UGARITIC LEXICAL STUDIES IN PERSPECTIVE

Wilfred G. E. Watson

I Previous Work

Since there are adequate surveys of previous studies in the field of Ugaritic lexicography there is no need to repeat all the material here, but some brief reminders may be helpful. To begin with, the only complete dictionary of Ugaritic, which also includes personal names and lemmata from the letters and administrative documents, still remains Aistleitner's *Wörterbuch*. Although revised several times since its first publication, it must be remembered that the original manuscript of this work dates back to 1958. The only other comparable «dictionary» is the glossary to Gordon's series of handbooks to Ugaritic. With each new edition, the glossary was revised as new texts were discovered and different solutions were proposed. Like Aistleitner's *Wörterbuch*, Gordon's glossary included all the words found in the Ugaritic texts, as well as personal and place names.

Partial glossaries are to be found in Segert's grammar and in the various translations of the Ugaritic texts. Works with specialised glossaries are studies on the personal names, the hippiatric texts, the ritual texts and the particles. Of particular interest is the study of terms connected with textiles used in the Ugaritic texts pre-

---

2 WUS. There are 2963 entries.
5 In addition to those mentioned by del Olmo Lete - Sanmartín, AuOr 6, 1988, 255, see now TOu II, 427-31 and 463-64.
pared by Ribichini and Xella. Useful, too, are the listing by Pardee of lexical items and the study of syllabic spellings by Huehnergard. The personal names of Ugarit are also a source of lexical items even though their meaning may not have been noticed overtly either by those who gave them or by those who bore them. The classic collection by Gröndahl is a useful if somewhat dated reference work in this respect. Some recent studies have provided additional material.

Several scholars have started out to write a series of articles on Ugaritic lexical problems. The most well-known of such series is, of course that begun by M. Dietrich and O. Loretz (later joined by J. Sanmartín) in the annual *Ugarit-Forschungen*. There were other additional series, begun by Aartun, Berger, Sanmartín, etc., as well as sets of studies on Ugaritic semantics.

A high number of notes and articles are on individual words or groups of words. It is, of course, impossible to list them all here. However, because they are so scattered in various journals, books, conference proceedings and so on, it is difficult for scholars to keep track of them. It is also a fact that some words receive more attention than others for a variety of reasons.

**II Two Dictionary Projects**

Two significant projects for the preparation of a Ugaritic dictionary have been under way for some time. The first was initiated in Münster at Ugarit-Forschung several years ago and at present exists in unpublished form in the files of that establishment. The second was started more recently in Barcelona. The Spanish

---

13 Gröndahl, *Personennamen*.
19 For example, O. Loretz, *Die Psalmen II. Beitrag der Ugarit-Texte zum Verständnis von Kolometrie und Textologie der Psalmen. Psalm 90-150*, AOAT 207/2, 1979, 415-501, where Ug. ḫlp, ḫšt, ḫkm, ḫkh, d (relative pronoun), ṡṣ, ḫkt, ṡṛt, ḫdy, etc. are discussed.
20 Of great use are the indices to UF, AfO, AuOr, etc., and the listings in the *Keilschriftbibliographie* of Or, the *Elenchus of Biblica* and elsewhere. To these can now be added NABU. Until 1989 the *Newsletter for Ugaritic Studies* was also very informative.
21 For a brief report see now W.G.E. Watson, *The Research Team «Ugarit-Forschung»*, Newsletter...
project for a dictionary of Ugaritic, under the heading «Canaanite Lexicography of the II Millennium. Materials for the edition of an Ugaritic Dictionary», was approved and funded by the Spanish «Advisory Commission for Scientific and Technical Research» ten years ago, in 1984. It was intended to be a glossary of the alphabetic texts from Ras Shamra, Ras Ibn Hani, etc., which would take into account comparative lexical material from around the same period as the Ugaritic texts and from neighbouring geographical areas. In other words, use would be made of texts from El Amarna, Mari and, if possible, Ebla as well as Akkadian and Hurrian material from the documents found at Ras Shamra. Full but not exhaustive bibliographical information was to be supplied, and alternative meanings for the more difficult words were to be included.

It is good news indeed that the first of the two volumes of the dictionary is now in the press and that the second is at an advanced stage of preparation.

III Methodology

In view of the vast literature on Ugaritic lexicography and the often conflicting or at least divergent conclusions reached by scholars, there have been several attempts to set out solid methodological principles. These are discussed here.

In his survey, de Moor discussed method in general terms, under a number of headings. Some of these are (a) the correct text must be established, (b) context is of «primary importance», (c) syllabic spellings must be taken into account, and (d) comparative philology is important. For (d) de Moor provides a set of rules which can be summarised as follows: context is more significant than etymology; without context, etymology (which must be based on the language closest to Ugaritic, whatever that might be) can only uphold a hypothetical proposal; phonological rules should only be flouted with supporting evidence; homographs and homonyms should only be assumed as a last resort; finally «we should not only compare words, but also idioms». Illustrative material is then given for all these.

The use of cognate languages has been the subject of several studies. Healey has surveyed the contributions which can be provided by Hebrew, Phoenician, Arabic, Akkadian, South Arabian and Ethiopic, with particular emphasis on Aramaic (and

---


23 For a more detailed description of the project see del Olmo Lete - Sanmartín, *AuOr* 6, 1988, 255-74, with the sample pages provided there (259-74).


26 De Moor, *Ugaritic Lexicography*, 78-101 (98).
The use of Arabic as a resource for determining the meaning of Ugaritic words has been examined at great length by Renfroe. He has shown that while there is a relatively high number of genuine Arabic-Ugaritic isoglosses there is an equal if not greater number of spurious isoglosses. In many cases we may simply have to say that there is insufficient evidence for any firm conclusions.

The first task necessary before resolving the meaning of a Ugaritic word is to survey all previous attempts, which is often very time-consuming, with no guarantee of complete coverage. With these preliminaries over, the scholar must then establish the correct reading on tablet, determine the context, use etymology based on established language laws, refer to a wide range of Semitic languages, if necessary, use other languages (including Egyptian, Hurrian, Hittite and even Sumerian) and avoid the multiplication of homonyms and homographs. These rules, however, are an over-simplification. In practice, several other factors need to be taken into account, as the following examples show.

IV Some Illustrative Examples
A selection of examples is presented in alphabetical sequence.

(1) adr
This word occurs in the passage listing materials for making the famous composite bow: *adr ṭqbm blhnn* etc., (KTU 1.17 vi 20-24) and has been discussed recently. G. Garbini argues that *adr* must be a verb here and suggests that it means «to cut», corresponding to Phoen. *ṭz* with the same meaning. Renfroe, instead, posits a root *dry*, «to carry, fetch, bring», as in Aramaic. The important point here is that both scholars agree in rejecting a nominal meaning for *adr* (such as «most splendid») on syntactical grounds.

(2) anṣt
Caquot has suggested that in KTU 1.18 iv 9-11 - as in 1.16 vi 36 - *anṣt* derives from the verb *nš*, «to be weak». Here it refers to the feeble light of the new moon which would provide cover for Yatpan’s nefarious deed. The point is that this removes the
need for a homonym with a different meaning, as some scholars have posited.

(3) *dd*, occurs in the following texts:

KTU 1.4 iv 23-24
*tgly. dd il. wtbu.
qrš. mlk. ab. šnm.*

KTU 1.1 iii 23
*ygly dd [i...]*

KTU 1.2 iii 5
[ ] *dd [i/], wybu.
q|rš. mlk|. ab. šnm*

KTU 1.3 v 9
[it]bu. gdm. qny[ ]

KTU 1.19 iv 49-52
*mgy[t] tgt. lahlm.
rgm. ly[t] [pn. y]bl
agrt. bat. b̄ddk.
[... ] bat. bhlm*

«Pughatu reached the tent(s).
Word was brought to Yapanu:
- Our employee35 has entered your *dd,*
[...] has entered the <t>ent(s)>36.

In all these passages the word *dd* is clearly in a context involving a «camp» (*qrš)*37 with «tent» or «tents» (*ahlm)*38 and use of the verb «to enter» (*ba + b «into»)*39. F. Renfroe has studied this word in some detail. He rejects derivatives from Arabic *dwd* as irrelevant since the Arabic root means «to expel», etc. He proposes, instead, comparison with (Mari) Akkadian *š/sadādu, «to camp»*40. Many years previously,

---

34 Parallel or near-parallel texts: KTU 1.3 v 7-8 (// 1.5 vi 1-2); 1.6 34-36; 1.17 vi 48.
36 Emending to *ahlm*; cf. Margalit, *AQHT, 242 and AULS, 98 for discussion. The meaning of *ahlm* is discussed by Renfroe, AULS, 98, n. 7 (probably «when») and by myself in *Final -m in Ugaritic,* AuOr 10, 1992, 223-52 (246).
37 As suggested by Renfroe, AULS, 99, the cognate here is Akk. *karaššu,* «encampment».
38 The -m may be a plural ending or a final -m.
39 J.C. Greenfield, Keret's Dream: *d̄hr and hbrt,* BSOAS 57, 1994, 87-92 comments: «Since *dd* is found in parallelism with *qrš* 'pavilion' and *ahl* 'tent'... the translation 'territory' or 'premises' fits» (89, n. 17).
40 R. Kutscher, Akkadian šadādu/sadādu= «To Camp», ZA 76, 1986, 1-3. As Renfroe notes, AULS, 99, this meaning is not included in CAD S/1.
Cassuto had commented «Another possible meaning is 'tent-curtains', on the basis of Akkadian»\(^{41}\), though he did not cite an actual cognate. In fact, the Akkadian word in question is probably *šiddu*, «cloth, curtain» (CAD S/2, 407b-408), «Vorhang, Decke» (AHw, 1230b). It would seem that in the above passages «curtains» is metonymic for «tents».\(^{42}\)

This difficult word illustrates some of the principles set out above. As expected, context is of great importance. Also, reference to another Semitic language cannot be arbitrary; Arabic proves to be of little help but Renfroe's suggestion, based on Akkadian is very attractive. However, he overlooked Cassuto's earlier proposal, also based on Akkadian (though Cassuto did not cite an Akkadian word). The result is two different etymologies for the same word, both based on Akkadian, and both supporting the meaning already established by context.

In at least two other passages the meaning is not so clear because of lack of context (note that in both the word appears to be plural). One is KTU 1.19 iv 57-58 *il dyqny, ḍdm*, perhaps «The god who created tent-camps»\(^{43}\) or «Ilu, the owner of the encampments».\(^{44}\) The other is KTU 1.18 iv 15 *išṭir. b̄ḍm wnr's[ ], «He/I (will) stay in the tents(?) and [ ]»\(^{45}\).

There appear, then, to be two homographs: ḍd I, «(tent-)curtain» and ḍd II, «breast» (variant or dialectal spelling of ḍd) in KTU 1.23\(^{46}\).

\(4\) ḍrq

KTU 1.5 i 5-6

*ank. ispi. utrm ḍqm. amtm*

There is clearly a reference to eating here (*ispī is from sp*, «to consume»), but the exact meaning of these two lines escapes us, in spite of several attempts by scholars\(^{47}\). Renfroe shows that Arab. *ʿatta* means basically «to enclose» and with

---


\(^{42}\) Similarly in Hebrew; cf. M.V. Fox, *The Song of Songs and the Ancient Egyptian Love Songs*, Madison-Wisconsin-London 1985, 101-102 on Song 1:5, and cf. 2 Sam. 7:2 // 1 Chron. 17:1; for «tents» // «curtains» see Jer. 4:20, 10:20, 49:29; Is. 54:2. Note de Moor's comment (ARTU 16, n. 82): «In the texts of Ugarit 'encampment' is a metaphor for territory and 'tent' a metaphor for dwelling».

\(^{43}\) So Margalit, *AQHT*, 166 and 458.

\(^{44}\) ARTU, 265.

\(^{45}\) The meaning of the passage was established by J. Hoftijzer, *A Note on G 10833 and Related Matters*, UF 3, 1971, 361-64. See also MLC, 384.

\(^{46}\) Renfroe, AULS, 100-102; see Pardee, *Ugaritic Bibliography*, 424. There is no third homograph since ḍṭd is a single word and not ṭ + ḍd.

reference to meat may denote cooking in a sealed pot. If Ug. *ut* can be explained along these lines, then *drq* may have a cognate in Akk. *šarāqu* C, «to cook meat» (CAD S/2, 57b; not in AHw)\(^{48}\). Unfortunately, no clear translation results. The final *amtm* is particularly difficult.

Although etymologies can be suggested for the two most difficult words, since the precise context cannot be determined a convincing solution cannot be reached.

\(5\) *ht*

In a list of offerings related to the palace comes the entry *wtn htm* (KTU 1.41:22). This was translated «unseasoned bread» by de Moor with reference to Arab. *hutt*\(^{49}\) and later «two unseasoned loaves»\(^{50}\). Other scholars followed suit, e.g. «due forme di pane»\(^{51}\), «deux pains secs»\(^{52}\) and «dos panes ácimos»\(^{53}\). Egyptian *ht3* «a kind of bread»\(^{54}\) can be cited in support of de Moor's rendering. However, M. Tsevat has questioned the validity of this proposal. First, he argues, the reading may be *h*\(^{5}\) and not *ht*\(^{55}\). Second, he calls into question the Arabic etymology; however, he makes no suggestion as to the meaning of the Ugaritic word.

A completely different translation is offered by Levine-de Tarragon on the basis of Akk. *hišu*, «basket, cage», i.e., «2 cages». According to their interpretation, the «two pigeons» (*ynt q[t]*) mentioned in the previous line (line 21) were brought to the temple in these cages\(^{55}\), presumably one in each\(^{58}\). This suggestion is plausible and it is interesting to see an alternative proposal. However, one would expect a preposition, e.g. *b*, before *tn htm*, it is uncertain whether *ynt qrt* is singular or plural (let alone dual), and the passage seems to be a list of separate items. There is no definitive solution as yet.

Here, then, is a case where the reading is uncertain, the etymology disputed (two entirely different meanings have been proposed) and yet the context is reasonably

---


\(^{49}\) J.C. de Moor, New Year with Canaanites and Israelites, Kampen 1972, II, 15, n. 49.

\(^{50}\) ARTU, 162.

\(^{51}\) TRU (1), 62; however, see Xella's comment: «senso qui accettato in via ipotetica» (67).

\(^{52}\) TOU II, 155, with no comment.

\(^{53}\) Del Olmo Lete, Religión, 75 and 80, n. 82, following de Moor and also citing Arab. *hutt*.

\(^{54}\) R.O. Faulkner, A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian, Oxford 1962, 181.


\(^{56}\) Tsevat, Samuel, 203.


\(^{58}\) Note that del Olmo Lete, Religión, 75 translates *ynt q[t]* as «una paloma 'domestica'".
clear. Unusually, we do have a parallel text to KTU 1.41 (KTU 1.87, probably copied from 1.41) but the corresponding passage is missing from this tablet. The word *ht* only occurs here. Part of the problem lies in our not knowing to what extent bread formed part of ritual offerings.

(6) *m$rrt*

It occurs in a list of clothing (KTU 4.270:9) and so may mean «benda, fascia» or «veste a fasce» as suggested by Ribichini and Xella. It could also mean «libation garment» (i.e. ritual clothing worn during libation ceremony) in view of Akk. *mušarrītu*, «ein Tropfgefass» (AHw, 678b-79a) from the root ṣararu. However, the restoration at the end of line 9 (*tltm. ūlt, kbd. m$rrt. p[t]*), i.e. «li[nen]», though very plausible, is uncertain. It is possible that Ug. *m$rrt* may simply denote a saucer or plate, corresponding to Akk. *mušarrītu*, «(a flat dish)» (CAD M/2, 241-42).

Once again context indicates the meaning here, but as elsewhere the exact translation of the word in question remains uncertain.

(7) *palt*

KTU 1.19 ii 12-16

*ydnīl. ysb. palt*

*b$q[ ] / yph. b$q[l] . yph. b$g[l] .

*b$q[l] . yhbq wynṣq.*

*a$h. an. b$q[l] / ynp't. b$palt.*

*b$q[l] . y$p / by$g[l] .

«Danil went round his *palt*,

he saw an ear of corn in the *palt*,

an ear of corn he saw in the weeds(?)».

He hugged and kissed the ear of corn,

- If only the ear of corn would grow in the *palt*,

the ear of corn grow in the weeds(?)».

The following meanings and cognates for *palt* have been proposed:

1. «fissured land, parched ground», a by-form of *pwl/pll*

59 Tessili, 49-50, and 85, on the basis of Heb. *ṣrr.*

60 The actual meaning of *ygl* is uncertain: cf. Renfroe, AULS, 158-60 for discussion.

61 Largerly following ARTU, 253; see also Margalit, AQHT, 159; MLC, 390. In the initial line there may be haplography (*ydn<h. dnt>il*), on which see the remarks of M. Dijkstra - J.C. de Moor, Problematical Passages in the Legend of Aqḫātu, UF 7, 1975, 203; MLC, 390, etc.


63 Dijkstra - de Moor, Problematical, 203; Renfroe, AULS, 159, comments: «That Ugaritic knew a form *p’lt*, ultimately to be derived from his biconsonantal etymon [i.e. *pl*], signifying 'split, broken, cracked' and that the term was applied to damaged soil can be postulated on the basis of the comparative and contextual evidence, despite the absence of any cognate *p’lt* having semantics
2. «'parched ground' or the like», Arab. fa 'ala, dried up — «parched ground»
 though according to Greenfield this root does not exist;
3. «cracked-field», a hybrid of the (unattested) Ugaritic roots p (w/y) (Arab. fa 'ay/wa), «to cleave, split» and l (w/y?) with the same meaning;
4. «vegetable patch», from context alone;
5. «field with meagre growth», Arab. ba 'il «thin, lean»;
6. «fallow land, waste land», perhaps connected with p (w/y).

However, in view of Arab. fa 'ala, «to give a good omen»; Qatabanian f'I, «one who wishes ill, ill-wisher»; Sabaeanc f'I, «to wish ill to someone», yet another explanation is possible. Ug. palt may mean «ill-omened (land)». Some support for this meaning can be provided from Akkadian ba 'alu, «to pray to, to beseech» (CAD B, 2), also attested in the texts from Ebla. Whether there is any connection with Ug. pil in lth pil (KTU 4.751: 7) and [ ]x.dd.pil (KTU 4.747: 4') is uncertain.

(8) šlw

Only found in KTU 1.14 iii 45 ašlw bsp 'nh. The accepted translations are «I would repose in the glance of her eyes» and «(Give me the girl Hry... so that I may find rest in the clarity of her eyes». The verb is šlw, «to rest». An alternative is «(whom) I circle because of the clarity of her eyes», proposed by de Moor and Spronk, where the verb would be a Š-stem of Iwy. This proposal is rejected by...
Yet another possibility is that Ug. šlw is cognate with Akk. šalû, «to sub­merge oneself (in water)» (CAD Š/1, 273-74). In that case, sp would mean «bowl» here, indicating the translation «that I may immerse myself in the bowl of her eyes». Assuming the stichometry is correct, the problem then becomes a matter of imagery.

(9) Itn

Although Ug. itn (KTU 4.123:16; 4.146:8, and perhaps 4.402:5 and 4.185:5.7) is commonly accepted as meaning «dyed scarlet» (Heb. Šani, «scarlet»), the Akk. cognate šinittum, «dyed textile» suggests the meaning may simply be «dyed», i.e., «dyed textile». In Akkadian the nominalized feminine adjective šintu, «Abspülung, Färbung» (AHw, 1242b) derives from šanû, «to flood with water, etc.» (CAD Š/1, 408-409), «abspülen» (AHw, 1167). And, in fact, part of the dyeing process comprised washing and drying the raw wool.

It is also important to compare not just individual words but syntagmata in Ugaritic with those in another (Semitic) language. Del Olmo Lete has provided a list of syntagmata common to Ugaritic and Phoenician. An example (cited by Del Olmo Lete) is Ug. šlh yd (KTU 1.15 iv 24) and Phoenician šlh yd (KAI 24: 6), both meaning «to stretch out (one’s) hand».

IV Non-Semitic words in Ugaritic

It is known that many words in the Ugaritic lexicon are in fact borrowed from Hurrian, occasionally from Hittite and more rarely from Egyptian. Over the years more and more such words have been identified. Here one particular word (nht) is examined to determine whether in fact it is purely Semitic.

(169) with discussion of the reading and stichometry.

76 Verreet, Modì, 141-42, 157-58 and 173. A Š-stem of šlw is not included in J. Tropper, Der ugariti­sche Kausativstamm und die Kausativbildungen des Semitischen, ALASP 2, Münster 1990, nor is this passage discussed.

77 See TRU (I), 41, with references. This would remove the homograph sp, «glance», from the Ug. lexicon.

78 For references cf. Ribichini - Xella, Tessili, 68-69; KTU 4.146 is translated ibid., 76.


80 See van Soldt, Fabrics, 332-33.


82 See now J. Tropper, Die Inschriften von Zincirli, ALASP 6, Münster 1994, 35 for further references.

83 See the list provided by de Moor, Ugaritic Lexicography, 98. Not all are correct, of course. For additional material the indices of UF and other periodicals my be consulted.
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nht, «seat»

KTU 1.3 iv 3

lnht. lkht drkth

«from the seat of the throne of his dominion»84

As de Moor remarked many years ago, the collocation of ytb, «to sit» and nht (in KTU 1.16 vi 23-24) «lends support to Aistleitner’s view... that nht means something like ‘upholstery, seat’ rather than ‘dais’»85. The etymology of nht is considered to be Ug. nh, «to rest»87; cf. Akk. nāhu (nuāhu), «to be slow, etc., to take a rest» (CAD N/1, 143; cf. AHw, ) from which is derived nēhtu, «peace, security» (CAD N/2, 150b-51a), «Ruhe» (AHw, 775a). From etymology alone, however, nht is a place where one can rest, with no specific reference to being seated.

In Ugaritic, nht is followed by kht, which scholars consider to be a Hurrian word88. It has also been suggested that in Hurrian, naḥha- may mean «to sit»89. Remarkably, both these words also co-occur (as in the Ugaritic texts) in Hurrian texts. The first text runs as follows:

\[\text{DIM-ub ... ge-eš-ḥi-ni na-ah-ḥa-ab}\]

«and the Weathergod sat down on the stool...»90.

Similar are na-ah-ḥa GIS ki-iš-ḥi-ni 91 and ki-iš-ḥi-ni na-ah-ḥu-u-du-wa 92. These collocations indicate that Ug. nht, «seat», is another loanword from Hurrian. Alternatively, there may be an ancient stem NH denoting «to rest» which appears in Hurrian (and Urartian) and in the Semitic languages (Akkadian, Ugaritic, Phoenician, Hebrew, etc.) with different but related meanings.

Two other loanwords can be mentioned. One is ḥšw]/šwn (KTU 4.4:9; 4.14:3:11; 4.44:26; 4.232:32) for which different meanings have been suggested such as

---


85 Translation, ARTU, 12. Similarly, MLC, 589: «del diván, del solio de su poder».

86 J.C. de Moor, The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba’lu According to the Version of Illimiku, AOAT 16, 1971, 120, with further references.

87 For a survey cf. Pardee, Ugaritic Bibliography, 426.


90 KBo XXXII 13 14; Hitite parallel in KBo XXXII 13 I 5-6, cited by Neu, Varia Hurrítica, 251.

91 KBo 12, 80 + KUB 45.62 obv. i 14 cited by Salvini, Betrachtungen, 127-28.

92 ChS I/1, Nr. 41, rev. iii 39, cited by Salvini, Betrachtungen, 127-28.
«thyme»\textsuperscript{93} and «lettuce»\textsuperscript{94}. It may even be a plant from the onion family\textsuperscript{95}. The other is \textit{mgn}. To the data collected by O'Conner on this word\textsuperscript{96} can be added Salvini's comment: «L'attestation de ce mot à Mari montre qu'il n'est pas nécessairement un emprunt indo-arien»\textsuperscript{97}.

V Conclusions

The set of principles set out by de Moor over twenty years ago (see above) has stood the test of time. Three additions can be suggested: the significance of correct stichometry, implicitly or explicitly recognised by all scholars, the contribution of correct syntactical analysis and the importance of comparing syntagmata across different languages. Other aspects, such as imagery, may also play a part. However, our main obstacle to understanding correctly many a difficult passage is principally that there is no similar passage in Ugaritic or that the context is uncertain. In other words, the Ugaritic corpus is simply too small owing to lack of texts. It is to be hoped that continuing excavation will bring more tablets to light (as has happened so remarkably in 1994) and thus reduce the number of questionable entries in the Ugaritic lexicon.

\textsuperscript{96} M. O'Connor, \textit{Yahweh the Donor}, AuOr 6, 1988, 47-60, esp. 47-51.
\textsuperscript{97} M. Salvini, \textit{Un texte houritte nommant Zimrilim}, RA 82, 1988, 59-68 (65).