KTU 1.92 (Obv.): A Ugaritic Theophagy

B. Margalit – Haifa

[Restoration, prosodic and epigraphical analysis, along with a detailed philological discussion of KTU 1.92 Obv. The text deals with theophagy. Astarte shoots the bull-Baal with a spear, apparently unaware of his identity, and then serves him up for dinner to the unsuspecting gods.]

Foreword

KTU 1.96 is a very short and fragmentary literary text which describes how Anat was walking along one day when she espied her brother Baal. Overcome by his handsomeness [n'm/ /ysmsm], she proceeded to devour him, "eating his flesh without a knife // drinking his blood without a cup". Since gods were not usually prone to cannibalism, and Anat as a devoted and loving sister presumably knew her brother's mien well enough not to be suddenly overcome at the sight of him, it may be assumed (especially in light of 1.92 which forms the subject of this study) that brother Baal has taken the form of an animal, most likely a bull, and that it is the theriomophic Baal whom Anat devours rather than the anthropomorphic god proper.

Commenting on this text, M. C. Astour has written[1]:

This is by far the closest analogy to the Dionysiac [Bacchic] sanguinary cult known by now...[T]hese scenes reflect, on the mythological plane, the custom of personifying Baal himself in the slain and dismembered victim. It is highly probable that sacral cannibalism was actually performed...[though] an animal was probably substituted... In the Ugaritic text [1.96] the conception of *theophagy* appears in the most naked form".

We intend to show *au fond* text 1.92 is also dealing with theophagy, though of a more refined and less bloodthirsty type, reflecting perhaps the 'substitution' of the tender Astarte for the sadistic Anat. Instead of tearing the bull-Baal apart with her hands, as does Anat, Astarte shoots him with a spear, apparently unaware of his identity, and then serves him up for dinner to the seemingly unsuspecting gods.

---

1. *Hellenosemitica*, (²1967), 181. Astour's interpretation was accepted by Albright (*Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* [London 1968]: 114f., and with some variation, by E. Lipiński, *Syria* 42 (1965) 45-62. A dissent has been registered by J.C. De Moor (*UF* 11 [1979] 647f.), reversing an earlier position (*AOAT* 16 [1971] 78, n. 18), in which the connection of 1.96 with Dionysiac rites was thought to be "undeniable". Cf. also A. Caquot, "Problèmes d'histoire religieuse", in: M. Liverani, (ed.) *La Siria nel Tardo Bronzo* [Roma 1969]: 75 (Mieux vaut... de comprendre ce fragment [comme la suite]: ... ᶜAnat qui est la source se gorge de la substance de Baal qui est l'eau..."). Cf. now Astour, *SEL* 5 (1988) 13-24.

Historical Introduction

The fragmentary mythological text 1.92, measuring 75 × 55 mm., was discovered in the excavations of the French team at Ras Shamra in 1954-55. It was the subject of a short report by Schaeffer in his *Ugaritica IV* [1962]: 75 ff., including an excellent photograph – unfortunately of the reverse side only [p. 68]. Schaeffer, alluding to Virolleaud's as yet unpublished *editio princeps*, considered the text to be "un épisode inconnu jusqu'à présent du vaste poème mythologique...de Baal"[2]. The supralinear caption on the tablet's obverse side –DṬBIL– was thought to designate the owner of the tablet as well as the library of the private house in which it was found.

Virolleaud's publication of the tablet in PRU V [RS 19.39] appeared formally in 1965[3]. The first in a series of mostly fragmentary liturgical and mythological texts, Virolleaud provided a transcription of the text alongside a hand-copy, and appended some brief philological notes. The absence of a consecutive translation may be taken as an indication that Virolleaud was unable to make coherent sense of the text in its entirety.

A comparison of the hand-copy with Virolleaud's transcription suggests that someone other than Virolleaud was responsible for its preparation. The deviations extend from the presence or absence of word-dividers (e.g., line 6) to the more significant discrepancies in the reading of the signs; e.g., line 2, where Virolleaud reads, correctly, *ṣwd[ ]* but autograph (and UT!) has *ṣwb[ ]*.

C. H. Gordon incorporated this text (along with the others in the series) as text no. 2001 in his UT Supplement of 1967[4]. Gordon seems to have relied more on the autograph than on Virolleaud's transcription; for his text differs from Virolleaud's precisely where the autograph would seem to warrant such deviation. Thus Gordon reads *ṣwb* [in line 2, and an emended *tḥd t!n* in line 4, reflecting the autograph's apparent *tḥdᵏn*. Similarly, in line 11 autograph warrants *'r*, and is so read by Gordon. Virolleaud has *šr* (in our transcription system *ṯr*). With the hindsight afforded by KTU's edition of the text –now labelled 1.92– and our own study, it is quite clear that Virolleaud's transcription is preferable to the text reflected by the autograph and published in UT. The one exception in my opinion is at the end of line 13, where autograph shows two horizontals which are best taken as an incipient *r*. This datum, however, eluded UT as well as KTU.

In the nearly 25 years which have elapsed since Virolleaud's edition, there have been only two major studies of this text: the first, by W. Herrmann in 1969[5]. With Virolleaud's text as his basis, Herrmann undertook a re-examination of the rôle and character of the Canaanite Astarte, beginning with the 2nd millennium B.C.E. and into Hellenistic times. Herrmann makes no attempt to improve on Virolleaud's text epigraphically or by way of reconstruction; and his philological notes –no consecutive translation is provided– leave much to be desired[6]. Nevertheless, Herrmann deserves credit for a pioneering study and for his gallant attempt to elicit a coherent meaning from the text as a whole, the obverse portion in particular, of which he writes:

"Es wurde in ihr davon erzählt, wie die Göttin Aštart von der Jagd zurückkehrt. Dabei hat sie eine Begegnung mit der Flut, offenbar dem Gott des Ozeans...Sie wird von ihm bedroht, kann aber schliesslich ihre Jagdbeute glücklich heimbringen und für die Götter ein Festmahl veranstalten"[7].

2. *Ibid.*, p. 77.

3. Ch. Virolleaud, "Fragments Mythologiques et Liturgiques", *Palais Royal d'Ugarit* [MRS XI, Paris 1965]: 3-5.

4. p. 3*, seq. 346.

5. W. Herrmann, "Aštart", *MIO* 15 (1969) 6-55. Discussion of 1.92, pp. 6-16, with photographic reproductions of autograph and photo in *PRU* V and *Ugaritica* IV at the end of the article. The text is not cited by R.A. Oden Jr. in his survey on Astarte in *Studies in Lucian's DE SYRIA DEA* [Missoula, MT, 1977]: 73-81.

6. E.g., Herrmann interprets the verb *tġpy* in line 11 as cognate with Ar. √*hpy*, despite the anomalous phonological correspondence of Ug. *ġ* and Ar. *h* which such an equation presupposes; and he fails to connect the word *ġl* in lines 6 and 8 with its counterpart in *Aqht* [1.17:VI], where it clearly denotes the site where good reeds (*qnm*) are found. Cf. the discussion below, § *Philological Notes*.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 15.

As we shall see below, our text makes no mention at all of Yamm, much less of a confrontation with Astarte. Herrmann's study thus underscores the difficulties and the danger in attempting to elicit far-reaching religio-historical conclusions from a fragmentary text without first ensuring a sound epigraphic basis, be it by collation or restoration.

Some 15 years later, (with the interim publication of KTU [1976]), J.C. De Moor undertook a textual reconstruction of both the obverse and reverse portions of the tablet, including a line-by-line translation and some brief explanatory notes, mostly of a philological nature[8]. Yet in contrast to Herrmann, no attempt is made at a general interpretation of the reconstructed contents as a test of their inner coherence. Nor is the reconstruction itself complete, even in the more amenable obverse portion. Of the approximately 18 lines whose reconstruction is attempted, lines 3, 4, 16, 17 and 18 remain void.

But the principal shortcoming of De Moor's reconstruction is that it lacks what may be termed 'prosodic credibility', the necessary consequence of any restoration work carried out without benefit of prosodic guidelines and criteria. Lowthian parallelism alone is insufficient in such an enterprise because, with few exceptions –e.g., conventionalized word-pairs– it has no 'predictive', as opposed to 'descriptive', powers. Thus one finds in De Moor's reconstruction such prosodically improbable couplets as:

^{2}'ttrt swd[t. tsdn. bšdm] // tlk. bmdbr

which represents a highly irregular [4 + 2] when scanned by the Ley-Sievers method[9].

A still more flagrant violation of prosodic norm is the following reconstruction:

tr [mrḫh] // ^{14}tšpl. b'l. 'bb. [bšbr]

which scans as a 'lopsided' [2 + 4].

Another deficiency is that De Moor takes no account in his reconstruction of prosodic structures beyond the level of the individual 'verse' (distich, etc.) and the far reaching –to my mind, decisive– implications which this has for text-restoration. De Moor seems unaware (at least in this study) that Ugaritic poetry consists of a concatenous sequence of 'strophic structures', with each strophe (or stanza) representing a conventionally ordered grouping of individual 'verses', with the prosodic 'valence' of each verse determined by its position within the strophic structure. Among other things, this means that the use of monostichic and tristichic verses, alongside the more frequent distichs, is not haphazard; they play vital rôles in either 'opening' or 'closing' strophes.

Much the same is true for the phenomenon of 'alliteration' which also finds no expression in De Moor's reconstruction of 1.92. The Ugaritic poets compose their verses not only with an eye for prosodic rules, but with an ear for assonantal euphony. Each verse is an alliterative entity with its characteristically dominant sounds, effected by the repetition of consonants, both individually and in clusters[10]. Many *hap. leg.* in Ugaritic poetry owe their existence to the poet's response to alliterative constraints, which often will also determine the poet's choice –all other things being equal– between two or more synonyms expressing the same concept (e.g., the conjunctions *w* and *p*; √*bky*-√*dm'* 'cry, weep'; *hkl* or *ḥzr* as B-word parallel for *bt* 'house'). The recognition of the alliterative factor in Ugaritic versification is important for philology; but it is *crucially* so for text-restorative work. Knowing what the poet is saying in any given context gives one only an approximation of what he is likely to have said in the missing continuation. The epigraphic constraints reduce the options significantly, as do considerations of grammatical feasibility

---

8. J.C. De Moor, "'Athtartu the Huntress", *UF* 17 (1986) 225-230. De Moor's article came to my attention after my own tentative reconstruction had been completed, so that where our conclusions coincide they may be taken as independently arrived at.

9. As I have argued elsewhere [*UF* 7 (1975) 289-313; and my *MLD, passim*] Ugaritic poetry adheres to the rule that in a given distich [A + B], the relationship of A to B is either one of equality [A = B] or a differential of '1' in favour of the A-line [A-B = 1]. There are to be sure exceptions to this rule; but they are relatively few in number and invariably reflect artistic transformations by the poet which themselves answer to 'higher rules'. These exceptions, therefore, are of a type which 'prove the rule'!

10. Cf. my studies in *UF* 11 (1979) 537-557; *JNSL* 8 (1980) 57-79 and the philological implementations in *Maarav* 2 (1979/80) 65-120 and in *MLD, passim*.

and formulaic idiom. But without a recognition of the further constraints imposed on the poet by the rules and conventions of formal prosody and alliterative compatibility, one cannot reduce the semantic options sufficiently to achieve a credible reconstruction of a defective text.

The foregoing criticisms should not however obscure the fact that De Moor's study has nonetheless contributed towards a satisfactory reconstruction of the text. In line 10, he correctly restores *w*[tphn] on the basis of the well-known formula (cf. below), a restoration overlooked by all previous editors and commentators (including KTU). In line 12, he correctly restored *ti*[ḫd. byd] on the basis of the well-known word-pair *yd // ymn*, though he errs in his understanding of *yd* as referring to the left-hand: the parallelism *yd // ymn* is analogous to *kṯr // ḫss* and *b'l // bn dgn*, where the two parts of the parallelism are artificial halves of one entity (the so-called 'break-up' principle first identified by E.Z. Melamed).

Above all, De Moor has recognized that, given the shape of the tablet and the nature of the fracture, the certainty of the restorations in lines 10 and 12 –to which one should add line 14– enables the establishment of a relatively narrow range for the number of signs to be restored in the remaining lines, at least with respect to the obverse. To be sure, De Moor's reconstruction includes the reverse portion as well. But his efforts meet with little success owing to the poor state of preservation as well as inherent difficulties. Of the 17 lines [KTU: 23-40] to be restored, De Moor ventures to restore only lines 25-27, 29-32, and 34; and of these, the restorations proposed for lines 25-27 and 29 appear with question-marks. This contrasts with his reconstruction of the obverse, where only five of the 18 lines are left unrestored, and none of the restorations is marked as questionable. Aside from the inherent intractability of the reverse side, we should also bear in mind the possibility, noted already by Herrmann, that the absence of any explicit mention of Astarte in the reverse portion may indicate a literary composition thematically independent of the obverse, analogous –one might add– to the subsequently published 1.119. Our own study is thus deliberately restricted to the obverse portion of the text, reflecting our conviction that any attempt at reconstructing the reverse stands little chance of success.

Reconstruction

Strophe	Verse		Scansion
I	1	¹*dṯbil*	
		²*'ṯtrt*(.) *ṣwḏ*[. tṣd]	[3]
		[hlk] ³*tlk. bmdbr*	[3]
		[šbr. mrḥh] ⁴*tḥdṯn*	[3]
	2	*whl*[. tṭtn. bmt]	[3]
		⁵*wtglṯ*(.) *thmt*	2
II	1	'[dr. aylm] ⁶*yṣi. ġlh*	[4]
		thm(.) *d*[r'y. rumm]	[3]
	2	⁷ *mrḥh*(.) *ladrt. l'*[tqḥn(h)]	3
III	1	⁸*ṯtb*(.) *'ṯtrt*(.) *bġl*	3
		y[mnh] ⁹*qrẓ. tšt*	3
		lšmal[h. tšt] ¹⁰*arbḥ*	[3]

IV	1	*'nh. tšu. w*[tphn]	3
		¹¹ *aylt. tġpy*	2
		ṯr. ṯr[m(n)] ¹⁰*bqr*	3
	2	*mrḥh. ti*[ḫd. byd(h)]	[3]
		¹³*šbrh. bm. ymn*	3
	3	*tŕ*[. mrḥ lṯr]	[3]
		¹⁴*tšpl. b'l. 'bd* [il]	3
	4	[tšlḥm] ¹⁵*ṯr abh*(.) *il*	3
		ṯṯrm[. bn. aṯrt]	[3]
	5	¹⁶ *tšlḥm. yrḫ. ggn*	3
		[tṯrm] ¹⁷*k*[ṯr.]	2
		ḥŕš. ḥssm	2

Translation

(Belonging to/Composed by *Ṯbil*)

"Astarte [went a-]hunting,
        Proceed [did] she to the grazing-land;
                [The tip of her spear] she did polish.

And behold! [the hills began to shake],
             And the abysmal waters boiled up;

(As) a h[erd of antelope] went forth towards the Marsh,
        The *swamp/zone* wherein [buffalo graze].

She [took] the cover off her spear.

Astarte sat down [to hide] in the Marsh,
        [At (her) rig]ht she placed *acacia*-shrubs,
             At [her] left [she placed] ARBḤ-bushes.

She raised her eyes and [beheld]:
        A hind was drowsing,
             A bull was masticating in a pond.

She gra[sped] her spear [in (her) hand],
        Her lance in (her) right;

She hurled [the spear at the bull],
        She felled Baal, [El's] servant.

She would feed (him to) Bull-El, her father,
        She would serve (him as) dinner (to) [the sons of Asherah].

She would feed the glutton, Yariḫ,
        [She would serve dinner to] Ko[thar],
             He who fashions skillfully".

Prosodic Analysis

The text as reconstructed comprises four strophes of disparate size, ranging from a tristichic 'strophic-verse' –the smallest possible strophic structure in Ugaritic prosody– to the concluding strophe comprising five verses.

All but the second strophe have *[3 + 3] themes. The second strophe, consisting of a distich and a strophe-closing monostich, has a *[4 + 3] theme.

The initial strophe is introduced by a tristich and terminates with a brachycatalectic distich. The final strophe is similarly introduced by a tristich; but following the three torso distichs, it terminates with a tristich as well. Yet note the brachycatalectic character of the [3 + 2] which follows the sequence of double-three's in this strophe.

The scansion presents no irregularities. Virtually every 'word' scans as a 'verse-unit', including the 'short' words, such as M *ṯr* 'bull' and the preposition *bm* (which behaves differently from the preposition *km*). The 'exceptions' to the rule of 'word - unit' are the phrase... *ṯr. abh. il*, lit., 'Bull-his-father, El'. This compound scans as a '2', here as elsewhere in Ugaritic poetry;[11] and the (restored) construct phrase, involving the monosyllabic words *'bd il*, which scan as one verse-unit[12].

The alliteration factor is at work here as well, precisely as one would expect; i.e., each verse presents a specific alliterative patterning –consisting of 'dominant consonants' and consonantal clusters– which sets it apart (except for the occasional 'linkage') – from the verse both preceding and succeeding it. To illustrate, let us examine the relatively well-preserved lines 8-17. The initial tristich [III,1] features the combination –TṮ–/–TŠ no less than 4 times and includes 7 T's and 5 Ṯ/Šs. The following strophe-introductory verse [IV,1] has a 'linking' –TŠ– combination in the A-line, and four T's in the A and B lines. But, its alliterative patterning is dominated by the repeated –NH-HN– sequences in the A-line; by the adjacent Y-T/T-Y clusters of the B-line; and by the repeated ṮR-ṮR in immediate succession in the C-line. Note how the three R's in this line 'link up' with the R of *mrḥh* in the immediately sequent verse [IV,2]; and, if our restoration is correct, the repeated verse-linking ...ṯR[M..]...::MRḥḥ... The next verse [IV,2] contains three B's (of a total 20/21 consonants) in three successive words: ...Bydh] šBrh. Bm, which may explain the poet's choice of *šbr* as a B-word synonym for *mrḥ* (rather than, say, *mṭ*, which is the term regularly used in Aqht [1.19] to designate the 'walking-stick'].

The next verse [IV, 3] features [per restoration!] three R's in three immediately successive words: tR. [mRḥ. lṯR], and four L's in four immediately successive words (or rather 'verse-units, since *'bd-il* scans as a single unit): ...Lṯr//tšpL. b'L. 'bd-[iL], with 'linkage' to the next verse provided by [tšLḥm]. Verse IV,4 in turn has but one additional L; *its* distinctive alliterative pattern consists [per restoration!] of the threefold –ṮR– sequence, a pattern which 'spills over' into the strophe-terminating verse [IV,5] as well, so that the 'dinner verses' beginning with (restored) *tšlḥm* at the end of line 14 are set apart from the preceding 'hunting verses' by means of alliteration, if not by prosodic structure.

In sum, and schematically represented, verses III,1-IV,5 yield the following alliterative picture:

```
III, 1:  TṮ––ṮT–T / ––––––––TŠT / -Š––––TŠT––––(IV,1)–––TŠ––T
IV, 1:   –NH––––––––HN / –Y–TT–Y / –R–Rm (-)––R (IV,2) mR
    2:   ––––––––B––(-) / –B––B––––
    3:   –R–R–L–R / –––Lb'L'b––L (IV,4) –––L
    4:   ––––––ṮR–––––– / tṮR–––ṮRt (IV,5)tŠ
    5:   –––––––––––– / tṮR––ṮR––RŠ––––
```

11. Cf. *MLD.*, p. 223, § 2.3.4.2.
12. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 222, § 2.3.3.

Epigraphic Notes

1. The epigraphic 'givens' which underlie the present reconstruction are essentially those provided by the text of KTU. We have not had access to a photograph of the obverse, much less to the tablet itself now apparently in Damascus.

Our dependence on KTU refers both to the text actually preserved, in whole or in part, as well as to the estimated lengths of the lacuna (to the extent that the transcription is intended to be precise).

2. The following table lists the main discrepancies between the three principal text editions [Virolleaud-UT-KTU] as well as the corresponding readings/reconstructions in De Moor's study[13].

Table 1

Line	Virolleaud	Gordon [UT]	KTU	De Moor
2	ṣwd[t.	ṣwb[	ṣwd[	ṣwd[t.
4	thdšn[14]	thdt!n	thdtn	thdtn
6	thm b[	thm b[	thm d[	thmd[
7	ladrt[	ladrt[	ladrt. l[	ladrt l[qh.
8	bġl[	bġl[	bġl ỵ[	bġl[
11	šr. 'n(?)[14]	'r. 'ñ[	tr. tñ[	tr. 'ñ[
12	b[-]r	b[-]r	bqr	bqr
13	š[-]rh[14]	š[-]rh	šbrh	šbrh
17	k[..h]mš[14]	k[---]mš	k[---]dñrš	k[tr] hrš

As observed, we take KTU as our point of departure. The one exception is the end of line 13, where KTU follows Virolleaud and UT in reading ...t[. However, the autograph in PRU V shows two quite distinct horizontals after the t, a situation virtually duplicated at the end of line 18, where KTU reads 'ṯṯ[t] – Virolleaud/UT: 'ṯ[rt]. Our suggested reading tñ[at the end of line 13 has been anticipated by De Moor.

3. As KTU's transcription indicates, the 22 or so lines which once made up the obverse of the tablet were of approximately uniform length. Now, lines 10, 12, and 14 can be restored with a very high degree of certainty[15] on the basis of literary content and formulaic analogues. Thus in line 10, the restoration w[tphn] completes a well-known literary formula consisting of √nš' + √phy 'raise one's eyes and see'. Line 12 ti[ḥd. byd(h)] is based on the parallelism of the conventional word-pair yd//ymn and the near-identical passage in 1.16:1.47f. Finally, the restoration of...'bd [il. tšlḥm] at the end of line 14 is based on the well-known idiom 'servant-of-El' (with reference, to be sure, to the mortal Krt rather than the immortal Baal, as here) and the conventional word-pair √llḥm – √trm well-known from Aqht and elsewhere, invariably as A- and B-words respectively.

It is thus possible to establish a provisional range of 14-17 signs per line of text, with 15-16 as the average. The following table lists the respective sign-counts of lines 2-17 as restored in this study:

---

13.   *UF* 17 (1986) 225-230.

14.   In Virolleaud's system of transcription, š = /t/ and š = /š/.

15.   Contrast De Moor, *loc. cit.*, who cites only 10 and 12 in drawing similar conclusions. But line 14 is not in doubt once the stichometry comes into clear focus, which cannot be said of De Moor's treatment of this line.

Table 2

Line	Signs		Total
	Given	Restored	
2	8	6	14
3	8	7	15
4	8	7	15
5	10	6	16
6	10	7	17
7	10	4/5	14/15
8	12	3	15
9	11	4	15
10	[11 + x]	[x + 3]	15
11	12	1/2	13/14
12	9	5/6	14/15
13	$10\frac{1}{2}$	$6\frac{1}{2}$	17
14	10	7	17
15	11	6	17
16	11	4	15
17	9	2	[11 + ?][16]

As restored, only line 11 may be outside the 14-17 range established on the basis of lines 10, 12 and 14. This may be due to the space-consuming R's in the two final words of the line and/or to the scribe's preference to complete a word by line's end, which occasionally leads to lines being 'under-' or 'over-written'.

It should also be noted that line 17 differs from the rest by having two lacunae to be filled, one following the initial K and estimated by KTU as 2-signs long, the other at the end.

Philological Notes

dṯbil: Determinative particle *d-* < **ḏ* [cf. UT § 6.23; BGUL, § 51.3] + PN *ṯbil* [KTU 4.313:2; 4.380:25], syll. ᵐ*ša-bi-ilu* [UT, § 9.6]. Both Virolleaud and Hermann understand the name as designating the owner of the tablet, whose title, they assume, was lost in the missing continuation. However, with De Moor we consider it unlikely that any text-material is to be restored after the name which is separated from the body of the text by a straight horizontal line. Similar superscriptions (without the line) are known from the literary texts [1.6:I:1; 1.14:I:1; 1.19:I:1] where they serve as literary title: *lb'l, lkrt, laqht* "Belonging to [the story of] Baal/Krt/Aqht". The scribes, on the other hand, usually sign their names on the bottom of the tablet [1.6:VI:54] or in the lateral margin [1.16:VI; 1.17:VI]. But we cannot preclude *Ṯbil* as the author-composer of this text. Cp. the superscriptions in the Hebrew Psalter (whether factual or, more likely, attributed is of no consequence here). – The absence of comparative data makes it difficult to decide whether there is a significant semantic difference in Ugaritic between the prefixed *d-* of *dṯbil* and

16. The end of line 17 begins a new strophic unit most of which is entirely missing and seemingly beyond recovery. Basing ourselves on the autograph in PRU V and the upper limit of the range, we may assume that six signs, at most, are to be restored.

that of *l-* in *lbᶜl*; in other words, whether *dᵗbil* and a hypothetical **lᵗbil* are semantically identical. The particle *d(t)* is frequently used as a *nota genitivi* in Ugaritic: cp. e.g., 1.2:IV:10 *tqḥ. mlk ᶜlmk // drkt. dt. drdrk*. This may suggest that the particle *d* is more 'possessive' than the preposition *l*. Thus, whereas *lbᶜl* can mean both 'concerning/about Baal' as well as 'belonging to.../property of Baal', **dbᶜl* can only denote the latter.

ṣwd [.tṣd]: We differ with Virolleaud *et al.* in restoring an inf. abs. construction here with √*ṣ(w)d* as in the continuation with √*hlk*. The nominal form *ṣwd[t]* 'huntress" restored by Virolleaud is morphologically unattested in Ugaritic. Its Hebrew counterpart **ṣayyād* [Jer. 16:16] would lead one to expect Ug. *ṣ(y)dt* instead of the alleged **ṣwdt*. Nor is such a title particularly apt for Astarte, as opposed to the inveterate huntress Anat who despite her passion for the sport (reflected in *Aqht* and in *Rephaim*-text 1.22:I:10f.) is never so designated. – For the use of the inf. abs. construction in Ugaritic, cf. conveniently UT § 9.27.

As noted already by Virolleaud, our text at this point shows a literary affinity with 1.12:I:34f.: *bᶜl. ytlk. wyṣd // yḥ. pat. mdbr*. Cf. note immediately following.

bmbdr: Though evidently cognate with Heb. *midbar*, the Ug. *mdbr* cannot denote here (and most likely elsewhere) 'desert' (German: Wüste]. As the sequel makes clear (cf. also 1.10:II:44ff.), the *mdbr* in question is within walking distance of a *ǵl* – 'marsh' (cf. below) –semantically related to *aḫ* (+ Heb. *'aḥû* < Eg. *yḥ*) 'meadowland'. In fact, it is quite certain that the *ǵl* in question here, as well as in 1.17:VI (*Aqht*), is identical with the *aḫ. šmk* 'meadow of Semachonitis' of 1.10:II. We shall return to this problem below. The Ug. *mdbr* accordingly must be a *maqtal* formation of *dbr* (= Heb. *dober*) – cf. *arṣ. dbr* (// *šd. šḥlmmt*) in *Baal-Mot* (1.5 V-VI), qualified (non-euphemistically!) by *nᶜm* 'good', the Ugaritic equivalent of the Greek 'Elysian Fields'[17] – referring to grazing-land located outside the city/village limits. Similar reservations are in order with respect to the usage of *mdbr* elsewhere in Ugaritic literature, e.g., 1.14:II 50-III 1//IV:29-31 [Krt]: *km. irby. tškn. šd // k(m) ḥsn. pat. mdbr*: both the parallelism (*šd* 'field') and the subject – locusts do not attack desolate land! – make it clear that the *mdbr*, whose 'fringe' (*pat*) the locusts attack, refers to the grazing land immediately contiguous with the sown.

[šbr. mrḥh]: The restoration is based on the parallelism *mrḥ-šbr* in lines 12-13. The word *mrḥ*, cognate with Heb. *romaḥ* 'spear' (via metathesis), denotes basically, and originally, the (spiked] 'walking-stick' also known as *mṭ* 'staff'. It is so used, in language recalling lines 12-13 below, in 1.16:I:46ff. [Krt], where devoted son Ilḥu, commissioned by his ailing father to notify his [*naditu-?*]sister of the situation, "takes (*yiḥd*) his *mrḥ* in [his] hand // his *grgr* (< √*grr* 'drag') in his right". Upon arrival at his destination, we are told [1.16:I:6 1f.] that "he set his *mrḥ* erect (√*nṣb*) on the mountain (*tl*)", i.e., he drove the spiked bottom of the staff into the ground so that it stood erect. – This suggests that the *hap. leg. šbr* in line 13, the formulaic equivalent of *grgr* in the *Krt* passage, is etymologically related to Ar. *sabara* 'be pointed' and to Akk. *šibirru* 'stick, staff'. Of the latter, E. Salonen[18] writes: "*šibirru* ist keine eigentliche Waffe, aber wird als solche gebraucht" (citing references in the annals of Sargon and Sennacherib). The transformation of *mrḥ* 'staff' into *mrḥ* 'spear' (cf. Heb-Arab.) is made possible by the spiked tip (*šbr*),. Cp. similarly Heb. *maṭṭeh*, normally '[walking-]stick'; but in the fragment of the ancient Israelite war-epic preserved in Hab. 3:3-15 it is used in parallelism with 'bow' to denote a weapon which 'pierces' (√*nqb*) the head(s) of YHWH's enemies (vss. 9,14). The reason the 'staff' can 'pierce' is that it has a sharply pointed tip.

In 1.6:I 50-52, as in 1.16:I 44 ff., the *mrḥ* is a spiked staff used for 'climbing' (reading with KTU

---

17. Cf. Margalit, *MLD*, 123ff.

18. *St. Or.* 33 (1966) 161.

yrq < *rqy* 'climb') – and a ribald euphemism for the male genitalia[19]; in KTU 4.385 [=PRU, V, 50], *mrḥ* (// *ḫlpn*) denotes a surgical lance (note Eng. 'lance' = 'spear');[20] and in KTU 4.169 and 4.624 it is a weapon, presumably a 'spear'. – The ultimate confirmation both of our restoration [*šbr*] and our interpretation thereof comes from the attested verbal predicate *thdṯn*, to which we now turn.

thdṯn: As used here, this formation of √*ḥdṯ* 'be new' cannot be so rendered, any more than one would consider rendering nominal *ḥdṯ* 'month' by 'new' (unless the intention was 'new moon'). The verb √*ḥdṯ*, when predicated of a metallic object, and a bladed one in particular, denotes 'polished' or the like. Thus Heb. *ḥ-d-š* in Isa. 41:15: הבה שמתיך למורג חרוץ חדש בעל פיפירת "Behold, I will make of you a threshing-sledge, (with) a polished blade[21], doubled-edged"; 2 Sam. 21:16 חגר חדשה ... where *ḥădāšāʰ* is a nominal formation equivalent to **ḥereb ḥădāšāʰ*. Note also Ar. √*ḥdṯ* 'furbish (a sword)'[22].

To properly understand the present allusion to 'polishing the tip of the staff', it must be assumed that the *mrḥ* has served the goddess hitherto as a walking-stick, whose pointed tip is by now no doubt clodded with earth. To transform the *mrḥ* into a 'spear' useful for hunting, the goddess must first clean and polish its tip, and perhaps hone its conceivably blunted point. Though not expressly stated, one may infer from the sequel that, after polishing the ŠBR of the *mrḥ*, she covers it with a 'cloak' – Ug. *adrt* – so as to keep it clean.

[*tṯṯn. bmt*]: The restoration, here ventured for the first time[23], is basically *ad sensum*. The phrase itself recurs in 1.4:VIII:34f. (*Baal-Mot*): After Baal gives forth "his holy voice" (*qlh. qdš*], the earth trembles (√*trr*), the mountains are terrified (*grm. tḫšn*), and "the hillocks" (lit., 'the backside-protrusions of the earth') shake/wobble (√*nṯṯ*). A similar image is evoked by the Hebrew psalmist in 104:4. – In the present context, however, it is not the voice of Baal which sets off the earth tremors, but rather a stampeding 'herd' (**ʿdr*) of antelope (*aylm*), as described in lines 5[b]-6. The pressure of their hooves also causes the subterranean waters (*thmt*) to 'boil up' (√*glṯ*). All this, of course, is poetic hyperbole: neither more nor less!

tglṯ: Cf. MHeb √*glš* 'boil (over)', already as a metaphor in Cant. describing [N.B.] a herd of goats pouring down the slopes of Gilead like boiling water over the sides of a pot![24] Elsewhere (1.4:V:7; 1.101:7) Ug.√*glṯ* is used with reference to the atmospheric 'turbulence' generated by the storm-god, no doubt because of the association of the storm with water and the flashes of lightening interpreted as 'fire'. In other words, when the storm-god unleashes "his flash" [*šrḥ*] he is conceived as 'firing up' the atmospheric moisture.

[ʿ]*[dr. aylm]*: Ug. **ʿdr* [= Heb. *ʿēder*] is attested in 1.4:VII:78, unfortunately in a broken context[25]. Both thematically and alliteratively our restoration is apt; note the reference to the fem. *aylt* in line 11 (the ms. pl. *aylm* would obviously include both males and females), and the following alliterative patterns: (1) ʿ[DR...//...D[Rʿy...]...laDRt; (2) [...*a*YLm] Yṣi. ġLh. Note too the phonetically kindred ʿ[dR. AYLm]...ĠL [=Ar. *ġayl*][26].

---

19. Cf. *UF* 16 (1984) 158.

20. Cf. R.R. Steiglitz, *JCS* 33 (1981) 52-55; C.H. Gordon, *Cortesão Memorial Vol.* [Coimbra 1979]: 141-145.

21. √*ḥrṣ* = 'cut'; cf. Am. 1:3.

22. Hava, *Al-Faraid*, 114a.

23. De Moor: *wḥl*[.   ] rendered "and Hil[alu   ] identified as "the god of the crescent moon".

24. For this signification of Ug. √*glṯ*, cf. already Greenfield, *Proceedings...Semitic Studies* [1965/1969]: 99, n. 36; Dietrich-Loretz, *BiOr* 23 (1966) 129; *UT Supp.* [1967]: 551. – The conclusions here drawn obviously supersede what I wrote in *ZAW* 86 [1974] 10, n. 32.

25. Cf. my *MLD*, 52ff.

26. In Ugaritic, to be sure, *ġl* would be pronounced *ġêl*, with contracted diphthong. But if composed by a Canaanite, the phonetic fit would be perfect. Cp. Am. 8:2ff., where the assonantal word-play presupposes the north-Israelite contraction of the diphthong in MT *qayʿ(i)ṣ*.

Ug. *ayl* 'antelope' is attested in *Baal-Mot* (1.6:I:24) and as the fem. *aylt* in the same story (1.5:I:17) as well as in our text below.

ġlh (cf. also below, line 8): The word is to be analyzed as nominal *ġl* 'marsh, lagoon' or the like (= Ar. *ġayl*) + directional (locative) *-h*. 'The Marsh' can only be the 'Great Marsh' (or: 'El's Marsh') of 1.17:VI:23, to which the exuberant Aqht directs the covetous Anat to collect the reeds necessary for fashioning a composite bow[27].

This is the site alluded to in 1.10:II:9 as *aḫ. šmk* = Hellen. *Semachonitis* = Talmudic *S-m-k-w*, part of the river-valley which Josephus calls *Oulathos* and the so-called *Gen. Apocryphon* [§XXII,4] *ḫlt'. rbt'* "The Great Valley"[28] – the modern [el-]Huleh Valley. Vertically bisected by a network of meandering rivulets, including the eventual Jordan River which exits from the lake in its southern half, this river-valley featured historically, and until very recently, a large malarial swamp situated north of the lake. This swamp is designated *ġl* in our text.

This river-valley, and the marsh-lake region in particular, are undoubtedly the hunting-grounds of the Canaanite-Ugaritic family of gods, sired by El, residing on and about Mt. Hermon, Ug. *šryn* (= Heb. *śiryon*], the original Mt. Ṣaphon, Ug. *ġr. ṣpn*, (=Heb. *yrkty ṣpwn*]. The head of the family resides at or near Mt. KS, alternatively designated Mt. LL, situated at the confluence ('*dt*) of the Jordan headwater, nearby Israelite Dan – the eventual site of a Bull–cult in the Iron Age and undoubtedly a major center of El–worship in the Bronze Age[29]. Both *ks* and *ll* should be understood as poetic camouflage for Mt. Hermon: *ks* alludes to the pool at the foot of the mountain known in Hellenistic times as *Phiale* 'cup'[30], while *ll* (less certainly) plays on √*šry* [<*√*šry* of *šryn*, related to Ar. √*sry* 'travel-by-night'[31]. El's aqueous abode [*mbk. nhrm. apq. thmtm*] extends from the Phiale pool to the Sea of Galilee, with the Huleh Valley as 'El's *ġl*' (1.17:VI:23). Thus when the bereaved Dan'el casts some of his murdered son's mortal remains into the Kinnereth (1.19:III:47), he bids his son (line 47) "dwell forever in El's house" (*amd. gr. bt. il*).

Like Baal in 1.10 and, presumably, her alter-ego Anat in 1.22, Astarte comes to the swamp-and-lake region of the Huleh Valley known as *aḫ šmk* to hunt for game, which she will later serve the divine family for dinner atop, or below, Mt. Hermon.

The imagery which our text evokes at this point is accordingly that of a large herd of antelope rushing from an unspecified place of origin towards the water-holes of the Huleh marsh, a scene envisaged –we may recall– by Mot in his apology to the dying Baal in 1.5:I: 16f.: *hm. brky. <l> tkšd. rumm // 'n. kdd. aylt* "Do <not> buffalo seize pools-of-water // (Do not) hinds [*aylt* !] (seize) the spring like the teat?"

thm d[r'y. rumm]: This phrase stands in descriptive apposition to *ġl*. As used here, the word *thm* cannot therefore be the well-known synonym for *rgm* 'word, speech'. De Moor combines *thm* with the following *d* to form *thmd* [√*ḥmd*]. But aside from the dubious relevance of 'covet' in the present context, both Virolleaud and KTU indicate a divider-equivalent space between the M and the D.

The solution, I submit, is to take this word as *thm* (II), possibly cognate either with Ar. √*thm* 'be shady, black' referring to the swamp's jungle-like foliage; or with Syr.-Aram. *t-ḥ-m* 'boundary; delimited area'[32]. – The restoration *d*[r'y. rumm] is largely *ad sensum*. Aside from the attestation of both terms[33],

---

27. Since Y. Sukenik-Yadin [*BASOR* 107 (1947) 11-15] it is customary to see in the *qnm* the raw material for the arrows. However, 'arrows' are not at issue in *Aqht*; and *qṣ't* is definitely a B-word synonym of *qšt* [<√*qṣ'* 'be curved' preserved in Ethiopic; cf. already *WUS*, s.v., and *UF* 16 (1984) 78f].

28. Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon* [Roma 1966]: 64, 150, E. Lipiński, *OLP* 2 (1971) 155ff.

29. According to Abel (*Géographie de la Palestine*, I, [Paris 1933-1978]: 162) the ancients seem to have considered only the 'Dan' and the 'Banias' as the sources of the Jordan; whence the 'twin-deeps' (*nhrm*//*thmtm*] of El's abode?

30. Known today as *Birket Ram* "pool of Ram". For a description (and photograph) cf. F.M. Abel, *op. cit.*, 161f.; pl. XIII, 1.

31. Cf. already, in part, E. Lipiński, *loc. cit.*, 40.

32. Hava, *op. cit.*, 57a; C. Brockelmann, *Lex. Syriacum* [Hildesheim ²1928/1966]: 820f.; M. Jastrow, *Dictionary...Targumim* [New York 1950]: 1660.

33. Cf. *rumm* in 1.5:I:17; and *UT* § 19.2340, s.v. *r'y*.

our restoration is further supported by: (1) 1.10:II:10ff.: *...tk.aḥ šmk.mlat.rumm* "... towards/into the meadow of *šmk/Ḥuleh* full of buffalo"[34]; (2) alliteration: '[DR...]...D[R'y...] /...laDRt; ...D[R'y. RuMM] / MRḥh... But for the dominance of the –DR– combination of the preceding distich, it is unlikely that the poet would have chosen the *hap. leg.* ADRT to refer to the 'covering' for the MRḤ. Cf. immediately below.

ladrt: As De Moor has recognized, this is the Ug. cognate of Heb. *'aderet* 'cloak, mantle' (cf. Gen. 25:25; 1 Kgs. 19:13, etc.), normally as an article of clothing[35]. It is so understood here by De Moor who comments: "Apparently 'Athtartu needs an *'adrt* 'mantle'... because of the cold (cf. line 5)"[36]. In fact, the *adrt* necessarily refers to the [leather?] cover which the goddess wraps around the metallic tip of her *šbr* after having cleaned and polished it [lines 3-4]. The choice of the *hap. leg. adrt*, rather than [e.g.] *kst, lbš,* or *t'rt*, is determined by considerations of alliteration (cf. above), assuming of course the correctness of our restorations.

Fig. 1

Buffalo of the Huleh [ca. 1950] from: *Le Houlé et la Région du Haut-Jourdain* [Zionist Orgzn. - Keren Kayemeth] [Jerusalem, 1954]: 62.

---

34. "Originaire des Indes...le buffle noir, *ǵamūs (Bos bubalus)* se complaît dans les fonds paludéens du haut Jourdain..." – Abel, *op. cit.,* 221, Cf. also our fig. 1 which may well depict what our text is describing some 3300 years earlier!

35. The one apparent exception is Zech. 11:3; but this may be an abstract nominal formation of √'dr 'mighty' [= Ug. [1.17:VI] *adr.*]

36. The reference to line 5 reflects De Moor's understanding of *glt̲* as meaning 'snow'.

l[tqhn(h)]: The restoration of √*lqh* (similarly De Moor) is largely *ad sensum*. A verb is clearly wanted, one which has MRH as its object and is compatible with an indirect object governed by the preposition *l* "to/from". – Alliteratively, note ...LadrT. L[Tqhn(h)]::Ttb. 'tTrT...

qrz [//arbh]: Both terms are difficult to define with precision. Herrmann considered them "nicht deutbar"; De Moor admits that the terms "remain enigmatic to me", and conjectures: "Perhaps they are the names of Athtartu's sporting dogs", of which of course we know nothing, either from this or from any other text.

In my opinion, *qrz* is almost certainly cognate with Ar. *qaraz* and Syr. *qerata* denoting the "acacia"[37]. One type of acacia, known technically as *prosopis farcta*, flourishes along the banks of rivers and in swamps, and is to be found growing even today in the Jordan Valley[38]. It mostly takes the form of a low shrub suitable for hiding and camouflage.

This interpretation of *qrz* (and *arbh*, by way of analogy) is consistent with the idea that Astarte has followed the herd into the marsh, and like any competent hunter, looks for a suitable place to lie in wait, in such a way as to be hidden from view (and scent) but without obstructing her own view. To this end, she piles up shrubs of *qrz* and *arbh* to her right and left, thus concealing her flanks while leaving open her field of vision straight ahead. – The precise signification of the *arbh*-plant remains to be clarified.

tgpy: Citing the (alleged) parallelism with *'n*, De Moor endorses the (pre-KTU!) opinion of Dietrich and Loretz[39] who argued for the equation of Ug. √*gpy* with Heb. √*sph*, Akk. *subbu* 'behold'. This opinion, however, not only posits a phonological anomaly (Ug. *g* = Heb./Akk. *s*) but is based on a false reading here in 1.92. KTU reads unequivocally *tgpy. tr. tr*[, the asterisk (in KTU) denoting damage but not doubt.

We understand *tgpy* as cognate with Ar. 'sleep lightly; drowse'[40], attested here *hap. leg.* The contextual fit is in no way inferior to the etymological one. The camouflaged huntress perceives from her hideout two suitable targets: a female antelope (*aylt*) drowsing in the soft marshy grass, and a bull (*tr*), apparently unconnected to the herd of *aylm*, chewing (√*trm*) its cud (or whatever) in the cool waters of the lake (*qr*). Since Astarte has only one spear, and one shot, at her disposal, she must make a choice between the antelope and the bull. She chooses the latter, unaware that it is her relative, 'Bull-Baal'[41].

(b)qr: This term, denoting a 'pool' or 'reservoir' (< √*q(w)r*), recurs in 1.19 (*Aqht*) where it refers to the Sea of Galilee designated *knrt* (Heb. *kinnereth*). Here it refers to the 'lake' situated in the southern half of the Huleh Valley (today largely reclaimed). The word is obviously related to *mqr* 'source', but is semantically distinct: *qr* denotes a *body* of water (Eng. 'lake' being the closest approximation) whereas *mqr* denotes a 'well' or 'source' from which water issues.

37. Cf. C. Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, 694; I. Löw, *Die Flora der Juden* [Hildesheim 1967 repr.], vol. 2:398.

38. Cf. F.M. Abel, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, 211. The Hebrew equivalent, *šittah* [= Ar. *sant* = Eg. Lw.] is incorporated in a place-name in the Lower Jordan Valley, (*Abel-*)*Sittim*.

39. *WO* 4 (1968) 309.

40. Hava, *op. cit.*, 530.

41. The epithet 'bull' belongs originally to El, who is typically 'Bull-El'. But as a god-of-life who 'fertilizes' the earth [cf. *RB* 91 (1984) 102-109], it is natural for Baal to acquire bull-like attributes, reflected already in *Baal-Mot* (1.4-5-6) where the storm-god turns into a bull when incarcerated in Hades (1.5:V), and then mates with a heifer ('*glt*). Just as our text evidences the replacement of Anat by Astarte, reflecting the beginning of a process which will culminate in the virtual erasure of Anat from Canaanite religion in the first millennium [B.C.E.], so too Baal is here presumably on his way to replacing El as the main 'Bull-figure' in the Canaanite pantheon. The ancient Bull-cult of El lived on, of course, in the 'reformist' cult of Jeroboam I at Bethel and Dan. But the fierce polemic of the 8th cent. prophets, particularly Hosea and Amos, against the north-Israelite cult at Bethel suggests that the El-origins of the Bull-cult had been forgotten and were now interpreted as forms of Baal worship, reflecting presumably current Canaanite religious thought and practice. – The epigraphic and iconographic data newly available from Kh. el-Qôm and Kuntillet Ajrud bear decisively, and dramatically, on this subject; cf. my forthcoming "The Meaning and Significance of 'Asherah", in which it is argued that Hosea's "marital theology" should be viewed as a polemical response to the syncretistic Samarian cultus epitomized in the notion of YHWH W'ŠRTH "YHWH-and-His-Consort" (the word '*srh* to be analyzed as suffixed common-noun '*sr* meaning 'wife' (lit., 'she-who-follows-in-the footsteps ('*tr*) [of her husband]): cf. KTU 1.3:I:13-15; Job 23:11.

tr: As recognized by De Moor, this word is a verb derived from √*yry* 'hurl, cast', attested in 1.23:38: *...yr.šmmh // yr.bšmm. 'sr* "...he shoots [an arrow] skyward / He shoots a bird in the sky". Thus in both cases √*yry* is used to denote the act of 'shooting', be it arrow or spear.

tšpl: Given the idiomatic use of √*npl* to describe a felled animal, specifically a 'bull', in 1.12:II:53f. (*kn.npl.b'l(.) km tr*), the verb is doubtless to be parsed as a Š of √*npl* (rather than as a D of √*špl*). Note the similar O.T. use of √*npl* to denote 'slain (warriors)' [Ju. 5:27; 2 Sam. 1:19, etc.] and finding idiomatic expression in 'fall-by-the-sword' (Heb. √*npl bḥrb*). On the other hand, √*špl* 'be low[ly]' connotes 'humiliation', in Heb. as well as in Ugaritic [cf. 1.23:32].

b'l.'db [il]: In contrast to the autograph, neither Virolleaud nor KTU hesitates in reading '*bd*[. The restoration [il] suggests itself as all but certain despite the fact that the phrase '*bd il* "El's servant" is nowhere predicated of Baal. However, it is implicit in the description of Baal 'standing over' [*qm. 'l*] El at dinner in 1.2:I:20f. It should be noted that like its Hebrew counterpart, Ug. '*bd* 'servant' need not connote servitude. Even a high-ranking official can be 'servant of the king' (Heb. '*bd.hmlk*).

Note the alliterative properties of the restoration: tšpL. B'L. 'Bd[iL]::tšLḥm...

[bn.aṯrt]: The restoration is *ad sensum*, the phrase known from 1.3:V:4,39 [// *ilm*]; 1.4:I:11 [// *ilm*]; 1.4:VI:46. It occurs always as a B-line 'ballast variant', the choice here (rather than *ilm*) determined both prosodically – i.e., the need for a 3-unit line (*ttrm. bn. aṯrt*) – as well as for reasons of alliteration: ...TR...// tTRm [...aTRt]. Lines 16-17 will specify the *bn. aṯrt*, beginning with the moon-god *yrḥ*.

ggn: The word is known from 1.16:VI:26 [*Krt*]. It recurs as the reduplicated *gngn* in *Baal-Mot*, where it denotes the 'inner self' or 'soul'. It is cognate with Ar. *ǧanan* 'genie; soul'[42]. Given the semantic connection of 'soul'-'self'-'throat' evidenced by the word *npš* in Ugaritic, one may assume that *ggn* denotes here in 1.92 'glutton; voracious-of-appetite' [German: 'Fresser']. Something of Yariḥ's apparently proverbial gluttony comes through in 1.114 [= RS 24.258] which describes the (inebriated) moon-god, his back (*gbh*) arched like a dog's (*km. klb*), crawling (√*ql(q)ṯ*) under the tables (*tḥt. ṯlḥnt*) begging for (extra) food[43]. What the intrinsic connection between the moon-god and 'voracity' or 'gluttony' may be (*if* such there be) is not clear to the modern reader. That the moon-god is an unsavoury type over-all emerges nevertheless with considerable clarity from 1.24, where *ḥrḥb* does his best to dissuade *yrḥ* from becoming his son-in-law.

[ttrm]¹⁷*k*[*tr*] *dḥrš. ḥssm*: Though his reconstruction reflects, in my opinion, a faulty stichometry – cf. above – De Moor has nevertheless correctly seen the rather obvious corollary of KTU's reading (line 17) *k*[--]*dḥrš. ḥssm*, as opposed to Virolleaud's (and autograph!) ...*k*[...*ḥ*]*mš. ḥssm.*, viz., the near-verbatim correspondence with (1.17:V: 17-19//23-25): ...*lnpš*. KTR.WḤSS // *lbrlt. hyn*. DḤRŠ. YD(M). But the verbal similarities once noted, one should not overlook the prosodically determined differences of syntax and morphology. In contrast to the *Aqht* passage, (1) the binomial *KtR w-Ḥss* has been 'broken up' here in 1.92 (cp. similarly 1.6:VI:49f.); [2] *Ḥss* has been adverbialized (√*ḥss* 'be deft') on the analogy of *ydm* [= *yd* + adv. -M] in 1.17:V:25 (emend accordingly 1.17:V:19). Schematically represented:

Aqht	*1.92*
...ktr.wḥss...dḥrš.ydm	*...ktr.dḥrš.ḥssm*

Note well the resultant alliteration in 1.92 (precluding, e.g., the co-option of variant-PN *Hyn* from 1.17:V): [tTRm] k[TR] dḥRŠ...[44].

42. Cf. Y. Kutscher, *Lesonēnu* 31 (1966-67) 36, and my *MLD*, 67ff.

43. Cf. my detailed discussion of this text in *Maarav* 2 (1979/80) 65-118.

44. Š and T constitute alliterative 'allophones' in Ug. poetry, reflecting a phonetic affinity destined to culminate in their eventual merger in the so-called 'short alphabet'.