

The Cuneiform Short Alphabet: Part 5.

A School Text: KTU 5.22 (RS 26.135; *UF* 7 (1975), 166f; *UF* 11 (1979), 121f)

Detailed Discussion

Preliminary Remarks:

The first thing I noticed about this text was how little of it I could read, even in transliteration. Certain words like *ʾn*, "eye," and *nr*, "light" were clear enough but on the whole the vocabulary seemed very obscure. When I glanced through the secondary literature, I was surprised how often scholars cited Akkadian cognates to explain the various vocabulary items. Of course, many Ugaritic, and for that matter Northwest Semitic, words have Akkadian cognates but it is uncommon, although not unheard of, for an Ugaritic word to only have an Akkadian cognate unless it is a loanword. And when does the number of loanwords indicate that the actual language of a text is in the "loan" language? For this reason, I began to ask myself if it were possible that this word list was composed of Akkadian words rather than Ugaritic or some other Northwest Semitic words. As I will show, there are certain words and expressions that cannot be explained as being Akkadian but there are many others that, in my view, can best be explained as Akkadian words or loanwords.

On both internal and archaeological evidence, it is likely that this text was written during the last few decades before the fall of the city of Ugarit (see my discussion of line 21 below). The nature of the contents of the tablet and the lack of maturity of the hand of the student scribe indicate that KTU 5:22 is a school or training text. In addition, based on my interpretation of the last line, line 29, the text explicitly says that it is a recitation tablet.

The text is written from left to right and while some of the letters are somewhat unusual, none appear to be in the form I have come to expect of other texts written in the short cuneiform alphabet. So why take it up? First, M. Dijkstra (1986) treats it as a "text in the shorter cuneiform alphabet." Second, independent of the base language of the text, the scribe, or his teacher does use the ∇ (*j*₂) sign for both *ḥ* and *ḫ*. For this reason, the text may well represent an alphabet having fewer letters than the canonical long Ugaritic alphabet but more than those commonly used in the short alphabet.

There is another vexing feature of this text. While the obverse of the tablet is nicely spaced with each line clearly defined and self contained. The reverse is a bit of a mess. Lines 12 through 21, which continue around the bottom edge of the tablet and onto the reverse, are written as one might expect. When the reverse was full, the scribe simply turned the reverse 180 degrees and wrote so that lines 23 through 29 are interdigitized with lines 12 to 21. The scribe even had to curve the lines so they would fit.

Transliteration and Translation:

Below is my transliteration of the text followed by my translation, Dijkstra's (1986), 121, translation and Dietrich and Loretz' (1988), 189f., translation. Where we differ in transliteration, I have indicated Dijkstra's or Dietrich and Loretz' reading in parentheses.

	Mine	Dijkstra	Dietrich and Loretz
Obverse			
1) j_2r	hole	hole	Loch - PN
2) dqr	bowl	chisel	Topf - PN
3) kdr	basket	ball	Knäuel - Ball - PN
4) nr	light	light	Licht - PN
5) $m nrt$	lamp stand	($qnr\bar{t}$)moonlight(?)	Lampenständer, Leuchter
6) ptr	sword	sword	($p\bar{t}r/d$) Schwert - PN
7) $m fnt$	sandals	hearing(?)	Sandalen, Schuhe
8) \bar{n}	eye	eye(sight)	Auge; Quelle; Furche - PN
9) $zbl xr$	Prince of Tyre	prince of SR	Fürst von Sr/Tyros
Bottom			
10) kdr	basket	ball	Knäuel - Ball - PN
11) $m dpt$	cotton card?	($qdp\bar{t}$) projectile	† (see below)
Reverse			
12) $m p\bar{t}j_2$	key	key	Schlüssel
13) abn	stone	stone	Stein - PN
14) rj_2h	sorcerer	her hand-mill	seine/ihre Handmühle
15) rkb	chariot	millstone	(oberer) Mühistein
16) qj_2t	kettle	caldron	Topf, Kessel
17) $qm j_2$	flour	flour	Mehl
18) nr	light	light	Lich - PN
19) prj_2	leaf	blossom	Blüte - PN
20) $l\bar{t}j_2$	twig	kind of measure	Halbkor (Hohlmass) - PN
21) $\bar{m} rbe$?Ammurapi	($m rbe$) interest (?)	?Ammurapi
22) $Dn m f\bar{l}$	2/scarlet watering can(s)	($m f\bar{l}$) conjurer	zwei Purpur/Sprengkanne
Right edge			
23) $krSnm$	leather sack	($krS\bar{n}$)kind of measure	†† (see below)
24) $j_2\bar{m}$	wheat	wheat	Weizen
25) $kzm m$	emmer	emmer	Emmer
26) $apnm$	legumes	wheels	Räder
27) j_2h	window	window	Fenster
28) $gr yCb$	resident foreigner	sojourner/citizen	fremder Mitbewohner
29) lgn	recitation tablet	(city) council (?)	Lgn

† *Gerät zum Kämmen der Baumwolle*

†† *Lederschläuche (Masseinheiten)*

The table below shows the text and my translation again followed by the nearest equivalent word in standard Ugaritic and then in Akkadian. The asterisks after words in my translation indicate that I take them to be possible Akkadian words or as having significant Akkadian affinities.

	Mine	Standard Ugaritic (UT Glossary #)	Akkadian (AHw or CAD reference)
Obverse			
1) j_2r	hole*	$j r$ (UT 998)	$herû$ (CAD H, 176)
2) dqr	bowl*	$dqry$ (UT 696 PN)	$dīqaru$ (CAD D, 157)*
3) kdr	basket *	kdr (UT 1201)	$kudurru$ B (CAD K, 496)*
4) nr	light*	nr (UT 1702)	$nuru$ (AHw 805)
5) $m nrt$	lamp stand	$hapax legomenon$?
6) $p̄tr$	sword*	$p̄tr$ (UT2126 PN)	$patru$ (CAD P, 279)
7) $m fnt$	sandals*	$hapax legomenon$	$mešenu$? (CAD M II, 38)
8) $`n$	eye	$`n$ (UT 1846)	inu I (AHw, 383)
9) $zbl xr$	Prince of Tyre	$zbl xr$ (UT 815 + 2193)	
Bottom			
10) kdr	basket*	see line 3	see line 3
11) $m dpt$	cotton card?	$hapax legomenon$?
Reverse			
12) $m p̄tj_2$	key	$hapax legomenon$???
13) abn	stone*	abn (UT 32)	$abnu$ (CAD A1, 54)
14) rj_2h	sorcerer*	$r̄h$ (UT 2316)	$rahû$ (ra-hu-û) (CAD R, 76)*
15) rkb	chariot*	rkb (UT 2331 ?)	$rukubu$ (CAD R 409)
16) $q̄lj_2t$	kettle	$hapax legomenon$	
17) $qm j_2$	flour	$qm H$ (UT 2237)*	$qemû$ (CAD Q, 209) *
18) nr	light*	$`n$ (UT 1846)	see line 4
19) prj_2	leaf*	? (UT 2102 PN)	$per'u$ (CAD P, 416)
20) tj_2	twig*	$t̄h$ (UT 1399)	$lutû$ (lu-te-e-a) (CAD 2.257)
21) $`m rbe$?Ammurapi	$`m rpe$ (UT 1864)	^m am-mu-ra-pí
22) $Dh m f̄l$	2/scarlet watering can(s)	Dh ? (UT 2705 + ?)	$mašlahu$ / $maslahu$??
Right edge			
23) $krSm$	leather sack(s)*	$krsnm$ (UT 1310)	$kursinnu$ (CAD K, 567)
24) $j_2m̄$	wheat*	$H t̄t$ (UT 881)	$uttatu$ (AHw, 1446)
25) $kzm m$	emmer	$kSm m$ (UT1283)	
26) $apnm$	legume(s)*	$apnm$ (UT 305)	$appanu$ (CAD A1, 179)
27) j_2h	portico*	$H ln$ (UT 864)	$hilanu$ (CAD H, 184)
28) $gr yCb$	resident foreigner	$gr ylb$ (UT 567 + 1177)	
29) lgn	recitation tablet*	? (UT 1355 PN)	$liginnu$ (CAD L, 183)

Notes on the Orthography:

As already noted, the text is written from left to right. There is nothing in the orthography to associate it with other short cuneiform alphabetical text from Ugarit or

elsewhere other than the use of ḥ₂ for ḥ. While the m sometimes looks significantly like a q it is constructed far more like the m in the long Ugaritic alphabet. While there may be a misspelling in line 28 (although another option will be offered below) the fact that the ṭ appears in line 22 rules out the coalescence of the š and the ṭ. The small circle never appears and the scribe used ē and ś that are not seen in any other short alphabetical text. Other evidence that this text is not an obvious example of a text in the short alphabet will be given in the line-by-line analysis below. The hand of the scribe is, in my view, very uneven.

Notes on the Translation:

General remarks: This list of words and short phrases does not appear to be a part of any of the canonical vocabularies (cf. Landsberger [1937] and Nougayrol [1968], 199ff). As Dijkstra (1986), 121, points out *kdr* and *dqr* both appear in KTU 4.275:8, 17. However, they are separated by nine lines and in a different order. In addition, the lacunose nature of KTU 4.275 makes it difficult to interpret it even as to its overall genre. Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 189f, want us to consider that many of these words in our text could well be personal names. The most obvious example is *m rbe*, ?Ammurapi. But it is also hard to understand, for example, *kzm m*, emmer and many other of the words in the text as personal names.

Line 1) ḥ₂r - Dijkstra (1986), 121 and Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 189, take the word as equivalent to Ugaritic *jr* (UT 998) and this may well be the case. However, if we understand it as related to the Akkadian word *herû* (CAD H, 176) it means hole, the thing dug with the digging tool. The choice is based on the extent to which one understands this text as being influenced by the Akkadian language. I am not deeply committed either way, but I will lean towards the Akkadian usage as much for the sake of argument as anything else. Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 189, note the personal name in KTU 4.35 II:9 and 4.278:6 as well as the less clear KYU 4.11:6, 4.106:6 and 4.441:6.

Line 2) *dqr* - Dijkstra (1986), 121 translates *dqr*, "chisel" apparently from Hebrew *r q* ער meaning, "pick" or "mattock" or Aramaic *r v* רבד "chisel." Citing AHW, 172, and CAD D, 157ff, Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 189, suggest that it is related to Akkadian *diqaru* meaning "Topf," "pot." The word also appears in KTU 1.111:16 and 4.275:17. They also call attention to the Ugaritic personal name *dqry* in KTU 4.63:II 33; KTU 108:4 and KTU 116:17. The Akkadian word written di-qa-ru occurs in the vocabulary text RS 23.493 A:R^o10. Judging from its place in the S^a vocabulary list (44) Nougayrol (1968), 236, renders it "*bol*." Because the Akkadian word appears in Akkadian in a more or less contemporary tablet from Ugarit and the Hebrew/Aramaic examples are late, I render *dqr* "bowl." It is possible that we are dealing with an Akkadian loanword. As for the proposed personal name, the writing in this text lacks the final (hypocoristic?) *y*. For that reason, I find it hard to see a personal name here.

Lines 3 and 10) Dijkstra (1986), 121, and Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 189, translate *kdr* "ball" apparently from Hebrew *dvk* and Aramaic *dyvk*. Dietrich and Loretz (1988),

189, also note Arabic *kadara* meaning "Erdklumpen." An Ugaritic word with this spelling occurs in KTU 1.50:10 (some part of a sacrifice), KTU 4.275:8 (context unclear) and possibly also in KTU 4.123:11 (t]D ksp' l kdw/r[, "6 {shekels} of silver in payment for a kdw/r . . ."). Gordon, 1965, 418, #1201, took this word to mean "vulture." Also, see *kdm* in KTU 4:33:22, 4.55:26, 4.350:1 (also the personal name *bn kdr*). Note also *kdrt* in KTU 1.3 II:9 where the context seems to support something like "balls" as a translation of the Ugaritic, but other interpretations could well fit this context. I suggest, alternatively, that in our text the word could well come from Akkadian *kudurru* meaning "basket." Such a meaning could also fit the context of the Ugaritic passages cited above.

Line 4 and 18) *nr-* could be either Ugaritic *nr* (UT #1702) or Akkadian *nuru* (AHw 805).

Line 5) *m nrt-* Here Dijkstra (1986), 122, reads *qnrt* instead of *m nrt* as read by Dietrich and Loretz' (1988), 189, and Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartin (1995), 496. The autograph published by Bordreuil (1983), 9, appears to show a *q*, the one presented by Dietrich and Loretz' (1988), 189, appears to be a *m*. The photograph published in Bordreuil and Pardee (1989), 328, is no help in resolving the issue. Rather arbitrarily I follow Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 189, who note Hebrew *hr nm* (*r nm), "lamp stand." They also cite Nubian, *r nm*.

Line 6) *prr-* Occurs otherwise in unbroken form only in KTU 1.49:11 but see also KTU 4.248:9 and 4.190:3. Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 189, call the final *d* "*Rasur*" and indeed the only picture of this tablet (Bordreuil and Pardee [1989], 328) does show some smudging of the *d*. The transcription in Bordreuil (1983), 9, does not show the *d* at all and Dijkstra (1986), 121, does not indicate it in his transliteration. Without the final *d* the word clearly means "sword." The word is *hapax legomenon* as a common noun in Ugaritic. But it may also be a personal name (see KTU 4.190:3).

Line 7) *m fnt-* Such a word is *hapax legomenon* if Ugaritic (but see *m dnt* [UT # 1432] in KTU 1.3 II:16). Dijkstra (1986), 122, compares this word with Hebrew *nyzm* (from Proto-Semitic *'fn) in Proverbs 17:6 (sic, see Proverbs 17:4) and suggests "hearing" as a possible meaning. He further suggests that a spelling error may be involved (122). Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 190, suggest Akkadian *mešenu* and I have no better suggestion. There is a problem. Proto-Semitic *f* becomes *z* in Akkadian and not *š*. Is the final *ta* feminine plural, as I take it and if so, is it an Ugaritic-like feminine plural or is it an Akkadian feminine plural? Or is this word, like a few others in this text that begin with *m*, simply un-interpretable?

Line 8) *`n-* As much as I might like it, there is no reason to think that the Akkadian cognate is in any way intended. It is as clear as anything on this tablet that the word is the same as the common Ugaritic word *`n* (UT #1846). The probability that our student scribe thought he was writing Akkadian *inu* is very nearly zero. But as Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 189, correctly point out it might mean "to spring" or "furrow."

Line 9) *zbl xr*- This two word phrase can only reasonably be understood as Northwest Semitic (Ugaritic) meaning Prince of Tyre. See KTU 4.132:4 and particularly KTU 2.38:3, 12 where the King of Tyre writes to the King of Ugarit. Note the *ḥ* in *ṯḥm* where one might expect a *ḥ* in KTU 2.38:3 (compare KTU 2.40:3 and KTU 2.44:3 for example). We will return to KTU 2.38 in a later discussions for the short alphabet. Note also ^{URU}*su-ri-ya* in RS 19.42:6. These references are discussed in Astour and Smith (1975), 324, 364. Is it possible that our student scribe is from Tyre? Possible? Yes, but there is no other evidence to support such an identification.

Line 11) *m dpt*- Another one of those difficult to interpret "m" words. As in line 5, Dijkstra (1986), 122, reads an initial *q* instead of *m*. This line cannot be seen in Bordreuil and Pardee's (1989), 328, photograph. In Bordreuil's (1983), 7, autograph, this first letter of the line appears to resemble the clearer *m* in line 12. The word, if it does indeed begin with an *m*, is *hapax legomenon* in Ugaritic. Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 190 note Arabic *mindaf* and translate "*Gerät zum Kämmen der Baumwolle.*" I have no better suggestion.

Line 12) *m pṯ₂* - Still another *m* word! Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartin (1975b), 166, cite Hebrew *x t p m* (key) and the Ugaritic verb *pṯḥ* Ugaritic ("to open," see UT # 2130). *j₂* for *ḥ* is normal usage in this text. Dijkstra (1986), 122, also renders the word "key." We have here another word with a clear Northwest Semitic origin and without any clear Akkadian affiliation at all.

Line 13) *abn* - "stone" as in Ugaritic *abn* (UT #32) but see also Akkadian *abnu* (CAD A1, 54). Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 190, note that this letter cluster appears as a personal name in Ugaritic texts (*bn abn*, see KTU 4.33:24 and KTU 4.335:25).

Line 14) *rj₂h* - Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 190, translate "*seine/ihre Handmühle*" perhaps following Dijkstra (1986), 122, "her hand-mill" from *rḥm* as in KTU 1.6 II:34 but in the singular with a possessive feminine pronoun. This interpretation is based in part on the general "context" *abn, rj₂h, rkb*. Of course, this reasoning only applies if one interprets the local sequence of words "stone," "her hand mill," "millstone." This interpretation is certainly plausible. But it is not without problems. While there are short phrases as in lines 9, 22 and 28 in this text there is no other example of a personal pronoun. Also, as will be seen below, there is an alternative interpretation of *rkb* in line 15. I would suggest that *rj₂h* is associated with Akkadian *rahû* (ra-ḥu-û) meaning "sorcerer."

Line 15) *rkb* - Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 190, cite Hebrew *bkr*, "*Wagenzug; Zug; einzelner Wagen; oberer Mühlstein*" as well as rabbinic Aramaic *yōkr* and Middle Hebrew *bkr* both meaning "*oberer Mühlstein.*" Dijkstra (1986), 121, cites *bkr* in 2 Samuel 11:21, "upper mill-stone" where it is generally thought to mean the "rider" on the lower mill stone (see also Deuteronomy 24:6 and Judges 9:53). Both accept "millstone" over "chariot" based on the supposed local context (see discussion of line 14). I would suggest that this word be understood as "chariot," based on Akkadian *rukubu*.

Line 16) *qj₂t* - Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartin (1975b), 166, cite Hebrew קלח meaning caldron. This word may be a loanword from Egyptian, 𓂏𓂛𓂏 , "vessel." I have no better suggestion. As a side note: because the scribe seemed to make the q and the m in a very similar way, one might see a possible Ugaritic personal name, *m H t* (KTU 4.344:21).

Line 17) *qm j₂* - This is very likely the common Ugaritic word for flour (*qm H*). As an alternative proposal, see Akkadian *qemû* meaning "grinder."

Line 19) *prj₂* - Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartin (1975b), 166, cite Hebrew פרח , "blossom." *prj* also occurs as a personal name in KTU 4.88:2 (*bn prj*) and 4.134:7 (in a list of merchants). I suggest that the word is related to Akkadian *per'u*, meaning "leaf." In support of this idea, note that the word in line 20 can be understood as Akkadian for "twig." However, as I indicated in my discussion of line 14, I am not sure how much one should depend on word clusters to provide interpretive context in this text.

Line 20) *lj₂* - If this is an Ugaritic word it is from the fairly common *lH* which is some dry unit of measure. The word also appears as a personal name in KTU 4.611:14 (*bn lH*). Again, I suggest that we should look to Akkadian *lutû* meaning, "twig." Note the writing lu-te-e-a in Lambert (1960), 166.7.

Line 21) *m rbe* - Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 193, note the use of *b* for *p* and suggest that this indicates uncertainty (*Unsicherheiten*) about labial plosives. However, this "uncertainty" is also built into the way the name ?Ammurapi is generally represented in syllabic form (^mam-mu-ra-pí). See for example, RS 17.226:4, 8, 10 and RS 17.355:16 where the last sign is a KAŠ which is generally read pí in conformity with standard Ugaritic *m rpe* but could as well be read bi (see Labat [1963], 123 sign 122). The use of the KAŠ sign for both bi and pí is very common in the Akkadian texts from Ugarit and other western reaches of peripheral Middle Babylonian (see Huehnergard [1989], 35, 375 and Izre'el [1991b], 119). Note that the same ambiguity regularly applies to the signs for ba/pa and bu/pu. If I am correct that the student was heavily influenced by Akkadian usage, he may simply have tried to represent the Akkadian sign in the cuneiform alphabet rather than the sound. Note also the discussion of p>b and b>p shifts in Sivan (2001), 27f., which I don't think comes into play in this case. ?Ammurapi was the last king of Ugarit and as Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 194, point out, this text was likely written during his reign. In support of this hypothesis, the tablet was found in a scholar's archive that can be dated on archaeological grounds to the last decades Ugarit (see Bordreuil and Pardee [1989], 325-328).

Line 22) *Dn m fl* - Dijkstra (1986), 121, does not read the first word (*Dn*) of this short phrase. Nor does Bordreuil (1983), 9 show it in his autograph. But is very clear in the autograph published by Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 189, and it is the reading of the line published in KTU 5.22. The first word is either the indeclinable noun "pair" (UT # 2703) or the color "scarlet" (UT #2703). The second word is *hapax legomenon* in Ugaritic.

Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 191, cite Akkadian *mašlahu* / *maslahu* meaning "watering can" (CAD M I 325) and *masla'u* (CAD M I 326) meaning some kind of pot. In Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartin (1975b), 167, the word was thought to be related to Akkadian *mušlahhu* which they translate "*Schlangenbeschwörer*" (CAD M II, 276). Dijkstra (1986), 121, presumably following them, translates the word "conjurer." Neither Akkadian word is a perfect match for our word but the two possible meanings for *Dh* make *mašlahu* a slightly more understandable match for the word in our phrase but only by a small margin. Note that KTU 5.14:16 equates the letter alphabetic *l* with the Akkadian syllable *ha*.

Line 23) *krSnm* - This spelling is *hapax legomenon* but see *krsnm* in KTU 4.279:3 and perhaps KTU 4.123:13 where it is a liquid measure. Is this some kind of a spelling error as suggested by Dijkstra (1986), 122? Or is it an indication of other linguistic influences? Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartin (1975b), 167, point to the Akkadian *kursinnu*, which they render "*Lederschläuche (Masseinheiten)*." The final *m* is likely a plural suffix.

Line 24) *j₂m* - We have already seen this form in the certain short alphabet text KTU 4.710: 3,7. Note the Akkadian word *uttatu* that also means "wheat."

Line 25) *kzm m* - Again, an unusual spelling of an otherwise known Ugaritic word. Dijkstra (1986), 122, offers this spelling as a "proof" that the student had the short alphabet in mind as he wrote. Although he also suggests that the writing in line 25 may be a spelling mistake. Perhaps based on the short alphabet? See also Dijkstra (1986), 123. Note that KTU 5:14:20 equates the letter *S* with the Akkadian sign *zu* (see Dijkstra [1986], 123, n. 13.).

Line 26) *apnm* - If this is related to the Ugaritic word *apnm* it means "wheels" and so it is taken by Dijkstra (1986), 121, and Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 191. However if one sees the plural of the Akkadian word *appanu* then one would translate the word "legumes" and extend the local context of related words to three words.

Line 27) *j₂h* - This appears to be the fairly common Ugaritic word *h₂h* meaning window. However, it is also related, how directly I am not sure, to the Akkadian *hilanu*, "portico." The Akkadain word is usually in the expression, *bît hilani*, "portico house."

Line 28) *gr yCb* is no doubt a Northwest Semitic, if not Ugaritic, expression. But note the spelling with *C* rather than *D* Dijkstra (1986), 122, takes this as another "proof" that we are dealing with a text in the short alphabet. However, our text uses a *Din* line 22. Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 194, suggest that the student simply may not have differentiated the sounds here and in the cases of *j₂* for *h* elsewhere. They think the same thing of the *b* for *p* in line 21 and the *z* for *S* in line 25. This seems to me to be the most likely explanation. The reason for this lack of differentiation is another question.

Line 29) *gn* - For reasons I can not discern, Dijkstra (1986), 121, 122 n4, translates this word "(city) council(?)." Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartin (1975b), 166, take it to be the name of the student. Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 191, 192, maintain this position. They

see a personal name as a logical ending for both the text and the preceding line (i.e. Lgn was a foreign resident). The personal name does indeed occur in Ugaritic texts, for example, *bn ḫg* in KTU 4.33:23 and KTU 700:8. While it is clear that there is a personal name in KTU 4.53:7, it is not so clear that this is *bn ḫg*. There seems to be a letter between the *l* and the *p*, perhaps a *n*. On the other hand, the broken text in KTU 4.151 I:9 is very likely the personal name (*bn?*)*ḫg*. The same is true of KTU 4.444:6. I would like to propose an alternative suggestion for this word. Whatever else may be said about our text it is beyond doubt a school text and there is an Akkadian word for such a text, *liginnu*, "recitation tablet." In most Akkadian contexts the word is the tablet recited from but note ABL 447:4, where it is clear that the *liginnu* is to be written by the student (See CAD L, 183-4), "Why can't you even write your *tuppi* (tablet), do you not even know how to recite your IM.GIG (= *liginnu*)?"

Final Remarks:

As I have remarked before, even if my interpretation of line 29 cannot be supported, this is without doubt a school text. While local word clusters may be apparent, the over all text has a certain random quality. Was the student influenced by some knowledge of the short alphabet as Dietrich and Loretz (1988), 193, suggest as an option and Dijkstra (1986), 122, thinks certain? Aside from the *j*₂ for both *ḫ* and *ḥ* there is no other evidence that this is so. And the presence of long alphabet letters not found in other short alphabet texts seem to provide direct evidence against this hypothesis. More interesting is Dietrich and Loretz' (1988), 193, suggestion that,

Er gehörte zu einer Bevölkerungsschicht, die das phonizisch-kanaanäische Substrat Ugarits und dessen Umgebung sprach und deswegen bei der Darstellung der von ihm artikulierten Laute durch das standardgemässe Langalphabet zahlreiche Unsicherheiten mitbrachte.

But, as far as I can determine there is little evidence of this hypostasis either. Rather, I think our student was heavily influenced by the Akkadian scribal tradition. In the course of the line-by-line analysis, I noted, in addition to the frequent use of Akkadian words or loanwords, that the student scribe may have used *b* for *p* under the influence of Akkadian orthography; that he may well have used *ḫ* for *j* and *z* for *s* under the same influence.

Are there any patterns in the text that extend beyond a few words? Again, there does not appear to be any. One might note that from the beginning of the text to the line that mentions the prince of Tyre there are eight lines and between that line and the line that mentions the king of Ugarit there are eleven lines and from this line to the end of the text here are again eight lines. In other words, the text may divide into three approximately equal groups of words that are set off by royal names or titles. Fellow blogger Aydin Örstan suggested this segmentation in a comment to a post on my blog. Weak support may be found in the fact that the two words that appear twice in the text do not appear in the same section, if so divided. But there is little else to recommend such segmentation.

Like KTU 7.60, this text does not appear to be in the short cuneiform alphabet tradition and will be, for the time being, excluded from further study. It may be necessary to revisit it when I consider larger questions of the origin of the short alphabet. At that time and when we consider the Bet Shemesh abecedary, it will also be necessary to look at additional school texts from Ugarit and elsewhere.