Once again on the 'Divine Names' of the Ugaritic Kings. A Reply

Gregorio del Olmo Lete - Universidad de Barcelona, I.P.O.A.

[This paper is an analysis of the arguments put forward against the interpretation of the list KTU 1.102:15-28 as 'divine names' of Ugaritic kings. The arguments are rejected on the basis of an overall consideration of the occurrences of names of this type in the Ugaritic texts and of the phonetic phenomena involved.]

Some years ago[1] I proposed an interpretation of the list of names KTU 1.102:15-28 in an attempt to collect all the data available from other texts which could support it. The hypothesis gained some approval.[2] Recently, however, it has also been given an utterly negative critique by Prof. Pardee[3] in what seems to be an overall assessment of his understanding of the Ugarit cult of the dead, to be documented later in his long-awaited edition of the ritual texts. The arguments he puts forward seem to be solid and deserve careful attention, leading either to their acceptance, in which case my own interpretation should be abandoned, or to their rejection as not cogent.

First of all, nobody appears to deny that KTU 1.102:15-28 is a 'list of names'. Even Pardee concludes "that these names are true divine names", and at this point I would leave matters as they stand because that is precisely what I meant by speaking of 'divine names', irrespective of their structure. Accordingly, if these exceptional names can be 'true names', in spite of the formal objections put forward, it implies that such objections are not unsurmountable: we simply have names with a peculiar structure. Nevertheless, there is a problem: nobody knows which gods in the whole of ancient near Eastern mythology correspond to the 'gods' of KTU 102:15-28. I take them to be 'divine names' of the Ugaritic kings, in as much as they become 'divine' or 'divinized', and as such their 'onomastics' would not differ from divine names in general. I do not consider them to be "alternate names of the living Ugaritic king", but rather as 'cumulative', along the lines of the Egyptian royal titulary[4], according to the different theo-mythological attributes given to kings. In this regard, to assert "it would be a gratuitous exercise simply to alter the hypothesis to say that the names were created *post mortem* for these kings" is an unfair misrepresentation of my opinion. This is not an 'alteration' of the hypothesis, but its main thrust: it is

---

1. Cf. G. del Olmo Lete, "Los nombres 'divinos' de los reyes de Ugarit", *AuOr* 5, 1987, 39-66 (cf. *UF* 18, 1986, 83-95; id., *La religión cananea*, Sabadell [Barcelona] 1992, pp. 116-126).

2. Cf. J.C. De Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism. The Roots of Israelite Monotheism*, Leuven 1990, p. 240 n. 97; K. van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria and Israel*, Leiden 1996, p. 165; see also his "Ancestors and Anthroponyms: Kinship Terms as Theophoric Elements in Hebrew Names", *ZAW* 108, 1996, 5.

3. Cf. D. Pardee, "*Marzihu, Kispu,* and the Ugaritic Funerary Cult: A Minimalist View", in N. Wyatt - W.G.E. Watson - J.B. Lloyd, eds., *Ugarit, religion and culture. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Ugarit, religion and culture Edinburgh, July 1994* (UBL 12), Münster 1996, pp. 273-287.

4. Cf. A. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, Oxford 1982, pp. 71ff.; Del Olmo Lete, *AuOr* 5, 1987, 44, 58.

precisely in keeping with their *post mortem* divinization (as supported by the texts like KTU 1.113:12-26,[5] without taking into account the simple canonical divine title *mlkm*) that the kings receive those names[6].

As regards the question of 'identification': I admit that this is a highly hypothetical 'exercise' based principally on the evidence of KTU 1.6 VI 57-58; in no case is that for me "a necessary part" of my point of view or the "datum on which the entire hypothesis is built".[7] However, to disprove this datum because of the presence of a word divider is an extremely weak argument. First of all, as an experienced and highly qualified epigraphist, Prof. Pardee is well aware how often this orthographical device is incorrectly used;[8] furthermore, statistically speaking, it is extremely unlikely that the exceptional consonantal sequences /yrgbb'l/ and /yrgb.b'l/ could have different values. Finally, and more decisively according to Pardee's own point of view, if they are 'phrase names', it is quite feasible for them to be written either way, i.e., like 'names' or even 'phrases' with and without a word divider. Otherwise, we could object: if they represent 'meaningful phrases', why is there not a word divider in KTU 1.102 and 1.106, i.e., in 100% of the occurrences which are considered as so important in relation to KTU 1.6 V 58? The opposite irregularity will be present in this way in those texts. So, until more convincing arguments are put forward, the equivalence *nqmd/yrgbb'l* can be maintained[9].

However, let us now analyse the formal objection that "indicates that these are not simple personal names", (an assertion, incidentally, which I never made). On the contrary, they are quite exceptional names of a rather unusual type[10] among normal Ugaritic *personal* names (i.e. of living human beings), so that in principle they could also have an exceptional formal structure, too. The objections read: "Two rules of Ugaritic grammar indicate that these are not simple personal names: (1) geminated consonants are not written twice ...". This is simply not true as far as *gemination* goes. Different authors have questioned

---

5. Cf. Pardee's opinion: "I still believe it more likely, that this text describes the deceased king as deified" (*op. cit.* p. 276). I would point out that a similar list of divine names seems to have been found in Ebla; cf. A. Archi, "Die ersten zehn Könige von Ebla", ZA 76, 1986, 213-17; id., "Cult of the Ancestors and Tutelary God at Ebla", in Y.L. Arbeitman, ed., *Fucus: A Semitic/Afrasian Gathering in Remembrance of Albert Ehrmann*, Amsterdam 1988, pp. 103-112; P. Fronzaroli, "Il culto dei re defunti in ARET 3.178", in P. Fronzaroli, ed., *Miscellanea Eblaitica, 1* (QuSem 15), Firenze 1988, pp. 1-33. In this connection B.B. Schmidt, *Israel's Beneficient Dead* [FAT 11], Tübingen 1994, pp. 15ff. [cf. *UBL* 12, pp. 239ff.] has also assumed a 'minimalist' attitude; for a critical assessment of this 'dissertation', which I wholly accept, cf. the review by H. Niehr in *SEL* 13, 1996, 126-28. Cf. also in the same (Schmidt's) direction M. Liverani, "La royauté syrienne de l'âge de bronce récent", in P. Garelli, ed., *Le palais et la royauté*, Paris 1974, pp. 340-341 (on KTU 1.113); G. Pettinato, *Il rituale per la successione al trono ad Ebla* (SS NS, 9), Roma 1992, p. 276 (on *ARET* VII 150 [TM 75.G.2628]; the quoted article "Gli en-en ed i presunti re divinizati ad Ebla", has been inaccessible).

6. It may be noted in this connection that my studies of KTU 1.113 were apparently unknown to D. Pardee, *Les Textes para-mythologiques de la 24ᵉ campagne (1961)*, Paris 1988, pp. 165-178, as noted already by De Moor, *l. c.*

7. Cf. Pardee, *op. cit.*, pp. 282-283, nn. 14 and 16; cf. Del Olmo Lete, *AuOr* 5, 1987, 46: "No se puede insistir en estas correlaciones, ni son suficientes ... Al margen de toda correlación ...".

8. Its incorrect use has been known for some time; cf. St. Segert, "Die Schreibfehler in den ugaritischen literarischen Keilschrifttexten ...", in *Fs. O. Eissfeldt*, Berlin 1961², pp. 197f.; Gordon, *UT* § 4.23. 24; H.G.P Dressler, *The Aqhat-Text*, Diss. 1976, Univ. of Cambridge, pp. 571ff., 679 (analysis of the unpredictable use of the word divider in KTU 1.17 I 26-33 and par.). For a similar situation with punctuation devices in the El Amarna letters cf. Knudtzon, *EAT* I 25. The use of word divider with composite PPNN of the type ʿbd.yrh, ʿbd.hmn is a well established scribal practice at Ugarit.

9. Prof. J.C. De Moor (cf. *The Rise of Yahwism*, Leuven 1990, p. 240, n. 97, objects also to my interpretation/reading of yrgb[.]b'l in KTU 1.6 VI 58, but he offers a quite plausible solution to the difficulty the word divider presents in this case and an answer to Pardee's objection: yrgb alone may be considered as a hypocoristic name. On the identification of Niqmaddu see lately P. Bordreuil-Fl. Malbran-Labat, *CRAIBL* 1995, 448: "... il est clair qu'Ilimilku n'était pas le scribe de Niqmaddu II régnant au siècle XIVᵉ comme on le pensait jusqu'à maintenant, mais bien de Niqmaddu III régnant autour de 1200 av. J.C."; cf. Del Olmo Lete, *AuOr* 5, 1987, 45.

10. Cf. F. Grøndahl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit* (StPohl 1), Roma 1967, pp. 41f.; J.J. Stamm, "Erwägungen zu RS 24.246", *UF* 11, 1989, 753-758 (an excellent study of this nominal type in the Ugaritic texts as regards morphosyntactic and semantic interpretation, as well as comparison with Akkadian material).

this assertion and in his grammar, Segert sums up the situation in these words: "There is no sign for consonant doubling (i.e., gemination, according to this author two lines before) in Ugaritic alphabetic writing. *In a few instances* (emphasis mine) the doubled consonants may be indicated by repetition of the appropiate sign".[11]

But even leaving that matter unresolved, the fact is that Pardee has confused two separate problems: the case of *yrgbb'l* is not one of *gemination*, i.e. internal doubling (or lengthening, as others put it) of the consonantal radicals of a lexeme, but simply the juxtaposition of two different words, no matter how closely related they might be in a proper noun. This is resolved by what has long been called a *shared consonant*: "when the same consonant ended one word and began the next, the scribe often wrote it but once";[12] this is a question of economy or *haplography* in *scriptio continua*, mainly in the cursive alphabetic script of the first millennium, when case endings were dropped, although some sporadic antecedents can be found somewhat earlier. Grøndahl[13] makes a clear distinction between the two phenomena: "Konsonantenverdoppelung in Wortinneren", is frequently not indicated in syllabic names. Also, "Treffen bei alphabetischen Namen zwei gleiche Konsonanten aufeinander, *können sie in der Alphabetschrift nur einfach ausgedrückt werden*". Ugaritic grammars do not usually take this scribal practice into consideration, limited as it is to very few instances. In the very name *hd* /haddu/, the fusion or loss of /h/ is not the same phenomenon as the gemination of /d/. In fact we have three different phenomena here: (1) the scribal practice of 'writing' once a consonant that occurs twice ('shared consonants'); (2) the phonological and graphological 'merging of consonants', i.e., of the same consonant written consecutively at word boundary, and (3) the gemination of a consonant within the same word. Phonologically, cases (2) and (3) may coincide, but their (grammatical) origin is different.

On the basis of this grammatical inaccuracy, Pardee concludes: the name *yrgbb'l* should not be vocalized /yargubba'lu/, but /yargububa'lu/ or the like.[14] However, (2) this is impossible, Pardee says, because this kind of 'Amorite' *personal* name always has the jussive/preterite form (to be vocalised as /yargubba'l/). Naturally, this conclusion is also incorrect: if use of shared consonants is not a general and universal rule in Ugaritic, vocalisation and morphology are perfectly correct. On the other hand, Pardee

11. Cf. S. Segert, *BGUL* 29. M. Dietrich - O. Loretz, *UF* 5, 1973, 74, are not the only scholars to allow exceptions to Pardee's rule; many other authors have voiced the same opinion since (leaving aside double forms like *rb/rbb, rbt/rbbt, lb/lbb, hd/hdd, al/all, mrt/mrrt*); cf. Pope, *Fs. Finkelstein* 1997 170 (*'Ilmy*); E. McClive Good, "Geminated Sonants, Word Stress, and Energic *-nn/-.nn* in Ugaritic", *UF* 13, 1981, 117-121; E. Zurro, "Ebla y la Biblia: filología y exégesis", *Simposio Bíblico Español*, Madrid 1984, pp. 63f. (the phenomenon in Ebla, Ugarit and the OT); J. Friedrich - W. Röllig, *Phönizish-Punische Grammatik* (AnOr 46), Rome 1970², p. 38 (late Punic usage).

12. Cf. M. Dahood, "The Name *yišmā'-'ēl* in Genesis 16,11", *Bib* 49, 1968, 87-88 (also *Bib* 46, 1965, 328). -Just to quote a few authors, and leaving aside the numerous proposals of Dahood and his followers, cf. I.O. Lehman, "A Forgotten Principle of Biblical Textual Tradition Rediscovered", *JNES* 26, 1967, 93-101 ("textual ambivalence of Hebrew consonants"); W.G.E. Watson, "Shared Consonants in Northwest Semitic", *Bib* 50, 1969, 525-33; id., "More on Shared Consonants", *Bib* 52, 1971, 44-50 (general North-West Semitic usage, even outside PNN: *bn il(m) mt, ank (k)imr, m(h) hy, 'n(t) tkr', šb'(t) trt*, may be simple haplographies, in view of their sporadic occurrence). Furthermore, the interpretation of Ug. *yt(r)ršp* as 'may R. return' (p. 528) is unlikely in view of Ugarit Akkadian *yatar-rašap* (but Mari Akkadian *itûr-Mêr* 'M. has returned'); cf. Grøndahl, *PTU* 15, 43f, 148, 181; *bnš* may represent a different case; for *nklb* cf. *nkl w ib* (KTU 24:1, 37); apparently, *yrmu* does not exist. - For a criticism of this theory cf. A. R. Millard, "'Scriptio Continua': Ancient Practice or Modern Surmise?", *JSS* 15, 1970, 2-15; J.C. De Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu* (AOAT 16), Kevelaer / Neukirchen-Vluyn 1971, 231 (in relation to the phrase *bn il(m) mt* [haplography]). - For the same scribal practice in Phoenician cf. Friedrich-Röllig, *PPG* 39.

13. Cf. Grøndahl, *PTU*, 14f.

14. He even suggests the energic vocalization /yargubanba'lu/ which runs counter to his phonological suppositions: here, the regressive assimilation /-nb-/ should be more imperative (well documented in Ugaritic phonology) than the 'coalescence' /-bb-/ in /yargubba'l/. Of course, the scribal practice peculiar to Akkadian does away with this phenomenon: e. g. *ia-qub-bi-nu*, and perhaps *ia-qub-ba'l(ᵈU)*.

finds a solution to his own problem in the hypothesis that these are divine 'phrase names': these names, as 'divine names', do not follow the normal pattern of *personal* names. This conclusion also is very uncertain: the few divine names of this structure we have all function as yqtl/preterite + divine name, exactly like personal names, e. g. *išme-karaba, išme-la*.[15] Unfortunately, we have very few 'divine' names of this kind from Mari; nevertheless, some do occur in the Mari Pantheon and always with the morpho-syntactical structure just mentioned: *ikrub/yakrub-El, Itûr-Mêr, Tarâm-Mêr, Tašqi-Mamma*.[16] To resort to 'phrase names', therefore, is rather far-fetched and reminiscent of interpretations of the predicative type like *atrt*[.]*ym* "She who strides upon the Sea",[17] interpretations which as PNN at best represent dead predications.

In the case of *y<r>gbhd, ydbhd*, the exception (an intentional archaism, perhaps) is even clearer: in this case the /h/ is *written* and then *pronounced according to the text*. Consequently, it is useless to imagine that *ygbhd* should have been /yaggub(b)addu/, even if it runs counter to usage in the 'personal' onomastics, which perhaps follows Akkadian practice (cf. e.g. *niq-ma-a-du*)[18] and here as well was probably the usual pronunciation. In this case, the author pretends to impose his own phonological interpretation (how things should have functioned in the case of an assumed 'gemination' and normal use of the element -*(h)d*) upon the text as written, even if exceptional. However, even this assumption is false as well, at least as a universal rule: "not a single example is listed in Gröndahl 1967, 133, of a proper name containing the elements YQTL + *hd* that preserves the /h/ of the theophoric element", Pardee says. In fact, only one certain name of this sort is listed by Gröndahl: *y(ʿ)drd* (KTU 5.1:8, a plain scribal exercise!).[19] Texts KTU 1.102 and 1.106, where the two names with the /-hd/ element under discussion occur, *were not yet available*; nor was KTU 2.70:4, with *yrmhd*[20]. Had these texts been taken into account, the yqtl- names with the element /-hd/ would have equalled or outnumbered the others. But on this very page of Gröndahl's book[21] we have names like *ilhd, ndbhd*, and, in particular, *ytrhd* (Akk. *yatar-addu* [!]) to be found in a context (KTU 2.4:22: *wytn ilm bdhm bd ihqm gtr wbd ytrhd bʿl*) which I presume confirms my own interpretation of these as 'divine names' of the Ugaritic kings.[22] Naturally, Pardee will retort that these names are not names of the type under discussion (i.e., yqtl-names), but the

15. Cf. K. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta* (StOr VII), Helsingfors 1938, p. 330; J.J. Stamm, *Die akkadische Namengebung* (MVAG 44), Leipzig 1939, p. 19. Neither Huffmon nor Gröndahl have an index of possible 'divine names' of this kind. Perhaps the difference between a 'personal' and a 'divine' name was aspectual: jussive in one case, preterite in the other; cf. De Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism*, pp. 237ff..; Stamm, *UF* 11, 1989, 755; and the following note. Such a distinction was possible in North-West Semitic, but not in Akkadian.

16. Cf. J.-M. Durand, "La religión en Siria durante la época de los reinos amorreos según la documentación de Mari", G. del Olmo Lete, ed., *Mitología y religión del Oriente Antiguo* II/1. *Semitas Occidentales (Ebla, Mari)* (Estudios Orientales 8), Sabadell (Barcelona) 1995, pp. 202f., 306, 160ff., 191 (all interpreted as preterite predicates); also R.S. Hess, "Divine names in the Amarna Texts", *UF* 18, 1986, 149-68.

17. Most recently, W.G.E. Watson, "*Atrt ym*: Yet Another Proposal", *UF* 25, 1993, 431-434 ("She who determines the Day"); id., "An Antecedent to *Atirat* and '*Anat*?", in *UBL* 12, pp. 315-326, with previous bibliography.

18. Cf. G. del Olmo Lete - J. Sanmartín, *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica* (AuOrSup. 7), Sabadell (Barcelona) 1996, p. 163 (cf. the 'akkadianized' allophone *add*). - Cf. the exceptional alternative spelling *ri-ib-ad-di / ri-ib-ha-ad-di* in the Amarna letters; R.S. Hess, *Amarna Personal Names* (ASOR DS 9), Winona Lake, IN 1993, pp. 132f.

19. Cf. Gröndahl, *PTU* 41f., 133; the rest are more easily explained as qtl+/-d/ forms.

20. Quoted by Pardee, *AfO* 36-37, 1989-90, 407. On the other hand, some of the Ugaritic transcriptions of Akkadian PNN, taken from secondary literature, do not appear in the consonantic texts: *ygmr(h)d, yʿqbbʿl, yrg(!)bʿl, ygrd; yrgbbʿl* is a mistake [it would confirm Pardee's contention!] for *yrgbbʿl*.

21. Cf. Gröndahl, *PTU* 133.

22. Cf. on 2.4:18-23 cf. Del Olmo Lete, *AuOr* 5, 1987, 62 n. 110; J.-L. Cunchillos, *Textes ougaritiques. Tome II. Correspondance* (LAPO 14), Paris 1989, pp. 273f.; M. Dietrich - O. Loretz, *Yahweh und seine Asherah* (UBL 9), Münster 1992, pp. 70ff.

phonological phenomenon is the same[23] as the qtl-type names or names of the nominal type plainly show. Almost all of them have the element /-d/ instead of /-hd/,[24] which is more difficult to explain if we assume, according to normal Ugaritic morphology, that the first element ended in vowel; in this case there is no obvious phonetic reason for such an ellipsis of intervocalic /h/.[25] And this is precisely the phenomenon recorded by Grøndahl and the grammarians: the dropping of postvocalic /-h/.[26] Nevertheless, there are alternating forms such as *ḏmrhd / ḏmrd* (Akk. *zimraddu*).[27] It is obvious that this is not the same as the case put forward by Pardee, since he assumes dropping of /h/ in postconsonantal position (jussive yqtl). We have, then, to conclude to a twofold scribal practice: one based on the weakening of /hd/ to /(a)d/ (cf. the Ug. allomorph *add*, Akk. *addu*), which is more usual, and another more conservative or formal practice which retained the original form /hd/.

Were we to distinguish between PNN of the yqtl- and qtl- patterns, as far as the use of the element /-(h)d/ goes, the situation would be this: as a rule, nouns of the stative/noun structure + /-(h)d/ use the form /-d/ (intervocalic position), with some exceptions (*ilhd, ytrhd* = /ilu-haddu/, /yatru-haddu/); PNN of the yqtl-type use both forms /-d/ and /-hd/ (disjunctive prevocalic position) according to the evidence available; the second is clearer, more certain and grammatically more sound (cf. *yrgbhd, ydbhd* = /yargub-haddu/, /ya(d)dub-haddu/, as against *yᶜdrd* = /yaᶜdur-addu/). Accordingly, the ellipsis or dropping of /h/ in yqtl-PNN becomes optional.

The same can be said regarding the coalescence in general of a separate sequence of the same consonantal phoneme belonging to different lexemes (at the end of the first, at the beginning of the second): the phenomenon appears in PNN of both formations, in very few cases: only about three certain instances of the qtl-structure are quoted (cf. *ytršp, mršp, adnᶜm*, var. *adnnᶜm*)[28], while for the yqtl-class we have only the place name *yknᶜm*[29]. For the moment we have no evidence at all of shared consonants involving the DN *bᶜl* in onomastics (cf. *yrgbbᶜl, ydbbᶜl*)[30]. Then the picture which emerges from the empirical testing of facts is very different from that provided by Pardee.[31]

---

23. In fact Grøndahl, *PTU* §16, refers to PNN of both kinds, yqtl- and qtl-, as far as shared consonants is concerned (e. g. *yknᶜm* for /ykn-nᶜm/, *ytršp, mršp* for /ytrršp/, /mrršp/; but also *adnᶜm* and *adnnᶜm*); as for the /-h/ element, the examples quoted by her [§. 27] belong to the second class; that is to say, both are general phenomena, regardless of morphological type.

24. Cf. *aġld, arkd, ᶜmyd, ndbd, nqmd, sgld, slpd*; and maybe also *brdd* (= /brd + hd), *ḥdmrd, tġd* (Prof. Watson's personal communication).

25. The loss or contraction of intervocalic /-h-/ (?) is not attested in Ugarite outside the pronominal suffixes of the third person; cf. Gordon, *UT* § 5.39.

26. Cf. Gordon *UT* § 5.34; Grøndahl *PTU* § 27: "ursprüngliches und postvokalisches H fällt häufig aus, z. B. *ngršp* [*ngh-ršp], *ḏmrd* [vgl, *ḏmrhd*] (notice: both are examples of qtl-type); *in fast allen* (emphasis mine) Namen die *hadd- (correct to *-hadd) enthalten, ist H in der alphabetischer nicht ausgedrückt". Nevertheless, Grøndahl has also extrapolated the grammatical evidence mentioned by Gordon and Fronzaroli ('postvocalic -h'; e. g.: *d(h)rt, z(h)r*; the examples provided, *ngršp* and *ḏmrd*, are of a completely different phonetic nature). In the case in question it is better to speak of 'intervocalic / prevocalic discrete /-h-/', since the phoneme does not belong to the same lexeme.

27. The PN *ndbhd* does not exist in Ugaritic, *pace* Pardee, *AfO* 36-37, 1989-90, 412 (Dahood's error).

28. Other examples could be *šbᶜl* (< /š<b>bᶜl/ or /š<m>bᶜl) and *tbᶜl* (< /t<b>bᶜl/). As regards *šbᶜl* I prefer the second hypothesis as a reflex of the attribute of ᶜAshtarte, *šm bᶜl* (on the other had, I cannot accept the intrepretations put forward by É. Lipiński, *Dieux et déesses de l'univers phénicien et punique*, Leuven 1995, p. 134s). In this connexion cf. E. Puech, *Semitica*, 29, 1979, 27, although he ignores Ug. *tbᶜl*.

29. The possible ellipsis of /l/ in examples like *yrml* (< /yrm<i>l/) represents a different phonetic phenomenon.

30. The only exception could be the quoted qtl-type PNN *šbᶜl, tbᶜl* (= /tb + bᶜl/), cf. *infra* W. Watson's article: "Ugaritic Onomastics (5)", p. 105.

31. But even apart from these considerations, which invalidate Pardee's arguments against my opinion, and even accepting both axioms put forward by Pardee: (1) normative simple writing of geminated/coalesced consonants, which would occur in this case, (2) the normal verbal form of these names as jussive, and consequently the requirement of a 'phrase name'

All in all, I still maintain that my opinion holds. The actual identification of the kings who bore these names remains a debatable and highly hypothetical question; the attribution of such names to the Ugaritic kings, as a religious qualification, is very probable, at least, until more cogent counter-arguments are put forward.[32] I suppose that Prof. Pardee is keeping them for his promised new edition of the Ugaritic cultic texts which on my part I promise to examine closely and respectfully.

I am aware of the emphasis I place on the royal and funerary aspects in my global interpretation of the Ugarit ritual texts, but a unique and unusual text like KTU 1.161 and a myth such as the *rpum* myth, among other texts, justify in my opinion such a perspective. On the other hand, a minimalist attitude is very sound, because it imposes a critical evaluation of any hypothesis, provided that its arguments are also sound. In this case, I think that they are not and consequently I cannot as yet accept the assessment of my good friend, Prof. Pardee, that "this entire element of the Ugaritic mortuary cult must, therefore, be abandoned".

structure to solve the riddle, I presume that the supposed current orthographical 'rule' or use would simply not work with these special, formula-like, unusual names; a use that corresponded to a practical simplified spelling. The spellings *yrgbb'l, ydbb'l* (also *yrġmb'l*, without the normal expected regressive assimilation) would at worst represent a hypercorrection, probably favoured by comparison with the parallel names in the list - *yrgblim, y<r>gbhd* - in which the name of the deity appears undisputably in its full form (as in the others with -*il* as the divine element).

32. The consideration of these names as names of living persons, as proposed by Stamm (*UF* 11, 1989, 758) and reiterated by Schmidt (*UBL* 12 300; *FAT* 11 71; *supra* n. 5), does not deserve the slightest attention, since it is the result of pure ignorance of the syntax of the Ugaritic offering lists. Were the argument offered by Stamm valid, we would have to conclude, to quote just one example, that all the gods of Ugarit as numbered in KTU 1.148 are living persons, since they are not preceded by *l-* but on the contrary they precede the 'gift'. For other cases in which the syntactic formulae alternate cf. KTU 1.39 (exactly the same change of syntactic model in the first lines as in 1.106:1-5: *š l il ... ršp dqt*); 1.46; 1.109; 1.112. On the other hand, in the Ugaritic ritual and offering lists there are no offerers (named before the king!), but the king and his family; cf. Del Olmo Lete, *La religión cananea* 19, 33. - Furthermore, I would be *enchanté* to know on which works I am heavily dependent for my proposal (according to Schmidt), apart from the opinion which considers those names as 'divine names', in order to thank the authors and feel at ease in such a good company.