

The Image of the Dragon in RS 16.266 (= *KTU*¹⁻³ 1.83): Ugaritic $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ and Its Syriac, Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, and Mandaic Cognates

MADADH RICHEY
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The fragmentary Ugaritic text RS 16.266 (= *KTU*¹⁻³ 1.83) contains a number of lexical and other problems exacerbated by the state of the tablet and difficulties in defining the plot and characters involved in the text. One of these lexical issues involves the analysis of two verbs that appear to be from the root $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$. In the present paper, I survey previous hypotheses as to the etymology and semantics of this verb and contrast the deficiencies of these with the merits of identifying a thus far unrecognized cognate set in lexemes from the root $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ in later Aramaic dialects, i.e., Syriac, Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, and Mandaic. The verbs in this cognate set have the semantics ‘to strike (esp. of a snake)’, and thus clarify both the activity and morphology of the fearsome dragon described in RS 16.266.

The fragmentary Ugaritic text RS 16.266 (= *KTU*¹⁻³ 1.83)¹ presents a number of lexical and other problems that are exacerbated by the state of the tablet and an absence of certainty regarding the plot and characters. One of these lexical issues involves the analysis of two verbs that appear to be from the root $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$. These occur in ll. 4' and 6' of the text and are reproduced here in context:

l'] r X² [

1. RS 16.266 was discovered in the 16th campaign to Ras Shamra (1952) in the Royal Palace, pièce 73, p.t. 470 at 2.05m. It is held at the National Museum of Damascus, inventory number DO 4340. The *editio princeps* is C. Virolleaud 1957: 12 (*PRU* II no. 3), with hand copy only. Collations were undertaken by Dennis Pardee (April 23, 1981), by Wayne Pitard (with Theodore J. Lewis, in March 1995), results of which—including excellent, indeed the only published, photographs and new hand copies—are published in Pitard 1998, and by Pierre Bordreuil and Dennis Pardee (in May 1996). Pardee (written communication, June 26, 2017) has kindly shared with me his notes taken during both collations as well as personal photographs of the text.

The text is accessible in transliteration in *KTU*¹⁻³ (M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín 1976: 96; 1995: 101; 2013: 103 [all no. 1.83]), J. C. L. Gibson 1978: 136–37, and in the final version of C. Gordon’s *Textbook* (Gordon 1965/1998: 216a). A large number of studies and translations have been published. The issue of the semantics and etymology of {šbm} has received the most discussion; for this problem in particular, see J. Barr 1973, esp. 35–37 (= *ibid.* 1987: 407–9); Dietrich and Loretz 1982; and more recently G. Mazzini 2003 (with substantial commentary on the rest of the text) and 2004. Further translations and discussions that are useful for present purposes include S. E. Loewenstamm 1969 (Engl. transl. *ibid.* 1980: 356–59); U. Oldenburg 1969: 198–99; R. J. Clifford 1972: 59–60; F. M. Cross 1973: 119; Loewenstamm 1975 (= *ibid.* 1980: 465–70); M. Pope 1978: 150 n. 7 (= *ibid.* 1994: 43–44 n. 7); J. Day 1985: 15–16; J. C. de Moor 1987: 181–82; A. Caquot and J.-M. de Tarragon 1989: 28–30; T. Binger 1992: 146–47; G. del Olmo Lete 1996; S. B. Parker 1997: 192–93; N. Wyatt 1998/2002: 368–69; M. Dijkstra 1999: 152; T. J. Lewis 2011: 217–18; B. C. Benz 2013: 137 n. 30; M. C. A. Korpel and de Moor 2014: 60–61; N. Ayali-Darshan 2016: 144 n. 158; and Korpel and de Moor 2017: 15. The most complete bibliographies up to their respective dates are del Olmo Lete 1996: 132–33 and D. M. Clemens 2001: 1188.

2. The remains of a short vertical wedge here need not necessarily be read as a word divider (thus, e.g., Pitard 1998: 263, contra, e.g., Virolleaud 1957: 12; *KTU*¹⁻³); in earlier collation notes (April 1981), Pardee writes that the trace is “not certainly [a] w[ord] d[ivider]” but also “not certainly more than one trace”; later collation notes (May 1996) have “no separator!” but there is certainly too little of the sign remaining to determine anything further.

- 2'] r^d/_n¹³ i l .
 3'] r^ü n . b â r ş
 4' m ḥ n m . t⁴ r p y 'm' .
 5' l š n m . t l ḥ k .
 6' š m m . t t r p
 7' y m . ḍ n b t m .

Given the aforementioned lexicographical difficulties, I reserve a full translation of the text transliterated above for the conclusion of the present paper. Before moving to the main topic—the semantics of {trp} (l. 4') and {ttrp} (l. 6')—one can note that many of the complete lexemes in these lines are straightforward. The exception is {mḥnm}, which will be discussed below. More difficult are clause divisions. It is almost universally agreed that l. 8' {tân . lšbm} begins a new clause, so the question mainly involves deciding where to break syntactic units from l. 3' through l. 7'. This is, of course, complicated by the near total loss of ll. 1' and 2' and the minor break—probably two graphemes lost—at the beginning of l. 3'. Beginning from the observation that {trp} (l. 4'), {tlḥk} (l. 5'), and {ttrp} (l. 6') are certainly verbs, the following clause division appears most likely for reasons that will be explained more fully below:

- A mḥnm . trp y'm' .
 B lšnm . tlḥk . šmm .
 C ttrp ym . ḍnbtm

As already noted, this division results in each clause having a verb. It also results in clauses of roughly equal length, with clauses (A) and (C) having parallel constituents (the syntactic structure produced by these constituents will be discussed below): (A₁/C₃) BODY PART, (A₂/C₁) VERB, and (A₃/C₂) THEONYM {ym} *Yammu*.

The lexeme {mḥnm} must be discussed briefly to ground both the exclusion of {bârş} *bi'arşi* “in the land” (l. 3) from this clause division and the inclusion of this lexeme in the category BODY PART. The overwhelming majority of scholars⁵ have understood {bârş / (4')}

3. Traces of “the lower side of three horizontal wedges” were noted here by Bordreuil and Pardee (collation notes, both as cited by Pitard [1998: 263] and conveyed by Pardee [written communication, June 26, 2017]). As Pitard (see n. 1 above) writes, they are not visible in the published photographs.

4. The readings of this {t} and that in l. 6' were disputed first by Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín (1976: 96), who read {ʿ}, marked with “(?)”. The next edition of *KTU* (eidem 1995: 101) takes a slightly different approach: {ʿrp} is given in the transliteration, but a footnote to this lexeme reads “Lg. *trp?*.” Only in the most recent *KTU*³ do the authors finally give {trp}. This follows insistence by Pitard (1998: 266) that “it is clear that the first root letter in each case is made of two superimposed wedges of the style used to make the *t*.” Pardee read the relevant graphemes as {t} in both of his collations (April 1981; May 1996 [written communication, June 26, 2017]). The reading can be checked to some extent in Pitard’s photograph (1998: 264), too, perhaps more so for l. 4' than for l. 6', where a break intersects the grapheme and distorts it slightly. One nevertheless finds the reading {ʿrp} still in some publications postdating the late 1990s, e.g., the retention in Wyatt’s (2002: 368–69 n. 4) treatment and in the second edition of del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín’s dictionary (2003: 183, but there rightly marked as questionable; eliminated in eidem 2015, see p. 919 for √trp; apparently not listed in eidem 1996: 89–90). One also finds instances in which glosses based on {ʿrp} are retained despite professed preference for the new reading: “*trp ym* the storm clouds of the sea” (del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015: 533). Those who read {ʿrp} have interpreted it in at least two major ways, either as denominative from **ʿurp*- “neck” (de Moor 1987: 182; Binger 1992: 146); or as connected with Semitic “cloud” lexemes (Caquot and de Tarragon 1989: 29 and n. 42; Wyatt 1998/2002: 368–69 and n. 4; similarly del Olmo Lete 1996: 131; del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2003: 183).

5. This interpretation of {mḥnm} as a toponym is found in the *editio princeps* (Virolleaud 1957: 12) and in many studies thereafter. The most involved discussion is Astour 1975: 299–300. Also of this opinion are J. Aistleitner 1963: 181 (§1545); Gordon (1965/1998: 432a [§1455]); Oldenburg 1969: 198; Loewenstamm 1969: 100a (transl. *ibid.* 1980: 357); Clifford 1972: 60; Cross 1973: 119; Day 1985: 15; de Moor 1987: 182 and n. 2 (with

mḥnm} to constitute a preposition + construct chain in which the final lexeme {mḥnm} is a toponym to be compared with biblical Hebrew מַחְנֵה מַחְנֵה *maḥāna'yim*, thus *bi'arṣi maḥnēma* “in the land of Maḥnēma.” But this has generally produced awkward clause divisions that multiply difficulties in ll. 4'b–7'.⁶ Among alternatives,⁷ the suggestion of Pope (1978: 150 n. 7 = 1994: 43–44 n. 7) that {mḥnm} is actually cognate with Arabic مَخْنَة *maḥannat*- “nose,” has much to recommend it. Pope's hypothesis as to the Ugaritic word's etymology and semantics is based on a semantically clear and well-attested cognate noun.⁸ Furthermore, it produces a compelling structure with parallelism in both morphology—since {m} would be in {mḥnm}, {lšnm}, and {dnbtm} the dual morpheme—and semantics, since all these nouns would designate body parts.⁹

uncertainty); Binger 1992: 146; del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 1996: 269b (with uncertainty; similarly, with registration of new suggestions, in subsequent editions: eidem 2003: 539; 2015: 533); Pitard 1998: 275 (with uncertainty); W. G. E. Watson 2007: 201 (with uncertainty); Korpel and de Moor 2014: 60 and n. 240; Ayali-Darshan 2016: 144 n. 158; and Korpel and de Moor 2017: 15 and n. 23.

6. For example, “In the land of Mḥnm he (the dragon) swirled the sea. / His double tongue flicked the heavens; / His double tail swirled the sea. / She fixed the unmuzzled [! *lā-šabūma*] dragon; / She bound him to the heights of Leba[non]” (Cross 1973: 119) or “you should go into the land of Mahanaim. / Solidify Yammu (whose) forked tongue licks the heaven, / you should solidify Yammu-of-the-forked-tail!” (Korpel and de Moor 2014: 60–61). These translations represent the two basic syntactic and colometric options following analysis of {mḥnm} as a toponym, i.e., either understanding it to mark the location of the dragon's first {trp} activity (Cross) or the location in which the action designated by the fragmentary verb (?) {jān} of l. 3' occurs (Korpel and de Moor). With the former, the first colon becomes longer than the others by one word {bārš}. With the latter, very long colons of very unequal length are produced.

7. Other alternatives to the toponym interpretation (see n. 5 above) include: 1) Interpretation as cognate with Arabic *maḥana*, allegedly “tirer de l'eau” (Caquot and de Tarragon 1989: 29 n. 41, with much hedging). This verb appears to be listed in only the less reliable modern dictionaries, e.g., F. J. Steingass 1884: 973b. The sense produced is also not very compelling. 2) As a noun *maqṭal*- √ḥn(y) “to camp” (of course, the same root as in the toponymic analysis, like BH מַחְנֵה; this noun not [otherwise?] in Ugaritic) plus “adverbial” {m}, thus (!) “in a mad rush(?)” (del Olmo Lete 1996: 131). But such a semantic development finds no support in Semitic generally. Del Olmo Lete's (ibid.) citation of Spanish “en tropel” (~ *en masse*) could provide analogical grounding for something like “all together...,” but one still generally prefers homologous to analogous support for such things. 3) As a noun *maqṭal*- √ḥn(y), with semantics related to sharpness, grounded in biblical Hebrew מַחְנֵה “spear”, thus “talons” or “fangs” (admittedly “[a] guess” by Wyatt 1998/2002: 368 and n. 3). The etymology of the Hebrew noun is uncertain. The suggestion “as *flexible*” from *√ḥn(y) “to bend (down)” (thus F. Brown, C. A. Briggs, and S. R. Driver 1906: 333b) is found already in the various editions of Gesenius's *Handwörterbuch*. More recently, though, lexicographers have claimed that this is a loanword from Egyptian {ḥnj.t} (L. Kohler and W. Baumgartner 1967: 320b; H. Donner 2013: 372a). This rather decreases the likelihood that a supposedly cognate noun of different formation (i.e., with *m*-preformative) would share source and semantics with מַחְנֵה. 4) D participle √ḥn(n?) “to seize,” on the basis of Ugaritic {āḥnḥn} at RS 15.007:9 (= *KTU*¹⁻³ 2.15) (as alternative in Wyatt 1998/2002: 368 n. 3). But both the semantics and the morphology of this verb are much debated. The topic cannot be engaged in full here, but contrast (in addition to the literature cited in del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015: 393) Pardee 2003–4: 69, “plausibly explained as from a root Ḥ(W)N, ‘to betray; accuse someone of treachery’.” And 5) The lexeme goes untranslated in Parker 1997: 192 and Mazzini 2003: 394. The latter author does include substantial discussion in ibid.: 394–95 nn. 24–25 and agrees that {mḥnm} is likely the subject of its clause “[i]n view of the stichometry of the passage.”

8. The Arabic-English compendium of E. W. Lane (1863–93: 814a–b) indeed lists this noun. Evidence of its antiquity can be grounded in citation in, e.g., al-Jawharī's *aṣ-Ṣiḥāḥ* (tenth century CE, ed. A. A. 'Aṭṭār 1979) *sub* [خن] “to make a sound from the nose”: “والمخنة: الأنف” and the *maḥanna* is the nose (*anf*).”

9. Wyatt's (1998/2002: 368) suggestion of “talons” results in a similar semantic parallelism, but the etymological grounding for his lexicographical hypothesis is less solid (see n. 7, no. 3, above). Without mentioning the hypothesis of Pope, Pitard (1998: 275 n. 15) writes that “Bruce Zuckerman has pointed out to me that a cognate in Syriac means ‘nostrils’, which might work here, in view of the references to other body parts. But with no other attested cognate for the Syriac usage, caution must be used here.” I have not been able to locate the putative Syriac cognate—unspecified in Pitard's note—of which mention is made. One might wonder if Zuckerman's reference represents a memory of Pope's Arabic-grounded hypothesis.

With this noun thus clarified, the main topic of the present discussion—the cognate set and semantics of \sqrt{trp} —can be engaged. I offer first a summary of semantic hypotheses put forward and the cognate sets on which these are based (if any). As will become apparent, few of the cognate sets offered involve Ugaritic \sqrt{trp} being an unconditioned reflex of proto-Semitic $*\sqrt{\theta rp}$. All posit idiosyncratic developments in consonantal phonology; in general, these arouse suspicion by their *ad hoc* nature. This situation has arisen because few scholars have found cognates that are themselves likely reflexes of proto-Semitic $*\sqrt{\theta rp}$.¹⁰ An item that plausibly does constitute such a reflex will be presented below following the survey of scholarship on Ugaritic \sqrt{trp} .

1. Ugaritic \sqrt{trp} is cognate with biblical Hebrew \sqrt{trp} , Aramaic \sqrt{srp} , Akkadian \sqrt{sarapu} , and other cognates, all “to burn.” This requires that Ugaritic {t} represent the reflex of proto-Semitic $*s_2$ (= $t = s$), which is almost unparalleled.¹¹ Authors vary in how they employ this etymology in the analysis of both lexical semantics and syntax. Oldenburg (1969: 198–99) gives the verb “quaff,” both times with Yammu as the direct object. The morphological analysis of both verbs is only implied by translation; the first is an imperative to an unknown addressee, the second a prefix-conjugation 3.m.d., with {lšnm} as the subject: “they shall quaff Yamm the two tails of Tannin.” Aistleitner (1963: 344 [§2944]) has “D sengen,” but the dictionary context does not allow elucidation of how this might work in context. Dijkstra’s (1999: 152) “vanquish” is perhaps also based on this etymology, but there is no comment to this (or any) effect.¹² The phonological difficulty already mentioned—Ugaritic {t} for the reflex of proto-Semitic $*s_2$ —is already acute. The semantics required by this etymology are, if anything, more difficult. One has trouble imagining how the watery enemy might be “burned” in this passage. Generic “defeat” is not a sense attested for reflexes of $*\sqrt{s_2rp}$ in

10. The sole exception, to my knowledge, is Pope (1978: 150 n. 7 = 1994: 43–44 n. 7), who cites Syriac “*trp*”—perhaps \sqrt{trp} is intended—as grounding the semantics “to brush.” The possibility of an Aramaic cognate will be discussed in greater detail below, and see also n. 19.

11. Those supporting this hypothesis have occasionally acknowledged this difficulty (Oldenburg 1969: 199 n. 1). J. Tropper (2000/2012: 110 [§32.144.13]) does cite two possible examples of Ugaritic {t} for the reflex of $*s_2$: 1) the verbal root \sqrt{trp} “to set (a table)” and 2) {hṛmṫt} “sickle.” He also draws attention to the fact that both of these irregular correspondences—as well as many of those in which {t} seems to represent the reflex of $*s_2$ —occur in lexemes with resonants, especially *r*. The present root \sqrt{trp} shares, of course, this characteristic. It is indeed difficult to quarrel with the $*s_2$ -incorporating cognate set of \sqrt{trp} , especially Sabaic $\sqrt{s_2rp}$ “to erect, construct, equip” (A. F. L. Beeston et al. 1982: 133). Nouns denoting realia like {hṛmṫt} are, on the other hand, more susceptible to borrowing and phonological irregularity. Without entering into full etymological analyses of both nouns, I agree with Tropper’s (2000/2012: 111 [§32.144.15]) own formulation, “ug. /t/ nicht allein sem. /θ/, sondern zuweilen auch sem. /s/ (und vielleicht auch /s²/) entspricht.” I would prefer not to etymologize \sqrt{trp} by invoking a phonological phenomenon only clearly attested for one other Ugaritic lexeme.

12. The recent suggestion of Korpel and de Moor (2014: 60 n. 241) would be, according to some Assyriological etymologies, related to the present analyses, but it is otherwise idiosyncratic: “We take the verb *trp* as a denominative of Akkadian *šurīpu* ‘ice’ and connect this with the legends about the solidifying of the sea like glass.” They translate, “Solidify Yammu (whose) forked tongue licks the heaven, you should solidify Yammu-of-the-forked-tail!” But *šurīpu* “ice” (W. von Soden 1981: 1284a; CAD Š/3 [1992] 347–48) is by no account an instantiation of proto-Semitic $*\sqrt{\theta rp}$. Assyriologists connect it to *šarāpu* “to burn” by semantic polarity (von Soden 1981: 1185a; idem 1995: 75 [§55k] as *puris*- < *purais*; N. P. Heeßel 2002: 64) or to *šarbu* “rainy season, cold” and related lexemes (CAD Š/2 [1992] 60; cf. the earlier opinion of B. Landsberger [1934: 158–59], who derived *šurīpu* and evidently related lexemes from an unattested **šarāpu* B “gefrieren”). By the former hypothesis, it is from proto-Semitic $*\sqrt{s_2rp}$ (as above). By the latter, it is probably from proto-Semitic $*\sqrt{s_1rb}$ (compare, e.g., biblical Hebrew \sqrt{trp} “burning heat” [Isa. 35:7; 49:10]); most of the cognate West Semitic lexemes are heat- and drought-related words, so that this would also be an instance of semantic polarity, though here following East/West-Semitic lines, as is more common. The most detailed semantic analyses of *šurīpu* are von Soden 1949: 203; idem 1952: 84–85; and apud H. Freydank 1968: 316–17 n. 4.

any Semitic language, and the leap to this translation in this context strikes one as special pleading.

2. Ugaritic \sqrt{trp} is cognate with Arabic \sqrt{frt} “to scatter” (e.g., Lane 1863–93: 2358b–c) and Syriac \sqrt{prt} “to split” (R. Payne-Smith 1901: 3311; C. Brockelmann 1928: 609b [ed. M. Sokoloff 2009: 1255]). This requires the assumption of $R_1 < > R_3$ metathesis either in Ugaritic ($*\sqrt{pr\theta} > \sqrt{trp}$) or in Arabic and Syriac ($*\sqrt{\theta rp} > *\sqrt{prt}$). This hypothesis was first given by Loewenstamm (1969: 100a; transl. *ibid.* 1980: 358), who spoke of “שיכול-אותיות” in Ugaritic, without proving that this particular variety of metathesis occurs in the language (or elsewhere in Semitic). In this article, Loewenstamm (*ibid.*) prefers analysis of {trp} in l. 4’ as an infinitive: “מארץ מחנייים לבקוע ים’ [...] ענת יצאה מארץ זו כדי לבקוע את הים”.¹³ This etymological and semantic line is given again in Loewenstamm 1975: 25 (= *ibid.* 1980: 468–69; without additional support).

In fact, $R_1 < > R_3$ metathesis (from the proto-Semitic situation) is at best poorly attested in Ugaritic;¹⁴ furthermore, I know of no indication that it is common in either Arabic or Syriac (and the process would have to have occurred in both languages, unless a loan is involved).¹⁵ In support of Loewenstamm’s suggestion, Mazzini (2003: 393) cites Ugaritic {glt}, allegedly cognate with Semitic reflexes of $*\sqrt{\theta lg}$ “snow,” as representative of a parallel phenomenon with substantial phonetic similarity. But most scholars think Ugaritic {glt} an unlikely inclusion in the $*\sqrt{\theta lg}$ cognate set,¹⁶ with the result that this claimed metathesis is shaky, too. As for the previous hypothesis, each of two doubtful cases of an alleged phonological phenomenon cannot be used to prop each other up.

3. Ugaritic \sqrt{trp} is cognate with Arabic \sqrt{tfr} . Like the preceding hypothesis, this requires metathesis, here of the $R_2 < > R_3$ variety, either in Ugaritic ($*\sqrt{\theta pr} > \sqrt{trp}$) or in Arabic ($*\sqrt{\theta rp} > \sqrt{tfr}$). This is at least a more common metathetic process, especially when *r* is involved.¹⁷ Dictionaries of the classical language (compiled and translated in Lane 1863–93: 339c) record verbal instantiations of \sqrt{tfr} as occurring in stems IV (*ʔafʔala*) “to bind, tie, fasten” and X (*ʔistafʔala*) “to put [something] between (or around) one’s thighs.” Tropper (2000: 165; 2012: 165) suggests for Ugaritic \sqrt{trp} “peitschte”; he cites only A. Wahrmund’s

13. Loewenstamm (1969: 100; transl. *ibid.* 1980: 358) skips from a translation of {lšnm . tlhk / (6’) šmm} as “לשנות תלחנה שמים” (perhaps with a variation thereon) to “ונבות התנין (אשר) למחסום תשית תרכס למרום”, which serves to translate {dnbtm} and following. {trp / (7’) ym} is thus not translated, so one cannot be sure of Loewenstamm’s precise analysis here, except that these two lexemes presumably constitute a clause.

14. No such examples are cited in the relevant section of Tropper’s (2000/2012: 164–66 [§33.161]) grammar.

15. One group of lexemes that jumps immediately to mind are the reflexes of proto-Eastern Aramaic **rigla* “foot”: Jewish Babylonian Aramaic נ(י)גרא (Sokoloff 2002: 747b; *nigra* < **ligra*), Mandaic {ligra} (T. Nöldeke 1875: 74 [§67]; E. S. Drower and R. Macuch 1963: 235b), and rare magical Syriac -ܝܚܘܕܝܗ, e.g. ܝܚܘܕܝܗ “your feet” (text at P. Gignoux 1987: 14 [I:45]). Interestingly, this process for this lexeme is already attested in Samʿalian Aramaic (KAI 215:16 {lgry} *ligray-*; ed. Tropper 1993: 124). But this process involves the metathesis of two resonants $r < > l$, rather different from the situation involved in the process assumed by Loewenstamm.

16. Most determinative for this is the likelihood that Ugaritic {glt} (RS 2.[008]+ v:7; 3.364:13; 19.039+; 5; 24.245:7) is likely cognate with the rare biblical Hebrew verb גל”ש (Song 4.1; 6.5), of much-debated meaning (compare recently e.g., Pope 1977: 458–60, “surge” or “stream”; S. S. Tuell 1993: 103, “move in waves”; Y. Zakovitch 2004: 183, “herabgleiten”; and Donner 2013: 220b “herabspringen, -wallen”). Such semantics as can be established for this (see previously) and the Ugaritic lexeme (mostly in broken contexts) do not support any connection with “snow.” Skepticism is expressed by, e.g., Tropper (2000/2012: 166 [§33.161]) and M. S. Smith and Pitard (2009: 560). Watson’s (2007: 27) claim that “[t]he accepted meaning seems to be ‘snow’” is hardly correct; compare the more complete list of opinions in del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015: 296.

17. Some Ugaritic examples—notably $\sqrt{yʔr} < *\sqrt{wr}^c$ —are given by Tropper (2000/2012: 165 [§33.161a]) himself. One also thinks of many sporadic parallels in other Semitic languages, e.g., common Aramaic *tarʕa* (< $*\theta aʕr$) “gate” (oldest attestations listed in J. Hofstjzer and K. Jongeling 1995: 1232–33).

(1898: I.381b) Modern Arabic dictionary, but similar semantics for the cognate are suggested by Lane's (1863–93: 339c) "*He drove him, or urged him on, from behind,*" with the Arabic lexica cited. In favor of this hypothesis is the association of Arabic ثَفَّرَ \sqrt{tfr} with tails, since {dnbtm} co-occurs with {trp} in ll. 6'–7' of the Ugaritic text (so also Tropper 2000: 165; 2012: 165).

Speaking against this hypothesis, though, is the fact that the semantics of Arabic ثَفَّرَ \sqrt{tfr} are quite specific and difficult to adapt to the apparent requirements of the Ugaritic context. As noted above, the core of the Arabic lexeme's semantics appear to involve a particular anatomical location, the ثَفَّرَ *tafar*- "area underneath an animal's tail" (thus, e.g., M. Firūzābādī's *al-Qāmūs ad loc* [ed. 1952]; Lane 1863–93: 340a). Without going too far into Arabic lexicography, the "driving" semantics to which Tropper makes appeal are plausibly an extension based on employment of the crupper in horse driving. That such a development would also have occurred in Ugaritic is difficult to assume.

There are, as always, those who have thought it better to refrain from a conclusion on the etymology and semantics of {trp}. Such authors include Virolleaud (1957: 12), in the *editio princeps*, Barr (1973: 35–37 = *ibid.* 1987: 407–9), Pitard (1998: 275), and Ayali-Darshan (2016: 144 n. 158).

A number of scholars have offered renderings based on context alone. Gordon (1965/1998: 507a [§2751]) is clearest about the logic involved: "From context, the meaning seems to be something like, 'to churn up' or 'to swish in', referring to what a sea monster does with its tail(s) in the sea." Similarly contextual renderings include "swirled [...] churned up(?)" (Clifford 1972: 60), "swirled [...] swirled" (Cross 1973: 119), "'swish in'(?)" (Pardee 1976: 274), "swirled(?)" (Day 1985: 15–16), and "thrashes(?)" (Parker 1997: 192). Of course, the contextual approach is perfectly valid. At the same time, the breadth and density of attestation of Semitic languages have usually meant that one often finds at least one cognate lexeme by which to ground a contextual hypothesis.¹⁸

As it turns out, this proves true even for the enigmatic root \sqrt{trp} , so long as one takes the time to look closely at later Aramaic dialects, namely Syriac, Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, and Mandaic.¹⁹ The value of late stages of this Northwest Semitic language for Ugaritic lexicographic problems has been less often discussed in the abstract than the relevance of Arabic or Mishnaic Hebrew.²⁰ Here, I provide no full theoretical discussion but hope that the

18. In such cases as the above, one might prefer to flag such precise translations as "swirled" with a question mark or something similar, so as not to give the impression that a given rendering is at least as certain as the rest of the translation in which it occurs; compare, e.g., Cross 1973: 119 with Pardee's (1976: 274) double question marks and explicit caution: "This translation appears to be guess-work."

19. Pope (1978: 150 n. 7 = 1994: 43–44 n. 7) may have first uncovered the correct etymology of the Ugaritic lexeme. His suggestion is laconic, a comment to a text edition itself confined to a footnote: "The two extremities, snout (cf. Ar. *maḥannat*) and tail, brush (cf. Syr. *trp*) the sea, while the tongue licks the sky" (*ibid.*). Pope translates "Snout nuzzled sea, [...] Whisked sea twin-tail." Both "to nuzzle" and "to whisk" are intended as slight specifications of "to brush," each determined by their anatomical subjects. Of course, Syriac has no {t}, so perhaps ܬܝܐ is meant. But the distance between Pope's gloss "brush" and what can be substantiated from the Syriac sources below is so great that one wonders whether there is some misunderstanding here.

According to M. Astour (1975: 299), Pope first proposed this hypothesis in a paper delivered at the 184th meeting of the American Oriental Society (Santa Barbara, California) on March 26, 1974. The tangential and telegraphic nature of Pope's published comment (not to mention its appearance in a five-page *Festschrift* contribution) has resulted in minimal awareness of its substance even among Ugaritologists. So far as I have found, Mazzini (2003: 392 n. 12) is the only author to even cite Pope, and he claims that the proffered translations "nuzzled" and "whisked" are "without any philological support." The claimed Syriac cognate goes unmentioned.

20. For the former, the discussions of F. Renfroe (1986; 1992) are most exhaustive and rigorous. For the latter,

convincing cognate hypothesis outlined below will illustrate the possibilities of closer attention, preferably beyond simple dictionary citation, to the Aramaic lexicon in this connection.

Moving from least to most illuminating, one can begin with Syriac ܐܘܕܐ, a poorly attested verb. Payne-Smith (1901: 4507) is able to cite for ܐܘܕܐ *torep* ($\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ D) only the lexicographical treatment in Bar Bahlul's Syriac-Arabic lexicon (tenth century CE; ed. R. Duval 1901: 2090), in which the author catalogues two meanings: 1) *ܐܘܕܐ* "to sink [Syriac $\sqrt{\text{md}}$] : he will be submerged [Arabic $\sqrt{\text{gws}}$]" (Payne-Smith's "*baptizatur, immergitur*"), and 2) *ܐܘܕܐ* "setting [Syriac {mṭb}] upon him : he will ascribe [Arabic $\sqrt{\text{dyf}}$] to him" (Payne-Smith's "*inquirat vel imputat*." Neither of these glosses seems likely to illuminate Ugaritic $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$. But the more recent lexicon of Brockelmann (1928: 837; ed. Sokoloff 2009: 1672) includes additional glosses for ܐܘܕܐ on the basis of an entry in the 19th-century CE Syriac-Arabic lexicon *Al-Lobab* (G. Cardahi 1891: 634). This dictionary cites one *جيورجيس القوشى* "Georgios of Alqosh" as saying that with ܐܘܕܐ, the verb can mean to make a *جدة juda't*- "incision" (likewise Brockelmann 1928: 837b "incisionem induxit"; Sokoloff 2009: 1672 "make an incision"). Although one does not like to pin one's hopes on late and laconic glosses of this nature, the entry begins to hint at alternatives beyond baptism for later Aramaic $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$.

Fortunately, apparent reflexes of proto-Semitic $*\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ occupying a promising semantic field are not restricted to Syriac. One finds in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic the noun *תורפתא* "incision" in two manuscripts of *b. Ketubot* 39b. The text involves the rabbis relaying various things they have heard about the pain experienced by a woman losing her virginity. Bavarian State Library (Munich) Cod.hebr. 95 (1342 CE)²¹ has *רבא אמ' אמרה לי אם בת רב חסדא כתוס'פתא דסיבורי* "Rava said, 'The mother of Rav Hisda's daughter [his wife] told me, 'It is like the *prick* of blood-letting''." (The {s} in this lexeme is in error; an {r} is superscripted to its left.) Another older manuscript, Vat. ebr. 112 (mid-late fourteenth century CE)²² has the very similar *תורפת' דסיבורי* in the relevant portion of the simile, but printed editions—like the Vilna Talmud—give *ריבדא דכוסילתא* "the incision of a scalpel(?)." ²³ The context of the occurrence and the parallel lexemes in printed editions together make it clear that the noun *תורפתא* in the manuscripts means "prick" or something similar. Furthermore, it is reasonable to understand *תורפתא* as a nominal instantiation of a root $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$. Although this root does not occur in verbal instantiations in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, it would likely mean something like "to prick" if it did.

Again fortunately, yet another branch of Eastern Aramaic, Mandaic, does include verbal instantiations of $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ that are highly interesting and important for the present discussion. The lexical inventory of Mandaic is still poorly understood, largely because a huge percentage

the comments in Loewenstamm (1980: 405–18) are particularly illuminating. The relevance of the older Hebrew lexicon for Ugaritic lexicography is of course much discussed and generally assumed.

21. This is the famous Munich Talmud, published in facsimile as H. L. Strack 1912. The full facsimile is published online by the Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum Digitale Bibliothek. The relevant passage is at page 187v of the codex (i.e., opposite p. 188).

22. The facsimile edition of this manuscript is A. F. Sherry 1974. A comprehensive and accessible discussion of the manuscript is available in B. Richler 2008: 82.

23. Sokoloff (2002: 1072b) writes *sub* *ריבדא* that the etymology of this lexeme is unknown, but he does then refer the reader to *תורפתא*. Given that *ריפדא* (with {p}) is an attested variant in other passages of the Bavli, one wonders if *ריבדא* is in fact a late phonological deformation of *תורפתא*, with aphaeresis of *t-* and voicing of the cluster *-ft-*. I have found, however, no comparanda for either phenomenon noted in, e.g., M. Morgenstern 2011 or E. A. Bar-Asher Siegal 2016.

of the language's manuscript sources remains un- or underpublished.²⁴ But even restricting oneself to the published material, one finds a number of uses of verbal $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$. Most applicable for present purposes is a passage from the *Alf Trisar Šuialia* (“Thousand and Twelve Questions”),²⁵ a very long composition of seven sections consisting of instructions for the priesthood. In a discussion of how long one must wait to celebrate a *masiqta*—a sacramental meal—after various harmful events befall an individual, the following clause occurs:

(1536) uhanath • dhiuia **tariplh** ulanasib euštlia uhimiana ušuba iumia elh lahlipiu unpaq mn pagrh abatar arbin uhamša iumia / (1537) masiqta dhaisum elh qria eu hauia dnpaq mn pagrh abatar šuba iumia unsib euštlia uhimiana anat masiqta d / (1538) šitil elh qria btlata iumia amiñul dtparaq mn mhita dhiuia •²⁶

As for the one whom a snake $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ s, but who does not take stole and belt [i.e. prepares for death], and departs his body before seven days pass—celebrate a *masiqta* of Haišum for him after forty-five days. But should it happen that he departs his body after seven days and took stole and belt—you should celebrate a *masiqta* of Šitil for him for three days, so that he may be delivered from the wound of the snake.

That the subject of {**tariplh**}²⁷ is {hiuia} “snake” is immediately suggestive of relevance for discussion of the activity of the Ugaritic dragon in RS 16.266. In this Mandaic passage, we see that the act represented by $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ is potentially lethal, but not necessarily right away. The result of $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ is a {mhita} “wound.” A parallel passage in the *Alf Trisar Šuialia*²⁸ does not include the verb $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$, but shows that association of the generic {hiuia} “snake” and its attack was affiliated with reminiscence of {liuatan} “Leviathan”: {hanath dhauia mañlh

24. Regarding the dictionary of Drower and Macuch (1963) and ongoing efforts to supersede it, see Morgenstern 2009 and 2017.

25. Three manuscripts of this composition were known to scholarship at the time of Drower's (1960) composite edition: 1) Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF) Cod. Syr. 16 (dated 1716 CE [thus H. Zotenberg 1874: 21; cf. Drower 1941: 102, “entirely nineteenth century”]; catalogued and excerpts transliterated in Zotenberg 1874: 230–31; this is the text cited by Nöldeke and Lidzbarski in their Mandaic work). This manuscript contains only the first section of the composition. 2) Drower Collection, Bodleian Library (DC) 6 (Drower 1941: 101, “largely recopied in the nineteenth century. The last part was sixteenth century”). This contains sections I–V of the composition. Drower purchased this manuscript before 1939 (ibid.: 101). 3) Drower Collection, Bodleian Library (DC) 36 (1684 CE). This contains all seven sections of the composition, such as it is known to Western scholars of Mandaic. Drower purchased the manuscript in 1939 (Drower 1941: 101). Drower's (1960) edition (replacing her preliminary translation in Drower 1941) is for the most part based on DC 36, a photograph of which is included as a separate pamphlet, but references to manuscript variants in the other two manuscripts are included throughout. It is unclear how comprehensive these are; cf. Drower 1960: 17, “a word or words in round brackets indicate differences between the two MSS [BnF Cod. Syr. 16 and DC 36]. I have not thought minute differences such as l for 'l worth noting.”

26. I have transliterated the text from the facsimile of DC 36 given in Drower 1960: pl. 34 (ll. 1536–37 on the total manuscript). Leaving aside moderately different transliteration conventions, Drower's own transliteration (ibid.: 72) differs only in the final clause, where she has “d 'tparaq [sic] d (mn) mhita d hiwia.” This presumably represents in some way the witness of BnF Cod. Syr. 16 (see above), but lacking collation or a photograph of that manuscript, it is difficult to determine precisely how this is so. Drower's translation of this section, which she labels “(77),” can be found at ibid.: 224.

27. The verb is most likely a *Peal* (G) participle m.s. (+ enclitic {l} + object pronoun 3.m.s. {h}), rather than *Pael* (D) perfect 3.m.s. (etc.), given the following {ulanasib}. The root of this verb— $\sqrt{\text{nsb}}$ —is essentially restricted to the *Peal* (summary in Drower and Macuch 1963: 302a).

28. Portions of Drower's “Book II Part III(b),” from which the above section is quoted, have close parallels in sequence in Drower's “Book II Part V(a).” She suggests that these are “both versions of one original text dealing with methods of cleansing or healing (*asuta*) conditions of impurity caused by ritual faults, accidents, unwitting infringement of ritual rules, physical conditions and so forth—*mihata*, ‘blows’ or ‘wounds’” (Drower 1960: 262). Whether this source and compositional hypothesis is valid would require substantial additional study, but it is true that the “snake” passages quoted here are similar in content and context.

brušumḥ dliuatan etiršim} “As for the one whom a snake attacks, he will be marked with the sign of Leviathan.”²⁹ Connections like this perhaps increase the likelihood that Mandaic $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ is in fact cognate with Ugaritic $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$, even if phonology, subject use, and more general context were not already suggestive.

Another Mandaic source in which this verb occurs, again with {hiuia} “snake” as its subject, is the magical text *Šapta dPišra dAinia* (“The Scroll for the Eye-Exorcism”). Two manuscripts of this composition are known; these are held in the Drower Collection of the Bodleian Library as DC 21 and 29.³⁰ The relevant portion of the text, a threatening address to the evil eye, reads:

hiuia **tariplik** uarqba mgaršalik unandala mnaktalik uauaza mnaktalik usipa pasiqlik

“May the snake [$\sqrt{\text{trp}}$] you, the scorpion sting you, the centipede bite you, the goose bite you, and the sword cleave you.”

As is clear especially from the use of $\sqrt{\text{grš}}$ (< $*\sqrt{\text{qrš}}$) to designate the activity of the *arqba* “scorpion,” this list involves attributing to each entity the mode of destruction most characteristic of it. One thus finds that the snake attacks by means of $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$. The best English equivalent is perhaps something like “to strike,” understanding that this involves, semantically, rapid extension of the body and biting contact with the attacked object.³¹

One observation remains to be made. These Eastern Aramaic lexemes have no etymology that prevents them from being seen as reflexes of proto-Semitic $*\sqrt{\text{θrp}}$ rather than of $*\sqrt{\text{trp}}$, the only other option by unconditioned phonological developments. Should a $*\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ etymology be substantiable on the basis of lexemes in other Semitic languages, incorporation into the cognate set of Ugaritic $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ —as has been argued here—would have to be rejected. At present, though, no such $*\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ reflexes have been found to invalidate the hypothesis outlined here.

With semantics suggested by cognates in later Eastern Aramaic, the relevant portions of RS 16.266 (= *KTU* 1.83) can be analyzed and translated as below. The fragmentary nature of the text still complicates one’s understanding of the persons involved, but a few points can be made. First, {ym} Yammu is plausibly to be identified with {tān} (error for $*\{\text{tnn}\}$) *Tunnanu* “the dragon” in l. 8’ and is there placed ($\sqrt{\text{š-t}}$) and bound ($\sqrt{\text{rks}}$) to the mountain. These verbs have as their subjects either individuals addressed (2.m.s./2.f.s./2.m.p./2.f.p.) or described (3.f.s./3.m.p./3.f.p.) as the primary actor.³² But the lexemes {yymm} and {yn’hr’} in ll. 11’ and 12’, respectively, show that this does not preclude address to Yammu (/ Naharu)

29. For the text, see the photograph at Drower 1960: pl. 47 (l. 2162 on the total manuscript). Drower transliterates at *ibid.*: 94 and translates at *ibid.*: 262.

30. Drower (1937; 1938) edited *Šapta dPišra dAinia* early on, but her lack of experience with Mandaic particularly and with the norms of scholarly publication generally resulted in the publication being less than clear and authoritative in numerous respects. The source (DC 21? DC 29? Both?) for the transliteration offered is unspecified, and numerous points of interpretation are obviously incorrect, even by Drower’s (1953: 38) own admission. The text cannot be checked, either, since no facsimile is provided. M. Tarelko (1999–2000) thus promised “a completely new translation and transliteration,” which appears to have since been published (Tarelko 2011?), but I have thus far been unable to access this edition. Transliteration thus follows, for the present, Drower’s initial foray, faulty as this may be.

31. Drower and Macuch’s (1963: 490b) “to bite” is broadly correct, but for an English translation it may not be as marked for usual subject (the snake) as one might like.

32. The understanding of various authors on this point is in large part dependent on their interpretations of the semantics of $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ and various other nouns in the vicinity. A full catalogue of each scholar’s morphological analyses here would be extremely cumbersome.

in this text; these {y}s almost *must* be interpreted as vocative particles.³³ Given the syntax and structure suggested in the introduction and the semantics of $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ reached by the body of the present paper, the following interpretation of ll. 4–7¹ seems best:

(4') <i>maḥannêma turup Yammi</i>	“With (your) muzzle strike, o Yammu.
(5') <i>lišānêma tilaḥḥik(u)</i> (6') <i>šamêma</i>	With (your) tongues lick ³⁴ the heavens.
<i>tatrup(u)</i> (7') <i>Yammi danabatêma</i>	Strike, o Yammu, with (your) tails.”

The verbs are, respectively, {trp} (l. 4') *turup* G Impv m.s. $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$; {tlḥk} (l. 5') *tilaḥḥik(u)* D PC (Jussive?)³⁵ 2.m.s. $\sqrt{\text{tlḥk}}$; and {ttrp} (l. 6') *tatrup(u)* G PC (Jussive?) 2.m.s. $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$. In this context, the prefix conjugation verbs—which could be jussives or indicatives (see n. 35)—continue the instruction begun by the imperative verb, as in other cases (Tropper 2000/2012: 723–24 [§77.324]). The verb $\sqrt{\text{trp}}$ has as its instrumental correlate not only the front end—the muzzle—but also the back end—the tails—of the acting creature. The use of {mḥnm} *maḥann-* “muzzle” here perhaps requires that this dragon is a composite creature, not a simple snake, as one might not ordinarily describe serpents’ front ends in this fashion.

The text is thus shown to address Yammu in his draconic guise and to describe, incidentally, his fearsome composite morphology and the frightening action he is capable of performing. The fragmentary nature of the text still makes final determinations regarding genre³⁶ and other participants very difficult. Nevertheless, the present primarily lexicograph-

33. Both of these readings were first substantiated by Pitard (1998: 266). Virolleaud (1957: 12) by comparison was unable to read the ends of both lines; similarly Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín 1976: 96; 1995: 101, but both with the unsubstantiated suggestion {‘šst’} for the end of l. 11¹; cf. eidem 2013: 103, with Pitard’s readings here accepted. Early studies (e.g., Oldenburg 1969: 199; Caquot and de Tarragon 1989: 30) could thus understand very little of the end of the text, much less use it to clarify problems elsewhere. Interpretation of these {y}s as vocative is now supported by Parker (1997: 192); Pitard (1998: 278); Dijkstra (1999: 152); Tropper (2000/2012: 318 [§54.221b]); and Wyatt (1998/2002: 369 n. 10).

34. Ugaritic $\sqrt{\text{tlḥk}}$ is rare. The only other occurrence of this root is at RIH 78/26:8 (= *KTU*^{2–3} 1.176), a fragmentary possibly mythological text, where {yt . lḥk []} appears immediately before the break in an otherwise unclear context. This is of little help, then, for determining the precise semantics of the root in Ugaritic. Most Semitic verbs in the cognate set appear to mostly or exclusively denote “licking” rather than some other activity performed with the mouth; the relevant verbs are Akkadian *lêku* (quite rare; *CAD* L [1973]: 116), Syriac and other Aramaic $\sqrt{\text{tlḥk}}$ (e.g., Sokoloff 2009: 684, often figuratively of fire), and biblical Hebrew לָחַץ. This last probably has semantics extended beyond “lick” to “eat” or “consume,” since otherwise such passages as Num. 22.4 עֲתֹדֵי יִלְחֲכוּ הַקְּהָלִי אֶת־כָּל־סִבְיַתְיִנִּי בְּלֶחֶץ הַשּׂוֹר אֶת־יֶרֶק הַשָּׂדֶה הֶרְבֵּה הַשָּׂדֶה are rather difficult to explain (I am grateful to Simeon Chavel for noting this in written communication [June 23, 2017]). Given the rarity of attestation of $\sqrt{\text{tlḥk}}$ in Ugaritic, one cannot say whether the same semantic extension took place in this language; this is possible but not demonstrable. “Lick” is adopted here as best reflecting the semantics of the majority of Semitic verbs in the cognate set and as admitted by the Ugaritic data. A D-stem morphological analysis is assumed here from the prevalence of the Piel in biblical Hebrew (all occurrences but the infinitive construct at Num. 22.4, the passage cited above).

35. These interrogative marks represent a morpho-syntactic problem that cannot be solved in the present context: do prefix-conjugation verbs following imperatives—that seem, semantically, to continue instruction—represent jussives (*yaqtul*) or indicatives (*yaqtulu*)? In brief, Tropper (2000/2012: 723–24 [§77.324]) opts for interpretation of all of these as jussives, but Pardee (2003–4: 360–61) points out that none are orthographically marked as such, and some have energetic morphemes that may preclude such an analysis.

36. For a survey of proposals to date, see Clemens 2001: 1188. Most authors describe this text as a “myth” or as somehow “mythological,” but one will also find claims for incantatory connections (e.g., de Moor 1987: 181–82; Pitard 1998: 273, for whom see above; Clemens 2001: 474, but with lexical focus on $\sqrt{\text{tlḥk}}$; Mazzini 2003: 400–1, “lines 11–12 are directly addressed to the Dragon [...] This may contribute to supporting de Moor’s view that the fragment is an incantational text”). The morphological and syntactic analysis adopted above could dispose one to agree with Pitard (1998: 273; similarly Mazzini 2003: 401), who found in “the direct address of Yamm/Nahar in lines 11–12” a suggestion “that the myth is being used in an incantational/ritual context.” But, as pointed out to me by Simeon Chavel (written communication, June 23, 2017), this direct speech could very easily just be embedded

ical contribution should illustrate both the importance of attention to semantic detail at the lexical level and the potential of etymological studies incorporating data from the Semitic languages attested in broader corpora, even when these are somewhat distant, chronologically and geographically, from the object of inquiry.

REFERENCES

- Aistleitner, J. 1963. *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Astour, M. C. 1975. Place Names. In *Ras Shamra Parallels. The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. L. R. Fisher. Vol. II, pp. 249–369. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- ʿAṭṭār, A. ʿA. al-Gh. 1979. *Aṣ-Ṣiḥāḥ: Tāj al-luḡa wa-Ṣiḥāḥ al-ʿarabiyya taʿlīf Ismāʿīl ibn Ḥammād al-Jawharī*. 2nd ed. Beirut: Dār al-ʿIlm li-l-Malāyīn.
- Ayali-Darshan, N. 2016. מלחמת אל הסער בים בספרות המזרח הקדום. ספריית האנציקלופדיה. המקראית 33. Jerusalem: Bialik.
- Bar-Asher Siegal, E. A. 2016. *Introduction to the Grammar of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*. 2nd ed. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Barr, J. 1973. Ugaritic and Hebrew “šBM”? *Journal of Semitic Studies* 18: 17–39.
- . 1987. *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Beeston, A. F. L. et al. 1982. *Sabaic Dictionary (English-French-Arabic)*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Benz, B. C. 2013. Yamm as the Personification of Chaos? A Linguistic and Literary Argument for a Case of Mistaken Identity. In *Creation and Chaos: A Reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel’s Chaos-kampf Hypothesis*, ed. J. Scurlock and R. H. Beal. Pp. 127–45. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Binger, T. 1992. Fighting the Dragon. Another Look at the Theme in the Ugaritic Texts. *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 6: 139–49.
- Brockelmann, C. 1928. *Lexicon syriacum*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.
- Brown, F., C. A. Briggs, and S. R. Driver. 1906. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Caquot, A., and J.-M. de Tarragon. 1989. *Textes Ougaritiques*, vol. 2: *Textes religieux et rituels: Introduction, traduction, commentaire* [with *Correspondance* edited by J.-L. Cunchillos]. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Cardahi, G. 1891. *Al-Lobab, seu, Dictionarium syro-arabicum*. Beirut: Catholica S.J.
- Clemens, D. M. 2001. *Sources for Ugaritic Ritual and Sacrifice*, vol. 1: *Ugaritic and Ugarit Akkadian Texts*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Clifford, R. J. 1972. *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Cross, F. M. 1973. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Day, J. 1985. *God’s Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Dietrich, M., and O. Loretz. 1982. *šb, šbm und udn im Kontext von KTU 1.3 III 35B – IV 4 und KTU 1.83:8*. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 14: 77–81.
- , and J. Sanmartín. 1976. *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit [= KTU¹]*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- . 1995. *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places [= KTU²]*. 2nd ed. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- . 2013. *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und andern Orten [= KTU³]*. 3rd ed. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

in narrative, perhaps one describing in its lost portions the defeat of Yammu. One can note also that del Olmo Lete (2014: 93) has recently disputed the text’s incantatory character; his objections primarily address those who would identify lexical markers of the incantatory genre.

- Dijkstra, M. 1999. Ugaritic Prose. In *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, ed. W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt. Pp. 140–64. Leiden: Brill.
- Donner, H. 2013. *Wilhelm Gesenius Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* [...]. 18th ed. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Drower, E. S. 1937. *Šafta d Pishra d Ainia*. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1937: 589–611.
- . 1938. *Šafta d Pishra d Ainia* [Continued]. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1938: 1–20.
- . 1941. The Alf Trisar Šualia: “The Thousand and Twelve Questions.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1941: 101–26.
- . 1953. A Mandaean Bibliography. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1953: 34–39.
- . 1960. *The Thousand and Twelve Questions (Alf Trisar Šualia): A Mandaean Text Edited in Transliteration and Translation*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- , and R. Macuch. 1963. *A Mandaic Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Duval, R. 1901. *Lexicon syriacum auctore Hassano bar Bahlule*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- al-Firūzābādī, M. 1952. *al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ*. Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī.
- Freydank, H. 1968. *bīt šurīpim* in Boğazköy. *Die Welt des Orients* 4: 316–17.
- Gibson, J. C. L. 1978. *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Gignoux, P. 1987. *Incantations magiques syriaques*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Gordon, C. H. 1965. *Ugaritic Textbook*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- . 1998. *Ugaritic Textbook*. Rev. repr. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Heeßel, N. P. 2002. *Pazuzu: Archäologische und philologische Studien zu einem altorientalischen Dämon*. Leiden: Brill/Styx.
- Hoftijzer, J., and K. Jongeling. 1995. *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Kohler, L., and W. Baumgartner. 1967. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Korpel, M. C. A., and J. C. de Moor. 2014. *Adam, Eve, and the Devil: A New Beginning*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.
- . 2017. The Leviathan in the Ancient Near East. In *Playing with Leviathan: Interpretation and Reception of Monsters from the Biblical World*, ed. K. van Bekkum et al. Pp. 3–18. Leiden: Brill.
- Landsberger, B. 1934. Lexikalisches Archiv. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 42: 152–66.
- Lane, E. W. 1863–93. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Lewis, T. J. 2011. ṢAṭṭartu’s Incantations and the Use of Divine Names as Weapons. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 70: 207–27.
- Loewenstamm, S. E. 1969. מיתוס הים בכתיבי אורגית וזיקתו אל מיתוס הים במקרא. *Eretz-Israel* 9: 96–101.
- . 1975. Anat’s Victory over the Tunnanu. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20: 22–27.
- . 1980. *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Mazzini, G. 2003. The Defeat of the Dragon in KTU 1.83,4–10: Ugaritic ŠBM and the South Arabian Root ŠBM. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 35: 391–406.
- . 2004. Further Lexical Material to Ugaritic ŠBM “Height” (KTU 1.83,8) and Some Comparative Remarks. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 36: 313–22.
- de Moor, J. C. 1987. *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Morgenstern, M. 2009. The Present State of Mandaic Lexicography I: The Mandaic Dictionary. *Aramaic Studies* 7: 113–30.
- . 2011. *Studies in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic Based upon Early Eastern Manuscripts*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- . 2017. A New Mandaic Dictionary: Challenges, Accomplishments, and Prospects. In *From Ancient Manuscripts to Modern Dictionaries: Select Studies in Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek*, ed. T. Li and K. Dyer. Pp. 139–71. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias.
- Nöldeke, T. 1875. *Mandäische Grammatik*. Halle: Waisenhaus.
- Oldenburg, U. 1969. *The Conflict between El and Baʿal in Canaanite Religion*. Leiden: Brill.

- del Olmo Lete, G. 1996. KTU 1.83: An Astro-Mythological Text? *Aula Orientalis* 14: 130–33.
- . 2014. *Incantations and Anti-Witchcraft Texts from Ugarit*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- , and J. Sanmartín. 1996. *Diccionario de la lengua Ugarítica*. Barcelona: AUSA.
- . 2003. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2015. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. 3rd ed. Leiden: Brill.
- Pardee, D. G. 1976. The Preposition in Ugaritic [2]. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 8: 215–322.
- . 2003–2004. Review of J. Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik* [First ed.]. *Archiv für Orientforschung* 50 (online edition): 1–404.
- Parker, S. B. 1997. The Binding of a Monster. 18. CAT 1.83. In *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, ed. S. B. Parker. Pp. 192–93. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Payne-Smith, R. 1901. *Thesaurus Syriacus*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Pitard, W. T. 1998. The Binding of Yamm: A New Edition of the Ugaritic Text KTU 1.83. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57: 261–80.
- Pope, M. H. 1977. *Song of Songs*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- . 1978. Mid Rock and Scrub, a Ugaritic Parallel to Exodus 7:19. In *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor*, ed. G. A. Tuttle. Pp. 146–50. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1994. *Probative Pontificating in Ugaritic and Biblical Literature: Collected Essays*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Renfroe, F. 1986. Methodological Considerations Regarding the Use of Arabic in Ugaritic Philology. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 18: 33–74.
- . 1992. *Arabic-Ugaritic Lexical Studies*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Richler, B., ed. 2008. *Hebrew Manuscripts in the Vatican Library: Catalogue*. Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Sherry, A. F. 1974. אוסף כתבי היד של התלמוד הבבלי בספריית הוטיקן ברומה. Jerusalem: Maqor.
- Smith, M. S., and W. T. Pitard. 2009. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, vol. 2: *Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU/CAT 1.3–1.4*. Leiden: Brill.
- von Soden, W. 1949. Das altbabylonische Briefarchiv von Mari: Ein Überblick. *Die Welt des Orients* 1: 187–204.
- . 1952. Zu den politischen Korrespondenzen des Archivs von Mâri. *Orientalia* NS 21: 75–86.
- . 1981. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, Band 3: S–Z. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1995. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. 2nd ed. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Sokoloff, M. 2002. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods*. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan Univ. Press.
- . 2009. *A Syriac Lexicon*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Steingass, F. J. 1884. *The Student's Arabic-English Dictionary*. London: Allen.
- Strack, H. L. 1912. *Talmud Babylonicum*. Leiden: Sijthoff.
- Tarelko, M. 1999–2000. A Magical Scroll from the Drower Collection (DC 21 Šapta d-pišra d-aina [sic] ‘The scroll(?) of the annihilation of the Eyes’). *ARAM Periodical* 11–12: 249–52.
- . 2011(?). *The Scroll for the Purging of the Eyes: Shapta d-Pishra d-Ainia*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Tropper, J. 1993. *Die Inschriften von Zincirli*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- . 2000. *Ugaritische Grammatik*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- . 2012. *Ugaritische Grammatik*. 2nd ed. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Tuell, S. S. 1993. A Riddle Resolved by an Enigma: Hebrew גלש and Ugaritic glt. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112: 99–104.
- Virolleaud, C. 1957. *Le Palais Royal d’Ugarit II: Textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques des archives est, ouest et centrales*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Wahrmund, A. 1898. *Handwörterbuch der neu-arabischen und deutschen Sprache*. 3rd ed. Giessen: Ricker.
- Watson, W. G. E. 2007. *Lexical Studies in Ugaritic*. Barcelona: AUSA.
- Wyatt, N. 1998. *Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilmilku and His Colleagues*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

———. 2002. *Religious Texts from Ugarit*. 2nd ed. London: Sheffield Academic.

Zakovitch, Y. 2004. *Das Hohelied*. Freiburg: Herder.

Zotenberg, H. 1874. *Catalogues des manuscrits syriaques et sabéens (mandaites) de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.