

A DIFFICULT PART OF MOT'S MESSAGE TO BAAL IN THE UGARITIC TEXTS

(CTA 5. i. 4-6)

By J. A. EMERTON

The references to Ugaritic texts in this article are given according to CTA, that is, A. Herdner, *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939* (Paris, 1963), and Herdner's system of transliteration is adopted. A list of works to which reference is made merely by the authors' names, or by names and dates of publication, is given at the end of the article. In considering the arguments for and against the principal interpretations that have been offered of the passage under discussion, I am aware that not all the theories examined are still maintained by those who first advanced them; nor, in venturing to disagree with some scholars, have I forgotten how much is owed by any student of Ugaritic to those who have gone before him.

The text CTA 5 (known also as I*AB, by Gordon as Text 67, and by Driver as Baal I*) contains the following passage in i. 4-6 (omitting *lyrt* at the end of line 6, because it begins a new sentence, or at least a new clause):

4. *tłkḥ . ttrp . šmm . krs*
5. *'ipdk . 'ank . 'isp'i . 'uṭm*
6. *drqm . 'amtm*

I

Before CTA 5. i. 4-6 is examined, the context in which these lines are found must be considered.

(1) *The passage is part of Mot's message to Baal*

At the beginning of CTA 5, Mot is giving Gpn and 'Ugr a message to take to Baal; the messenger's departure is narrated in lines 9-11, and the message is delivered in lines 12 ff. It is agreed by most scholars that the previous tablet in the series is CTA 4, because 4. vii-viii tells how Baal sends Gpn and 'Ugr to Mot. Those who favour a different order of tablets (see the references in de Moor, 1971, p. 36; cp. pp. 1-2) fail to offer so satisfactory an account of the evidence, and the fact that Baal says in 5. ii. 12 that he is Mot's servant is not necessarily evidence (as Aistleitner, pp. 11-12, supposes) that this passage cannot come after his boast in 4. vii. 49 ff., for his submissive words may be merely a polite mode

of expression (cp. Driver), or perhaps a sign that his courage has now failed him. Ginsberg, who earlier advanced the view that the tablet immediately preceding CTA 5 is CTA 4, now (1950, p. 138) suggests the possibility that the order is CTA 4-3-5, but he gives no reason for the suggestion, and he does not explain why 3. v. 46 ff. says that Baal has no house, whereas 4. v-vi appears to record how the house was built.

CTA 5 begins in the middle of Mot's words, and it is a reasonable assumption that the earlier part of the message, which was contained in the illegible end of CTA 4, is identical with 5. i. 12-27 for, although lines 27 ff. are damaged, enough can be read to make it plain that they include a repetition of lines 1 ff. It is no longer necessary to discuss earlier opinions about the message which have not been maintained in recent publications, such as the view that the message is sent by Baal to Gpn and 'Ugr (Virolleaud), by Spš to Gpn and 'Ugr (Dussaud), or by Gpn and 'Ugr to Anath (Albright).¹ The presupposition of the following discussion is that CTA 5. i. 4-6 is part of Mot's message to Baal.

(2) *Mot's message to Baal is hostile*

In seeking to determine the meaning of the passage, it will be helpful to know whether Mot's message to Baal is openly hostile. Baal is killed by Mot later in CTA 5, and it must be asked whether hostility is already apparent in Mot's words. Lines 6 (end) to 8 speak of someone descending into Mot's throat:

6. . . . *lyrt*

7. *bnpš . bn 'ilm . mt . bmh*

8. *mrt . ydd . 'il . gzt*

. . . Thou shalt surely descend

into the throat of Mot the son of El, into the
miry depths of the hero, the beloved of El.

The person who is to descend can scarcely be anyone other than Baal, to whom the message is addressed. It would not make sense to say that Mot is to descend into his own throat, and the words cannot refer to Gpn and 'Ugr, who is about to take Mot's message to Baal. Are these words to Baal a threat or an ostensibly friendly message?

There are three reasons for believing that lines 6-8 contain a threat. First, line 26 includes the words [*t*]^c*n* . 'i^c*nk* and is apparently addressed to Baal. The verb is perhaps to be understood in the same sense as in CTA 10. ii. 24-5:

n^tcⁿ . b'arš . 'iby

wb^cpr . qm . 'ahk

1. Cp. the criticisms of Albright's view made by Ginsberg in 1941.

There Baal tells Anath what they will do to his enemies, and the verb must have a hostile sense: it is probably to be explained from the Hebrew verb *tāʿan*, 'to pierce', and its cognates in Arabic and Aramaic. If *tʿn* in CTA 5. i. 26 has the same meaning, then Mot is threatening to pierce Baal. It is also possible that Ugaritic, like Hebrew, had a homonym meaning 'to bear, carry', but the latter meaning is not clearly attested in Ugaritic, and there is a slight advantage for accepting the established meaning 'to pierce'; nor is it clear why Mot should wish to carry Baal, unless that too has a hostile sense. Secondly, Mot's message to Baal is a reply to what Baal has said. In CTA 4. vii. 49-50, Baal announces that he will send someone (presumably Gpn and 'Ugr) to Mot, and then says *'ahdy . dymk . ʿl . 'ilm*, 'I alone am he that will reign over the gods.' If these words are part of Baal's message to Mot, they appear to be a challenge to him, and it follows that Mot's response is more likely to be hostile than friendly. Thirdly, the reference to the future descent of Baal into Mot's throat has a hostile appearance. In CTA 4. viii. 17-20 and 6. ii. 22-3, it appears that to enter Mot's throat is equivalent to dying. If, therefore, Mot says in CTA 5. i. 6-8 that Baal will descend into his throat, it is probably a warning that he intends to kill Baal. For these three reasons it seems likely that Mot's message to Baal should be understood in a hostile sense.

There is one piece of evidence that might appear to tell against the interpretation of Mot's message in a hostile sense. Later in the same column of the tablet, we find in lines 22-5 what seems to be an invitation to Baal to come to a banquet to eat and drink with Mot's kinsmen; and an invitation to a banquet is normally regarded as friendly. How is the apparent conflict between different pieces of evidence to be reconciled? First, Driver (pp. 16-7) thinks that the words about descending into Mot's throat are an aside, and not part of the message that is to be taken to Baal: if Baal accepts the invitation and shares Mot's food, he will fall into Mot's power. The objection to his view is that lines 6-8 address Baal in the second person and come immediately after words that are addressed to him, and there is nothing to indicate that they are anything other than part of the message. While Driver's theory cannot be described as impossible, it is desirable to seek for a more satisfactory explanation of the evidence. Secondly, Gaster (1950 and 1961) understands the *l* of *lyrt* in a negative sense: Mot says that Baal has never descended into his throat. The translation is possible, but it involves an interpretation of the passage as a whole that raises problems, as will be seen below. Moreover, there is still the difficulty that Mot probably threatens to pierce Baal—and Gaster leaves [*tʿn* . *'itʿnk*] untranslated. Thirdly, Aistleitner

supposes that Mot presents a choice to Baal: either he accepts Mot's invitation or Mot will kill him. His view involves the translation of *pnšt* in line 26 as 'Solltest du aber . . . (es) verschmähen (wörtl.: unterlassen)'. However, he explains the root *nšy* from Hebrew *nāšāh* and its Arabic and Aramaic cognates, which all mean 'to forget', and not 'to omit, neglect'. The suggested transition in meaning is conceivable, and it may be observed that *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* includes under 'Forget' the meaning 'To neglect wilfully, disregard, overlook, slight' in Middle English;² nevertheless, the fact that Aistleitner has to postulate a semantic development without direct evidence tells against his theory. Moreover, it would be surprising if Baal's challenge to Mot were to be met with an invitation to a banquet.

All the interpretations of the invitation to a banquet discussed above understand it to be, ostensibly at least, a friendly invitation. It is, however, also possible to understand it in a different way. In lines 14-20, Mot speaks of his appetite, and perhaps the invitation to Baal is intended in the following sense: although Baal is invited to eat and drink, what is really meant is that he is to join the banquet as the meal, or to be invited to dine with Mot may be equivalent to being invited to die. If it is legitimate to interpret in such a way the invitation to a banquet, then, so far from being a friendly act, it is a threat.³

It is, therefore, probable that Mot's message to Baal is hostile. The words in lines 4-6 must be understood in a way compatible with that probability.

(3) *The struggle with Ltn in lines 1-3*

It must next be asked what is meant by the reference to the struggle with Ltn in the first three lines of the tablet.

1. *ktmhš . ltn . btn . brḥ*
2. *tkly . btn . °qltn*
3. *šlyt . d . šb^{ct} . r'ašm*

There is agreement about the general sense of the passage, and it is unnecessary for the present purpose to discuss the problems raised by *brḥ*⁴ and *šlyt*. However, opinions differ about the precise meaning which the conjunction *k* has here, and about the time to which the verbs refer. The conjunction has been thought by different scholars to mean 'because', 'when', 'if', 'although', and 'as'. For convenience, 'because' (Kapelrud) is used in the following

2. I am grateful to Dr. P. Wernberg-Moller for making this point and for several other helpful suggestions.

3. A similar view is perhaps presupposed by Kapelrud.

4. Cp. C. Rabin, *Journal of Theological Studies*, xlvii (1946), pp. 38-41.

translation, but its use is not intended to prejudice the question.

Because thou didst (or dost, or wilt) smite Ltn the slippery serpent, didst (or dost, or wilt) make an end of the twisting serpent, the cursed one (or tyrant) with seven heads.

The fact that lines 1-3 are introduced by *k* suggests that they are subordinate clauses in a longer sentence, and it is usually thought that the main clause, or clauses, begins in line 4; however, it is impossible to be certain, for the main clause may have occurred in the illegible last part of CTA 4 or in the damaged CTA 5. i. 26-7.

Some scholars have thought that the verbs refer to the future. It has been suggested that the slaying of Ltn was a condition to be fulfilled by Baal⁵ before he could have autonomy (Ginsberg, 1936, p. 165) or come to Mot's banquet, whether the condition was intended seriously or as an ironical challenge to Baal to undertake a task that he could not perform. If, however, the interpretation of Mot's invitation that was advanced above is correct, such suggestions are unlikely. A different explanation of lines 1-3 has been offered by Gaster (1961), who translates the beginning of the passage, 'If now thou go fighting Leviathan . . .' He thinks that Baal intends to fight his various enemies, and that line 4 says that he will merely wear himself out. Gaster's interpretation of line 4 will be considered later, but it may be pointed out here that there has been no explicit reference in any previous part of the story to Baal's intention to fight Ltn, although the fact that the tablet is damaged makes it impossible to attach too much importance to this argument. Gaster's earlier (1944) suggestion is more plausible: even if Baal were to defeat Ltn he would himself still fall.

The other possibility is that these lines refer to Baal's defeat of Ltn in the past, as has been held by many scholars, including Gaster in 1950. The passage can then be understood in several different ways: although Baal killed Ltn, he will not succeed in killing Mot but will himself be killed; because Baal killed Ltn, he too will be killed; as Baal killed Ltn, so he will be killed; when Baal killed Ltn, it had unpleasant results for Mot. The last view will be discussed later, and reasons will be given for doubting its plausibility. The other explanations of lines 1-3 as a reference to a past event are all compatible with the view that Mot's message to Baal is a threat. However, of the various meanings that have been proposed for *k* in line 1 the one that is clearly

5. It is unnecessary for the present purpose to discuss the relation between this passage and CTA 3. iii. 35 ff., where Anath claims to have killed the dragon, or to consider whether Ltn is to be identified with Ym.

attested elsewhere is 'because', and it seems best to adopt it, although without denying the possibility of the others. The reason why Baal's killing of Ltn should lead Mot to kill him is uncertain, but it may be conjectured that Ltn and Mot were allies, or that the killing was an act that deserved retribution.

It is thus likely that lines 1-3 give as a reason why Baal will be killed the fact that he slew Ltn in the past.

II

Now that the context has been discussed, it is possible to examine lines 4-6.

(1) Preliminary considerations

The first problem to be considered is the arrangement of the passage in lines of verse. There are probably three lines, but it is not certain whether *krs* belongs to the first or the second, and whether *'isp'i* to the second or the third.

ttkh ttrp šmm
krs
'ipdk 'ank
'isp'i
'uṭm drqm 'amtm

The second line is unlikely to have been much shorter than the others, and so it is probable that either *krs* or *'isp'i*, or perhaps both, belongs to it. The above scheme arranges the words in three lines of three or four words each; and that seems more probable than the view that, for example, *ttkh ttrp* and *šmm krs* form two lines of two words each, although Ugaritic verse allows of such variety that such a view cannot be described as impossible.

Some comments may be made about individual words. Since these lines occur in the message of Mot, the first person singular pronoun *'ank* must refer to him. Further, if the last consonant of *'ipdk* is the second person singular pronominal suffix, as is generally agreed, it presumably refers to Baal to whom the message is addressed. It is also widely agreed that *'isp'i* is the first person singular of a verb *sp'*. Although Albright explains it from Aramaic *s^epā'*, 'to perish', most scholars have followed Virolleaud in believing that it is related to Biblical Hebrew *mišpō'*, 'fodder', Mishnaic Hebrew *sāpāh*, 'to give a portion, to give to eat', and Aramaic *s^epā'* with the same meaning. A verb *sp'* is found in other Ugaritic passages (CTA 6. v. 20; 17. i. 32, ii. 4, 21; also 20. B. 10, where the tablet is too damaged to offer much help), where the meaning 'to give to eat, to feed' or, perhaps in a reflexive theme, 'to eat' would fit the context (cp. de Moor, 1971,

pp. 229, 233); it therefore seems best to accept the view that it has the same meaning here.

It must next be asked how this passage is related to what precedes and what follows. If the conjunction *k* at the beginning of line 1 introduces a subordinate clause or a series of subordinate clauses, it is possible, as was seen above, that the main clause of the sentence is to be found in lines 4-6, although it may not include all ten words in those lines. It is also possible that part, or all, of lines 4-6 is linked in sense with lines 6 ff. (from *lyrt*), which speak of Baal's death.

(2) *The third line: (\pm 'isp'i) 'u \dot{t} m drqm 'amtm*

Although this line is the third in the passage, it is best to begin with it, because it contains a word that might be thought to be the clue to the understanding of the whole. The word *'amtm* has been regarded by some scholars as the first person singular of the familiar verb *mwt*, 'to die', with an enclitic *m*. Since Mot is probably the subject, it might appear to state that he will die, or has died, or is dying, and that would involve interpreting the preceding words in a way that is compatible with his death.

Some have understood *'amtm* to refer to the speaker's death in the future. Albright's translation 'let me die' is related to his view that the passage is addressed by Gpn and 'Ugr to Anath, and it need not be discussed when that view has been rejected. If Mot is the speaker and the verb refers to his death in the future (Jirku), then perhaps there is an allusion to the time, later in the myth, when Mot, after killing Baal, is himself killed by Anath. Yet it is not clear why Mot should refer to his own death in the present context—and Jirku admits that he cannot understand all the words and offers no translation of *drqm*. Moreover, it may be doubted whether Mot knows at this stage of the story that he is himself to be killed. Even if the passage is part of a seasonal vegetation myth in which Baal and Mot die every year (and that is far from being universally agreed), and even if the narrative should not be expected to conform in all respects to our ideas of what is logical, we may nevertheless legitimately expect it to make sense as a story, and there is no reason to suppose that Mot, who here expresses his intention of killing Baal, knows that Anath will succeed in avenging her brother's death. Such attempts to explain *'amtm* as a reference to the speaker's death in the future are thus unsatisfactory.

Another suggestion is that *'amtm* refers to something that happened to Mot in the past. Driver translates it 'I died' and gives in a footnote the alternative rendering 'I was (as one) dead' (p. 103), and he suggests that, after Baal's defeat of Ltn whom he identifies with Yam, Mot 'felt himself as it were dead while

he partook of the funeral feast (held in Yam's honour)' (p. 16). Driver's explanation appears to involve the acceptance of his alternative translation or at least the understanding of 'I died' in the same sense. Yet it is not easy to accept the view that 'I died' can legitimately be understood to mean 'I was (as one) dead'. Further, there is no reference in the extant Ugaritic texts to a funeral meal in honour of Yam, and Driver's explanation of the passage depends on his translation of *'uṭm* as 'funeral meats' which, as will be argued below, is very questionable. It is, therefore, unlikely that Driver is right in understanding *'amtm* as a reference to Mot's 'death' in the past.

It must next be asked whether any better sense can be obtained by regarding *'amtm* as a reference to what is happening in the present. Gaster, who in 1944 had understood the word to mean 'I am destined to die', later changed his mind and in 1950 rendered it 'I am as good as dead'. He suggested that *'uṭm* was related to Hebrew *l'e'at* and *drqm* to Arabic *srq*, 'to do by stealth', and that the two words meant 'slowly (or, easily?) and "imperceptibly" or the like', respectively. Thus, the words *'uṭm drqm 'amtm* 'mean, approximately, "I am dying by slow degrees"'. He thought that the first few lines of the tablet refer to the smiting of Ltn in the past, and that the next part describes 'a pointed contrast between the sorry state of Môt, subsequently described, and that of the triumphant Baal now ensconced in his glorious mansion'. The theory is open to objection on two grounds. First, the implied shift in meaning from dying stealthily to dying by slow degrees is not entirely convincing, although its possibility cannot be denied. Secondly, a contrast between Baal's success and Mot's present sorry state scarcely justifies Mot in saying that he is slowly dying. Gaster had revised his opinion again by 1961, when the second edition of *Thespis* was published. He now thinks that the opening lines of the tablet tell Baal that he will wear himself out if he fights Ltn; then Mot describes 'his sorry state' and says, 'I am the one that is dying'. Gaster also refers to Mot's 'own fate as the result of challenging Baal', and says that Baal 'is now "sitting pretty" and has turned the tables effectively on Mot'. Gaster's revised opinion rests partly on his translation of the words immediately before, which will be considered later, but, in any case, it is still not clear from the context that there is any justification for saying that Mot is dying.

If it is difficult to accept the view that *'amtm* refers to Mot's death in the future, past, or present, it must be asked whether there is any other way of explaining the word. Gray, who understands *'isp'i* to mean 'I shall . . . eat thee' (the force of the pronominal

suffix at the end of *'ipdk* is presumably thought to be carried over to *'amtm*), then translates *'utm drqm 'amtm* 'Cleft, forspent, and exhausted', relating the words to, respectively, Arabic *'aṭṭa*, 'to split', *sariqa*, 'to be enervated', and *'amtun*, 'weakness, emptiness'. He regards all three words as adverbs, although he could also understand them as adjectives. Gray has offered a possible solution of the problem of *drqm* and *'amtm*, although he does not explain how his translation fits the context—does he suppose that the words imply a long struggle between Baal and Mot for which the former's strength will be inadequate? His explanation of *'utm* seems to me to be unsatisfactory, for *'aṭṭa* means 'It produced, made, gave, emitted, or uttered, a sound, noise, voice, or cry . . . particularly, it creaked; and it moaned'; it can be said of a camel's saddle (Lane). I can find no evidence that it means 'to split'. It is true that J. G. Hava, *Arabic-English Dictionary* (revised ed., Beirut, 1921), gives the rendering 'To crack (saddle)', but it may be suspected that it means the emitting of a cracking noise rather than splitting. Unless Gray can give evidence that *'aṭṭa* means 'to split', his explanation of *'utm* must be rejected.

Another scholar who does not regard *'amtm* as a verb is Aistleitner. He translates *'isp'i 'utm drqm 'amtm* as follows: 'Fressen würde ich frischblutende Bissen, zwei Ellen lang!' He explains *'utm* from Arabic *'aṭama*, 'to bite',⁶ *drqm* from Hebrew *zāraq*, Aramaic *d'raq*, and Accadian *zarāqu*, 'to scatter, sprinkle', and Arabic *z/daraqa*, 'to throw', and he regards *'amtm* as the dual of *'amt* (cp. Virolleaud), which is found elsewhere in the Ugaritic texts with the meaning 'forearm' and may also, like the Hebrew cognate *'ammāh*, have had the meaning 'cubit'. Mot will eat Baal, gobbling him up in huge bites. Aistleitner's rendering of *drqm* involves a slight difference from the meanings of the supposed cognates, but his translation of the clause as a whole fits the context and has the advantage of explaining *'amtm* from a word that is attested elsewhere in Ugaritic. However, it is still necessary to ask whether there are any other possible solutions of the problem. Habel translates *'utm drqm 'amtm* 'Thy red blood will be dried up and lifeless'. His translation of the first two words will be discussed below, but he offers no justification for his rendering of *'amtm*, and it is impossible to accept his suggestion without knowing how he would explain it.

6. G. W. Freytag, *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum* (Halle, 1830-37), 'Momordit (manum suam)'. The meaning 'to bite' is found in the *Lisān* and the *Taj al-^cArus*. I am indebted to Mr. G. R. Smith for help in discussing the Arabic evidence.

Yet another view is that *'amtm* is a form of the verb 'to die', but that it does not refer to Mot's death. Cassuto understands it as a causative theme of the verb with the third person masculine plural pronominal suffix: 'I will kill them'. His opinion that the antecedent of the suffix is a word denoting 'images' will be considered later, but it may be observed here that his understanding of the verb could be adapted to the view that the unexpressed object is 'thee', that is, Baal, and that the last letter of the word is an enclitic *m*. The possibility of Cassuto's translation of the verb depends on the acceptance of the theory that Ugaritic had a causative theme with prefixed *h-* or *'a-*, which has been disputed and is uncertain but is not impossible.⁷ Another possibility is that there has been a scribal error: the Ugaritic letter *t* resembles both *'a* and *m* in appearance, and scribes sometimes write one or other of them instead of it.⁸ It is, therefore, conceivable that *'amtm* is a mistake for either *tmtm* or *'amtt*: the former would be the second person masculine singular meaning 'thou wilt die', and the latter the first person singular of the verb with reduplication of the last radical meaning 'I will kill (thee)'—this form can be used as the causative of a hollow verb (Gordon, § 9. 36), and the Hebrew *po^olel* of *mut* may be compared. While it is desirable not to resort to emendation, the possibility that a simple scribal error has occurred must be taken seriously in a discussion of so difficult a passage. The most satisfactory solution of the problem is probably to emend *'amtm*, unless it is thought legitimate to postulate a causative meaning for the word as it stands, or unless further study of the passage establishes the probability of the alternative explanation offered by Aistleitner.

It is now time to examine *'isp'i 'u^otm drqm*, some explanations of which have already been noted in passing. Apart from Gray's translation, which was seen to involve difficulties, interpretations can be classified in three groups.

First, the verb *'isp'i* ('I ate', 'I will eat', 'I was eaten', or 'I will be eaten') has suggested that the other two words refer to food. Driver translates the three words 'I myself was consumed like blood-red funeral meats', and offers as an alternative 'I myself

7. The existence of such a theme in Ugaritic is questioned by Driver, p. 129, and Gordon, §9.40. The other point of view is presented by E. Hammershaimb, *Das Verbum im Dialekt von Ras Schamra* (Copenhagen, 1941), pp. 25-40; he considers *'amtm* in the present passage on p. 214. M. Dahood, 'Some *aphel* causatives in Ugaritic', *Biblica*, xxxviii (1957), pp. 62-73, argues for the existence of an *'a-* causative, but none of the examples given by him is certain.

8. Cp. S. Segert in J. Hempel and L. Rost (ed.), *Von Ugarit nach Qumran* (Berlin, 1958), pp. 204-5.

consumed the blood-red funeral meats', but the interpretation of the passage offered by him on p. 16, which was mentioned above, really requires the second meaning. A connexion between *drqm* and Hebrew *šruqqīm*, 'vine tendrils', was proposed by Virolleaud in 1934, but later scholars have tended to see in the Ugaritic word a reference to the colour 'red', which probably underlies the noun meaning 'vine tendrils' and appears in the description of the horses in Zech. i. 8, in Mishnaic Hebrew *sārāq*, 'light red', in Accadian *šarqu*, 'red (arterial) blood' (Albright), and Arabic *šariqa*, 'to become red'. The problematical Ugaritic letter transliterated *d* can correspond to several different sibilants or to a voiced interdental spirant in other Semitic languages, and so this explanation of *drqm* is philologically possible. The translation of *'uṭm* as 'funeral meats' is much less likely. Driver suggests in the Glossary (p. 134) that it is related to Arabic *'waṭmu* "funeral meat", and attributes the identification to Gaster. A correspondence between an Arabic *waw* and a Ugaritic *'aleph* is conceivable (cp. the Semitic roots that appear in Hebrew as *'āšar* and *yāšar* and are perhaps related to one another), but there is a more serious difficulty: I have been unable to find either the Arabic word with the meaning given it by Driver or a reference to it in the writings of Gaster. Dussaud (p. 36) proposed such a meaning for the Ugaritic word and suggested an Arabic cognate, but the Arabic word was *wadīmatun*, not *waṭmun*. Arabic *d* normally corresponds to Ugaritic *š*, not *ṭ*, and the irregularity makes Dussaud's explanation of the Ugaritic word improbable especially since the correspondence of *w* and *'u*, though possible, is incomplete). Another suggestion is made of F. Lokkegaard, namely, that *drqm* is to be explained from Arabic *darqum*, 'excrement', and that it is the object of the verb *'uṭm*, 'I consume', to which he emends *'uṭm*. His suggestion is to be rejected because it is not clear how it fits the context, because he fails to explain why the first person preformative is vocalized with *u*, and because an emendation, which should in any case be avoided if possible, would presumably also be needed in CTA 18. iv. 3, where *'uṭm dr[qm]* is found. If *'uṭm* has anything to do with food, it is better to follow Aistleitner in relating it to Arabic *'aṭama*, 'to bite'. On the other hand, his explanation of *drqm* is less likely than the view that it is connected with 'red' or 'red blood'. The clause may thus mean 'I will eat thee in gory bites' or the like.

Secondly, it has been suggested that *'uṭm drqm* is concerned with the stopping of the flow of the blood. The Hebrew verb *'ātam*, like its Arabic and Aramaic cognates, means 'to shut, stop up', and Albright explains the first Ugaritic word as a passive verb and translates the two words 'the red blood is stopped'. Gaster's

(1961) translation of *'uṭm* is probably based on the same etymology: 'a stopper, as it were, has been placed upon me'; he presumably understands it to be a passive verb in the first person singular (and his translation continues 'drained of strength (?) as I am'—perhaps supposing that *drqm* is related to Hebrew *zāraq*), but it seems more likely that the flow of a person's blood, rather than the person himself, would be said to be stopped. Habel adopts Albright's explanation of the words, but he regards the tense as future: 'Thy red blood will be dried up'; since the context shows that Baal's blood is meant, it is legitimate to express the meaning in idiomatic English by using 'Thy' rather than 'The'. His translation, no less than Aistleitner's rendering in terms of eating, fits the context as it has been understood in this paper.

Thirdly, Virolleaud thinks that *'uṭm* is related to the Hebrew word *'iṭṭīm*, which occurs in Isa. xix. 3, and which he understands to denote diviners or necromancers. Cassuto, however, argues that the context in Isaiah shows that the Hebrew word refers rather to gods, and he suggests that the Ugaritic word means 'images'. He explains *drqm* from Arabic *ṣarīqun*, 'fair of face', and translates *'uṭm drqm 'amtṃ* as follows: 'I will kill thy beautiful images.' His translation is related to his dubious understanding of *'ipdk* in line 5, which will be considered below, and it involves for *'uṭm* a questionable transition in meaning from 'gods' to 'images'. Moreover, it would be better in the present context to speak of harm being done directly to Baal, rather than to his images.

It is now possible to sum up this part of the paper. First, if *'isp'i* is closely connected with *'uṭm drqm*, the three words are best translated 'I will eat thee in gory bites.' If it is not, then it goes with the previous line, and the following two words are to be translated 'the flow of thy blood will be stopped'. Secondly, if *'amtṃ* may be understood as a causative, it can be translated 'I will kill thee'; if not, it is possible that it should be emended to *'amtṭ*, 'I will kill (thee)' or to *tmtṃ*, 'thou wilt die'. If the preceding words refer to eating, *'amtṃ* may mean 'two cubits thick'. A choice among the various possibilities must wait until the remaining lines have been discussed.

(3) *The first line: tṭkḥ ttrp ṣmm*

The three words above probably belong to the same line, although some take *ṣmm* with the following word *krs* and regard them as a line on their own. *krs* will be more fully discussed later, but it may be observed now that Cassuto's explanation of it from Hebrew *kārēs*, 'belly', which is related to Accadian *karšu* and Arabic *karṣun*, is improbable because the Ugaritic consonant corresponding to the sibilants in the other Semitic languages should be *š*, not *s* (cp. Gaster, 1944).

Before various translations of the line are considered, the principal etymologies proposed for the individual words in it will be examined. *ttkḥ* is presumably derived from a root *tkḥ*, and the same consonants are found elsewhere in the Ugaritic texts (CTA 11. 1, 2; 24. 4) in contexts describing sexual intercourse. Ginsberg (1936) compares the word here with South Arabian *mikḥ*, 'stone tablets'. It is not at once obvious how the same root could explain the present passage, the sexual contexts, and the South Arabian meaning, but de Moor (1964) suggests a connexion with Arabic *kataḥa*, 'to uncover', and postulates metathesis; the South Arabian noun could be explained if there were a relationship similar to that between Hebrew *gālāh*, 'to uncover', and *gillāyōn*, 'tablet'. Albright also postulates metathesis, but the cognate with which he associates the Ugaritic word is Hebrew *kāḥaš*, 'to grow lean'. The theory suffers from the disadvantage that the Aramaic cognate is *k^eḥaš*, which does not have as the last radical the letter *taw* that would have been expected if Albright's explanation had been correct; the explanation could be maintained only if the Aramaic verb were a loan from Hebrew. A similar difficulty stands in the way of Aistleitner's attempt to relate the Ugaritic word to Syriac *'eškaḥ*, 'to find'⁹; however, a comparison with Hebrew *šākaḥ*, 'to forget' (Cassuto) is possible, provided that it is not related to the Aramaic and Syriac root with *šin*. Albright had seen the difficulty about the correspondence of sibilants in other people's theories, but failed to realise that it told against his own.

ttṛp was originally thought to be a noun related to the Hebrew word 'teraphim' (Virolleaud, and Ginsberg, 1936), but some (e.g. Albright) have compared it with Hebrew *rāpāh*, 'to sink, relax', and others (e.g. Cassuto) with Arabic *tarīfa*, 'He enjoyed, or led, a plentiful, and a pleasant or an easy, and a soft or delicate life; or a life of ease and plenty' (Lane), which Albright believes to be related to the Hebrew verb.

šmm is unlikely to be the Ugaritic word meaning 'name'—at least, such a translation has not been suggested for the present context. A connexion with Hebrew *sīm*, 'to place, put' (Ginsberg, 1936) or *šōmēm*, 'to be appalled' (Gaster, 1944) has been suggested, but most scholars have followed Virolleaud in identifying the word with the common Ugaritic *šmm*, 'sky, skies, heavens' (cp. Hebrew *šamayim* and its cognates), and the abundant attestation of the noun elsewhere commends the identification.

It is now time to consider the translations of the line that have been proposed. Ginsberg (1936) suggested the rendering 'the tablets of the teraphim shalt thou don', but it is difficult to

9. A. Goetze, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lx (1941), p. 372, draws attention to the problem of the sibilants.

see why a noun denoting teraphim should have a preformative *t*, and the translation raises more problems for the understanding of the line that it solves, and Ginsberg himself left the line untranslated and described it as 'very obscure' in 1950. In 1944, Gaster offered the translation 'Yet still wouldst thou fall weary, inert, Exhausted, . . . (?)!' His comparison of the second and third words with Hebrew *rāpāh* and *šōmēm* is possible, but he accepted the improbable explanation of *ttkḥ* in terms of Hebrew *kāḥaš*, and his theory does not fit the sexual contexts in which the verb is used; further, the fact that *krs* was left untranslated tells against his suggestion, and he had abandoned it by 1950. Aistleitner translates the first two words 'Also würdest du getroffen werden und hinsinken', and the next four 'Den Bauch schlitzend würde ich durchbohren'. His translation involves a guess about the meaning of *šmm*, and also the improbable explanation of *ttkḥ* with the help of Syriac *'eškah* and of *krs* with the help of Hebrew *kārēs*.

The remaining theories more plausibly explain *šmm* to mean 'the skies, heavens'. First, Cassuto's translation, 'Thou wilt forget the pleasures of the heavens', involves the difficulty that, although Baal is the god of the skies, there is no evidence that they were regarded as 'heaven' in the sense of the realm where the gods lived. Even if Baal's palace was thought to be in the sky, it may still be doubted whether the idea presupposed by Cassuto's translation is quite the same. Secondly, it is more widely held that the line tells of a disaster that befell the skies. Since Baal is a sky god, it is likely that a disaster for them would occur at a time when he encounters disaster himself, rather than a time when he triumphs. It is, therefore, improbable that Driver is right in suggesting that the words, which he translates 'the heavens wilted (and) drooped (slack)', refer to what happened when Baal smote Ltn. It is more likely that the words speak of what will happen to the skies in the future when Baal is killed. Even if Albright's attempt to relate *ttkḥ* to *kāḥaš* is mistaken, it is still possible to argue that the context favours such a meaning as 'waste away, wilt, wither', and even to follow those who compare the use of *šākah* in Ps. cii. 5, cxxvii. 5, although such a translation of the Hebrew verb has perhaps been accepted too readily on the basis of this very obscure Ugaritic passage. If, however, the meaning is to be derived from the context, it may be doubted whether 'wilt' or 'wither' is the most suitable translation, especially since it does not easily fit the sexual usage, for which Driver proposes the translation 'relax', which is different and perhaps not entirely appropriate to the context. There is more to be said for the opinions of Gordon, who suggests the meaning 'to shine (of heavenly bodies)' and 'to be passionate', and of Pope, who favours to 'be hot, ardent, passionate', and so to 'wither (from heat). CTA 3. v. 25-6; 4. viii.

21-4; 6. ii. 24-5 relate how the weather became hot and dry, and the last of these passages describes the state of affairs after Baal's death; it would thus make good sense in CTA 5. i. 4 for Mot to predict that the skies will become hot and dry when he kills Baal. The idea of being hot would also suit the contexts in which the verb has a sexual sense. The present passage is understood in a similar way by Gray, who is followed by Habel in translating these words 'The heavens will dry up'. If, however, de Moor's explanation of *tkh* is accepted, Baal will be the subject of the verb, which will be translated 'Thou wilt be stripped', and *šmm* will be the subject of *ttrp*; in fact, de Moor understands the verbs to refer to the past, but his explanation of the etymology would also fit an understanding in terms of the future.

It remains to determine the meaning of *ttrp šmm*. If the first word is thought to be a verb and explained with the help of *rāpāh*, the clause means 'the skies will become slack'. Such a translation is related to a view of the following words which will be examined later, but it is in itself rather surprising, though not impossible if the sky is pictured as a curtain or a tent (cp. Isa. xl. 22, Ps. civ. 2). Albright, who translates the verb 'will sag', compares Isa. li. 6 and Ps. cii. 27, which speak of the skies wearing out like a garment, but that is different from saying that the skies will sag. Nor does Job xxvi. 11, to which he also refers, offer him much help, for it says of the pillars of the skies, not of the skies themselves, that they *y^erōpāpu* (which is, in any case, probably a form of the verb *rāpāp*, not *rāpāh*).

Another explanation of *ttrp* should probably be sought, and it may be suggested that it is related to the Arabic verb *raffa*, which is said by Lane to have such meanings as '*Its colour shone, or glistened . . . The lightning gleamed, or shone*'; the noun *raffatun* means '*a shining, or glistening*', and the adjective *rafīfun* '*Shining, or glistening*'. If *ttrp* is explained thus, it is probably necessary to postulate a by-form *rpy* in Ugaritic, because the form expected for a root *rpp* in a theme with preformative *t-* (cp. the fifth theme in Arabic) would be *ttrpp*, not *ttrp*¹⁰; but there would be nothing surprising in the existence of such a by-form (cp. the familiar relation between verbs like *rābab* and *rābāh*, and *šāgag* and *šāgāh* in Hebrew). *ttrp* may then be translated 'will shine', and the passage may be compared to the description of what happens to the skies after Baal's death and before his return to life is

10. It may, however, be observed that II Sam. xxii. 27 has the form *tittābār* from the root *brr*, where Ps. xviii. 27 has the regular *tittābār*. It is usually thought that the former is a scribal error for the latter, but a different view is presented by F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxxii (1953), p. 28.

accompanied by the skies raining fatness. In CTA 6. ii. 24-5 (cp. 3. v. 25-6, and 4. viii. 21-4, which refer to a time before Baal's death), we are told:

nrt . 'ilm [.] špš . šhrrt
l'a . šmm . byd . bn 'ilm . mt

Spš the lamp of the gods blazed (?);
 the skies shone (?) because of Mot the son of El.

Such a translation of the passage is contested by de Moor (1971, pp. 114-5, 177, 226-8), who argues that *šhrrt* means 'became dust-coloured', like Arabic *'iṣḥārā* (cp. 'Hebr. **ṣāhōr* "brownish yellow" or "reddish" . . . Syr. *ṣeḥar* "to become reddish"), and *l'a* 'was soiled', like Accadian *lu''u*, 'to make dirty, soil', and that there is a reference to the obscuring of the sun and sky by clouds of dust and sand in the dry season. He draws attention to the fact that the Accadian verb can be used with the sky as its object—though that is scarcely conclusive evidence. He thinks it improbable that the Ugaritic verb *šhr* means 'to shine, gleam, burn' or the like, and argues that such a meaning does not fit CTA 23. 41, 44-5, 47-8, where he thinks that *šhrrt* (parallel to *thrr*, 'thou dost roast') means 'fry (it) brown'. Against de Moor, although the root *šhr* is used of a colour or colours in Semitic languages, it is questionable whether the primary meaning is 'to become dust-coloured'; and, even if it is, there is also evidence for the meaning 'to make hot'. Lane records that *ṣaḥāra* in Arabic can mean 'he cooked it . . . The sun pained his brain' or 'melted him'; cp. the noun *ṣaḥīratun*, 'Milk into which heated stones are thrown, so that it boils'. It is scarcely surprising that the eleventh theme, *'iṣḥārā*, can refer to colour, but it has other meanings as well: 'It (a plant) dried up; or became yellow; or dried up and became yellow.' In CTA 23, the Ugaritic verb may be used of heating and cooking food, and it may refer to the sun blazing in CTA 3. v. 25; 4. viii. 21; 6. ii. 24. CTA 6. v. 4 is difficult on any showing, but de Moor's understanding of it is dependent on his translation of the verb when used in connexion with the sun, and must be modified if that translation is changed. It is possible that Ginsberg (1932, pp. 113-4) is right in seeing in *l'a*¹¹ a verb cognate to Arabic

11. The view of some (e.g., Driver) that *l'a* is a form of the negative particle is less likely. The negative is regularly written without 'aleph, and the form *l'a* is found only in the passages listed above. Further, the understanding of it as a negative involves the view that *šmm* here means 'rain', whereas it means 'skies' elsewhere in Ugaritic. Nor is it likely that Gordon (p. 426) is right in supposing that *l'a šmm* means "'the heavens were weakened/stopt"; i.e., the heavenly bodies stood still'. There is a difference between growing weak and stopping, and the situation is different from that of Joshua x. 12-13 and two passages in the Illiad, to which Gordon refers.

la'la'a, 'It (a star, and the moon . . . and lightning . . . and fire . . .) shone, glistened, or was bright . . . or shone with flickering light . . . The fire burned brightly' (Lane). To say that the skies shine would probably mean that the sun shines and makes them bright.

To sum up, it is probable that the words *ttkh ttrp šmm* refer to what will happen to the skies when Baal is killed. *ttkh* may be explained from the context to mean 'will be hot', or may, as de Moor suggests, be related to Arabic *kataha*, 'to uncover'. *ttrp* is probably from a root *rpy*, a by-form of *rpp*; cp. Arabic *raffa*, 'to shine'.

The line may be translated either 'The skies will be hot and will shine', or 'Thou wilt be laid bare, and the skies will shine'. On the whole, it seems better to adopt the former rendering, because it understands the two verbs, which have the same external form and stand side by side asyndetously, to be both in the same person.

(4) *The second line: krs 'ipdk 'ank (± 'isp'i)*

It has already been noted that the first two words are attached by some to the previous line and are thought to refer to what happened, or will happen, to the skies. Such scholars accept the view of Virolleaud that *'ipdk* is a noun with a pronominal suffix denoting a garment, and that it is related to Hebrew *'ēpōd* and its Accadian and Aramaic cognates; and it is possible, although far from certain, that *'ipd* is used of a garment elsewhere in the Ugaritic texts (cp. de Moor, 1971, p. 187). Albright, who translates the previous line 'The heavens will wear away and will sag', renders *krs 'ipdk* 'like the fastening of thy garment'; his translation involves the emendation of *krs* to *krks*, which he explains as the preposition *k*, 'like', and a noun *rks* related to Hebrew *rākas* and Arabic *rakasa*, 'to bind'. His suggestion has been accepted by several other scholars, although there have been differences of opinion on details such as the time of the event described. Four objections may be brought against the theory. First, while it is sometimes necessary to postulate scribal errors in the text of the Ugaritic tablets (and the possibility of an error in *'amt* was considered above), it is a disadvantage to a theory that it involves emendation, unless satisfactory sense cannot be obtained from the existing text. Secondly, it is not clear why the noun should have a second person singular pronominal suffix and a reference should be made to 'thy garment'. Thirdly, as was argued above, it is strange to say that the skies will sag. Fourthly, as Gaster (1944) points out, 'it is difficult to understand how the fastening . . . could sag. Become undone, yes, but not sag'. The objections

brought against Albright's theory seem to make it untenable. Gaster, however, has at different times proposed two modified forms of the theory since abandoning his 1944 view that *'ipdk 'isp'i* means 'How in the world can I feed myself?'; he then understood the first word to be compounded of an interrogative particle *'ip* related to Hebrew *'ēpō*, and 'a quasi-deictic enclitic' *dk*—and his translation left *krs* unexplained and is difficult to reconcile with what is, if the argument of the present paper is correct, the meaning of the context. In his later writings, Gaster adopts the view that *'ipd* is a garment, and that there is a comparison between it and the heavens. In 1950, he accepts the emendation of *krs* to *krks*, and translates *šmm* and the two following words: 'the heavens themselves enwrapping thee like a mantle', literally 'the heavens are (as) the girdle of thy mantle (ephod)'; the translation is related in sense to the rendering of *ttkḥ ttrp* as 'now thou proceedest to live at ease'. By 1961 his opinion had changed again, and he now translates *ttrp* and the next three words: 'the girdle of thy robe—(that robe which is) the sky—would (thereby) become loosed!'; he regards this event as the likely result of an attempt by Baal to fight Ltn. For the idea that the sky is Baal's robe he compares Ps. civ. 2, where, however, it is light, not the sky, that is pictured as God's garment. Gaster's translations in both 1950 and 1961 avoid some objections that can be brought against Albright's rendering, but they are subject to the difficulty, not only that the view that Baal's robe is the sky is unique, but that *krs* is emended to *krks*—at least, the emendation is accepted in 1950, but there is no explanation in 1961 of what has been done with *krs*, and it seems possible that it is emended to *rks* or that metathesis is postulated. It is better to look for a different solution of the problem before accepting Gaster's suggestion. Even less satisfactory is Habel's translation: 'The heavens will dry up and languish like the dew of thy robe'; *krs* is taken to be the preposition *k* with a noun *rs*, 'dew', related to Hebrew *rāsīs*, 'drop of dew' (Ct. v. 2), and *rāsas*, 'to moisten' (Ezek. xlvi. 14). He does not explain what he supposes the point of the comparison to be: presumably, he thinks of the evaporation of the dew that has settled on someone's robe, but the figure of speech is strange and does not go well with 'languish'.

Other scholars see in the words under discussion a threat that Mot will harm Baal. Cassuto thinks that the words from *krs* to *'isp'i* mean 'I will fill my belly with thy graven images', and that the ephod is here an image as in Judges viii. 27. However, even granting the questionable opinion that the ephod in the story of Gideon is an image, it may be doubted whether a reference to

images is suitable here, and Cassuto's translation of *krs* as 'belly' has been seen to involve an irregular correspondence of sibilants. A similar irregularity weakens the theory of Gray, who explains *krs* from Arabic *karaṣa*, 'to pound', and translates it and the following four words 'I shall pound thee, consume thee, and eat thee'. He thinks that '*ipdk* is a first person singular form of a verb *npd* with a second person masculine singular suffix, and that *npd* is related to Arabic *nfd*, 'to consume'. He presumably does not intend 'consume' to be understood in the sense of 'eat', for that is not the meaning of the Arabic verb *naḥada*, 'It . . . passed away and came to an end; became spent, exhausted, or consumed; failed entirely, ceased' (Lane). Aistleitner, who wrongly thinks that *krs* means 'belly', translates '*ipdk* 'würde ich dich durchbohren' and explains it as a form of *npd*, related to Arabic *naḥada*, 'to pierce'.

The renderings proposed by Gray and Aistleitner fit the context, but their explanations of *krs* both involve an irregularity, and it is not easy to decide which root suggested for '*ipdk* is more likely, for a verb *npd* is found in no other context in Ugaritic, and there is no criterion to help us to choose between the two possible Arabic cognates. The difficulties may be overcome by making two new suggestions. First, *krs* may be explained as the conjunction *k*, 'because', and a noun *rs* related to Mishnaic Hebrew *rāsas*, which means in the *pi^cel* 'to break, crush', and to the Aramaic cognate with the same meaning; in Biblical Hebrew, *r^esīsīm* is used in Amos vi. 11 of what a great house becomes when it is smitten by Yahweh (the New English Bible translates it 'rubble'). The Ugaritic word may thus be explained from a root attested in two North-West Semitic languages, and the correspondence of sibilants is regular. Secondly, '*ipdk* may be a form of the verb *pdd*, which occurs in lines 58 and 60 of the text numbered 1106 by Gordon and 106 in C. Virolleaud, *Textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques des archives est, ouest et centrales = Mission de Ras Shamra*, VII = *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, II (Paris, 1957), pp. 137-41. The passage refers to garments which are to be replaced by new ones. Virolleaud and Gordon think that the verb is used of their becoming old and worn out (and Virolleaud compares the use of *yšn*, 'to be old', in a similar context in no. 107, lines 5-8), but the context is also compatible with the view that it means 'to be torn'. Either meaning is suitable in CTA 5. i. 5: Mot may threaten to tear Baal or to wear him out, and the latter sense may be compared with the use of the *pi^cel* of *bālāh* in I Chron. xvii. 9, and of the *pa^cel* of the Aramaic cognate in Daniel vii. 25. Aistleitner believes that the Ugaritic verb *pdd* is related to Arabic *ḥatta*, 'He crumbled a thing, or broke it into small pieces, with his fingers . . . he broke

a thing . . . *he bruised, or brayed . . . a thing*’; cp. *fattun*, ‘A fissure in a rock’ (Lane). There are other examples in Ugaritic of interchange between voiced and unvoiced consonants, and a correspondence between Ugaritic *d* and Arabic *t* is possible. If Aistleitner is right, the appropriateness of the root to the present passage is clear, especially if the explanation of *krs* proposed is correct; however, Aistleitner’s suggestion is far from certain. Anyhow, it is possible that *pdd* is a transitive verb which is used here in the active voice, and is used in the passive with reference to clothes in the other passage.

If *krs* *'ipdk* is explained in the way suggested above, two translations are possible, depending on whether *pdd* means ‘to tear’ or ‘to wear out’. First, if the former meaning is accepted, then *rs* may be regarded as an accusative of product: ‘because I will tear thee into pieces’. Secondly, if the latter meaning is accepted, then *rs* may be understood in an adverbial sense: ‘because with a breaking, or crushing, I will wear thee out’, or, to write more natural English, because ‘I will crush thee and wear thee out’. Whether the first translation or the second is accepted, the word ‘because’ may give the reason why the heavens will become hot and dry; the reason would be different in kind from the reason given in lines 1-3, which state Mot’s motive for killing Baal (but they are perhaps to be taken with the preceding part of Mot’s message). Another possibility is that the clause beginning with ‘because’ in line 4 explains what follows it.

The words *krs* *'ipdk* are followed by *'ank* *'isp'i*, and the pronoun may go with either the verb that precedes or the verb that follows. While it is not certain how the passage is to be arranged in lines, it is perhaps best to regard these four words as a whole line in themselves, which is comparable in length to the preceding and following lines.

III

The above discussion of CTA 5. i, 4-6 has reached the conclusion that the passage is probably to be explained consistently as a threat of what Mot intends to do to Baal, and a description of what will happen to the skies as a result. It is suggested that *'amtm* may need to be emended, unless it is legitimate to postulate the existence of an *'a-* or *h-* causative theme; otherwise, no change is made to the text. New translations of *krs* and *'ipdk* have been proposed. Lines 4-6 may thus be translated:

The skies will become hot and will shine,
because I will tear thee into pieces and eat thee

[or, because I will crush thee and wear thee out and eat thee],
the flow of thy blood will be stopped: I will kill thee.

It is a pleasure to offer this essay to a volume in honour of a friend who is an alumnus of the University of Cambridge and has contributed so much to the promotion of Semitic studies in the University of Sydney.

List of books and articles cited:

The following list is not intended to be a complete bibliography, or even a list of all the works consulted, but only a list of works that are cited by the authors' names, or by names and dates of publication.

- J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1963).
- J. Aistleitner, *Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Shamra* (2nd ed., Budapest, 1964), p. 14.
- W. F. Albright, 'Are the Ephod and the Teraphim mentioned in Ugaritic literature?', *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, lxxxiii (October, 1941), pp. 39-42.
- W. F. Albright, 'Anath and the Dragon', *B.A.S.O.R.*, lxxxiv (December, 1941), pp. 14-17.
- U. Cassuto, 'The Death of Ba^cal (Table I*B from Ras Shamra)' (in Hebrew), *Tarbiz*, xii (1940-41), pp. 169-80, especially 170-3.
- G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh, 1956), especially pp. 16-17, 102-3.
- R. Dussaud, 'Le Mythe de Ba^cal et d'Aliyan d'après des documents nouveaux', *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, cxi (1935), pp. 5-65, especially 35-6.
- T. H. Gaster, 'Folklore Motifs in Canaanite Myth', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1944), pp. 30-51, especially 34-6, 47-9.
- T. H. Gaster, *Thespis* (New York, 1950), pp. 185-6, 448-9; 2nd ed. (Garden City, 1961), pp. 201-3.
- H. L. Ginsberg, 'The Epic of ^clyn-b^cl' (in Hebrew), *Tarbiz*, iv. 1 (1932), pp. 106-19.
- H. L. Ginsberg, 'The Rebellion and Death of Ba^clu', *Orientalia*, N.S. v. (1936), pp. 161-98, especially 186.

- H. L. Ginsberg, 'Did Anath Fight the Dragon?', *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, lxxxiv (December, 1941), pp. 12-14.
- H. L. Ginsberg, 'Poems about Baal and Anath', in J. B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton, 1950), pp. 129-42, especially 138; the translation of the passage is unchanged in the second (1955) and third (1969) editions.
- C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome, 1965).
- J. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan* (Leiden, 1957), pp. 27, 47; his understanding of the passage is unchanged in the second edition (1965), pp. 30-31, 56.
- N. C. Habel, *Yahweh versus Baal: A Conflict of Religious Cultures* (New York, 1964), pp. 94-5, 110.
- A. Jirku, *Kanaanäische Mythen und Epen aus Ras Shamra-Ugarit* (Gütersloh, 1962), pp. 56-7.
- A. S. Kapelrud, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts* (Copenhagen, 1952), pp. 119-20.
- E. W. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon* (London, 1863-93).
- F. Lokkegaard, editorial notes in F. F. Vvidberg, *Weeping and Laughter in the Old Testament* (Leiden and Copenhagen, 1962), p. 23.
- J. C. de Moor, 'Ugaritic *tkh* and South Arabian *mtkh*', *Vetus Testamentum*, xiv (1964), pp. 371-2.
- J. C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba^llu According to the Version of Ilmilku* (Neukirchen, 1971).
- M. H. Pope, review of the second edition of J. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan*, in the *Journal of Semitic Studies*, xi (1966), pp. 228-41, especially 240.
- C. Virolleaud, 'La mort de Baal. Poème de Ras-Shamra (I*AB)', *Syria*, xv (1934), pp. 305-36.