

From Phrase to Clause: The Active Participle in Ugaritic

TANIA NOTARIUS*

Hebrew University; University of the Free State; Polis Institute

Received: March 4, 2020 • Accepted: July 11, 2021

© 2021 Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest



ABSTRACT

This paper suggests a morphological, syntactic, and semantic analysis of the active participle in Ugaritic. The formally ambiguous cases are interpreted by taking into account the syntactic and semantic properties of explicit cases. The syntactic usages of the participle are the attributive phrase, the substantivized attributive phrase, the agent-noun, and the circumstantial participial phrase. The semantic analysis points at explicit verbal properties of some participial phrases in Ugaritic: they can denote a stage-level predicative core acquiring episodic interpretations and attaching temporal arguments. I hypothesize that the prototypical context for the development of the predicative participle (sporadically attested in the language of Ugaritic prose and consistently in later Northwest Semitic languages) is a participial phrase that suggests stage-level episodic interpretation and assigns subject that is co-referential with the main-clause subject.

KEYWORDS

Ugaritic, Northwest Semitic languages, active participle, syntax, semantics, language change

* Corresponding Author. E-mail: tania.notarius@mail.huji.ac

The paper was first presented at the 6th Meeting of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Semitistik of the Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft in February 2015, Heidelberg. The present version of the paper was finalized during my stay at the University of Halle-Wittenberg—generously supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Fellowship—in 2018–2019. I am much obliged to the anonymous reviewers, whose comments stimulated me to refine the analysis thoroughly. My thanks also go to my research assistant John Thuppayath (Polis – the Jerusalem Institute of Languages and Humanities).

Abbreviations: KTU = Dietrich, Loretz, and Sanmartín 2013; EA = Rainey 2015; KAI = Donner and Röllig 2002; TAD = Porten and Yardeni 1986; DULAT = Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2015.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Late Bronze Age ancient North-West Semitic (NWS) languages, attested mainly in the 14th and 13th centuries' corpora from Ugarit and Canaan, the active participle was not a tense: it was not used as a verbal predicate denoting an event or situation and did not systematically render tense, aspect, and modality values.¹ The research on the verbal system in the Old Canaanite of El-Amarna omits discussion on active participle forms, or only remarks on their supposed insignificant role for the verbal system.² The research into Ugaritic suggests a broader view, considering the formal properties of the active *qātil* participle, and to its primarily nominal functions – adjectival and substantival.³

In contrast to the El-Amarna Canaanite and Ugaritic languages, the NWS languages of the Late Iron age (the first millennium BC), both in the Canaanite and Aramaic branches, attest for the predicative participle used as an expression of the imperfective aspect, overtaking the functions of the ancient imperfective prefix conjugation **yaqtulu*: as a (a) simple or progressive present, (b) progressive aspect in past or future temporal framework, and as a (c) historical present; cf. the examples in ex. 1.⁴

These examples demonstrate, that the NWS prefix imperfective *yaqtulu* abandoned its usages associated with the imperfective aspect leaving space for a new imperfective aspect form, rendered by the active participle. Other branches of Semitic do not reveal the same level of innovation on the Proto-Semitic participle.⁵

¹ For the pattern of active participle in Semitic languages, see Fox 2003: 238–243; in Amorite onomasticon the active participle is used as an agent-noun, also in predicative position, according to Golinet (2018: 128–136), and see also the bibliography there.

² Cf. in Rainey 1996 or Baranowski 2016, who do not discuss participle forms at all, and see Tropper and Vita 2010: 88–89: 'In Textkorpus des KA sind insgesamt nur sehr wenige Partizipien bezeugt, bringing two cases of the agent-noun usage *sú-ki-ni*, 'chief-commissioner', EA 256:9 and *ú-bi-il*, 'carrier', EA 288:12, 287:55, adding: 'Der Verwendung des activen Partizips (in Kombination mit Personalpronomina) zum Ausdruck des Präsens in jüngerer kanaänischen Sprachen is somit ganz eindeutig eine späte Entwicklung.'

³ On the formal marking and functions of the active participle in Ugaritic, see Gordon 1965: 77–78, Sivan 2001: 121–122, Bordreuil and Pardee 2009: 57; Huehnergard 2012: 59, and Tropper 2012: 471–473.

⁴ For Phoenician, see Krahmalkov 2001: 45–46, 153, 158, 199–200; cf. also Kerr 2010: 161. About the Old Aramaic of Neo-Assyrian period, cf. Degen 1969: 65, 69, 75, 77, who concludes on p. 116: 'Die wenigen belegen aktiven und passiven Partizipien werden wie Nomina konstruiert. Sie sind Subjekte oder Objekte in Verbal- und Nominalsätzen. Temporale Funktionen erfüllen sie in Aa (noch) nicht,' but Gzella (2004: 131 n. 43) points at the predicative participle case מְחַיֵּה in KAI (Nerab II) 226:5. For the predicative participle attested in the Aramaic of the Neo-Babylonian and Persian periods; see Hug 1993: 119, Gzella 2004: 305–309, Rogland 2003, Muraoka and Porten 2003: 203–207; for Epigraphic Hebrew cf. Gogel 1998: 111; for Biblical Hebrew see Joosten 1989, Cook 2008, and Notarius 2010. The data about the use of the predicative participle in different branches of NWS in the Late Iron Age period would need more systematic representation, which is outside the scope of the present article.

⁵ While this linguistic change in the temporal-aspectual verbal system is particularly characteristic for the North-West Semitic branch, the data from other Central Semitic language need further clarification: on Classical Arabic see the discussion in Marmorstein 2016: 152–157, and on Sabaic see Stein 2013 vol. 1: 51, 11. About the lack of predicative usages associated with the active *qātil* participle in East Semitic, namely in different branches of Akkadian, see Kouwenberg 2010: 209–210, and cf. von Soden 1995: §148. The Old Ethiopian language Ge'ez does not have a productive active participle of this type at all, see Tropper 2002: 98.



Ex. 1

TAM values	Late Bronze: 14–13 th cent. BC	Iron / Late Iron: 1 st mill. BC
a. actual present	KTU 2.39:21 <i>špšn tūbd</i> ‘Sun himself is perishing’ EA 90:24–25 i-nu-ma [yi]-i[l]-te ₉ -qú-šu-nu LÚ.GAZ.MEŠ ‘Now Apiru are taking them’	KAI 13.1 ʾNK PN ŠKN BʾRN Z ʾI, PN, lie in this coffin’ TAD A2.6:9 אלה בנן אלף ‘we are looking for a boat’
b. progressive	KTU 1.4 VI 24–26 <i>hn ym w tn tūkl išt b bhtn nblāt b hklm</i> ‘There, for day and second the fire was burning in the house, the flame in the palace’	Num 24:18 וְיִשְׂרָאֵל עֹשֶׂה הָיִל and Israel will be doing valiantly’ TAD A4.7:19 אנהנה שקקן לבשן וצימין ‘we have been wearing sackcloth and fasting’
c. historical present	KTU 1.15 I 8 <i>w y^{ny} krt t</i> ‘Then Kirta the noble answers’	TAD B2.8:4 אדין מומאה משה עליכי ‘then the oath came upon you’

A linguistic change does not occur all at once. Despite its limited role in the tense system, the active participle has syntactic representation in the NWS languages of the second mill BC that foreshadows its prospective historical development. In this paper I will concentrate on the syntactic and semantic analysis of the active participle in the Ugaritic corpus — the earliest NWS corpus that offers rich material about verbal morpho-syntax in different text-types written in alphabetic writing.⁶ A great amount of data attested in Ugaritic poetry illustrates the so-called ‘hymnic participle’ usage — a conventional stylistic device, widespread in Akkadian and Biblical Hebrew poetic discourse as well, that aims at describing divine or heroic attributes and deeds by means of participial phrases instead of a finite verbal clause.⁷ In what follows I will demonstrate that the syntactic properties and semantic scope of the Ugaritic hymnic participles are consistent with the language’s grammar and usage, attested in other text-types.

This paper is based on a comprehensive collection of cases of the active participle in the Ugaritic corpus (about 195 cases), excluding repetitive and parallel cases. I will first characterize the morphological hallmarks of participles which differentiate them from other verbal forms in the language (§2). Then I will depict the main syntactic functions of the participle, distinguishing four main syntactic usages: the agent noun (§3.1), the attributive phrase (§3.2), the substantivized attributive phrase (§3.3), and the circumstantial phrase (§3.4). Some possible cases of the predicative participle will be discussed in §3.5. Based on this formal analysis, a semantic analysis of the constructions involving the participle will be suggested (§4); it is claimed in this paper that the participial phrase can take episodic interpretations, assigning arguments and rendering tense and aspect functions. In the conclusion (§ 5), I will consider a prototypical context in which the predicative participle developed from a participial phrase by reanalyzing the syntactic role of the assigned subject.

⁶ The cases of the passive participle in Ugaritic attest to a different path of development; see (Notarius 2019).

⁷ On hymnic participles in Babylonian poetry, see von Soden 1932–33: 213–225, Groneberg 1971, and Groneberg 1987: 46–49; according to Groneberg 1987, this usage is properly nominal, cf. also GAG von Soden 1995: §148c, Kouwenberg 2010: 204, and Huehnergard 2012: 197. The hymnic participle is widely attested in Biblical Hebrew poetry in its Classical stage, see Crüsemann 1969; it also found its way into the Old Aramaic literary style as attested in the Tel-Fakhariya-Inscription (KAI 309): מעדן, משקי, נתן, מהנחת, in lines 2–5.



2. PARTICIPLE: THE MORPHOLOGICAL MARKING

A study of the syntactic and semantic properties of the active participle in Ugaritic faces a basic methodological challenge: the consonantal writing complicates a clear-cut identification of some forms, and presumed participles can be homographs of the suffix conjugation or the infinitive forms.⁸ In general, participles can be marked fully or partially by the following formal means:

1. Some affixes:

1.1. The *-t* ending contrasts feminine participles to infinitives and suffix-conjugations in the plural; see *ḥtbt*, '(the women) cutting wood', et al. in Ex. 2a; but not to the suffix conjugation in the singular; see *nšrt*, 'sobbing', in 2b.

1.2. The *-m* ending contrasts masculine plural participles to the suffix-conjugation (but not to the infinitive) because the enclitic *-m* is practically rare in the suffix-conjugation; see *yrdm*, 'those who descend', and *qmm*, 'standing', in Ex. 2c and 2d.⁹

1.3. The prefix *m-* is an explicit marking of participles in the derived stems except in the N-stem; see *mmlāt*, '(the women who are) filling', in Ex. 2a.

2. The II-² verbs denote the second *i*-vowel contrasting G participles to G infinitives and dynamic suffix-forms; see *šibt*, '(the women drawing) water', and *šiy*, 'killer', in Ex. 2a and 2e.¹⁰

3. In the III-*y* verbs the out-spelled triphthong excludes the dynamic G-stem suffix-conjugation, see *šiy*, 'killer', *ány*, 'lamenting', in Exs. 2e and 2f; whereas with the feminine *-t* ending the triphthong is reduced in the singular; see *bkt* /bākīy(a)tV > bākīV/, 'weeping', in Ex. 2b, but preserved in the plural, cf. *bkyt* /bākīyātV/, 'female mourners' (1.19 IV 20).

4. In the III-² verbs the spelling *-i-* contrasts the feminine singular participle with the 3fem sing suffix conjugation; see *qrit*, '(she is) calling', in Ex. 2g (and cf. the discussion below). In masculine forms the spelling of *aleph* marks the case ending, see *spū*, '(the one who) consumes', *šnú*, 'haters', in Ex. 2h:

⁸ Cf. the statement of Piquer Otero (2007: 31): «Contribuye, no obstante, a aumentar la incertidumbre en las conclusiones que puedan extraerse sobre la conjugación aformativa, dada la coincidencia de su 3ª persona del singular masculino con infinitivo y participio G en el esquema consonántico. Las principales soluciones propuestas han seguido la evolución que hemos expuesto a lo largo de este capítulo: valor aspectual 'perfectivo', valor temporal de pretérito.» Thus in KTU 1.108: 8 w 'nt *dī dīt rhpt*, 'Anat flies, she hovers', considered later in this article, the forms *dīt* and *rhpt* are participles according to Rainey (1974: 188), Sivan (2001: 121): /rāḥip(a)tu/, and Tropper (2012: 184, 551: /dā'iyat > dā'iyt > dā'īt/, but are suffix conjugation in Pardee 2002: 194, who interprets *dīt* as a noun 'kite' and Pardee 1988: 105 where *rhpt* is a suffix form of G or D stem. In KTU 1.114: 1-2 *il dbḥ b bth mšd šd b qrb hklh šḥ l qš ilm*. 'Ilu slaughters game in his house, prey within his palace; he invites the gods to partake' Bordreuil and Pardee (2009: 196) vocalize *dbḥ* and *šḥ* as participles: /dābiḥu/, /šāḥu/, while *šd* is a noun (DULAT translates in present); but Tropper (2012: 648) claims that *šd*, *šḥ*, and *dbḥ* are suffix conjugation forms, and see the discussion below.

⁹ Cf. Tropper 2012: 829 who mentions a possible case *qrym* (1.19 IV 29) but it is better explained as an infinitive.

¹⁰ See Tropper 2012: 472: if there is an explicit evidence for an active *qatala* pattern of a particular II-² verbs, the II-²i spelling would be an indication of the participle.



Ex. 2

- a. KTU 1.14 III 7-10 *s't b šdm ḥḫbt b grnt ḥpšt s't b n<p>k šibt b mqr mmlāt* 'Sweep from the fields the women cutting wood, from the threshing-floor the women picking straw! Sweep from the well the women drawing water, from the spring, the women filling jars.'
- b. KTU 1.16 VI 4-5 *bkt tgly w tbū nšrt tbū pnm* 'weeping she made her way (to the house of PN) and entered, sobbing she went inside.'
- c. KTU 1.4 VIII 8-9 *tspr b yrdm ārš* 'be counted among those who descend to the Netherworld.'
- d. KTU 1.2 I 31-32 *qmm ātr āmr [tn]y d'thm* 'standing, they transmitted the demand, repeat their instruction.'
- e. KTU 1.18 IV 23-24 *špk km šiy dm km šḫ l brkh* 'spill the blood like a butcher, down to his knees, like a killer.'
- f. KTU 1.3 V 35 *āny l yšh tr il* 'lamenting, indeed he cries to Bull El.'
- g. KTU 1.100:1-2 *ūm pḫl pḫlt bt 'n bt ābn bt šmm w thm qrit l 'pš ūmh* 'The mother of stallion and mare, daughter of spring, daughter of stone, daughter of Heavens and Deep, is calling to Shapsh, her mother.'
- h. KTU 1.17 I 31 *spū ksmh bt b'ł* '(who) consumes his share in the temple of Baal'; see also 1.4 VII 36 *šnū hd* 'the haters of Baal.'

The formal criteria partly disambiguate many of the cases in Ex. 2. In Ex. 2a forms like *šibt* / šā'ibāti/, 'the women drawing water', and *mmlāt* / mumal(i)ʾāti/, 'the women [who are] filling', are feminine plural participles marked by the middle radical *'i*, prefix *m-*, and suffix *-t* of plural, but in 2b *bkt* / bākītu/, 'weeping', and *nšrt* / nāširtu/, 'sobbing', remain ambiguous because the suffix-conjugation 3rd feminine singular forms have the same spelling. In Ex. 2c *yrdm* / yāridīma/, 'those who descend', the *-m* ending denotes a masculine plural participle that governs a complement in accusative *ārš* / ʾarša/, 'the Netherworld', but *qmm* / qāmūma/, 'standing', in Ex. 2d remains ambiguous and could be an infinitive. In Ex. 2e *šiy* / šā'iyi/, 'killer', is clearly a participle marked by the middle-*'i* and the preserved *-iyi-* triptong, but *āny* / ʾāniyu/, 'lamenting', in Ex. 2f can be interpreted as an infinitive. In Ex. 2g *qrit* / qāriʾ(a)tu/, '(she is) calling', is a participle in the feminine singular, as the suffix conjugation form would expectedly be *qrāt* / qar(a)ʾat/, but the form, like *spū*, '(the one who) consumes', (Ex. 2h), can be interpreted as an infinitive.

3. UGARITIC ACTIVE PARTICIPLE: SYNTACTIC FUNCTIONS

Altogether, plain morphological criteria are not enough, and syntactic criteria are equally required. In what follows it will be demonstrated that the Ugaritic active participle is used in four main syntactic functions: as an agent noun, an attribute or attributive phrase, a substantivized attributive phrase, or a circumstantial phrase, while the predicative usage is only sporadically attested.¹¹ The cumulative data about the morphological marking and syntactic function help in disambiguating many cases.

¹¹ According to Huehnergard (2012: 59), the participles can be used either attributively (modifying a noun) or substantively (as an agent noun). Tropper (2012: 477) suggests a much more detailed description emphasizing the following syntactic characteristics: (1) participles are used as nominal attributes – i.e. adjectively, (2) or as verbal arguments – i.e. adverbially; (3) participles have substantive use, namely are used as agent nouns to denote profession, occupation, etc.; (4) participles appear as nouns in construct attaching genitives, (5) or attaching pronominal



3.1. Agent Noun

The most common usage of the active participle in Ugaritic is *nomen agentis* (agent noun). Agent nouns are generic nouns that refer to a person by his/her typical occupation or activity. There are dozens of agent nouns in the corpus, apparently derived from dynamic verbs in the active participle pattern **qātil*, although in some cases the morphological pattern is speculative. Basically, they have all the nominal characteristics: they can be used as a proper name (*hby* DN (1.114:19)), appear in construct chains both as *nomen regens* and *nomen rectum* (*mḥš āḥy* ‘my brother’s killer’ (1.19 IV 34); *ydy dbbm* ‘banishment of foul-mouthed creatures’ (1.169:1), or attach a pronominal suffix (*āgrtn* ‘our mistress’ (1.19 IV 51)). In a clause, agent nouns can be a subject (Ex. 3a), object (Ex. 3b), stay in apposition (Ex. 3c), or appear in a prepositional phrase (Ex. 3d); in administrative texts, agent nouns are common in lists and titles. Rarely, the participial agent noun is used in a predicative position (see Ex. 3e, and see the discussion in § 3.5 below):

Ex. 3

a. KTU 1.14 I 25 *klhn šph yṭbd w b phyrh yrt* ‘in their entirety the family perished, and in its totality – the heir;’ cf. also *mḥš*, ‘charmer/magician’, (1.100:5), *āklm*, ‘the Voracious Ones’, (1.12 II 35), and many.

b. KTU 1.10 II 24–25 *nṯsn b ārš iby w b špr qm āḥk* ‘we shall attack, in the ‘earth’, my enemies, in the dust – your brother’s adversaries;’ cf. also *gllm*, ‘the thirsty ones’, (1.12 II 34) and more.

c. KTU 1.2 I 34 *tḥm ym b⁹lkm [ad]nkm tpṭ nhr* ‘Message of Yam, your Master, your Lord, the Ruler Nehar;’ see also *tnnm*, ‘archers’, (1.23:26), *sīd*, ‘the chief butler’. (1.3 I 3) and more.

d. KTU 1.18 IV 23–24 *špk km šīy dm km šḥṭ l brkh* ‘spill the blood like a butcher, down to his knees, like a killer;’ see also *p ākl*, ‘mouth of the devourer’, (1.107:35), *b ḥrtm*, ‘among ploughmen’, (4.141:3) and more.

e. KTU 2.17:7 *ānk šm mlākth šmšh* ‘I was his auditor in his embassy;’ cf. also *krtn dbḥ dbḥ* ‘Kirta is the one who offer a sacrifice’ (1.16 I 39),¹² *qnyt ilm il* ‘a creator (fem) of gods’ (1.4 I 2), *ānh* ‘complainer’ (1.17 I 17).

3.2. Attributive Phrase

The participle or participial phrase with arguments can be used as an attributive phrase, referring to a nominal antecedent. The antecedent either immediately precedes a participle (see Ex. 4a), or, in some cases, can be remote from it (Ex. 4b). The nominal antecedent is common in the position of a vocative or a subject in the main clause (cf. Ex. 4a, b), so that sometimes the distinction between the attributive and predicative functions of an active participle is not straightforward (see

suffixes; (6) moreover, participles can have verbal rection in the accusative. As a matter of fact, participles rarely take pronominal suffixes, usually in possessive *nīsh* ‘his abusers’ (1.17 I 28), *mšqbk* ‘your rival’ (1.18 I 19), *āgrtn* ‘our mistress’ (1.19 IV 51), and occasionally objective *m’msh* ‘who support him’ (1.17 I 30), functions. Participles are never preceded by the modal assertive particle *l* (or *āl*), since it hardly ever expresses the proposition; on the negative usage and with the relativizer *d-*, see below.

¹² The case was compared to the agent noun /*dābiḥu*/ ‘sacrificer’, attested in Emar, see Pentiuć 2001: 193–194, DULAT 259, parallel to *mlk šsr ššrt* the king gives a banquet (1.16 I 40): according to DULAT 185, *šsr* is D-stem, and can be interpreted as a suffix conjugation.



Ex. 4d, and cf. the discussion in §3.5 and in the conclusion below). Rarely, the antecedent is an object or a prepositional phrase in the main clause (Ex. 4c).¹³ In Ugaritic the antecedent always controls the subject of the attributive participial phrase:

Ex. 4

- a. KTU 1. 23:40 *y mt mt nḥtm ḥḥk mmmnm mṭ ydk* ‘O man, man, preparing your staff, grasping your rod in your right hand;’¹⁴ see also *ḡnt*, ‘(the one who) gulps’, (1.108:11), *mḥst*, ‘(the one who) wounded’, (1.19 IV 58), *ynqm*, ‘(the ones who) suck’, (1.23:24), *ḥqntm* ‘stranglers’, (1.39:18), *hlkm*, ‘(the ones) coming with’ (1.23:27), and many.
- b. KTU 1.17 I 25–33 *w ykn bnh b bt šrš b qrb hklh nšb skn ilibh b qdš ztr ‘mh l ārš mššū qtrh l ‘pr dmr ātrh ṭbq lḥt nišh grš d ‘šy lnh āḥd ydh b škrn m‘msh [k] šb‘ yn spū ksmh bt b‘l [w] mnth bt il ṭḥ ggh b ym [ṭi] ṭ rḥš npšh b ym rt* ‘so that he may have a son in his house, a scion within his palace: (someone to) raise up the stela of his father’s god, in the sanctuary the votive emblem of his clan; to send up from the earth his incense, in the dust (he) protects his remains; to shut up the jaws of his detractors, to drive out anyone who would do him in; to take his hand when (he is) drunk, to bear him up when he is full of wine; to supply his grain(-offering) in the Temple of Balu, his portion in the Temple of Ilu; to roll his roof when rain softens it up, to wash his outfit on a muddy day;’¹⁵ see also *mtkt*, ‘(the one who) takes’, (1.15 I 1), *yrdt*, ‘(the ones who) go down’, (1.24:42).
- c. KTU 1.15 II 26 *tld yšb ḡlm ynq ḥlb ā[trt mšš ṭd btlṭ] [ṣnt]* ‘she will give birth to the prince PN who will suck the milk of DN; who sucks (will suck) the breasts of the virgin [DN];’ cf. also *mšdpt* ‘throwing’ (1.14 III 14), *ynqm* ‘sucking’ (1.23:24), *yrdt* ‘(those who) come down’ (1.24:42); for the antecedent in a prepositional phrase cf. *ḥrt* ‘ploughing’ (1.14 III 18), *npl*, ‘(the one who had) fallen’ (1.5 VI 8).
- d. KTU 1.96:1–2 *ṣnn hlkt w šnwt* ‘the evil eye (that) walks also transforms;’ cf. also *w ṣnt di dīt rḥpt [b šm]m rm[m] āklṭ ṣgl il* ‘Anat of flying (who) flies, hovers in the high heavens, devours the divine Bullock’ (1.108: 8), *škn* ‘(the one who) dwells’, *nḡr*, ‘(the one who) takes care’, (2.39:6), *šrk* ‘(the one who) joins’ (1.15 V 17), *mšprt* ‘(the one) who watches over’ (1.23:25).

The distribution of cases gathered in Ex. 4 shows that this usage is particularly common in poetry and is one of the most typical manifestations of the ‘hymnic participle’ as a conventional stylistic device. These long chains of attributive participial phrases (cf. also *yṭb*, *ṭpṣ* ‘residing, judging’ [1.108:2–3], *ynq*, *mšš* ‘sucking, sucking’ [1.15 II 26], *tkmt*, *ḥspt*, *ydc[t]* ‘carrying, collecting dew, knowing’ [1.19 II 1–3]) are used to create a manifold description of a divine or human person, referring to his/her typical or concrete actions.

¹³ This syntactic tendency points towards the participial phrase as a reduced relative clause that modifies the most promoted, topicalized element of the sentence. On relativization as one of the syntactic characteristics of subjects as clause topics, see Keenan 1976.

¹⁴ The form *mmnm* is an L-stem participle of a denominative verb *ymn* ‘do with right hand, direct’ used with enclitic *-m*, see Bordreuil and Pardee 2009: 185; thus also in lines 43–44, 47 in the same text.

¹⁵ For the *dmr*, ‘protect’, participle, see DULAT: 124, 184; but Bordreuil and Pardee (2009: 175) vocalize it as an infinitive.



3.3. Substantivized Attributive Phrase

Substantivized participial phrases are participles in attributive functions with a zero antecedent.¹⁶ As the cases in Ex. 5 demonstrate, the zero antecedent can be in any syntactic position in the matrix clause so that the substantivized attributive participial phrases are used as subjects (see Ex. 5a, e), objects, commonly as *nomen regens* (see Ex. 5b, f), or in prepositional phrases (see Ex. 5c); the position of *nomen rectum* is practically rare, but cf. *šlm šmš rgmk nšm* ‘the well-being of those who hear your good word’ (2.86:17–19). In some cases, substantivized attributive phrases are not easily distinguished from agent nouns (see Ex. 5d):

Ex. 5

- a. KTU 1.18 I 19 *dṭ ydṭ m'qbk* ‘whoever opposes you will certainly become soft;’ see also *šbd dgn*, ‘those who cultivate the grain’, 1.16 III 13, *šnū hd*, ‘the haters of DN’, 1.4 VII 36, and many.
- b. KTU 1.19 IV 39–40 *tmḥš mḥš[āḥh] tkl mkly 'l ūmt* ‘May she (you) slay the slayer of [her sibling], finish who finished the family;’ see also *mštšltm*, ‘two consecrated women’, 1.23:31, *mzmā*, ‘thirsty one’, 1.15 I 2, *gršt ydṭ*, ‘she who casts out, expels’ 1.16 V 27, *grš ym*, ‘(the one who) drives away DN’, 1.2 IV 12, *mrḡtm ṭd*, ‘(the ones who) suck at the teat’, 1.4 III 41, *šil šlmy*, ‘(the one who) who would ask’, 2.63:8.
- c. KTU 1.4 VIII 8–9 *tspr b yrdm ārš* ‘be counted among those who descend to the Netherworld;’ see also *k yrdm ārš*, ‘like those who descend to the Netherworld’, 1.114: 22, *l šbrm*, ‘for guests’, 1.22 I 15, *bd nsfk*, ‘at the hands of those who uproot you’, 1.19 III 54.
- d. KTU 1.19 IV 20–21 *t[bš b] bty bkyt bhkly mšpdt b ḥzrh pžgm gr* ‘go from my house (female) mourners, from my palace wailing women, from my mansion those lacerating (their) skin;’ cf. also *ḥtbt*, ‘the women cutting wood’, *mmlāt*, ‘(the ones who) fill up’, *ḥpšt*, ‘(the ones who) gather’, 1.14 III 7–10, *mḥllm*, ‘desacralizers’, 1.119: 23, *šbd dgn* ‘those who cultivate the grain’, 1.16 III 13, and more.
- e. KTU 1.16 V 11–12 *my b ilm ydy mrš gršm zbln* ‘who among the gods (is the one who) expels the illness, will be able to drive out the sickness?’
- f. KTU 1.17 I 29 *grš d ššy lnh* ‘ejects one who does something to him.’¹⁷

Long chains of participial phrases are typical in this usage as well, as part of the ‘hymnic participle’ strategy: see in Ex. 5b, d and cf. *ydy*, *gršm*, ‘(the ones who) drive out, (the one who) expels’, (1.16 V 11–12). In substantivized attributive phrases, participles attach dependent arguments either nominally, in the genitive (*šbd dgn* ‘those who cultivate the grain’ [1.16 III 13], *šnū hd*, ‘the haters of DN’, [1.4 VII 36]), or verbally with a preposition (*mkly 'l ūmt* [‘the one who] finished your family’ [1.19 IV 39–40]), or in an accusative case [*yrdm ārš*, ‘[the ones who] descend to the Netherworld;’ [1.4 VIII 8–9], *pžgm gr*, ‘[the ones who] lacerate [their] skin’ [1.19 IV 11], *mrḡtm ṭd*, ‘[the ones who] suck at the teat’, [1.4 III 41]), if *-m* is a plural ending. The type of rection can

¹⁶ On the zero nominal anaphoric element used as an antecedent in such constructions, see the discussion in Baker 2003 and Miller-Naudé and Naudé 2016, and the bibliography there.

¹⁷ Cf. DULAT 188. According to the vocalization of Bordreuil and Pardee (2009: 175), this participle as an object is in the accusative /dā ‘āšiya/. However, *ydf* in [[d]] *ydy l ydf* ‘the one who knows the exorcism’ (1.178:1) is not necessarily a participle – the verb of cognition is preceded by its argument and is negated by *l*.



vary within the same verse (Ex. 5e).¹⁸ As a rule, the participle in an attributive and substantivized attributive phrase takes the first position in a phrase and precedes its arguments. A unique exception would be *rgb yd mtk̄t mzmā yd mtk̄t*, ‘(she who) takes the hungry by the hand, takes the thirsty by the hand’ (1.15 I 1–2), but the context is obscure and perhaps *mtk̄t* is not a participle but a suffix conjugation form. Normally, the substantivized participial phrase in Ugaritic is not introduced by a relative particle *d-*, but some exceptions are possible (see Ex. 5f above).

3.4. Circumstantial Phrase

Much more rarely, the participial phrase can be used as a circumstantial phrase. The circumstantial participial phrase always precedes the main clause, and the implied subject is co-referential with the main-clause subject, agreeing with it grammatically in gender and number.¹⁹ Probably, the circumstantial participial phrase can be viewed as a subject-relativized attributive phrase in a fronted position, abandoning its syntactic host. As a result of this movement, the circumstantial participial phrase functions as an adverbial argument in the main clause,²⁰ denoting an event concomitant with the main-verb event (see also the discussion in § 4.3 below). It is not in the position of a subject controlled by a zero antecedent, in contrast to substantivized phrases.

Ex. 6

a. KTU 1.3 III 47 - IV 7 *trd* b^l b mrym špn mššš k šr ūdnh gršh l k̄sī mlkh l nht l k̄ht drkth mnm īb yp^l l b^l šrt l rkb r̄pt ‘Expelling Baal from the heights, driving (him) out like a bird from his dominion, driving him from the throne of his power, has an enemy against Baal risen, a foe against the Cloud-Rider?’²¹

b. KTU 1.16 VI 4-5 *bkt* tgly w tbū nšrt tbū pnm ‘weeping she made her way (to the house of PN) and entered, sobbing she went inside.’

c. KTU 1.2 I 31-32 *qmm* ātr āmr [tn]y d^lthm ‘standing, they transmitted (their) demand, repeat their instruction;’²² cf. also *bkm* yšny ‘weeping, he answers’ (1.107:12) (in a very broken context); *qm* ydb w yšr ‘standing up he intoned and sang’ (1.3 I 18); *qm* ‘standing’ (1.3 I 4, 1.4 III 12).

d. KTU 1.3 V 35 *āny* l yšh tr il ‘lamenting, indeed he cries to Bull El.’

In Ex. 6a the chain of participial phrases *trd*, *mššš*, and *gršh* stand in a fronted position, preceding the rhetorical question. One of the cases in this example (*mššš* ‘[the one who] drives out’) is unambiguously marked as a participle. The other examples (Ex. 6b-d) in a similar syntactic environ-

¹⁸ According to Tropper (2012: 478–480), the participle in Ugaritic demonstrates different strategies in attaching modifiers: some are attributed in the genitive; some are obviously objects in the accusative (marked by the remoteness of the argument or by mimation on the participle), and some are prepositional phrases.

¹⁹ A possible exception could be *ytn gh bky* ‘he gave his voice weeping’ (1.16 I 13), an apparent circumstantial usage of the participle that is not fronted and is object-controlled. The parallel case with a verb in the feminine (*ttn gh bky* ‘she gave her voice weeping’ [1.16 II 35]) shows that the apparent participle *bky* is not in agreement with the subject, and either agrees with the object *gh* in attributive function or depends syntactically on the verb *ytn* ‘gave’ in accusative case. Alternatively, it could be a verbal noun (‘in weeping’); cf. Tropper 2012: 213, 482, 666.

²⁰ According to Tropper (2012: 477), the participial phrases used as adverbs are in the accusative case, but I am not aware of any explicit example of such a case marking.

²¹ For the translation and interpretation of participles, cf. DULAT: 187, 309, 630, 890; cf. also Tropper 2012: 478.

²² For the reading *ātr* ‘they transmitted’ or ‘pronounce’, see M. Smith 1994: 263; see also Tropper 2012: 477.



ment are formally ambiguous cases (cf. Ex. 2b, d, f above and the discussion there): *bkt* and *nšrt* in 6b could be participles or suffix-conjugations, but not infinitives; *qmm* (as well as *bkm* and *qm*) in Ex. 6c could be a participle in the masculine plural or an infinitive with the enclitic *-m*, but hardly a suffix-conjugation; equally, *ány* in Ex. 6d could either be a participle or an infinitive, not a suffix-conjugation. The cases in Ex. 6 have the same syntactic and semantic function, complementing each other as cumulative evidence of the circumstantial participial phrase: *mššš* is unambiguously a participle, *qmm* and *ány* exclude a suffix-conjugation interpretation, and *bkt* and *nšrt* exclude the infinitive interpretation. The participle seems to be the best formal solution for all these cases.

3.5 Predicative Usage

Although the predicative participle, as claimed above, is not a typical hallmark of the Ugaritic verbal system, the active participle is sporadically attested in predicate usage (for the cases of the agent-noun used as a nominal predicate cf. Ex. 3e above; the distinction between the attributive and predicative usages of a participle can remain ambiguous in some instances, see in Ex. 4d above and cf. the following discussion in §5).

Some verbal predicates remain debated: these are verbs interpreted as the present tense, which can be parsed as a suffix conjugation or an active participle (Ex. 7a), or as an active participle or an infinitive with the 1st person singular pronominal subject (Ex. 7b). The negative existential particle *in* seems to suggest the active participle parsing of the verbal form (Ex. 7c). An attributive participial phrase, assigning the resumptive pronoun cogently in the function of subject, acquires a predicative function (see Ex. 7e). The active participle in the predicative position denoting progressive aspect is quite explicit morphologically in at least one case (*qrit* in ex. 7d); less certain is the form in a relative clause introduced by the particle *d* (Ex. 7f), an equivalent of the attributive usage:

Ex. 7

a. KTU 1.114:1-2 *il dbh b bth mšd šd b qrb hklh šh l qš ilm* ‘Ilu slaughters game in his house, prey within his palace; he invites the gods to partake’;²³ cf. also *im ht l b mšqt ytb qrt* ‘if the city is really (placed) in a trouble’ (2.72:20–24),²⁴ *ql ‘fell’* (1.114:21),²⁵ *k hr ššw* ‘the horse has spasms’ (1.85:5 and parallels).²⁶

b. KTU 1.2 I 28 *w ank fny* ‘I myself is going to reply’;²⁷ cf. also *w rgm ank* ‘and I say’ (2.42:25).

²³ As mentioned above, Bordreuil and Pardee (2009: 196) vocalize *dbh* and *šh* as participles, whereas *šd* is a noun: *dābiḥu*, *šāḥu*, *šēda*. DULAT 259, 767, 706 translate the verbs in the present and parse *dbh* as a participle and *šh* as an infinitive. However Tropper (2012: 648, 713) explicitly claims that *dbh*, *šd*, and *šh* are suffix conjugation forms. Lewis (1997: 194) also interprets *šd* as a verbal form.

²⁴ For this case see Tropper 2012: 636; DULAT 978–979. The stative semantics of the verb *ytb* ‘sit, dwell’ might preclude the active participle morphology, and the suffix conjugation is equally possible, although the representative *ht* suggests an actual present tense interpretation.

²⁵ Cf. Tropper 2012: 648; DULAT 687–688.

²⁶ The form is usually interpreted as a suffix conjugation, cf. DULAT 401. Cf. also *yldt* ‘gives birth’ (1.179:22) but this is too fragmentary to translate; *yṭb*, ‘is seated’, (1.23:29, 8) is hardly a participle.

²⁷ Thus in DULAT 169, but this is uncertain, and it could be an infinitive in predicative function.



c. KTU 2.90:18–20 *k in [h]lk w l likt 'm mlk w 'mkm likt* ‘although he is not coming, I don’t write to the king, but to you I am writing,’²⁸ *w ank inny ydft* ‘but I don’t know’ (2.108:4); *in b ilm snyh* ‘there was none among the gods answering him’ (1.16 V 16).

d. KTU 1.100:1–2 *um phl phlt bt 'n bt abn bt šmm w thm qrit l 'pš umh* ‘The mother of stallion and mare, daughter of spring, daughter of stone, daughter of Heavens and Deep, is calling to Shapsh, her mother.’²⁹

e. KTU 1.4 II 22–26 *ijk mgy āliyn bšl ik mgyt b[t]lt šnt mšy hm [m]hš bny hm [mkly š]brt āryy* ‘how is it that Baal, the ‘Most Powerful’, arrived, how is it that the Virgin Anat arrived? they are my assassins, the assassins of my sons, destroyers of the clan of my kin;’ and parallels; cf. also *w mspr hnd hwm* ‘the one who recited this is he himself’ (1.179:41), but less evident.

f. KTU 3.33:7 *npk kwr d hlk b nhl* ‘the spring of PH that flows in the torrent;’ see also *w mlk d mlk b hwt* ‘the king who rules in the country’ (2.47:12).

Most of the cases collected in Ex. 7 are prosaic. However, the scarce nature of the data impedes making decisive conclusions.

4. PARTICIPIAL PHRASE IN UGARITIC: SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

4.1. Individual vs. Stage-level Predication in Participial Phrases

The Ugaritic participle is a deverbal adjective, and as such it is neither a noun nor a verb.³⁰ On the one hand, the agent-noun, the most common usage of the active participle in Ugaritic, is a result of a morphological operation, by which the participle gets the referential index, becoming a generic noun. On the other hand, the attributive and related usages of the active participle acquire characteristics, associated with verbal semantics, denoting events and assigning subjects, not as an inflectional morpheme, but applied from the matrix clause: in attributive participial phrases, the subject is controlled by the nominal antecedent; in substantivized attributive phrases by the zero antecedent; in circumstantial participial phrases the subject is co-referential with the main-clause subject. In other words, the participial phrase can be interpreted as encoding a predicative core.³¹

²⁸ The negative particle *in* suggests a participle, cf. Bordreuil and Pardee 2009: 33, Bordreuil, Pardee, and Hawley 2012: 95; and see DULAT: 74.

²⁹ For the form *qrit* /qāri'(a)tu/, ‘(she is) calling’, in (1.100:2) as a feminine singular participle in predicative use, see Huehnergard 2012: 59 and Sivan 2001: 69; according to Tropper (2012: 472): ‘kann nicht SK 3fsg sein (man erwartet *qrāt*)’.

³⁰ On verbs, nouns, and adjectives as distinct lexical classes, see Baker 2003: According to his approach, while verbs take a specifier, normally assigned as an agent theta-role, nouns have criteria of identity, bearing referential indices, whereas adjectives have neither of these.

³¹ According to Goldenberg (2013a: 230 and 2013b: 82), the attributive relation is a syntactic complex that incorporates both the attributed quality and the possessor of the quality. According to Isac (2003) the attributive relation can be described as a restrictive relative clause, whereas Kayne (1994: 100) interprets the participial phrase as a reduced relative clause.



In the terminology suggested in the seminal work of Gregory Carlson, a predicative core can be either individual-level or stage-level.³² Individual-level predicates are genuinely generic, whereas stage-level predicates are eventive and, as demonstrated by Angelika Kratzer, are spatially and temporally located.³³ However, as claimed in the scholarship, an eventive stage-level predicate can be ambiguous and obtain either habitual/generic or episodic interpretations: for e.g., the utterance ‘Mary ate oatmeal’ with a frequency adverb ‘every morning’ is habitual but with a temporal adverb ‘yesterday’ is episodic.³⁴

This approach is applicable to the predicative core of participial phrases in Ugaritic. Agent nouns are, by definition, individual-level and generic; in fact, they are a result of a lexicalization of substantivized participial phrases in an individual-level (generic) interpretation, by which a zero-antecedent loses its separate syntactic status and the referentiality is expressed by the participle form itself: *šḥt* (1.18 IV 24) ‘(one) killing’ => ‘killer’ (cf. the discussion in §3.1 above). Some attributive participial phrases are individual-level predicates specifying the quality of the antecedent (cf. Ex. 8a). Substantivized attributive phrases as individual-level predicates are sometimes not easily distinguishable from agent nouns (cf. Ex. 8b, and see also in Ex. 5d above):

Ex. 8

a. KTU 1.108:2-3 *il ytb b šṭrt il tpz b ḥdr’y* ‘the god residing in TN, the god judging in TN;’ see also *ḡnt* ‘gulping’ (1.108:11), *šd* ‘hunting’ (1.108:12), *ḥrt* ‘working’ (1.14 III 18), *ynq* ‘sucking’ (1.15 II 6).

b. KTU 1.4 VI 56 (and parallels) *pq mrgtm td* ‘they obtained (animals) who suck at the teat;’ cf. also *nsfk* ‘those who uproot you’ (1.19 III 54), *šmš* ‘those who hear’.

4.2 Stage-level Predicates and Temporal Arguments

Many participial phrases are stage-level predicates that can obtain either generic or episodic interpretation, depending on the core arguments’ referentiality, temporal and spatial arguments, and other pragmatic factors. In the largest amount of cases collected in this work, the stage-level participles impose a generic (iterative or habitual) interpretation combined with the indefinite and non-referential antecedent and the implied frequency adverb ‘ever, always’: for e.g., ‘(whoever) descends to the Netherworld’ in Ex. 9a.

The stage-level participles that necessitate episodic interpretation deserve special attention: the episodic interpretation is validated if the core arguments of predication are concrete and referential, and the temporal-spatial location is available—e.g., in Ex. 9b-e, the core arguments are

³² See Carlson 1980: stage-level predicates are true at a temporal stage of a subject, e.g. ‘Bill is hungry’; individual-level ones are true throughout the subject’s life-span, e.g. ‘Bill has blue eyes’. In other words, while stage-level predicates report events, individual-level predicates report individual properties.

³³ Cf. Chierchia 1995, Kratzer 1995.

³⁴ See the discussion in Dahl 1995, or Carlson 2006. In terms of this approach, there is a distinction between generics that are individual-level kind-generalizations (‘Beavers build dams’) and generalizing (iterative and habitual) sayings that are stage-level situation-generalizations (‘In the summer they wear short skirts’); cf. also Smith 2003: 72–74. The distinction between generics and generalizing sayings is difficult to follow up consistently in the analysis of participial phrases and is largely ignored in the following discussion.



definite and the temporal argument is applied either referring to the main-clause event or, even, to speech-time, as implied by pragmatic factors:

Ex. 9

- a. KTU 1.4 VII 8-9 *tspr b yrdm arš* ‘be counted among those who descend to the Netherworld;’ and many.
- b. KTU 1.19 IV 39-40 (and parallels) *tmḥš mḥš[āḥh] tkl mkly ḥl ūmt* ‘May she slay the slayer of [her sibling], finish who finished the brother;’ cf. also *mḥšt* ‘(the hand) which wounded’ (1.19 IV 58), *mḥsy* ‘my assassins’, *mḥš* ‘assassins of [my son]’, *mkly* ‘the destroyers of (my clan)’ (1.4 II 22–26), *npl*, ‘(the one who had) fallen’ (1.5 VI 8), *ʿnyh* ‘answering him’ (1.16 V 16).
- c. KTU 1. 23:40 *y mt mt nḥtm ḥḥk mmnm mḥ ydk* ‘O man, man, preparing your staff, grasping your rod in your right hand.’
- d. KTU 1.3 IV 1-4 *ṯrd bḥl b mrym špn mššš k ʿsr ūdnh gršh l kš mlkh l nḥt l khṭ drkth mnm ib yp l bḥl šrt l rkb ʿrpt* ‘Expelling Baal from the heights, driving (him) out like a bird from his dominion, driving him from the throne of his power, has an enemy risen, a foe against the Cloud-Rider?’
- e. KTU 1.16 VI 4-5 *bkt tgly w tbū nšrt tbū pnm* ‘weeping she made her way and entered, sobbing she went inside;’ cf. also *bkm* ‘weeping’ (1.107:12), *mšdpt* ‘throwing’ (1.14 III 14), *bky* ‘in cry’ (1.16 I 13 // 1.16 II 35, if indeed a participle), *qmm* ‘standing’ (1.2 I 31), *qm* ‘standing’ (1.3 I 18), *āny* ‘lamenting’ (1.3 V 35), *hlkt*, *šnwt* ‘walks, transforms’ (1.96:1-2), *dīt*, *rhpt*, *ākl* ‘flies, hovers, eats’ (1.108: 8 but the generic interpretation is also possible), *škn*, *ngr* ‘dwells, takes care’ (2.39:6).

In Ex. 9b the temporal location of the events, encoded by the forms *mḥš* and *mkly*, is anterior to the reference-time set by the main clause event in view of contextual information. In Ex. 9d the temporal interpretation of *ṯrd*, *mššš*, and *gršh* is posterior to the main clause event.³⁵ The most common temporal interpretation of some attributive and most circumstantial participle phrases, collected in Ex. 9e (and cf. Ex. 4, 6 above), is to express an event simultaneous with the main clause event or situation. In Ex. 9c the participles *nḥtm* and *mmnm*, with the vocative as an antecedent, denote present progressive events, simultaneous with speech time.

5. FROM PARTICIPIAL PHRASE TO VERBAL PREDICATE: CONCLUSIVE CONSIDERATIONS

This paper offers a morphological, syntactic, and semantic analysis of the active participle and the participial phrases in Ugaritic. The cumulative evidence of explicit morphological marking, typical syntactic positions, and characteristic semantic functions complement each other by providing a basis for a comprehensive descriptive endeavor.

In Ugaritic the prototypical syntactic position for the active participle is the *attributive phrase*, a reduced relative clause, the subject of which is controlled by the antecedent. In the corpus considered for this analysis, most of the relativized antecedents are subjects or vocatives in the main clause; in other words the antecedent of the attributive participial phrase is typically the most

³⁵ The impression is that the imperfective aspect is not a necessarily encoded function of the active participle, contra the opinion of Tropper (2012: 477–480), who claims that the active participle is imperfective, and that the passive participle is perfective; cf. also Notarius 2019.



prominent nominal argument of the sentence. The attributive phrases get ‘substantivized,’ becoming dependent on a zero antecedent; the *substantivized attributive phrases* are indiscriminately used in any syntactic position in a clause. *Agent-nouns* are a result of lexicalization of substantivized attributive phrases, by which the zero antecedent becomes a referentiality index; they are also attested in any syntactic position within clauses. *Circumstantial participial phrases* are sentence-initial, they lack any explicit or zero antecedent, and their subject is co-referential with the main-clause subject. It has been hypothesized in this paper that circumstantial participial phrases are subject-relativized attributive participial phrases, fronted for focus, and divested from their syntactic dependency on the antecedent. The semantic analysis demonstrated that although most participial phrases in Ugaritic are individual-level predicates and receive generic interpretations, there are cases with more explicit verbal properties, denoting a stage-level predicative core in episodic interpretation and attaching direct objects and temporal arguments.

In my view, some of these formal and semantic characteristics point towards the development of the *predicative participle* use, sporadic examples of which can perhaps already be detected in the Ugaritic corpus (as above in §3.5). It is outside the scope of this paper to follow up on the linguistic change from the state attested in Ugaritic to the state characteristic for the later Northwest Semitic languages in all its details. Therefore, just preliminary notes are in order, based on the data collected in the present research.

In my view, rare cases of the predicative usage of agent nouns (cf. Ex. 3e) are not a decisive factor in verbal syntax and remain outside the present discussion about the development of the predicative participial usage. In this work several syntactic features were noticed that point towards explicitly verbal properties of participial phrases:

- a. Attributive or substantivized participial phrases can be introduced by the relativizer *d-* that practically advances the participle to the position of a self-standing predicate (Ex. 10a, and cf. 5f and 7f above).
- b. In substantivized attributive phrases, the participle can have verbal rection (Ex. 10b, cf. the discussion in § 3.3 above).
- c. Sporadically, the subject of attributive or substantivized attributive phrases, assigned from the matrix clause by the antecedent, is raised to the surface as a resumptive pronoun, seemingly for the sake of topicalization (Ex. 10c; cf. Ex. 7e above).

Therefore, I assume that the prototypical contexts for the development of the predicative participle are the subject-relativized attributive (Ex. 10e) and circumstantial (Ex. 10d) phrases in a stage-level episodic interpretation that allow ambiguity about the position of the assigned subject (cf. also the cases collected in Ex. 9ce above):

Ex. 10

- a. KTU 1.17 I 29 *grš d ḥšy lnh* who ejects one who does something to him.
- b. KTU 1.19 IV 39–40 *ākl mkly ḥl ūmt[k* ‘I am going to finish off the one who finished off my kin’ (1.19 IV 39–40).
- c. KTU 1.4 II 22–26 *i]k mgy āliyn bḥl ik mgyt b[t]lt ḥnt mḥsy hm [m]ḥs bny hm [mkly ṣ]brt āryy* ‘how is it that DN, the ‘Most Powerful’, arrived, how is it that the Virgin DN arrived? they are my assassins, the assassins of my sons, destroyers of the clan of my kin.’



- d. KTU 1. 16 VI 4–5 *bkt tgly w tbū nšrt tbū pnm* ‘weeping she made her way (to the house of PN) and entered, sobbing she went inside.’
- e. KTU 1.96:1–2 *šnn hlkt w šnwt tp āhh k nšm* ‘the evil eye, walking also transforming, saw his brother that is beautiful.’

In Ex. 10d the subject of the main verb and the subject of the participial predicative core are co-referential (3rd feminine singular for the healer named Š^c*tqt* as is evident from the closest syntactic environment). The participles *bkt* ‘weeping’ and *nšrt* ‘sobbing’ function as circumstantial phrases denoting events simultaneous with the main clause event. If the subject were on the syntactic surface due to pragmatic reasons (*nšrt* <Š^c*tqt*> *tbū pnm*) it could potentially be a syntactic pivot: the default syntactic parsing would be [*nšrt*] Š^c*tqt tbū pnm* ‘sobbing, Ša^catiqat went inside,’ but the subject co-referentiality could have spawned syntactic reanalysis, resulting in an explicit predicative use of the participle: [*nšrt* Š^c*tqt*] *tbū pnm* ‘sobbing was Ša^catiqat, she went inside.’³⁶ Under such syntactic and semantic conditions, the newly-born predicative participle would denote a concurrent ongoing event.

The reanalysis process would be quite similar in cases like Ex. 10e with the subject-relativized attributive participial phrase that take episodic interpretation: the underlying structure *šnn [hlkt w šnwt] tp āhh*, ‘the evil eye, walking and transforming, saw his brother,’ could be reanalyzed as [*šnn hlkt w šnwt*] *tp āhh*, ‘the evil eye was walking and transforming, it saw his brother’ applying a simultaneous progressive interpretation to the participle in the predicative position. Typically, the present progressive function can be attributed to the predicative usage of the active participle in several cases attested in the corpus (Ex. 7cd above).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAKER, Mark C. 2003. *Lexical Categories: Verbs, Nouns, Adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BARANOWSKI, Krzysztof J. 2016. *The Verb in the Amarna Letters from Canaan*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- BORDREUIL, Pierre and Dennis PARDEE 2009. *A Manual of Ugaritic*. [Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 3.] Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns.
- BORDREUIL, Pierre, Dennis PARDEE, and Robert HAWLEY 2012. *Une Bibliothèque au Sud de la Ville: Textes 1994–2002 en cunéiforme alphabétique de la Maison d’Ourtenou*. [Ras Shamra-Ougarit, XVIII.] Lyon: Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée – Jean Pouilloux.
- CARLSON, Gregory N. 1980. *Reference to Kinds in English*. [Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics. New York & London: Garland. <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations/AAI7726414>.]
- CARLSON, Gregory N. 2006. ‘Generics, Habituals, Iteratives.’ In: Keith BROWN (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. [2nd ed.] Amsterdam: Elsevier, 18–21.
- CARLSON, Gregory N. and Francis J. PELLETIER (eds.) 1995. *The Generic Book*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- CHIERCHIA, Gennaro 1995. ‘Individual-Level Predicates a Inherited Generics.’ In: CARLSON and PELLETIER 1995: 176–223.

³⁶ A typologically similar path of reanalysis is reconstructed by Hasselbach (2012: 133) for the grammaticalization of the ‘new’ West Semitic imperfective *yagtulu*.



- COOK, John 2008. 'The Hebrew Participle and Stative in Typological Perspective.' *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 34: 1–19.
- CRÜSEMANN, Frank 1969. *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- DAHL, Osten 1995. 'The Marking of the Episodic/Generic Distinction in Tense-Aspect Systems.' In: CARLSON and PELLETIER 1995: 412–426.
- DEGEN, Rainer 1969. *Altaramäische Grammatik der Inschriften des 10-8 Jh. v. Chr.* Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- DIETRICH, Manfred, Oswald LORETZ and Joaquín SANMARTÍN 2013. *The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani and Other Places*. [3rd ed.] Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- DONNER, Herbert and Wolfgang RÖLLIG 2002. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. [5., erw. und überarbeitete Aufl.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- DULAT = OLMO LETE and SANMARTÍN 2015.
- FOX, Joshua 2003. *Semitic Nouns Patterns*. [Harvard Semitic Studies 59.] Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- GOGEL, Sandra 1998. *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- GOLDENBERG, Gidon 2013a. *Further Studies in Semitic Linguistics*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- GOLDENBERG, Gidon 2013b. *Semitic Languages: Features, Structures, Relations, Processes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GOLINETS, Viktor 2018. *Das amurritische Onomastikon der altbabylonischen Zeit. Vol. 2: Verbmorphologie des Amurritischen und Glossar der Verbalwurzeln*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- GORDON, Cyrus H. 1965. *Ugaritic Textbook: Grammar, Texts in Transliteration, Cuneiform Selections, Glossary, Indices*. [Analecta Orientalia 38.] Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- GRONEBERG, Brigitte 1971. *Untersuchungen zum hymnisch-epischen Dialekt der altbabylonischen literarischen Texte*. [Inaugural-Dissertation; Münster: Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität zu Münster.]
- GRONEBERG, Brigitte 1987. *Syntax, Morphologie und Stil der jungbabylonischen „hymnischen“ Literatur. Vol. Teil 1: Grammatik*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- GZELLA, Holger 2004. *Tempus, Aspekt und Modalität im Reichsaramäischen*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag.
- HASSELBACH, Rebecca 2012. 'The Verbal Endings -u and -a: A Note on Their Functional Derivation.' In: Rebecca HASSELBACH and Na'ama PAT-EL (eds.) *Language and Nature: Papers Presented to John Huehnergard on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 119–136.
- HUEHNERGARD, John 2012. *An Introduction to Ugaritic*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing.
- HUG, Volker 1993. *Altaramäische Grammatik der Texte des 7. und 6. Jh.s v. Chr.* Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag.
- ISAC, Daniela 2003. 'Restrictive Relative Clauses vs. Restrictive Adjectives.' In: Anna M. DI SCULO (ed.) *Asymmetry in Grammar. Vol. 1. Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 27–49.
- JOOSTEN, Jan 1989. 'The Predicative Participle in Biblical Hebrew.' *Zeitschrift Für Althebraistik* 2: 128–159.
- KAYNE, Richard 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- KEENAN, Edward L. 1976. 'Towards a Universal Definition of Subject.' In: Charles LI (ed.) *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press, 303–334.
- KERR, Robert 2010. *Latino-Punic Epigraphy: A Descriptive Study of the Inscriptions*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- KOUWENBERG, N. J. C. 2010. *The Akkadian Verb and Its Semitic Background*. [Languages of the Ancient Near East] Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- KRATZER, Angelika 1995. 'Stage-Level and Individual-Level Predicates.' In: CARLSON and PELLETIER 1995: 125–175.



- LEWIS, Theodore 1997. 'El's Divine Fiest.' In: Simon B. PARKER (ed.) *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 193–196.
- MARMORSTEIN, Michal 2016. *Tense and Text in Classical Arabic. A Discourse-Oriented Study of the Classical Arabic Tense System*. [Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 85.] Leiden: Brill.
- MILLER-NAUDÉ, Cynthia and Jacobus NAUDÉ 2016. 'Is the Adjective Distinct from the Noun as a Grammatical Category in Biblical Hebrew?' *Die Skriflig* 50/4: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ids.v50i4.2005>.
- MURAOKA, Takamitsu and Bezalel PORTEN 2003. *A Grammar of Egyptian Aramaic*. [2nd ed.] Leiden: Brill.
- NOTARIUS, Tania 2010. 'The Active Predicative Participle in Archaic and Classical Biblical Poetry: A Typological and Historical Investigation.' *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 47: 240–268.
- NOTARIUS, Tania 2019. 'Passive Participle in Ugaritic.' *Aula Orientalis* 37: 329–342.
- OLMO LETE, Gregorio del and Joaquín SANMARTÍN 2015. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. [Trans. by Wilfred WATSON] 2nd ed. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- PARDEE, Dennis 1988. *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24e campagne (1961)*. [Ras Shamra-Ougarit, IV.] Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- PARDEE, Dennis 2002. *Ritual and Cult in Ugarit*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- PENTIUC, Eugen J. 2001. *West Semitic Vocabulary in the Akkadian Texts from Emar*. *West Semitic Vocabulary in the Akkadian Texts from Emar*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- PIQUER Otero, Andrés 2007. *Estudios de sintaxis verbal en textos Ugaríticos: el Ciclo de Baal y La «poesía bíblica arcaica»*. Estella, Navarra: Verbo Divino.
- PORTEN, Bezalel and Ada YARDENI 1986. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*. 4 vols. [Texts and Studies for Students.] Jerusalem: Hebrew University, Department of the History of the Jewish People.
- RAINEY, Anson F. 1974. 'The Ugaritic Texts in Ugaritica 5.' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 94: 184–94.
- RAINEY, Anson F. 2015. *The El-Amarna Correspondence: A New Edition of the Cuneiform Letters from the Site of El-Amarna Based on Collations of All Extant Tablets*. Edited by William SCHNIEDEWIND and Zipora COCHAVI-RAINEY. 2 vols. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- ROGLAND, Max 2003. 'Remarks on the Aramaic Verbal System.' In: Martin F. J. BAASTEN and Wido Th. VAN PEURSEN (eds.) *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Leuven: Peeters, 421–432.
- SIVAN, Daniel 2001. *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*. [Handbook of Oriental Studies. Near and Middle East 28.] Leiden: Brill.
- SMITH, Carlota S. 2003. *Modes of Discourse: The Local Structure of Texts*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- SMITH, Mark 1994. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill.
- VON SODEN, Wolfram 1931, 1933. 'Der hymnisch-epische Dialekt des Akkadischen.' *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 40: 163–227, 41: 90–183.
- VON SODEN, Wolfram 1995. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. [3rd ed.] Roma: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- STEIN, Peter 2013. *Lehrbuch der sabäischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- TROPPER, Josef 2002. *Altäthiopisch: Grammatik des Ge'ez mit Übungstexten und Glossar*. [Elementa Linguarum Orientis] Ugarit-Verlag.
- TROPPER, Josef 2012. *Ugaritische Grammatik*. [Zweite, stark überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 273] Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- TROPPER, Josef and Juan-Pablo VITA 2010. *Das Kanaano-Akkadische der Amarnazeit*. [Lehrbücher Orientalischer Sprachen, I/1.] Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

