

Okita does not assess the relative strengths of Madhva's, Jīva's, Baladeva's, etc., arguments and interpretations, but maps them out and compares them. There seems to be an unspoken *pūrvapakṣa* running through the analysis: that we should expect theologians with the same theological affiliation to hold the same views on essential topics. This assumption is not evaluated.

In conclusion, this is a rich source of information on the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition, with careful philological and comparative argumentation. It makes an important contribution to our understanding of Baladeva's role in the history of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition and establishes a firm foundation and critical methodology for further comparative studies within the Vaiṣṇava traditions of theology.

JONATHAN EDELMANN
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Bhāṭṭatantrarahasyam: The Bhāṭṭatantrarahasya of Khaṇḍadeva with the Sāraprakāśikā Commentary by N. S. Ramanuja Tatacharya. By N. S. RAMANUJA TATACHARYA. Regards sur l'Asie du Sud/South Asian Perspective, no. 4. Pondichéry: INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DE PONDICHÉRY, 2015. Pp. xxi + 664. Rs. 1200, €52.

The eminent polymath N. S. Ramanuja Tatacharya has made many contributions to scholarship on Sanskrit writings in several areas of learning, particularly Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā, and Vyākaraṇa. Among his recent contributions are a four-volume compilation (*Śābdabodhamīmāṃsā: An Inquiry into Indian Theories of Verbal Cognition*) published by the Institut Français de Pondichéry between 2005 and 2008, in which are collected major selections of works dealing with aspects of verbal cognition; a commentary (*Bālapriyā*) on Nilakaṇṭha's *Prakāśikā* to Annambhaṭṭa's *Tarkasaṅgrahadīpikā* (*The Tarka-saṅgraha-Dīpikā-Prakāśikā with the Commentaries Bālapriyā and Prasāraṇā*, 2nd ed., edited by N. Veezhinathan, [Chennai Mahalakshmi-Mathrubhuteswar Trust, 2008]); and an edition of Gadādharaḥaṭṭa's *Vyutpattivāda* with his commentary *Vidvanmanoramā* (*Tārkikacakraḥvartī Gadādharaḥaṭṭācāryaviracitaḥ Vyutpattivādaḥ N. S. Rāmānujācāryakṛtāyā Vidvanmanoramākhyayā vyākhyayā sahitaḥ*, 2 vol. [Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidya-peetha, 2011, 2012]).

Ramanuja Tatacharya has now contributed an edition of the *Bhāṭṭatantrarahasya* of the Mīmāṃsaka Khaṇḍadeva, with his commentary, *Sāraprakāśikā*. The text and commentary (pp. 1–640) are preceded by a short introduction (*prastāvanā*, i-v) as well as a detailed table of contents (vii-xxi, where the order of the first two indexes is reversed), and followed by four appendixes: index of Pāṇinian sūtras (*pāṇinisūtrasūci*, 643–52) and vārttikas of Kātyāyana (*vārttikāni*, 652–53) quoted both in the main text and in the commentary, index of kārikās cited in the main text and commentary (*kārikāsūci*, 655–57), and a catalog of works cited (*udāhṛtagranthānām sūci*, 659–64).

Khaṇḍadeva, who received the name Śrīdharendra when he took sannyāsa, flourished in Kāśī in the early to mid seventeenth century and died in 1666 (samvat 1722), as is made known by his disciple Śambhubhaṭṭa in the seventh and ninth verses at the end of his *Prabhāvalī* on the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* (*yaḥ khaṇḍadevanāmā san śrīdharendrābhīdhām gataḥ | sa gurur me vijānātu tīkāḥkṛtipariśramam || varṣe netradvisaptadvijapatigaṇite māsi jyeṣṭhe karakṣe . . . kāśyām śrībrahmanāle nirupamacaritaḥ khaṇḍadevābhīdhānaḥ | prāptaḥ śrībrahmanābhāvaṃ nibudhavaraguruḥ śrīdharendro yatīndraḥ ||*).

Khaṇḍadeva is known to have composed three works on Mīmāṃsā: *Mīmāṃsākaustubha*, *Bhāṭṭadīpikā*, *Bhāṭṭatantrarahasya*. The first is a commentary extending from the second pāda of the first adhyāya through the third pāda of the third adhyāya of Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*. The *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* covers from the second pāda of the first adhyāya through the twelfth adhyāya. There are earlier editions of the *Bhāṭṭatantrarahasya*. A. Subrahmanya Sastri's edition (3rd ed. [as mentioned on p. 74 of the Sanskrit introduction], Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University, 1970) includes an extensive Sanskrit introduction of seventy-five pages, a shorter English introduction of ten pages, comments on some

passages, and an index of cited passages. Sūryanārāyaṇa Śāstrī later composed a commentary, entitled *Khaṇḍadevabhāvaprakāśa*, on the entire text, published in 1985: *Khaṇḍa Deva Bhava Prakasa, a Commentary on Mahamhopadhyaya Khandadeva's Bhattarahasya* (as given on the Roman title page), Rajahmundry (no publisher specified). This edition does not have any indexes but does include a short introduction in English (pp. x–xxi) by K. T. Pandurangi and an extensive Sanskrit introduction (xxvi–lx), followed by an unpaginated three-page chart giving the positions of grammarians, Naiyāyikas, and Mīmāṃsakas on major topics), in which Sūryanārāyaṇa Śāstrī not only refers to and critiques A. Subrahmanya Sastri's edition but also mentions (lviii) an earlier edition of 1900 and its reprint.

The *Sāraprakāśikā* is more thorough than the comments in Subrahmanya Sastri's edition. Moreover, although the *Bhāvaprakāśa* is in part even more thorough than Rāmānuja Tatacharya's commentary, the text which it accompanies is visually inferior in that it abounds in cases of poor spacing such as *natāvāt vihita kriyātvam, liṅādi śravaṇottaram pravṛtti darśanā tpravṛttisāmagrī janādvārā* instead of *na tāvadvihitakriyātvam, liṅādiśravaṇottaram pravṛttidarśanātppravṛttisāmagrījanādvārā*. This new edition of the *Bhāṭṭatantrarahasya* and the commentary thereon are therefore welcome.

The topics treated in the *Bhāṭṭatantrarahasya* are as follows (page numbers and section titles as in the edition under review): 1. discussion of the defining characteristic of dharma (*dharmalakṣaṇavicārah*, 3–17) and its contrary, adharma; 2. what constitutes vidhi, linked with the injunctive use of the optative (*vidhivādaḥ*, 19–109); 3. the concept of bhāvanā ('causing something to be') (*bhāvanāvādaḥ*, 111–94); 4. description of meaning(s) attributed to a verbal base (*dhātvarthanirūpaṇam*, 195–203); 5. description of meanings attributed to verb endings (*ākhyātārthanirūpaṇam*, 205–41); 6–12. discussions of the meanings attributed to each of the seven triplets of nominal endings (*vibhakti*): 6. *prathamāvibhaktiyarthavicārah* (243–75), 7. *dvitīyāvibhaktiyarthavicārah* (277–378), 8. *trītyāvibhaktiyarthavicārah* (379–419), 9. *caturthāvibhaktiyarthavicārah* (421–66), 10. *pañcamāvibhaktiyarthavicārah* (467–521), 11. *ṣaṣṭhāvibhaktiyarthavicārah* (523–84), 12. *saptamāvibhaktiyarthavicārah* (585–640).

Khaṇḍadeva begins by stating that Jaimini, in his work of twelve chapters, basically investigated only dharma and adharma, since the knowledge acquired from such investigation serves to allow the proper performance of rituals (2: *tatra tāvad dvādaśalakṣaṇyām dharmādharmaṅ eva jaiminīnānuṣṭhānopayogitayā vicāritau*). He then remarks that, although the term *dharma* is commonly used to signify some imperceptible quality that results from one's performing a particular act, it is also used in Mīmāṃsā to refer to an action that produces such a quality (and *adharma* is used with reference to an act that produces the contrary); accordingly, in Mīmāṃsā, such acts are the primary objects of investigation (2: *tathāpi . . . tajjanakavihitaniṣiddhakriyāyām api dharmādharmaśabdaprayogāt tāv iha prādhānyena vicāryete*). This is in harmony with the way Jaimini proceeds in his work. He begins by declaring that an inquiry is to take place concerning dharma (J[aimini]S[ūtra] 1.1.1.1: *athāto dharmajijñāsā*), then says (JS 1.1.1.2: *codanālakṣaṇo 'rtho dharmah*) that dharma is that which is made known by Vedic injunctions and leads to acceptably desired results. Commenting on the second sūtra, Śābara states that the object that is made known by a Vedic injunction (*codanālakṣaṇo 'rthah*) is something that is the cause of ultimate happiness (*śreyaskarah*, Ś[ābara]Bh[āṣya] 20.3: *tasmāc codanālakṣaṇo 'rthah śreyaskarah* [Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series vol. 97.1, Poona, 1976]) and that only an object which is such a cause is referred to by the term *dharma* (ŚBh. 20.4–5: *ya eva śreyaskarah sa eva dharmāśabdenocyate*). He also notes that this is justified by the use of the related term *dhārmika*: one refers to a person who carries out a ritual as *dhārmika* (ŚBh. 20.5–21.1: *yo hi yāgam anuṣṭhāti taṁ dhārmika iti samācaksate*). Śābara here implicitly refers to Pāṇini 4.4.41: *dharmāṁ carati*, which introduces the taddhita suffix *thak* (4.4.1: *prāg vahateṣ thak*) to a pada with a second-triplet ending to form a derivative signifying one who regularly carries out dharma. In his *Ślokovārttika* on the codanāsūtra (ed. Kei Kataoka: *Kumārila on Truth, Omniscience, and Killing*, pt. 1: *A Critical Edition of Mīmāṃsā-Ślokovārttika ad 1.1.2 [codanāsūtra]* [Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte 814, 2011]) Kumārila notes that by *śreyas* Śābara refers to a happiness (*prītiḥ*) in man that is to be brought about (*sādhyā*) through acts together with substances and their properties that are made known by Vedic injunctions, so that only these have the property of being dharma (ŚIVC 191: *śreyo hi puruṣapriṭh sā dravyaguṇakarmabhiḥ | codanālakṣaṇaiḥ sādhyā tasmāt teṣv eva dharmatā*).

In a comparable vein, Khaṇḍadeva says, as did Kumāṛila, that the property of being dharma resides in acts made known by injunctions, then also asks what constitutes being dharma and adharma (3.3: *atha kin nāma dharmatvam adharmatvam vā*), and takes up problems associated with different formulations. Now, a ritual act is enjoined by a Vedic command such as *darśapūrnamāsābhyām svargakāmo yajeta* (“One who desires the happiness called *svarga* should perform the new- and full-moon rites”) uses an optative form—which has an ending that derives, in Pāṇini’s system, from the *l*-affix *liñ*—or its equivalent. Such a form is considered from two aspects of causing something to be (*bhāvanā*), respectively called *śābdi* (‘verbal . . .’) and *ārthī bhāvanā* (‘. . . related to an object’): the Vedic text, once understood, causes a ritual act—signified by a verbal base like *yaj*—to be performed, and one who performs that act thereby causes a desired object to come about. Accordingly, after treating dharma, Khaṇḍadeva proceeds to discuss what constitutes vidhi and bhāvanā, then what one can justifiably consider to be the meaning of a verbal base. The first major section of his work ends with a discussion of views concerning the meaning of any verb ending. Subsequently, he takes up nominal endings and their meanings, in the traditional order of triplets of such endings (*vibhakti*), from first (*prathamā*) through seventh (*saptamī*). He regularly begins by citing Pāṇinian sūtras that serve to introduce such *vibhakti*, interprets the rule in accordance with Bhāṭṭamīmāṃsā views, and deals with positions taken by other scholars, such as Naiyāyikas.

Khaṇḍadeva thus enters into complex arguments concerning grammar and semantics that engaged the attention of other major scholars who were his mid-seventeenth century contemporaries, the Naiyāyika Gadāharabhaṭṭa and the Pāṇinian grammarian Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa. The arguments become quite complex and Khaṇḍadeva’s style is terse. As Ramanuja Tatacharya notes in his introduction (iii), this style is not easy to understand (*śailī ca na sugamā*). His commentary is therefore welcome: it explains many difficult arguments in detail and with clarity.

Much as I am therefore grateful for this commentary, I would be remiss if I failed to take note of what to my mind are some lacks in this work. Although Ramanuja Tatacharya cites many passages from other works of Mīmāṃsā and Nyāya, his very brief introduction does not give the reader an overview of Khaṇḍadeva’s relations to other authors of his period and to predecessors with respect to the tenets upheld and arguments proposed. An interested reader can consult the introductions to earlier editions of the *Bhāṭṭatantrarahasya*, in which such matters are treated.

Another shortcoming of the present edition concerns the citations and the indexes supplied. The main text abounds in citations, as does the commentary, but, except for Pāṇinian sūtras, vārttikas, and kārikās from grammatical works listed in the first two indexes, there is a lack of precise references and even the indexes provided of sūtras, vārttikas, and kārikās is not without blemishes. For lack of space, I limit myself to a few examples.

Śabara (ŚBh. 1.1.1.2 [21.6–22.1]) speaks of a ritual act with a good purpose (*arthah*), which is intended to gain ultimate happiness (*niḥśreyasāya*), opposed to one with a bad purpose (*anarthah*), which leads to a sin in the destruction of someone (*pratyavāyāya*); an example of the former is the Jyotiṣṭoma rite, of the latter the Śyena rite: *ko ’rthah | yo niḥśreyasāya jyotiṣṭomādīḥ | ko ’narthah | yah pratyavāyāya śyeno . . . ity evamādīḥ*. Elsewhere, Śabara repeatedly cites the injunction *jyotiṣṭomena svargakāmo yajeta* (e.g., ŚBh. 2.3.1.1), which has a counterpart in *Āpastambaśrautasūtra* 10.2.1: *svargakāmo jyotiṣṭomena yajeta*; and the *Ṣaḍvīmśabrāhmaṇa* (4.2.1–2) introduces a section dealing with the Śyena rite, saying that one who intends harm to an enemy should perform this: *athaiṣa śyenaḥ | abhicāran yajeta*. In the section concerning dharma and adharma, Khaṇḍadeva (5) remarks that the Śyena rite nevertheless has the property of being a dharma, since the Veda conveys that it is the means to a desired end; being the cause producing an unacceptable result pertains only to the result of performing this rite—namely causing harm by acts such as striking with a weapon, leading to the death of an enemy—that has the property of being adharma, since it is possessed of the property of being a means to an unacceptable end, as made known by the Veda: *śyene ceṣṭasādhanatāyā eva vedabodhitatvād dharmatvam eva | anīṣṭajanakatvaṃ tu śyenaḥpalasya vairimaraṇānukūlaśastraghātādirūpahimsātma-kābhicārasyaiva | tasyaiva ca vedabodhitānīṣṭasādhanakatvād adharmatvaṃ na tu śyenasya . . .* That is, performing the rite does not directly cause the death of an enemy; it is what this performance causes that brings this about. In this way, Khaṇḍadeva justifies the position that *dharma* refers only to an act

enjoined by a Vedic command and that such a command is only dharma. The *Sāraprakāśikā* explains this clearly (pp. 6–7). It also cites (6.8) *śyenenābhicaran yajeta* as a Vedic command, but no reference to a Vedic source appears in the commentary proper or included in an index. The same holds for a multitude of Vedic citations.

The indexes also lack references to citations from other texts, which are identified globally in the text. For example, on page 211 a group of verses are cited and identified as from Someśvarabhaṭṭa's *Nyāyasudhā* on Kumārila's *Tantravārttika*, but no specific text reference is supplied (the verses occur in the commentary on 2.1.1.1) nor is this work listed in the bibliography. Moreover, in two instances, the text cited differs from what occurs in the only edition known to me (*Nyāya Sudhā: A Commentary on Tantravārttika by Pandit Someshwara Bhatta*, edited by Pandit Mukuna Shastri, 2nd ed., 2 vols. [Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 14, Varanasi, 2000]). Ramanuja Tatacharya cites *na karotyarthatā śaṅkyā siddharūpā prayogataḥ* (p. 211.8) and *ācāryaiś ca prayatnasya vyāpāratvābhidhānataḥ* (211.13), but the Chowkhamba edition has (579.23, 25) *akarotyarthatā śaṅkyā siddharūpā pratītaḥ* and *ity ācāryaiś ca yatnasya vyāpāratvābhidhānataḥ*.

The indexes that are provided are fairly comprehensive, but even these are not without problems. For example, on page 652 *dānaś ca sā cec caturthyarthe* is listed as a vārttika: “. . . (vā. 5040) 419.” On page 419. the *Sāraprakāśikā* says, “‘*dānaś ca sā cec caturthyarthe*’ *iti* (vā. 5040) *sūtreṇa ātmanepadam*.” The same text is thus identified both as a vārttika and a sūtra. In addition, the index (652) has an entry “*aśiṣṭavyavahāre dānaḥ prayoge caturthyarthe tṛtīyā vācyā* (vā 5040) 417” and on page 417 the text cited is also identified as a vārttika. To my knowledge, *dānaś ca sā cec caturthyarthe* has always been recognized as a Pāṇinian sūtra (1.3.55, *Siddhāntakaumudī* no. 2728), and all but one of the *Mahābhāṣya* available to me lack a vārttika on 1.3.55. Patañjali here asks how a third-triplet ending could occur in the meaning of a fourth-triplet ending and answers that the rule itself provides both for ātmanepada affixes after *dān* used with the preverb *sam* and for a third-triplet ending in construction with such a form, in the usage of uninstructed non-élite speakers: *katham nāma tṛtīyā caturthyarthe syāt | evaṁ tarhi aśiṣṭavyavahāre 'nena tṛtīyā ca vidhīyata ātmanepadam ca* (Kielhorn's ed. I.284.2–3 [3rd ed., Pune, 1985]), Nirnaya-Sagar Press ed. II.166b [1st ed. 1912, rpt. Varanasi 1988, 2nd. ed. 1935], Rohtak ed. II.259 [1963]). In Guru Prasad Shastri's edition (vol. I.2.234 [2nd ed. by Dr. Bal Shastri, Varanasi, 1987]), after the question is posed, the text continues as follows: *evaṁ tarhi* [|*|| *aśiṣṭavyavahāre tu tṛtīyā ca vidhīyate* ||*|| *aśiṣṭavyavahāre tu tṛtīyā ca vidhīyate* ||*|| *kim ca?* *ātmanepadam ca* |] *aśiṣṭavyavahāre 'nena tṛtīyā ca vidhīyata ātmanepadam ca*. In a footnote (234 n. 5) the editor remarks that the text identified as a vārttika by asterisks with double daṇḍas fails to occur in some sources and is a śloka-vārttika; he also notes (234 n. 6) that *kim ca? ātmanepadam ca* has presumably been lost in our sources. He does not, however, give any evidence of his sources for these conjectures. The *Kāśikāvṛtti* on 1.3.55 does say *katham nāma tṛtīyā caturthyarthe syāt | vaktavyam etat aśiṣṭavyavahāre tṛtīyā caturthyarthe bhvavatīti vaktavyam*, giving the appearance of a vārttika, but there is no textual evidence for such a vārttika being cited and explained in the *Mahābhāṣya*.

During his discussion of the kāraḥ class called *apādāna*, Khaṇḍadeva considers Pāṇini 1.4.24: *dhruvam apāye 'pādānam* in connection with the example *vrkṣād vibhajate* (“[A leaf] gets separated from a tree”), and remarks that with regard to this also the sūtra noted is interpreted in the *Vākyapadīya* and other works as providing that with respect to movement away from something—that is, separation—an object playing the role of a firm point—that is, which has the status of being a boundary—shall bear the name *apādāna*: *tatrāpy apāye vibhāge dhruvam avadhibhūtam apādānasaṁjñam syād iti vākyapadīyādau sūtram vyākhyātam* (479.17–18). The *Sāraprakāśikā* (482) then cites four kārikās attributed to the *Vākyapadīya*, as did also the *Bhāvaprakāśa* (276). The last two of these verses occur in all editions I know of this text, including Wilhelm Rau's critical edition (*Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya* . . . Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1977): 3.7.140–41. The other two, however, are not found in any of these editions, although later Pāṇinīyas attribute them to Bharṭṛhari; see *Vākyapadīya of Bharṭṛhari* ed. K. V. Abhyankar and V. P. Limaye (Poona, 1965), Appendix IV, pp. 358–59 and 363–64. In his *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa* (ed. Manudeva Bhaṭṭacharya, *Bṛhadvaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇam of Śri Kauṇḍ Bhaṭṭa* . . . [Varanasi: Choukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan, 1985]), Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa says (111) *uktam ca vākyapadīye* and then cites the four kārikās quoted in the *Sāraprakāśikā* in the same order.

I know from having studied with traditional paṇḍitas that some are not overly concerned with the finer points of tracing quotations. Nevertheless, they are concerned with relations among opposing

points of view in their fields and are supremely adept at citing pertinent texts from memory. Ramanuja Tatacharya himself evidences interest in the historical relations among texts when he remarks (p. 467, last two lines) that all the elaborations on finer points set forth in the text at hand are for the most part found in the *Vyutpattivāda* but that it is not possible to determine their precise chronology (*atratyāḥ pariṣkārah sarve 'pi prāyaḥ vyutpattivāde drśyante | param tu anayoḥ kālavīṣaye nirmayaḥ kartum na śakyate*).

In an edition and commentary intended for a broad audience of both students and learned scholars, it would not be amiss to include precise references to all sources cited and to discuss, in a more extensive introduction, the history of ideas these texts represent. Nevertheless, I am grateful to Ramanuja Tatacharya for having composed a commentary that serves to clarify a difficult important work on *Mīmāṃsā*.

GEORGE CARDONA
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Ugaritische Grammatik. Zweite, stark überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. By JOSEF TROPPEL. Alter Orient und Altes Testament, vol. 273. Münster: UGARIT-VERLAG, 2012. Pp. xxii + 1068. €100.

Since its initial publication in 2000, Josef Tropper's monumental *Ugaritische Grammatik* (*UG*) has been the standard reference work on the language, superseding and supplanting all others. In terms of comprehensiveness and detail, no previous work had come even close to *UG*, and it is unlikely anything will, for the foreseeable future, even as more texts continue to be excavated and published.

To be sure, there have been criticisms of *UG*, some of them sharp, among the many reviews. Reviewers complained that Tropper devoted too much attention to the historical Northwest Semitic background of Ugaritic; that he sometimes cited too many previous views on a particular issue or, conversely, that he sometimes did not cite enough such views; that, in some instances, Tropper offered more than one interpretation of his own about a difficult passage; or that he offered any interpretation at all. In this reviewer's opinion, however, the compiler of a reference grammar of an incompletely understood language such as Ugaritic has to decide how best to interpret every text, based on his understanding of the grammar as a whole, and then describe that grammar consistently as he understands it; and this Tropper did in exemplary fashion. And since much of our understanding of Ugaritic is based on comparative Semitic, especially Northwest Semitic, evidence, it was necessary for Tropper to present his view of that evidence as well. And while one may always quibble about some details of historical Northwest Semitic grammar, in this regard too Tropper was consistently judicious.

A second edition of *UG* has now appeared, on which Tropper labored for nearly a decade. The title page states that the new edition is "heavily reworked and expanded," and indeed it is. It is in large part a new book.

In the preface to the new edition, Tropper responds graciously to his critics, in the spirit of scholarly cooperation. (He also replied to some criticisms in a separate article, Tropper 2001.) And he has incorporated their corrections and many of their suggestions into the text of the revision, especially those offered by Dennis Pardee in his 400-page review—undoubtedly the longest review in the history of ancient Near Eastern studies (Pardee 2003–2004). Tropper has also incorporated references to nearly one hundred Ugaritic texts published since *UG* first appeared (although some of those texts were published too late to be considered in detail). Unfortunately *UG*² appeared just over a year before the latest—third—edition of *Die Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit / Cuneiform Alphabet Texts from Ugarit* (*KTU*³), the standard edition of all Ugaritic texts, in January 2014 (Dietrich, Loretz, Sanmartín 2013), and so the citations in *UG*² to the most recently published texts are according to the *editiones principes* rather than by their new *KTU*³ numbers.

Among the many changes and additions in the new edition are the following:

§21.341.2, p. 51: A new paragraph expressing increased doubt concerning the use of {y} as a vowel letter; so also in following paragraphs.

§33.141.5: Loss of aleph after emphatic consonants is now thought to be unlikely.