THE "PANTHEON" OF UGARIT: FURTHER NOTES

John F. Healey

The honouring of Oswald Loretz is a particular pleasure not only because of his historic role in the development of Ugaritic studies - he has played the major role in establishing Ugaritic studies as a discipline independent of Biblical studies - but also because of his unfailing kindness and generosity to younger scholars in a field of study of which he is himself the master. I wish him "Many Happy Returns".

I have argued elsewhere that the Ugaritic "pantheon" list is a schematic resumé of Ugaritic theology¹ and discussed the various texts which represent this listing. I return here to the same group of texts in order to add some epigraphic notes, some specific comments on new material related to particular entries in the lists and finally some general comments on the Ugaritic pantheon.

EPIGRAPHIC NOTES. A visit to Syria in 1985, facilitated by the kind help of Dr. Afif Bahnassi of the Syrian Directorate General of Antiquities, enabled me to check certain aspects of the "pantheon" texts in the museums in Damascus and Aleppo, as well as a number of other texts which bear upon the Ugaritic pantheon².

The "pantheon" lists checked are KTU 1.47; 1.118 and Akkadian text RS 20.24. Since KTU 1.148 played an important role in the discussion of the lists, although it is a ritual, not a god-list as such, it too was checked. The following notes add to what was said in the earlier article.

SEL, 5 (1988) – Fs. O. Loretz
KTU 1.47 (Aleppo, Museum no. M 3334):
(i) Line 12 (face, 24 in Herdner's CTA edition) is clearly to be read as: ṣēm].
The last visible letter is /m/, not /q/, as in Herdner's copy, and the line is to be completed as in KTU as 'arē ṣēmm.
(ii) Line 13, not represented at all in Herdner's copy, contains directly below the /w/ of line 12 a combination of wedges, 𐤀𐤓𐤃, which could be /t/ followed by (the beginning of) /w/. That the 𐤀𐤀 is not part of the /r/ of ktrt is suggested by the fact that it is so far to the right (compare KTU 1.118). While ktrt is correctly read at the beginning of the line, it looks as though this is followed by a /w/ and we have to consider the possibility that we are dealing with a binomial.
(iii) Finally it is confirmed that there are no check-marks on the tablet.

KTU 1.118 (Damascus, Museum no. D 6604):
This is a large, crudely written tablet.
(i) To the readings of Herdner there is very little to add, though the tablet is not as clear as Herdner implies. For example, line 20 should read 𐤀𐤀, though there is, of course, no doubt about the correctness of the restoration.
(ii) Line 32: 𐤀𐤀 is quite clear, with only slight damage to the /k/.
(iii) The single wedge Ṣ on the edge of the tablet alongside each line does not vary and cannot, therefore, have quantitative significations. The line drawn after the list of Baals is to be noted.

RS 20.24 (Damascus, Museum no. DO 5287):
This is a neat little tablet. The quality of Nougayrol's copy is confirmed, but note:
(i) Line 11, ḫDIM ḫDIM (thus Nougayrol) is correctly interpreted as orthographically artificial. However, Nougayrol's doubts about the interpretation of it as 进博会 are to be set aside in view of the Ugaritic version (KTU 1.118:11).
(ii) Line 18b is in fact very unclear: 𐤀 a-mu-[?]. The reading of the final sign as /tum/ seems doubtful. And one would expect an equivalent for the Uga
ritic version's 'mqt.

(iii) Close examination shows that the check-marks do not vary. There are always two wedges, even in places like line 26, where Nougayrol has clearly copied only one. The marks, therefore, do not have quantitative significance, though the list may have been checked twice.

KTU 1.148 (Damascus, Museum no. DO 6660):
This ritual text was used in my former article to supply some gaps in the lists themselves.

(i) Line 6. There are a number of points here. First, 'ztr is missing from his expected place between pdry and gm\(^5\). In the same line the reading is probably gm \([\text{\sigma}]\)'mq\(\text{t.s}\). There is, however, very little room for the /m/ and /q/ as restored and a possible alternative reading might be gm\([\text{t.s}]\)'ztr\(\text{t.s}\).

(ii) Line 9 is to be read with certainty as \([\text{\kappa}]nr.\,\text{mikm}.\,\text{gm g\(\tilde{a}\)lt}, so that mlkm, which is virtually clear, is not missing\(^6\). This brings KTU 1.148 more into line with the "pantheon" list than I allowed earlier.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON DEITIES. To the discussion of the general character of lists of this type can now be added W.G. Lambert's recent article on "The Pantheon of Mari"\(^7\). We may note in a text there discussed (pp. 528ff.) the use of check-marks introducing each entry in a list of gods. The fact that there is the number ten beside the tenth deity clearly points to the fact that the marks have a checking function, though it could be offerings which are being totalled up.

(i) Dagan. The two Dagan steles (KTU 6.13 and 6.14) were originally published in 1935\(^8\). Since they are of stone and are therefore not included in CTA, they have been somewhat neglected and have not been re-edited definitively like most of the other Ugaritic texts discovered in the early days.

No revision of the reading of KTU 6.13 (Paris, Louvre Museum no. AO 19. 931) is needed\(^9\), except to say that the reading of the first letter of the person named, usually taken to be tryl, is really speculation. Dussaud had read it as tryl. Nor is the question insignificant, since the name has usually been
identified with that of the Ugaritic queen ḏryl (cf. KTU 2.34:2). The text is
to be translated:

"Stele[^1] which ṭ(? ḏryl set up to Dagan:

a pgr-offering, a sheep and an ox, to be eaten".

The other stele, KTU 6.14 (Aleppo, Museum no. M 8388) also requires revisi-

The other stele, KTU 6.14 (Aleppo, Museum no. M 8388) also requires revisi-
stion. In the last line we should read [§ w]̱ p. ̱mhrm. The last sign has two
wedges and cannot be /t/ as supposed by KTU. It might be /n/ but mhrm is the
most satisfactory reading. This tends to confirm the reading I preferred in
an article published in 1976[^1]. mhrm can be guessed at on the basis of the
root hṟm with meanings related to "forbidden, dedicated" in a wide variety of
Semitic languages (Ethiopic, Arabic, Aramaic, Hebrew, Akkadian) but not, up
to the present, in Ugaritic. Both Arabic and Nabataean Aramaic have m-prefix
forms suggesting "sacred place, reserved area, etc." We might, therefore, ha-
ve an allusion to the total dedication of the offerings or to the sanctuary
or part of the temple in which the offerings were to be made[^2]. The transla-
tion would be:

"pgr-offerings which "zn offered to Dagan his lord:

a sheep and an ox for total dedication (or in the sacred precinct)".

pgr is a particular type of offering, paralleled, as I argued in 1976[^3], at
Mari (pgrāwm, etc.). K. Spronk[^1] comes to the same conclusion, though he is
surely mistaken in supposing that pgr sacrifices are only offered to under-
world deities or deities with underworld connections. He cites in evidence the
phrase ṣpš pgr (KTU 1.39: 12, 17; 1.102:12) but this is almost certainly a com-
posite title of Šapšu the sun-goddess and pgr is not an offering to her[^4]. In
deed in KTU 1.39:17-18 ṣpš pgr receives a qdlt-offering, not a pgr-offering.

The best explanation of ṣpš pgr is based on Arabic fājr, "dawn". The title might
then mean "Sun-goddess of Dawn"[^1]. In any case there is no real evidence that
Dagan and Šapšu are underworld deities, even if they have some underworld con-
nections, and there is no specific connection between Ugaritic pgr and rites
for the dead.

There remains, however, the question of the nature and purpose of these
steles which are unique in the Ugaritic tradition, though there are, of course, steles with figures of divinities on them. Do the two steles simply commemorate particular sacrifices? Is the fact that ֵרגל (if that is the reading) and ַכנ were people of importance (cf. KTU 2.34:2 and 4.93 II 8) significant? Are the sacrifices kept present before the god through the presence of the steles in or near the sanctuary? Was it only Dagan who received such steles?

Series of standing steles from Byblos, Gezer, Hazor and ׃שור were discussed in the earlier article. Spronk most recently has also concluded, as I did, that it is difficult to be certain of the purpose of all of these. The Gezer steles were set up at the same time, not successively. The importance of the ׃שור steles lies in the fact that they were inscribed with the names and brief genealogies of kings and officials. They were probably regarded as the image (גּל) of the king or official. But unlike the ׃שור steles the Ugaritic ones mention offerings and are dedicated to a particular deity. We must certainly reject W.F. Albright's view of them as of funereal significance.

In fact the best parallels to the Ugaritic steles are much later Phoenician/Punic steles dedicated to Baal-Hammon where sacrifices are commemorated on steles. These would suggest that the Ugaritic steles are to be taken at their face value as records of sacrifices, originally set up in a sanctuary.

The identification of the Dagan temple at Ugarit is, as I have argued elsewhere, far from certain. The best information available on the find-spots of the steles is that they were found outside a supposed Middle Bronze Age temple, "parmi l'amoncellement des grand blocs provenant de ses murs", i.e. the blocks from the temple wall. The absence of other such steles and the lack of the socketed stone bases into which the steles originally slotted lead one to suspect that they were not found in their original place (in the אֲרֶךְ?).

(ii) On the multiplicity of Baals see the article of W.G. Lambert already referred to (p. 533).

(iii) The ֻיר may now be found in a Mari text, though the singular, equivalent to ֻיר, may also be read. To the bibliography of the ֻיר may be added J. Day's article on Asherah. He rightly rejects the equation of נֶשה in KTU 1.
23:13, 16, 28 with \( \text{d} \) _sa-sú-ra-tum_ on the grounds that \( \text{d} \) _sa-sú-ra-tum_ = _ktrt_. He suggests that _rimy_ is an independent deity. However, her absence from offering lists makes this at least doubtful. Identity with Athirat remains a possibility.

(iv) Athirat is newly treated by Day\textsuperscript{26} in the context of the Bible and ancient Israel. While accepting most of what he says, we may make one minor correction to his background data. New evidence removes all allusion to Athirat ('AšIrā) from the Aramaic of Taymā\textsuperscript{27}. A new text published by H.I. Abu-Duruk\textsuperscript{28}, contemporaneous with the long-known Taymā' stele in the Louvre, refers clearly to 'ṣyrm', and this should certainly be read instead of 'ṣyr', which is in fact unclear in the Louvre text. The new evidence makes clear allusion to the deity mentioned in 2 Kings 17:30, 'ṣīmā' of Hamath, and eliminates all question of the Hebrew text containing a pious euphemism, as assumed, for example, by J. Gray\textsuperscript{29}.

(v) _mlkm_. To what has been written on _mlkm_ must now be added the monograph of G. Heider\textsuperscript{30}.

In addition to the confirmation of the reading of _mlkm_ in KTU 1.148 (above), it is also now important to add RIH 78/14, recently translated by M. Dietrich and O. Loretz\textsuperscript{31}. The text contains a list of astrological/meteorological omens. No. III is translated:

"If on the 3rd of Kislim the moon is dim,

the _mlkm_ will remain at a distance."

The apodosis, _mlkm_ tbrm, could be interpreted in a variety of ways\textsuperscript{32}. The _mlkm_ here could well be more than simply hostile foreign rulers, though admittedly other apodoses are in the natural rather than supernatural sphere. It is at least possible that we have here the demonic aspect of the _mlkm_\textsuperscript{33}.

GENERAL. The elimination of Athirat from Taymā' throws even further into relief the presence of Athirat as part of South Arabian religion\textsuperscript{34} and reminds us of the rather unlikely links that exist between Ugarit and Arabia. Of course in many cases the sharing of deities between the two is of little significance, since the same divine names may be found throughout the ancient Near
East. Yet there are some features of religion, as there are eccentric linguistic isoglosses and connections of script, which are noteworthy.

Ṣapšu is female at Ugarit and otherwise regularly female only in South Arabian religion\(^{15}\). This is in contrast with the basically male character of Šamaš in Babylonia and elsewhere. Š\(\text{ṣ}tr\) and Š\(\text{ṣ}tr\) are a distinct male/female pair in Ugaritic religion, while Mesopotamian Ištar is (extremely) female. Š\(\text{ṣ}tr\) is very prominent and male in South Arabian religion\(^{16}\).

There are other divine titles from Ugarit worthy of further investigation in this context. In discussion of a recent conference paper on the Ugaritic rp\('m\)^{37}, attention was drawn to the divine epithet rp\('f\)/rp\('n\) applied in South Arabia, for example, to Š\(\text{ṣ}tr\)^{38}. This leads plausibly to the view that Ugaritic rp\('u\) is "the healer" or "the one who shows favour"\(^{4,0}\). Even the demonic mikm find a suggestive parallel in the demonic Mālik of the Qur'ān (ṣu\(\text{ra} 48:77\)).

Other suggested connections with Arabia are in language (with J. Aistleitner as principal advocate) and script\(^{1}\), while other scholars, notably B. Margalit\(^{2}\), have advocated a southern connection in Ugaritic legend. Are we after all on the track of a southern origin of at least part of the Ugaritic tradition and perhaps of its royal family?

This speculation is respectfully dedicated to Oswald Loretz.
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