

Del Olmo Lete, Gregorio, and Joaquín Sanmartín. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 1, The Near and Middle East, 67. Leiden: Brill, 2003. 2 parts: xlv, 1007 pp. Hardcover, €199.00.

Until the end of the twentieth century, the most comprehensive works on Ugaritic lexicography were the glossary in C. H. Gordon's *Ugaritic Textbook* (1965, revised reprint 1998) and J. Aistleitner's *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache* (1963, 1965). Of course, since their publications new texts have surfaced and there has been a constant stream of articles and studies devoted to Ugaritic lexicographic research and comparative linguistics. Our understanding of the Ugaritic language has immensely grown (see the recent grammars by D. Sivan [1997] and J. Tropper [2000] and the essays in the fourth chapter of the *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies* [1999]). Thus, the up-to-date *Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language* (*DUL*) fills a wide gap in Ugaritic lexicography.

DUL is the English edition of the two-volume Spanish *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica* (*DLU*), *Aula orientalis supplementa* 7-8 (Barcelona: AUSA, 1996, 2000) that began in 1984 (cf. G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, "A New Ugaritic Dictionary: Its Lexicographical and Semantic Structure," *Aula Orientalis* 6 [1988]:255-274, esp. 255). Appearing only a little over two years after the completion of the Spanish work, this comprehensive dictionary is now available to a wider circle of English-speaking readers, making the additional use of a Spanish-English dictionary obsolete. The two original editors, and particularly Wilfred G. E. Watson, who translated and edited the English *DUL* in an exemplary way, as well as the publishers, are to be congratulated for such a speedy materialization.

In fact, *DUL* is not merely a translation of the Spanish original. Watson was able to incorporate recent results in Ugaritic lexicography and to consistently update the bibliographic references, fulfilling the clearly stated task "to indicate the stage reached by lexical description and to serve as a reference work for later study" (vii).

With regard to bibliographic references and sources, *DUL* uses for the Hebrew *HALOT* (*DLU* uses the German *HAL*), and adds for Amorite R. S. Hess, *Amorite Personal Names* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1993) and for Egyptian the transcription in J. E. Hoch, *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and the Third Intermediate Period* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994). Also included has been text material from the epigraphic collection of RS 86.-RS 92, to be published by P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, and from J. Belmonte Marín's *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Texte aus Syrien im 2. Jt. v. Chr.*, *RGTC* 12/2 (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001), as well as bibliographical references to a number of works that appeared after the publication of the Spanish *DLU*. For example, *DUL* incorporates the articles in *UF* up to 32 (2000). However, the article by Dietrich and Loretz on *ma/ihd* and *m(a/i)hdy* is not cited (*UF* 32 [2000]: 195-201), and some of the corrections to *CTU* published by J. Tropper and J.-P. Vita (*UF* 30 [1998]: 697-702) have not been incorporated; e.g. *DUL* refers to *mabbi* instead of *mabdt* in 4.14:11, or to *mkby* in 4.299:4 (although the correct *mlky* is cited under *mlky* [I] and *mlky* [II]). On the whole, *DUL* is remarkably comprehensive in its inclusion of recent literature, although a few more could have been incorporated. For example, M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, *Studien zu den ugaritischen Texten I: Mythos und Ritual*, *AOAT* 269/1 (Münster: Ugarit, 2000) is truly a goldmine for lexicographical information, and its glossary makes this information readily accessible.

A comparison of *DUL* with the Spanish *DLU* by means of randomly selected entries illustrates the extent of augmentation in the English edition. For example, the entry *bnš* ("man") contains the following additional material: one bibliographic reference with text reference in the heading, five additional and five corrected text references, and two bibliographic references in the main body, and three additional phrases and seven

additional text references under "fragmentary context." The entry *att* ("woman") contains the following additional material: one uncertain reading with text reference, three corrected text references, one corrected form, thirteen additional text references (of which seven are to one text tablet), two bibliographic references, a whole paragraph of four lines on readings in fragmentary context (two bibliographic references, seven texts, four phrases), and one comparative entry. The entry of the common verbal root *l-q-h* ("to take") adds two morphological verb forms attested, six text references, one corrected text reference, and six passages in fragmentary context.

DUL comes in two parts. Part 1 contains a foreword, a list of abbreviations that includes 24 pages of bibliographical abbreviations, and the dictionary proper, covering the lexemes from *ʔ(a/i/u)* to *kzy* (1-474); Part 2 covers the lexemes from *l* to *z* (475-1007). The lexical units listed are independent morphemes (i.e., words); attached morphemes (i.e., affixes); and proper names of people, places, deities, and months. As such, *DUL* is also a Ugaritic word list with a complete inventory.

In general, there are two commonly used ordering systems of lexical items: one follows the Hebrew alphabet (e.g., *Word-List of KTU* [1996]); the other lists the transliteration symbols according to the Roman alphabet (a third one, suggested by Pardee, follows the native Ugaritic alphabetic order as attested in at least eleven alphabet tablets, but so far has not gained wide acceptance). The lexical items in *DUL* are ordered according to the Roman alphabet with the *aleph*-sign *ʔ* and the *ayin*-sign *ʕ* as the first two letters before *b*. The reasons provided for choosing that order are pragmatic: to emphasize the difference between Ugaritic and Hebrew, and to adopt the standard order in Akkadian, as in *CAD*. In the alphabetic order *š* is included under *s*, *ṣ* under *ʃ*, and *ṭ* under *t*, which leads to the headings *s/š, ʃ/ṣ, and t/ṭ*.

Nouns are entered in the absolute singular form, verbs by verbal stem. Derivatives are listed at the end of an entry. This system is a major advantage for beginning students, who would find it difficult to locate a specific word if verbs and nouns alike had been listed under a single triliteral root (for Hebraists: the organization of *DUL* is similar to *HALOT* but different from *BDB*).

The readings are based on *CTU*. Different readings are marked by the sign "(!)." It is unfortunate that *DUL* refrains from using square brackets for "certain" reconstructions. I believe that the epigraphic evidence could have been incorporated in such a way, particularly as Ugaritologists are well accustomed to this practice (cf. *CTU*).

The typical entry is arranged in two paragraphs. The entry begins with the lexical item in bold face, its grammatical category, and a gloss or glosses. After this follows the etymological and comparative data with a list of cognates, sometimes qualifying the likelihood of their relation. Since the Ugaritic text material is relatively limited, such comparative data is relevant, as it often provides the only extended context for determining the best gloss of a given lexeme. Then, selected bibliographic references are provided (a good help for further study), giving due note to views different from the one of the editors. The first paragraph ends with a list of all attested forms of the lexeme. The second paragraph is devoted to contextual verification. Here, the editors present a selection of what they consider to be the important contexts for establishing the glosses of the lexical item. Finally, any derivatives of the lexeme are listed.

By nature, a lexicon is at the same time an interpretation. It has to be expected that one cannot always agree with the choice of the authors in regard to a gloss or translation, or with their selection of important contexts. All in all, however, their decisions are reliable, and the bibliographic addition of different opinions guarantees, at least to some degree, a well-balanced nature of the lexicon.

Let me mention briefly some methodological considerations. *DUL* follows the pattern of the traditional Semitic lexicons. Such a dictionary has its place and is certainly necessary for the Ugaritic language. However, it may be noteworthy to consider also a more functional approach to lexicography. For example, *DUL* does not include syntactic analyses (e.g., with which verbs a noun is used as subject or as object, or with which nouns or prepositions a verb is used), which are at least advisable for lexemes occurring more frequently. The relation of a specific lexical item with other lexical items in a clause (syntagmatic analysis) could receive more attention. Also the organization of glosses under frequently used lexical items does not necessarily reflect a semantic analysis. A paradigmatic analysis is partly undertaken in that parallel lexemes in a poetic context are listed. However, *DUL* lacks a systematic notation of synonyms or antonyms. There is also no differentiation between the use of a word in prose texts and in poetic texts. Since the occurrences of a lexical item are not necessarily listed comprehensively in an entry, an indication of frequency would have been a helpful feature.

The layout of the dictionary leaves a few things to be desired, especially if one is used to the clearly arranged Spanish original. In *DUL* there is no additional space between the individual entries, and the hanging indent of the lemmata is barely large enough to indicate a new entry. Here, a more liberal use of space and especially the printing of the lemmata in a more distinct boldface (the boldface used is hardly distinguishable from the normal typeface) and/or in a larger font size would have facilitated a much easier and quicker overview. The type of font used is, at least for my taste, not pleasant to read, particularly because the print does not appear to be very sharp. These shortcomings regarding the layout are partly due to the small format of the volume (6" x 9.5"=15 cm x 24 cm; cf. the size of the Spanish *DLU*: 8" x 10.5"=20 cm x 27 cm). The inconsistency on the title page of part 1—the beginning lemma is given as “(a/i/u)” instead of “ʔ(a/i/u)” —catches one’s eye. Somewhat unorthodox is the transliteration of the gutturals /ʔ/ and /ʕ/ with the signs ʔ and ʕ (the Spanish *DLU* uses ’ and ‘). The list of abbreviations lacks the frequently used “*bkn*” (always “*bkn dx:*”) which apparently stands for “broken” and designates fragmentary readings.

DUL sets a high standard for Ugaritic lexicography. Presently, it is the most important and up-to-date lexical tool for Ugaritic studies. Not only students of Ugaritic, but also those of cognate languages (including particularly Biblical Hebrew) will tremendously benefit from it. Despite the fact that this dictionary is expensive, I highly recommend it for use in Ugaritic classes of all levels, since it is simply the best choice for serious translation. It is not difficult to foresee that *DUL* will find its firm place on the scholarly desk for years to come, even when finally the long-awaited *Ugaritisches Handwörterbuch (UHW)* is published.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

MARTIN PRÖBSTLE

Goodacre, Mark. *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002. 228 pp. Paperback, \$30.00.

The author, Mark Goodacre, is Senior Lecturer in New Testament Studies in the Department of Theology at the University of Birmingham in the United Kingdom. He earned his B.A., M. Phil., and D.Phil. degrees from Oxford University. His previous publications include *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm* (JSNTSup, 133; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) and *The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze* (The Biblical Seminar, 80; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001). Goodacre’s study joins several recent works analyzing the hypothetical gospels source document Q (e.g., Christopher M. Tuckett’s *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* [Edinburgh: