

Ug. *hgb* y *slh* como material sacrificial

G. del Olmo Lete – Universidad de Barcelona

En una nota precedente¹ habíamos propuesto para *slh*, en razón del contexto cultural en que aparece este lexema, el valor de ‘viscera/parte del cuerpo/animal especial’, materia de ofrenda, en definitiva; valor que se justificaba en textos como KTU 1.46:1 y RIH 77/10B:9. Su conjunción con *npš/ap wnpš* y su paralelismo con *kbd* hacen muy verosímil tal determinación, que etimológicamente puede apoyarse en diversas posibilidades que el léxico académico técnico ofrece al respecto².

Teniendo en cuenta, por otra parte, el paralelismo de estructura y sintaxis existente entre RIH 77/10B:8-12, por un lado, y RIH 77/10B:8-12, por un lado, y RIH 77/10B:1-7 y KTU 1.90:1-7, por otro, se impone entender *hgb* con idéntico valor semántico que el mentado lexema *slh*, bien como topónimo, valor que ciertamente posee éste³ pero que no se conoce para aquél, bien como elemento de ofrenda, según nuestra propuesta. Se aumenta así en un elemento la ofrenda previa, propiciatoria o apotropaica, sin destinatario específico (*hgb/slh ap wnpš ksp whrs*), como a continuación se hace con la ofrecida a la divinidad a la que va dirigido el ritual (*hz alp ws**), en ofrenda *šrp wšlmm*, mientras en RIH 77/2B:1-7 tal elemento añadido falta en ambos casos⁴.

Desechado el valor toponímico de *hgb*, no atestiguado, la interpretación de tal lexema como título divino con el sentido de “portero”, “guardián” es meramente etimologizante, basada en el valor que tal base tiene en árabe: “cubrir con un velo” (*hiḡāb*) y de ahí (?) “impedir a alguien el acceso”⁵, mientras KTU 1.78:3-4 designa tal función de *Rašpu* con el lexema *igr*.

Resulta así preferible entender *hgb* como designación de una víscera en paralelo con *slh* en RIH 77/10B:2/9. Su aceptable derivación de la base **hgb*, “tapar, ocultar” (así en árabe, arameo y siríaco) tiene

1. Cf. G. del Olmo Lete, “Anatomía cultural de Ugarit. Ofrenda de vísceras en el culto ugarítico”, *AuOr* 7 (1989) 123-125.

2. En tal sentido sería quizá de tener en cuenta ac. *samaḫhu*, “bazo” como determinación semántica más precisa y acorde con el contexto mentado, si tal lexema se confirma con ese valor en acádico; cf. H. Holma, *Die Namen der Körperteile in Assyrischbabylonischen. Eine lexikalsich-etymologische Studie*, Helsinki 1911, pp. 82-83; pero cf. *AHW* 1016, *CAD* S.

3. Cf. KTU 4.355:19; 4.365:34; RIH 77/27:10⁶; cf. Bordreuil-Caquot, *Syria* 56 (1979) 300-301, que, en consecuencia, interpretan ^c*nt slh*, en los lugares citados más arriba, como una epifanía local de la diosa ^cAnatu (la relación con *slhu* [1.48:19] y el valor onomástico de este lexema es discutible; cf. Pardee, *Syria* 65 [1988] 189). Por otro lado, el uso onomástico y gentilicio del *hgb* es abundante en la prosopografía de Ugarit; cf. *UT* n.° 836; *WUS* n.° 899-902.

4. Esta simetría se esperaría también en RIH 77/10B:8-12, a propósito de *slh*, compensada de alguna manera por la ofrenda siguiente a la misma divinidad (^c*nt/nt/nt*) de una víctima complementaria (*š l^cnt*, lín. 13), mientras en los textos mentados no se da una tercera repetición del nombre de la divinidad destinataria (*ilib/ilib/il/šmn, ršp/ršp/... ršp/ršp²/inš ilm³*).

5. Cf. Caquot, *Syria* 46 (1969) 260; Del Olmo Lete, *SEL* 3 (1986) 58, n. 19; Xella, *TRU* I, p. 83; id., “Le dieu Rashap à Ugarit”, *AAAS* 29-30 (1979-1980) 150. Su correlación, en cambio, con hb. *hgb*, “langosta”, tiene menor verosimilitud; cf. W. J. Fulco, *The Canaanite God Reshep*, New Haven. CT 1976, p. 44.

fácil aplicación anatómica, referida, en principio, a toda piel o membrana que ‘tapa’/‘impide el acceso’; así tenemos en árabe *ḥāḡib*, “ceja”, *ḥiḡāb* (*alḥāḡiz*), “diafragma”, “sebo que recubre el corazón”⁶. Este valor, “diafragma”, “pericardio” o “peritoneo” convendría bien al sitagma *ḡb ap w nps̄*.

Esta interpretación semántica alivia, por otra parte, la dificultad que presenta KTU 1.106:1. En su momento supusimos que en el encabezamiento perdido se indicaba la ‘víctima’ ofrecida a *Rašpu*, que de otra manera ‘faltaba’, creando un desequilibrio en el texto⁷. Pero si *ḡb* indica una materia de ofrenda, queda resuelto el problema estructural de este texto; ofrenda destinada a un sacrificio *šrp* que, como decíamos, es el normal para este tipo de ofrendas viscerales⁸:

“A *Rašpu*, un *ḡb*,
dos aves a las ‘gentes divinas’,
en holocausto”.

6. Cf. Lane, *AEL*, pp. 515-516. Ac. *e/iqbu* es posible que esconda dos homónimos (?), correspondientes a **qb* y **ḡb* (**ikbu*): cf. CAD E. p. 248 s.

7. Cf. Del Olmo Lete, *SEL* 3 (1986) 55, 61. Otras versiones suponen que *lršp ḡb* juega el papel de encabezamiento o título del ritual (sin paralelo en los restantes rituales) o bien que se ha omitido *kmm* después de *inš ilm*; cf. Xella, *AAAS* 29-30 (1979-1980) 152; id., *TRU I*, p. 83; De Tarragon, *TOu II*, p. 185, n. 131.

8. Cf. Del Olmo Lete, *AuOr* 7 (1989) 125. En la misma línea debería analizarse el sintagma *ršp mhbn š šrp* en 1.105:14; cf. 1.106:6: ya Herdner, *Ug VII*, p. 15, proponía el valor “ofrenda” para *mhbn* (< **whb*); pero este valor genérico es difícilmente asumible en un texto de precisión cultural en el que todos los elementos son ‘ofrendas’.

Akkadisms in Ugaritic texts. KTU 2.41:14-22: a suggestion¹

I. Márquez Rowe – Universidad de Barcelona

No doubt Ugarit scribes practised Ugaritic-Akkadian bilingualism on a large scale as clearly attested in the written tradition². As a result Ugarit syllabic texts contain a considerable number of Ugaritic vocabulary³. This note is an attempt to give some evidence of the logical reciprocal process, that is the presence of Akkadisms in Ugaritic texts (probably as translations of original Akkadian documents).

KTU 2.41:14-22

Certainly the Ugaritic letter KTU 2.41 as found in the oven of Court V stands for the translation of the original Akkadian letter (likely addressed to the king of Ugarit). Accordingly it was written by a scribe belonging to the Ugarit royal palace itself.

Unfortunately the obverse of the tablet is badly damaged and only its reverse (lines 14-22) provides an intelligible reading. The first sentence of the reverse runs as follows:

(14) *i*nm. bdk. hwt* (15) *y*rš*

1. This note has been completed during my scholarship granted by the *Direcció General d'Universitats del Departament d'Ensenyament de la Generalitat de Catalunya*.

The abbreviations used in this note follow AHW and UF.

2. Cf. e. g. L. Milano “Osservazione sul bilinguismo ugaritico-accadio”, (Atti del seminario di studi su bilinguismo e traduzione nell'antico Oriente, Roma 1980) *VO* 3 (1980), 179-197.

3. Cf. e.g. the study of J. Huehnergard, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*, Atlanta 1987.

ANALYSIS

inm: <Akk. *i/enūma* adv. "now, now then" (cf. AHw 384; in Ugarit Akk. cf. S.E. Loewenstamm, "Lexicographical notes on 1. *ṭbh*; 2. *hnnny/hlly*", *UF* 5 (1973) 211; A.L. Kristensen, "Ugaritic Epistolary Formulas" *UF* 9 (1977) 154; J. Huehnergard, *The Akkadian of Ugarit*, Atlanta 1989, 196f; W.H. van Soldt, *Studies in the Akkadian of Ugarit: Dating and Grammar*, Newkirchen-Vluyt 1991, 465). For this same Akkadism-interpretation in 2.41:14, cf. M.C. Astour, "New evidence on the last days of Ugarit", *AJA* 69 (1965), 256 n. 24, although he translates it as the conjunction 'when'.

hwt /r-š-y/: <Akk. *aw/māta(m) rašū(m)* "to have a cause (for complaint)" (cf. AHw 961 s.v. *rašū(m)* 6). For Ug. */r-š-y/*, cf. JAram. *ršy* (Jastrow DTT 1500), and Syr. *ršō* (Brockelman LexSyr. 744).

It is clear that the Ugaritic scribe made a *literal translation* of the original Akkadian letter thus introducing Ugaritic terms and expressions borrowed from Akkadian patterns.

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

Rs.	<i>i[*]nm.^cbdk.hwt</i>
15	<i>y[*]rš.^cmy</i> <i>mnm.irštk</i> <i>d ḥsrt.w.ank</i> <i>aštn..l.ihy</i> <i>w.ap.ank.mnm</i>
20	<i>ḥ[*]sr[*]t.w.uhy</i> <i>y[*]msn.tmn</i> <i>w. [u]hy.al.yb^rrn</i>

"(14) Now then your servant (15) has got (14) the (following) cause for complaint: (15)' (We agreed that whenever you wrote) to me (16) any wish of yours (17) that you required then I (18) should certainly supply it to my brother; (19) and likewise (should) I (ever write to you) anything (20) I required then my brother (21) would deliver it to me there!⁴ (22) Accordingly may my brother not abandon me!"⁵.

4. For this formula in the Akkadian letters from Ugarit, cf. especially RS 15.24+ (PRU 3 18): 12-21, as well as RS 20.03 (Ug 5 N 26): 10-14; RS 22.06 (PRU 6 16) Rs: 1'-6'; RS 17.116 (PRU 4 132ss.): 21'-30').

5. For this complaint-contextual interpretation of KTU 2.41, cf. M. Dietrich-O. Loretz-J. Sanmartín, "Zur ugaritischen Lexicographie (VII)", *UF* 5 (1973) 86, whose rendering of the verb *b^rr* 'bringen' was later corrected into 'vernachlässigen, verlassen' (cf. M. Dietrich-O. Loretz-J. Sanmartín, "Die keilalphabetischen Belege für *b^rr* I und *b^rr* II", *UF* 7 (1975) 555, and lately M. Dietrich-O. Loretz, "Ugaritisch *b^rr* I 'anzünden' und *b^rr* II 'verlassen'", *UF* 22 (1990) 53); for other different interpretations of this verb, cf. C. Virolleaud, *PRU* 5 65 'gaspiller'; M.C. Astour, *AJA* 69 (1965) 265 'to squander'; S. Ahl, *Epistolary texts from Ugarit*, Diss. Brandeis Univ. 1973, 445 (probably following C.H. Gordon UT 19.495) 'to disappoint'; K. Aartun, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen* 2 (1978) 81-82 'vertigeln'. For the whole passage, cf. C. Virolleaud *PRU* 5 65 (although he does not translate lines 14-15); M.C. Astour, *AJA* 69 (1965) 256 (whose rendering of lines 14-15 is far from convincing: 'when thy servant delivered (?) (thy) word to me') and S. Ahl, *Epist.*, 445 (followed by E. Verreet, "Beobachtungen zum ugaritischen Verbalsystem II", *UF* 17 (1986) 322) who prefers according to her interpretation the reading *i^{*}rš* in line 15 (instead of the evident *y^{*}rš*) and takes it to be the imperative of /'r-š/ 'to request'.

COMMENTARY

The lack of context makes it difficult to provide a satisfactory interpretation of the whole passage, especially concerning the rather confusing relationship between sender and addressee (*bdk* in l. 14, and *i/uhy* in ll. 18,20,22). However, I propose to understand the letter as the message of a *middleman*, that is either an emissary of the king of Ugarit sent to another kingdom (GN) or the vizier of GN (probably from the same Syrian area (Amurru?)). The sender reports then to the king of Ugarit (his "lord", hence as his "servant": *bdk* in l.14) the complaint or claim of a third person, obviously the king of GN (who is in "brotherhood" relationship with the king of Ugarit, hence: *i/uhy* in ll. 18,20,22)⁶.

6. This "position ambiguë" assumed by the addresser (cf. his subjectship with regard to the king of Ugarit vs. his defence of the cause of the king of GN) is also found in similar contexts in other letters (cf. e. g. RS 20.162 (Ug 5 N 37), RS 17.383 (PRU 4 221ss.) or RS 34.135 (RSOu 7 17); for this interpretation, cf. J. Nougayrol, *Ug* 5, 114).

Some Brief Remarks on Hippiatric Methodology

Dennis Pardee – University of Chicago

Reacting to the two recent studies of the Ugaritic hippiatric texts¹, an article published a short time ago in the journal *Orientalia* has made some new suggestions for certain of the more obscure terms in those texts². I do not wish to deal here in detail with the specifics of these suggestions but to make some claims regarding fruitful methodology when approaching this specific *genre*, as well as a plea for making available the Arabic hippiatric tradition to Semitists.

In the introduction as well as in the commentary of my edition, I attempted to show that the Ugaritic hippiatric texts are at the very least forerunners of the later tradition and that they may indeed reflect a larger tradition and descend from still older hippiatric formulations for which there is as yet little evidence³. It appears to me that the parallels both of structure and of phenomena between the Ugaritic and later traditions are strong enough to make the hypothesis of some form of direct transmission of the traditions a plausible one, though the lack of data prohibits a demonstration. If this hypothesis be valid, any treatment of Ugaritic hippiatric phenomena should attempt to link a proposed solution with the later hippiatric literature. Moreover, the hypothesis should be refuted before a purely lexical approach, one that ignores the hippiatric traditions, is adopted.

Now, Renfroe's method is lexical, based largely on the Arabic lexicon. One does not find in his footnotes a single reference to a hippiatric text from any one of the many traditions in which this *genre* is attested. It appears to me that arguments of a purely lexical nature, no matter the erudition and propriety with which the comparative lexical method is handled⁴, are a dead end in the study of the hippiatric texts, for they depend on considerations regarding what is or is not logical in the matter of equine illnesses when we have a vast literature at our disposal demonstrating how the ancients viewed and expressed these illnesses.

1. C. Cohen and D. Sivan, *The Ugaritic Hippiatric Texts: A Critical Edition* (AOS 9; New Haven 1983); D. Pardee, *Les textes hippiatricques* (Ras Shamra-Ugarit II; Paris 1985). The texts in question are RS 5.300, 5.285 + 5.301, 17.120, and 23.484.

2. F. Renfroe, "Diagnosing Long-Dead Patients: The Equine Ailments in *KTU* 1.85", *Orientalia* 57 (1988) 181-91.

3. Cf. the discussion of 'horse doctors' in the Old Babylonian period by J.-M. Durand, *ARMT* 26 (*AEM* 1/1; Paris 1988) 55,570.

4. See Renfroe's excellent article regarding the comparative lexical method, with particular regard to Arabic, in *UF* 18 (1986) 33-74. One might nonetheless question his own use of the method in the example cited below.

There is no doubt that a lexically-oriented approach is necessary for much of the Ugaritic, and other Northwest Semitic, literature. But in the very specific case of the hippiatric texts, for which, if my hypothesis regarding transmission be acceptable, the similar texts in several languages provide a source of comparison on many phenomena, the purely lexical method must be viewed as inadequate.

An explicit example of the points I wish to make: on pp. 183-84 of his article Renfroe suggest that *g^cr* in the Ugaritic hippiatric texts should mean something along the lines of 'to void dry dung'. This is proposed on the basis of Arabic *ḡ^cr*, 'to void dung', where the added notion of 'dryness' appears, but not, one might add, with any frequency (an important part of Renfroe's argument is an extrapolation from *ḡ^cr* being used for rodents' dung, which is dry). One nominal form (*maḡ^cār*) denotes 'costiveness' in humans. To the point of the present remarks are the following observations: (1) no evidence is cited for the cited Arabic usage being present in any older Semitic language - unless such evidence exists the presumption must be for an inner-Arabic development⁵; (2) no evidence is cited for *ḡ^cr* being used in Arabic hippiatric texts for the voiding of dry dung, nor for costiveness; and (3) no parallels are cited from any hippiatric source for the voiding of dry dung being a hippiatric disorder - and this might possibly have been done since 'costiveness' is a frequently-mentioned disorder in the hippiatric texts⁶. In my commentary I cited both ancient Northwest Semitic evidence for *g^cr* denoting some kind of forceful cry and hippiatric evidence for various kinds of forceful cries marking disorders of the horse⁷. What I was unable to do was to check the Arabic hippiatric literature to see if *ḡ^cr* is used there. An argument of a more convincing nature on the part of Renfroe would have included as many as possible of the following features: the ancient use of *g^cr* to denote some defecatory disorder, dryness of dung as a hippiatric disorder, evidence from Arabic hippiatric texts on *ḡ^cr*.

At this juncture, of much greater usefulness than further exploitation of the Arabic lexica, and the arguments and counter-arguments they spawn⁸, would be an edition of the Arabic-language hippiatric texts. My use of Ibn al-ʿAwwām's *Kitāb al-filāḥah* was limited to the French translation thereof⁹ for the simple reason that, to my knowledge, no edition of that work or of any of the Arabic hippiatric treatises exists. For scholars of hippiatry who are not conversant with the Arabic manuscript tradition there are two primary *desiderata* in this regard: (1) a full edition, with translation, commentary, and glossary/concordance; (2) a reliable discussion of the history of the *genre* in Arabic, particularly the question of its reliance on classical originals as compared with a possible independent Semitic tradition. The former would allow comparisons on a lexical level - in my commentary I was only able to cite comparisons regarding hippiatric phenomena, based on the French translation; the latter would allow better-grounded statements regarding the question of transmission from the second-millennium B.C. Semitic texts.

5. The questions of the inner-Arabic relationship of *ḡ^cr* and *g^cr* and of the relationship of these roots to old Northwest Semitic are not without interest, of course, and deserve a more thorough treatment by an Arabist conversant with the older materials. But without more extensive argumentation, one cannot leave unchallenged the bald assertion of an Arabic sense for old Northwest Semitic *g^cr* when in the older dialects that root denotes a vocal production (cf. also ESA and Ethiopic, according to the dictionaries).

6. But there one would run up against the fact that 'costiveness' is expressed in very different and explicit terms in §V of the Ugaritic text. In order to provide a significant difference, the notion of 'defecating dry dung' is required.

7. *Les textes hippiatriques* (see n. 1) 42-45.

8. My declining to debate Renfroe's particular points is thus not based on any denigration of their intrinsic value, but on their nature: wherever possible, I adduced both philological and hippiatric bases for my arguments, whereas Renfroe's arguments are philological in nature. Until his solutions are shown to have a better grounding in the hippiatric traditions than do mine (or until my hypothesis regarding the comparability of the various hippiatric traditions is demolished), his proposals do not by their very nature invite further discussion on my part. His or my view of what is hippiatrically logical or appropriate is not so important as the ancient view.

9. J. J. Clément-Mullet, *Le livre de l'agriculture d'Ibn-al-Awam (Kitab al-felahah)* (Paris 1864-1867).