



# EL IN THE UGARITIC TEXTS

SUPPLEMENTS  
TO  
VETUS TESTAMENTUM

EDITED BY

THE BOARD OF THE QUARTERLY

G. W. ANDERSON	HENRI CAZELLES
P. A. H. DE BOER	E. HAMMERSHAIMB
MILLAR BURROWS	MARTIN NOTH

VOLUME II

MARVIN H. POPE  
EL IN THE UGARITIC TEXTS



LEIDEN  
E. J. BRILL  
1955

# EL IN THE UGARITIC TEXTS

BY

MARVIN H. POPE

Assistant Professor of Hebrew language and literature,  
Yale University



LEIDEN  
E. J. BRILL  
1955



*Copyright 1955 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands*  
*All rights reserved, including the right to translate or to reproduce*  
*this book or parts thereof in any form*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

## CONTENTS

Preface . . . . .	vii
List of Abbreviations . . . . .	ix
I. The Word ʿēl as Appellative and as Proper Name. . . . .	1
II. The Etymology of ʿēl . . . . .	16
III. Ugaritic Proper Names Compounded with <i>il</i> . . . . .	22
IV. El's Epithets and Attributes in the Ugaritic Texts . . . . .	25
A. El as Nominal King of the Gods . . . . .	25
B. El as ex-King of the Gods? . . . . .	27
C. El's Seniority and Senility . . . . .	32
D. El as Bull; His Marital Relations . . . . .	35
E. El's Wisdom . . . . .	42
F. El as Holy . . . . .	43
G. El's Temperament. . . . .	44
H. The Graphic Representation of El . . . . .	45
I. El as Father of Gods and Mēn . . . . .	47
J. The Pantheon, the Assembly of the Gods, the Family of El . . . . .	48
K. El as Creator . . . . .	49
V. Elyon and El and Baal Shamēm . . . . .	55
VI. Bethel . . . . .	58
VII. El's Abode . . . . .	61
A. The Nature of El's Abode . . . . .	61
B. The Location of El's Abode . . . . .	72
VIII. El's Status and Significance in the Ugaritic Texts . . . . .	82
Indices. . . . .	105



## PREFACE

The present study is a somewhat hasty compromise with a more ambitious project. The original plan was to treat all the Ugaritic deities, individually and collectively, and to include a new translation of the texts with philological notes and commentary. The accumulated material, however, soon exceeded what could be properly presented in a short time and space. Accordingly it was decided to do the job piecemeal and later to revise and combine the several studies, profiting by criticisms that may be made in the meantime. This first study, quite naturally, concerns El as the father of the gods. Studies of the other Ugaritic deities, Dagan, Baal, Asherah, °Anat, Mot, and the lesser gods, are in preparation and it is hoped that they can be published in the near future.

In view of the lack of uniformity which still prevails in the designation of the Ugaritic texts, indulgence is sought for a minor inconsistency. The great mythological and legendary texts are designated according to the first editions of VIROLLEAUD. The small texts are designated by GORDON's numbers. A useful table of the various systems of text reference is given by R. DE LANGHE, *Les Textes de Ras Shamra Ugarit*, Paris 1945, vol. 1, pp. 137-149. The system of transliteration of Ugaritic, Hebrew, and other languages, it is hoped, will be self-evident.

The names of scholars cited in this study furnish a rough index of my debt to others. To mention the names would add considerably to the length of this preface. I am especially indebted to my teachers, Professors Albrecht GOETZE and Julian OBERMANN, who introduced me to Ugaritic as well as to other Semitic languages and literatures. Professor GOETZE read portions of the first draft of this study and made many valuable suggestions, but he has not seen the final draft and is in no way responsible for my errors or views. I am also grateful to Professor OBERMANN for many stimulating discussions of problems pertaining to Ugaritic. A special expression of gratitude is due Dr. Beatrice GOFF who put aside her own research to come to my aid in checking and typing footnotes. Professor Ferris J. STEPHENS, Curator of the Yale Babylonian Collection, was most obliging in steering me many times in the sea of cuneiform bibliography to the exact reference sought. Thanks are also due to Dr. Vaughn E. CRAW-

FORD who read a part of the typescript and weeded out a goodly number of errors. Finally, I am beholden to my wife who typed the manuscript and aided and encouraged me in countless ways.

MARVIN H. POPE



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- AfO* Archiv für Orientforschung.  
*AGG* Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.  
*AJA* American Journal of Archaeology.  
*AJSL* The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.  
*ANET* *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, ed. J. B. PRITCHARD.  
*A Or* Archiv Orientalní.  
*ARI* W. F. ALBRIGHT, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. Baltimore, 1942.  
*ARW* Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.  
*BASOR* Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research.  
*BSGW* Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.  
*BZAW* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.  
*DRS* R. DUSSAUD, *Les découvertes de Ras Shamra (Ugarit) et l'Ancien Testament*. 2nd ed. Paris, 1941.  
*EBB* Encyclopaedia Biblica (Miqrāʾit), the Bialik Institute, vol. 1, Jerusalem, 1950.  
*EJ* Encyclopaedia Judaica.  
*EUP* O. EISSFELDT, *El im ugaritischen Pantheon*. Berlin, 1951.  
*FHG* *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, ed. C. MÜLLER, Paris, 1841-1870.  
*FSAC* W. F. ALBRIGHT, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*. Baltimore 1940.  
*FuF* Forschungen und Fortschritte.  
*GKC* GESENIUS' Hebrew Grammar, edited and enlarged by E. KAUTZSCH, revised by A. E. COWLEY, 2nd. English Edition, Oxford 1910.  
*HkAW* Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft.  
*HTR* Harvard Theological Review.  
*HUCA* Hebrew Union College Annual.  
*Incubation* J. OBERMANN, "How Daniel was blessed with a Son, an Incubation Scene in Ugaritic". (*JAOs*, Suppl. No. 6, 1946).  
*JA* Journal Asiatique.  
*JAOs* Journal of the American Oriental Society.  
*JBL* Journal of Biblical Literature.  
*JCS* Journal of Cuneiform Studies.  
*JNES* Journal of Near Eastern Studies.  
*JPOS* Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society.  
*JPSAV* Version of the Jewish Publication Society of America.  
*KOEHLER, Lexicon* *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, ed. L. KOEHLER.  
*KJ* The King James Version of the Bible.  
*LK* "The Legend of King Keret. A Canaanite Epic of the Bronze Age". (*BASOR*, Suppl. Studies Nos. 2-3, New Haven, 1946).  
*MAOG* Mitteilungen der altorientalischen Gesellschaft.  
*MbBA* Monatsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.  
*MVAG* Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen-ägyptischen Gesellschaft.  
*NKZ* Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift.  
*OLZ* Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.  
*Or* Orientalia.

- PWRE* *Real-Enzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. I. PAULY and C. WISSOWA.
- RB* Revue Biblique.
- RHR* Revue de l'Histoire des Religions.
- RLA* Reallexicon der Assyriologie, ed. B. MEISSNER.
- ROSCHER's *Lexikon Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, ed. W. H. ROSCHER.
- RŠMBT* D. NIELSEN, *Ras Samra Mythologie und Biblische Theologie* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Bd. XXI, 4), Leipzig, 1936.
- RSV* Revised Standard Version of the Bible.
- SbBA* Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin.
- SMSR* Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni.
- TbR* Theologische Rundschau.
- UH* C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Handbook*. I-III Rome, 1947. (Analecta Orientalia 25).
- UL* C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Literature*. A Comprehensive Translation of the Poetic and Prose Texts. Rome, 1949.
- UM* J. OBERMANN, *Ugaritic Mythology*. New Haven, 1948.
- UUA* Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift.
- VT* Vetus Testamentum.
- WZKM* Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
- YOS* Yale Oriental Series.
- ZA* Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.
- ZAW* Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
- ZDMG* Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

## FIRST CHAPTER

### THE WORD ʔēl AS APPELLATIVE AND AS PROPER NAME

The word *il(u)*, West Semitic ʔēl, is common to all the Semitic languages except Ethiopic <sup>1)</sup>, as the general appellative meaning “god” in the broadest sense. It is also the most frequent element in theophorous proper names all over the ancient Semitic world. The ubiquity of this element as an appellative and as the theophorous component of proper names, where the analogy with the usual pattern of Semitic proper names naturally suggested the possibility that it might be the proper name of a specific deity, has provoked much discussion and speculation as to the etymology of the word and the question whether it was originally an appellative or a proper name and how it developed from the one to the other. The answer to this question has far-reaching implications for the history of primitive Semitic religion and the origins, background, and development of monotheism. Divergent answers have been given by various scholars in the past and will doubtless continue to be given. RENAN <sup>2)</sup> ascribed to the Semites a monotheistic instinct which led them to conceive from the divine power they saw active in things and in the processes of nature an abstract “All Lord”, an only sovereign who occupies all. DELITZSCH <sup>3)</sup> affirmed the existence of a Babylonian high god Ilu and saw a strong monotheistic tendency at least among one ancient group of Semites, the so-called “Canaanites”. LAGRANGE <sup>4)</sup> held that for the primitive Semites El was the proper name of God and the word became an appellative because of the multitude of persons to whom the trans-

---

1) In Ethiopic ʔēl is found only in personal names derived from the O.T. It is, however, possible that Ethiopic also may have had the word ʔēl before it was displaced by the form ʔamlak. Cf. W. BAUDISSIN, *Kyrios*, Giessen 1929, vol. 3, p. 10.

2) *Histoire du peuple d'Israel*, vol. 1, Paris 1887, especially Book I, chaps. III and IV; „Nouvelles considérations sur le caractère général des peuples sémitiques et en particulier sur leur tendance au monothéisme,” *JA*, Série 5, vol. 13, 1859, pp. 214-282, 417-450; cf. R. DUSSAUD, *L'Oeuvre scientifique d'Ernest Renan*, Paris 1951, pp. 28, 41.

3) *Babel and Bible* (ed. G. H. W. JOHNS, Crown Theological Library, vol. 1), New York 1903, pp. 69 ff., 125 ff.; *Wo lag das Paradies?* Leipzig 1881, p. 164.

4) *Études sur les religions sémitiques*, Paris 1905, p. 70.

centent properties of this being were attributed. NIELSEN <sup>5)</sup> identified the common Semitic El with the old South Arabic lunar god and held that the name follows him in all the stages of his development from the first primitive beginnings in the Arabian-Aramaeen desert to the last phase when it finally designates the great God of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. CLAY <sup>6)</sup> regarded Ilu or El as an all-important Amorite deity whose name was later syncretised with Anu, or rather written with the ideogram AN. The deity Anu, according to CLAY, had no real existence but arose because originally the ideogram AN was used for the name El and subsequently was Semitized into Anu. The error of this view, as regards Anu, is now made manifest by the Hurrian theogony in Hittite treated by GÜTERBOCK <sup>7)</sup>.

It has generally been held that *il(u)* was originally appellative. ED. MEYER <sup>8)</sup> asserted that in Akkadian *ilu* is purely appellative and designates nearly always an individual concrete object of worship, a definite *daimon*, but that it is no real proper name. HEHN <sup>9)</sup> concluded that the notion of a proto-Semitic Ilu-El, "God" in the absolute sense, one who stood at the head of the pantheon and subsumed all the other gods, is a reversal of the actual historical development and projects the later O.T. concept back into ancient time. The Sumerian ideogram AN represents the god Anu who embodied the highest concept of divinity. AN means "high", "heaven", hence his exalted position, but there is nothing to indicate that Anu is to be regarded as the original equivalent of the pantheon. The symbol AN is read in Akkadian *ilu* and *ilu* is regularly used as an appellative. The Babylonian Semites adopted the Sumerian god Anu, whereas if they had had a god Ilu, according to HEHN <sup>10)</sup>, they would have substituted him for Anu instead of adopting the latter. It now appears, however, that the god Ilu or El was introduced into Mesopotamia very early, in pre-Sargonic times <sup>11)</sup>. Despite the connection of Ilu with the ideogram AN, the original identity of the gods Ilu and Anu is now seen

---

<sup>5)</sup> *Der dreieinige Gott in religionshistorischer Beleuchtung*. Copenhagen 1942, vol. 2, p. 219.

<sup>6)</sup> *The Origin of Biblical Traditions* (YOS, XII), New Haven 1923, pp. 99-102.

<sup>7)</sup> *Kumarbi, Mythen vom churritischen Kronos*, New York 1946.

<sup>8)</sup> ROSCHER's *Lexikon*, vol. 1, pt. 1, cols. 1223-1229, s.v. „El.“

<sup>9)</sup> *Die biblische und die babylonische Gottesidee*, Leipzig 1913, chap. IV, „Gab es einen ursemitischen Gott Ilu oder El?“ pp. 150-213.

<sup>10)</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 150 f.

<sup>11)</sup> Cf. I. GELB, *A Or*, 18 (1950), p. 197; and *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar* (Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary, no. 2), Chicago [1952], pp. 4-6, 8.

to be out of the question because they stand in different generations of the ancient theogony<sup>12)</sup>. BAUDISSION<sup>13)</sup> likewise decided for an original appellative meaning of ʔēl and suggested that it might have become a proper name by being compounded as an appellative with divine proper names, the proper name later being dropped *brevitatis causa*. Similarly NOTH<sup>14)</sup> suggested that the appellative could have become a proper name if a tribe practising exclusive monolatry used the word ʔēl to designate only its own particular god so that his actual name fell into oblivion.

The chief reason for doubt that ʔēl was anciently the proper name of a single specific god, in spite of the existence of theophorous names with this element among all the Semitic peoples, was that prior to the discoveries at Ras Shamra it was attested with certainty as such only relatively late in the old Aramaic inscriptions of the 8th century from Senjirli<sup>15)</sup> and Sujin<sup>16)</sup> in South Arabic<sup>17)</sup>, and in Philo of Byblos<sup>18)</sup> and other late classical sources<sup>19)</sup>. In the Hadad<sup>20)</sup> and Panammu(wa)<sup>21)</sup> inscriptions El appears following Hadad in a

12) Cf. below p. 56, n. 6.

13) *Kyrios*, vol. 3, pp. 14 f.; A. MURTONEN, *A Philological and Literary Treatise on the O.T. Divine Names*, Helsinki 1952, p. 28, n. 4.

14) *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*, Stuttgart 1928, p. 97.

15) F. VON LUSCHAN, *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*, Berlin, 1893, vol. 1, pp. 49-84; D. H. MÜLLER, „Die altsemitischen Inschriften von Sendschirli,“ *WZKM*, 7 (1893), pp. 33-70 and 113-140; M. LIDZBARSKI, *Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik*, Weimar, 1898, vol. 1, pp. 440-444, vol. 2, pls. xxii, xxiii; G. A. COOKE, *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions*, Oxford, 1903, pp. 159-185.

16) S. RONZEVILLE, „Fragments d'inscriptions araméennes des environs d'Alep,“ *Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph Beyrouth*, 15 (1931), pp. 235-260, and pls. xxxix-lix; H. BAUER, „Ein aramäischer Staatsvertrag aus dem 8. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Die Inschrift der Stele von Sudschin,“ *AJO*, 8 (1932-1933), pp. 1-16; J. HEMPEL, „Zeitschriftenschau,“ *ZAW*, 50 (1932), pp. 178-183; G. R. DRIVER, „Notes on the Aramaic Inscription from Soudschin,“ *AJO*, 8 (1932-1933), pp. 203-206.

17) Cf. G. RYCKMANS, *Les noms propres sud-sémitiques*, Louvain, vol. 1, 1934, p. 1; *Les religions Arabes préislamiques* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, 26), Louvain, 1951, p. 47; A. JAMME, *Le Panthéon sud-arabe préislamique*, (extract from Muséon, 60, pts. 1-2), Louvain, 1947, pp. 113-115, citation of literature n. 495, pp. 113 f.

18) *FHG*, vol. 3, pp. 567b-570a; E. H. GIFFORD, *Eusebii Praeparatio Evangelica*, Oxford, 1903, pp. 36-47; C. CLEMEN, *Die Phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos*, (*MVAG*, 42, pt. 3) Leipzig (1939), pp. 25-32, 62-75.

19) Cf. ED. MEYER, s.v. „El“ in ROSCHER'S *Lexikon*, vol. 1, pt. 1, cols. 1223-1229; F. CUMONT, s.v. „El“ in *PWRE*, vol. 5, cols. 2217-2219.

20) LIDZBARSKI, *Handbuch*, vol. 1, pp. 440 f., ll. 2-3, 11.

21) *Ibid.*, p. 443, l. 22.



series of gods and in the Sujin<sup>22)</sup> inscription El is mentioned along with Elyon among the gods who sanction the treaty. In the gate inscription of Azitawaddu discovered at Karatepe<sup>23)</sup> in Cilicia in 1946, belonging probably to the end of the 8th century, is mentioned "Baal Shamēm, El Creator/Lord of the Earth, Shamash the Eternal, and the whole family of the gods". Here we have further evidence of the ancient importance of El as a distinct deity and an important clue to his nature which will be considered below in relation to the Ugaritic and the O.T. data. Philo of Byblos, who flourished ca. 100 A.D. and who claimed to derive his information from the Phoenician priest Sanchunyatōn<sup>24)</sup> in the 13th century B.C., has preserved for us the tradition of El as an ancient Phoenician deity whom he equates with the Greek Kronos. Scholars have given varying appraisals of the reliability of Philo of Byblos. In the days of MOVERS<sup>25)</sup>, EWALD<sup>26)</sup>, and RENAN<sup>27)</sup> considerable attention and respect were paid to this author and his testimony, but in later generations his work generally discounted as late theological speculation<sup>28)</sup>. The Ugaritic texts, however, have shown that much of Philo of Byblos' material is based on very ancient authentic sources and traditions and there has been a renewal of interest in Hesiod and Philo<sup>29)</sup> and other classical sources. This interest has been greatly furthered by the publication of

<sup>22)</sup> A bibliography of this inscription is found in F. ROSENTHAL's *Aramäische Forschung*, Leiden, 1939, p. 13, n. 5. On El and Elyon cf. G. L. DELLA VIDA, *JBL*, 63 (1944), pp. 1-9.

<sup>23)</sup> For a bibliography on Karatepe see U. BAHADIR ALKIM, *Revue Hittite et Asiatique*, 9 (1948), pp. 33-35, and additional items in the notes of R. O'CALLAGHAN, "An Approach to Some Religious Problems of Karatepe," *A Or*, 18 (1950), pp. 354-365.

<sup>24)</sup> W. F. ALBRIGHT (*BASOR*, 70 (1938), p. 24), on the basis of the form of the name, would put Sanchunyatōn in about the 7th century B.C. Cf. O. EISSFELDT, "Zur Frage nach dem Alter der Phönizischen Geschichte des Sanchunyatōn," *FuF*, 14 (1938), pp. 251-252 and *Ras Shamra und Sanchunyatōn*, Halle, 1939, pp. 67-71. In *Sanchunyatōn von Berut und Ilumilku von Ugarit* (Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums, 5), Halle, 1952, p. 68, EISSFELDT dates him in the second half of the 2nd millennium B.C. and regards him as an "Ebenbild" of the Ugaritic scribe Ilumilku.

<sup>25)</sup> *Die Phönizier*, vol. 1, Bonn, 1841, pp. 116-147.

<sup>26)</sup> "Abhandlung über die phönizischen Ansichten von der Welterschöpfung und den geschichtlichen Werth Sanchunyatōns," *AGG*, 5 (1853), pp. 1-68.

<sup>27)</sup> "Mémoire sur l'origine et le véritable caractère de l'histoire phénicienne qui porte le nom de Sanchunyatōn," *Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, 23, pt. 2, (1857), pp. 241-334.

<sup>28)</sup> Cf. the summary and critique by LAGRANGE, pp. 396-437.

<sup>29)</sup> For the latest discussion and bibliographical notes see EISSFELDT, *Sanchunyatōn von Berut und Ilumilku von Ugarit*, pp. 3-46.

the Hurrian mythological texts in Hittite<sup>30</sup>). Nevertheless the use of Philo of Byblos and other late sources for the elucidation of the Ugaritic myths should be made with extreme caution.

The Ugaritic mythological texts have completely dispelled any doubt as to the existence of El as the proper name of a specific deity<sup>31</sup>). The long mooted question whether the Semites in general or any considerable section of them originally, or at least anciently, worshipped a god named El is now answered in the affirmative, as far as the Ugaritians are concerned. This fact is of considerable importance for the history of Semitic religion and for O.T. studies<sup>32</sup>). Premature and far-reaching conclusions, however, are not to be drawn from this fact. Some of the old and crucial questions remain outstanding and new problems have been raised by the new material. The Ugaritic texts are our second oldest body of Semitic literary material, coming from the middle of the 2nd millennium, but they are still far removed from primitive Semitic religion. The historical, cultural, and linguistic relation of the Ugaritians to the Canaanites is still problematic. The common assumption of the virtual linguistic identity of Ugaritic with Canaanite remains unproven<sup>33</sup>). GOETZE'S<sup>34</sup>) suggestion that Ugaritic may be Amorite is still to be considered a possibility, since of the little that is known of Amorite there is nothing to contradict this hypothesis. At any rate it is risky to assume the unproven linguistic identity of Ugaritic with Canaanite-Phoenician and on this basis further to assume direct cultural or historical relationships. The Ugaritic texts do not bring us any nearer to a solution of the question

30) E. FORRER, "Eine Geschichte des Götterkönigtums aus dem Hatti Reiche," in *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slaves*, 5 (Mélanges Franz Cumont), Brussel, 1936, pp. 687-713; R. DUSSAUD, "Les antécédents orientaux à la Théogonie d'Hésiode," in *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slaves*, 9 (Mélanges Henri Grégoire), Brussel, 1949, pp. 227-231; H. GÜTERBOCK, *Kumarbi*; *AJA*, 52 (1948), pp. 123-134; *The Song of Ullikummi*, American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven, 1952 (reprinted from *JCS*, 5 [1951], pp. 135-161); H. OTTEN, "Ein kanaanäischer Mythos aus Boğazköy," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientalforschung*, 1 (1953), pp. 125-150; A. GOETZE, *ANET*, pp. 120-128.

31) EISSFELDT, *EUP*, p. 7, n. 1.

32) *Ibid.*, pp. 8-10.

33) J. FRIEDRICH, J. CANTINEAU, and J. G. FÉVRIER have maintained a sceptical attitude on this question from the first. Cf. CANTINEAU, *Semitica*, 3 (1950), pp. 21-34. FRIEDRICH in his *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik*, Rome, 1951, p. 1 regards Ugaritic as a North-west Semitic language which, in spite of its close and incontestable relation to Canaanite, still is to be placed as a separate language alongside Canaanite and Aramaic.

34) *Language*, 17 (1941), pp. 127-138.

whether *ilu*, ʔēl was originally a proper name or an appellative since the vocable has both uses in Ugaritic. But the problem of the appraisal of the position and the significance of El in the Ugaritic pantheon is of crucial importance and calls for reconsideration in view of some of the estimates that have been given by eminent scholars. There can be no doubt that El is the proper name of a specific deity in the Ugaritic texts and that he is the putative head of the pantheon, but the view that he embodies *par excellence* all the concepts and attributes of deity and subsumes all the other gods who are regarded as mere manifestations or hypostases of various aspects of his nature and power finds no support in the texts. There is, as we shall see, no clear evidence of the alleged tendency toward an El monotheism at Ugarit.

In his study *El im Ugaritischen Pantheon*, EISSFELDT has collected and discussed the passages in the Ugaritic texts in which the vocable *il*, plural *ilm*, is found and has classified them as to use and meaning. The results, in brief, are as follows. In Ugaritic, as in Semitic generally, *il* is used as the generic appellative for divinity, but relatively infrequently in the mythological texts. Some of the occurrences are ambiguous. In the majority of the occurrences of *il* it is undoubtedly the personal name of the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, El<sup>35</sup>). This fact has been recognized from the beginning of the study of the texts, but because of its importance for the history of Semitic religion EISSFELDT has done a service in documenting this point with characteristic thoroughness. The form *ilm* in the majority of cases is the plural of the appellative and means “gods”<sup>36</sup>). In one or possibly two cases *ilm* may be the plural of majesty in reference to a single god, as in the Phoenician use of ʔlm and the Amarna *ilāni*, but this is by no means certain<sup>37</sup>). Once *ilm* is clearly to be divided into *il* plus the enclitic emphatic *-m*, II AB IV-V 65, *rbi ilm lhkmt*, “thou art great, O El, thou art wise”, and possibly in a few other cases<sup>38</sup>).

Besides the forms *il* and *ilm*, the forms *ilt*, *ilb*, *ilbt* and *ilbm* are attested in Ugaritic. The form *ilt*, feminine singular of *il*, appears as the appellative “goddess” in text 1 : 11, *š ilt mgdl š ilt asrm*. In text 23 : 4, *š lilt š l'trt*, *ilt* appears to be the equivalent of a proper name, a synonym for Asherah as it is in the poetic texts, “the Goddess”, or perhaps, the proper name Elat. The personal name *bn ilt* occurs in text

35) *EUP*, pp. 29-53.

36) *Ibid.*, p. 26.

37) *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

38) *Ibid.*, pp. 22 f., 27.

80 1 : 19. (The use of the feminine of *il* as a virtual proper name of Asherah suggests the possibility that her male counterpart might have had a proper name which was displaced by the appellative, but we have no evidence for this). The form *ilb*, corresponding to Arabic ʔilāb, Aramaic ʔēlāb, Hebrew ʔēlōab, and perhaps to Amorite Akkadian *ila*, does not appear intact but can be restored with probability from the remains of three passages in the 1929 texts 1 : 3, 5, 9 and 3 : 12, 14, 18. The feminine plural form *ilbt* does not occur in the small texts but only in the poetic texts where it has the appellative sense “goddesses” (II AB VI 48-54, NK 11, 40, II K IV 5, 9, 13). The Phoenician form ʔln, ʔlnm, the *alonim* of Plautus<sup>39)</sup>, has a corresponding form in Ugaritic *ilnym*, although the *y* of the latter form is hard to explain. In I D 10 there is a form *ilnm*, which is what one would expect in Ugaritic orthography. GORDON<sup>40)</sup> considers it doubtful whether this is the same word as *ilyn*, but he translates it<sup>41)</sup> “gods”, although the context is very obscure.

The relationship of the forms *ilb*(?), *ilbt*, *ilbm* to the forms *il*, *ilt*, *ilm* in the Ugaritic texts is highly problematic. The forms *il*, *ilt*, *ilm*, *ilb*(?), and *ilbm* all occur in the sacrificial lists, texts 1 and 3. It is virtually certain that *il* in these texts is the proper name El and that *ilt* in text 23 : 4 refers to Asherah, as always in the poetic texts. In 1 : 11, *ilt mgdl*, *ilt asrm*, *ilt* may be appellative, “the goddess of the tower”, “the goddess of the binders/bound ones(?)”, or it may possibly refer to some local or special form of Asherah under her title Elat, or “the Goddess”, “Elat of Magdal”, “Elat of Asrm”<sup>42)</sup>. If the form *ilb* is to be restored in any or all of the passages 1 : 5; 3 : 14,30, it is impossible to determine its usage, or to what god or gods it refers<sup>43)</sup>. Similarly the meaning of *ilbm* in 1 : 3, 5, 9; 3 : 12, 14, 18 is difficult to define. BAUER<sup>44)</sup> takes it as the proper name of a god, except in 1 : 3,5, *gdlt ilbm*, where he takes it as the equivalent of the superlative, “Gotteskuh”, i.e. “Prachtkuh”. GORDON<sup>45)</sup> takes *ilbm* as appellative, even in 1 : 3, 5, where he renders *gdlt ilbm* as “a large beast of the gods”, and *alp wš ilbm* as “a head of large (and) small

39) Cf. EISSFELDT, *ZAW*, 58 (1940-41), pp. 248-251; 59 (1942-43), p. 219.

40) *UH*, 18. 149, p. 211.

41) *UL*, p. 94.

42) As seems to be implied by GORDON's translation, *UL*, p. 111.

43) Cf. H. BAUER, *ZAW*, 51 (1933), pp. 84 f.

44) *Ibid.*

45) *UL*, p. 111.

cattle of the gods”, whatever that might mean. The use of *ilbm* as over against the common use of *ilm* as the plural of the appellative raises the question of their relationship and usage, but unfortunately the occurrences of *ilb(?)* and *ilbm* are too few and the contexts in which they occur too obscure to permit any conclusions. The problem of the various uses of *il*, *ilt*, *ilm*, *ilb(?)*, *ilbt*, *ilbm* in Ugaritic may receive some clarification from examination of the usages of these same forms in the O.T. and elsewhere in Semitic.

The forms ʔēlôab and ʔēlôhîm are not used in proper names in Hebrew. In Amorite proper names, however, there is the form *ila*. TH. BAUER<sup>46)</sup> took the final vowel of *ila* as the case ending which would mark the accusative of *ilu*, whereas one would expect either the nominative or the genitive in such names as *I-la-ilu* (AN), “Ila is god”, *I-la-la-ka*, “Ila is for thee”, *Bu-nu-ka-ma-i-la*, “(It is) thy son, O Ila”, *Bu-ni-i-la*, “Son of Ila”. Accordingly, DHORME<sup>47)</sup> took *ila* to be the equivalent of ʔilāb. The name *Bu-ni-i-la* has the variant writing *Bu-ni-AN* and the names *Bu-nu-ka-la(!)-i-li* and *Bu-nu-ka-ma-i-la* are perhaps to be identified, from which it would appear that *il* and *ila* were interchangeable equivalents. GOETZE<sup>48)</sup>, however, regards DHORME’s equation of *ila* with West Semitic ʔilāb as unsatisfactory and holds that the form *ila* can hardly be separated from other nouns ending in *-a* like *hala* and *kumra*. The view of J. LEWY<sup>49)</sup> and HROZNÝ<sup>50)</sup> is that the ending of *ila* represents the postpositive article as in Aramaic. Although ʔēlāb is the usual form of the appellative in Aramaic it is not used in personal names. The form ʔlby (*-lby*) in Nabatean proper names is probably a loan from Arabic since most of the Nabatean names are Arabic<sup>51)</sup>. The complete lack of compounds with ʔēlôab in Hebrew and *ilb* in Ugaritic, and the absence of this form in compounds elsewhere, except in Amorite(?) and Nabatean, indicates a preference for the shorter and probably more archaic form ʔēl, *il* in compounds<sup>52)</sup>.

In the O.T., outside of proper names, ʔēl is used independently some 226 times<sup>53)</sup>, usually as an appellative, and may designate a

46) *Die Ostkanaanäer*, Leipzig, 1926, p. 65.

47) *RB*, 37 (1928), p. 68.

48) *Language*, 17 (1941), p. 135, n. 72.

49) *ZA*, N.F. 4 (1929), p. 243 f.; *JBL*, 54 (1935), p. 198, n. 85.

50) *A Or*, 1 (1929), p. 67 f.

51) Cf. TH. NÖLDEKE, *ZDMG*, 17 (1863), pp. 703 ff.

52) HEHN, p. 167; NOTH, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

53) Cf. LAGRANGE, p. 71, n. 2.



heathen god as well as the unique god of Israel <sup>54</sup>). In prose when ʔēl refers to the God of Israel it is usually grammatically determined by the article, the possessive suffix, a genitive or an attributive, or another divine name <sup>55</sup>). In poetry, however, particularly in Job, Psalms, and Deutero-Isaiah, ʔēl is used without the article or other adjunct in the function of a proper name <sup>56</sup>). The article is commonly omitted in poetry <sup>57</sup>), so that little can be made of its omission in this instance. In nearly all cases it is clear that the reference is to the God of Israel, but in a few instances it appears that the allusion may be to the old West Semitic, Ugaritic, Canaanite-Phoenician god of that name. We will consider this possibility below.

The morphologic plural of ʔēl, ʔēlīm is rare in the O.T., occurring only in Ex. xv 11, Dan. xi 36, and in the phrase *bēnē ʔēlīm*, Ps. xxix 1 and lxxxix 7. Whether ʔēlīm in this expression has singular meaning is uncertain. The expression may be construed as the plural of *ben ʔēl* on the analogy of *luḥōt ʔāḥānīm* as the plural of *luḥ ʔehen* <sup>58</sup>). The same applies to the Ugaritic *bn ilm*.

The form ʔēlōah occurs 57 times in the O.T., exclusively in poetry, 41 occurrences being in Job. Although its corresponding forms serve as the regular appellative in Aramaic and Arabic, it is only rarely used as such in the O.T., Dt. xxxii 17, Is. xliv 8, Ps. xviii 32, Dan. xi 48, 2 Chron. xxxii 15. It never has the article and only once is it determined by a suffix, Hab. i 11. Once it occurs in construct with the proper name Jacob, Ps. cxiv 7, and once with a common noun, ʔēlōah *sēlīḥōt*, Neh. ix 17. It does not occur in combination with another divine name. Its regular use in the O.T. is in the function of a proper name designating the God of Israel.

The form ʔēlōhīm is used some 2570 <sup>59</sup>) times in the O.T. in the general sense of deity. Morphologically it is the plural of ʔēlōah and it is sometimes used as a numerical plural to designate divine beings, especially the heathen gods, as e.g. Ex. xii 12. For the most part, however, it has singular meaning, the plural of majesty <sup>60</sup>). It may designate a deity in general, e.g. Dt. iv 33, a specific heathen god

<sup>54</sup>) Cf. U. CASSUTO, *EJ*, vol. 7, cols. 551-559.

<sup>55</sup>) *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup>) *Ibid.* CASSUTO suggests that the conclusion that ʔēl in such cases is a proper name is probably to be avoided. The question, however, is debatable.

<sup>57</sup>) *GKC*, 2s, p. 15; 126h, p. 405.

<sup>58</sup>) *Ibid.*, 124q, pp. 400 f.

<sup>59</sup>) LAGRANGE, p. 71, n. 2.

<sup>60</sup>) *GKC*, 124g, pp. 398 f.

(Chemosh), Jud. xi 23, or an angel, Jud. xiii 22. Most frequently it refers to the God of Israel and may be determined by the article, a possessive suffix, or a following genitive or attributive. In the E and P strands of the Pentateuch and in the Elohistc Psalms it is used without the article as a proper name. Elsewhere without the article ׳ֵלֹהִים usually stands in genitival relation with a preceding noun, as ׳ֵשׁ ׳ֵלֹהִים, גַּן ׳ֵלֹהִים, בְּנֵי ׳ֵלֹהִים, etc. <sup>61</sup>).

The predicate of ׳ֵלֹהִים stands regularly in the singular, and only exceptionally in the plural of which some cases are probably scribal errors and others convey some special sense. A word in apposition with ׳ֵלֹהִים may be either singular or plural, ׳ֵלֹהִים הַיְיִים or ׳ֵלֹהִים הַי, but this problem of grammatical congruity <sup>62</sup>) is usually avoided by the use of ׳ֵל with appositions <sup>63</sup>).

Despite the discrepancy in frequency of use in the O.T., it is clear that there is a substantial equalization of meaning between the forms ׳ֵל, ׳ֵלֹאֵה, and ׳ֵלֹהִים, since they are used to some extent alternatively, both in the appellative sense and in the function of a proper name as a synonym of YHWH. This substantial identity of meaning, however, does not imply that there were not differences and particular nuances in the use and meaning of the different words. CASSUTO attempted to clarify these uses and to establish the general rule <sup>64</sup>). In prose narrative ׳ֵלֹהִים is used to designate the God of Israel, and very rarely ׳ֵל <sup>65</sup>). With pronominal suffixes the form ׳ֵלֹהִים is regularly used. The form ׳ֵל is used a few times with the suffix of the first person singular, ׳ֵלִי, and the form ׳ֵלֹאֵה has a suffix only once, Hab. i 11. Accordingly, the first rule established by CASSUTO is the preference for the form ׳ֵל rather than ׳ֵלֹהִים when the word is followed by an adjective or a participle in attributive position <sup>66</sup>). In such constructions the form ׳ֵלֹהִים was generally avoided because of the problem of numerical concordance of the noun with its attribute; ׳ֵלֹהִים גְּדֹלִים is embarrassingly ambiguous as applied either to a heathen god or gods, or the God of Israel, and ׳ֵלֹהִים גְּדֹל is grammatically incongruous. Accordingly, the number of cases of ׳ֵלֹהִים followed by an adjective or participle in attributive position

<sup>61</sup>) Cf. CASSUTO, *op. cit.*, and the more detailed treatment by the same author in *SMSR*, 8 (1932), pp. 132-135.

<sup>62</sup>) *GKC*, 145h, i, p. 463.

<sup>63</sup>) CASSUTO, *SMSR*, 8 (1932), p. 132.

<sup>64</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 130 ff.

<sup>65</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 131.

<sup>66</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 133.

is very insignificant <sup>67</sup>). CASSUTO noted another difference in the usage of ʔēlôhîm and ʔēl in the appellative sense when they govern a genitive. If the genitive expresses a relation of the divinity with something other than itself, such as the person or people who worshipped the god, the place where the god was thought to dwell or show his power, or an action which the god was thought to exercise toward someone else, then ʔēlôhîm is used and only rarely ʔēl. If, however, the genitive expresses a quality inherent in the divinity, or an action which is attributed to him without regard to the connection of this action to a specific person, then ʔēl is used and only rarely ʔēlôhîm. The reason for this different use of the two words, CASSUTO suggested, is that ʔēlôhîm as a plural lends itself better to express the generic concept of divinity, or to designate a specific divinity considered in isolation, without putting into relief his divergence from other divinities, while the singular noun ʔēl commends itself when one wants to differentiate a given divinity from others. This is another reason, beside the problem of grammatical agreement in the case of ʔēlôhîm, for the preference of ʔēl in connection with the adjunct of an element which determines the particular character of the divinity treated <sup>68</sup>).

CASSUTO would see confirmation of the correctness of this distinction in usage between ʔēl and ʔēlôhîm in the expressions ʔēl ʔēlôhê yîsrâʔēl|ʔābîkâ|bāruhôt, Gen. xxxiii 20, xlvi 3; Num. xvi 22. In these formulae he discerns two ideas: 1) the connection of the divinity with the people or persons who worship him, or with the spirits created by him; 2) the distinction of this divinity from every other divinity which is implied by this relationship. The first idea, in accordance with CASSUTO's rule, is expressed by the construct of ʔēlôhîm, (ʔēlôhê) as the *regens* and the following genitive as the *rectum*, while the second idea is expressed by ʔēl <sup>69</sup>). To the present writer, however, it seems distinctly preferable to take ʔēl in these expressions as a proper name rather than as an appellative, exactly as the proper name YHWH is used instead of ʔēl in Num. xxvii 16, YHWH ʔēlôhê bāruhôt lēkol-bāsār. CASSUTO points out that in Num. xvi 22 ʔēl is vocative and asserts that in the vocative the appellative ʔēl is frequently used <sup>70</sup>). This generalization, however, may be misleading. The absolute of ʔēlôhîm in the vocative occurs some 52 times in the Psalter,

<sup>67</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 132, n. 3.

<sup>68</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 133 f.

<sup>69</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 134.

<sup>70</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 134, n. 1 and p. 136, n. 2.

almost exclusively (47 times) in the Elohist Psalms, xlii-lxxxiii, and never outside the Psalter. The 6 occurrences of the absolute of ֵֶ֑ל in the vocative are also, with one exception (Num. xii 13), in the Psalter, x 12, xvi 1, xvii 6, cxxxix 17, 23. Thus ֵֶ֑ל is found in the vocative once for each 38 occurrences and ֵֶ֑לֹהִים once for each 50 occurrences, and the difference is hardly sufficient to support the generalization. The form ֵֶ֑לֹֹֿב is found only once in the vocative, Ps. cxxxix 19.

The passage Num. xii 13 presents some difficulty for CASSUTO. In his prayer to YHWH to heal Miriam's leprosy, Moses' invocation of the deity is expressed by ֵֶ֑ל used absolutely without any other epithet: ֵֶ֑ל-נָֹֿ(ֶ) רֵֶ֑פָֹֿ(ֶ) נָֹֿ(ֶ) לָֹֿב. CASSUTO takes the Masoretic vocalization as correct, scouting the proposed emendation of ֵֶ֑ל to ֵֶ֑ל. Again he justifies the use of the alleged appellative on the ground that it is vocative, as in the case of Num. xvi 22 as opposed to Num. xxvii 16, and further suggests that ֵֶ֑ל was also chosen as a monosyllable in keeping with the rest of the prayer which is monosyllabic to give the effect of extreme conciseness and disquietude <sup>71</sup>). Apart from the monosyllables, however, this case is no different from the several other examples of the use of ֵֶ֑ל in the vocative. Quite contrary to CASSUTO's explanation that in the vocative it is the appellative that is used, it would seem that in the vocative especially one would incline to construe ֵֶ֑ל as a proper name rather than as an appellative. In view of the fact that it is now assured that *il* was anciently, at Ugarit and elsewhere, the proper name of a specific and very important deity, as well as an appellative, it seems altogether likely that in the O.T. in cases where it is a synonym of the God of Israel ֵֶ֑ל is to be taken as a proper name. In Ezek. xxviii 2, ֵֶ֑ל ֵֶ֑אֱנִי, CASSUTO takes ֵֶ֑ל as appellative and yet he suggests that the reference is perhaps to the Phoenician god El <sup>72</sup>). In the clause *môšab ֵֶ֑לֹהִים yāšabî,* in keeping with his general rule, CASSUTO takes ֵֶ֑לֹהִים as designating divinity generically. This alleged distinction between ֵֶ֑ל and ֵֶ֑לֹהִים, however, is contradicted in vs. 9 where ֵֶ֑לֹהִים ֵֶ֑אֱנִי occurs in exactly the same sense as ֵֶ֑ל ֵֶ֑אֱנִי of vs. 2. Whatever the explanation of the discrepant use of ֵֶ֑ל and ֵֶ֑לֹהִים, the reference to the deity's abode localized in the heart of the sea, *bēlēb yammim,* makes it apparent that the allusion is to the abode of El as depicted in the Ugaritic texts. It is clear from the Ugaritic texts that the abode of El was not shared by the gods in

<sup>71</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 136.

<sup>72</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 135.

general; the various Ugaritic divinities apparently had their separate abodes and when one of them wished to confer with El he had to journey to the latter's abode. The ambiguity of the use of ʔēl in the passage under consideration is probably intentional. The Prince of Tyre is represented as arrogating divinity to himself, and not just any divinity, but specifically the head of the pantheon El <sup>73</sup>).

In Micah vii 18, *mī-ʔēl kāmôkâ*, it is problematic whether ʔēl is to be taken as an appellative <sup>74</sup>) or as a proper name in the vocative. In the light of the proper name *mī-kāʔēl*, "Who is like El?," it is tempting to construe ʔēl as a proper name here <sup>75</sup>). In Dt. iii 24, 2 Sam. xxii 32, however, there is no doubt that ʔēl is appellative. In Dt. xxxiii 26, *ʔēn kâʔēl yěšurûn*, the text is possibly corrupt and CASSUTO <sup>76</sup>) suggested emendation to *ʔēn ʔēl kēʔēl yěšurûn*, which would make ʔēl clearly appellative. If, however, the text is correct, the interpretation of the RSV, "there is none like God, O Jeshurun", is most plausible. In this case, ʔēl would be the equivalent of a proper name.

Hosea xii 1 also appears to contain an allusion to the Canaanite El rather than to the God of Israel. This possibility was suggested by CASSUTO <sup>77</sup>) and treated in detail by NYBERG <sup>78</sup>) who translates: "Mit nichtigem Tun umzingelt mich Ephraim, mit Trug das Haus Israel; und Juda [ursprünglich Israel] tappt in seinem Verhältniss zu El noch verlassen umher; weil er in seinem Verhältniss zu den 'Heiligen' fest ist." The *qēdôšîm* here are the heathen gods, as in Ps. xvi 3, and NYBERG thought especially the Assyrian gods, but more likely the reference is to the indigenous Canaanite gods. Here ʔēl is not appellative, but the proper name of the deity whom the Israelites still worshipped as distinct from YHWH <sup>79</sup>). In the late apocalyptic passage Zech. xiv 5, YHWH has replaced or absorbed El, but the *qēdôšîm* are still there as distinct divine beings. Comparison of Hosea xii 1 with Zech. xiv 5; Ps. lxxxix 6, 8; Job v 1, xv 15 makes it clear that in none of these cases is *qēdôšîm* a title of the God of Israel.

<sup>73</sup>) This passage will be treated below in another connection; see below pp. 97 ff.

<sup>74</sup>) So CASSUTO, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

<sup>75</sup>) Cf. B. GEMSER, *De beteekenis der persoonsnamen voor onze kennis van het leven en denken der oude Babyloniërs en Assyriërs*, Wageningen, 1924, p. 44 f.

<sup>76</sup>) *Op. cit.*, p. 130.

<sup>77</sup>) *Ibid.*

<sup>78</sup>) "Studien zum Hoseabuche," *UUA*, 1935, pt. 6, pp. 91-93, 123-125.

<sup>79</sup>) In *The Goddess Anat*, Jerusalem, 1951, p. 45, CASSUTO cites this passage and also Is. xiv 13 and Ezek xxviii 2 as referring to the Canaanite El by name. In Is. xiv 13, however, *kôkēbê ʔēl* may be the equivalent of a superlative, "the highest stars." On Ezek. xxviii 2 see below pp. 97 ff.



In Prov. ix 10, however, where *daʿat qēdōšim* stands parallel with *yirʔat* YHWH, it is clear that *qēdōšim* is used as a synonym of YHWH. This case, however, is unique in the O.T. and, in the light of the passages noted above, is to be regarded as a clumsy modification of the older Canaanite formula in which El stood in parallelism with *qēdōšim*.

In this connection it is suggested that ʔēl be restored to the text in Prov. xxx 3<sup>80</sup>) and interpreted as a proper name. The Greek indicates that the word ʔēl has fallen out of the Hebrew and its restoration would put it in parallelism with *qēdōšim*, as in Hosea xii 1. The original reading, it is conjectured, was:

*lū lāmadtī hoḵmat ʔēl* "Would I had learned the wisdom of El,  
*wēdaʿat qēdōšim ʔēdaʿ* and knew the lore of the holy ones."

This whole passage, Prov. xxxi 1-10, except vs. 5-9, has all the earmarks of pre-Israelite or non Israelite wisdom; the mood is secular, sceptical, and pessimistic. The query "Who has ascended to heaven and come down?", vs. 4, shows familiarity with Mesopotamian secular wisdom<sup>81</sup>). If ʔēl is restored to the text as proposed, it might still be construed as appellative, *hoḵmat ʔēl*, "divine wisdom", but in view of El's distinction for wisdom, as seen in the Ugaritic texts, it seems likely that the allusion was to him specifically.

The O.T. divine names compounded with ʔēl need not be discussed in detail here since CASSUTO has dealt with them at some length<sup>82</sup>). The names ʔēl *elyōn* and ʔēl *bēt ʔēl* will be considered below in other connections. CASSUTO interprets ʔēl *elyōn*, ʔēl *bēt ʔēl*, ʔēl *ʿōlām*, and ʔēl *ʔēlōhē yiśrāʔēl* as local liturgical names, the first three being Canaanite in origin and the last Israelite. Each is connected with a specific locality, Jerusalem, Bethel, Beersheba, and Shechem, respectively. The second element of each of the first three compounds is attested independently as the proper name of a deity outside the O.T. Thus the Israelites adopted the cults of the various local gods who were identified with YHWH, more or less vaguely in the popular mind, but with precision in the theological doctrine of the priests. The liturgical names of these Canaanite gods came to be considered as alternative attributes or epithets of YHWH; this identification is clearly shown in the formulae YHWH ʔēl *elyōn*, Gen. xiv 22, and

<sup>80</sup>) For an interesting treatment of the opening verses of this chapter, cf. C. C. TORREY, *JBL*, 73 (1954), pp. 93-96.

<sup>81</sup>) Cf. *ANET*, p. 438 b.

<sup>82</sup>) *SMSR*, 8 (1932), pp. 136-144.

YHWH ʔēl ʕōlām, Gen. xxi 33. CASSUTO does not see in the divine names compounded with ʔēl in Genesis any archaic survival; ʔēl in such names he regards as appellative following a fixed and constant norm of Hebrew linguistic usage. Since YHWH as a proper name cannot take a genitive or be followed by an adjective in attributive position <sup>83</sup>), the appellation ʔēl was adopted rather than ʔēlôbîm. As it is said that YHWH is ʔēl *rahûm*, *nəqāmôt*, etc., it can be said that he is ʔēl ʕelyôn <sup>84</sup>), ʕōlām, etc. The names compounded with ʔēl in Genesis CASSUTO regards as testimony to the religion of Israel in Canaan after the conquest rather than archaic survivals <sup>85</sup>). The alternatives, however, it seems to the present writer are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, the projection of the origins and the names of these shrines back to the patriarchal period suggests that the names are indeed archaic survivals. The formula ʔēl ʔēlôbê *yisrāʔēl* applied to the altar at Shechem, Gen. xxxiii 20, CASSUTO <sup>86</sup>) would see as the projection of the liturgical usage of the time when the passage was written and when the local divinity of Shechem was identified with YHWH. Be that as it may, the important question is: what was the proper name of the god with whom YHWH was identified? Mere comparison of the unique formula ʔēl ʔēlôbê *yisrāʔēl* with the common one YHWH ʔēlôbê *yisrāʔēl* should convince one that ʔēl in this case is as much a proper name as is YHWH. To construe ʔēl as appellative in this expression is a manifest absurdity. We conclude that the name of the god in question was originally El and that the adjunct of the apposition ʔēlôbê *yisrāʔēl*, whether applied early or late, was merely for the purpose of making the identity of YHWH and El explicit.

<sup>83</sup>) CASSUTO, *ibid.*, p. 143, does not explain here how he would construe YHWH *ʕēbāʔôt*, but in YHWH *nissî*, Ex. xvii 15, and YHWH *ʕālôm*. Jud. vi 24, he takes *nissî* and *ʕālôm* as predicate. OBERMANN, *JBL*, 68 (1949), pp. 309-318, has dealt in detail with YHWH *ʕēbāʔôt*, | *nissî* | *ʕālôm* in connection with his view that YHWH is a *nomen agentis* in the form of a participle, in the sense of "Sustainer." The qualifying element *ʕēbāʔôt* OBERMANN inclines to construe as a genitive rather than as accusative, *ibid.*, p. 313. For proper names in the construct and with suffixes, see now, G. R. DRIVER, *JBL*, 73 (1954), p. 125 ff.

<sup>84</sup>) DUSSAUD, *Syria*, 27 (1950), p. 332 f., would interpret El Elyon as meaning El (son of) Elyon. According to the ancient theogony, however, El was the grandson of Elyon. It seems likely that El Elyon is really a compound name blending the two originally distinct gods.

<sup>85</sup>) *Op. cit.*, p. 145.

<sup>86</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 141.

## SECOND CHAPTER

### THE ETYMOLOGY OF 'ēl

Much ink has been expended on the problem of the etymology of *ilu*, 'ēl with no sure results except the emphasis of uncertainty. The notion is that the etymology of this word, if it could be established, would give us the key to the understanding of the primitive Semitic conception of deity. We review some of the various proposals because of the great interest in the matter and to show the futility of the endeavor.

The original quantity of the vowel of the word may have an important bearing on the choice of roots from which the word may be derived. It is generally conceded that the vowel was originally short. It is rarely, if ever, written *plene* in Akkadian <sup>1</sup>). In Hebrew proper names the vowel of 'ēl at the beginning of the name is shortened to *sēgôl* ('eldād, 'elzābād, 'elqānā(*b*), etc.), or reduced to *ḥāṭēḥ sēgôl* in the more common combining form 'ēlî. The form 'ilāb, whatever its original relation to the shorter form, also shows a short reducible vowel in the Aramaic and Hebrew forms 'ēlāb and 'ēlôab. In the face of this, the long vowel indicated in South Arabic may be regarded as a secondary development. The Greek transcription of the vowel with η in North Arabic proper names, before the confusion of the quantities of the Greek vowels <sup>2</sup>), does not necessarily indicate that the vowel was long; it could have been a matter of quality rather than quantity. There may have been a tendency to lengthen the vowel in order to bolster the consonantal deficiency of the word <sup>3</sup>).

The common view is that 'ēl is to be connected with the middle weak root 'w|yl in the sense "be in front", cf. Hebrew 'ûl, "belly", 'ûlām, 'êlām, "porch", 'ayil, "ram, leader, chief", 'ayil, 'êlā(*b*), 'êlôn, 'allā(*b*), 'allôn, "a large tree", 'ayyāl, "stag", Arabic 'awwal, "first", Aramaic 'awlā('), "beginning". The meaning "be strong" has also

---

<sup>1</sup>) MURTONEN, p. 27, states "that the vowel of the Akkadian *il(u)* has never been written *plene*." DHORME, *L'évolution religieuse d'Israël*, Brussel, 1937, p. 338, however, cites the orthography *i-il* in certain Amorite names and inclines to the view that the vowel is long. Cf. J. STARCKY, *A Or*, 17 : 2 (1949), p. 384 f., n. 6.

<sup>2</sup>) NÖLDEKE, *MbBA*, 1880, p. 760; *SbBA*, 1882, p. 1181 ff.

<sup>3</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 1191; cf. STARCKY, *op. cit.*, p. 385.

been posited for this root <sup>4)</sup>, but BAUDISSIN <sup>5)</sup> objected that all the words connected with this root which have a connotation of strength could be derived from the sense “be in front”. Whether this would apply to the *hapaxlegomenon* ʔĕyāl, Ps. lxxxviii 5, if it really means “strength”, may be doubted. The main support of the argument that the basic meaning of the root is “strength, power” is in the expression *yeš-lēʔĕl yādî*, Gen. xxxi 29, with variations in Dt. xxviii 32, Micah ii 1, Neh. v 5, and Prov. iii 27. The meaning of the expression is clear, but the derivation has not been satisfactorily explained. The expression certainly means “it is in my power”, but it is doubtful whether the word ʔĕl taken alone here means “power”. Friedrich DELITZSCH <sup>6)</sup>, who, independently of LAGARDE <sup>7)</sup>, emphatically claimed the meaning “direction, goal” as proven for the word ʔĕl explained *lēʔĕl* in this expression as being precisely like the preposition *liḥnê*, “at one’s disposal”. The translation “it is in the power of my hand”, which takes ʔĕl as being in construct with *yādî*, is against the Masoretic punctuation <sup>8)</sup>. BROCKELMANN <sup>9)</sup>, nevertheless, citing parallels among other peoples, would ascribe to the ancient Hebrews a belief in a special god or spirit of the hand; “it belongs to the god (spirit) of my hand”. O. PROCKSCH <sup>10)</sup> interpreted the expression to mean ‘my hand is directed to God’, i.e. can do what a god’s hand can do <sup>11)</sup>. None of the proposed explanations is entirely convincing. If, as seems probable, the word in this formula means “god”, it affords no clarification of its own etymology.

O. PROCKSCH <sup>12)</sup> suggested the meaning “power”, derived from a root ʔll, “bind”. Such a root is found in Akkadian and in the permansive it means, “be or show oneself strong” <sup>13)</sup> but this development from the sense “bind” to the sense “power” is difficult to follow. There is no evidence that ʔĕl is derived from a “double ʕayin” root.

<sup>4)</sup> Cf. the references given by MURTONEN, p. 34, nn. 8 and 9.

<sup>5)</sup> *Kyrios*, vol. 3, p. 16 f.

<sup>6)</sup> Cf. *Babel and Bible*, pp. 125-129.

<sup>7)</sup> “Erklärung hebräischer Wörter”, *AGG* 26 (1880), p. 3 ff. Cf. “Übersicht über die in Aramäischen, Arabischen und Hebräischen übliche Bildung der Nomina”, *AGG* 35 (1888), pp. 159 ff., 170 f.

<sup>8)</sup> Cf. BAUDISSIN, *Kyrios*, vol. 3, p. 17, n. 2.

<sup>9)</sup> *ZAW*, 26 (1906), p. 30 ff.

<sup>10)</sup> *NKZ*, 35 (1924), p. 23.

<sup>11)</sup> *Kyrios*, vol. 3, p. 17, n. 2.

<sup>12)</sup> *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Gütersloh, 1950, p. 444.

<sup>13)</sup> C. BEZOLD, *Babylonisch-assyrisches Glossar*, Heidelberg, 1926, p. 36a.

The root ʕly, whence the preposition ʕel ʕālê, Arabic ʕilāy, was suggested by LAGARDE<sup>14)</sup> as the derivation of the word. The meaning would then be, “goal, direction”, the goal to which all the efforts of men are directed<sup>15)</sup>. Such an abstract conception does not seem likely for a primitive word, in spite of LAGARDE’s<sup>16)</sup> preference and DELITZSCH’s<sup>17)</sup> eloquent and independent defense of this view.

H. L. FLEISCHER proposed the connection of the word with Arabic ʕaliba, “to experience dread”, meaning “the being who is to be feared”, but BAUDISSION<sup>18)</sup> objected that the verb in this sense is used only rarely and in obscure contexts. It seems likely that this verb is secondary and denominative from ʕilāb, “god”. J. W. JACK<sup>19)</sup> suggested connection with Sumerian *el*, “shine”, derived from Semitic *ellu*, “bright, clear, gleaming, etc.”. H. BAUER<sup>20)</sup> suggested that the word is to be connected with the proto-Semitic demonstrative ʕl which he supposes to have been used pronominally, “that one”, as a tabu word for a specific deity, just as the pronoun *buwa* is used instead of Allah in Islamic mystical literature and as a substitute for the name of the deity in proper names like ʕābīhū, ʕēlīhū, and Akkadian *ma-nu-ki-šū* (cp. *māḫāʕēl*). BAUER emphasized that this is only a hypothesis, but it seems a most unlikely one in view of the fact that we have no indication of such a tabu in the use of a god’s name in early times.

It has also been suggested that the word may be connected with the root *wʕl* in its Arabic sense “take refuge”, the god being “a Refuge”, or in the sense of its use in the Hif’il in Hebrew (*hōʕil*), “show willingness”, the god being the highest will<sup>21)</sup>. Again this conception is too abstract and philosophical to be considered as having any plausibility or probability.

There is little point in entering into further discussion of these and other proposals. None of them carries conviction or appears to have any considerable degree of probability. The present writer is unable

<sup>14)</sup> Cf. above, p. 17, n. 7.

<sup>15)</sup> This idea was suggested already by the French reformed theologian LA PLACE who died in 1655. Cf. LAGRANGE, p. 79 ff.

<sup>16)</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17)</sup> Cf. above, p. 17, n. 6.

<sup>18)</sup> *Kyrios*, vol. 3, p. 16.

<sup>19)</sup> *The Ras Shamra Tablets and their Bearing on the Old Testament*, Edinburgh, 1935, p. 15; cited after G. B. ROGGIA in *Aevum*, 15 (1941), p. 564. JACK’s book is not accessible to me.

<sup>20)</sup> *ZAW*, 51 (1933), p. 84.

<sup>21)</sup> Cf. CASSUTO, *EJ*, vol. 7, col. 559.

to choose between any of them or to offer any new suggestion. The bottom of the etymological barrel has been thoroughly scraped and the etymology remains obscure. The notion that any word must necessarily be derived from a "root", particularly from a "verbal root", is perhaps entirely wrong-headed. As far as the word *ilu*, ʔĕl is concerned, it gets us nowhere; the problem is philologically insoluble on the basis of the materials now at our disposal. The word *ilu*, ʔĕl is simply a primitive noun and as such cannot be further analyzed.

The relation of ʔil, ʔĕl to ʔilāb, ʔĕlāb, ʔĕlôab is highly problematic. It has been argued that the forms ʔil and ʔilāb have no connection<sup>22</sup>). Since nearly all groups of Semites used one or the other, or both forms as a general designation of deity, it seems altogether likely that they had a common origin, i.e. ʔilāb is either an expansion of ʔil, or ʔil a contraction of ʔilāb. The suggestion that ʔil is an abbreviation of ʔilāb has nothing to support it<sup>23</sup>). It has been supposed that ʔilāb is a plural of ʔil<sup>24</sup>), which would make the form ʔĕlôhîm a double plural, but nowhere does ʔilāb have plural meaning. The form ʔilāb has been explained as a vocative of ʔil, like the Arabic vocatives of nouns of relationship, ʔabab, ʔummab<sup>25</sup>). MURTONEN<sup>26</sup>) accepts this latter view and offers the explanation that the old Semites were very religious and used the name of god very frequently, principally in the vocative, so that the original form in some places fell into oblivion and the vocative form began to be used in the nominative also. If ʔilāb were originally vocative, it might be expected that it would be used as such in preference to other forms, but such is not the case. In Ugaritic, our second oldest Semitic language, there is no trace of the vocative use of *ilb*, and in the O.T. ʔĕlôab is found in the vocative only once, Ps. cxxxix 19.

The view that ʔĕlôhîm is the plural of ʔĕl<sup>27</sup>) appears at first glance to find support in the analogy of plurals of weak roots with an artificial expansion into a trilateral root by the addition of a consonantal

22) Cf. MURTONEN, p. 39, n. 3.

23) H. EWALD, *Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott; oder Theologie des alten und neuen Bundes*, vol. 2, Leipzig, 1873, p. 328 ff.; A. FISCHER, *ZDMG*, 71 (1917), p. 445.

24) WELLHAUSEN, *ZDMG*, 55 (1901), p. 699; O. PROCKSCH, *Theologie*, p. 447, "eine Kollektivbildung".

25) K. VOLLERS, *ZA*, 17 (1903), p. 305 ff.; H. BAUER, *ZDMG*, 69 (1915), p. 561.

26) P. 40 f.

27) Cf. MURTONEN, p. 41 f.

*b*, cf. Ugaritic *um*, *umbt*, *amt*, *ambt*, Hebrew ʔāmābôt, Aramaic ʔābābāt and šēmābāt (constructs), Phoenician *dlbt*, Arabic ʔababāt, ʔummabāt<sup>28</sup>). The Ugaritic plural of *ilt*, “goddess”, *ilbt* would appear to be a case of this sort, like Phoenician *dlt*, *dlbt*, except for the existence of the masculine singular form *ilb*. The forms ʔāmābôt etc. cited above are all morphologically feminine and there is no analogy of the insertion of a *b* before the masculine plural ending. In the form ʔāmābôt the vowel before the *b* is originally short as seen from the construct ʔambôt, and so also in the Arabic forms ʔababāt, ʔummabāt, but not so in the Aramaic forms ʔābābāt, šēmābāt. The form *ilāb*, however, has a nature-long *ā*, *ō* before the *b*. The fact that the form ʔēlim is very rare in the O.T. and the form ʔēlôhîm very common is no ground for supposing that ʔēlôhîm is the plural of ʔēl. In Ugaritic and Phoenician the plural of ʔl is ʔlm while the forms ʔlb and ʔlbm are rare and of uncertain meaning in Ugaritic and entirely lacking in Phoenician. Apart from the matter of distribution, it is obvious that morphologically ʔēlim is the plural of ʔēl and ʔēlôhîm the plural of ʔēlôah<sup>29</sup>).

How the plural form ʔēlôhîm came to have singular meaning, as commonly in the O.T. as the designation of the God of Israel, remains something of a problem. It has been supposed that this meaning developed from the use of the plural to designate collectively a limited group of divinities<sup>30</sup>), such as a local pantheon. This is a normal and well attested use, but the transition from a group of deities to a single deity is not thus explained. Again it is suggested that the plural developed singular meaning with reference to a single god who was regarded as the comprehension of divine powers<sup>31</sup>). This is essentially the view which EISSFELDT<sup>32</sup>) takes of El in a couple of the Ugaritic texts, but, as we shall see, there is little to support this. ALBRIGHT<sup>33</sup>) suggests that as a result of the worship of important deities in many different places in Canaan there was an increasing tendency to employ the plural of the name “in the clear sense of totality of manifestations of a deity”, such as ʔAštārôt, “Astartes”, and ʔAnatôt, “Anaths”. In the Amarna letters, ALBRIGHT points out, the

28) Cf. GKC, 96, p. 285; UH, 8. 47, p. 42 f.

29) This also is the conclusion of MURTONEN, p. 42.

30) Cf. W. R. SMITH, *The Religion of the Semites*, London, 1894, p. 445 f.; K. MARTI, *Geschichte der Israelitischen Religion*, Strassburg, 1903, p. 26.

31) KOEHLER, *Lexicon*, p. 52.

32) EUP, pp. 60-70.

33) FSAC, p. 161.

Canaanite vassals address the Pharaoh as “my gods, my sun-god”, and this grandiloquent flattery he assumes was borrowed from their cultic phraseology, “where they magnified one of their own gods in monolatrous fashion by addressing him as the totality of the gods, i.e. as equivalent to the entire pantheon”<sup>34</sup>). ALBRIGHT takes the fact that the Israelites took over the Canaanite plural, ʔēlôhîm, “gods”, in the sense of “God”, as confirmation of the correctness of his view. Which of the Canaanite gods they thus exalted, ALBRIGHT does not venture to say. That the use of the so-called plural of majesty in reference to a single god is pre-Israelite is virtually certain from the use of *ilāni* as singular in the Amarna letters, but there is no certain attestation of the pre-Israelite use of the form ʔēlôhîm as a singular. In a couple of cases in the Ugaritic texts the plural *ilm* may possibly refer to a single god, as with Phoenician ʔlm, but this is not certain. The use of *ilbm* in the Ugaritic texts 1 : 5, 13; 3 : 28 is enigmatic and it is by no means sure that it refers to a single deity as BAUER<sup>35</sup>) says, “Eigenname einer Gottheit”.

---

<sup>34</sup>) *Ibid.*

<sup>35</sup>) *ZAW*, 51 (1933), p. 85



### THIRD CHAPTER

#### UGARITIC PROPER NAMES COMPOUNDED WITH *il*

The Ugaritic proper names containing the element *il* are not numerous <sup>1)</sup>, nor are they especially informative, but they merit notice as part of the data on El. Here, as elsewhere, it is not always certain whether the element *il* is to be taken as the proper name or as the appellative, but it is expedient first to attempt to cull out the cases in which *il* is probably appellative. This is probably the case with a group of names composed of *il* plus the proper name or title of a well-known deity, viz. *ilbc<sup>l</sup>* <sup>2)</sup>, *ilbd* <sup>3)</sup>, *ildgn* <sup>4)</sup>, *ilmk* <sup>5)</sup>, *ilšn* <sup>6)</sup>, *ilšpš* <sup>7)</sup>. It does not seem at all likely that any of these names are intended to equate El with the deities mentioned, although *mlk* is perhaps a special title of El. The element *il* in these names is almost certainly to be taken as the appellative “god”, and probably with the possessive suffix of the first person singular, “(my) god is Baal, Had(d), Dagan, Milku, Sin(?), Shapsh” <sup>8)</sup>. In a couple of cases the element *il* follows the proper name, *ymil* <sup>9)</sup>, “Yam is (my?) god”, and *šdqil* <sup>10)</sup>, “Šedeq is (my?) god”.

In the remainder of the Ugaritic personal names containing *il* it seems likely that the element is to be taken as the proper name of the god. Most of these names are composed of *il* plus a verbal form or an adjective: *ilgn* <sup>11)</sup> “El protects”, *ilhbn* <sup>12)</sup> “El loves me”, *ilštm<sup>c</sup>* <sup>13)</sup> “El listens”, *iltḥm* <sup>14)</sup> “El speaks”, *iltṫmr* <sup>15)</sup> “El is bounteous(?)”,

---

1) Cf. DE LANGHE, vol. 2, pp. 272-315 and 347-354.

2) 322 : V : 22.

3) 321 : 1 : 7. GORDON reads *blbd*!

4) 321 : III : 9.

5) I AB V 53; II K VI 59; 308 : 24.

6) 321 : III : 34; 333 : 3.

7) 304 : 12.

8) Cf. EISSFELDT, *EUP*, p. 46 f.

9) 322 : rev. : V : 4.

10) 321 : III : 4.

11) 321 : I : 34.

12) 321 : III : 44.

13) 113 : 29, a place name, with the gentilic *ilštm<sup>c</sup>y*, 64 : 29, 30, 31; 91 : 1; 314 : rev. 6, 7, 9; 327 : 8. Cf. EISSFELDT, *EUP*, p. 45 f., n. 8.

14) 321 : II : 5.

15) 300 : 11. Cf. EISSFELDT, p. 47 f., n. 4.

or watchful(?)", *ilmbr* 16) "El is swift", *ilrb* 17) "El is great", *iltm* 18) "El is perfect". It is uncertain whether the names *ilwn* 19), *ily* 20), *ilyn* 21), *ilsk* 22), *ilš* 23), *ilšy* 24), and *ilrš* 25) are El theophora; as such no likely meaning can be derived. With the element *il* last, there are the names *dnil* 26) "El is judge", *mril* 27) "El blesses(?)", and *tibil* 28) "El returns", or "Return, O El". There are a couple of names with "imperfect" verbal forms, *yknil* 29) "El establishes", and *ybnil* 30) "El builds, or creates", cf. Amarna *yabni-ilu* and O.T. *yabnēzēl*, Josh. xv 11. Another group of names is formed by nouns in construct with *il*: *bdil* 31) "In the hand of El", *bnil* 32) "Son of El", *n<sup>r</sup>!(?)il* 33) "Lackey of El", *bdil* 34) "Servant of El".

From these few names we get only a modest bit of information about the Ugaritians' conception of El's nature and activities. El creates, establishes, protects, watches(?), or is bounteous(?), loves, listens, speaks, judges, blesses(?), returns (repents). He is great, perfect, swift. The worshipper is in his hand (power) and is counted as his son and slave. There is hardly anything here predicated of El that cannot be matched or paralleled in other Semitic theophorous names.

There is need for a comprehensive study of proper names compounded with *il* throughout the Semitic world and a comparison with all other Semitic theophora, but such a task is far beyond the scope of this present study. A. MURTONEN 35) in a recent treatise has listed over two hundred West Semitic personal names containing the element *il*, *ilb* from Amorite, Ugaritic, Canaanite-Hebrew-Phoenician, Aramaic, and South Arabic sources. This list is, of course, far from being exhaustive, but it gives a broad picture of the qualities attributed to El and the attitudes of the pious toward him. MURTONEN presents a map 36) showing the appearances of *il* as a proper name in time and space; it is attested as such in Lower Mesopotamia before 2300 B.C.,

16) 321 : I : 9.

17) 321 : III : 41, IV : 15.

18) 314 : 16.

19) 331 : 4.

20) 321 : II : 22.

21) 321 : II : 47.

22) 119 : 8.

23) 311 : rev. : 1.

24) 300 : rev. : 15.

25) 321 : II : 15; 323 : IV : 10.

26) I D 19, 36, 38, 47, 90 etc.

27) 113 : 51, a place-name.

28) 10 : 6.

29) 314 : 15.

30) 332 : 5.

31) 322 : II : 2.

32) 321 : II : 41.

33) 10 : 16.

34) 80 : I : 3.

35) Appendix, pp. 93-103.

36) P. 107.

among the Amorites ca. 2000-1500 B.C., in Cappadocia ca. 2000-1500 B.C., at Ugarit ca. 1500-1200 B.C., in South Arabia ca. 1200 B.C.-500 A.D., at Karatepe (according to MURTONEN ca. 1200 B.C., but this date is probably a few centuries too early), and at Senjirli ca. 800-700 B.C. As a component of personal names, presumably, but as uncertain whether it is to be taken as a proper name, MURTONEN further maps *ʔl* as attested in Lower Mesopotamia from ca. 2700 B.C.-100 A.D., in Assyria ca. 1500-600 B.C., in Nuzi ca. 1500 B.C., in Palestine ca. 1400 B.C.-100 A.D., in South Arabia, among the Lihyanites, Safaites, and Thamudians ca. 600(?) B.C.-500 A.D., and among the Palmyreans and Nabateans ca. 200 B.C.-500 A.D. MURTONEN makes scant use of the interesting list he has compiled, giving only the name, probable meaning, and source. Without going into detail, we may venture to give a greatly condensed summary of the information about El furnished by MURTONEN's list: El is father, uncle, king, master, ruler, lord; he is a bull, a bear, a lion, a rock; he is light and peace; he is first, great, exalted, perfect, most high, strong, merciful, trusty, honored; he ordains, produces, builds, commands, speaks, judges, thinks, chooses, lives, knows, remembers, increases, opens (inspires?), heals, helps, forgives; blesses, provides, gives, saves, rescues, hears, loves, makes happy, enriches(?); the worshipper is El's son, his slave, his warrior, adherent, darling; he is in the hand (power) and in the shadow (protection) of El; El is his shepherd, his companion, his song. Inauspicious names containing *ʔl* are very rare; MURTONEN's list gives only the following, and some of these are doubtful: destroy, bereave, sweep away, be or make sick, cause a quarrel.

From the attributes and actions predicated of El in personal names distributed over almost the entire Semitic world from the middle of the 3rd millennium down to the Christian era it is manifest that El was a very ancient and important deity, especially among the Western Semites, but beyond this it is hard to draw any more definite conclusions.

## FOURTH CHAPTER

### EL'S EPITHETS AND ATTRIBUTES IN THE UGARITIC TEXTS

The epithets and attributes applied to El in the Ugaritic texts are of especial interest and value because of the dearth of epithets applied to him elsewhere. Apart from the proper names containing El as the theophorous element, summarily noted above, we have very few clues to his nature and character outside the Ugaritic texts. In Amorite, Aramaic, North and South Arabic there is nothing in the way of epithets of this god. In the O.T. we have the adjuncts *elyōn*, *ōlām*, *šadday*, and *bēṯēl*, all of which are probably originally divine names or epithets become divine names, and some of which may have originally had nothing to do with El, as is certainly the case with *elyōn*. The epithet *ēl qannā(ʔ)|qannō(ʔ)* is several times applied to YHWH in the O.T., Ex. xx 5, xxiv 13; Dt. iv 24, v 9, vi 15; Josh. xxiv 19; Nahum i 2, where it would appear that *ēl* is to be understood as appellative rather than as the proper name. However, in the light of El's epithet *qn rš* attested at Karatepe, Leptis Magna, and Palmyra, and now possibly at Boğazköy <sup>1)</sup>, one may wonder whether the O.T. *ēl qannā|ō(ʔ)* may not be an echo of this title, with a play on the roots *qny* and *qnʔ*. The epithet *ēl raḥūm wēḥannūn* is also applied to YHWH, Ex. xxxiv 6, Dt. iv 3, Neh. ix 31, Jonah iv 2, where *ēl* likewise appears to have been intended as appellative, but again, in view of El's Ugaritic epithets *lṭpn*, "beneficent" and *dpid*, "benign", it appears likely that *raḥūm* and *ḥannūn* were traits of El assimilated to YHWH.

#### A. EL AS NOMINAL KING OF THE GODS

It is beyond the scope of this present study to attempt any detailed or exhaustive treatment of the use of *mlk* as a designation of divinity or the equivalent of a divine proper name throughout the ancient Semitic world. The discussion here will have to be confined for the most part to Ugaritic and specifically to El.

The element *mlk* is widely distributed among the Western Semites

---

<sup>1)</sup> See below pp. 52 ff.

and South Arabs as the designation of a divinity and the equivalent of a divine proper name<sup>2</sup>). In most personal names containing *mlk* it is the theophorous element and must be regarded as an epithet become a divine proper name. In Phoenician and Punic personal names *mlk* has nearly always the value of a divine name, e.g. *mlkḥlš*, "M rescues", *mlkḥrm*, "M is holy", *mlkyʿzr*, "M will help", *mlkytn* and *ytnmlk*, "M gives", *mlkpls*, "M levels", *mlkrm*, "M is high", *ʿdrmlk*, "M is majestic", *ʿhlmlk*, "Tent-mate(?) of M", *ʿḥtmlk* (Ugaritic *ahṭmlk*), "Sister of M", *ʿmtmlk*, "Slave-girl of M", *bnmlk*, "Son of M", *grmlk*, "Protégé of M", *ḥmlk*, "Brother of M", *ḥnmlk*, "M is gracious", *ydʿmlk*, "M knows", *yḥwmlk* (Ugaritic *yḥmlk*), "M lives or enlivens", *mqnmlk*, "Property of M", (*ʿ*)*bdmlk*, "Slave of M", *ʿzmlk*, "M is strong", *rʿmlk*, "Friend of M", *ʿrmlk*, "M is light"<sup>3</sup>). In the name *šdqmlk*, cf. O.T. *malkiṣedeq*, it is uncertain whether *mlk* or *šdq* is the theophorous element, and similarly with Amarna *abimilki*, O.T. *ʿābīmelek*, Ugaritic *abmlk*. In Amarna *ili-milku* and *milki-ilu*, O.T. *ʿēlīmelek*, Ugaritic *ilmlk*, however, it is certain that *mlk* is the epithet, just as in *bʿlmlk*, "Baal is king", and in Ugaritic *ktrmlk*, "*Ktr* is king", since in Canaanite *ʿl* and *bʿl* according to BAUDISSIN<sup>4</sup>) are not used predicatively. (The Punic *mlkbʿl* and *mlkʿsr* are compound divine names<sup>5</sup>). In the name *mlkʿl*, attested both at Palmyra<sup>6</sup>) and in Safaitic<sup>7</sup>), *mlk* is certainly the epithet and *ʿl* the proper name, just as in Amarna *milki-ilu*. While El is not the only deity whose name is compounded with the epithet *mlk* in personal names, it is the one most anciently and widely attested. The question then arises whether in the personal names in which *mlk* serves as the equivalent of a divine name, such as the Phoenician and Punic names cited above, the god in question may in some cases be El. In the Phoenician and Punic names it is possible or even probable that *mlk* is in most cases the abbreviation of *melqart*, *milk-qart*, "King of the city"<sup>8</sup>). We do not know the identity of Melqart, the chief god of the Tyrians, but it is certain that he was a cosmic deity<sup>9</sup>). ALBRIGHT<sup>10</sup>) has suggested that *qart* in his

2) BAUDISSIN, *Kyrios*, vol. 3, pp. 44-51.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 45, n. 1.

4) *Ibid.*, p. 44.

5) *Ibid.*, p. 45.

6) *Ibid.*, p. 47.

7) *Ibid.*, p. 49.

8) *Ibid.*, p. 45.

9) Cf. ALBRIGHT, *ARI*, pp. 81 and 196, n. 29; *BASOR*, 87 (1942), p. 29; 90 (1943), p. 32.

10) *FSAC*, pp. 235 and 333, n. 43.

name refers not to Tyre but to the netherworld in general, just as *qrt* in Ugaritic, II AB VIII 11, I\* AB II 15, refers to the abode of Mot in the netherworld and Akkadian *ālu*, "city", is sometimes used of the netherworld. If ALBRIGHT is right, the god Melqart, we suggest, may then be none other than El. DELLA VIDA<sup>11)</sup> has suggested that El's title *qn ʔrš* "Lord of earth" would in this event be perfectly parallel to *mlkqrt*, the only difference being the stress on the depths of the earth in *mlkqrt* and on the surface in *qn ʔrš*. This proposed distinction as to strata, however, is not justified in this case. The "earth" often refers to the netherworld in Hebrew, Ugaritic, and Akkadian<sup>12)</sup>. ALBRIGHT<sup>13)</sup> notes that "the god of the underworld was at the same time a chthonic deity, that is, he was lord of the ground and of its productive faculties." DELLA VIDA<sup>14)</sup> has shown that what we know of El points to his connection with the earth and not with heaven<sup>15)</sup>. El's abode, as described in the Ugaritic texts, is clearly subterranean. There seems to be nothing to oppose the suggestion that Melqart, the god doubtless designated by some of the numerous personal names containing the element *mlk* as a divine name, may be identical with the Ugaritic El.

#### B. EL AS EX-KING OF THE GODS?

In the Ugaritic texts the epithet *mlk*, "king", in the expressions *mlk ab šnm*, I AB I 8, II AB IV-V 24, V AB E 16, II D VI 49, and *il mlk dyknnb*, II AB IV-V 48, V AB E 44, presumably establishes El as at least titular ruler of the Ugaritic pantheon. Baal is also referred to as king and chief, "above whom there is none", II AB IV-V 43-44, V AB E 40-41<sup>16)</sup>. *Attar* also, with El's approval, reigns in Baal's stead, I AB I 15-37, and the personal name *kṯrmlk*, 314: rev. 5, shows that the god Kṯr was also in some sense considered as a king among the gods. But in the mythological texts *mlk* as a direct epithet is applied only to El. El on one occasion only appears to preside over the assembly of the gods, III AB 13-47; the gods

11) *JBL*, 63 (1944), p. 7, n. 29.

12) Cf. GUNKEL, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, Göttingen, 1895, p. 18, n. 1; CASSUTO, *The Goddess Anath*, p. 22, n. 1.

13) *ARI*, p. 81.

14) *JBL*, 63 (1944), pp. 1-9.

15) Cf. DELLA VIDA, *op. cit.*, p. 6, nn. 24 and 25.

16) On the implications of this passage cf. A. S. KAPELRUD, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts*, Copenhagen, 1952, pp. 63 f.

are about to sit down to eat and Baal is standing by El, either to minister to him <sup>17</sup>), or perhaps hoping for protection from Prince Sea whose hostile messengers have been dispatched with a demand for the surrender of Baal. At the sight of the fearsome messengers of Prince Sea, the gods, presumably including El, but not Baal, cravenly lower their heads down on their knees. The messengers in accordance with their master's instructions, dispense with the usual obeisance and do not bow before El and the divine assembly but arrogantly deliver their master's demand for the surrender of Baal. El acquiesces, but Baal rebukes the gods for their cowardice, voices defiance, seizes a weapon and moves to attack the messengers. El is apparently helpless in this brawl, but ʿAttart, and perhaps also ʿAnat or Asherah step in and stay Baal's hand. The text breaks off before we can see the conclusion of this episode, but it is obvious that El is not master of the situation, and his power and control are hardly what we would expect of the ruler of the gods. El's authority appears elsewhere to be precarious and more nominal than real. It seems to be taken for granted that his approval is prerequisite for any important matter affecting the gods, but he appears soft and unduly susceptible both to flattery and coercion. His approval in the momentous matter of construction of a house for Baal is gained by Asherah through intrigue and flattery, II AB IV-V 40-80, and by ʿAnat through the threat of violence to his person, V AB E 9-11, 27-37. On another occasion, in the episode involving Aqhat's bow, III D VI 11-20, ʿAnat again gets her way by threatening her venerable father with mayhem. DUS-SAUD <sup>18</sup>) attempts to get around this affront to El's dignity by taking ʿAnat's words not as a threat to bash his aged head but as an offer to regenerate him by means of a blood bath such as the one she gives herself in V AB B 5-37. This interpretation, however, is entirely out of the question as seen from V AB E 9 where ʿAnat before visiting El declares she will "smite him like a lamb to the ground". With due allowance for ʿAnat's violent temperament, these threats of physical violence by the daughter against her father, the father of all the gods and nominal head of the pantheon, raise some doubt as to El's real authority. Proper respect and fear of El's authority and power, how-

---

<sup>17</sup>) Note the subservient position of Kumarbi before he dethroned Anu: "(As long as) Anus was seated on the throne, the mighty Kumarbis would give him his food. He would sink at his feet and set the drinking cup in his hand." GOETZE's translation, *ANET*, p. 120 b (15).

<sup>18</sup>) *DRS*, p. 109.

ever, are seen in a couple of episodes, when the sun goddess Shapsh halts the fray between Baal and Mot with the mere threat to Mot that El will hear him and overthrow the throne of his dominion, I AB VI 22-31, and Mot is seized with fear and presumably desists, (the text becomes fragmentary at this point), and similarly she admonishes [‘A<sub>1</sub>tar?'] in III AB C 16-18.

This warning that El will take away the gods' dominions clearly implies that it is he who sets up and deposes the lesser gods, his children. But the disrespectful behaviour of Prince Sea's messengers, El's ready capitulation to their demand, his apparent helplessness in the altercation that breaks out in the divine assembly, his submission to ‘Anat's threats, is rather difficult to understand, if his authority and power are really commensurate with his nominal position. It is hard to see how the Ugaritians who composed and read and heard these ironical episodes recited could have had a firm belief in El's supremacy<sup>19</sup>). ROGGIA<sup>20</sup>) has concluded that among the Ugaritians the god El has undergone a progressive degradation. This may indeed be the clue to the understanding of the puzzling discrepancies. If he once held sway supreme and later in his old age was deposed, he may have retained his ancient titles and prestige without any real power except in advisory capacity. It is clear that Baal is the rising young god at Ugarit. Moreover, El appears somewhat aloof and remote from the center of activity in the mythological texts. The gods and goddesses come to him with their entreaties and demands or send their messengers. The actual rule of the world, however, appears to be divided between Baal in the heavens and on the earth's surface, Mot in the netherworld, and Yam in the sea. These three gods are at times in conflict and El seems to vacillate in his favor of now one and now another of the rivals.

This situation is strikingly reminiscent of the Greek legends about Kronos who was identified with the Semitic El<sup>21</sup>). Kronos was banished by his sons Zeus, Hades, and Poseidon, corresponding to Baal, Mot, and Yam respectively, and these then divided the dominion among themselves<sup>22</sup>). Kronos, nevertheless, continued as nominal

---

19) EISSFELDT, however, *EUP*, pp. 57 f., argues that such humor does not necessarily indicate any deterioration of belief in El and he cites similar phenomena in Homer and the medieval mystery plays.

20) *Aevum*, 15 (1941), p. 575.

21) Cf. above p. 4.

22) Cf. the *Iliad* XV 187.



king even in exile and there is further the legend that Zeus, after he had bound and imprisoned his father Kronos, appropriated his counsel about the ordering of the world by means of demons who conveyed to him Kronos' dreams<sup>23</sup>). That this motif, at least in part is no late development is now seen from the Hurrian myth of Kumarbi in the Hittite texts discovered at Boğazköy<sup>24</sup>). It is related of Kumarbi that he rebelled against the sky god Anu and dethroned and banished him. Moreover, Kumarbi bit off and swallowed Anu's genitals (termed "knees" after the common Akkadian euphemism, similar to the Hebrew euphemism "feet") and, being impregnated by Anu's genitals, gave birth by way of his mouth to several gods, including the Storm-god (Hurrian Teshub, counterpart of Hadad-Baal and Zeus). The parallel to the Greek myth of Kronos (El) who emasculated and banished his father Ouranos (Heaven, corresponding to Anu, Sumerian AN) has been pointed out by GÜTERBOCK<sup>25</sup>). The Storm-god in his turn apparently dethroned Kumarbi, as Zeus deposed Kronos, but the account of this is not complete in the Hittite source<sup>26</sup>). CASSUTO<sup>27</sup>) has suggested that a similar story may have been told of El and Baal in the Ugaritic cycle of myths of which only fragments have been so far recovered. That such an episode was related seems altogether probable since it would explain El's somewhat ambiguous position in the extant Ugaritic texts. The writer ventures to suggest with great reserve, that the episode postulated by CASSUTO may have been related in the sadly mutilated fifth column of the poem designated VI AB. It is clear that Had (Baal) and El are involved in the action, lines 4, 17, 22. Twice, lines 4, 17, it is said "Had accosts/attacks him", *hd tngtnb*; cf. the use of *ngt* in °Anat's attack on Mot, I AB II 6, 27, and Baal's attack on the Eaters and Devourers, BH I 40. The verbs *asr* and *rks* occur four times, lines 9, 10, 22, 23, and in line 22 it is virtually certain that El is the victim of the binding, *tasrn tr il*, "they bind Bull El". There are three references to "loins", *mtn(m)*, lines 12, 14, 25, and the enigmatic phrase *bn abnm* is twice repeated, lines 11, 23. The mention

<sup>23</sup>) PWRE, vol. 11, col. 2013, ll. 30-50; Plutarch, *Peri tou prosōpou tēs selēnēs* (ed. P. RAINGEARD, Chartres, 1934), 941; J. H. WASZINK, "The Dreaming Kronos in the Corpus Hermeticum," in *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slaves*, 10 (Mélanges Henri Grégoire), Brussel, 1950, pp. 639-653.

<sup>24</sup>) Cf. above p. 2, n. 7; p. 5, n. 30.

<sup>25</sup>) *Kumarbi*, pp. 100-115.

<sup>26</sup>) Cf. GOETZE, *ANET*, p. 121 b.

<sup>27</sup>) *The Goddess Anath*, p. 42 f.

of loins suggests that possibly emasculation is involved, but the text is so fragmentary that any guess is hazardous. The obscure *bn abnm* is also provocative of speculation. GORDON's<sup>28</sup>) rendering "the builder of stone(s)" would hardly make sense in any context. The phrase might mean "between the stones", although <sup>3</sup>*bn* in the sense of "testicles" is not certainly attested in Semitic<sup>29</sup>). The meaning "son of stone" or "children of stone" is also possible and recalls the account of Hesiod (*Theogony*, 453-500) that Kronos forewarned by Gaia and Ouranos that one of his sons would overthrow and supplant him, swallowed his children as soon as they were born. Only Zeus escaped, saved by a stratagem of Rhea who gave Kronos a stone wrapped in swaddling clothes and spirited Zeus away to grow up in Crete. Zeus on reaching maturity forced his father to disgorge the stone first and then the other offspring. Afterward there occurred the Titanomachy (*Theogony*, 617-735) in which Zeus hurled the Titans down to Tartarus and bound them in hard bonds. While Kronos is not mentioned in this episode, it is to be inferred from passages in the *Iliad* (XIV 203-4, 274, 279) that Kronos was confined with the Titans. In the Kumarbi myth, II 39-54, there may be a parallel to the above motif. There is, according to GÜTERBOCK<sup>30</sup>), mention of the Storm-god, a wife and perhaps a child, if GÜTERBOCK's restoration is correct, and then someone laments. In GOETZE's<sup>31</sup>) translation of the intelligible portions, Kumarbi says, "Give me my son, I want to devour my son!" It appears that Kumarbi receives something to eat, but it hurts his mouth and he begins to moan. In line 60, according to GÜTERBOCK<sup>32</sup>), a stone is mentioned shortly before a passage in which some cultic procedure is apparently introduced, lines 62-65, 71 ff., and he calls attention to the possible parallel with Hesiod's account of Kronos and the stone-swallowing, judiciously warning, however, that much is obscure in detail and expressing true scholarly reserve. As regards the Ugaritic fragment VI AB V, the present writer also would reemphasize the reserve with which he offers the suggestion that this may be a part of the missing episode which CASSUTO postulated and possibly also a parallel to the above mentioned incident in the Kumarbi myth and in Hesiod's account

28) *UL*, p. 26 f.

29) Unless the <sup>3</sup>*obnayim* of Ex. i 16 has this meaning rather than "birthstool". Cf. H. TORCZYNER, *Die Entstehung des semitischen Sprachtypus*, Vienna, 1916, p. 163 f.

30) *Kumarbi*, p. 102.

31) *Anet*, p. 121.

32) *Loc. cit.*

of Kronos. The Ugaritic text is broken down the middle and many words are obscure, but what is intelligible is provocative and the writer hopes to torture more information from this lamentable fragment at some future date.

The preceding digression is by no means irrelevant to the question of El's kingship over the gods of Ugarit. The deposed god Kumarbi corresponds to El in the succession of gods in the Hurrian theogony in Hittite. Kumarbi was known and worshipped at Ugarit where a considerable proportion of the population, to judge from the proper names, was Hurrian<sup>33</sup>). It is to be expected that the Hurrian citizens of Ugarit and probably also the Semitic populace, knew the story of Kumarbi, his deposition of Anu and his own deposition in turn by the Storm-god (Teshub). It is natural that Kumarbi should be identified or at least equated with El at Ugarit, as actually he appears to have been from the prefixing of the Semitic *il* to his name in the Hurrian text 4 : 6, 7, 8, *il kmrb*. If El, like Kumarbi, was deposed king of the gods, his baffling status in the Ugaritic mythological texts is thereby clarified. We will return to this topic later because of its crucial importance for the understanding of the Ugaritic myths and the appraisal of El's role in them.

### C. EL'S SENIORITY AND SENILITY

El's seniority over all the other Ugaritic gods is everywhere implicit, whether the title *ab šnm* is to be taken as "Father of Years" or as "Father (of) Shunem", whatever that might mean. BAUER'S proposal<sup>34</sup>), "Father of Years", has been rejected by a number of scholars, following GINSBERG<sup>35</sup>), because the plural of the word for year in Ugaritic appears only as *šnt* and never as *šnm*<sup>36</sup>). This, however, cannot be considered decisive. In Hebrew the word for "year" has both masculine and feminine plurals, *šānîm* and *šānôt*, as does also the word for "day", and several others<sup>37</sup>). Moreover, as a proper name *šnm* finds no satisfactory explanation. The only occurrence of *šnm* in the Ugaritic texts outside the epithet *ab šnm* is in the compound name *škmn wšnm*, identified as the Cassite deities Thukamuna

<sup>33</sup>) Cf. DE LANGHE, vol. 2, pp. 330-336.

<sup>34</sup>) ZAW, 51 (1933), p. 82.

<sup>35</sup>) Or, 5 (1936), p. 164.

<sup>36</sup>) Cf. GORDON, UH, p. 60, n. 5.

<sup>37</sup>) GKC, 87m-q, pp. 243 f.

and Shumaliya<sup>38</sup>) who have a very minor, nondescript, and problematic role in the Ugaritic pantheon and are not even mentioned in the literary texts. There is no known reason why El should be called the father of Shunem/Shumaliya. The town of Shunem near Jezreel and Gilboa (Josh. xix 18, 1 Sam. xxviii 4) is well-known as the home-town of the beautiful Abishag and of the anonymous patroness of the prophet Elisha. But El would hardly be called the father of a locality. In association with the predication of El as king, *mlk ab šnm*, one would not expect the name of any single one of his progeny, but something more comprehensive such as "Father of Mankind" (*ab adm*) I K 37, or "Father of the Gods". As "Father of Years" *ab šnm* would have arresting parallels in the famous phrase *ʿābî ʿad*, "father of Eternity", "Everlasting Father", Is. ix 5, and the "Ancient of Days", *ʿattîq yômîn*, Dan. vii 9. If the meaning "years" for *šnm* is rejected, as it perhaps should be, it is even more certain that the *pis aller* Shunem must be rejected. It has been suggested that *šnm* might be connected with the root *šny*, "change, pass away" and *ab šnm* would then mean "Father of Mortals"<sup>39</sup>), similar to *ab adm*. But the root *šny* is never used to designate mortals as such. The form *šônîm*, Prov. xxiv 21, is puzzling as seen from the Versions both ancient and modern. The meaning "those who change", i.e. "change-lings, turncoats, unstable persons", does not suit the context. D. WINTON THOMAS<sup>40</sup>) has suggested that the word *šônîm* is to be connected not with *šny* "to change, alter" but with Arabic *saniya* "to become high, exalted in rank"; accordingly he renders Prov. xxiv 21:

"My son, fear thou the Lord and the king,  
But meddle not with those of high rank."

THOMAS does not note the bearing of his observation on the problem of the Ugaritic *ab šnm*, but the present writer, before seeing THOMAS' note, had already thought of the possibility that Ugaritic *šnm* might be connected with one or the other of the Arabic roots *snw*, *snv*, "shine, be exalted, eminent, old", or *sanimā*, "be tall, prominent". Either of these roots would make excellent sense as applied to El, "Father of Exalted Ones", or "Exalted Father".

If *šnm* has nothing to do with time, still El's advanced age is well

---

<sup>38</sup>) On this divine pair cf. EISSFELDT, *ZDMG*, 99 (1950), pp. 29—42, and *EUP*, pp. 66 ff.

<sup>39</sup>) *Ibid.*, pp. 30 f., n. 4.

<sup>40</sup>) *ZAW*, 52 (1934), pp. 236-238.

attested. All the gods, of course, are accounted durable. ʿAnat offers immortality to Aqhat:

*ašsprk ʿm bʿl šnt*      “I will make thee count years with Baal,  
*ʿm bn il tspr yrlym*      With the sons of El thou shalt count months.”  
 (II D VI 28-29)

But El is the patriarch of the gods. His hair and beard are gray. His consort Asherah flatters him thus:

*rbt ilm lhkmt*      “Thou art great, O El, thou art wise,  
*šbt dqnk ltsrk*      Thy gray beard instructs thee,  
*rhnt d[qnk?] lirk*      Soft <sup>41)</sup> is [thy] b[earde?] on thy chest.”  
 (II AB IV-V 65-67)

And the impetuous ʿAnat threatens him:

*ašblk šbt k dmm*      “I will make thy gray hair flow with blood,  
*šbt dqnk mmʿm*      Thy gray beard with gore.” (V AB E 32-33,  
 III D VI 11-12)

The Egyptian god Nun, the personification of the primeval watery mass surrounding the earth, from which all life sprang at the creation <sup>42)</sup>, is referred to as “Father of the Eldest” <sup>43)</sup>, a title similar to, if not virtually identical with El’s title *ab šnm*. The Egyptians also attributed great age and an advanced stage of senility to their god Re. “His bones were of silver, his flesh of gold, and his hair of genuine lapis lazuli.” “A divine old age had *slackened* his mouth. He cast his spittle upon the ground and spat it out, fallen upon the soil” <sup>44)</sup>. As a driveling dotard, Re had difficulty maintaining his control among the gods and even humanity plotted against him. In like manner El’s decline in physical power in his old age apparently left him helpless in the face of gross disrespect by the messengers of Prince Sea, and unable to prevent a brawl from breaking out in the divine assembly. ʿAnat’s threat of violence to his person is the crowning indignity of his old age.

The Greeks also connected Kronos with time by connecting his

41) Cf. Arabic *rahuwa*.

42) Cf. A. W. SHORTER, *The Egyptian Gods*, London, 1937, pp. 50 and 94.

43) John A. WILSON, *ANET*, p. 11, n. 5.

44) Translation of John A. WILSON, *op. cit.*, p. 11. According to SHORTER, *op. cit.*, p. 6, “It was thought by some that Ra aged during the day. At dawn he was a new-born child, by midday he was a hero in the prime of life, and at sunset he became an old man tottering with feeble steps into the western horizon.” There is nothing to indicate that El is a solar god or that his senility is transitory. The similarity between El and Nun, however, is very striking.

name with *chrónos* <sup>45</sup>), but with no apparent implication of senility. Damascius <sup>46</sup>) applies to Kronos the epithet *ᾠagḗraos*, "ageless". The O.T. portrayal of God as ancient probably derives from the tradition of the venerable El, but here also he is ageless and eternal and his antiquity only enhances his majesty.

#### D. EL AS BULL; HIS MARITAL RELATIONS

El's procreative powers are symbolized by the epithet *tr*, "Bull", I AB III-IV 34, VI 27; II AB II 10, III 31, IV-V 47; V AB E 18, 43; I K 41, 59, 76, 169, a common symbol of masculine fertility throughout the ancient Near East <sup>47</sup>). ṬUR SINAI <sup>48</sup>) would see a reference to Bull El in Hosea viii 6 where he proposes to divide the difficult Masoretic reading *kî miyyîsrā'ēl* into *kî mî šôr 'ēl*, "who is the Bull El (whom you serve)?" This brilliant and ingenious suggestion, however, may be regarded with some dubiety <sup>49</sup>). The tradition of El as a bull may perhaps be preserved in the Qabbalistic names of angels, *šry'l* and *try'l* <sup>50</sup>). Kronos also seems to have been sometimes conceived in the form of a bull <sup>51</sup>). El's amative propensity is vividly portrayed for us in the seduction episode of the poem SS in a scene which ALBRIGHT <sup>52</sup>) has aptly characterized as "one of frankest and most sensuous in ancient Near-Eastern literature." GASTER <sup>53</sup>) supposes that the females here seduced are the wives of some mortal who, in spite of the rather unusual nature of the resultant progeny, is not even aware that he has been cuckolded and rushes to tell El the astonishing news of the births. This seems highly fanciful, but, if the females in question are regarded as human, the story of the miscegenation of gods with mortal women and the birth of a race of demi-gods, Gen. vi 1-4, would be a possible parallel. If the willing victims of El's senile amativeness are divine, as seems likely, they being probably

<sup>45</sup>) Cf. *PWRE*, vol. 11, col. 1986; *HkAW*, vol. 5, pp. 427, n. 4; 1064, n. 2.

<sup>46</sup>) Cf. J. A. MONTGOMERY, *JAOS*, 53 (1933), p. 111.

<sup>47</sup>) L. MALTEN, "Der Stier in Kult und mythischen Bild," *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, 43 (1928), pp. 90-139.

<sup>48</sup>) *EBB*, vol. 1, col. 31 a, s.v. *ʿabbir*, *ʿābir*.

<sup>49</sup>) Cf. the writer's treatment of this passage, *JAOS*, 73 (1953), pp. 96 f.

<sup>50</sup>) M. SCHWAB, *Vocabulaire de l'Angéologie*. Paris, 1897, pp. 260 and 264; cf. BAUER, *ZAW*, 51 (1933), p. 83, n. 1.

<sup>51</sup>) *HkAW*, vol. 5, p. 1106, n.

<sup>52</sup>) *ARI*, p. 73.

<sup>53</sup>) *Thespis. Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East*, New York, 1950, pp. 226 f.

none other than Asherah and <sup>c</sup>Anat, an episode related by Philo of Byblos may have a bearing here. Philo <sup>54</sup>) relates that Ouranos in exile sent his virgin daughter Astarte and her two sisters Rhea and Dione to slay Kronos by treachery, but Kronos took and married them although they were his sisters. It is not clear in the poem SS how El managed the simultaneous seduction of the females, but it is apparent that they did not object to the proceedings, and further it is obvious that El, as might be expected, was not strictly monogamous. Presumably El was reckoned as the sire of the "seventy children of Asherah", as the gods are collectively designated, but he may have had other consorts and casual affairs when he was in his prime. According to Philo of Byblos, polygamy caused the separation of El's (Kronos') parents, Ouranos and Ge <sup>55</sup>). There are hints in the Ugaritic texts that relations between El and his chief consort Asherah are not exactly harmonious. The two appear to be estranged. When Asherah, taking the part of Baal, goes to visit El to secure from him permission for the construction of a house for Baal, El appears unduly excited, as if it had been a long time since he had seen her <sup>56</sup>), II AB IV-V 27-39:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (27) <i>blm il kyphbnh</i>                                  | "As soon as El spies her,                      |
| (28) <i>yprq lsb wysbhq</i>                                 | He spreads his <i>jaws</i> and laughs.         |
| (29) <i>p<sup>c</sup>nh lbdm yipd</i>                       | Stamps his feet on the footstool,              |
| <i>wykrkr</i> (30) <i>u<b>s</b>b <sup>c</sup>tb</i>         | The while he <i>twiddles</i> his fingers.      |
| <i>y<b>s</b>u gb wy[<sup>s</sup>b]</i>                      | He lifts his voice and c[ries]:                |
| (31) <i>ik mgyt rbt atr[t y]m</i>                           | 'Why comes Lady Asherah of the<br>Sea,         |
| (32) <i>ik atwt qnyt i[lm]</i>                              | Why the Progenitress of the<br>G[ods]?         |
| (33) <i>r<b>g</b>b r<b>g</b>bt wt<b>g</b>t[ ]</i>           | Are you famished and fors[pent],               |
| (34) <i>hm gmu gmit w<sup>c</sup>s[ ]</i>                   | Or are you thirsty and <i>way[-worn]</i> ?     |
| (35) <i>l<b>h</b>m hm <sup>s</sup>ty</i>                    | Eat, yea, drink.                               |
| <i>lb[m]</i> (36) <i>bilbnt l<b>h</b>m</i>                  | Ea[t] from the tables food;                    |
| <i>st[y]</i> (37) <i>bkrpnm yn</i>                          | Drin[k] from the jars wine,                    |
| <i>bk&lt;s&gt; hr<b>s</b></i> (38) <i>dm <sup>c</sup>sm</i> | From a cu<p> of gold the blood<br>of the vine. |

<sup>54</sup>) FHG, vol. 3, fr. 2, 18, p. 568; GIFFORD, 37 c, p. 42; CLEMEN, *op. cit.*, 22, p. 27.

<sup>55</sup>) FHG, vol. 3, fr. 2, 14, p. 567; GIFFORD, 36 c, p. 41; CLEMEN, *op. cit.*, 16, p. 25.

<sup>56</sup>) A. VAN SELMS, *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature*, London, 1954, p. 66, remarks: "The text leaves us in no doubt that this was an unusual incident."





- (33) *wblb tšb um um*  
*tirkm yd il kym* and now they cry 'Mama, mama'.  
El's 'hand' grows long as the sea,
- (34) *wyd il kmdb*  
*ark yd il kym* El's 'hand' as the flood.  
Long is El's 'hand' as the sea,
- (35) *wyd il kmdb*  
*yqb il mšt<sup>c</sup>ltm* El's 'hand' as the flood.  
El takes the two torches,
- (36) *mšt<sup>c</sup>ltm lriš agn*  
*yqb yš<t> bbtb* the two torches from the top of  
the fire,  
he takes and puts in his house.  
El, his rod sinks.  
El, his love-staff droops.  
He raises, he shoots skyward.  
He shoots a bird in the sky;  
he plucks and puts it on the coals.  
El would seduce the woman.  
Lo the women exclaim:  
'O mate, mate, your rod sinks,  
your love-staff droops.'
- (37) *il lḫb nḫt*  
*il ymnn mṭ ydb*  
*yš<sup>u</sup> (38) yr šmmh*  
*yr bšmm ḥsr*  
*yḫrt yšt (39) lḫm*  
*il atṭm kypt*  
*hm atṭm tšḫn*  
Now the bird roasts on the fire,  
bakes on the coals.  
The women are El's wives,  
El's wives and forever.  
Lo the wives exclaim:  
'O daddy, daddy, your rod sinks  
your love-staff droops.'
- (40) *ymt mṭ nḫtm lḫk*  
*mmnnm mṭ ydk*  
Now the bird roasts on the fire,  
bakes on the coals.
- (41) *b[l] ḥsr ṭḫr lišt*  
*šḫrt lḫm*  
The women are El's wives,  
El's wives and forever.  
Lo the wives exclaim:  
'O daddy, daddy, your rod sinks  
your love-staff droops.'
- (42) *a[t]tm atṭ il*  
*atṭ il w<sup>c</sup>lmb*  
*wbm (43) a[t]tm tšḫn*  
*y ad ad nḫtm ḫk*  
Now the bird roasts on the fire,  
bakes on the coals.  
The girls are El's girls,  
El's girls and forever.  
Lo the women exclaim:  
'O mate, mate, your rod sinks,  
your love-staff droops.'
- (44) *mmnnm mṭ ydk*  
*hl ḥsr ṭḫr lišt*  
Lo, the bird roasts on the fire,  
bakes on the coals.  
The women are [El's wives],  
El's wives and forever.  
He bends, their lips he [kis]ses,  
Lo, their lips are sweet,  
sweet as grapes.
- (45) *wšḫrt lḫmm*  
*btm bt il*  
*bt il (46) w<sup>c</sup>lmb*  
*wbm atṭm tšḫn*  
*y mt mṭ (47) nḫtm lḫk*  
*mmnnm mṭ ydk*  
*hl ḥsr (48) ṭḫr lišt*  
*wšḫr<r>t lḫmm*  
*atṭm a[tt il]*  
The women are [El's wives],  
El's wives and forever.  
He bends, their lips he [kis]ses,  
Lo, their lips are sweet,  
sweet as grapes.
- (49) *atṭ il w<sup>c</sup>lmb*  
*ybb<sup>r</sup> šṭḫm yš[q]*  
The women are [El's wives],  
El's wives and forever.  
He bends, their lips he [kis]ses,  
Lo, their lips are sweet,  
sweet as grapes.
- (50) *bn šṭḫm mtqtm*  
*mtqtm klrmn[m|t(?)]*

- (51) *bm nšq wbr* As he kisses, they conceive;  
*bhbq hmhmt* as he embraces, they become pregnant.
- tqt[nšn]* (52) *tlđn* They travail and give birth  
*šbr wšlm* to Dawn and Dusk.  
*rgm lil ybl* Word is brought to El:  
*a[tt]* (53) *il y[l]t* 'El's wi[ves] have given [bi]rth.'  
*mh ylt* 'What have they borne?'  
*yldy šbr wšl[m]* 'They have borne Dawn and Dus[k].''

The sexual symbolism of fire is ancient <sup>60)</sup> and universal. Fire and torches played an important part in ancient fertility and birth rites, as at Afqa <sup>61)</sup> and elsewhere. Pictorial art represented Hera with a torch <sup>62)</sup>. The torch was the symbol of Artemis and Hekate <sup>63)</sup>. The "torches" in our poem represent a pair of passionate females <sup>64)</sup>, presumably divine, probably none other than Asherah and <sup>c</sup>Anat. The phallic symbolism of *yd* throughout the poem is patent; it has long been recognized that "hand" in *Ih. lvii 8* is a euphemism, having the same meaning as the usual euphemism "feet". There can scarcely be any doubt that a play is intended on the meanings "hand" and "love", therefore we have ventured to translate *mš ydb* as "his love-staff" rather than "the staff of his hand" <sup>65)</sup>. The prodigious length of El's "hand" befits the father of the gods <sup>66)</sup>. The difference between the verb forms *tirkm*, l. 33, and *ark*, l. 34, is puzzling <sup>67)</sup>. We surmise that El's member is represented as in a state of semi-tumescence and not full erection. ALBRIGHT suggested that "the sinking of the staff may refer to the subsidence of the penis after sexual intercourse" <sup>68)</sup>.

<sup>60)</sup> Cf. *HkAW*, vol. 5, pp. 726 f., 813, 859, 1174. On the belief that fire itself is able to impregnate, cf. J. G. FRAZER, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* (The Golden Bough, Part IV), 3rd ed., vol. 2, London, 1919, p. 235.

<sup>61)</sup> *HkAW*, vol. 5, p. 1614; BAUDISSIN, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1876, vol. 2, p. 160, n. 3.

<sup>62)</sup> *HkAW*, vol. 5, p. 1133.

<sup>63)</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1298, n. 1.

<sup>64)</sup> D. NIELSEN, *RŠMBT*, pp. 82 f. recognized *mš<sup>c</sup>ltm* as a metaphor for the females, and strikingly rendered it as „die beiden Liebesentzänder“, from Arabic *ša<sup>c</sup>ala*.

<sup>65)</sup> Cf. NIELSEN, *RŠMBT*, pp. 83 f.

<sup>66)</sup> As the Ugaritians ascribed extravagant sexual stamina to their gods, e.g. Baal copulates with a heifer 77 or 88 times, I\* AB V 19-21, and 1000 times with Anat(?), text 132 : 3, it is natural that they would also endow them with gigantic genitalia.

<sup>67)</sup> Cf. GOETZE, *JAOS*, 58 (1938), p. 268, n. 7.

<sup>68)</sup> *JPOS*, 14 (1934), p. 135, n. 186.

There is, however, no indication that intercourse occurs before l. 49b. Therefore the drooping of El's rod, we suggest, represents his inability to achieve and maintain an erection rather than post-coital detumescence. The shooting skyward (presumably the unexpressed subject of the verbs *yšū* and *yr* is El, and not his "rod" <sup>69</sup>) is for the purpose of bagging the bird, but it may also reflect the custom, attested elsewhere, of shooting into the air to drive away the demons that were believed to hover over the marriage bed ready to take the place of the husband <sup>70</sup>). ALBRIGHT <sup>71</sup>) suggested that "the roasting of the bird may refer to male excitement". It is clear, however, that it is not merely a metaphor but is an actual ritual which has a very important role in the proceedings. El himself shoots the bird and plucks it and roasts it. He is certainly not preparing a meal either for himself <sup>72</sup>) or for his feminine guests. The roasting of the bird does not represent El's sexual excitement, but is a ritual designed to produce this coveted state. Cooking is well known as a rejuvenation ritual <sup>73</sup>). It seems that El has to employ the ritual extensively before he can rise to the occasion. El attempts(?) to have intercourse with the females, l. 39, but they remark that his rod is drooping. Three times the females note that El's rod droops and each time attention is called to the roasting bird and the loyalty and patience of the females is affirmed. It is never stated that El's rod rises, but this may be simply a poetic lapse. At any rate, coitus apparently does not take place till l. 49 when El bends and with a hug and a kiss impregnates the females, which probably does not imply that it was a process of adosculation rather than normal intercourse <sup>74</sup>). Having once got started, El repeats

<sup>69</sup>) It would be in keeping with the tenor of the poem if El brought down the bird with a flirt of his phallus, but it seems more likely (with GASTER, *Thespis*, p. 226) that he shot with bow and arrow.

<sup>70</sup>) Cf. H. OLDENBERG, *Die Religion des Veda*, Berlin, 1894, p. 271; *HkAW*, vol. 5, pp. 858 f.

<sup>71</sup>) *JPOS*, 14 (1934), p. 135, n. 186.

<sup>72</sup>) So GASTER, *Thespis*, p. 226.

<sup>73</sup>) Cf. *HkAW*, vol. 5, p. 892, n. 4.

<sup>74</sup>) A similar expression is used of Danel's intercourse with his wife, II D I 40-42. The present writer in a paper entitled "Nouns as Apodoses of Temporal Sentences in Ugaritic", presented at the meeting of the American Oriental Society, April 10, 1953, but as yet unpublished, has shown that the words *br* and *hmbmt* in SS 51-52, 56 are nouns serving as the apodoses of temporal sentences. Without going into detail here, the proof is furnished by I K 31-35:

*bm bkyb wyšn* "As he weeps, he falls asleep

*bām<sup>c</sup>b nbmmt* As he sheds tears, (comes) slumber.

*šnt iluan wyškb* Sleep prevails and he reclines,

*nbmmt wyqmš* Slumber and he reposes."

the process several times in the remainder of the poem and sires a series of goodly gods. El is certainly not sterile, but if we are right in the view that sexual union is not consummated before l. 49, then the drooping of El's rod would mean initial impotence and the roasting bird would not represent a rapid recovery of a state of excitement but would find its natural explanation as a rejuvenation ritual which is eventually effective. El's impotence and rejuvenation is thus made a matter of great interest in the poem which devotes almost a score of couplets to this theme. That the Ugaritians should represent an aged god as sexually debilitated is not too surprising in view of other gross anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms in the mythological texts. It is obvious that in a fertility religion a god whose procreative powers are waning must soon give way to a younger and more virile successor.

In his very interesting study *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature*, already cited above, A. VAN SELMS uses the relations between El and Asherah as a basis for conclusions as to types of human marriage customs reflected in the texts. The fact that El and Asherah have separate dwellings leads to the inference "that the Ugaritians could conceive of a marriage relation without the bride entering the house of the bridegroom" <sup>75</sup>). The relation in question, however, does not correspond either to the *erēbu* type marriage in which the bridegroom takes up residence in his father-in-law's house, or to the *beena*-marriage in which the husband visits his wife at her home. Accordingly VAN SELMS supposes that the marital relation of El and Asherah is of the type KOSCHAKER termed "muntfrei", i.e. one in which the husband has no legal power over his wife <sup>76</sup>). He suggests that the Ugaritic poets intended "to convey that the period of sexual intercourse between the father god and the mother god (*sic*) was of the past, something which occurred before the beginning of the present era with its multitude of younger gods and goddesses, the

---

Here *nbmmt* in the first distich is parallel with the verb *yšn* and has exactly the same function, i.e. it serves as the apodosis of a temporal sentence, while in the second distich it is parallel with the noun *šnt*. Accordingly the literal rendering of SS 51-52, 56 would be:

"As he kisses (them), (there is) conception,  
As he embraces (them), (there is) pregnancy."

Since this passage is still causing difficulty (cf. VAN SELMS, *op. cit.*, pp. 83 f.), the writer will submit for publication as soon as possible the argument to support the proposed grammatical analysis.

<sup>75</sup>) *Op. cit.*, p. 65.

<sup>76</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 69.

offspring of the old couples" 77). Certainly VAN SELMS is right in noting that "Asherah is not a simple and colorless *parbedros* of Il" 78). He recognizes also that El is aged and that Asherah is more active and shows more temperament, though she cannot have been much younger than El 79). This sort of incompatibility, whether by difference in temperament or age, often leads to estrangement and this, we believe, is the clue to the strange relation between El and Asherah in the Ugaritic mythological texts. If the couple are now estranged, we can deduce nothing as to the nature of their former marriage. The ground for the separation we suppose—taking the cue from the indication of El's impotence in the poem SS and Asherah's disparagement of her mate's virility in the Hittite mythological fragment—would be Asherah's dissatisfaction with El as a husband. We do not have to look for the other member of this triangle. In the Hittite myth Asherah makes the overtures to the Storm-god only to be rebuffed, but Elkunirša gives the young god permission to sleep with Asherah. We do not know the outcome of this version of the myth, but we do know that in the long run Asherah got her man. In the O.T. it is Baal and Asherah who are associated in the heathen fertility cult and El has passed from the scene. KAPELRUD 80) has shown rather convincingly that in the Ugaritic myths Asherah is in the process of becoming Baal's consort. "The first goddess of the pantheon must be the consort of the first god, and as Baal, apparently slowly, drove out Il from the leading place, he also took over his wife." Asherah's infidelity is justified in the mythology by El's impotence. The poem SS in which El appears as sexually active has been generally held, on other grounds, to be earlier than the other compositions 81), but even here El has to overcome his initial impotence by means of magic and this episode may very well represent his last fling and farewell to sex.

#### E. EL'S WISDOM

Wisdom is, of course, an attribute of gods in general, but only El is singled out for this quality in the Ugaritic texts. El's wisdom is the

77) *Ibid.*, p. 65.

78) *Ibid.*

79) *Ibid.*, p. 66.

80) *Op. cit.*, p. 77.

81) F. LØKKEGAARD's protest against this is perhaps justified: "A Plea for El, the Bull, and other Ugaritic Miscellanies", in *Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen Dicata*, Copenhagen, 1953, p. 235.

natural by-product of his mellow age, as Asherah says: *šbt dqnk ltsrk* "thy gray beard instructs thee", II AB IV-V 66. Both Asherah and 'Anat, II AB IV-V 41-43, V AB E 38-39, flatter El thus:

<i>ḥmḳ il ḥḳm</i>	"Thy word, O El, is wise,
<i>ḥḳmt</i> (var. <i>ḥḳmḳ</i> ) <i>ʿm ʿlm</i>	Wise art thou to eternity (var. Thy wisdom is to eternity)
<i>ḥyt ḥzt ḥmḳ</i>	<i>Triumphant</i> life is thy word."

In place of the verb *ḥḳmt*, "thou art wise", in the II AB passage, the parallel in the V AB passage has the noun *ḥḳmḳ*, "thy wisdom" and RINGGREN<sup>82</sup>) says: "In this version it would seem as if El's wisdom was becoming at least a kind of objective entity which might be the starting point of a hypostatization." ALBRIGHT<sup>83</sup>) would combine the variant forms into *ḥḳmtḳ*, which would give RINGGREN a basis for his view in both passages. El's wisdom is again mentioned in II K IV 2-3, where someone is complimented by being likened in wisdom to El:

<i>ḥb[ ]kil</i>	"[Thou hast in]sight like El,
<i>ḥḳmt ktr lḥpn</i>	Thou art wise like the Bull Beneficent" <sup>84</sup> )

El's imputed wisdom is mentioned only in the foregoing expressions and we do not see it conspicuously illustrated in any of his actions.

The Sumero-Akkadian Enki, Ea was also especially noted for his wisdom, and, as we shall see below, he and El had other characteristics in common and are implicitly identified in later times by the substitution of Kronos (i.e. El) for Ea in Berossus'<sup>85</sup>) account of the deluge.

#### F. EL AS HOLY

The attribute of holiness is applied to El in the epithet *lḥpn wqdš*, "Beneficent and Holy", II K I-II 11, 21-22. Although *qdš* is well known as a synonym of Asherah there is nothing to indicate that it is so used in the Ugaritic texts. Against DUSSAUD<sup>86</sup>) it is here held

<sup>82</sup>) *Op. cit.*, p. 80.

<sup>83</sup>) In *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet*. Tübingen, 1950, p. 5, n.

<sup>84</sup>) Rendering based on GINSBERG's, *LK*, ad loc. Cf. H. RINGGREN, *Word and Wisdom*, Lund, 1947, p. 80, for the supposed difficulties of this passage. GINSBERG's genius for discovering the parallelism and stichometry dispels the difficulty at a stroke: *kil* and *ktr* and *lḥpn* are parallel and the *k* in both cases is the comparative particle; thus the god *Ktr Lḥpn* vanishes.

<sup>85</sup>) *FHG*, vol. 2, fr. 7, 2, p. 501.

<sup>86</sup>) *DRS*, pp. 106-109.

that *lṭpn wqdš* refers to El alone and does not represent the divine pair El and Asherah. The element *qdš* in the divine name *qdš wamrr* also cannot possibly designate Asherah, as seen from II AB IV-V 13-14 where this single god with a double-barrelled name places Asherah on the back of her ass. Holiness pertains to the gods in general who are called *bn qdš*, "sons of holiness, holy ones", III AB B 21, 28, II D I 4, 9, 14. Baal's voice is called "holy", II AB VII 29, 31, and the cup in a divine banquet is also described as holy, V AB A 13. It may be inferred that holiness pertains to El in a greater degree than to any of the other gods, since to none of the others is the word applied directly as an epithet.

#### G. EL'S TEMPERAMENT

With El's advanced age and ripe wisdom goes a marked affability, benevolence, benignity, and sympathy. His common epithet *lṭpn il dpid* was happily explained by BAUER<sup>87</sup>) from the Arabic *latif*, "friendly", and *du fu'ad*, "one who has a heart", "der mit Gemüt", and may be rendered "Beneficent El Benign", or the like. The epithet *lṭpn* occurs alone as a designation of El, I AB III-IV 35 and II K I-II 23, and once in combination with the epithet *tr*, "Bull", *tr lṭpn*, "the Bull Beneficent", II K IV 2-3. The combination *lṭpn wqdš*, II K I-II 11-12, 21-22, represents El alone as "Beneficent and Holy," being a double-barrelled name like *Kṭr w-Ḥss*, *Qdš-w-Amrr*. The epithet *dpid* is also combined with that of Bull, *tr il dpid*, "Bull El Benign", II AB II 10, III 31. Benignity is not a quality commonly associated with the bull, but El is apparently an old bull and not very spirited. El's behavior admirably exemplifies the qualities attributed to him by the epithets "Beneficent" and "Benign". He expresses joy and sorrow, but never anger—although a couple of times Shapsh restrains Mot and 'Aṭtar with warnings that El will overthrow them, III AB C 17 and I AB VI 26-29. Courage, however, appears not to be a quality attributable to El when with the rest of the gods, excepting Baal, he cowers before the fearful messengers of Prince Sea, III AB B 21-29. Nowhere in the Ugaritic texts does El exhibit the violence of Kronos who castrated his father, murdered his son, and beheaded his daughter<sup>88</sup>), but he may have been capable of such deeds in his

<sup>87</sup>) ZDMG, 51 (1933), p. 83.

<sup>88</sup>) FHG, vol. 3, fr. 2, 18, p. 568; GIFFORD, *op. cit.*, 37 c, p. 42; CLEMEN, *op. cit.*, 21, p. 27.

earlier years. When the news of Baal's death reaches El, he performs violent mourning rites, descends from the throne to the footstool, then to the ground, pours ashes and dust on his head, rends(?) his clothing, lacerates his face, arms, and body, laments, and expresses the desire to follow Baal to the netherworld, I\* AB VI 11-25. These are, of course, only the conventional mourning rites, but the purpose of their elaboration was certainly to depict El as sympathetic. When Baal again comes to life, El is elated, stamps on the footstool, breaks into laughter, and gives voice to his joy and consolation, I AB III-IV 14-21. Note the almost identical description of Danel's expression of joy in II D II 11-15. Again, when his spouse Asherah comes to see him, El goes through the same antics, and in addition *twiddles*(?) his fingers. He greets Asherah warmly, offers her food and drink, and either makes amorous overtures or assures her of his affection, II AB IV-V 27-39. With due allowance for the poetic elaboration, it would appear that the Ugaritians thought of El as highly emotional and demonstrative. Some of these features appear distinctly humorous, or even ludicrous, to the modern mind, but we need not assume that they appeared so to the ancient Ugaritians<sup>89</sup>).

It would appear, too, that forbearance and longanimity must be attributed to El when in the face of 'Anat's insolent threats he maintains his composure and answers calmly and courteously V AB E 27-33, III D VI 6-14. It may be that the conception of El as kindly, patient, and forbearing had a mollifying influence on the originally martial character of YHWH.

The Sumero-Akkadian Enki, Ea, with whom El was implicitly identified in later times, is likewise always represented as peaceful and non-violent. Ea kindly transmits his might and wisdom to his first-born son Marduk, but he is not above deceit and guile in robbing his son Adapa of immortality by false advice<sup>90</sup>). El also is not always benevolent: in the lamentably fragmentary and obscure poem BH he contrives the undoing of Baal by a cunning and cruel stratagem, laughing inwardly as he sends out his female agents, BH I 12 ff.

#### H. THE GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF EL

What the epic texts tell us indirectly about El is graphically represented in low relief on a limestone stela ca. 47 cm high, discovered

<sup>89</sup>) Cf. above p. 29, n. 19.

<sup>90</sup>) Cf. B. MEISSNER, *RLA*, vol. 2, pp. 374-379, s.v. "Enki (Ea)".



in 1937. There can be little doubt that the god portrayed is El, as first proposed by the excavator SCHAEFFER<sup>91</sup>). The god is depicted as a majestic figure, seated on an ornate throne of Egyptian type, wearing a long robe and a high tiara crowned with horns. His beard is full and prominent. The god's right arm is extended and the hand receives an offering proffered by the worshipper, a robed and crowned figure represented as only slightly smaller than the god, presumably the King of Ugarit, who with his right hand presents the offering and in his left hand holds a pitcher for a libation. The god's left hand is raised in a gesture of benediction. Above the heads of the god and the worshipper spreads the Egyptian winged solar disc. It is not too much to see in this portrait the characteristics attributed to El by the epithets King, Father, Bull, Beneficent, Benign, Holy.

The portrait of the god on the stela bears little resemblance to some of the details specified by Philo of Byblos. According to Philo<sup>92</sup>), the god Tauthos devised for Kronos as insignia of royalty four eyes in front and behind, two of them closed in rest, and four wings on his shoulders, two as spread for flying and two as folded. This indicated that Kronos could see while asleep and sleep while waking; and similarly in the case of the wings that he flew while at rest, and was at rest when flying. (The picture of the ever wakeful god is reminiscent of Ps. cxxi 4). The other gods were given two wings. In addition Kronos was given two wings on his head, one representing the controlling mind, and one sensation. The six wings are reminiscent of the Seraphim of Isaiah's vision, though the functions are quite different; the extra wings of the Seraphim were for reverence (covering the face) and for modesty (covering the "feet"). Mesopotamian deities are frequently represented with two pairs of wings, one raised and one lowered. Coins of Byblos represent El in the form of a man with six wings, one pair hanging down<sup>93</sup>). Damascius says the Phoenicians in their myths gave Kronos seven heads<sup>94</sup>). There is no trace of any of this on the stela from Ras Shamra.

---

<sup>91</sup>) Syria, 18 (1937), pp. 122 ff. and pl. xvii; *The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra-Ugarit*, London, 1939, pp. 60-62, and pl. xxxi.

<sup>92</sup>) FHG, vol. 3, fr. 2, 26, p. 569; GIFFORD, *op. cit.*, 39 a-b, p. 44; CLEMEN, *op. cit.*, 36-37, p. 30.

<sup>93</sup>) Cf. LAGRANGE, p. 72, fig. and n. 2.

<sup>94</sup>) C. A. RUELLE, *Damascii Successoris*, vol. 2, Paris, 1889, 265, p. 131; A. E. CHAIGNET, *Les Premiers Principes*, Paris, 1898, vol. 2, p. 349.

## I. EL AS FATHER OF GODS AND MEN

The title *ab*, "Father", is one of the most common epithets applied to El. The various gods address him or refer to him as "Bull El, his / her / my / thy Father", I AB III-IV 34, VI 37; II AB IV-V 47; V AB E 18, 43; II D I 24. Thus El and his consort Asherah are clearly represented as the parents of the gods who are collectively designated as the "seventy children of Asherah", II AB VI 46. The gods in the aggregate are also referred to as *dr il*, "generation, circle, or family of El", III K III 17-19, and as *dr bn il*, "circle of the sons of El", 2 : 17, 34; 107 : 2. With the possible exception of Baal, who is commonly called Dagan's son, I AB I 24, 6\*; I K 78, there is no evidence in the Ugaritic texts that any of the Semitic gods stand outside the family of El. It is, of course, possible that some of the gods may have been adopted or otherwise engrafted on the family tree <sup>95</sup>).

El is also in some sense the "Father of Mankind", *ab adm*, I K 37, 43, 136, 151, 278. He is also called "Creator of Creatures", *bny bnwt*, II D I 25. El bestows fecundity on Danel <sup>96</sup>) and Keret and presumably he was thought to do the same for humanity at large both in normal and abnormal cases, just as in the O.T. YHWH grants and withholds fertility. In this sense the god is the "Father of Mankind", and "Creator of Creatures", and mankind is figuratively his progeny, cf. Mal. ii 10. BAUDISSION'S view that "father" in Semitic theophorous names denotes the god's fatherhood of the national community and not of the individual, and that *bn* in such names does not mean "son", since the relationship of man to god was that of slave to master, is wholly untenable <sup>97</sup>). Keret addresses El as his Father, I K 41, 59, 76, 169, and is called "the son of El", *bn il*, and "the

<sup>95</sup>) According to Philo of Byblos (*FHG*, vol. 3, fr. 2, 16, pp. 567 f.; GIFFORD, *op. cit.*, 37, p. 41; CLEMEN, *op. cit.*, 18-19, p. 26), when Kronos drove Ouranos from the dominion, he captured in the battle Ouranos' beloved concubine who was already pregnant and gave her in marriage to Dagan. The unnamed concubine gave birth to the child begotten by Ouranos and named him Demarous. This Demarous is none other than Hadad-Baal, as recognized by GRUPPE, *Die Griechischen Culte und Mythen*, Leipzig, 1887, p. 360. CASSUTO, "Zeus Demarus *bēkiḫbē* 'Ugarit'", in *Sēfer Dinburg*, Jerusalem, 1949, pp. 65-67, has strikingly confirmed GRUPPE'S identification by finding the name *dmrn* parallel to *bd* in II AB VII 38-39. This story may help to explain the confusion as to Baal's paternity which is evident in the Ugaritic texts. Both El and Dagan would be in a sense foster fathers of Hadad whose natural father was Ouranos (Anu, Baal Shamēm(?)). The writer will deal with this point in more detail in a subsequent study of Baal in the Ugaritic texts.

<sup>96</sup>) OBERMANN, *Incubation*, pp. 18 ff.

<sup>97</sup>) Cf. EISSFELDT, *EUP*, pp. 50 ff., n. 5.

offspring of the Beneficent and Holy One", *šph lšpn wqdš*, II K I-II 10-11, 20, 21, as well as "the servant of El", *bd | glm il*, I K 40, 153, 155, 299, and Keret is a mortal, or at most a hero or divine king. The difference between a son and a slave was doubtless of great importance, yet, to judge from the list of filial duties of a model son in the Danel epic <sup>98</sup>), the son was little more than a body-servant to the father. The Ugaritic evidence certainly indicates that *bn* in names like *bnil* <sup>99</sup>), 321 II : 41, is patronymic. In the Ugaritic name *ybnl[l]*, 332 : 5, however, it may be that *ybn* has the meaning which BAUDISSION <sup>100</sup>) posited for *bn*.

#### J. THE PANTHEON, THE ASSEMBLY OF THE GODS, THE FAMILY OF EL

The Ugaritians had a definite idea of a pantheon as indicated by the expressions *phr ilm*, 17 : 7, "the totality of the gods", and *mphrt bn il*, 2 : 17, 34; 107 : 3, "the totality of the sons of El" <sup>101</sup>). That the root *phr* means "sum, totality" is clear from I K 25 *bphyrh*, "in its totality", referring to the extermination of Keret's progeny, and SS 57 where *phr* probably refers to the completion of the period of pregnancy. The use of *phr*, however, as applied to the gods does not necessarily imply a plenary session or perfect attendance, but is used loosely of any considerable aggregation of the gods. The sum of the gods is also referred to as *dr il*, "circle, family of El", which stands in parallelism with *ilm*, "the gods" in III K III 17-19, and *dr bn il*, "the circle, or family of the sons of El", which stands in parallelism with *mphrt bn il* in 2 : 17, 34 and 107 : 2. Thus it is clear that the gods in the aggregate are represented as the family of El. In text 1 : 7 there is the enigmatic expression *dr il wp[h]r bcl* which GORDON <sup>102</sup>) renders "The assemblage of ʿIl and congr[eg]ation of Baal". This might be taken to imply that El and Baal each had their separate and distinct families or coteries and there are some other indications of this, but the matter is by no means certain. In one of the meetings of the gods, in the course of the banquet (called *dbh*, "sacrifice"), Baal is offended by some affront or misbehavior involving the maid-servants and rises and spits in the midst of the assembly of the gods,

<sup>98</sup>) Cf. OBERMANN, *Incubation*, pp. 14-18, 29 f.

<sup>99</sup>) Cf. DE LANGHE, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 277.

<sup>100</sup>) *Kyrios*, vol. 3, pp. 357 f.

<sup>101</sup>) Cf. Phoenician *mphrt ʿl gbl qdšm*, "the assembly of the holy gods of Byblos", l. 4 of the Yehimilk inscription, Z. S. HARRIS, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, New Haven, 1936, p. 77.

<sup>102</sup>) *UL*, p. 111.

*btk p[<sup>h</sup>]r bn ilm*, II AB III 13-14. Note that the expression here for gods is not *bn il*, "sons of El", but *bn ilm*; if *ilm* is not the plural of majesty, i.e. if the final *-m* is not enclitic, then *bn ilm* would be "sons of the gods", "divine beings", without explicit connection with El. It is not stated where this session of the gods was held, but El was not present at this meeting for shortly after the spitting episode Asherah mounts her ass and goes to visit him to wheedle from him permission for construction of Baal's house, II AB IV-V 1-73. When Baal finally gets his house built and gives a big housewarming banquet for his fellow gods, II AB VI 44-58, El appears to have been snubbed or at least given no special honor or mention if he was present. In III AB B we have the only account of a session of the divine assembly with El presiding. The meeting takes place at "the mountain Ll", l. 20. The location of this particular meeting will be considered again below in other connections. The assembly is here called *plr m<sup>c</sup>d*, ll. 14, 15, 20, the first word being the one commonly used for the assembly of the gods in Akkadian, and the second in the O.T., cf. Lam. ii 6, *mô<sup>c</sup>ēd ʔēlôhîm*, and Is. xiv 13 *bar mô<sup>c</sup>ēd*.

Another term for an aggregation of gods is *dt ilm*, "council of the gods", III K II 7, 11. Note the almost identical expression *ʔādāt-ʔēl*, "divine council", in Ps. lxxxii 1.

The gods collectively and generically are also referred to as Baal's brothers and kindred as "the seventy children of Asherah", and "those who suck the breasts of Asherah", II AB VI 44-46, 56; cp. II AB III 41 and SS 24, 59.

#### K. EL AS CREATOR

The references to El as father of both gods and men raises the question of the nature of El's creativity, cosmic or otherwise. There is hardly anything that could be called a creation story or any clear allusion to cosmic creativity in the Ugaritic texts so far exhumed. The closest approach to this sort of thing is the poem SS, and this is only a theogony of minor gods<sup>103</sup>). The tradition of YHWH as a Creator God, however, is a prominent feature of the O.T. and YHWH was almost certainly identified with El. It is altogether probable that El was a Creator God, but the Ugaritic evidence is by no means explicit. All the Ugaritic allusions to El's creativity are in terms of generation

<sup>103</sup>) Cf. NIELSEN, *RŠMBT*, pp. 71 ff. and BAUMGARTNER's sober judgment, *TbR*, 13 (1941), p. 167.

and paternity. El is called *ab adm*, I K 37, 151, "Father of Mankind" and *bn̄y bnwt*, I AB III-IV 5, 11; II AB II 11, III 32; II D I 25, "Creator of creatures". The translation "Creator of creatures" for *bn̄y bnwt* is not quite satisfactory or adequate, but a woodenly literal rendering "Builder of Built Ones" or "Begetter of Begotten Ones" would be rather awkward. The verb *bn̄y*, "build, make", probably to be connected with the noun *bn̄*, "son", is used in the O.T. in the Qal of establishing a family (house), either by man, Dt. xxv 9, or by the deity for man, 2 Sam. vii 27, 1 Kings xi 38, and in the Nif'al of a woman becoming a mother, Gen xvi 2, xxx 3. In the Adam and Eve story, Gen. ii 22, it is used in the sense of "create, make, form": "and the Lord God formed (*wayyib̄en*) the rib ... into a woman".

The Ugaritic locution *il mlk dyknnh*, "King El who begot him", II AB IV-V 48 = V AB E 42-43, also represents El as creator in the sense of progenitor (of Baal). The Pô'îlêl of *k(w)n* is used in the same sense in the O.T., of the deity as the creater and progenitor of mankind. Ps. lxxxvii 5-6:

<i>ûl̄siyyôn yē'āmar</i>	"And of Zion it shall be said,
<i>ʔîš wē'îš yullaḏ bāb</i>	"This one or that one was born in her;
<i>wč̄hû(ʔ) yēk̄ônēnehā ʕelyôn</i>	It is Elyon himself who begot her (him?).'
<i>yhw̄b̄ yispōr bik̄tōh̄ ʕammîm</i>	YHWH will record when he registers the peoples,
<i>ze(h) yullaḏ šām</i>	'This one was born there.'
Job xxxi 15:	
<i>hālô(ʔ) babbēten ʕôšēnî ʕāsāhû</i>	"Did not he who made me in the belly make him?"
<i>wayēk̄ûnennû bāreḥem ʔehād</i>	The same one create us in the womb?"
Dt. xxxii 6:	
<i>hālô(ʔ) hû(ʔ) ʔāb̄îk̄ā qānek̄ā</i>	"Is he not your Father who created you,
<i>hû(ʔ) ʕāsēk̄ā wayēk̄ônēnek̄ā</i>	who made you and begot you?"

In Is. xlv 18 the Pô'îlêl of *k(w)n* is also used in reference to the creation of the world, synonymously with *br̄ʔ*, *yšr*, and *ʕsy*. The parallelism of the Pô'îlêl of *k(w)n* with *qny* occurs in Ugaritic, IV AB III 5-7:

*wy<sup>c</sup>ny aliyn b<sup>cl</sup>*  
*lm kqny<sup>n</sup> V[m]*  
*kdvd<r> dyknn[ ]*

“Then Aliyan Baal declares,  
 . . . that our Creator is eternal  
 that from age to a<ge> is he who  
 begot [us].”

The text is fragmentary and the context somewhat obscure, but in the light of the expression *il mlk dyknnb* it is virtually certain that Baal here refers to his father El and applies to him the term *qny<sup>n</sup>*, “our Creator”. If the above interpretation is correct, the use of *qny* in this sense is of considerable interest and importance. It has been denied that the root *qny* has in any Semitic language the sense “create, make”<sup>104</sup>). The meaning “create” given for *qny* in Arabic dictionaries is doubted by DELLA VIDA<sup>105</sup>). In Ethiopic *qny* means “dominate, enslave” and accordingly it is argued that Asherah’s epithet *qnyt ilm* does not mean “Creatress or Progenitress of the Gods”, but “Mistress of the Gods”, *qnyt* being synonymous with *ba<sup>c</sup>alat*. Accordingly DELLA VIDA held that *qône(b)* in the title of El Elyon, Gen. xiv 19, 22, *q<sup>cl</sup>l<sup>c</sup>elyôn qône(b) šamayim w<sup>cl</sup>āreš*, does not mean “Creator”. This traditional understanding, he alleges, is derived from midrashic interpretation based on the familiar *q<sup>cl</sup>šē(b) šamayim w<sup>cl</sup>āreš*. The passages Dt. xxxii 6 and Ps. cxxxix 13, where *qny* appears to have the meaning “create”, DELLA VIDA<sup>106</sup>) regards as late. P. HUMBERT<sup>107</sup>), however, in a thorough study of the uses of *qny* in the O.T. finds that it is used clearly in the sense of “create” in 6 of the 83 occurrences, Gen. xiv 19, 22; Dt. xxxii 6; Ps. lxxviii 54, cxxxix 13; and Prov. viii 22. The two meanings, “acquire” and “create”, HUMBERT<sup>108</sup>) concludes, are independent, derived from two different roots, *qny* and *qny*, and belonging to different strata of the Hebrew language, *qny*, “create”, being a relic of Canaanite and pre-Israelite mythological and cultic language as seen from Ugaritic where the word is rare and has a mythological savor. In Ugaritic, outside Asherah’s title *qnyt ilm* and the passage IV AB III 6 where *qny<sup>n</sup>* is parallel to the Pô<sup>cl</sup>l<sup>c</sup>l of *k(w)n*, as in Dt. xxxii 6, *qny* occurs twice, once in an obscure context<sup>109</sup>), I D 220, and once in a broken

104) Cf. MONTGOMERY, *JAOS*, 53 (1953), pp. 107, 116; NIELSEN, *RŠMBT*, p. 32.

105) *JBL*, 63 (1944), p. 1, n. 1.

106) *Ibid.*

107) “*Qânâ en hébreu biblique*”, in *Festschrift Bertholet*, pp. 259-266; cf. CASUTO, *From Adam to Noah*, Jerusalem, 1944, pp. 112-114.

108) *Op. cit.*, pp. 265 f.

109) GINSBERG, *ANET*, p. 155, does not attempt to translate *i[l] dyqny šdm* and

context, II D VI 41 <sup>110</sup>), but both times apparently with the meaning "create". Thus in Ugaritic *qny* seems to have only the sense "create", and never "acquire".

Apart from the question of the meaning of *qny*, it would appear that DELLA VIDA <sup>111</sup>) is right in his view that the original form of the title <sup>2</sup>ēl <sup>c</sup>elyôn *qône(b) šamayim wā'āreš*, Gen. xiv 19, 22, was simply <sup>2</sup>ēl *qônē(b) hā'āreš*. It is now clear that <sup>c</sup>elyôn was originally a celestial deity quite distinct from El, corresponding to Alalu of the Hurrian theogony in Hittite <sup>112</sup>), and thus older than El by two divine generations, just as Philo of Byblos had told us <sup>113</sup>). In the O.T. the two originally distinct deities El and Elyon are blended and identified with YHWH <sup>114</sup>). Moreover, as DELLA VIDA <sup>115</sup>) justly emphasizes, there is nothing in the Ugaritic texts to indicate that El was a celestial deity. All the evidence tends to connect El with the earth, even though the title *qn ʾrš* may not mean "Lord of the earth", but rather "Creator of the Earth". The title *qn ʾrš*, although not found in Ugaritic <sup>116</sup>), is attested at Karatepe <sup>117</sup>) in the 8th century B.C., at Leptis Magna in Tripolitania in a neo-Punic inscription <sup>118</sup>), and probably at Palmyra in a bilingual inscription dated A.D. 39 in which DELLA VIDA <sup>119</sup>) reads <sup>2</sup>l *qn* [<sup>2</sup>]r<sup>c</sup>[<sup>2</sup>]. This title of El, *qn ʾrš*, acquires new interest and importance in the light of OTTEN'S <sup>120</sup>) recent treatment of the mythological fragments in Hittite which mention a god Elkunirša. These fragments deal, in addition to Elkunirša, with Ashertu, the Storm-god, and Ishtar. In these fragments Ashertu is the consort of Elkunirša, just as Asherah is the wife of El in the Ugaritic texts. There can be little doubt then that Elkunirša is to be

the preceding line. GORDON, *UL*, p. 101, renders, uncertainly, "Who created the abode".

<sup>110</sup>) Cf. GINSBERG, *BASOR*, 98 (1945), p. 22, n. 68.

<sup>111</sup>) *Op. cit.*, p. 1, n. 1.

<sup>112</sup>) DUSSAUD, „Les antécédents orientaux à la Théogonie d'Hésiode", in *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slaves*, 9 (Mélanges Henri Grégoire), Brussel, 1949, p. 231.

<sup>113</sup>) *FHG*, vol. 3, fr. 2, 12-15, p. 567; GIFFORD, *op. cit.*, 36 b—d, pp. 40 f.; CLEMEN, *op. cit.*, 14-16, pp. 24-25.

<sup>114</sup>) Cf. DELLA VIDA, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-4, 8-9.

<sup>115</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>116</sup>) GASTER, however, *Thespis*, p. 312, sees in I D 200 *i[l] dyqny šdm*, which he renders "the god who owns the land," a parallel to El's title *qn ʾrš*.

<sup>117</sup>) Cf. above p. 25, n. 1.

<sup>118</sup>) Cf. DELLA VIDA, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-6, text and translation p. 5; GASTER, *Thespis*, p. 312.

<sup>119</sup>) *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>120</sup>) *Op. cit.*

identified with the Semitic El. The term *kunirša*, presumably, would also be Semitic and the connection with El's title *qn ʾrš* immediately comes to mind. But, as OTTEN<sup>121</sup>) realized, a number of phonological difficulties stand in the way of the derivation of *kunirša* from *qn ʾrš*. The most formidable problem is the corruption of *š* to *ř* in the word *ʾrš*. If the word came into Hittite through the medium of Hurrian, some corruption is to be expected, but it is not certain just what the process would be. OTTEN<sup>122</sup>) ascribes to EBELING the suggestion that the ending of *irša* might represent the last consonant of the Semitic root or the Greek nominative ending. The *a* ending might also be explained as the Semitic accusative case ending or as the post-positive article. If *kun* represents the participle of *qny*, there is no problem as to the initial consonant, but the *u* vowel would indicate that it did not come through the medium of Ugaritic where the shift from *â* to *ô* did not take place, but from a dialect distinctly Canaanite in this respect. These Hittite fragments date from the 15th-12th century B.C. and we do not as yet know of Canaanite influence so far north at such an early date.

The similarity between *kunirša* and Kinyras, the legendary king of Byblos and Paphos in Cyprus and the father of Adonis, is provocative of speculation<sup>123</sup>). The origin of the name Kinyras has never been satisfactorily explained. It has been commonly derived from the Semitic *kinnôr*<sup>124</sup>), "stringed instrument, lyre", but this derivation is very dubious. DUSSAUD<sup>125</sup>) in his recent study *Kinyras* passes over the problem of a Semitic etymology for Kinyras, but the question must now be reconsidered in the light of the epithet Kunirša in the Hittite mythological fragments. The forms of the two words are so similar as to present no great phonological impediment to their equation. As the father of Adonis, the mythological role of Kinyras—discounting the late euhemerism—would correspond to that of the Semitic El as the father of Baal and of the gods in general. In spite of the phonological difficulties, El's title *qn ʾrš* seems to be the only explanation at hand for the Kunirša, or better Qunirša, in the Hittite fragments of originally West Semitic myths. There are, however, many links to be supplied before it can be demonstrated that *qn ʾrš* = Qunirša = Kinyras.

<sup>121</sup>) *Ibid.*, pp. 135-137.

<sup>122</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 138, n. 39.

<sup>123</sup>) *Ibid.*, pp. 138 f.

<sup>124</sup>) Cf. H. W. STOLL, "Kinyras" in ROSCHER's *Lexikon*, vol. 2, cols. 1189-1192.

<sup>125</sup>) "Kinyras, Étude sur les anciens cultes chypriotes", *Syria*, 27 (1950), pp. 57-81.



In this connection it may be noted that the origin of the name Kronos also has never explained. The attempt to supply a Greek etymology must be considered a failure <sup>126</sup>). The ancient folk etymology which considered it a variant of *chrónos* is, of course, impossible. The modern connection with *kratnō* in the sense of "Completer, Ripener", while it gives acceptable sense, is philologically very dubious. If Kunirša and Kinyras could develop from *qn ʾrš*, a similar derivation for Kronos may not appear so far fetched and impossible as it otherwise might. This, however, is merely suggested as a possibility and with the utmost reserve.

While the title *qn ʾrš* is not applied to El in the Ugaritic texts, the participle *qny* is once used of him, IV AB III 6, but the reference is to his procreation of the gods, as with the title of his consort, *qnyt ilm*. If, however, *qn ʾrš* means "Creator of the Earth", it attests to El's cosmic creativity. And if Elkunirša is derived from *ʾl qn ʾrš*, it carries this tradition of El's cosmic creativity back to a time roughly contemporary with the Ugaritic texts. The O.T. personal name *ʾelqānā(h)*, Akkadian *iluqanā*, however, probably does not refer to El as creator of the world, but as divine progenitor of the individual bearer of the name.

---

<sup>126</sup>) Cf. POHLENZ, *PWRE*, vol. 11, cols. 1986 f.; FARNELL, *Cults of the Greek States*, Oxford, vol. 1, 1896, p. 23.

## FIFTH CHAPTER

### ELYON AND EL AND BAAL SHAMĒM

The question of the identity of the god Elyon was touched on above in connection with El's title *qn ʿrṣ*, attested at Karatepe, Leptis Magna, and Palmyra, and the fuller title *ʿēl ʿelyōn qōnē(b) šamayim wāʿāreṣ*, Gen. xiv 19, 22. Although Elyon is not mentioned in the Ugaritic texts, the problem of his relation to El is posed by the compound El Elyon in Gen. xiv 18, 19, 22 and Ps. lxxviii 35. A couple of times in the O.T., Ps. ix 3 and Is. xiv 14, the name Elyon is used independently, but otherwise always in parallelism or collocation with the divine names El, Elohim, YHWH. In Ps. lxxxii 6 "sons of Elyon" is parallel with *ʿēlōhîm*, "gods". In the Aramaic of Dan. vii 18, 22, 25, 27 the plural of majesty is used in the phrase *qaddîšê ʿelyōnîn*, "Saints of Elyon". The compounds YHWH Elyon, Ps. vii 18, xlvi 3, and Elohim Elyon, Ps. lvii 3, lxxviii 56, show the complete identification of the God of Israel and Elyon.

In the Sujin <sup>1)</sup> inscription El and Elyon are joined by the conjunction *w* and on the basis of the O.T. compound El Elyon and the Ugaritic compounds like Kṯr wḤss and Qdš wAmrr, one might be inclined to assume that the reference is to a single deity <sup>2)</sup>. If this were so, it would constitute the only parallel to the Ugaritic divine names of this pattern. But it is virtually certain that El and Elyon are intended as distinct deities in the Sujin inscription <sup>3)</sup>, as they are in the account of Philo of Byblos. According to Philo of Byblos <sup>4)</sup>, Elioun (Hypsistos) was the father of Epigeios or Autochthon, later called Ouranos; the latter married his sister Ge and begot Elos, also called Kronos. Thus Elyon is represented as the grandfather of El, and

---

<sup>1)</sup> Cf. above p. 3, n. 16. A full bibliography of the inscription to 1939 is given by ROSENTHAL, *Die Aramäistische Forschung*, Leiden, 1939, p. 13, n. 5.

<sup>2)</sup> So CASSUTO, *EBB*, vol. 1, col. 288, s.v. *ʿēl ʿelyōn*; in *The Goddess Anath*, p. 43, he ascribes the separation into different entities to the later hearsay of Philo of Byblos or the sources from which he drew.

<sup>3)</sup> MONTGOMERY, *HTR*, 31 (1938), pp. 143-145; NYBERG, *ARW*, 35 (1938), p. 336; DELLA VIDA, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

<sup>4)</sup> Cf. above p. 3, n. 18.

not the father as apparently assumed by DUSSAUD <sup>5)</sup> who suggests that El Elyon means "El (son of) Elyon".

The tradition preserved by Philo of Byblos that there was an intermediate stage between Elyon and El in which the sovereignty was held by Ouranos is now confirmed by the Hurrian myths in the Hittite language, dating from ca. 13th century B.C., in which the order of divine succession corresponds exactly to that given by Philo of Byblos <sup>6)</sup>.

<i>Hurrian</i>	<i>Phoenician</i>
Alalu	Elyon
Anu	Ouranos
Kumarbi	El (Kronos)
Storm-god (Teshub)	Hadad (Zeus-Demarus)

The god Alalu corresponds to Elyon as the first in the line of succession. Alalu is known from Akkadian as one of the "21 fathers and mothers of Anu" <sup>7)</sup>. The Hittite text tells of the defeat and flight of Alalu before Anu who then occupied the throne <sup>8)</sup>. In Hesiod's *Theogony* there is no counterpart of Alalu and Philo of Byblos does not tell of any conflict between Elioun and Ouranos, but says that Hypsistos (i.e. Elioun) died in an encounter with wild beasts and was succeeded by Ouranos <sup>9)</sup>. Philo may have connected Elyon with the Adonis motif for want of specific data, or this tradition might very well be ancient, but in the light of the conflict between Alalu and Anu it is probable that a similar story was told of the deposition of Elyon by another Semitic celestial deity corresponding to Anu, Ouranos. It is suggested that the Semitic deity who would best correspond to Anu and Ouranos is Baal Shamēm, a god who appears throughout the Semitic world from Mesopotamia to Sardinia, from the beginning of the first millennium B.C. to the middle of the first millennium A.D. <sup>10)</sup>. A. VINCENT <sup>11)</sup> identified Baal Shamēm with

<sup>5)</sup> *Syria*, 27 (1950), p. 332.

<sup>6)</sup> Cf. FORRER, *op. cit.*; GÜTERBOCK, *Kumarbi*, pp. 88, 115; DUSSAUD, "Les antécédents orientaux à la Théogonie d'Hésiode", in *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slaves*, 9 (Mélanges Henri Grégoire), Brussel, 1949, p. 231.

<sup>7)</sup> Cf. GÜTERBOCK, *Kumarbi*, p. 86.

<sup>8)</sup> GOETZE, *ANET*, p. 120.

<sup>9)</sup> *FHG*, vol. 9, fr. 2, 12-14, p. 567; GIFFORD, *op. cit.*, 36 b, p. 41; CLEMEN, *op. cit.*, 15-16, pp. 24-25.

<sup>10)</sup> Cf. R. T. O'CALLAGHAN, *A Or*, 18 : 1-2 (1950), p. 362, n. 28.

<sup>11)</sup> *La religion des judéo-araméens d'Éléphantine*, Paris, 1937, p. 127.

Elyon, but this equation has not been received with unanimous consent<sup>12)</sup> In Philo of Byblos the relation of Beelsamēn to Elioun and Ouranos is not clear<sup>13)</sup>. Philo puts Beelsamēn at the head of the gods and equates him with the sun and with Zeus<sup>14)</sup>. The identification of Baal Shamēm with Hadad-Zeus is late; there is no early evidence that Baal Shamēm is either a weather-god or a sun-god. In the Zakir inscription, 8th century B.C., Baal Shamēm is distinct from Iluwer (<sup>2</sup>*lwr*) who is elsewhere equated with Hadad<sup>15)</sup>. In the Karatepe gate inscription, col. III 18 ff., Baal Shamēm is invoked as an avenging deity ahead of and distinct from both El and Shamash<sup>16)</sup>.

In an Aramaic letter, discovered at Saqqārah in 1942, dating from perhaps the late 7th century B.C., the king of [Ashkelon?] addresses the Pharaoh (GINSBERG'S<sup>17)</sup> reconstruction): "To Lord of Kingdoms, Pharaoh, thy servant Adon, king of [Ashkelon. May X the lord] of heaven and earth, and Baalshemain the great god, [make the throne of Lord of Kingdoms] Pharaoh enduring as the days of heaven." For the deity X whose name is missing, DUPONT-SOMMER<sup>18)</sup> proposed the restoration "Ishtar, the mistress of heaven and earth". GINSBERG did not venture to supply a name, but in a note suggested<sup>19)</sup>: "If the writer was not a Philistine after all, but a more northerly potentate, he may possibly have known of "El 'Elyon the Lord (or Creator) of heaven and earth" (Gen. xiv 19, 22), since both El and 'Elyon are attested—though as separate deities—for Phoenicia and Syria." This possibility is very intriguing and it is tempting to take it more seriously than GINSBERG probably intended. The restoration of Elyon here, if it could be supported, would clearly establish the distinction between Elyon and Baal Shamēm.

In the Ugaritic texts now at our disposal, there is no hint of the existence of gods corresponding to Alalu, Elyon and Anu, Ouranos (Baal Shamēm?), nor any indication that El was preceded by older

<sup>12)</sup> Cf. EISSFELDT, *ZAW*, 57 (1939), p. 2, n. 4 and p. 19, n. 1.

<sup>13)</sup> Cf. O'CALLAGHAN, *op. cit.*, p. 362, n. 32.

<sup>14)</sup> *FHG*, vol. 3, fr. 2, 5, p. 565; GIFFORD, *op. cit.*, 34 c, p. 39; CLEMEN, *op. cit.*, 7, pp. 20 f.

<sup>15)</sup> Cf. H. SCHLOBIES, *Der akkadische Wettergott* (MAOG, 1, pt. 3), Leipzig, 1925, p. 7; A. VINCENT, *op. cit.*, p. 130; DUSSAUD, *DRS*, p. 99.

<sup>16)</sup> O'CALLAGHAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 363 f., inclines to the identification of Baal Shamēm with El; however, (Postscript, p. 365) he does not insist on this because of El's undeniable relation with the earth.

<sup>17)</sup> *BASOR*, 11 (1948), pp. 25 f.

<sup>18)</sup> *Semitica*, 1 (1948), p. 48.

<sup>19)</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 26, n. 8.

gods. But the texts so far exhumed are surely only a small portion of the original corpus of Ugaritic mythological texts. It seems altogether likely, in view of the nearly contemporary Hittite texts recounting the struggles of the gods, that similar traditions about the predecessors of El were known at Ugarit and that literary evidence for this may yet come to light.

The only thing that might possibly be a reminiscence of Elyon in the extant Ugaritic texts is the epithet <sup>c</sup>ly<sup>20</sup>) applied to Baal, II K III 6, 8. The name <sup>c</sup>ly appears to be identical with Elyon, except for the -ô<sup>n</sup> affirmative<sup>21</sup>), and it may be that both forms originally designated the same deity, the grandfather of El.

---

<sup>20</sup>) This name will be considered in a subsequent study in the light of NYBERG's recovery of the god <sup>c</sup>Al (better <sup>c</sup>ly), *Studien zum Hoseabuch* (UUA, 1935, pt. 6), pp. 58 ff., 90, 120; *ARW*, 35 (1938), pp. 329-387, and M. DAHOOD's discovery of further occurrences of the name in Ps. vii 9, lvii 3, *Theological Studies*, 14 (1953), pp. 452-457.

<sup>21</sup>) Cf. DAHOOD, *op. cit.*, pp. 453, n. 8, and p. 457.

## SIXTH CHAPTER

### BETHEL

Philo of Byblos registers a god Baitylos, i.e. Bethel, as a brother of El 1). A West Semitic god Bethel has long been known from cuneiform sources, from the O.T., and from the Elephantine papyri. The evidence has been thoroughly treated by EISSFELDT 2) in 1930, with review and criticism of previous studies, and again by HYATT 3) in 1939. There is thus no need to re-examine the evidence here. The question whether the god Bethel is also attested at Ras Shamra is our present concern. In the early attempts to interpret the Ugaritic texts a few scholars prematurely took some of the occurrences of the phrase *bt il* as referring to the god Bethel. In the last line of text 10 BAUER 4) saw the deity Bethel in the name which he read *n<sup>c</sup>bt<sup>il</sup>* and took to mean "Bethel rules", or "rule of Bethel", comparing it with the O.T. theophoron *Ṣalmunnā<sup>c</sup>*, the last element being explained by the root *n(w)<sup>c</sup>*, "sway" (of trees) which is used as a parallel to the verb *mlk* in Jud. ix 8, 9. The reading of 10 : 16, however, is very uncertain; instead of *n<sup>c</sup>bt<sup>il</sup>* GORDON 5) reads *n<sup>c</sup>r!(?)il*.

The first line of text 14 consists of the words *bt il* and the succeeding series of lines begin with the words *b<sup>l</sup> bt* followed by apparently foreign proper names of which the first three seem to have the Semitic gentilic ending *-y*. The text is apparently a list of Baals, probably Baals of local shrines, with BAUER 6), rather than of Baals in the temple of El. The words *bt il* heading the list probably designates the content of the list as a group of "shrines". There is nothing to suggest that *bt il* here represents the god Bethel.

In BH II 61 occur the words *qr bt il* and in I D 153 *gr bt il*. VIROL-

---

1) *FHG*, vol. 3, fr. 2, 14, p. 567; GIFFORD, *op. cit.*, 36 c, p. 41; CLEMEN, *op. cit.*, 16, p. 25.

2) *ARW*, 28 (1930), pp. 1-30.

3) *JAOS*, 59 (1939), pp. 81-98.

4) *Die Entzifferung der Keilschrifttafeln von Ras Schamra*, Halle, 1930, pp. 70 and 72; *OLZ*, 33 (1930), cols. 589-590; *ZAW*, 51 (1933), p. 82.

5) *UH*, p. 132.

6) *ZAW*, 51 (1933), p. 82.

LEAUD 7), on the questionable assumption that *g* and *q* are interchangeable, rendered both alike “l’hôte de la maison d’El”. VIROLLEAUD may be right in supposing that in I D 153 the phrase designates Aqhat, but there is nothing to support HYATT’s 8) suggestion that here “the expression may represent one of the stages by which the ‘house of El’ became personified and deified”. In II D I 32-33, II 5,22, where *bt il* is parallel with *bt b<sup>cl</sup>*, there is not the slightest hint of personification of the temple of El. (This, however, does not affect HYATT’s plausible explanation of the process by which Bethel became a deity which seems well grounded on the cuneiform data he adduces.)

In text 107 : 1, *il b(t)n il* is rendered by GORDON 9) as „God of ‘Bethel’ ”. The reading *bt* or *bn* is equivocal and in the light of the similar formula in text 2 : 16-17, 25-26, 33-35 it seems preferable to read *bn*, *il bn il*.

There is thus not a single instance in the Ugaritic texts where the words *bt il* may, with any degree of probability, refer to the god Bethel. There may have been a deity Bethel in the Ugaritic pantheon, but as yet there is no evidence of it.

In this connection it should also be noted that other supposed personifications and deifications of the dwellings of deities in the Ugaritic texts have no basis in fact. The term *dr il* does not mean “dwelling of El” as some 10) have interpreted it, but “generation of El”, “family of El”, or the like. This is shown by the parallelism of *dr* with (*m*)*plur(t)* in 1 : 7; 2 : 17, 34; 107 : 2-3, and still more clearly in III K III 17-19 where the gods, designated collectively as *ilm* and *dr il*, return to their respective dwellings:

<i>tbrk ilm tity</i>	“The gods bless and depart.
<i>tity ilm lablhm</i>	The gods depart to their tents,
<i>dr il lmskntbm</i>	the family of El to their dwellings.”

Neither is *atr b<sup>cl</sup>* a reference to ‘Anat as “shrine of Baal” in I AB II 9, 30 11); *atr* here is not a noun but a preposition, “toward”, as also in I\* AB VI 24-25; I AB I 7\*.

7) Syria, 16 (1935), pp. 251, 265; *La légende phénicienne de Danel*, Paris, 1936, p. 167, n. 1.

8) *Op. cit.*, pp. 88 f., n. 42, and p. 91.

9) *UL*, p. 109.

10) DUSSAUD, *RHR*, 104 (1931), p. 360; BAUER, *ZAW*, 51 (1933), p. 82.

11) ALBRIGHT, *JPOS*, 12 (1932), p. 192.

## SEVENTH CHAPTER

### EL'S ABODE

#### A. THE NATURE OF EL'S ABODE

EISSFELDT <sup>1)</sup> in 1944 summed up the problem of the nature and location of El's abode as follows: "Entrückt in mythische Ferne unbestimmbarer Verschwommenheit erscheint bis zu einem gewissen Grade auch der Wohnsitz des El, wobei es noch strittig ist, ob die für ihn gebrauchten Ausdrücke auf einem am flachen Ende der Welt, etwa im äussersten Westen, zu suchenden Punkt, an dem die Ströme in den Ozean fliessen, zu deuten sind, oder was mehr für sich hat — auf einem hohen Berg, dem die schliesslich in dem Ozean mündenden Ströme der Welt entspringen." In his monograph on El in 1951, EISSFELDT <sup>2)</sup> had no further contribution to the solution of the problem and simply referred to his previous statement, emphasizing that the word *hršn* which is used of El's abode in the Ugaritic texts is probably to be equated with Akkadian *huršān*, "der Weltberg". Had he pursued this point further, as we shall see, EISSFELDT would have come to the solution of the apparent contradiction or incongruity as to the nature and setting of El's abode.

When a god or goddess visits El, the departure and arrival is regularly described by the formula:

<i>idk al l y tn pnm</i>	"Forthwith he/she/they set/s face
<i>°m il mbk nbrm</i>	towards El at the springs of the (two) rivers,
<i>qrb apq thmtm</i>	midst the channels of the (two) deeps.
<i>y tgly šd il wy tbu</i>	He/she/they penetrate/s the domain(?) of El
	and enter/s
<i>qrš mlk ab šnm</i>	the pavilion(?) of the King, Father of Exalted
	Ones."

I AB I 4-10, II AB IV-V 20-24, III AB C 4-6, V AB E 13-16, II D VI 46-51. The expressions *mbk nbrm* and *apq thmtm* make it clear that El resides in aqueous and subterranean environs. The phrase

<sup>1)</sup> *FuF*, 20 (1944), p. 25.

<sup>2)</sup> *EUP*, pp. 30 f., n. 4.



*mbk nbrm* has parallels in Job xxviii 11, *mibbēkē nēbārôt ḥibbēs*, “the springs of the rivers he binds”, and xxxviii 16-17,

*ḥābā(ʔ)tā ʿad nibkē yām* “Have you entered the springs of the  
sea,  
*ūbhēqer tēhôm ḥiḥallākīā* Or walked in the recess of the deep?  
*ḥāniḡlū lēkā šaʿārē māwet* Have the gates of death been revealed  
to you,  
*wēšaʿārē šalmāwet tirʔe(b)* Or have you seen the gates of deep  
darkness?”

The closest O.T. parallel to *apq thmtm* is 2 Sam. xxii 16 = Ps. xviii 16,

*yiggālū mōsēdôt tēḥēl* The foundations of the earth laid bare.”  
*wayyērāʾū ʾāpīqē yām* “Then the channels of the sea were re-  
vealed,

The primary meaning of the root ʾpq appears to be connected with the idea of strength, cf. Arabic ʾafaqa, “overcome, surpass”. In the O.T. as a verb ʾpq occurs only in the Hitpaʿēl in the sense of “force, compel, restrain oneself”. As a common noun ʾāpīq is used once in the singular, Job vi 15, and about a score of times in the plural with the regular meaning “channel, bed of stream, river, or sea, a wady or ravine”, as confining or capable of confining water. In Job xl 18 and xli 7 there are problematic uses of the word having nothing to do with channels for water. In xl 18 the bones of Behemoth are characterized ʾāpīqē nēḥūšā(b). The LXX evades the difficulty by an inexact rendering, “his ribs are bronze ribs”, but the Vulgate has *fistulae aeris* which is followed by modern versions generally, “pipes, or tubes of bronze”. The parallel of ʾāpīqē nēḥūšā(b) is *mēṭīl barzel*, but this does not help much since *mēṭīl* is *hapax* and is explained by Arabic *maṭala*, “shape metal (iron) by beating”, and *maṭlūl*, “sword”, i.e. a bar beaten into long shape. Thus there is no certainty that ʾāpīqīm here means “pipes, tubes”, with reference to the hollowness of bones. If ʾāpīqīm does have this meaning in Job xl 18, it would be of particular interest for our present concern since it would indicate that the word might be used to designate a tunnel or subterranean aqueduct. In Job xli 7, in the description of Leviathan, it is said that his back is ʾāpīqē māḡinnīm and the text goes on to elaborate the meaning of this phrase, “closed up as a tight seal, one so close to the other that no air can come between them, each sticks to the other, they cling together and cannot be separated”. The LXX renders ʾāpīqē

*māginnim* very inaccurately, <sup>2</sup>*aspides chálkeiai*. The KJ and the JPSAV evade the problem with "his scales are his pride". The Chicago Translation and the RSV render "rows of shields". What is clearly emphasized here is the compactness of the scales, and "rows" would be suitable only in the sense of "phalanx" or serried ranks of shields. The Vulgate renders most appropriately *scuta fusilia* and LUTHER came very close with "feste Schilder". The English rendering should be something like "massed shields", or "tightly closed shields". One may think of Akkadian *epēqu* which is used in the sense of "close, close tight", as an antonym of *petū*, "open", but <sup>2</sup>*pq* cannot be connected with Akkadian *epēqu* <sup>3</sup>) which shows by the umlaut of the vowels that the root originally contained a sharp laryngeal, cf. Aramaic <sup>c</sup>*pq* and Arabic <sup>c</sup>*afaqa* and <sup>ġ</sup>*afaqa*.

The parallelism of *nbr* and *thm* raises the question as to whether the water of El's abode was sweet or salt, or undifferentiated. In Akkadian *tīramtu*, cognate with Ugaritic *thm* and Hebrew *tēhôm*, means "sea", including inland lakes without an outlet, and therefore salt water in contrast to sweet water. In *Enuma elish* the personified male *apsū* is the mate of the personified female *tīramtu* and this is interpreted as indicating the contrast between the sweet water and the salt water seas. This distinction, however, is secondary, as first suggested by POEBEL <sup>4</sup>) and more fully demonstrated by KRAMER. According to KRAMER <sup>5</sup>), "there is no evidence to indicate that the Sumerians, like the Akkadians who composed the *Enuma elish* epic, divided the sea into a male principle "sweet water" (*abzu* or *engur*) and a female principle "bitter water" (*a-ab-ba*); the sea was conceived as a single body of water completely surrounding the universe, above, below, and on all sides, and the terms *a-ab-ba*, *engur* and *abzu* are all more or less synonymous, with *a-ab-ba* used primarily for the sea as a geographically conceived body of water". In the O.T. *tēhôm*, *tēhômôt* generally refer to the subterranean supply of sweet-water, the source of the fountains, springs and rivers that come out of the earth, as contrasted with the celestial reservoir whence comes the rain, cf. Gen. vii 17, viii 2, xlix 29; Dt. viii 7, xxxii 17; Prov. viii 28. A few times in the O.T. *tēhôm* is used in connection with the deliverance of Israel at the Red Sea, Ex. xv 5, 8; Is. lxiii 13; Ps. lxxvii 17; and in Ps. cvi 9 *tēhôm* actually stands in parallelism with *yām sūp*. Thus the

<sup>3</sup>) ALBRIGHT, *JPOS*, 2 (1922), pp. 184 f.

<sup>4</sup>) Cf. MEISSNER, *RLA*, vol. 1, p. 123, s.v. *apsū*.

<sup>5</sup>) *JCS*, 2 (1948), p. 43, n. 6.

Hebrew use of *těhôm*, as originally with Sumerian *abzu*, *engur* and *a-ab-ba*, makes no distinction as to sweet or salt water. This explains the Ugaritic parallelism of *tbm*, *tbmtm* with both *nbr* and *ym* and the fact that the Ugaritic sea god is called both *zbl ym* and *tp̄t nbr*, "Prince Sea" and "Chief River". The parallelism of river(s) and seas in passages like Ps. xxiv 2 and Jonah ii 4 present no problem in this light.

The verb *gly* is also an important clue to the nature and location of El's abode. In the O.T. *gly* means "uncover, reveal, remove, depart, go into exile". There is no sufficient reason for separating *gly* meaning "uncover, reveal" from *gly* "depart, go into exile". As a verb of motion *gly* usually refers to departure, but it may also refer to arrival, Amos i 5, or to both departure and arrival, Amos v 27 and Jer xxix 7, 14. GASTER <sup>6)</sup> renders *tgly šd il* as "she leaves the wide open fields". It is clear, however, that the reference here is not to departure, but to arrival at the destination; the direction was already expressed in *idk al tt̄n pnm*, "forthwith she sets face". While *il* may be used as a circumscription for the superlative <sup>7)</sup>, it is certainly not the case in *tgly šd il*. El here is the proper name and is paralleled by the title *mlk ab šnm*, and the words *šd* and *qrš* refer to El's abode which is entered. In Ugaritic *gly* occurs only in parallelism or collocation with *b(w)* <sup>8)</sup> in the sense of "arrive, enter". Outside the cliché *y|tgly šd il wy|tbu*, *gly* occurs once, II K VI 3-5, and this passage is crucial for the definition of its meaning in the other passages:

*bt krt bu tbu* "Keret's house she verily enters,  
*bkt tgly wtbu bkt* she penetrates and enters  
*nšrt tbu pnm* the secret chamber she enters within."

The adverb *pnm*, Hebrew *pěnimā(b)*, as GINSBERG <sup>8)</sup> perceived, indicates that it is not a matter of simple entry, but of entry into the innermost recesses of the house, hence the propriety of his translation of *gly* as „penetrate". The words *bkt* and *nšrt*, so far as the writer knows, have not been explained. GINSBERG <sup>9)</sup> did not attempt to translate them. Unless *bkt* <sup>10)</sup> is a scribal error for *bt krt*, there seems

<sup>6)</sup> *Thespis*, p. 288.

<sup>7)</sup> Cf. EISSFELDT, *EUP*, p. 37, n. 4; D. WINTON THOMAS, *VT*, 3 (1953), pp. 209-224.

<sup>8)</sup> *LK*, p. 31.

<sup>9)</sup> *Ibid.*, and *ANET*, p. 148.

<sup>10)</sup> GORDON's conjectural rendering of *bkt* as "weeping", *UL*, p. 81, leaves *nšrt* philologically inexplicable.

to be nothing to suggest. But *nšrt* may be explained by *nēšûrîm*, "secret places", Is. lxxv 4, which sense would comport with *pnm* which GINSBERG rendered "to its innermost recesses".

We learn from V AB E 19-20, 33-35 that El in his watery abode is ensconced within a complex of several chambers or enclosures:

*y<sup>c</sup>ny il bšb<sup>c</sup>t ḥd<sup>r</sup>m* "El answers from/in the seven chambers,  
*b<sup>i</sup>mnt ap sgrt* from/in the eight enclosures."

Presumably he was in the innermost of these enclosures, in a sort of *dēbîr*, *adyton*, or *penetralia*. The seven or eight enclosures recalls the seven walls and seven gates through which Ishtar passed in her descent to the netherworld<sup>11</sup>). The use of the verb *gly* to describe the mode of access to such an abode again is seen to be particularly appropriate. In the O.T. *gly* is used of discovering or uncovering a hidden thing, such as a secret, a hiding place, pudenda, the foundations of a wall. Most enlightening for our present interest is its use in reference to subterranean places, as the foundations of the earth, 2 Sam. xxii 16 = Ps. xviii 16, the depths of darkness, Job xii 22, the gates of Death, Job xxxviii 17. In the latter passage, Job xxxviii 16-17, quoted above, the verbs *gly* and *r<sup>2</sup>y* are in collocation with *b(w)<sup>2</sup>* and *blk*, from which it is easy to see how *gly* could develop the sense it has in Ugaritic, of discovery, entry, or penetration into a secret subterranean retreat.

In this connection we may be instructed by another Ugaritic stereotype description of entry into the netherworld, II AB VIII 1-9, I\* AB V 11-16. In the longer of the two parallel passages, Baal orders his servants to transmit a message to Mot in the netherworld:

*idk al ttn pnm* "Forthwith set face  
*°m gr trğzz* toward the mountain Trğzz,  
*°m gr trmg* toward the mountain Trmg,  
*°m ilm ḡsr arš* toward the hill that confines the netherworld.  
*ša ḡr ʿl ydm* Lift the mountain on your hands,  
*ḥlb l<sup>r</sup> rḥtm* the hill on top of your palms,  
*urd bi ḥp<sup>t</sup>t arš* and descend to the infirmary of the netherworld.  
*tšpr byrdm arš* be counted among those who descend to the  
netherworld."

<sup>11</sup>) On the seven gates of the netherworld cf. P. JENSEN, *Kosmologie der Babylonier*, Strassburg, 1890, pp. 232 f.; cf. Is. xxxviii 10, Ps. ix 14, Job xxxviii 17, Wisdom of Solomon xvi 13; Matt. xvi 18; Qur<sup>2</sup>ān 15 : 44.

Here is a rather full elaboration of the mode of access to the netherworld. Although the verb *gly* is not used here, the lifting of the mountain on the back of the hand, a prodigious excavation, is equivalent to uncovering.

The reference to a mountain covering the subterranean abode of Mot in the passage just cited raises the problem of the meaning of the word *śd* which designates El's abode. The word *śd*, *śdm* occurs more than thirty times in the Ugaritic texts with the meaning "field, fields". The word used in reference to El's abode, however, is always spelled *śd* and this form occurs only three times elsewhere, I D 213, 220; III D I 15. The passage III D I 15, *ištir bśdm wn<sup>c</sup>rs* [ ], is too obscure to contribute anything to our understanding of the word. GORDON's<sup>12)</sup> conjectural rendering, "*I shall cast light on the area so that we may* — [ ]", is not enlightening. GINSBERG<sup>13)</sup> translates; "He is left in the fields and — [ ]." The passage I D 220 has already been noticed above<sup>14)</sup>. In both these passages the meaning "fields" appears to be suitable. In I D 211-214, however, *śd* stands in association with *ablm*, "tents":

<i>mğyt pğt lablm</i>	"Pğt reaches the tents.
<i>rgm ly[tpn y]bl</i>	Word to Y[tpn is b] rought,
<i>agrtm bat bśdk</i>	'Our <i>agrt</i> has entered your <i>śd</i>
[ ] <i>bat bblm</i>	[ ] has arrived here'."

In a couple of other passages, III K III 18, II D V 32, we hear of the gods dwelling in tents. In the Hittite mythological fragment dealing with the marital mix-up of Elkunirša, Asherah, and the Storm-god, the Storm-god finds Elkunirša living in a "tent"<sup>15)</sup> by the river Mala. It is clear, however, that this is not his regular abode, but that he is living away from his spouse and house. In I D 213 the word *śdk* is not in parallelism with *abl* and GORDON renders "thine abode" while GINSBERG translates more confidently "thy fields". The problem of the relation, if any, of *śd* and *śd* is complicated by an ambiguity of orthography and phonology. In Ugaritic orthography Proto-Semitic *š* and *ś* regularly appear as *š*. The consonant *ś* or *ś*<sub>2</sub> occurs mainly in foreign words, chiefly Hurrian<sup>16)</sup>. Thus the firm(?)

<sup>12)</sup> *UL*, p. 92.

<sup>13)</sup> *ANET*, p. 152.

<sup>14)</sup> Cf. above p. 51, n. 109.

<sup>15)</sup> OTTEN, *op. cit.*, pp. 126 f., l. 6 of the text, *gisZA.LAM.GAR-aš* "Zelt."

<sup>16)</sup> Cf. *UH*, 4.10-12, pp. 15 f.

orthographic distinction between *šd* and *śd* may mean that the two words have no connection. If, however, *šd* and *śd* are only orthographic variants<sup>17)</sup> of the same word, this would give a presumption in favor of the meaning "field", since *šd* seems always to have this meaning in Ugaritic. But the meaning "mountain" is not necessarily excluded. While in Hebrew *śāde(h)* regularly means "field", it can also apply to a mountainous area as shown by Jud. v 18, 'al *mērômē śāde(h)*, "upon the heights of the field". This is not surprising since much of the land of Syria-Palestine is mountainous and the hillsides were terraced and intensively cultivated. On the other hand, Akkadian *śadū*, certainly cognate with Hebrew *śāde(h)*, regularly means "mountain", but is also occasionally applied to the steppe or open country, as HEIDEL<sup>18)</sup> has shown.

Since it is by no means certain that the words *śd* and *šd* are at all related, there is no assurance that the choice of meaning for the word *śd* lies between "mountain" and "field". The meaning of the word *qrš* which is parallel with *śd* is also uncertain. The basic meaning of the root *qrš* is apparently "to be or become firm, clot, congeal". The connection with Akkadian *qarāšu*, "split", is problematic. In the O.T. *qereš* means "board" and is used of the frame of the tabernacle and the deck of a ship, but it nowhere has the meaning "dwelling". The usual translation of the Ugaritic *qrš* as "pavilion" is thus not entirely above suspicion. In Arabic *qarasa* has the same general sense as in Hebrew, but is used particularly of water in the sense of "freeze, congeal". Similar meaning for *śd* can also be supplied by Arabic *sadda*, "stop up, arrest, make firm" and *šadda*, "increase (cold)". PARROT<sup>19)</sup>, in his interesting study of the "refrigerium", documents profusely the importance of the role of water in life and death, but adduces very little that emphasizes the importance of coolness. The choice of the word "refrigerium" to designate the blissful state of the dead presumably had an ancient background of emphasis on alidity which should be investigated further. The sea of Kronos in later times was believed to be frozen<sup>20)</sup>. If the words *śd* and *qrš* have to do with coolness, it would be of considerable interest and importance for the history of the idea of the "refrigerium", but this suggestion is made with utmost reserve, pending further study.

<sup>17)</sup> Cf. OBERMANN, *JBL*, 65 (1946), p. 234, n. 3.

<sup>18)</sup> *JNES*, 8 (1949), pp. 233-235.

<sup>19)</sup> *Le "Refrigerium" dans l'au delà*, Paris, 1937, p. 19, n. 3.

<sup>20)</sup> Cf. *HkAW*, vol. 5, p. 392, n. 2; Plutarch, *Peri tou prosōpou tēs selēnēs* (ed. P. RAINGEARD, Chartres, 1934), 941 b, p. 40.

The question of the exact meaning of *śd* and *qrś* must be set aside for the present as inconclusive. We retain for the time being the noncommittal translation "domain" and "pavilion". There are other passages which give us more information as to the nature of El's abode.

In III AB B 13-14 the god Yam dispatches his messengers to the assembly of the gods to demand the surrender of Baal. It is not explicitly said that the place is the abode of El, but El is apparently presiding over the divine assembly. In the instruction of the messengers the crucial words are broken away, but are intact in the parallel passage, III AB B 19-20, where the messengers carry out their mission:

<i>ib<sup>c</sup> ḡlmm lytb</i>	"The lads depart, they tarry not,
<i>idk pnm lytn</i>	Forthwith they set face
<i>ik ḡr l(?)l</i>	toward the mountain ll(?),
<i>ᶜm pḥr m<sup>c</sup>d</i>	toward the assembled pantheon."

GASTER <sup>21)</sup> would read here *il* instead of *ll* which is otherwise unknown. This text, unfortunately, we have only in transcription and no photograph or autograph of the original is yet available. The original needs to be examined to determine whether the reading *ll* or *il* is indicated. Even if the reading *ll* is established, it might, of course, still be a scribal error. GORDON <sup>22)</sup> takes *ll* as the name of the mountain and suggests that *ll* here is perhaps identical with the *ll* of text 2 : 22, 30, but it is not even certain that *ll* is there a whole word <sup>23)</sup>. If *ll* is the proper reading in III AB B 14, 19, it remains to be identified or explained. In the Hurrian myth of Ullikummi in Hittite there is mentioned a Mount Lalapaduwa <sup>24)</sup> which along with Mount Kandurna has something to do with the issue of kingship in heaven. Tasmisu says to the Storm-god (GOETZE'S translation) <sup>25)</sup>: "Where shall we sit down? — on Mount Kandurna? While we sit on Mount Kandurna, someone else will be seated on Mount Lalapaduwa. If we move anywhere else, there will be no king in heaven." It is not clear which of the two mountains is the one from which the divine rule is to be exercised. There is also in the Ullikummi <sup>26)</sup> myth a place called *ikunta luli* where was a great rock with which Kumarbi

<sup>21)</sup> *Tbespis*, pp. 138, 447.

<sup>22)</sup> *UH*, 18.1092, p. 243; *UL*, p. 13.

<sup>23)</sup> Cf. EISSFELDT, *EUP*, p. 33, n. 3.

<sup>24)</sup> GÜTERBOCK, *The Song of Ullikummi*, pp. 41-42, l. 15.

<sup>25)</sup> *ANET*, p. 124.

<sup>26)</sup> GÜTERBOCK, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13, l. 16 and commentary p. 52.

had sexual intercourse. The word *ikunta* GÜTERBOCK suggests might be a "Luwian" form of Hittite *ekuna* — "cool, cold" — while *luli* "(if the reading is correct) is known as meaning 'pond' or the like." Nevertheless GÜTERBOCK refrains from translating "Cool Pond". It would be rather far-fetched to suggest a connection of this word with the Ugaritic *ll*, but the association of the great rock and cold water is reminiscent of the nature of the abode of the Ugaritic El.

It is certain that *ġr* means "mountain". If GASTER's reading is correct, *ġr il* would be El's mountain. GASTER<sup>27</sup>) renders it "the Mountain Divine". If, however, the reading is *ll*, it might refer to some place distinct from El's abode, as represented elsewhere in the texts. This passage stands apart from all the other references to El's abode and we shall consider the possible implications of this below.

In spite of the uncertainty as to the meaning of *śd* and the reading of *ġr ll*, the mountainous character of El's abode is assured by the use of the term *hršn* in VI AB II 23 and III 22. The longer and more complete passage, VI AB III 21-25, is cited:

<i>idk lyt[n pnm</i>	"Forthwith he set[s face
<i>°m ltpn] il dpid</i>	toward Beneficent] El Benign
<i>tk hrš[n ]</i>	midst Hurša [n ]
<i>ygly śd i[l wybu</i>	He penetrates the domain(?) of E[l and
	enters
<i>qrš mlk] ab šnm</i>	the pavilion(?) of the King], Father of
	Exalted Ones.
<i>l[p °n il ybbr wyql]</i>	At [the feet of El he bows and falls],
<i>yštḥwy [wykḥdnb]</i>	does obeisance [and honors him]."

In both passages there is a lacuna following *hršn* and the words *tk hršn* seem too short to make a full line, so it is likely that a word, presumably a proper name, followed *hršn*. In the Ullikummi<sup>28</sup>) myth HUR. SAC (= *huršān*) is used as determinative before the proper names of the sacred mountains. ZIMMERN<sup>29</sup>) has shown that in Mesopotamian mythology *huršān* originally designated the cosmic mountain of the netherworld. From the connection of the cosmic mountain and the world-encircling river where the dead were judged, *huršān* in Akkadian came to denote the place of the river ordeal, or

<sup>27</sup>) *Thespis*, p. 138. On the nature and location of this "Mountain Divine", cf. *ibid.*, pp. 169-171.

<sup>28</sup>) GÜTERBOCK, *op. cit.*, pp. 30, l. 23; 38, l. 13; 40, ll. 14, 15.

<sup>29</sup>) *Zum babylonischen Neujahrfest* (BSGW, 70, pt. 5 [1918]), p. 3, n. 2.



the ordeal itself. The word sometimes has the determinative for river  $\text{fd|nār}$ , but more often not. There is no doubt, however, that it refers to the river-ordeal. PALLIS<sup>30)</sup> cites a text which says in reference to a messenger on his way to the netherworld, "that house is at the edge of the *huršān*; there they shall examine him" (*bītu šū ina eli šaptē ša huršān ina libbi iša'ulušū*). In Babylonian texts from Arrapha of the 14th or 15th century, the expression for the ordeal is *ana nār huršān alāku*, "to go to the river *huršān*". A bilingual text equates the Sumerian DINGIR  $\text{fd KUGGA}$ , "the pure river-goddess", with Akkadian *amēlu ina huršān zukkū*, "to declare a man pure by the river ordeal"<sup>31)</sup>. The river ordeal was a standard feature of Mesopotamian legal procedure<sup>32)</sup> and the actual ordeal was apparently a substitute for the final ordeal at the real *huršān*. Even where the river is not called *huršān*, it is clear that this is the meaning. In the composition *Ludlul Bēl Nīmēqi*, e.g., the expression *ina itē dnāri ašar dīn nīšēmeš ibbirru*, "on the holy river shore (in the underworld) where the (last) judgment of men is manifested"<sup>33)</sup>, is explained by an ancient commentary as *itē dnār huršān*, "beside the river *huršān*"<sup>34)</sup>.

The virtual identity of *huršān* with the infernal river is thus well established. That *huršān* also refers to a mountain cannot be doubted, in spite of JENSEN'S<sup>35)</sup> denial that *huršān* in the usage considered above means "mountain" in the usual sense or has anything to do with the *huršān* which does mean "mountain". There is only one word *huršān* which includes both mountain and river. The word comes from Sumerian  $\text{HUR. SAG}$ , the *g* of  $\text{SAG}$  being nasalized when affirmatives are added. Although it is difficult to get at the "Urbild" and the basic meaning of the element  $\text{HUR}$ , the meanings "entrails, liver, heart" are sufficient to establish the reference to the netherworld. The element  $\text{SAG}$ , "head", makes it certain that the reference is to an elevated place<sup>36)</sup>. In the Assyrian version of the Gilgamesh epic *huršān* is

<sup>30)</sup> *The Babylonian akītu Festival*, Copenhagen, 1926, pp. 221 f.

<sup>31)</sup> A. T. CLAY, *Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*, vol. 4, New Haven, 1923, 20, 59.

<sup>32)</sup> Cf. DRIVER and MILES, *The Assyrian Laws*, Oxford, 1935, pp. 86-90. On the infernal river in Canaanite, cf. M. TSEVAT, *VT*, 4 (1954), pp. 41-49.

<sup>33)</sup> R. H. PFEIFFER, *ANET*, p. 437 a.

<sup>34)</sup> H. C. RAWLINSON, *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. 5, London, 1884, pl. 47, rev. l. 31; cf. M. TSEVAT, *op. cit.*, p. 48, n. 3.

<sup>35)</sup> *OLZ*, 27 (1924), p. 576.

<sup>36)</sup> Cf. A. DEIMEL, *Sumerisches Lexikon*, pt. II, vol. 3, Rome, 1932, no. 401.1 p. 792 and 401.111 p. 798.

explicitly termed a mountain, *šadê<sup>mes</sup> hur[šani]* 37). The river is so closely connected with the mountain, however, that the two are virtually equated and the sporadic use of the river determinative, *in* *nār* before *huršān* when it refers to the place of the river ordeal, or to the ordeal itself, was to make it clear that the reference was not primarily to the mountain but rather to the river.

GORDON 38) in his *Handbook* suggested the meaning "forest" for *huršn*, but in his translation 39) returned to "mountain", following VIROLLEAUD. CASSUTO 40), surprisingly, translated *ya<sup>car</sup>* 41). There can be little doubt, however, that the Ugaritic *huršn* represents essentially the same mythological concept as Akkadian *huršān*, an infernal cosmic mountain (Weltberg or Unterweltsberg), adjacent to the sources of the subterranean cosmic waters. The term *huršn* thus included both the mountainous and aqueous features of El's abode and makes it unnecessary to use the words *nbr* and *thm* as elsewhere in usual formula; the text VI AB III 21-25 is merely a variant of the regular cliché with the substitution of the lines *em ltpn il dpid* and *tk hurš[n ]* for the usual *em il mbk nbrm* and *qrb apq thmth*, and the reference in each case is to one and the same place. The question whether *gr ll* refers to El's abode or to some other mountain, or whether *šd il* means "mountain of El" or "field of El", is no more crucial since the mountainous character of El's abode is made certain by the term *huršn*.

It is to be lamented that the text is defective after the two occurrences of the word *huršn* in the mythological texts, so that we cannot tell whether it is used as a proper name or as a common noun determined by a missing proper name. At any rate, we believe that the connection of the word with Sumero-Akkadian HUR.SAG—*huršān* comprehends all the features which seem at first disparate.

The nature of El's abode is thus seen to be similar to that of the Sumero-Akkadian Enki-Ea who dwells in the *apsū*. Enki is called *dlugal-zu-ab*, "King of the Apsū". While the synonymy of *apsū* and *huršān* is not attested, as far as the writer knows, the two are certainly connected and are to be identified in part. Enki's spouse is

37) R. C. THOMPSON, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, Oxford, 1930, Tablet IX, col. IV, l. 41, p. 51.

38) *UH*, 18.796, p. 232.

39) *UL*, pp. 24 and 25.

40) *The Goddess Anath*, pp. 96, 98.

41) On the probable connection of *huršān* and *hōreš* cf. H. ZIMMERN, *Akkadische Fremdwörter*, Leipzig, 1917, p. 43.

Ninḫursag<sup>42</sup>), “Lady of Ḫursag”, ḪUR. SAG being the word behind *luršn* which designates El’s abode. We do not need to suggest the identification of Enki, Ea with El, for this was implicitly done already by Berossus who puts Kronos, i.e. El, in the place of Ea in his account of the deluge<sup>43</sup>). The word *apsū* has apparently come into Hebrew as *ʔepes* which has no Semitic etymology<sup>44</sup>). The meaning “extremity” in the common expression, *ʔāp̄sê ʔāreṣ*, “the ends of the earth”, may be explained as coming from the notion that the *apsū* was located in the far distance. The meaning of “non-existence” would naturally develop from the idea of extremity, end. The verb *ʔāp̄es* is clearly denominative. The word *aps* occurs only once in the Ugaritic texts and it has the meaning “extremity”, as in Hebrew, I AB I 31-33:

*ḫnb ltmḡyn ḫdm* “His feet does not reach the footstool,  
*ršb lymḡy apsb* his head does not reach the top.”

Thus neither in Ugaritic nor Hebrew does *ʔps* appear to have any connection with water. In the Old Aramaic Zakir inscription, however, there is the word *ʔps* apparently meaning “cistern”, which may be related to *apsū*<sup>45</sup>). The Hebrew expression *ʔāp̄sê ʔāreṣ*, however, does have an ultimate connection with water, since in the ancient cosmology the earth was bounded and surrounded by the waters of the *apsū*. It is interesting to note that in Arabic the word *tihām* appears to have a connotation of extremity like the Hebrew *ʔāp̄sê ʔāreṣ* since it is applied as the proper name of the distant coastal region of southwest Arabia, Tihāmat<sup>46</sup>).

#### B. THE LOCATION OF EL'S ABODE

If we assumed that El’s abode had a purely mythical and imaginary existence in some never never land, we might drop the matter here. It is *a priori* likely, however, that the Ugaritians localized the abode of this important god somewhere within their own geographical

<sup>42</sup>) On Enki and Ninḫursag cf. KRAMER, *Sumerian Mythology*, Philadelphia, 1944, index, and BASOR, SS, no. 1 (1945).

<sup>43</sup>) Cf. A. HEIDEL, *The Gilgamesh Epic*, Chicago, [1946], 116 ff.

<sup>44</sup>) OBERMANN, *New Discoveries at Karatepe*, New Haven, 1949, p. 37, construed the word *ʔps* in the first of the three lines on the “lion” adjoining the relief as a perfect, “probably in the intensive”, of *ʔps*. The intensive or factitive stem of this verb, however, is never used in the O.T.

<sup>45</sup>) Cf. H. ZIMMERN, *Akkadische Fremdwörter*, p. 44.

<sup>46</sup>) *Ibid.*

horizon, just as Baal's abode was located on the nearby Jebel el Aqra<sup>c</sup>, as EISSFELDT<sup>47)</sup> has shown. There is little in the Ugaritic texts themselves to support the dictum<sup>48)</sup> that El resided in the mythical distance. It could be, of course, that the Ugaritians took this for granted, just as Ugaritologists generally have, but in the descriptions of the gods' visits to El's abode cited above there is no clear implication of remoteness. The expression *balp šd rbt kmn*, which GORDON<sup>49)</sup> suggests "means something like the English idiom 'by leaps and bounds' and is applied to the speed with which gods travel", probably refers rather to distance. In II D V 9-10, where Danel lifts his eyes and sees *balp šd rbt kmn* the approach of the god Ktr, the reference is almost certainly to the distance at which the god is seen and not to the speed<sup>50)</sup> of his approach. This expression, if it refers to distance, is applied to the interval between the abode of Baal and that of Mot<sup>51)</sup> in the netherworld, II AB VIII 24-26, to the distance between the abode of <sup>c</sup>Anat and that of Baal, V AB C + D 77-82, to the distance between the abode of El and that of Baal, II AB IV-V 82-86, and, indirectly, to the distance between El's abode and the place where <sup>c</sup>Anat returned to Aqhat (presumably *qrt ablm* where Aqhat was later smitten, cf. I D 163-166) after her visit to El to extract from him permission to take Aqhat's bow, III D VI 20-22. There is thus nothing to suggest that El's abode was more remote than that of <sup>c</sup>Anat or Mot.

For the location of El's abode for the Ugaritian we should doubtless look first to Syria. The words *mbk* and *apq* in the usual designation of El's abode may furnish a clue. Although both are common nouns, they also became place names. In 1933 MONTGOMERY<sup>52)</sup> suggested that the ancient name of Hierapolis, Bambyke, Mambuj, Mabbuj is cognate with the Ugaritic *mbk*. ALBRIGHT<sup>53)</sup> in 1942

---

<sup>47)</sup> *Baal Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer*, Halle, 1932, pp. 5 ff.

<sup>48)</sup> Cf. R. DE VAUX, *RB*, 48 (1939), p. 597; ALBRIGHT, *JBL*, 59 (1940), p. 106; EISSFELDT, *FuF*, 20 (1944), p. 25; CASSUTO, *EBB*, vol. 1, col. 284.

<sup>49)</sup> *UH*, 18.989, p. 239.

<sup>50)</sup> There is nothing in the Ugaritic texts to indicate that Ktr, like his later analogue Hephaestos, was lame. But as a skilled craftsman he probably did not specialize in speed of locomotion.

<sup>51)</sup> Or, as GINSBERG takes it, *ANET*, p. 135, n. 29, it applies to the safe distance which Baal's messengers are instructed to keep between themselves and the rapacious Mot.

<sup>52)</sup> *JAOS*, 53 (1933), p. 111.

<sup>53)</sup> *ARI*, p. 194, n. 7.

suggested that the form was originally *mabbiggu* "Fountain", from Syriac *nbg*, "gush forth", a partial assimilation of Hebrew-Canaanite *nbk* with the same meaning. A year later, G. GOOSSENS<sup>54</sup>) in an exhaustive study of Hierapolis reviewed the previous theories of the origin of the ancient name and, overlooking the explanation of MONTGOMERY, concluded that the origin and etymology were unknown. There can be no doubt, however, that MONTGOMERY's suggestion is correct. GOOSSENS<sup>55</sup>) cites from the Arab geographer Abdulfida the form *Manbik*, which surely represents the primitive form of the word, *manbik* > *mabbik*. MONTGOMERY did not go beyond the suggestion of the connection of the Ugaritic word *mbk* with the name *Mabbuj*, but it appears that there may be more than a merely verbal connection. This is not to suggest that Hierapolis itself was the ancient abode of El; the possible connection will become apparent below.

The word *apq* also which is parallel to *mbk* is not merely a common noun or a purely mythological concept, as indicated by its frequent use as a place name. There were at least four, and perhaps five or six, different sites with the name *Apheq*, variant *Aphiq*, in the O.T.<sup>56</sup>) and at least two ancient places named *Apqu* in Mesopotamia. ALBRIGHT<sup>57</sup>) interpreted the name *Apheq* as meaning "fortress", on the basis of Akkadian *epēqu*, but, as we have seen, this is linguistically impossible. Yet the meaning is somewhat similar to "fortress" in that *ᵑpq* is a sort of stronghold of water<sup>58</sup>). In every case where ancient sites named *Apheq* or *Apqu* are identified with any degree of certainty, there is a source of water in the vicinity. The *Apheq/Aphiq* in the territory of Asher, Josh. xix 30, Jud. i 31, is located by ALT<sup>59</sup>) at Tell Kurdāneh near the source of the Na<sup>c</sup>mein which empties into

<sup>54</sup>) *Hiéropolis de Syrie*, Louvain, 1943, pp. 6-12.

<sup>55</sup>) *Op. cit.*, p. 9, n. 4.

<sup>56</sup>) Cf. the article *ᵑāḫēq. ᵑāḫīq* by S. E. LOEWENSTAMM, *EBB*, vol. I, cols. 501-503 with bibliography.

<sup>57</sup>) *JPOS*, 2 (1922), pp. 184 f.; 3 (1923), pp. 50-53.

<sup>58</sup>) The derivation from the root *npq* in the sense of "sortie, source", RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie*, Paris, 1864-1874, p. 299, is appropriate as to meaning but linguistically improbable if not impossible. The root is *ᵑpq* and the original form of the noun was *ᵑapīqu*, with the usual syncope of the medial short vowel in Akkadian, *ᵑapqu*. The *Etymologicum Magnum's* derivation of the name from *ᵑpq*, "embrace", accepted by MOVERS, *Die Phönizier*, vol. I, p. 192, is linguistically absurd, but very interesting.

<sup>59</sup>) Cf. F. M. ABEL, *Géographie de la Palestine*, Paris, 1933-1938, vol. 1, p. 467, vol. 2, pp. 67, 246.

the Mediterranean near Acco. The Apheq in the plain of Sharon, Josh. xii 18 (following the Greek text of RAHLFS), the later site of Herod's Antipatris, which according to Josephus was surrounded by a river, is to be located at Ras el 'Ain where the Auja gushes forth, the present-day source of Jerusalem's water supply<sup>60</sup>). The two sites named Apqu in Mesopotamia are also located by copious sources of water. The one nearest Ugarit is in the Ḥarrān near the impressive pool which is the source of the Balikh river, ca. 2 km south of the railroad station Tell 'Abyad. The modern names of the place are 'Ain el 'Arūs and 'Ain Ḥalil ar-Rahmān which connect it with the ancient abode of a deity. In the Old Babylonian Itinerary published by GOETZE<sup>61</sup>) this place coincides with *Apqum ša dBalihā*, obviously considered as the residence of the river-god. The other Mesopotamian Apqu is probably to be located at Tell Būmāriyah<sup>62</sup>) ca. 20 mi. west of Mosul. Here also an abundant spring issues from the foot of the tell. In GOETZE'S Old Babylonian Itinerary this town is called *Apqum ša dIM*, "Apqu of the Weathergod"<sup>63</sup>). It is not certain what god is here designated by dIM; nothing is known to recommend the usual reading of this ideogram as Adad. At any rate, this Apqum is also the abode of a deity who in accordance with the nature of the place would be connected with the spring water. Thus it appears likely that each place named Apheq was also considered the abode of a god of subterranean waters, like El in the Ugaritic texts.

The Apheq which particularly interests us here is the one mentioned in Josh. xiii 4<sup>64</sup>), the modern Khirbet Afqa in Syria, ca. 23 mi. northeast of Beirut, midway between Byblos and Baalbeq (Hierapolis), at the source of the Nahr Ibrāhīm, the ancient river of Adonis. In late antiquity this site, Ephka, Aphaca, was famous as a shrine of Astarte, Aphrodite, Venus. Here, according to legend, was the scene of the first and last embrace of Adonis and Aphrodite and the name of the place was accordingly connected erroneously with the root 'pq, "embrace"<sup>65</sup>). Here the wild orgies of the Syrian fertility cult, sacred prostitution, sacrifice of virginity, self-emasculation, were practised until the scandalized Constantine ordered the destruction of the

<sup>60</sup>) *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 246.

<sup>61</sup>) *JCS*, 7 (1953), p. 61.

<sup>62</sup>) F. J. STEPHENS, *JCS*, 7 (1953), p. 74.

<sup>63</sup>) *JCS*, 7 (1953), p. 57.

<sup>64</sup>) Cf. ABEL, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 247.

<sup>65</sup>) Cf. above p. 63, n. 3; p. 74, n. 58.

shrine<sup>66</sup>). The site remains sacred to the Syrian peasants who continue to invoke here "Our Lady of Afqa". It must have been a holy place from remotest antiquity.

The extraordinary natural beauty of Afqa has deeply impressed all who have seen it. RENAN<sup>67</sup>) called it one of the most beautiful spots in the world. The river emerges from a cavern, Muğārat Afqa, near the bottom of a mighty amphitheatre of towering cliffs and plunges in a series of roaring cascades into a deep and verdant gorge. Above the cavern the cliffs rise more than a thousand feet<sup>68</sup>). Here in one spot we have the features which characterize El's mythological abode in the Ugaritic texts, a mountain with water gushing from its bowels. If the Ugaritians localized El's abode as they did that of Baal, there is no likelier spot to be found in their geographical milieu. Nor is this the whole picture. On the other side of the mountain, Jebel el Munēṭireh (2500 m elev.) is a remarkable intermittent lake, Birket el Yammūneh (ca. 1400 m elev.), fed by an equally remarkable spring, the Neba<sup>c</sup> el Arba<sup>c</sup>in, "Spring of the Forty (Martyrs)", to the northeast of the lake bed. In the basin of the lake, toward the north shore, is a sink-hole called Bal<sup>a</sup>. When the supply of water exceeds the capacity of the sink-hole, the water spreads out to form a veritable lake, whence the name el Yammūneh or The Little Sea<sup>69</sup>). During the heavy winter rains the area is flooded for a considerable distance, and even in summer there is a sheet of water about a mile long and a half-mile wide. In the autumn the spring dries up and the lake is greatly reduced or disappears<sup>70</sup>). Annually at about the vernal equinox the spring erupts suddenly with a loud roar and subterranean tremors and in a few days the dry basin is again transformed into a lake. According to BURTON<sup>71</sup>), "On the 9th day of ʔAdav (*sic*, Adar), (March), the Feast of the Forty Martyrs, the spring begins to flow, and continues to do so till the last day of Tammuz (July), when it ceases. All the neighbouring natives agree that it keeps to these dates within a day, or perhaps two." VIKENTIEV<sup>72</sup>)

<sup>66</sup>) Cf. FRAZER, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* (The Golden Bough, Part IV), 3rd ed., vol. 1, London, 1919, p. 28, n. 3.

<sup>67</sup>) *Mission de Phénicie*, p. 296.

<sup>68</sup>) FRAZER, *op. cit.*, pp. 28 f., n. 4.

<sup>69</sup>) Cf. V. VIKENTIEV, *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Fouad I University*, vol. 11 (1949), pp. 71-84.

<sup>70</sup>) Cf. W. M. THOMSON, *The Land and the Book*, New York, 1883, vol. 3, pp. 313 f.

<sup>71</sup>) R. BURTON and C. F. DRAKE, *Unexplored Syria*, London, 1872, vol. 2, p. 137.

<sup>72</sup>) *Op. cit.*, p. 77, n. 3.

reports that the keeper of the ruins of Baalbeq assured him that the force of the spring was sufficient to eject a stone as big as a man's head. Here is a wonder of nature that must have made a profound impression on the minds of the ancients: a torrent springs out of the mountain to form a lake which subsequently disappears into the earth. Where does the water go? Modern travellers report that there is a popular tradition among the natives of the region that the waters of el Yammūneh are the same as those of Afqa, that Afqa on the other side of the mountain, some 12 km away, is the outlet of the sink-hole of el Yammūneh, and that the two are connected by a tunnel <sup>73</sup>). This is a natural assumption. The modern geographer E. RECLUS <sup>74</sup>) accepted this belief as fact: "... the Nahr-Ibrahim flows for a long distance below the surface. Its headstream rises on the eastern slope in a lakelet near the village of Yanumeh (*sic!*), and after winding through a series of subterranean fissures, reappears intermittently on the western slope about 4,000 feet above sea level." Whether this has been proved or disproved by any geohydrological survey, the present writer does not know. A similar notion is found among the Arabs of Bahrein <sup>75</sup>) who believe that the famous fresh water springs there come by underground route from the Euphrates. The question that concerns us here is whether this tradition is anciently attested for el Yammūneh and Afqa. There is no clear proof of this, but it appears that there was some confusion between the waters of Aphaca and those of el Yammūneh. According to Zosimus <sup>76</sup>) there was at Aphaca near the temple of Aphrodite a lake ... into which the worshippers of the goddess cast their gifts of silver and gold, napkins of fine linen, or other precious materials; if their gifts were pleasing to the goddess, the napkins sank like the metal, but if they were not acceptable the metal as well as the cloth floated on the surface. ROUVIER <sup>77</sup>) allegedly discovered at Afqa the emplacement of a basin with canals which led to the water and he believed that the priests were able to produce this miracle by means of certain hydraulic forces. It is hardly credible that the priests could have constructed a

---

<sup>73</sup>) THOMSON, *loc. cit.*: "The natives think that Birket el Yemmūneh is the source of the Nahr Ibrahim." Cf. VIKENTIEV, *op. cit.*, p. 79 and pl. X.

<sup>74</sup>) *South-western Asia* (The Earth and its Inhabitants. Asia, vol. 4), New York, 1885, p. 369.

<sup>75</sup>) Cf. ALBRIGHT, *AJSL*, 35 (1918), p. 185.

<sup>76</sup>) Zosimus, *Historia nea* (Corpus scriptorum historiae byzantinae, vol. 49), Bonn, 1837, Book I, 58.

<sup>77</sup>) Cf. LAGRANGE, p. 159.



hydraulic device capable of floating or rejecting silver and gold, or would have done so if they could. The prodigious force of the Neba<sup>c</sup> el Arba<sup>c</sup>in during the spring appears to be the most likely origin of this miracle story. Although Afqa and el Yammūneh are on opposite sides of the mountain, they are only a few miles apart and it is possible that Zosimus confused them, as some scholars have assumed <sup>78</sup>). Such confusion would be easily understandable if the two bodies of water were popularly believed to be connected.

The Syrian and Moslem legends about Alexander the Great make him cross Mount Masius (the Mashu of the Gilgamesh epic) and enter the land of darkness through the tunnel at the source of the Tigris <sup>79</sup>). In the Gilgamesh epic no tunnel is specifically mentioned, but since the hero travelled a dozen double hours or leagues (*bēru*) in complete darkness it is assumed that it was through a tunnel <sup>80</sup>). It is indecisive whether the mountains traversed and penetrated by Gilgamesh were supposed to be the Anti-Lebanons and Lebanons or the mountains of Armenia. If the mountains in question were the Anti-Lebanons and Lebanons, which seems most likely since Gilgamesh's direction is designated as westward <sup>81</sup>) (*ḥarrān šamšī*), the tunnel might be the one supposedly connecting el Yammūneh and Afqa rather than the tunnel at the source of the Tigris. The reference in the Qur<sup>ān</sup>, Sura 18 : 59-63, to the juncture of the two seas, *majma<sup>c</sup> el baḥrain*, and to the rock that marked the spot could very well apply to Afqa where the cliff is such a prominent feature. "And when Moses said to his servant, 'I will not stop until I come to the juncture of the two seas, or else I will travel for a long space of time.' But when they arrived at the juncture of the two, they forgot their fish and it took its way into the sea *sarabān*. And when they had passed on, he said to his servant, 'Bring us our dinner, for now we are tired with our journey.' He answered, 'Do you know when we stopped at the rock, I forgot the fish — and none but Satan made me forget it, that I might not remind (you) of it — and it took its way into the sea in a wonderful manner.' He said, 'This is what we were

<sup>78</sup>) Cf. I. BENZINGER in *PWRE*, vol. 1, col. 2709, s.v. "Aphaka".

<sup>79</sup>) R. HARTMANN, *ZDMG*, 67 (1913), pp. 749-751; ALBRIGHT, *AJSL*, 35 (1919), p. 192.

<sup>81</sup>) Cf. R. C. THOMPSON, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, Oxford, 1930, Tablet IX, col. III, l. 10, *ana 12 bēru libbašu* [...]. SPEISER, *ANET*, p. 88, renders, "For twelve leagues [extends] its inside".

<sup>81</sup>) Cf. *ibid.*, p. 89, n. 152, for further evidence in favor of the western direction and locale, viz. the Hurrian name Siduri, Siduri.

seeking.' So the two went back, returning as they came." The story then goes on to relate how an unnamed worthy tested Moses' patience and wisdom and found both deficient. Moslem commentators<sup>82)</sup> explain this curious episode by a story to the effect that Moses, being so admired by the people for his knowledge and eloquence, freely admitted that he did not know any man in the world wiser than himself. Allah rebuked Moses and informed him that el Khidr was more knowing than he. Moses expressed the desire to meet this person and was told that he might find him at a certain rock where the two seas meet. Moses was instructed to take with him a fish in a basket and the spot where he would lose the fish would be the place to find el Khidr. The motif of the miraculous escape of the fish is of especial interest. The word *saraban* usually translated as "freely" may also mean a subterranean passage, conduit, channel, a pipe or arched canal for the conveyance of water and Moslem tradition has taken it in this sense, suposing that the fish passed miraculously through the sea as under an arch, without the water touching him. If *saraban* was really intended as a play on the meanings "freely" and "subterranean conduit", one may think of the possible meaning "tube, pipe" for *ʔāḫāq* in Job xl 18 and of the belief that there is a subterranean channel connecting el Yammūneh and Afqa. The striking motif of the escape of the fish has not been explained. There is an ancient legend that Aphrodite fleeing from Typhon changed herself into a fish at Aphaca and escaped<sup>83)</sup>. The emphasis on the rock (*ṣalḫrat*), or perhaps better cliff, as the landmark of the juncture of the two seas is particularly significant. FRIEDLAENDER<sup>84)</sup> thought of the Rock of Gibraltar and the subterranean passage as a sort of forerunner of the Suez Canal! HARTMANN<sup>85)</sup> thought to have proved that the scene of this episode, as far as it is to be sought on earth, was the cave at the source of the Tigris, since pre-Islamic legend makes Alexander the Great enter this cave on his way to Paradise which accordingly would be located in Armenia. ALBRIGHT<sup>86)</sup>, however, denied that the prophet had in view any definite terrestrial location. It may be that Mohammed was

<sup>82)</sup> Exhaustive treatment of this passage and the traditions by I. FRIEDLAENDER, *Die Chadirlegende und der Alexanderroman*, Leipzig, 1913, pp. 61-107; cf. the Rabbinic parallel in Talmud Babli, Tractate Tāmīd folio 31 b, end, treated by the same author, pp. 42-50, and the Syrian homily, pp. 50-61.

<sup>83)</sup> Cf. MOVERS, *Die Phönizier*, vol. 1, p. 591.

<sup>84)</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 303 f.

<sup>85)</sup> *ZDMG*, 67 (1913), pp. 750 f.

<sup>86)</sup> *AJSL*, 35 (1918), p. 193.

somewhat vague as to the exact location of the juncture of the two seas, but in view of the considerations adduced above, the Syrian Afqa-el Yammūneh recommends itself as a most likely place.

We have already mentioned above that Aphaca in the late classical tradition was the scene of the amours of Adonis and Aphrodite. The lake el Yammūneh also is associated with divine concupiscence. Here, according to a late Phoenician myth, Astarte escaped the amorous advances of Typhon by changing herself into a fish and diving into the lake<sup>87</sup>). It is suggested that Afqa-el Yammūneh may be the setting of the now famous love scene between El and Asherah and probably ʿAnat in the Ugaritic poem SS. In this difficult text El is again associated with the sea, or lake (*ym*) and the deep (*thm*), SS 30:

—] *gp ym*            “—] shore of the sea,  
*wyṣ(?)d gp thm*    and strides by the shore of the deep.”

It is certain that El is the subject of the verb *wyṣ(?)d*, since he is the only male involved in this part of the poem. It is not explicitly said that the setting is El's abode, but this is virtually certain from the mention of El's house in l. 36. In the very enigmatic activities that precede and accompany the *hieros gamos*, fire plays a prominent part, cf. ll. 31, 36, 41, 44 ff. 48. In ll. 35-36 it is said:

*yqb il mšt'ltm*        “El takes *mšt'ltm*,  
*mšt'ltm lriš agn mšt'ltm* from the top of the fire  
*yqb ys<t> bbth*    he takes and puts in his house.”

The word *mšt'ltm*, apparently a dual, has been connected with Hebrew *šō'al*<sup>88</sup>), “hollow of the hand”, and taken to mean that El takes water in his cupped hands and puts it in a receptacle of some sort<sup>89</sup>). It is clear, however, that *agn* means “fire” as seen from ll. 14-15 of this same poem where it is parallel to *išt*. If it is a matter of hydrophoria<sup>90</sup>), it seems odd that the water should first be heated. Moreover, water is not specifically mentioned in this part of the poem. The word is perhaps better explained by Arabic *ša'ala*, “kindle, burn,

<sup>87</sup>) MOVERS, *op. cit.*, p. 591.

<sup>88</sup>) Cf. ALBRIGHT, *JPOS*, 14 (1934), p. 134, n. 176.

<sup>89</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 134, “reservoir”; GASTER, *Thespis*, p. 249, “until the vessel is full to the brim”.

<sup>90</sup>) The hydrophoric rites at Hierapolis are well known from the account of Lucian. Cf. GOOSSENS, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 41, 69-72, 131.

blaze", with the meaning "brands, torches" <sup>91</sup>), or the like. The emphasis on fire recalls the statement of Zosimus <sup>92</sup>) that a light like a torch or a globe of fire was seen on the sanctuary at Aphaca at the season when the people assembled to worship the goddess. According to Sozomenus <sup>93</sup>), the signal for the celebration was a flashing meteor which on a certain day fell like a star from the top of Lebanon into the river Adonis. The meteor was thought to be Astarte herself and FRAZER <sup>94</sup>) suggested that its flight through the air might naturally be interpreted as the descent of the amorous goddess into the arms of her lover. We have already suggested above <sup>95</sup>), following NIELSEN, that the *mštlm*, "brands", or "torches" which El takes and puts in his house may represent the passionate goddesses whom he subsequently impregnates. It is perhaps not too daring to suggest, in view of the various lines of evidence that tend to localize the abode of El at Afqa, that the Ugaritic poem SS with its torrid *hieros gamos* is the ancient prototype of the myths and rites which persisted at Aphaca down to Christian times and provoked Constantine to destroy the shrine.

---

<sup>91</sup>) Cf. above p. 39, n. 64.

<sup>92</sup>) Zosimus, *loc. cit.*

<sup>93</sup>) *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II, 5 (MIGNE's *Patrologia Graeca*, lxxvii, col. 948).

<sup>94</sup>) FRAZER, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* (The Golden Bough, Part IV), 3rd ed., vol. 1, London, 1919, p. 259.

<sup>95</sup>) Cf. above p. 39.

## EIGHTH CHAPTER

### EL'S STATUS AND SIGNIFICANCE IN THE UGARITIC TEXTS

That El has a position of high honor in the Ugaritic pantheon seems incontrovertible. Yet, as has been already noted, there are indications that his exalted position is more or less titular and that he may be slipping, or have already been displaced, from the position of unchallenged leadership and control over the gods.

Eminent scholars have nevertheless given appraisals of the Ugaritic El's position and prestige that are monotheistic, or nearly so. According to DUSSAUD <sup>1)</sup>, the Ras Shamra texts confer on El such grandeur and power that it can only be explained by his identification with Aton, the Egyptian "god of empire". DUSSAUD ascribes to El solar character which would make the identification natural and easy. The scribes and priests are presumed to have been familiar with and favorably disposed toward the reforms of Ikhnaton. The fact that a chief priest of Ugarit in the time of king Niqmad bears the name *atnprln*, I AB VI 54-55, and the Hurrian text 4 : 1, 12 contains the vocable *atn* is taken by DUSSAUD as corroboration of this view. GORDON <sup>2)</sup> also suggests that *atn* is perhaps a god's name, the sun disc(?), because it stands parallel to divine names in this Hurrian text. But even if this is so, there is nothing to connect *atn* with El. That there was strong Egyptian influence at Ugarit is abundantly evident <sup>3)</sup>, but there is no evidence whatever within the Ugaritic texts for attributing solar character to El. Even if the epithet *ab šnm* means "Father of Years", it refers only to El's venerability and certainly does not imply that El as the sun was the ruler of the seasons and the years <sup>4)</sup>. The winged solar disc above the god depicted on the limestone stela, if the god is really El, is hardly of itself sufficient to characterize the god as a solar deity. DUSSAUD <sup>5)</sup> freely admits that

---

1) *DRS*, 2nd ed., pp. 92-97.

2) *UH*, 18.340, p. 216.

3) Cf. DE LANGHE, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, pp. 37-85.

4) DUSSAUD, *RHR*, 104 (1931), p. 358.

5) *Ibid.*

El was not the only solar deity at Ugarit, since the goddess Shapsh clearly has that function. It would be passing strange to have more than one solar deity at a given place at the same time. The later identification of Kronos with the sun <sup>6)</sup> cannot be imposed on the Ugaritic El in the complete absence of any internal evidence in the Ugaritic texts. DUSSAUD <sup>7)</sup> regards El as the chief god of the Canaanites and Phoenicians as well as of the Hebrew patriarchs. It is this worship of El as the principal deity which identifies and defines the Canaanite tribes and clans, according to DUSSAUD <sup>8)</sup>, and outside the Canaanite milieu *ilu*, <sup>9)</sup> *ēl* is never anything but an appellative. The enigmatic phrase *barṣ il klb*, I AB I 37, he takes to mean the land of the Canaanites as the worshippers of El. The element *ilu* in Akkadian theophorous names he would regard as purely appellative, even in a name like *ili-ma-ilu*, "my god (i.e. my protecting deity) is truly God" <sup>9)</sup>. The occurrence of El as a specific deity among the Arameans and South Arabians he regards as a borrowing from the Canaanites <sup>10)</sup>. DUSSAUD <sup>11)</sup> further believes that El very early supplanted the god Elyon and reigned over all Canaan from the end of the 2nd millennium. El, however, in his turn gave way to Baal (Hadad) who was primitively specialized as a storm-god. This latter view is certainly true, but DUSSAUD fails to recognize the important fact that the displacement of El by Baal seems already to be well under way in the Ugaritic texts, especially in the AB cycle, at least as early as the middle of the 2nd millennium B.C.

In contrast with DUSSAUD's view of El as a solar deity, D. NIELSEN <sup>12)</sup> interpreted the Ugaritic texts to support his view that the ancient Semitic chief god was a lunar deity. NIELSEN tried to find at Ugarit the same sort of divine triad he found in South Arabia: father = lunar, mother = solar, son = stellar deity <sup>13)</sup>. The North Semitic triad, however, allegedly had Venus as the daughter and mother and the Sun as the son. Of NIELSEN's <sup>14)</sup> view that <sup>10)</sup> *Ilāt*,

<sup>6)</sup> Cf. LAGRANGE, pp. 71 ff.; ED. MEYER in ROSCHER's *Lexikon*, s.v. "El"; DUSSAUD, *op. cit.*, pp. 358 and 385.

<sup>7)</sup> *Syria*, 27 (1950), pp. 332 f.

<sup>8)</sup> *DRS*, p. 91.

<sup>9)</sup> *Ibid.*, n. 4.

<sup>10)</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11)</sup> *Syria*, 27 (1950), pp. 332 f.

<sup>12)</sup> *RŠMBT*, pp. 9-26; *ZDMG*, 17 (1938), pp. 504-551; *Der dreieinige Gott*, vol. 2, pp. 68-74; cf. JAMME, *Le Panthéon sud-arabe préislamique*, p. 59, n. 4.

<sup>13)</sup> Cf. *RŠMBT*, p. 6.

<sup>14)</sup> *Handbuch der altarabischen Altertumskunde*, vol. 1, Copenhagen, 1927, p. 223.

solar goddess, is the consort of ʿIl, lunar god, G. RYCKMANS<sup>15)</sup> says: "Cette hypothèse n'est vérifiée par aucun texte." NIELSEN's approach to the Ugaritic texts with preconceived ideas of what was to be found there naturally led him to tendentious misinterpretations. There is no more evidence for the lunar character of El in the Ugaritic texts than there is for his solar character. Neither DUSSAUD nor NIELSEN recognized that El's residence in the netherworld would seem to preclude the likelihood that he could be either a solar or a lunar deity.

Like DUSSAUD, G. B. ROGGIA<sup>16)</sup> would also identify the Ugaritic El with the El of the Hebrew patriarchs, since the god appears with some of the same attributes among both peoples. The differences between Hebrew religion and that of Ugarit ROGGIA regarded as secondary and accordingly concluded that an original Semitic monotheism is more than probable. ROGGIA conceded, however, that among the Ugaritians El had undergone a progressive degradation. This latter conclusion accords with the evidence that has been presented in this study.

J. AISTLEITNER of Budapest has communicated to EISSFELDT<sup>17)</sup> relevant sentences in German of an article in Hungarian in which the role of El in the Ugaritic texts is seen as corresponding to that of the "Hochgott" of Father W. SCHMIDT's "Urkulturkreis" in which primitive religions ostensibly polytheistic are regarded as actually monotheistic in that the lesser gods owe their existence to the chief god who begot them and who gives them their power and assigns them their functions and spheres of activity. The fact is stressed that none of the Ugaritic gods can be shown to stand outside the family of El. Accordingly AISTLEITNER regards the religion of Ugarit as the oldest example of "cryptomonotheism". The evidence from the Ugaritic texts which serves as the basis for this view of AISTLEITNER is not cited by EISSFELDT, thus it is impossible to offer any criticism here<sup>18)</sup>. The writer believes, however, that all data relevant to this question has

---

<sup>15)</sup> *Les Religions Arabes Préislamiques*, p. 15. For a summary and bibliography of NIELSEN's and others' views of the South Arabian pantheon, cf. JAMME, *op. cit.*, pp. 59 f.; for JAMME's own reconstitution of the pantheon, *ibid.* p. 61.

<sup>16)</sup> *Aevum*, 15 (1941), p. 575.

<sup>17)</sup> *EUP*, p. 71, addendum to p. 9, n. 4.

<sup>18)</sup> This article was cited, summarized and appraised already by W. BAUMGARTNER, *TbR*, 13 (1941), pp. 1 and 91. With BAUMGARTNER's judicious comment the present writer heartily agrees: "dass El je der einzige Gott gewesen, wird auch durch die Berufung auf Pater Schmidt nicht wahrscheinlicher".

been considered in the preceding discussion and is at a loss to see how the total evidence could serve as a basis for such an estimation of the Ugaritic El.

EISSFELDT himself at the end of his masterly study of El in the Ugaritic Pantheon comes to a conclusion equally surprising. He admits that it is too much to derive the argument for an original El monotheism from the mythological texts. He concedes that the lists of offerings to El in the ritual texts do not show him to have had a markedly preferred status as compared with the other gods. Nor do the personal names containing the element *il*, of themselves, indicate even that El stood at the head of the pantheon. Yet, in spite of these weighty considerations, EISSFELDT arrives at the view that at least a certain segment of the population of the city-state Ugarit, ca. 1400 B.C., worshipped El not only as the highest god, but as the absolute God, and that there was in the history of the Ugaritic cultus a movement that assumed a monarchical position for El and tended to regard the other gods as mere emanations of his divine power<sup>19</sup>).

The basis for this view EISSFELDT finds in the first five lines of the text numbered 107 by GORDON (RS 1932, 4474, BAUER and GINSBERG's text 51, EISSFELDT's text 53) supported by parts of text 2. This text (107) was first published and studied by DHORME<sup>20</sup>) in 1933 and a new copy (with radically different readings in ll. 4 and 10) was published by VIROLLEAUD<sup>21</sup>) in 1939. Studies based on DHORME's copy were made by GASTER<sup>22</sup>), GINSBERG and MAISLER<sup>23</sup>), and OBERMANN<sup>24</sup>), while treatments on the basis of VIROLLEAUD's new copy have been given by RINGGREN<sup>25</sup>) and EISSFELDT<sup>26</sup>). GORDON<sup>27</sup>) gives a translation of the text but without notes or discussion. In view of the crucial importance which EISSFELDT's interpretation gives to this text, it may be well here to give a brief sketch of attempts to interpret it. The text reads:

obv.	rev.
(1) <i>il b(n t) il</i>	(12) <i>bmrḥ il</i>
(2) <i>dr b(n t) il</i>	(13) <i>bnit il</i>

<sup>19</sup>) *EUP*, pp. 59-70.

<sup>20</sup>) *Syria*, 14 (1933), pp. 221-235 and pl. XXV.

<sup>21</sup>) *Syria*, 20 (1939), pp. 129-133, pl. XXV, no. 1.

<sup>22</sup>) *Religions*, 9 (1934), p. 6, and *Tarbiz*, 8 (1937), pp. 340-344.

<sup>23</sup>) *JPOS*, 14 (1934), pp. 266 f.

<sup>24</sup>) *JBL*, 55 (1936), pp. 21-44.

<sup>25</sup>) *Word and Wisdom*, pp. 74-79.

<sup>26</sup>) *EUP*, pp. 60-68.

<sup>27</sup>) *UL*, p. 109.



obv.	rev.
(3) <i>mḫrt bn il</i>	(14) <i>bšmd il</i>
(4) <i>ṭrnm wšnm</i>	(15) <i>bdṭn il</i>
(5) <i>il waṭrt</i>	(16) <i>bšrp il</i>
(6) <i>ḫnn il</i>	(17) <i>bknt il</i>
(7) <i>nšbt il</i>	(18) <i>ḡḡdyn il</i>
(8) <i>šlm il</i>	(19) [       ]
(9) <i>il ḫš il ad(d u)</i>	
(10) <i>b<sup>c</sup>(d l) špn [b<sup>?</sup>]<sup>c</sup>(d l)</i>	
(11) <i>ugrt</i>	

The text is replete with enigmas and ambiguities and the divergent interpretations that have been given to it merely emphasize the great uncertainty. DHORME<sup>28</sup>) considered the text an incantation, erroneously connecting the first word with Hebrew <sup>2</sup>ālā(*b*). GINSBERG<sup>29</sup>), however, pointed out that <sup>2</sup>ālā(*b*) in Hebrew has the sense of an adjuration reinforced by a curse, which hardly suits the tenor of the text. It is virtually certain that the word *il* in all its 17 occurrences in this text represents the proper name El<sup>30</sup>). Still DHORME may have been close to the truth in designating the text an "incantation"<sup>31</sup>). GASTER<sup>32</sup>) considered the text as a prayer to El to "hasten and succour the whole of Ugarit," ll. 9-11, based on DHORME's reading of the last word of l. 10 as *kl*. El is invoked, ll. 12-18, along with his pride (*mrḫ*), Grandeur (*nit*), Sublimity (*šmd*), Richness (*dṭn*), Nobility (*šrp*), Magnificence (*knt*), and Vigour(?) (*ḡḡdyn*) which GASTER regarded as personified qualities and attributes of El, "divine or semi-divine spirits who attended upon the high god and formed his inseparable coteries"<sup>33</sup>). OBERMANN<sup>34</sup>) interpreted the text as an antiphonal psalm and divided it into ritual (ll. 1-4), supplicatory (ll. 5-9), and hymnal (ll. 10-18) sections. The responses he found in ll. 3, 4b, 6, 8, with the words *kl ugrt* of ll. 10-11 serving as the response for l. 10a and intended to be repeated with each of the succeeding lines. The difficult words *mrḫ*, *nit*, *šmd*, *dṭn*, *šrp*, *knt*, *ḡḡdyn* of ll. 12-18 OBERMANN<sup>35</sup>) interpreted as "exultation", "presence",

<sup>28</sup>) *Syria*, 14 (1933), p. 231.

<sup>29</sup>) *JPOS*, 14 (1934), p. 266.

<sup>30</sup>) Cf. DE LANGHE, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 171 f.

<sup>31</sup>) This is the opinion of RINGGREN, *op. cit.*, p. 75, n. 3.

<sup>32</sup>) *Religions*, 9 (1934), p. 6.

<sup>33</sup>) *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup>) *Op. cit.*, p. 44.

<sup>35</sup>) *Ibid.*, and p. 37.

“loyalty”, “abundance”, “honor”, “justice”, “care” of El, understanding them as “qualifications either owned by El, or granted by him (to man)” and, significantly, without any suggestion that these attributes or qualities were intended as personified.

RINGGREN dealt with this text in some detail in connection with his studies in the hypostatization of divine qualities and functions in the whole area of the ancient Near East. If one assumes that all the different components listed in ll. 12-18 denote similar things (which is a questionable assumption), RINGGREN<sup>36)</sup> suggests two obvious alternatives: they are *either* “cult objects or cult actions”, *or* “a series of personified qualities and other divine beings”. He apparently inclines to the latter alternative, for he renders the words *mrḥ*, *nit*, *šmd*, and *knt* as the “delight”, “grace”, “suite”, and “laws (? or: truth)” of El and he suggests that if this interpretation is correct, we should have here examples of hypostatized qualities or functions of El. For the words *dīn* and *gdyn* he can find no satisfactory meaning, but for *šrp* which he renders tentatively “(burnt offerings?)” he suggests that if the combination with Hebrew *šērāpīm* is correct, “we should here have evidence that these hypostases have been regarded as kinds of inferior divine beings”. He judiciously concedes, however, that “for the present this must remain a conjecture”<sup>37)</sup>. The terms *hnn*, *nšbt*, and *šlm* of ll. 6-8, however, RINGGREN regarded as “somewhat more certain: the grace of El, the firmness(?) of El and the peace of El are probably three personified or hypostatized qualities of El”<sup>38)</sup>. There is, however, no certainty that these words are in construct with El; OBERMANN<sup>39)</sup> construed the words as verbs and EISSFELDT<sup>40)</sup> inclined to take them as predicates of nominal sentences with El as the subject, “El is grace”, “El is solidarity”, “El is health”. Thus the personifications and hypostatizations vanish.

EISSFELDT's interest in text 107 is directed mainly to the first five lines which contain a series of names of deities or groups of deities ending with El and Asherah. The salient points of his analysis of the rest of the text are as follows<sup>41)</sup>: ll. 6-8 are probably nominal sentences. In l. 9 *hš* and *adu* are construed as imperatives, “El protect”,

36) *Op. cit.*, pp. 77 f.

37) *Ibid.*, pp. 74 f. and 78.

38) *Ibid.*, p. 78.

39) *EUP*, p. 44.

40) *Ibid.*, p. 61 n.

41) *Ibid.*, pp. 60-62, espec. n. 3, pp. 60 f.

"El enter". In ll. 10-11 he reads *b<sup>c</sup>d špn b<sup>c</sup>d ugrt*, "für Zaphon und für Ugarit", taking *špn* and *ugrt* as parallel and synonymous. In the six word-pairs of ll. 12-18 the preposition *b* is understood as precative and the following words partly as weapons of El — *mrh*, "lance", *šmd* "club" — and partly as characteristics of El, appellations either of emblems or qualities of El. He makes no attempt to determine the meanings of the puzzling words *nit*, *dtn*, *šrp*, and *gdyn*. As with OBERMANN, there is no suggestion that these emblems or qualities are personified or hypostatized.

The exalted position which EISSFELDT attributes to El is based almost entirely on the opening lines of text 107 and the "elevation-formula" of text 2, which recurs, with variations, in ll. 16-17, 25-26, 33-35:

*yšī lab bn il* "It is brought to the Father of the Gods.  
*yšī ldr bn il* It is brought to the family of the gods,  
*(lmplyrt bn il)* (to the totality of the gods),  
*lšknn wšnm* to Thukamuna and Shumalia."

The first five lines of text 107 EISSFELDT takes as representing El as the essence ("Inbegriff") of all the gods, rather than as merely listing El in a series of gods. The words *il bn il* of the first line, he maintains, do not represent two separate elements, "El" and "the sons of El", but is rather a genitival combination in the sense of "God of Gods".

Similarly the expression *ab bn il* of text 2 : 16, 25, 33 does not consist of two elements, "father" and "gods", but is a genitival combination, "Father of the Gods", meaning El. The formulae *dr bn il* and *mphyrt bn il*, 2 : 17, 25-26, 34; 107 : 2-3, are interpreted as predications of El who accordingly is held to comprehend within himself the totality of the gods <sup>42</sup>). The mention of the Cassite divine pair *šknn wšnm*, Thukamuna and Shumaliya, 107 : 4; 2 : 26, 35, as specific deities alongside El who allegedly is represented here as comprehending all the gods is somewhat disturbing to this view, but EISSFELDT surmounts this difficulty with a plausible conjecture. The Cassite pair are presumed to have been received into the Ugaritic pantheon through some political development, such as the accession of a Cassite prince to the throne, or the marriage of the king to a Cassite princess. The author of text 107, having had to mention the

---

<sup>42</sup>) *Ibid.*, pp. 62-65.

Cassite gods in consideration of the supposed political situation, then hastens to add *il waḫrt*, El and Asherah, in the following line in order to give the foreign gods an *interpretatio ugaritica* and relate them to the predication of El as "God of Gods" <sup>43</sup>). To the implication of bisexuality inherent in El's alleged subsumption of female deities, including his own consort Asherah, EISSFELDT cites as parallel the case of Anu and Antu and Macrobius' statement to the effect that the Syrians considered Adad and Adargatis as a unity <sup>44</sup>).

The preceding interpretation of portions of two enigmatic ritual texts furnish the basis for EISSFELDT's conclusion that there was, as it were, a society of El monotheists at Ugarit. Evidences of other monotheistic movements in the ancient Near East are cited: the oft treated Neo-Babylonian text which represents different aspects of Marduk's nature and activity as being various other gods, and the Document of Memphite Theology, going back to the beginning of the 3rd millennium B.C., in which the priests of Ptah in Memphis labored to glorify their god by ascribing to him all powers of creation and the embodiment of all the deities <sup>45</sup>). Surprisingly, no mention is made of the movement of Ikhnaton roughly contemporary with the Ugaritic texts.

This view of EISSFELDT's depends mainly on the syntax and meaning of *il bn il* in the first line of text 107. It is by no means certain that *bn il* stands in genitival relationship with *il* or that the whole expression means "God of Gods". The first *il* may very well be independent of *bn il*, "El, sons of El". Nor does it follow that the words *dr* and *mḫrt* of the succeeding lines are in synonymous parallelism with the first *il*, thus implying that El comprehends and subsumes the entire pantheon. As for the phrase *ab bn il* in the "elevation formula" of text 2 : 16, 25, 33, EISSFELDT is almost certainly correct in taking it as a genitival combination, "Father of the Gods", meaning El. This, however, occasions no surprise since the mythological texts make it abundantly clear that El was regarded as the father of the gods. But again it does not follow that the father is synonymous with his family (*dr*) and the "totality" (*mḫrt*) of his children (*bn il*), or that he comprehends or subsumes his entire family. Of this there is not the slightest hint in all the other texts.

<sup>43</sup>) *Ibid.*, pp. 66-68.

<sup>44</sup>) *Ibid.*, n. 2, pp. 68 f.; cf. NIELSEN, *RSMBT*, p. 82, on the cry *ad ad, um um*, addressed to El in SS 32-33.

<sup>45</sup>) *EUP*, pp. 68-70.

The specific mention of the Cassite pair *tkmn wšnm*, 2 : 26, 35, and 107 : 4, probably implies that they were recognized as standing outside the family of El and their juxtaposition with *il waṛt* in 107 : 5 may indicate that they were equated with El and Asherah, but there is nothing to suggest that they were also regarded as subsumed by El <sup>46</sup>). Everywhere else in the Ugaritic texts these and all other deities are clearly distinguished from El. In the list of sacrifices to various gods in text 1, El receives an ox and a sheep, *alp š lil*, l. 2, and again he and Asherah are separately allotted a sheep, l. 6, while *tkmn wšnm* jointly receive offerings, ll. 3, 6, and other deities, Resheph, °Anat, Baal Ṣapān, etc., receive offerings as separate entities. In l. 7 of this same text an offering is allotted jointly to *dr il wplṛ b<sup>c</sup>l*, "the family of El and the aggregation of Baal". The term *dr il* occurs elsewhere only in III K III 19 where it is parallel with *ilm*, "gods". The expressions *dr il* and *dr bn il* seem to be synonymous; it is hard to see what difference there could be in meaning. It is not clear just what deities are included in the terms *dr il wp[l<sub>b</sub>]r b<sup>c</sup>l*. Perhaps the reference is to separate aggregations of minor deities, one associated with El and the other with Baal, although the two here combined as joint recipients of a single offering. The reference can hardly be to the entire pantheon, since the major gods are specified by name in text 1.

Even if EISSFELDT's interpretation of these two brief passages in texts 2 and 107 is valid—and this is very doubtful—still the implications seem overdrawn. If there was such a monotheistic movement among some of the more enlightened devotees of El at Ugarit—and EISSFELDT qualifies this estimation of El by limiting it to a certain segment of the populace, presumably some priests of El—still the movement had little perceptible influence on the mainstream of Ugaritic religion as reflected in the rest of the texts where El's status, to say the least, appears somewhat ambiguous. As we have seen, El's titles and epithets clearly establish him as nominal head of the pantheon, as father and king of the gods. It seems that his approval is prerequisite for any action proposed by the other gods, both in the momentous matter of a construction of a house for Baal and in °Anat's wish to rob Aqhat of his bow. But there is something very strange about all this. The approval by El would certainly seem to be an empty formality when °Anat on two different occasions, involving

---

<sup>46</sup>) DUSSAUD, *DRS*, p. 94 takes the text to imply that they were reckoned as El's progeny.

two unrelated affairs, threatens to thrash it out of him if he refuses. There seems to be no getting around the obvious implications of this episode 47). It is hard to see how this could be interpreted otherwise than as the grossest disrespect for her father on the part of ʿAnat and as weakness or utter helplessness on the part of El. The assertion that disregard for old age is a phenomenon of modern times 48) does not seem to hold true here. How could ʿAnat possibly have proper respect for her aged father and at the same time threaten (perhaps in a reverent and apologetic tone?) to batter his hoary head to a gory pulp? The greater the respect for old age in Ugaritic society, the more serious would be this affront to El's dignity and prestige. Could one seriously imagine that this twice repeated episode was intended to enhance El's prestige in the eyes of his devotees by showing to what extreme his affability could be pressed? LØKKEGAARD 49) argues that El's attitude is not weakness, "but the highest virtue the Arabs knew in a ruler, *ḥilm*. This means a mixture of goodness, friendliness and wisdom, which results in moderation and tolerance, but after all is based on self-reliance and belief in one's own power, so that one is able to let the forces have free scope while standing in the point of balance." ʿAnat's behavior toward El, however, seems to put an intolerable strain on the concept of *ḥilm*. LØKKEGAARD comments that "El's affability is remarkable" 50). One might go further and say that it is almost incredible, assuming that El was still in complete control of divine affairs. LØKKEGAARD 51) draws an interesting parallel between El and the mortal king David who exercised a high degree of *ḥilm* in his reign. One could press this comparison a little further into the latter days of David's reign when what might appear as *ḥilm* was largely senile incompetence and incapacity.

ʿAnat's disrespect toward El is by all odds the grossest, but there are still other affronts to El's dignity and prestige, as mentioned previously. The messengers of Prince Sea are ordered deliberately to insult El and the whole pantheon by neglecting to bow before him and are further instructed to refer to their master as lord (*bʿl*) and master (*adn*) of the gods, III AB B 17, 33-34, implying that Prince

---

47) DUSSAUD's explanation, *DRS*, pp. 109 f., as we have seen, above p. 28, is utterly impossible. El, if we have judged him rightly, needs rejuvenation, but the blood bath which Anat offers him is his own blood!

48) LØKKEGAARD, *op. cit.*, p. 232, n. 125.

49) *Ibid.*, p. 233.

50) *Ibid.*, p. 234.

51) *Ibid.*, p. 233.

Sea has assumed dominion over the gods. Actually it appears that El himself had appointed Yam as Lord and even King. In VI AB IV 17 El says to Yam, *at adn tpr*, "Thou art named Lord", and in III AB C 22 someone, presumably El, says [*tp*]*t nhr mlkt*, "Chief River, thou art King". Both Asherah and 'Anat, even as they extract from El permission for the construction of Baal's house, refer to Baal as their king and chief "above whom there is none", II AB IV-V 43-44, V AB E 40-41.

KAPELRUD<sup>52</sup>) has shown rather convincingly that a hidden struggle between El and Baal is going on in the Ugaritic texts and that Baal is ultimately victorious. El, however, does not appear to be always inimical to Baal; he seems to be on Baal's side in the conflict with Mot, and Shapsh even threatens Mot with punitive action by El, I AB VI 22-31. When Baal perishes at the hands of Mot, El seems genuinely grieved, or at least he makes quite a show of grief, I\* AB VI 11-25, and when Baal revives El's joy is unrestrained, I AB III-IV 14-21. There is no hint that El in this instance is guilty of double-dealing, or is not sincere in his concern for Baal. In the poem BH, however, although El and Baal are not in direct physical conflict, it is obvious that El wants to get rid of Baal and he laughs inwardly as he sets in motion a stratagem that results in Baal's undoing. The battle between Baal and Prince Sea in III AB A may be regarded as an indirect conflict between El and Baal, as KAPELRUD<sup>53</sup>) suggested. The fact, however, that Baal takes refuge with El in III AB B may seem to cast doubt on this view. On the other hand, El's readiness to deliver up Baal as a prisoner of Prince Sea may indicate that he had no real interest in protecting Baal, if indeed he was capable of affording him any protection, but was glad to expedite Baal's downfall in any way possible. In what is preserved of the account of the fight between Baal and Prince Sea there is nothing to indicate that El favors or supports Prince Sea or takes any active part in the fray. But we may infer from Prince Sea's epithet *mdd il*, "Darling of El", that El did hold him in special favor. Moreover, it is El himself who bestows this title on his son and proclaims him as lord, VI AB IV 13-20. After El announces the name of his son, there is reference to a silver house and Aliyn Baal is mentioned, then the order is given to drive someone from his throne, VI AB IV 24. Presumably it is

52) *Op. cit.*, pp. 75-78, 86-93, 130-135.

53) *Ibid.*, p. 103.

El who here commissions Prince Sea to depose and banish Baal. There follow then the remains of a stereotype description of a feast, ll. 30-32, and it is probable that El is regaling Prince Sea before the latter sets out to join battle with Baal. Just how this relates to the situation in III AB B where Baal appears to take refuge with El is not clear. If III AB B is the sequel to VI AB, then it appears that El is indeed practising some double-dealing. It may be, however, that III AB and VI AB are independent versions of more or less similar myths. At any rate, VI AB makes it likely that El sets up Prince Sea as his champion and on him pins his hopes for the defeat of Baal. Despite the differences in detail, the situation and the plot are similar to that of the Ullikummi myth in which Kumarbi in the hope of regaining his rule over the gods sets up and uses the stone monster Ullikummi in a vain attempt to defeat the Storm-god<sup>54</sup>). We do not have in the fragments of Hurrian myths in Hittite any account of how Kumarbi, the Hurrian Kronos, was deposed, but that he was deposed is certain<sup>55</sup>). We may be a little better off in this regard in the Ugaritic texts. In VI AB V, in spite of the lamentably fragmentary state of the text, it is apparent that some acts of violence are taking place and that El and Baal are involved. We have already ventured the suggestion, howbeit warily, that this fragmentary fifth column of VI AB may be the remnant of the episode postulated by CASSUTO in which Baal deposed El, as Zeus deposed Kronos and probably as the Storm-god deposed Kumarbi. The verbs *asr* and *rks*, "bind", occur here several times and from l. 22 it appears that it is El who is bound<sup>56</sup>). This binding of El recalls the "bound gods", *ilāni kamūti*, mentioned in *Enuma Elish* IV 127, VII 27<sup>57</sup>). In his plea for El the Bull, LØKKEGAARD<sup>58</sup>) is scandalized at the suggestion that El has become a *deus otiosus*, a retired god. This he says: "Is simply an outrage. How is it possible that El is otiosized?" Not only is it a possibility, but a fact the myths affirm. There is an outrage involved, but it is an outrage against the old father god who is vanquished and banished by the son who supplants him. The tradition is well-known and well attested that El (Kronos) castrated and deposed his father Ouranos and was in turn forcibly retired by his son Baal-Hadad

54) *Ibid.*, pp. 89-93, 99, 103 f.

55) Cf. GOETZE, *ANET*, p. 121 f., top of page.

56) Cf. above p. 30.

57) Cf. GÜTERBOCK, *Kumarbi*, pp. 99, 108.

58) *Op. cit.*, p. 232.



(Zeus). (Some versions of the myth also represent Zeus as castrating Kronos) <sup>59</sup>). That this is an ancient Near Eastern mythological motif which was transmitted to the Greeks and not originated by them is now made certain by the Kumarbi myth, as GÜTERBOCK <sup>60</sup>) has shown. As Kronos was deposed by Zeus, and as Kumarbi was apparently displaced by the Storm-god, so we believe, following the suggestion of CASSUTO and KAPELRUD's study of Baal, that the Ugaritic myths included an account of El's banishment at the hands of Baal. This important episode, we have suggested, may actually be represented in the extant Ugaritic texts by the fragmentary fifth column of the text VI AB. Given only this sad remnant of the original text, it will probably remain impossible either to prove or disprove this conjecture. But even if this particular fragment should prove to have a meaning quite different from that we have suggested, still the conjecture that such an episode was somewhere recounted in the Ugaritic myths and is to be assumed as the background of most of the episodes of the AB cycle, seems to afford the best explanation of El's paradoxical status.

If El once ruled in heaven before he was deposed and banished to the netherworld, it is to be expected that some indication of this would be found in the Ugaritic texts. And possibly there are some evidences of this. In our study of the references to El's abode and the visits to El, the passage III AB B 19-31 stands by itself. Here the site is designated as *gr ll* and although there is nothing to indicate that it is El's abode—unless GASTER's reading, *gr il* is accepted—still the fact that El is presiding over the divine assembly makes it probable that the setting is El's abode. There is nothing in this passage to indicate that the place in question has the infernal and aqueous character elsewhere predicated of El's abode. In all the references to El's infernal abode there is no instance in which it is implied that it is the setting of the assembly of the gods. The gods, individually, and in small delegations, go to visit El in his infernal abode and extract from him his assent to their various projects, but nowhere is there any hint that the divine assembly meets there. In I AB I 4-37 Asherah is present with El in his infernal abode when news is brought (by °Anat?) of Baal's demise and a discussion ensues between El and Asherah as to the proper candidate to succeed Baal, but there is nothing to indicate that the rest of the divine assembly is present. In the "Great Expecto-

<sup>59</sup>) Cf. *HKAW*, vol. 5, p. 1114, n. 1.

<sup>60</sup>) *Op. cit.*, pp. 100-115.

ration" <sup>61)</sup> passage, II AB III 13-22, when Baal rises and spits in the midst of the assembly of the gods, the meeting place is not specified, but it is apparently Baal's abode, Mount Šapān, for Baal refers to the table as his own, l. 15. At any rate it is not at El's abode and El is not present at the meeting, for in the following episode Asherah is persuaded to intercede with El and mounts her ass and goes to visit him in his infernal abode.

LØKKEGAARD <sup>62)</sup> opines that El's location "at the fountain-head of the rivers and the river bed of the deep" was "no doubt a key position for the government of the world". There would seem to be some support for this view in the fact that in Mesopotamian mythology the place where the gods assembled, Ubshukkina(kku), apparently lay in the netherworld, in the east in the mountains of the Sunrise, adjacent to the cosmic ocean <sup>63)</sup>. But against this is the clear and ancient tradition that the divine dominion was exercised from heaven, from a supernal and not an infernal mountain. When a god was deposed he was banished to the infernal regions. In the Kumarbi myth, Alalu ruled in heaven and when he was vanquished by Anu he went down to the dark earth, i.e. to the netherworld, just as Kronos was banished to Tartaros with the Titans. If El in the Ugaritic myths was likewise driven from his heavenly throne and banished to the netherworld, then such control as he exercises from his infernal abode is merely government in exile, an "underground" both literally and figuratively, dedicated to the overthrow of his supplanter.

Since the passage III AB B 19-31 is the only one in the Ugaritic texts which represents El as presiding over the assembly of the gods, and since the place of this meeting is designated in terms different from the regular stereotype description of El's infernal sea, we venture to suggest that this episode transpires while El rules in the supernal regions, on his holy mountain, before he was vanquished and banished to the infernal regions. There is only one other passage from which one might infer that El's dwelling is exalted; in I\* AB VI 24-25 El, in mourning Baal's demise at the hands of Mot, says, "After Baal I will descend into the earth (i.e. the netherworld)", *atr b<sup>el</sup> ard ars*. The natural inference from this statement would be that El does not — at this time — dwell in the nether regions. On the other hand, it

<sup>61)</sup> *JCS*, 1 (1947), p. 340.

<sup>62)</sup> LØKKEGAARD, *op. cit.*, p. 233.

<sup>63)</sup> Cf. JENSEN, *Kosmologie der Babylonier*, pp. 234-243; MEISSNER, *Babylonien und Assyrien*, Heidelberg, 1925, vol. 2, p. 111.

could be argued that the abode of the dead to which Baal has descended and whither El in grief threatens to follow, merely lay at a lower level than El's abode. Thus the import of this passage for this particular problem is indecisive.

In all other places where El's abode is specifically mentioned, it is designated as infernal and watery by the terms *mbk nbrm*, *qrb apq thmtm*, and *hršn*. Now this supposed differentiation between the supernal and infernal abodes of El, if it is valid, might serve as a guide to the order and sequence of some of the mythological texts. Thus III AB B would belong to the stage of the myths before El was deposed and when he still reigned in the supernal regions and presided over the assembly of the gods. All the texts in which El's abode is represented as being in the netherworld — i.e. all the other texts now extant — would be later. The decisive and divisive point in the myths would be VI AB V which we have supposed to refer to Baal's actual dethronement of El. The fact, however, that in VI AB II 23 El's abode is designated as infernal by the term *hršn*<sup>64</sup>) would completely destroy this hypothesis, if the order of the columns of the *editio princeps* is correct. But VIROLLEAUD<sup>65</sup>) remarked of VI AB: "Vu l'état du morceau, la numérotation des colonnes est forcément provisoire." CASSUTO<sup>66</sup>) has taken considerable pains to show that what VIROLLEAUD provisionally took as the obverse of the fragment is more probably the reverse and thus VI AB V, according to CASSUTO's reconstitution of the original, would belong to the first column of the originally large six column tablet. This does away with the only textual impediment to our hypothesis, since a great deal may have transpired between the time El is bound in the first column (VI AB V 22) and the time we find him in the netherworld, VI AB III 21-24, II 23.

The myth of the vanquished and banished god or gods is known in both the O.T. and the N.T. and is elaborated in the Book of Enoch. This material has been treated at some length and with keen insight,

---

<sup>64</sup>) The fact that 𐤇𐤅𐤔𐤀𐤂 is used as a determinative of all the mountains in the Ullikummi myth — even of Mount 𐤇𐤅𐤔𐤀𐤂 (cf. GÜTERBOCK, *The Song of Ullikummi*, p. 30 l. 23) which GOETZE, *BASOR*, 79 (1940), pp. 32-34, has shown to be identical with the Ugaritic 𐤇𐤅𐤔𐤀𐤂, the later Casius — would seriously undermine the view that *hršn* in the Ugaritic texts characterizes El's abode as subterranean and aqueous were it not otherwise clearly designated as such by the terms *mbk nbrm* and *apq thmtm*.

<sup>65</sup>) *La Déesse Anat*, Paris, 1938, p. 91.

<sup>66</sup>) *The Goddess Anath*, pp. 91 f.

by MORGENSTERN <sup>67</sup>) who says: "All this evidence establishes with absolute certainty that the myths we have found cited in several variant forms in apocalyptic and N.T. writings, the myth of the fall of Satan and his associate angels from heaven to earth, or even into the abyss, is identical with the myth of Helel ben Shahar of Isa. 14. 12-14, that, in other words, we have to do in all these passages with only one myth, which must have been current in Judaism for a very long period and which quite naturally in the course of its evolution and its adaptation to various purposes, historical and theological, developed several slightly variant forms" <sup>68</sup>). MORGENSTERN <sup>69</sup>) considers momentarily the question "Whether the Greek myth of the Titans who stormed heaven and sought to overthrow the gods had any original connection with this North-Semitic-Israelite myth of the gods or angels who rebelled against (El(?) — Yahweh, and sought to make one of their number ruler in his stead", but dismisses it as one that would lead too far afield. Actually this does not lead afield, but is the key to the understanding of the original form of the myth, as now appears from the Kumarbi and Ullikummi myths and from the recognition of El's fallen state in the Ugaritic myths. The mythological background of Psalm lxxxii and related passages is thus deepened by a millennium or more. This myth is pre-Israelite and originally had nothing to do with YHWH. The rebellion was not against El, but it was El himself who attempted an unsuccessful counter-revolution to regain the sovereignty from which he had been deposed by Baal. As Kronos used the Titans in an abortive attempt to oust Zeus, and as Kumarbi used the colossus Ullikummi to fight for him against the Storm-god, even so, we believe, El set his hopes on Prince Sea to defeat Baal <sup>70</sup>). With Baal's defeat of El's champion, El's fate is sealed and he remains in exile in the netherworld.

The two poems of Ezek. xxviii 2-10, 12-19 are of crucial import for our present interest. Again MORGENSTERN <sup>71</sup>) says; "The full implication of this allegory is self-evident; it is the myth of the divine being in heaven who rebelled against the Deity and conceived the foolish thought of making himself the ruler of the universe in the place of God and so was cast out of heaven down to earth." This allegory of

---

<sup>67</sup>) *HUCA*, 14 (1939), pp. 29-126.

<sup>68</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 109.

<sup>69</sup>) *Ibid.*, n. 153, pp. 112 f.

<sup>70</sup>) Cf. KAPELRUD, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-93.

<sup>71</sup>) *Op. cit.*, p. 111.

the downfall of the Prince of Tyre, however, is in terms of the aforementioned fate of El rather than of some lesser deity supposedly designated here as a cherub <sup>72</sup>). YHWH, of course, had originally no connection with this myth, but is superimposed on it.

As briefly as possible, we will comment on parts of the text which suggest that the fallen god is none other than El. In vs. 2 the Prince of Tyre says, "I am <sup>72</sup>*el*, I sit in the seat of <sup>72</sup>*elôbîm* in the heart of the seas." The use of <sup>72</sup>*el* is perhaps intentionally ambiguous; the Prince of Tyre as a mere human arrogates divinity to himself so that <sup>72</sup>*el* in this sense is merely appellative, "a god". But there are other indications that the particular god in view is El. The reference to the "seat of <sup>72</sup>*elôbîm* in the heart of the seas" is highly suggestive. The gods do not dwell in the heart of the seas, but on the mount of assembly. The allusion thus cannot be to the general abode of the gods, but to the specific abode of a god who does dwell in watery environs. And who could this be but the Ugaritic El? <sup>73</sup>) The phrase *bêlēb yammîm* would seem to be out of place here since it applies to the abode of El after he has been ousted from heaven; cf. vs. 8, "They shall thrust you down into the Pit, and you shall die the death of the slain in the heart of the seas." The justification of the disturbing use of *bêlēb yammîm* in vs. 2, however, is that it applies literally to the insular position of New Tyre; cf. Ezek xxvi 5, 17-18, xxvii 3, 4, 26, 27, 32. The Egyptian Papyrus Anastasi I speaks of Tyre as "a city in the sea" <sup>74</sup>) and Ashurbanipal says, "In my third campaign I marched against Baal, king of Tyre, who dwells in the midst of the sea (*a-šib qabal tamtim*) <sup>75</sup>). Tyre's maritime position and her predicted downfall by sinking into the heart of the seas, Ezek xxvii 27, naturally invites comparison with El's latter day abode. The association of the

<sup>72</sup>) *Ibid.*, MORGENSTERN's identification of the rebel divinity with the cherub, vss. 14 and 16, is by no means certain. Both verses are obscure and almost certainly corrupt.

<sup>73</sup>) CASSUTO already in *SMSR*, 8 (1932), p. 135, suggested that the reference was perhaps to the Phoenician El: "io sono un Dio (El, una divinità singola, forse con allusione all'El fenicio) e nelle sede divina (Elohim, designazione generica della divinità) io dimoro." In his article "El in the Canaanite Pantheon", *EBB*, vol. 1, col. 284, and in *The Goddess Anath*, pp. 45, 86, he recognizes that the allusion is to the specific abode of El.

<sup>74</sup>) W. Max MÜLLER, *Asien und Europa*, Leipzig, 1893, p. 185.

<sup>75</sup>) D. LUCKENBILL, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, vol. 2, Chicago, 1927, 779, p. 296; H. C. RAWLINSON, *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. 5, pl. 2, l. 50; A. C. PIEPKORN, *Historical Prism Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal I* (Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Assyriological Studies, no. 5, [1953]), pp. 40 f.

netherworld (*šabaṭ*) and the "heart of the seas" in vs. 8 suggests rather strongly that the author had in view El's infernal sea. The author of this allegory is obviously familiar with the Ugaritic, Canaanite, Phoenician mythology as shown by his allusion to Danel in vs. 3<sup>76</sup>). The emphasis on divine wisdom which the Prince of Tyre arrogates to himself further suggests connection with El who was noted for his wisdom.

In vss. 12-19 the associations with Ugaritic mythological motifs are especially striking. In vs. 13 the Prince of Tyre is in Eden the garden of the gods with every precious stone as his covering. Among the precious stones enumerated is *bārēqaṭ* which is reminiscent of the wondrous *abn brq*<sup>77</sup>) of Baal's abode, V AB C + D 23. Vs. 14b says, "You were on the holy mountain of the gods, you walked in the midst of the stone of fire." These "stones of fire", *ʿabnê ʿēš*, have been a puzzle to exegetes. DUSSAUD<sup>78</sup>) proposed emendation to *bēnê ʿēl*, alleging that *ʿabnê ʿēš* makes no sense. CASSUTO<sup>79</sup>) related the *ʿabnê ʿēš* of Ezek. xxviii 14-16 with the Ugaritic *abn brq* and explained it as a heavenly stone which stores up the fire that appears as lightning (fc. Ezek. i 13) from the lofty mountains of El whose head reaches to heaven and on which was situated the garden (of the gods). OBERMANN<sup>80</sup>) emphasized the extraordinary and unheard of character of this *abn brq* in the Ugaritic building saga and pointed out that it could "hardly refer to precious metals *per se*, but rather to their extraordinary profusion, that is, to the circumstance that 'stone of splendor' would be used as the building material of Baal's future house"<sup>81</sup>). In spite of the obscurity of the meaning of *ʿabnê ʿēš*, it is clear that it refers to the splendiferous surroundings in which the

<sup>76</sup>) Cf. M. NOTH, *VT*, 1 (1951), pp. 251-260.

<sup>77</sup>) In an Akkadian prayer to Adad, L. W. KING, *Babylonian Magic and Sorcery*, London, 1896, text 21, l. 17, p. 78 and pl. 41, the words *abni* and *birqu* stand in juxtaposition and it is uncertain whether they are to be taken separately or as in construct relation. Both KING and E. EBELING, *Die Akkadische Gebetsserie "Handerhebung"*, (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung 20), Berlin, 1953, pp. 100 and 101, construed the words as nominatives in a series. EBELING read *zunnu u abnê(mēš) birqu iš[ātu?]* and translated "Regen und Hagel, Blitz, Feuer". In the light of the Ugaritic *abn brq*, it may be that the two words are to be taken as construct and genitive, *abnēmeš birqi*. Even so, they constitute only a phraseological parallel to the Ugaritic *abn brq*, since the Akkadian reference is clearly to meteorological phenomena and not to mythical building material.

<sup>78</sup>) *RHR*, 108 (1933), p. 40; *DRS*, p. 94. Cf. NIELSEN, *RŠMBT*, p. 113, n. 2.

<sup>79</sup>) *From Adam to Noah*, pp. 42 f.; Cf. *The Goddess Anath*, p. 81.

<sup>80</sup>) *UM*, cf. index, p. 100, s.v. "Building Saga".

<sup>81</sup>) *JBL* 65 (1946), p. 239, n. 15.

god lived, vs. 13, and from which he was cast out, vs. 16. The term ʿabnê ʿēš is virtually certified as authentic by the Akkadian *aban išāti*, but unfortunately the meaning of the Akkadian is also obscure<sup>82</sup>). In a lexical text *aban išāti* is given as a synonym of *hipindu* which is possibly related to *pēntu*, *pēndu* (from *p̄m*), “glowing coal, charcoal, coal-fire”, and *pēndū*, “sear (wound from burning?), pustule(?), a stone (fire-stone?), a product(?) of gold”<sup>83</sup>). This suggests that smelting is involved in the production of ʿabnê ʿēš and recalls the description of the marvelous construction of Baal’s mythical abode on Mount Šapān. The house was made of silver and gold, lapis lazuli, and perhaps some other kind/s of precious stone/s (*ilqšm*) and the materials were apparently fused by a fire set inside the structure. Asherah, as soon as she had got El’s approval, sends instructions posthaste to Baal, II AB IV-V 75-81 (cf. 91-97, 98-102):

<i>šp ḥrn bbtk</i>	“Summon plants in your house,
<i>ʿšbt bqr̄b bklk</i>	vegetation in the midst of your palace.
<i>tblk ḡrm mid ksp</i>	The mountains will bring you much silver,
<i>gb<sup>c</sup>m mḥmd ḥwš</i>	the hills the choicest gold;
<i>yblk udr ilqšm</i>	they will bring you glorious <i>ilqšm</i> .
<i>wbn bht ksp whr̄š</i>	Then build a house of silver and gold
<i>bht ṭhr̄m iqnim</i>	a house of purest lapis lazuli.”

The words *ḥrn* and *ʿšbt* have not been satisfactorily explained, either as to etymology or sense in the present context. VIROLLEAUD<sup>84</sup>) concluded that the resemblance of *ʿšbt* to the plural of Hebrew *ʿēšēb* is purely fortuitous. ALBRIGHT explained *ḥrn* as *ḥarrān*, “caravan”, and then connected *ʿšbt* with Arabic-Aramaic *ʿšb*, “to bind, unite”, with interchange of *s* and *š* after *ʿayin*; cf. Arabic *ʿuṣbah*, “band, company”<sup>85</sup>). GORDON<sup>86</sup>) says that “Semitic etymologies for these words must be abandoned” and his attempt to define them as “bulls” and “gazelles” is “admittedly a last resort”. GINSBERG<sup>87</sup>) is almost certainly right, though somewhat hesitant, in taking the words to mean “weeds”, “herbs”, but he gives no indication that he under-

<sup>82</sup>) Cf. F. H. WEISSBACH, *ZDMG*, 65 (1911), p. 11 n. 1; H. HOLMA, *Kleine Beiträge zum assyrischen Lexikon*, Helsinki, 1913, p. 17, n. 2; R. C. THOMPSON, *A Dictionary of Assyrian Chemistry and Geology*, Oxford, 1936, p. 88.

<sup>83</sup>) BEZOLD, *Babylonisch-assyrisches Glossar*, pp. 125 a and 219 a.

<sup>84</sup>) *Syria*, 12 (1931), p. 141.

<sup>85</sup>) *JPOS*, 14 (1934), p. 124, nn. 119, 120.

<sup>86</sup>) *UL*, p. 33, n. 1.

<sup>87</sup>) *ANET*, p. 133.

stands why the vegetation is to be brought into the house. We suggest that the vegetation is to serve as fuel for the fire that burns seven days inside the house. If so, it would of course be dry weeds and shrubbery which is still the common fuel in the Near East. In Arabic the word *ʿašiba* means "to be dry", although *ʿušbum* means "fresh, juicy herbage". The word *ḥrn* may be connected with Akkadian *ḥurnū* which is a plant of some kind<sup>88</sup>). GINSBERG<sup>89</sup>) may be right in assuming that Baal already had some sort of habitation, albeit one unworthy of his newly acquired rank. If this is so, the new house may have been built around the old which was stuffed with brushwood and burned to fuse the precious new exterior. At any rate, whether the dwelling was entirely new, or a drastic renovation of an older one, the unusual method of construction is rather fully explained by the text, II AB VI 22-35:

<i>tšt išt bbhbm</i>	"Fire is set in the house,
<i>nblat bhklm</i>	flame in the palace.
<i>bn ym utn</i>	Lo a day and a second,
<i>tikl išt bbhbm</i>	the fire feeds in the house,
<i>nblat bhklm</i>	the flame in the palace.
<i>tlš rb<sup>c</sup> ym, etc.</i>	A third, a fourth day, etc.

<i>mk bšb[<sup>c</sup>] y[mm]</i>	Then on the seve[nth] d[ay]
<i>td išt bbhbm</i>	the fire subsides in the house,
<i>n[b]lat bhklm</i>	the f[ame] in the palace.
<i>sb kšp lrqm</i>	The silver turns to plates
<i>hrš nsb llbnt</i>	The gold is turned to bricks."

The saga of Baal's bizarre house-raising, we suggest, affords a plausible and withal very striking explanation of the enigmatic *ʿabnê ʿēš* of Ezek. xxviii 14, 16. The end product of this prodigy of metallurgy performed by the Ugaritic Hephaestos, *Ktr w/l/ss*, which is apparently referred to as *abn brq* in V ABC + D 23, could quite appropriately have been termed *abn išt*, in keeping with the process by which it was produced. This quite novel explication of the possible connection between the Ugaritic *abn brq* and the Hebrew *ʿabnê ʿēš* is in no way incompatible with CASSUTO's plausible explanation. The *ʿabnê ʿēš* and the *abn brq* may very well refer to the notion that

<sup>88</sup>) BEZOLD, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

<sup>89</sup>) ANET, p. 133, n. 23.



lightning is the flashing of the precious metals and jewels of which the heavenly dwelling was made and the Ugaritic building saga tells us how the divine architect and craftsman achieved this marvel in precious metal and stone.

The fact that the Ugaritic myth deals with Baal's house, while the allegory of Ezek. xxviii concerns the general abode of the gods, is no real impediment to the correlation of the two. The O.T. author may have transferred Baal's celebrated palace to El, or it may well be that in the ancient tradition El also had such a splendiferous house. Certainly El when he was undisputed ruler of the gods must have had the most elegant house that could be imagined by the faithful. OBERMANN<sup>90</sup>) points out that in VI AB El appears to be the hero of a building saga similar to that related of Baal in V AB. But because of the fragmentary state of the text VI AB it is not at all clear for whom this house is to be built. We suggest that the house in question is to be not for El, but for Prince Sea whom El commissions to depose Baal, cf. VI AB IV 13-25, III AB C 7-10, after the latter—as we have supposed—had ousted him (El) in VI AB V.

If El was deposed as king of the gods and driven from the supernal mountain of the gods to an infernal haunt, the presumption would be that the place from which he was expelled was the same as that over which his supplanter later held sway. It is clear from both the Ugaritic myths and the O.T. tradition that this place was Mount Şapān. But nowhere in the Ugaritic texts is El clearly connected with Mount Şapān. In V AB C + D 26 it is not clear whether *il špn* refers to the mountain, "divine Şapān", or to Baal as the god of Şapān, but it certainly does not here connect El with Şapān. In text 17 : 13 *il špn* occurs in a list of gods, but can hardly refer to El who is listed elsewhere in the text, ll. 4 (?) and 15. Only in III AB B 20 does El appear as presiding over the assembly of the gods, with Baal standing by him, l. 21, and here the location of the place is uncertain. Whether the reading of the text is *gr il* or *gr ll*, the identification of the place with Mount Şapān seems most likely, for this was the *bar mō'ēd*, "the mount of assembly" of the Canaanite-Phoenician mythology as preserved in the O.T. The star witness for this is Is. xiv 13-15 where the "king of Babylon" is represented as boasting:

I will mount on the backs of the clouds,  
I will sit on the Mount of Assembly

<sup>90</sup>) *UM*, pp. 55, 85, and nn. 21 and 25, pp. 13 f. and 17 f.

in the fastness of Şapôn<sup>91</sup>);  
 "I will scale the heavens;  
 above the highest stars  
 I will exalt my throne;  
 I will make myself like Elyon.'  
 But you are brought down to Sheol,  
 to the recesses of the Pit."

We pass over the problem of the identity of the mythical Helel ben Şahar<sup>92</sup>) as well as of the historical figure called the "king of Babylon"<sup>93</sup>). The form of the myth represented by this allegory is probably late and mixed with other myths, whether the villain is Alexander the Great<sup>94</sup>) or some lesser conqueror. We believe that the ultimate mythological background of this allegory, as also in the case of the Prince of Tyre in Ezek. xxviii, is a theomachy or Titanomachy, similar to the Hurrian and Greek versions, in which El and his champion (Prince Sea) and his cohorts were defeated and banished to the netherworld.

If the conclusions to which we have been led in regard to El's status in the Ugaritic myths are at all valid, it removes the ground from under any view of him as a "high god" or as the object of any serious monotheistic movement at the time and place these myths were composed and as long as they continued in use. The social and political forces that caused El to be displaced before Baal at Ugarit can only be surmised<sup>95</sup>). The displacement of one god by another is probably brought about chiefly by the influx of new cultural and ethnic groups, whether by conquest or peaceful infiltration. At Ugarit there was a large Hurrian element mixed with the Semitic population<sup>96</sup>). For the Hurrians, Kumarbi, like El, was the father of the gods, but Hittite texts of about the 14th century B.C. or earlier mythologize the displacement of this god before the Storm-god, and

<sup>91</sup>) Cf. EISSFELDT, *Baal Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer*, pp. 14 ff.

<sup>92</sup>) On his later identification with Satan, cf. MORGENSTERN, *op. cit.*, pp. 109 f.

<sup>93</sup>) For attempts to identify this personage historically, cf. G. B. GRAY, *The Book of Isaiah* (International Critical Commentary), New York, 1912, vol. 1, p. 193; W. H. COBB, *JBL*, 15 (1896), pp. 18 ff.; EISSFELDT, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Tübingen, 1934, pp. 107, 359; C. BOUTFLOWER, *The Book of Isaiah Chapters I-XXXIX in the Light of the Assyrian Monuments*, London, 1930, pp. 69-86.

<sup>94</sup>) Cf. TORREY, *BZATW*, 41 (1925), p. 286, and *JBL*, 57 (1938), pp. 116 f.

<sup>95</sup>) Cf. FORRER, *op. cit.*, pp. 688 f.

<sup>96</sup>) Cf. DE LANGHE, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, pp. 316-354.

the Ugaritic texts, we believe, do the same in regard to El and Baal. In the Amarna and Ramessid period, the storm-gods, the Hurrian Teshub and the Semitic Hadad-Baal, are the major deities—their identification with one another and with the Egyptian Seth in the Ramessid period is patent—while Kumarbi and El have passed out of the picture <sup>97</sup>).

The displacement of El before Baal, as at Ugarit, need not have been general over all the area in which El was worshipped. Nor was the displacement complete even at Ugarit where El still has a place in the cult and an important though quite ambiguous role in the myths. Here El retains his titles and prestige of former days, though he is no longer the real head of the pantheon. Still he may have had for a long time diehard devotees who refused to accept his displacement, but they are submerged by the tide of Baal-worship.

In so far as YHWH was identified with El, the Israelites certainly did not recognize or admit of such a degradation as represented in the Ugaritic myths. The El of the patriarchs was the god at the height of his power and prestige and this was the god with whom YHWH was identified. The struggle between Yahwism and Baalism in Israel was preceded by several centuries at Ugarit by a conflict between El and Baal in which the younger god was victorious. This struggle and victory is mythologized in the Ugaritic texts. Some parts of the myths seem to reflect the early stages of the struggle in which Baal is gaining strength. But if we are right in the assumption that El once ruled in heaven on the supernal mount of assembly, then the struggle is already over before the myths attained their final form, for throughout the myths, with one exception, we find El in the netherworld whither he had been presumably banished by Baal.

---

<sup>97</sup>) Cf. J. WILSON, *ANET*, pp. 249 and 257, n. 18.

# INDEXES

## UGARITIC PASSAGES

	P.		P.		P.
1 : 2	90	107 : 1-4	86	321 : III : 34	22 n. 6
1 : 3	7, 90	107 : 1-5	87	321 : IV : 15	23 n. 17
1 : 5	7, 21	107 : 2	48	322 : II : 2	23 n. 31
1 : 6	90	107 : 2-3	60, 88	322 : rev. : V : 4	22 n. 9
1 : 7	60, 90	107 : 3	48, 86	322 : rev. : V : 22	22 n. 2
1 : 9	7	107 : 4	85, 88, 90	323 : IV : 10	23 n. 25
1 : 13	21	107 : 4b	86	327 : 8	22 n. 13
2	90	107 : 5	90	331 : 4	23 n. 19
2 : 16	88, 89	107 : 5-9	86	332 : 5	23 n. 30; 48
2 : 16-17	60, 88	107 : 6	86	333 : 3	22 n. 6
2 : 17	48, 60, 88	107 : 6-8	87	I AB I 4-10	61
2 : 25	88, 89	107 : 8	86	I AB I 4-37	94
2 : 25-26	60, 88	107 : 9	87	I AB I 8	27
2 : 26	88, 90	107 : 9-11	86	I AB I 15-37	27
2 : 33	88, 89	107 : 10	85	I AB I 24	47
2 : 33-35	60, 88	107 : 10a	86	I AB I 37	83
2 : 34	48, 60, 88	107 : 10-11	86, 88	I AB II 6	30
2 : 35	88, 90	107 : 10-18	86	I AB II 9	60
3 : 12	7	107 : 12-18	86, 87, 88	I AB II 27	30
3 : 14	7	113 : 29	22 n. 13	I AB II 30	60
3 : 18	7	113 : 51	23 n. 27	I AB III-IV 5	50
3 : 28	21	119 : 8	23 n. 22	I AB III-IV 11	50
4 : 1	82	300 : 11	22 n. 15	I AB III-IV 14-21	45, 92
4 : 6	32	300 : rev. : 15	23 n. 24	I AB III-IV 34	35, 47
4 : 7	32	304 : 12	22 n. 7	I AB III-IV 35	44
4 : 8	32	308 : 24	22 n. 5	I AB V 53	22 n. 5
4 : 12	82	311 : rev. : 1	23 n. 23	I AB VI 22-31	29, 92
10 : 6	23 n. 28	314 : 15	23 n. 29	I AB VI 26-29	44
10 : 16	23 n. 33, 59	314 : 16	23 n. 18	I AB VI 27	35
14 : 1 ff.	59	314 : rev. : 6	22 n. 13	I AB VI 37	47
17 : 4	102	314 : rev. : 7	22 n. 13	I AB VI 54-55	82
17 : 7	48	314 : rev. : 9	22 n. 13	I AB I 6*	47
17 : 13	102	321 : I : 7	22 n. 3	I AB I 7*	60
17 : 15	102	321 : I : 9	23 n. 16	I* AB II 15	27
23 : 4	6, 7	321 : I : 34	22 n. 11	I* AB V 11-16	65
64 : 2	22 n. 13	321 : II : 5	22 n. 14	I* AB V 19-21	39 n. 66
64 : 30	22 n. 13	321 : II : 15	23 n. 25	I* AB VI 11-25	45, 92
64 : 31	22 n. 13	321 : II : 22	23 n. 20	I* AB VI 24-25	60, 95
80 : I : 3	23 n. 34	321 : II : 41	23 n. 32, 48	II AB II 10	35, 44
80 : I : 19	7	321 : II : 47	23 n. 21	II AB III 11	50
91 : 1	22 n. 3	321 : III : 4	22 n. 10,	II AB III 13-14	49
107	85 f., 90	321 : III : 9	23 n. 17	II AB III 13-22	95
107 : 1	60, 89		22 n. 4	II AB III 15	95

II AB III 31	35, 44	P.	IV AB III 5-7	50 f.	P.	SS 39	40
II AB III 32	50		IV AB III 6	51, 54		SS 41	80
II AB III 41	49		V AB A 13	44		SS 44 ff.	80
II AB IV-V 1-73	49		V AB B 5-37	28		SS 48	80
II AB IV-V 13-14	44		V AB C D 23	101		SS 49	40, 41
II AB IV-V 20-24	61		V AB C D 26	102		SS 51-52	40 n. 74
III AB IV-V 24	27		V AB C D 77-82	73		SS 56	40 n. 74
II AB IV-V 27-39	36 f., 45		V AB E 9	28		SS 57	48
II AB IV-V 40-80	28		V AB E 9-11	28		SS 59	49
II AB IV-V 41-43	43		V AB E 13-16	61		NK 11	7
II AB IV-V 43-44	27, 92		V AB E 16	27		NK 40	7
II AB IV-V 47	35, 47		V AB E 18	35, 47		BH	92
II AB IV-V 48	27, 50		V AB E 19-20	65		BH I 12 ff.	45
II AB IV-V 65-67	34		V AB E 27-33	45		BH I 40	30
II AB IV-V 65	6		V AB E 27-37	28		BH II 61	59
III AB IV-V 66	43		V AB E 32-33	34		I K 25	48
II AB IV-V 75-81	100		V AB E 33-35	65		I K 31-35	40 n. 74
II AB IV-V 82-86	73		V AB E 38-39	43		I K 37	33, 47, 50
II AB IV-V 91-97	100		V AB E 40-41	27, 92		I K 40	48
II AB IV-V 98-102	100		V AB E 42-43	50		I K 41	35, 47
II AB VI 22-35	101		V AB E 43	35, 47		I K 43	47
II AB VI 44-46	49		V AB E 44	27		I K 59	35, 47
III AB VI 44-58	49		VI AB 30, 93, 94,	102		I K 76	35, 47
II AB VI 46	47		VI AB II 23	69, 96		I K 78	47
II AB VI 48-54	7		VI AB III 21-25	69		I K 136	47
II AB VI 56	49		VI AB III 21-24	96		I K 151	47, 50
III AB VII 29	44		VI AB III 22	69		I K 153	48
II AB VII 31	44		VI AB IV 13-20	92		I K 155	48
II AB VII 38-39	47 n. 95		VI AB IV 13-25	102		I K 169	35, 47
II AB VIII 1-9	65		VI AB IV 17	92		I K 278	47
II AB VIII 11	27		VI AB IV 24	92		I K 299	48
II AB VIII 24-26	73		VI AB IV 30-32	93		II K I-II 10-11	48
III AB	93		VI AB V 31, 93, 96,	102		II K I-II 11	43
III AB A	92		VI AB V 4	30		II K I-II 11-12	44
III AB B	49, 92, 93		VI AB V 9	30		II K I-II 20	48
III AB B 13-14	68		VI AB V 10	30		II K I-II 21	48
III AB B 13-47	27		VI AB V 11	30		II K I-II 21-22	43, 44
III AB B 14	68		VI AB V 12	30		II K I-II 23	44
III AB B 17	91		VI AB V 14	30		I K III 6	58
III AB B 19	68		VI AB V 17	30		I K III 8	58
III AB B 19-20	68		VI AB V 22	30, 96		II K IV 2-3	43, 44
III AB B 19-31	94, 95		VI AB V 23	30		II K IV 5	7
III AB B 20	102		VI AB V 25	30		II K IV 9	7
III AB B 21	44		SS 14-15	80		II K IV 13	7
III AB B 21-29	44		SS 24	49		II K VI 3-5	64
III AB B 28	44		SS 30	80		II K VI 59	22 n. 5
III AB B 33-34	91		SS 30-53	37-39		III K II 17	49
III AB C 4-6	61		SS 31	80		III K III 17-19	47, 48
III AB C 7-10	102		SS 33	39		III K III 18	66
III AB C 16-18	29		SS 34	39		III K III 19	90
III AB C 17	44		SS 35-36	80		I D 10	7
III AB C 22	92		SS 36	80		I D 19	23 n. 26

	P.		P.		P.
I D 36	23 n. 26	II D I 9	44	II D V 32	66
I D 38	23 n. 26	II D I 14	44	II D VI 11-12	34
I D 47	23 n. 26	II D I 24	47	II D VI 28-29	34
I D 90	23 n. 26	II D I 25	47, 50	II D VI 41	52
I D 153	59, 60	II D I 32-33	40 n. 74	II D VI 46-51	61
II D 163-166	73	II D I 40-42	60	II D VI 49	27
I D 211-214	66	II D II 5	45	III D I 15	66
I D 213	66	II D II 11-15	60	III D VI 6-14	45
I D 220	51, 66	II D II 22	73	III D VI 11-20	28
II D I 4	44	II D V 9-10		III D VI 20-22	73

## SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES

	P.		P.		P.		P.
<i>Genesis</i>				xiv 13-15	102 f.		
ii 22	50	xxv 9	50	xxxviii 10	63 n. 11	<i>Jonah</i>	
vii 17	63	xxxii 6	50, 51	xliv 8	9	ii 4	64
viii 2	63	xxxii 17	9, 63	xlv 18	50	iv 2	25
xiv 18	55	xxxiii 26	13	lxiii 13	63		
xiv 19	51, 52, 55			lxv 4	65	<i>Micah</i>	
xiv 22	14, 51, 52, 55	<i>Joshua</i>				ii 1	17
xvi 2	50	xiii 4	75	<i>Jeremiah</i>		vii 18	13
xxi 33	15	xix 18	33	xxix 7	64		
xxx 3	50	xix 30	74	xxix 14	64	<i>Nabum</i>	
xxxix 29	17	xxiv 19	25			i 2	25
xxxiii 20	11, 15			<i>Ezekiel</i>			
xlvi 3	11	<i>Judges</i>		i 13	99	<i>Habakkuk</i>	
xliv 29	63	i 31	74	xxvi 5	98	i 11	9, 10
		v 18	67	xxvi 17-18	98		
<i>Exodus</i>		vi 24	15 n. 83	xxvii 3	98	<i>Zechariah</i>	
xv 5	63	ix 8	59	xxvii 4	98	xiv 5	13
xv 8	63	ix 9	59	xxvii 26	98		
xv 11	9	xi 23	10	xxvii 27	98	<i>Psalms</i>	
xvii 15	15 n. 83	xiii 22	10	xxvii 32	98	x 12	12
xx 5	25			xxviii	103	vii 9	58 n. 20
xxiv 13	25	<i>1 Samuel</i>		xxviii 2	12;13	vii 18	55
xxxiv 6	25	xxviii	4		n. 79; 98	ix 3	55
				xxviii 2-10	97	ix 14	65, n. 11
<i>Numbers</i>		<i>2 Samuel</i>		xxviii 3	99	xvi 1	12
xii 12	12	vii 27	50	xxviii 8	98, 99	xvi 3	13
xii 13	12	xxii 16	62, 65	xxviii 12-19	97, 99	xvii 6	12
xvi 22	11	xxii 32	13	xxviii 13	99, 100	xviii 16	62
xxvii 16	11			xxviii 14	101	xviii 17	65
		<i>1 Kings</i>		xxviii 14-16	99	xviii 32	9
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		xi 38	50	xxviii 16	100	xxiv 2	64
iii 24	13					xxix 1	9
iv 3	25	<i>Hosea</i>				xliv-lxxxiii	12
iv 24	25	viii 6	35			xlvi 3	55
iv 33	9	xii 1	13, 14			lvii 3	58 n. 20
v 9	25			<i>Amos</i>		lxxvii 17	63
vi 15	25	<i>Isaiah</i>		i 5	64	lxxviii 35	55
viii 7	63	ix 5	33	v 27	64	lxxviii 54	51
		xiv 12-14	97				
		xiv 13	13 n. 79				
		xiv 14	55				

	P.		P.		P.		P.	
lxxxviii	56	55	viii 22	51	xxxviii 17	65 n. 11	ix 17	9
lxxxii	6	55	viii 28	63	xl 18	62, 79	ix 31	25
lxxxvii	5-6	50	ix 10	14	xli 7	62		
lxxxviii	5	17	xxiv 21	33			2 <i>Chronicles</i>	
lxxxix	6	13	xxx 3	14	<i>Daniel</i>		xxxii 15	9
lxxxix	7	9	xxxi 1-10	14	vii 9	9		
lxxxix	8	13	xxxi 5-9	14	vii 18	55	APOCRYPHA	
cvi	9	63			vii 22	55	<i>The Wisdom of</i>	
cxiv	7	9	<i>Job</i>		vii 25	55	<i>Solomon</i>	
cxix	13	51	v 1	13	vii 27	55	xvi 13	65 n. 11
cxix	17	12	vi 15	62	xi 36	9		
cxix	19	19	xii 22	65	xi 48	9	NEW TESTAMENT	
cxix	23	12	xv 15	13			<i>Matthew</i>	
<i>Proverbs</i>			xxviii 11	62	<i>Nehemiah</i>		xvi 18	65 n. 11
iii 27	17		xxxi 15	50	v 5	17		
			xxxviii 16-17	62, 65				

## UGARITIC WORDS

<i>ab</i> 27, 32, 33, 34, 47	<i>ilb</i> 6, 7, 8	<i>bkt</i> 64	<i>ybnl</i> 23, 48
<i>ab adm</i> 47, 50	<i>ilhd</i> 22	<i>bn</i> 30, 31	<i>yd</i> 39
<i>ab bn il</i> 89	<i>ilbm</i> 6, 8, 21	<i>bn ilm</i> 49	<i>yhmlk</i> 26
<i>ab šnm</i> 82	<i>ilbt</i> 6, 7, 8	<i>bnil</i> 23	<i>yknil</i> 23
<i>abmlk</i> 26	<i>ilwn</i> 23	<i>bny bnwt</i> 47, 50	<i>ym</i> 64, 80, 92
<i>abn brq</i> 99, 101	<i>ilm</i> 21	<i>balp šd rbt kmn</i> 73	<i>ymil</i> 22
<i>abnm</i> 30, 31	<i>il wašt</i> 90	<i>bcl</i> 48, 91	<i>k(w)n</i> 51
<i>agn</i> 80	<i>ilhbn</i> 22	<i>bcl bt</i> 59	<i>kl ugri</i> 86
<i>ad</i> 89 n. 44	<i>ily</i> 23	<i>bclmlk</i> 26	<i>kmrb</i> 32
<i>adn</i> 91, 92	<i>ilyn</i> 23	<i>bt il</i> 59, 60	<i>knt</i> 86, 87
<i>adu</i> 87	<i>ilm</i> 6, 8	<i>bt bcl</i> 60	<i>Ktr</i> 26
<i>abl</i> 66	<i>ilmbr</i> 23	<i>bt krt</i> 64	<i>ktrmlk</i> 26
<i>ašimlk</i> 26	<i>ilmk</i> 22, 26	<i>gly</i> 64, 65, 66	<i>lšpn</i> 44
<i>asr</i> 30, 93	<i>ilnym</i> 7	<i>gr bt il</i> 59	<i>lšpn wqdš</i> 44, 48
<i>apq</i> 73, 74	<i>ilsk</i> 23	<i>dbh</i> 48	<i>il</i> 68, 69, 71, 94
<i>apq ibmtm</i> 61, 96 n. 64	<i>išy</i> 23	<i>dnil</i> 23	<i>mbk</i> 73, 74
<i>ark</i> 39	<i>ilqšm</i> 100	<i>dpid</i> 44	<i>mbk nbrm</i> 61, 62
<i>atn</i> 82	<i>ilrb</i> 23	<i>dr</i> 47, 48, 60, 89	<i>mdd il</i> 92
<i>atnprln</i> 82	<i>ilrš</i> 23	<i>dr il</i> 60, 90	<i>mbk nbrm</i> 96 n. 64
<i>ašr</i> 60	<i>iš</i> 23	<i>dr bn il</i> 88, 90	<i>mt</i> 39
<i>ašr bcl</i> 60	<i>išn</i> 22	<i>dšn</i> 86, 87, 88	<i>mlk</i> 22, 27
<i>il</i> 6, 8, 22, 23, 32, 47, 48, 68, 85, 86	<i>išpš</i> 22	<i>hd</i> 30	<i>mphrt</i> 60, 89
<i>il bn il</i> 89	<i>ištm<sup>c</sup></i> 22	<i>br</i> 40	<i>mphrt bn il</i> 88
<i>il špn</i> 102	<i>ištmr</i> 22	<i>hkmt</i> 43	<i>mrl</i> 23
<i>ilbcl</i> 22	<i>ilt</i> 6, 8	<i>hmlmt</i> 40	<i>mš</i> 86, 87, 88
<i>ilgn</i> 22	<i>ilthm</i> 22	<i>hnn</i> 87	<i>mš<sup>c</sup>ltm</i> 39 n. 64; 80; 81
<i>ildgn</i> 22	<i>išt</i> 80	<i>šrn</i> 100	<i>mtn(m)</i> 30
	<i>um</i> 20, 89 n. 44	<i>šršn</i> 61, 69, 70, 71, 72, 96	<i>nit</i> 86, 87, 88
	<i>umht</i> 20	<i>šš</i> 87	<i>ngt</i> 30
	<i>bdil</i> 23		

<i>nḥmmt</i> 40 n. 74	<i>gr</i> 69, 94	<i>qny</i> 51, 52	<i>šph</i> 48
<i>nbr</i> 63, 64, 71, 92	<i>gr il</i> 102	<i>qnyt ilm</i> 51	<i>šrp</i> 86, 87, 88
<i>n<sup>c</sup>btil</i> 59	<i>gr ll</i> 102	<i>qr bt il</i> 59	<i>šd</i> 64, 66, 68, 71
<i>n<sup>c</sup>r(?)il</i> 23	<i>pid</i> 44	<i>qrš</i> 64, 67, 68	<i>šdm</i> 51 n. 109
<i>nšbt</i> 87	<i>pḥr</i> 48, 49, 60	<i>qrt</i> 27	<i>thm</i> 63, 71, 80
<i>nšrt</i> 64, 65	<i>pḥr ilm</i> 48	<i>qrt ablm</i> 73	<i>tbil</i> 23
<i>ḥbd</i> 48	<i>pḥr bcl</i> 90	<i>rks</i> 30, 93	<i>tkmn</i> 32, 88
<i>ḥbdil</i> 23	<i>pḥr m<sup>c</sup>d</i> 49	<i>šd</i> 66, 67	<i>tkmn wšnm</i> 88, 90
<i>ḥdt ilm</i> 49	<i>pnm</i> 64, 65	<i>šlm</i> 87	<i>tr</i> 35
<i>ḥšbt</i> 100	<i>šmd</i> 86, 87, 88	<i>šnm</i> 27, 32, 33, 34, 88, 90	
<i>ḡdyn</i> 86, 87, 88	<i>qdš</i> 43, 44	<i>šnt</i> 40 n. 74	
<i>ḡlm</i> 48	<i>qdš wamrr</i> 44		

## HEBREW WORDS

<i>ḥāḥibū</i> 18	<i>ḥēl rabūm</i> 15	<i>bārēqat</i> 99	<i>nēqāmōt</i> 15
<i>ḥāḥimelek</i> 26	<i>ḥēlōab</i> 7, 8, 9, 16, 19, 20	<i>bēṭ<sup>ḥ</sup>ēl</i> 25	<i>ḥādāt ḥēl</i> 49
<i>ḥāḥnē ḥēš</i> 99, 100, 101	<i>ḥēlōhīm</i> 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, 21, 55, 98	<i>gly</i> 65	<i>ḥelyōn</i> 25, 51
<i>ḥōḥnayim</i> 31	<i>ḥēlihū</i> 18	<i>dēḥīr</i> 65	<i>ḥōlām</i> 25
<i>ḥayyāl</i> 16	<i>ḥēlīm</i> 8	<i>ḥōḥil</i> 18	<i>ḥAnatōt</i> 20
<i>ḥēyāl</i> 17	<i>ḥeldād</i> 16	<i>hlk</i> 65	<i>pēnīmā(h)</i> 64
<i>ḥayil</i> 16	<i>ḥelzāḥād</i> 16	<i>har mō<sup>c</sup>ēd</i> 49, 102	<i>šēḥāḥōt</i> 15 n. 83
<i>ḥāl</i> 16	<i>ḥēlimelek</i> 26	<i>ḥōreš</i> 71 n. 41	<i>qēdōšīm</i> 13, 14
<i>ḥēl</i> 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 25, 35, 98	<i>ḥelqānā(h)</i> 16, 54	<i>yaḥnē<sup>ḥ</sup>ēl</i> 23	<i>qannā(ḥ)</i> 25
<i>ḥēl bēṭ ḥēl</i> 14	<i>ḥālā(h)</i> 86	<i>yammīm</i> 98	<i>qannō(ḥ)</i> 25
<i>ḥēl ḥēlōhē yiḥrā<sup>ḥ</sup>ēl</i> 14, 15	<i>ḥallā(h)</i> 16	<i>yam sūḥ</i> 63	<i>rḥy</i> 65
<i>ḥēl yādī</i> 17	<i>ḥallōn</i> 16	<i>ya<sup>c</sup>ar</i> 71	<i>rahūm</i> 15
<i>ḥēl nēqāmōt</i> 15	<i>ḥēlām</i> 16	<i>k(w)n</i> 51	<i>šadday</i> 25
<i>ḥēl ḥelyōn</i> 14, 15	<i>ḥēlām</i> 16	<i>māḡinnīm</i> 62, 63	<i>šabat</i> 99
<i>ḥēl ḥelyōn qōne(h) šamayim wā<sup>ḥ</sup>āreš</i> 51, 52, 55	<i>ḥēlōn</i> 16	<i>mēṭil</i> 62	<i>šānim</i> 32
<i>ḥēl ḥōlām</i> 14, 15	<i>ḥāmāhōt</i> 20	<i>mī-kā<sup>ḥ</sup>ēl</i> 18	<i>šōnim</i> 33
	<i>ḥēpes</i> 72	<i>malkīšedeq</i> 26	<i>šānōt</i> 32
	<i>ḥāḥīq</i> 62, 79	<i>mō<sup>c</sup>ēd ḥēlōhīm</i> 49	<i>šō<sup>c</sup>al</i> 80
	<i>b(w)<sup>ḥ</sup></i> 65	<i>n(w)<sup>c</sup></i> 59	<i>šōr</i> 35
		<i>nissi</i> 15 n. 83	<i>šāde(h)</i> 67
		<i>nēšūrim</i> 65	<i>šērāḥīm</i> 87
			<i>tēhōm</i> 63
			<i>tēhōmōt</i> 63

## ARABIC WORDS

<i>ḥababāt</i> 20	<i>tihām</i> 72	<i>ḥašiba</i> 101	<i>laṭīf</i> 44
<i>ḥabab</i> 19	<i>ḥilm</i> 91	<i>ḥšb</i> 100	<i>mabbik</i> 74
<i>ḥafaqa</i> 62	<i>raḥūwa</i> 34 n. 41	<i>ḥuṣbah</i> 100	<i>majma<sup>c</sup> el baḥrain</i> 78
<i>ḥilāb</i> 7, 8, 16, 18	<i>sarabān</i> 78, 79	<i>ḥafaqa</i> 63	<i>maṭala</i> 62
<i>ḥaliha</i> 18	<i>snw</i> 33	<i>ḡafaqa</i> 63	<i>maṭlūl</i> 62
<i>ḥilāy</i> 18	<i>snv</i> 33	<i>fu<sup>ḥ</sup>ad</i> 44	<i>manbik</i> 74
<i>ḥummab</i> 19	<i>saniya</i> 33	<i>qarasa</i> 67	<i>huwa</i> 18
<i>ḥummabāt</i> 20	<i>šadda</i> 67	<i>qnw</i> 51	<i>wḥl</i> 18
<i>ḥawwal</i> 16	<i>ša<sup>c</sup>ala</i> 80		



## AKKADIAN WORDS

<i>ālu</i> 27	<i>ilu</i> 1; 2; 6; 16 n. 1;	<i>ḫipindu</i> 100	<i>pēndu</i> 100
<i>abimilki</i> 26	19; 83	<i>ḫarrān</i> 100	<i>pēndū</i> 100
<i>aban išāti</i> 100	<i>ili-ma-ilu</i> 83	<i>ḫarrān šamši</i> 78	<i>pēntu</i> 100
<i>abnēmeš birqi</i> 99	<i>ili-milku</i> 26	<i>ḫurnu</i> 101	<i>petū</i> 63
<i>apsū</i> 63 n. 4; 71; 72	<i>iluqanā</i> 54	<i>ḫuršān</i> 69, 70, 71	<i>qarāšu</i> 67
<i>a-šib qabal tamtim</i> 98	<i>ila</i> 7, 8	<i>yabni-ilu</i> 23	<i>šadū</i> 67
<i>apqu</i> 74 n. 58	<i>ilāni</i> 6	<i>kumra</i> 8	<i>iṣāmtu</i> 63
<i>Apqum ša ḏBaliḫa</i> 75	<i>ilāni kamūti</i> 93	<i>ma-nu-ki-šu</i> 18	
<i>ellu</i> 18	<i>bēru</i> 78	<i>milki-ilu</i> 26	
<i>epēqu</i> 63	<i>ḫala</i> 8	<i>nār</i> 70	

## OTHER SEMITIC WORDS

<i>ḏābābāt</i> 20	<i>ḏamlak</i> 1 n. 1	<i>mlkḏl</i> 26	<i>ḏzmlk</i> 26
<i>ḏbn</i> 31	<i>ḏmtmlk</i> 26	<i>mlkḏsr</i> 26	<i>ḏly</i> 58
<i>ḏawlā(ḏ)</i> 16	<i>ḏpq</i> 62	<i>mlkbḏl</i> 26	<i>ḏpq</i> 74 n. 58; 75 n. 65
<i>ḏhlmlk</i> 26	<i>ḏrmk</i> 26	<i>mlkḫlš</i> 26	<i>ḏattiq yōmīn</i> 33
<i>ḏḫtmlk</i> 26	<i>bnmik</i> 26	<i>mlkḫrm</i> 26	<i>ḫm</i> 100
<i>ḏl</i> 18, 20, 23, 24, 26	<i>bḏl</i> 26	<i>mlkyḏzr</i> 26	<i>šdqmlk</i> 26
<i>ḏlh</i> 23	<i>baḏalat</i> 51	<i>mlkytn</i> 26	<i>qaddiše ḏelyōnīn</i> 55
<i>ḏēlāb</i> 7, 16, 19	<i>grmlk</i> 26	<i>mlkpls</i> 26	<i>qn ḏrš</i> 27, 52, 53, 54
<i>ḏilāb</i> 19	<i>dlbt</i> 20	<i>mlk-qart</i> 26	<i>qny</i> 51, 53
<i>ḏlby</i> 8	<i>ḫmlk</i> 26	<i>mlkqrt</i> 27	<i>qart</i> 26
<i>ḏlwr</i> 57	<i>ytnmlk</i> 26	<i>mlkrm</i> 26	<i>rḏmlk</i> 26
<i>ḏly</i> 18	<i>yḫwmlk</i> 26	<i>mqnmlk</i> 26	<i>šēmābāt</i> 20
<i>ḏll</i> 17	<i>ydḏmlk</i> 26	<i>melqart</i> 26	<i>šryḏl</i> 35
<i>ḏlm</i> 20	<i>kinnōr</i> 53	<i>nbg</i> 74	<i>tryḏl</i> 35
<i>ḏln</i> 7	<i>mlk</i> 33	<i>nbk</i> 74	
<i>ḏlnm</i> 7	<i>mabbigu</i> 74	<i>npq</i> 74 n. 58	
<i>alonim</i> 7	<i>mlk</i> 25, 26, 27, 59	<i>ḏbd-mlk</i> 26	

## SUMERIAN WORDS

<i>a-ab-ba</i> 63, 64	<i>el</i> (Sum. <i>sikil</i> ) 18	72, 96 n. 64	<i>lugal-zu-ab</i> 71
<i>abzu</i> 63, 64	<i>engur</i> 63, 64	īD 70, 71	<i>gišZA.LAM.GAR</i> 66
AN 2, 8, 30	ḪUR.SAG 69, 70, 71,	ḏIM 75	

## HITTITE WORDS

<i>ekuna</i> 69	<i>ikun'a</i> 69	<i>ikunta luli</i> 68	<i>kunirša</i> 53
<i>luli</i> 69			

## AUTHORS CITED

- Abel, F. M. 74 n. 59; 75 n. 64  
Aistleitner, J. 84 n. 17  
Albright, W. F. 4 n. 24; 20 n. 33; 21; 26 nn. 9, 10; 27 n. 13; 39; 40 n. 71; 43 n. 83; 60 n. 11; 63 n. 3; 73 nn. 48, 53; 74 n. 57; 77 n. 75; 79 n. 86; 80 n. 88; 100 n. 85  
Alt, A. 74 n. 59  
Alkim, U. Bahadir 4 n. 23  
Baudissin, W. W. 1 n. 1; 3 n. 13; 17 n. 8; 18 n. 18; 26 nn. 2-8; 39 n. 61; 47; 48 n. 100  
Bauer, H., 3 n. 16; 18 n. 20; 21 n. 35; 35 n. 50; 59 nn. 4, 6; 60 n. 10; 85  
Bauer, Th. 7 nn. 43, 44; 8 n. 46; 32 n. 34  
Baumgartner, W. 84 n. 18  
Benzinger, I. 78 n. 78  
Bezold, C. 17 n. 13; 100 n. 83; 101 n. 88  
Boutflower, C. 103 n. 93  
Brockelmann, C. 17 n. 9  
Burton, R. 76 n. 71  
Cantineau, J. 5 n. 33  
Cassuto, U. 9 nn. 54, 56; 10 nn. 61, 63; 10; 11; 13 nn. 74, 79; 14 n. 82; 15 n. 83; 18 n. 21; 27 n. 12; 30 n. 27; 31; 47 n. 95; 51 n. 107; 54 n. 2; 71 n. 40; 73 n. 48; 94; 96 n. 66; 98 n. 73; 99 n. 79; 101  
Chaignet, A. E. 46 n. 94  
Clay, A. T. 2 n. 6; 70 n. 31  
Clemen, C. 3 n. 18; 36 nn. 54, 55; 44 n. 88; 46 n. 92; 47 n. 95; 52 n. 113; 56 n. 9; 57 n. 14; 59 n. 1  
Cobb, W. H. 103 n. 93  
Cooke, G. A. 3 n. 15  
Cumont, F. 3 n. 19  
Dahood, M. 58 nn. 20, 21  
Deimel, A. 70 n. 36  
Delitzsch, F. 1 n. 3, 17 n. 6, 18 n. 17  
Della Vida, G. L. 4 n. 22; 27 nn. 11, 14, 15; 51 nn. 105, 106; 52 nn. 111, 114, 115, 118, 119; 55 n. 3  
Dhorme, E. 8 n. 47; 16 n. 1; 85; 86 n. 28  
Drake, C. F. 76 n. 71  
Driver, G. R. 3 n. 16; 15 n. 83; 70 n. 32  
Dupont-Sommer, A. 57 n. 18  
Dussaud, R. 1 n. 2; 5 n. 30; 15 n. 84; 28 n. 18; 43 n. 86; 52 n. 112; 53 n. 125; 56 nn. 5, 6; 57 n. 15; 60 n. 10; 82 nn. 1, 4; 83 nn. 6, 7, 8, 11; 84; 90 n. 46; 91 n. 47; 99 n. 78  
Ebeling, E. 99 n. 77  
Eissfeldt, O. 4 nn. 24, 29; 5 n. 31; 6; 7 n. 39; 20 n. 32; 22 nn. 8, 13, 15; 29 n. 19; 33 n. 38; 47 n. 97; 57 n. 12; 59 n. 2; 61 nn. 47, 48; 84 n. 17; 103 n. 91; 103 n. 93  
Ewald, H. 4 n. 26, 19 n. 23  
Farnell, L. R. 54 n. 126  
Février, J. G. 5 n. 33  
Fischer, A. 19 n. 23  
Fleischer, H. L. 18  
Forrer, E. 5 n. 30; 56 n. 6; 103 n. 95  
Frazer, J. G. 39 n. 60; 76 nn. 66, 68; 81 n. 94  
Friedlaender, I. 79 nn. 82, 84  
Friedrich, J. 5 n. 33  
Gaster, T. H. 35 n. 53; 40 nn. 69, 72; 52 nn. 116, 118; 64 n. 6; 68 n. 21; 69 n. 27; 80 n. 89; 85 n. 22; 86 nn. 32, 33; 94  
Gelb, I. 2 n. 11  
Gemser, B. 13 n. 75  
Gifford, E. H. 3 n. 18; 36 nn. 54, 55; 44 n. 88; 46 n. 92; 47 n. 95; 52 n. 113; 56 n. 9; 57 n. 14; 59 n. 1  
Ginsberg, H. L. 32 n. 35; 43 n. 84; 51 n. 109; 52 n. 110; 57 n. 17; 64 nn. 8, 9; 65; 66 n. 13; 73 n. 51; 85 n. 23; 86 n. 29; 100 n. 87; 101 n. 89  
Goetze, A. 5 nn. 30, 34; 8 n. 48; 28 n. 17; 30 n. 26; 31 n. 31; 39 n. 67; 56 n. 8; 63 n. 25; 75 n. 61; 93 n. 55  
Goossens, G. 74 nn. 54, 55; 80 n. 90  
Gordon, C. H. 7 nn. 40, 41, 42, 45; 22 n. 3; 31 n. 28; 32 n. 36; 48 n. 102; 52 n. 109; 59 n. 5; 60 n. 9; 64 n. 10; 66 n. 121; 63 n. 22; 71 n. 38; 82 n. 2; 85 n. 27; 100 n. 86  
Gray, G. B. 103 n. 93  
Gruppe, O. 47 n. 95  
Güterbock, H. 2 n. 7; 5 n. 30; 30 n. 25; 31 nn. 30, 32; 56 nn. 6, 7; 63 nn. 24.

- 26; 64 n. 28; 69 n. 28; 93 n. 57;  
94 n. 60  
Gunkel, H. 27 n. 12
- Harris, Z. S. 48 n. 101  
Hartmann, R. 78 n. 79; 79 n. 85  
Hehn, J. 2 nn. 9-10; 8 n. 52  
Heidel, A. 67 n. 18; 72 n. 43  
Hempel, J. 3 n. 16  
Holma, H. 100 n. 82  
Hrozny, F. 3 n. 50  
Humbert, P. 51 nn. 107, 108  
Hyatt, J. P. 59 n. 3; 60 n. 8
- Jack, J. W. 18 n. 19  
Jamme, A. 3 n. 17; 83 n. 12; 84 n. 15  
Jensen, P. 65 n. 11; 70 n. 35; 95 n. 63
- Kapelrud, A. 27 n. 16; 42 n. 80; 92 nn.  
52, 53; 94; 97 n. 70  
King, L. W. 99 n. 77  
Koehler, L. 20 n. 31  
Koschaker, P. 41  
Kramer, S. N. 63 n. 5; 72 n. 42
- de Lagarde, P. 17 n. 7; 18 nn. 14, 16  
Lagrange, M. J. 1 n. 4; 4 n. 28; 8 n. 53;  
9 n. 59; 18 n. 15; 46 n. 93; 77 n. 77;  
83 n. 6  
de Langhe R. 22 n. 1; 32 n. 33; 48 n.  
99; 82 n. 3; 103 n. 96  
Lewy, J. 8 n. 49  
Lidzbarski, M. 3 nn. 15, 20  
Løkkegaard, F. 42 n. 31; 90 nn. 48-51;  
93 n. 58; 95 n. 62  
Loewenstamm, S. E. 74 n. 56  
Luckenbill, D. 98 n. 75  
Von Luschan, F. 3 n. 15
- Maisler, B. 85 n. 23  
Marti, K. 20 n. 30  
Meissner, B. 45 n. 90; 63 n. 4; 95 n. 63  
Meyer, E. 2 n. 8; 3 n. 19; 83 n. 6  
Malten, L. 35 n. 47  
Migne, J. P. 81 n. 93  
Miles, J. C. 70 n. 32  
Montgomery, J. A. 35 n. 46; 51 n. 104;  
55 n. 3; 73 n. 52; 74  
Morgenstern, J. 97 nn. 67, 68, 69, 71;  
98 n. 72; 103 n. 92  
Movers, T. C. 4 n. 25; 74 n. 58; 79 n.  
83; 80 n. 87  
Müller, D. H. 3 n. 15
- Müller, W. Max 98 n. 74  
Murtonen, A. 3 n. 13; 16 n. 1; 17 n. 4;  
19 n. 26, 27; 20 n. 29; 23 n. 35;  
24 n. 36
- Nielsen, D. 2 n. 5; 39 nn. 64, 65; 49  
n. 103; 51 n. 104; 81; 88 n. 12; 83  
n. 14; 84 n. 15; 99 n. 78  
Nöldeke, Th. 8 n. 51; 16 n. 2  
Noth, M. 3 n. 14; 99 n. 76  
Nyberg, H. S. 13 n. 78; 55 n. 3; 58 n. 20
- Obermann, J. 15 n. 83; 47 n. 96; 48 n.  
98; 67 n. 17; 72 n. 44; 85 n. 24; 86  
n. 34; 86 n. 35; 87 n. 39; 88; 99 n.  
80; 102 n. 99  
O'Callaghan, R. 4 n. 23; 56 n. 10; 57  
nn. 13, 16  
Oldenberg, H. 40 n. 70  
Otten, H. 5 n. 30; 37 nn. 58, 59; 52 n.  
120; 53 nn. 121, 122, 123; 66 n. 15
- Pallis, S. A. 70 n. 30  
Parrot, A. 67 n. 19  
Pfeiffer, R. H. 70 n. 33  
Piepkorn, A. C. 98 n. 75  
Poebel, A. 53 n. 4  
Pohlentz, M. 54 n. 126  
Procksch, O. 17 nn. 10, 12; 19 n. 24
- Rahlfs, A. 75  
Raingeard, P. 30 n. 23; 67 n. 20  
Rawlinson, H. C. 70 n. 34; 98 n. 75  
Reclus, E. 77 n. 74  
Renan, E. 1 n. 2; 4 n. 27; 74 n. 58; 76  
n. 67  
Ringgren, H. 43 n. 84; 85 n. 25  
Roggia, G. B. 18 n. 19; 29 n. 20; 84 n. 16  
Ronzevalle, S. 3 n. 16  
Rosenthal, F. 4 n. 22; 55 n. 1  
Rouvier, 77 n. 77  
Ruelle, C. A. 46 n. 94  
Ryckmans, G. 3 n. 17, 84 n. 15
- Schaeffer, C. F. A. 46 n. 91  
Schlobies, H. 57 n. 15  
Schmidt, W. 84  
Schwab, M. 35 n. 50  
van Selms, A. 36 n. 56; 37 n. 57; 41 n.  
74; 42  
Shorter, A. W. 34 nn. 42, 44  
Smith, W. R. 20 n. 30  
Speiser, E. A. 78 n. 80  
Starcky, J. 16 nn. 1, 3

- Stephens, F. J. 75 n. 62  
 Stoll, H. W. 53 n. 124
- Thomas, D. W. 33 n. 40; 64 n. 7  
 Thompson, R. C. 71 n. 37; 78 n. 80; 100 n. 82  
 Thomson, W. M. 76 n. 70; 77 n. 73  
 Torczyner, H. 31 n. 29  
 Torrey, C. C. 14 n. 80; 103 n. 94  
 Tsevat, M. 70 n. 34  
 ʿTur Sinai, N. H. 35 n. 48
- de Vaux, R. 73 n. 48
- Vikentiev, V. 76 nn. 69, 72  
 Vincent, A. 56 n. 11; 57 n. 15  
 Virolleaud, C. 60 n. 7; 71; 85; 96 n. 65; 100 n. 84  
 Vollers, K. 19 n. 25
- Waszink, J. H. 30 n. 23  
 Weissbach, F. H. 100 n. 82  
 Wellhausen, J. 19 n. 24  
 Wilson, J. A. 34 nn. 43, 44; 104 n. 97
- Zimmern, H. 69 n. 29; 71 n. 41; 72 n. 45

## GENERAL INDEX

- Abdulfida 74  
 Abishag 33  
 Acco 75  
 Adad 75, 89  
 Adapa 45  
 Adar 76  
 Adargatis 89  
 Adon 57  
 Adonis 53, 56, 57, 80  
 Adonis, river of 75, 81  
*adyton* 65  
 Afqa 39, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80  
 Afqa, Our Lady of 76
- ʿagēraos 35  
 ʿAin el ʿArūs 75  
 ʿAin Ḥalil ar-Rahmān 75  
 ʿAl 58 n. 20  
 Alalu 56, 57, 95  
 Alexander the Great 78, 79, 103  
 Aliyn Baal 92  
 Amarna 20, 23, 26  
 Amarna period 104  
 Amorite 5 n. 34  
 ʿAnat 28, 29, 34, 36, 39, 60, 73, 80, 90, 91, 92, 94  
 Anath 20  
 Anti-Lebanons 78  
 Antipatris 75  
 Antu 89  
 Anu 2; 28 n. 17; 30; 32; 47 n. 95; 56; 57; 89  
 Aphaca 75, 77, 79, 80, 81  
 Apheq 74, 75  
 Aphiq 74  
 Aphrodite 75, 79, 80
- Aphrodite, temple of 77  
 Apqu 74, 75  
 Apqum 75  
 Aqhat 27, 34, 60, 73, 90  
 Aramaic, Old 3  
 Arrapha 70  
 Artemis 39  
 Asher 74  
 Asherah 7, 28, 34, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 66, 80, 89, 92, 94, 95  
 Ashkelon 57  
 Ashurbanipal 98  
 ʿaspides *chālkeiai* 63  
 assembly of the gods 94  
 ʿAštarôt 20  
 Astarte 20, 36, 75, 80, 81  
 Aton 82  
 ʿAṭtar 27, 29  
 ʿAṭtart 28  
 Auja 75  
 Autochthon 55  
 Azitawaddu 4
- Baal 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 36, 42, 44, 45, 47, 49, 60, 65, 68, 76, 83, 90, 92, 93, 95, 96, 100, 102, 103, 104  
 Baal-Hadad 93  
 Baal Ṣapān 90  
 Baal Shamēm 4; 47 n. 95; 55; 56; 57  
 Baalbeq 75, 77  
 Baalism 104  
 Baals 59  
 Baalshemaim 57  
 Baḥrein 77  
 Baitylos 59

- Balikh 75  
 Bambyke 73  
*beena* marriage 41  
 Behemoth 62  
 Beirut 75  
 Berossus 43, 72  
 Bethel 59, 60  
 Birket el Yammūneh 76  
 Boğazköy 5 n. 30; 25; 37  
 Būmāriyah, Tell 75  
 Byblos 53, 75
- Canaanite-Phoenician 5  
 Casius, Mount 96  
 castration 94  
 cherub 98 n. 72  
*chrónos* 35  
 Constantine 75, 81
- Dagan 22; 47 n. 95  
 Damascius 35, 46  
 Danel 99  
 David 91  
 Dawn 39  
 Demarous 47 n. 95; 56  
*deus otiosus* 93  
 Dione 36  
 Dusk 39
- Ea 43, 45, 71, 72  
 El Elyon 15 n. 84; 56  
 Elat 7  
 Elephantine papyri 59  
 Elioun 55, 56, 57  
 Elisha 33  
 Elkunirša 37, 52, 54, 66  
 Elohim 55  
 Elohistic Psalms 10, 12  
 Elos 55  
 Elyon 15 n. 84; 52; 55; 56; 57; 58; 103  
 Enki 43, 45, 71, 72  
 Enoch, Book of 96  
*Enuma elish* 63, 93  
 Ephka 75  
 Epigeios 55  
*erēbu* marriage 41  
 Ethiopic 1 n. 1  
*Etymologicum Magnum* 74 n. 58
- Ge 36, 55  
 Gibraltar 79  
 Gilgamesh epic 70, 78
- Had(d) 22, 30  
 Hadad 47 n. 95; 56; 83  
 Hadad-Baal 104  
 Hadad-Zeus 57  
 Hadad inscription 3 n. 20  
 Hades 29  
 Ḥarrān 75  
 Ḥazzi, Mount 96 n. 64  
 Hekate 39  
 Helel ben Shaḥar 97, 103  
 Hephaestos 101  
 Hera 39  
 Hesiod 4, 31, 56  
 Hierapolis 73, 74, 75  
*hieros gamos* 80, 81  
 Homer 29  
 Hurrian myths in Hittite 5 n. 30  
 Hurrians at Ugarit 103  
 Ḥursag 72  
 Ḥuršan 69  
 hydrophoria 80  
 Hypsistos 55, 56
- Ikhnaton 82, 89  
 Iliad 31  
 Ilu 2  
 Ilumilku 4 n. 24  
 Iluwer 57  
 Ishtar 52, 57, 65
- Jebel el Munēṭireh 76  
 Josephus 75
- Kandurna 68  
 Karatepe 4 n. 23; 24; 25; 52  
 Keret 47  
 Khidr 79  
 Khirbet Afqa 75  
 Kinyras 53, 54  
 Kronos 4; 29; 30 n. 23; 31; 32; 34; 35;  
 43; 44; 46; 47 n. 95; 54; 56; 72; 83;  
 93; 94; 95; 97  
 Kronos, sea of 67  
 Kṭr 27; 43 n. 84; 73  
 Kṭr w-Ḥss 44, 55  
 Kumarbi 5 n. 30; 28 n. 17; 30 n. 25; 31;  
 32; 53; 54; 56; 68; 93; 95; 97; 103;  
 104
- Lalapaduwa 68  
 Lebanonons 78  
 Leptis Magna 25, 52  
 Ll 68  
*Ludlul Bēl Nimēqi* 70

- lunar god 84  
 Luwian 69
- Mabbuj 73, 74  
 Macrobius 89  
 Mala 66  
 Mambuj 73  
 Manbik 74  
 Marduk 45, 89  
 Mashu 78  
 Masius, Mt. 78  
 Melqart 26, 27  
 Memphite Theology (document of) 89  
 Mesopotamia 56  
 Milku 22  
 Mohammed 79  
 monotheism 84, 85  
 monotheistic movement 90, 103  
 Moses 78 f.  
 Mosul 75  
 Mot 29, 44, 65, 66, 73  
 Muğārat Afqa 76  
 „muntfrei“ marriage 41  
 mystery play, medieval 29 n. 19
- Nahr Ibrāhīm 75, 77  
 Na<sup>c</sup>mein 74  
 Neba<sup>c</sup> el Arba<sup>c</sup>in 76, 78  
 Ninḥursag 72  
 Niqmad 82  
 Nun 34  
 Nuzi 24
- ocean, cosmic 95  
 Ouranos 30; 36; 47 n. 95; 56; 57
- Palmyra 25, 26, 52  
 Panammu(wa) inscription 3 n. 21  
 pantheon 48  
 Paphos 53  
 Papyrus Anastasi 98  
*penetralia* 65  
 Pġt 66  
 Pharaoh 57  
 Philistine 57  
 Philo of Byblos 3 n. 18; 4 n. 29; 5; 36;  
 46; 47 n. 95; 52; 55; 56; 57; 59  
 Phoenician 5  
 Plautus 7  
 plural of majesty 9  
 Plutarch 30 n. 23; 67 n. 20  
 Poseidon 29  
 Ptah 89
- Qdš wAmrr 55  
 Qunirša 53  
 Qur<sup>ʿ</sup>ān 15 : 44 65 n. 11  
 Qur<sup>ʿ</sup>ān 18 : 59-63 78 f.
- Ra 34 n. 44  
 Ramessid period 104  
 Ras el <sup>c</sup>Ain 75  
 Re 34  
 refrigerium 67  
 Resheph 90  
 Rhea 36  
 River 64, 92
- Ṣalmunna<sup>c</sup> 59  
 Sanchunyatōn 4 nn. 24-29  
 Ṣapān 95; 96 n. 64; 100; 102  
 Saqqārah 57  
 Sardinia 56  
 Satan, fall of 97  
*scuta fusilia* 63  
 Sea 28, 29, 34, 44, 64, 91, 92, 93, 102,  
 103  
 Sedeq 22  
 Senjirli 3 n. 15; 24  
 Seraphim 46  
 Seth 104  
 Shamash 4, 57  
 Shapsh 29  
 Sharon, plain of 75  
 Shumaliya 33, 38  
 Shunem 33  
 Siduri 78 n. 81  
 Sin 22  
 solar disc 82  
 Sozomenus 81  
 Suez 79  
 Sujin 3 n. 16; 4 n. 22; 55  
 Sunrise, mountains of the 95
- Talmud Babli 79 n. 82  
 Tammuz, month of 76  
 Tartaros 95  
 Tauthos 46  
 Tell <sup>ʿ</sup>Abyad 75  
 Tell Kurdāneh 74  
 Teshub 30, 32, 56, 104  
 Theogony (Hesiod) 31; 56 n. 6  
 theomachy 103  
 Thukamuna 32, 88  
 Tigris, source of 78, 79  
 Tihāmat 72  
 Titanomachy 103

- Titans 31, 95, 97  
 Trġzz 65  
 triad, divine 83  
 Trmġg 65  
 Tyre 27, 98  
 Tyre, Prince of 13, 97, 98, 99  
 Typhon 79  
  
 Ubshukkina(kku) 95  
 Ugaritic, linguistic affinity 5 n. 33  
 Ullikummi 5 n. 30; 68; 69; 93; 96 n.  
     64; 97  
 Venus 75, 83  
  
 wisdom 14  
  
 Yahwism 104  
 Yam 22, 29, 68, 92  
 Yammūneh 77, 78, 79, 80  
 Yeḥimilk inscription 48 n. 10'  
 Yṯpn 66  
  
 Zakir (inscription) 57, 72  
 Zeus 29, 30, 56, 57, 93, 94  
 Zeus Demarous 56  
 Zeus Demarus 47  
 Zosimus 77, 78, 81



