

to the local environment. On the other hand, the absence is closely related to the philosophical/religious framework of the modern village. Thus, in this case, the modern village, which could be an ethnographic model for understanding the past, shows that the unique characterizing feature of the culture—the absence of the pig—is not related to the environment at all and must be called something other than “peripheral culture” (p. 176). A greater sensitivity to the real underlying cultural forces would not invalidate the essential soundness of LaBianca’s ethnographic analogy model. His work has so far not addressed the interface between the ethnographic/environmental/zooarchaeological approach and the historical and cultural approach that sees philosophical/religious factors as fundamental components of a total cultural system. This methodological interface needs further exploration.

James A. Sauer writes on the “Umayyad Pottery from Sites in Jordan.” He follows the traditional approach to pottery discussions. Date parameters are established, the selected sites are discussed, and then follows a description of the pottery by technique, ware, surface treatment, and form. The value of the article is obvious to anyone who has had to do any work with pottery from the Early Islamic period. For certain periods there is a lack of published material presented authoritatively and systematically. Sauer’s article goes a long way toward filling an obvious gap in ceramic studies. Such an essay is quite appropriate in a *Festschrift* honoring Horn. One of the issues in the biblical archaeology debate has been a legitimate concern about responsible treatment of data from outside the biblical period. It is to the credit of Horn that he had the foresight to incorporate a multidisciplinary approach to archaeological field work in the 1960s. That strategy assured the proper treatment of all data.

The other essays are also informative and useful for the archaeologist, linguist, and biblical scholar. One of the strong points of the book is its diversity in scope, as indicated by the titles of the various sections listed above. There are some sections and articles that are less affected by the passage of time than others. This is particularly true in regard to articles that do not base their conclusions on dated material. The editors are to be congratulated for putting together the works of such a fine group of scholars to honor a man who has given so much to so many of us.

Andrews University

J. BJØRNAR STORFJELL

Huehnergard, John. *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*, Harvard Semitic Studies 32 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987). xvii + 371 pp. Paperback, \$29.95.

Most Ugaritic writings available to modern scholarship are written in the cuneiform alphabet of Ugarit, which consists of 26 consonants and

four consonant-vowel combinations. Thus the pronunciation of stems and the morphology of noun declensions and verb conjugations are poorly represented in the spelling system. Important sources of information on vocalization are those documents in which Ugaritic is written in the syllabic cuneiform of Sumerian and Akkadian. This resource of Ugaritic vocalization has been exploited, but there has remained a need for a systematic treatment of syllabic Ugaritic—a need which Huehnergard seeks to fill.

Ugaritic Vocabulary begins with an introduction to the texts available and the work that has been done thus far. Huehnergard is a minimalist concerning the syllabic data which he will recognize as Ugaritic. To be recognized as Ugaritic a term must be in the fourth (Ugaritic) column of the polylingual lexicons, or be marked by a gloss sign, or be of a form or meaning foreign to Akkadian and/or characteristic of Northwest Semitic (= Ugaritic), or found in a location where a Ugaritic term is expected. Most proper nouns are excluded from the study because they often preserve foreign, archaic, and nonlocal characteristics.

Part 1 draws together the polylingual lexicons of Ugarit into a synoptic list. These lexicons consist of three to four columns of word equivalents in syllabic cuneiform: the first column is Sumerian, the second is Akkadian, the third is Hurrian, and on some tablets there is a fourth column of Ugaritic. Thus the lexicons are important for both Ugaritic vocalization and semantic range. Huehnergard orders the lexical entries according to the standard Sumerian sign list numbers (Sa Voc. No.). In Huehnergard's synoptic list there are seven columns: the Sa numbers, the four languages of the lexicons, the meaning, and the publication references for the tablets. This synopsis is not only useful for Ugaritic lexicography, but also for the study of Western Akkadian and Hurrian. A detailed commentary follows the synopsis, concentrating on implications for Ugaritic.

Part 2, the glossary, is the heart of the book. Here the Ugaritic terms found in syllabic cuneiform are listed alphabetically by root and discussed. This glossary is heavily dependent on the synoptic lexicon of Part 1, but also draws from other syllabic texts. The root is vocalized, and in the case of verbs the tense is discussed. The relevant syllabic transcriptions follow with references to source, and the Sa number is given if the root is found in the lexicons. The alphabetic spelling is then given, followed by commentary on the term.

Part 3 discusses implications for orthography and grammar. Chapter 1 compares syllabic and alphabetic spellings, chapter 2 notes phonological developments evidenced, and chapter 3 discusses the morphology of nouns and verbs.

Three indexes conclude the book. The first two list syllabic texts cited. The third index lists forms cited from Ugaritic, Sumerian, Akkadian, Hurrian, Arabic, Aramaic, Eblaite, Ethiopic, Hebrew, and South Arabian.

This book is an excellent and much-needed work in Ugaritic studies. Some points, however, are without full support. For instance, it is commonly taught that for the three alephs *a*, *i*, and *u*, the designated vowel may precede or follow the aleph. However, on page 268 Huehnergard states that for *a* and *u* the vowel always follows the aleph (with exceptions of course, pp. 279-280, n. 58), but that the *i* sign is used both for $\text{?}i$ and for any vowel preceding the aleph (a^2 , i^2 , u^2). The exceptions are precisely the problem, and Huehnergard's solution may not be regarded as final.

Huehnergard quietly ignores evidence of Canaanite shift in Ugaritic, and the question is not discussed in his orthography and phonology sections. A commonly cited example of Canaanite shift is $\text{?}olmatu$ ("future") as the vocalization of $\text{?}lmt$. However, the syllabic term on which this vocalization is based is $\text{?}u-ul-ma-tum$ (Sa numbers 198.8-9). The other three columns of the lexicon are badly damaged, making lexical identification of the term difficult. Huehnergard does point out, however, that ? rarely transcribes Ugaritic ? , though it may transcribe Ugaritic ? (pp. 98-99). Thus a different transcription and translation of $\text{?}ulmatum$ is proposed without bringing up the subject of Canaanite shift.

Another important example of Canaanite shift is *a-du-nu* (Jean Nougayrol, [ed. and trans.], "RS 19.139," line 2 in *Le Palais royal d'Ugarit*, ed. Claude F.-A. Schaeffer, Mission de Ras Shamra, vol. 12 [Paris, 1970], 6, pt. 1:109) which represents Ugaritic *adn* ("father" or "lord"). However, the syllabic form is part of a proper name, and thus is not considered by Huehnergard. In the lexicon the term occurs only as *a-da-nu*, the only syllabic transcription which Huehnergard recognizes (p. 104). Huehnergard is probably correct in not recognizing *a-du-nu* as representing standard Ugaritic, but the question remains: Where did the middle vowel come from? Does this name reflect the presence of Canaanite shift in one of the Northwest Semitic dialects of the surrounding area?

In the case of $\text{?}u-ul-ma-tum$ and $\text{?}lmt$, and even in the glossary entry for *adn*, one might wish that Huehnergard had taken up these presumed examples of Canaanite shift in Ugaritic, if only to debunk them as examples of the shift. There is a great deal of speculation and many premature conclusions circulating in the study of Ugaritic. As this book ignores some prominent examples of these, the student and even the scholar may become confused. The reader will profit by investigating what is not mentioned as well as what is mentioned in this book.

Huehnergard's book is an important contribution to the study of Ugaritic phonology and lexicography. This systematic treatment of the subject will provide an important stimulus for further work in the field.