berger, *UF* 1 (1969) 218.

[452] J. Huehnergard, *Akkadian of Ugarit* (1989) 144-145, n. 112; W. L. Moran, *Amarna Letters* (1992) xxii, n. 52; and A. F. Rainey, *CAT* 2 (1996) 174-180.

[453]See the comments of A. Goetze in Marcus, *JCS* 2 (1948) 224. H. A. Hoffner, Jr., however, has expressed (personal communication) strong reservations about interpreting the "stem forms" of Hittite nouns as "genitives".

[454]*Ibid.*

common noun meaning 'word' or the like, was operative there as well.[455] Apart from the Hittite evidence, to characterize this broad pattern of usage in Akkadian texts as a "misunderstanding" on the part of Western scribes[456] takes a prescriptive approach to language use that is misplaced in the modern study of Late Bronze Akkadian. At Ugarit at least, the scope and depth of Ugaritian scribal compositions in the Akkadian language[457] suggest that these ancient scholars knew that language quite well, perhaps even with something approaching the competence of a native speaker. Since anything close to native speaker competence in Akkadian is hopelessly beyond the abilities of even the brightest of modern students, it is perhaps ultimately more profitable to adopt a more descriptive approach; and an adequate description of the use of *umma* followed by the genitive would merely point out that such a usage is inconsistent with the usage of that particle attested in previous periods and in the Mesopotamian heartland generally.

Even aside from the peculiar usage of *umma* in the West, however, the differences between the standard Akkadian « S » component and its Ugaritic equivalent do not extend far beyond the morpho-syntactic level. The overall contextual function of standard Akkadian « *umma* N_S », 'thus N_S', is identical with that of Ugaritic « *tḫm* N_S », 'message of N_S', namely, to introduce the direct speech of N_S.

---

[455]H. A. Hoffner, Jr., has cautioned against this understanding (personal communication), since the two syntagms derive from distinct contexts: the former, « *UM-MA* N_S », is "entirely appropriate in the opening line of a ritual text to indicate the practitioner who speaks the procedure," while the latter, « *A-WA-AT* N_S », is "more appropriate than *UMMA* in a colophon." Hoffner drew my attention instead to KBo 6.29 i 1-5, where the two syntagms are indeed contextually parallel.

[456]A. Rainey, *IOS* 5 (1975) 22-23, n. 25. Note his more cautious presentation in *CAT* 2 (1996) 174.

[457]See D. Arnaud, *SDB* 9 (1979), cols. 1348-1359; and the recent survey of W. van Soldt, *HUS* (1999) 28-45, and references there.

In fact, the surface morpho-syntactic dissimilarity should not cause much discomfiture in any case. Its explanation no doubt lies in the fact that languages are not simple substitution codes on the lexical level: two different languages may use different grammatical structures to express the same basic meaning.[458] To express the idea behind the « S » component, standard Akkadian simply preferred « adverb *umma* 'thus' + N_S », while Ugaritic preferred « common noun *tḥm* 'message' + N_S »; both Akkadian *umma* and Ugaritic *tḥm* refer directly to the message which followed the address formula.

The semantics of *tḥm* are well-established, thanks to several factors: (1) the inner Ugaritic contextual usage of *tḥm*;[459] (2) the specific "B-words" found parallel to *tḥm* in Ugaritic poetic texts;[460] and (3) the cross-cultural parallels for the « S » component in which the element corresponding to Ugaritic *tḥm* is a common noun

---

[458]A few examples might serve as illustrations, should this statement require defence. Despite the differences in surface grammatical structure between English "I miss my country" and French "mon pays me manque," no one would deny the semantic equivalence of these two statements. Another illustration is provided by two of the formulas used to introduce prophetic speech in the Hebrew Bible: (1) « N_S כה אמר », "thus said N_S," and (2) « N_S נאם », "word of N_S." The second of these, « N_S נאם », is precisely analogous to Ugaritic « *tḥm* N » in both form and function; the first, analogous only in function, not in form. On the relevance of this point for translation in general, compare A. L. Oppenheim's citation of Jerome in *Letters from Mesopotamia* (1967) 67.

[459]By far the most important passage is the letter RS 17.434+, line 5, which reads { | (5) ky . lik̇t . bt . mlk . tḥmk [.] hl⌜n⌝[...]}, "(As for the fact) that you sent your message to the royal palace, now then, [...]." This example is particularly significant, for not only does the pronominal suffix and the syntax support understanding the word *tḥm* here as a common noun, but the overall context suggests that in this letter the noun *tḥm* is being used to refer specifically to the message, probably written, sent by the Ugaritic king Niqmaddu to the Hittite court. Such a usage of the word *tḥm* to refer to the actual message itself is consistent with the overall contextual setting of the « S » component, where « S » immediately precedes the message.

[460]Namely, *hwt*, 'word' in *KTU*^{2} 1.3:III.13-14 and parallels (the literary « S » motif), on which see above, in section 1.5.2, on the *Sitz-im-Leben* of the « S » component; and possibly also the word *ḥkmk*, 'your wise utterance', in *KTU*^{2} 1.3 V 30-31.

meaning 'message, word,' or the like.[461] The semantics resulting from these data, namely « *tḥm* N_S » as 'message of N_S', are eminently appropriate for the overall contextual function of the « S » component in introducing the actual message itself.

In light of the semantics of Ugaritic *tḥm* as 'word, message', well-established by inner Ugaritic usage, etymological speculation, though interesting, is rendered virtually unnecessary. There is, in fact, no wide-spread agreement on the etymology of *tḥm*, and its origins remain mysterious.[462] In general, one can distinguish three types of etymological proposals: (1) *tḥm* is a loan-word into Ugaritic from a non-Semitic source;[463] (2) *tḥm* has an inner West-Semitic etymology which may be

---

[461]These include (a) Western peripheral Akkadian epistolary usage in which the word *umma* of the « S » component is followed by the genitive case, indicating that the sign sequence {um-ma} was understood as a substantive, on which see above, this section; (b) a Hittite example of a motif comparable to the Ugaritic « S » component, « *A-WA-AT* N_S », 'the word of N_S', appearing in the colophon of KBo 6.29 (column i, lines 1-5); (c) one of the Middle Assyrian versions of the « S » component, which takes the form « *ṭuppi* N_S », 'tablet (or message) of N_S' (see E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* [1996] 56); (d) the Neo-Assyrian version of the « S » component in royal letters, « *amat šarri* », 'the word of the king', on which see above, section 1.5; and (e) the version of the « S » component used in the Hebrew Bible to introduce prophetic speech, « N_S נאם », 'the utterance of N_S', on which see above, section 1.5.2, as well as similar constructions such as « N_S דבר », 'the word of N_S.'

[462]A recent survey of proposals is that of W. G. E. Watson, *UF* 30 (1998) 745-749.

[463]See the references cited in Watson, *UF* 30 (1998) 747-748. On non-Semitic loanwords into Ugaritic in general, see Watson, *UF* 27 (1995) 533-558; Watson, *UF* 28 (1996) 701-719; and Watson, *HUS* (1999) 128-131. On this possibility, it can be said that the semantics of *tḥm*, 'word, message', are not typical of loan-words from non-Semitic languages, which often tend to be "Kulturwörter", technical terms for commodities, textiles, or specific political or administrative offices and institutions, etc.; the borrowing of such technical terms being easily imaginable as a result of cultural contact. See *ibidem*, and the majority of the examples cited there. Note also the statement of J. Barr, *Comparative Philology* (1987 [1968]) 104: "Non-Semitic words are, it would seem, most likely to be identified if the words are nouns and if the reference seems to be to foreign officials, institutions of foreign origin, unusual artefacts and foods likely to be transported from distant lands. . . ." The proposed borrowing of a word like *tḥm*, 'word, message', the semantics of which are much less marked than the kinds of technical words cited in the above sources, would seem to represent a different case. Are we to assume that the ancient Ugaritians themselves did not have a word for "word" or "message", and therefore needed to borrow one? This seems intuitively unlikely; although, of course, the chaotic and arbitrary nature of linguistic evolution admittedly places considerable limitations on any arguments founded on intuitive

established by a standard application of the comparative method;[464] or (3) *tḥm* has an inner West-Semitic etymology, but because of unusual aspects in its development, its true etymological cognates do not show the standard consonantal correspondences.[465]

---

likelihood. The relative paucity of Ugaritic words lacking a plausible inner Semitic etymology, however, does suggest additional caution regarding the idea of identification of loan words.

[464]See the examples cited in Watson, *UF* 30 (1998) 746, nos. 1- 2. The first proposal, given by E. Ullendorf, *Or* 20 (1951) 270-271, is a legitimate example of this category in that the Ugaritic graph {ḥ} regularly corresponds with the Arabic phoneme represented by {a}, namely /ḥ/. From the presentation in Watson, *UF* 30 (1998) 746, one would also think that the proposal labelled "2." belonged here as well, for he twice gives the Arabic cognate as "*taḥama*" (sic), and the Akkadian as "*taḫūmu*" (sic). Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (1998 [1965]) #345], §19.2542, too, in citing only Syriac *tᵊḥūmā*, without further comment, gives the impression that he understood the Syriac word to provide an example of regular consonantal correspondences with Ugaritic *tḥm*. Neither does J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch* (1963), § 2752, provide any explanatory comment, though he does correctly cite Akkadian *taḫūmu* and Arabic *taḫama*. Since the Ugaritic graph regularly corresponding to Arabic {b} and Akkadian {(-)ḫ(-)} signs is not {ḥ}, but {ḫ}, the proposal of an etymological link between Ugaritic *tḥm* and (all) the suggested cognates cited in Watson, *UF* 30 (1998) 746, no. 2, can be rejected; these latter seem to derive from a primitive root TḪM and not from TḤM. A similar confusion with respect to the Semitic phonemes /ḫ/, /ḥ/, and /h/ is evident in the comments of J.-M. Durand, *Miscellanea Eblaitica* 2 (1989) 39-40, though here the problem is probably due at least in part to the Mari team's decision to transcribe the sequence of {ḫ} signs with {h} in roman script.

[465]If one allows the possibility that Arabic *taḫama*, etc., and Akkadian *taḫūmu* represent not etymological cognates of Ugaritic *tḥm*, but rather inner Semitic loan words, thus explaining the unusual correspondence between Ugaritic {ḥ} and Akkadian and Arabic {ḫ} signs, the proposal cited in Watson, *UF* 30 (1998) 746, no. 2 (see the above footnote), belongs here. Another proposal that may be placed here is the defense of a connection between Ugaritic *tḥm* and Akkadian *ṭēmu* and West Semitic *ṭʿm*, meaning 'decree', mentioned in J. C. De Moor, *Seasonal Pattern* (1971) 102, and recently defended by Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 2 (RS 1.018), commentary, line 3: "Si la fonction et le sens général de *tḥm* sont clairs, l'étymologie demeure inconnue . . . . Le point de comparaison le plus utile pour sonder le sens de base de *tḥm* nous semble être l'accadien *ṭēmu*, dont les acceptions d' ḥ ordre, jugement, décision » ont été empruntées tardivement en araméen et en hébreu (*ṭaʿam*). Ce mot ne présente évidemment pas le même phonétisme que le mot ougaritique (ṬʿM au lieu de TḤM), mais le champ sémantique dans les deux langues est similaire, comme le montre l'usage de *tḥm* dans les textes mythologiques, où ce mot peut signifier « décision » comme en accadien. Il est pourtant impossible pour le moment de dire si le mot ougaritique reflète une transformation locale de la racine ṬʿM (dé-emphatisation de l'interdental et désonorisation du pharyngéal) ou une ancienne racine perdue dans les autre langues sémitiques ; il est bien connu que ṬʿM comporte deux sens assez dissimilaires, celui de « goût » et celui de « décision, etc. », et l'on pourrait envisager qu'elle reflète une fusion ancienne de deux racines, TḤM et ṬʿM." S. A. Kaufmann, *Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* (1974) 109, points out that the meaning 'order, decree' is already well-established for Akkadian *ṭēmu* in the Old Babylonian period, and further proposes that this sense entered the West Semitic languages from Akkadian during the era of Imperial Aramaic. Compare also H. Zimmern, *Akkadische Fremdwörter* (1915) 10. The idea of "une transformation locale de la racine ṬʿM" may indeed be possible, but explicit knowledge of the phonetic reality of this transformation ("dé-emphatisation de

If an etymological proposal is considered absolutely essential for a thorough philological treatment, those proposals based on inner West-Semitic cognates with the expected consonantal correspondences would theoretically present the fewest methodological and substantive problems; in other words, those proposals which need not resort to "special pleading" in one form or another, in the absence of explicit evidence to the contrary. In this light, the proposal to align Ugaritic *tḥm* with the common Semitic root ḤMM is perhaps slightly more defensible than others, if only on methodological grounds, yet still leaves much to be desired.[466] Certain manifestations

---

l'interdental et désonorisation du pharyngéal") is inaccessible, since the writing systems in which Ugaritic is attested provide little or no direct evidence for the underlying phonological system (this does not, of course, invalidate reconstructions of Ugaritic phonology on the basis of comparative evidence; it merely emphasizes their hypothetical nature). Furthermore, the idea of such a local transformation lacks inner Ugaritic parallels: proto-Semitic /*ṯ/ and /*ʿ/ are regularly realized in Ugaritic with the graphs {ṯ} and {ʿ}, not with {t} and {ḥ}. The possibility of "une ancienne racine perdue dans les autre langues sémitiques", however, is entirely plausible, but unverifiable. A possible mechanism for this latter development is provided by the often ambiguous nature of the Sumero-Akkadian writing system. If, in fact, there ever existed two distinct common nouns in proto-Akkadian, **taḥm-*, 'order, decree', and **ṭaʿm-*, 'taste', the ambiguous syllabic values of the appropriate Sumero-Akkadian signs for writing these words could easily have lead to the eventual collapse of a phonemic distinction between them, though retaining their distinctive semantics as homonyms.

[466]One should note, however, that by concentrating on the mythological texts, Ullendorf, *Or* 20 (1951) 270-271, overlooked the much more general, or "less marked", meaning of *tḥm* as 'word, message', which seems to have been primary. That is, in the « S » component, « *tḥm* N_S », it seems to have been the identity and person of N_S which lent authority, if any, to the message itself, and not the semantics inherent in *tḥm*, which merely refers to the message, regardless of the social status of the correspondents. Compare the comments of Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 2 (RS 1.018), commentary, line 3: "Parce que pendant des années on a consacré davantage de ressources à l'étude des documents mythologiques qu'à ces humbles documents en prose, les acceptions de mots employés dans les deux genres littéraires ont souvent été comprises partout de façon propre aux textes mythologiques. . . . Or les cas que l'on rencontre dans ces textes de messages d'un inférieur à son supérieur montrent que le *tḥm* n'a pas en soi la valeur d'un « décret » et que l'autorité de l'expéditeur peut être nulle par rapport à celle du destinataire. La comparaison des textes mythologiques avec les documents épistolaires montre que le mot désigne au fond la parole, dont la force varie selon les rapports entre les correspondants. . . . [O]n peut expliquer les diverses acceptions du mot *tḥm* que l'on peut légitimement reconnaître dans les traductions modernes par la variété des circonstances : *tḥm* n'est « décret » ou « décision » que lorsque la parole sort de la bouche d'un être supérieur (dieu, roi …) par rapport à celui à qui la parole est adressée."

of this root in Arabic do, in fact, touch the broader semantic field of speaking;[467] and, unlike the example cited above, this suggestion has the benefit of the expected consonantal correspondences.[468] Unfortunately, only the meaning 'to be hot' is attested for this root in Ugaritic; no occurrences of the root show any connection with the broad semantic field of speaking.[469] Thus, the etymology of Ugaritic *tḥm* remains uncertain; fortunately, and more importantly, it is also relatively unimportant.

1.6.3 The grammatical analysis of the « R » component

The morphosyntax and semantics of the standard version of the « R » component, « *l* N_R *rgm* », as well as its variants, « *l* N_R » and « *ʿm* N_R », are as well understood as most anything can be said to be in Ugaritic, thanks not only to the well-attested nature of the vocabulary, but also to several contextual aids: (1) the existence of an exact parallel to the Ugaritic « R » component in contemporary epistolary

---

[467]Compare, in Modern Standard Arabic, the meaning 'to decree' for the G-stem, which has its own verbal noun, *ḥumūm-* , distinct from the verbal noun of the other G-stem meaning, 'to heat', *ḥamm-* ; see H. Wehr, *Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic* (1979) 237. Such may, of course, be a secondary development; see below.

[468]The Arabic phoneme /ḥ/ shows a regular correspondence with the Ugaritic phoneme behind the graph {ḥ}.

[469]See G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 177. Furthermore, the Arabic meanings within the semantic field of speaking are plausibly latter developments from the basic meaning 'to be hot'. Compare the comments of Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 2 (RS 1.018), commentary, line 2: "On peut pourtant se demander si cet usage n'est pas une évolution particulière à l'arabe, un élargissement sémantique à partir du sens propre de « donner la fièvre à quelqu'un », qui se dit aussi de Dieu, et qui reflète directement le sens de base de la racine ḤMM, « être chaud ». Aucun texte ougaritique ne trahit la même évolution sémantique du verbe qu'en arabe, et la forme du nom ougaritique serait différente de la forme arabe (*t*-préformative au lieu de *qullat*), éliminant la possibilité d'une longue transmission d'un usage particulier du nom. D'ailleurs, le sens de « parole, message » n'est pas attesté en arabe, et on est donc obligé d'envisager la possibilité que les deux mots n'aient en commun que le fait qu'ils peuvent désigner une décision divine, et que le mot arabe n'est pas apparenté au mot ougaritique."

traditions in Akkadian and Hittite, as attested as Ras Shamra and elsewhere, (2) the light shed on the « R » component by the literary « R » motif in Ugaritic poetic narrative, and (3) the *Sitz-im-Leben*, or contextual function, of the formula itself in its epistolary setting.

It has been said that the structure of the Ras Shamra letters, Ugaritic and Akkadian, is identical.[470] Given the fact that these two epistolary corpora were produced by the same civilization, and in some cases, the very same individual scribes, these structural similarities are not surprising.[471] Yet, even if one does not admit the exact equivalence between the Ras Shamra Akkadian and Ugaritic epistolary structures, the overwhelming number of precise parallels between these two traditions, not only in the address formula, but throughout the other formulaic components of the *praescriptio*, as well as in the motifs of the body, more or less require that the interpretation of the Ugaritic formulas lean heavily on the grammatical analysis of the better understood Akkadian formulary. Concerning the epistolary « R » component in particular, the value of the Akkadian texts for discerning the morphology and syntax of the Ugaritic formulas has been recognized since the decipherment of Ugaritic. Already in 1929, Ch. Virolleaud had recognized the equivalence between the Ugaritic

---

[470]Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 198, writes that "as regards structure, the Ugaritic and Akkadian letters are identical." For more on this topic, see Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 130-140; Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 11; Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 143-144; M. Liverani, *SDB* 9 (1979), col. 1328; and Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 244-247.

[471]That the some Ugaritian scribes wrote in both alphabetic and logo-syllabic cuneiform is evident from, among other evidence, the numerous administrative (and other) texts which contain text in both systems of writing; see W. van Soldt, *SAU* (1991) 29, n. 233; especially W. van Soldt, ALASP 7 (1995) 183-186; and I. Márquez Rowe, *UF* 28 (1996) 457-462. It has been suggested that the celebrated *ʾIlī-Milku* was one such "bi-scriptal" scribe; see *ibid.*, p. 185; van Soldt, *SAU* (1991) 27-29; and A.-S. Dalix, *Le bilinguisme* (1996) 83-90. Another such candidate is *Burqānu*; see van Soldt, ALASP 7 (1995) 185. More generally on the topic of bilingualism, see L. Milano, *VOr* 3 (1980) 179-197; and F. Malbran-Labat, *Le bilinguisme* (1996), esp. pp. 56-61.

preposition *l* and Akkadian *ana*, used to express the indirect object of the verb in Akkadian versions of the epistolary « R » component,[472] and not long afterward, E. Dhorme correctly observed that *rgm* was the Ugaritic equivalent of Akkadian *qibī*, the masculine singular imperative "say!" in the address of letters.[473] In addition to Akkadian *qabû*, D. Pardee points out the functional equivalence of the Ugaritic root RGM and the root ʾMR in the epistolary traditions of the Northwest Semitic languages of the Iron Age.[474] From these functional correspondences, it is justifiable to conclude semantic equivalence, in an epistolary context at the very least, of Akkadian *qabû*, Ugaritic RGM, and later Northwest Semitic ʾMR, all meaning 'to say'.

Secondly, one can draw on evidence from Ugaritic poetic narrative, where the literary « R » motif, used in recounting the commissioning of messages, closely resembles the epistolary « R » component, both in form and function. In the context of

---

[472]Virolleaud, *Syria* 10 (1929) 306-307.

[473]Dhorme, *Syria* 14 (1933) 236. On the semantics of RGM, Dhorme cites the earlier statement of Baneth, *OLZ* 35 (1932), col. 452, n. 2 (regarding *rgm* in the « R » motif of the mythological texts): "*rgm* . . . heißt nicht 'senden' . . . , sondern 'sagen', o. ä., was dem akkad. *ragāmu* ziemlich nahe kommt." That the scribes of Ugarit themselves understood Ugaritic *rgm* to be the equivalent of Akkadian *qibīma* is shown, among other ways, by the occasional "expanded" writing of both forms at the very end of the « R » component; the words are written in such a way that the three constituent signs occupy an entire line on the tablet. A. Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), col. 1414, refers to this feature; compare now RS 94.2580, among others For this expanded writing of {qí-bi-ma} in the RS Akkadian letters, compare, as examples, RS 16.003:3 and RS 16.112:2: J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 (1955) 3-4, and pl. xxxix.

[474]Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 2 (RS 1.018), commentary, line 2: "Par sa fonction dans la langue ougaritique, *ragāmu* correspond à *qabû* en accadien et à ʾMR dans les autres langues nord-ouest-sémitiques"; and earlier, in remarques épistolographiques: "L'usage qui consiste à employer un verbe signifiant « dire » à l'impératif, précédé par le même verbe au parfait avec pour sujet le nom de l'expéditeur, est attesté dans les rares documents épistolaires en phénicien (cf. Pardee, *et al.*, *Handbook* [1982] 165-68), en édomite (Beit-Arieh et Cresson, *TA* 12 [1985] 97) et en ammonite (Yassine et Teixidor, *BASOR* 264 [1986] 47). Cette formule est presque absente dans les documents épistolaires hébreux et araméens (cf. Pardee, *et al.*, *ibid.*, p. 121, 146), bien qu'elle soit employée dans d'autres genres de textes (ibid., p. 121). Le double usage du verbe ʾMR en phénicien, édomite et ammonite (parfait suivi de l'impératif + *l*) s'ajoute à l'argument fondé sur la présence de l'impératif dans la formule correspondante en accadien pour confirmer que dans la formule ougaritique « *rgm* + *l* » le verbe est à l'impératif."

the narrative, the verb *rgm* in the literary « R » motif, and it's poetic "B-term", *ṯny*, are imperatives, addressed to the messengers. The prepositional compliment represents the indirect object of the verb, the party to whom the following message is to be said. If one assumes that the commissioning of messages thus described in the myths was reflective of the actual practice of commissioning messages, this motif provides further evidence for understanding the verb *rgm* in the epistolary « R » component as an imperative.

Finally, given the tertiary rather than binary nature of epistolary communication in this epoque,[475] common sense requires that the sender must have explicitly stated the identity of the intended recipient of the message to the intermediary, such information being obviously essential for the transmission of the message. That such a statement should contain a verb meaning 'to speak, say' (RGM), in the form of an imperative directed to the messenger, and a prepositional phrase expressing the indirect object of this verb, 'to such-and-such', fits this context perfectly.

Thus, despite the graphic ambiguity of the morphology of the word *rgm*, the contextual considerations outlined above indicate that it is a verb, a masculine singular imperative.[476] Some have suggested explaining *rgm* as a suffix conjugation form, 3rd

---

[475]That is, the fact the long distance communication between two parties was not direct, but necessarily passed through a third party, an intermediary. On this issue, see Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1979) 241.

[476]One assumes that the Ugaritic form was singular in number, despite the possibility of there having been two or more messengers rather than one (in fact, the most common means of referring to messengers in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus is with a collective: *mlåkt*, 'messenger party' or the like; the singular "count" noun **mlåk*, 'messenger', is unattested in the letters), on analogy with Akkadian *qibī*, also singular in number. Because of the dual character of the messengers in the mythological texts, one often vocalizes the verb of the literary « R » motif there as dual in number.

person masculine singular, 'he said',[477] but if such were the case, one wonders why letters in which the author is a woman do not show the corresponding feminine form of the verb, *rgmt*, 'she said'.

As for syntax, the only feature that requires comment is the clause-final placement of the verb *rgm* in the epistolary « R » component, since in the literary « R » motif, we notice the opposite order: « verb + adverbial modifier ».[478] It is conceivable to explain the different word order as an aspect of the difference between poetry and prose; but since the Akkadian version of the epistolary « R » component, namely « *ana* N_R *qibīma* », is precisely parallel to the Ugaritic, « *l* N_R *rgm* », one must also admit the possibility that the Ugaritic order was influenced by Akkadian usage.

There are few problems, if any, with the semantics of the elements. The contextual usage of the verb *rgm* in the epistolary « R » component, outlined above, is consistent with other inner Ugaritic usage for the verb, and there is no reason to doubt the standard understanding of the verb as 'to say'.[479] The use of the preposition *l* in an "allative" or "dative" sense is well-attested for Ugaritic, including its specific usage to mark the indirect object of the verb RGM.[480]

---

[477]This morphological analysis of *rgm* is mentioned by Wansbrough, RAI 30 (1986) 208. For earlier rebuttals of this view, see Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 6, n. 13; and Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 2 (RS 1.018), remarques épistolographiques. The translation of the « R » component given in O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 12: "Zu NN spricht", is a misprint, as is clear from context and from the correctly printed translation, "Zu NN sprich", on p. 13.

[478]In the (unlikely) event that RS 94.2273, lines 1-2, should be interpreted as a fourth variant of the « R » component, {ql / l . ůrtṯb}, "Say to ʾUri-Teššub," this would be the only Ugaritic epistolary « R » component to parallel the literary « R » motif in placing the verbal element prior to its prepositional complement.

[479]See, for example, Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch* (1963), §2491; C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (1965), §19.2307; and G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 385-386.

[480]See D. Pardee, *UF* 7 (1975) 369.

If contextual usage of *rgm* in Ugaritic firmly establishes its meaning, for the sake of completeness, not to mention fidelity to the traditional fixation with etymology in Semitic philology, one ought perhaps to include a discussion of the word's etymology. In the cognate languages, the root RGM often contains the notion of speech in a greater or lesser degree of markedness.[481] Ugaritic *rgm*, 'to say', represents one of the least marked manifestations of the root, and appears, in fact, to be the least-marked verb of speaking in the language. Semantically, its closest cognate appears to be Akkadian *ragāmu*, which can mean 'to call out', although it often has very specific legal connotations: 'to lodge a claim, to sue, etc.,' as in Ras Shamra judicial texts.[482] More marked semantics occur in Arabic and Ethiopic, where the verb can mean 'to curse', but can also refer to death by stoning as well.[483] In Hebrew and Syriac, only the meaning 'to stone' is attested for the verb RGM; no overt hint of the semantic field of speaking has survived.[484] Semantic evolution can account for much of this diversity, though the direction of this evolution is a matter of some

---

[481]Compare D. Pardee's etymological comments in *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 2 (RS 1.018), commentary, line 2: "Du point de vue de la sémantique, le rapport entre le verbe ougaritique signifiant « dire » et les acceptions de la même racine dans les autres langues ouest-sémitiques n'est pas clair, et le verbe ougaritique se rapproche par son sens plutôt de l'accadien, où *ragāmu* signifie « appeler, donner de la voix, crier »," with the following footnote reference: "RGM signifie en hébreu et araméen « lapider », en arabe « lapider » et « injurier, maudire » ; cf. l'éthiopien « injurier, maudire ». Parfois on a essayé d'expliquer le rapport comme évolution sémantique (Driver, *JANES* 5 [1973] 112-13 [où le verbe ougaritique n'est pas mentionné]), parfois on introduit d'autres éléments étymologiques (Stol, *Trees* [1979] 11, n. 36 : l'ancien RGM serait devenu RGN en hébreu, où ce dernier verbe signifie « murmurer »)."

[482]See *CAD* 14 (R) (1999) 62-67; and *AHw* 3 (1981) 941b.

[483]See Wehr, *Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic* (1979) 381; and W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (1987) 465.

[484]See L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *HAL* 3 (1996) 1187; and J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (1903) 529.

disagreement.[485] Finally, one ought to mention the common noun *targūm*, 'translation,' and related forms, attested in Aramaic and other languages, the semantics of which seem appropriate to the broader semantic field of speaking; this feature may point to this word's ultimate derivation as a t-preformative noun from the verbal root RGM.[486]

There is no reason to doubt that Ugaritic *rgm*, 'to say', was in the G-stem,[487] as in the cognates mentioned above; and, for purposes of vocalization, we can assume a /*u*/ class stem vowel, on analogy with this stem vowel (or its reflexes) in Akkadian, Syriac, Arabic, and Modern Hebrew.[488]

1.7 Typological classification of the Ugaritic address formulas

This section presents in tabular form the results of the typological classification detailed above in section 1.2. Its purpose is twofold: (1) to review in a graphically accessible way the distribution of the various compositional patterns found in the corpus of Ugaritic address formulas, and (2) to describe briefly those address formulas

---

[485]See the recent etymological proposal in Koehler and Baumgartner, *HAL* 3 (1996) 1187: "the basic meaning develops from to heap up stones > to stone > to curse > to make a statement." Such an evolution is difficult to reconcile with the chronology of the respective sources, however (Ugaritic and Akkadian are, after all, considerably earlier than Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic). A better suggestion is that of Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (1987) 465: "in view of the various meanings within Semitic, the development seems to be: 'speak, say > speak against, bring legal action against > abuse, curse > cast stones'."

[486]Such an explanation would require that these forms were reanalyzed as being derived not from RGM, but from a quadrilateral root TRGM in later languages; compare the quadrilateral verb *tarjama* in Arabic.

[487]Note Huehnergard's reconstruction of a possible G-stem infinitive of this root, {ra-g[a?]-[mu?]} (understood as the Ugaritic equivalent of Akkadian *zakāru*) in Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 177.

[488]On Akkadian *irgum*, see *CAD* 14 (R) (1999) 62; on Syriac *nergōm*, see Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (1903) 529; and on Arabic *yarjumu*, see Wehr, *Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic* (1979) 381. Biblical Hebrew contains no evidence for the stem vowel of the imperfect and imperative; in Modern Hebrew it is a reflex of /u/: יְרֻגֵּם; see R. Alcalay, *Complete Hebrew-English Dictionary* (1981), col. 2404.

which present atypical features of a compositional or distributional nature. Those address formulas of "standard" composition will be treated first, followed by the smaller, more diverse group of "non-standard" patterns.

1.7.1 "Standard" patterns

The diagnostic features of the "standard" address formula in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus have been defined above.[489] Among the "standard" address formulas, three compositional patterns are prominent. These are presented here, organized according to conceptual status and model. Following these, the remaining address formulas which are compositionally "standard" but do not fall under the rubric of one of the three main patterns are listed.

1.7.1.1 « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL »

« ASC POW »

RS 9.479A:1-5	« *l mlkt ảdty rgm tḥm tlmyn ʿbdk* »
RS 16.137[bis]:1-4	« *l mlkt ảdty rgm tḥm ỉllḏr ʿbdk* »
RS 16.402+:1-2	« [*l mlkt*] *ảdty* [*rgm tḥ*]*m ỉrrṯrm ʿbdk* »
RS 17.327:1-3	« [*l* …]⌜-⌝*n bʿ*[*ly rgm*] *tḥm* […] *ʿbdk* »
RS 18.040:1-4	« *l mlk bʿly rgm tḥm ṯpṭbʿl* [ʿ]*bdk* »
RS 18.113+:1-3	« *l mlk b*[ʿ*ly*] *rg*[*m*] *tḥm rb mỉ*[… *ʿbdk*] »
RS 18.140.2:7'-9'	« *l*⌜--⌝[… *bʿly*] *r*[*gm*] *tḥm* ⌜--⌝[… *ʿbdk*] »

[489]For the definition, as well as the grounds on which this pattern may be qualified as "standard", see above, section 1.2.1.

RS 19.102.2:13-16 « *l ybn*[*n*] *bʿly rg*[*m*] *tḥm ʿbd*[…] *ʿbdk* »

RS 20.199:1-3 « *l mlkt ảdty rgm* [*t*]*ḥm ủrǵtṯb ʿbdk* »

RS 29.093:1-5 « *l ydrm bʿlny rgm tḥm pnḥṯ w yrmhd ʿbdk* »

RS 34.148:1-4 « *l m*[*lk bʿly*] *rg*[*m*] *tḥm* […] *ʿbdk* »

RS 34.356:1-2 « [*l špš mlk*] *rb mlk ml*[*km*] [*bʿly*] *rgm tḥm ʿmrpỉ* [*ʿbdk*] »

RS 34.356:9-11 « [*l ml*]*k rb mlk mlk*[*m bʿl kl ḥ*]*wt mlk mlk*[*m bʿly rg*]*m tḥm ʿmrp*[*ỉ ʿbdk*] »

RS 92.2010:1-4 « *l ḫdmrt bʿly rgm tḥm ảnntn ʿbdk* »

RS 94.2391:1-3 « *l mlk bʿly rgm tḥm ʿzn ʿbdk* »

RS 94.2479:1-2 « *l mlkt ảdty rgm tḥm skn ʿbdk* »

RS 94.5009:1-3 « *l mlkt ảdty r*[*gm*] *tḥm skn* [*ʿbdk*] »

RIH 78/03+:1'-5' « [*l špš*] *mlk rb mlk mṣrm* […]*m mlk ṣdq* [*mlk m*]*lkm bʿl kl ḥwt* […]*m rgm tḥm* [*ʿmṯtm*]*r ʿbdk* »

« ASC BIO »

RS 11.872:1-4 « *l mlkt ủmy rgm tḥm mlk bnk* »

RS 16.379:1-3 « *l mlkt ủ*[*m*]*y rgm tḥm mlk bnk* »

RS 19.102.1:1-5 « *l ybnn ảdny rgm tḥm tl*[*m*]*yn bnk* »

RS 34.124:1-3 « [*l mlkt ủmy rgm tḥm*] *m*[*lk bnk*] »

RS 92.2005.1:1-5 « [*l ủ*]*rtn* [*ả*]*dny rgm w l bḏ*[-]*r ủmy rgm tḥm ʿzỉlt bnkm* »

RS 94.5003+:1-3 « *l mlk*[*t ủmy*] *rg*[*m*] *tḥm* [*mlk bnk*] »

« HOR BIO »

RS 18.031:1-3 « *l mlk ủgrt ảḫy rgm tḥm mlk ṣr ảḫk* »

RS 18.134:1-3 « *l mlk ủgrt ỉḫy rgm tḥm mlk* [*g*]*bl ỉḫk* »

RS 94.2383+:1-3 « *l ủrtn ảḫy rgm tḥm ʿṯty ảḫtk* »

The only comment occasioned by this group is of a distributional nature: since the pattern in question would seem to be appropriate first and foremost in conceptually ascending letters, and since conceptually horizontal letters more frequently employ another compositional pattern,[490] the presence of three conceptually HOR BIO letters in this group might appear anamolous. Since this same pattern is also used for HOR letters in those corparative corpora which present the same composition and distribution for the address formula,[491] the easiest explanation for the presence of HOR letters here is the hypothesis according to which these letters represent social situations in which the relationship between the sender and recipient is of an ascending nature, but not of such a magnitude to elicit explicitly ascending REL terminology.[492]

1.7.1.2 « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* »

« HOR BIO »

RS 1.021:1-3	« *tḥm hl*[…] *l pzry ả*[*ḫy*] *w l gpn r*[*gm*] »
RS 15.174:1-3	« [*tḥm*] ⌜--⌝[-]⌜-⌝[… *l*] *mlkt ủ*[*grt ả*]*ḫty rgm* »
RS 92.2005:23-25	« *tḥm ʿzỉlt l ả̀by ả̀ḫty rgm* »
RS 94.2284:1-3	« *tḥm ả̀bny l ủrtṯb ủrtn ả̀ḫy rgm* »
RS 94.2406:31-32	« *tḥm ỉlmlk l ủrtn ỉḫy rgm* »

---

[490]The address formula in conceptually HOR letters more frequently follows the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* », discussed below in section 1.7.1.2, and, in more detail, above in section 1.2.5.3.

[491]See above, sections 1.4.2.1 (Ras Shamra Akkadian), 1.4.2.2 (Tell Meskene), 1.4.2.3 (Boğazköy and Ma□at), and, to a lesser extent, 1.4.2.4 (Amarna).

[492]See above, section 1.2.6. Two Ras Shamra Akkadian letters attest to the existence of such terminologically horizontal, but practically ascending situations: RS 34.164, addressed to two individuals whom the sender describes as {ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ia GAL.MEŠ}, “my big brothers”; and RS [Varia 25], addressed to an individual whom the sender calls {ŠEŠ-ḫi-ia GAL}, “my big brother”.

RS 94.2537:1-2	« [*tḥm*] *ảǵltṯb* [*l* …]⌜-⌝*yn ỉḫy rgm* »
RS 96.2039:1-3	« [*t*]*ḥm mlkt l yrmhd ỉḫy rgm* »

OTHER CONCEPTUAL CATEGORIES:

RS 15.008:1-3	« *tḥm tlm*[*y*]*n l ṯryl ủmy rgm* »	« ASC BIO »
RS 17.139:1-2	« *tḥm mlk l ṯryl ủmy rgm* »	« ASC BIO »
RS 19.181A:1-2	« *tḥm ủṯryn* [*l g*]*rgš* ⌜*bdy*⌝ *r*[*gm*] »	« DESC POW » (?)
RS [Varia 4]:1-3	« *tḥm ỉwrḏn l ỉwrpzn bny ảḫy rgm* »	« MIXED BIO » (HOR and DESC)

The presence in this group of two conceptually ascending letters, RS 15.008 and RS 17.139, requires special comment. The use of this particular pattern in these two cases, rather than the pattern typically used in conceptually ascending letters,[493] would appear to reflect the multi-faceted nature of human social relationships, or, put another way, of "mixed" social situations.[494] The problem is best represented in the Ugaritic corpus by the letters between the king and his mother.[495] While RS 11.872, for example, shows the compositional pattern "expected" in such ASC BIO situations, « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL », RS 17.139 shows the pattern « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* », atypical in such a context. As recognized by D. Pardee, the formal diversity encountered here is

---

[493]The address formula in conceptually ASC letters generally empoys the pattern « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL », discussed above in section 1.7.1.1, and, in more detail, in section 1.2.5.1.

[494]This is the term used by D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 14 (RS 11.872), remarques épistolographiques, for those social situations in which the correspondents share one type of relationship on the biological level, and another type of relationship, not analogous to their biological relationship, on the societal level. This use of the term "mixed" for such social situations should not be confused, however, with letters of "mixed" conceptual classification (the presence in the REL terminology of more than one conceptual model or status), on which see above in the introduction to part one, section 1.6.4.1.

[495]These include RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 34.124, RS 94.5003+, and RIH 78/12. Also of possible relevance are RS 8.315 and RS 15.008.

no doubt due to "un mélange des catégories sociale et familiale."[496] Social situations such as this must have been very confusing in an epistolary context, where standard usage dictated that the person with higher social status was named first. On the one hand, the recipient is described as the sender's mother, and as such enjoys priviledged social status *vis-à-vis* her son. On the other hand, the sender of the letter is the king himself, who, representing the ultimate authority in the land and the very apex of Ugaritian society, ought certainly to receive pride of place. Although examples of both patterns are attested, it appears that in most instances such as these, the prevailing notions about a son's inherent subservience to his mother apparently prevailed,[497] though in the case of RS 17.139,[498] the social dominance of the king in his role as monarch took precedence over notions about a mother's superior social position with respect to her son. Thus, in general, "mixed" social situations apply when the correspondents have a particular biological kinship which is not precisely

---

[496]Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 4 (RS 1.021), remarques épistolaires, n. 5. He continues, "Ce mélange des catégories indique des rapports humains compliqués : le roi est roi mais il est toujours le fils de sa mère, qui en tant que reine-mère exerce une certaine autorité." And further, *ibid.*, chapter 11 (RS 11.872), remarques épistolaires: "Il faudra examiner chaque cas pour en être certain, mais à ce stade de notre étude, il nous paraît probable que ces deux formes d'adresse reflètent la psychologie de la situation « mixte » plutôt qu'une différence de correspondants."

[497]These include RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 34.124, RS 94.5003+, and RIH 78/12. A similar but not identical situation is represented by RS 8.315.

[498]RS 15.008 may also belong in this category, if the personal name *tlmyn* belonged to one of kings of Ugarit (in the same sense that the name Urḫi-Teššub belonged to one of the Hittite kings, known in his royal capacity as Muršili [III]); this implies a "private name" // "royal name" hypothesis, or more specifically, that the old Amorite onomastic tradition (Niqmaddu, Niqmepa, ʿAmmurapiʾ, etc.) was in some sense reserved for reigning monarchs, and that prior to taking the throne (and perhaps even afterwards, in certain social contexts) such individuals bore other personal names, not of the royal onomastic tradition.

analogous to their societal relationship.[499] Situations more or less analogous to RS 17.139 and RS 15.008 are known in the Ras Shamra Akkadian and Boğazköy corpora,[500] with which these Ugaritic examples might profitably be compared.

1.7.1.3 « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* »

« UNMARKED »

RS 4.475:1-3	« *tḥm ỉwrḏr l plsy rgm* »
RS 15.158:1-2	« [*tḥm mlk g*]*rgmš* [*l … m*]*lk ủgrt rgm* »
RS 18.038:1-2	« *tḥm špš l ʿmrpỉ rgm* »
RS 29.095:1-2	« *tḥm tlmyn l pzy rgm* »
RS 94.2406.1:1-2	« *tḥm mlkt l ủrtn rgm* »
RS 94.2429:1-2	« *tḥm mlk*[…] *l skn r*[*gm*] »
RS 94.2580:1-3	« *tḥm mlkt l ủrtn rgm* »

---

[499]In addition to the letters between the king and his mother, other probable or possible examples of "mixed" situations include RS 15.008, RS 96.2039, and RS [Varia 4], among others. There are parallels to such situations also in the Hebrew Bible: note the correspondence between Jacob and Esau in Gen 32:5, where the correspondents are biological brothers in the narrative, yet Jacob refers to his brother as אדני and refers to himself as עבדך.

[500]All of the following letters certainly or probably display in the address formula the compositional pattern « *UM-MA* ID *A-NA* ID REL *QÍ-BI-MA* » and yet are conceptually ascending: RS 19.070 « ASC BIO »; KBo 18.001 « ASC MIXED »; KBo 18.002 « ASC MIXED »; KBo 18.004 « ASC BIO »; probably KBo 18.005 « ASC BIO »; and KUB 3.070 « ASC BIO ». It is no doubt significant that all of these (including the two Ugaritic letters RS 15.008 and RS 17.139) contain REL terms conceived on the BIO model.

« UNKNOWN »

RS 17.434+:1-2 « [*tḥ*]*m pdǵb mlk*[*t … l*] *nqmd rgm* »

RS 18.286[A]:1-3 « *tḥm mlk*[…] *l mlk* […] *rg*[*m*] »

RS 88.2159:1-3 « *tḥm* […] *l gr*[…] *rg*[*m*] »

RIH 77/21A:1-3 « *tḥm š*[*pš mlk*] *rb l m*[…] *rgm* »

Despite the UNMARKED or UNKNOWN terminological status of the letters in this group, the nature of the social relationship between the sender and the recipient can be determined with some confidence in the majority of cases: in all of these the relationship is of a contextually descending nature.[501] This fact, along with the small number of terminologically descending letters, leads to the likely hypothesis that not only was this pattern favored by Ugaritic scribes in socially descending situations, but also that in such cases it was not standard usage to emphasize the descending nature of the social relationship with conceptually explicit REL terminology.

1.7.1.4 Other "standard" address formulas

This category covers two groups: (1) those address formulas which are compositionally "standard" but which do not fall under one the above three compositional rubrics, and (2) those formulas which are probably or possibly compositionally "standard", but of unknown composition on the micro-level.

The first group contains three examples:

RS 1.018:1-3 « *l rb khnm rgm tḥm* […] »

---

[501]See above, section 1.2.5.2.

RS 8.315:1-3 « *l ủmy ảdtny rgm tḥm tlmyn w ảḫtmlk ʿbdk* »

RS 18.147:1-3 « *tḥm pgn ảbk l mlk ủgrt* […] *rgm* »

and the second group, possibly as many as seven:

RS 15.098:1-2 « *t*[*ḥm* …] *l* ⌜-⌝[…] »

RS 18.[387].2:3'-5' « [*l* …] *bʿly* [*rg*]*m* […] »

RS 18.[400]:1'-3' « [*l* …]*y* [*rg*]*m* […] »

RS 19.029:1-3 « [*l* …]*k* ⌜*b*⌝[…] *rgm tḥm wrỉ*[…] »

RS 94.2545+:1-5 « *tḥm* […] *l ủr*[*tṯb*] *ủrt*[*n* …] *r*[*gm*] »

RS 94.2545+:9-10 « *w l ảḫy* [… *t*]*ḥm ảbny ả*[*ḫtk*] »

RS 94.2957.1:1'-2' « [*tḥm* …] *l* […] *rg*[*m*] »

All three of the letters in the first group, RS 1.018, RS 8.315, and RS 18.147, present atypical compositional patterns. The address of RS 1.018 is atypical since it presents the order « RS », and yet contains no REL term in the « R » component. Its composition may be compared with that of RS 20.021, a conceptually UNMARKED Akkadian letter from Ras Shamra, and perhaps Msk 7474+, a conceptually ASC POW letter from Tell Meskene.

The address formula of RS 8.315 contains no ID element in the « R » component,[502] but is otherwise conistent with the compositional pattern typical of conceptually ascending letters. In various respects, its composition may be compared with the partially preserved second address formula in the Ugaritic letter RS 94.2545+; with that of several Akkadian letters from the Meskene corpus, Msk 7451.1, Msk 7472,

---

[502]Note, however, the possibility that *ủmy* in line 1 is not, in fact, a REL phrase ('my mother') but a personal name (and thus an ID phrase, as expected on formal grounds). The {-y} hypochoristic suffix is well-known in the Ugaritian onomasticon (Gröndahl, *PTU* [1967] 49-56), and the {ủm-} element is attested in personal names of Hurrian origin (*Ibid.*, p. 99; compare {^{f}um-mi-ḫe-bi} in RS 16.343:4).

and probably Msk 74270, which also derive from conceptually ascending letters; and also with the conceptually ASC MIXED Hittite letter from Ma□at, HBM 81.1.

RS 18.147 is atypical not only in the composition of the address formula, but also in distributional terms: it is the only conceptually DESC BIO letter in the corpus. Such letters are encountered in the comparative corpora, however, although they regularly display the compositional pattern « *umma* ID *ana* ID REL *qibī-ma* » in the address formula.[503] This suggests that it is the presence of a REL term in the « S » component that is peculiar to the address formula of RS 18.147.

1.7.2 "Non-standard" patterns

That multiple scribal traditions were known at Ugarit, even if not part of the "mainstream" training, seems clear from various indications, among which the presence at Ras Shamra of an abecedary showing a graphic inventory different, both in the shape of the signs and in their canonical order, from that of the standard cuneiform abecedary used at Ugarit.[504] With respect to the letters, one may easily imagine that, in terms of their literary heritage, those few formulas which are compositionally non-standard reflect other such traditions which were independent of the standard scribal curriculum learned and used at Ugarit.

---

[503]Compare the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters RS 11.730, RS 16.111, RS 17.078, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.152, RS 17.247, RS 25.131, and RS 34.133; the Meskene Akkadian letter Msk 7451.4 (Msk 7497.2 presents a peculiar pattern); the Ma□at Hittite letters HKM 18.2, HKM 56.2, and HKM 65.1; and the Boğzaköy Akkadian letters KBo 28.046, KBo 28.053, KBo 28.055, and probably KBo 28.044+.

[504]RS 88.2215, which received a preliminary treatment by P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee in *CRAI* (1995) 855-860.

At least thirteen Ugaritic letters contain address formulas which are "non-standard" in terms of the composition.[505] For the sake of convenience in presentation, this group may be further subdivided by a consideration of the composition of the « S » component in each case. Three formal categories emerge: (1) those addresses in which the composition of the « S » component is limited to simply the « N_S » element, (2) those in which it is also contains the word *tḥm*, and (3) those in which the « S » component is entirely absent.

1.7.2.1 "Non-standard" addresses in which « S » = « N_S »

A. Caquot has described the pattern « N_S *l* N_R » as "la forme la plus simple de l'adresse."[506] Notwithstanding its simplicity, this type of address is found only very rarely in the epistolary corpus. Two attestations are certain:

RS 15.007:1-2 « *gnryn l mlkytn* »

RS 17.063:1 « *ʿzn bn byy l ảḫth ʿṯty* »

This structure is also possibily present in a third letter:

RS 17.117:1 « *ʿzn bn byy* ⌜-⌝[…] »[507]

The distinctive characteristics of this form, with respect to the standard Ugaritic address formula, may be described as follows: (1) all three examples carry the « SR »

---

[505]See above, section 1.2.4.

[506]A. Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), col. 1414.

[507]According to Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 33 (RS 17.117), remarques épistolographiques, the traces designated here by {⌜-⌝} are not consistent with the sign {l}, so this address formula is not strictly parallel to that of RS 17.063. Pardee suggests {⌜w⌝}, implying two authors (*ibid.*), in which case no trace whatsoever of the <R> component would have been preserved.

order of mention,[508] (2) the word *tḥm* is absent from the « S » component, and (3) the imperative *rgm*, 'Say!' is absent from the « R » component.

Like the standard address formula,[509] the function of this variant appears to be comparable to that of other free-standing nominal phrases used as "titles" or headings. In such a case, the entire address formula « N_S *l* N_R » would function as a heading to the entire epistolary text which follows.[510]

I know of no parallels for this pattern in the contemporary epistolary corpora.[511]

1.7.2.2 "Non-standard" addresses in which « S » contains *tḥm*

Two letters, RS 16.265.1 and RS 94.2273, exhibit a second important formal variant of the address formula, characterized by the structure « *tḥm* N_S *l* N_R »:

RS 16.265:1-2 « [*t*]*ḥm ỉṯtl l mnn* »

RS 94.2273:1-2 « [*tḥ*]*m ảbny* [*l*] *ủrtṯb* »

This pattern is distinguished from the standard address formula by the absence of the word *rgm*, normally a standard element of the « R » component.[512] In this respect,

---

[508]None of the examples permits a determination of whether the <SR> order of mention was independent of social variables; a proof text would be an ascending letter bearing an address of this type, <N_S *l* N_R>. There are, however, no examples of this pattern which bear a <RS> order of mention.

[509]See above, section 1.5.2.3; for the similar functional role played by the literary « S » motif (though not the literary « R » motif), compare section 1.5.2.1.

[510]The administrative corpus contains examples of nominal phrases of composition similar to this pattern, that is, exhibiting the pattern « noun phrase + preposition + noun phrase », which also function as headings or titles to the text which follows. Compare line 1 of RS 19.016: {(1) spr . ḥpr . bnš mlk . b yrḫ ỉṯ⌈t⌉[bnm]}, "Document of the rations of the king's personnel in the month of ʾIṯṯ[BNM]."

[511]It is known, however, much later, among a few of the Aramaic letters from the Bar Kochba period; see D. Schwiderski, *Handbuch des nordwestsemitischen Briefformulars* (2000) 247-248.

three other "non-standard" address formulas, which also lack the verb *rgm*, may be grouped here as well:

RS 16.264:1-3 « *tḥm rgm mlk l ḫyʾl* »

RS 16.265:21-23 « *tḥm ḏ mn l iṯtl* »

RS 18.148:1-2 « *tḥm ydn ʿm mlk bʿlh* »

Taken together, these five address formulas do not form a perfectly coherent group in terms of their structure. RS 16.265.2 is the fewest formal divergences from the pattern « *tḥm* N_S *l* N_R »: it differs only by the presence of a relative pronoun, here written {ḏ}, between the two elements of the « S » component.[513] RS 16.264 differs from the others in that its « S » component bears the structure « *tḥm rgm* N_S » rather than « *tḥm* N_S »,[514] and by the fact the « S » component is there separated from the « R » component by a scribal line.[515] Finally, RS 18.148 is distinguished from the other three letters, and from all other Ugaritic letters in fact, by its use of the preposition *ʿm* rather than *l* at the beginning of the « R » component,[516] and by its use of a third

---

[512]See above, section 1.2.3.

[513]See above, section 1.2.2.

[514]It is possible, in theory at least, to harmonize this apparent difference, by interpreting the word *rgm* in the string {(1) tḥm rgm (2) mlk } as a G-stem participle (or comparable nominal form), in construct with the following word: */*taḥmu rāgimi malki*/, 'Message of the *porte-parole* of the king.' This would yield the pattern « *tḥm* N_S *l* N_R ». In practicical terms, however, there is no evidence (apart from this ambiguous passage) for a royal functionary bearing the title *rgm mlk*, and in the absence of such support, it may methodologically preferable to avoid multiplying the ranks of the royal administration without warrant.

[515]See above, section 1.2.2.

[516]See above, section 1.2.3. These peculiarities may require a reconsideration of the precise literary genre of the tablet; D. Pardee (personal communication) does not exclude its status as an archival record rather than as a letter proper.

person pronominal suffix, rather than first person, attached to the REL term in the « R » component.[517]

Despite these heterogeneities, all five address formulas are similar in a number of key respects which justify grouping them together as variant representations of a basic pattern « *tḥm* N_S *l* N_R »: (1) presence of *tḥm* in the « S » component, (2) the absence of the verb *rgm* from the « R » component, and (3) the « SR » order of mention. On the basis of RS 18.148 and RS 94.2273,[518] and the fact that there are no examples of this pattern which bear an « RS » order of mention, one can even suggest that the « SR » order of mention in addresses of this type was fixed and independent of social variables. Thus, this variant pattern is distinct from the standard address formula not only in terms of composition, but also in terms of distribution.

The fact that three of these formulas derive from scribal practice letters[519] is intriguing, and would seem to imply the existence at Ugarit itself of an actively used epistolary tradition which was independent, at least in respect to the composition of the address formula, from the mainstream tradition. Furthermore, allowing equivalences of a functional if not purely formal nature, the pattern represented here is in many respects comparable with the old Syrian epistolary address formula attested in the Ebla texts,[520] as well as with the address formula in the Old Akkadian tradition.[521]

---

[517]This feature is also found in the address of RS 17.063: {ʿzn bn byy l ảḫth ʿtty}.

[518]RS 18.148 is explicitly ASC POW. RS 94.2273 is technically HOR POW, but the presence of the prostration formula suggests a socially ascending relationship within this broad category of "siblingship".

[519]RS 16.265.1 and RS 16.265.2 (on the same tablet, accompanied by abecedaries and other exercises); and RS 94.2273 (accompanied on the verso by a lexical text in syllabic script).

[520]At least three attested compositional patterns for the address formula are comparable in certain respects: the most common pattern « *en-ma* ID NI-*na* ID », and the less well attested patterns

Among the more or less contemporary cuneiform epistolary traditions of the western periphery, few parallels are known to me.[522] Epistolary traditions posterior to the Late Bronze Age also employ similar patterns.[523]

1.7.2.3 "Non-standard" addresses in which « S » is absent

RS 1.020:1-2	« *l ri*[*š r ʿy*] *ypt* ʿ⌈-⌉[…] »
RS 3.334:1	« [*l r*]*iš r ʿy yp*[*t* …] »[524]
RS 19.011:1-2	« *l ǵrdn bʿly rgm* »
RIH 78/12:1-2	« *l mlkt ủmy ảdty* »

Finally, at least two, and possibly as many as four Ugaritic letters contain address formulas which contain no « S » component. At least in the case of RS 19.011 and RIH 78/12, however, one hesitates to attribute this omission to an explicitly

---

« *en-ma* ID *si-in* ID » and « maḫ-maḫ ID NI-*na* ID ». For further detail as well as bibliographical references, see above, section 1.4.2.5.4.

[521]On the Old Akkadian pattern « *enma* N_S *ana* N_R », see E. Salonen, *StOr* 38 (1967) 12-13; and Kienast and Volk, *Die sumerischen und akkadischen Briefe* (1995) 4-20.

[522]EA 100, for example, presents a similar, though not identical structure. Msk 7441.2 may present another such parallel.

[523]Compare, for example, Neo-Assyrian « *awāt šarri ana* N_R » and Late Babylonian « *ṭuppu* N_S *ana* N_R ». The Neo-Assyrian model is especially common in letters from the king; compare S. Parpola, SAA 1 (1987) 4 (NL 39:1 {⌈a⌉-bat LUGAL a-na PN}), p. 9 (ABL 305:1-2 {a-bat LUGAL (2) a-na PN}), and p. 12 (ABL 306+:1 {a-bat LUGAL a-na PN}); and also S. W. Cole and P. Machinist, SAA 13 (1998), nos. 1, 4, and 5, pp. 4-6. The Late Babylonian form is discussed by E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 81.

[524]On the possibility that the address of this letter lacked a <S> component, compare Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 9 (RS 3.334), remarques épistolographiques: "Si notre interprétation de la première ligne s'admet . . . , les formules d'introduction n'ont peut-être pas comporté la formule indiquant le nom de l'expéditeur. Pour graver la fin du toponyme ({y⌈-⌉[…]}) et la formule « *rgm tḥm* NP » le scribe aurait vraisemblablement fait déborder l'écriture sur le *verso* de la tablette."

independent scribal tradition: the circumstances under which these letters were composed may also have been a factor.

CHAPTER 2

THE PROSTRATION FORMULA

2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.1 The "polite formulas" in general

Following the address and prior to the body of the letter, the scribes of Ugarit, depending on the circumstances of the writing of the letter and the social relationship between the correspondents, often inserted one or more formulas which may be described collectively, on the basis of their tone and content, as "polite formulas".[1]

---

[1]Compare the descriptive phrases used by O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 11 ("die den Brief eröffnenden Höflichkeitsformeln", and, throughout, "die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln"); and by A. Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), cols. 1414-1415 ("les phrases de politesse"). S. W. Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 49-50 (on the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra) and p. 99 (on the Ugaritic letters), refers to these formulas collectively as the "salutation", a terminology which is also adopted by M. Yamada, *UF* 24 (1992) 432, and J. Huehnergard, *HUS* (1999) 376 [Note, however, that this usage of "salutation" by Ahl, Yamada, and Huehnergard is not to be confused with that of this dissertation, in which the term "salutation" is used specifically for the polite formula of the type *yšlm lk*, 'May it be well for you', and its variants, and not as a general cover term for all the "polite formulas" taken collectively]. Studies of other more or less contemporary cuneiform epistolary traditions have employed similar terminology: the German term "Grussformeln" was adopted by Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967), *passim*, in his study of Akkadian epistolary traditions (note also the more specific phrase used in the title of his work), and by A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 64, in her treatment of the Hittite traditions. E. Cancik-Kirschbaum employs the phrase "Ergebenheitsformeln und Grussformeln" for a comparable group of formulas in the Middle Assyrian tradition: see her *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 53-61.

At least three types of "polite formulas" may be distinguished on formal grounds: (1) the "prostration formula", studied here; (2) the "salutation", treated below in chapter 3; and (3) the "benediction", treated below in chapter 4.[2]

The distribution of these polite formulas varies widely, from the cool and distant tone of some letters which contain none of them, to the extreme civility of others which contain all three; it appears to be directly linked to at least two factors: (1) the conceptual status of the letter as ascending, descending, or horizontal; and (2) the specific conceptual model used to characterize the social relationship between the correspondents.[3]

The placement of horizontal scribal lines, mentioned above, is another feature which aids in the isolation and definition of the "polite formulas" as distinct from other structural sections of the letter.[4] Not only is the section of the letter containing the "polite formulas" often physically separated from the address and the body by the use of these lines,[5] but also, and perhaps more importantly, such lines are not used

---

[2]I am thus in basic agreement with Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 49-50 : ". . . the salutation . . . can include as many as three sections: 1) obeisance of the sender to the addressee, 2) greeting, and 3) divine blessing, in that order." Compare also Yamada, *UF* 24 (1992) 432. The status of the "double formula of well-being", treated below in chapter 5, as a potential fourth component of the "polite formulas", or, rather, as a highly stereotyped element of the body of the letter, is also treated below, in section 5.

[3]On these issues, see above, section 0.6.

[4]Section 0.3.

[5]This feature is found in RS 4.475, 11.872, 15.174, 16.137[bis], 16.379, 16.402, 17.139, 18.040, 18.113, 18.134, 18.140.2, 18.147, 19.029, 19.102.1, 34.124, 92.2005.2, 94.2383+, 94.2479, and 94.5003+. Some caution is required in drawing conclusions from this physical distribution, despite its frequency, due to the occasionally unsystematic way in which horizontal scribal lines were employed. In some letters, horizontal scribal lines were used either not at all or to a markedly lesser extent in marking structural divisions; compare RS 92.2010, 94.2273, 94.2406.2, RIH 78/03+, and RIH 78/12. Furthermore, as mentioned above, in some cases the three "polite formulas" described above were grouped together along with another formula, the "double formula of well-being" (see below, section 5.3). Finally, the use of scribal lines between the address and the "polite formulas" was not entirely

internally within the "polite formula" section. These physical aspects suggest the conceptual unity of the "polite formulas" as a distinct structural unit for the Ugaritian scribes themselves, and further justifies, perhaps even requires, treating them together under a single rubric.[6]

2.1.2 The "prostration formula" as a polite formula

Among the polite formulas is one particular form, the "prostration formula", so-called on the basis of the imagery and vocabulary employed within,[7] which

---

consistent either; compare RS 1.018, 1.020, 15.158, 16.265, 17.063, 17.117, 17.434+, 29.093, 34.148, and RS [Varia 4] (note that many of these letters contain features which are unique or otherwise non-standard within the Ugaritic epistolary corpus). These exceptions should not, however, invalidate the statistical tendency to group these three "polite formulas" together physically by means of scribal lines.

[6]The treatment of Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 49-50, 99, shows an awareness of this distribution; and in this she is followed by Yamada, *UF* 24 (1992) 432; and Huehnergard, *HUS* (1999) 376 (both treating the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters). Treatments of Ugaritic, or, more broadly, Ugaritian epistolography which do not, however, highlight this physical aspect also tend to overlook the conceptual bond between these three polite formulas over against other epistolary formulas and motifs. Compare A. L. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 143, 147-153, who treats the "salutation" (see below, section 3) and the "benediction" (see below, section 4) together under the rubric "greetings", and further places the "greetings" on a conceptual level of parity with the address, prostration formulas, and "informations about . . . well-being." J.-L. Cunchillos, *HUS* (1999) 361, also groups the address, "proskynesis" (here called the prostration formula), "greetings" (here called the salutation), and "wishes" (here called the benediction) together under a single rubric, the "heading" (here called the *praescriptio*). These descriptions may be valid and useful in some respects, but they neglect the fundamental structural unity of the three polite formulas over against the address on the one hand and the body which follows on the other.

[7]This is the appellation used by S. E. Loewenstamm, *Lešonenu* 30 (1966), in the English summary (the Hebrew phrase he uses is נוסחאות השתחוויה, that is, "formulas of prostration"; but "formulas of prostrations" in *Comparative Studies* [1980] 234); also *idem*, *BASOR* 188 (1967) 42 ("prostration"); reprinted in *Comparative Studies* (1980) 246-248. Compare also J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 67 ("prosternation"), referring to the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra; O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) p. 13 and following ("[die] Proskynese"); Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 49-52 and pp. 99-104 ("statement of obeisance"), referring to the Ras Shamra Akkadian and Ugaritic letters; F. B. Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 421-422 ("prostration formula"), referring to the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra; A. L. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 147-150 ("prostration formula"); A. Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979) cols. 1415 ("formule de proskynèse"); J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 244, 249-251 ("la proskynèse"); A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 55 and *passim* ("die Huldigungsformel"),

communicates not merely politeness, but explicit subserviance on the part of the sender toward the recipient. This "prostration formula", abbreviated « pros », is treated here, first among the polite formulas,[8] for two reasons: (1) it occurs prior to the other polite formulas in the vast majority of examples,[9] and (2) in the situational context of

---

referring to this formula in Hittite letters; E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 57 ("die Prosternierungsformel"), referring to middle Assyrian letters; Cunchillos, *HUS* (1999) 361-363 ("the proskynesis"); J. Huehnergard, *HUS* (1999) 376 ("statement of obeisance"), refering to the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra; Yamada, *UF* 24 (1992) 432 ("Homage: statement of X's obedience [sic] to Y"); and D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 12 (RS 8.315) and throughout ("la formule de prosternation").

[8]Compare Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 147-150, and Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 249-251, who treat the « pros » formula immediately after the address, and prior to the other polite formulas; but contrast Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 20-22, who treats it last of all the polite formulas.

[9]When more than one polite formula is present, the « pros » occurs first in fourteen out of seventeen reasonably well-preserved examples: RS 8.315, 11.872, 16.379, 16.402, 18.113 (a non-standard polite formula follows the « pros »), 20.199, 34.124, 94.2273, 94.2391, 94.2428 (partially reconstructed), 94.2479, 94.2545+ (the structure of this letter is unusual: although the "polite formulas" do not immediately follow the address in this letter, a « pros » formula does occur immediately prior to a "benediction"), 94.5003+ (partially reconstructed), and RIH 78/03+ (partially preserved). In several other letters, which lack the polite formulas here called the "salutation" (see below, chapter 3) and the "benediction" (see below, chapter 4), but which contain one or both components of the "double formula of well-being" (see below, chapter 5), the « pros » formula occurs prior to either part of the "double formula of well-being": RS 9.479A, 16.137[bis], and 19.102.2. The final five illegible lines following the « pros » formula in RS 19.102.1 may also have contained the "double formula of well-being". In at least three letters, however, the « pros » formula is not the first of the polite formulas: RS 29.093 (which contains a non-standard salutation), RS 92.2010, and RS 94.5009 (which is not perfectly preserved, but appears to contain, following the address, a scribal line followed by a "salutation" and a partially preserved prostration formula). Although very fragmentary, RS 18.[364] may represent a fourth such exception, in having a "salutation" formula, {[...]yšl[m ...]}, prior to the « pros » formula, {[...]mr⌜ḥ⌝[qtm]}, however: (1) the letter is too fragmentary for the reconstruction of these formulas to be certain, and (2) the would-be "salutation" is separated from the would-be prostration formula by a scribal line, a physical arrangement which would be unique for the three "polite formulas" within the Ugaritic corpus. It is also possible that RS 18.287 does not, in fact, represent a fifth exception; D. Pardee, *JNES* 43 (1984) 239-242, identified two joins in re-collating this text which allowed him to improve the readings of the *editio princeps*, C. Virolleaud, *PRU* 5 (1965), no. 128, p. 176, and more importantly for our purposes, reconstruct the prostration formula prior to the previously published portions of the letter. Prior to the reconstructed prostration formula, Pardee saw a horizontal scribal line, and above this, traces of two signs at the end of a preceding line of text, which he reconstructed as {[tǵrk . tšl]⌜mk⌝} (the "benediction" formula, see below, section 4). Although, of course, such would need to be verified through collation, formal considerations lead one to expect the two partially preserved signs at the end of the first preserved line to belong not the "benediction", which occurs prior to the prostration formula in only two known examples (RS 29.093 and RS 92.2010, mentioned above),

"indirect" communication,[10] as in the scenes portraying the delivery of messages in the Ugaritic mythological narratives, the act of prostration, when present, occurs prior to any verbal exchange.[11]

2.2 Composition

The Ugaritic « pros » formula is a grammatically intact verbal utterance,[12] with both the predication and an indication of its grammatical subject expressed in the finite verbal form, which normally occurs at the very end of the formula.[13] Apart from this verbal element, the rest of the formula is made up of various adverbial phrases, some occurring in all attestations of the formula, others employed only occasionally.

---

and which is to date never separated from the prostration formula by a horizontal scribal line within the Ugaritic corpus, but rather to the end of the « S » component of the address, which virtually always appears immediately before the prostration formula, and virtually always with an intervening horizontal scribal line. In this light, it may be worthwhile to re-collate this portion, with the reading {[ʿb]⌈dk⌉}, '⌈your⌉ [serva]⌈nt⌉', in mind as an epigraphic possibility for the first preserved line, rather than {[tšl]⌈mk⌉}—Pardee, *ibid.*, made no textual remarks on the reading of these two signs; this problem thus presents an example of the occasional utility of intricately detailed textual remarks, of the type included in the tablet publications here.

[10]By "indirect" communication, I mean communication between two parties by means of an intermediary agent, to be contrasted with "direct" communication, which takes place without an intermediary agent. J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 241, describes these situations as "ternaire" and "binaire", respectively.

[11]That is to say, the standard messenger protocol portrayed in the Ugaritic literary texts appears to have consisted of (1) actual prostration before the recipient, followed by (2) the commencement of verbal exchange, where one should presumably place the situational context of polite greetings such as the "salutation" and "benediction" formulas. Assuming that the epistolary formulas of the *praescriptio* were to some extent adapted from the polite protocols reflected in this conceptual world, the sequence described above may help explain why the epistolary « pros » formula frequently precedes other formulas. For more on the conceptual background of the « pros » formula, see below, section 2.5.

[12]In this respect the « pros » is unlike the « S » component of the address, which is described above as a "free-standing nominal phrase".

[13]The most common verbal form is singular: *qlt*, 'I have fallen prostrate'. The dual is also attested: *qlny*, 'we (two) have fallen prostrate'. For the grammatical analysis of these forms, see below, section 2.6.

The first component of the Ugaritic « pros » formula[14] is a prepositional phrase composed of the following structural elements: « *l p ʿn* N_R », where N_R, as in the address formula, represents the noun or noun phrase(s) referring to the recipient. The composition of this N_R element in the « pros » formula, however, is significantly different from that of the address formula. In the address the N_R component virtually always contained an ID element,[15] and very often a REL element as well.[16] In the Ugaritic « pros » formulas, the N_R component consists of only a REL element.[17] This

---

[14]The prepositional phrase « *l p ʿn* N_R » is the first element of every example of the « pros » formula in the Ugaritic corpus preserved adequately enough to permit analysis, with the possible exception of RS 94.2273, in which the signs {ql[t]} at the end of line 1 may represent the beginning of the formula (see the edition, below, in part 2). In the « pros » formulas of the Akkadian and Hittite comparative corpora, the corresponding phrase, « *ana šēpē* N_R », is also very often the first element of the « pros » formula. Nevertheless, exceptions are known from Ras Shamra, Tell Meskene, Boğazköy, and Amarna, in which the « pros » formulas begin not with this prepositional phrase, but with other elements. Compare, for example, RS 32.204.1, RS 32.204.2, and probably also RS 25.138 from Ras Shamra; Msk 7474+ from Tell Meskene; KBo 9.82, 18.01.2, 18.11, 18.12.2, and probably also 18.50 from Boğazköy; and at least twenty-four letters from Amarna: EA 52-53, 55, 88, 147-151, 153-157, 159-161, 168, probably 200, 211, 215, 282, and 317-318.

[15]By the ID element, I mean that element identifying the recipient individually and specifically, by means of a personal name or administrative/political title; see the introduction, section 1.6.2. On the ID elements in Ugaritic address formulas, see above, sections 1.2.2-1.2.3.

[16]The nature of the REL element in the « pros » formula corresponds to that of the address: a noun phrase which expresses, whether in a literal or metaphorical sense, the social relationship between the recipient and the sender, as perceived by the sender. More specifically, the noun phrase consists of a common noun and an attached first person suffix (referring to the sender); the common noun may be drawn from one of two conceptual models, that of immediate biological kinship or that of hierarchical power relationships, both of which coexist in the broader conceptual model of the "household". On the REL element, and on the two conceptual models from which it is drawn, see section 0.6.

[17]As already noted by Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 249, n. 26, there is some variation in the composition of the N_R component of the « pros » formula (this variation is described in the text above). What Cunchillos does not explicitly mention is that the ID element of the « R » component of the address is, as of the present data, never used in the « pros ». While he is certainly aware of the distinction between the elements here labeled ID and REL (he describes the REL elements as "des appellatifs de relation qui remplacent les noms des correspondants ou s'y ajoutent," *ibid.*, p. 247), in translating this element of the « pros » as "aux pieds de X (le destinataire)" and "aux pieds de N (le destinataire)", *ibid.*, p. 249, it is not explicitly clear that, in the Ugaritic corpus, this "X" or "N" is always a REL element, never a ID element.

REL element may be drawn on the biological kinship model, as in *l pʿn ůmy*,[18] 'at the two feet of my mother'; or it may be drawn from the hierarchical power model, as in *l pʿn bʿly*,[19] 'at the two feet of my lord', and *l pʿn ådty*,[20] 'at the two feet of my lady'. While it is true that the vast majority of these REL elements denote an explicitly superior social role, in at least two instances a conceptually "horizontal" social term, drawn on the biological kinship model, is used: *l pʿn åḫy*, 'at the two feet of my brother.'[21] Finally, in one instance, the REL element contains no relative social status information at all, but is simply a second person pronominal suffix: *l pʿnk*, 'at your two feet.'[22] Since this prepositional phrase, « *l pʿn* N_R », occurs in every intact example

---

[18]Compare RS 11.872, RS 16.379, and RS 34.124. Note that the masculine equivalent *l pʿn ådny*, 'at the two feet of my father,' though not yet explicitly attested in any extant « pros » formula in Ugaritic, is probably to be restored in the « pros » formula of RS 19.102.1: {| (6) l . ⌜pʿ⌝[n . ådny] (7) q[lt ...]}. Compare, in an Akkadian version of the « pros », RS 20.168 (*Ug* 5, no. 21), { (2') [a-n]a GÌR.MEŠ a-bi-i[a am-]q[ut]}, 'at the feet of m[y] father [I f]a[ll].'

[19]Compare RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 18.140.2, RS 19.102.2, RS 92.2010, and RS 94.2391. Note also this form with the 1st person common dual suffix in RS 29.093, *l pʿn bʿlny*, 'at the two feet of our lord.'

[20]Compare RS 9.479A, RS 16.137[bis], RS 20.199, RS 94.2479, RS 94.2479. Note also this form with the 1st person common dual suffix in RS 8.315, *l pʿn ådtny*, 'at the two feet of our lady.'

[21]The citation is from RS 94.2273. Compare also the "phonetic" spelling of the same phrase in RS 94.2545+:17, [*l p*]*ʿn îḫy*. Note that such a usage occurs also in conceptually horizontal Ras Shamra Akkadian letters: RS 20.232:4, and RS 34.164:5.

[22]RIH 78/12:2. The same feature is also found in at least two Ras Shamra Akkadian letters: RS 20.200C and RS 20.232. The usage of a pronoun in a REL slot, and the concomitant omission of social status information, is consistent with a pattern visible elsewhere in the employment of the biological kinship model: less informational content presumably indicates less attention to social status differences, and, by extension, a lack of explicit deference. A similar situation will be encountered in the "salutation" formula (see below, section 3): *yšlm lk*, which uses a pronoun for the N_R element, may be considered less deferential than *l ådty yšlm*.

of the Ugaritic « pros » formula,[23] it may be described as a "necessary" element of the Ugaritic « pros » formula.

Another component of the Ugaritic « pros » formula, as mentioned above, is a finite verbal form in the suffix conjugation, inflected in the first person and in number appropriate for the sender or senders.[24] This verbal component occurs as the final element of the Ugaritic formula, without exception.[25] As with the prepositional phrase « *l p'n* N_R » described above, this verbal element is also attested in every preserved example of the « pros ».[26] This, combined with the fact that, in containing both the subject and verbal predication of the formula, it may be considered essential for the grammatical integrity of the utterance, justifies describing the verbal form as a second "necessary" element of the « pros » formula.

---

[23]The syllabic « pros » formulas from the epistolary corpora of Ras Shamra, Tell Meskene, Boğazköy, Tell el-Amarna, Tell Atchana, and Tel Aphek also consistently contain the equivalent of this Ugaritic element, normalized in Akkadian « *ana šēpē* N_R ». See below, section 2.4.

[24]In other words, when the sender is a single individual (the vast majority of cases), the form of the verb is singular, *qlt*, 'I have fallen prostrate'; but when there are two authors (attested twice: RS 8.315 and 29.093), the verb is inflected in the dual number, *qlny*, 'we (two) have fallen prostrate'. The case of more than two authors is not yet attested in the Ugaritic corpus. Note the Akkadian letter from Emar, Msk 7452, which has two authors, but yet which uses a singular verbal form, *amqut*, 'I have fallen', in the « pros » formula. Contrast this with EA 59 and 100 from the Amarna corpus, for example, which have multiple authors, and which use a first person plural form of the verb, spelled {ni-am-qut} and {ni-am-qú-ut}, respectively, 'we have fallen.'

[25]This statement applies within the Ugaritic corpus. The « pros » formulas written in syllabic script, comparable in composition and distribution to the alphabetic « pros » formulas, also tend to show such a verb-final structure, but exceptions are known from Ras Shamra, Boğazköy, and Tell Amarna which do not show verb final structure: RS 32.204.1 and probably also RS 25.138 from Ras Shamra; KBo 9.82 from Boğazköy; and, from Amarna, EA 64, 65, probably 200, 209, 213, 224, 232-235+, 263, 281-284, 298-299, 301, 303-306, 314-316.1, 319-320, 322-326, 328, 330-331, 366, and 378.

[26]In the case of RS 94.2273, lines 1-6, this verbal element occurs more than once, and possibly as many as three times (see below, in the publication of that tablet). Compare also the multiple occurrences of *amqut* in the "piggyback" letter, RS 32.204.2 (RSO 7, no. 19), *verso*, lines 4-5. Several Amarna letters also show multiple verbal forms: EA 63, 184, 209, and 283.

A number of examples of the Ugaritic « pros » formula contain only these two elements,[27] illustrating that they are the only two components to be considered as necessary elements of the formula. In terms of distribution, such two-element « pros » formulas are most often associated with the biological kinship model.[28] Such an association appears explainable, at least in part, if one admits (1) that two-element « pros » formulas, in containing less information, are correspondingly less deferential than more elaborate versions of the « pros » formula, and further, (2) that a less deferential formulary is not only typical of but more appropriate for the biological kinship model over against the hierarchical power model. In other words, the child-parent relationship implies less social distance than the slave-master relationship, and, generally speaking, the lesser the social distance which separates the correspondents, the less elaborate, that is, the less deferential, the corresponding epistolary formulary.[29]

---

[27]These include RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 19.102.1, RS 34.124, RS 94.2479, RS 94.2545+, RS 94.5003+, RIH 78/03+, and RIH 78/12.

[28]Of the nine letters containing such two-element « pros » formulas, seven are composed along the biological kinship model: RS 11.872, 16.379, 34.124, and 94.2545+; despite the fact that the appropriate REL terms of the « pros » formula need to be reconstructed, RS 19.102.1 and 94.5003+ belong here as well. Finally, RIH 78/12, where the « pros » formula uses a pronoun instead of a REL term (*l p ʿnk*), is also composed along this model. The remaining two letters which contain a two-element « pros » formula are composed along the hierarchical power model: RS 94.2479 and RIH 78/03+ (partially reconstructed).

[29]This line of inferences allows some further comment on the two letters, mentioned above, which contain a two-element « pros » formula, but which are composed along the hierarchical power model: RS 94.2479 and RIH 78/03+. If it is admitted that the social relationships between the respective recipients and senders of these two letters are ascending ones (the REL terms used are *ȧdty* / *ʿbdk*, and *bʿly* / *ʿbdk*, respectively), the fact that in both cases the senders also occupy relatively "elite" positions on a broader social perspective (RS 94.2479 is from the *skn* of Ugarit to the queen; RIH 78/03+ is plausibly from [*ʿmṯtm*]*r*, king of Ugarit, to the "great king" of Egypt) may also be relevant in explaining the use of a less elaborate, and consequently less deferential two-element « pros » formula.

Other attestations of the Ugaritic « pros » formula, however, contain more than two elements. These additional elements all function adverbially, and are normally positioned between the two "necessary" components described above. These may be considered "optional" elements, and include, in order of their frequency, (1) the word *mrḥqtm*,[30] (2) an adverbial phrase expressing multiplication, with the structural pattern « (numeral)(*i*)*d* (*w*) (numeral)(*i*)*d* »,[31] and (3) the word *hllm*, attested only once, in RS 94.2273, and of uncertain meaning. The inclusion of these "optional" elements appears to have been largely influenced by the social relationship between the correspondents, and more specifically, by the conceptual model used to portray that

---

[30]In RS 16.402:3, this element of the « pros » is spelled {mrḥqm} instead of standard {mrḥqtm}. This appears to have been a simple scribal error. Note, however, the second occurrence of the spelling {mrḥqm}, in RS 24.277, a text, probably of an ominological nature, inscribed on a lung model, published in M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *Ugaritica* 6 (1969) 165-172 (photo, p. 101); see now the re-edition in D. Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000), chap. 51 (RS 24.277) 712-727 (with comprehensive anterior bibliography). In "field « 10 »", lines 26'- 27', Pardee reads: { (26') bt hn bnš yqḥ ʿz (27') w yḥdy mrḥqm}, which he translates "dans la maison (ou : quant à la maison), voici que le(s hommes du) personnel prendront une chèvre et ils verront au loin." The context is clearly not the same as that of the epistolary « pros » formula, but in light of two attestations of the spelling {mrḥqm}, it is at least conceivable that *mrḥqm* in RS 16.402 was an intentional spelling. The equivalent of *mrḥqtm* in the « pros » formulas of (Syro-)Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra and Tell Meskene is *ištu rūqiš*, 'from afar'; this element does not occur in the Amarna corpus.

[31]The structure of this phrase can be represented by the following formula: « (numeral)(*i*)*d* (*w*) (numeral)(*i*)*d* », with the most common element in both numeral slots being *šbʿ*, "seven". In four examples (RS 19.102.2, 29.093, 94.2391, and probably 94.5009), the first numeral slot is occupied by *ṯn*, "two" (with the second occupied by *šbʿ*, "seven"); and in one example (RS 94.2273) the final numeral slot is occupied by *ṯmn*, "eight" (with the first occupied by *šbʿ*, "seven"). The multiplicative particle attached to *ṯn*, "two", and *ṯmn*, "eight", is, without exception -*id*. There are six examples in which both numeral elements are *šbʿ*, "seven"; in five of these cases (probably RS 16.137[bis], 18.040, 18.113, 20.199, and 92.2010), both multiplicative particles are -*d*; in one case the second multiplicative particle is -*id* (RS 9.479A). For a grammatical treatment of these components, see below, section 2.6.5. Akkadian equivalents to this Ugaritic multiplicative element are attested in letters from Ras Shamra, Tell Meskene, and Amarna. In many respects they exhibit more formal diversity than the Ugaritic formula: (1) there is a greater number of numerals attested in the numeral slot (in addition to 7, 2, we have 3, 9, 10, and 12); (2) there are examples in which as many as four numerals occur; (3) there is in the Amarna corpus a greater diversity in the multiplicative particle; and (4), also in the Amarna corpus, there are adverbial elements unattested in Ugaritic versions of the formula. For the syllabic versions of the multiplicative element in more detail, see below, section 2.4.

social relationship, as reflected by the REL components employed. In terms of distribution, all but one of the Ugaritic « pros » formulas which contain one or more "optional" elements reflect, at least in part, the hierarchical power model.[32] Such a distribution is not surprising since this conceptual model is typically characterized by a more elaborate, and consequently more deferential, formulary.

Upon present evidence for the Ugaritic « pros » formula, when only one "optional" element is present, it is without exception the word *mrḥqtm*.[33] In other words, every example of a Ugaritic « pros » formula which contains a multiplicative phrase also contains the word *mrḥqtm*. In « pros » formulas which contain both the word *mrḥqtm* and a multiplicative phrase, the multiplicative element very often occurs first.[34] In RS 94.2273, the single example of a « pros » formula containing all three

---

[32]The exception is RS 94.2273, conceived on the HOR BIO model (*l pʿn åḫy*). Not only does the « pros » formula here appear in a horizontal letter, itself a rarity, but the particular « pros » formula used is more elaborate, and consequently, one would suppose, more deferential, than any other « pros » formula preserved in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus. The fact that this tablet is a scribal exercise (see the edition below) seems to have been a factor; compare the most elaborate example known of a "benediction" formula, that of RS 16.265.1, also a scribal exercise. Perhaps that genre, in preparing scribes for the potentially delicate protocols of diplomacy which awaited them, encouraged a certain ampleness of expression. RS 8.315 may also represent an exception of sorts, even though the « pros » formula itself uses a term drawn from the hierarchical power model (*l pʿn ådtny*), since the letter is also in part composed along the biological kinship model: one of the two authors elsewhere addresses the recipient with the biological kinship term *ůmy*.

[33]This type is represented by three Ugaritic letters: RS 8.315, 16.402, and 18.140.2 (partially reconstructed); and also by an example in an Akkadian letter from Ras Shamra, RS 34.164: {a-na GÌR.II ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ia iš-tu ru-qiš am-qut}, 'At the two feet of my brothers, from afar, I have fallen prostrate.' D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, has pointed out that "on peut aussi s'attendre à ce que l'expression du nombre de prosternations soit attestée un jour en ougaritique sans l'adverbe [that is, the word *mrḥqtm*], car la formule se recontre sous cette forme précise cinq fois en accadien (RS 20.182, RS 25.461, RS 34.135, RS 34.140, RS 34.151)."

[34]There are three Ugaritic « pros » formulas in which the word *mrḥqtm* precedes the multiplicative phrase: RS 18.113 (partially reconstructed), RS 20.199, and RS 94.2273. In eleven other letters, the multiplicative phrase precedes the word *mrḥqtm*: RS 9.479A, 16.137[bis], 18.040, 18.287, 18.[312] (partially reconstructed), 19.102.2, 29.093, 92.2010, 94.2391, 94.2428 (partially reconstructed), and 94.5009 (partially reconstructed).

"optional" components, the order of the elements is (1) *hllm*, (2) *mrḥqtm*, and (3) the multiplicative phrase *šbʿd ṯmnîd*.

At least one "expanded" version of the « pros » formula is known, in which one of the "necessary" components, which would normally occur only once per formula, is repeated: in RS 94.2273 the finite verbal form *qlt* occurs several times.

2.3 Distribution of the « pros » formula

The « pros » formula is explicitly attested or partially reconstructed at least twenty-seven times in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus as it is presently known,[35] and explicitly absent from at least twenty-seven Ugaritic letters.[36] This distribution shows that, unlike the address, the « pros » formula is not a necessary component of Ugaritic epistolary structure, but an optional one.

If optional, however, the distribution of the « pros » formula is not random. Its presence or absence is conditioned by the conceptual status of letter. Specifically, the « pros » formula tends to be used first and foremost with ascending letters,[37] tends not

---

[35]These include RS 8.315, 9.479A, 11.872, 16.137[bis], 16.379, 16.402, 18.040, 18.113, 18.140.2, 18.287, 18.[312], 19.102.2, 20.199, 29.093, 34.124, 92.2010, 94.2273, 94.2391, 94.2479, 94.2545+, 94.5003+, RIH 78/03+, and RIH 78/12. The « pros » formula is probably present, but needs to be partially reconstructed, in RS 19.102.1, 94.2428, 94.5009, and possibly also 17.327, bringing the total to twenty-seven occurrences. The formula may also be present in RS 18.[364]:3'.

[36]These include RS 4.475, 15.007, 15.008, 15.098, 16.264, 16.265, 17.063, 17.139, 17.434+, 18.031, 18.038, 18.134, 18.147, 18.148, 19.011, 19.029, 29.095, 34.148, 88.2159, 92.2005.1, 94.2284, 94.2383+, 94.2406.1, 94.2406.2, 94.2580, 96.2039, and RS [Varia 4]. In addition, the « pros » formula is very likely explicitly absent from RS 1.021, 15.158, 15.174, 17.117, 18.286[A], 19.181A, 92.2005.2, 94.2429, and RIH 77/21A, bringing the tentative total to thirty-six letters from which the « pros » formula is certainly or very likely explicitly absent.

[37]Of the twenty-seven explicit or plausibly reconstructed occurrences of the « pros » formula (see above), all but two (RS 94.2273 and 94.2545+) occur within letters which must be classified as ascending on the basis of the REL terms employed therein.

to be used in horizontal letters,[38] and is not used at all in conceptually unmarked or descending letters.

Regarding the use of the « pros » formula in horizontal letters, its recent appearance in two Ugaritic letters from the 1994 excavations which are terminologically HOR BIO, namely, RS 94.2273 and 94.2545+, brings the distribution of the Ugaritic « pros » formula in line with that of Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, where the usage of the « pros » formula in such letters was already known;[39] and makes obsolete previous treatments which equated the appearance of the « pros » formula uniquely with ascending letters.[40] The appearance of an epistolary motif expressing explicit subserviance in a letter of which the social terms are horizontal may seem less paradoxical if it is granted that even terminologically horizontal relationships could display an internal hierarchy in social status, a hierarchy significant enough to engender structural features typical of an ascending social situation. Put another way, no social relationship, even that of "brothers", is truly equal.[41]

---

[38]About twenty letters in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus are terminologically horizontal. Of these, only two examples employ the « pros » formula: RS 94.2273 and RS 94.2545+.

[39]See RS 20.232 [*Ug* 5, no. 58], and RS 34.164 [RSO 7, no. 34].

[40]Compare the remarks of D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, footnote: "Les exemples ne sont pas nombreux, mais ils permettent de nuancer la description courante de la formule comme employé uniquement dans un message provenant d'un personnage de rang inférieur au destinataire." As examples of this latter approach, Pardee here cites Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 13 and 20-21; Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 52, 75, and 101-102; F. B. Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 422, n. 1; Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 147-48; and S. A. Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 158.

[41]Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, footnote, offers the following comment on this aspect of the formula's distribution: "En effet, que le rapport soit familial ou social, on peut penser que la formule s'emploie entre personnages dont le niveau social est formellement égal mais pratiquement inégal ; cette inégalité consiste vraisemblablement en une différence d'âge : par exemple, un frère cadet, un débutant dans le commerce ou dans un poste administratif."

J.-L. Cunchillos had earlier described the distribution in slightly different terms, observing that the « pros » formula "se trouve, dans l'état actuel de la documentation, exclusivement dans les lettres qui utilisent le premier type d'adresse [that is, in addresses of the « RS » type]."[42] Since Ugaritic letters from a social subordinate to a superior, that is, ascending letters, very often contain the « RS » order of mention in the address, such a view has substantial overlap with the approach I have taken here, namely, proposing a connection between the « pros » formula and ascending letters. While this observation remains valid for the majority of examples, however, it no longer accounts for all of the currently available data: letters are now known which contain the « pros » formula, and yet bear the « SR » order of mention in the address.[43]

Beyond these distributional tendencies, however, the factors governing the presence or absence of the « pros » formula are difficult to define in a prescriptive way. Even within the corpus of ascending letters, for example, the « pros » formula is not a necessary element, but an optional one.[44] Neither does the presence or absence

---

[42]Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 249; retained in *idem*, *HUS* (1999) 361: "the proskynesis occurs only when the first form [= « RS »] is used."

[43]Just as the existence of two Ugaritic letters from the 1994 season, RS 94.2273 and RS 94.2545+, required adjustment of the view that the « pros » is associated uniquely with ascending letters (these two letters are terminologically horizontal, and yet nevertheless contain the « pros » formula; see above), RS 94.2273 also provides an exception to Cunchillos's statement, since it contains the « SR » order of mention as well as the « pros » formula. RS 94.2545+, if it is not considered as a double letter, represents another exception—it begins with an address of the « SR » order, and contains the « pros » formula in line 15. The overall interpretation of the epistolary structure of this text remains difficult, however (see part 2, below, in the edition of that tablet).

[44]Among the thirty ascending letters for which a standard Ugaritic epistolary *praescriptio* is intact or only partially restored, the « pros » formula is explicitly present or plausibly reconstructed in twenty-five instances (these include RS 8.315, 9.479A, 11.872, 16.137[bis], 16.379, 16.402, 17.327, 18.040, 18.113+, 18.140.2, 18.287, 18.[312], 19.102.1, 19.102.2, 20.199, 29.093, 34.124, 92.2010, 94.2391, 94.2428, 94.2479, 94.5003+, 94.5009, RIH 78/03+, and RIH 78/12); it is absent from at least five terminologically ascending letters for which a standard *praescriptio* is present and preserved: RS 15.008, 17.139, 19.011, 34.148, and 92.2005.1.

of the « pros » formula appear to be directly dependent on the conceptual model used to portray the social relationships within the letters. That is, the « pros » formula is present in the majority of ascending letters composed on the biological kinship model,[45] and absent from only a few;[46] and likewise present in the majority of ascending letters composed on the hierarchical power model,[47] and absent from only a few.[48]

---

[45]Among the eight ascending letters composed on the biological kinship model for which a standard Ugaritic epistolary *praescriptio* is intact or only partially restored, the « pros » formula is explicitly present or plausibly reconstructed in five instances: RS 11.872, 16.379, 19.102.1, 34.124, and 94.5003+. It is also present in the following letters which are "mixed" in using both conceptual models at the same time: RS 8.315 (*ůmy ådtny*, 'my mother, our lady') and RIH 78/12 (*ůmy ådty*, 'my mother, my lady').

[46]The « pros » formula is absent from three ascending letters composed on the biological kinship model: RS 15.008, 17.139, and 92.2005.1. It is also absent from RS 17.117, probably an ascending letter which is also conceived, at least in part, along the biological kinship model (compare *bnk* in line 3), but which represents an alternate epistolographic tradition; like other such letters based on alternative traditions, it too lacks a « pros » formula. A detailed treatment of the epistolographic form of this letter will appear in Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 33 (RS 17.117), remarques épistolographiques.

[47]Among the twenty ascending letters composed on the hierarchical power model for which a standard Ugaritic epistolary *praescriptio* is intact or only partially restored, the « pros » formula is explicitly present or plausibly reconstructed in eighteen instances: RS 9.479A, 16.137[bis], 16.402, 17.327, 18.040, 18.113+, 18.140.2, 18.287, 18.[312], 19.102.2, 20.199, 29.093, 92.2010, 94.2391, 94.2428, 94.2479, 94.5009, and RIH 78/12. As mentioned above, it is also present in two letters which are "mixed" in that they incorporate REL terms drawn from both conceptual models: RS 8.315 (*ůmy ådtny*, 'my mother, our lady') and RIH 78/12 (*ůmy ådty*, 'my mother, my lady').

[48]The « pros » formula is absent from two ascending letters composed on the hierarchical power model: RS 19.011 and 34.148. It is also absent from RS 19.029, which had previously been reconstructed with terms appropriate for an ascending letter; in light of its observable structure, its reconstruction ought now to be reconsidered. It is also absent from RS 18.148, which is also an ascending letter conceived along the hierarchical power model (compare *l mlk bʿlh* in "lines 1-2"), but which represents an alternate epistolographic tradition; like other such letters based on alternative traditions, it lacks a « pros » formula. The « pros » formula is also probably absent from RS 16.078+, 34.356, and 94.5015, all of which are ascending letters composed on the hierarchical power model; although, as mentioned above, these letters may also be archival copies rather than letters that were actually "sent".

Plausible explanations for the lack of a « pros » formula from at least some ascending letters are suggested by distributional considerations. In the first place, the « pros » formula is typically missing from (1) ascending letters which lack a standard *praescriptio*. These are of two types: (1a) letters which derive from an epistolary tradition different from that of the vast majority of Ugaritic letters, a tradition in which the « pros » formula was not a standard component of the formulary for ascending letters;[49] and (1b) archival copies and/or translations of international diplomatic letters, a literary form which represents a sub-set of the epistolary genre proper.[50] Secondly, the « pros » formula is absent from (2) "mixed" letters which are terminologically ascending, but which follow a structural pattern inconsistent with that of ascending letters, but consistent with that of horizontal and/or descending letters.[51]

Beyond these considerations, however, one is left with at least three ascending letters, containing an otherwise standard *praescriptio*, which nevertheless omit the « pros » formula: RS 19.011, 34.148, and 92.2005.1. Even in these cases, credible

---

[49]Ugaritic ascending letters lacking the « pros » formula which derive from an alternative epistolary tradition include RS 17.117, and probably RS 18.148. The unique formal aspects of RS 18.148 suggest that it either stems from an epistolary tradition independent of that in which most of the Ugaritic letters were composed, in which the « pros » formula was not part of the standard protocol of ascending letters, or represents a literary genre (or sub-genre) other than that of most of the preserved Ugaritic letters. A discussion of the formal features of RS 18.148 will appear in Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 46 (RS 18.148), remarques épistolographiques.

[50]Two Ugaritic ascending international diplomatic letters, RS 16.078+ and RS 94.5015, contain no hint of a standard *praescriptio*, and as such, lack the « pros » formula. Another two Ugaritic ascending international diplomatic letters, RS 34.356 and RIH 78/03+, do contain a recognizable *praescriptio*: Of these, RIH 78/03+ contains the « pros » formula; its *praescriptio* is not strikingly non-standard in that it contains an address of the « RS » order, a « pros » formula, and a recognizable « sal » formula. RS 34.356 probably does not contain a « pros » formula, but the *praescriptio* of RS 34.356 is non-standard at least for the reason that it contains two distinct address formulas, separated by six lines of text which do not contain motifs normally associated with the standard Ugaritic *praescriptio*. The fact that RS 34.356 contains another self-abasement motif in line 5, *ht ånk ʿbdk mîd*, 'Now then , I (am) indeed your servant!' may offer another, partial explanation for the lack of a « pros » formula.

[51]These include RS 15.008 and 17.139.

contextual explanations for the lack of the « pros » formula are not lacking.[52] Such explanations, however, are often difficult to test empirically, and it may be best simply to consider the « pros » formula as a typical feature of ascending letters, though not a necessary one.

When present, the « pros » formula occurs once per letter.[53] The placement of the formula within the letter is consistent; it always occurs within the epistolary section devoted to the "polite formulas", that is, within the epistolary section following the address, and prior to the non-formulaic body of the letter. Within the "polite formulas"

---

[52]In RS 19.011, for example, the catastrophe described in the body of the letter may have made polite deferential protocols seem superfluous and irrelevant to the author in light of the gravity of his own situation; compare the treatment of this letter in a recent synthesis by I. Singer, *HUS* (1999) 726. In RS 34.148, despite the explicitly ascending terminology, the structure of the *praescriptio*, namely, « RS sal ben body », is consistent with the structure of horizontal letters; perhaps in this sense RS 34.148 represents a "mixed" letter, terminologically ascending, structurally horizontal. In RS 92.2005.1, the biological kinship terms used may have literal meaning, and perhaps among family members deferential protocol was less important (when « pros » formulas are used in letters composed on the biological kinship model, they do tend to be less elaborate in terms of composition than « pros » formulas in letters composed on the hierarchical power model).

[53]I consider RS 94.2273 to contain not multiple « pros » formulas, but rather a single "expanded" version of the standard « pros », the expansion being the repetition of one constituent component. Compare the the "expanded" version of the « ben » formula in RS 16.265.1, also a scribal exercise. The « pros » of RS 94.2273 contains multiple occurrences of the verbal component *qlt*, 'I have fallen prostrate;' this element occurs at least two, and possibly as many as three times (see below, part 2, in the edition). Compare a similar repetition of the verbal element in an Akkadian letter from Ras Shamra, RS 32.204.2 (RSO 7, no. 19), *verso*, {(4) am-qut a-na GÌR.MEŠ EN-ia (5) iš-tu ru-qiš 2-šú 7-šú am-qut}, 'I have fallen at the feet of my lord; from afar, two times, seven times have I fallen.' Repeated elements are also known in Amarna examples, as in EA 63, {(5) a-na I GÌR.MEŠ ^{m}LUGAL-ri EN-ia (6) 7 ù 7 ma-aq-ta-ti a-na GÌR.MEŠ ^{m}LUG[AL] [E]N-[ia a]m-qú-ut}, where both components are repeated. Setting aside the issue of "expanded" « pros » formulas with repeated components, there are no examples of Ugaritic letters which contain two distinct « pros » formulas, separated by intervening elements.

section, the « pros » formula may occur either alone,[54] or along with one[55] or more[56] of the other polite formulas. When the « pros » formula appears along with other "polite formulas", it is most often the first component.[57]

---

[54]The best examples of this are RS 16.137[bis], 18.040, 18.140.2, and RIH 78/12. RS 9.479A and 19.102.2 are also comparable in that, of the "polite formulas", they contain the « pros » formula, but omit the "salutation" (see below, section 3) and the "benediction" (see below, section 4); the case of these two letters is complicated, however, by that fact that in both, the « pros » is immediately followed by the "request for information of well-being", without an intervening scribal line, allowing the possibility that this latter motif was considered as a "polite formula" in these instances. In the comparative corpora, letters which contain the « pros » but omit other "polite formula" are very frequent: *Ras Shamra*: RS 17.391, 17.393, 17.425, 20.016, 20.033, 20.095A, 20.151, 20.232, 25.138, 25.461, 34.135, and 34.150. *Tell Meskene*: all of the published letters from Emar which contain the « pros » formula show this structure: Msk 7454, 7442, 7452, 7497.1, 7441.1, 74102c, 7451.1, 7451.2, 7474+, 7472, 7498d (although this letter groups the "double formula of well-being" with the « pros », implying that, for the scribe, it too belonged among the "polite formulas"), and, assuming its provenance is Tell Meskene, RE 97. *Amarna*: This structure is found in EA 51-55, 58, 60, 62-65, 82, 84, 90-91, 93-94, 103-104, 106, 111, 126, and 129. *Boğazköy*: This structure is found in two of the Hittite « pros » formulas: KBo 18.11 and KBo 9.82; and probably all five Akkadian « pros » formulas: KBo 8.16, KBo 28.56, KBo 28.54, and probably KBo 28.55 and KBo 28.78.

[55]Ugaritic letters which contain the « pros » and the "benediction", but omit the "salutation", include RS 8.315, 18.113+, 94.2273, and probably also 94.2545+ (though the unique features of this text make it difficult to interpret). Of these three, RS 8.315 represents a special case in that the scribe has placed the "double formula of well-being" immediately following the "benediction", and without an intervening scribal line, perhaps implying that the scribe understood this latter motif to be part of the "polite formulas". Several letters from Amarna also show a "polite formulas" section which consists of the « pros » and the "benediction", but omits the "salutation": EA 71, 73, 77, 85-87, 92, 95, 102, 118, and 125. This structure is not attested in the letters found at Tell Meskene.

RS 92.2010 presents a somewhat unusual case within the Ugaritic corpus, in that the "benediction" there precedes the « pros » (RS 18.287 would also seem to present this structure, but the extensive nature of the reconstructions and the presence of a horizontal scribal line between the would-be "benediction" and the « pros » call for a new collation and more careful reconstruction of the *praescriptio* of this tablet). This structure finds extensive parallels in the Amarna corpus: EA 68, 74-76, 78-79, 81, 83, 89, 105, 107-110, 112, 114, 116-117, 119, 121-124, 130, 132.

Other Ugaritic letters which contain the « pros » and the "salutation", but omit the "benediction", include RS 16.402 and 94.2479, and possibly (though not definitively) RS 19.102.1, 94.2391, and RIH 78/03+. Amarna letters EA 48 and possibly also EA 49 show a similar structure.

[56]Compare especially RS 11.872, 16.379, 20.199, 34.124, 94.5003+, and probably also 94.2428. RS 29.093 also belongs in this category, despite the fact that the three polite formulas occur in an unusual order: "salutation", "benediction", and « pros ».

[57]Exceptions include RS 29.093, 92.2010, and perhaps also 94.5009, in which cases the « pros » is not the first of the "polite formulas" (see above). Compare also parallels for the « pros »-first

2.4 Comparative evidence for the Ugaritic « pros » formula

Comparative evidence for a deeper interpretation of the form and function of the Ugaritic « pros » formula may be drawn from two main sources: (1) Akkadian, and to a much lesser extent, Hittite epistolary traditions which contain comparable prostration formulas,[58] and (2) the Ugaritic literary texts, which contain a prostration motif showing strong formal and contextual similarities with its epistolary counterpart. These two bodies of comparative evidence provide formal and functional parallels which are extensive enough to necessitate their incorporation in a detailed treatment of Ugaritic epistolography. Finally, several additional categories of comparative evidence exist, which, because of differences in composition and/or distribution, may be considered of lesser importance. These data will be grouped under a third rubric, (3) miscellaneous comparative evidence.

2.4.1 Akkadian and Hittite « pros » formulas of similar composition

The comparative material drawn from Akkadian and Hittite epistolary traditions is of two types: (1) those epistolary formulas expressing prostration which

---

structure among the polite formulas of the Amarna correspondence: EA 71, 73, 77, 85-87, 92, 95, and others; and among the letters found at Boğazköy: KBo 18.1.2 and 18.52 (both in Hittite).

[58]Many previous students of Ugaritic epistolography have drawn attention to formulaic parallels with the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra and El Amarna: compare, for example, O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 10-21, and A. L. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 143-158. More recently, A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989), especially pp. 55-63, has enlarged the field of comparative evidence, drawing on the epistolary formularies of Akkadian letters from Tell Meskene, and of Akkadian and Hittite letters from Boğazköy. Finally, E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 56-59, has highlighted the parallels with formulas from the Middle Assyrian epistolary tradition(s). To my knowledge, no previous treatment has interacted with the (two) prostration formulas from Tell Atchana.

show a composition and distribution similar to, or identical with, that of the « pros » formulas in the Ugaritic corpus, and (2) those of which the composition is markedly different from that of the Ugaritic formulas. The former are of primary importance for comparative analysis, and will be treated below in detail; the latter are of peripheral interest, and will be mentioned below, though not studied in detail.

The composition and distribution of the Ugaritic « pros » formulas, as described above, applies, in all or nearly all essentials, not only to the Ugaritic « pros » formulas, but also to the vast majority of the prostration formulas found in roughly contemporary Akkadian (and Hittite) letters recovered from at least six sites: (1) Ras Shamra (ancient Ugarit),[59] and (2) Tell Meskene (ancient Emar) in modern Syria,[60] (3) Tell

---

[59]Among the nearly 150 Akkadian letters published thus far, inclusive of RSO 7 (1991), some thirty-seven examples of the « pros » formula are available for study: RS 1.[056], RS 1.[057], RS 15.014, RS 15.178, RS 16.112, RS 17.383, RS 17.391, RS 17.393, RS 17.422, RS 17.425, RS 17.455, RS 19.006, RS 19.080, RS 20.016, RS 20.019, RS 20.033, RS 20.095A, RS 20.151, RS 20.162, RS 20.168, RS 20.178.2, RS 20.182A+, RS 20.184, RS 20.200C, RS 20.219, RS 20.232, RS 20.238, RS 25.138, RS 25.461, RS 32.204.1, RS 32.204.2, RS 34.135, RS 34.140, RS 34.150, RS 34.151, RS 34.164, and CK 107 I was unable to incorporate here the sixteen letters were published by D. Arnaud, F. Malbran-Labat, and S. Lackenbacher in *Études ougaritiques* 1 (2001) 239-290.

[60]The salvage excavations at Tell Meskene recovered as many as sixteen tablets whose literary genre was epistolary (three of these tablets bear multiple letters), in which are found eleven examples of the « pros » formula: Msk 7441.1, Msk 7442, Msk 7451.1, Msk 7451.2, Msk 7452.1, Msk 7454, Msk 7472, Msk 7474+, Msk 7497.1, Msk 7498d, Msk 74102c, and Msk 74270, all published by D. Arnaud in Emar 6 (1985-1987). To these we may add three further examples in letters from clandestine excavations whose provenance is thought by some to be found in the vicinity of Tell Meskene, though the editor favors a more general "euphratéen syrien" provenance (Arnaud, *SMEA* 30 [1992] 195): these are ME 53.1, ME 54, and ME 127, also published by Arnaud, in *SMEA* 30 (1992) 195-197, and in *AuOr* 2 (1984) 180-183. The latter (ME 127) was treated again (as RE 97, with copy) by G. Beckman in *Vicinity of Emar* (1996).

Atchana (ancient Alalaḫ),[61] and (4) Boğazköy (ancient Ḫattuša) in modern Turkey,[62] (5) Tel Aphek in modern Israel,[63] and (6) Tell el-Amarna (ancient Akhetaten) in Egypt.[64] The number of data from Tell Atchana and Tel Aphek is relatively small,[65] but the epistolary corpora of Boğazköy, Tell Meskene, and especially Ras Shamra and Tell el-Amarna, supply a sizable number of examples of the « pros » formula. Within these corpora, the following similarities are notable:

---

[61]Three of the letters published in D. J. Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets* (1953) 58-62, and pls. 24-27, may be classified as "ascending" letters on the basis of the REL terms used therein (all in Akkadian: AT 107, AT 113, and AT 115); and two of these three contain recognizable versions of the « pros » formula: AT 107 and AT 115.

[62]From Boğazköy come eleven certain or reasonably certain occurrences of the « pros » formula, composed according to the same conventions as those formulas attested in Ugaritic, and following similar distributional patterns. Of these eleven letters written in logo-syllabic cuneiform, six are written in Hittite and five in Akkadian. Four of the five Akkadian letters were authored by {^{m}ZAG.ŠEŠ}, probably to be identified with Bentašina, king of Amurru. The author of the fifth of these Akkadian letters is not known, but {^{m}ZAG.ŠEŠ} is mentioned within the body of the letter, suggesting in any case a connection with the other four letters. Thus at least four of these Akkadian letters, and probably the fifth as well, reflect not the epistolary conventions of Ḫattuša, but rather those of the scribes of Amurru: KBo 8.016, KBo 28.054, KBo 28.055, KBo 28.056, and KBo 28.078 (in Akkadian). KBo 28.082 is another Akkadian letter which contains a « pros » formula, though not of composition similar to the Ugaritic pattern (see below, section 2.4.3.2.1). What is more striking is the presence of genuine « pros » formulas, clearly showing the composition and distribution of those known from Ugarit, in six letters written in Hittite: KBo 9.082, KBo 18.001.2, KBo 18.011, KBo 18.012.2, KBo 18.050, and KBo 18.052. The fact that the vast majority of ascending letters in Hittite corpora (including all such letters from the Ma□at corpus) omit the « pros » formula suggests that it was not a standard element of the main epistolary traditions learned by Ḫatti scribes.

[63]Aphek 52055/1, found at Tel Aphek, published in D. Owen, *TA* 8 (1981) 1-17. Significantly, the Tel Aphek letter was authored by {^{m}ta-ku-uḫ-li-na (5) LÚ ŠA.KI KUR URU ú-ga-ri-it}, presumably the "prefect" (*skn* in alphabetic script) of Ugarit, making its inclusion among other letters representing Ugaritian epistololgraphy a virtual necessity.

[64]Over 250 Amarna letters contain intact examples, partially preserved examples, or traces of the « pros » formula: EA 12.2, EA 45, EA 48-56, EA 58-60, EA 62-65, EA 67-68, EA 70-71, EA 73-79, EA 81-95, EA 100, EA 102-112, EA 114, EA 116-119, EA 121-126, EA 129-130, EA 132, EA 136-161, EA 164-165, EA 168, EA 170.1, EA 171, EA 174-178, EA 182, EA 184-EA 189, EA 191-196, EA 198-207, EA 209, EA 211-234, EA 235+327, EA 238-239, EA 241-244, EA 246-250, EA 252-290, EA 292-308, EA 311-312, EA 314-315, EA 316.1, EA 316.2, EA 317-331, EA 333, EA 336-338, EA 362-366, and EA 378.

[65]Namely, two examples of the « pros » formula from Tell Atchana, and one from Tel Aphek.

(1) The « pros » formulas of all these corpora contain a prepositional phrase which corresponds precisely to the Ugaritic element « *l pʿn* N_R », having the basic structure « *ana šēpē* N_R »,[66] 'at the two feet of N_R', in Akkadian letters.[67] Like its Ugaritic counterpart, « *ana šēpē* N_R » may be considered a "necessary" element, since it is present in all intact examples of the formula in these corpora.[68] Also like its Ugaritic cousin, « *ana šēpē* N_R » very often occurs in first position in these Akkadian and Hittite « pros » formulas.[69] Finally, the N_R component is, in the vast majority of

---

[66]The element I have normalized as *šēpē* (being the dual construct) is normally written logographically, most commonly as {GÌR.MEŠ}. I have not normalized as *šēpāt* (being the plural construct), since (1) logographic writings of the word with the determinative for "two", such as {GÌR.II} (as in RS 32.204.1, and 34.164, for example) or {II.GÌR.MEŠ} (as in EA 323-326, for example), seem to suggest that the {MEŠ} sign is not there indicative of plural number as distinct from dual number, but is rather indicative of "multiple" number, be it dual or plural (though in this case dual), as distinct from singular number; (2) the orthography of the corresponding Ugaritic element is never appropriate for interpretation as a plural (that is, the spelling **pʿnt* is not attested); and (3) the part of the body in question ('foot', denoted by the Sumerogram {GÌR}, Ugaritic *pʿn*) occurs in pairs. Some variations of this structure are attested, in which another element intervenes between the preposition *ana* and the noun phrase « *šēpē* N_R »; such variations are attested at Ras Shamra (RS 32.204.1, {(4) am-qut a-na ša-ap-la GÌR.II be-el-ti-ia}); Amarna (among other examples, EA 126, {(2, cont'd) a-na KI.TA (3) GÌR.MEŠ BE-ia}); and Boğazköy (compare KBo 18.001.2, {(4', cont'd) *A-NA* GAM GÌR.MEŠ (5') GAŠAN-*IA*}). On these additional elements, in further detail, see below, in this section.

[67]The few examples of the « pros » formula in Hittite letters from Boğazköy (six total) all represent this element logographically, with an "Akkadogram" for the preposition, {*A-NA*}, and Sumerogram(s) for the noun, {GÌR} or {GÌR.MEŠ}. On the underlying Hittite normalization, see Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 61.

[68]Specifically, it is explicitly attested or partially reconstructed in all « pros » formulas from Ras Shamra, all from Emar, all eleven « pros » formulas from Boğazköy, both « pros » formulas from Tell Atchana, and the one from Tel Aphek. The statement also applies to virtually all the « pros » formulas from Amarna; the omission of this element in EA 241 probably represents a scribal error.

[69]By "very often", I mean about 90% of the examples. At least three exceptions are known from Ras Shamra (RS 25.138, 32.204.1, and 32.204.2), one from Emar (Msk 7474+), one from Boğazköy (KBo 9.082), and at least twenty-four from Amarna (EA 52-53, 55, 88, 147-151, 153-157, 159-161, 168, 200, 211, 215, 282, and 317-318). In addition, four Hittite letters from Boğazköy must be mentioned (KBo 18.001.1, 18.011, 18.012.2, and probably 18.050), in which this element is preceded by a deictic particle, spelled {ka-a-ša}, which functions to establish the temporal immediacy of the verb (see H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *JAOS* 88 [1968] 531-534). Fl. Malbran-Labat has informed me of the presence

examples from Ras Shamra, Tell Meskene, Boğazköy, Tell Atchana, and Tel Aphek, composed only of REL terminology, that is, noun phrase(s) characterizing the social role occupied by the recipient with respect to the sender. In other words, ID elements are generally omitted from the N_R component of the « pros » formulas in these corpora, with the notable exception of the Amarna corpus.[70] In a few cases, as attested once in the « pros » formula of the Ugaritic letter RIH 78/12, the REL element of the N_R component is not a noun phrase denoting social relationship, but rather a second person personal pronoun.[71]

At least two important differences distinguish the composition of this component in Akkadian and Hittite letters, especially those from Amarna, from that of the Ugaritic corpus: (a) the N_R component of the « pros » formula in the Amarna corpus very often contains an ID element, and (b) several examples from Boğazköy, Ras Shamra, and especially Amarna, show an intervening element between the

---

of a « pros » formula in an unpublished Akkadian letter from Ras Shamra, which is also preceded by a deictic element, {a-nu-um-ma}.

[70]ID elements are absent from all the « pros » formulas from Ras Shamra, all from Tell Meskene, all but one from Boğazköy (the exception is KBo 18.052, which reads {*A-NA* GÌR ^{d}UTU-*ŠI*}), both formulas from Tell Atchana, and the one from Tel Aphek. By contrast, ID elements are quite common in « pros » formulas from El Amarna, alongside REL elements; a typical example is EA 49, {(3) a-na UZU.GÌR.MEŠ LUGAL ^{d}UTU-ši EN-ia am-qut}, 'At the (two) feet of the King, the Sun-God, my lord, I hereby fall prostrate,' which contains two ID elements prior to the REL element. In this respect the epistolary formulary as attested at Amarna would seem to distinguish itself from the other comparative data. This apparent difference may be illusory, however, and simply an aspect of Levantine epistolary protocol in those ascending letters specifically addressed to a "great king" (a situation particularly well-attested in the Amarna corpus), and not a feature of the « pros » formula in general. Compare, for example, Amarna letters not addressed to "the king", which tend to contain no ID element: EA 73, 82, 86-87, 93, 102, 158, 164, and others.

[71]This variation occurs in « pros » formulas from Ras Shamra (RS 20.200C, 20.232); from Tell Meskene (Msk 7451.2 and 74102c); and in several from Tell el Amarna (EA 71, 93, 102, 153, 230, 316.2, 333).

preposition *ana* and the logogram for "foot".[72] The various attested intervening elements are:

(i) the logogram for the numeral "2", written {II};[73]

(ii) the determinative appropriate for parts of the body, written {UZU};[74]

(iii) the sign {PA};[75]

(iv) the sign {GAM}, which can be formally identical to the *Glossenkeil*;[76]

(v) a single vertical wedge, identical in form to the *Personnenkeil* or the logogram for the numeral "1", transcribed as {I};[77]

(vi) the logogram {KI.TA};[78]

---

[72]Such intervening elements are attested in only one letter found at Ras Shamra (RS 32.204.1, in Akkadian) and two letters found at Boğazköy (KBo 9.082 and 18.001.2, both in Hittite). This feature is found in no less than fifty examples are known from the Amarna corpus (for detailed citations, see below).

[73]Known only from the Amarna corpus: EA 50, 234, 244, 256, 260, probably 285, 286, 288-290, 298-300, possibly 301, 303, 305-306, 314-315, 316.1, 316.2, 317-319, 321, 323-326, and 331. The placement of the logogram for "2" prior to the logogram for "feet" may reflect more than a graphic indication of the dual inflection of the latter noun; it could also represent the presence of the cardinal numeral "two" prior to the noun, a grammatically "redundant" construction of the type /*ana šinē šēpē* N_R/.

[74]Attested only in the Amarna corpus: EA 49, 53, 55, 303-305, 320, 328, and 378.

[75]Two examples: EA 209 and 225.

[76]Attested in two Hittite letters found at Boğazköy: KBo 9.082 and 18.001.2. Probably also attested in the « pros » formula of RS 25.138 (a letter which contains several indications of an Anatolian provenance; see S. Lackenbacher, *Festschrift Sjöberg* [1989] 318-320).

[77]This feature appears in EA 63-65, 212, and 228. Regarding this aspect of EA 65, see now J.-P. Vita, *Festschrift Renger* (1999) 619, "Z. 4 und 6: vor {GÌR} kommt das Zahlwort "1" (so auch *VAB* und *VS*). Handelt es sich dabei um eine Ligatur {*na*+2}? Es sei in diesem Zusammenhang auf die Ligaturen {$^{I\lceil}$*Ab*l-[*d*]*i*+^{d}INANNA} (Z. 3) und {LUGAL+*ri*} (Z. 6 und 9) innerhalb dieses Textes verwiesen (vgl. dazu auch Moran, *LAPO* 13, 240; *Amarna Letters*, 135, Anm. 1 zu EA 63 sowie 136)." For another interpretation, see below.

[78]Four examples: EA 126, 137-138, and 362. For this writing outside of the « pros » formula, see the references collected by E. Ebeling in J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 2 (1915) 1526-1527.

(vii) the word {ša-ap-la};[79]

(viii) the word {up-ri};[80] and

(ix) the phrase {šu-pa-li up-ri}.[81]

This diversity is reduced somewhat by the fact that {GAM} and {KI.TA} most likely represent logographic writings of a common noun meaning 'bottom, underside', derived from the root ŠPL; such common nouns are attested in syllabic orthography as {ša-ap-la} and {šu-pa-li}.[82] Furthermore, {PA} in this slot may have been intended as a determinative denoting a body part, similar to {UZU}.[83]

(2) All comparative corpora also contain a second "necessary" element: a finite verbal form.[84] Several different Akkadian verbal forms are attested, as well as a significant number of variant spellings for each distinct form. Beneath this diversity, however, the various verbs appearing in the Akkadian and Ugaritic « pros » formulas share a host of similarities: (a) semantics connected with 'falling' or 'prostration',[85] (b)

---

[79]Attested once in an Akkadian letter from Ras Shamra, RS 32.204.1.

[80]EA 177, {up-ri}, and EA 182, {up-ri ša}.

[81]EA 175, 363, and probably 174.

[82]According to *CAD*, volume 17 (Š), part 1, p. 468, *šaplu*, "bottom, underside" is written logographically as {KI.TA}; and according to the same source, part 3, p. 324, *šuplu*, "depth; minimum" is written {GAM} in mathematical texts. Does one include those examples of {I} in this category as well?

[83]Compare the comments of J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 1 (1915) 742, note h, "Unmittelbar vor *šēpu* sind Spuren vorhanden, die nicht gestrichen zu sein scheinen und von einem *pa* herrühren können. Ist dies richtig, so wird der Schreiber hier ebenso wie 225, 5 das Zeichen für 'Esel' mit dem für 'Füss' verwechselt haben;" and in the same work, p. 765, note a, "Was das steht, ist das Zeichen für *imêru* 'Esel', das der Schreiber also mit dem für *šêpu* 'Fuss' verwechselt hat."

[84]As mentioned above, the omission of the preposition *ana* and the verb from the « pros » formula of EA 241 is most easily explained as scribal error.

[85]Specifically, three different verbal roots are attested, all sharing a similar general semantic field, denoting the physical act of falling (for the social purpose of expressing subserviance): MQT in

grammatical inflection in the 1st person, the subject being the sender or senders of the letter,[86] (c) conjugation patterns expressing the same classes of temporal and/or aspectual notions,[87] and (d) a strong tendency to occur as the final component of the « pros » formula.[88] The nearly twenty different spellings attested for the verbal forms

---

the G-stem; the difficult (Š)Kʾ N forms, probably in the ŠD stem; and GRR / QRR, apparently in the N-stem. For the discussion of each, see below.

[86]Since the vast majority of the letters are authored by a single sender, the vast majority of verbal forms are in the singular number. Letters with multiple senders are known, however, and corresponding verbal forms in the plural number are occasionally attested in the Amarna corpus: compare {ni-am-qut} in EA 59 and {ni-am-qú-ut} in EA 100, for example. In other cases a singular form was used, in spite of multiple authorship; compare Msk 7452 from Tell Meskene, which has two authors, but shows a singular verbal form, {am-qut}. In Ugaritic, where a dual inflectional number was still productive, letters with two authors show a corresponding dual verbal form, *qlny*.

[87]That is, while the West Semitic system uses the suffix conjugation in this slot, the Akkadian system uses the conjugation(s) which correspond(s) to the aspectual and temporal nuances of the West Semitic suffix conjugation, namely, the preterite, and perhaps also the perfect. Certain Amarna letters contain verbal forms superficially similar to the Akkadian stative conjugation, but these must be understood to reflect not the semantic nuances of the Akkadian stative, but rather the tense/aspect of the formally identical West Semitic suffix conjugation. Whether these verbal forms express an explicitly "past" temporal nuance, or rather express a "performative" nuance of a punctual action (in the "present") is peripheral to this point (on which issue, see below, section 2.6); what is germane is that the same semantic nuances are expressed in Ugaritic (and other West Semitic languages) by the suffix conjugation, and in Akkadian by the preterite (or the perfect). Thus, the correspondences are such as one would expect.

[88]There are a number of exceptions to this tendency, especially in the Amarna letters, but the statement is otherwise accurate for the comparative data. The verb-final structure is found in all intact examples of the « pros » formula from Tell Meskene, all but one from Boğazköy (the exception being KBo 9.082, all but two from Ras Shamra (RS 25.138 and RS 32.204.1; RS 32.204.2 also represents a special situation in containing multiple occurrences of the verbal element, of which one occurs at the end of the formula); the one intact « pros » formula from Tell Atchana; and the one from Tel Aphek. There are a number of exceptions in the Amarna corpus, which are of three sorts: (1) « pros » formulas which are entirely comparable, in terms of composition, with the other comparative data, and yet which are not verb-final (EA 200, 224, 263, and 282 fall in this category), of which EA 224 is representative: {(4) a-na GÌR.MEŠ LUGAL EN-ia (5) am-qú-ut-me (6) 7-šu ù 7-ta-a-an}; (2) those Amarna letters which contain an element in the « pros » formula not found in the other corpora, namely, an adverbial phrase of manner, meaning '(on) the back and (on) the stomach'; in many cases this adverbial phrase follows an otherwise "normal", verb-final formula (EA 213, 232-234, 281, 284, 298-299, 301, 303, 305-306, 316.1, 319-320, 322, 325-326, 328, 331, 366, and 378), of which EA 325 is an adequate representative: {(6) a-na II.GÌR.MEŠ LUGAL EN-ia am-qú-ut (7) 7-šu ù 7-ta-na (8) lu-ú iš-tu-ḫu-ḫi-in (9) ṣe-ru-ma ù ka-ba-tu-ma | }; and (3) « pros » formulas which are not verb-final, and which contain, following the verb, the aforementioned adverbial phrase of manner along with other elements (EA 314-

found in these « pros » formulas may be grouped under six historical morpho-phonemic normalizations. The most common, by far, are the forms (a) **ʾamqut*, and (b) **ʾuškaʾʾin*. Other less well-attested variants include (c) **ʾuštakaʾʾin*, (d) **maqtāti*, (e) **ʾaggarar*, and (f) **ʾattagarrir*.

(a) Historical **ʾamqut* , or, in a normalization more consistent with Assyriological tradition, *amqut*, is the G-stem preterite of the root MQT, 1st person common singular, 'I have fallen', translated as a "past tense", or 'I hereby fall', translated in a performative sense. It is by far the most common verbal form in the corpus of « pros » formulas from Ras Shamra, Tell Meskene, Boğazköy, and Amarna; and is present in the single example from Tel Aphek. It is not attested in the two examples from Tell Atchana. The most common writing is {am-qut}, standard at Ras Shamra, Meskene, Boğazköy, and Aphek; and very frequent at Amarna. In the Hittite letters from Boğazköy which contain the « pros » formula, the verbal element is most often written this way as well, as an Akkadogram, {*AM-QUT*}.[89] The writing {am-qú-ut} is rather common in the Amarna corpus,[90] but is unattested in the « pros » formulas of the other corpora. Other variant "Amarna" spellings include {am-qa-ut}[91] and {im-qú-ut}.[92] The fact that, outside of the epistolary prostration formula, the syllabic value

---

315, and 323-324), of which EA 314 is representative: {(5) a-na II.GÌR.MEŠ LUGAL EN-ia (6) DINGIR.MEŠ-ia ^{d}UTU-ia ^{d}UTU (7) ša iš-tu ^{d}sa-me lu-ú (8) iš-ta-ḫa-ḫi-in 7-šu (9) ù 7-ta-na ṣe-ru-ma (10) ù ka-ba-tu-ma}.

[89]Four times: KBo 9.082, 18.001.2, 18.011, and 18.012.2. On the Hittite verbal form underlying this orthography, see Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 61.

[90]There are over 80 occurrences of this spelling; it is especially common in letters from Byblos.

[91]EA 212.

[92]EA 317 and EA 318.

qut for the sign {TAR}[93] was not especially common in the West,[94] probably explains the scribal utility of the occasional expanded writings {am-TAR-ut}[95] and {am-qú-TAR}.[96]

(b) The form **ʾuškaʾʾin* is difficult to parse since it does not correspond to the standard patterns of the Š-stem.[97] It has often been taken as representing the rare "Š-group of quadrilateral verbs".[98] Specifically, according to this view, the form **ʾuškaʾʾin* would be the preterite of a quadrilateral root ŠKʾN, in the basic stem (of quadrilateral roots), 1st person common singular, 'I have prostrated myself', if translated as a "past tense", or 'I hereby prostrate myself', translated in a performative sense.[99] Morphologically, though not semantically, the form might also be grouped with examples of the rare "ŠD-stem" in trilateral roots, since the conjugation of the ŠD-stem and the Š-group of quadrilaterals follows one and the same morphological pattern, the essential differences being semantic.[100] In this view, the etymology of the

---

[93]Labat and Malbran-Labat, *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne* (1988), sign no. 12.

[94]For Ugarit, compare J. Huehnergard, *Akkadian of Ugarit* (1989) 353-354.

[95]EA 126 and EA 362.

[96]EA 184.

[97]In other words, the apparent lack of a vowel following the /š/ element seems to indicate that the form is not simply to be considered as an example of the Š-stem, which, in the preterite, would show the pattern */ʾuŠaCCiC/.*

[98]Compare von Soden, *GAG*[3] (1995), § 109, and the paradigm on p. 48*. The standard treatment of such verbs was A. Heidel, *Quadrilateral Verb in Akkadian* (1940). See also R. Whiting, *Or* 50 (1981) 5; and J. Tropper, *WO* 30 (1999) 91-94.

[99]Compare M. I. Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 238-239; W. von Soden, *AHw* 3 (1981) 1263; and *CAD*, volume 17 (Š), part 3, pp. 214-218.

[100]For the forms, see von Soden, *GAG*[3] (1995), §§ 95 and 109, and the paradigms on pp. 12* and 48*. Judging from von Soden's paradigms, the present of the ŠD-stem would be *ušCaCCaC*, and the preterite *ušCaCCiC*. The perfect for the "ŠD-stem" is not given, but a good guess would seem to be *uštaCaCCiC* (or *ultaCaCCiC*), which is compatible with von Soden's proposal for the Š-group of

form might be connected with trilateral roots[101] such as *K(W)N,[102] or perhaps *KNʿ.[103] In any case, the historical morphology of the word is most easily recognized in the orthographic traditions of Old Akkadian and various Assyrian periods, though not in the context of an epistolary prostration formula: compare the spellings {uš-kà-in} and {uš-kà-i-in} in Old Akkadian.[104] Babylonian orthography tended as a rule to be less conservative, however, and the "weak" 3rd radical, denoted, according to conventions used by modern Assyriologists, with the « ʾ » symbol in normalizations of the Old Akkadian and Assyrian spellings, tended to quiesce in Babylonian forms, with contraction of the resulting -**ai*- diphthong to -*ê*-. It is this phonological development which appears to be reflected in the only spelling of the verbal form in a « pros »

"quadrilateral roots". A familiar analogy for such a morphological connection between the ŠD-stem and the Š-group of quadrilaterals would be the relationship between standard "causative" Š/H-stems and "internal" ones in the West Semitic languages: morphologically identical, semantically different. This topic has probably received the most discussion with reference to biblical Hebrew and classical Arabic grammar: see, for example, the presentation of "internal Hiphils" in Waltke and O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (1990) §27.2f, pp. 439-440; and that of intransitive examples of the 4th stem in W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* 1 (1896-1898) 34-35.

[101]The early solutions of J. Knudtzon (*OLZ* 17 [1914] 489-491) and R. Labat (*L'Akkadien de Boghaz-Köi* [1932] 128, "ḫaḫânu = se courber"), seem untenable since (1) productive verbal roots in which the 1st and 2nd radicals are identical are rare in the Semitic languages, and (2) such an analysis would not account for the Assyrian forms in which the radical sequence K-ʾ-N is fairly transparent ({uš-ka-in}, for example; see below).

[102]Compare the semantics of the hollow root KWN in Arabic, in the 1st and 10th stems: *kāna / yakūnu* (that is, the 1st, or basic, stem) is the standard verb of existence in classical Arabic, and is thus comparable in some respects with Akkadian *kânu*. In the 10th stem (*ʾistakāna / yastakīnu*), however, the root is glossed "to become lowly, humble, miserable; to submit, yield, surrender, humble o.s. abase o.s. . . . (Áö to s.th.)" by H. Wehr, *Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic* (1979) 993-994. Such a semantic relationship is reminiscent of that between the Akkadian verb *kânu* and the prostration verbs under discussion here.

[103]Tropper's proposal, in *WO* 30 (1999) 91-94, to connect this form with the etymological root *KNʿ, here having undergone consonantal metathesis, is also plausible (note the semantics of KNʿ in Hebrew and Arabic).

[104]See the citations in *CAD*, volume 17 (Š), part 3, p. 217.

formula from Tell Atchana: {uš-ké-en}.[105] Setting aside the spelling of this verb in this Alalaḫ letter, which presents no particular problems, the writing of the verb in the remaining « pros » formulas of interest here can only be described as extremely odd. Several different spellings of this verb are attested at Ras Shamra, Tell Meskene, and Tell Amarna, and they share in common the unusual use of the signs {ḪI} and {KAN} in the writing of this word.[106] The attested writings[107] are:

(i) {uš-ḫé-ḫi-in},[108]

(ii) {uš-ḫé-ḫi-en},[109] and

---

[105]AT 115:6. The second sign in line 6 of the copy of Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets* (1953), no. 115, pl. 26, is clearly {GI} (sign no. 85 in Labat and Malbran-Labat, *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne* (1988), so "uš-kè-en" in *AHw*, vol. 2, p. 1263, and in *CAD*, vol. 17 (Š), part 3, p. 217, must be simple misprints.

[106]On these forms and their morphology, compare von Soden, *GAG*[3] (1995), §109m, p. 198: "Aus den ass. Formen *šukênu* wurden im churritischen Bereich zahlreiche entstellte Formen einer dort entwickelten Wurzelform **šḫḫn* abgeleitet wie das Prt. *ušḫeḫe/in* und als Pf. *ištaḫaḫin*, *ištiḫeḫin*, *ištuḫuḫin*, *uštuḫeḫin*, *ušteḫeḫin* usw. Sie begegnen nie in gut akkad. Texten." One understands what von Soden means by the phrase "gut akkad. Texten", but such a notion probably requires further definition in a linguistic treatment that pretends at description rather than prescription. Other treatments of these forms include A. Heidel, *Quadrilateral Verb in Akkadian* (1940) 37-46; W. von Soden, *AHw* (1965-1981), volume 3, p. 1263; A. Ungnad and L. Matouš, *Akkadian Grammar* (1992 [1969]) 79-80; M. I. Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 162-171; and *CAD*, volume 17 (Š), part 3, pp. 214-218. According to D. E. Fleming, *The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar* (1992) 185, note 338, "The form *šuḫeḫunu* occurs only in the periphery, at Amarna, Ras Shamra (not texts written at Ugarit proper), Boghazkoy, and Nuzi." See now Tropper, *WO* 30 (1999) 91-94.

[107]I provisionally omit from inclusion here Knudtzon's transcription "[*a*]*s*-ḫi-ḫi-en" for EA 214, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 1 (1915) 748-749, since (i) the first sign is broken, (ii) the resultant spelling is otherwise unattested, and (iii) the hand copy of O. Schroeder, *Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna* 1 (1915), no. 123, p. 138, would seem to favor the {KAN} sign where Kn. read "[*a*]*s*", the {KAN} sign being used for the syllable *ḫé* elsewhere in the writing of this very word (EA 221, 232, 232, 233, 242, and 366).

[108]The spelling {uš-ḫé-ḫi-in} is attested in two Emar letters (Msk 7451.2 and 74102c), two Ras Shamra letters (RS 1.[057] and 20.019), and four Amarna letters (EA 221, 232, 233, and 366).

[109]Attested in two Amarna letters (EA 223 and 242). The {ḪI} sign should probably be normalized as /ḫe/, with following {EN}.

(iii) {uš-ḫi-ḫi-en}.[110]

There are two "odd" features: (1) the use of signs whose syllabic values are typically associated with the Akkadian phoneme /ḫ/ to represent a syllable containing, at least historically, the Akkadian phoneme /k/; and (2) the use of these same signs, typically associated with the Akkadian phoneme /ḫ/, to represent the Akkadian phoneme /ʾ/, without regard to the etymological origin of that particular "ʾaleph". Both features, though difficult, are not unattested. The first feature seems to offer the easiest explanation. It would seem to represent a phonetic, rather than phonemic, spelling. If one assumes, on the basis of comparison with living Semitic languages, that the Akkadian phoneme /k/ was an unvoiced velar stop, and that Akkadian /ḫ/ was a unvoiced velar fricative,[111] it is a simple step to postulate a phonological development of the phoneme sequence /-šk-/ to /-šḫ-/ under certain specific conditions (unknown to me); such a phonological change would be merely the "fricativization" of the /k/ to /ḫ/, perhaps under the influence of the preceding fricative /š/.[112] The second feature, the use of /ḫ/ signs to denote syllables with Akkadian "ʾaleph", appears more difficult, though not unknown.[113]

---

[110]Attested in a single Amarna letter (EA 222). As above, the {ḪI} sign here should be normalized as /ḫe/.

[111]See, for example, Lipiński, *Outline of a Comparative Grammar* (1997) 97.

[112]On this process, see Lipiński, *ibid.*, §18.5, p. 138, "The spirantization or fricativization of non-geminated and non-emphatic velar plosives is attested in various Semitic languages. The occasional cuneiform spelling with the "ḫ" signs instead of signs with *g/k* reflects this change, e.g. *ḫanāšu* instead of *kanāšu* . . . ." See also the references cited by Tropper in *WO* 30 (1999) 93, n. 14.

[113]For the situation at Ugarit, compare Huehnergard, *The Akkadian of Ugarit* (1989) 45-46, "The glottal stop is either (i) not represented by a specific sign, in which case its presence may be assumed between vowels of different quality as shown by broken writings, but only suggested as a possibility between vowels of the same quality; or (ii) indicated by a specific sign, normally the ʾ sign (397), very rarely by a *ḫ*-sign (two examples, both in canon. texts)." He cites, in the same place, (1) "in one lit. example medial /ʾ/ is written with ḪA (589) = ʾa$_4$: bu-ʾa$_4$-ri-šu Ug. 5 168:10' " and "in one lex.

(c) The parsing of **ʾuštakaʾʾin* is also ambiguous.[114] Its conjugational pattern is either the preterite of an infixed -t- stem,[115] or the perfect of a basic stem.[116] In any case, it is certainly to be linked etymologically with **ʾuškaʾʾin*, treated above, and its inflection is also certain: 1st person common singular. Given the unambiguous nature of other preterite forms in this context,[117] the former analysis is perhaps to be preferred, as not unnecessarily complicating the problem. The word is attested in Middle Assyrian « pros » formulas, where the spelling more closely reflects the word's historical morphology, with one minor and predictable "phonetic" feature: {ul-ta-ka-in}.[118] In the comparative data under study here, the attested spellings of the form **ʾuštakaʾʾin* are no less confusing than those of the related form **ʾuškaʾʾin*. Like the latter, they are characterized by the use of signs typically associated with the

---

entry syllable final /ʾ/ is apparently written with AḪ [398] (=úʾ): šu-⌈uḫ⌉(sic)-[r]i IGI.II.MEŠ (for šuʾri "eyebrow") MSL 10 37ff. A 68." Note also the ḪI sign (396) used for ʾì in middle Assyrian, according to Labat and Malbran-Labat, *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne* (1988).

[114]See the discussion in Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 56-57, and n. 41; and Tropper's article in *WO* 30 (1999) 91-94.

[115]See Tropper, *WO* 30 (1999) 93, "als Präterita eines ŠDt-Stamms". Compare also Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 57, who cites O. Weber and E. Ebeling in J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 2 (1915) 1508; and A. Heidel, *Quadrilateral Verb in Akkadian* (1940) 37-40.

[116]See Tropper, *WO* 30 (1999) 93, "als Perfekte des ŠD-Stamms" (Tropper, *ibid.*, had envisioned both possibilities: "Sie lassen sich als Perfekte des ŠD-Stamms oder als Präterita eines ŠDt-Stamms erklären."). Compare also Cancik-Kirschbaum, p. 56, n. 41, who cites von Soden, *GAG*[3] (1995), paradigm 38, where *ultakaʾʾin* is given as a perfect.

[117]Compare (a) **ʾamqut*, (b) **ʾuškaʾʾin*, and (e) **ʾaggarar*, all preterites.

[118]See below, section 2.4.3.2.1, and the references collected in Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 56, n. 37. Compare also the citations mentioned in *CAD*, vol. 17 (Š), part 3, p. 218.

Akkadian phoneme /ḫ/ to represent syllables which ought, from a historical perspective, to contain the Akkadian phonemes /k/ and /ʾ/.[119] The spellings include:

(i) {ul-ta-ḫé-ḫi-in},[120]

(ii) the broken spelling {*UŠ-TE-ḪI*-[…]} in a Hittite letter,[121]

and several spellings showing up only in the Amarna corpus:

(iii) {iš-ta-ḫa-ḫi-in},[122]

(iv) {iš-ti-ḫa-ḫi-in},[123]

(v) {iš-ti-ḫi-ḫi-in},[124] and

(vi) {iš-tu-ḫu-ḫi-in}.[125]

The obvious superficial phonetic and semantic parallels between these "unusual" spellings of this Akkadian verb and one of the standard verbs for prostration in the West Semitic languages, represented in Hebrew by השתחוה, and in Ugaritic by *yštḥwy*(*n*),[126] though not of issue here since Ugaritic *yštḥwy*(*n*) is not used in the epistolary tradition, probably provide an example of a loanword having been reanalyzed in the morpho-phonemic system of the borrowing language.

---

[119]Compare other examples in *CAD*, vol. 17 (Š), part 3, p. 218, where the spelling, in a one word prostration formula from Boğazköy, is mentioned: {ul-tu$_4$-ḫé-ḫi-in}; published in H. G. Güterbock, *AfO* Beiheft 7 (1942) 36.

[120]Attested once in a letter from Ras Shamra, RS 34.140.

[121]KBo 18.050.

[122]Attested in 16 examples: EA 298, 304-306, 308 (partially reconstructed), 314-315, 319-324, 326, 328 (partially reconstructed), and 378.

[123]Attested in 3 letters: EA 301, 303, 329.

[124]Attested once, in EA 302.

[125]Attested once, in EA 325.

[126]The similarity has been recognized before; for bibliography, see Liverani, *Le lettere di el-Amarna* 1 (1999) 59, n. 161.

(d) Despite certain superficial similarities with the morphology of the Akkadian stative,[127] the verb **maqtāti* is almost certainly to be understood as a West Semitic verbal form, both in terms of its morphology and in terms of its semantics. It is the G-stem suffix conjugation, 1st person common singular,[128] and is attested in several Amarna spellings: (i) {ma-aq-ta-ti},[129] (ii) {⌜ma⌝-aq-ta-te},[130] and (iii) {ma-aq-ti-ti}.[131]

---

[127]That is, like the Akkadian stative, it bears the pattern CvCC + inflectional suffix.

[128]The apparent morphology (« CvCC + *ā* + *ti* » rather than « CvCvC + *ti* ») is typical of the 1st person common singular form in the Canaanite suffix conjugation as attested in the Amarna corpus; see already F. M. T. Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe* (1909) 45-46.

[129]Attested five times: EA 63, 65 (preceded by {GAM}), 282, 283, and probably 336.

[130]Attested once, in EA 138.

[131]Attested twice: EA 64 and 284. This spelling is interesting, and difficult to interpret. Does one assume an underlying morphology of **maqtāti* and a scribe not overly concerned with the vowel quality of the syllabic signs used? Or does one rather accept the spelling as an intentional reflection of an underlying morphological pattern? Most students of these texts appear to have adopted the latter solution (compare, for example, Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe* [1909] 48); but Rainey's statement in AOAT 8a (1978) IX, is telling: "there is little to be gained by an attempt to normalize West Semitic EA passages! Akkadian [read: 'the Mesopotamian logo-syllabic writing system'] in the hands of most West Semitic scribes was only a kind of short-hand (not so short!) in which the words and sentences stood for West Semitic originals. Grammatical niceties such as vowel length, consonantal gemination, etc., were seldom of importance." I believe it would not be unwise to add vowel quality to this list of features often ignored by West Semitic scribes. I wonder if, already in the Late Bronze Age, these Levantine scribes were profoundly influenced by the prejudices of alphabetic scribal traditions, in which neither consonantal gemination, nor vowel quantity, nor (with some very few exceptions) vowel quantity, were reflected in the orthography. By this, I do not mean to doubt the utility of the Amarna tablets for reconstructing certain details of the substrate languages hidden beneath the logo-syllabic orthographies; rather I would only caution against the (naïve) assumption that a Levantine scribe's choice of a particular sign necessarily and unquestionably revealed anything decisive about the quality of the vowel intended.

(e) The form **ʾaggarar* appears to be the N-stem preterite, 1st person common singular, of the verbal root GRR (or QRR).[132] It is attested only once in the corpora under discussion here, written {ag-ga-ra-ar}.[133]

(f) The only example of **ʾattagarrir*, written {at-ta-gar-ri-ir}, comes from a text in a private collection.[134] Given the existence of the form **ʾuštakaʾʾin* alongside **ʾuškaʾʾin* in other examples of the Levantine epistolary prostration formula, and the fact that the preterite is the only unambiguously attested conjugation, one might assume that if the writing {ag-ga-ra-ar} represents a preterite in the N-stem, then the writing {at-ta-gar-ri-ir} might very well represent a preterite in an infixed -t- N-stem.[135] Needless to say, the form, as we have it, is inconsistent with the standard Akkadian paradigms.

---

[132]In his publication of this letter, D. Arnaud, Emar 6:3 (1986) 262-263, transcribes the form as {aq-qá-ra-ar }, with the syllabic values *aq* and *qá* corresponding to his understanding of the word's etymology (QRR). Whether the underlying root was, in fact, QRR (with Arnaud and von Soden, *AHw*, vol. 2, p. 902), or rather, GRR (with *CAD*, volume 3 [G] 48), is not particularly important for my purposes here. I assume the latter on the basis of both internal and external evidence. Internally, the writing of a presumably related form of the verb with the {NÍG} sign (sign no. 597 in Labat's *Manuel*) in ME 127, favors GRR since the syllabic reading of this sign as *gar* is better known in the West during the Late Bronze Age than is *qár* (see Labat, *ibid.*, and, for Ugarit Akkadian, Huehnergard, *The Akkadian of Ugarit* [1989] 414, where the value *gar* appears once in the sequence *gur-gar-gir*, but *qár* is unattested). External evidence comes from cognate forms in other Semitic languages, either in the form of a geminate trilateral root GRR, or in another biform of a primitive bilateral root GR (as in Syriac *gargay*, *ʾetgargay*, 'to prostrate oneself'; see Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* [1903] 77).

[133]This form is from the letter Msk 7451.1, from Tell Meskene. The expected paradigm form, however, would be *aggarir* — compare von Soden, *GAG*^{3} (1995), paradigm 9*. But note the examples of this form with an /a/ vowel in the final stem syllable, cited in *CAD*, vol. 3 (G) 48; and von Soden, *AHw*, vol. 2, p. 902.

[134]ME 127.

[135]The other possibility is that this form represents a perfect conjugation, corresponding to the preterite represented by {ag-ga-ra-ar} in Msk 7451.1. Since such an analysis is not without its own problems, and since unambiguous examples of this verbal element are all preterites (see above), I prefer to avoid the needless complexity introduced by analyzing this form as a perfect.

These exhaust the "necessary" elements of the « pros » formulas in all three corpora. As in Ugaritic « pros » formula, "optional" elements are also present; all are adverbial phrases, and these adverbial elements are often placed between the two "necessary" components. These "optional" elements include the following elements:

(3) The « pros » formulas of the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra and Tell Meskene contain an adverbial element corresponding to Ugaritic *mrḥqtm*, namely *ištu rūqiš*.[136] The phrase is relatively frequent in these two corpora,[137] but does not occur within the comparative material from Amarna, Boğazköy, Tell Atchana, or Tel Aphek. While this fact alone highlights the compositional affinities among the « pros » formulas found at Ras Shamra (in Ugaritic and Akkadian) and Tell Meskene (in Akkadian) over against those of other corpora under study here, the distribution of this *mrḥqtm*/ *ištu rūqiš* element among these corpora shows important differences. In the Akkadian formulas, the *ištu rūqiš* element usually appears prior to other "optional" elements; the opposite is often true for Ugaritic *mrḥqtm*.[138] Secondly, in the Ugaritic

---

[136]The phrase is virtually always spelled {iš-tu ru-qiš}; in one letter from Ras Shamra an "Assyrianized" spelling of the preposition shows up: {ul-tu ru-qiš}, in RS 25.138. Since the etymological root is RḤQ, and since, as a matter of convention, one generally represents the etymological phoneme */ḥ/, which is rarely explicitly noted in Sumero-Akkadian orthography, with a lengthened vowel in standard normalization, *rūqiš* may be preferred over *ruqiš*.

[137]Within the epistolary corpus from Tell Meskene, the phrase occurs in eight « pros » formulas out of twelve total. Within the Ras Shamra Akkadian epistolary corpus it is slightly less frequent: fourteen occurrences in thirty-eight examples of the « pros » formula.

[138]In the Ugaritic formulas, the multiplicative element normally precedes the *mrḥqtm*-element, with three exceptions; see above, section 2.2. For the formulas from Tell Meskene, the *ištu rūqiš* element always precedes the multiplicative element, with no exceptions. In fact, in one case, assuming the editor's (partial) restorations are correct, the *išṭu rūqiš* element even appears prior to the « *ana šēpē* N_R » element: Msk 7474+. For the Ras Shamra Akkadian « pros » formulas, the *ištu rūqiš* element precedes the multiplicative element in all cases but one: the exception being RS 34.150, {(4) a-na ⌜GÌR⌝.MEŠ EN-ia (5) 2-šú 7-šú iš-tu ru-qiš am-qut}.

« pros » formulas the word *mrḥqtm* is the more common "optional" element,[139] while in the Akkadian « pros » formulas of Ras Shamra and Tell Meskene the "multiplicative" element (see below) is the more common.[140] Furthermore, although the semantics of both phrases are practically identical, the morphology underlying *ištu rūqiš* is almost certainly different from that of Ugaritic *mrḥqtm*.[141]

(4) A second "optional" adverbial element in the Akkadian (and Hittite) « pros » formulas found at Ras Shamra, Tell Meskene, Tell Amarna, Boğazköy, and possibly in one of the two formulas from Tell Atchana, is a multiplicative phrase, corresponding in structure and meaning to the Ugaritic multiplicative phrase, of which a common example is *šbʿd w šbʿd*, "seven times and seven times".[142] As mentioned above, in contrast to Ugaritic letters, this multiplicative element in Akkadian letters is the most common of all the "optional" elements of the formula, and consequently is attested fairly often as the sole "optional" element in « pros » formulas, especially in the Amarna corpus.[143]

---

[139]See above, section 2.2.

[140]Among the « pros » formulas from Tell Meskene the element *ištu rūqiš* occurs in eight out of twelve examples, a multiplicative element in ten out of twelve. For Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, there are fourteen occurrences of the *ištu rūqiš* element, seventeen of the multiplicative element.

[141]The Akkadian phrase is a "doubly marked" adverbial phrase, containing not only the preposition *ištu*, but the adverbial affix *-iš* as well. Given the apparent absence of a preposition **min* in Ugaritic generally, the Ugaritic phrase *mrḥqtm* is probably best understood as a *m*-preformative common noun *mrḥqt* with an attached *-m* affix, as proposed early on by Dhorme (*Syria* 19 [1938] 143-144); and not as representing the preposition **min*, hidden in the beginning *m*- element of *mrḥqtm*. The Hebrew expression מן רחוק might seem to offer idiomatic support for the latter morphology, but no amount of cross-linguistic parallels will account for the fact that the preposition **min* is not yet attested with certainty in Ugaritic, and that the semantic nuances normally expressed by **min* in the cognate languages are expressed in Ugaritic by other means. See below, section 2.6.

[142]For this multiplicative element in Ugaritic letters, see above, section 2.2.

[143]Compare this pattern in EA 136, {(4) a-na GÌR.MEŠ EN-ia (5) 7 u 7-ta-an am-qú-ut}. Such a structure is not yet attested in Ugaritic. By contrast, the Ugaritic corpus contains examples of formulas

In terms of composition, the structure of this adverbial element in the Akkadian (and Hittite) letters closely resembles that of its Ugaritic counterpart; in most cases it may be described by means of the following formula: « [numeral]+(suffix) (conjunction) [numeral]+(suffix) ». As shown by the formula, one may usually speak of two numerical components,[144] which may or may not be joined by a conjunction,[145] and each component consisting of a cardinal numeral with an adverbial suffix attached.[146]

The integers occupying the numeral slots vary, but certain recognizable patterns are noticeable. The most commonly attested combinations are 2:7, 7:7, and 3:9.[147] The sequence 2:7 is typical of Akkadian formulas from Tell Meskene[148] and Ras Shamra,[149] and appears to have been present in several of the « pros » formulas in

---

in which *mrḥqtm* is the sole "optional" element, as in RS 8.315, { | (5) l . pʿn . ȧdtny (6) mrḥqtm (7) qlny }; the equivalent structure is as yet unattested in the Akkadian (and Hittite) comparative material. See above, section 2.2.

[144]While two numerical components are certainly the norm, exceptions are known. In one example (ME 127) there are 4 numerical components; and in at least two formulas from the Amarna corpus there is only one (EA 52 and EA 55).

[145]In some examples of the multiplicative component from Amarna, the two numerical components are joined not with a conjunction, but with the prepositional phrase *ana pāni*, probably best glossed in vernacular English along the lines of "by" or "in addition to", etc.

[146]The presence of the adverbial suffix in the orthography was not consistent (see below).

[147]The statement of W. G. E. Watson, *WO* 24 (1993) 39, "The form 'three times, nine times' is unattested elsewhere", does not take account of the « pros » formulas in Hittite letters from Boğazköy, in which this sequence occurs; these were discussed in A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 59-60.

[148]Among ten « pros » formulas found at Tell Meskene which contain a multiplicative element, this sequence is attested in six intact or virtually intact examples: Msk 7454, possibly 7442, 7452, 7441.1, 7451.1, and 7498d, all of which also omit an intervening conjunction. As a representative example, compare Msk 7454, {(4) a-na GÌR.MEŠ EN-ia iš-tu ru-qiš (5) 2-šú 7-šú am-qut | }.

[149]Seventeen Akkadian « pros » formulas found at Ras Shamra contain a multiplicative element; of these as many as thirteen appear to show the 2-7 sequence, all of which also omit an intervening conjunction: RS 17.383, 17.391, 17.393, 17.422, possibly 17.425, 20.016, 20.151, 20.219,

Akkadian letters found at Boğazköy.[150] This sequence is attested to date in at least three Ugaritic « pros » formulas as well,[151] but is not found elsewhere within the corpora under study here. It should also be remarked that all formulas showing this sequence also lack an intervening conjunction between the two adverbial phrases. The sequence 7:7 is by far the most common combination among the Amarna letters,[152] and, as mentioned above, is also the most common sequence for « pros » formulas in Ugaritic.[153] To date, it has not yet appeared in the other comparative corpora. Although the sampling size is very small, the sequence 3:9 would appear to be typical of the « pros » formulas of Hittite letters found at Boğazköy;[154] it also shows

---

25.461, 32.204.2, 34.135, 34.150, and 34.151. RS 17.383 provides a representative sample: {(4) a-na GÌR.MEŠ EN-ia iš-tu ru-qiš (5) 2-šú 7-šú am-qut}.

[150]The 2:7 sequence is found in KBo 28.054, possibly KBo 8.016, and possibly KBo 9.082 (in Hittite). It has been reconstructed (by Hagenbuchner) in KBo 28.056 and KBo 28.078, but whether this or another restoration is to be preferred is an open question, especially in light of the presence of the conjunction *ù* between the numerical elements in KBo 28.078 (the sequence 2:7 is otherwise unattested with an intervening conjunction, a fact which may or may not have syntactic implications; see below, section 2.6).

[151]The three Ugaritic formulas showing this 2:7 sequence (out of 14 formulas total which contain a multiplicative element) are RS 19.102.2, 29.093, and 94.2391. Compare, as an example, RS 19.102.2: { | (17) l pʿn . bʿly (18) ṯnỉd . šbʿd (19) mrḥqtm (20) qlt }.

[152]I estimate the number of EA letters explicitly containing this sequence to be approximately 119, by far the majority of those « pros » formulas which contain multiplicative elements. Formulas with and without the intervening conjunction are known. Compare, as samples, EA 118, {(4) a-na GÌR.MEŠ EN-ia ^{d}UTU (5) 7-šu 7-ta-an am-qú-ut} (without a conjunction); and EA 258, {(4, cont'd) a-na GÌR.MEŠ LUGAL EN-ia (5) 7-šu ù 7-ta-a-an am-qut | } (with a conjunction).

[153]Of the 14 Ugaritic « pros » formulas which contain a multiplicative element, only 10 are preserved sufficiently enough to determine the exact numerical sequence used. Of these ten formulas, six use the sequence 7:7: RS 9.479A, possibly 16.137[bis], possibly 18.040, 18.113, 20.199, and 92.2010. Compare, as a representative, RS 9.479A, { | (6) l . pʿn (7) ảdty (8) šbʿd (9) w . šbʿỉd (10) mrḥqtm (11) qlt}. Most examples of this sequence in Ugaritic would appear to contain the conjunction *w*; with the exception of RS 18.040, Pardee's collation of which is as follows: { | (5) [l .]⌜pʿ⌝n . bʿly (6) [šb]⌜ʿ⌝d . šb⌜ʿd⌝ (7) ⌜m⌝[r]ḥqtm (8) qlt | }.

[154]It appears in KBo 18.01.2, 18.11, and 18.12.2. As a representative, compare KBo 18.01.2, { | (verso, 4') ka-a-ša *A-NA* GAM GÌR.MEŠ (5') GAŠAN-*IA* 3-*ŠU* 9-*ŠU AM-QUT* | }. The only other

up in one Akkadian letter from Ras Shamra,[155] but is otherwise unattested to date in the comparative corpora. Other numerical combinations are known,[156] but are extremely

---

Hittite letter for which the multiplicative element is preserved is KBo 9.82, which shows the 2:7 sequence, as mentioned above.

[155]RS 25.138: {(4) ⌜am-qut⌝ a-na GÌR.MEŠ GAŠAN-ia (5) ul-tu ru-qiš 3-šú 9-šú}. This letter is addressed to the queen of Ugarit from an individual bearing the name {al-lu-wa-ma}. This and other features within the letter suggest an Anatolian provenance.

[156]This statement would appear to present a slight break from "common knowledge", judging from Watson, *WO* 24 (1993) 39, who claims "It is common knowledge that the 'prostration formula' used in letters from Ugarit (both syllabic and alphabetic), El Amarna and elsewhere contains one of the following two numerical sets: (i) 2 times 7 times; (ii) 7 times (and) 7 times."

rare: 7 alone,[157] 2:8,[158] 7:8 or 8:7,[159] 8:8,[160] 2:3,[161] 3:7,[162] possibly 10:[?],[163] and 2:7:10:12[164] (*sic*).

---

[157]EA 52 and EA 55. Compare also Gen 33:3 from the Hebrew Bible; see S. E. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies* (1980) 234, and n. 30.

[158]J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 4 (1956), pl. 75, copied eight wedges for the second integer of the « pros » formula of RS 17.425, but transcribed "7(!)" on p. 218. It is possible that a similar pattern is found on CK 107 (collation of C. Roche, July 2001); this document is also referred to as "RS [Varia 35]" (the designation "CK 107" is from D. Arnaud, *Textes syriens de l'âge du Bronze Récent* (1991), no. 107, pp. 219-220).

[159]The only example I have found of the sequence 7:8 appears in the Ugaritic letter RS 94.2273, {(2, cont'd) l pʿn[…] (3) ⌜å⌝ḫy . hl⌜1⌝m . (4) mrḥqtm (5) qlt . šbʿd (6) ṯmnỉd qlt}. This unambiguous (alphabetic) example of the integer 8 in a multiplicative component can be used as a corrective to the overly enthusiastic identification of scribal errors in the Amarna corpus, where the sign {8} was often interpreted as a poorly written {7!}. While the sequence 7:8 has not yet been identified in the Amarna corpus, the transposed sequence 8:7 would appear to be attested in EA 84-85: compare EA 84, {(4, cont'd) a-na GÌR.MEŠ ^{d}UTU (5) BE-ia 8-it-šu ù 7-ta-a-an (6) am-qú-ut}. The epigraphers generally agreed in reading {8}: see L. Abel's copy in H. Winckler, *Der Thontafelfund von El Amarna* (*WA*) (1889-1890), no. 73, p. 77; the copy of Schroeder, *Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna* 1 (1915), no. 41, p. 52; and the remarks of Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 1 (1915) 404, note c.

[160]It is not certain that this sequence is genuinely attested. As many as two witnesses suggest that the reading of EA 107 should contain this sequence: {(6, cont'd) a-na GÌR.MEŠ EN-ia (7) ^{d}UTU-ia 8$^{?}$-šu 8$^{?}$-ta-an (8) am-qú-ut}. Regarding the numerals, the copy of L. Abel in Winckler, *Der Thontafelfund von El Amarna* (*WA*) (1889-1890), no. 41, p. 48, shows {8} and {8} respectively; compare the transcription of H. Winckler, *Die Thontafeln von Tell-El-Amarna* (*W*) (1896), no. 80, p. 172. I suspect Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 1 (1915) 472, too, saw {8} in both slots as well, for he transcribes "7(!)-šu 7(!)-ta-an" (compare his transcription of EA 84, line 5, on p. 404, and note c). Judging from his copy, however, Schroeder, *Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna* 1 (1915), no. 55, p. 67, saw {7} in both slots.

[161]This sequence is known from one Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra: RS 34.140.

[162]To date, the sequence 3:7 appears only in letters from Tell Meskene: Msk 7474+, and possibly 7442.

[163]The copy in Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets* (1953), no. 115, pl. 26, shows the sign {U} in a position where a multiplicative element would not be out of place. Given that the integer "10" is attested already as a multiplicative element in ME 127, it does not seem extravagant to propose its presence in this letter from Alalaḫ: {(4, cont'd) a-na GÌR.⌜MEŠ⌝ [?] (5) a-bi-ia EN-ia 10 [...] (6) uš-ké-en}.

[164]To my knowledge, the only example of a « pros » formula to contain more than two numerical elements in its multiplicative component is ME 127: {(5) a-na GÌR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ-i[a] (6) iš-tu ru-⌜qíš 2-šu 7⌝-šu (7) 10-šu 12-šu [a]m-qut at-ta-gar-ri-ir | }. Note the scribe's use of the sign {šu} to

An integer appearing in the multiplicative component is normally followed by an adverbial suffix of which the function may be described as "multiplicative". Several different adverbial suffixes are known in the Amarna corpus, but only one in other comparative corpora containing multiplicative elements: the Akkadian multiplicative suffix *-šu*.[165] This particle appears in « pros » formulas from Ras Shamra, Tell Meskene, Boğazköy, and Tell el Amarna in at least two different writings: {šú} and {šu}.[166] The spelling {šú} is standard in the formulas found at Ras Shamra,[167] Tell

---

denote the multiplicative suffix; this is at odds with the standard usage known from texts recovered in controlled excavations of Tell Meskene, where it is written {šú}.

[165]See von Soden, *GAG*[3] (1995), §71a, p. 117, "Die Multiplikativzahlen 'einmal, zweimal usw.' werden durch Anhängung der Adverbialendung *-ī* (s. § 113 k) und des Suffixes *-šu* 'sein' an den Stamm der Kardinalzahlen (§ 69 b-d) gebildet"; and Ungnad and Matouš, *Akkadian Grammar* (1992 [1969]) #457], §50, p. 59, "Multiplicatives are formed by adding an adverbial ending *-ī* (cf. §90j) and the pron. suff. *-šu* 'its' to the cardinal." The fact that the suffix *-šu* is preceded by an adverbial suffix, *-ī*, is an important clue that its etymology is not to be found in the pronominal paradigm (*contra* the explanation offered in these standard grammars of Akkadian). What appears to be an etymologically related suffix is attested in Arabic, spelled with etymological /ḏ/: the adverbial suffix *ʾiḏ*[in] is discussed by Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon* (1863) 39; and by W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* 1 (1896) 292. The natural reflex of this etymological phoneme (*ḏ) in the Sumero-Akkadian syllabary is to be found in the /š/ sequence of graphs. Another explanation is offered by Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe* (1909) 38-39 (among other possibilities, he proposes that *šu* is an abbreviation for *šanītu*, meaning "times").

[166]The presence of a spelling {šú} alongside {šu} suggests that the suffix is not a logogram for the word *qātu*, 'hand'. This is mentioned with respect to the proposal to explain the etymology of the Ugaritic multiplicative suffixes {-id} and {-d} as derived from the Ugaritic word **yad-*, 'hand'; see, for example, C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (1965), §7.68, p. 51; and, for a balanced perspective, the treatment of the problem in J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), §65.14, pp. 377-379.

[167]To my knowledge, all of the « pros » formulas from Ras Shamra which contain a multiplicative element contain this spelling of the adverbial multiplicative suffix.

Meskene,[168] the Akkadian formulas found at Boğazköy[169] and two of the four Hittite formulas from the same site.[170] To my knowledge, it is not found in the Amarna corpus. The writing {šu} is standard in the Amarna letters, and is also found in two Hittite letters from Boğazköy,[171] and in one « pros » formula whose provenance is thought to be inland, that is, Euphratian, Syria;[172] it is not found at Ras Shamra or in any of the letters recovered in controlled excavations of Tell Meskene.

Variations from the use of the suffix *-šu* following the integer in the multiplicative component are found only in the Amarna corpus: examples are known which show (1) numerical components with no suffix whatsoever,[173] and (2) numerical components followed by suffixes or phrases unattested in other « pros » formulas. The writing of a numerical component with no suffix whatsoever may be a mere orthographic phenomenon rather than a syntactic one: the presence of a multiplicative suffix in many cases may have been assumed to lie behind the numerical "logogram".[174] The case of suffixes or phrases other than *-šu*, however, has

---

[168]In the nine examples of « pros » formulas with the multiplicative element, an adverbial suffix is always present, and it is always spelled {šú}. This feature distinguishes the « pros » formulas recovered in controlled excavations of Tell Meskene from one acquired on the antiquities market: ME 127, where the formula contains the spelling {šu}.

[169]All four multiplicative elements sufficiently preserved to permit analysis show this spelling: KBo 8.16, 28.54, 28.56, and 28.78.

[170]KBo 9.82 and 18.12.2 show this spelling of the adverbial suffix.

[171]KBo 18.01.2 and 18.11 show this spelling.

[172]ME 127.

[173]These are: EA 52, 55, 63-65, 94, 126, 136, 138, 140-142, 147-151, 153-155, 174-177, 182, 194, 209, 211, 215-217, 220, 225-226, 228, 239, 257, 263, 281-284, 330, and 362-363.

[174]Note, for example, that a "multiplicative" suffix is always attested in alphabetic writings of the numerical component.

implications for the overall interpretation of the Ugaritic « pros » formula, and will be considered here in some detail.

On a purely orthographic level, there is a bewildering diversity in the representation of these adverbial suffixes. Allowing for variant spellings of the same (or similar) underlying grammatical form(s), however, permits significant reduction of this apparent diversity. At least four types multiplicative elements showing a structure other than « (integer) + *šu* » appear to be present in the Amarna corpus: (a) examples apparently containing the afformative suffix /*-*ān*/, by far the most common, and three others, markedly less well-attested: (b) examples in which the -*šu* suffix is present, but is preceded by the {IT} sign, (c) examples apparently containing precise morphological parallels for the Ugaritic forms where the multiplicative suffixes are spelled {id}/{d}, and (d) examples in which the integer is followed by a form of the particle /*-*mil*-/.

(a) Two of the most common suffixes in the Amarna corpus are represented by (1) {7-TA.ÀM},[175] and (2) {7-TA.AN}.[176] The spelling {TA.ÀM} is known elsewhere in cuneiform literary tradition to represent a distributive suffix following numerals.[177] Within the Amarna corpus itself, however, the fact that the spellings {TA.ÀM} and {TA.AN} appear to have been used almost interchangeably, even

---

[175]Compare EA 68, 84, 85, 88, 92, 141, 142 (both), 144, 192, 198, and others.

[176]Compare EA 83, 89, 100, 103-110, 112, 114, 116-125, 130, and others.

[177]Compare R. Labat and F. Malbran-Labat, *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne* (1988), no. 139, p. 99, "TA-ÀM: déterminatif suivant les nombres distributifs"; and C. Rüster and E. Neu, *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon* (1989), no. 160, p. 167, where he transcribes the signs as {-TA.ÀM}, and comments "-TA.ÀM 'je' (zur Bezeichnung von Distributivzahlen)."

within letters deriving from the same city,[178] suggests that {ÀM} is perhaps best read as {A.AN}, as was done by early students of the Amarna letters.[179] Furthermore, the fact that some letters contain {DA.A.AN} instead of {TA.A.AN},[180] implies that these spellings are to be read syllabically and not logographically.[181] It appears difficult to avoid the conclusion that these three spellings, {TA.AN}, {TA.A.AN}, and {DA.A.AN}, are, in fact, orthographic variants of the same underlying grammatical form. I accept this view, and choose to normalize the initial consonant of the suffix as voiced, that is, /d/, rather than unvoiced, /t/, because it seems simpler to me from a methodological point of view to connect them etymologically with the Ugaritic multiplicative suffix, where the alphabetic writing clearly distinguishes these phonemes:[182] in this view, {TA.AN}, {TA.A.AN} and {DA.A.AN} may be transcribed as {dá-an}, {dá-a-an} and {da-a-an}, respectively. Finally, the relatively

---

[178]The spellings are both attested in letters sent from the city of Byblos; compare EA 83-85, 88-89, and 92.

[179]See, for example, Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe* (1909) 38-39; and Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 1 (1915) 360 and elsewhere.

[180]Compare EA 266-271, 273-280. Juan-Pablo Vita has recently argued, on the basis of his collation of the tablets, in support of the suggestion of Knudtzon in *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 2 (1915) 1328-1329, that these letters represent the hand of a single scribe to be linked with the Gezer Corpus; see Vita's article in *ZA* 90 (2000) 70-77.

[181]This point was made by R. F. Youngblood in his dissertation, *Correspondence of Rib-Haddi* (1961) 16.

[182]In other words, I consider the fact that the Ugaritic suffix is written {id} (or {d}), and not {it} (or {t}) sufficient basis to prefer /d/ over /t/ in the normalization of the syllabic writings {TA.AN}, {TA.A.AN}, and {DA.A.AN}. The presence of the final /n/ in the syllabic versions, and its absence from the alphabetic writing, is not a serious problem in my opinion: it can be thought of as an "enclitic" suffix whose presence was regular in some traditions (such as those of the Amarna letters), but not in others (those in Ugaritic).

infrequent spellings such as {7-an}[183] and {7-a-an}[184] may be thought of further examples of these forms, with only the final syllable noted orthographically. Taken collectively, these assumptions allow for the grouping of several distinct spellings under a single grammatical form. The spellings are: (1) {7-an},[185] (2) {7-a-an},[186] (3) {7-dá-an},[187] (4) {7-dá-a-an},[188] (5) {7-da-a-an},[189] (6) {ši-ib-e-dá-an},[190] (7) {ši-BI-dá-a-an},[191] (8) {ši-BI-dá-an},[192] and perhaps also (9) {ši-i[b-]i[-d]á-an}.[193] The latter, fully syllabic, spellings of this multiplicative element provide further hints of the underlying morphology of the form, allowing for an interpretation from a comparative Semitic point of view. This multiplicative phrase in the Amarna corpus would seem to consist of (1) a cardinal numeral, most often the number "7", /**šibʿ-*/; (2) a short vowel, perhaps the /-*a*/ of the accusative case,[194] used here in an adverbial

---

[183]EA 193.

[184]EA 74-76, 78-79, 81, 90, 337 (8 items).

[185]EA 193 (1 item).

[186]EA 74-76, 78-79, 81, 90, 337 (8 items).

[187]EA 83, 89, 100, 103-110, 112, 114, 116-125, 130, and others.

[188]EA 68, 84, 85, 88, 92, 141, 142 (both), 144, 192, 198, and others.

[189]EA 266-271, and 273-280.

[190]EA 215.

[191]EA 196. One can normalize as /*šibʿêdān*/ (reading {BI} with the value {bé}) or /*šibʿîdān*/ (reading {BI} as {bi}).

[192]EA 221. One can normalize as /*šibʿêdān*/ (reading {BI} with the value {bé}) or /*šibʿîdān*/ (reading {BI} as {bi}).

[193]EA 211.

[194]The spelling {ši-ib-e-dá-an} in EA 215 is the single datum suggesting the presence of /a/ in the historical form. In theory, a quiescence of the intervocalic /ʾ/ in the hypothetical form /*šibʿaʾiḏān/

sense; (3) the multiplicative suffixal morpheme /*-ʾiḏ-/, known from the Ugaritic tradition; and (4) the /*-*ān*/ afformative suffix.[195] The result of such speculative reconstruction is a historical form /**šibʿaʾiḏān-*/, which was realized either as /*šibʿêdān-*/ or as /*šibʿîdān-*/.[196] Finally, one may mention several spellings which appear to represent this same morphology, with the addition of a final (short?) vowel: (9) {7-dá-na},[197] (10) {7-dá-ni},[198] and perhaps also (11) {7-dá-an-ni},[199] and (12) {7-IT-dá-na}.[200]

(b) The morphological pattern attested by the writings {8-IT-šu}[201] and {7-IT-šu}[202] would seem to represent another formulation, related to the pattern discussed

---

could have resulted in a contracted /ê/ vowel (/šibʿêdān/), as it did in Ugaritic phonology: the spelling of the word in EA 215 would be the sole datum reflecting such a development. An alternative explanation for the /e/ spellings such as {ši-ib-e-dá-an} and {ši-be-dá-a-an} is that the presence of the etymological /*ʿ/ has, as is often the case, colored the syllabic spelling; see von Soden, *GAG*[3] (1995), §9a, p. 11, and §23, p. 24.

[195]On the use of such an afformative suffix for multiplicatives, note the comparative data (taken from biblical Hebrew) mentioned in Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe* (1909) 38-39.

[196]Assuming the correctness of the restoration, the writing {ši-i[b-]i[-d]á-an} in EA 211 would imply a vowel of /i/ rather than /e/ quality between the cardinal number and the multiplicative suffix. If I have correctly understood the morphology of these forms, the spellings with /e/ signs would represent the resolution of the /*-*ai*-/ diphthong (resulting from the quiescence of intervocalic /ʾ/ in the proto-form /**šibʿaʾiḏān*/) to /-*ê*-/, while the /i/ spellings would represent an alternate resolution of the same diphthong to /-*î*-/, such as happened in some dialects of Babylonian: see [von Soden, 1995 #337], § 11.

[197]EA 314, 315, 323-326. (6 items).

[198]EA 203-206. (4 items).

[199]EA 195, 201 (2 items).

[200]EA 235+ (1 item): {7-IT ù (9) 7-IT-TA-na}. For the latter form, I prefer the normalization /*šibʿêdāna*/, reading {IT} as {ed}, {TA} as {dá}, and assuming the orthographic gemination of the /d/ to represent the long /ā/ vowel (on this latter phenomenon, see the references cited by Huehnergard, *Akkadian of Ugarit* [1989] 48-50, though the author himself is less optimistic on the question), but other normalizations are conceivable, including /*šibʿîdāna*/, reading {IT} as {id}.

[201]EA 84, 85.

[202]EA 315.

above, in rubric (a), and to the pattern discussed below, in rubric (c), in the sense that it also would seem to consist of a numeral and the multiplicative suffix /*-ʾiḏ-/, known from Ugaritic. In the case of these forms, however, this sequence was not followed by the afformative suffix /-*ān*/, as above, but rather by another type of afformative, here written with the {šu} sign. The presence of the {IT} sign between the integer and {šu} would seem to distinguish these forms from the standard Akkadian multiplicative formulation, where the afformative *-īšu* immediately follows the cardinal numeral stem.[203] Like the examples discussed above, one may propose a speculative morphology for these writings: perhaps they consist of (1) the stem of the cardinal numeral (in these cases, /*šibʿ*-/ or /*ṯamānî*-/), (2) perhaps a short vowel,[204] (3) the multiplicative suffixal morpheme /*-ʾiḏ-/, (4) perhaps another short vowel, not reflected in the orthography,[205] and finally, (5) the suffix /-*šu*/. Thus, for these

---

[203]For a presentation of the data, see von Soden, *GAG*^{3} (1995), § 71. Von Soden's interpretation of the underlying morphology is difficult to accept, however, since, across the Semitic languages, pronominal suffixes (he views the {šu} element as such a suffix: "sein") are attached to common nouns and to prepositions, not to morphologically-marked adverbs (v.S. understands the *-ī-* element to be an "Adverbialendung" attached to the cardinal number). Furthermore, note that (1) the Ugaritic multiplicative suffix is normally written {ỉd}; (2) the existence (and semantics) of the Arabic word e□ (among other cognate evidence) shows that the probable historical phoneme behind the Ugaritic sign {d} was /*ḏ/, not /d/; and (3) historical /*ḏ/ was reflected in Akkadian writing with the /š/ sequence of signs. This chain of facts provides the simplest explanation of the Akkadian multiplicative suffix *-īšu*: it is the regular Akkadian cognate of the Ugaritic multiplicative suffix normally written {ỉd}, and it has nothing to do with the pronominal paradigm.

[204]Because of the adverbial function of the multiplicative phrases, I proposed above to reconstruct the accusative vowel /a/ here.

[205]The morphology strikes me as odd should one not propose such an intervening vowel. Given writings like {7-dá} in EA 362, I propose to reconstruct a short /a/ vowel also in this slot as well. Regarding the fact that this putative vowel is not indicated in the orthography, one can compare the Akkadian habit of omitting from the orthography the second short vowel in a series of two short syllables; on which see von Soden, *GAG*^{3} (1995), § 12. For grammarians of Akkadian, this feature, observable in the orthography, is most often assumed to represent an underlying phonological reality in which the vowel in question is not pronounced: compare von Soden's "Vokalausstossung in der Wortmitte". Whatever the case may have been, a similar process may have been operative in the

writings, {7-IT-šu} and {8-IT-šu}, perhaps one can transcribe {7-ed-šu} and {8-id-šu}, reconstruct the historical forms as /*šibʿ-(a)-ʾiḏ-(a)-šu/ and /*ṯamānî-(a)-ʾiḏ-(a)-šu/, and normalize as /šibʿêdᵊšu/[206] and /ṯamānîdᵊšu/, respectively. An alternative interpretation, which avoids the problem of the "missing" vowel between the {IT} and {šu} signs, is to interpret these forms as identical to those treated below, under the rubric (c): they would then represent an underlying form /*šibʿaʾiḏ-/, which may have resolved to /šibʿêd-/ or /šibʿîd-/. In this view, the {šu} sign must be interpreted not as a syllabic sign, but as a quasi-logogram, showing the scribe's effort to link, for his reader's comprehension, the West Semitic multiplicative form that he knew and employed with the standard Akkadian equivalent which would have been written with a {šu} (or {šú}) sign. I have no parallels to present as analogies for such a usage, however, and the suggestion must therefore remain purely speculative.

(c) Some writings appear to represent multiplicative forms which are identical, in terms of morphology, to the corresponding multiplicative forms in Ugaritic, where the cardinal numeral is followed by the multiplicative suffix written {-i̇d} or {-d}. As many as three writings may represent such possible parallels: {7-IT},[207] {7-dá},[208] and perhaps also {7-e-T[I-?]}.[209] Given the writing with the {e} sign in the latter example,

---

dialects reflected by the forms used here: for whatever reason, the second short vowel in a series of two short syllables was not reflected in the orthography.

[206]One could also normalize as /šibʿîdᵊšu/, reading {IT} as {id}.

[207]EA 235+ (1 item): {7-IT ù (9) 7-IT-TA-na}. I prefer to normalize the first form as /šibʿêd/ (reading {IT} as {ed}, but /šibʿîd/ is also consistent with the syllabic orthography (reading {IT} as {id}).

[208]EA 362. (1 item).

[209]EA 214 (1 item). Given that the {e} is certain but what follows is partially damaged, it may be that the writing {7-e-T[I-?]} in EA 214, would be more profitably compared with forms such as {ši-ib-e-dá-an} in EA 215. If the reading of {T[I]} is correct, one can transcribe {dì}, yielding a normalization /šibʿêdi-/.

one can propose /*šibʿêd-*/ as a possible normalization for all forms, representing the resolution of the diphthong /*ai*/ to /*ê*/, following a putative quiescence of the intervocalic /ʾ/ from the speculative historical form /**šibʿaʾid-*/. I have no explanation for the *a/i* variability apparently observable for the final vowel.

(d) At least four spellings are represented forms of the multiplicative phrase in which the integer is followed by a form of the word or particle /**-mil-*/: (1) {7 mi-la},[210] (2) {7 mi-lí},[211] (3) {7 mi-la an-na},[212] and perhaps also {7 mi-l[a]-m[a]}.[213] As has long been recognized,[214] the obvious point of departure in the interpretation of these forms is Akkadian word *mala*, 'once'.[215] Ugaritic usage provides no parallel for this construction.

In addition to the two "optional" adverbial elements described above, namely (3) the "from afar" element, and (4) the multiplicative element, both of which appear in Ugaritic letters as well, there is another "optional" adverbial element which appears in the Amarna corpus but which is attested neither in Ugaritic letters nor in the Akkadian (nor Hittite) letters from the other comparative corpora under study here. This element will be mentioned here only briefly, though perhaps not without some value for the contextual interpretation of the formula.

---

[210]EA 65, 282, 284 (3 items).

[211]EA 225 (1 item).

[212]EA 64, 283 (2 items).

[213]EA 330 (1 item).

[214]Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe* (1909) 39.

[215]On Akkadian *mala*, see *CAD*, vol. 10 (M), part 1, pp. 146-147. This Amarna form *mila* receives an entry in *CAD*, vol. 10 (M), part 2, p. 66, where it is said to be adverbial, meaning 'times' following numerals, and of West Semitic origin.

(5) An adverbial phrase describing the manner of prostration in further detail, a common example of which is found in EA 233, {(14) ka-ba-tu-ma (15) ù ṣe-ru-ma}, "(on) the belly and (on) the back." This element is attested in at least thirty-one Amarna letters.[216] The specific words referring to the front and the back are occasionally preceded by the determinative {UZU} indicating their primary reference to parts of the body. The "frontal" element is most often a writing of the Akkadian word *kabattu*(*m*),[217] literally 'liver', but apparently extended to mean 'belly, front' in these Amarna references.[218] Other forms used to denote the "frontal" element include: (i) the logographic writing {UZU.ḪAR} in EA 211,[219] (ii) the phrase {i-na pa-an-te-e : ba-aṭ-nu-ma} in EA 232, line 10,[220] and (iii) EA 316.1, {ka-íb-du-ma}, which, may represent the grammatically "masculine" version of the common noun *kabattu*, namely

---

[216]EA 64-65, 211, 213, 215, 232-234, 282, 284, 298-299, 301, 303-306, 314-316.1, 319-320, 322-326, 328, 331, 366, and 378.

[217]Compare the writings {ka-ba-tu-ma} in EA 64, 65, 213, 233, 282, 284, 314, probably 315, and 323-326; {ka-bat-tu$_4$-ma} in EA 298, 304-306, 320, 322, 328, probably 331, 366, and 378; {ka-bat-tum/tu$_4$} in EA 299, 301, and 319; {ka-bat-tu-ma} in EA 234 and 303; and {ka-ba-tu$_4$-ma} in EA 215. All of these forms may be analyzed morphologically as the common noun *kabatt-* followed by a short *u* vowel, probably intended in an adverbial sense here rather than as a marker of the nominative case, followed by the "adverbial" *-ma* suffix. On adverbial *-u*(*m*), see B. Kienast, *Historische Semitische Sprachwissenschaft* (2001), § 340.2, p. 389; Lipiński, *Outline of a Comparative Grammar* (1997), §32.18, p. 261; and Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), §54.41, pp. 326-328; note also the comment of A. F. Rainey, *CAT* 3 (1996) 232, regarding these forms, "locative *-um* reinforced by *-ma*."

[218]Compare the comments in *CAD*, volume 8 (K) 14.

[219]The logogram {ḪAR} may correspond to Akkadian *kabattu*(*m*); see *CAD*, volume 8 (K) 11.

[220]On the word {pa-an-te-e}, see the glosses provided by the editors of *CAD*, 'chest, front of the chest' under *bamtu* B (*bandu*, *pandu*) in *CAD*, volume 2 (B) 78. The gloss {ba-aṭ-nu-ma} appears to be a West Semitic common noun, /**baṭn-*/ (*qatl* base), meaning 'belly', (compare Ugaritic *bṭn* and Hebrew בֶּטֶן), followed by a short *u* vowel with adverbial meaning (see above), followed by an "adverbial" *-ma* suffix (similar morphology as in {ka-ba-tu-ma}, {ṣe-ru-ma}, etc.).

**kabd-*, followed by a short *u* vowel,[221] with an attached "adverbial" *-ma* suffix.[222] The "dorsal" element is most often a writing of the Akkadian word *ṣērum*,[223] 'back'. The two other forms used are: (i) {zu-uḫ-ru-ma} in at least six letters,[224] and (ii) {ša-ša-lu-ma} in two letters.[225]

2.4.2 Comparative evidence drawn from the Ugaritic literary texts

As was the case with the epistolary address formula,[226] there exists in the Ugaritic literary tradition a poetic equivalent of the epistolary « pros » formula, expanded according to the principles of Ugaritian prosody.[227] Although not epistolary in genre *per se*, this poetic adaptation, here termed the literary « pros » motif, exhibits striking formal and functional parallels with its epistolary counterpart. Such parallels

---

[221]See the references cited above.

[222]The standard West Semitic word for 'liver, belly' is */*kabd-*/; compare Ugaritic *kbd* and Hebrew כָּבֵד, etc.

[223]Always written {ṣe-ru-ma}: EA 213, 232-234, 298-299, 301, 303-305, 314-316.1, 319, probably 320, 322-325, probably 326, 328, probably 331, 366, and 378. In EA 232 this spelling is followed by the *Glossenkeil* and a syllabic spelling of the corresponding West Semitic word: {(11) ù ṣi-ru-ma : zu-uḫ-ru-ma}.

[224]EA 64, 65, 282, probably 284, and 306. In EA 232 this spelling is used as a gloss for the more common standard Akkadian noun *ṣēru*(*m*): {(11) ù ṣi-ru-ma : zu-uḫ-ru-ma}.

[225]EA 211 and 215. The Akkadian word *šašallum* appears to have been borrowed from Sumerian (compare (UZU.)SA.SAL). It may mean 'back'; see *CAD*, volume 17 (Š), part 2, p. 168.

[226]See above, section 1.4.3.

[227]For a recent overview of Ugaritic poetry, see W. G. E. Watson, *HUS* (1999) 165-192, with anterior bibliography. On the various forms and distributions of poetic parallelism, this being generally accepted as the most significant structural feature of Ugaritic poetry, see also D. Pardee, *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism* (1988) xv-xvi and 168-201; and S. Parker, *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition* (1989) 7-59.

are of especial importance in interpreting the form, meaning, and contextual background of the epistolary « pros » formula.[228]

S. Meier identified twelve intact or partially reconstructed literary « pros » motifs in the Ugaritic mythological corpus, eleven of these occurring in the "Baʿlu Cycle" of myths, and one in the "ʾAqhatu Text".[229] To these one may add a thirteenth occurrence of the motif, in one of the less well known mythological texts: *KTU*[2] 1.10 II 18.

These thirteen literary « pros » motifs may be divided into two groups on the basis of their contextual function within the narrative: (1) those that are couched in direct speech, and consist of instructions for prostration given to messengers in an indirect communication situation[230] between two parties, and (2) those that are presented in 3rd person narrative voice, and consist of an account of the act of prostration, a context which is valid for both direct and indirect communication situations.[231] This first group of literary « pros » motifs will be referred to as

---

[228]To my knowledge, the prostration motif of the literary texts has not been extensively exploited in the interpretation of the situational context of its epistolary counterpart; or, if so, by only a handful of scholars. Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 293-294, for example, mentions the parallels, but does not extensively exploit them. Compare a similar awareness in S. A. Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 154-156; and M. S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* 1 (1994) 167-168.

[229]Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 154-156. These passages are *KTU*[2] 1.1 II 15-17; 1.1 III 2-3; 1.1 III 24-25 (largely reconstructed); 1.2 I 14-15; 1.2 I 30-31; 1.2 III 5-6; 1.3 III 9-10; 1.3 VI 18-20; 1.4 IV 25-26; 1.4 VIII 26-29; 1.6 I 36-38; and 1.17 VI 50-51.

[230]By "indirect communication situation" I mean communication between two parties by means of an intermediary or messenger, a situation which generally encompasses Late Bronze Age epistolary communication as well. J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 241, describes such a situation as "ternaire". "Indirect communication situations" are to be contrasted with what I will term "direct communication situations", by which I mean communication between two parties which takes place "directly", without the agency of a third party. Cunchillos, *ibid.*, labels such situations "binaire".

[231]A similar distinction between "command" and "execution" was encountered in literary versions of the epistolary address formula; see above, section 1.4.3. On these and similar contextual

"commands" and the second group as "narratives". Such a contextual distinction between command and narrative fulfillment is reinforced by formal differences.[232] At least four[233] prostration "commands" are attested: *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 14-15;[234] 1.3 III 9-10;[235] 1.3 VI 18-20;[236] and 1.4 VIII 26-29.[237] These belong, by definition, only to indirect

---

distinctions within Ugaritic poetic narrative, see G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (1981) 52-55 (the rubric "orden-ejecución"); and Parker, *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition* (1989) 28-31 (on "instructions and execution").

[232]The verbal forms used in commands, with the exception of forms derived from ḪWY (Št-stem), bear no prefixes, and thus must be imperatives; verbal forms derived from ḪWY (Št) always bear the prefix *t-*, regardless of gender and number, and are thus, as expected from context, 2nd person forms of the prefix conjugation. Used in a volitional context, we can analyze these forms as "jussives". By contrast, the verbal forms used in a narrative « pros » motifs are probably all in the prefix conjugation. In a narrative context, such forms can be analyzed as "indicative". *KTU*[2] 1.1 III 2-3 presents a special problem; it is typically understood as narrative rather than direct speech (compare the recent treatments of D. Pardee, *Context* 1 [1997] 244, and N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit* [1998] 43), but such an analysis is problematic on the formal grounds just described, for the preserved verbal forms (*hbr* and *ql*) are such as one finds in commands, not in narrative versions of the « pros » motif (where these verbal forms are otherwise universally in the prefix conjugation). If the formal distinction between command and narrative, as described here, is to be maintained, one tentative solution would be to interpret the « pros » motif in lines 2-3 as a command (on formal grounds), and to interpret the phrase *w yʿn kṯr w ḫss* in line 17 (as well as all subsequent prefix conjugation verbal forms in the remaining lines of the column) as being a continuation of the direct speech of *il* rather than as a marker of a transition into narrative (or a continuation of the 3rd person narrative voice). Such would require consequently translating line 17 as 'and (then) *kṯr w ḫss* will reply' rather than 'and *kṯr w ḫss* does (then) reply.' Parallels for speeches embedded within speeches are not unknown in Ugaritic poetic narrative; compare *KTU*[2] 1.14 (from the Kirta Text), for example, where the messages of King *pbl* (col. 3, lines 22-32) and of *krt* (col. 3, lines 33-49) are embedded within *il*'s speech (col. 2, line 9 through col. 3, line 49).

[233]On a possible fifth example, *KTU*[2] 1.1 III 2-3, see below.

[234]In *KTU*[2] 1.2 I:14-15, *ym* commands his messengers *not* to bow before *il* and the "assembly-council" (this example is thus a "negative" prostration command), and then goes on to entrust them with the message they are to deliver.

[235]In *KTU*[2] 1.3 III 9-10, *bʿl* commands his messengers to prostrate themselves before *ʿnt*, and then goes on to recite to them the message they are to deliver. Interestingly, the expected narrative version of the fulfillment of this command is explicitly omitted — Was *ʿnt*'s fearful reaction to seeing *bʿl*'s messengers (lines 32 and following) reason enough for them to abandon standard polite protocol?

[236]In *KTU*[2] 1.3 VI 18-20, the messengers typically associated with *ảṯrt*, namely *qdš* (*w*) *ảmrr*, are commanded to prostrate themselves before *kṯr*; they are then given the message they are to recite.

communication situations, since "commands" necessarily entail an intermediary agent. Prostration narratives, however, may reflect either direct and indirect communication situations. At least eight prostration narratives are preserved. Of these, six reflect direct communication situations.[238] These are: *KTU*[2] 1.1 III 24-25;[239] 1.2 III 5-6;[240]

---

[237]In *KTU*[2] 1.4 VIII 26-29, *bʿl* instructs his messengers to prostrate themselves before *mt*, then goes on to entrust them with the message they are to recite.

[238]The corresponding absence of a literary version of the « S » component of the address formula (*tḥm* N_{S1} *hwt* N_{S2}) in these cases provides another datum for confirming their identity as direct rather than indirect communication situations. In indirect communication situations, a literary version of the « S » component of the address would immediately proceed the message itself (as discussed above). It is interesting to note that, at least as far as the social hierarchy among the gods is currently understood, by means of the literary context in the mythological references and supported by the order of the canonical pantheon lists, five of these six passages reflect "ascending" social situations; the sixth, *KTU*[2] 1.10 II 18, appears in a "horizontal" context.

[239]*KTU*[2] 1.1 III 24-25 is largely reconstructed, but from context appears to report the prostration performed by *kṯr w ḫss* before *ʾil*, immediately prior to speaking.

[240]From context, *KTU*[2] 1.2 III 5-6 is an account of *kṯr* prostrating himself before *ʾil*. Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 155, attributes the act of prostration to *ʿṯtr*; it is true that *ʿṯtr* is mentioned some six lines later (line 12) , but the narrative context is quite different.

1.4 IV 25-26;[241] 1.6 I 36-38;[242] 1.10 II 18;[243] and 1.17 VI 50-51;[244] and at least two indirect: *KTU*[2] 1.1 II 15-17[245] and 1.2 I 30-31.[246] *KTU*[2] 1.1 III 2-3 also reflects an indirect communication situation, be it understood as a narrative or as a command.[247] Given the contextual restraints on the distribution of commands, it is not surprising that narrative versions of the « pros » motif are the more common.[248]

A second internal compositional distinction can also be noted among these thirteen literary « pros » motifs, apart from the narrative "voice" employed, and apart from the status of the communication as direct or indirect. One can distinguish at least three formal compositional patterns: (1) one attested only once, in a narrative version

---

[241]*KTU*[2] 1.4 IV 25-26 is a narrative account of *åṯrt* prostrating herself before *il* prior to speaking to him. Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 155, mistakenly attributes the act of prostration to *ʿnt*.

[242]*KTU*[2] 1.6 I 36-38 is an account of *ʿnt* prostrating herself before *il* prior to speaking to the latter, informing him of the death of *bʿl*.

[243]*KTU*[2] 1.10 II 18 contains an account of *bʿl* prostrating himself at the feet of *ʿnt* prior to speaking to her. This seldom-cited text was published in C. Virolleaud, *Syria* 17 (1936) 150-173; a recent treatment, with anterior bibliography, is N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit* (1998) 155-160.

[244]*KTU*[2] 1.17 VI 50-51 is a narrative account of *ʿnt* prostrating herself before *il* prior to her speaking to him, seeking his sanction for her plan of murdering *åqht*.

[245]In *KTU*[2] 1.1 II 15-17, messengers of *il* prostrate themselves before *ʿnt* prior to reciting the message entrusted to them.

[246]In *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 30-31, the messengers of *ym* explicitly do *not* prostrate themselves before *il* and the "Assembly-council" (*pḫr mʿd*) prior to reciting the message which *ym* earlier entrusted to them.

[247]*KTU*[2] 1.1 III 2-3 is typically understood as a narrative account of the messengers of *il* prostrating themselves before [*kṯr*] (restored from context), and reciting to him the message which *il* earlier entrusted to them; compare, for example, the recent treatments of D. Pardee, *Context* 1 (1997) 244, and N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit* (1998) 43, each with extensive anterior bibliography. As described above, such an analysis is problematic on formal grounds, for the preserved verbal forms are such as one finds in commands, not in narrative versions of the « pros » motif.

[248]At least eight "narrative" versions (*KTU*[2] 1.1 II 15-17; 1.1 III 24-25; 1.2 I 30-31; 1.2 III 5-6; 1.4 IV 25-26; 1.6 I 36-38; 1.10 II 18; and 1.17 VI 50-51) versus four "commands" (*KTU*[2] 1.2 I 14-15; 1.3 III 9-10; 1.3 VI 18-20; and 1.4 VIII 26-29).

in *KTU*[2] 1.10 II 18; (2) a second pattern attested twice, in both a (negative) command and a (negative) narrative version, both occurring in the "Baʿlu Cycle" of myths;[249] and (3) a third pattern attested ten times, in the Baʿlu Cycle as well as in the ʾAqhatu text, at least three times as a command and at least six times as a narration. These three compositional variants are distinguished from one another by (1) the specific verbal roots employed, (2) the total number of verbs present in the motif, and (3) the manner in which the N_R element is represented in the "B"-line. Semantically, the differences between these two compositional variants are of negligible importance. One may compare the structure of the two "command" versions of these literary « pros » motifs:

(1) « *l pʿn* N *hbr w ql tštḥwy* (*w*) *kbd hwt/hyt* »,[250]

'At the two feet of N bow and fall! You shall do homage, (and) honor him/her!'

and, attested only as a negative command,

(2) « [*l pʿn* N_1] *ảl tpl ảl tštḥwy* N_2 »,[251]

'[At the two feet of N_1] do not fall! Do not do homage (to) N_2!'

as well as that of the three "narrative" versions:

(1) « *l pʿn* N *y/thbr w y/tql y/tštḥwy*(*n*) *w y/tkbd*(*n*)*h* »,[252]

---

[249]*KTU*[2] 1.2 I 14-15 and 1.2 I 30-31.

[250]Attested at least three times: *KTU*[2] 1.3 III 9-10; 1.3 VI 18-20; and 1.4 VIII 26-29. This formal structure is probably also to be found in *KTU*[2] 1.1 III 2-3, { [l pʿn . kṯr] (3) hbr . w ql . ⌜t⌝[štḥwy . w kbd . hwt]}, which may be a formal clue as to the contextual interpretation of the passage as a command rather than a narrative (see above).

[251]Attested only once: *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 14-15. The verbal construction of *ảl* + prefix conjugation (specifically, the jussive) is the normal and expected form of a negative command; see J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), §87.2, pp. 816-817.

[252]This formal structure is attested six times: *KTU*[2] 1.1 II 15-17; 1.1 III 24-25 (largely reconstructed); 1.2 III 5-6; 1.4 IV 25-26; 1.6 I 36-38; and 1.17 VI 50-51.

‘At the two feet of N he/she/they bow(s) and fall(s); he/she/they do(es) homage and he/she/they honor(s) him/her,’

and, attested only as a negative account,

(2) « *l pʿn* N_1 *l tpl l tštḥwy* N_2 »,[253]

‘At the two feet of N_1 they do not fall; they do not do homage (to) N_2.’

and, the unique example,

(3) « *l pʿnh ykrʿ w yql* »,[254]

‘At her two feet he stoops and falls.’

If, as shown, these thirteen literary « pros » motifs are not precisely identical in terms of composition, they do all share certain important similarities, and it is these similarities which demonstrate their fundamental formal and contextual affinity with the epistolary « pros » formula.

Specifically, the “A-line” of all the literary « pros » motifs contains two components which correspond precisely to the two “necessary” structural components of the epistolary « pros » formula: (1) a prepositional phrase bearing the structure « *l pʿn* N », where the N element represents the god or goddess honored by the action

---

[253]Attested only once: *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 30-31.

[254]For a fuller context, the text of *KTU*[2] 1.10 II 13-19 is {(13) w yšů . ʿnh . åliyn . bʿl (14) w yšů . ʿnh . w yʿn (15) w yʿn . btlt . ʿnt (16) nʿmt . ⌜b⌝n . åḫt . bʿl (17) l pnnh . ydd . w yqm (18) l pʿnh . ykrʿ . w yql (19) w yšů . gh . w yṣḥ}; compare the translation of A. Caquot, M. Sznycer, and A. Herdner, *TO* 1 (1974) 283-284, “Le Très Puissant Baʿal élève son regard, il élève son regard et il voit, il voi la Vierge ʿAnat, la (plus) gracieuse d’entre les soeurs de Baʿal. Il court à sa rencontre et s’arrête. Il s’incline et tombe à ses pieds. Il prends la parole et déclare. . . .” On the root NḎḎ, see G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 318 (there cited as “/n-d-d/”); and J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), §75.4, p. 626. On KRʿ, del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 222.

of prostration,[255] and (2) (a) finite verbal form(s) derived from a root connected with the basic semantic field "to fall".[256]

Secondly, the order of the constituent components in these "A-lines", in all cases, parallels that of the epistolary « pros » formula: « *l p ʿn* N + verb(s)-of-prostration ».

Thirdly, like the epistolary « pros » formula which, by its very nature as "epistolary", is necessarily linked with indirect communication situations, so also the literary « pros » motif is explicitly linked with contexts of communication, be they direct or indirect. This connection is especially apparent from the frequent association of the literary « pros » motif with the literary "address" motifs in indirect communication situations.[257] While, in such situations, the order of mention of these two motifs is different from the order of the corresponding epistolary formulas,[258] the situational context is one and the same.

---

[255]The attested elements occupying the N slot in the literary « pros » motifs are divine names in all cases but one: *ʿnt* (*KTU*[2] 1.1 II 15 and 1.3 III 9), *ỉl* (*KTU*[2] 1.2 I 30, 1.4 IV 25, and 1.6 I 36-37), *kṯ<r>* (*KTU*[2] 1.3 VI 18), and *mt* (*KTU*[2] 1.4 VIII 26). The exception is *KTU*[2] 1.10 II 18, where this slot is occupied by a pronominal suffix, the antecedent of which is found three lines earlier, in line 15: *btlt ʿnt*. It is of interest to note that in these literary « pros » motifs, the N element is nearly always a single divine name (that is, an ID element), and never a social relationship term (a REL element). This neatly differentiates the composition of the literary motif from that of the epistolary formula.

[256]The attested verbal roots used in this slot are HBR and Q(Y)L (a pair always occurring together, and in that order); NPL; and KRʿ, which also appears alongside Q(Y)L. On these verbs, see the respective entries in del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 1-2 (1996-2000). The forms derived from Q(Y)L are of particular significance, since it is this root alone which is used in the Ugaritic epistolary « pros » formulas. It should also be noted that, despite the semantics of these three roots (which are entirely congruent with those of the verbs in the epistolary « pros » formulas), neither the verbal root HBR nor NPL are known from Ugaritic or Akkadian versions of the epistolary « pros » formula.

[257]The association of the two motifs, in fact, only occurs in indirect communication situations, a distribution which underlines the affinity of such literary passages with corresponding epistolary structures, epistolary communication also being indirect. On indirect communication, see above.

[258]The literary « pros » motif normally precedes the literary "address" motifs (denoted « R » and « S » in the discussion above, section 1.4.3) when both appear together (namely, in indirect

A fourth point of comparison between the literary motif and the epistolary formula is less obvious. Among the "optional" elements occurring in the epistolary « pros » formulas is one which expresses distance: Ugaritic *mrḥqtm* and Akkadian *ištu rūqiš*, both meaning 'from afar'. Many of the Ugaritic literary « pros » motifs occur immediately following another literary motif which also expresses distance, this motif being « *b ålp šd rbt kmn* », 'over (a distance of) a thousand *šd*-measures, ten-thousand *kmn*-measures.'[259] Since there is virtually no doubt that this motif expresses distance, and great distance at that, and since in its distribution it is very often adjacent to the literary « pros » motif, one might easily wonder if the motif in question represents a poetic adaptation and expansion of this "optional" element of the Ugaritic epistolary « pros » formula, *mrḥqtm*, 'from afar'.[260] Its distribution fits the "optional" distribution of the word *mrḥqtm* in that it does not occur in all attestations of the motif. However, this "distance" motif also occurs independent of the « pros » motif proper,[261] and its frequent association with the literary "departure" motif[262] suggests that in many,

---

communication situations); the opposite order is attested in epistolary structure (namely, the address formula, followed by the « pros » formula).

[259]Compare G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (1981) 40, who characterizes the motif as the "formulario predicho y la precisión de la distancia," and translates it "a través de mil yugadas, diez mil obradas." Note also the variant (unfortunately only partially preserved) in *KTU*[2] 1.1 II, {(14, cont'd) b ålp . ḥẓr (15) [...]}, "over (a distance of) a thousand court(-length)s, [...]."

[260]Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* 1 (1994) 168, shows himself well aware of this possibility. Smith's citation of Loewenstamm, *ibid.*, is slightly deceptive however: no mention of the literary motif « *b ålp šd rbt kmn* » is to be found in the article cited (available in *Comparative Studies* [1980] 246-248).

[261]As in *KTU*[2] 1.3 IV 38; discussed by Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* 1 (1994) 168.

[262]On this motif, see del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (1981) 54-55, there described an "orden de marcha"; and Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* 1 (1994) 165, described as "an expression for departure towards a location."

though not all,[263] cases, it functions syntactically as a complement to this latter motif.[264] M. S. Smith describes this distributional ambiguity well: "It is evident that *bålp šd rbt kmn* constitutes a poetic line that could augment a bicolon into a tricolon, either by fronting or following the bicolon. It could modify bicola describing either obeisance or duration of travel."[265]

A fifth and final point of comparison involves one of the verbs present in the "B"-line of the literary « pros » motif. A suitable example is provided by *tštḥwy*, 'she does homage,' in *KTU*[2] 1.4 IV 26. Despite its typical analysis as a rare example of the Št-stem of the root ḤWY,[266] one is struck by the superficial resemblance[267] of (1) this verbal form in Ugaritic and Hebrew,[268] and (2) the unusual spellings of the

---

[263]Compare *KTU*[2] 1.4 VIII 24; discussed by Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* 1 (1994) 167-168, with anterior bibliography.

[264]Compare del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (1981) 54-55, who includes this motif as one component of the "orden de marcha". This would also seem to be the opinion of Pardee, *Context* 1 (1997) 243, n. 10: "the attested formula for expressing the distance of a deity's journey is *ålp šd rbt kmn* . . . ."

[265]Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* 1 (1994) 168. A better characterization would have been "distance of travel"; the terms employed, after all, apply first and foremost to distance, and not to duration. Compare also Parker, *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition* (1989) 23-24: "The occurrence in the poems of stock situations, actions and reactions produces clusters of formulaic cola … . Frequently such clusters will consist of transposable formulaic monocola, but they will also include fixed formulae, invariable phrases dependent on contiguous cola for completion of a clause, e.g. *bålp šd rbt kmn*, *ʿm* + nominal phrase. The poets draw rather freely on the stock of formulae pertaining to a given situation—that is, they may use fewer or more of the monocola in the traditional stock for that situation, and they may vary the order in which these appear from passage to passage."

[266]See, recently, Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), §74.642, pp. 606-607.

[267]For previous discussions of the resemblance, see the references cited by M. Liverani, *Le lettere di el-Amarna* 1 (1999) 59, n. 2.

[268]On this verb in biblical Hebrew, see L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *HALOT* 1 (1994) 295-296, with some anterior bibliography; and Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 90-118, 187-200, and 303-310, although the minute contextual distinctions he makes often seem arbitrary.

"Akkadian" verbal form **uštakaʾʾin*,[269] of which a common example is EA 298, {iš-ta-ḫa-ḫi-in},[270] which appear occasionally in syllabic epistolary « pros » formulas deriving from the Levant. One wonders if the resemblance is not merely coincidental, for the grammatical form of both verbs is atypical, and the semantics of both are nearly identical. Should speculation be allowed, we might consider the possibility that this word represents a productive verbal loanword, a *Kulturwort* which was part of the shared vocabulary of court protocol. We might explain its various manifestations by means of the linguistic phenomena of grammatical reanalysis and paradigm leveling. In other words, West Semites encountered the word, and comprehended it within the framework of their own morpho-syntactic system, from which the form became grammatically productive.[271]

Alongside these similarities, however, the literary « pros » motif also exhibits important compositional differences with its epistolary counterpart: (1) poetic expansion in the literary motif, (2) differences in the choice of verbal roots and in the conjugation of the verbal elements, and (3) the absence of "optional" elements known from Ugaritic and syllabic comparative material.

---

[269]The Middle Assyrian tradition preserves a more conservative spelling of this verb: {ul-ta-ka-in}; see below, section 2.4.3.2.1.

[270]See above, section 2.4.1.

[271]As an example, compare Lipiński's statement in his *Outline of a Comparative Grammar* (1997) 558, that "East Semitic *malāḫum*, 'sailor', [was] borrowed from Sumerian má, 'ship', and laḫ$_4$, 'to transport'." Assuming this is correct, the Akkadian abstract common noun *malāḫūtu*, "boatmanship", shows a grammaticalization of the borrowed item. Subsequent reanalysis could have resulted in a perceived link with the productive West Semitic verbal root, MLḤ, 'to be salty'.

2.4.3 Miscellaneous comparative evidence

This rubric is used as a blanket to cover the remaining comparative data relevant to a study of the Ugaritic « pros » formula. In general, these parallels differ from the Ugaritic « pros » formula in terms of composition and/or distribution, to an extent such that they are of lesser importance for interpretive purposes. These remaining categories of comparative evidence include: (1) examples of the Akkadian idiom « *ana šēpē* N + (verb of prostration) » outside of the epistolary « pros » formula; (2) motifs of prostration, epistolary or otherwise, of which the composition is different from that of the Ugaritic « pros » formula, and (3) a collection of some iconographic evidence for the practice of prostration.

The first group represents usages of the idiomatic vocabulary typical of the « pros » formula in other distributional contexts, epistolary or otherwise. In other words, these passages present a composition similar or identical to that of the Ugaritic « pros » formula, but a different distribution. The prostration motifs of the second group, however, are dissimilar in terms of composition to those of the Ugaritic formula; in terms of distribution they may or may not be comparable. The third group simply provides a few examples of visual representations of the act of prostration.

2.4.3.1 The « pros » idiom outside of the epistolary formulary

The two "necessary" components of the Ugaritic and syllabic « pros » formulas are the prepositional phrase « *l p ʿn* N_R » / « *ana šēpē* N_R », 'at the two feet of N_R', and the finite verbal form expressing prostration. An idiom consisting of these two elements, « *ana šēpē* N *maqātu*(*m*) » in Akkadian, 'to fall at the feet of N,' is not limited to the corpus of the epistolary « pros » formulas under study here. The idiom

also occurs (1) within the body of certain Old Babylonian letters, (2) in treaties connected with the Hittite realm (from Boğazköy and Ras Shamra), and (3) in a ritual text from Tell Meskene.

The *CAD* cites three occurrences of this idiom in Old Babylonian sources,[272] all drawn from the body of letters:

TCL 17, no. 55, line 21. {[a-na (?)] še-pí-šu am-qù-ut-ma}[273]

'I fell [at] his foot.'

TCL 17, no. 74, line 18. {a-na še-⌜ep⌝ « PN » mu-qú-ut-ma}

'Fall at the foot of PN!'

PBS 7, no. 15, line 7. {(6) a-na še-ep « P[N » (?)] (7) mu-qù-ut-ma}[274]

'Fall at the foot of P[N]!'

In addition to the presence of both "necessary" components, one notes their verb-final order, not surprising as it is standard Akkadian syntax, and the use of the preterite in the first example.[275] The final *-ma* is also attested in at least one « pros » formula

---

[272]*CAD*, vol. 10 (M), part 1, p. 242.

[273]G. Dossin, *Textes cunéiformes du Louvre*, volume 17: *Lettres de la première dynastie babylonienne*, tome 1 (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1933). In text no. 55, line 21, the phrase occurs in a broken context within the body. In transcribing {še-pí-šu} and translating in the singular, I am following the normalization *šēpīšu*, found in *CAD*, vol. 10 (M), part 1, p. 242; one can compare the use of the singular (construct) form in the other OB examples cited here. Epigraphically, one could also read {še-pé-šu}, in the dual: 'I fell at his two feet.' Such would align with the idiom as it is used in the « pros » formulas of Late Bronze Syrian letters.

[274]A. Ungnad, *Babylonian Letters of the Ḫammurapi Period*, Publications of the Babylonian Section of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, no. 7 (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Museum, 1915). I am following the transcription of M. Stol, Altbabylonische Briefe 11 (1986), text no. 15, p. 10, lines 6-7. The phrase occurs in a broken context within the body of the letter.

[275]The preterite *amqut* is the most commonly attested verbal form in the syllabic pros formulas.

from Amarna.[276] Differences include the syllabic writing of the word *šēpu*,[277] its singular number,[278] and the use of the imperative in the latter two examples.

Treaties from the Hittite Realm often contain a prostration motif within that section of the treaty which recounts the historical background of the political agreement formalized therein.[279] It occurs within a more general "submission" scenario, which may consist of the following: (1) the would-be vassal "comes to" the Hittite king, and (2) either (i) prostrates himself at the feet of the great king, or (ii) declares "I am indeed your servant," or the like.[280] The interchangeability of these latter two motifs shows their functional equivalence in the broader discourse scheme of the treaty.

A Boğazköy example of this idiom occurs in the historical prelude of a treaty, in its Akkadian version, between Šuppiluliuma of Ḫatti and Šattiwaza of Mittanni.[281] A Hittite version of this treaty also exists, but the relevant section corresponding to this one has not been preserved.[282]

---

[276]Compare EA 299.

[277]In the epistolary « pros » formulas, the orthography of this element always includes the logogram {GÌR}.

[278]Contrast its dual number in the epistolary « pros » formulas.

[279]This section is often the historical prelude, but may also be the conclusion.

[280]Note the Ras Shamra example RS 17.227 and parallels: RS 17.300, RS 17.330, RS 17.347, RS 17.372B, RS 17.373, RS 17.446. Note also the Ugaritic parallel RS 11.772+, which probably contains a similar motif in lines 1-5; see the discussion of these lines in Pardee, *Semitica* 51 (forthcoming).

[281]The text is KBo 1.3, line 21. For a translation and anterior bibliography, see G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (1996) 44-50 and 172.

[282]The *editio princeps* of the Hittite version is J. Friedrich, *AfO* 2 (1924) 119-124. An improved reading, aided by the addition of two small fragments, is found in G. Beckman, "Some Observations on the Šuppiluliuma-Šattiwaza Treaties," in M. Cohen, D. Snell, and D. Weisberg, eds.,

KBo 1.3, line 21. {a-na GÌR ^{d}UTU-ši ^{m}šu-up-pí-lu-li-u-ma LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR URU ḫa-at-ti UR.SAG na-ra-am ^{d}U a[m-t]a-qú-ut}.[283]

'I fell at the foot of the Sun God, Šuppiluliuma, the great king, the king of the land of the city of Ḫatti, the hero, the beloved one of the Storm God.'

As in the OB examples, one notes the presence of both necessary components and the verb-final order. One also notes that the word *šēpu* is spelled without {MEŠ},[284] the « N_R » component is extremely elaborate,[285] and, assuming the correctness of the partial restoration, the verbal form is written {a[m-t]a-qú-ut}.[286]

The example from Tell Meskene occurs in a ritual text documenting the "intronisation et marriage de la prêtresse-*entu*"[287] at the inland Syrian city of Emar. The text is attested in at least four copies, but only two preserve the portion containing the "prostration" idiom. Furthermore, these two copies show different versions of this passage. The passages are:

The Tablet and the Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo (Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 1993) 53-57, esp. pp. 53-54.

[283]I have followed E. F. Weidner, BoSt 8 (1923) 40, in transcribing {a[m-t]a-qú-ut} (for his "a[m-t]a-ku-ut"). On the copy (KBo 1, no. 3), however, the space available for the reconstruction of the two signs {a[m-t]a} is quite slim.

[284]Compare the use of the singular in the OB examples.

[285]That is, there are six consecutive ID elements, and no REL elements. This kind of elaboration is reminiscent of the « N_R » components of many Amarna letters which are also addressed to "the great king."

[286]This spelling is unattested in the corpus of epistolary « pros » formulas. Normally the preterite is used for this element. This form could be the preterite of the Gt stem, or, it could also represent the perfect conjugation of the G stem.

[287]This is the title given to the work by its editor; see D. Arnaud, Emar 6:3 (1986), no. 369, pp. 326-337 (transcription, translation, and epigraphic notes).

A. Line 44: {LÚ.MEŠ ši-bu-ut URU.KI a-na GÌR.MEŠ i-ma-qu-tu$_4$},[288]

'The elders of the city fall at (her) feet,' and

B. Lines 30-31: {[...] (31) a-na GÌR.MEŠ-ši uš-ḫé-ḫa-nu},[289]

'[The elders of the city] do homage at her feet.'

As in previous examples, both necessary components are present, and the order is verb final. A further point of comparison with the epistolary « pros » formulas is the spelling of the word for "foot": it is spelled logographically, {GÌR.MEŠ}, as in the vast majority of syllabic « pros » formulas. In terms of differences, one notes that (1) the grammatical subject of the phrase is explicitly expressed and occupies first position in copy A, and is probably to be reconstructed in this location in copy B; (2) the « N_R » component consists of a personal pronoun in copy B,[290] and not a social status term, and that no « N_R » component is present in copy A;[291] and (3) that, although the

---

[288]Copy A consists of two joined fragments, Msk 731027 and Msk 74245, the former containing the beginning of the text. The copy of Msk 731027 was published in D. Arnaud, Emar 6:1 (1985) 100-101—the label of the relevant copy, the "recto suite," apparently contains a misprint: "731023" instead of "731027". Line 44 reads {DU-lak LÚ.MEŠ ši-bu-ut URU.KI a-na GÌR.⌈-⌉[...]}; judging from Arnaud's copy, the {GÌR} sign is followed by the remains of the head of a single vertical wedge prior to the tablet break. The continuation of this line is found on the other fragment, Msk 74245, the copy of which was published in D. Arnaud, Emar 6:2 (1985) 566-567. The editor's join allows for certain identification of the sign following {GÌR}; the continuation of line 44 on Msk 74245 reads {MEŠ i-ma-qu-tu$_4$}.

[289]Copy B is represented by one tablet: Msk 731042, the copy of which was published in Arnaud, Emar 6:1 (1985) 123. The transcription of these two passages in D. Fleming, *The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar* (1992) 19, follows that of the editor. Fleming also includes epigraphic notes on p. 39, a translation on p. 54, and commentary on this passage on p. 185: "Imbedded (sic) in the description of the procession is an encounter with the elders of Emar, who bow down at her feet as to a superior."

[290]The context of this passage is not direct address, and so there is perhaps little need for explicit markers of social status accompanying personal deixis or reference.

[291]It has perhaps been accidentally omitted, or else is clear from context, or unnecessary in this version of the idiom.

verbal forms are derived from roots commonly used in the epistolary prostration formulas, they follow a different conjugational pattern, namely, the present.[292]

Although the above examples show a composition quite similar to that of the Ugaritic « pros » formula, their distribution is quite different. The examples from Boğazköy and Tell Meskene occur not in letters, but in the context of the historical prologue of a treaty and the description of a ritual, respectively. While the idiom in the Old Babylonian examples does occur in texts of the epistolary genre, it does not occur as part of a formulaic polite protocol of the *praescriptio*, but rather embedded within the non-formulaic body of the letter.

2.4.3.2 Miscellaneous prostration motifs of dissimilar composition

Included under this rubric are examples of passages which allude to the act of prostration, but which are not precisely analogous to the Ugaritic epistolary « pros » formula in terms of composition. These passages are of several types: (1) epistolary prostration formulas which contain a different composition, but a similar, if not identical, distribution as that of the Ugaritic formula; (2) non-formulaic prostration motifs, of composition dissimilar to that of the Ugaritic « pros » formula, occurring in

---

[292]The orthography of the verb of copy A is the easiest to interpret; the presence of a vowel between the first and second root consonants indicates that we are dealing with the "present" conjugation (the gemination of the /q/ is not indicated in the orthography); such a conjugation is not inappropriate for a descriptive (or prescriptive) ritual. Per usual in the periphery, the forms of *šukênu* are spelled with signs typically connected with the phoneme /ḫ/. The presence of the {KAN} sign, here transcribed with the syllabic value *ḫé*, is not in this case a meaningful indicator of the word's morphology, which I would reconstruct, in its historical form, as /*ˀ*uška*ˀˀ*anū*/. Much more telling is the use of the {ḪA} sign, which, in indicating an *a*-quality vowel in the final stem syllable, provides a contrast with the *i*-quality vowel in the spellings of this verb in the epistolary « pros » formulas, such as {uš-ḫé-ḫi-in}, for example, in RS 20.019. In peripheral spellings of this verb, this *a* / *i* polarity in the final stem syllable may be the sole indication of the present / preterite conjugational distinction.

epistolary and non-epistolary passages; and (3) literary allusions to prostration in the literatures of neighboring areas. Due to similarities of distribution and situational context, the first group is of greater importance for my purposes here than the other three.

2.4.3.2.1 EPISTOLARY « PROS » FORMULAS OF DISSIMILAR COMPOSITION

While quite a number of Akkadian epistolary traditions make use of formulas alluding to prostration, the composition of some such formulas are markedly less similar to the Ugaritic data than that of others, and, correspondingly, of less value in a comparative analysis. A large number of letters in the Middle Assyrian tradition, recovered from several sites,[293] contain epistolary formulas which touch the subject of prostration, but in a fashion significantly different from that attested at Ugarit.[294] These "prostration" formulas, so labeled on the basis of their semantics, for the most part follow a single compositional structure, distinctly different from the alphabetic and syllabic cuneiform « pros » formulas described above.

The Middle Assyrian "prostration" formula consists of a single Akkadian word, cited here in the form of a historical morpho-phonemic normalization: **ʾuštakaʾʾin*. The other "necessary" component of the syllabic « pros » formulas studied above, namely, the « *ana šēpē* N_R » element, is not present in letters of the Middle Assyrian

---

[293]These derive from sites not only in Assyria proper, but also southern Mesopotamia, Syria, Anatolia, and Egypt. See the citations in E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 49-50.

[294]For a recent and detailed discussion, see Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996), pp. 56-59 ("die Prosternierungsformel"). See also E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 77; and M. I. Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 249-252.

tradition; nor are any of the three types of "optional" components, also described above, present.

This formula occurs in ascending letters in the Middle Assyrian tradition, of which at least twenty-six are known.[295] This one-word "prostration" formula stands on its own in at least one letter,[296] but in the vast majority of cases, this it is immediately followed by another "polite formula", normalized *ana dinān bēlīya attalak*,[297] 'I have gone as a substitute (*dinānu*) for my master'.[298] This double motif, which Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum calls the "Ergebenheitsformel", follows the address and precedes the body.[299] As an example of this double formula, compare the structure of the *praescriptio* of the following letter found at Tell Billa: {(1) a-na « N_R » EN-ia (2) tup-

---

[295]For a list, see Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 56, n. 37.

[296]This is KBo 28.082 (from Boğazköy), presented as text no. 3 in H. G. Güterbock, *AfO* Beiheft 7 (1942) 83 (copy), with transliteration on p. 36 (the copy in KBo 28 is that of H. Kümmel). The transcription of Güterbock implies a reading of {(1) a-na ^{m}bi-la-an-za [...] (2) ù ^{m}su-na-i-lum um-m[a ... -t]a(?)-ma (3) ul-tu$_4$-ḫé-ḫi-in lu DI-mu (4) a-na KUR-at ḫa-at-te-e(?) lu DI-mu }; Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 58, n. 49, reads line 2 slightly differently: {(2) ù ^{m}su-na-i-lum ṭup-p[í ^{m}X-x]-ta$^{?}$-ma}. The reading of the signs following the proper name in line 2 is not clear from the copies; those of both Güterbock and Kümmel show a sign seemingly compatible with either {UM} or {DUB}. At Ras Shamra, at least, the {UM} and {DUB} signs are often indistinguishable (so Huehnergard, *Akkadian of Ugarit* [1989] 368, nn. 26-27).

[297]VAT 8851 lacks this element; see Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 56 and part II.2.1.3. By reason of the frequent pairing of the word **uštakaʾʾin* and the phrase *ana dinān bēlīya attalak* in the *praescriptio* of middle Assyrian letters, Cancik-Kirschbaum (*ibid.*, p. 56 and elsewhere) groups these two syntactic units together under a single rubric, the "Ergebenheitsformel".

[298]The translation of the verb *attalak* with an English past tense is a literal, but slightly deceptive rendering (the verb is either the Gt preterite or the G perfect of *alāku*, 'to go', 1st person common singular), since in this context the form is best understood in a performative sense (compare the discussion in Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 [1987] 1-31), a usage for which Akkadian employs the preterite or the perfect, but English the present tense.

[299]In this respect, the distribution of the Middle Assyrian « pros » formula is similar to that of the Ugaritic « pros » form and its syllabic Syrian counterparts.

pí « N_S » | (3) ul-ta-ka-in a-na di-na-an (4) EN-ia at-ta-lak | « body » }.[300] A similar motif, including a one word « pros » formula, is attested in a piggyback letter on one of the Amarna tablets.[301]

2.4.3.2.2 NON-FORMULAIC PROSTRATION MOTIFS OF DISSIMILAR COMPOSITION

Among the parallels occasionally cited by students of the prostration motif are passages which (1) are not derived from the formulaic *praescriptio* of letters, and (2) show a composition different than the Ugaritic « pros » formula. These motifs are relevant because, like the Middle Assyrian « pros » formulas described above, they contain a finite verbal form expressing prostration. Also like the Middle Assyrian examples, however, they lack the other "necessary" element of the epistolary « pros » formula, the prepositional phrase « *ana šēpē* N ». As such, their composition is significantly different from that of the Ugaritic « pros » formula, and their distribution further distances these examples from the formula under study here. In other words, these passages differ from the Ugaritic examples both in terms of composition and in terms of distribution. At least three passages which fall under this rubric may be mentioned here: a ritual text from Meskene, and two legal documents from Yorgan Tepe (ancient Nuzi).

D. Fleming has drawn attention to use of a prostration motif in a ritual text from Emar.[302] In his edition, D. Arnaud transcribed this passage as {a-na ^{d}é-a tu-uš-ḫé-ḫa-

---

[300]J. J. Finkelstein, *JCS* 7 (1953), text no. 62, pp. 135 and 167 (copy).

[301]EA 12.2. The address formula consists of only an « S » component with the structure « REL ID », and is thus reminiscent of the address formulas of conceptually ascending letters from Kassite Nippur (see above, section 1.4.2.5.3.2). The two polite formulas which follow, however, resemble those of the Middle Assyrian tradition: « one word prostration formula » + « *ana dinān* REL *alāki* ». See J. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 1 (1915) 100-101; and M. Liverani, *Le lettere di el-Amarna* 2 (1999) 360, n. 52.

an}, and translated "Elle se prosterne devant Ea."[303] The compositional structure of the prostration idiom here may thus be represented as « *ana* N + verb-of-prostration ».

M. Gruber has mentioned "a Nuzi letter which may be the oldest attestation of the verb *šḫḫn* 'prostrate oneself' in the opening formula of a letter."[304] Gruber's characterization of this tablet, SMN 1153,[305] as epistolary is curious, however, since (1) as an epistolary *praescriptio*, this passage would have few, if any, precedents in the known epistolary traditions of Mesopotamia and Syria, and (2) E. A. Speiser had already highlighted the legal nature of the text in his treatment.[306] In any case, the prostration motif shows a distinctly different composition than that of the Ugaritic « pros » formula.[307] Gruber also drew attention to another legal text from Nuzi, which contains a prostration motif similar in compositional structure to the Emar text discussed above.[308]

---

[302]D. Fleming, *The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar* (1992) 185, n. 338: "Only one ritual text [apart from Emar 369, which Fleming himself is discussing] uses the [prostration] formula: the *mašʾartu* prostrates herself (*tu-uš-ḫé-ḫa-an*) before Ea before addressing him in his temple, following the same protocol found in the letters (370.83)."

[303]The text is Emar 6, no. 370, entitled by its editor "l'intronisation de la prêtresse-*mašʾartu*." It is preserved on a single tablet: Msk 74303a. The relevant passage is from line 83'. The cuneiform copy of this line is found in D. Arnaud, Emar 6:2 (1985) 646; transcription and translation in D. Arnaud, Emar 6:3 (1986) 340 and 344, respectively.

[304]Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 223.

[305]SMN 1153 was published in R. H. Pfeiffer and E. A. Speiser, *AASOR* 16 (1935-1936), as text no. 71, pp. 46-47 (transliteration), and pp. 117-118 (translation and commentary).

[306]Pfeiffer and Speiser, *AASOR* 16 (1935-1936) 117. A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 55, had apparently accepted Gruber's identification of the text as epistolary.

[307]Line 2: { « PN_1 » a-na pa-[ni] « PN_2 » u[š]-te-ḫé-in}. Note Speiser's technical translation of the verb {u[š]-te-ḫé-in}, ". . . made an appeal," *AASOR* 16 (1935-1936) 117.

[308]In discussing KBo 28.082, Gruber, in *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 223, n. 1, remarks "see also JEN IV #321, ll. 1-14". This text, published in E. Chiera, *JEN* 4 (1934), text no. 321, appears to be legal in nature. The "prostration" passage is found in line 8; Chiera's copy reads {(8) a-na LUGAL uš-tu-ḫé-ḫi-in}, 'he prostrated himself before (*ana*?) the king.' See also the comments in P. Koschaker,

2.4.3.2.3 EXTRA-UGARITIC LITERARY EVIDENCE FOR THE « PROS » FORMULA

Several ancient Near Eastern literary texts also allude to prostration. Like the prostration motifs mentioned above, these passages lack precise compositional parallels with the Ugaritic « pros » formula; their distribution in literary texts further distances their value.

The composition of these literary passages is characterized by the presence of a "prostration" verb, such as Akkadian *šukênu*. The second "necessary" component of the epistolary « pros » formula, « *ana šēpē* N », is absent.

M. Gruber and S. Meier mention literary prostration motifs from three Akkadian sources: (1) *Nergal and Ereshkigal*,[309] (2) *Enuma Elish*,[310] and (3) *Atra-Ḫasis*.[311] Samuel Loewenstamm had already drawn attention to a reference from (4)

ZA 43 (1936) 205: "In Nuzi IV 321, 7f. berichtet der Kläger, dass er 'hinter dem Gegner her gerufen (*ina arki šasû*), d. h. mit ihm prozessiert, und sich vor dem König niedergeworfen habe' (*ana šarri uštuḫeḫin*)." The compositional structure of the prostration idiom, « *ana* N + verb-of-prostration », is the same as that of Emar 6, no. 370, line 83', mentioned above.

[309]Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 314 and 316, and Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 153, allude to two passages; Meier's reference is "*STT* 28 I 28'; III 49". The edition is O. Gurney, "The Sultan Tepe Tablets VII: The Myth of Nergal and Ereshkigal," *Anatolian Studies* 10 (1960) 105-131; see now the bibliography accompanying S. Dalley's translation in *Context* 1 (1997) 384-389.

[310]Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 313, and Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 153, cite one passage: *Enūma Elish*, tablet 3, lines 68-70. For bibliographical references, see E. Speiser's treatment in J. B. Pritchard, *ANET*[3] (1969) 60-72; and, more recently, the references given by B. Foster in *Context* 1 (1997) 390-402.

[311]A standard edition is W. Lambert and A. Millard, *Atra-ḫasīs: the Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969); more recent bibliographical references are given by B. Foster in *Context* 1 (1997) 450-453. Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 315, and Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 153, cite two passages; Meier 's reference is "*Atra*. I 122-4; 134-136; p. 54-55" (the latter referring, presumably, to Lambert and Millard's edition).

the *Gilgamesh* Epic.[312] Outside of Akkadian literature, Meier added (5) an example from Sumerian literature, in *The Marriage of Sud*;[313] and F. B. Knutson[314] added (6) two passages from the Hebrew Bible: Gen 33:3[315] and Ex 24:1.[316] M. S. Smith cited (7) the Egyptian story "Astarte and the Sea".[317] Finally, W. G. E. Watson[318] has drawn attention to a literary prostration motif in *The Song of Ullikumi*, a literary work characterized by its editor as a "Hittite version of a Hurrian epic".[319]

Interestingly, two of these texts, the passages from *Gilgamesh* and the Hebrew Bible, contain components semantically similar to the "optional" element *mrḥqtm* in Ugaritic « pros » formulas.

---

[312]S. E. Loewenstamm, *BASOR* 188 (1967) 41-43; reprinted in Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies* (1980) 246-248. The passage is *Gilgamesh*, tablet 6, lines 152-155; see bibliography and other references given by Speiser in Pritchard, *ANET*[3] (1969), no. 85, pp. 72-99, esp. pp. 72-73, and more recent refs in B. Foster's treatment in *Context* 1 (1997) 458-460. M. S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* 1 (1994) 168, also mentions this passage in connection with the « pros » idiom.

[313]Meier's reference in *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 153, is "*Sud* 47", referring to M. Civil, "Enlil and Ninlil: The Marriage of Sud," *JAOS* 103 (1983) 43-66.

[314]F. B. Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 421-422.

[315]Gen 33:3: וְ□הוּא עָבַר לְ□פָנֶי□הֶם וַ□יִּשְׁתַּחוּ אַרְצָ□ה שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים עַד־גִּשְׁתָּ□וֹ עַד־אָחִי□ו׃
"And he [Jacob] moved up in front of them, and prostrated himself to the ground seven times, until he reached his brother."

[316]Exodus 24:1: עֲלֵה אֶל־יְה□וָה אַתָּה וְ□אַהֲרֹן נָדָב וַ□אֲבִיהוּא וְ□שִׁבְעִים מִ□זִּקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְ□הִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתֶם מֵ□רָחֹק׃ וְ□אֶל־מֹשֶׁה אָ□מַר , "And unto Moses he said, 'Come up to the Lord, you and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, and do homage from afar."

[317]See Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* 1 (1994) 189, 288; and, for comments and bibliography on this story and its plausible West Semitic background, *ibid.*, pp. 23-25. For an accessible translation, compare Pritchard, *ANET*[3] (1969) 17-18, especially (iii y-2), "and the lesser ones saw her, and they lay down upon their bellies".

[318]Watson, *WO* 24 (1993) 41.

[319]For the edition of the text (in transcription), see H. G. Güterbock, *The Song of Ullikummi* (1952). A recent translation, with anterior bibliography is found in H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *Hittite Myths* (1990) 38-39, 52-61.

2.4.3.3 Iconographic evidence for the « pros » formula

In principle, one ought to be able to draw at least some information about prostration from illustrations the practice in the iconography from Ras Shamra and the Near East in general. By its subjective nature, however, and by my own limited experience, the iconographic evidence is difficult to interpret. I restrict myself to a few superficial comments.

A. Kristensen has pointed out at least one such datum from Egyptian iconography: a relief, from the tomb of Horemheb at Memphis,[320] which depicts a group of Syrians, identifiable presumably on the basis of their beards and dress, in postures of reverence before the Pharaoh. All have their hands in the air or otherwise extended toward the Pharaoh in gestures of adoration; some are standing, many are kneeling, but at least one is fully prone on his stomach, and another lying on his back. These latter two are strikingly reminiscent of the Amarna "optional" element, *kabattum u ṣērum*, '(on) the stomach and (on) the back.'

It may also be possible to pull some data from Ras Shamra itself. The catalogue of P. Amiet contains the photo and drawing of one seal impression which the editor describes as follows: "Un potentat nu-tête est assis sur un siège . . . . En face : orant sans jambes visibles, tendant les 2 bras en avant, au-dessus d'un personnage (?) ou animal prosterné."[321] The seal is classified among the "scènes de culte",[322] implying that the seated figure be interpreted as a divinity, although, as Amiet notes,

---

[320]A. L. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 149, n. 49, cites J. B. Pritchard, *ANEP*^{2} (1969), no. 5, p. 2. On this relief, see also A. Hermann, *ZÄS* 90 (1963) 49-66, and especially p. 58, "Abb. 12"; and S. Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 158, n. 71, who comments "note in particular the un-Egyptian manner of prostration which Syrians assume before pharaoh."

[321]Amiet, RSO 9 (1992), no. 205, pp. 91 (description) and 102 (photo and drawing).

[322]*Ibid.*, pp. 87-110.

"dans une iconographie dont les normes sont largement oubliées, [les dieux] sont souvent dépourvus d'attributs spécifiques, si bien qu'ils ne diffèrent guère de potentats purement humaines."[323]

Although the situational context is different, it would perhaps not be out of place to mention also the iconography of prototypical "smiting" or "submission" scenes, where the "victim" is in a kneeling posture at the feet of the conqueror, a position which is strongly reminiscent of the vocabulary of the « pros » formula. Perhaps the position assumed in such prostration motifs is intended to evoke the type of total and abject submission, the vulnerability and humility conveyed by such scenes of military defeat. An example of this motif at Ras Shamra comes from one of the well-known ivory bed panels.[324]

2.5 The *Sitz-im-Leben* of the Prostration Formula

Obeisance of one individual "at the feet" of another, as a means of expressing various levels of subservience or deference, is, of course, neither limited to Ugaritian society in particular, nor to the Late Bronze Age civilizations in general. Since a competent treatment of the "real-life" contextual setting of such a pervasive social behavior is quite beyond the scope of this dissertation, this section will concern itself not with the contextual setting of obeisance as a social behavior, but specifically with that of the Ugaritic epistolary « pros » formula.

---

[323] *Ibid.*, p. 87.

[324] See A. Caubet and F. Poplin, RSO 3 (1987) 285, for line drawing, and some bibliographical information in I. Cornelius, *HUS* (1999) 595. Pritchard, *ANEP*^{2} (1969) also contains a number of images of prostration. Compare, for example, nos. 440 and 447, pp. 152, 154 (king with conquered enemies); nos. 351, 355, pp. 120, 122 (Jehu son of Omri kneeling before Shalmaneser); and no. 371, p. 129 (defeated inhabitants of Lachish kneel from a distance before Sennacherib).

Furthermore, as another means of control, the basic data for this study will be derived from only two sources, one direct and one indirect. The direct evidence is the corpus of the Ugaritic « pros » formulas themselves; the indirect evidence is the comparative evidence assembled above in section 2.4. Especially useful in respect to the latter is the body of epistolary « pros » formulas in logo-syllabic script, attested in contemporary epistolary traditions, and the literary prostration motifs of the Ugaritic mythological texts. The other types of comparative evidence will be used as well, though on an *ad hoc* rather than a systematic basis. Finally, the utility of these comparative data will be found not only in their compositional and distributional similarities with the Ugaritic epistolary « pros » formula, but also in their differences.

The available data permit observations on the contextual background of the « pros » formula on several levels. Those exploited here include: (1) the geographical, chronological, and literary settings of the formula, and (2) the situational context implied behind its usage. It will be found that considerations linked to the composition of the « pros » formula yield certain insights into its contextual background, while other insights, often quite independent of these, are only evident when one takes into account the distribution of the formula.

2.5.1 Geographical, chronological, and literary background

There is no evidence for the Ugaritic idiom « *l p ʿn* N_R + Q(Y)L », 'to fall at the two feet of N_R,' beyond its appearance in the alphabetic texts from Ras Shamra and Ras Ibn Hani.[325] One cannot describe this idiomatic usage as a feature unique to

---

[325]According to the editor, RS [Varia 4] almost certainly derives from Ras Shamra as well, despite its clandestine origin. See P. Bordreuil, *Semitica* 32 (1982) 5: "elle provient certainement

Ugarit, however, for the "interdialectal distribution"[326] of an equivalent idiom in Akkadian, « *ana šēpē* N + *maqātu* », 'to fall at the two feet of N', is known in logo-syllabic script not only in texts from Ras Shamra, but also in texts from numerous other sites in the Levant: Meskene, Atchana, and Tel Aphek. Many more Akkadian examples appear in syllabic texts of Syrian provenance found at Boğazköy and Amarna. At this level, at least, the idiom appears to be as much a feature of Levantine linguistic usage in general as it is of the Ugaritic language in particular.

As shown above in section 2.4.3, however, the Akkadian idiom « *ana šēpē* N + *maqātu* », 'to fall at the two feet of N', is not only attested in Syrian sources, but also in sources from Babylonia and Anatolia. Thus, the "interdialectal distribution" of the idiom is not demonstrably unique to Syria, but spans several of the literary cultures of ancient West Asia. Neither is this prostration idiom unique to the Late Bronze Age, for the Old Babylonian attestations predate those of the epistolary « pros » formulas by several centuries. Furthermore, the idiom was not restricted to epistolary usage; it occurs also in a treaty from Boğazköy, a ritual from Meskene, and in the Ugaritic mythological texts from Ras Shamra.[327]

If the composition of the prostration idiom is unique neither to Syria, nor to the Late Bronze Age, nor to the epistolary genre, however, the adaptation of this idiom as a formulaic part of the epistolary *praescriptio* is another matter. In other words, the composition of the « pros » formula presents no distinctively Late Bronze Levantine features; its distribution does.

---

d'Ougarit". The excavation number "RS 11.875", apparently given in the first edition of *KTU*, is now considered fictive, however; see Bordreuil, in the same place, and in n. 3, and P. Bordreuil, and D. Pardee, *TEO* 1 (1989) 379: " «RS 11.385» est fictif (l'année de la trouv. clandestine est inconnue)."

[326]On this terminology, see C. Cohen, *JANES* 19 (1989) 9-23, and especially p. 13.

[327]For these occurrences, see above, sections 2.4.2-2.4.3.

As a component of a formulaic epistolary *praescriptio*, that is, as an epistolary "polite formula", the motif is almost entirely restricted to sources of Syrian provenance in the final centuries of the Late Bronze Age. There are distributional parallels for the epistolary « pros » formula in letters of the contemporary Middle Assyrian tradition, but these parallels are not exact in terms of composition.[328] A few contemporary Hittite letters contain prostration formulas which parallel both the composition and the distribution of the Ugaritic « pros » formula; these are more problematic since, to my knowledge, they exhibit no explicit indication of Syrian provenance. The vastness of the Hittite epistolary corpus, however, combined with the meager attestation of the « pros » formula there, show that the « pros » formula is not a feature of standard Hittite epistolography.[329] The few examples of the « pros » formula in the Boğazköy corpus must represent the conventions of another epistolary tradition. In light of the attested parallels, a Syrian origin for these features is not implausible. The distribution of the « pros » formula, then, is highly suggestive of a local Syro-Palestinian epistolary tradition.

Since deferential obeisance as an aspect of social protocol is widely attested throughout the cultures of the ancient Near East, the Late Bronze Levantine epistolary « pros » formulas, including those in Ugaritic language, can be seen as literary representations of this social practice.[330] This adaptation of a social protocol into a

---

[328]The Middle Assyrian epistolary prostration "formula" consists of only one word, the finite verbal form **ʾuštakaʾʾin*. This word is also virtually always linked with another polite formula which has no correspondent in the Levantine epistolary tradition: the phrase *ana dinān bēlīya attalak*. For further details, see above in section 2.4.3.2.1.

[329]Note, for example, the absence of the « pros » formula in the Ma□at corpus.

[330]As the literary parallels make clear, prostration was also an aspect of court etiquette, and, as such, a standard part of messenger protocol. This messenger protocol, too, extended far beyond the Levant. The epistolary « pros » formula, however, alludes only to the sender and the recipient; it does

relatively fixed epistolary « pros » formula, and its nearly institutionalized use within contemporary epistolary traditions, appears, on present evidence, to be limited to the cultures of Syria and Palestine in the final centuries of the Late Bronze Age.

Admitting the Levantine usage of the « pros » formula, is it valid to assume a Levantine origin for it? The data are neither abundant nor clear enough to be certain. A consideration of the composition of the formula suggests a negative answer to this question. Since the Old Babylonian attestations of the prostration idiom predate those of the epistolary « pros » formulas under study here by some centuries, clearly the idiomatic linguistic usage attested in the latter is not demonstrably unique. If not unique, one may consider the possibility of a loan translation to explain the compositional similarity of the idioms. But, who borrowed from whom? Are the Old Babylonian occurrences of the idiom, and the presence of a comparable « pros » formula in the Middle Assyrian epistolary tradition, to be considered as remnants of a West Semitic or "Amorite" linguistic heritage? I know of no explicit support for such a hypothesis, unless it be found in the broader currents of Mesopotamian cultural history. A loan in the opposite direction is equally plausible: the Ugaritic idiom « *l p ʿn* N + Q(Y)L » could be a local calque of the Akkadian expression.[331] It may be possible,

---

not mention a third party. As such, it difficult to insist on a connection between the contextual background of the epistolary « pros » formula and the established messenger etiquette beyond a very general similarity with ascending social situations.

[331]This point of view has proven very attractive to past students of the Ugaritic letters, and is understandable, especially for those working prior to the discoveries at Tell Mardīḫ (ancient Ebla), in light of widespread assumptions about the pervasive influence of Mesopotamian culture over the peripheral areas. Compare, as examples, C. Virolleaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 130, "Il faut reconnaître toutefois que l'équivalence de la locution phénicienne [he is speaking of the « pros » formula] avec celle des Lettres E.-A. est difficile à établir, bien que la phrase (6-11), prise dans sons ensemble, paraisse calquée sur la formule accadienne et en fournir la traduction littérale"; and A. L. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 144, "The Ugaritic formula is basically the same as the Akkadian formula and must derive from it." If the « pros » formula was Mesopotamian in origin, however, it has left no trace, to my knowledge, in Mesopotamian epistolary traditions other than the Middle Assyrian.

however, and even desirable, to dismiss entirely the question of a loan translation. A parallel linguistic evolution of these comparable idioms may be at least as plausible as that of direct borrowing in one direction or another.[332] Whatever its historical origin, the distribution of the « pros » formula is consistent with other observable features of Late Bronze Levantine epistolography, features which appear to give special attention to differences in social status.[333] In this respect, the « pros » formula, in its semantics as well as its distribution, is well at home in the cultural milieu of Late Bronze Syria and Palestine.

2.5.2 The Situational Context

A consideration of the distribution of the epistolary « pros » formula also allows for the following observations regarding its *Sitz-im-Leben* or situational context: (1) the type of social situation in which the « pros » formula is appropriate, and, by inference, the type of situation in which it is not appropriate; (2) the agent, or performer, of the act of prostration; (3) various details surrounding the act itself; (4)

---

[332]Such a suggestion is influenced by the "Held Method" of comparative Semitic lexicography, for which see Cohen, *JANES* 19 (1989) 9-23; and eventually C. Cohen, *Contextual Priority* (forthcoming, and unavailable to me). Two principles in particular are especially relevant: (1) that of "interdialectal distribution", namely, the existence of "corresponding idiomatic phrases *even when such correspondence involves only semantic and non-etymological equivalents*" (Cohen, *JANES* 9 [1989] 13) ; and (2) the principle dealing with the "identical semantic development of semantically equivalent terms even if they are etymologically distinct" (*ibid.*, p. 17).

[333]Compare, for example, (1) the variable order of mention in address, (2) the variable composition of N_R and N_S elements in the address, and (3) the variable order « *yšlm lk* » versus « *l*-N *yšlm* » in the salutation, all governed by differences in social status between the correspondents. Although many anthropologists are perhaps no longer quite as cavalier with respect to cultural generalizations, J. Nougayrol 's casual remark in *PRU* 3 (1955) 2, n. 5, is of interest: "Les petits pays sont toujours pointilleux en matière d'étiquette ou de cérémonial."

the contextual moment at which prostration occurs; and finally, (5) the contextual "burden" or purpose of prostration.

2.5.2.1 The Prostration Formula and Ascending Social Situations

The distribution of the « pros » formula in both alphabetic and syllabic letters illustrates, first and foremost, that the formula is appropriate in ascending social situations and inappropriate in descending situations. This observation seems all the more intuitively evident in light of the self-abasing semantics of the vocabulary used within the formula. The implication of this distribution is that the « pros » formula is not only a gesture of respect or politeness toward the recipient,[334] but also a tangible sign of the subordinate social status of the sender.[335] It is in this respect that the distribution of the « pros » formula distinguishes itself from that of the other polite formulas.[336]

If the distribution and semantics of the formula lead to such an inference, further theoretical support has been provided by M. Gruber.[337] Drawing from information theory, he distinguishes the various types of greetings by means of their informational content. He distinguishes between (1) "phatic greetings", or greetings with very little if any informational content, intended not so much to inform as to

---

[334]Compare J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 249, "une formula . . . de respect envers le destinataire"; retained in *idem*, *HUS* (1999) 362, "a formula of . . . respect towards the recipient".

[335]Compare O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 21-22.

[336]Note, however, the distributional overlap of the « pros » formula and address formulas of the pattern « RS »; see Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 249.

[337]Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 182-186.

"establish links of fellowship";[338] (2) "deferential greetings", or greetings in which the speaker seeks not only to "establish links of fellowship", but also to communicate "information concerning the relative status of the speaker and the addressee", specifically, "that the speaker recognizes that the addressee is a person of higher social rank";[339] and finally, (3) "obeisance formulae", greetings which

> "tend to be the most elaborate of the three types of greeting for a reason now made abundantly clear by information theory, namely that it contains more information. Specifically, while the phatic greeting indicates only the desire of the speaker to 'establish links of fellowship' and while the deferential greeting contains additional information concerning the high social rank of the addressee, the obeisance formula contains still more information disparaging the low status speaker."[340]

This theoretical framework lends itself well to the three "polite formulas" in Ugaritic epistolography: the form and usage of the "benediction" formula conforms with the description of "phatic" greetings,[341] as do those "salutation" formulas which follow the pattern « *yšlm lk* ».[342] Salutations of the pattern « *l*(*y*)-REL *yšlm* », however, appear to conform better to the description of "deferential" greetings, since the REL component employed there communicates social status information. The "prostration" formulas, of course, belong in the third category, "obeisance formulae".

The sole problem with an unequivocal association of the « pros » formula with ascending social situations is the existence of terminologically "horizontal" letters

---

[338]Gruber here borrows the phrase used by B. Malinowski, "The Problem of Meaning" (1946) 314.

[339]Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 182-186.

[340]*Ibid.*

[341]See below, chapter 4.

[342]See below, chapter 3.

which nevertheless contain the « pros » formula. Such letters from the site of Ras Shamra have been known at least since J. Nougayrol published an Akkadian example in 1968,[343] but appear not to have much affected the study of Ugaritic epistolography.[344] This pattern is now attested in the Ugaritic corpus as well: two letters from the 1994 excavations are terminologically horizontal, and yet carry the « pros » formula.[345] As D. Pardee comments in his manuscript of *Les textes épistolaires*,[346] in speaking of occurrences of the « pros » formula in horizontal letters, "Les exemples ne sont pas nombreux, mais ils permettent de nuancer la description courante de la formule comme employé uniquement dans un message provenant d'un personnage de rang inférieur au destinataire."

If one accepts that the presence of "horizontal" REL terms implies equality of social status while the presence of the « pros » formula implies an explicitly subordinate social status for the sender, this is obviously an interpretive problem. There are at least two solutions. One approach is to allow that the use of the « pros »

---

[343]Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968), no. 58 (RS 20.232) 154-155, and 399. He characterizes the text (*ibid.*, p. 154) as a "lettre de Abdiḫagab à Iluramu, son « frère »." That this letter is indeed a horizontal letter, as the editor indicated, seems clear from the appearance of the horizontal REL term, spelled {a-ḫi}, 'my brother,' referring to the recipient, in line 20. On the occurrence of the « pros » formula in such a letter, the editor comments, *ibid.*, p. 155, n. 1, "La prosternation est inattendue dans une lettre adressée à un « frère ». . . . Bien que « frère », le destinataire est donc, sans doute, de rang très supérieur à l'expéditeur." He envisions the possibility that the recipient is the elder, biological brother of the sender. A second Akkadian example was published by D. Arnaud in RSO 7 (1991), text no. 34 (RS 34.164) 73-74 (copy on p. 191).

[344]Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, footnote, cites the following references: Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 13, 20-21 ; Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 52, 75, 101-2 ; Knutson, *RSP* II (1975) 422, n. 1 ; Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 147-48 ; Meier, *Messenger* (1988) 158.

[345]RS 94.2273 and RS 94.2545+.

[346] Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, footnote.

formula in explicitly ascending letters reflects a social inferiority, while the usage in explicitly horizontal letters reflects simple politeness; in other words, that the presence of the « pros » formula need not necessarily imply social subordination.[347] Another approach is to allow for multi-dimensional social relationships; in other words, that the presence of "horizontal" REL terms need not necessarily imply equality on all levels of social relation.[348]

To be sure, at least some occurrences of the « pros » formula are to be interpreted metaphorically and not literally. For example, it seems intuitively absurd to imagine, if one interprets literally the presence of the « pros » formula in RS 34.124, that every time the king entered his mother's presence, he fell at her feet in a gesture of submission. Yet, to equate systematically this "metaphorical" usage of the prostration formula with simple politeness, with no implication whatsoever regarding social status, seems extreme. By its distribution as well as the imagery employed, the « pros » formula is connected with explicit subordination, not merely with mutual positive regard. The formula is an explicit expression of the subordinate status of the sender, even if that expression was intended to be interpreted metaphorically by the recipient. If one defines this as "politeness", it is "politeness" of a very special type

---

[347]Compare the comments of Pardee in his manuscript of *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, "l'usage de la formule entre « frères » montre que l'infériorité qu'elle exprime au niveau linguistique peut avoir pour fonction d'exprimer la simple politesse." Pardee, in the same place, supports this possibility with the example of RS 34.124; in this letter the king writes to his mother, and includes the « pros » formula in the *praescriptio*; we are invited to interpret the formula as a token of simple politeness, and not as reflecting literally a physical gesture practiced by the king whenever he entered into the presence of his mother.

[348]Pardee envisions this possibility as well; compare his remarks in *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, footnote: "En effet, que le rapport soit familial ou social, on peut penser que la formule s'emploie entre personnages dont le niveau social est formellement égal mais pratiquement inégal ; cette inégalité consiste vraisemblablement en une différence d'âge : par exemple, un frère cadet, un débutant dans le commerce ou dans un poste administratif."

which cannot be divorced from explicit overtones of social subordination. What seems necessary is to allow the validity of metaphorical prostration alongside literal prostration. Just as correspondents in the Ugaritic tradition felt no need to distinguish between biological and metaphorical "brotherhood" in characterizing their own social relationships, no need was felt to distinguish between literal and metaphorical prostration. The fact that the sender, or the sender's scribe, chose to employ the « pros » formula at all is surely significant for our understanding of the social relationships between the correspondents.

A much better point of departure, in my opinion, is to allow for the multi-dimensional nature of social relationships. This feature manifests itself in the epistolary corpus in at least two respects.

One tangible aspect shows up in letters which derive from "mixed" social situations, that is, letters in which the correspondents have one type of relationship on the biological level, but another type of relationship on the societal level, where the two types are not analogous in terms of hierarchical status.[349] Concrete examples of such a situation are provided by the correspondence between the king and his mother.[350] The « pros » formula appears in some letters of this corpus,[351] but is absent in others.[352] When present, the formula must reflect that particular conceptual model according to which the sender occupies an explicitly inferior social role with respect to

---

[349]On "mixed" social situations, see above, section 1.7.1.2; and, for empirically observable examples of such situations, see the discussion of terminologically "mixed" letters, in section 0.6.4.1.

[350]These include RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 34.124, RS 94.5003+, and RIH 78/12. Also of possible relevance are RS 8.315 and RS 15.008.

[351]RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 34.124, RS 94.5003+, RIH 78/12, and, if it belongs here, RS 8.315.

[352]RS 17.139, and, if it belongs here, RS 15.008.

the recipient, namely, the biological kinship model where the sender is the son of the recipient. Correspondingly, the absence of the formula in RS 17.139 reflects another social model, that of power, where the king is "master" of all the realm.

A second aspect of the multi-dimensional nature of social relationships is represented by the internal hierarchy of social status within nominally "horizontal" relationships, that is, within the ranks of "brothers". Put another way, behind the social fiction of "brotherhood" lies a hegemonic reality such that no true equality exists, or, exists only rarely. Genuine social status differences, even if they are more subtle and less pronounced than those of relationships characterized by explicitly unequal REL terms such as "master" / "servant", are present even within the ranks of "brothers", these differences being based on age, gender, political power, experience, or prestige. In this sense, such unequal "horizontal" relationships are another example of the "mixed" social situation: on the broader conceptual level of brothers, the correspondents are equals, but on the practical level there are hierarchical status differences between them.[353] Such inequality among "brothers" is explicitly attested in the REL terms employed in two Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra: compare RS 34.164 and RS [Varia 25], where the senders address their correspondents as {ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ia GAL.MEŠ}, 'my big brothers', and {ŠEŠ-ḫi-ia GAL}, 'my big brother', respectively. Significantly, the former letter also carries a « pros » formula. The social relationship between the correspondents in that case was apparently "equal" enough to justify the use of "brother" as a REL term, but unequal enough to justify the

---

[353]Compare the statement of Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, footnote, "En effet, que le rapport soit familial ou social, on peut penser que la formule s'emploie entre personnages dont le niveau social est formellement égal mais pratiquement inégal ; cette inégalité consiste vraisemblablement en une différence d'âge : par exemple, un frère cadet, un débutant dans le commerce ou dans un poste administratif. "

inclusion of the « pros » formula, as a token recognition of the superior status of "big brothers". In other words, the status of the recipient as {ŠEŠ}, 'brother', of the recipient, does not negate the status difference implied by {GAL}, 'big'. Such a multi-dimensional situation may be behind the other occurrences of the « pros » formulas in horizontal letters as well.[354]

One practical tool for detecting such situations is the fact that Ugaritic epistolary structure is very often not conducive to expressing equality of status. In many cases the compositional pattern of a given formula is binary, with one formal pattern being appropriate for ascending situations, and the other for descending. Of these, the address formula is a convenient example. There, there is no structural pattern associated with "horizontal" letters, only the « RS » order, explicitly associated with ascending letters, and the « SR » order, explicitly associated with descending letters. This makes the isolation of such "unequal horizontal" relationships theoretically possible, in that the order of mention, « RS » or « SR », reflects not the conceptual fiction of "brotherhood", but rather the underlying hegemonic reality as expressed by the sender, or, by the sender's scribe.

Furthermore, just as not all "horizontal" relationships are the same, some exhibiting greater social status differences than others, so also some nominally ascending relationships exhibit greater social distance than others. On an intuitive level, such a situation seems obvious: a palace slave and the prefect of Ugarit, for example, are both subordinate to the king, but the social distance involved is much greater in the former case than in the latter. Likewise, it seems plausible that an

---

[354]The phenomenon is certainly not limited to Late Bronze societies. In the narratives of the Hebrew Bible, which date to a much later period, note the exchange between Jacob and Esau in Genesis 32:5, where the correspondents are biological brothers in the narrative, yet Jacob refers to his brother as אדני and refers to himself as עבדך.

ascending relationship conceived on the biological kinship model, that of "son" to "father", would involve significantly less social distance than an ascending relationship conceived on the hierarchical power model, that of "servant" to "master". Such an intuition finds support in the distribution of the "optional" elements of the « pros » formula.[355]

In letters composed on the biological kinship model, the « pros » formulas tend to be less elaborate. Often they contain no "optional" elements,[356] and in one case the REL term is a pronoun rather than a social status metaphor.[357] By contrast, « pros » formulas in letters composed on the hierarchical power model tend to be more elaborate, very often containing one or both "optional" elements. Judging from information theory, more information implies more deference, more social distance; while less information implies familiarity, less social distance. In fact, the semantics of the optional elements themselves may reflect this social distance, as in the optional element *mrḥqtm*, '(from) afar', where the allusion to physical distance may operate, on some level, to emphasize awareness of the social distance between the two parties.[358]

---

[355]Specifically, the optional adverbial elements tend to be present in ASC POW letters (greater social distance), and absent in ASC BIO letters (lesser social distance). See above, section 2.2; and Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 21.

[356]The appearance of the multiplicative component *šbʿd ṯmnʾd* in RS 94.2273, a terminologically horizontal letter composed on the biological kinship model, prevents me from complete agreement with Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 13 (RS 9.479A), "L'expression du nombre de prosternations ne s'employait, ni en ougaritique, ni en accadien, lorsqu'il existait un rapport familial entre correspondants." The interpretation of AT 115 is by no means clear, but if {a-bi-ia} in line 5 represents a REL component conceived on the biological model, that is, 'my father', and the sign {U}, also in line 5, represents the remnant of a multiplicative phrase, '10 [...]', this letter would represent another exception. Apart from these few cases, however, Pardee's statement accurately describes the statistical distribution of the multiplicative phrase.

[357]RIH 78/12.

[358]On this word in detail, see below, section 2.6.4.

This familiarity inherent in the biological kinship model perhaps even plays a role in explaining the occasional absence of the « pros » formula in ascending letters.[359] In RS 92.2005.1, for example, and perhaps also in RS 15.008, the biological kinship terms used may have literal meaning, and perhaps in such intimate family relationships, even if they were hierarchically ascending, deferential protocol was less important, or occasionally even unnecessary.

These considerations allow the preservation of the general rule that the « pros » formula is appropriate for "ascending" social situations, and inappropriate for "descending" situations. The « pros » formula is, first and foremost, an expression of subservience, whether that subserviance be literal or metaphorical. Metaphorical subservience may be referred to as deference or politeness, but only so long as such an appellation does not mask the inherent social subordination that is present.

2.5.2.2 The Agent of Prostration

In the corpus of the epistolary « pros » formulas, the agent "doing" the action of prostration is the sender himself, as is clear from the 1st person inflection of the verbal form *qlt*.[360] Such use of the grammatical 1st person for the sender, and the occasional presence of the 2nd person for the recipient, as in *l p'nk*, 'at your two feet, in line 2 of RIH 78/12, show that the « pros » formula, like most epistolary discourse, implies a (fictive) direct or "binary" communication situation. This is further illustrated by the

---

[359]For some proposals to explain the absence of the « pros » in various ascending letters, see above, section 2.3.

[360]In isolation, the Ugaritic word *qlt* could also be 2nd person singular, or even 3rd person feminine singular. That such is not the case is clear not only from context, but from the unambiguous 1st person parsing of the verbal form in the corresponding Akkadian formulas.

1st person pronominal suffixes attached to the REL term(s), as in *l pʿn ȧdty*, 'at the two feet of my lady,' in RS 16.137[bis], for example. The formula makes no allusion to the involvement of a third party.[361]

Since epistolary communication in Late Bronze West Asia was indirect or "tertiary", taking place through an intermediary agent, obviously the direct-address situation implied by the « pros » formula is fictive. In this epistolary fiction, the face-to-face meeting of the sender and the recipient is imaginary, and at this imagined meeting the sender performs the act of prostration in the presence of the recipient. This binary scenario would seem to be drawn from a social protocol of everyday existence. Inasmuch as they reflect a native conception of social reality, the Ugaritic mythological texts present several examples of prostration as a polite protocol in direct communication situations.[362]

Other occurrences of the Ugaritic literary prostration motif, however, represent not direct but indirect communication, and in this sense are more analogous to epistolary communication, which, in the Late Bronze Age, was also of an indirect nature. If, however, the agent of prostration in the epistolary « pros » formula was the

---

[361]Contrast J.-L. Cunchillos, *AEPHER* 88 (1979-1980) 238, " … la formula [*mrḫqtm*] fait allusion au rite accompli par le messager (au nom de l'expéditeur de la lettre) devant le destinataire." Compare also *idem*, SVT 32 (1981) 44, where, in speaking of the « pros » formula, he comments: " … il s'agit d'une action immédiate qui vient d'avoir lieu. C'est le *mlak* qui a fait les gestes protocolaires. C'est le *mlak* qui parle au nom de son maître l'expéditeur." Finally, compare *idem*, *TO* 2 (1989) 251. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, footnote, expresses objections to these interpretations: " … le messager était sans doute obligé de se prosterner (au moins devant un destinataire royal), mais cela ne change en rien la fiction qu'exprime le destinataire lorsqu'il prononce en dictant la lettre « je tombe » tout en restant assis ou debout … . Puisqu'il s'agit d'une formule épistolaire et d'un rapport entre l'expéditeur et le destinataire, cette formule ne règle strictement rien dans le comportement du messager … dont le protocole était celui des messagers … ."

[362]These are *KTU*[2] 1.1 III 24-25; 1.2 III 5-6; 1.4 IV 25-26; 1.6 I 36-38; 1.10 II 18; and 1.17 VI 50-51. See above, section 2.4.2.

sender himself, in these literary prostration motifs of an indirect nature, the agent performing the prostration is not the sender of the message, but rather an intermediary or messenger. A "negative" example is provided by *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 14-15, where the god Yammu commands his messengers not to prostrate themselves, a command which they faithfully carry out in *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 30-31.[363]

If the agent of prostration in these cases is the intermediary, the situation is still further complicated by the fact that, in performing the act of prostration (or not, as in the case above), the intermediary is acting not in his own stead, but as a proxy for the sender. In the mythological episode just mentioned, for example, the behavior of the messengers surely reflects the presumed higher social status of their master, the god Yammu, and not any attempt to portray themselves, mere messengers, as of higher social status than the likes of ʾIlu, Baʿlu, and company.

Thus, one of the central problems of indirect communication is as follows. On the one hand, the intermediary has a social relationship of his own with the recipient, and in this context his behavior ought to be appropriate for his own social status. But on the other hand, he must also play the role of a proxy for the sender, and in this capacity his behavior will reflect not his own social position, but rather that which is appropriate for the sender with regard to the recipient. Had Yammu's messengers in *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 30-31, for example, been so intimidated by the presence of ʾIlu and Baʿlu as to consequently disregard their master's orders and fall prostrate anyway, thus behaving in accordance with their own social status rather than acting as their master's proxy, obviously part of the purpose of Yammu's communication would have been

---

[363]See above, section 2.4.2. On these passages as negatives, and not asseveratives, see M. S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* 1 (1994) 287-288; S. A. Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 154-155; and the references given in N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit* (1998) 58-59, n. 102 (Wyatt himself opts, mistakenly in my opinion, for the asseverative interpretation).

foiled. Fortunately for the gods, the mythological messengers' complete fidelity to the character of the command may be safely assumed; the fidelity of human agents is another matter.

The fact that the sender is not physically present in front of the recipient means that the gesture of prostration must be communicated indirectly. For this, two solutions present themselves. The sender may rely on a human intermediary to perform the prostration in his stead, and/or he may express his gesture in writing, by means of an epistolary formula. The first scenario is often envisioned in the Ugaritic mythological texts, and no doubt derives from a general courtly protocol whereby messengers regularly performed prostration on behalf of their master, the sender of the message. The second scenario is represented by the Levantine epistolary « pros » formula of the Late Bronze Age. Its utility is that it provides the sender with a valable means of control over the messenger. The inclusion of the « pros » formula reduces the power and influence of the intermediary agent, since by means of the epistolary « pros » formula, the human messenger is no longer the sole mouthpiece communicating the politically important gesture of prostration.

2.5.2.3 The Act of Prostration

The action expressed in the « pros » formula consists of "falling", and, as described above, the agent performing this action is the sender. The second "necessary" component of the formula, the prepositional phrase « *l p'n* N_R », describes the action as terminating "at the feet" of the recipient.[364] The optional element

---

[364]On the terminative nuance of the preposition *l* in this case, and in general with verbs of movement, see below, section 2.6.2.

« *mrḥqtm* », 'from afar', also refers to distance. It is probably not purely locative, else these two adverbial elements would be contradictory. Rather, « *mrḥqtm* » appears to be ablative, describing the point at which the action of prostration commences.[365]

Those « pros » formulas containing the element *mrḥqtm* allude to a fictional scenario in which the sender does not wait until he is directly before the recipient, but prostrates himself at a distance. After commencing his prostration "from afar" as it were, he nevertheless continues the gesture, or rather, repeats it, as the multiplicative phrases invite one to believe, until he reaches a point "at the feet of" the recipient. This scenario, in which the act of prostration begins at some distance from the recipient, finds extra-Ugaritic parallels in three literary texts: two passages from Hebrew Bible, namely, (1) *Genesis* 33:3[366]and (2) *Exodus* 24:1-2,[367] and (3) a mythological text

---

[365]On the ablative adverbial nuance of *mrḥqtm* in the « pros » formula, see below, section 2.6.4. Compare Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, footnote, "Comme Loewenstamm l'a très justement remarqué en commentant le parallélisme entre les formules ougaritique et accadienne (*BASOR* 188 [1967] 42), l'expression « de loin » ne désigne pas la distance qui sépare les correspondants . . . , mais celle qui sépare la personne qui se prosterne du personnage honoré dans une situation vécue."

[366]Gen 33:3 reads וְ□הוּא עָבַר לְ□פָנֶי□הֶם וַ□יִּשְׁתַּחוּ אַרְצָ□ה שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים עַד־גִּשְׁתְּ□וֹ עַד־אָחִי□וֹ, 'And he [Jacob] moved up in front of them, and prostrated himself to the ground seven times, until he reached his brother.' The prepositional phrases עַד־גִּשְׁתְּ□וֹ עַד־אָחִי□וֹ , 'until his reaching as far as his brother,' shows that the action was begun at certain distance away, a situation which fits an ablative interpretation of Ugaritic *mrḥqtm*.

[367]Ex 24:1 reads:

אָ□מַר עֲלֵה אֶל־יְה□וָה אַתָּה וְ□אַהֲרֹן נָדָב וַ□אֲבִיהוּא וְ□שִׁבְעִים מִ□זִּקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְ□הִשְׁתַּחֲוִיתֶם מֵ□רָחֹק וְ□אֶל־מֹשֶׁה

'And to Moses he [YHWH] said, "Come up to YHWH, you, and Aaron, and Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, and prostrate yourselves from afar."' Verse 2 is essential:

וְ□נִגַּשׁ מֹשֶׁה לְ□בַדּ□וֹ אֶל־יְהוָה וְ□הֵם לֹא יִגְּשׁוּ וְ□הָ□עָם לֹא יַעֲלוּ עִמּ□וֹ

' "And then Moses alone shall draw near to YHWH. They [the others] will not draw near, they will not come up with him."' Since Moses is invited to approach the recipient (presumably still in an appropriate posture, namely, prostrate), the word מֵ□רָחֹק expresses, in his case, not a purely locative nuance (the place at which an action occurs), but, like the epistolary « pros » formula, an ablative nuance (the place at which an action commences). For the other actors mentioned here, there is no

known from Hittite literature: *The Song of Ullikummi*.[368]

The archeological remains of the royal palace at Ras Shamra provide a concrete setting for imagining such a fictional scenario.[369] Upon entering the palace complex from the main exterior entrance, one turns to the right, where, across a distance of over thirty-five meters, and across a span of three rooms, the visitor could have caught a glimpse the throne room, and, if conditions were right, presumably of the king upon the throne. In such a scenario, a particularly deferential visitor would conceivably not have waited until he actually entered the throne room, but rather would have begun the action of prostrated himself immediately upon catching a glimpse of the monarch, "from afar" as it were, three rooms and more than thirty-five meters away.[370]

If the adverb *mrḥqtm* marks the point at which the action of prostration is imagined to begin, and the phrase *l pʿn* N marks the point at which the action is imagined to terminate, another "optional" component, the multiplicative phrase,

---

meaningful difference between the categories of purely locative and ablative, since not only are invited to begin the action of prostration at a distance, they are also forbidden from progressing any further. As regards the actors other than Moses, this passage represents a situation quite different from the prostration act alluded to in the epistolary formula, which always terminates *l pʿn* N, 'at the two feet of', the recipient.

[368]See H. G. Güterbock, *The Song of Ullikummi* (1952); the passages used here come from tablet 3, col. 2, lines 17-23 and 30-32. A convenient recent translation is H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *Hittite Myths* (1990), § 49 and § 50, p. 58; anterior bibliography is found on pp. 38-39. Hoffner's translation is quoted in the text below, section 2.6.5.2.

[369]For convenience, the reader is invited to follow the plan of the Ras Shamra palatial complex, which incorporates much of the recent architectural research of O. Callot and others, reproduced in M. Yon, *La cité d'Ougarit* (1997) 47.

[370]Pierre Bordreuil brought this aspect of the palatial architecture to my attention during a visit to the site in the summer of 1999. I wish to thank the archeological team for the hospitality extended to me during the summers of 1999 and 2000; Yves Calvet, Jean Margueron, and especially Olivier Callot took valuable time from their work on several occasions to explain the archeology and architecture of the site to me (misrepresentations of the archeological data remain, of course, my own responsibility).

presents a portrayal of the action(s) imagined to occur between these two points: the act of prostration was imagined to be repeated as the visitor advanced toward the honoree. The comparative data are not consistent, however, in expressing the manner in which this repetition was realized. At least three "manners" of repetition appear: (1) the prostration formulas from the Amarna corpus often include the adverbial phrase *kabattuma u ṣēruma*, 'on the belly and on the back,' always accompanied by the numerical sequence 'seven (times) (and) seven (times)',[371] (2) at least two prostration formulas, one from Meskene, the other deriving from a private collection, use forms of the verb *garāru*, 'to roll oneself over (in the N-stem)',[372] and (3) at least one myth from the Hittite literary tradition contains a prostration motif which alludes to the repetition of prostration on several occasions, the number of repetitions being lowest when far away from the honoree, greatest when in close proximity.[373] These three "manners" are not mutually exclusive, but it is the last that is most easily compatible with the contextual situation(s) implied behind the other "optional" components of the « pros » formula.

---

[371]This phrase occurs in EA 64-65, 211, 213, 215, 232-234, 282, 284, 298-299, 301, 303-306, 314-316.1, 319-320, 322-326, 328, 331, 366, and 378.

[372]These are Msk 7451.1, and ME 127.

[373]See Güterbock, *The Song of Ullikummi* (1952), tablet 3, col. 2, lines 17-23 and 30-32; and the recent translation of Hoffner, *Hittite Myths* (1990), § 49 and § 50, p. 58. Hoffner's translation is quoted in the text below, section 2.6.5.2.

2.5.2.4 The Moment of Prostration

Judging from the literary prostration motifs in Ugaritic,[374] the act of prostration, when present, occurs prior to any other verbal exchange. In commands, the prostration motif occurs immediately following the departure motif, and immediately prior to the address motif. Narratives show the same pattern as well, with a few variations. *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 30, for example, inserts the phrase *åḫr tmǵyn mlåk ym tʿdt ṯpṭ nhr*, 'Then, the two messengers of Yammu enter, the embassy of Judge Naharu (enters),' immediately preceding the prostration motif. Two other narratives insert the speech-opening motif immediately after prostration.[375] These examples from the conceptual world portrayed in the Ugaritic myths situate the act of prostration (1) after arrival, and (2) prior to verbal exchange. The epistolary structure of the majority of letters containing the « pros » formula supports such a setting. The epistolary « pros » formula is by and large placed prior to other "polite formulas", and always prior to the body of the letter.

The epistolary and literary portrayals of prostration differ, however, in one key aspect: in the epistolary corpus the « pros » formula occurs after the address, while in the literary texts, the « pros » motif occurs prior to the literary equivalents of the address formula. There is for this distribution a single explanation, to be found in the pragmatics of indirect communication. In direct communication situations, the act of prostration was no doubt literally performed: the recipient (or beneficiary) could have no doubts about who is performing the prostration for it is taking place in front of him, "at his feet" as it were. With respect to the epistolary « pros » formula, however, the

---

[374]See above, section 2.4.2.

[375]Compare *KTU*[2] 1.6 I 39, *tšû gh w tṣḥ*, 'She lifts up her voice and declares. . . .'

setting is indirect, and the act of prostration was metaphorical or fictive. The "agent" performing the action, that is, the sender himself, is not even physically present. For the metaphorical gesture behind the formula to be properly understood, the recipient must know who its agent is. The recitation of the address formula at the beginning of the letter provides the necessary interpretative framework for the recipient to understand not only the prostration, but the entirety of the letter: it is the sender, he who was just named in the « R » component of the address formula, who "falls at his two feet".

Additional caution is required in interpreting the literary references to prostration: namely, the prostration motif may be omitted without any apparent narrative implications, and for this reason, the literary portrayals should not be taken as faithful portrayals of court protocol. In this sense, only the presence of prostration is significant; not its absence, which could be happenstance. In other words, when it is simply not meaningful in a given narrative context to include a prostration motif, such was omitted.[376] In letters, however, both the presence and the absence would be significant.

The "moment" of the polite protocol of prostration was, in light of the literary texts, the meeting of the two parties. With respect to the epistolary « pros » formula in particular, this meeting is a fiction which takes place upon the recital of the tablet.

---

[376]Compare S. Meier, *Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World* (1988) 152-153; and p. 156: "[inclusion of the literary prostration motif] is thus an optional feature of narrative, exploited for verisimilitude and color or to reflect social relationships."

2.5.2.5 The Contextual Burden of the Prostration Formula

The semantics of the prostration idiom describe an action of "falling", performed by the sender. The action was often portrayed as commencing "from afar", and often as being repeated, until eventually terminating "at the feet" of the recipient. The distribution of the formula affirms what is intuitive from such semantics: that the formulaic expression of this action is appropriate for ascending social situations and inappropriate for descending situations. Beyond this, however, one might wonder at the purpose or goal of such an utterance. Did it simply affirm the subordinate nature of the social relationship? Such is suggested by the formula's distribution, by the self-abasing semantics, and by information theory as presented by M. Gruber.[377]

But "purpose" and "function" are slippery topics, especially liable to positivist interpretations which, plausible as they may seem to modern minds, are ultimately external to the society and to the social discourse in which the formula was used and had meaning. With this in mind, one can seek a more subjectively meaningful interpretation of the formula. A reasonable approach, as was the case with the address formula, would be to survey the semantics of the "B-words" used in the literary prostration motifs.

Several "B-words" are attested for the verbal action of prostration in the literary motif. These include verbal forms of the roots HBR, Q(Y)L, ḤWY (apparently in the rare Št-stem), KBD, NPL, and KRʿ. Many of these roots are not particularly common

---

[377]Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 182-186. The formula fits Gruber's description of a genuine obeisance formula: not only is it compositionally "the most elaborate of the three types of greeting for a reason now made abundantly clear by information theory, namely that it contains more information", but also functionally, "while the phatic greeting indicates only the desire of the speaker to 'establish links of fellowship' and while the deferential greeting contains additional information concerning the high social rank of the addressee, the obeisance formula contains still more information disparaging the low status speaker."

in Ugaritic outside of the literary « pros » motif, and thus the inner Ugaritic usage alone is often insufficient determine their underlying semantics. Context and comparative Semitic evidence, however, suggests that most of these verbal roots denote movement, in this case movement downward, that is, the action of "falling" in various permutations.

One of these verbs, however, is not a verb of movement: KBD. Its semantics are well established, however, not only by the textual context of the Ugaritic prostration motif and by strong comparative Semitic evidence, but also on the basis of inner Ugaritic usage. Transitive in the Ugaritic examples, the D-stem of the root KBD in the cognate languages is normally glossed 'to honor'; such a meaning fits inner Ugaritic usage very well.[378] The verb reflects not a concrete action, but the abstract "purpose" of the action: "falling at the feet" of the recipient is a concrete means of "honoring" the recipient.

2.6 Grammatical Analysis of the Components

The grammatical analysis of the Ugaritic « pros » formula has long been reasonably well established. Thanks to the presence of similar formulas in the Amarna corpus,[379] Ch. Virolleaud was able to understand fairly well the morphology

---

[378]See del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 207. Apart from literary « pros » motif, this verb also occurs in *KTU*[2] 1.17.V.20 and parallels; the narrative context is as follows: the craftsman god Kothar-wa-Ḫasis arrives *chez* Daniʾilu and presents him with a bow, after which Daniʾilu's wife prepares a meal for the god; it is in this dining context that the verb KBD is mentioned: {šlḥm . šsqy (20) ìlm . sȧd . kbd. hmt}, 'Give food, give drink to the two gods! Serve (?), honor them!'

[379]Virolleaud's debt to the Amarna parallels is clear in *CRAIBL* (1937) 353: " … on y retrouve [in RS 9.479A], traduites en cananéen, les formules de salutation qui sont usitées dans les lettres babyloniennes d'El Amarna ; la comparison permettra sans doute de préciser la valeur de certaines expressions ambiguës, car les termes sont, sauf sur un point, tout à fait équivalents, comme si l'on était en présence d'une inscription bilingue."

and semantics of the Ugaritic « pros » formula already in 1937 when he presented the first example.[380] Since then, subsequent Ugaritic and comparative data have allowed a number of refinements.

This section will review the grammatical analysis of the following elements: (1) the verbal forms *qlt* and *qlny*, including a treatment of the usage of the suffix conjugation in the context of the « pros » formula; (2) the semantics of the preposition *l-* in the verbal idiom « *l pʿn* N_R + Q(Y)L »; (3) the common noun *pʿn*; (4) the word *mrḥqtm*; (5) the multiplicative phrases; and (6) the unique word *hllm*.

2.6.1 The verbs qlt *and* qlny

2.6.1.1 General

One of the "necessary" elements of the « pros » formula is a finite verbal form. In the Ugaritic epistolary corpus two forms are attested: *qlt*, by far the most common, and *qlny*, attested twice.[381] The morphology of both forms was understood rather quickly: both in the suffix conjugation, *qlt* as the 1st person singular,[382] *qlny* as the 1st person dual.[383] No 1st person plural form, the spelling of which would conceivably be

---

[380]A preliminary presentation of RS 9.479A was given by Virolleaud to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres; see *CRAIBL* (1937) 352-353. The *editio princeps* appeared in C. Virolleaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 127-131.

[381]RS 8.315:7, and RS 29.093:10.

[382]Virolleaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 129, "*qlt*, qui tient la place d'*amqut*, est, comme *amqut*, la 1er p. du prft." The spelling *qlt* is graphically ambiguous, of course—the same orthography is used for the 2nd person singular and the 3rd person feminine singular. That the form is 1st person is clear from context, as well as the Akkadian parallels.

[383]Ginsberg, *BASOR* 72 (1938) 19, n. 9, was apparently the first to propose that *qlny* in the « pros » formula of RS 8.315 was a 1st person dual form. On the 1st person dual in the Ugaritic verbal paradigm, see now J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 73.333.4, p. 469. As an inflectional

**qln*, is yet attested in the Ugaritic corpus, but in light of syllabic spellings such as {ni-am-qut} in EA 59 and {ni-am-qú-ut} in EA 100, for example, one might also expect such forms in Ugarit letters from more than two authors to come to light some day.[384]

Both the Akkadian formulaic parallels and inner Ugaritic usage affirm the basic semantics of the root, which, in the Ugaritic orthography is represented only by two radicals, Q-L, as "to fall."[385]

The fact that the orthography presents only two root consonants also impedes the identification of the word's etymology. The comparative etymological data for a radical sequence (-)Q(-)L(-) with the semantics "to fall" are not abundant, but the presence of (1) Akkadian *qiālu*(*m*), 'to fall',[386] and (2) Arabic Gv£Gñ / H · √IſGû , 'to take a midday nap (in the G-stem)', 'to annul, cancel, dismiss (in the 4th

---

suffix, it is not common in the verbal paradigms of other Semitic languages; compare E. Lipiński, *Outline of a Comparative Grammar* (1997), § 40.9, p. 364. In seeking its phonemic structure, D. Pardee alludes to the existence of such a verbal suffix in Eblaite; see Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), commentaire, line 1, and footnotes 100-102, where he speaks of "l'orthographe {-a-a} (variante {-e-a}) du même suffixe en éblaïte," and cites P. Fronzaroli, *Maarav* 5-6 (1990) 119, 123.

[384]Contrast, however, Msk 7452 (D. Arnaud, Emar 6, no. 261), in which there were two authors, but the form of the verb was nevertheless singular: {(1) a-na ad-da EN-i[a] (2) qí-bi-[ma] (3) um-ma ^{m}ka-pí-^{d}KUR (4) ù ^{md}30-a-bu ÌR-ka-ma | (5) a-na GÌR.MEŠ EN-ni iš-tu ru-qiš (6) 2-šú 7-šú am-qut | } Note the REL term {EN-ni} in line 7, indicating that both senders were in an ascending relationship with the reciepient (is the restoration of {i[a]} in line 1 the best option? Is {n[i]} possible?). Note also EA 170.1, a letter from two senders in which the verb of the « pros » formula is spelled {ni-am-qut}. Morphologically, this would appear to be a plural form, not a dual (compare also EA 59 and 100). Should this datum be taken as evidence that the 1st person dual was not grammatically productive in (1) the substrate language of the scribe of this letter, or (2) Akkadian, the language in which the text is "framed", or (3) both? Or, (4) is this "plural" spelling simply a reflex of the fact that the scribe had imperfect knowledge of the orthography of (rare) dual forms in Akkadian?

[385]Compare Virolleaud already in *Syria* 19 (1938) 129, ". . . le sens littéral est « tomber », car, si *ql* remplace ici l'acad. *maqâtu*, il alterne ailleurs . . . avec *npl*." See now G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 364-365, with bibliography.

[386]See W. von Soden, VTS 16 (1967) 295-296; and *AHw* 2, p. 918. The verb is also cited in the standard dictionaries as "*qâlu* II" or "*qâlu* B".

[causative] stem)', and the noun K · √IſGõ , 'resting place',[387] argue in favor of Th. Gaster's suggestion of the hollow root Q(Y)L.[388]

Accepting this analysis of the verbs' morphology and etymology, one may propose the following phonemic reconstructions for the orthographies: for *qlt*, */*qīlātu*/;[389] and for *qlny*, */*qīlānayā*/.[390]

---

[387]See H. Wehr, *Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic* (1979) 942-943; E. W. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon* (1863), vol. 8, p. 2997; and A. de Biberstein Kazimirski, *Dictionnaire arabe-français* (1860) vol. 2, p. 847-848.

[388]Th. Gaster, *Iraq* 6 (1939) 127, n. 31. As D. Pardee points out in his manuscript to *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, footnote, the proposal goes back to Gaster, despite the fact that "Ces dernières années on attribue couramment l'identification de QL comme racine *mediae infirmae* à Von Soden (SVT 16 [1967] 295-96)." More recently, see M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 32 (2000) 177-178.

[389]There are several problems in reconstructing the morpho-phonemic structure of this word: (1) the presence or absence of a "connecting vowel" (perhaps */ā/; compare B. Kienast, *Historische Semitische Sprachwissenschaft* [2001] 203) between the verbal stem of the hollow root and the inflectional suffix in the suffix conjugation; and (2) the quality of the vowel in the inflectional suffix for the 1st person common singular. On the former problem, the existence of spellings for formally analogous verbs such as *štt*, 'I/you have put' (Š[Y]T), and *mtt*, 'I/you have died' (M[W]T), suggests the presence of the */ā/ connecting vowel (assuming that all hollow roots followed the same paradigm); see Tropper's discussion in *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000) 642. Regarding the latter problem, in the absence of internal data, one must decide on the basis of comparative Semitic evidence. Standard Arabic shows the vowel /u/ in this slot, as do Ethiopic and this form of the Akkadian stative. Other Northwest Semitic languages often show /i/, as in Tiberian Hebrew, Amarna Canaanite, etc. Choosing /u/ allows the paradigm to distinguish between the 1st common singular and on 2nd feminine singular; see the discussion in Tropper, *ibid.*, p. 465.

[390]In the absence of internal data, the phonemic reconstruction of this inflectional suffix is theoretical. D. Pardee, in his manuscript of *Les textes épistolaires*, chap. 12 (RS 8.315), commentaire, proposes */-nayā/. He chooses vowels of /a/ quality on the basis of comparative evidence from Eblaite, citing P. Fronzaroli, *Maarav* 5-6 (1990) 119 and 123 (see above). With the aid of I. J. Gelb's "sequential reconstruction" theory (for which see I. J. Gelb, *Sequential Reconstruction of Proto-Akkadian* [1969]), Pardee further explains the morphological composition of this inflectional suffix: /-na/ (being the 1st person plural inflectional suffix) + /y/ (being a "consonne de liaison", or "consonantal glide" in Gelb's terminology) + /ā/ (being the dual morpheme). Pardee points out that "Le concept d'élément de liaison, qui peut être vocalique ou consonantique (cf. le /t/ de « y a-t-il ? » en français), est fondamental dans la « sequential reconstruction » de Gelb (1969), et l'on n'a pas manqué de l'évoquer pour expliquer l'orthographe du suffixe ougaritique," for which he cites Wagner, *ZDMG* 102 (1952) 231, and Fontinoy, *Le duel* (1969) 208. Other attempts to vocalize this suffix include E. Lipiński, *Outline of a Comparative Grammar* (1997) 364 (*/-nāya/); and Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000) 469 (*/-nayā/).

2.6.1.2 The usage of the suffix conjugation in the « pros » formula

The interpretive problems posed by the use of the suffix conjugation in the « pros » formula are evoked by two questions posed by D. Pardee and R. Whiting: "Did the writer really fall? and, When did he fall or not fall?"[391] In other words, the issues at hand are (1) the literal or metaphorical interpretation of the action described, and (2) the temporal / aspectual reference, implied by the use of the suffix conjugation, for this action.

On the first issue, logical considerations make the metaphorical solution appear much more plausible than the literal one. Strictly speaking, it is not impossible, of course, that the sender actually did prostrate himself at the moment of, or prior to, dictating this portion of the letter. What is impossible, however, is that this supposed prostration occurred in the manner described in the formula itself. If the action described in the formula is interpreted literally, the action must take place where the sender is, for the 1st person grammatical subject of the verb refers to the sender.[392] The fact that the action is also explicitly said to be achieved *l p'n*, 'at the two feet of,' the recipient, is obviously a problem. The sender and recipient are potentially miles apart; how can the sender, without leaving home, literally perform an action which terminates at the recipient's feet?

---

[391]D. Pardee and R. M. Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 28.

[392]The « pros » formula makes no allusion to the messenger; see above, section 2.5.2.2.

Pardee and Whiting continue:[393]

> ". . . one must ask, with Edzard,[394] whether the writer *really* fell or whether he was expressing a respectful fiction. It appears to us that Rainey has missed the point in responding to Edzard by saying that 'the sender of the letter is now on his face before Pharaoh; in fact, he was forbidden to speak until *after* he had prostrated himself the regulation 7 x 7 times.'[395] The writer's messenger certainly had to bow before the Pharaoh, but the writer himself was back at home and could not possibly know when to 'speak' and when to 'bow'. Edzard is simply saying that because of this separation, the self-representation as bowing is a fiction."

This view of the « pros » formula, as expressing a "respectful fiction", is consistent not only with (1) the distribution of the formula, but also with (2) its situational context. In terms of distribution, the presence of the « pros » formula in terminologically horizontal letters as well as in ascending letters from the king to his mother also strongly favors a metaphorical interpretation. The question posed by Pardee is difficult to answer in the affirmative: "le roi d'Ougarit tombait-il aux pieds de sa mère lorsqu'il entrait en sa présence comme l'interprétation littérale de la formule épistolaire

---

[393]Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 28-29.

[394]The reference is to D. O. Edzard's review of A. F. Rainey, AOAT 8 (1970), which appeared in *ZA* 62 (1972) pp. 123-125. The quotation is from p. 124, "Für *amqut* und *iš-ta-ḫa-ḫi-in* bzw. *iš-ḫé-ḫi-in* in der Briefeinleitung müsste statt "I have fallen", "I have prostrated" eher "hiermit falle ich nieder" etc. übersetzt werden, da die Fiktion ist, dass der Absender während der Verlesung seines Briefes vor Pharao niederfiel."

[395]The reference is to A. F. Rainey, *UF* 6 (1974) 305. The context is as follows: "In spite of Edzard's argument that the context requires "herewith I fall," I still favor the rendering "I have fallen," for *amqut*. Some WS texts use *maqtāti/maqtīti* and Ug translates *qlt* (= *qilti) . . . . To say "I have prostrated myself," does mean in these contexts that the sender is now on his face before Pharaoh; in fact, he was forbidden to speak until *after* he had prostrated himself the regulation 7 x 7 times." Obviously Rainey is working under the assumption that the suffix conjugation in the West Semitic languages implies past completed action (and only past completed action), and that this form is not used for performatives (which, in English, ought not be translated in a past tense).

amènerait à le croire (par exemple en RS 34.124) ?"[396] In terms of situational content, the "moment" of prostration is the meeting of sender and recipient; at this meeting, the myths situate the act of prostration (1) after arrival, and (2) prior to verbal exchange.[397] In a literal interpretation of the formula, these conditions are never met.

This brings the discussion to the second question posed above, that of temporal / aspectual reference. In light of the use of the suffix conjugation, can one answer the question of *when* the action described was imagined to have taken place? The only possible logical possibilities would seem to be: (1) at a moment prior to the dictation of the letter, (2) at a moment simultaneous with the dictation of the letter, (3) sometime after the dictation of the letter, for example, at the moment of the recital of the letter, and, perhaps, (4) during a longer period encompassing one or more of the previously mentioned "moments".

The conjugation of the verb, namely the use of the suffix conjugation, is certainly relevant to this problem, for, in non-literary or "prose" texts, the suffix conjugation is generally used with non-stative verbs to denote past completed action.[398] In other words, in prose texts, the suffix conjugation is most often best translated with an English "past tense".

Reference to the "past", however, has meaning only with respect to a fixed point of temporal reference, normally the "present". In the case of letters, this fixed point of reference is particularly complicated, for an epistolary context necessarily

---

[396]Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques.

[397]This situational context is reflected in the position of the « pros » formula in letters, after the address and prior to the other polite formulas (see above, section 2.5.2.3).

[398]Compare Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 76.521, pp. 702-704, on the suffix conjugation ". . . zur Darstellung vergangener Sachverhalte in Prosatexten".

involves not one, but two temporal reference points: (1) the "present" of the sender at the moment of dictating the letter, and (2) the "present" of the recipient at the moment of hearing the letter.

With respect to the first logical possibility mentioned above, namely, that the "performative act" took place prior to the dictation of the letter, the use of the suffix conjugation is not problematic; in fact, it is expected. That actions occurring prior to the moment of the dictation of the letter, that is, actions prior to the "present" of the sender, should be expressed by the suffix conjugation is no surprise: punctual events which were in the past at the moment at the composition of the letter necessarily remain so at the time of its recital; in these situations, the problem of the point of temporal reference is irrelevant.

The use of the suffix conjugation for the second logical possibility described above, however, is more complicated, for in this case the suffix conjugation would have been used to describe an action occurring concurrent with the dictation of the letter and prior to its recital. This category applies in particular to "epistolary acts themselves, such as 'writing', 'sending', and 'commanding'."[399] Are these actions portrayed according to the temporal reference point of the sender, in a verbal conjugation appropriate for simultaneous action, or, are they portrayed according to the temporal reference point of the recipient, in a conjugation appropriate for past completed action? Previous students of epistolary verbal usage have argued in favor of the latter: in the epistolary traditions of Hebrew, Akkadian, and Ugaritic, at least,[400]

---

[399]Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 1.

[400]This was also the case in the epistolary traditions of Greek and Latin, and of classical Arabic; see the references in Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 1-31. On the possibility of a wider application in the Ancient Near East, compare D. Pardee, *BN* 22 (1983) 39-40, "In this short note I have made no attempt to establish the "epistolary" perfect as a general Near Eastern phenomenon, but it

these "epistolary acts", contemporaneous with the dictation of the letter, are represented from the temporal point of view of the recipient, by conjugations appropriate for past completed action: namely, the suffix conjugation in Ugaritic and Hebrew, and the *iprus* ("preterite") and *iptaras* ("perfect") conjugations in Akkadian.[401] Fr. Thureau-Dangin, no doubt aware of the "epistolary" tenses in Greek and Latin, had provided a rationalization for such a usage (in Akkadian) already in 1935: "Le lettre n'étant en principe que le texte du discours que le messager doit tenir à son arrivée, le moment où elle a été écrite et expéditée est envisagé au passé."[402] Pardee has termed this grammatical usage the "epistolary perfect".[403]

The third logical possibility mentioned above is even more complicated. Can the suffix conjugation be used in letters to represent an action that "happens" at the moment of the recitation of the letter, a moment which, from the sender's point of view, is well in the future? Taking a cue from the "epistolary perfect", discussed above, the problem may be clarified by a consideration of the "epistolary perspective," the fixed point of temporal reference according to which the "moment" of an action is defined in a letter. In this light, the point of view of the sender may be dismissed entirely, for it is the temporal perspective of the recipient that is adopted in letters, not that of the sender. This granted, however, can the suffix conjugation be used to designate action in the "present"? In his recent grammar, J. Tropper answers "yes", and

---

appears it may well be one for a casual glance turned up examples immediately in sources as disparate . . . as Mari Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Aramaic from Egypt."

[401]Pardee, *BN* 22 (1983) 34-40; Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 1-31.

[402]Thureau-Dangin, *Syria* 16 (1935) 192.

[403]As applied to Hebrew epistolography, see D. Pardee, *UF* 10 (1978) 300 and 311; Pardee *et al.*, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters* (1982) 35 and 49; and Pardee, *BN* 22 (1983) 34-40. On the phenomenon in Ugaritic and Akkadian epistolography, see Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 1-31. A recent treatment of the Hebrew examples is M. Rogland, *ZAH* 13 (2000) 194-200.

lists several types of usage in which the suffix conjugation refers to the "present".[404] With respect to the « pros » formula, it is of particular significance that the performative usage, namely, that linguistic usage in which utterance and act are not only simultaneous but identical,[405] is among these categories.[406]

The fourth logical possibility mentioned above refers to the use of the suffix conjugation for an action which began in the recipient's "past" and has continued right up until his "present". That the suffix conjugation could be used in such a case is not clear from any Ugaritic data, to my knowledge. From a comparative point of view, such a usage of the suffix conjugation is known in Biblical Hebrew;[407] its theoretical existence in Ugaritic would present no new problems.

If the use of the suffix conjugation allows for all four logical possibilities of temporal reference, then, can contextual considerations determine which one of these is most appropriate for the formula? The nature of the available data prevents certainty, of course, but a variety of factors argue that the "action" expressed in the « pros » formula was imagined as having "occurred" during a span of time which began at the dictation of the letter, but only ended at its recital. These factors include: (1) the situational "moment" of prostration, (2) the participants required by the formula, and

---

[404]Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 76.53, pp. 714-716, treating the suffix conjugation ". . . für perfektive Sachverhalte der Gegenwart."

[405]The identity of utterance and act means that the utterance can also be qualified as being "effective" of the act.

[406]Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 76.531, pp. 715; though not all of his examples are unambigously performative. On the « pros » formula as performative, see Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 29. A Hittite datum in favor of a performative interpretation is the deictic *kāša*, which establishes the temporal immediacy of the verb (see H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *JAOS* 88 [1968] 531-534).

[407]Compare B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (1990), § 30.5.1 c, p. 487.

(3) the contextual "burden" of the formula, and (4) the implications of the « pros » formula as a performative utterance.

The situational "moment" of prostration[408] is (1) after the meeting of the two parties, which most often took place *chez* the recipient, but (2) prior to verbal exchange. The time span suggested above is appropriate for these conditions. In the case of epistolary communication, the "meeting" is fictional, of course, but can be imagined to have taken place after the recital of the address, if not already with the arrival of the messenger, as sender's proxy. Verbal exchange between the two parties is also fictional in epistolary communication, but can be symbolized by the polite formulas and body of the letter which follow the « pros » formula.

The action expressed by the formula requires the presence of both sender and recipient.[409] The sender, as the agent of the action, must be present; and the recipient, at whose feet the action terminates, must also be present. In an epistolary situation, these circumstances are never met, and therefore must be fictional. The time span suggested above allows for the participation of both sender and recipient.

The contextual "burden" of the « pros » formula, judging from the use of the root KBD in Ugaritic literary parallels, is to "honor" the recipient.[410] In terms of information theory, the « pros » formula communicates information about the high social status of the recipient and the low status of the sender.[411] These goals can only

---

[408]For a more detailed presentation, see above, section 2.5.2.4.

[409]For more detail, see above, sections 2.5.2.2-2.5.2.4.

[410]For a more detailed presentation, see above, section 2.5.2.5.

[411]Compare the presentation in M. Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 182-186.

be fully accomplished when this information is communicated to the recipient, in his presence.

Finally, granted that the action of prostration ought to be interpreted metaphorically, as argued above, the « pros » formula itself is, in the words of Pardee and Whiting, "a prime candidate for performativity, for it is the *saying* of the formula that produces the reality of obeisance on the part of the writer."[412] As a performative utterance, the temporal reference of the « pros » formula is not that of a past completed action, for, if it were, it would be reporting an event, not effecting one.[413] As a performative, the "action" of the « pros » formula occurs in the present,[414] since,

---

[412]Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 29. These authors also provide a useful history of the linguisitic discussion of "performatives" on pp. 23-26. Compare Pardee's comments from his manuscript for *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, "Dans notre étude du parfait épistolaire, nous avons présenté les difficultés qui entravent la description précise de la fonction de la formule de prosternation (Pardee et Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 [1987] 28-29), préférant l'interprétation qui voit dans cet usage une fiction (l'expéditeur ne tombe pas par terre au moment de prononcer la formule) ; la formule épistolaire est donc une sorte de performatif (pour l'expéditeur, le fait de prononcer les paroles est l'équivalent de l'acte)."

[413]Compare Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 26: ". . . is the 'epistolary perfect, etc.' a performative? No, because, it reports an act, it does not effect it."

[414]Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 28-29, did not endorse this interpretation: "We find it unlikely that the epistolary perspective allows the falling to take place during the reading of the letter: the fact that the Akkadian uses preterites and perfects to express acts accomplished in conjunction with the sending of the letter leads us to believe that the writer is representing himself as having fallen during the dictation of the letter. In this sense, then, the perfect preterite forms are 'epistolary', for the writer is expressing an act contemporary with the writing of the letter as a completed one." Pardee (personal communication) considers that the verb in the « pros » formula is "only performative in the sense that the act itself was probably not performed"; for him, it is "an epistolary perfective expressing an epistolary fiction." For these arguments to carry weight, however, all Ugaritic suffix conjugation verbal forms and all Akkadian preterites and perfects occurring in letters would have to refer to "acts accomplished in conjunction with the sending of the letter"; such would not allow for the "epistolary performative" to exist in Ugaritic or Akkadian letters. Furthermore, Pardee and Whiting's position on the performative is not entirely consistent. On the one hand, they classify (with some hesitation) the « pros » formula as a performative (pp. 29-30), but on the other hand, they resist situating the action in the "present" of the recipient, at the moment of the recital of the letter (pp. 28-29). Rather, they place it "during the dictation of the letter" (p. 29). If, however, the action took place prior to the recitation of the letter, the action is a past completed action from the epistolary perspective, namely, from the temporal point of view of the recipient. In this case the « pros » formula would represent the report of a past

like other performatives, speech and act must be synonymous. The fact that this performative occurs in a letter, however, introduces another question: At what moment is the sender imagined to "pronounce" the phrase? Is it during the dictation of the letter, in the "present" from the sender's point of view? Or, is it during the recital of the letter, in the "present" from the recipient's point of view? The answer, I suspect, is "both". This requires a special category of performative, the "epistolary performative",[415] in which the "action" occurs in a special category of "present" time, which might be termed a "suspended present". In theory, the act itself requires both participants: it requires the sender who is imagined to pronounce the formula, and it requires the recipient in whose presence the utterance is imagined to be pronounced. The separation of these two necessary parties, however, requires an epistolary fiction whereby the time intervening between dictation and recitation of the formula "is not taken into account in the formulation of the letter."[416] The time frame proposed above,

---

action. To be a performative, as defined, however, the utterance itself must effect the action, not simply report its occurrence in the past.

[415]Pardee and Whiting, *ibid.*, p. 29, also speak of an "epistolary performative" defined in slightly different terms: "a performative that, because of social realities, could only exist in a letter." Their reason was that, ". . . when indeed in the Pharaoh's presence the verbal performative would not have sufficed, actual prostration had to take place" (p. 29). A brief glance at the distribution of the formula, however, shows that it is not used uniquely when addressing a "great king"; it is used in virtually all types of social situations characterized by ascending relational terms, even biological ones; and, it is used occasionally in terminologically horizontal situations. Pardee shows his awareness of this in the manuscript of his manuscript of *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, where he asks, ". . . le roi d'Ougarit tombait-il aux pieds de sa mère lorsqu'il entrait en sa présence comme l'interprétation littérale de la formule épistolaire amènerait à le croire (par exemple en RS 34.124)?" The intuitive answer, of course, is no. If the portrayal of prostration in the myths and in Egyptian iconography shows that not all prostration was metaphorical, it certainly does not follow that no prostration was metaphorical.

[416]Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 27, n. 79; the context is as follows: ". . . the gap between the dictation and the reading of the letter is not taken into account in the formulation of the letter." Compare also D. Arnaud, *Syria* 59 (1982) 104, n. 26: ". . . le rédacteur de la lettre se transporte idéalement au moment où le destinataire l'aura en main." To take an example from a modern language, compare the use of the phrase "je t'embrasse" in French. As a performative utterance, the phrase is used

that of a "suspended present", is appropriate for this, since it situates the "action" in a moment which comprehends the dictation of the formula and its recitation, but makes no grammatical reference to the temporal interval separating them.

2.6.2 The semantics of the preposition l *in « l pʿn N_R + Q(Y)L »*

As a verb of motion denoting movement, in this case movement downward, the verb Q(Y)L may take a prepositional complement *l* to denote the location at which the movement terminates.[417] In this sense, the semantics of the preposition *l* in this idiom are not simply locative, but terminative. Outside of the « pros » formula, compare *KTU*[2] 1.2 IV 25-26, *yql l ảrṣ*, 'He falls to the earth,' where the "point of arrival" is not a part of the body, as it is in the « pros » formula; and *KTU*[2] 1.19 III 37-38, *tql tḥt pʿnh*, 'She falls at his feet,' where the terminative notion is expressed not by *l*, but by means of another preposition, *tḥt*.

---

in letters (that is, as an "epistolary performative"), but also in telephone conversations (that is, as a true performative utterance). The context of these two situations (epistolary and telephone) is identical; the only significant difference, to my understanding, is that, as in the epistolary usage, there is an interval of time which passes between utterance (in this case, written) and comprehension. In this latter case, this span of time is ignored in the formulation of the verb. In other words, in the use of "je t'embrasse" as an epistolary performative, the verb appears in the tense appropriate for true performatives (the present), not a past tense. This parallels the use of *qlt* (the suffix conjugation) in Ugaritic epistolary performatives, where it is the status of the utterance as performative that conditions the use of the suffix conjuation, not the situation of the action in the past. Compare the usage of the suffix conjugation in this sense (performative, with no reference to past time) in the following prostration motif from the Hebrew Bible, 2 Sam 16, verse 4:

וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ לְצִבָא הִנֵּה לְךָ כֹּל אֲשֶׁר לִמְפִי־בֹשֶׁת וַיֹּאמֶר צִיבָא הִשְׁתַּחֲוֵיתִי

"The king said to Ṣiba, 'Everything that belongs to Mepi-Bosheth is (hereby) yours.' and Ṣiba replied, 'I (hereby) prostrate myself!' "

[417]See D. Pardee, *UF* 7 (1975) 367 (where the verb is equated with *qll*); and *idem*, *UF* 8 (1976) 277-278, where several intransitive verbs are listed which take the preposition *l* as a complement in a terminative sense, and p. 292, where "verb of obeisance + *l* + part of the body" is treated, with the preposition denoting "point of arrival at."

2.6.3 The common noun pʿn

The common noun *pʿn* poses no semantic problems. The meaning 'foot' is supported by several types of evidence: (1) inner Ugaritic usage, (2) the "B-words" which accompany *pʿn* in poetic texts, (3) logographic writings of the corresponding element in syllabic « pros » formulas, which use the {GÌR} sign, and, though weaker, (4) comparative etymological evidence.[418]

The syntax requires that the noun be in construct with the following noun phrase, which designates the recipient. This being the case, the orthography allows that the grammatical number could be either singular or dual. The plural may be excluded for both contextual and grammatical reasons.[419]

2.6.4 The word mrḥqtm

The « pros » formulas of the Amarna letters contained no equivalent to Ugaritic *mrḥqtm*, and early students of Ugaritic letters had only context and etymology as interpretive aids. The presence of the corresponding syllabic element *ištu rūqiš* in letters now known from Ras Shamra and Meskene confirms the early proposal of

---

[418]For the third category of evidence mentioned here, namely, the use of the logogram {GÌR} in logo-syllabic parallels, see above, in section 2.4.1. For the other categories of evidence, see now del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 342; and also the information collected in L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *HALOT* (1994-2000) 952.

[419]On the contextual level, this word is a common noun which refers to a part of the body occurring in pairs, and, as such, the dual form would normally have been used when referring to these two body parts of a single individual (the vast majority of Ugaritic letters are directed to a single recipient). On the grammatical level, the plural of such nouns denoting parts of the body which occur in pairs would, in theory, be morphologically "feminine" in gender, and, as such, bear the feminine plural morpheme *-t* in the construct state. The use of {MEŠ} in the parallels in Akkadian letters should also not indicate a plural, but a dual form; apparently for the scribes involved, the {MEŠ} sign meant "more than one", not "more than two" (see above, section 2.4.1).

É. Dhorme for this word,[420] and makes superfluous those of Ch. Virolleaud,[421] R. Dussaud,[422] and H. L. Ginsberg.[423] Dhorme's semantic and morphological analysis of *mrḥqtm* is still largely valable; he translated 'de loin', and remarked: "Quant à *mrḥqtm*, de la racine *rḥq* « être loin », nous y voyons un substantif féminin *marḥaqat*, suivi de la terminaison adverbiale *am*."[424] To this treatment, one may now add the following comments: (1) *mem*-preformative nouns, feminine in grammatical gender, of sound roots may have had the structure *maqṭalt-* instead of *maqṭalat-*,[425] (2) in light of the evidence for a productive case system in Ugaritic,[426] and in light of the adverbial

---

[420]Dhorme, *Syria* 19 (1938) 143-144.

[421]Virolleaud, *Syria* 19 (1938), leaves the word untranslated in p. 128, but see his commentary on pp. 129-130 (discussed below).

[422]Dussaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 185: "tout de long".

[423]Ginsberg, *BASOR* 72 (1938) 19, n. 7: "on both lengths".

[424]Dhorme, *Syria* 19 (1938) 143-144. Virolleaud was also aware of the interpretive possibility chosen by Dhorme, though he did not favor it; compare his remarks in *Syria* 19 (1938) 129: "*mrḥqtm*. Le mot, appartenant à la rac. *rḥq*, signifie, en gros ou littéralement, « éloignement » ; mais il reste d'expliquer le *-m* final;" further, ". . . on attendrait plutôt ici un adverbe;" and, in footnote 3: "Adverb en -am, comme il y en a, en hébreu, quelques exemples. . . . Si *mrḥqtm* signifie simplement « dans l'éloignement (où je me trouve) », Talmayân voudrait dire que, malgré la distance qui le sépare de la reine, il ne lui est pas moins soumis qui s'il était à Ugarit même. On a cependant le sentiment que la locution a un sens plus expressif que celui-là."

[425]Compare {mar-kab-te}, 'chariot' (context is difficult), in RS 16.249, line 28 (see J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 [1955] 96-98, pl. lxxiv; and J. Huehnergard, *UVST* [1987] 179); {ma-a-al-tu$_4$}, 'bolt (?)' in RS 20.123+, column 2, line 12' (S^a Vocabulary, entry no. 179; see Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 [1968], no. 137, pp. 240-249 and 420-423; and Huehnergard, *UVST* [1987] 153); and {mar-de$_4$-em-tu}, 'path (??)', in RS 2.[018], line 6 (variant of ḪAR-*ra* : *ḫubullu* lexical series, second tablet; see F. Thureau-Dangin, *Syria* 12 [1931], no. 7, pp. 231-234, pl. xlvii; and Huehnergard, *UVST* [1987] 177). On these forms in general, see Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), §51.45e-p, pp. 266-269, and §52.2, pp. 278-280; Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 295-296 and 313-315; and D. Sivan, *GUL* (1997) 71-72 and 75-76.

[426]For a recent presentation, see Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 54.1, pp. 302-313, who cites two sources of information for the Ugaritic case system: (1) Ugaritic words written in syllabic script, and (2) Ugaritic words written in alphabetic script in which the use of one of the three "ʾaleph"-signs ({å}, {î}, or {û}) is indicative of grammatical inflection. On the former category of evidence, see

function of this common noun in the « pros » formula, we may add the accusative case vowel -*a* to the nominal stem, and (3) "enclitic *mem*" probably had the phonemic structure /-*ma*/.[427]

Virolleaud had earlier observed the value of Akkadian epistolary formula for the interpretation of those in Ugaritic,[428] and following up on the assumption of a mechanical correspondence between alphabetic *mrḥqtm* and its syllabic counterpart *ištu rūqiš*, S. Loewenstamm proposed an alternative morphology for the former:[429]

> "The morphology of *mrḥqtm* remains doubtful. Pleonastic *ištu ruqiš*[430] (preposition *ištu* + adverbial termination *iš* instead of standard Babylonian *ruqiš* [without *ištu*] is peculiar to the Ugaritic documents. . . . Its interpretation as loan-translation from Ugaritic would not only

---

Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 299-301. The latter category, the use of alphabetic spellings as evidence for the Ugaritic case system, is slightly more complicated. Unlike the rest of the graphic inventory of the Ugaritic alphabet, these three signs are apparently not "alphabetic" at all, but rather syllabic. Their exact nature has received much discussion and is not yet entirely resolved, but the hypothesis that has gained the most adherents is probably that of H. L. Ginsberg. According to Ginsberg's model, all three signs are polyvalent: {å} may represent both /ʾa/ and /ʾā/; {ů} may represent /ʾu/, /ʾū/, and /ʾô/ (a contraction of the /*aw/ diphthong); and {i̊} may represent /ʾi/, /ʾī/, /ʾê/ (a contraction of /*ay/ diphthong), and syllable final /ʾ/. A history of the discussion is provided in E. Verreet, *UF* 15 (1983) 223-226. For the articulation of the theory, see H. L. Ginsberg, *Tarbiz* 4 (1933) 381-383 (in Hebrew); *idem*, *JRAS* 35 (1935) 45; *idem*, *Orientalia* 5 (1936) 175-176; and *idem*, *Orientalia* 7 (1938), pp. 2-3. A defense of the merits of the theory in all of its essentials can be found in D. Marcus, *JANES* 1 (1968) 50-60.

[427]Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), §89.21, p. 826.

[428]Compare the paraphrase of Virolleaud's presentation in *CRAIBL* (1937) 353, with respect to the Amarna letters: " la comparison [between Ugaritic and Amarna formulas] permettra sans doute de préciser la valeur de certaines expressions ambiguës, car les termes sont, sauf sur un point, tout à fait équivalents, comme si l'on était en présence d'une inscription bilingue." Further, Virolleaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 130, on the « pros » formula. ". . . bien que . . . la phrase [that is, the « pros » formula], prise dans sons ensemble, paraisse calquée sur la formule accadienne et en fournir la traduction littérale."

[429]Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies* (1980) 246, addition to n. 2.

[430]One may reflect the presence of etymological */ḫ/ in the Akkadian word in normalization by a lengthened /*ū*/ vowel; thus *ištu rūqiš* may be preferred over Loewenstamm's *ištu ruqiš*.

imply the explanation of the second *m* as an adverbial one, but even that of the first *m* as the preposition *min*."

In the first place, the phrase *ištu rūqiš* is no longer "peculiar to the Ugaritic documents",[431] with the result that a "loan translation from Ugaritic" is not likely. Secondly, Loewenstamm himself was certainly already aware of another problem with his analysis, for he cites scholars who had already pointed out the absence of the preposition *min* in Ugaritic.[432] On present data, there is still no unambiguous evidence for the existence of a productive preposition *m*(*n*) in Ugaritic.[433] Finally, despite Virolleaud's contention that the Ugaritic « pros » formula appears to be ". . . calquée sur la formule accadienne et en fournir la traduction littérale,"[434] the parallel epistolary formulas do not always show a mechanical morpheme-for-morpheme equivalence. The fact that Ugaritic *mrḥqtm* and its syllabic equivalent *ištu rūqiš* do not share the same morphology is not any more of a problem than in the « sal » formula, where the syllabic equivalent of Ugaritic *yšlm* is *lū šulmu*.[435] In both cases, it is the utterances that are equivalent, not the individual morphological components.[436] Given these facts, Loewenstamm's morphological solution introduces unnecessary

---

[431]Compare its presence in « pros » formulas from Meskene; see above, section 2.4.1.

[432]Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies* (1980) 246, addition to n. 2.

[433]See now Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 82.22, pp. 762-763, where each of the three supposed examples are provided with alternative explanations.

[434]Virolleaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 130.

[435]See below, chapter 3.

[436]This aspect of linguistic equivalence between the two parallel formulas shows an ancient awareness on the part of the scribes, predating Jerome by many centuries (compare Oppenheim's citation of Jerome in *Letters from Mesopotamia* [1967] 67, mentioned above), of modern translational method.

complications into the Ugaritic morphology, and may be dismissed on methodological grounds.

As Dhorme and Virolleaud recognized, one expects *mrḥqtm* to function adverbially within the formula.[437] This adverbial function may have been grammatically marked in more than one way: (1) by means of the accusative case vowel,[438] and (2) possibly by means of the "enclitic" particle *-m*, often found on nouns used adverbially.[439] That two adverbial markers could have been present is not problematic, in light of the doubly-marked syllabic parallel *ištu rūqiš*, and in light of the presence of other doubly-marked adverbials in Ugaritic.[440]

If the linguistic "denotation" of the common noun *mrḥqt-* as 'distance' is fairly straightforward, defining the precise adverbial nuance present in the syntax is more difficult and relies heavily on situational context. At least two possibilities exist for the precise adverbial nuance: (1) locative, marking the place at which the action occurs, and (2) ablative, marking the place from which the action originated. If the semantics of the preposition *l* are indeed terminative, as argued above, one would

---

[437]Dhorme, *Syria* 19 (1938) 144; Virolleaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 129, ". . . on attendrait plutôt ici un adverbe."

[438]Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 54.133.2, pp. 310-313.

[439]The enclitic particle *-m* is found on all parts of speech, and its precise semantics are not clear. Compare M. Pope's statement in *JCS* 5 (1951) 128:"even when adverbial sense is indicated in nouns with enclitic *-m*, it cannot be proven that the adverbial force is resident in the *-m*"; and see Pardee, *Semitic Langauges* (1997) 141; and Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), §89.21, p. 826. Its presence on nouns in the (adverbial) accusative is nevertheless frequent.

[440]Compare, for example, the phrase *l ʿnth* , 'for ʿAnatu' in the ritual text RS 1.005, line 13; it is probably a doubly adverbial phrase, in which the adverbial nuance is expressed both by means of the preposition *l* and by the adverbial suffix *-h*. See now the discussion in D. Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 247-248.

expect the adverbial nuance of *mrḥqtm* to be ablative.[441] Such is perfectly consistent with the situational context of the formula, in which prostration can be imagined to have begun at some (visible) distance from the recipient, and continued until it terminated at his feet.[442]

Several other students of the letters, however, have treated this as a locative, as literally expressing the physical distance which separates the correspondents.[443] Such an interpretation is problematic for at least three reasons:[444] (1) the distribution of the term suggests that its usage was governed first and foremost by social, not local, criteria;[445] (2) in terms of situational context, the "moment" of prostration is the meeting of the two correspondents, a meeting which does not occur physically, but is a

---

[441]On the ablative interpretation of *mrḥqtm*, see the discussion and the comparative parallels cited above in section 2.5.2.3. I believe this was also the opionion of Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies* (1980) 247, "The expression makes better sense and is more picturesque if we assume that the sender figuratively represents himself as entering into the presence of his lord and doing hommage to him from a distance, which lays additional stress on his reverence." Compare also Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, footnote, "Comme Loewenstamm l'a très justement remarqué en commentant le parallélisme entre les formules ougaritique et accadienne … , l'expression « de loin » ne désigne pas la distance qui sépare les correspondants … , mais celle qui sépare la personne qui se prosterne du personnage honoré dans une situation vécue."

[442]See above, section 2.5.2.3.

[443]Compare Virolleaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 129, "Si *mrḥqtm* [in RS 9.479A] signifie simplement « dans l'éloignement (où je me trouve) », Talmayân voudrait dire que, malgré la distance qui le sépare de la reine, il ne lui est pas moins soumis que s'il était à Ugarit même." D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 12 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques, footnote, cites two other examples of this view: De Langhe, *Le Muséon* 59 (1946) 108; and Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 76. This interpretation is also present in F. B. Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 421; and F. Renfroe, *Arabic-Ugaritic Lexical Studies* (1992) 12.

[444]I agree with Loewenstamm's (apodictic) assessment of this position as " … not convincing at all" (*Comparative Studies* [1980] 247); but it seems desirable to provide material arguments.

[445]In ascending letters *mrḥqtm* is restricted to those composed along the hierarchical power model; ascending letters composed along the biological kinship model do not employ this term. Had the nuance been purely locative, such an uneven "social" distribution is not explained. On the distribution in detail, see above, section 2.2.

fiction imagined to take place upon the recital of the tablet;[446] and (3) a purely locative interpretation of *mrḥqtm* would seem to entail, in some sense at least, a logical contradiction[447] in the semantics of the formula; if the action took place *mrḥqtm*, 'at a distance', it cannot have terminated *l pʿn*, 'at the two feet,' of the recipient.

2.6.5 The multiplicative phrases

The morphology underlying the multiplicative phrase is easily described: it consists of two "numerical components", which may or may not be joined by the conjunction *w*. Each numerical component, in turn, consists of two elements: (1) a numeral, and (2) an "enclitic" suffix, spelled either *-ỉd* or *-d*.[448] The following section treats the grammatical analysis of the individual numerical components, followed by that of the multiplicative phrase as a whole.

2.6.5.1 The numerical components šbʿd, t̲nỉd, šbʿỉd, and t̲mnỉd

Only four numerical components are attested. Listed in order of frequency, these are *šbʿd*,[449] *t̲nỉd*,[450] *šbʿỉd*,[451] and *t̲mnỉd*.[452] The form of the numeral may be

---

[446]See above, section 2.5.2.4.

[447]Independent of context, however, this is not a strong argument; languages do not necessarily follow the rules of propositional logic. From a methodological point of view in lexicography, it is usage, not logic, that determines meaning.

[448]See also above, section 2.2.

[449]This orthography is by far the most common (as many as fifteen times, in no less than eleven letters): RS 9.479A (once), 16.137[bis] (at least once), 18.040 (probably twice), 18.113 (twice), 18.[312] (at least once), 19.102.2 (once), 20.199 (twice), 29.093 (once), 92.2010 (twice), 94.2273 (once), and 94.2391 (once).

assumed to be the cardinal,[453] though explicit confirmation of this awaits the appearance of either "4" or "6" in the integer slot of the formula.[454] The grammatical "gender" of the numeral in all cases follows the least marked form; that is, the form which lacks the *-t* "feminine" morpheme. Since the cardinal number is treated as a noun, it is probable that a case vowel followed it; given the adverbial function of this component, the accusative case vowel /*a*/ is not inappropriate, although the comparative data are not unanimous in this respect.

The morphology underlying the multiplicative suffixes themselves is more complicated. On a superficial level, the appearance of two distinct orthographies, namely, {ỉd} and {d}, would seem to argue in favor of two distinct underlying suffixes.[455] Several factors, however, imply that these spellings {-ỉd} and {-d} represent variant orthographies of a single underlying multiplicative morpheme: (1) the identical contextual function of both suffixes,[456] (2) the highly restricted

---

[450]There are as many as four examples of this orthography: RS 19.102.2, 29.093, 94.2391, and probably 94.5009. (section 2.2)

[451]One example: RS 9.479A.

[452]One example: RS 94.2273.

[453]In terms of comparative morphology, an adverbial suffix such as *-ỉd* would be most appropriate following the cardinal numeral, which is treated as a common noun in Semitic syntax, rather than the ordinal, which is most often treated as an adjective. In Akkadian also, the multiplicative suffix *-īšu* (on which see below, section 2.4.1), which is probably etymologically cognate to the Ugaritic suffix *-ỉd*, is used on the cardinal form of the numeral.

[454]These integers are the only ones to distinguish graphically the cardinal and ordinal forms.

[455]Obviously, in light of the very frequent attestation of the form *šbʿd*, it is no longer possible to appeal to scribal error as an explanation for the spelling of the suffix, as was done by Virolleaud when he published the first example in *Syria* 19 (1938) 129.

[456]In his manuscript of *Les textes épistolaires*, D. Pardee proposes a functional difference for these two suffixes: "A en juger du fait que le suffixe *-ỉd* s'emploie uniquement en deuxième position lorsque l'expression est « sept fois (et) sept fois » et uniquement en première position lorsque l'expression est « deux fois sept fois [égale quatorze] », c'était par cette forme [namely, *-ỉd*]que l'on

distribution of the spelling *-d*, found only in the word *šbʿd*,[457] and (3) the apparent lack, apart from the word *šbʿid*, of any sign sequences consisting of {ʿ} followed by one of the "ʾalif" signs, throughout the entire Ugaritic corpus.[458] Considering that (4) with numerals other than "7", the suffix is, on present data, always spelled *-id*, and (5) the cognates (see below) suggest the presence of an etymological /ʾ/ in the suffix, these factors strongly suggest a link between the spelling *-d* and the final phoneme /ʿ/ in the numeral *šbʿ-*, lending credence to J. Tropper's suggestion that the spellings of the type *šbʿd* are "sehr wahrsch. phonetisch motiviert und zeugen von einer progressiven Assimilation des /ʾ/ an /ʿ/,"[459] if they do not represent simply a "Schwund von /ʾ/".[460] Assuming the plausibility of these analyses, one may describe the morphology underlying each of the numerical components as follows: « cardinal stem + case vowel + *id* multiplicative suffix ».

---

exprimait la notion de multiplication en plus de celle de répétition." I consider the comparison of the pattern *šbʿd w šbʿd* (found on at least three other letters) with *šbʿd w šbʿid* (found uniquely on RS 9.479A) sufficient evidence that, in these cases at least, the multiplicative suffixes *-d* and *-id* are semantically equivalent. Furthermore, the form *-d* is not used on any integer other than "7", a fact which makes it difficult to identify any semantic differences presumed to exist between it and the usage of the more common *-id*.

[457]As mentioned above, in section 2.2, the form of the multiplicative *-d* is found only on the integer "7": *šbʿd*. This form, *šbʿd*, is quite common; it occurs as many as fifteen times, in no less than eleven letters (see above, this section). The spelling *šbʿid* occurs only once, in line 9 of RS 9.479A; it is otherwise unattested (in line 8 of this same text one finds the word written with the more common orthography, *šbʿd*).

[458]Note also the apparent lack of sequences consisting of an "ʾaleph" sign followed by {ʿ}. I have attempted an exhaustive search for the strings {ʿȧ}, {ʿi}, {ʿu̇}, {ȧʿ}, {iʿ}, and {u̇ʿ} in two databases: (1) J.-L. Cunchillos *et al.*, *GSRC-BDFSN* (1996), and (2) a database containing previously unpublished Ugaritic texts collated by P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee.

[459]Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 65.145, p. 378. Compare also *ibid.*, § 33.141, p. 157: "Das Phonem /ʾ/ kann im Ug. an diversen Silbenpositionen seinen konsonantischen Charakter verlieren," including the example of "/ʾ/ im Wortanlaut vor silbenschliessendem /ʿ/". Compare Gordon, *UT* (1965), § 5.38, p. 34.

[460]Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 33.141, pp. 157-159.

The semantics of the numerical component are certainly multiplicative,[461] in light of (1) the clear situational context,[462] (2) other inner Ugaritic evidence for the multiplicative function of the suffix *-ỉd* attached to numerals,[463] (3) the well-established adverbial function of the suffixes which appear on the numerical component of the syllabic « pros » formulas,[464] and (4) the clear multiplicatives in literary prostration motifs from the Hebrew Bible and from Hittite literature.[465] Thus, the component « numeral + (*ỉ*)*d* », in and of itself, expresses repetition of the verbal action of prostration.

Since the alphabetic writings themselves provide the consonantal superstructure, a phonemic reconstruction of the numerical component is, per usual, simply a search for vowels. From the point of view of historical grammar, one needs to reconstruct vowels of several categories within each numerical component: (1) the stem vowel(s) of the cardinal number, (2) the "case" vowel between the integer and the multiplicative suffix, (3) the stem vowel of the suffix, and perhaps (4) a vowel following the final consonant of the suffix. An attempt at the phonemic reconstruction of each of the attested numerical components follows; for each form, the first entry provides the orthography, the second a breakdown of the word's historical morphology, and the final entry a reconstruction of the Ugaritic phonemic structure:

---

[461]On the other means of expressing multiplication in Ugaritic, none of which is found in the epistolary formularies, see *ibid.*, § 65, pp. 376-381, including « number + *-m* », and « *pảmt* + number » and « number + *pảmt* ».

[462]See above, section 2.5.3.

[463]See the discussion in F. Renfroe, *Arabic-Ugaritic Lexical Studies* (1992) 11-14; and del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 8.

[464]Compare W. von Soden, *GAG*[3] (1995), § 71a, p. 94.

[465]For Gen. 33:3 and *The Song of Ullikummi*; see above, section 2.4.3.2.3.

ṯnỉd	ṯin + ay [466] + ʾiḏa [467]	ṯinêʾida [468]
ṯmnỉd	ṯamāniy + a [469] + ʾiḏa	ṯamānâʾida [470]
šbʿỉd [471]	šabʿ [472] + a + ʾiḏa	*šabʿaʾida (?) [473]

---

[466]The oblique case is reconstructed here, on the theory that adverbial notions are so expressed in the dual (and plural) number(s).

[467]The quality of the vowel which followed */*ʾid-*/ is difficult to ascertain. The Akkadian multiplicative suffix *-īšu* would seem to favor "adverbial" /*-u*/, which also existed in Ugaritic; but at least one Amarna spelling suggests /*-a*/. EA 362 contains the writing {7.TA} for a numerical component, perhaps to be interpreted as */*šabʿîda*/ (the syllabic value *dá* is quite common for the {TA} sign in western peripheral texts; compare Huehnergard, *Akkadian of Ugarit* [1989] 368).

[468]One may simply assume that the use of the {d} sign for historical */*ḏ*/ reflects, in this case, the merger of this phoneme with /*d*/. The same situation seems to be present with forms of the deictic / demonstrative elements from */*ḏV-*/. See Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 32.144.3, pp. 115-119.

[469]The data are slim, but one may propose an accusative case vowel in this slot on the basis of (1) the adverbial function of the phrase, and (2) the use of the {E} sign in EA 214 and 215 (see below).

[470]The cardinal forms of "8" in Ugaritic are not written with the {y} sign (see Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* [2000], § 62.18, pp. 348-349), leading one to reconstruct the Ugaritic base as *ṯamān-*, the presence of the historical /*y*/ being indicated in phonemic reconstruction by means of a circumflex accent over the case vowel. Historically, however, the phoneme /y/ was present in the root for "8", as shown by the writings of the "plural" of "8", that is 'eighty', written *ṯmnym*. Had the phoneme /*y*/ been preserved in the singular, one would have expected it to appear in the orthography, for the sequence */*-iyV-*/ does not generally reduce (*ibid.*, § 33.322.2, p. 195).

[471]Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 33.445, p. 204, offers the possibility that this orthography represents a pausal form.

[472]The stem vowels of the numeral "7" must be reconstructed on the basis of comparative evidence; internal evidence is lacking. I favor a *qatl-* base, as implied by the forms in Arabic, Hebrew, and Aramaic. Tropper also proposes a *qatl-* base in presenting the cardinal numeral (*Ugaritische Grammatik* [2000], § 62.17, p. 348), but finds it necessary to allow for the insertion of an anaptyctic vowel into the form in the case of an attached multiplicative suffix (*ibid.*, § 33.116.3, p. 150, /šabaʿʿida/ < *šabaʿʾiḏa < *šabʿaʾiḏa), and § 65.145, p. 378). Since examples are known of the absence of an (etymologically) expected {ʾ} sign in the environment of {ʿ}, where one would have expected, from a historical morphological point of view, the presence of a vowel between the /ʾ/ and /ʿ/ phonemes, it appears to me unnecessary to propose anaptyxis, unless such be on the basis of latter vocalization traditions for Hebrew and Aramaic.

[473]I remain somewhat suspicious about the valability of (1) accepting {šbʿỉd} as an intentional spelling, and (2) attempting a phonemic reconstruction that faithfully reflects each of the consonantal phonemes assumed to lie behind this orthography. Phonological data are very slippery in cases like that of Ugaritic, where one must often simply assume the underlying phonology on the basis of the

šbʿd šabʿ + a + ʾiḏa šabʿêda [474]

The etymology of the multiplicative suffix *-ỉd*, is probably best to be found in the various Semitic adverbial particles deriving from a historical base */-ʾiḏ-/*, nearly all of which refer to time. Those cognates of highest interest are the enclitic suffixes of adverbial function, referring to time;[475] and especially the explicitly multiplicative particle attached to numerals in Akkadian[476] and South Arabian.[477] Other usages, such as that of a subordinating conjunction, with reference to time, in Arabic, are no

---

orthography, a method which would prove notoriously unreliable should one apply it to the orthography of modern languages. It is conceivable that the use of the graph {ỉd} in this case (RS 9.479A) is an orthographic hypercorrection, presumably stemming from the scribe's own awareness that the historically "correct" form of the suffix was spelled {ỉd}. A parallel from the English orthographic traditions would be the use of the article "an" with the words "history" or "historical" in dialects in which the /*h*/ phoneme in this position had not quiesced (as in most North American dialects of English, for example).

[474]Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 65.145, p. 378: " … von einer progressiven Assimilation des /ʾ/ an /ʿ/."

[475]Compare the usage of the Arabic adverbial suffix *-ʾiḏ*^{in}, discussed in Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon* (1863) 39: "When [*-ʾiḏ*^{in}] is adjoined to nouns signifying times, the Arabs join it therewith in writing, in certain instances" (examples cited include *saʿtaʾiḏ*^{in}, 'in that hour', *ʿāmaʾiḏ*^{in}, 'in that year', and *yawmaʾiḏ*^{in}, 'on that day'); and W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* (1896-1898), vol. 1, p. 292. Note, however, Renfroe, *Arabic-Ugaritic Lexical Studies* (1992) 11-14: "The occurrences of the Arabic particle *ʾiḏ* as a suffix in expressions such as *ḥīnaʾiḏ*^{in}, 'at that time,' … are noteworthy but inexact parallels."

[476]The Akkadian multiplicative suffix *-īšu* is probably etymologically cognate to the Ugaritic suffix -ỉd (*/-ʾiḏa/*, or perhaps even */-ʾiḏu/*), and it is also used on the cardinal form of the numeral; compare W. von Soden, *GAG*^{3} (1995), § 71a, p. 94. Grammarians of Akkadian have generally not interpreted the forms in this way (that is, *-īšu* as an adverbial suffix attached to numerals), but rather prefer to analyze the morphology as « cardinal numeral + adverbial suffix *ī* + *šu* (3rd masc. sg. pronominal suffix, 'his') »; J. Tropper came close to proposing the etymological affinity of Ugaritic *-ỉd* and Akkadian *-īšu* in *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 65.142, p. 377, but ultimately he considered such an etymological connection unconvincing, the only reason cited for such being found in the phrase ". . . wegen der konsequenten Orthographie von ug. *id* mit Aleph." That Akkadian orthography would not indicate the presence of historical inner-vocalic /ʾ/ is to be expected, however. While Proto-Semitic */ḏ/*, it is true, often shows up in Akkadian orthography written with /*z*/ series of signs (compare ḎKR, 'to remember', Akkadian *zakāru*); it is also occasionally realized with /*š*/ series of signs, as in the relative pronoun (historical **ḏV*, Akkadian *ša*).

[477]See J. C. Biella, *DOSA* (1982) 518; additional references are collected in Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 65.142, p. 377.

doubt related, but of less direct interest.[478] W. Wright suggested the existence of a primitive noun *ʾi*d̲*-, meaning 'time',[479] which, to my knowledge, is not attested as such in any source. An ultimate derivation from the deictic / demonstrative particle *d̲*V*-, suggested by D. Cohen,[480] is plausible, but not as immediately relevant as the various *ʾi*d̲*- adverbial particles, which, in any case, were probably derivative of */d̲*V*-/. The proposals to connect this word with the common noun *yd*, 'hand',[481] may be dismissed since, among other reasons, (1) spellings of the adverbial suffix in Ugaritic use the {i} sign, not the {y} sign; (2) the etymological cognates bear the proper reflexes of consonantal /ʾ/, not /*y*/, and of */d̲/, not /*d*/; and (3) the use of the {šú} alongside {šu} in the Akkadian and Hittite parallels shows that these elements should not be interpreted as logograms.

2.6.5.2 "How many times?"

Setting aside the variant orthography of the multiplicative particle in RS 9.479A, the multiplicative phrases of the Ugaritic epistolary corpus exhibit three patterns, each

---

[478]See the references collected in D. Cohen, *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques* 1 (1970) 10, where he refers to occurrences of a subordinating conjunction *ʾd̲, referring to time, in Arabic, South Arabian, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Ugaritic data.

[479]Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* (1896-1898), vol. 1, p. 292, referring to "the obsolete noun *ʾi*d̲*un* 'time' . . . ."

[480]Cohen, *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques* 1 (1970) 10.

[481]Compare C. H. Gordon, *UT* (1965), § 7.68, p. 51: "bound forms of the word 'hand'."

containing two numerical components: (1) « *šbʿd w šbʿd* »,[482] (2) « *ṯnỉd šbʿd* »,[483] and now (3) « *šbʿd ṯmnỉd* ».[484] Judging from these patterns, the presence or absence of the conjunction *w* would appear to be conditioned by the sequence of integers used within the phrase: examples of the integer sequence « 7 : 7 » contain the intervening conjunction;[485] examples of the sequence « 2 : 7 » and the unique example of the sequence « 7 : 8 » omit it. The syntactic implications of this distribution are no longer clearly discernible, and the overall semantics of the multiplicative phrases thus remain difficult to define with certainty.

S. Loewenstamm, working with the Ugaritic and Akkadian data available to him in 1967, noticed the presence of the conjunction *w* in the sequence « 7 : 7 », and its absence in the sequence « 2 : 7 », and, obviously seeking to harmonize the semantics of the two patterns, proposed that the appearance or non-appearance of the

---

[482]This pattern is attested in RS 9.479A (with variant spelling of the final component: « *šbʿd w šbʿỉd* »), probably 16.137[bis], 18.113+, 20.199, and 92.2010. It may be plausibly reconstructed in RS 18.287 and 18.[312]. RS 18.040 presents a special problem, owing to the absence of the conjunction, and the apparent presence of [*šb*]⌜ʿ⌝*d* in the first integer slot (following the collation of D. Pardee). Regarding the latter, the single partially reconstructed sign, {⌜ʿ⌝}, may be slim evidence for insisting on the status of this formula as an exception. A recollation, with detailed notes on the damaged sign and on the possibility of reading {⌜i⌝}, may be in order.

[483]This pattern is attested in RS 19.102.2, 29.093, and 94.2391. RS 18.040 (see the above footnote) may also belong here.

[484]This pattern is represented uniquely by RS 94.2273.

[485]As mentioned above, on the basis of D. Pardee's collation, RS 18.040 represents an exception (he reads line 6 as { [šb]⌜ʿ⌝d . šbʿ⌜d⌝ }). In the *editio princeps*, Virolleaud's copy (and transcription) reflects only {[...]d . šbʿ[...]}; see *PRU* 5 (1965), no. 63, p. 90. The fact that the relevant sign, {⌜ʿ⌝}, is partially reconstructed for Pardee and was not seen at all by Virolleaud may justify some caution, and perhaps a recollation of this portion of the tablet with the epigraphic possibility of {[ṯn]⌜i⌝d . šbʿ⌜d⌝ } in mind, in order to avoid a formally aberrant phrase.

conjunction *w* had translational relevance.[486] M. Gruber accepted this proposal, and characterized Virolleaud's rendering of *ṯnid šbʿd* as 'deux fois et sept fois'[487] as a "mistranslation", speaking of "Loewenstamm's demonstration of the untenability of Virolleaud's rendering on syntactical grounds. . . ."[488] Loewenstamm and Gruber imply a syntactic interpretation whereby the pattern *šbʿd w šbʿd* means literally 'seven times and seven times', that is, a cumulative total of fourteen times, while *ṯnid šbʿd* means 'twice seven times', also totaling fourteen times, not 'two times (and) seven times', which would amount to nine times total. Thus, in grammatical terminology, these authors have denied the existence of asyndesis for the multiplicative phrases. Asyndetic conjunction, however, is well at home in the Ugaritic texts,[489] and any objection to its presence within the multiplicative phrases must be based on contextual, not "syntactical grounds".

Shortly after the publication of the first examples of the Ugaritic « pros » formula in 1938, H. L. Ginsberg found an important clue to the contextual background of the multiplicative components in the usage of the adverbial phrase *kabattuma u ṣēruma*, 'on the belly and on the back' in the « pros » formulas of the Amarna

---

[486]Loewenstamm, *BASOR* 188 (1967) 41-42, and n. 2, "The editor [Virolleaud, in *PRU* 5 [1965], no. 115, p. 138] explains: 'Le serviteur se prosterne "deux fois et sept fois".' But it should read 'deux fois sept fois' without 'et'."

[487]Virolleaud, *PRU* 5 (1965), no. 115, p. 138 (the page bears the incorrect excavation number for this tablet; it should read "19.102").

[488]Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 233.

[489]See now Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 96.2, pp. 891-903. Among the epistolary formulas, compare the asyndetic construction in the <ben> formula, of which a typical example is *ilm tǵrk tšlmk*, 'May the gods guard you (and) keep you well!'

corpus.[490] The fact that each of the Amarna letters which contains this adverbial phrase also contains a multiplicative component with the numerical combination « 7 : 7 »,[491] lends credence to Ginsberg's contextual interpretation of Ugaritic *šbʿd w šbʿd*, as hinting at "two sorts of prostration". In addition, (1) the well-documented presence of the pattern « *ṯnỉd šbʿd* » alongside « *šbʿd w šbʿd* » in Ugaritic letters governed by the same body of epistolary conventions, (2) the cleanly marked distribution of the conjunction *w* within these two patterns, and (3) the fact that the numerical combination « 2 : 7 », with no intervening conjunction, is by far the most common combination in the Akkadian letters found at Ras Shamra, which appear to follow the same epistolary conventions as those letters written in Ugaritic, strongly favor accepting Loewenstamm's proposal for the interpretation of these numerical combinations, and construing these combinations as referring to a total of fourteen prostrations, seven on the belly, and seven on the back.

However, if Loewenstamm's interpretation is valid, one might expect it to apply to other attestations of the multiplicative phrase among the compositionally identical « pros » formulas in the Ugaritic and comparative corpora. The proposal may be tested by its application to (1) the multiplicative phrase « *šbʿd ṯmnỉd* » in RS 94.2273, and (2) the multiplicative phrases found in the Akkadian and Hittite epistolary traditions containing numerical combinations other than « 2 : 7 » and « 7 : 7 », namely,

---

[490]H. L. Ginsberg, *BASOR* 72 (1938) 19, n. 7: "Virolleaud rightly compares the Amarna formula. . . . However, he fails to note that 7-*šū* and 7-*anni* mean literally 'seven that' and 'seven this' and thus apparently indicate that half the prostrations are ventral and half dorsal. In the Ugaritic *šbʿd* and *šbʿỉd*, *d* and *ỉd* are of ocurse also (familiar Semitic) demonstratives, and no doubt likewise hint at two sorts of prostration." Ginsberg's analysis of the morphology of the multiplicative component, however, is no longer tenable (see above). Virolleaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 129-130; and R. Dussaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 185, also allude to this Amarna adverbial phrase, but in the context of interpreting the word *mrḫqtm*.

[491]See the references given above, in section 2.4.1.

those containing the numerical combinations « 3 : 9 », « 7 » (alone), « 2 : 8 », « 8 : 7 », « 8 : 8 », « 2 : 3 », « 3 : 7», « 8 : 7», possibly « 10 : [?] », and « 2 : 7 : 10 : 12 ».[492] Since all of these combinations omit the conjunction between the numerical components, a mechanical application of Loewenstamm's dismissal of asyndesis would result in a vast diversity in the cumulative number of prostrations expressed, from merely six in the case of RS 34.140, to no less than 1,680 in the case of ME 127.[493] Of especial interest for the Ugaritic epistolary tradition is RS 94.2273, where the cumulative number of prostrations, on this theory, would be fifty-six.

Either way it be interpreted, as 'seven times (and) eight times', that is, fifteen times total, or, as 'sevenfold eight times', that is, fifty-six times, the phrase « *šbʿd ṯmnîd* » lacks the symmetry of the patterns « *šbʿd w šbʿd* », with the conjunction, and « *ṯnîd šbʿd* », without the conjunction. Without this symmetry, it is difficult to justify a contextual interpretation guided by the Amarna phrase *kabattuma u ṣēruma*, for the only similarity lies in the fact that both phrases contain two components.

The Amarna adverbial phrase *kabattuma u ṣēruma* also lacks force as a contextual aid when used to elucidate those multiplicative phrases in the comparative corpora which are composed of only one numerical component, or more than two numerical components. Following Ginsberg's insight, do the multiplicative phrases of EA 52 and 55, for example, which contain a single numerical component, hint at only

---

[492]For references to these multiplicative phrases, see above, section 2.4.1.

[493]Note that many Amarna examples of the combination « 7 : 7 », ostensibly expressing the notion 'seven times and seven times', also omit an intervening conjunction. Compare EA 232-234, and 366, for example, all which also contain the adverbial phrase *kabattuma u ṣēruma*. If the number of prostrations is to be understood as forty-nine, *à la* Loewenstamm, how many were ventral and how many dorsal?

one type of prostration; while that of ME 127, which contains four numerical components, hints at no less than four types of prostration?

Furthermore, past attempts at harmonizing the Amarna adverbial phrases used in the « pros » formula with those of Ugarit have proven deceptive. All of the early treatments, for example, interpreted Ugaritic *mrḫqtm* in the light of the Amarna phrase *kabattuma u ṣēruma*, on the unproven assumption that the context implied by these two adverbial phrases was identical.[494]

An alternative situational context, applicable to the multiplicative phrases of both the Ugaritic and the comparative corpora, is provided by *The Song of Ullikummi*, a myth presumably of Hurrian origin, known in its Hittite version. The myth contains literary prostration motifs which are accompanied by a version of the multiplicative component. Two scenes are of particular importance; H. Hoffner's recent translation of both is given here.[495] The first occurs as a volition in direct speech:

> " [Tasmisu] spoke again to Tessub, '[Hear] my words, my lord Tessub … . Come, let us go to Apzuwa, before Ea. . . . [When] we come before the gate of the house of Ea, we will bow [five times] at Ea's door and [again] five times at Ea's inner door(?). [When] we come [before] Ea, we will bow fifteen times before Ea. Perhaps . . . Ea [will . . .] have pity on us … "

The second represents the narrative fulfillment of the volitional passage given above:

---

[494]See Virolleaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 129-130; Dussaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 185 ("Le terme *mrḫqtm* . . . répond . . . à la prosternation « sur le ventre et sur le dos » des tablettes d'el-Amarna. . . . nous proposons de la comprendre « tout du long ». . . ."); and Ginsberg, *BASOR* 72 (1938) 19, n. 7 ("The dual form [of *mrḫqtm*] and the foregoing data all point to the meaning "on both lengths," i.e., as the Akkadian formula states explicitly , on the belly and on the back").

[495]The translations given here are taken from H. A. Hoffner Jr., *Hittite Myths* (1990), § 49 and § 50, p. 58; anterior bibliography is found on pp. 38-39. The edition of the text (in transcription), is H. G. Güterbock, *The Song of Ullikummi* (1952); the passages used here come from tablet 3, col. 2, lines 17-23 and 30-32 in Güterbock's edition, p. 41. The parallel nature of the episode allows for the reconstruction of the lacunae.

"[When Tessub] heard the words [of Tasmisu], he hastened [and hurried] … . [Tessub] went to the house of Ea. [He bowed five times] at the first [door], he bowed five times at the inner door(?). [When] they arrived before Ea, he bowed [fifteen times before Ea]."

This literary passage provides a context whereby repetition of the act of prostration may be imagined successively, on several different occasions. This is entirely compatible with the other adverbial components of the formula. The adverb *mrḥqtm* marks the point at which the action of prostration is imagined to begin, and the phrase « *l pʿn* N » marks the point at which the action is imagined to terminate. The various repetitions would occur, then, in between these points; and the progressive augmentation of the number of repetitions is not only consistent with what one observes in the epistolary parallels, but intuitively appropriate for expressing greater reverence at greater proximity.

Judging from a Hebrew literary passage from a much later period which portrays prostration , namely, *Genesis* 33:3, this situational context would apply equally well to examples where the number of prostrations is represented by only a single numerical component.

Gen 33:3: וְ□הוּא עָבַר לִ□פְנֵי□הֶם וַ□יִּשְׁתַּחוּ אַרְצָ□ה שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים עַד־גִּשְׁתּ□וֹ עַד־אָחִי□ו׃

"And he [Jacob] moved up in front of them, and prostrated himself to the ground seven times, until he reached his brother."

The valability of this situational context being granted, the possibility of asyndetic conjunction in the multiplicative phrases ought not be dismissed *a priori*, simply in order to achieve a cumulative result of fourteen; rather, it appears necessary to allow more variability in the multiplication of prostrations than previously thought. Granted, the scribes who authored the letters found at Emar and Boğazköy seem to have enjoyed greater flexibility in the use of various integers than that which is visible in the data from Ras Shamra and Amarna; but this should not prevent us from

recognizing the possibility that « *šbʿd w šbʿid* » and « *ṯnid šbʿd* » need not necessarily refer to the same situation, namely, the repetition of the act of prostration fourteen times total, seven times on the belly and seven times on the back. This contextual interpretation is attractive, to be sure, especially for the numerical sequence « 7 : 7 », but its inapplicability in exceptional cases, such as that of RS 94.2273, RS 34.140, and ME 127, requires one to admit the possibility that the multiplicative phrase may also express the successive repetition(s) of the act of prostration, after beginning the gesture *mrḫqtm*, 'from afar', and prior to completing it at a point « *l pʿn* N_R », 'at the two feet of', the recipient; polite protocol apparently encouraged the number of these repetitions to increase with increasing proximity to the honoree. Such an interpretive context is consistent with both the Amarna adverbial phrase *kabattuma u ṣēruma*, 'on the belly and on the back', two "manners" in which one can lie prostrate, and the Akkadian verb *garāru*, 'to roll over',[496] which provides a means of not only of moving from the belly to the back, but also of progressively approaching the honoree. It is also consistent with all the attested numerical combinations of the comparative corpora, not merely those typical of Ras Shamra and Amarna.[497]

In this light, and without further evidence to clarify the context, it is perhaps best to translate the Ugaritic phrase *ṯnid šbʿd* literally, as 'two times, seven times', bearing in mind two possible situational contexts: (1) 'twice seven times', for a total of

---

[496]Compare its presence in Msk 7451.1 (from Meskene) and in ME 127 (from a private collection).

[497]The multiplicative components of the syllabic « pros » formulas found at Ras Shamra and Meskene are predominatly of the « 2 : 7 » type; and those from Amarna are dominated by the « 7 : 7 » combination. The corpus is small, but Hittite letters from Boğazköy show a preference for the « 3 : 9 » combination. The pattern « 2 : 7 » is found in a few Akkadian letters from Boğazkoy, probably all of which stemming from Bentašina of Amurru, and thus underlining the Syrian nature of this numerical combination.

fourteen prostrations, of which seven were conceivably ventral and seven dorsal, or (2) 'two times, (and then) seven times', alluding to two occasions of prostration, in which one augmented the number of prostrations as one approached the honoree.

The phrase *šbʿd ṯmnid* in RS 94.2273 is also amenable to both interpretations; although the editors may be correct in imagining this pattern to be a poetic adaptation of the standard *šbʿd w šbʿd* : "La formule « sept fois, huit fois » reflète vraisemblablement la tendance poétique de présenter tout en phrases parallèles, car lorsqu'il s'agit du parallélisme numérique la formule habituelle est « x // x + 1 ».''[498] The fact that parallelistic expansions may be considered characteristic of letters composed as scribal exercises,[499] of which this tablet is probably one, supports such a view.

2.6.6 The word hllm

The tablet RS 94.2273, probably a scribal exercise in the form of a letter, contains the first known occurrence of the word *hllm* in the Ugaritic corpus. It appears there as a component of the « pros » formula:

RS 94.2273, lines 2-6: { l pʿn (3) ⌜ả⌝ḫy . hl⌜l⌝m . (4) mrḥq⌜tm⌝ (5) qlt . šbʿd (6) ṯmnid ⌜.⌝ qlt }

On the level of clause syntax, the word is probably an adverb, considering (1) the fact that the verbal predication and an indication of its grammatical subject are already present in the verbal forms *qlt*, (2) the fact that other optional components of the « pros » formula in Ugaritic and in the comparative corpora are all adverbial, and

---

[498]P. Bordreuil *et al.*, *Textes ougaritiques 1994-2002* (in preparation).

[499]Compare, for example, the greatly expanded form of the <ben> formula used in RS 16.265, lines 2-6, also probably a scribal exercise.

(3) the presence of the "enclitic" suffix *-m*, which is frequently found attached to nouns in the (adverbial) accusative case.

Assuming a Semitic origin for the word, a preliminary morphological division suggests itself: *hll* + *m*. In an adverbial context, the "enclitic" suffix *-m* is not out of place.[500] The sequence *hll*, in turn, may be interpreted in at least two ways: (1) as a trilateral root HLL, or (2) an agglomeration of several constituent particles.[501]

Despite the fact that several cognate languages contain a productive verbal root HLL, with semantics entirely consistent with the contextual burden of the « pros » formula,[502] the fact that no certain attestation of this root has yet been recognized in Ugaritic[503] renders this possibility rather weak.

A single comparative datum from Tell Atchana offers a tempting, but ultimately disappointing, parallel to Ugaritic *hllm*. Lines 4-6 of AT 107 read: {(4) a-na GÌR-pé be-li-ia [(?)] (5) a-li-na-ma LÚ.MEŠ [...] (6) i-na URU ku-ši-pu.KI [

---

[500]On the "enclitic" *-m* suffix with adverbial meaning in Ugartic, see Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 89.21, p. 826; on the same topic in the Semitic languages in general, see Lipiński, *Comparative Grammar* (1997) 260-262.

[501]Compare, for example, K. Aartun, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen* 1 (1974) 3; and the comments of Bordreuil and Pardee in their unpublished manuscript of the *editio princeps* of this text, where they speak of " la présence entre *l pʿn …* et *mrḫqtm* de l'adverbe *hllm*, forme précédemment inconnue qui doit consister en l'adverbe *hl*, « ici, voici », suivi des éléments d'allongement *-l-* et *-m*.…"

[502]On the root HLL in Arabic, Akkadian, Hebrew, and various Aramaic dialects, see D. Cohen, F. Bron, and A. Lonnet, *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques* 5 (H-HṮṮ) (1995) 414-415. The Hebrew verb הִלֵּל, 'to praise (D-stem)', and the noun תְּהִלָּה, 'praise', provide semantics which would fit especially well in the « pros » formula.

[503]Some have proposed that the etymology of the word *hll* in the divine epithet *bnt hll*, 'the daughters of HLL (?)', which is used parallel to the *kṯrt*-deities in the mythological texts, be sought in this verb, HLL, meaning not so much 'to praise' as 'to shout' (the notion of 'shouting' being considered appropriate for goddesses of childbirth). Other etymological proposals exist, however; see del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 165.

(?)]}.[504] Line 4 is obviously a remnant of the « pros » formula;[505] and the item of interest here is the word {a-li-na-ma} at the beginning of line 5, which would appear to be a deictic particle.[506] If indeed it is part of the « pros » formula, it would provide a valuable parallel with *hllm* in RS 94.2273. Wiseman's transliteration implies that no signs have been lost following {be-li-ia} on line 4; and such is consistent with the placement of the {ma} sign of {qí-bí-ma} on line 2 in the copy, where these three signs are spaced out evenly on the line in such a way that {ma} would be very near the right margin of writing. If such were the case, {a-li-na-ma} and *hllm* would both have been placed immediately following the « *ana šēpē* N » / « *1 pʿn* N » prepositional element. Even if it be allowed that {ma} marks the right margin of the recto surface, however, nothing prevents the scribe from having continued the impression of line 4 past this margin, and onto the right edge, which is now lost.[507] Furthermore, given the signs which follow on line 5, namely, {LÚ.MEŠ}, as well as the unambiguous reference to a city on line 6, two phrases which are difficult to explain as components of the « pros » formula, it appears best to reconstruct the prostration verb in the lacuna following {be-li-ia} in line 4, and consequently to interpret the word {a-li-na-ma} in line 5 as marking the transition from the formulaic *praescriptio* to the body of the

---

[504]See D. J. Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets* (1953) 58 (transliteration), and pl. 24 (copy).

[505]Compare lines 4-6 of AT 115.

[506]That the form {a-li-na-ma} is Akkadian is not immediately obvious (though compare also poorly attested Akkadian deictics *alānumma*, and *allānum*, both mentioned in *CAD*); it could easily reflect an underlying West Semitic morphology, however, deriving from "le dialecte parlé dans l'Amq au IIe millénaire avant notre ère" (D. Arnaud, *AuOr* 16 [1998] 144) rather than from the literary Akkadian dialect as used in the western periphery. To my knowledge, the form is not mentioned by G. Giacumakis in *The Akkadian of Alalaḫ* (1970), nor by D. Arnaud in *AuOr* 16 (1998) 143-186.

[507]Compare lines 3, 5, and 6 on Wiseman's copy of AT 11, for example. Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets* (1953), pl. 25.

letter;[508] and not as a component of the « pros » formula. This possibility being dismissed, I know of no parallels for Ugaritic *hllm* in the « pros » formulas of the comparative corpora.

If a deictic origin of *hllm* be allowed, the word's morphology may be understood in the light of other West Semitic "deictic" particles derived from a **hallV-* base.[509] This category of particles includes the Ugaritic deictics *hl*, *hlm*, *hln*, *hlk*, and *hlny*;[510] the word *hllm* would appear to represent a new addition to this series.

The phonemic structure underlying the morphology is not obvious, but a reasonable reconstruction is possible on the basis of both internal and external evidence. The syllabic writing {al-li-ni-ya},[511] if John Huehnergard is correct in proposing this as the Ugaritic deictic particle corresponding to Sumerian UD and Akkadian *anumma*, and written in alphabetic texts as *hlny*,[512] would appear to provide internal evidence of the morpho-phonemic structure of the *hl-* component: */halli-/. This sequence, in turn, may be further subdivided, on the basis of comparative Semitic evidence, into the deictic particles */han-/ and */-li-/, the latter of these apparently having been repeated in the Ugaritic word *hllm*. The final *-m* on *hllm* is easily

---

[508]Compare a similar function for the Ugaritic deictic particle *hlny*, and for RS Akkadian *anumma*.

[509]On a broad Semitic level, compare the data assembled in Cohen, et al., *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques* 5 (H-HT̲T̲) (1995) 408-409. On the Amarna forms, probably also to be derived from **hallu-*, see now A. F. Rainey, *CAT* 3 (1996) 159-167 (although Rainey does not reconstruct the consonantal phoneme /*h*/, but classifies these forms under *allû*, a normalization more familiar to the Assyriological tradition).

[510]On these particles, see now del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 164-165. J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 81.4, pp. 750-751, classifies these particles as "Demonstrative Adverbien".

[511]J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968), no. 138, line 5'.

[512]J. Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 121.

explainable as "enclitic" *-m*, which is often found attached to nouns used adverbially.[513] A plausible phonemic reconstruction of the word is */hallilima/*.

Without the benefit of other Ugaritic attestations of this word, its semantics cannot be defined on the basis of inner Ugaritic usage, but must rest solely on (1) the textual context in which it occurs, and (2) plausible etymological proposals. Furthermore, even if its etymology as a compound deictic particle be granted, the semantics of *hllm* are not greatly clarified. Given the situational context of the prostration formula, the adverb *hllm* ought to describe or elaborate a means of "falling down at the two feet of" the recipient in some contextually appropriate way. The components *l p'n* N_R and *mrḥqtm* already communicate two "local" adverbial nuances: terminative and ablative, respectively. Does *hllm* represent a third "local" nuance? Such is a possibility; another possibility is that *hllm* is purely deictic, or "presentative",[514] like French "voici". It was argued above that the verbal utterance of the « pros » formula was a performative occurring in an epistolary context. Does the word *hllm* represent a lexical marking of this nuance, in a manner similar the optional use of the German deictic "hiermit" and English "hereby" in marking performatives?

---

[513]The observation that enclitic *-m* frequently accompanies nouns in the (adverbial) accusative is not to be taken as an attribution of adverbial semantics to the particle; see above.

[514]In speaking of the etymologically related particle *hlny*, D. Pardee, in his manuscript of *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 10 (RS 3.427), commentaire, ligne 3', comments that "sa principale fonction est d'ajouter à la simple notion de *deixis* (« voici ») une nuance de lieu (« ici »)." In a footnote he adds "Nous nous exprimons ainsi parce qu'il nous paraît clair que la fonction des deux particules *hl-* et *hn-* était à l'origine et restait en ougaritique « présentative » ; il en va de même de *hinnē^{h}* en hébreu biblique (il ne s'agit pas d'une particule d'existence, mais de présentation)." Compare also the editors' use of "presentative" *voici* in their provisional translation of this formula (P. Bordreuil *et al.*, *Textes ougaritiques 1994-2002* [in preparation]): "Aux pieds de mon frère voici de loin je tombe ; sept fois, huit fois je tombe."

2.7 Classification of the « pros » formulas by conceptual category

As above with the address formulas, this chapter ends with a brief section summarizing the typological classification of the Ugaritic « pros » formulas. Its purpose is to provide a brief review, in tabular form, of the distribution of the various compositional patterns found in the corpus of Ugaritic « pros » formulas.

2.7.1 In conceptually ASCENDING letters

2.7.1.1 « ASC POW »

RS 9.479A:6-11	« *l pʿn ảdty šbʿd w šbʿỉd mrḥqtm qlt* »
RS 16.137[bis]:5-7	« *l pʿn ảdty šbʿd w* [*š*]*b*[ʿ(*ỉ*)*d*] *mrḥqt*[*m*] *ql*[*t*] »
RS 16.402:3-4	« [*l pʿn ả*]*dty mrḥqm* [*qlt*] »
RS 17.327:4-5	« [*l pʿn*] ⌜*bʿly*⌝ (?) [… *qlt*] »
RS 18.040:5-8	« [*l*] *pʿn bʿly* [*šb*] *ʿd šbʿd m*[*r*]*ḫqtm qlt* »
RS 18.113+:4-5	« *l pʿn bʿly* [*mrḥqtm*] *šbʿd w šbʿd* [*qlt*] »
RS 18.140.2:10'-11'	« *l pʿn bʿly m*[*rḥ*]*qtm qlt* »
RS 18.287:2'-4'	« [*l pʿn bʿ*]*ly šb*[ʿ*d w šbʿ*(*ỉ*)*d*] *mrḥqt*[*m qlt*] »
RS 18.[312]:2'-3'	« [*l*] *pʿn b*[ʿ*ly* …] *w šbʿd* [… *qlt*] »
RS 19.102.2:17-20	« *l pʿn bʿly ṯnỉd šbʿd mrḥqtm qlt* »
RS 20.199:4-7	« *l pʿn ảdty mrḥqtm šbʿd w šbʿd qlt* »
RS 29.093:8-10	« *l pʿn bʿlny ṯnỉd šbʿd mrḥqtm qlny* »
RS 92.2010:6-9	« *l pʿn bʿly šbʿd w šbʿd mrḥqtm qlt* »
RS 94.2391:4-6	« *l pʿn bʿly ṯnỉd šbʿd mrḥqtm qlt* »
RS 94.2428:1'-3'	« [*l pʿ*]⌜*n*⌝ ⌜*b*⌝[ʿ*ly* …]*d m*[*rḥqtm qlt*] »

RS 94.2479:3 « [*l p*] ʿ*n ảdty qlt* »

RS 94.5009:5-6 « *w l p*⌈ʿ*n*⌉ *ả*⌈*d*⌉[*ty t*̲]⌈*nỉ*⌉[*d*] *š*⌈*b*⌉[ʿ(*ỉ*)*d … qlt*] »

RIH 78/03+:5'-6' « *l p*ʿ*n* [*b*ʿ*ly q*]*lt* »

Letters which contain ASC POW relational terminology typically contain the « pros » formula.[515] The composition of the formula in such letters usually includes one or both of the "optional" adverbial elements.[516] Given these tendancies, special interpretive attention should be paid to ASC POW letters which do not contain a « pros » formula, or in which the « pros » formula is present but does not include one or both of the "optional" components.

2.7.1.2 « ASC BIO »

RS 11.872:5-6 « *l p*ʿ*n ủmy qlt* »

RS 16.379:4-5 « *l p*ʿ*n ủmy qlt* »

RS 19.102.1:6-7 « *l p*ʿ[*n ảdny*] *q*[*lt*] »

RS 34.124:4 « [*l p*] ʿ*n ủmy* [*qlt*] »

RS 94.5003+:4 « *l p*ʿ*n* [*ủmy qlt*] »

---

[515]The *praescriptio* of the following conceptually ASC POW letters is entirely or virtually intact, but explicitly omits the « pros » formula: probably RS 18.148, RS 19.011, RS 34.148, and probably RS 34.356. All but one of these (the exception is RS 34.148) show various features of form or context atypical for the Ugaritic corpus.

[516]Two exceptions are RS 94.2479 and RIH 78/03+, which omit both "optional" elements. In this respect, their composition resembles that of « pros » formulas in letters conceived on the biological kinship model (either ASC BIO or HOR BIO); see below.

The majority of conceptually ascending Ugaritic letters conceived on the BIO model contain the « pros » formula.[517] None of the « pros » formulas present in this group contain either of the "optional" components.

2.7.1.3 « ASC MIXED »

RS 8.315:5-7 « *l pʿn ådtny mrḥqtm qlny* »

RIH 78/12:2-3 « *l pʿnk qlt* »

Two Ugaritic letters employ explicitly ascending relational terminology drawn from both conceptual models. Both of these letters contain the « pros » formula. The pronominal reference to the recipient in RIH 78/12 is unique in the corpus.[518]

2.7.2 In « HOR BIO » letters

RS 94.2273:1-6 « *ql*[*t*] *l pʿn åḫy hllm mrḥqtm qlt šbʿd ṯmnỉd qlt* »

RS 94.2545+:17 « [*l p*]*ʿn ỉḫy qlt* »

Outside of explicitly ascending letters, the « pros » formula is rare. Its presence is certain, however, in the two conceptually horizontal letters cited here. The two letters

---

[517]Exceptions are RS 15.008, RS 17.139, and RS 92.2005.1, which are ASC BIO but explicitly omit the « pros » formula.

[518]But compare the same feature in at least two Ras Shamra Akkadian letters: RS 20.200C and RS 20.232. The usage of a pronoun in a REL slot, and the concommitant omission of social status information, is consistent with a pattern visible elsewhere in the employment of the biological kinship model: less informational content presumably indicates less attention to social status differences, and, by extension, a lack of explicit deference. A similar situation will be encountered in the "salutation" formula (see below, chapter 3): « *yšlm lk* », which uses a pronoun for the N_R element, may be considered less deferential than « *l ådty yšlm* ».

derive from a similar archeological and prosopographical context.[519] The elaborate composition of RS 94.2273 may be related to its status as a scribal exercise.[520] The brevity of the formula in RS 94.2545+ is consistent with its composition in other letters composed on the biological kinship model.

2.7.3 In letters of unknown conceptual classification

RS 18.[364]:3' « […]*mr*⌜*ḫ*⌝[*qtm* (?) …] »

The presence of the « pros » formula in this letter is not certain.

---

[519]See the editions of these tablets below, in part 2.

[520]Compare the expanded « ben » formula in another scribal exercise: RS 16.265.1; and see the edition of RS 94.2273 below, in part 2.

CHAPTER 3

THE SALUTATION FORMULA

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Two of the "polite formulas" are volitive expressions which communicate the sender's desire for the well-being of the recipient. They may be represented by the following well-attested forms:

(1) « *yšlm lk* », 'May it be well for you.'

(2) « *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* », 'May the gods guard you, may they keep you well.'

The first formula is not only the simpler of the two in terms of grammatical complexity, but also the more general in scope. It is an impersonal volition, expressing the sender's hope that "it be well" for the recipient. The verbal predication is derived from the root ŠLM, the regular verb for expressing the notion of "well-being" in Ugaritic. Throughout this dissertation, I will refer to this formula as the "salutation",[1]

---

[1]I follow J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 244, 251-254, in using the term "salutation" to refer specifically to this short volitional formula, namely Ugaritic *yšlm lk* and variants, and to no other polite formula or group of formulas. The use of the term "salutation" in this dissertation is thus distinct from, and not to be confused with, that of S. Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 49-50 (referring to the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra) and p. 99 (referring to the Ugaritic letters), who uses this term to refer collectively to the three formulas called in this dissertation the "polite formulas" (see above, section 2.1): ". . . the salutation . . . can include as many as three sections: 1) obeisance of the sender to the addressee, 2) greeting, and 3) divine blessing, in that order." J. Huehnergard, *HUS* (1999) 376 (also referring to the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra), follows her in this usage. J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 (1955) 5, n. 2 (referring to the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra), also uses "les salutations" in a wider sense; as does M. Liverani, *SDB* 9 (1979), cols. 1328-1329: "la manque de salutations [in letters] est consideré comme grave," by which he surely means the omission of not only the formula referred to here as « sal » (in RS Akkadian, *lū šulmu ana muḫḫīka*, and variants), but also others motifs, such as the one which is here called the "request for information" formula (see below, chapter 5), judging from the (Akkadian) examples Liverani cites: RS 13.007B (see Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 [1955] 6), and KUB 3, no. 74

abbreviated « sal ». It is treated in the pages which follow. The second formula is more grammatically complex and more specific or "marked" from a semantic point of view. It will be referred to as the "benediction", abbreviated « ben », and will be treated below in chapter 4.

Some students of Ugaritic epistolography have considered the « sal » and the « ben » formulas not as distinct and independent epistolary formulas in their own right, but rather collectively, as a single complex greeting formula.[2] I have followed

---

(see H. Otten, *AfO* Beiheft 12 [1970] 64-65), to which one may add RS 15.033 (see Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 [1955] 15-16). Similarly, A. Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), cols. 1413-1415, uses the term "salutation" in a slightly wider sense, in speaking of "plusieurs formules de salutation", a phrase which he uses to describe both « sal » and « ben », and other polite formulas; F. B. Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 199 (referring to the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra), likewise implies a wider understanding of the term: "one or more salutation formulae may be present"; for him the RS Akkadian formula *lū šulmu ana muḫḫīka*, and variants, is just one type of salutation among many. As for the specific volitional formula here called the "salutation" or « sal », that is, Ugaritic « *yšlm lk* » and variants, S. E. Loewenstamm, *BASOR* 194 (1969) 52, calls it "the short greeting", to be contrasted with "the complex [greeting] formula", by which he refers to Ugaritic *yšlm lk ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* (a sequence here considered as two distinct formulas, namely, the « sal », followed by the « ben »). O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 15, uses the phrase "der einfache Gruss", for both the Ugaritic « sal » formula and its Akkadian equivalent. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 244, 251-254, as mentioned above, uses "salutation", but in the recent English abridgement, *HUS* (1999) 363, he uses "the greeting". Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 49-55, 77-81 (referring to the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters), and pp. 99-102, 117-118 (referring to the Ugaritic letters), also calls it "the greeting". Note that Cunchillos' and Ahl's use of "the greeting" should thus not be confused with that of A. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 150-153, who denotes with this term both the formula here called the salutation (or « sal »), and the formula here called the benediction (or « ben »); that is, he treats these two formulas together as "the greeting". Huehnergard, *HUS* (1999) 375-376 (discussing the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters), refers descriptively (and accurately) to the « sal » formula as "a wish for the well-being of the addressee". In discussing the formulary of Middle Assyrian letters, E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 56, characterizes the Akkadian version of this formula as a type of "Grussformel", and, p. 59, specifically calls it "[der] Wunsch nach Wohlbefinden des Empfängers", and more simply "[der] *Šulmu*-Wunsch". A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 64-67, in discussing this formula in letters of the Hittite realm (in Akkadian and in Hittite), classifies it as a "Briefeinleitungsformel" (p. 64), and specifically labels it "Die Wunsch für das Wohlergehen einer Person" (p. 64); she also discusses the Hittite equivalent. E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 59, mentions a precise equivalent to the « sal » in Middle Babylonian (Kassite) letters, which he describes as a type of "Grussformel". Compare also L. Milano, *VOr* 3 (1980) 192, who uses the term "la salutatio" to denote the ensemble (*yšlm lk ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk*) here identified as the « sal » and the « ben » formulas: "La salutatio . . . si articola in due parti, la prima contenente il vero e proprio saluto, la seconda intesa ad impetrare la protezione divina sul destinatario della missiva."

[2]Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 150-153, treats the « sal » and « ben » formulas together as "the greeting". Loewenstamm, *BASOR* 194 (1969) 52, who had called the « sal » formula, Ugaritic *yšlm lk*

O. Kaiser,[3] S. Ahl,[4] and J.-L. Cunchillos,[5] however, in treating the « sal » formula separately and independently of the « ben » formula, for the following reasons: (1) the « sal » formula occurs a fair number of times without the « ben » formula,[6] and often in

---

and variants, "the short greeting", refers to Ugaritic *yšlm lk ìlm tǵrk tšlmk* as "the complex [greeting] formula", a chain which will be analyzed here as a sequence of two distinct formulas, « sal ben ».

[3]Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 15-16: "Als weitere Grundform ist neben dem Gruss (G) [= « sal »] der Schutzwunsch (SW) *ilānu liṣṣurūka*, 'Die Götter mögen dich beschützen!' [= « ben »], anzuführen."

[4]Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 49-55, 77-81 (referring to the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters), and pp. 99-102, 117-118 (referring to the Ugaritic letters); she refers to the « sal » as "the greeting".

[5]Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 244, 251-254: "On différencie donc la salutation des voeux à contenu religieux exprimés, souvent, immediatement après" (p. 251).

[6]Cunchillos, *ibid.*, pp. 251-252, had already noted "la présence de salutation sans voeux dans quelques lettres" (he alludes to KTU 2.10 [RS 4.475]; 2.33 [RS 16.402+]; 2.67? [RS 19.181A]; and RIH 78/3+30). We may probably add RS 15.158 (partially reconstructed) to this list; collation has allowed the improvement of the reading in the *editio princeps* (C. Virolleaud, *PRU* 2 [1957], no. 11, p. 25 [no photo]). Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 20 (RS 15.158), reads {yš⌈lm⌉ [. lk]} at the end of line 2, wrapped around the right edge of the tablet and onto the verso (collation from a photograph of the recto would have prevented seeing the end of the line); this reading is also found in M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartin, *KTU*^{2} (1995), no. 2.20. The new letter RS 94.2406.2 also contains a « sal » formula, but no « ben ». In four of these letters (RS 4.475, RS 15.158, RS 19.181A [probably], and RS 94.2406.2) , the « sal » formula is the sole polite formula present (the « pros » formula precedes the « sal » in the other two); structural similarities among these four, namely, the fact that the order of mention in the address is « SR » (appropriate for conceptually unmarked, descending and some horizontal letters), may be significant. In RS 1.020 and RS 3.334, the « sal » is also the only polite formula present, but in both of these, (1) the « sal » is non-standard in composition, either showing an unusual volitional form, an unusual expansion, or both; and (2) there is no certain trace of the « S » element of the address. In these (minor) respects, these letters may represent an independent epistolary tradition. As mentioned by Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 252, n. 37, several Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra contain not only a single polite formula, the « sal », without the « ben » or the « pros », but also this « sal » formula is isolated from what precedes and follows by scribal lines (it is, in fact, fairly well-attested for the entire group of polite formulas to be separated from the rest of the letter by scribal lines; these cases appear to represent the same usage, though with a polite formula section consisting of only one element, the « sal »). Cunchillos lists RS 12.033:4; RS 8.333:4; RS 15.011:4; RS 16.003:4 (all of which are published by J. Nougayrol in *PRU* 3 [1955]); RS 17.289:5; RS 17.292:5; RS 17.385:5; RS 17.394+:4; RS 17.423:5 (published by Nougayrol in *PRU* 4 [1956]); RS 20.003:4; RS 20.162:5; RS 20.216:4; RS 20.237:4; and RS 20.248:5 (published by Nougayrol in *Ugaritica* 5 [1968]); and RS 17.452:4 (published by Nougayrol in *PRU* 6 [1970]). To these we may add RS 10.046; RS 15.014; RS 15.178; RS 16.112 (Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 [1955]); RS 17.315; RS 17.397B+ (Nougayrol, *PRU* 4 [1956]); RS 20.013; RS 20.022; RS 20.168; RS 20.182A,B; RS 20.184; RS 20.200C; RS 20.238; RS 20.243; RS 21.064 (Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 [1968]); RS 17.148.2; RS 17.451; RS 17.455; RS 19.050; and RS 19.080(?) (Nougayrol, *PRU* 6 [1970]). Many of the subsequently published Akkadian letters

fairly specific circumstances; (2) the « ben » formula occurs several times without the « sal » formula;[7] (3) the two formulas are grammatically independent utterances, with different grammatical subjects and predications;[8] (4) the differences in the composition and distribution of the two formulas show that, for the scribes who inscribed these letters, the two formulas were not confused;[9] and (5) in terms of

---

also show this structure: RS 34.135; RS 34.136; RS 34.140; RS 34.143; RS 34.145; RS 34.146; RS 34.163; RS 34.165; and RS 34.180,60 (published by Fl. Malbran-Labat and D. Arnaud in RSO 7 [1991]).

[7]Seven example are certain: RS 8.315 (« RS | pros ben i.r. s.r. », [the abbreviation « i.r. s.r. » refers to the "motif of reciprocal well-being", discussed below in chapter 5]), RS 16.265 (« SR ben | body »; the nature of the text inscribed on the verso, and the frivolous content of the body of this letter suggest a scribal exercise; the « ben » formula here is an expanded version of the standard « ben »), RS 92.2010 (« RS ben pros i.r. s.r. »), probably RS 94.2273 (« SR pros ben »; the method of inscription of this tablet, the nature of the two texts inscribed [one on each face], and the structure of the letter all suggest a scribal exercise; see below in the edition of this text), RS 94.2383+ (« RS | ben | body »), and RS [Varia 4] (« SR ben | body »). Another probable example is RS 94.2545+ (« SR body RS body pros ben body »; the tablet may or may not contain multiple letters. In the middle of the text, one can reconstruct the sequence « pros ben », followed by a non-formulaic section of the body; though the text is quite fragmentary in places, no traces of any « sal » formula remain). RS 18.113 may represent another example of sorts; it contains two polite formulas: (1) the reconstructable remains of a standard « pros » formula, followed by (2) a polite formula otherwise unattested in Ugaritic, containing an apparently declarative statement that the sender has "spoken" (*ånkn rgmt*, 'I myself have spoken') "before" (*l pn*) various gods "the splendour? of (your) eternal kingship" (this interpretation of the phrase *nmry mlk ʿlm* follows M. Dijkstra, *HUS* [1999] 158); no « sal » formula is present. While this second polite formula is substantially different from the standard « ben » formula, it is conceptually similar in involving divine parties in the concern for (probably) the recipient's well-being.

[8]One similarity between the two formulas is etymological: the « sal » formula contains a jussive form of the root ŠLM in the G-stem, *yšlm*, 'may it be well', while the « ben » formula often contains a jussive form of the same root in the D-stem, *tšlmk*, 'may they cause you to be well'.

[9]Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 2 (RS 1.018), remarques épistolographiques, outlines the difference in usage between the « sal » and the « ben » formulas; he claims that this difference "se remarque par deux aspects principaux de l'emploi de ces formules : (1) là où les deux types de vœux se rencontrent dans une même lettre, *yšlm l-* précède sans exception l'autre série ; (2) la formule *yšlm l-* ne varie que par l'expression de l'objet du vœu, alors que l'autre ne comporte pas un seul élément verbal mais jusqu'à trois, et l'ordre des deux principaux composants verbaux, N□R et ŠLM, n'est pas fixe. Elles varient aussi par leur contenu : le sujet de *yšlm* est indéfini, alors que les verbes de la seconde série ont pour sujet *ìlm*, « les dieux ». Le premier veux constitue donc une salutation et les autres des bénédictions. . . . Les deux aspects d'emploi cités suffisent, nous semble-t-il, pour distinguer les deux sortes de vœux." Pardee, *ibid.*, adds, in a footnote, "Que les scribes ne les aient pas confondues est amplement indiqué par les deux aspects d'emploi mentionnés dans le texte."

information theory, the « sal » shows a higher, and thus different, informational content than the « ben ».[10]

This distinction being made, it is also necessary to acknowledge the profound conceptual and contextual similarities between the « sal » and the « ben » formulas, even if these similarities should not prevent us from recognizing the distinctiveness, and independent status, of each:[11] (1) both the « sal » and the « ben » are volitional in aspect, and (2) both are specifically concerned with the well-being, expressed by various forms of the root ŠLM, of the recipient. Furthermore, (3) the two formulas share a very similar distribution; when both are present, they are invariably placed adjacent to one another, in the order « sal ben ».[12] Finally, (4) the two formulas are never separated by a horizontal scribal line;[13] in fact, they are quite often inscribed in an "enjambed" fashion, such that the « ben » formula often begins on the same line on which the « sal » ends. In light of these similarities, it may indeed be justified to

---

[10]This difference in informational content is manifested in the composition of the « sal » formula: the distribution of the compositional patterns reflects an explicit acknowledgement of the higher status of the recipient in conceptually ascending letters. The « ben » formula, on the other hand, contains no such informational content regarding the relationship between sender and recipient, but merely "phatic greeting"; see M. Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 182-186.

[11]Compare the similar statement of Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 2 (RS 1.018), remarques épistolographiques: "En décrivant toutes ces formules comme des vœux, nous n'avons pas l'intention de nier qu'il y ait une différence d'usage entre *yšlm l-* et l'autre série."

[12]By my calculations, as many as twenty-two Ugaritic letters contain both the « sal » and the « ben »; in all of them the two formulas are not only adjacent to one another, but appear in the order « sal ben »: RS 1.018, RS 1.021, probably RS 3.427, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 15.174, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 19.029, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 29.095, RS 34.124, RS 34.148, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2428, RS 94.2537, and RS 94.5003+. I know of no Ugaritic letters in which the « ben » formula precedes the « sal » formula.

[13]This feature, of course, follows from the status of these two formulas as "polite formulas", since horizontal scribal lines do not occur within the "polite formulas" section of the letter. See above, section 0.3.1.

distinguish these two elements with a common cover term:[14] on a descriptive level the cover term "volitive expressions of well-being" is accurate. Even granting the validity of such a cover term for the « sal » and « ben » formulas, however, a detailed analysis of Ugaritic epistolary structure must also address the dissimilarities in form, meaning, and contextual usage between these two formulas, and for this purpose it is convenient to treat the « sal » and « ben » formulas separately, and to have a distinct terminology for each.[15]

Finally, the « sal » formula is treated here, following the « pros » formula, but prior to the « ben », because (1) it more often follows the « pros » formula, when only these two formulas are present;[16] (2) it always precedes the « ben » formula, when only those two are present;[17] and (3), when all three polite formulas are present, the

---

[14]Compare the discussion in Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 253-254. It is no doubt in this collective sense, namely, as a general cover term for any of those volitional formulas which follow the address and precede the body, that Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 (1955) 5, n. 2 (referring to the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra); Liverani, *SDB* 9 (1979), cols. 1328-1329; Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), cols. 1413-1415, refer to "les salutations"; and Milano, *VOr* 3 (1980) 192, to "la salutatio". So also Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 199, 203-206 (referring to the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra): "[the] salutation". Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967), *passim*, also uses a convenient cover term, as is clear from the title of his work, while discussing individual varieties.

[15]Compare the usage of Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 56, who characterizes the Middle Assyrian versions of these formulas as "Grussformeln", but, p. 59, specifically calls the « sal » formula "[der] Wunsch nach Wohlbefinden des Empfängers" and more "[der] *Šulmu*-Wunsch". Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 64-67, in discussing this formula in letters of the Hittite realm (in Akkadian and in Hittite), also uses a cover term, "Briefeinleitungsformel" (p. 64), and specifically labels the « sal » formula "Die Wunsch für das Wohlergehen einer Person" (p. 64).

[16]At present, four letters illustrate this feature; they include RS 16.402 (« pros sal », where both formulas are reasonably certain, but have been partially reconstructed), RS 94.2391 (« pros sal [?] »), RS 94.2479 (« pros sal »), and RIH 78/03+ (« pros sal [?] », where the « sal » formula, though not preserved in its entirety, is a greatly expanded version of the more common pattern). An exception is RS 94.5009, (« sal pros [?] »), if lines 4-6 have been correctly reconstructed (see below, in the edition of that tablet). On RS 18.[364] as another potential exception, see above, section 2.2.

[17]I count sixteen such situations in the known corpus, and no attested exceptions: RS 1.018 (« sal ben », where both formulas, though reasonably certain, have been partially reconstructed),

« sal » formula is regularly placed in the middle, following the « pros », but prior to the « ben » formula.[18]

3.2 Composition of the « sal » formula

As was the case with the address formula, the presence of several distinct formal variants of the salutation formula makes it difficult to describe the compositional structure of all attested Ugaritic « sal » formulas in a straightforward and categorical way. On the one hand, these variants, taken collectively, show sufficient formal and functional similarity to justify their inclusion under the broader rubric of "salutation formula", but, on other hand, any attempt at describing the compositional structure of the internally diverse corpus which results would be not only unnecessarily and overly general, but also needlessly complicated. In order to avoid this, I have concentrated on describing that compositional pattern of the « sal » formula which is not only statistically preponderant but also contextually normative,[19] and have

---

RS 1.021 (« sal ben »), RS 3.427 (« [?] sal ben », where both formulas have been heavily reconstructed), RS 15.008 (« sal ben »), RS 15.174 (« sal ben »), RS 17.139 (« sal ben »), RS 18.031 (« sal ben »), RS 18.075 (« sal ben », where both formulas have been heavily reconstructed), RS 18.134 (« sal ben »), RS 18.147 (« sal ben »), RS 19.029 (« sal ben »), RS 29.095 (« sal ben »), RS 34.148 (« sal ben », where the « sal » is slightly unusual in containing an ID element as well as a REL element), RS 92.2005.1 (« sal ben ») and RS 92.2005.2 (« sal ben »), and RS 94.2537 (« sal ben [?] », where both formulas have been partially reconstructed).

[18]The present corpus yields seven such letters: RS 11.872 (« pros sal ben »), RS 16.379 (« pros sal ben »), RS 20.199 (« pros sal ben »), RS 34.124 (« pros sal ben », where the « sal » formula is unusual in showing *šlm* rather than *yšlm* as the volitional form, unless a scribal error is involved), RS 94.2391 (« pros sal ben », where the benediction has been almost entirely reconstructed), RS 94.2428 (« pros sal ben », where all three formulas have been heavily reconstructed), RS 94.5003+ (« pros sal ben », where all three formulas have been partially reconstructed). RS 29.093 represents an exception (« sal ben pros »), though in this case the « sal » formula is non-standard, *p šlm l bʿlny*, a factor which may or may not be significant in explaining the sequence of formulas.

[19]My means of defining the "standard" form of the « sal » formula in Ugaritic are thus intended to be both statistical and contextual. The form described here as standard is not only (1) the best attested structural pattern of the « sal » formula, but is also (2) regularly attested with other epistolary

relegated the discussion of those less well-attested formal variants to section 3.7 below.

The standard « sal » formula in Ugaritic letters is composed of two elements: (1) the prefix conjugation verbal form « *yšlm* », and (2) a prepositional phrase expressing the "beneficiary" of this predication, having the basic structure « *l* N_R »,[20] where « N_R » represents the noun phrase or phrases referring to the recipient.

Both constituent components of the formula are "necessary" in the sense that they appear in all occurrences of the standard « sal » formula that are preserved well enough to permit analysis. At least one "expanded" version of the standard « sal » formula,[21] in which one or both of these components is repeated, is known.[22] The only significant structural variations encountered within the corpus of standard « sal » formulas are: (1) the order in which the two components occur, (2) the orthography and underlying morphology of the preposition, and (3) the precise form of the noun phrase « N_R » governed by the preposition. All three of these features appear directly related to the conceptual status of the letter as ascending or not ascending.[23]

---

formulas which are statistically standard, and (3) generally found on letters which pertain directly to members of the royal family or to aspects of the administration of the kingdom, and as such represent the known norms as practiced by socio-political elites in the kingdom (in other words, those responsible for the bulk of the written documentation available to modern students).

[20]Two expanded writings of the preposition *l* are also attested for this element: (1) « *ly* N_R » and (2) « *ln* N_R ». The distribution of the three writings of the preposition in the formula appears to be related to the conceptual status of the letter as ascending (the patterns « *ly* N_R » and « *ln* N_R ») or non-ascending (the pattern « *l* N_R »); see below, this section.

[21]Compare a similar "expanded" version of the standard « pros » formula in RS 94.2273, in which the verbal component *qlt*, which normally occurs only once per formula, is repeated.

[22]This is RIH 78/03+, discussed in section 3.7, below.

[23]By "not ascending" I mean, of course, those letters which are conceptually unmarked, horizontal, or descending.

Within the corpus of Ugaritic « sal » formulas, standard and non-standard alike, the verbal form *yšlm* occurs no less than twenty-six times.[24] Only one of these occurs in a « sal » formula which must be described as "non-standard" in terms of compositional structure.[25] The several remaining non-standard and poorly attested variants of the « sal » formula also contain forms, verbal and nominal, derived from the root ŠLM, but not in the prefixing conjugation.[26] No Ugaritic « sal » formula here characterized as "standard" lacks the form *yšlm*.[27]

---

[24]I count at least twenty-six certain or very probable occurrences of the form *yšlm* within the corpus of Ugaritic « sal » formulas: RS 1.018, RS 1.021, probably RS 3.334, RS 4.475, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 15.158, RS 16.379, RS 16.402, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, probably RS 18.075, RS 18.134, RS 18.147, probably RS 18.[364], RS 19.029, RS 20.199, RS 29.095, RS 34.148, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2479, possibly RS 94.5009 (in my collation I believe to have seen traces of the {y} of *yšlm*, which must be otherwise entirely reconstructed), and RIH 78/03+. The word *yšlm* needs to be mostly or entirely reconstructed, though its presence is not generally doubted, in RS 3.427 (mostly reconstructed), RS 17.327 (mostly reconstructed), RS 94.2428, RS 94.2537 (mostly reconstructed), RS 94.5003+, and RS 94.5009 (virtually entirely reconstructed). I have excluded from this list RS 15.174 and RS 19.181A, which also very probably contained the form *yšlm*. In these two letters the first sign of the line containing the « sal » formula is broken and must be restored; one reads {[y]šlm} in both cases (with the editor in the case of RS 15.174, with S. Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* [1973] 462-463 in the case of RS 19.181A). Such a restoration is not problematic since in both cases spatial considerations require the restoration of but a single sign at the beginning of the line; but since the salutation in RS 29.093 begins not with *yšlm*, but with the string {p šlm}, one cannot be absolutely certain of {[y]} as the sole possibility for the restoration. I have also excluded RS 34.124 from the list, since the word *yšlm* is probably not physically present on the tablet, though the editors and subsequent students of the text have generally assumed its intended presence. The orthography is believed to contain a scribal error of the eye, the intended phrase being *ly ủmy yšlm*, but the scribe having written only one instead of two successive {y} signs (haplography), resulting in the visible remains {[l]⌜y⌝.ủmyšlm} at the beginning of line 5. Finally, I have also excluded RS 17.063 from this list, since the visible text of line 3, {rgmlủmyšlmbʿlkm}, should be (and has been) divided *rgm l-ủmy šlm bʿl-km*, and, unlike the case of RS 34.124, there have been, to my knowledge, no proposals to emend the visible text of this tablet to read *rgm l-ủmy «y»šlm bʿl-km.*, 'Say to my mother: "May your lord be well!" '

[25]RS 3.334, line 2: {(2) [š]lm . bnš . yš⌜l⌝[m ...]}, *[*šu*]*lmu bunuši yišla*[*m*], 'May the [st]ate of the personnel be we[ll]!' For this motif, see below, section 3.7.

[26]Ugaritic « sal » formulas which certainly contain forms of the verb ŠLM other than *yšlm* include RS 1.020, RS 3.334, 17.063, 17.434+, and 29.093; potentially in this category is RS 34.124 (reading the text as it stands). RS 1.020, RS 3.334, and 17.063 are clearly non-standard. RS 17.434+ and 29.093 have some standard features but contain unmistakably unique aspects. RS 34.124 is

The absence of a prepositional phrase « *l* N_R » is here considered sufficient cause to eliminate various salutary phrases from the status of "standard" « sal » formula.[28] The orthography of the preposition shows some variation; attested spellings include {l},[29] {ly},[30] and {ln}.[31]

---

otherwise standard. The attested alternate forms of the verb ŠLM include « *šlm* », as in RS 29.093, lines 5-6, { p šlm (6) l bʿlny }; and « *šlmt* », occurring several times in a poorly preserved multi-component « sal » formula in RS 3.334, lines 3-6. For these non-standard variants, see below, in section 3.7.

[27]This statement necessarily excludes the « sal » of RS 29.093, {(5, cont'd) p šlm (6) l bʿlny }, from the status of "standard". Obviously, such a classification is difficult, since the letter exhibits several consistencies with the statistically and contextually "standard" Ugaritic epistolary tradition: (1) the « SR » order of mention in the address of an ascending letter, (2) the fact that, in the address of an ascending letter, both the « S » and « R » components follow the structural pattern « ID REL », (3) the letter contains three "polite formulas", answering the description of the « sal », « ben » and « pros » formulas respectively, which occur immediately following the address and immediately prior to the body of the letter, (4) the « sal » formula appearing here is impersonal, like those « sal » formulas containing *yšlm*, and (5) a horizontal scribal line separates the polite formulas from the non-formulaic body. All these features place RS 29.093 squarely within the Ugaritic epistolographic tradition. On the other hand, one can highlight the following departures from standard Ugaritic epistolary habits: (1) the verb of the « sal » is not *yšlm*, (2) the « sal » is preceded by the conjunction *p*, (3) the letter is an ascending one, and yet the prepositional phrase « *l* N_R » is not fronted to the verb, (4) the « sal » and « ben » formulas precede the « pros » formula, and (5) there is no horizontal scribal line between the address and the polite formulas. While the decision is a difficult, and to a certain extent, an arbitrary one, in light of these differences I elect to classify the « sal » of RS 29.093 as "non-standard" « sal » formula. See below, in section 3.7, where this formula is discussed, along with those « sal » formulas which exhibit a formal structure more profoundly distinct from the standard Ugaritic pattern: RS 1.020, RS 3.334, possibly RS 17.063, and RS 17.434+.

[28]The preposition *l* is reconstructed, its presence being not generally doubted, in the « sal » formulas of: RS 1.018, possibly RS 1.020, RS 3.427, RS 15.158, RS 16.402 (partially reconstructed), RS 17.327, RS 18.075, RS 18.[364], RS 34.124 (partially reconstructed), and RS 94.2391. The discussion of the "non-standard" salutations of several letters, in which the "beneficiary" of the ŠLM predication is expressed by means other than the prepositional phrase « *l* N_R », is here deferred to section 3.7 below: RS 3.334, which probably contains at least five salutatory motifs, probably RS 17.434+, and perhaps RS 17.063.

[29]This is the typical spelling of the preposition throughout the Ugaritic corpus. In the « sal » formula it is most often found in those « sal » formulas which place the « *yšlm* » component prior to the « *l* N_R » component, that is, in « sal » formulas used in conceptually unmarked, horizontal, and descending letters, or in mixed letters whose compositional structure does not reflect an ascending social relationship: RS 4.475, RS 15.174, RS 18.031, RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 19.029, RS 19.181A, RS 29.095, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2406.2, and RS 94.2537. Though not the norm for « sal » formulas used in ascending letters, it does occur occasionally: RS 11.872, RS 29.093, RS 34.148, and RS 94.2479. This writing is also found in two conceptually ascending letters (both ASC BIO) which

The composition of the « N_R » component of the « sal » formula shows the same diversity as that of the « N_R » component of the « pros » formula, though this diversity does not manifest itself in the same statistical proportions. More specifically, the « N_R » component of the « sal » formula may consist of, in order of frequency:

(1) a 2nd person pronominal suffix,[32] or

(2) a REL term[33] appropriate for an ascending social relationship, with an attached 1st person pronominal suffix, referring back to the sender. The attested REL terms include *ủmy* 'my mother',[34] *ảdty* 'my lady',[35] and *bʿly* 'my lord'.[36] In one example of the « sal » formula, the « N_R » component is *mlk bʿly* 'the king, my lord'.[37]

---

appear nevertheless to reflect, in certain respects, contextually descending social situations: RS 15.008 and RS 17.139 (on these two letters, see above, section 1.7.1.2).

[30]Within the corpus of Ugaritic « sal » formulas, this "expanded" spelling of the preposition is found exclusively in conceptually ascending letters: RS 16.379, RS 16.402 (partially restored), RS 20.199, RS 34.124 (partially restored), RS 94.2428, RS 94.5003+, and RS 94.5009. On the morphology underlying this spelling, see below, in section 3.6.

[31]This "expanded" spelling occurs once in the corpus of Ugaritic « sal » formulas: RIH 78/03+.

[32]The attested forms include the singular *-k* and the dual *-km*. The singular form *-k* is explicitly present in RS 4.475, RS 15.008, RS 15.174, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 19.029, RS 19.181A, RS 29.095, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2537; and reconstructed, though its presence is not generally doubted, in RS 1.018, RS 3.427, RS 15.158, and RS 18.075. The dual *-km* is explicitly present in RS 92.2005.1, and reconstructed, though its presence is not generally doubted, in RS 1.021.

[33]For a definition and discussion of "REL term", see the introduction, section 1.6.

[34]The REL term *ủmy*, 'my mother', appears in the « sal » formulas of RS 11.872, RS 16.379 (partially reconstructed), RS 34.124, and RS 94.5003+ (partially reconstructed).

[35]The REL term *ảdty*, 'my lady', appears in the « sal » formulas of RS 16.402, RS 20.199, RS 94.2479, and RS 94.5009.

[36]The REL term *bʿly*, 'my lord', appears in the « sal » formulas of RS 29.093, RS 34.148, RS 94.2391 (partially reconstructed), RS 94.2428, and RIH 78/03+. It may be reconstructed in the « sal » formula of RS 17.327, line 4. RS 17.063 does not contain a standard « sal » formula; if the string {šlmbʿlkm} line 3 reflects a "non-standard" salutation (outside of an epistolary context as well), the REL term is *bʿlkm*, 'your (pl.) lord'.

[37]RS 34.148.

The presence of the REL term *bʿly* in this example places it within the second category described above, but prior to the REL term the scribe inserted the title *mlk*, 'the king'. As a political title applicable to a single individual, independent of discourse context, this word may be qualified as an ID term,[38] an element otherwise unattested among the « N_R » components of the « sal » formulas, thus setting the composition of the formula in this letter apart. Though no close parallels are to be found within the Ugaritic corpus proper, similar usages of noun phrases of the pattern « REL ID » appear frequently in the « pros » and « sal » formulas in the Amarna corpus. In light of the social hierarchical context applicable there and here, this usage may be a feature of what might be called "extreme" ascending situations, in which a sender addresses himself to royalty. In these cases, a royal title,[39] which is an ID element, is included along with the conceptually appropriate REL term.

The most readily observable compositional distinction, however, is, without a doubt, the order in which the constituent components occur. As with the address formula, two compositional patterns are possible, and these two patterns appear to correspond more or less directly with conceptually ascending letters on the one hand, and letters which are not conceptually ascending on the other.

In letters which are not conceptually ascending, that is, in letters which are conceptually horizontal, unmarked, or descending, the most typical form of the « sal » formula is « *yšlm lk* ». In this pattern, one notices that (1) the verbal element is placed before its prepositional complement, (2) the preposition is spelled simply *l*, and (3) the

---

[38]For a definition and discussion of "ID term", see the introduction, section 1.6.

[39]In the cases described, the ID component inserted into the « sal » formula is always a royal or honorific title, never a personal name.

« N_R » element takes the form of a 2nd person pronominal suffix attached to the preposition.

The structure of the « sal » in conceptually ascending letters, however, is different; the pattern « *ly ådty yšlm* » may be taken as paradigmatic. In « sal » formulas of this type, one notices that (1) the prepositional phrase precedes the verbal form,[40] (2) the preposition itself usually shows an expanded spelling, most often *ly*, but once *ln*,[41] and (3) the « N_R » element is not represented by means of a pronominal suffix, but rather by a conceptually ascending REL term, with attached 1st person suffix.[42]

3.3 Distribution of the Salutation

Within the Ugaritic epistolary corpus as it is presently known, a recognizable salutation formula, in the broad sense of a formulaic wish for the general well-being of the recipient, occurs in at least thirty-three letters.[43] Of these, at least twenty-nine

---

[40]Despite the prevalence of this feature, at least four conceptually ascending letters nevertheless follow the order « *yšlm l* N_R »: RS 15.008, RS 17.139, RS 34.148, and RS 92.2005.1. These "exceptions" are discussed below in section 3.7.

[41]Despite the prevalence of expanded writings of the preposition in those « sal » formulas in which the « N_R » element precedes the verbal element, two exceptions are known, which follow the pattern « *l* REL *yšlm* » (the writing of the preposition is not expanded): RS 11.872 and RS 94.2479. These "exceptions" are discussed below in section 3.7.

[42]Despite the prevalence of this feature, at least three conceptually ascending letters represent exceptions, in which the « N_R » element takes the form of a pronominal suffix; all three present the order « *yšlm l* N_R »: RS 15.008, RS 17.139, and RS 92.2005.1. These "exceptions" are discussed below in section 3.7.

[43]The presence of a salutation formula (in the broad sense) is certain or virtually certain in at least thirty three letters: RS 1.018 (partially reconstructed), RS 1.021, RS 3.334, RS 3.427 (partially reconstructed), RS 4.475, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 15.158 (partially reconstructed), RS 15.174, RS 16.379, RS 16.402, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.075 (partially reconstructed), RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 19.029, RS 19.181A, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 29.095, RS 34.124, RS 34.148,

represent salutation formulas which may be characterized as "standard", using the criteria described above.[44] The formula is explicitly lacking from at least nineteen Ugaritic letters for which the *praescriptio* is both well enough preserved to permit such an observation and also not anomalous in terms of its composition.[45] This distribution requires that the « sal » formula be considered an optional component of standard Ugaritic epistolary structure.

RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2428 (partially reconstructed), RS 94.2479, RS 94.2537, RS 94.5003+ (partially reconstructed), RS 94.5009 (partially reconstructed); and RIH 78/03+. The presence of a salutation formula (still in the broad sense) is probable in four other letters (RS 1.020, RS 17.327 [partially reconstructed], RS 17.434+ [partially reconstructed], and RS 18.[364] [partially reconstructed]); and possible, though by no means certain in another four (RS 17.063, RS 17.117, RS 18.[400] [partially reconstructed], and RS 94.2545+ [partially reconstructed]. This brings the total to forty-one potential examples of an epistolary salutation formula in the Ugaritic corpus.

[44]The definition of the "standard" « sal » formula is given above, in section 3.2. At least twenty-nine Ugaritic letters certainly or almost certainly contain a "standard" « sal » formula: RS 1.018 (partially reconstructed), RS 1.021 (partially reconstructed), RS 4.475, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 15.158 (partially reconstructed), RS 15.174 (partially reconstructed), RS 16.379 (partially reconstructed), RS 16.402 (partially reconstructed), RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 19.029, RS 19.181A (partially reconstructed), RS 20.199, RS 29.095, RS 34.124 (partially reconstructed, and scribal error assumed), RS 34.148, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2391 (partially reconstructed), RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2428 (partially reconstructed), RS 94.2479, RS 94.2537 (partially reconstructed), RS 94.5003+ (partially reconstructed), RS 94.5009 (partially reconstructed), and, in an expanded version of the "standard" « sal » formula, RIH 78/03+. The standard « sal » formula is very plausibly present, but needs to be extensively reconstructed, in RS 3.427, RS 17.327, RS 18.075, and RS 18.[364], bringing the tentative total to thirty-three plausible occurrences of the standard Ugaritic « sal » formula.

[45]Among those Ugaritic letters which contain a standard *praescriptio*, the « sal » formula is explicitly absent from RS 8.315, RS 9.479A, RS 16.265.1, RS 18.038, RS 18.040, probably RS 18.113+ (assuming the « sal » was not impressed at the end of line 5, having wrapped around the right edge and onto the *verso*), RS 18.140.2, RS 19.011, RS 19.102.2, RS 88.2159, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2273 (assuming all of *praescriptio* has been preserved), RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2429, RS 96.2039, RIH 78/12, and RS [Varia 4]. In addition, the « sal » formula is lacking from as many as five other Ugaritic letters which, for one reason or another, contain a *praescriptio* which is in some respects "non-standard": RS 15.007, RS 16.078+, RS 16.264, RS 18.148, and possibly RS 94.5015. Finally, among the texts for which the *praescriptio* is less well-preserved, the « sal » formula is very likely absent from RS 15.098, RS 16.137[bis], RS 18.286[A], RS 94.2580, and RIH 77/21A; and, with much less certitude, possibly absent from RS 15.191[A], RS 34.356, and RS 94.2957. This brings the tentative total to at least thirty-two Ugaritic letters from which the « sal » formula is certainly or probably absent.

If the presence of the « sal » formula is optional, is it arbitrary? As observed with respect to the « pros » formula, the distribution of the "polite formulas" may be linked with two factors: (1) the conceptual status of the letter as ascending, horizontal, descending, or unmarked; and (2) the conceptual model used to portray the social relationship between the correspondents.

The presence or absence of the « sal » formula does not appear to be solely dependent on the terminological status of the letter as ascending, horizontal, descending, or unmarked. The standard « sal » formula appears in at least sixteen

conceptually ascending letters,[46] but is explicitly absent from at least ten;[47] it is present in at least nine conceptually horizontal letters,[48] absent from at least five;[49] and, it is present in at least three terminologically unmarked letters,[50] and absent from at least five.[51] Of the three letters which contain explicitly descending relational terminology, the « sal » formula is present in two,[52] and absent from one.[53]

---

[46]Conceptually ascending letters which contain the « sal » formula include: RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 16.402, RS 17.139, RS 20.199, RS 29.093 (not a "standard" « sal » formula, however), RS 34.124, RS 34.148, RS 92.2005.1, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2428, RS 94.2479, RS 94.5003+, RS 94.5009, and RIH 78/03+ (an "expanded" « sal »). RS 17.327 probably belongs here as well.

[47]Conceptually ascending letters which omit the « sal » formula include: RS 8.315, RS 9.479A, RS 16.137[bis], RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 18.140.2, probably RS 18.287, probably RS 18.[312], RS 19.011, RS 19.102.2, RS 92.2010, and RIH 78/12. The letter RS 18.148, which presents several unusual epistolary features, also omits the « sal » formula.

[48]Conceptually horizontal letters which contain the « sal » formula include: RS 1.018 (a "horizontal" REL term is present in line 19 of the body), RS 1.021, RS 15.174, RS 18.031, RS 18.075 ("horizontal" REL terms are present in lines 19', 21', and 23' of the body), RS 18.134, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2406.2, and RS 94.2537. RS 19.029 and RS 19.181A may belong here as well.

[49]Conceptually horizontal letters which omit the « sal » formula include: RS 16.265.1, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383, probably RS 95.2545+, and RS 96.2039. RS 15.007, which contains a number of features that set it apart from the other letters, also omits the « sal » formula.

[50]Terminologically unmarked letters which contain the « sal » formula include: RS 4.475, RS 15.158, and RS 29.095. RS 17.434+ may also belong in this category; it probably contained an "expanded" « sal » formula.

[51]Terminologically unmarked letters which omit the « sal » formula include: RS 16.264, RS 18.038, RS 94.2406.1, and RS 94.2580. The terminological classification of RS 94.2429 and RIH 77/21A is technically unknown; they are in all probability "unmarked" letters, however, and they too lack the « sal » formula.

[52]RS 18.147 (apparently DESC BIO) contains a « sal » formula. The terminological classification of RS 19.181A is not clear; if the editor's reading of line 2, {'bdy}, is valid, the letter would appear to be terminologically descending on the hierarchical power model (the unique example in the Ugaritic corpus of this status); it contains a « sal » formula in line 3.

[53]RS [Varia 4] is a "mixed" letters, containing relational terminology appropriate for (1) descending letters conceived on the biological kinship model (DESC BIO), and (2) horizontal letters (HOR BIO). It does not contain a « sal » formula.

Nor does the distribution of the « sal » formula appear to be solely dependent on the conceptual model used to describe the social relationships between the correspondents. The « sal » formula appears on at least seventeen letters composed along the biological kinship model,[54] and is absent from at least three;[55] it appears on at least ten letters composed along the hierarchical power model,[56] and is absent from at least ten others.[57]

If these empirical observations invite a certain amount of pessimism regarding the predictability of the « sal » formula, its distribution nevertheless would not appear

---

[54]Ascending letters composed on the biological model which contain the « sal » formula include: RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, and probably RS 94.5003+. The only explicitly descending letter composed on the biological kinship model is RS 18.147; it contains the « sal ». One may legitimately hesitate over the inclusion here of the terminologically horizontal letters, since in these letters the biological kinship model, represented by the « REL » terms *åḫ* and *åḫt*, has practically displaced the hierarchical power model, which would ostensibly be represented by the terms *rʿ* and **rʿt*, but which are in fact attested very seldom (compare RS 15.007; and also the mixed letter RS 16.265, where the hierarchical REL term *rʿ* is used alongside its biological counterpart *åḫ*). This being the case, the conceptual model used in terminologically horizontal letters may turn out to be less useful than that of ascending and descending letters. Nevertheless, should one include the horizontal letters here for the purposes of comprehensiveness, nine further letters containing the « sal » formula must be listed here (RS 1.018, RS 1.021, RS 15.174, RS 18.031, RS 18.075, RS 18.134, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2406.2, and RS 94.2537), bringing the tentative total to seventeen letters composed on the biological kinship model which contain the « sal » formula.

[55]These are: RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, and RS [Varia 4]. The former two are horizontal letters; RS [Varia 4] is a terminologically "mixed" letter (containing two sets of REL terms composed along the biological kinship model, one descending and one horizontal).

[56]Ascending letters composed along the hierarchical power model which contain the « sal » formula include: RS 16.402, RS 20.199, RS 29.093 (in which the « sal » formula is slightly atypical), RS 34.148, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2428, RS 94.2479, RS 94.5009, and RIH 78/03+ (in which the « sal » is "expanded"). It is possible that RS 17.327 belongs here as well. RS 17.117 is probably a "mixed" ascending letter, incorporating "ascending" relational terminology drawn from both conceptual models; it may contain a "non-standard" « sal » formula (on which, see section 3.7). RS 19.181A is apparently an example of a descending letter drawn on the hierarchical power model which contains the « sal » formula (present in line 3).

[57]Ascending letters composed along the hierarchical power model which do not contain the « sal » formula include: RS 9.479A, RS 16.137[bis], RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 18.140.2, RS 18.148, possibly RS 18.287, RS 19.011, RS 19.102.2, RS 92.2010; RS 15.007 is apparently a terminologically horizontal letter composed along the hierarchical power model; it omits the « sal » formula.

to be entirely arbitrary, and does reveal at least one statistical tendency, provided that the small number of data exploited here is assumed to be adequately representative: with respect to the distribution of the « sal » formula according to conceptual model, one may observe that the formula appears in a large majority of letters composed on the biological kinship model,[58] while it appears only about half of the time in letters composed on the hierarchical power model,[59] and somewhat less than half the time in letters which are terminologically unmarked.[60] With respect to the distribution according to conceptual status, however, the present data reveal no marked tendencies for the presence or absence of the formula; it appears somewhat more than half of the time in ascending,[61] horizontal,[62] and descending letters;[63] and somewhat less than half of the time in terminologically unmarked letters.[64]

Combining the two categories of data exploited above only serves to reinforce these observed tendencies. Ascending letters composed on the hierarchical power

---

[58]For the explicitly ascending, descending, and mixed-status letters composed uniquely along the biological kinship model, the « sal » formula is present in eight out of nine (or 89%) unambiguous cases (see above). If one includes the horizontal letters, the vast majority of which contain uniquely the biological model, the proportions shift to seventeen out of twenty (or 85%).

[59]At least ten out of twenty letters (or 50%) composed on the hierarchical power model contain the « sal » formula (see above).

[60]At least three out of eight (or 38%) terminologically unmarked letters contain the « sal » formula (see above).

[61]The « sal » formula is present in sixteen out of twenty-two (or 62%) unambiguous examples in the corpus of conceptually ascending letters (see above).

[62]The « sal » formula is present in nine out of fourteen (or 64%) unambiguous examples in the corpus of conceptually horizontal letters (see above).

[63]The « sal » formula is present in two out of three (or 67%) unambiguous examples in the corpus of letters which contain conceptually descending REL terminology (see above).

[64]The « sal » formula is present in three out of eight (or 38%) unambiguous examples in the corpus of conceptually unmarked letters (see above).

model contain the « sal » formula roughly half of the time,[65] while ascending letters composed on the biological kinship model contain the « sal » formula in the majority of examples.[66] The majority of horizontal letters are composed along the biological model; the majority of these contain the « sal » formula.[67] Only two letters for which the "descending" conceptual status is explicitly definable on the basis of the REL terminology are known:[68] RS 18.147 is composed on the biological kinship model, and contains the « sal » formula; RS 19.181A is apparently composed on the hierarchical power model,[69] and also contains the « sal » formula.

If one introduces contextual factors into the analysis, one other seemingly meaningful pattern emerges, although the slim amount of data available should urge considerable caution: the « sal » formula tends not to be used in terminologically

---

[65]At least nine such ASC POW letters contain the « sal » formula, at least nine omit it (or 50%). See above.

[66]At least six, and probably seven, ASC BIO letters contain the « sal » formula (see above); I know of no such letter which explicitly omits the « sal » formula. The « sal » formula is not present in RIH 78/12 or RS 8.315; both of these are unusual since, they are "mixed" ascending letters, containing « REL » terminology derived from both the biological kinship model and the hierarchical power model. Another such "mixed" ascending letter, incorporating "ascending" relational terminology drawn from both conceptual models, is RS 17.117; it may contain a "non-standard" « sal » formula (on which, see section 3.7).

[67]At least nine out of fourteen HOR BIO letters contain the « sal » formula (see above).

[68]RS [Varia 4] is a letter of "mixed" status; it includes terms (all conceived on the biological kinship model) appropriate for both descending and horizontal social relationships. It omits the « sal » formula.

[69]RS 19.181A is somewhat problematic, in my opinion, since (1) D. Pardee's recent collation of the tablet revealed the reading of the would-be REL term, {ʿ⌈bdy⌉}, in line 2, to be substantially damaged (contrast with the editor's reading, {ʿbdy}, in the *editio princeps*); (2) the presence of an explicit REL term in the « R » component of the address of a descending letter composed along the hierarchical power model is otherwise unprecedented in the Ugaritic corpus; and (3) the body of the letter begins with {⌈hl⌉ny . åḫ⌈y⌉} in line 4, a common motif (presentative particle + vocative) which leaves open the possibility that the relationship between the correspondents was a horizontal one: 'Now then, my brother, . . .'

unmarked letters for which contextual factors suggest an underlying descending social relationship.[70]

Thus, *grosso modo*, two distributional tendencies are remarkable: (1) the « sal » tends to be used in letters composed on the biological kinship model, whatever their conceptual status; and (2) tends not to be used in terminologically unmarked letters for which the underlying social relationship is descending. Beyond these, it can only be said that, on present data, the « sal » formula appears about half of the time.

The Ugaritic « sal » formula is not known to occur more than once per letter.[71] Its placement is consistent: as a "polite formula", it is found in the epistolary section which follows the address, but precedes the less formulaic body of the letter. Within this "polite formula"-section, it may occur either alone, or along with one or both of the other polite formulas. One can speak of at least four distributional categories: (1) those letters in which the « sal » formula is the only polite formula present, (2) those

---

[70]If one turns to context to aid in the isolation of descending situations among the letters which are terminologically unmarked, it would appear that the « sal » formula is absent from five out of six cases. The following terminologically unmarked letters may be considered "contextually descending": RS 15.158 (from [*mlk g*]*rgmš* to [« PN » *m*]*lk ủgrt*), RS 16.264 (from *mlk* to « PN »), RS 18.038 (from *špš* to « PN »), RS 94.2406.1 (from *mlkt* to « PN »), RS 94.2580 (from *mlkt* to « PN »), and RS 96.2039 (from *mlkt* to « PN »). Of these, only RS 15.158 contains a « sal » formula; in the others it is explicitly lacking. The terminological classification of RS 94.2429 (from *mlk*[*t*?] to *skn*) and RIH 77/21A (from *š*[*pš mlk*] *rb* to *m*[?]) is technically unknown; they are in all probability "unmarked" letters, however, and may be considered "contextually descending" as well; they too lack the « sal » formula. RS 17.434+ (from *pdǵb mlk*[*t* ?] to *nqmd*), which probably contained an "expanded" « sal » formula, must be mentioned here as a special case. Assuming the most obvious identification of the correspondents, one might have assumed that Queen *Puduḫepa*, the (grand?)mother of "the Sun, the Great King" of Ḫatti, would occupy a superior role *vis-à-vis Niqmaddu* (II, in the old system), the king of Ugarit, but such is not obvious from the *praescriptio*, which follows a model familiar from the Amarna corpus for international diplomatic correspondence between "brothers". On the usage of the « sal » in this letter, see below, section 3.7.

[71]I do not consider an "expanded" version of the standard « sal » formula, in which one or both of the constituent components are repeated, to represent multiple occurrences of the formula. RIH 78/03+ is the sole "expanded" standard « sal » formula of which I am aware; it is discussed in section 3.7.

letters in which the « sal » occurs along with the « pros » formula, but without the « ben » formula; (3) those letters in which the « sal » occurs along with the « ben » formula, but without the « pros » formula; and (4) those letters in which the « pros », « sal », and « ben » formulas are all present.

Relatively few letters contain the « sal » formula as the sole "polite formula". The Ugaritic corpus contains at least three: RS 4.475, RS 15.158, and RS 94.2406.2. RS 19.181A probably belongs here as well, assuming that no additional "polite formulas" have been lost in the lacuna at the end of line 3. A few common features are notable within this "mini-corpus": (1) the address formulas show the « SR » order of mention, and (2) the « sal » formulas follow the pattern « *yšlm lk* ». Differences are also present: (1) in RS 94.2406.2, for example, the social relationship is explicitly horizontal, while in RS 19.181A it is, assuming the reading is correct, explicitly descending;[72] and (2) three of these letters, namely, RS 15.158, RS 19.181A, and RS 94.2406.2, lack a horizontal scribal line between the address and the « sal » formula, while such is present in RS 4.475.

Letters which contain the « pros » and « sal » formulas but lack the « ben » formula are rare in the Ugaritic corpus.[73] At least two are known: RS 16.402 and RS 94.2479.[74] Given the presence of the « pros » formula, it is not surprising that both

---

[72]Note also that two of these letters are unmarked as to their conceptual status: RS 4.475 and 15.158. Contextual considerations would suggest that RS 15.158 be descending, as the kings of Carchemish normally held considerable political authority over the kings of Ugarit during the period of textual documentation at Ras Shamra.

[73]To my knowledge, such a structure is also rare in the comparative corpora. Among the Amarna letters, for example, one of the few examples of such a structure, of which I am aware, is EA 48. It is ironic that a "Ugaritian" provenance of this letter is occasionally proposed (as, for example, by W. F. Albright in *BASOR* 95 [1944] 30).

[74]I omit RS 18.[364] from consideration here, due to the paucity of the evidence for the presence of the « pros » formula in line 3': (1) the string {[...]mrʿḫ[...]} is insufficient to exclude

of these (1) are conceptually ascending letters, (2) are conceived on the hierarchical power model, and (3) show the order « pros sal » in the "polite formulas" section. Further similarities which follow from the ascending status include (4) the « RS » order of mention in the address, (5) the fact that both the « R » and the « S » components of the address formulas consist of a single ID term followed by a single REL term, and (6) the fact that the « sal » formulas follow the pattern « *l*(*y*) REL *yšlm* ».

The "polite formula" pattern which contains the « sal » and the « ben » formulas but omits the « pros » formula is one of the most common in the Ugaritic corpus.[75] At least twelve such letters are known, perhaps as many as fourteen.[76] Amidst a host of diversities,[77] one common thread binds this group together: the « sal » formula of each shows the pattern « *yšlm l*-N_R », even in those letters which contain REL terms appropriate for ascending social relationships. One can summarize the distribution of

---

reconstructions other than the « pros » formula, and (2) the « sal » formula, followed by a horizontal scribal line, followed by the « pros » formula is an otherwise unattested sequence in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus.

[75]This pattern is also relatively common in the comparative corpora; see the discussion in A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 77-80 (with reference to this pattern in Middle Babylonian letters as well).

[76]These include RS 1.021, RS 15.008, RS 15.174, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 19.029, RS 29.095, RS 34.148, RS 92.2005.1, and RS 92.2005.2. Damaged letters for which such a pattern is very possible, if not probable, include RS 1.018 and RS 94.2537. I suspect that RS 3.427 and RS 18.075 belong here as well.

[77]The following differences may serve as illustrative of the phrase "a host of diversities": (1) eight of these letters contain addresses of the « SR » order of mention, six of the « RS » order of mention; (2) at least six of these letters contain explicitly horizontal « REL » terms, five explicitly ascending; (3) of the ascending letters, this being the only conceptual status for which the following observation is relevant, four contain « REL » terms derived from the biological kinship model, at least one from the hierarchical power model; (4) the "motif of reciprocal well-being" (see below, chapter 5) is present in at least six of these letters, absent in as many as five; and (5) the « sal » and the « ben » formulas are discreetly separated from the preceding and following parts of the letter by horizontal scribal lines in at least six of these letters, but one or both such scribal lines are lacking in as many as seven letters.

this pattern as follows: it is found (1) at least four times and possibly as many as eight times on horizontal letters;[78] (2) at least three times on ascending letters composed along the biological kinship model,[79] but (3) only once on an ascending letters composed along the hierarchical power model;[80] (4) once on a descending letter composed on the biological kinship model;[81] and (5) once on a letter containing no REL terms.[82] Stately all the more briefly, this pattern is not out of place in letters composed along the biological kinship model, especially in horizontal letters.

Finally, another fairly common pattern for the "polite formulas" contains of all three formulas: « pros », « sal », and « ben ». This combination occurs in at least seven Ugaritic letters.[83] As may be expected from the presence of the « pros » formula in this pattern, these letters (1) are conceptually ascending; and, as ascending letters, they characterized by (2) the « RS » order of mention in the address, and (3) the pattern « ID REL » for both the « R » and « S » components of the address. Furthermore, setting aside RS 29.093, which presents an anomalous « sal » formula, the remaining letters in this category show (4) the order « pros sal ben », and (5) the

---

[78]These include RS 15.174, RS 18.031, RS 18.134, and RS 92.2005.2; and most likely RS 1.018 and RS 94.2537. It is my suspicion that line 1 of RS 19.029 has been incorrectly reconstructed, and that this letter belongs here as well. Finally, the reading of the REL term {å[ḫy]} at the end of line 2 of RS 1.021 is an entirely plausible, though not a necessary reconstruction.

[79]RS 15.008, RS 17.139, and RS 92.2005.1.

[80]RS 34.148.

[81]RS 18.147.

[82]RS 29.095.

[83]These include RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 20.199, RS 29.093 (where the « sal » is atypical) RS 34.124, RS 94.2428, and RS 94.5003+.

pattern « *l*(*y*) REL *yšlm* » for the « sal » formula;[84] and (6), though one ought probably to attribute this to happenstance, where the address is preserved, these letters are addressed to *mlkt*, 'the queen'. Finally, one may add the following tendencies: (7) in five of these letters the "polite formulas" proper are immediately followed by the motif of reciprocal well-being,[85] and (8) in at least four and perhaps all of these letters the string of polite formulas, « pros sal ben », is separated from the preceding and following parts of the letter by horizontal scribal lines.[86]

Two of the above categories contained the « pros » and the « sal » formulas. In both of these, the « sal » formula followed the pattern « *l* REL *yšlm* ». In fact, this correspondence can be put another way: when the form of the « sal » formula follows the pattern « *l* N_R *yšlm* », where the « N_R » slot is occupied by a REL term, the « pros » formula is always present as well.[87] Conversely, when the form of the « sal » in

---

[84]Line 5 of RS 34.124 contains the string {[l]⌜y⌝ . ủmy šlm}, which the editors correct to {[l]⌜y⌝ . ủmy « . y »šlm}; see the *editio princeps*, RSO 7, p. 145; and below, in section 3.7.

[85]These are RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 20.199, RS 34.124, and RS 94.5003+.

[86]These are RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 34.124, and RS 94.5003+. The address and the beginning of the « pros » formula of 94.2428 are not preserved, but the fact a horizontal scribal line separates the "polite formulas" from the motif of reciprocal well-being on this tablet suggests that a similar line marked the division between the address and the polite formulas (note however, that such a line is lacking in the anomalous RS 29.093). RS 20.199 may very well have contained such a scribal line as well; the tablet is very poorly preserved between lines 10-11, and, given the distribution of this phenomenon, it may be worthwhile to look for the remains of such a scribal line in a future recollation of this portion of the tablet. Even if no such traces are found, however, it is also conceivable that the curve of the tablet, between the *recto* and the lower edge, was considered by the scribe as sufficient to mark the structural break, and that the additional impression of a scribal line was considered unnecessary.

[87]These letters include RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 16.402+, RS 20.199, RS 34.124, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2479, RS 94.5003+, and RIH 78/03+. RS 94.2428, though broken, probably belongs here as well. There appear to be no exceptions; the « sal » of RS 34.124 is typically corrected to read {[l]⌜y⌝ . ủmy < . y >šlm}.

terminologically ascending letters is « *yšlm l* N_R », where the « N_R » slot is occupied most often by a pronominal suffix, the « pros » formula is not present.[88]

3.4 Comparative evidence for the salutation

This section surveys comparative evidence for the interpretation of the form and function of the Ugaritic « sal » formula, drawn from two main sources: (1) roughly contemporary Akkadian and Hittite epistolary traditions which contain comparable "salutation" formulas, and (2) non-epistolary Ugaritic texts which contain motifs resembling, in some fashion, the epistolary « sal » formula. Unlike the cases of the address and prostration formulas, the Ugaritic literary texts contain no motif which manifests both formal and contextual parallels with the epistolary « sal » formula.

3.4.1 Epistolary comparative material

Several roughly contemporary epistolary traditions make use of a polite formula in which the sender expresses his wish for the general well-being of the recipient. These include the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra, Tell Meskene, and Tel Aphek; the Akkadian and Hittite letters from Tell el-Amarna, Boğazköy, and Tell Atchana; and the Hittite letters from Ma□at Höyük. I have also included the relevant

---

[88]These letters include RS 15.008, RS 17.139, RS 19.029, and RS 92.2005.1. There appear to be no exceptions to the rule, as stated. At least two letters require comment, however: RS 29.093 and RS 34.148. RS 34.148 is terminologically ascending, conceived on the hierarchical power model, and yet lacks the « pros » formula; in the « sal » formula, the « N_R » slot is not occupied by a pronominal suffix, but rather by an anomalous « ID REL » sequence: « *yšlm l mlk bʿly* ». RS 29.093 is also a terminologically ascending letter composed on the hierarchical power model; it contains a « sal » formula, though with a non-standard form: « *p šlm l bʿlny* », and a « pros » formula is present, though not immediately adjacent.

data from the Middle Assyrian, Middle Babylonian, and Old Babylonian epistolary traditions, which derive from a variety of sites.

The magnitude of this comparative material is tempered, however, by its heterogeneous nature. While all such formulas that may be called "salutations" in a broad sense are relevant to the discussion, only some of them provide close parallels for the standard Ugaritic salutation formulas. In order to isolate those comparative data of highest import, I have found it useful to classify the various salutation formulas according to criteria of composition and distribution. These criteria permit the following classification: (1) those salutation formulas of which the composition and distribution are similar or identical to the standard Ugaritic « sal » formula, (2) those of which the composition is markedly different from that of the standard Ugaritic « sal » formula, (3) those of which the distribution is different, and (4) those of which both the composition and the distribution are different.

The first category is of primary importance for comparative analysis, and will be treated below in detail. Of all the comparative corpora, this category is represented only by the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters. For this reason, not only is this corpus treated first in this section, but it may also be considered of primary importance in the comparative study of the Ugaritic salutation. The latter categories are of more peripheral interest, since they are not precisely comparable to the standard Ugaritic formula. A study of them is necessary, however, since they represent models which are relevant for the interpretation of several "non-standard" Ugaritic « sal » formulas, and since these categories are especially common in three of the most important comparative corpora for this study, outside of the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters: namely, the letters from Boğazköy, Ma□at Höyük, and Amarna. Furthermore, a dissection of the salutation formulas attested within these latter corpora permits a more

precise identification and description of categories (2) through (4), defined in the paragraph above. One can make the following precisions with respect to the classification of the salutation formulas in these three comparative corpora:

(2) The second category described above, which contains « sal » formulas distinct from the standard Ugaritic formula in terms of composition, is represented by what may be called "expanded salutations", that is, those salutation formulas which are "expanded" by the addition of supplementary prepositional phrases expressing further "beneficiaries" of the polite volition.

(3) The third category, which contains « sal » formulas of a distribution distinct from that of the formula in the Ugaritic corpus, is represented by those letters in which the « sal » formula is incorporated as the second component of a double formula of well-being, the first component being the epistolary motif here called the "situation report".[89]

Finally, (4) the fourth category, which contains those formulas which are dissimilar both in terms of composition and in terms of distribution, is represented by « sal » formulas which are both "expanded" and conjoined with the situation report as a double "polite formula".

The second category, that of "expanded" salutation formulas, is also represented by at least one "non-standard" Ugaritic « sal » formula.[90] The third and fourth categories, which together treat those salutations which are conjoined with a

---

[89]The standard Ugaritic « sal » formula is not paired with the "situation report" in the layout of the letter. On the "situation report", see below, chapter 5.

[90]Regarding the "non-standard" salutation formula of RIH 78/03+, see below, in section 3.7.

formulaic "situation report",[91] are probably also represented by at least one "non-standard" Ugaritic formula.[92] Given the existence of such types, even if rare, within the Ugaritic corpus, the comparative examples of these patterns from the Amarna and Ḫatti letters acquire a certain interpretive importance, and for this reason these corpora are treated in some detail, following the section on the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters.

Finally, in the remaining parts of this section, I treat comparative examples of salutation formulas of less direct relevance for the interpretation of the standard Ugaritic formula. These include salutation formulas in letters recovered from the Levantine sites: Tell Meskene, Tel Aphek, and Tell Atchana; as well as salutation formulas from certain Mesopotamian epistolary traditions: Middle Assyrian, Middle Babylonian, and Old Babylonian.

3.4.1.1 The syllabic « sal » formulas from Ras Shamra

The corpus of Akkadian letters found at Ras Shamra and nearby Ras Ibn Hani is the most important body of comparative evidence for the interpretation of the

---

[91]A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 49, has characterized this structure as "Die Amarna-Formel" (chapter V.3 of her work, pp. 49-55, is devoted to it).

[92]Regarding the "non-standard" salutation formula of RS 17.434+, see below, in section 3.7. In fact, the « sal » formula of RS 17.434+ represents the fourth category, since it is both "expanded" and occurs as the second component of the "Amarna-style" double formula of well-being: that is, the formulaic pattern « s.r. sal ». Type (4) is also only very poorly represented in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus: only two letters display the third pattern: RS 34.139 and RS 34.165. The third category, those « sal » formulas which are conjoined with a "situation report" (thus making up an "Amarna"-style double formula of well-being), but which are not expanded, is not represented in the Ugaritic corpus, nor in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.

standard Ugaritic salutation formula. The published corpus[93] contains ninety-five certain or reasonably certain examples of a salutation formula, defined in the broad sense of a formulaic wish for the general well-being of the recipient.[94]

3.4.1.1.1 COMPOSITION

Of these ninety-five examples, only one represents a compositional pattern entirely foreign to the standard Ugaritic « sal » formula.[95] The remaining ninety-four formulas are of direct relevance for the interpretation of their Ugaritic counterparts, since they are internally unified by several compositional similarities shared with the Ugaritic corpus. These compositional similarities include the following:

---

[93]Sixteen letters were published by D. Arnaud, F. Malbran-Labat, and S. Lackenbacher in *Études ougaritiques* 1 (2001) 239-290. The volume reached for me too late to be taken into account in the composition of this section; the data, however, appear consistent with the conclusions drawn from the previously published corpus.

[94]These are: RS 1.[056] (partially reconstructed), RS 6.198, RS 8.333, RS 10.046, RS 11.723, RS 11.730, RS 12.033, RS 15.011, RS 15.014, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 15.077, RS 15.178, RS 16.003, RS 16.112, RS 17.078, RS 17.083, RS 17.116, RS 17.142, RS 17.143, RS 17.144, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.152, RS 17.239, RS 17.286, RS 17.288, RS 17.289, RS 17.292, RS 17.315, RS 17.385, RS 17.394+, RS 17.397B+, RS 17.423, RS 17.451, RS 17.452, RS 17.455, RS 18.089, RS 19.050, RS 19.053, RS 19.070, RS 19.080, RS 19.115, RS 20.003, RS 20.013.2, RS 20.015, RS 20.017, RS 20.018, RS 20.021, RS 20.022, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.150, RS 20.158, RS 20.162, RS 20.168, RS 20.172, RS 20.178.1, RS 20.178.2, RS 20.182A+, RS 20.184, RS 20.200A, RS 20.200B, RS 20.200C, RS 20.216, RS 20.237, RS 20.238, RS 20.239, RS 20.242, RS 20.243, RS 20.248, RS 20.255A, RS 20.426,14+, RS 21.064, RS 21.183, RS 22.006, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.136, RS 34.137, RS 34.138, RS 34.139, RS 34.140, RS 34.143, RS 34.145, RS 34.146, RS 34.154, RS 34.158, RS 34.163, RS 34.164, RS 34.165, RS 34.167+, RS 34.171.2, and RS 34.180,60 from Ras Shamra; RS [Varia 16] and RS [Varia 25] probably from Ras Shamra; and RIH 81/4 from Ras Ibn Hani.

[95]This is RS 17.451, the « sal » of which the editor reconstructed as {(6) b[u]-u[l]-l[u$^{?}$-uṭ ...] }, "L[i]v[e] [...]!" An intact example of this pattern is represented by AT 109 from Tell Atchana (see D. Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets* [1953] 59): {(3) bu-lu-uṭ dun-qí-iš}, "Live well!". On the possibility that this pattern is attested in several "non-standard" Ugaritic salutations, see below, section 3.7.

(1) All ninety-four « sal » formulas are composed of at least two elements: (i) an impersonal volition derived from the root ŠLM,[96] or, in the case of some "expanded" formulas, multiple impersonal ŠLM-volitions; and (ii) a prepositional phrase expressing the "beneficiary" of this volition,[97] that is, the recipient of the letter, or, in the case of the "expanded" « sal » formulas, multiple prepositional phrases which express the multiple "beneficiaries" of the volition, usually beginning with the recipient of the letter.

(2) These two elements, the ŠLM volition(s) and the prepositional phrase(s), are the only "necessary" elements of the « sal » formula. In fact, the majority of the « sal » formulas contain *only* these two elements. A minority do contain "optional" elements, however, and these are two types, both of which tend to show up in "expanded" « sal » formulas: (i) nearly all of the "expanded" « sal » formulas, and five unexpanded « sal » formulas,[98] contain the adverbial element *danniš*, usually spelled {dan-níš}; and (ii) the « sal » formulas of two letters,[99] both of which are "expanded",

---

[96]The Akkadian volitional form which corresponds to Ugaritic *yšlm* is *lū šulmu*, usually spelled {lu-ú šul-mu}. It may be observed that, as is often the case in translation, the correspondence is semantic, not morphological. In the Ugaritic version it is the verbal form of the root ŠLM which marks the volition; in the Akkadian version it is the volitional particle (or "Wunschpartikel") *lū*. One may imagine the volitional particle *lū* to modify a "gapped" verb of being: "may well-being (exist). . . ." Allowing the validity of cross-linguistic parallels, such a verb of being shows up in the corresponding formula in Hittite letters ({e-eš-du}, 'let (it) be. . . ,' see below), and in a similar salutary expression in Biblical Hebrew (Dt. 29:18).

[97]In the Ugaritic version, the "beneficiary" of the volition is communicated by means of the simple preposition *l* (which may also appear in "expanded" forms: *ly* and *ln*). The RS Akkadian idiomatic equivalent is a complex preposition: *ana muḫḫi*, usually spelled {a-na UGU-ḫi}, literally, 'for the skull of'. Three letters, all of which probably derive from Carchemish, use a different idiom: *ana kâša*, that is, the simple preposition *ana* plus the "dative" form of the 2nd person pronoun: RS 34.136, RS 34.143, and RS 34.163.

[98]RS 10.046, RS 17.083, RS 17.143, RS 20.150, and RS 34.163.

[99]RS 20.013.2 and RS 34.139.

contain, at the beginning of the formula, the deictic particle *anumma*, spelled {a-nu-um-ma}. No known Ugaritic « sal » formula contains an equivalent of either adverbial element.[100]

(3) Setting aside those prepositional phrases of "expanded" « sal » formulas that do not refer to the recipient of the letter, which show a great deal of internal variation, the significant structural variations encountered within this corpus of « sal » formulas are of only two types: (i) structural variation, in the order in which the two "necessary" elements occur, and (ii) compositional variation within the prepositional phrase: specifically, in the composition of the noun phrase(s) which refer(s) to the recipient (that is, the « N_R » element). Both of these features appear directly related to the conceptual status of the letter as ascending or non-ascending.

(4) These ninety-four formulas are characterized by two fundamental structural patterns: (i) those formulas which begin with the ŠLM-volition,[101] and (ii) those which begin with a prepositional phrase.[102]

---

[100]Presumably, the Ugaritic equivalent of Akkadian *danniš* would have been *mid*, and of Akkadian *anumma*, perhaps *hlny* or *ht*.

[101]Sixty-seven out of eighty-eight (or 76%) of the unambiguous cases show this structure: RS 8.333, RS 11.723, RS 11.730, RS 12.033, RS 15.011, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 15.077, RS 16.003, RS 17.078, RS 17.116 (partially reconstructed), RS 17.142, RS 17.144, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.152, RS 17.239, RS 17.286, RS 17.288, RS 17.289, RS 17.292, RS 17.385, RS 17.394+, RS 17.397B+, RS 17.423, RS 17.452 (partially reconstructed), RS 18.089 (partially reconstructed), RS 19.050, RS 19.053, RS 19.070, RS 19.115, RS 20.003, RS 20.015, RS 20.017, RS 20.021, RS 20.022, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.158, RS 20.162 (partially reconstructed), RS 20.172, RS 20.178.1, RS 20.200A, RS 20.200B, RS 20.200C (partially reconstructed), RS 20.216, RS 20.237, RS 20.239, RS 20.242 (partially reconstructed), RS 20.248, RS 20.255A (partially reconstructed), RS 20.426,14+ (partially reconstructed), RS 21.183, RS 22.006, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.136, RS 34.137, RS 34.138, RS 34.143, RS 34.145, RS 34.146, RS 34.154, RS 34.158, RS 34.163, and RS 34.167+; RS [Varia 16] and RS [Varia 25]; and RIH 81/4.

[102]Twenty-one out of eighty-eight (or 24%) of the unambiguous cases show this structure: RS 6.198, RS 10.046, RS 15.014, RS 16.112 (partially reconstructed), RS 17.083, RS 17.143, RS 17.315 (partially reconstructed), RS 17.455 (partially reconstructed), RS 19.080, RS 20.013.2, RS 20.018, RS

(5) These two compositional patterns show a distribution which appears to correspond rather easily with letters which are *not* conceptually ascending,[103] and letters which *are* conceptually ascending,[104] respectively.

20.150, RS 20.168 (partially reconstructed), RS 20.178.2 (partially reconstructed), RS 20.184, RS 20.238, RS 21.064, RS 34.139, RS 34.140, RS 34.164, and RS 34.180,60 (partially reconstructed).

[103]By "letters which are not terminologically ascending", I mean those which are horizontal, descending, or unmarked in terms of conceptual status. Of the sixty-seven « sal » formulas of the pattern « ŠLM form + prepositional phrase », the terminological status may be determined in sixty-four cases (RS 19.115, RS 20.200A, and RS 20.242 are of unknown status). Of these unambiguous examples, only four (or 6%) are conceptually ascending (RS 19.070, composed on the biological kinship model; and RS 20.023.2, RS 20.162, and RS 20.200C, composed on the hierarchical power model). The rest are conceptually horizontal (twenty-two), conceptually descending on the biological kinship model (five), or unmarked for conceptual status (thirty-three). With respect to the four Ras Shamra Akkadian letters which are terminologically ascending, but which nevertheless contain « sal » formulas of the pattern « ŠLM-volition + prepositional phrase » (namely, RS 19.070, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.162, and RS 20.200C), in all four cases the « N_R » element is not a terminologically ascending REL term (as one might have expected in such a situation), but rather a pronoun suffix. This may suggest a link between the composition of the « N_R » element and the compositional order of the components.

[104]Of the twenty-one « sal » formulas of the pattern « prepositional phrase + ŠLM form », the terminological status may be determined in all cases. Fourteen of these (or 67%) are conceptually ascending letters, and seven (or 33%) are not conceptually ascending. Of the ascending letters in this batch, eight are composed on the hierarchical power model (RS 15.014, RS 16.112, RS 17.455, RS 19.080, RS 20.184, RS 21.064, RS 34.140, and RS 34.180,60) and six on the biological kinship model (RS 17.083, RS 17.143, RS 20.150, RS 20.168, RS 20.178.2, and RS 20.238). Of the seven letters which are not ascending, five (or 24% of the total number of twenty-one) are conceptually horizontal (RS 6.198, RS 10.046, RS 17.315, RS 20.013.2, and RS 34.164); and two (or 9% of the total) are conceptually unmarked (RS 20.018 and RS 34.139). The weight of the "exceptions", the seven non-ascending letters which nevertheless contain « sal » formulas of the pattern « prepositional phrase + ŠLM form », may be tempered somewhat by the following observations. (1) First of all, as many as six of these were not composed by Ugaritians, and so the fact that their composition presents "unusual" features is less surprising: the editor characterized RS 6.198 as "une lettre assyrienne" (although, despite the examples of "Assyrian" orthography, as well as prosopographical considerations, the letter presents no striking formal parallels with the presently known corpus of middle Assyrian letters, on which see E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* [1996], esp. pp. 49-73); the fact that the sender of RS 10.046 feels it necessary to address his letter to {LUGAL KUR URU ú-ga$_5$-ri-it}, while he himself is the subject of another king, indicates that he was not of the kingdom; the editor of RS 17.315 was certainly correct, it seems to me, to identify its sender as a foreign king; the editor of RS 34.164 convincingly suggests its sender was installed at Emar; and the senders of RS 20.018 and RS 34.139 were installed at Alašiya and Tarḫuntašša, respectively. (2) Secondly, despite the explicitly horizontal terminology employed in RS 34.164 (one of these "exceptions"), the REL term employed in the address of this letter provides an important interpretive clue for the nature of the social relationship between the correspondents. The REL term used there is {ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ia GAL.MEŠ}, 'my "big" brothers'; this reveals a "mixed" relationship: one that is terminologically horizontal, but functionally ascending within the broader category of "brothers". Though less explicit, the elaborate title {ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA-ia}, 'my "good"

(6) The structure of the prepositional phrase which refers to the recipient of the letter is « preposition + N_R », where « N_R » represents a noun phrase or phrases. The « N_R » element here presents two main compositional patterns:[105] (i) a 2nd person pronominal reference to the recipient,[106] or (ii) a conceptually explicit REL term with an attached 1st person pronominal suffix referring back to the sender.[107] As in the Ugaritic corpus, further structural variants are known, but poorly attested.[108]

---

brother', used in RS 20.013.2, may point to a similar hierarchy within the ranks of "brothers". (3) Finally, the possibility was suggested in the above footnote of an intimate link between the composition of the « N_R » element (in the « sal ») and the compositional order of the components of the « sal »; specifically, between the « N_R » element as a pronominal suffix and the pattern « ŠLM-volition + prepositional phrase ». In the case of the opposite pattern, « prepositional phrase + ŠLM-volition », the converse may be observed, reinforcing such a possibility. In at least four of the "exceptions" (RS 6.198, RS 10.046, RS 17.315, and RS 34.164), the « N_R » element is not a pronominal suffix, but a conceptually explicit REL term; in a fifth case both pronominal suffixes and a conceptually explicit REL term are present (in the multiple prepositional phrases of the expanded « sal » of RS 20.013.2).

[105]Of the ninety-four « sal » formulas under discussion here, twenty-two contain ambiguous, uncertain, or no information about the composition of the « N_R » element: RS 1.[056], RS 11.723, RS 15.178, RS 17.288, RS 17.394+, RS 17.397B+, RS 17.452, RS 19.050, RS 19.115, RS 20.013.2, RS 20.162, RS 20.178.1, RS 20.178.2, RS 20.182A+, RS 20.200C, RS 20.242, RS 20.243, RS 20.426,14+, RS 21.183, RS 34.165, RS 34.171.2, and RS 34.180,60. This leaves a corpus of seventy-two unambiguous examples.

[106]Fifty-six out of seventy (or 78%) of the unambiguous cases show this composition: RS 8.333, RS 11.730, RS 12.033, RS 15.011, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 15.077, RS 16.003, RS 17.078, RS 17.116, RS 17.142, RS 17.144, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.152, RS 17.239, RS 17.286, RS 17.289, RS 17.292, RS 17.385, RS 17.423, RS 18.089, RS 19.053, RS 19.070, RS 20.003, RS 20.015, RS 20.017, RS 20.018, RS 20.021, RS 20.022, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.158, RS 20.172, RS 20.200A, RS 20.200B, RS 20.216, RS 20.237, RS 20.239, RS 20.248, RS 20.255A, RS 22.006, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.136, RS 34.137, RS 34.138, RS 34.139, RS 34.143, RS 34.145, RS 34.146, RS 34.154, RS 34.158, RS 34.163, RS 34.167+; RS [Varia 16], RS [Varia 25]; and RIH 81/4.

[107]Sixteen (or 22%) of the seventy-two unambiguous examples show this structure: RS 6.198, RS 10.046, RS 15.014, RS 16.112, RS 17.083, RS 17.143, RS 17.315, RS 17.455, RS 19.080, RS 20.150, RS 20.168, RS 20.184, RS 20.238, RS 21.064, RS 34.140, and RS 34.164.

[108]In one Ugaritic letter, RS 34.148, the « N_R » element of the « sal » formula is *mlk bʿly*; that is, an ID term followed by a REL term. This compositional pattern is also attested at least once in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus: the « N_R » element of the « sal » formula of RS 10.046 is {LUGAL KUR URU ú-ga$_5$-ri-it (5) a-ḫu-ia}.

(7) The distribution of these two compositional patterns for the « N_R » element corresponds roughly to letters which are *not* terminologically ascending,[109] and to letters which *are* terminologically ascending,[110] respectively.

Several compositional differences between the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian « sal » formulas are observable as well:

(1) A comparison reveals at least two cases where the Ugaritic and Akkadian components that are formally parallel are "equivalent" only on the semantic level, not on a precise morphological level.[111] These are (i) the form of the ŠLM-volition,[112] and (ii) the composition of the preposition.[113]

---

[109]Of the fifty-six « sal » formulas in which the « N_R » element is a pronoun, the conceptual status may be determined in all but one case (the status of RS 20.200A is unknown), leaving a corpus of fifty-five unambiguous examples. Of these, fifty-three (or 96%) are not conceptually ascending. The remaining two formulas (constituting 4% of the total) do occur in ascending letters: RS 20.023.2 is composed on the hierarchical power model, and RS 19.070 on the biological kinship model. Of the fifty-three examples which are not ascending, eighteen occur in conceptually horizontal letters, five in descending letters conceived on the biological kinship model, and thirty in letters in which the conceptual status is unmarked. With respect to the two exceptions, RS 19.070 and RS 20.023.2 (terminologically ascending letters carrying « sal » formulas in which the « N_R » element is represented by means of a pronoun), the « sal » formulas also display the pattern « ŠLM-volition + prepositional phrase »; as mentioned above, this distribution may suggest a link between the composition of the « N_R » element and the order of mention of the components.

[110]Of the sixteen « sal » formulas in which the « N_R » element contains a conceptually explicit REL term, the conceptual status may be determined in all cases. Of these, twelve (or 75%) are conceptually ascending letters, and four (or 25%) are not conceptually ascending letters. The ascending letters include seven composed on the hierarchical power model, and five on the biological kinship model. Of the four "exceptions" (letters which are not ascending), all are conceptually horizontal: RS 6.198, RS 10.046, RS 17.315, and RS 34.164. These letters are familiar from the discussion above, and amenable to the same explanations offered there. I suspect that of especial value in their explication is the concept of the "mixed" letter, whereby the explicit social terminology employed denotes one type of relationship (in this case a horizontal one), while the structural pattern used is appropriate for another type of relationship (in this case an ascending one).

[111]See above, section 2.6.4.

[112]Akkadian *lū šulmu* ≈ Ugaritic *yšlm*.

[113]Akkadian *ana muḫḫi* ≈ Ugaritic *l*.

(2) In the corpus of Ugaritic « sal » formulas, the orthography of the preposition shows significant variation according to the ascending / non-ascending conceptual distinction.[114] No similar distinction is maintained in the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters.

(3) Finally, some Ras Shamra Akkadian « sal » formulas contain "optional" elements which have no attested equivalents in the Ugaritic corpus.[115]

Despite the compositional similarities described above, it is not the case that all ninety-four examples are precisely comparable in terms of composition with the standard Ugaritic « sal » formula. At least fifteen letters, and possibly as many as eighteen,[116] contain salutation formulas which are "expanded" by the addition of (1) further prepositional phrases, expressing further "beneficiaries" of the polite volition, and sometimes (2) further ŠLM-volitions. If not of paramount importance for the interpretation of the standard Ugaritic « sal » formula, this mini-corpus of "expanded" salutations is directly relevant to the discussion of two "non-standard" Ugaritic salutations: those of RS 17.434+ and RIH 78/03+, discussed in more detail below, in section 3.7. The seventy-six "unexpanded" « sal » formulas which remain are precisely comparable in virtually every respect with the standard Ugaritic « sal ».[117]

---

[114]See above, section 3.2.

[115]These are the adverbs *danniš* and *anumma*; see above.

[116]These are: possibly RS 1.[056], RS 15.014, probably RS 15.178, RS 16.112, RS 19.050, RS 19.080, RS 20.013.2, RS 20.018, RS 20.168, probably RS 20.182A+, RS 20.184, RS 20.200C, RS 20.238, RS 20.243, RS 34.139, RS 34.140, RS 34.165, and RS 34.180,60.

[117]Among these are several which are very poorly preserved, but have been restored on formal and spatial considerations. These letters (RS 17.452, RS 17.455, RS 18.089, 19.115, 20.162, 20.255A, 21.064, RS 34.171.2, and RIH 81/4) yield less detailed information, but are nevertheless included in the following list: RS 6.198, RS 8.333, RS 10.046, RS 11.723 (partially reconstructed), RS 11.730, RS

3.4.1.1.2 DISTRIBUTION

A consideration of the distribution of the « sal » formula in this corpus also yields some meaningful insights. If a salutation formula is present in ninety-five Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra, it is explicitly absent from no less than fifty-one letters.[118] This shows a distribution similar to that of the Ugaritic corpus,[119] requiring that the « sal » formula be considered an optional element of epistolary structure in this corpus as well. Also like the distribution in the Ugaritic corpus, the « sal » formula is part, along with the « pros » and « ben » formulas, of the "polite formula" section of the letter; this section follows the address and precedes the body of the letters, and its boundaries are very often demarcated by horizontal scribal lines.

12.033, RS 15.011, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 15.077, RS 16.003, RS 17.078, RS 17.083, RS 17.116 (partially reconstructed), RS 17.142, RS 17.143, RS 17.144, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.152, RS 17.239, RS 17.286, RS 17.288, RS 17.289, RS 17.292, RS 17.315 (partially reconstructed), RS 17.385, RS 17.394+, RS 17.397B+, RS 17.423, RS 17.452 (partially reconstructed), RS 17.455 (partially reconstructed), RS 18.089 (partially reconstructed), RS 19.053, RS 19.070, RS 19.115 (partially reconstructed), RS 20.003, RS 20.015, RS 20.017, RS 20.021, RS 20.022, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.150, RS 20.158, RS 20.162 (partially reconstructed), RS 20.172, RS 20.178.1, RS 20.178.2 (partially reconstructed), RS 20.200A (partially reconstructed), RS 20.200B (partially reconstructed), RS 20.216, RS 20.237, RS 20.239, RS 20.242 (partially reconstructed), RS 20.248 (partially reconstructed), RS 20.255A (partially reconstructed), RS 20.426,14+ (partially reconstructed), RS 21.064 (partially reconstructed), RS 21.183 (partially reconstructed), RS 22.006, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.136, RS 34.137, RS 34.138, RS 34.143, RS 34.145, RS 34.146, RS 34.154, RS 34.158, RS 34.163, RS 34.164, RS 34.167+, RS 34.171.2 (partially reconstructed); RS [Varia 16] and RS [Varia 25]; and RIH 81/4 (partially reconstructed).

[118]RS 1.[057], RS 4.449, RS 13.007bis, RS 15.063, RS 16.111, RS 16.116, RS 17.130, RS 17.132, RS 17.133, RS 17.148.2, RS 17.247, RS 17.383, RS 17.391, RS 17.393, RS 17.422, RS 17.425, RS 17.428, RS 19.006, RS 20.013.1, RS 20.016, RS 20.019, RS 20.033, RS 20.151, RS 20.174A, RS 20.212, RS 20.219, RS 20.232, RS 25.131, RS 25.138, RS 25.461, RS 32.204.1, RS 32.204.2, RS 34.129, RS 34.133, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.135, RS 34.141, RS 34.142, RS 34.149, RS 34.150, RS 34.151, RS 34.152, RS 34.153, RS 34.155, RS 34.160, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.173, RS 34.180,17 from Ras Shamra; and RS [Varia 26] and CK 107 (also cited as RS [Varia 35]) probably from Ras Shamra.

[119]The ration in the Ugaritic corpus is 29 : 19 (see above, section 3.3).

If optional, it does not appear to be entirely arbitrary, and like the distribution of the formula in Ugaritic, the presence of the « sal » in this corpus may be linked with two factors: (1) the terminological status of the letter as ascending or non-ascending; and (2) the conceptual model used to portray the social relationship between the correspondents. In fact, the distribution of the « sal » formula in this corpus is strikingly similar to that observed in the Ugaritic corpus.

The ninety-five examples of the « sal » formula in this corpus are distributed as follows: (1) fifteen in terminologically ascending letters composed on the hierarchical power model,[120] (2) seven in terminologically ascending letters composed on the biological kinship model,[121] (3) twenty-seven in horizontal letters (all of which are conceived on the biological kinship model),[122] (4) five in terminologically descending letters composed on the biological kinship model,[123] (5) thirty-five in terminologically unmarked letters,[124] (6) one in a terminologically mixed letter,[125] and (7) five in

---

[120]RS 1.[056], RS 15.014, RS 15.178, RS 16.112, RS 17.455, RS 19.080, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.162, RS 20.182A+, RS 20.184, RS 20.200C, RS 20.243, RS 21.064, RS 34.140, and RS 34.180,60. RS 34.171.2 is terminologically mixed (the sender addresses one of the two recipients as {EN-ia}, the other as {ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA-ia}; he characterizes himself as {ŠEŠ-ku-nu}); it also contains a « sal » formula.

[121]RS 17.083, RS 17.143, RS 19.070, RS 20.150, RS 20.168, RS 20.178.2, and RS 20.238.

[122]RS 6.198, RS 10.046, RS 11.723, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 17.116, RS 17.142, RS 17.144, RS 17.286, RS 17.315, RS 17.452, RS 18.089, RS 19.053, RS 20.013.2, RS 20.158, RS 20.172, RS 20.178.1, RS 20.200B, RS 20.248, RS 21.183, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.154, RS 34.163, RS 34.164, RS 34.167+; RS [Varia 25]; and RIH 81/4. RS 34.171.2 is terminologically mixed (the sender addresses one of the two recipients as {EN-ia}, the other as {ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA-ia}; he characterizes himself as {ŠEŠ-ku-nu}); it also contains a « sal » formula.

[123]RS 11.730, RS 17.078, RS 17.148, RS 17.152, and RS 20.255A.

[124]RS 8.333, RS 12.033, RS 15.011, RS 15.077, RS 16.003, RS 17.239, RS 17.288, RS 17.289, RS 17.292, RS 17.385, RS 17.394+, RS 17.397B+, RS 17.423, RS 19.050, RS 20.003, RS 20.015, RS 20.017, RS 20.018, RS 20.021, RS 20.022, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.216, RS 20.237, RS 20.239, RS 20.426,14+, RS 22.006, RS 34.136, RS 34.137, RS 34.138, RS 34.139, RS 34.143, RS 34.145, RS 34.146, RS 34.158; and RS [Varia 16].

letters of unknown terminological classification.[126] These numbers acquire some meaning when compared with those letters from which the « sal » formula is explicitly absent: it is absent from twenty-two ascending letters composed on the hierarchical power model,[127] from none of the eight ascending letters composed on the biological kinship model, from fourteen horizontal letters,[128] from the single attested terminologically descending letter composed on the hierarchical power model,[129] from four terminologically descending letters composed on the biological kinship model,[130] and from ten unmarked letters.[131]

The results reveal a distribution of the « sal » formula remarkably similar to that of the Ugaritic corpus. This may be adequately illustrated by simply repeating verbatim the distributional tendencies observed above in section 3.3, this time with reference to the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.

With respect to the distribution according to conceptual model, two observations are relevant: (1) "the formula appears in a large majority of letters

---

[125]In RS 34.171.2, the sender addresses one of the two recipients as {EN-ia}, and the other as {ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA-ia}; he characterizes himself as {ŠEŠ-ku-nu}. Thus, the terminological classification of this letter is a mixture of the categories ASC POW and HOR BIO.

[126]These are: RS 17.451, RS 19.115, RS 20.200A, RS 20.242, and RS 34.165.

[127]RS 1.[057], RS 17.383, RS 17.391, RS 17.393, RS 17.422, RS 17.425, RS 19.006, RS 20.016, RS 20.019, RS 20.033, RS 20.151, RS 20.219, RS 25.138, RS 25.461, RS 32.204.1, RS 32.204.2, RS 34.135, RS 34.142, RS 34.150, RS 34.151, RS 34.152; and CK 107 (=RS [Varia 35]).

[128]RS 15.063, RS 17.148.2, RS 17.428, RS 20.013.2, RS 20.232, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.141, RS 34.149, RS 34.153, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.173, RS 34.180,17; and RS [Varia 26].

[129]RS 34.155.

[130]RS 16.111, RS 17.247, RS 25.131, and RS 34.133.

[131]RS 4.449, RS 13.007bis, RS 17.130, RS 17.132, RS 17.133, RS 20.013.1, RS 20.174A, RS 20.212, RS 34.129, and RS 34.160.

composed on the biological kinship model,"[132] and (2) "it appears only about half of the time in letters composed on the hierarchical power model."[133]

With respect to the distribution according to conceptual status, it was observed in section 3.3 that, for the Ugaritic corpus, "the present data reveal no marked tendencies for the presence or absence of the [salutation] formula; it appears somewhat more than half of the time in ascending, horizontal, and descending letters. . . ." The data for the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters are not incompatible with this assessment.[134]

In fact, one of the few significant distributional differences between the Ras Shamra Akkadian and Ugaritic corpora shows up in the case of terminologically unmarked letters. In section 3.3, it was observed that in the Ugaritic corpus the « sal » formula appears "somewhat less than half the time in letters which are terminologically unmarked."[135] The opposite tendency is observable in the Ras

---

[132]Twelve out of sixteen (or 75%) of the explicitly ascending and descending letters composed along the biological kinship model contain the « sal » formula (see above); the Ugaritic ratio was 8:9 (or 89%). If one includes the horizontal letters, all of which are composed on the biological kinship model (see above), the proportions shift to thirty-nine out of fifty-seven (that is, 68%); the Ugaritic ratio was 17:20 (or 85%).

[133]At least fifteen such letters contain the « sal » formula (see above), at least twenty-three explicitly omit it (see above); the « sal » is thus present roughly 39% of the time. The Ugaritic ratio was 10:20 (or 50%).

[134]For ascending letters in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, twenty-two out of forty-four (or 50%) of the unambiguous examples contain the « sal » formula (see above); the Ugaritic ratio was 16:22 (or 62%). For horizontal letters for which the data is preserved and unambiguous, twenty-seven out of forty-one (or 66%) contain the « sal » formula (see above); the Ugaritic ratio was 9:14 (or 64%). Finally, for the descending letters of the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, five out of ten (or 50%) of the unambiguous examples contain the « sal » formula (see above); the Ugaritic data were 2:3 (or 67%).

[135]The Ugaritic ratio was 3:8 (or 38%).

Shamra Akkadian corpus, where a strong majority of unmarked letters contain the « sal » formula.[136]

Moreover, this distributional difference carries over into the category of letters which are technically unmarked in terms of conceptual status, but "contextually descending". Regarding this category in the Ugaritic corpus, it was observed in section 3.3 that "the « sal » formula tends not to be used in terminologically unmarked letters for which contextual factors suggest an underlying descending social relationship." For such letters in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus,[137] the opposite distribution is present.[138]

---

[136]Among the unmarked letters, thirty-five out of forty-five (or 78%) of the unambiguous examples contain the « sal » formula (see above).

[137]Among the corpus of terminologically unmarked letters, I believe the following twenty-two letters may be safely assumed to derive from a "contextually descending" social situation: RS 8.333 (from {LUGAL KUR-kar-ga-m[is]} to {^{m}a-[m]is-tam-ri LUGAL KUR-ú-[g]a-ri-it}); RS 12.033 (from {[LUGA]⌜L$^{?}$⌝ - ma} to {^{f}šar-e-li GAŠAN KUR ú-[g]a-r[i-it]}), RS 13.007bis (from {LUGA[L-r]i-ma} to {^{m}am-m[u]-ra-bi LUGAL KUR-ú-ga-ri[-it]}); RS 16.003 (from {LUGAL KUR kar-ga-[mi]s} to {^{m}a-mis-tam-ri LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 17.130 (from {^{m}ta-ba-ar-na ^{m}ḫa-at-tu-ši-li LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR ḫa-at-ti} to {^{m}níq-mu-pa}); RS 17.132 (from {^{d}UTU-ši LUGAL GAL} to {^{m}ni-iq-ma-an-da}); RS 17.133 (from {^{d}UTU-ši-ma} to {^{m}a-mis-tam-ri}); RS 17.289 (from {LUGAL KUR kar-ga-mis} to {^{m}i-bi-ra-ni LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 17.292 (from {LUGAL KUR kar-ga-mis} to {^{m}i-bi-ra-na LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 17.385 (from {LUGAL KUR k[ar-g]a-mis} to {^{m}i-bi-ra-ni LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 17.423 (from {LUGAL-ma} to {^{m}i-bi-ra-ni LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 20.013.1 (from {MÍ.LUGAL-m[a]} to {^{m}ia-an-ḫa-[m]u}); RS 20.022 (from {LUGAL KUR kar-[g]a-mis} to {^{m}a-mis-tam-ri LUGAL KUR ú-[g]a-ri-it}); RS 20.174A. (from {LUGAL-ma} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 20.216 (from {LU[GA]L-ma} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 20.237 (from {LUGAL-m[a$^{?}$]} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 34.129 (from {^{d}UTU-ši-m[a] LUGAL GAL-ú} to {LÚ sà-ki-in-ni}); RS 34.136 (from {LUGAL-ma} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-rít}); RS 34.138 (from {LUGAL KUR kar-g[a-mis]} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-r⌜i-i⌝t}); RS 34.143 (from {LUGAL-ma} to {LUGAL KUR ú-ga-ri-it}); RS 34.145 (from {LUGAL-ma} to {MÍ.LUGAL KUR u-ga-⌜ri⌝-it}); and RS [Varia 16] (from {LUGAL - ma} to {^{m}am-mu-ra-pi L[UG]AL KUR ú-ga-rít}).

[138]Of twenty-two such letters (see the above footnote), fifteen (or 68%) contain the « sal » formula: RS 8.333, RS 12.033, RS 16.003, RS 17.289, RS 17.292, RS 17.385, RS 17.423, RS 20.022, RS 20.216, RS 20.237, RS 34.136, RS 34.138, RS 34.143, RS 34.145, and RS [Varia 16]. The Ugaritic ratio was 1:6 (or 17%).

How is this single striking distributional difference, between two epistolary corpora which are otherwise so formally similar, to be explained? Both formal and contextual reasons could be advanced.

In theory, one could attribute the distinction observed above to differences conditioned by language or script. In practice, however, there is little evidence for believing that the epistolary conventions of Ugaritic letters differed significantly from those of Ras Shamra Akkadian letters; nor, by extension, that those of letters written in alphabetic script differed significantly from those in logo-syllabic script. On the contrary, the available data point to a whole host of formal similarities between the Late Bronze letters found at Ras Shamra (and beyond) and the Ugaritic letters, regardless of language or script. The most appealing explanations, then, would appear to be those based on contextual factors.

Some casual contextual considerations suggest that the difference may be attributed to the local origin of letters. For the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, those terminologically unmarked letters presumably composed by Ugaritian scribes tended to omit the salutation;[139] those presumably composed by foreign scribes, notably those of Ḫattuša and Carchemish, tended to include it.[140]

---

[139]There is no reason to doubt that, among the Ugaritic letters, RS 4.475, RS 16.264, RS 29.095, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2580, and RS 96.2039, were composed by Ugaritian scribes. Given the identity of the sender of RS 15.158, apparently someone at the court of Carchemish was responsible for its composition. Is it significant that this is the sole conceptually UNMARKED letter in the Ugaritic corpus to contain the « sal » formula? Among the Ras Shamra Akkadian conceptually UNMARKED letters from which the « sal » is explicitly omitted (see above), RS 20.013.1 and perhaps RS 34.160 conceivably derive from Ugaritian scribes. This is not to suggest that Ugaritian scribes would never have included the « sal » when composing conceptually unmarked letters; such must remain a possibility. Since the sender of RS 17.239 and of 20.023.1 is "the prefect", written {^{m}sà-ki-in(-ni)}, these letters could easily derive from Ugaritian scribes (but is the editor necessarily correct in identifying the sender in each case as the prefect *of Ugarit*?). Furthermore, several conceptually UNMARKED letters between private individuals also include the « sal » formula; these could also easily reflect Ugaritian epistolary conventions: RS 15.011, RS 20.015, RS 20.239, and RS 20.426+ (although the presence of the « sal » formula in this latter is by no means certain). It remains, however, that

This distribution may be deceptive, however, for hidden behind the differences in local origin are contextual differences of a more profound nature: the Ras Shamra letters composed by Ugaritian scribes are, by and large, "private" correspondence,[141] while the Ras Shamra letters composed by foreign scribes are, by and large, "royal". In fact, not only are they "royal, but they also by and large represent international diplomatic correspondence between courts. In this light, another explanation for the unusual distribution observed above appears possible: a « sal » formula is appropriate when addressing any "king", even one who occupies a relatively lower social position with respect to the sender.[142] If valid, this would provide another illustration for the expediency of polite flattery in international diplomacy.

The distribution of the "expanded" « sal » formulas is also significant. Of the eighteen probable examples of such formulas, the conceptual status is identifiable in

---

where the data are explicit, conceptually UNMARKED letters presumably composed by Ugaritian scribes tend to omit the « sal » formula.

[140]In the Ugaritic corpus, compare RS 15.158 (from [*mlk g*]*rgmš*). In the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, compare the letters mentioned three footnotes above, as well as the following conceptually UNMARKED letters which also contain the « sal » formula: RS 17.288, RS 20.017, RS 20.021, and RS 34.158 (all from *Ušnatu*); RS 17.397B+ (from *ʿAmqu*); RS 20.018 (from *Alašiya*); RS 34.137 (from Byblos); RS 34.139 (from *Tarḫuntašša*); RS 34.146 (from Qadeš); RS 17.394 (from an unknown foreign king); and RS 15.077, RS 20.003, RS 22.006, and probably RS 19.050 (from senders who characterize themselves as {DUMU LUGAL}). This is not to suggest that foreign scribes would have always included the « sal » formula when composing unmarked letters; indeed such is not always the case (compare RS 13.007bis and RS 20.174A from Carchemish; and RS 17.130, RS 17.132, RS 17.133, RS 20.212, and RS 34.129 from Ḫattuša, all of which are conceptually UNMARKED and explicitly omit the « sal » formula). Rather, these observations are intended to reveal a tendency to include the « sal » formula in various letters of foreign provenance; and above all, to point out the lack of such a tendency in letters presumably composed according to epistolary conventions current at Ugarit.

[141]By my use of the term "private", I do not intend to evoke an overarching theory of Ugaritian society as being composed of two sectors, "royal" and "private". Rather, this observation is intended to highlight a formal classificatory distinction based on the identification terms used by the correspondents themselves: for example, correspondence between "PN" and "PN" I consider "private", while correspondence between "PN, the king of GN" and "PN, the king of GN" I consider "royal".

[142]C. Roche drew my attention to this distributional feature.

all but one case.[143] The vast majority of these are conceptually ascending; and, of these which are ascending, the vast majority are composed on the hierarchical power model.[144] If one concludes from this that "expanded" « sal » formulas are not inappropriate for conceptually ascending letters composed on the hierarchical power model, such would coincide with the Ugaritic data, where at least one, and possibly both, of the two attested "expanded" « sal » formulas are also found in such letters.[145] This granted, however, an interesting distributional difference emerges between the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian corpora: "expanded" « sal » formulas are thus very rare among the ASC POW letters in Ugaritic, but quite common among the ASC POW letters in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.[146] Since the two epistolary corpora are in other respects so similar, one might assume that the reasons for this difference are contextual.[147]

---

[143]The conceptual status of RS 34.165 is unknown.

[144]The conceptually ascending letters are thirteen in number (or 76% of the unambiguous cases): RS 1.[056], RS 15.014, RS 15.178, RS 16.112, RS 19.080, RS 20.168, probably RS 20.182A+, RS 20.184, RS 20.200C, RS 20.238, RS 20.243, RS 34.140, and RS 34.180,60. Of these thirteen, eleven are composed on the hierarchical power model (the two composed on the biological kinship model are RS 20.168 and RS 20.238).

[145]On the « sal » formulas of RS 17.434+ and RIH 78/03+, see below, section 3.7.

[146]Of the fifteen ASC POW letters in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, the character of the « sal » formula as "expanded" or unexpanded is discernible or probably discernible in all of the examples. Of these, eleven (or 73%) are certainly or probably "expanded" (RS 1.[056], RS 15.014, RS 15.178, RS 16.112, RS 19.080, RS 20.182A+, RS 20.184, RS 20.200C, RS 20.243, RS 34.140, and RS 34.180,60), and four (or 27%) are certainly or probably unexpanded (RS 17.455, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.162, RS 21.064).

[147]For an attempt at an explanation, see below, in section 3.7; and compare above.

3.4.1.2 Salutation formulas in the Amarna corpus

The Amarna corpus contains over forty recognizable examples of the « sal » formula.[148] Like the "salutations" of the Ugaritic corpus, these are formulaic wishes for the general well-being of the recipient; what is more, they all follow compositional patterns represented in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus.

3.4.1.2.1 COMPOSITION

In broad terms, one can describe the corpus of Amarna salutation formulas as consisting of two basic compositional patterns: (1) one in which the "beneficiary" of the salutation is expressed by means of a prepositional phrase, the volition itself being impersonal, and (2) another in which this "beneficiary" is the grammatical subject of the volition. The former pattern is found in all but one of the salutations in the Amarna corpus, and is also typical of the Ugaritic salutation formulas. The latter is found uniquely in EA 34 among the Amarna letters, and apparently in RS 3.334 in the Ugaritic corpus. This "atypical" salutation is discussed below, in section 3.7.

---

[148]The letters containing « sal » formulas number at least forty-three: EA 1-3, EA 5 (partially reconstructed), EA 6, EA 7 (partially reconstructed), EA 8-10, EA 11 (partially reconstructed), EA 12.1 (two occurrences apparently, of which the first is partially reconstructed), EA 15-17, EA 18 (partially reconstructed), EA 19-21, EA 23, EA 24 (partially reconstructed), EA 26 (partially reconstructed), EA 27 (partially reconstructed), EA 28, EA 29 (partially reconstructed), EA 31, EA 33-35, EA 37-40, EA 41 (partially reconstructed), EA 42.1 (partially reconstructed), EA 44, EA 48 (partially reconstructed), EA 49 (partially reconstructed), EA 59, EA 158, EA 166, EA 169 (partially reconstructed), EA 170.1, and EA 170.2. EA 45 may have contained a « sal » formula in lines 4-7, as suggested by W. Moran (*Les lettres d'El-Amarna* [1987] 215-216, and n. 2), but nothing conclusive of this is preserved. EA 382 is also poorly preserved; it too may have contained another example of the « sal » formula in lines 5-8.

The remaining forty-one Amarna « sal » formulas which are preserved sufficiently well to permit analysis[149] are internally unified by at least one compositional similarity shared with the Ugaritic corpus: all are composed of two and only two "necessary" elements: (i) an impersonal volition derived from the root ŠLM; and (ii) a prepositional phrase[150] expressing the "beneficiary" of this volition. In the case of "expanded" « sal » formulas, one or both of these elements may be repeated.

Unlike the Ugaritic « sal » formulas, the order of these two necessary components in the Amarna corpus appears to be more or less fixed: the "beneficiary" phrase occurs prior to the *ŠLM*-volition. The single exception to this is EA 49, a conceptually ascending letter composed on the hierarchical power model, where the « sal » formula begins with the *ŠLM*-volition, and continues with the "beneficiary" prepositional phrase. If the sender of this letter was indeed one of the kings of Ugarit named Niqmaddu, as W. F. Albright suggested,[151] this letter represents yet another oddity. Not only is it the only Amarna « sal » formula to begin with the *ŠLM*-volition, but it also makes use of a compositional pattern which, judged from the point of view of Ugaritic scribal conventions, is expressly inappropriate for conceptually ASC POW letters.[152] On the whole, it cannot be maintained that the Amarna salutation formulas

---

[149]EA 169 is thus omitted. The composition of the remaining « sal » formulas, even those which are partially reconstructed, is discernible.

[150]In the case of EA 31, which is in Hittite, "prepositional phrase" does not apply; read instead "nominal phrase".

[151]Albright, *BASOR* 95 (1944) 31: {níq-ma-^{d}IM}.

[152]While such a situation (a conceptually ASC POW letter in which the « sal » formula begins with the *ŠLM*-volition) is not unknown in the epistolary corpora from Ras Shamra, it is by no means standard. In most cases, when conceptually ASC POW letters, both in Ugaritic and Akkadian, employ a « sal » formula, they place the prepositional phrase prior to the *ŠLM*-volition. See above, sections 3.2 and 3.4.1.1 (Ras Shamra salutations).

present compositional patterns which distinguish conceptually ascending from non-ascending letters, as was the case in the Ugaritic corpus.

The orthography of the *ŠLM*-volition in the Amarna corpus shows variations in the spelling of both elements: the particle *lū* and the noun *šulmu*. Two writings are dominant: {lu-ú šul-mu}, found in letters of various provenience,[153] and {lu šu-ul-mu}, found exclusively in the letters from the kings of Kar(an)duniaš.[154] Other writings are less common.[155]

The composition of the phrase referring to the "beneficiary" also shows considerable diversity. In the Akkadian version of the formula, this is generally a prepositional phrase, and variation is encountered both in the orthography of the preposition, be it simple or complex, and in the structure of the noun phrase which follows, be it a pronoun, a common noun, or a noun phrase. In "expanded" « sal » formulas, which contain multiple prepositional phrases, the most variation, in both of the categories just mentioned, occurs in the first prepositional phrase encountered, this being the phrase which refers to the recipient of the letter. In other words, it can be said that the most variation, in the writing of the preposition as well as the form of the noun phrase(s) governed by it, occurs in the prepositional phrase in which the "beneficiary" of the volition is the recipient of the letter. In these types of phrases in

---

[153]This writing, which is also standard among the « sal » formulas of the Ras Shamra corpus, is found in EA 1, EA 15, EA 17-21, EA 23-24, EA 26-29, EA 35, EA 38, EA 40-41, EA 42.1, EA 44, EA 48-49, EA 59, EA 158, EA 166, and EA 170; also EA 169 and EA 382; and apparently in the "situation report" of EA 5.

[154]This writing is found in EA 2-3, EA 6, EA 8-10, and probably EA 11. Compare also this orthography in Ni 615 and Ni 641: A. Goetze, *JCS* 6 (1952) 142-145.

[155]These include {lu-ú šu-ul-mu}, in EA 12 and EA 37 (the latter of which is from Alašiya); {lu šul-mu} in EA 16 (from Assyria); and {lu-ú šal-mu} in EA 34 (from Alašiya). EA 31, written in Hittite, expresses this component with {SIG$_5$-in e-eš-tu} (compare HKM 95.2). Finally, EA 33 seems to show two spellings of this clause: {lu-ú šul-<mu>} in line 4 and {lu šul-mu} in line 8.

particular, whether the « sal » formula be "expanded" or not, several different structures and orthographies occur. The most common writing is (1) {a-na « N_R »}, where « N_R » may be either a pronoun[156] or (a) noun phrase(s)[157] referring to the recipient. Other attested structures include: (2) {a-na maḫ-ri « N_R »},[158] where « N_R » is a pronoun; (3) {a-na UGU « N_R »}, where « N_R » may be either a pronoun[159] or a noun phrase;[160] (4) {a-na UGU-ḫi « N_R »},[161] where « N_R » may be either a pronoun[162] or a noun phrase;[163] and (5) {a-na ma-ḫar « N_R »}, where « N_R » is

---

[156]The attested forms are {a-na ka-ša} (EA 6, EA 8, EA 12.1, EA 15-16, and EA 38); {a-na ka-a-ša} (EA 2-3, EA 9-11, EA 17, EA 19-20, EA 23-24, EA 27-29), and {a-na ka-a-ši} (EA 26). These appear to be the productive "dative" forms of the 2nd person singular pronouns in active use both in Mesopotamia proper (letters from the kings of Karaduniaš [that is, Babylonia] and Assyria) and in the western periphery (letters from the kings of Mittanni, Alašiya, Egypt, etc.). Judging from usage, *kāša* is masculine, *kāši* feminine. This would differ from the Old Babylonian paradigm; perhaps paradigm pressure (the corresponding independent pronouns are *atta* and *atti*) played a role in such a development.

[157]At least three formulas show this structure, including EA 7 {a-na a-ḫi-ia} and EA 37 {[a]-na ŠEŠ-ia}. The sender of EA 21 refers to his correspondent with a compound nominal phrase: {a-na ŠEŠ-ia ù a-na ḫa-ta-ni-ia}. As shown, these noun phrases all consist of REL terms with attached 1st person singular suffixes, referring back to the sender.

[158]Compare {a-na maḫ-ri-ka} in EA 1, EA 33, and EA 41.

[159]Compare {a-na UGU-ka} in EA 39 and EA 166.

[160]Compare {a-na UGU ŠEŠ-ia} in EA 35; and {a-na [U]GU LUGAL! ^{d}UTU-ši EN-ia} in EA 49. In both examples the noun phrases contain REL terms with attached 1st person singular suffixes, referring back to the recipient; the latter example also includes a ID term: {LUGAL! ^{d}UTU-ši} (compare the Ugaritic letter RS 34.148, in which the « N_R » element of the « sal » formula also contains both ID and REL terms).

[161]This is the standard pattern in the « sal » formulas of the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.

[162]Compare EA 170.2 {a-na UGU-ḫi-ku-nu}.

[163]Compare EA 158 {[a]-na ⌜UGU⌝-ḫi a-bi-ia}; and EA 170.1 {a-na UGU-ḫi EN-ni}. In both of these, the noun phrase consists of a REL term, with attached 1st person singular suffix, referring back to the sender.

represented by a noun phrase.[164] In the single Hittite letter in this corpus, EA 31, the reference to the recipient of the letter as "beneficiary" of the volition is pronominal.[165] The structure {iš-tu « N_R »} is not here considered relevant, despite frequent interpretations of this motif in EA 166, for example,[166] as part of a salutation formula. I consider this to be part of another motif: the "situation report".[167] In "expanded" « sal » formulas, the prepositional phrases referring to "beneficiaries" other than the recipient show less formal diversity. The most common prepositional structure, by far, is {a-na + « noun phrase(s) » }; but {i-na + « noun phrase(s) » } is also attested.[168]

The diverse means of writing the prepositional idioms in the corpus of Amarna salutation formulas do not show a distribution which corresponds to differences in conceptual status, that is, ascending versus non-ascending, as was the case with the Ugaritic salutation.[169] However, the manner in which the sender refers to the recipient in the « sal » formula, whether by means of conceptually explicit REL terminology or by pronominal reference, does appear to correspond, if loosely and with less

---

[164]Compare EA 44 {a-na ma-ḫar be-lí a-bi-ia}. The noun phrase consists of an ID term (since no suffix is present, this is a contextually independent title, 'the lord', and therefore an ID term) and a REL phrase, the latter with an attached 1st person singular suffix referring back to the sender.

[165]This component in EA 31 is represented by the writing {du-uq-qa kat-ta} (that is, {tù-uk-ka$_4$ kat-ta}); compare {tu-uq-qa kat-ta} (that is, {tu-uk-ka$_4$ kat-ta}) in ABoT 65.

[166]Compare, for example, W. L. Moran, *Les lettres d'El-Amarna* (1987) 406, and n. 1.

[167]See below, chapter 5. The presence of the particle *lū* is not decisive, as it is also used in situation reports (compare such usage in EA 5, EA 24, and EA 35, for example). In addition to other arguments, the distribution of the prepositions in the *praescriptio* of the Amarna letters: *ana* (in the salutation) and *ištu* (in the situation report), parallels that of Ugaritic: *l* (salutation) and *ʿm* (situation report).

[168]Compare EA 35 {i-na ŠÀ-bi KUR.KUR.MEŠ-ka}; EA 38 {i-na ma-a-du ERÍN.MEŠ-ka (6) KUR.KUR-ka LÚ.MEŠ.GAL.GAL-ka}; and EA 39 {i-na KUR mi-iṣ-ri KUR-ka}. The « sal » formulas of EA 5 and EA 42.1 also contained this preposition.

[169]See above, section 3.2.

consistency than was observable in the Ugaritic corpus, with the conceptual distinction between ascending and non-ascending letters, respectively. In other words, when conceptually ascending letters contain a « sal » formula, the « N_R » element tends to be a conceptually explicit REL term,[170] but in the « sal » formulas of letters which are not conceptually ascending, this « N_R » element tends to be a pronoun.[171] Such a distribution is also found in the Ugaritic corpus.

The various "optional" elements attested in the corpus of Amarna salutations include: (1) the conjunction *u*, always spelled {ù},[172] prefaced to the formula; (2) the adverb *danniš*, occurring in at least four different spellings,[173] immediately preceding the *ŠLM*-volition; and (3) the noun *gabba*, written {gab-ba},[174] in which the

---

[170]In conceptually ascending letters, the « N_R » element of the « sal » formula is a conceptually explicit REL term in five out of six (or 83%) of the unambiguous cases: EA 44, probably EA 48, EA 49, EA 158, and EA 170.1. The exception is EA 59, where the « N_R » element is a pronoun.

[171]In conceptually non-ascending letters (that is, in letters which are conceptually horizontal, descending, or explicitly unmarked), the « N_R » element of the « sal » formula is a pronoun in twenty-three out of twenty-seven (or 85%) of the unambiguous examples. The four exceptions are EA 7, EA 21, EA 35, and EA 37, all of which contain conceptually explicit REL terminology in this slot. What is more, all of these exceptions also contain explicitly horizontal REL terminology (EA 21 is conceptually mixed, containing both horizontal and descending REL terms; the other three are horizontal). This usage of conceptually explicit REL terminology in the case of four horizontal letters is another example of a tendency already observed with respect to the « pros » formula in the Ugaritic corpus (see above, section 2.3): namely, the occasional presence, in correspondence between "brothers", of formal structures which are otherwise typical of conceptually ascending situations (compare also the Ras Shamra Akkadian examples of this phenomenon mentioned above in section 3.4.1.1).

[172]Present in EA 34-35, and EA 38-40, all of which were presumably composed in Alašiya.

[173]These are {da-an-ni-iš}, found in the salutations of letters from Babylonia (EA 2-3 and EA 7-11), Egypt (EA 1), and Mittanni (EA 20); {dan-níš}, in the salutations of letters from Mittanni (EA 19, EA 21, EA 23-24, and EA 26-29), Alašiya (EA 35 and EA 38), and Ḫatti (EA 41); {MA.GAL}, in the salutations of letters from Alašiya (EA 33-34 and EA 39); and {dá-an-ni-iš} in one letter from Mittanni (EA 17). EA 37 (from Alašiya) may present a fifth spelling, {KAL}, unless this be a simple scribal error: {dan-<níš>}.

[174]This occurs in EA 44.

accusative case vowel apparently marks an adverbial usage, '(with respect to) everything'. The Ugaritic corpus of salutations contains a possible equivalent to the first,[175] but no equivalent for either of the latter two "optional" elements.[176]

Thus, the several compositional differences between the Ugaritic and Amarna salutations are the same as those already mentioned above for the corpus of Ras Shamra Akkadian salutations: (1) the two cases in which the Ugaritic and Akkadian components which are formally parallel[177] are "equivalent" only on a semantic level, not on a precise morphological level. (2) In the corpus of Ugaritic « sal » formulas, the orthography of the preposition shows significant variation according to the ascending / non-ascending conceptual distinction; such a compositional distinction is not maintained in the Amarna letters. In addition, (3) some Amarna « sal » formulas contain "optional" elements which have no attested equivalents in the Ugaritic corpus. Finally, (4) unlike the Ras Shamra Akkadian salutations, the Amarna salutations do not show a compositional distinction in the order of the two necessary components, one characteristic of conceptually ascending letters, and the other of non-ascending letters; only one compositional pattern is widespread in the Amarna corpus, regardless of conceptual status: that in which the prepositional phrase expressing the "beneficiary" occurs prior to the *ŠLM*-volition.

---

[175]Compare RS 29.093, a Ugaritic letter in which the « sal » formula begins with the conjunction *p*; see below, section 3.7.

[176]One can nevertheless guess at the form such an element would take, were it to be found in a Ugaritic letter one day: probably Ugaritic *mìd* ≈ Akkadian *danniš*, and Ugaritic *kll* ≈ Akkadian *gabb-*, judging from this correspondence in Ugaritic and Akkadian "situation reports" (see below, chapter 5).

[177]These are (i) the form of the ŠLM-volition, and (ii) the morphological composition of the preposition; see above, section 2.6.4.

A further necessary step in the interpretation of the Amarna salutations is the isolation of those « sal » formulas which are "expanded" from those which are not. In the Ugaritic corpus, "expanded" salutations are the exception, not the rule. The opposite distribution is found in the Amarna corpus.[178] Of the forty-three examples of the « sal » formula in the Amarna corpus, their character as "expanded" or "non-expanded" may be determined in all cases but one.[179] Of these, thirty-four formulas are "expanded",[180] and eight are not.[181]

The distribution of these two structures appears, strictly on the Amarna evidence, fairly straightforward. Virtually all of the "expanded" « sal » formulas are found in letters in which both of the correspondents are certainly or almost certainly identified as {LUGAL}, 'king'.[182] On the other had, none of the eight non-expanded

---

[178]The reasons for this difference appear to be linked to the geographical and cultural scope of the respective corpora, or, in other words, the character of the letters as domestic or international. The majority of the Ugaritic letters appears to represent domestic correspondence; the Amarna corpus, on the other hand, is virtually all of an international diplomatic nature. The "expanded" « sal » formula appears to be at home in international correspondence, especially of a diplomatic nature, and the non-expanded « sal » formula at home in domestic correspondence.

[179]The exception is EA 169, of uncertain composition.

[180]EA 1-3, EA 5-11, EA 12.1, EA 15-17, probably EA 18, EA 19-21, EA 23-24, EA 26-29, EA 31, EA 33-35, EA 37-39, EA 41, EA 42.1, and EA 49.

[181]EA 40, EA 44, EA 48, EA 59, EA 158, EA 166, EA 170.1, and EA 170.2.

[182]There are two exceptions: EA 12.1 and EA 26. The recipient of EA 12.1 is possibly a king, even if the address does not identify him as such (the letter is addressed to {^{m}BI-NI-ia}), since the salutation contains wishes for the well-being of his "chariots" and "men"; the sender identifies herself as {DUMU.MÍ LUGAL-ma}. In EA 26, the recipient is referred to as {[N]IN KUR mi-⌜iš⌝-[ri-i$^{?}$]}, 'the lady of the land of Egypt' ({NIN} in this context must have connotations of superior power; contrast the usage of this sign for 'sister' in non-diplomatic correspondence in the epistolary corpora of the western periphery); this woman is, for prosopographical reasons, almost certainly the {^{f}te-i-e} mentioned in EA 28, and must have wielded a considerable influence, since she is mentioned by name in the salutation of EA 28 (no other king's mother is specially mentioned in the salutations of the Amarna corpus).

« sal » formulas occur in such letters. Of these latter, in some cases the recipient is identified as a {LUGAL},[183] but in none of these does the sender so identify himself.

In terms of composition, the eight "non-expanded" Amarna salutations are comparable to the standard Ugaritic « sal » formulas; the thirty-four "expanded" salutations are of less importance, though these are of relevant to the discussion of the "non-standard" Ugaritic salutation in RIH 78/03+, discussed below, in section 3.7.

3.4.1.2.2 DISTRIBUTION

Like the « sal » formula in the other epistolary corpora discussed thus far, the Amarna salutation is an optional component of epistolary structure.[184] Nevertheless, its presence does not appear to be entirely arbitrary, but may be linked with the conceptual status of the letter: it tends to be used in conceptually horizontal letters,[185] and tends not to be used in conceptually ascending[186] or descending[187] letters.

---

[183]The recipients of EA 40, EA 44, and EA 170.1 are identified as {LUGAL}.

[184]This is obvious from the fact that only forty-three letters in a corpus of nearly four hundred tablets contain the formula.

[185]The vast majority of EA 1-43 are conceptually horizontal or contain conceptually horizontal REL terms (this latter statement applies to the letters of Tušratta, which are generally conceptually mixed, containing both horizontal and descending terminology); of these virtually all contain a « sal » formula (when preserved sufficiently for such a determination to be possible).

[186]The vast majority of EA 44-378 are conceptually ascending; of these, only a small fraction (about five, or less than 2%) contain a salutation.

[187]There are not many letters which contain explicitly descending conceptual terminology (and only descending terminology) in the corpus. I have found four: EA 30, EA 96, EA 162, and EA 369. None of these contains a « sal » formula. The majority of the letters from Tušratta to "Nimmureya" (=Amenophis III) are terminologically mixed, employing both horizontal ({ŠEŠ} 'brother') and descending ({ḫa-ta-ni-ia} 'my son-in-law') terms (these are EA 19-21, EA 23-24, and EA 27-29); in terms of structure, these letters resemble the other horizontal letters in this corpus, and, outside of the *praescriptio*, Tušratta always calls his correspondent "brother". Thus, I do not include these "mixed" letters as examples of "pure" descending letters.

Terminologically unmarked letters do not show any remarkable tendency with respect to the presence or absence of the « sal » formula.[188] The distribution of the « sal » also appears to be related to the conceptual model employed in the letters to express the social relationship(s) between the correspondents: the majority of letters composed on the biological kinship model contain the « sal » formula,[189] and the majority composed on the hierarchical power model omit it.[190] This apparent difference may be illusory, or, perhaps more accurately, heavily influenced by conceptual status, since the majority of letters containing « sal » formulas are conceptually horizontal, and all of these are composed along the biological kinship model; and since the majority of letters from which the « sal » is absent are conceptually ascending, and nearly all of these are composed on the hierarchical power model.

Thus, provided that the statistical manipulations presented here are sufficiently valid to permit such conclusions, the distribution of the « sal » in the Amarna corpus is not noticeably parallel to that of the Ugaritic corpus. Nevertheless, it does resemble

---

[188]Like the conceptually descending letters, the body of conceptually unmarked letters in the Amarna corpus is not large. I have found as many as ten (EA 12.1, EA 15, EA 31, EA 71, EA 97, EA 98, EA 170.2, EA 316.2, EA 367, and EA 370), of which four contain a « sal » formula (EA 12.1, EA 15, EA 31, and EA 170.2).

[189]The majority of EA 1-43 are composed on the biological kinship model. Of all of these for which an identification is possible, the « sal » is present (EA 12.2 and EA 30, from which the « sal » is absent, do not represent exceptions since they are composed on the hierarchical power model). Among the rest of the corpus, EA 44, EA 158, and EA 166, are also composed on the biological kinship model, and also contain the « sal » (I include EA 44 here because the REL terms are all composed on the biological kinship model; the phrase {be-lí}, in lines 1 and 5, is not here used as a REL term to describe the relationship between the correspondents, rather it appears to be a ID term, characterizing the recipient individually and specifically). At least one exception should be mentioned: EA 73, composed on the biological kinship model, from which the « sal » is absent.

[190]The vast majority of EA 44-378 are, where an identification is possible, composed on the hierarchical power model. The « sal » is lacking from all of these, with the exception of EA 48, EA 49, EA 59, and EA 170.1. EA 44, EA 158, and EA 166 do not represent exceptions, since they are composed on the biological kinship model.

the Ugaritic data in at least two respects: a disposition for the « sal » to appear in letters composed on the biological kinship model, and in conceptually horizontal letters.[191] Neither should the distributional differences between the Ugaritic and Amarna « sal » formulas be exaggerated, however, without taking into account certain fundamental contextual factors: the Amarna corpus contains, above all, international diplomatic letters between kings on a level of parity, and international diplomatic letters from subordinate "vassal" kings to a "great king" of superior status. Both of these situations are the exception rather than the rule in the Ugaritic corpus, and the distributional differences observed above could just as easily be explained with reference to these features as by the supposition that the differences imply independent epistolary traditions.

With respect to the placement of the formula, the distribution in the Amarna corpus resembles that of the Ugaritic: the « sal » formula is part of the "polite formulas" section of the letter, that is, the structural section which follows the address and precedes the body of the letter. As in the Ugaritic corpus, the structural boundaries of this section are often demarcated by horizontal scribal lines. In the Amarna corpus, this is nearly always the case for the boundary between the "polite formulas" and the body of the letter; much more rarely are such lines placed between the address and the polite formulas.[192]

Regarding the composition of these "polite formulas", however, one may observe a remarkable difference between the Amarna and Ugaritic corpora. In the Ugaritic corpus, the "polite formulas" are typically composed of a combination of only

---

[191]For a discussion of the Ugaritic data, see above, section 3.3.

[192]Compare, for example, this usage in EA 7, EA 16, EA 41.

three elements: the « pros », the « sal », and the « ben » formulas. In rare cases, the use of horizontal scribal lines suggests that some scribes also conceived of a fourth component as belonging among the "polite formulas": the "motif of reciprocal well-being", consisting of a formulaic "situation report" and "information request". It is important to remark, however, that (1) the « sal » is not part of this Ugaritic "motif of reciprocal well-being", and (2) the Ugaritic "motif of reciprocal well-being" is not, in any case, one of the "polite formulas"; rather it belongs formally to the body of the letter, as will be demonstrated below.[193] In the Amarna corpus, the "polite formulas" also consist of the « pros », the « sal », and the « ben » formulas; but they also very frequently contain the formula referred to above as the "situation report". Furthermore, especially in the case of conceptually horizontal letters, the "situation report" and the « sal » are grouped together in such a way as to suggest that they represent another type of "motif of reciprocal well-being", in which reference to the well-being of the recipient is accomplished not with a formulaic "information request", as it is in the Ugaritic corpus, but rather with the « sal » formula.[194] Thus, it seems that in the Amarna corpus, (1) the « sal » is very often part of a "motif of reciprocal well-being", and (2) this Amarna-style "double-formula of well-being" must be considered as part of the "polite formulas" for the scribal tradition(s) which these letters represent. These differences are especially significant in the interpretation of the "non-standard" Ugaritic salutation found in RS 17.434+.

It was mentioned above that the Amarna corpus contains only eight « sal » formulas which are precisely comparable in terms of composition with the Ugaritic

---

[193]See below, section 5.3.1.

[194]See A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 49-55.

« sal », these being the formulas which are unexpanded by the addition of further prepositional phrases or *ŠLM*-volitions. Of these eight, at least three, contain, as part of the "polite formulas", the "Amarna-style" double formula of well-being, in which a "situation report" occurs alongside the salutation. This distributional feature distinguishes these three « sal » formulas from the standard Ugaritic « sal », and leaves only five Amarna salutations which seemingly resemble the standard Ugaritic « sal » in terms of both composition and distribution: EA 44, EA 48, EA 59,[195] EA 158, and perhaps EA 170.2.[196]

3.4.1.3 Salutation formulas from Boğazköy and Maḫat Höyük

A formulaic and impersonal wish for the general well-being of the recipient is also a standard part of the *praescriptio* in roughly contemporary letters from the Hittite realm. However, because of the considerable bulk of the corpus of published letters from the Hittite realm,[197] because recent treatments of such letters are now

---

[195]In the "polite formula" section of EA 59, the « sal » formula precedes the « pros »; such a sequence is unusual in the Ugaritic corpus, but it is attested (compare RS 29.093).

[196]EA 170.2 appears to be a scribal "piggy-back" letter. It is difficult to know how to interpret the motifs following the « sal », since their semantics lend themselves to classification as "polite formulas". These are not typical motifs, however, and I prefer to consider lines 40-44 not as a mechanically formulaic "polite formulas", but as the context-sensitive and non-formulaic "body" of the letter: the contextual relationship between the "do not worry" motifs in lines 40-41 and the "situation report" in lines 42-43 appears to be contained in the conjunction at the beginning of line 42, which appears to me to have causal force: "Do not distress (lit. 'sicken') your heart(s), nor put anything (worrisome) on them (that is, 'on your heart[s]'), *since*, here, with your households (it) is very well." The only "polite formula" proper of this letter, then, would be the salutation, which, in this case, is not separated from the following body by a horizontal scribal line.

[197]A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* (1989), offers what is by far the most comprehensive treatment of Hittite epistolography available, treating over four hundred letters. However, even this is selective; she devotes very little attention, for example, to the important corpus of international correspondence with Egypt, for which see E. Edel, *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi* (1994). By my estimation, the corpus of Late Bronze epistolary texts

available,[198] and because of my own limited competence in Akkadian and Hittite epigraphy (certain of the published letters being available only in hand-copy), I have not surveyed the epistolary structure of all attested letters from the Hittite realm in a comprehensive way. In a certain sense this is unfortunate, since the salutation formulas in the corpus of letters recovered from Boğazköy and other sites within the Hittite realm present not only functional parallels, but also extensive formal parallels for the Ugaritic formula. On the other hand, these parallels, while significant, appear to be neither as profound nor as widespread as those of certain other comparative corpora, such as those of the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra. Furthermore, in her recent book on the correspondence of the Hittites, A. Hagenbuchner has already devoted considerable attention to the « sal » formula, in its various manifestations.[199] The combination of my own tentative collection of data with hers results in a selective corpus which, I believe, is not only adequately representative of the usage of the « sal » formula in the epistolographic traditions current in the Late Bronze kingdom of Ḫatti, but also adequately indicative of the parallels of form and function with the Ugaritic « sal » formula which make these letters valuable as comparative evidence.

The selective corpus contains over sixty reasonably certain examples of the « sal » formula, of which many are largely restored.[200]

---

from Boğazköy alone is considerably larger than that yielded by any other site within my purview; and to this corpus may be added that of Ma□at Höyük, containing nearly one hundred letters; and those of Ortaköy (ancient Sappinuwa) and Ku□aklı (ancient Šarišša) which await publication. On these latter sites, see, provisionally, O. Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries* (1998) 56-60.

[198]Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* (1989); and Edel, *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi* (1994).

[199]Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 49-55 and 65-67.

[200]There are at least twenty-six "unexpanded" « sal » formulas (I have added the parenthetical remark "partially reconstructed" for those formulas of which one of the "necessary" components needs to be entirely reconstructed): ABoT 65; IBoT 1.34; KBo 8.017.2 (partially reconstructed), KBo 9.083.2

3.4.1.3.1 COMPOSITION

Within this corpus, one can distinguish two main compositional patterns, both of which are attested in the Ugaritic corpus: (1) "expanded" and (2) "unexpanded".

(1) A considerable portion of the letters recovered from Boğazköy represent international correspondence of a diplomatic nature between the courts of Ḫatti and other independent kingdoms.[201] Owing to their international character, these letters are for the most part redacted in Akkadian.[202] Like the Amarna and Ras Shamra representatives of this sub-genre, they tend to display a salutation formula "expanded" by the addition of further volitions and phrases to express further beneficiaries of the polite wish other than the recipient himself. Also, this "expanded" salutation tends to be placed alongside a formulaic "situation report", forming a sort of "motif of

---

(partially reconstructed), KBo 13.062, KBo 18.003, KBo 18.004, KBo 18.006 (partially reconstructed), KBo 18.007 (partially reconstructed), KBo 18.013 (partially reconstructed), KBo 18.046, KBo 18.050, KBo 18.052 (partially reconstructed), KBo 18.077.2 (partially reconstructed), KBo 18.097.2, KBo 18.100 (partially reconstructed), KBo 18.103 (partially reconstructed), KBo 28.044+, KBo 28.082; HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2 (partially reconstructed), HKM 53.2, HKM 58.2, HKM 82.2 (partially reconstructed), HKM 95.2; *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1, and *Mélanges Laroche* 3.2 (partially reconstructed). It appears likely that, though both need to be restored in places, the « sal » formulas of KBo 28.030 and KUB 3.022 should be added to this list. A comparable « sal » formula would in all likelihood also have been present, but now needs to be entirely reconstructed, in KUB 48.88.2. The "expanded" « sal » formulas number over thirty, nearly all of which are partially reconstructed: ABoT 59+, KBo 1.009+, KBo 1.010+, KBo 1.024+, KBo 1.029+, KBo 2.010, KBo 8.014, KBo 18.018, KBo 18.052, KBo 28.004, KBo 28.005, KBo 28.007, KBo 28.008, KBo 28.014, KBo 28.017, KBo 28.021, KBo 28.023, KBo 28.041, KBo 28.050, KBo 28.065, probably KBo 28.082, KBo 31.040, KUB 3.025+, probably KUB 3.042, probably KUB 3.044, KUB 3.062, KUB 3.063, KUB 3.066, KUB 3.068, KUB 3.070, KUB 3.071, KUB 3.123, KUB 34.002, and KUB 37.114. The « sal » formula of KBo 28.048, which is all but destroyed, may have belonged here as well. Finally, at least three letters contain « sal » formulas for which the "expanded" / "non-expanded" classification cannot be made with certainty: KBo 28.047, KBo 28.059, KBo 28.066.

[201]By "independent", I mean those kingdoms of which the ruler is not the "servant", {ÌR}, of another king. In terms appropriate to this study, this is the correspondence between "great kings", {LUGAL(.MEŠ) GAL(.MEŠ)}, who refer to each other as "brother", {ŠEŠ}.

[202]KBo 18.018, KBo 18.052, and KBo 31.040, however, were written in Hittite.

reciprocal well-being" typical of correspondence of this type.[203] These subtle differences of composition and distribution distinguish such "expanded" salutations from the standard « sal » formula in the Ugaritic corpus, which is neither expanded, nor linked with the situation report. As such, these types of "expanded" salutations are not of highest import in a comparative analysis. They are relevant, however, to at least one, and perhaps two non-standard Ugaritic « sal » formulas: those of RIH 78/03+ and RS 17.434+, discussed below in section 3.7.

The distribution of the "expanded" « sal » formula in two Ma□at letters appears suggestively different from that encountered throughout the rest of this corpus, and in the Amarna and Ras Shamra corpora: there is no reason to suppose that HKM 33.2 and HKM 82.2 belong to international diplomatic correspondence of any sort. Rather, it seems likely that these "piggy-back" letters represent inter-scribal correspondence.[204] These letters are addressed to a single recipient, but contain salutations intended not only for the benefit of the recipient himself, but also for the benefit of another party. It is in this sense, in containing two "beneficiary" phrases, that these salutations are "expanded". The "expansions" observable in the international diplomatic letters are of a different sort, but both there and in scribal correspondence, these "expansions" appear to represent an "expanded" amount of polite deference or concern on the part of the sender. In the case of the scribal letters, solicitude is shown not only for the recipient, but also for someone close to the recipient. Thus, perhaps not only

---

[203]Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 49, refers to this double formula of well-being as "Die Amarna-Formel", or, more specifically, as "Die ausführliche Amarna-Formel". In her discussion on pp. 49-55, she makes reference to as many as forty such "expanded" « sal » formulas, some of which are better preserved than others; this alone yields a corpus as important in purely numerical terms as that of Amarna.

[204]Compare S. Alp, RAI 34 (1998) 47-48, 51, and 53-54.

diplomatic correspondence, but also scribal correspondence, typically made active use of "expanded" formal variants of the salutation intended to communicate a higher amount of deference.

(2) Apart from these "expanded" salutations, one can also isolate a fair number of "unexpanded" « sal » formulas which represent closer compositional parallels for the Ugaritic formula.[205] These "unexpanded" « sal » formulas are found in letters recovered from Ma□at Höyük as well as from Boğazköy,[206] written in Akkadian as well as Hittite.[207]

3.4.1.3.1.1 Compositional similarities

Despite the fact that the "expanded" « sal » formulas represent a compositional type less well-attested in Ugaritic than its "unexpanded" cousin, both types are considered together in the analysis which follows since they show certain features,

---

[205]The following twenty-nine letters certainly or probably contain "unexpanded" « sal » formulas: ABoT 65; IBoT 1.34; KBo 8.017.2, KBo 9.083.2, KBo 13.062, KBo 18.003, KBo 18.004, KBo 18.006, KBo 18.007, KBo 18.013, KBo 18.046, KBo 18.050, KBo 18.077.2, KBo 18.097.2, KBo 18.100, KBo 18.103, KBo 28.030, KBo 28.044+, KBo 28.082; KUB 3.022, KUB 48.88.2; HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2, HKM 53.2, HKM 58.2, HKM 82.2, HKM 95.2; *Mélanges Laroche* no. 3.1, and *Mélanges Laroche* no. 3.2.

[206]Six of the formulas listed above are from letters found at Ma□at Höyük: ABoT 65, HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2, HKM 53.2, HKM 58.2, HKM 82.2?, and HKM 95.2. The remainder come from Boğazköy.

[207]Six of these formulas are in letters written in Akkadian: IBoT 1.34, KBo 8.017.2, KBo 28.030, KBo 28.044+, KBo 28.082, and KUB 3.022. The remainder are in Hittite. It is no doubt of significance to observe that, despite the fact that the « sal » formula in these letters is not "expanded", four of these six Akkadian letters are international in scope: IBoT 1.34, KBo 28.030, KBo 28.044+, and KUB 3.022, making their redaction in Akkadian entirely comprehensible. In addition, a fifth letter in this group no doubt represents inter-scribal correspondence; on the preference of Akkadian for inter-scribal correspondence with certain Hittite scribes, see Alp, RAI 34 (1998) 47-61; and especially, HKM 72, lines 34-36. The remaining example is KBo 28.082, which, as discussed in the following footnote, is more formally akin to the Middle Assyrian epistolary tradition than to the Hittite.

here considered diagnostic, which link them with the « sal » formulas of the Ugaritic corpus in terms of composition and distribution.

The most significant compositional similarity is the fact that, judging from those examples of which the composition is clear, all of the sixty-some « sal » formulas surveyed here, "expanded" and "unexpanded" alike, are directly comparable to those in the Ugaritic corpus, in containing two and only two "necessary" components: (1) a well-being volition and (2) a phrase expressing the "beneficiary" of this volition, virtually always the recipient of the letter.[208] "Expanded" « sal » formulas differ from this only in containing not one, but multiple occurrences of either or both of these two components; the additional "beneficiary" phrases include, under the purview of the well-being volition(s), various people and things intimately connected with the recipient.

---

[208]The only exception to this statement, of which I am aware, is KBo 28.082. The « sal » formula is slightly anomalous in that, while it does contain both necessary components [(1) an impersonal volition of well-being and (2) a prepositional phrase expressing the beneficiary of this volition], the first and only "beneficiary" mentioned is not the recipient of the letter, as is usual, but rather {KUR-at ḫa-at-te-⌜e?⌝}, 'the land of Ḫatti'. Additional features which set this particular « sal » formula apart from the bulk of the « sal » formulas in the Ras Shamra, Meskene, and Ḫatti corpora of Akkadian letters include: (1) the spelling of the volitional particle, {lu} instead of the more typical {lu-ú}; (2) the spelling of the verb, {DI-mu} instead of the more typical writings {šul-mu} and {šu-ul-mu}; and (3) the repetition of the volitional form, unaccompanied by a corresponding prepositional phrase. Outside of the « sal » formula, the letter is further distinguished by its prostration formula; both in the form of the verb, {ul-tu$_4$-ḫé-ḫi-in} (apparently an unusual spelling of an underlying form: **ʾuštakaʾʾin*), and in the lack of any prepositional phrases complementing this verb. Both of these features are reminiscent of letters in the Middle Assyrian epistolary tradition(s), for which see E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 56-59. A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989) 414, however, suggested a Syrian provenance. For my part, I see no formal features in the letter which can be shown to be distinctly Syrian. If Hagenbuchner is correct in her identification, it must be said that the putative "Syrian" traits of KBo 28.082 do not particularly correspond with the distinctive formal traits typical of the letters from the Ras Shamra, Meskene, and Amarna corpora. In any case, since there are good reasons to suppose that this letter does not reflect the epistolary conventions current in Ḫatti, and since its distinctive features are not comparable to those found in the Ugaritic letters, this formal disparity is not particularly troubling for this comparative analysis.

The form of the well-being volition in Akkadian letters is *lū šulmu*, and the writing of both words shows some variations.[209] The most common writings are {lu-ú šul-mu}[210] and {lu-ú šu-ul-mu};[211] but the following other spellings are found: {lu šul-mu},[212] and {lu DI-mu}.[213] In Hittite letters the volition is normally written {SIG_5-in e-eš-du}, or, more rarely, {SIG_5-in e-eš-tu}.[214]

The "beneficiary" phrase common to all the « sal » formulas is that which refers to the recipient of the letter: this is the only such phrase present in "unexpanded" formulas, but in "expanded" versions it is the first of many such phrases. In Akkadian letters, this phrase is prepositional, taking the form « preposition + N_R », where « N_R » represents the nominal phrase or phrases referring to the recipient of the letter. The form of the preposition is most often {a-na}, but two other prepositional idioms occur:

---

[209]Sometimes different writings of the volition show up in the same letter: compare KBo 1.009+ and KUB 3.068 where both {lu-ú šul-mu} and {lu-ú šu-ul-mu} appear. This variation within the same tablet shows the weakness of orthography, when used in isolation, as a diagnostic indicator of provenance.

[210]ABoT 59+; IBoT 1.34; KBo 1.010+, KBo 1.024+, KBo 28.023, KBo 28.041, KBo 28.066; KUB 3.025+, KUB 3.123, and KUB 34.002.

[211]KBo 1.029+, probably KBo 2.010, probably KBo 28.007; KUB 3.063, KUB 3.066, KUB 3.070, and KUB 3.071. This writing appears to have been particularly common in letters sent by members of the Egyptian court.

[212]KBo 28.050 and KBo 28.059.

[213]KBo 28.082; compare also this spelling in Tell Billā letter no. 65, line 5, another letter in the Middle Assyrian tradition according to Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 59. J. J. Finkelstein, *JCS* 7 (1953) 136 and 168 had read {[lu]-ú DI-mu} here.

[214]Compare this spelling in HKM 95.2, as well as in EA 31 of the Amarna corpus.

{a-na UGU-ḫi}[215] and {ma-ḫar}.[216]

The composition of the « N_R » component is more complicated. It may be a single noun phrase, whether this be a pronoun,[217] or a REL term with attached 1st person pronominal suffix, referring back to the sender.[218] But, more often, it is composed of several noun phrases joined in asyndetic apposition. When this is the case, several types of noun phrases are used, including both of those just mentioned, but also two other types of noun phrases: (3) political titles,[219] and (4) personal names.[220] These noun phrases occur in various combinations. When a pronoun is present, it invariably occurs first, immediately following the preposition. When a conceptually explicit REL term is used, it is typically the final noun phrase in the series. Political titles, when used, thus tend to follow pronouns, and precede REL phrases.

---

[215]IBoT 1.34. Compare also the use of this complex preposition in KBo 28.023 in lines 8-9: {a-na UGU-ḫi ^{m}ḫa-[at-tu-ši-li (?) LUGAL] GAL LUGAL KUR ḫa-at-ti (9) ŠEŠ-ia lu-ú šul-[mu]}; and, this in a « sal » formula which begins {(7) a-na k[a]-[a]-ši [... lu-ú]šul-mu}. Such a distribution might lead one to assume that {a-na} was used with pronouns (in the dative form), but {a-na UGU-ḫi} with names and titles. This may have sometimes been the case, but note also KBo 18.052, where {a-na} is used before a title: {(4) *A-NA* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI BE-LÍ*[-*IA*]}.

[216]KBo 8.017.2. It is surely relevant that the sender is probably a Hittite scribe, and that, in Hittite letters, this portion of the « sal » formula is often rendered with Akkadograms (namely, as {*MA-ḪAR*}).

[217]Compare {a-na ka-a-ša} in KBo 1.009+, KBo 1.010+, KBo 28.030, and KUB 3.071; and {a-na ka-ša} in KBo 28.065. The pronominal form used is the "dative": the writing {ka(-a)-ša} for the 2nd person masculine singular is standard in international letters on the western periphery; judging from a fair number of examples in the Egypt-Ḫatti correspondence from Boğazköy, the feminine form was written {ka-(a-)ši} (the standard grammars give the Old Babylonian form *kâši* for both genders).

[218]Compare {ma-ḫar ŠEŠ-ia} in KBo 8.017.2.

[219]For example, {LUGAL KUR mi-ra-a} in KBo 1.024+; {[MÍ.LUGAL G]AL MÍ.LUGAL KUR ḫa-at-ti} in KUB 3.066; and {^{d}UTU-ši} in IBoT 1.34 and KBo 18.052. It may simply be accidental, but I know of no « sal » formula in which the recipient of the letter is referred to by means of a political title alone; such titles are always accompanied by a pronoun or a REL phrase.

[220]Compare KUB 3.022: {a-n[a ka-a-ša?] (4) ^{m}ḫa-at-tu-ši-li LUGAL GAL LUGA[L KUR ...] ŠEŠ-ia [lu$^{?}$-ú$^{?}$ šul$^{?}$-mu$^{?}$] | }.

The "beneficiary" phrase in Hittite letters is written in two ways, either in Hittite or by means of prepositional Akkadograms. When written in Hittite, the word used to express the relation between the volition and its beneficiary is the word *katta* accompanied by a pronominal form. Two compositional patterns occur: (1) {kat-ti-ti},[221] where reference is made to the recipient by means of the 2nd person pronominal suffix *-ti*; and (2) {tu-uk-ka$_4$ kat-ta},[222] where the 2nd person pronoun *tukka* is fronted rather than suffixed. Two prepositional Akkadograms are used to represent this component, {*MA-ḪAR*} and {*A-NA*}.

3.4.1.3.1.2 Compositional differences

Beyond the fact that the salutations in letters found at Boğazköy and Ma□at contain the same two "necessary" components as the « sal » formulas of Ugaritic letters, however, there are a host of compositional differences with respect to the formula in these two traditions.

(1) Perhaps the most important of these compositional differences, for typological purposes, is the fact that the order of these two components appears to be fixed in the extant corpus of « sal » formulas in letters found at Hittite sites. Not only conceptually ascending letters, but also conceptually non-ascending letters use the order « "beneficiary" phrase + volitional form ».[223] In the Ugaritic corpus, and in the

---

[221]HKM 31.2, HKM 58.2, and probably *Mélanges Laroche* no. 3.2.

[222]ABoT 65; EA 31 from the Amarna corpus contains a similar form: {tù-uk-ka$_4$ kat-ta}.

[223]As examples of conceptually non-ascending letters in which the "beneficiary" phrase precedes the volitional form in the composition of the « sal » formula, compare the following. "Expanded" « sal » formulas: ABoT 59+; KBo 1.009+, KBo 1.010+, KBo 1.029+, KBo 28.014, KBo 28.017, KBo 28.023; KUB 3.063, KUB 3.066, and KUB 3.071. "Unexpanded" « sal » formulas: ABoT 65; KBo 8.017.2, KBo 9.083.2, KBo 18.007, KBo 28.030, KBo 28.044+; HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2, HKM 58.2, HKM 82.2, and HKM 95.2. The only exception to this observation, of which I am aware, is

Ras Shamra Akkadian epistolary corpus, the order of these two components varied according to this ascending / non-ascending conceptual distinction.

(2) It was observed above that the orthography of the preposition, or, in the case of some Hittite letters, of the phrase used to express the relationship between the "beneficiary" and the volitional form,[224] varied in the « sal » formulas of Ḫatti letters, as it did in the Ugaritic corpus. But, this orthographic variation is not patterned along a conceptual distinction between ascending and non-ascending letters, as was the case for the Ugaritic evidence. One pattern which does emerge in the letters redacted in Hittite is the writing of the Hittite word *katta* when the "beneficiary" of the salutation is expressed as a pronoun, but the writing of a prepositional Akkadogram when the "beneficiary" is expressed by means of a conceptually explicit REL term. This pattern is apparently not directly linked to the ascending / non-ascending conceptual distinction, however.[225]

(3) The variable composition of the « N_R » element was also mentioned in the description given above. In the Ugaritic corpus, this element tended to be a pronoun in non-ascending letters, but a conceptually explicit REL phrase in ascending letters. Such a patterned difference in the composition of the « N_R » element between conceptually ascending and non-ascending letters does not appear to be a regular

---

KBo 28.082, a letter atypical in several other respects, and which probably belongs typologically in the Middle Assyrian epistolary tradition.

[224]I include this cumbersome phrase to account for usages of the Hittite word *katta*, which is not technically a preposition. Like prepositions, however, it does express various forms of relation.

[225]The variation mentioned appears to be conditioned primarily by the composition of the « N_R » element, and not the conceptual status of the letter. Compare KBo 9.083.2, KBo 18.100, HKM 33.2, HKM 53.2, and HKM 95.2, which are conceptually horizontal; KBo 18.007, which is conceptually descending; and HKM 82.2, which is conceptually mixed (horizontal and descending), which nevertheless express the « N_R » element not by means of a pronoun, but with a conceptually explicit REL phrase.

feature for the letters from Boğazköy and Ma□at, where one finds conceptually explicit REL terms in non-ascending as well as ascending letters,[226] and pronouns in ascending as well as non-ascending letters.[227] Finally, some salutations in Boğazköy and Ma□at letters contain compositional patterns for the « N_R » element which are not attested in the corpus of Ugaritic « sal » formulas.[228]

(4) As was observed above for the salutation, as well as for the address formula, semantic equivalence between the Ugaritic, Akkadian, and Hittite epistolary formulas exists on the phrase level, not on the morpheme level; there is not necessarily a morpheme-for-morpheme correspondence in the composition of the formulas. The Hittite version of the volitional component of the « sal » formula provides a further example of this aspect: the Hittite equivalent of the ŠLM-volition in Ugaritic (*yšlm*) and Akkadian (*lū šulmu*) is {SIG_5-in e-eš-du}. In this syntagm, the verb itself is not derived from a stative verb meaning 'to be well', as in Ugaritic, but rather from the verb of being, written with the signs {e-eš-}. The volitional aspect, and the 3rd person singular grammatical number of the verb (compare Ugaritic), are conveyed by the

---

[226]Compare the use of conceptually explicit REL terms in the following non-ascending letters: KBo 18.017.2, KBo 9.083.2, KBo 18.007, KBo 18.100; HKM 33.2, HKM 53.2, HKM 82.2, and HKM 95.2; as well as in ascending letters: KBo 18.004, KBo 18.013, KBo 18.050, and KBo 18.097.2.

[227]Compare the use of a pronoun in the conceptually ascending letter, KBo 28.065; as well as in non-ascending letters: ABoT 65; KBo 1.009+, KBo 1.010+; KUB 3.071; HKM 31.2, HKM 58.2; and *Mélanges Laroche* no. 3.2.

[228]These include (1) « pronoun + conceptually explicit REL phrase »: ABoT 59+; KBo 1.029+, KBo 28.017, KBo 28.030, KBo 28.044+; KUB 3.063 (all of these are conceptually horizontal, save KBo 28.044+ which is DESC BIO); (2) « pronoun + ID term »: KBo 1.024+ (?), KBo 28.031; KUB 3.028, KUB 3.066, and KUB 3.123; and (3) « pronoun + REL phrase + ID term »: KBo 28.014. A fourth pattern, (4) « ID term + REL phrase » is fairly frequent in the letters found in Anatolian sites: IBoT 1.34; KBo 13.062, KBo 18.003, KBo 18.052, KBo 28.038; and *Mélanges Laroche* no. 3.1 (all of which are conceptually ASC POW, save IBoT 1.34 [ASC BIO] and KBo 28.038 [HOR?]); this may play a role in explaining the single example of this formation in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus (RS 34.148), for which see section 3.7.

inflectional suffix {-du}. Since it is not expressed in the verb, the notion of "well-being" is conveyed with a complement, {SIG$_5$-in} 'well, in a good state'.

(5) Finally, some Boğazköy and Ma□at salutations contain "optional" elements which have no attested equivalents in the Ugaritic corpus. One of these optional elements occurs in "unexpanded" versions of the salutation, that is, those most closely comparable to the standard Ugaritic salutation. It functions as the grammatical subject of the volition and its semantics are clear: it is an abstract common noun, meaning 'all', represented in Akkadian texts by {gáb-bu}[229] and in Hittite texts by {ḫu-u-ma-an}.[230] The presumed Ugaritic equivalent would be *kll*.[231] As was the case in the Amarna and Ras Shamra corpora, the "expanded" « sal » formulas from Boğazköy typically contain another "optional" element, the adverb *danniš*, written most often {dan-níš}.[232]

3.4.1.3.2 DISTRIBUTION

As in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus, the « sal » formula in letters found at Boğazköy and Ma□at is an optional component of epistolary structure. In the domestic

---

[229]This is found in KBo 8.017.2, a "piggy-back" letter in Akkadian which follows a primary letter written in Luwian. Aside from any prosopographical considerations, this fact alone would seem adequately to illustrate the Anatolian origin of this letter.

[230]Compare KBo 13.062, probably KBo 18.003, KBo 18.004, KBo 18.046, KBo 18.050, KBo 18.097.2, KBo 18.100, KBo 18.103; HKM 31.2, HKM 53.2, HKM 58.2, HKM 82.2, HKM 95.2; and *Mélanges Laroche* nos. 3.1 and 3.2. The writing {ḫu-u-ma-an} is found in all examples of the « sal » formula cited, with the exception of HKM 95.2, where the spelling {ḫu-u-ma-a-an} appears.

[231]Though unattested in the « sal » formula, this word *kll* does show up as an optional element in the formally similar motif here called the "situation report"; see below, chapter 5.

[232]The writing {dan-níš} is the most common: ABoT 59+; KBo 1.010+, KBo 28.004, KBo 28.005, KBo 28.008, KBo 28.014, probably KBo 28.017, KBo 28.023, KBo 28.041, KBo 28.059, KBo 28.066; KUB 3.024+, KUB 3.025+, KUB 3.035, KUB 3.044, KUB 3.068, and KUB 34.002. Other attested writings include {da-an-ni-iš} in KBo 2.010, KUB 3.063, and KUB 3.066; {ta-an-ni-iš} in ABoT 59+, KBo 28.038, KUB 3.042+, and probably KUB 3.062. Note that ABoT 59+ contains two different writings of the word: {dan-níš} in line 7, and {ta-an-ni-iš} in line 9.

correspondence, this corpus being most comparable to the Ugaritic epistolary corpus, the « sal » formula is occasionally omitted from conceptually ASC POW letters,[233] but also from some explicitly HOR letters which contain, in the address, the « SR » order of mention.[234] Even within the corpus of international diplomatic correspondence, the « sal » is an optional, if very frequent, component. It is absent, for example, from vassal letters from Bentašina, king of Amurru, to the great king or great queen of Ḫatti.[235] It is also occasionally absent from diplomatic correspondence between the courts of Ḫatti and Egypt.[236] Another remarkable distributional feature, pertaining to both international and domestic correspondence found at Boğazköy, is the virtual absence of the « sal » formula from letters which contain the « pros » formula.[237]

The placement of the « sal » formula within the letter resembles that of the Ugaritic corpus: it is a "polite formula", occurring in that formulaic epistolary section which follows the address but precedes the less formulaic body of the letter. This

---

[233]Compare KBo 9.082, KBo 18.001.2, perhaps KBo 18.012.2, KBo 28.078; KUB 57.001, and KUB 57.123.

[234]Compare HKM 22.2, HKM 65.2, and HKM 66.

[235]Compare KBo 8.016, KBo 28.054, KBo 28.055, and KBo 28.056.

[236]Compare the probable absence of the « sal » formula from KUB 3.026, KUB 3.041, and KUB 57.125; apparently all of these are letters from the king of Ḫatti to the Egyptian pharaoh. In the latter two, KUB 3.041 and KUB 57.125, the sender refers to his correspondent as {ŠEŠ-ia}. The « sal » formula is also absent from KBo 28.040 (from the Egyptian pharaoh to the queen of Ḫatti), from KBo 28.046 (from the Egyptian pharaoh to a Hittite prince?), and from KBo 28.048 (apparently from a group of high-ranking Egyptian court officials to the king of Ḫatti).

[237]These are KBo 8.016, KBo 9.082, KBo 18.001.1, KBo 18.011, KBo 18.012.2, KBo 28.054, KBo 28.055, KBo 28.056, and KBo 28.078. Exceptions include KBo 28.082, a letter already remarked for its affinity with the Middle Assyrian epistolary tradition; KBo 18.050 and KBo 18.052, genuine exceptions, both. In spite of these few exceptions, the general pattern of omitting the « sal » formula when the « pros » formula is present distinguishes the usage found in Boğazköy corpus (none of the examples are from Ma□at) from that observable in the Ugaritic corpus, where the « pros » and the « sal » formulas frequently occur together in conceptually ascending letters.

"polite formula" section is typically demarcated by horizontal scribal lines,[238] but very often such lines occur also within the "polite formula" section, separating the component formulas from one another.[239] Also, as can be seen occasionally in the Ugaritic corpus, sometimes scribes were less attentive in placing the horizontal scribal lines at structural and syntactic breaks in the text; in these cases the horizontal line occurs between lines of text which belong together from a structural and syntactic point of view.[240]

The composition of the "polite formula" section appears to be related to the contextual background of the letter. International diplomatic correspondence between courts generally employs an "Amarna-style" double formula of well-being as a polite formula, consisting of the "situation report" followed by a « sal » formula, both of

---

[238]In some cases the scribes did not place a horizontal line between the address and the beginning of the "polite formula" section: compare KBo 1.024+ and KUB 3.068 from the international correspondence, and HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2, and *Mélanges Laroche* nos. 3.1 and 3.2. In other cases, no line was placed between the end of the "polite formula" section and the beginning of the body: KBo 8.017.2 and KBo 9.083.2 (in this case I am not considering the "information request" motif to have been part of the "polite formulas").

[239]This is typical of the Ḫatti-Egypt international correspondence, where a scribal line is frequently placed between the two elements of the "Amarna-style" double formula of well-being: ABoT 59+, KBo 1.009+, KBo 1.010+, KBo 1.024+, KBo 1.029+, KBo 8.014, KBo 28.004, KBo 28.005, KBo 28.007, KBo 28.014, KBo 28.017, KBo 28.023, KBo 28.030, KBo 28.031, KBo 28.038, KBo 28.047, KBo 28.050, KBo 28.059, KUB 3.025+, KUB 3.028, KUB 3.035, KUB 3.062, KUB 3.063, KUB 3.066, KUB 3.068, KUB 3.070, KUB 34.002, and KUB 37.114. It also occurs occasionally in the domestic correspondence: KBo 13.062. When the "situation report" and the "information request" appear together (as they do in the Ugaritic corpus), this "motif of reciprocal well-being" (which is compositionally distinct from the "Amarna-style" double formula of well-being) is usually separated from the "polite formulas" by a scribal line (as is often the case in the Ugaritic corpus as well): KUB 48.88.2 and HKM 53.2.

[240]Compare the "misplaced" scribal line in KBo 28.047. A Ugaritic example is RS 16.264.

which are usually "expanded".[241] As mentioned above, this structure is atypical of the Ugaritic epistolary corpus.[242]

The domestic correspondence from Boğazköy and Ma□at shows combinations of "polite formulas" which are more familiar to the Ugaritic epistolary tradition: (1) In at least two letters the « sal » is the only polite formula present: IBoT 1.34 and KBo 28.044+.[243] (2) Many letters contain the sequence « sal ben » in the "polite formulas" section.[244] A few letters contain this sequence with slight additions: (3) three present a structure which places the "situation report" prior to the « sal ben » sequence,[245] and one which places it after the « sal ben » sequence;[246] both of these patterns are as yet unattested in the Ugaritic corpus. (4) At least one other letter is known in which the « sal ben » sequence is followed by the "information request";[247]

---

[241]This double formula is found in ABoT 59+; KBo 1.009+, KBo 1.010+, KBo 1.024+, KBo 1.029+, KBo 8.014, KBo 18.018, probably KBo 28.004, probably KBo 28.005, KBo 28.007, KBo 28.014, KBo 28.017, KBo 28.023, KBo 28.030, probably KBo 28.031, probably KBo 28.038, KBo 28.047, probably KBo 28.050, probably KBo 28.059; KUB 3.022, KUB 3.025+, KUB 3.028, KUB 3.035, perhaps KUB 3.044, probably KUB 3.062, KUB 3.063, KUB 3.066, KUB 3.068, KUB 3.070, KUB 3.123, KUB 34.002, and perhaps KUB 37.114. Of the preceding letters, the vast majority represent diplomatic correspondence between the courts of Ḫatti and Egypt.

[242]This is no doubt due to the fact that very few of the extent Ugaritic letters are of an international diplomatic nature. Among those few Ugaritic international diplomatic letters which are known is RS 17.434+, which probably contains this "Amarna-style" double formula; see section 3.7.

[243]Both of these are composed on the biological kinship model, the first is conceptually ascending, the second descending. In the Ugaritic corpus, the « sal » is the only polite formula in RS 4.475, RS 15.158, and RS 94.2406.2. This is also one of the more common patterns in the Ugaritic corpus.

[244]These are KBo 8.017.2, KBo 18.046, KBo 18.077.2, KBo 18.097.2, KBo 18.100, KBo 18.103, HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2, HKM 58.2, HKM 82.2, and *Mélanges Laroche* no. 3.2. This pattern is also very common in the Ugaritic corpus; see above, section 3.3.

[245]ABoT 65; KBo 13.062 (which contains a horizontal scribal line between the "situation report" and the « sal ben » sequence); and HKM 95.2.

[246]*Mélanges Laroche* no. 3.1.

[247]KBo 13.062.

but this sequence occurs much more frequently with an intervening horizontal scribal line,[248] suggesting that the "information request" was more often perceived by scribes not as belonging in the "polite formula" section, along with the « sal ben » sequence, but as a part of the body of the letter. (5) As mentioned above, the use of the « sal » formula accompanied by the « pros » formula is atypical in these letters; nevertheless one letter contains a pattern in which the prostration formula follows the « sal ben » sequence, with a scribal line placed between.[249] (6) Finally, at least two other letters contain the sequence « pros sal », without the « ben » formula.[250]

Thus, like the Amarna corpus, the letters in the Hittite tradition also require some arrangement prior to discussing the « sal » formulas. In addition to (1) "expanded" salutations, and (2) double formulas of well-being which incorporate the salutation as one of its components (the other being the situation report), the Ḫatti corpus also contains (3) salutations of which the composition and distribution are comparable, though not identical, to that of the standard Ugaritic « sal » formulas.

3.4.1.4 Salutation formulas from Tell Meskene

The corpus of letters from Tell Meskene presents no more than four possible examples of the « sal » formula.[251] Two of these letters, Msk 7451.3 and Msk 7451.4, contain clear well-preserved examples of the formula; both occur on the same tablet,

---

[248]Compare KBo 18.003, KBo 18.004, KBo 18.006, KBo 18.007, and KBo 18.013.

[249]KBo 18.050; compare RS 29.093 from the Ugaritic corpus, though in this letter there is no scribal line within the "polite formulas" section.

[250]KBo 18.052 and KBo 28.082.

[251]Msk 7451.3, Msk 7451.4, Msk 7497.3; and RE 83.

as "piggy-back" letters. A third example of the « sal » formula is probably present, though in a very fragmentary state, in Msk 7497.3, another "piggy-back" letter. Finally, a fourth recognizable version of the « sal » formula occurs in RE 83, a tablet now in a private collection, but thought to derive from "the vicinity of Emar".

The preservation of Msk 7497.3 is not sufficient to permit analysis, but the « sal » formulas of Msk 7451.3 and 7451.4 show strong compositional similarities with the standard Ugaritic « sal » formulas. Most notably, (1) both consist of two components, corresponding to the two components of the Ugaritic « sal » formulas,[252] and (2) neither is conceptually ascending, and the order of the components in both is « ŠLM-volition + prepositional phrase », a sequence which, in the Ugaritic corpus, typically accompanies letters which are not terminologically ascending and in which the « N_R » element is a pronoun. The « sal » of RE 83, however, resembles neither the other two « sal » formulas in the Meskene letters, nor the standard « sal » formula in Ugaritic letters. It does present a resemblance to several of the « sal » formulas known from the Middle Assyrian epistolary tradition.[253]

---

[252]For a discussion of the two corresponding components in Akkadian letters, see above, section 3.4.1.1. Note, however, the lack of the "Wunschpartikel" *lū* in Msk 7451.4.

[253]See below, section 3.4.1.7. See especially VAT 8851 (from Assur), CBM 10575 and Nippur 669 (from Nippur), and perhaps also Tell Billā no. 61, all of which are mentioned in E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 59-60. Note, however, that the « SR » order of mention in the address of RE 83 is not typical of Middle Assyrian letters (*ibid.*, p. 55). If indeed this tablet was recovered in clandestine excavations at Tell Meskene, its « sal » formula follows an unexpected pattern (the epistolary conventions in the Emar letters generally match those of the Ras Shamra letters); in light of the formal similarities, one may surmise that the scribe responsible for this letter had been influenced by the Middle Assyrian tradition. Regarding the distinctive features of the "RE" letters, note also RE 97 (here classified as ME 127), where the use of {šu} instead of {šú} distinguishes the « pros » formula of that letter from the others found in controlled excavations at the site. The « sal » formulas of RE 83 will be mentioned below in section 3.7, in treating the "expanded" « sal » formulas.

In terms of composition, then, it may be said that two of the three intact « sal » formulas from the Meskene corpus show little or no compositional differences with the standard Ugaritic « sal » formula. The third, that of RE 83, does show significant compositional differences, but, since its provenance is unknown, and since it presents little formal affinity with the other « sal » formulas in the Meskene corpus, it need not represent an exception to the observed compositional similarity between the Meskene and Ras Shamra epistolary corpora.

Although the relatively small corpus of letters from Tell Meskene admittedly requires caution in dealing with distributional tendencies in the form of statistics, some remarks on this topic are also unavoidable: the data, such as they are, can be discussed, and the few insights which result can be evaluated with the necessary prudence.

Of the thirty preserved letters in the Emar corpus, only four contain possible examples of the « sal » formula. In light of the strong formal resemblances between the Emar and Ugarit epistolary traditions, as observed with respect to the address and « pros » formulas, this virtual dearth of « sal » formulas among the Emar letters is surprising. In fact, of the three « sal » formulas that show a composition similar to that in the Ras Shamra epistolary corpora, all occur in "piggy-back" letters.[254] The « sal » formula is not so restricted in either of the Ras Shamra corpora.

In terms of conceptual status, the Meskene corpus shows a high percentage of ascending letters.[255] Seventeen out of twenty-nine (or 59%) of the letters in which the

---

[254]Msk 7497.3 is also a piggy-back letter.

[255]Seventeen out of twenty-nine (or 59%) of the letters in which the conceptual status is clear (the status of Msk 7497.3 is unknown) are conceptually ascending. None of these contains a « sal » formula

conceptual status is clear[256] are conceptually ascending. None of these contains a « sal » formula. This distribution presents a contrast with that of the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian corpora, where roughly half of the ascending letters contain the « sal » formula.[257] There are eight conceptually UNMARKED letters in the Meskene corpus; none of these contains a « sal » formula either. This may be contrasted with the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, where a large majority of the conceptually UNMARKED letters incorporated the « sal » formula.[258] The contrast is less strongly marked when applied to the Ugaritic corpus, however, where the « sal » is present in UNMARKED letters less than half of the time.

In terms of conceptual model, none of the sixteen letters composed on the POW model contains the « sal » formula.[259] The formula is present, however, in three of the four letters composed on the BIO model. Though the sample is small, this latter distributional tendency is consistent with that observed in the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian letters: the « sal » tends to be present in letters composed in the BIO model.[260]

---

[256]The conceptual status of Msk 7497.3 is unknown.

[257]See above, sections 3.3 and 3.4.1.1.2.

[258]The lack of the « sal » in conceptually UNMARKED letters may have a contextual explanation: unlike many of the Ras Shamra Akkadian UNMARKED letters, the Meskene UNMARKED letters, like the Ugaritic UNMARKED letters (with the exception of RS 15.158, which , incidentally, contains the « sal » formula), are generally not of an international diplomatic nature. It was suggested above (section 3.4.1.1.2) that part of the local polite protocol when addressing a foreign "king" (LUGAL), even one of explicitly subordinate standing (as in the case of the king of Carchemish addressing the king of Ugarit), was the inclusion of the « sal » formula in the *praescriptio*.

[259]All of these are explicitly ascending (ASC POW), and thus the contrast with the distribution of the formula in the Ras Shamra Akkadian and Ugaritic corpora remains the same as above: letters conceived on the POW model (most of which are also ASC POW) contain the « sal » about half the time in the Ugaritic corpus, slightly less than half the time in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.

[260]See above, sections 3.3 and 3.4.1.1.2.

Setting aside the lack of « sal » in unmarked letters, which does not appear to me to be of great significance,[261] the only significant distributional difference is to be found in the conceptual category of ASC POW letters. This category contains the « sal » in the Ugaritic corpus over half of the time,[262] and in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus somewhat less than half of the time.[263] I am at a loss to explain the absence of the « sal » formula from the Meskene ASC POW letters; this distributional difference appears all the more striking in light of the host of other compositional and distributional similarities between these three corpora.

The placement of all four Meskene « sal » formulas resembles the distribution of the "polite formulas" in Ugaritic letters; they occur after the address and prior to the body of the letter, when the latter is present at all,[264] and are occasionally separated from these adjacent parts of the letter by means of horizontal scribal lines.[265] However, in no example does either of the other "polite formulas" appear grouped

---

[261]The lack of the « sal » formula in conceptually UNMARKED Meskene letters appears to me to be relatively insignificant for at least two reasons: (1) the corpus (eight UNMARKED letters) is too small to be of great interpretive importance, and (2) the frequent presence of the « sal » in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus appears to be amenable to a contextual explanation, namely, that letters of an international diplomatic nature tend to include the « sal », even if conceptually UNMARKED. Since one of the three UNMARKED Ugaritic letters which contains the « sal » is also of an international diplomatic nature (RS 15.158), the presence of the « sal » formula in the remaining two (out of eight) Ugaritic UNMARKED letters presents a distribution more comparable to that of the Meskene corpus, than to that of the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.

[262]Section 3.3.

[263]Section 3.4.1.1.2.

[264]In the case of Msk 7451.3, and possibly of Msk 7497.3, the letter ends immediately after the « sal » formula; the fact that both of these letters are "piggy-back" letters may play a role in explaining this feature.

[265]Compare this use of horizontal scribal lines in Msk 7451.3, and in RE 83. Such lines are not present in Msk 7451.4 (contrast the preceding "piggy-back" letter), nor probably in Msk 7497.3.

together with the « sal » formula in the Meskene corpus.[266] This feature too distinguishes the Meskene corpus from the conventions observable in the Ras Shamra material.

Finally, it can be noted that no comparable examples of « sal » formulas of the compositional pattern « prepositional phrase + ŠLM-volition »[267] are attested in the Meskene letters.[268] In this respect, the small size of the Meskene corpus is unfortunate, since the distribution of this pattern with respect to the more common pattern « ŠLM-volition + prepositional phrase » is particularly important in illustrating the distinctiveness of the Late Bronze Syrian epistolary traditions.

3.4.1.5 Tel Aphek

A single datum is available from the site of Tel Aphek.[269] In light of the fact that the sender of this letter was the *sākinu* of Ugarit, it is not surprising that it bears a salutation formula entirely consistent in terms of composition and distribution with the Ugaritic epistolary tradition: (1) the salutation consists of only two elements, a *šulmu*-volition and a prepositional phrase expressing its "beneficiary"; (2) the "beneficiary" phrase is placed prior to the volitional form, an order typical of conceptually ascending

---

[266]Note, however, Msk 7451.4, where the « sal » is followed by the motif of reciprocal well-being, a highly formulaic motif which, in Ugaritic letters, is occasionally treated as a polite formula rather than as part of the body (see below, chapter 5).

[267]Since the « sal » of RE 83 represents a pattern foreign to the Ugaritic epistolary tradition, I do not here consider it "comparable".

[268]The absence of this pattern may reflect the same distributional tendency observable in the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian epistolary corpora: in these latter, the compositional order in question is connected with conceptually ascending letters, and none of the eighteen conceptually ascending letters in the Meskene corpus contains the « sal » formula (see above).

[269]The letter Aphek 52055/1 was published by D. Owen in *TA* 8 (1981) 1-17.

letters in the Ugaritic corpus; (3) the "beneficiary" is expressed by means of conceptually explicit REL terminology,[270] a structure typical of ascending letters in the Ugaritic corpus; and (4) the salutation occurs in the "polite formula" section of the letter, where it follows the prostration formula, and precedes the benediction, a distribution consistent with ascending letters in the Ugaritic corpus. Thus, in all important respects, the salutation of this letter found at Tel Aphek resembles the standard Ugaritic « sal » formula, in both composition and distribution.

3.4.1.6 Tell Atchana

Among the known letters from Tell Atchana, very few bear recognizable salutation formulas. Those « sal » formulas that are recognizable do not resemble, in a precise and detailed way, the compositional patterns attested for the standard Ugaritic formula.

Three letters contain formulaic wishes for the general well-being of the recipient: AT 109, AT 115, and AT 116.[271] Of these, the salutary formula {bu-lu-uṭ dun-qí-iš}, 'Live well!'[272] appears in two letters, AT 109 and AT 116. This motif does not correspond to composition of the standard Ugaritic salutation.[273]

---

[270]There are two such noun phrases, not just one: line 8 reads {a-na muḫ-ḫi a-bi-ia EN-ia}. The REL terms are both conceptually ascending, but the models used are mixed: the sender characterizes his recipient both as {a-bi-ia} 'my father' (biological kinship model) and {EN-ia} 'my lord' (hierarchical power model).

[271]I do not here consider AT 116 or AT 117 to contain salutations. Lines 5-7 of AT 116 should be classified as a "benediction" formula, and the motif contained in lines 5 and following of AT 117 was probably part of the body of the letter, concerned with the *šulmānu*, 'well-being (gift)'. Neither of the Hittite letters, AT 124 and AT 125, contains the « sal » formula.

[272]I assume {dun-qí-iš} to be a "phonetic" spelling of a form derived from the root DMQ, with the attached adverbial ending, *-iš*. Compare the spelling of this formula, {bu-lu-uṭ dam-qí-iš},

Beyond these, two other letters contain salutations which offer a closer compositional parallel to the Ugaritic pattern:

AT 109 {(4) a-na mi-im-mu-ka (5) lu-ú šul-mu}

AT 115 {(6, cont'd) lu-ú š[ul ...] (7) ... (9) lu-ú šul-mu a-na ... }

Both AT 109 and AT 115 contain the volitional phrase {lu-ú šul-mu}, the typical Akkadian counterpart of Ugaritic *yšlm* in the Ras Shamra corpora, accompanied by an *ana* prepositional phrase, no doubt expressing the "beneficiaries" of the volition. Furthermore, both formulas occur in that section of the letter which follows the address but precedes the less formulaic body of the letter, that is, the section devoted to "polite formulas". In this respect, the distribution of the « sal » formula in these two letters resembles that of the Ugaritic corpus. In AT 109 the "polite formulas" consist of two salutations, one patterned around the word *buluṭ*, the other on the phrase *lū šulmu*. In AT 115, a prostration formula occurs prior to the salutation. The parallels with the Ugaritic salutation, however, end here.

The « sal » formula of AT 109 is "unexpanded", and no such Ugaritic « sal » formula contains a counterpart to the "beneficiary" phrase {a-na mi-im-mu-ka},[274] 'for

---

appearing in Tell Taanach no. 1, line 4 (for which see now A. Rainey, *EI* 26 [1999] 156, with anterior bibliography).

[273]There is a possibility, however, that the Ugaritic word *ḥytn*, attested in at least two letters, RS 17.063 and RS 17.117, may be profitably compared with the Akkadian form *buluṭ* in these examples; on which see below, section 3.7.

[274]Since the scribe marked case distinctions elsewhere in this letter, one might assume he understood the basic principles of the Semitic case system. The spelling with the {mu} sign, then, could represent one of two things: either (1), for this scribe, the word *mimmu* in this phrase was "frozen" and uninflected for case, or (2) the spelling with the {mu} sign is an error of the mind for an intended {mi} (that is, as a result of a lack of attention the scribe wrote the nominative form instead of the genitive). I know of no reliable means of deciding this question. Past students of these texts have described usages of this type as "errors". Such pronouncements are normative, of course, and assume a conscious imitation, on the part of the scribe, of an Akkadian dialect in which the form *mimmu* would have been productively cased. Such a situation is by no means impossible, and in some cases perhaps even likely,

whatever of yours'. In this formula, the "beneficiary" phrase occurs prior to the volitional form even though the letter itself is not conceptually ascending; in the Ugaritic corpus, such a compositional order is typical of letters which are ascending.

In containing at least two *šulmu* volitional forms, the salutation of AT 115 may be classified as "expanded". It does not appear to represent international diplomatic correspondence. In both of these formulas, the *šulmu* volition occurs prior to the "beneficiary" phrase, even though this letter is conceptually ascending; in the Ugaritic corpus this compositional pattern is typical of letters which are not ascending.

3.4.1.7 Salutation formulas in the Middle Assyrian tradition

Several letters in the Middle Assyrian tradition make use of a formulaic salutation in the "polite formula" section of the letter, following the address, but prior to the less formulaic body of the letter.[275] With respect to this particular aspect of the distribution of the formula, then, the Middle Assyrian epistolary salutation resembles that of the Ugaritic tradition. Further distributional similarities are rare,[276] however,

---

but the ease with which many modern students have passed from description to prescription in their analyses is unsettling from a methodological point of view.

[275]A recent survey is E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 59-60. She discusses twelve examples. Several salutations from the corpora already surveyed are formally similar or identical to this Middle Assyrian pattern, and deserve to be mentioned here. *Ras Shamra*: RS 20.018, { | (5) a-na ku-a-ša KUR-[t]i-ka-ma (6) lu-ú šul-mu | }; the sender of this letter bears the title {LÚ MAŠKIM GAL ša KUR a-la-ši-a}. *Amarna*: EA 15: {(4) a-na ka-ša É-ka a-⌈na⌉ ⌈KUR?-ka⌉ (5) a-na GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ-ka ù ERÍN.MEŠ-ka (6) lu-ú šul - mu }, and EA 16: { | (5) a-na ka-a-ša a-na É-ka ù KUR-ka lu šul-mu | }; the sender of both of these is {^{md}a-šur-TI.LA}, the king of Assyria. *From a private collection*: RE 83 (allegedly from "the vicinity of Emar"), { | (4) a-na ku-a-ša É-ka (5) MÁŠ-ti-ka lu šul-mu! | }.

[276]Exceptions (that is, examples of further distributional similarities with the Ugaritic « sal ») include (1) those MA letters in which the sole "polite formula" occurring between the address and the body of the letter is the « sal » formula, and (2) those MA letters in which the "polite formulas" consist of the sequence « pros sal ». Cancik-Kirschbaum, *ibid.*, pp. 60-61, discusses both patterns, neither of

since the other formulaic components used in the *praescriptio* of Middle Assyrian letters are not compositionally analogous to those found in the Ugaritic *praescriptio*.[277]

As to composition, I know of no Middle Assyrian salutation formula which contains two and only two components, one being a *ŠLM*-volition, the other a prepositional phrase expressing the recipient of the letter as the beneficiary of the wish. All of the examples that I have seen contain a *ŠLM*-volition; but these contain not one, but multiple "beneficiary" phrases, naming not only the recipient, but also various persons or objects associated with him. Such an "expanded" compositional structure is not the standard pattern for the « sal » formula in the Ugaritic corpus; and the "unexpanded" « sal » formula, which is standard in Ugaritic, is entirely absent from the Middle Assyrian tradition. A second compositional feature which distinguishes these salutations from those in the Ugaritic corpus is the order of the elements, which is fixed: the "beneficiary" phrases always precedes the *ŠLM*-form. In the standard Ugaritic salutation the order of the two components varies according to the ascending / non-ascending conceptual status of the letter.[278] Furthermore, there are very few examples of Middle Assyrian salutations in which reference is made to the recipient by means of conceptually explicit REL terms.[279] This is a key element of the Ugaritic

---

which is very frequent in her corpus. Both patterns occur in the Ugaritic corpus as well, but are also infrequent; see above, section 3.3.

[277]The address formula used in the Middle Assyrian tradition follows a fixed order, « RS », unlike the Ugaritic address, where the order varies according to the conceptual status of the letter as ascending / non-ascending; the composition of the MA prostration formula is also distinct from that of the Ugaritic corpus; and finally, I know of no Ugaritic formula which corresponds to the MA polite formula *ana dinān* « ascending REL term »*-ia attalak*.

[278]See above, section 3.3.

[279]Dūr Katlimmu no. 19, line 5, may contain such a reference. This would apply primarily to conceptually ascending letters. In other "ascending" letters reference is made to the recipient only by means of the ID term, {LUGAL}; see the examples mentioned in Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die*

formula in conceptually ascending letters. Finally, the orthography of the prepositional element of the "beneficiary" phrase does not vary according to the ascending / non-ascending conceptual status of the letter, as it did in the standard Ugaritic salutation.

In light of the compositional and distributional differences outlined above, the comparative evidence provided by the Middle Assyrian salutation formulas is of less significance for the interpretation of the Ugaritic formulas than the evidence from Ras Shamra, Meskene, Amarna, or the Anatolian sites of Boğazköy and Ma□at Höyük.

3.4.1.8 The salutation in letters from Kassite Babylonia

The salutation formulas in Akkadian letters of the Middle Babylonian (Kassite) epistolary tradition follow the scheme « *ana kâša lū šulmu* ».[280] In his study of these formulas, E. Salonen mentions ten such salutation formulas,[281] to which may be added those of the two "Dilmun" letters recovered from Nippur.[282]

The Middle Babylonian salutation formula is distinguished from its Ugaritic counterpart by the fact that its composition is fixed.[283] Thus, the order of the components does not vary according to the ascending / non-ascending conceptual

---

mittelassyrischen Briefe (1996) 59. With the exception of RS 34.148, the known Ugaritic salutations do not make use of ID elements.

[280]See H. Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings* (1908) 17-19; and A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 49: ". . . *ana kâša lū šulmu* zählt zu den typischen Grussformeln der mittelbabylonischen Zeit. . . ."

[281]Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 59-61, mentions five such « sal » formulas in "BE 17/1" (Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings* [1908], nos. 81, 82, 87, 89, 92); and five in "UM 1/2" (H. F. Lutz, *Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts* [1919], nos. 30, 36, 45, 67, and 74).

[282]Compare Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 49, n. 35. These two texts were published by A. Goetze in *JCS* 6 (1952) 142-145.

[283]BE 17/1, no. 82, may represent an exception. The orthography is also virtually fixed: nearly all examples (except BE 17/1, no. 87) are written {a-na ka-ša lu-ú šul-mu}.

distinction, as in the Ugaritic formula; nor does the composition of « N_R » element, that is, the noun phrase referring to the "beneficiary" of the salutation, vary according to this same ascending / non-ascending conceptual distinction, as in the Ugaritic formula.

If thus distinguished in its composition, the distribution of the Middle Babylonian salutation does show some similarities with the Ugaritic « sal »: both are polite formulas, frequently followed by another polite formula, the "benediction". Since, however, Middle Babylonian letters employ an address formula in which the order of mention is basically fixed,[284] and since they also make extensive use of polite formulas of the pattern « *ana dīnān bēliya lullik* », literally 'I would go in my lord's stead', that is, 'I would lay down my life for my lord',[285] which has no analogue in the Ugaritic tradition, further distributional similarities are not obvious.

3.4.1.9 Salutation formulas in the Old Babylonian traditions

In his discussion of the "Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln" of Old Babylonian letters, Salonen mentions several motifs which can be descriptively qualified as salutations in the sense of formulaic wishes for the general well-being of the recipient.[286] These include, (1) *lū šalmāta*, 'May you be well!' (2) *lū balṭāta*, 'May you live!' and, less common, (3) *lū dariāta*, 'May you persevere!' The ŠLM and BLṬ forms

---

[284]The address formula used in the Middle Babylonian tradition follows a fixed order, « RS », when both correspondents are mentioned; see Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 57-58. This is distinct from the Ugaritic address, where the order varies according to the conceptual status of the letter as ascending / non-ascending; see above, sections 1.2 and 1.4.2.5.3.2.

[285]The idiomatic translation is taken from *CAD*, vol. 3 (D) 149.

[286]Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 30-47.

of these salutations frequently occur together.[287] Within the letter these formulas are used as "polite formulas", that is, in the formulaic section of the letter which follows the address and precedes the less formulaic body, and often accompanied by a "benediction",[288] another "polite formula" known also in the Ugaritic tradition.

In terms of composition, however, these salutation formulas do not correspond to the standard Ugaritic salutation: (1) the Old Babylonian salutations are not impersonal as is the Ugaritic « sal » formula, the volitional forms being themselves marked for person; and (2) the Old Babylonian salutations have a one-component compositional pattern while that of the Ugaritic formula is a two-component pattern. These differences also prevent the Old Babylonian formula from formally distinguishing the salutation of conceptually ascending letters from that of non-ascending letters, a feature which is essential to the Ugaritic tradition. In light of these differences, the Old Babylonian salutations are of less value as comparative evidence. They do, however, provide early evidence, predating the Late Bronze Age, for the use of the salutation as a polite formula in "Amorite" epistolary traditions.[289]

---

[287]Compare VAB 6, no. 261: {lu ba-al-ṭa-ta lu ša-al-ma-a-ta}, and other examples cited by Salonen, *ibid.*, pp. 30-47.

[288]Compare the examples cited by Salonen, *ibid.*, pp. 30-47. Compare also Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 49, n. 36: "Beiden Formeln [one of the formulas she is speaking of is *lū šalmāta*] werden aber nicht miteinander verbunden, sondern treten meistens mit der altbabylonischen Hauptformel GN *u* GN *liballiṭūka* 'GN und GN sollen dich am Leben erhalten' auf."

[289]Such a characterization of the Old Babylonian epistolary conventions as "Amorite" is a speculative attempt on my part to account for the fact that in many respects the Old Babylonian epistolary tradition does not resemble its chronological predecessors in Mesopotamia, while it does resemble, in certain respects, the epistolary traditions of the "Amorite" civilizations of West Asia of subsequent periods. Since this issue of a putative "Amorite" heritage for the Old Babylonian tradition, however, is not germane to this study, it may be set aside, pending a more detailed demonstration.

3.4.2 Extra-epistolary Ugaritic comparative evidence

Unlike the cases of the address and prostration formulas, neither the Ugaritic literary texts nor any other genre of text other than the epistolary contains a motif showing both formal and functional similarities with the salutation formula.

A few passages contain motifs that may be functionally similar, however, provided these motifs in question are interpreted as wishes of general well-being for a certain person or group. These include: (1) *šlm*-motifs, occurring in several texts, and (2) a possible salutary motif occurring twice in succession from the Baʿlu Cycle of myths.

3.4.2.1 The syntagm « *šlm* + noun phrase(s) »

The most important, and best attested, of these possible functional parallels for the salutation in non-epistolary Ugaritic texts is represented by the syntagm « *šlm* + noun phrase(s) ». At least four texts contain this motif:

(1) the mythological text *KTU*[2] 1.23,[290] which contains at least three[291] examples;

(2) the much-discussed ritual RS 34.126,[292] which contains six[293] examples;

---

[290]*KTU*[2] 1.23 is traditionally titled "The Birth of the Gracious and Beautiful Gods", "birth" after the content of the mythological narrative on the latter part of the tablet, and "the gracious and beautiful gods" after a presumed restoration of the phrase *ỉlm nʿ*[*mm*] / *w ysmm*, 'the (two) good and beautiful gods', in lines 1-2. The *editio princeps* is C. Virolleaud, *Syria* 14 (1933) 128-151. Two recent English translations, with extensive commentary and anterior bibliography, are D. Pardee, *Context* 1 (1997) 274-283; and N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit* (1998) 324-335.

[291]These are « *šlm mlk* » and « *šlm mlkt ʿrbm w ṯnnm* » in line 7; and « *šlm ʿrbm ṯnnm hlkm b dbḥ nʿmt* » in lines 26-27.

[292]The *editio princeps* is P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, *Syria* 59 (1982) 121-28; see also the preliminary publication in A. Caquot, *ACF* 75 (1975) 427-429, and the recent re-edition in Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000), ch. 71, pp. 816-825, where anterior bibliography may be found. "Ritual" seems descriptively appropriate for the genre of the text in light of the seven-fold repetition of the sacrificial term *ṯʿy* in lines 27-30, and the directive *tqdm ʿṣr šlm*, perhaps 'Let them (now) offer up the bird(s)-of-well-being,' in lines 30-31. This text is one of the few which actually bear a title in Ugaritic, and this may have served as a genre identification of sorts: line 1 reads {spr . dbḥ . ẓlm}, 'the document of the sacrifice(s) of the "shades"' Pardee's translation of this phrase, in his recent re-edition of the text in *Les textes rituels* (2000) 818, is more idiomatic: "livret de sacrifice funéraire".

[293]These are « *šlm ʿmr*[*pỉ*] *w šlm bt*ˡ*h* » (two examples) in lines 31-32; « *šlm ṯryl šlm bth* » (two examples) in lines 32-33; and « *šlm ủgrt šlm ṯgṕrh* » (two examples) in lines 33-34. The reading *šlm bt*ˡ*h* in line 32 is conjectural: the texts reads {båh}, which would seem to present certain semantic, contextual, and structural difficulties, though the verb Bʾ does exist in Ugaritic, on which see G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 98-99. In a literal interpretation of this passage, as it stands, the writing with {å} would yield a transitive verbal understanding for *šlm*: 'Make ʿAmmurapiʾ well, and make his "entering" well!' Would *båh*, 'his entering', then refer to the new king's enthronement, or the like? Emendation is tricky business from a methodological point of view, given our general ignorance regarding the Ugaritic language; it is nevertheless tempting in this case, for at least two interrelated reasons: (1) the structural parallelism and the sense yielded by emendation are too attractive from a structural and contextual point of view to ignore (compare *bth* with reference to *ṯryl* in line 33), and (2) epigraphically an error of {å} for {t} or {n} (another proposed emendation is *bn*ˡ*h*, 'his sons') is a relatively simple one (a matter of one wedge too many or too few, respectively).

(3) the god-list RS 24.271,[294] which may contain as many as five[295] examples; and (4) the god-list RS 4.474,[296] which contains one example.[297]

3.4.2.1.1 « *ŠLM* + NOUN PHRASE(S) » IN *KTU*^{2} 1.23 AND RS 34.126

It is by no means clear that all examples of this syntagm represent one and the same syntactic construction, but I am inclined because of certain structural and contextual parallels to interpret the examples of the *šlm*-motif occurring in *KTU*^{2} 1.23 and in RS 34.126 together.[298] Lines 1-29 of *KTU*^{2} 1.23 are divided into nine discrete

---

[294]The *editio princeps* is Virolleaud, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 583-586; see now the re-edition by Pardee in *Les textes rituels* (2000), ch. 49, pp. 691-706. As Pardee remarked regarding the literary genre of this text (*ibid.*, p. 694), "La structure principale est celle de la liste nominative divine. Même si l'on accepte qu'il s'agisse d'une sorte de prière adressée à ces divinités (une « litanie »), il n'est pas moins vrai que la prière s'organise en fonction de la liste des théonymes." Notwithstanding the plausibility of identifying this text as a "litany" or a "prayer", addressed to the deities listed therein (on which possibility, see the references cited in Pardee, *ibid.*, pp. 694-695, n. 15), I find the *šlm*-motifs (these being the only elements in the text which are not divine names — in my view, the string {ḥnbnỉldn[...]} in line 15 is of too uncertain an interpretation to constitute much of an argument — and thus the only firm data on which the "litany" / "prayer" identification could be based) in lines 2-3, 28'-30', and 33', which are few in number, often fragmentary, and of uncertain syntactic and semantic interpretation, to be a rather slim basis for such an identification. "God-list", which is descriptively indisputable, seems a safe alternative; compare the editor's "liste de noms divines", C. Virolleaud, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 584. Given the identical structure (list, with constituent elements often separated by horizontal scribal lines) and content (divine names where recognizable, some of which being accompanied by the word *šlm*) observable on the *recto* and *verso* of this tablet, it seems evident that *recto* and *verso* should be considered, in the absence of empirical evidence to the contrary, as part of the same text; on this issue, see Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 695-696.

[295]Examples which are reasonably certain are « *šlm ỉl šr* » in line 3; « *šlm ỉl bt* » in line 29'; and {šlmỉlḫš⌈-⌉[...]}, that is, « *šlm ỉl ḫš*⌈-⌉[...] », in line 30'. Other plausible examples include {šlmỉ[...]}, that is, « *šlm ỉ*[...] », in line 2; {[-]lmtmrd[...]}, that is, « [*š*]*lm tmrd*[...] », in line 19'; and {⌈--⌉mỉl⌈-⌉[...]}, that is, « ⌈*šl*⌉*m ỉl*⌈-⌉[...] », in line 32'.

[296]The *editio princeps* is E. Dhorme, *Syria* 14 (1933) 231-235; see now the re-edition, with comprehensive anterior bibliography, in Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000), ch. 16, pp. 364-385.

[297]The motif occurs in line 8: « *šlm ỉl* ».

[298]*Contra* Pardee, who distinguishes the *šlm*-motifs in these two texts in *Context* 1 (1997) 276, n. 11.

sections by horizontal scribal lines; the *šlm*-motifs occur in two of these "paragraphs": that of lines 1-7 and that of lines 23-27. It is these two paragraphs which correspond, in terms of structure and context, not only to one another, but also to lines 2-34, that is, virtually the entire text, of RS 34.126. The parallels consist of the following:

(1) In terms of structure, all three passages begin[299] with a form of the verb QRʾ, 'to call, invite (in the G-stem)',[300] probably functioning as a sort of invitation, summons, or invocation of the divinities concerned. The QRʾ forms in *KTU*[2] 1.23 are active, formed from the prefix conjugation with the addition of the /*a*/ mood vowel, that is, the pattern typically called the "cohortative": *ỉqrả* in line 1, and *ỉqrản* in line 23. The forms used in RS 34.126 are, for the most part,[301] passive, and formed from the suffix conjugation: *qrỉtm* is in the second person, *qrả* and *qrủ* in the third person. I do not consider the conjugational differences between these forms to be of great import: the « yqtl + /-*a*/ » forms appear to emphasize the volitional aspect of the invitation, thus Pardee's translation of 'I *would* call. . .'[302] is not inappropriate, while the suffix

---

[299]Technically, RS 34.126 begins with a heading or title, inscribed on the upper edge, not with one of the QRʾ verbal forms, which begin on the *recto*. Since, however, in some sense the title is independent of and external to the text itself, I consider the text proper to begin with the QRʾ verbal form *qrỉtm* in line 2.

[300]On this usage of QRʾ, see G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 370-371.

[301]The verbal form in line 8 is not passive; line 8 reads {qrủ . rpỉm . qdmym}. Because of the writing with the {ỉ} sign, the common noun *rpỉm* must be understood in the oblique case, not in the nominative, and, consequently, cannot be the subject of the verb *qrủ*. Since it is the *rpỉm* who experience the action described by the verb, and since *rpỉm* is not the grammatical subject, the verb cannot be passive. The construction would thus appear to be an active one, in which the 3rd person plural grammatical subject of the verb is impersonal, like the impersonal "they" in English "They say you shouldn't look a gift horse in the mouth," for example. Since such constructions are basically functional equivalents of the passive (compare the passive Ugaritic verbal forms which parallel the active form *qrủ* in the text, and, for the English example given, compare the passive paraphrase, "it is said that you shouldn't look a gift horse in the mouth"), its weight as an exception is minimal.

[302]Pardee, *Context* 1 (1997) 276 and 279.

conjugation forms may emphasize the "performative" nature of the utterance,[303] 'You are *hereby* called. . . ,' rather than completeness of action.

(2) All three passages make reference to some sort of divine meal, whether this be described purely in terms of human feasts, or rather by reference to technical sacrificial terminology. The verbal forms of line 6 of *KTU*[2] 1.23 are seemingly best interpreted as imperatives addressed to the gods invoked: *lḥm b lḥm*, 'Eat the food!' and *šty b ḫmr yn*, 'Drink the *ḫmr yn* (a type of wine)!' In the second passage, that is, lines 23-27 of the same text, a reference to a divine meal is present, though less explicit: line 27 contains an unmistakable reference to sacrifice in the phrase *hlkm b dbḥ nʿmt*, 'those coming in with the sacrifice-of-goodness'. Another reference to what can certainly also be described as a "divine meal" is present earlier in this passage, in line 24, where the invited party, *ỉlm nʿmm*, 'the good gods', are apparently further qualified as *ynqm b ảp zd ảṯrt*, 'those sucking the nipple(s) of the breast(s)[304] of (the goddess) ʾAṯiratu.' I am not certain, however, that this passage is as germane to the point being made here as are references to sacrifices and feasts. Finally, not only does the third passage, RS 34.126, bear the technical term for a sacrificial feast, *dbḥ*, as part of its Ugaritic title, *spr dbḥ ẓlm*, 'the document of the sacrifice(s) of the shades', but it also makes several technical references to sacrifice in lines 27-31, including the

---

[303]It is clear from the usage of the verb *qlt* in the epistolary prostration formula that performatives were expressed with the suffix conjugation in Ugaritic; see above, section 2.6.

[304]Because of the orthographic variation (the spellings *zd*, *ṯd*, and *ḏd* are all attested in the corpus), it is difficult to know the underlying phonemic structure of this word in Ugaritic. The context, however, here and later in lines 59 and 61 (where the word is spelled *ḏd*), seems to me sufficiently clear for the meaning to be indubitable. On these allomorphs, see G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 139; and *idem*, *DLU* 2 (2000) 487 and 549. The word *ảp* means 'nose'; in the phrase *ảp zd* here the meaning is idiomatic: 'the nose of the breast' must be English 'nipple' (*idem*, *DLU* 1 [1996] 43).

sevenfold repetition of the *ṯʿy* sacrifice, culminating in the phrase *tqdm ʿṣr šlm*, 'You / they should (now) offer up the bird(s)-of-well-being.'

(3) In all three passage, the reference to the divine meal occurs in connection with the *šlm*-motifs. In lines 6-7 of *KTU*[2] 1.23, the *šlm*-motifs immediately follow the commands for the invited gods to eat and drink. In lines 26-27, the reference to the divine meal is actually part of the *šlm*-motif. In RS 34.126, the *šlm*-motifs immediately follow the references to sacrifice in lines 27-31.[305] This latter passage also offers a further clue to the contextual relationship between the sacrifice and the *šlm*-motif: the divine meal and *šlm*, 'well-being', are linked to such an extent that the bird(s) intended to be sacrificed can be described as "bird(s) of *šlm*".

(4) Finally, and obviously, all three passages end with the *šlm*-motifs under study here. The compositional order in these motifs is invariable: « *šlm* + noun phrase(s) ». It is certainly significant that the noun phrases in question do not denote the divinities invited, but rather human parties, for the most part,[306] who were probably present during the pronouncement of the invitation. This fact is relevant to the contextual interpretation of the *šlm*-motifs. Other interpretive issues of importance are the following questions: who is speaking these *šlm*-motifs, and to whom are they addressed?

Granted that the parallels cited above justify grouping these passages together,[307] the issues at hand in interpreting them on the philological level would be

---

[305]The connection between the sacrificial term *ṯʿy* and the word *šlm* in lines 27-34 is even more striking: *ṯʿy* is repeated seven times, the word *šlm* occurs seven times.

[306]The exceptions are *ůgrt*, 'Ugarit', and *ṯǵrh*, 'her gates', in lines 33-34.

[307]I do not follow the reasons on the basis of which Pardee claims, in AOAT 42 (1993) 210, n. 8, that "The Ugaritic construction [that is, the *šlm*-motifs in RS 34.126] is genitival", and in *Context* 1 (1997) 276, n. 11, that "The syntax here [he is speaking of the *šlm*-motifs in *KTU*[2] 1.23] is different

the following: (1) the morphological classification of the word *šlm*, that is, whether it is a noun or a verb, and, if the latter, what type of verb; and (2) the grammatical role of the noun phrase (or phrases) which follows *šlm*, that is, whether the noun phrase is in a genitive or accusative relation with *šlm*, or, whether it is syntactically independent of *šlm*, for example, as a vocative phrase. Since the two issues are logically interrelated, they must be jointly conceived. It seems possible to imagine at least four interpretive possibilities which plausibly fit the context, assuming the motif itself to represent direct address: (1) *šlm* as a common noun with the following noun phrase in the genitive: 'Peace of NP!',[308] (2) *šlm* as a common noun with the noun phrase as a vocative: 'Peace, O NP!',[309] (3) *šlm* as a transitive verbal form, in the imperative, with the noun phrase as its accusative complement: 'Make NP well!',[310] and (4) *šlm* as an intransitive verbal form, in the imperative, with the noun phrase as a vocative: 'Be well, O NP!' [311]

---

from that of RS 34.126:31-34 (*šlm ʿmrpi* ...), where *šlm* is a noun in construct with the following word. . . ." I know of no evidence which indicates a syntactic difference between the *šlm*-motifs of these two texts. Pardee himself admits, in *Context* 1 (1997) 276, n. 11, that "the situation [in *KTU*^{2} 1.23] is thus very similar, though it is expressed differently, to that of RS 34.126." If he is correct that the *šlm*-motifs are "expressed differently", it must be said that this putative difference is not empirically observable.

[308]For a recent example of this view, see Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 818-819. That he understood the syntax of the *šlm*-motifs of RS 34.126 in this way is clear from his vocalization: for *šlm bth*, for example, he vocalized /*šalāmu bêtiha*/; his translation, however, is idiomatic: 'Paix à sa maision!' Such a translation reflects a "subjective" understanding of the genitive phrase: it is the noun phrase (in this case *bth*) that is imagined to experience the state denoted by the word *šlm*.

[309]The translation given for these three passages in del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 438-439, implies this understanding.

[310]Pardee offers this interpretation for the *šlm*-motifs of *KTU*^{2} 1.23 in *Context* 1 (1997) 276.

[311]The imperative would present a personal usage of the root ŠLM in the G-stem, providing an important formal difference from the epistolary « sal » formula. A parallel for the semantics of the verb in such a case (that is, the personal usage), namely, 'to be in a state of well-being (G-stem)' is provided by the Ugaritic *šumma izbu* text, RS 24.247+, published by A. Herdner in *Ugaritica* 7 (1978) 44-60. In line 54 of the transcription of this text in *KTU*^{2} 1.103 (Herdner's line 29), the apodosis reads {mlkn . yšlm l ỉbh }, '(If . . .), then the king will be in a state of *šlm* with his enemies.'

If the *šlm*-motifs in these three passages are to be taken as functional parallels for the epistolary salutation,[312] they ought to represent a phrase spoken in direct address, in which the speaker wishes his interlocutor well. Especially the second and fourth of the interpretive possibilities mentioned above, but also the first, are consistent with this situation. If the *šlm*-motifs in question were indeed to be so interpreted, the invited divinities would be "speaking", and the "beneficiaries" to whom these salutations are addressed would be the human parties who issued the invitation, or more specifically, those parties who are mentioned in the *šlm*-motifs. The changes of "voice" in such a reading, between the human parties who extend the invitation, and the gods who would pronounce the *šlm*-motif, are not marked. They may have been distinguished in cultic practice, however, by the use of responsive recitation, a practice to which specific allusion is made, though probably with respect to a different passage, in line 12 of *KTU*[2] 1.23: *šbʿd yrgm ... w ʿrbm tʿnyn*, 'One should say (this) seven times . . . , and then those who enter[313] should reply.' Applying this view to lines 1-7 of *KTU*[2] 1.23, for example, one can imagine line 6 to represent imperatives addressed by

---

[312]Compare Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), col. 1367: ". . . une bénédiction addressée au roi , à la reine et à des officiants."

[313]Pardee, *Context* 1 (1997) 276, n. 12, observes that "the common cultic use of the verb [ʿRB, 'to enter'] is with a deity as subject. . . ," but does not admit such a usage of the verb here in these *šlm*-motifs, reasoning that "there is no indication here that the *ʿrbm* are anything but human." He is correct that the other parties associated with the *ʿrbm* certainly appear to represent human beings, not deities: *mlk*, 'the king', *mlkt*, 'the queen', and *ṯnnm*, 'the *ṯnn*-military-personnel (?)'. Beyond this association, however, neither is there any explicit indication that the *ʿrbm are* human. One hesitates to dismiss the established cultic usage of ʿRB, where it is the deity who "enters", since these three *šlm*-passages themselves deal with a meeting between human and divine, a meeting where actual verbal exchange takes place between the human and divine parties. An entirely speculative proposal, which I will simply mention but not defend in detail, is that the *ʿrbm* represent the human party whose task it was to "play the role of the gods" during the recital of the text, that is, to recite the responsive passages that were intended to represent divine speech. Despite its speculative nature, and the general lack of data for proving and disproving hypotheses of this nature, such a suggestion at least has the advantage of compromise: it refers to deities inasmuch as deities are being portrayed, and it refers to humans inasmuch as those who play this role are humans.

the human parties to the gods, as an invitation of sorts: *lḥm ... w šty ...* , 'Eat . . . and drink . . . !' Line 7, in this view, would then represent the gods' response to this hospitality, perhaps given by proxy, that is, by another human party present at the recital of the text: « *šlm mlk šlm mlkt* … » perhaps 'Be well, O king! Be well, O Queen . . . !' Such an association would also coincide with the explicit linking of sacrifice and well-being found in lines 30-31 of RS 34.126: *tqdm ʿṣr / šlm*, 'You / they should offer up the bird(s)-of-well-being,' which is then followed by the *šlm*-motifs, and in lines 26-27 of *KTU*[2] 1.23: *šlm ... / hlkm b dbḥ nʿmt*, perhaps 'Be well, . . . O (you) who come in with the sacrifice(s)-of-goodness!'

This interpretation of these three *šlm*-motifs, as representing "salutations" spoken by the gods for the benefit of the parties named, is admittedly speculative, but has, I believe, a certain amount of internal consistency. As Pardee points out,[314] "From the standard epistolary formula *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk*, 'may the gods guard you and keep you well,' it is clear that the effecting of *šlm* was considered to be a standard function of deities." Furthermore, that one could, so to speak, "bribe" the gods with food in exchange for their services, among which was the effecting of *šlm*, is clear from, among other evidence, the prayer in lines 26'-36' of RS 24.266: in this passage the prayer promises various offerings to Baʿlu should he drive hostile attackers away from the city's gates and walls.[315]

In his translation of *KTU*[2] 1.23, Pardee has opted for the third interpretive possibility cited above in interpreting these motifs, namely, *šlm* as a transitive verbal form, in the imperative, with the following noun phrase as the verb's accusative

---

[314]Pardee, *Context* 1 (1997) 276, n. 11.

[315]On this passage, see the re-edition in Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 661-685.

complement: *šlm mlk* in line 7, for example, is translated 'Give well-being to the king'.[316] In favor of this view, it would be unnecessary to postulate a change of "voice" between lines 6 and 7; the verbal forms *lḥm*, *šty*, and *šlm* in these lines would all be D-stem imperatives, addressed to the invited gods by the human party reciting the text. I have neither grammatical nor contextual arguments against this interpretation. I do not find, however, Pardee's arguments against the "salutation" interpretation, and thus indirectly in favor of his own view, to be convincing. He advances two arguments against the "salutation" view:[317] (1) he mentions "the syntactic problem posed by the absence of a preposition in this context", and (2) he claims that "the usual translation of *šlm* here as a simple wish ('peace be with...') or greeting ('hail to ...') . . . leaves partially unmotivated the invitation tendered to the 'gracious gods' in line 1."

The first objection is not relevant to the interpretive possibilities given here for « *šlm* + noun phrase(s) », where the noun phrase in question is considered vocative. Since there appear to be no obvious grammatical objections[318] to interpreting « *šlm*

---

[316]Pardee, *Context* 1 (1997) 276 and 279.

[317]Both are mentioned in *Context* 1 (1997) 276, n. 11.

[318]It is true that vocative interpretations of the second, fourth, and sixth *šlm*-motifs in lines 31-34 of RS 34.126 are awkward: « *šlm ʿmr*[*pi*] *w šlm bt*ˡ*h* » 'Be well, O ʿAmmurapiʾ! And, be well, O household of his!' « *šlm ṯryl šlm bth* » 'Be well, O Ṯaryelli! Be well, O household of hers!' and « *šlm ůgrt šlm ṯǵrh* » 'Be well, O Ugarit! Be well, O gates of hers!' The reason for the awkwardness, I suspect, is three-fold: (1) the vocative phrase consists of a two-component noun phrase in which the grammatical relationship between the first noun and the second is the genitive relation (that is to say, in the phrase *bth*, 'her house', for example, the relationship between the noun *bt*, 'house', and the 3rd feminine singular pronoun *-h* is a species of the genitive, in this case probably expressing possession or relation between the two entities); (2) the second element of this two-component noun phrase is not a common noun, but a suffixed pronoun; and (3) this pronoun is in the third person. Judging from attested Ugaritic syntactic patterns, neither the first nor the second situation is inappropriate for a vocative. This very text presents several probable examples of two-component noun phrases used as vocatives; compare, for example, line 9, *qrìtm rpỉ ảrṣ*, where the phrase *rpỉ ảrṣ* is best understood as a vocative: 'You are (hereby) summoned, O *Rapiʾūma*-of-the-Earth!' For other examples, see J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 54.221, pp. 317-319. Secondly, noun phrases which consist of a common noun with an attached pronominal suffix may used as vocatives; compare the phrase from lines

mlk », for example, in line 7 of *KTU*[2] 1.23 as 'Be well, O king!' or as 'Peace, O king!' objections to such an interpretation must rely on contextual arguments. In this sense, Pardee's argument may be taken simply as an observation that in the letters, the salutation is formed on the pattern *yšlm lk*; with the follow-up question: if this phrase, *šlm mlk*, is indeed a salutation, why does it not resemble the epistolary salutation in form? Beyond remarking that differences of literary genre might very well have conditioned differences in the linguistic idiom, I have no explanation as to why, if *šlm mlk* means 'Be well, O king!' or the like, it was not formulated instead as **yšlm l mlk*.

The second objection involves literary criticism, namely, the motivations, or lack thereof, for the invitation extended to the gods. Inasmuch as these motivations are accessible to modern students of these texts, I do not feel the force of this objection with respect to the proposals offered above. If *šlm mlk* in line 7 of *KTU*[2] 1.23 represents the response of the invited gods to the "dinner invitation" offered to them by the human parties involved in the text's recitation, as is suggested above, an interpretation of this phrase as a "salutation" of sorts, 'Be well, O king!' appears perfectly to answer the motivations of hospitality. As argued above, the services of

---

20-21 of the Ugaritic letter RS 16.379: *w åt ùmy ål tdḥṣ/l*[!], 'Now then, as for you, O my mother, do not DHṢ/L[!](?) !' (the orthography of *ùmy* implies that it is not in the nominative case, and therefore not the grammatical subject of the verb); for other examples, see Tropper, *ibid*. It is above all the third aspect mentioned above, the vocative use of noun phrases bearing 3rd person pronominal suffixes, as in *bth*, 'O house of hers!' that is problematic. I know of no evidence from the Ugaritic corpus to support their existence, and as such, this interpretation may be dismissed as methodologically unsound. Note, however, that such an understanding appears to be behind the translation given in del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 439, where *šlm tryl šlm bth* is translated '¡salve NP, salve su casa!' Other Semitic languages which are capable of such vocative constructions (of nouns bearing a 3rd person pronominal suffix) include classical Arabic and Biblical Hebrew; see W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* (1896-1898), vol. 2, pp. 85-93; and B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (1990) 77. For the latter, Micah 1:2 is clear:

שִׁמְעוּ עַמִּים כֻּלָּם הַקְשִׁיבִי אֶרֶץ וּמְלֹאָהּ.

A literal translation would be 'Hear, O Nations, O All of them! Pay attention, O Earth, and O fullness of it!' Compare also Is 44:23, where the vocative phrase is יַעַר וְכָל־עֵץ בּוֹ, 'O Forest, and O every tree in it!'

the gods could be gained in exchange for food. Since the effecting of *šlm* is within the power of the gods, and since such a link between sacrifice and *šlm* is clear in all three passages under discussion, it seems reasonable to speculate that the "motive" of the invitation offered in

KTU[2] 1.23 was to incite just such a "salutation" from the gods. Given the similar format in RS 34.126, it seems to me that such a motivation would be valid there as well in explaining the connection between sacrifice and *šlm*.

3.4.2.1.2 THE *ŠLM*-MOTIFS IN THE GOD-LIST RS 24.271

The *šlm*-motifs in RS 4.474 and RS 24.271 are formally and contextually distinct from those found in *KTU*[2] 1.23 and RS 34.126. Both of these texts are, entirely or in part, lists of divinities,[319] and as such, the structure of these texts is profoundly different from that of the three "invitation - sacrifice - well-being" passages discussed above.

With respect to RS 4.474, the nature of lines 1-11 as a list of divinities (or groups of divinities) seems clear.[320] Given this context, and the position occupied by the phrases *ḥnn ỉl*, *nṣbt ỉl*, and *šlm ỉl*, in the middle of the list, it appears best to agree with Pardee[321] in interpreting these three motifs is as "trois qualitiés de ʾIlu présentés comme des hypostases, la forme étant « X + ỉl », où « X » est un terme abstrait." I am

---

[319]Such an understanding of lines 1-11 of RS 4.474 is implicit in Virolleaud's treatment in *Syria* 20 (1939) 129-131. As for RS 24.271, in his edition, Virolleaud, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 584, characterized the text as a "liste de noms divines".

[320]See the recent treatment, with anterior bibliography, in Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000), ch. 16, pp. 364-385; and the bibliographical information assembled by D. Clemens in *Sources for Ugaritic Ritual and Sacrifice* 1 (2001) 1179-1180.

[321]Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 368. C. Virolleaud, *Syria* 20 (1939) 131, had spoken of "trois attributs de El".

not inclined to interpret this *šlm*-motif as functionally similar to the epistolary salutation.

The *šlm*-motifs of RS 24.271, however, are even less clear. The text is basically a list of divinities, but alongside at least six of the entries in this list, the word *šlm* appears. In most of the examples, the motif follows the pattern « *šlm* DN »,[322] but in at least one case the order is apparently « DN *šlm* ».[323] This variable order also distinguishes the usage of the *šlm*-motifs here from that of the other texts discussed above, where the order is fixed as « *šlm* NP ».

Since these two elements, divine names and the word *šlm*, are the only two clear compositional constituents of this text,[324] Pardee's observation is incisive: "Le problème qui se pose . . . est de savoir ce que contribue à la structure du texte le mot *šlm* plusieurs fois répété, au début et à la fin du texte."[325] Most past students of the text

---

[322]The abbreviation "DN" represents "divine name". For these motifs, see above.

[323]This is « *kṯr ḫss šlm* [...] » in line 28'. Other possible examples of this motif are {(1, cont'd) wìl⌈-⌉[...] (2) [-(-)]⌈š⌉lm}, that is, « *w il*⌈-⌉[...] *šlm* », in lines 1-2; and {[-(-)]⌈-⌉mšlm[...]}, that is, « [...]⌈-⌉*m šlm* », in line 33'.

[324]The possibility has been suggested that the word *ḥn*, in the string {ḥnbnìldn[...]} in line 15 constitutes another formal "prayer" element. See this possibility mentioned in a note by G. del Olmo Lete, *La religión cananea* (1992) 230, n. 34 ("¡Favor, dioses de … !"); and in Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 695, n. 17, and p. 702. The sense of the line is uncertain, however; and since it occurs in a part of the text where other recognizable divine names and double names are listed, one divine name or double name per line with horizontal scribal lines separating the lines of text from one another, and since more than a few lines in this section apparently present previously unknown divine names and double names (compare, for example, lines 5, 12-14 and 16), it seems best to follow most previous students of this text in viewing {ḥnbnìldn[...]} in line 15 as another previously unknown divine name: the first to express this opinion was apparently M. Astour, *JAOS* 86 (1966) 283; see also the other references mentioned by Pardee in *Les textes rituels* (2000), ch. 49, p. 702, n. 63; and the useful information in D. Clemens, *Sources for Ugaritic Ritual and Sacrifice* 1 (2001) 1179-1180.

[325]Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 695.

have seen a "salutation"-like usage here,[326] some explicitly comparing the biblical Hebrew expression *šālōm lᵊ*.[327] A few others have suggested an identification of this word with the sacrificial term normally written *šlmm*.[328]

The latter view has gained few adherents. As a foil to purely speculative research, it seems reasonable to interpret an unknown or ambiguous form on the basis of established Ugaritic usage; the fact that the sacrificial term, where its presence is clear and unambiguous, is written *šlmm*, and not *šlm*; thus presents a strong argument against this view.[329]

Regarding the first view, in the first place it must be said that, as functional parallels go, the Ugaritic epistolary salutation *yšlm lk* would have offered a much more meaningful parallel to the motifs of RS 24.271 than the Hebrew salutation *šālōm lᵊ*.[330] Furthermore, from a purely philological point of view, the Ugaritic expression

---

[326]Compare the editor's view: 'salut!', Virolleaud, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 585; subsequent proponents of this view are listed in Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 696, n. 28, to which may be added the view of del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 438-439: *šlm ỉl bt*, for example, as "¡salve, el dios del palacio!" For K. Spronk, *HUS* (1999) 275, the text is "probably best described as a benediction."

[327]Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 696, n. 30, mentions these two references: B. Levine and J.-M. de Tarragon, *JAOS* 104 (1984) 658-659; and J. C. De Moor, *UF* 2 (1970) 313.

[328]This possibility is mentioned by Dietrich, Loretz et Sanmartín, *UF* 7 (1975) 542; and A. Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), col. 1404.

[329]See Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 696, and n. 29.

[330]As noted in the references cited above, some students of this text have compared this motif, « *šlm* DN », with the biblical Hebrew salutation *šālōm lᵊ*. Presumably, this is due to the fact that the Ugaritic form *šlm* here may very well be a common noun and the biblical form *šālōm* is a common noun, while the Ugaritic form *yšlm* of the epistolary salutation is obviously verbal. In other words, these scholars appear to have sought formal (and in this case specifically morphological) parallels rather than functional ones. If it is formal parallels that are sought, Pardee's objection regarding the absence of the preposition *l* in the Ugaritic motif is legitimate: see *Les textes rituels* (2000) 696. On a more general level, however, this method of cross-linguistic comparison requires a comment. For the simple purpose of illustrating a given interpretation, in a work directed at an audience more familiar with biblical Hebrew than with Ugaritic, I see no problem with making a comparison between Ugaritic « *šlm* DN »

« *šlm* DN » in RS 24.271 could be functionally similar to a "salutation" without being formally so. With respect to this motif in line 29', for example, *šlm ỉl bt*, the following two translations, both of which are philologically sound, yield functional parallels, in the sense of formulaic wishes for the general well-being of the recipient, for the epistolary salutation: 'Peace, O God-of-the-household!' and 'Be well, O God-of-the-household!' This granted, the *formal* dissimilarity between this motif and epistolary *yšlm lk*, namely, the formal difference between *šlm* and *yšlm*, and the absence / presence of the preposition *l*, has little relevance to the potential *functional* similarity of the two motifs.[331]

D. Pardee opted for neither of the above views in his recent re-edition,[332] but interpreted the word *šlm* here as an imperative of the D-stem, 'donne le bien-être!'; with the accompanying divine names as vocatives, the imperatives being addressed to them; and with the expected accusative complement of the verb omitted, apparently being clear from context.[333] In this view, then, the text itself would represent "un genre littéraire mixte, à savoir une prière, consistant en peu de mots, qui est adressée à

---

and biblical Hebrew *šālōm lᵃ*; but as a means of determining the meaning of the Ugaritic expression in question, comparison with Hebrew, without reference to Ugaritic contextual usage, runs all the risks of any uncritical etymological method in lexicography. If this motif is indeed a "salutation", the first step in the search for functional parallels is the Ugaritic corpus, not in the cognate languages; and one need not have searched very long, especially since this text was published in 1968, before finding an obvious potential functional parallel in epistolary *yšlm lk*.

[331]Thus the syntactic objections raised by Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 696, with respect to this interpretation of the motif in RS 24.271, and again in *Context* 1 (1997) 276, n. 11, with respect to this interpretation of the motif in *KTU*^{2} 1.23 and RS 34.126, apply only to proposals which imply *formal* parallels as well as *functional* ones.

[332]Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 696-697.

[333]Does one imagine, in this view, that the implied direct object of the transitive verb was represented, in whole or in part, by the person(s) carrying out the recitation?

un grand nombre de divinités," and the word *šlm* would designate "le « bien-être » qu'on prie les divinités nommées de conférer."[334]

Pardee's defense of his view appears sound: the epistolary benediction formula, of which a typical example is *ìlm tǵrk tšlmk*, 'May the gods guard you (and) keep you well!' does indeed indicate that "the gods" had the power to bestow *šlm*, 'well-being'. His criticism of the "salutation"-interpretation, however, relies not so much on textual evidence as on the theoretical argument that a "salutation", as proposed for these motifs, addressed to the gods by humans, would seem inconsistent with "la psychologie religieuse de penser".[335] He may be correct, but, from a methodological point of view, one may admit a certain skepticism regarding the validity of arguments derived from general notions about the psychology of a religious mode of thought. It will certainly be readily granted that the Ugaritic "mode of religious thought", inasmuch as such an abstraction can be said to exist, ought not to be assumed to conform to a modern Western one, in which, I grant, the divine is not generally believed to require human wishes of "well-being", but rather to bestow "well-being" upon humans. This allowed, it will certainly also be granted that any notions about "la psychologie religieuse de penser" among the ancient Ugaritians would be best derived from evidence left by the people themselves, in the form of texts and architectural remains, to name two categories of evidence. On the basis of such evidence, I for my part see no necessity

---

[334]*Ibid.*, p. 694, n. 15; and p. 695, respectively.

[335]The context, in Pardee, *ibid.*, p. 696, is as follows: "On ne peut guère douter que dans cette dernière formule [Pardee is speaking here of the formally similar motif *šlm ʿmr*[*pí*] in RS 34.126] il s'agisse du génitif objectif : on souhaite que le bien-être soit accordé à *ʿAmmurāpiʾ* de la part des divinités invoquées. Mais en est-il de même lorsqu'il s'agit du *šlm* en rapport avec des divinités ? Celles-ci ont-elles besoin qu'on leur souhaite le bien-être ? Il nous paraît plus conforme à la psychologie religieuse de penser, si la structure syntaxique est la même ici, qu'il s'agit du bien-être dont jouissent déjà les dieux et que le fidèle voudrait voir devenir sien (génitif subjectif : « le bien-être qui appartient en propre à la divinité [et qu'il doit conférer au fidèle] »)."

to conclude from the fact that the gods were able to effect *šlm* among humans, that they neither needed nor desired these same human subjects in return to do their part to effect, as much as possible, a state of well-being among the gods themselves. Admittedly, few data are available for the religion of ancient Ugarit, but the prominence of sacrifice as a religious act in the preserved textual documentation would seem rather to confirm the gods' need of human solicitude, in this case, of food. If the gods needed humans to feed them, might not one also suppose that they could benefit from a "salutation", addressed to them by humans? Such considerations might lead one to answer Pardee's question, "Celles-ci [the divinities listed in this text] ont-elles besoin qu'on leur souhaite le bien-être?" with a hesitant "yes": perhaps in ancient Ugarit the gods did need to be wished well.[336] It is not my intention here to force this view, but merely to point out that the theoretical approach is, in my opinion, too slippery to be of much use as an argument against the "salutation" view.

In sum, I see neither grammatical nor contextual objections to viewing the *šlm*-motifs of RS 24.271, like those of *KTU*[2] 1.23 and RS 34.126, as salutary motifs, functionally parallel to the epistolary salutation.

3.4.2.2 The salutary motif in the *Baʿlu Cycle* of myths

The mythological tablet *KTU*[2] 1.5 II 8-11[337] contains a narrative account of Baʿlu addressing his messengers, entrusting them with a message for delivery to the god

---

[336]A lack of parallels makes it difficult to endorse this possibility without reservation, however.

[337]The *editio princeps* is C. Virolleaud, *Syria* 15 (1934) 305-356. The re-edition of the tablet in A. Herdner, *CTA* (1963), no. 5, pp. 31-36, also contains a photograph (pl. 11) as well as a reproduction of Virolleaud's original hand-copy (fig. 18-19).

Môtu. Following the formal commission of the message[338] in lines 8-9, and the formulaic identification of the sender of the message[339] in lines 10-11, the messengers are commanded to say the following to Môtu: *bht̲ l bn ỉlm mt ʿbdk ản w d ʿlmk*, 'BHT̲ L the son of ʾIlu, (namely,) Môtu! Your servant am I, yours for ever!'[340] This constitutes the entire message. A very plausible interpretation of the phrase *bht̲ l bn ỉlm mt* in lines 11-12 is as a salutation.[341] Such an interpretation can be supported by contextual and etymological arguments. Placed as it is between the formulaic literary elements which correspond to the epistolary address formula, and the non-formulaic passage *ʿbdk ản w d ʿlmk*, which would appear to contain the essentials of the message Baʿlu wishes communicated, the position of this motif reflects rather well that of the epistolary polite formulas, which occur between the address formula and the body of the letter. Furthermore, a reasonable guess at the semantics of the phrase, on the basis of this context as well as the etymological cognates, would seem to align

---

[338]The literary equivalent of the « R » component of the address (see section 1.4.3).

[339]The literary equivalent of the « S » component of the address (section 1.4.3).

[340]My translation of the last phrase is idiomatic. Literally, *w d ʿlmk* can be translated 'and (he) of your perpetuity'. The relative pronoun *d* would seem to be genitival in function, and to have as its antecedent the noun *ʿbd*, 'servant', of the preceding clause. This implies an underlying genitive phrase **ʿbd ʿlm*, literally 'a servant of perpetuity', for which an idiomatic English translation would be 'a perpetual servant'. In constructions such as these, a pronominal suffix attached to the noun in the genitive (that is, the last noun in the construct chain) governs not merely that noun, but the entire nominal phrase. Thus, a hypothetical noun phrase **ʿbd ʿlmk*, literally 'a servant of your perpetuity' would have the idiomatic meaning 'your perpetual servant'. Compare the presentation in J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 91.315, pp. 846-847, including, among others, the following examples: *mlk ʿlmk*, 'your eternal kingship' (lit., 'the kingship of your perpetuity') in *KTU*^{2} 1.2.IV:10; and *ảt̲t ṣdqh*, 'his rightful wife' (lit., 'the wife of his rightfulness') and *mtrḫt yšrh*, 'his legitimate bride' (lit., 'the bride of his legitimacy') in *KTU*^{2} 1.14.I:12-13.

[341]See, for example, the discussion in A. Caquot, M. Sznycer, and A. Herdner, *TO* 1 (1974) 244, and note g, with allusions to previous treatments. This view is preferred in three recent English language treatments: D. Pardee, *Context* 1 (1997) 266; M. S. Smith's translation in *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (1997) 144; and N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit* (1998) 121.

this idiom with ŠLM-salutations: the Ugaritic root BHṮ can thus be understood here as sharing a certain amount of semantic overlap with ŠLM.[342]

Lines 17-20 of column 2 contain the narrative account of the fulfillment of this commission. The messengers begin speaking in lines 16-17, and they deliver the message basically as instructed: their first words spoken identify the sender,[343] and the message itself is reiterated with only one significant change. In the commission, the message contained the phrase *bhṯ l bn ilm mt*; in the delivery, the preposition *l* has been omitted: *bhṯ bn ilm mt*.

Assuming it does not reflect a scribal error, such variation in the same motif in virtually identical contexts is not without implications for the syntactic understanding of the two passages: (1) since the context supports a salutation here, (2) since some salutations contain vocative phrases, and (3) since the vocative in Ugaritic may or may not be marked with *l*, the easiest explanation of these two passages is that the *l* in line 11 represents the vocative marker *l*, and that its absence in line 19 reflects an unmarked vocative construction. This granted, the morphology of the word *bhṯ* is plausibly comparable to that proposed above for the *šlm*-motifs in *KTU*[2] 1.23, RS 34.126, and RS 24.271: namely, either a common noun or an imperative of a stative verb, with a meaning appropriate for use as a salutation.

---

[342]See, for example, Caquot *et al.*, *TO* 1 (1974) 244, note g; G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (1981) 526; and, for a general overview of the comparative cognates, D. Cohen, *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques* 1 (1970) 50. For classical Arabic *bahaṯa*, A. de Biberstein Kazimirski, *Dictionnaire arabe-français* (1860) 170, glosses the 1st stem (and the 6th stem) of this verb as follows: 'accueillir quelqu'un avec un visage riant.'

[343]On the discrepancy between *tḥm ålỉyn bʿl* in the commission in line 10, and *tḥm ålỉyn bn bʿl* in the delivery in lines 17-18, compare the explanation of the intervening {bn} in Caquot *et al.*, *TO* 1 (1974) 245, n. h': "très probablement une erreur de scribe".

3.5 *SITZ-IM-LEBEN* OF THE SALUTATION

This section represents an exploitation of the data presented above in an attempt to clarify the *Sitz-im-Leben*, or contextual setting, of the salutation formula. It consists of two sections: (1) a consideration of the geographical, chronological, and literary background of the formula, and (2) a study of the situational context implied behind its usage.

3.5.1 Geographical, chronological, and literary background

Formulaic wishes pronounced by one individual for the general well-being of another are not restricted geographically to the Levant, nor chronologically to the Late Bronze Age, nor literarily to the epistolary genre.[344]

With respect to the use of such salutary motifs in letters in particular, the first evidence for the regular use of ŠLM-wishes as part of an epistolary *praescriptio* comes from the Old Babylonian period.[345] Such a historical distribution is not insignificant for the cultural history of the "salutation" as an epistolary formula, for, if the Mesopotamian world of the early 2nd millennium BCE is far from Ugarit in

---

[344]Compare the discussion of "der Gruss des täglichen Lebens" in the Babylonian world by B. Landsberger in MAOG 4 (1928-1929) 298-302. *CAD*, vol. 17 (Š), part 3 (1992), contains references to other non-epistolary Mesopotamian examples of *šulmu*-greetings on p. 251, among which the Neo-Assyrian tablet VAT 8807 is also discussed. On the latter, see the edition by W. G. Lambert in *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (1960) 216-217 and pl. 55-57: the *šulmu*-motifs occur on the *verso* of VAT 8807, col. 3, lines 20 and 45. In speaking of a similar salutation formula used in the Hebrew Bible, F. B. Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 420, is able to suggest that the formula "was originally oral". For him, "It was a greeting, exchanged when two men met."

[345]Compare Landsberger, MAOG 4 (1928-1929) 300-301; O. Schroeder, *RlA* 2 (1938) 64-65; E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 14-15; and, more recently, E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 59: "*Šulmu*-Wünsche als Teil der Briefeinleitung haben Tradition seit der aB Zeit und finden sich in den unterschliedlichsten Varianten, sowohl knapp als auch ausführlich."

geographical and chronological terms, it is not particularly distant culturally: I refer here to the common "Amorite" heritage of historic Ugarit and the ruling dynasties of the Old Babylonian period, a heritage which is illustrated, among other ways, by the shared linguistic history evident in the royal onomastic traditions.[346]

If, however, the usage of the Ugaritic salutation resembles the Old Babylonian usage in terms of gross distribution, that is, in the fact that both traditions employ ŠLM-wishes as formulaic elements at the beginning of letters, this resemblance does not extend to the compositional level. The Ugaritic salutations are impersonal, the Old Babylonian are not; and the Ugaritic salutations consist of two necessary elements, the Old Babylonian of one.

These two compositional features which characterize the Ugaritic salutation, namely, an impersonal construction and at least two necessary elements,[347] are also the dominant characteristics of salutations in the other contemporary epistolary traditions of Late Bronze West Asia: Middle Babylonian, Middle Assyrian, Hittite, and the various western peripheral Akkadian traditions. In this respect, Ugaritic shows a common kinship[348] with contemporary cuneiform traditions.

---

[346]On the "Amorites", see the now classic article of M. Liverani, *Peoples of Old Testament Times* (1973) 100-133. A more recent presentation, with bibliography, may be found in R. M. Whiting, *CANE* 2 (1995) 1231-1242.

[347]These two features are, of course, interrelated in the sense that the impersonal nature of the Late Bronze pattern requires that an additional element be present in order to express the beneficiary of the wish.

[348]I would emphasize this "kinship" without attempting to draw conclusions regarding priority of East or West in tracing the origin of the shared usage. It is still acceptable, even after the considerable 3rd millennium epigraphic finds from the Syrian heartland and from the Ḫabūr Basin, to assume, without apparent hesitation, Mesopotamian priority in all things literary. While this must remain a possibility, perhaps even a probability in most cases, it seems methodologically unsound to assume its accuracy *a priori*, especially in light of the epigraphic data from Ebla and elsewhere.

This kinship, however, though striking, is not of a sort to permit one to assume the Ugaritic usage to be merely derivative of an older, better established Mesopotamian, or even Anatolian, model. It may have been the case, but not necessarily so, that the origin of the Ugaritic epistolary salutation is to be sought in the widespread influence of Mesopotamian "letters" and learning during the 2nd millennium BCE in the West.

Origins aside, however, the standard Ugaritic salutation cannot be directly derivative of a known Mesopotamian model for the simple reason that no known Mesopotamian epistolary tradition shows a dual compositional pattern like that of Ugaritic, where one pattern is typical of conceptually ascending letters, while the other is typical of letters which are not conceptually ascending. This compositional pattern for the salutation is, to my knowledge, unique to the local corpora: the Ugaritic and Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra. In light of such a restricted distribution, and in light of the fact that this variable order resembles other distinctly Syrian epistolary habits, namely, in the tendency to distinguish ascending letters from non-ascending letters by formal means, leads one rather to suspect a local Syrian origin for this formal attention to social status differences.[349] Thus, with respect to its composition, the standard Ugaritic salutation formula may, on present evidence, be said to be a

---

[349]Compare the comments of D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 2 (RS 1.018), remarques épistolographiques, footnote: "Comme pour les autres formules épistolaires . . . nous hésitons devant l'hypothèse selon laquelle la formule ougaritique constitue l'emprunt de la formule correspondante en accadien … parce que cette hypothèse implique qu'il n'y avait pas de tradition épistolaire ouest-sémitique et que les formules épistolaires devaient donc être empruntées à une civilisation plus avancée en cette matière, ce qui reste à prouver. Pour Huehnergard, l'ordre des deux formules *yšlm lk* et *l ůmy yšlm* (par ex.), qui se répète dans ces mêmes formules dans les lettres accadiennes de Ras Shamra, serait le résultat de l'influence accadienne sur l'ougaritique (*Akkadian of Ugarit* [1989] 212). Ce savant a pourtant remarqué que l'ordre *lū šulmu ana muḫhīka* est annormal en accadien (*ibid.*, p. 211). N'est-il pas tentant par conséquent de voir dans l'ordre accadien le résultat de l'influence ougaritique, et non pas *vice versa* ?"

characteristic of epistolary usage in Late Bronze Syria. The contemporary epistolary salutations used in adjacent areas are similar, but not identical.

3.5.2 The situational context of the salutation

A consideration of the situational context of the salutation formula yields insights into the following issues: (1) the type of social situation in which the « sal » formula is appropriate or inappropriate; (2) the nature of the salutation as a "speech act", including reflections on the "speaker" of the salutation, the "agent" by whom the predication described by the verb *yšlm* is achieved, and the contextual "burden", or purpose of the speech act; and (4) the contextually appropriate "moment" at which a salutation would typically occur.

3.5.2.1 The salutation in its social setting

The distribution of the formula in the Ugaritic corpus permits no clear-cut conclusions regarding those social situations in which a salutation was appropriate or inappropriate: the formula appears in letters of every conceptual status, and of both conceptual models. Certain distributional tendencies, however, permit some speculation. If the presence of the « sal » formula was theoretically possible in *all* types of conceptual situations, the current corpus does reveal that the presence of the formula was (1) especially frequent in letters which employ the biological kinship model, regardless of their conceptual status,[350] and (2) it was especially infrequent in terminologically unmarked letters for which contextual factors suggest a descending

---

[350]See above, section 3.3.

social relationship.[351] When one enlarges the scope of inquiry to include the corpus of Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, another feature regarding terminologically unmarked letters becomes apparent: (3) if the recipient was a king, even if a low-ranking one with respect to the sender, a salutation is appropriate.[352]

A link with the biological kinship model, visible from the data themselves, is consistent with M. Gruber's interpretation of greetings, derived from information theory.[353] The salutation fits conveniently into Gruber's second category: "deferential greetings", or greetings in which the speaker seeks not only to "establish links of fellowship"[354] but also to communicate "information concerning the relative status of the speaker and the addressee."[355] The sender's choice to employ the biological kinship model rather than the hierarchical power model, in and of itself, reveals a concern to "establish links of fellowship".[356] The frequency of the salutation formula in these letters serves to reinforce such a concern for establishing and maintaining such fellowship. One cannot infer, however, from the appropriateness of the salutation in letters conceived on the biological kinship model, that it was correspondingly

---

[351]See above, section 3.3.

[352]See above, section 3.4.1.1.

[353]Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 182-186.

[354]Gruber employs the expression coined by B. Malinowski, "The Problem of Meaning" (1946) 314.

[355]The dual compositional pattern for the salutation, observable in the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian epistolary corpora, means that such status information is communicated whichever order was used: the presence of the pattern « *yšlm lk* » (appropriate in situations which are not conceptually ascending), for example, indicates a conscious choice not to employ the pattern « *ly bʿly yšlm* » (which would have been appropriate in situations which are conceptually ascending).

[356]Given the nature of the BIO model, the phrase "links of kinship" would be even more appropriate.

inappropriate in letters conceived on the hierarchical power model: such does not agree with the available data.[357]

The « sal » formula is uncommon in terminologically unmarked letters which, from context, appear to reflect a socially descending situation. This distribution, it seems to me, also reinforces the inference drawn above: of all possible types of letters, that in which the social relationship between the correspondents is unmarked is the least deferential, displaying the least concern for "establishing links of fellowship".[358] In the case of such letters used in socially descending situations, this lack of concern is even more evident: when the king and queen write to their agents,[359] for example, virtually the only interest they show concerning these underlings is that they execute their orders in a timely and competent manner. This provides a revealing contrast to Gruber's "deferential greeting": just as the king and the queen show no interest in "establishing links of fellowship" with their correspondents, nor do they employ the « sal » formula in such letters.[360]

Extrapolating from this distribution, one might propose the following: a salutation is appropriate in those social situations in which the speaker wishes to

---

[357]See above, section 3.3.

[358]A lack of concern for "establishing links of fellowship" is evident from the very fact that these letters are terminologically unmarked: the sender felt no need whatsoever to characterize his relationship with the recipient by means of social metaphors, neither by means of kinship terms, nor even by means of terms of social hierarchy (*bʿlk*, *ʿbdy*).

[359]Letters of this type are well-represented in the corpus by RS 16.264, RS 94.2406, RS 94.2429, RS 94.2580, and RS 96.2039.

[360]A special case is RS 96.2039. In the address, the sender (*mlkt*, 'the queen') addresses her correspondent not only with a personal name, but also with a REL term drawn from the BIO model: *l yrmhd iḫy rgm*, 'To Yarimhaddu, my brother, say:' Since the queen has written to someone whom she characterizes as her brother, one might have expected her to include the « sal » formula as well. It is not present, and the tone (the letter is full of imperatives and other second person volitional forms) resembles that of other letters of the queen to her agents.

emphasize the "links of fellowship", even of kinship, which connect him to the recipient, the best examples of such situations being letters composed on the BIO model; and the formula is omitted in those social situations in which the speaker displays little or no concern for expressing such "links of fellowship" with the recipient, the best examples of these situations being terminologically unmarked letters which, from context, can be said to reflect socially descending situations.

One significant problem with such a formulation, as it stands, is represented by the usage of the « sal » formula in the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters. In the Ugaritic corpus, the « sal » formula tends not to be used in terminologically unmarked letters for which contextual factors suggest an underlying descending social relationship;[361] the opposite distribution is present for such letters in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.[362] This poses a problem since, in virtually all other respects, the structure of these two epistolary corpora is profoundly similar, if not identical, in composition and distribution. The discussion in section 3.4.1.1.2 above surveyed some possible reasons for such a distributional difference, finally suggesting the possibility that the fact that the letters in question were addressed to a king, even if one of relatively low rank with respect to the sender, was relevant to the presence of the « sal » formula. Applying this possibility to the conceptually unmarked but "contextually descending" letters in Ugaritic is particularly fruitful, as it would explain why a « sal » formula was present in two letters: RS 15.158 and RS 17.434+.[363] In this sense, the usage of the « sal »

---

[361]See above, section 3.3.

[362]See above, section 3.4.1.1.

[363]RS 15.158 is from [*mlk g*]*rgmš* to [<PN> *m*]*lk ůgrt*); RS 17.434+ is from *pdǵb mlk*[*t* ...] to *nqmd*. Even though the recipient of the latter letter is not explicitly called *mlk*, 'king', in the address, it is virtually certain that the *nqmd* in question was in fact a king of Ugarit of that name.

formula in conceptually unmarked letters which are contextually descending may represent a form of calculated politeness, or flattery, of the sort made expedient by the demands of international politics, as, for example, in the diplomatic relations between the courts of Carchemish and Ugarit. It was no doubt politic for the king of Carchemish to maintain good relations, or, if such a characterization be permitted, "links of fellowship", with Ugarit; one means of doing this, without surrendering the dignity of his station by addressing the Ugaritian king as "his brother", may have been to employ the salutation formula. As a "deferential greeting" in Gruber's terms, the « sal » formula would fulfill the political goal of establishing and maintaining "links of fellowship", and, at the same time, the social goal of communicating information about the relative social status of the sender and recipient.[364]

3.5.2.2 The salutation as a speech act: "speaker" and "agent"

The verb ŠLM is stative in the G-stem, and thus the verbal form of the salutation formula, *yšlm*, does not describe an action *per se*, but rather the state of "being well". The formula *does* involve an "act" however: this act is perceptible, not from the semantics of the verb, which is stative, but rather from the pragmatic function of the formula within the letter. On the basis of the epistolary context in which it is

---

[364]In this light, the use of the pattern « ŠLM-wish + prepositional phrase » represents a conscious choice not to use the alternate pattern, « prepositional phrase + ŠLM-wish », appropriate for ascending social situations.

used, as well as the morphology of the verb,[365] the linguistic act[366] accomplished by means of the salutation formula may be called a wish. With respect to this wish, as a speech act, the paragraphs that follow address the questions: who is speaking the wish? and by what means is the wished-for state achieved?

3.5.2.2.1 THE "SPEAKER" OF THE SALUTATION

The formula itself does not explicitly clarify the identity of the person whose volition is represented, but from the direct address situation inherent in Ugaritic epistolary communication,[367] it is clear that it is the sender of the letter who desires the recipient to experience the "well-being" described by the verb ŠLM.

3.5.2.2.2 THE "AGENT" OF ŠLM IN THE SALUTATION.

The benediction formula[368] is also a wish, which treats the same basic theme as the « sal » formula, namely, that of "well-being". There, however, the ŠLM-verb is transitive, and the agent(s) intended to bring about this pleasant state are explicitly

---

[365]The morphology of the Ugaritic form *yšlm* is ambiguous: it is clearly a prefix conjugation verbal form, but the consonantal orthography shows no indication of the "mood" vowel used. Because of their compositional and distributional congruence with the Ugaritic formula, the form of the "well-being" expression in Akkadian and Hittite salutations provides valuable comparative evidence to supplement the context: in both Akkadian and Hittite the forms are explicitly vocative (Akkadian uses the vocative particle *lū*, and Hittite uses an explicitly vocative form of the verb "to be", {e-eš-du}). It thus seems reasonable to reconstruct the Ugaritic form as the "jussive" (yqtl + Ø); see below, section 3.6.

[366]Introductory presentations of "speech act theory" from university-level linguistics textbooks which have been helpful to me in formulating this section may be found in E. Finegan, *Language: its structure and use*, 2nd edition (1994) 333-343 (bibliography on pp. 362-364); and Ohio State University Department of Linguistics, *Language Files*, 6th edition (1994) 228-234.

[367]Compare the 2nd and 1st person pronouns used throughout the epistolary corpus to refer to the recipient and the sender, respectively.

[368]See below, in chapter 4.

stated as the grammatical subject of the verb(s): *ìlm*, 'the gods'. Unlike the « ben » formula, however, in which the main verbs are active and transitive, the « sal » formula contains a stative verb. This being the case, the "agent" intended to bring about or cause the state of well-being described is not expressed as the grammatical subject of the verb. A reasonable question one may pose regarding the formula is thus: who or what is the "agent" intended to bring about or cause the state of well-being solicited by the « sal » formula?

Over seventy years ago, B. Landsberger pointed out that in the Babylonian world, "good words" had their practical effect either in and of themselves, or through the agency of the gods.[369] This distinction reflects rather well the agency involved in the epistolary salutation and benediction, respectively. Landsberger argued that the "self-effectiveness"[370] of "good words" is implied, if indirectly, by the numerous incantations concerned with checking the self-effective power of "bad words".[371]

At least two formal incantations[372] have been preserved in the Ugaritic corpus. Both of these display a concern with *dbbm*, a group of potential antagonists whose title

---

[369]Landsberger, MAOG 4 (1928-1929) 294.

[370]The word he employed is "Selbstwirksamkeit"; *ibid.*

[371]*Ibid.*

[372]I say "formal incantations" to refer to that particular literary genre represented by the two documents RIH 78/20 and RS 92.2014. Among other shared formal features, both texts show poetic parallelism among the incantory elements; both are full of volitional forms soliciting action (or a cessation of action) from the malevolent parties; and the first word of both texts, *ydy* and *dy*, respectively, is plausibly derived from the Ugaritic root YDY, 'to expel (by incantation)' (compare del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 [2000]. p. 523). On other lexical and thematic features which unite these texts, see D. Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000), ch. 73, p. 833 ("conclusions générales"). Because of its extensive mythological narrative elements, I exclude RS 24.244, the "serpent incantation", from this category. On the two texts RS 92.2014 and RIH 78/20 in detail, see now the (re)edition in Pardee, *ibid.*, chapters 73 and 81, pp. 829-833 and 875-893.

is most likely derived from a verb of speaking.[373] This etymology is, I believe, a clue to the effectiveness of this party: it is through the act of speaking, and the power of their speech, that they constitute a threat. An additional illustration of the perceived power of the spoken word is provided by RS 92.2014; in lines 8-10 one of the aspired goals of the incantation is stated: *l tủdn dbbm kšpm hwt ršʿ hwt bn nšm*, 'May the *dbbm* (and) the *kšpm* not give ear to the words-of-evil, to the words of human beings!' This incantation was private in nature, belonging to an important functionary named Urtenu to whom the house, in which this document and several hundred others were found, probably belonged.[374] The fact that *hwt ršʿ* , 'word(s)-of-evil', was/were considered a formidable enough threat to Urtenu's well-being as to require the commission of an incantation suggests, I think, the power inherent in the spoken word for Urtenu and his fellows. Furthermore, if the "bad word" has such power, it seems sensible to assume that the "good word" had a correspondingly beneficial effect. Indirectly, the very existence of incantations in the Ugaritic corpus would seem to support this supposition: why would they exist if not for an intended beneficial effect? More explicit clarification of the potentially beneficial effect of the spoken word is attested in RIH 78/20. One of the goals of the incantation is stated in line 2: *w tṣủ l pn ql ṯʿy*, 'So let

---

[373]On this etymology, and the reasons for its appropriateness in this context, see Pardee, *ibid.*, ch. 81, p. 879, n. 23. Pardee characterizes the semantic development as "parler → médire, attaquer par la parole". An alternative explanation derives the word from ḎBB, 'fly', for which see *ibid.*, n. 22.

[374]That the incantation was intended for Urtenu's private use seems clear from the colophon (lines 14-15): *l ủrtn l gbh l tmnth*, '(This incantation is intended) for Urtenu, for his "back" (*gb*, a euphemism for "body"?), for his "form?" (*tmnt*).'

them[375] depart at (the sound of) the voice of the *ṯʿy*-official!' Whatever the role of the *ṯʿy*-official at Ugarit was, clearly his voice, *ql*, was not without power.

I consider these examples sufficient basis to argue that the "agent" who brings about the "well-being" to which the salutation formula alludes was the speaker of the formula, that is, ultimately, the sender of the letter: it was through the saying, or, in this case, the writing and subsequent recitation, of the formula that its desired effect, "well-being", was achieved.

3.5.2.2.3 THE SALUTATION AND THE *ŠULMĀNU*-GIFT IN AKKADIAN LETTERS?

Beyond the self-effectiveness of the words themselves, was there any additional agency involved? The Ugaritic incantations, which, like the salutation formula, are "speech acts" in the sense that they represent actions done with words, often make reference to physical objects which accompanied, or in some other way were connected with, the "speech act" itself. Such objects are prominent in RS 24.244,[376] a literary text which incorporates many incantory motifs in a narrative context, and in RS 92.2014,[377] an incantation in the formal sense. In RS 24.244, the narrative relates how the central character, *ủm pḥl pḥlt*, 'the stallion's mother, the mare,' sends the same message, concerned with snakebite, to eleven different deities successively. Finally, upon sending this message a twelfth time, the recipient, this

---

[375]I follow the interpretation of these lines presented in Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 875-893, where the pronominal subject of *tṣủ* is considered 3rd person masculine plural, with the antecedent understood as *dbbm d ǵzr*, 'those who curse the young man' (the genitive may thus be described as "objective"), in line 1.

[376]The *editio princeps* is C. Virolleaud, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 564-572; reedited in D. Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988), ch. 7, pp. 193-226. A recent translation into English, with commentary and anterior bibliography, is D. Pardee, *Context* 1 (1997) 295-298.

[377]A preliminary edition appeared in Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000), ch. 73, pp. 829-833.

time the god Ḥôrānu, actually performs an incantation by which the venom is expelled. As related in the text, Ḥôrānu's act of expulsion is achieved by means of[378] various objects, all probably types of wood, trees or plants.[379] The newly published incantation RS 92.2014 also mentions objects made of wood as accompanying the act of expulsion itself: compare the phrase *ʿṣ qdš*, 'the wood-of-sacredness', that is, 'the sacred wood' in line 3.[380]

Such a link between the incantations themselves, as "speech acts", and accompanying physical objects provokes an interesting question with respect to the

---

[378]I say "achieved by means of" because the Ugaritic expression employs the preposition *b*, which, in my opinion, here expresses agency.

[379]I refer to the objects accompanying the verbal actions mentioned in lines 64-67. Compare, for example, line 64, *ydy b ʿṣm ʿr<.>ʿr*, 'He expels (it) by means of the wood of the *ʿrʿr*-tree. My translation should make it clear that I understand *ʿṣm ʿr<.>ʿr* to be a construct phrase, in which the *-m* of *ʿṣm* ("enclitic *-m*") occurs between the two nouns in construct; on this phenomenon in Ugaritic, compare the examples mentioned in J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 89.232, pp. 827-828.

[380]The context in lines 1-3 is: *yṣḥk ůzb w ånk åṣḥk åmrmrn ʿṣ qdš*, which, I believe, can be interpreted as 'Let one call out to you (with) the hyssop! Even I myself would call out to you (as?) I shake(?) the sacred wood!' With Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 829-831, I interpret *åmrmrn* as a verb, in the prefix conjugation, 1st person singular, with an attached energic suffix *-n*, from a reduplicated bi-consonantal root MR (Pardee, *ibid.*, cites the Arabic cognate *marmara* for the semantics). It seems to me another option would be to interpret *åmrmrn* as a common noun, denoting a kind of wood: 'Let one call out to you (with) the hyssop! Even I myself would call out to you, (with) *åmrmrn*, the sacred wood!' I interpret the string {ůzb} as a common noun, 'hyssop', */ʾuz(z)ub-/*; compare biblical Hebrew אֵזוֹב, for which see L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *HALOT* 1 (1994) 27, and the etymological data given there. This would be the first occurrence of this word in the Ugaritic corpus. The orthography with {ů} would suggest that vowel harmony had occurred in the underlying Ugaritic form (the Hebrew cognate with {ו} suggests the final vowel could have been /*u*/); on this phenomenon across geminated consonants in Ugaritic phonological development, see J. Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 267-268. I prefer this interpretation to that of Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 829-831, where he had understood *ů zb*, that is, the conjunction *ů* + a suffix conjugation verbal form *zb* (from a geminate root ZBB [attested for the first time in Ugaritic], which he translated, on the basis of an Arabic cognate, as "et se met à écumer". Obviously, since in either case the phrase is a *hapax*, little about its interpretation can be certain. Nevertheless, I see at least two problems with Pardee's reading: (1) *epigraphic*: there is no word divider between {ů} and {zb}, and, elsewhere in this text the use of word dividers, even after conjunctions like *w*, is consistent; and (2) *syntactic*: the so-called "waw-consecutive + perfect" construction is not, to my knowledge, attested with the conjunction *ů* in Ugaritic; see Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 76.541, pp. 716-717.

salutation formula as a "speech act": was there a physical object which typically accompanied it? I know of no data which would suggest so in no uncertain terms. A speculative possibility, however, is that the well-being alluded to in the « sal » formula should be linked with the *šulmānu*-gift[381] so often mentioned in the bodies of Akkadian letters found at Ras Shamra.[382] That the purpose of these gifts was well-being seems evident from the etymology; and further, that the well-being of their recipient suffered when the gifts accompanying the letter were insufficient is suggested by several passages.[383] No Ugaritic functional equivalent of Akkadian *šulmānu*, in the sense of a gift accompanying a letter, is known,[384] however, and this absence prevents further pursuit of this question as it concerns the Ugaritic salutation in particular.[385]

---

[381]Compare the claim of G. G. Swaim, *Grammar of the Akkadian Tablets Found at Ugarit* (1962) 75, n. 45: "The word *šulmānu* is actually much more than "greeting". It refers to the gift which one person . . . would send to another as a concrete expression of his good wishes for the health and welfare of the recipient." On the relationship of the letter and accompanying gift(s), see C. Zaccagnini, *Lo scambio dei doni* (1973) 51-58; M. Liverani, *SDB* 9 (1979), col. 1327-1329, and 1331; and M. Liverani, *Le lettere di el-Amarna* 2 (1999) 324-331.

[382]I have not found a convincing Ugaritic functional equivalent of Akkadian *šulmānu*, in the sense of a common noun denoting a type of gift. On the equivalence of Ugaritic *šlm* and Akkadian *šulmānu* in the motif of reciprocal well-being, where both are abstract nouns meaning 'well-being', see below, chapter 5.

[383]This is somewhat of an understatement; compare, for example, RS 34.136:5-38.

[384]I do not consider the Ugaritic sacrificial term *šlmm* of the ritual texts to represent a functional parallel for this sense of Akkadian *šulmānu*. The use of *šlmm* in the literary text *KTU*[2] 1.14 III 26-27 may represent such a functional parallel, however. For a detailed discussion of *šlmm* as a sacrificial term, with reference to the usage of the terms *šlm* and *šlmm* in the literary texts, see Pardee, *Les textes rituels* (2000) 42-50.

[385]Even if such a link between the *šulmu*, 'well-being', of the salutation formula and the *šulmānu*-gift(s) mentioned in the body of Akkadian letters be granted (and I have not undertaken to demonstrate such a link; I mention it here only as a possibility), would it be reasonable to imagine that the « sal » formula was always accompanied by a *šulmānu*-gift? One can hazard a guess: probably not. At most, the *šulmānu*-gift itself was probably no more than a medium through which "well-being" was

3.5.2.2.4 THE CONTEXTUAL "BURDEN" OR PURPOSE OF THE SALUTATION

In terms of the semantics of the formula itself, the "burden", or purpose, of the salutation seems evident: the speaker wishes that his interlocutor enjoy a state of *šlm*, 'well-being'. As a "speech act", the purpose is less clear. Above I appealed to M. Gruber's interpretation of greetings,[386] derived from information theory, in an effort to explain the distribution of the formula. The salutation matches the criteria of Gruber's second category, "deferential greetings", for which Gruber proposes two functions: greetings of this type seek not only (1) to "establish links of fellowship" but also (2) to communicate "information concerning the relative status of the speaker and the addressee." The symmetry with which these two "functions" match the semantics and distribution of the formula lend them a certain credibility. Whether these contextual "functions" can be said to be anything more than credible, however, is another issue: the available data, in my opinion, do little more than coincide with these theoretical functions, they do not demonstrate them.

---

assured of being transmitted, perhaps in much the same manner as *ʿṣ qdš*, 'the sacred wood', was a physical medium which greatly aided in combating the effectiveness of the *hwt ršʿ*, 'the evil word', in RS 92.2014. It seems to me that one empirical means of pursuing such a question, which I have not taken the time to do, would be to chart the presence of the « sal » formula with respect to the presence of "messages d'envoi" which describe the accompanying item(s) as a *šulmānu*-gift. If a large number of letters containing this latter motif lack the salutation formula, obviously the hypothesis presented here can be dropped. If, on the other hand, such "messages d'envoi" typically occur in letters which contain the « sal » formula, the hypothesis is still valable.

[386]Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 182-186.

3.5.2.3 The contextual "moment" of the salutation

I know of no direct evidence concerning the moment when the speaking of a salutation was appropriate or expected, and thus am able neither to confirm nor to contradict the confident statement of F. B. Knutson:[387] "this formula was originally oral. It was a greeting, exchanged when two men met."

Indirect evidence, however, tends to support Knutson's statement. It may be observed that the structural organization of the epistolary *praescriptio* reflects, to a certain extent, the sequence of events accompanying the meeting of two individuals: (i) the address reflects the appearance and mutual recognition of both parties, (ii) the prostration formula reflects the deferential gesture which preceded verbal exchange in the case of unequal status, (iii) and the body of the letter reflects the substance of the conversation following the exchange of greetings.[388] Along these lines, the salutation and the benediction, since they both represent "wishes" spoken by one of the parties, and since both generally follow the « pros » formula, would reflect the pleasantries spoken at the beginning of verbal exchange between the parties, but prior to the "substance" of the conversation. Assuming the passage has been correctly interpreted, the salutation-motif occurring in the Baʿlu Cycle of myths offers further support for such a scenario.[389]

This moment, the commencement of speaking at the meeting of two parties, would not seem to have been the only contextually appropriate time for saying a salutation. The *šlm*-motifs of *KTU*[2] 1.23 and RS 34.126 may imply another

---

[387]Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 420.

[388]See above, in the introduction to part 1, section 1.3.1.3.2.

[389]The passage is *KTU*[2] 1.5 II 8-20; see above, section 3.4.2.2.

contextually appropriate moment: if these motifs are indeed to be interpreted as salutations, one might infer that these passages reflect a social reality in which an invited guest pronounced a salutation in favor of his host following the meal.[390] Obviously, such a situational context would be distinct from that of the epistolary salutation formula.

3.6 Grammatical analysis of the salutation

The structure of the salutation is easily discernible, as is the morphology of its components. The formula consists of: (1) *yšlm*, a finite form of the verb ŠLM in the prefix conjugation, and (2) the prepositional phrase, « *l*(*y*) N_R », where « N_R » represents a noun phrase, or, very rarely, several noun phrases in apposition. The general morphology being clear, this analysis addresses various problems surrounding, respectively, the semantics, the morpho-syntax, and the phonemic reconstruction of the formula.

3.6.1 The semantics of the « sal » formula

The « sal » formula is a wish, expressed by the sender, that 'it be well' for the recipient. Three discrete topics contribute to these semantics: (1) the verb ŠLM, (2) the prefix conjugation as it is used in the « sal » formula, and (3) the preposition *l* as a complement of the impersonal usage of the stative verb ŠLM.

---

[390]See above, section 3.4.2.1.1.

The root ŠLM is the regular Ugaritic verb for expressing the notion of "well-being" in its various aspects.[391] The meaning in the G-stem is stative: 'to be well, fine, healthy'. There is no reason to doubt that the « sal » formula employed this stem.

Since É. Dhorme's treatment in 1933, the analysis of the verbal form *yšlm* as jussive has been standard.[392] That the form is volitional is assured not only by the context of the epistolary "polite formulas", but also by the formally parallel salutations in the Akkadian and Hittite comparative corpora, which employ explicitly volitional forms.[393] Volitions in Ugaritic could be expressed by means of the prefix conjugation, almost certainly with a *-Ø* marked "mood vowel".[394] This morphological pattern is typically called the "jussive", because of this volitional use, and especially with reference to the 3rd person.[395] The prefix *y-* denotes the 3rd person masculine

---

[391]See G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 438-439, with bibliography.

[392]Compare Dhorme, *Syria* 14 (1933) 236, where the author analyzes *yšlm* in this formula as "Troisième personne de l'optatif du verbe *šlm* employé comme signifiant « être en bon état » : *sit tibi salus!*" As D. Pardee points out in his manuscript of *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 2 (RS 1.018), remarques épistolographiques, footnote, "Dès 1933 Dhorme a comparé la formule ougaritique au latin *sit tibi salus* . . . , et depuis cette date l'accord semble être général pour accepter cette analyse."

[393]The Akkadian parallels employ the volitional particle (or "Wunschpartikel") *lū*, and the Hittite equivalents use a volitional form of the verb "to be", {e-eš-du}; see above, section 3.4.1.

[394]J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 73.233.1, p. 443, lists several alphabetic spellings of prefix conjugation forms in volitional contexts, many in the 3rd person, which imply a *-Ø* marked mood vowel; these are derived from III-ʾ roots (where the use of the {i̇} sign indicates syllable-final /ʾ/) and III-w/y roots (where the absence of any orthographic indication of the "weak" consonants /w/ or /y/ may have indicated -Ø mood vowel). An example from a syllabic text shows a *-Ø* marked mood vowel on a 1st person form; for this form, see J. Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 135, and the references there. For a more detailed survey of the use of the prefix conjugation to express volitions, see Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 77.32, pp. 721-725.

[395]There is some confusion in the use of the terms "jussive" and "cohortative" in modern discussions of Semitic grammar. One sense is purely morphological: « prefix conjugation + *-Ø* mood vowel » as "jussive", and « prefix conjugation + *-a* mood vowel> as "cohortative". Another sense, drawn largely from usage in the Biblical Hebrew grammatical tradition, is largely semantic: "jussive" for 3rd person volitions, "cohortative" for 1st person volitions. This latter usage is not entirely applicable for

"subject" of the verb. It is generally assumed to be singular in number.[396] Since this subject prefix *y-* has no concrete "real-world" reference, it may be thought of as an impersonal or "dummy" subject construction, similar to the "dummy" subject pronouns in English "*it*'s going well", French "*ça* va", and German "*es* geht mir gut."

The semantics of *l* are among the most diverse of any of the prepositions in Ugaritic. Like many other Semitic languages, Ugaritic uses this preposition to mark not only spatial and temporal relationships, but also the notion of advantage or disadvantage.[397] It is this role it plays in the « sal » formula: it expresses advantage,

---

Ugaritic, nor even for Hebrew, where the morphological pattern « prefix conjugation + -*Ø* mood vowel » was apparently used in the 1st person and 2nd person as well; compare the unambiguous 1st person forms *ỉspỉ*, 'I intend to eat', in *KTU*[2] 1.5 I 5; *åḥd*, 'I intend to look,' in *KTU*[2] 1.19 III 4 and 19; and the syllabic writing {it-ti-ki la-a a-ši-ib}, published by J. Nougayrol in *Ugaritica* 5 (1968), no. 81, line 26, p. 173, perhaps to be translated 'I do not wish to dwell with you'. For the interpretation of this latter verbal form as Ugaritic, see J. Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 135. The usage of *yšlm* in the « sal » formula, however, is "jussive" in both of the senses described above: it is a 3rd person volitional form, and it probably carried -*Ø* mood vowel.

[396]Graphically, the form is ambiguous: *yšlm* can represent the singular or dual of the 3rd person in "masculine" grammatical gender; the plural should now be omitted as a possibility, in light of J. Tropper's convincing demonstration that, in prose texts (though not in poetry), the 3rd person plural of the prefix conjugation follows the pattern *tqtl*, not *yqtl* (see the references cited below in section 4.6.2.1). In the Hittite epistolary « sal » formulas which correspond to the Ugaritic both functionally and formally, the verb of the salutation is 3rd person singular (see above, section 3.4.1). In Biblical Hebrew, the 3rd masculine singular is often found in similar impersonal constructions of stative verbs; see the examples cited in B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (1990) 376-377.

[397]See D. Pardee, *UF* 8 (1976) 278, where many verbs, both transitive and intransitive, are listed which take *l* as a prepositional complement marking (dis)advantage. For this sense with the verb ŠLM, see Pardee, *UF* 7 (1975) 371. On the use of לְ to mark the "dative of advantage (or disadvantage)" in Biblical Hebrew, see Waltke and O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (1990) 207, "marks the person for or against whom the action is directed"; and L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *HALOT* (1994-2000), vol. 2, pp. 508-509.

in this case, the "beneficiary" of the volition.[398] Since this function is fulfilled in Greek and Latin by the dative case, such a role is often referred to as "dative".[399]

3.6.2 Syntax: "surface" and "deep" structure of the idiom yšlm *+* l *N_R*

One may omit from a discussion of the syntax of the « sal » formula the variation observed in the order of the two components. This variation does not appear to be governed by purely linguistic factors, but rather by the extra-linguistic social context in which the formula was used.[400] The distribution of the formula shows that, by and large, the prepositional phrase was placed first in conceptually ascending letters, the verb placed first in letters that were not ascending.[401]

The "surface structure" of the « sal » formula is complicated by two factors: (1) the fact that the salutation idiom is impersonal, the grammatical subject of the verb having no concrete "real-world" reference, and (2) that fact that the verb ŠLM is

---

[398]Such an analysis lies behind Dhorme's treatment in *Syria* 14 (1933) 235-236. On the idiom ŠLM + *l*, 'to be well, satisfactory (for s.o.)', see also Pardee, *UF* 7 (1975) 371.

[399]The phrases "dative of (dis)advantage", or *dativus* (*in*)*commodi*, are convenient means of referring to a particular group of functions, and of especial use for those who are already familiar with the classical languages; they do not, however, refer to an overtly marked grammatical category of Ugaritic syntax: in this sense, they are purely translational. Compare the similar approach taken by D. Pardee and R. M. Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 1; and the cautions voiced by Waltke and O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (1990) 205.

[400]See above, section 3.2.

[401]The (few) exceptions are explainable in at least two ways: (1) the structure of the « sal » formula does not reflect standard Ugaritic epistolary usage, but has been influenced by independent scribal traditions, or (2) the letters in question involve "mixed" social situations, situations in which the REL terms used in the letter point to one type of social relationship between the correspondents (ascending, horizontal, descending), while the structure of the address and "polite formulas" of the letter points to another type of social relationship; as an example of this latter situation, compare RS 17.139, where the REL terms (composed on the biological kinship model) are explicitly ascending, but the composition of the epistolary *praescriptio* is such that is used for horizontal and descending letters, not ascending ones; on this letter, see above, section 1.7.1.2.

stative. In standard morpho-syntax of stative verbs, even those in a volitional context, the person or thing which experiences the state described by the verb is designated by the grammatical subject of the verb: compare, for example, *KTU*[2] 1.6 I 39-40, *tšmḫ ht åṯrt*, 'Let *ʾAṯiratu* now be glad!' The volition in the « sal » formula, however, is impersonal; and in these circumstances, the person who is to experience the state described by the verb is expressed not as the grammatical subject of the stative verb, but rather as the object of the preposition *l*.[402] In theory, a Ugaritic speaker was surely capable of expressing such a notion more directly, as in the poetic example cited above, with the "experiencer" of the state as the grammatical subject of the utterance. Such forms might have been written **tšlm*, 'May you be well!' or **tšlm ådty*, 'May my lady be well!'[403] For one reason or another, however, such a formation was not favored in the case of the epistolary « sal » formula.[404]

---

[402]Several examples of such a usage, namely, impersonal usages of stative verbs which mark the person who experiences the state described by the verb with the preposition *l*, are found in the Hebrew Bible; compare the forms listed in Waltke and O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (1990), § 22.7, pp. 376-377.

[403]Compare J. Friedrich, *AfO* 10 (1935-1936) 81, n. 7, who comments on the form *yšlm*: "Die auf die Adresse folgende Grussformel ist . . . ungewöhnlich kurz, sie besteht nämlich nur aus den zwei Worten *yšlm* | *lk*, wörtlich 'es sei dir wohlbehalten!' d. h. 'es möge dir gut gehen!' Auffällig ist dabei die unpersönliche Konstruktion des Verbums, man erwartet eher *tšlm* 'du mögest wohlbehalten sein!' " Compare also the "personal" formation of the Babylonian salutation *lū šalmāta*, 'May you be well!', for which see E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 14-15.

[404]In all probability, the "information structure" of epistolary polite volitions had a role. In such a case, the informational content of the volition would have been organized and expressed in such a way as to lay special attention on the « N_R » element (the "beneficiary" of the volition). The impersonal construction would have highlighted the role of the beneficiary in the phrase; much less focus would have been laid on this "beneficiary" had he been expressed merely by means of the prefixed subject pronoun *t-*. Furthermore, in using a two-element compositional pattern, variation in the order of mention of these two components would have permitted a means of distinguishing structurally between conceptually "ascending" and "non-ascending" letters, a distinction which appears to have been particularly important in the Ugaritic epistolary tradition(s).

In using the preposition *l* to denote the one who benefits from the predication expressed by the verb, this usage of the preposition *l* resembles that of other examples of the "dative of advantage". On a deeper level, however, this resemblance is deceptive. As discussed above, stative verbs used in impersonal constructions employ the preposition *l* to express not only advantage, but to denote the person who actually experiences the state described. In this sense, *yšlm lk* and the hypothetical form **tšlm*, which have two very different surface structures, may share similar "deep structures" in which their semantics are nearly identical.

3.6.3 The phonemic reconstruction of the « sal » formula

A phonemic reconstruction of the Ugaritic « sal » formula involves proposals for the following vowels: (1) the stem vowels in the prefix conjugation of the verb ŠLM, (2) the mood vowel appropriate for the jussive form, and (3) the vocalization of the preposition *l*, and of its "expanded" forms *ly* and *ln*.

There is no internal evidence for the stem vowels of the verb ŠLM, in either conjugation.[405] As a stative verb, the pattern *qatil- / yiqtal-*[406] would not be inappropriate. Such a pattern is attested in several close cognate languages, in

---

[405]The syllabic writings of the type {šal-li-ma} and {ša-li-ma} found in Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968), no. 96, pp. 189-191 (copy on p. 406), probably represent the D-stem according to Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 182, since "the incorrect double writing of single consonants is rare in Ugarit Akk. texts, especially in Ugar. forms." In his edition, Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 189, n. 1, had normalized these forms *šalima*, and translated, pp. 190-191, "achevé" or "inachevé" (for {la-a ša(l)-li-ma}), implying a G-stem interpretation. If Nougayrol's analysis is valid, these forms would provide internal evidence for the stem vowels of the suffix conjugation of this verb: *qatila*.

[406]The discovery that Barth's law (which described the correspondence of *yaqtal-* and *yiqtal-* patterns) was operative in Ugaritic (in the sense that Ugaritic carried the *yiqtal-* pattern) is generally attributed to H. L. Ginsberg; see the discussion in J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 73.242, p. 447; and D. Sivan, *GUL* (1997) 115.

Arabic,[407] Hebrew,[408] and Syriac,[409] for example, and its presence in Ugaritic is plausible: */*yišlam-*/.

The mood vowel appropriate for the jussive is *-Ø*. Such a conclusion is derived from internal evidence from (1) alphabetic spellings of III-ʾ verbs which use the {ỉ} sign,[410] (2) alphabetic spellings of III-y/w verbs in which the final "weak" consonant is not represented in the orthography,[411] and (3) one syllabic spelling.[412] Conclusions

---

[407]The pattern is *salima* / *yaslamu*; compare H. Wehr, *Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic* (1979) 495. In accordance with Barth's law, the prefix conjugation form in Arabic is *yaqtal-*, not *yiqtal-*.

[408]The pattern *šālēm* / *yišlam* points to the proto-forms **šalim-* / **yišlam-* ; compare L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *HALOT* (1994-2000), vol. 4, pp. 1532-1533 (including much etymological data).

[409]The pattern *šlem* / *nešlam* points to the proto-forms **šalim-* / **yišlam-* ; see J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (1903) 581.

[410]Compare the forms *yṣỉ*, 'Let it go out!' (in the 3rd person) in *KTU*[2] 1.14 II 32, and *ỉspỉ*, 'I intend to eat' (in the 1st person), in *KTU*[2] 1.5 I 5, and several other examples assembled in Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 73.233.1, p. 443, where the {ỉ} sign is assumed to represent syllable-final /ʾ/. The essential correctness of H. L. Ginsberg's hypothesis that the {ỉ} sign was used for this function (namely, to represent syllable-final /ʾ/) is generally granted; there are exceptions which remain unexplained on Ginsberg's theory, but these are relatively few in number, and have proven amenable to "compromise" proposals which explain them as "phonetic spellings". See the discussion, and especially the data assembled in Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 21.322, pp. 33-38; note that it is not necessary to accept Tropper's own proposal to interpret spellings of the type *yṣỉ*, *tṣỉ*, etc., as *matres lectionis* (*/*yaṣî*/, */*taṣî*/, etc.).

[411]Such evidence is only valid on the assumption that the historical morphology of third weak roots was tri-consonantal (not bi-consonantal); that is, that the "jussive" forms of such verbs contained proto-phoneme sequences of the type */*-uw-* + *Ø*/ and /*-iy-* + *Ø*/ which resolved to /*-û*/ and /*-î*/, respectively. Compare *ảḥd*, 'I intend to look,' in *KTU*[2] 1.19 III 4 and 19, and other examples cited in Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 73.233.1, p. 443.

[412]Compare the syllabic writing {it-ti-ki la-a a-ši-ib} in J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968), no. 81, line 26, p. 173 (copy, p. 402), perhaps to be translated 'I do not wish to dwell with you'. For the interpretation of this latter verbal form as Ugaritic, see J. Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 135; and Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 73.233.1, p. 443.

reached on the basis of this internal evidence are consistent with the implications of the comparative Semitic evidence.[413]

The most important datum for the phonemic reconstruction of the preposition *l* is the syllabic spelling {LI-⌜e⌝}, attested in RS 20.149.[414] The text is one example of the well known "polyglot vocabularies", in which a fixed series of cuneiform signs, namely the Mesopotamian lexical series *Syllabary A*,[415] is supplied, in the adjacent columns, with lexical equivalents in Akkadian, and, in this case, Hurrian and Ugaritic, all these being written syllabically.[416] The spelling {LI-⌜e⌝} in the Ugaritic column corresponds to {a-na} in the Akkadian column, confirming that the Ugaritic word there represented is indeed the preposition. To this piece of internal evidence, one can add the comparative Semitic evidence, divided between data which suggest */li/* and those which suggest */la/* for the preposition, both of these containing short vowels.[417] A final datum is the "expanded" writing of the preposition as *ly* in several « sal »

---

[413]The *-Ø* marked jussive mood vowel on the prefix conjugation is productive in classical Arabic; see W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* (1896-1898), vol. 1, § 95, p. 60. The remnants of a *-Ø* marked jussive mood vowel on the prefix conjugation in Biblical Hebrew are discussed in W. Gesenius and E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (1910), § 48, pp. 130-131.

[414]RS 20.149 was published by J. Nougayrol in *Ugaritica* 5 (1968), no. 130, pp. 232-234 (copy on p. 418). On "column 3" of the tablet (the *verso*), line 5', the editor reads {[...] | a-na | i-di-da | LI-⌜e⌝[...]}. Because of the context, the editor reconstructs the Sumerogram for this line (which has been lost in the lacuna on the left side of the *verso*) as {MU}; see his comments in *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 232, n. 7.

[415]On *Syllabary A* (S^a), see R. T. Hallock in *MSL* 3 (1955) 1-45.

[416]RS 20.149 is thus an Akkadian-Hurrian-Ugaritic example of the Mesopotamian lexical series *S^a Vocabulary*, for which see B. Landsberger and R. T. Hallock in *MSL* 3 (1955) 47-87; and Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 21-22.

[417]For a survey of data available to the author at the time, see C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss* 1 (1908) 495. Several allusions to more recent etymological data are given by Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT* (1994-2000), vol. 2, pp. 507-508. In some languages, the vocalization varied; so in classical Arabic, for example, where one finds at least two allomorphs: *li* prefixed to nouns, but *la-* in several suffixed forms, as in *lahu*, 'to him', and *laka*, 'to you (m.s.)'.

formulas of ascending letters; this expanded writing is not found in the « sal » formulas used when the letter is not conceptually ascending.[418] This distribution, and the fact that the writing of the preposition in the « sal » formula of RIH 78/03+, which is also an ascending letter, is also "expanded", this time by means of the particle *-n*, which is certainly consonantal, argue against the explanation of the *-y* in *ly* as a *mater lectionis*.[419]

In light of these data, a phonemic reconstruction of the Ugaritic preposition *l* must confront the following issues: (1) the quality of the vowel, (2) the quantity of the vowel, and perhaps also (3) the existence of context-sensitive allomorphs of the preposition, or allophones of the vowel of the preposition, that is, forms or vowels which differ according to context, but which do not affect meaning.[420]

In regard to the latter, it seems methodologically best to choose the simplest reconstruction that fits the available evidence, and to avoid introducing needlessly complicated explanations. In this light, J. Huehnergard's interpretation of the evidence is weak on methodological grounds, for he proposes the existence of two allomorphs of the preposition, one, /*li-*/, found in most contexts, but another, */*lī*/, found "outside of a

---

[418]See above, section 3.2.

[419]So D. Pardee, *AfO* 31 (1984) 215; see also the particle hypothesis of K. Aartun, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen* 1 (1974), especially pp. 44-47 for enclitic *-y*; summary in Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 89, pp. 823-835. For {ly} as a *plene* writing of /*lī*/, see J. Tropper, *UF* 26 (1994) 460, n. 14; G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 234; and Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 21.341.21c, p. 52. Since, however, both *-y* and *-n* are fairly well-attested as enclitic particles, and since there are very few clear examples of *matres lectionis* in Ugaritic, it seems best from a methodological point of view to explain the spellings {ly} and {ln}, which are found in identical epistolary contexts, in the same fashion, namely, by reference to enclitic particles.

[420]As examples of "allomorphs", compare the form of the *nota accusativi* in Tiberian Hebrew (*ʾēt* in isolation, *ʾet-* in proclitic constructions, and *ʾôt-* with suffixes), and the form of the 3rd person masculine singular pronominal suffix in Classical Arabic (*-hu* following the nominative or accusative case vowels, *-hi* following the genitive vowel).

normal speech context," in isolation.[421] The existence of such allomorphs for this preposition is certainly not impossible,[422] but one must ask if such a proposal is preferable. There is, to my knowledge, no evidence for more than one morphological form of the preposition in Ugaritic, and until the phonology of Ugaritic is better understood, it appears unnecessary to complicate phonemic reconstruction with allophonic variants. Furthermore, while there may indeed be Mesopotamian examples which demonstrate the principle that Huehnergard proposes,[423] the two examples he has chosen are deficient: with respect to the writing *ša-a*, the vowel of the relative pronoun was historically long, even if its orthography in Akkadian texts does not always reflect this; and the {I} sign in *li-i* may reflect not a long vowel, but rather an orthographic means of differentiating the *li* value from the *le* value for the sign {LI}.[424]

In the absence of further internal data, then, one may assume a single morpho-phonemic form for the preposition *l* throughout the Ugaritic language, regardless of context, and not multiple context-sensitive allomorphs. One may further assume that the syllabic spelling {LI-⌜e⌝}, this being the only internal evidence available, reflects this morpho-phonemic structure.

---

[421]See Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 53; he summarizes as follows: ". . . the writing *le-e* simply reflects the pronunciation [lē] for the morpheme /*li-*/, with its vowel lengthened outside of a normal speech context."

[422]Compare the allomorphs of the preposition in Classical Arabic: *li-* in most cases, but *la-* when followed by several of the pronominal suffixes, as in *lahu*, 'to him', *laka*, 'to you (m.s.)', etc.

[423]Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 53, n. 8.

[424]Compare this observation in another context in D. Sivan, *UF* 18 (1986) 309.

These assumptions permit at least one conclusion regarding the quality of the underlying vowel: the use of the {LI} sign precludes */la/* as a possibility.[425] Students of Ugaritic phonology have proposed at least two other solutions, however:

(1) Huehnergard has proposed that the phonemic quality of the underlying vowel was /*i*/, but that, in the environment of the sonorant *l*, this phonemic vowel was phonetically realized as [e], and it was this realization which was reflected in the syllabic writing.[426] If such a proposal cannot be ruled out as impossible, it does present methodological flaws of a rather serious nature. Huehnergard invites us to believe that ". . . an examination of [the set of exceptions . . . in which the reflexes of **i* and **ī* are written with *e*-signs] reveals that all but one of them occur in a well-defined phonological environment, namely, before or after the sonorants /*l*/, /*m*/, /*n*/, and /*y*/. In view of the consistent use of *i*-signs for /*i*/ and /*ī*/ in all other environments, we may therefore propose that those phonemes had allophones, [e] and [ē] respectively, in the neighborhood of a sonorant."[427] The exceptions of which he speaks are cited on pages 260-261; they consist of various syllabic spellings of no more than twelve different words, of which at least one does not fit the hypothesis suggested.[428] If this small sampling size alone is not sufficient to produce a good deal of skepticism regarding the proposal,[429] one may raise the following additional objections: (1) as the author himself admits, the supposed phonological development is

---

[425]*Contra* C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (1965), § 10.10, p. 97.

[426]Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 259-264.

[427]*Ibid.*, pp. 261-262.

[428]The author admits this exception: {mar-kab-te}, not *{mar-kab-ti} (*ibid.*, n. 208).

[429]Compare the author's own remark: "the evidence of the lowering of /*i*/ to [e] around sonorants in Ugaritic is admittedly rather sparse" (*ibid.*, p. 262).

not operative in all cases governed by the conditions proposed;[430] and (2) the supposed examples of phonemic /*i*/ and /*ī*/, which Huehnergard claims are realized phonetically as [e] and [ē], are more often than not purely hypothetical, the presence of the underlying phonemes /*ī*/ or /*i*/ apparently being assumed purely on the basis of the writings with *e*-signs.[431] In short, Huehnergard's proposal is not impossible and has the advantage of tidiness; the arguments presented, however, do little to move it from the realm of the possible to that of the probable.

(2) A second approach to the problem involves accepting the phonemic quality of the vowel as /*e*/, not /*i*/, in light of the syllabic writing. This granted, the quantity of the vowel can only be long, that is, /*ê*/,[432] since, on present evidence, Ugaritic had no short vowel of /*e*/ quality.[433] Though not acceptable in the form presented there, the

---

[430]Huehnergard cites two such exceptions (*ibid.*, p. 262): {⌈i?-lu⌉}, not *{e-lu}, for /*ʾilu*/ 'god' and {mi-dá-ar-ú}, not *{me-dá-ar-ú}, for /*midarʿu*/?, 'seed-land'. To these one may add {ṣi-il-yv[...]}, written with {IL}, not {EL} (see p. 170); {qi-i-lu}, written with {I}, not {E} (see p. 175); and perhaps also {ti-[n]a?-t[u]4}, written with {TI} and not {TE} (see p. 51, where /*tīnatu*/ is offered as one possibility). Neither is this proposal operative in the environment of the sonorant /*r*/, a feature Huehnergard admits as "curious" (*ibid.*, p. 262, n. 208).

[431]Of the "exceptions" cited in Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 260-261, why is {⌈e?⌉-la-PI} reconstructed as /*ʿilāyi*/ and not /*ʿalāy-*/; {ḫé-yu-ma} as /*ḥiyyūma*/ and not /*ḥayyūma*/; and, of especial relevance here, {le-⌈e⌉} as /*li-*/ and not */*lay-*/? If phonetic explanations are indeed to be sought for these writings with *e*-signs, the phonological environment characteristic of many of the forms cited is the presence of the "guttural" consonants /ʾ/, /ʿ/, /*ḥ*/, and /*ḫ*/. That this was this environment which induced the use of the *e*-signs seems at least as likely as Huehnergard's proposal; compare standard Arabic, for example, in which the vocalic phonemes /*a*/ and /*i*/ in the environment of /ʿ/, /*ḥ*/, and /*ḫ*/, for example, are often realized as distinct allophones, audibly different from the phonetic realization of these same vocalic phonemes in other environments; compare also the "Proto-Akkadian" phonemic sequence */ʿ*a*/ which is regularly represented in syllabic script with the {E} sign (as in the writing of the preposition {e-li}, from */*ʿalay-*/).

[432]Since this vowel in Ugaritic results, historically, from the contraction of a diphthong */*ay*/, I consider it long and, out of habit, transcribe it with a circumflex accent to indicate its origin as a contraction, rather than with a macron, which I use only for historically long vowels.

[433]On the inventory of productive vocalic phonemes in Ugaritic, see now the discussion in Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 32.2, p. 134.

essentials of this solution are found in a 1970 article by J. Blau and J. C. Greenfield.[434] The sole problem with this hypothesis is that few, if any, of the cognate languages show a long vowel, be it "pure" or contracted, for the preposition *l*. If unattested for *l*, however, several cognate languages do contain a by-form of *l* with "prothetic ʾalif",[435] where the historical presence of the diphthong /*ay*/ following the consonant /*l*/ is likely.[436] The preposition * *ʾilay*- is not attested in Ugaritic, but if accepted as a legitimate by-form of the preposition *l* in the cognate languages, the cognate evidence for a phonemic structure with */*ay*/ following the consonant /*l*/ may provide analogical support for the phonemic reconstruction of the Ugaritic preposition *l* as */*lay*/.[437] If such were the case, one would have expected the proto-Ugaritic */*lay*/ to resolve to /*lê*/, and the expected alphabetic and syllabic spellings of this form are consistent with the available evidence: *l* and {LI-⌜e⌝}, that is, {le-⌜e⌝}, respectively.

The "expanded" writings of the preposition as {ly} and {ln} are probably an independent issue, representing forms of the simple preposition *l* expanded by means

---

[434]Blau and Greenfield, *BASOR* 200 (1970) 16. This interpretation was championed by D. Pardee in *JNES* 50 (1991) 305, and is now is offered as an "alternative interpretation" in J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 33.214.1, p. 172.

[435]On * *ʾilay*- as a by-form of the preposition *l* (with "prothetic ʾaleph" attached to the base), compare E. Lipiński, *Outline of a Comparative Grammar* (1997), § 48.6, pp. 461-462.

[436]Compare the consonantal orthography of Arabic ({ÁöZ} = {ʾly}), and the form with suffixes, which both imply * *ʾilay*-. In Hebrew, the orthographies with {y} and the vocalization of the form with suffixes (where the vowel following the /*l*/ and prior to the suffix is represented with Tiberian *ṣērē*) also imply historical * *ʾilay*-.

[437]As additional comparative evidence, note the recently published grammar of North Sinai Bedouin dialects of Arabic, where several dialects show a form /*lay*/ for the preposition with attached 1st common singular pronominal suffix. Assuming such forms are not examples of analogical leveling, they provide evidence of a base */*lay*/ for the preposition (*/*lay* + *ya* (1cs)/ = */*layya*/, which becomes /*lay*/ with the dropping of the final short vowel); see R. E. de Jong, *Bedouin Dialects of the Northern Sinai* (2000) 167 and 372.

of enclitic suffixes,[438] and not, in the case of {ly}, *plene* spellings of the preposition[439] uniquely restricted to the « sal » formulas of conceptually ascending letters. In the absence of more explicit data, one must reconstruct the phonemic structure of the enclitic particles *-n* and *-y* on the basis of rather sparse evidence. The internal evidence is the syllabic spelling {al-LI-NI-PI}, presumably representing the Ugaritic word written in alphabetic script as *hlny*.[440] If one assumes that "enclitic" *-n* and "enclitic" *-y* particles are among the morphological components of this word,[441] the signs NI and PI represent the syllabic realization of "enclitic" *-n* and *-y*, respectively. Unfortunately, both signs are multi-valent: NI probably represents *né* as well as *ni*;[442]

---

[438]This is consistent with K. Aartun's particle theories; see especially *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen* 1 (1974) 44-47; such an analysis has since been cautiously defended by Pardee in *AfO* 31 (1984) 215; compare D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chap. 10 (RS 3.334), comm., l. 7, n. 31, "Il nous paraît pourtant nécessaire de décrire toutes les formes avec {y} final comme « allongées » et d'y voir un phénomène de la prononciation ({k} = /kī/, {ky} = /kīyV/ — la position d'Aartun)."

[439]Tropper, *UF* 26 (1994) 459-460 and 474; del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 234; and Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000) 51-53.

[440]Huehnergard interpreted the spelling {al-LI-NI-PI} in RS 20.426 B, line 5', published by Nougayrol in *Ugaritica* 5 (1968), no. 138, pp. 249-250 (copy on p. 424), as {al-li-ni-ia}, representing the Ugaritic equivalent of Sumerian UD and Akkadian *anumma* or *enūma*; see Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 68 and 121. If legitimate, the writing {al-li-ni-ia} would be entirely consistent with alphabetic *hlny*, which has adverbial functions in many respects similar to those of the Akkadian adverbs *anumma* and *enūma* (see below, chapter 5).

[441]This is also the opinion expressed by Pardee in his manuscript for *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation) chapter 10 (RS 3.427), commentaire, footnote: ". . . le suffixe *-ny* est lui-même composite, formé de *-n-* et *-y* ." As Pardee points out, this is consistent with the spirit of K. Aartun's "particle" theory, though Aartun himself considered *-ny* as a single "Derivationsmorphem" (*Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen* 1 [1974] 3).

[442]According to J. Huehnergard, *Akkadian of Ugarit* (1989) 376, the value *né* is only explicitly clear in a few lexical or literary texts, while *ni* is used throughout. The same author points out in *UVST* (1987) 258, n. 191, however, that the NE sign is virtually never used in the Ugarit Akkadian syllabary; perhaps we may wonder if some values transcribed as *ni* represent in fact *né*?

and the PI sign is not vowel-specific for the *yV* values.[443] Assuming that NI reflects the underlying quality of the vocalic phoneme and not the "phonetic" spelling of an allophonic variant,[444] */na/* must be excluded for the enclitic particle *-n*.[445] Comparative evidence for "enclitic" *-y* suggests */ya/*.[446] In light of these provisional suggestions for the enclitic particles *-n* and *-y* as */ni/* and */ya/*, then, one may reconstruct the phonemic structure of the "expanded" prepositions *ly* and *ln* as */lêya/*[447] and */lêni/*, respectively.

---

[443]Huehnergard, *Akkadian of Ugarit* (1989) 391-392.

[444]In light of the insufficiency of the evidence, I do not consider it methodologically sound to complicate the phonology of Ugaritic with allophonic variants until such is absolutely necessary. This being said, should one mention the possibility that the phoneme sequence */-nayya/* was realized phonetically along the lines of [neyya], and thus written with the NI sign? Does one compare {KAN-PI-ma} and {ḪI-PI-ma} for */ḥayyVma/*, both mentioned in Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 261? I do not here promote this suggestion, but one might keep it in mind as further phonological data come to light.

[445]This argument (that the phonemic structure of enclitic *-n* is */-ni/*, not */-na/*) need not apply to the "energic" morpheme(s) written *-n* in the verbal paradigms, for which other phonemic structures, including */-anØ/* and */-anna/*, seem likely on comparative grounds.

[446]For the discussion of the comparative evidence for "enclitic" *-n* and *-y*, see Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 89.1, pp. 823-825, and § 89.3, pp. 833-835.

[447]This reconstruction represents the Ugaritic preposition */lê/* with the enclitic particle */-ya/* simply attached at the end. An alternative reconstruction, */layya/*, is perhaps also possible. Judging from Arabic and Hebrew, suffixed forms often followed their own path of phonological evolution , independent of non-suffixed forms. Thus, (i) if the phonemic sequence */ay/* in proto-Ugaritic reduced to /ê/ in all cases save in the gemination of the /y/, (ii) if proto-Ugaritic had both */lay/* and */layya/* as prepositions, and (iii) if no paradigm leveling had occurred, then it is possible that, while the simple preposition */lay/* became */lê/*, the form with enclitic suffix retained the structure */layya/*. If, however, the existence of */layya/* already in proto-Ugaritic is disputed, the form should be reconstructed on the basis of the reduced form of the preposition, */lê/*.

3.7 Typological classification of the Ugaritic « sal » formulas

The results of the typological classification of the Ugaritic « sal » formulas, detailed above,[448] are presented here in tabular form. In addition to reviewing the distribution of the various compositional patterns found in the corpus, this section also includes a brief description of those formulas which present atypical features of a compositional or distributional nature. Those « sal » formulas of "standard" composition are treated first, followed by the smaller, more diverse group of "non-standard" patterns.

3.7.1 "Standard" patterns

The diagnostic features of the "standard" « sal » formula in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus have been defined above.[449] Among the "standard" « sal » formulas, two compositional patterns are prominent. These are presented here, organized according to conceptual status and model. Following these, the remaining « sal » formulas which are compositionally "standard" but which do not fall under the rubric of one of the two main patterns are listed.

---

[448]See especially sections 3.2-3.3.

[449]For the definition, as well as the grounds on which this pattern may be qualified as "standard", see above, section 3.2. Briefly, a standard Ugaritic « sal » formula consists of two, and only two, components: (1) the verb « *yšlm* », and (2) a prepositional phrase consisting of the preposition *l* (or in its expanded form, *ly* or *ln*) and a noun phrase « N_R » referring to the recipient.

3.7.1.1 « *yšlm lk* » or « *yšlm lkm* »

« HOR BIO »

RS 1.018:4	« *yšlm* [*lk*] »	« UNKNOWN » (probably « HOR BIO »)
RS 1.021:4	« *yšlm l*[*km*] »	« UNKNOWN » (possibly « HOR BIO »)
RS 3.427:1'	« [*yš*]*lm* [*lk*] »	« UNKNOWN » (possibly « HOR BIO »)
RS 15.174:4	« [*y*]*šlm lk* »	
RS 18.031:4	« *yšlm lk* »	
RS 18.075:1'	« *yš*[*lm lk*] »	« UNKNOWN » (probably « HOR BIO »)
RS 18.134:4	« *yšlm lk* »	
RS 19.029:4	« *yšlm lk* »	« UNKNOWN » (possibly « HOR BIO »)
RS 92.2005.2:26	« *yšlm lk* »	
RS 94.2406.2:33	« *yšlm lk* »	
RS 94.2537:3	« [*yšl*]*m lk* »	

« UNMARKED »

RS 4.475:4	« *yšlm lk* »	
RS 15.158:2	« *yšlm* [*lk*] »	
RS 29.095:3	« *yšlm lk* »	

OTHER CONCEPTUAL CATEGORIES:

RS 15.008:4	« *yšlm lk* »	« ASC BIO »
RS 17.139:3	« *yšlm lk* »	« ASC BIO »
RS 18.147:4	« *yšlm lk* »	« DESC BIO »
RS 19.181A:3	« [*y*]*šlm lk* »	« DESC POW » (or « HOR BIO »?)
RS 92.2005.1:6	« *yšlm lkm* »	« ASC BIO »

The compositional pattern surveyed here is typical of those letters which are not conceptually ascending. Three striking exceptions are observable, however: RS

15.008, RS 17.139, and RS 92.2005.1 are conceptually ascending, and yet present a « sal » formula of the type « *yšlm lk*(*m*) ». The case of RS 15.008 and RS 17.139 as representing "mixed" social situations has already been discussed.[450] Since RS 92.2005.1 presents the pattern « RS » in the address, it seems unlikely that it is amenable to the same explanation as that offered for RS 17.139 and RS 15.008. It is conceivable that the explanation for the structure of the « sal » in RS 92.2005.1 is to be found in the use of the BIO model. It seems likely that the sender is literally the biological son of the two recipients. Perhaps it was this intimacy that allowed for the use of a less deferential form of the « sal », even in an ascending social situation.

3.7.1.2 « *ly* REL *yšlm* », « *l* REL *yšlm* », or « *ln* REL *yšlm* »

« ASC POW »

RS 16.402:4	« [*l*]*y ådty yšlm* »
RS 20.199:7-8	« *ly ådty yšlm* »
RS 94.2391:7	« *ly bʿly yšlm* »
RS 94.2428:3'	« *ly bʿly* [*yšlm*] »
RS 94.2479:4	« *l ådty yšlm* »
RS 94.5009:4	« *ly ådty* [*yšlm*] »
RS 17.327:5-6	« […] *bʿly* […] »

[450]See above, section 1.7.1.2: " … 'mixed' social situations apply when the correspondents have a particular biological kinship which is not precisely analogous to their societal relationship." The case of RS 17.139 is clearest: the sender is the son of the recipient (and thus inferior on the BIO model), but he is also the king of Ugarit (and thus superior on the social level). The conceptually ascending REL terms in this letter are appropriate for the biological kinship between the two correspondents, but the epistolary structure followed is not appropriate for such ascending situations.

RIH 78/03+:6'-11' « *ln bʿly yšlm* [*l* …-*k*] *l ỉnšk l ḥwtk l* […]*k l mrkbtk* [*l* … -*k*] *l kl d ỉṯ*

[*l* … *m*]*lk rb mlk mṣ*[*rm* …] *mlk ṣ*[*dq* … *yšlm*?] »

« ASC BIO »

RS 11.872:6-7 « *l ủmy yšlm* »

RS 16.379:5-6 « *ly ủ*[*m*]*y yšlm* »

RS 34.124:5 « [*l*]*y ủmy* <*y*>*šlm* »[451]

RS 94.5003+:5 « *ly ủ*[*my yšlm*] »

This pattern is typical of letters which are conceptually ascending. It is not found in letters of any other conceptual status. The unexpanded form of the preposition, *l*, in the « sal » formulas which follow this pattern should be considered statistically atypical.[452]

Only one other formula classed here merits comment: the « sal » formula in RIH 78/03+, one of only two Ugaritic letters addressed to a "great king" for which the *praescriptio* is preserved.[453] The « sal » of RIH 78/03+ follows a pattern otherwise unattested in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus. Following the initial salutation, « *ln bʿly yšlm* », which presents no striking formal problems,[454] a series of additional prepositional phrases is perceptible. Judging from the formal parallels in the letters

---

[451]The formal and contextual parallels between this letter and other letters from the king to his mother make it likely that the « sal » formula contains a scribal error (haplography).

[452]There are only two clear examples: RS 11.872 and RS 94.2479.

[453]The other is RS 34.356+. Neither the praescriptio of RIH 78/03+ nor that of RS 34.356+ is intact, however. RS 34.356+ contains no trace of a « sal » formula. The Ugaritic texts RS 16.078+ and RS 94.5015 also represent letters to "great kings", but neither of these bears a recognizable *praescriptio*.

[454]The form of the preposition (*ln* instead of *ly* or *l*) is discussed above in sections 3.2 and 3.6.

from the Ras Shamra Akkadian, Amarna, and Boğazköy corpora,[455] these prepositional phrases almost certainly designate additional "beneficiaries" of another volitional form, « *yšlm* »,[456] probably to be reconstructed in the lacuna at the end of line 11'. The explanation for this expanded composition is probably to be linked with the identity of the recipient of the letter: when writing to a "great king", an expanded salutation was appropriate.[457]

---

[455]The body of comparative data directly relevant to the « sal » formula of RIH 78/03+ is large: fifteen, and possibly as many as eighteen expanded « sal » formulas from Ras Shamra Akkadian letters (possibly RS 1.[056], RS 15.014, probably RS 15.178, RS 16.112, RS 19.050, RS 19.080, RS 20.013.2, RS 20.018, RS 20.168, probably RS 20.182A+, RS 20.184, RS 20.200C, RS 20.238, RS 20.243, RS 34.139, RS 34.140, RS 34.165, and RS 34.180,60); as many as thirty-four from Amarna (EA 1-3, EA 5-11, EA 12.1, EA 15-17, probably EA 18, EA 19-21, EA 23-24, EA 26-29, EA 31, EA 33-35, EA 37-39, EA 41, EA 42.1, and EA 49); and over thirty from Boğazköy (ABoT 59+, KBo 1.009+, KBo 1.010+, KBo 1.024+, KBo 1.029+, KBo 2.010, KBo 8.014, KBo 18.018, KBo 18.052, KBo 28.004, KBo 28.005, KBo 28.007, KBo 28.008, KBo 28.014, KBo 28.017, KBo 28.021, KBo 28.023, KBo 28.041, KBo 28.050, KBo 28.065, probably KBo 28.082, KBo 31.040, KUB 3.025+, probably KUB 3.042, probably KUB 3.044, KUB 3.062, KUB 3.063, KUB 3.066, KUB 3.068, KUB 3.070, KUB 3.071, KUB 3.123, KUB 34.002, and KUB 37.114).

[456]Compare *l ỉnšk l ḥwtk*, '(May it be well) for your women?, for your land,' in line 7'; *l mrkbtk*, '(May it be well) for your chariots' in line 8'; and *l kl d ỉṯ* [*l špš*? *m*]*lk rb*, '(May it be well) for everything that belongs [to the Sun?], the great [K]ing . . . ,' in lines 9'-10'. In the formal parallels from Ras Shamra (Akkadian corpus), Amarna, and Boğazköy (see above), the Ugaritic phrase *l ḥwtk* corresponds to {a-na KUR-ka}; Ugaritic *l mrkbtk* to {a-na GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ-ka}; and *l kl d ỉt* [*l … m*]*lk rb* to (for example) {a-na gab-bi mim-mu-ú ša EN-ia}. The Ugaritic phrase *l ỉnšk* is more difficult; it is not clear to me whether the noun *ỉnš* is gender neutral, 'people', or semantically (though not grammatically) feminine,'women' (inner Ugaritic usage is ambiguous and the cognate languages support both possibilities). If the former is preferred, the phrase might correspond to {a-na LÚ.MEŠ-ka} or perhaps {a-na ERÌN.MEŠ-ka}, but in these cases one might have expected a more common Ugaritic phrase (such as *l bnšk* or *l šbỉk*). If the latter proposal is valid (*ỉnš* = 'women'), it could correspond to the enigmatic {a-na SAL.UŠ.MEŠ-ka} (see the discussion in *CAD*, vol. 15 (S) 216-217).

[457]This is consistent with the usage in international diplomatic correspondence from other corpora: Ras Shamra Akkadian (see above, section 3.4.1.1), Amarna (section 3.4.1.2), and Boğazköy (section 3.4.1.3).

3.7.1.3 Other compositionally "standard" « sal » formulas

This category includes two formulas: (1) that of RS 34.148, in which the « sal » formula is compositionally "standard" but does not fall under one the two compositional rubrics given above, and (2) that of RS 18.[364], in which the composition of the « sal » formula is technically unknown, though a "standard" formulation cannot be ruled out.

RS 34.148:4-5	« *yšlm l mlk bʿly* »	« ASC POW »
RS 18.[364]:1'	« […] *yšl*[*m* …] »	« UNKNOWN »

Despite its status as compositionally "standard", the « sal » formula of RS 34.148 is peculiar in at least three respects: (1) the verb precedes the « *l* N_R » phrase, which is atypical in conceptually ASC POW letters, (2) the preposition is not expanded, which is also atypical for conceptually ascending letters, and (3) the « N_R » element contains an ID term as well as a REL phrase. These three aspects suggest that the letter was composed by a scribe familiar with a related, though not identical epistolary tradition.[458] Since the body of the letter alludes to the kingdom of Carchemish,[459] and since the structure « ID REL » for the « N_R » element in a salutation formula which is

---

[458]If one assumes that at least some scribes in foreign courts were able to redact letters in Ugaritic language and script (a supposition which finds support in [i] the existence of Ugaritic letters of foreign provenance [compare, for example, RS 17.434+, RS 18.031, RS 18.038, RS 18.134, and RS 18.147], [ii] the indications that a Ugaritian scribe resided at the court of the king of Alašiya [see Bordreuil and Malbran-Labat, *CRAIBL* (1995) 445], and [iii] the indirect evidence of the Amarna corpus, where despite the prevalence of international correspondence in Akkadian, the resident scribes must also have been able to read and compose letters in other languages, such as Hittite [cf. EA 31, and especially the request in EA 32:24-25]), it is possible that this letter was sent by an individual, perhaps the *ʾuriyannu* official, representing the Hittite emperor or the king of Carchemish; compare the label RS 17.364 (*PRU* 2 [1957], no. 171), which alludes to the establishment of boundary stones (*pât*, cf. the probable Hittite loanword *ʿps*, of similar meaning; see *DLU* 1 [1996] 85, with bibliography) by the *ʾuriyannu* official for the king of Ugarit.

[459]RS 34.148:8.

otherwise compositionally parallel to the standard Ugaritic « sal » is found in several letters from Boğazköy,[460] the formal idiosyncracies of this letter should probably be interpreted in light of scribal habits current in the Hittite realm.

3.7.2 "Non-standard" « sal » formulas

This sections treats those formulaic wishes for the general well-being of the recipient which do not follow the compositional pattern of the standard Ugaritic « sal » formula. These "non-standard" salutations present several divergencies from the standard compositional pattern, which may include one or both of the following: (1) the grammatical means by which the beneficiary of the salutary wish is expressed,[461] and (2) the morphology of the ŠLM form.[462]

3.7.2.1 Salutations in which the grammatical subject of *yšlm* is expressed

EA 34, a letter from the king of Alašiya to the king of Egypt, presents a salutation formula otherwise unparalleled in the Amarna corpus.

---

[460]Two of these are redacted in Akkadian and represent international correspondence: IBoT 1.34 (the sender of this letter is the king of Ḫanigalbat) and KBo 28.038 (the sender is the Egyptian pharaoh); and the rest are in Hittite, and probably domestic in nature: KBo 13.062, KBo 18.003 (reconstructed), KBo 18.052, and *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1. Nearly all of these are conceptually ASC POW, as is RS 34.148 (the exceptions are IBoT 1.34, which is ASC BIO, and KBo 28.038, probably HOR).

[461]In other words, while the (statistically) standard Ugaritic tradition expressed the beneficiary of the salutation by means of the prepositional phrase « *l*N$_R$ », a few "non-standard" salutations place the beneficiary phrase as the grammatical subject of the salutary verbal form.

[462]The standard form is « *yšlm* »; other attested forms include « *p šlm* », « *p šlmt* », and « *šlm* ».

EA 34:4-7 {(4, cont'd) ù iš-tu šul-⌜mu-ka$_4$⌝ (5) ù šu-lum-ka$_4$ šu-lum É-ka$_4$ DUMU.MEŠ-ka$_4$
(6) DAM.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ GIŠ.GIGIR-ka$_4$-MEŠ
(7) KUR.KI-ka$_4$ MA.GAL lu-ú šal-mu }

'Now (as) for your (own) well-being, may your (own) well-being, the well-being of your house(hold), (that of) your sons, wives, horses, your chariots, (and) your land be very well!'

The volitional predication *lū šal(i)mū*, 'May (they) be well',[463] at the end of the formula in line 7, has, as its grammatical subject, a long and complex noun phrase beginning in line 5 with the noun phrase *šulum-ka*, 'your well-being'. The salutation formula of the Ugaritic letter RS 3.334 presents a similar grammatical structure.

RS 3.334:2 « [*š*]*lm bnš yšl*[*m*] », 'May the well-being of the *bnš*-personnel be well!'

The salutary motifs in this letter continue through line 6, but following a different structural pattern.[464] At least one other Ugaritic letter probably contains a salutation formula of comparable structure. RS 17.434+ is a letter from Puduḫepa, queen of Ḫatti, to Niqmaddu, king of Ugarit.[465] Following the protocol used in contemporary international diplomatic letters in the western periphery, this letter contains a double formula consisting of (i) a situation report and (ii) a salutation.[466] The salutation

---

[463]Note that the scribe apparently employs a volitional form of the stative verb *šalim*, 'it is well', and not, as is usual, the common noun *šulmu*, 'well being'.

[464]See below, section 3.7.2.2.

[465]It seems clear that the *pdǵb* in question is the well-known Hittite queen of the same name, the wife of Ḫattušili III; and that the *nqmd* in question must be Niqmaddu III (that is, "Niqmaddu IV" according to the revised king list published by D. Arnaud in *SMEA* 41 [1999] 163); for a resume of the debate regarding the identity of the correspondents, see I. Singer, *HUS* (1999) 693-694.

[466]On the "situation report", see below, chapter 5; on this double formula, see A. Hagenbuchner, *Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 49-55.

portion of RS 17.434+ is only partially preserved in line 4, but very probably showed a compositional structure comparable to that of RS 3.334:2.

RS 17.434+:3-4 « [*šlmk*? …] *w šlm d ḥw*[*t*]*k w* [*d*] *bt mlk* [… *yšlm*?] »,

'[May your well-being …] and the well-being of your country, and (that) of the palace [… be well!]'

3.7.2.2 Forms of ŠLM other than « *yšlm* »

As many as three Ugaritic letters contain salutary motifs in which the well-being volition is not expressed by the form *yšlm* as it is in the standard formula, but rather by the syntagm « *p šlm* »: certainly RS 29.093, and probably RS 1.020 and RS 3.334.

3.7.2.2.1 « *P šLM L* N_R »

The clearest example of this motif occurs in RS 29.093:

RS 29.093:5-6 « *p šlm l bʿlny* » « ASC POW »

The « sal » formula in this letter differs from the standard compositional pattern in two fundamental respects: (1) « *p šlm* » appears where one would have expected « *yšlm* », and (2) the prepositional phrase « *l* N_R » is placed following the *šlm*-motif, despite the fact that the letter is conceptually ASC POW. An additional micro-compositional particularity is (3) the presence of the conjunction *p* prior to the word *šlm* at the beginning of the formula.[467] On a broader level, the polite formulas in this letter also present atypical features: (4) the « sal » and the « ben » formulas precede the « pros »

[467]In the Amarna corpus, several « sal » formulas, all in letters from Alašiya, also begin with a conjunction, in this case *u*, written {ù}: EA 34-35 and EA 38-40.

formula,[468] and (5) there is no horizontal scribal line between the address and polite formulas. On the other hand, several consistencies with the standard Ugaritic epistolary tradition are also remarkable: (1) the address presents the compositional order « SR », typical in a conceptually ascending letter, (2) the composition of both the « S » and « R » components follows the pattern « ID REL », also typical of conceptually ascending letters, (3) three "polite formulas" are present, which, despite minor compositional peculiarities, answer the description of the « sal », « ben » and « pros » formulas respectively, and these polite formulas occur immediately following the address and immediately prior to the body, and (4) a horizontal scribal line separates the polite formulas from the non-formulaic body of the letter.

The morphology of the phrase « *p šlm* » is distinct from « *yšlm* ». Since the context is clearly volitional, and since the suffix conjugation in Ugaritic prose texts does not mark this nuance,[469] the construction must be nominal as in the Akkadian construction *lū šulmu*.[470] It is difficult to know if the semantics of the conjunction *p* in this case are explicitly volitional, or if the volitional sense derives mainly from context.

3.7.2.2.2 « (*P*) *šLM* NP *L šLMT* » AND « (*P*) *šLM* NP *P šLMT* »

The syntagm « *p šlm* » probably appears in at least two other salutation motifs.

RS 1.020:3-4 « *p*! *šlm* […] *btk b*[…] »

---

[468]When all three polite formulas are present, the order is usually « pros sal ben ».

[469]See the discussion of Tropper in *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 77.35, p. 727.

[470]*Ibid.*

RS 3.334:2-6 « […] ⌜*ú*?⌝*gr*⌜*t*?⌝ *l šlmt šl*[*m* …] *bth p šlmt p šlm* […] *dt l bnš trgm* […] *l šlmt l šlm b*[…] »

There is no reason to doubt that here, as above in RS 29.093, the word *šlm* is the common noun **šalām-*,[471] 'well-being'.

The initial salutation at the beginning of line 2 of RS 3.334, « [*š*]*lm bnš yšl*[*m*] », 'May the state of the personnel be well!', has already been discussed.[472] RS 1.020 contains no obvious parallel for this motif. Both RS 1.020 and RS 3.334, however, contain « sal » motifs which incorporate the syntagm « *p šlm* », and further contextual and literary similarities between these two letters argue in favor of interpreting them together. Unfortunately, the state of preservation of both tablets prevents a clear understanding of either passage, and the propositions and reconstructions given below must remain largely hypothetical.

The repetition of the word « *šlmt* » in RS 3.334 suggests that lines 2-6 contain several grammatically distinct salutations, though it appears likely that these repeated motifs share a similar structural pattern.[473] Judging from its repetition in RS 3.334, the word « *šlmt* » was a central component of this pattern. There is little evidence for "optative" or otherwise volitional usages of the suffix conjugation in Ugaritic prose texts,[474] so it seems unlikely that this form means 'May you be well!' At least two epistolary formulas, however, employ the suffix conjugation to express "performative"

---

[471]A *qutl* base is also possible, as in Akkadian *šulmu*.

[472]See above, section 3.7.2.1.

[473]In my attempt to understand these two "non-standard" « sal » formulas, I have profited from access to D. Pardee's manuscript of *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 10 (RS 3.334).

[474]Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 77.35, p. 727. Some "optative" usages of the suffix conjugation are known in the poetic corpus, however (*ibid.*, § 77.34, pp. 726-727).

utterances,[475] and in light of this, the form *šlmt* is perhaps best understood in this sense. The context of an epistolary polite formula makes the 1st person singular appropriate.[476] If the word *šlmt* contains the verbal predication in this pattern, the common noun *šlm* may represent its grammatical complement, in the accusative.[477] Thus, the motif in question seems to consist of two components: (1) the verb « *šlmt* » and (2) its accusative complement « *šlm* NP ». If the D-stem semantics of ŠLM are not simply factitive here,[478] they may be more specifically declarative.[479] In that case, the idiom might best be translated 'I hereby declare well the state of NP!'

---

[475]These are *qlt*, '(I declare that) I hereby fall!' in the « pros » formula (above, section 2.6.1.2), and *rgmt*, perhaps '(I declare that) I hereby pronounce … ' (see below, section 4.7). Compare a similar usage of the suffix conjugation in the Iron Age Hebrew epistolary formula *brktk*, '(I declare that) I hereby bless you!' (on this latter, see the citations in D. Schwiderski, *Handbuch des nordwestsemitischen Briefformulars* [2000] 38-42). It seems to me that performative utterances such as these, in which the utterance is not only simultaneous of the action but is also effective of it, and examples of the "epistolary perfect" (see the overview by Pardee and Whiting in *BSOAS* 50 [1987] 1-31), in which actions simultaneous with the sending of the letter are in the suffix conjugation, representing their status as past completed actions from the temporal viewpoint of the recipient, are two different, though occasionally overlapping usages.

[476]In other words, the 1st person reflects the "voice" of the sender, as in *qlt* in the « pros » formula, in *rgmt* in the non-standard « ben » formula of RS 18.113, and generally throughout the letters.

[477]This interpretation follows D. Pardee's interpretation of this motif, discussed in his manuscript of *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 10 (RS 3.334), remarques épistolographiques: " … nous proposons d'analyser la forme comme au schème-D avec vraisemblablement pour complément d'objet direct *šlm* (/šallamtu šalāma/) et que la formule signifie littéralement « rendre entier le bien-être (de quelqu'un) »."

[478]In other words, if the G-stem means 'to be in a state of well-being', the (factitive) D-stem would mean 'to bring about a state of well-being (+ accusative complement, for s.o. or s.th.).' Thus, « *šlmt* » + « *šlm* NP » could be translated '(I declare that) I hereby safeguard the well-being of NP!'

[479]Compare the comments regarding such usages of the D-stem in biblical Hebrew, with anterior bibliography, in Waltke and O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (1990), § 24.2f, pp. 402-403: "Jenni refers to such verbs as declarative-estimative, by which he means that the state described is attained by a declaration (i.e., 'to declare someone to be in a state') or as a result of an estimation (i.e., 'to esteem someone as being in a state')."

This motif may be present as many as four times in RS 3.334. The reconstructions provided here, however, should be taken as hypothetical.

RS 3.334:2-3 « [*šlm*] ⌜*ủ*?⌝*gr*⌜*t*?⌝ *l šlmt* », '[The well-being? of] Ugarit? I hereby declare well!'

RS 3.334:3-4 « *šl*[*m* …] *bth p šlmt* », 'As for the well-be[ing of … (and that?)] of his/her household, I hereby declare (it) well!'

RS 3.334:4 « *p*? *šlm* [… *šlmt*?] »,[480] 'And the well-being of [… I hereby declare well]!'

RS 3.334:5-6 « ⌜*d*?⌝*t l bnš trgm* […] *l šlmt l šlm b*[…] », 'What you should say to the *bunušu*-personnel: "[…] I hereby declare well, for the well-being of […]!" '

The latter example is a relayed salutation, functionally similar, though not formally so, to a motif appearing in EA 170.2:43-44 from the Amarna corpus,[481] and not very unlike the relayed "situation report" in the Ugaritic letter RS 17.063:3, « *rgm l ủmy šlm bʿlkm* », 'Say to my mother: "Your[482] husband (lit. master) is well." '

I have no explanation for the alternation between the presence of the conjunction *p* and that of the so-called "emphatic" *l* particle[483] prior to the form *šlmt* in these examples, nor any proposal for possible semantic differences between the two syntagms.

---

[480]It is also conceivable that the first two signs of line 5 should be read as {⌜b⌝t} rather than {⌜d⌝t} and incorporated into an inverted version of this motif: « *p*? *šlm*[*t šlm* …] *bt* », 'I hereby declare well the state of well-being of the … of the household!'

[481]EA 170.2: { ù a-na ^{m}a-na-ti (44) šul-ma qí-bi }, 'And say "Peace!" to Mr. ʿAnatu.' Or perhaps, 'And say a *šulmu*-salutation to Mr. ʿAnatu.'

[482]It is difficult to interpret the final *-m* on *bʿlkm*. Since the relayed message is addressed to a single individual (*l ủmy*), it should probably be interpreted as enclitic *-m*, of unknown semantics.

[483]Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 85.8, pp. 811-812, lists a number of examples of this particle preceding suffix conjugation verbal forms, including one clear epistolary example (in RS 19.011:9).

If the « sal » formula of RS 1.020 is also to be classified here, it too may have contained a repetition of this motif. As above, the following reconstructions should be considered hypothetical.

RS 1.020:3 « *p*! *šlm* [… *šlmt*?] », 'The well-being of [… I hereby declare well]!'

RS 1.020:3-4 « [(*p*?) *šlm*] *btk b*[… *šlmt*?] », '[The well-being of] your house (and) [your?] B[… I hereby declare well]!'

3.7.2.3 « *ḫytn* » in a salutation formula?

Salutation formulas containing two volitional forms, one derived from the verb *balāṭu* 'to live' and the other from *šalāmu* 'to be in a state of well-being,' are known in Old Babylonian epistolary traditions.[484] An example is *lū balṭāta lū šalmāta*,[485] 'May you live, may you be well!' At first glance, the Ugaritic letter RS 17.063 may seem to present a Late Bronze West Semitic parallel to this formulation.

RS 17.063:2 « *ḫytn w šlmtn* »

Not only are the Ugaritic stative verbs ḪY(Y) 'to live (G)' and ŠLM 'to be in a state of well-being (G)' precisely analogous to the semantics of the two Akkadian verbs, but they also present a superficially similar morphology: 2nd person forms in a suffixing conjugation. Furthermore, like the Old Babylonian example, the Ugaritic formula « *ḫytn w šlmtn* » occurs in the *praescriptio* of the letter, following the address formula in line 1, and prior to a "relayed" situation report in line 3. The non-formulaic body of the letter begins in line 4, and is separated from this *praescriptio* by a horizontal scribal

---

[484]See E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1968) 30-47.

[485]The example is taken from Salonen, *ibid.* (VAB 6 261 {lu ba-al-ṭa-ta lu ša-al-ma-a-ta}).

line. The formula « *ḥytn w šlmtn* », then, is reminiscent of the "polite formulas" in its distribution, as well as its etymology and morphology.

If such similarities tempt one to interpret this formula as a salutation, a difficulty is encountered in the form of the verbs: the suffix conjugation is not used in Ugaritic prose to denote volitions.[486] In this light, the verbs in this formula would seem rather to be best understood as 1st person forms,[487] representing the state of the well-being of the sender, and therefore variants of the "situation report". Such an interpretation is not inconsistent with the following epistolary motif in line 3, which may also be understood as a situation report, though relayed rather than direct.

The single problem with the analysis of the verbs *ḥytn* and *šlmtn* as 1st person forms is the presence of the suffixed particle *-n* following the standard 1st person singular inflectional morpheme *-t*.[488] Beyond this morphological peculiarity, however, this appears to be the least problematic interpretation of the motif:

---

[486]See above, section 3.7.2.2; and Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 77.35, p. 727.

[487]That is */*ḥayyātu-na wa šalamtu-na*/, 'I am alive and I am well!'

[488]In other words, one would have expected the phrase 'I am alive and in good health' to be written *{ḥyt w šlmt}, */*ḥayyātu wa-šalamtu*/, without suffixed *-n* on the verbal forms. D. Pardee comments on this problem in his manuscript of *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 33 (RS 17.063), remarques épistolographique: "Dans notre étude préliminaire [the reference is to Pardee's article in *AfO* Beiheft 19 (1982) 39-53], nous nous sommes senti obligé par notre lecture de la ligne 2 d'y voir une formule correspondante à celle que nous appelons dans l'étude actuelle « la formule de bien-être », dont la forme habituelle est *hnny ʿmny kll šlm*, « ici chez moi tout va bien » (avec des variantes) … . Cette interprétation est fondée sur l'analyse de {ḥytn} et {šlmtn} comme des formes verbales, 1ère personne du sing., lit. « je suis en vie et je suis bien ». Pour cette analyse, le {n} final constitue indubitablement un obstacle, mais jusqu'à présent nous n'avons pas trouvé de meilleure solution. Ce qui convainc que *ḥytn* et *šlmtn* ne constituent pas des formes nominales … , c'est les trois autres exemples de la forme dans cette lettre et RS 17.117 (*štntn*, ici, l. 4 ; *ḥytn*, RS 17.117:4 ; *yṯbtn*, ibid., l. 5) et le fait que deux sur trois de ces formes (*štntn* et *yṯbtn*) ne sont pas susceptibles de l'analyse comme formes nominales. La question qu'on aurait aimé être en mesure de résoudre est de savoir si ces formes reflètent un dialecte d'ougaritique où l'on prononçait toujours le morphème de la 1ère personne du sing. au parfait avec /n/ ou s'il s'agit de l'usage affecté de la particule *-n* par l'auteur de cette lettre … ."

« *ḥytn w šlmtn* », */ḥayyātu-na wa- šalamtu-na/*, 'I am alive, and I am in good health!'

Two other letters contain motifs with the form « *ḥytn* ». A similar interpretation of this word is valable in these cases as well.

RS 17.117:4-5 « *ḥytn l p<n>*[489] *špš yṯbtn b bt trtn* », 'I am alive in the pre<sence> of the "Sun" (and) I am dwelling in the house of the *tartênu*[490]-prince."

RS 94.2545+:(erased but still legible line between present lines 3-4)

« *ḥy*[*tn*? …] », '[I] am alive? […]'

The « *ḥytn* » motifs in these three letters will be mentioned below as possible variant formulations of the epistolary "situation report".[491]

---

[489]On the correction {l p<n>}, see M. Dijkstra, J. de Moor, and K. Spronk, *BiOr* 38 (1981), cols. 379-380. It is not grammatically impossible to read the text as it stands: *l p špš*, 'according to the declaration (lit., "mouth") of the "Sun" ' (compare the usage of the syntagm « *l p* N », 'according to the declaration of N,' throughout RS 1.002).

[490]The individual here designated in alphabetic script as *trtn* would seem to be the same as the {LÚ tar-te-ni} (in a genitive context) and {LÚ tar-te-en-ni DUMU LUGAL} (also genitive) in RS 17.227:28 and RS 17.347:28, respectively (see Nougayrol, *PRU* 4 [1956] 42-44).

[491]See below, chapter 5.

CHAPTER 4

THE DIVINE BENEDICTION

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The third and final of the polite formulas in the standard Ugaritic epistolary tradition is a volitional utterance in which the sender entreats the direct agency of the gods in wishing various manifestations of well-being for the recipient. A typical example is « *ìlm tǵrk tšlmk* », 'May the gods guard you, may they keep you well!' An accurate descriptive title for this formula would be the "divine benediction"; for the sake of brevity, however, I will refer to it simply as the "benediction", abbreviated « ben ».[1]

---

[1]In the previous discussion of Ugaritic letters, various terminology has been used to refer to the formula here called the "benediction" or « ben »: O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 16, called it "[der] Schutz- und Heilswunsch" (with reference to those formulas which employ two verbal forms: N□R and ŠLM), but he also used "der Schutzwunsch" (referring to those Akkadian formulas which employ only NṢR); S. Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 49-56, 77-82, and 117-20, called it "the blessing" (for Ahl, the "statement of obeisance" [=« pros »], the "greeting" [=« sal »] and the "blessing" [=« ben »] together make up the "salutation"); and J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 254, referred to formulas of this type as "les voeux à contenu religieux". The same author's treatment in *HUS* (1999) 363-364, remains substantially unchanged: he refers to the « sal » formulas as "greetings" and to the « ben » formulas as "wishes", or, more specifically, "a wish with a religious content as expressed by the sender in favour of the recipient." In his manuscript, D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 2 (RS 1.018), remarques épistolaires, also distinguishes the « sal » from the « ben »: "Le premier veux [referring to the formula here called the « sal »] constitue donc une salutation et les autres [the formula here called « ben »] des bénédictions." Some students of these texts, however, have not rigorously differentiated the « sal » from the « ben »; so A. L. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 150-153, who groups the « sal » and the « ben » together as the "greetings": he describes them jointly as " … a greeting where the sender wishes the addressee peace and the protection of the gods." Several roughly contemporary Akkadian and Hittite epistolary traditions contain a polite formula which is formally and functionally similar to the Ugaritic « ben ». In discussing "die Grussformeln der Briefe" (from ancient Mesopotamia), B. Landsberger, MAOG 4 (1928-1929) 300-301, distinguishes "die profane (*lū šulmu*)-Formel", that is, the « sal », from "die religiöse (Formel)", that is, the « ben ». The latter he describes as "eine lange stets völlig stereotype

The « ben » formula is treated here, last of the "polite formulas", for the following reasons: (1) when all three polite formulas occur together, the « ben » formula most often occurs in final position;[2] (2) the « ben » follows the « sal » when these two formulas occur together, without the « pros »;[3] and (3) the « ben » typically follows the « pros » when these two formulas occur together, without the « sal ».[4]

Formel, in welcher dem Adressaten Leben und göttlicher Schutz gewünscht." O. Schroeder, *RlA* 2 (1938) 64, refers to the Old Babylonian polite formula which resembles the « ben » as "der Segenswunsch". In treating the letters from the Hittite realm, A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 64 and 67-71, refers to the equivalent of the « ben » formula as "die Segensformeln". Treating the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, J. Huehnergard, *HUS* (1999) 375-376, refers to the « ben » as "an invocation of divine blessing." As was the case for the Ugaritic letters, some scholars do not terminologically differentiate the « sal » from the « ben »: E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 14-15 and throughout, classifies both « sal » and « ben » together as "Grussformeln"; he isolates the different types, but does not give them names. In treating the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, F. B. Knutson, *RSP* 2 (1975) 203-206, also groups the « sal » and the « ben » together as the "salutation formula."

[2]At least six, and possibly as many as nine Ugaritic letters contain all three polite formulas in the order « pros sal ben »: RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 20.199, RS 34.124, RS 94.2428, and RS 94.5003+ certainly contain this sequence; it is possibly present, but needs to be partially reconstructed, in RS 3.427 and RS 18.075 (both of which contain the order « [...] sal ben »), and in RS 94.2391 (where the order is « pros sal [...] »). An exception is RS 29.093, where the polite formulas follow the order « sal ben pros ».

[3]At least fourteen, and possibly as many as seventeen Ugaritic letters containing the « sal » and the « ben » (but omitting the « pros ») follow the pattern « sal ben »: these are RS 1.018, RS 1.021, RS 15.008, RS 15.174, RS 17.139, RS 18.031 (in the sequence « sal ben s.r. i.r. »), RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 19.029, RS 29.095 (in the sequence « sal ben s.r. i.r. »), RS 34.148, RS 92.2005.1 (in the sequence « sal ben s.r. i.r. »), RS 92.2005.2, and RS 94.2537; it may also be found in RS 3.427 and RS 18.075 (which both display the pattern « [...] sal ben »). On RS 17.117, see sections 3.7, 4.7, and 5.7. I know of no Ugaritic letters which contain the opposite order, *« ben sal ».

[4]Four Ugaritic letters contain a sequence of two polite formulas matching the description « pros ben »: RS 8.315 certainly belongs here; and the sequence is found as well in RS 94.2273 (« pros be[n ...] » and in 94.2545+ (a formally atypical letter which contains portions of a second *praescriptio* in the middle of the letter, in which the sequence « RS (body) pros ben (body) » is found; see the edition of that tablet below). RS 18.113+ may belong here as well, even though it contains a "non-standard" « ben »: « RS | pros *ben | body »; see below, section 4.7. An exception to this pattern, however, is RS 92.2010, where the polite formulas follow the order « ben pros ».

4.2 THE COMPOSITION OF THE "STANDARD" BENEDICTION

The brief description of the « ben » formula, offered above, touches on at least three diagnostic aspects of the formula's definition: (1) in terms of distribution, the « ben » formula is an epistolary "polite formula", occurring in the section following the address but prior to the body of the letter; (2) in terms of context and morpho-syntax,[5] it is volitional[6] in mood; and (3) in terms of semantics, it solicits the agency of the gods in establishing the well-being of the recipient. This definition applies to several formally distinct syntagms in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus. Only one such idiom, however, is both statistically predominant and contextually normative, and it is this motif which will be treated in detail in the pages that follow as the "standard" « ben » formula in Ugaritic letters. The other functionally similar motifs may be characterized as "non-standard" benedictions; they are mentioned below, in section 4.7.

4.2.1 The "necessary" components of the benediction

The standard « ben » formula in Ugaritic letters is composed of at least three elements: (1) a noun phrase containing a plural form of the noun *ỉl*, 'god', of which the most common example by far is *ỉlm*, 'the gods',[7] (2) a prefix conjugation form derived

---

[5]The Ugaritic verbs themselves are formally ambiguous as to mood; the prefix conjugation serves to mark several semantically diverse nuances in verbs, including, but not limited to, the expression of wishes. It is context, as well as comparative evidence from the « ben » formulas in contemporary Akkadian and Hittite epistolary traditions, that indicates the volitional use of the prefix conjugation here.

[6]The party whose volition is represented is the sender of the letter; see below, section 4.5.

[7]All of the "standard" « ben » formulas save one contain the "absolute" form *ỉlm* as this element, where the state of preservation allows a determination to be made. The exception occurs in the « ben » of RS 15.008, where this element is represented not by the expected *ỉlm*, but instead by the nominal phrase *ỉly ủgrt*, 'the gods of Ugarit', in which *ỉly* apparently represents an expanded writing of the "construct" form. On the writing of the word *ỉly* with the {y} sign, see below, section 4.6.

from the verb NR,[8] namely *tǵr*(*k*)(*m*), normally written with an attached 2nd person suffix,[9] and (3) an analogous form derived from the verb ŠLM, namely *tšlm*(*k*)(*m*),[10] also typically written with an attached 2nd person suffix. All three compositional elements may be considered as "necessary" components of the formula.[11]

---

[8]On the etymology of the verbal form *tǵrk* (and variants), see below, section 4.6.

[9]The attested forms include (1) *tǵrk*, statistically the most common, where the suffix *-k* is singular, (2) *tǵrkm*, attested only once (RS 92.2005.1), where the suffix *-km* is dual, and (3) *tǵr*, a form attested twice (RS 18.134 and RS 94.2545+), which contains no pronominal suffix. For the writing *tǵr* in the « ben » formulas (*ỉlm tǵr tšlmk*) of both of these latter texts (the transcription *tǵrk*, with suffix, given in *KTU*[2] 2.44:5 for RS 18.134, would appear to be an error; see the *editio princeps* [Virolleaud, *PRU* 5 (1965) 191] and note that D. Pardee's collation of the tablet confirms the editor's reading at this point [see *AuOr* 16 (1996) 98]), a scribal error in both cases for intended *tǵr<k>* cannot be ruled out (the superficial resemblance between {r} and {k}, in fact, would provide a credible mechanism accounting for such an error, namely, haplography), but it is certainly not a necessary assumption, and, in fact, may be erroneous. Note, in particular, RS 92.2005.2, where the « ben » should probably be read {(26, cont'd) . ỉlm (27) [t]šlm . tǵrk (28) [...]⌈-⌉mmk | } (with the editors, P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, *Études ougaritiques* 1 (2001) 372; note that it is conceivable that the first sign of line 27 should be reconstructed as {[l .] šlm} rather than as {[t]šlm}; compare this phrase in the « ben » in line 7 of the first letter). Of interest here is the lack of a pronominal suffix on the first of a series of verbal forms (on this occasion ŠLM, not NR, apparently occurs first), a pattern which fits the cases of RS 18.134 and RS 94.2545+. For a discussion of these forms which lack the pronominal suffix, see below, section 4.6.

[10]Three writings are attested: (1) *tšlmk*, by far the most common, where the suffix *-k* is singular; (2) *tšlmkm*, attested once (RS 92.2005.1), where the suffix *-km* is dual; and [*t*]*šlm*, also attested once (RS 92.2005.2, positioned prior to *tǵrk*; but see the above footnote).

[11]That is to say, the Ugaritic epistolary corpus contains no analog to that pattern found in the « ben » formulas of the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus in which only one verbal predication, usually derived from *naṣāru* (≈ Ug. NR), is present (as in RS 34.160: { | (4) DINGIR.MEŠ PAP-ru-ka | }); for further information on the « ben » formulas in the RS Akkadian corpus, see below, section 4.4. "Non-standard" Ugaratic « ben » formulas are known which contain a single predication, such as that of RS 17.117, « *bʿl yšủl šlmk* », 'May Baʿlu seek your well-being!', but these represent an entirely different compositional pattern, for which, see below, section 4.7. Hypothetical variants of the compositionally "standard" « ben » containing a single predication, such as **ỉlm tǵrk*, 'May the gods guard you!' may one day be discovered in Ugaritic letters, at which point the definition of "necessary" and "optional" elements must be adjusted correspondingly; at this point, however, the data indicate that all three elements described above should be considered "necessary". Furthermore, since, by their distribution, all three components are "necessary", it would be conceptually unhelpful, and inaccurate, to describe the individual verbal constituents, namely *tǵrk*, 'may they guard you!' and *tšlmk*, 'may they keep you well!' as independent formulas in their own right: the Ugaritic « ben » formula is compound in the sense that it contains more than one verbal predication, but it is nevertheless a single formula.

Regarding the order in which the "necessary" components of the formula occur, one may speak both of a consistency and of a variability. The consistency concerns the relative placement of nominal and verbal elements: the noun phrase referring to "the gods" always occurs in first position in the formula, followed by the verbal predicates.[12] The variability involves the order in which the final two verbal elements occur.[13] Most of the time the sequence of verbs is NR -ŠLM,[14] but in a few instances the opposite order is found: ŠLM-NR .[15]

It is unclear, due to the limited nature of the available evidence, whether this variable order is to be linked with other empirically observable aspects of epistolary composition. Nevertheless, when sorted according to the criteria of conceptual status and model, the data, such as they are, reveal certain patterns.

In terms of conceptual status, (1) the sequence NR -ŠLM can be characterized as appropriate for ascending situations;[16] no example of the sequence ŠLM-NR

---

[12]I know of no exceptions to this observation for the "standard" « ben » in the Ugaritic corpus. At least one "non-standard" benediction motifs, however, represents an exception: RS 18.113+.

[13]The poor preservation of the formula in two letters prevents this determination from being made: RS 3.427 and RS 94.2391. This aspect is not applicable, of course, to "non-standard" « ben » formulas: RS 17.117, RS 18.113+, and RS 16.078+.

[14]As many as twenty-four « ben » formulas show this order: RS 1.021 (probably), RS 8.315, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.265.1, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.075 (probably), RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 19.029, RS 20.199 (probably), RS 29.093, RS 34.124, RS 34.148, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2273 (probably), RS 94.2428 (probably), RS 94.2537, RS 94.2545+, RS 94.5003+ (probably), and RS [Varia 4].

[15]This pattern appears in as many as five « ben » formulas: RS 1.018 (probably), RS 15.174, RS 29.095, possibly RS 92.2005.2, and RS 94.2383+.

[16]Of the twenty-four « ben » formulas which certainly or probably show the order N R-ŠLM, thirteen (that is, 54%) occur in conceptually ascending letters: RS 8.315, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 34.124, RS 34.148, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2428, and RS 94.5003+. None of the five « ben » formulas which contain the sequence ŠLM-N R are conceptually ascending. A further distributional feature linked with "ascending" social situations may also be remarked: the sequence N R-ŠLM is also found in the « ben » formulas of

occurs in an ascending situation. (2) Both sequences are attested in conceptually horizontal letters,[17] both in those containing the « RS » order of mention in the address,[18] as well as those containing the « SR » order.[19] (3) Only one conceptually unmarked letter contains a « ben » formula;[20] the verbal elements there follow the sequence ŠLM-NR. (4) Finally, two letters which contain conceptually descending REL terminology employ the « ben » formula;[21] both follow the sequence NR-ŠLM.

RS 94.2273 and RS 94.2545+; both of these letters are conceptually horizontal, yet, in containing also the « pros » formula (the distribution of which is virtually restricted to conceptually ascending letters), they reveal an "ascending" social relationship beneath the explicitly "horizontal" terminology.

[17]Of the twenty-four « ben » formulas containing the sequence N□R-ŠLM, at least six (that is, 25%), and possibly eight (that is, 33%) occur in conceptually horizontal letters: RS 16.265.1, RS 18.031, RS 18.134, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2537, and RS 94.2545+; the REL terminology in the *praescriptio* of RS 1.021 and RS 18.075 has not been preserved, but certain motifs of the body suggest that they too are conceptually horizontal. RS [Varia 4] (the « ben » formula there follows the order N□R-ŠLM) is a conceptually "mixed" letter which contains both horizontal and descending REL terminology. The conceptual status of RS 19.029 (the « ben » formula there also follows the order N□R-ŠLM) is unknown. Of the five « ben » formulas which certainly or probably show the order ŠLM-N□R, at least three (that is, 60%), and probably four (that is, 80%) occur in conceptually horizontal letters: RS 15.174, RS 92.2005.2, and RS 94.2383+; the REL terms in the *praescriptio* of RS 1.018 are not preserved, but the content of the body of the letter leads one to consider the letter conceptually horizontal.

[18]The « RS » order of mention is found in the address formulas of (1) RS 18.031 and RS 18.134 (conceptually HOR letters in which the « ben » formula follows the sequence N□R-ŠLM); and (2) RS 1.018 and RS 94.2383+ (conceptually HOR letters in which the « ben » formula follows the sequence ŠLM-N□R). The epistolary structure of RS 94.2545+ (another HOR letter in which the « ben » formula follows the sequence N□R-ŠLM) is difficult to interpret: it would seem that two recognizable address formulas are present, but certain contextual factors lead me to disfavor the hypothesis that this tablet represents a double letter (on which issue, see below, in the edition of that tablet); the address formula in lines 1-4 follows the order « SR », but second address formula, in lines 9-10, follows the order « RS ».

[19]The « SR » order of mention is found in the address formulas of (1) RS 1.021, RS 16.265.1, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2537, and RS 94.2545+ (conceptually HOR letters in which the « ben » formula follows the sequence N□R-ŠLM); and (2) RS 92.2005.2 and probably RS 15.174 (conceptually HOR letters in which the « ben » formula follows the sequence ŠLM-N□R). On RS 94.2545+, see the remarks in the footnote above.

[20]This is RS 29.095.

[21]These are RS 18.147 and RS [Varia 4]. RS 18.147 uses only descending REL terminology; RS [Varia 4] is conceptually mixed, containing both horizontal and descending REL terminology.

The distribution of the two compositional patterns according to conceptual model is most easily judged without reference to conceptually horizontal letters, since all of these are composed, at least in part,[22] on the biological kinship model.[23] Setting aside these conceptually horizontal letters, then, one can observe a preference for the sequence N R -ŠLM, both in "non-horizontal" letters composed on the hierarchical power model,[24] and in "non-horizontal" letters composed on the biological kinship model.[25] The sequence ŠLM-N R , on the other hand, occurs, on present data, only in letters which are conceptually horizontal and in those which are conceptually unmarked.

---

[22]RS 16.265.1 is one of two Ugaritic letters (the other possible example is the atypical letter RS 15.007) to contain a horizontal REL term which is not conceived on the biological kinship model: *rʿ*, presumably 'companion, friend', perhaps even 'colleague'. One can assume that this term represents the otherwise unattested "horizontal" term appropriate for the hierarchical power model: *bʿl* / *ådt* ('master' / 'mistress'); apparently *rʿ* / ? ('colleague' / *'[female] colleague'); and *ʿbd* / *åmt* ('servant' / 'maidservant'). In this letter, however, the REL term *rʿ* is not used alone, but always occurs alongside the more familiar REL term *åḫ*, 'brother', drawn from the biological kinship model.

[23]In other words, for expressing conceptually "horizontal" relationships, the scribes essentially had only one conceptual model at their disposal (that of biological kinship), and not two, as was the case for ascending and descending social situations. This being the case, the choice of model in horizontal situations carries little meaning.

[24]Setting aside the conceptually HOR letters, of the sixteen « ben » formulas in "non-horizontal" letters which certainly or probably show the order N R-ŠLM, five (that is, 31%) are conceived on the hierarchical power model: RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 34.148, RS 92.2010, and RS 94.2428 (all five are also conceptually ascending). The REL terms of the "mixed" letter RS 8.315 (both of which, *ům* and *ådt*, are ascending) are drawn from both models. No « ben » formula containing the sequence ŠLM-N R occurs in a letter drawn on the hierarchical power model.

[25]Of the sixteen « ben » formulas in "non-horizontal" letters which certainly or probably show the order N R-ŠLM, eight (that is, 50%) are conceived on the biological kinship model: these are RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, and RS 94.5003+, all seven of which are conceptually ASC; and RS 18.147, which is conceptually DESC. RS [Varia 4], a conceptually "mixed" letter, also contains conceptually descending REL terminology conceived on the biological kinship model. Three, and perhaps four « ben » formulas containing the sequence ŠLM-N R occur in letters drawn on the biological kinship model; but all of these are conceptually horizontal, and thus of limited value in this respect (on this topic, see above).

If it be permitted to draw general conclusions from this distribution, the easiest explanation would appear to be following: the sequence NR̄ -ŠLM was preferred in letters which seek, by means of their use of conceptually explicit REL terms, to stress a social status difference between the correspondents, while the sequence ŠLM-NR̄ was preferred when such differences of social status were not explicitly marked. Further interpretation may also be justified: the sequence NR̄ -ŠLM, in paying more attention to differences of social status, expressed more polite deference than the sequence ŠLM-NR̄ . Such polite deference was appropriate not only in ascending social situations, but also in situations where the sender expressed his relationship with the correspondent by means of the more intimate of the two conceptual models, that of biological kinship.

4.2.2 The "optional" components of the benediction

In most cases these three elements, *ìlm*, *tǵrk*, and *tšlmk*, are the only constituents of the formula. A few « ben » formulas, however, contain additional elements whose presence in the « ben » formula may be described as "optional". There are four compositionally "standard" « ben » formulas which contain such expansions: RS 1.018, RS 16.265.1, RS 92.2005.1, and the "piggy-back" letter appended to it, RS 92.2005.2. The expansions themselves are of two types: (1) additional verbal predications, and (2) adverbial phrases.

The "optional" verbal forms include (i) *tʿzzk*, 'may they keep you strong!',[26] attested in RS 1.018 and RS 16.265.1; and (ii) the string {[-]⌜-⌝mmk} in RS 92.2005.2, possibly to be read [*t*]⌜*t*⌝*mmk*, '[may they] keep you ⌜comp⌝lete!'[27] In the « ben » formula of all three letters, these "optional" predications follow the three "necessary" components.

The "optional" adverbial phrases are also two in number; they are found in at least two letters, RS 16.265.1 and RS 92.2005.1.[28] The former, a scribal exercise, contains the compound adverbial phrase *ảlp ym w rbt šnt bʿd ʿlm*, '(for) a thousand day(s) and (for) a myriad of years, (even) unto perpetuity' at the very end of the « ben » formula.[29] The latter contains the prepositional phrase *l šlm*, 'for (the purpose of?)[30] well-being', placed in the interior of the formula, following the initial *ỉlm* element, but prior to the verbal predications.[31]

---

[26]As in the form *tšlmk* and in the reconstructed form [*t*]*tmmk* (see in the text above), the verb here (*tʿzzk*) is in the D-stem, this being the factitive stem for a stative G-stem verb; see G. del Olmo and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 96.

[27]P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee present this interpretation in their edition of this letter, published in RSO 14, no. 49 (M. Yon and D. Arnaud, eds., *Études ougaritiques* 1 [2001] 374).

[28]Depending on the restoration of the beginning of line 27, RS 2005.2 may also belong here.

[29]The « ben » of RS 16.265.1 thus contains both types of "optional" components: the order followed is « *ỉlm* + *tǵrk* + *tšlmk* + the "optional" predication *tʿzzk* + the "optional" compound adverbial phrase *ảlp ym w rbt šnt bʿd ʿlm* ».

[30]It is difficult to judge the semantics of the preposition *l* here; the RS Akkadian analog is *ana šulmāni*. I consider that the use of Ugaritic *l* / Akkadian *ana* in these idioms to express purpose is as plausible as anything else. Thus, the basic clause semantics of the idiom *l šlm* + N□R could be paraphrased: 'May the gods protect you for the purpose of (your) well-being'. On the role of *l šlm* as a complement to the verb N□R, see below, section 4.6.

[31]In other words, the order followed in the « ben » formula of RS 92.2005.1 is « *ỉlm* (first "necessary" component: common noun) + *l šlm* ("optional" adverbial phrase) + *tǵrkm* + *tšlmkm* (second and third "necessary" components: both verbs) ». A similar compositional pattern is fairly frequent among the « ben » formulas of the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus; compare, for example, RS 34.167+: {(3, cont'd) DINGIR.MEŠ a-na šul-ma-ni PAP-ru-[k]a | }; and RS [Varia 25]: {(5) DINGIR.MEŠ a-na

The data are too few to permit a determination of the contextual factors governing the presence or absence of these optional components. In terms of conceptual status, three of the four letters containing an "expanded" « ben » formula are conceptually horizontal,[32] and one ascending.[33] In terms of the conceptual model used to express the social relationship between the correspondents, all four letters employ, at least in part,[34] the biological kinship model, but this fact loses some of its weight since three of these letters are conceptually horizontal, and the only model productively used to express horizontal relationships was that of biological kinship. Other speculations are also possible, provided their tentative nature is kept in mind: (1) "Family letters",[35] such as RS 92.2005.1 and its "piggy-back" letter, RS 92.2005.2, might be expected to show a warmer tone, and the expansions to the « ben » formula could be interpreted as a sign of an "expanded" amount of such solicitude or deference. (2) Scribal exercises, such as RS 16.265.1,[36] might also be expected to display

---

šul-ma-ni (6) PAP-ru-ka}. It is conceivable that RS 92.2005.2 belongs here as well, and should be reconstructed as {(26, cont'd) ilm (27) [l .] šlm . tǵrk (28) [tšlmk . t]⌈-⌉mmk} (the plausibility of this proposal depends on the size of the lacuna in line 28).

[32]RS 16.265.1 and RS 92.2005.2 are conceptually horizontal; RS 1.018 is very likely so.

[33]RS 92.2005.1.

[34]RS 16.265.1 employs two REL terms, one, *åḫ*, is derived from the biological kinship model, the other, *rʿ*, is otherwise unattested as an epistolary REL term; it may represent a rare usage of the "horizontal" term drawn from the hierarchical power model: 'colleague'.

[35]The REL terms of RS 92.2005.1 and RS 92.2005.2 are best interpreted literally.

[36]That the epistolary portion of the tablet RS 16.265 was a scribal exercise is clear on both contextual and epigraphic grounds. On the contextual side, note: (1) the presence of abecedaries and word-lists on the same tablet, (2) the plausible interpretation of the "recipient" of the letter as indefinite: *l mnn*, 'to whomever' (the personal indefinite [usually interrogative] pronoun *mn* + enclitic *n*), and (3) the frivolous nature of the message itself (*tn ks yn w ištn*, 'Give (me) a cup of wine so I may drink (it)!'). From an epigraphic point of view, note: (4) the extraneous wedges, as at the end of line 6 (whether these derive from imperfectly erased previous impressions or were intended to be purely decorative; compare the presence of similar wedges on RS 94.2273), and (5) the fact that the two faces

expanded forms of typical motifs.[37] Finally, (3) the sender of RS 1.018, in addressing his letter to *rb khnm*, 'the chief (of the) priest(s)', might, by virtue of the latter's position, have considered certain elaborations in the divine benediction to be appropriate for his correspondent.

4.2.3 Survey of the attested compositional patterns

Given this inventory of "necessary" and "optional" components, it is possible to catalog the various combinations of these different components among the attested « ben » formulas. The purpose of such a survey is that it allows one to recognize, among the theoretically possible compositional patterns, those which may be regarded as typical or atypical for the Ugaritic corpus. This will prove useful in interpreting the data derived from comparative corpora, especially that of the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.

Among the thirty Ugaritic « ben » formulas which may be considered compositionally standard,[38] the compositional structure is perceptible in all cases but one.[39] Of these twenty-nine unambiguous examples, twenty-five display a compositional structure consisting of all three "necessary" components and no other components:

---

of the tablet were impressed in different orientations (the side containing the letter is impressed "height-wise", but the word-lists are impressed "width-wise"; the faces of RS 94.2273 were also impressed in different orientations).

[37]Compare the expanded "request" motif in lines 7-16 of this letter, and the expanded « pros » formula on RS 94.2273.

[38]Thus, I omit the « ben » formulas of RS 17.117 and RS 18.113+ from this triage.

[39]The fragmentary state of RS 3.427 prevents any identification of its compositional pattern. This applies also to RS 94.2931, which may contain traces of a « ben » formula in line 8.

(1) twenty-two show the order « [*ỉlm*] + [NR̄] + [ŠLM] »,[40]

and (2) three show the order « [*ỉlm*] + [ŠLM] + [NR̄] ».[41]

The four « ben » formulas which remain unaccounted for[42] all contain optional components. Among these, at least three distinct compositional patterns are attested:

(3) « [*ỉlm*] + [*l šlm*] + [NR̄] + [ŠLM] », attested once, in RS 92.2005.1;

(4) « [*ỉlm*] + [NR̄] + [ŠLM] + [ʿZZ] + [temporal adverbial phrase] », attested at least once, in RS 16.265.1, and possibly also in RS 1.018;[43]

and (5) « [*ỉlm*] + [ŠLM] + [NR̄] + [?] + [TMM?] », apparently attested once, in RS 92.2005.2.[44]

4.2.4 Reference to the recipient in the benediction

A further aspect of note regarding the composition of the Ugaritic « ben » formula involves the means by which reference is made to the recipient: the formula

---

[40]These are RS 1.021 (probably), RS 8.315, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.075 (probably), RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 19.029, RS 20.199 (probably), RS 29.093, RS 34.124 (probably), RS 34.148, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2273 (probably), RS 94.2428 (probably), RS 94.2537 (probably), RS 94.2545+ (probably), RS 94.5003+ (probably), and RS [Varia 4].

[41]These are RS 15.174, RS 29.095, and RS 94.2383+.

[42]These are RS 1.018, RS 16.265.1, RS 92.2005.1, and its "piggyback" letter RS 92.2005.2.

[43]The observable pattern of the « ben » of RS 1.018 can be characterized as « [?] + [N□R] + [ŠLM] + [ʿZZ] + [temporal adverbial phrase?] + [further verbal form?] ». The last two components, here characterized as "[temporal adverbial phrase?]" and "[further verbal form?]", are informed guesses. It is also possible that the « ben » formula of this letter ended with the form *tʿzz*[*k*], and that the two-and-a-half lines which follow contained instead a concise version of the "double formula of well-being"; such a formulaic pattern (including the disposition of the horizontal scribal lines) is found in RS 18.031, RS RS 20.199, RS 29.095, and RS 92.2005.1.

[44]This is the pattern understood by the editors (P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee *Études ougaritiques* 1 [2001] 371-374). That the second element, however, is indeed a verbal form, [*t*]*šlm*, and not a prepositional phrase, [*l*] *šlm*, as above in the first letter, RS 92.2005.1, is not evident.

always makes use of a 2nd person pronominal suffix to refer to the recipient, regardless of the conceptual status of the letter, and never a conceptually explicit REL term or even a 3rd person pronominal form. It is above all this usage of the 2nd person in the « ben » formulas of conceptually ascending letters that is striking here, since reference to the recipient in such ASC letters is generally accomplished, not only in the body of the letter but also in the other formulas of the *praescriptio*, using 3rd person grammatical forms: conceptually ascending REL terms and 3rd person pronominal forms.

Such a usage may be characterized as "atypical" for the Ugaritic epistolary tradition in general, where the presence of formal differences between ascending and non-ascending letters are so frequent as to be almost diagnostic. When this fact is situated alongside other indicators, such as the word order followed in the formula, where the grammatical subject always precedes the verbal predications, and the presence of a formally similar polite formulas in Old Babylonian letters, one wonders if the Ugaritic « ben » formula does not preserve, in its syntax as well as its means of reference, certain conventions of an older or foreign epistolary tradition.

4.3 Distribution of the benediction formula

The "standard" « ben » formula appears as many as thirty-one times within the corpus of Ugaritic letters,[45] and is explicitly or probably absent from at least twenty-six

---

[45]The following thirty-one letters contain a recognizable "standard" « ben » formula (the parenthetical notation "partially reconstructed" is added when one or more of the necessary components of the formula need to be reconstructed): RS 1.018 (partially reconstructed), RS 1.021 (partially reconstructed), RS 3.427 (partially reconstructed), RS 8.315, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 15.174, RS 16.265.1, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.075 (partially reconstructed), RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 19.029, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 29.095, RS 34.124 (partially reconstructed), RS 34.148, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2383+, very probably

letters.[46] Like the other "polite formulas", it is an optional component of Ugaritic epistolary structure. No known Ugaritic letter contains more than one « ben » formula.

4.3.1 The benediction in conceptually UNMARKED letters

As was also the case with the other "polite formula", the presence or absence of the « ben » formula appears to have been linked to the choice of conceptual terminology used to express the social relationship between the correspondents. One of the most important terminological categories in the Ugaritic corpus is represented by those letters which employ no conceptual terminology whatsoever, that is, conceptually UNMARKED letters. The Ugaritic epistolary corpus contains at least seven,[47] and possibly as many as ten[48] such letters. Of these, only one contains the « ben » formula: RS 29.095.[49]

If one takes the respective identity of the correspondents into consideration, it is clear that conceptually UNMARKED letters were very frequently used in what may be

---

RS 94.2931 (partially reconstructed), RS 94.2428 (partially reconstructed), RS 94.2537 (partially reconstructed), RS 94.2545+, RS 94.5003+, and RS [Varia 4]; RS 18.[482] may belong here as well. At least three letters contain a "non-standard" polite formula answering the description of the « ben »: RS 16.078+, RS 17.117, and RS 18.113+.

[46]RS 4.475, RS 9.479A, RS 15.007, RS 15.158 (probably), RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.264, RS 16.402, RS 17.063, RS 17.434+ (probably), RS 18.038, RS 18.040, RS 18.140.2, RS 18.148, RS 18.286[A], RS 19.011, RS 19.102.2, RS 88.2159, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2429, RS 94.2479, RS 94.2580, RS 96.2039, RIH 77/21A, and RIH 78/12. RS 18.287 probably contains no trace of the « ben » formula; see above, section 2.1.2.

[47]These are RS 4.475, RS 15.158, RS 16.264, RS 18.038, RS 29.095, RS 94.2406.1, and RS 94.2580.

[48]Three other Ugaritic letters, of which the conceptual terminology is technically "unknown" due to tablet damage, were probably conceptually "unmarked" as well: RS 17.434+, RS 94.2429, and RIH 77/21A. None of these contains the « ben » formula.

[49]Compare the marked infrequency of the « ben » formula among conceptually UNMARKED letters in Hittite recovered from Boğazköy and Ma□at; see below, section 4.4.4.2.5.

described as "contextually descending" social situations. Of the eight Ugaritic letters which may plausibly be placed in this category,[50] none contains a « ben » formula.

4.3.2 Distribution according to conceptual status

The conceptually explicit relational terminology used in the letters may be distinguished according to two criteria, that of status and that of model. In principle, a triage according to either or both of these could reveal recognizable patterns in the distribution of the « ben » formula. Since distinctions of conceptual status prove to be especially useful in explaining (1) the order of the components in the address formula, (2) the presence or absence of the « pros » formula, and (3) the order of the components of the « sal » formula, it would not be inappropriate to seek to explain the distribution of the « ben » formula by similar means.

The most common conceptual status in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus is that of ascending letters. As many as forty conceptually ascending letters may be identified;[51] the state of preservation of the *praescriptio* of twenty-nine[52] of these is

---

[50]The following terminologically unmarked letters may be considered "contextually descending": RS 15.158 (from [*mlk g*]*rgmš* to [<PN> *m*]*lk ůgrt*), RS 16.264 (from *mlk* to <PN>), RS 18.038 (from *špš* to <PN>), RS 94.2406.1 (from *mlkt* to <PN>), and RS 94.2580 (from *mlkt* to <PN>). The terminological classification of RS 94.2429 (from *mlk*[*t*?] to *skn*) and RIH 77/21A (from *š*[*pš mlk*] *rb* to *m*[?]) is technically "unknown", though in all probability they are conceptually "unmarked" letters, and may also be considered "contextually descending" as well. The conceptual terminology of RS 17.434+ (from *pdǵb mlk*[*t* ?] to *nqmd*) is also technically unknown. The most obvious identification of the correspondents, however, leads one to assume a contextually descending social setting (Note, however, that the *praescriptio* of this letter follows a model familiar from the Amarna corpus for international diplomatic correspondence between "brothers", not for descending relationships).

[51]See section 0.6.5.

[52]Of the known conceptually ascending letters, the *praescriptio* is entirely missing from nine (RS 15.098, RS 15.191[A], RS 16.078+, RS 16.196, RS 18.[387], RS 18.[565], RS 18.286[B], RS 94.5015, and RIH 77/01), and too damaged to be revealing in four (RS 18.[312], RS 19.102.1,

sufficient to yield information on the presence of the « ben » formula: fifteen conceptually ascending letters contain the « ben » formula,[53] and fourteen omit it.[54]

Of the eighteen Ugaritic letters which contain explicitly horizontal relational terminology,[55] the « ben » formula is present in thirteen,[56] and omitted from five.[57]

Three Ugaritic letters certainly or apparently contain explicitly descending REL terminology.[58] Of these three, the *praescriptio* of RS 19.181A is not sufficiently preserved to yield meaningful data, but the « ben » formula is present in the other two letters. Despite this fact, however, the small inventory of descending letters, the "mixed" status of one of these, and the use of different conceptual models among these three letters, ought to caution against a conclusion that the « ben » formula was appropriate in conceptually descending situations.

RS 94.5009, and RIH 78/03+); this leaves a corpus of twenty-nine ascending letters for which the presence or absence of the « ben » formula is observable.

[53]RS 8.315, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.113, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 34.124, RS 34.148, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2428, and RS 94.5003+.

[54]RS 9.479A, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.402, RS 17.117, RS 17.327, RS 18.040, RS 18.140.2, RS 18.148, RS 18.287, RS 19.011, RS 19.102.2, RS 34.356, RS 94.2479, and RIH 78/12.

[55]See section 0.6.5. Several letters which, because of their poor state of preservation, are technically "unknown" may also have been conceptually horizontal: RS 1.020, RS 3.334, RS 3.427, RS 18.286[A], RS 19.029, perhaps RS 19.181A [but see below], and RS 88.2159. Of these, three are too poorly preserved to be of much use (RS 1.020, RS 3.334, and 19.181A), two contain a « ben » formula (RS 3.427 and RS 19.029), and two omit it (RS 18.286[A] and RS 88.2159).

[56]These are RS 1.018, RS 1.021, RS 15.174, RS 16.265.1, RS 18.031, RS 18.075, RS 18.134, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2537, and RS 94.2545+; as well as RS [Varia 4], a "mixed" letter which contains horizontal as well as descending REL terminology.

[57]RS 15.007, RS 17.063, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2406.2, and RS 96.2039.

[58]RS 18.147, apparently RS 19.181A, and RS [Varia 4]. RS 18.147 is DESC BIO; RS 19.181A is apparently DESC POW; and RS [Varia 4] is of mixed status, containing both horizontal and descending terminology (both drawn from the BIO model).

The results of this triage by conceptual status are not revealing for conceptually ascending and descending letters: about half of the known ascending letters contain the « ben » formula, the other half omit it; and as mentioned, the data for the descending letters is deficient. In fact, the only conceptual status which shows a noticeable pattern in the distribution of the « ben » formula is that of the horizontal letters: on present data, thirteen out of seventeen (or 76%) of the unambiguous examples contain the formula. Since, apart from the horizontal letters, the distribution of the « ben » formula shows no obvious links with differences of conceptual status, and since letters of conceptually horizontal status virtually always made use of the biological kinship model,[59] one's attention is immediately drawn to the possibility that the distribution of the formula is to be linked first and foremost with differences of conceptual model. Such a suspicion is borne out by the data.

4.3.3 Distribution according to conceptual model

The REL terms used in Ugaritic letters are drawn from two conceptual models: that of biological kinship and that of hierarchical relationships of power. Twenty-five Ugaritic letters employ REL terms derived from the biological kinship model.[60] Of

---

[59]Unlike the case of ascending and descending letters, in which the scribes made productive use of two different conceptual models to express the relationships between the correspondents, there is no indication that any model other than that of biological kinship was productively used to express "horizontal" relationships.

[60]See section 0.6.5. Of these twenty-five, eight are conceptually ascending in terms of status (RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 19.102.1, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, and RS 94.5003+), fifteen are horizontal (RS 1.018, RS 1.021, RS 15.174, RS 17.063, RS 18.031, RS 18.075, RS 18.134, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2537, RS 94.2545+, and RS 96.2039), one descending (RS 18.147), and one of mixed status (RS [Varia 4] makes use of BIO terms appropriate for two different statuses: horizontal and descending).

these, the presence or absence of the « ben » may be determined in twenty-three cases:[61] nineteen letters contain the « ben » formula,[62] and four omit it.[63] Those from which the « ben » formula was certainly omitted are all conceptually horizontal letters. Since conceptually horizontal letters do not effectively represent the conscious choice of the BIO model over the POW model,[64] they carry less weight in analysis than letters which contain conceptually ascending or descending REL terms drawn on the BIO model; in these latter cases the presence of the « ben » formula is, on present data, universal.[65]

---

[61]RS 19.102.1 (ASC BIO) and RS 18.075 (HOR BIO) contain no information regarding the presence or absence of the « ben » formula.

[62]These are RS 1.018, RS 1.021, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 15.174, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2537, RS 94.2545+, RS 94.5003+; and RS [Varia 4].

[63]These are RS 17.063, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2406.2, and RS 96.2039. RS 17.063 shows many features which are not consistent with the "standard" Ugaritic epistolary tradition. In addition, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2406.2, and RS 96.2039 all present address formulas of the order « SR », which probably indicates that, despite the presence of explicitly HOR terminology, these letters derive from effectively "descending" social situations. Two other letters, which must be considered conceptually "unknown" due to their state of preservation, may also have been horizontal (and thus, by default, drawn form the BIO model): RS 18.286[A] and RS 88.2159. Neither contains the « ben » formula.

[64]The Ugaritian scribes used the biological kinship model for horizontal letters more by default than by conscious choice. Though horizontal REL terms drawn from the POW model may have existed (such as *rʿ*, 'colleague'), they were not in productive use: only one set of REL terms (*åḫ* / *åḫt*) was available for expressing horizontal relationships. This being the case, it is only with difficulty that the structural features of horizontal letters, virtually all of which are drawn on the BIO model, can be assumed to be representative of the BIO model over against the POW model.

[65]I know of no exceptions to this statement: every ASC BIO letter for which such a determination is possible contains the « ben » formula (these are seven in number: RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, and RS 94.5003+); and the single DESC BIO letter and the single MIXED BIO letter both contain the « ben ».

As many as twenty-nine Ugaritic letters contain REL terms drawn from the hierarchical power model.[66] Of these, twelve contain no data regarding the presence or absence of the « ben » formula,[67] leaving a corpus of seventeen letters drawn from the POW model for which explicit data on the distribution of the « ben » is available.[68] In these seventeen letters, a recognizable « ben » formula is present in as many as six cases,[69] and absent from eleven.[70]

The data are relatively clear: the « ben » was especially appropriate in letters composed on the biological kinship model; it was rare[71] in letters composed on the

---

[66]See section 0.6.5. Of these, twenty-seven are conceptually ascending (RS 9.479A, RS 15.191[A], RS 16.078+, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.196, RS 16.402, RS 17.327, RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 18.140.2, RS 18.148, RS 18.287, RS 18.[312], RS 18.[565], RS 19.011, RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 34.148, RS 34.356, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2428, RS 94.2479, RS 94.5009, RS 94.5015, and RIH 78/03+), apparently one conceptually horizontal (RS 15.007; this letter is unique in the Ugaritic corpus), and apparently one conceptually descending letter (RS 19.181A; such letters are extremely rare not only in the Ugaritic corpus, but also across the contemporary cuneiform epistolary traditions).

[67]RS 15.191[A], RS 16.078+, RS 16.196, RS 17.327, RS 18.287, RS 18.[312], RS 18.[565], RS 19.181A, RS 94.2428, RS 94.5009, RS 94.5015, and RIH 78/03+. In addition, three letters which are technically of "unknown" conceptual status probably belong here as well, though the *praescriptio* is not preserved: RS 18.286[B], RS 18.[387], and RIH 77/01.

[68]RS 9.479A, RS 15.007, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.402, RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 18.140.2, RS 18.148, RS 19.011, RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 34.148, RS 34.356, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2391, and RS 94.2479.

[69]These are RS 20.199, RS 29.093, RS 34.148, RS 92.2010, and possibly RS 94.2391. RS 18.113+ also contains a « ben » formula, though of "non-standard" composition; see below, section 4.7.

[70]These are RS 9.479A, RS 15.007, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.402, RS 18.040, RS 18.140.2, RS 18.148, RS 19.011, RS 19.102.2, RS 34.356, and RS 94.2479.

[71]Those few POW letters which contain a « ben » formula are often not without other unusual features: the « ben » of RS 18.113+ is "non-standard", the order of the "polite formulas" in RS 29.093 (« sal ben pros ») is otherwise unattested in Ugaritic, and RS 34.148, though an ascending POW letter addressed to *mlk*, contains no « pros » formula, and the « sal » formula displays a compositional order typical of non-ascending letters. Finally, the presence of a « ben » formula in RS 94.2391 is by no means certain. This leaves only two letters, RS 20.199 and RS 92.2010, which not only contain ASC

hierarchical power model, and rare in those letters for which the conceptual relationship between the correspondents was unmarked. In light of this distribution, one may speculate that above all else the « ben » formula denotes intimacy or familiarity of one sort or another; its presence in a letter would seem to indicative that the sender wished to express his closeness to the correspondent, either as kin (shown by the prominence of the « ben » in BIO letters) or as a social equal (shown by the prominence of the « ben » in conceptually horizontal letters).

4.3.4 The placement of the benediction among the "polite formulas"

The placement of the « ben » formula in the letter is fairly consistent: it is a "polite formula", occurring in that section of the letter which follows the address but precedes the body of the letter.[72] Within this "polite formula" section, it may occur either alone, or along with one or both of the other polite formulas.

One can speak of at least four distributional categories: (1) those letters in which the « ben » formula is the only polite formula present,[73] (2) those letters in which the « ben » occurs along with the « pros » formula, but without the « sal »

POW terminology but also display structural patterns entirely consistent with other ASC POW letters, which contain a « ben » formula.

[72]The single exception is RS 16.078+. The standard *praescriptio* is not present, but a motif resembling the benediction is found within the body of this letter, in lines 15-24. This motif does not resemble the standard « ben » formula, however, neither in composition nor in distribution; see below, section 4.7.

[73]There are three such letters (the structure of the *praescriptio* is given in angled brackets): RS 16.265.1 « SR *ben | », RS 94.2383+ « RS | ben | », and RS [Varia 4] « SR ben | ». Compare this category in the RS Akkadian (RS 15.063, RS 16.111, RS 17.148.2, RS 20.174A, RS 25.131, RS 34.133, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.141, RS 34.153, RS 34.160, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.173, and RS 34.180,17; compare also RS 4.449 in which the « ben » is the only "polite formula" present but is not separated from the adjacent sections by scribal lines) and Meskene (Msk 7461 and ME 53.2) corpora.

formula,[74] (3) those letters in which the « ben » occurs along with the « sal » formula, but without the « pros » formula,[75] and (4) those letters in which the « pros », « sal », and « ben » formulas are all present.[76]

Its placement shows certain consistencies: (1) the « ben » formula always occurs immediately following the « sal » formula when both appear together,[77] and (2) the « ben » formula tends to occur following the « pros » formula when both appear together, whether or not the « sal » formula is present.[78]

---

[74]Two patterns are probably attested for this category: (1) the order « pros ben », and (2) the order « ben pros ». The order « pros ben » is found in RS 8.315 « RS | pros ben », probably in RS 94.2273 « ⌜S⌝R *pros be[n ...] » (I say "probably" because there are no known examples of Ugaritic letters in which a « sal » formula follows the « ben », and thus its presence is unlikely), and 94.2545+ (an atypical letter, which contains portions of a second *praescriptio* in the middle of the letter; this second *praescriptio* follows the order « RS (body motif) pros ben (body) »). RS 18.113+ may belong here as well, even though it contains a "non-standard" « ben »: « RS | pros *ben | ». The order « ben pros » is found in only one letter, RS 92.2010 « RS ben pros ».

[75]Only one pattern is known for this category, and it is a common one: « sal ben ». No known Ugaritic letter displays the pattern « ben sal ». The pattern « sal ben » is attested in at least fourteen, possibly as many as seventeen letters: RS 1.018, RS 1.021, RS 15.008, RS 15.174, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 19.029, RS 29.095, RS 34.148, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, and RS 94.2537. This structure is possibly to be found in RS 3.427 and RS 18.075 (which are both « [...] sal ben »). On the *praescriptio* of RS 17.117, which probably does not contain a salutation, see above, section 3.7.

[76]Two patterns are attested for this category, (1) « pros sal ben », by far the most common, and (2) « sal ben pros », attested once. The pattern « pros sal ben » is found in six, and possibly as many as nine letters: RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 20.199, RS 34.124, RS 94.2428, and RS 94.5003+. This structure is possibly present, but needs to be reconstructed, in RS 3.427 and RS 18.075 (both of which contain the order « [...] sal ben »), and in RS 94.2391 (« pros sal [ben] »). The pattern « sal ben pros » is found only in RS 29.093.

[77]I know of no exceptions to this tendency.

[78]There are two exceptions: RS 29.093 « RS2 *sal ben pros | », in which all three polite formulas are present, and RS 92.2010 « RS ben pros », from which the « sal » is absent. Elsewhere, the « pros » precedes the « ben » formula.

Among the polite formula structures which omit the « ben » formula, at least three patterns are known, though each is rare: (1) the structure « sal »,[79] which omits both the « pros » and « ben » formulas; (2) the structure « pros sal »,[80] which omits only the « ben » formulas; and (3) the structure « s.r. sal »,[81] representing an "Amarna-style" double formula of well-being composed of a formulaic "situation report" followed by a salutation, which also omits both the « pros » and « ben » formulas.

4.4 Comparative evidence for the benediction

The most important comparative evidence for the interpretation of the Ugaritic benediction formula derives from roughly contemporary cuneiform epistolary traditions which employ a similar polite formula which parallels the Ugaritic « ben » in both composition and distribution. This evidence is treated in the section which immediately follows.

An eventual study of the *Sitz-im-Leben* of the « ben » formula, however, must also move beyond the epistolary genre in its attempt to place the formula in its

---

[79]One example: RS 15.158 « ⌜SR⌝ ⌜sal⌝ | » (probably conceptually unmarked, though contextually descending).

[80]Letters which contain the « pros » and « sal » formulas but lack the « ben » formula are rare in the Ugaritic corpus: at least two are known: RS 16.402 and 94.2479. Given the presence of the « pros » formula, it is not surprising that both of these are ascending letters, and conceived on the hierarchical power model. I omit RS 18.[364] from consideration here, due to the paucity of the evidence for the presence of the « pros » formula in line 3': (1) the string {[...]mr⌜ḥ⌝[...]} is insufficient to exclude reconstructions other than the « pros » formula, and (2) the « sal » formula, followed by a horizontal scribal line, followed by the « pros » formula is an otherwise unattested sequence in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus. To my knowledge, this structure, « pros sal » is also rare in the comparative corpora. Among the Amarna letters, for example, the only parallel of which I am aware is EA 48 (a "Ugarit" provenance of this letter is occasionally proposed; compare W. F. Albright in *BASOR* 95 (1944) 30-33).

[81]One example: RS 17.434+ « SR ⌜s.r.?⌝ ⌜sal⌝ | » (probably conceptually unmarked, though contextually descending).

contextual setting in everyday life, and so must consider other types of literary parallels. I know of very few Ugaritic benediction motifs outside of the epistolary corpus which are formally parallel to the « ben » formula. A number of functionally comparable motifs, that is, motifs which contain volitional expressions addressed to an individual, soliciting the agency of the gods in promoting the well-being of the addressed individual, are recognizable, however, in other literary genres in the Ugaritic corpus. A selection of these functional parallels are treated following the epistolary evidence.

Finally, this section also treats a selection of those benediction motifs in Akkadian and Hittite sources which are at once formally parallel to the standard Ugaritic epistolary « ben » formula, and derive from non-epistolary sources.

4.4.1 The « ben » formula in other epistolary traditions

If such non-epistolary benediction motifs, which offer functional but not formal parallels to the epistolary « ben » formula, are valuable in considering the contextual setting of the formula, the corpus of those roughly contemporary Akkadian and Hittite « ben » formulas which offer both formal and functional parallels for the Ugaritic « ben » is particularly crucial for an appreciation of the Ugaritic epistolary tradition itself, and of its kinship with these foreign traditions.

In order to facilitate this study, some selection was required. I have limited my purview to those formulas which present the closest formal parallels with the "standard" Ugaritic « ben » formula. Thus, this survey is not so much concerned with the presence in other epistolary traditions of polite motifs which fall under the general

definition of a "benediction",[82] as it is with those particular formulas which not only satisfy such a definition, but also show precise compositional parallels with the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula. In this sense, certain comparative corpora reveal themselves as more important than others: as might have been expected, the closest compositional parallels for the Ugaritic « ben » are to be found in the Akkadian and Hittite letters from western peripheral sites: Ras Shamra itself, Tell Meskene, Atchana, Boğazköy, Ma□at Höyük, and other sites which have yielded minor epigraphic finds. The « ben » formulas from these corpora are treated in the following pages, beginning with the most important corpus, those formulas occurring in letters recovered from Ras Shamra.

4.4.1.1 Ras Shamra Akkadian letters

Of the one hundred ninety Ras Shamra Akkadian letters taken into consideration in this study,[83] seventy-three contain a recognizable "benediction",[84]

---

[82]See above, section 4.2.

[83]Sixteen letters, distributed over fourteen tablets (one of these contains three letters), were published by D. Arnaud, F. Malbran-Labat, and S. Lackenbacher in *Études ougaritiques* 1 (2001) 239-290. The volume reached for me too late to be taken into account in the composition of this section; the data are in any case consistent with the conclusions drawn from the previously published corpus.

[84]RS 4.449, RS 6.198, RS 11.723, RS 11.730, RS 12.005, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 15.063, RS 15.077, RS 16.111, RS 16.116, RS 17.078, RS 17.083, RS 17.116, RS 17.142, RS 17.143, RS 17.144, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.148.2, RS 17.152, RS 17.239, RS 17.286, RS 17.288, RS 17.390, RS 17.397B+, RS 17.429, RS 18.089, RS 19.053, RS 19.070, RS 19.115, RS 20.015, RS 20.017, RS 20.021, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.150, RS 20.158, RS 20.172, RS 20.174A, RS 20.178.1, RS 20.178.2, RS 20.200B, RS 20.225, RS 20.227.1, RS 20.239, RS 20.242, RS 20.255A, RS 21.007C, RS 21.183, RS 21.201, RS 22.006, RS 25.131, RS 34.133, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.137, RS 34.141, RS 34.142, RS 34.153, RS 34.154, RS 34.158, RS 34.160, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.163, RS 34.164, RS 34.167+, RS 34.173, RS 34.180,17, RIH 81/4, RS [Varia 16], RS [Varia 25], and RS [Varia 26]. RS 12.005 is a special case: it resembles the Ugaritic text RS 16.078+ in that a recognizable, but not compositionally standard, « ben » formula is present in the preserved body of the letter, and not within the formulaic *praescriptio*.

seventy-two explicitly omit it,[85] and forty-five are not preserved well enough for its presence or absence to be known.[86]

All but one of the seventy-three letters which contain a recognizable "benediction" fit the broad three element definition of the « ben » formula given above:[87] (1) they occur in that section of the letter devoted to the "polite formulas", (2) they are volitional in mood, and (3) in terms of content, they solicit the agency of the gods in establishing the well-being of the recipient.[88] For these seventy-two letters, the distribution of the formula may be mapped against the classificatory criteria of conceptual status and conceptual model.

---

[85]RS 1.[056], RS 1.[057], RS 8.333, RS 10.046, RS 12.033, RS 13.007bis (probably), RS 15.011, RS 15.014, RS 15.178, RS 16.003, RS 16.112, RS 17.130, RS 17.132, RS 17.133, RS 17.247, RS 17.289, RS 17.292, RS 17.315, RS 17.383, RS 17.385, RS 17.391, RS 17.393, RS 17.394+, RS 17.422, RS 17.423, RS 17.425, RS 17.428, RS 19.006, RS 19.050, RS 19.080, RS 20.003, RS 20.013.1, RS 20.013.2, RS 20.016, RS 20.018, RS 20.019, RS 20.022, RS 20.033, RS 20.151, RS 20.162, RS 20.168, RS 20.184, RS 20.212, RS 20.216, RS 20.219, RS 20.232, RS 20.237, RS 20.238, RS 20.243, RS 20.248, RS 21.064, RS 25.138, RS 25.461, RS 32.204.1, RS 32.204.2, RS 34.129, RS 34.135, RS 34.136, RS 34.138, RS 34.139, RS 34.140, RS 34.143, RS 34.145, RS 34.146, RS 34.149, RS 34.150, RS 34.151, RS 34.152, RS 34.155, RS 34.165 (probably?), RS 34.180,60, and CK 107 (= RS [Varia 35]).

[86]RS 11.794, RS 11.834, RS 15.018, RS 15.019, RS 15.124, RS 17.398, RS 17.451, RS 17.452, RS 17.455, RS 17.456, RS 18.054, RS 18.057, RS 18.268. RS 18.281, RS 20.[438], RS 20.095A, RS 20.130, RS 20.141A, RS 20.141B, RS 20.159, RS 20.182A+, RS 20.182C, RS 20.182D, RS 20.189D, RS 20.191, RS 20.194, RS 20.196D, RS 20.200A, RS 20.200C, RS 20.214D, RS 20.227.2, RS 20.244, RS 20.246, RS 20.426,14+, RS 21.006C, RS 21.054B, RS 21.063F, RS 26.158, RS 34.170, RS 34.171.1, RS 34.171.2, RS 34.174, RS 34.180,13, RS 34.180,5, and RS 1980.387.

[87]See above, section 4.2.

[88]The exception is RS 12.005, which, like the non-standard Ugaritic "benediction" of RS 16.078+, not only presents an atypical compositional pattern, but also occurs within the body of the letter, not within the formulaic *praescriptio*.

4.4.1.1.1 DISTRIBUTION

Sixteen of the seventy-two « ben » formulas in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus occur in conceptually unmarked letters,[89] and eight in letters of unknown conceptual status.[90] This leaves forty-eight examples of the formula which occur in letters in which the conceptual relationship between the correspondents is explicitly stated; such letters may be sorted according to both status and model. In terms of status, seven of these forty-eight « ben » formulas occur in conceptually ascending letters,[91] thirty-three in conceptually horizontal letters,[92] and eight in conceptually descending letters.[93] In terms of model, forty-six of the forty-eight « ben » formulas occur in letters conceived on the biological kinship model,[94] and two in those conceived on the hierarchical power model.[95]

---

[89]RS 4.449, RS 15.077, RS 17.239, RS 17.288, RS 17.397B+, RS 20.015, RS 20.017, RS 20.021, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.174A, RS 20.239, RS 22.006, RS 34.137, RS 34.158, RS 34.160, and RS [Varia 16].

[90]RS 16.116, RS 17.390, RS 17.429, RS 19.115, RS 20.225, RS 20.242, RS 21.007C, and RS 21.201.

[91]RS 17.083, RS 17.143, RS 19.070, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.150, RS 20.178.2, and RS 34.142. Of these, at least two are composed on the POW model: RS 20.023.2 and RS 34.142; the rest are composed on the BIO model. RS 34.142 represents an epistolary tradition foreign to local conventions.

[92]RS 6.198, RS 11.723, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 15.063, RS 17.116, RS 17.142, RS 17.144, RS 17.148.2, RS 17.286, RS 18.089, RS 19.053, RS 20.158, RS 20.172, RS 20.178.1, RS 20.200B, RS 20.227.1, RS 21.183, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.141, RS 34.153, RS 34.154, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.163, RS 34.164, RS 34.167+, RS 34.173, RS 34.180,17, RIH 81/4, RS [Varia 25], and RS [Varia 26].

[93]RS 11.730, RS 16.111, RS 17.078, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.152, RS 20.255A, RS 25.131, and RS 34.133.

[94]These forty-six letters include five of the seven ASC letters which contain the « ben » (RS 17.083, RS 17.143, RS 19.070, RS 20.150, and RS 20.178.2), all thirty-three of the HOR letters which contain the « ben » (see above), and all eight of the DESC letters which contain the « ben » (see footnote).

[95]Both of these are conceptually ascending: RS 20.023.2 and RS 34.142. The latter represents an epistolary tradition foreign to local conventions.

Among the seventy-two letters in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus which explicitly omit the « ben », twenty-eight are conceptually unmarked,[96] and one is of unknown conceptual status.[97] The forty-three remaining letters contain explicit information on status and model. Sorting by status, thirty-four of these forty-three are conceptually ascending,[98] seven conceptually horizontal,[99] and two conceptually descending.[100] Sorting by model, ten of these forty-three are composed on the biological kinship model,[101] and thirty-three on the hierarchical power model.[102]

Interpreted, the distributional patterns revealed by these data dovetail neatly with those observed above for the Ugaritic corpus, where the formula was described as being ". . . especially appropriate in letters composed on the biological kinship model; .

---

[96]RS 8.333, RS 12.033, RS 13.007bis, RS 15.011, RS 16.003, RS 17.130, RS 17.132, RS 17.133, RS 17.289, RS 17.292, RS 17.385, RS 17.394+, RS 17.423, RS 19.050, RS 20.003, RS 20.013.1, RS 20.018, RS 20.022, RS 20.212, RS 20.216, RS 20.237, RS 34.129, RS 34.136, RS 34.138, RS 34.139, RS 34.143, RS 34.145, and RS 34.146.

[97]RS 34.165.

[98]RS 1.[056], RS 1.[057], RS 15.014, RS 15.178, RS 16.112, RS 17.383, RS 17.391, RS 17.393, RS 17.422, RS 17.425, RS 19.006, RS 19.080, RS 20.016, RS 20.019, RS 20.033, RS 20.151, RS 20.162, RS 20.168, RS 20.184, RS 20.219, RS 20.238, RS 20.243, RS 21.064, RS 25.138, RS 25.461, RS 32.204.1, RS 32.204.2, RS 34.135, RS 34.140, RS 34.150, RS 34.151, RS 34.152, RS 34.180,60, and CK 107 (= RS [Varia 35]). All but two of these are composed on the hierarchical power model; RS 20.168 and RS 20.238 are composed on the biological kinship model.

[99]RS 10.046, RS 17.315, RS 17.428, RS 20.013.2, RS 20.232, RS 20.248, and RS 34.149. Notable features among these HOR letters include the following: (i) RS 20.232 contains a « pros » formula (thus indicating an ascending aspect behind the conceptually HOR terminology), and (ii) RS 10.046 and RS 20.013.2 are addressed to {ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA-ia} rather than {ŠEŠ-ia} (perhaps indicating the same).

[100]RS 17.247 (composed on the BIO model) and RS 34.155 (composed on the POW model).

[101]These ten consist of two of the thirty-four ASC letters which lack the « ben » (RS 20.168 and RS 20.238), all seven of the HOR letters which lack the « ben » (see above), and one of the two DESC letters which lack the « ben » (RS 17.247).

[102]These consist of thirty-one of the thirty-four ASC letters which lack the « ben » (see above), and one of the two DESC letters which lack the « ben » (RS 34.155).

. . rare in letters composed on the hierarchical power model, and rare in those letters for which the conceptual relationship between the correspondents was unmarked."[103] In particular, the disposition for the « ben » formula to be present in BIO letters and absent in POW letters is immediately apparent in the relative proportions of these two models in the corpus of those letters which contain the formula, and in that of those letters which omit it. In other words, among the forty-eight letters which contain the « ben » formula, forty-six (that is, 96%) follow the BIO model; only two follow the POW model. Of the forty-three letters which explicitly omit the « ben » formula, only ten (that is, 23%) follow the BIO model, thirty-three follow the POW model.[104] In addition, however, the patterns observed for the Ugaritic corpus with respect to the distribution according to conceptual status, which is not mentioned in the passage cited above, also apply very well to the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters. Thus, the distribution of the formula in Ugaritic applies, *grosso modo*, to that of the « ben » formula in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus. In order for these distributional similarities with the

---

[103]See above, section 4.3.3.

[104]Excluding the HOR letters from this consideration, on the grounds that the horizontal conceptual status only makes uses of the BIO model, and thus that the choice of this model is not a meaningful choice to use this model and not to use the POW model, does not mitigate these ratios: thirteen of the fifteen ascending and descending letters containing a « ben » formula (that is, 87%) follow the biological kinship model (All eight conceptually descending letters containing the « ben » are composed on the BIO model: RS 11.730, RS 16.111, RS 17.078, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.152, RS 20.255A, RS 25.131, and RS 34.133; and five of the seven conceptually ascending letters which contain the « ben » are composed on the BIO model: RS 17.083, RS 17.143, RS 19.070, RS 20.150, RS 20.178.2, and RS 20.225); only two (or 13%) show the hierarchical power model (Both are conceptually ascending: RS 20.023.2 and RS 34.142). Of the thirty-six ASC and DESC letters which omit the « ben », only three (or 8%) follow the BIO model (RS 20.168 and RS 20.238, both conceptually ascending, and RS 17.247, conceptually descending); thirty-three (that is, 92%) follow the POW model (Thirty-two of these are conceptually ascending: CK 107, RS 1.[056], RS 1.[057], RS 15.014, RS 15.178, RS 16.112, RS 17.383, RS 17.391, RS 17.393, RS 17.422, RS 17.425, RS 19.006, RS 19.080, RS 20.016, RS 20.019, RS 20.033, RS 20.151, RS 20.162, RS 20.184, RS 20.219, RS 20.243, RS 21.064, RS 25.138, RS 25.461, RS 32.204.1, RS 32.204.2, RS 34.135, RS 34.140, RS 34.150, RS 34.151, RS 34.152, and RS 34.180,60; and one is conceptually descending: RS 34.155).

Ugaritic corpus to stand out in more detail, one can offer a more explicit analysis of the distributional data: (1) in conceptually unmarked letters, and according to (2) conceptual status, and (3) conceptual model.

Among the conceptually unmarked letters of the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, the « ben » formula is relatively uncommon, occurring in sixteen out of forty-four,[105] or 36%, of the unambiguous cases.[106] A more striking comparison with the Ugaritic data, however, results when one charts the presence of the formula in those terminologically unmarked letters which represent "contextually descending" situations. One can isolate at least twenty-two unmarked but "contextually descending" letters in the Ras Shamra

[105]There are a total of forty-five "unmarked" letters in the RS Akk. corpus; the presence or absence of the « ben » may be determined in all but one of these, the exception being RS 20.426,14+.

[106]The Ugaritic ratio was 1 : 8, or 13% (see above, section 4.3.2).

Akkadian corpus.[107] Of these, only two, or 9%, contain a « ben » formula.[108] The others explicitly omit it. None of the comparable Ugaritic "conceptually descending" letters contains a « ben » formula.[109]

In terms of distribution according to conceptual status, the « ben » formula is uncommon in ascending letters, common in horizontal letters, and common in descending letters. The latter two statements apply equally well to the Ugaritic corpus. Specifically, among ascending letters in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, the « ben » formula is present in seven out of forty-one,[110] or 17%, of the unambiguous cases;[111] among horizontal letters, in thirty-three out of forty,[112] or 83%, of the unambiguous cases;[113] and, among descending letters, in eight out of ten, or 80%, of the unambiguous cases.[114] The only striking distributional difference here is that of conceptually ASC letters: on present data, the « ben » formula occurs in such letters approximately 52% of the time in the Ugaritic corpus, but only 17% of the time in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus. No explanation for this apparent difference is offered here.

---

[107]See above, section 3.4.1.1.2.

[108]These are RS 20.174A and RS [Varia 16], both of which are from {LUGAL-ma}, and addressed to the king of Ugarit.

[109]See above, section 4.3.1.

[110]Of the forty-nine total conceptually ASC letters in this corpus, the presence of the « ben » is not knowable in eight instances: RS 17.455, RS 20.182A+, RS 20.182D, RS 20.200C, RS 20.227.2, RS 21.054B, RS 34.170, and RS 34.171.1.

[111]The Ugaritic ratio was 15 : 29, or 52% (see above, section 4.3.2).

[112]Of the forty-four total conceptually HOR letters in this corpus, the presence of the « ben » is not knowable in four instances: RS 17.452, RS 20.182C, RS 20.194, and RS 34.174.

[113]The Ugaritic ratio was 13 : 17, or 76% (see above, section 4.3.2).

[114]The Ugaritic ratio was 1 : 1, or 100% (see above, section 4.3.2).

In terms of distribution by conceptual model, the pattern observed with respect to the Ugaritic corpus is present here as well: the « ben » formula is extremely common in letters composed on the BIO model, and rare in letters composed on the POW model. Where a determination is possible, the « ben » formula is present in forty-six out of fifty-six,[115] or 82%, of the BIO letters,[116] and in two out of thirty-five,[117] or 6%, of the POW letters.[118] Even if one excludes the HOR letters from this analysis, on the grounds that, since conceptually horizontal letters make use of only the BIO and not the POW model, the choice of the BIO model over the POW model in these instances is not a meaningful one, the pattern remains the same: the « ben » formula is present in thirteen out of sixteen, or 81%, of the BIO letters where a determination of the presence or absence of the formula is possible.[119]

4.4.1.1.2 COMPOSITION

If these extensive distributional parallels represent further illustrations of the fundamental kinship of the main epistolary traditions represented in the Ugaritic and

---

[115]Of the sixty-one total BIO letters, five contain no information for the presence or absence of the « ben »: RS 17.452, RS 20.182C, RS 20.194, RS 34.170, and RS 34.174.

[116]The Ugaritic ratio was 19 : 22, or 86% (see above, section 4.3.3).

[117]Of the forty-two total POW letters, seven contain no information for the presence or absence of the « ben »: RS 17.455, RS 20.182A+, RS 20.182D, RS 20.200C, RS 20.227.2, RS 21.054B, and RS 34.171.1.

[118]The Ugaritic ratio was 6 : 17, or 35% (see above, section 4.3.3).

[119]The Ugaritic ratio was 9 : 9, or 100%: seven of eight Ugaritic ASC BIO letters explicitly contain the « ben » (RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, and RS 94.5003+; the presence of the « ben » formula is unknown in the eighth ASC BIO letter, RS 19.102.1); and both the single Ugaritic DESC BIO letter (RS 18.147) and the single Ugaritic BIO letter of mixed status (RS [Varia 4] contains both horizontal and descending BIO terminology) contain the « ben » formula.

Ras Shamra Akkadian corpora, such is not immediately evident from a superficial comparison of the composition patterns of the formulas of each corpus. In particular, no single Ras Shamra Akkadian « ben » formula shows an equivalent of the standard Ugaritic compositional pattern « *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* ».[120] Given the extensive formal parallels observable elsewhere between the two corpora, such a lack is striking.[121] This apparent difference should not be exaggerated, however, and, if no Akkadian parallels exist for this particularly common Ugaritic compositional pattern, detailed and extensive parallels do exist in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus for each and every one of the "necessary" and "optional" components found in the « ben » formulas of the Ugaritic corpus. It is this basic symmetry in terms of compositional inventory which reveals the common heritage underlying these two corpora.

4.4.1.1.2.1 Necessary components

Collectively, the seventy-two « ben » formulas in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus are unified, not only by their conformity to the broad functional definition of the « ben » given above, but also by certain shared formal features, namely, the presence

---

[120]Such an equivalent would take a form comparable to *{DINGIR.MEŠ PAP-ru-ka li-šal-li-mu-ka}, for example, with no additional "optional" elements attached.

[121]On the assumption that a precise Akkadian compositional equivalent of Ugaritic « *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* » must exist, many students of these texts interpret the Akkadian phrase « *ana šulmāni* » as the cross-linguistic equivalent of Ugaritic *tšlmk* in the benediction formula (compare, for example, S. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies* [1980] 362; and S. Ahl, Epistolary Texts [1973] 138). Thanks to the « ben » formula now known from RS 92.2005:7-8, however, it seems likely that these two phrases (Ug. *l šlm* and Akk. *ana šulmāni*) represent in fact two different compositional components in the formula, and that each possesses a precise morphological parallel in the other language; that is, the cross linguistic equivalent of Akkadian {a-na šul-ma-ni} is to be found in Ugaritic *l šlm*, and the cross-linguistic equivalent of Ugaritic *tšlmk* is represented by, for example, the syllabic spelling {li-šal-li-mu-ka}.

of compositional components which are "necessary" in the sense that, where such a determination is possible, every attested example of the formula contains them.

While the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula was characterized by three "necessary" compositional components,[122] the Ras Shamra Akkadian « ben » formulas are characterized by only two such "necessary" components: (1) a noun phrase referring to "the gods", which functions as the grammatical subject of the utterance, and (2) a verbal predication derived from the Akkadian verb *naṣāru*, 'to guard'. No example of the « ben » formula in this corpus explicitly omits either of these elements.[123] Unlike the Ugaritic « ben » formula, a volitional form derived from the verb ŠLM is not a "necessary" component of the « ben » in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.

4.4.1.1.2.1.1 The noun phrase referring to "the gods"

As was the case in the Ugaritic corpus, there is some internal variation in the makeup of each of these "necessary" elements. For the noun phrase referring to "the gods", two Ugaritic variants are attested: *ỉlm*, 'the gods', by far the most common, and *ỉly ủgrt*, 'the gods of Ugarit', attested only once. Equivalents of each of these patterns are attested in the syllabic corpus, but the compositional variation observable there is

---

[122]These are (1) a noun phrase referring to "the gods" (typically *ỉlm*), (2) a verbal predication derived from N□R (typically *tǵrk*), and (3) a verbal predication derived from ŠLM (typically *tšlmk*); see above, section 4.2.

[123]The noun phrase {[DINGIR.MEŠ]} needs to be entirely reconstructed in RS 21.201, though its presence is extremely likely. The *naṣāru* verbal form needs to be entirely, or almost entirely reconstructed in three letters: RS 20.178.2 {[PAP-ru-ki]}, RS 20.225 {[PAP-ru]-ka}, and RS 20.227.1 (no reconstruction attempted due to the very fragmentary state of lines 2'-4'); in none of these cases is there any reason to doubt the presence of the verb, however.

much greater than that of the alphabetic corpus, and numerous additional variants, unattested in Ugaritic, are also known.

Among the « ben » formulas of the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, the noun phrase referring to "the gods" may take any of several forms. Two of these have just been mentioned, as being attested in Ugaritic as well: (1) purely logographic as well as logo-syllabic writings which are equivalent to the pattern represented in Ugaritic by *ỉlm*, that is, various writings of the plural absolute form of a common noun meaning 'gods', of which a common example is {DINGIR.MEŠ};[124] and (2) logo-syllabic writings which are equivalent to the pattern represented in Ugaritic by *ỉly ủgrt*, that is, noun phrases of the structure « [plural absolute form of the common noun meaning 'god'] + (*ša*) + [noun phrase, most often being a geographical proper name, in a genitive relation with the preceding noun] », of which an example is RS 34.164, {(7) DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR ú-ga-ri-it}.[125] Actually, only three letters represent more or less precise parallels to the Ugaritic « ben » formula which contains the pattern *ỉly*

---

[124]This pattern is represented in forty-two « ben » formulas. The noun phrase is written entirely logographically, as {DINGIR.MEŠ}, in thirty-nine instances: explicitly in RS 11.723, RS 11.730, RS 15.063, RS 15.077, RS 17.078, RS 17.142, RS 17.144, RS 17.286, RS 19.053, RS 19.070, RS 19.115, RS 20.015, RS 20.021, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.150, RS 20.158, RS 20.172, RS 20.174A, RS 20.178.2, RS 20.239, RS 20.242, RS 21.183, RS 22.006, RS 25.131, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.154, RS 34.158, RS 34.160, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.167+, RS 34.173, RS 34.180,17, and RS [Varia 25]; and very probably in RS 17.390, RS 20.255A, RS 21.007C, and RS 21.201, where this component must be partially or entirely reconstructed. In three cases, however, this component is written logo-syllabically, twice {DINGIR.MEŠ-nu}: RS 17.397B+ and RS [Varia 16], and once {DINGIR.MEŠ-ni}: RS 20.017 (a prescriptivist approach would interpret this latter form as a grammatical "mistake" for the "correct" form, {DINGIR.MEŠ-nu}).

[125]This pattern for the "gods" component is present in as many as eighteen letters: RS 6.198, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 16.111, RS 16.116, RS 17.116, RS 17.429 (probably), RS 20.178.1, RS 20.200B, RS 20.225 (one may consider the string {EN.II URU ḫa-zu-ra.KI}, 'the two lords of Ḫazor', in line 2', to represent this pattern as well), RS 20.227.1 (possibly), RS 34.134.1, RS 34.141, RS 34.142, RS 34.163, RS 34.164, RIH 81/4, and RS [Varia 26]. Note also the possible presence of this pattern for this component in the "non-standard" benediction of RS 12.005.

ủgrt.[126] In the other cases, when this component takes this form and only this form,[127] it occurs not once, as is the case in this Ugaritic letter,[128] but twice[129] or even three times,[130] and thus is not parallel, strictly speaking, to the Ugaritic form in question.[131]

In addition to these two patterns, which have Ugaritic analogs, at least three other compositional patterns for this "necessary" component referring to "the gods" are attested in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus, which have no known equivalents in Ugaritic. These are listed in order of statistical frequency: (3) logo-syllabic writings of a noun phrase consisting of « 1 + [the construct form of the cardinal numeral 1000] +

---

[126]These are RS 6.198 {DINGIR.MEŠ-nu ša KUR URU ú-ga-ri-ta}, RS 15.033 {DINGIR.MEŠ KUR ú-ga-ri-it}, and perhaps RS 16.116 {[DINGIR.MEŠ] ša KUR u-ga-r[i-it]}.

[127]I say "this form and only this form" because the « ben » formulas of at least six letters (RS 17.116, RS 20.225, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.142, RIH 81/4, and RS [Varia 26]) contain this pattern alongside other compositional patterns for this component; on which see below. As many as twelve letters contain this and only this pattern for the "gods" component, whether or not this component is repeated: RS 6.198, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 16.111, RS 16.116, RS 17.429 (possibly), RS 20.178.1, RS 20.200B (probably), RS 20.227.1 (possibly), RS 34.141, RS 34.163 (probably), and RS 34.164.

[128]The entire « ben » formula of RS 15.008 reads {(4, cont'd) . ỉly (5) ủgrt . tǵrk (6) tšlmk}.

[129]Compare the following four letters, in which this component occurs twice: RS 16.111 {(4) DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR u-ga-ri-it (5) ù DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR a-mur-ri}, RS 20.200B (probably) {(5) [DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR kín-z]a? DINGIR.MEŠ [?] (6) [ša KUR u-ga-ri-i]t}, RS 34.163 (probably) {DINGIR.MEŠ ⌜-⌝[...] (5) ù KUR ú-g[a-ri-it]}, and RS 34.164 {(7) DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR-ú-ga-ri-it (8) ù DINGIR.MEŠ ša É-ti ṭup-pi}. Notice that in the final example the genitive noun phrase is not a geographical proper name, but a common noun phrase, 'the tablet-house'.

[130]This pattern occurs three times in the following two letters: RS 15.024+ {(5) DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR a-mur-ri (6) DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR u-ga-ri-it (7) ù DINGIR.MEŠ ša-a LUGAL EN-ka}, and RS 20.178.1 {(5) DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR-ti pa-at (6) ù DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR u-ga-rít (7) ù gab-ba DINGIR.MEŠ ša É a-b[i-ni?]}. As above in the cases of RS 34.141 and 34.164, both of these examples show genitive noun phrases which are not geographical proper names: {DINGIR.MEŠ ša-a LUGAL EN-ka}, 'the gods of the king, your lord' in RS 15.024+, and {gab-ba DINGIR.MEŠ ša É a-b[i-ni?]}, 'all of the gods of our father's house' in RS 20.178.1.

[131]There are contextual considerations which help to explain such a distribution, notably, that the local affiliation of the deities is typically mentioned in international contexts, and in such cases the sender frequently did not limit himself to invoking only the gods of the recipient, or only his own gods, but often included them both.

[the plural absolute form of the common noun meaning 'god'] », of which a common example is RS 17.152:5, {li-im DINGIR.MEŠ};[132] (4) a divine proper name or names,[133] which may or may not be followed by common noun phrases serving as titles,[134] as in {^{d}é-a EN DUGUD} in RS 34.134.1:5;[135] and (5) a combination of any or all of the last three of the patterns here described.[136]

4.4.1.1.2.1.2 The naṣāru *verbal form*

---

[132]This pattern for the "gods" component is present in as many as twelve letters: RS 17.083, RS 17.116 (possibly), RS 17.143, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.148.2, RS 17.152, RS 17.239, RS 17.288, RS 18.089 (possibly), RS 34.133, RS 34.137, and RIH 81/4. Of these twelve, nine contain only this pattern (RS 17.083, RS 17.143, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.148.2, RS 17.152, RS 17.239, RS 17.288, RS 18.089, and RS 34.137); three contain this pattern among others for this element (RS 17.116, RS 34.133, and RIH 81/4). The Ugaritic equivalent of this pattern is unattested; it might have taken the form **ålp ìlm*. (compare *ålp ymm* in RS 16.265:4 and *ålp ḥẓm* in *KTU* 4.169:2).

[133]The most frequently cited deities are (1) the storm god ({^{d}IM} in RS 4.449, RS 17.116, RS 20.225, and RS 34.142) and (2) Ea ({^{d}é-a EN DUGUD} in RS 34.133 and RS 34.134.1, {^{d}é-a BE DUGUD} in RS [Varia 26], and {^{d}a-a EN DUGUD} in RS 34.153). Other divinities occurring in this pattern include (3) {^{d}pí-id-ra-i} in RS 17.116, (4) {^{d}AG EN GI.DUB.BA.A} in RS 34.133 (Note that the "non-standard" benediction motif in RS 12.005 also mentions {^{d}AG}), (5) {^{d}da-gan} and (6) {^{d}ú$^{?}$-tar$^{?}$-mi-ri} in RS 34.142, and probably (7) {[^{d}eš$_{18}$]-tár} in RS 20.225.

[134]Compare {EN DUGUD} and {BE DUGUD}, 'the honored lord' (or 'the lord of honor(?)') (on this title in Hittite, see below, section 4.4.4.2.1), for Ea in RS 34.133, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.153, and RS [Varia 26]; and {EN GI.DUB.BA.A}, 'the master of the stylus', for Nabû (^{d}AG) in RS 34.133.

[135]This pattern for the "gods" component is present in as many as eight letters: RS 4.449, RS 17.116, RS 20.225, RS 34.133, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.142, RS 34.153, and RS [Varia 26]; note also its presence in the "non-standard" benediction motif of RS 12.005. Of these eight letters, two contain only this pattern (RS 4.449 and RS 34.153), and six contain this pattern among others for this component (RS 17.116, RS 20.225, RS 34.133, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.142, and RS [Varia 26]). No statistically and contextually "standard" Ugaritic « ben » formula contains this pattern, but at least one "non-standard" benediction does show it: compare *bʿl* in RS 17.117:2.

[136]Seven letters contain such combinations: RS 17.116, RS 20.225, RS 34.133, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.142, RIH 81/4, and RS [Varia 26]. These include combinations of all three patterns, that is, those patterns described here as (2), (3), and (4): RS 17.116; but also combinations of two of these three patterns: « (2) + (3) »: RS 17.116 and RIH 81/4; « (2) + (4) »: RS 20.225, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.142, and RS [Varia 26] (Note that the "non-standard" benediction motif in RS 12.005 also appears to contain this combination); and « (3) + (4) »: RS 34.133.

The Ugaritic corpus contains three variants of this "necessary" component: « *tǵrk* », by far the most common, « *tǵrkm* », attested once, and « *tǵr* », attested twice. In these examples, the variations observed are all related to the means by which the formula makes reference to the "direct object", or "patient",[137] of the verbal action, that is, the recipient of the letter. In the forms *tǵrk* and *tǵrkm*, this is accomplished by means of 2nd person pronominal suffixes, singular and dual, respectively; the two *tǵr* forms, however, contain no such suffixes, and as such must either represent scribal errors for intended *tǵr<k>*, or forms in which the direct object of the verb is unexpressed, being clear from context.

In any case, the « ben » formulas of the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus also contain variations of this nature, and these variations may be sorted into two categories: (1) « ben » formulas in which the direct object of the verb is a 2nd person pronominal suffix, attached to the verb, this pattern being by far the most common pattern in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus[138] as well as in the Ugaritic; and (2)

---

[137]The semantics of a transitive verb like *naṣāru*, 'to guard, watch over (s.o.)', necessarily entail an "agent" (he who does the guarding) and a "patient" (he who is guarded). In this case, these terms, "agent" and "patient", correspond to the more familiar syntactic categories "subject" and "direct object".

[138]Sixty-five out of seventy-one unambiguous examples (the composition of this component of RS 20.227.1 is unknown) certainly or probably use this pattern. These include sixty-one examples in which the pronoun is 2nd person masculine singular: RS 6.198, RS 11.723 (probably), RS 11.730, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 15.063, RS 15.077, RS 16.116 (probably), RS 17.078, RS 17.083, RS 17.116, RS 17.142, RS 17.143, RS 17.144 (probably), RS 17.148.1, RS 17.148.2, RS 17.152 (probably), RS 17.239, RS 17.286, RS 17.288, RS 17.390 (probably), RS 17.397B+, RS 17.429, RS 18.089, RS 19.053, RS 19.070, RS 19.115, RS 20.200B (probably), RS 20.015, RS 20.017, RS 20.021, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.150, RS 20.158, RS 20.172, RS 20.174A, RS 20.225 (probably), RS 20.239, RS 20.242 (probably), RS 20.255A, RS 21.007C (probably), RS 21.183, RS 21.201 (probably), RS 22.006 (probably), RS 25.131, RS 34.133, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.137, RS 34.154, RS 34.158, RS 34.160, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.163 (possibly), RS 34.167+, RS 34.173 (probably), RS 34.180,17 (uses the {QA} sign!), RS [Varia 16], RS [Varia 25], RS [Varia 26], and RIH 81/4; and three in which it is 2nd feminine singular: RS 16.111, RS 20.178.1, and RS 20.178.2 (probably); and one in which it is 2nd common plural: RS 20.023.2.

formulas in which the direct object is not expressed directly by means of a pronoun, but by a common noun phrase, of which all attested examples include the word *napištu*, 'life, self';[139] this category is unrepresented in the Ugaritic corpus.

A second compositional variation for this component in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus deals with the orthography of the verbal form itself. Most often it is written logo-syllabically,[140] but entirely syllabic writings are also attested.[141] Obviously, because of the nature of the alphabetic writing system, this criterion is not applicable to the Ugaritic data.

4.4.1.1.2.2 Optional components

Aside from these two "necessary" components, the composition of the « ben » formulas of the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus is characterized by a host of "optional" components. Some of these represent the Akkadian equivalents of components known from the Ugaritic « ben » formulas, such as the verbal form *lišallimūka*, 'may they

---

[139]Six of seventy-one unambiguous examples use this pattern: RS 4.449 {na-pí-iš-ta-ka}, RS 34.134.1 {ZI$^{!}$-ka}, RS 34.141 {ZI-ka}, RS 34.142 {nap-ša-ti be-lí-ia}, RS 34.153 {nap-ša-ti-ka}, and RS 34.164 {nap$^{!}$-šat ša ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ia}.

[140]Sixty-five of seventy-one unambiguous examples use the writing logo-syllabic writing {PAP-ru-} for the verbal element: RS 11.723 (probably), RS 11.730, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 15.063, RS 15.077, RS 16.111, RS 16.116 (probably), RS 17.078, RS 17.083, RS 17.116, RS 17.142, RS 17.143, RS 17.144 (probably), RS 17.148.1, RS 17.148.2, RS 17.152 (probably), RS 17.239, RS 17.286, RS 17.288, RS 17.390 (probably), RS 17.397B+, RS 17.429, RS 18.089, RS 19.053, RS 19.070, RS 19.115, RS 20.200B (probably), RS 20.015, RS 20.017, RS 20.021, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.150, RS 20.158, RS 20.172, RS 20.174A, RS 20.178.1, RS 20.178.2 (probably), RS 20.225 (probably), RS 20.239, RS 20.242 (probably), RS 20.255A, RS 21.007C (probably), RS 21.183, RS 21.201 (probably), RS 22.006 (probably), RS 25.131, RS 34.133, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.137, RS 34.141, RS 34.154, RS 34.158, RS 34.160, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.164, RS 34.167+, RS 34.173 (probably), RS [Varia 16], RS [Varia 25], RS [Varia 26], and RIH 81/4.

[141]Six of seventy-one unambiguous examples use entirely syllabic writings for this component: RS 4.449 {li-iṣ-ṣur}, RS 6.198 {li-SU-ru-ka}, RS 34.142 {li-iṣ-[ṣu-]rù}, RS 34.153 {li-iṣ-ṣu-ur}, RS 34.163 {li-iṣ-ṣu-[ru-ka]}, and RS 34.180,17 {li-iṣ-ṣi-ru-kà}.

keep you well!' which corresponds to Ugaritic *tšlmk*, and the adverbial phrases *ana šulmāni*, 'for well-being' (compare Ug. *l šlm*), and, more loosely, *adi darīti*, 'unto perpetuity' (compare Ug. *bʿd ʿlm*). Others, however, have no attested Ugaritic analog. These include vocative phrases, adverbs, and various verbal predications.

Each of the "optional" components is discussed below; those which have analogs in the Ugaritic corpus are treated first, in order of their statistical frequency in the Akkadian letters, followed by those which represent compositional elements unattested in the Ugaritic ben formulas, also treated in order of statistical frequency.

4.4.1.1.2.2.1 The prepositional phrase ana šulmāni

The prepositional phrase *ana šulmāni* is the most common of the "optional" components in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.[142] Among seventy-one unambiguous examples,[143] it is certainly or probably present in the « ben » formulas of forty-eight letters,[144] and absent from twenty-three.[145] The relative frequency of this component

---

[142]The orthography of this component is virtually always {a-na šul-ma-ni}. Only two exceptions are known: RS 20.255A, in which this component is apparently written {i[-na] š[u]l-ma-[n]i} (Nougayrol's copy agrees with his transcription); and RS 34.180,17, in which this component is written {a-na DI-ma-ni}.

[143]The presence or absence of this element in RS 20.227.1 cannot be determined. Note also that there is no sign of this element in the "non-standard" benediction motif of RS 12.005.

[144]RS 11.730, RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 15.077, RS 16.111, RS 16.116, RS 17.078, RS 17.083, RS 17.142, RS 17.143, RS 17.144, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.148.2, RS 17.239, RS 17.286, RS 17.288, RS 17.390, RS 17.397B+, RS 17.429, RS 19.053, RS 19.070, RS 20.015, RS 20.021, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.150, RS 20.172, RS 20.174A, RS 20.178.1, RS 20.178.2, RS 20.239, RS 20.242, RS 20.255A, RS 21.007C, RS 21.201, RS 22.006, RS 34.133, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.154, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.163 (probably, although the phrase needs to be entirely reconstructed), RS 34.167+, RS 34.173, RS 34.180,17, RIH 81/4, RS [Varia 16], and RS [Varia 25].

[145]RS 4.449, RS 6.198, RS 11.723, RS 15.063, RS 17.116, RS 17.152, RS 18.089, RS 19.115, RS 20.017, RS 20.158, RS 20.200B, RS 20.225 (probably), RS 21.183, RS 25.131, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.137, RS 34.141, RS 34.142, RS 34.153, RS 34.158, RS 34.160, RS 34.164, and RS [Varia 26].

in the syllabic corpus, being roughly 68% of the unambiguous examples, is striking, especially in light of the infrequency of its Ugaritic equivalent, *l šlm*.[146]

In fact, this correspondence is one element of an interesting problem. In most respects, the formulary of the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian epistolary corpora is structurally parallel to such a point that one may often speak of translational equivalence. Yet, the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula contains a "necessary" compositional element, *tšlmk*, 'may they keep you well!', which is only very rarely attested in the form an Akkadian equivalent in the letters from Ras Shamra, as in {li-šal-li-mu-ka} in RS 34.133.[147] Conversely, the Akkadian element *ana šulmāni*, 'for well-being', discussed here, which is very frequent among the « ben » formulas from Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, is only attested once in the form of a Ugaritic equivalent in a « ben » formula: *l šlm* in RS 92.2005. This apparent problem is probably to be resolved by acknowledging the primacy of semantic equivalence, and denigrating the importance of morphological equivalence. In other words, it seems reasonable to maintain that the statistically predominant forms of the benediction, Ugaritic « *ìlm tǵrk tšlmk* » and Akkadian « *ilānu ana šulmāni liṣṣurū-ka* » represent, in a certain sense, semantic equivalents at the clause level.[148] On the other hand, the infrequent presence of the adverbial element *l šlm* in Ugaritic « ben » formulas and of the verbal element *liṣṣurū-ka* in Akkadian formulas, probably points to the awareness, on the part of certain scribes, of the lack of morphological symmetry between the functionally

---

[146]A single example of the Ugaritic equivalent of this element is now known: the phrase *l šlm* occurs in the « ben » formula of RS 92.2005.1: {(7) ilm . l . šlm (8) tǵrkm . tšlmkm }.

[147]See below, section 4.4.1.1.2.2.2.

[148]Compare S. Ahl's view (*Epistolary Texts* [1973] 138): "The second verb in the Ugaritic blessing, tšlm, seems to convey the same thought as the Akkadian phrase ana šulmani." See also S. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies* (1980) 362.

equivalent « ben » formulas in the two languages. The scribes responsible for adding the elements *l šlm* or *liṣṣurū-ka* may have simply wished to show off their philological competence by employing precise morphological equivalents.

4.4.1.1.2.2.2 The šullumu *verbal form*

If the "optional" component « *ana šulmāni* » is notable for its high frequency with respect to its Ugaritic analog « *l šlm* », the opposite situation applies to the presence, in the « ben » formulas of the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, of a verbal predication derived from *šullumu* (D-stem), 'to keep (s.o.) well.' A verbal component of this type occurs in the « ben » formulas of no more than five letters;[149] such an infrequency is surprising since, as stated above, the Ugaritic equivalent of this component, which takes the form of « *tšlmk*(*m*) », constitutes one of the "necessary" components of the « ben » formula in that corpus.

The orthography shows a considerable amount of variation for so few examples. Three patterns are attested: (1) {li-šal-li-mu(-ka)}[150] in RS 34.133 and RS 34.164; (1) {⌜li⌝-šal-la-mu-ka} in RS 20.225 and RS 34.154; and (3) {li-iš-la-mu-ki} in RS 20.178.1.

Since, in most dialects of Akkadian, the expected stem vowel pattern in such forms would be /-CaCCiC-/,[151] the first spelling ought to be considered "standard" for

---

[149]RS 20.178.1, RS 20.225, RS 34.133, RS 34. 154, and RS 34.164.

[150]This component in RS 34.164 does not contain an attached pronominal suffix, as is standard in Ugaritic (and typical in RS Akkadian) « ben » formulas. Instead, the direct object of the verb is expressed with a noun phrase: {(9) nap!-šat ša ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ia PAP-ru (10) ù li-šal-li-mu }, 'May they guard and may they keep well the "lives" of my brothers!' This type of structure is frequent in letters composed at Emar, as this one probably was (see the editor's presentation in RSO 7 [1991] 65-66).

[151]Compare W. von Soden, *GAG*[3] (1995), paradigm 10, p. 10*.

Akkadian orthography, in spite of only two attestations here out of five. The other two spelling patterns are more difficult to explain. Should we consider them as relatively "careless" writings of the single expected underlying form, namely *lišallimūka*, in spite of their superficial appearances to the contrary? If so, these two patterns would present further examples of western peripheral scribes' relative inattention to consistent indications of vowel quality and gemination in the use of syllabic signs.[152] Or, do these two spellings indicate the intentional representation of two distinctly "non-standard" underlying forms, *lišallamūka* and *lišlamūka*, respectively? To be sure, the first form is less troubling, since similar spellings are known elsewhere in the Western periphery.[153] But, the third spelling, {li-iš-la-mu-ki} in RS 20.178.1, is particularly odd, since a superficial interpretation would suggest an underlying G-stem form, with attached pronominal suffix, and the G-stem of ŠLM is intransitive, both in Akkadian

---

[152]Note that western inattention to such features could only have been encouraged by the conventions of contemporary alphabetic writing, where consonantal gemination and vowel quality were generally not indicated in the orthography.

[153]I refer to certain verbal forms in the Amarna corpus, which would appear to represent D-stem verbs, and which also appear to reflect the stem vowel pattern /-CaCCaC-/, as here in RS 20.225 and RS 34.154, for preterite (or precative, etc.) forms, instead of expected /-CaCCiC-/; see the forms cited in A. F. Rainey, *CAT* 2 (1996) 136, 139, 157, 169, 171, and 174. Regarding the two letters under discussion here, the sender of RS 20.225 was probably in Ḫazor, judging from the re-edition of this text by D. Arnaud in *AuOr* 16 (1998) 27-35; and in the *editio princeps* of RS 34.154, F. Malbran-Labat suggests that the sender of this letter was a Hittite princess, perhaps even a daughter of the king of Carchemish (see RSO 7 [1991] 48).

Even if the locality of the sender is established, however, it seems unwise to draw the conclusion too hastily that observable formal variants are attributable to a distinct "local" dialect of Akkadian, since, (1) in any case, it was the sender's scribe and not the sender himself who was primarily responsible for the form of the letter, and (2) there is often little direct evidence for the local background of the various scribes responsible for the preserved letters. The mechanical assumption that, if the sender of a particular letter was situated in a particular place, then the scribe responsible for the writing that particular letter was a local resident of that place, and therefore, that the literary habits observable in the work of this scribe reflect the conventions current at that particular place, may frequently yield correct results, but the assumptions inherent in this line of reasoning need to be acknowledged in such cases.

and in the West Semitic languages.[154] With this in mind, and without arguing this point further, I am inclined to suspect the former option mentioned above, namely, that Syrian scribes, steeped as they were in the alphabetic tradition, paid relatively little attention, when compared to their counterparts in Mesopotamia proper, to matters of vowel quality and consonantal gemination in their habits of usage of syllabic signs. This granted, the D-stem interpretation presents no problems.

4.4.1.1.2.2.3 Temporal adverbial phrases

At least one, and probably two known Ugaritic letters bear « ben » formulas which contain, as an "optional" component, a temporal adverbial phrase.[155] RS 16.265, a letter which was part of a scribal exercise, provides the only intact example of this element: lines 2-6 read *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk tʿzzk ảlp ym w rbt šnt bʿd ʿlm*, 'May the gods guard you, may they keep you well, (and) may they keep you strong for a thousand days and a myriad of years, (even) unto perpetuity!' This compound adverbial phrase, *ảlp ym w rbt šnt bʿd ʿlm*, has no precise equivalent among the « ben » formulas of the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, but three such letters do contain

---

[154]The sender of RS 20.178.1, {^{m}rap-a-na}, is apparently the well-known Ugaritian, Rapʾānu. Assuming the scribe of this letter was Ugaritian (but see the above footnote), there is no reason to attribute the unusual spelling to "substrate influence", since the G-stem of the verb *šalāmu* was intransitive in Ugaritic as well as in Akkadian.

[155]These are RS 16.265, and probably also RS 1.018, where such a phrase must be partially reconstructed. On the reconstruction of RS 1.018:4-6, see M. Dijkstra *et al.*, *BiOr* 38 (1981), col. 379; and the comments of D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 2 (RS 1.018), remarques épistolographiques: "Par comparaison avec RS 16.265:4-6, où la formule temporelle *bʿd ʿlm* se rapporte à la formule verbale *tʿzzk*, on voit que la restitution partielle ici de la même formule est vraisemblable." Pardee continues, *ibid.*, n. 29, "Cette formule correspond à l'usage d'*ana darīti* en accadien. . . . Comme nous l'avons signalé dans les remarques textuelles, le texte restitué ici et à la ligne suivante dans *KTU*/*CAT* n'aura aucun attrait jusqu'à ce que de pareilles formules soient attestées (ces auteurs restituent ici et à la ligne suivante la double formule de retour de nouvelles … , mais sous une forme inattestée)."

partial parallels to this "optional" component: RS 20.178.1, RS 20.225, and RS 20.227.1. In these letters, the relevant phrase is *adi darīti*, 'unto perpetuity', which is more or less the Akkadian verbatim equivalent to Ugaritic *bʿd ʿlm*. One of these letters, RS 20.225, contains a slightly more elaborate version, unattested among the Ugaritic « ben » formulas:[156] {(6, cont'd) [ul-t]u (7') i-na-an-na a-di da-ri-ti | }, 'from now unto perpetuity'.[157]

4.4.1.1.2.2.4 "Optional" components with no Ugaritic equivalents

Among those "optional" components of the Ras Shamra Akkadian « ben » formulas which have no analog in the Ugaritic corpus are (1) vocative phrases, (2) adverbs, and (3) various verbal predications.

The most frequent of these is a vocative phrase:[158] twelve letters contain such an element.[159] Its placement within the formula is fairly uniform: in all cases but one it is fronted.[160] The composition of the vocative phrase is also consistent: it all cases it is composed of a REL term drawn from the BIO model with an attached 1st person

---

[156]A Ugaritic equivalent of such an idiom is attested, albeit in poetic form, in a curse motif from the ʾAQHT epic: see *KTU*[2] 1.19.IV:5-6, *l ht w ʿlmh l ʿnt p dr dr*, literally 'from now and unto perpetuity, from now and (unto) every generation' (see the idiomatic translation of N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit* (1998) 307: "henceforth and forever, now and for all generations!").

[157]See the re-edition of this text in Arnaud, *AuOr* 16 (1998) 27-28.

[158]While no Ugaritic analog of this is known, a vocative phrase is, however, a regular element in « ben » formulas of letters found at Boğazköy and Ma□at Höyük in the Hittite realm; see below, section 4.4.1.4.

[159]RS 6.198, RS 17.143, RS 17.148.1, RS 17.148.2, RS 25.131, RS 34.133, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.141, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.173, and RS 34.180,17.

[160]The single exception, where the vocative phrase is not fronted to the formula, is RS 6.198: {(5) DINGIR.MEŠ-nu ša KUR.URU-ú-ga-ri-ta (6) ŠEŠ-ia li-SU-ru-ka | }, 'May the gods of the land of the city of Ugarit guard you, O my brother!' In this example, the vocative follows the noun phrase referring to "the gods".

pronominal suffix. The most frequently attested examples are conceptually horizontal terms, that is, {ŠEŠ-ia} and the like,[161] but descending and ascending terms are also attested.[162]

One « ben » formula, that of RS [Varia 26], contains an adverbial component otherwise unattested for this formula: the phrase {dan-níš dan-níš}, 'very much', which modifies the *naṣāru* predication.

In addition to the verbal predications derived from NṢR and ŠLM, which have clear parallels in the Ugaritic « ben » formulas and which have already been discussed, several other verbal predications occur in the « ben » formulas of the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, if only infrequently.

"Optional" verbal predications derived from 'ZZ, and perhaps from TMM, occur in the Ugaritic « ben » formulas; note also that no equivalents to these predications are to be found among the « ben » formulas of Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.

There are four of these rare verbal predications, which may be catalogued here by verb: (1) *kubbudu* (D-stem of *kabādu*), 'to honor (s.o.) (in the presence of s.o.)';[163]

---

[161]Eight of the twelve examples of vocative phrases are conceptually horizontal. The following forms are attested: (1) {ŠEŠ-ia}, 'O, my brother', in RS 6.198, RS 17.148.2, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, and probably RS 34.180,17; (2) {ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA-ia}, 'O, my "good" brother', in RS 34.141 and RS 34.173; and (3) {ŠEŠ-ḫi-ia}, 'O, my brother', in RS 34.134.1. On this latter spelling, J. Huehnergard, *Syria* 74 (1997) 218, offers the suggestion that it should be read instead {ŠEŠ.DÙG-ia}, 'O, my "good' brother'.

[162]Four of these twelve vocative phrases are not conceptually horizontal; they include three conceptually descending terms: {DUMU-ia}, 'O, my son', in RS 17.148.1, RS 25.131, RS 34.133; and one ascending: {a-bu-ia}, 'O, my father', in RS 17.143.

[163]Two « ben » formulas contain this element: RS 34.133 and RS 34.153. The « ben » of RS 34.133 reads as follows: { | (4) DUMU-ia 1 li-im DINGIR.MEŠ (5) a-na šul-ma-ni PAP-ru-ka (6) li-šal-li-mu-ka (7) ù ^{d}é-a EN DUGUD (8) ^{d}AG EN GI.DUB.BA.A (9) ma-'-da-a a-na pa-ni (10) EN.MEŠ-ka li-ka-bi-du-ka | }, 'O, my son, may the one thousand gods protect you (and) keep you well, for (the purpose of your) well-being; and may Ea, the honored lord, and Nabû, the lord of the stylus,

(2) *šubbû* (D-stem of *šebû*), 'to satisfy (s.o.) (with respect to s.th.)';[164] (3) *šalāma šakānu*, 'to establish peace (for s.o.)';[165] and (4) *qāta ṣabātu*, 'to hold the hand (of s.o.) (in the presence of s.o.).'[166]

---

honor you much in the presence of your (own) lords!' and that of RS 34.153, as follows: { | (4) ^{d}a-a EN DUGUD nap-ša-ti-ka (5) li-iṣ-ṣu-ur (6) a-na pa-ni LUGAL be-li-ka (7) ù KUR ú-ga-rít (8) li-kab-bi-id-ka | }, 'May Ea, the honored lord, protect your life (and) may he honor you in the presence of the king, your lord, and (in) the land of Ugarit!'

[164]Two « ben » formulas contain this element: RS 20.178.1 and RS 20.225. The former is sufficiently well preserved to serve as an example: RS 20.178.1: {(5) DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR-ti pa-at-<ru$^{?}$-na$^{?}$> (6) ù DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR u-ga-rít (7) ù gab-ba DINGIR.MEŠ ša É a-b[i-ki/ni$^{?}$] (8) a-na šul-ma-ni PAP-ru-ki (9) ù li-iš-la-mu-ki (10) ù li-ši-bu-ki ši-bu-ta (11) a-na pa-ni DINGIR.MEŠ ša É a-b[i-ki/ni$^{?}$] (12) a-di da-ri-ti | }, 'May the gods of the land of Pat<runa?> and the gods of the land of Ugarit and all the gods of [(y)our?] father's house protect you for (the purpose of your) well-being, and may they keep you well, and may they grant you old age before the gods of [(y)our?] father's house, unto perpetuity!' Since both « ben » formulas which contain this verbal element also contain the *adi darīti* element, RS 20.227 (a fragmentary letter in which the « ben » also contains the *adi darīti* element) may belong here as well.

The orthography of the verb, {li-ši-bu-(ki/ka)}, with the {ši} sign in both examples, remains to be explained. The underlying historical form ought to be /**lišabbiʿū*/, and one can posit a "standard" Akkadian normalization *lišebbû*, showing the typical phonological coloring of /a/ to /e/ in the environment of historical */ʿ/. The value {še$_{20}$} for {IGI} is rare in the West, however, (for Ugarit, for example, see H., pp. 53, and 399) and it is conceivable that the spelling is either (1) only approximate, reflecting the inattention to vowel quality typical of western scribes, or (2) reflects vowel harmony in the underlying form (that is, /*lišebbû*/ —> /*lišibbû*/).

[165]Two « ben » formulas contain this element: RS 34.142 and RS 34.163. Both of these letters display formal features (such as otherwise unattested polite formula) which isolate them from the main body of RS Akkadian letters; RS 34.142, moreover, bears contextual indications (the gods invoked in the « ben ») that its sender was affiliated with Mari. Unfortunately, neither of these « ben » formulas is intact. I cite, as an example, RS 34.142: {(2, cont'd) ^{d}IM ^{d}da-gan ù (3) ^{d}ú$^{?}$-tar$^{?}$-mi-ri DINGIR.MEŠ GAL-tu$_{4}$ (4) ša KUR ma-ri nap-ša-ti be-lí-ia (5) li-iṣ-[ṣu-]rù a-na na-ṣa-[ri] (6) ku-ul [...] ša be-lí-ia [li$^{?}$- ...] (7) a-na É-ti be-lí-ia ki-i[b-si] (8) ù tal-la-ak-ti ša b[e-lí-ia] (9) ša-la-ma liš-ku-nu}, 'May the Storm God, Dagan, and Utar-Miri, the great gods of the land of Mari, protect the life of my lord, in (order to?) prote[ct? . . .] of my lord [. . .]! May they establish peace for the house of my lord, (for every) step (taken) and (for every) path (followed) by my lord!' Note that in line 7 the prepositional complement to *šalāma šakānu* appears to be *ana*, not *ana muḫḫi* (as restored for RS 34.163:6 in RSO 7 [1991], no. 39, p. 83).

[166]This element occurs in one « ben » formula: RS 34.141: { | (4) ŠEŠ DÙG.GA-ia DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR ú-ga-ri-it (5) ZI-ka PAP-ru ù DINGIR.MEŠ «x» (6) ša LUGAL EN-ka ŠU-ka a-na pa-ni (7) LUGAL EN-ka li-iṣ-ba-tu$_{4}$ | }, 'O, my "good" brother, may the gods of the land of Ugarit protect your life, and may the gods of the king, your lord, hold your hand in the presence of the king your lord!' Several analogs for this element occur in the « ben » formulas of letters from the Hittite realm; see below, section 4.4.

Other "miscellaneous" verbal predications occur along with the « ben » components just described; these are not treated in detail here, however, because they do not fit the definition of the « ben » formula, in the sense that they do not invoke the agency of "the gods". These motifs may be considered not as "benedictions", but as miscellaneous polite formulas.[167] None of them have analogs among the Ugaritic « ben » formulas.[168]

4.4.1.1.2.3 Attested compositional patterns

In the paragraphs above, I have attempted to demonstrate the depth of affinity between the « ben » formulas in the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian epistolary corpora, both in terms of distribution and in terms of compositional components. In light of these demonstrable affinities, it is striking that so few parallels of compositional structure are to be found. I am referring here to the incongruity which exists between these two corpora in terms of typical compositional patterns, that is, in

---

[167]Four such "miscellaneous" polite formulas can be distinguished, occurring in three different letters (RS 34.142, RS 34.163, and RS [Varia 26]). These should be classified apart from the components of the « ben » under discussion here:

(1) RS [Varia 26]: {(13) a-na LUGAL EN-ka (14) lu-ú at-tu-ka}, 'May you belong to the king, your lord!'

(2) RS [Varia 26]: {(15) ù i-na bi-ri ša (16) LÚ.MEŠ ki-na-ta-ti-ka (17) IGI.MEŠ-šú ša! LUGAL li-id-gu8-la-ka | }, 'And, among (all of) your colleagues, may the king's eyes look upon you (in particular)!'

(3) RS 34.163: {(9) man-nu pa-ni-ka ba-nu-ti li-mur (10) ù da-ba-ab-ka ṭa-ba liš-me}, 'Who would (not) want to see your beautiful face and hear you good word?' Compare also RS 34.142: {(11, cont'd) man-nu pa-n[i ba-nu-ti] (12) ša be-lí-ia li-mur [ù] da-b[a-ba] (13) DÙG.GA ša be-lí-ia liš-[te-e]m-mi},

and (4) RS 34.142. {(9, cont'd) a-na a-[ma-ri] (10) ša be-lí-ia lìb-bi ma-ʾ-[da] (11) iṣ-ṣi-ḫa-an-ni}, 'My heart would (?) rejoice much at the sight of my lord!'

[168]Note, however, the resemblance, even if remote and imprecise, between the "miscellaneous" polite formula present in RS 34.163:10 and RS 34.142:12-13 (see "type (3)" in the above footnote) and the reference to *šmʿ rgmk nʿm*, almost certainly a participial phrase, 'those who hear your good word', in the "information request" of the Ugaritic letter RS 92.2010:17-19.

terms of the statistical frequency of various combinations of "necessary" and "optional" components.

The Ugaritic corpus presents one main compositional pattern, consisting of three and only three components: (1) a noun phrase referring to "the gods", (2) a verbal form derived from NṬR, 'to guard, protect' in the G-stem (≈ Akkadian *naṣāru*), and (3) a verbal form derived from ŠLM, 'to keep (s.o.) well' in the D-stem (≈ Akkadian *šullumu*).[169] Individual equivalents for each of these three components exist among the syllabic « ben » formulas from the RS letters; in fact, the Akkadian equivalents of two of these components may be considered as "necessary" components of the « ben » formula in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus. Despite this, however, only one single Ras Shamra Akkadian example of this compositional pattern may be found: RS 34.164; and this, in a corpus of seventy-two "standard" « ben » formulas. Furthermore, even this parallel is valid only on the general level, and does not apply to the particular composition of each component.[170]

Among the few Ugaritic « ben » formulas which do not show this pattern, three "variant" (and statistically infrequent) compositional patterns may be recognized.[171]

---

[169]For details, see above, in section 4.2.

[170]I am referring here to the fact that, while the standard Ugaritic pattern may be represented by « *ỉlm* + *tṡrk* + *tšlmk* », for example, the individual Akkadian components which correspond to each of these three elements are not precise morpheme-for-morpheme parallels. In other words, (i) while the Ugaritic noun phrase referring to "the gods" is generic (*ỉlm*, 'the gods'), that of RS 34.164 is specific (*ilānu ša ugarīt(a) u ilānu ša bīti ṭuppi*, 'the gods of Ugarit and the gods of the tablet-house'); and, (ii) while both Ugaritic verbal forms refer to the recipient of the letter (who is the direct object of the verbal forms in question) by means of pronominal suffixes (*tṡrk*, 'may they guard *you*', and *tšlmk*, 'may they keep *you* well'), RS 34.164 accomplishes this by means of a common noun phrase incorporating conceptually explicit REL terminology (*napšāt ša aḫḫīya liṣṣurū u lišallimū*, 'may they guard and keep well the life [lit., lives] of my brothers'), a means of reference which does not occur in any known Ugaritic « ben » formula.

[171]See above, section 4.2.

One of these, that of RS 92.2005, is also found in a single Ras Shamra Akkadian example: RS 34.154. The pattern followed consists of four components, in the following order: (1) a noun phrase referring to "the gods" (Ug. *ỉlm* ≈ logographic {DINGIR.MEŠ}), (2) a prepositional phrase meaning, literally, 'for well-being' (Ug. *l šlm* ≈ Akk. *ana šulmāni*), (3) a predication derived from a verb meaning 'to guard, protect' (Ug. NṬR , G-stem ≈ Akk. *naṣāru*), and (4) a predication derived from a verb meaning 'to keep (s.o.) well' (Ug. ŠLM, D-stem ≈ Akk. *šullumu*). Unlike the case of RS 34.164, however, discussed in the paragraph above, these two « ben » formulas, Ugaritic RS 92.2005.1 and Akkadian RS 34.154, represent precise, morpheme-for-morpheme parallels.

None of the other micro-compositional patterns found in the Ugaritic « ben » formulas are attested in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus. As stated above, this lack of formal parallels is curious between two corpora otherwise so similar.

Apart from the two Ras Shamra Akkadian « ben » formulas discussed above, there remain seventy « ben » formulas in the corpus which follow micro-compositional patterns unattested in the Ugaritic corpus. Four of these compositional patterns are recurrent; they are listed here, in order of statistical frequency.

(1) The most common compositional pattern, attested in thirty-seven examples,[172] consists of three components: (i) a noun phrase referring to "the gods",

---

[172]Internal structural variation among these thirty-seven formulas is found mainly in the form taken by the "gods" noun phrase. Twenty-eight examples express this element generically, with the logogram {DINGIR.MEŠ} (RS 11.730, RS 15.077, RS 17.078, RS 17.142, RS 17.144, RS 17.286, RS 17.390, RS 17.397B+ {DINGIR.MEŠ-nu}, RS 19.053, RS 19.070, RS 20.015, RS 20.021, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.150, RS 20.172, RS 20.174A, RS 20.178.2, RS 20.239, RS 20.242, RS 20.255A, RS 21.007C, RS 21.201, RS 22.006, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.167+, RS [Varia 16] {DINGIR.MEŠ-nu}, and RS [Varia 25]); and nine examples specify the deities involved, either by means of including the numeral '1000', that is, {li-im DINGIR.MEŠ} (RS 17.083, RS 17.239, and RS 17.288), or by means of including the local affiliation of the deities (RS 15.024+, RS 15.033, RS 16.111, RS 16.116, and probably RS 17.429), or both (RIH 81/4). In terms of conceptual status, this

(ii) the prepositional phrase *ana šulmāni*, and (iii) a predication derived from the verb *naṣāru*. RS 20.015, {(6) DINGIR.MEŠ a-na šul-ma-ni (7) PAP - ru - ka | }, presents a typical example of this pattern: literally 'May the gods guard you for well-being!'

(2) The second most frequent pattern, found in fourteen examples,[173] displays a two-element composition: (i) a noun phrase referring to "the gods", and (ii) a predication derived from *naṣāru*. A representative example is RS 15.063, {(4) DINGIR.MEŠ PAP-ru-ka | }, 'May the gods guard you!'

(3) A third pattern, less frequent, is represented by the « ben » formulas of seven letters;[174] it consists of (i) a noun phrase used as a vocative, (ii) a noun phrase referring to "the gods", (iii) the prepositional phrase *ana šulmāni*, and (iv) a predication derived from the verb *naṣāru*. A representative is RS 34.161.1, {(4) ŠEŠ-ia DINGIR.MEŠ a-⌜na š⌝ul-ma-ni (5) PAP - ru - ka | }, literally, 'O my brother, may the gods guard you for well-being!'

---

pattern is distributed as follows: Of thirty-one unambiguous examples (the conceptual status of six of these thirty-seven examples is unknown), eleven are conceptually unmarked, eleven HOR, four DESC BIO, five ASC (of which four ASC BIO).

[173]Among these fourteen, variation is encountered mainly in the form taken by the noun phrase referring to "the gods": eight letters express this phrase generically, with the logogram {DINGIR.MEŠ} (RS 11.723, RS 15.063, RS 19.115, RS 20.017 {DINGIR.MEŠ-ni}, RS 20.158, RS 21.183, RS 34.158, and RS 34.160); and six specify the deities involved, by means of including the numeral '1000' {li-im DINGIR.MEŠ} (RS 17.152, probably RS 18.089, and RS 34.137), by means of logographic identifications (RS 4.449), by means of including local affiliations of the deities (RS 20.200B), or by both of the latter (RS 17.116). Most of the examples of this pattern are conceptually horizontal (six examples) or unmarked (five examples).

[174]Structural variation among these seven is encountered in the form taken by the "gods" noun phrase: four letters express this phrase generically, with the logogram {DINGIR.MEŠ} (RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.173, and RS 34.180,17), and three specify the deities involved, by including the numeral '1000' {li-im DINGIR.MEŠ} (RS 17.143, RS 17.148.1, and RS 17.148.2). In terms of conceptual status, these seven are distributed as follows: one is ASC BIO (RS 17.143), five are HOR (RS 17.148.2, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.173, and RS 34.180,17), are one DESC BIO (RS 17.148.1).

(4) Finally, one can mention a relatively infrequent, if recurrent, three-component pattern, attested in three letters,[175] consisting of (i) a noun phrase used as a vocative,[176] (ii) a noun phrase referring to "the gods", and (iii) a predication derived from *naṣāru*. RS 25.131 serves as an example: {(4) DUMU-ia DINGIR.MEŠ PAP-ru-ka | }, 'O my son, may the gods guard you!'

Setting aside the « ben » formulas which display one of these four patterns, there remain nine Ras Shamra Akkadian letters which contain what may be described as "atypical" compositional patterns, "atypical" not only in the sense that they are particularly elaborate in terms of composition, but also in the sense that no more than

---

[175]These are RS 6.198, RS 25.131, and RS 34.134.1. Variation is encountered among them in the form taken by the "gods" noun phrase: one of these formulas expresses this phrase generically, with the logogram {DINGIR.MEŠ} (RS 25.131), and the other two specify the deities involved (RS 6.198 and RS 34.134.1).

[176]One of the formulas representing this pattern occurs in a slightly different order: RS 6.198 shows « ["the gods" noun phrase] + [vocative phrase] + [*naṣāru* predication] ».

one example of each pattern is attested in the corpus.[177] Despite the unique structure of each, however, this group is not without internal similarities. Two of these formulas, for example, are distinctive in that they are "expanded",[178] containing not one, but two components corresponding to the "gods" noun phrase: RS 34.133 and RS 34.141. Regarding the formal similarities among three others, namely, RS 20.178, RS 20.225, and RS 20.227, J. Nougayrol posed the question "Sont-elles [the distinctive benedictions used therein] le signe distinctif d'un même secrétariat?"[179] He envisaged a positive response, and tentatively suggested that this "secrétariat" was that of Rapʾānu.[180] Further data, however, unavailable to Nougayrol, suggest that the best interpretation of these "atypical" formulas, not only of the three of which he spoke, but perhaps of all nine discussed here, is probably to be found not simply in the

---

[177]RS 20.178.1: ["the gods" noun phrase] + [*ana šulmāni*] + [*naṣāru* predication] + [*šullumu* predication] + [*adi darīti šubbû* predication];

RS 20.225: [?] + ["the gods" noun phrase] + [*naṣāru* predication] + [*šullumu* predication] + [*adi darīti šubbû* predication];

RS 20.227.1: ["the gods" noun phrase] + [?] + [*adi darīti šubbû* predication?];

RS 34.133: [vocative] + ["the gods" noun phrase] + [*ana šulmāni*] + [*naṣāru* predication] + [*šullumu* predication] + ["the gods" noun phrase] + [*kubbudu* predication];

RS 34.141: [vocative] + ["the gods" noun phrase] + [*naṣāru* predication] + ["the gods" noun phrase] + [*qāta ṣabātu* predication];

RS 34.142: ["the gods" noun phrase] + [*naṣāru* predication] + [?] + [*šalāma šakānu* predication];

RS 34.153 : ["the gods" noun phrase] + [*naṣāru* predication] + [*kubbudu* predication];

RS 34.163: ["the gods" noun phrase] + [*ana šulmāni* ?] + [*naṣāru* predication] + [?] + [*šalāma šakānu* predication]; and

RS [Varia 26]: ["the gods" noun phrase] + [*danniš danniš*] + [*naṣāru* predication].

[178]I use the term "expanded" in the sense used above, in section 3, to refer to those formulas in which one or more of the "necessary" components is repeated.

[179]J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 132, n. 1.

[180]*Ibid.*, p. 151, n. 3: "Les salutations de grand style de [RS 20.178] et [RS 20.227] portent peut-être la marque de son [that is, Rapʾānu's] secrétariat."

idiosyncratic tendencies of the scribes of a particular locality,[181] but rather in the distinct socio-cultural sphere in which the correspondents in question, who may have resided in various localities at various times,[182] lived and moved. In this vein, D. Arnaud has emphasized the "formation intellectuelle" of this social sphere: whatever their local affiliation, these correspondents were unified by their participation in a common literary culture.[183] I believe Arnaud is essentially correct when he speaks of these « ben » formulas, "fort originales", as belonging more properly "au monde des scribes avant celui du roi".[184]

---

[181]Arnaud's re-edition of RS 20.225 in *AuOr* 16 (1998) 27-35, suggests that the sender of this letter was affiliated with Ḫazor. Furthermore, in the same article, p. 30, n. 14, he proposes, on the basis of the local affiliations of the deities mentioned in the « ben » formula, that the sender of RS 20.178 was situated not at Ugarit, but at Pat<rūna>. Thirdly, prosopographical considerations, as well as the mention of the local affiliations in the « ben » formulas, suggest that the senders of RS 34.141, RS 34.153, and RS [Varia 26] ought to be linked with Emar. Thus, for the formal similarities in these letters at least, the hypothesis of distinctive local scribal habits is not fully satisfactory.

This is not to suggest that geography is never relevant to explaining diversity in epistolary habits. On the contrary, at least one letter in the group under discussion here, RS 34.142, shows a compositional pattern in the address which is unfamiliar to local patterns, a pattern which, in this case, seems most easily explained by reference to the locality of the sender, which seems to have been, judging from the deities mentioned in the « ben » formula, Mari in inland Syria. Rather, the point to be made here is that the link between local and formal diversity is not a necessary or automatic one.

[182]Compare, for example the movements of {^{m}KUR.EN} referred to in RS [Varia 26]:19-20, and those of Zu-Aštarti in RS 34.153:9-23; and see the comments of the editor in RSO 7 (1991) 65. Given the amount of "international" travel shown by these and other texts and, above all, the ambiguous nature of the data, it seems premature, at this point, to attach this or that epistolary habit to a particular local scriptorium.

[183]D. Arnaud, *Syria* 59 (1982) 107, is more specific: "la culture écrite accadienne". On the specific geographical and cultural background of these formulas and their formal variations, a background which appears to me to be adequately characterized under the rubric of "the cuneiform culture(s) of Syro-Anatolia", see below, section 4.5.

[184]*Ibid.*, p. 107, n. 53. In the spirit of J. D. Schloen, *The House of the Father* (2001), the solidarity of these diverse correspondents, of which Arnaud speaks, can be expressed in terms of their common membership in a single "household"; further, the common household in question was not that of a particular local king, but was rather an over-arching "scribal" household, headed by appropriate "scribal" patriarchs, like Ea "the honored lord", and Nabû "the lord of the stylus".

In Akkadian, Ugaritic,[185] and Hittite[186] letters alike, it appears to have been in just such a literate, and even "scribal" milieu in which elaborate formulaic expansions of the « ben » formula, such as those here discussed, were not out of place.

4.4.1.2 Akkadian letters from Tell Meskene

Among the thirty-some letters which may be certainly or tentatively linked with Tell Meskene, only two contain a « ben » formula: Msk 7461 and ME 53.2.

Msk 7461 { | (4) DINGIR.MEŠ a-na šul-ma-ni PAP-⌈ru⌉-k[a] | }[187]

ME 53.2 { | (26) DINGIR.MEŠ PAP.MEŠ-ku-nu-ši | }[188]

In terms of composition, both of these are obviously very similar to those known from the Ras Shamra corpus: the noun phrase referring to "the gods" is written {DINGIR.MEŠ}, the *naṣāru* verbal form is written with the {PAP} sign, and one of them, Msk 7461, contains the adverbial phrase {a-na šul-ma-ni}.

---

[185]Compare the compositionally unique but similarly elaborate « ben » formula of the Ugaritic letter RS 16.265, which is almost certainly a scribal exercise of sorts.

[186]See below.

[187]The transcription given in the *editio princeps* (D. Arnaud, Emar 6:3 [1986] 265) is {PAP-ur}, that is, a singular verbal form, *liṣṣur*, 'may he guard!' in spite of the writing {DINGIR.MEŠ} at the beginning of the formula. Compare the editor's remarks, *ibid.*, n. 4, and note also a similar "plural of majesty" in the (formally different) « ben » formula of EA 96: {(4, cont'd) DINGIR.MEŠ-nu (5) šu-lum-ka šu-lum É-ka (6) li-iš-al}). Unlike the Amarna example just cited, however, in this formulation of the « ben » formula, {DINGIR.MEŠ a-na šul-ma-ni PAP-ur}, the accusative complement of the verb would be unexpressed, which would be atypical for this pattern. Moreover, in making his copy (Emar 6:1 [1985] 196), the editor would seem to have favored the more typical reading of the formula: the three closely spaced signs at the end of the line might be read {PAP-⌈ru⌉-k[a]}, that is, the standard writing of the verb in the formula in the RS Akkadian corpus.

[188]D. Arnaud, *AuOr* 2 (1984) 180 and 182-183, no. 1, second letter; *idem*, *Textes syriens de l'âge du Bronze Récent* (1991) 150, no. 96.

The « ben » formula of ME 53.2, however, displays a number of unique formal features with respect to the Ras Shamra formulas. It expresses the *naṣāru* predication with {PAP.MEŠ-ku-nu-ši}, a writing which presents two features unusual for the « ben » formula: (1) the plurality of the underlying verbal form, *liṣṣurū*, 'may they guard!' is apparently expressed by means of the {MEŠ} sign, and (2) the attached pronominal suffix, which refers to the three recipients of the letter, would appear to present a "dative" form, unexpected in this context.[189] On the other hand, the « ben » formula of Msk 7461, assuming the reading given above is valid, presents a form entirely consistent with the most common form of the « ben » formula in the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters.

In terms of distribution, both of the examples of the « ben » formula are found in conceptually UNMARKED letters; a remarkable distribution, since in the Ras Shamra corpora the formula was found to be particularly rare in letters of this type. The « ben » formula is explicitly omitted from five other letters which are conceptually UNMARKED.[190] In addition, one can mention the absence of a « ben » formula (1) from all seventeen conceptually ascending letters in the Meskene corpus,[191] including

---

[189]To my knowledge, distinct dative forms of the pronominal suffixes are, in any case, rare in the western peripheral corpora; for the situation at Ugarit, for example, see J. Huehnergard, *Akkadian of Ugarit* (1989) 132-134; and more generally in Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian texts, see W. von Soden, *GAG*[3] (1995), § 42e. On the use of a classical dative form by a western scribe in a context where one would have expected an accusative, one may, if speculation be permitted, invoke the linguistic concept of a "hypercorrection": the scribe, perhaps proud of his knowledge of the classical Akkadian pronominal paradigm and wishing to display it, used the distinctive dative form without regard for its contextual usage.

[190]Msk 7437, Msk 7441.2, Msk 7452.2, Msk 73280 (which represents, in any case, an independent epistolary tradition), and ME 57.

[191]Msk 7441.1, Msk 7442, Msk 7445, Msk 7451.1, Msk 7451.2, Msk 7452.1, Msk 7452.3, Msk 7454, Msk 7472, Msk 7474+, Msk 7497.1, Msk 7498d, Msk 74102c, Msk 74270, ME 53.1, ME 54, and ME 127. Of these, all employ terms drawn from the ASC POW model; one letter, Msk 74102c, employs conceptually ascending terms drawn from both the BIO and the POW models.

Msk 74102c, which also incorporates ASC BIO terminology, (2) from the single known conceptually HOR letter,[192] and (3) from the two conceptually descending letters, both of which employ the BIO model.[193]

Finally, in both of these letters, the « ben » formula is the only "polite formula" present, and in both cases it is neatly separated from the surrounding sections by horizontal scribal lines, a disposition known also in the Ras Shamra Akkadian and Ugaritic corpora.[194]

4.4.1.3 Benedictions in the Amarna corpus

Polite formulas fitting the definition of the « ben » formula, as applied here, are known, but by no means frequent in the Amarna corpus. Because of the unwieldiness of the corpus, which includes well over three hundred letters, I have found it helpful, in my own attempt at comprehension, to stress the predominance of two conceptual "types" of letters among the whole: these are (1) conceptually horizontal letters, in which the sender characterizes himself as the "brother" of the recipient, and (2) conceptually ascending letters, in which the sender characterizes himself as the "servant", or, more rarely, as the "son" of the recipient. In practical terms, these

---

[192]RE 83.

[193]Msk 7451.4 and Msk 7497.2.

[194]There are three letters in the Ugaritic corpus in which the « ben » is the only "polite formula" present (RS 16.265 « SR *ben | », RS 94.2383+ « RS | ben | », and RS [Varia 4] « SR ben | »), but in only one of these (RS 94.2383+) do scribal lines both precede and follow the « ben ». In the RS Akkadian corpus this pattern (« ben » formula as sole "polite formula", separated from preceding and following sections by scribal lines) is more common: compare RS 15.063, RS 16.111, RS 17.148.2, RS 20.174A, RS 25.131, RS 34.133, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.141, RS 34.153, RS 34.160, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.161.2, RS 34.173, RS 34.180,17; and note also RS 4.449 in which the « ben » is the only "polite formula" present but is not separated from the adjacent sections by scribal lines.

categories translate, more or less accurately, into two main contextual groupings: (1) royal international diplomatic correspondence between "great kings" and (2) royal international diplomatic correspondence from "vassal" kings in Syria and Palestine addressed to the "great king" of Egypt.[195]

To my knowledge, none of the letters in the first group contains a benediction.[196] This absence provides a striking contrast with the distribution of the « ben » formula among the conceptually HOR letters in the RS Akkadian and Ugaritic corpora, where the formula is common.[197] It may be worthwhile to point out contextual differences between these corpora, which may help to explain, at least in part, this seeming distributional discrepancy. One such contextual difference lies in the fact that the international "court-correspondence" between the "Great Kings" of the Late Bronze Age is a well represented genre in the Amarna corpus, but not so in the RS Akkadian or Ugaritic letters. This granted, one is tempted to believe that the "international" epistolary conventions employed in "brotherly" correspondence differed from the local Syro-Anatolian habits employed for conceptually similar "brotherly" letters. Some support for such a suggestion is found in the near complete absence of the « ben » formula from the sizable Ḫatti-Egypt inter-court correspondence of the same period,[198] but its frequent presence in domestic correspondence.[199]

---

[195]M. Liverani highlights this contextual difference in the subtitles of his book, *Le lettere di el-Amarna* (1999): "Le lettere dei « Grandi Re »" (vol. 2) and "Le lettere dei « Piccoli Re »" (vol. 1).

[196]The « ben » formula is explicitly or probably absent from the following thirty-two Amarna letters of this category: EA 1-3, EA 5-11, EA 15-21, EA 23-24, EA 26-29, EA 33-35, and EA 37-42. It is also absent from EA 166, a conceptually HOR letter which is not part of the correspondence between "great kings". I have found no conceptually HOR letter in this corpus which contains a « ben » formula.

[197]For the distribution of the « ben » formula in conceptually HOR letters in the Ugaritic corpus, see above, section 4.3.2; for the RS Akkadian corpus, see above, section 4.4.1.1.

[198]E. Edel, *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi* (1994).

Among the much more numerous letters of the second group,[200] namely, those conceptually ASC letters which represent, for the most part, correspondence from the "little kings" of Syria-Palestine sent to the Egyptian pharaoh, the presence of "polite formulas" which match the description of the « ben » formula in the *praescriptio* is infrequent, but not inexistent: a recognizable benediction formula may be found in as many as thirty-three letters of this group,[201] but is explicitly or probably absent from nearly two hundred others.[202] The distribution of the « ben » formula in the letters of this class provides one of those few cases for which a convincing explanation, beyond mere statistical approximations, is possible: all of the letters in this group certainly or almost certainly derive from a single sender, Rib-Haddi[203] of Byblos. Moreover, in the letters of which he is the sender, two compositional patterns for the "benedictions"

---

[199]I refer to the frequent presence of the « ben » formula in the many Hittite letters from Boğazköy and Ma□at-Höyük; see below, section 4.4.1.4.

[200]The corpus contains over three hundred such letters; the greater part of EA 44-338 and EA 361-378 represent this category.

[201]The following thirty-three Amarna letters are certainly or probably conceptually ASC, and contain a recognizable benediction formula: EA 68, EA 73-79, EA 81, EA 83, EA 85-87, EA 89, EA 92, EA 105, EA 107-110, EA 112, EA 114, EA 116-119, EA 121-125, EA 130, and EA 132.

[202]I count one hundred ninety-eight conceptually ASC Amarna letters which explicitly or probably omit the « ben » formula: EA 44, EA 48, EA 51-55, EA 58-60, EA 62-65, EA 82, EA 84, EA 90-91, EA 93-94, EA 100, EA 103-104, EA 106, EA 111, EA 126, EA 129, EA 136-161, EA 164-165, EA 168-170, EA 174-175, EA 177-178, EA 182, EA 184-185, EA 187, EA 189, EA 191-196, EA 198, EA 200-207, EA 209, EA 211-235+, EA 238-239, EA 241-244, EA 246, EA 248-250, EA 252-276, EA 278-290, EA 292-306, EA 308, EA 314-331, EA 333, EA 336-337, EA 362-366, and EA 378.

[203]Following general convention, I would like to cite the personal name in its nominative form, but the attested orthographic variation makes it difficult to understand the name's grammatical inflection. I adopt "Rib-Haddi" as the nominative form on the basis of EA 92: {(1) ^{m}r[i-i]b-ad-di iq-bi (2) a-na LUGAL be-li-šu}; the forms of the name which follow *umma* should not be assumed to represent the nominative case since, in the West, *umma* was generally followed by the genitive (R. Marcus, *JCS* 2 [1948] 223-224). The grammar underlying such the form cited above seems comprehensible: the name appears to be West Semitic in origin, of a dialect in which the "construct" state of a common noun was not productively cased (the **rīb-* element shows no case vowel); this form shows *haddi* as the genitive of the divine name *haddu*.

are apparent: one when Rib-Haddi writes to a "superior" other than the pharaoh, and one when writing to the pharaoh himself.

The benediction formulas of the letters of the first group may number as many as four,[204] and are exemplified by EA 73: {(4) ^{d}NIN ša URU gub-la ti-din (5) ba-aš-ta-k[a] i-na pa-ni (6) LUGAL-ri EN-ka}, 'May the Mistress of Byblos give you honor[205] before the king, your master!' Either one or two divinities may be invoked: 'the Mistress of Byblos',[206] '(the Egyptian god) *Amun*, [the god of the king,] your master' [207] or both: '*Amun* and the Mistress of Byblos.'[208] The benedictory idiom itself consists of (1) a 3rd person volitional form of the verb *nadānu*, 'to give', having the god(s) mentioned above as its grammatical subject, accompanied by (2) an accusative complement in the form of the noun phrase *bāšta-ka*, 'your honor',[209] and (3) an adverbial complement in the form of the prepositional phrase *ina*[210] *pāni šarri bēlika*,

---

[204]EA 73 is ASC BIO and EA 87 ASC POW. Because of the identity of the recipient of EA 77 and of EA 86 (in both cases the same as EA 73), these two may belong here as well; the fragmentary state of the *praescriptio* prevents certainty.

[205]My translation is idiomatic; literally, 'May the Mistress of Byblos give (in the sense of "establish" or "put") your honor before the king, your master!'

[206]EA 73:4 {^{d}NIN ša URU gu-ub-la}.

[207]EA 86:3-4, {(3) ^{d}a-ma-n[a ...] (4) EN-ka}, should probably be restored in light of EA 71:4, {^{d}a-ma-na DINGIR ša L[UGA]L [be$^{?}$-li$^{?}$-k]a$^{?}$}, as J. Knudtzon proposed in *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 1 (1915) 412, note f. For the « ben » formula of EA 71, which is probably a conceptually UNMARKED letter, see the paragraphs which follow.

[208]EA 87:5-6 {(5) ^{d}a-ma-na ù ^{d}NIN (6) ša URU gub-la}. Very probably, EA 77 belongs here as well; W. Moran's reconstruction in *Les lettres d'El-Amarna* (1987) 257, n. 1, seems formally plausible.

[209]This noun phase is written syllabically in EA 73:5 {ba-aš-ta-k[a]}, but logographically in EA 86:4 and 87:7 {UR-ka}, as probably EA 77:5 {U[R-ka]}.

[210]EA 87:7 shows {a-na pa-ni}.

'in the presence of the king, your[211] master.' Though the formulation here is different, this idiom may be profitably compared with the *kubbudu* idiom, present in the « ben » formulas of a few Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra.[212]

The benediction formulas of the letters of the second group, that is, in the letters from Rib-Haddi to the (Egyptian) king, are more numerous, at twenty-nine.[213] EA 68 provides a convenient example: {(4) [d]NIN ša URU gu-ub-la (5) ti-id-di-en du-na (6) a-na LUGAL be-li-ia }, 'May the Mistress of Byblos give strength to the king, my master!' In this group, the deity invoked is always "the Mistress of Byblos". As above, the verbal idiom here also consists of (1) a 3rd person volitional form of the verb *nadānu*, 'to give',[214] having the goddess just mentioned as its grammatical subject, accompanied by (2) a direct object in the form of the common noun *dunnu*, 'strength',[215] and (3) an indirect object in the form of the prepositional phrase *ana šarri bēliya*, 'to the king, my master'. Again, the formulation is different, but a semantically similar idiom is known, though rare, in Ugaritic « ben » formulas: *tʿzzk*, 'May they (that is, the gods) strengthen you!'[216]

---

[211]So EA 73:6 and EA 86:5, which both have {EN-ka}, '*your* master'; but EA 87:7 reads {BE-ia}, '*my* master'.

[212]See above, section 4.4.1.1.2.4.

[213]EA 68, EA 74-76, EA 78-79, EA 81, EA 83, EA 85, EA 89, EA 92, EA 105, EA 107-109, probably EA 110, EA 112, EA 114, EA 116-119, EA 121-125, EA 130, and EA 132.

[214]The orthography of this form varies: compare, for example, EA 68:5 {ti-id-di-en}, EA 74:3 {ti-di-in}, EA 75:4 {ti-din}, and EA 76:4 {ti-di-en}.

[215]This element is written syllabically, as in EA 68:5 {du-na}, for example; but more often logographically: either {KAL.GA}, as in EA 75:4, for example, or, less frequently, {GA.KAL}, as in EA 74:3, for example.

[216]See above, section 4.2.3.

These two categories, those of conceptually HOR and ASC letters, do not exhaust the corpus, however: there remain a few conceptually UNMARKED letters and a handful of conceptually DESC letters from Amarna as well, some of which contain "benediction" formulas.

At least thirteen Amarna letters may be classified as conceptually UNMARKED.[217] Among these, five contain recognizable "benediction" formulas.[218] A link between the use of epistolary benediction formulas and Rib-Haddi of Byblos continues to be perceptible in this category: three of these five letters were sent by him.[219] These three letters, and the benediction formulas they contain, follow, in all essentials, the compositional patterns of EA 73, 77, and 86-87, also sent by Rib-Haddi, described three paragraphs above.[220]

---

[217]These are EA 12.1, EA 31, EA 71 (probably), EA 95 (probably), EA 97 (probably), EA 98-99, EA 102 (probably), EA 170.2, EA 316.2, EA 367, EA 369, and EA 370. The conceptually "unmarked" category encompasses a rather wide variety of letters in the Amarna corpus, including (i) letters from the Egyptian pharaoh to rulers of Levantine city-states (compare EA 99, EA 367, EA 369, and EA 370), (ii) "person-to-person" letters in which the correspondents are often identified only by their personal names (compare EA 71, EA 97-98, EA 102), (iii) letters from individuals addressed to imperial officials (EA 95), and (iv) "piggy-back" letters possibly reflecting scribal correspondence (compare EA 170.2 and EA 316.2); there is the possibility of overlap among the final three categories.

[218]EA 12.1, EA 71, EA 95, EA 97, and EA 102.

[219]EA 71, EA 95, and EA 102.

[220]In terms of formulaic structure all seven of these Rib-Haddi letters (EA 73, EA 77, and EA 86-87, which are certainly or probably conceptually ASC; and EA 71, EA 95, and EA 102, which are UNMARKED) display a pattern: « RS pros *ben body ». Furthermore, the « ben » formulas of each of these three letters show essentially the same compositional pattern as EA 73, EA 77, and EA 86-87; the description of the benediction formulas of these letters, given three paragraphs above, applies also to the formulas of EA 71: {(4) ^{d}a-ma-na DINGIR ša L[UGA]L [be$^{?}$-li$^{?}$-k]a$^{?}$ (5) ti-di-nu UR-ka i-na (6) pa-ni LUGAL be-li-ka }; EA 95: {(3, cont'd) ^{d}a-ma-na ù (4) ^{d}NIN ša URU gub-la (5) ti-di-nu UR-ka i-na pa-ni (6) LUGAL-ri EN-li-ka-ma}; and EA 102: {(5) ^{d}NIN ša URU gub-la (6) DINGIR LUGAL BE-ia li-din (7) UR-ba-ka a-na pa-ni LUGAL be-li-ku}.

The two conceptually UNMARKED letters containing benediction formulas which are not connected with Rib-Haddi of Byblos, namely EA 12.1 and EA 97, follow compositional patterns unlike those thus far surveyed:

EA 12.1: {(7) DINGIR.MEŠ ša ^{m}b[u]r-ra-˹bur$^{?}$˺-[i]a-aš (8) it-ti-ka li-li-ku}[221]

EA 97: {(3) [DINGIR.M]EŠ šu-lum$^{!}$-ka li-[iš$^{?}$-a]l$^{?}$}[222]

The former formula is otherwise unique in the Amarna corpus, but the later has parallels not only elsewhere in this corpus,[223] but also in several other roughly contemporary epistolary corpora, in Akkadian and in Ugaritic.[224]

The remaining conceptual category is also represented the least in the corpus: there are, to my knowledge, three letters which make use of explicitly descending REL terminology: EA 30, EA 96, and EA 162. One of these, EA 96, a conceptually DESC BIO letter, contains a benediction formula. In formal terms, it parallels the benediction of EA 97, mentioned above.[225] Also worth pointing out is another link between the

---

[221]'May the gods of Burraburiaš go with you!'

[222]Given the singular form of the verb, the best translation is probably 'May the god$^{!}$ seek your well-being!' As below, in EA 96, the writing with the {MEŠ} sign apparently does not indicate a grammatically plural entity; should these examples be considered as "plurals of majesty", as in the use of אלהים, treated as a singular, in Hebrew? Compare A. Rainey, *CAT* 2 (1996) 215.

[223]EA 96:4-6.

[224]See below, in the discussion of the "non-standard" « ben » formula of RS 17.117:2, section 4.7; and note the observations of J.-L. Cunchillos, *AuOr* 1 (1983) 61-62 (with respect to RS 17.117, EA 96, and the letter TT 1 from Tell Taanach [see below section 4.4.1.5.2]).

[225]EA 96:4-6 {(4, cont'd) DINGIR.MEŠ-nu (5) šu-lum-ka šu-lum É-ka (6) li-iš-al }, 'May the god$^{!}$ seek your well-being, and the well-being of your household!' On the use of the {MEŠ} sign and the singular form of the verb, see above, regarding EA 97.

Amarna benediction formulas and Rib-Haddi of Byblos, to whom this letter is addressed.[226]

Among the thirty-nine "polite formulas" surveyed above which may be qualified as "benediction formulas" in the broad sense,[227] there is not one which resembles the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula in terms of composition. In particular, the Amarna benedictions do not employ the verb *naṣāru*, neither do they employ a verbal form derived from *šalāmu*, both of which are "necessary" components of the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula. In this respect, the epistolary traditions reflected in the Amarna letters differed from those reflected in the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian epistolary corpora.

If not directly comparable in terms of composition, the Amarna letters which contain benedictions do show formulaic patterns in the disposition of the "polite formulas" which are more or less familiar to the Ugaritic tradition.[228] Among these letters, the most common pattern is « ben pros », which occurs frequently in letters which bear address formulas of the order, « SR »,[229] and less commonly in those of the

---

[226]Note, however, that the benediction of this letter, addressed to Rib-Haddi, does not follow the same formal pattern as those letters sent by Rib-Haddi, discussed above.

[227]The following thirty-nine Amarna letters contain polite formulas fitting the description of the "benediction" formula offered above, in section 4.2: EA 12.1, EA 68, EA 71, EA 73-79, EA 81, EA 83, EA 85-87, EA 89, EA 92, EA 95-97, EA 102, EA 105, EA 107-110, EA 112, EA 114, EA 116-119, EA 121-125, EA 130, and EA 132.

[228]An exception is EA 12.1, which contains "polite formulas" which have no known equivalent in the Ugaritic epistolographic tradition.

[229]As many as twenty-one Amarna letters show the structural pattern « SR ben pros body »: EA 68, EA 74-76, EA 78-79, probably EA 81, EA 83, EA 89, EA 105, EA 107-109, EA 112, probably EA 114, probably EA 116, EA 117, EA 119, and EA 121-123. All of these are conceptually ASC POW, and all were certainly or probably sent from Rib-Haddi of Byblos to the Egyptian pharaoh.

« RS » order.[230] A single Ugaritic letter shows a comparable pattern.[231] A second common pattern is « pros ben », which occurs with both orders of mention in the address,[232] and for which several parallels are known in the Ugaritic corpus.[233] A third pattern, less common, contains only the « ben » formula among the "polite formulas";[234] this pattern, too, has analogs in Ugaritic.[235]

4.4.1.4 The « ben » formula in letters from Anatolian sites

My treatment of the « ben » formula in epistolary texts found at sites in the Hittite realm incorporates data drawn from three major corpora: (1) the corpus of

---

[230]Four Amarna letters display the pattern « RS ben pros body »: EA 110 (probably), EA 124 (which contains a repeated address formula, following the polite formulas), EA 130, and EA 132. These four are also conceptually ASC POW, and were certainly or probably sent from Rib-Haddi of Byblos to the Egyptian pharaoh.

[231]RS 92.2010 shows the pattern « RS ben pros body ». The *praescriptio* of RS is similar, but not directly comparable since it also contains a salutation formula: « RS *sal ben pros | body ».

[232]The structural sequence « RS pros ben body » occurs in ten Amarna letters: EA 71, EA 73, EA 77, EA 85-87, EA 95, EA 102, EA 118, and EA 125. All of these certainly or probably have Rib-Haddi of Byblos as their sender; three of them are conceptually ASC POW and addressed to the pharaoh (EA 85, EA 118, and EA 125); four others are certainly or probably conceptually ASC, but are addressed to individuals other than the pharaoh (EA 73 ASC BIO, EA 87 ASC POW, and EA 77 and EA 86, both of which are probably conceptually ascending); and three are conceptually unmarked, addressed to individuals other than the pharaoh (EA 71, EA 95, and EA 102). The sequence « SR pros ben body » occurs in a single Amarna letters: EA 92, conceptually ASC POW, sent by Rib-Haddi of Byblos to the pharaoh.

[233]There are four possible parallels: RS 8.315 « RS | pros ben body », RS 18.113+ « RS | pros *ben | body? », probably RS 94.2273 « ⌜S⌝R *pros be[n ...] », and 94.2545+ (an atypical letter, which contains portions of a second *praescriptio* in the middle of the letter; this second *praescriptio* follows the order « RS (body motifs) pros ben body »).

[234]Two Amarna letters show the pattern « RS ben body »: EA 96 and EA 97. EA 96 is conceptually DESC BIO (addressed to Rib-Haddi of Byblos by an unnamed official); and EA 97 is conceptually unmarked (addressed to PN from PN).

[235]Compare RS 16.265 « SR *ben | body », RS 94.2383+ « RS | ben | body », and RS [Varia 4] « SR ben | body ».

Akkadian letters from Boğazköy, (2) the corpus of Hittite letters from Boğazköy, and (3) the corpus of Hittite letters from Ma□at-Höyük. Within these corpora, it is possible to isolate those "benediction" formulas which meet the tripartite definition offered above in section 4.2,[236] to survey their composition and distribution, and to enumerate those patterns which have formal parallels in the Ugaritic corpus.

Some letters from sites in the Hittite realm contain "benediction" motifs which occur not in the epistolary *praescriptio*, but in the body of the letter.[237] These will be mentioned here, but not studied in detail. Of four "benediction" motifs isolated from the corpus of Akkadian letters recovered from Boğazköy, three represent this category,[238] and at least three such motifs may be found in the corpus of Hittite letters from Ma□at-Höyük.[239] Not only do the "benediction" motifs in these letters occur in the body of the letter and not in the formulaic *praescriptio*, but also they present compositional patterns which must be classified as "non-standard" with respect to the those displayed by the epistolary « ben » formulas.

These passages aside, there remain nearly fifty « ben » formulas which I have examined, which meet all three definitional criteria: twenty-nine of these are drawn

---

[236]I reprint it here for convenience: ". . . the « ben » formula . . . encompasses at least three aspects: (1) in terms of distribution, it is an epistolary "polite formula", occurring in the section following the address but prior to the body of the letter; (2) in terms of context, and morpho-syntax, it is volitional in mood; and (3), in terms of semantics, it solicits the agency of the gods in seeking the well-being of the recipient."

[237]Compare the similar motifs in the Ugaritic and Akkadian corpora from Ras Shamra (as in RS 16.078+ and RS 12.005, respectively).

[238]KBo 28.048:13-17, KUB 3.070:17-22, and probably KUB 34.002:16-18.

[239]HKM 18.2:29-30; HKM 33.1:27'-28'; and perhaps also HKM 53.2:17-18.

from the corpus of Hittite letters from Ma□at,[240] seventeen from the corpus of Hittite letters from Boğazköy,[241] and one example from the corpus of Akkadian letters from Boğazköy.[242] This collection is not intended to be comprehensive; I do, however, consider it to be adequately representative of the composition and distribution of the formula in the major epistolary tradition(s) represented in these archives.

Since the Hittite and Akkadian versions of the « ben » formula require separate treatment, I will deal first with the single Akkadian example in the paragraphs which follow, and then with the Hittite examples.

4.4.1.4.1 IN THE BOĞAZKÖY AKKADIAN LETTERS

The standard « ben » formula would appear to be very rare in the corpus of Akkadian letters from Boğazköy. To my knowledge it occurs only in KBo 8.017.2:

KBo 8.017.2 {(12') ù ŠEŠ-ia li-im D[INGIR.MEŠ . . .] (13') i-na EGIR u_4-mi li-i[ṣ-ṣu-ru]}

Such a restricted distribution for the formula is striking given the considerable size of this corpus. The fact that it occurs here in a "piggyback" Akkadian letter, appended to

---

[240]The following letters from Ma□at contain the « ben » formula: ABoT 65 (probably from Ma□at); HKM 2.2, HKM 3.2, HKM 10.2, HKM 17.2, HKM 17.3, HKM 21.2, HKM 27.3, HKM 28.2, HKM 29.2, HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2, HKM 36.2, HKM 36.3, HKM 52.1, HKM 52.2, HKM 53.2, HKM 56.1, HKM 56.2, HKM 57, HKM 58.1, HKM 58.2, HKM 60.2, HKM 63, HKM 64, HKM 71.2, HKM 73.2, HKM 82.2, and HKM 95.2.

[241]The following Hittite letters from Boğazköy contain the « ben » formula: KBo 9.083.2, KBo 13.62, KBo 18.003, KBo 18.004, KBo 18.006, KBo 18.007, KBo 18.013, KBo 18.046, KBo 18.050, KBo 18.077.2, KBo 18.097.2, KBo 18.100, KBo 18.103; KUB 48.88.2; *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1, *Mélanges Laroche* 3.2, and VS 28.129. Compare A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 67-71.

[242]Only one « ben » formula among the Akkadian letters from Boğazköy is known to me: KBo 18.017.2.

a principal letter written in Luwian,[243] and the fact that the correspondents both bear Akkadian names, would seem to be strong indications that this letter represents scribal correspondence.[244] This consideration, along with the "horizontal" nature of the REL terms employed in the letter, must be taken into account in explaining the appearance of the « ben » formula here. Conversely, the absence of the formula from the other Akkadian letters found at Boğazköy can also no doubt be credibly explained: for the most part these are international letters of a diplomatic nature, and « ben » formulas are rare in such letters,[245] as was observed with respect to the Amarna corpus where this genre is also well-represented.[246]

A number of structural characteristics pertinent to the « ben » formula are noteworthy in KBo 8.017.2. With respect to the structure of the *praescriptio*, for example, it may be observed that (1) the « sal » formula and the « ben » formula are joined on the clausal level by the conjunction {ù}.[247] With respect to the « ben » formula in particular, one notes that (2) the formula begins with a vocative phrase, {ŠEŠ-ia}, 'O my brother!' (3) The noun phrase referring to the gods shows a pattern attested occasionally in the RS Akkadian corpus: {li-im D[INGIR.MEŠ]}, 'the thousand g[ods]'. (4) It contains the adverbial phrase {i-na EGIR u_4-mi}, 'to length of

---

[243]See the treatment of this letter in A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989), no. 109, p. 165, with anterior bibliography.

[244]On the phenomenon of Anatolian scribes bearing Akkadian names, see S. Alp, RAI 34 (1998) 47-61, with some anterior bibliography. See also G. Beckman, *JCS* 35 (1983) 97-114.

[245]For example, to my knowledge, not one single example of a genuine « ben » formula is to be found among the sizable number of such letters presented in E. Edel , *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi* (1994).

[246]See above, section 4.4.1.3.

[247]Compare the regular presence of the enclitic conjunction *nu* in this slot in Hittite « ben » formulas (see below).

day(s)'.[248] (5) There appears to have been only one verbal component in the formula, or at least only one that has been partially preserved; this component is spelled entirely syllabically,[249] {li-i[ṣ-ṣu-ru]}. (6) Finally, and this assumes that the restoration just given of the verbal form is correct, and more particularly, that the accusative complement of the verb was not attached in the form of a 2nd person pronominal suffix, one may reasonably reconstruct the direct object of the verb in the lacuna at the end of the preceding line, perhaps as {[na-ap-ša-ti-ka]}, or, more briefly {[ZI-ka]}, a compositional pattern for which parallels are known from Ras Shamra.[250]

In sum, even if the « ben » formula of KBo 18.017.2 shows some unusual features, it is well at home, in terms of composition and distribution, among the family of « ben » formulas represented in the Ugaritic letters, the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra and Tell Meskene, and the Hittite letters from Boğazköy and Ma□at-Höyük. This particular formula does not, however, represent an exact micro-compositional parallel to any of the Ugaritic « ben » formulas.

---

[248]A phrase with comparable semantics occurs in the "non-standard" benediction motif ("non-standard" in the sense that [1] it occurs in the body of the letter rather than in the *praescriptio*, and that [2] it presents a compositional pattern unknown among the epistolary « ben » formulas) of a Ugaritic letter, RS 16.078+, line 20. The benediction motif in which this adverbial phrase occurs is lengthy and only partially preserved; but excerpts from lines 18-21 provide a suitable paraphrase of the syntax: [*å*]*rš ... ůrk ym bʿly l pn åmn*, '. . . I am wishing for a lengthening of the days of my lord before (the god) Amun. . . .' As an element of the epistolary « ben » formula proper, this phrase is also known in at least two Hittite letters: KBo 18.050 and KBo 18.097.2 (on which, see below, section 4.4.1.4.2). For this particular formulation, as an adverbial phrase, compare Ps. 23:6 in the Hebrew Bible: וְ□שַׁבְתִּי בְּ□בֵית־□יְהֹוָה לְ□אֹרֶךְ יָמִים, 'And I shall dwell in the house of YHWH forever (lit., "to length of days").'

[249]It is more typical for spellings of this particular form to include the logogram {PAP} for the verb *naṣāru* in the « ben » formula.

[250]See above, section 4.4.1.2.1.2.

4.4.1.4.2 IN THE HITTITE LETTERS FROM BOĞAZKÖY AND MA□AT-HÖYÜK

As the Hittite letters from Boğazköy and Ma□at-Höyük reflect basically the same epistolary conventions, these two corpora are treated together in the paragraphs which follow. I have selected forty-five Hittite examples of the « ben » formula to be treated here, seventeen from Boğazköy,[251] and twenty-nine from Ma□at.[252] All of these formulas occur within the formulaic *praescriptio* section of the letter. Compositionally, they are not identical; they do share certain structural regularities, however, and it is in this sense that one can speak of a "standard" epistolary « ben » formula in these corpora.

4.4.1.4.2.1 Composition: necessary components

As in previous sections, I have found it useful to classify the various constituents of the Hittite « ben » formula as either "necessary" or "optional". Three components may be considered as "necessary" in the sense that all attested examples of the formula contain them. These are (1) the noun phrase referring to "the gods",[253] functioning as the grammatical subject of the verb(s) in the formula, (2) one or more

---

[251]KBo 9.083.2, KBo 13.62, KBo 18.003, KBo 18.004, KBo 18.006, KBo 18.007, KBo 18.013, KBo 18.046, KBo 18.050, KBo 18.077.2, KBo 18.097.2, KBo 18.100, KBo 18.103, KUB 48.88.2, *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1, *Mélanges Laroche* 3.2, and VS 28.129.

[252]ABoT 65, HKM 2.2, HKM 3.2, HKM 10.2, HKM 17.2, HKM 17.3, HKM 21.2, HKM 27.3, HKM 28.2, HKM 29.2, HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2, HKM 36.2, HKM 36.3, HKM 52.1, HKM 52.2, HKM 53.2, HKM 56.1, HKM 56.2, HKM 57, HKM 58.1, HKM 58.2, HKM 60.2, HKM 63, HKM 64, HKM 71.2, HKM 73.2, HKM 82.2, and HKM 95.2.

[253]The absence of such a noun phrase from the « ben » formula of HKM 56.2:24-25 would seem to indicate that this component should not be considered as a "necessary" component of the formula. It seems clear, however, as the editor's translation implies (S. Alp, *Hethitische Briefe aus Masat-Höyük* [1991] 227), that these lines contain a scribal error: the scribe simply neglected to write {DINGIR.MEŠ} between {nu-ut-ta} and {aš-šu-li}; otherwise, the third person plural subject of the verbal form {pa-aḫ-ša-an-ta-ru} would not have been identified.

verbal predications, in which the verb is volitional in mood, and 3rd person plural, having the noun phrase referring to "the gods" as its grammatical subject, and (3) a phrase indicating the "beneficiary" of the formula, which in most cases is simply the recipient.

4.4.1.4.2.1.1 "The Gods" element

Three patterns are attested for the noun phrase referring to "the gods". In order of frequency, they are (1) {DINGIR.MEŠ},[254] 'the gods', (2) {*LI-IM* DINGIR.MEŠ},[255] 'the thousand gods', and (3) {(DINGIR.MEŠ) ^{d}*É-A*-aš(-ša) ḫa-at-ta-an-na-aš LUGAL-uš},[256] '(the gods) (and) Ea, the king of wisdom.' The first of these has an attested equivalent among the Ugaritic « ben » formulas, but not the

---

[254]The writing {DINGIR.MEŠ} for this component is found in as many as twenty-five of the forty-five examples surveyed here: KBo 13.062, KBo 18.004, KBo 18.006; KUB 48.88.2; *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1 and 3.2; ABoT 65; HKM 10.2, HKM 21.2, HKM 27.3, HKM 28.2, HKM 31.2, probably HKM 33.2, HKM 36.2, HKM 36.3, HKM 52.1, HKM 52.2, HKM 53.2, HKM 57, HKM 58.1, HKM 58.2, HKM 63, HKM 73.2, HKM 82.2, and probably HKM 95.2. Four other letters (HKM 17.3, HKM 56.1, HKM 64, and HKM 71.2) also represent this structural pattern, though in these cases the phrase is written with an attached enclitic *-ta*, a 2nd person singular pronoun which marks the accusative complement of the verb: {DINGIR.MEŠ-ta}, 'the gods (nominative) + you (accusative)'. An example with a 2nd person plural pronominal suffix is VS 28.129:5, {DINGIR.MEŠ-ma-aš}.

[255]This component is written {*LI-IM* DINGIR.MEŠ} in as many as ten letters: KBo 9.083.2, KBo 18.003, probably KBo 18.013, KBo 18.046, KBo 18.050, KBo 18.077.2, KBo 18.097.2, KBo 18.103; probably HKM 29.2, and HKM 60.2.

[256]Two of the Ma□at letters contain this pattern: HKM 2.2 {$^{d\lceil}$*É-A*⌉-aš ḫa-at-ta-an-na-aš LUGAL-uš}, and HKM 3.2 {DINGIR.MEŠ ^{d}*É-A*-aš-ša ḫa-at-ta-an-na-aš LUGAL-uš}. The former is curious, since only one god is mentioned (Ea), and yet the following verb is plural, {pa-aḫ-ša-an-ta-ru}, 'May they guard!' (the ending {-an-ta-ru} indicates the 3rd plural). One might assume, on the analogy of HKM 3.2, that the phrase {DINGIR.MEŠ} was accidentally omitted by the scribe (compare the editor's restoration, S. Alp, *Hethitische Briefe aus Masat-Höyük* [1991] 122), perhaps by haplography; but this would leave unexplained the absence of the enclitic conjunction *-a* in HKM 2.2 {^{d}*É-A*-aš}, in view of its presence in HKM 3.2 {^{d}*É-A*-aš-ša}, 'and Ea. . . .' A better explanation, it seems to me, is that the singular "(the god) Ea" is intentional, but that the scribe wrote the plural form of the verb as a matter of habit. It would seem that these two letters present a rendering in Hittite of the same title given to Ea in the « ben » formulas of three RS Akkadian letters: RS 34.133, RS 34.153, and RS [Varia 26].

others; all have analogs in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.[257] One notes the absence of patterns which include the local affiliation of the deities invoked, an absence reminiscent of the Ugaritic corpus. One might surmise that the mentioning of the local affiliation of deities is especially relevant for letters which are international in scope; such letters are infrequent in the Ugaritic and Hittite epistolary corpora alike.

4.4.1.4.2.1.2 Two verbal idioms

4.4.1.4.2.1.2.1 The verbal idiom « paḫšandaru »

The Hittite « ben » formulas surveyed here contain between one and three verbal predications; all are 3rd person plural volitional forms. The most commonly attested verb, by far, is *paḫš-*, 'to guard'.[258] In the « ben » formula, it always takes the

---

[257]The corpus of Ras Shamra Akkadian letters contains parallels for all three formations; see above, section 4.4.1.2.1.1.

[258]Among the forty-five examples of the Hittite « ben » formula surveyed here, thirty-six certainly or probably contain this verb: ABoT 65, HKM 2.2, HKM 3.2, HKM 10.2, HKM 17.2, HKM 21.2, HKM 27.3, HKM 28.2, HKM 29.2, HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2, HKM 36.2, HKM 36.3, HKM 52.1, HKM 52.2, HKM 53.2, HKM 56.1, HKM 56.2, HKM 57, HKM 58.1, HKM 58.2, HKM 60.2, HKM 63, HKM 64, HKM 71.2, HKM 73.2, HKM 82.2, HKM 95.2, KBo 18.003, KBo 18.004, KBo 18.046, KBo 18.050, KBo 18.077.2, KBo 18.097.2, *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1, and *Mélanges Laroche* 3.2. In a thirty-seventh case, that of KBo 18.013, this verb was probably present, but needs to be entirely restored. This verb is explicitly absent from only two formulas in this corpus: KBo 13.62 and KUB 48.88.2. Its presence or absence cannot be determined in six cases: KBo 9.083.2, KBo 18.006, KBo 18.007, KBo 18.100, KBo 18.103, and HKM 17.3. The status of *paḫšandaru* (from *paḫš-*) as the Hittite equivalent of Ugaritic *tġr* (from N□R, 'to guard' in the G-stem) and Akkadian *liṣṣurū* (from *naṣāru*, 'to guard' in the G-stem) is assured by the logographic writing of the verbal root in KBo 18.004:7 and KBo 18.077.2:18': {PAP-an-da-ru}.

form « *paḫšandaru* », although at least three different writings are attested: {pa-aḫ-ša-an-da-ru},[259] {pa-aḫ-ša-an-ta-ru},[260] and {PAP-an-da-ru}.[261] This form represents a precise morphological and semantic equivalent, in Hittite, of the Ugaritic verbal element *tǵr*- and Akkadian *liṣṣurū*-, all meaning 'May they guard!'[262] Because of its absence from the « ben » formulas of two letters,[263] this particular verb cannot be considered as a "necessary" component of the Hittite formula, unlike the corresponding verbs in the Ugaritic and Akkadian « ben » formulas. If not "necessary", however, it is certainly present in the statistical majority of examples.[264]

---

[259]This spelling is used in the « ben » formulas of twenty letters: ABoT 65, HKM 10.2, HKM 17.2, HKM 21.2, HKM 27.3, HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2 (probably), HKM 36.3, HKM 52.1, HKM 53.2, HKM 57, HKM 58.1, HKM 58.2, HKM 60.2, HKM 73.2, HKM 95.2, KBo 18.003, KBo 18.046, KBo 18.050, and KBo 18.097.2.

[260]Eleven letters contain this spelling: HKM 2.2, HKM 3.2, HKM 36.2, HKM 52.2, HKM 56.1, HKM 56.2, HKM 63, HKM 64, HKM 71.2, *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1, and *Mélanges Laroche* 3.2.

[261]Two letters use this spelling: KBo 18.004 and KBo 18.077.2.

[262]A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 67-69. Compare, for example, the editor's translation of the idiom in HKM 3:18,20 "(Dich) sollen (die Götter) … schützen!" (S. Alp, *Hethitische Briefe aus Masat-Höyük* [1991] 125); and the recent English treatment of H. Hoffner, " … may (the gods) keep you … !" (*Context* 3 [2003] 46).

[263]KBo 13.62 and KUB 48.88.2.

[264]That is, in thirty-six out of thirty-eight unambiguous cases (see above).

4.4.1.4.2.1.2.2 The verbal idiom « TI-an ḫarkandu »

The second most frequent verbal idiom is « TI-an + *ḫark-* », literally 'to hold (someone) in life'.[265] It is attested in at least twenty letters,[266] and the spelling of the idiom is consistent: {TI-an ḫar-kán-du}, 'May they keep (you) alive (?)!' It seems essential to distinguish this idiom from other, less well-attested verbal idioms of the « ben » formula which also employ the verb *ḫark-*, 'to hold'.[267] For the idiom under consideration here, the complement {TI-an} is a necessary element, not an optional one. A second necessary complement of this idiom is the phrase, usually pronominal, expressing the "beneficiary" of the volition, in this case the recipient. Thus, the formula {nu-ut-ta DINGIR.MEŠ TI-an ḫar-kán-du}, as in ABoT 65:4 and HKM 10.2:45, for example, may be effectively translated '(And) may the gods keep you alive!'[268]

If the sense of the logogram {TI} is to be connected with the Akkadian common noun *bulṭu*, or its probable Ugaritic equivalent *ḥ*(*y*),[269] I know of no verbal idiom among the « ben » formulas of the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian corpora which would correspond, on a morpheme-for-morpheme level, with this Hittite

---

[265]For the value of {TI} here, compare Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 69; Ph. Houwink ten Cate, *Festschrift Römer* (1998) 171.

[266]ABoT 65, HKM 10.2, HKM 27.3, HKM 36.2, HKM 52.1, HKM 52.2, HKM 53.2, HKM 56.1, HKM 57, HKM 64, HKM 71.2, HKM 73.2, HKM 82.2, HKM 95.2, KBo 13.62, KBo 18.077.2, KBo 18.100 (probably), KUB 48.88.2, *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1, and VS 28.129.

[267]I refer in particular to « ŠU.ḪI.A-*uš araḫzanda aššuli ḫark-* », 'to hold (one's) hands (around s.o.) favorably', known in at least three letters: *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1:8-11; HKM 73.2:21-22; and HKM 81.1:6-7.

[268]H. Hoffner, *Context* 3 (2003) 48.

[269]My guess is that the Ugaritic common noun *ḥ*(*y*), 'life', provides the best approximation of the core semantics of Akkadian *bulṭu*, as 'life' in the sense of existence (as opposed to non-existence). Akk. *bulṭu* can have other senses, including that of 'health' (that is, a qualitative state, as opposed to 'unhealth', another qualitative state), for which Ug. *ḥ*(*y*) is not the most appropriate correspondence.

expression. The closest parallel would seem to be found among the « ben » formulas of the Old Babylonian period: {^{d}UTU li-ba-al-li-iṭ-ka}, 'May Šamaš keep you alive!'.[270] If, however, one allows a correspondence of the logogram {TI} with the root ŠLM in Ras Shamra Akkadian and Ugaritic, instead of BLṬ / ḤY(Y),[271] or in other words, an English translation of {TI} which emphasizes the notion of 'health' rather than 'life', it is possible to find functional analogs for this frequent Hittite idiom among the « ben » formulas of the Ras Shamra corpora. If this be allowed, one may imagine that the frequent Hittite idiom, TI-an *ḫark-*, corresponds, on a broad semantic level if not a precise morphological one, to the Ugaritic idiom ŠLM (D-stem) and the Ras Shamra Akkadian *šullumu* (D-stem), both meaning 'to keep (s.o.) well / healthy' in the « ben » formula.

Several other verbal idioms are known but extremely rare in the Hittite « ben » formulas.[272] None has obvious parallels among the Ugaritic formulas.

4.4.1.4.2.1.3 Reference to the recipient

The third "necessary" component of the Hittite « ben » formulas is the phrase in which the beneficiary of the formula is mentioned. In most cases this is simply the

---

[270]Compare the citations in E. Salonen, E. *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 22; Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 70, n. 26.

[271]Akkadian BLṬ, as in the noun *bulṭu*, for which a logographic writing with {TI} would not be surprising, can itself denote 'health' (a qualitative state of existence) in addition to 'life' (existence); see, for example, *CAD*, vol. 2 (B), 311-312. In the « ben » formulas of the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, however, such a notion is not denoted with Akkadian BLṬ (or its Ugaritic equivalent, ḤYY); rather, verbal or nominal derivations of the root ŠLM, the Semitic root *par excellence* for expressing all notions connected with health and prosperity, are used instead for this sense.

[272]One, which also employs the verbal root *ḫark-*, is attested at least three times (*Mélanges Laroche* 3.1:7-11; HKM 73.2:20-22; and HKM 81.1:5-7). Two other idioms are present in the « ben » formula of a single Hittite letter, KBo 13.62:5-6. On these and other non-standard benediction idioms, see Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 82-86.

recipient of the letter, but in at least one letter another individual is mentioned alongside the recipient.[273] In the Ugaritic « ben » formulas, this component is represented by the 2nd person pronoun suffixed directly to the verbal forms; as such it is not considered as an independent compositional element. Furthermore, this element of the Ugaritic « ben » formulas is always a 2nd person pronominal suffix, regardless of the social relationship between the correspondents. In the Hittite examples, several patterns are attested, and sometimes two patterns in a single formula. The conceptual status of the letter appears to have conditioned the choice of pattern employed.

The most common pattern incorporates a 2nd person pronominal suffix, as in Ugaritic and Akkadian. Unlike these latter, however, the Hittite pronominal complement is not suffixed to the verb. It is most often suffixed to the clause level conjunction *nu*, as in {nu-ut-ta},[274] 'and you (acc. sg.)', and {nu-uš-ma-aš},[275] 'and you (acc. pl.)', but is also attested suffixed to the noun phrase referring to "the gods", as in {DINGIR.MEŠ-ta},[276] 'the gods (which must be nom.) + you (acc. sg.)', and {DINGIR.MEŠ-ma-aš},[277] 'the gods (nom.) + you (acc. pl.).' In either case, the

---

[273]HKM 2.2:21.

[274]The « ben » formulas of at least sixteen letters employ this pattern and only this pattern: compare, for example, HKM 3.2, HKM 10.2, HKM 21.2, HKM 27.3, HKM 28.2, HKM 29.2, HKM 31.2, HKM 36.3, HKM 52.1, HKM 52.2, HKM 53.2, HKM 56.2, HKM 58.1, HKM 58.2, HKM 63, and HKM 73.2; it should probably be reconstructed in *Mélanges Laroche* 3.2. The « ben » formulas of several other letters employ this pattern along with another: KBo 13.62 uses {nu *BE-EL-DI-IA*} (a REL term, conceptually ASC POW) and later {nu-ut-ta}; ABoT 65 employs first {nu-ut-ta} and then {nu SAG.DU-*KÀ*} (a noun phrase meaning 'your head'); and three letters, HKM 56.1, HKM 64, and HKM 71.2, contain first the pattern {DINGIR.MEŠ-ta}, followed by {nu-ut-ta}.

[275]Compare HKM 57, HKM 60.2, HKM 82.2. Probably to be restored in KBo 9.083.2.

[276]This pattern is found in HKM 17.3, HKM 56.1, HKM 64, and HKM 71.2. The latter three contain this pattern as well as another: first {DINGIR.MEŠ-ta}, then {nu-ut-ta}.

[277]VS 28.129:5.

phrase containing the pronoun is clause-initial. These differences, however, should probably be treated as aspects of Hittite syntax, and not as evidence of an epistolary tradition independent from that represented in the Ugaritic corpora.

A second common pattern, which has no parallels among the Ugaritic « ben » formulas, incorporates conceptually explicit REL terminology, followed by the pronominal Akkadogram {-*IA*}, 'my', as a means of referring to the recipient. Such patterns are attested most often for conceptually ascending letters,[278] but at least once each for conceptually horizontal[279] and descending[280] letters. Letters addressed to the Hittite king incorporate an ID element as well as a REL element of ASC POW status.[281]

4.4.1.4.2.2 Optional compositional elements

I will treat here only those phrases which are optional complements of the two most common verbal idioms in the Hittite « ben » formula: *paḫš*-, 'to guard (s.o.)', and TI-an *ḫark*-, 'to keep (someone) in life'. The best attested of these optional components, and certainly also the most important from a comparative perspective, is

---

[278]Conceptually ASC POW terms are most common. These include {nu *BE-LÍ-IA*} in KBo 18.050:3 (partially restored) and perhaps to be restored in KBo 18.077.2:17'; {nu *BE-LU*} and {nu *BE-LÍ*} in HKM 36.2:40-41; probably {nu EN-*IA*} in KUB 48.88.2:2'; {nu *BE-EL-DI-I*[*A*]} in KBo 13.62:5; and {nu GAŠAN-*IA*} in KBo 18.013:4. Two letters addressed to the Hittite king also incorporate such ASC POW terminology along with the typical imperial title, an ID term; see below.

Conceptually ASC BIO terms are more rare: KBo 18.004:6 {nu *A-BI*-DÙG.GA-*IA*} and perhaps also KBo 18.006:2', where this component should be restored as {[nu AMA.DÙG.GA-*IA*]}.

[279]Compare KBo 18.100:5 {[n]u ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA-*IA*}. It is possible that KBo 18.046:4 belongs here as well: {[nu ...]-DÙG.GA-[*I*]*A*}.

[280]Compare KBo 18.007:3' {nu DUMU-*IA*}.

[281]These are {[nu ^{d}UTU]-*ŠI* EN-*IA*} in KBo 18.003:3' (partially restored) and {nu ^{d}UTU-*ŠI* (7) *BE-LÍ-IA* } in *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1:6-7 (see also lines 8-9 and 11-12).

{aš-šu-li},[282] 'good, well,' appearing frequently as an optional complement to the *paḫš-* verbal idiom.[283] Compare, for example, KBo 18.004: {(6) nu *A-BI*-DÙG.GA-*IA* (7) DINGIR.MEŠ aš-šu-li PAP-an-da-ru | }, 'And may the gods keep my "good" father in well-being!' The semantics and even the morphology of *aššuli* correspond more or less precisely to those of the optional component *ana šulmāni* in the « ben » formulas of the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, and probably also to the single instance of *l šlm* in the Ugaritic « ben » formula of RS 92.2005.1:7. Furthermore, like Hittite *aššuli*, Akkadian *ana šulmāni* and probably Ugaritic *l šlm* are optional complements of the respective Akkadian and Ugaritic verbs which correspond to Hittite *paḫš-*, namely *naṣāru* and NṬR . Finally, the case inflection in the Hittite form, being the dative-locative, provides an important datum for understanding the semantic relationship of this component to the verb, and correspondingly, of the relationship of Akkadian *ana šulmāni* to the verb *naṣāru*, and of Ugaritic *l šlm* to the verb NṬR .

A second optional complement to the benediction verb *paḫš-* is an adverbial phrase, written logographically, with a combination of Akkadograms and Sumerograms: {*I-NA* EGIR *U₄-MI*}, 'during a long span of days (lit., in a length of

---

[282]When used as an optional component of the *paḫš*--idiom in the « ben » formula, this is the regular spelling.

[283]The word *aššuli* complements the verb *paḫš-* in the « ben » formulas of at least twenty-six letters: HKM 2.2, HKM 3.2, HKM 10.2, HKM 28.2, HKM 29.2 (partially restored), HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2, HKM 36.3, HKM 52.1, HKM 52.2, HKM 53.2 (partially restored), HKM 57, HKM 58.1, HKM 58.2, HKM 60.2, HKM 63, HKM 71.2, HKM 82.2 (partially restored), KBo 9.083.2, KBo 18.003, KBo 18.004, KBo 18.006 (partially restored), KBo 18.013, KBo 18.077.2, KBo 18.097.2 (partially restored), and KBo 18.103. It was probably present, though needs to be entirely reconstructed, in four additional letters: KBo 18.007, KBo 18.046, KBo 18.050, and *Mélanges Laroche* 3.2. This word also appears as a complement in the less-well attested verbal idiom, ŠU.ḪI.A-uš *araḫzanda aššuli ḫark-*, 'to hold (one's) hands (around s.o.) favorably', known from the « ben » formulas of at least three letters: *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1:8-11; HKM 73.2:21-22; and HKM 81.1:6-7.

days).'[284] As an element of the « ben » formula, this phrase is also known, in exactly the same form, in a "piggy-back" Akkadian letter known from Boğazköy.[285]

Both of the optional components surveyed here are complements of the verb *paḫš-*. Despite its frequent appearance in the « ben » formula, I know of no optional complements to the idiom TI-an *ḫark-*.

4.4.1.4.2.3 Two main predications

Given this compositional inventory, one may speak of two "grammatically intact" verbal predications which are commonly present in Hittite « ben » formulas:

(1) The most common consists of *paḫš-*, the verb, accompanied by the following possible complements: (i) If this predication is the first of several in the formula, then the following is present. Otherwise it is understood, a noun phrase referring to "the gods" (understood in the nominative, as the grammatical subject of verb) (this phrase is necessary in the « ben » formula as a whole, but generally occurs only once per formula, as part of the first predication mentioned; in subsequent predications the grammatical subject of the verb is understood to be the same as the preceding predication; in this sense (and others) the « ben » is a single formula, not several), (ii) a phrase referring to the recipient (in the accusative, the direct object complement of the verb), and (iii) an optional adverbial phrase aššuli (dative-locative, probably expressing goal or purpose). (iv) an optional adverbial phrase *I-NA* EGIR *U₄-MI*, (the Akkadogram is a prepositional phrase, expressing duration of the action).

---

[284]This component appears in the « ben » formulas of KBo 18.050:3 and KBo 18.097.2:4.

[285]On the « ben » formula of KBo 18.017.2, see above, section 4.4.4.1.

The order of these components is highly patterned: [nu+NR] (gods) (*I-NA* EGIR *U₄-MI*) (aššuli) [paḫš-].

(2) The second common predication consists of the verb ḫark-, complemented by (i) (in those cases when this predication begins the ben) a noun phrase referring to "the gods" (understood in the nominative, as the grammatical subject of verb) (this phrase is necessary in the « ben » formula as a whole, but generally occurs only once per formula, as part of the first predication mentioned; in subsequent predications the grammatical subject of the verb is understood to be the same as the preceding predication; in this sense (and others) the « ben » is a single formula, not several), (ii) a phrase referring to the recipient (in the accusative, the direct object complement of the verb), and (iii) the common noun {TI-an}.

4.4.1.4.2.4 Distribution of Compositional Patterns

The order in which these two main predications occur is not fixed. Two main patterns, however, are statistically predominant: (1) one, the most common, which consists of the *paḫš-* prediction alone,[286] and (2) a second which consists of the TI-an

---

[286]As many as twenty-three « ben » formulas may certainly or probably represent this pattern; these may be grouped into three compositional sequences:

(i) [*nu*+N_R]+[gods]+[*aššuli*]+[*paḫš-*]: This sequence is certainly or probably represented in the « ben » formulas of fifteen letters: HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2 (partially restored), HKM 36.3, HKM 58.1, HKM 58.2, HKM 60.2, HKM 63, KBo 18.003, KBo 18.004, KBo 18.013 (partially restored), KBo 18.046 (partially restored), KBo 18.103 (partially restored), and *Mélanges Laroche* 3.2 (partially restored). HKM 2.2 and HKM 3.2, in which "the gods" noun phrase is expanded, also show this sequence. It is possibly present, but needs to be partially reconstructed in the « ben » formulas of four other letters: KBo 9.083.2, KBo 18.006, KBo 18.007, and HKM 17.2.

(ii) [*nu*+N_R]+[gods]+[*I-NA* EGIR *U₄-MI*]+[*aššuli*]+[*paḫš-*]: Two formulas show this structure, with the insertion of the optional adverbial element *I-NA* EGIR *U₄-MI*, 'for length of days': KBo 18.050 and KBo 18.097.2.

(iii) [*nu*+N_R]+[gods]+[*paḫš-*]: Finally, at least one, and perhaps two formulas show this sequence without either optional element: HKM 21.1 certainly belongs here, and HKM 56.2 probably

ḫark- predication followed by the *paḫš-* predication.[287] Several other structural patterns are known,[288] but none is attested in more than three examples.

4.4.1.4.2.5 Distribution of the « ben » formula

As in previous sections, the distribution of the « ben » formulas in these corpora may be mapped against the conceptual status and model used within the letters. Of the nearly fifty Hittite « ben » formulas treated here, none occurs in a conceptually unmarked letter. Such a dearth is significant in light of the size of this conceptual class: over forty conceptually unmarked letters are known from the Ma□at corpus

---

does as well, though in this latter the "gods" noun phrase, {DINGIR.MEŠ}, needs to be reconstructed (its omission seems to have been the result of a scribal error).

[287]At least fifteen « ben » formulas certainly or probably represent this structure; they may be grouped into four compositional sequences:

(i) [*nu*+N_R]+[gods]+[TI-an *ḫark-*]+[*nu*+N_R]+[*aššuli*]+[*paḫš-*]: This sequence, in which the *paḫš-* predication contains the optional element *aššuli*, is the most common, attested in eight letters: HKM 10.2, HKM 28.2, HKM 29.2, HKM 52.1, HKM 52.2, HKM 53.2, HKM 57, and HKM 82.2.

(ii) [*nu*+N_R]+[gods]+[TI-an *ḫark-*]+[*nu*+N_R]+[*paḫš-*]: a second sequence, in which the optional element *aššuli* is omitted from the *paḫš-* predication, is slightly less frequent, at five examples: ABoT 65, HKM 27.3, HKM 36.2, HKM 56.1, and HKM 95.2.

Finally, two other sequences are represented which are, in fact, variations of (i) and (ii), in which the formula itself does not begin with the clause-level conjunction *nu*, but with the "gods" phrase: (iii) the sequence [gods+N_R]+[TI-an *ḫark-*]+[*nu*+N_R]+[*aššuli*]+[*paḫš-*] is found in HKM 71.2, and (iv) ["the gods"+N_R]+[TI-an *ḫark-*]+[*nu*+N_R]+[*paḫš-*] is found in HKM 64. Though not entirely preserved, HKM 17.3 {DINGIR.MEŠ-t[a ...]} may also have contained one of these sequences.

[288]The following patterns are attested:

(i) [*nu*+N_R]+[gods]+[TI-an *ḫark-*]: A « ben » formula which consists of the TI-an ḫark-predication alone is known from one letter, KUB 48.88.2.

(ii) The « ben » formula of KBo 18.077.2, [?]+[gods]+[...]+[TI-an *ḫark-*], provides a possible examples of a « ben » formula in which the *paḫš-* predication precedes the TI-an *ḫark-* predication; the presence of the latter seems certain, but the former must be almost entirely reconstructed (there is no way to know, in fact, beyond its statistical frequency in this formula, that the *paḫš-* predication was present).

(iii) [*nu*+N_R]+[gods]+[TI-an *ḫark-*]+[*nu*+N_R]+[ŠU.ḪI.A-uš ... *ḫark-*]+[*nu*+N_R]+[*paḫš-*]: There are as many as three examples of this particular sequence of three verbal predications: HKM 73.2, HKM 81, and *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1.

And, finally, (iv) [*nu*+N_R]+[gods]+[TI-an *ḫark-*]+[*nu*+N_R]+[*irman nammad-*]+[*nu*+N_R]+[*ḫattulaḫḫ-*]: KBo 13.62 shows another sequence of three verbal predications, which does not contain the *paḫš-* idiom.

alone.[289] The distribution observable for this class in the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian corpora is comparable, though much less decisive from a statistical point of view.[290] With respect to conceptual status, at least eighteen conceptually ASC letters contain the

[289]Conceptually unmarked letters in Hittite from these two corpora generally do not contain the « ben » formula, nor any polite formulas for that matter. These include not only letters from the Hittite king to various subordinates, which are conceptually unmarked, but may also be considered as "contextually descending" (HKM 1, HKM 2.1, HKM 3.1, HKM 4-HKM 9, HKM 10.1, HKM 11-HKM 17, HKM 18.1, HKM 19.1, HKM 20-HKM 23, HKM 24.1, HKM 25-HKM 26, HKM 27.1, HKM 30.1, HKM 31.1, HKM 32, HKM 34, HKM 36.1 (probably), HKM 37.1, and HKM 38), but also other conceptually unmarked letters (usually from PN to PN), for which there is no evidence for a contextually descending relationship (HKM 39.2, HKM 53.1, HKM 54, HKM 55, HKM 59, HKM 60.1, HKM 62.1, HKM 68, HKM 71.1, HKM 72.1, and HKM 73.1). Provisional total: forty-five.

[290]See sections 4.3.1 and 4.4.1.1, above.

« ben » formula.[291] It is omitted from seven such letters.[292] At least twenty-five conceptually HOR letters contain the formula,[293] and eight omit it.[294] And finally, of the four conceptually DESC letters, two contain the « ben » formula,[295] and two omit it.[296] Sorting by conceptual model, at least thirty-two BIO letters contain the « ben »

---

[291]These include eight ASC POW letters: KBo 13.62, KBo 18.003, KBo 18.013, KBo 18.050, KBo 18.077.2, KUB 48.88.2, *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1, and HKM 17.2; three ASC BIO letters: KBo 18.004, KBo 18.006, and KBo 18.097.2; and one conceptually ascending letter which contains both models (thus ASC MIXED): HKM 81.1; as well as the following "miscellaneous" ascending letters: *Mélanges Laroche* 3.2, which contains what is obviously a conceptually ascending REL term, {*MAḪ-RI-IA*}, conceivably derived from the biological kinship model, 'my elder (kinsman)' (?); HKM 27.3, which contains ASC POW terminology as well as the term {*MAḪ-RI-IA*} (thus ASC MIXED); and, finally, three conceptually ascending letter which incorporate not only the term {*MAḪ-RI-IA*}, but also typical ascending REL terms from both the BIO and POW models (thus, also ASC MIXED): HKM 29.2, HKM 36.2, and HKM 52.2. One other letter containing the « ben » formula, HKM 60.2, is also conceptually mixed, being addressed to two recipients, one termed {*A-BI*-DÙG.GA-*IA*}, and thus ASC BIO, and the other termed {NIN.DÙG.GA-*IA*}, and thus HOR. Provisional total: eighteen letters which incorporate conceptually ASC terminology contain the « ben » formula.

[292]These include six ASC POW letters: KBo 9.082, KBo 18.001.2, KBo 18.011, KBo 18.052, KUB 57.001, KUB 57.123; and one ASC BIO letter: HKM 62.2.

[293]These include KBo 9.083.2, KBo 18.100, ABoT 65, HKM 2.2, HKM 3.2, HKM 10.2, HKM 21.2, HKM 28.2, HKM 31.2, HKM 33.2, HKM 36.3, HKM 52.1, HKM 53.2, HKM 56.1, HKM 57, HKM 58.1, HKM 58.2, HKM 63, HKM 64, HKM 71.2, HKM 73.2, HKM 81.2, HKM 82.2, and HKM 95.2. Several other letters, which are technically conceptually unknown, may have belonged here as well: KBo 18.046, KBo 18.103, and HKM 17.3.

[294]These include KBo 31.040, HKM 19.2, HKM 22.2, HKM 27.2, HKM 30.2, HKM 65.2, HKM 66, and HKM 70. Two other letters, conceptually unknown both, may also have belonged here: KBo 18.018 and KUB 57.125. The absence of the « ben » formula from three of the letters cited here, KBo 18.018, KBo 31.040, and KUB 57.125, is not surprising in light of the fact that these are international letters, which followed a tradition in which the « ben » was not standard (see below for the Amarna letters, and the similar situation represented by the important Egypt-Ḫatti correspondence from Boğazköy).

[295]KBo 18.007 and HKM 56.2.

[296]HKM 18.2 (no « ben » in the *praescriptio* at least) and HKM 65.1.

formula,[297] and eleven omit it.[298] At least eight POW letters contain the « ben »,[299] and six omit it.

Interpreted, three distributional similarities stand out with respect to the « ben » formula in the Ugaritic and Ras Shamra Akkadian corpora: (1) the « ben » is rare or unknown in conceptually unmarked letters,[300] especially those which are "contextually descending",[301] (2) the « ben » is very common in conceptually HOR letters,[302] and (3) in letters which employ the BIO model, generally speaking.[303] Despite these similarities, several distributional differences are noticeable as well, especially as

---

[297]These include three ASC BIO letters (KBo 18.004, KBo 18.006, and KBo 18.097.2), two DESC BIO letters (KBo 18.007 and HKM 56.2), and all twenty-five conceptually HOR letters mentioned above. To these may be added HKM 60.2, which contains BIO terms of ASC and HOR status (thus MIXED BIO), and probably also *Mélanges Laroche* 3.2, which contains a conceptually ascending REL term, {*MAḪ-RI-IA*}, which is possibly to be derived from the biological kinship model, 'my elder (kinsman)'.

[298]Of these, HKM 62.2 is conceptually ASC BIO, eight others are conceptually HOR (and thus BIO by definition) (KBo 31.040, HKM 19.2, HKM 22.2, HKM 27.2, HKM 30.2, HKM 65.2, HKM 66, and HKM 70), and two are DESC BIO (HKM 18.2 and HKM 65.1).

[299]All of these are conceptually ASC POW: KBo 13.62, KBo 18.003, KBo 18.013, KBo 18.050, KBo 18.077.2, KUB 48.88.2, *Mélanges Laroche* 3.1, and HKM 17.2. I have found no examples of conceptually explicit HOR POW or DESC POW letters in the corpora from the Hittite realm.

[300]None of the forty-five such letters contains the « ben » formula. This is comparable to the Ugaritic corpus (see above, section 4.3.1), where the ratio of unmarked letters with the « ben » to total unmarked letters is 1 : 11 (or 9%); but less comparable to the RS Akkadian corpus (see above, section 4.4.1.1), where the « ben » formula is more common in conceptually unmarked letters (16 : 44, or 36%), but see the footnote below.

[301]None of the thirty-four "contextually descending" conceptually unmarked letters in the Ma□at corpus, and none of the nine such letters in the Ugaritic corpus (see above, section 4.3.1), contains the « ben » formula; and for the RS Akkadian corpus (see above, section 4.4.1.1), the ratio of the number of such letters containing the « ben » to the total number of such letters is 2 : 22 (or 9%).

[302]For the Hittite letters from Boğazköy and Ma□at, the ratio of HOR letters with the « ben » to total HOR letters is 25 : 33 (or 76%); compare the comparable rations from the Ug. corpus (13 : 17, or 76%; see above, section 4.3.1), and the RS Akk. corpus (33 : 40, or 83%; see above, section 4.4.1.1).

[303]For the Hittite letters, the ratio of BIO letters with the « ben » to total BIO letters is 32 : 43 (or 74%); compare the comparable rations from the Ug. corpus (19 : 22, or 86%; see above, section 4.3.1), and the RS Akk. corpus (46 : 56, or 82%; see above, section 4.4.1.1).

regards the occurrence of the formula in conceptually ASC letters,[304] and in letters conceived on the POW model generally.[305]

4.4.1.5 Miscellaneous Syrian Corpora

Epistolary formulas falling under the general rubric of "benedictions" are also attested in letters recovered from Atchana, Taanach, Hazor, and Aphek. Some of these present meaningful compositional parallels to the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula; others do not.

4.4.1.5.1 COMPARABLE TO THE STANDARD UGARITIC « BEN »

Of the six letters discussed here which are comparable to the standard Ugaritic « ben » in terms of composition, three come from excavations at Taanach.[306]

TT 2 {(2) … EN DINGIR.MEŠ-nu (3) ZI-ka lí-iṣ-ṣur}

TT 5 {(3) ^{d}IM ZI-ta-ka li-iṣ-ṣur}

TT 6 {(3) [^{d}IM] ZI-ta-ka li-i[ṣ-ṣur]}

The compositional similarities include: (1) the presence of an explicitly volitional form of the verb *naṣāru*, 'to guard (G)', at the end of the formula, and (2) the presence, at

---

[304]The « ben » formula is rather common in conceptually ASC letters from the Boğazköy and Ma□at corpora (18 out of 25 such letters, or 72%, contain the formula); less frequent in this conceptual class in the Ug. corpus (15 out of 29 letters, or 52%; see above, section 4.3.1); and rare in this class of letter in the RS Akk. corpus (7 out of 41 letters, or 17%; see above, section 4.4.1.1).

[305]The situation is similar to that described in the above footnote: the « ben » formula is rather common in Hittite letters which employ the POW model (8 out of 14 such letters, or 57%, contain the formula); less frequent in such letters in the Ug. corpus (6 out of 17 letters, or 35%; see above, section 4.3.1); and rare in such letters in the RS Akk. corpus (2 out of 35 letters, or 6%; see above, section 4.4.1.1).

[306]See the convenient republication of TT 1-2 and TT 5-6 by A. Rainey in *EI* 26 (F. M. Cross volume) (1999) *156-*160.

the beginning of the formula, of the grammatical subject of this verbal form, a noun phrase referring to a divinity.

But the compositional differences are at least as important, if not more so, than the similarities: (1) the verb is singular, not plural, corresponding to (2) a grammatically singular,[307] not plural, subject; (3) furthermore, not only is this subject phrase singular here, but the reference is also specific, and not generic as in the Ugaritic formula (*ỉlm*, 'the gods'); (4) only one, not two, predicates are present; and (5) reference to the recipient of the letter in the formula, is indirect, not direct.[308]

Two[309] « ben » formulas in Hittite letters from Tell Atchana show compositional patterns which are similar, though not identical, to those found in the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula.[310]

---

[307]Obviously, {EN DINGIR.MEŠ-nu} is a problem. Rainey translates "Baʿlu the deity", explaining that the sign {EN} is "taken here as the DN *Baʿlu* with the plural *ilānu* in apposition, plural of majesty" (*ibid.*, pp. *157-*158); compare already *idem*, *IOS* 7 (1977) 50, n. 87 ("Evidently a plural of majesty") and the references to similar phenomena in EA 71:5 and EA 86:4. Equally possible is the editor's solution: his translation of the string, 'der Herr der Götter', implies the use of {nu} for expected {ni} (F. Hrozný, *Tell Taʿannek* [1904] 115); a solution also adopted by W. F. Albright in *BASOR* 94 (1944) 20 ('the lord of the gods').

[308]In other words, the verbal complement is not a reference to the recipient himself, as in the Ugaritic formula (*tǵrk*, 'May they guard *you*!'), but rather the more elliptical *napišta-ka liṣṣur*, 'May he guard your life!' Such a formulation is also known among the « ben » formulas in Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra and Tell Meskene (see above, sections 4.4.1.1 and 4.4.1.2).

[309]The other Hittite letter(s) (a double letter, in fact: AT 35.1 and AT 35.2) from Atchana treated by C. Niedorf, *Festschrift Dietrich* (2002) 518 (and see also n. 3) and 526 (copy), do(es) not preserve the « ben » formula.

[310]The Ugaritic morpheme-for-morpheme equivalent of the « ben » formula of AT 125 would have been *« *ỉlm l šlm tǵrk* », a pattern unattested as such, though all of the constituent components are familiar (in other words, the following individual equivalences are well-established: {DINGIR.MEŠ} ≈ *ỉlm*, {aš-šu-li} ≈ *l šlm*, and {PAP-*RU*} ≈ *tǵr-*). The exact Ugaritic equivalent of the Hittite benediction idiom TI-*an ḫark-* is not clear. Given the structural similarity observable between the Hittite and Ugaritic epistolary formularies, and the frequency of the idiom TI-*an ḫark-* in Hittite « ben » formulas, it seems probable that the Ugaritic idiom *tšlm-*, 'may they keep (s.o.) well,' represents a "translational", though not morphological nor etymological, equivalent of Hittite TI-*an ḫark-*. If so, the Ugaritic

AT 124 { | (3) DINGIR.MEŠ-ta TI-an [ḫar-kán-du] | }

AT 125 { | (3) DINGIR.MEŠ-eš-da aš-šu-li PAP-*RU* | }

Both of these « ben » formulas represent variants of compositional patterns attested in the Hittite letters from Boğazköy and Ma□at,[311] and in the various Akkadian corpora surveyed above.[312] The latter formula, however, that of AT 124, does present two otherwise unattested orthographies: (1) {DINGIR.MEŠ-eš-da} instead of the more typical {DINGIR.MEŠ-ta}, and (2) {PAP-*RU*} for the verb *paḫšandaru*, 'May they guard!'[313] This formula also corresponds to the most common compositional pattern for the « ben » in the RS Akkadian corpus: « *ilānu ana šulmāni liṣṣurū-ka* ».

"equivalent" of the « ben » formula in AT 124 would have been *« *ỉlm tšlmk* », a pattern unattested as such, though composed of familiar components.

[311]See above, section 4.4.1.4.2.4.

[312]The Akkadian equivalent of the compositional pattern represented by the « ben » formula of AT 125 (that is, formulas of the type « DINGIR.MEŠ a-na šul-ma-ni PAP-ru-ka ») is the most common compositional pattern in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus; see above, section 4.4.1.1.2.3. I know of no precise morphological Akkadian equivalent for the Hittite benedictory idiom TI-*an ḫark-*. However, the Akkadian "translational" equivalent of the Hittite idiom may have been the verb *šullumu*, 'to keep (s.o.) well', which is a fairly frequent component of the « ben » formulas in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus (compare the above footnote, and see above, section 4.4.1.1.2.2.2).

[313]Rost interprets the {RU} sign as an Akkadogram — {PAP-*RU*} would represent *liṣṣurū* in Akkadian, rather than as a syllable — that is, {PAP-ru} for the final syllable of *paḫšandaru*. At least one other Hittite « ben » formula uses the Sumerogram {PAP} for the verb *paḫš-*, KBo 18.004:7 {PAP-an-da-ru}. In either interpretation, the writing is thus far unique for this element of the formula.

One other « ben » formula that should be mentioned here is that of the letter found at Tel Aphek[314] which was sent by the Ugaritian royal functionary[315] Taguǵlinu to a high-ranking official[316] named Ḫaya:

Aphek 52055/1 {(9) … DINGIR.MEŠ ša LUGAL GAL EN-ka (10) ù DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR URU ú-ga-ri-it (11) lu-uk-ru-bu-ka (12) li-iṣ-ṣu-ru-ka}.

This « ben » formula is comparable to the standard Ugaritic « ben » (1) in its use of the phrase {DINGIR.MEŠ}, 'the gods', comparable to Ugaritic *ỉlm*; (2) in its use of two verbal predications; and (3) in referring to the beneficiary of the benediction directly, by means of 2nd person pronouns attached to the verbal forms. Differences are noticeable as well: (i) the identities of "the gods" are further specified as being those of the addressee's overlord (the Egyptian pharaoh) and those of Ugarit; and (ii) the first verbal predication, {lu-uk-ru-bu-ka}, 'May they bless you!', does not correspond etymologically to the Ugaritic element *tšlmk*, 'May they keep you well!' However, these apparent differences seem negligible, since *lukrubū-ka* and *tšlmk* could easily be translational, or at least functional, equivalents even if they do not share the same etymology; and since the kind of specification visible in the noun phrases referring to "the gods" is easily explained in light of the international nature of this letter. The marked similarities with the Ugaritic epistolary tradition with respect to the other

---

[314]D. Owen, *TA* 8 (1981) 1-17.

[315]The sender describes himself as {LÚ ŠA.KI KUR URU ú-ga-ri-it}, ' "prefect" (the Ugaritic equivalent is *skn*) of the Ugarit city-state.'

[316]The sender addresses the recipient by name, by title {LÚ GAL}, literally 'big man', and by means of conceptually ascending REL terms: {a-bi-ia EN-ia}, 'my father, my lord'. Given the high status of Taguǵlinu at Ugarit and at Carchemish, Ḫaya must have been important indeed to merit such attentions. On these prosopographical matters, see Owen, *TA* 8 (1981) 1-17; I. Singer, *TA* 10 (1983) 3-25; and now C. Roche, *Recherches sur la prosopographie du royaume d'Ougarit* (2001), ch. 3.

formulas, and the sender's connection with Ugarit serve only to reinforce the likelihood that this « ben » can be profitably compared with the Ugaritic examples.

4.4.1.5.2 NOT COMPARABLE TO THE STANDARD UGARITIC « BEN »

Many of the « ben » formulas in letters found at Levantine sites, however, do not show such formal parallels with the standard Ugaritic « ben » formulas. Three such formulas come to mind here, one from Tanaach,[317] one from Atchana,[318] and one from Hazor:[319]

TT 1 {(5) DINGIR.⌜MEŠ⌝ li-iš-a-lu (6) ⌜šu⌝-lum-ka šu-lum (7) É-ka DUMU.MEŠ-ka}, 'May the gods seek your well-being, the well-being of your house(hold), (and that of) your sons!'

AT 116 {(5) ^{d}IM šu-lum$^{!}$-ka [?] (6) šu-lum DUMU.MEŠ-ka ⌜ù⌝ [?] (7) KUR-ti$_4$-ka li-ip-p[u-u]š }, 'May the Storm God effect your well-being, the well-being of your sons, and (that of) your land!'

Hazor 16455 {(4) DINGIR.MEŠ ù ^{d}UTU šu-lum-ka (5) šu-lum É-ka DUMU.MEŠ-ka (6) KUR-ti$_4$-ka li-iš-a-lu}, 'May the gods (in general) and the Sun God (in particular) seek your well-being, the well-being of your house(hold), (that of) your sons, (and that of) your land!'

If these « ben » formulas do not resemble the "standard" Ugaritic « ben », however, they do show certain similarities with at least one "non-standard" Ugaritic letter.[320] Inasmuch as these formulas solicit a particular deity, in this case, the storm god, in a matter regarding the "well-being" of the recipient, they do resemble the

---

[317]A. Rainey, *EI* 26 (1999) 156* (with anterior bibliography).

[318]D. J. Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets* (1953) 60, and pl. 25 (copy).

[319]W. Horowitz, *IEJ* 50 (2000) 17-18.

[320]See below, section 4.7.

compositionally "non-standard" « ben » formula of RS 17.117:2, *bʿl yšůl šlmk*, 'May Baʿlu seek your peace!' The « ben » formulas of TT 1 and Hazor 16455, like those of EA 96 and EA 97 in the Amarna corpus,[321] represent rather precise parallels in Akkadian for this Ugaritic idiom.[322] That of AT 116, on the other hand, represents a functional if not a precise etymological parallel, in its use of the idiom *šulma epēšu*, literally 'to do, make (someone's) well-being'.

4.4.1.6 Middle Assyrian Epistolary Tradition

One of the features which distinguishes the Middle Assyrian epistolary tradition from contemporary traditions in the West is the absence of a polite formula corresponding to the « ben » formula; E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996), pp. 53-60. If one accepts the currently known corpus of Middle Assyrian letters as representative, the obvious conclusion is that the « ben » formula was not a typical element of Middle Assyrian epistolary composition.

4.4.1.7 Middle Babylonian (Kassite) Letters

In his publication of a sizable collection of letters from Kassite Nippur, Hugo Radau pointed out the occasional presence in the *praescriptio* of a formulaic divine benediction.[323] In form, these Middle Babylonian « ben » formulas bear a strong

---

[321]EA 96:4-6 reads {(4, cont'd) DINGIR.MEŠ-nu (5) šu-lum-ka šu-lum É-ka (6) li-iš-al }; see above, section 4.4.1.3.

[322]J.-L. Cunchillos, *AuOr* 1 (1983) 61-62, with respect to EA 96 and TT 1.

[323]H. Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings* (1908) 17-19. "greeting, which is coupled in some instances with an invocation to the gods to bless and protect the addressee" (p. 18). "In many cases

resemblance to those of the Old Babylonian period; A. Kristensen's description of the « ben » formula of Old Babylonian letters applies equally well to those of the Kassite period: "In older Akkadian letters we do not find the rather stereotype greeting formula of the Ugaritic letters or the Akkadian letters from Ugarit and Amarna. Instead we find a great variety of formulas, often referring to numerous gods, mentioned by name."[324]

There are formal similarities with the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula, the most striking being a preference for the verb *naṣāru* 'to guard',[325] but the formal differences should be emphasized: (1) the « ben » formulas of Akkadian letters from Kassite Nippur consistently identify the deities involved, either specifically[326] or descriptively.[327] In other words, we do not find an equivalent of the more general designation *ỉlm*, 'the gods' (unspecified), used in the Ugaritic tradition. (2) Reference to the beneficiary of the formula is consistently made, not directly, as in the Ugaritic idiom *tǵrk*, 'May they guard you!', but indirectly, using a circumlocution involving the noun *napištu*, 'life', as in *napšāti-ka liṣṣurū*,[328] 'May they guard your life!' Finally, (3)

---

there is coupled with this greeting an invocation to the gods of the *writer's* city in the form of a prayer for the well-being and protection of the addressee. These invocations are of the highest importance, both for determining the exact domicile of the writer and for a correct understanding of the religion of the Babylonians [ref. to no. 89:4f., 24, 26]. . . ."

[324]A. L. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 153.

[325]Akkadian *naṣāru* 'to guard' corresponds to Ugaritic N□R 'to guard', both on the level of etymology and on that of usage.

[326]Compare, for example, the gods { ^{d}in-za-ag (8) ù ^{d}mes-ki-la-ak } mentioned in the « ben » formula of Ni 641, lines 7-8 (A. Goetze, *JCS* 6 [1952] 142-145).

[327]Compare the phrases { DINGIR.MEŠ ma-at! be-lí }, 'the gods of the lord's country', in H. Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings* (1908), text no. 5, line 8; and { šar-rat URU ⌜x x⌝ [.KI] }, 'the queen of the city of ⌜X⌝', *ibid.*, text no. 38, line 3.

[328]*Ibid.*, no. 89, line 6.

despite the regular usage of the verb *naṣāru*, the « ben » formulas in the letters from Kassite Nippur only rarely employ a second verbal form.[329]

4.4.1.8 Old Babylonian Traditions

The use of formulaic « ben » formulas in the various epistolary traditions of the Amorite kingdoms of the Old Babylonian period is well documented.[330] By and large, the Ugaritic standard « ben » formula resembles the Old Babylonian examples in its general form and function: that of a formulaic wish invoking divine intervention for the well-being of the recipient. But on the more detailed level of comparison with which this section is concerned, the various Old Babylonian corpora, like the epistolary corpus from Kassite Nippur discussed above, do not offer precise formal parallels for the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula. The most important of these differences may be described as follows: (1) the Old Babylonian formulas generally identify specifically the god or gods invoked, usually by name; and (2) they do not generally employ two and only two verbal predications, *naṣāru* and *šullumu*.

If not, then, of direct import for the immediate comparative background of the Ugaritic « ben » formulas, many of the Old Babylonian epistolary traditions, including those of the peripheral areas such as Mari, do present compositional models which show up again later in the Late Bronze epistolary corpora. This is especially

---

[329]An exception is the « ben » formula in Radau, *ibid.*, which contains, in lines 6-7, the sequence { nap-ša-ti-ka li-iṣ-ṣu-ru (7) ki-bi-is-ka li-šal-li-mu }, 'May they guard your "life", may they keep your "foot(-steps)" in well-being!' In employing the verb *šullumu* alongside *naṣāru*, this « ben » formula resembles the Ugaritic verbal combination *tǵrk tšlmk*, 'May they guard you, may they keep you well!', which is a standard part of the « ben » formula in the Ugaritic tradition.

[330]E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 20-54; Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 153.

interesting with regard to the various statistically "non-standard" formulas found in the Ugaritic, Ras Shamra Akkadian, and Hittite corpora.

4.4.2 Non-epistolary comparative evidence for the « ben »

A study of the *Sitz-im-Leben* of the Ugaritic epistolary « ben » formula must, of course, look beyond the epistolary genre in its attempt to place the formula in its contextual setting in day-to-day life. For this reason, other types of literary parallels are here considered. The breadth of the subject, however, prevents a detailed surveyed of all available comparative evidence. This section will consequently restrict itself to a discussion of the seemingly pertinent comparative data from the Ugaritic corpus, with only occasional allusion to other comparative material where especially relevant. Ugaritic functional and formal parallels are discussed first, followed by those Akkadian and Hittite parallels deemed especially important.

4.4.2.1 Functional parallels, mostly Ugaritic

In sifting through the imposing body of potential comparative data, one must distinguish between general functional parallels to the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula, that is, volitions for well-being mentioning the gods, and more precise parallels in which one finds not only such functional similarity, but also extensive formal equivalency. The former are valuable for an overview of the distribution of similar types of well-wishes, and for the insight they lend into the structure and function of the « ben » formula; these are treated first, in the paragraphs which follow. The latter parallels, however, those of a formal as well as a functional nature, are of

greater import in interpreting the contextual setting of the Ugaritic « ben » formula; a survey of these concludes this section.

Quite a number of different non-epistolary passages provide general functional parallels to the benediction formula.[331] Discussions of Ugaritic literature or religion often collect these under the rubric "blessings and curses." Prior to discussing these passages individually, however, I prefer to clarify a number of contextual criteria, all essential to the definition of the epistolary «ben » formula, which will help not only in evaluating the interpretive importance of the parallels, but also in clarifying the nature of the « ben » formula as an utterance. Five factors seem germane: (1) that the mood of the passage be "volitional", that is, expressing a wish or desire; (2) that the wished-for action or state require divine agency for its achievement; (3) that its effect be beneficial for the "patient" undergoing or experiencing it; (4) that the wish be addressed directly to this "patient", and not to any other party; and finally, (5) that the speaker be a third party, neither the divine agent, nor the "patient" intended to experience beneficial effects.

4.4.2.1.1 WISHING AND TELLING: *KTU*[2] 1.15 II 19 AND RS 24.266:34'-36'

The relevance of the first factor mentioned above is apparent when one examines "blessings" that are indicative in mood rather than volitional. One such "counter-example" comes from the *Kirta* text. In *KTU*[2] 1.15 II 19, the story narrates Ilu's conferral of a blessing upon the protagonist:

---

[331]See the discussion of G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (1981) 47-48, 57. Literary parallels are discussed by N. Wyatt, *HUS* (1999) 569-573; and parallels in the legal and scholarly texts (and others) have been collected by D. Clemens in *Sources for Ugaritic Ritual and Sacrifice* 1 (2001) 148-259, 1080-1083, and 1118-1123. Both of these works provide anterior bibliography.

« *ybrk il krt* », ‘ʾIlu blesses[332] Kirta.’

Since the text eventually continues with the words of the blessing spoken by ʾIlu,[333] this passage has an added interest: it also illustrates the Ugaritic verbal idiom for “blessing” someone, and thus suggests one possibility for the native Ugaritic term for the « ben » formula itself.[334] The narrative nature of the passage, however, entails one other contextual aspect relevant for comparison with the « ben » formula: as narrative, the statement « *ybrk il krt* » is not, of course, addressed directly to the “patient” of the divine action,[335] as the epistolary « ben » is.

A better illustration, then, of the pertinence of “volitional” mood for the « ben » formula, comes from ritual text RS 24.266.[336] The final portion of the text[337] gives (ritual) directions for delivering the city of Ugarit from hostile forces. The wording of this part is in the 2nd person, though it is not clear who the persons (plural) addressed are. One possibility is that the directions are directed specifically to individuals named at the head of this section, in line 25’: « *bʿl mtk mlkm* », perhaps cultic officials, ‘Those

---

[332]The use of the prefix conjugation to advance the storyline in narrative poetry corresponds more or less to the so-called “historical present” in English or French.

[333]For this “blessing” motif, see below, section 4.4.2.1.5.

[334]In other words, since the verbal idiom employed the root BRK, it is conceivable that the Ugaritic name for the « ben » formula itself (and other “blessings” of that type) employed a nominal manifestation of this same root: perhaps **brkt* (/*barakatu/), a form known from other Semitic languages (compare Arabic ÉòÆÓ, and Hebrew ברכה), or even **tbrkt* (/*tabraktu/), using a nominal base attested in Ugaritic for abstract nouns (a probable example is found in the syllabic spelling {ta-ap-de$_4$-tu$_4$}, ‘exchange’, from PDY, as in RS 16.343:9 and elsewhere; cf. Huehnergard, *UVST* [1987] 166).

[335]This is the fourth criterion discussed above; see below, section 4.4.2.1.4.

[336]See D. Pardee’s re-edition in *Les textes rituels* (2000) 659-685, with bibliography.

[337]Lines 26’-36’.

in Charge of Royal Libations.'[338] In any case, the passage directs those addressed, in the event of an attack,[339] to pray to Baʿlu for deliverance, with promises to perform various ritual acts for the benefit of that deity.[340] Should this prayer be made, Baʿlu, it is claimed, will deliver the city from peril. It is this latter phrase[341] which is of interest here:

« [*b*] *ʿl … ydy ʿz l ṯ́grkm* », '[B]aʿlu … will drive the strong (foe) away from your gate.'

Like *KTU*[2] 1.15 II 19, this passage is indicative, and not volitional, in mood. Unlike the former, however, but like the epistolary « ben » formula, it is addressed to the potential "beneficiary" of divine benevolence.

4.4.2.1.2 GODS AND MEN: *KTU*[2] 1.15 II 21-23 AND *KTU*[2] 1.19 II 17-18

The second criterion under discussion here, the issue of the divine agency of the benevolent act, may also be illustrated by examining counter-examples. One of the components of ʾIlu's "blessing" in the passage of the *Kirta* text already mentioned may serve this purpose, *KTU*[2] 1.15 II 21-23, in which ʾIlu promises the following blessing:

« *ảṯt* [*tq*]*ḥ y krt … tld šbʿ bnm lk* »,

'(As for) the wife (that) [you will ta]ke, O Kirta, … she will bear you seven sons.'

---

[338]Line 25'. Placed as it is, following the horizontal scribal line that apparently marks the end of the previous section, and at the beginning of a new "paragraph" consisting of twelve lines of text grouped together on the tablet (that is, not separated by horizontal scribal lines), this phrase may represent, then, an introduction of sorts for this paragraph: '(The following passage is intended) (for) "(the cultic official)s in Charge of Royal Libations." ' Pardee (*ibid.*, pp. 679-680) discusses other interpretations.

[339]Lines 26'-27', including « *k gr ʿz ṯ́grkm* », 'When a strong (foe) attacks your gate … .'

[340]Lines 29'-34', including, for example, « *ỉbr y bʿl nšqdš* », 'A bull, O Baʿlu, we will sanctify!'

[341]Lines 34'-36'.

Although it is admittedly difficult to know whether the verbal form *tld* represents the volitional (jussive)[342] or the indication mood,[343] this question is not particularly meaningful here, since even if the mood of the verb *tld* were indicative, ʾIlu's "declaration" of the future still would still represent, in some sense at least, his own desire (or volition) of how things should be. For this passage, then, more important than the question of volition is the question of agent. Despite ʾIlu's power to dictate the future, the grammatical subject, and the agent of the action described by the verb YLD 'to give birth to (children),' is not ʾIlu, but rather Kirta's wife-to-be. It is thus not divine intervention that is wished for here, but future human events that are described. In this sense this passage represents a slightly different situation than the epistolary « ben » formula.

Another "blessing" passage which may serve as a counter-example, to illustrate the divine nature of the agency in the epistolary « ben » is *KTU*[2] 1.19 II 17-18, from the *ʾAqhatu* text. Unlike the *Kirta* passage discussed in the preceding paragraph, this passage resembles the context of the epistolary « ben » in all but one respect: it is not divine agency that is wished for, but human. The protagonist of this section of the text, Dāniʾilu, utters the following blessing when, during the course of inspecting fields parched by drought, he comes across one of the few surviving plants. He addresses the plant directly:

> « *tỉspk yd åqht ǵzr tštk b qrbm åsm* »,
>
> 'May the hand of valiant ʾAqhatu reap you (and) put you inside the silo!'[344]

---

[342]That is, */*talid*/, 'Would that she bear (sons) … !'

[343]That is, */*talidu*/, 'She will bear (sons) … !'

[344]In this agricultural context, the common verbs ʾSP 'to gather' and Š(Y)T 'to put' evidently have technical meanings connected with the harvest and storage of grain, respectively.

The situational context of this passage differs from that of the epistolary « ben » formula in invoking human, and not divine, agency in wishing the well-being of the "beneficiary".[345]

A final counter-example to this criterion may be taken from a difficult and poorly preserved text: RS 15.134:12.[346] This passage serves equally well as a transition to the following section, since it also provides a counter-example to the contextual criterion discussed there, that of beneficial effect. Though much about this text remains elusive,[347] what is clear is that it is poetic in structure,[348] that it mentions various divinities,[349] and that, among other things, it is concerned with snakes[350] and wood.[351] Given these observations, and the fact that many of the deities mentioned are elsewhere connected with serpents,[352] it seems reasonable to connect this text with other incantations. The passage in question occurs in line 12:

> « *ʿpr btk tgršk* », 'May the dust of your (own) house chase you out!'

Despite the non-divine nature of the agent in this passage, and despite the adverse effects of the wish for the "patient", the presence of this motif in a text containing

---

[345]Compare another contextual setting in *KTU*[2] 1.4 V 15-17.

[346]*KTU*[2] 1.82.

[347]See the recent treatment (with anterior bibliography) of G. del Olmo Lete, *La religión cananea* (1992) 251-255; translated with some modifications in *Canaanite Religion* (1999) 373-379.

[348]The frequent presence of semantic parallelism between adjacent lines suggests this.

[349]A number of deities are mentioned by name, among whom Ḥôrānu, Šapšu, Baʿlu, ʿAnatu, Rašap, « *ẓẓ w kmṯ ilm* » ('the two gods *ẓẓ* and *kmṯ*'), probably the Rāpiʾūma, and probably Môtu.

[350]Note the terminology: *tnn*, *bṯnm*, *bṯnt*, *ḥmt*, *brḥ.*, and perhaps [*n*]*ḥš*.

[351]The word *ʿṣm* is repeated several times, for example. Note also the presence of the word *ḥẓ* 'arrow', and the repetition of the term *prṭl*, which some take to be an herb.

[352]Especially Ḥôrānu, but many of the other deities also have such associations.

characteristics of incantations reveals another interesting aspect of volitions such as this: their practical power.

4.4.2.1.3 BLESSING AND CURSING: *KTU*[2] 1.19 III 30-32 AND IV 5-6

Another close functional parallel to the epistolary « ben » is provided farther on in the *ʾAqhatu* narrative. This "curse" motif provides a counter-example to the third criterion under discussion, that of positive effect for the "patient" of the action. After finding and burying the remains of his son ʾAqhatu, Dāniʾilu sets out to curse the various localities situated near the site of the latter's murder. Some of these curses mention no agent, and are thus less comparable to the « ben ». Note, however, the curse pronounced against *qrt åblm*, 'the city of ʾAblama', in *KTU*[2] 1.19 IV 5-6:

ʿwrt yštk bʿl	'Blind may Baʿlu render you,[353]
l ht w ʿlmh	'now and to eternity,
l ʿnt p dr dr	'in the present and (for) generations (to come)!'

Not only is the situational context of this example similar to that of the epistolary « ben » in all but one respect, namely, the nature of the effect for the "patient", but it also employs adverbial complements that highly resemble, in sense and function if not in form, the adverbial phrases found in certain epistolary « ben » formulas, such as that of the Ugaritic scribal exercise letter, RS 16.265:2-6, « *ålp ym w rbt šnt bʿd ʿlm* », 'for a thousand day(s) and a myriad of years, (even) unto eternity'. This resemblance of motifs prompts a further series of observations. Like nearly all of these "blessings and curses" drawn from the literary corpus, the curse in *KTU*[2] 1.19 IV 5-6 is poetic in

---

[353]It seems easiest to interpret the pronominal suffix *-k* on *yštk* as a dative (that is, as the indirect object; on this usage, see J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* [2000], §73.7, p. 506), and the noun *ʿwrt*, 'blindness', as the accusative complement of the verb: literally, 'May he put blindness to you'.

form.[354] While the epistolary formulas are generally quite prosaic, some of the more elaborate « ben » formulas in the Ugaritic corpus, such as that of the scribal exercise letter mentioned above, do show a fair amount of parallelism, not only of a grammatical,[355] but also of a semantic nature. The « ben » formula of RS 16.265 provides good examples of both types of parallelism: the repetition of formally similar verbs such as « *tǵrk tšlmk tʿzzk* », 'May they protect you, may they keep you well, may they strengthen you,' is a kind of grammatical parallelism; and the adverbial phrase already mentioned above, « *ảlp ym w rbt šnt bʿd ʿlm* », '(for) a thousand day(s) and (for) a myriad of years, (even) unto eternity', represents a kind of semantic parallelism. The scribal nature of RS 16.265 would seem to be no coincidence; its elaborations and embellishments are reminiscent of the literary "blessings," and imply scribal familiarity with the Ugaritic and broader West Asian literary traditions in which similar parallelistic benedictions frequently appear as literary motifs.

The *Kirta* narrative also contains a passage which presents the same functional similarities and the same difference as the passage discussed in the preceding paragraph. This passage, *KTU*[2] 1.16 VI 54-57,[356] follows what has been called the "staircase" pattern.[357] Kirta curses his son in the following terms:

yṯbr ḫrn y bn	'May Ḥôrānu break, O (my) son,
yṯbr ḫrn riš̓k	'May Ḥôrānu break your head!

---

[354]By "poetic in form" as applied to Ugaritic, I mean characterized by the phenomenon of "*parallelismus membroram*", that is, the presence of parallels of a semantic, grammatical, or other nature between the individual lines.

[355]Note the repetition of formally similar verbs, such as « *tǵrk* » 'May they protect you!', « *tšlmk* » 'May they keep you well!', and « *tʿzzk* » 'May they strengthen you!'

[356]*KTU*[2] 1.2 I 7-8 probably contained another example of this same motif.

[357]E. L. Greenstein, *UF* 9 (1977) 77-86.

ʿṯrt šm bʿl qdqdk! ‘(May) ʿAṯtartu “Name-of-Baʿlu” (break) your skull!’

Here again, as in *KTU*[2] 1.19 IV 5-6 from *ʾAqhatu*, discussed above, the only significant contextual difference with regard to the epistolary « ben » formula is the negative intent of the wish.

Another “curse” motif from the *ʾAqhatu* text provides yet a further counter-example for this criterion of “positive effect”. In the narrative, prior to cursing the environs of his son’s murder, as in the passage discussed above, Dāniʾilu, already informed of ʾAqhatu’s demise, embarks on a search for his physical remains. His intention takes the form of an autopsy of the stomach contents of various carrion-eating birds, called *nšrm* in Ugaritic. In order to carry out the examinations, however, he obviously needs to have the birds in hand, and to accomplish this, Dāniʾilu utters his wish that the god Baʿlu break the wings of the birds so that they fall at his feet. An example is *KTU*[2] 1.19 III 30-32:

knp ṣml bʿl yṯbr ‘The wings of (the bird named) ṢML may Baʿlu break!

bʿl yṯbr dỉy hyt ‘May Baʿlu break her pinions?![358]

tql tḥt pʿny ‘May she fall at my two feet!’

Obviously, like the example discussed above, the immediate effects of this volition would not be positive for the “patient” who experiences the action evoked. Perhaps more of interest for the interpretation of the situational context of the epistolary « ben » formula, however, is the fact that this “curse” is actually fulfilled a few lines farther on in the narrative.[359] Furthermore, not only is the curse fulfilled, but it is

---

[358]Literally, ‘the pinions of her’. The pronoun employed is an independent form used for the genitive and accusative, *hyt*. Such a construction was apparently considered more appealing on a literary or aesthetic level than the more banal formulation with attached pronominal suffix, **dỉyh*.

[359]*KTU*[2] 1.19 III 36-38.

fulfilled immediately, the curse having not even fully left the speaker's mouth.[360] Inasmuch as this passage may be compared with the epistolary « ben », then, the efficacy of the latter might also have been imagined as immediate. Finally, this "curse" provides a convenient transition to the following section. Not only is the effect of this volition not positive for the "patient" of the action, but it is also not addressed directly to the "patient" of the action, and is thus a counter-example to the fourth criterion mentioned above.

4.4.2.1.4 BLESSINGS AND PRAYERS: *KTU*[2] 1.15 II 13 AND OTHER PASSAGES

The *Kirta* text also contains a "blessing" motif which illustrates, by way of exception, the fourth criterion, that the "patient" of the act be directly addressed. This passage, *KTU*[2] 1.15 II 13, is drawn from the section immediately preceding ʾIlu's blessing of Kirta, discussed above.[361] Here, the god Baʿlu intercedes with ʾIlu on Kirta's behalf, petitioning the elder god for the blessing described above.[362] This intercession also resembles the epistolary « ben » formula in many respects, though not in regard to the party addressed:

> « *l lṭpn … l tbrk* [*krt*] », 'O Luṭpānu,[363] … you should bless [Kirta]!'

Since the beneficiary of the volition is referred to not directly, as in the epistolary « ben » formula, but indirectly, in the 3rd person, this example is not so much a blessing as a solicitation for a blessing. Although it may be more appropriate, given

---

[360]*KTU*[2] 1.19 III 35: « *b ph rgm l y*[*ṣ*]*ả* ».

[361]The blessing motifs of *KTU*[2] 1.15 II 19-23 are discussed in sections 4.4.2.1.1 and 4.4.2.1.2.

[362]Section 4.4.2.1.2.

[363]An epithet of ʾIlu.

the fact that it is spoken by the god Baʿlu, to characterize this solicitation as an "entreaty", in the mouths of mortals such an utterance could be called a "prayer".

Some of the other Ugaritic texts considered to be "prayers" are not easily included here, since their structure and function are often not apparent, and consequently the various interpretations given to them are frequently more than a little subjective.[364] One "prayer" passage, however, which does seem to be somewhat clear, though still difficult, is RS 24.252:24'-27'.[365] These lines are addressed to a (single) divinity; the parallelism between these lines and those immediately preceding[366] seems to favor identifying that deity as one of the "*rāpiʾūma*", that is, the ghosts[367] of dead kings.[368] Here is an excerpt:

« *ʿzk ḏmrk … b tk ůgrt l ymt špš w yrḫ w nʿmt šnt ỉl* »

'(May) your strength (and) your protection … (be) in Ugarit for (the duration of) the days of Šapšu and Yariḫu, and (for the duration of) the best of ʾIlu's years!'

---

[364]Some of the god-lists (such as RS 4.474 and RS 24.271) fall into this category.

[365]See the re-edition of D. Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques* (1988) 75-118, and the more recent treatments of N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit* (1998) 395-398, with anterior bibliography;

[366]I refer to the repetitive parallelism between lines 21'-23' and lines 24'-25'.

[367]"Shades" may be a better term; they are specifically characterized as such (*ẓlm*) in the title of the royal funerary rite RS 34.126.

[368]One is tempted to go further, and interpret the epithets « *rpů mlk ʿlm* », 'Rāpiʾu, the king of eternity', and « *rpỉ ảrṣ* » as semantically (and poetically) parallel. In this case, the latter would be singular, 'Rāpiʾu of the Earth' rather than plural (the same phrase in RS 34.126:2,9 is evidently plural), but this presents no interpretive problem (for example, the plural noun phrase « *mlk ůgrt* », 'the kings of Ugarit', does not preclude the existence of the same phrase in the singular, « *mlk ůgrt* », 'the king of Ugarit'). Thus, for poetic and contextual reasons, the phrase « *l r[p]ỉ ảrṣ* », which straddles lines 23'-24', could easily be a vocative phrase, addressed to the single deity (elsewhere called « *rpů mlk ʿlm* ») to whom allusion is made during the remainder of the "prayer".

The interpretive importance of this passage for the « ben » formula is lessened by the formal disparity between them. Nevertheless, if interpreted correctly, this "blessing" can be compared with the « ben » inasmuch as it meets all but one of the criteria discussed above, the exception being the fourth criterion, that of being addressed to the "patient" who experiences divine benevolence.

A further passage which may be might presented as a counter-example of this criterion comes from a tablet probably used in scribal training, RS 22.225:8-9.[369] It is not unambiguously clear that the passage cited below is volitional, but such is certainly one possibility.

> « *ʿn ṯġr l ṯġr ṯṯb* », 'May the "Eye"[370] of the gatekeeper return to the gatekeeper!'

This passage actually fails to meet more than one of the criteria under discussion here: (1) it is not clear that the entity « *ʿn ṯġr* » should be considered divine, (2) it is not clear that the action evoked is to be considered beneficial for the "patient",[371] and, relevant here, (3) the "patient" is not addressed directly. As such, then, its value as a contextual parallel to the epistolary « ben » formula is correspondingly diminished.

A more legitimate example of a "blessing" which presents strong contextual similarities with the epistolary « ben », but which nevertheless represents a counter-example to the criterion discussed here, is the "blessing" clause as used in legal texts

---

[369] *KTU*[2] 1.96. The "scribal" nature of this tablet seems clear from the presence of the elementary syllabary « tu-ta-ti » on one side; see W. van Soldt, *SAU* (1991) 749-750; *idem*, ALASP 7 (1995) 171-212. For two recent studies of the text, each interpreting the text very differently, but both supplying the essential anterior bibliography, see del Olmo Lete, *La religión cananea* (1992) 255-259, translated into English in *Canaanite Religion* (1999) 379-384; and M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *Mythos und Ritual* (2000) 227-261.

[370] For Dietrich and Loretz, *Mythos und Ritual* (2000) 234, the word *ʿn* here is to be rendered "der Quelle".

[371] Nor is it even evident that a "patient" (one who experiences the action) is involved.

such as treaties. Unfortunately, no Ugaritic documents of this type have been preserved well enough for analysis.[372] However, one of the Akkadian treaties between a Ugaritic king and the Hittite emperor, on a tablet found at Ras Shamra, does preserve this motif: RS 17.353: v 14'-17'.[373] The "blessing" is found at the end of the text; it is intended for the benefit of the Ugaritic king in the event that he "protects" or "keeps", {i-na-ṣur}, the terms of the agreement. It is a volition that the gods mentioned early in the treaty "protect" the Ugaritic king:

> {li-iṣ-ṣú-ru-šu}, 'May they protect him!'

Again, all criteria under discussion here save one are present: the "beneficiary" of the blessing is not addressed directly in the 2nd person as in the « ben », but indirectly, in the 3rd person.

Since, however, this blessing probably does not reflect Ugaritic usage proper as much as it does the diplomatic scribal habits current in imperial Ḫattuša,[374] it may be helpful to consider another example, closer to Ugarit in geographical and cultural, if not chronological, terms. The autobiographical inscription on the statue of Idrimi of Alalaḫ[375] carries also carries a scribal colophon.[376] After giving his name, the scribe

---

[372]RS 11.772+ has irrefutable formal parallels with several Akkadian treaties found at Ras Shamra (see D. Pardee, *Semitic* 51 [forthcoming]); it has no formal epistolary characteristics (*contra* G. Knoppers, *BASOR* 289 [1993] 81-94). No section corresponding to blessings and curses has been preserved, however.

[373]See J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 4 (1956) 90 and pl. lvi; and now S. Lackenbacher, *Textes akkadiens d'Ugarit* (2002) 78-85, with anterior bibliography.

[374]For further parallels in Hittite treaties, see below, section 4.4.2.3.3.

[375]See S. Smith, *The Statue of Idri-mi* (1949); the treatment of M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 13 (1981) 201-269 (especially the copies and the photographs); and the recent translation, with anterior bibliography, in T. Longman, *Context* 1 (1997) 479-480.

[376]Lines 99-101.

includes a blessing intended for his own benefit. A portion of this blessing runs as follows:

> {DINGIR.MEŠ ša AN u KI (100) li-bal-li-ṭu-ú-šu li-na-ṣa-ru-šu … },
>
> 'May the gods of heaven and earth keep him alive (and) protect him … !'

Like the other examples discussed here, this "blessing" is not addressed directly to the "patient" of the benevolent action. However, much more than any of the examples discussed thus far, this passage is formally very similar to the epistolary « ben »: (1) it begins with a plural noun phrase referring to "the gods",[377] and (2) it ends with several successive volitional verbs of blessing. This formal and contextual similarity lends value to this passage in interpreting the situational context of the « ben » formula. In particular, the fact that the scribe inscribed a benediction for his own benefit may imply, not so much that merely uttering these words made them effective, but above all that *writing* them did. This, too, may lie behind the persistence of the « ben » as an epistolary formula: "benedictions" in writing effective.

4.4.2.1.5 SPEAKER: *KTU*[2] 1.15 II 21-23 AND OTHER PASSAGES

The epistolary « ben » formula does not represent the words of the divine agent who performs the action, nor those of the human "patient" who benefits from it. The words of the « ben » formula are those of a third party, and one that is not directly involved as a participant in the act described: the sender of the letter. This brings up a fifth criterion in evaluating the comparative "blessing" motifs: the speaker. The

---

[377]The second benediction phrase (lines 100-101), however, is not addressed to multiple gods, but to the sun god alone: {^{d}UTU EN e-lu-ti (101) ù šap-la-ti EN … e-ṭem-mi}, 'Šapšu, the lord of the upper and lower (realms), the lord of the *eṭemmū*-spirits.'

relevance of this criterion may again be illustrated by examining counter-examples. At least three such passages come to mind; all have been cited already.

In the first, *KTU*[2] 1.15 II 21-23,[378] the god ʾIlu addresses Kirta, the "beneficiary" of the blessing, directly:

« *ảṯt* [*tq*]*ḥ y krt … tld šbʿ bnm lk* »,

'(As for) the wife (that) [you will ta]ke, O Kirta, … she will bear you seven sons.'

Another passage which may, in some sense, serve as a counter-example for this criterion of "speaker" is the benediction in RS 24.252:24'-27'.[379]

« *ʿzk ḏmrk … b tk ủgrt l ymt špš w yrḫ w nʿmt šnt ỉl* »

'(May) your strength (and) your protection … (be) in Ugarit during the days of the Šapšu and Yariḫu, (during) the best of ʾIlu's years!'

The "beneficiary" of the blessing is "Ugarit", but since the speakers of the blessing were almost certainly residents of that city-state, it follows that the real "beneficiaries" are the residents of Ugarit.[380] As such, the party that speaks this blessing, and the party that benefits from it are one and the same.

A final example comes not from Ugarit, but Alalaḫ: the self-blessing formula added to the Idrimi inscription by the scribe: lines 99-101, for example.[381]

{DINGIR.MEŠ ša AN u KI (100) li-bal-li-ṭu-ú-šu li-na-ṣa-ru-šu … },

'May the gods of heaven and earth keep him alive (and) protect him … !'

---

[378]See above, section 4.4.2.1.2.

[379]See above, section 4.4.2.1.4.

[380]In other words, this is a case of one party being designated by means of an extended metaphor, as in the use of the phrase "the crown" as a designation for a ruling monarch, or "the White House" or "10 Downing Street" as designations for the current government administration in Washington and London respectively.

[381]See above, section 4.4.2.1.4.

It is the scribe who is blessing himself here, even if the self-allusion is made in the third person.

4.4.2.2 Formal and functional parallels in Ugaritic

The discussion in the preceding section was concerned primarily with identifying contextual and functional parallels for the epistolary « ben » formula. None of the examples discussed above, however, were found to meet all five contextual criteria outlined at the beginning of that section. For that reason, it might be useful to cite one passage which apparently does meet all five of these criteria, *KTU*[2] 1.24:38-39.

> « *w yrḫ yårk* », 'and may Yariḫu illuminate you!'

I have followed A. Caquot, M. Sznycer, and A. Herdner[382] in deriving the verb from the "hollow" root ʾR, 'to be bright, to shine', rather than ʾRK, 'to be long'. A volitional rendering of the verb,[383] followed here, is a possible, though not a necessary interpretation. The volition would be addressed to a single entity,[384] probably the protagonist's new bride.[385]

---

[382]A. Caquot, M. Sznycer, and A. Herdner, *TO* 1 (1974) 395, note a.

[383]G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (1981) 460: "¡Que Yarḫu te ilumine!"

[384]It is not the only example of such direct address (2nd person singular); compare « ⌜*å*⌝*qrbk* » in line 27 and « *lk* » in line 29, but these occur in passages in which Yariḫu is himself speaking. It may seem awkward that Yariḫu should also be speaking in this passage, since he would be referring to himself in the 3rd person, but this does occur elsewhere in the text: lines 16-18 read « *ylåk yrḫ … ʿm … mlk qẓ tn nkl yrḫ ytrḫ* », 'Yariḫu … (then) sends (a message) to … the King of Summer: "Give (me) Nikkal (in marriage)! Yariḫu will pay the bride-price … !" '

[385]For Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit* (1998) 340, n. 25, it is the listener that is addressed: "Thus the power of the myth is invoked for other marriages."

Beyond examples such as this, however, a few passages may be mentioned which resemble the epistolary « ben » formula not only contextually or functionally, but also on a formal level. The extent of the formal similarity may vary from one passage to another. Some of these have already been discussed.

An example of very minor formal parallelism, for example, may be noted with respect to the various adverbial phrases expressing duration which appear in at least one epistolary « ben » formula and in two contextually similar non-epistolary motifs discussed in the preceding section. This parallelism is weak, however, not only because it concerns a single "optional" component of the « ben » formula, but also because it is only operative on the level of semantics and grammatical role (adverb of duration), and not on the morphological level.

RS 16.265:4-6	« *ảlp ym w rbt šnt bʿd ʿlm* »	‘(for) a thousand day(s) and (for) a myriad of years, (even) unto eternity’
RS 24.252:26’-27’	« *l ymt špš w yrḫ w nʿmt šnt il* »	‘for the days of the Šapšu and Yariḫu, and (for) the best years of ʾIlu’
KTU[2] 1.19 IV 5-6	« *l ht w ʿlmh l ʿnt p dr dr* »	‘from now and to eternity, in the present and (for) generations (to come)’

Such similarities are noteworthy, perhaps, but not extensive enough to justify speculation regarding a common contextual origin.

More striking on the formal level, but unfortunately not entirely preserved, is the apparent benediction motif in *KTU*[2] 1.6 IV 22-24, from the *Baʿlu Cycle* of myths. As mythological narrative, the passage is poetic, of course; its specific parallelistic structure being the so-called “staircase” pattern.[386]

[386]Greenstein, *UF* 9 (1977) 77-86.

ån l ån y špš	'No matter what,[387] O Šapšu,
ån l ån il yg⌈r⌉[k]	'No matter what, may ʾIlu prote⌈ct⌉ [you]!
tǵrk š⌈lm⌉[388] [*ilm*?][389]	'May [the god]s? protect you (for)[390] w⌈ell-being⌉!'

Unfortunately the state of preservation of line 24 prevents the full force of this potential parallel from being felt. What is noteworthy is (1) the presence of the verbal form « *tǵrk* », which is probably plural here as it is in the « ben », rather than feminine

---

[387]I consider the phrase « *ån l ån* » to be adverbial in meaning, and thus in a certain sense grammatically parallel to the adverbial accusative *š⌈lm⌉*, '(for) well-being' in the third poetic line of this unit (accepting the reading of *KTU*[2]). In light of this (supposed) parallelism, I wonder if the expression « *ån l ån* » also expresses manner or purpose, and not location ('wherever'). In form, it is superficially reminiscent (cf. J. De Moor, *UF* 7 [1977] 204) of the Old Babylonian idiomatic expression « *annītam lā annītam* », literally 'this (one), not this (one),' that is, 'one way or another' (cf. *CAD* 1 [A], part 2 [1968] 137, where {a-ni-tám la a-ni-tám} is cited, and glossed 'whether or not'). Such an interpretation for the Ugaritic particle « *ån* », however, disregards the most obvious West Semitic etymological cognates, which favor a locative sense ('where', 'wherever'). The inner Ugaritic data themselves do not provide much support for either view (locative or adverb of manner). A particle *ån*, of seemingly adverbial sense, is present in the *ʾAqhatu* text (*KTU*[2] 1.19 II 15,22). If this is the same word, manner seems more likely than location for its semantic nuance. See the proposals and bibliography in G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 37. Another possibility is that the particle *ån* may be used in an exclamatory (perhaps affirmative) sense: 'O Indeed!' or the like. Such semantics would be appropriate not only for the particle in the idiom « *ån l ån* », but perhaps also for the idiom « *åḥl ån* » in the *ʾAqhatu* passage mentioned above.

[388]I have followed the text as given in *KTU*[2].

[389]The poetic B-terms which parallel « *il* » elsewhere in the literary corpus are either epithets of ʾIlu, and thus singular (such as *lṭpn*, *ṯr*, *åb*) or else the collective term *pḫr mʿd*, 'the (divine) assembly-council' (as in *KTU*[2] 1.2 I 31, for example). Since the poetic division or versification was consistently taken into account by the scribe in his lineation of column IV, the grammatical subject of the verb *tǵrk* should be restored at the end of line 24. I would hesitate to restore the phrase *pḫr mʿd* there, however, not so much because of space considerations (the line could have wrapped onto the edge as elsewhere in this column), but rather because it is not evident that *pḫr mʿd* would take feminine agreement (*tǵrk*, unless the form is plural, and agrees in sense but not in form). I prefer tentatively to restore [*ilm*], and to take *tǵrk* as a plural, but would note that the parallel *il* // *ilm* is, to my knowledge, unattested. Note also, however, the use of *ilm*, 'the gods' following *pḫr*, 'assembly', in the god-lists RS 1.017:29 (*pḫr ilm*, 'the assembly of the gods'), RS 24.264+:28 (*pḫr ilm*), and RS 20.024:28 (^{d}pu-ḫur DINGIR.MEŠ).

[390]In my view (compare also Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* [2000], § 54.133.2d, p. 312), the adverbial nuance of the noun *š⌈lm⌉* here would express goal or purpose (much like prepositional phrase of the epistolary benediction, « *l šlm* »), and not instrument (*contra* Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit* [1998] 140, n. 101).

singular; (2) the divine nature of the agent of the action evoked by the verb, at least in line 23 (*il*); and (3) the possible presence of the noun *šlm*, 'well-being', in line 24. Thus, if correctly interpreted, this passage appears to contain elements which correspond, semantically,[391] and to a more limited extent, morphologically,[392] to each of the three "necessary" components of the standard epistolary « ben » formula.

Another possible formal parallel, though here the possibility is more remote given the state of the text, is found in the fragment RS 24.652 D. The reading given in *KTU*[2] contains, in line 4, the string {[…]⌜-⌝ tǵr . i[…]},[393] for which the authors suggest reading « *tǵr i*[*l*(*m*) …] », 'May the god(s) protect … !' Unfortunately, little about this text is certain, neither in form, nor in content.

4.4.2.3 Akkadian and Hittite parallels

Outside of the Ugaritic corpus proper, several striking parallels to the epistolary « ben » formula could be pointed out. The Akkadian "blessing" formula in the Ugarit-Ḫatti treaty RS 17.343 has already been mentioned, as has another Akkadian example, the "self-blessing" formula added to the Idrimi autobiographical inscription by the

---

[391]Not just semantically, but also etymologically: (1) « *il* » and perhaps « [*ilm*] » ≈ « *ilm* »; (2) « *yg⌜r⌝*[*k*] » and especially « *tǵrk* » ≈ « *tǵrk* »; and (3) possibly « *š⌜lm⌝* » ≈ « *tšlmk* ».

[392]The only clear example is « *tǵrk* » ≈ « *tǵrk* », both probably 'may they protect you!' As for the other elements, « [*ilm*] » ≈ « *ilm* » is conceivable, but cannot be demonstrated; and « *š⌜lm⌝* » is grammatically much closer to epistolary « *l šlm* » (as in RS 92.2005:7) than it is to the volitional form « *tšlmk* », 'may they keep you well!' Note, however, that the statistically most frequent compositional pattern in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus of letters is « DINGIR.MEŠ » + « a-na šul-ma-ni » + « PAP-ru-ka », which presents a striking parallel to the (partially reconstructed) third "step" in the poetic staircase discussed above: *tǵrk š⌜lm⌝* [*ilm*?], 'May [the god]s? protect you (for) w⌜ell-being⌝!'

[393]*KTU*[2] 7.164:4.

scribe.[394] These passages are but two of many formal parallels which might be cited from the abundant literature in Akkadian, not too mention potential parallels in Hittite, which have not yet been mentioned. Although limitations of time and competence prevent a comprehensive survey of such examples in these corpora, several passages were felt to be of such significance for a comparative study that they could not be passed over.

Three "benediction" motifs will be briefly discussed here. Each has relevance, I believe, in situating the standard Ugaritic epistolary « ben » formula in a wider cultural context. Furthermore, each provides a parallel of a slightly different nature, and thus, of different interpretive value. The three motifs are the following: (1) the Akkadian (and Sumerian) benediction formulas preserved in the literary work *Blessings upon the King*[395] known from Tell Meskene and Ras Shamra, (2) a benediction formula which appears in the *Gilgamesh Epic*, and (3) one of the benediction motifs used in the "blessings and curses" portion of Hittite treaties.

4.4.2.3.1 THE « BÉNÉDICTIONS SUR LE ROI » AS KNOWN AT EMAR AND UGARIT

Among the several hundred cuneiform documents recovered from Tell Meskene is the tablet Msk 74243,[396] of relatively large size and beautifully preserved,[397] which contains a bilingual literary text in Akkadian and Sumerian, descriptively characterized by D. Arnaud as « les bénédictions sur le roi ». The editor

---

[394]For both, see above, section 4.4.2.1.4.

[395]This is a descriptive title provided by the editor ("Bénédictions sur le roi"), not an *incipit*.

[396]D. Arnaud, Emar 6:4 (1987), no. 775, pp. 371-374; *idem*, Emar 6:2 (1985) 564 (photo).

[397]Its size, state of preservation, and the legibility of the orthography permitted the editor to omit a hand-copy from the publication; *ibid*.

was further able to identify two other manuscripts of this same literary work among the tablets from Ras Shamra: one small fragment in Akkadian[398] and a sizable fragment in "syllabic" Sumerian.[399] Only a selection of benediction motifs from the Akkadian version[400] which will be treated here:

(4b) « ^{d}nin-líl i-na pí-ša ṭà-a-bi li-ik-ru-bu-ka »

'May Ninlil bless you by her (own) good mouth!'

(5b) « DINGIR.MEŠ KALAM.MA$^{\text{ša ma-ti}}$ li-ik-ru-ba-ak-ku$_8$ »

'May the gods of the country bless you!'

(6b) « ^{d}be-le-et DINGIR.MEŠ be-el-tu$_4$ ra-bi-tù ku-uz-ba li-ze-en-kà »

'May the Mistress of the Gods, the Great Lady, adorn you with potency!'

(7b) « ^{d}AMAR.UTU be-el na-ag-bi na-ga$_{14}$-ab-šu -ip$^{!}$-te-ku »

'<May> Marduk, Lord of the Spring(-waters), open his spring(s) to you!'

(10b) « ^{d}UTU re-i ma-ta-ti ki-ma U$_4$-mi ša nam-ri li-na-me-er-ka »

'May Šapšu, Shepherd of the Lands, illuminate you like a day of brilliance!'

(11b) « ^{d}na-bi-um be-el qa-an-ṭup-pí U$_4$.MEŠ-ka EGIR-ku-ti liš-ṭur »

'May Nabû, Lord of the Stylus, write down your lengthy days!'

(12b) « qar-ra-du$_4$ ^{d}nin-IB e-mu-qí-ka -dan$_5$-nin$^{!}$ »

'<May> the Hero Ninurta augment your force!'

---

[398]RS 79.025 « B »; D. Arnaud, *Syria* 59 (1982) 212-213 (copy and transcription); *idem*, Emar 6:4 (1987) 376 (variant readings with respect to the Emar version).

[399]RS 79.025 « A »; Arnaud, *Syria* 59 (1982) 209-213 (copy, transcription, translation); *idem*, Emar 6:4 (1987) 374-376.

[400]In any case, the Akkadian text appears to be primary. Compare the editor's comments in *Syria* 59 (1982) 209; and in Emar 6:4 (1987) 376.

These benediction motifs provide contextual parallels to the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula,[401] but not precise formal or semantic parallels.[402] However, it seems to me that many of the individual blessings are nevertheless of comparative interest, since they exhibit a structural pattern familiar from those Akkadian and Hittite « ben » formulas most closely related to the Ugaritic tradition,[403] and, to a lesser extent, familiar from certain of the Ugaritic « ben » formulas themselves.[404] This structural resemblance takes the form of the following sequence of clause components:

« DIVINE AGENT » + « VERBAL COMPLEMENT » + « VOLITIONAL VERBAL FORM »

Such a syntactic sequence is, of course, typical of a great many epistolary benediction motifs: not only those from the Western periphery[405] but also those from the Mesopotamian core area;[406] not only those in Akkadian, but also those in Hittite[407]

---

[401]By this, I mean that these motifs meet the five criteria discussed above in section 4.4.2.1.

[402]Specifically, none of them invokes "the gods" in general rather than specifically (A partial exception is the benediction of verse 5, which invokes {DINGIR.MEŠ KALAM.MA$^{\text{ša ma-ti}}$ }, 'the gods of the land'), and none contains the verbs *naṣāru* and *šullumu*.

[403]In other words, these benedictions are structurally reminiscent of the most common patterns of the « ben » formula in the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters and in Hittite letters (from Boğazköy, Ma□at Höyük, and Atchana); see sections 4.4.1.1.2.3 (Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus), 4.4.1.4.2.4 (Hittite letters from Boğazköy and Ma□at Höyük), and 4.4.1.5.1 (Atchana).

[404]Specifically, the « ben » formulas in the letter RS 92.2005.

[405]In addition to those cuneiform epistolary traditions in which the « ben » formula is compositionally similar to that of the Ugaritic tradition, compare also those in which it is not: this same syntactic pattern is followed, for example, in the « ben » formulas of the Amarna corpus; see above, section 4.4.1.3.

[406]Compare, for example, the following formula from Kassite Nippur: Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings* (1908), text no. 89, which contains, in lines 5-7, the structure { « DIVINE NAMES » nap-ša-ti-ka li-iṣ-ṣu-ru … }, 'May [VARIOUS NAMED DEITIES] protect your life … !'

[407]In the Hittite « ben » formulas, the element which refers to the beneficiary of the blessing is not suffixed to the verbal form, but is sometimes fronted, sometimes placed after the {DINGIR.MEŠ} element. Aside from that the structural pattern described here is valid. Compare, for example, the « ben » formulas of *HKM* 31.2 (from Ma□at), {(23, cont'd) nu-ut-ta DINGIR.MEŠ (24) aš-šu-li pa-aḫ-

and Ugaritic;[408] and finally, not only those from the Late Bronze Age, but also those anterior to it.[409] Despite the pervasiveness of this pattern, then, what is interesting about this text is not so much the structural similarity between these benediction motifs and those of various epistolary traditions, as it is the Syrian provenance of the copies. Benedictions of this structure, whatever their ultimate origin, were already an established part of Syrian and Anatolian scribal tradition, both in letters and in literature, and regardless of linguistic medium. This is an important point in evaluating the occasional claim that the Ugaritic epistolary formulas were "translated" from Akkadian.

4.4.2.3.2 A BENEDICTION IN THE *GILGAMESH EPIC*

A striking formal parallel to the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula comes from the *Gilgamesh Epic*. The passage occurs in the context of the city elders addressing Gilgamesh directly, beseeching him to take care of himself, and expressing their wish that Enkīdu watch over him and keep him safe:

{ ^{d}EN.KI.DÙ ib-ri li-iṣ-ṣur tap-pa-a li-šal-lim }[410]

'May Enkīdu protect (his) friend, may he keep (his) companion safe and sound!!'

ša-an-da-ru | }, of AT 125 (from Atchana), { | (3) DINGIR.MEŠ-eš-da aš-šu-li PAP-*RU* | }. (and see section 4.4.1.4.2.4., 4.4.1.5.1,

[408]Compare RS 92.2005:7-8, « *ìlm l šlm tǵrkm* … »; probably also to be restored in lines 26-28, « *ìlm* [*l*] *šlm tǵrk* … ».

[409]A great many Old Babylonian examples are collected in Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 14-29.

[410]Tablet III, line 9 in the Neo-Assyrian version (see below); line 228 may contain this same motif.

The passage cited here is drawn from the Neo-Assyrian version of the Epic, from Nineveh.[411] One tablet which preserves this portion of the text in its Old Babylonian recension,[412] however, shows a slightly different formulation: instead of the elders' entreating Enkīdu to keep his companion safe and sound, they simply declare that such should be the case: { tap-pa-a ú-ša-lim }, '(his) companion he should keep safe and sound!' The elders then go on to invoke divine blessings on the pair, but the form of these "benedictions" is not comparable to the above example. Despite the formal disparity between the Neo-Assyrian and Old Babylonian versions of this episode, however, it is still reasonable to suppose that the date of composition of the Neo-Assyrian version goes back to an earlier period; and a provenance during or anterior to the Late Bronze Age is a strong possibility.[413]

Assuming, then, that this passage is contemporaneous or anterior to the Ugaritic epistolary corpus, the parallel is valuable because it is valid not only on the contextual level,[414] but also on a formal level: (1) two volitional verbal forms, one derived from *naṣāru* and the other from *šullumu*, appear, and in that order; and (2) and the divine agent of the wished-for actions is mentioned first. This formal parallelism is not

---

[411]S. Parpola, SAACT 1 (1997) 15 (cuneiform text), and p. 79 (transliteration).

[412]M. Jastrow and A. T. Clay, YOS 4/3 (1920) 94 (transcription and translation), pl. 6 (copy), line 255.

[413]J. Tigay, *Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (1982) 131; and S. Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia* (1989) 47.

[414]It can be argued that all five of the contextual criteria outlined above in section 4.4.2.1 are here satisfied. The only criteria that could be considered problematic are the second (divine agency) and fourth (addressed directly to "patient" of benevolent act). However, that the agent of the benediction is, in some sense, divine seems clear from the determinative preceding his name: { ^{d}EN.KI.DÙ }. And, even though the "patient" is expressed in the 3rd person, this passage represents the speech of the elders to Gilgamesh himself: the use of the 3rd person in direct address is intended to show respect.

complete, however: (3) the "gods" phrase mentions one particular deity, by name; and (4) reference to the beneficiary is not made by means of 2nd person pronominal forms.[415]

This passage does not, of course, show that the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula was Babylonian in origin, but it does show that volitions of this type were at home in Babylonian literary compositions.

4.4.2.3.3 SOME BENEDICTIONS FROM THE HITTITE TREATY TRADITION

A third and final comparative parallel may be drawn from the "blessing" clauses which appear as components of treaties imposed by imperial Ḫatti on its vassals, both those written in Akkadian and those in Hittite.[416] Like the "blessing" formula in the treaty RS 17.343, already mentioned above,[417] these benediction motifs appear as the apodosis of a conditional sentence. The basic form may be paraphrased as 'If (you, the vassal king, keep the terms of this treaty …), then (may the gods protect you)!'

These benedictions often contain a motif which resembles the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula on both functional and formal levels. An example attested in several Akkadian treaties is the following:

---

[415]On both of these points, compare the « ben » formula from the following Akkadian letter from Kassite Nippur: Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings* (1908), no. 89, lines 5-7.

[416]Owing to structural similarities with the Deuteronomic covenant narratives in the Hebrew Bible, the formal structure of Hittite treaties has been extensively studied. Compare E. Bickerman, *Archives d'histoire et du droit oriental* 5 (1950-1951) 153-155, and G. E. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant* (1955). Later, more detailed studies are D. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant* (1978), and especially G. Kestemont, *Diplomatique et droit international* (1974), who studied the treaties on their own terms rather than as a vehicle of biblical interpretation.

[417]See above, section 4.4.2.1.4.

« DINGIR.MEŠ an-nu-tu$_4$ li-iṣ-ṣú-ru-ku-nu »[418]

'May these (same) gods[419] protect you!'

A more precise[420] parallel to the epistolary « ben » formulas, however, occurs in the Hittite version of this same motif:

« nu-ut-ta … *NI-IŠ* DINGIR.MEŠ aš-šu-li pa-aḫ-ša-an-da-ru … »[421]

'May the oath-gods keep you in well-being … !'

Another example is found on the bronze treaty tablet:

« tu-uk-ma … DINGIR.MEŠ aš-šu-li pa-aḫ-ša-an-ta-ru … »[422]

'May the gods keep you in well-being … !'

The most obvious point to be noted is the formal identity of this benediction clause in Hittite treaties with the epistolary « ben » formula as attested in Hittite letters from Boğazköy, Ma□at, and Atchana.[423] Equally striking, however, are the cross-linguistic

---

[418]KBo 1.01 verso 72 (CTH 51, a treaty between Šuppiluliuma [I] of Ḫatti and Šattiwaza of Mittanni). See the copy in H. H. Figulla and E. F. Weidner, *KBo* 1 (1916) 8; the edition in E. F. Weidner, BoSt 8 (1923) 34; as well as the recent treatment, with anterior bibliography, in G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (1996) 37 and 172. The same motif occurs in numerous other examples; compare those cited in G. Kestemont, *Diplomatique et droit international* (1974) 180 (Type 1).

[419]The gods referred to are those listed as witnesses to the treaty, and agents in the curse-motif, in the preceding sections.

[420]The only reason it is "more precise" is the presence of the adverbial phrase « aš-šu-li », which corresponds formally and semantically to Akkadian « a-na šul-ma-ni » and Ugaritic « *1 šlm* ». It is likely that comparable Ḫatti treaties in Akkadian existed which contained « a-na šul-ma-ni » here.

[421]KBo 5.03 or 5.12 ii 11-12 (CTH 42, a treaty between Šuppiluliuma [I] of Ḫatti and Ḫuqqāna of Ḫayaša). See the copy in F. Hrozný, *KBo* 5 (1921); the edition in J. Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache* 2 (1930) 114; and the recent treatment, with anterior bibliography, of Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (1996) 29 and 171. For other examples of this motif, see Kestemont, *Diplomatique et droit international* (1974) 180 (Type 1).

[422]H. Otten, *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy* (1988) 26, col. 4, line 14; Tafel II (photo), and Autographie Rs. IV (copy).

[423]See above, sections 4.4.1.4.2.4 and 4.4.1.5.1.

parallels with Akkadian « ben » formulas: this pattern is statistically standard for the « ben » formula in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus,[424] and is attested in at least one of the few « ben » formulas known from Meskene epistolary documents.[425] Finally, this pattern now has at least one clear counterpart among the Ugaritic « ben » formulas,[426] and also corresponds in a fairly straightforward way to the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula, although this correspondence is operative on a translational level, not on a morpheme-for-morpheme basis.

4.5 *Sitz-im-Leben* of the Benediction formula

This section contains a number of observations and speculations drawn from the internal and comparative data presented above, all of which touch on the *Sitz-im-Leben*, or contextual setting, of the standard Ugaritic epistolary « ben » formula. Two main aspects of this contextual setting are considered here: (1) the origins of the formula; and (2) the situational context implied by and behind its usage.

4.5.1 Origins

In the first place, it may be observed that formulaic benedictions, pronounced by one individual, and entreating divine intervention to promote the well-being of

---

[424]Compare the « ben » in RS 20.015, {(6) DINGIR.MEŠ a-na šul-ma-ni (7) PAP-ru-ka }; and see above, section 4.4.1.1.2.

[425]See above, section 4.4.1.2.

[426]RS 92.2005:7-8, « *ilm l šlm tǵrkm* … »; and probably in lines 26-28, « *ilm* [*l*] *šlm tǵrk* … ».

another, are not restricted geographically to the Levant,[427] nor chronologically to the Late Bronze Age,[428] nor literarily to the epistolary genre.[429] Because of the breadth and unwieldiness of this subject, then, this section will pay special attention to those formulas which not only fall under a functional definition of "benediction", but also present significant formal parallels with the standard benediction motif used in Ugaritic letters. In other words, this section is concerned not so much with the origins of the widespread phenomenon of divine benedictions used as epistolary formulas as it is with that of the specific formula here defined as standard for the Ugaritic tradition: « *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* », 'May the gods protect you, may they keep you well!' It is the particular geographical, chronological, and literary background of this standard Ugaritic benediction formula that is considered here, and not that of epistolary divine benedictions in general. Finally, this section interacts essentially with comparative evidence from the cuneiform cultures of West Asia, and not with sources in Egyptian.[430]

---

[427]See above, sections 4.4.7-4.4.8 (benediction motifs in Mesopotamia, epistolary and otherwise); and sections 4.4.1.4 and 4.4.2.3.3 (benediction motifs in Anatolia). For epistolary benediction formulas in Egyptian, see E. Wente, *Letters from Ancient Egypt* (1990) 10, and the references cited there.

[428]For epistolary benedictions from the Old Babylonian period, for example, see the references cited above in section 4.4.8. Several epistolary benediction motifs appear in Egyptian documents antedating the Late Bronze Age; see Wente, *Letters from Ancient Egypt* (1990), nos. 1 and 9, for a few examples from early texts.

[429]For benediction motifs in literary works, see above, section 4.4.2.2 (Ugaritic literary texts), and sections 4.4.2.3.1 and 4.4.2.3.2 (Sumero-Akkadian literary texts); for benediction motifs in the Ancient Near Eastern (and especially Hittite) treaty tradition, see above, section 4.4.2.3.3.

[430]Even *a priori*, such a restriction is not necessarily illegitimate for the Ugaritic material. The intellectual contact of Ugaritian culture with Mesopotamian traditions was much more profound than with those of Egypt. Not only were a great many Ugaritian scribes able to write Mesopotamian languages, using Mesopotamian scripts, but they used these tools in local, domestic contexts. Furthermore, the scholastic cursus followed by the Ugaritian scribes was more or less identical to that

The above precisions having been made, the question of origin may be approached from at least three different points of view: (1) literary, (2) chronological, and (3) geographical. To a certain extent, each of these reveals an independent aspect of the background of the formula.

4.5.1.1 Literary Background

The literary setting of the « ben » formula can be dealt with first, since it is fairly straightforward. The formal parallelism between the standard Ugaritic epistolary « ben » formula and the benediction motifs found in the Ugaritic *Baʿlu Cycle* of myths, in Hittite treaties, and in the canonical Akkadian *Gilgameš Epic*, all of which are described above,[431] is empirically sufficient to confirm what already seems intuitively likely: that the origin of the benediction formula need not be sought uniquely in the epistolary genre. These diverse literary settings share two features in common: a desire on the part of the speaker for the well-being of the "beneficiary", and the absence of the speaker from the beneficiary's presence. On this basis one might speculate that the appropriate literary setting of the Ugaritic « ben » formula would be any in which such conditions are met, with the epistolary genre providing the most frequently encountered example.

---

known for the Mesopotamian heartland during the Old Babylonian period: the Ugaritian scribes knew and copied the same canonical lexical lists and literary works as their counterparts in Nippur several centuries earlier. This does not mean, of course, that Egyptian parallels are either invalid or uninteresting, but simply that the cultural and intellectual relationship of the Ugaritians with Mesopotamian culture is much more evident than the Egyptian contacts. For these reasons, in addition to the writer's incompetence, then, the Egyptian data will not be treated here.

[431]Sections 4.4.2.2 and 4.4.2.3.

4.5.1.2 Geographical and chronological background

It may be of some significance for our understanding of Ugaritic literary heritage that the earliest evidence for the regular use of formulaic divine benedictions in cuneiform epistolary texts comes from the Old Babylonian period.[432] This observation, assuming its accuracy, is relevant to the extent that the "benediction", as a stereotyped epistolary formula in the cuneiform traditions of West Asia, might be viewed as a vestige of the common "Amorite" cultural and intellectual heritage that the Ugaritic tradition shares with the numerous Old Babylonian traditions.[433]

On a more precise level, however, close attention to patterned compositional structure allows a more nuanced perception of the background of the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula. In compositional and distributional terms, the most important clues to the historical background of the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula are found not so much in the East, in Mesopotamia during the periods of "Amorite" political domination, but rather in the West, in Syria and Anatolia during the era of Hittite hegemony in the Late Bronze Age.

To my knowledge, the epistolary corpora which present the closest compositional and distributional parallels to the Ugaritic « ben » formula are: (1) the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, (2) the Hittite letters from Boğazköy, Ma□at Höyük, and Tell Atchana, and, to a lesser extent, (3) the Akkadian letters from Meskene. While few of these present precise parallels on the morphological level,[434] the pervasiveness of the equivalence of these Ugaritic, Akkadian, and Hittite versions of

---

[432]E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 22.

[433]See above, section 3.5.1; and see below.

[434]The Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus contains a few exceptions.

the « ben » formula is evident, both in terms of parallel distribution and of semantic equivalence:

Ugaritic example: « *ʾilūma taǵǵurū-ka tašallimū-ka* »

Akkadian example: « *ilānu ana šulmāni liṣṣurū-ka* »

Hittite example: « *nu=ta* DINGIR.MEŠ *aššuli paḫšandaru* »

Given this translational equivalence, the absence of precise equivalence on the morphological level is not necessarily evidence for the independent status of the Ugaritic formula,[435] but it does show that the latter was not simply a loan-translation, or calque, from either Akkadian or Hittite.[436]

Those epistolary traditions which do not present striking parallels to the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula include (i) the Amarna corpus, (ii) the various other epistolary traditions of the Levant, and (iii) the Middle Assyrian tradition in Mesopotamia. Some Old Babylonian letters (from various sites), and some letters from Kassite Babylonia do present certain formal parallels to the Ugaritic « ben » formula, but these parallels generally lack the compositional precision of the corpora mentioned above, and, more importantly, they lack distributional regularity.

With this in mind, it is not at all obvious to me that the Ugaritic « ben » formula was "translated from Akkadian." Such is a possibility, of course, and in any case there was certainly a fair amount of "cross-pollination in cultural matters", to quote a phrase of Lambert.[437] Furthermore, it is also true that, apart from possible Egyptian evidence, the earliest examples of the formula come from the Old Babylonian period. Since,

---

[435]J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 254, neglects the existence of verbal hendiadys in Ugaritic.

[436]On these issues in more detail, see above, section 4.4.1.9.

[437]W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (1960) 10.

however, there was certainly an epistolary tradition in the West prior to the 2nd Millennium BCE,[438] it seems reasonable to assume the continuous existence of local, western scribal cultures on the Mediterranean coast from the late 3rd Millennium until the end of the 2nd Millennium. Given their shared intellectual heritage with the Mesopotamian East, the existence of formal parallels in Eastern and Western scribal compositions does not seem surprising, much less evidence for an explicit borrowing during the Late Bronze Age. To be sure, the literary heritage of Babylonia enjoyed a great deal of cultural prestige in the West, and perhaps this sentiment lies behind the assumption that the Ugaritic epistolary formulas must be loan translations from Akkadian. But had the Ugaritian scribes genuinely wished to pattern their epistolary usage after a Babylonian model, they certainly could have done a better job of it. They were able to transmit the canonical lexical lists and various literary compositions with some fidelity. Had they wished to parrot Babylonian usage in epistolary form as well, it seems necessary to conclude that they would have been capable of such, but for some reason chose not to.

The existence, alongside the canonical Mesopotamian compositions, of a local literature, in the local language, written with a local script, may be of some importance here. Whatever their reverence for all things Babylonian, the Ugaritian scribes were also conscious of their own cultural identity. What is more, this reverence for Mesopotamian culture alongside a pride in local heritage was not perceived as contradictory; in other words, "Babylonian" scribal culture was not perceived as something foreign, but, on the contrary, part of an indigenous heritage. If this is allowed, the thread that would bind East and West together is the "Amorites". The

---

[438]The stereotyped structure in the letters from Ebla suggests this. For the patterns of the address formula, for example, see M. Tonietti, *Miscellanea Eblaitica* 4 (1997) 89.

recently published list of divinized Ugaritian Kings makes clear, if there were any remaining doubts, that the kingdom of Ugarit was part of the widespread "Amorite" political revolution of the early 2nd Millennium BCE. This heritage was strong enough to affect the royal onomastic tradition nearly a thousand years later. Furthermore, the scientific manuals complied and copied at Ugarit parallel, but do not necessarily derive from, the corresponding divination traditions of the Mesopotamian heartland. Finally, the mythological traditions of Mesopotamia and Ugarit share at least one motif which finds its probable « mise-en-scène » on the Mediterranean coast.

The point of these speculations is that it may be somewhat deceptive to imagine literary and intellectual influence as originating in Babylonia and slowly filtering out towards peripheral centers. In general, as well as with respect to the « ben » formula in particular, a plausible scenario is one in which "Amorite" scribal culture was cultivated over most of the Fertile Crescent in the first half of the 2nd Millennium BCE. Inasmuch as Ugaritic usage resembles certain Old Babylonian traditions, one may imagine that one of the most significant moments of shared cultural contact occurred in this period. As historical and social circumstances changed, for example, with the decline of Mittanni and the advent of Hittite power in Syria in the West, and the installation of a Kassite dynasty in southern Mesopotamia, different "Amorite" areas followed different paths. On this hypothesis, then, the striking similarities observable between Syrian and Anatolian corpora from the Late Bronze Age would reflect the common development of the "Amorite" scribal cultures under Hittite political domination.

The most evident and tangible geographical and chronological background that can be attributed to the Ugaritic « ben » formula is suggested by the formal similarities described above. The common thread that unites the parallel « ben » formulas in the

documentation from Boğazköy, Ma□at, Atchana, Ras Shamra, Ras Ibn Hani, and Meskene is the geographical area of Anatolia and northern Syria during the period of Hittite political domination in the final centuries of the Late Bronze Age.

4.5.2 The situational context of the « ben » formula

A study of the situational context of the « ben » formula touches on the following issues: (1) the type of social situation in which the « ben » formula is appropriate or inappropriate; (2) the nature of the benediction as a "speech act", including reflections on the "speaker" of the formula, the "agent" by whom the predication described by the verbs *tǵrk tšlmk* is achieved, and the "patient" or "beneficiary" intended to experience the wished-for actions; and (3) the contextual "burden", or purpose of the speech act.

4.5.2.1 The « ben » in its social setting

Judging from the distribution of the formula, the standard « ben » is especially appropriate in (1) letters composed on the « BIO » conceptual model,[439] but also, to a lesser extent, in (2) letters of « ASC » conceptual status, regardless of model.[440] It is inappropriate in socially "descending" situations, most of which are conceptually UNMARKED in terms of their use of REL terminology.[441]

---

[439]See above, section 4.3.3.

[440]See above, section 4.3.2.

[441]See above, section 4.3.1.

Thus, the internal evidence, derived from the distribution of the Ugaritic « ben » formula, suggests two aspects of its contextual appropriateness: as a mark of familial intimacy, and as a mark of polite deference. The comparative evidence for the formula is complimentary; this distributional pattern corresponds rather well with that observable for the « ben » formula in the most important comparative corpora: Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra,[442] and Hittite letters from Ma□at and Boğazköy.[443]

In addition, non-epistolary comparative evidence allows for some further speculation. Two examples are considered here: the Idrimi inscription from Alalaḫ, and the treaty tradition of the Hittites.

The statue of Idrimi bears three lines of text on the figure's cheek and beard, " … giving the impression that these words were uttered by the figure represented by the statue."[444] These lines,[445] containing an utterance phrased in the 1st person:

> { (102) MU.30.KÁM.MEŠ LUGAL-ku }, 'For thirty years I was king.'
>
> { (103) ma-na-aḫ-ti-ia a-na DUB-ia aš-ṭú-ur }, 'I inscribed my labor(s) on my inscription.'
>
> { li-d[à]g-gal-šu-nu (104) ù a-na UGU-ia li-ik-ta-na-ra-bu }, 'One should look on them and (consequently) pronounce (repeated) benedictions on my behalf.'

The sequence of propositions is very probably intended to convey a relationship: one should bless Idrimi since he not only reigned as king, but also because he commemorated his acts in the form of a statue. This illustrates two aspect of the

---

[442]See above, section 4.4.1.1.1. Note, however, that, unlike the distribution in Ugaritic, the « ben » is not common in conceptually « ASC » letters in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus.

[443]See above, section 4.4.1.4.2.5.

[444]T. Longman, *Context* 1 (1997) 479.

[445]See E. Greenstein and D. Marcus, *JANES* 8 (1976) 59-96; and M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *UF* 13 (1981) 201-269. The latter also contains a sign-list and useful photographs (*ibid.*, pp. 231-241 and 262-268).

contextual motivations of benedictions: it is appropriate to pronounce blessings in someone's favor (1) in the case of high social standing ({LUGAL-ku}, *šarrāku*, 'I am king'), (2) owing to the accomplishment of commendable acts, such as erecting commemorative statues. This linking of benedictions with high social status is reminiscent of the distribution of the « ben » formula.

A quite different motivation for the « ben » formula, and one not apparent from the epistolary data, is suggested by the usage of benedictions in Hittite vassal treaties. There, the blessings are coupled with curses. Both of these would apply to the vassal: the former in the event of the vassal's observation of the terms of the treaty, the latter in the event of non-observance.[446] The use of benedictions and curses as positive and negative sanctions, or as Beckman put it, as the "ideological glue which held the Hittite Empire together",[447] shows an aspect of the formula's use not directly obvious in the letters: the formula was not mere verbiage; it was considered effective.[448]

4.5.2.2 The « ben » as a speech act: speaker, beneficiary, and agent

If the « ben » formula is considered as a "speech act", that is, an action performed with words, it is possible to speculate further on various aspects of this act, including speaker, agent, beneficiary, and purpose.

The "speaker" of the formula is the sender of the letter. This is clear from the epistolary context, from the use of the 2nd person, in addressing the recipient, but also,

---

[446]Compare, for example, G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (1996) 3-4.

[447]*Ibid.*

[448]See below. Note that, as a vehicle of legal or juridical control, benediction and curse motifs have a long history in Mesopotamia, well prior to the Hittite usage; compare the Code of Lipit-Ištar, a Sumerian composition (see M. Roth, *Context* 2 [2000] 410-414, for translation and bibliography).

for example, from the benedictions of "non-standard" letters such as RS 18.118+ and RS 86.2230, in which the motif is actually portrayed as being "spoken" by the sender.[449]

The "beneficiary" is alluded to in the second person. In an epistolary context, this refers to the recipient of the letter.

The "agent" responsible for the beneficent action described by the formula is not the speaker, but rather a third party, the gods. In the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula the noun phrase referring to the divine agent is most often generic: *ỉlm*, 'the gods'.[450] In fact, the generic nature of this phrase in the Ugaritic tradition is so pervasive that it seems a useful criterion for differentiating the Ugaritic epistolary « ben » formulas from those of the Mesopotamian traditions, in which the gods in question are frequently identified by name.[451]

At least twice, however, and possibly a third time, the gods invoked in the Ugaritic « ben » formula are identified: once by name, and in the other instances by geographical provenance. The former practice occurs in RS 17.117, a letter that is formally and contextually non-standard.[452] The latter device is certainly found in RS 15.008, and perhaps also in a fragmentary passage in RS 18.[482].[453]

RS 15.008:4-6 « ỉly ủgrt tǵrk tšlmk »

---

[449]See below, section 4.7.2.

[450]See above, section 4.2.1.

[451]See above, sections 4.4.7 and 4.4.8.

[452]See below, section 4.7.2.

[453]If lines 3'-5' of RS 18.[482] do indeed contain a « ben » formula, the structure of this letter must be considered atypical, since the preceding motif is most probably the « double formula of well-being », and, as part of the body, this generally follows, and does not precede, the polite formulas section (which includes the « ben »).

RS 18.[482]:3'-5' « […]⌜-⌝ åmr […]⌜-⌝ ḫt […] tǵrkm […] »[454]

Though the reconstruction remains necessarily speculative, the last passage cited is plausibly to be restored « [… ỉ]⌜l⌝ åmr [… w ỉ]⌜l⌝ ⌜ḫ⌝t […] tǵ⌜rkm⌝ [tšlmkm] », 'May [… the gods] of Amurru [… and the gods] of Ḫatti […] guard you [and keep you well]!'

Nevertheless, the practice of providing the geographical affiliation of the divinities involved remains statistically non-standard in the Ugaritic corpus, despite its occasional presence in the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters.[455] In any case, these two rare formulations of the phrase do not affect the general observation that the agent of the action in the formula is always divine, and most often the generic phrase *ỉlm*.

4.5.2.3 The contextual "burden" or purpose of the benediction

On a superficial level, the "purpose" of the formula is clear. Not only is evident from the semantics of the components, but at least one Ugaritic « ben » formula, that of RS 92.2005:7-8, contains the prepositional phrase « *l šlm* », in which the preposition *l* probably expresses purpose. The formula, then, is intended **lê šalāmi*, "for well-being".

If the "denotational" purpose of the « ben » is to promote well-being, however, one may still speculate on the "connotational" function of the formula, that is, its purpose as used in mundane social communication. This type of contextual meaning is

---

[454]D. Pardee's collation of these lines is as follows: {(3') […]⌜-⌝ . åmr (4') […]⌜yḫ⌝t (5') […]tǵ⌜rkm⌝ […]}. The reading I have given is not identical; it should be taken as a speculative proposal, to be checked in a future collation.

[455]See below, section 4.7.

difficult to define for any Ugaritic phrase with precision, and the epistolary « ben » formula is no different. There is a fair amount of diversity among the hypotheses advanced by past students of Ugaritic, from minimalist views, in which the « ben » would be merely a "phatic greeting" with little informational content,[456] to maximalist interpretations, according to which the « ben » formula would provide a clue to the religious beliefs of the ancient Ugaritians.[457]

The question is not an easy one, however. On the one hand, accepting the « ben » formula as data for the religious beliefs of the Ugaritians seems to neglect the formulaic aspect of the motif, both in terms of composition and distribution, which implies a distinction between denotation and connotation. In other words, it neglects the possibility that the « ben » formula is merely a "phatic" greeting, with little or no informational content, and more generally neglects what seems intuitively evident: that formulaic expressions, such as the Ugaritic « ben » formula, do not necessarily shed any light on personal religious sentiment. On the other hand, neither is it easy to deny the informational content for the formula, since the inherent efficacy of verbal utterances, the idea that words had power in and of themselves, seems to be a legitimate supposition for Ugaritian thought.[458]

---

[456]This position is typified by M. Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 182-184.

[457]A frequent advocate of this latter position has been J.-L. Cunchillos; see *AEPHER* 90 (1981-1982) 237-239; *idem*, *TO* 2(1989) 244-263; *idem*, *Estudios de Epistolografía ugarítica* (1989) 195-234.

[458]On this aspect of Mesopotamian thought, see, for example, B. Landsberger, MAOG 4 (1928-1929) 294-321; and J. Bottéro, *RlA* 7 (1987-1990) 207-208. It appears to me legitimate to postulate as much for Ugaritian thought as well; see above, in section 3.5, and compare N. Wyatt, *HUS* (1999) 569: "Just as vows have their rationale in the potency of the spoken word, so blessings are believed to be efficacious by the mere fact of utterance."

A compromise position seems best. It is not legitimate to deny that the Ugaritic « ben » formula was perceived, in certain circumstances, as having an inherent efficacy. In Ugaritic mythology, as in Daniʾilu's blessing of Puǵatu in the *ʾAqhatu* text, for example, it is evident that the pronouncement of a blessing was probably not superfluous, but was likely conceived as playing a role in the ultimate success of Puǵatu's mission of vengeance:

KTU[2] 1.19 IV 32 « *l tbrkn ålk brktm* », 'You must bless me, (so that) I may go (away in a) blessed (state)!'

Despite the fact that the benediction eventually uttered[459] is not comparable to the epistolary « ben » formula, in some sense or another, the fact that the blessing was uttered verbally was imagined as having a tangible effect on outcome of events. In this sense, to deny the informational content of the formula seems extreme.

However, if such assumptions about the efficacy of the spoken word were universally operative with respect to the epistolary « ben » formula, one would expect it to be consistently present, especially in conceptually « ASC » and « BIO » letters, which generally show the greatest amount of solicitude for the recipient's well-being; and this is not the case.

4.6 Grammatical Analysis of the Benediction

The semantics and the grammatical structure of the standard « ben » formula have been well-understood since Édouard Dhorme published the first intact example in 1938: he accurately translated the « ben » formula appearing in lines 7-9 of RS 8.315,

---

[459] *KTU*[2] 1.19 IV 36-40.

ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk, as "Que les dieux te gardent, qu'ils te sauvegardent!"[460] His translation, and the brief commentary he offered on it,[461] reflect, for the most part, the current consensus among modern students of the grammar of the formula: (1) the word *ỉlm* is a common noun, masculine in grammatical gender, plural in number, and absolute in state,[462] meaning "(the) gods", and functioning as the explicit grammatical subject of the two verbs which follow; and (2) *tǵrk* and *tšlmk* are both prefix-conjugation verbal forms, 3rd person masculine plural, volitional in "mood",[463] derived from the transitive

---

[460]E. Dhorme, *Syria* 19 (1938) 143. Because of the completeness of RS 8.315, Ch. Virolleaud was able to identify the fragmentary « ben » formula in RS 3.427:1-2, published in the same volume: C. Virolleaud, *Syria* 19 (1938) 343. Working earlier, and with fewer data, Dhorme, *RB* 40 (1931) 50-51, had quite obviously been looking for a "benediction" formula among the first fragmentary Ugaritic letters found at Ras Shamra, and he nearly succeeded in identifying accurately the remnants of the « ben » formula in RS 1.018:5-7 — he had read line 7, for example, as { [... yš]lmk} and translated ". . . te gardent en bonne santé".

[461]Dhorme, *Syria* 19 (1938) 144: "Nous avons ici [in lines 7-9 of RS 8.315] deux cas très clairs de la 3e pers. pl. masc. de l'imparfait avec le préfixe *t*, au lieu de *y*. . . . Il s'agit ici [he is referring to the verbal form *tǵrk*] du verbe ÆÐú « garder ». La forme *tšlm* représente le *pi'el* ou l'*hiph'il* de *šlm* « être sain et sauf, en bonne santé »." Dhorme's understanding is also clarified in a citation by A. Herdner, *Revue des Études Sémitiques* 1938 (1938) 80, "M. Dhorme a bien voulu me signaler, dans une lettre provenante de Ras-Shamra [the letter in question must be RS 8.315], dont la publication est très prochaine : *tǵrk*, « qu'ils te gardent » ; *tšlmk*, « qu'ils te maintiennent en bonne santé » ; le sujet est *'ilm*, « les dieux »."

[462]By the phrase "absolute in state" I refer to the "unbound" character of the noun *ỉlm*, which is not joined to a following genitive. Students of Akkadian grammar should note that in Northwest Semitic philology, the phrase "absolute state" corresponds to what is traditionally referred to as the "*status rectus*" in the (modern) Akkadian philological tradition, that is, the inflected but syntactically unbound form of the noun, and not to the so-called "*status absolutus*", the form of the noun which is uninflected for case. On these issues, see the treatments in J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 54.6, pp. 336-338 (on the question of a "zero-marked" case in Ugaritic [≈ Akkadian "*status absolutus*"], and § 55, pp. 338-340 (on the unbound state [≈ Akkadian "*status rectus*"]).

[463]I do not mean to imply by this that Dhorme envisioned orthographically distinct forms for the various moods (indicative, volitional, etc.) of this verb in the prefix conjugation. Rather, he recognized that the context required interpreting the (formally ambiguous) prefix conjugation of this verb as volitional.

verbs NR (in the G-stem) 'to guard (s.o.),' and ŠLM (in the D-stem)[464] 'to keep (s.o) well,' respectively, both having as their explicit grammatical subject *ỉlm*, and to both of which are attached pronominal suffixes expressing the accusative complements of these verbs. Given this analysis, it is possible to offer a plausible phonemic reconstruction of the formula: */ʾilūma taǵǵurū-ka tašallimū-ka/*.[465]

Several aspects of this analysis have been questioned at one time or another, however; in addition, subsequently discovered "variant forms" of the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula have raised grammatical questions unaddressed in Dhorme's early treatment. It is worthwhile, therefore, to comment briefly on certain of these grammatical topics here. Since these issues may be further categorized into sub-topics, in this case, of orthography, morphology, syntax, and etymology, such an organization provides a convenient means of presenting the relevant issues in a coherent way.

4.6.1 Orthography: grammatical implications of the writing ỉly ủgrt

Given what can be known of Ugaritic morphology, one would have expected the Ugaritic equivalent of the noun phrase "the gods of Ugarit" to be written **ỉl ủgrt*.[466]

---

[464]As mentioned above, Dhorme, *Syria* 19 (1938) 144, also allowed the possibility that the form *tšlmk* represented "l'*hiph'il* de *šlm*", a position which, though perhaps more understandable in Dhorme's time, is not tenable; see below.

[465]In the absence of inner Ugaritic evidence, I vocalize the G-stem prefix conjugation of NR as *yaqtul*, on the basis of (1) the transitivity of the verb in the G-stem, and (2) the presence of the reflexes of this pattern (yaqtul) in the cognate languages. On my vocalization of the D-stem prefix conjugation as *yaqattil-* (and not *yuqattil-*), see the discussion in section 4.6.2.

[466]Compare, for example, the orthography of the plural construct form, that is, {il}, in the phrases *ỉl mṣrm* (*dt tǵrn npš špš*), 'the gods of the two Egypts (who protect the life of the Sun)' in RS 16.078:22; and *kl ỉl ảlṯy*, 'all of the gods of Alašiya' in RS 18.113:8. It is worth pointing out that both of these examples occur in epistolary "benediction" motifs, albeit "non-standard" ones (see below, section

Such a writing is not attested, however, and when the phrase appeared for the first, and, to my knowledge, the only time to date in alphabetic script, in RS 15.008:8, it took the form *ỉly ủgrt*.

In publishing this text, Ch. Virolleaud sought to elucidate this orthography by an appeal to the form *šmym*, appearing where one might have expected *šmm*, in two passages from the *Baʿlu Cycle* of myths. He drew attention to "*ely ugrt*, qui postule pour *el* un pl. cstr. *elym*, à côté de *elm*; comp. *śmym* « cieux », au lieu de *śmm*, dans I *Danel*, 186 et 192."[467] One wonders what Virolleaud meant by the abbreviation "pl. cstr." If he meant "pluriel (à l'état) construit", the suggested parallel is not illuminating, since in both places in the myth the noun *šmym* is most probably in the absolute, not the construct state, and thus the writing *šmym* would have no relevance to a purported link between the presence of the {y} sign and the construct state. Since Virolleaud himself did not interpret the form *šmym* as a construct form in his own treatment,[468] one might conclude that for him "pl. cstr." here referred to "pluriel construction", that is, he was suggesting that *ỉlm* and **ỉlym*, both meaning 'the gods', would simply be orthographic variants of the same word, in the same manner as *šmm* and *šmym*, both 'the heavens'.

Virolleaud was not more explicit than this. Those who tended to approach Ugaritic philology from the perspective of the West Semitic languages of the Iron Age were quick to suggest that the spelling *ỉly ủgrt* corresponded to the plural construct

---

4.7). Compare also the same orthography in plural construct forms in other prose texts (non-epistolary): *ỉl ṣpn*, 'the gods of (Mount) Ṣapunu' in RS 1.017:1; *ỉl ḫyr*, 'the gods of (the month of) Ḫiyyāru', and *ỉl lb*[-]*n*, 'the gods of LB[-]N' (compare the writing {DINGIR.MEŠ la-ab-a-na} in RS 26.142:17') in RS 24.643:23 and 43; and *ỉl bldn*, 'the gods of BLDN (the countryside?)' in RS [Varia 20]:1.

[467]C. Virolleaud, *PRU* 2 (1957) 30. The passages to which he referred, " I *Danel*, 186 et 192" are *KTU* 1.19.IV:24 and 30.

[468]See C. Virolleaud, *Danel* (1936) 173-174.

form of the corresponding Hebrew noun אל, 'god'; that is, Ugaritic « *ỉly* [GN] » ≈ Hebrew « [GN] אֵלֵי », 'the gods of [GN]'.[469] Such a suggestion necessarily entails interpreting the sign {y} in the phrase *ỉly ủgrt* not as a consonantal phoneme, but rather as a *mater lectionis*, representing an underlying vowel.[470] Proposals for the quality[471] of this

---

[469]Compare, for example, the Hebraicized vocalization proposed by C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (1965), § 4.5, p. 18: "(1015:4) *ily* (5) *ugrt* = 'ilê 'ugarita 'the gods of Ugarit'."

[470]S. Loewenstamm was apparently the first to draw this inference for the form in question, in S. Loewenstamm, *IEJ* 8 (1958) 139, n. 8. Other "classic" statements in favor of the existence of *matres lectionis* in Ugaritic which deal with this form include Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (1965), § 4.5, p. 18 (see the above footnote); J. Blau and S. E. Loewenstamm, *UF* 2 (1970) 20, n. 5, and p. 25; M. Dietrich, and O. Loretz, *UF* 18 (1983) 114, n. 31; J. Tropper, *UF* 25 (1993) 391; J. Tropper, *UF* 26 (1994) 459-460; and, most recently, Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 21.341.21, pp. 51-53, and § 54.121.2, pp. 306-307 (where the author also allows the possibility that {y} is consonantal, representing an enclitic particle, on which see below). For further bibliography, see D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 18 (RS 15.008), commentaire, ligne 4.

[471]Since the form in question is almost certainly plural (or, in any case, not singular), it is generally agreed that the quantity of the case vowel should be long.

vowel have included /ê/[472] and /ī/.[473] The obvious problem with either of these approaches is that, since the noun phrase *ỉly ủgrt* occurs in a context where one would expect the nominative, neither /ê/ nor /ī/ is appropriate for the nominative case vowel of masculine plural nouns in the Ugaritic case system. Consequently, those who seek to explain the {y} sign in *ỉly ủgrt* as a *mater lectionis* are obliged to argue for a

---

[472]Out of habit, I transcribe the "long" Ugaritic vowel of /e/ quality with a circumflex accent to reflect its origin as a resolved diphthong (<*/ay/) rather than as a historically long vowel, which would be transcribed in this system with a macron.

As examples of those who interpret the {y} sign here as a *mater lectionis* for such a vowel, /ê/, compare M. Liverani, *RANL* 8:19 (1964) 179; Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (1965), § 4.5, p. 18; S. Segert, *SEL* 5 (1988) 202, n. 39; F. Israel, RSO 11 (1993) 259; and A. Rainey, *UF* 27 (1995) 706 ("In the form *ʾily ʾugrt* one might seek evidence that the bound oblique dual form has also supplanted the bound nominative of the plural, just as it did in biblical Hebrew").

Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 18 (RS 15.008), commentaire, ligne 4, n. 15, offers a critique of this approach worth repeating here in full: "Or, adopter cette vocalisation du pluriel construit laisse entendre non seulement que le système casuel avait disparu d'usage, mais aussi que le duel avait disparu comme nombre grammatical (/ʾilê/ < /ʾilay/ duel, cas oblique). L'ougaritique aurait déjà suivi la même voie que les langues nordouest-sémitiques du premier millénaire, où la perte du duel comme nombre grammatical a permis à la désinence du duel oblique à l'état construit de remplacer celle du pluriel oblique à cet état (/dabarī malk/ → /dibrê melek/ en hébr.). Mais en ougaritique il est clair que le duel fonctionnait toujours dans les textes administratifs comme nombre grammatical, et ces textes reflètent la langue parlée vers la fin du royaume d'Ougarit. Les données linguistiques des textes ougaritiques les plus tardifs interdisent donc la vocalisation /ʾilê/ tout comme /ʾilī/, et l'on ne peut admettre que « la comparaison avec l'état construit de l'hébreu et de l'araméen s'impose d'elle-même » (Israel, ibid.). Voir déjà la critique des deux analyses par Rainey, *UF* 3 (1971) 162, propos toujours valables (quand, en 1995, il préconise que /ʾilê/ représenterait le nominatif, il met la forme au compte de « some of the scribes [who] were already speaking a dialect in which the dual had really lost its original nominative » et pour qui « the bound oblique dual form has also supplanted the bound nominative of the plural » [UF 27, p. 706] — or, tirer cette conclusion d'un nombre de formes qui ne peut être qualifié que d'infime, lorsqu'il existe en même temps un grand nombre de formes qui vont à l'encontre de cette conclusion et une particule capable d'expliquer les formes rares, nous paraît relever d'une méthode inadmissible). Pour Jirku [the reference is to A. Jirku, *Der Mythus der Kanaanäer* (1966) 49], *ỉly* serait un véritable duel et signifiait « deux dieux ». Pourtant, comme De Moor l'a signalé [the reference is to J. C. De Moor, *BiOr* 26 (1969) 103], l'usage exclusif du pluriel dans la formule attestée dans les lettres en langue accadienne infirme cette interprétation."

[473]Compare, for example, Blau and Loewenstamm, *UF* 2 (1970) 25, n. 35; Tropper, *UF* 25 (1993) 391; Tropper, *UF* 26 (1994) 459-460; and, most recently, Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 21.341.21, pp. 51-53, and § 54.121.2, pp. 306-307 (Tropper also allows the possibility that {y} is consonantal here, representing an enclitic particle; see below).

weakening of the productive case system in Ugaritic.[474] Since the putative *plene* writings are often used as evidence for such a weakening of the case system, the argument quickly becomes circular.[475]

The best means, it seems to me, of avoiding not only circular argumentation but also the necessity of introducing questionable typological distinctions such as "Spätugaritisch" in order to explain unexpected writings,[476] involves a consideration of

---

[474]First presented by Liverani, *RANL* 8:19 (1964) 179-180 (for "non-literary" Ugaritic); compare also Tropper, *UF* 25 (1993) 391-392 (for "late" Ugaritic); and Rainey, *UF* 27 (1995) 705-706. On the productivity of the Ugaritic case system, see, for example, J. Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 299-301, with references to the previous discussion.

The majority of the evidence for the Ugaritic case system, however, suggests that it was fully productive: (1) the spellings of common nouns of III-ʾ roots, and (2) syllabic spellings of Ugaritic common nouns. A summary of the evidence may be found in Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 54.111, pp. 302-303 (for common nouns of singular number); § 53.212-213, pp. 289-290 (of dual number); and § 53.312, pp. 293-294 (of plural number).

[475]The fact that *matres lectionis* are not fully productive in Ugaritic orthography, neither for historical diphthongs, nor for historically long vowels (that is to say, even for those who defend the existence of *matres lectionis* in Ugaritic, examples are few and far between), further weakens the hypothesis. A additional weakness is that this view neglects particle accretion as an important aspect of Ugaritic morphology, on which see below.

[476]For some, such typological distinctions are a means of reconciling perceived contradictions in the available evidence. The argument generally runs as follows: (1) the unambiguous evidence for a fully productive case system reflects an older, more conservation stage of the Ugaritic language, while (2) data which are not compatible with the Ugaritic case system, that is, examples of "incorrect" case endings (interpreted on the basis of syllabic writings, alphabetic writings with the "ʾaleph" signs, *matres lectionis*, etc.), represent a later stage of the language, in which the case system was falling out of productive usage. Statements which reflect this line of thinking include Liverani, *RANL* 8:19 (1964) 179; S. Segert, *Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* (1984), § 13.1, p. 15; Israel, RSO 11 (1993) 255-262; and the more detailed presentations in Tropper, *UF* 25 (1993) 389-394; and Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 54.113, pp. 305-306, and § 54.121.2, pp. 306-307.

Against this view, it seems germane to make two points: (1) Differences of literary genre are often accompanied by differences of linguistic register, and such differences might easily be reflected in varying orthographic habits. Thus, if it is true (and this remains to be proven) that certain prose texts contain more "unexpected" orthographic usages of the {y} sign (whether these be interpreted as *matres lectionis* or as enclitic particles) than do certain literary texts, it does not necessarily follow that the literary texts are older than the prose texts; on the contrary, it does not seem necessary at all to arrange these differences into a tidy linear diachronic development. (2) Many of the examples presented as evidence of "incorrect" case vowels are of ambiguous syntactic interpretation, and thus are of questionable worth as evidence for a putative "late Ugaritic". Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 18 (RS 15.008), commentaire, ligne 4, n. 18, voices similar objections, rejecting

the use of "enclitic particles" in Ugaritic morphology. Since the evidence for the existence of an enclitic particle *-y*, attached not only to nouns, but also to verbs, pronouns, and adverbs, is fairly strong,[477] it seems reasonable, and methodologically sound, to interpret the writing *ỉly ủgrt* in this vein: */ʾilū-ya*[478] *ʾugarīta*/.[479] It seems to me that a strong argument for this view is to be found in the literary text *KTU* 1.23,

---

"l'affirmation que la forme *ỉly* constitue un élément du « Spätugaritisch » [he refers here to Tropper, *UF* 25 (1993) 391] capable de prouver que la langue tardive avait perdu le système casuel (comme nous l'avons plusieurs fois signalé, presque tous les textes ougaritiques sont « tardifs », c'est-à-dire qu'ils datent des dernières décennies du royaume, et ce qu'on dit au sujet de RS 15.008 doit donc être valable pour au moins les neuf dixièmes des textes ougaritiques)."

[477]A recent analysis of the available evidence can be found in Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 89.3, pp. 833-835; see also J. Tropper, *UF* 26 (1994) 480-481. The early champion of this view was K. Aartun, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen* 1 (1974) 44-47; see also D. Pardee, *AfO* 31 (1984) 221 and 229, and n. 53; and D. Pardee, *AfO* 33 (1986) 136, and n. 151.

[478]I vocalize the particle as */ya*/, but this arbitrary, being unsupported by any inner Ugaritic data that I know of. The polyvalent nature of the {PI} sign (in the writing {AL-LI-NI-PI} in RS 20.426B:5') prevents it from being much use, in my opinion, for any reconstruction of the Ugaritic phonemic structure, *contra* Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 89.3, p. 833.

[479]Tropper offers this explanation as "möglich" in *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 89.35, p. 835 (he also considers the *mater lectionis* explanation as possible, however: *ibid.*, § 54.121.2). Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 18 (RS 15.008), commentaire, ligne 4, is more decided in favor of the enclitic particle: ". . . il nous paraît nécessaire de privilégier le connu par rapport à l'inconnu : on frôle l'arbitraire en affirmant que la forme *ỉly* (avec *ymy* en RS 24.247:34' si l'on adopte cette interprétation de la forme) est suffisante pour faire croire que le système casuel était tombé d'usage en ougaritique alors qu'une particule *-y* existe dont la fonction précise est inconnue et qui peut donc servir pour expliquer la forme *ỉly* ." Further, Pardee, *ibid.*, n. 18, criticizes Tropper, *UF* 26 (1994) 474-475, for not having classified the phrase *ỉly ủgrt* as an example of enclitic *-y*: ". . . dans son étude de la particule *-y* [he refers here to Tropper, *UF* 26 (1994) 473-482] il fait le partage entre *matres lectionis* et la particule *-y* sans déclarer sur quels critères les décisions se font (ce qui serait difficile vu que la fonction de la particule est inconnue). Ce que les spécialistes qui choisissent l'analyse comme *mater lectionis* dans ce cas et dans plusieurs autres n'ont pas remarqué est que cet usage orthographique se réduirait en ougaritique en grande partie au signe {y}, qui a fournit la plupart d'exemples cités (peu d'exemples de {ʾ}, encore moins de {w}, presque tous les exemples cités pour {h} reflètent soit la particule locative/adverbiale soit la forme *ʿšrh* du nom de nombre « dix »). Or il est évidemment possible que l'usage de *matres lectionis* ait commencé avec le signe {y}, pour devenir ensuite plus général (plus tard et dans d'autres langues !) ; mais il est également possible, et à notre avis plus conforme aux données de la langue qui sont bien attestées, que l'une des caractéristiques les plus frappantes de l'ougaritique, à savoir l'usage très répandu de particules enclitiques, soit à l'origine des orthographes en question (et que les deux cas cités de {h} constituent des morphèmes comportant la consonne /h/)."

where one finds two writings, both noun phrases used in nominative contexts which are otherwise equivalent in terms of their semantic denotation, one of which employs the "expected" writing *ảṯt ỉl*,[480] 'the two wives of ʾIlu', and the other of which attaches the enclitic particle *-y* to the noun in the construct state: *ảṯty ỉl*,[481] still 'the two wives of ʾIlu'. Does the first writing reflect "classic" orthographic conventions, while the second one, with its use of {y} as a *mater lectionis*, reflects "late" developments? Such a hypothesis would seem to introduce more problems than it solves. Better by far, it would seem, to view the {y} as an example of "enclitic *-y*",[482] the existence of which seems certain. But, granting the existence of enclitic *-y*, what is its function? Josef Tropper[483] may be correct to seek the function of enclitic *-y* not on a local semantic level, but on a broader discourse level; his proposal, however, namely, viewing it as a marker of direct speech, is not applicable to the phrase *ỉly ủgrt*, treated here. Beyond offering the tentative proposal that the presence of *-y* here may have played a role, not on the level of semantic "denotation", but rather on the level of socio-linguistic "connotation",[484] I have no explanation to offer for this problematic spelling.

---

[480]*KTU* 1.23:42. Contextual considerations indicate that the noun was dual in number, and in the nominative case; one can thus reconstruct the phonemic structure as */ʾaṯṯatā ʾili/.

[481]*KTU* 1.23:60. As above, contextual considerations indicate the nominative case and dual number: */ʾaṯṯatā-ya ʾili/.

[482]So Aartun, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen* 1 (1974) 44-45.

[483]Tropper, *UF* 26 (1994) 475-482.

[484]Hani Hayajneh has pointed out to me (personal communication) that the "enclitic particle" situation in Ugaritic appears to resemble that of the Old South Arabian languages, for which see N. Nebes, *Mélanges Ryckmans* (1991) 133-151: several enclitic particles are known, which are found attached to virtually all parts of speech, but which are notoriously difficult to pin down in terms of semantics, to the point where one may even speak of a lack of informational content in terms of linguistic "denotation". If the *-y* in the case of *ỉly ủgrt* is similarly "empty" in terms of semantic denotation, the alternative, it seems to me (unless one wishes to suggest the presence or absence of the

4.6.2 Two morphological issues

The two questions of morphology dealt with here are (1) the breadth of usage of *t-* prefix forms of the verb for the 3rd person masculine plural in Ugaritic prose texts, and (2) the verbal stem of the form *tšlmk*.

4.6.2.1 The scope of *taqtulū*(*na*) for the 3rd m pl

Sixty-some years after Andrée Herdner's article on the subject,[485] subsequent textual discoveries have shifted the discussion from simply highlighting the existence of *t-* preformative forms of the 3rd masculine plural in the prefix conjugation,[486] to considering seriously the possibility that such forms were the sole productive pattern in these cases.[487]

---

particle is purely arbitrary), is to seek the "meaning" of the particle on a broader level, either in terms of its role in the discourse (cf. Tropper's hypothesis, mentioned above), or in terms of putative socio-linguistic "connotations" carried by it.

[485]Herdner, *Revue des Études Sémitiques* 1938 (1938) 76-83.

[486]Herdner, *ibid.*, p. 76, n. 2, credits this observation to H. L. Ginsberg, *Kitvē Ugarit* (1936) 25, 31-32, and 63 (notes); H. L. Ginsberg, *Orientalia* 5 (1936) 188; and U. Cassuto, *Orientalia* 7 (1938) 278, n. 4. Z. S. Harris, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects* (1939) 12, n. 27, notes this phenomenon as well, and cites H. L. Ginsberg, *Tarbiz* 4 (1933) 166; and A. Goetze, *JAOS* 58 (1938) 290.

[487]Goetze, *JAOS* 58 (1938) 290, n. 128, was tentative in offering this hypothesis: "As to the prefix *t-* it should be added that *taqtulāni* seems to be the normal form of the 3rd plural. . . ," but as D. L. Dobrusin, *JANES* 13 (1981) 5, n. 2, points out, it is clear that Goetze also allowed for the existence of *yaqtulū*(*na*) forms: cf. his interpretation of *ymrů* on p. 294 and of *ytk* on p. 300. It was not until Dobrusin's article, *ibid.*, pp. 5-14, that the claim was made in a categorical way: compare p. 5: "the basis for a 3rd masculine plural prefix with *y* cannot be established with any certainty", and p. 14: "The examples of 3rd masculine plural with *y* preformative are few in comparison and inconclusive. . . . the 3rd masculine plural prefixed form of the Ugaritic verb is formed only by preformative *t*. Any examples of *y* preformative are suspect and should be scrutinized for alternative interpretations."

The early discussion was prejudiced by the predominance in the known corpus of literary texts in parallelistic poetic narrative style.[488] It was generally admitted that *taqtulū*(*na*) forms existed in these myths,[489] but they were assumed to coexist in free variation alongside "expected" *yaqtulū*(*na*) forms.[490] D. Dobrusin attempted to explain away all the *yaqtulū*(*na*) examples in the poetic corpus as amenable to alternative explanations,[491] but J. Tropper's more cautious position,[492] that *taqtulū*(*na*) is statistically standard, but a few *yaqtulū*(*na*) forms do exist in the poetic texts, which may be viewed as a "morphologisches Fossil", analogous to the *taprus* pattern for the 3rd f. sg. preterite in Akkadian literary compositions, is equally plausible.

Unlike the situation in the literary texts, however, where *taqtulū*(*na*) appears to be standard and a few *yaqtulū*(*na*) examples are often thought to exist, the situation in Ugaritic prose is fairly straightforward: as Tropper has recently shown,[493] all

---

[488]Because of this, all but one of the examples discussed by Herdner are taken from poetic narrative; the single prose form is mentioned on p. 80: "Ces formes ne se rencontrent pas seulement dans les textes poétiques. M. Dhorme a bien voulu me signaler, dans une lettre provenante de Ras-Shamra [the letter in question must be RS 8.315], dont la publication est très prochaine : *ṯġrk*, « qu'ils te gardent » ; *tšlmk*, « qu'ils te maintiennent en bonne santé » ; le sujet est *'ilm*, « les dieux »."

[489]Since fairly clear examples of *taqtulū*(*na*) for the 3rd m pl are now generally admitted from Mari (Old Babylonian), from Amarna (Late Bronze), and perhaps also from Ras Shamra syllabic texts (for Mari examples, see J.-M. Durand, *MARI* 1 (1982) 79-89; and D. O. Edzard, *Mélanges Birot* (1985) 85-86; for Amarna, see W. L. Moran, *JCS* 5 (1951) 33-35; S. Izre'el, *UF* 19 (1987) 79-90; and A. F. Rainey, *CAT* 2 (1996) 26-28 and 43-45; for the putative RS syllabic examples, see J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 73.223.31, p. 432), it is no longer necessary to speculate that the formally ambiguous Ugaritic *tqtl* forms represent 3rd f. sg. forms used for plural entities, as in Arabic where all non-human plurals are treated grammatically as f. sg.

[490]Compare Herdner, *Revue des Études Sémitiques* 1938 (1938) 76: " … les formes *tqṯl*(*n*) qui ont été expliquées jusqu'ici comme des 3e m. pl. sont peu nombreuses … ."

[491]Dobrusin, *JANES* 13 (1981) 5-14.

[492]Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 73.223.33, p. 433.

[493]*Ibid.*, §73.223.3, pp. 432-38.

unambiguous examples of the 3rd masculine plural in the prefix conjugation show *taqtulū*(*na*).[494] If this holds, this is an important insight, since it dramatically reduces the interpretive possibilities for *yqtl* verbal forms when encountered in poorly preserved prose texts.

4.6.2.2 *tšlmk*: D-stem or Š-stem?

Working with the data available to him in 1938, it is not particularly troublesome that Dhorme hesitated between "le *pi'el* ou l'*hiph'il* de *šlm*" in explaining the form *tšlmk*.[495] Since that time, however, not only is it clear that the causative stem in Ugaritic bore a Š-prefix, not H-, ʾ-, or Y-,[496] but also that a short vowel occurred between the /š/ of the causative prefix and the first radical of the verbal root. A survey of the examples of Š-stem prefix conjugation forms derived from I-Š, but also from I-T̲, roots, has made this clear.[497]

---

[494]The example of the form *ydk* from the hippiatric tradition (compare, for example, RS 17.120:14) need not be plural; compare the "impersonal" singular translation of D. Pardee, *Les textes hippiatriques* (1985) 25, 'on doit broyer [the following ingredients together]', retained in his recent English translation, D. Pardee, *Mélanges Dion* 3 (2001) 248, 'one should bray [the following ingredients together]. . .' (in this technical context, the verb DK(K) apparently means 'to mix together by smashing', as with a mortar and pestle, for example). The verb *ymǵyk* in RS 3.334:8 (probably a letter) is also ambiguous; Dijkstra's interpretation, '[Children] will come to you', in M. Dijkstra, *HUS* (1999) 152, is speculative. In a recent English translation of RS 34.148, D. Pardee, *Context* 3 (forthcoming), letter no. 23, and n. 132, divided line 7 differently (than it was divided in the *editio princeps*, RSO 7 [1991] 163-164): *w lny kn påt / 'm ml<k>t grgmš*, translated, 'Now for the two of us, the border with the ki<ng>dom of Carchemish is holding solid.'

[495]Dhorme, *Syria* 19 (1938) 144.

[496]See J. Tropper, *Kausativstamm* (1990) 113-182; Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 74.612, p. 586.

[497]See Tropper, *Kausativstamm* (1990) 60-67, and Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 74.622.1, p. 587-588, and § 74.622.3, pp. 593-594, for the examples of I-Š and I-T̲ roots.

Consequently, it is clear that *tšlmk* is not a Š-stem form,[498] and therefore ought to be classified as a D-stem: */*tašallimūka*/.[499]

---

[498]As Pardee remarks in D. Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 2 (RS 1.018), remarques épistolographiques, footnote 26: "L'accord semble être général maintenant pour analyser *tšlmk* comme au schème-D." References follow, beginning with C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Grammar* (1940), § 14.825, p. 109; recently, see Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 74.412.27, p. 555. As mentioned above, Dhorme, *Syria* 19 (1938) 144, considered the causative stem as possible, but he envisioned "l'*hiph'il*", not the Š-stem; so also E. Hammershaimb, *Das Verbum im Dialekt von Ras Schamra* (1941) 17, who mentioned "Hif'il ('Af'el)". J.-L. Cunchillos, as in J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 255, retained in J.-L. Cunchillos, *HUS* (1999) 364, appears to have been the only student of these texts to consider *tšlmk* as a genuine Š-stem. From the examples mentioned in the above footnote, however, it is clear that if this verb had been in the Š-stem, it would have been written **tššlmk*, not *tšlmk*.

[499]On methodological grounds, I favor inner Ugaritic evidence, when such exists, over comparative Semitic evidence in phonemic reconstruction. The inner Ugaritic evidence for the reconstruction of this word consists of alphabetic spellings of D-stem prefix conjugation verbal forms which contain one of the "ʾaleph" signs. I know of no syllabic evidence relevant to the reconstruction of this form (on the validity of personal names as evidence, see below). Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 74.412, pp. 544-557, presents the alphabetic evidence, which permits a reasonable reconstruction of all three pertinent vowels. The two stem vowels are the easiest to deal with: (1) the consistent use of the {å} sign in the writing of I-ʾ roots in the D-stem prefix conjugation forms (such as *tåršn* in KTU 4.370:2; for the other examples, see Tropper, *ibid.*, § 74.412.21, pp. 546-548) suggests /a/ for the stem vowel between the 1st and 2nd root consonants; and (2) spellings with {i} for verbs of this type derived from II-ʾ roots (see the examples given in Tropper, *ibid.*, § 74.412.22, p. 548; note especially the forms from the root LʾK, for which the opposition between G-stem *tlåk* and D-stem *tlik* is fairly well understood) suggest that the stem vowel between the 2nd and 3rd root consonants was /i/. For (3) the vowel of the prefix, the only inner Ugaritic evidence comes from 1st person forms: the attested 1st person forms, all written with {å} (for the forms, see Tropper, *ibid.*, § 74.412.26, pp. 550-552), have been interpreted as evidence that the prefix vowel was /a/, not simply in the 1st person, but across the paradigm; Tropper, *ibid.*, p. 545, cites C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (1965), § 9.35, p. ; S. Segert, *Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* (1984), § 54.41, p. ; and Verreet, p. 33). I also advocate this view, and in its defense, would point out that it is not only consistent with the available inner Ugaritic evidence, but also, being the simplest explanation of the available data, does not introduce unwarranted complications into the verbal system.

Tropper's proposal is considerably more complicated: he suggests that the prefix vowel was originally /u/ across the paradigm, but that in the 1st person, /**ʾuqattil*/ was phonetically realized as [ʾ^{a}qattil], the /a/ quality in the prefix vowel perhaps being the result of vowel harmony; elsewhere in the paradigm, as in the 3rd person, for example, */*yuqattil*/ was phonetically realized as [yəqattil], with a "Murmelvokal" in the prefix syllable. Tropper's preference for /u/, against the uniform alphabetic evidence for /a/, comes from his consideration of several lines of evidence, both inner Ugaritic and comparative Semitic. In addition to the methodological criticism that his proposal is needlessly complicated, I would offer the following substantive criticisms: (1) the syllabic writings of the personal name {mu-na-ḫi-mu} (nominative) and {mu-na-ḫi-ma} (genitive) (for citations, see Tropper, *ibid.*, § 74.415, p. 562) can only be admitted as evidence with great difficulty; the use of personal names as evidence in the reconstruction of Ugaritic has been justly criticized by J. Huehnergard, *UVST* (1987) 8-

4.6.3 Three syntactic questions

This section treats (1) those examples of « ben » formulas in which one of the verbal forms lacks a pronominal suffix, (2) the grammatical scope of the adverbial phrase *l šlm* in the « ben » formula, and (3) the consistent « S V O » word order in the « ben » formula.

4.6.3.1 "Anticipatory gapping" in *ỉlm tǵr tšlmk* and *ỉlm tšlm tǵrkm*

The « ben » formulas of three letters share a syntactic feature I have provisionally labeled "anticipatory gapping":

(i) RS 18.134:4-5, *ỉlm tǵr tšlmk*;

(ii) RS 92.2005.2:26-28, *ỉlm* [*t*]*šlm tǵrk* [*t*]*tmmk*;[500] and

---

9; (2) Admitting that two of the four spellings of verbs of this type which show {w} as the 1st radical (examples listed in Tropper, *ibid.*, § 74.412.14, p. 545) probably represent the D-stem (*ywpṯn* and *ywsrnn* are plausibly D-stem, but the other two, *twtḥ* and *twḥln*, are intransitive, and so are unlikely to have been in the D-stem; see Pardee, *AfO* 31 (1984) 221). It is by no means as clear to me as it is to Tropper that spellings of this type are more likely to represent an underlying vowel sequence /*uwa*/ rather than /*awa*/. If one takes verbal forms of III-w roots as examples, *åtwt* and *ʿrwt* (*Ibid.*, § 75.531b, p. 653, where Tropper himself plausibly reconstructs these forms as /*ʾatawat*/ and /*ʿara*/*uwat*/, respectively) would seem to imply that, in some cases at least, Ugaritic tolerated /*awa*/. (3) Finally, the Ugaritic verbal paradigms need not follow Arabic and Akkadian paradigms; on the contrary, these languages both show /u/ for the prefix vowel of the 1st person for the prefix conjugation in the D-stem (*ʾufaʿʿilu* and *uparris*), while Ugaritic, judging on present data, did not. Tropper's proposal could very well turn out to be correct, but I see no empirical reason to adopt it on present evidence.

[500]Because of the unusual nature of the « ben » formula carried by the first letter on this tablet, the restoration of this formula (which belongs to the second, "piggy-back" letter) is difficult. The editors (Bordreuil and Pardee, *Études ougaritiques* 1 [2001] 371-374) read these lines as {(26, cont'd) ỉlm (27) [t]šlm . tǵrk (28) [-]⌈-⌉mmk }}. The « ben » of the first letter is epigraphically clear: {(7) ỉlm . l . šlm (8) tǵrkm . tšlmkm}, which leads one to wonder if the correct restoration of the beginning of line 27 ought not be {[l .] šlm} instead of {[t]šlm} (compare D. Clemens, *Sources* [2001] 568, n. 2179). Furthermore, it may be worthwhile double-checking the reading of line 28: can {[tš]⌈l⌉mk} (instead of {[ ]⌈-⌉mmk}) be definitively ruled out? This question provides an example of the utility of detailed epigraphic notes for every signed damaged to the extent that its value is not beyond doubt (in other

(iii) RS 94.2545+:16-17, [*i*]*lm tǵr tšlmk*.

These three formulas are characterized by the omission of the pronominal suffix *-k* from the first of two (or more) successive transitive verbal forms, the suffix in question being the expected accusative complement of each of the verbs in the « ben » formula. In each of these three examples, the gapping of the suffix is "leftward", regardless of the order of verbal components.[501] Given the occurrence of no less than three examples, it seems reasonable to accept this syntax as a legitimate and intentional device,[502] a literary devise which is also attested in Ugaritic poetry.[503] A poetic example of such "anticipatory gapping" is provided by the following passage from the Kirta text, *KTU*[2] 1.17.V:19-20: *šlḫm ššqy ỉlm sȧd kbd hmt*, 'Feed (the two gods), Give drink to the two gods! Serve? (the two of them), honor the two of them!'

---

words, every sign which carries half-brackets, {⌜x⌝}, in transcription, merits prose description of the visible remains).

[501]Two examples (RS 18.134 and RS 94.2545+) show the order « N□R-ŠLM », one shows the order « ŠLM-N□R(-TMM) » (RS 92.2005.2).

[502]That is, three examples of the same scribal error seem unlikely. RS 18.134 is the only example of this pattern already published: C. Virolleaud, *PRU* 5 (1965), no. 159, p. 191, had read line 5 {tǵr . tšl[m]k}, but offered no comment. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, *KTU* (1976), no 2.44; and M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, *KTU*[2] (1995), no. 2.44, read {tǵrk . tšlmk} on line 5, against the *editio princeps*; it is not clear that they envisioned a scribal error here, however, for their transcriptions do not contain the <> signs typically used for inserting omitted signs into a defective text. J. Tropper, *AuOr* 13 (1995) 235, read {tǵr . k . [t]⌜š⌝lmk}, apparently working from photographs (*ibid.*, p. 231); his reading has been justly criticized for this reason by D. Pardee, *AuOr* 16 (1998) 98, who in turn reported his own collation of the line, {tǵrk . tšlmk}, which by and large conforms to Virolleaud's reading.

[503]On this feature in Ugaritic poetry, see W. G. E. Watson, *HUS* (1999) 172-173 ("ellipsis"); for similar constructions in biblical Hebrew poetry, see M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (1980) 404-405. Ugaritic poetry (like that of the Hebrew Bible) is characterized, above all, by the pervasiveness of parallelism in its various semantic and grammatical distributions. Since the standard Ugaritic « ben » formula shows parallelistic constructions both on the semantic level (compare the semantic overlap among the verbs N□R, ŠLM, ʿZZ, and TMM) and on the grammatical level (all verbal forms in the formula are 3rd m pl prefix conjugation forms used in volitional context), the presence of further "poetic" features in the corpus of the « ben » formulas may not be purely coincidental.

4.6.3.2 The scope of the adverbial phrase *l šlm*

The « ben » formula of RS 92.2005.1:7-8, *ìlm l šlm tǵrkm tšlmkm*, presents, in the form of the prepositional phrase *l šlm*, the first attestation of the Ugaritic component corresponding to a frequent component of the « ben » formula in the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, namely, the prepositional phrase *ana šulmāni*, literally 'for well-being'.[504] A legitimate grammatical question relates to the scope of this adverbial phrase: does it modify only one of the several verbal predications present in the formula, or is it operative rather on the clause level, modifying them all?

Due to the limited nature of the Ugaritic evidence, it does not appear possible, at this point, to provide a confident answer to this question, presented on the basis of and supported by a sufficiently convincing amount of textual data. If some uncertainty is therefore unavoidable, it does not follow that one's interpretation of this phrase should be arbitrary. For this reason, comparative material may be exploited in an attempt to argue, in an informed if still provisional way, for the more probable of the interpretive possibilities. Among the comparative corpora, I single out the RS Akkadian material for the simple reason that the formal parallels between the Ras Shamra Akkadian and Ugaritic epistolary corpora are sufficiently pervasive, and sufficiently profound, not only to justify seeking a single answer to this question that is valid for both corpora, but perhaps even requiring it.

With this in mind, I propose that in the « ben » formula the phrase *l šlm* / *ana šulmāni* is an adverbial complement to the NṬR / *naṣāru* predication, but to none of the

---

[504]See above, section 4.4.1.

other verbs occurring in the formula.[505] I lean in this direction for the following reasons: Not only (1) does every occurrence of *l šlm* / *ana šulmāni* occur in a « ben » formula which also contains the NṬR / *naṣāru* predication, but also (2) when the former is present, it is always immediately followed by the latter. Furthermore, (3) in the RS Akkadian corpus, the phrase *ana šulmāni* is used most often with *naṣāru* as the sole verbal predication,[506] showing that an Akkadian idiom *ana šulmāni naṣāru*, 'to protect (s.o.) for well-being', is not only conceivable, but statistically standard. Finally, (4) the phrase *l šlm* / *ana šulmāni* is comparatively rare in « ben » formulas which contain, in addition to NṬR / *naṣāru* forms, verbal predications derived from other roots.[507]

Provided that the comparative method employed here be legitimate, I consider that the RS Akkadian evidence is sufficient to suggest that the grammatical scope of the phrase *l šlm* is confined to the NṬR verbal predication, and is not operative on the broader level of a multi-predication clause. Since not all examples of the verbal predication NṬR / *naṣāru* are accompanied by the phrase *l šlm* / *ana šulmāni*, the latter would seen to be an "optional" elaboration of the NṬR / *naṣāru* predication, perhaps 'to protect (s.o.) for (the purpose of) well-being'.

---

[505]In other words, I suggest that both Ugaritic and Akkadian possessed an idiom, meaning loosely 'to protect (s.o.) for well-being', which was frequently used in the « ben » formula in the epistolary traditions of LB Syria. Not only were these two idioms virtual semantic equivalents, but they were also virtual morphological equivalents, displaying a precise morpheme-for-morpheme correspondence among their components.

[506]See above, section 4.4.1.

[507]In at least four « ben » formulas, *l šlm* / *ana šulmāni* and a verbal predication derived from ŠLM (D-stem) / *šullumu* are both present (three of these are Akkadian letters: RS 20.178.1, RS 34.133, and RS 34.154; and one Ugaritic: RS 92.2005.1); in each of these, however, a NṬR / *naṣāru* verbal form is also present, immediately following the prepositional phrase.

4.6.3.3 The « S V » order of syntactic components

Since it is still fairly common to attribute, often without supporting arguments, various aspects of Ugaritic epistolary structure to "Akkadian influence",[508] and since classical Akkadian syntax tends to be verb-final while West Semitic syntax, though showing considerable variation, is very often not, it seems worthwhile to draw attention to examples of "genuine" Ugaritic syntax in an effort to stave off the ascertain that, for example, the respective positions of subject and verb in the Ugaritic « ben » formula, namely, *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* = « S V V », reflects Akkadian influence.

For this purpose, I have found the presentation of data assembled recently by J. Tropper,[509] and, to a lesser extent, D. Sivan,[510] useful. Two points seem germane: (1) the "subject-initial" status of the Ugaritic « ben » formula presents nothing unusual for attested Ugaritic syntactic patterns, in both poetry and prose;[511] and (2) even if an as yet undiscovered Ugaritic « ben » formula should turn up one day which showed the

---

[508]Compare A. F. Rainey, *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 3 (1968) 135, "The epistolary style was strongly influenced by the standard forms in Akkadian" (apparently as an example of a "standard Akkadian epistolary form", he cites a typical prostration formula from an Amarna letter). More recently, compare Sivan, *GUL* (1997) 210, "most of the prosaic texts are formulaic and are in fact imitations of Akkadian legal epistolary [sic]." Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 93.424, p. 876, describes the Ugaritic epistolary « pros » formula as an "Übersetzung eines akk. Formulars".

[509]Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 93.4, pp. 869-881.

[510]Sivan, *GUL* (1997) 210-212.

[511]See the examples collected in Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 93.422.1, pp. 872-873. Two volitional examples from epistolary prose, both cited by Tropper, *ibid.*, include RS 15.008:10-11, *w ủm tšmḫ måb*, 'May my mother cause M'AB to rejoice!' (or, if emendation of {måb} to {måd[!]} be allowed, 'May my mother rejoice very much[!]!'); and RS [Varia 4]:10-12, *w ht åḫy bny yšål ṯryl*, 'Now then, let my brother, my son ask Ṯaryelli!'

order « S O V »,[512] this pattern is also attested in Ugaritic, certainly in poetry and probably in prose,[513] and therefore should not be assumed *a priori* to reflect Akkadian influence.

My belaboring this point is not intended to deny categorically the possibility of Akkadian influence on Ugaritic syntax. On the contrary, given the broad and profound impact of Mesopotamian culture on Syria, Akkadian influence on Ugaritic literature seems plausible. Rather, what I am criticizing here is the mechanical and uncritical nature of the assumption that Ugaritic prose is a mere imitation of Akkadian prose style. Such may have been the case, but any statement to this effect which is advanced without argument is clearly unacceptable, especially in those cases for which Akkadian parallels for the putatively "Akkadianizing" Ugaritic syntax do not exist. It seems to me that the working assumption should be that a given Ugaritic literary pattern reflects genuine Ugaritic syntax, and that the burden of proof lies on those who wish to propose Akkadian influence for this or that syntactic pattern.

---

[512]As a hypothetical example, one may imagine a putative Ugaritic version of a « ben » formula resembling those found in the Akkadian letters from Meskene: **ʾilm npšk tǵr* (or perhaps **ʾilm ḥ(y)k tǵr*), 'May the gods protect your life!'

[513]Compare the poetic example (*KTU* 1.2.IV:11) given in Sivan, *GUL* (1997) 211 (but note that the putative prose example given on p. 210, *KTU* 4.125:8, seems extremely unlikely: the string *yd lmdhm* is almost certainly not a noun phrase, 'the hands of their apprentice' (*ibid.*), functioning as the subject of the verb, but rather more likely a prepositional phrase 'along with their apprentices' (cf. G. del Olmo Lete, and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 1 (1996) 226). Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 93.423, pp. 874-875, has collected several more examples from poetry, and, in § 93.424, p. 876, two examples (although in these an adverbial component is present: « S O A V ») from epistolary prose, though Tropper insists that these (both are from RS 18.031) represent "evtl. Übersetzung eines akk. Originals". Tropper also cites A. Farber's doctoral dissertation, *Genetic Subgroupings of the Semitic Languages*, University of Texas (Austin) (1980) 44-50, which surveyed two Ugaritic literary texts, and found, for example, that 30% of the sentences therein displayed « S V » order, and 6% « S O V » order.

4.6.4 The etymology of tǵrk *and related forms*

The semantics of the verbal form *tǵrk*, 'May they guard you!' are clear, thanks to the convergence of lines of evidence drawn from (i) the context in which the formula occurs, (ii) the Akkadian parallels derived from *naṣāru*, 'to guard, protect (in the G-stem)', and (iii) any of various formally plausible etymological proposals consistent with the semantic context and with the sequence of consonantal radicals, -*ǵr*-, visible within the form *tǵrk*. To my knowledge, these etymological proposals have included at least two different roots: (1) Proto-Semitic *NẒR, represented in Ugaritic as NṬR ,[514] and (2) the Proto-Semitic hollow root *ʿ(Y)R, represented as such in Ugaritic, but in Hebrew as ʿ(Y)R.[515]

Since, from a methodological point of view, one must give priority to inner Ugaritic evidence in resolving any question regarding Ugaritic lexicography, only the former proposal is tenable: the existence of Ugaritic NṬR , 'to guard, protect (in the G-

---

[514]In certain cases, the phoneme represented by Ugaritic {ǵ} corresponds etymologically to that of Hebrew {ṣ}, Aramaic {ṭ}, and classical Arabic {ẓ}, from which data (among others) one may speculate, following the comparative method, that the "Proto-Semitic" (hereafter "PS") phoneme in question was */ẓ/*. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 32.123.31, pp. 94-95, also mentions Ugaritic *ǵr* 'mountain' and ʿMʾ, 'to be thirsty (G-stem)' for this class of correspondences. The case of Ugaritic MṬY is more confusing because of the Arabic and Hebrew forms, but probably belongs here as well: in this case, Ug. {ǵ} ≈ Aram. {ṭ} ≈ probably Hebrew {ṣ} (though the Hebrew verb מצא shows III-ʾ not III-y) ≈ Akk. {ṣ} (*maṣû*) ≈ Arab. MḌY (not MẒY!). It is clear that this view, namely, that the Ugaritic form *tǵrk* should be connected with a I-N root cognate with Arabic NẒR, was held by E. Dhorme, *Syria* 19 (1938) 142 and 144, despite the fact that he had not yet adopted the current convention of transcribing this particular Ugaritic sign as {ǵ} (he used instead "ẓ" in transcription).

[515]H. L. Ginsberg, *BASOR* 72 (1938) 19, n. 11, was apparently the first to propose this etymology of the form *tǵrk* of the « ben » formula; in this view he was followed by H. N. Richardson, *JBL* 66 (1947) 322; and by B. Hartmann, *Festschrift Baumgartner*, VTS 16 (1967) 102-105, who includes a good deal of the anterior bibliography.

stem)' is clear,[516] but there is no unambiguous evidence for the existence of a semantically appropriate hollow root *□(Y)R in Ugaritic.

4.7 TYPOLOGY OF THE UGARITIC BENEDICTION FORMULAS

A typological classification of the Ugaritic « ben » formula is presented below, organized according to form and conceptual classification. The "standard" formulas are treated first, followed by "non-standard" patterns.

4.7.1 Compositionally standard formulas

4.7.1.1 Unexpanded benedictions

The vast majority of the Ugaritic « ben » formulas contain three and only three compositional elements: (1) a noun phrase referring to "the gods", (2) a 3rd person plural finite verbal form derived from N□R, with attached 2nd person pronominal suffix, and (3) an analogous verbal form derived from ŠLM, also with an attached 2nd person pronominal suffix.

---

[516]Compare G. del Olmo Lete, and J. Sanmartín, *DLU* 2 (2000) 320-321. Compare also Pardee, *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 2 (RS 1.018), remarques épistolographiques, n. 27, and the bibliography assembled there: "Vu les formes *ngr* dans ces lettres . . . et les translittérations syllabiques {na-ḫi-ru […]} (*PRU* VI 136:9) et {ni-iḫ-ru} (*Ugaritica* V$_N$ 137 I 11'), il n'est plus loisible de douter que la racine du verbe est N□R (voir les éléments bibliographiques réunis dans *AfO* 34 [1987] 429-30, 459, auxquels on ajoutera Albright, *BASOR* 72 [1938] 19, n. 11 ; Gaster, *JAOS* 70 [1950] 10 ; Aistleitner, *WUS* [1963], § 1811 [p. 209] ; Von Soden, SVT 16 [1967] 290-94 ; Rainey, « Scribe » [1968] 136 ; Pardee, *BiOr* 34 [1977] 3, 5 ; Margalit, *Matter* [1980] 174 ; Ajjan, *Notes* [1983] 23-26 ; Cunchillos, *Misterio* [1983] 72 ; idem, *AEPHER* 92 [1983-84] 260 ; idem, *RHR* 201 [1984] 230-34 ; idem, *Simposio* [1984] 120, 122 ; idem, *TO* II [1989] 255-56 ; Avishur, *Word Pairs* [1984] 432-33 ; Murray, *Or* 53 [1984] 307-10 ; Sivan, *Grammatical Analysis* [1984] 253 ; Huehnergard, *Vocabulary* [1987] 362 ; Segert, *UF* 20 [1988] 295-96 ; Verreet, *Modi* (1988) 114 ; Tropper, *JNSL* 20/2 [1994] 24)."

The formulas which contain these three, and only these three, elements may be classified by compositional pattern. Three patterns are known within this group. The most frequent is (1) that in which the noun phrase is « *ỉlm* » and the sequences of verbal predicates NR̄ -ŠLM. The other two patterns are much less well attested: (2) that in which the noun phrase is « *ỉlm* » and the predicate sequence ŠLM-NR̄ , and (3) that in which the noun phrase is « ỉly ủgrt » and the sequence of predicates NR̄ -ŠLM.

4.7.1.1.1 « *ỉLM TǵRK TšLMK* »

« ASC BIO »

RS 11.872:7-8	« *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* »
RS 16.379:6-7	« *ỉl*[*m*] *tǵrk tš*[*l*]*mk* »
RS 17.139:3-4	« *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* »
RS 34.124:5-6	« [*ỉlm t*]*ǵrk tšlm*[*k*] »
RS 94.5003+:6-7	« *ỉlm t*[*ǵrk*] *tš*[*lmk*] »

« ASC POW »

RS 20.199:9-10	« [*ỉ*]*lm tǵrk* [*tšl*]*mk* »
RS 29.093:6-7	« *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* »
RS 34.148:6	« *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* »
RS 92.2010:4-5	« *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* »
RS 94.2391:8	« [*ỉl*]⌜*m*⌝⌜*tǵr*⌝[*k tšlmk*] »[517]
RS 94.2428:4'	« [*ỉlm t*]*ǵrk t*[*šlmk*] »

[517]The consistent presence of this compositional pattern in other conceptually ASC POW letters renders the reconstruction given here likely, though still hypothetical.

« HOR BIO »

RS 1.021:5-6	« *ỉlm* [*tǵrkm t*]*šl*[*mkm*] »	« UNKNOWN » (possibly « HOR BIO »)
RS 3.427:1'-2'	« [*ỉlm*] *tǵrk* [*tšlmk*] »[518]	« UNKNOWN » (possibly « HOR BIO »)
RS 18.031:4-5	« *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* »	
RS 18.075:1'-2'	« [*ỉlm*] *tǵ*[*rk tšlm*]*k* »	« UNKNOWN » (probably « HOR BIO »)
RS 18.134:4-5	« *ỉlm tǵr tšlmk* »	
RS 19.029:5-6	« *ỉlm t*[*ǵ*]*rk tšlmk* »	« UNKNOWN » (possibly « HOR BIO »)
RS 94.2273:7	« *ỉlm tǵrk tš*[*lmk* …] »	
RS 94.2537:4-5	« [*ỉlm*] *tǵrk* [*tš*]*lmk* »	
RS 94.2545+:18-19	« [*ỉ*]*lm tǵr tšlmk* »	

OTHER CONCEPTUAL CATEGORIES:

RS 18.147:4-5	« *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* »	« DESC BIO »
RS [Varia 4]:4-5	« *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* »	« MIXED BIO »
RS 8.315:7-9	« *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk* »	« ASC MIXED »

[518]The reconstruction is not certain, of course, but follows the compositional pattern and "mise-en-page" attested in as many as twelve other letters (RS 8.315, RS 11.872, RS 16.265.1, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, probably RS 18.075, RS 18.134, RS 18.147, RS 29.093, RS 34.124, and RS 92.2005.2). The "mise-en-page" in question consists of (1) the first element of the « ben » formula, « *ỉlm* », as the last word of the line which also contains the « sal » formula, and (2) the first predication of the « ben » formula, « *tǵrk* » as the first word of the subsequent line.

4.7.1.1.2 VARIANT OF *ỉLM* ELEMENT, OTHERWISE STANDARD

RS 15.008:4-6	« *ỉly ủgrt tǵrk tšlmk* »	« ASC BIO »

The correct reconstruction of RS 18.[482] remains elusive:

RS 18.[482]:3'-5'	« […]⌜-⌝ *ảmr* […]*y ḫt* […] *tǵrk* […] »[519]	« UNKNOWN »

4.7.1.1.3 « *ỉLM TšLMK TǵRK* »

RS 15.174:5-6	« [*ỉl*]*m tšlmk* [*t*]*ǵrk* »	« HOR BIO »
RS 29.095:4-5	« *ỉlm tšlmk tǵrk* »	« UNMARKED »
RS 94.2383+:4-5	« *ỉlm tšlmk tǵrk* »	« HOR BIO »

4.7.1.2 Expanded benedictions

A handful of Ugaritic « ben » formulas contain not only the three necessary components, but also additional elements, whether these be predications or adverbial phrases. This small group of expanded « ben » formulas is not internally unified in terms of composition.

---

[519]On the analogy of RS 15.008:4-6, it is easy to imagine lines 3'-5' here as a « ben » formula, perhaps to be restored « [*ỉl*]⌜*y*?⌝ *ảmr* [… *w ỉl*]*y ḫt* […] *tǵrk* […] », 'May [the gods] of ʾAmurru [… and the god]s of Ḫatti […] protect you […]!' This passage, however, follows what seems clearly to be the « I.R. » motif, which would not normally precede a « ben » formula. Atypical sequences of the epistolary formulas are known, of course (compare RS 94.2545+), but often seem to derive from specific contextual circumstances (RS 94.2545+, for example, is probably an unsent draft). It occasionally happens that the "double formula of well-being" ends the letter. If such were the case here, the horizontal scribal line following line 2' could mark the division between two letters, a main letter and a "piggy-back". This leaves little room, however, for the reconstruction of the address formula and probably a salutation prior to the traces best understood as a « ben » formula.

4.7.1.2.1 ADDITIONAL ADVERBIAL ELEMENT *L šLM*, OTHERWISE STANDARD

RS 92.2005.1:7-8 « *ỉlm l šlm tǵrkm tšlmkm* » « ASC BIO »

Apart from the additional component, the formulation otherwise resembles that of other « ASC BIO » letters. The "piggy-back" letter appended to this tablet may also contain the « *l šlm* » phrase.[520]

4.7.1.2.2 ADDITIONAL PREDICATION, OTHERWISE STANDARD

RS 92.2005.2:26-28 « *ỉlm* [*t*]*šlm tǵrk* [*t*]⌜*t*⌝*mmk* » « HOR BIO »

This formal variant adds a third predication, derived from the verb TMM, 'to render (someone) complete (D-stem)'.[521]

4.7.1.2.3 ADDITIONAL PREDICATIONS AND ADVERBIAL PHRASES

RS 1.018:4-8 « […] *tšlm*[*k tǵ*]*rk tʿzz*[*k* …]*lm* […]*mk* […] » « UNKNOWN »[522]

RS 16.265.1:2-6 « *ỉlm tǵrk tšlmk tʿzzk ảlp ym w rbt šnt bʿd ʿlm* » « HOR MIXED »

4.7.2 Compositionally non-standard « ben » formulas

4.7.2.1 The « ben » formula in RS 17.117

RS 17.117:2 « *bʿl yšủl šlmk* » « ASC MIXED »

'May Baʿlu seek your well-being!'

---

[520]D. Clemens, *Sources* 1 (2001) 568, n. 2179.

[521]P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, RSO 14 (2001) 374.

[522]Possibly « HOR BIO ».

In a 1983 article, J.-L. Cunchillos discussed the comparative parallels of this non-standard Ugaritic benediction.[523] Among the contemporary parallels, he cited letters in Akkadian from Amarna and Tell Taʿanak:

EA 96:4-6 « DINGIR.MEŠ-nu[524] šu-lum-ka šu-lum É-ka li-iš-al »[525]

TT 1:5-7 « DINGIR.⌜MEŠ⌝ li-iš-a-lu ⌜šu⌝-lum-ka šu-lum É-ka DUMU.MEŠ-ka »[526]

Several other Akkadian parallels from Late Bronze Levantine corpora may be added, some more precise than others:

EA 97:3 « [DINGIR.M]EŠ šu-lum!-ka li-[iš?-a]l? »[527]

AT 116:5-7 « ^{d}IM šu-lum!-ka šu-lum DUMU.MEŠ-ka ⌜ù⌝ [?] KUR-ti$_4$-ka li-ip-p[u-u]š »[528]

Hazor 16455:4-6 « DINGIR.MEŠ ù ^{d}UTU šu-lum-ka šu-lum É-ka DUMU.MEŠ-ka KUR-ti$_4$-ka li-iš-a-lu »[529]

---

[523]Cunchillos, *AuOr* 1 (1983) 61-66.

[524]Given the singular form of the verb here and below, the best translation is probably 'May the god! seek your well-being!' As below, in EA 97, the writing with the {MEŠ} sign apparently does not indicate a grammatically plural entity; is it marking an ideogram, or should these examples be considered as "plurals of majesty", as in the use of אלהים, treated as a singular, in biblical Hebrew? Compare A. Rainey, *CAT* 2 (1996) 215.

[525]A recent treatment with references to editions, facsimiles, and anterior bibliography may be found in M. Liverani, *Le lettere di el-Amarna* 1 (1999) 186.

[526]Published by F. Hrozný, *Tell Taʿannek* (1904) 113-114 (cuneiform copy, p. 120; photo, Taf. 10). See now A. Rainey, *EI* 26 (1999) *156-*157, with transliteration, translation, commentary, and anterior bibliography.

[527]For references, see Liverani, *Le lettere di el-Amarna* 1 (1999) 242.

[528]D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* (1953) 60 (copy on pl. 25). The use here of the verbal idiom « *šulma epēšu* », literally 'to do (someone's) well-being', rather than « *šulma šaʾālu* », 'to seek (someone's) well-being', distinguishes this formula from the others.

[529]W. Horowitz, *IEJ* 50 (2000) 17-18.

This idiom is also one of the few formulas to have continued in productive epistolary usage, *mutatis mutandis*, in the Iron Age.[530]

4.7.2.2 The « ben » formulas in RS 16.078+ and RS 18.113+

RS 16.078+:15-24 « *w ản*[*k* …] *ảrš* [… *špš*] *mlk r*[*b bʿl*]*y p 1 ḥy np*[*šh ả*]*rš 1 pn bʿ*[*l*] *ṣpn bʿly w ủrk ym bʿly 1 pn ảmn w 1 pn i1 mṣrm dt tǵrn npš špš mlk rb bʿly* […] »

'Now, (as for) m[e, …] I am making requests [… for the well-being? of … the Sun] the gre[at] king my [master]! (More precisely), [I] am making requests for the life of [his] "sou[l]" before Baʿlu of (Mount) Ṣapunu my master! (I am making requests) for a lengthening of the days of my master before Amon! (I am making requests) before the (other) gods of Egypt, (requests) which (are as follows): "May they guard the life of the Sun the great kong my master … !'

RS 18.113+:6-9 « *ảnkn rgmt 1 bʿlṣp*[*n*] *1 špš ʿlm 1 ʿṯtrt*[…] *1 ʿnt 1 kl i1 ảlṯy* […] *nmry mlk ʿlm* »

'(As for) me, I hereby say to Baʿlu of (Mount) Ṣapunu, to the eternal? Šapšu, to ʿAṯtartu […] to all the gods of Alašiya […] NMRY (of?) the eternal king!'

These two non-standard « ben » formulas occur in « ASC POW » letters. In RS 18.113+, the formulation of the *praescriptio* is otherwise standard. The verbal clause « *ảnkn rgmt 1* DN … » there finds formal parallels among the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters,[531] and more distantly, in Akkadian letters from the Old Babylonian period[532]

---

[530]Cunchillos, *AuOr* 1 (1983) 61, nn. 5-6, cites the parallels in Aramaic and Hebrew letters.

[531]RS 86.2230:7-9 { | (7) a-na-ku a-qa-ab-bi a-na ^{d}a-ma-ni (8) a-na ^{d}UTU ^{d}IM DINGIR.MEŠ ša KUR mi-iṣ-ri (9) ma-a li-iṣ-ṣu-r[u …] | }; published by D. Arnaud in RSO 14 (2001), 278-279, text no. 18 (copy on p. 289).

and in Egyptian letters.[533] A fuller interpretation of both of these Ugaritic formulas must involve not only internal philological arguments, but also these and other comparative data.[534]

---

[532]Compare the citation given in J.-M. Durand, *Doc Épist* 3 (2000) 388, no. 1194, [X 3], lines 40-42: {an-na-tum ša IGI ^{d}d[a-g]an ak-ta-na-ra-ba-k[u]m um-ma-mi « PN » lu ša-li-im-ma}, translated 'Voici la constante prière que j'exprime devant Dagan: Puisse PN être en bonne santé!'

[533]For possible Egyptian parallels, compare E. Wente, *Letters from Ancient Egypt* (1990), nos. 132 ("Now I am calling upon Amon. . . ."), 138-140, 152-154, 156, 158, 164, for example.

[534]In particular, the parallels suggest that the final request was a prayer that the named gods keep the recipient in the favor of or under the protection of NMRY, the 'eternal king'.

CHAPTER 5

FORMULAIC ASPECTS OF THE BODY

The third and final section of a standard Ugaritic letter is the "body".[1] Like the address, but unlike the polite formulas section, the body appears to be a necessary compositional element.[2]

It is here where the sender communicates his or her purpose for writing. Thus, of the three epistolary sections, the body carries the highest "information content". No doubt for this reason, namely, its capacity to communicate a greater amount of information, the body is also markedly less formulaic than either the address or the polite formulas section. Only one motif of the body is both sufficiently schematic in terms of its composition and sufficiently regular in terms of its distribution to merit consideration as a potential "formula": the motif of reciprocal well-being, treated below in section 5.3. The other elements of the body display formal variety and distributional irregularity, which excludes them from the status of "formulas".

Because of the formal and distributional variety in the corpus of passages drawn from the body of Ugaritic letters, then, my treatment of this section will differ

---

[1]For the terminology used for this part of the letter in past studies, see above, section 0.3.2.

[2]The only example known to me of a Ugaritic letter which lacks a body is RS 94.2273, almost certainly a scribal exercise. It is possible, however, to imagine the eventual discovery of "piggy-back" letters in Ugaritic which contain only the address and the polite formulas, and lack the body, similar to two "piggy-back" letters from the Emar corpus: Msk 7451.3:27-32 (D. Arnaud, Emar 6:1 [1985] 191 [copy]; *idem*, Emar 6:3 [1986], text no. 266, p. 263 [transcription and translation]) and Msk 7497.3:41-42 (*idem*, Emar 6:1 [1985] 236 [copy]; *idem*, Emar 6:3 [1986], text no. 263, p. 260 [transcription and translation]). In the event of such a discovery for the Ugaritic corpus, this formulation would have to be modified.

substantially from that of the previous two sections. With the exception of the motif of reciprocal of well-being, mentioned above, which does display a certain amount of formal and distributional regularity, the various motifs of the body will be surveyed, classified, and analyzed in a more superficial way; they are not discussed in the amount of detail accorded to the formulas discussed in the preceding chapters.

Though not formulaic in a regular and predictable sense,[3] many motifs found in the body of Ugaritic letters nevertheless do show recognizable structural patterns. These, in turn, may be classified, and potentially exploited for typological purposes. This section is a preliminary attempt at such a structural analysis.

5.1 MACRO-STRUCTURE

5.1.1 The "message" as the primary macro-structural unit

In defining the main compositional elements of the body, it seems best to begin on the macro-structural level. Here, both the grammatical integrity of the text as well as its « mise-en-page »[4] help to isolate the largest discrete structural unit in the body: what will here be termed a "message".[5] A good example of the convergence of these two criteria occurs in RS 94.2580:25-27.

« … | (25) *w l gtn* (26) *w l klby* (27) ⌜*kt*⌝ *lḥm tn lhm* | … »

---

[3]On the motif of reciprocal well-being, see below, section 5.3.

[4]By "mise-en-page" I mean the scribe's use of horizontal lines to separate the sections of the letter from one another; see S. Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 65-69 (on this usage in the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters) and 106-108 (on the same in Ugaritic letters).

[5]I adopt Ahl's terminology; *ibid.*, p. 102 (Note, however, that Ahl's "subject" corresponds to my use of "body", and her "salutation" corresponds to my phrase "polite formulas").

Here, by means of two horizontal lines traced across the facial surface of the tablet, the scribe has separated this portion of the body both from what precedes and from what follows, confirming the grammatical analysis of this string of words as constituting a single coherent unit:

> ‘ Now, as for Mr. Gatênu and as for Mr. Kalbiya, give them a *kt*-jar of food! ’

Accepting the existence of discrete “messages”, then, such as the passage just cited, as the largest compositional units of the body, it may be further observed that Ugaritic letters may contain just one message, or more than one. In theory, each message would thus represent a distinct and individual communication: a report, a request, a demand, and so forth.

This view is deceptively simple, however, since in practice, the two criteria used for isolating discrete messages from one another, namely grammatical analysis and the scribal « mise-en-page », are not entirely satisfactory. Often the scribes did not employ horizontal scribal lines to separate distinct messages.[6] What is worse, sometimes the placement of the horizontal lines is incompatible with the seemingly evident grammatical integrity of sequential lines.[7] Finally, sometimes particularly complex “messages” are subdivided into discrete subsections by means of scribal lines.[8] All of these factors contribute to the questionable reliability of such lines as a

---

[6]Compare, for example, RS 15.008:4-20, from which horizontal scribal lines are absent. They are used neither within the body (lines 7-20), to separate the distinct “messages” from another, nor even between the polite formulas section and the body itself (between lines 6-7).

[7]A good example of this occurs in RS 16.264, in which horizontal scribal lines are (1) absent from obvious structural transitions (as between the address and body in lines 3-4), but (2) present between the lines of a single grammatically integrated message (as between lines 5-6).

[8]S. Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 131-132 (with special attention paid to the Ras Shamra Akkadian texts). Although she (correctly) characterized this usage as less common in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus, a number of examples are known; compare, for example, RS 16.264:9-16.

criterion in the isolation of discrete messages. Furthermore, the grammatical analysis of a string of lines in a given Ugaritic letter is often ambiguous. In spite of such inconsistencies with respect to definitional criteria, however, I see no other solution than to retain the "message" as the most convenient means of describing the main macro-structural unit of the body, and thus, the structural concept which permits the observation of more precise patterns on the micro-structural level.

5.1.2 The analysis of messages in terms of function and form

Due to the diversity of message types and content, the ambiguity surrounding their grammatical analysis, and their varying degree of preservation, it is difficult to define *a priori* the compositional structure of a typical message. The attempt seems worthwhile, however, if for no other reason than for potentially better organizing, and thus better understanding, the diverse corpus of Ugaritic messages.

Although I have not succeeded in elaborating a fully satisfactory typological classification of the attested messages in the Ugaritic corpus, my own study of the corpus has benefited from two insights which, I believe, merit reiteration here. The first is (1) that "speech act theory" provides a convenient supplement to traditional philological analysis in defining and classifying the pragmatic function of a given message in the context of epistolary discourse; and the second, (2) that the prototypical form of a given message is best and most often characterized by the information structure « topic : comment ».

5.1.3 A typology of messages in terms of pragmatic function

For the Ras Shamra material, the attempt to classify the various messages according to their pragmatic function in the epistolary discourse is not new. When J. Nougayrol published the sizable group of Akkadian letters from the Rapʾānu archive in 1968, he also proposed just such a typology of message types: « lettre de politesse », « lettre d'introduction », « lettre d'envoi », « lettre d'information », and « lettre d'injonction ».[9] Shortly thereafter, in her 1973 Brandeis dissertation, S. Ahl was able to adopt and adapt[10] this typology of pragmatic function to the Ugaritic letters in alphabetic script as well.[11] Ahl's formulation also had a terminological advantage over Nougayrol's by focusing on the message rather than on the letter as a whole.[12]

The attempt below to refine such a typology of the pragmatic functions of messages relies on the foundations laid by Nougayrol and Ahl. However, it also introduces a « speech act » theoretical framework, which has proven particularly helpful, not only in distinguishing the pragmatic function of a given message from its

---

[9]Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 67-68.

[10]Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 83, mentions six "kinds of topics" in the Ras Shamra Akkadian corpus: four which correspond to those already defined by Nougayrol (Ahl's « situation report », « message of introduction », « message of information », « message of direction »), one composite type (« message of information and direction »), and one type not mentioned by Nougayrol (« message of inquiry »).

[11]*Ibid.*, p. 120. For the Ugaritic epistolary corpus, she mentions five "kinds of messages": « situation report », « message of introduction », « message of information », « message of information and direction », and « message of inquiry ». The sixth type, « message of direction », was, at the time, "not yet attested" (*ibid.*, p. 540, n. 56).

[12]This follows from Ahl's recognition that many letters contain not one, but several messages (*ibid.*, pp. 83, 103).

surface grammar, but especially in clarifying the relationship between these two levels of analysis.[13]

This relationship is an interesting one, since the correspondence between linguistic form and pragmatic function is not always straightforward.[14] That these two levels of analysis are often distinct may be illustrated by three messages taken from Ugaritic letters:

RS 19.011:12-13 « *qrtn ḫlqt w dʿ dʿ* »,

‘ … Our city has perished! Know (this)! Know (this)!’

Despite the presence of an imperative form at the end of this message, it is clear that its pragmatic function is best classified, not under a functional rubric « message of direction », as if such were defined solely on the basis of the imperative form, but rather as a « message of information », since its evident purpose is to inform the recipient.

In a second example, assuming the appropriateness of the given interpretation given below,[15] the main verbal forms are in the suffix conjugation, ostensibly describing past actions:

RS 15.098:8-10 « … | *l yblt ḫbṯm åp ksphm l yblt* | … »,

---

[13]The difference between these two levels of analysis is brought to the fore through the study of so-called « indirect speech acts »; see J. R. Searle, *Syntax and Semantics* 3 (1975) 59-82.

[14]Searle puts it well in *Language* 52 (1976) 970: “The problem of indirect speech acts is that of how one can say one thing, mean what one says, and also mean something more. Thus when we say … (3) Can you shut the door? [or] (4) Will you be quiet? … we often mean what we say, but we also mean … (5) Shut the door [and] (6) Be quiet. The explanation of how these utterances work is fairly simple in broad outline, though complicated if you try to work it out in any detail.”

[15]It is also possible to interpret the verbal forms in the 1st person, and the *l* particles as asseverative instead of negative, in which case the pragmatic function of this message would be quite different (cf. Nougayrol’s « message d’envoi »): ‘I hereby do indeed deliver the *ḫbṯ*-personnel (to you); Also their money I hereby indeed deliver.’ The use of the suffix conjugation in this sense is expected (cf. Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 [1987] 1-31).

'You have not brought the *ḫbṯ*-personnel. Nor even have you brought their money!'

The verbal forms would seemingly suggest an informative function for the message itself, but a consideration of the discourse context in which this phrase occurs renders such an intuitive classification improbable: surely the information reported would already have been known to the recipient. Much more likely, it seems, that the pragmatic function of this message is to reprimand inappropriate conduct on the part of the recipient, or, at the very least, to express the sender's dissatisfaction about the event or situation described.

Finally, a third example, assuming it too has been correctly reconstructed and interpreted below,[16] would seem, on the basis of form, to represent an inquiry:

RS 15.174:10-14 « *hnkt rgmt* [*i*]⌜*k*⌝*y l iIåk* [*ʿm*]⌜*k*⌝ *ʿmy* [*l š*]*lm w lm* [*iI*]⌜*å*⌝*k* ⌜ ⌝*mk* »,

'Now then, (in a previous letter) you said (something regarding) [h]ow (it is that) I do not send [y]ou (messages) — With me it is [not w]ell! So, why should [I s]end you (messages)?'

Again, it seems clear from the discourse context that the sender is not genuinely seeking an answer to this question. Rather, these lines are intended for quite a different pragmatic purpose: again, apparently to communicate to the recipient the sender's dissatisfaction. This, in turn, adds weight to the following utterance,

---

[16]While many of the restorations given here were proposed by M. Dijkstra in *UF* 19 (1987) 40, I find D. Pardee's general interpretation of this passage (manuscript of *Les textes épistolaires* [in preparation], ch. 22), more convincing on several points, both on epigraphic and contextual grounds. My understanding does differ from Pardee's, however, in one respect: in the interpretation of the string « *hnkt rgmt* » in line 10 (which Pardee translates "Celle-là [referring to the queen of Ugarit] dit :"). The queen, however, is in all likelihood the recipient of this letter; and since her correspondent is clearly not her social subordinate (note the order of mention in the address, and the identity and form of the polite formulas, for example), third person forms for direct address would be unusual.

apparently an attempt to exact financial payment from the recipient: « [*t*]*šlm kspy* », '[You must] repay my money!'[17]

These examples are sufficient, it seems, to show, had there been any doubt, that a valid typology of the pragmatic function of the various Ugaritic messages cannot be done solely on the basis of form; the discourse context must also be taken into account. Such should be obvious from common sense, of course, but an explicit recognition of such brings to the fore the potential value of speech act theory as a tool, other than intuition, for the typological classification of pragmatic function that takes account of both factors.[18]

I do not pretend to have followed the various technical intricacies introduced and discussed by the numerous speech act theorists who have contributed to the literature on the subject since the sixties. Rather, I have merely drawn on three insights expressed in the early, classic formulations of the theory, all of which strike me not only as valid, but also and especially as useful for any attempt to understand and classify the corpus of Ugaritic messages:

---

[17]On progressions of successive pragmatic functions, see below.

[18]For the early formulation of speech act theory, see J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (1962) (drawn from his 1955 lecture series of the same title); the second edition of the same work, published in 1975; and especially the publications of J. R. Searle: *Speech Acts* (1969); *idem*, *Language, Mind and Knowledge* (1975) 344-369; and *idem*, *Language in Society* 5 (1976) 1-23. The ulterior bibliography on the subject is immense: K. Bach and L. M. Harnish, *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts* (1979), for example, expand and refine Austin and Searle's formulations. A brief but useful orientation to linguistic approaches to discourse analysis in Ancient Near Eastern texts (in this case, the Hebrew Bible) may be found in M. O'Connor, *Congress Volume, Basel 2001* (2002), esp. pp. 20-21, 25-27.

(1) Epistolary messages, like all linguistic utterances in general, serve to accomplish many things,[19] and not merely the assertion of propositions.[20] These "things" accomplished by epistolary messages, which are here descriptively characterized as "pragmatic functions",[21] are "speech acts".

(2) The relationship between grammatical form and pragmatic function is not always straightforward.[22]

(3) Finally, and most importantly for typological purposes, all epistolary messages, like all "speech acts" generally, fall into one of five basic functional categories. These five categories, in turn, serve as a convenient basis for the typological classification of Ugaritic messages according to pragmatic function.

---

[19]Compare the title of J. Austin's 1955 Harvard lecture series, "How to Do Things with Words," published posthumously in 1962 (second edition, 1975).

[20]Austin was not, of course, the first to notice this diversity (B. Smith cites a very telling statement from Aristotle's *De Interpretatione* in his "Towards a History of Speech Act Theory," *Speech Acts, Meanings and Intentions* [1990] 29: "Every sentence is significant […], but not every sentence is a sentence-making sentence, but only those in which there is truth or falsity. There is not truth or falsity in all sentences: a prayer is a sentence but is neither true nor false … . [17 a 1-5 Edghill translation]"), but, since his formulation has launched much of the recent discussion, he provides a convenient starting point.

[21]Austin himself distinguished "locutionary acts" from "illocutionary acts", which J. R. Searle defined as "an utterance with a certain [literal] meaning" and "an utterance with a certain [intentional] force", respectively (*The Philosophical Review* 77 [1968] 408). The use of the phrase "pragmatic function" here corresponds, I believe, to this second entity, which is the "Speaker Utterance Meaning" (to use another of Searle's terms), which may or may not correspond to the "Literal Sentence Meaning". See also Searle's *Expression and Meaning* (1979).

[22]Compare especially Searle's category of "indirect speech acts" (*Syntax and Semantics* 3 [1975] 59-82).

Following Searle,[23] the five functional categories are (i) « directive », (ii) « assertive », (iii) « commissive », (iv) « expressive », and (v) « performative ».[24]

With these premises drawn from the conceptual framework of speech act theory in mind, then, (4) a list of the Ugaritic messages representing each of these categories may be drawn up, and (5) a survey of the common structural features within each group, or across groups, may be attempted.

5.1.4 Survey of the five speech act categories, with Ugaritic examples

Since the five principle categories of speech acts are to play an important role in the typological classification of the Ugaritic messages in terms of their pragmatic function, it seems worthwhile to present a Ugaritic example of each category, for purposes of illustration.

5.1.4.1 « Directives »

« Directives » are messages in which the sender attempts to elicit action from others, and especially from the recipient. In many respects, then, this category resembles Nougayrol's « lettre d'injonction » and Ahl's « message of direction ».[25] It is

---

[23]Searle, *Language, Mind and Knowledge* (1975) 344-369.

[24]Searle (*ibid.*) labels this category "declarative"; I have followed J. Sadock's more appropriate label, "performative" (*Journal of Symbolic Logic* 54 [1989] 301).

[25]As above with Nougayrol's typology, examples from several of Ahl's categories would fall under the speech act rubric of directive; compare her "Message of Information and Direction " (Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* [1973] 96-97 and 126-128), "Message of Inquiry and Direction " (*ibid.*, 129), and her comments on the "Message of Introduction " (*ibid.*, 89-91),which ". . . presents the person who comes to the addressee and commonly tells the purpose for which he comes. It also frequently includes directive(s) for action to be taken in behalf of this person."

also one of the most frequently encountered speech act categories in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus. An example has already been cited above:

RS 94.2580:25-27 « *w l gtn w l klby* ⌜*kt*⌝ *lḥm tn lhm* »,

'Now, as for Mr. Gatênu and as for Mr. Kalbiya, give them a *kt*-jar of food!'

This passage employs an imperative form, but prefix conjugation forms in the jussive mood are also frequent for this type of speech act:

RS 9.479A:12-15 « *ʿm ȧdty mnm šlm rgm tttb l ʿbdh* »,

'With my lady, (as for) whatever (news of) well-being (there is),[26] may she have word (of that) returned to her servant!'

However, the absence of a volitional form does not necessarily mean that a message is not directive. A sizable number of messages which are interrogative in form, for example, should probably also be classified under this rubric. Despite the absence of a grammaticalized marker of the sender's volition, many epistolary questions are, in fact, veiled directives: the interrogative form hides an implicit attempt to elicit action from the recipient. An example is the following:

RS [Varia 4]:6-9 « *ỉky lḥt spr d lỉkt ʿm tryl m hy rgmt* »,

'How about the letter that I sent to Taryelli — what did she say?'

Here, an action of the part of the recipient is implicitly solicited: a response of some sort informing the sender of that matter about which he is curious. For thematic reasons, Nougayrol included this category under his rubric « lettre d'information »,[27]

---

[26]Students of Ugaritic are not in complete agreement on the interpretation of this motif. For a grammatical analysis of this formula, which justifies the translation given, see D. Pardee, *Studi Fronzaroli* (forthcoming), and below in section 5.3.6.

[27]Nougayrol, in *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 68, alludes to three types of « lettre d'information »: "donnée", "promise", "demandée". Setting aside the thematic unity of such messages (all have to do with "knowing"), the approach taken here would classify these three types as three different speech acts: assertive, commissive, and directive.

while Ahl put it in a category all its own, « message of inquiry ».[28] I prefer, however, to follow the speech act theorists, and classify certain[29] formally interrogative utterances as functionally directive.

Finally, neither does the presence of an unambiguous volitional form, in and of itself, signal the necessary identification of that message as a « directive » category. As mentioned above, many messages containing the imperative *dʿ*, 'Know!', have, as their pragmatic function, not to elicit action, but rather to inform. This introduces a second statistically important category of speech act in the epistolary corpus, that of « assertives ».

5.1.4.2 « Assertives »

« Assertive » messages are those in which the sender asserts the truth of a proposition. The category thus includes such things as descriptions, reports, statements, and claims which portray or represent a state of affairs, and which are falsifiable. This category, too, is one of the most frequently encountered speech act categories in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus. It corresponds in many respects to Nougayrol's sub-group « lettre d'information (donnée) »[30] and to Ahl's category « message of information ».[31] .

---

[28]Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 97-98, 128-129.

[29]Not all, since some formal questions function as expressives; see below.

[30]Nougayrol, in *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 68; the first element of his « lettre de politesse » also belongs to this category. Note, however, that the sub-groups « lettre d'information (promise) », and « lettre d'information (demandée) » do not belong here.

[31]Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 84-94, 120-126. The first element of Ahl's « situation report » also belongs to this category.

The frequent inclusion of volitional forms derived from the verb YDʿ, 'to know', has already been mentioned. Another example is:

RS 15.008:6-10 « *ủmy tdʿ ky ʿrbt l pn špš w pn špš nr by mỉd* »,

'May my mother know that I have been[32] in the Sun's presence, and the countenance of the Sun shone on me very much.'

This compositional tendency provides internal evidence for the native understanding of the pragmatic function of this category: such messages were intended to inform.

The formulaic motifs in which the sender reports his or her state of well-being to the recipient belong here as well:

RS 18.038:3-4 « *ʿm špš kll mỉdm šlm* »,

'With "the Sun", everything is very well.'

This corresponds to the first elements of Nougayrol's « lettre de politesse »,[33] and Ahl's « Situation Report ».[34] Owing to its formulaic structure, this motif is treated in more detail below, in section 5.3.

A number of other types of messages also belong in this category. One such example is the category represented by Nougayrol's « lettre d'envoi »,[35] which S. Ahl correctly identified as a sub-type of her category « message of information ».[36] An example is:

---

[32]Literally, 'I entered into the presence of the Sun.'

[33]Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 67-68.

[34]Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 84-88, 120-125, refers to this motif as the "Report of the Well-Being of the Sender", the first part of her "Situation Report".

[35]Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 67-68.

[36]Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 91-94, 125-126, placed both the "message of dispatch", which gives information about accompanying delivery, and the "message of factual information" under her rubric "message of information".

RS 94.2479:11-21 « [*w*] *hln … d znt ådty kllm štnt* »,

'[Now] then, … (the commodities listed herein) … , which (form part) of my lady's provisions, in (their) entirety, I hereby deliver.'[37]

Nougayrol was correct, however, to separate this motif from reports of events, since not only is it easily recognizable and quite frequent in the epistolary corpus, but it also has structural characteristics of its own,[38] and derives from distinct contextual circumstances.[39]

A final sub-category of this type of speech act corresponds to Nougayrol's « lettre d'introduction » and Ahl's « message of introduction ».[40] I have found no unambiguous Ugaritic examples, but the following passages is possibly[41] to be so interpreted:

RS 94.2580:4-6 « *hlny klby w gtn yỉt ʿmk* »,

'Here, Mr. Kalbiya and Mr. Gatênu are on their way[42] to you.'

---

[37]Literally, 'I caused to be given.' The use of the suffix conjugation to express an action accomplished concomitant with the writing, sending, or delivery of the letter is typical of the "epistolary perfect" (see Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 [1987] 1-31).

[38]The most notable structural characteristic is the use of the suffix conjugation (or, in Akkadian, of the preterite or perfect) to represent "Koinzidenzfall". See Pardee and Whiting, *ibid.*

[39]The information communicated by such messages is for the purposes of verification. In case of any doubt about the original contents of the shipment of goods, this "invoice" could be consulted.

[40]Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 67-68. For Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 89-91, the "message of introduction … presents the person who comes to the addressee and commonly tells the purpose for which he comes. It also frequently includes directive(s) for action to be taken in behalf of this person." She cites a number of Akkadian examples of this motif.

[41]The verbal form may also be volitional (**yaʾtû*, 'let them come!'), as if the two messengers were at the same locale as the recipient, but had not received an audience. The orthography (yỉt instead of yỉtn) may be another argument for a volitional interpretation (the short form of the prefix conjugation is generally jussive, the long form indicative).

[42]Literally, 'they (are going to) come.'

This message is formally and, to a lesser extent, contextually similar to Nougayrol's « lettre d'envoi » and Ahl's « message of dispatch », identifying the persons, however, rather than the commodities which have been sent.

5.1.4.3 « Commissives »

« Commissives » are messages in which the sender commits himself or herself to a future course of action, as in the following example:

RS 16.264:7-8 « *p ånk åtn ʿṣm lk* »,

'Now, I myself will provide you with the lumber.'[43]

Alongside « directives » and « assertives », this category is one of the more common in the corpus of epistolary messages. It has no direct correspondents in the typologies of Nougayrol and Ahl; both subsume « commissive » messages under the broader rubrics treating informative messages.[44] Such a connection is not without merit from a thematic point of view, however, since « commissive » messages, like « assertives », are also frequently marked by the presence of a volitional form of the verb YDʿ, 'to know':

RS 17.139:28-29 « *ybl šdh … dʿ k šṣů åšṣ'ů* »,

'(As for) his fields' produce … , know that I will indeed[45] have (it) harvested!'[46]

---

[43]Literally, 'I (will) give the logs/trees (plural) to you.'

[44]Compare Nougayrol's « lettre d'information (promise) » (*Ugaritica* 5 [1968] 67-68), which would represent one type of « commissive ».

[45]This is the so-called "infinitive absolute" used as an adverbial modifier to a cognate finite verbal form; an awkward, but literal rendering is ' … causing (it) to go out, I will cause (it) to go out!'

[46]Literally, 'I (will) cause (it) to go out.' The verb YṢʾ in the Š-stem is not the regular verb for expressing the sending of commodities from the sender to the recipient; judging from statistical usage, YTN (Š) or YBL (G or D) would be expected in such cases. Another letter, however, RS 15.007:5, does

In fact, the scribes did not always rigidly distinguish « commissive » messages from « assertive » messages, no doubt since both function essentially to inform. An example of such a hybrid usage is the following:

RS 94.2406:3-11 « *hlny ånk … b ym hnd ånk b mlwm btt w ʿlm ådnyh … w dʿ* »,

'Here, (as for) me, … today[47] I was lodging in MLWM, but tomorrow (I will be lodging) in Adana … , so know (this)!'

In a certain sense, this message crosses the boundary from « assertive » to « commissive », since the queen first describes to her correspondent her factual whereabouts during the preceding night (assertive), but then commits herself to a planned itinerary for several nights to come (commissive).

Such mixed examples are rare, however, and as a working hypothesis, « assertives » may be taken as referring to a state of affairs already existing, while « commissives » allude to a state of affairs which the sender intends to bring about in the future. This criterion also allows for easy formal differentiation of the two categories, since the former would normally employ the suffix conjugation, and the latter the prefix conjugation.

---

employ YṢʾ in the Š-stem with *ìdn* (semantics uncertain) as its apparent accusative complement, but this letter's "non-canonical" status and the unlikelihood that *ìdn* refers to an agricultural commodity, make its comparative value uncertain. In an agricultural context, I wonder if the expression 'to cause (a field's produce [*ybl*]) to go out' might not be an idiom for the harvest.

[47]Literally, 'on this day'. The pairing of this phrase with *ʿlm* (itself plausibly a "phonetic spelling" of etymological *ʿl ym* [cf. RS 17.156:2], much like the writings *bd* and *b yd*), 'on (the following) day', implies 'today' and 'tomorrow' as the best idiomatic translations.

5.1.4.4 « Expressives »

« Expressives » are messages which communicate the emotions, the psychological state, or the attitude of the sender regarding a given situation. A paradigm example from the letters is the expression of dissatisfaction with a given situation.

RS 34.124:10-16 « *lm tlỉkn ḫpṯ hndn p mšmʿt mlk ỉnn … w tlkn ṯn ṯnm ʿmy w tṯbrn lby* »,

'Why would you send (merely) this *ḫupṯu*(-troop), and not the royal guard?! … Now, should a pair (of) just any (soldiers)[48] come to me, you will break my heart!'

Often the force of the dissatisfaction expressed is such, that, assuming an appropriate social relationship as existing between the correspondents, it may have the force of a reprimand, often for past inappropriate conduct on the part of the recipient.

RS 18.038:13-16 « *ht* [*å*]*t špš bʿlk ydʿm l ydʿt ʿmy špš bʿlk šnt šntm lm l tlk* »,

'Now, as for [yo]u, indeed you have not acknowledged the Sun, your master! Year (after) year, why do you not come to me, the Sun, your master?!'

This category is particularly revealing for the relationship between morpho-syntactic form and pragmatic function invoked by speech act theory: in form many of these « expressive » messages contain utterances which are obviously interrogative:

---

[48]The construction « *ṯn ṯnm* », literally 'two, two' or 'a pair, a pair', is apparently an indefinite idiom analogous to the better known examples « *bnš bnšm* » and « *mnk mnkm* » in the juridical texts. See the other examples of this phenomenon (but not this one) cited in J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik*, § 89.26, pp. 830-831; and the first identifications of these constructions by S. Loewenstamm, *Lešonenu* 23 (1959) 76 (English translation in *Comparative Studies* [1980] 61-62), and M. Liverani, *RSO* 39 (1964) 199-202. A different interpretation was offered by the editors (P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, RSO 7 [1991] 142-150).

RS 16.264:4-21 « *lm tlỉk ʿmy ỉky åškn ʿṣm l bt dml* »,

'Why are you (continually) sending me (messages asking,) "How am I to provide the trees for the Temple of DML" ?! '

RS 29.093:11-19 « *w lm ṯb bn ʿyn w lqḫ ṯqlm ksp bd åmtk* »,

'Now, why has Mr. BN ʿYN again taken two shekels of silver from (me,) your maidservant!?'

In function, however, it seems intuitively unlikely that in any of these cases the senders really sought an answer to their questions. The obvious intent of such passages, despite there interrogative form, is disciplinary,[49] remonstrative,[50] or the like.

Not all « expressives » are interrogative in form. Many resemble, in terms of their form, « assertives »:

RS 15.098:8-10 « *l yblt ḫbṯm åp ksphm l yblt* »,

'You have not brought the *ḫbṯ*-personnel! Nor even have you brought their money!'

Often it is possible to deduce the pragmatic function of such formally ambiguous examples on the basis of context and intuition. In the message just cited, for example, since the information communicated was surely already known to the recipient, it seems evident that the pragmatic function of the message was to express the sender's dissatisfaction with the stated information, and not merely to assert its truth.

In other cases, however, the distinction between the two categories « assertive » and « expressive » is less intuitively evident:

---

[49]As in the case of contextually descending social situations.

[50]As in conceptually ascending situations.

RS 94.2284:34 « *l yd‘t lby k mrṣ* »,

‘You have not acknowledged that[51] my heart is sick!’

RS 94.2284:7-11 « *w lb åḫtk mrṣ ky … ṭbḫ ålp mrů w ỉn d ytn ly* »,

‘Now, the heart of your sister is sick, since … a fattened ox was slaughtered, but no one gave me (any)!’

In these examples, it is difficult to decide whether the sender genuinely wished to assert the truth of these propositions, or if she intended to communicate her own attitude about the situations described. In such cases, it is perhaps deceptive to attempt to define pragmatic function in a polar way, as either (i) asserting the truth of a proposition, or (ii) expresssing the sender's emotions. Rather, it may be more helpful in such cases to attempt to determine (i) whether a given message merely asserts the truth of a proposition, in which case it is best classified as « assertive », or (ii) whether it not only asserts the truth of a proposition, but also communicates the sender's emotional attitude about it,[52] in which case it is best classified as « expressive ». Whatever the case, this category remains one of the more difficult to define on purely formal grounds.

---

[51]Ugaritic, in both poetic and prose texts, expressed such notions in a particular idiomatic way: with respect to the situation that is or is not "acknowledged" (YD‘), its grammatical subject is fronted as the accusative complement of the verb YD‘ in an independent clause, while the predication follows in a subordinate clause. Thus, literally, ‘You have not acknowledged my heart, the fact that it is sick!’ It is important to distinguish this usage of the subordinating conjunction *k*(*y*) from that of a relative pronoun.

[52]Compare Searle's statement in *Language* 52 (1976) 970: "The problem of indirect speech acts is that of how one can say one thing, mean what one says, and also mean something more."

5.1.4.5 « Performatives »

Finally, « performatives » are messages in which the sender effects, by means of the message itself, instantaneous changes in the state of affairs described or named. In a natural speech environment, this category would group together speech acts such as declaring someone innocent, calling a base-runner "out", pronouncing a couple "man and wife", knighting someone, etc. In all of these cases, a spoken statement brings about, simultaneous with its utterance, a certain change in the state of affairs. In an epistolary context, however, the performative category is an especially problematic one, primarily because there, the simultaneous nature of utterance and act is difficult to establish. In my treatment of the prostration formula above,[53] I followed Pardee and Whiting[54] in admitting the existence of epistolary performatives, but differed from them in accounting for the simultaneous aspect of utterance and action, which is required, by definition, for performative utterances. My tentative solution was that epistolary performatives treat the real time interval between written expression *chez* the sender and comprehension *chez* the recipient as if it did not exist, or perhaps better, as if it resembled the interval between performatives in spoken conversation.

Whether or not this explication of the mechanics of epistolary performatives be valid, the existence of messages belonging to this category is another issue. This category is certainly the rarest of the five surveyed here, but I believe several valid examples exist.

The clearest comes, not from the body, but from the prostration formula in the polite formulas section:

---

[53]See above, section 2.5.

[54]Pardee and Whiting, *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 1-31.

RS 11.872:5-6 « *l pʿn ůmy qlt* »,

'At my mother's feet I hereby fall!'

A number of verbal usages in the body, however, are also very possibly performative:

RS 16.265:7-16 « *ỉršt åršt l åḫy … tn ks yn w ỉštn* »,

'I hereby make a request of my brother: … Give me a cup of wine so I can drink it!'

RS 94.2406:27-28 « *w gpm ʿdbm w l ʿrbt bk l ʿrbt* »,

'And (as for) the prepared GP items, (I hereby declare that) I do not guarantee you. I do not!'

RS 19.029:7-12 « *lm l lỉkt šỉl šlmy* [*b*]*d růš* ⌜*w*⌝ *ly l lỉkt ånk* ʿ⌜*m*⌝[*k*] … *šỉl š*[*lmk*] »,

'Why did you not send (me), by the agency of Mr. RʾUŠ [the messenger], an inquiry about my well-being?! [So then], as for me, I myself hereby send you no … inquiry about your well-being!'

In these examples, by means of the verbal phrases « *ỉršt åršt* », 'I hereby make a request'; « *l ʿrbt bk* », 'I hereby refuse to guarantee you!'; and « *l lỉkt* », 'I hereby send you no (message)!' the sender effects an instantaneous change in the state of affairs described.

5.1.5 One pragmatic function per message?

A great difficulty with the functional typology elaborated above arises in the case of long and complex messages. In order to classify the "message" as a whole, and not merely its component sentences, it is necessary that each message correspond essentially to one and only one functional category. For messages which consist of only one sentence this poses no problem. For messages which consist of several

sentences, however, the question is more acute, since it would appear that in many such cases the constituent sentences often represent distinct speech acts. If several distinct pragmatic functions are thus represented in a single message, how is the overall functional classification of the message to be determined?

S. Ahl's solution was the creation of composite categories, such as « message of information and direction »,[55] or « message of inquiry and direction ».[56] Such recourse to description may ultimately be the safest solution, but it also introduces what may be needless complications into the typological classification. Another tentative solution, which is offered here as a working hypothesis, is that by a shift of perspective from description at the sentence level to rhetorical strategy at the message level, it is possible to avoid composite categories.

The basis premise, which holds for many complexes messages that I have seen, is that the overall pragmatic function of complex messages is generally equivalent to that of the final speech act communicated in the message. In other words, the arrangement of arguments within the message followed a linear rhetorical strategy such that background information and supporting arguments are given first, followed, at the end of the message, by that utterance which best encapsulates its overall functional purpose. Should this hypothesis prove valid, a convenient means of determining the overall pragmatic function of complex messages is found in the analysis of the final independent clause.

---

[55]Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 96-97, 126-128.

[56]*Ibid.*, p. 129.

The message contained in RS 29.093:11-19, discretely separated from the adjacent parts of the letter by horizontal scribal lines, is presented here as an illustration. These lines subdivide neatly into four successive and distinct speech acts:

RS 29.093:11-12 « *hlny bn ʿyn yštål ʿm åmtk* »

'Here, Mr. Binu-ʿAyyāni is continually making demands of (me,) your maidservant!'

RS 29.093:13 « *w låk lh w kḥdnn* »

'So, send him (a message) and (therein) reprimand him!'

RS 29.093:14-16 « *w ånk ḥrš lqḥt w ḥwt hbt* »

'Now, for my part, I have taken on an artisan, and have repaired? the? house.'

RS 29.093:16-19 « *w lm ṯb bn ʿyn w lqḥ ṯqlm ksp bd åmtk* »

'So, why has Mr. Binu-ʿAyyāni again taken two shekels of silver from (me,) your maidservant?!'

The pragmatic function of these four constituent clauses of the message are easily identifiable as « assertive », « directive », « assertive », and « expressive », respectively.

In classifying the pragmatic function of these lines, there appear to be at least three solutions: (1) These lines contain several distinct messages, representing different speech acts, but all treating the same subject matter. (2) The lines contain a single message, marked off from its surroundings by horizontal scribal lines, which corresponds to not one, but to several different pragmatic functions.[57] Or, (3) the lines contain a single message which, despite its complexity, corresponds best to a single pragmatic function.

---

[57]In other words, this message represents a composite category.

While I believe that the problem remains unsolved, it appears best to me to favor the third possibility, that the pragmatic function of the message cited above is essentially « expressive ». The sender wished, above all, that her dissatisfaction be known; the preceding elements may be interpreted as reinforcing the sender's distress, which is the central concern here, either by supplying background information or supporting evidence,[58] and/or by proposing a tangible means of alleviating certain aspects of it.[59]

This question will be addressed again in the following section on micro-structure.

5.2 Micro-structure: introduction

The approach described above pays attention essentially to pragmatics, not primarily to semantics, nor even primarily to the grammatical structure of the Ugaritic passages. This is admittedly dangerous for a dead language, since the correct interpretation of pragmatic function must depend essentially on an intuitive comprehension normally accessible only through native speaker competence. While I believe that our modern understanding of Ugaritic, though it does not approach anything resembling native speaker competence, is in some cases sufficient to distinguish unambiguously between, say, directive, commissive, and representative messages, this is certainly far from being always, or even often, the case. In order to

---

[58]Both of the assertive utterances, « *hlny bn ʿyn yštål ʿm åmtk* » in lines 11-12 and « *w ånk ḥrš lqḥt w ḥwt hbt* » in lines 14-16, provide background information: the first supports the following directive, the second the final expressive utterance.

[59]The directive utterance « *w låk lh w kḥdnn* » in line 13.

proceed further, it is necessary to complement the study of pragmatic function with considerations of formal structure, a topic much more empirically accessible.

5.2.1 The pervasiveness of the formal structure « topic : comment »

In studying the compositional structure of Ugaritic messages, one is immediately struck by the pervasiveness of the *casus pendens*,[60] or fronted nominal clause, constructions. If defined in terms of information structure, the descriptive characterization of the function of such a pattern, by 20th century linguists and by medieval Arab grammarians, as « topic : comment »[61] and « *mubtadaʾ* : *ḫabar* »,[62] respectively, is accurate.[63] In fact, the most convenient means I have found of approaching the micro-structure of Ugaritic messages is through this dichotomy of « topic » and « comment ». The presence of fronted topicalizing elements is so

---

[60]The phrase used in German treatments of the subject is "Pendenskonstruktion"; see, for example, W. Gross, *Die Pendenskonstruktion im Biblischen Hebräisch* (1987); and J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), §94, p. 882.

[61]See the references cited by C. L. Miller, *Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew* (1999) 6-7, and esp. n. 15.

[62]Sībawayhi (8th century CE) discusses both terms as the two parts of *ʾal-jumla*^{tu} *l-ʾismiyya*^{tu}, the "nominal sentence", that is, one that begins with a nominal phrase and not with a verb (Note that this definition of "nominal sentence" is quite different from one that implies the lack of a verb, for which one may use the term "verbless sentence"). See G. Troupeau, *Encyclopédie de l'Islam* 7 (1993) 285; and H. Fleisch, *Encyclopédie de l'Islam* 4 (1978) 928, both of which cite the primary sources. The term *mubtadaʾ* refers to the "preliminary" information, while *ḫabar* designates the "new" information.

[63]The explicit comparison of these two terminologies (« topic : comment » and « *mubtadaʾ* : *ḫabar* ») is made by D. Michel, *ZAH* 7 (1994) 217; but such an identification is implicit elsewhere, as in Waltke and O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (1990) 76, n. 13, for example.

frequent that one may legitimately speak of systematic topicalization[64] in Ugaritic epistolary composition.

5.2.1.1 « Topic : comment » on the sentence level

The information structure « topic : comment » is very frequent in the epistolary corpus.[65] Its presence is occasionally clear and unambiguous, as in the following passage:

RS 4.475:16-19 « *mnm rgm d tšmʿ ṯmt w št b spr ʿmy* »,

'(As for) whatever news that you hear there, put (that) in a letter to me!'

More often, however, the syntactic separation of the « topic » and « comment » elements is graphically unmarked, and the presence of the structure is therefore ambiguous:

RS 29.093:11-12 « *bn ʿyn yštâl ʿm åmtk* »,

'(As for) Mr. Binu-ʿAyyāni(,) he is continually making demands of your maidservant!'

Finally, the role of the « topic » element is not limited to noun phrases; prepositional phrases or other adverbial phrases can also fill this role:

RS 94.2580:25-27 « *w l gtn w l klby* ⌜*kt*⌝ *lḥm tn lhm* »,

'Now, as for Mr. Gatênu and as for Mr. Kalbiya, give them a *kt*-jar of food!'

RS 15.008:14-15 « *ʿmny šlm kll* »,

'(As for the situation) with me, everything is well.'

---

[64]J. Tropper alluded to this feature in his study of word order in the divinatory texts in *UF* 26 (1994) 469-471. See now Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 94, pp. 882-884; and also D. Pardee, *EWAL* (forthcoming), section V (on syntax).

[65]Compare J. Tropper's treatment in *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), §94, pp. 882-884, in which ten out of the sixteen passages cited come from the body of letters.

RS 18.031:6-7 « *hnny ʿmn šlm* »,

'(As for the situation) here, with me, it is well.'

It should be clear from the preceding examples that the topicalizing element may fill various syntactic roles. One finds not only the grammatical subject as a fronted element, but also the direct object of the verb, the indirect object, and other adverbial modifiers. This favors, I believe, the present attempt at explaining Ugaritic message composition in terms of « topic » and « comment », rather than in terms of the word order of the sentence constituents.

5.2.1.2 « Topic : comment » on the level of two sentences

This brief introduction to the « topic : comment » information structure applies essentially to sentences, that is, to individual grammatically independent clauses. Sometimes epistolary messages are composed of a single sentence, as in RS 94.2580:25-27, mentioned above. Many Ugaritic messages, however, consist not of one, but of several sequential sentences. In these cases, the structure « topic : comment » may still be perceived, though the identification of the « topic » and « comment » elements must be transferred from the clause constituent level to a higher level of the hierarchical structure within the message. In other words, the information structure « topic : comment » may also be perceived at the level of successive independent clauses, with some clauses functioning as « topic » elements and others as « comment » elements.

The pattern may occur, for example, in a string of two clauses:

RS 16.379:16-18 « *hm ḫt ʿl w likt ʿmk* »,

'If the Hittite (delegation?) comes up, then I will send you (a message).'

Here, each of the two constituent clauses has grammatical integrity.[66] The particles « *hm* » and « *w* » function to mark the constituent clauses as « topic »[67] and « comment » elements, respectively.

5.2.1.3 « Topic : comment » on the level of multiple sentence messages

The applicability of the « topic : comment » information structure is not limited to messages which consist of two sentences. It may also apply to strings of more than two sentences:

RS 29.093:11-13 « *hlny bn ʿyn yštảl ʿm ảmtk w lảk lh w kḥdnn* »,

> ‘(As for the situation) here, Mr. Binu-ʿAyyāni is making continual requests of your maidservant! So send him (a message) and (thereby) reprimand him!’

It seems clear that this passage consists of two parts. The first consists of a single grammatically intact utterance: « *hlny bn ʿyn yštảl ʿm ảmtk* ». It is essentially « assertive » in terms of speech act theory; it asserts the truth of a proposition. The second part of the passage consists of two grammatically intact utterances: « *lảk lh* » and « *kḥdnn* ». Taken together, these two clause are clearly « directive » in pragmatic function: they elicit action from the recipient. The relationship between the two parts of this message seem clear: taken as a whole, the message must be considered as « directive », with the necessary background information provided initially, as « topic »

---

[66]I mean by this that the utterances « *ḫt ʿl* », ‘the Hittite has come up’, and « *lỉkt ʿmk* », ‘I sent you (a message)’, are grammatically intact and may stand alone; that is, they are “sentences”.

[67]Conditional clauses are, by definition, topic elements, though of a particular type: “In the event of the situation described by the following clause, « X », then the following comment, « Y », applies.”

information, in order to add weight to the request and to place the requested action in a comprehensible context.

Many messages, however, are even more complex. One passage from RS 15.174, for example, contains the following sequence of clauses:

RS 15.174:10-12 « *hnkt rgmt* [*i*]⌜*k*⌝*y l iIåk* [*ʿm*]⌜*k*⌝ »,

'Now then, (as for the fact that in a previous letter) you said (something about) [h]ow I do not send [y]ou (messages),'

RS 15.174:12-13 « *ʿmy* [*l š*]*lm* »,

'With me it is [not w]ell!'

RS 15.174:13-14 « *w lm* [*il*]⌜*å*⌝*k* ⌜ ⌝*mk* »,

'So, why should [I s]end you (messages)!?'

RS 15.174:15 « [*w t*]*šlm kspy* »,

'[Now, you] must pay back my money!'

RS 15.174:16-17 « [*t*]*t måt ʿmnkm w l ttnnnn* »,

'(As for) the [s]ix hundred (shekels which) you have,[68] now you must give it (to me)!'

Despite the uncertainty surrounding the correct reading of these lines,[69] the presence of several successive grammatically intact clauses is clear. More importantly, despite this complexity, two basic parts may be recognized: those which provide « topic » or preliminary information, and those which provide « comment » information. The three clauses in lines 10-14 are necessary background for correctly interpreting the « comment », which is communicated by the final two clauses of the message, in lines 15-17. A further point of interest here is the presence of the « topic : comment »

---

[68]Literally, "the [si]x hundred with you (m. pl.)".

[69]I have followed the essentials of the interpretation given by D. Pardee in his manuscript of *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 22.

structure on several levels at once: on the message level, as just described, but also on the level of certain individual clause constituents, as in the final sentence, for example. This multivalence is significant; it shows that the identification of a given element as « comment » on one level does not preclude its status as a component of a « topic » element on a higher level of the discourse structure.

The proportion of those messages which may be convincingly analyzed in terms of the functional sequence « topic : comment » is such that this pattern should be described as the most common information structure employed in the body of Ugaritic letters. It may even be worthwhile to advance a hypothesis which goes even farther: virtually all Ugaritic messages can be imagined as bearing the information structure « topic : comment », in that order. Where one element is unambiguously absent, it may be considered as implicitly present, or understood, from the immediate context of the epistolary discourse.

5.2.1.4 Stereotyped features within the pattern « topic : comment »

Granted that the information structure « topic : comment » may be perceived not only at the sentence level but also at the paragraph level, it becomes necessary for typological purposes to identify those aspects of the pattern which are more or less stereotyped in structure, since it is the identification and classification of such patterned elements which would provide the basis of an eventual structural classification.

In the first place, whatever the grammatical complexity of the message, the « topic » element precedes the « comment » element.

Secondly, there are, in fact, three, and not two, structural components within messages: (1) « topic » elements, (2) « comment » elements, and also (3) conjunctive elements which mark the boundary between the two other categories, as well as that between adjacent « topic : comment » sequences.

The respective function of each of these three elements is stereotyped: (1) the « topic » element provides preliminary or background information which facilitates the intended interpretation of (2) the « comment » element, which contains the linguistic expression of the main speech act accomplished by the message. (3) « Conjunctive » elements mark the boundaries between « topic » and « comment », as well as those between larger units.

Finally, at the clause level, the form of all three elements is stereotyped: certain formal patterns are typical of « topic » elements, others of « comment » and « conjunctive » elements.

5.2.2 Inventory of « topic », « comment », and « conj » motifs

Assuming that most or all Ugaritic messages exhibit the information structure described above, sometimes in nested hierarchical levels, and further assuming a certain formal uniformity among the grammatical markers of these elements, a typological approach seems very promising. The development of a full, mature typology of these three constituent elements is not possible here, given the constraints of this dissertation. It is possible, however, to offer a preliminary inventory of the main stereotyped structural features of each. Such could provide a basis for a future typology, itself a means of better perceiving, and better understanding, the micro-structural patterns within Ugaritic messages in general.

5.2.2.1 « Topic » elements

The following paragraphs discuss both the function and the form of topicalizing motifs in messages. Function is treated first, then form, with typical functions attributed to each form, where possible. The analysis is carried out on « topic » elements at the clause level; the typological classification of topicalizing elements at higher structural levels is not attempted here.

5.2.2.1.1 THE FUNCTION OF « TOPIC » ELEMENTS

Topicalizing elements convey a fair amount of informational content, namely, that background or preliminary information deemed by the scribe, or by scribal tradition, to be necessary and helpful in interpreting the primary message clause(s). Such « topic » elements situate the following comment in any several ways. They offer precisions and clarifications regarding virtually any attribute of the speech act represented in the « comment ». Such precisions and clarifications may concern

(i) persons,[70] (ii) places,[71] (iii) things both concrete[72] and abstract,[73] and even (iv) events and situations,[74] past and non-past, real or potential.

5.2.2.1.2 THE FORM OF « TOPIC » ELEMENTS

There are four main formal categories applicable to « topic » elements: (i) noun phrases, (ii) prepositional phrases, (iii) adverbial particles, and (iv) entire verbal clauses. The formal inventory of each is explored below.

5.2.2.1.3 THE DISTRIBUTION OF « TOPIC » ELEMENTS

As mentioned above, « topic » elements precede « comment » elements within messages. Even at the clause level, there may be one or several topicalizing elements prior to the comment:

---

[70]The person topicalized is typically the sender or the recipient, but third parties are also attested. As an example of this function, the topicalizing phrase « *ȧnk* » in RS 18.075:20' indicates that the following « comment » element (a request for a gift) concerns a particular person (*ȧnk*, 'me', a self-reference to the sender), and not someone else.

[71]In RS 29.093:11, for example, the topicalizing phrase « *hlny* » implies that the following « comment » element (a report on the activities of another individual) concerns a certain place (*hlny*, 'here', that is, where the sender is located), and not somewhere else.

[72]The topicalizing element « *ṯn ḫpnm* » in RS 17.117:16', for example, specifies that the following comment element (a directive to "Give!") concerns those particular objects (*ṯn ḫpnm*, 'two *ḫpn*-garments'), and not something else.

[73]By abstract things, I mean, for example, pieces of information. Compare the topicalizing phrase « *mʿnk w mnm rgm d tšmʿ ṯmt* », 'your account and whatever (other) word that you hear there', in RS 4.475:15-18, which implies that the following comment (a directive to put something in writing) concerns that particular piece of news, and not some other matter.

[74]All conditional clauses are topicalizing elements, communicating that the following comment applies in one particular situation, and not necessarily in other circumstances. In RS 94.2284:20-21, for example, the conditional clause « *hm ȧk⌈ǵ⌉ ỉqnȧ štt bhm* », 'If Ms. ʾAK□ has put the lapis(-beads) into them … ', is a topicalizing element: it specifies that the following « comment » element (a directive to dispatch the messenger) applies under the conditions described.

RS 18.031:10-13 « *ånykn dt lỉkt mṣrm hndt b ṣr mtt* »,

'(As for) your fleet, which you dispatched toward Egypt, that (one) perished at Tyre.'

In this passage it is a single item, a fleet belonging to the king of Ugarit, which is topicalized.

RS 17.117:16'-17' « *bl ʿly ṯn ḫpnm w tn ly* »,

'O my master, (as for) the two *ḫpn*-garments, give (them) to me!'

There are two topicalizing elements in this passage: the person to whom the directive is addressed is topicalized, as is the thing about which a demand is made.

Some passages, however, show more than two topicalizing elements at the clause level:

RS 29.093:20-22 « *w ṯn ʿbdk ṯmt ʿmnk … tn åkl lhm* »,

'Now, (as for) your two servants, there, with you, give … (some) grain to them!'

Here, the first noun phrase topicalizes the persons making the request, that is, the senders of the letter; the second topicalizes the place concerned; and the third the person concerned by the following comment, a directive to provide food.

RS 11.872:11-13 « *ṯmny ʿm ủmy mnm šlm w rgm ṯṯb ly* »,

'There, as regards my mother, (as for) whatever well-being (there is), return word (of that) to me!'

In this passage, the first phrase topicalizes the place concerned; the second the person concerned; and the third the piece of information concerned by the following comment.

5.2.2.1.4 TOWARD A FORMAL TYPOLOGY OF « TOPIC » ELEMENTS

The inventory given below concentrates on form, with occasional comments regarding function, as appropriate. The four main formal categories of « topic »

elements were identified above:[75] (i) noun phrases, (ii) prepositional phrases, (iii) adverbial particles, and (iv) entire verbal clauses. They will be treated in that order, with examples given for each. Where possible, the associated functions[76] attested for each formal pattern are identified.

5.2.2.1.4.1 Noun phrases

Noun phrases are the most frequently encountered « topic » elements in the Ugaritic corpus, and exhibit the widest formal and functional diversity.

5.2.2.1.4.1.1 Function

Fronted noun phrases serve to topicalize (1) persons, such as the recipient, the sender, but also third parties; (2) concrete things like objects, commodities, money, and even epistolary correspondence, anterior and ulterior; and (3) abstract things like well-being.

5.2.2.1.4.1.2 Form

Such a functional classification may be refined by close attention to formal composition. In terms of form, one finds the following types of noun phrase used as « topic » elements: (i) pronouns; (ii) common nouns and noun phrase, such as « REL » phrases, political titles, or indefinite noun phrases; and (iii) personal names. Examples of each are given below.

---

[75]See above, section 5.2.2.1.2.

[76]Any of several aspects associated with the « comment » may be topicalized; four such functional categories were identified above, in section 5.2.2.1.1: (i) persons, (ii) places, (iii) things both concrete and abstract, and (iv) situations, real or potential.

RS 18.075:20'-22' « *w åp* ***ånk*** *mnm ḫsrt w ůḫy yʿmsn ṯmn* »,

'Now, for my part, (as for) whatever I lack, my brother should have it loaded up there (and sent to me)!'

Here, the first noun phrase, *ånk*, is a 1st person pronoun, referring to the sender. Pronouns are frequently employed to topicalize the recipient as well:

RS 16.379:20-21 « *w* ***åt*** *ůmy ål tdḥ⌈ṣ⌉* »,

'And (as for) you, O my mother, do not be in state of agitation!'

Common nouns are also employed as « topic » elements, as in the following example:

RS 4.475:11-13 « *w* ***yd ỉlm*** *p k*[77] *mtm ʿz mỉd* »,

'And, (as for) the « hand of the god(s) »,[78] the dead are very numerous![79]

Two such common noun phrases are present in the following passage:

---

[77]There is no word divider between {k} and {m}; since the usage of word dividers elsewhere in this text is systematic, it might seem preferable to interpret the string {kmtm} as a single word. The adverb *kmt*, 'so also … ', however, appears elsewhere to be coordinate with a preceding *km*, 'just as … ', and I have found no other credible interpretation of the string *kmtm* as a unit. Since the conjunction *k* is sometimes not separated from the following word by a word divider, even in letters which make systematic usage of word dividers (as in RS 29.093:23, 25), it seems reasonable to imagine this possibility here.

[78]There is no evidence, apart from this passage (which, in any case, is of uncertain interpretation and therefore cannot serve as proof), for the existence in Ugaritic of a proximal local adverb *p*, 'here', as in Hebrew. Ugaritic generally, and Ugaritic epistolary discourse in particular, express this notion with the *hn-* and *hl-* sequences of adverbial particles; see J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 81.1, pp. 737-739. The conjunction *p*, on the other hand, of which the productive existence in Ugaritic is not in doubt, is quite commonly used in epistolary messages to mark the transition between « topic » and « comment » elements; see below.

[79]Literally 'they are very strong', reading */ʿazzū/*, a 3rd masc. pl. suffix conjugation form of the stative verb ʿZZ, 'to be strong'. The metaphorical extension of the semantics from 'to be strong' to 'to be numerous' is suppositional, and should be taken as a suggestion.

RS 94.5015:22'-25' « *w* ***špšm mlk rb*** *bʿly ydʿ ky šỉsp ȧrtṯb ʿprm ʿmnh* »,

'And, may the Sun, the Great King, my master, know that Mr. ʾAri-Teššub has assembled the *ʿApiru*-people unto himself … .'

In this case, both are political titles, and serve to topicalize the recipient.

Another very frequent type of « topic » element which incorporates common nouns is the « REL » phrase, also typically used to refer either to the recipient, as with the phrase *bʿly*, 'my master', in the example cited above, or to the sender, as in the following example:

RS 29.093:20-22 « *w* ***ṯn ʿbdk*** *ṯmt ʿmnk klt tn ȧkl lhm* »,

'And, as for (us,) your two servants, there, where you are, give them everything (they need) for food!'

Not all common nouns with attached pronominal suffixes are « REL » terms, however:

RS 4.475:15-19 « ***mʿnk*** *… w št b spr ʿmy* »,

'(As for) your account (of a given matter) … , put (it) in a letter (to be sent) to me!'

The same message also illustrates the use of an indefinite common noun phrase as a « topic » element:

RS 4.475:16-19 « *w* ***mnm rgm*** *d tšmʿ ṯmt w št b spr ʿmy* »,

'And, (as for) whatever word that you hear there, put (that) in a letter to me!'

This example includes not only an indefinite noun phrase, *mnm rgm*, 'whatever word', but also a following relative phrase which modifies it. Some other topicalized noun phrases are also grammatically quite complex:

RS 17.139:5-7 « ***lḥt šlm*** *k lỉkt ủmy ʿmy ht ʿmny kll šlm* »,

'(As for) the well-being letter, (the fact) that my mother sent (it) to me, now, with me all is well.'

Here the topicalized noun phrase is *lḥt šlm*, 'the letter of well-being'. The subordinate clause which follows, however, is also part of the noun phrase: the conjunction *k* nominalizes the entire verbal clause *lỉkt ủmy ʿmy*, 'my mother sent (it) to me', and this nominalized clause functions in a certain respect as an attributive adjective, modifying the antecedent noun phrase *lḥt šlm*.

Proper nouns such as personal names may also appear as « topic » elements. I have found no examples in cleft sentences, but the personal names in the following example are nevertheless fronted for topicalization:

RS 94.2580:4-6 « *hlny* ***klby*** *w* ***gtn*** *yỉt ʿmk* »,

'Here, (as for) Mr. Kalbiya and Mr. Gatênu (, they) are going[80] to come to you.'

5.2.2.1.4.2 Prepositional phrases

A fair number of « topic » elements in messages take the form of prepositional phrases. An apparent problem in treating this usage is the question of verbal rection: verbs associated with certain prepositional complements. In the following passage, for example, do the prepositional phrases function as « topic » elements, or do they represent the prepositional complement of the verb?

RS 4.475:5-8 « *l trǵds w l klby šmʿt ḫtỉ nḫtủ* »,

'Concerning Mr. Tarǵuddasi and concerning Mr. Kalbiya, I have heard (that) they were indeed[81] smitten.'

---

[80]I have no explanation for the use of the "short form" of the prefix conjugation (*yỉt* = */yaʾtû/*) in what is apparently an indicative context. Had the adverb *hlny* not been present (which topicalizes a locality; 'here' refers to the sender's location), a volitional interpretation of this message ('Let them come into you[r presence]!') would have been more consistent with the apparent verbal morphology.

[81]The construction clearly involves a cognate accusative. Assuming that the basic semantics of the verb ḪTʾ are 'to beat, to strike' (appropriate in this context; for etymological support compare

The combination of the verb ŠMʿ 'to hear' and the preposition *l* may or may not constitute an idiom: 'to hear (something, accusative) concerning (someone, *l*)'.[82] But even if it does, this does not affect the issue of the fronting of the phrase for purposes of topicalization. It is frequent, in fact, for grammatically "required" complements of the verb in the « comment » element to be fronted for topicalization. This is especially clear in the case of cleft sentences, as in one passage from the same letter:

> RS 4.475:15-19 « *mʿnk w mnm rgm d tšmʿ ṯmt w št b ṣpr ʿmy* »,
>
> '(As for) your account (of a certain matter) and whatever (other) word that you might hear there, put (that) in a letter to me!'

The fronted noun phrase is the accusative complement of the imperative *št*, 'Put!' Further, since the cleft structure clearly indicates the topicalizing function of the fronted phrases, it is clear that the question of whether a given phrase is or is not the idiomatic complement of the verb in the « comment » element has no bearing on the identification of the former as topicalizing in function. A given phrase can be both fronted for topicalization and the grammatical complement of the verb in the « comment » element.

5.2.2.1.4.2.1 Function

In terms of function, fronted prepositional phrases serve to topicalize (1) persons, such as the recipient, the sender, and third parties; (2) concrete things, (3) places, and (4) moments.

Akkadian *ḫatû*), a literal rendering would be something like '(with) smiting blows they were smitten (N-stem for passive voice).'

[82]Compare, for example, D. Pardee, *UF* 8 (1976) 270.

5.2.2.1.4.2.2 Form

Three formal patterns are attested: (i) « *ʿm* NOUN PHRASE », (ii) « *l* NOUN PHRASE », and (iii) « *b* NOUN PHRASE ». If the question of verbal rection, introduced above, is not essential for the identification of the information structure of a given message as « topic : comment », it is much more relevant to the choice of one preposition over another in determining the composition of the prepositional « topic » element.

5.2.2.1.4.2.2.1 « *ʿm* NOUN PHRASE »

The first preposition cited above, *ʿm*, is often attested for topicalizing a person, especially the sender or the recipient.

RS 18.031:6-7 « *hnny* ***ʿmn*** *šlm* »,

'Here, with me, it is well.'

In this situation report, and in the many examples like it, the prepositional phrase *ʿmn*, 'with me', topicalizes the sender. In addition, however, it also seems clear that the preposition *ʿm* is a grammatical complement of the verb ŠLM; the idiom is « ŠLM + *ʿm* » 'to be well for (*ʿm*, someone).'[83]

RS 17.139:7-9 « *ṯmny* ***ʿm ůmy*** *mnm šlm w rgm ṯṯb ly* »,

'There, with my mother, (as for) whatever well-being (there is), have word (of that) returned to me!'

In this formalized information request, and in others like it, the preposition *ʿm* marks the person concerned (the recipient) by the following request, which is about *šlm*,

---

[83]Compare Pardee, *UF* 7 (1975) 371.

'well-being'. Although the form *šlm* is probably nominal here, and not verbal,[84] the choice of this particular preposition for topicalization might have derived from its association with the root ŠLM in the verbal idiom.

RS 94.2479:7-10 « *tmny* ***ʿm ådty*** *mnm w rgm tttb ʿm ʿbdh* »,

'There, with my lady, (as for) whatever (piece of information there is), may she have word (of that) returned to her servant!'

In this example, unless one supposes a scribal error, the preposition *ʿm* is used without an associated verb or verbal root, to topicalize the person concerned in the following request.

RS 29.093:20-22 « *w tn ʿbdk tmt* ***ʿmnk*** *… tn åkl lhm* »,

'And, (as for) your two servants, there, with you, give … (some grain) to them!'

Here again, the preposition *ʿm* marks the recipient, whose action is solicited in the following request.

5.2.2.1.4.2.2.2 « *l* NOUN PHRASE »

Like *ʿm*, the preposition *l* is also used to topicalize persons. In addition to RS 4.475:5-8, cited above,[85] compare:

RS 34.148:7-8 « *w* ***lny*** *kn påt ʿm ml<k>t grgmš* »,

'And, as far as the two of us (are concerned), the border(-stone)s with the kin<gd>om of Carchemish are in place.'[86]

---

[84]The formal parallels in Akkadian make this clear; see below.

[85]See above, section 5.2.2.1.4.2.

[86]This interpretation follows that of D. Pardee, *Context* 3 (2002) 105.

RS 15.007:6-7 « ***l šmn*** *… p iḫdn …* »,

'Concerning Mr. Šamunu … , I will seize him … !'

Unlike *ʿm*, however, the usage of *l* is not limited to persons:

RS 16.264:17-18 « *w* ***l ʿṣm*** *tspr* »,

'And, as for the logs,[87] you must count (them)!'

RS 18.148:3 « *w* ***l ảnyt*** *tšknn* »,

'And, as for the fleet, you must prepare it!'

In these two examples, apparently the accusative complements of transitive verbs are fronted for topicalization, and marked with the preposition *l*.

5.2.2.1.4.2.2.3 « *b* NOUN PHRASE »

Finally, the preposition *b* is also attested in « topic » elements. Unlike *ʿm* and *l*, it topicalizes neither persons nor things, but places and moments.

RS 94.2479:5-7 « *hlny hnn* ***b bt mlk*** *kll šlm* »,

'Here, in the royal palace, all is well.'

The presence of *b* here instead of *ʿm*, especially in a motif as formulaic as the situation report, indicates that when a place rather than a person is topicalized, *b* is preferred over *ʿm*, at least for the complement to the stative verb ŠLM.

RS 18.040:9-12 « *ʿbdk* ***b lwsnd*** ⌜*ả*⌝*bṣr*[88] *ʿm mlk* »,

'(As for) your servant, in Lawasanda, I am watching over the king.'

This passage shows a fronted preposition phrase with *b* as a local complement to another verb, BṢR, 'to watch (over someone, *ʿm*)'.

---

[87]The noun is plural, so literally 'trees' or 'logs'.

[88]Reading with Pardee, *Context* 3 (2002) 104, n. 123.

A few examples of *b* topicalize moments rather than places:

RS 94.2406:3-7 « *hlny ånk … **b ym hwt** ånk b mlwm btt* »,

'Here, for my part … , on this day, I was lodging at MLWM.'

Here it is a particular day that is topicalized. A similar example probably also occurs in the following poorly preserved passage:

RS 16.402:14 « ⌜*w*⌝ ***b ym k ybt mlk*** … »,

'And, on the day when the king lodges … '

5.2.2.1.4.3 Adverbial particles

Adverbial particles are also fronted as « topic » elements in epistolary messages. Their functions and their form are considerably stereotyped.

5.2.2.1.4.3.1 Function

In terms of function adverbial particles as « topic » elements serve to topicalize location. More precisely, there are two main series of locative adverbs used in this way: (1) one which topicalizes a proximal locality, that is, where the sender is, and (2) another a distal locality, where the recipient is. Reference is made to the locality of a third party in only a few cases.

5.2.2.1.4.3.2 Form

The two main functional categories described above, proximal and distal, are echoed in two main formal categories: (1) those which represent expansions of the "proximal" particular base **han-* and (2) expanded forms of a corresponding "distal" base **ṯamm-*. The motif of reciprocal well-being presents a context, formally and

semantically symmetrical, which serves to confirm the classification and semantic analysis of these two series of adverbial particles as essentially proximal and distal.

5.2.2.1.4.3.2.1 *hln*(*y*) and *hnn*(*y*) in the reciprocal well-being motif

Working within the corpus of examples taken from the motif of reciprocal well-being, the proximal series presents the following formal variants.

RS 16.379: « ***hlny*** *ʿmny* [*š*]*lm* »,

'Here, with me, it is [w]ell.'

The particle *hlny* is one of the more common forms to appear in this slot, but other closely related forms also occur here:

RS 92.2005:9-10 « ⌜***h***⌝***ln*** ⌜*hn*⌝ *ʿmn šlm* »,

'Here, with me it is well.'

The writing *hln* is clearly to be related to *hlny*; but the presence of the final *-y* on the latter is difficult to explain. Either it should be interpreted as "enclitic *-y*", of uncertain semantic content, or as a historical spelling.[89] The word following *hln* in the example cited, *hn*, is also difficult to interpret. Since its primary function in prose texts is presentational, one wonders if it serves here to mark a sort of transition between « topic » and « comment » on a certain level: "(As for the situation) here—now then with me it is well."

A second pair of proximal adverbs shows the same interpretive problems:

---

[89]Assuming for the moment that rare examples of *matres lectionis* exist in the alphabetic Ugaritic sources (and this assumption entails a good many problems), the syllabic writing of the word *hlny* as {a-li-ni-PI} (Huehnergard, *UVST* [1987] 121) suggests that the {y} in the alphabetic orthography was not a *mater lectionis*. What is possible is that *hlny* and {a-li-ni-PI} both represent historical spellings, while *hln* represents a phonetic spelling (**hallinīya* as the historical form, and perhaps **hallinê* as its latter phonemic realization).

RS 18.147:6 « ***hnny*** *ʿmn šlm* »,

'Here, with me, it is well.'

Again, the formulaic and symmetrical nature of the motif of reciprocal well-being confirms that the semantics of *hnny* here must be closely related, if not identical, to those of *hlny* and *hln* in the preceding examples: a local adverb of proximity, to be contrasted with symmetrical local adverb of distance. Like the *hln*(*y*) series, this word too shows orthographic variation:

RS 92.2010:9-11 « *w* ***hnn*** *ʿm ʿbdk mid šlm* »,

'And, here, with your servant, it is very well.'

The same pair of explanations to this orthographic variation may be advanced here as well: either the *-y* on *hnny* represents an enclitic particle *-y* of uncertain semantic content, or the spelling *hnny* reflects the word's historical morphology while *hnn* reflects the word's contemporary phonemic realization.[90]

A final example may, in fact, belong with the conjunctive elements:

RS 94.2479:5-7 « ***hlny hnn*** *b bt mlk kll šlm* »,

'Here, now then, in the royal palace all is well.'

As above in RS 92.2005:9-10, the local adverb of proximity here is surely *hlny*. The following word, *hnn*, represents either a synonymous repetition or plays a role more akin to the presentation particle *hn*: perhaps marking, on a certain level,[91] a transition from « topic » to « comment ».

---

[90]That is, *hnny* may reflect a historical form **hanninīya*, but *hnn* a later phonemic rendering **hanninê*. On the basis of (i) the semantic equivalence of *hnn*(*y*) and *hln*(*y*) in these formulaic motifs, (ii) the probable syllabic evidence {a-li-ni-PI} for the morphology of *hlny*, and (iii) the general rarity of unambiguous examples of *plene* spellings in Ugaritic orthography, the possibility that *-y* in *hnny* represents a *mater lectionis* seems quite slim.

[91]At another level the following prepositional phrase is also topicalizing: "(As for the situation) here—Now then, (as for the situation) in the royal palace—All is well."

5.2.2.1.4.3.2.2 *ṯmn*(*y*) in the reciprocal well-being motif

The sequence of distal equivalents to *hln*(*y*) and *hnn*(*y*) shows a parallel orthographic variation:

RS 11.872:11-13 « ***ṯmny*** *ʿm ůmy mnm šlm w rgm ṯṯb ly* »,

'There, with my mother, (as for) whatever well-being (there is), have word (of that) returned to me.'

RS 92.2005:10-13 « ⌜*w*⌝ ***ṯmn*** *mnm šlm rgm ṯṯb ʿmy* »,

'And, there, (as for) whatever well-being (there is), have word (of that) returned to me.'

There possibilities for interpreting the -*y* on distal *ṯmny* are the same as those offered above for proximal *hlny* and *hnny*.

5.2.2.1.4.3.2.3 Proximal adverbs outside the reciprocal well-being motif

The forms inventoried thus far, proximal *hln*(*y*) and *hnn*(*y*), and distal *ṯmn*(*y*), are found in the motif of reciprocal well-being; but local adverbs are used as « topic » elements outside of this stereotyped motif as well. Of those forms just cited, only *hlny* is frequent in this function; *hnny* and *ṯmny* are, to my knowledge, not yet attested. As in the formulaic motif of reciprocal well-being, *hlny* in other messages topicalizes a proximal locality, that is, the sender's location.

RS 29.093:11-12 « ***hlny*** *bn ʿyn yštůl ʿm ůmtk* »,

'Here, Mr. Binu-ʿAyyāni is continually making demands on your maidservant!'

RS 94.2406:3-7 « ***hlny*** *ůnk … b ym hwt ůnk b mlwm btt* »,

'Here, as for me … , on this day I was lodging in MLWM.'

The form of the word with the short orthography is also attested in this function:

RS 94.2479:11-21 « [*w*] ***h!ln*** *… d znt ådty kllm štnt* »,

'[And], here, I hereby deliver in (their) entirety … (the commodities listed) … which (constitute) my lady's provisions.'

In some examples, it is not clear whether the semantic force of *hlny* is locative (proximal) or merely presentative. Given the clear evidence of the locative usage of this word, combined with the lack of any unambiguous examples of a presentative usage, it seems best to interpret the unknown in light of the known.

RS 94.2580:4-6 « ***hlny*** *klby w gtn yìt ʿmk* »,

'Here, Mr. Kalbiya and Mr. Gatênu are going to come to you.'

Finally, this extremely frequent usage of *hlny* as a fronted « topic » element may also provide plausible solutions to certain difficult texts:

RS 34.148:7-8 « *w* ***<h>lny*** *kn påt ʿm ml<k>t grgmš* »,

'And, <h>ere, the border(-stone)s with the kin<gd>om of Carchemish are (now) set up.'

5.2.2.1.4.3.2.4 Distal adverbs outside the reciprocal well-being motif

The distal counterpart of *hlny* in non-formulaic messages is *ṯmt*.

RS 29.093:20-22 « *w ṯn ʿbdk* ***ṯmt*** *ʿmnk … tn åkl lhm* »,

'And, as for your two servants, there, with you, … give (some) grain to them!'

This example is especially interesting because of the semantic similarity of two of its « topic » elements to two of the components of the formulaic information request, as in « *ṯmny ʿmk* », 'there, with you.' Not all examples of *ṯmt* function independently as fronted « topic » elements, however:

RS 4.475:16-19 « *w mnm rgm d tšmʿ* ***ṯmt*** *w št b spr ʿmy* »,

'And, (as for) whatever word that you hear there, put (that) in a letter to me!'

In general, the **han-* and **ṯamm-* series of adverbial serve to topicalize the location of the sender (proximal) and recipient (distal), respectively. When it is a third party whose locality is topicalized, another adverb is employed, *ỏṯr*. Unlike the particles surveyed up to this point, *ỏṯr* is not formed by particle accretion, but is originally a common noun, 'place'. Only two examples are known to me:

RS 18.038:33-35 « ⌜*ỏ*⌝*dm* ***ỏṯr*** *ỉṯ bqṯ w štn ly* »,

'As for a (qualified) man, (in whatever) place he be, seek (him out) and have (him) sent to me!'

The orthography of the following passage is non-standard, but the word involved is the same:

RS 15.007:6-7 « *l šmn* ***ỉṯr*** *hw p ỉḫdn …* »,

'Concerning Mr. Šamunu, (in whatever) place he (be), I will seize him … !'

5.2.2.1.4.4 Verbal clauses

Entire verbal clauses also appear frequently within « topic » elements, often playing syntactic roles similar to those played by simple noun phrases. The precise syntactic role of the clause was often, but not always, formally marked by a subordinating conjunction or some other particle prefixed to the clause. This rubric surveys the attested functions and forms of these clauses.

5.2.2.1.4.4.1 Function

Attested verbal clauses in « topic » elements show one of two functions. Either (1) they provide additional information about a preceding noun phrase, and thus

resemble attributive adjectives in function; or (2) they are nominalized such that the entire clause is treated in much the same way as a noun phrase, that is, as a unit. Unlike fronted noun phrases, however, such nominalized verbal clauses do not topicalize persons or things, but rather events or situations, whether these be real or potential, past or non-past. Finally, (3) a few verbal clauses appear to be idiomatic, serving not so much to topicalize a particular situation as to reinforce a following comment element:

RS 1.018:19-20 « *yšmʿ ůḫy l gy* »,

'May my brother listen to my voice!'

This verbal clause apparently draws particular attention to the requests which follow. It is, perhaps generally as well as in this specific instance, an idiomatic means of signaling a following « directive » message.

The most important of these three functional categories is the second, (2) those verbal clauses which are nominalized, and function akin to noun phrases, topicalizing an entire event or situation relevant to the predication in the following « comment » element. This clause may refer, locally, to an event or situation where the recipient is, where the sender is, or where a third party is located. The topicalized event or situation may be past, present, or future (or potential). Finally, contextually, it may be known or unknown to the sender.

5.2.2.1.4.4.2 Form

Subordinate verbal clauses in « topic » elements are either marked or unmarked. The various particles attested as prefixed markers include: (1) the relative pronouns *d* and *dt*, (2) subordinating conjunctions *k* and *ky*, and the related series *ỉk* and *ỉky*, and (3) the conditional particles *hm* and *ỉm*.

5.2.2.1.4.4.2.1 Relative pronouns

When verbal clauses in « topic » elements are governed by a relative pronoun, they almost always function as adjectival attributes of a preceding noun phrase.

RS 18.075:17'-19' « *mnm ỉrštk* ***d ḫsrt*** *w ảnk ảštn l iḫy* »,

'(As for) whatever request you have,[92] (for something) that you lack, for my part I will have (that thing) given to my brother!'

RS 18.031:10-13 « *ảnykn* ***dt lỉkt mṣrm*** *hndt b ṣr mtt* »,

'(As for) your fleet which you sent (to) Egypt, that (one) perished at Tyre.'

RS 94.2284:31 « *hn ksp* ***d ytnt ly*** … »,

'Now, (as for) the money that you had given me, … '

RS 96.2039:4-6 « *lḥt hn bnšk* ***d lqḫt*** *w …* »,

'(As for) the (letter)-tablet about that "man" of yours, whom you had taken, now … '

The attributive adjectival role of such verbal clauses closely resembles that of noun phrases used in similar constructions:

RS 17.434+:4 « *w šlm* ***d ḫw[t]k*** … »,

'And, (as for) the well-being of your country … '

RS 94.2284:28-29 « *ḥdm hyn* ***d znt*** *ly l ytn* »,

'Look! (As for) that wine which (was part) of the provisions, it was not given to me!'

5.2.2.1.4.4.2.2 Conditional clauses marked by *hm* and *ỉm*

While verbal clauses within relative phrases, surveyed above, function adjectivally, all of the remaining formal types of verbal clauses within « topic »

---

[92]Literally, 'whatever request of yours.'

elements function as noun phrases, topicalizing an event or situation instead of a person or thing. One of the larger formal categories within this latter group is the corpus of conditional clauses marked by the fronted particles *hm* or *ỉm*.

Both particles may be employed with either finite conjugation. The following examples employ the suffix conjugation:

RS 94.2284:20-22 « *w* ***hm*** *åkǵ ỉqnå* ***štt*** *bhm w grš bnỉl* »,

'And, if Ms. ʾAKǵ has put the "blue"[93] into them (the garments), then dispatch Binu-ʾIli!'

RS 34.124:20-24 « ***ỉm*** *… l b mṣqt* ***yṯbt*** *qrt p mn lỉkt ånk lḥt bt mlk åmr* »,

'(Now), if the city … was[94] not in anguish, then why, (after all,) did I myself send the message regarding the King of Amurru's daughter!?'

The prefix conjugation is also used in conditional clauses:

RIH 78/12:19-22 « ***hm ymt*** *w ỉlḥmn ånk* »,

'If he dies, then shall I go on fighting (alone)!?'

RS 15.007:8-10 « ***ỉm*** *mlkytn* ***yrgm*** *åḫnnn w ỉḫd* »,

'If Mr. Milkiyatanu says (so), then I will ḪN(N) him/it and seize (him/it)!'

In most cases, the employment of a particular conjugation is explicable in terms of standard prose usage, but in some cases the rationale for the usage of the suffix conjugation is not evident:

---

[93]The substance designated by the word *ỉqnå* is either blue dye, used with wool, or blue semi-precious stones, that is, lapis lazuli. Clear instances of both occur in Ugaritic; see del Olmo and Sanmartín, *DULAT* 1 (2003) 93-94. Whatever option is preferred, the passage must be interpreted jointly with RS 15.004:4-5 (*KTU*[2] 4.132) « *ktn d ṣr pḥm bh w ṯqlm ksph* », 'A *ktn*-tunic of Tyr(ian origin/style), (with) "red" in it, and its price is two shekels.' The mention of Tyre in the latter passage leads one to think of the dyeing industry.

[94]Literally 'sat'; or, possibly 'is/was sitting', if *yṯbt* is understood as a participle.

RS 16.379:16-20 « *w* ***hm*** *ḫt* ***ʿl*** *w lỉkt ʿmk w* ***hm*** *l* ***ʿl*** *w låkm ỉlåk* »,

'Now, if the Hittite (delegation) comes up, then I will send you (a message); and if they do not come up, I will certainly still send (you a message).'

RS 94.2284:27-28 « ***hm ỉbt*** *w åtn tn ḫpnm* »,

'If I perish, shall I then (be able to) give you two *ḫpn*-garments!?'

5.2.2.1.4.4.2.3 The *k*- series of subordinating conjunctions

The subordinating conjunctions *k* and *ky* are the most common means of substantizing verbal clauses. The resulting unit functions as a noun phrase, and may occupy any of the various syntactic roles that noun phrases occupy. In the following examples, the *k*(*y*) clause is the predicate nominative, and direct object, respectively:

RS 18.565:7'-9' « *w nʿm* ***k yd*** ***ʿ b*** ***ʿly rgm hwt*** »,

'Now, it is good that my master know (about) this matter!'

RS 15.008:6-8 « *ůmy tdʿ* ***ky ʿrbt l pn špš*** »,

'O my mother, may you know that I had an audience[95] with the Sun.'

Also like noun phrases, *k*(*y*) clauses are often fronted as « topic » elements, in which the situation or event described by the verbal clause is itself topicalized, as such. Within the epistolary corpus, one such type of event to which frequent allusion is made, and which is frequently topicalized, is anterior epistolary correspondence.

RS 94.2406:33-36 « ***k lỉk⌈t⌉ ʿmy*** … *w ht ånk rg<m?>t l pn mlkt* … »,

'(As for) the fact that you sent me (a message saying "X"), now then, for my part I have spo<k>en? before the queen … .'

---

[95]Literally, 'I entered into the presence of', or 'I entered before'.

RS 17.434+:5-7 « ***ky lỉkt bt mlk tḥmk*** *hln*[*y ḫ*]*rṣ ȧrgmny* [*ʿm*] *špš štn*[*t*] *w ȧt* … »,

'(As for) the fact that you sent your message to the royal palace, "Her[e], as for the [g]old (which constitutes) my tribute, [I] (hereby) deliver it [to] the Sun!"[96]—Now, as for you … '

RS 18.147:9-14 « ***ky lỉk bny lḥt ȧkl ʿmy*** … *w bny hnkt yškn ȧnyt ym yšr*⌈-⌉[…] »,

'(As for) the fact that my son sent me (that) letter regarding grain,[97] … now let my son prepare sea-ships, and let him […]!'

Often, these verbal clauses which topicalize past correspondence are placed immediately following noun phrases referring to the letters themselves. In these cases, the relationship between the noun phrase and the following nominalized verbal clause is reminiscent of the relationship between a noun and a following attributive adjective:

RS 18.140:21'-23' « *w lḥt ȧlpm ḥrṯm* ***k rgmt ly blym ȧlpm*** *ȧršt lk* »,

'And, (as for) the letter regarding plow oxen, (as for) the fact that (therein) you said to me, "The oxen are exhausted"—(Now), I had made a request of you!'

RS 17.139:5-7 « *lḥt šlm* ***k lỉkt ủmy ʿmy*** *ht ʿmny kll šlm* »,

'(As for) the well-being letter, the fact that[98] my mother sent (it) to me —Now, with me, all is well. '

---

[96]The structure « *hlny* (items delivered) … *štnt* »is a typical format for messages accompanying the delivery of goods; compare the same motif in RS 94.2479:11-21, « *hln* (list of commodities) … *štnt* ».

[97]Etymologically, the word means 'food', but contextual usage in the administrative and epistolary texts indicates that *ȧkl* was used to denote 'grain'; see del Olmo and Sanmartín, *DULAT* 1 (2003) 44.

[98]The translations given here and below for *k*(*y*) are intentionally literal, in an effort to emphasize the (morphological) fact that these passages involve the subordinating conjunction *k*(*y*), and not the relative pronoun *d*(*t*). A English translation with a relative pronoun is much more fluid: 'As for the well-being letter that my mother sent me … .'

RS 18.038:17-21 « *w lḥt ȧkl* ***ky lỉkt ʿm špš bʿlk*** *… špšn tʳủbˡd* […] »,

'And, (as for) the letter regarding grain, the fact that you sent (it) to the Sun, your master, … Now, the Sun is perishing … !'

RS 34.124:17-19-24 « *w lḥt bt mlk ȧmr* ***ky tdbr ủmy l pn qrt*** *…* »,

'Now, (as for) the letter regarding the King of Amurru's daughter, (as for) the fact that my mother is going to speak? (of it) in front of the city … '

RS 17.434+:14 « *… rgm* ***ky lỉkt bt mlk*** *…* »,

' … (as for) the message, (as for) the fact that you sent (it) to the royal palace … '

Past epistolary correspondence is not the only event alluded to in this manner. In the following passage, for example, it is apparently a past conversation that is topicalized:

RS 16.078+:1-3 « *w* ***k rgm špš … l ʿṯt***[***y w l***?] ***mlȧkt ʿbdh*** »,

'And, (as for) the fact that the Sun said (the following) to ʿTṮ[Y and to] his servant's messenger-delegation … '

Furthermore, *k*(*y*) clauses are used not only to topicalize events or situations in the past, but also those in the future:

RS 29.093:25-29 « *w* ***k ymǵy ʿbdk l šlm ʿmk*** *p l yšbʿl ḫpn l bʿly mnm ỉṯ l ʿbdk* »,

'Now, (as for) the fact that your servant is going to come to you[99] for (the purpose of) the "well-being (gift)",[100] now then, (for that) he shall indeed have a *ḫpn-*

---

[99]The verb M□Y 'to come, arrive' often takes *ʿm* as a complement in the epistolary corpus; compare RS 16.078+:8; RS 18.566:6'; RS 34.356:4; and probably RS 88.2159:16.

[100]In the formulaic motif of reciprocal well-being, Ugaritic *šlm* is used where the parallel formula in Ras Shamra Akkadian letters has *šulmānu*, both with the abstract meaning 'well-being'. Also in Ras Shamra Akkadian letters, the sense of *šulmānu* may be concrete, 'well-being (gift),' apparently even in texts of local composition, such as RS 17.354:10 (*PRU* 6, no. 150), where a list of luxury items (including garments, {túg GAD}) is characterized as {šul-ma-ni MÍ.LUGAL-ti}. Compare also RS 34.171:9'-10' (RSO 7 no. 20), also concerning garments, {2 TÚG}, *ana šulmāni*, 'as the *šulmānu*-gift' (cf. *l šlm* in the Ugaritic text here); and RS 34.141:13 (RSO 7 no. 32), with the same usage by Emariote scribes. RS 17.247 (*PRU* 4, p. 191) is not of local composition either, but illustrates this sense for *šulmānu* in the Hittite chancellery.

garment made for my lord —(It will be made from) whatever your servant has[101] (on hand).'

A further sub-class of the usage of *k*(*y*) occurs in citations of passages from anterior correspondence. Like the examples cited above, *k*(*y*) in these cases also governs the following clause or clauses; and the event(s) and situation(s) described therein are thus topicalized as a nominalized unit. The citations may be either indirect or direct; each is represented below:

RS 18.038:17-21 « *w lḥt ảkl ky lỉkt ʿm špš bʿlk* ***ky ảkl b ḥwtk ỉnn*** *špšn tủbd*[…] »,

'Now, as for the letter regarding grain, the fact that you sent (it) to the Sun, your master, (to the effect) that "there is no grain in your country" —The Sun is perishing!'

RS 94.2406:33-36 « *k lỉk*[*t*] *ʿmy* ***ky ḥš w lảk*** *w ht ảnk rg<mʔ>t l pn mlkt* »,

'As for the fact that [you] sent me (a message), (to the effect) "Hurry up and send (back a message)!" —Now then, for my part I have spoken before the queen … .'

Finally, the *ỉk*- series of particles should be included here as well, owing to their functional and etymological[102] similarity to subordinating conjunction *k*(*y*). Several messages include verbal clauses fronted by the particle *ỉky*, in which the event or situation described by the clause is topicalized as such. In terms of semantics, the prothetic *ʾ* may add an interrogative sense to the topicalized clause:

---

[101]As in other Semitic languages, possession in Ugaritic is expressed with the copula and a prepositional complement *l*.

[102]The particles *k*(*y*) and *ỉk*(*y*) appear to share a common etymology, the latter containing prothetic /ʾ-/.

RS 15.174:10-14 « *hnkt rgmt* [***ỉ***]⌜***k***⌝***y 1 ỉlåk*** [ˁ***m***]⌜***k***⌝ *ˁmy* [*1 š*]*lm w lm* [*ỉl*]⌜*å*⌝*k* ⌜ˁ⌝*mk* »,

'Now then, you said (something about) [h]ow (it is) that I do not send you (messages)

—With me it [is not w]ell! So, why [should I s]end you (messages)!?'

RS 16.264:4-8 « *lm tlỉk ˁmy* ***ỉky åškn ˁṣm 1 bt dml*** *p ånk åtn ˁṣm lk* »,

'Why are you sending me (messages) (to the effect) "How can I provide the trees for

the Temple of Damala?" —Now, I myself will give you the trees!'

In both of these cases it may be noted that the particle *ỉky* also marks the beginning of a citation from previous correspondence, indirect discourse in the first example, direct in the second. This usage also resembles that of *ky*.[103]

In a final example, *ỉky* is fronted to a noun phrase[104] rather than a verbal clause:

RS [Varia 4]:6-9 « ***ỉky lḥt spr d lỉkt ˁm t̲ryl*** *m hy rgmt* »,

'How about the letter-tablet that I sent to T̲aryelli —What did she say?'

The particle *ỉd* is seemingly used once in a manner quite like the subordinating conjunction *k*(*y*). This passage is included here for convenience:

RIH 78/12:3-7 « ***ỉd lỉkt ˁky*** *nplṭ ˁbdmlk … w lb bnk 1 yšqp* »,

'When you sent (the messenger) ˁAkkuya (with the message), "Mr. ˁBDMLK was

saved! … " Now, the heart of your son will not be seized[105]!'

---

[103]See above, this section.

[104]The verbal clause « *d lỉkt ˁm t̲ryl* », '(the one) that I sent to T̲aryelli', is a subordinate attribute of the noun phrase *lḥt spr*, 'letter-tablet'.

[105]The verb YPQ (or PQ, as a hollow root) means 'to acquire (acc., something)', so Š-stem should, in theory, be doubly transitive: 'to make (someone) acquire (something).' The present passage shows no accusative complements for the verb, so one might suppose it to be passive: 'your son's heart will not be caused to be "seized up" (by the potentially sad event).' Whatever the precise semantics, the expression apparently communicates the sender's relief at the good news that « *nplṭ ˁbdmlk* », "ˁAbdimilku was saved!'.

5.2.2.1.4.4.2.4 Unmarked subordinate verbal clauses

Finally, verbal clauses fronted for topicalization are occasionally unmarked. This is the case, for example, in the protases of some conditional sentences:

RS 29.095:9-12 « *hnk tšmʿm ʿdn* ***yštål ʿmnk*** *pm yqḥ bk* »,

'Now then, you shall listen to[106] the ʿDN-official.[107] Should he make requests of you, let him take from you (what he wants).'

It is also the case in some citations from anterior correspondence:

RS 18.140:21'-23' « *w lḥt ålpm ḥrṯm k rgmt ly* ***blym ålpm*** *åršt lk w ly* […] »,

'Now, (as for) the letter regarding plow oxen, (the fact) that you (therein) said to me (words to the effect) "The oxen are worn out" —I had made a request of you, but to me […]! '

5.2.2.2 « Comment » elements

This section explores the function and form of « comment » elements. Functional aspects are surveyed first, then formal patterns. As above with the « topic » elements, this analysis pays attention essentially to « comment » elements on the

---

[106]The idiom is often ŠMʿ + *l*, 'to listen to (*l*, something, someone)'. There is, however, a good deal of overlap between the prepositions *l* and *ʿm*,in epistolary prose as generally in Ugaritic, especially with verbs of motion such as M□Y and T̲B (see D. Pardee, *UF* 8 [1975] 288), but also with transitive verbs such as ʾRŠ and LʾK. If such an overlap be allowed for ŠMʿ, one might imagine a scribal error as having occurred here in line 9, due to haplography; perhaps read « *tšmʿ* <ʿ>*m* ».

[107]The word is used as the poetic parallel of *skn* in *KTU*[2] 1.12 II 52-53; its etymology has to do with storage (see del Olmo and Sanmartín, *DULAT* 1 [2003] 150-151). If the orthography *ʿtn* represents a variant spelling of the same function, one version of this title, *ʿtn ḫrd*, 'the ʿTN of the army', was born by Talmiyānu, a member of the royal family, in RS 15.008:13.

simplest, most basic structural level, that of the "sentence", or smallest grammatically intact utterance.

5.2.2.2.1 THE FUNCTION OF « COMMENT » ELEMENTS

It was supposed above[108] that each epistolary message corresponds essentially to one of the five categories of pragmatic function elaborated by the speech act theorist J. Searle. When a message appears to represent more than one category,[109] the successive speech acts therein may often be interpreted in a subordinate way, such that the first speech act(s) serve(s) primarily to reinforce or add credibility to the final speech act. It is usually this final speech act which communicates and encapsulates the pragmatic function of the overall message.[110] In complex messages and in simple messages alike, however, the identification of constituent speech acts in a message corresponds, in essence, to the analysis of the various « comment » elements. This correspondence is important for a study of form and function, and provides a link between macro-structure and micro-structure. Each « comment » element may thus be identified with one of the five speech act categories surveyed above: assertive, commissive, directive, expressive, or performative.

---

[108]See above, sections 5.1.3-5.1.4.

[109]Compare, for example, S. Ahl's category of « message of information and direction » (*Epistolary Texts* [1973] 96-97, 126-128), which corresponds to the sequence « assertive : directive ».

[110]In the example given in the footnote above (Ahl's category of « message of information and direction », *ibid.*), the first speech act, « assertive », serves to reinforce the second, « directive », such that the message as a whole is one of direction, in which the initial « assertive » provides background information.

5.2.2.2.2 FORMAL PATTERNS IN « COMMENT » ELEMENTS

In order to elaborate a workable formal and functional typology for « comment » elements, attention must be paid essentially to those components which are regular in distribution and patterned in composition. The most obvious of these is the linguistic expression of predication within the utterance: it is a necessary compositional element in terms of distribution, and its composition follows a small number of stereotyped patterns. Finite verbal forms are the most common: (1) imperatives, (2) verbs in the suffixing conjugation and (3) in the prefixing conjugation. However, (4) several other non-finite predications also occur, whether these be (i) quasi-verbal, such as verbal adjectives (participles), verbal nouns (infinitives), or particles which predicate existence; or (ii) non-verbal.

5.2.2.2.3 THE DISTRIBUTION OF « COMMENT » ELEMENTS

In many messages, the « comment » element is represented by a single verbal predication, usually at the end of the message, following the « topic » element(s):

RS 18.038:3-4 « *ʿm špš* ***kll mỉdm šlm*** »,

'With the Sun, everything is very well.'

RS 9.479A:12-15 « *ʿm ådty mnm šlm* ***rgm tṯṯb l ʿbdh*** »,

'With my lady, (as for) whatever well-being (there is), may she have word (of that) sent back to her servant.'

Some messages, however, contain two or more verbal predications within a single « comment » element. The relationships between these predications are diverse. The following passages, for example, illustrate examples of sequential, resultative, and *hendiadys* relationships:

RS [Varia 4]:15-18 « *w h⌈t⌉ åḫy … **yšål ṯryl** w **rgm ṯṯb l åḫk** …* »,

'Now then, let my brother … make (this) request of Ṯaryelli! And then return word (about what happened) to your brother … !'

RS 29.093:11-13 « *w **låk lh** w **kḥdnn*** »,

'So send him (a message) and reprimand him (therein)!'

RS 94.2406:34 « … *ky **ḥš** w **låk*** … »,

"Hurry and send (a message)!"[111]

Finally, a number of messages are more complicated in terms of their structure, containing several successive sequences of the « topic : comment » information structure. These are often related to one another in a coordinate way, but in some cases the relationship seems to be subordinate, such that the initial « comment » elements serve to reinforce or provide additional background information for the final speech act. In RS 15.174:12-17,[112] for example, the sequential verbal predications in the « comment » elements plausibly relate to one another in a subordinate way, leading up to the final « comment », for which the previous predications provide both supporting evidence or background information. In this case, the essence of the message, which concerns an unpaid monetary debt, is expressed in the final verb of the message: *ttnnnn*, 'You must give it!' Many clause sequences within complex messages can be interpreted in a similar manner:

RS 18.075:17'-19' « *mnm ỉrštk … w … **åštn l ỉḫy*** »,

'(As for) whatever your desire (is) … , I will have (that) given to my brother!'

---

[111]This clause is a quotation from previous correspondence.

[112]Cited above in section 5.2.1.3.

RS 18.075:20'-22' « *w åp ånk mnm … w ůḫy* ***yʿmsn*** … »,

'And for my part, (as for) whatever (desire I have) … , may my brother have (that) loaded up (for delivery) … !'

RS 18.075:23' « *w* [*ů*]*ḫy* ***ål ybʿrn*** »,

'Now, may my brother not abandon[113] me!'

Here, the final « directive », *ål ybʿrn*, 'Let him not abandon me!', encapsulates the essence of the message in typical epistolary hyperbole: as far as the sender is concerned reciprocal gift exchange with the recipient must continue.

The examples of complex messages cited thus far are essentially « directive », but other pragmatic functions are also found. The following example is « assertive »:

RS 11.872:14-15 « *bm tyndr*[114] ***ỉṯt*** *ʿmn mlkt* »,

'In (the city of) Ṯiyindara,[115] I am (there) with the queen.'

RS 11.872:16-17 « *w rgmy l* ***lq<ḫ***?***>t*** »,

'And, (as for) my words, she did indeed acce<pt>? (them).'

RS 11.872:17-18 « *w pn mlk* ***nr*** *bn* »,

'And, (as for) the king's countenance, (it) shone upon us.'

Finally, a « commissive » message may also be cited:

RS 15.007:3-4 « *ḥnny l pn mlk* ***šỉnk ỉtn*** »,

'Favor me before the king,[116] (and as for that) matter of yours, I will agree[117] (to it)!'

---

[113]The potential failure of the recipient to reciprocate in a gift exchange is here alluded to with a verb which means 'to burn', 'to destroy', and 'to abandon' in Ugaritic; see del Olmo and Sanmartín, *DULAT* 1 (2003) 212. Such hyperbole is common in epistolary discourse.

[114]The string {tyndr} should be read as a unit, as indicated by the scribal placement of word dividers, used consistently in this text.

[115]On this city, see the interpretation of J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 289; and the data collected in J. Belmonte Marín, *Orts- und Gewässernamen der Texte aus Syrien* (2001) 356-357.

RS 15.007:5-7 « *rʿ yšṣå ỉdn ly l šmn … p* ***ỉḫdn*** … », grant

'My colleague should have a *ỉdn*-announcement sent out to me, (and then), as for Mr. Šamunu … I will seize him … !'

RS 15.007:8-10 « *ỉm … yrgm* ***åḫnnn*** *w* ***ỉḫd*** »,

'If (my colleague) says (so), I will ḪNN him (Mr. Šamunu) and seize (him)!'

This message consists of a sequence of three « topic : comment » structures; in each it is an event as such that is topicalized. The overall function of the message seems to be contained in *ỉḫd*, 'I will seize (him)!' The semantic repetition here is typical in sequences of « topic : comment » units in complex messages.[118] Such parallelism also serves to reinforce the main communicative purpose of the message.

The subject of the structure of complex messages is difficult, and could be developed at much more length in a treatment of rhetorical strategy within epistolary composition, for example. It will not be explored further here.

5.2.2.2.4 A PROVISIONAL TYPOLOGY OF THE « COMMENT » ELEMENTS

The typology proposed here consists of an inventory of those formal patterns attested for the predication of the « comment » element, and an associated attempt to link these forms with the set of five pragmatic functions discussed above. Of the main formal categories within « comment » elements, finite verbal forms are the most

---

[116]Here the « topic » element is the first verbal clause, an imperative and thus a « directive » speech act. In terms of function, this sentence resembles a conditional sentence in which the protasis contains an entire verbal clause which topicalizes an event or situation. See above, section 5.2.2.1.4.4, and in particular 5.2.2.1.4.4.2.2.

[117]Literally, 'I will give'. Unexpected writings with the {ỉ} sign, as in *ỉtn* and *ỉḫd*(*n*), are among the orthographic peculiarities of this "non-canonical" letter.

[118]Compare, for example, the semantic parallelism between « [*t*]*šlm kspy* » 'You must pay back my money!' and « *ttnnnn* » 'You must give it!' in RS 15.174:15,17.

important and will be treated first, followed by those predications which do not contain finite verbs. Examples are given for each, with the associated pragmatic functions identified where possible.

5.2.2.2.4.1 Imperatives

5.2.2.2.4.1.1 Function

One of the most frequent formal patterns within « comment » elements are imperatives. In terms of pragmatic function, they are easily aligned with the speech act category of « directives ». The unique exception to this correspondence between imperative form and « directive » function occurs with imperatives of the verb YDʿ, 'to know', which are often used in conjunction with « assertive » and « commissive » messages:

RS 94.2406:5-10 « *… w b ym hwt ånk b mlwm btt … w* ***dʿ*** »,

'… Now, today I am spending the night in MLWM … . Know (this)!'

RS 94.2406:7-10 « *… w ʿlm ådnyh … w* ***dʿ*** »,

'… but tomorrow, (I will be spending the night) in Adana … . Know (this)!'

In fact, the frequency of this usage suggests that « assertive » and « commissive » epistolary messages were perceived as being special types of directives: directives to "know" about a stated assertion or commitment to act. This native perception does not, however, affect the theoretical integrity of assertives and commissives as categories.

5.2.2.2.4.1.2 Form

Imperatives are often formally ambiguous as regards distinguishing them from the suffix conjugation. In such cases their identification must rely on context:

RS 18.038:33-35 « ⌜*å*⌝*dm* … ***bqṯ*** *w* ***štn*** *ly* »,

'(As for) a (qualified) man, … seek (him) out and have (him) sent to me!'

RS 94.2946:5'-7' « *ḫpn ḥtṯ* … *bd yšn* ***št***[***n*** *ly*] »,

'(As for) the *ḫpn*-garment (in the style) of Ḫattuša … , have (it) se[nt to me] in the care[119] of Mr. Yašīnu (the messenger)!'

For "1st weak" verbal roots, however, imperatives are formally unambiguous:

RS 29.095:17-19 « *ḫpr ʿdn dd åkl m*⌜*ṭ*⌝*r* ***tn*** *lh* »,

'(As for) the ʿDN-official's rations, give him a *dd*-jar of the *mtr*-grain!'

RS 19.011:12-13 « *qrtn ḫlqt w* ***dʿ dʿ*** »,

'Our city has perished! Know (this)! Know (this)!'

5.2.2.2.4.2 Suffix conjugation

5.2.2.2.4.2.1 Function

In Ugaritic prose, the suffix conjugation is commonly used for actions and situations which are aspectually complete or situated temporally in the past. This usage corresponds to the « assertive » category of speech act. The expression of past complete actions or achieved states is the most common function attested for suffix conjugation forms in Ugaritic epistolary messages:

RS 96.2039:10-12 « *w ht hn bnš h*[*w*] *ʿmm åṯth btk* ***ṯb*** »,

'Now then, as for that *bnš*-man, he, along with his wife/wives, has returned (to) your household.'

---

[119]Literally, 'in the hands of'.

Other pragmatic functions, though less common, are known however: « expressives »; less frequently, « performatives », and at least one « commissive ». These functions are illustrated by passages cited below, in the following section.

5.2.2.2.4.2.2 Form

Suffix conjugation verbs are often graphically identical to other forms. Owing to this graphic ambiguity, they must be identified as such on the basis of context. Again, "1st weak" verbal roots provide typical examples:

RS 34.124:25-29 « *ybnn hlk ʿm mlk åmr w* ***ybl*** *hw mỉt ḫrṣ … l mlk åmr* »,

'(As for) Mr. Yabnīnu, he went to the king of Amurru, and brought him[120] 100 (shekels) of gold'

RS 34.124:29-32 « *w lqḥ hw šmn b qrnh w* ***yṣq*** *hw l rỉš bt mlk åmr* »,

'Then, he took oil in his "horn", and he poured (it) on the head of the King of Amurru's daughter.'

In the 1st and 2nd person, however, both of which are frequent in epistolary discourse, as well as in the 3rd feminine singular, suffix conjugation verbs are formally unambiguous.[121]

RS 94.2391:15'-16' « *w ånk qdšh* ***mǵt*** »,

'Now as for me, I have arrived in Qadesh.'

RS 15.008:6-10 « *ůmy tdʿ ky* ***ʿrbt*** *l pn špš w pn špš nr by mỉd* »,

'O my mother! May you know that I entered into the Sun's presence, and his countenance shown on me very much. '

---

[120]Literally, 'he brought … to the king of Amurru.'

[121]Context is still primary, of course: it is context that implies that a given word is a finite verbal form, and not a common noun, for example.

Thus far, all cited examples have been « assertive ». A number of suffix conjugation verbal forms occur in messages which seem to be « expressive » in function. Often, these are formally characterized by the presence of an interrogative particle, such as *lm*, 'Why?'

RS 16.402:22-24 « *w mlk bʿly ht* ***lm škn*** *hnk l ʿbdh ảlpm ššwm* »,

'Now, (as for) the king my master, why did he thus[122] impose upon his servant (the obligation to provide) 2000 horses!?'

RS 16.402:25-26 « ***lm l ytn*** *hm mlk ʿly* »,

'Why indeed did the king put[123] them (as an obligation) upon me!?'

RS 19.029:7-9 « ***lm l lỉkt*** *šỉl šlmy* »,

'Why did you not send an inquiry about my well-being!?'

It seems that in all of these examples, the sender is not so much seeking information as expressing his or her own emotional state of dissatisfaction.

« Performative » usages of the suffix conjugation are difficult to distinguish from « assertive » usages, owing to their formal identity and contextual similarity:

RS 16.265:7-16 « *ỉršt* ***ảršt*** *l ảḫy* »,

'I hereby make a request of my brother!'

RS 94.2406:27-28 « *w gpm ʿdbm w* ***l ʿrbt*** *bk* ***l ʿrbt*** »,

'Now, as for the prepared *gp*-items, I hereby refuse to guarantee[124] you. I refuse!'

---

[122]I am uncertain of the precise semantics of the deictic particle *hnk*. Other interpreters have rendered it 'that (thing)' or 'this (thing)'; see the bibliography in del Olmo and Sanmartín, *DULAT* 1 (2003) 344.

[123]Literally, 'give'.

[124]The idiom 'to guarantee (someone)' was expressed in Ugaritic with the verb ʿRB ('to enter'), with the person guaranteed referred to with a prepositional complement *b*. Thus, a more literal rendering of this passage would be 'I do not hereby guarantee you!'

RS 19.029:7-12 « *lm l likt šil šlmy … **l likt** ånk ˹m˺[k] … šil˹š˺[lmk]* »,

'Why did you not send an inquiry about my well-being!? … For my part (therefore) I hereby refuse to send[125] you an inquiry about your well-being!'

Finally, in one passage which occurs in a particular morpho-syntactic environment,[126] a suffix conjugation verbal form functions as a « commissive »:

RS 16.379:16-20 « *w hm ḫt ʿl **w likt** ʿmk w hm l ʿl w låkm ilåk* »,

'Now, if the Hittite (delegation) arrives,[127] then I will send you (a message); but if it does not arrive, I will certainly still send (you a message).'

5.2.2.2.4.3 Prefix conjugation

5.2.2.2.4.3.1 Function

Finite verbal forms in the prefixing conjugation present the most diversity, both in terms of pragmatic function and in terms of form. Credible examples may be cited for four of the five speech act categories: directive, assertive, commissive, and, less frequently, expressive. Only performatives are not attested with prefix conjugation forms.

---

[125]Literally, 'I do not hereby send'.

[126]The form occurs at the head of the apodosis of a conditional sentence, following the conjunction *w*, which marks the transition from protasis to apodosis. This environment thus resembles that of *wᵊ-qāṭaltí* forms in biblical Hebrew, which may also be « commissive »; see Waltke and O'Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (1990) 519-539.

[127]Literally, 'if it has come up'.

5.2.2.2.4.3.2 Form

As with the other classes surveyed above, prefix conjugation verbal forms are occasionally formally ambiguous, as with "1st weak" verbal roots. Their identification in such cases must rely on contextual criteria:

RS 18.040:18-19 « *w mlk bʿly* ***ydʿ*** »,

'Now, may the king my master know (this)!'

RS 94.2580:11-12 « … *ålp pḥm* … [*å*]*lp iqnỉ w ʿmy* ***ybl*** »,

' … (Now as for) the 1000 (shekels?) of red(-dyed wool) … (and) the [1]000 (shekels?) of blue(-dyed wool), let them bring (that) to me!'

The inconsistent use or absence of word dividers can also lead to ambiguity regarding a possible prefix conjugation form. In the following passage, for example, a lack of legible word dividers on this portion of the tablet allows at least two possible interpretations to the string {lnykn}, « *lny kn* » and « *ln ykn* ». The latter, of course, would yield a prefix conjugation form:

RS 34.148:7-8 « *w* ***ln ykn*** *påt ʿm ml<k?>t grgmš w ånnå ỉlåk b mlåkt ʿmk* »,

'Now, (if) the border(-stone) with the kin<gd>om of Carchemish is[128] not[129] in place, then (as for) Mr. ʾAnanaʾa, I will send (him) to you with the messenger-delegation.' [130]

Even when the orthography permits one to exclude the possibility of an imperative or suffix conjugation form for a finite verb, the formal question is still not

---

[128]Assuming in this case that *påt* is singular. There would in any case also be a problem of gender agreement between the verb as *ykn* and its grammatical subject *påt*, 'border (stone)', which is morphologically feminine. Perhaps the noun could take masculine agreement (del Olmo and Sanmartín, *DULAT* 2 [2003] 659).

[129]Interpreting *ln* as the negative particle *l*, with enclitic *-n*, of uncertain semantic content.

[130]A different interpretation of this passage was proposed above, in section 5.2.2.1.4.2.2.2.

settled for prefix conjugation verbs, since Ugaritic had at least three formal sub-systems, called "moods", within the broader rubric of the prefix conjugation. For convenience these will be referred to as « *yqtl+ø* », « *yqtl+u* », and « *yqtl+a* », respectively. Taking the verb YṢʾ as an example, hypothetical representatives of these three are, respectively: (1) *yṣỉ*, for */*yaṣiʾ/*, 'let him go out!', (2) *yṣủ*, for */*yaṣiʾu/*, 'he goes out, he will go out', and (3) *yṣả*, for */*yaṣiʾa/*, apparently similar to *yṣỉ* in being primarily volitional in sense.[131]

The frequent formal ambiguity as to mood is unfortunate, since there is a straightforward correspondence between mood and pragmatic function. The moods « *yqtl+ø* » and « *yqtl+a* » are directive:

RS 1.032:2' « … [*ả*]***l tṣỉ*** *b b*[*t*]*k* … »,

'Do not go out of your house!'

RS 94.2406:21-22 « *w ảt b pk* ***ảl yṣỉ*** *mnk ʿd mǵ*[*y*] »,

'Now, (as for) you, let nothing escape from your mouth until my arrival!'

RS 15.007:5 « *rʿ* ***yšṣả***[132] *ỉdn ly* »,

'May my colleague have a *ỉdn*-announcement sent out to me!'

The « *yqtl+u* » mood, on the other hand, is quite broad in terms of its function. It is employed frequently for « commissive » messages:

---

[131]The semantics of the formal pattern « *yqtl+a* » are still not well understood, but several unambiguous examples appear to be volitional in semantics rather than grammatically subordinate; see J. Tropper, *UF* 23 (1991) 341-352; D. Pardee, *JNES* 52 (1993) 314-17; and Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 73.26, pp. 455-457.

[132]This word division is not certain; equally possible is « *rʿy šṣả* … », 'O my colleague, have (X) sent out … !' in which the so-called "emphatic" form of the imperative (*qtl+a*) is used.

RS 17.139:30-31 « *hn mrṯ d štt* ***åšṣû*** *b ddtk* »,

'Now then, (as for) the *mrṯ*-plot that you planted,[133] I will have (it) harvested (and put) in with your *ddt*-pots!'

It is also employed frequently for « assertive » messages:

RS 94.5015:24'-27' « *… årṯṯb … w* ***yšdd*** *ḥwt ʿbdk* »,

' … (as for) Mr. ʾAri-Teṯṯub … , he is destroying your servant's country!'

Finally, « expressive » messages with prefix conjugation forms probably also employed the mood « *yqtl+u* ». In such messages the verb was often accompanied by an interrogative particle:

RS 16.264:4-8 « ***lm tlîk*** *ʿmy îky åškn ʿṣm l bt dml p ånk åtn ʿṣm lk* »,

'Why are you sending me (messages) (to the effect) "How can I provide the trees for the Temple of Damala?" —Now, I myself will give you the trees!'

RS 18.038:16 « *šnt šntm* ***lm l tlk*** »,

'Year (after) year, why do you not come!?'

In certain cases, prefix conjugation forms in a potentially « expressive » context contain no interrogative particle. Given the link between interrogative form and « expressive » function observed elsewhere, however, one might wonder if these forms were unmarked interrogatives. These too probably employed the mood « *yqtl+u* »:

---

[133]Literally, 'that you put'. It is possible that ŠT has a technical agricultural meaning here. The meaning of *mrṯ* is unclear; perhaps, in light of the preceding context, compare Akkadian *mērešu*, 'cultivated land'.

RS 16.402:27-29 « *w hn ỉbm šṣq ly p* ***l åšt*** *åṯty nʿry ṯh l pn ỉb* »,

'Now then, (as for) the enemy, he has constricted me![134] So, shall I now offer[135] my (own) women and little (one)s (as) tribute before the enemy!?'

RIH 78/12:20-22 « *hm ymt w* ***ỉlḥmn*** *ånk* »,

'If he dies, shall I then fight on alone?!'[136]

RS 94.2284:27-28 « *hm ỉbt w* ***åtn*** *ṯn ḫpnm* »,

'If I have perished, shall I then (be able to) give you two *ḫpn*-garments!?'

5.2.2.2.4.4 Predications not containing finite verbal forms

The corpus of Ugaritic messages also contains a number of comment elements in which predication is not expressed by means of a finite verbal form. Such non-finite predications include both non-verbal and "quasi-verbal" sentences. The latter category includes such things as verbal adjectives (participles), verbal nouns (infinitives), and particles which predicate existence or non-existence. These are "quasi-verbal" forms of predication since in some respects they resemble non-verbal sentences, but in certain other respects, such as form, function, or both, they are reminiscent of finite verbal forms.

5.2.2.2.4.4.1 Function

In terms of pragmatic function, non-verbal predications are generally assertive, but may also be expressive.

---

[134]Literally, 'he has had pressure put on me'.

[135]Literally, 'I will indeed put'.

[136]Literally, 'I will fight, (I) myself'.

5.2.2.2.4.4.2 Form

Non verbal predications take three basic forms: (1) particles which predicate existence or non-existence, (2) predicate nouns, and (3) predicate adjectives.

5.2.2.2.4.4.2.1 Predicators of existence and non-existence

Ugaritic epistolary prose employs two predicative particles, one which expresses existence and another non-existence: *ỉṯ* and *ỉn*, respectively.

RS 94.2284:10-13 « *w ṭbḫ ảlp mrủ w* ***ỉn*** *d ytn ly … hm* ***ỉṯ*** *d ytn l*[*y*] »,

'Now, a fattened ox was slaughtered, but there did not exist (anyone) who gave me (some)! … (May the gods curse me) if there existed (anyone) who gave me (some)!'

On a semantic level, such predications of existence are reminiscent of stative verbs in the suffix conjugation, also usually « assertive » in function, the state expressed in the case of the former being 'to be existent' or 'to be inexistent':

RS 19.011:10-12 « *ảp krmm* ***ḫlq*** *qrtn* ***ḫlqt*** »,

'Even the vineyards have perished! Our city has perished!'

This similarity may also extend to a formal level. At least one of these particles, *ỉṯ*, occurs in a form that is plausibly interpreted as bearing an inflectional marker[137] of gender, number, and person, as with stative verbs, following the morphology of the suffix conjugation:

---

[137]Compare Akkadian *bašû*, 'to exist', and Arabic *laysa*, 'to be inexistent', which are also inflected for person, number, and gender.

RS 11.872:14-15 « *bm tyndr*[138] ***ỉṯt*** *ʿmn mlkt* »,

'In (the city of) Tiyindara,[139] I am (here) with the queen.'

RS 16.379:12-14 « *hlny ʿmn mlk b tyndr*[140] ***ỉṯt*** »,

'Here, with the king in (the city of) Tiyindara (is where) I am.'

This morphological aspect is not shared by the particle *ỉn*, however. Its inflection is marked by means of pronominal suffixes:

RS 18.038:19-20 « *ảkl b ḫwtk* ***ỉnn***[141] »,

'(As for) grain, in your country there is none.' [142]

RS 94.2383+:6-7 « *tlt ymm k* ⌜***ỉnn***⌝[143] *ảkl* ⌜*b*⌝ *btk* »,

'(As for) three days (ago), (when you sent me the message) that there is no grain in your house, … .'

RS 94.2592:3'-5' « *w ảnk* ***ỉnny***[144] *ydʿt kl bnšm dt ḫbt tmn* »,

'Now, for my part, I do not know[145] (the names of) all of the *ḫbt*-personnel there.'

---

[138]The string {tyndr} should be read as a unit, as indicated by the scribal placement of word dividers, used consistently in this text.

[139]On this interpretation, see J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989) 289; and the data in J. Belmonte Marín, *Orts- und Gewässernamen der Texte aus Syrien* (2001) 356-357.

[140]Read {tyndr} as a unit; see the above footnotes.

[141]The morphology is /*ʾên*(*a*)/ 'there is not' + /-(*a*)*n*-/ ("energic" ending I) + /-*hu*/ 'him'.

[142]Literally, 'it does not exist'.

[143]In this case the pronominal suffix *-n* (-(*a*)*nnu*, 'it, him', < **-an+hu*) attached to *ỉn* is "proleptic" —It refers to the following word, *ảkl*, 'grain'.

[144]The morphology is /*ʾên*(*a*)/ 'there is not' + /-(*a*)*nna*-/ ("energic" ending II) + /-*ya*/ 'me'.

[145]Literally, 'it is not me (who) knew … ' or 'it is not me (who) is cognizant of … .'

5.2.2.2.4.4.2.2 Predicate adjectives

Some predications are expressed adjectivally:

RS 18.038:33 « *sprn* ***ṯhrm*** »,

'Our documents are uninscribed.'[146]

Owing to certain facts of historical morphology, such predicate adjectives are very often graphically indistinguishable from stative verbs:

RS 4.475:11-13 « *w yd ỉlm p k mtm* ***ʿz*** *mỉd* »,

'Now, (as for) "the hand of the gods", indeed death is very strong!'

RS 94.2284:7 « *lb åḫtk* ***mrṣ*** »,

'Your sister's heart is sick.'

RS 18.031:24-25 « *w ånyk ṯt by ʿky* ***ʿryt*** »,

'Now, (as for) your fleet, it is moored in Acco; (it is) denuded (of rigging).'

In terms of morphology and syntax, participles are also adjectives:

RS 15.098:11-14 « *w ht* ***lůk*** *ʿm ml*[*åkty*] *pǵsdb šmlšn w* ***tbʿ*** *ånk ʿm mlåkth* »,

'Now then, Mr. P□SDB ŠMLŠN is being sent (to you) with [my] (messenger)-dele[gation], but I am departing with his (messenger)-delegation.'

5.2.2.2.4.4.2.3 Predicate nouns

In other cases, non-verbal predications are expressed equationally, with predicate nominatives:

RS 15.008:13 « ***ʿtn ḫrd*** *ånk* »,

'I am the *ʿtn*-officer[147] (in charge) of the *ḫrd*-corps.'

---

[146]Judging from the word's etymology, the literal meaning is 'clean' or 'pure'.

[147]The writing *ʿtn* should perhaps be interpreted as a variant spelling of *ʿdn*, a person or group mentioned in the epistolary corpus. In one poetic text (*KTU*[2] 1.12 II 52-53), the phrase « *ʿdn ʿdnm* » is

RS 18.038:11-12 « *ht* [*åt*] *l špš* … ***sglth*** *åt* »,

'Now then, [you] (belong) to the Sun … . You are his property!'

RS 96.2039:8-9 « *w ht hn bnš hw b gty* ***ḫbṯ*** »,

'Now then, (as for) that *bnš*-man, (he is) a *ḫbṯ*-worker at my *gt*-rural estate.'

From a morphological and syntactic point of view, "quasi-verbal" usages of verbal nouns or infinitives belong here as well:

RS 18.031:21-23 « *w åklhm bd rb tmtt lqḥt w* ***ṯṯb*** *ånk lhm* »,

'Now, (as for) their grain, I took (it) from the chief (officer in charge) of shipwrecks, and I had (it) return(ed) to them.'

RS [Varia 4]:10-13 « *w ht åḫy … yšål ṯryl p* ***rgm*** *l mlk šmy* »,

'Now, (as for) my brother … , may he make (that) request of Ṯaryelli, namely, (that she) mention my name to the king.'

5.2.2.2.4.4.2.4 Prepositional phrases as predicates

In messages containing the particles *ỉṯ* and *ỉn*, the main predication is often expressed with prepositional phrases:

RS 16.379:12-14 « *hlny* ***ʿmn mlk b ṯyndr*** *ỉṯt* »,

'Here, I am with the king in (the city of) Ṯiyindaru'

RS 17.434+:31' « … *w pḥm* ***b bty*** *ỉn*[*n* …] »,

'Now, (as for) red(-dyed wool), there isn't [any] in my house […]!'

Such predicative usages of prepositional phrases also occur in non-verbal sentences:

---

used in poetic parallelism with « *skn sknm* »; such implies the plausible interpretation of *ʿdn* as a title, an interpretation which fits the epistolary examples quite well. On "phonetic" (as opposed to "historical") spellings which involve the signs for the dental phonemes /d/ and /t/, see J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000), § 33.112.52, p. 140; the writings *kd* and *kt* may also belong here.

RS 18.038:11-12 « *ht* [*ȧt*] ***l špš*** »,

'Now then, [you] (belong) to the Sun!'

RS 16.264:7-12 « *p ȧnk ȧtn ʿṣm lk ȧrbʿ ʿṣm* ***ʿl ȧr*** *w ṯlṯ* ***ʿl ủbrʿy*** »,

'Now then, I myself will provide you with the logs! Four logs (are the obligation) on (the city of) ʾAru, and three (logs) on (the city of) ʾUburʿaya.'

5.2.2.3 Conjunctive elements

5.2.2.3.1 FUNCTION

Ugaritic messages also contain a variety of particles which tend to convey little informational content, but rather mark lexically the transition from one section of the body to another. Such particles may be characterized as presentative, conjunctive, and disjunctive in function; they are operative on a number of hierarchical levels, from the macrostructure of the body to the microstructure of individual « topic » and « comment » elements. They typically introduce « topic : comment » sequences, as well as separate them from one another when adjacent. They also frequently mark the transition from « topic » to « comment » within a given message, and may even mark the boundary between the constituents of individual « topic » and « comment » elements.

5.2.2.3.2 FORM

In terms of form, this category includes those particles generally called conjunctions or disjunctions, such as *w*, *p*, and *ȧp*; as well as those considered as presentative particles, such as *hn*, *ht*, *hnk*, and *k*.

5.2.2.3.3 DISTRIBUTION OF CONJUNCTIVE AND PRESENTATIONAL ELEMENTS

None of these particles is a necessary element. This is clear from a survey of formulaic motifs in which the presence of such elements varies. The conjunction *w*, for example, occasionally marks the transition from topic to comment in the formulaic request for information regarding well-being:

RS 11.872:11-13 « *ṯmny ʿm ůmy mnm šlm* ***w*** *rgm ṯṯb ly* »,

'(As for the situation) there with my mother, (concerning) whatever well-being (there is), have word (of that) returned to me.'

RS 20.199:14-17 « *ṯmny ʿm ȧdty mnm šlm rgm ṯṯb l ʿbdk* »,

'(As for the situation) there with my lady, (concerning) whatever well-being (there is), have word (of that) returned to your servant.'

The presentational particle *hn* also irregularly marks this transition in the formulaic situation report:

RS 92.2005:9-10 « *hln* ⌈***hn***⌉ *ʿmn šlm* »,

'(As for the situation) here, now then, with me, it is well.'

RS 11.872:9-10 « *hlny ʿmny kll šlm* »,

'(As for the situation) here, with me, all is well.'

A third example is the presentational particle *ht*, which occasionally marks the transition from topic to comment following a stereotyped allusion to anterior correspondence:

RS 17.139:5-7 « *lḫt šlm …* ***ht*** *ʿmny kll šlm* »,

'(As for) the well-being letter (that you sent) … , now then, with me, all is well.'

RS 18.140:21'-23' « *w lḫt ȧlpm ḫrṯm … ȧršt lk* »,

'Now, (as for) the letter about plow oxen (that you sent) … , (now) I had (specifically) made a request to you (about them)!'

5.2.2.3.4 PRELIMINARY TYPOLOGY

This section represents merely a first step toward a more developed typology of these conjunctive, disjunctive, and presentational particles. As such, it consists of a representative inventory of the particles belonging to this category, and a survey of the primary functions of each.

5.2.2.3.4.1 w

The particle with the widest distribution and the broadest inventory of functions is the conjunction *w*. It occurs at the micro-structural level, linking constituents within « topic » or « comment » elements, for example:

RS 4.475:5-8 « *l trǵds* ***w*** *l klby šmʿt … nḫtů* »,

'Concerning Mr. Tarǵudassi and concerning Mr. Kalbiya, I heard (that) … they have been smitten.'

RS 15.008:8-10 « *ʿrbt l pn špš* ***w*** *pn špš nr by mỉd* »,

'I entered into the Sun's presence and his countenance[148] shone on me favorably.'

Another frequent usage is to mark the transition between « topic » and « comment »:

RS 18.075:17'-19' « *mnm ỉrštk …* ***w*** *ånk åštn l ỉḫy* »,

'(As for) whatever your request (is) … , for my part I will have (that thing) sent to my brother!'

RS 16.379:16-20 « *w hm ḫt ʿl* ***w*** *lỉkt ʿmk w hm l ʿl* ***w*** *låkm ỉlåk* »,

'Now, if the Hittite (delegation) comes up, then I will send you (a message). (Even) if they do not come up, I will certainly still send (you a message).'

---

[148]Literally, 'the face of the Sun'.

Finally, the particle can be employed at a higher level of information structure, introducing « topic : comment » sequences, or separating them from one another:

RS 16.402:22-24 « ***w*** *mlk bʿly ht lm škn … l ʿbdh ålpm ššwm* »,

'Now, (as for) the king my master, why did he … impose upon his servant (the obligation to provide) 2000 horses!?'

RS 29.093:11-19 « *hlny bn ʿyn … w låk lh w kḥdnn* ***w*** *ånk … lm … lqḥ ṯqlm ksp bd åmtk* »,

'Here, (as for) Mr. Binu-ʿAyyāni … , send him (a message) and (thereby) reprimand him! Now, (as for) me, … why … has he taken two shekels of silver from your maidservant!?'

5.2.2.3.4.2 p

The particle *p* is used less frequently than *w*, and seems to have been more highly marked on the semantic level. Its most common function, by far, was marking the transition from « topic » to « comment »:

RS 4.475:11-13 « *w yd ỉlm* ***p***[149] *k mtm ʿz mỉd* »,

'And, (as for) the « hand of the gods », the dead are very numerous!' [150]

RS 15.007:6-7 « *l šmn …* ***p*** *ỉḫdn …* »,

'Concerning Mr. Šamunu … , I … will seize him!'

The same usage is also found in motifs which resemble polite formulas:

---

[149]Unlike Hebrew and Phoenician, there is no evidence in Ugaritic (apart from this passage which cannot be considered as proof since its interpretation is uncertain) for a local adverb *p*, 'here'. Since, however, the existence of the conjunction *p* is well-established, and since that interpretation is applicable here, there is at present no reason to postulate the existence another word written *p*.

[150]On this interpretation, see above, in section 5.2.2.1.4.5.2.

RS 16.078+:17-19 « *mlk r[b bʿl]y* ***p*** *l ḥy np[šh ȧ]rš l pn bʿ[l] ṣpn* … »,

'(As for) the gre[at] king my [master], [I] am (continually) making [re]quests for the life of [his] "sou[l]" before (the god) Baʿ[lu] of (Mount) Ṣapunu … !'

As noted above, the information structure « topic : comment » was also extended to a higher level of discourse organization, one in which the « topic » and « comment » elements are each grammatically intact sentences. Here, too, the particle *p* marks the transition from « topic » to « comment »:

RS 16.264:4-8 « *lm tlỉk ʿmy ỉky ȧškn ʿṣm l bt dml* ***p*** *ȧnk ȧtn ʿṣm lk* »,

'Why do you keep sending me (messages) (to the effect of) "How can I provide the logs for the Temple of Damala?" —Now, I myself will give you the logs!'

RS 16.402:27-29 « *w hn ỉbm šṣq ly* ***p*** *l ȧšt ȧṯty nʿry ṯh l pn ỉb* »,

'Now then, (as for) the enemy, he has constricted me! So, shall I now put up my (own) wives and little (one)s as tribute before the enemy!?'

RS 29.093:25-29 « *w k ymǵy ʿbdk l šlm ʿmk* ***p*** *l yšbʿl ḫpn l bʿly* … »,

'Now, (as for) the fact that your servant is going to come to you for (the purpose of) the "well-being (gift)",[151] now then, (for that) he shall indeed have a *ḫpn*-garment made for my lord.'

RS 29.095:9-12 « *yštȧl ʿmnk* ***pm*** *yqḥ bk* »,

'(Should) he make requests of you, then let him take from you (what he wants).'

RS 34.124:20-24 « *ỉm … l b mṣqt yṯbt qrt* ***p*** *mn lỉkt ȧnk lḥt bt mlk ȧmr* »,

'(Now), if the city … had not remained in anguish, then why, (after all,) did I myself send the message regarding the King of Amurru's daughter!?'

---

[151]See above, section 5.2.2.1.4.4.2.3.

RS 94.2545+:30-32 « *w lb åḫtk mỉd* [*mrṣ*] ***p*** *bnỉl šḥš … w yqḥ t*[*ʿnk*] »,

'Now, your sister's heart is very sick, so hasten (the return) of (the messenger) Mr. Bini-ʾIlu, … and let him take (along) your reply (to this letter)!'

In a few passages, *p* is used on a "lower" level of textual organization, to mark precisions or contrasts within the « topic » or the « comment »:

RS 94.2592:12'-14' « *w ḫpṯ* ***p*** *mnm h*⌈*w*⌉ *w b spr štnn* »,

'Now, (concerning the composition of) the *ḫpṯ*-troop, (as for) whatever it (is), put it in a document!'

RS [Varia 4]:10-13 « *w ht åḫy … yšål ṯryl* ***p*** *rgm l mlk šmy* »,

'Now then, (as for my brother … , may he make (that) request of Ṯaryelli, namely, (that she) mention my name to the king.'

RS 34.124:10-12 « *lm tlỉkn ḫpṯ hndn* ***p*** *mšmʿt mlk ỉnn* »,

'Why did you send (merely) this *ḫpṯ*-troop, and not the royal guard!?'

In the *praescriptio* of one letter, the particle appears to mark the transition between address and salutation:

RS 29.093:3-6 « *… tḥm pnḥt w yrmhd ʿbdk* ***p*** *šlm l bʿlny …* »,

' … Message of Ms. Pinḥaṯu and Mr. Yarimhaddu, your two servants. Well-being to our master! … '

Since the canonical form of the verb in the salutation is *yšlm* and not *šlm*, however, the string « *p šlm* » may represent an idiomatic usage, such that « *p šlm* » 'and well-being!' is more or less semantically equivalent to *yšlm* 'may it be well.' If such were the case, this idiomatic usage should be distinguished from independent occurrences of the particle.

5.2.2.3.4.3 åp

Another particle which is fairly frequent in Ugaritic letters is *åp*. It probably shares a common etymology with *p*,[152] and its function in epistolary discourse is similar to the latter in many respects. Like *p*, further precisions within a « comment » element may be marked by *åp*:

RS 8.315:10-14 « *hnny ʿmny kll mỉd šlm* ***w åp*** *ånk nḫt* »,

'(As for the situation) here, with us, all is very well —Moreover, for my part I have rested.'

RS 15.098:8-10 « *l yblt ḫbṯm* ***åp*** *ksphm l yblt* »,

'You have not brought (me) the *ḫbṯ*-personnel! Nor even their money have you brought!'

RS 16.379:20-24 « *w åt ůmy ål tdḥ⌈ṣ⌉* ***w åp*** *mhkm b lbk ål tšt* »,

'Now, (as for) you, O my mother, do not be in state of agitation! Moreover, put no (worries) whatsoever in your heart!'

In each of the above examples, *åp* joined grammatically independent clauses within a single « comment » element. This usage also appears on a "higher" level of textual organization, between adjacent « topic : comment » sequences:

RS 18.075:17'-19' « *mnm ỉrštk … w ånk åštn l ỉḫy* ***w åp*** *ånk mnm … w ůḫy yʿmsn ṯmn* »,

'(As for) whatever your request (is) … , for my part I will have (that thing) given to my brother! Moreover, as for me, whatever (I want) … may my brother have it loaded up there (and sent to me)!'

---

[152]A number of particles appear in Ugaritic in two by-forms: the particle itself and with "prothetic ʾ". In addition to *p* and *åp*, compare *k* and *ỉk/åk/ůk*, and *d* and *ỉd*.

RS 19.011:8-11 « *åkln b grnt l bʿr* ***åp*** *krmm ḫlq* »,

'(As for) our grain on the threshing floor, he did indeed burn (it)! Even the vineyards he destroyed!'

Finally, *åp* is also used on a "lower" hierarchical level of message structure, within a « comment » element:

RS 94.2406:38 « *w dʿ k yṣå*[*t*] ***åp*** *mlkt* »,

'Now, know that even the queen has departed!'

5.2.2.3.4.4 ht

One of the most heavily used presentational particles in Ugaritic epistolary discourse is *ht*. Etymologically, it is likely related to the many other Ugaritic deictic particles composed from the particle base **han-*.[153] It is attested over twenty times, in nearly twenty different letters. Functionally, *ht* occasionally marks the transition from « topic » to « comment » within this information structure:

RS 16.402:22-24 « *w mlk bʿly* ***ht*** *lm škn … l ʿbdh ålpm ššwm* »,

'And, (as for) the king my master, now then, why did he … impose upon his servant (the obligation to provide) 2000 horses!?'

RS 94.2406:33-36 « *k lik*⌈*t*⌉ *ʿmy ky ḫš w låk w* ***ht*** *ånk rg<m*?*>t l pn mlkt …* »,

'(As for) the fact that you sent me (a message saying) "Hurry up and send (a message)!", now then, for my part I have spo<k>en? before the queen … .'

Even when the « comment » element is complex, *ht* may mark this transition:

---

[153]Presumably, the historical morphology of *ht* may be represented as */*hantV/*, that is, **han* + enclitic *-t*. Given the particle's adverbial function, the accusative case vowel /*a*/ seems appropriate; thus a plausible proposition for the word's phonemic structure is */*hatta/*.

RS 17.139:5-7 « *lḥt šlm k lỉkt ủmy ʿmy* ***ht*** *ʿmny kll šlm* »,

'(As for) the well-being letter, (the fact) that my mother sent (it) to me, now then, (as for the situation) with me, all is well.'

In this example, the role played by *ht* may also be understood on another level: it introduces the "micro-level" « topic : comment » sequence *ʿmny kll šlm*, '(As for the situation) with me, all is well.' This function, that of marking the transition from one « topic : comment » sequence to another, is very frequent and clearly attested in several passages:

RS 17.434+:12-13 « ***ht*** *hln ḫrṣ* [… *l*?] *štnt ʿmy ʿm špš štn* »,

'Now then, here, (as for) the gold […] you did [not?] have (it) delivered to me — Have it delivered to the Sun!'

RS 18.038:11-12 « ***h⌈t⌉*** [*ỏt*] *l špš … sglth ỏt* »,

'Now then, [you] (belong) to the Sun … . You are his property!'

RS 18.038:13-14 « ***h⌈t⌉*** [*ỏ*]*t špš bʿlk ydʿm l ydʿt* »,

'Now then, (for) [y]ou(r part), (as for) the Sun your master, you have not at all acknowledged (him)!'

RS 18.040:13-15 « *w* ***ht*** *mlk syr ns* »

'Now then, (as for) the king, he has hastened off to (the place) SYR.'

RS 94.2592:6'-10' « ***ht*** *ỏt kl bnšm dt ḫbṯ ṯmn by spr št w štn hndh ʿmy* »,

'Now then, (for) you(r part), (as for) all of the *ḫbṯ*-personnel there, put (their names) in a document and have that (document) sent to me!'

RS 96.2039:8-9 « *w* ***ht*** *hn bnš hw b gty ḫbṯ* »,

'Now then, (as for) that *bnš*-man, he (is) a *ḫbṯ*-worker at my *gt*-rural estate.'

RS 96.2039:10-12 « *w* ***ht*** *hn bnš h*[*w*] *ʿmm åṯth btk ṯb* »,

'Now then, (as for) that *bnš*-man, he, along with his wife, has returned (to) your household.'

This function for *ht* is also attested when the « topic » element is complex, being itself a grammatically intact verbal predication:

RS 16.402:30-36 « ***ht*** *hm yrgm mlk … w … bnš bnny ʿmn mlåkty hnd ylåk ʿmy* »

'Now then, if the king … says ("X"), then … , (as for) Mr. Bunaniya the *bunušu*, let (the king) send (him) to me along with this messenger-delegation of mine!'

RS 15.098:11-14 « *w* ***ht*** *lůk ʿm ml*[*åkty*] *pǵsdb … šmʿh* »,

'Now then, Mr. P□SDB … is being sent (to you) with [my] (messenger)-dele[gation] … . Obey him!'

RS 1.018:19-21 « [*w*] ***ht*** *yšmʿ ůḫy l gy w yhbṭ bnš w ytn ỉlm bdhm* »,

'Now then, may my brother listen to my voice: May he invest some personnel with the status of *hbṭn*-officials, and may he then entrust the two divine (statuette)s into their care!'

These passages also illustrate an extension of the function discussed above, that of marking the transition from one message to another:

RS 29.095:13-15 « ***ht*** *åt dbr hmhkm b l<b>k ål tšm* »,

'Now then, (for) you(r part), put no matter whatsoever on your heart!'

RS [Varia 4]:10-13 « | *w* ***ht*** *åḫy … yšål ṯryl p rgm l mlk šmy* »,

'Now then, (as for) my brother … , may he make (that) request of Ṯaryelli, namely, (that she) mention my name to the king.'

RS [Varia 4]:15-18 « | *w* ***h***⌈***t***⌉ *åḫy … yšål ṯryl w rgm ṯṯb l åḫk …* »,

'Now then, let my brother … make (this) request of Ṯaryelli! And then return word (about what happened) to your brother … !'

Finally, in at least one passage, *ht* is operative not on the clause level but on the phrase level. It occurs within the « topic » element, and presumably has adverbial meaning:

RS 34.124:20-24 « *ỉm* ***ht*** *l b mṣqt yṯbt qrt p mn lỉkt ảnk lḥt bt mlk ảmr* »,

'If the city has not remained in anguish, then why, (after all,) did I myself send the message regarding the King of Amurru's daughter!?'

5.2.2.3.4.5 hn

The particle *hn*, probably etymologically related to *ht*, is another common presentative particle in epistolary prose. Like *ht*, it often precedes « topic » elements, thus marking the transition from one « topic : comment » sequence to another:

RS 16.402:27-29 « *w* ***hn*** *ỉbm šṣq ly p l ảšt ảṯty nʿry ṯh l pn ỉb* »,

'Now then, (as for) the enemy, he has put pressure on me! So, shall I now put up my (own) wives and little (one)s as tribute before the enemy!?'

RS 17.117:3 « ***hn*** *ủnk bnk* »,

'Now then, (as for) me, (I am) your son!'

RS 17.139:30-31 « ***hn*** *mrṯ d štt ảšṣủ b ddtk* »,

'Now then, (as for) the *mrṯ*-plot that you planted,[154] I will have (it) harvested (and put) in your ***ddt***!'

RS 94.2284:31-34 « ***hn*** *ksp d ytnt ly … lm tšḫr* »

'Now then, (as for) the silver which you gave to me, … why are you spending? (it)!?'

This function is also attested in spellings of this particle which are "phonetic" rather than etymological:

---

[154]For this interpretation, see above, in section 5.2.2.2.4.3.2.

RS 17.063:8-9 « ***h*** *tlṯ lg rqḥ* […] *štn tzn åḥd ly* »,

'Now then, (as for) the three *lg*-jars of perfume(d oil) […], have one (of them) given to me (as part of my) provisioning.'

RS 94.2284:28-29 « *ḥdm* ***h*** *yn d znt ly l ytn* »,

'Look! Now then, (as for) the provision-wine, they did not give (it) to me!'

In addition to these usages, which operate on the clause level, *hn* also functions on the phrasal level, apparently as a lexical marker of definiteness with noun phrases:

RS 96.2039:4-6 « *lḥt* ***hn*** *bnšk d lqḥt w …* »,

'(As for) the (letter)-tablet (about) that "man" of yours, whom you had taken, now … '

RS 96.2039:8-9 « *w ht* ***hn*** *bnš hw b gty ḫbṯ* »,

'Now then, (as for) that *bnš*-man, he (is) a *ḫbṯ*-worker at my *gt*-rural estate.'

RS 96.2039:10-12 « *w ht* ***hn*** *bnš h*[*w*] *ʿmm åṯth btk ṯb* »,

'Now then, (as for) that *bnš*-man, he, along with his wife, has returned (to) your household.'

RS 16.402:31-32 « *tmǵyy* ***hn*** *ålpm ššwm hnd* »,

'You will bring me those two thousand horses!'

This usage, too, of the particle is possibly also attested in "phonetic" spellings, providing a plausible explanation of the origin of the preposed definite article *h*- as it later developed in Phoenician and Hebrew:

RS 29.093:14-16 « *w ånk ḥrš lqḥt w ḥwt* ***h****bt* »,

'Now, for my part, I have taken on an artisan and have renovated[155] the! house.'

RS 29.095:13-15 « *ht åt dbr* ***h****mhkm b l<b>k ål tšm* »,

'Now then, (for) you(r part), put no matter whatsoever on your heart!'

---

[155]Literally, 'I have brought (the house) back to life'.

5.2.2.3.4.6 Other particles

Several other particles are used occasionally to mark relationships between « topic » and « comment » elements, and between adjacent « topic : comment » sequences. Their distribution is markedly less frequent than the particles already surveyed, and they are therefore treated here collectively. Two categories are reasonably well represented: (1) deictic particles containing the sequence *hnk-*, and (2) imperative forms of the verb ḤDY, 'to look, see.'

The function of the latter is fairly straightforward: imperatives meaning 'Look!' are used as presentative particles introducing « topic » elements, and thus functioning as a marker of the transition from one « topic : comment » sequence to another:

RS 94.2284:28-29 « ***ḥdm*** *hyn d znt ly l ytn* »,

'Look! (As for) that wine which (was part) of the provisions, it was not given to me!'

RIH 77/01:8'-9' « ***ḥd*** *hlny … bnš bỉr*[*t* …] »,

'Look! Here, … the men of Beirut … '

The function of the former category is more difficult to define. That Ugaritic made productive use of demonstrative adjectives formed from the base *hnd* is well known. Such adjectives follow standard adjectival syntax when used attributively: they follow the noun modified. None of the occurrences of *hnk* or *hnkt* is attributive. Furthermore, since the *hnd* series of demonstrative adjectives may also be used as demonstrative pronouns: 'this (one)', 'these (ones)', etc., it is also striking that there are no unambiguous examples of *hnk* or *hnkt* which illustrate a corresponding usage: all

putative examples may also be interpreted adverbially. These factors lend credibility to K. Aartun's proposal to interpret *hnk* and *hnkt* as presentative particles.[156]

Such a view is applicable to a few of the usages of the particles *hnk* and *hnkt* in messages. In some cases, *hnk* and *hnkt* appear to mark the transition between adjacent « topic : comment » sequences, much like the similar function observed for *hn* and *ht*:

RS 29.095:9-12 « ***hnk*** *tšmʿm ʿdn yštâl ʿmnk pm yqḥ bk* »,

'Now then, you shall obey the *ʿdn*-official. Should he make requests of you, let him take from you (what he wants).'

RS 15.174:10-12 « ***hnkt*** *rgmt* [*i*]⌜*k*⌝*y l ilâk* [*ʿm*]⌜*k*⌝ *ʿmy* [*l š*]*lm w lm* [*il*]⌜*â*⌝*k*⌜ ⌝*mk* »,

'Now then, (as for the fact that in a previous letter) you said (something regarding) [h]ow (it is that) I do not send [y]ou (messages) —With me it is [not w]ell! So, why should [I s]end you (messages)!?'

Also like *ht* and *hn*, *hnk* and *hnkt* appear to operative on the phrasal level. In such cases, they may have an adverbial sense:

RS 16.402:22-24 « *w mlk bʿly ht lm škn* ***hnk*** *l ʿbdh âlpm ššwm* »,

'Now, (as for) the king my master, why did he thus? impose upon his servant (the obligation to provide) 2000 horses!?'

RS 18.147:9-14 « *ky lik bny lḥt âkl ʿmy … w bny* ***hnkt*** *yškn ânyt ym yšr*⌜-⌝[…] »,

'(As for) the fact that my son sent me (that) letter (about) grain, … now (as for my son), let him thus? prepare sea(-going) ships, and let him […]!'

RS 94.5015:10-11 « *âp* ***hnkt*** ⌜*l k*⌝*nt mlḥmt b ḥwt ʿbdk* »,

'And thus? there was no war in your servant's country!'

---

[156]Aartun, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen* 1 (1974) 70.

The infrequent number of attestations of these particles in clear contexts prevents further comprehension of their function.

5.3 THE MOTIF OF RECIPROCAL WELL-BEING

5.3.1 Introduction

Within the corpus of Ugaritic messages are two motifs which are sufficiently stereotyped in composition and regular in distribution as to be amenable to a treatment similar to that applied to the formulas of the epistolary *praescriptio* in the preceding sections. The two motifs are (1) an « assertive » message, consisting of a positive statement about the sender's well-being, and (2) a « directive » message, containing a request for information regarding the well-being of the recipient. For convenience, these two motifs are referred to in abbreviated form: « S.R. » for "situation report", and « I.R. » for "information request".[157] The following passages represent typical examples:

RS 18.038:3-4 « *ʿm špš kll mḫdm šlm* »,

'With the Sun, all is very well.'

RS 9.479A:12-15 « *ʿm ȧdty mnm šlm rgm tṯb l ʿbdh* »,

'With my lady, (as for) whatever well-being (there is), may she have word (of that) returned to her servant!'

Furthermore, more often than not these two motifs are joined:

---

[157]The message contained in RS 19.029:7-13 probably expresses the sender's dissatisfaction about the explicit absence of an « I.R. » motif from a previous letter sent by the recipient: « *lm l lḫkt šỉl šlmy … l lḫkt ȧnk* ˹*m*˺[*k*] … *šỉl*˹*š*˺[*lmk*] », 'Why did you not send an inquiry about my well-being!? … For my part (therefore) I hereby refuse to send [you] an inquiry about [your] we[ll-being]!' Assuming the accuracy of this interpretation, this passage provides a native Ugaritic allusion to the motif: it is called « *šỉl šlm* », 'an inquiry about (someone's) well-being.'

RS 11.872:9-13 « *hlny ʿmny kll šlm tmny ʿm ủmy mnm šlm w rgm ttb ly* »,

'Here, with me, all is well. There, with my mother, (as for) whatever well-being (there is), have word (of that) returned to me!'

RS 34.124:7-9 « *hnny ʿmn šl[m kl]l tmny ʿmk mnm šlm rgm tt<b> ly* »,

'Here, with me, [al]l is we[ll]. There, with you, (as for) whatever well-being (there is), have word (of that) retu<rn>ed to me!'

These two motifs were not only frequently joined in this manner, but they were also very often separated from adjacent sections of the letter by horizontal scribal lines, as in the two examples cited above. This testifies to their conceptual unity, at least in the minds of a good number of Ugaritian scribes. The sequence « S.R. I.R. » is thus not merely a double formula, but also a double message, « assertive directive », with integrity as a stereotyped unit of epistolary composition. The discussion in this section centers on this formulaic pair of message motifs, here referred to collectively as the "(double) motif of reciprocal well-being".[158]

---

[158]The name(s) given to these motifs depend naturally on one's grammatical understanding. O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 19, referred to the motifs here called « S.R. I.R. » as "die Frage nach seinem Wohlergehen und die Bitte um Auskunft." In her dissertation, S. Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973), refers to « S.R. » as the "Situation Report", containing a "Report of the Well-Being of the Sender" (pp. 84-88, 120-125) and to « I.R. » as a "Request for Information about Well-being of Recipient." (*ibid.*). A. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 153-156, speaks of the "Well-being of Sender" and "Well-being of addressee" formulas. A. Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979), col. 1413, is probably alluding to the double motif « S.R. I.R. » (among other "salutations") when he speaks of "ces expressions conventionelles de politesse" in Ugaritic letters; compare also col. 1415: " … une autre formule conventionelle venant en supplément, par laquelle l'expéditeur fait part au destinataire de sa bonne santé « ici, chez nous » et souhaite que « là bas », chez son correspondant, tout aille bien." J.-L. Cunchillos, *TO* 2 (1989), perceives the "structure dialogique" of these two motifs (p. 257), describes « S.R. » as a motif in which "l'expéditeur donne des nouvelles de son environment" (p. 258), and « I.R. » as "l'expression d'un souhait de la part de l'expéditeur « que tout aille bien auprès de N » … (p. 259)." The author's treatment in *HUS* (1999) 365-366, presents similar views. D. Pardee refers to the sequence « S.R. I.R. » as "la double formule d'état de bien être des correspondants" in *Studi Fronzaroli* (forthcoming), and in the manuscript to his *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), ch. 8 (RS 8.315), remarques épistolographiques: the individual components, « S.R. » and « I.R. » are called, respectively, "le rapport sur l'état de l'expéditeur" and "la demande de retour de nouvelles sur l'état du destinataire."

Some of the scribes who composed letters in Ugaritic seem to have conceived of the sequence « S.R. I.R. » as a "polite formula" since they physically grouped the double motif together with other polite formulas by means of horizontal scribal lines.[159] This is important since it represents a native perception of Ugaritic epistolary structure, and one that is apparently at odds with the analysis proposed here. A host of arguments, however, converge against grouping the motif of reciprocal well-being with the polite formulas. In the first place, (1) as observed above,[160] it is the presence of scribal lines that is important, and not necessarily their absence: the presence of a scribal line indicates that a structural break was perceived,[161] while the absence of a line has no such implications.[162]

(2) The motif « S.R. I.R. » always follows the polite formulas, and never precedes them.[163] In one case, intervening messages separate the polite formulas from the « S.R. I.R. » motif.[164]

---

[159]Compare, for example, RS 18.031:4-9 « | sal ben S.R. I.R. | », perhaps RS 20.199:4-17 « | pros sal ben S.R. I.R. | », RS 29.095:3-8 « | sal ben S.R. I.R. | », and RS 92.2005:6-13 « | sal ben S.R. I.R. | ».

[160]See above, section 0.3.3.2.

[161]Compare this « mise-en-tablette » not only in RS 11.872 and RS 34.124, cited above, but also in RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.147, RS 92.2005.2, RS 94.2479, and RS 94.5003+.

[162]This is clear from the double letter RS 92.2005. In the first letter the motif of reciprocal well-being is grouped with the polite formulas (RS 92.2005:6-13 « | sal ben S.R. I.R. | »), but in the second letter it is separated from them (RS 92.2005:26-32 « | sal ben | S.R. I.R. | »). Since the tablet was written by a single scribe, it follows that that scribe perceived a structural break between the polite formulas and the motif of reciprocal well-being, but only marked it graphically in one instance.

[163]D. Pardee, *Studi Fronzaroli* (forthcoming).

[164]*Ibid.*, RS 15.008:6-13. Compare also RS 4.475:14-19, where a motif reminiscent of « I.R. » occurs at the very end of the letter, following a salutation and other non-formulaic parts of the body. This motif, however, linked as it is to the specific content of the letter, should be distinguished from the formulaic « I.R. »; D. Pardee makes this point in the manuscript of his *Les textes épistolaires* (in preparation), chapter 12, remarques épistolographiques.

(3) In terms of function[165] and form,[166] the « S.R. » and « I.R. » motifs align easily with other Ugaritic messages, but not with the polite formulas. (4) In one letter, a non-formulaic assertive message, namely « *w åp ånk nḫt* », 'Now, (as for) me, I have gotten some rest,' is inserted within an otherwise standard version of the double motif « S.R. I.R. ».[167] Finally, (5) on a theoretical level, it is best to consider « S.R. I.R. » as part of the body purely in terms of the informational content contained therein.[168]

D. Pardee has treated this double motif in some detail in his recent contribution to a volume honoring P. Fronzaroli.[169] Since it serves little purpose simply to repeat here the data, history of discussion, and analysis provided there, this section will concentrate on those aspects of the double formula either not mentioned by Pardee or which continue to pose problems of interpretation. Owing to the formulaic nature of

---

[165]« S.R. » is an assertive message, and « I.R. » directive; see above.

[166]Both « S.R. » and « I.R. » bear the information structure « topic : comment »; moreover the form of the topicalizing motifs is entirely consistent with that of other messages; see above, and note in particular the formal (and functional) similarity between the stereotyped topicalizing element « *ṯmn*(*y*) *ʿmk* » in « I.R. » and the similar element « *ṯmt ʿmnk* » in a non-formulaic directive message: RS 29.093:20-24, « *w ṯn ʿbdk ṯmt ʿmnk … tn åkl lhm* », 'Now, (as for) your two servants, there, with you, … give (some) grain to them!' Compare also RS 17.139:5-10, where the double motif « S.R. I.R. » is preceded by a topicalizing element commonly used to introduce comments regarding anterior correspondence within the body of the letter: « *lḫt* X », '(As for) the tablet regarding (the subject of) X, (which you sent me) … .'

[167]Pardee, *Studi Fronzaroli* (forthcoming).

[168]Compare M. Gruber, *Nonverbal Communication* (1980) 182, who cites R. Firth, *Essays A. I. Richards* (1972) 11: " … (a) lack of informational content is characteristic of greetings." Gruber provides further references to general informational theory. That the motifs « S.R » and « I.R. » were not devoid of informational content is clear from those letters which contain only these motifs in the body section (Pardee, *Studi Fronzaroli* [forthcoming]): RS 9.479A, RS 19.102.2, RS 20.199. Judging from the RS 17.139:5, such "lettres de politesse" were referred to with the phrase « *lḫt šlm* », '(epistolary) tablet about well-being.'

[169]Pardee, *Studi Fronzaroli* (forthcoming), made available to me by the author, along with the text of his lecture "An Epistolary Formula in Ugaritic and Akkadian Letters from Ras Shamra," given at the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, Boston, November 21, 1999. My access to these studies is gratefully acknowledged here.

the double motif, the organization of this section will follow that applied to the formulas of the *praescriptio* in the preceding chapters.

5.3.2 Composition

The « S.R. » and « I.R. » each occur separately on occasion, but such is rare.[170] When either of these stereotyped motifs are present, the other is usually present as well.[171] Furthermore, the two motifs are virtually always adjacent,[172] and their the compositional order is fixed: « S.R. I.R. ».[173] This compositional integrity justifies speaking of one "double motif", that of reciprocal well-being.

---

[170]The « S.R. » occurs without the « I.R. » in RS 18.038:3-4, and perhaps also in RIH 77/21A:4-8. The opposite case, « I.R. » without « S.R. », is attested in RS 9.479A:12-15, RS 19.102:20-24, and probably in RS 18.287:4'-6'. When an information request has to do with another subject discussed in the body, other than *šlm* 'well-being', it may naturally occur without an associated « S.R. »: compare RS 4.475:14-19, RS [Varia 4]:6-19, and probably RS 94.2457:17'-23'.

[171]Twenty-six Ugaritic letters certainly or probably contain at least one component of the double motif. Of these, the immediate context of six (RS 17.434+, RS 18.287, RS 18.[312], RS 18.[400], RS 18.[482], and RIH 77/21A) is too poorly preserved to permit analysis. This leaves twenty letters, of which seventeen contain the double motif « S.R. I.R. »: RS 8.315, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.137[bis], RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.147, RS 19.158B, RS 20.199, RS 29.095, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 92.2010, RS 94.2479, and RS 94.5003+. Only three contain but one element: RS 9.479A « I.R. », RS 18.038 « S.R. », and RS 19.102.2 « I.R. ».

[172]As mentioned above in section 5.3.1, in the example of the double motif in RS 8.315:10-18, a non-formulaic assertive message, « *w åp ånk nḫt* », 'Now, (as for) me, I have gotten some rest,' was inserted between otherwise standard versions of the « S.R » and « I.R. » components.

[173]Given the marked tendency observable elsewhere in the composition of Ugaritic epistolary formulas to distinguish formally conceptually « ASC » letters from those which are not « ASC », this compositional rigidity is singular. On the analogy of the compositional structure of the address and salutation formulas, for example, one might have expected the double motif of reciprocal well-being to show the structure « I.R. S.R. » in letters which are conceptually ascending, but « S.R. I.R. » in those which are not (and especially in those which are contextually descending); but such is not the case.

5.3.2.1 Composition of the « S.R. »

In terms of pragmatic function, the « S.R. » motif is an assertive message. This is clear from one of the two necessary compositional elements in the motif, the stative verb *šlm*,[174] 'it is well.'

Like most other epistolary messages, the « S.R. » motif displays the information structure « topic : comment ». Both elements are represented by one "necessary" constituent in the composition of the motif: (1) the stative verb *šlm*, 'it is well,' mentioned above, is the comment element; (2) the fronted topicalizing element is a prepositional phrase which usually[175] takes the form « *ʿm* N_S », 'with N_S,' where the « N_S » element[176] refers to the sender.[177]

Both « topic » and « comment » often contain "optional" compositional elements. One of the most common optional components in the « topic » element is a deictic adverb of local proximity: *hln*(*y*) or *hnn*(*y*), 'here'.[178] These are formed from the **han-* particle base and refer to the locality of the sender.[179] These two

---

[174]This element must be entirely reconstructed in RS 16.137[bis], RS 17.434+, RS 92.2005.2, and RIH 77/21A, but, for reasons of space as well as form, its presence is not generally doubted.

[175]In RS 94.2479:5-6, this slot is represented by the prepositional phrase « *b bt mlk* », 'in the royal palace,' topicalizing a location rather than a person.

[176]« N_S » is a pronoun, noun, or noun phrase.

[177]In RS 17.434+:2-3, this prepositional phrase refers to another member of the sender's entourage as well as the sender herself: « [*ʿm*] *šp*[*š* (*mlk rb*)] *w ʿm mlkt* », '[with] the Su[n], [(the great king)?] and with the queen'.

[178]Nineteen of the twenty-one attestations of the « S.R. » motif contain this component (or traces of it); it is explicitly absent from only two formulas: RS 15.008 and RS 18.038.

[179]See above, section 5.2.3. These forms represent the "proximal" counterpart to the local adverb of distance, *ṯmn*(*y*), 'there', which often fronts the « I.R. » motif (see below). Together, these two adverbs constitute a binary pair, which, like other forms of epistolary reference to the respective correspondents, reflects the deixis inherent in epistolary communication.

topicalizing elements, the one necessary and the other optional, are conceptually reminiscent of the distinction made above between the « ID » and « REL » semantic functions in the address formula. The prepositional phrases are individualizing, while the local adverbs are relativizing.

Another optional element, also formed from the deictic base **han-*, is less frequent: the particle *hn*(*n*). Judging from the usage of *hn* elsewhere in Ugaritic messages, its semantics here are probably not local, but presentational: 'Now then!' It seems necessary to differentiate this particle from a potential homograph, the local adverb *hnn*.[180]

Within the topicalizing element, the constituent order is fixed: first the local adverb, then a presentational particle if such was present, then the prepositional phrase.

Two other optional components occur within the « comment »: the adverb *mid*(*m*),[181] 'very', and the word *kll*, 'all'.[182] In contrast to the « topic » element, the order of the components in the « comment » element is not fixed.[183] Several

---

[180]The local adverb may be spelled *hnn* (without enclitic *-y*), as in RS 94.2479:5; the presentational particle (usually *hn*) may be written with enclitic *-n*, that is, *hnn*, as in RS 19.158B:2'.

[181]This component occurs in as many as four formulas: RS 8.315 (*mid*), RS 18.038 (*midm*), probably RS 20.199 ([*mi*]*d*), and RS 92.2010 (*mid*).

[182]This component is certainly attested in at least eight examples of the « S.R. » motif: RS 8.315, RS 11.872, RS 17.139, RS 17.434+, RS 18.038, RS 20.199, RS 94.2479, and RIH 77/21A (partially reconstructed); and may possibly have been present, though now needs to be entirely restored, in RS 16.137[bis]. When present, it apparently functioned as the explicit grammatical subject of the stative verb *šlm*: 'all is well' (there is some ambiguity here; see Pardee, *Studi Fronzaroli* [forthcoming], and below, section 5.3.6).

[183]Pardee, *Studi Fronzaroli* (forthcoming).

sequences are attested: (i) « *kll šlm* »,[184] but also (ii) « *šlm kll* »;[185] (iii) « *mḏd šlm* »[186] but also (iv) « *kll mḏd*(*m*) *šlm* ».[187]

In terms of micro-composition, it is the prepositional phrase of the topic element that is the most interesting. Judging from the available data, this phrase employs the preposition *ʿm* when it governs a personal reference to the sender, but *b* when the governed noun phrase is a place, not a person.[188] On present evidence, the latter situation is attested only once;[189] all other attested examples of this component use *ʿm*.[190] In each of the cases where *ʿm* is used, the governed noun phrase refers to the person of the sender: either to the sender alone, as in most cases,[191] or to the sender and another individual in the sender's immediate entourage, a pattern attested

---

[184]RS 11.872, RS 17.139, and RS 94.2479.

[185]RS 15.008 and probably RS 34.124.

[186]RS 92.2010.

[187]RS 8.315, RS 18.038, and probably RS 20.199.

[188]Such a distinction, sensitive to the personal / impersonal nature of the governed noun phrase, finds a parallel in English usage, where the idiom "to be well" (for example) would be complemented by "with" or "for" in references to persons *with* whom or *for* whom "it is well", but by "at" or "in" if referring to a place *at* which or *in* which "it is well".

[189]The reference is to the phrase *b bt mlk*, 'at the royal palace', in RS 94.2479:5-6.

[190]These are fifteen certain examples: RS 8.315, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 17.434+ (partially reconstructed), RS 18.031, RS 18.038, RS 18.147, RS 19.158B, RS 29.095, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, and RS 92.2010. Given this pattern, the preposition *ʿm* was probably present, though now needs to be entirely restored, in five other cases: RS 16.137[bis], RS 18.[400], RS 20.199, RS 94.5003+, and RIH 77/21A.

[191]RS 8.315, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, probably RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.038, RS 18.147, RS 19.158B, RS 29.095, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, RS 92.2010, and probably RIH 77/21A. A comparable structure was probably present, though now needs to be entirely restored, in three other cases: RS 18.[400], RS 20.199, and RS 94.5003+.

once.[192] The compositional variation observable for the « N_S » element has been surveyed by Pardee.[193] In sum, the « N_S » may be (i) a title as in « *ʿm špš* »,[194] 'with the Sun', (ii) a conceptually explicit REL phrase as in « *ʿm ʿbdk* »,[195] 'with your servant', or (iii) direct pronominal reference as in « *ʿmn*(*y*) »,[196] 'with me'. As noted above for the variable forms of reference in the address and polite formulas, this variation is best explained in light of the social relationships between the correspondents.[197] In the present case, one might suppose that « *ʿmn*(*y*) » was avoided when the sender wished to emphasize a great difference in social status.[198]

---

[192]The legible portion of the sender's name in RS 17.434+:1 is *pdǵb mlk*[*t* ...], 'Puduḫepa, the quee[n]' — perhaps to be restored, with E. Lipiński, *OLP* (1981) 81, n. 9, as {pdǵb . mlk[t . rbt . ml]⌜kt⌝[. ḫt]}, 'Puduḫepa, the [great] quee[n, queen of Ḫatti],' but note the pattern observed in the cuneiform letters addressed to Puduḫepa from various members of the royal court of Egypt, KBo 1.029+, KBo 28.023, and KBo 28.049: {MÍ.LUGAL GAL ša KUR < GN >}, which should perhaps incite a recollation of this line with the restoration {pdǵb . mlk⌜t⌝[. rbt . dt . ḥ]⌜wt⌝[. ḫt]} in mind. By using the term "entourage", I do not intend subservience of any sort on the member of the entourage in question, who in this case is *šp*[*š* (*mlk rb*)], 'the Su[n (the great king)]'.

[193]*Studi Fronzaroli* (forthcoming).

[194]RS 18.038:3. Compare also « [*ʿm*] *šp*[*š* (*mlk rb*)] *w ʿm mlkt* » in RS 17.434+:2-3; as well as RIH 77/21A:4-5, where « [*ʿm špš mlk*] *rb* » should probably be reconstructed.

[195]RS 92.2010:10.

[196]This is the most common pattern: RS 8.315, RS 11.872, RS 15.008, probably RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.147, RS 19.158B, RS 29.095, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2, and RS 92.2010. A comparable structure was probably present, though now needs to be entirely restored, in three other cases: RS 18.[400], RS 20.199, and RS 94.5003+.

[197]Social structure, in turn, is most often accessible through the "household" metaphors employed as REL terms for designating all types of relationships. See above, section 0.5.

[198]In RS 18.038, RS 17.434+, and RIH 77/21A, the vast social distance between the Hittite emperor (or his queen) and his subject is stressed. In RS 92.2010, one might suppose that the superior station of the recipient is stressed.

5.3.2.2 Composition of the « I.R. »

The volitional predication in the « I.R. » motif shows that its pragmatic function is directive: a typical form is « *rgm ttb ly* »,[199] 'Have a word sent back to me!'

Like the « S.R. » motif, and most Ugaritic messages for that matter, the « I.R. » motif shows the information structure « topic : comment ».

One may isolate seven distinct components which may appear in the « I.R. » motif. Three of these belong to the « topic » element, three to the « comment » element, and one which may occur between them. This inventory may be divided into "necessary" and "optional" components.

Of the three topicalizing elements, two may be considered as necessary: (i) a prepositional phrase « *ʿm* N_R », 'with N_R,' where « N_R »[200] refers to the recipient,[201] and (ii) an indefinite noun phrase « *mnm šlm* », 'whatever well-being',[202] which topicalizes the subject concerned in the motif.[203] The third element, (iii) the local

---

[199]In RS 11.872:13, for example.

[200]« N_R » is a pronoun, noun, or noun phrase.

[201]This phrase is explicitly absent only from RS 92.2005.1 and RS 92.2010. In the latter, it is "replaced" by a functional equivalent in the fronted noun phrase *bʿly*, '(as for) my master.' In the former, its apparent absence is more problematic; was it written around the right edge, now too damaged to be legible?

[202]On the grammatical analysis of this phrase, see below, section 5.3.6.

[203]The noun phrase *mnm šlm* is explicitly absent from RS 29.095, RS 92.2010, and RS 94.2479. Again, RS 92.2010 is not problematic since "standard" *mnm šmn* has a functional equivalent in this "non-standard" « I.R. » in the noun phrase « *šlmh … w šlm bth …* », 'his (that is 'of my master') well-being … a the well-being of his house … .' Owing to the presence of *mnm* in RS 94.2479:8, one may suppose a scribal omission. The absence of the phrase from RS 29.095 is problematic, however: this is the only conceptually UNMARKED letter to contain the motif of reciprocal well-being, and it would not be inappropriate in such a case to employ a terse, less deferential version of the formula, such as we have here.

adverb of distance, *ṯmn*(*y*), is technically optional,[204] but usually present when the « I.R. » is used in conjunction with a preceding « S.R. » as a double formula.

The comment element also contains two necessary elements: (iv) a volitional form of the verb Ṯ(W)B in the Š-stem, 'to have (something) returned,'[205] and (v) its accusative complement, the common noun *rgm*, 'word'.[206] The third element is optional: (vi) a prepositional complement expressing the goal of the action noted by the verb,[207] taking either the form « *l* N_S »[208] or « *ʿm* N_S ».[209]

Finally, (vii) the seventh component, the conjunction *w*, often marks the transition from topic to comment;[210] it is also optional.[211]

The order of these components is consistent. Within the topic element the sequence is generally: the adverb *ṯmn*(*y*), when present, followed by the prepositional

---

[204]It is explicitly absent from RS 9.479A, RS 15.008, RS 19.102.2, and RS 92.2010. All of these, however, are atypical in one way or another: the « I.R. » motif occurs alone in RS 9.479A and RS 19.102.2, making its absence in those cases comprehensible (in terms of local deixis, *ṯmn*(*y*) and its "proximal" correspondent *hln*(*y*)/*hnn*(*y*) in the « S.R. » form a binary pair; the absence of one may thus condition the omission of the other). The placement of the « S.R. I.R. » in RS 15.008 is odd (following the non-formulaic body); and it contains several compositional peculiarities. Finally, the « S.R. I.R. » motif in RS 92.2010 is non-standard in terms of composition.

[205]No examples of the « I.R. » motif explicitly omit this element.

[206]This element is explicitly omitted from RS 92.2010, which, in any case, is a compositionally non-standard version of the « I.R. ».

[207]This prepositional phrase is explicitly omitted from RS 18.031 and RS 94.5003+, two otherwise standard versions of the motif.

[208]On statistical and contextual grounds, this should probably be considered the standard form, attested in ten examples: RS 8.315, RS 9.479A, RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, probably RS 19.102.2, RS 19.158B, RS 20.199, RS 29.095, and RS 34.124.

[209]Four examples: RS 15.008, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2010, and RS 94.2479, of which two (RS 15.008 and RS 92.2010) are non-standard in other respects.

[210]That is, the so-called "*waw* of apodosis". See above, section 5.2.3.

[211]Four examples: RS 11.872, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 94.2479.

phrase « *ʿm* N_R », and finally the noun phrase « *mnm šlm* ».[212] Within the comment element the compositional order is also basically fixed: first *rgm*, then the verb, followed by the prepositional phrase.[213]

On the micro-compositional level, several variations are relevant: (1) the form of « N_R » in the topicalizing phrase « *ʿm* N_R », and in the comment: (2) the form of the verb, and (3) the form of « N_S » in that verb's prepositional complement « *ʿm/l* N_R ». As above, the variation is usually best explained in light of the social relationships between the correspondents. In the present cases, one observes patterns of formal composition quite consistent with those noted for other formulas: the use of conceptually explicit REL phrases over direct pronominal reference generally implies a concern to emphasize the social relationship. Finally, the use of jussive forms over imperatives seems to reveal a similar concern for differences of social status: in conceptually ASC letters the sender often took care to express directive messages indirectly.

5.3.3 Distribution

Twenty-six Ugaritic letters contain at least one component of the double motif: either « S.R. », or « I.R. », or both.[214] Of these, the full motif of reciprocal well-being,

---

[212]RS 15.008 (in which the placement of the motif is non-standard) is an exception: « *mnm šlm ʿm ủmy* ». RS 92.2010 is compositionally non-standard, but not a true exception if one takes account of the "functional equivalents" of the components; in this case the stated order is followed.

[213]RS 15.008 is once again an exception « *ʿmy tt̲tb rgm* ». The "functional equivalents" of the motif in RS 92.2010 follow the stated order.

[214]RS 8.315 « S.R. … I.R. », RS 9.479A « I.R. », RS 11.872 « S.R. I.R. », RS 15.008 « S.R. I.R. », RS 16.137[bis] « S.R. I.R. » (partially reconstructed), RS 16.379 « S.R. I.R. », RS 17.139 « S.R. I.R. », RS 17.434+ (probably « S.R. »), RS 18.031 « S.R. I.R. », RS 18.038 « S.R. », RS 18.147 « S.R. I.R. »,

« S.R. I.R. » certainly or possibly occurs in twenty letters.[215] Thirty-eight letters contain neither motif,[216] and the state of preservation in fifty-one cases prevents an unambiguous determination.[217]

When present, the « S.R. I.R. » double motif almost always[218] occurs following the polite formulas section, and preceding the non-formulaic part of the body.[219] This

---

RS 18.287 (probably « I.R. », partially reconstructed) , RS 18.[312] (possibly « S.R.+[?] »), RS 18.[400] (possible traces of « S.R. I.R. », largely reconstructed), RS 18.[482] (probably « [?]+I.R. »), RS 19.102.2 « I.R. », RS 19.158B « S.R. I.R. » (partially reconstructed), RS 20.199 « S.R. I.R. », RS 29.095 « S.R. I.R. », RS 34.124 « S.R. I.R. », RS 92.2005.1 « S.R. I.R. », RS 92.2005.2 (probably « S.R. I.R. », partially reconstructed), RS 92.2010 « S.R. *I.R. » (the latter is formally non-standard), RS 94.2479 « S.R. I.R. », RS 94.5003+ « S.R. I.R. » (partially reconstructed), and RIH 77/21A (probably « S.R.+[?] ».

[215]RS 8.315 « S.R. … I.R. », RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.137[bis] (partially reconstructed), RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 18.031, RS 18.147, RS 19.158B (partially reconstructed), RS 20.199, RS 29.095, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, RS 92.2005.2 (partially reconstructed), RS 92.2010 (« S.R. *I.R. », the latter being formally non-standard), RS 94.2479, and RS 94.5003+ (partially reconstructed). Its presence is possible, but needs to be reconstructed, in RS 18.[312] (possibly « S.R.+[?] »), RS 18.[400] (possible traces of « S.R. I.R. », largely reconstructed), and RS 18.[482] (probably « [?]+I.R. »).

[216]RS 3.334 (probably), RS 3.427 (probably), RS 4.475 (the "information request" here is not formulaic, and not explicitly about *šlm*), RS 15.007, RS 15.158 (probably), RS 15.174 (probably), RS 16.078+ (probably), RS 16.264, RS 16.265, RS 16.402, RS 17.063 (the "situation report" here is non-standard) and RS 17.117 ("situation report" non-standard), RS 18.040, RS 18.075 (probably), RS 18.113 (probably), RS 18.134 (probably), RS 18.140.2 (probably), RS 18.148 (probably), RS 18.286[A] (probably), RS 19.011, RS 19.029 (probably), RS 19.181A (probably), RS 29.093, RS 34.148, RS 88.2159, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2428 (probably), RS 94.2429 (probably), RS 94.2545+, RS 94.2580, RS 94.5015 (probably), RS 96.2039, RIH 78/12, and RS [Varia 4].

[217]RS 1.013+, RS 1.018, RS 1.020, RS 1.021, RS 1.026+, RS 1.032, RS 1.[084]+, RS 2.[026], RS 1-11.[118], RS 15.098, RS 15.107, RS 15.191[A], RS 16.196, RS 16.394, RS 16.401, RS 17.327, RS 18.140.1, RS 18.250[D], RS 18.285[A], RS 18.286[B], RS 18.[364], RS 18.[380], RS 18.[386], RS 18.[387], RS 18.[443], RS 18.[500], RS 18.[508], RS 18.[528], RS 18.[565], RS 18.[566], RS 18.[567], RS 19.022, RS 19.102.1, RS 19.174G, RS 19.181B, RS 24.660G, RS 34.356, RS 94.2391, RS 94.2450, RS 94.2457, RS 94.2537, RS 94.2592, RS 94.2946, RS 94.2957, RS 94.2960, RS 94.5009, RIH 77/01, RIH 77/25, RIH 78/03+, RIH 78/21, and RIH 78/25.

[218]RS 15.008, in which the « S.R. I.R. » motif follows a series of non-formulaic messages, is an exception.

[219]In RS 20.199, the motif « S.R. I.R. » constitutes the entire body, and thus ends the letter (RS 8.315 is comparable, with the exception of the non-formulaic assertive message appended to the « S.R. » in lines 13-14). Such letters, entirely concerned as they were with *šlm*, 'well-being', were apparently referred to as *lḫt šlm*, 'well-being letter(s)' (RS 17.139:5).

sequence is observed even in those cases where « S.R. » or « I.R. » occur separately.[220]

A number of observations regarding the distribution of the double motif may be made with respect to conceptual status and model. First and foremost, one may mention the « ASC BIO » conceptual category, which is represented by eight members in the Ugaritic corpus. Where a determination can be made,[221] all of these contain the double motif, « S.R. I.R. »,[222] and in its standard form.[223] This fact has clear relevance for the correct reconstruction of fragmentary letters of this type.[224]

A similar situation may also apply to the « DESC BIO » category, which contains a single member in the Ugaritic corpus: RS 18.147. This letter also contains the double motif « S.R. I.R. » in its standard form.[225] Unfortunately, the size of the sample makes the distribution of the motif in this category difficult to evaluate.[226]

---

[220]RS 9.479A « RS | pros I.R. | », RS 18.038 « SR | S.R. | body », RS 18.287 « [R?]⌜S?⌝ | ⌜pros⌝ [?] ⌜I.R.⌝ | body », RS 19.102.2 « RS | pros I.R. », and probably RIH 77/21A « SR | ⌜S.R.⌝ body ».

[221]The state of preservation of RS 19.102.1 does not permit a determination (but see below).

[222]RS 11.872, RS 15.008, RS 16.379, RS 17.139, RS 34.124, RS 92.2005.1, and RS 94.5003+.

[223]The form of the « S.R. I.R. » motif in RS 15.008 is standard, even if its position is not (it ends the letter, following several non-formulaic messages).

[224]RS 19.102.1 is the text concerned. The distribution observed above and the space available on the tablet make it virtually certain that lines 10-12 contained the « S.R. I.R. » motif, making of this missive another *lḫt šlm*, 'well-being letter.'

[225]Another letter which contains explicitly « DESC BIO » terminology is RS [Varia 4], which explicitly omits the motif of reciprocal well-being. This letter is conceptually mixed, however, also containing « HOR BIO » terms, so the lack of « S.R. I.R. » is not necessarily connected with the presence of DESC BIO terminology.

[226]The « DESC POW » category is also apparently (the reading of the REL term in line 2 is not clear) represented by a single example: RS 19.181A. The state of preservation prevents a determination of the presence of the double motif.

A striking contrast appears when the conceptually HORIZONTAL categories are examined. Fifteen Ugaritic letters, for example, belong to the « HOR BIO » category.[227] In light of the consistent presence of the « S.R. I.R. » motif in other categories composed on the « BIO » model, it is surprising to note that, of the twelve instances in which the state of preservation allows a determination to be made,[228] only two « HOR BIO » contain the double motif.[229] Furthermore, the motif does not occur in the few letters of the « HOR MIXED »[230] and « HOR POW »[231] conceptual categories.

One of the best represented conceptual categories in the Ugaritic epistolary corpus is « ASC POW ». Of the twenty-seven letters which may be so classified, the presence of the « S.R. I.R. » motif may be determined in nineteen cases.[232] Of these unambiguous examples, five letters certainly or probably contained the full double motif,[233] three contain only the « I.R. » motif,[234] and eleven explicitly omit both

---

[227]See above, section 0.6.5.

[228]The presence of the motif in RS 1.018, RS 1.021, and RS 94.2537 cannot be determined.

[229]RS 18.031 and RS 92.2005.2 contain the « S.R. I.R. » motif. It is explicitly absent from RS 15.174, RS 17.063 (the statistically standard « S.R. I.R. » is absent), RS 18.075, RS 18.134, RS 94.2273, RS 94.2284, RS 94.2383+, RS 94.2406.2, RS 94.2545+, and RS 96.2039.

[230]Only one letter is concerned here: RS 16.265.1, which explicitly omits the « S.R. I.R. » motif.

[231]In RS 15.007, a letter which is "non-standard" in many respects, the sender employs the REL term *rʿ*, 'colleague,' apparently belonging to the poorly attested « HOR POW » conceptual inventory, to refer to his correspondent. The « S.R. I.R. » motif is explicitly absent.

[232]The presence of the motif cannot be determined in eight instances: RS 15.191[A], RS 16.196, RS 17.327, RS 18.[565], RS 34.356, RS 94.2391, RS 94.5009, and RIH 78/03+.

[233]RS 16.137[bis], probably RS 18.[312] (assuming that the reading of line 4' is {[…] ʿm⌈n⌉ š⌈l⌉[m…]}), RS 20.199, RS 92.2010, and RS 94.2479.

[234]RS 9.479A, probably RS 18.287, and RS 19.102.2.

motifs.[235] Finally, of the three conceptually ascending letters which incorporate REL terms drawn from both conceptual models, one contains the « S.R. I.R. » motif,[236] and two explicitly omit it.[237]

Of the ten Ugaritic letters which are certainly or probably conceptually « UNMARKED », only one contains the full double motif « S.R. I.R. »,[238] three contain the « S.R. » element but omit « I.R. »,[239] and six explicitly omit both.[240]

Finally, one letter of unknown conceptual status probably contained at least the « I.R. » motif: RS 18.[482].

5.3.4 Comparative evidence

In his 1967 Johns Hopkins dissertation, S. Parker explicitly identified the formal structure of the Ugaritic motif of reciprocal well-being with a corresponding Akkadian

---

[235]RS 16.078+, RS 16.402, RS 18.040, RS 18.113, RS 18.140.2, RS 18.148, RS 19.011, RS 29.093, RS 34.148, RS 94.2428, and RS 94.5015.

[236]RS 8.315.

[237]RS 17.117 and RIH 78/12.

[238]RS 29.095.

[239]RS 18.038. RS 17.434+ and RIH 77/21A are very probably conceptually UNMARKED; both also probably contained « S.R. » but omitted « I.R. ».

[240]RS 4.475, RS 15.158, RS 16.264, RS 94.2406.1, RS 94.2580, and RS 94.2429.

idiom appearing frequently in the Ras Shamra epistolary corpus.[241] D. Pardee has now conveniently catalogued the published examples.[242]

Pardee also noted that a further formal parallel for the motif occurs in the Akkadian letters from Tell Meskene.[243] At least nine[244] clear examples of the motif of reciprocal well being, « S.R. I.R. »,[245] have been preserved. They are listed here for convenience:

> Msk 7442:6-8 « I (6) it-ti-ia šul-mu aš-ra-nu (7) it-ti EN.MEŠ!-ia mi-nu-me-e (8) šul-ma-nu ṭé-ma li-te-er-ru-ni I »[246]

---

[241]Parker, *Ugaritic Prose Texts* (1967) 27. A similar formal identification was made a few years later by O. Kaiser in *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 19-20, but the grammatical analysis and translation given there for both the Akkadian and Ugaritic idioms can no longer be accepted (see below, section 5.3.6).

[242]Pardee, *Studi Fronzaroli* (forthcoming); he also lists occurrences of the « S.R. » and « I.R. » motifs when used alone. Twenty occurrences of the double formula (« S.R. I.R. ») are transcribed: RS 17.383, RS 17.428, RS 18.089, RS 19.050, RS 20.023.1, RS 20.023.2, RS 20.178.1, RS 20.178.2, RS 20.189D, RS 20.227.1, RS 20.227.2, RS 21.201, RS 32.204.1, RS 34.134.1, RS 34.134.2, RS 34.141, RS 34.161.1, RS 34.164, RS 34.173, and RS [Varia 26]. To these a likely twenty-first occurrence should be added: RS 13.007B:4-7 (Ch. Virolleaud, *Syria* 28 [1951] 53-54; J. Nougayrol, *PRU* 3 [1955] 6), which should probably be read as {(4) e-nu-ma it-ti LUGAL! (5) šul-mu [aš]-ra-nu (6) [… it-ti]-ka (7) […]}. None of the letters published in RSO 14 (2002) contains the double motif.

[243]*Ibid.*

[244]These derive from six tablets recovered in excavations (one of these tablets, Msk 7497, contains two examples of the motif); and two acquired on the antiquities market. A probable tenth example may be reconstructed in Msk 74270:5-6 (see the edition of D. Arnaud in Emar 6:2 [1985] 586; *idem*, Emar 6:3 [1986] 267, no. 272.

[245]The Emar corpus also contains several examples of the « I.R. » motif used alone, a situation which finds formal parallels in the Ugaritic letters RS 9.479A and RS 19.102.2: Msk 7441:7-8 (D. Arnaud, Emar 6:1 [1985] 182; Emar 6.3 [1986] 261, no. 264), Msk 7451:6-7 (*ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 190; vol. 3, pp. 262-263, no. 266), Msk 7451:24-26 (*ibid.*), Msk 7452:7-9 (*ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 192; vol. 3, p. 257, no. 261), and ME 127:8-9 (*idem*, *SMEA* 30 [1992] 195-197, no. 1; see also G. Beckman, *Vicinity of Emar* [1996] 120-121 (with cuneiform copy in appendix), who assigns the tablet a different number, "RE 97").

[246]D. Arnaud, Emar 6:1 (1985) 183 (copy); *idem*, Emar 6:3 (1986), text no. 260, pp. 256-257 (transcription and translation).

Msk 7451:40-42 « (40) [it-]ti-ia šul-mu aš-ra-nu (41) it-ti-ku-nu mi-nu-me-e šul-ma-nu (42) ṭé-ma li-te-er-ru-ni »[247]

Msk 7454:6-9 « | (6) e-nu-ma [it-ti-i]a šul-mu | (7) aš-ra-nu [it-ti] EN-ia (8) mi-nu-me-e [šul-m]a-nu (9) ṭé-ma [l]i-t[e]-er-ru-ni | »[248]

Msk 7497:7-12 « | (7) [e-nu-ma it-ti] ŠÀ É EN-ia (8) [ù it-ti] ŠÀ a$^{!?}$-li (9) [gáb-bá dan-n]íš šul-mu (10) [aš-ra-nu] it-ti E[N-ia] (11) [mi-nu-me-e] šul-ma-[nu] (12) [ṭé-ma] li-te-er-[ru-ni] | »[249]

Msk 7497:33-37 « | (33) e-nu-ma it-ti-ia šul-mu (34) aš-ra-nu it-ti LÚ.UGULA KALAM.MA (35) it-ti-ka mi-nu-me-e (36) šul-ma-nu ṭé-ma (37) li-te-er-ru-ni »[250]

Msk 7498d:8-12 « |[251] (8) a-nu-ma it-ti-ia (9) dan-níš šul-mu aš-ra-nu (10) it-ti GAŠAN-ia (11) mi-[nu-m]e-e šul-ma-nu (12) ṭé-[ma] li-te-er-ru-ni | »[252]

Msk 7474+:11-15 « | (11) it-ti (12) ^{m}lu$^{!}$-da$^{!}$-ti (13) mi-nu-me (14) šul-ma-nu (15) ṭé-ma li-te-ru-ni || »[253]

---

[247]Arnaud, *ibid.*, vol. 1 (1985) 191 (copy); vol. 3 (1986), text no. 266, p. 263 (transcription and translation).

[248]Arnaud, *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 193; vol. 3, text no. 258, p. 255.

[249]*Ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 235-236; vol. 3, text no. 263, pp. 259-260.

[250]*Ibid.*

[251]The scribal line, visible in the copy, was inadvertently omitted from the transcription.

[252]*Ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 239; vol. 3, text no. 270, pp. 265-266.

[253]Msk 7474 + 7475. *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 197; vol. 3, text no. 267, pp. 263-264.

ME 53:7-10 « | (7) i-na ŠÀ KUR ù i-na ŠÀ (8) É EN-ia dan-níš šul-mu (9) it-ti EN-ia mi-nu-me-e (10) šul-ma-nu ṭe$_4$-ma li-te-ru-ni | »[254]

ME 54:8-12 « | (8) e-nu-ma i-na ŠÀ KUR URU e-mar (9) gáb-bá dan-níš šul-mu (10) aš-ra-nu it-ti EN-ia (11) mi-nu-me-e šul-ma-nu (12) ṭe-ma li-te-ru-ni | »[255]

Finally, A. Hagenbuchner described the formally equivalent motifs in Hittite letters in her 1989 monograph.[256] Letters composed by scribes in the Hittite realm show that formal equivalents of both « S.R. » and « I.R. » were in productive used as separate epistolary motifs. Their joint use as a double motif « S.R. I.R. », however, is surprisingly rare. I have found only three examples, all in Hittite,[257] and all appearing on scribal "piggy-back" letters. These are cited here:

KBo 18.001.2: *verso* 6' - left edge 3 « | (6') ka-a-ša *MA-ḪAR* ^{d}UTU-*ŠI* (7') *Ù MA-ḪAR* DUMU.SAL GAL (8') ḫu-u-ma-an SIG$_5$-in (left edge, 1) [*MA-ḪAR* SAL.LUGAL GAŠAN-*IA* aš-š]u-ul (2) [ku-it ma-aḫ-ḫa-an] (3) [nu-mu EGIR-pa ḫa-at-]ri-eš-ki »[258]

---

[254]Published by D. Arnaud, *AuOr* 2 (1984), no. 1, first letter (lines 1-22) 180-183 (copy on p. 180); the editor made a small number of corrections to the *editio princeps* in *Textes syriens de l'âge du Bronze Récent* (1991), no. 96, pp. 149-150 (transcription, translation, and a few epigraphic notes).

[255]*Idem*, *AuOr* 2 (1984), no. 3, pp. 186-188 (copy on p. 187); also appears in *idem*, *Textes syriens de l'âge du Bronze Récent* (1991), no. 94, p. 148. The statement in G. Beckman, *Emar: History, Religion, and Culture* (1996) 12, erroneously implies that the letters called "*AuOr* 2, no. 3" and "*TBR* 94" are two different documents.

[256]Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 71-77.

[257]Given the Akkadian parallels from Ras Shamra and Tell Meskene, where the double motif « S.R. I.R. » is quite common, the apparent absence of this motif from the Akkadian corpus from Boğazköy is remarkable.

[258]Published by H. G. Güterbock in *KBo* 18 (1971) 1 (copy only). Transcription, translation, commentary, and bibliography in Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989) 3-4, 84-85. This missive is a "piggy-back" letter; the main letter is from "the Sun" to his mother (Hagenbuchner, *ibid.*, p. 4, identifies these correspondents with Tutḫaliya IV and Puduḫepa, respectively).

KUB 48.88.2: *verso* 3'-4' « | (3') [ka-a-ša *MA-ḪAR* ÌR?-*KA*? ḫ]u-u-ma-an SIG5-in (4') [*MA-ḪAR* EN-*IA* aš-šu-ul ku-it GIM-an nu-mu EGIR-pa ḫa-at-r]i-iš-ki-ši | »[259]

HKM 3.2:21-26 « | (21) ka-a-ša *I-NA* É-*K*[*A*] (22) *ŠAL-MA MA-ḪAR* DAM-*KA* ḫu-u-ma-a[n] (23) SIG5-in … (25) ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA-*IA*[[-*IA*]]-mu EGIR-pa (26) aš-šu-ul ḫa-at-ra-a-i »[260]

Tell Atchana represents a somewhat comparable situation. No formal equivalent of either motif has been identified in the Akkadian corpus; but one Hittite letter contains two examples of the « I.R. » motif, used alone.[261]

The Amarna corpus contains no precise formal equivalent to the Ugaritic motif « S.R. I.R. ». Several letters, however, do show a kind of reciprocal well-being formula, which follows a pattern different from that of Ugarit. The Amarna double formula is composed of an Akkadian equivalent of the « S.R. » motif and a following « sal » formula.[262] An example is:

---

[259]Published by H. Berman and H. Klengel in *KUB* 48 (1977) 28 (copy only); full treatment in Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 2 (1989) 18.

[260]M□t. 75/40. Cuneiform copy in S. Alp, *Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Ma□at-Höyük* (1991) 3; transcription and translation, *idem*, *Hethitische Briefe aus Ma□at-Höyük* (1991) 124-125.

[261]AT 35. See the recent treatment of C. Niedorf, *Festschrift Dietrich* (2002) 518 (transcription) and 526 (copy). The « I.R. » motif is reconstructed in lines 4-6: { | (4) [*MA-ḪAR* … aš-]⌜šu-ul⌝ ku-it (5) [ma-aḫ-ḫa-an nu-mu … EGI]R-pa (6) [ḫa-at-ra-a-i …] }; and, in the "piggy-back" letter, in lines 9'-10': { | (9') [*MA-ḪAR* ŠEŠ-*I*]*A* aš-šu-ul ku-it (10') [ma-aḫ-ḫa-an] nu-mu ŠEŠ-*IA* EGIR-p[a ḫ]a-at-re-eš-ki | }.

[262]This "Amarna-formel" (Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 [1989] 49-55) occurs over thirty times in the corpus: EA 1-3, EA 5-11, EA 17, probably EA 18, EA 19-21, EA 23-24, EA 26-29, EA 31, EA 33-35, EA 37-39, probably EA 40, probably EA 41, and probably EA 42. In all but one (EA 40) of these, the « sal » component is "expanded".

EA 38:3 « a-na ia-ši šul-mu ù a-na ka-ša lu-ú šul-mu … »[263]

'For me, it is well. For you, may it be well … !'

This motif is also well-attested in the Akkadian corpus from Boğazköy,[264] and is known in Ugaritic from a few examples.[265]

I know of no other formal parallels to the Ugaritic « S.R. I.R. » motif among the cuneiform epistolary corpora of Late Bronze West Asia. Among chronologically anterior sources, Old Babylonian letters contain functional, though not formal parallels.[266]

5.3.5 Sitz-im-Leben

5.3.5.1 Geographical, chronological and literary background

A consideration of the geographical and chronological background of the motif of reciprocal well-being requires a fuller study of the comparative evidence. In the Late Bronze Age, the « S.R. I.R. » double motif was regularly present not only in the Ugaritic corpus, but also in the Akkadian letters found at Ras Shamra and Tell Meskene; it is occasionally present in Hittite letters from Boğazköy, Ma□at, and Tell

---

[263]VAT 153. For the transcription, see J. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* 1 (1915) 292-295; cuneiform copies in O. Schroeder, *Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna* 1 (1915), no. 14, p. 31; and, earlier, L. Abel's copy in H. Winckler, *Der Thontafelfund von El Amarna* (1889-1890), no. 11, p. 10. For the secondary literature, see now M. Liverani, *Le lettere di el-Amarna* (1999).

[264]Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 49-55.

[265]See below, section 5.3.7.

[266]E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln* (1967) 52; A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 49, nn. 35-36; D. Pardee, *Studi Fronzaroli* (forthcoming).

Atchana.[267] Given the apparent absence of the double formula from Kassite Babylonian letters,[268] from Middle Assyrian letters,[269] and even from the Amarna corpus,[270] the present evidence suggests that the « S.R. I.R. » motif was at home in North Syrian epistolary practice, was known but less used by Hittite imperial scribes, but was not productively used elsewhere. The fact that the Late Bronze usage of the « S.R. I.R. » motif was essentially North Syrian, however, does not necessarily imply a local origin. This question remains open for the present.

In terms of its literary background, the « S.R. I.R. » motif appears epistolary in origin, in contrast to the address and polite formulas studied above. Among other factors, the local deixis of the parallel pair *hln*(*y*)/*hnn*(*y*), 'here', and *ṯmn*(*y*), 'there', implies a situation in which the correspondents are physically separated; and the binary nature of the personal references, such as *ʿmn*(*y*), 'with me', and *ʿmk*, 'with you', with no direct allusion to a third party,[271] may imply that the correspondence was of a written rather than oral nature.

5.3.5.2 Situational context and speech acts

If a more developed treatment of origins requires a more extensive comparative study, certain aspects of the situational context implied behind the « S.R.

---

[267]See above, section 5.3.4.

[268]I found no examples, for example, in H. Radau, *Letters to Cassite Kings* (1908).

[269]E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe* (1996) 49-71.

[270]See above, section 5.3.4.

[271]Contrast the imperative *rgm*, 'Say!' in the address formula, which points to an origin in oral communication, by means of a third party (see above, section 1.5.2.2).

I.R. » motif are accessible through the internal Ugaritic data. Two preliminary remarks may be made, regarding (1) the type of social situation in which « S.R. I.R. » is appropriate or inappropriate, and (2) the character of both motifs as "speech acts".

The close association of the « S.R. I.R. » double motif with the « ASC BIO » and « DESC BIO » conceptual categories indicates that the motif is especially appropriate in situations of familial intimacy, and more particularly in correspondence between parents and their children, whether such relations be biological or figurative. Judging entirely from the distribution of the motif, the regular giving and receiving of news about well-being was an integral element of what was considered acceptable behavior between parents and children.

The absence of « S.R. I.R. » in « HOR BIO » letters does not detract from this formulation. On the contrary, since the horizontal conceptual status effectively disposed of only one conceptual model, that of biological kinship, to express all types of "horizontal" relationships,[272] the rarity of the « S.R. I.R. » there serves rather to reinforce the connection of the motif with deliberate expressions of familial intimacy. This is not to suggest that « S.R. I.R. » is never appropriate in conceptually horizontal letters. Rather, on those occasions when it does occur, one may suppose that the formula is intended to evoke the kind of familial intimacy typical of « ASC BIO » and « DESC BIO » letters, where the motif is regularly present. This line of reasoning also provides a plausible explanation for the presence of the motif in several « ASC POW » letters. If the sender was not at liberty in such cases to present his or her social

---

[272]Only in letters which were conceptually ASC were two models in productive use: « ASC BIO » and « ASC POW ». But a conceptual dichotomy is also attested with descending letters, though not directly: the « DESC BIO » category was used productively, but probably not « DESC POW ». Rather, conceptually descending relationships in which the terminology of biological kinship was inappropriate were most often not explicitly articulated; thus many conceptually « UNMARKED » letters reflect implicit « DESC POW » situations (see above, section 0.6.4.1 and 1.7.1.3).

relationship with the recipient in familial terms, a subtler means of bolstering the sender's social link with the recipient was available in the form of the « S.R. I.R. » motif. By including the « S.R. I.R. », the sender implies that the relationship with the recipient, even if nominally one of servitude, was nevertheless intimate. The sender portrays himself not as merely a servant, but as a servant who enjoys a privileged relationship, almost on a par with kin. Less blatant attempts to insist upon such intimacy in « ASC POW » situations are found in examples which omit the « S.R. » altogether, thus manifesting the concern typical of a child toward a parent, but without imposing reciprocity from the recipient.

Finally, in terms of speech act theory, the context implied by the « S.R. » resembles in many respects that of any assertive message.[273] In like manner, that of the « I.R. » resembles directive messages.[274]

5.3.6 Grammatical issues

Of the grammatical questions which remain unresolved,[275] the most significant for the overall interpretation of the motif involves the correct interpretation of the phrase « *mnm šlm* » in the « I.R. » motif. Two lines of argument now suggest that H. Ginsberg was essentially correct when, in 1938, he interpreted the first published

---

[273]See above, section 5.1.4.2.

[274]See above, section 5.1.4.1.

[275]Two other problems of less consequence involve the correct interpretation of the words *šlm* and *kll* in the « S.R. » motif. The former may be understood as (i) a stative verb in the suffix conjugation, */*šalima/*, 'it is well' (compare H. Ginsberg, *BASOR* 72 [1938] 19), or (ii) a common noun, */*šalāmu/* or */*šulmu/*, 'well-being' (compare S. Loewenstamm, *Biblica* 56 [1975] 112). The latter may be understood in the nominative or accusative (adverbial) case. D. Pardee, *Studi Fronzaroli* (forthcoming), has surveyed the anterior bibliography on these issues.

example of the Ugaritic « I.R. » motif to mean "what welfare".[276] D. Pardee has summarized both lines of evidence.[277] In sum, the analysis of « *mnm šlm* » as an non-personal, indefinite pronoun with a following common noun, 'whatever well-being', is consistent not only with the established usage of *mnm* in Ugaritic prose,[278] but also with the comparative parallels in Akkadian and Hittite.[279]

5.3.7 Catalog of the formulaic well-being motifs

This section lists the occurrences of the motif of reciprocal well-being, « S.R. I.R. », in Ugaritic letters, along with formal and functional variants. It is arranged according to categories of conceptual status and model. The statistically and contextually "standard" versions of the motif are treated first, followed by "non-canonical" variants.

---

[276]Ginsberg, *BASOR* 72 (1938) 19.

[277]Pardee, *Studi Fronzaroli* (forthcoming).

[278]See now J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* (2000) 243, § 45.122; G. del Olmo and J. Sanmartín, *DULAT* 2 (2003) 563.

[279]On Syro-Akkadian {mi-nu(-um)-me(-e) šul-ma-nu}, see the analysis proposed by G. Swaim in his 1962 Brandeis dissertation, *Grammar of the Akkadian Tablets Found at Ugarit*, 22-23 (for further bibliography, see del Olmo and J. Sanmartín, *DULAT* 2 [2003] 563; and Pardee, *Studi Fronzaroli* [forthcoming]). On the Hittite string {aš-šu-ul ku-it}, see Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 73.

5.3.7.1 « S.R. I.R. », the standard motif of reciprocal well-being

In « ASC BIO » letters:

RS 11.872:9-13 « *hlny ʿmny kll šlm tmny ʿm ůmy mnm šlm w rgm ttb ly* »

RS 15.008:14-20 « *ʿmny šlm kll w mnm šlm ʿm ůmy ʿmy tttb rgm* »

RS 16.379:8-11 « *hlny ʿmny* [*š*]*lm w tmn ʿm* [*ů*]*my mnm šl*[*m*] *w rgm* [*ttb*][280] *ly* »

RS 17.139:5-9 « *lḫt šlm … ht ʿmny kll šlm tmny ʿm ůmy mnm šlm w rgm ttb ly* »

RS 34.124:7-9 « *hnny ʿmn šl*[*m kl*]*l tmny ʿmk mnm šlm w rgm tt*<*b*> *ly* »

RS 92.2005:9-13 « *hln hn ʿmn šlm w tmn mnm šlm rgm ttb ʿmy* »

RS 94.5003+:8-12 « *hnn*[*y ʿmn*(*y*)] *šlm* [*tmny*] *ʿm ů*[*my mnm*] *šlm r*[*gm*] *tt*[*b*] »

As noted above,[281] there is no known example of a Ugaritic « ASC BIO » letter which explicitly omits the double motif « S.R. I.R. ».

In « ASC MIXED » letters:

RS 8.315:10-18 « *hnny ʿmny kll mỉd šlm … tmny ʿm ådtny mnm šlm rgm ttb l ʿbdk* »[282]

In « ASC POW » letters:

RS 16.137bis:8-12 « [*hnn*]*y* [*ʿm*]*ny* [*kll šlm*] *tm*[*ny ʿm*] *å*[*dty*] *mnm* [*šlm* (*w*)] *rgm* [*ttb l ʿbdk*] »

RS 20.199:11-17 « [*hnn*]*y* [*ʿmn*] *kll* [*mỉ*]*d šlm tmny ʿm ådty mnm šlm rgm ttb l ʿbdk* »[283]

---

[280]Reconstructed on the analogy of RS 11.872:13, which provides the closest formal, conceptual (ASC BIO), and contextual parallel.

[281]See above, section 5.3.3.

[282]The double motif here is "non-standard" in some sense, owing to the inclusion of the phrase « *w åp ånk nḫt* », 'and also I have rested,' between the formulaic « S.R. » and « I.R. » elements.

[283]The formulation is almost exactly identical to that of RS 8.315.

RS 94.2479:5-10 « *hlny hnn b bt mlk kll šlm tmny ʿm ȧdty mnm*[284] *w rgm tttb ʿm ʿbdh* »

RS 18.[312]:4'-5' « […] *ʿm⌜n⌝*[285] *šl[m* …] »

RS 92.2010:9-20 « *w hnn ʿm ʿbdk mȧd šlm w bʿly šlmh w šlm nkly w šlm bth w šlm šmʿ rgmk nʿm ȧt ttb ʿm ʿbdk* »[286]

In « HOR BIO » letters:

RS 18.031:6-9 « *hnny ʿmn šlm tmny ʿmk mnm šlm rgm ttb* »

RS 92.2005:29-33 « […] *hnn ʿmn* [*šlm t*]*m⌜n⌝* [*mnm š*]*⌜l⌝m* [*rgm*] *ttb* [?] »

In « DESC BIO » letters:

RS 18.147:6-8 « *hnny ʿmn šlm tmny* ʿ[*m*] *bny mnm* [*š*]*lm rgm ttb* [*ly*] »

In conceptually « UNMARKED » letters:

RS 29.095:5-8 « *hnny ʿmn š*[*l*]*m tmny ʿmk rgm ttb ly* »

In letters of unknown conceptual classification:

RS 19.158B:2'-6' « [*hln*]*y hnn ʿmn šlm tmn ʿmk mnm šlm* [*r*]*gm ttb l*[*y*] »

---

[284]Probably reconstruct « *mnm* <*šlm*> »; and explain the scribal error as a result of haplography (of the sign {m}).

[285]D. Pardee reads {ʿm⌜k⌝} (collation). On (purely!) formal grounds however, this is surprising: (1) one would have expected « *ʿm bʿly* » in this slot in a ASC POW letter such as this, and (2) one would have expected « *mnm šlm* » in the « I.R. » and not « *šlm* », following the prepositional phrase. It may be worthwhile to recollate line 4' with an imperfectly preserved « S.R. » motif in mind.

[286]The « I.R. » motif in particular contains numerous departures from the "standard" form.

5.3.7.2 « S.R. » alone

In conceptually « UNMARKED », contextually « DESCENDING » letters:

RS 18.038:3-4 « *ʿm špš kll mỉdm šlm* »

RIH 77/21A:4-9 « *hlny* [*ʿm špš mlk*] *rb k*[*ll šlm* …] *d m*⌈-⌉[…] *ḥw*[*t* …] *ṣb*[*ỉ* …] ⌈--⌉[…] »[287]

RS 17.434+:2-4 « *h*⌈*l*⌉[ny… *ʿm*] *šp*[*š mlk rb*] *w ʿm mlkt kll* [*šlm*] »[288]

5.3.7.3 « I.R. » alone

In « ASC POW » letters:

RS 9.479A:12-15 « *ʿm ảdty mnm šlm rgm tt̲t̲b l ʿbdh* »

RS 19.102:20-24 « *ʿm bʿly mnm šlm rgm* [(*t*)*t̲t̲*]*b* [*l*] *ʿbdk* »

RS 18.287:4'-6' « [*ʿm bʿly*] *mnm* [*šlm rgm* (*t*?)]*t̲t̲b* [*l*[289] *ʿb*]*dk* »

5.3.7.4 Imperfectly preserved

In letters of unknown conceptual classification:

RS 18.[400]:4'-6' « […]⌈-⌉*ny* […] *šlm* […] … »

RS 18.[482]:1'-2' « … [… *rg*]*m t̲t̲b* […] »

---

[287]The continuation of the « S.R. » motif in lines 6-9 is fragmentary, but probably represents an expansion similar to those found in the Amarna, Boğazköy Akkadian, and Ras Shamra Akkadian corpora; see above, section 3.4.1, and Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter* 1 (1989) 49-55.

[288]On the motif which follows the « S.R. », which is a formal variant of the « sal » formula, see above, section 3.7.2.1.

[289]This reconstruction requires that a blank space had been left between the preposition *l* at the beginning of the line and the noun phrase *ʿbdk* at the end; such exaggerated spacing in the final line of the « S.R. » is rare, but not unattested (cf. RS 94.5003+:12).

5.3.7.5 Possible "non-standard" situation reports

RS 17.063:2 « *ḥytn w šlmtn* »

'I am alive, and I am in good health!'

RS 17.117:3-4 « *hn ủnk bnk* [?] *ḥytn lp špš* »

'Now then, (as for) me, your son … I am alive by the word[290] of the Sun!'

On the interpretation of these two passages, see the discussion in section 3.7.2.3 above.

[290]Literally, 'mouth'.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

The studies in Ugaritic epistolography presented here treat two bodies of data: (1) the formulas of the *praescriptio*, and (2) the patterned motifs found in the body. A different approach was necessary for each.

The former are superficially well understood, and have been the subject of various synthetic treatments.[1] Chapters 1-4 build on this previous research both materially and contextually: by incorporating data from unpublished letters, by approaching the formal analysis from the wider perspective of cuneiform letter-writing in Late Bronze West Asia, and by consistently attempting to interpret the patterns of formal variation in terms of social facts drawn from the letters themselves.

The detailed study of the address, prostration, salutation, and benediction formulas presents a contrast with the coverage, of a much more preliminary nature, accorded to the second category of data. Chapter 5 treats the body of Ugaritic letters, relying on the functional analyses done by J. Nougayrol[2] and S. Ahl,[3] but also paying particular attention to stereotyped patterns of compositional structure. The resulting dual emphasis on form and function is ultimately intended to complement a more

---

[1]O. Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 10-23; S. Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973); A. Kristensen, *UF* 9 (1977) 143-158; A. Caquot, *SDB* 9 (1979) 1413-1417; J.-L. Cunchillos, *Estudios de Epistolografía ugarítica* (1989) 141-234; *idem*, *TO* 2 (1989) 241-267 (revised English translation in *HUS* [1999] 359-374).

[2]Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* 5 (1968) 67-68.

[3]Ahl, *Epistolary Texts* (1973) 99-129.

traditional philological approach in the ongoing interpretation of Ugaritic epistolary prose.

6.1 Epistolary formulas

6.1.1 Standard and non-standard traditions

The statistical predominance of certain formal patterns and their association with culturally normative contexts allow the definition of a "standard" formulary over against a diverse group of "non-standard" traditions. Both corpora deserve study, but the mainstream tradition takes precedence, since it provides the formal and contextual standards against which variants are defined. Chapters 1-4 treat essentially the "standard" Ugaritic epistolary formulas; the discussion of variant traditions is peripheral.

6.1.2 The standard Ugaritic epistolary tradition

Four epistolary formulas in the *praescriptio* and one highly formalized motif in the body provide the basis for a formal definition of the "standard" Ugaritic epistolary tradition. Each formula presents distinctive aspects of composition and distribution.

The address formula is characterized by three main compositional patterns, which dovetail neatly with three distinct conceptual categories:

(1) « *l* ID REL *rgm tḥm* ID REL », appropriate in conceptually ASC letters;

(2) « *tḥm* ID *l* ID *rgm* », employed in conceptually UNMARKED letters;

and (3) « *tḥm* ID *l* ID REL *rgm* », frequent in conceptually HOR letters.

The prostration formula is distinguished by its distribution more than its composition: it occurs in conceptually ASC letters, but otherwise generally not.

The salutation formula pairs two main compositional patterns with a corresponding conceptual distinction:

(1) « *l*(*y*/*n*)+REL *yšlm* », appropriate in conceptually ASC letters;

and (2) « *yšlm l*+PRONOUN », employed in other situations.

The benediction formula is standardized in composition, the most frequent pattern being « *ỉlm tǵr*+PRONOUN *tšlm*+PRONOUN ». Its distribution is also patterned: the formula is (i) especially appropriate in letters which are conceptually HOR in status or which follow the BIO model, (ii) not inappropriate in ASC POW letters, and (iii) generally not used in UNMARKED letters.

Finally, the distribution of the motif of reciprocal well-being also shows a pattern: it is especially appropriate in letters in which the relation between the correspondents is expressed with the REL terminology of parents and children.

6.1.3 An appreciation of the Ugaritic tradition

An accurate evaluation of the Ugaritic epistolary tradition requires that attention be paid not only to the formal parallels shared with contemporary Akkadian and Hittite traditions, but also to the compositional and distributional features that render the Ugaritic scribal usage unique. Both contribute to a meaningful internal and comparative analysis of the tradition.

6.1.3.1 The independence of the Ugaritic tradition

On a superficial level, considerations of script and language affirm the independent status of the Ugaritic epistolary tradition. Demonstrating independence on a formal level is more difficult, since the five epistolary formulas productively used in Ugaritic letters were also known and widely employed in contemporary Akkadian

and Hittite epistolary traditions. Even here, however, the existence of three precise formal parallels in the Ugaritic literary corpus provides a strong argument for the independent status of the standard Ugaritic epistolary tradition. The micro-compositional components of the address and prostration formulas find clear parallels in the local mythological tradition; the literary motifs corresponding to the « pros » formula, and to the « R » and « S » elements of the address formula, are as follows:

« R »:	literary « *rgm l* ID (REL) »	≈	epistolary « *l* ID (REL) *rgm* »
« S »:	literary « *tḥm* ID (REL) »	≈	epistolary « *tḥm* ID (REL) »
« pros »:	literary « *l pʿn* N … (QL) … »	≈	epistolary « *l pʿn* N … QL »

In addition, the contextual usage of these literary motifs generally echoes, and perhaps even reflects, local epistolary protocol.

The existence of such formal and contextual parallels requires, at the very least, that the contextual interpretation of the Ugaritic epistolary address and prostration formulas be intimately linked with that of the corresponding literary parallels in the Ugaritic mythological texts. If the two epistolary formulas are to be explained as translations from an original Akkadian protocol, for example, then the corresponding literary motifs ought to be explained in like manner. Since the latter appears unlikely, however, it is reasonable to suppose a certain independence for these aspects of the local epistolary tradition.

These parallels also have implications for the antiquity of the Ugaritic epistolary tradition. Inasmuch as the literary motifs derive from the context of epistolary communication, the chronological origins of the corresponding epistolary formulas must be pushed back, at least as far as the date of redaction of the literary texts in which they appear. Since the literary « R », « S », and « pros » motifs are found predominantly in the *Baʿlu Cycle* of myths, the date of redaction of this

particular literary work would provide a plausible *terminus ante quem*, not only for the address and prostration formulas, but also for the tradition of which they formed an integral part.

6.1.3.2 Comparative parallels

The emphasis in the preceding paragraph on the independence of the Ugaritic epistolary tradition is not intended to contradict the clear and far-ranging formal parallels found in contemporary Akkadian and Hittite traditions, but rather to aid in dealing with the latter in an informed and reasonable way.

Shared formal traits between one scribal tradition, « X », and another, « Y », can be interpreted in at least three different ways, including any combination thereof: (1) tradition « X » inherited the shared traits from tradition « Y », (2) traditions « X » and « Y » share a common ancestor, or (3) formal resemblances between « X » and « Y » are coincidental.

The extensiveness and magnitude of the comparative parallels observed in chapters 1-4 above render the third possibility unlikely in most cases. The first interpretation, on the other hand, would seem to require the demonstrable existence of formal parallels in earlier traditions. This observation assumes importance when one attempts to evaluate critically the occasional claim that the Ugaritic epistolary formulas were "translations from Akkadian." Until the existence of precise compositional and distributional parallels to the five Ugaritic epistolary formulas can be demonstrated in chronologically anterior traditions, the second hypothesis offered above should be favored.

6.1.3.2.1 SIBLING TRADITIONS IN LETTERS FROM RAS SHAMRA AND MESKENE

In terms of the composition and distribution of the formulas deemed diagnostic of the Ugaritic epistolary tradition, the closest comparative parallels are without a doubt offered by the corpus of Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra. No significant compositional or distributional differences are evident. The implications of this extensive formal similarity become clear when one considers the local provenance of the Ras Shamra Akkadian letters: the formal parallels are found not only in letters which derive from domestic correspondence within the kingdom of Ugarit, but also in those which reflect correspondence within the northern Levant generally.

This broader horizon implies, at the very least, that the Ugaritic epistolary tradition was one manifestation of a common tradition which included other scribal centers in North Syria. The formal parallels between the Ugaritic formulas and those attested in the Akkadian letters from Tell Meskene bear this out. The size of the Meskene corpus is admittedly more modest than that of Ras Shamra, and the compositional and distributional parallels with the Ugaritic tradition less extensive, but the productive presence of all five diagnostic epistolary formulas is unmistakable. In matters of epistolary usage, the scribal habits represented there share a common heritage with those known from Ras Shamra.

6.1.3.2.2 COUSIN TRADITIONS FROM HITTITE ANATOLIA AND THE SOUTHERN LEVANT

After Ras Shamra and Meskene, the next most significant comparative corpora for the contextual appreciation of the Ugaritic tradition come from sites in Hittite Anatolia. The Hittite letters from Ma□at Höyük and Boğazköy attest to traditions that are unmistakably related to those of northern Syria. All five diagnostic formulas have precise compositional parallels that were in productive use. Significant differences of

composition and distribution must also be mentioned, however, implying a more distant kinship than within the contemporary north Syrian group: (1) the prostration formula, though attested in Hittite letters, is rare; (2) the salutation formula follows essentially one compositional model, not two as in the Syrian corpora; and (3) the reciprocal motif of well-being is very rarely attested as such, although the individual components were both productively used independently. In other formal respects, however, the traditions attested in the Ma□at and Boğazköy letters align with those of Ras Shamra and Meskene.

Various Levantine epistolary traditions which show remarkable formal parallels with Ugaritic usage are also known from the Amarna corpus. With respect to the five epistolary formulas studied here, however, these letters of diverse provenance generally show fewer and less extensive compositional and distributional parallels than the Hittite corpora. The prostration formula, rare in the Hittite traditions, is an exception: well over two hundred « pros » formulas appear in conceptually ASC letters in the Amarna corpus, and these find extensive formal parallels in Ugaritic letters and in the Akkadian letters from Ras Shamra and Tell Meskene. The address formula in some of the traditions attested in the Amarna corpus also resembles the composition and distribution of its Ugaritic counterpart, but such is not the case for the « sal » or « ben » formulas. Furthermore, the Amarna corpus contains no parallel to the Ugaritic motif of reciprocal well-being. Despite certain indications of a common scribal heritage with the traditions of their northern neighbors, the epistolary usages employed in the diverse cities of the southern Levant present parallels to the Ugaritic corpus which are nevertheless more distant, both formally and contextually, than those in letters from Anatolian sites.

6.1.3.2.3 DISTANT KIN IN MESOPOTAMIA: A SHARED AMORITE HERITAGE

Significant formal parallels between the Western scribal traditions described above and the epistolary formulas used in contemporary Mesopotamia are few and far between. The Middle Assyrian and Kassite Babylonian epistolary traditions alike (i) lack precise compositional and distributional parallels to the Ugaritic address formula, (ii) productively employ certain "polite formulas" unknown to the Ugaritic tradition, and (iii) in those rare cases where a « pros » formula appears, contain one that is significantly different from the Ugaritic pattern.

Such formal similarities as do exist between the Ugaritic formulas and their counterparts in Middle Assyrian and Kassite Babylonian letters, such as the basic form of the salutation and benediction, are also shared with epistolary traditions of the Old Babylonian period. Clearly, no direct influence from contemporary Assyria or Babylonia was involved in the form of the Ugaritic address formula, prostration formula, and the motif of reciprocal well-being. For the « sal » and « ben » formulas, formal similarities are probably best explained as a result of a shared "Amorite" heritage, rather than direct influence in one direction or the other.

6.2 STEREOTYPED MOTIFS OF THE BODY

Chapter 5 includes a discussion of the pragmatic functions which may be attributed to messages in the body of Ugaritic letters, as well as a treatment of the formal patterns found there. These studies represent a contribution of an entirely different nature than chapters 1-4. Where the latter aim at exhaustive coverage, the former is preliminary in nature, and intended to lay the groundwork for further research in Ugaritic epistolary prose.

In particular, a more detailed treatment of the stereotyped motifs found in the body of Ugaritic letters, cataloging not only their form but also their contextual function, would pave the way for an eventual comparative study, along similar lines as that undertaken for the epistolary formulas of the *praescriptio*. Judging from its importance in chapters 1-4, a controlled comparative approach could prove complementary to a more traditional philological treatment in the contextual interpretation of those Ugaritic messages which have thus far eluded a convincing decipherment. Beyond potentially providing for a better understanding of Ugaritic epistolary prose, however, expanding and developing the formal study of the body also has merit on a broader level, by allowing a more subtle analysis of the position of the Ugaritic epistolary habits within the contemporary scribal traditions of the Late Bronze Age, and especially those of Syria and Anatolia, and thus permitting a better understanding of the position of the Ugaritic scribal tradition in its wider cultural environment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aartun, K. *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen.* 1. Teil: *Adverbien, Verneinungspartikeln, Bekräftigungspartikeln, Hervorhebungspartikeln.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 21. Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1974. [*Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen* 1]

Ahl, S. W. *Epistolary Texts from Ugarit: Structural and Lexical Correspondences in Epistles in Akkadian and Ugaritic.* Ph. D. dissertation, Brandeis University. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1973. [*Epistolary Texts*]

Aistleitner, J. *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache.* Edited by O. Eissfeldt. Berichte über die Verhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Band 106, Heft 3. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963. [*Wörterbuch*]

Albright, W. F. "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 56 (1937), pp. 145-176.

Albright, W. F. "A Case of Lèse-Majesté in Pre-Israelite Lachish, with Some Remarks on the Israelite Conquest." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 87 (1942), pp. 32-38.

Albright, W. F. "A Prince of Taanach in the Fifteenth Century B.C." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 94 (1944), pp. 12-27.

Albright, W. F. "An Unrecognized Amarna Letter from Ugarit." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 95 (1945), pp. 30-33.

Alcalay, R. *The Complete Hebrew-English Dictionary.* Ramat-Gan and Jerusalem: Massada Publishing Co., 1981. [*Complete Hebrew-English Dictionary*]

Alp, S. *Maşat-Höyük'te Bulunan Çivi Yazili Hitit Tabletleri (Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat-Höyük).* Turk Tarih Kurumu Yayinlari, VI, no. 34. Ankara: Turk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, 1991. [*Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat-Höyük*]

Alp, S. *Hethitische Briefe aus Masat-Höyük.* Turk Tarih Kurumu Yayinlari, VI, no. 35. Ankara: Turk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, 1991. [*Hethitische Briefe aus Masat-Höyük*]

Alp, S. "Akkadian Names of Some Scribes in the Maşat-Letters." In H. Erkanal, V. Donbaz, and A. Uğuroğlu, eds., *XXXIV. Uluslararası Assiriyoloji Kongresi. Istanbul, July 6-10, 1987 (XXXIVème Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale).* Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, XXVI. Dizi - Sa. 3. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1998. Pp. 47-61. [RAI 34]

Alster, B. "Epic Tales from Ancient Sumer: Enmerkar, Lugalbanda, and Other Cunning Heros." In J. Sasson *et al.*, eds., *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East.* 4 Volumes. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1995. Vol. 4, pp. 2315-2326. [*CANE* 4]

Amiet, P. *Corpus des cylindres de Ras Shamra-Ougarit.* Volume 2: *Sceaux-cylindres en hématite et pierres diverses.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, no. 9. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1992. [RSO 9]

André-Salvini, B., and M. Salvini. "Un nouveau vocabulaire trilingue sumérien-akkadien-hourrite de Ras Shamra." In D. I. Owen and G. Wilhelm, eds., *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians.* Volume 9: *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi* 10/2. Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 1998. Pp. 3-40 (photos pp. 32-40). [*Nuzi and the Hurrians* 9]

Archi, A. *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi.* Heft 57: *Hethitische Briefe und Texte verschiedenen Inhalts.* Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Zentralinstitut für alte Geschichte und Archäologie. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1977. [*KUB* 57]

Arnaud, D. "La culture suméro-accadienne." In J.-C. Courtois *et al.*, "Ras Shamra", *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible.* Volume 9. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1979. Cols. 1348-1359. [*SDB* 9]

Arnaud, D. "Une lettre du roi de Tyr au roi d'Ougarit: milieux d'affaires et de culture en Syrie à la fin de l'âge du Bronze Récent." *Syria* 59 (1982), pp. 101-107.

Arnaud, D. "Les textes cunéiformes suméro-accadiens des campagnes 1979-1980 à Ras Shamra-Ougarit." *Syria* 59 (1982), pp. 199-222.

Arnaud, D. "La Syria du moyen-Euphrate sous la protectorat hittite: l'administration d'après trois lettres inédites." *Aula Orientalis* 2 (1984), pp. 179-188.

Arnaud, D. *Recherches au pays d'Aštata.* Emar, tome 6. 4 volumes. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1985-1987. [Emar 6]

Arnaud, D. "Les ports de la «Phénicie» à la fin de l'âge du Bronze Récent (XIV-XIII siècles) d'après les textes cunéiformes de Syrie." *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 30 (1992), pp. 179-194.

Arnaud, D. "Tablettes de genres divers du Moyen-Euphrate." *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 30 (1992), pp. 195-245.

Arnaud, D. "Études sur Alalah et Ougarit à l'âge du Bronze récent." *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 37 (1996), pp. 47-65.

Arnaud, D. "Hazor à la fin de l'âge du Bronze d'après un document méconnu: RS 20.225." *Aula Orientalis* 16 (1998), pp. 27-35.

Arnaud, D. "Le dialecte d'Alalah: un examen préliminaire." *Aula Orientalis* 16 (1998), pp. 143-186.

Arnaud, D. "Prolégomènes à la rédaction d'une histoire d'Ougarit II: Les bordereaux de rois divinisés." *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 41 (1999), pp. 153-173.

Arnaud, D. "Lettres (nos 5-21)". In M. Yon and D. Arnaud, eds., *Études ougaritiques.* Vol. 1: *Travaux 1985-1995.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, tome 14. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 2001. Pp. 257-322. [*RSO* 14]

Arnaud, D. "Textes administratifs religieux et profanes (nos 22-28)". In M. Yon and D. Arnaud, eds., *Études ougaritiques.* Vol. 1: *Travaux 1985-1995.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, tome 14. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 2001. Pp. 323-332. [*RSO* 14]

Astour, M. "Some New Divine Names from Ugarit." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 86 (1966), pp. 277-284.

Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1962. [*How to Do Things with Words*]

Bach, K., and L. Harnish. *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1979. [*Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*]

Bakir, ʿAbd el-Moḥsen. *Egyptian Epistolography from the Eighteenth to the Twenty-first Dynasty.* Bibliothèque d'étude, tome 48. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, 1970.

Baneth, D. H. "Zu den altkanaanäischen Epos von Ras Shamra." *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 35 (1932), cols. 449-453.

Barr, J. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament.* Reprint of 1968 edition, with additions and corrections. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987. [*Comparative Philology*]

Beckman, G. "Mesopotamians and Mesopotamian Learning at Ḫattuša." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 35 (1983), pp. 97-114.

Beckman, G. "Some Observations on the Šuppiluliuma-Šattiwaza Treaties." In M. Cohen, D. Snell, and D. Weisberg, eds., *The Tablet and the Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo.* Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 1993. Pp. 53-57. [*Studies Hallo*]

Beckman, G. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts.* SBL Writings from the Ancient World, no. 7. Edited by H. A. Hoffner, Jr. Atlanta: Scholars, 1996.

Beckman, G. *Texts from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen.* History of the Ancient Near East Monographs, no. 2. Padova: La Modernissima, 1996. [*Vicinity of Emar*]

Belmonte Marín, J. A. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Texte aus Syrien im 2. Jt. v. Chr.* Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes, Band 12/2. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2001. [*Orts- und Gewässernamen der Texte aus Syrien*]

Berger, P.-R. "Die Alašia-Briefe Ugaritica 5, Noug. Nrn. 22-24." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 1 (1969), pp. 217-221.

Berman, H., and H. Klengel. *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi.* Heft 48: *Texte des hattischen Kreises und verschiedenen Inhalts.* Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Zentralinstitut für alte Geschichte und Archäologie. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1977. [*KUB* 48]

Bezold, C., and E. A. W. Budge. *The Tell el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum with Autotype Facsimiles.* London: Harrison and Sons, 1892. [*Tell el-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum*]

Bickerman, E. "Couper une alliance." *Archives d'histoire et du droit oriental* 5 (1950-1951), pp. 133-156.

Biella, J. C. *Dictionary of Old South Arabic, Sabaean Dialect.* Harvard Semitic Studies, no. 25. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982. [*DOSA*]

Biggs, R. D. "A Letter from Kassite Nippur." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 19 (1965), pp. 95-102.

Blau, J., and J. C. Greenfield. "Ugaritic Glosses." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 200 (1970), pp. 11-17.

Blau, J., and S. E. Loewenstamm. "Zur Frage der scriptio plena im ugaritischen und Verwandes." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 2 (1970), pp. 19-33.

Böhl, F. M. T. *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Kanaanismen.* Leipziger Semitistische Studien, Band 5, Heft 2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1909. [*Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe*]

Bordreuil, P. "Cunéiformes alphabétiques non-canoniques. I. La tablette alphabétique senestroverse RS 22.03." *Syria* 58 (1981), pp. 301-311.

Bordreuil, P. "Quatre documents en cunéiformes alphabétiques mal connus ou inédits (*U.H.* 138, RS 23.492, RS 34.356, Musée d'Alep M 3601)." *Semitica* 32 (1982), pp. 5-14.

Bordreuil, P., ed. *Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville: Les textes de la 34e campagne (1973).* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, no. 7. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1991. [RSO 7]

Bordreuil, P., R. Hawley, and D. Pardee. "Lettres (n°s 59-79)." Chapter 3 in *Textes ougaritiques des campagnes de 1994, 1996, 1999, 2000, 2002.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit series. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, in preparation. [*Textes ougaritiques 1994-2002*]

Bordreuil, P., and Fl. Malbran-Labat. "Les archives de la maison d'Ourtenou." *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1995), pp. 443-456.

Bordreuil, P., and D. Pardee. "Le rituel funéraire ougaritique RS 34.126." *Syria* 59 (1982), pp. 121-128.

Bordreuil, P., and D. Pardee. *La trouvaille épigraphique de l'Ougarit.* Volume 1: *Concordance.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, tome 5. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1989. [*TEO* 1]

Bordreuil, P., and D. Pardee. "Lettres (nos 49-51)". In M. Yon and D. Arnaud, eds., *Études ougaritiques.* Vol. 1: *Travaux 1985-1995.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, tome 14. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 2001. Pp. 371-386. [*Études ougaritiques* 1]

Borger, R. *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur.* Volume 3: *Inhaltliche Ordnung der sumerischen und akkadischen Texte. Anhang: Sekundärliteratur in Auswahl.* Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1975. [*HKL* 3]

Bottéro, J. "Magie. A. In Mesopotamien." In E. Ebeling *et al.*, eds., *Reallexikon der Assyriologie.* Band 7. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1987-1990. Pp. 200-234. [*RlA* 7]

Brinkman, J. A. *Materials and Studies for Kassite History.* Vol. 1: *A Catalogue of Cuneiform Sources Pertaining to Specific Monarchs of the Kassite Dynasty.* Chicago: The Oriental Insitute of the University of Chicago, 1976. [*Materials*]

Brockelmann, C. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen.* I. Band: *Laut- und Formenlehre.* Berlin: Verlag von Reuthner & Reichard, 1908. [*Grundriss* 1]

Cancik-Kirschbaum, E. *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe aus Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad.* Berichte der Ausgrabung Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad / Dūr-Katlimmu, Band 4, Texte 1. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1996. [*Die mittelassyrischen Briefe*]

Caquot, A. "Hébreu et Araméen." *Annuaire du Collège de France* 75 (1975), pp. 423-432.

Caquot, A. "La lettre de la reine Puduḫepa." In C. F.-A. Shaeffer, ed., *Ugaritica.* Volume 7. Mission de Ras Shamra 18. Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 99, no. Paris: Mission Archéologique de Ras Shamra and Geuthner, 1978. Pp. 121-134. [*Ugaritica* 7]

Caquot, A. "La littérature ugaritique." In J.-C. Courtois *et al.*, "Ras Shamra", *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible.* Volume 9. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1979. Cols. 1361-1417. [*SDB* 9]

Caquot, A., M. Sznycer, and A. Herdner. *Textes ougaritiques.* Tome 1: *Mythes et legendes. Introduction, traduction, commentaire.* Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient, no. 14. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1974. [*TO* 1]

Caubet, A., and F. Poplin. "Matières dures animales : Études du matèriau." In M. Yon, ed., *Le Centre de la Ville: 38e-44e Campagnes (1978-1984).* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, no. 3. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1987. Pp. 273-306. [RSO 3]

Chiera, E. *Excavations at Nuzi.* Volume 1: *Texts of Varied Contents.* Harvard Semitic Series, vol. 5. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929. [HSS 5]

Chiera, E. *Joint Expedition with the Iraq Museum at Nuzi.* Vol. 4: *Proceedings in Court.* American Schools of Oriental Research, Publications of the Baghdad School. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1934. [*JEN* 4]

Chiera, E. *Joint Expedition with the Iraq Museum at Nuzi.* Vol. 5: *Mixed Texts.* American Schools of Oriental Research, Publications of the Baghdad School. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1934. [*JEN* 5]

Clemens, D. *Sources for Ugaritic Ritual and Sacrifice.* Vol. 1: *Ugaritic and Ugarit Akkadian Texts.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 284. Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 2001. [*Sources for Ugaritic Ritual and Sacrifice* 1]

Cohen, C. "The 'Held Method' for Comparative Semitic Philology." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 19 (1989), pp. 9-23.

Cohen, C. *Contextual Priority in Biblical Hebrew Philology.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming. [*Contexual Priority*]

Cohen, D. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques, comprenant un ficher comparatif de Jean Cantineau.* Fascicule 1. Paris and La Haye: Mouton, 1970. [*Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques* 1]

Cohen, D., F. Bron, and A. Lonnet. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques.* Fascicule 5: H-HṮṮ. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 1995. [*Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques* 5 (H-HṮṮ)]

Cohen, S. *Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1973. [*Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta*]

Cole, S. W., and P. Machinist. *Letters from Priests to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal.* State Archives of Assyria, no. 13. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1998. [SAA 13]

Cornelius, I. "The Iconography of Ugarit." In W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, no. 39. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999. Pp. 586-602. [*HUS*]

Cross, F. M. "William Foxwell Albright (1891-1971)." *Yearbook of the American Philosophical Society* (1972), pp. 114.

Cross, F. M. "Alphabets and Pots: Reflections on Typological Method in the Dating of Human Artifacts." *Maarav* 3 (1982), pp. 121-136.

Cross, F. M. *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998. [*From Epic to Canon*]

Cunchillos, J.-L. "Les adverbs I." *l'Annuaire de la Ve Section de l'E.P.H.E.* 88 (1979-1980), pp. 237-240.

Cunchillos, J.-L. "Étude philologique de *malʾāk*. Perspectives sur le *malʾāk* de la divinité dans la Bible hébraïque." In *Congress Volume. Vienna 1980.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. 32. Leiden: Brill, 1981. Pp. 30-51. [SVT 32]

Cunchillos, J.-L. "Expressions religieuses de la vie quotidienne à Ugarit." *l'Annuaire de la Ve Section de l'E.P.H.E.* 90 (1981-1982), pp. 237-239.

Cunchillos, J.-L. "Une formule inédite de salutation en ugaritique: *bʿl yšûl šlmk* "que Baʿal s'occupe de ton bien-être!" RS 17.117. Ses parallèles akkadiens, hébreu et araméen." *Aula Orientalis* 1 (1983), pp. 61-66.

Cunchillos, J.-L. "Recherches sur le vocabulaire de la correspondance ugaritique." *l'Annuaire de la Ve Section de l'E.P.H.E.* 92 (1983-1984), pp. 257-264.

Cunchillos, J.-L. "Correspondance." In A. Caquot, J.-M. de Tarragon, and J.-L. Cunchillos, *Textes ougaritiques.* Tome 2: *Textes religieux, rituels, correspondance.* Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient, tome 14. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1989. Pp. 239-421, 446-478. [*TO* 2]

Cunchillos, J.-L. *Estudios de Epistolografía ugarítica.* Institucíon San Jerónimo para la Investigacíon Bíblica IV: Fuentes de la Ciencia Bíblica, no. 3. Valencia: Institucíon San Jerónimo, 1989. [*Estudios de Epistolografía ugarítica*]

Cunchillos, J.-L. *La trouvaille épigraphique de l'Ougarit.* Volume 2: *Bibliographie.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, tome 5. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1989. [*TEO* 2]

Cunchillos, J.-L. "The Ugaritic Letters." In W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, Band 39. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999. Pp. 359-374. [*HUS*]

Dalley, S. *Myths from Mesopotamia : Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh and Others.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1989. [*Myths from Mesopotamia*]

Dalix, A.-S. "Exemples de bilinguisme à Ougarit. Iloumilkou: la double identité d'un scribe." In F. Briquel-Chatonnet, ed., *Mosaïque de langues, mosaïque culturelle: Le bilinguisme dans le Proche-orient ancien. Actes de la Table Ronde du 18 novembre 1995 organisée par l'URA 1062 "Études Sémitiques".* Antiquités Sémitiques, no. 1. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1996. Pp. 81-90. [*Le bilinguisme*]

Dalix, A.-S. "Ougarit au XIIIe siècle av. J.-C.: nouvelles perspectives historiques." *CRAIBL* (1997), pp. 819-824.

Dalix, A.-S. "Šuppiluliuma (II ?) dans un texte alphabétique d'Ugarit et la date d'apparition de l'alphabet cunéiforme. Nouvelle proposition de datation des « Archives Ouest »." *Semitica* 48 (1998), pp. 5-15.

De Moor, J. C. Review of *Der Mythus der Kanaanäer*, by A. Jirku (Bonn: Habelt, 1966). In *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (1969), pp. 101-104.

De Moor, J. C. "Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra II." *Ugarit Forschungen* 2 (1970), pp. 303-327.

De Moor, J. C. *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu according to the Version of Ilimilku.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, no. 16. Kevelaer: Butzon and Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1971. [*Seasonal Pattern*]

de Biberstein Kazimirski, A. *Dictionnaire arabe-français contenant toutes les racines de la langue arabe, leurs dérivés, tant dans l'idiome vulgaire que dans l'idiome litéral, ainsi que les dialectes d'Alger et de Maroc.* 2 Volumes. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1860. [*Dictionnaire arabe-français*]

de Jong, R. E. *A Grammar of the Bedouin Dialects of the Northern Sinai Littoral: Bridging the Linguistic Gap between the Eastern and Western Arab World.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, Band 52. Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill, 2000. [*Bedouin Dialects of the Northern Sinai*]

del Olmo Lete, G. *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan segun la tradicion de Ugarit.* Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1981. [*Mitos y leyendas de Canaan*]

del Olmo Lete, G. *La religión cananea según la litúrgia de Ugarit.* Aula Orientalis-Supplementa, no. 3. Barcelona: Editorial AUSA, 1992. [*La religión cananea*]

del Olmo Lete, G. *Canaanite Religion: According to the Liturgical Texts of Ugarit.* Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1999. [*Canaanite Religion*]

del Olmo Lete, G., and J. Sanmartín. *Diccionario de la Lengua Ugarítica.* 2 Volumes. Aula Orientalis - Supplementa, nos. 7-8. Barcelona: Editorial AUSA, 1996-2000. [*DLU*]

del Olmo Lete, G., and J. Sanmartín. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition.* Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section One: The Near and Middle East, volume 67. Translated from Spanish by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Two Parts. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003. [*DULAT*]

Dhorme, É. "La langue de Canaan. 1. Le verbe aux formes simples." *Revue Biblique* ?? (1913), pp. Pp. 369-393.

Dhorme, P. "Première traduction des textes phéniciens de Ras Shamra." *Revue Biblique* 40 (1931), pp. 32-56.

Dhorme, E. "Deux tablettes de Ras-Shamra de la campagne de 1932." *Syria* 14 (1933) 229-237.

Dhorme, E. "Nouvelle lettre d'Ugarit en écriture alphabétique." *Syria* 19 (1938), pp. 142-146.

Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz. "Beschriftete Lungen- und Lebermodelle aus Ugarit." In C. F.-A. Schaeffer, ed., *Ugaritica.* Volume 6. Mission de Ras Shamra 17. Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 81. Paris: Geunther, 1969. Pp. 165-179. [*Ugaritica* 6]

Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz. "Die Inschrift der Statue des Königs Idrimi von Alalaḫ." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 13 (1981), pp. 201-269.

Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz. "Orthographie und Inhalt im ugaritischen Brief KTU 2.16." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 18 (1983), pp. 111-114.

Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz. *Studien zur den ugaritischen Texten.* Vol. 1: *Mythos und Ritual in KTU 1.12, 1.24, 1.96, 1.100 und 1.114.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 269/1. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000. [*Mythos und Ritual*]

Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz. "Ugaritisch *qīl* G 'fallen' und seine abgeleiteten Stämme Š und Št." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 32 (2000), pp. 177-194.

Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín. *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit [KTU].* AOAT, no. 24/1. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1976. [*KTU*]

Dietrich, M., O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín. *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places (KTU: second, enlarged edition).* ALASPM, no. 8. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995. [*KTU*^{2}]

Dijkstra, M. "Marginalia to the Ugaritic Letters in KTU (I)." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 19 (1987), pp. 37-48.

Dijkstra, M. "Ugaritic Prose." In W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, Band 39. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999. Pp. 140-164. [*HUS*]

Dobrusin, D. L. "The Third Masculine Plural of the Prefixed Form of the Verb in Ugaritic." *Journal of the American Near Eastern Society* 13 (1981), pp. 5-14.

Dossin, G. *Textes cunéiformes du Louvre.* Volume 17: *Lettres de la première dynastie babylonienne.* Tome 1. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1933. [TCL 17]

Driver, G. R. "Affirmation by Exclamatory Negation." *JANES* 5 (1973) 107-114.

Durand, J.-M. "Sumérien et akkadien en pays amorite." *M.A.R.I.* 1 (1982), pp. 79-89.

Durand, J.-M. "L'assemblée en Syrie à l'époque pré-amorite." In P. Fronzaroli, ed., *Miscellanea Eblaitica*, vol. 2. Quaderni di Semitistica, no. 16. Firenze: Dipartimento di linguistica, Università di Firenze, 1989. Pp. 27-44. [*Miscellanea Eblaitica* 2]

Dussaud, R. "A propos d'un protocole à Ugarit." *Syria* 19 (1938), pp. 184-186.

Edel, E. *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi in babylonischer und hethitischer Sprache.* Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Abhandlungen 77. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1994. [*Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköi*]

Edzard, D. O. "Die Tontafeln von Kāmid el-Lōz." In D. O. Edzard, R. Hachmann, P. Maiberger *et al.*, *Kamid el-Loz—Kumidi: Schriftdokumente aus Kamid el-Loz.* Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Alterumskunde, Band 7. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1970. Pp. 50-62 (photos: pp. 50-51; copies: pp. 52-54). [*Kamid el-Loz—Kumidi*]

Edzard, D. O. "Die 3. Person m. pl. *tiprusū* im Altakkadischen von Māri." In J.-M. Durand and J.-R. Kupper, eds., *Miscellanea babylonica: Mélanges offerts à Maurice Birot.* Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1985. Pp. 85-86. [*Mélanges Birot*]

Fales, F. M. "Aramaic Letters and Neo-Assyrian Letters: Philological and Methodological Notes." *JAOS* 107 (1987) 451-469.

Figulla, H. H., and E. F. Weidner. *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi.* Heft 1. 30. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1916. [*KBo* 1]

Fincke, J. "The Nuzi Collection of the Harvard Semitic Museum." In D. I. Owen and G. Wilhelm, ed., *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians.* Volume 10: *Nuzi at Seventy-Five.* Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 1999. Pp. 13-24. [*Nuzi and the Hurrians* 10]

Finegan, E. *Language: its structure and use.* Second Edition. New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1994.

Finkelstein, J. J. "Cuneiform Tablets from Tell Billa." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 7 (1953), pp. 111-176.

Firth, R. "Verbal and Bodily Rituals in Greeting and Parting." In J. S. La Fontaine, ed., *The Interpretation of Ritual: Essays in Honor of A. I. Richards.* London: Tavistock Publications, 1972. [*Essays A. I. Richards*]

Fleisch, H. "Khabar." In C. E. Bosworth *et al.*, eds., *Encyclopédie de l'Islam.* Tome IV: IRAN-KHA. Leiden, New York, and Paris: Brill and Éditions Maisonneuve & Larose, 1978. P. 928. [*Encyclopédie de l'Islam* 4]

Fleming, D. E. *The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar: A Window on Ancient Syrian Religion.* Harvard Semitic Studies, no. 42. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992. [*The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar*]

Foster, B. R. "Letters and Literature: A Ghost's Entreaty." In M. E. Cohen, D. C. Snell, and D. B. Weisberg, eds., *The Tablet and the Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo.* Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 1993. Pp. 98-102. [*Studies Hallo*]

Friedrich, J. *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache.* 2. Teil. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft, Band 34, Heft 1. Hethitische Texte im Umschrift, mit Übersetzung und Erläuterungen (ed. by F. Sommer), Heft 4. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1930. [*Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache* 2]

Friedrich, J. "Kleine Bemerkungen zu Texten aus Ras Schamra und zu phönizischen Inschriften." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 10 (1935-1936), pp. 80-83.

Friedrich, J. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch.* 1. Teil: *Kurzgefasste Grammatik.* Indogermanische Bibliothek, 1. Reihe: Lehr- und Handbücher. Dritte, unveränderte Auflage. Heidelberg: Carl Winter and Universitätsverlag, 1974. [*Hethitisches Elementarbuch*^{3}]

Fronzaroli, P. "Forms of the Dual in the Texts of Ebla." *Maarav* 5-6 (1990), pp. 111-125.

Fronzaroli, P. "Divinazione a Ebla." In P. Fronzaroli, ed., *Miscellanea Eblaitica*, vol. 4. Quaderni di Semitistica, no. 19. Firenze: Dipartimento di linguistica, Università di Firenze, 1997. Pp. 1-21. [*Miscellanea Eblaitica* 4]

Gaster, T. H. " 'Baal is Risen...' An Ancient Hebrew Passion-Play from Ras Shamra-Ugarit." *Iraq* 6 (1939), pp. 109-143.

Gelb, I. J. *Sequential Reconstruction of Proto-Akkadian.* Assyriological Studies, no. 18. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969. [*Sequential Reconstruction of Proto-Akkadian*]

Gesenius, W., and E. Kautzsch. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.* 2nd English edition. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910. [*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*]

Giacumakis, G. *The Akkadian of Alalaḫ.* Janua Linguarum, Series Practica, no. 59. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1970. [*The Akkadian of Alalaḫ*]

Ginsberg, H. L. "Addenda to the Epic of *'àlîyn b'l*" (in Hebrew). *Tarbiz* 4 (1933), pp. 380-390.

Ginsberg, H. L. "Notes on 'The Birth of the Gracious and Beautiful Gods'." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 35 (1935), pp. 45-72.

Ginsberg, H. L. *Kitvē Ugarit* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1936. [*Kitvē Ugarit*]

Ginsberg, H. L. "The Rebellion and Death of Ba'lu." *Orientalia* 5 (1936), pp. 161-198.

Ginsberg, H. L. "Ba'l and 'Anat." *Orientalia* 7 (1938), pp. 1-11.

Ginsberg, H. L. "Two North Canaanite Letters from Ugarit." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 72 (1938), pp. 18-19.

Goetze, A. "The Tenses of Ugaritic." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 58 (1938), pp. 266-309.

Goetze, A. "The Texts Ni 615 and Ni 641 of the Istanbul Museum." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 6 (1952), pp. 142-145 (copies by F. R. Kraus on p. 143).

Goody, J. R. *The Domestication of the Savage Mind.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. [*Domestication of the Savage Mind*]

Gordon, C. H. *Ugaritic Grammar: The Present Status of the Linguistic Study of the Semitic Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra.* Analecta Orientalia, no. 20. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1940. [*Ugaritic Grammar*]

Gordon, C. H. *Ugaritic Literature: A Comprehensive Translation of the Poetic and Prose Texts.* Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, no. 98. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1949. [*Ugaritic Literature*]

Gordon, C. H. *Ugaritic Textbook.* Analecta Orientalia 38. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965. [*Ugaritic Textbook*]

Greene, J. T. *The Role of the Messenger and Message in the Ancient Near East and in the Hebrew Scriptures.* Brown Judaic Studies 169. Atlanta: 1989.

Greenstein, E. "One More Step on the Staircase." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 9 (1977), pp. 77-86.

Greenstein, E., and D. Marcus. "The Akkadian Inscription of Idrimi." *The Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 8 (1976), pp. 59-96.

Gröndahl, F. *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit.* Studia Pohl, no. 1. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967. [*PTU*]

Gross, W. *Die Pendenskonstruktion im Biblischen Hebräisch.* Studien zum althebräischen Satz 1. Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament, 27. Band. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1987. [*Die Pendenskonstruktion im Biblischen Hebräisch*]

Gruber, M. I. *Aspects of Nonverbal Communication in the Near East.* Studia Pohl, no. 12. 2 Volumes. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1980. [*Nonverbal Communication*]

Grzegorzewski, K. Elemente vorderorientalischen Hofstils auf kanaanäischem Boden. Diss. Theol., Königsberg. Borna-Leipzig, 1937.

Güterbock, H. G. "Ein hethitischer Brief aus Maşat bei Zile." Article in *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* II 3 (1944), pp. 390-391, 399-405.

Güterbock, H. G. *Siegel aus Boğazköy.* 2. Teil: *Die Königssiegel von 1939 und die übrigen Hieroglyphensiegel. Archiv für Orientforschung* Beiheft, no. 7. Osnabrück: Biblio-Verlag, 1942. [*AfO* Beiheft 7]

Güterbock, H. G. *The Song of Ullikummi. Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth.* New Haven, CT: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1952. [*The Song of Ullikummi*]

Güterbock, H. G. *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi.* Heft 18: *Hethitische Briefe, Inventare und verwandte Texte.* 85. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1971. [*KBo* 18]

Hagenbuchner, A. *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter.* 2 vols. Texte der Hethiter, Bänder 15-16. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1989. [*Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter*]

Hallo, W. W. *Origins: The Ancient Near Eastern Background of Some Modern Western Institutions.* Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East, vol. 4. Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill, 1996. [*Origins*]

Hallo, W. W., and K. L. Younger, eds. *The Context of Scripture.* 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997-2003. [*Context* 1-3]

Hallock, R. T., B. Landsberger, *et al. Materialen zum sumerischen Lexikon.* Volume 3. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1955. [*MSL* 3]

Hammershaimb, E. *Das Verbum im Dialekt von Ras Schamra. Eine morphologische und syntaktische Untersuchung des Verbums in dem alphabetischen Keilschrifttexten aus dem alten Ugarit.* Kopenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1941. [*Das Verbum im Dialekt von Ras Schamra*]

Harris, Z. S. *Development of the Canaanite Dialects: An investigation in linguistic history.* American Oriental Series, vol. 16. New Haven, Conn: American Oriental Society, 1939. [*Development of the Canaanite Dialects*]

Hartmann, B. "Mögen die Götter Dich behüten und unversehrt bewaren." In B. Hartmann, E. Jenni, E. Y. Kutscher, *et al.*, eds., *Hebraïsche Wortforschung. Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Walter Baumgartner.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. 16. Leiden: Brill, 1967. Pp. 102-105. [*Festschrift Baumgartner*, VTS 16]

Heidel, A. *The System of the Quadrilateral Verb in Akkadian.* Assyriological Studies, no. 13. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940. [*Quadrilateral Verb in Akkadian*]

Herdner, A. "Une particularité grammaticale commune aux textes d'El-Amarna et de Ras-Shamra: *t*-préfixe pronominal de la troisième personne masculin pluriel." *Revue des Études Sémitiques* 1938 (1938), pp. 76-83.

Herdner, A. *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939.* Mission de Ras Shamra 10. Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique 79, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale and Geuthner, 1963. [*CTA*]

Herdner, A. "Nouveaux textes alphabétiques de Ras Shamra — XXIVe campagne, 1961." In Schaeffer, C. F.-A., *Ugaritica 7.* Volume 7. no. Paris and Leiden: Mission Archéologique de Ras Shamra, Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, and E. J. Brill, 1978. Pp. 1-74. [*Ugaritica* 7]

Hermann, A. "Jubel bei der Audienz." *Zeischrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 90 (1963), pp. 49-66.

Hirsch, H. "Über den Briefbeginn in der Korrespondenz der altassyrischen Kaufleute." In R. G. Stiegner, ed., *Al-Ḫudḫud.* Festschrift for M. Höfner (Graz: ??, 1981), pp. 79-94.

Hoffner, H. A., Jr. *Hittite Myths.* Society of Biblical Literature, Writings from the Ancient World, vol. 2. Edited by G. Beckman. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990. [*Hittite Myths*]

Hoffner, H. A., Jr. "Syrian Cultural Influence in Ḫatti." In M. W. Chavalas and J. L. Hayes, eds., *New Horizons in the Study of Ancient Syria.* Bibliotheca Mesopotamica, vol. 25. Malibu: Undena Publications, 1992. Pp. 89-106. [Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 25]

Horowitz, W. "An Inscribed Clay Cylinder from Amarna Age Beth Shean." *Israel Exploration Journal* 46 (1996), pp. 208-218.

Horowitz, W. "Two Late Bronze Tablets from Hazor." *Israel Exploration Journal* 50 (2000), pp. 16-28.

Houwink ten Cate, P. H. J. "The Scribes of the Maṣat Letters and the GAL DUB.SAR(.MEŠ) of the Hittite Capital during the Final Phase of the Early Empire Period." In T. E. Balke, M. Dietrich, and O. Loretz, eds., *dubsar anta-men: Studien zur Altorientalistik. Festschrift für Willem H. Ph. Römer zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres mit Beiträgen von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 253. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1998. Pp. 157-178. [*Festschrift Römer*]

Hrozný, F. "Keilschrifttexte aus Taʿannek." In E. Sellin, *Tell Taʿannek.* Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Band 50, Abhandlung 4. Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1904. Pp. 113-122; pls. 110-111. [*Tell Taʿannek*]

Hrozný, F. "Die neugefundenen Keilschrifttexte von Taʿannek." In E. Sellin, *Eine Nachlese auf dem Tell Taʿannek in Palästina.* Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Band 52, Abhandlung 3. Vienna: Alfred Hölder, 1906. Pp. 36-41, pls. 31-33. [*Nachlese auf dem Tell Taʿannek*]

Hrozný, F. *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi.* Heft 5. 36. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1921. [*KBo* 5]

Huehnergard, J. " 'Stative,' Predicative Form, Pseudo-Verb." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 47 (1987), pp. 215-232.

Huehnergard, J. *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription.* Harvard Semitic Studies, no. 32. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987. [*UVST*]

Huehnergard, J. *The Akkadian of Ugarit.* Harvard Semitic Studies, no. 34. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989. [*Akkadian of Ugarit*]

Huehnergard, J. "Notes on *Ras Shamra-Ougarit* VII". Review of *Une bibliothèque au sud de la ville: Les textes de la 34e campagne (1973)*, by Bordreuil, P.D. ArnaudB. André-Salvini, *et al.* (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, In *Syria* 74 (1997) 213-220.

Huehnergard, J. "The Akkadian Letters." In W. G. E Watson and N. Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, Band 39. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999. Pp. 375-389. [*HUS*]

Israel, F. "Études de grammaire ougaritique. La dernière phase de la langue." In M. Yon, M. Sznycer, and P. Bordreuil, eds., *Le pays d'Ougarit autour de 1200 av. J.-C. Histoire et Archéologie. Actes du Colloque International Paris, 28 juin – 1er juillet 1993.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, no. 11. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1993. Pp. 255-262. [RSO 11]

Izre'el, S. "Early Northwest Semitic 3rd pl m Prefix. The Evidence of the Amarna Letters." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 19 (1987), pp. 79-90.

Jacobsen, T. "Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta." In W. W. Hallo and J. K. L. Younger, eds., *The Context of Scripture.* Vol. 1: *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World.* Leiden: Brill, 1997. Pp. 547-550. [*Context* 1]

Jastrow, M., and A. T. Clay. *An Old Babylonian Version of the Gilgamesh Epic, On the Basis of Recently Discovered Texts.* Yale Oriental Series, Researches, vol. 4, part 3. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920. [YOS 4/3]

Jirku, A. *Der Mythus der Kanaanäer.* Bonn: Habelt, 1966. [*Der Mythus der Kanaanäer*]

Kaiser, O. "Zum Formular der in Ugarit gefunden Briefe." *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 86 (1970), pp. 10-23.

Kaufman, S. A. *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic.* Assyriological Studies, no. 19. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974. [*Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*]

Kaufman, S. A. "The Pitfalls of Typology: On the Early History of the Alphabet." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 57 (1986), pp. 1-14.

Kestemont, G. *Diplomatique et droit international en Asie occidentale (1600-1200 av. J.C.).* Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, vol. 9. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste, 1974. [*Diplomatique et droit international*]

Kienast, B. *Historische Semitische Sprachwissenschaft.* Mit Beiträgen von Erhart Graefe (Altaegyptisch) und Gene B. Gragg (Kuschitisch). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2001. [*Historische Semitische Sprachwissenschaft*]

Kienast, B., and K. Volk. *Die sumerischen und akkadischen Briefe des III. Jahrtausends aus der Zeit vor der III. Dynastie von Ur.* Freiburger altorientlische Studien, Bd. 19. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1995. [*Die sumerischen und akkadischen Briefe*]

Knoppers, G. "Treaty, Tribute List or Diplomatic Letter: KTU 3.1 Reexamined." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 289 (1993), pp. 81-94.

Knudtzon, J. "Zu den El-Amarna Tafeln". *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 17 (1914), pp. 489-491.

Knudtzon, J. *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln.* 2 Volumes. Vorderasiatische Bibliothek, no. 2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1915. [*Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*]

Knutson, F. B. "Literary Genres in *PRU* IV." In L. R. Fisher, ed., *Ras Shamra Parallels.* Vol. 2. Analecta Orientalia 50. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1975. Pp. 155-214. [*RSP* 2]

Knutson, F. B. "Literary Phrases and Formulae." In L. R. Fisher, ed., *Ras Shamra Parallels.* Vol. 2. Analecta Orientalia 50. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1975. Pp. 403-422. [*RSP* 2]

Koehler, L., and W. Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Translated into English and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 5 volumes. Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill, 1994-2000. [*HALOY*]

Komoróczy, G. "Zur Ätiologie der Schrifterfintlung im Enmerkar-Epos." *Altorientalische Forschungen* 3 (1975), pp. 19-24.

Koschaker, P. "Randnotizen zu neueren keilschriftlichen Rechtsurkunden." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete* 43 (1936), pp. 196-232.

Kramer, S. N. *Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta.* Philadelphia: University Museum, 1952. [*Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta*]

Kristensen, A. L. "Ugaritic Epistolary Formulas: A Comparative Study of the Ugaritic Epistolary Formulas in the Context of the Contemporary Akkadian Formulas in the Letters from Ugarit and Amarna." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 9 (1977), pp. 143-158.

Kümmel, H. M. *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi.* Heft 28: *Nichtliterarische Texte in akkadischer Sprache.* Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Kommission für den Alten Orient. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1985. [*KBo* 28]

Labat, R. *L'Akkadien de Boghaz-Köi. Étude sur la Langue des Lettres, Traités et Vocabulaires Akkadiens trouvés à Boghaz-Köi.* Bordeaux: Librairie Delmas, 1932. [*L'Akkadien de Boghaz-Köi*]

Labat, R., and F. Malbran-Labat. *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne (Signes, Syllabaire, Idéogrammes).* 6th edition, edited and augmented by Fl. Malbran-Labat. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1988. [*Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne*]

Lacheman, E. R. *Excavations at Nuzi.* Volume 5: *Miscellaneous Texts from Nuzi,* Part 2: *The Palace and Temple Archives.* Harvard Semitic Series, vol. 14. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950. [HSS 14]

Lacheman, E. R. *Excavations at Nuzi.* Volume 6: *The Administrative Archives.* Harvard Semitic Series, vol. 15. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955. [HSS 15]

Lackenbacher, S. "La correspondance internationale dans les archives d'Ugarit." *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 89 (1995), pp. 67-76.

Lackenbacher, S. "Une lettre d'Égypte (no 1)". In M. Yon and D. Arnaud, eds., *Études ougaritiques.* Vol. 1: *Travaux 1985-1995.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, tome 14. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 2001. Pp. 239-248. [*RSO* 14]

Lackenbacher, S. *Textes akkadiens d'Ugarit. Textes venant des vingt-cinq premières campagnes.* Littératures anciennnes du Proche-Orient, no. 20. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002. [*Textes akkadiens d'Ugarit*]

Lambert, W. G. *Babylonian Wisdom Literature.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960. [*Babylonian Wisdom Literature*]

Lambert, W. G. "A New Babylonian Descent to the Netherworld." In T. Abusch, J. Huehnergard, and P. Steinkeller, eds., *Lingering over Words: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran.* Harvard Semitic Studies, no. 37. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990. Pp. 289-300. [*Studies Moran*]

Landsberger, B. "Das « gute Wort »." In *Altorientalische Studien. Bruno Meisner zum sechzigsten Geburtstag am 25. april 1928 gewidmet von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern.* Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft, no. 4. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1928-1929. Pp. 294-321. [MAOG 4]

Lane, E. W. *An Arabic-English Lexicon.* 8 Parts. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1863. [*Arabic-English Lexicon*]

Laroche, E. *Catalogue des textes hittites.* Études et commentaires, no. 75. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1971. [*Catalogue des textes hittites*]

Laroche, E. "RS 20.189." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 11 (1979), pp. 477-480.

Laroche, E. *Glossaire de la langue hourrite.* Paris: 1980. [*Glossaire de la langue hourrite*]

Larsen, M. T. "Affect and Emotion." In W. van Soldt *et al.*, eds., *Veenhof Anniversary Volume: Studies Presented to Klaas R. Veenhof on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday.* Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, vol. 89. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2001. Pp. 275-286. [*Studies Veenhof*]

Leslau, W. *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez (Classical Ethiopic).* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1987. [*Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez*]

Levine, B., and J.-M. de Tarragon. "Dead Kings and Rephaim: The Patrons of the Ugaritic Dynasty." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 104 (1984), pp. 649-659.

Lipiński, E. "Aḫat-milki, reine d'Ugarit, et la guerre du Mukiš." *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 12 (1981) 79-115.

Lipiński, E. *Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar.* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, no. 80. Leuven: Peeters, 1997. [*Outline of a Comparative Grammar*]

Liverani, M. "Elementi innovativi nell' ugaritico non litterario." *Atti della accademia nazionale dei lincei, Rendiconti morali* series 8, vol. 19, fasc. 5-6 (1964), pp. 173-191.

Liverani, M. "Un tipo di espressione indefinita in accadico e in ugaritico." *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 39 (1964), pp. 199-202.

Liverani, M. "The Amorites." In D. J. Wiseman, ed., *Peoples of Old Testament Times.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973. Pp. 100-133. [*Peoples of Old Testament Times*]

Liverani, M. "Histoire." In J.-C. Courtois *et al.*, "Ras Shamra", *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible.* Volume 9. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1979. Cols. 1295-1348. [*SDB* 9]

Liverani, M. "Communautés rurales dans la Syrie du IIe millénaire A.C." In *Les communautés rurales — Rural Communties.* Deuxième partie — Second Part: *Antiquité / Antiquity.* Receuils de la Société Jean Bodin pour l'histoire comparative des institutions, no. 41. Paris: Dessain et Tolra, 1983. Pp. 147-185. [*Les communautés rurales* 2]

Liverani, M. *Le lettere di el-Amarna.* Testi del Vicino Oriente antico, 2. Letterature mesopotamiche, no. 3 (parts 1 and 2). 2 volumes. Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1999. [*Le lettere di el-Amarna*]

Loewenstamm, S. Review of *Ugaritica*, vol. 3, by C. F.-A. Schaeffer (Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1956). In *Israel Exploration Journal* (1958), pp. 138-140.

Loewenstamm, S. "הערות לתורת הכינויים באוגריתית לאור הכנענית (Notes on the Pronouns in Ugaritic in the Light of Canaanite)." *Lešonenu* 23 (1959), pp. 72-84.

Loewenstamm, S. "זוטות אוגריתיות (Ugaritic Gleanings)." *Lešonenu* 30 (1966), pp. 85-91.

Loewenstamm, S. "Prostration from Afar in Ugaritic, Accadian and Hebrew." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 188 (1967), pp. 41-43.

Loewenstamm, S. "Ugaritic Formulas of Greeting." *BASOR* 194 (1969) pp. 52-54.

Loewenstamm, S. *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, no. 204. Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1980. [*Comparative Studies*]

Longman, T. *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography: A Generic and Comparative Study.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1991. [*Fictional Akkadian Autobiography*]

Longman, T. "The Autobiography of Idrimi." In W. W. Hallo and J. K. Lawson Younger, eds., *The Context of Scripture.* Vol. 1: *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World.* Leiden: Brill, 1997. Pp. 479-480. [*Context* 1]

Lutz, H. F. *Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts.* University of Pennsylvania, the University Museum Publications of the Babylonian Section, vol. 1, no. 2. Philadelphia: The University Museum, 1919. [*Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts*]

Maidman, M. P. "The University of Chicago Nuzi Texts: History and Prospects." In D. I. Owen and G. Wilhelm, eds., *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians.* Volume 10: *Nuzi at Seventy-Five.* Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 1999. Pp. 25-34. [*Nuzi and the Hurrians* 10]

Malbran-Labat, Fl. "La découverte épigraphique de 1994 à Ougarit (les textes akkadiens)." *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 36 (1995), pp. 103-111.

Malbran-Labat, F. "Akkadien, bilingues et bilinguisme en Élam et à Ougarit." In F. Briquel-Chatonnet, ed, *Mosaïque de langues, mosaïque culturelle: Le bilinguisme dans le Proche-orient ancien. Actes de la Table Ronde du 18 novembre 1995 organisée par l'URA 1062 "Études Sémitiques".* Antiquités Sémitiques, no. 1. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1996. Pp. 33-61. [*Le bilinguisme*]

Malbran-Labat, Fl. "Les textes akkadiens découverts à Ougarit en 1994." In K. Van Lerberghe and G. Voet, eds., *Languages and Cultures in Contact: At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm. Proceedings of the 42th RAI.* Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, no. 96. Leuven: Peeters, 1999. Pp. 237-244. [RAI 42]

Malbran-Labat, Fl.. "Lettres (nos 2-4)". In M. Yon and D. Arnaud, eds., *Études ougaritiques.* Vol. 1: *Travaux 1985-1995.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, tome 14. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 2001. Pp. 249-255. [*RSO* 14]

Malinowski, B. "The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Langauges." In C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, eds., *The Meaning of Meaning.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1946. Pp. 296-336. ["The Problem of Meaning"]

Marcus, D. "The Three Alephs in Ugaritic." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 1 (1968), pp. 50-60.

Marcus, R. "On the Genitive after *umma* in the Amarna Tablets." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 2 (1948), pp. 223-224.

Márquez Rowe, I. "Syllabic and Alphabetic Texts - A Further Note of Scribal Education at Ugarit." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 28 (1996), pp. 457-462.

Marty, J. "Contribution à l'étude de fragments épistolaires antiques, conservés principalement dans la Bible hébraïque. Les formules de salutation." In *Mélanges syriens offerts à Monsieur René Dussaud.* Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique, Tome 30. Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1939. Tome 2, Pp. 845-855. [*Mélanges Dussaud*]

Matouš, L. "Les textes accadiens d'Ugarit." *Analecta Orientalia* 24 (1957), pp. 375-382.

McCarthy, D. *Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament.* New edition, completely rewritten. Analecta Biblica, no. 21A. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978. [*Treaty and Covenant*]

Meier, S. A. *The Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World.* Harvard Semitic Monographs, no. 45. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988. [*Messenger in the Ancient Semitic World*]

Meier, S. A. *Speaking of Speaking: Marking Direct Discourse in the Hebrew Bible.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, volume 46. Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill, 1992. [*Speaking of Speaking*]

Mendenhall, G. E. *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East.* Pittsburgh, PA: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955. [*Law and Covenant*]

Michalowski, P. *Letters from Early Mesopotamia.* Society of Biblical Literature, Writings from the Ancient World, vol. 3. Edited by E. Reiner. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993. [*Letters from Early Mesopotamia*]

Michel, C. *Correspondance des marchands de Kaniš au début du IIe millénaire avant J.-C.* Littératures anciennnes du Proche-Orient, no. 19. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2001. [*Correspondance des marchands de Kaniš*]

Michel, D. "Probleme des Nominalsatzes in biblischen Hebräisch." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 7 (1994), pp. 215-224.

Milano, L. "Osservazioni sul bilinguismo ugaritico-accadico." *Vicino Oriente* 3 (1980), pp. 179-197.

Miller, C. L. "Pivotal Issues in Analyzing the Verbless Clause." In C. L. Miller, ed., *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew.* Linguisitic Studies in Ancient West Semitic, no. 1. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1999. Pp. 3-17. [*Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*]

Moran, W. L. "New Evidence on Canaanite *taqtulū(na)*." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 5 (1951), pp. 33-35.

Moran, W. L. *Les lettres d'El-Amarna. Correspondance diplomatique du pharaon.* With the collaboration of V. Haas and G. Wilhelm. Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient, no. 13, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1987. [*Les lettres d'El-Amarna*]

Moran, W. L. *The Amarna Letters.* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins, 1992. [*Amarna Letters*]

Munn-Rankin, J. M. "Diplomacy in Western Asia in the Early Second Millennium." *Iraq* 18 (1956), pp. 68-110.

Nashef, K. "The Nippur Countryside in the Kassite Period." In M. deJong Ellis, ed., *Nippur at the Centennial. Papers Read at the 35e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Philadelphia, 1988.* Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund, no. 14. Philadelphia: The University Museum, 1992. Pp. 151-159. [RAI 35]

Nebes, N. "Die enklitischen Partikeln des Altsüdarabischen." In *Études sud-arabes: Receuil offert à Jacques Ryckmans.* Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, no. 39. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1991. 133-151. [*Mélanges Ryckmans*]

Negri Scafa, P. "The Scribes of Nuzi." In D. I. Owen and G. Wilhelm, eds., *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians.* Volume 10: *Nuzi at Seventy-Five.* Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 1999. Pp. 63-80. [*Nuzi and the Hurrians* 10]

Niedorf, C. F. "Ein hethitisches Brieffragment aus Alalaḫ." In O. Loretz, K. A. Metzler, and H. Schaudig, eds., *Ex Mesopotamia et Syria Lux. Festschrift für Manfried Dietrich zu seinem 65. Geburtstag.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 281. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002. Pp. 517-526. [*Festschrift Dietrich*]

Nougayrol, J. "Une lettre du roi de Sidon au roi d'Ugarit." *Semitica* 3 (1950), pp. 19-20.

Nougayrol, J. "Les textes accadiens." In C. F.-A. Schaeffer, ed., *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit.* Vol. 3: *Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives est, ouest et centrales.* Mission de Ras Shamra, Tome 6. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale & Klincksieck, 1955. Pp. xxxiii-xliii, 1-280. [*PRU* 3]

Nougayrol, J. *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit.* Vol. 4: *Textes accadiens des archives sud (Archives internationales).* Mission de Ras Shamra, no. 9. Edited by C. F.-A. Schaeffer. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale & Klincksieck, 1956. [*PRU* 4]

Nougayrol, J. *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit.* Vol. 6: *Textes en cunéiformes babyloniens des archives du Grand Palais et du Palais Sud d'Ugarit.* Mission de Ras Shamra, Tome 12. Edited by C. F.--A. Schaeffer. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale and Klincksieck, 1970. [*PRU* 6]

Nougayrol, J. "Textes suméro-accadiens des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit." In C. F.-A. Schaeffer, ed., *Ugaritica.* Vol. 5: *Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit, Commentaires des textes historiques (première partie).* Mission de Ras Shamra, Tome 16. Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique, Tome 80. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale and Geunther, 1968. Pp. 1-446. [*Ugaritica* 5]

O'Connor, M. *Hebrew Verse Structure.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1980. [*Hebrew Verse Structure*]

O'Connor, M. "Discourse Linguistics and the Study of Biblical Hebrew." In A. Lemaire, ed., *International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament: Congress Volume, Basel 2001.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, volume 92. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2002. Pp. 17-42. [*Congress Volume, Basel 2001*]

Ohio State University Department of Linguistics. *Language Files: Materials for an Introduction to Language & Linguisitics.* Sixth Edition edited by S. Jannedy, R. Poletto, and T. L. Weldon. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1994.

Oller, G. H. "Messagers and Ambassadors in Ancient Western Asia." In J. M. Sasson *et al.*, eds., *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1995. Vol. 3, pp. 1465-1473. [*CANE* 3]

Oppenheim, A. L. *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1964. [*Ancient Mesopotamia*]

Oppenheim, A. L. *Letters from Mesopotamia: Official, Business, and Private Letters on Clay Tablets from Two Millennia.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1967. [*Letters from Mesopotamia*]

Oppenheim, A. L., *et al. The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary.* 21 vols. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1956-. [*CAD*]

Otten, H. *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi.* Heft 8: *Texte der Grabungen 1953 und 1954.* 69. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. Berlin: Verlag Gebr. Mann, 1955. [*KBo* 8]

Otten, H. *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi.* Heft 9: *Vorwiegend Texte der Grabungen 1955 und 1956.* 70. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. Berlin: Verlag Gebr. Mann, 1957. [*KBo* 9]

Otten, H. *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi.* Heft 13: *Texte aus Stadtplanquadrat L/18, II. Teil.* 78. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. Berlin: Verlag Gebr. Mann, 1967. [*KBo* 13]

Otten, H. "Korrespondenz mit Tukulti-Ninurta I. aus Boğazköy." *Archiv für Orientforschung* Beiheft 12 (1970), pp. 64-68.

Otten, H. *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy : Ein Staatsvertrag Tutḫalijas IV.* Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Beiheft 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988. [*Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy*]

Otten, H., and C. Rüster. *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi.* Heft 31: *Tafelkataloge, Inventare u. a. vorwiegend von Büyükkale.* Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Kommission für den Alten Orient. Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 2000. [*KBo* 31]

Owen, D. "An Akkadian Letter from Ugarit at Tel Aphek." *Tel Aviv* 8 (1981), pp. 1-17.

Pardee, D. "The Preposition in Ugaritic (Part 1)." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 7 (1975), pp. 329-378.

Pardee, D. "The Preposition in Ugaritic." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 8 (1976), pp. 215-322, 483-493.

Pardee, D. "Letters from Tel Arad." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 10 (1978), pp. 289-336.

Pardee, D. "New Readings in the Letters of *ʿzn bn byy.*" *Archiv für Orientforschung* Beiheft 19 (1982), pp. 39-53.

Pardee, D. "The 'Epistolary Perfect' in Hebrew Letters." *Biblische Notizen* 22 (1983), pp. 34-40.

Pardee, D. "The Letter of Puduḫepa: The Text." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 29-30 (1983-1984), pp. 321-329.

Pardee, D. "Three Ugaritic Tablet Joins." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 43 (1984), pp. 239-245.

Pardee, D. "Ugaritic: Further Studies in Ugaritic Epistolography." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 31 (1984), pp. 213-230.

Pardee, D. *Les textes hippiatriques.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, vol. 2. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1985. [*Les textes hippiatriques*]

Pardee, D. "Ugaritic: The Ugaritic *šumma izbu* Text." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 33 (1986), pp. 117-147.

Pardee, D. "Epigraphic and Philological Notes." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 19 (1987), pp. 199-217.

Pardee, D. *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24e campagne (1961).* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, vol. 4. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1988. [*Les textes para-mythologiques*]

Pardee, D. *Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism: A Trial Cut (ʿnt I and Proverbs 2).* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 39. Leiden: Brill, 1988. [*Ugaritic and Hebrew Poetic Parallelism*]

Pardee, D. "Poetry in Ugaritic Ritual Texts." In de Moor, J. C., and W. G. E. Watson, *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 42, no. Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1993. [AOAT 42]

Pardee, D. Review of E. Verreet, *Modi Ugaritici: Eine morpoh-syntaktische Abhandlung über das Modalsystem im Ugaritischen*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, no. 27 (Leuven: Peeters, 1988). In *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 52 (1993) Pp. 314-317. [*JNES* 52]

Pardee, D. "Remarks on J.T.'s "Epigraphische Anmerkungen"." *Aula Orientalis* 16 (1998), pp. 85-102.

Pardee, D. "The Baʿlu Myth," "Dawn and Dusk," and "Ugaritic Liturgy against Venomous Reptiles." Artciles in W. W. Hallo and J. K. L. Younger, eds., *The Context of Scripture.* Vol. 1: *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World.* Leiden: Brill, 1997. Pp. 241-274, 274-283, and 295-298. [*Context* 1]

Pardee, D. *Les textes rituels.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit, no. 13. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 2000. [*Les textes rituels*]

Pardee, D. "Ugaritic Studies at the End of the 20th Century". Review of Wilfred G. E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Abteilung 1: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, Band 39 (Leiden: Brill, 1999). In *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 320 (2000) Pp. 49-86. [*BASOR* 320]

Pardee, D. "Épigraphie et structure dans les textes administratifs en langue ougaritique: les exemples de RS 6.216 et RS 19.017." *Orientalia* 70 (2001), pp. 235-282, 345.

Pardee, D. "Ugaritic Science." In P. M. M. Daviau, J. W. Wevers, and M. Weigl, eds., *The World of the Aramaeans: Studies in Language and Literature in Honour of Paul-Eugène Dion*, volume 3. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplemental Series, no. 326. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001. Pp. 223-254. [*Mélanges Dion* 3]

Pardee, D. "Le traité d'alliance RS 11.772+." *Semitica* 51 (forthcoming).

Pardee, D. "Ugaritic". In *Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages.* Forthcoming. [*EWAL*]

Pardee, D. "Ugaritic Letters." In W. W. Hallo and J. K. Lawson Younger, eds., *The Context of Scripture.* Vol. 3. Leiden: Brill, 2002. [*Context* 3]

Pardee, D. "Une formule épistolaire en ougaritique et accadien." Forthcoming article in a volume of studies dedicated to P. Fronzaroli. [*Studi Fronzaroli*]

Pardee, D. *Les textes épistolaires.* Ras Shamra-Ougarit series. In preparation. [*Les textes épistolaires*]

Pardee, D., *et al.* *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters.* Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study, no. 15. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982. [*Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters*]

Pardee, D., and P. Bordreuil. "Ugarit: Texts and Literature." In D. N. Freedman, ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1992. Vol. 6, pp. 706-721. [*ABD* 6]

Pardee, D., J. D. Whitehead, and P.-E. Dion. "An Overview of Ancient Hebrew Epistolography." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978), pp. 321-346.

Pardee, D., and R. M. Whiting. "Aspects of Epistolary Verbal Usage in Ugaritic and Akkadian." *BSOAS* 50 (1987) 1-31.

Parker, S. *Studies in the Grammar of Ugaritic Prose Texts.* Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microflims, 1967. [*Ugaritic Prose Texts*]

Parker, S. "Some Methodological Principles in Ugaritic Philology." *Maarav* 2 (1979-1980), pp. 7-41.

Parker, S. *The Pre-Biblical Narrative Tradition.* SBL Resources for Biblical Study, no. 24. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Parker, S., ed. *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry.* Translations by Mark S. Smith, Simon B. Parker, Edward L. Greenstein, Theodore J. Lewis, and David Marcus. Society of Biblical Literature, Writings from the Ancient World Series, vol. 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997. [*Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*]

Parpola, S. *The Correspondence of Sargon.* Part 1: *Letters from Assyria and the West.* State Archives of Assyria, no. 1. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1987. [SAA 1]

Parpola, S. *Assyrian Prophecies.* State Archives of Assyria, no. 9. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1997. [SAA 9]

Parpola, S. *The Standard Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh.* State Archives of Assyria, Cuneiform Texts, vol. 1. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1997. [SAACT 1]

Payne Smith, J., ed. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary, Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith, D. D.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1903. [*A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*]

Pedersén, O. *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East, 1500-300 B.C.* Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 1998. [*Archives and Libraries*]

Pfeiffer, R. H. "Assyrian Epistolary Formulas." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 43 (1923), pp. 26-40.

Pfeiffer, R. H. *Excavations at Nuzi.* Volume 2: *The Archives of Shilwateshub Son of the King.* Harvard Semitic Series, vol. 9. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. [HSS 9]

Pfeiffer, R. H., and E. R. Lacheman. *Excavations at Nuzi.* Volume 4: *Miscellaneous Texts from Nuzi,* Part 1. Harvard Semitic Series, vol. 13. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942. [HSS 13]

Pfeiffer, R. H., and E. A. Speiser. "One Hundred New Selected Nuzi Texts." *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 16 (1935-1936), pp. 1-168.

Pinches, T. G. *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum 44.* Part 44: *Miscellaneous Texts.* London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1963. [*CT* 44]

Pope, M. "Ugaritic Enclitic *-m*." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 5 (1951), pp. 123-128.

Pritchard, J. B. *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament.* Second Edition with Supplement. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969. [*ANEP*^{2}]

Pritchard, J. B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969. [*ANET*^{3}]

Radau, H. *Letters to Cassite Kings from the Temple Archives of Nippur.* Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A: Cuneiform Texts, vol. 17, part 1. Philadelphia: Dept. of Archaeology, University of Pennsylvania, 1908. [*Letters to Cassite Kings*]

Rainey, A. F. "The Scribe at Ugarit: His Position and Influence." *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 3 (1968), pp. 126-147.

Rainey, A. F. "El-'Amârna Notes." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 6 (1974), pp. 295-312.

Rainey, A. F. "More Gleanings from Ugarit." *Israel Oriental Studies* 5 (1975), pp. 18-31.

Rainey, A. F. "Verbal Usages in the Taanach Texts." *Israel Oriental Studies* 7 (1977), pp. 33-64.

Rainey, A. F. *El Amarna Tablets 359-379. Supplement to J. A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, no. 8a. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978. [AOAT 8a]

Rainey, A. Review of *Mantik in Ugarit: Keilalphabetische Texte der Opferschau – Omensammlungen – Nekromantie*, Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas, Band 3 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag 1990), by M. Dietrich and O. Loretz. In *Ugarit-Forschungen* (1995), pp. 704-706.

Rainey, A. *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets: A Linguistic Analysis of the Mixed Dialect Used by Scribes from Canaan.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, 25:1-4. 4 volumes. Leiden: Brill, 1996. [*CAT*]

Rainey, A. "Taanach Letters." *Eretz Israel* 26 (F. M. Cross volume) (1999), pp. *153-*162.

Renfroe, F. *Arabic-Ugaritic Lexical Studies.* Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas, Band 5. Münster: UGARIT-Verlag, 1992. [*Arabic-Ugaritic Lexical Studies*]

Richardson, H. N. "A Ugaritic Letter of a King to His Mother." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 66 (1947), pp. 321-324.

Roche, C. *Recherches sur la prosopographie du royaume d'Ougarit de la fin du XIVe siècle au début du XIIe siècle av. J.-C.* Ph.D. Dissertation, Université Paris IV (Paris-Sorbonne) and l'Institut Catholique de Paris (École de Langues et Civilisations de l'Orient Ancien). Unpublished Ph.D. thesis: 2001. [*Recherches sur la prosopographie du royaume d'Ougarit*]

Rogland, M. "The Hebrew 'Epistolary Perfect' Revisited." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 13 (2000), pp. 194-200.

Rost, L. "Die ausserhalb von Boğazköy gefundenen hethitischen Briefe." *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 4 (1956), pp. 328-350.

Roth, M. "The Laws of Lipit-Ishtar." In W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger, eds., *The Context of Scripture 2.* Volume 2: *Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World.* Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 2000. Pp. 410-414. [*Context* 2]

Rüster, C., and E. Neu. *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon. Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten.* Studien zur den Boğazköy-Texten, Beiheft 2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1989. [*Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon*]

Sadock, J. M. Review of J. R. Searle and D. Vanderveken, *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985). In *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 54 (1989) 300-302. [*Journal of Symbolic Logic* 54]

Salonen, E. *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen.* Studia Orientalia (Fennica), 38. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1967. [*Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln*]

Schaeffer, C. F.-A, ed. *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit.* Vol. 3: *Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives est, ouest et centrales.* Mission de Ras Shamra, Tome 6. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale & Klincksieck, 1955. [*PRU* 3]

Schloen, J. D. *The Patrimonial Household in the Kingdom of Ugarit: A Weberian Analysis of Ancient Near Eastern Society.* Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1995. [*Patrimonial Household*]

Schloen, J. D. *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the Ancient Near East.* Studies in the Archaeology and History of the Levant, no. 2. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001. [*The House of the Father*]

Schmandt-Besserat, D. *Before Writing.* Volume 1: *From Counting to Cuneiform.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1992. [*Before Writing* 1]

Schroeder, O. *Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna.* Erste Teil. Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der königlichen Museen zu Berlin, no. 11. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1915. [*Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna* 1]

Schroeder, O. "Briefe (in Keilschrift)." In E. Ebeling and B. Meisner, eds., *Reallexikon der Assyriologie.* Volume 2. Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1938. Pp. 62-68. [*RlA* 2]

Schwiderski, D. *Handbuch des nordwestsemitischen Briefformulars. Ein Beitrag zur Echtheitsfrage der aramäischen Briefe des Esrabuches.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 295. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2000. [*Handbuch des nordwestsemitischen Briefformulars*]

Searle, J. R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.* London: Cambridge University Press, 1969. [*Speech Acts*]

Searle, J. R. "A taxonomy of illocutionary acts." In K. Gunderson, ed., *Language, Mind and Knowledge.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1975. Pp. 344-369. [*Language, Mind and Knowledge*]

Searle, J. R. "Indirect Speech Acts." In P. Cole and J. Morgan, eds., *Syntax and Semantics.* Volume 3: *Speech Acts.* New York: Academic Press, 1975. Pp. 59-82. [*Syntax and Semantics* 3]

Searle, J. R. "A classification of illocutionary acts." *Language in Society* 5 (1976), pp. 1-23.

Searle, J. R. Review of J. M. Sadock, *Toward a Linguistic Theory of Speech Acts* (New York: Academic Press, 1974). In *Language* 52 (1976) 966-971. [*Language* 52]

Searle, J. R. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts.* New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1979. [*Expression and Meaning*]

Segert, S. *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language with Selected Texts and Glossary.* Berkeley: University of California, 1984. [*Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*]

Segert, S. "Die Orthographie der alphabetischen Keilschrifttafeln in akkadischer Sprache aus Ugarit." *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico* 5 (1988), pp. 189-205.

Silberman, N. A. "Petrie, William Matthew Flinders." In E. Meyers, ed., *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East.* 5 volumes. New York and Oxford: Oxford University, 1997. Vol. 4, pp. 308-309. [*OEANE* 4]

Singer, I. "Takuḫlinu and Ḫaya: Two Governors in the Ugarit Letter from Tel Aphek." *Tel Aviv* 10 (1983), pp. 3-25.

Singer, I. "A Political History of Ugarit." In W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 39. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999. Pp. 603-733. [*HUS*]

Sivan, D. "Problematic Lengthenings in North West Semitic Spellings of the Middle of the Second Millennium B.C.E." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 18 (1986), pp. 301-312.

Sivan, D. *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, 28. Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill, 1997. [*GUL*]

Smith, B. "Towards a History of Speech Act Theory." In A. Burkhardt, ed., *Speech Acts, Meanings and Intentions. Critical Approaches to the Philosophy of John R. Searle.* Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1990. Pp. 29-61. [*Speech Acts, Meanings and Intentions*]

Smith, M. S. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle.* Vol. 1: *Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU 1.1-1.2.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 55. Leiden: Brill, 1994. [*The Ugaritic Baal Cycle* 1]

Smith, S. *The Statue of Idri-mi.* London: British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, 1949. [*The Statue of Idri-mi*]

Spronk, K. "The Incantations." In Watson, W. G. E., and N. Wyatt, *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, no. 39. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999. Pp. 270-286. [*HUS*]

Stol, M. *On Trees, Mountains, and Millstones in the Ancient Near East.* Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Voraziatisch-egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Orient Lux", no. 21. Leiden: Zutphen, 1979. [MVEOL 21]

Stol, M. *Letters from Collections in Philadelphia, Chicago and Berkeley.* Altbabylonische Briefe in Umschrift und Übersetzung, Heft 11. F. R. Kraus, ed. Leiden: Brill, 1986. [Altbabylonische Briefe 11]

Swaim, G. G. *A Grammar of the Akkadian Tablets Found at Ugarit.* Ph. D. dissertation, Brandeis University. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1962. [*Grammar of the Akkadian Tablets Found at Ugarit*]

Thureau-Dangin, F. "Vocabulaires de Ras Shamra." *Syria* 12 (1931), pp. 225-266.

Thureau-Dangin, F. "Une lettre assyrienne à Ras Shamra." *Syria* 16 (1935), pp. 188-193.

Tigay, J. *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982. [*Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*]

Tonietti, M. V. "Il sistema preposizionale nei tre testi del rituale di *ARET* XI: analogie e divergenze." In P. Fronzaroli, ed., *Miscellanea Eblaitica*, vol. 4. Quaderni di Semitistica, no. 19. Firenze: Dipartimento di linguistica, Università di Firenze, 1997. Pp. 73-109. [*Miscellanea Eblaitica* 4]

Tropper, J. *Der ugaritische Kausativstamm und die Kausativbildungen des semitischen. Eine morphologisch-semantische Untersuchung zum Š-Stamm und zu den umstrittenen nichtsibilantischen Kausativstämmen des Ugaritischen.* Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas, Band 2. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1990. [*Kausativstamm*]

Tropper, J. "Finale Sätze und *yqtla*-Modus im Ugaritischen." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 23 (1991), pp. 341-352.

Tropper, J. "Morphologische Besonderheiten des Spätugaritischen." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 25 (1993), pp. 389-394.

Tropper, J. "Die entklitische Partikel *-y* im Ugaritischen." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 26 (1994), pp. 473-482.

Tropper, J. "Zur Grammatik der ugaritischen Omina." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 26 (1994), pp. 457-472.

Tropper, J. "Epigraphische Anmerkungen zur Neuauflage von KTU." *Aula Orientalis* 13 (1995), pp. 231-239.

Tropper, J. "Zur Etymologie von akkadisch *šukênu/šuḫeḫḫunu.*" *WO* 30 (1999), pp. 91-94.

Tropper, J. *Ugaritische Grammatik.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 273. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000. [*Ugaritische Grammatik*]

Troupeau, G. "Mubtadaʾ." In C. E. Bosworth *et al.*, eds., *Encyclopédie de l'Islam.* Tome VII: MIF-NAZ. Leiden, New York, and Paris: Brill and Éditions Maisonneuve & Larose, 1993. Pp. 285-286. [*Encyclopédie de l'Islam* 7]

Ullendorf, E. "Ugaritic Marginalia." *Orientalia* N. S. 20 (1951), pp. 270-274.

Ungnad, A. *Babylonian Letters of the Ḫammurapi Period.* Publications of the Babylonian Section of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, no. 7. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Museum, 1915. [PBS 7]

Ungnad, A., and L. Matouš. *Akkadian Grammar.* Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Bibical Study, no. 30. Translated into English by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., from the fifth, corrected edition (1969) of Arthur Ungnad's *Grammatik des Akkadischen*, as revised by Lubor Matouš. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992 [1969]. [*Akkadian Grammar*]

van Soldt, W. *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit: Dating and Grammar.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 40. Kevelaer: Butzon and Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991. [*SAU*]

van Soldt, W. "Babylonian lexical, religious and literary texts and scribal education at Ugarit and its implications for the alphabetic literary texts." In M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, eds., *Ugarit: ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum. Ergebnisse und Perspektiven der Forschung. I. Ugarit und seinem altorientalische Umwelt.* Abhandlungen zur Literatur Alt-Syrien-Palästinas und Mesopotamiens, no. 7. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995. Pp. 171-212. [ALASP 7]

van Soldt, W. "The Syllabic Akkadian Texts." In W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, no. 39. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999. Pp. 28-45. [*HUS*]

Vanstiphout, H. L. J. "*Mihiltum*, or the Image of Cuneiform Writing." *Visible Religion* 6 (1988), pp. 152-167.

Vanstiphout, H. L. J. "Enmerkar's Invention of Writing Revisited." In H. Behrens *et al.*, eds., *DUMU-E$_2$-DUB-BA-A: Studies in Honor of Åke W. Sjöberg.* Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund, no. 11. Philadelphia: University Museum, 1989. 515-524. [*Studies Sjöberg*]

Vanstiphout, H. "Memory and Literacy in Ancient West Asia." In J. Sasson *et al.*, eds., *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East.* 4 volumes. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1995. Vol. 4, pp. 2181-2196. [*CANE* 4]

Veenhof, K. R., ed. *Cuneiform Archives and Libraries. Papers Read at the 30e Recontre Assyriologique Internationale, Leiden, 4-8 July 1983.* Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 1986. [RAI 30]

Verreet, E. "Die Silbenschliessende Aleph im Ugaritischen." *Ugarit Forschungen* 15 (1983), pp. 223-258.

Virolleaud, C. "Les inscriptions cunéiformes de Ras Shamra." *Syria* 10 (1929), pp. 304-310, pl. LXI-LXXX.

Virolleaud, C. "Note complémentaire sur le poème de Môt et Aleïn." *Syria* 12 (1931), pp. 350-357.

Virolleaud, C. "La naissance des dieux gracieux et beaux. Poème phénicien de Ras-Shamra." *Syria* 14 (1933), pp. 128-151.

Virolleaud, C. "La mort de Baal." *Syria* 15 (1934), pp. 305-356.

Virolleaud, C. "Baal et la génisse, poème de Ras-Shamra (IV AB)." *Syria* 17 (1936), pp. 150-173.

Virolleaud, C. *La légende phénicienne de Danel.* Mission de Ras Shamra, Tome 1; Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique, Tome 21. Paris: Geunthner, 1936. [*Danel*]

Virolleaud, C. "Séance du 29 octobre." *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1937), pp. 352-353.

Virolleaud, C. "Fragments alphabétiques divers de Ras Shamra." *Syria* 19 (1938), pp. 335-344.

Virolleaud, C. "Textes alphabétiques de Ras-Shamra provenant de la neuvième campagne." *Syria* 19 (1938), pp. 127-141.

Virolleaud, C. "Fragments alphabétiques divers de Ras Shamra." *Syria* 20 (1939), pp. 114-133.

Virolleaud, C. "Les nouvelles tablettes de Ras Shamra (1948-1949)." *Syria* 28 (1951), pp. 22-56.

Virolleaud, C. *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit.* Vol. 2: *Textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques des archives est, ouest et centrales.* Mission de Ras Shamra, Tome 7. Ed. by C. F.-A. Schaeffer. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale & Klincksieck, 1957. [*PRU* 2]

Virolleaud, C. *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit.* Vol. 5: *Textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques des archives sud, sud-ouest et du petit palais.* Mission de Ras Shamra, Tome 11. Ed. by C. F.-A. Schaeffer. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale & Klincksieck, 1965. [*PRU* 5]

Virolleaud, C. "Les nouveaux textes mythologiques et liturgiques de Ras Shamra (XXIVe campagne, 1961)." In C. F.-A. Schaeffer, ed., *Ugaritica*, vol. 5: *Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit, Commentaires des textes historiques (première partie).* Mission de Ras Shamra, Tome 16. Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique, Tome 80. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale and Geunther, 1968. Pp. 545-595. [*Ugaritica* 5]

Vita, J.-P. "Kollationen zu Berliner Amarnabriefen." In B. Böck, E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, and T. Richter, eds., *Munuscula Mesopotamica. Festschrift für Johannes Renger.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 267. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1999. Pp. 617-622. [*Festschrift Renger*]

Vita, J.-P. "Das Gezer-Corpus von El-Amarna: Umfang und Schreiber." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 90 (2000), pp. 70-77.

von Soden, W. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch.* 3 volumes. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965-1981. [*AHw*]

von Soden, W. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik.* Analecta Orientalia, 33. With W. R. Mayer. 3., ergänzte Auflage. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1995. [*GAG*]

Waltke, B. K., and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990. [*Biblical Hebrew Syntax*]

Wansbrough, J. "Ugaritic in Chancery Practice." RAI 30 (1986), pp. 205-209.

Watson, W. G. E. "An Unusual Prostration Formula in Ugaritic Akkadian." *Die Welt des Orients* 24 (1993), pp. 39-41.

Watson, W. G. E. "Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 27 (1995), pp. 533-558.

Watson, W. G. E. "Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon (2)." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 28 (1996), pp. 701-719.

Watson, W. G. E. "Delimiting Ugaritic *tḫm*: A Brief Report." *Ugarit-Forschungen* 30 (1998), pp. 745-749.

Watson, W. G. E. "Ugaritic Lexicography." In W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, no. 39. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999. Pp. 122-133. [*HUS*]

Watson, W. G. E. "Ugaritic Poetry." In W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, Band 39. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999. Pp. 165-192. [*HUS*]

Wehr, H. *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic.* Edited by J. M. Cowan. 4th edition. Ithaca, NY: Spoken Languages Services, Inc., 1979. [*Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*]

Weidner, E. F. *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi.* Heft 3. Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Zentralinstitut für alte Geschichte und Archäologie. Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 1922. [*KUB* 3]

Weidner, E. F. *Politische Dokumente aus Kleinasien: Die Staatsverträge in akkadischer Sprache aus dem Archiv von Boghazköi.* Boghazköi-Studien, no. 8. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1923. [BoSt 8]

Wente, E. *Letters from Ancient Egypt.* Society of Biblical Literature, Writings from the Ancient World, vol. 1. Ed. by E. Meltzer. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990. [*Letters from Ancient Egypt*]

Whiting, R. M. "The R Stem(s) in Akkadian." *Orientalia N. S.* 50 (1981), pp. 1-39.

Whiting, R. M. *Old Babylonian Letters from Tell Asmar.* The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Assyriological Studies, no. 18. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1987. [*Tell Asmar*]

Whiting, R. M. "Amorite Tribes and Nations of Second-Millennium Western Asia." In J. M. Sasson, ed., *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East.* Volume 2. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1995. Pp. 1231-1242. [*CANE* 2]

Winckler, H., ed. *Der Thontafelfund von El Amarna.* Mitteilungen aus den Orientalischen Sammlungen, Königliche Museen zu Berlin, nos. 1-3. Berlin: W. Spemann, 1889-1890. [*Der Thontafelfund von El Amarna* (*WA*)]

Winckler, H. *Die Thontafeln von Tell-El-Amarna.* Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, no. 5. Edited by E. Schrader. Berlin: Verlag von Reuter & Reichard, 1896. [*Die Thontafeln von Tell-El-Amarna* (*W*)]

Wiseman, D. J. *The Alalakh Tablets.* Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, no. 2. London: The British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1953. [*Alalakh Tablets*]

Wiseman, D. J. "Supplementary Copies of Alalakh Tablets." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 8 (1954), pp. 1-30.

Wright, W. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language.* Translated from the German of Caspari and edited with numerous additions and corrections. Third Edition revised by W. Robertson Smith and M. J. de Goeje. 2 Volumes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896-1898. [*A Grammar of the Arabic Language*]

Wyatt, N. *Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilimilku and his Colleagues.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998. [*Religious Texts from Ugarit*]

Wyatt, N. "The Religion of Ugarit: An Overview." In W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt, eds., *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies.* Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, Band 39. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1999. Pp. 529-585. [*HUS*]

Yamada, M. "Reconsidering the Letters from the 'King' in the Ugaritic Texts: Royal Correspondance from Carchemish?" *UF* 24 (1992) 431-436.

Yon, M. *La cité d'Ougarit sur la tell de Ras Shamra.* Guides archéologiques de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie du Proche-Orient, no. 2. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1997. [*La cité d'Ougarit*]

Youngblood, R. F. *The Amarna Correspondence of Rib-Haddi, Prince of Byblos (EA 68-96).* Ph.D. Dissertation, Dropsie College. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1961. [*Correspondence of Rib-Haddi*]

Zaccagnini, C. *Lo scambio dei doni nel Vicino Oriente durante i secoli XV-XIII.* Orientis Antiqui Collectio, no. 11. Rome: Centro per le antichità e la storia dell'arte del Vicino Oriente, 1973. [*Lo scambio dei doni*]

Ziegler, N. "Correspondance." In F. Joannès, ed., *Dictionnaire de la civilisation mésopotamienne.* Paris: Éditions Robert Laffont, 2001. Pp. 202-205.

Zimansky, P. Review of D. Schmandt-Besserat, *Before Writing*, 2 volumes (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1992). In *Journal of Field Archaeology* 20/4 (1993) Pp. 513-517. [*Journal of Field Archaeology* 20]

Zimmern, H. *Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kultureinfluss.* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1915. [*Akkadische Fremdwörter*]