

Dynasty Building at Ugarit
The Ritual and Political Context of KTU 1.161^{*}
Construcción de la Dinastía en Ugarit
El contexto ritual y político de KTU 1.161

Matthew J. Suriano – Los Angeles
25563 Alicante Dr., Valencia, CA 91355 USA

[The Ugaritic ritual-text KTU 1.161 (=RS 34.126) focuses upon themes of kingship and royal dynasty, however the ritual's important role in dynastic succession has remained an undeveloped aspect in studies of the text. The context of the ritual is the wake of Niqmaddu's death, and this event served as acknowledgement of the defunct king's heir: Ammurapi. Thus, the ritual action of the text contains two foci that involve the dead king and the successor (and living) king. Contained within the text are acts of mourning and commemoration that are related to the defunct king Niqmaddu. A re-analysis of the term '*aṭra*' and a new interpretation of the preposition *taḥta* will provide the basis for understanding Ammurapi's involvement in the ritual. The purpose of this essay is to describe in more precise terms the ritual context of the text, to identify the role of the Ammurapi within the ritual (he is only mentioned by name once), and ultimately to explain the political significance of the event..] - Key words: Ugarit, Ritual text, Kingship.

[Le rituel ugaritique KTU 1.161 (=RS 34.126) met l'accent sur la royauté et la dynastie royale, pourtant le rôle si important du dit rituel dans la succession royale est resté un aspect qui n'a pas été développé par ceux qui ont étudié ce texte. Le contexte du rituel est la veille à la mort du roi Niqmaddu, ce événement a indiqué la reconnaissance de l'héritier du roi mort : Ammurapi. Alors, l'action rituelle du texte contient deux points de repère qui concernent le roi mort et le roi qui le succède (et qui est vivant). Dans le texte il y a des actes de deuil et commémoration qui se rattachent au roi mort Niqmaddu. une nouvelle analyse du terme '*aṭra*' et une nouvelle interprétation de la préposition *taḥta* fournira la base pour comprendre la relation de Ammurapi avec le rituel. L'objet de cet étude est de décrire dans des termes plus précis le contexte rituel du texte, identifier le rôle qui y jouât Ammurapi et expliquer la signification politique de cet acte..] - Mots clef: Ugarit, texte rituel, royauté.

The death of a king was a subject that was difficult, if not tacitly forbidden, in ancient Near Eastern literature, and only a few documents survive that deal with the immediate context of a ruler's end.¹ In

* This paper was originally presented at the 2008 annual meeting of the American Oriental Society in Chicago, where it benefited from comments and suggestions. In addition, I would like to acknowledge the input of William Schniedewind and Ryan Roberts. Any deficiencies contained within, however, are the sole responsibility of the author.

contrast, once they were dead, the names of kings were collected for posterity in royal genealogies, king lists and chronologies. These sources, common in Mesopotamia and the northern Levant, testify to the significance of dead kings in spite of any reticence that may have existed regarding the portrayal of a king's actual fate or even burial.² Although it is not a king list per se, the Ugaritic royal ritual known as KTU 1.161 (RS 34.126) provides an important witness for understanding the purpose of king lists and the political response to a king's death in the ancient Levant. A careful review of the text's literary contours will reveal that KTU 1.161 held two purposes that were integral to dynastic politics in the ancient Near East: the dedication of the dead king (Niqmaddu) to the royal ancestors, and the assumption of the new king (Ammurapi) to the throne.³

The ritual outlined in KTU 1.161 has three general parts comprised of two principal halves (Parts A and C) and a short intermediary section between them (Part B). Parts A and C are distinguished by morpho-syntactical considerations, with the first marked by remote passives that summon the dead in a reverent manner, while the latter part is marked by imperatives directed at the unnamed participant (taken here as the new king).⁴ At the center of the ritual is the summoning of Shapshu to oversee the royal ceremony (Part B), a literary unit that incorporates the multiple themes of deferential invocation (N-stem imperatival verbs) and active participation. This transitional literary unit provides the conceptual division between Parts A (dedication of the dead king) and C (acknowledgment of the new king).⁵ A survey of this literary structure (Parts A, B, and C) makes it possible to better identify and discuss the roles assumed by the participants in the text allowing for a much clearer picture of the social and political context of the ritual.

1. *The Text with Commentary*

The commentary that follows will concentrate primarily on the second half of the ritual (labeled Part C), as the treatment here of the first half (labeled Parts A and B) follows the established readings found in most publications of the text.⁶ Yet, in order to demonstrate the ritual context and political purpose of this

1. The famous exception is the Sumerian literary work concerning the death of Ur-Nammu, an Ur III king, see S. N. Kramer, "The Death of Ur-Nammu and His Descent in the Netherworld," *JCS* 67 (1967).

2. This is regardless of whether the list's greater purpose was genealogical or chronological. For the distinction, refer R. R. Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*, vol. 7, Yale Near Eastern Researches. New Haven 1977.

3. While a full historical discussion is not possible here, this study interprets the multiple references to Niqmaddu as the same individual, Niqmaddu III, the predecessor and (probably) father of Ammurapi III, cf. K. A. Kitchen, "The King List of Ugarit," *UF* 9 (1977) 131–142. See more recently, I. Singer, "A Political History of Ugarit," in *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, ed. W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt, HdO I (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 1999), p. 613.

4. The text generally follows a pattern of verb use that begins with SC-Passives and concludes with Imperative forms. The abbreviations for verbal forms follows that of W. M. Schniedewind and J. H. Hunt, *A Primer on Ugaritic: Language, Culture, and Literature*. New York 2007, p. 168.

5. A similar dual focus is seen in the ritual at Emar that oversaw the succession of the high priestess of Ba'al, where both the dead priestess and her successor are honored, see D. E. Fleming, *The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar: A Window on Ancient Syrian Religion*, vol. 42, Harvard Semitic Studies. Atlanta, Ga. 1992, pp. 192–195. I would like to thank Daniel Fleming for drawing my attention to this parallel.

6. For recent (English) translations, refer to D. Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*. ed. T. J. Lewis. Atlanta 2002, pp. 87–88; and B. A. Levine, J.-M. de Tarragon, and A. Robertson, "The Patrons of the Ugaritic Dynasty (KTU 1.161) (1.105)," in *Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, ed. W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 357–358, hereafter *COS* 1.105. Refer also the French translations found in the studies of Bordreuil and Pardee (cited below) as well the treatment in J.-M. de Tarragon, "Les rituels," in *Textes Ougaritiques, Tome II: Textes Religieux et Rituels, Correspondance*, ed. A. Caquot, J.-M. d. Tarragon, and J.-L. Cunchillos, Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient (Paris: Éditions du CERF, 1989), pp. 103–110.

document it is necessary to discuss the text as a whole (along with its conceptual divisions). Therefore, The text here follows the editions published by Pierre Bordreuil and Dennis Pardee,⁷ as well as Wayne Pitard,⁸ based upon their work with the tablet in Aleppo, Syria.⁹ The vocalized text and translation below draws from upon the studies of Dennis Pardee and Theodore Lewis.¹⁰

2. Title and Dedication of the Dead King

- | | |
|---|--|
| (1) <i>sipru dabahī zalmi</i> | “Sacrifice of the Shades” liturgy: |
| (2) <i>qura’tumu rapi’ī ’a[rṣi]</i> | You are summoned, O Rephaim of the earth, |
| (3) <i>quba’tumu qibūṣī di[dāni]</i> | You are invoked, O council of the Didanu! |
| (4) <i>qura’ā ’Ulkn rap[i’u]</i> | <i>Ulkn</i> , the <i>Raphi</i> ’, is summoned, |
| (5) <i>qura’ā Trmn rapi[’u]</i> | <i>Trmn</i> , the <i>Raphi</i> ’, is summoned, |
| (6) <i>qura’ā Sdn-w-rdn</i> | <i>Sdn-w-rdn</i> is summoned, |
| (7) <i>qura’ā Tr ’ilmn</i> | <i>Tr ’ilmn</i> is summoned, |
| (8) <i>qura’ū rapi’īma qudmīyyīma</i> | the Rephaim of old are summoned! |
| (9) <i>qura’tumu rapi’ī ’arṣi</i> | You are summoned, O Rephaim of the earth, |
| (10) <i>quba’tumu qibūṣī didāni</i> | You are invoked, O council of the Didanu! |
| (11) <i>qura’ā ’ammiṭtamru malku</i> | King Ammishtamru is summoned |
| (12) <i>qura’ā ’ū niqmaddu malku</i> | King Niqmaddu is summoned as well! |
| (13) <i>kussa’i niqmaddi ’ibbakiyī</i> | O throne of Niqmaddu, be bewept. |
| (14) <i>wa-yidma’ hidāma pa’néhu</i> | May he shed tears, the footstool of his soles. |
| (15) <i>lē panēhu yabkiyu tulhanu malki</i> | Before him, may the king’s table weep. |
| (16) <i>wa-yibla’ā ’udma’ātihu</i> | May it swallow down its tears. |
| (17) <i>’udmatu wa ’udmatu ’udamātī</i> | Misery! Misery of miseries! ¹¹ |

Part A begins with a formal summons of royal ancestors that consists of groups of distant dead (the Rephaim¹² and Didanu) followed by two historical kings. The dead are summoned in lines 2–12 using

7. P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, “Le rituel funéraire ougaritique RS.34.126,” *Syria* 59 (1982) 121–128. J. F. Healey, “Ritual Text KTU 1.161 - Translation and Notes,” *UF* 10 (1977) 83–88; idem, “Mlk/Rp’um and the Kispu,” *UF* 10 (1977) 89–91. See also J. C. de Moor, “Rāpi’ūma – Rephaim,” *ZAW* 88 (1976) 333–336, 341–345. These studies were based on Caquot’s transliteration.

8. W. T. Pitard, “The Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126,” *BASOR* (1978) 65–75; and “RS 34.126: Notes on the Text,” *Maarav* 4 (1987) 75–86, 111–155 (plates).

9. The text first appeared in transcription in A. Caquot, “Hébreu et Araméen,” *Annuaire du Collège de France* 75 (1975–76), pp. 427–429; and photographs in C. F. A. Schaefer-Forrer, “Épaves d’une bibliothèque d’Ugarit,” in *Ugaritica* 7, ed. C. F. A. Schaeffer (Paris.; P. Geuthner, 1978), Plates VII–IX.

10. D. Pardee, *Les textes rituels*, vol. 2: Chapitres 54–83, Appendices et Figures, Ras Shamra-Ugarit 12. Paris 2000, pp. 816–825; and P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, *Manuel d’ougaritique*, vol. 2. Choix de textes, Glossaire, Geuthner Manuels. Paris 2004, pp. 63–65. T. J. Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, Harvard Semitic Monographs, No. 39. Atlanta 1989, pp. 7–10. The publication of studies based on this text are prolific, refer to the bibliographies in the works cited above.

11. Bordreuil and Pardee, “Le rituel funéraire ougaritique, RS 34.126”, 123, 126..

12. The lexical item *rp’u* is translated here as Rephaim. This study acknowledges that the translation utilizes a biblical term, but it also recognizes that biblical literature preserves a vestige of the same phenomena encountered in Late Bronze Age sources from Ugarit. Although the etymology of the term will probably never be established with any certainty, this study will avoid a vocalization based on the root sense of “healer.” Never once are the Rephaim involved in healing practices in the ancient sources, as noted in T. J. Lewis, “Toward a Literary Translation of the Rapuma Texts,” in *Ugarit, Religion and Culture: Essays Presented in Honour of Professor John C.L. Gibson*, ed. N. Wyatt, W. G. E. Watson, and J. B. Lloyd, Ugaritisch-biblische Literatur; 12. (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1996), p. 142; and K. van der Toorn, “Funerary Rituals and Beatific Afterlife in Ugaritic Texts and in the Bible,” *BiOr* 48 (1991) 57. (The interpretation suggested by van der Toorn is the adj. “pure,” based on lexical

remote passive verbal forms (or performative utterances) built on the SC-form of the verbs *qr'a* and *qb'a* (specifically G-passive).¹³ This interpretation is grammatically correct,¹⁴ and it maintains an order of uniformity found in the unit. Furthermore, the reading is consistent with the passive element of the liturgy (nowhere in the ritual is an agent specifically named),¹⁵ which represents a ritually appropriate form of address.¹⁶ The last section of Part A (lines 13–17) calls out the implements symbolic of Niqmaddu's royal sovereignty in order to begin his lamentation. The throne of Niqmaddu (*kussi' Niqmaddi* [line 13]) is the first object that is addressed. Other pieces of furniture are also told to weep (the king's footstool and table) and collectively they represented the office of kingship. Yet, it is the throne that is most significant and this single object symbolized Niqmaddu's individual sovereignty.

Previous studies have noted the significance of the throne in other texts that involve dead kings, notably the Mari *kispu*-ritual (12803) and Isa 14:9.¹⁷ These studies, however, only emphasize the particularity of enthronement in the netherworld.¹⁸ The throne of a dead king played a critical role within a much wider political context that included royal funerary rituals and dynastic succession. The criticality of the throne as a political symbol is evident in the biblical Hebrew phrase *yāšab 'al-kissē* that is associated with dynastic succession,¹⁹ note for example the formulaic use in 2 Kg 13:13: “he (Jeroboam II) sat upon his (Joash's) throne.” The throne's symbolic power was granted to whoever was installed upon it, and while a defunct king may have been portrayed as an enthroned sovereign, his death would

lists.) The vocalization here (*rapi'ūma*) is the Stative form of *vrp'* (“robust; healthy”), see Lewis, *ibid*, and Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, p. 14. The interpretation (which goes back to Frank Moore Cross) elicits the paradox inherent in the Rephaim, who are heroes now resident in the netherworld: the “hale ones” are members of the dead.

13. S. L. Sanders, “Performative Utterances and Divine Language in Ugaritic,” *JNES* 63 (2004) 174–177. To quote Theodore Lewis, the G-Passive in this text “is analogous to the Akkadian *Koinzidenzfall* in which the words recited represent the very action to which they refer.” Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, p. 13. (Refer to GAG § 80 c, p. 13 n. 37.) See also R. M. Good, “Supplementary Remarks on the Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126,” *BASOR* (1980) 41. Good reconciled the syntactical problems in this text by interpreting the verbal forms in lines 2–12 as internal passives.

14. In lines 2, 8 and 9 the Rephaim are interpreted as vocative subjects, marked in the oblique (accusative) case, see Sanders, “Performative Utterances and Divine Language in Ugaritic,” 176; cf. also Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, p. 13 n. 35.

15. Sanders, “Performative Utterances and Divine Language in Ugaritic,” 177.

16. This form of address is explained by Sanders (“Performative Utterances and Divine Language in Ugaritic,” 176–177) as a “polite, or remote passive voice, with no marked agent … [is a] denial of personal agency, and thus responsibility … well known in Mesopotamian ritual.” Here Sanders acknowledges the observations of N. Wyatt concerning Ugaritic religion, (*Religious Texts from Ugarit*, 2nd ed., vol. 53, Biblical Seminar. London, New York 2002, pp. 432–433 n. 8). To quote Pardee regarding the language of this text: Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, p. 86: “[t]he poetic form of the text appears, … to reflect the perception at Ugarit that talk about gods was to be poetic in form (as opposed to the essentially administrative talk about the care and feeding of the gods in their earthly sanctuaries that characterizes the prose ritual texts).”

17. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, “Totenverehrung in Māri (12803) und Ugarit (KTU 1.161),” *UF* 12 (1980) 381–382; elsewhere they suggest that *lks< i>h* in lines 20–21 is parallel with *arṣ* (taken as the netherworld), see “Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit (II): Nr. 6 – Epigraphische und inhaltliche Probleme in KTU 1.161,” *UF* 15 (1983) 21. For other discussions of thrones in the netherworld, see J. G. Taylor, “The First and Last Thing to Do in Mourning: KTU 1.161 and Some Parallels,” in *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical & Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie*, ed. P. C. Craigie, L. M. Eslinger, and G. Taylor (Sheffield, England: JSOT, 1988), pp. 169–171.

18. Taylor, “The First and Last Thing to Do in Mourning: KTU 1.161 and Some Parallels,” pp. 161–174. For Taylor, the ritual involves the throne's descent to the netherworld in order to provide seating for Niqmaddu. Earlier studies include de Moor, “Rāpi'ūma – Rephaim,” 335. Healey, “Ritual Text KTU 1.161,” 87. See also M. Pope, “Notes on the Rephaim Texts from Ugarit,” in *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein*, ed. M. d. J. Ellis (Hamden, Conn.: Published for the Academy by Archon Books, 1977), p. 180.

19. A similar phrase is found in Akkadian; see e.g., its occurrence in an Amarna letter (EA 17:11).

have left it vacant in actuality.²⁰ Therefore, at this stage in the ritual, the throne is empty and in recognition of its bereavement it must mourn the defunct king.

3. *Invocation of the Deity*

(18) <i>iššahinī Šapšu</i>	Grow hot, O Shapshu
<i>wa- iššahinī (19) nayyāri rabbati</i>	Yes, grow hot, O great light!
<i>'alāna Šapši taṣīḥī</i>	Upon high Shapshu cries out:

The next literary unit of lines 18-19 (Part B) invokes Shapshu using imperative verbs, setting a pattern that remains consistent throughout the remaining text (Part C), with the exception of line 19b.²¹ While the exact meaning of the verb *išhn* is debatable (it is used twice in this unit [lines 18-19]),²² the observation of remote passivity in the performatives of lines 2-12 may indicate that the verbal form here is an N-stem, corresponding to the G-stem passive. Thus, the verb should be interpreted as *iššahinī* ($\sqrt{\text{išhn}}$, “to grow hot”),²³ an imperative of the N-stem that is a form known also in Akkadian and often related with Shamash (*AhW* 1128b). It is important not to deny Shapshu’s role as psychopomp, as this deity is connected with the netherworld and probably held some role associated with the accompaniment of the defunct king to the afterlife.²⁴ Yet, the importance of the goddess in this liturgy is her role as the divine protector of order who is called upon to oversee and bless the ritual’s participants (i.e., the dead king and the new king).²⁵ Effectively, the summoning of Shapshu marks the division of the ritual, as this unit (Part B) stands between the invocation of the dead and the instruction of an unnamed living participant (Part C).

20. The actual throne of the king was probably used in this ritual, thus making it unlikely that a throne was buried (along with its former occupant) or dedicated to an effigy of the defunct ruler. This is not to deny the possibility that statues (or effigies) were used in the ritual, an interpretation that is partially influenced by the interpretation of *zlm* as “statue.” See, e.g. Dietrich and Loretz, “Totenverehrung in Māri (12803) und Ugarit (KTU 1.161),” 381–382; and “Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit (II): Nr. 6 – Epigraphische und inhaltliche Probleme in KTU 1.161,” 18.

21. The form *tsh* used in line 19b in the final line addressing Shapsh may be a Jussive (PC^{Sj}) or an Imperfect (PC^L) following Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, p. 88. Vocalized as *taṣīḥī* in *Les textes rituels 2*, p. 819.

22. One suggestion is to render the verb as an N-stem of the root $\sqrt{\text{šhh}}$, reading *iššahī-na* (“to go down/lower oneself”), Pitard, “The Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126,” 71; and Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, p. 23. This interpretation is principally guided by the need to associate Shapshu with the netherworld and to involve her with an activity that is in harmony with the acts of mourning seen elsewhere in the text. The interpretation of *iššahī-na*, however, requires an energetic *nun* where it is easier to interpret the letter as part of the verbal root. Furthermore, in line 19b the combination of the adverb *'In* (“high”) and the final verb in this unit, *tsh* (probably *taṣīḥī*, 2 f.sg PC^{Sj}) complicates any image of Shapshu descending into the netherworld.

23. Pitard, “The Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126,” 71.

24. H. Rouillard, “Rephaim,” in *Dictionary of Demons and Deities in the Bible*, ed. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999), 694. Dietrich and Loretz call attention to the similar role played by Shamash in the Mari *kispu*-ritual, where the sun god determines the order of offerings (12803 Obv. Col. I. Lines 12–15). Dietrich and Loretz, “Totenverehrung in Māri (12803) und Ugarit (KTU 1.161),” 382; and “Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit (II): Nr. 6 – Epigraphische und inhaltliche Probleme in KTU 1.161,” 21.

25. With regard to her role in the Baal Cycle, Wiggins has stated that Shapshu: “... is a royal messenger, bearing the news of kingship.” S. A. Wiggins, “Shapsh, Lamp of the Gods,” in *Ugarit, Religion and Culture: Essays Presented in Honour of Professor John C.L. Gibson*, ed. N. Wyatt, W. G. E. Watson, and J. B. Lloyd, Ugarisch-biblische Literatur; 12. (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1996), p. 337. While he still maintains the goddesses role as psychopomp, Wiggins acknowledges that her primary role is the supervision of all events and activities, Wiggins, “Shapsh, Lamp of the Gods,” pp. 345–346.

The throne and the goddess Shapshu affirm the conceptual divide of Parts A and C. The two occurrences of the throne effectively frame the call to Shapshu and it is important to recognize that the combined symbolism represented the passage of kingship from the dead to the living. This indicates that the unnamed male figure addressed in lines 20–22, at the beginning of Part C, is Ammurapi.²⁶ It is Ammurapi who is commanded to approach the throne of his lord and father in line 20, and it is Ammurapi who is commanded to publicly mourn in lines 20–22.

4. Acknowledgment of the New King

- | | |
|---|---|
| (20) <i>'atra [ba] 'alīka
lē kussa 'ihu</i> ²⁷ | "To the place of your lord,
to his throne, |
| <i>'atra (21) ba 'alīka
'arṣa rid
'arṣa (22) rid
wa-šipla 'apari
tahta (23) Sdn-w-rdn
tahta <u>tr</u> (24) 'llmn
tahta rapa 'īma qudmīyyīma</i> | to the place of your lord,
descend to the earth,
descend to the earth,
lower (yourself) to the dust! ²⁸ |
| (25) <i>tahta 'Ammittamru malki</i> | In <i>Sdn-w-rdn</i> 's stead, |
| (26) <i>tahta 'ū Niqmaddi malki</i> | In <i>Tr- 'llmn</i> 's stead, |
| (27) <i>'aštaya wa <u>ta</u> 'a[y <u>tinā</u>] wa <u>ta</u> 'ay</i> ²⁹ | In the Rephaim of old's stead, |
| (28) <i>talāṭa wa <u>ta</u> 'ay 'a[rba] 'a wa <u>ta</u> 'a[y]</i> | In King Ammishtamru's stead, |
| (29) <i>hamiša wa <u>ta</u> 'ay <u>titta</u> wa <u>ta</u> 'ay</i> | In King Niqmaddu's stead. |
| (30) <i>šab 'a wa <u>ta</u> 'ay
taqaddim 'uṣṣūrī (31) šalāmi
šalāmu 'Ammura[pi']</i> | One benefaction! Two benefaction! |
| (32) <i>wa šalāmu banīhu
šalāmu Tarriyelli</i> | Three benefaction! Four benefaction! |
| (33) <i>šalāmu bētihu</i> | Five benefaction! Six benefaction! |
| | Seven benefaction! |
| | Cast forth a bird (offering) |
| | Peace, peace upon Ammurapi! |
| | Peace upon his sons! |
| | Peace upon Tharriyelli! |
| | Peace upon his house! |

26. Cf. similarly C. E. L'Heureux, *Rank among the Canaanite Gods: El, Ba'al, and the Rephaim*, vol. 21, Hsm. Missoula, MT 1979, p. 191. L'Heureux maintains that prostration of the living king before the royal ancestors is the ceremony's main purpose.

27. Written *ks<i>h* (with the affixed preposition), representing the spelling of "throne" with the loss of the 'aleph-i due to haplography and the 3 m.sg possessive suffix. This suggestion is listed as a possibility in Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, p. 25. For further explanation, see D. T. Tsumura, "The Interpretation of the Ugaritic Funerary Text KTU 1.161," in *Official Cult and Popular Religion in the Ancient Near East*, ed. E. Matsushima (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1993), pp. 51–52. See also Wiggins, "Shapsh, Lamp of the Gods," p. 345 n. 44.

28. The verb *špl* is rendered as an imperative, though it could also be an infinitive (*šapal*), so Pardee, *Les textes rituels 2*, p. 819.

29. A type of offering, interpreted it as 2 m.sg imperative, D-Stem from *√t'* ("generous, benefaction"), essentially: "Offer a proficient sacrifice." Refer to B. A. Levine and J.-M. de Tarragon, "Dead Kings and Rephaim: The Patrons of the Ugaritic Dynasty," *JAOS* 104 (1984) 653; see also *COS* 1.105: 27–30 (and n. 13). The difficulty is in finding an appropriate form of English to translate the imperative here. Levine, et al., have also suggested that an infinitive form would also work here, and this would certainly offer an easier rendering into English. Yet, the imperatives in Part C suggest that the verbal forms in Part D are imperative as well (addressing Ammurapi).

Part B begins with the command to approach a throne located at the “place of your lord” (*'atra ba 'alika*).³⁰ The term *'atra* is taken as a noun following an earlier suggestion by Wayne Pitard and more recently David Tsumura, who compare the term with the Akkadian cognate *ašru*.³¹ A closer parallel is observed in an Old Aramaic funerary stele found at Neirab, Syria (KAI 225), where the cognate refers to the place of the effigy and burial of the priest Sinzeribni.³² Another example from an Old Aramaic source, the Sefire Treaties (KAI 222 A1: 5), highlights the political significance of the term where the “place” refers to a position of power (specifically kingship) that the king’s son may ascend in the future.³³ In the Sefire example, the term is unrelated to death, but it presents an apt parallel because it is used in reference to dynastic succession. The idea of “place” transcends any narrow association with death, for it involves a position of power that spanned the past, present and future. The Ugaritic term *'atra* is used frequently in the Rephaim texts (KTU 1.20–22),³⁴ and in KTU 1.22 i, 2–4 the term appears in the fragmentary lines of what may have been a dynastic oracle.³⁵ This broken part of the text makes reference to the royal lineage, reading: “your son [...] grandson (in) your place” (*bnk.[...]**bnbn. 'atr**k*). The reference in this line is more than a divine assurance of an heir; the promise is for a perdurable lineage. A successive line of future sons insured the continuity of political privilege, but the essence of this continuity is the preservation of the royal house’s “place” (*'atra*) of power through the act of dynastic succession.³⁶ Thus, the “place” in KTU 1.161: 20 should be recognized as a hypostatized position of power, visibly marked by the throne.

30. Most studies have preferred the interpretation “after your lord,” see e.g., *COS* 1.105: 20–21 and “à la suite de ton seigneur” in de Tarragon, “Les rituels,” pp. 108–109; cf. the comments in Rouillard, “Rephaim,” p. 694. Pardee, who prefers this translation, rejects the interpretation of “place” (*endroit*) as insufficiently based, Pardee, *Les textes rituels* 2, p. 822. The study here seeks to demonstrate that the translation “place” works lexically and is supported by the interpretation of the ritual.

31. Tsumura, “The Interpretation of the Ugaritic Funerary Text KTU 1.161,” pp. 45–46, cf. 43. Wayne Pitard had also read the term as a noun (“place”), suggesting that it referred to the place of dead king’s funerary offering (specifically a libation offering), “The Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126,” 71–72. (Pitard, however, has since shown that the evidence for post-mortem libation offerings at Ugarit is problematic, “The ‘Libation Installations’ Of the Tombs at Ugarit,” *BA* 57 [1994] 20–37). See also the translation “shrine” found in L’Heureux, *Rank among the Canaanite Gods: El, Ba’al, and the Rephaim*, pp. 188, 191.

32. This inscription warns against the removal of Sinzeribni’s “effigy and burial from their place” (*slm' znh w'rṣt' mn 'ṣrh* [KAI 225: 6–8]), which highlights the spatial importance involved here. This “place” (*'ṣr* = *'atra*) encompassed both the effigy (the inscribed stele bearing Sinzeribni’s image) and the burial.

33. KAI 222 A1: 5 refers to “the sons who will come up in his place” (*bnwh.zy.yskn.b 'ṣr[h]*); see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*, Revised ed., vol. 19/A, *Biblica et Orientalia*. Rome 1995, p. 67.

34. In these texts the term predominantly refers to the location where the Rephaim are to begin their symposium. Lewis, “Toward a Literary Translation of the Rapiuma Texts,” pp. 126, 130; corresponding to Pitard’s KTU 1.22 B (refer to his edition in “A New Edition of The ‘Rāpi’ūma’ Texts: KTU 1.20–22,” *BASOR* (1992) 53, 56–57).

35. J. Tropper, *Nekromantie: Totenbefragung im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*, AOAT. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1989, pp. 144–150; and van der Toorn, “Funerary Rituals and Beatific Afterlife in Ugaritic Texts and in the Bible,” 52. Refer to the brief comments in Rouillard, “Rephaim,” p. 693.

36. A similar sense and meaning of *'atra* may be found in the well known passage of the Kirta Epic (KTU 1.17 i. 28) that describe the actions of a dutiful son. This line is much discussed in scholarship (with very little agreement); see the review of interpretations found in Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, pp. 60–67. (In this passage, Lewis prefers the reading “his footsteps” [*'atruhu*].) Note in particular Lewis’s discussion of J.C.L. Gibson’s comparison of *'atra* in Kirta with *mqm* in KAI 214: 14, as well as examples of *māqōm* in the Hebrew Bible where the term is associated with death, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, p. 64 n. 61. (Regarding *māqōm* and *'atra*, *vide infra* n. 37.) The most common interpretation of *'atra* in Kirta involves some form of family tomb such as those found beneath the floors of domestic structures at Ras Shamra/Ugarit; e.g., D. Pardee, “The Kirta Epic,” in *The Context of Scripture I*, ed. W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger (Leiden: Brill, 1992), p. 344, n. 8. It would seem that the general sense of *'atra* in these texts is one of a place that visibly marked the ancestral right of a kinship group.

The '*atra*' referenced in this ritual was probably a designated locus within the palatial complex where a royal image was set,³⁷ although it is unclear how this "place" would have been physically manifested.³⁸ The relationship between the place and its symbolic object is apparent in the suffix attached to "throne / his throne," which refers to the twice-mentioned "lord" (*ba'al*) of lines 20–21. The throne here is most likely the "throne of Niqmaddu" (*kussi' niqmaddi*) that begins the lamentations in line 13. The verbal forms used in lines 21–22 are all masculine imperatives, *rida* ("descend" [used twice]) and *šipla* ("lower [yourself]"), and the addressee here is Ammurapi who is instructed in lines 20–22 to descend from a throne to the earth ('*arṣu*) and dust ('*aparu*).³⁹ It is unnecessary to reconstruct a scenario in which the throne symbolically descends into the netherworld.⁴⁰ Nor is it required to interpret the imperatives as directed toward the dead king, Niqmaddu.⁴¹ Although the verbs *yrd* and *špl* effectively emulate descent into the netherworld,⁴² they are most typically used to describe the act of mourning performed by the survivor.⁴³ Thus, the active participant in this section of KTU 1.161 can be no other than the new king,

37. Lewis's comment on the translation of '*atra*' in KTU 1.20 ii is appropriate here also: "'Shrine' adequately connotes the sacred quality of the place in question while being vague enough not to overstate the precision of the Ugaritic." Lewis, "Toward a Literary Translation of the Rapiuma Texts," p. 143.

38. For example, the bottom of the Neirab stele (KAI 225) has a base fitted for a socket in the floor, indicating that it was mounted in a specific place. Yet on the second stele (KAI 226) for Si'gabbari, where the term is absent, this physical feature is lacking. In addition, the palace tomb at Qatna, which dates from the Middle to Late Bronze Ages, had statues of royal ancestors guarding the entrance of the main chamber, P. Pfälzner, "Die Politik und der Tod im Königtum von Qatna," *Nurnberger Blätter zur Archäologie* 190 (2002–2003) 93–94; cf. 92. Note also the royal mortuary cults of Iron Age kingdoms in the northern Levant, specifically at Sam'al (Zincirli, Turkey) and Guzana (Tell Halaf, Syria). In both examples, statues as effigies adorned shrines dedicated to the royal ancestors, refer H. Niehr, "Bestattung und Ahnenkult in den Königshäusern von Sam'al (Zincirli) und Guzāna (Tell Halāf) in Nordsyrien," *ZDPV* 122 (2006) 111–134. The analogy is significant if Niehr's interpretation of KAI 214:14–15 is correct. According to Niehr, the term *māqōm* in this inscription from Sam'al refers to the cultic space at the (nearby) site of Gerçin, which was the location of the extramural royal cemetery, "Zum Totenkult der Könige von Sam'al im 9. und 8. Jh. v. Chr.," *SEL* 11 (1994) 57–73. Thus, the term refers to a cultic space devoted to dead kings in the Iron Age kingdom of Sam'al, see Niehr, "Zum Totenkult der Könige von Sam'al im 9. und 8. Jh. v. Chr.," 69. This term is the semantic cognate (in Phoenician and Hebrew) to Aramaic '*tr*', and also Ugaritic '*atra*'. In the Eshmunazor inscription, however, *māqōm* refers to the entire burial complex containing the king's sarcophagus, KAI 14: 3–4: *škb 'nk bħlt z wbqbr z wbmqm š bnt*. In this inscription, the term occurs in a relative clause that describes the "place," built by the king, where he lies in his "box" (i.e., sarcophagus that contains the inscription) and "burial."

39. The use of the terms 'earth' (i.e., netherworld) and 'dust,' together with the verb *yrd*, found elsewhere at Ugarit, as well as other Northwest Semitic sources, indicate that lines 20–22 describe an act of mourning. Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, p. 44. The term '*arṣu*' here is polyvalent as it refers to both the ground (where the physical act of mourning is performed) and the netherworld. As Lewis notes (*Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, pp. 43–44), the emulation of the dead is a common feature of mourning rites; see also S. M. Olyan, *Biblical Mourning: Ritual and Social Dimensions*. Oxford 2004, 39–45.

40. See Pope, "Notes on the Rephaim Texts from Ugarit," p. 180. This interpretation is defended by Taylor, "The First and Last Thing to Do in Mourning: KTU 1.161 and Some Parallels," pp. 151–177. Cf. also Healey, "Ritual Text KTU 1.161," 87; and Tropper, *Nekromantie*, p. 149.

41. See Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, pp. 40–42, although he does discuss the interpretation that the action is performed by Ammurapi, *ibid.*, pp. 43–44. As Lewis correctly observes (*idem.*, p. 26), the imperatives can only be directed at Niqmaddu or 'Ammurapi.

42. See Taylor, "The First and Last Thing to Do in Mourning: KTU 1.161 and Some Parallels," pp. 161–162, cf. 162 ns. 27–28.

43. This seems apparent in the examples cited by B. A. Levine and J.-M. de Tarragon, "Dead Kings and Rephaim: The Patrons of the Ugaritic Dynasty," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 104 (1984) 656–658. Discussed also in Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, pp. 42–44; cf. KTU 5.6:12–14, 24–25; KTU 6.1:1ff; Gen 37:35. Lewis notes that 2 Sam 12:15–24 involves David emulating death in his vigil beside his son's deathbed.

Ammurapi, who claims the throne of his lord and father, Niqmaddu, and physically descends from it to engage in symbolic acts of mourning and lamentation.

The recognition of a focus on the successor in the ritual's second half allows for a new understanding of the preposition *ṭht* in this text. This term has been one of the more peculiar lexical features of KTU 1.161 where it occurs repeatedly throughout lines 22b–26, in each instance preceding a proper noun.⁴⁴ Almost all commentators have followed the most common sense of the term and interpret it as a preposition,⁴⁵ meaning “below; under.”⁴⁶ The general idea behind this translation is that the persons described by the preposition are all buried and are therefore beneath the surface of the earth in the netherworld.⁴⁷ The problem with this translation is that it does not add any clarity to the text, forcing scholars to infer activities that are otherwise unattested in the text itself.⁴⁸ As a result, several attempts have been made to reconstruct the activities associated with lines 22b–26. One intriguing idea is that the preposition refers to the ritual lowering of the dead king into a pit-installation beside the royal tombs inside the palace.⁴⁹ This action would ritually enact the dead king joining his ancestors in the afterlife, and

44. See the discussion in Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*, p. 439 n 32.

45. A few studies have suggested, implausibly, that *ṭht* here is a noun. For instance, the interpretation “throne,” based on Arabic *taḥt* of the same meaning, (Healey, “Ritual Text KTU 1.161,” 85 and 87) cannot work because the Arabic term is a loanword from Persian (Yona Sabar, personal communication). Another interpretation takes *ṭht* as a term for the netherworld, S. M. Cecconi, “*ṭht* in KAI 2, 3 e in KTU 1.161, 22ss,” *UF* 13 (1981) 27–31. Brian Schmidt, following Gregorio del Olmo Lete, has posited that the term is a verb (refer *infra*, n. 48).

46. See, e.g., the brief review in de Tarragon, “Les rituels,” 109 n. 336. In addition, it should be noted that *rp'lm* is morphologically oblique (m.pl), which largely excludes the possibility that *ṭht* is adverbial, G. del Olmo Lete, *Canaanite Religion: According to the Liturgical Texts of Ugarit*. Winona Lake, IN 2004, p. 196 n 88. For the argument that *ṭht* is an adverbial accusative, rendered “below is...” see R. M. Shipp, *Of Dead Kings and Dirges: Myth and Meaning in Isaiah 14:4b-21*, vol. 11, Academia Biblica. Atlanta 2002, p. 58 n. 78.

47. To be sure, the preposition *ṭht* is found with the meaning “below” in reference to either the grave or the netherworld. See for instance KAI 2, where it is inscribed at the entrance of Ahiram’s tomb in Byblos (found in J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, vol. 3. Phoenician inscriptions, including inscriptions in the mixed dialect of Arslan Tash. Oxford 1982). Note the discussion of this inscription by Reinhard Lehmann (*Dynastensarkophage mit szenischen Reliefs aus Byblos und Zypern. Teil 1.2: Die Inschrift(en) des Ahiram-Sarkophags und die Schachtinschrift des Grabes V in Jbeil (Byblos)*, FPZP. Mainz 2005, pp. 42–53), who views *ṭht* here as a concrete reference (“stock-werk”) understood as an accusative of place (*ibid*, p. 50). Likewise, see the denominative adjective *ṭhty*, which serves as a noun in the expression “depths of the earth” (*taḥtiöt ‘āres*), i.e., the netherworld (Isa 43:23). The term is used similarly throughout Ezekiel 32, where it relates to *s̄’ōl*; cf. also the adjectival use in Deut 32:22; Sir 51:6; Ps 86:13 and Isa 14:9. The preposition can also be used to describe the treatment of the dead as in Isa 14:11 (“worms beneath you”) and the Deir ‘Allah inscription (KAI 312 B: 11): “I will place [--] beneath your head (*ṭht.r šk*), you will lay in your eternal resting place.”

48. The same problem exists with the suggestion that *ṭht* is a 2 m.sg verb from the *√taḥta*, meaning “descend,” (i.e., descent into the netherworld), see B. B. Schmidt, *Israel’s Beneficent Dead: Ancestor Cult and Necromancy in Ancient Israelite Religion and Tradition*. Winona Lake 1996, p. 119; following an earlier suggestion by G. del Olmo Lete, “El mito de Ba’lu: Prosodia y hermenéutica,” *AuOr* 1 (1983) 171. Schmidt goes further and suggests that *ṭhm* in line 26, which is usually taken as a scribal error, is also a 2 m.sg verb from *√hmm* = “warm.” Thus, he renders the line as “May you remain warm, yea, Niqmaddu, O king,” Schmidt, *Israel’s Beneficent Dead*, pp. 119–120 (see p. 108). While, this translation may refer back to Shapshu (invoked earlier in the ritual), it hardly makes sense of the ritual nor is it consistent with the previous lines. The interpretation of this ritual offered in this present study understands the new king (‘Ammurapi) as the focus of the ritual’s second half (lines 20–30); thus, it is unnecessary to interpret *ṭht* (or even *ṭhm*) as 2nd person verbs.

49. This interpretation is found in Pardee’s publications of the text, “Marzihi, Kispu, and the Ugaritic Funerary Cult: A Minimalist View,” in *Ugarit, Religion and Culture: Essays Presented in Honour of Professor John C.L. Gibson*, ed. N. Wyatt, W. G. E. Watson, and J. B. Lloyd, Ugaritsch-biblische Literatur (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1996), pp. 274–275; *idem.*, *Les textes rituels 2*, pp. 823–824. See also the brief remarks in J.-F. Salles, “Rituel Mortuaire et Rituel Social à Ras Shamra / Ugarit,” in *The Archaeology of Death in the Ancient Near East*, ed. S. Campbell and A. Green, Oxbow Monograph 51 (Oxford: Oxbow, 1995), p. 179.

would correspond with the imperatives to draw below in lines 21–22 occurring simultaneously with the sacrifices of lines 27–30. Indeed, pits are found in other royal tombs such as the Palace of the Šakkanakku in Mari.⁵⁰ Yet the ritual is not well defined in the text and the proposed action is unparalleled in any other ancient Near Eastern source. Furthermore, archaeologists have yet to properly study the phenomenon of pit-installations inside royal tombs.⁵¹ Ultimately, these reconstructed activities only complicate our understanding of the ritual, as there is little else stated in the text to support their existence.⁵²

The sense and meaning of *tahta* is the key to understanding the purpose of this ritual. The preposition holds a much wider semantic range than simply “under/below,”⁵³ and it is translated here (lines 22b–26) as “in the stead/place of” [...].⁵⁴ This use of the preposition is found in the Hebrew Bible as well as Phoenician inscriptions from the Persian Period,⁵⁵ often in texts that describe the accession of

50. Pardee, *Les textes rituels 2*, p. 823 n 43.

51. The stone-lined pit in question is filled with debris and has not been excavated to determine its depth or the nature of its contents. It is possible that the pit reached the water level and served as a well (along the analogy of wells found in domestic quarters at Ras Shamra). I wish to thank Dennis Pardee for his insight, shared in conversation, regarding the palace tomb and pit. In a recent publication Herbert Niehr discusses the palace pit at Ugarit (and Pardee’s hypothesis) within the context of *api*-pits, such as the installation excavated at Urkesh (Tell Mozan, Syria), leading to the conclusion that Pardee’s reconstructed ritual actions are improbable because of limited access to the installation at the ground level, see H. Niehr, “The Topography of Death in the Royal Palace of Ugarit. Preliminary Thoughts on the Basis of Archaeological and Textual Data,” in *Le royaume d’Ugarit de la Crète à l’Euphrate: nouveaux actes de recherche*, ed. J.-M. Michaud, Proche-Orient et littérature Ougaritique (Sherbrooke, Québec: GGC, 2007), pp. 226–231. For the *api* at Urkesh, Tell Mozan, see M. Kelly-Buccellati, “Ein Hurritischer Gang in die Unterwelt,” *MDOG* 134 (2002) 131–148.

52. A passage in the Ba’al Cycle (5:45–47) where Shapshu returns Baal to the world of the living has influenced much of the discussion regarding *tht*. In this passage, one can interpret *thtk* as meaning that the *rp’m* and the *ilnym* are “under” Shapshu; cf. Levine and Tarragon, “Dead Kings and Rephaim: The Patrons of the Ugaritic Dynasty,” 657 n 34. It is better to interpret *thtk* as a 2 f.sg verb (*tahtuki*) from *√htk*, meaning here “you preside over,” refer the discussion in Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, p. 36 n. 155. See also, D. Pardee, “The Ba’lu Myth,” in *The Context of Scripture I*, ed. W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger (Leiden: Brill, 1992), p. 273 n. 279.

53. Pope, “Notes on the Rephaim Texts from Ugarit,” p. 168 and 178, translated the preposition as “with,” noting elsewhere that it can take the meaning “among”. Refer also the translation “together with,” listed among other possibilities by del Olmo Lete, *Canaanite Religion*, p. 196 (see n. 88).

54. See KTU 4.133, which contains a short list of six proper nouns, two in each line mediated by the preposition *tahta*. S. Segert, *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language: With Selected Texts and Glossary*. Berkeley 1985, p. 79 (§ 56.75); citing KTU 4.133: 2 with the translation: “Abdu-Ilu instead of Ilmilku” (*bdil. tht.ilmlk*). Note, however, the lexical entry in G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition. Part Two [L-Z]*, trans. W. G. E. Watson, vol. 2, HdO I. Leiden 2003, pp. 865–866. The dictionary lists four general meanings for *tht*: (1) the more common meaning of “under, beneath;” (2) the translation “at the feet of...” (citing KTU 1.161: 24ff.); (3) “subordinate to...” (citing KTU 4.133), and (4) “among.” The second meaning is preferred by L’Heureux, *Rank among the Canaanite Gods*, pp. 191–192. Although L’Heureux notes that idiom is usually expressed as: “*tht.p’n...*” Yet, KTU 1.161, and 4.133, both indicate a fifth meaning that is common in Classical Hebrew: “the stead/place of...” This fifth sense of the preposition is certainly related to the fourth, and although “among” still implies inclusion among the ancestors, it is important to specify its nuance as “in [something’s] stead” in order to highlight its political significance in structuring the dynastic lineage. The interpretation “among” is rejected by Wyatt because of its “static” sense, (Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*, p. 439 n. 42), yet it is precisely this sense (i.e., stability) that is at the very heart of dynastic succession – the continuation of power and the preservation of order. The political implications of this preposition are alluded to by del Olmo Lete, *Canaanite Religion*, p. 196 n. 88, who notes its relationship “to the function of the throne “upon” which the “Kings” sit”..

55. C. R. Krahnklov, *A Phoenician-Punic Grammar*, vol. 54, HdO I. Leiden and Boston 2001, p. 258. (See also his *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary*, vol. 90, OLA. Leuven 2000, s.v. “*Tht*.”) A notable occurrence is found in the Eshmunazor sarcophagus inscription (see below). Note also the Phoenician inscription of Kulamuwa, King of Sam’al, where the preposition refers to future kings (lit. his “sons”) who will “sit in my stead [*tht*]” (KAI 24: 13–14).

office. It regularly occurs in formulaic summaries in the Book of Kings (with parallels in Chronicles) that conclude a king's regnal account: "and PN his son ruled in his stead" (*wayyimlōk* PN *b^enō tahtāyw* [refer, e.g., 1 Kg 22:51]). The comparison is appropriate, given the fact that KTU 1.161 and the biblical formulae share an identical context: the death of a king and dynastic succession. With the focus turned to the unnamed king (beginning in lines 20–22a), the purpose of lines 22b–26 is the invocation of the royal ancestors to affirm the new king's proper place in the dynastic line.⁵⁶

The unit of lines 27–30 consists of a specified formula enumerating a series of repetitive sacrifices. In this sense the unit is similar in fashion to the previous unit (lines 23–26) where we have the formulaic recitation of proper nouns and the repetition of the preposition *t̄ht*. Furthermore, the sevenfold sacrifice corresponds in general with the six names listed at the beginning of the text (lines 2–12) plus the final sacrifice of a bird offering (lines 30a–31b) for the new king.⁵⁷ Yet questions remains with regard to the identity of the actual participant performing the sacrifices. It is usually assumed that the person addressed in lines 27–30 was an anonymous priest.⁵⁸ But if the subject of the imperatives in lines 20–22a is the new king, it becomes difficult to assume that another unnamed participant enters the ritual (such as a priest).⁵⁹

The ritual's second part seems to consist of two directives, first to mourn and then to sacrifice, and both effectively bracket the declaration in lines 27–30. The second and final directive (lines 30a–31b), is followed by a concluding declaration: the benediction of 'Ammurapi, his dynasty, the royal family and the kingdom. The benediction is the first and only mention of 'Ammurapi (lines 31b–32a), and it is likely that his name could be acknowledged only after he performed the necessary ritual actions in this commemorative event.⁶⁰

5. Synthesis

The text of KTU 1.161 describes a ritual concerned with the royal dead. Yet beyond this general point, agreed upon by all (to some extent), the specific nature of the ritual itself has remained a problem because it has defied all attempts at classification. The human response to death is usually divided by

56. Lewis ("Toward a Literary Translation of the Rapiuma Texts," pp. 118–119 n. 9) is correct in comparing this invocation with the Akkadian phrase *šumu zakāru* ("to invoke the name"). The Akkadian phrase is associated not only with Mesopotamian ancestor cults but also is a prominent feature of succession rituals.

57. As noted by Lewis (*Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, p. 31). The seven sacrifices were probably performed at one time, possibly before a symbol or icon of the royal ancestors, rather than over a series of seven days, as suggested by Healey, "Ritual Text KTU 1.161," 87

58. Pitard saw lines 27–30 as an extispicy incantation intended to gage the ancestor's approval, Pitard, "The Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126," 67, 72

59. The problem of changing referents and multiple agents occurs in the attempt to read the verbal forms of lines 2–12 as an alternation of imperfect (Jussive) and imperatives, found in Dietrich and Loretz, "Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit (II): Nr. 6 – Epigraphische und inhaltliche Probleme in KTU 1.161," 18–19. Although they state (*ibid.*, 23): "Äußerst bemerkenswert ist der poetische Aufbau des Textes. Der *Parallelismus membrorum* erleichtert wesentlich sein Verständnis. Daneben ist auch die Verteilung der Sprecherrollen für die Struktur des Textes wesentlich." They are correct, however, in rejecting the *dramatis personae* proposed in M. Dijkstra, J. C. de Moor, and K. Spronk, "Review of: Manfried Dietrich, Oswald Loretz, Joaquín Sanmartín, *Die keilalphabatischen Texte aus Ugarit, einschliesslich der keilalphabatischen Texte ausserhalb Ugarits, Teil 1* (1976)," *BiOr* 38 (1981) 374–375.

60. One possibility is that this blessing, which is almost the climax of the ritual, is the first declaration of the new king's throne name. The King of Ugarit would have held mutiple names as part of his titulary. See, G. del Olmo Lete, "The 'Divine' Names of the Ugaritic Kings," *UF* 18 (1986) 83–95; idem., "Los Nombres 'Divinos' de Los Reyes de Ugarit," *AuOr* 5 (1987) 39–69; and *Canaanite Religion*, pp. 168–184.

scholars into basic classes, which are partly defined in the following quote by the classicist Ian Morris:⁶¹ “(1) the rite-of-passage ceremonies which separate the deceased from the living, producing the archaeological remains of burials which we excavate, and (2) those rituals which provide continued access to the deceased in the afterworld.” A third category is the practice of divination that is directed at the dead, known as necromancy.⁶² Yet, which of these three (funerary rites, ancestor cults, necromancy) represent the most fitting form of classification for the ritual described in KTU 1.161? The ritual does not qualify as necromancy, as it lacks any mantic element that would mark it as such.⁶³ Nor does the ritual contain any reference to burial, a tomb, or even a body; therefore, it cannot be a funerary ritual.⁶⁴ Scholars commonly associate the ritual with an ancestor cult that effectively deified dead kings.⁶⁵ Certainly the royal dead have a place of prominence here,⁶⁶ yet the text offers little evidence that would conform to the definition of ancestor cult.⁶⁷ The ritual simply invokes the ancestors and, aside from the sacrifice at the end, there is no veneration beyond this action. Furthermore, the ritual itself is apparently unrelated to any regularly occurring cult; instead KTU 1.161 seems to be event specific and most would agree that this

61. I. Morris, “The Archaeology of Ancestors: The Saxe / Goldstein Hypothesis Revisited,” *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 1 (1991) 150, following the anthropological work of Max Gluckman and Meyers Fortes. It is important to add that the first is occasional (predicated by death) while the second is regular, as Schmidt has argued (see note below). The distinction between the occasional rituals associated with burials (funerary rites) and the regular observance of mortuary cults (ancestor cults) in ancient Ugarit is discussed in Salles, “Rituel Mortuaire et Rituel Social à Ras Shamra / Ougarit,” pp. 171–184. See also Pardee, “Marzihi, Kispu, and the Ugaritic Funerary Cult,” pp. 273–287.

62. Following Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficent Dead*, pp. 4–12. Schmidt defines four general categories, with funerary rituals (along with mourning customs) and mortuary cults placed alongside the cult of the dead (roughly equivalent to ancestor cults) and necromancy, *Israel's Beneficent Dead*, pp. 4–12. Cf., the brief note in A. Skaist, “The Ancestor Cult and Succession in Mesopotamia,” in *Death in Mesopotamia*, ed. B. Alster, RAI XXVI (Copenhagen 1980), pp. 127–128, n. 3. (Both Schmidt and Skaist base their classifications on the anthropological work of Meyers Fortes.)

63. The ritual is interpreted as a necromantic rite in J. Tropfer, *Nekromantie: Totenbefragung im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*, AOAT 223. Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn 1989, pp. 141–150. Pitard, “The Ugaritic Funerary Text RS 34.126,” 71–72, at one point, implied such an interpretation; however, his approach has become more cautious (see, for example, his observations in “The ‘Libation Installations’ Of the Tombs at Ugarit,” 34–35).

64. Although Klaas Spronk initially treated this text as an ancestor cult (or “death cult”) ritual, (see his *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East*. Neukirchen-Vluyn 1986, pp. 189–193), he refers to it as a ritual related to burial in a later publication (“The Incantations,” in *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, ed. W. G. E. Watson and N. Wyatt, HdO I. Leiden and Boston 1999, p. 283).

65. See, for example, de Moor, “Rāpi’ūma – Rephaim,” 323–345; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, “Neue Studien zu den Ritualtexten aus Ugarit (II), 17–24; and Dietrich and Loretz, “Totenverehrung in Māri (12803) und Ugarit (KTU 1.161),” 381–382. While Dietrich and Loretz interpret the rite as a type of repast that they equate with the *Marzeah*, the ancestor cult interpretation is usually influenced by the well-known *kispu(m)* ritual found in Akkadian sources (see, e.g., de Moor, “Rāpi’ūma – Rephaim,” 333 n. 72). In fact, several scholars have attempted to relate KTU 1.161 with the Mesopotamian ancestor-cult rite. Refer, for instance, Pope, “Notes on the Rephaim Texts from Ugarit,” p. 178; Healey, “Mlkm/Rp’um and the Kispu,” 90. See also Levine and Tarragon (“Dead Kings and Rephaim: The Patrons of the Ugaritic Dynasty”), although to be fair, they state: “[the ritual] shares common objectives with the *kispu(m)*, or sacrifice of the dead, although its overt orientation is somewhat different.” (*ibid.*, p. 654). See also note 103 (below).

66. To a certain degree this study agrees with the brief statement of van der Toorn concerning KTU 1.161, “[t]he special place of the ancestral cult in connection with dynastic claims...are part of the common heritage of the ancient Near East,” K. van der Toorn, “Funerary Rituals and Beatific Afterlife in Ugaritic Texts and the Bible,” *BiOr* 48 (1991) 63.

67. A brief review of the ancestor-cult interpretation (where it is denied) is found in Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficent Dead*, pp. 102–103. For a negative assessment of the *Marzeah* (as a death-cult repast) and the *kispu* (unattested at Ugarit), see Pardee, “Marzihi, Kispu, and the Ugaritic Funerary Cult,” pp. 273–287; cf. also D. Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24e campagne (1961)*, vol. 4, Ras Shamra-Ougarit. Paris 1988, pp. 176–178.

event was the death of Niqmaddu.⁶⁸ But what manner of contextual interpretation can be offered that is relative to this political event? Attempts to read the document as a coronation ritual are unconvincing and fail to explain the motif of mourning, which is so prominent in the text.⁶⁹ This is not to deny the political nature of the ritual, but to place it more accurately within the context of a king's death. In fact, regardless of its classification, the text's multiple points of focus (royal ancestors, dead kings and a living king) combine to indicate the ritual's political function – dynastic succession.

The ritual was probably one component of a larger process that facilitated the transition of power following a king's death. Although the exact classification for this ritual may elude us,⁷⁰ the basic interpretation offered here elucidates the specific function and purpose of KTU 1.161, that purpose being dynastic succession. In addition, the placement of KTU 1.161 within a larger ritual context, albeit one that no longer survives in the sources, allows for a better understanding of the principal actors involved: Niqmaddu, 'Ammurapi and the royal ancestors (the Rephaim and Didanu). The nature of their identities, and the status assigned to these identities, is the key to understanding the ritual action described in this Ugaritic document.

Social actions associated with death (acts of mourning and funerary rites) often serve as transition rituals.⁷¹ The purpose of the transition ritual is to enable the actors involved to assume new identities, as necessitated by death: the dead become an ancestor and the living (bereaved by death) assume roles vacated by their deceased predecessors. The ritual process is of cardinal importance, because it marks the period in which the actors involved essentially hold no stable identity. For instance, the corpse is no longer a living being, but it is not (yet) an ancestor either. This marginal identity represented a fluidity of status (defined by Victor Turner as "state") that is in its essence a question of identity.⁷² Ultimately, the question must be resolved during a middle period (called liminality) that defines the length of time during which the actor's identity is marginalized.⁷³ For a royal dynasty, this liminality was tenuous in the most extreme, representing a period of weakness and vulnerability. Thus, it is probable that a ruling house would have a ritual system in place that would facilitate a smooth transfer of power. In order to do this, the dynasty would have to maintain stable identities for the involved actors to assume. The identities in this ritual document are clear: kingship and the royal ancestry. Yet the two are intrinsically related and

68. For instance, de Tarragon, "Les rituels," pp. 103–104, asserts that the ritual honored the dead king Niqmaddu III, despite the questions that remain about the ritual's precise function: "le service funèbre d'un roi ... ou la commémoration de la disparition de ce roi".

69. Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficent Dead*, pp. 103–104. See the brief statement denying this interpretation in Pardee, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, pp. 86–87. Schmidt's comparison of KTU 1.161 with coronation rituals in Akkadian literature is unconvincing. The few parallels that Schmidt identifies are too general to prove his point and only represent commonalities in royal literature (such as "acclamation of the king"). In addition, the *rapa'ī 'arṣi* do not represent a group of living nobility ("Rephaim of the land") at Ugarit, or anywhere else in the ancient Near East. Furthermore, it is unclear why the motif of mourning would be so prominent in a ceremony whose purpose is to install a new ruler.

70. A fair assessment is offered by Rouillard, "Rephaim," p. 693, who states that the text is "...either a libretto of a funerary service for a king who recently died, or a ritual in commemoration of his death."

71. The term "funerary" is often used to describe this text, see for instance the recent works of Pardee and Pitard. Although KTU 1.161 does not describe a funerary ritual, the described action of the text was certainly associated with the rites and ceremonies that accompanied the royal burial.

72. V. W. Turner, *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. Ithaca, NY 1967, pp. 93–94.

73. Turner, *The Forest of Symbols*, pp. 93–96. In other words, while the initiate moves from one state to the next they endure a period in which they have not status (or, state). This model of transition is built upon Arnold Van Gennep's concept of *rite de passage*, and corresponds with Van Gennep's middle stage: the rite of marginality.

are combined in this ritual to aid the succession of the new ruler. Thus, KTU 1.161 exhibits the process in which a dead king joined the royal ancestors and his son became the new king.⁷⁴

The royal ancestry, the latter identity, is initially marked by the passive verbal forms of lines 2–12.⁷⁵ The repeated and regular usage of the remote passive indicates that the persons invoked are supernatural and belong to the realm of the netherworld. The dead, listed in lines 2–12, consist of two groups and are distinguished by the refrain in lines 2–3 and 9–10.⁷⁶ This refrain forms an inclusio that distinguishes the long dead, collectively referred to as the “Rephaim of old” (*rapa ՚imā qudmiyyimā* [line 8]), from the recently defunct kings (Ammishtamru and Niqmaddu).⁷⁷ This categorical approach to the dead is a critical point in the interpretation of the ritual text and highlights a certain ancestral ideology that is common among ancient Near Eastern king-lists and royal genealogies. It is necessary to place the two groups of the long dead, the Didanu and Rephaim, within this ancestral ideology in order to understand the political import of the ritual as a whole.

The Didanu appear in the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty as well as in the Assyrian King List (written in Akkadian: *'di-ta-nu* and *'di-da-a-nu*, respectively),⁷⁸ and in both sources they occur at the beginning of the register of names (together with other eponymous ancestors).⁷⁹ The names of historical kings follow the general list of ancestors, representing the specific lineage of the respective ruling house

74. The first part of the process (the dead king joining the royal ancestors) is nothing new, as several scholars have already identified this in the ritual (Levine and Tarragon, Pardee, etc.). The second part of the process (the son becoming the new king) has yet to be identified in studies of this text, and naturally the relationship inherent in the ritual’s dual nature has never been discussed.

75. Note that treatments of KTU 1.161 that have argued for a more active role for the participants (both living and dead), what might be called “the privilege of the deceased,” have resisted the interpretation of passive verbs in lines 2–12, cf. Levine and de Tarragon, “Dead Kings and Rephaim: The Patrons of the Ugaritic Dynasty,” 652. Quoted by Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, p. 13.

76. This observation runs counter to interpretations that suggest the summoning of two categories of individuals in lines 2–10: the deceased (6–8) framed by the dual summons of a living warrior class (2–5 and 9–10). According to L’Heureux, *Rank among the Canaanite Gods*, pp. 189, 192. This interpretation is defended by Schmidt, *Israel’s Beneficent Dead*, p. 106; see also his treatment of this text in, “Afterlife Beliefs: Memory as Immortality,” *NEA* 63 (2000) 238–239. Schmidt’s conjecture that the repetition of lines 2–3 and 9–10 is a chiasm that distinguishes one class of figures from another is problematic. This literary style is used to focus attention on the unit that is framed and not to distinguish two separate semantic categories. Furthermore, the ‘traditio-historical’ interpretation of the *rapa ՚ū ՚arši* as a special warrior class that was formed in the waning days of the Ugaritic kingdom lacks support and is unconvincing (see *Israel’s Beneficent Dead*, 90–93 and 104–106). For instance, there is no mention of this specialized social category in Ugaritic administrative documents, as noted by several scholars. J. F. Healey, “The Last of the Rephaim,” in *Back to the Sources: Biblical and near Eastern Studies in Honour of Dermot Ryan*, ed. K. J. Cathcart and J. F. Healey Dublin 1989, p. 37; citing A. F. Rainey, “The Ugaritic Texts in *Ugaritica* 5,” *JAOS* 94 (1974) 188. See also J. N. Ford, “The ‘Living Rephaim’ Of Ugarit: Quick or Defunct?,” *UF* 24 (1992) 82; who cites D. Pardee, “Ugaritic,” *AfO* 28 (1981–1982) 266–267.

77. Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, pp. 29–30. Lewis follows Levine and de Tarragon, “Dead Kings and Rephaim,” 655–656. See similarly, Ford, “The ‘Living Rephaim’ Of Ugarit: Quick or Defunct?” 81–83. Ford’s objection to the “inclusio” interpretation is unnecessary. It is unclear what form of parallelism is at play in lines 4–7 and 11–12, other than the fact that they all represent the dignified dead (summoned in an identical fashion). While Ford is certainly correct that line 8 is a summarization of lines 4–7 (they are all Rephaim of old), this does not deny the recognition of inclusio as a focus device in this text. Redundancy is hardly a concern in ancient literature.

78. For the alternation in the orthography of this proper noun, see R. W. Garr, “On Voicing and Devoicing in Ugaritic”, *JNES* 45 (1986), 45–52 (listed on p. 47).

79. See, respectively, J. J. Finkelstein, “The Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty,” *JCS* 20 (1966) 95–118; and A. K. Grayson, “Königslisten, Akkadisch,” in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, ed. E. Ebeling, et al. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980), pp. 101–115.

(either Babylonian or Assyrian).⁸⁰ The fact that the initial sections of these royal lineages share similar eponymous ancestors has been taken as an indication that various royal dynasties of Mesopotamia (and the northern Levant) considered themselves related through earlier nomadic groups.⁸¹ But this common stock, or *Grundstock*,⁸² reflects more than an idea of shared nomadic heritage and goes beyond any singular tradition of Amorite origins.⁸³ The eponymous ancestors came to represent a special heritage of kings in the ancient Near East, and as a class and category separate from ethnic (or nationalistic) concerns they formed an integral component in building an identity that was distinctly royal. The individual names, such as Didanu (or Ḫana, etc.), originated as tribal eponyms during the early phases of the age of the Amorites (Middle Bronze Age/Old Babylonian Period), or even earlier;⁸⁴ however, at some stage in history these eponymous figures collectively formed a type of ancestry that a king could claim in order to give his lineage legitimacy. By association, this manner of categorization included the Rephaim, despite the fact that they do not appear in any syllabic cuneiform text (outside of the onomastic evidence).⁸⁵ In Ugaritic literature, the Rephaim along with the Didanu were additionally transformed as a specific group of characters that occupied a mythic past.⁸⁶ As such, in KTU 1.161 these royal ancestors formed an integral link between the lineage of the ruling dynasty and the mythic foundations of Ugarit.

The distinction between distant and recent (historical) figures shows the complex nature of the royal ancestry, yet collectively both groups demonstrate the political importance of an ancestral charter for a royal house. A source that exemplifies this ancestral ideology is an Old Babylonian source discovered at Mari (MARI 12803) in which the names of historical kings and eponymous figures are combined in a

80. The case of the Assyrian King List, of course, is much more complex as it contains an extensive listing of ancestors and historical kings that include lineages of several successive dynasties.

81. Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*, p. 111.

82. The term was first used by Benno Landsberger to categorize the early portion of the Assyrian King List (interpreted as the ancestors of Šamši-Adad I) and is also appropriate here. See S. Yamada, "The Editorial History of the Assyrian King List," *ZA* 84 (1994) 11–13; following, B. Landsberger, "Assyrische Königsliste und "Dunkles Zeitalter"," *JCS* 8 (1954) 33–38, "Assyrische Königsliste und "Dunkles Zeitalter" (Continued)," *JCS* 8 (1954) 109–114. In the categorical sense, the Assyrian King List represents an excellent analogue for the study of KTU 1.161 because the distant ancestors are classified in distinct groups. These groups include: "total: 17 kings who lived in tents," followed by "total: 10 kings who were fathers," and "total: 6 kings whose names are written on bricks but whose eponyms are not known." See Yamada, "The Editorial History of the Assyrian King List," 13–23.

83. J.-J. Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*. ed. T. J. Lewis, vol. 19, Writings from the Ancient World. Atlanta 2004, p. 72.

84. G. Buccellati, *The Amorites of the Ur III Period*. Naples 1966, p. 244; cf. Levine and de Tarragon, "Dead Kings and Rephaim," 655.

85. Healey, "The Last of the Rephaim," p. 39.

86. The literary depiction of the Rephaim at Ugarit is consistent with their role as royal ancestors. The stories associate the Rephaim with characters such as Dānī'ilu (repeatedly referred to throughout KTU 1.17 as the man of Rapa'u) and Kirta, the mythic king who is honored "amidst the Rephaim of the earth (*rapi'ṭ 'arṣi*) and the collective assembly of the Ditanu (*bi-puhrū qibūṣī didāni*)" (KTU 1.15 iii:3–4 and 14–15). The title given Dānī'ilu recalls the eponymous ancestor, Rāpi'u, who is referred to as the king of eternity in KTU 1.108. Thus from the perspective of the Ugaritic writers (living in the Late Bronze Age), the Rephaim had once lived privileged lives (glorified in the mythic literature) but now as members of the dead they resided in the netherworld. As such, they were a category of heroes whose ranks included famous kings (such as Kirta) and who feasted with the gods. Through these literary traditions the stable identity of the royal ancestry was enhanced; the king's constituency understood who the Rephaim were and recognized that they were an important component of the ruling house's lineage. In support of the interpretation of the Rephaim as a type of royal ancestry, Healey comments that in the passage from Kirta (KTU 1.15, quoted above) the mythic king received an "ancestral apotheosis," (see "The Last of the Rephaim," p. 38).

single ritual honoring the royal ancestor cult (the *kispim ša šarrâni*).⁸⁷ In this ritual, the images of historical figures, the Old Akkadian kings Sargon and Naram-Sin, are honored in a ritual along with the ancestors of West Semitic tribal groups (the Hana and Numha).⁸⁸ The Mari ritual differs from the Ugaritic ritual in that the historical kings seem to take precedence over the distant ancestors, yet it serves as a cogent parallel because it is another example of an Amorite (i.e., West Semitic) ruler, claiming political legitimacy by reconstructing his pedigree, in this case Šamši Adad I.⁸⁹

Kingship, the second identity dealt with in this ritual, was manifested in a single figure – the King. Yet its legitimacy was tied to the past through a linear foundation created in part by the first identity (the royal ancestry). The institution of kingship was presented as timeless, with progenitors that extended back into mythic antiquity. The tradition of king lists in the ancient Near East was built upon a linear foundation created through the assembled names of specific kings. The names of these kings were joined together with the names of distant (eponymous) ancestors to form a cohort that extended the lineage of a king and buttressed their claims of ancestral rights.⁹⁰ In this sense, the linear trajectory (i.e., eponymous ancestors and historical kings) that was claimed by the Assyrian rulers of the ninth and eighth centuries BCE formed a basis for the legitimacy of Assyrian kingship. In other words, the kings of Assyria justified their authority and power by compiling a list of former kings to serve as their exclusive lineage. As is well known, the tradition of king lists existed in the second millennium, and is manifest at Ugarit in both alphabetic-cuneiform (KTU 1.113 [= RS 24.257]) and syllabic-cuneiform sources (RS 94.2518).⁹¹

87. M. Birot, “Fragment de Rituel de Mari Relatif au *Kispum*,” in *Death in Mesopotamia*, ed. B. Alster, Rencontre assyriologique internationale (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1980), pp. 139–150. For the *kispum*(m) ritual at Mari, see A. Tsukimoto, *Untersuchungen zur Totenpflege (kispum) im alten Mesopotamien*, AOAT. Kevelaer 1985, pp. 57–78.

88. See MARI 12803 Obv. Col I. lines 5–6 (and 17–18), *ana lamasat Šarrukin u Naram-^dSin*; following the second reference (lines 5–6) is the reference to the ancestral identities of the Hana and Numha (lines 19–20). The exact interpretation of lines 19–20 is unclear, refer A. Malamat, *Mari and the Early Israelite Experience*, The Schweich Lectures. Oxford 1989, pp. 99–100, and Birot, “Fragment de Rituel de Mari Relatif au *Kispum*,” pp. 144–146.

89. Birot, “Fragment de Rituel de Mari Relatif au *Kispum*,” pp. 147–149; and Tsukimoto, *Untersuchungen zur Totenpflege*, pp. 76–78. It is interesting that Šamši Adad I, whose Amorite genealogy is preserved in the later Assyrian King List (according to most Assyriologists), lays claim to the Mesopotamian institution of kingship through the names of the great kings of Agade (Sargon and Naram-Sin). Šamši Adad I was certainly aware of the tradition of Mesopotamian kingship (**NAM-LUGAL**), represented in the Sumerian King List, as a manuscript of this document was found in Šubat-Enlil (Tell Leilān, Syria); Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, p. 74; refer C.-A. Vincente, “The Tall Leilan Recension of the Sumerian King List,” ZA 85 (1995) 234–270.

90. William Hallo also touches upon the importance of historical kings alongside distant, royal ancestors, in reference to KTU 1.161; W. W. Hallo, “Royal Ancestor Worship in the Biblical World,” in *Sha'arei Talmon*, ed. M. A. Fishbane, E. Tov, and W. W. Fields. Winona Lake 1992, p. 385; cf. Levine and de Tarragon, “Dead Kings and Rephaim,” 656.

91. See Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24e campagne (1961)*, pp. 165–178; and *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, pp. 195–210. The ritual use of the Ugaritic king lists is probably indicated by the check marks found beside each name on the Akkadian version (RS 94.2518); *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, p. 200. K. L. Younger Jr., “Ugaritic King List (1.104),” in *Context of Scripture 1: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, ed. W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger. Leiden 1997, pp. 356–357. The Assyrian King List tradition also bears evidence of ritual use, as two of the most extensive texts are recorded on “amulet type” tablets; the Khorsabad List and the SDAS List, I. J. Gelb, “Two Assyrian King Lists,” JNES 13 (1954) 230. The connection is uncertain between the ritual in KTU 1.161 and the rituals involving RS 94.2518. It is a well-documented observation that the Ugaritic king list (KTU 1.113 [=RS 24.257]) seems to indicate that the dead kings were assigned a status that was divine, or sacral (see del Olmo Lete, *Canaanite Religion*, 177–180), yet the exact meaning is unclear. The uncertainty of the list’s reading is made difficult by the fact that the Akkadian version shows that the diptotic declension of the proper noun (the names of kings) is genitival, save one exception. For example, the case of Yaqaru (as *nomen rectum* preceded by the term of *divinus*) is written DINGIR ^Mya-qa-ri in RS 94.2518 line 20; cf. the Ugaritic ‘il yqr in KTU 1.113, Rev. line 41. The Akkadian version may offer support to Schmidt’s theory that these king lists (including the third millennium king lists of Ebla) recorded offerings for the family deity of each king, *Israel’s Beneficent Dead*, pp. 69–70. Yet, Pardee’s observations are appropriate with

The primary purpose of this linear ideology was the legitimization of an institution of rule (i.e., kingship), and through this legitimization the lists would indemnify the ruling house itself.⁹² The legitimacy of the specific ruling house (or dynasty), however, was enforced through the act of dynastic succession.⁹³

The political process known as dynastic succession enabled the transfer of office, preserving the integrity of this timeless institution (and the dynasty's claim to it) through the proper protocols embedded within the royal ritual. Thus kingship represented the active embodiment of a royal dynasty: the king served as the head of the ruling house and stood as a living representative of his dynastic line. The throne would have been emblematic of this office, and as an item that passed from father to son the throne could simultaneously stand for the individual sovereignty of the king and the dynasty as a whole. In the rituals of dynastic succession, the venerable, yet passive, symbols of ancestry were coalesced with the active symbols of power attributed to kingship in a concerted effort to confer authority upon the new ruler.

6. Conclusion

Ultimately, KTU 1.161 shows the means by which ancestors legitimized the political ascent of a new king, and it provides a ritual setting for the construction of royal lineages such as those found in Mesopotamian king lists and royal genealogies. The linear ideology expressed in this ritual involves a political perspective that embraces the past, present and future. The political ideology is similarly expressed in the Hebrew Bible in the formulaic summarization of an Israelite ruler's reign found in the Book of Kings. In addition to their similar context (the death of a king and dynastic succession), both involve identical roles: the dead king, the new king and the royal ancestors.⁹⁴ Furthermore, both examples hold a binary purpose as they begin with the dead king joining his royal ancestors, and they end with the new king taking his place among the ranks of the same ancestors. In both examples, the preposition *tbt*

regard to the grammatical possibilities, such as the “genitive of identification” (although his example *bat y^orūšālāim* actually means “daughter of Jerusalem” and not “girl Jerusalem”). See also the various problems raised by Pardee, such as the question of why all of the important dynastic deities would remain anonymous (among other problems), *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, pp. 199–200. These issues suggest that the interpretation of the list as signifying a venerated (or semi-divine) status for dead kings is not beyond reason.

92. In his study of the Assyrian King List, Wilson states that the purpose of king lists in general is to present a “sequence” of legitimate rulers in order to establish the proper line of succession (and not necessarily the appropriate genealogical background of a king); *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*, pp. 90–101. This conclusion was related to Wilson’s observation that the occasional succession of brothers was altered in the Assyrian King List in order to present a line of rule based on paternal descent where son followed father. This observation is valid, yet it can be further suggested that the right of succession was an integral component in the greater representation of kingship as a legitimate form of rule. The validity of this form of rule would thus be represented in a lengthy list of legitimate kings. In this sense, the Sumerian King List best exemplifies this political purpose as the source served to legitimize the Mesopotamian tradition of kingship as it passed from city to city. Thus, the Sumerian King List was not concerned with the genealogical legitimacy of any specific ruler, but the legitimacy of kingship as an institution (**NAM.LUGAL** in Sumerian) claimed by the First Dynasty of Isin during the Old Babylonian Period. The classic study on the political function of this source is P. Michalowski, “History as Charter: Some Observations on the Sumerian King List,” *JAOS* 103 (1983) 237–248.

93. Refer to Pardee’s discussion regarding KTU 1.113 and 1.161, including his remarks on the different (possible) ritual contexts of each text, Pardee, *Les textes para-mythologiques de la 24e campagne* (1961), pp. 174–175.

94. The exception of course is the Ugaritic goddess Shapshu. The royal summaries (or better, epilogues) in the Book of Kings are expressed in three formulaic statements that follow after the next. For example 1 Kg 22:51: “and Jehoshaphat lay with his fathers and he was buried with his fathers in the City of David, his father, and Jehoram his son ruled in his stead.” Thus, the formulaic statements involve the dead king (Jehoshaphat), the royal ancestors (the fathers) and the new king (Jehoram). For a full discussion, see M. J. Suriano, “The Formulaic Epilogue for a King in the Book of Kings in Light of Royal Funerary Rites in Ancient Israel and the Levant.” Ph.D Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 2008.

connects the new king with his royal lineage and preserves the vital link between the ruling house and its ancestral charter.

An apt parallel for KTU 1.161, and the royal epilogues in Kings, is found in the Phoenician sarcophagus inscription of Eshmunazor, king of Sidon (KAI 14).⁹⁵ This source, which dates to the Persian Period, contains imprecatory statements that are standard among Phoenician inscriptions (effectively warning against tomb robbers).⁹⁶ Furthermore, the imprecations occasionally refer to the Rephaim, and in the Eshmunazor sarcophagus this reference is included in an extended curse found after the introduction,⁹⁷ (KAI 14: 7–9):

'lykn lm mškb 't rp'm w'l yqbr bqbr w'l lm bn wzr 'thtnm:

“May there not be for them a resting place with the Rephaim and may they not be buried in a grave, and may they have no son or seed in their stead”

The Eshmunazor inscription is an important analogue because it is royal and distinctly funerary in nature.⁹⁸ The images within the threefold curse correspond in negative form to the ideological trajectory evoked in the ritual of KTU 1.161. The imprecation begins with a denial of final rest among the Rephaim, continues with a rejection of burial and ends with a statement that the violator will have no progeny.⁹⁹ The trajectory evoked here relates directly to concepts of royal legitimacy that spanned the past, present and future, much like the ideology that underscores the Ugaritic royal ritual. Although KTU 1.161 contains no reference to burial (unlike the Eshmunazor sarcophagus), the terminology shared by both sources is striking. The Phoenician royal inscription begins and ends with imagery that involves the royal ancestry (personified by the *rp'm*) and a lasting lineage (utilizing the preposition *tht*), imagery that is evocative of dynastic succession. In KTU 1.161, this linear conception of political legitimacy is expressed in lines 22a–26, where the new ruler is placed in line (*tahta*) with the ancestral lineage (which includes the *rapi'ūma*).¹⁰⁰

95. See, conveniently, J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 101–115.

96. H.-P. Müller, “Die phönizische Grabinschrift aus dem Zypern-Museum KAI 30 und die Formgeschichte des nordwestsemitischen Epitaphs,” *ZA* 65 (1975) 121.

97. The Tabnit sarcophagus (Eshmunazor’s father) also contains reference to the Rephaim in its curses (KAI 13): “may you have no seed among the living under the sun nor a resting place with the Rephaim” ('ly<k>n l<k> zr'tht šmš wbmškb 't rp'm) [KAI 13:7–8]). The date of Tabnit’s reign is probably 500–490, and his son Eshmunazor (II) to 489–475 BCE, see Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 101–102. Refer also, the brief remarks in P. K. McCarter, “The Sarcophagus Inscription of Tabnit, King of Sidon (2.56),” in *The Context of Scripture*, ed. W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger, *Context of Scripture* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), p. 182 n. 1.

98. The royal provenance of these sources (inscribed on a king’s sarcophagus) argues against the assertion that the Rephaim represented a general class of ancestors who were not necessarily royalty, so Ford, “The ‘Living Rephaim’ Of Ugarit: Quick or Defunct?” 101. It is true that Phoenician curses are directed at anyone who trespasses the tomb. Yet, the implication is that the plunder of a royal tomb was an act of political appropriation, where the object of this appropriation was kingship (regardless of who committed the act).

99. Furthermore, each Phoenician curse parallels the successive statements found in the formulaic epilogues in the Book of Kings. Refer to Suriano, “Formulaic Epilogue for a King in the Book of Kings,” pp. 238–241.

100. Along with the Tabnit and Eshmunazor inscriptions, a third source that often factors into discussion of the Rephaim is a bilingual Neo-Punic and Latin inscription (KAI 117) from El-Amrūni, Libya that dates to the first century CE. Not only is this inscription far removed from the current discussion, both temporally and geographically, but it also represents a slightly different concept of the Rephaim than that found on the royal sarcophagi of Sidon. Like later wisdom literature in the Hebrew Bible, the Rephaim in the lone Neo-Punic source seemed to have been “democratized” and are no longer associated with kings. This is probably more indicative of the fact that the concept of kingship prevalent in the ancient Levant (and Phoenicia proper) was not adopted in the Punic culture of North Africa. Parker had suggested that the term was employed in this inscription in order to

The first millennium sources, whether cuneiform (Assyrian) or West-Semitic alphabetic (the Hebrew Bible and Phoenician inscriptions), attest to the survival of an ancestral ideology that first emerged among the competing Amorite dynasties of the second millennium BCE.¹⁰¹ Although this ideology is given full form in the Assyrian King List, with its roster of eponymous ancestors, it is developed further in the Hebrew Bible and Phoenician sources. In these sources the Rephaim appear as autochthonous inhabitants of a mythic past, and serve as ancestral figures associated with kingship. The Rephaim were not necessarily tied to any one ethnic identity, and as such, they bear witness to a specialized type of ancestry that is manifested already at Ugarit. The common purpose of these sources is the continuity of power and the ability of the ruling house to survive the single lifespan of an individual king: in other words, dynastic succession. Dynastic succession has long been recognized as an important element of this text. Pierre Bordreuil and Dennis Pardee summed up the beginning and end of the text with the statement: «Le Roi est mort! ... Vive le Roi!»¹⁰² Baruch Levine and Jean-Michel de Tarragon site this approvingly and comment: “this classic statement has two dimensions: “Long live” the new king, and “long live” the departed king in the afterlife! Both of these dimensions permeate the liturgy before us.”¹⁰³ These statements are supported by the interpretation offered in this study, which demonstrates more clearly how the dimensions of royal ideology worked within the important ritual text KTU 1.161.

translate the Latin portion of the inscription and the term DM, which stands for *dis minibus* (meaning “manes”), S. Parker, “The Feast of the Rāpi’u,” *UF* 2 (1970) 103 n. 49.

101. Michalowski, “History as Charter,” 240–241.

102. Bordreuil and Pardee (“Le rituel funéraire ougaritique RS.34.126,” 128): “Le début du texte RS.34.126 se référat donc au rituel funéraire accompli à l’intention de Niqmaddou III lorsque «le Roi est mort!» et la fin du texte ferait allusion à un sacrifice salutaire présenté à l’intention de sa veuve ou de sa bru Tryl et à l’intention de son fils et successeur ‘Ammourapi pur que «vive le Roi!».

103. Levine and de Tarragon, “Dead Kings and Rephaim,” 654; see also Lewis, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*, p. 32.