THE AKKADIAN "PANTHEON" LIST FROM UGARIT

John F. Healey

The term "pantheon" is used here not to refer to the gods of Ugarit in general but to a particular god-list extant in two Ugaritic copies and an Akkadian one. This composition has frequently been used by students of Ugaritic religion for the light that the syllabic equivalents throw on the nature of the individual Ugaritic gods. Thus the apparent equation of Rešep and Nergal tells us more about Rešep than any Ugaritic text.

However, this way of using the texts presupposes answers to fundamental questions about the nature and purpose of the composition itself and about the relationship between the Ugaritic and Akkadian. With regard to the latter, how safe is it to use the Akkadian for enlightenment on the Ugaritic ?

There have been some earlier discussions which touch on aspects of these questions. J. Nougayrol's commentary on the Akkadian[1] is the fullest and remains fundamental. In addition we may note the discussion of these texts included by J.C. de Moor in his discussion of the general pantheon[2]. Other lists are extant from Ugarit, some of the Mesopotamian type, others implicit in the ritual texts. Recent studies of the ritual texts by P. Xella[3] and J.-M. de Tarragon[4] contain relevant comment.

My comments fall into three parts. Firstly the manuscripts are discussed. Secondly there are comments on some individual aspects of the content. Finally an attempt will be made to evaluate the composition and answer the questions which have been posed.

THE MANUSCRIPTS. There are three tablets primarily involved:

RS 1929,7 (= CTA 29 = KTU 1.47) (alphabetic), RS 24.264+280 (= U 7, pp.1-3 = KTU 1.118) (alphabetic), RS 20.24 (= U 5, i, 18) (syllabic). Reference will also be made to a Ugaritic ritual text, KTU 1.148 obv. 1-9, which seems to be related to the "pantheon" list. De Moor[5] associates the list implicit in this text with what he calls the canonical list of the "pantheon", as does Xella[6]. KTU 1.148, it may be noted, is damaged in crucial places but it is important in later discussion.

By contrast the Akkadian text is clear and the Ugaritic tablets can be easily restored where defective by cross-reference between them and, in a few places, by resort to other Ugaritic texts. Thus in line 18 $\acute{g}rm$ $w[^cmqt]$ is completed by reference to KTU 1.148, while line 25, 'il $t^c\underline{d}r$ b^cl, is certain because of other occurrences of the phrase (including again in KTU 1.148).

It may be noted that the three main texts come from three distinct locations on the site. The older Ugaritic one is from the "High Priest" archive on the acropolis, while the other was found in a house in the area south of the acropolis (KTU 1.148 from the same location). The Akkadian text comes from the Rap'anu archive found east of the royal palaces. The distribution and the identity of the lists clearly implies that this was a fixed composition which had wide circulation.

Apart from the god-names, there are extra marks on two of the tablets which are of interest. RS 24.264 has a line drawn (carelessly, neither Ugaritic tablet being well written) after line 10, at the end of the list of Baals. It seems to mark a definite division in the text, since it is also found in the Akkadian.

More importantly, one of the Ugaritic texts (RS 24.264+280) and the Akkadian one bear marks which both original editors (A. Herdner and J. Nougayrol) regarded as tick-marks alongside the names. Although the editors reject this view, it is not impossible that these could be numerals. In the Ugaritic the wedge mark (⟨) might indicate "ten". However, since the mark does not vary from line to line, it can hardly have quantitative significance and is best taken as a check-mark of some sort[7].

This matter is not without significance. The so-called Mari "pantheon" list has offerings specified and the complete absence of offering annotations weakens the analogy between the two. It leaves open the question of whether the composition was used as a cultic reference list[8].

When we compare the three texts there is only one discrepancy. RS 1929,7 has an extra opening line: *'il ṣpn*. Some regard this as a secondary addition of an extra divine name, either the divine mountain, Ṣapānu, with the *'il* virtually as a determinative, or Baal, "the god of Ṣapānu". The difficulty about both of these hypotheses is that both the divine mountain and Baal of Ṣapānu are already accounted for elsewhere in the list (lines 14 and 4).

De Tarragon[9], it seems to me, is quite mistaken in suggesting that *'il ṣpn* is the anonymous deity of Ṣapānu, analogous to *'il'ib*, also anonymous. Unlike *'il'ib*, who is one of the most popular recipients of Ugaritic piety, *'il ṣpn* is never worshipped at all as a deity. Apart from the present text the sequence *'il ṣpn* only occurs in three places and in none of these is it in any way worshipped[10].

On the absence of *'il ṣpn* from lists of gods and offerings a short excursus is needed, since it has been restored in this context by M.C. Astour[11], J.C. de Moor[12] and, subsequently, P. Xella[13] in a lacuna in KTU 1.148. However, Astour and de Moor made this suggestion before the RS 24.264+280 text was published. Now that we have, in a sense, four texts, two without *'il ṣpn*, one with *'il ṣpn* and one with a lacuna, it is scarcely justifiable to restore *'il ṣpn* in the lacuna. KTU rightly rejects this restoration. Further, this conclusion about KTU 1.148 is confirmed by the absence of *'il ṣpn* from the second section of the text which otherwise lists again the main gods.

Undoubtedly the best and easiest explanation of *'il ṣpn* in RS 1929,7 is that it means "gods of Ṣapānu" and is the title or heading of the list[14]. And whether it is an addition or not it is clearly not an extra entry in the list of deities. Also uncertain is whether this title heads the whole list or only the first part of it, up to the line drawn after line 10.

The list as it stands, therefore, is as follows:

RS 24.264+280	RS 20.24
'il'ib	DINGIR *a-bi*
'il	*i-lum*^{lum}
dgn	^{d}*da-gan*
b^{c}l ṣpn	^{d}*adad be-el ḫuršān ḫa-zi*
5 b^{c}lm	^{d}*adad II*
b^{c}lm	^{d}*adad III*
b^{c}lm	^{d}*adad IV*
b^{c}lm	^{d}*adad V*
b^{c}lm	^{d}*adad VI*
10 b^{c}lm	^{d}*adad VII*
'arṣ wšmm	^{d}IDIM *ù* IDIM
kṯ[r]t	^{d}*sa-sú-ra-tum*
yr[ḫ]	^{d}*sîn*
[ṣ]pn	^{d}*ḫuršān ḫa-zi*
15 kṯr	^{d}*é-a*
pdry	^{d}*ḫé-bat*
^{c}ṯtr	^{d}*aš-ta-bi*
ǵrm w[^{c}mqt]	^{d}*ḫuršānu*^{M} *u a-mu-tu[m]*
['aṯ]rt	^{d}*aš-ra-tum*
20 ^{c}nt	^{d}*a-na-tum*
špš	^{d}*šamaš*
'arṣy	^{d}*al-la-tum*
'ušḫry	^{d}*iš-ḫa-ra*
^{c}ṯtrt	^{d}*ištar*$^{iš-tar}$
25 'il [t]^{c}ḏr b^{c}l	*ilānu*^{M} *til-la-at* ^{d}*adad*
r[š]p	^{d}$_{2}$*nergal*
ddmš	^{d}*dá-ad-mi-iš*
pḫr 'ilm	^{d}*pu-ḫur ilāni*^{M}
ym	^{d}*tâmtum*

30   '*ut̠ḫ[t]*   d DUG$_{BUR.ZI.NÍG.NA}$

        knr   d *is$_{ki-na-rum}$*

        mlkm ^{d}MA.LIK.MEŠ

        šlm   d $_{sa-li-mu}$

(These are Nougayrol's readings of RS 20.24. It may be noted that M.
Dietrich - O. Loretz: UF, 13 [1981], 67-68, read in line 4 [cf. 14]: ^{d}IM *be-*
-el ^{ḫ}ursag$_{Ḫa-zi}$).

THE CONTENTS. Turning to individual entries in the list, comments are
here restricted to matters which bear upon the nature of the composition and
the relation between the Ugaritic and Akkadian.

Line 1: '*il'ib*.

In a recent paper[15] W.G. Lambert finds the origin of '*il'ib* in Ilaba in
Old Akkadian texts. Ugaritologists have usually based understanding of it on
"divine father" with a meaning something like "ancestral spirit". This is the
kind of meaning suggested by the contexts in literary texts in which it occurs.
There may have been conflation of two originally distinct realities. However,
in excluding "ancestral spirit", Lambert gives great weight to the Akkadian,
although the Hurrian material from Ugarit itself seems to support the Ugarito
logists[16]. It is better simply to assume - and this is, I think, compatible
with Lambert's view - that the Akkadian here has a false etymology of a con-
fused and obscure term.

Lines 4-10: Baals.

The manner of the listing of Baals in both languages is odd. It must be
assumed that they did not need to be specified in full. There seem in fact to
have been more than seven Baals but the present list could refer to those con
nected with a particular theological or cultic (? statues) context[17].

Line 11: '*arṣ wšmm* // ^{d}IDIM *ù* IDIM.

As Nougayrol noted[18], the writing of IDIM as AŠ+AŠ (inverted) seems to
be a conscious attempt to distinguish IDIM and BE. Further he is now proved
correct in his hypothesis that the reading should be *šamû ù erṣetum* by the
publication of the newer alphabetic text. Elsewhere Ugaritic Akkadian has

^{d}*sa-mu-ú* ù ^{d}*er-ṣe-tum* for this deity[19].

Line 12: *k͟trt*.

These are the divine midwives familiar from the Ugaritic literary texts and paralleled in the Akkadian by *sasurātum*. (One supposes a plural, though Nougayrol has singular). The Akkadian word, referring to "birth-goddesses", is found, for example, in *Atra-ḫasis* (singular *šasurru/sassūru*)[20].

Lines 28ff.

The last part of the list is at first glance a strange rag-bag containing gods (*ym, šlm*), spirits (*mlkm*) and cultic equipment ('*ut͟ḫt, knr*). All of these follow *pḫr 'ilm*. "The totality of the gods" is often worshipped as a separate entity in Ugarit but it seems to have in addition a summary significance here.

'*ut͟ḫt* is a hapax in this pair of texts and is equated by Nougayrol with Akkadian *šēḫtu*[21]. It is some kind of thurible. The syllabic text seems to have improvised a combination of *pursītu* and *nignaqqu*. The cognate *šēḫtu* went unknown or unrecognised.

knr is the "lyre" but it is not provided with a recognisably Akkadian equivalent despite $^{d\,giš}$*zannaru* in U 5, i 170:6', which is preceded by a cultic vase.

Why, then, does *ym*, the god of the sea and enemy of Baal, appear here (as also in KTU 1.148) ? Could *ym* be not the god of the sea as such but another piece of cult equipment, to wit a metal sea or basin ? Nougayrol[22] alluded to this possibility and it can now be supported by the interpretation of *ym* in this sense in other Ugaritic texts[23]. If this is correct, we would have to assume the same meaning for KTU 1.148[24].

Leaving equipment we come to *mlkm*. It is fairly clear that these are powerful spirits, possibly connected with the ancestor cult[25]. The Akkadian is a rough equation, the *malikū/malkū* having had a similar role.

Finally we have *šlm*. There is a Ugaritic deity, *šlm*, who appears in receipt of offerings in cultic texts. Indeed, he is sometimes at the end of lists[26]. He does not, however, appear at all in KTU 1.148, despite a general

similarity between KTU 1.148 and our list. In fact, if this cultic text is
taken to be very closely connected with our list, serious consideration must
be given to the possibility noted but rejected by A. Caquot[27] that *šlm* here
is simply "completed" or "end". It is, however, possible that the deity is
playing a dual role here, in his own right and as the "closer" of the list[28].

DISCUSSION. Turning, then, to the questions we started with, it may be
noted firstly that the list is not random but has elements of order in it.
Lines 1-10, which are followed by a line in two texts, have all the major
gods. *'il'ib* may seem rather high on the list but in cultic terms he is one
of Ugarit's major deities and he often heads lists. It would make reasonably
good sense to have *'il'ib* at the top if he is the ancestral, if anonymous,
patron of the royal house.

Another division occurs after line 18, wherein most of the females are
assembled. These are headed by El's consort and Baal's consort. The promi-
nence of *'arṣ wšmm* and *ǵrm w°mqt* may be explained like *pḫr 'ilm* on the basis
of their having a dual role: they are entities in their own right but also
act as summary entries in the list.

Finally, as has been argued, we have the odds and ends, including cul-
tic paraphernalia.

On the other hand, against this impression of orderliness we should note
that some very minor divinities are listed, while other more important gods
are omitted. Some of these omissions can be explained away. Thus *nkl* may be
subsumed under *yrḫ*. The absence also of *šḫr* and, perhaps, *šlm* is not so very
surprising in the light of de Moor's thorough analysis of the relative impor
tance of Ugaritic gods[29]. *nkl*, *šlm* and *šḫr* do not figure in his list of twen
ty-two major deities. In fact, all the gods of de Moor's list are represented
in the present texts with the exception of *tkmn wšnm*.

The presence of unexpected minor figures in the last section need not im-
ply widespread worship. They may be specifically linked with the particular
cult-centre of which the whole list is a reflection. Thus worship of the *knr*
is only otherwise found in Ugaritic in KTU 1.148.

What, then, is the relationship between our list and KTU 1.148 ? De Moor and others after him[30] interpret KTU 1.148 as a special ritual, the *dbḥ ṣpn*, "the sacrifice of Ṣapānu" and associate our list with it. There is not, however, an exact correspondence between the two texts. One of the Baals, ^{c}*ṯtr*, *'uṯḫt* and *mlkm* are all missing from KTU 1.148. Less seriously, *'ušḫry* and ^{c}*ṯtrt* are reversed in order.

Could our list be regarded as a model for cultic practice, as assumed by Nougayrol and de Tarragon[31] ? It seems not. Out of about forty Ugaritic practical texts listing offerings to gods the list we are discussing is reflected only in KTU 1.148 and then only imperfectly. On the other hand the list certainly reflects practice both in general, because it replicates almost exactly the list of most important gods arrived at by other means by de Moor, and in particular, because it seems to be influenced by the ritual of KTU 1.148. The latter gives "the sacrifice of Ṣapānu", our list "the gods of Ṣapānu".

We turn finally to the Akkadian list. As has, perhaps, already been implied, it is widely agreed that the Akkadian is a translation of the Ugaritic. This conclusion is quite secure on the basis that the list is evidently a western composition within a religious tradition quite different from the Akkadian lists, the latter also being in evidence at Ugarit. The link with KTU 1.148 reinforces this.

The attempt to find equivalents was, however, no merely mechanical process. In some cases, to be sure, the equivalent was easy to find (as e.g. Šamaš, Sin). In others the writer seems to have exercised considerable ingenuity. Several of the Akkadian entries and equations are otherwise unattested and there seems to be no justification for Nougayrol's assumption that these are traditional equivalents at Ugarit[32].

In fact there are several types of equation. There are the traditional ones arising from the nature of the deities involved (thus, e.g., $b^c l$//Adad, *kṯr*//Ea, *ršp*//Nergal), sometimes with a more or less transparent historical and etymological connection (thus, e.g., *dgn*//Dagan, *špš*//Šamaš, though with

no sign of the incongruity of gender here involved).

Secondly there are innovative equations, where entries in the Akkadian amount to an exegesis of the Ugaritic (thus, e.g., *'il'ib, b^{c}l spn//Adad bēl ḫuršān Ḫazi, kt̠rt//sasurātum*). Some of the items in this category reveal the difficulties involved, with the supposed equivalent having little meaning from the Mesopotamian point of view (thus, e.g., *'ut̠ḫt//*^{DUG}BUR.ZI.NÍG.NA). Ingenuity is evident here, as it is in the use of the orthography of IDIM in line 11 and in the finding of an equivalent for *mlkm*.

To conclude, the Ugaritic original is fairly systematic, though based on cult rather than pure theorising. It may be a systematic abstract from the cult of a particular sanctuary or festival. If the two copies and the translation are any guide, the composition must have held a position of some importance in literary and religious circles. The Akkadian translation was produced, at least in part, in a theologically speculative way with rather uneven results. It should not be used uncritically, but the information it gives should be evaluated as far as possible in the light of the Ugaritic cultic and literary texts.

---

1) U 5, pp. 42-64. A recent discussion of this text by M. Dietrich and O. Loretz: UF, 13 (1981), 67-74, is referred to here only briefly. The paper published here with only slight modifications was delivered at the XXIXth RAI, 1982.

2) UF, 2 (1970), 187-228, especially 217-18.

3) TRU 1, especially 325-27.

4) *Le culte à Ugarit*, 1980, especially 150-62.

5) *Op. cit.*, 204. He also includes KTU 1.74 which is fragmentary. See also UF, 2 (1970), 306-12.

6) *Op. cit.*, 326-27. De Tarragon, *op. cit.*, 150 adds U 5, i, 170, but this longer text has a completely different basis.

7) The marks on the Akkadian text are varied (10 and 20 ?), but still un-
   clear. Some of the marks on the Ugaritic text seem to have been erased.

8) For the Mari "pantheon" cf. G. Dossin in *Studia Mariana*, 1950, 41-50.

9) *Op. cit.*, especially 156.

10) KTU 1.3 III 29; 1.3 IV 19; 1.101:2.

11) JAOS, 86 (1966), 279.

12) UF, 2 (1970), 309.

13) *Op. cit.*, 91, 96.

14) The possibility of a plural interpretation is noted in passing by de Tar
    ragon, *op. cit.*, 156 and TRU 1, 96, but set aside.

15) UF, 13 (1981), 299-301. De Tarragon, *op. cit.*, 156, also makes a link with
    Ilbaba.

16) I here rely on E. Laroche's equation of *ʾilʾib* with *ʾin ʾatn: eni attani*,
    U 5, p. 523. Cf. also RHA, 34 (1976), 63.

17) That there are more than seven Baals is clear from KTU 4.15. U 5, i, 170,
    seems to have about seven. We may also note Baal's weather-related quali-
    ties in KTU 1.5 V 5ff. de Moor's view (UF, 2 [1970], 219) is that the list
    indicates separate offerings to only one Baal (the *-m* suffix indicating
    plural of majesty). U 5, i, 170, and the numbers after the Baals in RS
    20.24 tell against this view. The suffix may actually be archaistic, per-
    haps with individualising force (cf. KTU 1.119:6, 28 [?]).

18) *Op. cit.*, 48.

19) PRU 4, 137: RS 18.06:6'.

20) Cf. W.G. Lambert - A.R. Millard, *Atra-ḥasīs*, 1969, p. 196 (index); cf.
    AHw, p. 1194.

21) Cf. AHw, p. 1209. See now Dietrich - Loretz: UF, 13 (1981), 68-69.

22) *Op. cit.*, 62.

23) Cf. M. Dietrich - O. Loretz - J. Sanmartín: UF, 7 (1975), 160-161,
    ḥl ym in KTU 1.41:47; 1.87: 51-52. The present author refers to this
    possibility for *ym* in KTU 1.6 v 19: cf. OrNS, 52 (1983), 249, footnote.

24) Other occurrences of *ym* in relation to offerings need further investi-
    gation. This interpretation of *ym* would not necessarily imply misunder
    standing on the part of the Akkadian but presumably the determinative
    URUDU could have been expected.

25) Cf. J.F. Healey: UF, 7 (1975), 235-38. To the repertoire of *mlkm* texts
    we can now add from U 7, RS 24.266 vo. 8 (KTU 1.119, but not reading
    mlkm) and, more importantly, a text from Ras Ibn Hani (cf. P. Bordreuil:

Syria, 57 [1980], 352-53) in which they appear to have a threatening role. See now Dietrich - Loretz: UF, 13 (1981), 69-74.

26) KTU 1.39:8; 1.41:17.

27) DBS 9 (1979), col. 1404. Caquot prefers to link *šlm* with Hurrian Keldi, "health" divinised.

28) P. Xella, TRU 1, 327, seems to adopt a dual interpretation.

29) UF, 2 (1970), especially p. 217. I have not expanded his statistics in the light of U 7.

30) UF, 2 (1970), 306ff.; TRU 1, 91-100.

31) Nougayrol, *op. cit.,* 43; de Tarragon, *op. cit.,* 151.

32) *Op. cit.,* 44.