

REMARKS ON KTU 1.96

Michael C. Astour

At the session of June 3, 1960, Charles Virolleaud reported to the French Academy of Inscriptions on a short mythological text in Ugaritic that had been discovered at Ras Shamra six months earlier. His report included a full transliteration of the tablet RS 22.225 and its tentative translation and interpretation¹. It is a very small tablet, 6 by 9 centimeters, and the text in question is written only on one of its faces, while the other side is covered by an excerpt from an Akkadian syllabary. It looks thus as a first draft or an exercise, perhaps copied from the middle of a longer poetic composition. By its protagonist, the text seems to be related to the great cycle of Baal, but its strange contents and obscure vocabulary make it unique in Ugaritic literature. No wonder that the search for its meaning caused a certain controversy among those dealing with the text. This will form the subject of the present paper, and for the reader's convenience I shall begin by bringing here the text KTU 1.96 in transliteration:²

- 1) ^cnt.hlkt.w šrwṯ.
- 2) tp.ahh.w n^cm.ahh
- 3) k ysmsm.tspi.širh
- 4) l.bl ḥrb.tšt.dmh
- 5) l bl.ks.tpnn.^cn
- 6) bty.^cn btt.tpnn
- 7) ^cn.mḥr.^cn.pḥr
- 8) ^cn.tḡr.^cn.tḡr
- 9) l tḡr.ttb.^cn.pḥr

- 10) ℓ p \dot{h} r.t \dot{t} b.^cn. m \dot{h} r
 11) ℓ m \dot{h} r.t \dot{t} b.^cn.b \dot{t} y
 12) ℓ b \dot{t} y.t \dot{t} b.^cn.b \dot{t} t³
 13) ℓ b \dot{t} t. t[t \dot{t} b.^cn.t \dot{g} r]⁴
 14)
 15)⁵

Thus the acting character of this poetic fragment is the well-known West-Semitic goddess Anath. Two words in the first lines of the text were new to Virolleaud when he reported on it: *šwt*, 3d p. fem. sg. perfect of a verb ŠNW, and the noun *tp* which, with ^c*n^m* (literally, "loveliness, charm"), was the object of that verb. Proceeding from the context, he tentatively rendered *šwt* "she regarded" or "she admired"; as for *tp*, he left it without translation. But on March 6, 1962, knowing that I was interested in the text, he informed me, with his invariable kindness to his former students, that he now understood *tp aḥh* as "her brother's timbrel" and ^c*n^m aḥh* as "her brother's melodious voice", because *tp* (=Heb. *tōph*) was found in another new Ugaritic text along with *knr* "lyre", *t \dot{t} b* (another musical instrument)⁶, and *mšltm* "cymbals"⁷. The text in question was published by Virolleaud a few years later⁸. It describes the banquet of *rpu mlk^clm* (perhaps a dead and divinized ancient king) in the company of several gods, including *Hd r^cy* "Hadd (alternate name of Baal) the Herdsman" who sings and plays (*dyšr w y \dot{a} mr*) the four aforementioned instruments. *Tp* also occurs, in an equally unmistakable context, in another text of the same bunch⁹ which technically belongs to the same type as our KTU 1.96: it also begins *in medias res* and is also written on one side of the tablet, while the other side carries an unrelated list of Ugaritian kings¹⁰. The phrase *w rm t \dot{p} h* (lines 1 and 5) alternates with (*w*) *rm t \dot{t} bm* (lines 3 and 8); each of these four occurrences is followed by a line ending in ℓ ^c*n^m*. *Rm* can only mean here "loud sound", short for an expression like *qōl rām* in Deut.27:14, as pointed out by Virolleaud¹¹; this provides a perfect analogy to the use of ^c*n^m* (often applied to singing and music in Ugarit and the Old Testament)¹² as short for "melodious" or "harmonious voice"¹³.

šwt has not been found yet in any other Ugaritic text. But it is certain that the underlying verb must be a transitive one. Attempts at postulating an intransitive

meaning for *šmw* (such as E. Lipiński's "Anath went, getting ever more inflamed"¹⁴ or J. Sanmartín's "Anath goes, nay she runs"¹⁵) leave line 1 without a syntactic link to what follows. If the author meant to convey the idea that Anath's "getting inflamed" or "running" was caused by her brother's *tp* and *n^cm*, this would have been explicitly indicated by the preposition *ʿl* in the sense of "on account of"¹⁶. The question is whether the root *šnw* has a cognate in some other Semitic language which could shed light on its semantics. In my 1963 study of KTU 1.96¹⁷ I made note of the existence of an Arabic root *sana* (SNW) "to shine" *et sim.*, but at that time I saw no connection between it and the expected meaning of Ugaritic *šmw*. The reason was that I relied on a dictionary which, as I soon found out, was inadequate for comparative linguistic research¹⁸. A couple of years later, Lipiński used the same entry of the same dictionary for establishing (with a twist) his interpretation of *šmw* and declared thereby: "It seems improbable that Semitic languages should have had two primary roots *šmw*, of which one would signify 'to shine' and the other, 'to admire' "¹⁹. There is nothing improbable in such a presumption. Identical roots can have different meanings in different Semitic languages (enough to mention the root *ʾmr* which means "to see" in Akkadian, Ugaritic and Ethiopian, but "to say" in Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic). In Arabic itself, many lexical entries combine two, three, or more homonymous and semantically unrelated roots. As we shall see, the root *sana* itself has also the meanings of "to irrigate" and "to draw water". Moreover, a verb may undergo significant changes of meaning in its various conjugations²⁰. The verb in question, *sana*, in its III conjugation (conative)²¹, signifies "to treat somebody with sweetness and kindness; to attract somebody by amiable words or ways". This is already fairly close to the semantic range of *šmw* as required by its context, but the X conjugation of the Arabic verb²² brings us even closer: "to find (somebody or something) beautiful, brilliant, or great, exalted". This is exactly what is conveyed by "admire"²³.

The rhythmic structure of lines 2-3a poses a problem. If they are to be considered a single verse - *tp aḥḥ w n^cm aḥḥ k ysmsm* - it may sound too heavy compared to the preceding and the following verses. Therefore Lipiński excised *w n^cm aḥḥ* as an unnecessary doublet of *tp aḥḥ*, inserted for some private reason by the scribe who

copied the text²⁴. This was approved by Sanmartín²⁵ and followed, without explanation, in Cazelles' translation²⁶. But it is very unlikely that a scribe (perhaps an apprentice) who wrote down a short excerpt on a casual tablet would have altered and expanded the text out of a personal whim. In general, one should keep in mind C.H.Gordon's judicious advice to metric perfectionists²⁷ and to take the verse as it has been transmitted²⁸. After all, pairs of words connected by *status constructus* (such as, in our case, *tp ahh* and *n^cm ahh*) were counted as metric units in Ugaritic prosody, so that two of them plus a third element (in our case, *k ysmm*) formed a verse of the most common pattern with three stressed words. We thus divide and translate lines 1-3a as follows:

- 1) Anath went and admired
- 2) her brother's timbrel and her brother's lovely voice,
- 3a) for he/it²⁹ was beautiful.

There were other proposals advanced for the understanding of these verses. H. Cazelles came, in passing and without much elaboration, with an ingenious and seemingly plausible solution³⁰. He indicated, with right, that "Arabic *šmw* [misspelling for *smw*], which explains the Ugaritic *šmw*, does not only signify 'to be bright' but, in the first place, 'to irrigate the soil' or 'to draw water' ". Thus the first verse became a complete sentence in itself, which Cazelles rendered by "Anath went to draw water" and linked it with the enumeration of what he took to be water springs in the second part of our fragment. But this did not leave the second verse without predicative, for Cazelles translated it (after throwing out the allegedly redundant *n^cm ahh*) by "she sees that her brother is attractive". In other words, he saw in *tp* not a noun but a verbal form, which he did not explain, but which he evidently took for 3d p. sg. fem. impf. of the root PH "to see, espy". As it happens, the consonant *h* does not stand here, as in Hebrew, for an original *ultima w* or *y*, but is the second radical of the biconsonantal root PH and, as such, is never omitted in Ugaritic writing³¹. Thus collapses Cazelles' construction of the passage.

We have already met Lipiński's assertion that *šmw* meant "she (Anath) was inflamed". He needed this meaning to conform to his integrally sexual interpretation of the text. In support of it, he claimed that one of the nuances of Arabic *sana* was "s'enflammer" and referred to Wehr's dictionary³². But he misquoted Wehr whose

definition of the verb in question was, in the German edition, "glänzen, strahlen, leuchten; aufflammen (Blitz)", and in the English, "to gleam, shine, glisten, be resplendent, radiate; to flash (lightning)". Thus the action of the verb *sana* has a purely optic, luminous, by no means a thermal effect and this verb cannot be used for making its Ugaritic cognate *šwt* to mean (following Lipiński's imagery) that Anath was in heat.

Lipiński rejected the translation of *tp* by "timbrel". "Unfortunately", he wrote, "this interpretation does not fit the context. The noun n^c_m must designate a sweet, delicate, delicious object or place... The parallel term *tp* cannot be but a noun with the preformative *t-*, formed from the root *wpy* 'to be beautiful' "³³. This reasoning is strange, coming from Lipiński who, as we have seen, removed *w n^c_m aḥh* as an interpolation and thus deprived himself of the parallelism from which he tried to proceed. But let us compare the odds. On the one hand, the Ugaritic poetic texts quoted above firmly attest to *tp* as "timbrel". In one of them, *tp* is associated with n^c_m (as in KTU 1.96); in another, it is played by Baal himself (who was, of course, Anath's brother). The word, with the same meaning, also exists in Hebrew (*tōph*, pl. *tuppīm*), Aramaic (*tuppā*), and Arabic (*duff-*)³⁴. On the other hand, the postulated **tōpt* is not found in any Semitic language, and the root WPY>YPY, from which it is theoretically derived, does not appear in Ugaritic in any meaning³⁵.

Lipiński claimed to have found an occurrence of **tōpt* "beauty" in Ezech. 23: 13b. It belongs to a poetic speech in which the king of Tyre is identified with a mythical being who dwelt in Eden, the garden of God³⁶, and was decked in all kind of gems. Then follows: *w^ezāhāb mal'eket tuppekā un^eqābekā bāk b^eyōm hibbāra'ākā kōnāmū*. Lipiński adduced Jerome's translation of the passage: *aurum, opus decoris tui, et foramina tua, in die qua conditus es, praeparata sunt*. After lopping off the first and the last words of the Hebrew and Latin versions, Lipiński characteristically rendered the rest "Thy beautiful penis and thy orifices were upon you since the day when thou wast created"³⁷. Jerome certainly mistranslated *tuppekā un^eqābekā* because he did not understand the latter term, a *hapax*³⁸; but the phraseology of his version, and of course of the unutilated Hebrew original, clearly shows that the passage deals not with corporeal organs but with artifacts wrought in gold.

Thus *tuppekā*, here as everywhere else, are quite simply "thy timbrels", and the associated *n^eqābekā* must be understood as "hollowed, perforated musical instruments", i.e. "thy flutes". Indeed, a derivative of Arabic *naqaba* (same meaning as in Hebrew), *naqāb*, signifies "pipe, flute"³⁹. Ezech.28:13b should therefore be translated: "And of gold was the workmanship of thy timbrels and thy flutes; with thee, on the day that thou was created, they were prepared". Ezechiel, who was quite familiar with the world of Canaanite imagery, described the mythical denizen of the divine mountain as the musician of the supreme god - very much like *Prdmn*, the servant of Baal in the Ugaritic epic cycle, who sang and played cymbals to Baal in the heights of Mount Šapān⁴⁰. Several translations of the Old Testament into modern languages rendered Ezechiel's passage in question in the same way (barring insignificant stylistic variants) as proposed above, among them Luther's version, the Geneva Bible, King James Version, Louis Segond's French version, the Jerusalem Bible, L.L.Zamenhof's translation into Esperanto; and even the translator of the Vulgate into Spanish used "y los instrumentos músicos" for *et foramina tua*. They did not know of the Ugaritic poetic parallel and probably not of the Arabic semantic parallel either: they simply used their common sense.

This leaves Lipiński's rendering of *tp aḥh w n^em aḥh* by "her brother's beautiful penis and her brother's sweet penis"⁴¹ without its only alleged analogy in ancient Semitic literature.

We turn now to the next distich. Unlike the preceding one, it raises neither rhythmic nor lexical problems; it is its general import and implication that perplexed some of its students: 3b) she ate his flesh 4) without a knife
she drank his blood 5a) without a cup.

How could Anath do it to her brother whom, according to the Baal cycle, she dearly loved, protected, and avenged? S.E. Loewenstamm, for one, refused to accept the plain meaning of the distich; he thought rather that "some unspecified person had done so. Apparently Anat finds her brother killed by Mot."⁴² But just before, Anath heard her brother's timbrel and voice - he was thus still alive. Let us not strive to impose a uniform system upon Ugaritic mythology. The Ugaritians, being pagans, had no official creed and did not fear to record contradictory versions. The

circumstances of, and the responsibility for, Baal's death are very different in the main poetic cycle and in KTU 1.12. Our fragment presents still a third version. Eating a god's flesh and drinking his blood had nothing to do with enmity or hatred: it was an immemorially old ritual of communion.

The first publisher of KTU 1.96, Virolleaud, took the distich literally. He recalled other instances of Anath's violent and murderous behavior in Ugaritic literature and adduced an extraneous parallel - the tearing apart of Actaeon by his own hounds at the behest of Artemis⁴³. In my own study of the text, I showed that analogous rituals are attested elsewhere among ancient West Semites and, very prominently, in Greek Bacchic cults, in which rending a living being with mere hands and teeth (*sparagmos*) and eating its flesh raw (*ômphagia*) was a central rite, reflected in a number of myths about Dionysus and his avatars (of whom Actaeon was one); I also recalled the role of the timbrel as the instrument *par excellence* in the performance of the wild Bacchic revels⁴⁴. M. Pope also gave our text a straightforward explanation; he, on his part, compared Anath's gory action with a myth of the Egyptian goddess Sekhmet and, especially, with what the Hindu religion tells about the goddess Kali⁴⁵. H. Cazelles, although he wrote after Lipiński, chose the direct meaning of the crucial words and noted: "I would even believe that... Anath acquired a supplementary power by eating the flesh and drinking the blood of her brother."⁴⁶

But for Lipiński, "the translations of these lines given by Ch. Virolleaud and M.C. Astour are quite unsatisfactory."⁴⁷ He saw in KTU 1.96 a description of Anath's conception and, to fit his theory, rendered practically every noun in it by "penis". I do not deny the existence of phallic cults and hierogamic feasts in the ancient world; what I deny is that this particular text has to do with them. When it comes to Lipiński's own concrete interpretation of the verses in question, he is strangely reticent. One looks in vain in his lengthy article for his idea of what exactly happened between Anath and Baal. In one place, speaking about lines 5b-13, he remarked that "undoubtedly they can all refer to carnal union and express its different aspects."⁴⁸ Should we conclude that "eating his flesh" and "drinking his blood" allegorically depicts Anath's taking in of Baal's penis and absorption of his semen? That is how Sarmartín thought that he understood Lipiński's view,⁴⁹ but Lipiński

himself did not say it. Elsewhere, dealing with the same lines, he stated: "In short, Baal's penis which Anath has swallowed is active in her inwards and seeks to impregnate her."⁵⁰ This implies that Anath had bitten off Baal's *membrum virile* - a most brutal and cruel act of *sparagmos* and *ōmophagia*, not so very different from the interpretation that Lipiński had rejected as "quite unsatisfactory". To be sure, such a situation does occur in the Hurrian myth of the Kingship in Heaven⁵¹, but as an episode of struggle for power between male gods, with no erotic connotation whatsoever⁵². For Anath, as a female, there was an easier way of conceiving.

Indeed, there is a fragment of the Baal cycle (KTU 1.11), which Lipiński quoted in support of his interpretation but which actually refutes it. Here are its first lines:

- 1) [*aliym.b^cl*]⁵³ .*ytkh.w yihd.b qrb[h]*
- 2) [*btlt.^cnt.t*]*t^ckh.w tihd.b ušr[h]*⁵⁴

- 1) [Aliyan Baal]⁵⁵ and took hold of [her] vagina,
- 2) [The Virgin Anath]..... and took hold of [his] penis.

This is followed by a few broken lines which mention conceiving, birth, and the birth-assisting goddesses Kosharot.

Hence follow two basic conclusions: (a) the hierogamy of Baal and Anath took place as a perfectly normal, heterosexual intercourse, and (b) when Ugaritians, like other peoples of the ancient Near East, wanted to speak of sexual relations, they did it in a straightforward manner, called a spade a spade, and did not involve themselves in obscure allegories.

Another explanation of KTU 1.96, also allegoric but less contrived, was advanced by A. Caquot⁵⁶. He retained Lipiński's *tp* "beauty", but rendered *šnw* "she saw" and did not accept the sexual exegesis of the text. Instead, he thought, "it may signify that Anath, the Spring, absorbs the substance of her brother, the rain water". Much of it is based on the assumption that the name of Anath (*^cnt*) derives from *^cn* "spring"⁵⁷. But the etymology of *^cnt* is too uncertain to draw mythological conclusions from it. Besides, a spring does not absorb but emits water; the ancients strictly distinguished celestial and subterranean waters. And even if "Baal's blood" could be used as a metaphor for "rain" (of which there are no examples), how does "Baal's flesh" enter the equation? One tends to suspect - especially in

view of Caquot's hostile reference to my alleged "pan-Semitism"⁵⁸- that he rejected the translation of *tp* as "timbrel" and the literal meaning of lines 3a-5a precisely because of their overt analogies to Bacchic cults and rites⁵⁹.

As for the last lines (5b-13) of the text, their connection with the preceding lines is not clear. Their understanding depends on the meaning given to the recurring noun ^c*n*. Virolleaud, Cazelles, and Caquot took it as meaning "spring"; Lipiński (you guessed it) as an euphemism for "penis". As for me, I was impressed by the semantic association between the five nouns which occur, along with ^c*n*, in those lines: *bty* (Akk. *būšu*, *bušū*) "goods", *btt* (Akk. *bašitu*) "possessions", *mḥr* (Akk. *maḥīru*) "market", *pḥr* (Ugar.; Akk. *puḥru*), "assembly", and *tgr* "gate". This evokes the image of a market place near a city gate, full of merchandise and congregated people. Hence I understood the passage in the sense that Anath turned her eye (*tpnn* ^c*n*) from one of these items to another, in sequence, and then returned her eye (*ttb* ^c*n*) in the reverse direction, as if surveying the scene before some action⁶⁰. The text stops before it allows us to perceive what Anath intended to do.

-
- 1) *Un nouvel épisode du mythe ugaritique de Baal*; CRAIBL, 1960, 180-86.
 - 2) Following KTU 1.105, which provides the word dividers which were omitted in Virolleaud's publication.
 - 3) KTU puts here *btt* into brackets, while Virolleaud's transliteration does not. Anyway, the word is required here by the iterative structure of the passage.
 - 4) Thus restored by Virolleaud and KTU.
 - 5) The two last lines of the tablet are missing according to Virolleaud.
 - 6) In his publications of this and another text in U 5, 553 and 561, Virolleaud tentatively translated it "flute", and it is still the most probable translation.
 - 7) In point of fact, *tp* "timbrel" appears in a previously known text, KTU 1.16 I-II 41, but the sign *t* was indistinct and the word division unclear. It was recognized there by WUS, N. 2794; thus also KTU, *l.c.*, and C.H.Gordon's translation, *Poetic Legends and Myths from Ugarit: Berytus*, 25 (1977), 52.
 - 8) U 5, ch. IV, No. 2 = KTU 1.108. The relevant lines are obv. 3-4.

- 9) *Ibid.*, No.5 = KTU 1.113, obv.
- 10) First published as KTU 1.113, rev.
- 11) Virolleaud believed that the possessive suffix in *tph* referred to Baal, as in KTU 1.108 and KTU 1.96.
- 12) Cf. KTU 1.3 I 18-19: *qm ybd w yšr mšltm bd n^cm*; II Sam. 23,1: *nā^cīm z^emirōt Yiśrā'el*; Ps. 81,3: *še'ū zimrā ut^enū tōph, kinnōr nā^cīm^c im-nābāl*.
- 13) As proposed in Virolleaud's quoted letter and in his commentary to his text No. 5 = KTU 1.113, obv.
- 14) *Les conceptions et couches merveilleuses de^c Anath: Syria*, 42 (1965), 47, 56.
- 15) *Glossen zum ugaritischen Lexikon (II)*: UF, 10 (1978), 354, on the basis of Akk. *šanū* "probably 'to run'"; but in Akk. the verb is applied only to hoofed animals (horses, donkeys, oxen).
- 16) See UT, § 10.14, and WUS No. 2030: ^cl 5 "wegen", both with examples. Sanmartín's explanatory addition (in parantheses) of "wegen" in his translation contradicts the attested Ugaritic usage. The same goes for the highly contrived syntax of Lipiński's translation of lines 1-5a.
- 17) *Un texte d'Ugarit récemment découvert et ses rapports avec l'origine des cultes bachiques grecs*: RHR, 164 (1963), 1-15.
- 18) H. Wehr, *Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Sprache der Gegenwart*, Leipzig 1956² (English edition ed. by J.Milton Cowan, Cornell U.Press, 1961).
- 19) Lipiński, 47.
- 20) See the relevant entry in A.de Biberstein Kazimirski, *Dictionnaire arabe-français*, Paris 1846, I, 1154-1155, for a number of other meanings, which are not included in Wehr's dictionary.
- 21) Formed by lengthening the first radical (*qātala*) and indicating the direction of the action toward another person. The existence of this conjugation (designated L) in Ugaritic is assumed in UT, § 9.36.
- 22) Form *istaqtala*, which often has the meaning "to consider somebody/something as ..". Admittedly, there is a difference in grammatical structure; but Ugaritic and Arabic grammars are not identical, and the Arabic system of conjugations is believed to be relatively recent.
- 23) I shall limit myself to translating an entry from the well known, extensive dictionary of the French language by P.Robert, I, Paris 1983, 53: "*admire* II: to contemplate with admiration: to find beautiful, charming, imposing, marvelous, sublime".
- 24) Lipiński, 59-60.
- 25) Sanmartín, 354. But he left free the choice of the alleged doublet to be eliminated.
- 26) H.Cazelles, *Essai sur le pouvoir de la divinité à Ugarit et en Israël*: U 6, 25-44, see 28 n. 20.

- 27) UT, n.2 to § 13.107.
- 28) Thus did A. Caquot, *Notes de lexicographie ougaritique: Actes du I^{er} Congr. Int. de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique*, The Hague 1974, 203-208, see 207.
- 29) It is not clear whether the adjective *ysmsm* "beautiful" modifies "her brother" or "lovely voice". In Ugaritic, the verse has considerably fewer syllables than in English translation.
- 30) Cazelles, *l.c.*
- 31) The frequently used root PH is attested only in Ugaritic, though it is possibly a cognate of Arabic *ba'aha* (not *bāha*, as in WUS, No. 2205) "to espy, to catch sight of". See the occurrences of PH in its various persons and tenses in WUS, *l.c.*, and UT, § 19.2205: the *h* is never missing; cf especially *hlm^c nt tph ilm*; *hlm ahh tph*. The same is true for other roots ending in *h*, like Ugar. and Heb. NGH, Heb. BLH, YQH, or the quoted Arabic B'H.
- 32) German ed., 397; English ed., 496. Also Kazimirski, I, 1154, mng. 4.
- 33) Lipiński, 60.
- 34) On the ritual role of the timbrel, see n. 44 below.
- 35) *Yāpha* "to be beautiful" is restricted to Hebrew and South Canaanite (to judge from the Bronze Age toponym *Yapu*). It is supposed to be cognate to Arabic *wafa* and Syriac *yafā*, but their meanings are quite different.
- 36) In the same chapter, v.16, the place is called "mountain of God".
- 37) Lipiński, 50-51. But whoever has heard of a human being, real or mythical, whose genitals and body openings were *not* created at the same time as he or she?
- 38) So did, in a totally different way, the LXX: "and hast filled (reading *ml² t* instead of *ml² kt*) thy treasures and thy stores with gold".
- 39) Kazimirski, II, 1319, *naqāb* mng. 4.
- 40) KTU 1.3 I 18-21.
- 41) Lipiński, 52.
- 42) *The Ugaritic Fertility Myth - a Reply*: IEJ, 13 (1963), 131 and n. 7 (with an unconvincing grammatical explanation).
- 43) Virolleaud, 183-84.
- 44) Cf. n. 17; briefly in *Hellenosemitica*, Leiden 1965, 1967², 180-81. Whoever is interested, can find about Dionysus, his avatars, his rituals, and their Semitic parallels *ibid.*, 163-212. Concerning the timbrel, cf. additionally the chorus song in Euripides' *Bacchae*, 120-69, and the song of the initiated, reported by Psellus and quoted in J. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, Cambridge 1922³ (reprint New York 1957), 568 n.2, 569.
- 45) M. Pope, *The Goddesses Anat and Kali*: 26th Int. Congr. of Orientalists, New Delhi 1964, 15-16. Also W.F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, London 1968, under-

stood the passage literally and agreed with my adduction of Dionysiac parallels to it.

- 46) See n.26 above.
- 47) Lipiński, 46.
- 48) Lipiński, 58.
- 49) See n. 15 above. W.G.E. Watson, *Gender-Matched Synonymous Parallelism in Ugaritic Poetry*: UF, 13 (1981), 186, thought that "the precise nature of the sexual allusion here was first identified by Sanmartín"; he has evidently not read Lipiński's pioneering study. CML² left KTU 1.96 without translation, but on p.32 characterized it as "a mythological text describing in picturesque and euphemistic language a love-affair between Baal and Anat". A.S.Kapelrud, *The Violent Goddess*, Oslo 1969, 44, unreservedly accepted Lipiński's interpretation of the text.
- 50) Lipiński, 61.
- 51) English translation by A.Goetze, ANET, 120-21.
- 52) Lipiński, 56, asserted that "a passage of the Assyrian Dream Book...confirms in a remarkable manner our interpretation". He referred to a tablet in A.L.Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East*, Philadelphia 1956, 270-74 (translation), 314-18 (transliteration). It lists hundreds of dreams about eating, which include all kind of meat and parts of body of various animals, living and dead human beings, the dreamer's own flesh, birds, bricks, sand, faeces, asphalt, naphta, etc. Two of the dreams deal with eating the dreamer's own penis and the penis of his friend. Taken in their vast context, these dreams have obviously no special sexual significance.
- 53) The beginnings of lines 1 and 2 have been restored according to the subsequent lines and the dimensions of the lacunae.
- 54) In previous editions of the text, the last preserved letter of line 2 was taken as a damaged *k* and the resulting *ušk[h]* was translated "[his] testicle(s)". TOu, 289 and n.2 corrected it to *ušr[h]* "[his] penis" on the basis of a text that was at that time still unpublished and which was referred under a wrong number. The text, RS 24.247, which belongs to a Ugaritic version of part of the *šumma izbu* series, has since been published twice: by M.Dietrich-O. Loretz-J. Sanmartín, *Der keilalphabetische šumma izbu-Text RS. 24.247+265+268+328*: UF, 7 (1975), 133-40, and A.Herdner, U 7, 44-60. The word *ušrh* occurs in line 47 according to the numeration of the former publication and in line 22, according to that of the latter. Its meaning was established from Akk. *išaru*, *ušaru*.
- 55) The meaning of the verb *tkh* is unknown; see TOu, 238-39 n. f.
- 56) A.Caquot, *Problèmes d'histoire religieuse*: M.Liverani (ed.), *La Siria nel Tardo Bronzo*, Roma 1969, 61-76, see 76-77; TOu, 87; and *art.cit.* in n.28 above, 207.
- 57) An idea earlier expressed by Virolleaud and Cazelles in their quoted articles.
- 58) In his 1969 article (see n.56), *l.c.*; cf. also his 1974 article (see n.28), 206.
- 59) On the traditional aversion to the idea of early Greco-Semitic cultural connections see the recent book by M.Bernal, *Black Athena*, I, London 1987.
- 60) Astour, article named in n.17, 6-8.